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PREFACE

The papyri which form the subject of the present volume were obtained in the spring of 1902 from the Ptolemaic necropolis of El-Hibeh, partly by purchase, partly from our first excavations at that site, as is recorded in the Introduction. On p. 5 will be found an explanation of the remarkable fact that some of the literary papyri here edited belong to MSS. of which fragments were published by us in 1897. The papyri were, with one exception (no. 23), derived from mummy-cartonnage, and all belong to the third century B.C.

In editing the classical fragments we have continued to avail ourselves very largely of the most generous assistance of Professor F. Blass, whose weighty judgement we have followed in the authorship suggested for most of the new pieces (nos. 1-18), and to whom is due much of their reconstruction and interpretation, besides many suggestions on difficulties arising in the fragments of extant authors (nos. 19-26). With regard to the non-literary texts we have received much help from Professor J. G. Smyly, who has not only placed at our service his intimate acquaintance with the contemporary Petrie papyri, but has in many cases revised our decipherments of the texts and made suggestions for their interpretation. His knowledge of ancient mathematics has materially assisted in the elucidation of the astronomical calendar (no. 27), and without his aid we should certainly not have ventured, as we have done in Appendix I, upon the difficult, perhaps even hopeless, task of attempting to solve the perplexing problems connected with the Macedonian calendar. Our proofsheets have also had the advantage of having been read through by Dr. J. P. Mahaffy, to whose liberality we owe the insertion of a facsimile of the calendar (Plate VIII). Some assistance which we have received from other scholars on special points is acknowledged in connexion with the individual papyri.

For the interpretation of several demotic docketts appended to the Greek texts we are indebted to Mr. F. Ll. Griffith, who has generously allowed us to utilize his forthcoming edition of demotic papyri in the John Rylands Library.
A few words of explanation are due concerning the alternative years B.C. on the Julian calendar into which for the convenience of our readers the dates by the king’s reign are converted. Apart from the difficulties caused by the frequent employment of the Macedonian in preference to the Egyptian months for dating purposes, an element of uncertainty is introduced into the conversion of practically all early Ptolemaic dates into their equivalents on the Julian calendar owing to the fact that at least two systems of reckoning the king’s years were in common use, while papyri rarely provide any indication which method is being employed in a particular case. The nature of these different systems is discussed in Appendix II, but the evidence is unfortunately at present insufficient for a satisfactory explanation. Accordingly we have converted the dates by the king’s years into what (granting the correctness of the Canon of Ptolemaic kings) are their equivalents on the Julian calendar, firstly on the conventional assumption that the king’s years were reckoned from Thoth 1 of the annus vagus, the balance of days between his accession and the next Thoth 1 being counted as his 1st year, and secondly on the assumption (which is likely to be correct in many cases) that another system of reckoning the king’s years was employed, according to which the dates when expressed by the Julian calendar may be a year later than they would have been if the first system had been employed. The dates B.C. which result or may result from the use of the second system are enclosed in brackets.

In conclusion we have to beg the indulgence of subscribers to the Graeco-Roman Branch for presenting them with a memoir which on account of its length is to count as a double volume. The next memoir of the Branch, Part V of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, in which we shall begin the publication of the very important literary texts discovered in 1905–6 (cf. The Times, May 14, 1906), is already in hand, and we hope to issue it in June, 1907.

BERNARD P. GRENFELL.
ARTHUR S. HUNT.
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<td>c. 245</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Return of Corn Revenue</td>
<td>239 or 214</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Account of Olyra</td>
<td>c. 250</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Account of Rent</td>
<td>c. 260</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Account of Goats</td>
<td>250–49</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Private Account</td>
<td>251–0</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122–171</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Documents</td>
<td>3rd cent.</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The general system followed in this volume is that of its predecessors. Literary texts are printed as they appear in the originals, except for division of words, capital initials in proper names, and reconstruction, where practicable, of lacunae. Additions or corrections by the same hand as the body of the texts are in small thin type, those by a different hand in thick type. Non-literary documents are printed in modern style with accentuation and punctuation: abbreviations and symbols are resolved, while additions and corrections are usually incorporated in the text, their occurrence being recorded in the critical notes; but where special considerations make this method inconvenient, alterations in the original have been reproduced, later hands being distinguished, as in the literary texts, by thick type. Faults of orthography, &c., are corrected in the critical apparatus wherever they seemed likely to cause any difficulty. Iota adscript is printed when so written, otherwise iota subscript is used. Square brackets [ ] indicate a lacuna, round brackets ( ) the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets ⟨ ⟩ a mistaken omission in the original, braces { } a superfluous letter or letters, double square brackets [ ] a deletion in the original. Dots placed within brackets represent the approximate number of letters lost or deleted; dots outside brackets indicate mutilated or otherwise illegible letters. Letters with dots underneath them are to be considered doubtful. Heavy Arabic numerals refer to the texts of the present volume, ordinary numerals to lines, small Roman numerals to columns. On the numeration of the different mummies from which the papyri were obtained see pp. 11–12; and on the alternative years B.C. in expressing dates according to the Julian calendar see the Preface.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used in referring to papyrological publications are practically the same as those adopted by Wilcken in Archiv für Papyrusforschung, I, pp. 25–8, viz.:


Archiv = Archiv für Papyrusforschung.


P. Leyden = Papyri Graeci Musei antiquarii Lugduni-Batavi, by C. Leemans.


P. Par. = Les Papyrus Grecs du Musée du Louvre, Notices et Extraits, t. xviii, 2, by W. Brunet de Presle and E. Egger.

P. Petrie = The Flinders Petrie Papyri, Parts I and II by the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, Part III by the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy and J. G. Smyly. Our references are to Part III wherever texts previously published are reprinted there.


P. Tor. = Papyri Graeci Regii Taurinensis Musei Aegyptii, by A. Peyron.


INTRODUCTION

In February and March, 1902, while we were excavating in the Fayûm, a dealer who had been travelling in Upper Egypt brought us a large quantity of broken papyrus-cartonnage, amongst which we noticed the presence of numerous literary fragments of the third century B.C. Our work in the Fayûm was at that time drawing to an end, the available sites for the discovery of Ptolemaic papyri being exhausted, and we were naturally anxious to take at once the opportunity of finding Ptolemaic papyrus-cartonnage in a different district. With some difficulty we ascertained that the provenance of the papyri brought to us was Hibeh, on the east bank of the Nile between Benisuêf and Shêkh Fadl (Cynopolis); and as the Director-general of Antiquities most obligingly gave us permission to proceed thither at once, we were able to start work on March 24. The excavations were carried on until April 11 (Arch. Report, 1901-2, pp. 4-5), and resumed in January, 1903, for nearly a month (Arch. Report, 1902-3, pp. 1-3). In February, 1903, after examining several sites between Hibeh and Shêkh Fadl, we returned to Behnesa, which has occupied us for the last three and a half seasons.

The ruins of the ancient town of Hibeh are situated on the river bank facing the villages of Feshn and Fent. The high desert at this point approaches the river edge, leaving only a narrow strip a few yards in width available for cultivation, and providing suitable places for quarrying limestone. The town was built on rising ground, which reaches its highest point at the north-west corner of the site. The most conspicuous feature is the massive wall of crude brick, some metres thick, which protects it from attack on the north and east sides, the east wall running in a south-westerly direction to meet the river, so that the area enclosed forms with the river a kind of acute-angled triangle. Stamped bricks with the names of the princess Estemkheb, her husband Menkheperrê or their son Pinotem II, show that the walls were built under the XXIst Dynasty. Near the south end of the site stood a small temple (36 x 16½ metres), built by Shishanq and Osorkon of the XXIInd Dynasty, the picturesque ruins being now overgrown with palms. The principal entrance to the town was through the north wall, near its east corner; west of the entrance the wall becomes more than usually strong as the ground rises to a peak, and it is probable that here was the citadel. The west face of this peak has been cut away for stone; and
it is not clear whether the wall was ever continued down to the river, which, moreover, has apparently encroached slightly upon the south end of the site, washing away the original south corner of the wall. Opposite the ruins, and separated only by a channel which becomes dry in the summer, is an island about 2 miles long, which was already there in early times, for it is mentioned in the demotic papyri from Hibeh of Darius’ reign (cf. p. 7). The modern village of El-Hibeh is a poor hamlet a few hundred yards to the south of the ruins, and is combined for administrative purposes with another village on the island which contains a few hundred feddans of cultivated ground, while on the main land there is practically none. The extensive necropolis of Hibeh lies round the ancient city to the north, east, and south of the walls, and dates from New Empire to Roman times. By far the greater part of it had been dug out before our arrival, principally in 1895–6, when, as report states, an Arab dealer from the Pyramids, known as Shékh Hassan, excavated the cemetery on a large scale. From the assertions of an inhabitant of Hibeh who was then employed as a reis, it appears that the dealer met with much success, especially in the discovery of scarabs, amulets, ushabtis, statuettes, faience and alabaster vases, and other objects such as would be found in the later tombs of the New Empire. Quantities of mummies of the Ptolemaic period with papyrus-cartonnage were also unearthed, but thrown away as worthless. This is the usual fate of cartonnage found in the Nile valley proper, where, except at one or two places, native tomb-diggers until quite recently attached no value to papyrus apart from large rolls. A handful of small fragments, however, found their way to Cairo, where they were bought by us in 1896; cf. p. 5. During the next few years much plundering continued at Hibeh, among the chief finds being a number of large demotic papyrus rolls, which were discovered together in a pot inside the town close to the east wall in the southern portion of the site. These were bought in Cairo by Lord Crawford, and having passed with the rest of his papyri into the possession of the Rylands Library are now being edited by Mr. F. Ll. Griffith in the Demotic Papyri of the John Rylands Library, pp. 38 sqq. The site, especially the necropolis, had thus been thoroughly ransacked before Ahmed Bey Kamal in the year preceding our excavations was sent by the authorities of the Cairo Museum to investigate the place. His excavations, which lasted only a short time, produced no results of importance; cf. his report in Annales du Service des Antiquités, ii. pp. 84–91.

We had taken the precaution of bringing thirty workmen with us from the Fayûm, and our anticipations that the local inhabitants would not be satisfactory were fully justified. The villagers of Hibeh, having hardly any land to cultivate, earn their living by antiquity-plundering or salt-digging in the neighbouring
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desert; for regular work at the normal rate of wages they were not in the least disposed, while the inhabitants of the village on the island were not sufficiently intelligent to be of much use in the rather difficult task of clearing out the remains of a much plundered cemetery. We had no hesitation in deciding at which part of the necropolis to begin operations. The tomb which had produced the papyri brought to us in the Fayûm was about 150 yards outside the town, in a rocky ridge which faced the north wall and ran from almost the river bank towards a square brick-walled enclosure near the north-east corner of the town; and the report of Shâkh Hassan's ex-reis that wusâsh waraq ('faces of paper,' the Arabic term for papyrus-cartonnage) were to be found in this quarter was confirmed by the presence of many broken Ptolemaic mummies and limestone sarcophagi strewn about in the vicinity. The area bounded on the south by the town wall, on the north and north-east by the rocky ridge just mentioned, forms a triangular depression, of which the base is the margin of cultivation on the west, and the apex the brick enclosure on the east. The surface of the desert, which rises in an easterly direction, was to a large extent covered with loose debris, consisting partly of rubbish thrown out from the town between the time of its foundation in the XXIst Dynasty and the Ptolemaic period, with occasional accumulations of later date above the earlier mounds, partly of bricks which had fallen down from the wall or belonged to the buildings that had stood there before the Ptolemaic period, partly of limestone chips from the rock-tombs scooped out in the ridge to the north and underneath the wall itself, of which we shall speak presently. Throughout this debris at intervals were Ptolemaic burials, mostly in plain limestone sarcophagi, sometimes in rudely painted or plain wooden ones, rarely in pottery coffins, and occasionally without any sarcophagus at all. The bodies were mumified and generally ornamented with detachable cartonnage, either of cloth or papyrus, very similar in the style of decoration to the Fayûm cartonnage. In many cases the Hîbeh mummies are externally indistinguishable from those from the Fayûm; but in the Hîbeh cartonnage the lower border of the head-pieces more commonly has a white band with a red check-pattern, and in the breast-pieces, though these are sometimes very large, the interstices between the figures or other objects painted have not infrequently been cut out, while foot-pieces are generally absent, but where found are of the larger kind and do not degenerate into the two small pieces of cartonnage attached to the soles which are so common in the Fayûm. The burials in the debris were very shallow, usually not more than two or three feet from the surface, occasionally only a few inches below it, though in some parts it was necessary to dig through six or seven feet of Roman rubbish to reach the Ptolemaic level. In the lower ground,
which had been much dug by sebakhén, near the river bank damp had proved fatal to the cartonnage, and even higher up the rise was often insufficient to protect the mummies from the moisture soaking through the soil from below, particularly when they had not been buried in the stone chips. In the process of digging through the rubbish of the late New Empire period to find the Ptolemaic sarcophagi, a few antiquities, such as scarabs and amulets, were found, and in the accumulations of the Roman period some small pieces of papyrus, none of which is later than the third century. In the Roman rubbish mounds and in some places in the earlier debris we also discovered a number of plain mummies very heavily draped, especially round the face, and tied with red bands. From the levels at which these were lying and the occurrence of similarly draped mummies in the neighbouring cemetery of Maghagha (Arch. Report, 1902–3, p. 3), it appears that this style of burial continued down to the sixth century, but most of the Hibe examples were probably earlier; for in one spot near the west end of the rocky ridge, where a large number of these later burials had been made, we also found, not far from each other, two admirably preserved portrait-mummies similar to those discovered at Hawâra and Rubayyát in the Fayûm. One of these (a woman) is now in the Cairo Museum, the other (a man) in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge. A plain mummy found in the same group was inscribed Ευδας Πνεφαρως (ετους) ιγ Τραιανοβ Γερτισκεκις (a place-name?), and the portraits too no doubt belong to the second century; cf. the authoritative discussion of the dating of the Fayûm portraits by C. C. Edgar in Journ. Hell. Stud. xxv. pp. 225–33. An inscription rudely carved on a block of limestone measuring 50 x 30 cm. records the death of ] Κρ[εφτοιωτος Απιων των ἑτων καμης Φιλονίκου (ετων) γ.

The Ptolemaic burials between the rocky ridge and the north wall of the town were mainly those of the poorer classes; wealthier persons were buried in rock-tombs. Of these the south side of the rocky ridge contained a double row, one at the foot, the other a little higher up. They consisted of one or more low chambers scooped out of the rock where a convenient ledge projected, and generally had plain doors. The upper row of tombs had in places been altogether destroyed owing to stone-quarrying; and nearly all the rest, as would be expected, had been plundered anciently, while many of them had been reopened in modern times, principally by Shêkh Hassan, so that such cartonnage as we obtained from them was for the most part very fragmentary. A few untouched tombs, however, were discovered. One of these was in the west face of the corner of the ridge facing the cultivation, and contained four very large limestone sarcophagi with painted wooden coffins inside, containing early Ptolemaic mummies. The head-piece
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(of cloth) was detachable, but the other decorations were in accordance with the pre-Ptolemaic practice painted on the mummy. Another tomb had escaped the plunderer through being covered up by the debris of a house which had been built, probably at the same date as the town walls, on a depression between two peaks of the ridge. This contained eight painted wooden coffins and two of limestone, and in the debris itself numerous other mummies had been buried either with or without sarcophagi; many of these contained papyrus-cartonnage, except in one room of the house, which was filled up with mummies mostly ornamented with cloth head-pieces alone.

The tomb which produced the papyri bought by us in the Fayûm was one of the lower row of this group of rock-tombs. It had five chambers, of which four were said to have been opened by Shêkh Hassan, while the fifth, which had been walled up, escaped detection until the beginning of 1902. This information fits in very well with the remarkable coincidence that some of the literary fragments from this tomb are actually parts of the same papyri as certain literary fragments bought by us in Cairo in 1896, and published in P. Grenf. II. Of the papyri in the present volume 4 belongs to P. Grenf. II. 1, 5 to 8 (b), 11 to 6 (c), 20 to 3, 21 to 2, 23 to 4; and there are numerous additional fragments of P. Grenf. II. 7 (b), which remain unpublished. It is clear that the mummies from which these literary fragments were derived had been originally discovered in 1896 in Shêkh Hassan’s excavations, but that his workmen only took the trouble to remove a few small pieces, the remainder being left behind in the tomb until attention was redirected to it in 1902. The much damaged character of the cartonnage containing these literary fragments indicates that the mummies to which they belonged had been broken up anciently, probably in Roman times, while the comparatively well-preserved pieces of cartonnage bought with them no doubt came for the most part from the chamber which remained intact until 1902.

Opposite these two lines of rock-tombs were two other similar rows, excavated underneath the foundations of the city wall between the entrance and the north-west corner. These were also Ptolemaic, and had contained mummies with the usual cloth or papyrus cartonnage. The lower line of tombs at the foot of the rock on which the wall stands had been thoroughly plundered in Shêkh Hassan’s time, but the upper line, placed in the ledge of desert on which the lower tier of the wall rested, had escaped notice because the entrances were covered over with the debris of bricks which had fallen down from above. These tombs had in every case been opened and sometimes re-used anciently,

1 We are informed by M. S. de Ricci that in 1899 he identified a few additional fragments belonging to P. Grenf. II. 4 in the Heidelberg collection. It is to be hoped that these will soon be published.
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for not only were the mummies more or less broken up, but some scraps of Roman papyri were found in one tomb, and an inscription rudely scratched above the door of another, Τάφος 'Αφρα. Πεταχωπάρα χυθ(ιοντά) α . . . », also probably dates from the Roman period. Some fairly well preserved pieces of cartonnage were nevertheless obtained; and in one spot we found in a recess under the wall a group of twenty mummies, nineteen buried in stone sarcophagi, one in a wooden one, of which fourteen contained papyrus-cartonnage. A passage led from this recess to a subterranean chamber filled with thin painted wooden sarcophagi, but the cartonnage of the mummies inside these was uniformly cloth.

This series of rock-tombs came to an end at the town gate; underneath the remaining piece of the north wall and the outside of the whole of the east wall there were no suitable ledges under which to excavate chambers. A few isolated stone or wooden sarcophagi had been laid here and there against the wall, and there were numerous burials of the Roman period, but no papyrus-cartonnage was found. The most important discovery here was an untouched tomb beneath a small brick building adjoining the east wall near its north corner. In the debris of this building were many inscribed bases of funerary statuettes and a wooden figure of Isis, probably of the Persian period. Below the floor of one of the rooms was a square shaft eight feet deep, leading to three rudely cut chambers in the rock, the chamber on the north being divided by a wall from one beyond. Here were found several sarcophagi, some of plain limestone shaped like a mummy, others of wood. The painting on the outside of the latter approximated in style to that on Ptolemaic coffins, but some of the sarcophagi were also painted inside, a rare phenomenon in the Ptolemaic period. Two well-preserved specimens of these were brought away; one, belonging to Khonsu-tef-Nekt, is now at Brussels, the other at Cairo. The mummies had no cartonnage and were bound in thick white wrappings. Sometimes a network of small blue beads had been placed on the breast, but often the beads were merely painted on the cloth. The tomb also contained a set of four Canopic vases, a good-sized bronze statuette of Osiris, and numerous very coarse ushabtis. From the style of the sarcophagi and other objects it is clear that this burial belonged to one of the last two or three centuries before the Ptolemies.

Near the north-east corner of the wall is, as has been said, a brick-walled enclosure measuring about 75 × 65 metres, of which a photograph is given in Petrie's Methods and Aims of Archaeology, fig. 6. Report states that antiquities were found underneath the walls, a rumour which gains some confirmation from the circumstance that they have been extensively dug about in recent times.
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Within the enclosure is a natural hillock with several convenient ledges for placing rock-tombs, which have all been plundered. Ahmed Bey Kamal (Annales, ii. p. 90) states that crocodile-mummies were found in them; but some at any rate of the burials were human. The tombs, like the surrounding wall, are no doubt anterior to the Ptolemaic period; and we conjecture that they formed a private cemetery belonging to one of the chief families of Hibeh in its early days, being walled off for greater protection; like the enclosures to be found in many modern Egyptian cemeteries in the desert.

In the ground to the east of the town, along the path which leads to the modern village of Hibeh, are numerous rock-tombs under low ridges or shallow shafts leading to subterranean chambers. Previous diggings show that dogs and cats were buried in this part as well as human mummies, generally without sarcophagi, and rumour is probably correct in stating that no antiquities of value have been found there. Probably the tombs belong to the later Ptolemaic period. They are now being again used for burial purposes by the Copts. Further south beyond the town walls are more rock-tombs, chiefly in low hillocks along the margin of cultivation. Papyrus-cartonnage is reported to have been found here, but spoiled by damp; and other burials in stone sarcophagi laid only a few inches under the surface are also frequent in this quarter. No part of the south-eastern necropolis seemed promising for our purposes, and the only find of any interest was an elaborately decorated Ptolemaic mummy (now at Cairo) in a painted wooden sarcophagus inside another of heavy limestone.

A few days were devoted to the investigation of the town ruins, where, except for the group of demotic papyri found in a pot (cf. p. 3), not much seems ever to have been discovered either by antiquity-seekers or by sebahhtn, who visit Hibeh in large numbers during the summer. As we had expected, the mounds were not at all productive of papyri. In the northern part near the wall the houses were filled up with debris of bricks and contained no afsh, and the mounds further south near the river were far too much affected by damp to yield papyrus, even in the upper strata. A few houses on higher ground in the south-east quarter of the town had some afsh, but had already been much dug, and we found little save some second or third century fragments. Underneath the east wall on the inside was a series of funerary chambers cut in the rock, which had been plundered long ago. These were probably used by the pre-Ptolemaic inhabitants.

That the old Egyptian name of Hibeh was Teuzoi in the Heracleopolite nome is known from the demotic papyri found there and now being edited by
Mr. Griffith (Dem. Pap. of the John Rylands Library, p. 40); but its name in Graeco-Roman times, during which it undoubtedly continued to be inhabited, remains undiscovered. Papyri from mummy-cartonnage give little help towards the identification of the site at which they happen to be found, since mummies were often carried a long distance to be buried in a particular place. Very few of the pieces of cartonnage found in the Hibeh cemetery are likely to have been manufactured at Hibeh itself, and from internal evidence it is clear that many of the mummies came from villages on the west bank in the Oxyrhynchite nome. It is, therefore, necessary to depend mainly on the evidence provided by the scanty papyri of the Roman period found in the town and by the statements of ancient geographers; the funerary inscription mentioning the village Φιλονίκου (cf. p. 4), which in Arch. Report, 1901–2, p. 5, we provisionally identified with Hibeh, may, like the cartonnage, have been brought from elsewhere, and is therefore not a sound basis for argument.

The evidence of the Roman papyri is as follows. One petition was written by a person ἀπὸ κόμης Ψύχεως τὸῦ κάτω τοῦ Κωλίτου; a receipt mentions the κομάρχαι Ἀγκυράων, and another document Ἀσσύνα τοῦ Κωλίτου τοῦ ὑπὲρ Μέμψιν [Ἡρακλεοπολίτου] (probably, cf. C. P. R. 6. 4, &c.; but τοῦ ὑπὲρ Μέμψιν might agree with Κωλίτου; cf. 95. 5 ἐν Ὀξυρόγκουν πόλει τῆς ὑπερθεὶς Μέμψιν). A taxing list of payments arranged according to villages mentions Ἀγκυράων, Φιλονίκου (cf. the funerary inscription, p. 4), Περόνη, Ἰππώνων, Ταυμάρων, Μοῦχως, Τάλη, Ἀσσύνας, Μουχωθανή ( ), Κερκεσθειως, Κόβα, and Ψεθυνθεμή βη (cf. 33. 7). Probably all these villages were in the Κωλίτης τόπος; cf. 117, where Τάλη and Ἀσσύνα occur in an account concerning villages in the Κωλίτης, and 112. On the verso of this papyrus is a long list of Heracleopolite villages including Ἀλλαδεος[ ], Κολασον( ), Πεταχ( ), Σάβδθ(eos), Πειεφάδ(ος), Τερτούχ( ), Μοῦχως( ), Τοσα( ), Τεροφιδ(νως), Φεβεϊν(εμος), Τάσεως, Θελβάνθεως), Τοκώεως, Νοῆρεως, Θομαβδ(ος), Τεθείν(ος) (corr. from Φεβεϊν(εμος), Χανεως, Πειεφάδ(ος), Κόμα, Κρήκεως, Βουσ[ερως], Τερονα( ), Τέχθως, Θομαβδ(ος), Νέεως, Σινάρου. Several of these villages are already known from published papyri, e.g. Σάβδθης, Πειεφάδ, Νοῆς, Θομαβδης, Θελβάνθης, Τοκώης from C.P.R., Φεβεϊν(εμος) from P. Amh. 147. 2, P. Gen. 10. 2, and P. Brit. Mus. 171 b. 7, 8, where 1. ἐν Φεβεϊν(εμος) τοῦ Κωλίτου (Κωλίτου) has already been suggested by Wilcken; it can also be recognized in C. P. R. 82 (1). 4, where 1. Κωλίτου κάτω [τοῦ ὑπ. Μέμψιν. Ἡρακλ. for Κωλίτου κάτω τέρον ὑπ. Μέμψιν. Ἡρακλ.]; but most of the names are new.

Combining the evidence of these Roman papyri with the frequent references to several of the same villages (e.g. Φεβεϊν(εμος), Περόνη, Κόβα, Ἀσσύνα) in the early Ptolemaic papyri of the present volume, it is certain that Hibeh was situated in the Κωλίτης τόπος of the Heracleopolite nome. This toparchy must therefore
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have comprised the south-east portion of the nome, where it adjoined the Cynopolite, the cemetery of Cynopolis itself being only twenty-five miles south of Hibeh. That the Κωίτης, which was subdivided like many toparchies into a lower and upper division, included the whole of that part of the Heracleopolite nome which lay on the east bank is very likely, and it may even have extended to the southern portion of the Heracleopolite nome on the west bank. The references to it in the present volume, especially 78. 12-4, indicate that for some administrative purposes it was distinct from the rest of the Heracleopolite nome and almost treated as a nome itself, though owing to the absence of the Κωίτης from the two lists of nomes in Rev. Laws, it cannot have ranked officially as such. The name of the district Κωίτης suggests that there was a town called Κά or Κόλσ which was its capital, and in fact the existence in this part of Egypt of a town called Κά or Κόλς is attested in the second century by Ptolemy, and in the fifth by Stephanus of Byzantium; cf. maps iv. and viii. of Parthey's Zur Erdkunde des alten Aegyptens (Abh. d. k. Akad. in Berl., 1858). Both these authorities place Κά close to Cynopolis and on the west bank; Ptolemy's statement (Geogr. iv. 5) is εἶτα ὅμοιος νομὸς Κυνοπόλις καὶ μητρόπολις ἀπὸ δυσμῶν τοῦ ποταμοῦ Κά . . . ἦν ἀντίκειται ἐν τῇ νήσῳ (sc. the island which was formed by the division of the Nile and contained the Heracleopolite nome) Κύνων πόλις. Müller, however, suggests in his note ad loc. that Ptolemy has created two separate towns out of the two ancient names of the capital of the Cynopolite nome, Πι-ανύς ('city of Anubis,' i.e. Κύνων πόλις) and Κα-σα (Coptic Kais, the modern Κές near Benimazar). That Ptolemy's Κά, if it was the metropolis of the Cynopolite nome, is really Cynopolis under a different name is fairly certain; but in view of the new evidence for the existence of a toparchy called Κωίτης in the vicinity of the Cynopolite nome, it is possible that there was a town called Κά or Κόλς in the south-eastern part of the Heracleopolite nome, and this Κά may have been confused by Ptolemy with Kais-Cynopolis. Papyri, however, provide no evidence for the existence of Κά, and there are in any case no grounds for identifying it with Hibeh.

Two other towns mentioned by ancient geographers have a claim to be considered as perhaps identical with Hibeh, Ἀγκυρῶν πόλις and Ἰππόνυμ. Ἀγκυρῶν πόλις, which is referred to in 67. 4, 112. 74, and 117. 15, as well as in two of the Roman papyri under the form Ἀγκυρῶν (cf. p. 8), is placed by Ptolemy about midway between Aphroditopolis and Cynopolis, while Hibeh is only about 12 miles north of the point half-way between Atfih and Κές (Cynopolis). Stephanus of Byzantium, on the other hand, places the town much further north in the same latitude as the Fayüm; but the quarries at Hibeh (cf. p. 1) would well accord with his explanation of the name Ἀγκυρῶν πόλις.
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(cf. Ptol. Geogr. iv. 5, ed. Müller) 'Ἀγκ. πολ. ὡς 'Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν ὑ 'Λυντιακῷ ὄντι, ἡποίηλ ἡ ἱδίων ἢ ἦμας ἢ ἄγκυρας ἐκ τῆς παρασκευής λατομίας. The position assigned by the Itinerarium Antonini to Hipponon, midway between Aphroditopolis and Speos Artemidos, corresponds very well with the relation of Hibeh to Atfih and Benihasan, and the identification of Hibeh with Hipponon (which has already been proposed, mainly on account of the similarity of the names) would suit the fact that Hipponon was a military post of some importance; cf. the Notitia Dignitatum, which shows that the ala Apriana was stationed there, and P. Amh. 142. 16, where l. τῷ πραυποσίτῳ τῷ κάστρῳ 'Ἰππόνων. The chief objection to this identification is the silence with regard to Hipponon not only of Ptolemy, but of the Ptolemaic papyri in the present volume, although so many villages of the Κωῖτης are mentioned. If the existence of 'Ἱππόνων as a place of some importance in the Ptolemaic period is ever proved by new evidence, the probability of the identification with Hibeh would be greatly increased; but in the meantime it must be regarded as very doubtful, and the grounds for identifying Hibeh with 'Ἀγκυρῶν πόλις are quite as strong. So far as can be judged from the Ptolemaic papyri in this volume, the most important village of the Κωῖτης was Φεβίχις, which seems to have been a kind of administrative centre; cf. 106. 3 τὸ ἐν Φεβίχι λογευτῆριον τοῦ Κωῖτου. But the fact that Φεβίχις is so often mentioned in the Hibeh papyri may well be due to a mere accident; and in any case there is little justification for identifying it rather than any other village of the Κωῖτης with Hibeh, especially as the principal deity of Φεβίχις appears from 72. 2 to have been Heracles, i.e. Hershef, the ram-headed god of Heracleopolis, while the principal deity worshipped at Hibeh in, at any rate, ancient Egyptian times was Ammon, as is shown both by the sculptures in the temple there and by the demotic papyri from Hibeh which Mr. Griffith is editing.

The papyri published in the present volume consist partly of Hibeh papyri bought by us in the Fayûm, partly of the papyri discovered in our first season's excavations in March–April, 1902. These came, either from the central depression or from the rock-tombs in the ridge to the north of it (cf. pp. 3–5). The cartonnage found in the second season's excavations in January–February, 1903, which approximately equals in bulk that found in the preceding year, and was obtained either from other parts of the central depression or from the rock-tombs under the town wall, has not yet been examined. The present volume by no means exhausts the first season's results, though all the larger literary fragments and most of the better preserved documents have been included. There still remain numerous small literary fragments, some of which, if they can be fitted together, may turn out to be of value, and a
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certain quantity of non-literary documents, the publication of which is postponed for various reasons. Another selection, together with the Ptolemaic papyri found in the second excavations and the Roman papyri, will form the subject of a future volume.

It was to be expected that cartonnage from an ordinary Graeco-Egyptian site in the Nile valley would prove to consist more largely of demotic papyri than cartonnage from the Fayûm, where the Greek element in the population was particularly strong. And though the papyri of the present volume show the presence of numerous Greek settlers in Middle Egypt outside the Fayûm, the proportion of Greek to demotic in the Hibeh cartonnage is distinctly smaller than in that discovered by Flinders Petrie at Gurob and Hawâra, and apparently smaller than in that found by Jouguet and Lefebvre at Magdola, though it is larger than in the cartonnage found by us at Tebtunis, the demotic papyri from which outnumberv the Greek by two to one. In point of date the bulk of the Hibeh papyri cover the same period (from the middle of Philadelphus’ reign to the end of that of Euergetes I) as the bulk of the Petrie papyri: but the Petrie papyri contain a certain admixture of documents belonging to the reigns of Philopator, Epiphanes and even Philometor, and the oldest document in that collection is dated in the 16th year of Philadelphus (P. Petrie I. 24 (a) = III. 52 (b)), whereas the latest certain date yet discovered in the Hibeh papyri is the 25th year of Euergetes I (90; 7, 91, and 117 for palaeographical reasons may perhaps belong to the reign of Philopator); and there are not only several documents dated in the earlier part of Philadelphus’ reign (80, 97, 99, and 100), but a unique specimen of a Greek document dated in the reign of Soter (84 a).

To know which papyri belonged to which mummy is often a matter of importance in determining the place where they were written, the identity of individuals with the same names, and the range of undated pieces, since the papyri from a particular mummy tend to form a group written in the same district, often concerning the same persons, and as a rule not widely separated in date; and in the case of a number of mummies found together, parts of the same papyrus are sometimes obtained from more than one of them. We therefore append a classification of the papyri in the present volume arranged according to the mummies in the cartonnage of which they were found. The bought papyri, which all or nearly all came from a single tomb (cf. p. 5), are distinguished from the others by having A prefixed to their numbers, or, in the case of smaller fragments of cartonnage, by being called simply Mummy A. These numbers accompanying A refer not to the collective cartonnage of one mummy (as the numbers elsewhere of course do), since the different parts were not kept together
by the native finders, but to the separate pieces from which several documents have been extracted. It may therefore occasionally happen that though two 'A' papyri have different numbers, the same mummy was actually their source. Like the great majority of the papyri discovered in the excavations, the bought papyri were partly written in the Koćret τοῦνομ of the Heracleopolite nome, partly in the Oxyrhynchite nome. From the presence of such a large quantity of literary fragments, it is clear that the papyrus used in making up the cartonnage of several of the mummies (unfortunately those which have suffered most at the hands of plunderers, both ancient and modern) was obtained from a library of classical literature. It is not unlikely that this had belonged to one of the Greek settlers at Oxyrhynchus, a town at which, as its papyri of the Roman period show, Greek literature was particularly widely studied. The mummies from the first season's excavations are distinguished by numbers only. Nos. 62, 64–5, 67, 73–8, 101, 116, and 127 were found together, as were Nos. 79–100. Smaller groups of mummies from the same tomb are (a) Nos. 109–12 and 121; (b) Nos. 68–72; (c) Nos. 118–20. 23, which was discovered in the debris outside the north wall, stands apart from the following list.

A. 2. 131.
A. 4. 121, 134, 135.
A. 5. 133.
A. 6. 95.
A. 7. 72.
A. 8. 57.
A. 10. 6.
A. 11. 71.
A. 13. 78.
A. 14. 32.
A. 15. 36, 75, 105–7, 136–44.
A. 17. 88, 96, 99, 128.

No. 5. 31, 39, 84 (a)–(b), 97, 100–1, 147–8.
No. 6. 30.
No. 10. 66–70 (b), 96, 103–4, 160–5.
No. 12. 116.
No. 13. 40–4, 85, 150–1.
No. 18. 8, 63, 65, 94, 110, 157 9.
No. 25. 114.
No. 46. 113.
No. 63. 83.
No. 68. 27 (part).
No. 69. 13 (part), 17, 27 (part), 34 (part), 73 (part), 111.
No. 70. 13 (part), 34 (part), 73 (part).
No. 83. 89, 109.
No. 84. 115.
No. 87. 79.
No. 97. 28–9, 64, 92, 146.
No. 98. 81–2, 152.
No. 117. 80, 98, 153–6.
No. 126. 87.
I. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

I. Epicharmus, Γωμαι.

Mummy A. 16.9 x 14 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240, Plate I.

This is an introduction in trochaic tetrameters to a gnomic poem (l. 11), for which the authorship of Epicharmus is expressly claimed in l. 13. The Γωμαι of Epicharmus were popular at an early period, and quotations from these gnomic verses are found in Xenophon (Mem. ii. 1. 20) and Aristotle (Rhet. ii. 21. 1394 b, 13). But there were doubts even in ancient times regarding their authenticity, and according to Philochorus the collection was the work of a certain Axiopistus; cf. Apollodorus, ap. Athen. xiv. 648 d Φιλόχορος δ' ἐν τοῖς Περὶ μαντικῆς 'Αξιόπιστου τὸν ἐπὶ Λοκρὸν γένος ἐπὶ Σικυώνιον τὸν Κανώνα καὶ τὰς Γομαις πεποιηκέναι φησίν. Following this criticism recent editors (Kaibel, Com. Gr. Fr. i. pp. 133 sqq., Diels, Vorsokratiker, pp. 91 sqq.) class this section of the fragments among the γενετεκαρμεία, although it is acknowledged to include some genuine elements. What Axiopistus seems to have done is to have edited in the poet's name a number of floating extracts from the comedies of Epicharmus, with additions from other sources; and the contents of our papyrus may be recognized as part of his preface to the work. Diels supposes that Axiopistus lived in the fourth century, perhaps in the circle of Heraclides Ponticus; the papyrus (provided that Philochorus was correct, and that Axiopistus was the author) shows that he must have lived at least as early as B.C. 300, since its own date cannot be later than about B.C. 250, and should probably be placed earlier in the reign of Philadelphus. It is written in finely formed upright uncialis, and shows to the best advantage a common literary hand of this period. The τ with its broad and carefully finished crossbar is a noticeable feature.
In this, as in the other new classical fragments, many of the restorations of lacunae and suggestions in the commentary are due to Professor Blass.

1-13. 'Here are phrases many and various for you to use on friend or foe, when speaking in court or in the assembly, on a rascal, on a gentleman, on a stranger, a bully, a drunkard, or a boor, or if any one has other bad qualities for these too here are goads; here also are wise maxims, obedience to which will make a man cleverer and better in all things. A man has no need for many words, but only just one of these verses, bringing...
2. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

There would be room for a quite narrow letter like \( \gamma \) between \( \upsilon \) and \( \eta \).

22. An alteration has been made in this line, possibly by a second hand; the letters \( \gamma \) are much smaller than usual and \( \varepsilon \) of \( \tau o \nu \) are added above them. There are also traces of ink below \( \upsilon \) which may represent part of the original writing, and perhaps all the letters between \( \eta \) and \( \varsigma \) are in an erasure.

23. \( \gamma \varepsilon \gamma \eta \varepsilon \beta e \) : the dialect requires \( \gamma e \gamma a \beta e \).

2. **Epicharmus (?)**, \( \Gamma \nu \omega \mu a i \).

Mummy A.  

Fr. \((a)\) 9 x 9.2 cm.  

Circa B.C. 280–240.

Four fragments from a trochaic poem, apparently of a gnomic character, and quite possibly coming from a later part of the work of which 1 is the preface. The MS. however is certainly not the same; the calligraphic hand is similar in some respects to that of 1, but the letters are larger and more widely spaced, and in some cases the formation is different. In the second column of Fr. \((c)\), where the beginnings of a few lines are preserved, the verses are divided off by paragraphi, indicating that they were \( \mu o n \delta \sigma \tau i x o i \), each complete in itself. The only alternative would be to suppose that those lines were part of a dialogue, which is here much less probable. A curious approximation occurs in 1. 6 to a verse attributed to Epicharmus by Stobaeus (Kaibel, Fr. 258) \( \delta \tau \rho \pi o s \ \alpha \nu \theta r \alpha p o i o i \ \delta a i m o n \ \alpha \gamma a b o s \), \( \delta e \ \delta e \ k a k o s \). The papyrus has \( \epsilon t r o p o s \ \alpha \nu \theta r \alpha p o i o i \ \delta a i m o n \), apparently in the same position of the verse (cf. note \( \alpha d \ \lambda o c \)), but the letter following \( \delta a i m o n \) is not \( \alpha \); probably, therefore, \( \epsilon t r o p o s \) is not a mistake and the line ended quite differently. This verbal coincidence is therefore an insufficient argument for assigning the fragments to the \( \Gamma \nu \omega \mu a i \) of Epicharmus; it is moreover to be observed that they fail to show the Doric dialect appropriate to that work (cf. l. 5 \( \alpha \gamma h \eta s \), l. 8 \( \epsilon \zeta \pi a t \eta \kappa e i v \)).
objection, however, is inconclusive, for dialect is frequently obscured (cf. notes on 1.4 and 23); and, apart from Epicharmus, we are at a loss for an author of γνώμαι μονόστιχοι in trochaic tetrameters. On the verso are the remains of a cursive document.

4–6. The three initial epsilons are in a vertical straight line, and it therefore seems practically certain that they are the first letters of the verses; for although, so far as the metre goes, the first foot in each might be the third of the verse, it is most unlikely that the two preceding feet would have occupied exactly the same space in three consecutive lines. Of the first ε of ἐπικαλυπτέται only a small speck of the base remains, but this suits ε; the letter following appears to be ν. not π. The cyclic dactyl at the beginning of l. 6 is very unusual.
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3. Sophocles, Tyro (?).

Mummy A. Fr. (c) 9.9 x 11.4 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. Plate II (Frs. b and f).

A number of fragments containing tragic iambics, but in very bad condition. This is largely due to the fact that the breast-piece from which they are derived, instead of being left in a solid sheet, was, according to a not uncommon fashion, cut into an open-work pattern, causing large gaps, and rendering the remainder much more fragile than it would otherwise have been. The pattern has assisted us in assigning their position to a few of the pieces, but the others remain unplaced and the total result is disappointing. This is the more regrettable since it appears not improbable that, as Prof. Blass has suggested, the play in question is the Tyro of Sophocles. Tyro was the mother of twin sons, Pelias and Neleus, by Poseidon, and was persecuted by her step-mother Sidero, who was eventually killed by Pelias. In l. 39 of the new fragments there is a mention of the river Alpheus, which is in keeping with the fact that the adoptive country of Tyro’s father, Salmoneus, was Elis. Indeed, Elis may well have been the scene of one of the two dramas written by Sophocles on the subject of Tyro. The extant fragments from the two plays amount only to twenty-seven lines, so that the absence of a verbal coincidence with our bare sixty is not at all remarkable. But allusions to the same circumstances are perhaps to be recognized. There is more than one reference in the papyrus to bad dreams, e.g. l. 37 [φο]βος τις αυτήν δειμα ṭ ειφυχομ πλαναι; cf. l. 9. It is remarkable that in the extant fragments similar references are found:—Fr. 58ο προστήμαι μέσην τράπεζαν ἀμφί σίκα καὶ καρχίστα, where the subject (according to Athenaeus) was τόσο δράκοντας, and a dream is apparently meant; cf. Fr. 581 πόλει ἐν κακοὶς θυμός εἰσινθείς ὅρπ, and Fr. 584 τίκτουν γάρ τοι καὶ οὕτως ὄντομεν. A still stronger argument for the identification proposed is supplied by ll. 52–3 ... as (?) αρωγον πατερα λισσομαί μολειν? ανακτα πουτον μητρι. This prayer is entirely appropriate in the mouth of one of the sons of Tyro, and, if ανακτα is right, must be addressed to Poseidon. Moreover it is just possible, though very hazardous (see note ad loc.), to read the mutilated word before αρωγον as [Πελ]ιος, which would of course be decisive. But even if that supplement be not adopted, the case for the Tyro may be considered fairly strong. A consideration of the style and diction does not materially assist in forming a conclusion, but they are at least consistent with a Sophoclean authorship.

The text is written in a small and not very clear hand, the decipherment of which is rendered difficult by a coat of plaster and brown stains. A peculiar
feature is the occasional indentation of the lines, apparently to indicate alternations in the dialogue (cf. l. 23, note). This expedient is sometimes employed in papyri to distinguish quotations (e.g. P. Oxy. 200) or fresh sections (P. Oxy. 665), but we are not aware of another instance of its use for dramatic purposes.

Frs. (a), (b), and (c).

Col. i.

Fr. (a).

\[\text{στὸπεισ}
\]
\[\text{κρωμ\ aπαν}\]

about 4 lines lost.

Fr. (b).

\[\text{κώσαν[}\]
\[\text{δίεμ}a\ νυκτερός}\]
\[10 \text{μεν\ ouδ\ an\ eis\ ελθοι\ πελασ}\]
\[\text{vστου\ δεμας}\]
\[\text{v\ ποτμος}\]

Fr. (c).

\[15 \text{πων}\]
\[\text{παθος}\]
\[\text{μμενον}\]
\[\text{προσυνω}\]

Frs. (a) and (c).

Col. ii.

\[\text{14\ letters}\]
\[\text{γου\ χαριν\ φοβουμ[ε]υ\ .}\]
\[\text{. . . . . . . χλοις\ ους\ εν[.]\ τεταγμ[ε]ινα}\]
\[\text{20\ σποι\ εαχ\ μη\ βρα[. . . . .].\ πε\ λογοις}\]
\[\text{ορασ\ γ\ σρα\ ω\ δεσπ[ο]ινα\ . . . . . . .\].\ ματα}\]
\[\text{στειχειν\ οτρυνε[}]
\[\text{15\ letters}\]
\[. \text{17}\]
\[\text{αμφοι\ ακουσαι\ τα[. . . . . . . . .]ενο[}\]
\[\text{25.\ την\ εντος\ οικων\ τ[. . . . . . . σκ[. . . . . . . . .\]
\[\text{ευνους\ δε\ και\ τασδ\ ειστοις\ πε[θηρφι]ας}\]
3. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

ορω τ[... ]δα... μητε πηματι
μητ...[... ]μησουσαν αλγεινων πα[...
[ ...] 18 letters  )υ αμ μονον λε[...
30  [ 17 " ]υ τε και κακον[...
καιν [. ...]. ...]. ονως τοσον [...
ει και θανειν χρη πρωτον εκπρα[ξ[
[ ] aeit[.]υτ αυτον ευ φεροι[
[ ...].]μεμ μη κενον χι[

Fr. (d).  

Col. i.

35  [. ]ρι ρδ[...
[...] ως Χαριζει της τ[...]. ...] [...
[φι]βοσ τις αυτην δειμα τ ενυχομ πλαναι[...
[ ...].] υς εν τωδε κοινωνει ταδε[...
[ ...].] καλαιρουν ετ Αλφειου πορου[...
40  [ ...] 24 letters ... γανος[...

Col. ii.

... ιαγ γαρ ησ [. ]
/ αλλ εκ κακων ει[...
αλλ ω τεκνου [. ]μ [. ]...
κουφος φερειν εγωιδ ετ[...]
45  [ ...]. ... η δεσπο[...

Fr. (e).

50  [ ...]. μκ[...
] κακαι συ γνης[...
] αγαν οδυρμα[...
] θων τρυχει τ[...
] οτ[. ] [ ...]

C 2
Fr. (f).

[. . . . . .] . ωσιν αι μετοικ[
[. . ] . ας αρωγον πατέρα λισσομαμει μολειν
[αν]εκτα ποινα κυμπρι της τειλι
[. . ] . ντα παιδας ειπερ [.);

Fr. (g).

55  [. . . . . ]κειτος ουκ ενε[ι
τι δεσ[ι] γεε. ετ ενδει σε κυρι . . [
ελεκτο[ι] . [. . . . . ] τρυχος [
νεα προφ . [
ετ . . [.

1 sqq. The position of Frs. (a) and (b), which contain ll. 1–2 and 8–12, is suggested by the appearance of the papyrus, but is not at all secure. Fr. (a) also contains the first five letters of l. 20, which do not fit the context there particularly well; neither is it certain that l. 1 is the first of the column. In Fr. (b) (ll. 8–12) there is a junction of two sheets of papyrus. Hence, if this fragment is rightly placed here, the first column of Fr. (d) and Frs. (f) and (g), which show no similar junction, cannot be referred to the same column. A junction occurs in the second column of Fr. (d) just before it breaks off, but this comes earlier in the verse than is the case in ll. 8–12.

20. Cf. the previous note.

23. This line will be metrical if it is supposed to have projected slightly to the left, as is the case with ll. 26 and 41. The purpose was probably to indicate a change of speaker; cf. ll. 26–7, which are evidently a question and answer. The syllable ev in l. 26 is indeed written rather below the level of the rest of the line, and may have been added later; but since the hand is identical, and other lengthened lines occur, it is unlikely that this is merely a case of accidental omission.

26. περι[θρυμιας (cf. Eurip. Hippol. 805) refers to the Chorus; the supplement is a trifle long for the space, but is just possible.

33. There is a gap in the papyrus before this line, which may therefore have had two or three more letters at the beginning than we have supposed; cf. l. 23, note.

44. The ε of γωδ is very doubtful; there may be nothing between the ω and δ. For κοινος φερειν cf. e.g. Eurip. Med. 1018 κοινος φερειν χρη βητον δοτα συμφορει.

48. Perhaps των or τοις [γαν αθαματον or -σιν. This fragment probably gives the latter halves of the lines.

52. Apart from any context the traces on the papyrus before αρωγον would most suitably represent a rather wide α. But ω is excessively awkward at this point, and we accordingly prefer the possible though not very satisfactory alternative ας, preceded by a letter which conceivably might be an i, though if so the three letters were crowded together in an unusual manner. Blass’s ingenious suggestion [Πολ]ας may, therefore, just be read, and it admirably fits both lacuna and context. The palæographical difficulty, however, has made us hesitate to introduce it in the text.
4. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

54. The first word is probably a participle.
56. The first letter after the lacuna is really more like ω than v, but if these verses are iambics the second foot of l. 56 must be a tribrach.
57. The ε at the beginning of the verse projects slightly beyond the lines above and below, and a narrow letter might be lost in a hole in the papyrus before ε. So perhaps this line should be classed with l. 23, &c. (cf. note ad loc.). [Π]vλαυ does not seem a possible reading.

4. EURIPIDES, Oeneus (?).

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 6 x 11·11 cm. Circa B.C. 300–280. Plate I (Frs. a and c).

The very archaic and delicate handwriting of these fragments of tragedy is obviously the same as that of the three small pieces previously published by us in P. G renf. II. 1 (cf. the facsimiles), and there can be no doubt that they are all derived from a single MS.; cf. p. 5. Concerning the identity of the author there was previously no evidence, but a clue is now provided by the occurrence at l. 5 of the words ἀδρά_updφιων, ἰλαχιστοῦ, which suggest that the drama may be the Meleager or the Oeneus of Euripides. The context makes the latter the more probable. The verses in Fr. (a), Col. i. (ll. 1–9; cf. Blass's reconstruction in the note ad loc.) would suitably form part of a speech by Diomedes, who after the successful expedition of the Epigoni against Thebes went to Aetolia to avenge Oeneus, his grandfather. Oeneus was the king of Calydon, and had been dispossessed by his nephews, the sons of Agrius; Diomedes killed the usurpers and restored Oeneus (cf. the ὑπάδεσσις in Schol. ad Aristoph. Acharn. 418). Meleager, the uncle of Diomedes, is assumed by the speaker in ll. 5 sqq. to be dead, but his grave is to be honoured by some of the spoils from Thebes. A certain similarity in sense may further be detected, as Blass suggests, between ll. 22 sqq. and Oeneus Fr. 569 (Nauck), quoted in the note ad loc. The suggestion of O. Rossbach (Berl. Phil. Woch. 1899, p. 1630) that the fragments published in 1897 came from the Chryses of Sophocles is not to be reconciled with the new evidence.

This papyrus along with 6 and 9, the Petrie fragment of the Adventures of Heracles (P. Petrie II. 49 (f); cf. I. p. 65), and the Timotheus papyrus are the oldest specimens of Greek literary writing that have been recovered. There seem to be no sufficient grounds for assigning the Timotheus to an appreciably more remote period than the rest. The archaeological evidence is inconclusive, and if the archaic appearance of the letters is more striking than in other cases, that is to no small extent due to their size and comparative coarseness. The argument from single characters is no doubt precarious; but the forms of Ε
in 4 and Ω in 6 and 9 are more distinctly epigraphic than in the Timotheus papyrus. We should therefore include it in the group named, and refer all five papyri approximately to the reign of Soter (b.c. 305–284). The other literary pieces in this volume most probably belong, like the dated documents found with them, to the reign of Philadelphus (b.c. 284–246), or to the earlier years of the reign of Euergetes I (b.c. 246–221), mainly to the former.

For convenience of reference we add a revised text of the fragments published in 1897.

Fr. (a).          Col. i.          Col. ii.
adj[η]ρον μ.[..........]τς φονοι 10 τι ποτ αρ ακονσαι προ[ι
]ν ανερον [. . . . .]. [. . .]ει
ς γαρ των [μ]ων λογων εχεις  ως εκποληγ["γ]μ
[ε]ι πραξν [ο]μης ποδι
5 αδελφ[ω]υ Μελ[ε]γρου δ[ωρ]ηματα  ειεν τυ[ι
]αι και αποπληρωθη ταφος  οσον ταχος κ[ι
]νον των κεκαλλιστευμ[ενω]ν  φε[. . .]νε[ι
]ενοις ανδρασιν [  
]\[ι[ι[

Fr. (b).

Fr. (c).

Fr. (d).

Fr. (d).
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\[\mu o\nu \eta s \]
\(\kappa \alpha \kappa o i s\)
\(30 \ \phi a]o\sigma \ \beta \lambda e\pi e i\)
\(\]o\sigma\)

\[\varepsilon \gamma o \ \gamma \alpha \pi [\ldots \]\]
\(\sigma t \ldots \ \gamma e \ [\ldots\]

\(40 \ \tau i s \ \varepsilon \sigma t i \ \theta [\]
\[\]o]\chi\lambda e i \ [\]
\[\ldots \]o\sigma\tho\nu [\]

Fr. (e).

Fr. (f).

\(\mu a[.]\alpha p \ [\)
\(\]e[\)
\(45 \ \varepsilon t a i \ \chi r o n o i s\)
\(\]\varepsilon \ \gamma e \gamma o s\)
\(\gamma\)
\(\tau]\chi \alpha \nu e i\)
\(\]\tau a i s i n o u [\)

Fr. (g)= P. Grenf. II. 1 (a). 1.

Fr. (h)= P. Grenf. II. 1 (a). 2.

\(\gamma a o \nu t a \ \gamma a p [\)
\(\]\gamma.\. \ \mu \nu \ \sigma e \ \mu a n t e [\)
\(55 \ \alpha \nu d r e s \ \omega \ \phi r e \nu \beta l a b e i s\)
\(\phi \theta i e r o u s i n \ \omega s \ \kappa a k o \mu \ \mu e [\gamma a\)
\(\] \epsilon m p o l o u s i n \ \eta \delta o n e s\)
\(\] i \ \pi r o s \ \sigma e \ \delta e \gamma i a s \ \chi e r o s\)
\(\] \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \]

Fr. (i)= P. Grenf. II. 1 (b).

Col. i.

Col. ii.

\(\]\sigma e \ldots \ldots\)
\(\] \kappa l \nu o n\)
\(65 \ \mu e [\gamma a \ \sigma \theta e n e i\)
\(\]\lambda \xi\)

\(\]ka[\)
1-2. The reference is probably to the capture of Thebes.

3-8. Blass proposes the following restoration of these lines:

1-2. 

3-8. For δ[αρήματα cf. Orest. 123 πρέπον δισήματα, and for κεκαλλιοτευμένων in the middle voice see Med. 947 διήρ' α καλλιοτευμένα των νόν εν ἀνθρώποισ. Ἀδελφοὶ Μελεάγρου occurs in the same position of the verse in Suppl. 904.

10. Perhaps προσεξήχωμεθ', with ἐκπεπληγμέθ' in the next line.

15. The marks in the margin, two horizontal strokes and a comma-shaped sign below, perhaps indicate the close of a scene; cf. l. 35.

16. This line is on a small detached strip; its position here is only suggested by the appearance of the papyrus and is not at all certain.

21. This line was the last of the column.

22 sqq. The speaker is probably Oeneus and the sense of the passage seems to have been similar to that in Oeneus Fr. 569 (Nauck):

Δι. αὐτά δ’ ἐρήμως τιμώμελον ἀποδώσαι;

1. 23 is perhaps the first of a column; ll. 1, 10, 32, and 60 certainly are so.

35. The letters of this heading, no doubt a stage-direction, are rather spaced out. If μῆν is right the play had a female Chorus.

5. PHILEMON (?).

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 10.4 x 24.5 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. Plate III (Fr. a, Cols. ii–iii).

It has been the subject of much speculation upon what Greek original the Aulularia of Plautus was based. Plays of Poseidippus and, of course, Menander have been suggested, but with little plausibility, and the general verdict has been that of not proven. Happily a small portion of the original comedy now appears to have come to light in the fragments below, which belong to the same
5. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

MS. as P. Grenf. II. 8 (b), and the author of which Blass has identified with great probability as Philemon. This identification rests upon the occurrence at l. 28 of the name Κροίσως in the same position of the verse as in a quotation from Philemon in Eustath. ad Hom. p. 1701. 6 τὰ Ταυτάλων τάλαντα, ἐπεὶ πλοῦσιὸς ποτὲ ἤν, ὡς δηλοῖ, φασὶ, Φιλήμων εἰπὼν Κροίσως λαλῶ σου καὶ Μίδα καὶ Ταυτάλω (Kock, Fr. 189). This argument is really stronger than it may seem at first sight to be; for there is apparently no other reference to Croesus in the extant remains of Attic comedy. Moreover the line fits in well with the supposed situation, the key to which is provided by the name Strobilus in ll. 20–1. In the Aulularia Strobilus is the slave who discovers and carries off the treasure concealed by the old miser Euclio, and so brings about the desired union of his master Lyconides with Euclio’s daughter. We suppose that the discovery has just preceded the scene disclosed in ll. 13 sqq. of the papyrus. The slave Strobilus (l. 21 παῖ . . . Στροβίλε) is almost beside himself with delight (ll. 15–19, 22), and is anxious to get away with the utmost speed (ll. 13–14); while the interlocutor, who arrives on the scene and is presumably his master, is astonished at Strobilus’ behaviour (l. 15), and thinks that he must have gone mad (l. 21 παῖ δυστυχεις). This interpretation is strengthened by some other coincidences. An echo of the line Κροίσως λαλῶ σου κ.τ.λ. may be recognized, as Blass points out, in Aul. 702–4 istos reges ceteros Memorare nolo, hominum mendicabula. Ego sum ille rex Philippus. L. 58 εφον πας τὴν (θ) suggests Aul. 781 filiam ex te tu habes. Further, the fragments published in our Greek Papyri II. 8 (b), of which we append a revised text, undoubtedly belong to the same MS., and there too, in spite of much obscurity, are phrases which harmonize with the plot of the Aulularia. The anxiety of Lyconides to marry Euclio’s daughter is aptly expressed in l. 77 εἰ δυστυχον εστι τῆς κορῆς αυτοῦ τυχεῖν, and τεκεῖν two lines above is quite in keeping with the situation in the Plautine play (cf. Aul. 691 sqq., &c.). Lines 79–80 εφον οὐκ ἄδυστον ἦν (to enter?) may well refer to the house of the miser Euclio, which he kept carefully shut up; cf. Aul. 98–9 Profecto in aedis meas me absente neminem Volo intromitt. 274 aedis occulte. The mention of a nomarch (l. 81), who was an Egyptian but not an Athenian official, suggests that the scene was laid at Alexandria, where Philemon is thought to have spent some time on the invitation of Ptolemy Soter; cf. Alciphr. Epist. ii. 3–4. If so, Plautus did not here follow his original, for the scene of the Aulularia is certainly Athens; cf. l. 810.

The text is written in a good-sized cursive hand which is not easy to read where the letters are incomplete; it may date from the reign of either Philadelphus or Euergetes. Alternations of the dialogue are marked by paragraphi, and where a line is divided between two speakers the point of division is marked.
by a short blank space. On the verso of Fr. (a) are three lines in a different hand giving explanation of words:

οἷς Ἀρμὸς [...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...]...[...
35 

Fr. (b).  
Col. i. 

Col. ii.

Fr. (c).

Col. i.  

Col. ii.

Fr. (d).

Fr. (e).

Fr. (f).

Fr. (g).

γ'μυνον"
Fr. (g) = P. Grenf. II. 8 (b).

Col. i.

75 [.]λάτης με ... [.] παρά μετε ... τεκειν
σκοτειν προσεκεί παρα πε. λη ... ε ...
ει διωταν εστι της κορης αυτων τυχειν
οτι της ανοιας μεστος ην τη ... ν
εποίησα α μοι προσετατεν ευρον οικιαν
80 αδυνατον ην ... [ ...
αυτην νομαρχη]
εν ζηλοτυπαι
7θ [ ...]

Fr. (h) = P. Grenf. II. 8 (b).

ε[νθυς συλλαβης μιας τι πυρ]
]. νοματι τουτο πυρ ακηκοα
90 [ πε νικαις αγαθος ει[ς] την Ελλαδα
ε]μογησαι πα ... αυτηθεν ... []
]. 9 μικρους φο ... ρ εφοδι]
]ναλλεδ . αν . πτο[εν]
... . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

13–23. ‘Strobilus. Imagine that you are running ... at Olympia! If you make your escape you are a lucky fellow! Lyconides. O Heracles, what ever can have happened? Strob. Now I know certainly that of all the world this spot alone is clearly sacred, and here all the gods have made their home and still are, and here have they been born. Lyc. Strobilus! Strob. Apollo and the gods, what breath! Lyc. You miserable slave, Strobilus! Strob. Who called me? Lyc. I. Strob. And who are you, most mighty of the Gods? Lyc. How fortunately I have seen you.’

13–4. αλι ... suggests αλ(ε)πτον, which is palaeographically possible, but would occupy all the space before τρησεων and so leave a syllable missing. Perhaps δη has dropped out; but with the reading so uncertain this can hardly be considered a satisfactory hypothesis. Strobilus is apostrophizing himself.

18. κατωικησας without τως is unsatisfactory. 1. κατωικησαι.

20. πυρεματοδ may refer either to the loudness of Lyconides’ shout, or, as Dr. Mahaffy suggests, to the supposed effluence of an approaching god; cf. e. g. Eur. Hippol. 1392 & δειον αθηνεις πυρωμα.

21. 1. Στροβιλε.

22. των θεουρ: Strobilus keeps up the idea of ll. 16 sqq., and affects to think that his master is a divine apparition.
23. The restoration is due to Prof. Leo,—who does not accept the attribution of these fragments to Philemon or their supposed connexion with the Aulularia.

50. The second α of απα is below the ς of ςπα in l. 58, and it is doubtful to which column the letter belongs. There would be room for a very small ς between the π and α, so that the line might be made to end with απα. But since the π is of the usual size, it is more probable that the α belongs to απ (e.g. απαν or απαι), and that the corresponding line in the next column was begun further to the right.

59. The doubtful α at the end of l. 55 may belong to this line; cf. the previous note.

65. This was the last line of a column.

68–9. There are about 14 cm. of papyrus to the left of ] τις and ]νυ, but the surface, though stained, appears to have been never written upon. Probably, therefore, it was covered by another sheet which was joined on at this point.

75 sqq. The identity of the speakers here is not very clear. Strobilus is probably one of them, and προσεκαταρτος in l. 79 indicates that the speaker there at least is a slave; but ll. 75–8 would also be appropriate to Strobilus. With σοκιστή cf. Aul. 605 Is spectulum hac misit me. The first two letters of l. 75 are very doubtful; [χ]ν unused or [ς]μυς τῆς is not impossible. In l. 76 the word after παρι (?) may perhaps be πεπληρωσιν.

78. The ν appears to be the end of the line, but this is hardly certain.

79. α of μοι has been rewritten.

88–9. There are short spaces between μος, τι, and την in l. 88 and σοκιστή, τωτο, την, and σφευκο in l. 89, like those which in ll. 20–3 indicate a change of speaker.

90. There is a hole in the papyrus as well as a space between ει and την, so ει[ς] may well be read; but cf. the previous note.

93. The first α has been corrected from ε or vice versa. The reading Ναλαδ[ις] given in P. Grenf. is unsatisfactory, the letter before δ being more like η than α.

6. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Mummy A. 10. Height 12.7 cm. Circa B.C. 300–280. Plate IV (Fr. a, Cols. i–iii).

The style of these mutilated remains of a comedy suggests Menander or some contemporary dramatist, but in spite of their considerable extent both author and play remain unidentified. Apparently no coincidence with extant fragments occurs, and other clues are not forthcoming. The proper names Νομμήνος (l. 7) and Σωστρατος (? l. 122) give no assistance; Δήμος (l. 40) was one of the characters of Menander’s Δις Ἐκπαρτών (Kock, Fr. 123), but that play is supposed to have been the original of Plautus’ Bacchides (Ritschl, Parerg. 405), with which, so far as can be seen, these fragments have nothing in common. A more positive idea of the plot is however difficult to obtain. Apart from the characters mentioned above there is a master and a slave (ll. 5–8), the former of whom seems to take part in the dialogue throughout Fr. (α), Cols. ii–iii; he had a wife (l. 32), and was about to dispatch some friends on a journey, for
which preparations were to be made (ll. 33 sqq.). A child and an old woman, perhaps a nurse, figure rather prominently (ll. 20, 43, 46, 52, 59).

The principal fragment, (a), contains parts of four consecutive columns, but the first of these contains mere vestiges and of the last only the beginnings of the lines are preserved. There is no indication of the relation of this piece to Fr. (b), comprising two very imperfect columns; and a large number of smaller pieces have resisted repeated attempts at combination. The text is written in short columns in a medium-sized, rather heavy uncial hand of a most archaic type. The regular capital shape of Ω and the square E are especially noticeable; and though these forms are here accompanied by a round sigma this papyrus must claim to be ranked among the earliest specimens of the Greek literary script; cf. introd. to 4. Alternations of the dialogue are marked by paragraphi, and double dots are also inserted when a line is divided between two speakers. One or two corrections have been made by the original scribe.

Fr. (a).

Col. i.  
Col. ii.

\[ \begin{align*}
0 & \text{ti yar pleson to[\delta e}\psiophkev } \eta \text{ thera} \\
5 & \text{exerxetai } \tau \iota \text{ the } [\sigma \text{tupida tauten ev } [\eta] \\
 & \text{enstau } \tau \iota s \text{ argous ekomias apofere} \\
 & [\text{apod[\jota } \text{ te } \text{ xorchati } \text{ to[} \text{ Nounmi[\iota} \\
 & [\ldots \text{] de ta } \omega ; \text{ deur anashtepas papen} \\
 & [\ldots \text{] ti legete : } ti \delta \text{ an exomun allo plen} \\
10 & [\ldots \text{]et } [\ldots ] \text{men apotrexhen tautas } \text{ de } [\ldots ] \text{ata } [\ldots ] \text{wme } \text{ men ovthe kalvei} \\
 & \text{ou to[\iota } [\delta \text{ et } \text{ o[\iota } \text{ taw } [\ldots ] \text{ dynshet apienai} \\
 & [\text{pos } [\ldots ] \text{ a[p]\nlethev } : } [\eta] [\ldots ] \text{ epiechete} \\
 & \omega \text{ the } [\ldots ] [\ldots ] \text{ wphi } \lambda[\iota] \text{ ein [ta]uthe } \text{ egr} \\
15 & \text{poro[\jota } \ldots \ldots ] \text{ ek polemwom feygete} \\
\end{align*} \]
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• [ 11 " ] ιπα σ εποδύμεν αυν
• 9[ 12 " ] ν . α της τημερον

Col. iii.

εις αυριον δ ἡδη πολεμιος γινομει

25 [γ]ενοιτο δ ειρη ποτ ο Ζευ δεσποτα
[δι]αλυσις . [ . ] [ . . ] [ . . ] [ . . ] ε πραγματων
η γαρ : νομιζεις [ . . ] λοι[ . . ] ιλαι
tα τριμε . [ . . ] [ . . . . . ] [ . . . . . ]
30 το χρυσιον δε [λαμβανε ου τ . [ . . . . ]
εμοι γε : αριθησον εν τοσονωι δ εις[.]ων
προς την γυναικα βουλομ ειπαι [τ]ην εμην
εις την οδον γ ετ αυτα ταναγκαι οπως
υμμ παροντιων ενδοθεν συνσκευαση

35 εξομεν απαντα : Απολλων ως αγρωκος ει
συνεκευα[σ]ατω περαιε πανομαι λεγων
νη την Αθηνη[η]γ και θεους αγανιω
ουκ οιδ οπω [νυ] αυτω επι τω πραγματι
Ελλην[υ . .]βε [ . . . ] φαινεις τις τους τροπους
40 ο Αμησα[ς α]ν[θρω]πος αλλα τη αρχη
γυναι τι βουλ[ει . . .] ημβ[ . . . .] ητα γε
γυμ πρωτο[ν . . . . ] ημικ[ . . . . . ] παιδιον
κλαεις περι[ . .] η[ . . . . . ] [ . . . ] προισαι
45 εξω φερετ[ε] αυτο δειρο μοι πι] τος θυρας
tον ημετ[ρομ] μεμ πα . [. . . . . ] ου γραυς εχει

Col. iv.

κακ[.]
μη τα [ . ]
ιδον σκο[.] [ ]
50 χρηστων ν[ ]
HIBEH PAPYRI

τις ληψεθ [. . .]ο[  
το παίδ[ίον ὅ]η : [  
ἐμῳ . . [  
οὐκ οὐδ'. [. . .]ρ[  
55 τι Χρη ποειν φ'. [  
αὐτος ὅ ὑπ' οὐθένος  
λαβης προελθο[ν

Fr. (d).  
Col. i.  
μβολας  
το  
δια  
ν  
. ομευ  
. η[  
. η[  
. εκα  
]  
. τι συν  
]κε με[.]  
. . .  
. . .  
. . .

Col. ii.  
ημῳν [. . .] [. .]ρ[  
ο Ἡρ[ακλε[ις ὡ Ὁ[εν  
ο το[θ]ε α]μψφμ[  
85 ελεγο[μ] παλαι[ι  
και της [δι]κης τ . [  
αὐτος γαρ ημε[ν . εν . [  
εδικαζ[ε] τ αυ με ουνη[  
tουτ εφ[τι . . .]ου παλ[  
90 . . . εφ[μ[. . .]λονται[  
tουτ εφ[τι . ]β ηττον [  
δακνοντ[ . . .] . κα . [  
80 ]  
και τα . [. . .] ελονται[  
αυτος σαζ[ωσε . [  
95 επι στρατοπή[δ . .]π[  
συναρη[α]σομ[ε . .] . ο . [  
τι λεγ[ον]τες ου[. . .]π[  
ουχ ομ[ο]λογη[σ  
tο π[ράγ]μα τ[  
100 ουκ[. . ] . ο . [  
ω Η[ρακ]λεις . [  
. . ! α[τα[  

Fr. (e).  
. . .  
. . .  
. . .  
ν[  
πη  
106 . ] . ϕ . . [  
]στελ[  

Fr. (d).  
. . .  
. . .  
. . .  
. . .  
. . .
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Fr. (e).

110 ε\)πειδη δι[ \\
115 ]...

Fr. (f).

120 η\)ζει π[ \\
125 ]της λ[ \\
130 ]...

Fr. (g).

135 ον τεκνον \\
140 ... \\

Fr. (h).

145 γι γαρ ηλθε την ταυτ[ \\
160 ]...

Fr. (i).

150 πραγμα ποιησι[ \\
160 ]...

Fr. (k).

150 ... \\
160 ...
1–3. The ends of these lines and the beginnings of ll. 12–23 are contained on a separate fragment, which is only conjecturally placed in this position.

4. Cf. the line quoted by Suidas and Schol. ad Aristoph. *Nub.* 132 to illustrate the distinction between *κόπτειν*, applied to a person entering a house, and *ψοφίζω* to a person coming out (Menander, Fr. 861, Kock) ἀλλ’ ἐψοφίζχεν ἡ χώρα τίς αὐτῶν (so Cobet; ἐψοφίζω καὶ τίς τὴν θύραν ἔξω, Suid.; ἐψοφίζχε τὴν θύραν ἔξω, Schol.). The papyrus supports Cobet’s emendation of the verse as against Kuster’s ἀλλ’ ἐψοφίζχε τὴν θύραν τίς ἔξω. Cf. also Plautus, *Bacch.* 234. *Sed foris concrepuit nostra: quinam exit foras*, which exactly corresponds to Cobet’s version and would almost justify its attribution to the Δίς ἐξισσατῶν, the supposed original of the *Bacchides.*
7. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

The o which is written rather large and some little way above this line is possibly a numeral referring to the number of the column. The margin above the other columns is imperfectly preserved.

8. τάς...ως: perhaps another proper name, e.g. Ταυρωί; but the letters between α and ω are so blurred and rubbed that they can no longer be identified.

9. [....] τι λεγετε is apparently addressed to the new arrivals referred to in ll. 4-5;

? [ερώτι τι.


12. ο[τ]δα πω[ς]: the supposed π may be μ, but there is not room for ο[τ]δαμως.

14. Either λαβεω or λαβεω might be read.

15. Blass suggests μετ' ωπερ for the lacuna.

16. If παρθε is right α is very likely the relative δ. γ might be read in place of τ, but the θ seems certain. The letter following α must apparently be τ, ν, or ψ, and the doubtful δ is possibly λ.

17. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish α from δ in this MS., but even if δν were read after νως the other vestiges do not suit δυναμαι.

27. The lower of the two dots after γως though very indistinct is fairly secure. There is no example in the papyrus of the use of a single point.

31. θρηματισον. Possibly the missing μ was inserted above the line (cf. l. 25); the papyrus is much rubbed at this point, and if a correction had been made it would hardly be visible.

33. γ(ε): or perhaps τ(ε), the sentence being interrupted by l. 35.

34. παροιτωνος, 'from her store'; cf. the Homeric phrase χαριζομενη παρεστιων.

39. ρα might be read in place of βε, but βε seems impossible, otherwise [βε]βα[ων], as Blass suggests, would be attractive. For Ελλην[ον] cf. P. Oxy. 211. 33 (Menander, Περικληψιμενη) τεκμήριον τουτ’ ἐστω τ’ Ἑλληνος τρόπον.

44-6. A small fragment, which we have after some hesitation assigned to the bottom of this column, is not shown in the facsimile. Both the contents of the fragment and the appearance of the papyrus suit this position, though the broken edges do not join particularly well.

51. There may be nothing between τι and λ, but there is a space sufficient for a narrow letter, and also a faint trace of ink which is consistent with υ.

89-90. A paragraphus may be lost between these two lines.

7. ANTHOLOGY.

Mummy A. Fr. (b) 15.6 x 19.2 cm. Circa B.C. 250-210. Plate VII (Frs. δ and ε).

The verso of the papyrus containing the speech of Lysias against Theozotides (14) was used for writing a series of extracts from different authors, such as are not uncommonly found in papyri of the Ptolemaic period, e.g. P. Petrie I. 3 (i), P. Tebt. 1 and 2. Among them are (ll. 10-22) a passage of thirteen iambic lines from the Electra of Euripides, and (ll. 91-4) an extract of four iambic lines, including the well-known verse, 'Evil communications corrupt good manners,' quoted by St. Paul. These are also probably Euripidean; but the other pieces cited are
not iambics, and seem to be chiefly of a lyrical character, if we may judge by the occurrence of such collocations as βρομικός κομπος (l. 8), ὀχετὼν ουταζεί (l. 47). They are however very badly preserved and in places seem to be corrupt, so that they remain quite unintelligible.

Two hands are found, the first being more cursive than the second, and approximating more towards the late third and early second century B.C. scripts than is the case with any of the other literary fragments in this volume. The anthology is therefore not likely to have been written as early as the reign of Philadelphus; but, especially since the Lysias text has no appearance of being later than the other classical fragments from Mummy A (cf. p. 22), which belong to the middle or early part of the third century B.C., there is no reason for assigning 7 to a later date than Philopator's reign; and in view of the fact that the 25th year of Euergetes (90) is the latest certain date in the Hibeh papyri, it is more probable that these extracts were written before that year than after it.

The text of the Electra passage presents some variations from the later MSS., of which there are but two for this play. In the most important place (l. 14 = El. 371), where the MSS. are probably corrupt, the surface of the papyrus is unfortunately much damaged and the reading uncertain.

Fr. (b).

Col. i.

Col. ii. PLATE VII.

[30 letters]

[17] . αφ[10 letters] . δε


[5] [10] μηθεις μοι φθορον α . . . ελ . . [ . . ]


[10] . ] . το Ευριπίδου

[10] (σκε δι εκριβείς ούθεν εις ευναυμιαν)

[έκχωςι γαρ ταρ]αγμοιν αι φυσεις βροτον]

[νηγαρ ειδον ανδρα γενναίου πατρος]

[το] μηθεν ous τα χρηστα τ ek κακων τεκνα

[φρο] δημον τ ε[ν α]νδρος πλουσιον πνηματι

El. 367

370
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS
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Fr. (m).

. . . . . .

67 ] · ις β·.]·[  
] α·.·[  
] . δε γαρ αιδ[  
70 ] ποις τοι .[  
. . . . .

(2nd hand)
Fr. (f).

75 ]·υ [ ]·ι·εγγυ πι[  
]. εβαν [.]·ειφ[  
] προι [.] · π . .[  
]. ην εκει π . [  
80 ] .  
]. . . . . . [ δι  
]. ου . . . [ .]·ε·[  
]. . . . . [ .]·π[  
]. . [ .]

85 ]π·ρ[  
. . .
Fr. (a).

Fr. (g).

97 ] στι[ . .].

Fr. (i).  PLATE VII.

επείτα χρησθαι [  
οροι δοκούσιν ο . [  
eιδωσ ο[ο]νεκ ο[  
φθειρονυιν ηθ[η] χρησθ ομιλια κακαί

95 ωστ εμιν δοκ[ει]

αλλ' απλως τ[  

12 = El. 369. ανδρα: so both MSS., M(urray). παίδα W(ecklein) following Herwerden.
8-12. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

13 = 370. τ: so MSS. \* Stob. Flor. 87, 10 and Orion, Anth. 8, 7, M., W.

14 = 371. The MSS. have λιμών τ’ ἐν ἄδρες πλουσίου φρονήματι. For λιμών, λοιμών (Scaliger), ῥόπων (Nauck), λήπων (Rauchenstein), δεμίω (Keene), and πίνων (W.) have been suggested. The papyrus certainly did not have λοιμῶν, for the first letter must be θ or ζ, and the second, if not η, must be read οι or ου, while the third is certainly μ or ι, and the vestiges of the last two letters suit θυ. δεμίω, if really the reading, must be wrong, and is much nearer to Keene’s δεμίω than to any other of the conjectures. δεμίω, however, is not at all satisfactory. The last word of the line seems to have been originally ποιμάτι (possibly ποιμάτη), which has been altered to φρονήματι by inserting φρω over the line and apparently correcting ο to ν, but whether the π was erased is uncertain.

16–22 = 373–9. These lines are bracketed by W. following Wilamowitz, who considers that they were introduced from another play.

16 = 373. δαρίσας: δαλαβών MSS. δαρίσας, being the commoner word in this sense, is more likely to be a gloss on δαλαβών than vice versa.

17 = 374. ταρά: γ’ ταρα MSS., γ’ ταρα W.

19. δ: so L (W., M.), γ’ P.

20 = 377. ελθώ [τίς]: so MSS., M.: ελθών τίς W. following Heath. There is just room for ν in the lacuna, but it is more likely that the papyrus read ελθώ.

22 = 379. This line is quoted as from the Αύγε by Diog. Laert. ii. 33.

32–3. For the two dots placed at the ends of these lines in order to divide them from the writing of the next column cf. 9, 1 and 27, 34.

65. ε is very likely the beginning of the name of the author of the following extract; cf. l. 9. Similar headings probably occurred in ll. 75 and 80.

94. The well-known line which apparently occurred in l. 94 is quoted by St. Paul (cf. II Cor. xv. 33) and many other Christian writers. Socrates (Hist. Eccl. 3, 16) assigns the authorship to Euripides, Photius (Quaest. Amphit. 151) and Jerome (vol. iii. p. 148, ed. Basil.) to Menander; cf. Nauck’s Eurip. Fr. 1013. The remains of ll. 91–3 certainly suggest tragedy rather than comedy, and since another extract from Euripides occurs in this anthology, it is probable that he was the author of ll. 91–4. But θείρων [πὴν κ.τ.λ. may, of course, have been found in Menander as well.

95. ωτι: ως γ cannot be read. The Doric form ἐμὲ and the apparent character of the metre suggest that this may be an extract from Epicharmus.

8-12. Poetical Fragments.

Some small unidentified fragments of poetry may here be conveniently grouped together; two are Epic, two Tragic; and the last is from a comedy.

8 (Mummy A) contains the beginnings and ends of lines from the upper parts of two columns of hexameters, written in a sloping cursive hand having a general similarity to that of the epic fragment P. Grenf. II, 5, especially in Col. ii, where the lines are much closer together than in Col. i. But there are some points of contrast: the letters in P. Grenf. II, 5 are less sloping, and some of them are rather differently formed; the papyrus is also of a lighter colour than 8. We therefore hesitate to assign them to a single MS.; if they belong to the same work they must at any rate come from different parts of it.
On the verso of 8 is some much effaced small cursive writing; the verso of P. Grenf. II. 5 as now mounted is invisible. In Col. i a combat is described, while Col. ii contains a dialogue; 'Αχαυός and 'Αργεώι are mentioned (ll. 9 and 24). The occurrence of the new compound ἀμφοτερήκης (= ἀμφήκης) may be noted in l. 8.

9 (Mummy 18) consists of seven small fragments, also in the Epic style. Phegeus, whose death at the hands of Diomedes is described in Iliad E 11 sqq., occurs here in connexion with Ajax in l. 2. Phegeus was one of the sons of Dares, the priest of Hephaestus (E 9–10), and the mention of this name suggests the possibility of a relation between these fragments and the Iliad attributed in antiquity to Dares, which according to Aelian was extant in his day (Var. Hist. xi. 2 οὖ Φρουλαν 'Ιλιακα ἐτί καὶ νῦν σωζόμεναν οἶδα), and upon which the Latin prose work bearing the name of Dares professes to be based. The careful rather small hand is of an extremely archaic character; E and Σ are square, and Ω has the capital shape as in 6. The only example of Ζ (l. 3) is imperfectly preserved, but probably had only a dot between the two horizontal strokes, not a vertical connecting line as in 4. We should assign the fragments to the reign of Soter; cf. 4, introd. The dated documents found with 9 in Mummy 18 range from about the 14th year of Philadelphus (110 recto) to the 28th (94). Two corrections occur, one of which at least (l. 14) is due to a different scribe.

10 (Mummy A). Four fragments of Tragic iambics, apparently all from the same text; there is little doubt of this except in the case of Fr. (d), which though very similar (cf. Plate V) is so small that it affords but slight material for comparison. The hand, which is of a somewhat common early third century B.C. type (cf. e.g. 12), is much like that of the longer pieces published in P. Grenf. II. 6 a (cf. the frontispiece of that volume; Fr. c. 2 may belong to a). But the evident resemblance is hardly strong enough to justify us in referring those fragments to the same MS. as 10. Moreover, as Blass has shown (Rhein. Museum, lv. pp. 96 sqq.), they are probably to be referred to the Niobe of Sophocles, whereas the subject of 10 is apparently different; there is a mention of Achilles in l. 5. The metre indicates that Fr. (a) comes from the right side of a column while Fr. (d) occupied a more central position.

11 (Mummy A). The script of this fragment is on the other hand closer to that of P. Grenf. II. 6 c than to that of 10. The Μ and Τ have the deep depression which is absent in 10, and the head of the ε is bent over towards the cross stroke in the same way as in P. Grenf. II. 6 c. 11 is therefore, we think, to be connected with that group of fragments, which, if Blass is right (cf. introd. to 10), belong to Sophocles' Niobe; J. Sitzler (Neue Phil. Rundsch. 1897, p. 386) would refer them to some play of Euripides. The contents of the fragment, so far as
they go, suit the attribution to the Νιοδέ (l. 4 τ onActivityResult, l. 7 αμφα, l. 9 ἀγαθὸς παρθένος). The metre is perhaps partly or entirely lyrical; and the fragment is from the bottom of a column.

12 (Mummy A) consists of four small pieces of a comedy, written in medium-sized upright uncialis similar in type to those of 10 and 11. The character of the fragments is quite doubtful; a slave is addressing his master at l. 5, and Antiphon is mentioned in l. 6; but that is too common a name to be of much assistance towards identification. A point in the middle position is used, but whether for purposes of punctuation or to mark a change of speaker is not clear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th>13.7 x 6.7 cm.</th>
<th>Circa B.C. 280–240.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col. i.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. ii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]  iota</td>
<td></td>
<td>χωρ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>} έσσον</td>
<td></td>
<td>αυτό[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>εσκε δ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] ωτες</td>
<td></td>
<td>ενθή[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>. . . κεσσιν</td>
<td>διοισ εν[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] ν αμφι δε πηληξ</td>
<td></td>
<td>εντε[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] εμπέδος αει</td>
<td></td>
<td>ιει πε[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α]μφοτερηκεσ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Δρυείοι[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] δ Αχαιοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ν το δ ενεγκον</td>
<td>τα προσθ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] α πελονται</td>
<td></td>
<td>ετλημε[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? προ[τιεισιν</td>
<td></td>
<td>ος φατο [.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>πευσμαι [.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>υιον</td>
<td>ειροντο αρ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αμ[φαγμωσιν</td>
<td></td>
<td>και θειοι[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td>ηνη Ζει[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ε]κποθεν ε [.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τον Π[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Fr. (a) 4·8 × 8·6 cm. Circa B.C. 300–280. Plate V (Fr. b).

Fr. (a). Col. i. Col. ii.

\[\mu\alpha\omega\nu : 2 \Phi\gamma\nu\varepsilon\ Α\iota\mu\nu\tau\sigma\varsigma [\ldots]\pi\alpha[\]

\[\delta\varepsilon[\iota][\iota][\iota]\pi\nu[\]

\[\nu[\nu]\nu\ \delta[\eta]\ \tau\iota\ \phi\iota\omega[\]

5 \[\chi\.\ldots]\iota\sigma\iota[\]

Fr. (b). Fr. (c). Fr. (d).

\[\chi\.\ldots][\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\]

\[\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\]

\[\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\]

Fr. (e). Fr. (f). Fr. (g).

\[\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\]

\[\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\chi\.\ldots\]

10. Fr. (a) 15·5 × 4·2 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. Plate V (Fr.s a and d).

Fr. (a). Fr. (b).

\[\chi\.\ldots\omega\iota[\]

\[\chi\.\ldots\omega\iota[\]

1. The two dots at the end of the line are to separate it from the first verse of the next column (l. 2), to which it nearly reaches; cf. 7. 32 and 27. 34.

7. Perhaps \omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron; cf. Homer, Od. \beta 135 \mu\iota\nu\nu\rho\iota\pi\nu\nu\sigma\epsilon\sigma\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\ \\
\eta\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron.

Fr.s (e)(f)(g). These three fragments may succeed each other immediately. \eta\pi\rho\iota\iota\iota in l. 22 seems to be the end of the verse. In l. 23 the reading is apparently not \omicron\kappa\iota\omicron\omega\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron.
8-12. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[voorbeeldtekst]
34. The letter below the superscribed o was perhaps deleted; cf. l. 36.

36. ἐναίμως, which is unmetrical, seems to have been the original reading, though the second i is further away from the μ than would be expected. δραίμως is found in Pindar, Nem. 6. 29, but ἐναίμως is apparently new.


11. 6·2 x 2·8 cm. Circa b.c. 280–240.

60] στ[ ]μ[ ]ο. [ ]

8. If the lines are lyrical, οδε may be ἄ δέ or ἄδε.
5. The letter apparently deleted between ε and π may be ν or μ.
8. The first letter is possibly ρ, but θ is more probable.

12. Fr. (a) 4·1 x 5·9 cm. Circa b.c. 280–240.

Fr. (a).

5 [. . . . . . .] θε[ ] επαπενυθ[ε]
[. . . . . . .] β[ ] ἀδίφιον ταυτ ερωτήσων
[. . . . . .] ερα παντα· παραδεδεκα[ ]
[. . . . . . .] ειν· ουκουν εγω παλιν ει[ ]
5 [. . . . . . .] λα μαχησ σε προσ σε δεσπόστα
13. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

[epemψεν] Αντίφωμ με επιρωτησοντ' α σε
[. . . . . . . .]κει της κορης· ακηκοα[
[. . . . . . . .]οφειλω μοι δοκει καρι[

Fr. (b). . . . Fr. (c). . . . Fr. (d). . . .

|σμα| |μο| |ων|
|---|---|---|---|
| 10 |οσαπ| |οι| 25 | σισ|
|υβων ωσι| |ψεται|
|αυτον ηδι| 20 |σομας|
|μ ψυσει γ| |
| δε α δρας| |
| 15 |ος| |δη|
|ακηκο| |

15. There is a broad blank space after ος, which is perhaps part of a stage direction.


Mummies 69 and 70. Height 15.6 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. Plate V (Col. ii).

Two consecutive and nearly complete columns from an oration or discourse upon the subject of music, probably the actual commencement of it. The author is evidently very ancient, for he speaks of the ἀρμονία or enharmonic system as still in wide use, whereas by the time of Aristoxenus it had almost disappeared; cf. Plut. Mus. 37, Westphal, Metrik der Griechen, i. pp. 420–1. Blass makes the happy suggestion that the fragment should be attributed to Hippias of Elis, the contemporary of Socrates, who gives his name to two of the Platonic dialogues. This sophist was accustomed to discourse in public on a variety of topics, of which music was one; cf. Plato, Hipp. Min. 363 C ὅταν τὰ Ὀλυμπία ὁ... παρέχω ἐκατόν καὶ λέγωντα δι' ἂν τις βούληται ὃν ἂν μοι εἰς ἐπι-

δειξιν παρασκευασμένων ἕ, Hipp. Mai. 285 E ἔκεια ἄν ὅ ἀκριβότατα ἐπιτότασαι ἀνθρώπων
diaireis, per... νοθῶν καὶ ἀρμονῶν, and Hipp. Min. 368 D. Some of these compositions were no doubt published in book form, but no part of them has survived beyond a short quotation in Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 2. 624. No standard
of comparison is therefore available; but the contents of this papyrus, if they be not by Hippias, represent what he might well have written.

The substance of the two columns is an attack upon certain musical theorists, who attributed to different harmonies and rhythms different moral effects. This is the view maintained by Plato in the well-known passage of the Republic 398–400, where some kinds of music are characterized as having a voluptuous or depressing tendency, and are therefore to be excluded from the ideal state. Hippias will have none of this theory, though it cannot be said that the arguments with which he opposes it are very convincing. He also ridicules the more extreme lengths to which it was carried by partisans who professed to express in music the attributes of natural objects, and whose perceptions would seem to have been even finer than any possessed by the writers of some of our modern programmes. Perhaps the person principally aimed at in this diatribe was Damon, the famous Athenian musician and contemporary of Hippias. Damon seems to have given more attention to the theory than to the practice of music (cf. ll. 7 sqq. below); and he was a believer in the effects of music upon character (Athen. xiv. 628 C, Aristid. Quint. ii. 14), and probably the views of Plato on this subject were to a large extent influenced by his teaching; cf. Rep. 400 B, and especially 424 C οὐδὰμοι γὰρ καθότι μουσικῆς τρόποι ἀνεν πολιτικῶν νόμων τῶν μεγάλων, δὲ φησὶ τε Δάμων καὶ ἕγω πείθομαι. There is indeed some evidence for the existence of a work on music by Damon in the form of a speech to the Areopagus (Rhein. Mus. xl. pp. 309 sqq.). The Herculaneum fragments of the treatise of Philodemus De Musica, as Dr. Mahaffy reminds us, take the same side in the controversy as Hippias.

The short, broad columns of the text are carefully written in good-sized uncials of an ordinary type; the lines show a noticeable irregularity of length. Punctuation is effected by means of two (in l. 9 three) dots, which are sometimes combined with marks resembling a small coroni, e.g. in l. 13. On the verso is a good deal of badly damaged cursive writing, probably by more than one hand and running in contrary directions.

Col. i.

[πολλ]ακίς επηλθέ μοι θαυμασαὶ ὁ αἰνῆς [Ἐλλῆνες
[εἰ αἱλοτριών τιμή]ς τας ἐπιδείξεις τῶν οἰκείων τε
[χρ]ῶν ποιομεν[οι] λανθανοῦσιν ὡμα ἄγουσες γαρ
[ο]ὗ ἀρμονικοί εἰσι καὶ προχειρισμένου ὁφίδας τινὰς
5 ταύτας συγκρινοῦσιν τῳ μὲν ὡς εὐχέον
κατηγοροῦντες τας δὲ εἰκῆ εγκω[μιάζοντες]
13. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

καὶ λεγοῦσι μὲν ὥς ὦν δὲ ἀυτοὺς υπ[τε ψ]αλτας
οὐτε οἰδοὺς θεωρεῖν περὶ μὲν γαρ τ[α]να ετεροὶ
φασὶν παραχωρ[ε]ῖν : ἀυτοῖς δὲ ιδίον [ε]ἰμαι το θε
10 οὐρητικὸν μερός φαίνονταί δὲ περὶ μὲν ταύτα
ὡν ετεροὶ παραχωρούσιν ὑπὸ μετρίως ἑσπονδακὸ
tες ἐν οἷς δὲ φασὶν ἵσχεν εἰν τοῦτοι σχ[εδ[ιὰ]
ζόντες ]—: λεγοῦσι δὲ ὡς τὸν μελῶν τ[α] μὲν
εγκρατεῖς τα δὲ φρονίμους τὰ δὲ δικαίους
15 τα δὲ ανδρείους τα δὲ δεῖλους ποιεῖ ]—: κακοὶς εἰδότες οτι
οὖτε χρόμα δεῖλους : οὐτε ἀρμονία αὐ τανδρείους
ποιήσειν τους αυτη χρομενους ]—: τίς γαρ οὐκ οἴδεν

Col. ii.

[Ἀιτ]όλους καὶ Δολοπᾶς : καὶ παντὰς τοὺς Θε[ρ]
[μοπυλ]ῆσι διατομων μὲν τὴν μουσικὴν χρο[μενους μα]
20 ἀλον] δὲ τὸν τραγῳδοὶν οντας ανδρείους τον δι
[α πα]ντος εἰωθοτων εφ αρμονιας αἰδειν ]—: [ωστε
�οτε] χρομα δεῖλους οὐτε αρμονια αν/δρείους τοι.
[ει εις τ]οὐτο δέ ερχονται τολμὴς ὡστε [ολον τον βιο]ν κα[τα
τριθεῖν ευ τος χορδας : ψάλλοντες μεν [πολυ χ]ε[ρον των]
25 [ψαλ]τον : αἰοντες δὲ τον οἱδον : συνκρινοντες δὲ
[του τ]αχοντος ρητορος παντα παντων χε[ρον ποιντες
[και π]ερι μεν τον αρμ[ομικοι]ς καλομενων ευ τοισ
φ[ασι]ν διακεισαθαι πος : ου[β ηπιαν φω[ιν] ἐχοντες λεγειν :
ἐνθο[κ]ωσιντες δε : και παρα τον ρυθμοι δε] πινοντες
30 το υποκειμενον σανιδιον αυτοις [αμα τοις] αυ[ο] τον
ψ[αι]τριου ψοφοις : και οουδε αισχυνιομενοι εξειπε[ειν
των] μελον τα μεν δαφνος εξειν [ιδιοι] τι τα δε κυ[του
ετι] δε ερωτοντες ει ου φαινεται [. . . . ]ειδια επιτη[. . .
ει. . . ]κραισθαι : και οι σανιοι προς [αιλοντ] χρονοντες

A fragment, possibly belonging to this papyrus:

35 ] . . [
'It has often been an occasion of surprise to me, men of Hellas, that certain persons, who make displays foreign to their own arts, should pass unobserved. They claim to be musical, and select and compare different tunes, bestowing indiscriminate blame upon some and praise upon others. They assert that they ought not to be regarded as harpers and singers, for these subjects, they say, they concede to others, while their own special province is the theoretical part. They appear, however, to take no small interest in what they concede to others, and to speak at random in what they say are their own strong subjects. They assert that some tunes make us temperate, others wise, others just, others brave, others cowardly, being unaware that enharmonic melody would no more make its votaries brave than chromatic will make them cowards. Who is there who does not know that the Aetolians and Dolopes, and all the folk round Thermopylae use a diatonic system of music, and yet are braver than the tragedians who are regularly accustomed to use the enharmonic scale? Therefore enharmonic melody makes men brave no more than chromatic makes them cowardly. To such lengths of confidence do they go that they waste all their life over strings, harping far worse than the harpers, singing worse than the singers, making comparisons worse than the common rhetorician,—doing everything worse than any one else. With regard to the so-called harmonics, in which, so they say, they have a certain state of mind, they can give this no articulate expression; but go into ecstasies, and keeping time to the rhythm strike the board beneath them in accompaniment to the sounds of the harp. They are not even ashamed to declare that some tunes will have properties of laurel, and others of ivy, and also to ask whether . . .'

2. ότειπων is very doubtful; the first letter may be ε or σ or possibly τ or υ.

18. If θηρμοσύλης is right, l. 18 was remarkably short; but the letter before s in l. 19 is almost certainly σ, and the preceding vestiges suit η. ό θηρμοσύλης would include e.g. the Aenianes and Octaeans, the eastern neighbours of the Dolopes and Aetolians. The mention of the Aetolians here, as Blass remarks, is appropriate in the mouth of Hippias of Elis, the Aetolians and the Eleans being closely related.

19–20. The division μαλλον is not usual, but [λον] seems insufficient for the lacuna at the beginning of l. 20, while [μαλλον] is too long.

28. Of the supposed dots after λεγειν only the upper one is preserved, and that not very clearly.

29. παρα might also mean 'in defiance of.'

30. π of απε is not quite satisfactory, and ν would in some respects be more suitable.

31–4. There can be little doubt that the small detached fragment μ [εξε]πι τ. τ. λ. contains the concluding portions of these lines, but its exact position is uncertain and the restoration proposed is highly conjectural. [θιον] τι in l. 32 is suggested by θια in the next line; but the supposed a before αθα is quite doubtful, and may be e.g. τ. τι is represented only by the tip of the crossbar, which would also suit γ or ν, but these letters are far less likely here. Compared with ομευς in l. 31 the supplement [θιον] τι is somewhat long, but with three iotae may perhaps be admitted. [αυλον] in l. 34 corresponds well with ομευς. Of the letter before απα all that is left is part of a vertical stroke, which would be consistent also with μ.
14. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

14. LYSIAS, In Theozotidem.

Mummy A. Fr. (b) 15.6 x 19.2 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. PLATE II (Fr. c, Cols. ii–iii).

The recto of this papyrus, of which there are twenty fragments, contains a speech of an Attic orator directed against a certain Theozotides. This, as was observed by Blass, must be the oration of Lysias κατὰ Θεοζωτίδου mentioned by Pollux 8. 46; cf. Sauppe, Fr. Ora.t. Att. p. 189. The script is a good-sized uncial, a thick pen being used and the lines written close together. On the verso are a series of poetical extracts (7) in two hands, of which one is a somewhat later type of cursive than most of those found in this volume. But, though the writing on the verso may perhaps belong to the reign of Philopator, the oration does not present any appearance of being appreciably later than the other literary fragments found with it, which probably belong for the most part to the reign of Philadelphus, or at latest to the early part of the reign of Euergetes. No stops are used; but the paragraphus is found, and a blank space is sometimes left at the beginning of a new sentence.

The three principal fragments, (a), (b), and (c), contain the lower portions of columns and clearly do not admit of any combination. The order of the three is uncertain, but Fr. (a) more probably precedes (or follows) the other two than comes between them, because the writing on the verso is different from that on the verso of Frs. (b) and (c). Of the small pieces, Frs. (c), (h), (m), and (p), on account of the writing on the verso, may be connected with Frs. (b) and (c), while Frs. (f), (g), and (n), of which the writing on the verso is in another hand, cannot be combined with Frs. (b) and (c), but may be connected with Fr. (a). Frs. (d), (i), (k), (l), (o), (q)–(x) have no writing on the verso, and to which part of the roll they belong is quite obscure.

It is difficult to glean much information about the nature of the speech from these scattered fragments, connected sense being only obtainable in a few passages. That the accusation against Theozotides was a γραφή παρανόμων is however clear. From Frs. (a) and (b) it appears that he had proposed to exclude illegitimate and adopted sons of citizens fallen in war from the benefits which the State conferred upon orphans, while Frs. (c) and (d) are concerned with a proposal, which was apparently carried by Theozotides, to reduce the pay of the ἱππεύς from 1 drachma to 4 obols per diem, while raising that of the ἵππος τοξοτας, an inferior class of soldiers, from 2 obols a day to 8. The description of this measure, which was obviously directed against the richer classes in the interests of the poorer, supplies some interesting information on the pay of the Athenian cavalry; cf. note on ll. 72–81. How the two seemingly distinct questions of legitimate
ancestry and pay of cavalry soldiers were connected is not evident. The text is not very accurate, several corrections being necessary; cf. notes on ll. 29, 41, and 85.

Fr. (a).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 15 letters | νόμοι |
| [ ... ] ἑτεροι
| νομοῖς τὸ καὶ τοὺς |
| [ σωκρᾶς] οὐτε νομιμῶς οὐν |
| [ θυγατέρας] ἔμοι γαρ δοκεῖ τοις ὁρ |
| [ φανον ... ] τῶν τοὺς νοθοὺς |

| Fr. (b). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 13 τοὺς νοθοὺς |

5

| 14 letters | μετὰ 
| [ ... ] θ[θ]υγατέρας νοθοὺς τὸ καὶ τοὺς |
| [ σωκρᾶς] οὐτε νομιμῶς οὐν |
| [ θυγατέρας] ἔμοι γαρ δοκεῖ τοις ὁρ |
| [ φανον ... ] τῶν τοὺς νοθοὺς |

10

| 15 letters | καταλείπει |
| [ ... ] | στον τ[ |

25

| 13 τοὺς νοθοὺς |

30

| κατὰ στησον Διονυσίου γαρ |
| [ο]ταγὸν ὁ κηρύξ ἀναγορευμένος τοὺς |
| [ο]φανῶς πατρόθεν υπειπῶν |
| [ο]τή τοῦ τῶν νεανίσκων οἱ |
| πατέρες απεθανοῦν εν τοις πο |

35 λέμου μαχομενοι ὑπὲρ τῆς
πατριδος ανδρες οντες αγαθοι
[kai] τοιτους η πολις ετρεφε με
[χρι] ηβης ενταυθα ποτερα χωρις
peri ton poιtων και ton νο
50 ton Χ
40 [θ]ων ανερεις λεγων στι τουσδε
dia Θεοζωιδην ουκ ετρεφων
η παντας αναγορευουν ομοιως
[ ιΙ letters των] ποιητων
και των [νο]θων ..... [ψευσε
55]
45 τα ται περι της τροφης υποστασων
ταυτα ουξ υβρις και [μ]εγαλη διαβο
..ον ..[.]...[]
[λ]η [ ΙΣ letters επιειδη δε Κλε
γαρ τα ελεγ[,] ..[.]...
[ομενης .. .. .. .. ω αν]δρες δικασται
[λ]αβοιν ε[,] ..[.]..
[ .. .. .. .. την ακροποι]λιν κατελαβε
60 ..[.] .. αλλη δ]

Fr. (c). Col. i. Col. ii. PLATE II.

70 . [ ιΙ letters ]. οντος ει πρεσ
[ ιΙ " ] περι φυλακης
[ 12 " ] .[ασαμ περι πο
[λ]ευξου Θεοζωιδης οντος
75 τους μεν ιπτεας αντι δρα
] απο χιμη τεσσαρα[ς οβ]λοους μις
[ν υντε
θοφορειν τοις δ ιπτητοξο
65 ρ ]του κ[.]
tas okto [οβ]λους] αντι δυοιν
[αι και
θοφοριαν
[ο]υ και μ[. .. .. .. .. ον]

Col. iii. PLATE II.

απασαν τους ιπτεας η υπερ
του παροιτος και του με[λ]λον
υπαρχοντων αλλα προβιματ
τειν οπως πλειω των ορ[τον
E 2
85 τοις συντεινειν τήν μισθοφορίαν εγὼ δὲ τὸ πορίζειν ωῷ καὶ ποστερεῖν ὁμηρὸν εἰναι τῶν [ 

90 η μηδὲν ελαττῶ τῶν ὑπάρχοντων εστὶν τοιοῦτο [...]

[τ]ουτὸν οὐχ ὁκνεῖν χρὴ [...]

[..]ν ἀλλὰ [...]. [...]. [...].

Fr. (d). Fr. (e). Fr. (f).

Col. i. Col. ii.

| έπεισεν υμᾶς π[ | οφεῖλ[ | 101 ]сте | 111 Τ[ |
| κη εξειν[ | i00 καίτοι ν[ | ]τα ε | Τ[ |
| ης διωβελίας [ | ... ] | έσβαι | 8 lines lost. |
| η σημειά [ | ] - [ | ] | 121 η[ |
| ... ... | | ] | |
| Fr. (g). | | | |
| ... | | | |
| 125 [...]μη [...] | | 110 [...] | |
| η ... αὐν . ἀναίσ[ | | | |
| λὼν συγκα[ | | | |
| ι or 2 lines lost. | | | |

Fr. (h). Fr. (i). Fr. (k).

| μοαν ... | | 142 ]δημη | 152 ]μ[-]Χ[ |
| ιπεν[ | | ]τὰ τὸ δείνον | ]ασαστο Τ[ |
| 130 ο[ρφαν ... η] | | . ημηδη | ]ρειτ ... [ |
| ]πολ ... έρ[ | | ] | |
| ] . υ συντ[ | | ] [.] βουλευση | ] . ιαι η[ |
| ]ποι ... ατο[ | | ]εισει | [ |
| ] . ου την μισθοφορίαν | ]αλεγων | ] . ιδ[ |
| 135 ]ασαν ειτει[ | | ]κο | [ |
| ] [τ]ο τ[ερ][ | | ] | |
| ] μισθοφορία[ | | ] [.] . ο[ | |
| ] . . . Τ . Λ ... [ | | | |

150 παρανομα 160 ιμ[ | | ] | |
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] . . . φυν Π[ Fr. (m). Fr. (u). . .
]ροι [. ] . . . 164 [. . .]β[ 170 [. . .]
. . . . . 165 καὶ τοὺς [. ] άτ[ Fr. (l).
]τατ[ [. . .]κ[ [. . .]κα[ [. . .]
. . . . . . . . .

Fr. (o).
Col. i. Col. ii. Fr. (p). (Fr. (q).
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7. [που]σ: cf. l. 39. This restoration is the basis of our calculation of the size of the lacunae at the beginnings of lines in this column, and, if it is correct, the supplements μ[θοφορας] in ll. 5–6 and ω[τε δικαια] in ll. 7–8 are both too long. The addition of three or four more letters to the initial lacunae throughout this column would render the restoration of l. 7 very difficult and make the lines longer than in the other columns.

26–47. 'Most monstrous of all is it that Theozotides should misrepresent the most splendid proclamation that is enjoined by law and establish a falsehood. At the Dionysiac festival when the herald proclaims the orphans with their fathers' names, and adds that the fathers of these youths died in war fighting for their country as brave men, and these youths were brought up by the State until manhood, is he then to make a separate announcement concerning the adopted and illegitimate sons, saying that owing to Theozotides these were not brought up, or is he to proclaim them all alike... and speak falsely by passing over in silence their bringing up? Would not this be an insult and the height of misrepresentation?'

Cf. Aesch. In Cles. 154 ταύτῃ ποτέ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μελλόντων ὄσπερ νυνὶ τῶν τραγῳδῶν γίγνεσθαι...


29. ἀμβολεῖ: l. ἀμβολεῖ.


41. ερεφοῦ: l. ερεφεῖν, sc. ἡ πόλις.

46. Blass suggests κατὰ τὴν πολέμιον for the lacuna, and in l. 49 [τὴν μετερον ακροσ]ρόλων.

47–9. The reference seems to be, as Blass remarks, to the expulsion of Isagoras in b.c. 508.

72–81. '... with regard to war Theozotides here advocates the motion that the knights should be paid four obols instead of a drachma, but the mounted archers eight obols instead of two, and this motion... he carried in the assembly of the people...'

The ἵππεις, who in the Peloponnesian war numbered 1000, received from the State (1) on enrolment a κατάστασις, i.e. a sum of money for equipment, which, as some think, had to be restored when their liability for service ended, and (2) a yearly μυσθός for the maintenance of their horses (Schol. ad Dem. In Timocr. p. 732. 6); but they probably received no personal pay, at any rate in times of peace (Ar. Eq. 577 προκειμένας δράκμους); cf. Boeckh, Staatsausstattung (3rd ed.), p. 317, and Gilbert, Staatsaltr. i. p. 362, note 2. The sum of about 40 talents, which according to Xen. Hipp. i. 19 the State paid annually εἰς τὸ ἵππειον, is identified by Boeckh and Gilbert with the allowance for the horses. It is tempting at first sight to connect this payment of 40 talents, which makes 4 obols a day for each ἵππεις, with the 4 obols a day which Theozotides' scheme substituted for the previous drachma; but Xenophon was speaking of times of peace, while it is fairly certain that the payments in the Lysias passage refer to time of war. For the payments to the knights during war the only piece of evidence is Dem. i Phil. 28, from which it appears that they received 30 drachmae a month, i.e. 1 drachma a day, so that in the interval between the speech against Theozotides and the first Philippic the rate which prevailed before Theozotides'
law seems to have been restored. The scale of payments to the ἰπποτοφόται was previously unknown; if our reading of ll. 78-9 is correct (neither διδάκμων nor δοῦν δραχμαν can be read), Theozotides raised their daily pay from 2 obols to 8. They were a body of 200 men, of inferior rank to the ἰππεῖς and probably drawn, like the τογόται, from the lower classes of citizens, since it may be inferred from Lysias xv. 6 that service as a ἰπποτοφότης was despised; cf. Gilbert, op. cit. p. 363. The proposal to pay them twice as much as the ἰππεῖς was evidently a democratic measure. The μισθοφορία of which the papyrus speaks must have been independent of the allowance for keeping a horse, since 2 obols would be ludicrously insufficient for that purpose.

85. συντέμευσι seems to be an error for συντεμένω: cf. Thuc. viii. 45 τὴν τε μισθοφόραν ἑωθίμεν.

92. l. 100.


151. This line was very likely the last of a column.

15. RHETORICAL EXERCISE.

Mummy A. 19·2 x 38·3 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240. Plate II (Part of Cols. i-iii).

Though in point of size the second of the literary papyri from Hibeh, this piece proves to be disappointing. It contains six consecutive columns, some in excellent preservation, from an oration which in Blass’s judgement—and his opinion on such a point is not likely to be challenged—was never really delivered, but is only a rhetorical composition. The supposed occasion is considered by Blass to be the situation resulting from the death of Alexander the Great, and the speaker, who is addressing an Athenian audience and advocating a forward policy, to be Leosthenes. That orator and soldier was with Hyperides the most active opponent at Athens of the Macedonian dominion, and played the principal part in the movement which resulted in the defeat of the Macedonian general Antipater in Thessaly. Antipater threw himself into Lamia, and there Leosthenes, who commanded the Greek allies, met his death. The phraseology of the papyrus is somewhat colourless, but references occur which suit this interpretation, e.g. the mention of a sudden change in the position of affairs (l. 43), the allusion to the speaker’s office as general (l. 116), and his personal risk in the cause he championed (l. 61) (a danger which as events were to prove he did not over-estimate), the possible reference to Taenarum (l. 58), and the exhortations to make a bold bid not only for freedom but for the leading position which freedom, if gained, might bring (ll. 73 sqq., 106 sqq., &c.). The composition is a favourable specimen of its class, and the early date gives it a certain interest. In spite of frequent confusion between ε and ι and other misspellings, there is no doubt that this text, which is carefully written in a handsome hand of medium size, is of approximately the same date as the bulk of the literary papyri in this
volume, and it is most unlikely to be later than the reign of Philadelphus. The
formation of omega, in which the second curve is unfinished and an intermediate
stage between Ω and ω is shown, should be noticed; cf. 26, which illustrates an
earlier stage in the transition. Punctuation is effected by a paragraphus, which,
when the pause comes within the line, is accompanied by a horizontal dash
marking the exact point. The text has been corrected with some care,
apparently by the original scribe. There is some illegible writing on parts of
the verso; cf. note on Fr. (a).

Col. i.  PLATE II.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. . αρου</td>
<td>[α]πεχει τον κακως τινα ποιει</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. [.]</td>
<td>των μηθευν αδικουντων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]τε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>]ξ[. .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ευ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]τα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μήκραν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>]ον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]γαρ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]τι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>]οςιαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[παρα[.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[πανει</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ν των</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]την</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>[.] [.]τα[.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.] ζημιαν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ροι εμοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]τα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.] .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>]τας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eυ[.]α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Col. ii.  PLATE II.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ρεστοτερους συμμαχους</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εξετε και φανερον απασι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταστησετε διοτι το της</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 πολεως ηθος ουτω μακραν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[α]πεχει τον κακως τινα ποιει</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>των μηθευν αδικουντων</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ελληνων — ωστε και τους</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φανερας εξημαρτηκας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 αθωνους αφιησιν δια την</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υπερβολην της φιλανθρω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πιας — μαλιστα δε λογι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ξεσθε προς των θεων ου αν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δρες Αθηναιοι [δι]ιστι το βρα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 δυνειν των νυν καθεστω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σιν ηκιστα συμφερον εστιν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οξεις γαρ εικος ευαι τους ε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ των μεταβολων καιρους</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαβει</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον αντι[[ληψει]]θε και παυσασ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 [[α]]θε προσεχουντες τοις την</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ραθυμιαν ασφαλειαν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αποκαλουσιν — και μη φοβη</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεντες [.] . . . . . . . . [.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>την σωτηριαν αλ[λα] και θαρ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 σησαντες τοιαυτα βουλ[ε]ν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σασθε δι ον μηδεποτε μ[η]θεν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Col. iii. PLATE II.

55 ἀλλὰ [α] ἡδ. [. . .] οὐδὲν τοιν [ . . .]
π. [. . .]ον [τοι]ς μὲν ἀλ

57 λοις επ’. [. . .] . . . [ φον υμιν
δὲ μ[[ε]]μεισθαῖ καθήκον εστὶν
κ[α]ἱ λογιζεσθαὶ μὲ η[κ]ιστ αν
εν Ταυ[α]ρω καθήκον
καὶ μηθενὸς γνη[τ]ρο[υν]τα

60 των εν τη θυλει ο [. . .] . υμιν
ούτως αμι φιλοκ[ι]νίδων επι
στηναὶ το[ε]ς π[ρα]γμασιν ει μη
tα των καιρων ηπισταμην
κατεπειγον[τ]α και κρισιν εω

65 ρων ουσαν της ημετερας
σωτηριας — και τ[. . . . . . . .]
των εφο[θ]υμην [ . . . . . . . .]
καθεστηκοτων [ . . . . . . . .]
eν μ[[ε]]υν αυτοις [ . . . . . . . .]

70 και ταπεινως υπ[ολ]ηφθειν
ως μηθεν των συμφεροντων
προιδειν αν δυνηθεις
ἀλλα και νυν προ[θ]ρω τα μελ
λοιτα και παρακαλω προς τα

75 πραγματα υμας και [ [ παρα
cαλω] ] την τυχην ην

Col. iv.

[ μη και]
τ[α]λειπειν — και δεομαι
μαλιστα των εστερων

80 των παρ υμ[[ε]]υν εκ παδος τα
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περὶ τὸν πολέμον ἵκανος
παιδευθεὶς — ακμασίᾳ

ποτὲ ταῖς διανοιαῖς καὶ χρη
σασθαι τοῖς οἰ[κ]είοις σωμασίν

85 ευκαιρίως τὴν αποδείξειν
ποιησάμενος τής αυτῶν
ἀρετῆς — ἐν[α] νομίζονται
καὶ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον
ησυχαζείν μὴ δι ἀνανδρίαν

90 ἀλλὰ δι ἐυλαβείαν — καὶ μὴ
θεῖος ὁ ἀνδρὸς Ἀθηναῖοι
χωρὶς τὴς μετέρας δύνα
μεσὶ τὰ πραγματα
καταδεστερον βαδίζομεν

95 μὴ ὑμεῖς ἀναγκαζήσαθε
dιὸν θατερον η ποητη ετερ[ο][[ς]
τὸ κελευμένον ἡ μετ ἔλατ
ς
tὸν στρατοπεδον κινὸν
νεεὶν ἤμων ἄλλως πῶς

Col. v.

100 α[ι]
καὶ ταῖς εμ[ι]. . . . . . . .
ἀποχρήσασθε καὶ τὴν εν
tοι πραττεὶν ὀρθῶς ἀσφα
λειαν ἔλεσθε μετα πλειωνων

105 τὴν σωτηρίαν ὑμ[ῳ]ν αὐτῶν
παρασκευαζοντες — ὡς
ἀναξιον ἐστὶν ὁ ἀνδρὲς
Ἀθηναῖοι τὼν ἐμ Μαραθωνί
tὶ
καὶ Σαλαμίν κινδυνον διὰ
teleιν ἡμᾶς τὸ συνολον
15. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

απογινωσκοντας την η
γεμοιαν — η λοιμωντας
ταντην εσοθαι ποτε υμιν
απο ταυτοματον μηδ οσι

115 ουν αυτοις πονοουσιν
ν
εγώ με ων επεί στρατηγου
ην μη τιδιας ασφαλειας και
χειροτονια[ς] φρονιζειν
αλλα της υπερτερας σωτη

120 ριας τουτο πραττων [προσε]
ληνθαβα προταξας εμ[ιαυτον]
υπερ της κουνης ελευθεριας

Col. vi.

[...

125 ἐκ...

τοιτε...

ο καιρος [...]αι [...] [.......

ελθειν επι τ [...] [.......

ριων και την [...] [.......

130 υμας εκκηριν [.......

την της πολεως αρχη
γετιν [...] και τους αλλους [εγ

χωριους θε[ους .]ον[.] αι[...

εσοθαι ξι[...

135 τας ελπις δ[...

μηνης λα[...

.[...[...

δουλειας φε [...] [.......

ελευθεριας φ[.......

νον ειρ [...] [.......

Ἀθη

140 ναιους υπερ[...

θεους ερισαι μ[...
γα... εινη[...]
υπηκοος ουτ[as]
ζεται μεγα[...]

145 [. . .]κα[...]

Fragments.

(a) . . . .
]αι τους κ[...]
]. αλλ[ο]ι με[...]
]αβας π[...]
]ηρον μεν [...]

150 ]του κα[...]
]. [...]

(b) . . . .
]μενον [.]
].]
].

155 ]ς δε νμεισ εαν [...]
]εν νυν δε νμας [...]
]αλλ ει προτερ[...]
]. εια [...]

(c) . . . .
(d) . . . .
(e) . . .

160 ]τα[...]
]. [...]

162 ]αλλης [...]
].

163 ]κα[...]
]. [...]

165 ]τα[...]
]. [...]

17. The letters παι are on a separate fragment placed here conjecturally.

26–51. '... you will have more contented allies, and will make it plain to all that the temperament of the State is so far from doing an injury to any one of the innocent Greeks that in the excess of its kindness it leaves unpunished those who are plainly guilty. Most of all, by heaven, consider, men of Athens, that delay in present circumstances is fatal, for the opportunities arising from the change are likely to be short. Seize them then, and give ear no longer to those who misname inaction safety. Do not miss your salvation through fear, but take courage, and adopt resolutions by means of which you will never...
44. παντασεθε has been altered to παντασεθε; with combinations of σ both methods of division are frequent.

54. The first word does not seem to be πλειονων, though τωι may be the last word in l. 53. γι may be read in place of π, but γιτονων is unsuitable.

55–66. ... you ought to imitate ... and reflect that although I am inferior to no ... in the city, I should not have stationed myself at Taenarum and courted danger so freely in my conduct of affairs, if I did not know that the occasion was pressing, and that the turning-point of our salvation was at hand.'

58. For εν Ταυμαρω καθημενον cf. Diod. xviii. 9 μανθοφρων, δυνα μεν δεκαοξιλες, διατρηθαντα δε πρι ταιναρω της Πελοποννησου. The reading Ταιναρω is however very uncertain.

60. Cf. ll. 116 sqq. At the end of the line the vestiges of the letter before ρων would suit η, and Ειληγρων is a possible reading; but this is not satisfactory in itself, and moreover the initial letter is much more like σ than ε. στρατηγων is inadmissible.

73–99. 'But now I foresee the future, and urge you to take action and not to neglect the good fortune which ... Especially the younger men, who have had among you a sufficient military training from their youth, I entreat to exert all their powers of mind and to employ their bodies in a timely display of their prowess, in order that their tranquillity in the past may be ascribed not to unmanliness but to prudence; and that we, men of Athens, may not proceed to action with inadequate numbers and without the aid of your power, nor yourselves be forced to the alternatives of either obeying the orders of others, or with an inferior force risking an engagement ...'

78. τα of καταλειπεω was at first omitted owing to homoiooteleuton, but was added before the insertion of the paragraphus.

90. l. μηδ (ημ)εις (sc. the mercenary troops), balancing μηδ νεις in l. 95.

96. l. ποιειν for ποιείν.

101–122. 'Make use of ... and choose the safety which lies in right conduct, working out your own preservation in larger force. For it is unworthy of the daring deeds at Marathon and Salamis, men of Athens, that you should persevere in the complete renunciation of the hegemony, or in the idea that it will ever come to you of its own accord without a single effort on your part. I therefore, since it was the duty of a general not to consider his own safety or chances of election but your preservation, have come forward with that object in view in championship of general liberty ...'

107 sqq. Cf. Diod. xviii. 10 και πρότερον μεν ο δήμος ... τούς επί δουλεία στρατευσαμένους βαρβάρους ἡμῶν κατὰ βίλαται, καὶ νῦν οἰκίαν δεῖν ἐπέρ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτηρίας ... προκινοῦμεν.

131. πολεος ἀρχηγετε: i.e. Athena; cf. C. I. G. 476 Ἀθηνα ἀρχηγετείτι καὶ θεοῖς, &c.

Fr. (a). The shape of this fragment suggests that it should be placed at the top of Col. vi, so that l. 124 combines with l. 148, but to this there are two objections, apart from the difficulty of finding suitable readings:—(1) the column would then be higher by a line than the others; (2) on the verso of this column there is some half-effaced writing, while the verso of Fr. (a) seems to have been left blank. The verso of Frs. (b) and (c) on the other hand has been used, and they may well belong to Col. vi, though we have not succeeded in placing them. Fr. (c), judging from its colour, is likely to belong to Col. i.
16. Theophrastus (?).

Mummy A. 13.3 x 19.5 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240.

One nearly complete column of twenty-two lines, and parts of two other columns, from a philosophical work, the subject of the fragment being a discussion of Democritus' atomic theory, particularly in relation to the composition of the sea. The author is, as Blass suggests, very likely Theophrastus, a passage in whose works affords a close parallel to part of the papyrus; cf. note on 141. The treatise to which the papyrus belongs may have been that peri ðòros (Diog. Laërt. v. 45) or one of his other numerous works on Natural Philosophy.

The text is written in a thick inelegant hand of a somewhat cursive character. It formed part of the same piece of cartonnage as Cols. ix-xi of 26, and belongs more probably to the reign of Philadelphus than to that of Euergetes. The paragraphus is employed, and a blank space is left before the beginning of a new section in the middle of a line.

We are indebted to Prof. H. Diels for some suggestions in the interpretation of this papyrus.

Col. i.

| 22 | πεδώνος απὸ τὴν ζητημένης αὐτοῦ διά... |
| ... | πεσθαὶ φησὶν εὐ τοι τῷ ἔρωτι τα ὁμοία |
| ... | πρὸς τὰ ὁμοία καθαπέρ εὖ τοι πάντι |
| 25 | καὶ οὕτως [γ]ενεσθαι βαλλατταν καὶ |
| Ἰτ. | ταλλα τὰ α[ι]... τὰ πάντα συνενε |
| ... | Χθεντον τ[镇党委]ν ὀμφολίων οὕτως Ἢ αδὲ |
| ... | ἐκ τῶν ὁμογενῶν εὕτω βαλλαττα |
| ... | καὶ εἴς ἄλλως εἰσὶν φανερὸν οὕτω γαρ |
| 30 | λιβανωτον οὕτω θεον οὕτω σιλφίον |
| 35 | αλλο σκεφασθαι διοίτι μέρος ποιῶν |
| 40 | τὴν βαλλατταν τὸν κόσμον τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦ τρ[α]ποῦν φησὶ γενεσθαι καὶ τα... |

Col. ii.

| 10 στα | περὶ τῆς γενεσε... |
| ... | οί μεγ γαρ υπο... |
| ... | τῆς ὑγροτητος νῦνδατον οί δέ... |
| ... | Δῆμοκρίτος δὲ... |
| 15 | τοῖ ποιεῖν... |
| ... | τὰ πρῶν... |
16. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

5 lines lost.

θαυμάστα καὶ τα παραλογώτατα
tης φύσεως ὦσπερ οὐ πολλὰς οὐσιάς

40 εἴ τις γνι θαυμώπορα επει ποιοῦντι
[γε] τοὺς χυλοὺς διὰ τα σχήματα καὶ
[to] α[λ]μυρον εγ μεγάλων καὶ γαμικο
[e]βων οὐκ [α]λογον πως περι τῆν

30. θ of θείων corr. 34. ν ει ὕποκείμενον εἰ σοιτ.

Col. iii.

κτ. [ ]
45 [.]π [ ]
τε προ[ ]
ν[ ]
καλλ. [. ] [ ]
ει δε [. ] π [ ]
50 αλλα κ [. ]
π [. ] τα [ ]
ου[ ]
σον το [. ] [ ]

λεγ. . . ωι εα. [ ]
55 ὥ γ. [. ]ομ. . . [ ]
 [. ] . . . [ ]
τοιοῦτ. [. ]αλ[ ]
ζωιων αμο [. ]
κεκρισθαι π[ ]
60 περ φυσιν [ ]
και π [. ] [ ]
πεση [. ] [ ]
ισος κατ[ ]

23-43. '... he says that in a wet substance like is (drawn) to like as in the whole creation, and thus the sea was created and all else that is . . ., through the combination of homogeneous atoms; and that the sea is composed of homogeneous atoms is also evident in another way; for neither frankincense nor sulphur nor silphium nor niter nor alum nor bitumen nor any other important and wonderful things occur in many places in the earth. In this way, therefore, it is easy to perceive this at any rate, that by making the sea a part of the world he maintains that it is produced in the same manner as the wonderful most unexpected things in nature, on the view that there are not many differences in the earth; for to one at any rate who considers that flavours originated by reason of atom-forms, and saltiness out of large and angular particles, it is not unreasonable . . .'

22. Probably σηπεδώνος, as Diels suggests. Δε πολλὴς επομενής αγε.λα[ξεθαί cannot be read.

26. α[.] . . τα: αλμυρα is inadmissible. Diels' suggestion α[λα]ροκα (cf. ll. 32 and 38) is possible, but the vestiges before τ (which is nearly certain) do not suit ὁκο at all well.

17. Sayings of Simonides.

Mummy 69. 27.7 x 15 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240.

A single column, written in cursive, containing a series of wise sayings, which according to the heading at the top were by Simonides, on the subject of expense. This heading suggests that the collection is a fragment of an anthology, but whether the papyrus itself formed part of an extensive work is doubtful; for there are 3 cm. of margin on one side of the column and 2½ on the other, without any signs of adjacent columns; on the left side however there is the junction of another sheet. The hand is a clear cursive which grows smaller in the last few lines; on the verso are parts of two columns of an account, which may be by the same writer. The date of the papyrus is about B.C. 250.

This Simonides, as the reference to the wife of Hiero (i. 4) at once shows, is Simonides of Ceos, who enjoyed a great reputation as a practical philosopher, and is ranked by Plato with Bias and Pittacus (Rep. i. 335 E). One of the sayings here recorded, which alludes to the poet’s well-known miserly tendencies, explains a reference in the Rhetoric of Aristotle (cf. note on ll. 10-13). The others we have not traced, though some illustrations will be found in the commentary. A Vienna papyrus (Wessely, Festschr. f. Th. Gomperz, pp. 67-74) contains part of a similar collection of anecdotes about Diogenes.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ανηλοματων} \\
\Sigmaιμωνιδου \\
eυδοκιμει \delta \ \alphaυτου \ προσ \ \alphaληθε\iota \ \\
an \ \kai \ \to \ \pi\rho\omicron \ \tau\eta\nu \ \Ier\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\sigma\omicron\upsilon \ \gamma\nu \\
\text{ναικα} \ \lambda\epsilon\th eta\epsilon i \ \epsilon\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\theta\omicron\epsilon\iota\omicron\omicron \ \\
g\alpha\rho \ \e\iota \ \pi\alpha\tau\alpha \ \gamma\eta\rho\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon \ \nuai \\
e\phi\eta \ \pi\lambda\eta\gamma \ \gamma\epsilon\kappa\rho\delta\omicron\upsilon \ \tau\alpha\chi\iota\sigma\iota\tau\a \\
de \ \a\i \ \epsilon\uomicron\rho\gamma\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\iota \ \kai \ \to\omicron \ \pi\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma \ \\
t\omicron \ \pi\nu\theta\alpha\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron \ \delta\iota \ \iota \ \iota \ \\
\eta \ \phi\epsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \epsilon\phi\omicron \ \d\iota \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \epsilon\iota \ \iota \ \\
f\epsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \o\tau\omicron\omicron \ \mu\alpha\lambda\llon \ \alpha\chi\theta\omicron \ \\
to \ \tau\omicron\iota\iota \ \alpha\nu\eta\lambda\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\omicron \ \eta \ \tau\omicron\iota\iota \\
\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \delta \ \epsilon\kappa \ \\
t\omicron \ \eta\theta\omicron\omicron \ \mu\epsilon\nu \ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota \ \phi\omicron \ \\
l\omicron \ \pi\alpha\tau\alpha \ \de \ \tau\alpha\omicron \ \omicron\gamma\omega\omicron \ \kai \ \\
\end{align*}
\]
17. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

4–5. About the last ten years of Simonides' life were spent at Hiero's court in Syracuse. Another reply made to Hiero's wife is recounted by Aristotle, *Rhet.* ii. 16.


10–13. This is evidently the saying of Simonides referred to in Arist. *Rhet.* iv. 1 εἰσενοχώρησα ἐστὶν ὁ ἔλευθερος εἰς κρήματα ὅτι ἄκομην μὴ τιμῶν γε τὰ κρήματα, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀχθομένος, εἰ τὶ δὲν μὴ ἀνάλωσεν, ἡ λυποῦμεν, εἰ μὴ δὲν τι ἀνάλωσε, καὶ τῷ Σιμωνίδη ὅν κράνη κομίνοι. Love of money was a favourite reproach against Simonides; cf. e.g. Aristoph. *Pax* 697–9.

17. Perhaps λαστελεῖν. π or σ may be read in place of λ.

18. An infinitive having the sense of 'injured' is lost in the lacuna; the first letter may also be γ or μ, or perhaps σ or λ.

20–2. The unpleasantness of dependence upon others is apparently here the point. Cf. Stob. *Ecl.* x. 61 Σιμωνίδης . . . εἶπεν, βούλομαι ἄν ἀποδιδόν τοῖς ἵπποις μᾶλλον ἀπολυτείν ἡ ἡμίν διότι τῶν φίλων.

25. εἰκαίνιας τὸς ψήφον is perhaps a technical phrase derived from account-keeping, but we have found no other example of it. According to Hdt. ii. 36 the Greeks in counting with ψήφον moved the hand from left to right, so 'drawing in the ψήφον' might mean 'keep
on the credit side of the account.' Prof. Smyly makes an alternative suggestion that the phrase may be equivalent to the Latin *calculum reducere*, to take back a move (at draughts), to retire from a position, the meaning practically being *δο δει μη ἀναλώσαι*. But the expression would be extraordinarily fanciful and obscure if that is the sense. *τὰς ψήφους ἐλεύσον* occurs in P. Petrie II. 13 (6). 15, but since that papyrus relates to quarrying the meaning there is probably quite different.

26. It is not very clear whether *διενεξεωθα* also is governed by δει or whether και το begins a new sentence, the inf. *διενεξεωθα* reverting to the oblique construction of II. 13–22; on the whole the latter view seems to give the better sense. Cf. Seneca, *De Benef.* v. 7 M. Cato ait, 'quod ubi dedit, a te ipso mutuare’, *Ep. Mor.* 119, §§2 and 12 (Smyly).

29. The short oblique stroke after *σπλω* apparently represents a stop.

18. **LITERARY FRAGMENT.**

**Mummy A.**

Frs. (a) + (b) 9·2 x 5·9. Circa b.c. 280–240.

The following small pieces of a literary work of uncertain character remain unidentified. Frs. (a) and (b) both come from the top of a column, but their relation is doubtful; the combination suggested in our text seems likely, but is far from certain. The resulting lines, so far as they go, will scan as the latter parts of iambic verses, and Blass seems to be right in regarding the fragments as derived from a comedy. The hand is slightly larger than that of 10–12, but is of a similar appearance, and probably dates from about the middle of the third century B.C.

Frs. (a) and (b).

5 |χι παντα [τα] σοφα γινε[ται]
   κα[τεραγαο[εν]α και επιθ[ε]
   μο[ει μικρο[ν α][πησαι μ[
   ψευδει [τι[. [] . αι διαπ[]
   μοιοι τιθ[. [] . γ . α η[τ[]
10 |ναι ους ε[. [] . τρ]σων []
   μαγ[. [] . μασο[]

Fr. (c). ...
II. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

19. Homer, Iliad II and III.

Mummy A. Fr. (i) 11 x 11 cm. Circa B.C. 285–250. Plate VI (Fr. i).

Twenty-three fragments, of which nine very small ones remain unidentified, containing parts of 105 lines from Books ii and iii of the Iliad. The writing is a handsome uncial, Ω still retaining a tendency to approximate to the epigraphic form, ε and Ω being written very small, M and Π very large. It represents one of the earlier types of literary hands in the present volume and, like 26, much more probably belongs to the reign of Philadelphus than to that of Euergetes.

In common with 21 and 22, both of which are fragments of MSS. already in part known from other pieces published in P. Grenf. II (cf. p. 5), 19, of which no published fragments exist, is remarkable for its variations from the ordinary text of the Iliad, especially in the insertion of additional lines, of which there are at least 12 or 13. Four of these expand a line describing the impartiality of Zeus (Γ 302), and three the description of Menelaus arming himself (Γ 339). As is the case with most of the additions in early Ptolemaic Homer fragments, where the 'new' lines in 19 are sufficiently well preserved to be intelligible, they are generally found to have been derived with little or no alteration from other passages in Homer; and many of the variants are also due to the influence of parallels, one conventional phrase being substituted for another, e.g. in Γ 361.

Of the readings peculiar to 19 some are probably errors, e.g. the nominative F 2
the amusing variant esto-opocots for 6ty 6p6<s>v in T 325, and
rjte for T,A0e in V ... take the present opportunity therefore of restating our views
in the light of Ludwich's criticisms and the new evidence.

Comparing the text of the papyrus with what is known about the readings of
the Alexandrian critics, 19 has three lines (B 673–5) of which two were athetized
and one omitted by Zenodotus, and two other lines (B 724–5) which he athetized,
but agrees with him in reading μαρτυρες (Γ 280), where Aristarchus had μάρτυροι,
while in Γ 295 19 agrees with Aristarchus in reading αφυσομενοι, not αφυσόμενοι,
but contains five lines (B 791–5) obelized by him; and no particular connexion
is traceable between this text and that of the chief Alexandrian grammarians.
Nor does 19 exhibit any marked affinity to the text of other and later Homeric
papyri which partly cover the same ground, the most important being the
Bodleian Homer discovered in the Fayûm, P. Brit. Mus. 126 and P. Oxy. 20. It is
specially noteworthy that the new line inserted in P. Oxy. 20 after B 798 is
absent in 19, which also differs from P. Oxy. 20 in B 795 and 797. Among
other peculiarities of the papyrus are its preferences for augmented forms, e.g.
Γ 296 ηνκοντο, Γ 370 ελκε, Γ 371 ηγχε, and for φη in place of ḫ (Γ 355 and 369).

The supplements of lacunae in 19–21 and 23 follow the text of Ludwich; in 22 that of La Roche.

In P. Grenf. II. pp. 12–13 we gave, in connexion with those fragments
belonging to 20, 21, and 22 which were published in 1897, our views upon some
of the problems arising from the great variations in early Ptolemaic texts of
Homer. Our contentions, in common with the much more far-reaching claims
advanced by some critics upon the earlier discovery of the Petrie and Geneva
fragments, were subjected to a searching examination by Prof. A. Ludwich in his
exhaustive discussion of the subject, Die Homervulgata als voralexandrinisch
erwiesen. The main objects of that work were (1) to dispose of the idea that
the texts of the early Homeric papyri represented the pre-Alexandrian condition of
the poems, out of which the vulgate was produced by the labours of the
Alexandrian critics; (2) to show from a detailed investigation of the Homeric
quotations in writers of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. that the texts used by
them substantially agreed with the vulgate; and (3) to deny practically any
critical value to the early papyrus fragments, which exhibit neither the vulgate
nor the critical texts, but an 'erweiterte oder wilde' category of Ptolemaic
MSS. (p. 66). We take the present opportunity therefore of restating our views
in the light of Ludwich's criticisms and the new evidence.
The present volume supplies additional fragments (20–22) of P. Grenf. II. 2–4, and pieces of two previously unknown Homeric papyri, 19 and 23. In the case of 21 and 22 the published fragments had already proved with sufficient clearness the existence of great divergences from the vulgate, and the newly discovered pieces merely provide further illustrations of the same tendency, which is particularly marked in the case of 21. 20, however, of which there are now extant parts of 71 lines in all, enables us to form a fairer estimate of the real nature of the MS. hitherto represented only by P. Grenf. II. 3, parts of Δ 109–13 containing no variations from the vulgate. Since the Geneva fragment, which is a MS. of the same type as the third century B.C. the evidence of great divergences from the vulgate. Since the Geneva fragment, which is a MS. of the same type as the third century B.C., and the insertion of new lines is concerned, 20 still seems to be more free from expansions than 19, 21, and 22, since the insertion of a line after Δ 69 is more than balanced by the omission of three lines which are found in the ordinary texts. The total number of lines is thus two less than in the corresponding portions of the vulgate, but on the other hand the existence in this MS. of numerous variations similar in character to those found in 19, 21, and 22 is now clear; for although the fragments of 20 are very small and most of the lines are represented by a few letters only, there are several noteworthy variants. Considering that additional lines tend to be very unevenly distributed, especially in 19 and 21, the circumstance that only one happens to occur in the extant pieces of 20 is quite compatible with the possibility that this text presented the same characteristics as those found with it; but the prima facie evidence is in favour of drawing a marked distinction between 20 and its companions, and probably that papyrus represents either a text which has been subjected to critical revision, especially by the omission of many superfluous lines, or else a tradition which from its origin was relatively free from interpolations, being in this respect perhaps superior even to the vulgate. In any case 20 certainly cannot be claimed to represent the vulgate. Both the two new papyri, 19, with 12 or 13 new lines out of 105, and 23, with 3 out of 30, exhibit the same degree of divergence from the vulgate as 21 and 22, 23 being of particular importance because it is the only early Ptolemaic fragment of the Odyssey, the text of which seems to have been in as fluctuating a condition as that of the Iliad. With regard to the later Ptolemaic period there is now a little more evidence for determining the date at which the vulgate superseded other texts. P. Fay. 4 (Θ 332–6 and 362–8) and P. Tebt. 4 (B 95–210, with Aristarchean signs) both belong to the latter part of the second century B.C., and agree fairly closely with the vulgate, at any rate as to the number of lines, whereas the numerous Homeric fragments of the Roman period published in recent years very rarely contain new verses, and serve to illustrate only too well the overwhelming predominance of the vulgate. Since the Geneva fragment, which is a MS. of the same type as the third century B.C.
HIBEH PAPYRI

fragments, belongs to the second century B.C., probably the earlier half of it, the dividing line, after which the tendency for Homeric papyri to vary from the vulgate rapidly diminishes, would seem to be best placed about B.C. 150 or even earlier, rather than at the end of the Ptolemaic period.

Briefly, therefore, the situation is as follows. There are extant fragments of six different papyri earlier than B.C. 200, most of them certainly, and perhaps all, earlier than B.C. 240 (the doubts expressed by Ludwich, op. cit., pp. 9–10, as to the early date of the Petrie fragment, though justified by some remarks of the first editor, have become, through the advance in knowledge of the palaeography of early Greek papyri, quite baseless). Of these six, one comes from the Fayûm, four from either the Heracleopolite or Oxyrhynchite nome, not improbably Oxyrhynchus itself, one (23) from the Heracleopolite nome. Five of them belong to the Iliad, one to the Odyssey; and all six exhibit very marked divergences from the text of the vulgate, particularly in the insertion of new lines. These are distributed through five of the papyri unevenly, in proportions ranging from one new line out of four in 21 to one line out of about twelve in 22, but are much less conspicuous in the sixth (20), which, so far as it goes, exhibits a shorter text than the vulgate. In the fragments of the second century B.C. there is only one which shows similar characteristics to the same extent; and by the end of that century the vulgate, so far as can be judged, seems to have almost attained to that pre-eminence which is attested by plentiful evidence in the Roman period.

From these facts we should draw the following conclusions:

(1) The effect of the new evidence afforded by the present volume is to confirm and amplify the evidence regarding the characteristics already known to exist in early Ptolemaic Homeric fragments, and to reduce still further the probability that the prevalence of these divergences is due to chance. It could formerly be maintained that, side by side with the 'eccentric' traditions represented by the papyri, there were circulating in the Fayûm (the supposed provenance of all the previously known fragments) as many or even more texts representing the vulgate, and that, taking the Homeric papyri earlier than B.C. 150, the majority of 4 to 1 in favour of the 'eccentric' traditions gave quite an unfair idea of their preponderance. The majority in favour of the 'eccentric' traditions has now become 6 to 1, while even the one exception (20) is not the vulgate text; and the area in which there is evidence for their currency has been extended, so that the probability that the extant fragments illustrate not unfairly the prevailing texts in Upper Egypt is greatly strengthened. Whoever and wherever the readers of the vulgate in the third century B.C. may have been, they certainly do not seem to have included more than the minority, if any at all, of the Greek settlers in Upper Egypt. Accordingly we adhere more strongly
than ever, in spite of Ludwich's objections (op. cit., p. 188), to the view (P. Grenf. II. p. 12) that 'if there was any one tradition generally accepted in Egypt in the third century B.C., it was at any rate not our vulgate. . . . It is clear that the rise of the vulgate into general acceptance took place in the interval (between B.C. 150 and 30). ' The point of view implied by that sentence is rather seriously misunderstood by Ludwich. He supposes (ibid.) that we wished to maintain 'dass unsere Homervulgata . . . erst in der zweiten Hälfte der Alexandrinerzeit entstanden ist,' a hypothesis which runs counter to the main argument of his book, that the vulgate was in existence long before the third century B.C. But though his presentation of the case against the position that the vulgate was not yet in existence when the early papyri were written leaves nothing to be desired in thoroughness, it does not affect our contention which was something quite different. What we meant and what in fact we said in the passage quoted above, though perhaps with insufficient clearness, was not that the rise of the vulgate took place after B.C. 150, but that its rise into general acceptance occurred after that date, i.e. that it did not supersede the 'eccentric' traditions until then, the evidence indicating that the text generally accepted in Egypt in the early Ptolemaic period was not the vulgate. And this we believe more firmly than before. The question how and when the vulgate, whether identical or not with the text called by Didymus and Aristonicus the κοινή, took its origin is another point; and even granting Ludwich's contention that the vulgate is substantially the text quoted by the fifth and fourth century Greek authors (which is by no means certain), so far from there being any evidence that in the earlier Ptolemaic period the vulgate was the normal text in circulation through Egypt apart from Alexandria, there is now fresh proof to the contrary.

(2) A more satisfactory comparison of the 'eccentric' texts with those of the chief critical editions is now possible, because among the Homeric fragments contained in the present volume, unlike those in P. Grenf. II, there are several passages in which the readings of the Alexandrian critics are known. On the whole the new evidence does not suggest any particular connexion between the 'critical' and the 'eccentric' texts, and supports our previously expressed view that, beside the enormous differences between the vulgate and these papyri, its disagreements with the text of Zenodotus and Aristarchus appear comparatively insignificant. Through the publication of Ludwich's most valuable collection of Homeric citations in fifth and fourth century B.C. authors, the position which these occupy in relation to the vulgate and the 'eccentric' texts can now be estimated. Ludwich's statistics (op. cit., pp. 140-1) show that out of 480 verses quoted by various authors before B.C. 300 only 9-11 are not found in the vulgate; from which he concluded (1) that the text used by the pre-Alexandrian writers
was much nearer to the vulgate than were the ‘eccentric’ traditions, and (2) that so far from the Homeric tradition being in a chaotic condition before the time of the Alexandrian grammarians, most of the pre-Alexandrian writers (24 or 25 out of 29) already used the vulgate, not the ‘eccentric’ texts. Without advocating the extreme position maintained on the appearance of the Petrie Homer fragment by some critics who denied the existence of the vulgate text at all before the Alexandrian period, and admitting that the fifth and fourth century B.C. quotations are on the whole slightly nearer the vulgate than are the ‘eccentric’ texts, we have less confidence than Ludwich in the inferences which he bases upon his figures. It is quite true that the average of new lines in the ‘eccentric’ texts (about 70 in 547 lines, i.e. 1 in every 8 approximately) is higher than that in the quotations (about 1 in 48), and if the new lines in the ‘eccentric’ text had been at all evenly distributed the argument from the difference in the averages would have considerable weight. But, as we pointed out in P. Grenf. II. p. 13, and as is again clearly illustrated by 19 and 21, the additional lines are distributed very unevenly. They tend to come at points where the thread of the narrative is loose, and to occur in batches; and between the premiss that there are few of them to be found in the pre-Alexandrian quotations and the conclusion that the texts from which those quotations are derived were free from extensive insertions of new lines, there is a broad gap, over which Ludwich’s bridge is very insecure, as will appear more clearly from an instance. In 19 there are 12 additional lines out of 105, but of the 13 fragments (treating Frs. (m) and (z) as one) 7 have no additional lines at all, and 8 out of the 12 additional lines occur on 2 fragments. Similarly in 21 (θ) there are (including P. Grenf. II. 2) at least 26 new lines out of 105, a proportion of 1 in 4; but 9 of these occur after l. 65, 4 before and 4 after l. 55, and 4 after l. 52: throughout the other passages additional lines are scarce. It is obvious that several citations might be made from the extant fragments of 19 and 21, particularly quotations of 2 or 3 lines such as figure largely in Ludwich’s list, without in the least betraying the fact that the average proportion of new lines in 19 is 1 in 8 or 9 and in 21 is actually 1 in 4, and that if only one or two short quotations were made from 19 or 21 the chances against the true average being indicated are very considerable, especially as the additional lines are seldom very striking. Moreover, of the 29 authors who appear in Ludwich’s list, and 25 of whom he claims as supporting the vulgate, those who are represented by more than 3 quotations and 10 lines in all (when the evidence is less than that it is really too slight to be of much value) number only 7, and 2 of these 7 (Aeschines and Aristotle),

1 In this calculation we omit 20 for the reasons explained on p. 69, but include the Geneva fragment, which contains 9–13 new lines out of 77.
and possibly a third (Diogenes of Sinope), make quotations containing extra lines, indicating that if they sometimes quoted from the vulgate they also at other times quoted from the 'eccentric' texts. The question of the relation of the quotations in fifth or fourth century B.C. authors to the vulgate can only be decided satisfactorily if a sufficient amount of the 'eccentric' traditions is recovered to make possible a direct comparison between it and the quotations. Passages in which the pre-Alexandrian quotations happen to coincide with the extant fragments of the 'eccentric' texts are naturally very rare, but one occurs in Θ 20–2, where Aristotle (π. ξενον κυ. 4. p. 699 B, 35) transposes ll. 20 and 22 of the vulgate, whereas 21 agrees with the vulgate with regard to the order. There is however a quotation in Plutarch (Consol. ad Apoll. 30) of a passage which is partly preserved in P. Grenf. II. 4 (Ψ 223), and in this it is curiously significant that Plutarch's text had an additional line which is also found in the papyrus. And if a writer as late as Plutarch was using a text which apparently resembled the 'eccentric' class long after the pre-eminence of the vulgate was unquestioned, have we the right to believe in the widespread circulation of the vulgate any earlier than the date attested by strong and direct evidence? The papyri, as we have shown, lend no support to the vulgate until the second century B.C.; and the quotations from fifth and fourth century B.C. authors are for the most part so small and so easily reconcilable with an inference exactly opposite to that drawn from them by Ludwich, as to be quite inconclusive. To maintain, therefore, as Ludwich proposes, in the face of the four additional lines added to Θ in the Pseudo-Platonic Alcibiades II and the quite different version of Ψ 77–91 in Aeschines' speech against Timarchus, in spite of the consensus of the early Ptolemaic papyri and notwithstanding the obviously hazardous character of an argument from averages based on comparatively few instances, the thesis 'dass es ganz unmöglich ist, die Existenz und die überwiegende Herrschaft dieses Vulgärtextes für die voralexandrinische Zeit zu leugnen,' seems to us a considerable exaggeration. In this, as in several other respects, the truth would seem to lie between the two extremes represented by Ludwich and the critics whom he was chiefly opposing. However unwelcome it may be, the fact remains that the history of the Homeric vulgate prior to B.C. 150 is still involved in very great obscurity, and dogmatism of any kind is to be deprecated. Before B.C. 200 we can distinguish a certain number of texts, represented either by papyri or by quotations, which certainly were not the vulgate, and a much larger number of texts, represented however only by quotations, which may or may not have been the vulgate. Until we know what were the readings of the 'eccentric' texts in the passages corresponding to these quotations, and whether they coincided or not with the
vulgate, the agreement between the quotations and the vulgate do not prove much, since the 'eccentric' texts often agree with the vulgate in the matter of lines throughout quite long passages. The extreme view that the vulgate was the creation of Alexandria is rightly rejected by Ludwich; for there is evidence to show that much of the Alexandrian criticism failed to influence the vulgate, and it is on general grounds unlikely that the vulgate could have attained its pre-eminence by B.C. 150 if it had only come into existence in the previous century. That some of the texts represented by the fifth and fourth century B.C. quotations were of the same character as the vulgate is likely enough. But that it had any right to the title of the 'common' text before the second century B.C. is extremely disputable. So far as the evidence goes at present, the use of the vulgate text seems to have been rather the exception than the rule down to B.C. 200.

(3) This brings us to another point. What were the causes of the rise of the vulgate into pre-eminence? For Ludwich, who regards the vulgate as already firmly established when the text of Homer first emerges from the mists of antiquity in the fifth century, the answer is easy. But if we are right in thinking that in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. the text which became the vulgate was fiercely competing with other texts which tended to be much longer, and that it only achieved the victory about B.C. 200, something more than its intrinsic merits would seem to be required to account for its success. If the 'eccentric' texts, which are, we think, as old as the vulgate, were good enough not only for Aeschines and the author of Alcibiades II, but for the first three generations of Greek settlers in Upper Egypt, why were they abandoned by the succeeding generations? It is very difficult to acquit the Alexandrian Museum of having had some part in the matter, at any rate in Egypt itself, and to disconnect entirely, as Ludwich wishes, the foundation of the chief University of antiquity from the great changes wrought during the next century and a half in the ordinary copies of the text of that author who was more studied than any other. Of the general teaching received by students of Homer at the Museum very little is known except the views of particular grammarians on particular points; and the fact that very few of the readings preferred by the great critics seem to have affected the text of the vulgate is by no means inconsistent with the hypothesis that the influence of the Museum, as a whole, in some way tended to foster the reproduction of the vulgate in preference to the 'eccentric' editions. Here too, as we have stated, we have endeavoured to strike a mean between the position of those who contended that the Alexandrians created the vulgate and that of Ludwich, who denies that they were in any way responsible for its general currency.

(4) With regard to the value of the variants in the early papyri, the new
lines are in many cases no doubt interpolated from other portions of the poems, and the other differences are often due to the unconscious influence of parallel passages. Some of the new readings, however, especially the omissions in 20, are at least defensible, and in themselves as good as those of the vulgate, though none of those found in 19 and 21-3 has so strong a claim to be considered superior as that much-discussed variant ὅκα δὲ ἕρις (Ψ 198), found in P. Grenf. II. 4, in place of ἄκελα δ’ ἕρις. That Ludwich rejects this is not surprising in view of his threefold classification of Ptolemaic Homeric MSS. (cf. p. 68) and his anxiety to deny any critical value to the ‘erweiterte oder wilde’ category. But in his continued preference for ἄκελα δ’ ἕρις in the face of the other reading Ludwich has not commanded general support (ὁκα δὲ ἕρις is accepted, e.g. by Monro and Allen, though not by Leaf); and the attempt to limit the knowledge of the truth to particular families of MSS. to the exclusion of the rest is not likely to be more successful in the case of Homer than in that of other authors. One of the most valuable results of recent discoveries is the proof of the fallacy of pinning one’s faith to one tradition. A comparison of the papyri of extant Greek authors with the corresponding portions of the mediaeval MSS. shows that the early texts (cf. e.g. 26 introd.) hardly ever favour in a marked degree any one of the later MSS. or families of MSS., while in the case of some authors, e.g. Xenophon (cf. P. Oxy. III. pp. 119–20), the papyri show that modern critics have often gone too far in preferring one family of MSS. to another, and prove clearly, what is apt to be sometimes forgotten, that the proper guiding principle in the reconstruction of the text of any ancient author is a judicious eclecticism. And though from the point of view of Homeric criticism of the twentieth century it may be convenient to label the texts of the early papyri as ‘eccentric’ or ‘wilde,’ it should be remembered that there was a long period during which this class probably formed the majority of texts in circulation, and that the similar variants existing in several of the quotations of Homer in the fifth and fourth century B.C. writers are now freed by the evidence of papyri from much of the suspicion of error which formerly attached to them. As was pointed out by Mr. Allen (Class. Rev. 1899, p. 41), it is now known that Aeschines and the author of Alcibiades II neither were the victims of imperfect recollection nor adapted passages to their own ends, but were quoting copies more or less resembling the texts of the early papyri.

Fr. (a).

B 174 [οὐτὸ δὲ οἰκὼν δὲ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν
175 [φευξεσθ ἐν νήσσι πολυκλῆσι πεσοντ]εσ

Fr. (a).
HIBEH PAPYRI

176 [καθ δε κεν ευχαλην Πριαμω και] Τρωσι λεποιτε
177 [Ἀργειην Ελευνης εινεκα πολλων] Αχαιων
178 [εν Τροιηι απολουτο φιλης απο πατριδος αιτης]
179 [αλλ ἰθι νυν κατα λαον Αχαιων μηδε] τ [ερωει

179. For μηδε τ ερωει the first hand in P. Brit. Mus. 126 has χαλκοχρωμων, which is possible here.

Fr. (b).

B 204 ουκ αγαθη πολυκοιρανη εις κοιρανος εστω
205 εις βασιλευς οι δωκε Κρονου παις αγκυλομητω

204. αγαθη: αγαθον MSS.
205. δωκε: so most MSS. δωκε Aristarchus and a few MSS.

Fr. (c 1).

B 621 [νες ο μεν Κτεανο ο δε Ευρυτον Ακτοριονος]
622 [τον δ Αμαργυκειδης Διωρης ηρχεν άμμων]
623 [τον δε τεταρτων ηρχε Πολυγειος θεοειδης]

The position assigned to this fragment, which was suggested by Blass, is almost certain. The remains of the first and third lines suit B 621 and 623, and though άμμων in l. 2 conflicts with the termination of B 622 in the MSS., the variant presents no difficulty. άμμων occurs at the end of a line in B 876, but the ends of the other two lines are there different.

621. Ακτοριονος: the MSS. are divided between 'Ακτορίων (Aristarchus) and 'Ακτορίωνος.
622. Διωρης ηρχεν άμμων: ηρχε κρατερε Διωρη MSS. The reading of the papyrus avoids the spondaic ending of the verse.

Fr. (c 2).

B 673 [Νιρενος ος καλλιστος ανηρ] υπηρι Ιλιον ηθε
674 [τον αλλων Δαναων μετ άμμωνα Πηλειωνα]
675 [αλλ αλαπαδον ευν παμορος δε οι εσπετο λαος
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676 [οι δ' αρὰ Νισυρο]ν τ' εἰχὸν [Κρα]παθο]ν [τε Κασον τε
677 [καὶ Κον Ευρυπ]υλου]ν πολιιν [νησου τε Καλυθας

673. This line and 675 were athetized by Zenodotus, who omitted 674.
675. εσπερο: εισητερο MSS. (except one which has εισητερο).

Fr. (d).

B 715 [Αλκηστις Πελιαο θυγ]ατρων [ειδος αριστη]
716 [οι δ' αρα Μηθωνη καὶ Θαιμακιην εφατινη]
717 [καὶ Μελιβοιαν εχον και Ολικωνα τρηξειαν
718 [των δε Φιλοκτήτης ηρχεν τοξων ευ [ειδως]
719 [επτα νεων ερεται δ εν εκαστην πειρη]ηκουτα
720 [εμφεβασαν τοξων ευ ειδοτες υφι μαχηςθα'ει
721 [αλλ ο με ν εν νησωι κειτο κρατερ αλγεα πασει]
722 [Λημυοι εν εγαθει οθι μυν λιπον υνεις Αξη]ςων [
723 [ελκει μοχθιζοντα κακωι ολοοφρονοι ιθων
724 [ενθ' ο γε κειτ αχεων ταχα δε μυνεσθαι εμελλον

716. εφατινη: ενυμοντο MSS.
718. Zenodotus read here των αδ ηγεμονειν Φιλοκτηνης ουδέ ανδρων.
722. The reading αιων is very doubtful, especially the α, and 31 letters are rather long
for the lacuna ; in l. 723, which has 31 letters in the corresponding space, there are 7 omicrons,
and in l. 724 only 21 or 22 letters are lost in the corresponding space.
724. This line and 725 were athetized by Zenodotus.

Fr. (e).

B 794 [δευμενος οπποι]τε μαρυφιν αφορμηθειειν Αχαιοι
794 a εις πεδιον Τρωεσαι φωογ και κηρα φεροντες
795 [τωι] μυν αρ ειδομενη προσεφη ποδας οκεα Ιρις
796 [ω γερον] αει τοι μυθοι οιλοι αξκριτοι εισιν
797 [ος τε πο]τε ειρηνη πολεμας δ αλιαστος οφορεν
798 [νηθ] μεν] μαλα πολλα μαχας εισηλυθον ανδρων
794. For the new line inserted after this cf. B 352 'Αργείων Τραγείας φάνον καὶ κήρα φέροντες.

795. μὴν αὐτοί εἴδομεν: μὴν εὐστρεπὴν ὁ Οὔξυ. 20, μὴν εὐστρεπὴν οἱ άλλοι Μ. Μ. Σ. Cf. λ 241, where ἀρά εἴδομεν is found in a Vienna MS. in place of ἀρά εἰσαμένοι οṁ ἀρά εἰσαμένοι. Lines 791-5 were obelized by Aristarchus.

796. οὐ: so X; οὐί other MSS. Cf. r 296.

797. [οὐ]τε ποτὲ εὐρή: the restoration of the lacuna is uncertain. The beginning of this line seems to have given much trouble in early times. P. Oxy. 20 has οὐ τε ποτὲ εὐρή which will construe but not scan, the Bodleian papyrus οὐ τε ποτὲ εὐρή which will scan and is defensible. The vellum MSS. mostly have οὐ ποτὲ εὐρή, with the unmetrical variant ἄρα τί ἦν, in three instances, and ἄστερ ἦν in one. 19 is unique in having the nominative εὐρή, which can hardly be justified and may represent a corruption of the reading οὐ τε ποτὲ εὐρή.

798. After this verse P. Oxy. 20 inserts from r 185 a new line ἐνθα ἐδει νηστικὸν ψυχας ἀνετὰς αἰώνασκοιν.

Fr. (f).

B 813 γῆν η τοῖς ανδρέσ Βατειαν κικλησκοῦν
814 ἄφαιστοι δὲ τε σῆμα πολύσκαρβοιο Μυρίνης
815 ἐνθα ἄντε Τράοις τε διεκρίθην ἡδ ἐπικουροὶ
816 Τράοις μεν πηγεμονεὶς μεγας κορυθαιὸς Εκτωρ
817 [Π]ραγμ[α]ίδης αμα τοι γε πολυ πλειστοι και αριστοι

Fr. (g)

B 826 [τον αὐτό] ηγεμονεῖ[ε] Λυκανους αγλαος υιος
827 [Πανδράρος οι και το]ξον Απολλων αυτος εδωκεν
828 [οι δ] αρ [Α]δρηστειαν ναξιον και δημον Απασου
829 [και Πιτρειαν εχον και] Τηρεις ορος αιτυν
830 [τον ηρ]χε Αδρητος τε [και Αμφιος λυνοθωρηξ]

826. τον αὐτό ηγεμονεῖ: the doubtful θ might be ρ, but there is not room for [τον αὐτό]. Most MSS. (including the Bodleian papyrus) read Τρῶες τῶν αὐτὸ ἢρχε, a few having the
variants τ’ ἀδ’ or τ’ ἀδ’. The papyrus version can be defended against that of the vulgate; for εἶ δὲ Ζελειάν ἔταιον in 824 are in any case contrasted with Τρωὶ μὲν ἐγγύλωσεν in 816 and Δαρδανῶν αὐτ’ ἔχειν in 819. But Τρῶες is, as Blass observes, in accordance with E 200 and 211, where Pandarus calls his people Τρῶες.

828. αρ: so Α and some other MSS.; the Bodleian papyrus and the rest omit it. 
1α’ων: τ’ έχον MSS. The papyrus avoids the repetition εξον ... έχον in 828–9.

Frs. (h) and (i). 

Γ 277 [Hελίος θ’ ος πάντες ἐφορᾷ κα’] πάντες ἐπάκουει
278 [καὶ ποταμοὶ] καὶ γαῖα κ’ αἰ ous ἐπενεργεῖ καμοῦντας
279 ? [ 24 letters ]
280 [υμεῖς μαρτύρητε εὐτε φιλασσεῖ δ’ ὀρκία π’οστα
281 [εἰ μεν κεν'] Μενέλαον Ἀλεξάνδρος καταπεφνῆι
282 [αὐς ἐπειθ Εἰλενην εξέω καὶ κτημ’]Επαν ταντα
283 [ημεῖς δ’ εν νη]έσσοι νεωμέθα κουριν Ἀχιών
283 a [Αργος εις ἐπιβοθον κ’ αἰ Αχαΐα ἀκαλλιγν’]αικα
284 [εἰ δέ κε τοῖς Μενέλαιοι Αλεξάνδροι καταπεφνήι
285 [Τρωάς επειθ Εἰλενην κ’ αἰ κτημ’]Επαν αποδούναι

Γ 277. ἐφορᾷ ... [ἐπάκουει: so P. Brit. Mus. 126 (ρα corr. from -ρας) and Sch. Apoll.; ἐφορᾷ ... ἐπάκουει] other MSS. Cf. λ 109, μ 323 Ἡλίον δὲ πάντες ἐφορά χαὶ πάντες ἐπάκουει.

279. Lines 277–8 are on a separate fragment, the position of which in relation to the following one is not certain. The vestiges of the line preceding 280 are not reconcilable with any letters from the middle of l. 279 as given in our texts ἄνθρωποι τίνων οἷς κ’ ἐπισκοπὸς ὄµος ὁτι, but whether the papyrus merely differed from the vulgate in that line or contained it and inserted one or more new lines afterwards cannot be decided. The combination γαῖα κ’ αἰ ous ἐπενεργεῖ καμοῦντας is not admissible.

280. μαρτύρητε: so Zenoetotus and a few MSS.; μαρτύρητε Aristarchus and the majority of MSS.

283. κουριν Ἀχιών: ποιταπάροισι most MSS. The line is not infrequently omitted. The new line inserted after 283 comes from Γ 258.

284. The MSS. have εἰ δὲ κ’ Ἀλεξάνδρου κτεῖν διαφθεῖ Μενέλαοι. The papyrus reading simply repeats l. 281 with the fewest necessary changes.

Fr. (k).

Γ 295 [ομον δ’ εκ κ’ ὑπηρετοις αὐ]φυσοῦ γενοῦς διεπασσιν
296 [ἐκχεον η’ δ’ ἤπιον θεὸς ἀεί ἑγενεθείσιν]
297. [ο]δὲ δὲ τις εἰπὼν Αχαιοί τε Τρωιῶν τι[ε

295. α]φυσάμενοι: so Aristarchus, A (second hand) and other MSS.; ἄφυσαμενοι P. Brit. Mus. 126, A (first hand) and others.
296. ηχοτο: εὖχοτο MSS. Cf. p. 68.
297. εἰπὼν: the doubtful a might be δ or λ, but there is hardly room for even a narrow letter such as i between it and οκεν. εἰπεὶκεν is uniformly found in the MSS.

Fr. (i).       Col. i.

Γ 302  [ο]ς εφαν εἰ[χο]μενοι μεγά δ ἐκτυπε μητήτα Ζεύς
302 a [ἐξ Ἰδης βρον]των επὶ δε στεροπὴν εφεικεν
302 b [θησεμεναι γ]αρ εμελεν ετ αλγε τε στοναχας τε
302 c [Τρωις τε και] Δαναοι[σι] δια κρατερας νο[μιμα]
302 d [ανταρ επε]ρ ο[µουεν τε τελευτησεν [τε] τον ορκ[ον
303 [τοια]υ τε Δαρβάνι[δης] Πριαμος προσ µωθον εειπεν
304 [κεκλυτε µεν Τρωες και Δαρβανοι ηδ [ἐ]πικουροι
304 a [οφρ ειπω] τα μεθθεσσιν αι[ω]γει
305 [ητοι ε]γων ειμι προ[οι]τι Ιλιον πηρεσσαν
306 [ο]ν γαρ κεν τλαιην [πο]τ εν οφθαλµουσιν ορασθαι
307 [µα]νανα[ε]νον φιλον νιον Αρηφιλωι Μενελαωι
308 [Ζευς µεν πον] τι[α] γε οιδε και αθανατοι θεοι αλλοι
309 [οπποτερω θα]νατοι τε[λος πεπρωμενον εστιν
310 [η] ρα και ει διφρο]ν αρθ[νας θετο ισοθεος φοι

Col. ii.

325 εισοραθων Παριος δε θοος εκ κληρους ορουσεν
326 οι µεν [επε]θ ιζουτο κατα στιχας ηχι εκαστου
327 [ε]πιπτοι αεραιποδες και ποικιλα τευχε εκείτο

302. For this the MSS. have δη ἐφαν ου δ' ἀρα τις σφυν ἐπεκβιάσεν Κρονίων, which is expanded in the papyrus into five lines. The papyrus version of l. 302 comes from Ο 377 δη ἐφαν ἐφήμεροι μεγά δ' ἐκτυπε μητήτα Ζεύς.
302 a-d. For the restoration [ἐξ Ἰδης βρον]των cf. Θ 170 τοις δ' ἀρ' ὑπ' Ἰδαιων ὁρεων κτυπε μητήτα Ζεύς and Θ 75 αὐτὸς δ' ἐξ Ἰδης μεγαλ' ἐκτυπε. The supposed τ might be combined
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with the supposed tail of the v of ενευτ evομευνη in the line preceding so as to read ]φων, but this arrangement is less satisfactory. eti followed by εφηκεν is awkward, but the reading is almost certain; eti is inadmissible. The next two lines, ]θηγημεναι γπρ ... ννυμυνας, are derived from Π 39–40 θήκην γυρ ετ’ έμελλεν επ’ άλγεα κτ.λ., where Nauck had conjectured θηγημινα γυρ εμελλεν τ’ εν, which seems to have been found in the papyrus. For the stock line [αυταρ εσε ρ ομοσεν κτ.λ. cf. Ξ 280, &c.

303. προς: μετά MSS.

304. Δαρδανος θδ [ε]πικουρον: έωκημενες 'Αχιωι MSS. For the papyrus reading, which is as appropriate as that of the vulgate, cf. Π 456, &c. The line which follows, δηρ’ εισω κτ.λ., occurs (with -οι κελεύει for -ειν δόνησι) in Η 68, 349, 369, and Θ 6, being omitted in the last two instances by the better MSS. For the variant δόνησι cf. Ι 703 δομος εις στόχως δόνης.

305. [ν]γαρ κεν πλαν [πος: άψι, επει ου πω τλήσομ MSS.; cf. Ω 565 ου γαρ κε πλαν βρότος.

306. διφρόν ορίας: the reading is very uncertain. Perhaps the papyrus has a new line here.

325. ευροφόων: άψι ορών MSS. The variant, which makes Hector behave in a very unheroic manner, is probably a mere error.

Frs. (m) and (e).

Γ 337 a [13 letters ]ης[η] 337 b. The remains of this line are inconsistent with I. 337 ἵππωρα τεωθν δέ λάφος καθηπεθεν ένεων. Perhaps the papyrus elaborated the description of the helmet in one or more new lines.

338. Here the MSS. have ελετο δ’ άλκην εγχε ε δ’ ιπαμωμμαι αρρης, with an ancient variant άλκημενον ἐξι χαλκῳ (cf. K 135) attested by Schol. Α, and perhaps ελετο δ’ άλκην] k.t.l. is a new line altogether, I. 338 occurring previously. Zenooutus athetized ll. 334–5 and inserted after 338 αμφί δ’ άρ’ άμοσαι βαλετ’ ασπίδα τερανάσσαν. For κακορυμήνα χαλκῳ cf. Γ 18, Α 43 δοχρο δοκεομεθεν χαλκῳ.

339. Αρης τευε ρευνε: Αρμοδο ένε ε έδεικν MSS. For the papyrus reading cf. Ζ 340 Αρης τευε δῶ. The three new lines expand the description of Menelaus arming himself. For ασπίδα καί k.t.l. cf. Α 256 εχον πόλησαι καί ασπίδα καί διο δοχρο. 339 δ καὶ καλαμιας κακορυμηνεσ επισφυριοις άρρηνες=Σ 459 (cf. Γ 331), and 339 c αμφί δ’ αρ’ k.t.l. repeats I. 334.
Frs. (f) and (n).

Γ 351. Ζεὺς ἀνα δοὺς τειχασθα[ί] τοῦ μὲ προχερο[φ] κακ εὑρις

352. διόν Ἀλ[ε]ξάνδρων καὶ [ε]μῆς ύπο χερείς δαμασσόν

353. όφ[π]α τις ερριγησί καὶ αὐτο[γ]ονον [ανθρωπον]


355. φη ρα καὶ [ε]μῆς αμπεσαλων προει διολιχοσκοιν εγχος

356. καὶ β[α]λε [Π]ριαμίδαο κατ αστικά παντος εισήν

357. δεια μεὶν αστικός ήκε φαιεινς [οβριμον εγχος

358. [καὶ dia] θωρηκος πολυθαιδα[λου ηηρειστο]

359. [α]ντικρυ δε παραι λαταρην διαμησε χιτωνα

360. [ε]γχος ο δ εκλινθη και αλενατ η[ηρα μελαινα]

361. Ατρείδης δ αορ αν ερυσαιμαις [παρα μηρουν

362. πληξεν επαιξας [κορυ]βος [φαλ]λον εποδαεσειης

363. α χαλκεις δειων [δε κορυς λακεν αμιφ δ αρ αυτη]

364. [τ]ροι θεα τε και τετρα χα διατρυφεν εκποσε χειρος

365. Ατρείδης δ ομοιαζεν ιδων εις ουρανοι ευρων

366. Ζευς πατερ [ου τις σειο θεων ολοστερος αλλος

367. η τα εφαμην τεισασθαι Αλεξανδρων κακοτητος ?

368. α διον Αλεξανδρων Ελενης ποσιν ηνκομου

369. νων δε μοι εν χειρεσιν αγη [ζεφος εκ δε μοι εγχος

370. ηηις[θη] παλαιμηφην ετοσιον ουδ εβαλον μιν

371. φη και επαιξας κορυς λαβεν εποδαεσειης

372. ειλκε δ επεξγομενος μετ ευκημιδας Αχαιος

373. ηγγε δε [μιν πολυκεστος μιας απαλην υπο δειρη]

352. This line was athetized by Aristarchus.

354. τις: κεν MSS.

355. φη: h MSS. Cf. l. 369.

357. ἡς: ἡδε MSS. The use of ἡς in such a context is not Homeric.

361. For this line the MSS. have Ατρείδης δε ἐρωτάμενος [ζεφος] ἄργυρόλουν. The papyrus reading corresponds to Φ 173, with the substitution of Ατρειδης for Πηλειθης.

362. επαιξας: ἀνασχόμενος MSS. Cf. l. 369. After φαλον the MSS. have ἀμφι δ' ἀρ' αὐτῷ (αὐτῷ Aristarchus and αἱ χαριστεραι) which probably came at the end of l. 362 a. For χαλκήθη as an epithet of κόρος cf. M 184, Y 398, and for ἰπποδάεσια ι' 369, Δ 459, &c. For δειων δε κορυς λακεν (suggested by Blass) cf. Δ 420 δειων δ' ἀβραχε χαλκῆς, and Σ 25 λακέ

369. δε σφι περὶ χροὶ χαλκῆς.
363. After this line there is a break in the papyrus, and Fr. (n), containing ll. 364–71, does not quite join Fr. (j), but it is improbable that any line is lost in the interval.

366 a. This new line comes from r 329. Whether the papyrus had Ἀλέξανδρον κακοῦ τητος in l. 366 is very doubtful.

369. ψηφίσματα MSS. Cf. l. 355.
370. εἰς: so P. Brit. Mus. 126 and Eustathius. ἀληθείᾳ MSS.
371. ηπιή: ηπιή Eust., ἐπιή MSS.

Fr. (o).

| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |

Fr. (p).

| τάλαι | τάλαι |
| τάλαι |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |

Fr. (q).

| μιου | μιου |
| μιου |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |

Fr. (r).

| τάλαι |
| τάλαι |
| τάλαι |
| τάλαι |
| τάλαι |

Fr. (s).

| μιου |
| μιου |
| μιου |
| μιου |
| μιου |

Fr. (t).

| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |

Fr. (u).

| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |

Fr. (w).

| μιου βαιν | μιου βαιν |
| μιου βαιν |
| μιου βαιν |
| μιου βαιν |
| μιου βαιν |

Fr. (x).

| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |
| . . . . . . |

Fr. (o) 2. Perhaps ἡρώνιαν δὲ λαός should be restored, as Blass suggests, and this line identified with Γ 318 which begins λαός ἡρώνιαν. The supposed τ in l. 1 would suit [σαποτερείς], the first word of l. 317; but after [ηρώνιαν δὲ λαός the papyrus must have continued quite differently from the MSS., which proceed θεός ἡ τε χεῖρας ἀνίσχων δὲ δὲ Τιτος εἰς εἰς κατεσκευασμένον Ἀρχαιῶν ἐν τῷ Ῥώσων τῆς.

Fr. (q) 1. Probably στρατάρχου; but the fragment does not suit B 207, 439, or 779. It is from the bottom of a column, as apparently are also Frs. (r), (t) and (u).

Fr. (w). It is tempting to read εἰς ἔρευς in l. 2 with ϵεις in the next line and place this fragment at Γ 363–4, but the vestiges of other letters do not suit διαρκείων and αὐρακον.

Fr. (x), from the top of a column, was probably in immediate proximity to Fr. (w).
20. Homer, *Iliad III–V.*

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 8 x 4 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. Plate VI (Frs. d, f, h).

Twelve small fragments containing parts of 66 lines from Books iii–v of the *Iliad,* forming part of the same MS. as P. Grenf. II. 3, a small fragment containing parts of 5 lines with no variants. 20 is much less remarkable than 19 and 21–3 for the presence of additional lines; only one is found (after Δ 69), and this is more than balanced by the omission of Γ 389, Δ 89, where the papyrus exhibits a striking agreement with Zenodotus, and Δ 527. The total number of lines is thus two less than in the corresponding portions of the vulgate, and, though most of the 71 lines are represented by only a few letters, there are several marked divergences from the ordinary text, e.g. in Γ 388, Δ 57, Δ 530 and 797. Owing to the rarity of additional lines 20 can hardly be placed in the same class as the other Homeric papyri in this volume (cf. p. 69); but it is clear that it differed widely from the vulgate.

The papyrus was probably written during the reign of Philadelphus.

Fr. (a).

Col. i.

Γ 347 [καὶ βαλεν Ατρείδαο κατ’ ασπίδα παντὸς εἰσηγήμ.]
348 [ου δ’ ερρηὲν χαλκὸς ανεγναμφῆ δὲ οἱ αἰχμῆ.
349 [ασπιδ εἰς κρατερῆι ο δε διετέρων ωρυτο χαλκοὶ.
350 [Ατρείδης Μενελαος επενεργεμένος Δι πα]μι.
351 [Ζεὺς ἀνα δος τισασθαι ο με προτερος κακ εοργ]ε.

Two lines lost.

354 [ξεινοδοκον κακα ρεξαι ο κεν φιλοτητα παράς]χη.
355 [ἡ ρα και αμπεπαλων προει δολιχοσκιον εγ]χος.
356 [καὶ βαλε Πριαμίδαιο κατ’ ασπίδα παντὸς εἰσηγήμ.]

354–6. It is not absolutely certain that the ends of these three lines, which were originally on a separate fragment, are to be placed here. But ηρ followed after an interval of one line by ινη only suits this passage in Books iii–v. The difficulty lies in l. 355, εγ]χος, for the traces of the χ are very faint and the supposed ο is not joined at the top. But as no other letter is more suitable than ο and the surface of this fragment has suffered a good deal εγ]χος is probably right.
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Col. ii.

Γ 383 [αρτι] ος αυθ Ελενην καλεουσι ει την δε κιχανε
384 πηγοι εφ υψηλοι περι δε Τρωαι αλια ησαν
385 χειρι δε νεκταριον εαυτον ετιναξε λαβουσα
386 γρηγηι δε μιν εικεν μαλαιγενε προσειετεν
387 ειροκομοι η οι Δακεδαιμοι ναιετασηι
388 ειρηια — ωι — ω μαλιστα δε μιν φιλεσσκε
389 δειξη ιδοι Αλεξιανδρος σε καλει οικουν δε νεοσβαι
390 κεινους ου εν θαλαμου και διώνωσι λεχεσσι
392 καλκει τε στιλβον και ειμασιν ουδε κε φαινης
393 ασκηρι μαχησαμενου τον γ ελθειν αλα χορον δε
394 ερχεσθ ηε χοροιο νεον ληγοντα καθιειν

388. The MSS. have ησκεν (or ησκει) ειρα καλα, μαλιστα δε μιν φιλεσκε with τη μιν 
εισαμενη προσειεουε ηε Αφροδιτη in l. 389, which is omitted by the papyrus and is quite 
unnecessary since Aphrodite is the subject throughout lls. 380 sqq. If the papyrus had 
προσειετεν in l. 386, it probably had μαλιστα δε μιν φιλεσκε in l. 388, in which case the 
beginning of l. 388 may have been ειρηια ησκει καλα ου ειρα κελ ησκεσιν ου ειρε επειεε καλα 
(cf. σ 316 ειρα πεικε), though none of these suggestions is satisfactory. An alternative 
to this arrangement is to read ειρα κελ ησκει προσειεουε δε Αφροδιτη in l. 388 with another word 
instead of προσειετεν at the end of l. 386.

Fr. (b).

Δ 19 [αυτις δ Αργειην Ελενειν Μενελαιον α]γο[το 
20 [οι εφαθ αι δ επεμυξαν Αθηναιη τε και] Ηρη 
21 [πηντια αι η ηηθην κακα δε Τρωεσι μεσθηηνυ 
22 [η τοι Αθηναιη ακεων ην ουδε τι ειπε

22. επε: the vestiges do not suit π very well, especially as the space is rather 
narrow for this usually broad letter.
55–6. These lines were athetized by Aristarchus.

57. k'ραινα: or] ρημαι. ἀλλά χρῆ καὶ ἐμον δήμαν αὐτόν οὐκ ἄτελεστον MSS. How the line should be restored is quite uncertain. αὐτόν οὐκ ἄτελεστον may, as Blass observes, come from Δ 26 πῶς ἔθελε διόν δήμαν αὐτόν ἢδ' ἄτελεστον.

Δ 55 [εἰ πέρ γαρ φθονεῖ τε κ]α[ι]ν[μ] [εἰω διαπέρσαι
56 [οὐκ αὐνοῦ φθονεῖυσ] επεὶ η [πολυ φερτερος εσσι
57 [αλλα χρη καὶ εμον κ]ρηναι τ]ορον οὐκ ἄτελεστον?
58 [καὶ γαρ εγα κες ειμι] γενος δι' ημι ενθεν οθε[ν σοι
59 [καὶ με πρεσβυτατην] τεκετο [Κρονος] αγυλομήθηνης
60 [αμφοτερον γενετι τε και ουνεκα] ση παρακοτισ[ε]
61 [κεκλημαι αυ δε πασι μετ αθανατουσιν ανασσευς]

67 [αρξωσι προτερο]μ' περ ορκια δηλησασθαι
68 [ις εφατ ουδ απιθησε πατηρ ανδρου τε θεων τε
69 [αυτωθ]ῃνει επ[ε]εα πτ]ερον ηπι[σθηδα
69 a [οροσ] θηναι κυδιστη Τριτγενεια
70 [αιγα μαλ ε στραστον ελθε] μετα Τρωας και Δ[χ]α[i]ους
71 [πειραν δ ος κε Τρωε οπερκυκυδαντας Δαχαιως
72 [αρξωσι προτερον υπερ ορκια δηλησασθαι]

69a. For κυδιςτη Τριτγενεια cf. Δ 515 ἄρον δως θυγατηρ κυδιστη Τριτγενεια. Considerations of space are against the restoration [οροσ] Δως θυγατηρ κυδιστη, and it is not satisfactory to make Zeus address his daughter as Δως θυγατηρ.

Δ 80 [Τρωας θ]υπ[οδαμους και ευκνημιδας Δαχαιους
81 [ος δε] της ειπ[εσκεν ιδων ε] πλησιων αλλων
82 [ν τον τους τε κακους και φυλοπις αινη
83 [εσσεται] η [φιλοτητα με]τα αμφοτερουι τιθει
20. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS 87

Fr. (A). Plate VI.

Δ 86 [η δ ανδρι ικελη Τροων κατεδυσεθ ομιλου]
87 [Δασδοκων Αντηνοριδη]ς κρατερωι αιχμητηι
88 [Πανδαρων αντιθεοι διξημενη ηπει δε] τηνδε
90 [εστατ αμφι δε μιν κρατεραι στιχηεις ασπι[οταν]
91 [λαων οι οι εποντο απ Αισνηπιο τωι ροαων

88. ηπει δε] τηνδε: so Zenodotus, omitting l. 89 like the papyrus; ει που έφειρων || εφειρε
Λυκιώνοι υιων άμυμονα τε κρατερων τε (=E 168–9) Aristarchus, P. Brit. Mus. 126, MSS.

Frs. (i), Col. ii, and (k).

Δ 98 [αι κεν αθα Μενε]λαιον Αρη]ιον Ατρ]εοις υιον
99 [σωε βελει δημη]δεντα πυρι[ης επιβαντ αληγεινη
100 αλη αγ οιστ]ευον Μενε[λαιου κυδα]λιμοιο
101 ευερ Απο]λλωνι λυ[κηγενει κλυτοτωι
102 αρ]μων προτογοιων Ρεξεω κλειτην εκατομβην

Δ 109 [του κερα] εκ κεφαλης εκκαι]δεκαδωρα πεφυκει
110 [και τα μ]εν ασκησας κερα]δους [ηπαρε τεκτων
111 [παν δ] ευ λ]ει[νας χρυσαν ε]πηθηκε κορωνη
112 [και το μεν ευ κα]τεθηκε] τανυσι]σαμενοι ποτε γαηη
113 [αγκλιμας προσθεν] δε σακεα σχε[θεν εσθοι εταιροι

Fr. (l) = P. Grenf. II. 3.

Δ 109 [του κερα] εκ κεφαλης εκκαι]δεκαδωρα πεφυκει
110 [και τα μ]εν ασκησας κερα]δους [ηπαρε τεκτων
111 [παν δ] ευ λ]ει[νας χρυσαν ε]πηθηκε κορωνη
112 [και το μεν ευ κα]τεθηκε] τανυσι]σαμενοι ποτε γαηη
113 [αγκλιμας προσθεν] δε σακεα σχε[θεν εσθοι εταιροι

Fr. (m).

Ε 525 [Σαχρειων ανερων οι τε νεφεα σκιοευν]τα
526 [πνοιασιν λιγυρισι διασκιδησιν αει]τες
528 [Ατρειδις δ] αν ομιλον εφοιτα πολλα κελευ]ων
529 [ο] φιλου ανερες εστε και αλκιμων ητορ ελεισθε
530 [αλλη]λους τ αιδεσθε κεδασθεις (?) υσμι]νης
531 άιδομενον άνδρων πλεονες σου ηε πεφα]μαι
532 φευγοντων δ' ουτ αρ κλεος ορινται ουτε τ]ες [αλκή

526. After this line the MSS. have δε Δαναοι Τροίας μένων ἔμπεδον οὔδε φέβωντο, which is not necessary and may have come from O 622.


Fr. (n).

Ε 796 άθρως γαρ μην ετειρήν έπιο πλατεῖς τελαιωνός
797 [ασπίδος αμφίβροτ]ης [τωι τειρετοι καμνε δε χειρα
798 [αν δ' ισχν ατελαιωνα] [κελαινεφες αιμ απομοργνυ
799 [ιππειον δε θεα θυγον] η:ψατο φωνησεν τε
800 [η ολιγον οι παιδα] εικοντα γεινατο Τυδευς
801 [Τυδεως τοι μικρος με]ν εην[ν δεμαν αλλα μαχητης
802 [και ρ οτε περ μιν] εγο [πολεμιζειν ουκ ειασκον
803 [ουδε εκπαιφασσει] οτ[ε τ ηλυθε νοσφιν Αχαιον

797. αμφίβροτης: εὐκύκλων MSS.; εὐκύκλων ή αμφίβροτης Eustathius. ἀσπίδος ἀμφίβροτης occurs in B 389, M 402, and Y 281.

21. HOMER, Iliad VIII.

Mummy A. Height 22.7 cm. Circa b.c. 290–260. Plate VI (Fr. and m).

A single fragment of this MS. also (cf. 20) was published in P. Grenf. II. 2, and was remarkable for several new lines. We are now able to add a number of other pieces, all from the earlier part of the book, and one of them actually joining the fragment which appeared in 1897 (cf. note on l. 216 a). That fragment proves to have been a very fair sample of the MS., for the newly recovered pieces differ widely from the accepted text, which is frequently expanded. As many as 21 new lines are inserted at intervals between l. 52 and l. 66, one of the additions consisting of 9 verses. This extraordinary rate of augmentation is not maintained, but it remains high throughout. The average
for the surviving fragments is about one new line in every four verses; for indications concerning some of the lost columns see note on l. 180. There are also a certain number of otherwise unrecorded variants, some of which are unobjectionable in themselves, though none is a definite improvement, unless ὁρνοτο in l. 58 may be so considered. The scribe as usual makes occasional mistakes; he wrote a small and rather curious sloping uncial hand, in which the archaic Ω is conspicuous. A specimen is given in Plate VI, in addition to the piece figured on the frontispiece of P. Grenf. II. We should assign the papyrus to the earlier part of the reign of Philadelphus.

Fr. (a).

Θ 17 [γνωσετ ἐπείδθ ὦσον εἰμι θεῷ ὁρνοτος ἀπαντῶν
18 [ἐι δ' ἀγε πειρησάσθε θεοὶ πασαὶ τε θειαίαι
19 [σειρήν χρυσεῖν εἰς οὐρανοθεν [κρεμασαντες
20 [παντες δ' εξαπεσθε θεοΐ πασαί τε θειαίαι
21 [ἀλλ' ουκ ἂν έρνοσαί εἰς οὐρανοθεν πεδίον δὲ
22 [Ζήνα ὑπατῶν μηστορᾶ] ουδ [ἐι μαλα πολλα καμοιτε

Fr. (b).

24 [αὐτήν κεῖν γαίην ερνοσαί ἀντή] τε θαλ' ἀσση (Col. ii)
25 [σειρήν μεν κεῖν επείδθα περί μιὼν Οὐλομη[οιο
26 [δησαίμην τα δε κ αντε μετηρα] παντ[α γενοιτο
27 [19 letters ανθρωπων τε [θεων τε
28 [οι εφαθ οι δ' αρα παντες ακην εγειροιτο σιωπη

Fr. (c).

29 [μνηθον αγασαμενοι μαλα γαρ κρατερως αγορευσεν
30 [οψε δε δη μετειπε θεα γλαυκων Αθηνη
31 [ω πατερ ημετερε Κρονιδη υπατε κρεογτων
32 [ει νυ και ημεις ηδην ο τοι σθενος ουκ [επιεικτον

Fr. (a).

Θ 17 [γνωσετ ἐπείδθ ὦσον εἰμι θεῷ ὁρνοτος ἀπαντῶν
18 [ἐι δ' ἀγε πειρησάσθε θεοὶ πασαὶ τε θειαίαι
19 [σειρήν χρυσεῖν εἰς οὐρανοθεν [κρεμασαντες
20 [παντες δ' εξαπεσθε θεοΐ πασαί τε θειαίαι
21 [ἀλλ' ουκ ἂν έρνοσαί εἰς οὐρανοθεν πεδίον δὲ
22 [Ζήνα ὑπατῶν μηστορᾶ] ουδ [ἐι μαλα πολλα καμοιτε

Fr. (b).

24 [αὐτήν κεῖν γαίην ερνοσαί ἀντή] τε θαλ' ἀσση (Col. ii)
25 [σειρήν μεν κεῖν επείδθα περί μιὼν Οὐλομη[οιο
26 [δησαίμην τα δε κ αντε μετηρα] παντ[α γενοιτο
27 [19 letters ανθρωπων τε [θεων τε
28 [οι εφαθ οι δ' αρα παντες ακην εγειροιτο σιωπη

Fr. (c).

29 [μνηθον αγασαμενοι μαλα γαρ κρατερως αγορευσεν
30 [οψε δε δη μετειπε θεα γλαυκων Αθηνη
31 [ω πατερ ημετερε Κρονιδη υπατε κρεογτων
32 [ει νυ και ημεις ηδην ο τοι σθενος ουκ [επιεικτον
Frs. (d), (e), and (g).  

Col. i.

38 [os pao meidhseu de pai][\eta]p av[\rho]no th e wno te  
38 a [khepi te miv kata[pe]g ev epo t efat ek t [o\rho]om[\alpha]xe  
39 [tharpei Trito]geneia filon tekon ou yu ti [\theta]m[\omega]  
40 [profroi mu[theta]m[\alpha]i ev[theta]l o te ou[upsilon]i[upsilon]  
41 [os eipon v][\upsilon] o[upsilon]phi tetv[\sigma]keto halk[\omicron]o[\omicron] [i][\iota][pi]  
42 [okupeta] xrhseaiw evxe[alpha]rniw ko[omicron][omega]  
44 [xrhseini ev]kuton eou d [epebhsete di[omicron][omicron][omicron][omicron][omicron]  
47 [Idnu de ikanou polu[upsilon][upsilon]aka mu[upsilon]etae[upsilon][upsilon]  
48 [Targarou evn][upsilon][upsilon] de o[upsilon][upsilon] [te][mu]x[omicron]v o[upsilon]mos te th[upsilon]pes  
49 [env[upsilon]v eipou eysthe Kronou paw aghkoul[upsilon][upsilon]tes  
51 [iautou d ev korofhnes kave[upsilon][upsilon]t euvi teivan]  
52 [eisophr]ov Troww te polin kai neph A[upsilon][upsilon][upsilon]  
4 lines lost.

Frs. (d), (e), and (h).

Col. ii.

53 [oi d ara deipou evonti kara komouwtes A[upsilon][upsilon][upsilon]  
54 [mu]phi kata[upsilon] kliaias apo d autou thorhhsou[upsilon][upsilon][upsilon][upsilon][upsilon]  
54 a [ 28 letters ][upsilon]}
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58 πασαὶ δὲ ὁμοῦ ντο πυλαὶ εκ δ ἐσοῦτο λαὸς
59 πεζοίθι θ ἵππηβες τε πολὺς δ' ὁμομαγόδος ὀρῷει
60 οἱ δ' ὡς [δῆ] ρ ἐ[ς] χι[ὼρον ενα ἠννοοῦντες ἵκοντο
61 σὺρ ρ ἐβ[ἀ]λον β[ίνους συν δ' εὑχεα καὶ μενε ανδρῶν
62 χαλκ[εοθ]ῳρηκ[ὼν ατα]ρ ασπίδες ὀμφαλοεσσαί
63 ἐπλη[ντ] ἀλλ[ῆ]ἡμα τε καὶ εὐχαλὴ πελεν ανδρῶν
64 ὀλυπτοὶ τίς καὶ ὀλυμπενῶν ρεῖ δ' αἰματι γαῖα
65 ἀν δ Ἔρισ έ[ν] δ' Ἐρ[σ]δαιμον ομιλεόν εν δ' ὀλοη Κηρ
66 δ' ἀλλον ζ[ω]ίουν εχ[ουσα νεοτατον ἀλλον αοτον
67 ἀλλον τε[θ]νητα κατα μοθον ελκε ποδοίν
65 d η...[?]

4 (?) lines lost

67 τοφρα μα[λ] ἀμφοτερον βελε ἡπτετο πιπτε δε λαος
68 ηρας δ' ἡλιος μεσ[ίον υρανον αμφιβεβθει]
69 καὶ τοσ[τε] δ'ἡ χρυ[σεια πατηρ εηταινε ταλαντα
70 εν δ' ετιβ[ει] δυο [κηρε τανηλεος θανατοιο
71 [Τρω]ον θ[π]οδ[αμων και Αχαιων χαλκοχιτωνον
72 [εικε δε μεσοσα λαβ]ων ῥεπε δ' αισιμον ημαρ Αχαιων
73 [αι μεν Αχαι]ων [κηρες επι χθοιι ποιλβοτειρη]

... ... ... ... ... ... ...

Fr. (i).
180 [ἀλλ οτε κεν δη νησειν επι γιαφυρησι]τι γενω[μ]α (Col. ix)
181 [μυημοσυνη τις επειτα πυρος δηιοι] γενεσω
182 [ως πυρι νησα ειπρησαν κτεινω δε και αυτου]ς
183 [Ἀργειους παρα νησειν ατυγωμενους] υπο καπνου
184 [ως ειτων ιππους εκεκλητο φαιδιμο]σ] Εκτωρ

... ... ... ... ... ...

Fr. (k).

... ... ... ... ... ...
187 [Ανδρομαχη θυγατηρ μεγαλητορ Η [εινων]
92 HIBEH PAPYRI

188 [υμιν γαρ προτεροισι μελι]φ[ρ]ωνα πυρο[ν εθήκεν
189 [οιων τ εγκερασασα πτειν οτε] θυμοῖς ανωγοι
190 [η εμοι οσ περ οι θαλερος ποσις] ευχομαι: ειναι

Fr. (f).

203 [οι] δε σοι εις Ελικ[ην]ν τε και Διαγας δωρ αναγοναι (Col. x).
204 πολλα τε καὶ χαριεντα συ δε σφισι βουλεο νικην
204a [. . . . . . .] και μι
205 [ει πε]ρ γαρ κ εθελοιμεν οσοι Δαναιων αρωγοι
206 [Γ]ρωας απ[ωσασθαι και ερυκεμεν ευρυστα Ζην
206a [. . .]μι

Fr. (m) with P. Grenf. II. 2. Col. i.

216a [ευθα κε λοιγος ευν και αμηχαν]α εργ εγ[ε]νοντο
217 [και ιν κ ενεπρησεν πυρι κηλεω ν]ης Δχ[αι]ον
218 [ει μη επι φρεσι θηκ Αγαμεμνο]ν: ποτη[ι]α Ηρη
219 [αυτοι ποινυσαντι θωος ατρομον εταιρους
220 [βη δ ειναι παρα τε κλισιςας και νης εισιας
221 [σορφυρεον μεγα φαρος ε]χων εγ χ[ει]οι π[αχειη

Col. ii.

249 παρ δε Δίος βωμοι περικαλλει καββαλε νεβρον (Col. xi).
250 ευθα πανομφαιω Ζηνι ρεξεσακν Αχαιοι
251 οι δ οις ουν ειδοντο Διος τερας [αυγιοχιο]
252 μαλλον επι Τρωεσι θορος μηθεαντο δε χαρμης
252a Ζευς δε πατηρ οτρυνε φαλαγγας κυθει γαιων?
252b εισαν δε Τρωες τυθον δα[]
253 ευθ ου τις [πρωτερος Δαναων πολλων περ ευντων
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Fr. (n).

. . . . . . . . . . . . . .

255 a? [ 21 letters ] kex

256 [αλλα πολυ πρωτος Τρωων ελευ ανδηρα κορυσην

257 [Φραδμονδην Αγελαον ο μειυ φυγαθ ετραπεν ιππους

258 [τω δι μεταστρεφθεντι μεταφερεων εν δορυ πηξεν

Fr. (o).

. . . . . . . . . . . . . .

]έν ολεθρον

] . ευστον[

] . ξ . . . [ 1. 0.

] . ξ . . . [ 1. 0.

18. The line should end ἦνα εἰσεῖς πάντες, in place of which the papyrus evidently repeats πασαι τε βιανας from l. 20. This is no doubt to be regarded as a mere blunder.

22. Even if the final a of ζηνα and μυσταρι be left unelided (cf. e.g. l. 58), the supplement at the beginning of this line is shorter by two or three letters than in the foregoing verses. The difference, however, is not sufficiently marked to necessitate the inference that there was a variant here. Plutarch, De Is. et Os. 371 B, has καὶ μυσταρι, which is unmetrical. In a quotation in Arist. peri ζηνων κω. 4. p. 699 B 35 l. 20 is placed after l. 22.

25-6. These lines were athetized by Zenodotus.

27. The ordinary version of this line is τόσον εγὼ περὶ τ’ εἰμι βεὼν περὶ τ’ εἰμι αἰθρόων, but in the papyrus the letter after ]ω is clearly τ not π, and, moreover, τοσον . . . βεων would not fill the lacuna, which is of the same length as in the preceding lines. The verse therefore probably ended with αὐθρόων τε βεων τε, and περὶ τ’ εἰμι was replaced by some synonymous phrase, e.g. τοσον εγὼ κρίσεον σινον; cf. Φ 190 τῷ κρίσεων μίν Ζεις.


30. The ν of Αθην has been corrected; the scribe apparently began to write a ρ.

38-9. The vulgate here has τῷ δ’ ἐπιμελήσας προσέθη νεφέληγερτα Ζεις’ δάμας κ.τ.λ. In the papyrus l. 38 apparently = Ε 426, Ο 47, and it is followed by the verse found also in Α 361, Ε 372, Ζ 485, Η 127. These two verses are not combined elsewhere in Homer. The margin is lost above both l. 38 and the corresponding l. 55 δ, but if, as is practically certain, l. 55 δ directly succeeded l. 55 ε, ll. 38 and 55 δ were the first of their respective columns. This conclusion, however, produces a complication with regard to the first column of the roll, which if it agreed with the ordinary text would have contained 37 lines, or 7 more than the column following it. Col. ii of Frs. (d)-(h) also apparently contained 30 lines, l. 73 being opposite l. 55 δ; and though a certain variation is admissible, this will hardly account for a difference of 7 verses. Perhaps, therefore, there was an omission of three or four lines; or ll. 1-37 of the book may have been divided between two columns of which the first was a very short one, and the second contained several new lines, though none occur in what remains of it; or, again, the roll may have originally included Book vii. At the
end of l. 38a, near the bottom of the final ε, is a short diagonal stroke, which may be accidental.

39. The supposed θ of θυμ[ω] has perhaps been corrected. The vestiges remaining of the ends of this and the next line are very slight.

41. ιδτυσκετο.

42. χρυσεπανον: χρυσεπανον vulg., as is normal.

45. πε[ταςθην]: this form is not found elsewhere, the aorist being always of the syncopated type ἐπταμην &c. πεταςθην MSS.

47-8. The ρ of θηρον is not very satisfactory, but as the ν is nearly certain, and the traces of the other letters suit well enough, we hesitate to suppose a variation from the accepted text here. Similarly with regard to τεμενος in l. 48, the vestiges hardly suggest με, but they are too slight to be conclusive.

49. According to the ordinary version this line ends πατηρ ἀνδρων τε θεῶν τε, in place of which the papyrus gives the synonymous stock phrase Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομητέω (Δ 75 &c.); cf. ll. 38-9.

50. There is a break in the papyrus below l. 50, and one line at least is lost between l. 50 and the vestiges which we have attributed to Αχαλων in l. 52. Between these vestiges and l. 53 there were four more lines, as is shown by the height of the margin. It is thus necessary to suppose the insertion of at least 4 new lines at some point between ll. 50 and 53. If Αχαλων is right, they occurred between ll. 52 and 53; but that reading is quite uncertain, and they may equally well have been inserted e.g. between ll. 50 and 51. Their source is in any case obscure, for the passage would admit of many forms of expansion; perhaps one of the additional lines was Θ 1, which was added before l. 53 by Zenodotus. It is possible that the loss between ll. 50 and 52 (?) is larger than we have supposed. But the column is already rather tall, and it is safer not to assume the insertion between ll. 50 and 53 to be longer than necessary. The corresponding passage in Col. ii gives no assistance, for the break there occurs in the middle of a series of additional lines, the precise number of which is uncertain; cf. note on ll. 65 a sqq.

54 a-d. 54 b μέτα δε... 54 d correspond to B 477-9. These lines are preceded in B (476-7) by δε τοὺς ἄγγελους διακόσμησαν ἅρων καὶ ἅρων ἀγγελοῦν ἅ ἄρμα, and it is of course possible that ἁρμὶν ἅ ἄρμα stood at the beginning of l. 54 b; but ἁρμα καὶ ἁρμα cannot be read at the end of l. 54 a, nor would the commencement of B 476 be suitable to the present passage without some alteration. The connecting link between ll. 54 and 54 b must therefore be sought elsewhere. Unfortunately the remains of l. 54 a offer a very slender clue; the final letter is possibly ν.

55. οὐκέλεωντο: so most MSS.; ὄπλ. Aristarchus.

55 a-d = Λ 57-60, where the beginning of the preceding line Τρωές δ' ὁδή ἐπερσεβεν ἐπὶ θροσμω πεδίων coincides with that of l. 55 in this book. There is not much doubt about the identity of Λ 55 a, although none of the letters except the τ is perfect; cf. note on ll. 38-9.

57. χρήμα: χρειᾷ most MSS., but there is considerable authority for χρεῖα, for which χρήμα would be an easy clerical error. χρήμα, however, is itself defensible, since χρημα is attested by Hesychius as an Ionic form of χρεῖα.

58. ωεγοντο: δείγγαντο MSS., but ω(ε)γοντο is preferable as the older form; cf. the Lesbian in fin. δειγγήν.

61. The first ρ, if it be ρ, has been corrected; σνν cannot be read. Such an attraction of ν to ρ, though natural, is unusual.

65 a sqq. The identification of ll. 65 a-c, which are found in Σ 535-7 (cf. Hesiod, Scutum, 156-8), is due to Blass. The scanty remains of l. 65 d do not suit Σ 538, nor would that verse be likely to appear in the present passage. The extent of the lacuna between
ll. 65 d and i depends on that at the corresponding point in Col. i between l. 50 and the supposed vestiges of l. 52. If only one line is there lost, not more than 4 lines are missing here, but the lacuna may be larger in both cases; cf. note on l. 52.

73. This line and 74 were atehetized by Aristarchus. There would be room for two more lines in this column, l. 73 being opposite l. 55 a.

180. This line is to all appearances the first of a column. Since the last line of the preceding column was probably l. 75 (cf. the previous note), there are 104 lines to be accounted for in the uncertain number of columns intervening between Frs. (d)–(h) and (i). If the average length of a column is taken as 30 lines (cf. note on ll. 38–9), three columns would contain 90 lines, four columns 120. That the papyrus version was shorter than the vulgate is highly improbable, its tendency being decidedly in the opposite direction. There were therefore four columns between ll. 75 and 180, containing additions which amounted to approximately 16 lines. Similarly there must have been an addition of about 7 lines between l. 184 and l. 203, which is again the top of a column.

183. The majority of the MSS. omit this line, which is printed in small type by Ludwich.

184. φαινόμενον Εκταφ: φαίνοντος τε MSS., a variant μακρον άσας being recorded by U. The new reading of the papyrus is in itself as good as either of these.

189. This line was rejected by Aristophanes and Aristarchus; cf. l. 73, note.

203. This line is the first of a column; cf. note on l. 180.

There may, evidently be a combination, the completion of which does not agree at all with 1. 252 in the vulgate, ἐγεῖθαι καὶ ἐναιτίσθαι.

204. All that remains of the κ of κατ is the vertical stroke, which could be read as an ι; but the second half of the κ may be supposed to have disappeared, as the papyrus is evidently rubbed.

204 a. Another new line, of which the remains are hardly sufficient for identification. There may, of course, have also been a variation in the termination of l. 204.

206 a. The vestiges of this line are inconsistent with l. 207 αὐτῷ κε ἐνθ' ἀναχώτο καθ' άνασαν ἐσέν ἐσ' ἠγ. The doubtful μ is possibly an ι, in which case κ or ρ might be read in place of ι.

216 a sqq. The discovery of a new fragment which joins on to the first column of the piece published in 1897 in P. Grenf. II. 2 confirms the restoration there proposed. For the line ἐνθα κε κ.τ.λ. which precedes l. 217 cf. θ 130 and Λ 310, where it occurs in a precisely similar context. ἐργα γίνοντο is the common reading, but ἔγινοντο, as in the papyrus, is found in two MSS. at the latter passage.

217. οὐρα λεπίσκουσα: if ενεργηθείς was written in l. 217 οὐρα is a mistake for οὐρα as in l. 220; but it is possible, as Blass suggests, that ενεργηθείς was substituted. άσας vulg. for λεπίσκουσα at the end of l. 220. The papyrus transposes the epithets.

219. l. οπρινοι. εταφανοι: Λεπίσκουσα MSS.

220. οὐρα εἰσαγα: cf. note on l. 217. άσας is found also in Vrat. b.

251. εἴδωντο κ.τ.λ.: cf. Ταυρ. 141–2 Ταυρ. κεφαλῇ ... Διός τέρας αι. The ordinary reading is εἴδωθ' δ' τε αὐτῷ ἐκ Διός ἢλθεν ὄρνη.

252 a–b. These two lines are not found elsewhere in Homer. The supplement in 252 a is that proposed by Ludwich, Homervulgata, p. 58; for ψαλάγγας cf. Λ 254 and Ν 90, where the word follows ἀτριμ. But the verse may be completed in various other ways, e.g. φαίνοντας τράγοντας ἐνόρας, as suggested by van Leeuwen. In l. 252 b the papyrus has εἰσάνω, not εἰσάνω as printed in P. Grenf. II. 2; εἴσαν ... τυχόν, however, makes a very unsatisfactory combination, and εἰσάνω may well be a mistake for εἰσάνω. In that case the line may be completed Δαλισάσαιν ντισάσων (Ludwich) or Δαλισάσαι απὸ ταφρον (van Leeuwen).

256. ἐλέει αὐτόρα: or perhaps αὐτόρα κοινώταν, though this does not suit the spacing so well. The remains of the previous line do not agree at all with l. 255 in the vulgate, τάφρον τ' ἐξελάσαι καὶ ἐνατίσθαιν μαχέομαι.
This fragment from the bottom of a column remains unidentified. αλεθρος, which is the only certain word, is found nowhere in the eighth book; either ἕν or ἕνει may precede. In the second line either ἔπευ or ἔπει may be read. The first letter is very indistinct, but does not seem to be ζ.

22. **Homer, Iliad XXI-XXIII.**

**Mummy A.** Fr. (c) 13.3 x 11 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240.

This series of fragments of the Iliad, Books xxii-xxiii, as in the case of 21, belongs to a MS. of which other pieces have previously been published in P. Grenf. II. (no. 4). In all there are parts of about 190 lines, a number which affords a sufficiently accurate estimate of the general character of the text. New verses appear sporadically, though never more than two are found together, and the proportion of them—at least 11 lines, perhaps 9 or 10 more, out of the 190, or about 1 in 13 probably—is much smaller than in 21. Other variations from the accepted text are not infrequent, the more remarkable being those at Φ 426, X 102, 110, 393, 442, 462, Ψ 129. Cf. introd. to 19.

The three books were written in the same hand, an upright rather large uncial, of which facsimiles are given in P. Grenf. II, Plates II and III, and which is probably of the reign of Philadelphus. The scribe was somewhat careless, and is guilty of several obvious slips. A correction by a second hand occurs in at least one passage (Ψ 129).

Frs. (a) and (b). Book xxii.

Φ 421 και [ὅ]ν αὐθ ν κυνμυνια αγει βροτολογιου Ἀρη
422 δὴν εκ πο[λ]εμοι κα[τα] κλονον ἀλλα μετελθε
423 οὐ φατ Ἁθηναιὴν δε μετεσαυτο χαρε δε θυμω
424 και πρ [ ... ] ος[μενη] πρ[ὸς] στηθεα χειρι παχεμη
425 νλασε [τ][ης] δ' αυτον λυτο γον[να]τα και φιλον ητορ
426 [τω μ][ε]ν αρ μαφ ϑεινε ποτι χθονεν πουλυβοτειρη
427 [η] δε [αρ] ϑεοχομενεν επ[θε]α πτεροευντ αγορευεν

There are also a few small pieces at Heidelberg; cf. footnote on p. 5.
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429 [εἰεν οὖν Ἀργείωσι μα]χιαστο κυδα[λιμούσιν
430 [οδε τε θαρσαλεοι] καὶ τλημονε [ως Αφροδιτή

Φ 422. There are horizontal marks like paragraphi below this line and 424, but there is other superfluous ink on this fragment, and a paragraphus below l. 424 would be out of place. Moreover, there are no other cases of its use in this MS.

424. καὶ ρ’ ἐπισαμενή MSS., but this is certainly not to be read in the papyrus. The supposed o before σαμενη cannot be correct, and was perhaps deleted; or it might be explained as a blotted σ, which would be more intelligible. Possibly ἐπισαμενή was written and the first σ afterwards cancelled; ἐπισαμενή is unsuitable. There are ink marks above the line here, but they are more probably to be regarded as accidental than as an interlinear correction; cf. note on l. 422.

426. θευνο ποτί: κεῖτο ἐπί MSS., though some read ποτί for ἐπί. For θευν (sc. Ἀθηναί) cf. 459 θεουμένου πρὸς οδητέ.

429. κυδαλιμοῦσι: θωρηκτῆσιν οὐ θωρηκτᾶσιν MSS.

Frs. (c) and (d). Book xxii.

Col. i.

X? [ ]
77 [η ρ ο γερων πολιας δ αρ ανα τριχας ελκετο χερσιν

Col. ii.

X 96 [ως Εκτορ ασβεστο]ν εχιων μενος ουχ υπεχαρει
97 [πυργο]ι επι προυχοντι θαεινην ασπιδ ερεισας
98 [ο]ξ[θ]ησας δ αρα ειπε πριον ον μεγαλητορα θυμων
99 οιμοι εγων η μειν κε πυλας και τειχα διω
99 a λοβητος κεν η[η]μι;
100 Πομινυμας μοι πρωτος ελεγχειν αναθησει
101 os μ εκελευν Τῆξοι ποτι πτολυν νηςασθαι
102 νυκτα ποτε δυοφερην στε τ αρετο διος Ἀρχελευς
103 αλλ εγω ου πιθομη λη τ αν πολυν κερδιον ην
104 μν δ επει ολεσα λαον απασθαλισειν εμησιν
105 [α]δεομαι Τρωιας κα[ι] Τρωιαδας ελκεσιπεπλους

H
106 μ[η] ποτε τις ειπησασ κακαυ[τα] [ερον αλλος εμειρ]
107 Εκτωρ [η]φι βηφι πι[θησας αλεσε λαον
108 ως [ερεουσιν εμοι δε . . . δ αυν πολυ κερδιον ηε]ν
110 η [αυτιοι προ πολης ευκλειοις απολεουσαι
111 [ει δε κε]ν αστιδια [μεν [καταθειμαι ομφαλουσαν
112 [και κορ]νθα βριαρην δ[ορυ δε προς τειχοις οραμα]
113 [αυτιοι [ει]ν ΑΧιλης αμυμονος αντιος ελθω

Col. iii.

X 137 αυθι μενειν οπισω δε τιλος λιπε βη δε φοβηθεις
138 Πηλειδης δ επορουσε ποσι κραινοις πεποθεσω
139 ηντε κεαδος ορεσφιν [ελαφροτατοι πετενουν
140 καρπαλιμος] ορυκτι[νε] μετα τρηρανα πελειαν
141 η δε τ υπαϊθεια φοβη[ται ο δ εγγυθεν ο]νι λεληκως
142 τα[ρφε]α επαισσει νη
143 [ως αρ ο γ εμι]μασωι εινυ πετετο τρεσε δ Εκτωρ

Fr. (e).

X 197 [τοσακι μεν προπαραθεν αποστρ]εψασκεν ΑΧιλ[ε]νης
198 [προς πεδιον αντος δε ποτι πτολίος πετετ α]ει

Fr. (f).

X 232 ? ημι δ αυτε προσειτε μεγας κορυθαιολος Εκτωρ
233 ? Δηφοβ η μεν μοι το παροι πολυ ϕιλτατος ηθα

Fr. (g).

248 [οι δ οτε δη ςχεδον ησαν επ αλλη]λοισιν ιοντεσ
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249 [τον προτέρος προσείπε μεγάς κορνθαίολος Εκτωρ
250 [ου σ εί τι Ηλίδος υμε φισησομαι ως το] παρος περ
251 [τρις περὶ αστι μεγα Πριαμοῦ διες ο]υδε ποτ ετλης
252 [μεναι επερχομενον νυν αυτε με] θυμος ανωγει
253 [στημεναι αντια σειο ελομι κευ η κευ αλ]οιην
254 [αλλ αγε δευρο θεους επιδομεθα τοι] γαρ αριστ[οι
255 [μαρτυροι εσοουνται και επισκοπο]ι ερμονιαων
256 [ου γαρ εγω σ εκπαγλον αεικω αι κευ εμοι Z[eu]ς

Fr. (a).

Χ 326 τη ρα επι [οι μεμωτ ελας εγχει διος Α]χιλλευ
327 [αν]τικρυ δ ασιλιοι δι αυχενος ηλυθ ακοκη
328 [ουδ αρ απ ασιφαραγον μελια ταμε χαλκοβαρεια

Fr. (i).

Col. i.

Χ 392 a [και τ]θηνατα περ τοσα γαρ κακ εμη[σα]τ] Αχαιογι
393 [. . . . . .]ν μεγα κυδος επεφυομεν Εκτ[ορα διον

Col. ii.

426 Εκτ[ορος ως οφελεν θανεειν εν χερσιν εμηισι

Fr. (j).

Χ 441 [διπ]λακα πορφυρην εν δε θρονα ποικιλ επασε
442 [αι]ψα δ αρ αμφιπολουτιν εκεκλευ ευπλοκαροσιν
443 [αμφι π]υρι στησαι τριποδα μεγαν οφρα πελοιτο
444 [Εκτορ]μ θερμα λυστρα μαχης εκ νοστησαντι
445 [υη]πιη δ ενη[σε]ν ο μιν μαλα τηλε λοετρων
446 [χερσ]ιν ιτι Α[χι]λης δαμασε γλαιουκτις Αθηνη
447 [κακυτ]οψ δ ηκουσε και οιμωγην απο πυργον
448 [της] δ ελι]χθη γυ[η]α χαμαι δε οι εκπεσε κερκις
X 458 [η μν εχεσκ επει ου ποτ ενι πληθυν μ]υ[ν]εν [ανδρων
459 [αλλα πολυ προβεσκε το ου μενος] ουδειν εικων
460? [ 29 letters ]

Fr. (k).

X 462 [ανταρ επει Σκαιας] τε πυλ[ας και] τιργον ικανεν
463 [εσθη παππη]νας επι τειχ[ει] τον δε νοησεν
464 [ελκομεν προσθε]ν πολε[ως τ]αχες δε μιν ιππ[οι]

Fr. (l), (m), and (n).

Fr. (o).

X 513 [ουδειν σοι] φε[θ]λοσ επει ουκ εγκεισαι αυτους
514 [αλλα π]ρος Τρω[ων και Τρωιαδων κλεος ειναι
515 [ος αρα ειφη κλαιοισ επι δε στεναχοντο γυναικες
Ψ 1 [ος οι με]ν στεναχοντο κατα πτολιν ανταρ Αχαιοι

X 77. Whether the two preceding lines are to be identified as ll. 75-6 is doubtful.
The traces at the end of the former of them are not inconsistent with a ς, but the conclusion
of the second diverges from l. 76, which is τουτο δη ολειστων πελετα διωλοι βροτων.
Before ς is what appears to be the top of a tall vertical stroke, like that of κ, φ or ψ.
Perhaps κιμι (l) εις is only a variant for πελετα, and the line, according to this version,
may have run τουτο δη ολειστων διωλοι βροτωι κεν εις. The construction would be
irregular after εις... αλεχωσι, but cf. e.g. Υ 250 ὅπως κ’ εισηγητα ἐνος τοιων κ’ ἐπικούσας.
But it is remarkable that l. 73 ends with φανεί (so C, &c.; φανηρ other MSS., Aristarchus);
and since in the papyrus φαθείν is so suitable a reading and χαλκω in the preceding line
is quite possible, there is a considerable probability that ll. 74-6 were omitted. The three
verses are not essential here; but they do not occur elsewhere in Homer. For another
instance of omission in this MS. cf. note on Ψ 129.

99. ομοιοι: δ μοι (δομοιοι, φοιοι) MSS. I. ei for η.
99a. A new verse, not found elsewhere in Homer. The adjective λοβθητοι only occurs
in Ω 531 λοβθητον ἔθηκε. Any round letter, e.g. θ or σ, may be read after the ι.
101. εκείλενοι: though the final letters are broken, there is not much doubt as to the
reading. έκείλενο MSS.
102. νυκτα ποτι δυναθεριν: νυχθ ου τηρη δολη MSS., ἐπο λυγαίην Et. Mag. 571. 22.
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105. *τρωας*: so L; *τρωμα* most MSS.

106. There is some ink above κακωτι[πος] which might represent a correction, but is more probably accidental.

108. The remains of the middle of this line are very difficult to decipher. *εμνο de* may just be read, but apparently not *τον*, which would be expected to follow. Possibly *τον* was written; but the papyrus may have been quite different from the common text here. The doubtful δ before *δ* could be *ξ*.

110. The ordinary reading here is *ἡ κεν αἵτω όλεθρια ἐκκλειόω πρὸ πόλησ*. The arrangement in the papyrus avoids the long syllables shortened in hiatus. *αιπολεθρια* seems preferable to *κεν όλεθρια; κεν* is superfluous here and hardly parallel to the other uses of *ἡ κεν*. *αιτω*, which is found in most MSS. (v. 1. αίτω), was read by Aristarchus.

113. [τος] is on a small fragment originally adhering, but of which the correct position is doubtful; the reading is very uncertain.

140. καρπαλ[λωσ] ἀφροσ: ῥηθίως οἴμασ (ἠμαρ C) MSS.

141. τ ντα[θα] / 1. θ ντ: but all the letters except the two alphas are very doubtful.

142. επαισσεθε, ἐλέει τέ ἐ θυμός ἀνώγη vulg., but the letter after *επαισσεθ* in the papyrus is certainly either *ν* or *μ*. Perhaps there was a variant *ματες* or *μαρτες*, as Blass suggests; or *επαισσεθ* may have been written owing to a confusion with *ελέει*.

143. The letters preserved are on a small fragment, which seems to be rightly placed here.

197–8. The identification of these two lines seems tolerably certain, notwithstanding the discrepancy from the vulgate, which has *ἀποστρέψας παραθήκεν οτ πορασάς*.

232–3. On the whole it is more probable that the remains of these two lines are to be referred to 232–3 than to 226–7. The slight vestiges indicate that the letter above *Δ* had a vertical stroke, the position of which suits an initial *τ* rather better than an *η*.

251. 1. επιλην. The error is easily intelligible, as Mr. T. W. Allen remarks, if the papyrus had υες, the reading of *αι χαρίσταμαι* (Didymus) and Vat. 10, in place of the vulgate διον.

252. αναγε: ἀνάκε MSS. Cf. Φ 396 (P. Grenf. II. p. 6), where the papyrus has *ανωγας* for the vulgate reading *ἀνάκας*.

255. 1. ἀμφοσαν.

327. The scribe seems to have miswritten the π of *απαλιωσ*, which has a vertical stroke too much; otherwise the letters must be read *απω αλ* or *απαλα*, but both of these readings are difficult to deal with, and the π would still be not quite satisfactory.

392 a. This additional line probably followed directly upon 392. *πεθηνάσα* seems to be required, but can only be read by ignoring a tiny fragment loosely adhering to the papyrus and having a vertical stroke which gives the supposed δ the appearance of a ρ; it may, however, be misplaced. Cf. Π 20, where καὶ τεθηνα τερ occurs in the same position of the verse. The latter part of the line is found in K 52.

393. The letter before *μεγα* is certainly a *τ*, and is preceded apparently by an *ι*, or at any rate not by an *ε*; perhaps *ημϊν*. ἡμᾶθα MSS. Aristarchus athetized II. 393–4.

443. Here again, though the sense of the line is the same, there is a marked divergence from the vulgate, which has *κέκλειδε δ άμφιπολοις ἐνπλοκάριοι κατά δώμα*. The verse may, of course, be completed in many other ways than that suggested in the text, e.g. *ἐνπλοκάριοι εκελεθεν*.

446. *χερεν* Ἀχιλλῆς MSS.; *but υπὸ χερεν* is the regular Homeric phrase, and may well be right here. For *χερα* ἐπι in the same position cf. Π 420, 452, Φ 208. 1. Ἀχιλλῆς; the same error occurs in CD.

447. κακωματοι: κακωτι... οἶμωγη MSS. The letter before the δ can hardly be read otherwise than as *ί*, and there is a spot of ink low down before it which suits the tail
of a v. The accusative is quite unobjectionable (cf. e.g. Φ 575 ἰδαμὸς ἄκουστη), but
the plural is somewhat suspicious, and it may be doubted whether this is a genuine
variant, and not rather a mistake on the part of the scribe. An alternative would be to
suppose that the line began with some feminine synonym of κοκυτός.

448. Though the margin below this line is incomplete, it has quite the appearance of
being the last of a column; but if so the column must have contained an unusually large
proportion of new lines. L. 448 is only the twenty-second line, according to the vulgate,
from the end of the preceding column, whereas the average length of other columns is about
30 lines. A column which covers only 25 lines of the vulgate is, however, shown by a
comparison of Fr. (p) l. 168, which is probably the last of a column, with P. Grenf. II.
4 (c). Fr. 2, where l. 195 is the second of a column; and the more lengthy columns may
to some extent be due to omissions; cf. notes on X 77 and Ψ 129.

458–60. This identification is doubtful; l. 459 is fairly satisfactory, but the scanty
vestiges of the preceding and following lines give small support. Those below οὐδεν might
be read as ἦλθ, i.e. μα][κατά, but something nearer the end of the line would be expected.

462. The ordinary version of this line is αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πύργον τε καὶ ἄνθρωπ ἐκείν ὄμλον.
Blass is probably right in suggesting the restoration of Σκαίας τε πύλας καὶ from 237, I 354
Σκαίας τε πύλας καὶ φυγὼν ἵκανεν, though the reading must be admitted to be very doubtful. τε
is satisfactory, but of the other letters as far as φοι only the merest vestiges remain. They
seem, however, to support πυργον as against φοι.

463. τεκές[ε]: τεκές[ε] would suit the space better.

464. πόλεως: πόλεως MSS., though πόλεως is well supported in other passages, e.g.
Λ 168.

513 sqq. That these lines are rightly identified hardly admits of doubt. The variant
in l. 515 causes no difficulty, and the absence of any division between the end of one book
and the beginning of the next has a parallel in the Geneva papyrus (Nicole, Rev. de Phil.,
1894), Λ 848–M 1.

513. If the indistinct vestiges are correctly read as οφελος, the γ', which precedes in
the common text, was probably omitted, since οὐδεν σοι amply fills the lacuna. γ' is
absent also in D.

515. ἢς ἐφαρμο vulg. It suits the space better to suppose that the final α of αρα was
unelided.

Ψ 1. Cf. note on X 513 sqq. The space between this line and the preceding one is of
the usual width, but there may, of course, have been a coronis or marginal note indicating
the commencement of a new book.

Fr. (p). Col. i.

Ψ 129 ? [ 28 letters ]ες εκαλευς
131 ? [ ]ες εκαλευς
132 [ἀν δ' εἶπαν ἐν διφροσὶ παραιθαίνειν ἦνι]χοι τε
133 [προσθε ὡμ ἐπτής μετα τε νεφος ἐ]πετο πεξων
134 [μυρια]ν ἐν δε μεσοιας φερον Πατροκλον ετ']αιρι
135 [θριξ]ι δε παντα νεκυν καταινευειν α']ς επεβαλλον
136 [κειρομενοι οπιθεν δε καρπ ηε' διος Aχιλλευς
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136 a [αμφοτερισάν τε χερσι κομην ησχυνα] δαιζων
137 [αχυμενον εταρον γαρ αμυμονα πεμπ Α]ίδος δε
138 [οι δ' οτε χωρον ικανον οθι σφισι πεφραξ Αχιλλεως]
139 [καθεσαν αιηα δε οι μενοικεια νηεον] γηην
140 [ενθ αυτ' αλλ ενοηε ποδαρκης διος Αχιλλεως]
141 [στας απανευθε πυρης ξανθην απεκεφαρατο χα[ιτ]ην

Col. ii. (with P. Grenf. II. 4 (c), Fr. 1).

Ψ 165 ? [...] ε[.].ραλθ[.]. νεκρός
165 α μυρ[ε] ονειξατα χερσιν αμησαμενοι
166 πολλα δε ιφια [...] μηη]α [και ειλποδας ελικας βους
167 προσθε πυρης [εδερον τε και αμφεπον εκ δ αρα παντων
168 δημον ελον [εκαλυψε νεκυν μεγαθυμος Αχιλλεως

Fr. (q).

Ψ 265 [τωι πρωτωι αταρ αν τωι] δεν[τερωι ε]πτον ε[θηκεν
266 [ετε αδμη] την βρεφ[ος] ημιονον κυεουσαν
267 [αυταρ τωι τριτατωι απυρον κατεθηκε λεβητα]
268 [καλον τεσσαρα μετρα κεχα]μ[ο]τα λευκον ετ αυτ[ω]ς

Fr. (r).

Ψ 276 [εσ] τε γαρ [ο]] β]φ] [β]ιν αρετην περιβαλλετον οπποι
277 αθανατοι τε [γαρ ειοι] Ποσειδαον δε πορ αυτους
278 πατρι εροι Πηλη[ι] ο δ' αυτ εροι εγγυαλιζεν
278 a ws τω γ αθανατοι και αγηροι ευδε ειοκε
278 b θυτους αθανατοις [δεμας και ειδος εριζεω]
279 αλλ η του μεν εγω μ[ε]νεω και μονυχες οπποι
280 τοιου γαρ σθενοι εσθον απωλεσαν ημιοχοιο
281 ηπιον ο σφωιν μαλα πολλακις υγρον ελαιον

Ψ 129?. It is clear that the papyrus differed considerably here from the ordinary text.
as ekelyuvye (?) which apparently corresponds to the end of l. 129 aitika Myrmidones a filasto-leivmei kelleuue, has been inserted close above l. 131 (?) by a different hand, and seems to have been originally omitted altogether. as suggests Myrmidon, with a lengthened a, or some variant for filastoleimou, e.g. aiva klesias; cf. II. 155-6 Myrmidones . . . thories ev Xillevns pantuus anlh klesias. If this be so, 130-1, chaleon zonastshai ezueis d' epi' ochephev ekastov upous' oi d' dromvto kai ev tevkevtein dveon, would seem to have been reduced to a single verse. evr at the end (the r is quite doubtful) suggests a termination parallel to cr 339 ev te dveon, preceded possibly by te kai, though there is barely room for kai. The letter before e, if not r, must be a y. But in the absence of the line above as ekelyuvye these suggestions must be regarded as merely tentative.

136 a. The proposed restoration, which is due to Blass, is based on 2 23 amfoterhoi de xerativ elon konw aiadalassan and 2 27 fileros de xeratik lymn hesyke diapev. 139. The vestiges of the supposed v suggest rather r or p, but this may be due to smearing.

165. We give a revised text of this line, which is found in P. Grenf. II. 4 (c), Fr. 1. The doubtful r might be t or v.

165 a, 166. These two lines combine with the last two of P. Grenf. II. 4 (c), Fr. 1. For the restoration mupe' oniastia (Blass) cf. k 9 and 3 316 oniastia myria. In l. 166 a short space remains unaccounted for between 6phi on the new fragment and the mu of myla on P. Grenf. II. 4 (c), Fr. 1. The reading of these two words is not very certain, but we can find no other epithet which suits the vestiges, and myla seems right. In the facsimile in P. Grenf. II, Plate II, myla kex [ looks possible, but the original shows this to be a less likely alternative.

168. This line was probably the last of the column, though it is slightly higher than l. 141. Cf. note on X 448.

278 a, b. These two additional lines have been restored by Blass from e 212-3 oude 70ike 6ntias athenitov dibias kai eldos erpev.

280. tovov gar sebenv: tovov gar klhov most MSS., but sebenv occurs in DGLS Syr., and is recorded as a variant in AE. tovov, which is new, may be defended, but is unconvincing.

281. This line is the last of the column. The final s of pallas is very close to the t, and was perhaps originally omitted; p was also first written in place of gr and subsequently altered, another gr being added for the sake of clearness above the line. These corrections may be by the first hand.

For r most MSS, have de, but d is attested by Didymus, who refers to Λ 73, where d σynv was read by Aristarchus. d is adopted by La Roche and Leaf, ds by Monro and Allen.

Unidentified fragments.

Fr. (s). . . . . . . . . . . . . Fr. (t) . . . . . . . . . . . .

| . aox ] meto p[ | . aπφιλ[ |
| . νοπ[ | . ηξτον [ |
| . . . . . . . | . ελω [ |
| . . . . . . . | . ημ[ |
| 5 ] . . . . | . . . . . . |
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Fr. (m). Not Ψ 584–6.

Fr. (dd). Not Ψ 584–6.

Fr. (gg). l. 2 seems to be the beginning of a verse, but this is not certain. καυμένος might be read, but the fragment cannot be identified with Φ 360–1 or 375–6.
This fragment, containing parts of ll. 41–68 of Book xx of the *Odyssey*, was found not in mummy-cartonnage but loose in the debris outside the north wall of the town, where so many sarcophagi were buried; cf. p. 3. The writing is a delicate uncial of the early or middle part of the third century B.C., Z and Ω in particular preserving a decidedly archaic appearance.

Unusual interest attaches to this papyrus, which is the first early Ptolemaic fragment of the *Odyssey* to be discovered, and exhibits much the same scale of divergence from the vulgate as that with which the fragments of the *Iliad* have made us familiar. This passage in the ordinary text contains 28 lines, but in the papyrus 30, three new lines being inserted (after 51, 55, and 58) and one line of the vulgate omitted (53); while in several other places also the papyrus presents hitherto unknown readings, the list of which would no doubt be increased if the lines had been completely preserved. As it is, all of them are represented by less than half of the total number of letters, and some by 5 or 6 letters only. Hence the restoration of the new lines is very difficult, especially as they differ from most of the additional lines in the *Iliad* fragments in being not at all obviously derived from other passages in Homer. We are indebted to Mr. T. W. Allen for some suggestions. On the chief problems raised by these early Ptolemaic papyri see pp. 68 sqq.

\[\begin{align*}
v 41 & \ [\text{pros} \ \delta \ \epsilon i \ \kappa a i \ \tau o \delta \ \mu \epsilon i x o n \ \varepsilon i n \ \phi r e s i \ \mu [\epsilon r m h] i [i] \xi a \\
v 42 & \ [\epsilon i \ \pi e r \ \gamma a r \ \k t e n a v i a i \ \Delta i o i s \ \tau e \ \sigma e b e n \ \tau e \ \epsilon k p t i \\
v 43 & \ [\pi n i \ \k e n \ \upsilon e k p r o f v y o i m u \ \tau a \ [s e] \ \phi r a \zeta a o t h \ \alpha n o [g a \\
v 44 & \ [\tau o n \ \delta \ \au t e \ \pi r o s e e i p e \ \theta e a \ \gamma l a u k o p i s \ \Lambda \theta \eta n i \\
v 45 & \ [\sigma x e t l i e \ \k a i \ \mu e n] \ \tau i s \ \? [e] \ \chi e r e i o i \ \theta a r s e i \ \epsilon t a i r o i \\
v 46 & \ [o s \ \pi e r \ \theta n o t o s \ \tau \ \epsilon a] i \ \k a i \ [o] \ \nu \ \tau o s a \ \mu t e a \ \epsilon i \ [i d \ldots \\
v 47 & \ [a u t a r \ \epsilon g o \ \theta e o s \ \epsilon i] m i \ \delta i a [m] \ \pi e r e s \ \eta \ \se [f] \ \pi l a [s o w \\
v 48 & \ [13 \ \text{letters}] \ \pi o w \ \epsilon r e o \ \de \ \se o i \ \epsilon x \ [v a f a n d o n \\
v 49 & \ [e i \ \pi e r \ \pi e n t h k o n \tau a \ \l o x o i \ \mu e r [o] \ \pi o w \ \alpha [v] \ \rho o p o w \\
v 50 & \ [n o w \ \pi e r i s t a i e n \ \k t e i n a i \ \mu e [\i o m a t e s \ \alpha r h i \\
v 51 & \ [k a i \ \k e n \ \tau o n \ \epsilon l a s o i a i o \ \beta o a s \ \k e [i \ldots \gamma a] \ldots \\
v 51 & \ [13 \ \text{letters}] \ \epsilon i a s \ \a p [\ldots]
\end{align*}\]
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52 [αλλ' ελευθ σε καὶ υπνός ε. [.ν επικ. . . . . . . .
54 [ως φατο καὶ ρα οι υπνον επι βλεφάρισιν εξενεν
55 [αυτή δ' αψ ες Ολυμπ]πουν απεστιχε δια [θεαν
55 a [14 letters] ρος με] 20 letters
56 [ευτε του υπνος ε]μαρπτε [λιυν ημεληματα θυμον
57 [Αυσμελός αλοχος δ'] αρ επεγρετο κεδν ειδουν
58 [κλαιε δ' αρ εν λεκτο]ισι καθεξομενη [μαλακοισιν
58 a [15 letters] οθεν ακην εχον οι .
59 [αυταρ επει κλαιουν] α καρέσατο ου κα]τα θυμον
60 [Αρτεμιδιν πρω]ισταν επευξατο [δια γυναλων
61 [Αρτεμι ποτα θέα] θυγατερ Διος αιθε μοι ηηη
62 [ιου ενι αντοθεσι] β]αλουα εκ θυμον [ελοιο
63 [αιτιαν] η ηπιετα με αναρπαξασα θυελλα
64 [ανοιξον προφερουσα] α κατ ηερεντα κελεντα
65 [εμ προχονος δε] β]αλου αφορρ]ον Μιξει[νου
66 [ος δ' στε Πανδαρειου κουρα[ι] ανελον]το θυελλαι
67 [τηη]ια θοκησα με]μ φθεισαν θεοι αι δε ληποντο
68 [ορφαναι εμ μεγαροις κομιζε δε δι Αφ[ροδίτη

45. σχέλις και μεν ν]ις τε χερειον πειθε]θ έταιρο ΜΣ.] χερειον is fairly certain, though ιο is cramped into a very narrow space, and at the end of the line the tops of the six letters after ε suit ταιροι. The difficulty is the intervening word θαρει, suggested by Blass. The second letter is much more like ρ than λ or ω, which are the only possible alternatives, and the first letter must have been a rather narrow one. All that remains of it is a speck of ink near the bottom of the line. The third letter can be either ι or ρ, and ε suits the vestiges at the end of the word much better than σι or δ; but the supposed σ is more like o, and θαρει is not very satisfactory, especially as this use of θαρειν with a dative is not found in Homer.

46. ε]υδ . . . οδε ΜΣ.] θ could be read instead of ε, but not ω. It is difficult to account for the ε except by the hypothesis that the scribe wrote ειδος or ειδων by mistake.

51. βοας καὶ ήρη με]λα MSS. κα]ι after βοας is very doubtful. The second letter might be e.g. τ. υφα is inadmissible, the letter after the lacuna being either τ, π or γ. The supposed α which follows is quite uncertain, but the vestiges do not suit ε, so that aσ]π[ατα is not satisfactory. The new line 51 a may have expanded the description of the prospective plunder; αν] may be, as Mr. Allen suggests, αν]αγων, but to read λ]ειας would introduce a word not found in Homer. Blass proposes [αυτου τε κτειρι]εις, comparing Σ 47 πριν πυρι νησι ωπρηται κτειναι δε καί αυτους.

52. υπνος' διη κα]ι το φυλαγσειν] παντοχυν έχρησοντα κακων δ' υποδεσσε] ηδη MSS. The papyrus, instead of this, has only half a line, but soon makes up for the omission of I. 53 by inserting a line after 55. The word following υπνος was perhaps εων, though the space between ε and ν is rather broad for only one letter.
55. ἀπεστίχε: ἀφίκετο MSS. except the Monacensis (of the fourteenth century), which has ἀπεστίχε corrected to ἀφίκετο. ἀπεστίχε διὰ θείων is the vulgate reading in μ 143.

55 a. Mr. Allen suggests [κομησαν οδυσσα πάρος μεμαυτά εκείν: cf. ω 487 πάρος μεμαυτάν. 58 a. The subject of ἐχον is probably, as Mr. Allen remarks, the διμωά of Penelope. The phrase ἀκην ἐχον does not occur in Homer, ἐσω, ἐσω, ἐμεινα or ἐγένοντα being the only verbs found with ἀκην. οὐδείς, followed by τι ειπον (cf. Δ 22, ἢ τοι οἰδάρην ἀκείν ἵν οἶδε τι εἶπε), does not suit the vestiges after ἐχον.

67. φθεισαν: on the spelling of this word with ν or μ MSS. and grammarians differ.

68. κομησε: κομησε (v. l. κόμησε) MSS. The imperfect is quite in place.


Mummy A. Height 16-8 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. Plate VI (Frs. k and m).

These small and scattered fragments of the Iphigenia in Tauris are written in a medium-sized flowing and slightly sloping hand, which is the precursor of the oval style of the second and third centuries after Christ. Though showing none of the markedly archaic characteristics displayed by some of the other literary papyri in this volume, the MS. belongs to the same find as most of the oldest pieces, and is very unlikely to be later in date than the reign of Philadelphus. The only letter calling for any comment is the Ω, the second loop of which is not raised to the same height as the first, but is left very shallow and has sometimes hardly any curve at all. The lines of one column are partially preserved throughout the 29 verses of which it is composed.

In spite of its fragmentary condition the text is decidedly interesting, and its nearness to the age of the poet gives it additional weight. In ll. 252 and 618 conjectures of Reiske and Bothe are confirmed; and in ll. 587 and 621 valuable readings occur, one of them unanticipated, the other nearly coinciding with an emendation of Maehly. But the papyrus is as usual not impeccable, and one or two small errors are found, while some other variants are more questionable. The division of the lines for the chorus (ll. 173–91) follows a new method. In the collation below we have made use of the editions of Prinz-Wecklein and of G. Murray, but in filling up lacunae have followed the text of the two MSS., except when obviously wrong.

Fr. (a).

174    ]γ· [ 
175    ηλο[θ]ι γάρ [ 
176    ε[μ]α[φ] [
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177 σφαχθεΐσα ἡ τλ[αμὼν
179 υμ[ὼν τε Α[ειταν
180, 181 ἄχ[αν δ[οσπονα
182 θρηνο[ι] μου[θαν
184 μο[λπαις Α[ιδας
185, 186 παίανο[ν ομ[οι] π[ῶν
187 φ[ῶς σκη[πτρων
189 εὐ[ολβων []
191 μο[χθω]ν δε εγ μ[σθος αισσει

Frs. (d) and (c).

245 [ουκ αν φθανοις] αν ευτρεπή ποιουμενη
[τοδαποι τιμω][γης ονομ [ἐχουσιν οι ξενοι
[Ἐλληνες εν το[υθ ώδα κ[ου περιτεροω
[ουδ ονομ] ακ[οντας [οισαθα των ξενων φρασαι
[Πυλαδης εκ]Η(θ)εθο ατερος προς βατεροω
250 [του ξυλενο][δε [του ξενου τι τουνυ ην
[ουδεις τοδ ώδευν ου γ]αρ [εισηκονσαμεν
[τως δ ει]δετ αυτωϋς και[τυχοντες ειλετε
[ακραις επι ρηγ]μους.[Βεξε]εινον πορου
[και της θαλασσης][βουκ[ολω]ς κοινωνια
255 [βους ηλθομεν νι]φοντες εν[αλιαι δροσωι

Fr. (d).

275 αλλος δε [τις ματαιος ανομια θρασυς
εγελ[ασε] ει[χαις ναυτιλους δ εφθαρμενους
θ[ασσειν φαραγγ εφασκε του νομου φοβωι
[κλινοτας ος θυομεν ενθαδε ξενους]
ε[βαζε δ] ημων εν λεγειν τοις πλευσι
280 θ[ηραν τε τη θεω σφαγια ταπιχωρια
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καὶ ντωδε πετραν ατερος λιπων ξενοιν
εστη καρα τε διετιναξ ανω κατω
[kαπεστεναξεν ωλενας τρεμον ακρας]
mανιων αλαινων και βοαι κυναγος ως
285 Πυλαθη δεδορκας τηνδε τηνδε δ ουχ οραις
A[ιδου δρακαναν ως με βουληται κτανειν

Frs. (e), (f), (g), and (h).

.. . . . . . . . . . . .
[ει παραι ταυτον πραγμ αρεσκοντως εχει
[θελοις αν [ει σωσαιμι σ αγγειλαι τι μοι
[προς] A[ργος ελθων τοις εμοι εκει φιλους
[δελτοιν τ ε]νε[γκε]ιν ς[ιυ τις οικτειρας εμε
585 [εγραφαιεν αι]χιλασπ[ος ουχι την εμην
[φανενα νομιςων] χειρα τιν νομου δυπο
[δυσκειν] τα τι[ον] θεου ταδε δικαι ηγουμενου
[ουδενα γαρ] ειχον οστις [αγγειλαι μολων
[εις Αργος αυθις τας εμας επιστολας
590 [πεμψε]ιε [σωθεις των εμων φιλων τινι
[σιυ δ [ει] γερ [ως εοικας ουτις δυσγενης
[και] τας M[υκηνας οις] θα χους καγω θελω
σωθητι και ου μια]θιον ουκ αισχρον λαβων
κουφων εκατι γραμματων σωτηριαν
595 [οι]τοις δ [επειτερ πολις αναγκαζει ταδε

Frs. (i), (k), (l), and (m).

Col. i. . . Col. ii. . . PLATE VI (Frs. k and m).

600 ουτος δε συμπλει των εμων μοιχων χαριν

ουκον δικαιον επ ολεθρων τινι τουδ εμε[ε]
χαριν τιθεσθαι καυτον εκδυναι κακων

υ αλα ως γενεσθω τωδε μεν δελτων διδουν

 ypos epsilon phi [epsilon] tau 

605 ημας δ ο χρητον κτεινετο τα των φιλων
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A fragment perhaps belonging to this papyrus.

. . .

]. me[ ]rat[ . . .

174-91. This fragment is too small to indicate clearly the point of division in the lines or the principle upon which that division was based. The lines were longer than they are according to the arrangement of either the older or the more modern editions—to which we owe the highly inconvenient system of numbering four lines as if they were five. Perhaps the lyrics were written continuously like prose in lines of approximately equal length, as in 25. That hypothesis would at any rate account fairly well for the sizes of the various lacunae.
174. The vestige after a would suit ν, ε, or κ, and so the two letters may belong equally well to εὐθανασίαν, χαῖτιν, or δικήρῳ.

175. The reading is very doubtful; τηλός γάρ MSS.

177. σφάξθησα a is not a very satisfactory reading, since it does not account for a speck of ink between the σ and the top of the supposed first a, which is moreover itself quite dubious. σφάξθησα, however, is not a better alternative, for the ε would be too far from the σ, and again a speck of ink in the intervening space would remain unexplained. The traces between a τά|ι would perhaps best suit an σ followed by a broad π or, possibly, μ; but they are too slight to necessitate the supposition of a departure here from the MSS. tradition—which, however, is corrupt in this passage.

179. The papyrus supports the traditional reading, for which Bothe’s conjecture ῥυμων τ’απειρῶν is adopted by Murray.

182. θρηνοῖς: so a corrector of P; θρηνοὶ LP, θρῆνωσιν Markland, on metrical grounds. The vestige in the papyrus is not indeed inconsistent with ὑ, but is more suggestive of η.

189. It is impossible to judge whether l. 188 πατριῶν ὑδαίων, which is bracketed by W(ecklein), following Hartung, stood in the papyrus or not. If, however, it be assumed that these lines were more or less equal in length (cf. note on ll. 174–91) it will be necessary to suppose an omission of one line between l. 187 and l. 189.

191. The first line is most probably ν; ιο cannot be read. The line is metrical if ἅντει be written as a trisyllable, as it is in LP, which have μόρας δ’ ἐκ μόραν.

246. σεβόμαι: the papyrus upholds the MSS. tradition; σεβόμαι Monk, whose conjecture is accepted by W. and M.

247. τοῦθεν: l. τοῦτο.

252. Reiske’s conjecture καὶ τυχόντες (so W. and M.) for the MSS. reading καὶ τυχόντες is confirmed by the papyrus.

253. ἐνεξεῖνοι: so Plut. De exil. p. 602; ἐξεῖνοι MSS. Cf. l. 125, where LP have ἐνεξεῖνοι and Markland conjectures ἐξεῖνοι (so M.), and l. 395, where W. and M. read ἐξεῖνοι (with Markland) for ἐνεξεῖνοι (LP) or ἐνεξεῖνοι (l). ἐξεῖνοι is probably right here.

587. The MSS. here have θησακεῖν γε, τὰ τῆς θεοῦ ταύτα δικὰ ἡγομένην; W. and M. print θησακεῖν σύ, τὰ τῆς θεοῦ τάδε, adopting conjectures of Markland and Pierson. The papyrus substitutes τού τουθεν γε for τὰ τῆς θεοῦ, and before του has a clear a preceded by a letter of which all that remains is a projecting tip on the level of the top of the a, which would suit γ, σ, or τ. Hence, since θησακεῖν sufficiently fills the remaining space, the word before τουθεν is most likely τα, which implies a quite different construction from that found in the MSS. We venture to suggest that the true reading is του τοῦμον δ’ ὑπὸ θησακεῖν, τὰ τῆς θεοῦ τάδε δικαῖ ἡγομένου. This is more logical than the accepted text, for the will of the goddess would have been ineffectual unless enforced by the law; cf. l. 38 ὅτε τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρόν πόλει, and l. 595 ἐπίτειρ πόλει ἀναγγέλει τάδε. The substitution of ἡγομένης for ἡγομένου would be a particularly easy confusion (the papyrus shows the reverse error of του for τῶς), and the alteration of τά would inevitably follow. It would also be possible, as Mr. Murray remarks, to keep ἡγομένης and connect τὰ τῆς θεοῦ in the sense of ‘the victims of the goddess’ with θησακεῖν instead of with τάδε. θησακεῖν probably had no iota adscript; cf. l. 249 εκλῆξειβ’.

588–90. These lines are rejected by Dindorf and Monk.

589. τὰ: so the MSS.; τὰς (τ’ M. following Elmsley.

593. Though the letters of σωθῆι are broken, they are all quite consistent with the ordinary reading except the τ, which is unusually cramped; perhaps σωθῆι was written (cf. l. 247 τοῦθεν). In any case the papyrus lends no support to the conjecture σωθητί κείσαι, though it may of course have had Reiske’s more probable emendation τοῦ for σῶ.
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To ll. 573–4 μονή and λόγαι or ll. 575–6 εἰδοσεί and γνωστοὶ. The β is opposite l. 603, which is the 26th line from the bottom of the column; ll. 573 and 575 would be respectively the 27th and 25th from the bottom.

600. μοιχὴν: or -θυγ., but the former is more probable.

606. εἰς συμφορὰν: εἰς ἕμψορὰ MSS.

614. Perhaps πεμπομεν was first written and then altered to πεμφομεν. The upper part of the vertical stroke of ψ is clear, but in place of the tip of the crossbar there is another short vertical stroke which would suit e.g. μ or π.

615. θεωί: θεόν MSS.

618. τηρε MSS., τηρε Pap., confirming Bothe's conjecture, which is accepted by W. and M. συμφοραν, which is an unknown variant, is intelligible in itself, but does not well accord with the following line. προστροπῆν (MSS.) is more likely to be genuine.

619. The space indicates that the κῶς here was neglected; cf. the absence of elision in ll. 613, 625, &c.

621. The new reading of the papyrus ετευνουσα is preferable to the traditional θείουσα. The first two letters are much damaged, but the vertical stroke of the τ is plain. Maehly's acute conjecture θείουσα, though not actually confirmed, is thus shown to have been on the right track.

622. The supposed ι of ιψαε is above χ of χαύτην which would approximately correspond with ι of σφαγευς. There is, therefore, scarcely room in the initial lacuna for οὐκόν, the unmetrical reading of the MSS., corrected in L to όκ.

626. χαυηματα is probably only a clerical error for χαυμα τ(ε). It is, however, noticeable that with Diodorus' variant (xx. 14) χαυνός for πέτρας, the plural form χαυματε εὐρωπά would at least scan. But there is no ground for suspecting χάμα τε εὐρωπάν πέτρας, the version of the MSS.

629. LP here read μάρασον ελήνη, δι τάλας, ὡστε τοιτ' εί, ἑξίων μακρῶν γάρ κ.τ.λ. There seems to have been an accidental omission in the papyrus, though without knowing how the critical first foot of the line was filled up a definite decision on the point is difficult.

25. EURIPIDES.

Mummy A. 8 x 5·7 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240.

On this fragment is written in a large cursive hand of the middle of the third century B.C. the favourite chorus of Euripides which closes the Alcestis (1159–63), Andromache (1284–8), Bacchae (1388–92), and Helena (1688–92), and, with a difference in the first line, the Medea (1415–9). Whether anything preceded the chorus here is uncertain; in any case the fragment is probably a school exercise, not part of a literary manuscript. The division of the lines is determined apparently by their length, and in no way corresponds to the metre or to the division found in the MSS. of Euripides. At least two new variants occur. The colon-shaped stop is found in l. 4.

[πολλαὶ μο]φι[αί] των

1
The restoration of this line is very doubtful: if the vestiges really belong to μο[ν]αι, των would project to the right beyond the following lines. [λα]μ μορφαῖς τῶν can equally well be read; but πολ must in that case be transferred to a line above, which would involve the inference that the extract contained more than the final chorus.

3. τ αἰλπτως: δ' αἰλπτως MSS. in all five places, but δ cannot possibly be read here, and αἰλπτως does not accord with the vestiges very well. The traces before τως suit σε better than λε.

4. δοκησαντ: δοκηθεύμ MSS. The active is preferred by Blass on the ground that ἐδοκήθην, apart from this chorus of Euripides, is a late form.

7. εὑρε[ν]: the ν is much fainter than the surrounding letters and seems to have been intentionally smeared out. εὑρε is generally found in the MSS., but εὑρεν occurs as a variant in Hel. 1691.

This, the longest of the Hibeh literary papyri, consists of seventeen fragments from the so-called 'Ἡτορική πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον, a treatise on rhetoric which already in the time of Athenaeus and perhaps even as early as the end of the third century B.C. passed as the work of Aristotle. The traditional view of its composition was decisively rejected in 1840 by Spengel, who endeavoured to substitute Anaximenes of Lampscus, an older contemporary of Aristotle, as the author; and with so much success that for half a century his conclusions with regard to the Anaximenean authorship were hardly disputed. In 1892, however, Susemihl (Gesch. d. Alex. Litt. ii. pp. 451-7) re-examined the whole subject, and in opposition to the generally received view argued for a third century B.C. date for the treatise. Hammer, who re-edited the text after Spengel in 1894, leaves the question of authorship undecided. The new discovery, as we shall presently show, goes far to overthrow Susemihl’s position and weaken his objections to the previously accepted conclusions of Spengel.
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Parts of eighteen columns are extant, but of these only one (Col. x) is quite complete, and Cols. iii, iv, vi, viii, xii, xv, and xviii are represented by the merest fragments, while the rest are all much disfigured by lacunae. The MS. falls into three main divisions, (A) Cols. i–viii, which are continuous, then after a gap of several columns (B), comprising Cols. ix–xi, followed after a loss of one column by (C), Cols. xii–xviii. In (B), which originally formed part of a small breast-piece together with 16, the surface of the papyrus is clean and the ink perfectly clear (see Plate III); but in the other two sections the writing had mostly been covered with plaster and is in parts much obliterated. The columns contain from 20 to 23 lines, which are decidedly irregular in length, varying from 20 to 30 letters with an average of 26. Since the columns lean over somewhat towards the right, the lines near the top tend to project at the ends, those near the bottom at the beginnings. Paragraphi mark the commencements of new sections, and where these begin in the middle of a line a blank space is left three or four letters in width.

The handwriting is an unusually small uncial with a tendency to cursive forms in certain letters, particularly N, the last stroke of which projects far above the line; Ï retains much of its epigraphic character. A later date than the reign of Philadelphus is extremely improbable. On the verso is some third century B.C. cursive writing, too much damaged for continuous decipherment. Since this MS. of the Ὀρτοφή it itself thus belongs to the first half of the third century, the treatise can hardly have been composed later than B.C. 300, and a fourth century date for it may now be regarded as established. This does not of course prove that its author preceded Aristotle, as has been generally maintained by those who support the idea of the Anaximenean authorship; the contemporary papyrus 16 is probably the work of Theophrastus who was Aristotle's disciple. But now that the antiquity of the treatise is shown to have been somewhat underestimated by Susenhi, and the terminus ante quem can be fixed at B.C. 300 instead of 200, the older theory that the Ὀρτοφὴ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον was the work of Anaximenes regains much of the ground which it has lost in the last fifteen years.

The extant MSS. of the treatise, which all belong to the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries, are divided by Spengel and Hammer into two classes, the better one composed of the MSS. called CFM, to which Hammer added OP, and the worse comprising ABDEGV. The existence of considerable interpolations in the treatise is generally suspected, in particular the introductory letter from Aristotle to Alexander, which has been long regarded as a later addition, and several passages chiefly towards the end, the true character of which was detected by Ipselkopfer. On these the papyrus (henceforth called Π), since it
only covers the latter part of chapter 1 and most of chapters 2 and 3 (about ¾ of the whole work), does not throw any direct light, but it shows clearly that interpolations do not extend in any serious degree to those chapters; for, apart from an apparent omission in Col. xv probably due to homoioteleuton, there is only one considerable collocation of words found in the MSS. which is wanting in II (l. 296, note), whereas in several passages II supplies words or clauses which are omitted by the MSS. As would be expected with texts removed from each other by no less than seventeen centuries, the number of divergences in II from the extant MSS. is very large; in fact two or three consecutive lines, where II is at all well preserved, seldom pass without a new variant. Upon the merits of these it is sometimes difficult to decide owing to the incompleteness of the context, but in many cases II unquestionably supplies the right reading. In particular several conjectures of the earlier editors are now confirmed, e.g. l. 3 η εν άκλητοι (η εν ευδόξοι) for η άκλητοι (ευδόξοι) (Spengel); 17 τούτον τον τρόπον for τον τρόπον τούτον (Spengel); 117 τριπτως for περιπτώς (Bekker); 121 the substitution of a phrase like δει μεθυστάναι (μεταστατευ) Π for πως (Spengel); 293 διελθομεν for διέλθομεν (Spengel); 313 ο νομος for νόμος (Spengel); 317 τιμωσιν for ίσαιαιι ειδώσιν (Spengel); cf. also notes on ll. 23 and 27. Other improvements in the text introduced by Π occur in ll. 30–1 αυτον τον διαγερεωντα νομον λαμβανειν for αυτον τον διαγερεοντα καλ τον νομον λαμβανειν; 67–8 Λακεδαιμονιος συμμαχιαν ποιησαμενας for το Λακεδαιμονιοι συμμάχους ποιησαμένους; 116 τοις λογοις χρησαι δει το χρησαι α ν ο γραφαι δει; 140–1 διπλα πολιτιμαιν for έκκαιαν διπλα πολιτιμαιν; 219 αιδε for αιδε (δε); 220 καιρον παραπτωκοτος for καιρών παραπτωκότων; 233 the insertion of πολεμώτες; 299 εσεχνησις for εξάγγελσις; 302 υποπτωθετων for καθυποτωθετων; 311 ημαρτημενων for αδικημάτων; cf. also notes on ll. 35, 142, 148–9, 164, 197, 231, 250, 271–6, and especially 316–8, where a whole clause is inserted. The numerous other variants in Π largely consist of minor alterations which hardly affect the sense; and though a text of this antiquity, written within a century of the composition of the work in question, naturally outweighs in most cases the evidence of MSS. which are so much later, confidence in Π is somewhat shaken by its inaccuracies. Not only are there several serious scribe’s errors, l. 146 γενομενων for γενομενον; 160 εις misplaced; 162 καινον παινιν for και τοις παισιν; 175 υβριζοντυς for υβρίζειν; 265 ωικος for εικός, and ωικος for αυτον by or by a dittography; 280 κα for κακα; 281 και μεν for (apparently) άς (or δε) είρηκαμεν; 294 ωμοτροπια for ωμοτρόποια; 296 συνεστηκια for συνέστηκε; 304 εξωτερικα for εξωτερικα but, to say nothing of the probable omission of several lines through homoioteleuton in Col. xv (cf. ll. 246–50, note), there are several places where Π’s reading, if not absolutely wrong, is distinctly inferior to that of the MSS., e.g. l. 72 ουτω for ουδε;
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118-9 αναγκαῖον . . . διαφυλαττεῖν for διαφυλακτέον; 137 the transference of μεῦ; 170 the omission of μεῦ; 269 the insertion of μεῦ.

Compared with the divergence of Π from both groups of MSS., the differences between the latter appear trivial; and since the variations between the two families do not happen to be very strongly marked in the passages where Π's readings are preserved with complete or tolerable certainty, the evidence of the new find does not greatly assist towards deciding the merits of the MSS. As commonly occurs with papyri, the text of Π is of an eclectic character. In seven cases it agrees with the so-called 'better' codices, CFMOP (or most of them) against ABDEGV (or most of them) which Spengel and Hammer call the 'worse'; l. 108 τας αλλας against ἀλλας; 115 περὶ τοῦτων ενδεχόμενα against ενδεχόμενα περὶ τοῦτων; 178 στεροῦμενον against στεροῦμενον; probably 223 αυτῶν against ἑαυτῶν; 279 τοὺς λόγους against τὸν λόγον; 304 ταυτὰς against τὰς αὐτὰς; 315 οπως against ὅπως καὶ. Where the MSS. of that group are divided Π tends to favour CF (especially F) against MOP whether these are supported by the 'deteriores' or not; cf. the notes on ll. 111, 35, 86, 147, 191, 229, 244, and 266, and the numerous slips in M, O, and P, e.g. in ll. 93, 102, 114, 145, 162, 191, 218, 237, 276, and 306. On the other hand Π supports the so-called 'deteriores' against the other group in l. 127 (apparently) διῶτι against ὅτι, 234-5 εὑρισκαν against ἑὑρισκαν, and 254 πρῶτος against πρῶτος; and in three instances the 'deteriores' or some of them alone preserve Π's reading in a corrupt form, l. 116 λόγῳ χρήσασθαι against χρήσασθαι (τοὺς λόγους χρησαθαι, Π), 231 ὅτι πλείστα τοῦτων against ὅτι τὰ πλείστα τοῦτων (τοῦτων τὰ πλείστα, Π), and 241 τοῦτων ὁμοορθῶς against τοιούτων (τοῦτοι ὁμοορθῶσαν, Π). On the whole the new evidence indicates that Spengel and Hammer were right in thinking F to be the best MS., but that Hammer, who pays less attention than Spengel to the 'deteriores,' somewhat underestimates their relative importance, since the preference of Π, so far as it goes, for the reading of the CFMOP group is very slight, and some of the apparent errors of the 'deteriores' seem to be due to their partial preservation of genuine readings, which by a process of correction have disappeared from the other family. Our restorations of the lacunae are taken, when Π provides no definite indications to the contrary, from the text of Hammer, to whose edition the pages and lines mentioned at the head of each column refer.

Frs. (a), (b), and (c).

Col. i, p. 15, 3-17.

[ω]ν [α]υτοῖς λέγειν καὶ τῶν εὐαντί
HIBEH PAPYRI

[η] ὑπε ἔνδοξοιον [κριτοίον] η ὑπὸ τῶν
5 [αὐτῷ] αἰχονοσι; [τῶν ἡμῶν τὸ] μεν οὐν [δίκαιον οἰον εστὶ προτερὸν ἡμῶν]
[δεδηλωται τὸ δὲ ομοῖον τοι δὲ]
[καὶ οἱ τοιοῦτοι εστὶν ωσπερ γαρ]
[δίκαιον νομίζομεν] τὸ τοῖς γάντιν

10 [σι πειθεσθαι τον αὐτὸν τρόπον]
[πρὸςηκεὶ τοῖς ζεῖεις μυμεσθαί]
[ταῖς τῶν π[α]τρ[ων π[α]παίς καὶ]
[καθαπε]ρ τοὺς εὖ ποιησαντας αν
[τενεργετεῖτιν δ]ικαιον εστίν οὕτω

15 [του]σ μ[η]δὲν κακὸν εργασμένους
[ημᾶς δίκαιον εστὶ] μὴ βλαπτεῖν
[τὸ με]ν [οὖν ομοῖον τ]οῖο [δίκαιοι t]ον
[τοῖς τῶν τρόπων δει λαμβάνειν]
[ἐκ δὲ] τοῖς εναντίων χρῆ κατὰ

20 [φανεῖς ποιεῖν το αὐτὸ παραδείγμα]
[καθαπε]ρ γὰρ τοὺς κα[κ]ου τι ποιη
[σαντας δ]ικαιον εστι τ[ι]μω[ρ]εισθαι οὖ

Frs. (b), (d), and (g). . . Col. ii, p. 15, 20—16, 7.

4 lines lost.

Ἀθηναίοι καὶ Ἀκαδαμιανοὶ

25 [δίκαιον κρινο]ν[σι] τόσον εἰδρόοι τι
[μερεσθαί το] μέν δὴ δικ[αίον οὖν τῷ]
[νοτ]ο[ιο] μεν ο εστὶν ορισταὶ
[ημῖν προτε]ρον δει δ ὀποῖαν [χρῆ]

[ον τοίς γεγρ]αμμενοι νομοὶ εξῆ δὲ
[ἀν τοιοῦ]τοι ω[σπερ γαρ] ο νομοθετ[ῆς]
[ταῖς μεγισταίς ζημίαις τοὺς]
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35 κλεπτοντας κολαζει ωτω δει κατι τους εξαπατωντας μαλιστα

τις μορειουθαι κατι γαρ ωτου κλη
πτουει την διανοιαν και καθαπερ
ο νομοθετης καθηρονους εποι

40 ησε τοις εγγυτατω γενους ον
tαι τοις απασιοὐν αποθηκοουσιν
ουτω των τιου απελευθερου χρη[

Frs. (d') and (e). Col. iii, p. 16, 13–22.

· · · · · · · ·

[νους αυτα παντας αδικειν ο νομοθετης εκρινεν ει γαρ τιμας θαι

45 [οi νομαι προστατουσαι τοις και δικαιος των κοινων επιστατησι[α

τας δηλον οσ και τους τα δημοσιας

[διαφθειραντας τιμωριας] αξι[ι

ους νομιζουσιν · · · · · ·· κακι

50 [των εναντιων το νομιζουν κατα

[φαινεις αυτω γινεται · · · · εκ δε των και ου μονον] εγω
[των νομων τουτων ενεκα τουτου]

[φημι των νομοθετην θεουι αλλα] και

55 [προτερον οι δικασται παραπλη[

Fr. (e). Col. iv, p. 17, 10–11.

· · · · · · · ·

και ταις πολεσιν ομονουσαις

57 προσκοπειν μη στασιασωσι


τα με ουν ομοια τοιι συμφεροντι του

tον τον [τροπον μετε]ων [πολλα

60 ποιησεις εικ δε των εμαντου[ων οδι[ε]
HIBEH PAPYRI

ei γαρ λυσθειε} επιεικεισ τιμαν
tou[s] ποιησιν κολαξειν ει] γαρ οισ
προς Θηβαιων] πολεμειν συμφε
[χ]ιαν] ποιησαμενος] ουτω Θηβαιων
ποιειν [εκ] μεν δη των ειναι
[χρη] λαμβανειν Δα]καδαιμοιν]
70 με[σαντε] συμφε]ρειν] αυτοις
[εξαν]ραποδι]σα[σθαι] και

Frs. (f) and (g). Col. vi, p. 17, 25—18, 14.

με]ν [του] δικαιου και του] νομου και
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τους μεν ἑδιοὺς λόγους αυτὰ τὰ πραγματα ὑπὸ καθ ἑκατῆν ἡμῖν
96 τῇ[ν συμβου]λίν παραδοσεὶ τὰς δὲ [κοινὰς ἰδεῖς] ἐκ πολλοῦ προειδο
[τῇ]ξ[ὶ εἰπερειν] ἐφ ἑκατὰς τῶν πρᾶξεων παῖδιος δυνησμέθα τὸν
τὸν ὧν εὐκα διαίρετον ἡμῖν
100 τῇ ὡν κοινῆ βουλευόνται πᾶν τῆς [ἐν κεφαλαίω] μὲν ὧν εἰπεῖν

Frs. (g) and (h). Col. vii, p. 18, 14—19, 4.

[εἰσιν επτὰ τὸν] ἀριθμὸν προθέσεις
[περὶ ὧν δὴμ]ηγορητέον ἀναγκαί
[οὖν γὰρ εστὶ] βο[ῦν][κανεσθαι καὶ λέ
105 [γειν ἡμᾶς εν βοῶλῃ ἡ εἰ δήμωι
[περὶ ιερῶν ἡ νομῶν ἡ] περὶ τῆς πολυ[τικῆς κατασκευῆς ἡ] πε[ρὶ τῶν προ[ῆς]
[τὰς ἀλλὰς πολείς σφμμαχο[ν] καὶ
[συμβολαῖον ἡ περὶ πολ]λ[ε[ῖ]ων ἡ
110 [εἰρήνης ἡ περὶ ποροῦ χρή][ματων] ἂ[ι
[μὲν ὧν προθέσεις αὐτ[ί]αι το[ῦ]χανο
[σι περὶ ὧν βο[ῦν]λευσμέ[θ]α καὶ δήμη
[γορησα][μὲν] ἑκατῆν δὲ προθέσιν
dιελμέθα καὶ σκοπομεν εἰς οἷς
115 τροποῖ[ς περὶ τούτων εὐ[δὲ]χεται
tοις λογοῖς χρησθαί περὶ μὲν [ὀ[ν]ω
ιερῶν τριττῶν [α]ναγκ[α]ων λέ
γειν ἡ γὰρ έρουμεν ὡς ἀναγκ[α]ων
tα καθεστοτα δ[ι][α]φυλαττεῖν
120 ἡ ως επι το μεγαλοπρεπεστε
ρον μεταστατεον ἡ ως επι το τα[τα]
πειστερον ὧτα μὲν ὧν λέγω
μὲν ὡς δὲ τα καθεστοτα διαφύ
Frs. (g) and (h). Col. viii, p. 19, 5–10.

\[\text{λατ[τειν εὐρησομεν αфорμας εκ μεν} \]
\[\text{του [δικαιου διοτι παρα πασι τα πα} \]
\[\text{τρια [εθη παραβαινειν αδικον εστι} \]
\[\text{kαι διοτι τα μαντεια παντα τοις} \]
\[\text{αρθρωποις προστατει κατα τα} \]
\[\text{πατρια ποιεισαι τας θυσιας} \]
\[\text{καὶ τ[ων πρωτων οικιζοντων} \]
\[\text{τα[s πολεις και τοις θεοις ἱδρυ} \]
\[\text{το lines lost.} \]

\[\text{σ’} \]
\[\text{σ’} \]
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Frs. (i) and (k). Col. ix, p. 22, 3–17. Plate III.

\[\text{[ειν συλληβδην δε δει παραφυλατ} \]
\[\text{τειν οπως οι μεν] νομοι το πληθος} \]
\[\text{αποτρέψουσι τοις τας ουσιας εξουσιων} \]
\[\text{επιβουλευειν τοις δε πλουτουσιν} \]
\[\text{εις τας κοινας λει]τουργιας βαπαναν} \]
\[\text{φιλοτιμαι εμπο]ησουντοι τουτο} \]
\[\text{δε ουτως αν τις π]αρασκευασειειν ει} \]
\[\text{τοις μεν τας ουσιας εξουσιων αντι} \]
\[\text{των εις το κοινον δ]απανωμενων τι} \]
\[\text{μαι τινες απο τ]ων νομων αφορι} \]
\[\text{σημεραι τυ]γχαι νοιειν των δε γενομε} \]
\[\text{κοινος τοις τ]ην χωραν εργαζομενους} \]
\[\text{τε] και τους [ραντικο]μεν μαλλον} \]
\[\text{των] αγιοραι]ον προτι]μαν ουτω γαρ} \]
\[\text{οι μεν πλουτουντες ε]κοντες τη} \]
\[\text{πολει λειτουργησουσ]ν το δε πλη} \]
\[\text{θος ου συκοφαντιας αλ]λα εργασιας επι} \]
\[\text{θυμησει . . . . . . .} \]
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Fr. (i). Col. x, p. 22, 17—23, 4. Plate III.
epikeisathai timoriais tois para
betaunoun tauta xrh kai tois ev
160 tois polemais teleutiasai tafrh

dhmioin xhorin eg kaloi pro th
poleos afhriasai kai tois pasin av
ton eous hphsow eis trophn didoivai
twm men ouv ev tais dhmokratias
165 vnomov toiautn de ei thn thein
poiesathai peri de tas olygarhias
tas men orchas dei touz vnomous
katanemis eis ison pasi tois th
politeias metauxoun touton
170 de einai tas pleistas klhrotais
tas de megistas kryfaiai thefou
meb orkou kai pleisths akrivei
as diazhfousta dei de kai tas zeta
mias ev tais olygarhias meg
175 stas epiekisathai tois ubrizeousin
tinas ton politon epixeirousin
to gar plhdos oux outo ton ar
xwv aganaktet stereomenov ws

Fr. (i). Col. xi, p. 23, 4—17. Plate III.
exei barbas ubrizeoumenon xrh de
180 tas diaforas twn politon sti
tachista dialvsi 

kai mhe [s]ynagiein ek ths xhoras
ton oikhon eis thn pollin ek gar ton

[\detai xwrai anadaston poiein

[\metai dhmoinein tas oiuiai
tos

[15 letters saantos ich
[prous keusai vnomous kai [megalas

[prj re xep av saar gnoieiv

[prj re Srjpeveiv ras ovaias

[prjre KeiaOai npoCopias tois npa
Batovaivaavra XPV Kal roty ev

[prjre Srjpoaiov xapiov €y
KaXaii npo rj

[prjre noXeoos apiaOai Kairoi

[prjre ecov rj
[prjre Kostrovai

[prjre pev ovv ev ras
SrjpoKpanais

[prjre npo rjBrjai ety

[prj re Copnpaiv oX
Oeaiv

[prjre exei Bapems vBpi£opevov

[prj re rip XoovaKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prj re rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos

[prjre rip XoovayavraKrei arepopevov cos
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185 τα πλῆθη καὶ [καταλυει τας ολι
gαρχιας καθολοίν δε ειπειν δει
εμ μεν ταῖς δημοκρατιαις καλειν
τους πολλους ταις των πλουσιων
ουσιας επιβουλειν εν δε ταις

190 ολιγαρχιαις αποτρεπειν τους
της πολιτειας μετεχοντας
υβριειν τους ασθενετερους
και συκοφαίντειν τους πολιτας ον
μεν ουν ορέγεσθαι δει τους νομους

195 και την πολιτικην κατασκευ
νυ εκ τοις τους ουκ αγνοησεις
δει δε συγκαγορευντα μεν νομου
δεικνυαι τουτων ισον οιτα τοις
πολιταις ομολογουμενον τε

Fr. (l). Col. xii, p. 24, 14–19.

200 [και πλησιον τω· το· το· το· το·]
κατοι [κουντας ει δε μη] τουτων απερ [αν ν]
[παρχηι συναγειν] δοται διακωλυ
[ης την συμμαχιαν ε]μφανιζειν
[ενδεχεται πρωτομ] μεν ως ου

205 [κ αναγκη ποιεισθαι] νυν αυτην
[επιθ ως ου δικαιοι τυχ[η]ανουσιν ουτ[ε]]

Frs. (l), (m), (n), and (o). Col. xiii, p. 24, 19—25, 8.

[eιθ ως] προτερον ημας κακως ποιη
[sα]ντει [14 letters ει δε μη
[ως] μακραν τωι τοπωι απεχοντες

210 και αξιονται ουτε κατα των προση
[κοινetas παραγενεσθαι καιρως ταις
[μεν ουν 18 letters ]ειν
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τοῖς περὶ τῶν συμμαχῶν εκ τούτων
καὶ τῶν τουτοίς ομοίως τροπῶν εὐτοποιημένως

δε καὶ εἰ[ημην]ν τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον
καὶ εἰσὶν τού πολέμου
[εκφ]ερεῖν πρὸς τίμιοις αἰδῆ προτε

220 [ρο]ν αδίκηθεντας νἀν καίρου παρὰ
πεπτῶκοτοσ αμνασθαί τοὺς
[α]δίκηθεντας αὐτὸν πολέμιον
[ν]επεισοδος καὶ μετὰ ταύτα δεικτεῖν

225 αδίκηθεντας βοήθειν ἡ τοῦ τῆς
πολεμικοῦ πολεμικοῦ εἰκεῖν ἡ οἰς

Fr. (o).

Col. xiv, p. 25, 10-18.

2 lines lost.

[ἐπὶ] τὸ πολέμιον παρακαλωμένον τούς
[τοὺς] τὴν τῶν προφαστῶν οἰ πλείον
[συν] ακτέον καὶ μετα ταύτα δεικτεῖν

230 [ὡς] ἐξ οὗ ἐστὶν περιγενεσθαι τοῖς
πολέμιοιν τοῦν οἰ πλείον οἰς
παρακαλουμένοις εστὶν ὑπό[ν]οι

περιγενεσθαι δὲ παντὸς πολεμίον

tes ἡ διὰ τὴν τοὺς θεοὺς εὐνοιαν [ἡν en

235 τυχιαν ημεῖς] κ[α]λοὶ [με]ν [ἡ διὰ σωμα
tou πληθος] καὶ ρωμην η διὰ χρη

ματον [ευποριαν η] διὰ στρατη
gov φιλονησιν η διὰ συμμαχων
argetην η δια τοπον . . . . . . . . . .

240 ευσφιαν τοῦν οὐν καὶ τοῖς
toutois omoiotropoiv τα τοῖς πρα

γμασίν οἰκειοτάτα λαμβα
Fr. (p). Col. xv, p. 29, 15—30, 8.

[phi(n)ontai mei'ous o]ta[pi pro [beta]xai [nu] [teipous parastwosin e]sta[di de ka][i

245 [o]we an[ve]in ei kekri]ta[']i: mu[ega
[agavon ............... ] me][ga . . .
[ 18 letters ] [nu [.] [••••••••••••••]
[ 23 " ] . . . .
[ 24 " ] . . .

250 [ 25 " ] a
[ek diavnoias sumbiba]xou [os]
[ek pol]λou proen[psi]even os pol[la]von
[tei os oudeis allos pr]oter[os

[tou]to es[pra]xe me[th o]n ou[deis] a\l
[los os ep]i tou]to[ei me[th ou]s ou]
[deis e[re]vos os ek]von os e\k pro
[noi]as os ei pa]nte[se . . . poi]me[n

[phaul[os x]rho de ka]i e\k[\sigma]o
[to e]teron os ep]i to e]teron anv[se]i

Fr. (p).

Col. xvi, p. 30, 8-21.

265 de[tai epikos ka]i tous yone[is] ti[ma]n ou
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col. xvii, p. 30, 21—31, 8.

ποτερον μείζον φα[νεται το πρ]α
για κατα μερη διαφορυμ[ενον η κ]α
θο[λον] λεγομενον ο[π]ήρεως αν α]υν
μείζον η τουτον τον τρ]οπον αυ
το δει λεγειν τα[σ] μεν [ο]υν αυξη
σεις ουτως μετων πλειστας και
μεγιστας ποιησεις τι[α]πεινωσεις
de τοις λογοι και ταγαθα] και τα
κα τον εναντιον τροπον μετιων
ευρησεις και μεν επι τωμ μεγα
λεων και μαλιστα μεν μηδενος
αιτιων επιδεικνυειν ει δε μη οσ ελα
χιστων και μικροτατων [ω]ς με
υ ουν εγκωμ[ια]κοντες και ψ[ε]γοντες

Fr. (p).
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Fr. (p).

Col. xviii, p. 31, 14–20.

7[ο παρατηρειν τους κατηγο]

ρουντας επι σωιος [των κατη
gορματων οι [νομοι τας τιμα]

310 μιας ταττο[να]ν και περι α

tων ημαρτημενον οι δικαιαι
tασ ζημιας οριζονταν οταν με

ν ονυ ο νομος δ[ι]ω[κως η η πουτο
dei μυον σκοπεων [του κατηγο]

315 ρ[ονως επιδειξη]ι το πραγμα

gεγενημεν[ον [οταν δ οι δικαιαι

τιμασιν προ[το]ν μεν αναγικη

[επιδειξαι τα κατηγορουμενα

Fr. (r).

Fr. (s).

Fr. (t).

νθη[ ]κατα[ ]Πτ . [ ]

ι–5. (ομοιων κτλ.: the whole sentence in the MSS. runs επιφορησμεν δε περι τοιων

λεγειν εξ αυτων τε των προερημεων και των ομοιων τοιων και των εναπτων αυτωι και των εκ

κεκριμεων υπο θεων η ανθρωπων ενδοξων η υπο κριτων η υπο των ανταγωνιστων ημων. The papyrus

(Π) exhibits several variations. λεγειν is placed later in the sentence, after ωμοιων [ομοιωι, which, owing to considerations of space, is more likely to have stood in the text than

ομοιων [το]ντωι. Possibly κοι should be restored in place of κοι in l. 1, but the supplement is already rather long for the lacuna. Before ντο θεων Π inserts η, and before ανθρωπων

adds ητ, while ενδοξων is transferred from ανθρωπων to κριτων, whether ητ [ενδοξων [κρι]τωι] is read, as we propose, or ητ [κριτωι [ενδοξων], which is also possible if the supposed

τ is regarded as ink that has come off from a different layer in the cartonnage. The transfer of the epithet is an improvement; cf. l. 72, where Π has υτο [ενδοξων κριτωι in place of εντ ινδοξυ of the MSS. in a passage which develops in detail the general statement in l. 4. Ανθρωπων by itself makes a better antithesis to θεων than άνθρωπων ενδοξων, and Spengel (p. 111) had already remarked that η εποθεων η επο άνθρωπων would be expected

— which is what Π actually has.
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9. to: om. MSS.
11. τον τό[ν] καί μεμειδα: so Hammer with CFM and the deteriores; μεμειδα τοις
υλόν OP Ald.
15. κακῶν ἐργασμένους [ημὺ]ν: ἡμᾶς κακῶν ἐργασμένους MSS. except V which has κακῶν
ημᾶς ἐργασμένους.
17. τῷ [τό]ν τὸν τῶν τρόπων τῶν τότων MSS. Spengel had already proposed to
place τῶν τότων first.

22. οὐτῶ καί: so Hammer following Spengel; the MSS. place οὐτῶ after ἐπεργητή-
σαντα. The reading of the papyrus is not quite certain. Lines 21, 22, and 23 as far as
σαντα are on a separate fragment (e), and the exact position of the two parts of l. 23
cannot be determined by external evidence. Adopting the arrangement in the text,
according to which only a is supposed to be lost between σαντα and Ἰτ..., it is necessary
to supply οὐτῶ between τῇ μου ἑπαθίαν and καί, as εἰκαργησαντας οὐτῶ cannot be read.
But a difficulty is caused by the last three letters of the line: the surface of the papyrus
is much damaged at this point, and it is hard to distinguish what is the original ink from
what has come off from a different layer. The vestiges following the σ, which is clear,
do not suit the beginnings of either προσημειωσ εις αντιεργητεων, the two last words of the
sentence in the MSS., for though ρω is possible there is not space for π between that
and the σ.
25. δίκαιον κρινο[ύς]: δίκαιον εἶναι κρίνουν MSS., which is too long for the lacuna.
26. μὲν δὲ: μὲν οὖν MSS.; but Π's reading is very uncertain. The letter before
ν could equally well be υ, i.e., οὖν, but then it is very difficult to account for the following
δ (or α), unless the beginning of δικαιον was written twice by mistake. There are some very
faint traces of the penultimate letter before τυν or υν, but not sufficient to help in deciding
between το μεν or μεν οὖν.
27. παλλάξας: so Spengel; παλλάξας MSS., Hammer. But Π's reading is very
uncertain.
28. ο: οὖν MSS.
29. στατον: δι' οὐν δὲ MSS., but the letter preceding αν is more like τ than ν. οπως αν
might also be read.
30-31. οὐρ[ημή]ν: οὐρ[ημή]ν αὐτόν MSS., avoiding the hiatus. It is not
certain that the order was different in the papyrus, but the lacuna in l. 30 corresponds to
μετροτ in l. 29 and ὁμολογ. in l. 31, so that [ουτα] is rather short for it, while [γρημή]
would make l. 29 rather long.
33-1. αὐτὸν τε τῆς διαση[ρεηκέν]τα τόμον λαμβανειν: αὐτόν τε τῶν διάρρηστα καὶ τῶν
νόμον λαμβανειν MSS., which will hardly construe, and is probably a corruption of the true
reading found in Π.
34. ταυς: om. MSS.
35. κελεστοτας κολαζει: κέλεσται ἐκλασει MSS. κελεστοτας makes a better contrast than
κέλεσται with ἐξεκαπτωτας in l. 36.
36. δει: so Hammer with CFM and the deteriores; δη ΜΟΠ Ald.
39. εποιηθη: πεποιηθη MSS.
42. των: καί τῶν MSS.
43-7. The vestiges of these lines are very slight and the reconstruction very uncertain.
48-9. ους τοιμα[ί] with a paragraphus below is on the fragment (d) containing most
of Col. ii, but the position of those letters in relation to Fr. (e) containing Cols. iii and iv
is rendered certain by the writing on the verso, although Col. iii proves to be shorter
by 3 lines than Col. ii. After τοιμαζομεν there may have been a blank space of 3 or
4 letters, so that the lacuna before ἦκ may be reduced from 10 letters to 6. The MSS.
proceed ἐκ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐναντίων, and οὖν would be expected at the end of the line, but the two letters that remain are almost certainly ακ. Since ἐκ must have occurred somewhere in l. 49, we propose καὶ, i.e. καὶ ἐκ, though this goes far to necessitate the alteration of μὲν οὖν, which would almost fill up the lacuna between νομὶζοντος and καὶ. It is just possible that ἐκ μὲν οὖν καὶ τῶν ἐναντίων should be read, but the vestiges suit καὶ much better than οὖν.

50. The order of words in the MSS. is ἐναντίων καταφαίνει οὖν γίνεται τὸ, νῦν μόνον, from which the papyrus must have varied, since only 20 letters are available in l. 51 between καὶ and the end of the sentence. The vestiges before [. . . καὶ] suit μ and are not easily reconcilable with the termination of ἐναντίων or γίνεται. There is room for 3 or 4 letters more than our supplement of the lacuna in l. 51, but there may well have been a blank space left between γίνεται and ἐκ.

54. The supplement, 26 letters, is rather long for the lacuna; in the corresponding space in the other lines the letters lost do not exceed 23.

55. παραθηκή(σε): διεβόλος Λαύθιδος παραθηκή MSS. Π either omitted διεβόλος Λαύθιδος or, more probably, the words later in the sentence.

56-7. Working back from τὰ μὲν in l. 58, the π in l. 57 seems to be the initial letter of προσωπεύων which is found in ABDV in place of σκοπεύει (CEFGMOP, Hammer), and κ in l. 56 must belong to καὶ. There is not room in l. 56 for the reading of the MSS. καὶ ταῖς πόλεως δρομούσας συμφέρον ἐστὶ, and probably συμφέρον ἐστί was omitted or placed before καὶ or a shorter phrase, e.g. δὲ, substituted.

60. σω[θα: δὲ οὐ MSS.

61. τον συμφερον: so Hammer with CFPM and the deteriores; om. O.

62. τῶν τῶν πολιτῶν: τῶν πολιτῶν τιμῶν MSS.

64. τον[θα: so Hammer with CFMO and the deteriores; om. P.

65. οἷο τοις συμφερον εἰσι: ἀσύμφερον MSS. Cf. l. 210, note.

67-8. Λακεδαιμόνιος συμμάχοι συμφέροντες ἔμει MSS. τὸ is not essential, and in other respects the new reading, which avoids the ambiguity of subject and object in that of the MSS., is preferable.

70. συμφερον: so Hammer with CFMP and the deteriores; om. O.

72. υπό (ἐκβολής καίτων: ὑπ' ἐκβολῆς συμφέρων MSS.; cf. note on ll. 1-5.]

οὔτω: δὲ MSS., which is better. οὔτω has just occurred twice previously, in ll. 68 and 70.

77. [ἐξαναπαυσθα]ο[θα: ἀναπαυσθάσθαι, the reading of the MSS., is too short for the initial lacuna, which requires 11-13 letters.

78. μετὰ Θῆβαις: om. MSS., which insert αὖθις after ἐξὼν in the next line. For the occasion referred to in ll. 78-81 cf. Dem. De Cor. pp. 258-9.

82. μὲν τὸν: so CF; μὲν οὖν τὸν Ημερίδος with the other MSS. The insertion of οὖν would make a line of 32 letters, which is unlikely; possibly Π had καὶ περὶ μεν οὖν τὸν. Π τοῦτος is omitted by MOP, but probably stood in Π. The restorations of ll. 82, 85, and 86 involve lines of 29 letters, that of l. 84 a line of 30 letters, which is 2 or 3 letters more than the average length of ll. 87-101; but it is fairly certain that l. 83 had 28 letters, and it is better to suppose that the lines at the top of this column were slightly longer than those below in spite of the fact that the beginnings of lines tend to slope away to the left, than to suppose that Π differed extensively from the MSS. in ll. 82-86.

88. If there was no space before πάλι there is just room for the reading of the MSS. πάλιν δὲ διορισμέθα (ορ-σομέθα) καὶ in this line. But elsewhere, when the writer inserts a paragraphus and the new sentence had begun in the line above, a space of from 2-4 letters is left. Hence it is not unlikely that Π had ὀρισμέθα (as conjectured by
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Spengel) or omitted καὶ at the end of l. 88. Line 89, as restored, is already quite long enough, so that καὶ cannot be transferred to it without omitting some other word. 93. πάντως μὲν εἴσοδον: so Hammer with CFMP and the deteriores; om. τοῦτο Ο. 95. τῇ: om. MSS. paradoxei: so Hammer with CFMO and the deteriores; παραδίδωσιν P. 97. εκκύσει: εἰκάστα MSS. Π’s reading may be right. 102. τῶν ἁρμόων: so Η. with CFM and the deteriores; τῶν ἁρμόων P; om. Ο. 103. ἐπιγγαγήσουν: ἐπιγγαγήσουσιν MSS. anagkai(ων): ἀνάγκη MSS. 104. βοῦ(λ)ευσθαί: καὶ βοολεύσθα MSS., but there is no room for both καὶ and εἰς in the lacuna. The reading βοῦ(λ)ευσθαί is very uncertain. The traces following the supposed β (which might be read ο) would suit τ better than ου. 105. η εν δημοί [περι ερων η νομων: καὶ δήμῳ η περι ερων η περι νομων MSS. Possibly [η περι should be read in l. 106, but the supplement is already quite long enough, and for περι before νομων there is certainly no room; cf. 109-10, note. 108. τας ἀλλα: so Hammer with CFM (and OP?); om. τας the deteriores. The size of the lacuna makes it practically certain that Π had τας. 109-10. CFOP and the deteriores have ἡ περι εἰρήμης ἡ περι πόρου, which is 4 or 5 letters too long for the lacuna here, while M omits ἡ περι εἰρήμης, with which reading Π cannot be brought into agreement. The simplest course is to suppose the omission of περι before either εἰρήμης or πόρου, preferably the former; cf. l. 105. note. 111. The supplement is rather long for the lacuna, and μεν or ου may have been omitted; cf. l. 82, note. τυχανοι: τυχάνοι οὖσα MSS. It would be just possible to restore τυχανοι οὖσα [ποιαι περι ου βου]; but this would make l. 111 unusually long, and the lacuna at the beginning of l. 112 suits 11 or 12 letters better than 14. οὖσα is quite unnecessary. 114. διελομεθα: so Η. with CFMP and the deteriores; διαλυόμεθα Ο. 115. περι τοιτων ενδιεξεται: so Η. with CDFMP; ενδιεξετα περι τοιτων the rest of the deteriores. 116. τως λογοις κρίσσαθαι: χρίσσαθα Η. with CF (first hand) MP; λόγοι χρίσσαθαι F (second hand) O and the deteriores. Π’s reading is the best; cf. l. 279. 117. τριτων: so Η. from a conjecture of Bekker; περιτων (περιτως C) MSS. [αργαστων λέγει: so Η. with CFMP and the deteriores; λέγει αργαστῶν O. 118-9. αργαστων τα καθεστατα διαφυλαττεται: τα καθεστάτα διαφυλακτά MSS., except O which adds εγκατατμίσεις, with what reading the repetition of αργαστών which has occurred in the previous line is inelegant, and διαφυλακτά is preferable, though this sentence has become corrupt in the MSS.; cf. the next note. 121. μεταστασεων: τως MSS. (except Οτως V, δοτος D), a reading which makes no sense and is justly bracketed by Η. following Spengel. The insertion of μεταστάσεων is a great improvement. With the MSS. reading a verb like μεταστάσεων had to be supplied out of its opposite διαφυλακτά, making a very harsh construction. Spengel (p. 121) had proposed the insertion of δει μεθυστάμαι. 125-6. After δικαίων the MSS. have λέγοσιν τα πάτρα έθη παρά πάσι παραβάταιν δικόν ἐστι καὶ, thus having 48 letters corresponding to what should occupy (allowing 28 letters for a line) not more than 46 letters in Π, and clearly placing τα πάτρα έθη earlier in the sentence than Π. παρά πάσι, which is constructed with δίκον, is awkwardly situated in the MSS. reading between έθη and παραβατέων, and the simplest restoration of l. 125-6 is to keep all the words found in the MSS. and transpose τα πάτρα έθη and παρά πάσι. This results, however, in giving 30 letters to l. 125, which is unlikely; and since out of the three illustrations the MSS. introduce the second and third by οτι . . . οτι (v. l. διστι . . . δετι),
omitting δεν before the first, while Π has δισι (apparently) in the second case but omits it before the third, we suggest that Π had δισι in place of λέγουσε to introduce the first. The editio Basil. of 1539, based on an unknown MS., inserted δεν after λέγουσε. If πάρα πάσιν is not placed before τα παρεμένει εστι then (δεν) λέγουσε (λέγουσε is much too long) παραμένει τα παρέμεινεν [εστι πάρα πάσιν αδέκαν εστι] is preferable to δισι αδέκαν εστι τα παρεμεῖα [εστι] παρά πάσιν παραμένειν. Blass prefers to restore l. 125 τοι [δισι] λέγουσε δισι τα παρέμεινεν, omitting παρά πάσιν on the ground that παρά πάσιν αδέκαν εστι is not satisfactory in the sense of παρά πάσιν αδέκαν νομίζεται.

127. δισι: the traces of the letter after κ συμ. and are irreconcilable with σιν ορ κ.
diσι C and the dactylioi; σιν H. with FMOP.

130. καὶ τινὲς καὶ δεν τινέων MSS. Cf. note on ll. 125—6.

131. οἱ μὲν σιν τό πλῆθος; οἱ νόμοι τὸ μὲν πλῆθος MSS., which is the better reading.

132. [αυτρέψωσι:] αυτοτέρψωσι (αυτοτέρψωσι MSS., but cf. l. 141 εμπολήσουσιν where they have εμπολήσουσι.

140—1. δαπαναν [φιλοτιμον εμπολήσουσιν: εκοινωνίαν δέσαν φιλοτιμον εμπολήσουσι MSS. Π probably represents the true reading, δαπαναν being a corruption of δαπαναν and εκοινωνία a gloss.

142. τοι παρασκευασενεις: κατασκευασεν MSS.; κατασκευασεν (sc. οἱ νόμοι) H., adopting a conjecture of Spengel. In the reading of the MSS. κατασκευασεν had no subject to refer to; but their error is now shown to have consisted not in the use of the singular but in the omission of the subject, which is probably τοις, since there is room for 3 or 4 letters between αν and παρασκευασεν.

145. απο τοιν νομον: so H. with CFOP and the dactylioi; om. M.

146. γνωριμοιν: πεινομένων MSS. The reading of Π is probably a mere error; cf. note on ll. 148—9.

147. εργαζόμενους: so H. with CFO and the dactylioi; ἐργαζόμενων MP.

148—9. τοι καὶ τους γαστικοὺς μαλλαν τοὺς αὐτοὺς [προτομιαν: καὶ ναυκληροῦντας τῶν ἄγαρων μᾶλλα] προτομιαν MSS. The letter before ε in l. 148 was certainly not α and the vestiges suit v. It is clear that Π varied considerably from the MSS. in this sentence, and the difficulty of restoring ll. 147—9 is increased by the fact that there is an error in l. 146 and probably another in l. 149. The reading of the MSS. is thus translated by Bekker sicque et agricolas pauperibus et navium gubernatores vectoribus antependant, which is correct but yields no satisfactory sense; for how would the poor be prevented from plotting against the rich by the laws favouring cultivators at the expense of the poor and shipowners at the expense of merchants? A meaning more relevant to the context is that suggested by St. Hilaire, 'dans les rangs des pauvres ceux qui cultivent la terre ou qui montent les navires soient entourés de plus d’estime que les marchands de la place publique.' This construction of τῶν πεινομένων as dependent on τῶν ἐργαζόμενων is in any case preferable to Bekker’s view that it depends on μᾶλλα, but ‘qui montent les navires’ is an impossible translation of ναυκληροῦντας—which apparently no one has proposed to emend to μᾶλλον πληροῦσαν. Π did not have ναυκληροῦντας, and though [ναυκληρον] would fit the lacuna, γαστικοὺς, suggested by Blass, is much more likely. 

The earlier parts of ll. 146—9 are on a separate fragment, the position of which is fairly certain since there is no other place among the extant columns to which it can be assigned. There remains the difficulty of the infinitive προτομιαν in l. 149. There is no room to insert in ll. 148—9 a verb in the optative which would govern it, and the choice seems to lie between supplying a verb or, better, altering προτομιαν to προτομιαν (sc. οἱ νόμοι) or προτομιαν (sc. τοις or whatever was the subject of παρασκευασενειν in l. 142). The frequency of infinitives after δεν and χοί throughout this chapter may account for the error.

149—51. οὐ παρε . . . λειτουργουσαν: οὐ παρε . . . λειτουργησατι MSS.

152—3. επιθυμησε: ἐπιθυμησε MSS.; cf. the previous note.
26. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS 133

153. ............. ἱ: δὲ δὲ πρὸς τοῦτοι MSS. Perhaps δὲ τοιοῦτον should be restored, but the construction of ll. 153–9 is not clear. ωἱ(φροις κεισθαι) τομοις in l. 156 may depend on χρη in l. 159 (cf. note ad loc.).

154. αναδαστὰν ποιεῖν: παῖε νανάδαστον MSS.

155–6. τῶν [15 letters σ' αρτγαὶ: τῶν τελευτών MSS., which will not do. Usener had suggested τῶν ἰδιωτῶν, Wilamowitz τῶν πλουτοῦντων; and Π now shows that some word has dropped out in the MSS., and an aorist, not a present, participle is the correct reading. (Ἰδιωτῶν τελευτῶν is possible, but τελευτῶν may come from the next clause (cf. l. 160, note). Blass proposes τῶν [τὴν πολύν μὴ αδικησαντιν.]

159. χρη καὶ: χρῆ δὲ MSS. Π thus makes εἰκείηθαν in l. 158 and perhaps κείσθαν in l. 157 (cf. l. 153, note) depend on χρῆ, as well as the two verbs that follow, ἀφωρίσθαι and διδοῦναι, whereas in the MSS. the words preceding χρῆ depend on δὲ at the beginning of the sentence, and χρῆ is connected only with what follows. The position given to χρῆ in Π is not very satisfactory, but without knowing what stood in the lacuna in l. 153 it is impossible to say whether the omission of δὲ is intentional or a slip.

160. τοῖ: om. MSS. τοι may be right; cf. e.g. 14. 34 and the passage of Aeschines quoted ad loc.

161. ταφὴν: εἰς ταφὴν MSS. The scribe has placed before τρόφον in l. 163 the εἰς which ought to have come before ταφὴν here.

162. αφωρίσθαι: so H. with Ald.; αφωρίζεσθαι MSS. (Hammer’s apparatus assigns αφωρίζεσθαι to a, his sign for the family CFMOP, but cf. Spengel’s notes ad loc. ‘αφωρίζουν] adde εἰσα, editi ex Venera αφωρίζεσθαι,’ and ‘αφωρίζουν sic libri omnes’).

163. εἰς: ἔνθα δημοσίαν τρόφον διδοῦσθαι MSS. Π is corrupt, the scribe having inserted before τρόφον the εἰς which ought to have come before ταφὴν in l. 160 (cf. note ad loc.). But εἰς ἔνθα may be right, for εἰς with the genitive is a late use, while ἔνθα with the subjunctive without ἀν is parallel to the similar construction occasionally found with πρὸ and μὲν in Attic prose; and though ἔνθα may have its origin in the omitted δημοσίαν, the insertion of that word is not necessary, especially as δημοσίαν χωρίν occurs in l. 161.

164. τοῖς δημοκρατίαις: τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ MSS.; cf. l. 174, note. Π’s reading is the better; cf. εἰ μὲν ταῖς δημοκρατίαις in p. 23. 10 (= l. 187).

165. τοιαύτην δὲ τὴν θέσιν ποιεῖθαι: τὴν θέσιν τοιαύτην δὲ ποιεῖθαι MSS. The order in Π is preferable.

168. κατανεμεῖν: ἀπονεῖμι MSS. EG omit ἀπο.; τὴν: so H. with CFMO and most of the deteriores; om. P; τὴν followed by πολεμεῖν DV.

170. τὸς πλείστος: τὸς μὲν πλείστος MSS., which is preferable.

171. κρυψαί: κρυπτῇ MSS.

172. μεθ': so H. with CFMP and the deteriores; καὶ μεθ’ O.

173. καὶ: om. MSS.

174. τοῖς ὀλιγαρχαῖς: τῇ ὀλιγαρχίᾳ MSS.; cf. note on l. 164.

175. υβρίζουσιν: υβρίζει MSS. Π’s reading is a blunder.

178. στερεόμενον: so H. with CFGMOP; στερεώμενον the rest of the deteriores.

179. χρῆ δὲ: χρῆ δὲ καὶ MSS., but a supplement of 18 letters is rather long for the lacuna, not more than 15 being lost in the corresponding space in this column, so that καὶ, which Π inserts in l. 173 where the MSS. omit it, was probably omitted here.
181-2. διαλύειν . . . . . . . . . . . . καὶ μὴ [σάνερεν] διαλύειν καὶ μὴ χρωσθήθω μηδὲ ανάγεται MSS. Π probably substituted a phrase meaning 'without delay' for the second infinitive.

183. τῷ οὖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν: ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν τὸν ὄχλον MSS.
186. καθήλον δὲ εἰσε εἶπεν δὲ: καθηλοῦ δὲ εἰσε εἶπεν δὲ τῶν νόμων MSS. There is not room for both εἰσεν and τοὺς νόμους in l. 186, but Π may equally well have omitted εἰσεν and kept τοὺς νόμους.

191. τῆς πολιτείας: so H. with CF and the deteriores; πολιτείας MP.
194. οὖν: so H. with CFMP and the deteriores; om. O.

197. συν' αγρόνομα μὲν νόμων: τὸν συναγόρευτον εἰσδοντα νόμων MSS. For our restoration cf. the antithesis ἀντιλέγοντα δὲ σποτεῖς (p. 23. 22), where δὲ has been corrupted in most MSS. to διέ. [αγρόνομον] However, it is too short for the lacuna, and the insertion of μὲν is an improvement. The omission of τῶν in Π may be an error, but τῶν is not necessary.

198. δικαιοῦμαι: δεικνύω MSS.
201. ἀπερ [ην] ψηφικὴν ἀπερ ἡ ἱστορία ταῦτα H. with CF and the deteriores; ἀπερ ὑπάρχει ταῦτα MOP; but ἀπερ [ην] ἱστορία is also possible, though for ταῦτα in any case there is no room. If Π had read ὑπάρχει we should have to suppose a lacuna of 10 letters instead of 13 before the first ν of l. 202, and hence diminish by 3 the size of the initial lacuna throughout. This would cause no trouble in ll. 200-1, where κατωκοινήσας would suit equally well, but would lead to difficulties in l. 205, where the lacuna could not be restored without cutting down the text of the MSS. (cf. note ad loc.). Line 206 is hard to reconcile with the ordinary reading, even with the longer lacuna; with the shorter some alteration would be imperative. The only serious objection to the view of the size of the initial lacunae in this column upon which we have based our restorations occurs in l. 204, where 18 letters would be expected instead of 14 before the μ of προτοῦ. The supplement [ἐνδείχται πρῶτο], however, contains several broad letters, and it is not, we think, necessary to insert anything.

204-5. οὐκ ἀναγηκὴ: so FMOP and the deteriores; οὐκ ἄναγκαιον H. with C, and there would be room for ἄναγκαιον in the lacuna, but cf. l. 204. If the lacuna were supposed to be smaller (cf. note on l. 201), χρη or δεον would have to be substituted for κ ἀναγηκη.

206. The MSS. reading (20 letters) is rather long for the lacuna, for which 17 letters are sufficient, and the line as restored contains 32 letters, which is a quite exceptional length, though in any case l. 206 projects considerably into the right-hand margin. Perhaps εἴθ should be read in place of επεθ. With a smaller lacuna at the beginning [επεθ ὡς οὖ τυχο[ν] ἀναγκαῖα ὄντες δικαίους] would be necessary; cf. note on l. 201.

207-8. ποιηταρίτης: ποιηταρίτης MSS., which proceed εἰ δὲ μὴ κ.τ.λ. There is no clue to what the lacuna of 14 letters in Π contained.

210. ἁ δυνατοὶ ὄντες: οὐκ ὑπάρχουσεν δυνατοὶ MSS. Cf. l. 65, note.

212. καίν: after μὲν οὖν the MSS. have ταῖς ἄντιλεγίαις καὶ ταῖς συνηγορίαις, for which Π substituted something much shorter (22 letters instead of 33), the second substantive (if there were two) being a word ending in -σις.

213. τοῖς: so MSS. The reading is very doubtful; περὶ would suit the traces better, but would leave only 10 letters for the lacuna, which requires 14-16.

215-6. περὶ πολέμου [δὲ καὶ] εἰσρήσῃ: περὶ εἰσρήσῃ δὲ πολίν καὶ πολέμου MSS. The order in Π is supported by that in ll. 109-10.

217. εὐλαβεῖται has been corrected from εὐλαβεῖται by writing λ above the β, which is crossed out, and β through the λ.

218. πολέμου: so H. with CFMP and the deteriores; πολέμου by a slip O.

219. αὐτῇ: αὐταὶ δὲ δὲ CFMOP; αὐταὶ δὲ H. with the deteriores. αὐτῇ is better than
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and \\ is quite unnecessary; II probably preserves the original reading, of which those of the MSS. are corruptions.

220-2. kai\wv para\wv\i

The MSS. vary between et\i\wv (the deteriores) and et\i\wv (CFMOP), but whichever tense be adopted the supplement is rather long, being 21 or 22 letters instead of 18 or 19 as would be expected; perhaps was omitted.

223. e\i\wv: e\i\wv; e\i\wv; e\i\wv. H. with the deteriores. It is highly improbable that II had e\i\wv, which would make an unlikely division at the end of a line of more than average length (cf. the preceding note).

229. [e\i\wv]e\i\wv: the e is corrected from o(?) . GV read e\i\wv, which is out of the question here.

230. [e\i\wv]: om. MSS. Cf. note on l. 231.

231. e\i\wv: so H. with ABCEF (first hand) MOP; e\i\wv: F (second hand) and DV.

237. e\i\wv: so H. with CFMO and the deteriores; e\i\wv: P.

239. e\i\wv: so H. with CFMO and the deteriores; e\i\wv: CDFMOP.

243. The scanty remains of Col. xv are so much obliterated that only a few letters can be deciphered with certainty, and the restorations are very doubtful in many cases. It is clear that between II. 245 and 252 II varied extensively from the MSS., in being considerably shorter. Very likely there were some omissions due to homoioteleuton, for the passage is a particularly confusing one for a scribe. In II. 243 o is the only certain letter, but the vestiges of the two preceding letters suit pr. B\i\wv is inadmissible; and pr. seems to be the word meant, though if the next word was intended to be B\i\wv either pr\i\wv or pr\i\wv must have been written, for the space between o and the supposed r is barely sufficient for even one narrow letter. pr. B\i\wv is not satisfactory, and since the reading r\i\wv is extremely doubtful II may have had something quite new here.

244. e\i\wv: so H. with A (second hand) BFG; om. other MSS.

245. The MSS. have d\i\wv (\i\wv DV) a\i\wv e\i\wv\i\wv, with which the reading of II cannot be reconciled. The vestiges of this line will not suit any part of e\i\wv\i\wv, and there is not room for 22 letters in the lacuna, which, taking the tolerably certain supplements of II. 254-6 as the standard and allowing for the slope of the column to the left, should contain 16 or 17 letters. The omission of \i\wv, which is not necessary, leaves 16 letters.
136 HIBEH PAPYRI

... which, is fairly certain in l. 246, comes too soon. The vestiges preceding it are reconcilable with λεγεσ, but do not suggest ν. The ν in l. 247 perhaps belongs to νομίζεται, and that in l. 248 to επιστημον, but the traces of other letters lend no assistance.

250. ια: working back from ζων in l. 251, the MSS. reading ειν ἀποφαίνεται αυτῶν ἐκ διανοιας φαναίται, does not produce an α at the right place. Perhaps ειν ἀποφαίνεται αυτῶν was omitted and the α belongs to αγαθὰ or κακα, or we might change the order and restore εκ διανοιας αυτῶν. But the MSS. reading is very unsatisfactory (Usener proposes αυτῶν for αυτῶν), and ια may represent a participle such as πραξάτητα, the insertion of which would be a great improvement.

252. The supplement (22 letters) is a little long, when judged by the standard of ll. 254 and 256, which have 19 in the corresponding space; but cf. l. 253 and l. 255, which apparently has 21.

253. The supplement (23 letters) is again rather long, and not more than 19 would be expected; cf. l. 252, note.

254. πράττετος: so ABEG; πράττετον H. with CDFMOPV.

257–8. The supplements of these lines are rather short. Possibly Π inserted επραξεν again after επι τοιτοις.

259. ... ποιοίμεν: τούτῳ ἵσως ποιοίμεν MSS., which is too long if μεν is correctly read. Those letters, however, are very uncertain, and ποι is possible, in which case τοιτοι ἵσως could be retained in l. 259. But difficulties would then arise in the restoration of l. 260, which seems to end in εν, the vestiges being inconsistent with πρ'ατ, φαίως, or φαίλως. On the whole, therefore, it seems preferable to suppose that Π had some variant (ομ. τούτῳ;) for τοιτοι ἵσως.

260–1. πράττομεν [φαίως: φαίως πράττομεν MSS., which cannot be reconciled with Π; cf. the preceding note. If our restoration of l. 261 is correct, there must have been a blank space before χρή.

264. The supplement is rather long; perhaps δὲ was omitted. But the supposed ν in l. 263 is very doubtful, and if there was an omission in Π it may have occurred in ll. 262 or 263, where os is really superfluous.

265. εὐκος: τοῖς εὐκος MSS. εὐκος must be wrong.

266. οὐσίας: so H. with F (and OP?); οῦ CM (so Spengel; from Η. it would be inferred that they read ἄστις) and the deteriores.

267. βυθίσθησαι εν ποιεῖν: εν ποιεῖν βυθίσθησαι MSS.

269. μεν: om. MSS., rightly. Whether Π had ε at the end of the line is very doubtful.

271–6. Π here differs considerably from the MSS., which have σκοπεῖν δὲ καὶ τὸ πράγμα ὅποιον φαναίται κατὰ μέρη διαφοροῦσαν καὶ (ἢ the deteriores) καθόλου λεγόμενον καὶ ὁπότερος (ὁπότερον ΦΟ) ἀν μείζον ἡ τόδε τῶν τρόπων αὐτὸ λέγειν. Π'ś version is superior in several respects; πράττετον ... ἢ ... brings out the contrast between κατὰ μέρη καὶ καθόλου better than ὅποιον ... καὶ ... , and τοῦτο is much preferable to τόδε. μεν in l. 271 is probably the termination of a verb in the future or subjunctive governing σκοπεῖν, and the insertion of this and of δὲ in l. 276 is an advantage, the infinitives σκοπεῖν and λέγειν in the MSS. reading
being dependent on χρή supplied from χρή δὲ καὶ εἰκᾶσων, although a different sentence
συνήλθον... φανερά has intervened.
276. αὐθήσεις: so H. with MSS., except M which has αὐθήσεις.
277. πλείστως καὶ μεγίστασ πώρωσι: πλείστως πώρωσι καὶ μεγίστασ MSS.
279. τοὺς λόγους: so H. with BCFMOPV; τῶν λόγων ADEG. Cf. l. 116, note.
280. καί is a mistake for κακόν. G and E (first hand) invert ἄγαθα and κακά. D omits
μετώπια.
281. εὐρήσεις καὶ μεν: ὡς ἑρήμαται MSS., which insert ἢν after μὲν in l. 282, and in
place of επιδεικνύειν. In l. 283 have επιδεικνύειν (C), επιδεικνύεις (EO) or
ἐπιδεικνύεις (the rest; so H.). εὐρήσεις, which makes ταπεινώσεις a substantive instead of a verb, as it is on
the MSS. reading, may in itself be right; but καί μὲν... επιδεικνύει αὐθήσεις must be wrong, and
εὐρήσεις looks somewhat like a corruption of ὡς εἰρή, due to a misunderstanding of ταπεινώσεις.
Whether εὐρήσεις be retained or not, καί μὲν must be altered to ὡς (or ὡς) εὐρήσεις and
ἐπιδεικνύεις corrected, either by reading ἢν... επιδεικνύεις with the majority of the MSS.,
or by the simpler substitution of the participle επιδεικνύον.
284. μικροτάτων MSS.
287. εὐθύραμον: εὐθύραμον MSS.; εὐθύραμον, 'bring forward,' is more pointed.
288. χρήστημα: χρήστημα MSS.
[ἢ] τῶν αὐθήσεων εἰσὶν αἱ αὐθήσεις: ὡς τῶν αὐθήσεων ἄφορα εἰσὶν MSS., and it is possible
to read [ἢ αἱ] τῶν αὐθήσεων εἰσὶν αἱ αὐθήσεις, though the other restoration seems more
probable.
290. ἔργας εἰς τοὺς εἰσκομίους καὶ τοῖς φῶσις εἰσίν αὐτάς: δύναμεν αὐτῶν ἔστω εἰς τοῖς
ἐγκωμίοις καὶ εἴς τοῦ φῶσιν MSS.
292. εὑρ.: so H. with most MSS.; om. C (B, not C Spengel).
293. διέλθομεν: so H. adopting a conjecture of Spengel. διέλθομεν MSS.
294. τούτοις ομολογοῦμεν: ὁμολογοῦμεν τούτοις MSS.
295. κατηγορικῶν: so H. with most MSS.; κατηγορικῶς GM. Cf. l. 297.
ἁπλογράφῳ τῷ ἄπολογον ὧν with MSS., except O which omits τό. Cf. l. 300.
296. Αἰτείς the MSS. have ἢ περὶ τήν δυσκινήν ἐστιν πραγματείαν αὐτά τε, which is
omitted by Π. The words are probably an interpolation; cf. p. 116.
συνετηκαί: l. συνετηκαί. G has συνετηκαί, and E has κε in an erasure.


carnant: so C. G and E have καί in a certain MSS. 297. κατηγορικῶν: so H. with most MSS.; κατηγορικῶς M. Cf. l. 295.
Date: so H. with most MSS. 299. ἐξίσους: ἐξίσους MSS. ἐξίσους is the more natural word.
300. ἀπολογικῶν: ἀπολογικῶν MSS. Cf. l. 295.
ἀδερματω ἄμαρτηματω: ἄμαρτηματω καὶ ἀδερματω MSS. 302. χαλκοπριντων: χαλκοπριντων MSS., probably by an erroneous repetition of the
initial syllable of κατηγορικῶν. 303. κατηγορικῶν MSS.
304-5. ταῦτα: so CFMOP. τὰ αὐτῶς H. with the deteriores.
ex[ο]τες: οι ὑποκείται the deteriores and Ald.; οι οἱ H. with CFMOP. οἱ οἱ is required
in Π if κατηγορικῶν is anything more than a mistake for κατηγορικῶν, and above the second ε of
ex[ο]τες (which must in any case be wrong) is some ink which may represent ο. But if
the 2 or 3 letters after οι οἱ that project into the margin beyond any other line in this
column, in which the end is preserved, the first is certainly not ο, and they are probably
to be connected with the following words.

τὸν κατηγοροῦντα τὸν κατηγόρωνο Μ. MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦντα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγοροῦ
κατηγοροῦ
HIBEH PAPYRI

enough for 11 or even 12 letters, but hardly for 13. touv[φ] μ[εν] might be read, but is not satisfactory; for touv[φ] λ[ει] μεν there is not room. In place of the second doubtful ρ, π or γ can equally well be read.

306. μεν: so H. with CFMO and the deteriores; ἐν P.

307. The vestiges of the first letter would suit π equally well (i.e. παρατηρεῖν), but a line of 20 letters would be unusually short.

308. The τ of ταυντὸς seems to have been corrected.

κατηγορηματῶν: ἀδικημάτων MSS.

309. οἱ [νομοὶ]: so H. with most MSS.; om. M.

310. ημαρισμένων: ἀδικημάτων MSS., probably an erroneous repetition. Cf. the contrast of ἀδικημάτων and ἀμαρτημάτων in II. 298-301.

311. οἱ νομοὶ δὲ[ο]ρίζοντες: δὲ νόμος διαμορφώθη MSS. Π's reading is better; Spengel had already suggested the insertion of the article before νόμος.

314. κατηγοροῦσα: o does not fill the space between ρ and ν, which would accommodate two letters, but it is difficult to see what these could have been, unless indeed the scribe wrote κατηγοροῦσα(δ').

315. οὐκ: so H. with CF (first hand) MP; ὁποῖος ἀν F (second hand) Q and the deteriores.

316-8. Π here preserves a much better text than the MSS., which have ὅταν (οί H. with C) ἐν δὲ ὅλως τὸ κατηγοροῦμενον ἰσόων (εἰδώς Λ (second hand) EG) αὐξητῶν ἀπὸ τὰ ἀδικήματα καὶ μαλάτα μὲν δευτέρων ὀς ἓκα τ.κ.λ. For the unsatisfactory ἰσόων or εἰδώς Spengel had acutely conjectured τιμῶν, the verb found in Π, and divined that τὸ κατηγοροῦμενον was wrong. Π inserts, no doubt rightly, a clause contrasting the preliminary proof of the facts with the subsequent magnifying of the crime. After κατηγοροῦμεν it probably continued επιστὰ αὐξητῶν κ.τ.λ. For ἀναγκὴ in I. 317 cf. IV 103, note; ἐν makes the line hardly long enough.

III. CALENDAR

27. CALENDAR FOR THE SAIITE NOME.

Mummies 68 and 69. Height 16-8 cm. B.C. 301-240. Plate VIII (Cols. iii and iv).

On the recto of this long papyrus, which is in 16 fragments, is a calendar for a year, preceded by an introductory treatise in which the writer explained for a pupil's instruction the source of his information, and gave a general sketch of his astronomical system. Of the calendar the larger portion is preserved, but the remains of the introduction probably represent only a small portion of it. Two hands, both a large clear semi-uncial, are found in the main text, the first being responsible for Cols. i-iii, the second for the rest. A few corrections in Col. iv sqq. are due to a third hand or, perhaps, to the writer of Cols. i-iii. On the verso of Fr. (a) is some demotic writing, on that of Fr. (d) a brief account, and
27. CALENDAR

on that of Fr. (m) part of a list of names, while on the verso of Fr. (c) is another short list of names headed (ērou) η Μεσορη. The king in question is presumably Euergetes, to the early part of whose reign we assign 34 and 78, from the same mummies as 27; and we regard B.C. 240 as the latest possible date for the writing on the recto. This, however, is probably a few decades older, and may even be as ancient as B.C. 291-298, the period to which the calendar apparently refers (v. inf.). At the conclusion of that period the dates of the recorded phenomena would cease to apply, and it is not easy to account for a copy of the calendar being made after the information contained in it had become antiquated and useless. The handwriting, though presenting no special signs of exceptional antiquity, is not inconsistent with the view that the calendar was written at the very beginning of the third century B.C., and the Hibeh collection has provided one document written in the 5th year of Ptolemy Soter I (84 a). Cols. i–iii each have 18 lines and very narrow margins between the columns, while Cols. iv–xv range from 13 to 15 lines in each and the margins are sometimes narrow, sometimes (as between Cols. vi and vii) as much as 7.5 cm. in breadth.

Fr. (a), containing Cols. i–iii, appears to come from a point near the actual commencement of the text, and it is possible that χεεβ in I. 1 is the termination of χαιρέεβ, and belongs to the opening sentence of the introduction, which is in any case couched in an epistolary form. Nothing further is to be gleaned from the scanty remains of Col. i; in Cols. ii and iii the compiler, who was in the Saite nome (I. 21; cf. note), explains that he had been receiving instruction on astronomy from a certain wise man (I. 19–33), and announces his intention of summarizing the teaching for his pupil’s benefit (I. 34–41). Accordingly in I. 41 he begins with a description of the different years in use in Egypt; this, so far as it goes (I. 54), corresponds closely to a passage in the account of the Εἰδωλοῦ τεκνη which was written by one of that astronomer’s followers, and is preserved in P. Par. 1; cf. p. 143, and I. 41–54, note. To the interval, extending probably to at least 6 or 7 columns, between Frs. (a) and (δ) may be assigned the small Frs. (n)–(q), which do not belong to the calendar portion of the papyrus, and are not likely to have followed Col. xiv, since that column may well be the last of the whole text. The subject of Frs. (n) and (o), which seem to be connected, though the relative position assigned to them in our text is not certain, is the seasons; that of Fr. (q) the length of the year.

Turning to the calendar, the year under discussion is an ordinary Egyptian annum vagus of 365 days beginning with Thoth 1. The account of the first three months is missing; but Frs. (δ)–(m), containing Cols. iv–xv, which are continuous, preserve with some lacunae the entries from Choiak 1 to the end
of the year, Col. xiv probably giving, as we have said, the conclusion of the
papyrus. The details recorded under the various days are (1) the changes
of the seasons indicated by the equinoxes and solstices; (2) the passing of the
sun at its rising from one of the 12 great constellations to another; (3) the risings
and settings of certain stars or constellations; (4) prognostications concerning
the weather, such as are commonly found in ancient calendars; (5) stages in the
rising of the Nile (ll. 126, 168, and 174); (6) certain festivals, which in two
instances (ll. 76 and 165) took place at Sais; (7) the length of the night and day.

For the following remarks on the place of observation and date of the
calendar, and its connexion with Eudoxus, to which we have already alluded,
we are indebted to Prof. J. G. Smyly, who has greatly assisted us in the
elucidation of this text.

'Place of observation. The length of the longest day is given by the
papyrus (l. 115) as 14 hours, and that of the shortest night as 10 hours; if then we
take the inclination of the ecliptic to have been 24° and I denote the latitude,
we can determine I from the equation \( \cos 75° = \tan 24° \tan I \), from which we
παράλληλος καθ' δὴ δὴ γένοιτο ἡ μεγίστη ἡμέρα ὃ ῥῶν ἱσημερινῶν τιθ. ἀπέχει δ' οὖσος
τοῦ ἱσημερινοῦ μοῖρας λ' κβ καὶ γράφεται διὰ τῆς κάτω χώρας τῆς Αἰγύπτου. This
agrees very well with the statement of the papyrus (l. 21; cf. ll. 76 and 165)
that the calendar was drawn up in the Saite nome, probably at Sais itself.

'Date. Since the calendar is constructed according to the vague year of the
Egyptians, it would have been possible to determine its date within four years
from the dates assigned to the equinoxes and solstices, had these been correctly
given. In the following table the Julian dates for the early part of the third
century B.C. are taken from Unger (I. Müller's *Handb.* I, p. 823):—

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring equinox</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tubi (l. 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer solstice</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pharmouthi (l. 120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn equinox</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Epeiph (l. 170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 September.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The date of the calendar deduced from the equations Tubi 20 = March 25
and Pharmouthi 24 = June 27 would be B.C. 301-298; that given by the
equation Epeiph 23 = September 27 is B.C. 313-310. These results do not
agree (see below), and we cannot be certain of the accuracy of the observations;
but we may safely deduce B.C. 300 as an approximate date.

'Connexion with Eudoxus. 1. The interval between the spring equinox and
summer solstice is correctly given by the papyrus as 94 days, that between the
summer solstice and autumn equinox as 89 days; the whole interval between
the spring and autumn equinoxes is thus 183 days, which is about 3 days too
few. The writer of the papyrus evidently belonged to a school of astronomers who supposed that the equinoxes divided the year into approximately equal parts; cf. G. V. Schiaparelli, Memorie del Real. Inst. Lomb. xiii. p. 129, Nov., 1874. If we may trust P. Par. i. 525 sqq., the interval between the autumn equinox and the spring equinox according to Eudoxus was \(92 + 91 = 183\) days, while according to Democritus it was \(91 + 91 = 182\) days, thus leaving for the period of \(183\) days given by the papyrus \(182\) days according to Eudoxus, and \(183\) according to Democritus. So far this would point to Democritus rather than Eudoxus; but there are other striking resemblances to the theories of Eudoxus.

2. According to the papyrus the spring equinox took place on Tubi 20 and the sun entered Taurus on Mecheir 6, so that the equinox took place when the sun was in the middle or at the 15th degree of Aries. Now according to Hipparchus the placing of the equinoxes and solstices at the middle of the signs was peculiar to Eudoxus; e.g. Hipp. i. 6. 4 ταύτης (τῆς Μικρᾶς "Αρκτοῦ) γαρ ὁ ἐσχάτος και λαμπρότατος ἀντίθετα κατὰ τὴν 'ε' μοίραν τῶν Ἰχθυῶν, ὡς δὲ Ἐδοξός διαρέει τῶν ἡμιδικών κύκλων, κατὰ τὴν γ' μοίραν τοῦ Κριοῦ. Thus the 1st degree of Aries according to Eudoxus’ division of the Zodiac coincided with the 15th degree of Pisces according to Hipparchus, and the equinox, which according to Hipparchus was at the 1st point of Aries, would according to Eudoxus occur at the 15th degree of Aries. Again Hipp. ii. 1. 15 says προδιειλήθη δὲ πρῶτον ὅτι τὴν διαίρεσιν τοῦ ἡμιδικοῦ κύκλου δὲ μὲν Ἀρατος πεποίησε ἀπὸ τῶν τροπικῶν τε καὶ ἱστηρικῶν σημείων ἀρχήν ἦσσα ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ἀρχής εἶναι Ἴδιων, δὲ δὲ Ἐδοξός ὀστῶ διήρησεν, ὅστε τὰ εἰρημένα σημεῖα μὲνα εἶναι, τὰ μὲν τοῦ Καρκίνου καὶ τοῦ Αλγόκερω τὰ δὲ τοῦ Κριοῦ καὶ τῶν Ἱχθυῶν; cf. ii. 1. 19 καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀπὸ μαθηματικῶν πάντων σχεδόν ἢ τῶν πλείονων τούτων τῶν τροπῶν (i.e. as by Aratus) ὁ ἡμιδικὸς κύκλος διήρησε. ὅτι δὲ Ἐδοξός τὰ τροπικὰ σημεῖα κατὰ μέσα τὰ ἡμιδικά τίθησι δῆλον ποιεί διὰ τούτων κ.κ.λ. As is clear from these quotations, Hipparchus considered that Eudoxus stood almost alone among ancient astronomers in putting the equinoctial and solstitial points at the middle of the signs. It was for a long time supposed that Eudoxus had used an ancient globe, many centuries older than his own times, constructed at a period when the spring equinox was really in the middle of the dodecathemary called Aries by Hipparchus, and that Eudoxus himself never even looked at the sky. This absurd theory was controverted by Ideler in Abhandl. der k. Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin, 1830, p. 58, who gives the true explanation that the dodecathemary called Aries by Eudoxus extended from the 15th degree of Pisces to the 15th degree of Aries according to Hipparchus. It may be remarked in this connexion that the correspondence of the signs κατὰ αὐξηγίαν described, but wholly misunderstood, by Geminus, El. Astr. ii. 27 sqq., depends upon placing the equinoctial points in the middle of the signs.
‘If we measure 15° back from the position of the equinox at the time of Eudoxus we find that the first point of Aries according to him very nearly coincided with the star ζ Piscium. This coincidence is very remarkable, and should prove of considerable importance in the difficult question as to the origin of the signs of the Zodiac. E. Burgess and Prof. Whitney, Sûrya-Siddhânta, Journal of American Oriental Society, vi. p. 158, write:—“The initial point of the fixed Hindu sphere, from which longitudes are reckoned, and at which the planetary motions are held by all schools of Hindu astronomy to have commenced at the Creation, is the end of the asterism Revati, or the beginning of Aṣvini. Its position is most clearly marked by that of the principal star of Revati, which, according to the Sûrya-Siddhânta, is 10° to the west of it, but according to other authorities exactly coincides with it. That star is by all authorities identified with ζ Piscium, of which the longitude at present, as reckoned by us, from the vernal equinox, is 17°54’.

Making due allowance for the precession, we find that it coincided in position with the vernal equinox not far from the middle of the sixth century or about 570 A.D. As such coincidence was the occasion of the point being fixed upon as the beginning of the sphere, the time of its occurrence marks approximately the era of the fixation of the sphere, and of the commencement of the history of modern Hindu astronomy.”

Now the exact correspondence of the initial points of the spheres of Eudoxus and of the Hindu astronomers cannot be an accidental coincidence, and seems to invalidate the theory that the Hindu sphere was fixed by the position of the spring equinox. In these circumstances we are at liberty, or rather are compelled, to reject the deduction that “the point from which longitudes are reckoned, and at which the planetary motions are held by all schools of Hindu astronomy to have commenced at Creation” was first fixed at about 570 A.D. This is not the place to discuss the question as to the relation of Eudoxus to Indian astronomy, but my own belief is that the Indian sphere was fixed at a very early period and adopted from Indian astronomers by Eudoxus.

‘The length of time occupied by the sun in passing through the constellations presents considerable difficulty; the details are as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Constellation</th>
<th>Constellation</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 62.</td>
<td>Aries, Tubi 5—Mecheir 6,</td>
<td>31 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 66.</td>
<td>Taurus, Mecheir 6—Phamenoth 4,</td>
<td>28 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 88.</td>
<td>Gemini, Phamenoth 4—Pharmouthi 3,</td>
<td>29 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 107.</td>
<td>Cancer, Pharmouthi 3—Pachon 6,</td>
<td>33 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 129.</td>
<td>Leo, Pachon 6—Pauni 4,</td>
<td>28 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 137.</td>
<td>Virgo, Pauni 4—Epeiph x,</td>
<td>58 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libra,</td>
<td>Epeiph x—Mesore 2,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 181.</td>
<td>Scorpio, Mesore 2—?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'The spring equinox is given as 15 days in Aries, the summer solstice as 21 days in Cancer, and the autumn equinox 10 days only before the sun enters Scorpio. If the signs of the papyrus are true dodecatemories, the dates of entering the different signs must be wrong; for the spring equinox being in the middle of the sign so also should the autumn equinox be.

3. The stars or constellations whose risings and settings according to Eudoxus are given in the calendar assigned to Geminus (Lydus, De Ostentis, &c., ed. Wachsmuth, pp. 181 sqq.) are Aquila ('Aηρός), Capella (Αλξ), Arcturus, Delphinus, Lyra, Pleiades, Scorpio, Sirius (Κύων), Corona Borealis (Σεφὼς), Hyades and Orion; all of these, except Αλξ (which can be restored with certainty in ll. 88 and 177), are mentioned in the papyrus, and the only star in it not contained in the list of Eudoxus is Προτοργητήρ (= ε Virginis), the statement about which (l. 130) is obviously erroneous.'

The agreement on this point between the papyrus and Geminus' references to Eudoxus is very striking. The intervals between the several entries (which in Geminus are measured by degrees, not, as in the papyrus, by days) are naturally different owing to the difference of latitude between Sais and the place in Asia Minor from which Eudoxus took his observations. But the order is the same in both, and there is only one clear instance in which the papyrus omits a reference to the rising or setting of a star that Geminus had inserted in his list from the calendar of Eudoxus (l. 107, note). Hence Geminus' list provides certain restorations for those lacunae in the papyrus which mentioned risings or settings, while conversely two corruptions in the text of Geminus can be restored from the papyrus; cf. notes on ll. 187 and 194.

The papyrus is therefore to be regarded as a composition for teaching purposes, written at Sais about B.C. 300 by a follower of Eudoxus' theory of astronomy, and is somewhat older than the analogous treatise based on Eudoxus in P. Par. i. In the passage common to both texts (ll. 41-54) may be recognized a more or less direct quotation from Eudoxus himself, but the presentation and application of his system are much disfigured in both papyri by frequent blunders, especially in regard to figures. The inconsistent dates in connexion with the equinoxes and the passing of the sun through the constellations, and the erroneous mention of Προτοργητήρ have already been mentioned. Cols. ii and iii of the introduction are very carelessly written, though some of the slips have been corrected by the writer himself. Mistakes in figures occur in ll. 62, 73, 91, and several times in the fractions of hours. Words are left out in ll. 88 and 199; cf. ll. 78 and 87, where an omission by the first hand is supplied by the corrector. The account of the summer solstice (ll. 120-2) is very inaccurately expressed, and other errors can be detected in ll. 79 and 83. All these mistakes are due
to the compiler or the scribe; and the compiler was, more probably than Eudoxus, responsible for the system of reckoning the changes in the length of day and night, which is only a rough approximation to the truth. The difference between the longest and shortest day being $14 - 10 = 4$ hours, and five days being deducted from the year on account of the solstices, the change in the length of the day and night is treated as uniformly $\frac{4}{30}$ or $\frac{1}{6}$ hour, which is a convenient fraction for purposes of calculation, but ignores the obvious fact that the changes are much greater at the equinoxes than at the solstices. The uniformity of the changes, however, simplifies the restoration of many lacunae, since, where the figures relating to the day or night are preserved, they are sufficient to indicate the day of the month, when lost, and vice versa.

Amongst the most valuable features of the papyrus are its references to Graeco-Egyptian festivals observed at Sais, of which we append a list:

(1) l. 60. Choiak 26, Festival of Osiris.
(2) l. 62. Tubi 20, Festival of Phitorois.
(3) l. 76. Mecheir 16 (19), Assembly at Sais in honour of Athena (Neith).
(4) l. 85. Mecheir 27, Festival of Prometheus-Iphthimis.
(5) l. 92. Phamenoth 9, Festival of Edu (?).
(6) l. 112. Pharmouthi 11, Feast of Hera (Mut?).
(7) l. 145. Pauni 16, Festival of Bubastis (Bast).
(8) l. 165. Epeiph [13 ?], Assembly at Sais in honour of Athena (Neith).
(9) l. 170. Epeiph 23, Festival of Anubis.
(10) l. 186. Mesore 2, Festival of Apollo (Horus).
(11) l. 205. 4th intercalary day, Birthday of Isis.

Festivals in honour of deities whose names are lost also occurred on a day between Pauni 24 and Pauni 26 (l. 150) and on Pauni 27 (l. 154). The dates of most of these festivals, and even the names of the deities connected with nos. (2), (4), and (5), were previously unknown; and except in the case of no. (11), which was universally observed, there are but few points of correspondence between the papyrus and other lists of festivals preserved in the Papyrus Sallier IV of Ramesside times (Chabas, Le Calendrier des jours fastes et néfastes), and the Ptolemaic calendars of Edfu, Esneh, and Dendereh (Brugsch, Drei Festkalender), while the list of festivals observed in Roman times at the temple of Socnopaeus in the Fayûm (Wessely, Karanis und Soknopaiu Nesos, p. 76) is altogether different. On comparing the list in the papyrus with the statements concerning festivals in the Canopus Inscr., the two are consistent concerning the date of no. (1), the voyage of Osiris, but disagree in a curious manner with reference to no. (7), the festival of Bast. It is clear that there was much local variation
with regard to the dates of the same festivals; and though in the above list only nos. (3) and (8) are actually stated to be specially Saite feasts, and nos. (1) and (11) are known to have been observed on the same days elsewhere, it is uncertain how far those remaining were observed outside the Saite nome on the days specified. The mention of a general illumination in connexion with no. (8) is particularly interesting, since this was the festival described by Herodotus ii. 62; cf. l. 76, note.


Fr. (a). Col. ii. Fr. (a). Col. iii. PLATE VIII.

τ. [. ]]εν ΢άι πάνω ἀνήρ
20 σοφός καὶ ἡμῶν χρείαν
έχων, ἐχομε γὰρ τὸν Ἐλαχιστοῖς
πάσαν ὅν τὴν ἀλήθειαν
[αν] ἡμῶν εἴσετθι καὶ ἐπ[ι]
25 [τοῦ] ἐργον ἐξίκενον ἐ-
[k τοῦ] δόμου τοῦ λιθίουν
[δὲ ἐκ]αλείτο Ἐλληνιστὶ
[γνόμων, ἐλεγον δὲ]
[δόο] τὰς πορείας εἶναι τοῦ
30 ἡλίου μία(μ) μὲν τὴν διορί-
ζουσαν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέ-
ραν μία(ν) δὲ τὴν διορίζου-
σαν χιμῶνα καὶ θέρος.
[ως] ὦν ἡδυνάμην ἄκρι-
35 βέστατα ἐν ἔλαχιστοις
συναγαγεῖν

20. ἡμῶν Pap. This is a very early instance of the placing of a dot both above and below a letter in order to indicate that it was to be omitted; cf. 15. 44, where dots are only placed above the cancelled letters.

25. 1. ἐξίκενον. 28. γρ[ωμον]: Pap. 34. ακρ.: Pap., the letters having been inserted later and the dots serving to separate them from the next column. 35. Final of ἔλαχιστοι inserted later. 37. 1. δόοι. 44. ωι above the line. 45. 1. δόσεις. 48. υ of ἐναντιων corr. from τ. 51. p of ἄστρων above the line.
Fr. (b), 2nd hand. Col. iv. PLATE VIII.

55 [ἡ] νῦξ ὥρῶν ἴγιβ’μ’έ’, ἡ δ’ ἡμέρα ἵβ’ἐχ’.
   [ἰ] ᾿Αρκτοῦρος ἀκρώνυχος ἐπιτέλλει,
   [ἡ] νῦξ ὥρῶν ἴβ’ἐμ’έ’, ἡ δ’ ἡμέρα ἰαβ’ἵλ’.
   [κ] Στέφανος ἀκρώνυχος ἐπιτέλλει
   [κ]αι βορέαι πνείουσιν ὄρνιθαι, ἡ νῦξ

 Ὅσίρις
   [π]ηριτλεί καὶ χρυσοῦν πλοῖον ἔξα-
   [γε]ραι. Τύβι (ἐ) ἐν τῷ Κρῖω. κ ἰσημερία
   [ἐ]ρνη, [ἡ] νῦξ ὥρῶν ἵβ καὶ ἡμέρα ἵβ,
   [κ]αι ἐορ[τ]ῇ Φιτοφώσοις. κξ Πλειάδες

65 ἀκρόνυχοι δύναν[σ]ιν, ἡ νῦξ ὥρῶν ἵαβ’ζ’ ἦ’,
   [ἡ] δ’ ἡμέρα [ἰ]β’ἵλ’μ’έ’. Μεχελρ ἕ ἐν τῷ
   [Τ]αύρῳ. ‘Τάδες ἀκρώνυχοι δύνασιν,
   [ἡ] νῦξ ὥρῶν ἰαβ’ἵλ’.

55. 1. ἵ’ for ἵβ’. 57. ἵ’ corr. from ἵβ’. 55. ἵ’ corr. 65. ἵ’ corr. 68. 1. λ’ for λ’.

Fr. (c).

ἡ δ’ ἡμέρα ἵβ’μ’έ’, καὶ Ἔρα
70 καει . καὶ ἐπ[ἰ]σημαίνει καὶ
νότος π[νεί]ς, ἦν δὲ πολὺς
γέννηται ὡς ἐκ τῆς γῆς
κατακάει. ἤ Λάρα ἀκρώ-
νυχος ἐπιτέλλει, ἡ νῦξ

75 ὥρῶν ἵαγ’ί’έ’ μ’, ἡ δ’ ἡμέρα ἵβξ’έ’,
καὶ πανήγυρις ἐν Σάι τῆς
لزم, καὶ νότο[ς] πνεί,
ἐὰν δὲ πολὺς γίνεται τὰ ἐκ τῆς
γῆς κατακάει. κξ . . . ἀκρώ-
80 νυχος ἐπιτέλλει, [ἡ] νῦξ ὥρῶν ἵα...
ἡ δ’ ἡμέρα ἵβ’[ . . . . . . . . . .
ἀγοσιν κα] . . . . . . . . . .

73. 1. ἵ for ἵ. 75. 1. ἵ for ἵ. 78. γν[ντα] above the line.
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Fr. (d). Col. vi.

κ'/ Δ'ρα άκρωνυχος δύνει,
ή νυξ ἄρων ιας', ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ιββ' (κρ)/(μ)'έ',
85 Προμηθέως ἐστὶ ὁν καλοῦσιν
'Ἰθημιν, καὶ νότος πνεῖ, ἕαν δὲ
πολὺς γίνεται τὰ ἐκ τῆς γῆς κατακαεί.
Φαρεννᾶτ [λ.] δέ ἐν τοῖς Διδύμοις. (Αἰξ ἱεώ) ἀνατέλλει, ἡ νυξ ἄρων ιας',
90 ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ιββ'δ'κ' η Σκορπίως ἱεώς
[ἀρΧ] ἐται δύνειν, ἡ νυξ ἄρων ιγ
[ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ιγ. θ παρά τοῖς Αἰ-
[γυπτίων] εἶν ἐστὶ, ιβ Σκορπίως
[ἱεώς ὁλος] δύνει, ἡ νυς ἄρων ιβ'ζ' η',
95 [ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ιγι'κ' η Μ' ιπέ. ιγ Πλειάδες
[ἱεώι ἐπιτέλλουσιν.

87. γενηται above the line. 89. ἱεώ for ἱμ'. 90. δ' corr. 91. ια for ιγ.
95. The scribe apparently began to correct the superfluous λ' into μ.

Frs. (e) and (f). Col. vii.

4 lines lost.

101 [ 23 letters ] ου
[ ] ] θ'.
[ ] ] ηα
[ ] .
[ ] ..
105 [ ]

σται γ[....] [....] . . . . . . . . ἐξοντια.
Φαρμοῆθε εὶν τοῖς Κ[α]ρπινοι γ. Λετός
άκρωνυχός ἐπιτέλλει, ἡ νυξ
ἀρων ιγ'θ', ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ιγ'ζ' η Μ'.

109. ημ'έ for ἱμ'.

L 2
Frs. (e), (g), (h).

Col. viii.

110 ἢ νῦξ ὥραν [ιε', ἢ δ'] ἡμέρα ἵγβ' {α'}λ',
[κ']αὶ τῆς Ἡρας [, . . .]εισα.
[i]ξ' Ὄριων ἑώιος ἐπιτέλεσε, ἢ νῦξ
ὥραν ἦ' ἢ δ' ἡμέρα ἵγβ'δ'ε'.

115 κ ἢ νῦξ ὥραν ι, ἢ δ' ἡμέρα ιδ',
καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει
ὁ ἥλιος ἡμέρας γ. ἐκ οὗ ἢ νῦξ ὥραν ι,
ἀδ' ἡμέρα ιδ'. κβ ἢ νῦξ ὥραν ι,
ἀδ' ἡμέρα ιδ'. κγ ἢ νῦξ ὥραν ι,

120 ἢ δ' ἡμέρα ιδ'. κδ ἥλιον τροπαί
ἐλθέρος καὶ ἢ νῦξ μείζον γ' γίνεται
τῆς ἡμέρας ὥρας δωδεκατημόρου μ'ἐ,

Fr. (i).

Col. ix.

καὶ γίνεται ἢ νῦξ ὥραν ιέ μ',
ἀδ' ἡμέρα ἵγβ'δ'κ'ἐ'. κε

125 ἐπησία αἴρεται πνεύμ
καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ἀρχεται ἀναβαίνει,
ἀναβαίνεις, ἢ νῦξ ὥραν ικ'ἐ',
ἀδ' ἡμέρα ἵγβ'δ'χ'ρ'π'.
Παχώς ἤ ἐν τῷ Δέοντι.

130 Πρὸτρυγητὴς ἀνατέλλει,
ἀδ' ἡμέρα [ἵμβ'λ']ἐ', ἢ άρ' Ὄριων (ἐώιος)
ἄλος ἀνατέλλει, ἢ νῦξ
ὥραν ἵγ β'ἐ', ἢ δ' ἡμέρα ἵγλ'ἐ'.

135 ἡ Κύων (ἀνίος) ἀνατέλλει, ἢ νῦξ
ὡραῶν [ιλΧμ'ἐ',

123. 1. μ'ἐ for ε'μ'.
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Frs. (i), (k), (l).

Col. x.

[ἡ δ' ημέρα ιγγ']δ'. Παῦνι [δ
[ἐν τῇ Παρθενω[ι. Ἀ]είδης ἡμιογ' [δύνει, ἥ νυξ] ὄρ[ων] ρ' ἓ'κ' λ' η'ξ',
140 [ἡ δ' ημέρα ιγγ' ἐ'μ' [ε'][ε'][[ε]].]]
[ἱς Στέφανος] ἐ'δώι[ε'
[δύνει, ἥ νυξ]
[ὁραν ιαγ'[ε']...
[ἡ δ' ημέρα ιβζ[ε'],

137. 1. ἡ for δ'.

Fr. (m). Col. xi.

150 [. . . . . . . ἐ']ορτή.
[κζ Λύρα ἐ'ωια] δύνει,
[ἡ νυξ ὄρων ιαγ'] ἓ'μ' ἓ',
[ἡ δ' ημέρα ιβζ' ἓ'ξ',
[. . . . . . . ο] ἐορτή.
155 [λ . . . . . η] μεγάλα
[. . ἐπισι'μαυει,
[ἡ νυξ ὄρων ιαγ'] ἓ'μ' ἓ',
[ἡ δ' ημέρα ιβζ' ἓ'ξ',
[Ἐπεῖφ' ἐν ταἰς
160 [χηλαίς τοῦ Σ]κορπίον.
[. . Αρκτόφορος ἐ'ωιος]
[ἐπιτέλλει, ]

152. 1. ἕ'μ' ἓ' for ἓ'μ' ἓ'.

Fr. (m). Col. xii.

165 καὶ ἐν Σάι πανήγυρις
Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ λόχνους
cάουσι κατὰ τὴν χώραν,
καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ἐπισημαίνει
πρὸς τὴν ἀνάβασιν.
170 κυ ἱσμερία φθινοπωρινή,
ἡ νυξ ὄρων ιβ,
ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ιβ,
τοῦ Ἀνούβιος ἐορτή,
καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ἐπι-
175 σημαίνει πρὸς τὴν
ἀνάβασιν.

158. 9 corr.

Fr. (m). Col. xiii.

180 ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ιαβ' ἓ'ξ'.
Μεσορεῖ β ἐν τῷ
Σκορπίων. Πλειάδες

Fr. (m). Col. xiv.

[ἀρχεται δύνειν,
[ἡ νυξ ὄρων ιβγ' ἓ',
[ἡ δ' ημέρα ιαλί'ξ',
[ο Ἐκτός δόλος δύνει,
195 ἡ νυξ ὄρων ιβγ' ἓ',
ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ιαλί'ξ'.
ákroûnχοι ἐπιτέλλουσιν,
η νυξ ὀρῶν ιβέ' ,
185 ἦ δ' ἡμέρα ιαβ’'ελ’,
Ἀπόλλωνος ἐορτή.
δ' Στέφανος ἐωιος ἐπι-
tέλλει, ἦ νυξ ὀρῶν ιβελ’χ’,
ἡ δ’ ἡμέρα ιαβ’’ε μ’ε’.
190 Θ Σκορπίος ἀκρόωνχος

Fr. (p) and (o). Col. i.

.....

| раз
]. καθά ω [. . .]διον
Ὑ[βη] κ λαιμερία ἐγρυνή
210 τρο[πο]ν θερι[νων . . .]νων
] κυ το[i . . .]. σιν
] [ ]
] [ ]

Fr. (q).

.....

τ[ ημερον [. . . . .]. . .]. [. .
πεντε τ[ων ἐπ]αγομένων
220 ἐν των ἐνιαυτοι ἐν αῖς . [
tὸν ἥλιον ἀνατέλλειν
ἐν τηι πορείαι τηι διορι-
ζούσῃ

Fr. (r).

.....

225 ὥ σται
]|σελην
].
|το
|ανε
230 |νων
|του
|νομει
|ν έ
|τα[ .
235 ] ο[.
19–54. '... at Sais a wise man and a friend of mine, for I have been in the Saite nome for five years. He expounded to me the whole truth, and illustrated it in practice from the stone dial which is called in Greek a "gnomon." He said that the courses of the sun were two, one dividing night and day and one dividing winter and summer. Accordingly, to summarize his information as accurately as I could in the shortest space, in order that the intricacy of the fractions may not appear to you a long and unfamiliar thing to understand (φ), I will divide the necessary days. The astronomers and sacred scribes use the lunar days for the settings and risings of the stars. They therefore keep most of the festivals annually on the same day, without alterations owing to the setting or rising of a star; but some festivals they keep...

19. ἀνήρ: a disciple of Eudoxus is probably meant; cf. introd.


34–41. The construction of this passage, which seems to be all one sentence and to require some correction, is obscure. The μέρια apparently refer to the fractions of the hours of the nights and days, and the general purport of the sentence seems to be that the writer, in order to avoid prolixity and a multitude of complicated fractions, would mention in his calendar only the more important days. This is in actual agreement with the calendar, which rarely notices days on which there was nothing more remarkable to record than the length of the night and day. The supplements proposed for ll. 38–40 will make lines 37–9 longer by two or three letters than ll. 41 sqq. Perhaps some letters at the end of those three lines were first omitted and then supplied in the margin, as has happened in ll. 34–5. The future tense μερούμεν in the apodosis after the imperfect ἱδενήσῃ is awkward, but the alteration of συνηγεγέντω συνηγεγέντω would make the connexion of μερούμεν with the preceding lines still more difficult.

41–54. Cf. P. Par. I. 71–80 οἱ δὲ ἀνήρ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ οἱ ἱεράγραμματεῖς χρόναι ταῖς κατὰ στιλπνοῖς καὶ ἀγοι πανδημίασ ἡμέραις τῶν ἑωράματα τὸ ἔνα ἑωράματα καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἀναστήλους καὶ σελήνες κατὰ τῶν θεῶν (l. 76, Blass) ἀναλέγεσθαι τὰς ημέρας εἰκ πάντων λατρειῶν, a passage which agrees closely with our papyrus and clearly indicates their common source. Combining the information from both, the meaning is that the days on which the risings or settings of stars took place were designated by the ordinary months, and were therefore continually changing. Most of the annual festivals in Egypt were kept according to the annus vagus of 365 days without reference to the stars, the movements of which took place a day later on the calendar every four years. Certain festivals, however, were observed according to the sidereal year of 365 ¼ days. The Paris papyrus specifies three of these, the fêtes at the Nile rising, the rising of Sirius, and some festival connected with the moon; and 27 may have done the same in the next column, which may also well have contained a passage corresponding to P. Par. I. 80–85, concerning the day to be intercalated once in every four years. The use of the adjective πλείστας for the festivals observed on the annus vagus confirms the view that the employment of the year of 365 ¼ days in Egypt, however ancient, remained quite exceptional, in spite of the efforts of Eun盖tes, down to the reform of the calendar by Augustus; cf. Dittenberger's note Orientis Gr. Inscr. I. p. 102. The phrase ταῖς κατὰ σελήνην ἡμέρας is rather difficult. The extract from the Paris papyrus quoted above, in which it also occurs, immediately follows a passage describing the difference between the lunar year of 354 days and the solar year of 365. But if 'the days according to the moon' are connected with the lunar year, the statement concerning the astronomers and sacred scribes is not only obviously incorrect but has no relation to what follows. It is therefore preferable to suppose that the phrase αἱ κατὰ σελήνην...
HIBEH PAPYRI

53. {γ}εῖναι: for another example in this volume of γ inserted between vowels cf. 62. 8 ἄρχωνερί. The practice is common in the Tebtunis papyri of the second century B.C.

55-205. "(Choaiak 1st.)... The night is 13 4/5 hours, the day 10 4/5. 16th, Arcturus rises in the evening. The night is 12 4/5 hours, the day 11 4/5. 17th, Orion rises in the evening, and the north winds blow which bring the birds. The night is 12 4/5 hours and the day 11 4/5. Osiris circumnavigates, and the golden boat is brought out.

'Phamenoth 4th, the sun enters Gemini. Capella rises in the morning. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5; and Hera burns (°), and there are indications, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 12th (16th?), Lyra rises in the evening. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5; and there is an assembly at Sais in honour of Athena, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 20th (16th?), Lyra (Canis?) sets in the evening. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5. Feast of Prometheus whom they call Iphthimis, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth.

'Phamenoth 4th, the sun enters Gemini. Capella rises in the morning. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5; and Hera burns (°), and there are indications, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 16th (16th?), Lyra rises in the evening. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5; and there is an assembly at Sais in honour of Athena, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 20th (16th?), Lyra (Canis?) sets in the evening. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5. Feast of Prometheus whom they call Iphthimis, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth.

'Phamenoth 4th, the sun enters Gemini. Capella rises in the morning. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5; and Hera burns (°), and there are indications, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 12th (16th?), Lyra rises in the evening. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5; and there is an assembly at Sais in honour of Athena, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 20th (16th?), Lyra (Canis?) sets in the evening. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5. Feast of Prometheus whom they call Iphthimis, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth.

'Phamenoth 4th, the sun enters Gemini. Capella rises in the morning. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5; and Hera burns (°), and there are indications, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 12th (16th?), Lyra rises in the evening. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5; and there is an assembly at Sais in honour of Athena, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 20th (16th?), Lyra (Canis?) sets in the evening. The night is 11 4/5 hours, the day 12 4/5. Feast of Prometheus whom they call Iphthimis, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth.
Mesore 2nd, the sun enters Scorpio. Pleiades rise in the evening. The night is \(12\frac{1}{2}\) hours, the day \(11\frac{4}{7}\). Feast of Apollo. 4th, Corona rises in the morning. The night is \(12\frac{7}{8}\) hours, the day \(11\frac{4}{8}\). 9th, Scorpio begins to set in the evening. The night is \(12\frac{7}{8}\) hours, the day \(11\frac{4}{8}\). 14th, Scorpio sets completely. The night is \(12\frac{7}{8}\) hours, the day \(11\frac{4}{8}\). 17th, Hyades rise in the evening. The night is \(12\frac{7}{8}\) hours, the day \(11\frac{4}{8}\).

In the 5 intercalary days: 4th, Arcturus sets in the evening. The night is \(12\frac{7}{8}\) hours, the day \(11\frac{4}{8}\); and the birthday festival of Isis takes place.

55. The length of the night and day shows that the day in question must be Choiak 1, since the compiler of the calendar treats the difference in length between two successive nights or days as uniformly \(\frac{1}{7}\) hour; cf. l. 122 and p. 144.

56. Cf. Geminus (Ἰχθύες δ.) Εὐδόξος δὲ ἄρσενόν ἄρονύχος ἐπίστελε καὶ ἑτός γίνεται καὶ χελδών φαινότα καὶ τῶν ἔρωτιν ἡμέρας Ἠρόδων πιέσει καὶ μάλιστα αἱ προορεθεῖαι καλοῦμεναι.

ἄρονύχος ἐπίστελε: whatever the technical meaning of ἄρονύχος (as it is generally spelled) in later Greek astronomers may have been, there is no doubt that Eudoxus, as both the papyrus and Geminus bear witness, used it as equivalent to ἐσπεριός, and that the risings and settings recorded in the papyrus mean the apparent or heliacal ones, not the true. No technical distinction is intended by the compiler of the calendar between ἐπίστελεν and ἄρονύχος, which occurs in ll. 89, 116, 130, &c.

58. Cf. Εἰχάθεις Ἐν δὲ τῇ καὶ Ἐὔδοξῳ Σελεφανός ἄρονύχος ἐπίστελε. ἄρονυχον ἐφηβεῖαν πιέσεις.

60. On the περίπλους of Osiris see Plut. De Iside et Osiride, 13. The ἐξαγωγή of the sacred boat took place according to the papyrus on Choiak 26, while according to the Canopus Inscr. l. 51 the ἀναγωγή του ἱεροῦ πλοίου του Ὀσείμος occurred on Choiak 29. The two statements are perfectly consistent on the view that the festival lasted 4 days; the papyrus refers to the beginning of the voyage, the Canopus Inscr. to the return of the sacred boat at the end of the festival. Plutarch, op. cit. 39, states that the mourning for Osiris occupied four days, but refers the production of the sacred boat to the third day. His date for the festival, Athur 17-20, nominally differs widely from the Ptolemaic evidence owing to his employment of the Julian calendar (a fact which Wiedemann seems to leave out of account in his discussion of the date of the Osiris festival, Herodots zweites Buch, pp. 261-2); but the divergence is really slight, for Athur 17 on the Julian calendar coincided with Choiak 26 of the vague year in a. d. 128, which is not long after Plutarch. At Esneh the feast of Sokar, the Memphite god of the dead, identified with Osiris in later times, also took place on Choiak 26.

62. Τῆς (ε) : it is clear from the parallel passages (ll. 66, 88, 129, 181) that a number has dropped out after Τῆς, and ε, which would easily have been omitted owing to the εν following, can be restored with practical certainty because, firstly, the sun entered Taurus on Mecheir 6 (l. 66), and it must therefore have entered Aries about 30 days (possibly 29 or 31) previously, and, secondly, the equinox, which took place on Tobi 20 (l. 62), was placed by Eudoxus in the middle of Aries (15°; cf. introd.), so that the sun must have entered Aries about 15 days before the 20th. In l. 107 we read Φαρμοσίδη εν ταῖς Καρκίναις γ. Λευκός κ.ά., and suppose that γ is misplaced and ought to have preceded εν ταῖς Καρκίναις. The size of the lacuna after Φαρμοσίδη suits 3 letters much better than 4, and if Φαρμοσίδη εν or Φαρμοσίδη (ε) εν (the figure would have to be α or β) be read, the already considerable disparity between the times during which the sun was in Gemini and Cancer respectively would be still further increased; cf. p. 142.

64. Φαρμοσίδης : the name of this deity is new. There is very likely a connexion between this festival and the 'festival of the child at the town of Sais' which took place on
Tubi 20 according to the Esneh calendar. Was Phitorois the son of Neith, the principal deity of Sais?


69. Ἡρα καὶ, καὶ ἐπισημαίνει: after καὶ is a smudge, and the letter between it and καὶ may have been intended to be erased; but the ink has run in several places in this column. l. 112 τῆς Ἡρας seems to refer to the goddess, but Ἡρα is here more probably the planet Venus or a constellation; cf. Arist. de Mundo p. 392 A 27 ὁ τοῦ Φωσφόρου ἐν Ἀφροβίτης οἶ δὲ Ἡρος προσυγιόντων, ὁ. Ὀξυ. 731. 6 τοὺς ἄστρους Ἡρας.

For the archaic form of καὶ cf. κατακόει in ll. 73 and 79, and κάωσι l. 167. ἐπισημαίνειν, which occurs in ll. 168 and 174 ὁ ποταμὸς ἐπισημαίνει πρὸς τὴν ἀνάβασιν, not in connexion with an astronomical phenomenon, means here probably, as often in the calendars of Ptolemy and Geminus, an indication with regard to the weather (sc. wind, thunder, rain, &c.). The word in this sense seems always to be used absolutely, without a subject.

73. η: this conflicts with the numbers in l. 75, which indicate the 16th; probably therefore η should be read here.


76. Athena at Sais was the goddess Neith (cf. Wiedemann, op. cit., p. 259), also identified in Roman times with Isis; cf. Plut. De Iside et Osiride, 9. The papyrus mentions another assembly in her honour in Epeiph (ll. 165–6), when there was a general ἀσκησις-φορία; and no doubt that was the festival to which Herodotus was referring in his description of the λαμπαδοθφορία at Sais in ii. 62, which is to be connected closely with his general statement in ii. 59 ἐσ ἐκάλον τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ παραγωγίζοντοι rather than, as has been done by Wiedemann and others, with the illuminations at the festival of Osiris in Cholak.

The day of general illumination, as now appears clearly from the papyrus, was in honour of Neith, not of Osiris.

The festival of Neith on Mecheir 16 was not known previously, but the Esneh calendar mentions one on Mecheir 8. That found in l. 165 is to be connected with another feast of Neith on Epeiph 13, also mentioned in the Esneh calendar; γε may even be the number lost in l. 161.

79. ζ to refers to the date, which may be any day between the 20th and 26th; cf. l. 83. Geminus does not quote from Eudoxus at this point any star rising in the evening soon after Lyra, but Ὄρας ἀκρόνυχος δύναν, Κύων ἀκρόνυχος δύναν and Αἰξ ἑώς ἐπιτέλει occur between the evening rising of Lyra (cf. l. 73) and the morning setting of Scorpio (cf. l. 90). The setting of Canis and rising of Capella are probably referred to in ll. 83 and 89, where in both cases the papyrus is corrupt; and here too, probably, there is an error and Ὄρας ἀκρόνυχος δύναν, not ἐπιτέλει, was meant.

82. Perhaps κατά τὴν χώραν; cf. l. 167. A festival is probably referred to, possibly that of 'the strong one '; cf. note on l. 85.

83. Λύρα ἀκρόνυχος δύναν: this statement cannot be correct in view of the fact that the evening rising of Lyra had taken place only 8 days previously (l. 73). Probably Κύων should be substituted for Λύρα, and the papyrus brought into conformity with Geminus' statements about the sequence of the risings and settings on Eudoxus' calendar at this point; cf. ll. 79 and 89, notes.

85. The identification of Prometheus with an Egyptian deity and the name of the latter, Iphthimis, are both new. Mr. F. L. Griffith would explain Ἰφθίμης as a Graecized form of Neferetm, son of Pth, whose name occurs as -ενημος at the end of compound names; he supposes that Nefer- was cut down to Ef- and the name pronounced Efeme, giving rise to two slightly different transliterations into Greek, as e.g. in the parallel forms Ἰπαρος and Ἰπαρας. The calendars of Esneh, Edfu, and Dendereh mention
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no festival on Mecheir 27; but the Papyrus Salier IV mentions a festival of Sokar on that day, and the Edfu calendar a festival of Ptah on Mecheir 28 and 29, while all three Ptolemaic calendars refer to a festival of 'the strong one' (the translation is doubtful according to Griffith; the word might mean 'victory' or 'battle') on Mecheir 21, the Edfu calendar adding that it was observed throughout Egypt. It is possible that there is some connexion between the festival of 'the strong one' and the ceremony referred to in l. 82, but the feast of Iphthimis is in any case probably different.

89. The name of the star rising has been omitted before ἀνατέλλει. We restore Ἀς ἔσσει from Geminus; cf. l. 79, note. ἀνατέλλειν and ἑψτεῖε are sometimes distinguished by later astronomers, and referred respectively to the true and apparent risings, but it is clear that the papyrus uses the two terms indiscriminately, meaning the apparent rising in both cases; cf. l. 2, note.

90. Cf. Gem. (Ταύρους) in. Ἐκρόπιος ἔσσει δύναι ἐρχεται. In the case of constellations with several very large stars, it was necessary to distinguish between the end of the rising or setting; cf. l. 93.

92-3. Ἐγν or Ἐγν seems to be the name of an unknown Egyptian deity. [γυμίως] is quite sufficient for the lacuna, but it is possible that one more letter is lost.


95-6. Cf. Gem. (Ταύρους) ed. Πλοιδεῖς ἑψτεῖεσι καὶ ἑπισμαίσει. The length of the night and day can be restored: ἡ νύξ ἄρων ἠθ' ἀμ', ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ἔς ᾠν.'

107. Cf. note on l. 62 and Gem. (Δίσμωμος) τή. Ἀστάς ἀκρόνυχος ἑψτεῖε. Between this and the entry corresponding to that in l. 110 Geminus inserts from Eudoxus (Δίσμωμος) τῆς Ἀρκτοφιός ἔσσει δύναι, the only certain reference to the stars on Eudoxus' calendar which is omitted in the papyrus.

110. Cf. Gem. (Δίσμωμος) in. Δαλφίς ἀκρόνυχος ἑψτεῖε. In place of ἐκεῖν, ν or ω or possibly η can be read. The word seems to refer to a festival in honour of Hera, who at Thebes was identified with Mut. The birth of that goddess was apparently celebrated in Pharmouthi (cf. Brugsch, Thesaurus, p. 523), and may be referred to here, though νεφέλαιa is the word used for the birthday of Isis in l. 205.

112. In the place of πρῶτον ἐρχεται ἑψτεῖε in. ὘ρίον ἀκρόνυχος ἑψτεῖεν.

116-22. Cf. introd. and the account of the ἄλαων πορεία in P. Par. 1. 8-51. Lines 121-2 are very inaccurately expressed. What the writer meant was that from the 24th of Pharmouthi the nights begin to lengthen and the days to diminish by 1/15 hour per diem, but his actual statement ἡ νύξ (which on the 23rd is 10 hours long) μεῖον γίνεται τῆς ἡμέρας (which on the 23rd is 14 hours long) is highly ambiguous. Nor does he seem to be justified in his use of διδεκακημώρων ἄρος. An hour might be 1/15 of the period of light irrespective of its length or 1/15 of the average, i.e. equinoctial, day, and it is of course 1/15 hour in the latter sense which throughout the calendar the writer actually adds to or subtracts from the length of days, though this system is inaccurate; cf. p. 144. But then ἰσημερώον would be the right word to use here, not διδεκακημώρων, especially as the 'day' in l. 122 contains 14, not 12, hours.

124-7. On the view that the papyrus dates refer to the years 301-298 B.C., Pharmouthi 25, on which day the river is stated to have begun to rise, is June 28. The attainment of its greatest height nearly two months later is apparently referred to in ll. 168-76. The Canopus Inscr. ll. 37-8 makes the rise begin on Pauni 1, i.e. July 19.

130. Προτριγινή ἀνατέλλει: Geminus has no entry concerning the stars on Eudoxus' calendar between the beginning and completion of the rising of Orion (cf. ll. 113 and 132), and nowhere mentions the star Προτριγινή (the more usual form) in connexion with Eudoxus. From Smyly's calculations (cf. p. 143) it appears that this statement of the
papyrus must be erroneous, whether ἐὼς or ἀκρώνυχος be supplied. Pliny, Hist. Nat. xviii § 310 (Wachsmuth, Lydus, &c., p. 328), says correctly that in Egypt Vindemitor rose on Sept. 5, or two months later than the date found in the papyrus.


145. Pauni 16 was also the day of a festival of Bast at Esneh; the statement that the Esneh calendar mentions a second festival in her honour on Pauni 30 (Dittenberger, Oriental. Gr. Inscri. I, p. 109) is erroneous. The Canopus Inscri., which in l. 37 mentions a μικρά and μεγάλα Βουκάστας, gives a different date, Pauni 1, for both, which is remarkable seeing that Pauni 16 is attested both before and after the date of the inscription.

146. κ.τ.: the earliest day in Pauni on which 1 appears as a fraction of the night is the 23rd, the earliest on which 2 disappears as a fraction of the day is the 24th. The date in question must therefore be the 24th, 25th, or 26th.

150. Cf. note on l. 154.
154. This festival is to be assigned to Pauni 27 rather than to Pauni 30, the day to which the figures in ll. 157–8 refer, for throughout the papyrus the mentions of festivals follow the details about the length of night and day. The Denderah calendar mentions a great feast of Hathor and Horus on the last four days of Pauni, and Ἀφροδίτης or Ἀπόλλωνος may have occurred here or in l. 150. The Esneh calendar mentions a festival of Sochet on Pauni 30, there having been already a festival of that goddess on Pauni 16.

156. For ἑπισχαίμαινεις, cf. Gem. (Δέλων) καὶ ἑπισχαίμαινεις, and note on l. 69.
159. The number lost is β, γ, or δ; cf. l. 137 and 181, and p. 142. The 'claws of Scorpio' take the place of Libra; cf. Gem. (Ζυγός) εἰς. Καλύττα κηραία ἐφος ἑπισκόπουσαν.
161. Perhaps (Επειθ) εἰς should be restored at the beginning of the line, there being a festival of Neith at Esneh on that day; cf. l. 76, note.
166. λύκρωμα καίσως: cf. Hdt. ii. 62, and note on l. 76.
168–9. This entry 'the river gives indication of rising,' which is repeated in ll. 174–6, refers apparently to the flood reaching its full height, which it usually does early in October. Επειθ 23, the date to which ll. 174–6 belong, being the day of the autumn equinox, was probably Sept. 27.

173. This date of the Anubis festival, Επειθ 23, was previously unknown.
186. Ἀπόλλωνος ἑφη: this date, Mesore 2, for the Horus festival is new.
187. Cf. Gem. (Ζυγός) εἰς δὲ τῇ Ἐλδάζερ ἐφος ἑπιτέλλεις. The entry clearly corresponds to that in the papyrus, and the omitted name of the constellation is to be restored Σπέφανος, as Pontedera had already proposed.

194. Cf. Gem. (Ζυγός) εἰς. Σκορπίων ἀκρώνυχος Αἴξ δῆος δῶνει, which requires correction.

The papyrus confirms Wachsmuth's view that Αἴξ is to be omitted.
199. The length of the day has been omitted; insert ἓν δὲ ἡμέρα ἑιρίκη.
205. The birthday of Isis on the 4th intercalary day is mentioned in the Papyrus Sallier IV, the Esneh, Edfu, and Dendereh calendars, and by Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride, 12.
209. Teit 7x: cf. l. 62.

211. Ἐπειφή is a probable restoration before κγ or after τοῦ, since the autumn equinox took place on Ἐπειφή 23; cf. l. 170.

212. The traces of a letter would suit γ with a stroke over it, i.e. the figure 3.

217-23. This fragment at first sight seems to be concerned with the five intercalary days at the end of Mesore, but it is difficult to connect these with the πορεία of the sun, which divides either summer and winter or day and night (cf. ll. 29-33). Hence we are more disposed to regard the five days as the three days at the summer solstice (cf. ll. 116-20) and the two at the winter solstice, upon which the sun rises ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (l. 116); these have to be added to the 360 days upon which the day or night increased by 3 1/3 hour (cf. ll. 121-2 and introd.) in order to make up the full year of 365 days. But if a figure followed ἡμερῶν in l. 218 the meaning in l. 220, though φιλοτε is possible.

IV. ROYAL ORDINANCES

28. CONSTITUTIONAL REGULATIONS.

Breadth 6.7 cm.

About B.C. 265.

Notwithstanding its unfortunate condition this papyrus, which refers to the tribal organization of some civic polity, is of no small interest. The style is that of an ordinance (ll. 7-8); and the natural inference is that these fragments belong to a royal edict regulating the constitution of one of the Greek cities of Egypt. The alternative is to suppose that they come from some literary work in which a municipal law was quoted at length. Palaeographical considerations do not materially assist a decision between these two possibilities. The sloping handwriting, which is of a good size and, like other papyri from Mummy 97, of an early period (cf. 64 and 92), is clear and careful; but not more regular than that of many other non-literary papyri, and certainly not of a marked literary character. The feature which is least suggestive of an edict is the narrowness of the column, which is not usual in non-literary documents of any length. But that is a quite inconclusive argument; while in favour of the more obvious hypothesis it is worth noting that a fragment of another series of ordinances (29) was obtained from the same mummy as this. Assuming then that we have here part of an ordinance promulgated in Egypt, the question remains to what city did it refer. The choice lies between Alexandria and the still more recent foundation
Ptolemais, and, so far as existing evidence goes, turns largely upon the interpretation of a fragment of Satyrus, Περὶ δήμων Ἀλέξανδρων, quoted by Theophilus, *Ad Autolyc.* II. p. 94 (Müller, *Hist. Gr. Frag.* III. p. 164). In the constitution described by the papyrus the tribes were five in number, each tribe containing twelve demes, and each deme twelve phratries (ll. 10 sqq.). The number of tribes at Alexandria and Ptolemais is unknown (cf. Kenyon, *Archiv.* II. pp. 70 sqq.)¹; but Satyrus in the passage cited enumerates eight demes of the Alexandrian tribe Διονύσια, and if his meaning be that it contained only eight then our papyrus cannot refer to Alexandria. But this is not a necessary inference from Satyrus’ words. His point is that Ptolemy Philopator, claiming descent from Dionysus, gave precedence to the Dionysian tribe, and that the eight deme-names mentioned were all connected with the god. But it is not stated that all the demes of the tribe were so connected, and had others existed in which the connexion could not be traced, there would have been no occasion to refer to them. The excerpt from Satyrus therefore hardly does more than create a slight presumption in favour of Ptolemais as the subject of these ordinances, though the presumption is somewhat strengthened by the consideration of *a priori* probability; for Soter’s creation was still so young that regulations like the present concerning it might be expected to occur. The apparent allusion in ll. 1–3 to previous ordinances forbids us to regard 28 as forming part of Soter’s original legislation. On the other hand in favour of Alexandria can be adduced the fact that the city is known from Ps. Callisthenes i. 32 to have been divided into five regions numbered Α, Β, Γ, Δ, Ε, with which the five tribes mentioned in the papyrus may have been connected.

Frs. (a), (b), and (c).

\[\text{ἄγνωσιν τὰ τε γεγραμμένα αὐτοῖς τε καὶ...} \]

\[\text{γραφέντα [ . . . . . . . ]} \]

\[\text{. . . . . . . . . } \]

\[5\text{ ταὶ εἰς τὰς φράτρις καὶ} \]

\[\text{γνωρίζεται ὑπὸ τῶν φρατώρων θυέτωσαν καὶ...} \]

\[\text{συνέστωσαν ταῖς [ . . . ]} \]

\[\text{. . . ἀπὸ φυλῆς ἐκάστης} \]

¹ To the three there mentioned, Διονύσιος, Πρωσαποστάταιεος, and Πτολεμαῖος, with perhaps a fourth Φιλαξιδαλάστειος, may now be added Μονοσατέριεος, which occurs in P. Tebt. II. 316.
28. ROYAL ORDINANCES

10 ἡμέρας φράτραι δύο. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὑπάρχουσιν φυλαὶ μὲν πέντε τοῦ θεοῦ [δὲ ἐν ἐκ[σ]ήμεροι φυλῆι δὴ μεν [δῶ]θεκα φράτραι δὲ
15 [δῶ]θεκα τῶ[ι]ς δῆμωι [εκα- [στῶι]] ὡστε γίνεσθαι μὲν δήμους ἐξήκοντα φιλά- τρας δὲ ἐπτακοσίας εἰκοσι, ὑπαρχοῦσαν [δὲ εἰς τὸν
25 δύο τοῖς [.] . . . . . . . . νοος κ[15 letters]

Fr. (d). Fr. (e). Fr. (f).

μ[ ] 30 ἵσμα ] , νσα[ ]

. . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Fr. (g). Col. i. Col. ii. Fr. (h).

. . . . . . . . . . . . . .

. . π[ ] 40 ]ματο[ ]

] . 35 ε[ ] ὁσαν οί [ ]
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Fr. (i). Fr. (k).
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Both sides of this papyrus are inscribed with royal ordinances, but they are too fragmentary to be of very much value. The subject of the recto, which is fairly preserved so far as it goes, is the farming of a tax upon slaves; these were to be registered by their owners at the offices of the agoranomi, and penalties are provided for any attempt at evasion or concealment. Of a general slave-tax at this period nothing is at present known; P. Petrie II. 39 (b) and (c), to which Wilcken refers (Ost. I. p. 304), are shown by the republication of them in III. 107 (a) and (b) to have no bearing upon the question. It is noticeable that the word here used for slave is not δοῦλος or σώμα but ἀνδρόποδος, which strictly signifies a captive or enslaved prisoner. Perhaps this ordinance was called forth by some considerable increase in that class as a result of one of the wars of Philadelphus,—to whose reign rather than that of Euergetes the papyrus is to be assigned. The prisoners (αἰχμαλώτων) brought from Asia by the latter monarch are expressly alluded to in P. Petrie III. 104. 2; cf. II. 29 (c). 2. The papyrus apparently indicates that the captives were disposed of by the government to private persons, who, besides no doubt having to pay for such appropriation, were subject to a special tax.

The verso is in a much worse case. It is unfortunately divided between two columns, and the amount lost at the beginnings and ends of the lines cannot be precisely fixed. In the text given below the numbers of letters assigned to the lacunae are based upon II. 22-3 and 36-7. But these numbers are chiefly designed to show the relation of the lines to each other, and the loss may easily be greater than we have supposed. In parts of Col. i restoration seems very difficult with a gap at the beginning of only about a dozen letters. The hand is smaller and more cursive than that of the recto, but the writer may well have been the same person; he was not over-accurate, and several corrections occur. The subject is again tax-farming, but to the nature of the tax there is no clear clue. There is a question of registration (l. 17), but that by itself is of course insufficient to establish a definite connexion with the recto. The most significant word is κτήμα (l. 20), which is often used technically of a vineyard (cf. e.g. 118. 20), and suggests a possible reference to the ἀπόμορφα (cf. 109 introd.); but there is nothing in the context to confirm this.

The papyrus probably dates from about the middle of the reign of Philadelphus; cf. 64 and 92, which came from the same mummy.
περ καὶ τ. . . η. διαν δὲ κ. [. . . . . . .] το ἀνδ[ρ]άποδου καὶ [δι]πλούτ[ν] ἀπο-
τινέτω. ἐὰν δὲ τες ἀλλα [. . . . . . .] υ[. . . .] ν ἡ ἀπογράψηται[ι]
dιὰ τῶν
ἀγορανομῶν [ἡ τ]ῇ τέλη [διαφυγών τιν] υ καταφυγή ἐπὶ βλάβη[ς] τοῦ
τελῶνος στε-
τοῦ ἀνδραπόδου· ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὕπ[ο]τε[β]εις μηνύσῃ ἑλέθερος ἐστω καταβαλ[α]ν
τὰ γι-
νόμενα τέλη, γραφέσθωσαν [δ]ὲ καὶ ταύτας τὰς ὑποθέσεις δ τε γραμμ[α]τεύ-
[...]
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25. [.....] οι τελώντες τοις βασιλεῖς πραγμάτων εξ οὗ ἀν τις [...].

30. [.....] τραχός τε καὶ μην ὑπόθεσαι προούμενοι, [εἰν δὲ [...]

35. [.....] τῆς τετελεσμένης ἐσθάνης ἄντων ἀντίτροποι (τραχός). καὶ ἐξ-[.....] ὑποθέσαι τοῖς τελώνας ἄντειπτοι [...]

32. 1. γραφῶν [...]

36. Χ of εἰσπρα[ά]χθησαν added above the line.

...
the slave when sold shall go to the informer. If the slave (assigned?) give information, he shall be free on payment of the usual taxes. The scribe of the slaves and the antigraphes and the tax-farmer shall write out these assignments (?), and the tax-farmer shall write this document upon a notice board in large letters and expose it in front of the agoranomus-office every day, and for every day that this exposure does not take place he shall pay a fine of ... drachmae, and shall further pay.

1. Probably καθιστη, and perhaps τὴν ... λήματι. The λ may be μ, but there is not room for τημή. τελη cannot be read.

2. If ἀλα ... is a verb, it can only be some part of ἀλλάσσειν, and ἀλλάξεια gives an appropriate sense; but the ε is not very satisfactory. A more definite expression than ἀλα (ποιήσῃ) is, however, expected; ἀλλάξεια is not impossible. The problem of the supplement is complicated by the doubt whether Fr. (e) should not be assigned to ll. 1-2. If so, ἃτι must be inserted about midway between ἀλα [and]. τι. This position is suggested by the verso, which contains the last two letters of a line and might be placed at the end of l. 28, and, adopting that arrangement, we might read ἀλλάξεια τι ... τι[το]-τελη (τε[ντε]τοῦ ὕπερ. is rather long); cf. the next note.

6. v[π ...]. εἰς must be an aorist participle passive, and the faint trace before εἰς would suit θ or perhaps φ. ὦ[ποτε]θείς is suggested by ὕποθεσις in the next line; but the technical meaning of those words here is uncertain. For ὕποθέσαν in the sense of ‘make subject to’ cf. Plato, Politi. p. 308 Α ἄρ' ὧν ὑποχειρίον τοῖς ἑκατοντες ὑπέθασαν ταυτών παρθενας.

7. The τελη are the taxes on emancipation rather than those which the owner was attempting to escape, and for which he would naturally remain responsible. For the taxes on emancipation in the Roman period cf. P. Oxy. 722, 19, note.

16-21. The first letters of these lines, [εο], [αι], [ειμι], ... ετελι[ and] κοσ[ are on a detached fragment, the position of which is not certain. The recto is blank, as it should be if placed here; but the necessity of supposing a misspelling in δοκειοῦσαι is not quite satisfactory, though [ειμι] is difficult to interpret in any case. A suitable reading of l. 20 is also not easy to obtain; the third letter is more like τ than ε, but δ τέλει is as little convincing as δ[ε]τέλει. For the δοκειοῦσαι and δοκειοῦσαι (l. 24) cf. 108, introd. and 110, 31, note.

22. κηρίσωσι seems intended to replace ὕπεριστή, but that word was apparently not deleted in any way; cf. ll. 32-4, note. If ὕπεριστή[ were read, as is just possible, κηρίσωσι then would have to be inserted before it; but this is an awkward collocation, and the final letter of ὕπεριστή ... is hardly high enough for a ν.

23. The infinitive προσκαταβαλλειν is unexpected and is perhaps an error for προσκαταβαλεῖ.

24. ἐν τούτων can hardly be right; νοι might be read for the final τού.

26. ἐπιθ[ο]ν in this phrase is a masculine substantive; cf. 85, 24, note.

28. Perhaps ἐδόρ δὲ τέλε; cf. notes on ll. 2 and 46.

30. Perhaps διερέται, though this division is unusual.

31. The top of a letter after κ suits τ better than α; possibly κηρίσωσι (cf. l. 20).

32-4. Cf. ll. 8-10. The scribe apparently intended to alter (?)γραφίσωσιν to γραφόσωσιν, but he neglected to delete αα; cf. note on l. 22.

37 sqq. The general sense clearly is that the tax-farmer was to produce the amount he had collected, while the banker was to make a statement of accounts. δ τραπεζίτης is probably to be supplied at the end of l. 39, but εκ τοῦ της is too long for the lacuna at the beginning of l. 40.

46. These two letters should perhaps be placed at the end of l. 28; cf. note on l. 2.

47-8. The recto of this fragment is blank.
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30. Judicial Summons. Fr. (d) 9·4 X 10·6 cm. B.c. 300–271.

This papyrus affords a specimen of a formal summons (ἐγκλημα) served by a plaintiff in a civil process upon his adversary. A longer but less well preserved example has lately been published in P. Petrie III. 21 (g). 12–35, where the same characteristic formulae appear; and the two documents well illustrate the procedure of the time in the preliminary stages of an action at law.

The papyrus is in four fragments which refer to more than one suit. The summons contained on Fr. (d) is complete in itself, and lacks only a few letters at the beginnings of the lines. The three smaller pieces are however certainly in the same hand, and probably came from the upper part of the same sheet. The document is therefore a copy of the original summonses actually presented, though the claimant, whose name is lost, may have been the same person in both cases. Both were actions for recovery of a debt, and in both the plaintiff and defendant belonged to the same military troop. In Fr. (a) the debt was 330 drachmae, in (d), the more complete specimen, principal and interest amounted to 1050 drachmae. A declaration is first given of the fact of the debt, and that applications for payment had been fruitless; then comes a formal announcement of the institution of judicial proceedings (διὸ διάδοξα ἐν τοῖς, cf. P. Petrie, ibid., l. 27), and a statement of the sums involved, followed by the names of the witnesses to the summons (ἐλητροπεῖς), who are two in number according to the usual Attic practice. At the end is the date and a notification concerning the court at which proceedings were to be instituted. Precisely the same scheme, except that the witnesses are placed last, is followed in the Petrie papyrus, where the point at issue was not a debt, but, apparently, an assault. The constitution of the court was in that instance a board of nine dicipasts under a president, and may have been the same here. The papyrus is written in a small neat hand of a decidedly early type. The fact that the gods Adelphoi were not yet associated with Alexander shows that the year is prior to the 15th of Philadelpus (cf. θθ, introd., and p. 368); and the reign may even have been that of Soter.

Fr. (a).

] Μαξ[εδων] τῶν Ἀλεξ[άνδρου

Fr. (d).

] 11 20
... decurion of the troop of Alexander to Perdiccas, Macedonian of the troop of Alexander. I give you notice that you owe me by a contract ... drachmae, for which Antigonus son of Limnaeus is surety, and that notwithstanding frequent demands from me you do not repay this sum nor were willing to acknowledge the debt to the collector; I therefore am taking legal proceedings against you for principal and interest amounting to 1050 drachmae; the assessment of damages is 1050 drachmae. Witnesses
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of the summons: [.]caphusius, Coan, private of the troop of Alexander, and ... laus son of Menon, Thracian of the Epigone.

The ... year, in the priesthood of Philiscus son of Spoudaeus, the 14th of the month... The case will be drawn up against you in the court at Heracleopolis in the presence of . . . (Signed) Through Epimenes.'

1. There are traces of ink near the edge of the papyrus; but the document really begins with l. 2.

5. κατὰ συγγραφὴν: cf. l. 15. Smyly is, we think, wrong in interpreting κατὰ συγγραφὴν ἰμαλογιας in P. Petrie III. 21 (δ) as an agreement of the parties ratified by the court (p. 43). κατὰ συγγραφὴν there, as here, probably refers to the contract out of which the case arose. There is nothing to show that 21 (δ) concerns an action for assault; αὐστασ (κ?) in l. 11, if μετὰ κυρίου is right, must be a feminine proper name.

13. ἐπεισόδιον: cf. 96. 21, &c. This military title has not previously been found written out in full, though it can now be recognized in P. Petrie III. 54 a. (4) 5 and 114. 1, where l. δ(κακίκος). δεκακαὶ φιλακτιῶν occur in the second century in P. Tebt. 27. 31, and a δεκακαὶ in P. Tebt. 251. Other military titles mentioned in this volume in connexion with the Greek settlers are λογαγός (81. 7, 15), πλάξις (105. 3), ἵγεμῶν (44. 2), all of which are familiar from the Petrie papyri, ἰδιότης (30. 21, 89. 7, &c.), which is not used elsewhere in papyri to denote a military rank, and a new (?) title of which the plural ends in ἱους (96. 13). τῶν (in 110. 72 τῶν πρώτων), followed by the name of the captain of the particular troop, is added in many instances, sometimes preceding the word denoting rank, sometimes following it, as is more usually the case in the Petrie papyri. The absence of the title κληροχῦς in the Heracleopolite and Oxyrhynchite papyri from Hibeh (the κληρούχος in 82. 16 were in the Fayum), and the comparative rarity of the titles ἐκαστόναρχος, ὑδορεόνταρχος, &c., afford another point of contrast with the Petrie papyri. ἰδιότης serves to distinguish the lowest rank of military settlers from that of 'decurion' (δεκακαὶ) and of higher officers such as the λογαγός, πλάξις, and χλαρχος. This use of the term anticipates our technical military sense of 'private'; cf. Xen. Anab. i. 3. 11, where ἰδιότης is contrasted with στρατηγός. λειτουργός in 96. 14 and 31 probably has no military signification; cf. note ad loc.

15. The title of Perdiccas, e.g. [ἰδιότη], may have stood in the lacuna, but the syntax is improved by supplying some verb like δῆλον.

19-20. ἄργαν [καὶ τύρων]: cf. 92. 15-16. The τίμημα demanded seems to be additional to the sum due on account of the actual loan, and represents the penalty which was no doubt provided by the contract in case of non-payment. To suppose that this penalty was equal to the amount of the debt accords with other evidence for this early period; cf. 84 (a), 9 and note on 88. 13.

21. [κλήτορας]: cf. P. Petrie III. 21 (g.), 34.

22. The space below this line is slightly wider than elsewhere, but there was probably nothing between ἐπίγαγης and the date.

24-5. The publication of the details of the charge at the court before which it came was part of the normal procedure at Athens. For [ἔφωτον cf. P. Petrie III. 21 (g.), 34, where ἔφωτη (or ἔφωτον ?) is to be read.

26. ἐκελευον: cf. P. Petrie III. 21 (δ), 5, where, however, the reference is equally obscure.
31. **Abstract of a Case for Trial.**

Mummy 5. Breadth 17.7 cm. About B.C. 270.

The contents of this papyrus are a short summary of the details of a judicial suit, but owing to lacunae and the involved construction the situation is not easy to grasp. The text, according to a common custom at this period (cf. 38, &c.), is given in duplicate, and nothing is lost above l. 1 or below l. 23; but there is a gap in the middle, and unfortunately the commencement is defective in both copies. Thrason and Pasis, the parties in the case, seem each to have accused the other of having lost 7 jars of wine from a store-place which had been leased by the owner Pasis. Affidavits were entered on both sides, and evidence was given that the store had been opened. The nature of the judgement, if indeed a judgement is recorded by the papyrus at all, depends upon the view taken of a mutilated passage, but there is reason to think that Pasis was condemned to pay compensation to Thrason to the extent of 56 drachmae; cf. note on ll. 6–7.

The papyrus is written in a rather large clear cursive, and is unlikely to be later than the first half of the reign of Philadelphus. The mummy from which it came produced also 84 (a) and 97, the earliest dated documents in this volume.

Fr. (a).

```
[ 23 letters ] Θράσος[ον] προ[. . ]
[ 22 " ] ων αυτῶν [. . ]
διακο[σ . . . . . . ] . . [ο]μένον Θράσος[ος]
τον δραχμαν καὶ Π[άντων δόντων ἀνομίας[ον]
5 Θράσος[ος] ἀπολογικόν[α] ἐκ τοῦ ταμείου
οὔνομ κεράμια [ ᾧ ] ποδοῦναι . . . . .
σιν ό τῶν ἐπτὰ κεραμίων τιμὴν ὡς εξὶ η̄ (δραχμαν),
/ (δραχμαὶ) ν Según ένεκάλεσεν ἀ[πολογικόν] [αὶ]
ἐκ τοῦ ταμείου ὡς ἐξεμ[ποίο]σεν Πάσις (προσ-
10 μαρτυρήσαντος Διονυσίου Ἀρσενιαδίου
[Nεκάρχ]ον ἄλλου Ἀρσενιαδίδου γεγονότα
[τὴν ἑπάνω ἦν] τ[οῦ τα]μ[αρτυρ]ήσει[ον]
```

Fr. (b).

7...α...[μένον Θράσωνος τῶν ὥρκων καὶ Πάσιτος]
15 δόντος ἀνομοῖοιμον Θράσωνα ἀπολολεκέναι ἐκ τοῦ τα[μείου οἷον] κεράμιοι μὲν
ἀ[πὸ]δούναι...[τῶν ἐπτὰ] κεραμίων τιμήν ὃς ἐξ’ ἡ (δραχμῶν), / (δραχμαῖ) ντε...

Fr. (c).

a]πεκρίνυ[το
25 ἑ[πι]π["προ

5. ἀπολολεκέναι. 9. α of πασίς corrig. from -. 12. α of ταμείου added above the line.

I. 2–12. '... having heard (?)...', after Thrason had made an oath, and after Pasis had given a contradictory declaration that Thrason had lost from the store-place 7 jars of wine, gave judgement that Pasis should pay to Thrason (?) the price of the 7 jars at the rate of 8 drachmae per jar, making 56 drachmae, which jars he accused Pasis of having lost from the store-place leased by Pasis, further testimony that the store had been opened having been given by Dionysius, Asclepiades, Nicarchus, and another Asclepiades.'

1–2. Πᾶσις.] Πᾶσιν.
4. δόντος ἀνομοῖοιμον: sc. ὥρκων. ἀνομοῖοmuos is a new compound.
6–7. For ἀ[πὸ]δο[ῦναι cf. I. 17, where ἀ[πὸ]δο[ῦναι seems almost inevitable. If ἀποδοῦναι be granted, it must depend on a finite verb which we think is to be found in ἀ[πεκρίνυ]το in Fr. (c). The first question is where this fragment is to be placed. It does not suit the end of I. 6, for it would quite fill up the line, and σω in I. 7 would be left suspended; moreover a discrepancy would result in I. 17 where the σ before α of is quite certain. Fr. (c) therefore belongs to the beginning of the document, and may be placed either in I. 1–3 or in the corresponding place of the second copy. It remains to find a suitable restoration of the words between ἀποδοῦναι and τῶν, upon which the interpretation of the document largely depends. σω at the beginning of I. 7, if right, can hardly be anything but a place-name; in I. 17, however, the letter before τῶν is not ο but almost certainly τ. This might no doubt be explained as an iota adscript which in I. 7 was omitted; but in view of the other inaccuracies on the part of this scribe we are disposed to expect a more
serious error, and suggest that σωμ is a slip of the pen for σωμ, i.e. Θράσωμ. [ναι in l. 17 will then of course be Πάνω and Πάνω Θράσωμ just fits the length of the lacunae in both copies. If this rather bold solution is correct, ἀπεκρίνομεν (or ῥατοῖ?) ἄπω καὶ ἄπων will be the verdict and not a statement by one of the parties, a view which is supported by διακοίτισσα (?) in l. 3.

8. If the interpretation proposed in the previous note be on the right lines, the subject of ἐνεκάλεσεν should be Thrason; for it would be hardly reasonable to make Pasis pay Thrason if Pasis had himself incurred the loss. The rate here fixed, 8 drachmae for a κεράμον, is just equivalent to the highest price found for a κεράμον in the Tebtunis papyri (4000 dr., P. Tebt. 253) if the ratio of the values of silver and copper drachmae be taken as 1 : 500. But prices of κεράμον are deceptive; cf. P. Tebt. 113. 36, note.

10. Διονυσίου is omitted in the second copy, l. 21.

### 32. SEQUESTRATION OF PROPERTY. [ειγη]

34.5 x 12 cm.  
B.C. 246 (245).

The purport of this document, which concerns the sequestration of sheep belonging to a military settler, is somewhat obscure owing to the mutilation of the chief verb in l. 4. If our interpretation is correct, the papyrus records the sequestration by Heraclitus, an Alexandrian citizen, of 38 sheep, the property of Neoptolemus, a Macedonian settler, who had been condemned by default to pay a fine for an act of βῆβας committed against Heraclitus. The relation of the last four lines, which are dated a week later, to the main text is uncertain. The writing is a large, handsome cursive; the second year no doubt refers to Euergetes.

(‘Ενους) β Δίων κε, διὰ Τηλε-
μάχον. Ἦρακλείτος Ἡρ[ακλεί-
tου Ἐκτορέιον τῶν οὐτῳ

Τεί π. 14 276  
[ἐ]πηγμένων παρέδεχεται; εἰς; ν ἔτη

5 ὑπάρχοντα Νεοπτολέμου
Μακεδόνος ἧδητον τῶν
Ἀντίχου πρὸς καταδι-
κὴν ἔρημον βῆβεως
πρὸς (δραχμᾶς) σ καὶ τοῦ ἐπιδε-

10 κατον (δραχμᾶς) κ πρόβατα λη,

/ ἔρις[ε]νες η, ἄρνες ἱγ,

ὑποδιφέρα ἡμίκουρ' ἡ.
On the verso

'... (Title) Pledge.'

1. Δίον Κέ: this day probably corresponded to some date in Choiak at this period; cf. App. i.

2. Καστόρειος κ.π.λ.: the formula in the Petrie papyri is fuller, e.g. III. 11. 27 'Αλέξαν-

3. δρέως τὴς ἐπιγονῆς τῶν ὄνων ἐπημένων εἰς δήμον Καστόρειον.

4. If παρεδέχαστο is right, there is hardly room for τά after it.

5. ἐπιδέκαστο: this is a clear instance of the use of that term, which occurs also in

92. 19, for an 'extra tenth,' not '13°.' Probably there is a connexion between these

ἐπιδέκαστα and the ἐπιδέκασταν which, according to an ordinance of (probably) Philadelphus

preserved in P. Amb. 33. 28–37, was to be levied twice over from advocates who had

pleaded in προσωπική κρίσεις to the detriment of the State revenues. The fine there levied

upon the advocates would seem to be twice the ἐπιδέκασταν levied upon their clients. But

the interpretation of the ἐπιδέκασταν in P. Amb. 33 is still very obscure.


14. [Ἀράβιον: cf. 36. 6 Ἀράβιον. νόδα in l. 15 probably means a mixture of the two

breds.


19. Probably nothing is lost after ἐπιγονής.
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33. Property-Return of Sheep.

Mummy A. 11.6 x 8.2 cm. b.c. 245 (244).

An ἀπογραφὴ of sheep, drawn up by a military settler; cf. P. Petrie III. 72 (b). Like the property-return in P. Petrie II. p. 33, 33 omits any mention of the official addressed, and the formula begins with ἀπογραφὴ instead of ἀπογράφομαι. P. Petrie III. 72 (b) is addressed in duplicate to the oeconomus and topogrammateus, and 33 is also apparently in duplicate; but it is unlikely that the two copies were intended for different officials, since the practice of writing documents twice over on the same papyrus is common at this period, e.g. 36–7.

The papyrus was written in a cursive hand; the second year might refer to Philadelphus' reign, though more probably that of Euergetes is meant.

["Ετους β Παμενώτ.] ἀπο-
[γραφὴ λείας . . .] τ. τ.
[. . . εἰς τὸ τρίτον] ἐ-
5 Θρακὸς ἱδιῶτον τῶν Λε-
τού. ὑπάρχει μοι πρόβασι-
τα ἴδια ἐν κόμη Ψε-
πθονέμβη τοῦ Κωεῖτ[ο]ν
ὀγθόνκοντα.

10 (ἐτους) β Παμενώτ. ἀπογρα-
φὴ λείας εἰς τὸ τρίτον ἐ-
τος παρ Αρομησίου Θρα-
κὸς ἱδιῶτον τῶν Λετοῦ.
ὑπάρχει μοι [πρόβασι ἴδια
15 [ἐν] [κόμη][] [Ψεπθονέμβη]
[τοῦ Κωεῖτον ὀγθονκόν]τα.

6. τοῦ corr. from τοῦ.
'The 2nd year, Phamenoth. Return of a flock (?) for the third year from Aroimeotes, Thracian, a private of Aetus' troop. I own eighty sheep as my private property at the village of Psephonembe in the Koite district.'

2. The sense of λεία here is obscure. For the word at this period in reference to sheep cf. P. Petrie III. 111. 8 φυλακτικόν λεία προβάτων, and 112 (a), 11, &c., where the φυλ. λεία is contrasted with the φυλ. ἰερεῖον, i.e. animals destined for sacrifice. In those instances, as here, the λεία of sheep occurs in connexion with military settlers, and it would be possible to suppose that they had received from the state a grant of sheep either taken as plunder or in lieu of plunder. But λεία occurs in Frs. (1), (3), and (6) of Rev. Laws in connexion with the ἐνόμον, or tax for the use of the royal pastures (cf. 52, introd.); and it seems probable that in reference to sheep the word had lost the connotation of plunder, though it is noticeable that λεία has its ordinary sense in 62. 4, and P. Petrie III. 28 (c). verso 3, and (apparently, though the context is not quite clear) 64 (c). 11-2. The vestiges at the end of the line do not suit any part of προβάτων, and the word, whatever it was, did not recur in l. 11. Perhaps there was a dittography or some other mistake.

34. Petition to the King. Breadth 32 cm. B.C. 243-2.

A petition to Ptolemy (Euergetes) from Antigonus, probably a phylacites, complaining that Patron, the archiphylacites of the lower toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome, had prevented him from carrying out his duties, and asking for redress. 78 is a letter from Antigonus on the same subject to Dorion, the epistates. Both documents are mutilated; but they supplement each other, and the sequence of events is clear. Callidromus, a Cyrenean settler, had obtained unlawful possession of a donkey belonging to a certain Dorion, and Antigonus has been directed by Dorion the epistates to compel Callidromus either to restore the animal to its owner or to pay its value. Antigonus accordingly arrested Callidromus and lodged him in a prison at the village of Sinaru. Patron then intervened, and not only released Callidromus from prison but himself took possession of the donkey (78. 13-4).

The most interesting feature of these two documents is their illustration of the practice of personal execution, and their references to the edict (διάγραμμα) authorizing it. According to Diod. Sic. i. 79, execution on the person of a debtor was abolished in Egypt by Bocchoris in the eighth century; but it was re-introduced under the Ptolemies and, as we now know, quite early in their regime; cf. P. Petrie II. 21 (a). 15. Wenger's inference from P. Amh. 43. 12 sqq. (B.C. 173), ἡ πράξεις ἔστω ... πράσσωτι κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα καὶ τοῦς νόμους, that the date of the διάγραμμα was probably not far removed from that of the Amherst
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papyrus (Archiv, II. 53), thus proves to be mistaken. Personal execution being a common institution in the Greek world (Mitteis, Reichsrecht u. Volksrecht, p. 446), its reappearance in Egypt is likely enough to have followed close upon the establishment of the Ptolemaic dynasty.

The papyrus is a good deal broken, and the ink in the lower lines of the first fragment is very faint and blurred. The frequent corrections show that this document, like 73, is only a rough draft. The writing (which is across the fibres) gradually becomes more cursive as it proceeds.

Frs. (a) and (b).
1 [Βασιλε] Πτολεμαίων χαίρειν. Ἀντίγονος ἀδικοῦμαί ὑπὸ Πάτρων τοῦ [φυλα]κτε[δ]οντος τὴν κάτω τοπαρχίαν. ἐμοῦ γὰρ ἀπαγα-

2 [γόνος Καλλιδρόμου Καλλικράτους Κυρηναῖον τῆς ἐπιγονῆς εἰς τὸ ἐν
Μεσίρι καὶ
Σινά[π] ἀρωτήτῳ κατὰ πρόσταγμα Δωρίους τοῦ ἐπισ-

3 [τάτου . . . . . . ] ἐν ὧν ἔγερσα ποταμοῖς ἐπαναγιάζσαι τὸν Καλλιδρόμου ὅ τὸ

4 [. . . . . Πάτρων] οὐθένα λόγον ποιησάμενος τῇ[ν τ]ε Ἐκαλ[νδρόμου


5 [. . . . . . . Καλ[ν]δρόμου [. . . . .] . θ[α[ . . . . . τ . . . [ . . [20 letters ]]

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

6 [. . . . . . Πάτρων] οὐθένα λόγον ποιησάμενος τῇ[ν τ]ε Ἐκαλ[ν]δρόμου


. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

7 προστάζει γράψαι Ξενοκράτη τῷ πράκτορι τῶν ἰδιωτικῶν ἐπειδῆ Πάτρων

παρὰ τὰ διαγράμματα

8 ἢ[ε]γήγαγε τῷ[ν ἀνθρωπον ἐκ τοῦ ἀρωτήτῳ ἓνα μὴ ἡ πράξεις [[γεννηθι

συντελε-

ηθὶ ἐκ του σωματος]] πράξει α[γνόν ]

[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

9 [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

10 [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

]] ἢ[ε]γήγαγε[[αγν]] ἄνευ ἡμῶν τῶν Πάτρων ἑξαγγυχότα τῶν [ἀνθρωπον
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11 τὸ ἀργυροῦν κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα ἣν [διὰ σὲ βασιλεὺν] διὰ σὲ βασιλεὺ τοῦ δικαίου τύχω.

12 γράφειτος ἀλλὰ ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ δ (έτους) Φαμοῦθε ιβ επ[ traces of I line. ]

Fr. (c). Fr. (d).

14 . ai ἐπαναγκασ[ ]

[τον καὶ τι]

[α βαφάνια ἐδω . []

]. μὴ κομισαί]

[τρόπων ἡθυνάμην τὰ τοῦ]

Fr. (e).

20 . γ[

δκ]σμο[Bημι

10. First a of ἐδοξηγοχείᾳ corr. from η.

Il. 1–4. 'To King Ptolemy, greeting. I, Antigonus, am unjustly treated by Patron the phylacites of the lower toparchy. For when I had removed Callidromus son of Callicrates, a Cyrenean of the Epigone, in Mecheir 25 of the 4th year to the prison at Sinaru in accordance with an order of Dorion the epistates, wherein it was written that I should either compel Callidromus to restore the donkey to its owner or else its value, 20 drachmae, Patron paying no heed to this released Callidromus from the prison at Sinaru . . .'

I. χαίρειν. 'Αντίγονος κ.τ.λ.: we prefer this method of punctuation, which has been adopted by the editors of the Magdola papyri, to that still supported by Wilcken (Archiv, III. p. 308) according to which the full stop is placed after the name of the petitioner. The formula gains nothing in respectfulness by the mere transposition of χαίρειν and the name, but it does distinctly so gain if the name is kept out of the salutation altogether. Cf. 35. 1–2, where the punctuation after χαίρειν is indicated by the division of the lines, and the new Magdola papyrus in Mélanges Nicole, pp. 281 sqq., with the editors' note.

[φυλακτοφύλαστος: in 73. 10 Patron is called the ἄρχωφυλακίτης of the lower toparchy. At this period therefore the ἄρχωφυλακίτης might be much more than a mere village official, which he sometimes certainly was in the second century B.C.; cf. P. Tebt. 43. 9. He was, however, subordinate to the ἐπιστάτης (φυλακτῶν), as 73. 19 shows. If ἄρχωφυλακίτης is to be restored in P. Petrie III. 130 ἐπιστάτης φυλακτῶν καὶ ἄρχ[ the two offices were sometimes combined in one person. The note on P. Tebt. 5. 159 requires modification in the light of the new evidence.]
2. *Συνέρων*: the reference to Τακών in 73. 14 as well as to the lower toparchy (cf. e.g. 52. 4) proves that this is the Oxyrhynchite Sinaru (P. Oxy. 373, &c.) rather than the Heracleopolite (p. 8).

4. *ἐπτάγατον* is supplied from l. 10 and 73. 11. If *δοσι* is right the line may have continued *μὴ δύνασθαι*, as in 73. 12.

5. The latter part of this line is puzzling; *Ἀσπένθων* does not seem admissible. The interlinear insertion may have been something like *διδοὺς αὐτὸν εἰναὶ τοῦ μὴ πρῶτον με δύνασθαι αὐτὸν ἐπαναγκάσθαι τὸ ὑποζύγιον ἀποδοῦναι* (cf. 73. 18–9); but the papyrus is here so much damaged that verification of the reading is hardly possible.

6 sqq. The position of this fragment in relation to that preceding is unknown, but the gap between them is unlikely to be large. If the fragment be so placed that the lacuna at the beginning of ll. 6–9 coincides with that in ll. 1–4, the loss at the ends would amount to about 20 letters.

7. πράκτορος τῶν ἰδιωτικῶν: this is the first occurrence of this title which is a natural antithesis to the πράκτορος ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν προσώπων τεταγμένος in P. Petrie II. 22. 15. The relation of the πράκτορος ἰδιωτικῶν to the πράκτορος ξενικῶν, who is also found in the third century B.C. (ξενικὸς πράκτορος, P. Magd. 41. 5), remains doubtful. The πράκτορος ξενικῶν certainly collected private debts, but he may have been distinguished from the πράκτοροι ἰδιωτικῶν by dealing with a special class of debtors; cf. P. Tebt. 5. 221, note. His peculiar functions, however, have not yet been clearly ascertained.

Above σ of τῶν is what appears to be a large γ, to which we can attach no meaning.

8–10. This passage apparently implies that according to the provisions of the διάγραμμα a person who prevented or obstructed an execution was liable for three times the amount of the debt. At the beginning of l. 10 ἀπὸ δεξιῶν might possibly be read.

9. The letters added above ἀλλα are coarsely written and imperfectly preserved. They are not more intelligible than the γ above l. 7.

12 sqq. There are clear indications of another line where the papyrus breaks off below l. 12, and the similarity of handwriting and phraseology (ἐπαναγκάσθαι; cf. l. 3) strongly suggests that Frs. (c) and (d) belong to the lower part of the petition. But Fr. (c) must be placed below l. 12, for there is a selis between ll. 15 and 16, which does not occur in Frs. (a) and (b). Whether Fr. (d), containing ll. 17–9, also belongs to 34 is more doubtful. ραβάνα seems irrelevant, but we are ignorant of the context and the hand is extremely similar. Line 19 was the last of the document.

35. Petition of Hieroduli.

Mummy A. 

11.5 x 8.6 cm. About B.C. 250.

This papyrus contains on the recto the beginning of a petition addressed to Sonnophris, no doubt an official, by the ἱερόδουλοι of a temple of Θεόρης, reminding him of the protection which he had previously afforded them in connexion with the collection of the temple revenues, and apparently complaining of the conduct of a comarch; but the papyrus breaks off before the point of the letter is reached. On the verso is a partly effaced document in 7 lines.
written in a large, thick cursive hand of an early type. The petition is to be assigned to the latter part of the reign of Philadelphus.

Σοῦνώφρει χαίρ[-ειν.]
Πετοσίρις Ποκώτος καὶ Ὄννώ-
φρεις Πετήσιος ἱερόδουλοι Θυή-
ριος μεγάλης καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ

5 ἱερόδουλοι διατελε[τ]μεν
τοὺς φόρους εὐτακτῶντες
eἰς τὸ ἱερὸν διὰ τὴν παρ’ ὑμῶν
σκέ[πτη]ν, καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τοῖς
ἐμπροσθε χρόνοις ὑπὸ ὑ-

10 [μῶν] σκεπαθόμεθ' θα.
ἐπεὶ Πετοσίρις ὁ κομαρχῶν
[11 letters ]αν πάντας
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.

'To Sonnophris, greeting. We, Petosiris son of Pokoís, Onnophris son of Petesis, hieroduli of the great Thoëris, and the rest of the hieroduli, have long administered with regularity the revenues of the temple on account of your protection, and now as in former times we are protected by you. Whereas Petosiris the comarch . . .'

1–2. For the punctuation adopted cf. 34. 1, note. We have found no other instance of the occurrence of the name Σοῦνώφρος, and the initial letter is not quite certain, the middle part having disappeared. The ink representing the two ends of the supposed Σ might perhaps be regarded as accidental, but if so l. 1 was begun further to the right than the lines following.

3. Θυήριος: perhaps the temple of Thoëris at Oxyrhynchus, known from P. Oxy. 43, verso iv. 13, is meant.

5–6. That the ἱερόδουλοι were particularly concerned with collecting the revenues of the temples is a new fact. Very little is known about their position; the title ἱερόδουλος is applied to the Twins at the Serapeum, and in P. Tebt. 6. 25 the ἱερόδουλοι are distinguished from the κατὰ μίσος ἰδιν of the regular priests, from which passage Otto (Priester und Tempel, i. p. 118 1) infers that the word was applied to the lower branches in general of the priesthood.


A notice of the loss of a sheep, addressed in duplicate to Harmiusis the φυλακής of Talaē in the 19th year of, probably, Euergetes. Cf. 144, a fragment of another notice addressed to Harmiusis, 37, which is also
in duplicate, and P. Petrie II. p. 33 (= III. p. x). The text, written in a large rude semi-uncial, is on the verso; the recto has a few traces of obliterated writing.

(Ἐτοὺς) ὑδ᾽ Ὑσύτ β. προσαγγέλ-λει Ἀρμύστι φιλακίτι. Ταλέος Σάτοκος ἀπο-λωλεκέναι ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς
5 νυκτὸς πρόβατον θηλυν δασὺ Ἀράβιον ἄξιον (δραχμῶν) η.

(Ἐτοὺς) ὑδ᾽ Ὑσύτ β. προσαγγέλλει 
 Ἀρμύστι φιλακίτι Τάλη
Σάτοκος ἀπολωλεκέναι
10 ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς νυκτὸς πρόβατον θηλυν Ἀράβιον
dasu áxiou (drachmów) η.

'The 19th year, Thoth 2. Satokos announces to Harmiusis, the guard of Talaë, that he has lost from the pen at night an unshorn ewe of Arabian breed, worth 8 drachmae.'

3. Ταλέος: for this form of the genitive cf. 37. 4. The genitive Ταλάως occurs in 157 and Τάλη in 1. 8, 144, and again in Roman times (p. 8), and the dative Τάλη(?) in 117. 8, while Ταλά is the form used in the more correctly written papyri 106-7 and 186-142. The accusative Ταλάνυ and dative Ταλάνι are found in 75. 1 and 5. This village, which was in the Δοκτῆ τόπος, is to be distinguished from Ταλανω (55. 2) in the Oxyrhynchite nome.


37. NOTICE OF LOSS.

Mummy A (probably A 9). 11.6 x 10 cm. b.c. 235 (234).

Notification to the φιλακίτης of Talaë of the loss of two goats; cf. the preceding papyrus. The hand is of a similar type to that of 36, and is probably to be referred to the reign of Euergetes, but the year is very uncertain.

(Ἐτοὺς) [ἰ]β [μηνὸς Φαρμοβθ[η] η. προσα[γ]γέλλει Στράτιος Στράτω-
vos Θραίς τής ἐπιγονής Πτολεμαίων φυλακή τῆς Κάλαρσ Ταλέους
5 ἀπολογικὰναι νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ
Ἡρακλείτου κλῆρῳ αἰγάς δασεῖς
dύο ἐρῶνα καὶ βέλεαν δὸν τεῖμι
μὴ δραχμαί τέτταρας.

(ἐτός) ἦ Μ[η]νός Φαρμοῦ.ῃ. προσ
10 αγγέλε: Στράτιος Στράτωνος
Θραίς τής ἐπιγονής Πτολεμαίων
ὁ [ν]υκτὸς κόμης Ταλέους
ἀγάς διαλογικὸν νυκτὸς
[ἐν τῷ Ἡρακλέιτου κλῆρῳ
15 αἰγάς] δασεῖς δύο ἐρῶνα
καὶ βέλεαν δὸν τιμὴ βραχμαί
tέτταρας.

5. 1. ἀπολογικὰναι. 7. 1. βέλεαν.

‘The 12th year, the 8th of the month Pharmouthi. Stratius son of Straton, Thracian
of the Epigone, announces to Ptolemaeus, guard of the village of Talaï, that he has lost
at night-time in the holding of Heraclitus two thick-haired goats, a male and a female,
worth 4 drachmæ.’

4. Ταλέους: cf. 38. 3. note.

38. DECLARATION ON OATH.

P. Enl. G. 5147, c. 4 x 3 x 2 cm. 257; p. 151, l. 11, 14. 17, 24. 26. 27, 31, 43. 44. 45. 46.
Mummy A. 25·6 x 21·6 cm. B.C. 252-1 (251-0).

A declaration on oath concerning a shipwreck, probably made by the
captain of one of the government transports; cf. P. Magd. 11 (of which P. Magd. 37
is the beginning), a petition to the king by a ναῦκληρος of one of these boats,
who had been delayed by a storm off Aphroditopolis (Atfih), near the scene of
the disaster which is the subject of 38.

Below the oath are 5 more lines, and 9 or 10 narrow lines have been added in
the right-hand margin, which are too incomplete for continuous decipherment,
but conclude with the date, the 34th year (of Philadelphus). The writing is extremely cursive.

[15 letters] αποδω[  
τημιργ. .] [. . . . . . . . ευην ἥξιωσ.  
αὐτῶν συγ(γ)ράψαι αὐτ[. . . . . . . . μω̣ . . . . . α  
ἀνέλαβεν μὲ καὶ συνκαταπλῆξ τοῦτος  
5 [ἐ]ρω τὸν πόρον τῷ κατὰ τὸν ὄρμον τὸν  
Ἀφροδιτοπολίτην, ἀνέμου δὲ γενομένου  
καὶ τῶν συρίων ὑπὲρ τὴν σκηνὴν φύσιν  
συνέβη κλέιναι τὸν δεξιὸν τοῖχον τοῦ  
πλοίου καὶ καταδύναι τὸ πλοίον διὰ  
10 [τ]ούτο.  
ὀμνῶ δὲ βασιλεά Πτολεμαίον καὶ  
καὶ θεός Σωτήρας τοῦς τοῦτον  
γον[ε]ῖς εἶναι τὰ προγεγραμμένα  
15 [ἀ]ληθῆ.

', 'and I sailed down with them as far as the channel by the harbour of Aphroditopolis; but a wind having arisen and the Syrian cloths being above the cabin, it came about that the right side of the ship listed and the ship thereby sank. And I swear by king Ptolemy and Arsinoe Philadelphus, gods Adelphi, and by the gods Soteres their parents, that the aforesaid statements are correct.'

5. τὸν ὄρμον τὸν Ἀφροδιτοπολίτην: the site of Aphroditopolis is only 1½ miles from the Nile, and its port does not seem to have borne a separate name of its own. P. Magd. 37. 1 has γενομένου χειρῶν [περὶ] Ἀφροδιτής ποῖ[=os. The ὄρμος τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου mentioned in I. 4 of that papyrus is probably, as the editors remark, Ptolemais ὄρμον.

7. συρίων: cf. 51. 3, note. Apparently they were piled up on deck above the level of the cabin.

13. The gods Soteres are also mentioned in another βασιλεάς ὄρμος written in the 34th year (unpublished), of which only the ends of lines are preserved; but they are omitted (apparently) in P. Petrie III. 56 (a). 4 (16th—27th years) and 56 (b). 7 (after the 26th year). In 56 (a). 3, where the editor restores (ὃμων) βασιλεὰ Πτολεμαίων καὶ τὸν νῦν Πτολεμαίων, we should prefer βασιλεὰ Πτολεμαίων preceded either by a title of the person taking the oath or by a name in the dative; cf. 56 (b). 5. The deification of Soter and Berenice took place in the earlier part of Philadelphus’ reign, but the year is not known. Otto (Priester und Tempel, i. pp. 143–6) places it between the 7th and 15th years.
A letter authorizing the embarkation upon a government transport of a quantity of corn, which was due from certain κλήρου. Xanthus and Euphranor, the two principals here concerned, recur in 100 and the latter also in 101, and on the analogy of those two documents the corn which is the subject of the present order is no doubt to be explained as rent. It is evident that the government frequently resumed possession of land which had been granted to military settlers, after whose names it nevertheless continued to be called; cf. 81 and 52. 26, note. The official status of Xanthus and Euphranor is not given, but they must both have been connected with the State granaries. The corn was apparently delivered in the first instance to Euphranor and was forwarded by him to Xanthus, who was of superior rank and probably occupied a position similar to that of Semnus in 101. As that document is the latest of the series it is even possible that Semnus was Xanthus’ successor. The mention of the village of Peroë in 84 (a), 7 indicates that the district both here and in 100–1, which came from the same mummy as 84 (a), was the Κωίνης.

Εὐφράνωρι
χαίρειν. σύνταξον
μετήσαι διὰ Κηλλέ-
οны Ὀμοί εἰς κοντω-
τὸν βασιλικὸν ἕφ’ ὁδ’ ναύκληρος
καὶ κυβερνήτης αὐτ-
τοῦ Ὀμοί τὸν ἐπιτε-
παγμένον σίτου
[τῷ] Ἀλέξανδρου
καὶ Βρομένου κλήρων
καὶ Νικοστράτου καὶ
Παναγιάν, σύμβολου
[δὲ] ὑμῖν γραφαίσθω
[Κ]λῆς ἢ ὁ ναύκληρος
[θ’ω, καὶ ἡμῖν ἀνενέγκατε.
ἐρρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) κα
Θωδὸ 1.

On the verso

Edphróamor.

5. βασιλικὸν above the line.
Xanthus to Euphranor, greeting. Give orders for the delivery through Killes to Horus on the State barge, of which the master and pilot is the said Horus, of the corn levied upon the holding of Alexander and Bromenus and Nicostratus and Pausanias; and let Killes or the ship-master write you a receipt and seal a sample, and bring them to me. Good-bye. The 21st year, Thoth 1. (Addressed) To Euphranor.

3. Killes was perhaps παρὰ τῶν βασιλικῶν γραμματέων, like Nechthembes in 98. 10.
15. Cf. 98. 12. The object was of course to prevent the corn from being tampered with during its transit.

40. LETTER OF POLEMON TO HARIMOUTHES.

Mummy 13. 32·7 x 11 cm. b.c. 261 (260).

This letter is one of a group (40-4) addressed to Harimouthes, who in 44. 9-10 is called the toparch of the lower toparchy (i.e. of the Oxyrhynchite nome), while in 85. 10, written like 40-3 several years earlier than 44, he is described as nomarch. Unless we are to assume that one of these descriptions is incorrect, or that the Harimouthes in 85 is a different person, it must be concluded either that Harimouthes combined the two offices of nomarch and toparch, or, what is the more natural inference, that he was first one and then the other, which suggests that the office of toparch was the superior. In Rev. Laws, however, the nomarch is regularly given precedence (cf. e.g. xxxvii. 3), though the passage in xli. 16-7 τῶν προεστηκότι τοῦ νομοῦ νομάρχης ἀπο τοπάρχης suggests that their functions differed little. Cf. note on P. Tebt. 61 (8). 46. The present letter and 41 are both from Polemon, whose position is not stated but was apparently above that of Harimouthes. He here writes somewhat obscurely about the sale of some barley.

The correspondence of Harimouthes, as is shown by 44. 9 and 85. 3, belongs to the latter part of the reign of Philadelphus.
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41. LETTER OF POLEMON TO HARIMOUTHES.

Another letter to Harimouthes from Polemon, notifying him of the arrival of Mnason, a ὀδοκιμαστής, who was to collect certain arrears and sell some oil. Harimouthes is directed to obtain security for Mnason to the value of 1000 drachmæ, and to assist him in the performance of his duties. The nature of the arrears in question is not stated, but very likely they too were connected with the oil-monopoly, and it is evident that Mnason was personally responsible. In other papyri in this volume the ὀδοκιμαστής is closely associated with the τραπεζίτης (cf. 108, introd.), but he appears here in a somewhat different capacity, though still in connexion with the royal bank (l. 25).

Πολέμων Ἀριμοῦθην χαίρειν ἄπεσταλκαμεν πρὸς σὲ Ἔνασωνα [τὸν] ὀδοκιμαστήν μετὰ φυλακῆς. διεγερτὰς ὅθεν ἀυτὸν παρα- 15 εἴσαχθήναι πάντα, καὶ ἡμῖν ἐπίστευκαν ὅτι παρεῖληφας αὐτὸν παρὰ τῶν παρὰ ἡμῶν μαχίμων καὶ δὲι διεγεγυήσεις αὐτῶν

On the verso Ἀριμοῦθην.

7. μέντοι.

'Polemon to Harimouthes, greeting. I have written to Criton and Callicles about the receipts, to have your requests carried out. But you must clearly understand that for the barley no one will pay so much as 1 drachma, at which price you have agreed to supply it; for the agents of Kerkion have now obtained (a lower price?) in a memorandum from the audit office. Good-bye. The 24th year, Epeiph 21. (Addressed) To Harimouthes.'
42. Letter of Callicles to Harimouthes.

Mummy 13. 19.8 x 8.1 cm. B.C. 262 (261).

This letter and 43 were written to Harimouthes by Callicles, an official superior whose title is nowhere stated. The subject of the present, rather obscure, note is the delivery of some corn which was due from Harimouthes.

Kallicles Ἀριμοῦθηι
χαίρειν. τὸν σῖτον δὲ

'Polemon to Harimouthes, greeting. I have sent to you Mnason the controller under guard. Obtain security of 1000 drachmae for his remaining, and allow him to collect the arrears as agreed upon between us; and contribute the penalty out of your own funds. . . . Assist him also so that everything be collected, and send me word that you have received him from my soldiers and that you will obtain the security of 1000 drachmae for him; and be careful to see that the existing store of oil be now sold by him, and the price be collected and paid into the royal bank. . . (Addressed) To Harimouthes.'

4–5. διεγγύτας . . . παραμονής: cf. 92–3, which are specimens of contracts made with sureties for the appearance of accused persons. For μετὰ φιλακῆς cf. e.g. 59. 4.

6. ἀφίς is somewhat short for the space.

9–10. The arrears apparently involved a penalty upon Mnason himself; the precautions taken against his absconding show that he was in difficulties.

11. The traces suggest ὁσοὺς μὴ ὀφειλοῖς; the apparent τοῦ prevents us from reading ὁσοὺς μὴ, with which ἐπιτρέπει would have to be a middle future.

13. ἡμᾶς ἵ τι might be read at the beginning of the line.

18. For μάχαιρα in attendance upon officials cf. P. Tebt. 113. 81, &c.

21 sqq. The καὶ perhaps indicates that the ὀφειλήματα had arisen in connexion with the oil-industry. According to the provisions of Rev. Laws xlviii, the manufactured oil was sold to the retail traders by the οἰκονόμος and ἀντιγραφέως, while the δοκυμαστὴς plays no part. But that ordinance had probably not yet been issued; and in any case the appearance of the δοκυμαστής here may be due to some special circumstances.
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On the verso
2nd hand 'Athôr δ, parâ Kalliclēous peri toû sîton.
1st hand 'Arιμοῦθην.

5. i of anεννρωκαει cor. from a.
7. ν of του above the line.

'Callicles to Harimouthes, greeting. With regard to the corn which you said you would transfer to the agents of the sitologi, the amount which they have paid (?) up to Phaophi 30 we will accept; but the rest, if you do not transfer it before Athur 8, we shall give to Leucius as a debt. Good-bye. The 24th year, Athur 4. (Addressed) To Harimouthes. (Endorsed) Athur 4, from Callicrates concerning the corn.'

3. For μεταβάλλω in connexion with corn cf. 45. 6.

43. LETTER OF CALLICLE TO HARIMOUTHES.

A second letter from Callicles (cf. 42) to Harimouthes, asking for some sesame to be delivered at Pela for the manufacture of oil. As the Revenue Papyrus shows, the nomarchs and toparchs were among the officials responsible for the management of that industry, so that it is natural to find Harimouthes acting in this connexion; cf. 40, introd.

Καλλικλῆς 'Αριμοῦθη
χαίρειν. σύνταξον μετρήσαι
τὸ σήσαμον τῷ ἑμ. Πέλαι
Πρωτομάχω καὶ τοῖς σιτολόγοις, οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν
5 ἐν τῷ πόλει σήσαμον. Ἡνά όδυν

Mummy 13. 16.7 X 8.6 cm.
B.C. 261 (260).
On the verso

2nd hand (ἔτους) καὶ Ἔπειφ κ.

Kaλικλέους περὶ ση- σάμου ὡστε Πρωτομᾶχωι.

4. καὶ των στελογ' ὧν added above the line.

'Callicles to Harimouthes, greeting. Give orders for the sesame at Pela to be measured out to Protomachus and the sitologus, for there is no sesame at the city. Take care then that the oil-presses do not fall short, lest you be blamed; and send me the oil-makers. Good-bye. The 24th year, Επειφ 20. (Addressed) To Harimouthes. (Endorsed) The 24th year, Επειφ 20, from Callicles about sesame for Protomachus.'

5. τὴν πόλιν: sc. Oxyrhynchus.


44. LETTER OF DINON TO HARIMOUTHES.

Mummy 13. 12.4 × 33.3 cm. B.C. 253 (252).

A letter to Harimouthes from an official named Dinon, giving urgent orders for the native soldiers in Harimouthes' district to be sent up under a captain, and also for the dispatch of some labourers for harvesting purposes. No reason is assigned for the movement of the soldiers, and its object cannot be guessed. The document is written in a fine hand across the fibres of the papyrus.

Δεῦνον Ἄριμούθην χαίρειν. ἔγραψαμεν σοι πρότερον περὶ τῶν μαχίμων τῶν ἄντων ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ σὲ τόπως ὅπως ἀποσταλῶσιν μετὰ Βιβελμεῖνος τοῦ ἴγε- μόνος καθότι γράψῃ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ διοικητὴς, ὅστις δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἐπι- γεγρα- μένους θεριστὰς κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν σοὶ γραφὴν, ὁρᾶντες δὲ σε καταραθυ- μοῦντα

5 ώμην δειν καὶ νῦν ἐπιστειλαί σοι. ὡς ἄν ὤν λάβῃς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν πάντα πάρεργα
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ποιησάμενος ἀπόστειλον πρὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς μαχίμους ἥδη, τοὺς δὲ θεριστὰς ὡς ἄν
ἐτοίμους ποιήσης ἐπίστειλον ἡμῖν· οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἐτυχεῖν περὶ τούτων τὴν
σπουδὴν
ποιεῖται ὁ διοικητὴς. ἔρρωσο. (ἔτους) λβ Μεχιρ ἱγ.

On the verso

τοπάρχη (in demotic) 'Ἀμιούθη
10 τῆς κάτω Μεχείρ 14

In the reverse direction, above 'Ἀμιούθη,

2nd hand Μεχιρ ἱδ,

περὶ μαχίμων
καὶ θεριστῶν.

1. ν of τον corr. from μ.  2. αι of βιβλεμένως corr. from η.  3. σε was inserted
above και and again crossed out.  4. σε added above the line.  9. τοπάρχη
corr. from η.

'Δινον to Harimouthes, greeting. I have written to you before concerning the
native soldiers in the district under you, that they be sent with Bithelminis the captain in
compliance with the letter of Apollonius the dioecetes, and similarly that the harvesters be
sent who have been levied in accordance with the list given to you; but seeing that you
are negligent I thought it my duty to send to you instructions again now. Therefore
as soon as you receive this letter put everything else aside and send me the soldiers
at once, and so soon as you can get the harvesters ready let me know; for the dioecetes
is showing no ordinary anxiety with regard to this. Good-bye. The 32nd year, Mecheir
13. (Addressed) To Harimouthes, toparch of the lower toparchy. (Endorsed) Mecheir 14,
concerning soldiers and harvesters.'

3. This is the same Apollonius who is mentioned in 95. 10, 110. 43 al., P. Petrie II
4 (3). 1, &c. The earliest date at which he is known to have held the office of dioecetes is
the 27th year of Philadelphus (Rev. Laws xxxviii. 3; cf. P. Amh. II. 33. 28 and 37); the
latest is supplied by the present document (32nd year, Mecheir 13).

ἐπιγραμμισθεὶς indicates compulsory labour; cf. 47. 12.

45. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LYSIMACHUS.

Mummy A 16. 12-7 X 7-5 cm. b. c. 257 (256).

This and the following five documents (46-50) are all letters written by
Leodamas, an official connected with the corn-revenues, probably in the
Oxyrhynchite nome since the Oxyrhynchite village Septhta is mentioned in
45. 5. Four of the letters (45–8) are addressed to a subordinate called Lysimachus, who seems to have been specially concerned with the collection and transport of grain; and the correspondence, which covers the 28th to the 30th years of Philadelphus, consists chiefly of instructions on official matters. Leodamas was a careless writer, and mistakes are more frequent than usual at this period of comparatively correct Greek.

In 45 on reaching the bottom of the papyrus Leodamas turned it over and finished his letter on the verso; cf. 48.

Leonidas to Lysimachus, greeting. As soon as you receive this letter, come here in order to transfer the corn at Sephtha before lading . . . , and if you have collected any money bring it at once, and try to levy the rest, and do not leave any arrears; and take care that you do not leave the corn from Philon still owing from him, but secure payment of everything, and take care that on no pretext whatever you collect the . . . and horse-doctors-tax; but if you have collected anything credit it to the embankments-tax. Good-bye. The 28th year, Choiak. (Addressed) To Lysimachus.
46. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LYSIMACHUS.

Mummy A 16. 13.1 x 6.2 cm. B.C. 258 (257).

Another letter from Leodamas to Lysimachus on official matters; cf. 45, introd.

\[ \text{Δεωδάμας Λυσί-} \]
\[ \text{μάχων χαίρειν.} \]
\[ \delta \text{ τι ἀν πρῶτον λο-} \]
\[ \text{γεύσῃς δῶς Κράτη-} \]
\[ \text{5 τί τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ ἴδι-} \]
\[ \text{λου (δραχμᾶς) οὐ ύπολογή-} \]
\[ \text{σας (δραχμᾶς) δ', καὶ σύμβο-} \]
\[ \text{λον ποίησαι ἀπε-} \]
\[ \text{χοντα αὐτῶν τὰς} \]
\[ \text{10 οὐ πλήρεις. καὶ} \]
\[ \text{τό οὖς λοιποὺς οὐκ εἶ-} \]

On the verso

\[ \text{Ἀυσιμάχω.} \]

11. σο ὑπερπαρασίσεις cor. from εἰς. 12. λαθομαίτε.

‘Leodamas to Lysimachus, greeting. As soon as ever you collect anything, pay Crates the rest of the freight charges, 75 drachmae, subtracting 4 drachmae; and get a receipt stating that he has received the 75 drachmae in full. You do not exact payment from the others, but are neglectful. Their securities ought to have been here long ago and sold; now therefore at length either collect the money or send their securities to be sold. Good-bye. The 28th year, Phaophi 20. (Addressed) To Lysimachus.’

47. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LYSIMACHUS.

Mummy A 16. 22.6 x 7.3 cm. B.C. 256 (255).

Another letter to Lysimachus from Leodamas, giving him various directions concerning his official duties. The letter is written with more than usual carelessness, syllables and even whole words being sometimes omitted, and the
damaged surface of the papyrus renders several passages very difficult to decipher.

\[\text{δε λοιπῶν μ’ . . .} \cdot \text{αχροῦ, χρεά γάρ ἐστιν μα . . ικον.} \]

καὶ ἀλωνὶν δὲ καὶ ἱλνὸν ἀλλὰν τῶν [. . ] ἐκαί[, . . ]

5 καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐώς τὸν ἀριθμὸν, θερίζειν δὲ καὶ ἀμάν καὶ λεπταγόοις νυμαρ’.

10 ὁσαύτως δὲ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐώς τὸν ἀριθμὸν, θερίζειν δὲ καὶ ἀμάν καὶ λεπταγόοις νυμαρ’.

15 τὸ τιρός παρ’ ἡμῖν ἄπο[θ]ον ἑνα περὶ[κ]ην [. . ] ρ [. . ]

σωμεν τῶν γινομένων τῶν ἐπανάγκων, τῶν ἐπιτόμων μ’ . . . .

On the verso

\[\text{Ανασάχωλι.} \]

12. γ of θερίζειν corr. 15. τ of παρ’ ἡμῖν above θ (?) erased. 20. ω of λοιπῶν corr. from ε or ρ.

'Leodamas to Lysimachus, greeting. Give instructions to (collect?) the crops of the son of Parmenion unremittingly, and likewise those of the others . . . since instructions have already been given to do so by the month of Panemus, and likewise those of the rest up to the full number, and to mow and reap them and . . . If there is any sifted wheat to hand with any one, sell it in order that we may pay over the value of the necessary dues, but . . . the rest, for it is wanted . . .; and prepare both olyra and barley in order that we may measure it to the State. With regard to the calves from Philon son of Lysanias and the calf from Philon and Spokes, if you have sent them to Dicomia (it is well); but if not send them at once that they may be delivered to Lycomedes, for those are his instructions. And send the letter to Demetrius immediately in order that a slave may not be sent. Goodbye. The 29th year, Mecheir 20. (Addressed) To Lysimachus.'
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4. It is not clear whether σύνταξεν governs καρτοὺς or an infinitive is to be supplied. On the former hypothesis σύνταξεν might mean 'assess,' a sense which would suit this context but is rare, and, in view of both the other instances of συντάξεως in l. 8 and 32, where the ordinary meaning 'instruct' is appropriate, and the frequency of σύνταξεν followed by an infinitive (e.g. 39. 2), decidedly difficult, especially as the infinitives in l. 12 seem to depend on σύνταξεν. It seems preferable, therefore, to supply an infinitive meaning 'collect' or 'assess'; cf. the omission in l. 29.

9. Panemus corresponded approximately to Pauni at this period; cf. App. i. The action which Lysimachus was told to perform had to be carried out before the end of the harvest.

13. Λεπταγόεσ seems to be equivalent to λεπτογείσ, meaning 'barren land.' The beginning of the next word suggests only ἔνα, 'plough-share,' but the third letter is certainly τ, and probably κ has been omitted and the word is some form of συντάξεως. ἕν in l. 14 is the termination of an infinitive, perhaps δ μ ἀν (cf. l. 12), but the first letter could be almost anything.

17. The verb following τιμήν very likely began with παρα, possibly παρά φιαγεὶς εις ἡμέραν.

20. ἄχρων is probably the termination of an imperative following μὴ: but the form seems to be erroneous.

23. [παράφηκους εις : cf. 45. 17 παραφηκόσανθε.

29. Δικωμία: this village (cf. Τιμωκοία in the Arsinoite nome) is not otherwise known. Lysimachus has omitted the apodosis to εἶ μὲν ... Δικωμίων. ἀποστέλλεται must be meant for κατά πλοῦτον, but it is difficult to reconcile the vestiges of the termination with εἰλον. Perhaps Lysimachus made a mistake and wrote ἀποστέλλεται... πελλον.

35. ποὺς: or Πόιας; cf. 112. 57, P. Petrie III. 65 (a). 1.

36. Possibly ἀποστολὴ της, but Lysimachus generally omits ἀδριστή with subjunctives, e.g. 46. 4 and 20.

48. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LYSIMACHUS.

Mummy A (probably 16). 11·5 X 7·1 cm. B.C. 255 (254).

Another letter from Leodamas to Lysimachus, asking for information with regard to advances of seed-corn. After concluding the letter with the customary salutation and date, Leodamas changed his mind and erased them, continuing the letter on the verso; cf. 45. The writing on the recto is across the fibres.

Δεωδάμας Δυσήλαχων
χαίρειν. τὰ σπέρματα τῶν διηγυμένων κλήρων τίνι γράφειν
5 ψάεις εἴδωκας; οὐ γὰρ εὑρίσκω ἐν τοῖς βυβλίοις. πάλιν οὖν γράφειν
'Leodamas to Lysimachus, greeting. To whom did you give in writing the seed for the holdings which have been taken in pledge? I cannot find the entry in the books. Write another list, therefore, of the seed issued for them and send it to me at once; and give it to the agent of Antipater or, if you cannot catch him, to some one else, that I may not be prevented from making up my account. Likewise measure ... Good-bye. The 30th year, Mesore 28.'

3. διαγγελμένων κλήρων: for an example of a deed placing a κλῆρος in pledge cf. Wilcken, Aktenstücke, no. 11.

49. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LAOMEDON.

Mummy A 16. 11.2 x 8.6 cm. About B.C. 257.

A short letter from Leodamas to Laomedon, another of his subordinates, giving him directions about the transport of corn and olives. The reference to the latter is interesting, since olives are not mentioned either in Rev. Laws or in the Petrie papyri.
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на ὁ σῖτος ἐμβληθή ὅτι τὰχ[ι]σ[τα
καὶ συνκατάγαγε μεθ' αὐτοῦ.
ἐ[η]π[η]ν δὲ αὐτῶι καθάπερ ἐγγα-
α [α]γα τῶι ὅπωι ἀν ἐμβάληται ἐν ἔκτο ἐν ἄρω.

τῶι ἐλαίαις εἰς βίκους ἤ εἰς μώια,
καὶ περάσθε ὡς ἀκοπωτάτας
καταγαγεῖν, καὶ παρὰ Φίλωνος
τοῦ Λυσανίου ὑπόμνησον ὅπωι ἀν
λάβῃ τῶι ἐλαίαις τὰς καλὰς
καθάπερ αὐτῶι ἐγγαφα.

ἐρρωσο.

On the verso

15 ε[η]π[η] τῇ πόλιν

Δαμαδόμοιτι

πα . . . [. . .

5. 1. μετ'.

8. ὡ of μώια above the line.

Leodamas to Laomedon, greeting. Go to whatever place you hear that Lysimachus is at, and take care that the corn is embarked as quickly as possible, and bring it down with him. Tell him that, as I wrote to him, he is to put the olives into jars or μώια for embarkation, and try to bring them as unbroken as possible. Remind him that he is to receive from Philon son of Lysanias the fine olives, as I wrote to him. Good-bye.

(Addressed) To Laomedon . . . , at the city.'

2. παρειδῆτι: the reading of the penultimate letter is very doubtful, but it is as much like τ as θ, which is the only likely alternative.

8. μώια are receptacles of some kind, either boxes or jars; cf. P. Petrie III. 65(θ), 6 and P. Grenf. I. 14. 13-16, βίκου occurring both times in the same context, as here. From P. Grenf. I. 14 it appears that a small μώιαν could contain 6 πόλιον, and that 2 μώια of Parian marble could be inside a lamp-stand. μώια, which are mentioned in P. Grenf. I. 14. 5 immediately after a βίκου, seem to be allied to μώια, which are also found in ostraca (e.g. Sayce, Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch., xxiii, p. 214) as a measure of ἄχρυρον; cf. the monει(α) in P. Oxy. 146. 3.

15. The πόλις is probably Oxyrhynchus; cf. 45, introd.

50. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO THEODORUS.

Mummy A 16. 8.8 x 8 cm.

A short letter from Leodamas (cf. 45, introd.) to Theodorus, another official, giving him instructions about the delivery of olyra to Lysimachus. The date is probably the 28th or 29th year of Philadelphus.
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[Δε]κο[δ]έμας Θεοδώρωι

[Χαίρειν. ἀνενυχαμέν εἰς τὸ

βασιλικὸν ὄλυρικῶν (ἀρτάβας) 'Αλωδῆ'.

σὺ [ὁ]ῶν ὑπολιπόμενος σαφῶς

5 ταύτῃ τὴν ὑληραν τὴν

λοιπὴν ἀπομετρηθείσην Λυσιμά-

χων ἑνα . . . ἡ τῇ . . .

ἐρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) κ[.]

On the verso

Θεοδώρωι.

2. νε of ἀνενυχαμέν above the line. 6. ὡ of λυσιμαχος corr. from or.

'Leodamas to Theodorus, greeting. I have paid over (?) to the State 1834½ ar tabae of olyra. Do you therefore leave this olyra for yourself and measure out the rest to Lysimachus, that it may be . . . Good-bye. The 2[.]th year . . . (Addressed) To Theodorus.'

51. LETTER OF DEMOPHON TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A 9. 9·9 X 35 cm. B. C. 245 (244).

The following twelve documents (51-62; cf. 167-8), which are dated in the closing years of the reign of Philadelphus or the first few years of his successor, are all addressed to Ptolemaeus, the holder of some minor post in the Oxyrhynchite nome. His title is not mentioned, but his sphere was a village (59. 11), where he apparently exercised the functions of an officer of police (59-62), and had also financial duties (51. 2-4, 58. 7). He was probably subordinate to the archiphylacites (56, introd.), and may have been a phylacites. Whatever his position, he did not always fill it to the satisfaction of his superiors, and on more than one occasion he received a reprimand (56. 7-8, 59. 9-12).

In the present letter, as also in 52-3, the correspondent of Ptolemaeus is Demophon, who here sends instructions for the collection of dues upon green crops and for the purchase of 'Syrian cloths' (cf. note on 1. 3), in accordance with an order, a copy of which is enclosed, from Apollodotus, a higher official.

Δημοφῶν Πτολεμαῖοι χαίρειν. ὑπογέγραψαν τῆς παρ' Ἀπολλοδότου

ἐλθὼν ἡμᾶς μοι ἐπιστολῆς
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περὶ τῆς λογείας τῶν χλωρῶν τάντιγραφῶν. π’ ῥάττε ὅθεν τῶν [...]. πρὸς ἄργῳ[ν] ἡγηρακότας

ἡδη καβάσαν γεγραπται, τὰς δὲ συρίας ὡς [ε]ὰν σοι παραθο[ν]τα[ι] [πρὶ]άμενοι λάμβανε ἀρεστάς

t[ε]μῶν τῶν ὑπογεγραμμένων.

έρρασο. (ἔτους) β Μεχήρ ιβ. 5. 'Απολλόδοτος Δημοφώντι χαίρειν. πρὸς τῇ τῶν χλωρῶν λογεία γλύ[ν]ον

ἡδη καὶ συρίας λάμβανε

ἐξ[αδρέχομαι καὶ ἐπαλλαγής τῶν ἡμίσους τῶν δ (δραχμῶν) (δβαλῶν) (ἡμω-βέλιον), τοσότο γάρ ἐκκείται ἐν βασιλικοῦ. έρρασο. (ἔτους) β Μεχήρ ιβ.

On the verso

Πτολεμαῖοι.

2. 1. ἡγηρακότας.

'Demophon to Ptolemaeus, greeting. Appended is a copy of the letter which has come to me from Apollodotus about the collection of green-stuffs. Do you therefore exact payment now from the purchasers on the silver standard, in accordance with his instructions; and any Syrian cloths that may be deposited with you accept, if satisfactory, and buy at the prices below written. Good-bye. The 2nd year, Mecheir 12.

'Apollocotus to Demophon, greeting. Take in hand now the collection of the green-stuffs, and accept Syrian cloths at 6 drachmae with an agio on half the sum at the rate of 1½ obols in 4 drachmae, for that is the rate published by the government. Good-bye. The 2nd year, Mecheir 12.

'(Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

2. By the λογεία τῶν χλωρῶν, as the following sentence shows, is meant the collection of the value of the green crops, not the crops themselves. What these particular χλωρά were and who are signified by τῶν πρὸς ἄργῳ[ν] ἡγηρακότας is, however, obscure. The latter phrase rather suggests the farming of a tax, and seeing that 52–3, which are also letters from Demophon to Ptolemaeus, not improbably refer to the ἐννόμων, that impost might be supposed to be also the subject here. Or the χλωρά may well be the produce of royal domains sown with this class of crops, the share of which accruing to the government as rent had been sold; cf. P. Tebt. 27. 54 sqq. μήθεια τῶν γεωργοῦσων τὴν δισεκατωμήν καὶ τὴν ἐν αἵρεις [γῆν] ἐφαγότων τῶν χλωρῶν πλὴν... τῶν ἐγκακηθημένων] ἐαν αἱ τεμαί καὶ τοῦτων αἱ ἀσφάλεια δοβείσα καταστεθοῦσαι ἐπὶ [γῶν τραπεζῶν] πρὸς τὰ καθήκοντα εἰς τὸ βασιλείον. Εἴ τις ἐγκακηθημένων there means ‘to be collected’ as the analogy of other passages suggests, the expression would be very similar to λογεία τῶν χλωρῶν in 51.

3. συρία: cf. Hesych. σύρα ἡ παρὰ χλωρία, ἦτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ συνόρητος, ἢ ὅτι ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ γίνεται, ὦτοι ἐν Σύροι, and Pollux 7. 61 ἢ δὲ συρίαν οἱ πολλοί, ταύτῃ αὐτόποιον ἱμάτιον οἱ κυριοί. Besides 38. 7 συρία are mentioned in a mutilated papyrus of about this period belonging to Dr. Mahaffy, 'Ἀκέστωρ δὲ ὁ ὀικονομός [...]' χρέων συρίας προδοθηκαί κάκως εἰς ἑαυτῷ τὸ [δραχμῖν [...]. The συρία were apparently included among the fabrics monopolized by the government, the producers of such fabrics, as is shown by 67–8, being paid on a scale similar to that
fixed in the present passage. The mention of an ἐπάλλαγη in l. 6 is another point of con
nection between the three documents. In 67 and 68 the rate of the ἀλλαγη or ἐπάλλαγη is
3/4 obol to the stater, while here it is 1 1/2 obols to the stater, reckoned upon half the amount,
which comes to the same thing.

\[\text{παραβούντα: cf. Rev. Laws xliv. 5, &c.}\]

52. LETTER OF DEMOPHON TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A (probably A 9). Fr. (a) 11.7 x 25, Fr. (b) 10.2 x 9.8 cm. About B.C. 245.

Another letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus (cf. 51, introd.), enclosing a
list of persons who are generally assessed at the rate of 1 drachma 4 obols per
aroura (a lower rate occurring in l. 23). Owing to the incompleteness of the
introductory letter the purport of the whole document is somewhat obscure;
but apparently the list refers to the amounts payable by certain inhabitants of
Tholthis, a village of the Oxyrhynchite nome, who had pastured their flocks
upon Crown lands in various parts of the lower toparchy. Whether the impost
in question is connected with the λογεία χλωρῶν in 51, 2, or is identical with
the tax called ἐννόμιον (182; cf. P. Petrie III. 109 (a)) or εἰς τὰς νομῶν, levied
for use of the royal pastures (Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 191 and 265), is not clear. From
references in receipts for ἐννόμιον to the number of the sheep Wilcken (l. c.) infers
that that impost was proportionate to the number of sheep turned out to graze,
whereas in 52 the tax is clearly proportionate to the area of the pasturage. The
terms of the introductory letter in 52, especially the references to the 'using up'
of the pastures and the securities to be obtained in consequence, suggest
that the proceedings of the persons mentioned in the list had been irregular
(cf. P. Tebt. 66. 75 sqq.); but this hypothesis does not accord very well with 53,
another letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus enclosing a precisely similar list
of persons who are mostly assessed at 1 drachma 4 obols on the aroura (cf. 180,
a fragment of a third document of the same character). The phrase προσάγγελμα
τῆς πρώτης δεξημέρου applied to the list in 53, 2 recalls the terminology employed
in regard to the collection of ordinary taxes, and on the whole it seems
preferable to identify the payments in 52 and 53 with the ἐννόμιον.

In l. 24–33, which are on a separate fragment, Demophon’s handwriting
is smaller, and perhaps this piece, which in any case is not part of Cols. i or ii,
belongs to 130 or another similar list, though not to 53.

Fr. (a).        Col. i.

[Δ]ημοφῶν Πτολεμαῖοι χαίρειν.
[ὑπ]ογέγραφα σοι τῶν ἀπὸ Θόλλεως
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[ol ka]ταπενεμήκασιν ἐκ τῆς βασι-
[λικῆς] γῆς τῆς ἐν τῇ κάτω το-
5 παρχλαὶ τὰ ὄνοματα καὶ τὰ
πλῆθη καὶ δύτων κλῆρον
ἀποκέχρηνται ταῖς νομαῖς. σὺ
οὖν πειρῶ ὅσ’ ἀσφαλέστατα
dιεγγυῆσαι ὅπως μηθεὶν διὰ-
10 πτωμα ἕξ ὑπέρου γίνηται,
οἷμαι γὰρ σε .... ν. [...]διαι,...

Col. ii.

[...]οσως Βαρκαῖος ἰδι(άτης) ὄσαύτως (δραχμαί) ἵ(τετράβολον) (ήμω-
βέλιον),
Π[...]ιας Κυρηναῖος τῆς ἐπιγονῆς (δραχμαί) θ (δυόβολοι),
Δ[η]μήτριος Φίλωνος Κυρηναῖος τῆς
15 ἑπιγονῆς (δραχμαί) ἡ (πεντάβολον) (τέταρτον),
[.] γ ... Τ[ε]χάτος πουμήν καὶ Πετερ-
μοῦθις Κομοϊάπιος (δραχμαί) θ (τέταρτον),
*Ωρος Πνάτος ἵππος γόητος ἵ(τετράβολον) (ήμωβέλιον),
ἀλλάς ὁ αὐτὸς (ἀροῦρας) β (δραχμαί) γ (δυόβολοι),
20 Πετοσεῖρις Φανῆτος καὶ Πετοσεῖρις
Πασιγώνως καὶ Ἰππόλυνος (ἀροῦρας) βδ’ (δραχμαί) γ (πεντάβολον),
ἀλλὰς Πετοσεῖρις Ἀφφωοῦτος ἄρακόν
[ ἀροῦρας ε (δραχμαί) ε (τριάβολον),

19. This line was inserted later. 22. eipis of petoseiris above the line.

Fr. (δ).

[. . . . . . . .] τῆς ἑπιγονῆς

25 [ἀράκον (ἀροῦρας)] ἵ(τετράβολον) [δραχμαί] κ[. .
[ἐκ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου Πραξίας Καλλιδρ[όμου
[. . . . τῆς] ἑπιγονῆς ἄρακ(ον) (ἀροῦρας) σ ἀν(ά) α (τετράβολον) (δραχμαί) ς,
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... 30 [.....]s ἀράκ(κου) ἓδ ἄνα (τετράβολον) ἄραχμαι) κυ (δυόβολοι),
... τος καὶ Ἀρμίνιος ποιμένες

... ροσ καὶ Ἅπωσις ... 
... ἰς ἀράκ(κου) (ἀρουρας) ἵ (τετράβολον),
... ροσ καὶ Ἅπωσις ... 
... Πούντος γεωργὸς

...[......]α. (πυρόβ) βία.

'Demophon to Ptolemaeus, greeting. I have written below the names of the inhabitants of Tholthis who have used pasturage in the Crown land in the lower toparchy, and the amounts, and the holdings in which they have used up the pastures. Do you therefore try to obtain as good security as possible, in order that there may be no subsequent loss, for I think that you...

... os, Barcean, private, likewise 17 dr. 4½ ob.; P ... ias, Cyrenean of the Epigone, 9 dr. 2 ob.; Demetrios son of Philon, Cyrenean of the Epigone, 8 dr. 5½ ob.; ... son of Teos, shepherd, and Petermouthis son of Komaios, 9 dr. ½ ob.; Horus son of Pnas, priest ... 17 dr. 1½ ob., and on 2 more arourae the same Horus 3 dr. 2 ob.; Petosiris son of Phaues and Petosiris son of Pasigonis and Hippolysus on 2½ arourae 3 dr. 5 ob.; on 5 more arourae of aracus Petosiris son of Auphmoüs 5 dr. 3 ob., ... In the holding of Ptolemaeus: Praxias son of Callidromos, ... of the Epigone, on 6 arourae of aracus at 1 dr. 4 ob. 10 ob.; ... on 14 arourae of aracus at 1 dr. 4 ob. 23 dr. 2 ob.; ... and Harmiisus, shepherds, on 10 arourae of aracus 16 dr. 4 ob.; ... son of ... rchonsis on 1 aroura of aracus 1 dr. 4 ob.; ... son of Paous, cultivator, ... 2½ artabae of wheat.'

3. κατανεμόμενοι: cf. the κατανεμημένη in P. Tebt. 61 (e). 188, &c.

6. Possibly καὶ ἰστινον, but παρά does not suit the vestiges after the lacuna very well. Cf. note on l. 26.

9. διαγγέλεια: the object understood is probably τοὺς ἀπὸ Θόλθεως (cf. 41. 5 and 53. 3), not the κλήρον, though διαγγελέων κλήροι occurs in 48. 3. ἀσφάλεια in connexion with the revenues derived from χλωρά also occur in an obscure passage in P. Tebt. 27. 55-9; cf. 51. 2, note.

13. (δυόβολοι): this, the early Ptolemaic expression for 2 obols, is written out in P. Petrie II. 44. 25 and the London Bilingual papyrus of Philopator’s reign (Pal. Soc. II. 143).

18. γάμτος: if this is a genitive, we must suppose the existence of a deity called ‘the Wizard’; if a nominative (of an unknown form), it is a very curious epithet to apply to a priest.

26. [ ἐκ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου: sc. κλήρου; cf. 53. 14 and 18, and 117. 8, note. It is probable that this κλήρος was βασιλικός like those called βασιλικοὶ in 85. 13 and 101. 5, and really formed part of the βασιλικὴ γῆ (cf. l. 3 above), having returned to the possession of the State either at the death of the original holder (cf. 81, introd.) or for some other reason. The name of the original holder continued, however, to be attached to it, as was still the case even in Roman times; cf. P. Oxy. 483. 5, note, and 118. 2, note. This view of the κλήροι βασιλικοὶ also suits 39, 100, and 119, where the State apparently receives a rent upon such holdings, and is confirmed by 75, which refers to the sale by government officials of part of the Φιλότεου κλήροι, though a difficulty arises in connexion with 99; cf. 99. 8, note. In 112. 9, however, where an impost upon χλωρά is apparently found, the land seems to be really cleruchic, and the same may be true of the κλήροι in 52, though
the βασιλικοί κληρον are in any case to be explained as land which had reverted to State ownership.

33. The sign for $\frac{1}{2}$, here applied to an artaba, instead of being angular is semicircular and identical with that employed at this period for $\frac{1}{2}$ obol; cf. notes on 53. 20 and 119. 17.

53. LETTER OF DEMOPHON TO PTOLEMAEUS.


Another letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus, dated in the last year of the reign of Philadelphus, and enclosing a list of persons at Tholthis and Mouchinaruo (in the Oxyrhynchite nome), who are for the most part rated at 1 drachma 4 obols on an aroura; cf. introd. to 52 and 130.
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Εὐνώμος ἐκ Μουχιαρνῳ [ἀράκου] γ] (δραχμαί) ε.

20 Ξηροίς 'Αρενδώτου ᾽Δ' (δραχμή) [α] (ὀβόλος ?) (ἡμιωβέλιον), 'Ωρος "Ορον
φιλακήτης"
Μουχιαρνῳ ζ (πιντὸβολον), Πετομύχις Πετοσείριος
[Mou]χι[ναρ]ῳ ἀράκ(ου) ζ' (δραχμή) α (ὀβόλος ?) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
ἀράκ(ου) (ἀρουραί) ε (δραχμαί) η (διοββολοί). τῆς κόμης ἀράκ(ου)
κβλη'
(δραχμαί) λε (ὀβόλος) (ἡμιωβέλιον), χόρτον βλ (δραχμαί) ε (ἡμιωβέλιον),
(δραχμαί) μ (διοββολοί).

5. καλλικράτους added above the line. 24. The sign for δραχμαί was inserted after /μ was written.

'Demophon to Ptolemaeus, greeting. I have sent you the report of the first ten days
of Athur. Do you therefore endeavour to obtain good security, knowing that you will be
held accountable. Good-bye. The 39th year, Athur 16. At Tholthis: Theodorus son of
Callocrates on 5½ arourae of the concessional (?) land 8 drachmæ 3½ obols,' &c.

3. Cf. 52. 9, note.
4. The year being the 39th must be the 'revenue' not the 'regnal' year (cf. App. ii).
Athur 16 of Philadelphus' 39th regnal year would almost certainly fall within his 40th revenue
year, which he did not live to enter; cf. p. 245.
5. τῆς παρεμένης: cf. P. Oxy. 713. 25 περί δὲ Πευνῳ ἐκ τῆς Θρασυμάχου παρεμένης. As
53 also refers to the Oxyrhynchite nome the same land is probably meant, and παρεμένη in
P. Oxy. 713 is then a survival from Ptolemaic times like the names of the κλήροι; but the
precise sense of the term is obscure.
10. Perhaps ἵκ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου; cf. 180, where Πτολεμαίου precedes Κυδρίους (l. 14).
17. The figures are restored from the total in l. 24; cf. note ad loc.
19. [ἀράκ(ου) γ] is restored from the number of drachmæ, on the assumption that the
rate is the usual one of 1 dr. 4 ob. on the aroura. But if 3 arourae is correct here, the items
making up the number 5 in l. 23 will be complete, and therefore οὐάρχης and Εὐνώμος must
be partners.
20. The symbol for ½ aroura here and elsewhere in this papyrus is a half-circle like
that representing ¼ obol; cf. notes on 52. 33 and 119. 17.
23-4. The amounts of land given in ll. 9, 17, and 23 add up correctly to the total of
22½ arourae. A half-aroura of Χόρτος also occurs in l. 17, leaving only 2 arouræ of Χόρτος
to be accounted for between ll. 9 and 14. This indicates that the loss between ll. 9 and 10,
if any, is very small.

54. LETTER OF DEMOPHON TO PTOLEMAEUS. Κ' ι'

Mummy A (probably A 9). 25 x 7.2 cm. About B.C. 245.

An undated letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus (cf. 51, introd.) on private
matters. The first part of it gives some interesting instructions about the
provision of musicians for a festival at Demophon's house; then follow messages about a kid (ll. 17–9), a fugitive slave (ll. 20–3), and various articles wanted by the writer (ll. 23–8), with a postscript concerning the mode of sending them (ll. 30–2).

Δημοφῶν Πτολεμαῖοι χαίρειν. ἀπόστειλον ἡμῖν ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου τὸν αὐτόν.

5 λυτήν Πετοῦν ἔχοντα τούς τέφρων ἀποθήκης καὶ τούς λοιποὺς, καὶ εἶναι δὲν δὲν λυτόσαι ἡμῖν καὶ τυπώσαι.

10 ἐσπευσθεῖν δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ Ζηνόβιον τὸν μαλακόν ἔχοντα τύμπανον καὶ κύμβαλα καὶ κρόταλα, χρεία γὰρ εστὶν ταῖς γυναιξίν πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν ἔχετω δὲ καὶ ἱματισμὸν ὅς ἀστεῖον.

On the verso

Πτολεμαῖοι.

10. λ' of αποστειλων corr. from ν.

'Demophon to Ptolemaeus, greeting. Make every effort to send me the flute-player Petoiis with both the Phrygian flutes and the rest; and if any expense is necessary, pay it, and you shall recover it from me. Send me also Zenobius the effeminate with a drum and cymbals and castanets, for he is wanted by the women for the sacrifice; and let him wear as fine clothes as possible. Get the kid also from Aristion and send it to me; and if you have arrested the slave, deliver him to Semphtheus to bring to me. Send me as many cheeses as you can, a new jar, vegetables of all kinds, and some delicacies if you have any. Good-bye. Put them on board with the guards who will assist in bringing the boat. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

11. μαλακὸς may be merely a nickname, but probably refers to the style of Zenobius' dancing. Smyly well compares Plautus, Mil. 668 Turn ad salandum non cinaedus malacius aequi altique ego.

26. καὶ ἵππον: or perhaps κενὼν. κραμον can also have a collective sense, 'earthenware.'
55. Letter of Scythes to Ptolemaeus.

Mummy A (probably A 9). 9.3 x 12 cm. b.c. 250 (249).

A short letter from Scythes, a superior official, to Ptolemaeus (cf. 51, introd.), ordering him to come to Talao, a village in the Oxyrhynchite nome (cf. P. Oxy. 265. 15), with a shepherd who was to give evidence. The writing is across the fibres.

Σκόθης Πτολεμαῖοι χαίρειν.
παραγενοῦ εἰς Ταλαών ἡδή
ἀγὼν καὶ τὸν ποιμένα τὸν ἑλέγ.
ἔστα περὶ ὄν μοι εἰπας. ἔναν δὲ
5 βραδύτερον ποιῆσαι σαυτὸν βλά−
ψεις, [ο]ὗ γὰρ σχολάζω μένειν πλείονα
χρῆ[όνων.] ἔρρωσο. (ἔτους) λε Χούαξ ἀ. 

On the verso

Πτολεμαῖοι.

'Scythes to Ptolemaeus, greeting. Come to Talao at once, and bring with you the shepherd in order that he may give evidence in the matter about which you told me. If you are remiss you will injure yourself, for I have no leisure to remain longer. Goodbye. The 35th year, Choiak 6. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

56. Letter of Patron to Ptolemaeus.

Mummy A 9. 12.1 x 4.6 cm. b.c. 249 (248).

A peremptory note to Ptolemaeus from Patron, perhaps the ἀρχιφυλάκις mentioned in 34. 1 and 73. 9-10, ordering him not to molest a certain Nicostratus; cf. 59. 9-12 and introd. to 51.

Πάτρων Πτολε−
[μα]ίοι χαίρειν. παρα−
γενόμενος πρὸς
ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ Ἰλων ἐφῄ ἐσ−
5 πρᾶσσειν σε Νικό−
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στρατον ἐκ Κόβα

(δραχμάς) β. ἄν οὖν μὴ ἐνό-
χλει [αὐτόν. [◿]]

7 lines erased.

ἐρρωσο. (ἔτους) Λξ

10 Παύσιοι Σξ.

On the verso

Πτολεμαίωι.

'Patron to Ptolemaeus, greeting. Ilon has come to me and said that you were
exacting 2 drachmae from Nicostratus of Koba. Do not molest him. Good-bye. The
37th year, Phaophi 17. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

6. Κόβα was in the Κοινής τόπος (cf. p. 8); but Nicostratus must have been for
the time being in the Oxyrhynchite nome, since he had come within reach of Ptolemaeus.
Whether this Κόβα is identical with the village called Κόμα in the Roman and Byzantine
periods (p. 8, P. Oxy. 142 and 150) is doubtful.

9–10. These two lines are over the erasure.

57. LETTER OF DIONYSODORUS (?) TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A 8. 7.7 x 32.2 cm. B.C. 247.

A letter to Ptolemaeus ordering a person who had brought the writer a
petition to be sent to him. The writer’s name is doubtful, but is perhaps
Dionysodorus, as in 58. The writing is across the fibres.

Δ[ιο][ν][σόδωρος Π][τ][ο][λεμαίωι χαίρειν. ὡς ἀν λάβης τὴν ἐπιστ[exterity]ν
ἀνάπ[εμψον

πρὸς ἡμᾶς [Δημή]τριον τὸν κομίσανθ' ἡμῖν κατ' Εὐαγόρον ἐντευξιν εἰς
'Ἀλ[εξ]αν-


ἐρρωσο. (ἔτους) η Πανήμου [.] On the verso

Πτ[ο][λεμαίωι.

'Dionysodorus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. As soon as you receive this letter send to me
Demetrius who brought me a petition against Evagoras to the . . . of Alexandria. Good-
bye. The 38th year, Panemus . . . (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'
3. There is not room for παρ' μπαλής.

4. Panemus at this period probably coincided approximately with Epeiph (cf. App. i), in which month the numbers of Philadelphus' regnal years were still one in arrear of those of the revenue years; cf. 80. 13–4, note. Since 57 is dated by the Macedonian calendar, Panemus-Epeiph would be expected to fall within the 38th regnal rather than the 38th revenue year; cf. p. 367. But it is difficult to refer Panemus-Epeiph to the 39th revenue year, for Philadelphus was almost certainly dead before that date; cf. p. 364.

58. Letter of Dionysodorus to Ptolemaeus.

Mummy A 9. 19.5 × 7.5 cm. b.c. 245-4 (244-3).

A letter to Ptolemaeus from Dionysodorus, asking for an advance of 8 drachmae. If this Dionysodorus was also the writer of 57, he was the official superior of Ptolemaeus.

\[\text{Διονυσόδορος Πτολεμαῖος} \]
\[\text{μαίας χαίρειν. ὡς ἄν} \]
\[\text{πὴν ἓπειρος τολὴν λάβης} \]
\[\text{δὸς Τέλλεως τοῖς παρὰ} \]

5 \[\text{Διοδότου τοῦ} \]
\[\text{δωτὸν ἀφ' ὀδ χελό-} \]
\[\text{γενικᾶς ἄργυρίου (δραχμάς) ἡ, τοῦ-} \]
\[\text{τοῦ δὲ σοι προσδέξομαι.} \]
\[\text{ἀναδεικταί γὰρ} \]

10 \[\text{ἡμῖν ἀπομετρήσεως} \]
\[\text{στὸν, μὴ ὤν ἄλλως} \]
\[\text{ποιήσῃς.} \]
\[\text{ἐρρωσ[ο. (ἐτοὺς)] γ [.....} \]

7. ἀργυρίου added above the line.

'Dionysodorus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. As soon as you receive this letter give Telestus the agent of Diodotus son of ... 8 drachmae of silver out of what you have collected, and for this sum I will be responsible (i) to you; for he has undertaken to measure us out some corn. So do not neglect this. Good-bye. The 3rd year...'

8. προσδέξομαι: cf. P. Petrie III. 64 (δ). 6 (ἐξεδέξατο) and 81 (δ). 1.
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59. LETTER OF ZENODORUS TO PTOLEMAEUS.

A letter from Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus, directing him to send up a woman who had been found in the illicit possession of a quantity of oil, and adding a sharp warning to Ptolemaeus himself. A Zenodorus is known from an unpublished Hibe papyrus to have been oeconomus of one of the toparchies of the Oxyrhynchite nome at this period, and he is probably to be identified with the writer of this and the following letter; cf. also 60 and 124-7.

Zenódoros ἔπολεμαῖωι
χαίρειν. ὡς ἐν λάβησιν
τὴν ἑπιστολὴν ἀπὸστειλοῦν πρὸς ἡμᾶς μετὰ.
5 φυλακῆς τὴν παραδοθεισὰν σοι ἔχουσαν τὸ κλέπμιον ἐλαιὸν
καὶ τὸν παραδόντα σῷ ἀπὸστείλον καὶ εἶ μὴ
10 παῖσει καὶ καποδίν
ἐν τῇ κωμῇ[α] μεταμελησεὶ σῷ.

ἐρρωσο. (ἔτους) [ἡ Ἐπειφά.]

On the verso

Π[το]πολεμαῖοι.

'Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. As soon as you receive this letter, send to us under guard the woman who was delivered to you with the contraband oil in her possession, and send also the person who delivered her to you; and if you do not stop your malpractices in the village you will repent it. Good-bye. The . . year, Epeiph 10. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

κλέπμιον: this adjective is unknown, but is a much more satisfactory reading here than κλῆπμιον. The same word is no doubt to be recognized in Rev. Laws lv. 20 ἐν ἕν . . . θολωται ἡπτεὶς φάμενοι ἐλαιῶν παρὰ τὶς ἐπάρχεις κλέπμιον, which suits the sense far better than καρπίη. On the smuggling of oil cf. also P. Tēbt. 38 and 39.
60. LETTER OF ZENODORUS TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A 9. 12·8 x 7 cm. About B.C. 245.

Another order from Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus (cf. 59) for the arrest of a man named Ctesicles if he failed to make a payment within a certain period.

Ζηνόδωρος Πτολεμαῖων
χαίρειν. ἔλαμ μὴ ἀποστελέητε Κτησικλῆς
εἰς Σινάρων πρὸ ἐκτῆς
5 ὁρᾶσ τῇ ἑδρᾷ (δραχμᾶς) καὶ ἀπόστειλον αὐτὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς μετὰ φι[ν]λακῆς ἡδῆς, καὶ δωσὶ μὴ ἄλλως ποιήσεις.

10 ἔριχωσ. (ἐτοὺς) .

On the verso

Πτολεμαῖων.

6. auton added above the line.

Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. If Ctesicles does not send 20 drachmae to Sinaru before the sixth hour on the 19th, send him to me under guard at once, without fail. Good-bye. The . . . year . . . (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.

61. LETTER TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A 9. 13·1 x 9·7 cm. B.C. 245 (244).

An order to Ptolemaeus to produce a number of persons before Ammonius, a superior official. The name of the writer is lost, but was perhaps Zenodorus; the hand is similar to that of 59, but not certainly identical with it.

[.. . . . . . . .] Π[το]λεμαῖω[ι
[χαίρειν. ὅσ'] ἀν λάβῃ τῇν
[ἔπιστο]λὴν κατάστησον

[... . . . . . . . .]
Letter of Philippus to Ptolemaeus

Mummy A 9. 18.4 x 8 cm. B.C. 245 (244).

A letter from Philippus, whose official status does not appear, to Ptolemaeus, directing him to bring before Philippus the accuser in a case of robbery.

Φλιππός Πτολεμαίοις ἡμῖν χαίρειν. [κακοῦργος τὸν τὴν λεῖαν ποιήσαντα
5 ἐπικαλεῖς Τνᾶς Ἀρνοῦφιος, ὃν συντέταξα τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ τῷ ἐν
10 θώλτει παραδόθηκε. ναὶ σοι. ὃς ἀν λάβῃς τὰ γράμματα
λαβὼν αὐτῶν τὸ τάχος ἀποκατά.
[στησόν πρὸς ἡμᾶς
ἐρρωσο. (ἐτούς) β Πάνι κ.}
On the verso

\[ \text{Πτολεμαῖω.} \]

'Philippus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. The criminal who did the pillage is accused by Tnas son of Harnouphis, whom I have instructed the chief priest at Tholthis to hand over to you. As soon as you receive this letter take him at once and produce him before me at the city of Oxyrhynchus; and be careful to carry out these directions. Good-bye. The 2nd year, Pauni 20. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

2. There would be room for \([τῶν \text{ after } χαίρειν, \text{ but it is unnecessary.}\]

8. \(\text{ἀρχηγεῖ}: \) another instance of the insertion of \(γ\) in this word perhaps occurs in P. Petrie III. 53 (p). 2. Cf. 27. 33 and P. Tebt. 63. 7, note.

63. LETTER OF CRITON TO PLUTARCHUS.

Mummy 18. 17.8 × 8 cm. About B.C. 265.

A letter from Criton asking Plutarchus to settle accounts, in order that Criton might meet a demand to pay for some seed which had been sown upon a cleruchic holding. It is probable that this Plutarchus is the same person as the Plutarchus addressed by Paris in 64, although the two documents were obtained from different mummies; for another connecting link is provided by 65, which comes from the same mummy (18) as 63, and is also concerned with a Paris. Moreover, the three letters deal with similar topics and are undoubtedly close together in date. 64 belongs to the 21st year of Philadelphus, while the dates in the papyri from Mummy 18 range from about the 15th to the 28th year of that reign. Criton and Plutarchus recur in 110. 13 and 17 (cf. 159), and seem to have been minor revenue-officials at or near Ἰερὰ Νήσος, a village in the division of Polemon in the Arsinoite nome; cf. 68. 19, 110. 21, 80. 3-4, 81. 16. The position of Paris was probably similar.

On the verso are parts of 7 much effaced lines, but no signs of an address.

\[ \text{Κρίτων Πλούταρχῳ:} \]

χαίρειν. παραγεν[δ]μενός
πρ[δ]ο μὲ Νίκαιος ἀπῆτει
τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ σπέρμα-
5 [τος] ὡς ἐφη ἐμβεβληκέ-
ν[α]ί εἰς τὸν Πρωταγόρου
κ[λ]ῆρον (ἐτῶν) γ (ἀρτάβας) λγ,
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[ei] δὲ μὴ ἐφη καθέξειν
τὸν χόρτον μου τὸν ἐν
10 τῶι πεδίωι. ei οὖν οὖ-
tως πολιτευόμεθα
ἀλλήλοις καλῶς ἄν
ἐχοι. οὐν οὖν διόρθωσαι
αὐτοῖς τὸ λο[π]ηδῶν δ προσ-
15 οφεῖλεις μοι. ἥσαν δὲ
(δραχμαὶ) ὦβ· τούτων ἀφελε
(ἀρταβῶν ?) μετιμήν κε (τετράβολον)
καὶ [...]γ ή [ἐλ]αβον πα-
ρά σοι ὡστε Θευδώρωι κ . . . [ . . . ] s ἐφ' Ἰερᾶς Νήσου [(δραχμᾶς) δ,
20 / (δραχμαὶ) Λ (τετράβολον), (λοιπῶν) μα (δυόβολοι),
λαβῶν παρὰ Τιμάρχου

19. ὡστε . . . | s added above the line.

Criton to Plutarchus, greeting. Nicaeus has come to me demanding the price of the seed which he said he had ordered for the holding of Protagoras during three years, namely 33 artabae, otherwise he said he should lay claim to my hay in the fields. If we are going to hold such relations it will indeed be well. Do you therefore settle with them the remainder owing from you to me. The sum was 72 drachmae; deduct from this the price of 40 artabae, 26 drachmae 4 obols, and for . . . which I received from you for Theodorus . . . at Hiera Nesus, 4 drachmae, total 30 drachmae 4 obols, remainder 41 drachmae 2 obols. Take from Timarchus . . .

5-7. The meaning of ἐμβεβληκέναι here is not quite clear. If it be 'imposed upon,' as e.g. in P. Tebt. 37:7 ἐμβεβληκέναι (ἐγη) εἰς τὴν γῆν, Nicaeus must be supposed to be an official who first ordered the loan of seed and then himself advanced it on behalf of Criton. This seems more likely than that ἐμβεβληκέναι is used literally of sowing, for which στείρεν would be the word expected. The land in question may have been one of the βασιλικά κλήρου, as in 85. 12-3; but loans or presents of seeds were also made to cleruchs, e.g. 87.

10-3. We suppose ἀλλήλοις to refer to Criton and Nicaeus, and καλῶς ἄν ἐχοι to be ironical. The construction of πολιτευόμεθα with a dative is unusual.

17. The lowness of the price (4 obols per artaba) shows that the grain was of some inferior kind, very likely olyra. An artaba of olyra was worth ½ artaba of wheat (85. 14-5, note), of which the normal value was 2 drachme (84 a. 8-9, note).

18. Perhaps [(ἀρταβῶν)] γ, but δ is then unsatisfactory; a neuter antecedent would be more appropriate. The stroke which we have considered to be the top of a γ may be a mark of abbreviation. The following letter is rather more like σ than ς, but σ cannot be read.
21. There are some blurred ink marks immediately in front of λαβέων, but they are outside the line and probably accidental. They might, however, be taken to represent an inserted καί.

64. LETTER OF PARIS TO PLUTARCHUS.

Mummy 97. Breadth 7.3 cm. b.c. 264 (263).

A letter from Paris asking for an advance of 60 drachmae on account of a large amount of olyra which was due to him from Plutarchus. The mutilation of the latter part of the letter has obscured some of the details of the proposed transaction. The writer is probably identical with the Paris mentioned in 65, and his correspondent with the Plutarchus to whom 63 is addressed; cf. 63, introd.

Πάρις Πλοντάρχου
χαίρειν. γέγραφέν σοι
'Αντίπατρος μετρή
[σ']α' [μ'] [οι] διυρών (ἀρτάβας) 'Ανν
5 [δ']ε[ι] σ'e λαβείν (ἀρτάβας) σον
to δ' δε λουπόν εμοί με-
τρήσαι. χρείαν οὖν
ἐξο (δραχμάς) ξ', καλῶς
'άν οὖν ποιήσως δοὺς
10 Ψεκομοῦτι τώι ἀποδι-
[δόντι] σοι τὴν ἐπίστο-
[λὴν]
. . . . . . . .
tὸν σίτον ἀπὸστεί[ει-
. . . . . . . .]

A fragment . . .

On the verso

Πλοντάρ-
χωλ.

13. τ of στον corr.? 22. κα cor. from κε or vice versa.

'Paris to Plutarchus, greeting. Antipater has written to you to measure out to me 1450 artabae of olyra, of which you ought to take 250 artabae and to measure out the rest to me. Now I am in want of 60 drachmae; you will therefore do well to give Psenomous,
the carrier of this letter, ... Send me the 60 drachmae and on the 2nd I will bring ... tes ... who will pay ... And you must write to me about anything which you require. Good-bye. The 21st year, Pauni (?). (Addressed) To Plutarchus.'

10. There is a break in the papyrus below l. 10, and several lines may be lost between ll. 12 and 13. Perhaps ll. 23-5 come in here.

13. The τ of σίγων is very doubtful; the letters τον σίγων and λογις with part of the μ of μοι in the next line are on a separate fragment, and its position is not quite certain.

16. τυν is the termination of a personal name, e.g. 'Αρνώτυν.

65. LETTER CONCERNING PARIS.

34.2 x 5.8 cm. About b.c. 265.

The purpose of this letter, the commencement of which is lost, was to secure the immediate delivery to Paris (cf. 64) of 80 artabae of aracus, in part-payment of a debt of 100 artabae of wheat. The writer proposed to obtain the remainder by purchase from the State. His correspondent, who is desired to pay over the aracus, was perhaps Plutarchus, the recipient of 63-4; cf. introd. to 68.

11. The numeral ρ corr.?
I have sent to you so that you may go and meet Paris in order to measure out to him the 80 artabae of aracus; for I have engaged under oath to measure out on the 4th 100 artabae of wheat. So since you will not be able to measure it to-day, you will do well to go to... on the 5th to measure out to Paris the 80 artabae of aracus. If this is not done I shall be liable to the consequences of my oath and shall be mulcted of 4 drachmæ per artaba. I wish to purchase the remainder of the corn from the State, in order that there may be no arrears against me. Good-bye. The...th year, Aithur 4.

8. A fragmentary specimen of such an oath is P. Petrie III. 56 (a).

10. τὴν τετραδε: i.e. the day on which this letter was written; cf. l. 31.

21 sqq. The oblique construction is probably a reminiscence of the actual contract, from which this sentence is a more or less exact quotation. Above the first few letters of l. 22 are some thin strokes which resemble ἅρτος and may represent an insertion.

66. LETTER OF PROTARCHUS TO CLITARCHUS.

The following documents (66-70 (b)), with 160-3, belong to the correspondence of Clitarchus, who, as is shown by their contents as well as by the endorsement on 68, was a government banker, his district being the Κωλτής τόπος. They belong to the reign of Euergetes and are close together in date, the only years mentioned being the 18th and 19th.

The present text consists of a letter from Protarchus informing Clitarchus that he had undertaken the collection of the tax of Χθονίας, an impost probably connected with the ἐγκόλπιον or tax on sales and mortgages of real estate (cf. note on l. 1), and requesting Clitarchus to collect the dues on his account. The writing is across the fibres of the papyrus.

Πρῶταρχος Κλειστάρχου χαίρειν. ἔξερχηθαμεν τὴν ῥ᾽ καὶ σ' παρὰ τῶν τὴν δώρεαν πραγματευομένων. ἔπει δὲν πίπτει [σοι] ἐν τοῖς κατὰ σὲ τόποις εἰκοστή, καλῶς δὲν ποιήσας συντάξας τοῖς παρὰ σοῦ προσλογείειν καθότι ὑμῖν καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης γέγραφεν, ὁδ' ἔδ' ἀν παραγένομαι ἀπὸ τῆς τῷ τάξ[.] [...] τοῦ χαλκοῦ συναλλάξω σοι ὡστε σε 5 μή διὰ κενῆς εὐχαριστήσαι ἡμ[ίν].

ἔρρωσο. (ἐτους) ἐβ Παχών ἑδ.
On the verso

2nd hand τραπεζήν Κωλ-

(1st hand) Κλειτάρχου.

'Protarchus to Clitarchus, greeting. I have contracted for the one per cent. and half per cent. with the managers of the δωρεά. Since therefore the 5 per cent. tax is paid to you in your district, you would do well to order your agents to collect the other taxes too, as Asclepiades also has written to you; and so soon as I arrive from the delivery (?) of the copper I will have a conversation with you, so that you shall not oblige me to no purpose. Good-bye. The 19th year, Pachon 14. (Addressed) To Clitarchus, banker of the Koite district.'

1-2. The character of this tax of 1½ per cent. and its relation to the δωρεά and the εικοστή are not quite clear. τὴν δωρεὰν here might be interpreted as τὴν ἐν δωρεὰς γῆν, as e.g. in P. Petrie II. 39 (g). 14, ἑσπερεῖ ἐν τῇ δωρεᾷ χώρος ικάνος, P. Magd. 28 τὴν Χρυσέρμου δωρεάς. As Rev. Laws show (xxxvi. 15, xliii. 11, xliv. 3), large tracts of land were held ἐν δωρεᾷ, chiefly perhaps by court favourites, and the holders seem to have had special treatment in respect of taxation. The εικοστή in l. 2 might then be compared with that in P. Petrie II. 11 (2). 4, a 5 per cent. tax on the rent of an αἰκόνεδον, while the 1½ per cent. would be some similar impost of which the present is the first mention.

But δωρεά may have another sense which is more suitable to the context in 66. In the first place πραγματεύσθαι is the word commonly used at this period for the farmers of a tax. Secondly, in the London Bilingual papyrus of the 13th year of Philopator (Proceed. Soc. Bibl. Arch. xxiii. p. 301, Pal. Soc. II. 143), appended to a demotic contract of sale is a banker's receipt in Greek, in which there appears, coupled with 8 drachmae 2½ obols for εγκύκλιον, a payment of 3 obols for δωρεά. Now the commonest form of εικοστή was the εγκύκλιον (cf. 70); and if this be the εικοστή in 66, 2 there will be here the same collocation of δωρεὰ and εγκύκλιον as in the London text. Moreover, the 1½ per cent. of l. 1 recalls the εἴκοσιτη and ἑκατοστή of the Zois papyrus which were paid on the occasion of a sale through the government of land given in security for a tax; cf. the extra charges amounting to 3½ X 2 (τὰ καθ' ἑκατοστὰ τῆς διπλᾶς), added to the πρόστιμον in P. Amh. 31, of b.c. 112. It thus seems possible to find a link between the 1½ per cent., the δωρεὰ, and the 5 per cent. by means of the supposition that they were all three connected with sales. Another passage in which δωρεὰ probably signifies a tax is P. Petrie III. 53 (g) ἐφείκεαν δὲ καὶ τὸ γραφεῖον τῶν Αἰγυπτίων συγγραφαί, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων πείπτον διδόναι παρ' αὐτῶν τὸὺς ἔχουσι τὴν δωρεάν. The γραφεῖον, a tax paid for drawing up contracts (?), is here remitted, and the proceeds previously derived from it are transferred to the 'holders of the δωρεά.' ἔχουσι at first sight suggests land-holders rather than tax-farmers; but it is very difficult to see what the former could have to do with the γραφεῖαν, and the view that ἔχουσι τὴν δωρεάν here means much the same as πραγματεύσαντο τὴν δωρεάν in 66 is supported by P. Oxy. 44.22, where the impost γραφεῖον is coupled with εγκύκλιον, with which, as we have seen above, the δωρεά was closely connected. We should therefore explain the ρ' καὶ σ' as a percentage upon sales, being an addition to the ordinary εἰκοστή and resembling the δωρεά, within which it may even have been included.

With regard to the 1½ per cent. and the analogous percentages of the P. Zois, it is singular that in P. Petrie III. 57 (b), where some land is sold by the government under conditions similar to those in P. Zois, the tax paid is the ordinary εγκύκλιον of 5 per cent. J. C. Naber, Archiv, I. p. 90, explains the difference in the rate as a remission. That is no
HIBEH PAPYRI.

doubt possible, and in the absence of further evidence it is difficult to find a better theory. But the idea of lightening the burden of taxation does not seem to have played much part in the policy of the Ptolemies; it is possible that, so far from representing a remission, the percentages in the Zois papyrus may mark an augmentation, the 1/20 and 1/10 rising to 1/8 and 1/6, and perhaps subsequently to the 1/5 of P. Amh. 31. An analogy for such an increase is provided by the history of the ἐγκύκλιον, the rate of which was doubled towards the end of the second century B.C. But the absence of the ἐγκύκλιον in P. Zois then remains unexplained.

3. Asclepiades is probably identical with the writer of 67-9.

4. Perhaps πα[πα]δόσεις or πα[πα]δοχής, but the reference is obscure. The fourth letter, if not a, might be e.g. γ, π, or ρ. συναλήθω κ.τ.λ. means that Protarchus was prepared to give a quid pro quo.

67. LETTER CONCERNING PAYMENT OF CLOTH-WORKERS. 328 B.C.

This papyrus and 67 are letters to the banker Clitarchus (cf. 66, introd.), officially authorizing him to pay different sums to certain weavers at Ἀγκυρὼν πόλις and Χαβεῖοντις in the Heracleopolite nome for a variety of fabrics manufactured on behalf of the government. As Rev. Laws lxxxvii sqq. (cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 267-9) and P. Tebt. 5. 63-4, 238 sqq. combine to show, the weaving industry was, at any rate in its more important branches, a government monopoly. The persons actually employed in it had of course to be paid for their work, and the scale of prices found here may be compared with those fixed in Rev. Laws xlvi. 18-20 for the production of the various kinds of oil; cf. the regulation of the price of σωρλαί in 51. 5-6 (note on l. 3), and P. Tebt. 5. 248 sqq., where it is forbidden to make the cloth-weavers, byssus-workers, and robe-weavers work δωρεάν μηδὲ μισθών ὀφειμένων. The finer processes of manufacture seem to have been centred in the temples; but it is not at all likely that the whole weaving industry was under their control (P. Tebt. 5. 63, note), and there is no hint either in 67-8 or 51 that priests were in any way concerned. The formula of the two authorizations closely resembles that found in P. Petrie III. 87 (a) verso, (b), and 89. Asclepiades, the official by whom they were sent, and who appends his signature in 67. 28, was probably the local ὀλκονόμος, the principal revenue official of the nome, or his ἀντιγραφεύς; cf. the frequent mentions of the ὀλκονόμος in the section of the Rev. Laws which concerns the δθονηρά, lxxxvii. sqq. Asclepiades' order to Clitarchus in 69 to bring an account is quite in keeping with such a position.

The names of the various fabrics are usually abbreviated both in 67 and 68, and are difficult to identify. They are all classed as ὀδύνα, and are also in-
cluded under an abbreviation which may be either εσ( ) or σε( ). On the whole we think λσ(τοι) 'webs' more probable than σεν(θόνεις), since λσ(τοί) also occur in Rev. Laws xciv. 2 and 5, where a λσ(τοί) is rated at 25 drachmae, though that passage is too mutilated to be conclusive; cf. also Ps. Aristeas ed. Schmidt, p. 69. 16 βυσσίων δθόνων λσ(τοί) ἐκατόν. Other abbreviations are μη( ), πρ( ), βυς( ), and ἴς(τιμα?), but it is doubtful, except in the case of πρ( ), what is the correct order of the letters. σοφοία (67. 14, in other places abbreviated σοφοί) may be connected with σοφός and denote a kind of cloth used for burials.

\'Ασκληπιάθης Κλειτάρχωι
χ(α)ρειν. [δότα] ἀπὸ τῶν πι-
πτόντων[ν εἰς τὸ θ(έτος)
tοὶ ἐν Ἀγκυρῶν πόλει

5 [ὑ]πογεγραμμένοι ὑφάνταις
διὰ ... εἰς τοῦ παρ' Ἀπολλωνίου
[καὶ Πετ]ειμοῦθον τοῦ Τε-
[. . . . τ]ὸπογεγραμματέως
[καὶ . . . .] κυμογραμματέως

10 [εἰς τιμά]ς δθόνων τῶν
[συντελ]ηνυμένων εἰς τὸ [βα-
σ[ι]ν]ικά[ν] μη( ) καὶ πρ( ) ζ, / ἴς[τοί?] κη,
(δραχμᾶς) τκς (τετράβολον), βυς( ) ζ ξε (δυοβόλους),
σοφοίοις ζ νς, / ἴς[τοί] μβ

15 (δραχμαί) νη, καὶ ἀλλα[γῆς] ἣ, / νξβ,
kαὶ σύμβολον ποίησαι πρὸς
αὐτοὺς. ἔρωσο. (ἔτους) θὸ Ἀθήρ κβ.
tοῦτων ἐκάστῳ τῶν ὑπο-
γεγραμμένων Θοτομοῦτι

20 Πετοσίριος μη( ) γ πρ( ) α, / δ,
(δραχμᾶς) μς (τετράβολον), βυς( ) α θ (δυοβόλους), σοφοί[ν]ιν η, / ἴς[τοί] ς (δραχμαι) ξθ, ἀλλα[γῆς] β, / ἴς.
'Αρμήνει: Σισώτως ὡσαύτως,
Πετονοῦτε: Πάσιτως,

25 Τέω: Αθεμέως, Πετοσίρει
'Αρχήβιος, 'Αμεννεί
Νεχθοσίριος, Τεσάμει [. . . .]
2nd hand Ασκληπιάδης Κλειτάρχος Χαίρετου. Χρημάτισα τισιαν Χαλκον τετρακόσια εξήκοντα δέκα καθότι γράφεται [ ... ]

[ ... ]βιον β α[ ... ]

35 γμάτων ζ [ ... ]

'Hibele papyri'

'Aesclapiades to Citarchus, greeting. Give out of the sums paid in for the 19th year to the weavers at Ancyronpolis below written, through ... , agent of Apollonius, and Petimouthes son of Te ... , topogrammatus, and ... komogrammatus, for the prices of cloths supplied to the Treasury, namely for 21 me ... 7 pr ... , total 28 webs, 326 drachmae 4 obols, for 7 buo ... 65 drachmae 2 obols, for 7 soroia 56 drachmae, total 42 webs 448 drachmae, and for agio 14 drachmae, total 462 drachmae; and make out a receipt with them. Good-bye. The 19th year, Athur 22. To each of the following: to Thotomous son of Petosiris for 3 me ... and 1 pr ... , total 4, 46 drachmae 4 obols, for 1 buo ... 9 drachmae 2 obols, for 1 soroia 8 drachmae, total 6 webs 64 drachmae, and for agio 2 drachmae, total 66. To Harmenis son of Sisais similarly, and to Petenoupis son of Pasis, Teos son of Athmenius, Petosiris son of Harcheius, Ameneus son of Nechthoris, Tesomis son of ...'

'Aesclapiades to Citarchus, greeting. Pay 462 drachmae of copper, as above written ...'


7. In 68. 5 the topogrammatus is Petimouthes son of Thotortaeus; but the patronymic here is certainly different, and since the villages are not the same in the two papyri and Petimouthes is not an uncommon name, it is unlikely that a single person is meant.

9. Perhaps τώρα καιρογραμματεῖος; cf. 68. 5–6, note. But there would be room for a short name like ἤρον.

10–1. A papyrus belonging to Prof. Gradenwitz, containing a receipt issued by the παραλτηπτοῖ δήμου ἱματίων for differently coloured cloths, indicates that the government control of the supply of such materials continued into the Roman period.

12–4. The abbreviation μη ( ) consists of a μ with an η written above (the μ being square in l. 12 and rounded in l. 20), πρ( ) of a π with a ρ drawn through it; the former possibly stands for μήργυμα (cf. note on l. 34–5), the latter might be connected with the προσκεφάλαια which occur in Rev. Laws cii. 7. The σ of λα(τί) is written in the form of a capital as in the symbol for 200, the β being a long stroke drawn through it. In the case of βυο ( ) the three letters are written one above the other, the ν being a good-sized curve immediately over the β, the third letter a small thick mark which at l. 21 is slightly elongated, suggesting a β or an ι rather than an ν; in 68. 7 it is a mere dot. In l. 21 the curve is slightly turned over and thickened at the left end and might be interpreted as ω; but this feature is not noticeable in l. 13 or 68. 7. βυο, i.e. βυο(σιν), can certainly not be read. The prices of the different fabrics work out as follows:—μη ( ) and πρ( ) cost 11 dr. 4 ob. each, βυο ( ) 9 dr. 2 ob., and σορόνω 8 dr.; in 68 the scale is the same and ἤμα(τί) also appear, costing 7 dr. apiece.
15. ἀδαλ(γῆ): the rate is \(\frac{2}{3}\) obol on the stater, which is identical with that in 68. 9 and 61. 6, where the word ἐπικλάλαγη is used. The prices are calculated on a silver basis \(\piρδος ἄργης\), and in making payment in copper (cf. l. 30) the government allowed a small agio. The usual rate of the agio on payments in copper at this period was about \(2\frac{1}{2}\) obols on the stater; cf. P. Petrie III. p. 86, where the data are collected (add P. Petrie III. 67 (a). 2, (b). 14, 117 (e). 12, 15). The difference is probably to be accounted for by the fact that in the present case the government was not receiving, but paying.

34–5. The numbers suggest that the reference is again to different sorts of cloth and that -βων and -γμάτων may be the termination of two of the words abbreviated in ll. 12 sqq. The figures, however, do not help to identify them, since the number 2 does not occur in the foregoing list, and so ll. 33–5 cannot be a repetition of it. -γμάτων might possibly be μηρογμάτων, though that term means the thread rather than the material woven from it; cf. Ἀσχυχ. μῆραμα, σπείρα ἡ ἐπικλάλαγη, and μῆραμα, κάταμα ἡ σπάμα ἔριον. As for -βων, there is one β if not two (cf. note on ll. 12–4) in βων( ), but we can find no likely word. Line 35 is probably, though not certainly, the conclusion of the document.

68. LETTER CONCERNING PAYMENT. OF CLOTH-WORKERS.

A letter, similar to 67, from Asclepiades to Clitarchus, authorizing payment to be made to a number of weavers for cloths of various kinds manufactured by them; cf. 67, introd. The writing is across the fibres of the papyrus.
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[ε] σ το βασιλικ[δν] 21 letters

15 Τ!Ύ.[··]ωτ[· [ "
[··] [ 30 "

............ μη( ) κ σ]λγ ([δινοβόλους],) β[νο( ) β [η (τετράβολον],
σοφω(ων) [δ λβ ] ][μα(τίων) β 1δ, / λσ(τοι)] κη σαη, ἐπαλ(λαγης) θ
(δβολον) (ημηοβελιον) (τεταρτον) χ(αλκουν), / τζ (δβολος) (ημηοβελιον ?)
[(τεταρτον) χ(αλκοις).

"Ομεω Πετ[ει]σιάμος μη( ) β κ]γ (δινοβόλους), βνι( ) α θ (δινοβόλους)
σοφω(ων) β 15,
20 ιμα(τίων) α ξ, / λσ(τοι) π νε (τετράβολον), ἐπαλ(λαγης) π (τετράβολον ?)
χ(αλκοις) γλ, / νζ (δυάβολοι) χ(αλκοι) γλ.
Σεμβεί Πασώτος . p. χος τουτοτα . [. .
[ . . . . . . ] . . . . . . . . . . Πετογιρ α . .
[ 25 letters ]φ[


5-6. The offices of togrammatheus and komogrammatheus here seem to have been
combined in a single person, as at a later period in P. Oxy. 251 and 252. There is
hardly room at the end of l. 5 for τοι, still less for a proper name. Perhaps, however,
tοι was abbreviated or written very small; it is noticeable that in the corresponding
passage in 67. 9 there is only a very short space between και and κομογραμματικοι.

10 sqq. This passage, ordering a deduction to be made for reasons which are obscured
by the mutilation of the papyrus, has nothing corresponding to it in 67.

16. There is a break below this line, and it is quite uncertain how many lines are
missing.

17-8. The total number of ιο(τοι) and their value being preserved in l. 18, and the
prices of the different units being known (cf. 67. 12-4), a calculation shows that the items
here must be either (α) 20 μη( ) at 11 dr. 4 ob. = 233 dr. 2 ob., 2 βνι( ) at 9 dr. 2 ob. =
18 dr. 4 ob., 4 σοφωα at 8 dr. = 32 dr., 2 ιμα(τια) at 7 dr. = 14 dr., total 298 dr.; or (δ)
19 μη( ) = 221 dr. 4 ob., 4 βνι( ) = 37 dr. 2 ob., 4 σοφωα = 32 dr., 1 ιμα(τιον) = 7 dr.,
total 298 dr. The first set of figures suits the vestiges of l. 17 the better.

21-2. The second halves of these two lines seem to be identical. τοι τοσαί/χονu might
possibly be read, but it is difficult to see why the toparch should be introduced in this context.
69. LETTER OF ASCLEPIADES TO CLITARCHUS.

Mummy 10.  
15.6 x 7 cm.  
b.c. 230 (229).

A short letter from Asclepiades (cf. 67–8), directing Clitarchus (cf. 66, introd.) to come to him bringing an account and the balance of some money. The writing is across the fibres of the papyrus.

'Ασκληπιαδῆς  
Κλειστάρχου χαίρειν.  
παραγίνω τῇ  
η τοῦ Ἀθηρ κομίζων  
5 τῶν τε λόγων τοῦ  
Φαώφη καὶ τὰ περιόν-

[καὶ] µὴ ἄλλως ποιή-
[σης.]  
10 ἑρρωσό. (ἐτοὺς) ἤ Ἀθηρ ε.  
3. ou of paraginnou corr. from ἐγκεφε.

'Asclepiades to Clitarchus, greeting. Come up on the 8th of Athur bringing both the account of Phaophi and the balance of the money, without fail. Good-bye. The 18th year, Athur 5.

70 (a). LETTER OF ZOILUS TO CLITARCHUS.

Mummy 10.  
15.4 x 7.6 cm.  
b.c. 229–8 (228–7).

A letter from Zoilus telling the banker Clitarchus (cf. 66, introd.) that a payment of 10 drachmas was due from another Zoilus for the 5 per cent. (ἐγκύκλιον) tax on a purchase of land. 70 (b) and 168 are similar notifications of payments due to the bank for the ἐγκύκλιον. The writer was most probably the farmer of the tax, and these documents represent the διαγραφὴ which figure in the common formula of ἐγκύκλιον receipts, τέτακται ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ἐγκυκλίον κατὰ διαγραφὴν τελοῦν; cf. e.g. P. Amh. 52.

The view of Revillout (Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch. xiv. p. 120 sqq.) that the rate of the ἐγκύκλιον tax, which according to him was fixed by Psammetichus at το,
was reduced in the 9th year of Epiphanes to \( \frac{1}{20} \), has already been refuted, as Wilcken points out (Ost. I. p. 183), by P. Petrie III. 57 (b), which proves that the rate of \( \frac{1}{20} \) existed in the 4th year of that king. The Hibeh papyri now carry this rate back to the reign of Euergetes I, and we suspect that Revillout’s account of the early history of the tax is altogether erroneous. It is very unlikely that the Ptolemies lowered a rate which they found already established; the tendency of their finance was rather in the opposite direction.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Zoi}l\text{os} & \text{ Kleitár}x\text{oi} \\
\text{chaírein. } & \text{ déξai parà} \\
\text{Zoi}l\text{on toû Ptole-} & \text{muáiou Σινωπέως} \\
5 \text{ ᾑρεύρων } & \text{ κ συκαμινοα-} \\
& \text{ κατάνυν λιτοῦ} \\
& \text{ ἂς ἐπράτο παρὰ} \\
\text{Bionos toû Φιλήμο-} & \text{νος Ἐπετριέως χαλ-} \\
10 \text{ κοῦ πρὸς ἀργύριον} & \\
(\text{δραχιοῦ} ) & \text{ σ’ (δραχιῶτά) δέκα.} \\
& \text{ ἔρρωσο. (ἐτους) ἰθ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Zoilus to Clitarchus, greeting. Receive from Zoilus son of Ptolemaeus, of Sinope, on account of 20 arourae of smooth (?) mulberry-acanthus land, which he has bought from Bion son of Philemon, Eretrian, for 200 drachmae of copper on the silver standard, the twentieth, namely 10 drachmae. Good-bye. The 19th year . . .’

5. The letters at the beginning of this line are broken, but it is clear that the abbreviation for ἀρουρῶν, if that be the word meant, is written in an abnormal manner, the usual stroke above the line being replaced by a small o; the supposed a and ρ are also very doubtful. But both the tenor of the document and the analogy of 70 (b) and 163 make ἀρουρῶν here almost indispensable. &sigma; in l. 6 is also a difficulty; we can find no parallel for the application of the adjective λιτός to land. There is, however, hardly any doubt about the reading; the only possible substitutes for the first two letters are α and ρ, but these are much less satisfactory.

9. χαλκοῦ πρὸς ἀργύριον: i.e. copper at a discount. An agio of about 10 per cent. was usually charged for payments in copper which ought to have been in silver; cf. 67. 15, note, and 109. 6.
Letter to Clitarchus.

Mummy 10. 7·5 x 7·1 cm. About B.C. 228.

Conclusion of another notification, no doubt addressed like 70 (a) to Clitarchus, that 2 drachmae were due to the bank for the έγκυλιον tax on a purchase of land. The vendor is described as a Perso-Egyptian (Περσαίγυπτιος), i.e., presumably, the son of a mixed marriage.

. . . . . . .
μάχιμος Ἡρακλειστὸς
οπολίτης ἀμφί-
λον (άροφρας) ἃδρον ην
ἐπιστατὸς κατ’ [Αί-
5 γυναῖκας συγγρα-
φᾶς παρὰ Ἀσφαξ
“Οροῦ Περσαίγυπτι-
οῦ περὶ κόμην Τμοι-
νεθύμιν (δραχμῶν) μ' κ' β.
10 [ ἔρρωσο. (ἐτους) . . .]

'(Payment is due from) . . . , native soldier, of Heracleopolis, on account of 1½ arourae of vine-land bought by him in accordance with Egyptian contracts from Aspheas son of Horus, Perso-Egyptian, near the village of Tmoinethumis for 40 drachmae, the twentieth, namely 2 drachmae. Good-bye. The . . . th year . . .'

1. The formula must have differed slightly from that in 70 (a). Probably ἀφ' ἔμε took the place of δέξασα παρά.
8. Τμοινεθύμιν: cf. 163; in 80. 7 the name is spelled with an initial Θ.

Correspondence concerning a Strike.

Mummy A 11. 8·5 x 11·7 cm. B.C. 245 (244).

A fragment of a series of official letters concerning a strike of slaves employed in a stone-quarry. Lines 4-11 contain a copy of a letter from Antiochus to Dorion forwarding a letter from Aenesidemus, of which only the beginning is preserved (ll. 12-4), and ordering the immediate arrest of the offenders. Lines 1-3 are the conclusion of a letter which may be from Dorion.
to the φυλακῆσιν. From 72, in which Antiochus and Dorion recur, it appears that
the latter was an epistates (sc. φυλακητῶν) probably at Phebichis, and the quarry
in question was most likely on the east bank in the neighbourhood of that village,
possibly at Hibehe itself; cf. pp. 9-10. The third year, in which the correspondence
took place, no doubt refers to the reign of Euergetes.

4-11. 'Antiochus to Dorion, greeting. I have sent you a copy of the letter which
Aenesidemus has written to me about the slaves who have deserted from the stone-quarry
at Cephalae. As soon as you receive this letter use every effort to search for them, and
send them to me under guard. Good-bye. 'The 3rd year, Thoth.'

6. ὁμάτων: slaves were also employed in the quarries in the Fayûm near Lake Moeris
(cf. P. Petrie II. 4 (2). 5 and 4 (9). 4), but there the λατώματα were free wage-
18 and 41. 14, where strikes of βασιλικοὶ γεωργοὶ are referred to.

72. CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING A TEMPLE SEAL.

Mummy A 7. 17 × 35 cm. B.C. 241 (240).

The subject of this lengthy text is the disappearance of the official seal
belonging to the temple of Heracles at Phebichis. A large piece is unfortunately
missing from the upper part of the papyrus, but the sense except in one or two
passages is nevertheless clear. The body of the document is occupied by a copy of a petition from Petosiris, high-priest of the temple, addressed to Dorion the epistates. The seal, it appears, had been missing for five months; and Petosiris had written previously to Dorion accusing a certain Chesmenis, a priest, and his son Semtheus of having stolen it. Information had also been given to the basilicogrammateus, but inquiries had led to no result. Dorion was therefore requested to take further steps. An official was accordingly sent, and the petition is succeeded by a copy of his report. Chesmenis on being questioned denied that he had the seal, but the next day four other priests volunteered the information that it was all the while in the sanctuary—of which Chesmenis seems to have been in charge—but said that they were afraid that if they gave it to the high-priest, he would use it for a common indictment against them. These two documents are inclosed in a short covering note from Dorion to Antiochus, who also appear in conjunction in 71. 4. It is noticeable that there Antiochus' name precedes that of Dorion, while here the positions are reversed. Since the papyri are practically contemporary and belong to the same find (cf. p. 11), there is good reason for assuming the identity of the persons. It will follow that the position of the names of writer and addressee is no surer guide to their relative dignity in the third century B.C. than in the second; cf. P. Tebt. 13. 2, note, and 22, introd. Except in formal petitions, the writer of a letter seems to have usually placed his own name first.

It is remarkable that in ll. 6–7 the high-priest accuses Chesmenis of having abstracted the seal in order to use it for letters to Manetho. The manner in which this name is introduced indicates that its bearer was a well-known man, and seeing that the persons concerned are priests, it is not impossible that we here have a reference to the famous writer on Egyptian history and religion, who was himself a priest, probably of Sebennytus. If that be so he lived later than has been generally supposed. Hardly any details concerning Manetho's life are known, but according to Plutarch (De Is. et Osir. 28) he was consulted by Ptolemy Soter. That he should be still alive and active in the 6th year of Euergetes is surprising, but not absolutely inconsistent with Plutarch's statement, if Manetho lived to a great age.

Διαφιόν Ἀντίδρως χαίρειν. τῷ πρὸς μὲ 15 letters ὑπομνήματος παρὰ Πετοσίριος τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τοῦ ἐμ Φεβίχει Ἡρακλέους Ἐνθε. [. . . . . . . . . .]. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .}
υπόμνημα. Δωρίσων ἐπιστάτη παρὰ [Πετοσίριος ἀρχιερέως. πρὸς] ἐράν 
σοι ἐνεφάνισα ἐν τοῖς Χολαχ
5 μηνὶ περὶ τῆς σφραγίδος τοῦ ιεροῦ διότι [ . . . . . . ἀυτὴν Χεσμῆνις] 
καὶ Σεμθέως οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἀθόρ μηνὶ 
ἀπὸ ἐνατής, τοῦτο δὲ ἐπὶ[ρα]ξεν πρὸς τὸ σι 22 letters] δῶν [ἀ]ν βού-
λωνται γράφειν. Μανε-
θῶι καὶ ὁ ἄν βούλωνται. 
προσαγγέλλω φο[υ] 18 letters ἐπεὶ] ο[ὐ]
δυνάμεθα χρῆσασθαι ἀλλη 
'Αρνώτου βασιλικῶι 
[γρ]αμματεὶ περὶ τοῦτον ὑπόμνηµη[ὴ]μα [ἀξίων 19 letters]. [. .] ἀρι-
σταλκότα πρὸς 
10 [Αρνώτην Νεχθεμέως τὸν πρότερο[ν] [ἐν τοῖς ἀδύτωι δυντα καὶ τῶν ν]ῶν 
ὑπάρχοντα Χεσμῆνιν 
[. . . ] . [. . ] πυθέσθων περὶ τῆς σφραγίδος [24 letters] ας παρὰ Σεμ-
θέως τοῦ Χεσ-
[νι[σ] . [. .]] τὴν φοσπρ. [. .] ν[. . . . . . ]. [. 14 letters εἰ-
λ]θεναι. καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις 
. . . . . . ]τοῦ Παιδότου καὶ 'Αρνώτου 
τοῦ Νεχθεμέως περὶ τοῦτον καὶ γράψαι[i] ἡµῖν π[ρὸς . . . . ]ον τῶν στρα-
15 (ἔτους) τὸς Φαμειώθ Σ. ἀποσταλείς Αριστόνικος πρὸς τὸν [ἐν τοῖς ἀδύτωι 
Χεσμῆνιν] ἐπηράτα καὶ ὑπάρξει ἐν τῶι 
ἰεροὶ [τ. . .] ἡ σφραγίς ἢ χρῶνται οἴ [1]ὲρ[ε]ῖς πρὸς τὰς γραφ[θησο]µένας ἐπι-
στολάς, Χεσμῆνις δὲ οὐκ ἔφη ἑχειν. 
τῇ δ[ε] τὸ παραγενόμενον Θοτορταῖος Ἀρμαχώρου 'Αρμάχωρος Νεχθθεμέ-
[ο[υ]ς] Ἱμαθῆς Πνάσιο[γ] 'Αρνώτης Νε-
' Χθεμέως τῆς μὲν σφραγίδα ἀµολύγουν ὑπάρχειν ἐν τῶι ἀδύτωι, τῶι δὲ 
ἀρχιερεῖ οὐ[κ] ἐφαραν πιστευεῖν 
ίνα µὴ κυρεύσας κοινὴν ἐπιστολὴν κατὰ πάντων γράψας σφραγίσῃ[ται 
αὐ]τής τῇ σφραγίςι.

On the verso

20 Ἀντίδχοι [ . . ]

2. Second κ of φεβίκει inserted after ι was written. 3. Α. βασιλικὸν γραμματίως?
'Dorion to Antiochus, greeting. I have written below for you copies of the memorandum addressed to me by Petosiris the high-priest of the temple of Heracles Eu... at Phebichis and the declaration presented by the priests. I beg you to (take cognizance of the matter?). Good-bye. The 6th year, Phamenoth 7.

'Memorandum. To Dorion the epistates from Petosiris, high-priest. I made a previous statement to you in the month of Choiak about the seal of the temple, that it was abstracted by Chesmenis and his son Semtheus on the ninth of the month Athur, which he did in order to (seal?) anything they may wish to write to Manetho and any other persons they please. I therefore report the matter to you, since we cannot use any other seal; and in the month of Choiak I presented a memorandum on the subject to... agent of Haruotes the basilico-grammateus (?), requesting him to send... to Haruotes son of Nechthemmeus, who was formerly in the sanctuary, and Chesmenis, who is now there, to inquire about the seal; and he (reported, having learnt?) from Semtheus son of Chesmenis, that... had (not?) taken it. You will therefore do well, if it please you, to send some one to them... son of Paous, and Haruotes son of Nechthemmeus concerning this matter, and write for me to... the strategus. Farewell.

'The 6th year, Phamenoth 6. Aristonicus having been sent to Chesmenis who is in the sanctuary asked him if the seal which the priests used for the letters that they had to write was in the temple; and Chesmenis denied that he had it. On the 7th, however, Thotortaeus son of Harmachorus, Harmachorus son of Nechthemmeus, Imouthes son of Pnasis, and Haruotes son of Nechthemmeus came and confessed that the seal was in the sanctuary; but they said they did not trust it to the high-priest, lest when he obtained possession of it he should write a letter accusing them all and seal it with the actual seal. (Addressed) To Antiochus.'

1. Petosiris the high-priest is also mentioned in 131.
2. Phamenoth... seems to be an unknown epithet of Heracles; the third letter looks like θ but this may be due to some ink having come off from another papyrus, in which case θ might be read. Perhaps, however, ἱερά did not follow, and εὐθεία need not then refer to Πετοσίριος at all. For the cult of Heracles, i.e. Hershef, cf. the mention of a 'Προσελίσκος in 110. 5.
3. ἀξιών εὖ εὖ...? or perhaps ἀξιώσας ν...? The doubt is caused by some extraneous ink; cf. note on l. 2.
4. οὐθενίσκωθα is the natural word, but the genitive ὅν is not easy to account for.
5. There remains only the tip of the letter before μον, but it is sufficient to exclude μάχιμον.
6. The supplement after πρὸς η[π]ρο[ν] is suggested by l. 15.
7. This passage is too much damaged for complete reconstruction. Something like ὅ δὲ αὐτῶι ἀπῆγγελειν ἀκούσας παρὰ Σεμθέους... τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἑλληνίδας (sc. τὴν σφραγίδα) or τὸν δεῖνα εἰληφέναι may have been written.
8. After πρὸς... αὐτοίς some such supplement as πενῳμένον παρά suggests itself, but the traces of letters are so scanty that they can hardly be identified.
9. η[π]ρο[ν]... τῷ ντροπῆ[ς] does not very satisfactorily, but στρογγύλον cannot be avoided, and the other letters, though not certain, suit the vestiges.
10. γραφῇ ὑπομένειν: the future is not wanted, but γραφῇ ὑπομένα does not fill the space. Possibly, however, there was a flaw in the papyrus, which the writer left blank.
73. Letter of Antigonus to Dorion.

Mummies 69 and 70. 23.5 x 12.9 cm. 243-2.

A letter from Antigonus to the epistates Dorion (who is different from the Dorion in 72) recounting the same events which are the subject of 84, a petition of Antigonus to the king; cf. introd. to that papyrus. This document, like 84, is only a draft, and is full of additions and corrections; it is written on the verso, the recto being blank.

"Ἀντίγονος Δωρίῳν χαίρειν. ἡ γραφαὶ περὶ Κάλλιδρό-

τοῦ Καλλικράτου μοὶ ὁμολογεῖ ἣν καὶ νῦν ἐπαναγκάσαι αὐτὸν τὸν ὄνομ

ἀποδοθ' αἱ ἡ ὁμολογεῖ ἣν καὶ νῦν ἐπαναγκάσαι αὐτὸν τὸν ὄνομ

KANJIΣΠΟΤΟΥ ΠΑΠΥΡΟΥ 2021

οἱ ἐπιστάτης, ὁ Ἀντίγονος, ἐπιστάτης. ἰδίως ἡν ἀποδοθ' αἱ ἡ ὁμολογεῖ ἣν καὶ νῦν ἐπαναγκάσαι αὐτὸν τὸν ὄνομ

ὁ φύλακτὴς παραγεγραμμένος ἐίπε τὸ δεσμωτήριον τὸν Σινάριν ἐξῆγεν τὸν Κάλλιδρον [ἐκ τοῦ δεσμωτήριον ἡμᾶς] καὶ τὸν ἐπιστάτη τὸν πράξειν πιθανεῖσθαι [ἐκ τοῦ διάγραμμα]

[ἐπιγραμμένος] τὸν τὴν ἀναγαγών εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τῶν Τακιν

καὶ ἔχον παρ' αὐτῷ ἐγέμοις ἐξ ἕφηρνεν αὐτόν.

ἐπὶ οὐκ ἢ ἡγεσιάσεων ἐπὶ 16 letters

[ἐπὶ] εἰλήφειν ἤν παρ' αὐτῷ διά τῶν μαχαίρων ἔγραψα ὅπως ἢ ἢ εἴδης εἶναι αὐτοῦ τὸν μὴ γενέσθαι τῶν Δωρίων ἀπόδοσιν τὴν Πάτρων βιαν, δόται ἡμῶν διατετελέσθη τοῖς ταῖς πα-

20 ἐκ οὐ διαστάγμασιν. ἦρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) 8

17. Ροῦ Παπ.
74. OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE

Antigonus to Dorion, greeting. You wrote to me about Callidromus, now at last to compel him either to give up the donkey to its master or to pay him its value. But Callidromus . . . to exact from him the value of the donkey, 20 drachmae. I therefore in accordance with the letter which you wrote to me removed Callidromus quietly to the prison at Sinaru in order that he might restore the animal to Dorion. But Patron the archiphylacites of the lower toparchy came to the prison at Sinaru and released Callidromus from the prison, so that I was not able to carry out the execution according to the edict; and he took away the donkey to his house and has removed it from my reach by keeping it with him at Takona. If I were not unwell I should have taken it from him through one of the sword-bearers. So I write to you about it in order that you may know the reason why restitution has not been made to Dorion is the violence of Patron, who has continued to disobey your orders. Good-bye. The 4th year . . .

2. The insertion above the line suggests a patronymic, and cf. 34. 2 Καλλίδρομος Καλλικράτος; but γιὰ Καλλικράτος (cf. e.g. ΙΙΙ. 32 [Θηραμένον] is rather long for the lacuna.

3. τὸν κυρία: cf. 34. 3.

4–5. The construction and sense of these two lines is obscure. With regard to the insertion above l. 5, there is a space both after ὅσος and before ἔναγμα. It is doubtful whether the erasure below extends beyond ὅσο; at any rate ὅσο was left untouched, though perhaps if ὅσο was written the interlinear ὅσος was intended to replace it. Above the end of l. 4 there are slight traces of ink which may represent another insertion.

5. (ἀπαχύνει) κ.: cf. 34. 3. ἡσυχία is written with an iota adscript also in P. Petrie I. 19. 5 and III. 8. 5.

6. ἀπαχύνει is written with an iota adscript also in P. Petrie I. 19. 5 and III. 8. 5.

7. ἣτο σοῦ ἐπιστολὴν: cf. 34. 2 καὶ πρόσταγμα Δαρίωνος.

8. ἢ. Cf. note on 34. 1.

9. Ἰ. Cf. note on 34. 1.

10. ποιμὴν: cf. 34. 8.

11. ἡσυχία is written with an iota adscript also in P. Petrie I. 19. 5 and III. 8. 5.

12. Μακαροφόρος: Μακαροφόροι are frequently met with in the second century B.C. (cf. P. Tebt. 35. 13, note), but there seems to be no other mention of them in the third. Μακαροφόροι might also be the termination of a proper name; but the supplement we have suggested is more suitable to the context.

74. ORDER FOR PAYMENT.

Mummy A. 8 x 24.2 cm. About B.C. 250.

A letter from one official to another, authorizing a payment of olyra (durra) to three persons who are probably minor officials. The conclusion of the document, which belongs to the reign of Philadelphus or Euergetes, is lost. An interesting conversion of artabae on the δοξικὸν measure into artabae on the ἀνηλιωτικὸν measure occurs in ll. 2–3, but the proportion of 40:38 which is found here brings the evidence of this papyrus into conflict with that from other sources; cf. note on l. 2. The writing is across the fibres.

[12 letters] χαί[τ]ρειν. μέτρησον Νοβόνχη χριστῇ καὶ
Σεμβεως καὶ Ἀρσεμϕθεβ[η] τῷ παρὰ Τε[ω]το[ς] ἡλυρ[ῶν] (ἀρτάβας) Ἠβῆ ᾱdehy λῆδη μετρῶν δοχικῶν,


4 (ἀρτάβας) Ἀχ ο γίνεται ἄνηλωτικῶι [(ἀρτάβας)] Ἀχαίοις, τὸ δ ἐτερον εἰς τομῶν θνομα (ἀρτάβας) ψῆθε δ',

5 ὅστε γίνονται ἄνηλωτικῶι (ἀρτάβας) οἰς, τὰ δὲ σύμβολα ποίησαι πρὸς αὐτῶς καθὰ ὑπογέγ-


7 [...]ι [...]ι [...] απ[ε] 28 letters κω[ε]. [...] [...] [...]

On the verso

κε.

3. [ω]στε added in the margin. ἄνηλωτικῶι above the line. 4. 1. τοιμῶν.

...greeting. Measure to Nobonchis the agent, and Horus son of Semtheus, and Harsemphtheus the subordinate of Teos 2368 3/4 artabae of olyra on the receiving measure, which are on the spending measure 2500, and make two receipts with them, one in the name of Cleomachus for 1600 artabae, equivalent to 1684 on the spending measure, the other in my name for 768 3/4 artabae, equivalent to 816 on the spending measure, and make the receipts with them as herein instructed...

2. 2368 3/4 artabae on the δοχικῶν measure were equivalent to 2500 on the ἄνηλωτικῶν measure, being subdivided in II. 4–5 into 1600 δοχ. (which = 1684 ἄνηλ.) + 768 3/4 δοχ. (which = 816 ἄνηλ.); the missing figures are supplied by the arithmetic. As often happens in conversions from one standard to another, the ratios implied are not quite consistent, being approximately 71 : 75, 400 : 421, and 161 : 171 in the three cases respectively. A proportion of about 20 : 21 seems to be that aimed at, i.e. 1 art. δοχ. = 1 16 3/4 ἄνηλ. The sizes and names of the different kinds of artabae mentioned in papyri give rise to many problems; for the most recent discussions of them cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 232–3, and Hultsch, Archiv, III. pp. 426–9. On the one hand there is a series of artabae ranging from 40 (or 42) to 24 chœnices, and on the other a series of artabae on measures which bear the names δρόμου, ἄνηλωτικῶ, Γάλλου, Φίλιππου, Ἑρμοῦ, χάλκου, φορικῶν, θησαυρικῶν, and δοχικῶν, to which may now be added the artaba μετρῶ τῶν χαὶ τῶι βασιλικῶι (84 [a]. 6, 90. 11), and the art. μετρῶ α. ( ) of apparently 40 chœnices in 119. 18. The main difficulty lies in the fact that although the relative sizes of the first six of the artabae in the second series are known from P. Brit. Mus. 265, in no case hitherto has there been direct evidence to connect any of these six with an artaba of the first series. In order therefore to determine the number of chœnices in the artabae of the second series it is necessary to start from an assumption that one particular artaba in it is identical with an artaba in the first, or at any rate has a definite number of chœnices. In P. Tebt. L c. we took as our starting-point the supposed identity of the artaba δοχικῶ, which was known to be an official measure and was shown by P. Tebt. 61 (b). 390 to be 3/8 of an artaba δρόμου, with
the artaba of 36 choenices often found in official corn-accounts in P. Tebt. I. From that primary assumption we concluded that the art. δρόμῳ in P. Tebt. 61 (δ) and P. Brit. Mus. 265 contained 42 choen., the art. ἄνθρωπος 31½ choen., and the art. χαλκός 32½ choen. Hultsch on the other hand, starting from the assumption that the art. δρόμῳ contained 40 choen. attributes 31½ choen. to the art. χαλκός and 29½ choen. to the art. ἄνθρωπος. The art. δοξικός, which in P. Tebt. 61 (δ), 390 stood at a ratio of 6 : 7 to the art. δρόμῳ, is not taken into consideration by Hultsch; it would on his view of the size of the art. δρόμῳ contain 34½ choen. Applying these rival theories to the present passage, which gives the relative sizes of the art. δοξικός and ἄνθρωπος, the ratio of 21 : 20 there indicated is equally inconsistent with our proposed ratio of 36 : 31½ and Hultsch's ratio of 34½ : 29½; and it is clear that whatever view be taken of the number of choenices in the arsabae δρόμῳ and δοξικός in P. Tebt. 61 (δ). 383, it is impossible to combine the evidence of that passage with 74. 2 and P. Brit. Mus. 265 except by supposing either that there are one or more errors in the arithmetic of the conversions, or, what is more likely, that one at least of the three arsabae δοξικός, δρόμῳ, and ἄνθρωπος, was capable of variation in size. The inconsistency between the ratio of the ars. δοξικός and ἄνθρωπος found in 74 and the ratio of them found by combining P. Tebt. 61 (δ). 383 with P. Brit. Mus. 265 is easily intelligible, if e.g. the art. δοξικός in 74 is not the same as the art. δοξικός in P. Tebt. 61 (δ). 390, or if the art. δρόμῳ in P. Tebt. 61 (δ). 390 is different from the art. δρόμῳ in P. Brit. Mus. 265, or if the art. ἄνθρωπος in 74 is different from the art. ἄνθρωπος in P. Brit. Mus. 265. But without further evidence it is impossible to detect by which of these three possible entrances the inconsistency has crept in. The ratio of 21 : 20 between the art. δοξικός and ἄνθρωπος found in 74 is thus irreconcilable for the present with the other evidence for the relation of those two measures, but does it correspond to the ratio of the art. ἄνθρωπος to any other known artaba? The answer to that question is in the affirmative. The ratio of the art. χαλκός to the art. ἄνθρωπος in P. Brit. Mus. 265 is also 21 : 20; and from this correspondence it follows that, provided that the art. ἄνθρωπος is the same in both papyri, the art. δοξικός in 74 is approximately identical with the art. χαλκός. Cf. also P. Petrie III. 129 (a). 4 διάφορον ἄνθρωπον (πυρόν) ρή άν(δ) ε ἡν / ατε, where ' 5 per cent on 135 art.' seems to correspond, as Smyly remarks, to the ratio of 21 : 20 between the art. χαλκός and ἄνθρωπος in P. Brit. Mus. 265, though how the total of 12½ arsabae was reached is quite obscure. The present volume supplies some important evidence as to the size of the art. χαλκός: cf. 85. 18 μέτρα τοῦ (ἐνεκακοσ- κοστοκοιτακτομοῦ) τῶν πρὸς τὸ χαλκοῦν. The phrase τῶν πρὸς τὸ χαλκοῦν, which is also found e.g. in P. Amh. 43. 10 and P. Cairo 10250 (Archiv, II. p. 80) without any previous specification of the number of choenices, suggests that this art. of 29 choen. is the art. χαλκός of P. Brit. Mus. 265. This inference is, however, far from certain, because the standard measures, whatever their size, were probably all made in bronze (cf. P. Tebt. 5. 85 τὰ εἵδεταιντα ἐν ἑκάτοιν νομίνι ἐπισκευημένα χαλκάς, sc. μέτρα), and the art. χαλκός may well have varied in size, as we have found reason to believe was the case with one at any rate of the art. δρόμῳ, δοξικός, and ἄνθρωπος. But assuming that the art. χαλκός in P. Brit. Mus. 265 contained 29 choenices we can deduce the approximate sizes of the other arsabae in that papyrus as follows:—

χαλκός : δρόμῳ = 25 : 32 . . . δρόμῳ = 37½ choen.
χαλκός : ἄνθρωπος = 21 : 20 . . . ἄνθρωπος = 27½ „
χαλκός : Φίλιππος = 10 : 11 . . . Φίλιππος = 31½ „
χαλκός : Ιάλλου = 200 : 207 . . . Ιάλλου = 302½ „
χαλκός : Ἑρμοῦ = 25 : 26 . . . Ἑρμοῦ = 302½ „

Applying this to the three arsabae, φορικός, δησαυρικός, and another unnamed, in P. Brit.
Mus. 125, the ratios of which to each other correspond almost exactly to those of the art. δρόμω, χαλκό, and Έρμω in P. Brit. Mus. 265, we should obtain \(37\frac{3}{5}\) choen. for the art. φορικό, 29 for the art. θησαυρικό, and \(30\frac{3}{5}\) for the unnamed art.; and with regard to 74, 2 the art. δοξικό, being apparently identical with that χαλκό, would contain 29 choen., and if the art. δοξικό in P. Tebt. 61 (6), 390 also has 29 choen. the art. δρόμω there contains \(34\frac{3}{5}\) art. There is a considerable element of uncertainty in these figures owing to the doubt attaching to the fundamental assumption that the art. of 29 choen. πρὸς τὸ χαλκῶν in 85, 13 is identical with the art. χαλκό in P. Brit. Mus. 265; but there seems to be as much evidence for that hypothesis as for either the assumption that the art. δοξικό in P. Tebt. 61 (6). 390 contains 36 choen., which was the basis of our previous calculations, or the assumption that the art. δρόμω contains 40 choen., which is the basis of Hultsch's scheme. The phrase used in P. Tebt. 105, 40 and 109. 20 μέτρων ἐξαχούσιοι δρόμου τού ἐν τῇ προγεγραμμένῃ κώμῃ (sc. Κερκεσίρι) Σοκχείου distinctly indicates that the μέτρων δρόμου of other temples might be different, so that the μέτρων δρόμου is a singularly unstable foundation upon which to build.

The μέτρα παραδοξικά in 87, 12 are probably identical with the μέτρων δοξικῶν of 74, and for another example of the μέτρων ἀνθρωπίνων cf. 101. 8.

6. Ζω[λο]ν νομερχιάς: cf. e.g. Νέανος νομερχιάς in P. Petrie III. 37 (a). i. 4. If Zoilus here is the captain who is so often mentioned in these papyri (e.g. 96. 39), ἀρχιά may be the termination of a military term; but ἀρχια does not occur in the Petrie papyri, and the ἀπορχιά there are distinguished by numbers or by nationalities, not by the names of their commanders.

75. LETTER OF THEODORUS TO THE PHYLACITAE.

Mummy A 15. 10.5 x 10.3 cm. B.C. 232 (231).

A letter from Theodorus, probably an ἀρχιφυλακίτης or ἐπιστάτης φυλακιτῶν (though cf. 105. 1, note), to the φυλακίται of Talaē in the Κωπής τόπος (cf. 36, 3, note), ordering them to survey and deliver to the purchaser part of a κλήρος, which had reverted to the ownership of the State and was now being sold; cf. 52. 26, note. Amongst other fragments from the same piece of cartonnage is part of a letter from Theodorus to Harmiusis, who is probably identical with the Harmiusis in 36. 2: the 15th year in l. 10 is therefore more likely to refer to Euergetes than to Philadelphus; cf. also l. 3, note.

\[\text{Θεόδωρος τοῖς ἐν Ταλάῃ φυλακίταις} \text{ χαλ-}\]
\[\text{ρειν. γέγραφεν ἢμιν Πετοσίρις ὁ το-}\]
\[\text{πάρχης καὶ Πετε[ι]μοῦθης ὁ το-}\]
\[\text{πογραμμάτευς} \text{ πεπρακέναι} \text{ Φιλάμμονι} \]
\[\text{5 ἐκ} \text{ τοῦ Φιλοξένου κλήρον} \text{ περὶ} \text{Ταλά-}\]
\[\text{χρατάκης} \text{ (ἀρώφας) γ} \text{γ} \text{.} \text{παραλαβόντες} \]
\[\text{οῦ ἄν τοῦ κομογραμμάτεα} \text{ περιμετρήσατε} \]
Theodorus to the guards at Talae, greeting. Petosiris, the toparch and Petimouthes, the topogrammateus have written to me that they have sold to Philammon out of the holding of Philoxenus at Talae 3,6 arourae of grass-aracus land. Take the komogrammateus therefore with you, and measure the area to him, but do not part with any more, knowing that you will be held responsible. Good-bye. The 15th year, Tubi 2.

This Petimouthes is probably identical with one or other of the topogrammateis mentioned in 67. 7 and 68. 5 in the 19th year of Euergetes.

5. Φιλοξένου κλήρος: a Φιλοξένου κλήρος in the Oxyrhynchite nome is mentioned in 85. 13, where it is called βασιλικός, implying that it had reverted to the Crown like the Φιλοξένου κλήρος in 75; cf. 52. 26, note. Hence in spite of the difference of situation Philoxenus may be the same person in both cases.

6. χρησαράκην is a new compound, for which cf. 130 χρησαράκων.

76. ORDER FOR PAYMENT.

Mummy A. 9-8 x 10 cm. B.C. 248 (247).

A letter to Docimus, who is probably identical with the Docimus in 86 and was most likely a sitologus or other official connected with the State granaries, from Eupolis, probably a higher official, authorizing a payment of durra to be made to the lessee of a κλήρος. This proceeding is stated to be in accordance with the terms of the lease, and the durra was perhaps required as an instalment of rent due to the landlord, but the mutilation of the important word in l. 8 leaves the object of the payment uncertain. The writing, which is very ill-formed, is across the fibres, and apparently on the verso.

Εὐπολίς Ζωπυρίων(os) Δοκίμωι
χαίρειν. προοῦ Τειμοκρά-
τηι κατὰ τὴν συγγραφὴν
τοῦ κλήρου οὗ ἐμισθώσατ(ο
5 παρὰ Κρέοντος τοῦ Αὐτίονο-
μου πυρῶν ἁρταβῶν τρι-
ἀκοσίων πεντῆκοντα [. .
εἰ[ε] τὴν ἑ. ἑ. αφοριὰν ἡ[δ]λυ
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π[δ]μ ἀρτάβας ἐκκοσι πέν[τε.]
10 ἐρ[ρ]ῳσο. (ἐτοὺς) λη
Θωῦτ κε.

On the recto

Δρκίμωι.

'Kupis son of Zopyrion to Docimus, greeting. Pay to Timocrates, in accordance with the contract concerning the holding which he has leased from Creon son of Autonomus for 350 artabae of wheat, for the... 25 artabae of olyra. Good-bye. The 38th year, Thoth 25. (Addressed) To Docimus.'

4-5. ἔμαθώσῳ is doubtful, but is preferable to ἔμαθωσῳ, although the middle and active forms of μαθῶν are occasionally confused in later papyri, e.g. P. Gen. 69 and 70. It would no doubt also be possible to translate ἔμαθωσῳ in the normal way by connecting παρὰ Κρεὸντος with προσ and making πυρῶν... πεντάκοντα a partitive genitive; and this would of course account for the payment to Timocrates. But the general structure of the sentence and the absence of ἀπὸ before πυρῶν are in favour of the other interpretation.

7. Possibly πεντάκοντα [τε, but more probably the line ended with πεντάκοντα.

8. None of the known words ending in -οπορά suits the context, and there is no sufficient justification for altering -οπορά to -οφορά, or -οφορά, though it is possible that the word is e.g. ἀναφορά, having the same meaning as ἀναφορά. There might then be some connexion between it and the β ἀναφορά found in P. Tebt. 100. β ἀναφορά, however, does not fill the space required here, and there is no stroke above the first letter to indicate that it is a figure. The mention of the 350 artabae of wheat for rent in l. 6 shows that the 25 artabae of olyra were in some way connected with that amount, perhaps forming part of it.

77. LETTER CONCERNING THE PRIESTLY REVENUES.

Mummy A. 15.2 x 21.8 cm. B.C. 249 (248).

Conclusion of a circular addressed very likely by the dioeceses or some other high personage to officials in, probably, the Heracleopolite nome (cf. l. 1 and 110. 5), securing to one or more temples the due payment of their revenues; cf. the similar decree by Euergetes II in P. Tebt. 6. A double date of particular importance occurs in l. 8; cf. App. l. p. 341.

[30 letters] εἰ τῶν Ἡρακλεόντων
[30 "] ὑπὸ παστοφόροις
[... ] τῶν λογεφύτων ἵνα συντελήται τὰ νομιζόμενα
... in order that the customary payments may be made to the gods in accordance with the king’s desire. So collect from the same persons as before and restore (to the priests) the amounts previously paid to them, for we have received instructions with regard to the collection of taxes that the sacred revenues (?) are to be preserved for the gods as in former times. The 36th year, Artemisius 23, Pachon 22.

78. LETTER OF NICIAS TO ARGAEUS.

AnA letter to Argaeus from Nicias requesting that two persons should be released from some public service, the nature of which is not specified. As the scene was Alabastropolis, it was probably connected with quarrying. The writer and addressee no doubt occupied official positions, but there is no indication of their rank. The 4th year (l. 24) refers no doubt to the reign of Euergetes.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N} & \text{i}\text{k} \text{i} \text{a} \text{s} \ ' \text{A} \text{r} \text{g} \text{a} \text{i} \text{o} \text{u} \ ' \chi\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\iota\nu. \ \pi\lambda\varepsilon\o\omicron\gamma\acute{\iota} \mu\omicron \ \chi\gamma\epsilon\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma \ ο\omicron \ \sigma\omicron \ \pi\epsilon\iota \ \eta\prime\iota \ \text{Zoi} \text{l} \text{ou} \ \kappa\iota \ \Pi\rho\alpha\omicron\iota\mu\alpha\acute{\iota} \ \omicron \ \nu\omicron\ \lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\gamma\iota\gamma\iota\iota\varsigma \ \pi\omicron\omicron\varsigma\omicron \ \text{ap} \\omicron\omicron\upsilon\varsigma. \\
5 \ \epsilon\iota \ \omega\omicron \ \varsigma \ \alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \kappa\epsilon\omicron\sigma\omicron \ \eta\mu\omicron\varsigma. \ \epsilon\iota \ \iota\omicron \ \nu\omicron \ \nu\omicron \ \epsilon\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \sigma\omicron \ \epsilon\iota \ \text{ap} \ \alpha\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \ \epsilon\iota\omicron \ \alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\varsigma \ \nu\omicron \ \epsilon\iota \ \text{A} \text{l} \text{a} \text{b} \text{a} \text{s} \text{t} \text{r} \text{o} \text{p} \text{l} \text{i} \text{n} \ \lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\gamma\iota\gamma\iota\iota\varsigma. \\
10 \ \delta\iota \ \tau\omicron \ \mu \ \epsilon\kappa\varphi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon \iota\nu \ \alpha\tau\omicron\omicron\iota \ \tau\omicron \ \nu\omicron \ \lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\gamma\iota\gamma\iota\varsigma, \ \kappa\iota \ \epsilon\iota \ \epsilon\kappa \ \tau\omicron \ \text{O} \text{\varphi} \text{\iota} \text{\nu} \text{\iota} \text{\chi} \text{\iota} \text{\iota} \text{\omicron} \ \epsilon\iota\omicron\pi\epsilon\iota\epsilon\omicron\iota\nu \ \omega\omicron\nu\nu\nu \ \text{Zoi} \text{l} \text{ou} \ \alpha\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \ \epsilon\iota\omicron \ \delta \ \epsilon \ \tau\omicron \ \text{K} \text{o} \text{\iota} \text{t} \text{o} \ \Pi\rho\alpha- \\
15 \ \epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\omicron\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \epsilon\iota \ \delta \ \mu \ \delta\nu\nu\nu.
\end{align*}
\]
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20 γελμα τοις ἄνθρωποις 

δοθη.

έρρωσο.

On the verso 2nd hand

(ἔτους ?) [8 . . . . . . ]

10. ες of ἐκείσει'γ' above the line. 18. γραφην above the line.

'Nicias to Argaeus, greeting. Though I have often written to you about Zoilus and Praximachus, to release them when they are called upon to serve, you have never listened to me. So now at last be careful to release them from their present service at Alabastropolis because it is not at present their turn to serve; and if people are being chosen from the Oxyrhynchite nome release Zoilus, if from the Koite toparchy, Praximachus. If, however, you are unable to release them, write to me and get the document from Dorion without me, so that I may be the means of giving the men the order. Good-bye. The 4th year . . . (Endorsed) The 4th year, concerning Zoilus.'

8. Cf. P. Petrie II. 47. 37-8 λειτουργείν ἐν 'Ἀλαβάστρων πόλει. 'Ἀλαβάστρων πόλει is presumably identical with the village in the Hermopolite nome which in Roman times was called Ἀλοβαστρίη; cf. B. G. U. 553. B. iii. 1. Alabastropolis is placed by Ptolemy at some distance from the river, to the south-east of Cynopolis and immediately opposite Hermopolis. λειτουργεί as a title occurs in 86. 14.

10. ἔκτενει'γ', if right, must have much the same sense as προσέπη in l. 4. The word has apparently been corrected; cf. critical note.

16. ἡσθα for ἦς is a grammatical curiosity, perhaps due to a confusion caused by the use of ἦς for ἡσθα.

18. Two persons called Dorion held the office of ἐπιστάτης φυλακητῶν in the Oxyrhynchite and Heracleopolite nomes respectively at this time (cf. 34. 2, 72. 4), and the Dorion in 78 may be identical with one of them or with the Dorion at Phebichis (if he be a distinct person) who occurs in 106. 9, &c.

79. LETTER OF PTOLEMAEUS TO HERACLIDES.

Mummy 87. 10-2 x 8.5 cm. About n. c. 260.

This fragment of a letter is noticeable for its elaborate introductory formula, which resembles, though it does not quite coincide with, that in P. Petrie III. 53 (φ); cf. II. 13 (6). 1-3. The date is probably within the reign of Philadelphus.
'Ptolemaeus to Heraclides, greeting. If you are well, and if the objects of your care and other concerns are to your mind I should be glad, and much gratitude would be due to the gods; I myself am also in good health. You will oblige me...

8. The letters above the line are very blurred and may have been cancelled. ἤδεως is unsatisfactory.

A notice from Epichares to Chaeremon that Horus and another person (cf. note on ll. 2–3) were each exporting two jars of wine from villages in the Heracleopolite nome to Hiera Nesus, and that the tax of \( \frac{1}{3} \) had not been paid. This Hiera Nesus is no doubt the village of that name in the south of the Fayum (cf. e.g. 81. 16), where Chaeremon presumably held an official post; and the tax of \( \frac{1}{3} \) is probably to be regarded as an export duty analogous to those known in the Roman period. It may be conjectured that these tickets were given to the persons exporting the commodity, and that they had to produce them on reaching their destination. At the end is a signature in demotic, having an important date by two different systems of reckoning the king's years; cf. note ad loc. 154–5 are similar notices passing between the same officials. The writing is across the fibres of the papyrus.

'Ἑπιχάρης Χα[η]σ[η]μον Χα[η]ρε[η].
[ε]ξέγει! ...................... [.....]
On the verso

6–14. 'Epichares to Chaeremon, greeting. Horus son of Teos is exporting from Thmoinethumis in the Heracleopolite nome to Hiera Nesus 2 jars of wine, on which we have not exacted a 24th. Good-bye. The 35th year, Epeiph 4.

'T (Signed in demotic) Written by Haruotes, 2 measures of wine... Written in year 34 which makes year 35, Epeiph 4.'

2–3. We are unable to reconcile the vestiges at the beginning of l. 3 with Ὄρος Τεώτως, neither do the very indistinct letters in 2 well suit Ὄρος Τεώτως, and a longer name seems to be required. It is therefore preferable to suppose that this is not a single notice in duplicate, but two distinct notices written on the same sheet. Perhaps Horus and the other person were going in company. 154–5 also are not in duplicate.

13–4. For the transcription and translation of the demotic signature of the scribe we are indebted to Mr. Griffith. It contains the earliest extant mention of the two different methods of counting the king's years, which is found also in P. Petrie III. 58 (d) and P. Magd. 35; cf. Smyly, *Hermathena*, X. No. xxv, p. 432, and our discussion in App. ii. pp. 358–367. The 'revenue' year, which in those two papyri is explicitly called the year ἀφ' αἰ πρόσεχον, began, we think, on Thoth 1, and the figures denoting it were sometimes one unit in advance of those of the 'regnal' year. In the present case the 35th is the revenue year, the 34th the regnal; and the papyrus shows that the 35th regnal year of Philadelphus must have begun later than Epeiph 4, i.e. more than 10 months after the beginning of the 35th revenue year.
This papyrus and the next both belong to the correspondence of Asclepiades, an official of some importance in the Arsinoite nome in the 9th year (of Euergetes). 81 contains a series of letters from Artemidorus, giving information of the death of certain cavalry soldiers, and directing that possession of their holdings should be resumed by the government. The language of Artemidorus plainly implies that the reversion of such klērots to the State at their owner's death was the usual course at this period. That fact was not before definitely ascertained, though it had been inferred from the apparent inability of cleruchs to dispose of their holdings by will. In the second century B.C. it became customary for the cleruchic holding to pass from father to son, and it is possible that at the date of our papyrus also sons of cleruchs commonly received their fathers' holdings by a fresh grant from the State; but this practice has yet to be proved. Even in the later period a cleruch's rights of ownership were by no means complete; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 555-6.

Besides the column printed there are the ends of lines of the preceding column, which, as the words μερίδος and κλήροις indicate, was of a like character. Adhering on the right is part of a new sheet containing the beginnings of lines of another letter from Artemidorus, with an enclosure addressed to Nicanor similar to that in II. 5-10; one of the holdings referred to was ἐν Φαρδαίδους, i.e. the Arsinoite village. There is also a separate strip having the first letters of lines preceded by a rather broad margin, which may have been the commencement of the roll; possibly it belongs to Col. i of the main fragment. Θε(μιστοῦ) occurs in the margin; cf. l. 15 below. On the verso are parts of three much effaced columns in a small hand.

Col. ii.

[ ]

Ἀρτεμιδώρος ὑπογέγραφ' ἂν τῆς πρὸς Νικάνορα [ἐπι-στολῆς] τῷ ἀντίγραφῳ δ[πους] εἰ[δὸς].

[(ἐτοὺς) θ] Φαύφη κ[θ.]

Νικάνορ[ι] ὃι υπογραμμ[ένοι] ἅπαντες τετρ[ε]λευθεραίοις,
ἀναλαβε οὖν αὐτῶν [τοῦ]ς κλήρους εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν.
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The cavalry soldiers below-written have died; therefore take back their holdings for the State. At Bubastus of the troop of Epimenes, Sitalces son of . . . , captain; at Theogonis of the troop of Lacon, . . . machus son of Sca . . . , captain; at Tebetnu of the troop of Sosipolis, Ammonius son of A . . . . The 9th year, Phaophi 29.

Choiaik 4. Artemidorus to Asclepiades, greeting. The cavalry soldiers below-written have died; therefore take back their holdings for the State. At Heraclia in the division of Themistes, of the troop of Damon, Leagrus son of Dionysophanes, captain; of the same troop Philonides son of Artemidorus, decurion; at Hiera Nesus in the division of Polemon, of the troop of Lichas, Ebruzemis son of Ziochorus, decurion. The 9th year, Athur 28.'

1. The day of the month, referring to the date on which the letter was received, was no doubt prefixed as in II. 11 and 19.

7. λο(χαγός): cf. P. Petrie III. 4 (2). 29 τῶν Δ[άμων]ος λο(χαγός]. The Damon mentioned there and elsewhere in the Petrie papyri was doubtless identical with the Damon in l. 15 below. The marginal entries below this and the next line give the μερίδες of the villages, Bubastus being in that of Heraclides, and Theogonis and Tebetnu in that of Polemon; cf. l. 15.

16. The first word of this line should be a title, perhaps [γρηγόρος].

16. The abbreviation of δεκακόσ (cf. note on 30. 13), recurs in 103. 7, and consists of a Δ with the right side omitted, followed by an ι.

18. The troop of Lichas, like that of Damon (l. 15; cf. note on l. 7), also occurs in the Petrie papyri, e.g. I. 16 (1). 12.
This papyrus, like 81, contains copies of a series of letters addressed to Asclepiades, but though written in the same hand it is part of a different roll. In this case the letters are copied on the verso of a demotic document, and there are other points of difference. The dates in 81 are on the Egyptian calendar and in chronological order; in 82 the calendar used is the Macedonian, and the chronological order is reversed. There the letters were from a single person and dealt with one subject; here the writers, in at least two cases out of the three, are different, and their subjects miscellaneous. The first correspondent, whose name is lost, writes commending to the care of Asclepiades a letter which was to be delivered in the Heracleopolite nome. The second letter, which is sent by Aphrus, announces the appointment of a scribe of those cleruchs who had been sent to the Arsinoite nome in the 6th and 7th years (of Euergetes). Those two years were therefore marked by new settlements in the Fayûm on a considerable scale. The subject of the third letter is some timber, which the writer, Sopater, wished to be sold for the benefit of the Treasury.

Col. i.

[82. OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE]

Mummy 98. 33 x 38-4 cm. B.C. 239–8 (238–7).

This papyrus, like 81, contains copies of a series of letters addressed to Asclepiades, but though written in the same hand it is part of a different roll. In this case the letters are copied on the verso of a demotic document, and there are other points of difference. The dates in 81 are on the Egyptian calendar and in chronological order; in 82 the calendar used is the Macedonian, and the chronological order is reversed. There the letters were from a single person and dealt with one subject; here the writers, in at least two cases out of the three, are different, and their subjects miscellaneous. The first correspondent, whose name is lost, writes commending to the care of Asclepiades a letter which was to be delivered in the Heracleopolite nome. The second letter, which is sent by Aphrus, announces the appointment of a scribe of those cleruchs who had been sent to the Arsinoite nome in the 6th and 7th years (of Euergetes). Those two years were therefore marked by new settlements in the Fayûm on a considerable scale. The subject of the third letter is some timber, which the writer, Sopater, wished to be sold for the benefit of the Treasury.

Col. i.

[82. OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE]

Mummy 98. 33 x 38-4 cm. B.C. 239–8 (238–7).

This papyrus, like 81, contains copies of a series of letters addressed to Asclepiades, but though written in the same hand it is part of a different roll. In this case the letters are copied on the verso of a demotic document, and there are other points of difference. The dates in 81 are on the Egyptian calendar and in chronological order; in 82 the calendar used is the Macedonian, and the chronological order is reversed. There the letters were from a single person and dealt with one subject; here the writers, in at least two cases out of the three, are different, and their subjects miscellaneous. The first correspondent, whose name is lost, writes commending to the care of Asclepiades a letter which was to be delivered in the Heracleopolite nome. The second letter, which is sent by Aphrus, announces the appointment of a scribe of those cleruchs who had been sent to the Arsinoite nome in the 6th and 7th years (of Euergetes). Those two years were therefore marked by new settlements in the Fayûm on a considerable scale. The subject of the third letter is some timber, which the writer, Sopater, wished to be sold for the benefit of the Treasury.
to Asclepiades, greeting. Phimenis, the bearer of the letter written from you to me about the disputed corn which you sent to us in the boat of . . . and another boat, has been given a letter by me to be forwarded to Nysius, the sitologus of the Heracleopolite nome. Kindly see that it is carefully delivered, for the matter on which I have written to him is rather urgent. The 9th year, Hyperberetaeus 27.

17th. Aphrus to Asclepiades, greeting. I have appointed Isocrates as scribe of the cleruchs sent to the Arsinoite nome in the 6th and 7th years from Daisius. Please therefore to give your zealous co-operation in all that concerns this, in order that the duties of the scribe's office may be performed in the district and none of the king's interests may be neglected. The 9th year, Gorpiaeus 15.

. . . th. Sopater to Asclepiades, greeting. Kindly take . . . our scribe and the other accustomed persons, and deliver the 32 good logs which are in the . . . ., in order that their value may be paid to the king. The 9th year, Lois 24.

8. Cf. 83. 2–3 τῶι στιτολογοιωτώι τῶν Ὀξιρυγχίτην. It is doubtful whether in these cases stress is to be laid upon the article or not, i.e. whether the person named was the sitologus in chief or only one of a number of subordinates.
12. In the 9th year of Euergetes Hyperberetaeus approximately coincided with Athur, Gorpiaeus (l. 22) with Phaophi, and Lois (l. 31) with Thoth; cf. App. i.
15. γραμματεῖα . . . κληροίχων: cf. the ἐπιστάτης καὶ γραμματέωι τῶι κατοίκωι ἰπτέωι in P. Tebt. 32. 15, &c.
25. \[\pi[e]\omega\delta[\omega],\] if right, was perhaps followed by the name of the γραμματεῖος.
27. \[\alpha\upsilon\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\omicron\nu\sigma\zeta\] cannot be read; but \[\alpha\upsilon\delta\omega\] is suitable enough in the sense of 'delivering' for the purpose of the sale implied by l. 30.
28. The doubtful \(\lambda\) might be the \(\alpha\) of χρηστά; but it is written quite close to the \(\beta\), and two logs only would hardly have formed the subject of a letter.

83. LETTER CONCERNING A PAYMENT OF CORN.

Mummy 63. \(11\cdot 11\times 8\cdot 8\) cm. About B.C. 258-7.

Conclusion of a letter in which the addressee, probably an official connected with the royal granaries, is urged to lose no time in making a considerable payment in kind. The payment is described as a σιτομετρία, a term not infrequent at this period in the sense of allowances or salaries from either the State or private persons; cf. 118. 37, P. Petrie III. 87 (a). 17, 141. 15. The 27th and 28th years (of Philadelphus) are referred to in ll. 5-6.

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\]
5 σιτομετρίαν τοῦ κή
καὶ κή (ἐτούς) (πυρῆν) (ἀρτάβας) πυγί
καὶ κριθὼν (ἀρτάβας) πυγί.
eі οὖν μῆ (με)τρήκας νῦν μέτρησον αὐτῶι,
kαὶ τοῦτο μή ἑκοῦσης,
10 οὖ γὰρ ἐπιτῆδειός ἐστιν.
ἐρρωσο.
(ἐτοὺς) \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots

8. This line inserted later. 9. "πος" of ἀλευρίας written above θητω (which is not crossed through), and the first σ corr. from θ. 10. l. ἐπιτῆδειον?

'\ldots\ldots' crates the sitologus of the Oxyrhynchite nome to measure out the allowance of corn for the 27th and 28th years, 83\(\frac{1}{4}\) artabae of wheat and 83\(\frac{3}{4}\) artabae of barley. If, therefore, you have not yet measured it to him do so now, and do not let this be delayed, for it (?) is inconvenient. Good-bye.'
2-3. τοις στιχοβυψαστα: cf. note on 82. 8, and for the phrase cf. e.g. P. Oxy. 246. 4
τοίς γράφουσι τὸν νομὸν.
8. αὐτός: i.e. the person who was to receive the στωμηπία, not the sitologus.
10. If ἐπίστησιος is right, it must refer to αὐτόν, 'he is a disagreeable person'; but the
correction to ἐπιστησιον gives a more natural sense.

VIII. CONTRACTS

84 (a). Sale of Wheat. 22.5 x 17.5 cm. B.C. 301-0. Plate IX.

The following contract between two Greek settlers at Peroë in the Koite
toparchy for the sale of 30 artabae of wheat claims the honour of being the first
dated Greek papyrus of the reign of Soter. All the documents derived from
Mummy 5 are remarkably early (cf. 97, 100-1); but the present is by far the
most ancient of them, being actually dated in the 5th year of 'the reign of
Ptolemy,' by whom only Ptolemy Soter can be meant. As the contract is
fortunately in duplicate the possibility of a mistake on the part of the scribe,
such as the omission of 'the son of Ptolemy,' is very remote. The cursive
handwriting however, though obviously of the earliest type, gives little indication
of its extreme antiquity, and without the date could not have been judged to
be appreciably older than other examples in this volume, e.g. 97. Curiously
enough, demotic papyri of Soter's reign are almost equally rare; not more than
two are known to Mr. Griffith (Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library,
p. 123).

The precise year in which Soter assumed kingly power is not certain. The
Canon of Ptolemy assigns 20 years to his reign, and it has been generally
supposed (cf. Strack, Dynastie der Ptolemäer, pp. 189-91) that he became king
in B.C. 304 before Nov. 7, and abdicated in the course of his 21st (revenue) year,
i.e. between Nov. 2, B.C. 285 and Nov. 1, B.C. 284. The Rylands demotic
contract to be published by Mr. Griffith was written in Phamenoth of his
21st year, and can easily be reconciled with the received chronology if the year
in question was a revenue year; for the month in which Philadelphia's accession
took place is unknown, and there is no difficulty in placing that event later than
Phamenoth (May) B.C. 284, provided that it be not later than Nov. 1. But
there is good reason to believe that in dating ordinary contracts the revenue
year was not employed (cf. App. ii. p. 362), and if the 21st year in the demotic papyrus is a regnal year, various difficulties arise. From other instances in the reigns of Philadelphus, Euergetes, and Philopator it appears that the regnal years of the sovereign were sometimes, perhaps always, one in arrear of the revenue years; and if the 21st regnal year of Soter corresponded in whole or part to his 22nd revenue year, the Canon of Ptolemy seems to be wrong in assigning him only 20 years, and his assumption of kingly power must, unless the date of Philadelphus' accession be altered, be put back a year or more, i.e. to B.C. 305 or earlier; cf. Mahaffy, The Ptolemaic Dynasty, p. 44. In 84 (a), in which the months are Macedonian, the year, whether calculated by a Macedonian or Egyptian system, is not the least likely to be a revenue year (cf. p. 365); and owing to the prevailing uncertainty as to the methods of reckoning non-revenue years in the 3rd century B.C., the 5th year of Soter may fall within B.C. 301-0, 300-299, or even earlier than B.C. 301.

The most interesting point in the papyrus is the occurrence of ἐφ' ἱερέως κ.τ.λ. in the date-formula. This disposes of a much disputed question, for 'the priest' here can be no other than the priest of Alexander, and therefore the official cult of Alexander was already established in Egypt at this early period; cf. App. iii. p. 368. The delivery of the wheat sold by the contract was postponed until after the harvest (l. 5), so that many of the provisions of the document follow the formula of loans.

[Bασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαϊῷ ἐφ' ἱερέως Μενελάου τοῦ Δαμάχου ἔ (ἔτους) μή-
ν[υὸς Διοῖ]. ἀπέδωκαὶ Ἐπιμένης Ἀθηναῖος Τιμοκλῆς Χαλκιδεῖ πυ-
[ρῶν ἄρταβας τριάκοντα, καὶ τὴν τιμὴν ἀπέχει Ἐπιμένης πα-
[ρὰ Τιμοκλέως ἀμα τῇ] ςυγγραφῆι. ἀποδότω δὲ Ἐπιμένης τῇ
ν 5 [σὲ]τον Τιμοκλῆς ἔγ[γ] νέοι τῶν ἐπίωντον ἄπ' ἄλω ἐν μηνὶ Πα-

[νῆμων οἰτὸν καθάρων ἀπὸ πάντων μέτρων τοίς χρόνοις οἱ] ἰσιλικὸι ἐν κώμῃ Περόνῃ, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀποδοθῇ ἀποτεισάτω Ἐπι-

[μένης Τιμοκλῆς τῆς ἄρταβας ἐκάστης δραχμᾶς
τέσσαρας, καὶ ή πραξίς ἐστοι Τιμοκλῆς ἐκ ἑκ] τῶν ὑπαρχόν-

10 [τῶν τῶν Ἐπιμένων] τὰς πράσσοντες τρόποι ὀς ἄν βούληται.

η δὲ συγγραφὴ ἢ ἤδε κύρια ἐστο ὡς ἐπιφέρη Τιμοκλῆς
ὴ [ἄλλος τίς ὑπὲρ Τιμοκλῆ] ὦς πράσσον κατά τάκτα.

μάρτυρις Π[. . . . . . . . Α] [ο]ψίος Κ [. . . . . . . . ο]. συγγραφοῦξιν Διονύσιος

15 [Η]ρακλέους.
In the reign of Ptolemy, in the priesthood of Menelaus son of Lamachus, the 5th year, in the month Dios. Epimenes, Athenian, has sold to Timocles, Chalcidian, 30 artabae of wheat, and Epimenes has received the price from Timocles concurrently with this contract. Epimenes shall deliver the corn to Timocles out of the coming new crops from the threshing-floor in the month Panemus free from all adulteration by royal ... measure at the village of Perno; and if he fails to deliver it Epimenes shall forfeit to Timocles as the value of each artaba 4 drachmai, and Timocles shall have the right of execution upon the property of Epimenes and may enforce it in any manner he chooses. This contract shall be valid whenever produced by Timocles or any other person on Timocles' behalf, executing it as aforesaid. The witnesses are ... Dionysius, Aristomachus, Meli ... Stasippus, C ... us. The keeper of the contract is Dionysius son of Heracles.

2. Δίου is restored here and in l. 17 as best suited to the space.
4. ἀποδόσα here refers to the delivery of the corn. The use of the same verb in two different senses within three lines is somewhat awkward.
5. Since the month Panemus coincided with the period of harvest, it must have partially or completely corresponded with one of the Egyptian months Pharmouthi, Pachon, or Pauni. For the significance of this equation cf. App. i. p. 339.
6. χοῖ: cf. 90. 11, where this obscure measure apparently occurs again, μέτρον χοῖοι τῶν ... In the present passage χοῖον or χοῖκον might be read and explained as a mis-
spelling for Κωύτου, but 90 shows that this is inadmissible. The form suggests a connexion with χώθς, but since the χώθς was a liquid measure, that explanation also is unsuitable.

8-9. 4 drachmae (cf. 65. 24) represent twice the normal value of an artaba of wheat in Middle Egypt; cf. 100. 6, 110. 6, P. Petrie III. 80. 16, &c. In 90. 14 the price is 2 dr. 1 obol, and in 90. 15 the penalty value is fixed at 5 dr. For corn transported to and sold at Alexandria the high price of 4 dr. 5 ob. is found in 110. 11.

12. ταυτά: or ταυτά?

14. The συγγραφοφυλάκι (cf. P. Tebt. 105. 53, note) here occupies the second position in the list of witnesses, as in 90. 12. He is sometimes placed first, e.g. P. Tebt. 104. 34, 105. 53, but there was no regular order; in P. Petrie II. 47. 30–3 the συγγραφοφυλάκι comes fourth or fifth. The name Μελικοσίων (?) probably recurs on the verso I. 30, but the termination is not decipherable.

30–31. If 'Επιμένων and Τ[ιμοκ]λη[σ] are rightly read, a fourth pair of names is lost at the beginning of these lines.

### 84 (β). DATE BY A PTOLEMAIC ERA (?).

Mummy 5. 2.4 x 6.4 cm. B.C. 272–1 (?). PLATE VII.

From the same cartonnage as 84 (a) comes a fragment bearing the following remarkable date from the commencement of a document.

(Ὅτους) μ. μν[έ]δις

The writing is large and clear, and there is not the faintest doubt about the figure. But according to the accepted chronology, Philadelphus, to whom the Canon of Ptolemy assigns 38 years, died in his 39th year (cf. p. 364); and the only Ptolemy who reached his 40th year, Euergetes II, is of course quite out of the question here. Hence without disturbing to an unjustifiable extent the ordinary view of the length of Philadelphus’ reign 84 (β) cannot be referred to the 40th year, whether revenue or regnal (cf. App. ii), of the second Ptolemy, so that apparently this date refers to some era. An era κατὰ Διονύσιον which started from the 1st year of Philadelphus is cited by Ptolemy (cf. Boucée-Leclercq, Hist. des Lagides, I. p. 99); but from the company in which the fragment was found and the character of the hand a date in the first half of the reign of Philadelphus would be much more suitable. Such a date may perhaps be obtained by identifying this era with that found on a large series of coins struck in years ranging from the 42nd to the 117th. Svoronos (Les Monnais de Ptolémée II qui portent dates, pp. 52 sqq. Τὰ ονόματα τῶν Πτολεμαίων, pp. 195 sqq.) supposes that the starting-point is the year B.C. 311–10, in which
the death of Alexander IV left Soter practically the monarch of Egypt, and that the coins come from Cyprus or Palestine. Svoronos’ classification of Ptolemaic coins marks a great advance upon that of Poole, but many of his proposed dates for different series are very uncertain (cf. G. Macdonald’s criticisms in the footnotes to the section concerning Ptolemaic coins in Catal. of the Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection, vol. iii, and A. Willers’ review of Svoronos in Liter. Zentralbl. 1905, nos. 17–8 and 19); and with regard to this series in particular several of the arguments which originally led Svoronos to fix upon B.C. 311 as the starting-point (Les Monnaies, l. c.) are tacitly (and quite rightly) abandoned in Tà νομίσματα, l. c. But an era starting from B.C. 311 is also attested by two inscriptions, one from Cyprus, the other from Tyre (C. I. Sem. I. 109, no. 93; 37, no. 7; cf. Strack, Rhein. Museum, liii, p. 417), and the commencement of the rule of Soter in Paros is dated in the year 311–10 in the recently discovered fragment of the Parian Chronicle (Ath. Mittheil. xxii. p. 188). The 40th year of this era brings us to the year B.C. 272–1, which is a thoroughly suitable date for the fragment; though the appearance in an Egyptian papyrus of a system of dating of which the other examples are all external to Egypt itself is certainly remarkable.

**85. Loan of Seed-corn.** 

![Mummy 13](image)

Contract for the loan of seed of different kinds from the government, as represented by the nomarch Harimouthes (cf. 40, introd.), to the lessee of a κλήρος βασιλικός, i.e. land which had been cleruchic but had reverted to the State, upon which see introd. to 89 and 52. 26, note. The loan was to be repaid after the next harvest before the rent; cf. 87, where an advance of seed is made without any such provision. The lacunae are supplied from 150, a duplicate copy of the contract.

**Βασιλεύωντος Πτολεμαίου τού**
**Πτολεμαίου καὶ τοῦ νιοῦ Πτο[λ]εμαίου ηερέως Αριστονίκου τοῦ Περιλάου Ἀλεξάνδρου**
5 καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν καὶ ηφόρου Ἀρσενός Φιλαδέλφου Χα[ρέας] τῆς Ἀπίου μηνὸς Μεσορῆ. ἐ[ξε]ὶ Π[ά]σις ἡ...
In the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy, and his son Ptolemy, the 24th year, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being Aristonicus son of Perilaus, the canephorus of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Charea daughter of Apius, in the month of Mesore. Pasis, son of ... priest, has received from Paris son of Sisybaeus, agent of Harimouthes the nomarch from the lower toparchy, as seed for the 25th year, being included in the lists of receipts and expenditure, for the royal holding of Philoxenus in the (troop?) of Telestes 40 artabae of wheat, 38½ of barley which are equivalent to 23 of wheat, and 67⅓ of olyra which are equivalent to 27 of wheat, making a total of 90 artabae of wheat, in grain pure and unadulterated in any way, according to just measurement by the 29-choenix measure on the bronze standard. Pasis shall deliver at the royal granaries in the 25th year the rent of the land for which he has received the seed, in accordance with the terms of the lease, in full, making no deduction for unwatered land; and he shall return the seed, which he has received, before the rent, from the new crops.

'(Signed in demotic) I, P ... son of ..., have received the stock above written.'

2. τοῦ υἱοῦ Πτολ.μαῖου: the question who was this 'son of Ptolemy,' associated with Philadelphus from the 19th (cf. 100, introd.) to the 27th years of his reign, has been much
disputed; cf. Bouché-Leclercq, Hist. des Lagides, I. p. 183. We prefer the view of Wiedemann and Mahaffy that he was Ptolemy Euergetes I.

7. τοῦ Ἀποις is unsatisfactory, especially as there is a lacuna after ἱερέως, which may have contained the name of the god. ... Ἀποις is more probably the name of the father of Πάσοις, but it is apparently not Ἀχαίποις or Κομψίποις.

8. Πάρτος: this is unlikely to be the Paris in 64–5, which refer to the Arsinoite nome.

11. τὸ γράφειν κ.τ.λ.: the reading is assured by 150. The meaning of the phrase seems to be that this loan of seed duly appeared in the official statement of accounts; cf. 48. 4.

13. Φαλοζίνου: cf. 75. 5, note.

14. τῶν Τελεστῶν: if these words apply to Φαλοζίνου (i.e. 'of Telestes' troop') they are out of place, though cf. 109. 4–5, note. It is probable that they here qualify κλήρον βασιλείων and serve to indicate the locality in some way, though Telestes was in any case probably a military officer of high rank; cf. 99. 7–8 o[μ]ομος Τελεστόν and note ad loc. We refer Τελεστόν to the common nominative Τελεστής, though the dative Τελεστῶν apparently occurs in 59. 4.

14–5. The ratio of the value of wheat to barley is the usual one of 5:3, to that of olyra 5:2, as in P. Tebt. 246 and 261, and approximately also in 119. 16; cf. 103. 2, note.

18. An artaba of 29 choenices occurs also in P. Grenf. I. 18. 20. The mention of πρὸς τὸ χαλκὼν in the present passage suggests that this artaba may be identical with the artaba χαλκός in P. Brit. Mus. 265; cf. 74. 2, note.

24. ἵππονος here is clearly a masculine substantive, as in 29. 26; in the Tebtunis papyri of the next century the substantival form, wherever its gender can be distinguished, is τὸ ἵππονον. In P. Petrie II. 30 (a). 5 and 18 εἰς τοὺς ἵππονον the substantive ἵππονος may also be meant.

28–9. The demotic signature has been translated for us by Mr. Griffith. P... can hardly be other than Pasis, though that name is apparently not recognizable.

86. Loan of Corn.

Mummy A.

Fr. (a) 13.5 x 7.4, (b) 4.8 x 4.6 cm. B.C. 248 (247).

Two acknowledgements with the same formula (or very likely one acknowledgement in duplicate) of loans of 15 artabae of olyra, another specimen belonging to the series being 129, where the borrower is a Mysian of the Epigone; cf. also 134–6. The lender in each case, Docimus, occupied an official position in connexion with the corn-revenue (cf. 76); and it is not unlikely that the loans are for seed, though this is not stated as in 85 and 87. Since repayment was to take place after the harvest of the 38th year (of Philadelphia), the papyrus was no doubt written in the 37th year or early in the 38th. Lines 14–26 are perhaps in a different hand.

Fr. (a) 13.5 x 7.4, (b) 4.8 x 4.6 cm. B.C. 248 (247).

Two acknowledgements with the same formula (or very likely one acknowledgement in duplicate) of loans of 15 artabae of olyra, another specimen belonging to the series being 129, where the borrower is a Mysian of the Epigone; cf. also 134–6. The lender in each case, Docimus, occupied an official position in connexion with the corn-revenue (cf. 76); and it is not unlikely that the loans are for seed, though this is not stated as in 85 and 87. Since repayment was to take place after the harvest of the 38th year (of Philadelphia), the papyrus was no doubt written in the 37th year or early in the 38th. Lines 14–26 are perhaps in a different hand.
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86. CONTRACTS
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86. CONTRACTS

εμ μηνι Δαισιω τοι εν τωι

doxoi kai triakostowi

5 έτει οίων καθαρων και

αδολον μεττοι βασιλικω

cal και αποκαταστήσω

έπι σκηνην τοις ιδιοις ανυλàμασιν. ειν δε μη

tephei ekάστης ἀρτάβης δραχμάς δυο.

έρρωσο.

Fr. (b). ερρωσο. (έτους) λι. 

Δημήτριος II. 

Κυρναίος τῆς ἐπιγηνῆς,

25 εκέλευσέ με ιε Πατής

γράψαι τήν ει.

I-13. '(... to Docimus, greeting. I have received from you) 15 artabae of olyra,

and I will return it to you in the month Daisius of the 38th year in grain that is pure and

unadulterated, measured by the royal measure, and I will restore it at the cabin at my own

expense. If I fail to repay it, I will forfeit to you the value of each artaba, 2 drachmae.

Good-bye.'

3. Δαισιω: in the 38th year of Philadelphus this month probably corresponded

approximately to Pauni, since in the 36th year it began on or about Pachon 29; cf.

App. i.

tοι: τοι could equally well be read both here and in l. 19, but would have no construc-
tion. τοι is omitted in 129.

8. σκηνη: cf. a second century B.C. papyrus in the Louvre published by Revillout,

Melanges, p. 335, which is a receipt for 2 talents 2500 drachmae of copper paid by a

banker εις τιμην οινον πηλιαυον δοστε ιπο σκηνην οινον κεραιμον ἐκοι πιντε. Revillout translates

σκηνη there 'tent,' and supposes that the wine was destined for soldiers, whose pay is the

subject of another receipt made out to the same bankers. This interpretation, however, is

very doubtful, and in any case there is no indication that the olyra in 86 was required for

military purposes. Judging by the use of σκηνη in 38. 7, we prefer to translate it here also

'cabin,' and to suppose the phrase ἐπι σκηνην to indicate that the grain was to be repaid on

board a government corn-transport.

12. Two drachmae are the penalty value of an artaba of olyra also in 102. 4 and

124; cf. 90. 15, where it seems to be 4 drachmae, and 102. 2, note.

21. The letters following βασιλικω are certainly not και (cf. l. 7). Perhaps ειν, sc.

dε μη ἀποδοι κτ.λ., should be read, but δε, sc. a repetition of βασιλικω, is possible.

25-6. This sentence differs from the usual formula γραψα συνεξατο (Πατής) found

at this period, e.g. in 124. The word following τήν is apparently not σ[υγγραφήν] or

διποχή. 
87. ADVANCE OF SEED-CORN.

Mummy 126. 17 x 9.8 cm. B.C. 256 (255).

An acknowledgement by several cleruchs, each of whose holdings contained 25 arourae, to a sitologus, of the receipt of 79½ artabae of wheat and 33½ artabae of barley for seed; cf. 85–8. Nothing is said about repayment (cf. 85. 25 and 86. 2), and probably the seed was in this case a present rather than a loan from the government; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 226–7. Since it was required for the sowing of the 30th year (of Philadelphus), the papyrus was no doubt written late in the 29th or early in the 30th year.

... son of Heraclides and Her ... son of Meniscus and Ze ... son of ..., holders of 25 arourae, acknowledge that we have received from ..., sitologus, for the holdings which we possess at the village of the Pastophori, as seed for the 30th year 79½ artabae of wheat and 33½ artabae of barley, in pure corn measured by the receiving measures, and we make no complaint.'

4. eikosi pentárouroi are not mentioned elsewhere except in the name of the Arsinoite village Ἰθέων Eikosi pentároun.

6. τὴν τῶν Παστοφόρων, sc. κόμην, does not occur apart from this passage (except perhaps in 118. 6; cf. note ad loc.), and it is uncertain to which nome it belonged.

12. μέτροις παραδοχικοί: more usually called δοχεια; cf. 74. 2, note.
88. **Loan of Money.**

9.8 x 5.1 cm. B.C. 263-2 (262-1). Plate X.

This papyrus contains the ends of lines of a contract for the loan of 100 drachmae or more at interest to a military settler. No third century B.C. contract concerning a loan of money has yet been recovered in good condition, the only other specimens, 89 and P. Petrie III. 55 (a), being also very fragmentary; but the general construction of 88 can be restored by the aid of similar contracts in the later Ptolemaic period, e.g. P. Grenf. I. 20, and of the parallel contract for the loan of corn in 86; cf. also 84 (a). The restorations of the lacunae in ll. 2-5 are derived from a fairly complete but much effaced agreement (unpublished) concerning a payment of rent, which belonged to the same piece of cartonnage and preserves nearly all the protocol. On reaching the word ἐκατόν in I. 8 the writer stopped, and resumed sometime afterwards in a slightly more cursive hand, leaving a blank space of a line between ll. 8 and 9. A noticeable feature of his handwriting is the occasional employment of a form of ω approximating to Ω, like that found in the *Ὑποτικὴ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον* (26).
4. ἀλιχεὲ: the day of the month was very likely not given (cf. e.g. 84 (a) and 85), in which case there was probably a blank space before ἕδενεν. Louis probably corresponded approximately to Pauni in the 23rd year; cf. App. i.

6. ἀλιχε: probably Κυρηναῖος (cf. 89. 6, &c.) or perhaps ἠυδηρίας (cf. 96. 4).

7. Φορὰ τῆς συγγραφῆς cf. 84 (a). 4. καὶ ἰστέξει probably occurred earlier in the line.

9. This line refers to the interest, and τόκου is to be restored somewhere in the lacuna. κατὰ μένα ἔκαστον in l. 10 also seems to refer to interest, and on the analogy of e.g. P. Grenf. II. 18. 16 we might restore καὶ τῶν ἱππεσκόμενων χρόνου at the beginning of l. 10 (cf. P. Petrie III. 55 (a). 13–4); but a mention of the contingency of failure to repay the loan before ἑὰν δὲ μὴ ἀρσῆται in l. 12 would be a curious inversion.

11. ἐν ἡμέραις κ.τ.λ.: cf. 89. 14.

13. ἠμιλίον might be restored after ἀποτελεσματο after ἀποτελεσμάτων on the analogy of later loans, e.g. P. Grenf. I. 18; but in the third century B.C. the penalties for failure to repay a loan were often on a higher scale; cf. 84 (a). 9 and 90. 15, where the penalty value of wheat is twice its ordinary price, and 90. 19–20, note. Hence both here and in P. Petrie III. 55 (a). 13, where the editors supply ἠμιλίον, διαλοῦ is more likely.

ΗΒΗΕΙ ΠΑΠΥΡΙ

4. Aalov: the day of the month was very likely not given (cf. e.g. 84 (a) and 85), in which case there was probably a blank space before ἐδένεν. Louis probably corresponded approximately to Pauni in the 23rd year; cf. App. i.

6. ἀλιχε: probably Κυρηναῖος (cf. 89. 6, &c.) or perhaps ἠυδηρίας (cf. 96. 4).

7. Φορὰ τῆς συγγραφῆς cf. 84 (a). 4. καὶ ἰστέξει probably occurred earlier in the line.

9. This line refers to the interest, and τόκου is to be restored somewhere in the lacuna. κατὰ μένα ἔκαστον in l. 10 also seems to refer to interest, and on the analogy of e.g. P. Grenf. II. 18. 16 we might restore καὶ τῶν ἱππεσκόμενων χρόνου at the beginning of l. 10 (cf. P. Petrie III. 55 (a). 13–4); but a mention of the contingency of failure to repay the loan before ἑὰν δὲ μὴ ἀρσῆται in l. 12 would be a curious inversion.

11. ἐν ἡμέραις κ.τ.λ.: cf. 89. 14.

13. ἠμιλίον might be restored after ἀποτελεσματο on the analogy of later loans, e.g. P. Grenf. I. 18; but in the third century B.C. the penalties for failure to repay a loan were often on a higher scale; cf. 84 (a). 9 and 90. 15, where the penalty value of wheat is twice its ordinary price, and 90. 19–20, note. Hence both here and in P. Petrie III. 55 (a). 13, where the editors supply ἠμιλίον, διαλοῦ is more likely.

Βασιλευόντων Ὑπολθευστῶν Παπυρός Ἰδιοῦ
καὶ Ἀσιανᾶς Θεοῦ Ἀδελφῶν (ἐτούς) ἦν ἔφ.[ἐ]ρεως Ὀνομαῖος Ἰππεῖς Ἰδιοῦ τῶν Παπυρῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Θεοῦ Ἀδελφῶν καὶ Θινὸς Ἐφερετῶν κατηφόρου Ἀσιανῆς Φιλαδέλφου Ἀρχε-5 στράτης τῆς Κηρυκλέους: μηνὸς Περιτίων ἐν Θώλ-θεοὶ τοῦ Ὁσύρου ἱδαίοις. ἢδανεισὶ Ἰωνίου Δέοντος Ἐρρηναίᾳ τῶν τοῦ Ἰδιοῦ ἱδαίοις.

Metὰ κυρίῳ Δέοντος [...] τοῦ αὐτῆς πατρὸς Ζηνίων
Δεινοῦτοι τῶν Α. [...] ἰδιοτῆς ἄτοκον ἄργυρον ὑθάλαμο-
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\[ \phi\alpha\num
12-4. These lines do not seem to contain provisions for the repayment of the loan (cf. 88. 11), for it is very difficult to see where ἀποδόν κ.τ.λ. can be brought in. Probably, therefore, the word lost in l. 15 after µι is not ἀποδῶν but the verb which occurred in l. 10.


17. For διπλῶν cf. 80. 19–20 and 88. 13, notes. A space is left for the name of the person to whom right of execution was reserved. Perhaps there was some doubt as to whether it should be Theodote herself or her κύριος.

18. κατὰ τὸ διάγραμα: cf. 90. 10, 91. 13, and 34, introd.

19. For the supplement cf. 90. 20, &c.

20–1. This endorsement looks like the title of the document, but we have failed to find a suitable reading of the latter part of it. It would perhaps be just possible to read συγγραφοῦ (φίλαξ) Ἡρώδης with Ἀραπίον below, and suppose that these are the names of two of the witnesses, but such an abbreviation of συγγραφοῦ (φίλαξ) is not satisfactory, nor is the word itself likely in this position. On the back of the fragment which contains the beginnings of ll. 1–10 there are also traces of ink, which may represent names.

90. Lease of Land.

11-1 × 16-6 cm.

B.C. 222 (221).

The document represents a lease for one year of an island, which formed part of a cleruchic holding in the Oxyrhynchite nome. The rent is fixed at 4 aratabae of olyra in addition, apparently, to a quarter of the wheat grown; but whether wheat constituted the whole or only a portion of the crop is not stated, neither is the acreage of the land specified. The lease was drawn up in the 25th year of Euergetes, the latest certain date in this volume; cf. note on 1. 2. The papyrus is in parts much discoloured and worn, and the small cursive hand is in consequence sometimes very difficult to read. The verso is covered with plaster, which, owing to the extremely brittle condition of the document, we have not ventured to remove.

[Bασιλεύσαντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ Ἀραπίος θεόν Ἁδελφόν [αὐτοῦ], τιμιστοῦ ἀριστοσ Ὀδυσσέου τοῦ Ἀριμύδου Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν καὶ θεῶν Ἐυεργετῶν κανηφόρου [Ἀραπίος Φίλα]-

δέλφου Βερενίκης τῆς Πυθ[αγγέλου] μηνὸς Γορπιαίου ἐν Θάλῳ τοῦ Ὀξυρογχίου ἐμίσθωσαν

5 εἰς ἐναντίον [ἐνα σ']πόρου [ἐνα] καὶ θερισμὸν ἑνα ἀπὸ τοῦ σ'πόρου τοῦ ἐν τῷ ἑκτων καὶ εἰ-
.....[8]  φι τῆς ἑπιγονῆς
ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου κλῆρου τὴν νήσου τὴν ἐμ Ἔμει τοῦ ᾽Οξυρυγχίτου νο[μοῦ]
πάσαν
δλυρῶν
ἀρταβ[ῶ]ν τεσσάρ[ω]ν, τὰ δὲ ἐκφ[ορία τὰ συγγεγραμμέν[α ἀποδόσει Εὐ]-
κράτης Διοδώ-
10 ῥοὶ ἐμ μῆν  Ζειν[δ]κιῶ τοῦ ἐβδόμου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἐτοὺς σίτων καθαρῶν καὶ ἕδολον

τὸν γενήμενν [ἐ]ν τῇ γ[ῆ] μέτρων χοει δικαὶοι μετρήσει δι[καίοι, παρα-
tέταρτον
μέρος κ[αὶ τοῦτο παρ]αστησάτω εἰς τὰ Διοδώρου ἰδιω[ὶ ἀναλώμα]τι. ἐὰν
de μὴ ἀ-
ποδοῦ [κατὰ τὰ γε]γ[ραμμένα ἀποτισάτω Εὐκράτης Α]μ[δῶρῳ] 6 τιμ[ὴν
τῆς ἀρτα-
ἡ πράξ[ε]σι ἐν]τω Διοδώρου παρὰ Εὐκράτων πράσ[ι]ντι κατὰ τὸ δ[i]-
γραμμα.
ἡ δὲ καλάμη ἐστὶ Διοδώρου. βεβαιοῦτω δὲ Δἰὸ[δ]ωρος καὶ τοῦς
cartod καὶ ἀ μεμίσθωκεν, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ βεβαιῶση κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα
ἀπ[η]οτισάτω
Διοδώρος Εὐκράτης ἐπί τιμον ἀργυρίῳ δραχμᾶς πεντακοσίας, ἐμ μὴ [τὰ βα-
κόλυμα] γείνηται. ἡ δὲ συγγραφὴ ἢδε κυρία ἐστω οὐ δὲ ἐπι-
φέρῃ.
...... Χαλκ[δ]εὺς Χί. ..... Πέρος τῶν Φίλωνος Κτήσιππος Καλλικράτους
.....[6]
In the reign of Ptolemy son of Ptolemy and Arsinoë, gods Adelphi, the 25th year, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi and the gods Euergetae being Dositheus son of Drimylus, the canephorus of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Berenice daughter of Pythangelus, in the month Gorpiaeus, at Thoth this in the Oxyrhynchite nome. Diodorus, Macedonian and decurion of the troop of Philon, has leased for one year, for one seed-time and harvest, from the seed-time in the 26th year to Eucrates, . . . of the Epigone, out of his own holding the island at Mena in the Oxyrhynchite nome all except any parts of the dry land which may be irrigated according to the survey, at a rent . . . of 4 artabae of olyra. The rent agreed upon Eucrates shall pay to Diodorus in the month Xandicus of the 27th year in pure and unadulterated grain grown upon the land by true . . . measure according to just measurement, and shall deliver it at the house of Diodorus at his own expense. He shall further give the fourth part of the wheat, which he shall also deliver at Diodorus' house at his own expense. If he do not pay as aforesaid Eucrates shall forfeit to Diodorus for the value of each artaba of olyra 4 drachmae, and for the wheat 5 drachmae, and Diodorus shall have the right of execution upon Eucrates in accordance with the edict. The straw shall belong to Diodorus. Diodorus shall guarantee the . . . crops and what he has leased, or if he fail to do so Diodorus shall forfeit to Eucrates a penalty of 500 drachmae of silver, if there be no obstacle on the part of the State. This contract is valid wherever produced. The witnesses are Eupa . . . and Collas, Cyreneans, both privates, Pam . . ., Chalcidian, Chi . . ., Persian of Philon's troop, Ctesippus son of Callocrates . . ., Straton son of . . ., Thracian, Euclion son of Ammonius, Cyrenean of the Epigone.'

2. The names of the priest and canephorus coincide with those of the 25th year, as known from an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus and a demotic contract; cf. p. 376. The period of the lease commenced from the sowing of the 26th year (l. 5), i.e. the autumn; so the present document being dated in Gorpiaeus which probably = Choaik-Tubi (cf. App. i), i.e. about February, of the 25th year, must have been drawn at some time in advance. If, as seems to be not improbable, the 25th and the other years mentioned by the papyrus are Macedonian years beginning on Dius i, which at this period fell near the end of Mecheir, Gorpiaeus fell near the end of the 25th year, and the interval between the date of ß0 and the sowing of the 26th year was at least 7 months. On the analogy of P. Tebt. 71, which shows that the sowing of crops in the Fayûm had just commenced on Nov. 9, a.c. 114, the απόφοιοι in l. 5 probably means November, which at the end of Euergetes' reign began on Thoth 15 and approximately coincided with Daisius. On this view the interval between the date of ß0 and the sowing of the 26th year would be completed by Xandicus (equivalent to Epeiph-Mesore, i.e. about September) of the 27th year (l. 10). We forbear to enter on a discussion of the complications which would ensue if the 25th and other years in ß0 do not begin on Dius i, or if εκτετάοι be read in place of πέμπτοι in l. 2. The very slight traces at the beginning of the line can be reconciled with either; and if ß0 be assigned to the 26th year instead of the 25th, Dositheus and Berenice may be supposed to have held office in both these years. There is a parallel for this in the case of the priests of the 9th and 10th years, but τό β, which would then be expected after πεμπτοι in l. 4, is absent; cf. p. 374. It is, moreover, very doubtful whether Euergetes actually reached a 26th year except on the revenue system of calculating the king's years, which is not at all likely to have been employed in a contract mentioning only Macedonian months; cf. App. ii.
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In the Tebtunis papyrus the name of Dositheus' father may be read as either Δριμύδου or Δρυμύδου. According to Spiegelberg's decipherment the demotic has Tripirus, which is in favour of Δρυμύδου. On the other hand that name is unknown, whereas Δριμύδου is attested (Luc. Gall. 14).

7. ἰδεις as an epithet of κλήρος does not imply full proprietary rights, as Meyer, Hegg. p. 42, assumes. All that need be meant here is that Diodorus was letting his own land, not sub-letting some one else's. Other instances, e. g. 105. 5, are capable of a similar explanation.

8. Above ἐκφρώσιον an insertion has been made, but the letters are too indistinct to be read.

11. μέτρων χολε: cf. 84. 6, note. The letters after τῶι are very small and illegible, but do not suit βασιλικά (84. 6) or δημιουργὸῖ. An erasure below is not likely, though the writing is somewhat blurred. μετρόσει δεκαλει is not very satisfactory, for the supplement hardly fills the lacuna, and a conjunction is missing. The final α of δεκαλει is more like a π, but to read δς καὶ and suppose that the π of παραιτήσο[ν] was written twice is not an attractive solution, although the scribe makes other mistakes, e. g. πράσων in l. 16.

15. ὀφρών: cf. l. 8, though there too the reading is doubtful. πυρῶν is possible in both places, but would be very unsuitable in l. 15 with τῶι δὲ πυρῶι immediately following. 4 drachmae an artaba is twice the ordinary penalty price of olyra; cf. 102. 2, note.

17. καὶ . . . may be a participle like καταγωγομένων or some adjectival phrase with κατά. The remains of the letters are too faint for recognition.

19. δραχμὰς πεντακοσίας: cf. P. Petrie III. 74 (a). 14-5, which is to be restored on the analogy of the present passage. The 500 drachmae for failure in the βεβαιώσει was no doubt a conventional penalty, and this suggests a new explanation of P. Amh. 43. 12, where it is stipulated that if the borrower did not repay a loan of 10 artabae of wheat he should forfeit τιμὴ δραχμὰς πεντακοσίας. The largeness of the sum is no longer a valid reason for supposing that the drachmae are not silver, but copper, and represent the price of a single artaba. On the other hand, if the 500 drachmae in P. Amh. 43. 12 is a conventional penalty, it is somewhat remarkable that they are not stated to be silver and that τιμὴ, not επίτιμως, is used.

For the clause εῦμ ῶ[τὶ κ.τ.λ. cf. 91. 5 sqq., where the same phrase occurs, also in reference to an επίτιμως. Similarly in P. Petrie II. 44, which is rather a contract of partnership than an ordinary lease, l. 13 sqq. may now be restored εὺς δὲ μὴ [βεβαιώσων] κατὰ τὰ γεγομένα αὐτονικώτατα Μητροδώρῳ καὶ Ἐπικούρῳ [δραχμὰς πεντακοσίας καὶ ἵπτῳ ἡ καύσῳ Μητροδώρῳ καὶ Ἐπικούρῳ εὖμ ῶ[τὶ] βασιλικά κάλλως γένηται, τῶι δὲ καρπίῳ κεφευτότων . . . . In 91. 8-10 a further provision is made in case the κάλλως did occur; according to 90 and P. Petrie II. 44, if the βεβαιώσει was prevented by any action of the government, the penalty was simply foregone.

22. If Χί. [ is a proper name, the number of witnesses is seven, as in 96. 12 sqq. But since Πέρσης is uncertain, it is possible that χί[ . . . Φάλων is all part of the description of Pam . . . the Chalcidian; ]ης, e. g. τέτραπετής might be read. A less probable method of reducing the number from seven to six would be to treat πομ . . . in l. 21 as part of the description of the two preceding witnesses and Χαλκίθεος as a personal name.

23-4. Κορημίως and [ἐπιγράφη] are both very doubtful. There would be room for about six letters at the end of the line after Κορημίως.
Conclusion of a contract for a lease of land from Eupolis to Cleopatra at a rent of 30 artabae of corn, with the names of the witnesses, who were six or seven in number, and part of the protocol of what was probably a duplicate copy on the same papyrus; cf. 90. The handwriting, which is extremely cursive, resembles that of P. Petrie I. 18 (1), and the 4th year in I. 19 no doubt refers to either Euergetes or Philopator, more probably the former.

If she fail to guarantee the lease in accordance with the aforesaid provisions, Cleopatra shall forfeit to Eupolis a fine of 100 drachmae of silver, unless some hindrance...
occur on the part of the State. If any hindrance occur on the part of the State, Cleopatra shall pay Eupolus the 30 artabae of wheat, or if she fail to pay she shall forfeit as the value of each artaba of the wheat, drachmae; and Eupolus shall have a right of execution against Cleopatra, exercising it in accordance with the edict. This contract is valid whereasover it be produced. The witnesses are Polyaeus, Cyrenean, private, and Th., decurion, both members of Zoilos' troop, Diocles son of Hippolyus,..., son of Apollonius from Hesperis, Nicanor son of Evagoras from Barca, ...'

2. Perhaps δικαι[ων] καὶ συναληθής; cf. 98. 19 and note.
8. Cf. 90. 19, note.
11. Probably δραχμάς δ', i.e. double the ordinary price (cf. notes on 84 (a). 9 and 88. 13); or perhaps δραχμάς ε'; cf. 90. 15.
13. οὐ ἀν ἑπιφέρηται: cf. 90. 20, &c.
16. Ἐπηρίτης: i.e. from Ἐπερίτης (= Ἐρενίδης) in the Cyrenaica.

92. CONTRACT OF SURETY. 6 x 5

Both this and the following papyrus are contracts of surety for the appearance of a person in court, and are of much interest as being by far the oldest examples of such agreements yet recovered; so far as we are aware, the only other specimen anterior to the Roman period is P. Brit. Mus. 220. ii, of the reign of Euergetes II, which is misunderstood by the editor. In their general purport and even in phraseology 92 and 93 show striking points of agreement with the later specimens, which have been discussed at length by L. Wenger in his Rechtshistorische Papyrussstudien. His view that the cases concerned are civil rather than criminal is supported by 92, where the suit is an action for debt. The sum involved was altogether 400 drachmae; and the two sureties bound themselves either to produce the defendant Timocles for trial before the strategos, or to pay the plaintiff Apollonius the amount of his claim. The agreement is made directly with the plaintiff, contrasting in this respect with the later examples in which an executive official is addressed.

**Βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ τοῦ νιὸν Πτολεμαίου έτους εὐπέριον καὶ εἰκοστείν’ ἐφ’ ἱερέως Πέλλοπος τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου Ἀλέξανδρου καὶ θεοῦ Ἀδελφῶν ἰ διακήνοιρ’ Ἀρεινώς Φιλαδήφου Μηνησίστρα- της τῆς Τεισάρχου μηνῶς Χανδικοῦ Ἀγνωτῆ- ὦν μηνῶς Μεσίπου τεσσαρακαιδεκάτης [[ai]]
260 HIBEH PAPYRI

em Mouxi|arath tou 'O|uxou|chitou. ey|noon
Timok|leous tou X|imon Trakos th|s epigounh

10 Mn|asou Xi|ouw] Thra|a th|s epigounh '|Ha|-
mou...mu|ou K|is tv|s epigounh ef di pai-
[raid|asto|tai au||]e|v |'Hrakaleous pol|ei eti
Krei|nou]
tou [e]t|p]a|y|al|ou e|w|s gn|stwos per|l th|s
dikh|s [ey|]|e|ne|n|se|n aut|n 'Apollonios

15 kata| sym|gat|phi|u| pros to ar|xa|on dra-
|x|mas tria|kostas kai to|ko|n dra|x|mas
ekat|on. e|a|n de| mi parad|o|ntai k|a|t|a
ta| gey|rammena apo|tei|o|t|asun tas te
|ra|ku|ou|as dra|x|mas kai ta| etid|ekata|k[al]

20 [al|a] gyn|me|na, kai h| prak|||is [e|a|]e|w| |Apop|l|vo|l|ou
|al|lo|w to|w |[Kr]a|spo|y ||to|b| prakto-
|[ro|s| v|p||e|rte|w| kata| to [di|ag|rap]ma.

14. σ of eneg|n|s inserted later.

In the 22nd year of the reign of Ptolemy son of Ptolemy and his son Ptolemy, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being Pelops son of Alexander, the canephorus of Arsinoe Philadelphus being Mnesistrate daughter of Tisarchus, on the 14th of the month Xandicus which is Mecheir of the Egyptians, at Mouchinaroo in the Oxyrhynchite nome. Mnason son of Simus Thracian of the Epigone and Hegemon son of...imus, Cretan of the Epigone, are sureties for Timocles son of Simus, Thracian of the Epigone, on the condition that they shall deliver him up at Heracleopolis before Crissippus the strategus until the decision of the suit in which Apollonius placed him on bail according to the contract for a principal of 300 drachmae and interest of 100 drachmae; and if they do not deliver him up as above written, they shall forfeit the 300 drachmae and the extra tenths and other charges, and Apollonius or any one besides of the attendants of Crissippus or of the collector shall have the right of execution in accordance with the decree.

3–6. Cf. P. Petrie III. 52 (a), where the names of the priest and canephorus can now be correctly restored.

7. Unfortunately at this critical point the papyrus is much rubbed and stained, and the correctness of the reading μη[τo]θ|Mx[ι] is open to grave doubts, for the vestiges of the supposed μ of μεΧ, which is the clearest of the letters, suggest rather η or κ. The traces of the other letters are very slight, and palaeographically Μες[σορθ] τη[γι] would be possible, though τ is less suitable than εΧ; but τη is not necessary (though cf. 93. 6), and, since the equation of Gorpiaeos to Mesore only five years later is certain from Rev. Laws lvii. 4–5, to read Μες[σορθ] here would produce a most serious inconsistency; cf. App. i. pp. 339–40. For the spelling Μες[ι] at this period cf. 34. 2, 51. 6, &c.

8. The name of this village is spelled Μουχιναρω in 53. The Μουχινωρ of P. Oxy. 491. 3 may be identical.
10. Mnason was most probably the brother of Timocles.

12. It is noteworthy that although the agreement was drawn up in a village of the Oxyrhynchite nome, the case was to be tried at Heracleopolis, as also in 30. 14 and 93. 3. The two latter papyri are not known to be Oxyrhynchite, but 93 was probably written in that nome like the other documents from Mummy A 9. The fact that in all three instances Heracleopolis is specified as the scene of the trial may be a mere chance, but it suggests the possibility that for judicial purposes the two nomes were combined under a single administration. There is evidence that in the time of Psammetichus Heracleopolis was the centre of government for Upper and Middle Egypt (Griffith, Demotic Papyri of the John Rylands Library, pp. 75 sqq.); and the city may well have still retained some of its pre-eminence in the early Ptolemaic period.

13. Κροτίπτον: cf. l. 21, where it seems more natural that the name of the strategus should be given than that of a ἀρχηγός, and something more than Κροτίπτον πόλις is necessary to fill the space. Moreover, there are very few possible names ending in -ωτιπτος, and that the first letters of one of them should occur in the name added above l. 13 seems to be more than a mere coincidence. In 93 also the judge was to be the strategus, and it is to that official that the earlier Roman examples of similar undertakings are addressed.

14. For the active ἐνεγώνον cf. the use of διεγγαίων in 41. 4, &c. The superfluous εγι is apparently due to a confusion on the part of the scribe, who also originally omitted the σ. εξενεγώνος can hardly be read, and besides gives a wrong sense.

15. The meaning probably is that the debt was κατὰ ἀναγραφήν (cf. 30. 5, 15). Clearness has been rather sacrificed to compression.

19. ἐπιδέος: cf. 32. 9, note. For τὰ γυμνά cf. 311. 33–4, where they amount to 30 drachmae 1 1/2 obols on a principal sum of 50 dr.

21. Cf. note on l. 13. Ἀλλα, of course, does not imply that Apollonius was himself a ἀπομικτή, but is an example of a common idiom.

---

93. Contract of Surety. 

9:5 x 11 cm. 

Mummy A 9. 

About B.C. 250.

Conclusion of a contract of surety similar in character to 92, but following a different formula. By its terms Diodorus, the surety, undertook to produce his friend on a given date before the strategus, but the nature of the case at issue is not stated as in 92. Some kind of inquiry was evidently to be held; but that any civil action had been instituted is doubtful, and the agreement is perhaps more likely to have been made with an official than with the plaintiff in a suit. The person for whom security is given may have been in a similar situation to that of the δοκεοματίς in 41, or of the prisoner released on bail in P. Oxy. 259. The papyrus most probably belongs to the reign of Philadelphia, and is likely to have been written in the Oxyrhynchite nome; cf. 92. 12, note.

σφοιξις Διοδόροι Στράτωνος Πέρση τῆς
HIBEH PAPYRI

ἐπιγονής ἐγγύων μονῆς ἐφ᾽ ἄι παρε- 

ζεταί αὐτῶν ἐν Ἡρακλέους τόδε ἐν 

tοῦ ἐμφανεὶ ἐξω ἱεροὶ καὶ πάσης 

5 σκέψης ὑπὶ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ μηνὸς 

Φαρμοῦθι τῇ γυ τοῦ ζύτου ἕτους 

εἰν δὲ ἀποκαταστήσῃ. . . . . . . . . . 

Διονύσιον ἂκουρὼς ἐστώ . . . . . . . . . . . 

λος, ζα ὑὲ μὴ ἀποκαταστήσῃ εἰς ἐκ- 

tεισὶν ἧ διάγγελμας περὶ αὐτῶν ἐσ- 

τω πρὸς βασιλικά.

...to Diodorus son of Straton, Persian of the Epigone, who is surety for appearance on condition that he shall produce him at Heracleopolis openly, outside of a temple or any other shelter, before the strategus on the 13th of the month Pharmouthi of the same year. If he cause Dionysius to appear (!), proceedings against him shall be invalid; but if he fail to cause him to appear for payment, decision about his case shall be made with reference to the royal decrees.

1. The first letters of the line suggest only a proper name. How the dative Διοδώρου was governed is doubtful; perhaps ἐνι γύναις or παρέδωκαν preceded.

2. ἐγγύων μονῆς: cf. 41. 5 διεγενήσας . . . παραμονής.

3−5. Cf. P. Tebt. 210, which may now be read ἔξω ἱεροὶ βομοῦ τεμένους σκέψης πάσης (with probably ἐν τοῦ τῶν τόπον preceding), and P. Oxy. 785 παρέδωκαν ἐν τοῦ ἐμφανές ἐκτὸς ἱεροὶ βομοῦ κ.τ.λ. These instances offer a good example of the persistence of such formulae. The elaborate explanation of ἂκουρὸν πατὸς κινδύνου in B. G. U. 1035. ii. 4 sqq. is couched in somewhat similar language.

7−9. The restoration of these lines depends upon the identity of Dionysius, who may have been either the person admitted to bail or the person permitting bail to be given. In the former case Δίοδωρος οτι ἐν ἐκτίσει (cf. l. 9), in the latter αὐτῶν πρὸς may be read.

ο ἐφοδιός or some equivalent word is required with ἂκουρὸς ἐστο, but this cannot be put into l. 7, since πρὸς Δίοδωρον not Διονύσιον would be expected. The syllable at the beginning of l. 9 may be the termination of a name in the dative, but it does not seem to be the same as that in l. 1. For ἀποκαταστίσῃ cf. P. Oxy. 259. 7.

10−1. Cf. the common phrase ὁ βασιλεὺς περὶ αὐτῶν (&c.) διαγράφεσαι, e. g. P. Amb. 29. 18. πρὸς βασιλείᾳ, which is found also in 94. 3 and 15, 95. 14, and 124−6 in connexion with πρᾶξις or πρᾶσσων, is apparently only a rather more general equivalent of κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα.

94. Contract of Surety.

19 x 8 cm. 

Mummy 18. 

b.c. 258-7 (257-6).

The two following texts are also contracts of surety, but of a kind of which examples belonging to this period are extant. The persons for whom surety is here given were contractors for the collection of taxes, as in P. Petrie III. 57
94. CONTRACTS

(a), (b), 58 (c), (d). The name of the tax in the present instance is unfortunately lost. The contractor was Semphtheus, a brewer, but since the amount involved is only 10 drachmae for a whole year, the tax is not likely to have been the ζυηρα at a considerable village such as Tholthis, unless Semphtheus was one of a large company, of which there is no indication. In P. Petrie III. 58 (d) the sum is also small, 20 drachmae. The sureties, two in number, were military settlers. Prefixed to the agreement is what appears to be an abstract of the contents, as in some other early Ptolemaic papyri (cf. 98, P. Petrie III. 58 (d), &c.), and in many of the later period.

5 [λεμαίου Σω]τήρος (έτους) κη ἕφ' ἑ[ρ])έως
[. . . . . . ] τοῦ Δικλύνου Ἀλεξάνδρου
[καὶ θεῶν Α]δελφῶν κανὴφ[ό]ρου Ἀρα[νό-
[ν] Φιλαδέ]λφου Νύμφης τῆς Μάγονος
[. . . . . . ] κη ἐν Θόλθε τη. ἔγγυος ἕ[ἰς
10 [ἐκτεινών] Σεμφθέως "Ο[ρ]ου ζυτοποιοῦ
[κάμης Θόθ]εως καθα ἕξι[λα]βεν πα-
[ρὰ . . . . . ]ς οἰκουμένου ἔγι[θ]. . . [.]Θο. . . .
[. . . . . . ] εἰς τὸ κη (έτος) Πο[λυκλής Θραί-
[τῶν Ζωίλοβ]υ [δραχμῶν] δέκα ἄνω[τιδὲ]κτω, καὶ
15 [ἡ πράξεις πρό]ς βασιλικὰ ἐπὶ πάσα[ν] τοῖς ὑπάρχου-
[σι. (2nd hand) . . . . . Κυρηναίους ἱδιωτής τῶν Ζωίλου] συνε-
[γγυόμαι. Πο]λυκλής Θραίς ἱδιῶτης τῶν Ζωίλου χειρο-
[γραφῶ ὑπὲρ αὐ[τῶν] ὅτι ἐγγυται εἰς ἐκτεινών Σεμθέ-
[α ᾽]Ορου ἐκ Θραίτιος δραχμῶν δέκα κατὰ τὸ σύμ-
20 [βολον τοῦτο. ]

4-20. 'In the 28th year of the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy Soter, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being . . . son of Lucinus, the canephorus of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Nympha daughter of Magon, . . . 27th, at Tholthis. Polycles, Thracian of the troop of Zoilus, is surety on behalf of Semphtheus son of Horus, brewer of the village of Tholthis, in accordance with his contract made with . . ., oeconomus, for the . . . in
the 28th year, for payment of 10 drachmae, about which there is no dispute; and execution
shall be made with reference to the royal decrees, at the risk of all his property. (Signed)
I . . ., Cyrenean, private of the troop of Zollus, am surety together with him. I, Polycle,
Thraic, private of the troop of Zoilus, attest on his behalf that he is surety for Sem-
pitheus son of Horus, of Tholthis, for payment of 10 drachmae, in accordance with this
deed.'

2. [πρὸς βασιλεία]: cf. l. 15 and note on 93. 10–1.
3. 4–5. Πτολεμαῖον τοῦ Πτολεμαῖον Σωτήρος: this formula replaced Πτολεμαῖον τοῦ Πτολεμαῖον
καὶ τοῦ νῦν Πτολεμαῖον (cf. e.g. 85) in the 27th year (Rev. Laws i. 1 and introd. pp. xix sqq.); the
formula in the early part of the reign was Πτολεμαῖον τοῦ Πτολεμαῖον simply (cf. 97 and
99), and of this the latest extant example is of 100. 8, written in the 19th year, in which the
change to the second formula took place; cf. 100, introd.

12. The word following οἰκονόμον may be a place-name, but the name of the tax
would be expected. Neither ζητηταί ορὸς ζητηταί can be read.
19. Θάλτιος: cf. 62. 9 Θάλτιος. Elsewhere (e.g. 55. 2) this village is spelled Θάλθιος.
20. Below this line are some marks in fainter ink which could be read 1/a/κ; but
they are more likely to be either part of a line in demotic or blottings from another
document.

Mummy A 6.

Breadth 11–1 cm.

b.c. 256 (255).

An agreement of surety for a tax-farmer similar to 94 (cf. introd.), but with
some peculiar features. The person for whom security was given was not
himself the principal contractor, but apparently occupied a secondary position by
an arrangement with the principal. The tax was the ‘24th upon four-footed
animals at Oxyrhynchus,’ which is not known from other sources. Perhaps this
was an export duty, which in the case of wine at any rate, as is shown by 80,
was at the rate of 1/4 of the value. But the name is hardly a natural one
for a customs duty, although such duties, in the Roman period at least, are now
shown by P. Brit. Mus. 929 and 1107 to have been computed upon the number
of laden animals, not the quantity which each carried. An alternative is to
make this 24th a general impost on property in four-footed animals, the φόρος
ποσικτόν, which is known from an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus to have existed
in the third century B.C., being perhaps a branch of it. A tax of 1/4 without
further qualification occurs in 112 and 132; cf. 112. 38, note.

The papyrus is broken into two pieces, and two or three lines are missing
in the middle, besides minor defects.

Βασιλεύος Πτολεμαίον τοῦ Πτολεμαίου Σωτήρος
ἐτοιμός καὶ ἑπτά ἐρεύος Ἀντίκχου τοῦ . . . Ἀλεξάνδρου.
95. CONTRACTS

δρο[ν κ[α]ι] θεόν Ἀδελφῶν κανηφόρου Ἀρσινόης
Φίλ[α]δέλφ[ο]ν Δημοκρίτης τῆς Φίλανος μηνός

5 Παῦ[λος] καὶ ὅν Ὀξυρύγχων πόλει τῆς ὑπὲρθε
Μέμβ[ήσων. Ἐγγυς εἰς ἑκτεισιν . . . . . . . .

. . . . . . . . .

Οξυρυγχϊτων τεταρτονεικοστής
tετραπόδων Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως ὁσι[ερ
[[ἐξελαβέν]] συνετέξατο πρὸς σχέτην

10 τοῦ τὴν κ’ δ’ [ἐγ]λαβόντος παρ᾽ Ἀπολλωνίου
tοῦ διοικ[η]τοῦ εἰς τὸ κ’ θ’ (ἔτος) Πασ . . . ὦνιος
λει . . . [. . . ] . . ε . . . ἐπὶ πάσι τοῖς ὑπάρ-
[καὶ] ἡ πράξει πρὸς βασιλικά.

'In the 29th year of the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy Soter, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being Antiochus son of . . . , the canephorus of Arsinoe Philadelphus being Demonice daughter of Philon, on the 24th of the month Pauni, at Oxyrhynchus above Memphis. Pas . . . son of . . . onis . . . is surety on behalf of . . . of the Oxyrhynchite nome, for the 24th upon four-footed animals at the city of Oxyrhynchus, in accordance with . . . 's agreement for the security of the person who contracted for the 24th in the 29th year with Apollonius the dioecetes, at the risk of all his property, for the payment of . . . drachmae about which there is no dispute, and the execution shall be made with reference to the royal decrees.'

2. The name of the priest in dem. P. Leyden 379 is read by Revillout as 'Antimachus son of Cebe,' which our papyrus shows to be inaccurate. The first name is 'Ἀντίοχος,' and we cannot reconcile the vestiges of the second with Καβεητος. The last letter is, however, probably ε rather than ν, and the termination may be -[ο]κ or -[ο]χ.

5. ὑπὲρθε Μέμβ[ήσων: the Heracleopolite nome is similarly described as being ὑπόρ Μέμβ[ήσων in papyri of the Roman period, e.g. C. P. R. 6. 4; cf. p. 8.]

7. τεταρτονεικοστῆς: τετρακαιεικοστῆς would be the normal form at this period; cf. e.g. P. Petrie I. 25 (2) 2.

9. The fact that ἐξελαβέν was first written (cf. 94. 11) shows that the subject of συνετέξατο is the person whose name is lost between ll. 6 and 7, and for whom security was given. σχέτην at the end of the line is extremely doubtful; επι may be ομ, and three letters instead of two may precede.

10. Ἀπολλωνίου: cf. 44. 3, note.

11-2. Πασ . . . may be either the name of the surety, whose description is then continued in the next line, or the name of the ἔγιαβόντος, in which case that of the surety would come in l. 12, Λε . . . . The addition above l. 11 looks more like an intentional insertion than ink which has blotted off from another papyrus. If it were ignored Πασ[λ’ θεωνίος would be a possible reading.

96. Renunciation of Claims.

Mummy A 17. Fr. (a) 10 x 11.7 cm. B. C. 259 (258).

An agreement in duplicate between two military settlers at Phebichis, one of whom at least was a Jew, for the settlement of a dispute between them, the nature of which is not specified. Each of the two parties withdraws his claims against the other; and the bulk of the contract is the earliest Greek example of the stereotyped formula found in P. Tor. 4, an agreement of a similar character (διωλογεί συναλλόθυμα), and in cessions of land and repayments of loans, e.g. P. Grenf. II. 25, 26, 28, 30. The title of the agreement is συγγραφὴ ἀποστασίων, which throws some light on the meaning of the latter term; cf. l. 3, note. At the end are the signatures of the witnesses, whose names are also given on the verso and who seem to have been seven in number; cf. note on l. 13. The papyrus is in three fragments which do not join, and both copies of the contract are very imperfectly preserved; but by combining them the body of the document emerges nearly complete. The writing is across the fibres.

[Baßileioντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου έτους
dékou kai elkostou
[έφ' ιερίως 22 letters Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεὼν Ἀδελφ[ῶν] καὶ Πτολεμαίου Πτολεμαίου Ἰρανίνης
[δέλφου 22 letters μηνὸς Δήστρου ἐμ Φεβ[ής] τοῦ Καίσαρα] συγγραφὴ ἀποστασίων
[Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ 15 letters τῆς ἑπιγονῆς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου
Ἰουδαιοῦ μετὰ
5 [ 20 letters τῶν Σωλίδων δεκαπεντάχοι. ὑμολογοῦσιν διαλλάζοντα πρὸς ἀλλήλους πάνω
[τὰ τὰ ἐγκλήματα περὶ δὲν ἐνεκάλεσαν ἀλλήλους τῶν ἐπάνω χρόνων, μὴ
[ἐξ[έ]σ[τ][ο] δὲ Ἀνδρονίκοι
[ἐπελθεῖν ἐκ Ἀλεξάνδρου μηδέ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπὶ Ἀνδρονίκου μηδὲ ἄλλων
[π我希望[π]ών αὐτῶν ἐπιφή τούτων τι ἐγ[κ]λήμα παρευρ-
[ῥέσει μηθεμαίοι περὶ μηθεμαίοι τῶν προγεγο[νθόντων αὐτοῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους
[ἐξ[έ]κληματῶν ἐως
[ἐτους ἐκτοῦ καὶ εἰκοστοῦ καὶ μηνὸς Δήστρου.] ἐδ[ν] δὲ ἐπέλθησι ὑπο[τ][τ]ερο[ς
[ [. .] [. .] [. .] . ἐπὶ τῶν ἐτε-
96. CONTRACTS

10 [κον η τ' ἐφόδος τοῖς ἐπιπορευμένῳ ἄκυροις ...] τα εὐτ[ω, ε]κτεινατό [δ' ὁ ἐπιπορευμένος] δι' ἐάν
[ἐπέλθη 33 letters ἢ συγγραφῇ ἢ δι' ἦδε κυ[ρία ἕστω παίνταχον ὦν ἄν ἐπι-
[φέρηται. 24 letters μα]ρτυρ[εῖς] Νικάβι[ος Χαλκιδεύς, Διονυσόδωρος
Κρωμί].

[τῆς 32 letters ] οὕτω τῶν Ζ[ωίλου, Στράτων . . .] κλεοῦς Ἐρυ-
[θρίτης 28 letters ότης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς λειτουργός, . . . .].κρ[. . .].[.].]

[ 10 " συγγραφοφούλαξ Διονυσόδωρος.)

[βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ τοῦ υἱὸν Πτολεμαίο]ν ἐτοῦς
ἐ]κτοῦ καὶ εἰκοσ-
[τοῦ ἐφ' ἐρέως 22 letters Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἄ]θλοπον κανηφόρου Ἀρα-

20 [συγγραφὴ ἀποστασίων Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ 15 letters τῆς ἐπιγονῆς καὶ Ἀλεξ-
-άνδρου
τοῦ Ανδρονίκου Γ[ωνδαί]ν μ[τά 20 letters τῶν] Ζωίλου δεκανικοῦ. ὀμολο-
γοῦσιν διαλειτουργεῖ γ]ραφαὶ πρὸς ἄλ[λην πάντα τὰ ἐγκλήματα πε]ξ[. . .] ὃν ἐγε-
κάλεσαν ἄλλην
τῶν ἐπάνω χρόνων, μὴ ἐξ[έ]στω δὲ Ἄνδρον]ίκων ἐπελ[θεῖν ἐπ' Ἀλέξανδρο]|ν
μηθ' Ἀλεξά-
-νδροι ἐπ' [Ἀ]νδρόνικου μηθ' ἄλλου ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν] ἐπιφέρομε[τὰ τὸ ἐγκ]λημα-
παρεθέσει μηθ' [α]υ[πό τὸν] Κ[ω]ίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ
κα[ί μηνὸς Δ]ύστρου. ἐὰν δ[ὲ] ἐπέλθη ὁ πότερος . . . .] ἐπὶ τῶν ἑτερῶν ἢ
τ' ἐφόδος τοῦ
[ἐπιπορευμένον] ἄκυροι [. . . .] ἐστω, ἐκτεινατό [δ' ὁ ἐπιπορευμένος δι' ἐάν
ἐπέλ-
[θη 33 letters ἢ συγγραφῇ ἢ δι'] κυ[ρία ἕστω παίνταχον ὦν ἄν ἐπι-
[φέρηται. 24 letters μα]ρτυρ[εῖς] Νικάβι[ος Χαλκιδεύς, Διονυσόδωρος
Κρωμί].

[. . . κλεοῦς Ἐρυθρίτης 28 letters ότης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς λειτουργός,
[ 48 letters ] Διωξάνδρου Βοιώτ[ίου τῆς ἐπιγονῆς
[λειτουργός. 30 letters συγγραφοφούλαξ Διονυσόδωρος.
In the 26th year of the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy and his son Ptolemy, ... being priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi, the canephorous of Arsinoe Philadelphus being ..., in the month Dystrus, at Phebichis in the Koite district. Contract of renunciation between Andronicus ... of the Epigone, and Alexander son of Andronicus, Jew, with ... of Zoilus' troop, decurion. They agree that they have settled all the claims which they made against each other in former times; and Andronicus has no right to proceed against Alexander nor Alexander against Andronicus, nor may any other party on their behalf bring any claim on any pretext with respect to any of the claims which they made against each other up to the 26th year and the month Dystrus. If either of the two parties proceed against the other, both the act of aggression shall be invalid for the person making it, and the aggressor shall forfeit to the injured party a fine of ... drachmæ. This contract is valid wheresoever it be produced ... The witnesses are Nicobius, Chalcidian, Dionysodorus, Cromnian, ..., all three ... of Zoilus' troop, Stratton son of ... cles, Erythrian (?), ..., of the Epigone, on special duty, ..., son of Dioxander, Boeotian of the Epigone, on special duty. The keeper of the contract is Dionysodorus.'

3. συγγραφὴ διαστασιά: this expression has hitherto always been found in connexion with the translations of demotic deeds concerning the renunciation of rights of ownership, the (συγγραφή) διαστασιά being contrasted with the πράσινος, the contract concerning the receipt of the purchase-price; cf. Wilcken, Archiv, II. p. 143 and pp. 388–9. The close similarity between the formula of 96 and that of cessions of land (e.g. P. Grenf. II. 25) fully supports Wilcken's explanation of the distinction.

3. Δύστροφος: this month corresponded approximately to Mecheir in the year after that in which 96 was written; cf. App. I.

4. Probably 'τουναίος τις ἐπιγόνης', even if this Andronicus is not identical with the father of Alexander.

9. The word following ὁμήρους is not αὐτῶν, and in l. 26 there is certainly not room for 8 letters between ὁμήρους and ἐπὶ, the restoration being in fact there sufficient without supposing the loss of any word after ὁμήρους. It is quite possible that in l. 9 ὁμήρους was written twice over by mistake. P. Tor. 4 has ἐπιτρόπος τις ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ at this point.

10. ἀναφέρεις ἔστω would be expected on the analogy of e.g. P. Grenf. II. 25, 20; but the traces at the beginning of the line are inconsistent with ὡς, and the initial lacuna should contain about 40 letters. Either, therefore, a word was inserted between ἀναφέρεις and ἔστω, or a longer verb than ἔστω was employed. The supposed ἐ of ἐστίω is not very satisfactory.

11–2. ἐπιστήμη would be expected to end the body of the contract; cf. 90. 20, 91. 13. Perhaps a blank space was left after it both here and in l. 29; or possibly καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐπιστήμην was added, as in papyri of a later period, e.g. P. Oxy. 269. 13. The reading μαθέων ἐστι is, however, very doubtful, and it is not quite certain that Νικόβιος is nominative. In two instances at least (ll. 13 and 15) the fathers' names are given; but on the other hand κρῶμεν suggests an adjective meaning 'from Kromna' (in Paphlagonia) rather than
a personal name, and cf. 91. 14-6, where the father's name is omitted in the case of the first witness, but not in that of the 3rd, 4th, and 5th.

13. ὧν τρίς is the termination of some military title not found elsewhere in these papyri. ὥν τρίς probably preceded, if the name of a third witness occurred in the lacuna, as its length suggests. That the witnesses to this contract were seven—not, as usual, six—in number, is further indicated by the list of them on the verso, where the σύγγραφοφυλακός Dionysodorus does not occur among the six mentioned. Probably his name followed next after that of the two principals of the contract, as is the case with the σύγγραφοφυλακός in the lists of names on the verso of P. Tebt. 104 and 105. Seven witnesses are apparently found in 80 also; cf. 90. 22, note.

Ἐρωθιτης, if correct, probably means a settler from Ἐπωκαδα in the Cyrenaica.

14. λειτουργὸς, which at this period can mean simply a 'workman' (e.g. P. Petrie III. 46 (3). 5), is a novel title of a military settler. Probably λειτουργὸς has no definitely military significance, but this settler had some special duties assigned to him. The tax called λειτουργικόν which was paid by Ptolemaic cleruchs (P. Petrie III. 110, P. Tebt. 102. 3) may have been in lieu of performing these duties; cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 382. For λειτουργιακὸν imposed on Greek settlers cf. 78.

16. There was very likely a blank space before σύγγραφοφυλακός both here and in l. 33.

IX. RECEIPTS

97. RECEIPT. - [143]

Mummy 5. 8 x 7.8 cm. B.C. 279-8 (278-7) or 282-1 (281-0). PLATE X.

Commencement of an acknowledgement of receipt, dated either in the 4th or the 7th year (cf. note on l. 2) of Philadelphus. In either case this is the earliest date in that reign yet found in a Greek papyrus, and ranks next in antiquity to that of 84 (a), which came from the same mummy. There is much similarity in the handwriting of the two documents. On the verso is an impression of Δαυσίως from another papyrus.

Βασιλεύοντος Π[τολεμα]ίου
τοῦ Π[το]λεμαίου (ἐτοὺς) ἕτερος
5 [ὁ]μολογεῖ ἀπέχειν Κ . . .
[. . .]ος ἔτει Ἀ-
2. The figure is broken and may be read either as δ or ζ, according as some traces of ink to the left of the diagonal stroke are regarded as accidental or not.
3. Α[ι][ω]ν[ων]. cf. 30. 16, P. Petrie III. 14. 9, &c. But the initial letter may equally well be Α, e. g. 'Α[θω][ων].
4. Apellaeus probably corresponded approximately to Mesore or Thoth at this period cf. App. i. p. 339.
6. A blank space is left for Κ... 's nationality.

Acknowledgement by a captain of a transport that he had received 4800 artabae of barley to be delivered at Alexandria; cf. 39, 100, 156 (which was found with 98), and P. Petrie II. 48. The contract is preceded by a short abstract of its contents, as in 94.

1. [...] (ἔτους) ΛΔ Μεσορὴ [κ.] δ[.] μολο-
5 Α[λεξάνδρου] κριθ[ῶν] (ἀρτάβας) 'Αω.

[βασιλεύσεως Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου]
[Σωτήρος] (ἔτους) ΛΔ ἐφ' ἱερέως Νεοπτολέμου
tοῦ Φερίζου Αλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν
'Αδελφῶν καὶ Κανηφόρον Ἀρσινόης Φιλάδελ-
10 [φο] ν Ἀρσινόης τῆς Νικολάου μηνώς
Μεσορὴ κ[.] δ[.] μολογεῖ Διονύσιος
νακλησ ἐμβεβληθ[σ]αὶ εἰς κέρ[κορον]
Ξενοδόκου καὶ Αλεξάνδρου ἐφ' [οῦ] (ἐκ) θερηνήτης)
'Εκτεύρις Πάσιτος Μεμφίτης διὰ

15 Νεκριμέθεος τοῦ παρὰ τῶν βασιλικῶν
γραμματέων ὅστε εἰς Ἀλ[εξ]άνδρειαν
eἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν σὺν δείγματι [κριθῶν]
The 34th year, Mesore 24. Dionysius, captain, acknowledges that he has embarked through Nechetmbes the agent of the basilicogrammateis on the boat of Xenodocus and Alexander 4800 artabae of barley.

In the 34th year of the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy Soter, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being Neoptolemus son of Phrixius, the canephorus of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Arsinoë daughter of Nicolaus, the 24th of the month Mesore. Dionysius, captain, acknowledges that he has embarked upon the boat of Xenodocus and Alexander, the pilot on which is Ecteuis son of Pasis, of Memphis, through Nechetmbes the agent of the basilicogrammateis, for transport to the royal granary at Alexandria, with a sample, 4800 artabae of barley, being pure, unadulterated and sifted grain, by the measure and smoothing-rod which he himself brought from Alexandria, with just measurement, and I make no complaint.'

1. Even if (τερν) was written out, the space at the beginning of the line would not be filled. Perhaps αὐτόμορφος preceded.

4. For κεφ(κοομον) cf. 82. 6. The abbreviation consists of a tail stroke slightly thickened at the top and joined to an ε, and might be read ω( ); but this suggests nothing, and the first stroke is really too large for an ι. Moreover, the abbreviation κεφ( ), more plainly written, occurs in some unpublished similar documents from Tebtunis. The same compendium is apparently repeated in l. 12 below, with a larger curve for the ρ.

13. ἐφ' ὅν καὶ ἐπ' (κερπῆς): the reading of the last word is very doubtful, but cf. 39. 5-6, P. Petrie III. 107 (c). 4, &c. Xenodocus and Alexander were the owners of the boat, and Dionysius the acting principal. A similar distinction between ναύανα and owner occurs in the Tebtunis papyri referred to in the note on l. 4, and P. Magd. 37. 1-2.

16. P. Petrie II. 48. 4-5 may now be restored on this analogy ὡςτε [ἐς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν, ἐμμεθήμοραν having preceded at the end of the previous line.


19-20. Cf. 158 and P. Cairo 10250. 10 sqq. (Archiv, I. p. 80) μέτρων ἐν αἰθρόο ἐσφυρα ἐς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. Probably something similar is to be restored in P. Petrie II. 48. 9. For the σκεῦη cf. P. Cairo 10250. 13 and P. Amh. 43. 10.

21. οὐδὲν ἐγκαλῶ: cf. 87. 13-4 and P. Petrie II. 48. 10. The same phrase also occurs at the end of some of the Tebtunis receipts referred to above.

99. RECEIPTS

14·5 x 9 cm. B.C. 270 (269). Plate X.

An acknowledgement of the payment of rent, partly in olyra partly in a money equivalent of wheat, by two γεωργοῖ; cf. 100. The land in question seems to have belonged to one of the βασιλικοὶ κλῆροι (85. 13; cf. 52. 26, note),
i. e. to be really βασιλική γῆ; cf. note on 1. 8. The protocol contains the earliest extant mention of the association of the gods Adelphi with Alexander in the Alexandrian cult, and the latest instance of the absence of the canephorus of Arsinoë. A comparison of this passage with 110. 40 and 44 shows that the association of the gods Adelphi took place between the 13th and 15th years of Philadelphus; cf. App. iii. p. 368. The canephorus first appears in a papyrus of the 19th year; cf. App. iii. p. 369. 128 is perhaps part of a duplicate of 99.

Βασιλευόντος Πτολεμαί·
on τοῦ Πτολεμαί[ο]ν (έτος) ιε
eφ' ιερέως Πατρ[ό]κλου τοῦ
Πάτρανος Ἀλεξάνδρ[ο]ν
5 καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν μηνὸς
Δαυιδοῦ κ. ὀ[κλογ]γεῖ
Παραμένης Κυρη[ν][α][ίς ὀ][ε[ό-
νόμος Τελέστου ἔχειν
παρὰ Διονυσίας ὑπὲρ [. .
10 δραχμὰς τὰ ἐκφόρμα τ[ο]β Περω-
tογένους κλήρου δλι[ρῶν] ἀρτάβας) ν
καὶ παρὰ Καλλισθένου
δλιρ[ῶν] (ἀρτάβασι) μν καὶ τιμῆν
πυρῶν (ἀρτάβασιν) ὥκ β (ἀβολοῦ) τῆι
15 (ἀρτάβηι) (δραχμάς) μνα (τετράβολον).

13. This line inserted later.

'In the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy, the 15th year, Patroclus son of Patron being priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi, the 20th of the month Daisius. Paramenes, Cyrenean, oeconomus of Telestes, agrees that he has received from Dionysia on behalf of . . drus, for the rent of Protogenes' holding, 400 artabae of olyra, and from Callisthenes 120 artabae of olyra and the value of 70 artabae of wheat at 2 drachmae 1 obol for the artaba, 151 drachmae 4 obols.'

6. Δαυιδοῦ: this month probably corresponded in the 15th year of Philadelphus to parts of Phamenoth and Pharnouthi; cf. App. i. p. 339.

8. Τελέστου: cf. 85. 13–4 Φδοξίνου κλήρων βασιλικῶν τῶν Τελέστου, and note. Telestes was probably captain of a troop, but what position this οἰκονόμος Τελέστου occupied is not clear. If he was an ordinary οἰκονόμος, Τελέστου would on the analogy of e.g. 169 be expected to refer to the district under his control, and it is possible that Τελέστου here and τῶν Τελέστου in 85. 14 means the district which was or had been governed by a military official called Telestes; cf. the use of the military term ἄγμα as the name of a toparchy in
101. 3. On the other hand, the mention of Paramenes' nationality suggests that he was not an ordinary δικαστής, but a military settler acting as agent for his captain, Telestes. If so, however, the rent of Protagoras' κληρός would seem to be paid not to the State, but to the leader of a troop of military settlers, whereas it is more satisfactory to regard Protagoras' κληρός as one of the κληρον μεταλλοί which are so often met with in the volume (cf. 52. 26, note). We prefer, therefore, to suppose that Paramenes was a government official.

10. The supposed ς of δραχμαί is very doubtful, and δραχμαί (or ρω) can equally well be read, and might be combined with the following ς as one name; but cf. 100. 11 εις τὰ ἑκάστρα.

14. 2 drachmae 1 obol for an artaba of wheat is slightly higher than the ordinary rate (2 dr.) found at this period; cf. 84 (a). 8–9, note.

100. ACCOUNT. RECEIPT FOR RENT.

Mummy 5.

14 x 7.9 cm. B.C. 267 (266). Plate X (recto).

On one side of this papyrus is a short account in drachmae, on the other an acknowledgement by an agent of Xanthus that he had received from Euphranor some barley which was the rent of a κλήρος, and was being forwarded by river; cf. introd. to 39, where the same persons are also concerned, and 98. It is not quite certain which side is recto and which verso; but the smoother side seems to be that occupied by the account, which will then be earlier than B.C. 267 (266). In any case, however, the interval between the two documents is small, since they were almost certainly written by the same person, whose hand is a characteristic example of the more cursive writing of this period (see Plate X). The receipt on the verso was not completed, and blank spaces were left for some of the details. The writing on both sides is across the fibres.

The most interesting point in the papyrus is the date in ll. 8–9, where the absence of καί τὸν υἱὸν Πτολεμαίου shows that Euergetes (if he is meant by τὸν υἱὸν in that formula) was still not generally known to have been associated in the sovereignty on Phaophi 11 of the 19th year (Dec. 6, B.C. 267 if it was a revenue year, probably B.C. 266 if it was regnal; cf. p. 367). On the other hand, according to a Louvre demotic papyrus (Revillout, Chrest. dém. pp. 231–40), the association had taken place before Athur 30 (Jan. 24) in the 19th year (B.C. 266 or 265). Hence, assuming that our papyrus may be trusted—and in the absence of other evidence there is no ground for doubting its accuracy—the date of the association can now be more narrowly determined than previously. If the 19th year in 100 and the demotic papyrus is in both cases a revenue year, the limits are Dec. 6, 267, and Jan. 24, 266; if it is in both cases a regnal year, they are
Dec. 6, 266, and Jan. 24, 265; if the 19th year in 100 is a revenue year and that in the demotic a regnal (which is the most likely hypothesis), the limits are Dec. 6, 267, and Jan. 24, 265; the converse hypothesis would produce an inconsistency between the two papyri and need not be considered. Bouché-Leclercq (Hist. des Lagides, I. p. 184) rather arbitrarily adopts the year B.C. 268 as the terminus ante quem for the date of the association, a view which is no longer tenable.

Recto.

[ὦπ]ερανήλωκας κη,
[εἰς] τούτο κομίζει
[πα]ρά τῶν τὰ ἄωλια ε,
[κ]αὶ παρὰ τὴν καταλ-

5 [λα]γήν γ,
[τι]μῶν (ἄρταβῶν) σ ἵπ,
[ / ] κ, λ(οιπαί) η.

Verso.

Βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαῖου
(ἔτους) ιθ μηνὸς Παφίον ια. ἔχει Παούτης

10 ὁ συνομέτρης Ξάνθου παρ' Εὐφραντόρος
δὲ Ἀντιπάτρου εἰς τὰ ἐκφόρια τοῦ Ἀλεντίου κλήρου εἰς τὸ ιθ (ἔτος) ἐξ Ἀνατίεω
κριθῶν (ἄρταβας ?) λ ὑψη ( ) εἰς βάριν ἐφ' ἵπ συ-
βερνήτης ναβικήθρος

1. [ὦπ]ερανήλωκας: τὸ ύπεραν(ήλωμα) occurs in the account on the verso of 112.

3. An ἄωλιον is shown by Smyly in P. Petrie III. pp. 345 sqq. to have been a volume equal to the cube of which the side was a royal double cubit. Following the letter ε at the end of the line is a circular mark resembling that used as an abbreviation of π, and it would be possible to regard επ( ) as a participle governing τὰ ἄωλια. But a γ is much wanted here for the arithmetic, and the mark in question is somewhat indistinct and may be accidental. With the reading adopted in the text a participle must be supplied.

4. καταλλαγή seems here to have much the same sense as ἐπικαταλλαγή, a use of the word found also in classical writers.

6. (ἄρταβων): sc. πυροῦ probably, 2 drachmae being the normal price of an artaba of wheat at this period; cf. note on 84 (a). 8–9.

8–14. 1In the 19th year of the reign of Ptolemy son of Ptolemy, the 11th of the month Phaophi. Paoutes the corn-measurer of Xanthus has received from Euphranor...
through Antipater for the rent of the holding of Alexander for the 19th year, from
Anatieu (?), 30 artabae of barley, which have been embarked (?) upon the boat
whose pilot is and whose captain is .

10. The space before αυτομέτρης was intended for a further specification of Paoutes,
e.g. ἐν with a place-name.

11–2. The Ἀλέξανδρος κλῆρος recurs in 39. 9. Ἀνατεύ is apparently the name of
a place, probably in the Κωτής τόπος; cf. 39, introd.

13. The meaning of the abbreviation is obscure; the ῥ (or ἱ) is written through the π,
which may also be read as μ. A participle would suit the sense.

14. This line was probably the last, but the margin below is not broad enough to
be quite decisive.

101. RECEIPTS

Mummy 5.

A receipt, similar to 100, for a large quantity of barley delivered by
Euphranor to a superior official as rent of cleruchic land; cf. introd. to 39.

’Ετοὺς καθ μηνὸς Τυμ. ἦχει
Δίβανος ὁ παρὰ Σέρνου σιτο-
λόγος τοῦ Ἀγάματος παρὰ
Εὐφράνορος ὑπὲρ Πλάτωνος
5 εἰς οῖς γεωργεῖ κλῆρος βασίλει(κονδν)‘
Ἄρ[ρ]υ[δ]ων ἐν Σισώνη ὑπὲρ
[. . . . . . . .]οἰν εἰς τοὺς αμαφι…
μέτρων ἀνηλιτικῶν κριθῶν ἀρτάβας ἐπτακοσίας
ἀγοθηκοντα τέτταρας
10 ἡμισυ τέταρτον ὀγδόον.

8. μέτρων ανηλιτικῶν above the line.

‘The 24th year, in the month of Tubi. Libanus, agent of Semnus and sitologus of the
Aegema, has received from Euphranor on behalf of Platon for the royal holdings cultivated
by Harendotes, at Sisine on account of . . . for the . . . 7843/4 artabae of barley by the
spending measure.’

2–3. σιτολόγος τοῦ Ἀγάματος: apart from the present passage ἄγαμα only occurs among
papyri of this period in P. Petrie III. 11 and 12 in personal descriptions, e.g. 12. 16
Μ[α]κεδῶν τῶν Πάπανων σύνταγμα τοῦ ἄγαματος. On that analogy τοῦ ἄγαματος here might be
dissociated from σιτολόγος and explained as a description of Libanus. But this seems
a strange addition after the specification of his office, and another explanation is suggested
by a passage in C. P. R. 6. 3–4 ἐν ἐπτετερῶν ἀγορανομίας μερῶν τοπορχίας Ἀγάματος τοῦ ἰπτερο
HIBEH PAPYRI

Μέμφαν Ἡραλδεπολίτου. Ἀγήματος there clearly designates a locality; and it is significant that the name is, most probably, the same as in our receipt (cf. 39, introd.). We are accordingly disposed to regard τοῦ Ἀγήματος as a geographical term (with τόπος understood) defining the sphere of Libanus, which would be a perfectly natural addition. The origin of the term remains obscure; perhaps a large grant had been made in this neighbourhood to members of the bodyguard.

5. κλήρου βαι[ν]ή(κού)ς: cf. 55. 13 and 52. 26, note.

7. The word lost at the beginning of the line is most probably the name of the place near which the κλήροι were situated, and at which the payment would be expected, whereas it was actually made at Sisine; cf. P. Petrie III. 78. 2 ἐν Ἀπίαδι ὑπὲρ Δυσμαχίδος, &c. αμασί after τῶν is puzzling. The last is the only doubtful letter, and not more than two or three more are lost after it, if indeed there is anything missing at all. There may, however, have been an abbreviation, as in l. 5. A break occurs in the papyrus below this line, and it is possible that we are wrong in supposing the second fragment to join it directly, in which case l. 7 might end with αμα[ί]. But there is a stroke in the lower fragment which just suits the tail of the v before els. Perhaps els τοῦ Λάμπυσιος (sc. κλήρος) should be read; cf. 117. 8 and 118. 2.

8. μέτρων ἀνθλητικῶν: cf. 74. 2, note.

102. Payment of Physician-Tax.

Mummy A. 12.3 x 16.5 cm. b.c. 248 (247).

An undertaking, addressed in duplicate to a physician by a military settler, to pay 10 aratabae of olyra or 4 drachmæ for the ιατρικὸν of the 38th year of Philadelphus. This impost for the maintenance of public physicians occurs amongst other taxes levied by the State upon military settlers in P. Petrie III. 110 and 111, where 2 aratabæ of wheat are paid for it, and in 108. 9, where the charge is 5 aratabae of olyra; but 102 is the only instance of the ιατρικὸν being paid direct to the physician, though payments to ιατροῦ occur in private accounts of the Ptolemaic period, e.g. P. Tebt. 112. The note on the verso probably refers to the same transaction, in which a loan of some kind seems to have been involved. The writing is across the fibres.

[. . . . . Κυρή[π]α[ν]ός τῶν Ζωίλου ἱδιώτης Εὐκάρ[π]οι ιατρῶι χαίρειν.]
[τετακταὶ (?) σοὶ ἀποδόσειν ὀλυρῶν (ἀρτάβας) ἢ δραχμᾶς τέσσαρας τῷ
ιατρῷ]
[κῶν τὸν λῆ (ἐτούς),] ταῦτας δὲ σοι ἀ(ποδόσω) ἐμ μηνὶ Δαισίω· ἑαν δὲ
σοὶ μὴ ἀ-
[ποδῷ ἀποτέλεσώ] σο[ι] τῆς ἀρτάβης ἐκάστης (δραχμᾶς) β. ἐρρωσο.
5 [ (ἐτούς) λή(το) Παῦμεν σ.]
103. RECEIPTS

[... . . . Κυρηναίος τῶν Ζωίου ἵδιος Εὐκάρπων ἰατρῶι
[χαῖρειν. τέτα]ρται σοὶ ἀποδώσεις ὄλυρών ἀρτάβας δέκα Ἕ δρα-
[χμᾶς τέσσαρα]ς τὸ ἰατρικόν τοῦ λή (ἔτους), ταύτας δὲ σοι ἀπο-
[δώσω ἐμί μηνὶ Αὐγοῦ]νέαν δὲ σοι μὴ ἀποδώ ἀποτείσω σημαίνει
too μην τῆς ἀρτάβας ἐκάστης (δραχμάς) β. ἔπρεπον. (ἔτους) λεπτὸν πέντε γενέτειρας.

On the verso

ἐχρήσατο παρὰ . απαντος.

'... Cyrenean, of Zoilus' troop, private, to Eucarpus, physician, greeting. It has been
ordered that I shall pay you 10 artabae of olyra or 4 drachmae as the physician-tax for
the 38th year. These I will pay you in the month Daisius; and if I fail to pay you, I will
forfeit to you as the value of each artaba 2 drachmae. Good-bye. The 37th year,
Pauni 6.'

2. That 4 drachmae should be the alternative (and therefore presumably the equivalent)
of 10 artabae of olyra gives rise to some difficulty. In 85. 15 and 119. 16 olyra is
converted into wheat at the ratio of about 2⅔ : 1; but 4 drachmae would be expected to be
equivalent at this period to 2 artabae of wheat (cf. 84 (a). 8-9, note), especially as 2 artabae
of wheat are the charge for iatropoikówn in P. Petrie III. 110 and 111; and this makes the ratio
of olyra to wheat indicated by 102 not 2⅔ : 1 but 5 : 1. 103. 9, on the other hand, where
5 artabae of olyra are paid for iatropoik FormsModule, will be in agreement with P. Petrie III. 110 if the
ratio between olyra and wheat was 2⅔ : 1 as found in 85 and 119; and since the same
ratio is also found in P. Tapt. 246 and 261 the circumstances in which 10 artabae of
olyra were in 102 equivalent to only 4 drachmae were no doubt exceptional. That an
artaba of olyra was really worth much more than 2 drachmae is also indicated by the fact
that its penalty value (1. 4) is 2 drachmae an artaba. This, which agrees with the penalty
value of an artaba of olyra in 86. 12, 124, and P. Tor. 13 (second century B.C.), would, if
olyra was normally worth nearly a drachma per artaba, not be exceptionally high, since
the penalty value of grain is in the third century B.C. often twice its normal price; cf. 88.
13, note. In 90. 15 the penalty value of olyra is apparently as high as 4 drachmae the
artaba.

3. Daisius: this month probably corresponded in the main to Pauni at this period; cf.
App. 1. Since the document was written in Pauni of the 37th year, Daisius no doubt refers to
the 38th.

---

103. RECEIPT FOR PHYSICIAN-TAX AND POLICE-TAX.

Receipt for the payment, on behalf of a military settler, probably in the
Koιτῆς τότου, of 5 artabae of olyra for the iatropoikówn, or tax for the maintenance
of physicians, and 9 artabae for φυλακητικών, the police-tax; cf. introd. to 102
and 105, and 165, a similar receipt issued to the same person. The reign is no doubt that of Euergetes; cf. 66-70 (δ), which came from the same mummy.

("Etovs) Ἐροσ) iς Φαώφι β, δλ(υρὼν) iδ.

Ἀπολλοφάνης Θε-
οφίλων χαίρειν. με-
μετρήμεθα παρὰ
5 Στρατίου ὑπὲρ
Διοδόρου Κεφάλλω-
νος δέ(κανικοῦ) τῶν Ζωίλου
δὲ καρο(γραμματέως) Εὐπόλεως
(ἔτους) ἵς ιατρικὸν ὀλ(υρὼν) ε,
10 φυ(λακτικῶν) ὀλυρῶν ἐννέα, / ὀλ(υρὼν) iδ.
ἐρρωσο. (ἔτους) ἵς
Φ[α]ώφι β.

'The 17th year, Phaophi 2: 14 artabae of olyra.
'Apollonites to Theophilus, greeting. We have had measured out to us by Stratius on behalf of Diodorus son of Cephallon, decurion of Zoilus' troop, through the comogrammateus Eupolis for the 17th year, 5 artabae of olyra as the physician-tax and 9 artabae of olyra as the police-tax; total 14 artabae of olyra. Good-bye. The 17th year, Phaophi 2.'

1. The abbreviation of ὀλ(υρὼν) here and in ll. 9-10 is a rounded λ surmounted by a small o.
6-8. Diodorus and Eupolis reappear in 104 and 165. For the abbreviation of δεκαπούς cf. 81. 16, note.

104. RECEIPT FOR VARIOUS TAXES.

Mummy 10.

A receipt in duplicate issued by Eupolis the comogrammateus to Diodorus (cf. 103) for the imposts called τριήραρχημα and διάχωμα, the police-tax (on which see 105, introd.), and the tax on horses. These four taxes are found together with some others in P. Petrie II. 39 (ε). The horse-tax is there mentioned but once under the name φόρος ἵππων, the amount paid being lost. Here it is simply called ἵππων, and 1 drachma 5 obols are entered under that head. It belonged to the category of taxes on property, and was no doubt paid by
Diodorus on the horse which his military duties obliged him to keep. The meaning of τριφάρχημα and διάχωμα is unknown. Smyly is probably right (P. Petrie III. p. 277) in doubting whether the former has any naval signification, and in connecting it rather with the use of τριφάρχος in e.g. P. Petrie III. 43 (3). 21, where the word apparently means an overseer of workmen. In P. Petrie II. 39 (e) the sums paid for these two taxes are 5 drachmae and 4 drachmae 1 obol respectively. The corresponding amounts in 104 are 6 drachmae 4½ obols and 6 drachmae.

(ε'Τους) βκ Παύνι λ. ἔχει Εὐπολίς παρὰ Διοδώρου
εἰς τὸ βκ (έτος) τριφάρχημα
[(δραχμᾶς)] τ (τετράβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον), διάχωμα (δραχμᾶς) τ,
5 φιλακτικῶν (δραχμᾶς) τ, ἵππων (δραχμῆ) α (πεντάβολον).

(έτους) κβ Παύνι λ. ἔχει Εὐ-
πολίς παρὰ [Διοδώρου]
Κεφάλλων[ε] εἰς) τὸ βκ [(έτος)
τριφάρχημα (δραχμᾶς) τ (τετράβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον),
10 [διάχωμα (δραχμᾶς) τ, φιλακτικῶν (δραχμᾶς) τ,
[ἵππων (δραχμῆ) α (πεντάβολον).]

'The 22nd year, Pauni 30. Eupolis has received from Diodorus for the 22nd year for τριφάρχημα 6 drachmae 4½ obols, for διάχωμα 6 drachmae, for police-tax 6 drachmae, for horse-tax 1 drachma 5 obols.'

1. βκ: other examples of this order are found e.g. in 110. 37, P. Petrie II. 13 (17). 3, P. Magd. 3. 3.
2. The omission of Κεφάλλων (cf. l. 8) was an oversight.

105. **Receipt for Police-Tax.**

Mummy A 15. 7·1 × 7 cm. B.C. 228 (227).

A receipt for 2 artabae of wheat paid by a military settler belonging to the troop of Zoilus, probably at Phebichis, for the maintenance of the police. This impost is frequently mentioned in the Petrie papyri, where, besides the tax on land called φιλακτικῶν γῆς (III. 112 (λ). 3–8) or simply φιλακτικῶν which
corresponds to the φυλ. τοῦ ἱδίου κλήρου here, we hear of a φυλακικόν levied upon sheep (λειας προβατίων, III. i. i. 8), animals for sacrifice (ἱερείων, III. roq (a). iv. 13), associations and workshops (ἐθνών καὶ ἐργαστηρίων, III. 32 (f). 2), and geese (χνών, III. i. i. 2 (a). ii. 5). When levied upon land it was sometimes paid in money, 1 drachma per aroura being the rate found in III. 70 (a). i. 4, but more often in corn, as here, the annual amounts ranging from 13 artabae of wheat (III. 54 (d). d, verso 3) to 3 artabae (II. 39 (a). 2). Cf. 143, another receipt with the same formula, 103. 10, where the charge is 9 artabae of olyra (equivalent to nearly 4 artabae of wheat; cf. 85. 15), and 104, where 6 drachmae are paid for φυλακικόν. The 19th year in I. i refers more probably to Euergetes than to Philadelphus.

("Ετοὺς") iθ Παυνί κη. δημολογεῖ Θεόδωρος μεμετήρησαί παρὰ
"Ερκάμιος τοῦ Χ. πιου ἱ(ἀρχιοῦ) τῶν
Ζωίλου τῷ γυνόμενον φυλα-
5 κιτικῶν τοῦ ἱδίου κλῆρου πυρ(ῶν) δύο.

'The 19th year, Pauni 28. Theodorus agrees that he has had measured to him by Herkamis son of Ch . . . , captain of Zoilus' troop, the due amount of the police-tax upon his own holding, two artabae of wheat.'

1. Θεοδωρος is perhaps identical with the Theodorus in 75. 1, though the Theodorus here would be expected to be an official of the δησαυρός, a position which does not suit the Theodorus in 75.

3. λ(ἀρχιοῦ): this abbreviation consists of a large λ with a small i underneath, and recurs in 143; cf. P. Petrie III. 54 (a). (4) ii. 5, where it appears to mean λ(ἀρχις). The circumstance that in 103. 7 the payer of ἵππων and φυλακικῶν is a δε(κακός) makes λ(ἀρχιοῦ) much more probable here than e.g. Λ(ευκός).

5. ἱδίον: cf. 90. 7, note.

106. Receipt for Beer-Tax.

Mummy A 15. 10.2 x 7 cm. B.C. 246 (245).

This and the following papyrus together with 136–142 form a series of receipts for the payment of θυηρά in the second and third years of a king who is no doubt Euergetes. The payments are made into the λογευτήριον at Phebichis, which village seems to have been a kind of centre of the finance administration of the Κωντῆς. The λογευτήριον, a term hitherto known only from
Rev. Laws xi. 13, in these receipts (cf. 108. 2, 114. 7) occupies the place of the royal bank, and seems to be hardly distinguishable from it, since the recipient of the tax is the τραπεζίτης, with whom is coupled the δοκιμαστής. The close association of these two officials (cf. 108. 4, where the δοκιμαστής is apparently found acting for the τραπεζίτης, and 41, a letter concerning a δοκιμαστής) casts a new light on the functions of the δοκιμαστής, who up to now has only been mentioned in P. Leyden Q and P. Petrie III. 50. 2. From the Leyden papyrus, a receipt for 20 drachmae on account of ἀπόμοιρα (cf. 109) paid over by a δοκιμαστής to a πράκτωρ in circumstances which are rather obscure, it has been supposed that the δοκιμαστής was particularly concerned with the ἀπόμοιρα, especially with conversions of payments in kind into money (Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 351-2). The Hibeh texts, however, indicate that his functions were much wider, and that he acted as a check on the τραπεζίτης in the same way as the ἀντιγραφεὺς controlled the οἰκονόμος, thus affording another illustration of a favourite Ptolemaic practice. In 41 the collection of arrears of taxation and the selling of oil manufactured by the government appear among the duties of a δοκιμαστής, and δοκιμασταῖ are mentioned in 29. 19 in an obscure context. An impost called δοκιμαστικῶν, apparently a charge for the maintenance of δοκιμασταῖ, occurs in 110. 44 and perhaps in 29. 24.

Besides the τραπεζίτης and δοκιμαστής who issue this series of receipts, other officials were generally present; in one instance (107. 5) the οἰκονόμος, but in most cases Dorion, whose title where it occurred in 107. 4 is lost (but may have been ἐπιστάτης if he is identical with the Dorion in 72. 4), and whose signature has usually been appended at the end of the receipts. The payments are made by different persons who are all agents of an inhabitant of Talaē called Taēmbes. Whether he was the tax-collector or the tax-payer is not clear; but from 108, in which the general formula is similar and the person in l. 5 corresponding to the agents of Taēmbes here is the tax-payer's representative, not the tax-collector, we prefer to suppose that Taēmbes is the person upon whom the χρηστὰ is levied, and to make these payments parallel to those mentioned in P. Petrie III. 37 (b). verso iv. 15 sqq., where καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἔτητοιον πέπτωκεν ἐν τὰ παρὰ Παμάτως . . . χαλ(κόδ) Ῥου κτλ. is found in an account of, probably, a royal bank. This interpretation will fit in very well with the generally-received view of the χρηστὰ (cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 369-73), that it was a tax on the profits of beer-manufacture, but a good many points connected with the taxes upon that important industry are still in doubt. The sums paid by Taēmbes' agents consist of monthly instalments ranging from 8 drachmae (188) to 20 (106. 8) in copper, the rate of which is three times (106. 8, 107. 7, and 188; in 187 the figures are obliterated) given as apparently 24½ obols for a stater. This
extremely small addition to the rate of 24 obols for a stater found in the case of those taxes in which the government accepted copper at par is in accordance with the evidence of P. Par. 62. v. 19, that in the second century B.C. the ζυνηρά was an ωνη προς χαλκων λοδομων. The extra \( \frac{1}{4} \) obol per stater or approximately 1 per cent., which is levied in the Hibe texts, probably corresponds to the extra charges of 1 per cent. for ἐποκενή and 2 per cent. for transport which are mentioned in connexion with the ζυνηρά in the Paris papyrus. Above each receipt is a brief summary, and at the end of each are a few words of demotic. The writing is in most cases, including 108, across the fibres.

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{Έτους}) \beta \ 'Αθή[ρ \ \lambda, \ (δραχμαί)] \ \kappa. \\
(\text{Έτους}) \beta \ 'Αθήρ \ \lambda. \ \piέτακεν \\
\text{ἐπὶ τὸ ἐμ \ Φεβίχι λογευτήμων} \\
\text{τοῦ \ Κοίτου \ Πάσωνι \ τραπε-} \\
5 \ \zetaίτη \ καὶ \ Στοτοήτι \ δοκι-
\text{ματήι παρὰ \ Αρενδώτου το(θ) \ παρὰ \ Ταμβέσου} \\
\text{ἐκ \ Ταλάη \ ζυνηράς \ εἰς τὸν} \\
'Αθήρ \ χαλκοῦ \ εἰς \ \kappaδ \ (τέταρτον \ ?) \ (δραχμάς) \ εἴκοσι, \ / \ \kappa. \\
\text{2nd hand \ [πα]ρὸντ[οί]ς \ Δωρίανος.} \\
\text{1 \ line \ of \ demotic.} \\
6. \ \text{αρενδωτον \ το(ν) \ παρα \ above \ the \ line.}
\end{align*}
\]

'The 2nd year, Athur 30: 20 dr. The 2nd year, Athur 30. Harendotes, agent of Taembes from Talaë, has paid into the collecting office of the Koite toparchy at Phebichis, to Pason, banker, and Stoteōtis, controller, for the beer-tax on account of Athur twenty drachmae of copper at \( 24\frac{1}{4} \) obols (for a stater), total 20. In the presence of Dorion.'

8. \( \kappaδ \ (τέταρτον): \) very little of the \( \delta \) is left; but the traces are inconsistent with \( \epsilon \) or \( \tau, \) and cf. 107. 7, where \( \delta \) is certain. There is more doubt about the fraction; all that remains is a piece of a horizontal stroke joining the sign for drachmae. If it represents \( \frac{1}{4} \) obol, which is usually written \( \underline{7}, \) the writer must on reaching the end of the horizontal stroke have drawn his pen back a little way before making the down stroke, just as he usually does in writing \( \tau. \) The only alternative is to read \( \hat{\eta} \muωβέλιον, \) but we hesitate to introduce a rate which would be necessarily different from those found in 107. 7 (cf. note) and 188; and if, as is likely, the rate is the same in all three cases, \( 24\frac{1}{4} \) is the only suitable number.
107. RECEIPTS

107 Receipt for Beer-Tax.

Mummy A 15. 6·5 x 7·2 cm.  B.C. 244 (243).

Another receipt for beer-tax similar to 108, but mentioning in ll. 3–4 the presence of two officials; cf. 108, introd. The writing is across the fibres.

[("Eteus) y Paevi λ, (dραχμαι) .]

(ἔτους) γ Παυνι λ. πεπτ[ω]κε[ν ἐπὶ τὸ ἐν
Φεβί[χει λα(γευτήριον) Νικολάοι τρ(απεξήπη) [καὶ Στοτ[οήτει
δο(κιμαστή]) παρόντος Δωρίωνοι [. . . . . . . . καὶ
5 Ζηροδόρου οἰκονόμου πα[ρὰ . . . . . .
στιος το[ῦ] παρὰ Ταεμβέον εκ [Ταλάντ ζυτηρᾶς
eis tòn Paunī eis ḝθ (τέταρτον) (δραχμᾶς) ε. . . . . . . . .
2nd hand (ἔτους) γ Παυνι λ, παρόντος Δ[ωρίωνος.
1 line of demotic.

4. The missing title is perhaps ἐπιστάτου; cf. 108, introd. In 108, 3 the βασιλικὸς γραμματεύς is associated with the οἰκονόμος in a similar context, but is named second.

7. The supposed sign for ½ obol has the horizontal portion longer and more curved than usual; but it is certainly not the symbol for ½ obol, nor can it be satisfactorily regarded as a combination of the two, especially since ½ is certainly the only fraction found in 188 where the preceding δ is doubtful, and in 108, 8 the doubtful symbol may represent ½ or ¼ obol, but not both; cf. note ad loc.

108. Receipt for Bath-Tax.

Mummy A 16. 8·2 x 6·3 cm.  B.C. 258 (257) or 248 (247).

A receipt with a formula very similar to that of 106–7, issued by a λογευτήριον for the payment of 10 drachmae on account of the bath-tax, probably a general impost levied for the construction and maintenance of public baths; cf. note on l. 7. The papyrus comes from the same piece of cartonnage as the correspondence of Leodamas (45–50), and the date is probably the 27th or 37th year of Philadelphus.
'[.]7th year, Pharmouthi ... P ... has paid on behalf of Demophon into the collecting office at Phus through Diodorus, oeconomus, and ..., basilicogrammateus, to Theodorus, banker, through Horus, controller, for the bath-tax of the [.]5th year 10 drachmæ.'

2. Φύς: a village of the Heracleopolite nome, probably in the Koïræ; cf. C. P. R. 64. 12.
7. Βαλανεῖον: cf. 112, 96 and Βαλανεῖον as the title of a tax in P. Petrie III. 37 (δ), verso 7, 119 (a), 2, and 121 (α) 14. On the bath-tax, which was in Roman times called βαλανεῖον, see Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 165-70. His argument from the silence of the ostraca, that this impost was introduced by Augustus, is now shown to be incorrect. Wilcken hesitates between two interpretations, (1) a general tax for the maintenance by the State of public baths, (2) a charge for the use of public baths levied in the form of a tax upon only those persons who used them. The former view seems to us much more likely, especially as small charges for the use of baths (generally ½ obol) are common in private accounts of the earlier Ptolemaic period, e.g. P. Petrie III. 132-42, and are clearly distinct from the tax called βαλανεῖον. That public baths were not in all cases owned by the government appears from 116, where the tax τρίηθεν βαλανεῖον occurs. This, on the analogy of e.g. τρίηθεν περιστεραίων, seems to be an impost of ½ upon the profits of privately owned baths. The supply of bathing-establishments in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt must have been surprisingly large.

109. Receipt for ἀπόμοιρα.

Two receipts for payments of 10 and 5 drachmæ respectively on account of the tax of ½ on the produce of vineyards and gardens, otherwise called the ἀπόμοιρα. For the history of this impost, the benefit of which was transferred in the 23rd year of Philadelphus from the temples to the deified Arsinoë (whence the name ἐκτη Φιλαδέλφων, e.g. in 138), cf. Rev. Laws pp. 119 sqq., Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 157 sqq. and 615, P. Tebt. 5. 51, note, and Otto, Priester und Tempel, I. pp. 340-56. In the present case the tax was levied upon a palm-garden, and therefore in money, and the two payments were for a single year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. . oικονόμου 'Αριστογένης] καὶ</td>
<td>[. . . τῷ] παρ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν μετόχων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τραπεζίτη καὶ . . . . δοκι-</td>
<td>τὸ παρ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν μετόχων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μα[σ]τή 'Αριστογένης καὶ . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαλκὸν πρὸς ἀργὺρίων (δραχμὰς) πέντε, / (δραχμαί) ε.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. 7-12. 'Aristogenes and . . . (have paid to) . . . , banker and . . . , controller, the amount due from them and their partners for the tax of ½ upon the palm-garden of Teisander, the finance official, for the 39th year, in copper on the silver standard five drachmae, total 5 drachmae.'

1. Either διὰ . . . οἰκονόμου or παρόντος . . . οἰκονόμου may be restored; cf. 107. 5-6, 108. 2.  
4-5. τοῦ πρὸς τῇ [διοικήσει] may refer to φοινικώνος, but is more easily explained if connected with Τεισάνδρου: this use of πρὸς in describing officials is extremely common; cf. e.g. P. Tebt. 30. 18 τῶν δὲ πρὸς τάς γραμματείας. ὁ πρὸς τῇ διοικήσει may well be, like ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως in Rev. Laws, a periphrasis for διοικητῆς. Aristogenes and his partners were probably lessees of Tisander.  
5. λό (ἐτος): the last (revenue) year of Philadelphus; cf. 53. 4, note and App. ii. p. 364.  
5-6. χαλκὸν [πρὸς ἀργὺρίων: cf. 70(a). 9, note. Down to the reign of Epiphanes the money payments for ἀπόμοιρα had to be made either in silver or in copper at a discount. Later in the second century b. c., as is shown by Wilcken, Ost. no. 1518, copper was accepted at par.  
The recto of this papyrus contains a long account apparently of a private or semi-private character, but kept by some person in the government service, since the document on the verso is clearly official. The account is in three columns; but of the first only ends of lines remain, and these are almost all occupied with a list of σώματα which are reckoned at sums varying from 1 obol to 2½ obols, e.g. σώματα i] ἄν(ά) (δυσβόλους) / (δραχμάι) γ (δυσβόλοι), ἄλλα δ (δραχμή) a | ...]τὸι σώματα καὶ ἄν(ά) (δυσβόλους) (ἡμιῳβίλου) / (δραχμάι) ε (τετράβολον),—no doubt a wages account. Near the top of the column occurs ἱσον κλήρων and at the bottom a mention of ... ἱππων (δραχμάι) κ and φωνίκων. Col. ii and the upper part of Col. iii are occupied with an account of corn, some of which was transported to Alexandria, and interesting details are given of expenses en route. The lower portion of the third column contains a few short money accounts, and concludes with three lines which belong to the document on the verso.

This is of a more novel and important character. It is a record of the arrival at and departure from some intermediate station of letters and other documents sent to or from the king or high officials, and affords a most interesting glimpse into the management and nature of the State postal-service. Careful note is made of the day and hour of the arrival of each messenger, his name and that of the clerk who received and issued letters at the office, the number and addresses of the packets, and the names of the messengers to whom they were handed on. The day-book in the registered letter department of a modern post-office can hardly be more methodical and precise. The documents forwarded are mostly described as κυλιστοῖ (usually abbreviated κ, but written out in ll. 51, 73, and 110), i.e. 'rolls,' which are apparently distinguished from ἐπιστολαί, 'letters' (ll. 57, 98, 107); but the difference was perhaps one of size rather than of contents. That the register on the verso was not separated by any wide interval of time from the account on the recto, which was drawn up soon after the 14th year, is shown by the mention of

X. ACCOUNTS

110. ACCOUNTS: POSTAL REGISTER.

Mummy 18. 19.4 x 30.5 cm. Recto about B.C. 270; Verso about B.C. 255.
Apollonius, the well-known dioecetes in the 27th–32nd years; cf. 44. 3, note. The locality of the postal bureau is not clearly defined. The writer of the recto had business concerns at Hieria Nesus in the south of the Fayûm, and Plutarchus and Criton, who are mentioned in Col. ii, are known from other papyri to have been connected with that neighbourhood; cf. introd. to 63. But Phebichis in the Κοινής τόπος is referred to in l. 36; and that is a much more suitable scene for the composition of the official register, which points decidedly to some town in the Nile valley as its provenance. Preceding the two columns of the verso which we print there remain the ends of a few lines of another much effaced column, but they add no information.

### Recto.
Col. ii.

έχω παρὰ Πολέμων (πυρών) (ἀρτάβας) θ,
kai παρ’ Αγάθωνος [ρ]+[δ],
παρὰ Σίμου κζ,
kai ὑπὲρ Εὐβοϊλου κζ,

5 / τὰ. 1 εἰς τὸ Ἡρακλεῖον α,
kai εἰς τὸ ναύλον ι (δραχμῶν) κζ [ ]
Πλούταρχος κζ, λοιπαὶ τ.
tοῦτον ἐγένετο δ.. [. . .] [. . .].[. . .],
ἐγβολὴν [ουχ χ. μονος [. . .] [. . .]. ειον α,

10 Φιλοκλῆς εἰς τὰ ἐπιτήδειµα [εί] / σφ.
ἐπράθησαν ἀν(ά) (δραχμᾶς) δ (πεντάβολον), / (δραχμαί) Ἀνκα.
ἐλαβον δὲ καὶ κριθὴν παρ’ Αγάθωνος ρις.
tοῦτον Πλούταρχος κζ, λοιπαὶ θ,
tοῦτον διαμετρὰς αξιομετρικοῦς [ζ].

15 λοιπαὶ πη. ἐπράθησαν ἀν(ά) [(δραχμῆν)] α (τριάβολον) (ημω— 58. τρήμ =

βέλιον),

/ (δραχμαῖ) ῥλθ (δυόβολοι).

εἴχον δὲ καὶ Κρίτων τῶν κ (ἀρταβῶν) τῶν (πυρῶν) (δραχμᾶς) μ,
kai ναύλον [των] τῶν πυρῶν καὶ κριθῶν ἐχω (δραχμᾶς) ίε.
eis ταῦτα ἤχει Κρίτων χρυσὸν την,

20 ἄργυρου (δραχμᾶς) υμ.

ἀνήλωμα τοῦ σιτ[ον] ἐφ’ Ἰερᾶι Νήσωι σάκκους β (τετράβολον),
φυλακικὰ ἀφ’ Ἰερᾶς Νήσου ἓως Αλεξανδρείας (δραχμαί) δή,
666 HIBEH PAPYRI

épí ἡλικῆς γραμματικῶν (δραχμαί) δ', τῶι παρερ.. ηπίο... (δραχμῆ ?) α, ἐμ Μέμβρει γραμματικῶν (δραχμῆ) α., ἐπὶ τῆς κάτω φυλακῆς

[25 Ἔν] Σχεδίας (δραχμαί) δ', [. . .]α . [. . .]ν (δραχμαί) ι, ἐν Ἀλεξίαν (δραχμαί) [. . . . . .] (πυρὼν)

τὴν (ἀρτάβην) (ἡμιωβέλιον ?), / (δραχμαί) καθ (τριάβιοιον), [. .] νετ... α κρίθης (δραχμαί) ζ (δυόβολοι).


Col. iii.

tέλος (δραχμαί) ος, ναύλον (δραχμαί) . . , ἀντι-

γραφεῖ τοῦ Φιλοκλέους . . . . . .

τραπεζήτη δοκιμαστικῶν . . . . . .

ἀπὸ Σχεδίας ναύλον εἰς πόλιν (δραχμαί) . . ,

ἀναπλέουτες ναύλον (δραχμαί) β

εἰς τούτο εἶχον παρὰ Κρίτωνος (δραχμᾶς) . .

(ἔτους) ἱδ 'Επειτ ὁ.

35 Λόγου γενομένου Πλούταρχοι

ἐμ Φεβίχι. προσωφελησά σὺν [ἀνηλώμα-

σιν καὶ φιλακτικοῖς τὸν γί ([ἔτους) . . . .

καὶ Ἀριστάρχου τὸ πάν (δραχμᾶς) Α [. .] καὶ

κριθῶν (ἄρταβας) τε.

40 (ἔτους) ιβ ἐφ' ἰερέως [ἐφ' ἰερεῶς] . . . . . . τοῦ Καλ-

λιμήδους μηνὸς Δύστροφον ἐξει . . . . . .

παρὰ Πλούταρχοι ὡ ἑκτέβαλε . . . . . .

καὶ Μνησιστράτω (δραχμᾶς) κ τόκ[o]ν τ[ὸ]μ μῆνα (δραχμῶν).

ἀλλας ἐχεῖ (ἔτους) ἢ ἐφ' ἰερέως Νεᾶ [. . . . τοῦ . .

45 οκλέους μηνὸς) Δωῖον ἃς ἐδώκεν Απολλωνίῳ

(δραχμᾶς) κ τόκου τὸμ μῆνα (δραχμῶν) δ'. [ἀ-

λλας τοῦ αὐτοῦ (ἔτους) μηνὸς 'Τπέρβε-

τηταῖον [ἐξ]εν (δραχμᾶς) κ ἃς κατέβαλεν Πηλ-

[λ]ωνίῳ τῷ φυλακίτῃ τόκου τ[ὸ]μ

μῆνα (δραχμῶν) ε.
2nd hand κυλιστοὶ ἂ, ἐ βασιλὲ γ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν, Ἐπιγένης χρηματαγωγῶι ἑ., Ἀπολλωνίῳ[ε] [δ]ο[κ][η][τη] [., . . . . .]

48. (δραχμᾶς) ἐ above the line.

110. ACCOUNTS

289

48. (δραχμάς) ἐ above the line.

48. (δραχμάς) ἐ above the line.
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twai pros the xorhigiai t'oun elefanta
80 eis thei Thebaia kata Ptolmeion
85 'Hrakleodora eis thei Thebaia (kuliostov)
Zeilow trapezami 'Ermopolitou (kuliostov) a,

Vestiges of three lines.

91 k. oras [ ] parideqov[v]en Akrokolhs 'Ampion
kuliostov) y, l [B]a[si]la [Ptol]e[m][ais] [ . . . ]

100 k.B. oras prothi par[r]e[do]kew [ . . . ]

anovn basilei Ptolomeiai (kuliostov) .

Col. iii.
10. ACCOUNTS

ky. ἐώθινης ἀνοθεν παρέδωκεν ......

110 Τιμοκράτης κυλιστοῖς, Ἀλέξανδροι,

I. Βασιλεί Πτολεμαῖοι κυλιστοῖς, Ἀπολλωνίωι

dioikhtíi κυλιστοῦ a, ἹI. . . . χρηματα-

γαργίς κυλιστοῦ a, Παρίκι . . . . . . . . κυλιστοῦ . . .

Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ παρέδωκεν ......

97. κ of παρεδωκεν above a β.

1-50. 'I have received from Polemon 90 artabae of wheat, and from Agathon 194, from Simus 27, and on behalf of Eubulus 20, total 331; of which 1 was paid to the temple of Heracles, 10 for freightage at 20 drachmae, and 20 to Plutarchus, remainder 300. Of these were expended for ... 1, to Philocles for necessaries 5, total 294. They were sold at 4 dr. 5 ob., making 1421 dr. I also received barley from Agathon to the amount of 110 artabae, of which Plutarchus had 20, remainder 90. Out of these were expended for difference on measure 14, measuring fee 3, remainder 88. They were sold at 1 dr. 3/4 ob., total 139 dr. 2 ob. I also had for Criton, for the 20 artabae of wheat, 40 dr., and I have as freightage of the wheat and barley 15 dr. For this Criton has 950 dr. in gold and 448 dr. in silver. Expense of the corn at Hiera Nessus, 2 sacks 4 ob., guards' fees from Hiera Nessus to Alexandria 14 dr., at the guard-house for scribes' fees 4 dr., to ... 1 dr., at Memphis scribes' fees 1 dr. [.] ob., at the lower guard-house at Schedia 4 dr., ... 10 dr., at Alexandria to 'Tisarchus 5 dr., 'scribes' fees ... dr., ... on the wheat at 3/4 ob. the artaba 24 dr. 3 ob., ... on the barley 7 dr. 2 ob., tax 76 dr., freightage ... dr., to the antigrapheus of Philocles ..., to the banker for controller's fees ..., freightage from Schedia to the city ... drachmae, sailing up, freightage 2 dr.; for this I had from Criton ... dr.'

'The 14th year, Epeiph 2. Account taken with Plutarchus at Phebichis. I owed an additional sum, with expenses and guards' fees for the 13th year ... and Aristarchus, of altogether 3[.]5 drachmae and 15 artabae of barley.

'The 12th year, in the priesthood of ... son of Callimedes, in the month Dysrns. ... has from Plutarchus 60 drachmae at the interest of [.] dr. a month, which sum he paid to ... and Mnesestratus. He also has in the 13th year in the priesthood of Nea ... son of ... ocles, in the month Lois, 60 dr. more, at the interest of 4 dr. a month, which he gave to Apollonius. He also had in the same year in the month Hyperberetaeus 60 drachmae more, which he paid to Apollonius the guard, at the interest of 5 dr. a month.'

6. If there is nothing lost after κ the price will be the common one of 2 dr. the artaba; cf. I. 17.

9. Perhaps ᾠρόχ ἡμῶν, but the is not satisfactory and the meaning quite obscure.

11. The high price, more than double the usual rate (cf. note on l. 6), is presumably due to the fact that the sale took place in Alexandria. The price of the barley in l. 115 is also rather higher than usual (it is normally about 1 dr. 1 ob., i.e. 3 of 2 dr.; cf. notes on 84 (a). 8-9, 85. 14-5), but the difference is not nearly so marked as in the case of the wheat.

14. διάμετρον is used of soldiers' allowances, 'rations' in Plut. Vit. Dem. 40, and some such sense would not be inappropriate here. But διάμετρον may well be equivalent to διάφορα μέτρον; cf. e.g. F. Petrie III. 129. 3 διάφορον ἀνθρωπικῶν. The στρατηγικῶν was no doubt a payment for the services of the στρατηγός, and thus analogous to the φιλακτικά and
The meaning of the dative ἐπὶ τῶν and the connexion of these entries with what precedes are not clear. If χρυσόν 950 means the value in gold of 950 dr. of silver, the two sums named in ll. 19-20 together go far to make up the total price of the wheat and barley in ll. 11 and 16. They may therefore perhaps represent the balance left after deducting the expenses enumerated in the next section, ll. 21 sqq.; but as the items are imperfectly preserved verification is not possible.

21. σάκκους β: these may be either empty sacks which were bought for 4 obols, or full sacks which together with the 4 ob. had to be expended. 4 ob. could not represent the price of two full sacks.

22. The context shows that φωλεκτικά here do not mean the tax so-called (cf. 106, intro.), but payments for the services of φωλεκτίου in charge of the boat; cf. 54. 30.

23. γράμματικόν: this impost is found in a variety of contexts, and is to be explained as a charge for the benefit of the numerous γράμματα; cf. P. Tebt. I. 61 (6). 342-5, note, and 97, intro. The word before (δραχμή) may be a proper name preceded by παρ or παρά.

25. Σχεδία was a place of some importance on the canal connecting Alexandria with the Canopic branch of the Nile, and had a custom-station in Strabo’s time; cf. Strabo, xvi. 805. In P. Fay. 104, 21, an account somewhat similar to this, Σχεδία should also be read. The word before (δραχμαί) is possibly ναύλον, but if so the space after the preceding numeral is broader than usual.

26. Τεσσάρων: a proper name seems likely, but the reading is doubtful. The first letter if not τ may be π or σ, and the termination may be αν.

27. A charge of 1/2 ob. on the artaba reckoned on 294 art. (l. 10) and 88 art. (l. 15) produces 24 dr. 3 ob. and 7 dr. 2 ob. The name of this impost was given in the lacuna before (πυρὰ) in l. 26, and probably coincided with the mutilated word before κρ(ιθής) in l. 27. The abbreviation for κρ(ιθής) is written as κ with a loop at the top of the vertical stroke.


41. γι: (γιον): cf. for the order of the numerals 104. 1, note.

42. Φορεῖται: cf. l. 48, but δ is awkward with (δραχμάς) following.

44. Νεδρεχοῦ τοῦ Νερόλονος would be about the right length. γ in the number of the year is rather tall, but to suppose that some other figure, e.g. α, was written with a stroke above it, is less satisfactory.

45. Ἀπολλωνίων: cf. l. 48.

51-3. These lines form part of the register on the verso, but there is no date or other indication of their intended position. We restore καὶ ἐπιστολὴν on the analogy of l. 57, but the construction requires ἐπιστολή. Θεοχρέστος the χρηματαγωγός recurs in l. 84; the title appears to be new.

55-114. ‘... delivered to Alexander 6 rolls; of these 1 roll was for king Ptolemy, 1 roll for Apollonius the dioecetes and two letters which were received in addition to the roll, 1 roll for Antiochus the Cretan, 1 roll for Menodorus, 1 roll contained in another (?) for Chel ... , and Alexander delivered them to Nicodemus. The 17th, morning hour, Phoenix the younger, son of Heraclitus, Macedonian owning 100 areata, delivered to Aminon 1 roll and the price for Phianias; and Aminon delivered it to Theochrestus. The 18th, 1st hour, Theochrestus delivered to Dinias 3 rolls from the upper country, of which 2 rolls were for king Ptolemy and 1 for Apollonius the dioecetes, and Dinias delivered them
to Hippolysus. The 18th, 6th hour, Phoenix the elder, son of Heraclitus, Macedonian owning 100 arourae in the Heracleopolite nome, one of the first company of E., delivered 1 roll for Phanias, and Aminon delivered it to Timocrates. The 19th, 11th hour, Nicodemus delivered from the lower country to Alexander [.] rolls, from king Ptolemy for Antiochus in the Heracleopolite nome 1 roll, for Demetrius, the officer in charge of supplies for the elephants, in the Thebaid 1 roll, for Hippoteles the agent of Antiochus accusing Andronicus (?) at Apollonopolis the Great 1 roll, from king Ptolemy to Theogenes the money-carrier 1 roll, for Heracleodorus in the Thebaid 1 roll, for Zoilus, banker of the Hermopolite nome, 1 roll, for Dionysius, oeconomus in the Arsinoite nome, 1 roll. The 20th, . . hour, Lycoleus delivered to Aminon 3 rolls, of which 1 roll was for king Ptolemy from the elephant-country below Th . . ., 1 roll for Apollonius the diocetes, 1 roll for Hermippus, member of the staff of workmen (?), and Aminon delivered them to Hippolysus. The 21st, 6th hour, . . delivered two letters from the lower country for Phanias, and Horus delivered them to Dionysius . . . The 22nd, 1st hour, A . . . delivered to Dinias 16 rolls, of which [.] rolls were for king Ptolemy from the elephant-country below Th . . ., 4 rolls for Apollonius the diocetes, 4 rolls for Antiochus the Cretan, and Dinias delivered them to Nicodemus. The 22nd, 15th hour, Leon delivered to Aminon from the upper country [.] rolls for king Ptolemy, and Aminon delivered them to Hippolysus. The 23rd, morning hour, Timocrates delivered to Alexander [.] rolls, of which [.] rolls were for king Ptolemy, 1 roll for Apollonius the diocetes, 1 roll for P . . . the money-carrier, [.] roll for Par . . ., and Alexander delivered them to . . .'

54. The traces at the beginning of the line do not suit ὅπασ or παρέθεκαν. ἀνωθεν probably occurred somewhere in the line, since one of the letters was for the king; cf. ll. 66 and 107.

55. Possibly καὶ(λιαντοῦ) stood as usual before the numeral, but there is no trace of it and the space is somewhat narrow. Alexander, Aminon, Dinias, and Horus occupy an intermediate position in the transmission of letters, as contrasted e.g. with Hippolysus and Nicodemus, who only bring in letters or take them away. Probably the former were officials at the postal-station.

59. ἐν ἀναλωσία appears to mean 'contained in a second roll,' and if this packet is counted as 2 rolls the number 6 in l. 55 is correct.

63. τὸ δέξου apparently means the sum paid by Phoenix at the office for postage. Such payments do not occur elsewhere in the document, and high officials would naturally have had the services of State messengers gratis. The sender of this particular letter may therefore be supposed to have been some unauthorized person, who would have to pay for the privilege of utilizing the messenger's services. There is, however, no mention of a payment in connexion with a letter sent by the brother of Phoenix (ll. 70–4).

72. τῶν πρῶτων Ἑνν. . . .: a similar military title is found in an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus of the third century B.C. τῶν Μενελάου πρῶτων ἐκ τοῦ Ἐρμομελίτου καὶ (ἐκατοντάρουσα).

79. Cf. ll. 91–2 and 102, P, Petrie II. 20. iv. 8 ἐν Ἔμμω Μέλαθρον, 40 (a). 22 ἡ ἐλεφανταγγείον ἡ ἐν Βερείκειᾳ, Π. 114. 16 τὴν ὑδατικήν τῶν οἰκίων. An inscription found at Edfu is dedicated to Philopator by the στρατηγός ἀποσταλέων ἐπὶ τῷ θύραν τῶν ἐλεφαντῶν; cf. Dittenberger, Or. Gr. Inscr. I. 82, with his note ad loc., and I. 86.

81. Ἀνδρονίκου is doubtful, especially the termination. ὁμ may be αἱ and the second ν could well be μ.

83. Between a and παρά is a diagonal stroke with a rounded top, the meaning of which is obscure.

84. χρηματάργω: cf. ll. 51–3, note.
92-3. [παρά] τῶν ὀλεθρών would be expected; cf. l. 102 and παρὰ βασιλέως in l. 83. But there is not room for παρά in the lacuna, the size of which requires πα(ρά) or ἀπό. θρ[. . .] σου, which recurs in l. 102, seems to be a geographical name; the second letter may be η.

95. πλήρωμα is used in several of the Petrie papyri for a company of workmen, e.g. III. 43 (3). 12; but whether the term has a similar sense here is doubtful.

97. The κ of παρέδωκεν is a correction; possibly the syllable κέν was written twice and the name of the messenger was 'Αλέξανδρος. He would, however, be different from the Ἀλέξανδρος in ll. 55 and 114, who was one of the clerks at the office. Ὄροι may have occurred at the end of the line; cf. l. 99. To read ἐν Ἀλέξανδρεία, which at first sight looks attractive, is inadmissible on several grounds: (1) it would imply that this register was kept in the immediate neighbourhood of that city, which is a most unlikely hypothesis; (2) there is no part of Egypt which could be described as κάτωθι (l. 98) relatively to Alexandria; (3) παρέδωκεν requires a subject.

100. Α[ε']ν might be read after παρέδωκεν, but Leon could hardly have arrived from the south twice on the same day (cf. l. 106).

### 111. List of Cases and Fines. - Τίγγε

Mummy 69. 

Breadth 15.3 cm. 

About b.c. 250.

This is a record, kept by some official connected with the judicial administration, of cases which had come up for decision, with the addition in some cases of particulars concerning amounts due to or from the different parties. These sums are sometimes followed by the word πράξας, signifying that they were still to be paid; and it is likely that the keeper of the account was the πράκτωρ who had to collect them. The items are arranged under the three villages of Takona, Tholthis, and Sephta, all in the Oxyrhynchite nome. The document appears not to have extended beyond the two columns of which parts are preserved; it belongs to the close of Philadelphus’ reign or the first few years of his successor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἔν Τάκωναί·</td>
<td>Θεόλθις·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὰ πρὸς Μελάνθιον</td>
<td>τὰ πρὸς Ζηνόδοτον καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περὶ τῆς βίας ἐπὶ</td>
<td>30 Καρνεάθην.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δημητρίαν &amp; (δυόβολοι) (ἡμιω-</td>
<td>Ἀριστοφος μονῆς Καλλι-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-βέλιον),</td>
<td>δρόμου [Θ]ηραμένου δ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 καὶ Ενοκράτης ἅτ,</td>
<td>Δημήτριου (δραχμαὶ) ν καὶ τὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀνδρομάχου θ.</td>
<td>γινόμενα λ (δβολὸς) (ἡμιωβε-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ενοκράτης τὰ πρὸς</td>
<td>λιον).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At Takona: the case against Melanthius for violence to Demetria, 7 drachmae 2½ obols, and to Xenocrates 16 dr., to Andromachus 9 dr. To Xenocrates in the case against Ptolemaeus ... to the oeconomus (?), to be collected. Polianthes in the case against Polon 2 dr., to be collected. To Patron against the rest, to be transferred to Polyarchus and Sosiphanes out of the number. To Appolonius against Appolonius 20 drachmae, to be collected. Connarus 2 drachmae, to be collected. In the case against Nicolaus and Amphilochos, to the oeconomus (?). At Sephtha: the case against Timaeus, 20 drachmae. For Apis to the city and concerning Theophilus and Melanthius son of Philon 3 dr. 3½ ob. At Tholthis: the case against Zenodotus and Carneades. Ariston for the appearance of Callidromus son of Theramenes 4 dr. Demetrius 50 dr. and costs 30 dr. 1½ ob. Docimus against Myrtous daughter of ... Demetrius concerning the donkey of ... 6 dr. Leontas concerning the sheep of Nechthenibis, 1 dr.'

5. ξενο(κράτη): the first name may be either in the nom., acc., gen., or dat. case, but probably these varieties do not all imply a corresponding distinction of meaning. Where the dative occurs, payment was presumably to be made to the person; the acc. and
HIBEH PAPYRI

gen. on the other hand might both be used of the persons who paid. The nom. is also more likely to represent the payer than the recipient.

10. ὁ ἔκοιον[μ]': cf. l. 21. The meaning possibly is that the fine was to be paid to the oeconomos. In both cases there is a short space before ὁ ἔκοιον[μ].

13-6. The sense seems to be improved by connecting l. 15-6 with the two preceding lines, notwithstanding the fact that πρὸς projects somewhat to the left like the other lines which commence a new sentence. None of the other entries begins with πρὸς, and ἐκ τοῦ ἄριθμου is more intelligible if constructed with μεταγράψατε than if l. 15 begins a new entry, in which case a verb has to be supplied.


27. The name Θαλῆς, which is repeated at the top of the next column, is faint, and was probably partly erased.

34. γυνόμενα: cf. 92. 20. The large amount of these 'costs' as compared with the first sum is remarkable; the ἐπίδεικτα were perhaps included.

41. This line, which is written in large letters across the fibres, looks like a regular endorsement, but its relation to the contents of the recto is not clear. An δῶρον is mentioned in l. 38.

112. Taxing-List.

Mummy A. Fr. (6) 22·2 x 19, Fr. (6) 9·2 x 14·1 cm. About B.C. 260.

Three fragments of a long taxing-list, perhaps written at the ἱγευτήριον of Phebichis (cf. 106, introd.), recording money payments for various taxes at different villages of the Κάρθης by individuals who are in most if not all cases the tax-payers, not the tax-collectors. Among the imposta are (1) a tax on pigeon-houses (l. 1, note); (2) payments for oil sold by the government (l. 2, note); (3) a new tax called δωδεκακολόλα, which was apparently a charge of 12 chalci per aroura on cleruchic and temple land (l. 8, note); (4) a tax upon green-stuffs (l. 9, note); (5) the beer-tax (ll. 11, 25, &c.; cf. 108, introd.); (6) the ἐπαρθυρόμεν, a charge on certain kinds of land, with which is coupled (7) the tax on embankments, amounting to about 1/3 of it (l. 13, note); (8) the tax on sales (l. 22, note); (9) a tax of 1/4, which can be explained in several ways (l. 38, note); (10) a tax of 1/4, probably that levied upon the salting and milling industries (l. 45, note); (11) a new tax connected with carpet-weaving (l. 76, note); (12) a new tax called φακῆς (l. 77), the nature of which is obscure; (13) a tax on gardens, perhaps the ἀπόμωρα (l. 92, note); (14) the bath-tax (l. 96; cf. 108. 7, note). The villages mentioned (in several instances for the first time) are generally in the nominative, but sometimes in the accusative or genitive; they include Κέρκεσης, Φισάκις, Ἀσσύρια, Ψύχις, Περόν, Ψήθων(ἴμβη?) (l. 25, note), Χοιλβάντας, Μοῦχις (l. 27, note), Ψελεμάχις, Ὁμοιότος, Τονέγιους.
(?, cf. l. 43, note), Περοχύφης, Θομοδόβης and Ἀγκυρών πόλις. The papyrus probably belongs to the latter part of Philadelpheus' reign. In some places the ink of another document to which it had been gummed has come off, and occasionally there is a difficulty in distinguishing this from the writing of 112. On the verso are parts of another account, mentioning large sums of money but without indicating the nature of the payments. We omit Fr. (c), which contains only the beginnings of lines, and Col. i of Fr. (a), of which only a few figures from the ends of lines are preserved.

Fr. (a). Col. ii.

[.. .]αν...] περιοτριδιος η.
[Κερκέης Θεοτρι[ταῖος ἑλαίου] λ,
δ αὐτός ἀλκής.
Φεβίχις Διογένης [... . . .] ις.
5 [Ἀ]σσύας Πετοσήρις [... . . .] λ.
[Κερκέης Ἰρακλε[ίδης [... .]] [(δ]ωδέκα)]χ(αλκίαν)
τοῦ Πολεμάρχου [τ, χα(λκο]) λ.
Διοκής (δωδέκα)χ(αλκίαν) π[οῦ] Ἡρωδότον (τριώμολον), χα(λκο) (τριώμολον).
Σωσίπατρός χα(λκορόν τοῦ Πο-
10 λεμάρχου ό.
[Ψ]ήχις Ἀμενεδς ζυπηρᾶς ε ὑπερβολον).
Ἀσσύας δ αὐτός κς (τετράβολον).
Φεβίχις Διόφilos ἑπαρν[ριον] δ (τετράβολον) (ἡμωβέλιον), χω(ματικὸν)
(τριώμολον) (ἡμωβέλιον).
Περόνων Θαγομῆς (δυομῆς) (τέταρτον), χω(ματικὸν) (τέταρτον),
15 [. . .]χωνες Θατοταίον α (τριώμολον), χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμωβέλιον) (τέταρτον),
[Θεοτριταῖος καὶ Αμώστρατος α, χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμωβέλιον) (τέταρτον),
]τρα[. . . .]υ[. . . .] (τετράβολον) (ἡμωβέλιον), χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμωβέλιον),
[. . . .]τριος (δυομῆς) (τέταρτον), χω(ματικὸν) (τέταρτον),
[. . . .] Μπο[σιος] (τετράβολον) (ἡμωβέλιον), [χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμωβέλιον).
2 lines lost.

22 [ 18 letters ]σ βοδός
Ταμάνος ἕσ ἐπρετο παρά
Εύρηνης δ (δοβολον).
25 Ψεβθον(ἐμβῆ ?) Πενούπις Ἀδγχίς ἔτ(τηρᾶς) ια (τετράβολον).
Χοιβνῶτιμος Πετῶς ἔτ(τηρᾶς) ἔγ (δυοβόλους).
Μοῦχιν Πᾶσις Τετραβάτις ἐπα-
ρούριον (δυοβόλους) (τέταρτον), ἔκμα(τικὸν) (τέταρτον),
καὶ Τεός (τριώβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον) (τέταρτον), Χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμιωβέλιον).
30 Ψεβίχις Τεός (δωδεκα)χ(αλκίαν) τοῦ Δημητρίου (τετράβολον) (τέταρτον),
χα(λκοῦ) (τετράβολον) (τέταρτον).
[.] Ἀνις Ὄροφ [. . . . .]ς κς (δβολόν),
Μι[. . . .]ς [. . . . .]νουβίος (δυοβόλους) (τέταρτον),
[18 letters] σις (δωδεκα)χ(αλκίαν) τοῦ
[20 " ] ἴα, χα(λκοῦ) ἴα.

16. τος of δημοστρατος above the line.

Col. iii.

35 κλήρου βασιλικῶν περὶ κόμης
Ψελεμάχιν εἰς τὴν καθήκουσαν
αὐτῶν ἀναφέραν ἐως τοῦ Πα[γ(?)] κη.
Ψεβίχις Διογένης κδ' ἵε (δβολόν).
Θομιτάθις Θάσις ἐλαῖου ἰβ.
40 Ψεβίχις Ἀντιγένης Πέρσης ὑπὲρ
Ποσειδώνου δωδεκαχαλκίαν οὖ γεωργεῖ κλήρου
τῶν πρὸς ἄργυριον ἵγ, [χα(λκοῦ) (?) ἵγ.
Τοινέγους Θορττάιος . . . . ,
Θηός ἑπαροῦριον δ' (τριώβολον), [χω(ματικὸν) .
45 Μοῦχιν 'Εμγῆς Ἀρνάτης κδ' [. .
Περχύφης Κολλοῦθης κδ' [. .
καὶ τετάρτῃς β' (τριώβολον) [. .
Ψεβίχις Ψεγχώνης (δωδεκα)χ(αλκίαν) τοῦ Κόμοι-
νος καὶ Ξενοφάντου ε, χα(λκοῦ) ε,
50 Σενύρης ἑπαροῦριον (τετράβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον), χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμιωβέλιον). [. .
'Ετφῆς Εἰσηγησ (τετράβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον), χω(ματικὸν) [(ἡμιωβέλιον).
112. ACCOUNTS

'Ασσύνας Διογένης τὸ παρὰ τι[...] πρὸς ἄργυριον τοῦ Φιλησίου [...]

55 Θομοσθῆς [...] σοίρης κ. [...] "[...] Φιδίχις Πάις εἰς τὴν Διογένιστον ἐγ.;

γυή κ'δ'[...] Πετοσίρης δ'[ [...] Φεβίχις Στοτοήτις Σερ[ [...] ἐπαρῷβριον φωνίκων [...]

Ἀπολλώνιος χα(ματικῶν) τοῦ α[ [...] Στοτοήτις (δωδεκα)χ(αλκίων) το[ [...] κλῆρου [...]

60 καὶ τοῦ ...[ [...] Ὄμρος Μιὰσιος τη[ [...] [.][.]!!![ [...] [. [... ... ... ... ... ... ...

41. δωδεκαχαλκίων above the line. 60. στοτοήτις above πετοσίρης erased.

Fr. (δ). Col. i.

Parts of four lines.

73 [... ]ς Ἀγατήτιτος ε. Ἀγκ[µ]ρὼν π(όλ)ις Ὄμρος ἐλαί(ων) βς.

75 [... ]κλῆς Φαμῆς κ'δ' ν, καὶ ταπιδυφαντῶν ε, καὶ φακῆς δ', καὶ δ' ὁ αὐτὸς [...]

Φεβίχις Θανώς Φα[ [...] ξικούτοι

80 εἰς Ψιντάνην β. Κερκέσης Στέφανος Σατόκου [...][...] βς ... Ἀπ[...] ολλοδόρου κδ, [...][...] [...]. Σατόκου κδ.
... a pigeon-house 8 dr. At Kerkeses, Thotortaeus for oil 30 dr., the same for salt-tax 60 dr. At Phebichis, Diogenes for ... 16 dr. At Assua, Petosiris for ... 30 dr. At Kerkeses, Heracleides for the (12 chalci-tax?) on Polemarchus' holding 10 (?) dr., 10 (?) dr. of copper. Diocles for the 12 chalci-tax on Herodotus' holding 3 obols, 3 obols of copper; Sosipater for the green-stuffs (?) of Polemarchus' holding 8 dr. At Psuchis, Amenneus for beer-tax 6 dr. 4 ob. At Assua, the same (Amenneus) 26 dr. 4 ob. At Phebichis, Diphilos for land-tax 4 dr. 4 1/2 ob., for embankments-tax 3 1/2 ob. At Poroë, Thagombes 2 1/2 ob., for embankments-tax 1/2 ob.; ... chonsis son of Thotortaeus 1 dr. 3 ob., for embankments-tax 1/2 ob.; Thotortaeus and Demostratus 1 dr., for embankments-tax 1/2 ob.; ... 4 1/2 ob., for embankments-tax 1/2 ob.; ... trius ... 2 1/2 ob., for embankments-tax 1/2 ob.; ... son of Miusis 4 1/2 ob., for embankments-tax 1/2 ob. ... on the cow of Tamanis which he bought from Eirene 4 dr. 1 ob. At Psebthonembe (?), Penoupis son of (?) Aunchis for beer-tax 11 dr. 4 ob. At Choibnotmis, Petoës for beer-tax 63 dr. 2 ob. At Mouchis Pasis son of (?) Tetobastis for land-tax 2 1/2 ob., for embankments-tax 1/2 ob., and Teos 3 1/2 ob., for embankments-tax 1/2 ob. At Phebichis, Teos for the 12 chalci-tax upon the holding of Demetrius 4 1/2 ob., 4 1/2 ob. of copper. At ... is, Horus ... 27 dr. 1 ob.; ... son of ... nubis 2 1/2 ob. ... for the 12 chalci-tax on the holding of ... 11 dr., 11 dr. of copper. ... the royal holding near the village of Pselemachis for the instalment due from him up to Pauni (?) 26 dr. At Phebichis, Diogenes for the tax of 15 dr. 1 ob. At Thmoitothis, Thasis for oil 12 dr. At Phebichis, Antigenes, Persian, on behalf of Posidonius for the 12 chalci-tax upon the holding which he cultivates among those which are valued in silver
112. ACCOUNTS

13 dr., 13 dr. of copper. At Toenegous (?), Thotortaeus; Theo for land-tax 4 dr. 3 ob., for embankments-tax... At Mouchis, Emges (?), son of (?) Harouites for the tax of \( \frac{3}{4} \) dr. at Perchuphis, Kolloutes for the tax of \( \frac{2}{3} \) dr., and for the tax of \( \frac{1}{2} \) dr. 3 ob. At Phebichis, Psenchonis for the 12 chalci-tax upon the holdings of Comon and Xenophon 5 dr., 5 dr. of copper; Senuris for land-tax 4\( \frac{1}{4} \) ob., for embankments-tax \( \frac{1}{4} \) ob.; Eptheus son of Isigetis (?) 4\( \frac{1}{4} \) ob., for embankments-tax \( \frac{1}{2} \) ob. At Assua, Diogenes the sum due from... son of (?) Harptronis for the 12 chalci-tax upon the holding of Cleon 3 dr., 3 dr. of copper. At Phebichis, Petobatis for the (12 chalci-tax upon) holdings valued in silver, upon the holding of Phileus... At Thmioithis... At Pschis, Pais for surety of Dionysius on account of the tax of \( \frac{1}{4} \) dr. 3 ob. The tax for \( \frac{1}{4} \)... At Phebichis, Stotoitis son of Sen... for land-tax (?) upon palms... Apollonius for embankments-tax upon... Stotoitis for the 12 chalci-tax upon the holding of...; Horus son of Miusis...

Fr. (6). '... son of Agathis 5 dr. At Ancromopolis, Horus for oil 160 dr. At (?)... cle Phames for the tax of 3\( \frac{1}{4} \) 50 dr., and for carpet-weavers 5 dr., and for lentil-cake 4 dr., and the same for the tax of 4\( \frac{1}{4} \) 10 dr. At Phebichis, Thanos son of Pha... akoutes to the credit of Psintaes 2 dr. At Kerkeses, Stephanus son of Satokos for... of Apollodorus 24 dr.;... son of Satokus 24 dr. At Phebichis, Ptolemaeus for the 12 chalci-tax upon the holding of The... 1 dr. \( \frac{1}{10} \) ob., 1 dr. \( \frac{1}{10} \) ob. of copper... At Choibnotmis,... upon holdings valued in silver... At Thmioithis... of Stotoitis for the 12 chalci-tax on the sacred land of Ammon... At Phebichis, Apollonius... the sum due from Psenchonis on account of the sixth (?) upon his garden which formerly belonged to Diphilus 9 dr. 5 ob., and...; for bath-tax... son of Philon...'

1. περατεράνον: a τρίτη περατεράνον, i.e. a tax of \( \frac{1}{3} \) on the profits of pigeon-houses, is known in Ptolemaic times from Wilcken, Ost. II. no. 1228 (cf. I. p. 279), P. Petrie III. 110 recto, and P. Tebt. 84. 9 (cf. note ad loc.); but the impost here may be different. The preceding words may be [\( \delta \) αύτός]; cf. I. 3.

2. θανωκάστης; cf. ll. 39, 74, and 113. 12-4. Thotortaeus was probably an θανωκάστης; cf. Rev. Laws xlviii. 3-12.

3. δάκτις: cf. P. Petrie III. pp. 273-4 and Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 141-4. That the salt industry was a government monopoly is practically certain, but the principles upon which it was managed are not clear.

6. Near the end of the line is an i somewhat above the level of the other letters, probably part of the abbreviation for δωδεκαχάλικαν; cf. the next note. With τοι before Πολεμάρχον in l. 7, as in l. 9, supply κλήρον; cf. l. 41 and notes on 52. 26 and 117. 8.

8. δακτικά(λικάν): this new word, which usually in 112 is abbreviated in the form ὀβ over χ, is written out in l. 41. The name indicates a tax of 12 chalci (1\( \frac{1}{4} \) obols) upon, probably, the aura; and it generally occurs in connexion with cleruchic land, being paid by the ἄγαρα on behalf of the cleruchs (cf. ll. 30, 33, 41, &c.), but in one case (I. 89) the land in question is ῥύπα. Payment is made in copper, except perhaps in ll. 42 and 55 (cf. l. 87), where the κλήροι are said to be τῶν πρὸς ἄγαρίον, Sc. διοικουμένων or some such word (cf. e.g. P. Tebt. 60. 41). A peculiarity of the entries concerning this tax is the fact that the amount is stated twice, χα(λκών) being prefixed in the second instance. If the unit of taxation was the aura, as would be expected, this impost of 1\( \frac{1}{4} \) obols, which is about \( \frac{2}{3} \) artaba of wheat (cf. 84. a. 8-9, note), may well correspond to the impost ranging from \( \frac{1}{4} \) artaba to \( \frac{1}{3} \) artaba upon cleruchic and sacred land found in the Tebtunis papyri of the next century; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 430-1. Whether πρὸς ἄγαρίον in ll. 42 and 55 is contrasted with payments in copper or with payments in kind is not clear.

9. For χαλκών cf. the λογεία χαλκών in 51. 2, and the payments for χαλκών in 119. 17 and for χαλκών εἰς στέρμα in 117. 4.
13. ἔπαρον(χίον): this is the first occasion on which the name of this impost upon the aroura of, probably, palm-, vine-, and fruit-bearing land (cf. l. 61 ἔπαρ. φοινίκων) has been found in the third century b.c.; but cf. P. Petrie III. 70 (a). 1 where the tax of 8 drachmæ per aroura on, apparently, vine-land may well be the ἐπαροῦν. In the second century b.c. it is mentioned in several ostraca (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 193) and in P. Tebt. 209, and frequently in the Roman period, payments being, as here, uniformly in money. In 112 the ἄκαρτεικόν or tax on embankments is regularly associated with the ἐπαροῦν, and in the present instance is about ½ of it. In l. 15 the ἄκαρτεικόν is only ⅓ of the ἐπαροῦν, but in the other cases (ll. 14, 16–9, 28–9, 50) the proportion of the amounts paid for the two taxes is nearly the same as in l. 13. Since the ἄκαρτεικόν at this period was often 1 obol per aroura (P. Petrie III. 108, 2, &c., and p. 273), the ἐπαροῦν in 112 was very likely about 8 obols per aroura.

14–9. The first of the two payments in each of these entries refers to the ἐπαροῦν; cf. the preceding note.

19. Perhaps Ἰππος Μιώτιος; cf. l. 67. For the supplement of the final lacuna cf. l. 17.

21. Perhaps ἀετός βοῦς; cf. P. Fay. 62. 3 ἀετός βοῦς ... ἓν ἔρημον. The impost in question is the ἐγκύκλιον of 5 per cent., on which cf. 70 (a), introd. The value of this cow was therefore 83 dr. 2 ob.

25. ἡβθον(είμη): cf. 33. 7 and p. 8. The names of the villages are, however, not abbreviated elsewhere in this papyrus; and it is quite possible that ἡβθονενοῦσα should be read, especially as this combination would avoid the difficulty with regard to Ἀδυνατος, which if Πενοινης is the tax-payer has to be treated as a genitive, i.e. for Ἀδυνατος. The fathers' names of the tax-payers are sometimes found in 112, e.g. in l. 81; but it is not very satisfactory to suppose the omission of o in the termination -ος in a papyrus so early and in other respects so well written as 112. A precisely similar difficulty arises in ll. 27 and 45, and on the whole it seems best to suppose that in all these cases two nominatives are found together, the second being a mistake for the genitive or καί being omitted.

27. Μοῦχων: cf. p. 8, and for the accusative l. 14 Περάν. But if Μοῦχων Πάσας be two words Τερεδωτησις must be corrected (cf. l. 25, note), and perhaps the name of the village was Μοῦχοπατας; cf. the form Μοῦχοπατας(ις) on p. 8, and l. 45, note.

29. The 3½ obols are for ἐπαροῦν; cf. l. 27 and note on l. 13.

30. For the supplement ὁδηκα(αλκης) cf. l. 8, note.

35. κλάρων βασιλικά: cf. 52. 26, note. What this payment of 28 dr. was for does not appear.

37. There is hardly room for Πα[κλῆξ], unless ας was very cramped.

38. κ'': several imposts called κ' are known in the Ptolemaic period; cf. 80. 4, κ'' on goods exported from the Heracleopolite to the Arsinoite nome, 95. 7 τεταρακαικιοκτή (sic) τεταράκιον, P. Petrie I. 25 (2). 2 τεταρακαικιοκτή πυρῶν, 115 introd. κ'' ἔριων, and the τεταρακαικιοκτή paid in kind by βασιλικὸς γεωργία at Kerkeosiris (P. Tebt. I. 93, introd.). Which of these taxes is meant here is uncertain.

41–2. Cf. note on l. 8.

43. Τενεώος seems to be a village rather than a personal name.

45. Μοῦχων 'Εργῆς: cf. l. 25 and 27, notes. If 'Εργῆς is a proper name 'Αρνώτης must be altered to 'Αρνώτης ο ἢ καὶ 'Αρνώτης; but perhaps Μοῦχονετῆς should be read.

8': cf. l. 47 and τετάρτη as the heading of a taxing-list in P. Petrie III. 117 (b). ii. 1, where it means the τετάρτη ταρχηρίων and εἰσιτωνίων. That is very likely to be the impost meant in 112, though a τετάρτη ἀλείων is also known, on which cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 137–41, and P. Tebt. I. pp. 49–50. For the τετάρτη ταρχηρίων and εἰσιτωνίων cf. P. Fay. 15. 3 (where l. τήν δ' (so Wilcken) τῶν σειτοπιοκών καὶ τῶν ταρχηρίων), and P. Petrie III. introd., p. 8 and 58 (a). 2.
It seems to have been a tax of \( \frac{1}{4} \) on the profits of the salting and milling (or perhaps baking) industries.

50. \( \text{Σερώς} \) may be a village-name, in which case \( \text{Ψερχώνος} \) must be supplied from l. 48.

51. \( \text{Σερχών} \): though the \( \gamma \) may well be superfluous (cf. 27. 53, note), this word would seem to be the name of the father of 'Εφέσωs rather than of a place (sc. 'Ισείου; cf. 167).

52. τὸ παρὰ: cf. l. 92 and 109. 9.

54. \( \text{δωδεκαυχάλεια} \) is probably to be supplied before \( \text{εὐήρων} \) from l. 53; cf. ll. 41–2 and l. 8, note.

57. For ἕ[γ]ών cf. the payments for \( \text{διεγύγησις} \) in 114–5.

61. Cf. note on l. 13. The \( \chiωματικόν \) was in the present case paid by a different person (l. 62).

74. \( [\text{λγκ}]\mu[\rho/on \pi(\alpha)\iota]s \): cf. pp. 9–10.

75. [,\( \kappa\lambdaει, \) if not a place-name, affords another example of two nominatives together; cf. l. 25, note.

76. \( \tauαπ[\delta]φυαρτών \): the name of this impost ‘for carpet-weavers’ is new. Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 177) resolves the abbreviation \( \delta[\alpha]φ(\) , which occurs in one of his ostraca as the name of a tax, as \( \delta[\alpha]φ(\epsilonιδήρων) \), i.e. \( \tauαπ[\delta]φυαρτών \), and regards it as a branch of the \( \chiερωματικόν \) or tax on trades; but this explanation of \( \delta[\alpha]φ(\) is not very likely. Whether \( \tauαπ[\delta]φυαρτών \) here means merely a tax on that trade, or is connected with the \( \text{εὐνυπ[α]} \) monopoly (on which cf. 87, introd., and Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 266–9) is uncertain.

77. \( \phiακίς \): this too is a new name of a tax; but cf. \( \text{ἐτοιμ[α] φακί[ς]} \) as the description of an impost in P. Par. 67. 16. \( \text{φακί[ς]} \) is also to be read above \( \beta[αλ]ν[είον] \) in P. Petrie III. 37 (b), verso 6, but seems to have been intentionally rubbed out. The nature of this impost connected with lentil cake is quite obscure.

80. \( \text{Ψερών} \) seems to be a man rather than a place.


89–90. Cf. l. 8, note.

92. For the supplement \( \text{ἐκτης} \) (i.e. the \( \text{ἀπόμυρα} \)) cf. 109. 10. But the \( \text{ἐπορο[υ]σι} \) may be meant; cf. l. 13, note.

93. For τοῦ αὐτοῦ \( \text{παραδείσιου} \) meaning ‘his garden’ instead of ‘the same garden’ cf. e.g. P. Petrie III. 117 (g). 38 and 40.

118. \( \text{Banker's Account.} \)


Two incomplete columns of an official account of sums paid or owing, resembling P. Petrie III. 93, verso. Judging by the miscellaneous character of the entries, which refer amongst other things to deficiencies in connexion with the revenues from the oil and beer industries (ll. 12–5), and a present from the State to distressed cultivators (ll. 18–20), it is probable that the writer was connected with a royal bank or \( \text{λαγωνῆριον} \) (cf. 108, introd.). The handwriting is a small, very flowing cursive of a distinctly early type, and the papyrus is
certainly not later than the end of Philadelphus' reign. We omit the second column which is much obliterated.

5 καὶ τὸ ἐπιγραφὲν τοῖς ... ] ... [ τοῖς τὸ ζυτός μὴ εἰληθοί ... καὶ τὸ ἐν Πάσιτι ... ξ ὁ λογευτὴ ταῖς παρα ... τι

10 Βότρων τοῦ φυλακίτην καὶ ...] ἀναχωρήσαντι ζυτή[πᾶς] χα(λκοῦ) λδ (ἡμιωβέλιον) (τέταρτον), καὶ ἑλακῆς χα(λκοῦ) ρξ (δῆβολος) (ἡμιωβέλιον).

καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀντιλέγονσιν μὴ εἰληθοί ... φέναι ἑλαιὸν χα(λκοῦ) ξ.

15 ἐν Τοτοῖν Πάσιτος λογευτῆ καὶ μὴθὲν ὑπάρχει ... τῶν γεωργῶν εἰς τὰ ἐργα τῶν κημάτων ἄργυροι λ.

2. ο of os above the line. 5. επι τοῖς ἐπιγραφεῖν above ανα erased. 6. ο of τοῖς corr. from α.

8–19. 'Item, owed by Pasis son of ... , tax-collector, who ... Botrus the guard and disappeared, for the beer-tax 34 dr. ¾ ob. in copper, and for the oil-tax 167 dr. 1¼ ob. in copper. Item, owed by the persons who deny that they have received it, for oil 6 dr. in copper. Oowed by Totoës son of Pasis, tax-collector, who has no property, 66 dr. 3¼ ob. Item, given to the distressed cultivators for operations in their vineyards, 20 dr. in silver.'

5. The persons meant are probably the beer-sellers, though ςτεγομάλις is too long; cf. ll. 13–4 which seem to refer to the ςτεγομάλις.

7. If κωμῶν is right a word meaning 'list' or 'distribution' would be expected after it; but the initial κ is doubtful, and μ or γ might be read.

9. Perhaps παρακατάγοντα. It is not clear whether ἀναχωρήσαντι refers to Πάσιτι or to Βότρων.

11–2. ὁ ὡς is to be supplied with both ςτηρᾶς and ἕλακῆς. The sum owed by Pasis under the latter heading probably refers to the payments by ἐλαιοκατηλοὶ to the government
officials for oil supplied; cf. Rev. Laws xlviii. 3-12 and the next note. The ἄριστος probably
means the tax levied on the beer-manufacturers; cf. 106, introd.
I3-4. τοῖς ἀντλέγοσις μὴ ἐληφθέναι is ambiguous. If the object to be supplied for ἐληφθέναι is the 6 drachmae, the ἀντλέγοσις are λογιαντίκες like Πάσει in I. 8. But on the
analogy of I. 6 the object of ἐληφθέναι is more likely to be ἐλαιον, in which case the ἐλαυκάπτης are most probably meant; cf. the preceding note.
19. For κτήμα in the sense of a 'vineyard' cf. P. Petrie III. 28 (e). 4, 67 (b). 10, &c. The abbreviation of ἀργυρίου forms a symbol resembling that for ἄρτιθη (which is of course nothing but a combination of ἄρτι), as in P. Petrie III. 114. 9.

114. OFFICIAL ACCOUNT.

Mummy 25. 23:5 x 19:8 cm. b. c. 244 (243).

An account of payments made at Cynopolis by Apollonius and Onnophris, contractors for the πλύνον καὶ στίβος (or -οῦ; the gender is in both cases doubtful), in the 3rd year of a king who is probably Euergetes. The precise meaning of these two words, upon which the interpretation of the papyrus turns, is not easy to determine. πλύνον occurs in two Ptolemaic ostraca published by Wilcken, Ost. II. 329 (third century B.C.) and 1497 (second century B.C.), which are receipts
for 60 drachmae and 500 drachmae for νυτρικῆς πλύνου, and also on the recto of 116 in proximity to an account concerning νῦτρων. There was therefore a close connexion between νῦτρων and πλύνον, and the question arises whether πλύνον and στίβος could signify some preparation of νῦτρων. The production of natron was most probably a government monopoly, and the market may have been supplied through contractors, in the same way as in the case of oil. But there is no other trace of any such sense for πλύνον or στίβος. πλύνον should mean either a place for washing or the articles washed; cf. Suid. πλύνως δέχοντος τὸ ἄγγελον αὐτό, παραδείγματος δὲ τὸ πλυμένου. It is in the latter sense that Wilcken understands the word in the combination νυτρικῆς πλύνου (Ost. I. p. 264). στίβος ordinarily means 'path' or 'footstep,' but in this context is obviously to be connected with the sense of 'washing,' which the same root has in στείβεω and στείβεται. On the whole we are inclined to think that Apollonius and Onnophris were contractors for washing and fulling carried out in a place or places under State control, though whether the words πλύνον and στίβος have themselves a local signification—which is not really incompatible with the ostraca—or are equivalent to τὰ πλυμένα καὶ στείβημα, has still to be determined. Another possible alternative would be to suppose that πλύνον and στίβος are loosely used, and that the subject of the contract was not the industry itself but the tax upon it. The tax upon the fuller's trade (γναφική) is well known in the Roman period, but there is as yet
no evidence concerning it in Ptolemaic times. Between the several alternative explanations a decision is hardly attainable without further evidence. The document is written in a large calligraphic hand. The order of the months in which the instalments are paid gives rise to a difficult chronological problem; cf. note on ll. 3–5.

Col. i.

[Παρά 'Απολλώνιου καὶ 'Οννήφρεως]
[τῶν ἔξεληφότον τῶν πλόνων]
[καὶ στίβων εἰς τὸ γένετο (δραχμᾶς) 'B . . . ]
[ἔτους δὲ ἢ ἀναφορὰ ἀπὸ Μεχείρ]

5 [ἐω]ς Φαῦφι μηνὸν θ (δραχμαὶ) 'Βις (διόβολοι) (ήμιωβέλιον).
[ἐἰς τὸ τοῦτο πέπτωκεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἐν Κυ(νόν) πᾶλει]
[λ]ογεντήριον

[Μ]έχειρ πλόνου
[στίβου]
[λέ]

10 [γ'ν]εταί (δραχμαί) ρπα.
[Φαμενώθ] πλόνου
[στίβου]

Col. ii.

Θωντ
καὶ ἀπὸ διεγγυὴσως (δραχμαί) ε,

15 /
πλόνου
στίβου
γίνεται
Φαῦφι πλόνου
στίβου
/
γίνεται

6. τοῦ of τοῦτο inserted above the line.
13. r of θωντ corr. from θ.

*From Apollonius and Onnophris, the contractors for the washing and fulling (?) in the third year at z[. . . ] drachmae. The instalment for the 9 months from Mecheir to
Phaophi is 2017 drachmas 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) obols: to meet this there has been paid into the collecting-office at Cynopolis, in Mecheir for washing 144 dr., for fulling 37 dr., total 181 dr. . . . Thoth 238 dr., and as surety-money 5 dr., total 243 dr. For washing 177 dr., for fulling 66 dr., making 243 dr. Phaophi for washing 156 dr., for fulling 66 dr., making 232 dr. Total 1898 dr.; remainder 119 dr. 2\(\frac{1}{3}\) ob.

3–5. If the amounts due each month were equal, the monthly instalment would amount to 224 dr. \(\frac{1}{16}\) ob., and the total to 2689 dr. \(\frac{5}{8}\) ob.; but those figures cannot be read in l. 3. The instalments may therefore be assumed to have differed; cf. 116. 3–4. That the series begins with Mecheir is worth noting in connexion with 115. 5 and 116. 3; cf. notes ad loc. It is impossible to be certain in the present case whether the fourth quarter of the year was reckoned as preceding Mecheir or following after Phaophi. But whether Athur or, as is more likely, Mecheir is here the beginning of the financial year, this does not coincide with the ordinary revenue year starting in Thoth, in spite of the fact that in l. 3 the two taxes are stated to be farmed 'for the 3rd year' of a king. We defer to App. ii. p. 361 a discussion of the possible solutions of this complicated problem.

7. \(\lambda\gamma\gamma\nu\gamma\tau\bar{o}r\bar{i}n\bar{a}m\bar{h}\): cf. 106, introd.

12. The lower half of the column which contained details for the five months from Pharnouthi to Mesore is lost.

14. The meaning of this item is that the payments being in arrear one of the sureties for the contractors had to make up the deficiency. At the end of the nine months there was still a considerable sum owing. Similar entries occur in 115. 15 and 34.

16–7. These are the details for Thoth, the 5 dr. \(\alpha\pi\omega\ \deltai\gamma\gamma\nu\gamma\tau\bar{o}r\bar{i}n\bar{a}m\bar{h}\) being included in one of the items; the total given in l. 15 is repeated in l. 18.

115. ACCOUNTS

115. ACCOUNT OF TAXES ON SACRIFICES AND WOOL.

Mummy 84. Fr. (a) 24.7 x 11 cm. About B.C. 250.

Some fragmentary taxing accounts, of which the two columns given below are in a fair state of preservation. The first of these relates to the \(\mu\omicron\sigma\chi\omega\nu\ \delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\), or 10 per cent. duty upon sacrificial calves, which is here first met with in the Ptolemaic period. The fragment published in P. Petrie II. p. 37, from which Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 377) infers the existence in the third century B.C. of a tax on sacrifices, is shown by the republication in P. Petrie III. 112 (a) not to justify that conclusion. The tax is also called a \(\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\) in P. Tebt. II. 307 and 605–7, of about the year A.D. 200, where the amount is 20 drachmae, paid in two cases at least by priests. The impost was probably levied by the State upon the profits which the priests derived upon the sacrifices offered by private persons; cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 384–5.

The subject of the next column is a tax of 5 per cent. on wool, apparently a property-tax, of which the present is the first mention. A tax of \(\frac{1}{3}\) on wool (\(\kappa\omicron\omicron\iota\ \epsilon\rho\lambda\omega\nu\)) is found in another (unpublished) Hibeh papyrus; but whether
that represents the same impost at a lower rate or is something distinct, e.g. an export duty (cf. 80), is not clear. Concerning the wool-tax in Roman times information is even scantier, though P. Cairo 10449 (Wilcken, Archiv, I. p. 552), in which ἔμηρά occurs, proves that it continued to exist.

Both accounts are arranged on the same plan. At the head of the column are the names of the tax and the tax-farmers, which are followed by estimates of the amounts expected in different months and statements of the sums actually paid; cf. 116.

The papyrus belongs to about the middle of the third century, but no date occurs. Col. iii is written over some earlier writing which has been washed out.

Col. ii.

μόσχου δεκάτης Ι[. . . . .] καὶ
Νικάνορ [ ] ν
ἐπιβάλλει τοῦ μ[ηνί . . .]
eἰς τούτο γράφουσι γείνεσθαι

5 Μεχίρ (τριάβολον),
Φαμενώθ (τριάβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον),
Φαρμοβίθι οὐθέν,
Παχών (δραχμᾶς) ξ[δ] [(δυόβολον),
/ (δραχμαί) ξε (δύόβολοι) (ἡμιοβέλιον).

10 πέπτωκε Μεχίρ οὐθέν,
Φαμενώθ (δραχμή) α (ἡμιοβέλιον),
Φαρμοβίθι οὐθέν,
Παχών (δραχμαί) νη (πεντάβολον) [ ]
Παύνι ἀπὸ (δραχμῶν) ξ[ξ] (δραχμαί) γ (τριάβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον) (τέταρτον ?), [λο(πταί)] (δραχμαί) ξβ (δύόβολοι) (τέταρτον).

15 καὶ διεγγύσεις ὑπ’ Ἀρμ[. . . . .] (δραχμαί) κε,
καὶ προσκαταστήσοντοι . . . . . . . . ραν (δραχμᾶς) ε, 
/ (δραχμαί) λ

Παύνι γείνεται
ε[. . .] . τ[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]
Col. iii.

20 eikosths epeow Tp[.ν.] [ kai
'Inarowos Apmouwio [
epiβallai th (tetp)µ(µrwi) [. . [. 
eis de to sto γραψουσι γεινεσθαι
Meξir (δραχμας ?) λγ (τριῳβολον ?),
25 Φαμεναθ (δραχμας ?) τλβ (δβολον) (τεταρτον ?),
Φαρμοθι [(δραχμας) ..]a (τριῳβολον) (ήμωβελιον),
Παξiων [(δραχμας ..]µa (δβολον ?) (ήμωβελιον) (τεταρτον ?),
/[
pεπτωκεν M[εξιρ
30 Φ[αμε]ναθ [ 
Φαρμοθι [ 
Παξiων (δραχμai ?) [ 
... σια (δραχμai) µia [ 
[kai] διεγγεισει υπò
35 kai ήπερ 'Inarowt[os
[ 
[ 
36 Παυνι γείφεται

37 [. . .]. δα νι [ 
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

'For the tenth upon calves, I . . . and Nicanor . . . The instalment due for the month is . . .; for this they write that there is (or was?) paid, in Mecheir 3 obols, in Phamenoth 3½ ob., in Pachon 64 dr. 2 ob., total 65 dr. 2½ ob. Receipts: in Mecheir nothing, in Phamenoth 1 dr. ½ ob., in Pharmouthi nothing, in Pachon 58 dr. 5 ob., in Pauni, out of 66 dr., 3 dr. 3½ ob., leaving 62 dr. 2½ ob. Also as surety-money from Arm . . . 25 dr., and they will in addition provide . . . 5 dr., total 30 dr. In Pauni is paid . . .

'The twentieth on wool, Tr . . . and Inarouis son of Ammonius. The instalment due every four days is . . .; for this they write that there is (?) paid, in Mecheir 33 dr. 3 ob., in Phamenoth 332 dr. 1½ ob., in Pharmouthi . . .1 dr. 3½ ob., in Pachon . . .51 dr. 1½ ob., total . . . Receipts: in Mecheir, &c.'

1-2. The ends of these two lines and of ll. 14-6 are upon the piece of papyrus
containing Col. iii, and are combined with Col. ii on the basis of the arithmetic in ll. 15-7; but there is nothing to determine the precise length of the lacunae. The names here and in ll. 20-1 are those of the tax-farmers.

3. Cf. l. 22, where τῆς (τερπ)μην(ἐροι) takes the place of τῶν μην (τερπ). The reading there is not very certain, and the letters might be read μη, i.e., (τερπ)μην(καται); but the former alternative is confirmed by the occurrence of the same abbreviation in the remains of the first column, and there the last letter is plainly μ (or π), not η. Apparently ll. 3 and 22 give purely hypothetical estimates, gained by a simple process of arithmetical division, of the amount falling due within the period named; cf. 116. 5, where after a statement of amounts payable in the two halves of the year the papyrus proceeds δεὶ ἐν αὐτῶν τὰ ἁμαθια τῆς (τερπ)μην(ἐροι) ... The estimates which follow in ll. 4-9 and 23-8, on the other hand, though also hypothetical, have obviously a closer relation to facts, and may be conjectured to be the amounts paid in the corresponding periods of the preceding year. This point would be clearer if the word after γράφωνι in ll. 4 and 23 were definitely ascertainable. An infinitive is expected, and on the whole γείνεσθαι or γείνοισθαι seem most suitable; if the latter were adopted the reference to a previous occasion would be more necessary.

5. Μεχύρ: this month perhaps began the financial year; cf. notes on 114. 3-5 and 116. 3-4, and pp. 360-1.

14. This mention of Pauni, which month does not occur in the list of estimates in ll. 5-8 and apparently belongs to the next group of entries (l. 18), is curious. Perhaps these 3 dr. 3½ obols paid in Pauni were reckoned with the account of Mecheir—Pachon in order to diminish the difference between 65 dr. 2½ obols, the total of the estimate (l. 9), and 59 dr. 5½ (or 5½) ob., the sum of the actual receipts in ll. 10-3. A somewhat similar difficulty arises in the corresponding passage of the other account at l. 33, where there is an additional entry of an obscure character after the sums relating to the 4 months; but Παுνί cannot be read there.

Some of the figures in l. 14 are by no means certain. The first number is probably 35 or 37; and the question arises whether the figures at the end of the line represent the difference between these 66 or 67 drachmes and the 3 dr. 3½ ob. actually paid, or the sum of the 3 dr. 3½ ob. and the preceding items in ll. 10-3. We have been led to adopt the former supposition owing to the circumstance that the obols and fractions in l. 14 add up to a drachma, as apparently they should do if λαδ(ωνί) is supplied in the lacuna, whereas the sums in ll. 10-3, which amount to at least 59 dr. 5½ obols, added to 3 dr. 3½ ob. make 63 dr. 3½ ob., and the number at the end of l. 14 is not 35 but 2½ obols. But the blurred vestiges at the end of the line do not suggest 35 or 37.

15. Perhaps Ἀρραύοις (?), a name which occurs in the first column. For διαγγέλλεις cf. 114. 14, note. The size of the lacunae in the middle of ll. 15-6 is uncertain; cf. note on ll. 1-2.

16. The vestige of the letter before ρω would suit ο or ω.

22 sqq. Cf. note on l. 3.

33. The supposed ι might be ρ and the preceding letter ε or η. Neither γείνεσθαι nor λαοῦρι can be read; cf. l. 14, note.

37. There are traces of five lines between this and l. 36, but they apparently all belong to the erased document; cf. introd.
116. ACCOUNTS


16 8 x 16 8 cm. About B.C. 245.

Part of an account dealing with the tax of a third upon baths, for the
collection of which at Busiris (the modern Abusir) the large sum of 1320
drachmae was paid by Aristander. This impost, which is to be distinguished
from the ordinary tax βαλανεῖων, was apparently a percentage of 1/3 levied upon
the profits of privately owned baths; cf. note on 108. 7. An estimate is first
given (cf. 116) of the amounts (which are not equal) accredited to the two halves
of the year, and of the sum falling due every four days; and an account of the
actual payments follows. It is remarkable that the half years commenced with
Mecheir and Mesore; cf. note on l. 3.

The column printed is preceded by the ends of lines from another
column, which contained a similar account relating probably to a different tax;
cf. 116. These two columns are written on the verso of the papyrus. On the
recto are two more columns of official accounts, unfortunately both fragmentary,
written in a different hand and referring to νίτρον and πλόνος (cf. 114). Col. i
shows that νίτρον was priced at 4 drachmae the talent, e.g. II. 10–1νίτρον
(τάλαντα) ραγίς ἀν(ά) δ (δραχμαί) φλόγ (δύσβολοι), | νίτρον (τάλαντα)'Ατηγγ ἀν(ά) δ (δραχ-
μαί) Ἑνλγ (δύσβολοι). In P. Tebt. I. 120 3 minae of νίτρον are valued at 90 copper
drachmae, which on a ratio of silver to copper of 1 : 450 exactly corresponds
with the price here. The three preceding lines contain the entry νίτρον ? (τάλαντα)
v, εἰσόδευα τῆς | [14 letters?] ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντος | [ἀντός (?) κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα ἀν(ά) k.
Col. ii, in which πλόνον occurs, mentions διεγράφοις [ (cf. 114. 14, 115. 13), and τῷ
παρὰ τοῦ οἰκονόμου ἐγγαθόντι . . . ἐγγύους εἰς ἐκτισμόν (cf. 94–5).

The papyrus may belong to the latter part of the reign of Philadelphus
or the earlier years of Euergetes; it was the only Greek document from
Mummy 12.

Col. ii.

βαλανεῖων γ'/

Βουσίερος Ἀρίστανδρος Θίβρανος (δραχμαί) Ἀτίκ'κ.

dιαίρεσις Μεχιρ ἐως 'Επειφ ἀν(ά) qa (τετράβολον) (δραχμαί) φν, |
'Mεσορή ἐως Τύβι ἀν(ά) ῥχ (δυσβόλου) (δραχμαί) ψρ, πλθρες ? |

5 δεὶ οὖν αὐτὸν τάξασθαι τῆς (τετρ)ημέρου) ἵγ (τετράβολον).

πέπτωκεν
HIBEH PAPYRI

Mexlep B B (rerpcoBoXov) (riraprov), y 8 (rerpcoBoXov), rj £ (SvoBoXoi), ia ... ob. still owing at the end of that month. How this deficiency was met was being explained when the papyrus breaks off.

312 HIBEH PAPYRI

The period from Mecheir to Epeiph at 91 drachmae 4 obols, 550 dr.; from Mesore to Tubi at 128 dr. 2 ob., 770 dr. He ought therefore to pay for every four days 13 dr. 4 ob.

Paid: on Mecheir 2nd, 2 dr. 4½ ob.; 3rd, 2 dr. 4 ob. &c.'

3-4. Since the two half-yearly periods commenced with Mecheir and Mesore the year must have been reckoned from one of those two months. Mecheir being put first would be more naturally regarded as the starting-point, and that view is to some extent corroborated by 114. 4, 115. 5, 24; cf. 114. 3–5; note. On the other hand Mesore as the beginning of a financial year is supported by the evidence of 133 and Rev. Laws lvi. 5. In any case it is strange that in matters directly relating to taxation the regnal or at any rate some year which differed from the revenue year beginning on Thoth 1 was so often employed; cf. pp. 360–1.

4. For παλη(πηρεσ) after a figure to indicate that nothing is wanting cf. e. g. P. Petrie III. 109 (e). 6. But παλ( ) if that be the right reading, may also stand for πλεῖον, and a figure would then have followed, perhaps σχ, i.e. the difference between the two totals.

5. (τετραπήμισ) or (τετραπήμισον), but the former seems preferable on the analogy of 115. 3; cf. note ad loc.

6. (τριώβαλον) or (τριώβαλον) may be read at the end of the line in place of (τετράβαλον), in which case another entry would follow for the 12th or 13th of the month.

12. The figure from which σλ (ιμιωβέλιον), the sum of the actual receipts from Mecheir to Pachon, is subtracted is the total due for those four months calculated on the scale given in L 3: 91 dr. 4 ob. x 4 = 366 dr. 4 ob. 230 dr. ½ ob. subtracted from this leaves 136 dr. 3½ ob., which were still owing. To this deficiency is added the estimated total for Pauni in accordance with the scale in L 3, making 228 dr. 1½ obols, from which are deducted the actual receipts for Pauni, 46 dr., leaving 182 dr. 1½ ob. still owing at the end of that month. How this deficiency was met was being explained when the papyrus breaks off.
Mummy A. 24 x 15.2 cm. B.C. 239 (238) or 214 (213).

An account of corn received during Epeiph, rendered by an official in charge of the State granaries of the Koitês; cf. the monthly returns of sitologi to the strategus in Roman times, e.g. B. G. U. 835. The total is curiously small, only 138 1/2 artabae of olyra and 12 of wheat, the olyra being apparently the repayments of loans of seed for green crops, while the wheat was for the crown-tax, an impost levied on special occasions; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 223–4. The papyrus is dated in the 8th year of a king who is certainly not earlier than Euergetes, for the handwriting, which is extremely cursive, approximates more than that of most documents in this volume to the second century B.C. style; the reign may be that of Philopator, though the latest certain date found in these papyri is the 25th year of Euergetes (80). On the right are the beginnings of lines of another document in a different hand, and on the verso is part of another account.

[ε]τους η, παρὰ 'Αροννώφριος
τοῦ πρὸς τοὺς θη(σαυροῖς) τοῦ Κοιτοῦ.
σήμου τοῦ μεμετρημένου
ἐν τῷ 'Επείφῳ χλωρῶν εἰς σπέρμα

5 [ὁ]λυρῶν ῥληθ', στεφάνου
η (ἐτους) πυρ(ῶν) δ, ζ (ἐτους) πυρ(ῶν) η, / πυρ(ῶν) τιβ,
[ὁ]λυρῶν ῥληθ', / τὸ καθ' ἑνε.

10 Ψῦχιν χλωρῶν σπ(έρμα) ὠλ(υρῶν) μξζ,
[ὁ] αὐτὸς τοῦ Παρμενίωνος χλ(ωρῶν) σπ(έρμα) ὠλ(υρῶν) μξζ,
[ὁ]ράτων τοῦ Φιλίππου περὶ Ἀσσύαν
[χ]λ(ωρῶν) σπ(έρμα) ὠλ(υρῶν) μγζ',
[εἰς ταῦ] τῷ χλ(ωρῶν) σπέρ(μα) ὠλ(υρῶν) ῥληθ'.

15 [ἐν] Φεβίχει Θεόδωρος τῶν ἔξ Ἀγ-
[κυρῶν πᾶλεως]. α στεφάνου πυρ(ῶν)
η (ἐτους) πυρ(ῶν) δ, ζ (ἐτους) πυρ(ῶν) η,
Traces of 3 more lines.

8. This line inserted later.
The 8th year, from Haronnophris, superintendent of granaries of the Koûte district. Account of corn measured in Epeirh: for green-stuffs for seed 138 ½ artabae of olyra, for the crown-tax of the 8th year 4 artabae of wheat, for that of the 7th year 8 artabae of wheat. Total 12 artabae of wheat, 138 ½ artabae of olyra. Of this the details are: paid at Talaë on account of holdings at Psuchis... shares on account of the holding of Callistратas at Psuchis for green-stuffs for seed 47 ½ artabae of olyra; Straton on account of the holding of Parmenion for green-stuffs for seed 47 ½ artabae of olyra; Strat on account of the holding of Philippus at Assua for green-stuffs for seed 43 ½ artabae of olyra; total for green-stuffs for seed 138 ½ artabae of olyra. At Phebichis, Theodoros from Ancyronpolis for the crown-tax paid in wheat of the 8th year 4 artabae of wheat, for that of the 7th year 8 artabae of wheat...

4. χλωρῶν εἰς στέρμα: cf. 119. 17, where 40 ½ artabae of wheat are paid for χλωρῶν among various items of receipts from a κλήρος, and the payments for χλωρά in 51. 2 and 112. 9.

8. Τάλημ: cf. 36. 3, note.

εἰς τοὺς: sc. κλήρους; cf. τοῦ Καλλαστράτου (sc. κλήρου) in l. 9, and notes on 52. 26, 112. 6, and 118. 2. Whether these κλήρου were really owned by cleruchs or had reverted to the Crown is not clear.

15–6. Ἀγκυρῶν πόλεως: cf. pp. 9–10, 67. 4, and 112. 74. Very likely one or both words were abbreviated, unless the word before στεφάνου (of which the last letter may be λ instead of α) was an abbreviation. πυρ(ῶν) after στεφάνου seems superfluous; cf. ll. 5–6.

118. ACCOUNT OF OLYRA.

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 17.8 x 26, Fr. (b) 26.2 x 20.8 cm. About B.C. 250.

Two fragments of an account of olyra, written probably by a sitologus or other official of the θησαυρός, in a large and clear hand over an obliterated document. Lines 1–15, which begin a new section headed στέρμα and may be the actual commencement of the account, give a list of seed issued to or repaid by cultivators of crown or cleruchic land (cf. l. 2, note). Lines 17–36 give various details of expenditure for horses and other purposes; and in l. 37 begins a list of (apparently) payments to various persons from Pharmouthi to Mesore, the names of women being placed after those of men.

Fr. (a) Col. i. Col. ii.

στέρμα: Χοιαχ β.
Πανεύς εἰς τὸν 'Ιάσωνος ὀλ(υρῶν) λξλ, ἔπεως ὀλ(υρῶν) β,
Πολέμων εἰς τὸν Θεοδώρου ροσ, ἦ ἔπεως ὀλ(υρῶν) β,
Ἀντικράτης εἰς τὸν Πολυαῦνος νξ, 20 ἔπεως ὀλ(υρῶν) β.
5 Ποκούς εἰς τὸν Τιμοκράτου ρκε,
Ποικίλα εἰς τὴν Θεορήστου

dιάργυρα ἤπειρον,
εἰς τὸν Ἰάσων ὁλοκρόνον ἀλ. κ. λ.
Παύτης με,

10 Ἡπέραξας ἡξιάλ.
Σωντεύς εἰς τὸν Θεοκρ. . . . . .
Σισός εἰς τὸν Παράτομοι . . . . .
καὶ ἢν ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς Θεοκρ.
[j...]τοις διάργυρα [. . . . . .]
15 [ ] ὁλοκρόνοι οὐδὴν.
[j...]φόροιν [. . . . . . .]

ἀνήλωμα:
'Ομοφώτα τέκτονες . . ,
μακρυλήρων γ.,
Σωντεύς ἀρχιερεὺς . . ,
25 Σωντεύς Πετοβάσιστος . . ,
Ἐδαγόρας σ.,
τοῖς Δωρίωνος [ . . . ]
καὶ ἐδοκα αὐτοῖς . . .
οὐ ἐλάττω εὐρέθη . . .
30 τὸ πάν τὸ ἀνήλωμα . . .
[j [...] [...] [. . . . .]

Col. i.

Παχώς ἐς ἐπιτοίχος διὰ λουρών α.,
i ὁλουρών β., ἑστὶν αλ., καὶ αλ.,
κέ αλ., / ὁλουρών) ζ.λ.

35 Παχώς β. ὁλουρών αλ., μ. αλ.,
η αλ., καὶ ζ., [ / διὰ λουρών) ε.]
Φαρμακία οἰομετρία: Μ[αί]θωτής ὁλουρών γ.,
Κρατίως ὁλουρών γ., [ / διὰ λουρών) ζ.

40 Παχώς οἰομετρία: Κλίτος γ., = N'.
[ Ταγιόνος γ., = N.]
Πο[λεύς γ.] = N'/
[Μελάνθιος δία] = N/2

45 [Κεφάλιος δία] = N/5
[Θεστοτάτος γ.] = N'
[Πάσις γ.] = N'/
[Θάρρυς γ.] = N/5
[Ἀπολλώνιος γ.] = N/9

Col. ii.

60 ['Επείφα]:
Θερμών γ., = N.3
Κλίτος γ., = N'.
Κεφάλων δία, = N.5
Θεστοτάτος γ., = N'.

65 Παχώς γ., = N3
/ ὁλουρών) ἑστί.
Μεσορία:
Μακαρωτῆς διὰ λουρών) γ., = N/3
Κρατίως γ., = N/10

70 Μελάνθιος δία, = N/3
Κεφάλων δία, = N/3
Θεστοτάτος γ., = N/3
Κλαδός γ., = N/3
Κλίτος γ., = N/3

75 Νικίας γ., = N'
Πάσις γ., = N'
Θάρρυς γ., = N'}
50 [K]|ρατίνος γ, $N^1$
[N]|κίς γ, $N^2$
[Π]|λάτων γ, $N^3$
[M]|αθωτής γ, $N^4$
[K]|λάδος γ, $N^5$
[Δ]|μίδος γ, $N^6$
[Δ]|ιννίας ζ, $N^7$
[M]|υρήνη β, $N^8$
[B]|ουβάλιον β, $N^9$
[\(δ \omega \text{υρών}) νή].

Fr. (c).

36. ε of ει corr. from γ, and ε at the end of the line corr. from ξ.

2. εις τῶν Ίάσων: sc. κλήρος, as we think, though in P. Petrie III. 100, an account resembling the earlier part of 118, the editors supply λόγον with εις τῶν. But κλήρος is more easily coupled with διαφύμα (ll. 7 and 14) than λόγον; and cf. 117. 8, where with εις τῶν περί ψύχων probably κλήρων is to be supplied, and P. Petrie II. 39 (a). 10, where seed is ordered to be issued εἰς τῶν Δαισίσπρων κλήρων (cf. ll. 13–4 εἰς τῶν Ἀσκλήπιων καὶ Σωσίᾶτρων πρεσβυτέρων κλήρων). It is not clear whether the account in ll. 2–15 refers to repayments of loans or to the actual advances of seed-corn, like P. Petrie III. 90. The 'Ιάσων κλήρος must have been very large, since besides the 37½ artabae issued to Paneus, 97½ artabae are advanced to another of its γεωργοί (l. 8), and probably the entries in ll. 9–10 also refer to it. The advances of seed altogether in this section seem larger than would be expected in the case of regular cleruchic holdings which rarely exceeded 100 arourae, and the κλήρος here are probably in reality βασιλείαι; cf. 52. 26, note. It is not certain whether 118 concerns an Οξυρχηνχίτης or a Κολλε village, but if the village is Οξυρχηνχίτης the 'Ιάσων κλήρος here may be identical with the Ίάσων κλήρος in P. Oxy. 265. 4.

6. The issue of seed for a canal is curious; cf. ll. 13–4. It must have been a deep cutting with sloping sides. Theochrestus is more likely to have been the constructor (cf. the Κλεώνος διάρριψ in P. Petrie II. 6). 5), or some person after whom it was called, than the owner.

12. Παρά is very likely Παρά μένου; cf. 99. 7.

13. Perhaps ὅτε ἐκρήγιζον; cf. l. 6. But there was plenty of room for Θεοχρήστου in l. 8.

16. This line is probably a heading like l. 1. [Παστοφόρων, sc. κόμη (cf. 87. 6), is possible. ἐκφόρων is unlikely, for the letter after φορ resembles ω more than ω, and a heading would be expected to project to the left.

37. στεμνερία: this word, which in itself might mean simply a measuring out of corn, is the technical term used for official payments from the State granaries to individuals for
salaries, &c. (cf. 83. 5, introd.); and it is probable that the persons in the following lists were recipients, not payers. The grants may have been for κάτεργον (wages); cf. 119. 4, where κάτεργον is coupled with ἐκφόρον and σπέρμα in connexion with a κλῆρον.

42–9. These names are restored from the list in ll. 68–86, which apparently agreed with that in ll. 41–58 with the addition of one more woman (Σίμων β, l. 86).

88–90. These lines are probably from the bottom of Fr. (a), Col. i or ii.

119. ACCOUNTS 317

Mummy A 9.  26·4 x 10·4 cm.  About B.C. 260.

A statement of the rents due from a cleruchic holding, with an account of the amounts paid. It is not clear whether the land was really in the occupation of a cleruch or belonged to the category of βασιλικὸς κλῆρον, on which see introd. to 39 and 52. 26, note. The latter is perhaps the more likely alternative, for the style is rather that of an official than a private document. The rent is classified under three heads: grain, which is reckoned in wheat and paid in olyra; green-stuffs, reckoned in wheat; and sesame, reckoned in sesame with its equivalent in wheat. The sesame was measured by an artaba of 40 choenices (cf. 74. 2, note); and the ratios of the values of wheat and olyra and wheat and sesame were given as approximately 2½:1 and 1:3½.

166, a more imperfect duplicate of this papyrus, supplies the figures in ll. 6–8. Both copies were probably written in the latter part of the reign of Philadelphus.

"Εστιν τὸ ἐκφόρον τοῦ Ἀπολλονίου
κλῆρον (πυράν) τυ, [ 
σπέρμα ı,
κατέργον ı, / το, 1
5 μεμέτρηται
Φαμενῶτ κῦ ὀλυ(ρῶν) ρ(πη),
Φαρμοσθῆ δ ὀλυ(ρῶν) ρ(ξη),
ια ὀλυ(ρῶν) ρ(ξιαζ),
κ  ὀλυ(ρῶν) σ,
10 κξ ὀλυ(ρῶν) ρι,
Παχὸς κ ὀλυ(ρῶν) κεξ,
Παῦνι ıβ ὀλυ(ρῶν) [.] ı
'Επείτ κτ ὀλυ(ρῶν) [ .] 
καὶ ὀλυ(ρῶν) .
The rent of the holding of Apollonius is 350 artabae of wheat, for seed 10 art., for wages 10 art., total 370 art.; of which there has been measured:—on Phamenoth 23rd 188 art. of olyra, on Pharmouthi 4th 136\frac{1}{2} art., on the 11th 161\frac{1}{2} art., on the 20th 200, on the 27th 110, on Pachon 20th 25\frac{1}{2}, on Pauni 12th 10, on Epeiph 26th . . . , on Chiaik 11th . . . , total 933\frac{1}{2} art. of olyra, which are 373\frac{3}{4} art. of wheat. On account of green-stuffs 40\frac{1}{2} art. of wheat; and of sesame by the . . . measure 7\frac{1}{2} art., from which deduct 3\frac{3}{4} art. for cleaning and 1\frac{1}{2} art. 4 choenices for seed. Remainder 6 art. 6 choen., of which the embankments-tax is 3\frac{1}{2} art., remainder 5\frac{3}{4} art. 6 choen.; total 5\frac{1}{2} art. 6 choen., which are 17\frac{1}{2} art. of wheat, total 58 art. of wheat; making altogether 431\frac{1}{2} art. of wheat.

4. καθαρίσεις: as the 10 artabae reckoned under this head are evidently additional, they must have been due to the owner, whether the State or a cleruch (cf. introd.), for labour supplied. For καθαρίσεις in the sense of wages cf. e.g. P. Petrie III. 39. ii. 5, 63. 3. 166 has τις at the end of this line in defiance of the arithmetic; τις in l. 2 is there quite certain.

6. In the abbreviation of δλη(ρων) here and in 166 the three letters are written one above the other, λ below, then ϕ, and last ν, which consists of a shallow curve.

12. It is doubtful what was written between δλη(ρων) and i, and whether there was any erasure. In the corresponding place in 166 δλη(ρων) i seems to have been written twice, and δλη(ρων) may have been similarly repeated here.

16. This ratio of the value of olyra and wheat, approximately 1 : 2\frac{1}{2}, agrees with that given in 85. 14-5; cf. note ad loc.

17. The absence of any dates of payments in the following section suggests that it is only an estimate like that in l. 2-4. But the deductions on account of καθαρίσεις, &c., and the improbability that the whole of the rent in grain would have been paid before any of that on other crops, are in favour of supposing that these items had also been paid. The figure after μ in l. 17 is uncertain; for \frac{1}{3} artaba is elsewhere in this papyrus and 166 written as a half-circle, like the symbol for \frac{1}{3} obol (cf. also notes on 52. 33 and 53. 20), while in this place it is square and might be taken for ς with the upper stroke rubbed off. But to read μς here causes difficulties in l. 23.

χλωράι: for payments on account of χλωρά cf. notes on 51. 2, 52. 26, and 112. 9.

18. The abbreviation of the name of the measure consists of an a, immediately above which is a horizontal stroke with a short vertical one depending from it to the right of the
apex of the a. The general effect is very like the common sign for ἀπράθω; but art( ) may be meant. Whatever the name, the arithmetic of the following lines shows that this measure contained 40 choenices: 7 1/2 art. − 1 1/2 art. 4 choen. = 6 art. 6 choen., · · · 6 1/2 art. − 4 choen. = 6 art. 6 choen., · · · 1/2 art. = 10 choen.


20. The abbreviation of χοιλ(μεσ) is written as a χ having an o above and an ε below.

22. This deduction for χωματικόν, if the land was a βασιλεύς κλήρος, is rather strange; but the meaning may be that a special allowance equivalent to the value of 1/3 arsita of sesame was made to the lessee in connexion with the tax on dykes. In any case 1/3 art. of sesame cannot represent the amount of the tax on the whole κλήρος, which may be guessed from the amount of the rent to have been nearly 80 or even 100 arouae. The rate of the χωματικόν was often 1 obol per aroua (P. Petrie III. 108. 2, &c., and 112. 13, note), whereas the value of 1/3 art. of sesame according to the ratio given in l. 23 would be about 1 2/3 art. of wheat, or slightly over 3 drachmae, which at the rate of 1 obol per aroua represents a taxing-area of about 20 arouae.

23. The conversion of 5 1/2 art. 6 choen. of sesame into 17 1/2 art. of wheat implies a proportion in values of about 3 1/2 : 1. The value of sesame is here lower than that in Rev. Laws xxxix. 3, liii. 16, where an arsita of sesame is priced at 8 dr., ordinarily equivalent to 4 art. of wheat. Moreover, the arsita of sesame in Rev. Laws contained only 30 choenices, that in 119 40 choen.; cf. l. 18, note.

25. The meaning of this number, which is written at the bottom of the papyrus some distance below l. 24, is not clear.

120. Account of Goats.

Mummy A. Height 15 cm. b.c. 250–49 (249–8).

An account rendered to Hipponicus, probably by his steward, of the changes that had taken place in a herd of goats during a period of several months in the 36th year of Philadelphus. The papyrus is broken into numerous fragments of which we print three, the rest providing no new information of interest. The goats are classified by colours as white, black, brown, streaked, grey, and mole-coloured (l. 15, note); cf. the list of horses in P. Petrie II. 35. At the beginning the herd numbered 80, and it increased partly through the birth of kids, partly through presents to the owner; cf. 123. Lines 30–33, which perhaps end the document, state that Botrys (the goat-herd?) had reported three deaths.

Fr. (a).

("Ετοὺς") λευ̨ς, λόγος Ἰππονίκωι
tón ὑπαρχοῦσῶν
aἰγῶν καὶ τράγων
λευκαί [.]

Fr. (b).

[Ἀ]δύρ
προσεγένοντο
aἰγες ἀπὸ ξενίων
παρὰ Ζηνοδώρου
HIBEH PAPYRI

Fr. (b). Col. ii.

(5) μέλαιναι [.]
πυρραί [.]
ποικίλαι [.]
...... καὶ θ
σπώδαι [.]

(10) / π.

15 σπάλακα a,
λευκῇ a,
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς
ἐπιγονής
μέλαιναι [.]

20 [ποικίλαι [.]
[......]αι [.]
πυρρα a.
ἀπὸ ξενίων λευκῇ [a,

/ δ.

Fr. (c).

(25) Χοῖλαχ
προσεγένοντο
ἀπὸ ξενίων παρὰ
Κρήτωνοι ξεροῖνες.
λευκὸλ [.]

(30) ἀνήμευγεν δὲ
Βότρυς τετελευ-
τηκιάς αἰγας
τρέις.

13. ξενίων: for the burdens entailed by the custom of giving presents to officials cf. P. Petrie II. 10 (1) and P. Tebt. 5. 184, note.

15. σπάλακα: this form, which should be nominative sing. fem., is probably an error for σπιλάκη; cf. P. Petrie II. 35 (a). iii. 2, where Wilcken reads σπαλακ'. ἐν πῶλαίνων; in (d) 5, where σπαλάκας occurs, the context is obscure. Hesychius says that σπαλάκας, properly 'moles,' was used for εἴδος ἵππων.

121. PRIVATE ACCOUNT.

Mummy A 4.

Fr. (a) 30.5 x 8.5; Fr. (b) 10.8 x 9 cm. B.C. 251-0 (250-49).

An account, probably rendered by a servant to his master, of expenditure for various purposes. The two groups of entries on the recto are separated by a long space left blank. On the verso is a detailed account of miscellaneous household expenses from the 14th to the 19th days of a month, like P. Petrie III. 137-40. The handwriting is a large irregular cursive, probably of the reign of Philadelphus, though the reading of the date in l. 1 is not quite certain. Whether the writing on Fr. (b) is part of the same column as that on Fr. (a)
or of a second column is not clear; but the interval between ll. 45 and 46 is in any case trifling, since both refer to the same day.

Fr. (a). Recto.

\[
\text{\textcolor{red}{[\text{\textit{Etovs}}] \lambda\varepsilon, παρά Ἀγχώφιος (πυρῶν ?) \upsilon
(δραχμαί ?) \rho, δοῦν ἐγραφας}
\]

\[
\text{\textcolor{red}{Αθ(υ)ρ ἁλύσιον (δραχμᾶς) \mu,}
\text{πο, ερ(ο)ν (δραχμᾶς) λβ,}
\text{5 Ἀλέξανδρω['] (δραχμᾶς) \eta,}
\text{kai ἔμοι δὰ \Pi[δ]λλης (δραχμᾶς) \delta,}
\text{kυ παρὰ Τεώτο['] (δραχμᾶς) \delta,}
\text{kς ἄλλας [.]}
\]

\[
\text{ἐλαβες (δραχμᾶς) ξ, l ἔμοι \[\varepsilon\]e,}
\]

\[
\text{10 Ἰσιδώρῳ μβ, Διονύσῳ \eta,}
\text{ἐπί τὸν καυνάκην (δραχμᾶς) \delta,}
\text{[Ζω[ι]λῳ (δραχμᾶς) \delta, \Διδ (δραχμᾶς) \eta,}
\text{[. . .] . . (δραχμᾶς ?) \delta.}
\]

Verso. Col. i.

\[
\text{\textcolor{red}{[5 letters \nu \varepsilon,}
\text{15 Πετειν( ) (τέταρτον), \ελαιον χοι( ) \varepsilon,}
\text{kai els τὸν σινδοφεῖτη \varepsilon,}
\text{θερμὼν (τέταρτον), κ[ε]κ (τέταρτον), \eta \varepsilon, \varepsilon,}
\text{ο[υ]ο[ς] (οβολὸς) (τέταρτον),}
\text{\textcolor{red}{(δραχμη)} α (τετράβολον) (τέταρτον).}
\]

\[
\text{20 \textcolor{red}{ιε. \ελαιον παι(δίοις) (ἡμωβέλιον), και παι(δίοις) (ἡμωβέλιον,}
\text{Ηρακλείδη)} δύσων (οβολὸς), κίκι (τέταρτον),}
\text{θερμὼν (τέταρτον), ξύλα (τέταρτον),}
\text{\ελαιον χοι( ) (τέταρτον), \ονιχ(ε)ρ( ) τε \varepsilon,}
\text{ο[υ]ο[ς] (οβολὸς) (τέταρτον),}
\text{25 (πεντάβολον) (τέταρτον).}
\]

\[
\text{15. \ελαιον παι(δίοις) (ἡμωβέλιον), και παι(δίοις) (ἡμωβέλιον,}
\text{v}
\]
HIBEH PAPYRI

\( \text{θερμών (tétartov), ἔλαιον χοί ( ) (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{'Ἡρακλείδη (ήμιωβέλιον), χόρτος (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{kíki (tétartov), οίνος σοι (ὀβόλος (ήμιωβέλιον),} \)
\( \text{30 ἐργάτη (ήμιωβέλιον), κράμβη (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{kai ἔλαιον (tétartov), ἄρτος μοι (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{ξίλα (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{/ (πεντάβολον) (ήμιωβέλιον).} \)
\( \text{iς. ἐρίθοις ἐρίων (τετράβολον) (ήμιωβέλιον), ξίλα [ ,} \)
\( \text{35 ἔλαιον παι(δίοις) (ήμιωβέλιον), καὶ παιδίοις (ήμιωβέλιον),} \)
\( \text{κικι (tétartov), θερμώδιν (tétartov), χοί [ ,] ο (tétartov ?)}, \)
\( \text{[ . . . ] χόρτος (tétartov), [ ] . εσ[ ,] .[ . . ,} \)
\( \text{[ . . ] . οίνοι (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{[οίνοι] σοί (ὀβόλος ?) (ήμιωβέλιον) (tétartov), φόρεθρα (δυόβολοι),} \)
\( \text{40 ραφάμων) [ ,] ἔλαιον εἰς ( ) (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{kai εἰς τὰ ὀρνιθα (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{/ (δραχμαί) β (ήμιωβέλιον).} \)
\( \text{[ι.η. ἔλαιον παι(δίοις) (ήμιωβέλιον), παιδίοις [(ήμιωβέλιον),} \)
\( \text{[ . . . ] (tétartov), ραφάμων) (tétartov), κικι [ ,} \)
\( \text{45 [ ι.ι.η. ] y. } . . . . . . . . . . . . .} \)
\( \text{. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .} \)
\( \text{Fr. (b).} \)
\( \text{'Ἡρακλείδη (ήμιωβέλιον), οίνοις σοι (δυόβολοι),} \)
\( \text{δψων (ήμιωβέλιον), ἀλφιτα (ήμιωβέλιον), ἔλαιον σοι (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{[ἐ]λαιον δψω (ήμιωβέλιον), παιδίοις κύσασι (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{/ (δραχμη) α (τριάβολον) (ήμιωβέλιον) (tétartov).} \)
\( \text{50 ιδ. μάντες (ὀβόλος) (ήμιωβέλιον), κράμβη (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{kai ἔλαιον (tétartov), ξύλα (ήμιωβέλιον) (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{oίνοι σοι (ὀβόλος) (ήμιωβέλιον), ρίσαι (ὀβόλος), ζ. θ. [ ,} \)
\( \text{ἔλαιον ὀριν(δίοις) (tétartov), καὶ εἰς βαλα(νεών) (tétartov),} \)
\( \text{κριθαί (tétartov), μέλι (ὀβόλος) (tétartov), λυβα[νακτός) .} \)
\( \text{55 γυγγυλίς [} \)
\( \text{τεῦτ[λον} \)
\( \text{ροιά (tétartov), [} \)
\( \text{. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .} \)
48. (ἡμωβιλιον) corr. from (τέταρτον).

55. λαγγαλίς.

57. o of ροια above the line.

The 35th year, from Anchophis for 50 artabae 100 drachmae, of which you wrote off on account of Arthur for a ring 40 dr., for a cup (?) 2 dr., to Alexander 8 dr., to me through Pollie 4 dr.; 23rd, from Teos 4 dr.; 26th, in addition [? ] dr.

You received 60 dr., of which 15 were given to me, to Isidorus 12, to Dionysus 8, for the cloak 4 dr., to Zoius 4 dr., to Didis 8 dr., to ... 4 dr.

"(14th)... to Petiese... ob. oil... and for the linen garment... hot water ½ ob., castor oil ½ ob.,... wine ½ ob. Total 1 dr. 4½ ob. 15th, oil for the children ½ ob. and to the children ½ ob., to Heracleides for sauce 1 ob., castor oil ½ ob., hot water ½ ob., wood ½ ob., oil... ½ ob.,... of onyx (?) 1 ob., wine 1¼ ob. Total 5½ ob. 16th, oil for the children ½ ob. and to the children ½ ob., hot water ½ ob., oil... ½ ob., to Heracleides ½ ob., grass ½ ob., castor oil ½ ob., wine for yourself 1¼ ob., to a labourer ½ ob., cabbage ¼ ob., and oil ¼ ob., bread for myself ¼ ob., wood ¾ ob. Total 5½ ob. 17th, to the wool-weavers 4½ ob., wood... oil for the children ½ ob. and to the children ½ ob., castor oil ½ ob., hot water ½ ob.,... grass ½ ob.,... oil for a sauce ½ ob., wine for yourself 1¼ ob., transport 2 ob., radishes [ ] ob., oil for... ½ ob. and for (cooking) the birds ¼ ob. Total 2 dr. ½ ob. 18th, oil for the children ½ ob., to the children ½ ob.,... ¼ ob., radishes ½ ob., castor oil... to Heracleides ¼ ob., wine for yourself 2 ob., sauce ½ ob., meal ½ ob., oil for yourself ¼ ob., oil for a sauce ½ ob., a cup for the children ¼ ob. Total 1 dr. 3½ ob. 19th, bowls (?) 1½ ob., cabbage ½ ob., and oil ½ ob., wood ½ ob., wine for yourself 1¼ ob., roots (?) 1 ob.,... oil for the birds ½ ob., and for a bath ½ ob., barley ¼ ob., honey 1¼ ob., frankincense... turnip... beet... pomegranate ¼ ob. ...

4. Perhaps ποτέρα, i.e. ποτήριοι.

8. It is very doubtful whether a figure was ever inserted after ἀλλας.

15. χοί( ) is more probably a substantive in the dative than an adjective agreeing with ἐλαυν. Perhaps χοί(δομι), i.e. 'oil for (cooking) the pig'; cf. l. 53 ἐλαυν ὀρνίθιοι. The sign for ½ obol in this papyrus is the same as the writer's τ, the right-hand portion of the cross-bar being omitted.

17. βερμον: sc. ἕδαρ probably; cf. P. Petrie III. 140 (c). 6 ἕδαρ βερμόν. It might also mean a lupine. At the end of the line 'Η[ρ][άκλανδη(ς)] τέταρτον' is possible, but not very satisfactory, reading.

23. The doubtful τ may be the sign for ¼ obol (cf. note on l. 15), in which case ὀνυξίων is probably for ὀνυξίως, and ε... (ἡμωβιλιον) (τέταρτον) must follow. With the reading adopted in the text, ὀνυξίων is more likely to be an abbreviation of the adjective ὀνυξίως.


40. Cf. P. Petrie III. 140 (d). 2 ῥαβάνα δυτε ἐψήφα. After εἰς a word has been omitted which was contrasted with ἔριδθα in l. 41.

50. μᾶντρας appears to be a plural of μάντας (or μαντής), meaning an earthenware vessel (cf. ll. 4 and 48), a sense found in a passage quoted from Nicon by Athenaeus, p. 487 c. The existence of the genitive in -τός from this word has been a matter of doubt, which the present passage will remove.

52. ροια is an unknown word; possibly μιξα was meant.

56. τεῦ(λαον): στέφλαιon and στεῖκλαιon are the forms used in the Petrie papyri.
XI. DESCRIPTIONS OF DOCUMENTS

122. Mummy A. 7 x 14.7 cm. Beginning of an account of corn. Lines 1-5 Διάλογος ὁ πρὸς Ῥων διὰ Κίσσου κρ(ιθῆς) (ἀρτάβας) β, Ποσειδώνιοι ὄλ(υρων) (ἀρτάβας) ε, Κίσσωι ὄλ(υρων) (ἀρτάβας) γ, ἄλλος Κίσσωι ὄλ(υρων) γ, Κράτη (πυρων) (ἀρτάβας) γ, Ἀπολλοδόρωι (πυρων) (ἀρτάβας) δ. The writing is across the fibres. About B.C. 250. 8 lines.

123. Mummy A. 8.3 x 8.6 cm. A short account of sheep received by the writer from different persons, some being bought. The text is Παρ' ὅν ἔχου πρόβατα Ἀπολλωνίου α, Σωπάτρου α, Ἀλεξάνδρου α, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ νῆσος Υπολού τιμής α, παρὰ Δημητρίου ἐκ Κόβα (cf. 56. 6) α, Εὔνωδος τιμής α, Νίκανδρος α. Written probably between B.C. 265 and 245. Complete. 10 lines.


125. Mummy A (probably A 9). 12.9 x 8 cm. Conclusion of another similar loan from Zenodorus to Menonides (cf. 124) for 31 ½ artabae of olyra with signatures of Archippus and Menonides. On the verso (δραχμαί) μδ and below Μενωνίδου (ἀρτάβας) λα[β’]. Written across the fibres about B.C. 250 in the Oxyrhynchite nome. 17 lines.

126. Mummy A (probably A 9). 4.5 x 9.2 cm. Fragment of another similar loan from Zenodorus to Menonides (cf. 124), beginning Ζη[νοδώρου καὶ ἄλλων ψ[περ] Ζη[νοδώρου παρὰ Μένωνος π[ρά défini ent πρὸς βασιλικά. [Μένωνος also occurs in the signature of Archippus, but [Μένωνος in that of Menonides himself. On the verso Μενωνίδου σύμβολα (ἀρτάβαι?) (δραχμαί) ηθ (θ corr.). Written about B.C. 250 in the Oxyrhynchite nome. 9 lines.
127. Mummy A (probably A.9). 9.5 x 10.3 cm. Beginnings of lines of a letter from Zenodorus (cf. 59) to Cresilas, ordering him to send certain persons under arrest; cf. 59–62. The text is (1) Ζηνοδορός Κρησιλαόν χαίρειν. [πεφέγγασι εἶς Ὁλυ-] (2) ρυγχίτων κόμισθε Θάλδεω. καλῶς ἀν ὦν ποιήσας ] (3) αὐτῶν πέμψας πρὸς ἡμᾶς μετὰ φυλακῆς ἐπεὶ οὖν διλεγόμενοι [ (4) γον ἀργόρημα ἀφήπτακότε σε εἰ ... [ (5) σε περὶ διν ἀν ἡμῖν γράφῃ; . . . . [On the verso Κρη[σ]ίλαόν. Written across the fibres about B.C. 250 in the Oxyrhynchite nome. 6 lines, of which probably only about ½ is preserved.

128. Mummy A 17. 4 x 8.5 cm. Beginning of a contract dated in the 15th year of Philadelphus (B.C. 271–6 or 270–69), corresponding to 99. 1–4 and probably written by the same person, perhaps a duplicate of 99. 4 lines.


130. Mummy A (probably A.9). 22.4 x 7 cm. Beginnings of lines of a letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus similar to 58, commencing [Δημό][φονος Πτολεμαίων χαίρειν. ἀπέσταλκα σοι τὸ προσάγαγ[έ]λμα τῆς πρωτῆς (?) δεξιαμένου] τοῦ Ἀθηρ τῶν κα[ποιονεμ[πό]νων .. . . . . . . . . .] ἔν τοῖς κατὰ σὲ τίποσ. περιῶν [ὁνίου διεγγομένου] ἀγαφάλως. Θωμᾶς ὡς τῆς παρεμηνέσης ...] χερισταίον [, ,], followed by a list of names arranged under κλῆροι (ἐκ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου, ἐκ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου, ἐκ τοῦ Κυδρέου, ἐκ τοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ). Amongst the names occurring are Ἀρχιππος Φιλοξένου (cf. 134), Νέστορ Ἀθηραίου, Πεμφείς, Μοχατάς and Πακάμοις. Written about B.C. 247. 27 lines.

131. Mummy A. 2. 18.5 x 10.9 cm. Part of a letter to an official mentioning the chief-priest at Phebichis (cf. 72. 1–2). The text is Πτολ[εμαί]ος τοῦ Ἀρχιππος ἀρχιερέως χ. . . . . . . . . . [ἐν Φεβίχει. καλῶς ἀν ποιήσας εἰς εἰς φανέραι τινὰ δόξα τῆς Ἱμωνῆς [13 letters] μετρῆσαι [11 letters] ἐλαίου ἐτι ἐν Φώκη μηρὶ [10 letters] ὀλοκλήρως [. Written about B.C. 245. 8 lines.

132. Mummy A. Fr. (a) 8.5 x 15.5 cm. Two fragments containing parts of two columns of a list of payments for various taxes, including the ἐννόμων (cf. 52, introd.), the tax of ¼ (κ’γ’; cf. 80, 95, and 112. 38, note), and the ε’ (i.e. ἐκτης) Φιλαδέλφων (cf. 109) for which 3 obols are paid at Ταλαώ by Πτολεμαίος καὶ Ἄστρομαχος, and 1 dr. 3 ob. at Σινάρα by Σεμφθεῖς,
besides ὀἶνον τιμή (i.e. the value of wine paid for the ἐκτη), for which 4 drachmae are paid at Σινάραν by Ἄρφικοσις and another person respectively. The village of Μοὐχωρά, the proper name Ψωφίς, and the 30th year (of Philadelphus) are also mentioned. Written about B.C. 255.

133. Mummy A 5. 10.9 × 7.2 cm. Beginnings of lines of part of a petition to Eutychus, dioecetes (?), from a farmer of the beer-tax (cf. 106, introd.). The text is Ἐνυθύχω δειοκτητή χαίρειν. Σοκονώτις Παθοί... ἀπὸ κάμης ἢ Σεβενυτού διδυκοῦμαι ἐπ' Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ οἰκονομῶντος τὴν Ἦρακλείσθου μερίδα καὶ Διείς 14 letters ἐξελάβω τὴν ἕτηραν τοῦ... ἐπὶ Μεσορή ἕως ἑτέρων [17 letters] τὸν (δραχμών) ὁμιλήτριον. On the verso Ἐνυθύχω παρὰ Σοκονώτιος τρὸς Ἀπολλώνιον. For Mesore as the beginning of a financial year cf. note on 110. 3-4, and pp. 360-1. Written about B.C. 250.

134. Mummy A 4. 7.5 × 4.4 cm. Fragment of the beginning of a contract written between the 19th and 27th year of Philadelphus; cf. 94. 4-5, note. The text is Βασιλείσθους Πτωλεμαίου τοῦ Πτωλεμαίου καὶ τοῦ νιὸν Πτωλεμαίου ἐτούς... ἐφ' ἑρεύοις 21 letters Ἀλεξάκρις καὶ θεᾶν Ἀδέλφαν καννήφορον Ἀρσινόης Φαλα[δέλφου Φιλωτέρας τῆς 30 letters] ἐν Ἀφροδίτης πολέει 31 letters Ἀρμαίος Ἀρ.[

135. Mummy A 4. Fr. (a) 9.5 × 4.4 cm. Two fragments of an account, containing a list of names and sums of money, each entry in Fr. (a) beginning with κε, i.e. the 25th of the month. The names Τεραῖς (v corr. from ἱ?) and Πεσαιρών occur. Written about B.C. 250. On the verso part of another account.

136. Mummy A 15. 10.5 × 8.8 cm. Receipt, having the same formula as 106, for 20 drachmae paid by Petosiris (cf. 137, 139, and 141), agent of Ταέμβους, for ζυθήρα, 11 drachmae (δεκαμίων) being on account of Pharmouthi, and 9 on account of Pachon, to Νικόλαος τρ (απεζήτης) and Στοτοητίς δοκιμαστής) at Phebichis; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion (παράφυτος Δωρυλόν τὸ ἀπό τοῦ δραχμαίς ἑκοστη), and a line of demotic. Dated Pachon 13 of the 3rd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 244 (243). The writing is across the fibres. Practically complete. 9 lines.

137. Mummy A 15. 10.3 × 7 cm. A similar receipt for 18 drachmae χα (λκοῦ) ἐλεσ κ... (the figures are hopelessly effaced but were probably κο (τέταρτον); cf. 106. 8) paid by Petosiris, agent of Ταέμβους, for ζυθήρα on account of Pachon to Nicolaus and Stotoetis; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Dated
Pachon 30 of the 3rd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 244 (243). The writing is across the fibres. Nearly complete, but much obliterated. 9 lines.

138. Mummy A 15. 9.7 x 7.5 cm. A similar receipt for 8 drachmae χο(λεον) ελς κδ (τεταρτον) paid by 'Αρενωτῆς, agent of Taėmbes, for ςηπρά on account of Athur to Πάσων τραπεζίτης and Στοτοῆτις δοκιμαστῆ at Phebichis; cf. 108, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Dated on Athur 24 of the 2nd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 246 (245). Practically complete. 9 lines.

139. Mummy A 15. 9.5 x 6.3 cm. Another similar receipt for 9 drachmae of copper for ςηπρά on account of Phaophi paid 'Ηρακλείων τραπεζίτης καὶ Νικολάω δοκιμαστῆ at Phebichis by Petosiris, agent of Taėmbes, from Talaε; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Written across the fibres about B.C. 247. Incomplete, the beginnings of the first 5 lines being lost. 11 lines.

140. Mummy A 15. 15.7 x 8 cm. Another similar receipt for 19 dr. 5½ obols for ςηπρά on account of Phaophi paid to Pason and Stotoētis by Δίβως, agent of Taėmbes; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic, and on the verso is a line of demotic. Dated on Athur 16 of the 2nd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 246 (245). Written across the fibres. Practically complete. 14 lines.

141. Mummy A 15. 11 x 6.7 cm. Another similar receipt for 15 dr. 3 ob. paid for ςηπρά on account of Pachon by Petosiris, agent of Taėmbes, to Nicolaus and Stotoētis; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Dated on Pachon 22 of the 3rd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 244 (243). Written across the fibres. Complete to 10 lines.

142. Mummy A 15. 11.1 x 6.7 cm. Another similar receipt for 12 dr. for ςηπρά paid ['Ηρακλείων τραπεζίτης καὶ Νικολάω δοκιμαστῆ; cf. 139 and 106, introd. At the end is the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Written across the fibres about B.C. 247. Nearly complete, but much obliterated. 10 lines.

143. Mummy A 15. 4.7 x 6.5 cm. Receipt for φιλακτικῶν paid by a military settler probably at Phebichis, similar to 105. The text is ('Ερως) ἵπ Μεσορῆ κυ. ὄμολογεi 'Ηρακλείδης μεμετηρῆθαι παρὰ Μενεκράτους Ἀρῆνον ἱ(δρχον) (cf. 105. 3, note) τὸ φιλακτικῶν . . . The 16th year probably refers to Euergetes (B.C. 232–1 or 231–0). Incomplete, the end being lost. 5 lines.

144. Mummy A 15. 4.3 x 7.9 cm. Beginning of a notice of loss, similar to
36 and 37. Lines 1–4 ("Étous) ἡ Παχ[ῶν . . . ] προσάγγελμα παρὰ Ἀμενέω[ς]
'Αρμύστε φιλακτίτη κόμης Τίλη (cf. 36. 3, note) ἀπολογητικάρι (L.-κέναι; cf.
37. 5). The 18th year probably refers to Euergetes (B.C. 230–29 or
229–8). 5 lines.

145. Mummy A. Fr. (a) 4·8 × 9·3 cm. Seven fragments of a contract,
of which one contains part of the protocol, [Βασιλεύουσας Προσελέβοι τοῦ
Προλεμαίου καὶ Ἀρσινῆς θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν ἔτους] τρίτου (ἐφ') ἱερώς Ἀρχε[λάο
τοῦ Δήμου] Ἀπειρο[τοῦ καὶ θεῶν] Ἀδελφῶν καὶ θεῶν Ἀρ[σινῆς Φιλαδέλφου]
'Ἀρσινῆς?] τῆς Πολεουχάτους(ς) μη[ν] Ἀρ[τεμίσιον . . . , i.e. B.C. 245–4
(244–3). The restorations of the priests' names are taken from Revillout's
I. p. 7), where they are assigned to the 4th year; cf. p. 373. On the
absence of the mention of the θεῖον Ἑλεφέτα την cf. 171, which was
written in the 5th year and mentions them, and p. 369.

146. Mummy 97. 11 × 9·4 cm. A much mutilated letter from Τίμανδρος,
dated (ἐτοὺς) λε وبعدημερείαν καὶ Π[α]τοὶ καὶ, i.e. B.C. 250 (249). On this
double date cf. App. i. p. 341. 14 lines.

147. Mummy 5. 12·7 × 6 cm. Conclusion of a letter, of which the text is
χειρογράφημα, ὁπὸ γὰρ διαποτεφρωσιν ἡμῶν. Αἰθρούσδωρος δὲ οὖκ ἔστω
ἀδικοῖς, ἀλλὰ σύντασσε [τοὺς] παρὰ σοι φιλάκας φιλάσιν καὶ πρὸ[φί]χεν ἵνα
μὴ συμβηθή ἡμῶν τα . [ . . ]θνα. On the verso are the beginnings of
3 lines, and on a detached fragment parts of 3 more. Early third
century B.C.

148. Mummy 5. 5·3 × 24 cm. Fragment of a contract of apprenticeship.
Lines 3–6 ἦλθο τε τι κλέπτων . . . . . οὐρος ἀλλάσκεται προσαποτεινάτω τὸ
βλάβος διπλωσί, μὴ ἐξουσία δ' ἐστω Πόροι μῆτε ἀποκο[φε]τε[τ]ε[ν] ὡς
ἀνεί τῆς Ἐπιμέλειας γνώμης, ἐλ δὲ μὴ ἀποτεινάτα τῆς μὴν ἡ[μέρας (τριάδοις]
τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς . . . ἐξουσία δ' ἐστω Ἐπιμένει ἔαμ μὴ ἄρεσ[κ]. Early third
century B.C. 6 lines.

149. Mummy A. Fr. (a) 14 × 10·8 cm. Two fragments of an account,
consisting of a series of names grouped under different days, with a few
lines of another account in a different hand. The names Σουτωρλάγα, Νολίκος, Ὀρφομήθης and Ὀπιεύος occur. Written about B.C. 250. On the
verso parts of two much obliterated columns of a document.

150. Mummy 13. 15·1 × 9·5 cm. Duplicate of 85, written in a different
hand, in B.C. 261 (260). Practically complete (but without the demotic
note). 21 lines.

151. Mummy 13. 7·5 × 10·5 cm. Fragment of a letter, of which the text is
μὴ παραγίνεσθαι αφ. . . . κα 'Ἀπ[ο]λωλίτην τρευχῆσαι τὸν ἀμπελώνα. ἐι οὖν
152. Mummy 98. 8.8 x 9.2 cm. Beginning of a letter, of which the text is

Xαρικλῆς Μύσει χαλαρει. έξαρα περί τον πλοῖον ἄλας καὶ λαοῦν ἐποὺς ἔκωσιν
about B.C. 250. 6 lines.

153. Mummy 117. 10.7 x 10.2 cm. Account of sums collected by an
agent of two government officials, beginning (Ἑτοῦς) βαθὺς λόγος

ἀργυρίῳν τὸν ἀλογογεμένον διὰ Ἀρενδώτην (I. ἡμότου) τοῦ παραδοτὸς Ἀγάπηφος
ἀλογομίου καὶ Παττεύτῳ τῶν βασιλικῶν γραμματέων (I. Παττεύτῃ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ
γραμματέως), followed by a list of six persons who pay 1 dr. or 3 obols.
The 2nd year no doubt refers to Euergetes (b.c. 246 or 245). Written
on the verso, the recto being blank. Nearly complete. 10 lines.

154. Mummy 117. 7.8 x 8.6 cm. A notice from Epichares to Chaeremon
similar to 80, but with Πασίης Ἀρ... in the place of Ὄμος Τεώτος.
Written probably in the 35th (revenue) year of Philadelphia (cf. 80. 5
and 13-4, note), i.e. B.C. 251-0. Nearly complete. 9 lines, of which the
last two are demotic.

155. Mummy 117. 8.2 x 9 cm. Another similar notice from Epichares to
Chaeremon, much mutilated. Dated in the 35th (revenue) year (of
Philadelphia), Athur (B.C. 251). 7 lines, the demotic note being
omitted.

156. Mummy 117. Fr. (a) 4.1 x 8.6 cm. Two fragments of an acknowledge-
ment by a λακκηγροσ to 98. The text is Fr. (a) τοῦ παρὰ

τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γραμματέως δώσει εἰς Ἄλεξ(ι)[ν]βετ[ε]ν εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν κριτ[ων]
(ἀρτάδας) ἐπικαιρίας πεντακο[ς] εἰς τὸν καθαρόν καὶ ἄδοξον καὶ κοσκυνιμένου
(cf. 98. 11-4). Fr. (b). ἀσκ[ε]μ. [.] ἐφοραγι[σ]μ[ε]ν... [μετρ]ων καὶ σκοτάλημ
οῦ [αὐτὸς ἢ]νεκάτω... (cf. 98. 20). Written about the 34th year of
Philadelphia (B.C. 252-1 or 251-0).

157. Mummy 18. 4.7 x 16.1 cm. Parts of two columns of an account, of
which the text is (Col. i) Ἐτοῦς kβ3. ἐλευθέρων [ε[ι]ς τον ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ [ν]] [του]
ἐκ τοῦ ἀδόξου στροφῶν ἀν[ώ] (ἀρτάδας) ἀδικ[ε] τὸν ἑρωδό ἄ συνήγαγεν...
(Col. ii) Ἐτοῦς kβ3. πα[ρὰ...] ζ[ε]νευθέντων (πυρὸν) παρὰ (with [φιλο],
above the line) Πολεμῶν τοῦ ἐκ Τα[λδοὺς (cf. 36. 3, note)... The 22nd
year refers to Philadelphia (B.C. 264-3 or 263-2). On the verso two
lines of another account.

158. Mummy 18. 8.5 x 19 cm. Fragment of a letter or memorandum
concerning wheat and olyra of the 32nd, 33rd, and 34th years (of
Philadelphia). Written about B.C. 251. 10 lines, of which the last
four are complete. In the right-hand margin and on the verso is some effaced writing.

159. Mummy 18. Breadth 7-2 cm. Three fragments of a letter from Zoilus to Plutarchus (cf. 68, introd.). Lines 6–10 στέρμα?] ἀπαν ἐπικεκομμένων καὶ ἄρειαν, θαυμάζω οὖν εἰ πιστεύεις. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐδόκαμεν ... Addressed on the verso Πλοῦταρχου. Written in the reign of Philadelphus, probably about B.C. 265.

160. Mummy 10. 11 x 6-9 cm. Receipt issued to Clitarchus (cf. 66, introd.) for a money payment, of which the text is Ηρακλείδωρος Κλειστάρχου χαίρειν, ἡχω παρά Πτολεμαίον τοῦ Νικολάου χαλκοῦ (δραχμῶν) τριακοσία τεσσαράκοντα. Addressed on the verso Κλειστάρχου. Written about B.C. 230. Apparently nearly complete. 8 lines.

161. Mummy 10. 7-2 x 7 cm. Fragment of a letter to Clitarchus similar to 69. The text is] Κλειστάρχου χαίρειν. παραγίνου τῆς κτὸ Φαμενώθ. . . Written about B.C. 230. 4 lines.

162. Mummy 10. Fr. (a) 24-5 x 8-7 cm. Two fragments of another letter to Clitarchus, concluding τῆς ἀποχῆς τῶν 'Α (δραχμῶν) ἄνωφέρεις δεδωκὼς εἰς ἐπισκευὴν ἱπποτροφίων, καὶ μὴ ἄλλως ποιήσῃς. ἐρρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) ἱθ Παντί. (B.C. 228 or 227.)

163. Mummy 10. 8-2 x 7-9 cm. Conclusion of a letter to Clitarchus similar to 70 (a) and (b), ending περὶ κάμην Τνοωθῆμι τοῦ 'Ηρακλεοπολίτου (δραχμῶν) κ' κ' (i.e. εἰκοστήν) (δραχμῆν) α. ἐρρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) ἵθ 'Αθιρ κ (B.C. 230 or 229). Cf. 70 (a), introd. 6 lines.

164. Mummy 10. 16-3 x 8 cm. A demotic document of 9 lines, below which is Κόβας Ψυδεσώτος (δραχμαί) π., Πετοσόρει (ἐι corr. from 10) καὶ Θεοτορταίος. Written about B.C. 230.

165. Mummy 10. 13-3 x 7-7 cm. Receipt, similar to 103, from Apollonides to Εὔπολεμος, acknowledging the payment of 11 ½ artabae of wheat (probably for φυλακιτικοῦ and λατρικοῦ) from Στράτιος on behalf of Diodorus, paid through Eupolis κωμο(γραμματεύς). Dated Phaophi ΙΙ of the 16th year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 232 (231). Nearly complete. 8 lines.


167. Mummy A 9. 4 x 7-6 cm. Beginning of a letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus (cf. 51, introd.), of which the text is Δημοφῶν Πτολεμαίων χαίρειν. ἀνάγαγε μετὰ 'Ἀρμίσσιος τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰσιδού φυλακίου καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Αλεξάνδρου τοῦ ἐκ Ταλαργα τὰ Πρωτογένους καὶ Γαστρωνοὺ πρόβατα πάντα εἰς . . . Written about B.C. 245. 7 lines.
168. Mummy A 9. 6 x 28 cm. Another letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus ordering him to send a herdsman; cf. 59. The text is Δημοφῶν Πτολεμαίων χάρεων. Ἀρμινεῖας about 20 letters νέμοντα τὰ Ῥαυνεάδου τοῦ λόγευτος πρόβατα ὁς ἀναμένεις τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀπόστειλον εἰς Ὄξιφρυχων πόλιν μετὰ φυλακῆς. συντέλεσεν γὰρ Ἀρμινείας ὁ οἰκονόμος διὰ τῇ [. . . . .] τινὰ αὐτῶς 55 effaced letters [. . . . .] καὶ τοῦτο ὅπως μὴ παρέμειν ἔσται, ἀλλὰ δομὰ ἡμέραι πάρεξα [αὐτῶς]. ἔρρωσο. Written across the fibres about B.C. 245. Incomplete. 6 lines.

169. Mummy A 9. 6 x 14.2 cm. Part of a letter to some officials with regard to the collection of money-taxes, mentioning οἰκονόμου τοῦ κατὰ τοπαρχίαν (sc. of the Oxyrhynchite nome). Dated Thoth 8 of the 31st (?) year (of Philadelphus) (B.C. 255 or 254). The writing is across the fibres. 5 lines, of which about half is preserved.


171. Mummy A. 6.1 x 12.5 cm. Beginning of a contract written in B.C. 243-2 (242-1), of which the text is Βασιλεύουσας Πτολεμαίων τοῦ Πτολεμαίων καὶ Ἀρτεμίδος θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν (ἐτούς) ἐ ἐφ’ ἱερεῖας Ἀρτεμισίου τοῦ Διοδότου Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν καὶ θεῶν Ἐνεργείτων κατηγόρου Ἀρτεμίδος Φιλαδέλφου Ιαμνέας τῆς 'Ὑσρ . . . [. . .] μηνὸς Ἀυίνου ἐν Ἡρακλέους τόλμη. This is the earliest instance of the association of the θεοὶ Ἐνεργείται with Alexander and the θεοὶ Ἀδελφοί; cf. 145, where the θεοὶ Ἐνεργείται are not yet mentioned in a papyrus of the 3rd year, and p. 369. The writing is across the fibres.
APPENDIX I

THE MACEDONIAN AND EGYPTIAN CALENDARS.

Of all the problems connected with Ptolemaic Egypt few are more obscure than the relation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian calendar before the reign of Euergetes II, when the Macedonian year starting from Dius was finally equated to the Egyptian annus vagus of 365 days. So perplexing and apparently contradictory were the items of information gained from double dates on both calendars in papyri and inscriptions, that in 1898 Strack (Rhein. Mus. liii. pp. 399–431), when trying to introduce order into the chaos, took refuge in the extremely complicated hypothesis that two different sets of both Egyptian and Macedonian months with the same names were in current use. The evidence available to Strack was however very imperfect, since out of 14 double dates within the period under review only 6 could be certainly assigned to particular years, and even in these 6 there were several doubtful readings of the figures. In 1903 J. Krall (Festschr. f. O. Hirschfeld, pp. 113–122) was able to show from some fresh double dates in the Amherst papyri and a Berlin papyrus that an attempt was made during the early part of Philometor's reign to equate the Macedonian to the Egyptian months; but though justly rejecting the views of Strack, he could make nothing of the relations of the Egyptian and Macedonian calendars before the time of Philometor. Now, however, with the large additional material provided by the Magdola, the new Petrie and the present Hibeh papyri together with unpublished Tebtunis papyri deciphered by Professor Smyly, who will collaborate with us in the publication of them, the conditions of the problem are quite altered. Professor Smyly (Hermathena, 1905, pp. 393–8) has recently discussed the double dates in the reigns of Epiphanes and Philometor, and proved that for a period of at least 16 years (from the 24th year of Epiphanes to the 5th year of the joint reign of Philometor, Euergetes II, and Cleopatra, which = the 16th of Philometor) the Macedonian months starting
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from Dystrus were assimilated to the Egyptian months of the vague year starting from Thoth. Our object in the present appendix, in which we have had the benefit of Professor Smyly's assistance, is to collect the evidence for the whole period from Alexander to Euergetes II, and to show that (1) it is unnecessary to suppose the existence of more than one Egyptian and, until the reign of Epiphanes, one Macedonian set of months in order to explain the double dates; (2) the general tendency of the movements of the Macedonian year was to lose in relation to the Egyptian, i.e. to revolve more slowly, though some exceptions occur owing to the irregularity of intercalations; (3) the character and limits of the variations in the Macedonian year are now so far determined that from about the middle of Philadelphus' reign to the 4th year of Philopator Macedonian months can, if the year of the reign is known, henceforth in most cases be converted into their approximate equivalents on the Egyptian calendar.

While the truth of any general hypothesis with regard to the relations of the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars can only be thoroughly established by verification through new evidence, the first test which must be applied to it is its ability to form the extant double dates into an intelligible and more or less consistent series. To attempt to prove uniformity of relation between the two calendars would be of course out of the question; our aim is to show that, in spite of the irregularities which must be conceded in any case, the trend of their relations to each other can now to a large extent be determined. Accordingly, in opposition to Strack's hypothesis that there were throughout two sets of both Egyptian and Macedonian months, we start from the far more probable and simpler assumption that there was originally but one set of each. This being granted, the Egyptian calendar year of 12 months can be no other than the ordinary vague year of 365 days beginning with Thoth 1. Though the knowledge of the true solar year of 365$\frac{1}{4}$ days was of extreme antiquity in Egypt, and an attempt was made in the reign of Euergetes I, as is shown by the Canopus Inscr., ll. 40 sqq., to substitute it for the vague year, there is no evidence that it ever penetrated, as Strack supposes, from the field of astronomy and religion into common use under the Ptolemies; and it is now almost universally admitted that the vague year continued its course uninterrupted until the introduction of the Julian calendar into Egypt by Augustus in B.C. 23. With regard to the length of the Macedonian year nothing is definitely known. Following the ordinary view, which has much probability, that it was like other Greek calendar years lunar, we suppose it to have contained apart from intercalations 12 months of alternately 29 and 30 days, making 354 days in all. Recently some confirmation of this view has been obtained from its suitability to the double dates grouped together as no. (16)
on our Table; cf. p. 345. In these Tubi 12 corresponds to Gorpiaeus 28, but Tubi 13 of the same year to Gorpiaeus 30. As Dittenberger has pointed out (Orient. Gr. Insr. I. p. 650), it is probable that there is here no inconsistency, and that the last day of a month containing only 29 days was called the 30th. Since Gorpiaeus is the 11th month of the Macedonian year, it is most likely that the months with 29 days were the 1st, 3rd, 5th, &c., rather than, as Strack supposes, the 2nd, 4th, 6th, &c. If the 29th day was omitted in months with 29 days, the mention of Peritus 29 in P. Petrie III. 21 (b). 8 and of Hyperberetaeus 29 in 146 indicates that these months (the 4th and 12th) had 30 days. A year of 360 days seems to be implied by 28. 20–1; but this is not likely to be connected with the Macedonian year.

Assuming therefore an Egyptian year of 365 days and a Macedonian year of 354, we have, at Professor Smyly's suggestion, constructed a chronological table of correspondences, which shows the days of the Egyptian months on which the 1st of each Macedonian month would, apart from intercalations, fall in every instance of a double date by both calendars. This Table much more clearly than a mere list of the double dates exhibits the variations which took place between any two points, and illustrates at a glance both the general tendency of the Macedonian months to lose, i.e. fall later in the Egyptian year, and the occasional instances in which this tendency is reversed, and the Macedonian year moves from one point to another more rapidly than the Egyptian. Since the Macedonian year was apart from intercalations 11 days shorter than the Egyptian, it would, if left to itself, gain this amount each year. The fact that on the contrary it tended to lose shows that intercalations were so frequent and so far in excess of the 11 days required to restore the balance between it and the Egyptian year, that the average length of the Macedonian year was more than 365 days. How the number of days to be intercalated was determined, and at what point or points they were inserted in the Macedonian year is involved in much obscurity. Papyri give surprisingly little help on the subject, the only reference to intercalation in the Macedonian calendar being in P. Petrie III. 22 (f). 2, where μηνῶς ἐμβολίων apparently indicates that a whole month had been inserted. But that intercalation of a whole month in the Macedonian calendar was not uncommon is shown by the story (Plutarch, Vit. Alex. 16) concerning Alexander who, in order to satisfy the religious objections of some of his soldiers to fighting in Daisius, inserted a second Artemisius. This, as Smyly remarks, seems to imply not only that the Macedonians inserted a whole month at a time, but that they called the intercalated month by the name of the preceding month; for unless such intercalation had been customary, Alexander could hardly have quieted the
superstition of his followers. Unfortunately, however, the hypothesis of intercalations of months of 29 or 30 days even at irregular intervals is not sufficient by itself to account for all the relations between the Egyptian and Macedonian months established by the evidence, and it is necessary to postulate the existence of other, at present unknown, disturbing elements which caused the Macedonian years to vary in length.

The Macedonian year being so uncertain, it must be remembered that in each column of our Table the correspondences for which there is no direct evidence are only meant to be approximate, and that the chances of error owing to the presence of intercalations increase the further the supposed correspondences in the year move away from the known correspondence. The months in which the correspondence is directly attested are in each column of the Table distinguished from the others by being printed in italics. Where the reign is not actually given and cannot be inferred with complete certainty, it is enclosed in brackets. The queries after some of the months in italics mean either that the reading of the month is not certain, or that there are special grounds for suspecting an error in the correspondence. That errors have crept into the extant double dates is, considering the complicated system of two independent calendars, unfortunately only too likely; but the hypothesis of a mistake is, as a rule, only to be resorted to in the last extremity. In the case of no. (23), however, which almost certainly falls within the period of the first assimilation of the two calendars, a correction of the reading or interpretation of a group of hieroglyphic signs is necessary, and we have placed the wrong series of correspondences in brackets after the right ones. Where, as in nos. (2), (20), (30), and perhaps (4), double dates mention two months but only one day, which uniformly follows the Egyptian month, we have not assumed that the writer intended to imply that the number of the day of the Macedonian month was the same; cf. the discussion of no. (2). Still less is there any justification for supposing in the correspondences of Egyptian and Macedonian months in which no days are mentioned at all, nos. (3), (11), (12), and (15), that these months exactly coincided. That such correspondences were not intended to be more than approximate is in itself far more likely, and is indicated not only by the evidence of nos. (12) and (15) but still more clearly by P. Magd. 32, where Δαυτον Ἀγνατίων ἤ Ἄθηρ occurs in I. 4 of the petition, while in the docket on the verso Daisius 27 = Athur 29. Hence in the Table the figures of the days are purposely omitted in connexion with those two classes of double dates.

From the Egyptian calendar year of 12 months and 365 days beginning on Thoth 1 and the Macedonian year of 12 months and 354 days (with an uncertain number of intercalary days in addition) beginning on Dius 1, must
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b.c. 323)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dias</td>
<td>14 Meso.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>Phao.</td>
<td>12 Athu.</td>
<td>3 Athu.</td>
<td>12 Choi.</td>
<td>15 Choi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apellaeus</td>
<td>8 Thot.</td>
<td>Phao.</td>
<td>Athu.</td>
<td>11 Cho.</td>
<td>2 Cho.</td>
<td>11 Tubi</td>
<td>11 Tubi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dystrus</td>
<td>7 Choi.</td>
<td>Tubi</td>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>10 Pham.</td>
<td>9 Pham.</td>
<td>9 Pach.</td>
<td>8 Pach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xandicus</td>
<td>6 Tubi</td>
<td>Mech. (?).</td>
<td>Pham.</td>
<td>9 Pham.</td>
<td>30 Pham.</td>
<td>9 Pach.</td>
<td>8 Epei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artemisius</td>
<td>6 Mech.</td>
<td>Pham.</td>
<td>Phar.</td>
<td>8 Pach.</td>
<td>29 Pach.</td>
<td>8 Pach.</td>
<td>8 Meso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daisius</td>
<td>5 Pham.</td>
<td>Phar.</td>
<td>Pach.</td>
<td>7 Epei.</td>
<td>28 Epei.</td>
<td>30 Pach.</td>
<td>8 Meso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panemus</td>
<td>5 Phar. (?)</td>
<td>Pach.</td>
<td>Paun.</td>
<td>8 Epei.</td>
<td>29 Pach.</td>
<td>8 Pach.</td>
<td>8 Meso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>4 Pach.</td>
<td>Paun.</td>
<td>Epei.</td>
<td>7 Epei.</td>
<td>28 Epei.</td>
<td>9 Pach.</td>
<td>9 Pach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gorpiaeus</td>
<td>4 Paun.</td>
<td>Epei.</td>
<td>Meso.</td>
<td>2 Thot.</td>
<td>28 Meso.</td>
<td>9 Pach.</td>
<td>9 Pach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyperberetaeus</td>
<td>3 Epei.</td>
<td>Meso.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>1 Phao.</td>
<td>22 Thot.</td>
<td>3 Thot.</td>
<td>1 Athu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dias</td>
<td>25 Mech.</td>
<td>12 Phar.</td>
<td>22 Pham.</td>
<td>18 Pach.</td>
<td>Pach.</td>
<td>18 Thot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apellaeus</td>
<td>24 Pham.</td>
<td>11 Pach.</td>
<td>21 Phar.</td>
<td>17 Paun.</td>
<td>Paun.</td>
<td>17 Phao.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peritus</td>
<td>23 Pach.</td>
<td>10 Epei.</td>
<td>20 Paun.</td>
<td>16 Meso.</td>
<td>Meso.</td>
<td>16 Choi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dystrus</td>
<td>23 Paun.</td>
<td>10 Meso.</td>
<td>20 Epei.</td>
<td>11 Thot.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>16 Tubi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xandicus</td>
<td>22 Epei.</td>
<td>4 Thot.</td>
<td>19 Meso.</td>
<td>10 Phao.</td>
<td>Phao.</td>
<td>15 Mech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artemisius</td>
<td>22 Meso.</td>
<td>4 Phao.</td>
<td>14 Thot.</td>
<td>10 Athu.</td>
<td>Athu.</td>
<td>15 Pham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daisius</td>
<td>16 Thot.</td>
<td>3 Athu. (?)</td>
<td>13 Phao.</td>
<td>9 Choi.</td>
<td>Choi.</td>
<td>14 Phar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panemus</td>
<td>16 Phao.</td>
<td>3 Choi.</td>
<td>13 Athu.</td>
<td>9 Tubi</td>
<td>Tubi</td>
<td>14 Pach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gorpiaeus</td>
<td>15 Choi.</td>
<td>2 Mech.</td>
<td>12 Tubi</td>
<td>8 Pham.</td>
<td>Pham.</td>
<td>13 Epei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyperberetaeus</td>
<td>14 Tubi</td>
<td>1 Pham.</td>
<td>11 Mech.</td>
<td>7 Phar.</td>
<td>Phar.</td>
<td>12 Meso.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\textbf{APPENDIX I}  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
<th>(14)</th>
<th>(15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Thot.</td>
<td>9 Phao.</td>
<td>27 Thot.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>Athu.</td>
<td>19 Phao.</td>
<td>(18) Phao.</td>
<td>Phao.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(22)</th>
<th>(23)</th>
<th>(24)</th>
<th>(25-8)</th>
<th>(29)</th>
<th>(30)</th>
<th>(31)</th>
<th>(32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2, 5, 8, 16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pach.</td>
<td>1 Pach.</td>
<td>1 Pach.</td>
<td>1 Pach.</td>
<td>24 Pach.</td>
<td>Phar.</td>
<td>3 Pach.</td>
<td>1 Thot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Paun.</td>
<td>1 Paun.</td>
<td>1 Paun.</td>
<td>1 Paun.</td>
<td>23 Paun.</td>
<td>Phar.</td>
<td>2 Paun.</td>
<td>1 Phao.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Epei.</td>
<td>1 Epei.</td>
<td>1 Epei.</td>
<td>1 Epei.</td>
<td>23 Epei.</td>
<td>Paun.</td>
<td>2 Epei.</td>
<td>1 Athu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Meso.</td>
<td>1 Meso.</td>
<td>1 Meso.</td>
<td>1 Meso.</td>
<td>22 Meso.</td>
<td>Ep.</td>
<td>1 Meso.</td>
<td>1 Choi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thot.</td>
<td>1 Thot.</td>
<td>1 Thot.</td>
<td>1 Thot.</td>
<td>17 Thot.</td>
<td>Meso.</td>
<td>1 Epag.</td>
<td>1 Tubi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Phao.</td>
<td>1 Phao.</td>
<td>1 Phao.</td>
<td>1 Phao.</td>
<td>16 Phao.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>25 Thot.</td>
<td>1 Mech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Athu.</td>
<td>1 Athu.</td>
<td>1 Athu.</td>
<td>1 Athu.</td>
<td>16 Athu.</td>
<td>Phao.</td>
<td>25 Phao.</td>
<td>1 Pham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Choi.</td>
<td>1 Choi.</td>
<td>1 Choi.</td>
<td>1 Choi.</td>
<td>15 Choi.</td>
<td>Athu.</td>
<td>24 Athu.</td>
<td>1 Phar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tubi</td>
<td>1 Tubi</td>
<td>1 Tubi</td>
<td>1 Tubi</td>
<td>15 Tubi</td>
<td>Choi.</td>
<td>24 Choi.</td>
<td>1 Pach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pham.</td>
<td>1 Pham.</td>
<td>1 Pham.</td>
<td>1 Pham.</td>
<td>14 Pham.</td>
<td>Mech.</td>
<td>23 Mech.</td>
<td>1 Epei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Phar.</td>
<td>1 Phar.</td>
<td>1 Phar.</td>
<td>1 Phar.</td>
<td>13 Phar.</td>
<td>Pham.</td>
<td>22 Pham.</td>
<td>1 Meso.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be carefully distinguished the years of the king's reign, which were with the apparent exception of the rare use of eras (cf. §4 (d)) the only kind of years employed for dating purposes. It has been shown by Professor Smyly (Her-mathena, X. xxv. p. 432) from two Petrie papyri of Euergetes I's reign dated (ἑυρως) ἀς δ' αἰ πρώσῳδοι (ἑυρως) ἤβ (cf. p. 359) that at any rate in the earlier Ptolemaic period two different systems of reckoning the king's years were in vogue. All that is quite certain about them is that one was employed for revenue purposes (ἄς αἱ πρώσῳδα), and that when the two systems occur together the figure of the revenue year was sometimes larger by one than the figure of the other, which we may call the 'regnal,' year. Smyly is, we think, right in identifying the 'revenue' year with the Egyptian vague year of 365 days beginning with Thoth 1, the balance of days between the king's accession and the following Thoth 1 being reckoned, in accordance with ancient custom, as his 1st year. The starting-point and length of the 'regnal' year are still quite uncertain, and in addition to the revenue and regnal years found in connexion with the Egyptian months there may have been yet another system of reckoning the king's years employed in connexion with the Macedonian months. These intricate questions are discussed in App. ii.

How far the revenue year penetrated into common use in the third and second centuries B.C. is a question which at present cannot be decided. It is noteworthy that even in papyri concerning the revenue administration the revenue year is by no means always found (cf. pp. 360-1); and it is probable that, down to the reign of Epiphanes at any rate, the regnal year was more often employed in dating ordinary documents than the revenue year. There is not a single instance among the dates in our Table in which the king's year is known for certain to be a revenue year; and, since only nos. (3), (4), (6) and (9) occur in documents concerned with the revenues, the presumption with regard to the third century B.C. instances is that in most or possibly even all of them either the regnal or some kind of Macedonian year is meant by the year of the reigning sovereign. This distinction of the regnal from the revenue year, however, does not greatly affect our Table except in the case of dates such as (5) and (6), (13), (14) and (16), (17), and (18), which are close together; but owing to the inevitable complications which surround the conversion of Ptolemaic dates into dates on the Julian calendar (cf. p. 367), we have generally avoided converting the dates in our Table into years B.C. except where the question is of particular importance.
Notes on the Table of Correspondences.

(1) The day of Alexander's death, which took place in B.C. 323, is given by Aristobulus ap. Plutarch, *Vita Alex.* 75 as Daisius 30, by the royal ἐφημερίδες (Plutarch, *op. cit.* 76) as Daisius 28 (τρίτη φθίνωντος), and by Cod. A of Pseudo-Callisthenes (Müller, *Anhang zu Arrian,* 151) as Pharmouthi 4; cf. Strack's note (*Rhein. Mus.* liii. pp. 416-7). Apart from the questions whether these dates are to be trusted, and how the two conflicting statements found in Plutarch are to be reconciled, it is quite possible that on the establishment of the Ptolemaic regime some modifications were introduced into the Macedonian calendar, and since B.C. 323 falls outside the period with which we are immediately concerned, there is no need to bring this double date into line with those following. But it is worth noting that the correspondence of the two calendars in B.C. 323, which results from the equation of Daisius 30 to Pharmouthi 4, is only different by two months from their correspondence 65 years later found in (3); and the hypothesis that the Macedonian year had in the interval moved the whole way round the Egyptian year (as it nearly does between the 27th year of Philadelphus and the 9th of Epiphanes) is vetoed by 84 (a). Line 6 of that papyrus, written about B.C. 300, indicates that Panemus, the month in which a payment is to be made from the new corn-harvest, then corresponded to Pharmouthi, Pachon or Pauni, an equation which agrees remarkably closely with the correspondences of Panemus with Pharmouthi in B.C. 323, and with Pauni and Epeiph in the latter part of Philadelphus' reign, as shown by nos. (3), and (4); cf. 86. 3, note. It is fairly certain that between B.C. 300 and the middle of Philadelphus' reign the general tendency of the Macedonian months to fall later in the Egyptian year was less marked than in the rest of the third century B.C., and that Soter was more successful than the next three Ptolemies in making the Macedonian year approximately keep pace with the Egyptian. Hence it is not unreasonable to suppose that between B.C. 323 and 300 the average length of the Macedonian year was also maintained at approximately 365 days, though for the reasons stated above we do not wish to lay any stress on the double dates of Alexander's death.

(2) 92. 6 μηνὸς Ξανδίκου Ἀλεξάνδρου μὴνὸς Μεξτρῦς τεσσαρακομίστος in the 22nd year of Philadelphus. The decipherment of the Egyptian month is very doubtful (cf. note *ad loc.*), but in view of the correspondence of Xandicus with Phamenoth only 5 years later Mecheir would be expected, and no satisfactory alternative reading suggests itself. Μεξτρῦς in place of μηνὸς Μεξτρῦς would necessitate the inference that in these 5 years the Macedonian year gained or lost as
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much as 6 months in relation to the Egyptian, a change far more rapid than even that which took place in the reign of Philopator; cf. nos. (18) and (21). But not much reliance can be placed upon this double date until fresh evidence is discovered for the relation of the two calendars about the 22nd year. The omission of the number of the day of the Macedonian month probably does not indicate that it was the same as that of the Egyptian month, i.e. the 14th. The day of the month is often omitted in the dates of early Ptolemaic contracts, e.g. 84 (a) and 85; and in most of the instances in which the day is only given once, nos. (2) and perhaps (4), and the undeciphered protocol of the papyrus discussed in connexion with nos. (11) and (15), there is no independent reason for thinking the days of the two months coincided. It is also significant that in nos. (24)–(28), when the two calendars were temporarily assimilated and the days of the Macedonian and Egyptian months coincided throughout the year, the day of the Macedonian month as well as that of the Egyptian is given in each of those five instances. Even after the final assimilation of the two calendars in the reign of Euergetes II there is as yet no example earlier than the reign of Ptolemy Alexander (P. Leyden O) of a single mention of the day doing duty for both the Macedonian and Egyptian months. With regard to (30) there is some reason for supposing that the day applies to both months, though the inference is far from certain. The only case in which there are really strong grounds for thinking that the number of the day of the Macedonian month, though not stated, coincided with that of the Egyptian month is no. (20), which is almost certainly a remarkably early instance of the use of the assimilated Macedonian calendar introduced by Philopator or Epiphanes. But it would be highly unsafe to generalize from these two examples, which both belong to a period when as regards the Macedonian calendar the conditions were quite different from those which prevailed, so far as is known, until after the 4th year of Philopator.

(3) Rev. Laws lvii. 4–5 = lix. 3–4 μηνὸς Γορπιαίου τοῦ [ . . . Αἴγυπτιων] Μεσορῆ; cf. Fr. 6 (c). 9–10, where, as Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 782) suggests, μηνὸς Δυστροῦ was probably equated in the same way to μηνὸς Μεχερ. The year in which Rev. Laws were written was the 27th of Philadelphus, and probably that is the year to which these double dates refer (it was most likely stated in the lacuna after Γορπιαίου τοῦ; but possibly in the case of one or both of them the 28th year may be meant). From the fact that Gorpiaeus and Dystrus are equated to Mesore and Mecheir respectively it must not be inferred that the correspondence was exact, for nos. (12) and (15) clearly show that when the days are omitted the equations are only approximate, and it is very unlikely that if the days in the two calendars at this period were the same in one month,
they would continue to be precisely the same several months later. To suppose
that an exact correspondence was maintained throughout a whole year before
the first assimilation of the two calendars introduced in the time of Philopator or
Epiphanes is so much at variance with the evidence as to be out of the question.

(4) P. Leyden I. 379, a docket on a demotic contract dated in Tubi of the
29th year of Philadelphus, where 1. (ıtovs) κθ Περιτίαυ (ıtovs) κθ Τῴβη (so Smyly
from a photograph). The date is generally quoted incorrectly as (ıtovs) κθ
Περιτίαυ κθ Τῴβη β, but the figure, if any, after Τوجب is wholly uncertain, and
between Περιτίαυ and κθ the sign for (ıtovs) is repeated. The day of the month
was therefore not given more than once, if at all, so that the only safe inference
to be drawn is that Peritius approximately corresponded to Tubi in the 29th
year. This gives the same equation as that found in (3) for the 27th, and shows
that no considerable change in the relation of the two calendars had taken place
in the interval.

(5) 146 (ıtovs) λε 'Ὑπερβερεταιαυ κθ Π[α]ῇπι κθ, the reigning being certainly
that of Philadelphus. In the interval of 6 years between this and (4) the Macedonian
year had lost in reference to the Egyptian to the extent of a number of days
which is not likely to exceed 30, since in the 29th year Hyperberetaeus probably
coincided in part with Thoth.

(6) 77. 8 (ıtovs) λς 'Ἀρτεμισίοιυ κγ Παχόυ κβ, the reign being certainly that of
Philadelphus. This date is particularly instructive, because it is the earliest
of several exceptions to the general tendency of the Macedonian year to revolve
at a slower rate than the Egyptian. In the interval between (5) and (6), which
may be either 7 months or 1 year and 7 months or 2 years and 7 months (the
uncertainties with regard to the use of regnal and revenue years have to be reckoned
with; cf. App. ii), the Macedonian year had gained about 9 days at the expense
of the Egyptian. This circumstance fits in very well with the view (cf. p. 334)
that the Macedonian year, when not subjected to intercalation, was shorter
by some days than the Egyptian. If the Macedonian year when left to itself
contained 365–9 = 356 days, the absence of any intercalation at all between
the dates of (5) and (6) might, on the assumption that those documents were
written in successive Macedonian years, bring about the correspondence found
in (6); on the supposition, which is on general grounds more probable, that
it contained 354 days, there remains a difference of two days (11–9 = 2) to be
accounted for by intercalation in the Macedonian year or otherwise.

(6 a) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 8) (ıtovs) η Γόρπταυβ β [Φ]αφύ
This double date was deciphered by Smyly too late to be included in our
Table. The reign is no doubt that of Euergetes, for the correspondence implied
by (6 a) only differs by four days from that implied by (7), which was written in
his 9th year. In the 8th year of Euergetes therefore the approximate dates for
the beginnings of the Macedonian months are Dios i = Choiak 16; Apellaeus i =
Tubi 15; Audnaeus i = Mecheir 15; Peritius i = Phamenoth 14; Dystrus i =
Pharmouthi 14; Xandicus i = Pachon 13; Artemisius i = Pauni 13; Daisius
i = Epeiph 12; Panemus i = Mesore 12; Lusi i = Thoth 6; Gorpiacius i =
Phaophi 6; Hyperberetaeus i = Athur 5. In the interval of 10 years between
(6) and (6α) the Macedonian year had lost about 43 days, which indicates
that the intercalations had been larger than those in the period before the
middle of Philadelphus' reign, but much smaller than those in the next 7 years
of Euergetes; cf. (1) and (9).

(7) Canopus Inscr. i. 3 μηνάς 'Απελλαίον ἐβδόμη Αἰγυπτίων ἀπὸ Τῆς ἑπτάκαι-
δεκάτη in the 9th year of Euergetes. As in the case of (5) and (6), which are
separated only by a short interval, the Macedonian year had gained 9 days
instead of losing, so here a comparison of (7) with (6a) shows that the Macedonian
year had gained 4 days in the interval, which may be 3 months, 1 year and
3 months, or 2 years and 3 months.

(8) P. Petrie I. 24 (1) Δ' αἰείου κύρ Οωίθ β. As will be seen from the Table,
the most suitable place for this third century date is between the 10th and 15th
years of Euergetes; but between the 10th year and the 21st the Macedonian
year regained some of the days which it had lost, and if the correspondence
implied by (11) ever took place and occurred between the 16th and 25th years,
(8) may also belong to that period. This is however less probable; cf. our
remarks on (11).

(9) P. Petrie III. 53 (5). Ι3-4 (ετός) ις Γορπιάλων δ Χολαχ ια. The reign is
probably that of Euergetes. In the 7 years therefore which had elapsed between
(7) and (9) the Macedonian year had lost 66 days.

(10) P. Petrie III. 21 (g). ΙΙ (ετός) κα Δ' αἰείου κύρ Παου κθ, the reign being
certainly that of Euergetes. The reading of the second figure of the year is
not certain. It is more like β, but in l. ΙΙ of the fragmentary second copy
of 21 (g) κα is clear, so that it is safer to adopt the 21st year, especially as the
figures of the reign at the beginning of the papyrus in l. Ι are probably κβ, not
κε, and the date in l. ΙΙ occurs in a quotation from an older document. In
the interval of about 5 years between (9) and (10) the Macedonian years instead
of losing had gained 12 days. This marked exception to their usual tendency
is more striking than the three similar instances in nos. (6), (7), and (16), which
are separated by probably less than two years from nos. (5), (6a), and (14) re-
spectively.

(11) In Fr. (a) of an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 107), partly
deciphered by Professor Smyly, Δ' αἰείου Αἰγυπτίων Παχώ (ν) occurs in a contract.
This long papyrus is in several pieces, of which the order is uncertain. On the recto are a series of copies or abstracts of contracts, each headed by the number of the day and in some cases by the month, but with no statement of the year. In Fr. (8) is an agreement for a loan of wheat and money in which the sentence ἵνα ἀπὸ ὑμῶν ἐν Ἑαυτίκῳ Ἀγνωτίῳ δὲ Μεσορῇ occurs. The same correspondence as Χανδικὸς = Μεσορε is also implied by ἐν μηνὶ Διυστρεὶς Ἀγνωτίῳ δὲ Ἐπέηφ in a contract in Fr. (c), and by Περειπτοῦ Παυνί, found in Fr. (d). These three equations form our no. (12), and are different by two months from the correspondence found in (11). On the verso of Fr. (c) is a lease dated in the 25th year of Euergetes, in the protocol of which the months were given in both calendars but have not yet been deciphered, the day being τετράδες καὶ εἰκάδι, while one of the provisions of the contract is that the rent shall be paid ἐν μηνὶ Ἑαυτίκῳ Ἀγνωτίῳ δὲ Ἐπέηφ (no. (15) of the Table). Probably this clause refers to the 26th year, not to the 25th, since in the preceding line Ἑαυτίκῳ Ἀγνωτίῳ δὲ Ἐπέηφ τοῦ ἕκτου καὶ εἰκόστοῦ ἔτους occurs. The equation of Χανδικὸς to Ἐπείπ in the 26th year causes no particular difficulty; cf. our remarks on (15). But the question of the period to which the several equations on the recto of the papyrus, Ζυξῦρ = Παχών, our no. (11), and Ζυξῦρ = Ἐπείπ, our no. (12), belong is more obscure, and is complicated by the fact that, as in (15), the correspondences are probably anticipatory. The circumstance that the series of contracts in which they are found is dated only by days of the month suggests that these documents were drawn up at no distant time from each other, and seeing that a lease written in the 25th year occurs on the verso, the dates to which the documents on the recto refer are probably not later than that year. There would be no difficulty in assigning no. (12) by itself to about the 25th year, since, though Ζυξῦρ then apparently began in Παυνί, the greater part of it coincided with Ἐπείπ, so that it might be equated to either Παυνί or Ἐπείπ. On the other hand no. (11), in which the general correspondence of the months in the two calendars is the same as that implied by no. (8), is most conveniently placed, like no. (8), between the 9th and 16th years of Euergetes; but in that case, if (12) belongs to the 25th year, there is a difference of several years between the dates of the contracts on the recto of the papyrus, which is not at all a satisfactory hypothesis. The inconsistency of 2 months between the equations in nos. (11) and (12) can however only be explained in two other ways. One of the two correspondences may be wrong (which would be certainly (11), an equation attested by only one instance against three for (12)); or the interval between (11) and (12) may be quite short, but in the course of it an intercalation of about 60 days was introduced into the Macedonian year in addition to the number of days (11, as we suppose)
necessary to make up the difference between the Macedonian and Egyptian
year. Seeing that in both (11) and (12) the correspondences are probably
approximate and anticipatory and need not have actually taken place, there
is more justification than usual for supposing a miscalculation in one of them.
But considering the irregularities of the Macedonian calendar, the possibility
of a sudden large intercalation cannot be excluded; and provisionally (11) and
(12) may be assigned to some year or years between the 9th and 25th of Euergetes.
The period from the 9th to the 21st years would not be so appropriate
as that from the 21st to the 25th, because the latter period suits (12), which
has better evidence than (11), and less disturbance is caused by placing (11)
after (10) than by placing (12) before (10). The correspondences implied by
(11) and (12) being in any case approximate are quite consistent with those
found in (10) and (13) respectively; the whole difficulty is caused by the apparent
shortness of the interval between (11) and (12) and the uncertainty as to which
of the two is the earlier.

(12) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 107), Fr. (b) Ξαινικῶι Αἰγυπτίων
dε Μεσοπόταμι, confirmed by two other correspondences; cf. (11).
(13) P. Magd. 2, 4 and 6 (cf. Deuxième Série, p. 205) ζέρων κε Δωκεῶν κζ
Χολακ ιμ, the reign being certainly that of Euergetes, since Diophanes is
mentioned; cf. (14). The Macedonian years had thus in the 4 years’ interval
between (10) and (13) resumed their tendency to lose, the amount of the loss
being 22 days, though if (11) and (12) are rightly placed between (10) and (13)
and the correspondence implied by (11) is trustworthy (which is far from certain),
some rapid changes seem to have taken place in the interval; cf. our remarks
on (11). The relation of the calendars is only different by the trifling amount
of one day from that found in (14). But what is the interval between (13)
and (14), and which of the two is the earlier? Both papyri were written in the
25th year, and of course if this year was in both cases the revenue year
which began on Thoth 1, the answer would be easy, viz. that (13), which
was written in Choisak, was 4 months earlier than (14), which was written
in Pharmouthi. But unfortunately since neither papyrus is concerned with
revenues, the presumption is that the 25th year is in both cases regnal, or at any
rate not a revenue year. The question of the priority of (13) or (14) will then
depend upon the starting-point of the 25th regnal year. If it was Thoth 1, (13)
is still 4 months earlier than (14); if it was Dius 1 or Dius 25, the probable date
of Euergetes’ accession (cf. p. 364), (14) being written in Apollaeus is 8 months
older than (13) which was written in Loius. And since the starting-point of the
25th regnal year is not confined to those alternatives, it is wholly uncertain
whether (13) or (14) is the earlier.
APPENDIX I

(14) P. Petrie II. 2. (2) (= III. 28 (b)), verso 1 (έτους) κε 'Απελλαίον τη Φαρμούθι Σ; cf. II. 2. (3) (= III. 28 (c)), verso 1 (έτους) κε 'Απελλαίον τη Φαρμούθι Σ. The reigning sovereign was supposed by Mahaffy to be Philadephus, by Grenfell (Rev. Laws, p. 162), and P. M. Meyer (Heerwesou, p. 51) to be Euergetes I, by Strack (Rhein. Mus., l. c.) to be Epiphanes. The Magdola papyri frequently mention the same strategus, Diophanes, who occurs in P. Petrie II. 2. (2) and (3), and he appears in a papyrus (Deuxième Série, no. 23, p. 174; cf. p. 205) in which the 26th year is clearly shown to be the last of a reign, and which therefore leaves no doubt that the 25th and 26th years in connexion with Diophanes refer to Euergetes I and the 1st and 4th years to Philopator. It is possible that (14) is really earlier than (13); see above.

(15) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 107, Fr. (c), verso); cf. no. (11). The equation Ξανδικῷ . . . Ἐπιφ (14) refers to the 26th year, but the contract in which it occurs was written in the 25th year, the day of the month in the protocol being given only once, and the names of both months being illegible. If the person who drew up the contract expected Xandicus to correspond exactly with Epeiph, his anticipation was almost certainly not fulfilled, for the dates in (13), (14), and (16), which are very close to (15), combine to indicate that Xandicus in both the 25th and 26th years began after Epeiph 20; it is therefore probable that the equation of Xandicus to Epeiph was not intended to be more than approximate. The equation would become more natural if we could infer from the absence of the day of the Macedonian month in the protocol that it was the same as that of the Egyptian. But the evidence does not justify that inference; cf. our remarks on (2).

(16) P. Magd. 16, 20–3, and 33 (έτους) α Γορπαίαν κν Τύβη ιβ and P. Magd. 14, 15, 18, 19, 25, and 34 (έτους) α Γορπαίαν λ Τύβη 2θ, the reign being certainly that of Philopator; cf. nos. (13) and (14). The apparent discrepancy of a day in these two series of double dates is probably due to the fact that Gorpiaeus contained only 29 days and that the last day of the month was called the 50th; cf. p. 334. Comparing (16) with (13) and (14) the Macedonian year has, instead of losing, gained 2 or 3 days upon the Egyptian, a phenomenon which considering that the interval is in any case very short is not surprising; cf. the 9 days' difference in the calendars implied by (5) and (6). The question of the interval between (14) and (16) is embarrassed, as usual, by complications caused by the two systems of reckoning the king's years; cf. App. ii. Jouguet and Lefebvre (P. Magd. Deuxième Série, p. 205) follow the ordinary practice of editors in regarding (έτους) α as the balance between Philopator's accession and the following Thoth 1, and hence naturally infer that Philopator came to the throne before Tubi 12, i.e. Feb. 26, B.C. 221. But, as in the case of (13) and
(14), the presumption is rather that the regnal not the revenue year is meant by (ετοὺς) \( \alpha \), and if so we cannot, owing to the uncertainty concerning the starting-point and length of Philopator's 1st regnal year, attribute \( \Delta \beta \iota \lambda u \) to B.C. 221 rather than to B.C. 220. Some stronger evidence for determining the date of Philopator's accession would now seem to be available in P. Petrie III. 141, which indicates that this event took place after Choiak of Euergetes' 25th regnal year and not later than the following Pauni; cf. p. 363. The interval between (13) and (16) may be 1 month or 13 months or even 2 years and 1 month; that between (14) and (16) 9 months or 1 year and 9 months or even 2 years and 9 months.

(17) P. Magd. 7, 8, 13, and 26–32 (ετοὺς) \( \delta \Delta \alpha \iota \iota \iota \iota \kappa \zeta \'A\theta \nu \rho \kappa \theta \), the reign being certainly Philopator's; cf. (14). In the interval of about 3 years between (16) and (17) the Macedonian year had apparently lost 47 days. There is, however, a notable inconsistency between the double dates in (17) and (18) which both belong to the 4th year, and the correctness of the figures \( \kappa \theta \) in (17) is open to doubt; cf. (18).

(18) P. Magd. 12, 14 and verso 1, and 39. verso 1, where in all three cases 1. (ετοὺς) \( \delta \Delta \iota \iota \iota \gamma \Phi \alpha \mu e n \omega \delta \kappa \delta \) (\( \delta \) corr. from \( \eta \)), the originals having been revised by Smyly and Grenfell. As in the case of (13) and (14), so with regard to (17) and (18) it is uncertain not only what is the interval between the pair but which of the two dates is the earlier. Assuming that the '4th year' is the same in both instances, which is probable in any case, since the double dates in the Magdola papyri were written in the same office, (18) may be either about 4 months later than (17) or about 8 months earlier, according to the day on which the 4th year is supposed to have begun. If (17) comes before (18) the Macedonian year would seem to have gained 20 days in about 4 months; if (18) precedes (17) it would seem to have lost 20 days in about 8 months. To account for so large a discrepancy between the relations of the two calendars in what is, apparently, so short an interval is very difficult; and it is therefore tempting, as Smyly suggests, to make (17) consistent with (18) by supposing that 'A\theta \nu \rho \kappa \theta \ in (17) is an error for 'A\theta \nu \rho \kappa \theta \, due perhaps to the presence of \( \kappa \) in the number of the Macedonian month, or else to suppose an error in (18) where the figures of the Egyptian month have certainly been altered. But there are no less than ten instances of 'A\theta \nu \rho \kappa \theta \, and though they are all written by the same person, the repetition of the date goes some way to confirm its correctness. Moreover, although with so complicated a system of reckoning as that which prevailed before the assimilation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian year the extant double dates are unlikely to be free from errors, the evidence is still too imperfect and the irregularities of the Macedonian calendar too
numerous to make the supposition of error a satisfactory explanation of inconsistencies.

(19) Inscr. on a vase found at Alexandria, Nerutsos, Rev. Arch. 1887, p. 62, (τους) Ἐν περιπετείαις αιρεμοῦντας. The day of the Macedonian month has been read as both α and λ; we adopt α, which Strack prefers. The reigning sovereign was considered to be Euergetes by Nerutsos, Philadelphus by Merriam (Amer. Journ. of Arch. i. p. 22), Wilcken (Gött. gel. Anz. 1895, p. 142), and Strack, partly on the ground that the Delphic Soteria mentioned in another inscription of the same year found with this one were instituted shortly before the 9th year of Philadelphus, partly because that festival took place in every 4th year of an Olympiad (Dittenberger, Syllsge 1 149 and 150), and the 9th years of Euergetes and Philopator were considered not to be the 4th years of an Olympiad, while in the 9th year of Epiphanes, which was, the relation of the two calendars was shown by the Rosetta Inscr. to be different. The reign of Euergetes may now be dismissed as quite unsuitable, but there are good reasons for attributing the inscription to Philopator or Epiphanes rather than to Philadelphus. The second argument in favour of Philadelphus proceeds on the assumption, which until recently was unquestioned, that this 9th year began on Thoth 1, and was what is now known as a revenue year. It is true that the 9th revenue year of Philopator, i.e. according to the ordinary reckoning B.C. 214–3, was not the 4th of an Olympiad, but his 9th regnal year, which probably corresponded in the main to his 10th revenue year, i.e. B.C. 213–2 (cf. p. 367), fulfils, as Smyly remarks, the required condition. The other argument for attributing the inscription to Philadelphus' reign, the circumstance that the Soteria at Delphi were instituted shortly before the 9th year of Philadelphus, is not at all conclusive, and the choice between the reigns of Philadelphus and Philopator must be decided mainly by the double date. In the absence of any direct and certain evidence of the relation of the calendars before the 27th year of Philadelphus, any correspondence is possible in his 9th year; but if (19) is placed in that reign it is necessary to infer that the Macedonian year lost over 4 months in the 18 years' interval between it and (3). This would imply more extensive intercalation than is attested for any other period of 18 years before the reign of Philopator, and moreover such evidence as we possess with regard to the movement of the Macedonian year before the 27th year of Philadelphus indicates that its changes in regard to the Egyptian were gradual and comparatively slow; cf. nos. (3) and (4). On the other hand a comparison of (17) or (18) with (21) suggests that in Philopator's reign the Macedonian year changed very quickly its relation to the Egyptian, and that the relation of the two calendars found in (19), when Dius 1 fell in the middle of Pachon, is one which is extremely
suitable as an intervening stage between the 4th year of Philopator when Dies I fell in Phamenoth or Pharmouthi and the 9th of Epiphanes when it fell in Thoth. Hence, if the choice lies between Philadelphus and Philopator, we prefer to regard (19) as written in the 9th regnal year of Philopator on May 19, B.C. 212, and to suppose that in the 5 years' interval between (19) and (18) the Macedonian year lost 56 days, or, comparing (17) with (19), 36 days. But the great divergence in the relation of the two calendars indicated by (19) and the Rosetta Inscr., our no. (21), respectively is no longer a sufficient reason for refusing to attribute (19) to the 9th year of Epiphanes, since the discovery of (20); for in that surprising double date of the 4th year of Epiphanes the relation of the Egyptian to the Macedonian calendar is nearly identical with that shown by (19). (20) is best explained (see below) on the view that the first attempt to reform the Macedonian calendar in Egypt by equating Dystrus to Thoth and the other months to correspond had then already been made, although the omission of the number of the day in the case of the Macedonian month prevents us from being absolutely certain that (20) is an example of the assimilated Macedonian calendar. From the 4th to the 9th years of Epiphanes, therefore, the reformed and unreformed Macedonian years seem to have been running side by side; and if in (19) the days of the Macedonian and Egyptian months were the same there would be no difficulty in assigning it to the 9th year of Epiphanes, and treating it as an example of the reformed calendar, while in the Rosetta Inscr. the Macedonian month is given on the unreformed calendar. There is, as stated above, a doubt about the reading of the figure of the Macedonian month in (19), but it seems unlikely to be the same as the figure of the Egyptian month; and since to attribute (19) to the reign of Epiphanes without at the same time supposing that the Macedonian month is on the reformed calendar would produce much complication, the reign of Philopator is on the whole the most suitable.

(20) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 6) βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ Ἀρσενής θεῶν Φιλοπατόρων ἐν τοῖς τετάρτον . . . μηνὸς Αὐδανάου Αἰγυπτίων ἐν Ἐπέφθ [πε]τεκαθέκατη. It is unfortunate that in this very remarkable double date the omission of the number of the day in connexion with the Macedonian month introduces a slight element of uncertainty into the precise relation of the calendars implied. But in view of the complete coincidence of Audnaeus with Epeiph on the assimilated Macedonian calendar, which had certainly been introduced by the 24th year of Epiphanes (cf. (24)), and probably by the 18th year (cf. (22)), there is not much doubt that in (20) [πε]τεκαθέκατη applies to both months, not merely to the Egyptian, in spite of the fact that in the earlier instances where the figure of the day is only stated once a similar
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inference is unjustifiable; cf. our remarks on (2). This being granted, two conclusions are almost inevitable: firstly, the date at which the Macedonian calendar was first assimilated to the Egyptian by equating Dystrus to Thoth and the other months to correspond must now be put back into the period preceding the 4th year of Epiphanes, which is the date of (20); secondly, on account of the wholly different relation of the Macedonian and Egyptian months found in the Rosetta Inscr., which is 5 years later than (20), the reformed and unreformed Macedonian calendars must for some years, perhaps throughout the whole period of the first assimilation, have run on concurrently. These conclusions present no special difficulty, for the fact that the earlier identification of the two calendars ultimately failed and irregularities again occur in the reign of Philometor shows that the obstacles to a reform of the Macedonian calendar were very serious; and the new system according to which the Macedonian months from Dystrus to Peritius became mere equivalents of the Egyptian months from Thoth to Mesore may well have failed to command universal acceptance, and to deprive even temporarily the old Macedonian year of independent existence. In any case this explanation of (20) as an example of the assimilated calendar, a view which is based on the assumption that \(\pi\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\phi\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\eta\) applies to both months, is more satisfactory than the rival hypothesis that the figures were really different or, if identical in Audnaeus-Epeiph, were yet different in the other months. If that were the case, not only must the nearness of the relation of the two months in (20) to their relation under the assimilated calendar be regarded as a mere accident, but since there would no longer be any reason for supposing that the earlier reform of the calendar was introduced before the date of the Rosetta Inscr., it would be necessary to maintain that in the interval of about 5 years between (20) and (21) Dius 1 moved on from some date in Pachon to the middle of Thoth, i.e. that the Macedonian year had lost more than 100 days. That in the interval of about 21 years between the 4th year of Philopator, as illustrated by (18), and the 9th year of Epiphanes, to which (21) belongs, the Macedonian year shifted its position in relation to the Egyptian to an extraordinary extent must be admitted on any theory; for the difference between the approximate dates of Dius 1 at the beginning and end of that period amounts to no less than 181 days, of which 125 have to be accounted for in the last 16 years of it, if (19) is correctly dated by us; cf. our remarks on (21). But to suppose a difference exceeding 100 days in the relation of the two calendars within about 5 years would imply a far graver disturbance than can be traced in the same length of time at any other point during the third and second centuries B.C. The choice of a month in the middle of the old Macedonian year instead of Dius to serve as the equivalent of Thoth is remarkable. Perhaps when the two calendars were
identified Dystrus nearly or quite coincided with Thoth. If so, the change would seem to have been introduced not long after the 4th year of Philopator, when, as is shown by (17) and (18), Dystrus fell near the end of the Egyptian year. In the 9th year of Philopator, if (19) is to be attributed to his reign, Dystrus began about Thoth 11. It is possible, though not at all likely, that (22), which is an example of the assimilated calendar, belongs to the 18th year of Philopator. But the earlier limit of the period within which the assimilation took place cannot at present be fixed more definitely than Philopator's 4th year, before which there is no evidence of any attempt to equate the Macedonian to the Egyptian months. The later limit of the period is, we think, fixed by (20) at the 4th year of Epiphanes.

(21) Rosetta Inscr. II. 4–6 έτους ενάντιον (of Epiphanes) μηνός Ζαυδικοῦ τετράδι Αγνηπτίων ἐδὲ Μεδερ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτη. This double date shows that, despite the efforts of the government to reform the calendar by equating the Macedonian months to the Egyptian, the old Macedonian year continued, at first at any rate, to have a separate existence; cf. (20). The changes of the Macedonian year in the two preceding decades had been extraordinarily rapid, for it had lost about 4 months in the 16 years' interval between (19) and (21), and even if (19) is wrongly dated by us, about 6 months in the 21 years' interval between (18) and (21), unless indeed it had gained 6 months. The latter hypothesis is by no means out of the question; for since the reign in the case of (19) is uncertain and in (20), as we have shown, the reformed Macedonian calendar was probably employed, the movements of the Macedonian year in those two decades are extremely obscure; and though from its previous tendency it would be expected to continue to lose ground, absence of intercalations would, on the assumption that it contained 354 days (cf. p. 334), more than account for a gain of 6 months in 21 years. Whether the 6 months were lost or gained, it is clear that some abnormal causes were at work to cause so great a change in the relation of the two calendars in a comparatively short period. That the government had already several years before the date of (21) undertaken the reform of the Macedonian calendar is now made probable by the discovery of (20), and the relationship of the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars in (21) may well be due less to a gradual process of divergence than to a sudden arbitrary alteration in the Macedonian year.

(22) Inscr. of Thera (Dittenberger, Or. Gr. Inscr. I. 59) έτους εἰς Αἰδναίου ἡ Ἐπείδη ἦ. This much discussed date has been assigned to the reign of Euergetes on palaeographical grounds by Hiller von Gärtringen, who is followed by Strack and Dittenberger, and to that of Soter I by Mahaffy and formerly Smyly, who recently in Hermathena, 1905, pp. 393–8, showed good reasons for attributing
it to the reign of Epiphanes. The correspondence implied by (22) is the same
as that which is known to have existed from the 24th year of Epiphanes to
the 5th of the joint reign of Philometor, Euergetes, and Cleopatra (which = the
16th of Philometor); and since this can hardly be the result of accident, and
the 18th year of Philometor is for various reasons unsuitable, the reign of
Epiphanes seemed to be indicated with practical certainty, for the evidence of
the Rosetta Inscr. appeared to negative the supposition that the assimilated
Macedonian calendar, with which (22) was in accordance, was introduced before
the 9th year of Epiphanes. The situation is, however, somewhat altered by the
discovery of (20), which shows that in spite of the Rosetta Inscr. the intro-
duction of the assimilated Macedonian calendar probably took place between the
4th year of Philopator and the 4th of Epiphanes; and though the difficulties
involved in assigning (22) to the reign of any of the first three Ptolemyes are still
insuperable, it is possible that (22) belongs to the 18th year of Philopator. This
monarch is generally supposed to have entered (though not completed) his
18th year reckoned on the system according to which his years were counted
from Thoth 1, and the balance between his accession and the following Thoth 1
was treated as his 1st year. There are, however, several objections to this date
for (22). In the first place if his 18th year be reckoned from Thoth 1 it is very
doubtful whether Philopator survived as late as Epeiph; cf. p. 362. Secondly,
since the system of reckoning the king’s year under which Philopator is con-
sidered to have entered his 18th year was, as is generally supposed, employed
principally for revenue purposes, and the Thera Inscr. is not concerned with the
revenues, the presumption is that the 18th year in (22) is calculated on some
other system, either Egyptian or Macedonian; cf. App. ii. But if the 18th
year in (22) is a ‘regnal’ year, Philopator is still more unlikely to have been
the reigning sovereign, for his 18th regnal year would almost certainly coincide
for the greater part, perhaps throughout, with his 19th revenue year, and the
received chronology of Philopator’s reign is inconsistent with the hypothesis that
he entered upon his 19th revenue year at all. Hence we adhere to Smyly’s
view that (22) belongs to the 18th year of Epiphanes, that being the only reign
to which it can be assigned without raising a host of difficulties. From this
year up to the 5th year of the joint reign of Philometor, Euergetes II, and
Cleopatra, which is illustrated by (28), a period of about 22 years, all the extant
double dates are on the assimilated calendar, but irregularities again occur soon
after Philometor’s return from exile; cf. (29), (30), and (31).

(23) Hieroglyphic stele of Damanhur (Bouriant, Recueil de Travaux, 1885,
p. 1) ‘Year 23 (of Epiphanes) Gorgaeus 24 = Pharmouthi 24.’ This date, if
correct, conflicts with (22) and (24) to the extent of 1 month, but, as Smyly
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(l. c.) has shown, probably either the hieroglyphic symbols which are supposed to mean 'the fourth month' of its season, i.e. Pharmouthi, ought to be interpreted as 'the third,' i.e. Phamenoth, or the stone-cutter has repeated a sign once too often, and has carved 'the fourth' in place of 'the third.' (23) then falls into line with (22) and (24)–(28).

(24) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus ἐτῶς ἑτάρτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ (of Epiphanes) μηνὸς Δώστρου ὁμόνι καὶ εἰκάδι Θωθὸν ὁμόνι καὶ εἰκάδι; cf. Smyly, l. c. This is the earliest absolutely certain instance of the assimilation of the two calendars, which probably took place between the 4th year of Philopator and the 4th of Epiphanes; cf. (20).


(28) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus ἐτῶς πέμπτου (of the reign of Philometor, Euergetes II, and Cleopatra) μηνὸς Ἀσσαλαίων ἐνεκαίδεκάτη Παινὶ ἐνεκαίδεκάτη; cf. Smyly, l. c. This year, which corresponds to the 16th of Philometor, provides the latest certain date for the continuance of the assimilation introduced by Philopator or Epiphanes; but a still later example is perhaps found in (30).

(29) P. Par. 63. xiii. 14 (ἐτῶς) ἐπ Περιτίου δ Μεσορῆ κε. The reign has generally been supposed to be that of Philometor, since Cols. i–vii (which have no connexion with Col. xiii) were written in the 6th and 7th years of the joint reign (which = the 17th and 18th of Philometor), and it has been assumed that Col. xiii was later than Cols. i–vii. It would in that case appear that in the interval of little more than 2 years between (28) and (29) the Macedonian year had broken away from the Egyptian, and that in Peritius–Mesore the Macedonian year was once more behind the Egyptian to the extent of 21 days. Smyly (l. c.) objects to this conclusion, and wishes to refer (29) to the reign of Philopator, supposing it to be a copy of an older document. This is a perfectly legitimate hypothesis in the case of a document like P. Par. 63. xiii (a royal rescript) which is anyhow a copy, not an original; but it seems to us unnecessary in the light of nos. (30) and particularly (31), both of which offer prima facie corroboration of the view that disturbances recurred in the Macedonian calendar after Philometor's return from exile. Smyly disposes of (30) by postulating an error of the stone-cutter similar to that which creates a difficulty in connexion with (23), and of (31) because 'it is assigned to
Philometor on conjectural grounds only.' The reasons for considering (31) to be later than the reign of Epiphanes are nevertheless very strong. The date occurs in a second century B.C. papyrus, which is less likely than (29) to be a copy of a much earlier document; secondly, the mention in l. 5 of 'the queen' in addition to 'the king' indicates a second century B.C. date, when the official status of queens was more important than in the third; thirdly, neither Philopator nor Epiphanes entered their 26th year, and the relation of the calendars in the 26th years of Philadelphus and Euergetes I was, so far as is known, different from that implied by (31). Hence the choice of reigns with regard to (31) is practically limited to Philometor and Euergetes II; and if the admission, which in our opinion is absolutely necessary in the case of (31), be once made, that the Macedonian year differed from the Egyptian in the interval between the 16th year of Philometor and the final assimilation of the Macedonian months to the Egyptian, there seems to be no sufficient reason for refusing to admit that (29) also belongs to that interval, especially since the introduction of the reformed Macedonian calendar failed, as (21) shows, to bring about the complete abandonment of the unreformed system, at any rate until after the 9th year of Epiphanes. It is quite possible that both systems continued in use until the second and final assimilation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian calendar took place, although from the 18th year of Epiphanes to the 16th of Philometor the present evidence indicates the employment of only one set of Macedonian months. We prefer therefore to adhere to the ordinary view that (29) belongs to the reign of Philometor, and consider either that in the interval between (28) and (29) the Macedonian year resumed its ancient tendency to lose, or else that the unreformed calendar had never fallen into desuetude, and reasserted itself in (29)-(31). In the Table of correspondences we have proceeded on the hypothesis that during the second period of irregularity the Macedonian year had reverted to its supposed former number of 354 days supplemented by intercalations.

(30) Hieroglyphic Inscr. at Philae (Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, IV. 27 b) 'Year 24 (of Philometor) Peritius = Epeiph r '. In the absence of a distinct mention of the day of the Macedonian month it is not clear that it coincided with the day of the Egyptian month; cf. p. 340. Smyly (l. c.), however, wished to regard it as the same, and brought this correspondence into conformity with those found in the earlier period of assimilation by supposing an error of the stone-cutter similar to that which, as there is good reason to believe, occurs in (23), and by substituting 'the fourth month' (Mesore) for 'the third month' (Epeiph). We, however, are less anxious to get rid of irregularities in the Macedonian year at this period, and prefer to admit that in the 6 years' interval between
(29) and (30) the Macedonian year may have gained considerably upon the Egyptian. The limits of this gain are if Peritius 1 was the day in (30), 51 days, if Peritius 30, as is conceivable since the figure is omitted, 80 days. Less disturbance, therefore, would be caused if the figure 1 refers to both Macedonian and Egyptian months than if the days are different; but on either view it would seem that several years passed without intercalations, or a large deduction was made from the Macedonian year at one or more points. If Smyly's suggestion that Epeiph in (30) is an error for Mesore be combined with our view that the calendar again became irregular in Philometor's reign, the first assimilated calendar may be supposed to have continued in use until the introduction of the second.

(31) P. Par. 60. recto 4 (ἔτους) καὶ Ἑλληνικὸν ἀΘωμὸν κε. The day of the Macedonian month might be λ or, less probably, δ. The view of Brunet de Presle, the first editor, that the reign of Philometor is meant, is supported by Strack, but has recently been called in question by Smyly (l. c.). As we have stated in connexion with (29), the objections to referring (31) to an earlier reign than Philometor's seem to be overwhelming, and on the other hand, since both the 26th year of Ptolemy Alexander is palaeographically, though possible, not a very suitable date for the papyrus, and an extant double date in that year (P. Leyden O) is in accordance with the later assimilation of the two calendars, the choice really lies between the reigns of Philometor and Euergetes II. Brunet de Presle justly prefers Philometor on the ground that the Dioscurides and two Dorions mentioned in P. Par. 61 may well be identical with the dioecetes Dioscurides and epimeletes Dorion who are mentioned in other Serapeum papyri in the 24th year of Philometor, and the Dorion who is known from P. Par. 63 as hypodioecetes in the 7th year of the joint reign of Philometor with his brother and sister (which = the 18th of Philometor). But since the 26th year of Euergetes II is only 11 years later than the 26th of Philometor it is impossible to decide between the two reigns with any degree of certainty. Contrasting (31) with (29), which is a little more than 7 or perhaps 18 years earlier, the Macedonian year had reverted nearly to its relation towards the Egyptian year under the assimilated calendar.

(32) P. Tebt. 25. 7 εἰς τοὺς ἔτους ᾿Ευεργέτης Βιος Μέξειρ ις. This is the earliest instance yet found of the second and final assimilation of the two calendars, introduced probably by Euergetes II, who with greater success than the author of the first assimilation deprived the Macedonian year of a separate existence by equating Dius to Thoth and the other months to correspond. Henceforth the Macedonian months, though often inserted in contracts far into the Roman period, became a useless appendage of their Egyptian equivalents.
We give below in tabular form a list of the differences between the relations of the Macedonian and Egyptian years implied by the double dates, leaving out of account those correspondences in which the day is not given on both calendars, and those which are on the assimilated calendar introduced in the interval between (18) and (20). The losses or gains of the Macedonian year (the sign for \textit{minus} means that it had lost, i.e. gone slower than the Egyptian year, the sign for \textit{plus} that it had gained, i.e. gone faster) are calculated on the hypothesis that it contained apart from intercalations 354 days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval between</th>
<th>Approx. no. of Egyptian years</th>
<th>Gain or loss of Macedonian year in days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) and (5)</td>
<td>73 years</td>
<td>-93 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) and (6)</td>
<td>1 year and 7 months (?)</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) and (6 a)</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 a) and (7)</td>
<td>1 year and 3 months (?)</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) and (9)</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) and (10)</td>
<td>5 &quot;</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) and (13)</td>
<td>4 &quot;</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) and (14)</td>
<td>4 months (?)</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) and (16)</td>
<td>1 year and 1 month (?)</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) and (17)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) and (18)</td>
<td>4 months (?)</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) and (19)</td>
<td>5 years (?)</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) and (21)</td>
<td>16 &quot; (? )</td>
<td>-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) and (21)</td>
<td>22 &quot;</td>
<td>-181 or +184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) and (29)</td>
<td>24 &quot;</td>
<td>+119 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) and (31)</td>
<td>7 &quot; (18 years ?)</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We conclude with a summary of the chief results of our inquiry into this complicated subject.

(1) The irregularities of the Macedonian calendar fall into two main sections, according as they are earlier or later than the introduction of the temporary system by which the Macedonian months beginning with Dystrus were equated to the Egyptian months beginning with Thoth.

(2) The earliest certain example of the use of this system is no. (24), which belongs to the 24th year of Epiphanes, but there is good reason to believe that it had already been introduced by the 4th year of Epiphanes; cf. no. (20). Since there is no indication of its employment in the evidence down to the 4th year of Philopator, the date of the first assimilation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian months is to be attributed to the period of 18 years between the 4th year of
Philopator and the 4th of Epiphanes. The latest certain example of the use of the assimilated Macedonian calendar is provided by no. (28), written in the 5th year of the reign of Philometor, Euergetes II, and Cleopatra, which = the 16th year of Philometor; but possibly no. (30), which is 8 years later than (29), is on the same system, and that system may even have survived until the introduction of the second assimilation by which the Macedonian months from Dius onwards were equated to the Egyptian months beginning with Thoth.

(3) There is no justification for such a hypothesis as Strack's that there were two sets of Egyptian months with the same names, making (1) the ordinary vague year of 365 days which starts from Thoth 1, and (2) a fixed year of 365\(\frac{1}{4}\) days reckoned from the rising of Sirius on July 19, and two sets of Macedonian months with the same names making years of unknown length starting approximately from the spring and autumn equinoxes, a hypothesis which accounts for dates on two calendars only by throwing all dates on one calendar into chaos. The view of Krall that the Egyptian months in documents of the Ptolemaic period are, so far as we know, all reckoned by the vague year of 365 days is sound, and there is no reason to suppose the existence of more than one set of Macedonian months before the introduction of the first assimilated Macedonian calendar between the 4th year of Philopator and the 4th year of Epiphanes.

(4) The Macedonian year was probably a lunar one of 354 days, the 12 months from Dius to Hyperberetaeus containing alternately 29 and 30 days. Without any intercalations or deductions, it was thus 11 days shorter than the Egyptian vague year.

(5) In order to make up for this difference between the two calendars the Macedonian year was subjected to frequent intercalations, the effect of which was to make it on the average longer than the Egyptian year. Hence, before the first period of assimilation, the general tendency of Dius 1 is gradually to fall later in the Egyptian year, so that at the end of the 32 years' period between the 35th year of Philadelphus (5) and the 4th of Philopator (17) the relation of the Macedonian calendar to the Egyptian was different by 150 days from what it had been at the beginning.

(6) No consistent method of intercalation in the Macedonian year was maintained through a series of years; the irregularities are such that the number of intercalated days seems to have varied from year to year. The principles on which the number was fixed by the government and the place in the year at which the days were inserted are quite uncertain; but a whole month was sometimes intercalated; cf. p. 334.

(7) In opposition to the general tendency of the Macedonian year to lose,
there are before the first assimilation four cases, (6), (7), (10), and (16), and perhaps three more, (11), (13), and (18), in which the sequence of Egyptian days corresponding to Dius I is broken, and the Macedonian year has in comparison with the immediately preceding correspondence gained instead of losing. Of these seven apparent exceptions to the general rule nos. (6), (7), (10), and (16) cause no great difficulty, because the number of days gained by the Macedonian year is in all four instances less than the amount that it would necessarily gain if there had been no intercalations in the year or, in the case of (10), the years preceding. The exceptional character of (11) is caused by its being placed after (9); but the correspondence is of an anticipatory character which may never have actually occurred, and the position assigned to this date, on the ground of the supposed shortness of the interval between it and (12), which is most conveniently placed immediately before (13), is very uncertain. The correspondence in (11), moreover, being only approximate, may be the same as that indicated by (10), and if (10) and (11) refer to the same year, (11) would cause no more difficulty than (10). As for (13), the break which it makes in the sequence is more apparent than real, for since in the year to which it refers Dius I fell near the end of Mecheir, the fact that in (12) Dius approximately corresponded to Phamenoth is in no way inconsistent with the hypothesis that between (12) and (13) the Macedonian year was, as usual, losing or at least not gaining. By far the most serious exception to the rule that the Macedonian year tends to lose would seem to arise in (18), which, if it is 4 months later than (17), indicates that in that interval the Macedonian year had gained no less than 20 days. Whether this is due to an error in the figures in (17) or (18) or to the sudden omission of 20 days in the Macedonian year is doubtful.

(8) The changes in the relation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian year are more rapid in the early parts of the reigns of Euergetes and Philopator than in the later parts of the reigns of Philadelphus and Euergetes.

(9) After the assimilation of the Macedonian months to the Egyptian introduced between the 4th year of Philopator and the 4th year of Epiphanes, irregular correspondences, which imply the existence of a distinct Macedonian year, are occasionally found. Of these (21), of the 9th year of Epiphanes, is best explained on the hypothesis that, side by side with the reformed Macedonian calendar, the old Macedonian year was still running, its movements in relation to the Egyptian year during the interval between (17) and (21) having been exceptionally rapid. After (21) there follows a period of about 21 years (from the 18th year of Epiphanes to the 5th year of the joint reign of Philometor, Euergetes II, and Cleopatra), during which, if Smyly's correction in no. (23) be
accepted, all the extant double dates, (22)–(28), exhibit the assimilated calendar, and the old Macedonian year may have then fallen into complete disuse. But soon after Philometor’s return from exile irregular correspondences are found once more in (29)–(31). Whether these are to be explained on the view that the old Macedonian year reasserted itself, or that the Macedonian year broke away from the assimilated calendar in the interval between (28) and (29), is not certain.

(10) The existence of a distinct Macedonian year cannot be detected with any degree of certainty after the 26th year of Philometor, but owing to the doubt as to the exact date of (31) it may have continued beyond the 26th year of Euergetes II. Between the year in which (31) was written and the 53rd of Euergetes II the Macedonian year beginning with Dius was finally assimilated to the Egyptian vague year beginning with Thoth.

If the general theory which by the aid of much new evidence we have suggested is on the right lines, and in all the extant double dates there was but one Egyptian year of 365 days and, until the introduction of the earlier of the two assimilated calendars, only one Macedonian year which on the whole tended to lose in relation to the Egyptian, the problems caused by the use of the Macedonian calendar will henceforth be somewhat simplified, for it is possible from our Table to predict within certain limits the Egyptian month with which a Macedonian month at any period from about the middle of Philadelphus’ reign to the 4th year of Philopator corresponded. If these predictions are fulfilled by fresh instances of double dates, the correctness of our explanation will be verified; while on the other hand, if e.g. in the future Dius in the 31st year of Philadelphus is found equated to Pharmouthi, or in the 18th year of Euergetes to Mesore, or in the 3rd year of Philopator to Choia, the proposed theory and the inferences based upon it must be abandoned. The irregular correspondences which occur after the first attempt to assimilate the Macedonian to the Egyptian calendar are still too few to admit the possibility of a satisfactory theory with regard to the movements of the unreformed Macedonian year in the second century B.C.

APPENDIX II

THE SYSTEMS OF DATING BY THE YEARS OF THE KING.

We have had frequent occasions in the course of the present volume to allude to the difficulties caused by the use of more than one system of calculating the years of the reigning king. Our object in this appendix is to discuss in the
APPENDIX II

light of the new evidence the relationship of the king's years to the ordinary Egyptian vague years of 365 days beginning on Thoth 1. Until 1891 it was generally supposed that the method of reckoning the years of the king in the earlier Ptolemaic period was the same as that employed in the later Ptolemaic and the Roman periods. According to this system the interval between a king's accession and the next Thoth 1 was counted as his 1st year, while his 2nd and succeeding years began on Thoth 1; and in spite of the discovery of some disconcerting evidence, nearly all editors and historians continue to convert early Ptolemaic dates into the corresponding years of the Julian calendar upon the assumption that the years of the king were reckoned on that method. In 1891, however, it was shown by a Petrie papyrus (Part I, 28 (2) = Part III, introd. p. 8 and 58 (c)) that in Euergetes I's reign two different systems of calculating the king's years were in vogue. The correct restoration of the mutilated date-formula in that papyrus, which in its imperfect form was discussed by Revillout (Mélanges, p. 350), and Strack (Rhein. Mus. liii, p. 410), was first established from a parallel text in the Petrie papyri (Part III, 58 (d)) by Smyly (Hermathena, 1899, p. 432), who showed that 'the formula was in both cases ἑυρως ϊα ύσ δ' αἱ πρόσοδοι ἑυρως ἢ β, the day being in one case Phamenoth 25, in the other case lost. To those two instances have now to be added (3) P. Magd. 35. 2 (re-edited by Th. Reinach in Mélanges Nicole, pp. 431–9) τοῦ γάρ ε ἑυρως ὑσ αἱ πρόσοδοι Φαμενώ[θ], the reign being that of Philopator; (4) 80. 13–4, where the demotic docket to a Greek receipt written on Epeiph 4 of the 35th year of Philadelphus is dated 'year 34 which makes year 35'; (5) an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus from mummy 8, containing part of a petition to the king, in which (ἑυρως) ἢ β ὑσ αἱ πρόσοδοι γυε occurs; (6) the British Museum bilingual papyrus of Philopator's reign (Griffith, Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch. 1901, pp. 294–302), in which the inconsistency between the date of the demotic contract ('Year 12, Tubi') and that of the Greek docket ('Year 13, Tubi 4') is probably to be explained by the hypothesis that the king's years are calculated by two different methods.

Combining the evidence for the double system of reckoning the king's years, three inferences are certain:—(1) the double system extended over the reigns of Philadelphus, Euergetes I, and Philopator, (2) one of the two systems was employed for revenue purposes, (3) the figures of the 'revenue' year were sometimes one in advance of those of the other, which we shall henceforth call the 'regnal' year. Beyond these three inferences we enter the region of conjecture, though a few steps may be taken with fair security.

In the first place it may be taken for granted that one of the two different years corresponds to the ordinary vague year, the second year of the reign commencing with the next Thoth 1 after the king's accession, as in later
Ptolemaic times and apparently under the XXVIth Dynasty (Spiegelberg, *Dem. Pap. der Strassburger Bibliothek*, p. 15; Krall, *Festschr. f. O. Hirschfeld*, p. 115). If any proof of this assumption is required it is supplied by e. g. P. Petrie III. 112, a taxing-list in which the 2nd year of Philopator is treated as the next after the 26th and last year of Euergetes, the incomplete 26th year of Euergetes being combined with the incomplete 1st year of his successor so as to make a single year; cf. also P. Petrie 119 verso, ii. 9] των του κυρίου (ετος). α (ετος).

Assuming therefore that either the revenue or the regnal year is the vague year, with which of the two is it to be identified? Revillout, who in spite of reading εσοδοι for πρόσοδοι had divined that P. Petrie I. 28 (2) referred to a financial year, identified this with the ordinary vague year; and the same hypothesis was maintained by Smyly (l. c.) and is accepted by Th. Reinach, although all three hold different views as to the nature of the regnal year. This identification is indeed a natural corollary of the preceding assumption, if it be also admitted that a revenue year should be fairly stable; for a year of 365 days regularly beginning on Thoth 1 fulfils this requirement far better than a year of which the duration and starting-point may have been irregular.

We have no wish to depart from this generally received view that the revenue years were ordinary vague years calculated as in later Ptolemaic times. Of the numerous papyri and ostraca concerning πρόσοδοι the great majority accord very well with it, especially the taxing-list for the 26th year of Euergetes and 2nd year of Philopator mentioned above, which is very difficult to reconcile with any other view of the revenue year. But the presence of numerous exceptions to the rule that for revenue purposes the years were reckoned from Thoth 1 must be admitted. In the regulations for the payment of the ἀπὸμώσα in Rev. Laws xxxiv. 5 the Egyptian calendar is ignored altogether, and the year is reckoned ἀπὸ Δίων ἐως Τερεταίου (cf. Wilcken, *Ost. I. p. 519*); and in Rev. Laws lvii. 4–5 the king sells the ἑλαιόν for two years reckoned from Gorpiaeus–Mesore, not from Thoth. In 114 the persons who are farming two taxes εἰς τὸ γ (ετος) of a king present a list of 9 monthly instalments reckoned from Mecheir to Phaophi, ignoring Thoth 1 as the beginning of a new financial year. In 116 the year which is the subject of the tax-farming account in question is divided into two halves beginning at Mecheir and Mesore respectively, and though no year is mentioned in this case, the normal practice in farming taxes was to buy the right of collection for a particular year of a reign; cf. Wilcken, l. c. A financial year beginning in Mecheir would also suit 115, another tax-farming account dealing with the period from Mecheir to Pachon, while 133 suggests a financial year beginning in Mesore. Neither of the last two instances, however, is very
strong, and it would be possible to explain away some of the other apparent exceptions. The case of the ἀπόμωρα might be accounted for, as Wilcken (l. c.) suggests, by supposing that ἀπὸ Διὸν ἔως Ἄπερβερταλοῦ applied only to Alexandria, and that in the χάρα the words would be understood as equivalent to ἀπὸ Θώθ ἔως Μεσορῆ, though this explanation is admitted by its proposer to be unconvincing, and in the light of the frequent use of the Macedonian calendar in the Petrie, and still more in the Hîbeh, papyri Wilcken seems to us to under-estimate largely the extent of its employment for official and ordinary purposes. The fact that the ἄλαικη was sold from Gorgiaeus–Mesore may well be due to special circumstances, or the regulations concerning the year for tax-farming purposes may have been different in the case of the oil-monopoly from what they were in the case of ordinary taxes (Wilcken, l. c.); in any event the two years for which the ἄλαικη was sold are not stated to have coincided with two definite years of the king’s reign. The difficulty caused by 116, in which Mecheir begins the financial year, might also be evaded by supposing either that for some exceptional reason the year for the collection of this particular tax was spread over parts of two revenue years instead of the whole of one, or that the 12 months from Mecheir to Tubi were, contrary to custom, only part of a larger period extending originally from Thoth 1, for which the tax was farmed. We do not however wish to bring 116 into conformity with the ordinary revenue year, for even if all the other apparent exceptions were explained away, there would still remain 114, where no exercise of ingenuity can make the year in which the instalments were paid (Mecheir to Tubi or, less probably, Athur to Phaophi) coincide with an ordinary revenue year, in spite of the fact that the taxes in question were farmed εἰς τὸ γ (ἐρος). This papyrus indeed leads to a serious dilemma: for either τὸ γ ἐρος is a loose expression for a period covering two parts of successive revenue years, which is not at all a satisfactory hypothesis, or else τὸ γ ἐρος began in Mecheir (or Athur). The latter inference is undoubtedly the more natural; but the adoption of it implies not merely that the taxing year in this particular case failed to coincide with an ordinary revenue year, a phenomenon for which there are other parallels, but that on the system of reckoning the king’s years employed in the case of τὸ γ ἐρος Mecheir (or Athur) was the first month of the year—a result which might have an important bearing on the question of the starting-point of the non-revenue or regnal year. Whichever alternative be chosen, it is clear that 114 is an exception to the rule that in documents concerning the revenue the year is reckoned from Thoth to Mesore. Our conclusion, therefore, with regard to the revenue year is that, although there is good ground for identifying it with the ordinary vague year, and in most cases where the years of a king’s reign occur in documents relating
to the revenues these are to be considered revenue years, nevertheless in some departments of finance the accounts were kept without reference to the beginning or close of the revenue year, and when the year of a king’s reign is mentioned in a revenue document this is not in itself a sufficient guarantee that it is a revenue rather than some other kind of year, whether Egyptian or Macedonian.

With regard to the system of calculating the regnal years the central fact is that where the regnal and revenue years are known to differ, the figures of the revenue year are in some cases (probably in all) one in advance. The circumstance that when both kinds of years are mentioned together the revenue year stands second and is in all the Greek instances defined, indicates that the undefined year which is mentioned first was the more important; and it is probable that down to the accession of Epiphanes at any rate the regnal year was more often employed than the revenue year in dating documents which are not concerned with the revenues. With regard to private contracts and wills there are some special grounds (cf. p. 374) for thinking that it was not customary to date them by the revenue year. The identification of the revenue year with the annus vagus (the balance of days between the king’s accession and the following Thoth 1 being reckoned as his 1st year) necessitates the conclusion that the regnal year was calculated differently, but a more definite view of it is very difficult to obtain.

Smyly (Hermathena, 1899, p. 432) proposed to regard the regnal years as Egyptian years of 365 days calculated from the king’s accession and succeeding anniversaries of it, according to which system the numbers of the regnal years would be one behind those of the revenue years in the period between Thoth 1 and the anniversary. The question then arises—In what months did the accession of the earlier Ptolemies take place? Epiphanes, if the hieroglyphic version of the Rosetta Inscr. may be trusted (the Greek is unfortunately defective on the point), and if παρέλαβεν τὴν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς in l. 47 refers, as is generally supposed, to the king’s accession, came to the throne on Phaophi 17, but unfortunately no document belonging to his reign has yet been discovered in which the revenue are distinguished from the regnal years. With regard to the month of Philadelphus’ accession nothing is known. From 80. 13 it would be necessary on the accession theory of regnal years to infer that he came to the throne after Epeiph 4; and this hypothesis would accord very well with the fact that a demotic papyrus now being edited by Mr. Griffith (cf. 84 (a) introd.) is dated in Phamenoth of the 21st year of Soter. The Canon of Ptolemy assigns only 20 years to Soter, and if that statement is accurate and the 21st year was not only his last year but a revenue year, the evidence would point to Philadelphus’ accession having taken place between Phamenoth and the
following Thoth 1. If the 21st year of Soter is a regnal year, the received chronology of Soter’s reign is in danger of being upset, and amid the general uncertainty which would result it would no longer be possible to be sure that the 21st year was his last. But either view is consistent with the hypothesis that Philadelphus’ reign began in Epeiph or Mesore.

Next with regard to Philopator P. Magd. 35. 2 would on the accession theory indicate that this event took place between Phamenoth and the following Thoth, and if Jouguet and Lefebvre are right in inferring from the Magdola papyri written in the 1st year of Philopator (P. Magd. Deuxième Série, p. 205) that he came to the throne between Thoth 1 and Tubi 12, it would be impossible to harmonize these inferences. But the conclusion that Philopator’s accession took place before Tubi 12 rests on the assumption that in the Magdola papyri written on Tubi 12 of the 1st year of that reign the 1st revenue year, which ended on the 5th intercalary day, is meant. If (as is on the whole more probable) they are dated by the regnal year, they do not, until the beginning and end of Philopator’s first regnal year have been determined by other evidence, prove more than the fact that his 1st regnal year included Tubi 12. Though Euergetes is known from P. Petrie III. 112 to have died in his 26th revenue year, we have been unable to discover any document actually dated in that year which would indicate how far into the 26th year his reign lasted. Some better evidence for the month of Philopator’s accession is provided by P. Petrie III. 141, an account dated at the beginning (ἐτος) κύριακ and ending with Thoth of the 1st year. Palaeographical considerations render it practically certain that the reigns of Euergetes and Philopator are meant, and the form of one of the entries, (ll. 24–5) καὶ ὃς ἤτοι Πούρι Εως τ. ὅ ταῖς μηνίν δὲ (ὅρασι) ἑτερ., implies, as Smyly remarks, that the whole of this period of 4 months was included in the 1st year. From this it is necessary to infer that the 1st is not a revenue year; and it becomes probable that the 25th year mentioned in the heading is the last regnal year of Euergetes, and that Philopator came to the throne between Choiak and Pauni. Since the accession theory only requires that Philopator should have come to the throne between Phamenoth and Mesore inclusive, it is perfectly in accord with the evidence of P. Petrie III. 141. But a great objection to this theory arises out of the data for the accession of Euergetes. The Canopus Inscr. l. 6 τὴν πέμπτην καὶ εἰκάδα τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνίν (sc. Dius) ἐν ἕνα παρέλαβεν τὴν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς has been almost universally interpreted as meaning that Euergetes’ accession took place on Dius 25th. The inference is not free from doubt, for the Rosetta Inscr. uses the phrase παρελάβεν τὴν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς to indicate a certain form of the previous days, Mecheir 18 (ll. 7–8) and Phaophi 17 (l. 47;
The first date is supposed to refer to the king's coming of age, the second to his actual accession when an infant (cf. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscr.* I. p. 145), and it is not quite certain that in the Canopus Inscr. the phrase refers to the king's accession rather than e.g. to his coronation; but we are disinclined to depart from the ordinary interpretation of the passage. The information, however, that Euergetes came to the throne on Dios 25 is not of much service unless that date on the Macedonian calendar can be converted into its approximate Egyptian equivalent. The general tendency of the Macedonian months to fall later in the Egyptian year, coupled with the fact that in the 36th year of Philadelphus Dios approximately coincided with Athur and in the 9th year of Euergetes with Choiak–Tubi (cf. Table), requires that the accession of Euergetes on Dios 25 should fall in the months Athur, Choiak or Tubi, or at any rate within the period from Phaophi to Mecheir inclusive. This is in accordance with the evidence of papyri dated near the end of Philadelphus' reign, for the latest recorded date in his 39th year is Athur 16 (58. 4). It is also consistent with Smyly's interpretation of the date in the heading of P. Petrie III. 141. In itself, therefore, the hypothesis that Euergetes' accession occurred in Athur–Tubi is quite satisfactory; but Smyly himself remarks that it is irreconcilable with his former explanation of regnal years, which requires that the revenue years should be in advance of the regnal years only in the period from Thoth 1 to the anniversary of the accession, whereas P. Petrie III. 58 (c) shows that the period during which the revenue years were in advance extended as late as Phamenoth 25. To suppose, as the accession theory requires, that Dios 25 in the 1st year of Euergetes corresponded to some day in the period between Phamenoth 25 and the end of Mesore would hopelessly break the sequence which we believe to be traceable in the months of the Egyptian year corresponding to Dios in the latter part of the third century B.C.

Another explanation of the regnal years has recently been suggested by Th. Reinach (*Mélanges Nicole*, p. 456), who proposes to regard them as ordinary Egyptian vague years of 365 days like the revenue years, but calculated from Thoth 1 after the king's accession, the balance of days between the king's accession and the following Thoth 1 (which constituted the 1st revenue year) being attributed to his dead predecessor. On this theory of the regnal years, their numbers were invariably one behind those of the revenue years, and so far as the papyri dated by both systems are concerned (which, it may be noted, with one exception fell in the second half of the Egyptian vague year), they are consistent with Reinach's explanation. But Reinach's view is open to grave objections. In the first place it is a priori improbable that people would continue to date documents by the reign of a king who was known to be
dead; and, not to mention 116 and the other instances quoted on pp. 360-1, P. Petrie III. 141 seems to us in itself sufficient to remove Reinach's inability to believe (l. c.) 'qu'à aucune époque les années régnales aient été officiellement comptées à partir d'une autre date que le 1er Thoth,' for a year in which Thoth comes after Mesore cannot have begun with Thoth. In order to reconcile Reinach's explanation of regnal years with P. Petrie III. 141 it seems necessary to suppose that the whole period from a king's accession to the end of his 2nd revenue year was counted as his first regnal year. From this it would follow that in a 1st regnal year some months occurred twice over, which is a very unsatisfactory hypothesis. Secondly, if Thoth 1 was New Year's day on both the revenue and regnal systems, the only intelligible justification for having a separate system for budget purposes is removed, and the distinction between the two systems would seem to have been designed for the purpose of creating confusion. If the regnal years ignored Thoth 1 altogether, it is perfectly natural that the Ptolemies maintained for financial purposes the observance of a year with a fixed number of days and a fixed starting-point which remained unaffected by the succession of sovereigns. But if the regnal year was of the same character as the revenue year, there seems to be no adequate reason for having a separate year for financial purposes which only differed from the regnal year by having its numbers one in advance.

Thirdly, if the regnal as well as the revenue year was regulated by the Egyptian calendar, it is practically necessary to postulate the existence of a third system of reckoning the years of a king employed in documents dated on the Macedonian calendar; for it is hardly credible that e.g. in royal edicts, which usually ignore the Egyptian months altogether, the commencement and duration of the years of the reign should be fixed with reference to an Egyptian system; cf. Strack, Rhein. Mus. lxxiv. 5 (cf. p. 360) shows that a Macedonian year from Dius to Hyperberetaeus was sometimes taken into account, even in matters relating to finance; and the evidence of the double dates proves that the relation of Macedonian months to the Egyptian was subject to perpetual alterations. It is of course not only a legitimate but no doubt the safer course to leave the question of Macedonian years on one side in discussing the distinction of the Egyptian revenue and regnal years; but to suppose that in documents dated by the Macedonian calendar the years meant are also Egyptian regnal years would greatly simplify the problem by reducing the number of systems in common use from three to two.

The view that the Egyptian regnal years were really Macedonian years calculated from the date of the king's accession and succeeding anniversaries of it was suggested by Revillout (Milanges, p. 350) in connexion with P. Petrie
I. 28 (a) (= III. 58 (c)), but so long as the relation of the Egyptian and Macedonian calendars was involved in complete obscurity remained incapable of proof or disproof. Now, however, granting that Euergetes' accession took place on Dius 25, it is worth while to inquire how far the view that his regnal years began on Dius 25 avoids the principal difficulty (cf. p. 364) which arises if the regnal years are supposed to have commenced on anniversaries of that day on the Egyptian calendar with which Dius 25th corresponded at Euergetes' accession. In order to make Phamenoth 25 of Euergetes' 12th revenue year fall within his 11th regnal year, as is indicated by P. Petrie III. 58 (c), it is necessary, on Revillout's theory of regnal years, to suppose that Dius 25, the first day of the 12th regnal year, fell later than Phamenoth 25, i.e. that Dius 1 fell later than Phamenoth 1. But the evidence of double dates in the 9th and 16th years of Euergetes (cf. App. i, Table) suggests that Dius 1 in the 12th year fell in Choia or Tubi, and the hypothesis that it fell later than Phamenoth 1 in the 12th year would therefore disturb the sequence of double dates not much less than the view that it fell later than Phamenoth 1 at Euergetes' accession. Nor is the date in P. Petrie III. 58 (c) easier to explain by supposing that the regnal years began on Dius 1, the balance of days between the king's accession and the following Dius 1 being reckoned as his 1st regnal year: for in that case Dius 1 of the 12th regnal year must have begun later than Phamenoth 25, a conclusion which increases rather than diminishes the difficulty referred to above.

The theory of a Macedonian origin of the Egyptian regnal years can indeed be reconciled with the extant evidence concerning both the divergence of the regnal and revenue years in the reign of Euergetes and the relation of the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars in his reign by supposing that the regnal years were reckoned from Dius 1, but that the 1st regnal year either began on Dius 1 following his accession or included the period from his accession up to the next but one Dius 1. The former alternative is, however, open to the objection already urged against Reinach's view (cf. p. 364), viz. the difficulty of supposing that documents would continue to be dated by the years of a king who is known to be dead, and the latter would lead to the conclusion that Euergetes' first regnal year contained two whole Macedonian years less 24 days; while from either theory it would follow that the numbers of the regnal years were in certain months two in arrear of those of the revenue years, which is unlikely.

We are reduced therefore to the conclusion that none of the suggested explanations of the distinction between revenue and regnal years can be regarded as satisfactory, and that the present evidence is inadequate to provide a solution of the problem. In these circumstances the only course is to fall back upon the one certain fact connected with regnal years that their numbers were sometimes
one in arrear of those of revenue years; and since the distinction between a revenue and regnal year is maintained in Philadelphus' reign as late as Epeiph and in the reigns of Euergetes and Philopator as late as Phamenoth, for practical purposes regnal years may be regarded as approximately a year in arrear of the revenue years. This consideration has an important bearing on the conversion of early Ptolemaic dates into years of the Julian calendar, since any date in which the year of the king is regnal is likely to fall within the year B.C. following that within which it would fall if the king's year were a revenue one; and the conventional system, which still prevails, of converting early Ptolemaic dates into years B.C. on the assumption that the king's years are reckoned on the revenue system is certainly in need of modification. With regard to the system of calculating the king's years employed in documents which are dated by Macedonian months, there are some reasons for thinking that the years correspond with regnal rather than with revenue years (cf. p. 374); and in the absence of any direct evidence for more than two systems of reckoning the king's years we are inclined to identify the official Macedonian years with the regnal years, and hence to connect the difficulties concerning the latter with the use of a Macedonian instead of an Egyptian year, although the fresh evidence adduced in this volume with regard to the Macedonian calendar does not render that connexion easier to unravel.

### APPENDIX III

**The Eponymous Priesthoods from B.C. 301–221.**

The list of the eponymous priesthoods during the Ptolemaic period in Otto's *Priester und Tempel*, pp. 175–96, can now be largely supplemented as regards the third century B.C. from the new volume of the Petrie papyri and the present series of texts, and a revised table of the priesthoods during the reigns of the first three Ptolemies may be found useful. The most striking feature of the new evidence is that which proves the extreme antiquity of the priesthood of Alexander at Alexandria, the origin of which cult has been in its various bearings one of the most widely discussed problems in the history of the Diadochi. Hitherto the earliest year to which the priesthood of Alexander could be carried back was the 16th year of Philadelphus (B.C. 270–69 or 269–8), to which P. Petrie I. 24, until now the oldest dated Greek papyrus, belongs; two earlier demotic contracts in the Louvre, dated in the 13th year of Soter
and the 8th year of Philadelphus respectively, made no mention of any priesthoods. Though the dangerous character of the *argumentum a silentio* when based upon date-formulae of contracts is by this time generally admitted, the evidence of these two demotic papyri that the cult of Alexander was not instituted till some years after the accession of Philadelphus seemed to be supported by the circumstance that, when that cult made its appearance, the gods Adelphi were uniformly associated with Alexander; and it is not surprising that the latest critic (Otto, *op. cit.* pp. 138–52) strongly supports the view of e.g. Wilamowitz and Wilcken, who regarded Philadelphus as the creator of the Alexander cult at Alexandria, against that of Kaerst and Kornemann, who mainly on the evidence of Pseudo-Callisthenes (III. 33) wished to credit the foundation of the cult to Soter. Kaerst and Kornemann nevertheless were right, and one more proof is given of the historical elements interwoven into the romance of Alexander. Though we need not accept its statement that the priesthood of Alexander was instituted by the will of Alexander himself, that assertion was not very wide of the mark. The Hibe papyri fortunately include several date-formulae earlier than P. Petrie I. 24; and not only in 110. 40 and 44 dated in the 12th and 13th years of Philadelphus, and 97. 3 dated in the 7th (or 4th) year of the same reign, but even in 84 (a) which was actually written in the 5th year of Soter, i.e. about B.C. 300, is the mention of the year of the reigning monarch followed by the entry εφ' ἵππως ἀγαθὸς B. It is true that this priest is in no instance stated to be the priest of Alexander; but even if it were not known independently that the cult of Ptolemy Soter at Alexandria was first introduced in the reign of Philopator (cf. Otto, *op. cit.* p. 180), no official cult but that of Alexander could have obtained such importance in Egypt by B.C. 300 that it was unnecessary to specify the deity to which 'the priest' was attached. It was only when, in some period between the 13th year and Daisius (i.e. Phamenoth or Pharmouthi probably) of the 15th year of Philadelphus (cf. 110. 44 and 99. 3), that sovereign associated the cult of his sister and himself with the worship of Alexander, that a more precise description of the greatest official priesthood was ordained, and the brief formula of the early documents took the first step in the direction of those interminable lists of priesthoods of deified Ptolemy which finally exhausted the patience of the later Ptolemaic scribes. Since Arsinoë Philadelphus died in the 15th year of her brother's reign before the month of Pachon (cf. the date of the Mendes stele quoted by Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides*, I. p. 180), the association of the gods Adelphi with the cult of Alexander may well have been one of the many divine honours paid to her by Philadelphus after her death, although the evidence does not exclude the
possibility that the association took place one or two years previously. To the interval between 99, written in Daisius of the 15th year, and dem. P. Louvre 2424, written in Athur of the 19th (if Revillout's decipherment of it is to be trusted), is to be assigned the creation of the canephorate of Arsinoë; and the institution of this priesthood at any rate is no doubt closely connected with her death.

Besides their new evidence for the existence of the priesthood of Alexander in B.C. 300, the date of the association of the gods Adelphi with Alexander, and the date of the institution of the canephorate of Arsinoë Philadelphus, the Hibeh papyri also serve to limit the date at which the association of the gods Euergetae in the Alexander cult took place to the 3rd, 4th, or 5th years of Euergetes; cf. 145 with 171 and our remarks on no. (21).

In the following Table the names of the priests and priestesses are given in Greek (in the genitive case) when the evidence for them is in that language, but in Roman characters when the evidence is derived from demotic documents. It is often difficult to recognize a Greek name in its demotic form, even when that is correctly deciphered; few, therefore, of the names which rest on the evidence of demotic are likely to be quite correct, while many of them are obviously wrong. Where, as in all the demotic and some of the Greek papyri which mention the priests, the months are given on the Egyptian calendar, the king's years may be either 'revenue' or 'regnal' years (cf. App. ii.); since most of the names of priests are derived from private documents, it is probable that the 'regnal' years largely predominate, but only in one case, no. (27), can it be determined with certainty which of the two years is meant. Where, as in most of the Greek evidence, the months are given on the Macedonian calendar, the presumption is that the king's years are calculated on a Macedonian system, which we are disposed to regard as identical with or approximating to the system employed in reckoning regnal years; cf. our remarks on (27). In converting the dates into years on the Julian calendar, the date B.C. which is probably implied if the year in question is regnal is placed in brackets after the date implied if the year is a revenue one. The priesthoods were annual offices, though sometimes renewable for a second term, e.g. nos. (25) and (26). Probably the year in question was the official Macedonian year, whatever that may have been. It is noticeable that inconsistencies with regard to the dates of particular priests are rare (cf. nos. (21) and (32)), and the evidence forms several consistent series covering a number of consecutive years, e.g. from the 8th to the 13th years of Euergetes. This strongly indicates that the priest's year of office coincided with the year (Macedonian or regnal, rather than revenue, as we think) employed in dating the great majority of the documents from which the list of priests is drawn up.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year of reign</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Priests.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>301-0 (?)</td>
<td>Soter: Μενελάος τοῦ Λαμάχου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7 (or 4)</td>
<td>279-8 (278-7) or 282-1 (281-0)</td>
<td>Philadelphus: Διμαναζοῦ τοῦ Ἀπιλλάω.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>274-3 (273-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>273-2 (272-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>lost</td>
<td>300-271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>271-0 (270-69)</td>
<td>Patroklov τοῦ Πάτρεωνος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>267-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(266-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>265-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(264-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>264-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(263-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>263-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(262-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>262-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(261-0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>258-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(257-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>257-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(256-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year of reign.</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Priests.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>253-2</td>
<td>Aētus (?) son of Apollonius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>252-1</td>
<td>Demetria daughter of Dionysius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>250-49</td>
<td>Νεοστολέμου τοῦ Φρίξου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>27-39</td>
<td>259-46</td>
<td>Αρασίνη τῆς Νεκταρίας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>31-39</td>
<td>255-46</td>
<td>Αρινίτας τῆς Μεμνήμος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>246-5</td>
<td>Ταπτολέμου τοῦ 'Αρπαστάτου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>245-4</td>
<td>Αρχελάδου γονὸς τοῦ Δεμοκράτου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>4 (?)</td>
<td>244-3</td>
<td>Αρινίτας τῆς Πολυμεσάνου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>243-2</td>
<td>Άρσενος τοῦ Διοδότου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>240-39</td>
<td>οὐσιήδατοι τοῦ Πολύγονος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>239-8</td>
<td>Αρχεστράτης τῆς Κυστικλέως.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>238-7</td>
<td>Απολλωνίδου τοῦ Μοσχίωνος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>236-5</td>
<td>Μενεκρατέας τῆς Φιλάμμονος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>235-4</td>
<td>Απολλωνίδου τοῦ Μοσχίωνος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>234-3</td>
<td>Μενεκρατέας τῆς Φιλάμμονος τὸ μ. (ἐτος).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>15 (?)</td>
<td>233-2</td>
<td>Άρσενος τοῦ Διοδότου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>232-1</td>
<td>Σοκιά τῆς Λικότας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>231-0</td>
<td>Μενεκάς γονὸς τοῦ Μενοεθίου.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Euergetes 1.

Formula: ἐπὶ ιερέως 'Αλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν 'Αθηναίων καὶ θεῶν Euergetῶν και αὐτὸν 'Αρσένος Φιλαδέλφου.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year of reign.</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Priests.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>227-6 (226-5)</td>
<td>Ταλέστου τοῦ Φιλιστάνου. Βερενίκης τής Σωσίπουλου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>226-5 (225-4)</td>
<td>Ἀλέξικράτου τοῦ Θεογένους. Βερενίκης τῆς Καλλιάνακτος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>224-3 (223-2)</td>
<td>Αλκέτας (?) son of Ιασός (?). Dionysia daughter of Silas (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>223-2 (222-1)</td>
<td>Δωσιθέου τοῦ Δρυμύλου. Βερενίκης τῆς Πυθαγέλου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>lost.</td>
<td>lost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 84 (a). 1, 16.
(3) 110. 40.
(4) 110. 44. The figure 3 in the number of the year is not quite certain; cf. note ad loc.
(5) 30. 23.
(6) 99. 3 and 128.
(8) Dem. P. Lond. (Revillout, *Rev. Égypt.* I. p. 6). 'Democrites' may be Δημοκράτης or Δημοκράτος, and 'Axipolus' is obviously wrong.
(9) 82. 3; cf. P. Petrie III. 52 (a). 3, where in l. 2 (ἐτών) κβ, l. 3 Πέλοπ[ος], and l. 5 τῆς Τείμαρχου should be read.
(10) 88. 2 and Hibeḥ unpubl. pap.; cf. 88, introd.
(11) 85. 3 and 150.
(12) 134. The papyrus was written while the viōs was associated with Philadelphus, i.e. after Phaophi 11 of the 19th year when Philadelphus was still reigning alone (100, introd.), and not later than the 27th, in which year the viōs disappeared from the date-formula (*Rev. Laws* i. 1). 134, therefore, belongs to the 20th, 23rd, 25th, 26th or, less probably, the 27th year.
(13) 94. 3.
canephorus correctly, and call the priest of Alexander Antimachus son of Cebes. Κέβητος does not, however, suit the traces of letters in 95. 2, though -τος is possible; cf. note ad loc.

(15) Dem. P. Louvre 2433 (Revellout, Chrest. dēm. pp. 241 sqq., Rev. Égypt. I. p. 6). In P. Petrie III. 42 F (a), written probably in this year, occurs the earliest extant example of τοῦ ὅτος and τῆς ὅσης in place of the names of the priest and canephorus.

(16) 98. 7.

(17) The name of the canephorus is preserved in P. Petrie I. 22 (i). 2 and dem. P. Louvre 2443, that of the priest of Alexander only in the latter (Revellout, Chrest. dēm. pp. 246 sqq., Rev. Égypt. I. p. 6). Apinatus is not likely to be right. Revillout deciphered the canephorus as Atis daughter of Mennas.

(18) P. Petrie III. 56 (b) (= Rev. Laws p. 187). The year is lost (Otto wrongly assigns it to the 27th), but is not earlier than the 27th, in which the formula Πτολεμαίων τοῦ Πτολεμαίων Σωτήρος was introduced (Rev. Laws i. 1). The papyrus therefore belongs to the 27th, 30th, 31st, 32nd, 35th, 37th, 38th, or 39th years.

(19) P. Petrie III. 54 (a). 2. The papyrus is later than the 30th year and probably belongs to the 31st, 35th, 38th, or 39th years rather than to the 32nd or 37th; cf. Smyly’s note.

(20) P. Petrie III. 43 (2). ii. 1 et saep.; cf. dem. P. Louvre 2438 (Revellout, Chrest. dēm. pp. 257 sqq., Rev. Égypt. I. p. 7), where the names were deciphered as Tlepolemos or Triporimos son of Altimios, and Ptolemaea daughter of Theon or Thian.

(21) 145 preserves the names Ἀρχελάων and Πολεμοκράτους; cf. for the rest the names of the priests in the 4th year in dem. P. Louvre 2431 (Revellout, Chrest. dēm. pp. 265 sqq., Rev. Égypt. I. p. 7), where they have been deciphered as Archelao or Alecros son of Demos and Arsinoë daughter of Polemocrates. 145 was written probably in Artemisius, which then corresponded approximately to Pauni (cf. App. i); the demotic papyrus is dated in Mecheir. It is possible to refer the two dates to the same year of office on the hypothesis that the Greek papyrus is dated by the regnal, the demotic by the revenue year; cf. App ii. Or, if the 3rd and 4th years are really distinct, and there is no error in the demotic, Archelaus and Arsinoë may have remained in office for two years, like the priests of the 9th and 10th years.

(22) Dem. P. Louvre 2431; cf. note on (21).

(23) 171.
HIBEH PAPYRI

(24) 89. 2 and Hibeh unpubl. pap. 'Ovopakḷtoν is a possible alternative for 'Ovopaḍtoν; cf. 89, introd.


(26) P. Petrie III. 5 (a), 2, 6(a), 17, &c.; it is uniformly stated in these documents that Apollonides and Menecratia held office for the second year.

(27) P. Petrie III. 58 (c). 7 (introd. p. 8) and 58 (d). 7. These two papyri are dated in the 11th regnal and 12th revenue year (cf. p. 359), and are therefore free from the uncertainty attaching to dates in which the two systems of dating are not distinguished. Since regnal years so far as can be judged (cf. p. 367) begin or may begin about a year later than revenue years having the same numbers, and the conventional system of converting early Ptolemaic dates into years of the Julian calendar probably applies only to the revenue years, we assign these two papyri to B.C. 236–5, not to B.C. 237–6. A comparison of the evidence concerning Seleucus and Aspasia, who are known to have held office in the 11th regnal and 12th revenue years, with that concerning Eucles and Stratonice, no (28), is instructive. There are no less than six instances in which the latter are mentioned in wills of the 12th year (excluding those cases in which the figure is lost), and seeing that different priests were in office during part at any rate of the 12th revenue year, it is very unlikely that the 12th year in connexion with Eucles and Stratonice was a revenue year, especially as none of these six papyri is concerned with revenues and the months, where their names are preserved, are given on the Macedonian, not the Egyptian, calendar. Whether the king's years reckoned on the Macedonian system are distinct from the Egyptian regnal years is uncertain (cf. p. 366); but even if the two systems are independent and the 12th year in those six instances is not identical with the twelfth regnal year, the circumstance that the priests mentioned in them are different from those who are known to have held office in the 11th regnal year and 12th revenue year suggests that the 12th Macedonian year corresponded much more closely to the 12th regnal year than to the 12th revenue year.

(28) P. Petrie III. 11. 10, 37, 13 (a), 21, 14, 12, 15, 2, 16, 18, &c.

(29) P. Petrie III. 18. 1 and 55. 1; cf. dem. P. Marseille correctly deciphered by Revillout, Rev. Égypt. I. p. 134. Since the 12th year in (28) is probably a regnal, not a revenue year, the fact that the priests in (29) are different from those in (28) indicates that the 13th year in (29) also is a regnal year; cf. our remarks on (27).

I. p. 8). The grandfather's name of the priest of Alexander ('Euphratoros,' Revillout) seems to be given, but we suspect an error either in the text or the decipherment. Otto (op. cit. p. 177) proposes "Ελλάνικος 'Ελλανίκου τοῦ Εὐφράνορος. The year is not quite certain, being lost in the demotic contract and restored from the Greek docket. Otto prefers (ἐρως) ἥ to (ἐρως) ἥ, but in the facsimile ἥ is more suitable. Neither 'Socia' nor 'Licota' can be right.

(31) Cf. three demotic papyri in the British Museum (Revillout, Chrest. dém. p. cxxxvi, and Rev. Égypt. I. pp. 15, 119, and 135), and dem. P. Berl. 3089 (Spiegelberg, dem. P. Berl. p. 6). Revillout gives the forms Mennas, son of Menetios, and Berenice (twice; elsewhere Cleonica and Cerdica) daughter of Atis (or Adaues), Spiegelberg Mnias son of Mntias (the last s being doubtful) and Brniga (i.e. Berenice) daughter of Atis (Aëtios?).

(32) In dem. P. Louvre 2425 (Chrest. dém. pp. 278 sqq., Rev. Égypt. I. p. 8), dated in Mesore of the 20th year, Revillout gives the priests' names as Calistos son of Philistion and Berenice daughter of Sosipatros. These persons are obviously the same as the priests of the 21st year, known from P. Petrie III. 21. (a). 1, 5, (b). 1, 6, (g). 29, as was pointed out by Wilcken (Gött. gel. Anz. 1895, p. 143), who in P. Petrie I. 27 (= III. 21 (b)) proposed to insert τὸ β (éros) after Φιλιστεία, but wrongly; cf. Smyly's note on III. 21 (b). The Greek documents therefore, unlike those mentioned in connexion with (26), give no indication that the 21st was the second year in which Galestes and Berenice held office, and another demotic papyrus (dem. P. Lond., Chrest. dém. p. 131, and Rev. Égypt. I. p. 118), which mentions them, is dated in Epeiph of the 21st year. Hence we think the attribution of a second year of office to Galestes and Berenice is erroneous. The conflict of evidence with regard to them can be reconciled by the hypothesis that the 20th is a regnal, the 21st a revenue year; cf. no. (21). But we are more inclined to suspect an error in the text or decipherment of dem. P. Louvre 2425, especially as Revillout from another demotic papyrus in London (Aegypt. Zeitschr. 1880, p. 111) gives Actitos and a daughter of Alexilaos as priests in the 20th year.

(33) Cf. note on (32).

(34) P. Petrie III. 19. (c). 1, 9, (f). 9, &c. and several demotic papyri. P. Petrie III. 21 (g). i–3, where the priests' names are omitted, also belongs to this year; cf. note on no. (36). The demotic names were deciphered by Revillout as Alexicrates son of Diogenes or Theogenes and Berenike daughter of Cleonicus, and by Spiegelberg as 'Algsigrts son of Thugns and Berenike daughter of Griangs.
(35) Dem. P. Lond. (Revillout, Aegypt. Zeitschr. 1880, p. 112), where the father's name of the priest of Alexander is given as Iasôu.

(36) 90. 2 and an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus; cf. note on 90. 2. The names occur in dem. P. Berl. 3096, where they were deciphered by Revillout (Rev. Égyp. IV. p. 152) as Dositheos son of Dositheos and Berenike daughter of Ph. . . tim . . krs, by Spiegelberg (dem. P. Berl. p. 6) as Tusitus (Dositheos) son of Triphirus (Tryphilos) and Berenike daughter of Phitimitr (or Khitimitr). In P. Petrie III. 21 (g), where the editors read in ll. 1–3 (έτους) κε [έφ' ἱερέως] Πτολεμαίου τοῦ . . . . . . . . . . . . οὗ 'Αλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελ. καὶ θεῶν Ἐνεργ. καινφ. 'Αρσ. Φιλ. Τμ. . . . . . . τῆς 'Αλεξάνδρου . . , we read (έτους) κβ [έφ' ἱερέως] τοῦ ὁνῆος ἐν 'Αλεξάνδρείαι 'Αλεξάνδρου κ.τ.λ. καινφ. 'Αρσ. Φιλ. τῆς οὔπης ἐν 'Αλεξάνδρείαι. This protocol therefore provides another early example of the omission of the priests' names; cf. no. (15).

(37) P. Petrie II. 25 (i). 5.
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άδύνατος 5. 80.
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άποδοσάν 6. 7.
άποδοσάν 14. 34.
άποδοσάν 8. 20.
άποκαλέσων 15. 4, 7.
'Απόλλων ἡ 5. 20; 6. 35.
άποκαλέσαν 4. 6.
άποκαλέσαν 14. 86.
άποκαλέσαν 6. 10.
άποκαλέσαν 6. 6.
άποκαλέσαν 15. 102.
άποκαλέσαν 10. 35.
άποκαλέσαν 3. 21; 4. 10; 10. 3.
'Αργείος 8. 24.
άρετή 15. 87.
'Αργα 5. versus 1.
άρετή 6. 31.
'Αργα 13. 16, 21, 22; 18. 2.
'Αργα 13. 4, 27.
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dεξετήτης 6. 25; 12. 5.
dεδώρ 6. 8, 19, 45.
dή 1. 12; 6. 52; 9. 4; 13. 27.

Δήμης 6. 40.

Δεικτορά 16. 5.

dήμος 14. 81.

δι 14. 51, 81; 15. 35, 51, 89, 90; 16. 41; 17. 9, 10.

dιαβάλλεται 14. 29.
dιαβαλέω 14. 46.
dιακείσθαι 13. 28.
dιάνοια 15. 83.
dιασελεξία 15. 109.
dιάτομος 13. 19.
dιαφέρων 6. 41.
dιαφερέων 8. 14.

dιαφορά 16. 40.

dιάδοσα 1. 15; 5. 2.
dιεί 8. 41.
dιεκαίων 6. 88.
dικαστήριον 14. 48.
dίκη 1. 6; 8. 86; 14. 167.
dίδο 17. 25.
dισονύμα 14. 30.
dιστήρη 17. 17.
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εγγενές 10. 36.

εγκαλίστησεν (εγκ.) 2. 4.

eγκεμαζέω 13. 6.
eγχώρασε 15. 132.
eγώ 1. 12 (εγώ); 3. 44; 4. 19, 26, 27, 38; 5. 10 et saec.; 6. 10 et saec.; 7. 5, 6, 95 (είμι); 10. 34; 12. 4, 6, 8; 13. 1; 14. 8, 86; 15. 22, 57, 116.
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elbaim 3. 44; 5. 16; 6. 12, 38, 54; 7. 93; 13. 15, 17.
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elbaim 1. 8, 17.
elbaim 8. 30.
elbaim 15. 141.
elbaim 9. 7.
elbaim 3. 10; 6. 145; 13. 25; 15. 128.
elbaim 12. 2; 13. 33; 17. 5.
elbaim 13. 8, 11; 16. 96.
elbaim 2. 10; 5. 19; 6. 12, 33; 13. 33.
elbaim 7. 48.
elbaim 3. 33.
elbaim 15. 26 (?).
elbaim 15. 3.
elbaim 17. 8.
elbaim 5. 88.
elbaim 16. 85.
elbaim 15. 90.
elbaim 5. 91.

Σείων 6. 25, 83; 8. 32; 9. 8.
Συλλογισμός 5. 82.
Σημειώσεις 15. 111.
Σημειώσεις 6. 24; 8. 32.
Σήμερα 4. 57.
Σήμερα 7. 94; 15. 30; 17. 14.
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Thalassai 16. 32, 38.
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Thalassai 8. 31.
Thalassai 14. 28, 41, 73.
Thalassai 5. 18, 20, 23, 49; 6. 37; 16. 38, 133, 141.
Thalassai 2. 14.
Thalassai 12. 1.
Thalassai 13. 18.
Thalassai 13. 8.
póros 3. 39.
póramínei 3. 17.
pótē 4. 10; 5. 15; 6. 25; 15. 83, 113.
pónta 14. 38. póntos 7. 32.
pọtv 1. 2, 3, 17; potv 1. 9.
pọtpérēn 1. 9.
póto 3. 12.
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pọtopâla¯kev 15. 45.
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pọtopâla¯kev 8. 12 (?).
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pọ́p 6. 12, 13, 17.
pọ́p 13. 28; 15. 99; 16. 43.
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τάχα 5. 4.
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tρέθε 14. 37, 41.
tρέθε 5. 13.
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tροφή 14. 45; 17. 28.
tρόπαιος 5. 52.
tρύχος 3. 49, 57.
tγγάκευς 4. 33, 47; 5. 77;
6. 18; 13. 5, 26.
tπάτερ 11. 4.
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tττηχ 6. 40; 15. 76.
tτσητέρ 14. 46.
tγύρος 16. 23.
tγύρητα 16. 12.
tωφα 16. 13.
I. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Φάναι 8. 28; 13. 9, 12, 28;
16. 23, 37; 17. 7, 10.
Φανέρας 6. 142; 15. 28; 16.
29. Φανερός 15. 34.
Φάνος 4. 30.
Φαυλός 2. 4, 27; 17. 14.
Φειδιάλος 17. 10, 11.
Φέρειν 3. 33, 44; 6. 45; 8.
10.
Φιλίγγες 6. 15.
Φιλές 9. 2.
Φιλάδερφους 4. 56; 7. 94.
Φιλάνθρωπος 15. 36.

II. KINGS.

ALEXANDER.

Ἀλέξανδρος 85. 4; 88. 3; 89. 3; 90. 2; 92. 4; 94. 6; 95. 2; 96. 2, 18; 98. 8;
99. 4; 134; 145; 171.

PTOLEMY I.

βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου ἔτες εσε 84 (α). 1, 16.

βεολ Σωτῆρες 38. 13.
Ptolemy II.

basilei?no?s Ptolemaiou tou Ptolemaion et. 5 (?) 97. 1. et. 87 99. 1; 128. et. 100. 8.
basilei?no?s Ptolel. tou Ptolel. kai tou vnoi Ptolemaion et. kE 92. 1. et. kv 88. 1. et. kd.
85. 1. et. kv 96. 1, 17. Year lost 134.
basilei?s Ptolemaion kai 'Arsono? Philadelpos theoi 'Adelphoi 98. 11.
basilei?s Ptolel. 110. 55 et seqn.
O basileis 77. 4. basileis 110. 51.
theoi 'Adelphoi 85. 5; 88. 3; 89. 3; 90. 3; 92. 4; 94. 7; 95. 3; 96. 2, 18; 98. 8;
99. 5; 134; 145; 171.

Year of a Ptolemaic era (?) et. p 84 (5) 1.

Ptolemy III.


Year to be referred to this reign: beta 110. 40. et 110. 44; et 110. 37. et 110. 34.

beta 110. 12. et 50. 8. et 39. 17; 84. 22. kE 157. kE 40. 17; 42. 11; 43. 10,
11; 101. et 85. 21; 105. 17 (?) . kv 96. 9, 25. kE 83. 5; 108. 1 (?). kv 45. 25;
46. 21; 83. 6; 94. 13. kE 47. 37; 95. 11. et 48. 22; 87. 8; 132. et 169.

Year 34 = year 35 80. 14. et 55. 7;
80. 5, 11; 108. 7 (?) ; 121. 1 (?); 146; 164-5. et 120. 1. et 56. 9; 102. 5, 10;
108. 1 (?). eta 57. 4; 76. 10; 86. 4, 19; 102. 3, 8; kE 53. 4; 109. 5, 11; 129;
170.

Year of a Ptolemaic era (?) et. p 84 (5) 1.

III. MONTHS.

(a) Macedonian and Egyptian.
III. MONTHS

(b) Macedonian.

Δόσ 32. 1; 84 (a). 2, 17.
'Απελλάδος 32. 17; 97. 4.
Περίτιος 89. 5.
Δόστρος 98. 3, 9, 19, 26; 110. 41.
Σανδίκης 90. 10; 92. 6.
'Αρτέμισιος 77. 8; 145.

Δάισιος 82. 17; 86. 3, 18; 97, introd.; 99. 6; 102. 3, 9; 129.
Πάνθους 47. 9; 57. 4; 84 (a). 5, 21.
Δάκος 82. 31; 88. 4; 110. 45; 171.
Γορτιάς 82. 22; 90. 4.
'Υπαρθερταῖος 82. 12; 110. 47; 146.

(c) Egyptian.

Θείνδ 39. 18; 71. 3, 11; 169-70. Θείνδ 36. 1, 7; 76. 11; 114. 13.
Φαούφι 42. 6; 56. 10; 69. 6; 81. 4, 10; 103. 1, 12; 114. 5, 19; 131; 139-40; 153; 165.
Παούφι 100. 1. Παούφ 48. 21; 146.
'Αδίφ 42. 9, 13; 53. 3, 4; 65. 31; 68. 3; 69. 4, 10; 73. 5; 81. 19; 106. 1, 2, 8; 120.
11, 121. 3; 130; 138; 140; 155; 163.
Χολί 45. 25; 55. 7; 73. 4, 8; 81. 11, 22; 118. 17; 119. 15; 120. 25.
Τίσι 27. 62, 209; 75. 10; 101. 1; 116. 4.
Μεχψ 27. 66; 44. 8; 47. 37; 114. 4, 8. Μεχψ 34. 2; 44. 11; 51. 4, 6; 92. 7; 115. 5.
24, 29; 116. 3, 6.
Φαμενώδ 73. 3, 15; 114. 11; 115. 6, 25, 30; 116. 8; 161. Φαμενώτ 27. 88; 119. 6.
Παμενώτ 33. 10.
Φαρμαύθ 27. 107; 34. 12; 37. 1, 9; 93. 6; 115. 7, 26, 31; 116. 10; 118. 37; 119. 7; 136.
Παχός 27. 129; 61. 9; 68. 6; 115. 8, 27, 32; 118. 32; 119. 11; 136-7; 141; 144.
Παχού 77. 8; 116. 11.
Πας 27. 137; 62. 17; 95. 5; 102. 5, 10; 104. 1, 6; 105. 1; 107. 2, 7, 8; 112. 37 (I);
115. 14, 18, 36; 116. 12, 13; 118. 35, 40; 118. 12; 162.
'Εσείφ 43. 10, 11; 59. 13; 80. 5, 12; 116. 3; 117. 4; 118. 60. 'Εσείφ 40. 17. 'Εσείπ 110.
34; 119. 13.
Μεσορά p. 139; 48. 22; 85. 7; 98. 1, 11; 116. 4; 118. 67; 133; 143.
'Επαγόμενα ἡμέραι 27. 201, 219.

IV. PERSONAL NAMES.

'Αλεξάνδρος 80. 2 et scep.; 39. 9; 92. 4.
'Αλεξάνδρος 96. 4, 20; 97. 6; 98. 5, 13; 100. 11;
110. 55 et scep.; 121. 5; 123; 167.
'Αλκάτας 88. 3.
'Αμασίς 101. 7 (?).
'Αμείνων 110. 63 et scep.
'Αμενέως 67. 26; 112. 11; 144.
'Αμμών 112. 90.

C C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Term</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Αμπέλωνες</td>
<td>61. 10; 90. 23; 115. 21; 168.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμπελώνες</td>
<td>111. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμφίδραμος</td>
<td>111. 6; 132.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμφίκτυς 96, 4 el saep. ; 110. 81 (?).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αποιζήμα</td>
<td>27. 173.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αποτίμησις</td>
<td>112. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απογέννηση</td>
<td>30. 16; 34. 1; 73. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αποκαμήνηση</td>
<td>118. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αποκόμισης</td>
<td>32. 7; 71. 4; 12; 71. 20; 95. 2; 110. 58; 77; 81; 104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αποκύρωσις</td>
<td>48. 11; 64. 3; 100. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολήμνημα</td>
<td>85. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολόγονος</td>
<td>111. 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολογέννησις</td>
<td>p. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολογοθέτος</td>
<td>51. 1, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολογοθέτωρ</td>
<td>112. 82; 122.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολογοθυσίμαης</td>
<td>108. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολπήμα</td>
<td>27. 186.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολπώνια</td>
<td>151; 165.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολπώνιας</td>
<td>44, 5; 53. 18; 67. 6; 68. 4; 91. 16; 92. 14; 20; 95. 10; 110. 45 et saep.; 111. 17; 112. 62; 91; 114. 1; 118. 49, 78; 119. 1; 123; 129; 133.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απολλώνημα</td>
<td>97. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αργάνιος</td>
<td>78. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρενώδωσις</td>
<td>53. 20; 101. 6; 106. 6; 138; 153.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αργανδός</td>
<td>143.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμανίνης</td>
<td>40. 1, 18; 41. 1, 26; 42. 1, 13; 43. 1, 12; 44. 1, 9; 85. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαλάτσιος</td>
<td>116. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαλότσιος</td>
<td>110. 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμάτων</td>
<td>54. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμάτωνος</td>
<td>171.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματάνημα</td>
<td>109. 1, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματάνημασι</td>
<td>84 (a), 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματάνημασιος</td>
<td>72. 15; 85. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμάτωνος</td>
<td>111. 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμάτωνος</td>
<td>134.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαχύρος</td>
<td>72. 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμάχυρος</td>
<td>23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαμική</td>
<td>86. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαμικής</td>
<td>36. 2; 52. 29; 53. 7; 119. 55; 81; 144; 167.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαφόρος 61. 7; 62. 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαφόρος</td>
<td>38. 4, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαφόρος</td>
<td>117. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαφόρος</td>
<td>112. 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαφόρος</td>
<td>74. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαφόρος</td>
<td>98. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμαφόρος</td>
<td>81. 2, 12, 17, 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρμάτωση</td>
<td>61. 8; 72. 8, 10, 13, 17; 112. 45; 131.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>132.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>145.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>89. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>124-6; 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>31. 10, 11, 21, 22; 66. 3; 67. 1, 28; 68. 1; 69. 1; 81. 12, 21; 82. 2, 14, 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>(70 (d), 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>(70 (d), 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>112. 25 (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>76. 5 (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>52. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρματωσίμαης</td>
<td>82. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βερενίκη</td>
<td>90. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βερενίκη</td>
<td>44. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βερενίκη</td>
<td>70 (a), 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βόρας</td>
<td>113. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βόρας</td>
<td>120. 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βούδαλλον</td>
<td>118. 58, 85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βούδαλλον</td>
<td>27. 145.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βρόμησος</td>
<td>39. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γιάστρων</td>
<td>167.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίσκος</td>
<td>149.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δάλλον 81. 15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>89. 8; 110. 66, 68, 100, 104; 123.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>44. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>111. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>47. 2, 34; 52. 14; 57. 2; 88. 23; 110. 78; 111. 33, 37; 112. 30; 123.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>95. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>112. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>51. 1, 5; 52. 1; 53. 1; 54. 1; 108. 6; 130; 167-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>121. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>112. 4, 38, 52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας 58. 5; 117.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>90. 6, et saep.; 93. 1; 103. 6; 104. 2, 7; 108. 3; 165.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>81. 15; 112. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>89. 9; 118. 56, 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαλίνας</td>
<td>31. 10; 68. 4; 84 (a), 13, 14, 31;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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93. 8; 96. 34; 98. 2, 11; 110. 87, 99 (?); 112. 57.
Διονυσίδροις 57. 1; 58. 2; 96. 12 et saep.; 147.
Διόνυσος 121. 10.
Διονυσίδροις 81. 16.
Δέξιας 112. 13, 94.
Διόκερας 96. 15, 32.
Δίκηρος 76. 1, 12; 86. 14; 111. 35; 129.
Δριμύτωρ 90. 2.
Δρυίδος 34. 2; 71. 4; 73. 1, 4; 73. 1, 4, 18; 78. 18; 106. 9; 107. 4, 8; 118. 27; 136-42.
Δωδεκάδες 90. 2.
Δ'Εβρίζωμεν 81. 18.
Δ'Ελληνες 27. 93.
Δ'Ερινῆς 112. 24.
Δ'Ετυρὸς (=Ευτύρος?) 112. 51.
Δ'Εστια 98. 14.
Δ'Εμνιός (?) 112. 45.
Δ'Επιμένης 90. 26; 81. 7; 84 (a). 2 et saep.; 148.
Δ'Εσαχυρής 80. 1, 6; 154-5.
Δ'Ερικαμος (?) 110. 3.
Δ'Ερυμέων 110. 94.
Δ'Εστιάς 112. 51.
Δ'Εθύγις 91. 16; 118. 26.
Δ'Ευξύμης 90. 4.
Δ'Εδέξας 90. 1, 6.
Δ'Ευξύμης 90. 9.
Δ'Ειγανίνης 90. 6 et saep.
Δ'Ερυμός 53. 19.
Δ'Εσπάλκορος 165.
Δ'Ευγνώμονα 76. 1; 91. 1 et saep.; 103. 8; 104. 1, 6; 185.
Δ'Ευμαγέων 89. 19.
Δ'Ευμυχανός 183.
Δ'Ευφράνωρ 38. 1, 19; 68. 11; 100. 10; 101. 4.
Δ'Ευφράνωρ 89. 7, 14, 15, 16.
Δ'Ευράξιος 54. 11.
Δ'Ευριδίκων 111. 29.
Δ'Ευρισκότας 59. 1; 60. 1; 107. 5; 120. 14; 124-7.
Δ'Ευρυχόρος (?) 81. 18.
Δ'Ευρύκλεος (?) 70 (a). 1, 3; 74. 6; 78. 3, 13, 24; 88. 6; 89. 7; 91. 15; 94. 14, 16. 17; 96. 5, 13, 21, 30; 102. 1, 6; 103. 7; 105. 4; 110. 86; 121. 12 (?) 124; 158.
Δ'Ευαντιών 76. 1.
Δ'Ηγαμός 92. 10.
Δ'Ημηρος 27. 69, 112.
Δ'Ιμακλήσιος 79. 1, 9; 84 (a). 15 (?) 87. 1; 111. 6; 121. 21, 28, 46; 143.
Δ'Ιμπέκλεος 189; 142.
Δ'Ιμπέκλεος 32. 2; 37. 6, 14; 110. 61, 70.
Δ'Ιμπέκλεως 110. 85; 160.
Δ'Ιμπέκλής 72. 2.
Δ'Ιμπέκλος 112. 8.
Δ'Θαμνόμεν 110. 2.
Δ'Ωνομάς 112. 79.
Δ'Ωθείς 112. 39.
Δ'Ωθύρον 116. 2.
Δ'Αθηναίος 89. 6, 12, 14, 16.
Δ'Αθρόων 50. 1, 9; 53. 5; 75. 1; 105. 1; 108. 4; 117. 15; 118. 3. Θ'Αθρόων 63. 19.
Δ'Αθρόων 118. 11.
Δ'Αθρόων 103. 2; 111. 25.
Δ'Αθρόων ως 118. 6. Θ'Αθρόων 110. 64, 65.
Δ'Αθρόων 110. 52, 84.
Δ'Αθρόων 111. 11. 32 (?).
Δ'Αθρόων 112. 44.
Δ'Αθρόων 115. 48, 61, 77.
Δ'Αθρόων 118. 68, 22.
Δ'Αθρόων 87. 19.
Δ'Αθρόων 68. 5; 72. 17; 112. 2, 15, 16 (?), 43; 118. 46, 64, 72; 104.
Δ'Αθρόων 31. 1 et saep.
Δ'Αθρόων 35. 3.
Δ'Ανασκαλόμεν 171.
Δ'Ανάσων 118. 2, 7.
Δ'Ανάσων 56. 4.
Δ'Ανάσων 72. 17; 131.
Δ'Ανάσων 115. 21, 36.
Δ'Ανάσων 52. 21; 91. 15; 110. 69, 96, 108 (?).
Δ'Ανάσων 121. 1 (?).
Δ'Αυξανόμεν 110. 80 (?).
Δ'Αυξανόμεν 121. 10.
Δ'Αυξανόμεν 27. 205.
Δ'Αυξανόμεν 82. 15.
Δ'Αυξανόμεν 119. 42, 79.
Δ'Αυξανόμεν 27. 86.
INDICES

Λίχας 81. 18.
Δυκίνας 94. 6.
Δυκόκλητος 110. 91.
Δυκόμηθος 47. 31.
Δυσανίας 47. 26; 49. 11.
Δυσίμαχος 45. 1, 26; 46. 1, 22; 47. 1, 38;
48. 1; 49. 3; 50. 6.

Μίγων 94. 8.
Μακδωνίης 118. 38, 53, 68.
Μανέθους 72. 6.
Μαρατας 130.
Μελάνθεος 111. 2, 25; 118. 44, 70.
Μελ. νος (?) 84 (a). 13, 30.
Μενεκράτης 143.
Μενελάος 84 (a). 1, 16.
Μενίμαχος 32. 18.
Μένιππος 32. 18.
Μενίκεος 87. 3.
Μάκων 30. 22; 53. 11; 128.
Μεσωνίδης 124-6.
Μησδάρας 110. 58.
Μέστης 112. 19, 67; 152.
Μεσσέας 97. 8.
Μεσάνων 41. 3; 92. 10.
Μησσειτράτη 92. 5.
Μησσειστρατος 110. 43.
Μερρινὴ 118. 57, 84.
Μερτοῦς 111. 35.

Νεότης 110. 44.
Νεόφηλης 110. 45 (†).
Νεωστέλεμος 98. 7.
Νέατωρ 130.
Νεξθρεμήθης 98. 3, 15.
Νεξθρεμείας 72. 10, 14, 17.
Νεξθρεμίας 111. 39.
Νεξθροφίας 67. 27.
Νεξθρόφης 118. 10.
Νίκαιος 63. 3.
Νίκανθος 123.
Νικάνωρ 30. 3; 81. 1, 5, 21; 91. 16; 115. 2.
Νικαρχες 31. 11, 21.
Νίκας 78. 1; 118. 51, 75.
Νικόδειος 98. 12, 29, 35.
Νικόδημος 110. 60, 75, 105.
Νικόδημος 98. 10; 107. 3; 111. 20; 130-9;
141-2; 160.
Νικόστρατος 59. 11; 56. 5.
Ναβάρχης 74. 1.
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Πέτερης 53. 6.
Πετερένιονε 67. 7; 68. 5; 75. 3.
Πετεριπα 121. 15.
Πετερνούσης 67. 24.
Πετερματίδης 52. 16.
Πετερχών p. 6.
Πετή 35. 3.
Πετοβάστις 112. 54; 118. 25.
Πετομαχίς (τ) 53. 21.
Πετοταίρες 35. 2, 11; 52. 20, 22; 53. 21;
61. 5; 67. 20, 25; 68. 19, 23; 72. 1,
4; 75. 2; 112. 5, 59; 131; 136-7;
139; 141; 164.
Πετούτα 54. 5; 112. 26.
Πευκερίας 53. 16.
Πλάτων 101. 4; 118. 52, 80.
Πλούταρχος 66. 1; 64. 1, 26; 110. 7, 13,
35. 42; 159.
Πολύς 52. 18.
Πολύς 72. 17.
Πολύφορος p. 4.
Πολύκως 35. 2; 118. 5, 6.
Πολύμαρχος 112. 7, 9.
Πολυμακράτης 88. 4; 145.
Πολύς 40. 1; 41. 1; 110. 1; 118. 3; 157.
Πολυάρις 111. 11.
Πόλη 121. 6 (?).
Πολύνασος 91. 14; 118. 4.
Πολύσαρχος 111. 15.
Πολυκλής 94. 13, 17.
Πολύμας 111. 11.
Πόρος 148.
Ποστειδόνας 112. 41; 122.
Ποσώς 118. 43, 65, 82.
Ποσημίων 52. 26.
Ποσημίων 78. 3, 14.
Ποσημίων 27. 85.
Ποσημίων 63. 6.
Ποσημίων 66. 1.
Ποσημίων 99. 10; 167.
Ποσημίων 43. 4, 13.
Πολεμαῖος 37. 3, 11; 51. 1, 7; 52. 1, 26;
53. 1; 54. 1, 33; 55. 1, 8; 56. 1, 11;
57. 1, 5; 58. 1; 59. 1, 14; 60. 1, 11;
61. 1; 62. 1, 17; 70 (α) 3; 79. 1; 111. 8;
112. 84; 130; 132; 160; 167-8.
Πολέμαχος 90. 4.
Ποιγιόν 89. 3.
Σάτοκες 36. 3, 9; 112. 81, 83.
INDICES

Σεμβρέως 68. 21 ; 72. 5, 11 ; 74. 2 ; 94. 18.
Σέμως 101. 2.
Σεμπλεύς 54. 22 ; 94. 10 ; 132.
Σενύρας 112. 50.
Σενχίς 61. 6.
Σίμως 92. 9, 10 ; 110. 3 ; 129.
Σίμων 118. 60.
Σιώδης 53. 20 ; 67. 23 ; 118. 12.
Σιωβάνιος 85. 9.
Στιαλής 81. 7.
Σκύθης 55. 1.
Σκοπέων 138.
Σκωνίφρος (?) 35. 1.
Σκυτείς 118. 11.
Σκυτωλήγα 149.
Σπαράς 47. 27.
Σπανιάδος 30. 23.
Σπάσαντος 84 (a). 14.
Σπαστός 82. 24 ; 123.
Σφαντάρας 112. 9.
Σφαίρος 61. 9.
Σφαίροφις 111. 16.
Σφάτηρος 98. 5, 10–12.
Σαρμάδης 106. 6 ; 107. 6 ; 136–41.
Σαρμάτης 53. 20.
Σαρπάτης 85. 14 ; 99. 8.
Σαρπάτος 58. 4.
Σαρπάτης 135.
Σαρπάτως 67. 27.
Σαρπατόν 112. 27.
Σάρας 53. 16 ; 55. 7 ; 67. 25 ; 74. 2 ; 80. 7, 112. 29, 30 ; 121. 7.
Σαμβακός 32. 1.
Σαμβέλος 111. 23.
Σαμβάτης 63. 21.
Σαμμαθή 84 (a). 2 et saec., 92. 9.
Σαμμαθίτης 76. 2 ; 110. 74, 110 ; 118. 5.
Σαμπόρας 98. 2 ; 108. 36 (?) 5.
Σαμανάς 108. 3, 10.

Πεπράξες 92. 6 ; 110. 26 (?).
Τιάς 62. 5.
Τσελέγους (?) 112. 43.
Τοτόης 113. 15.
Τ. .. απίς 85. 7.

Φανής 112. 75.
Φανής 110. 63, 73, 98.
Φανής 52. 20.
Φα. .. ακουστής 112. 79.
Φιθέως 53. 8.
Φιλάμμων 75. 4.
Φιλήμων 70 (a). 8.
Φιλήμων 112. 55.
Φιλίππος 62. 1 ; 117. 12.
Φιλικος 30. 23.
Φιλικός 110. 10, 29.
Φιλάκος 75. 5 ; 124 : 130.
Φιλός 47. 26, 27 ; 49. 10 ; 52. 14 ; 90. 6.
22 ; 95. 4 ; 96. 35 ; 111. 26 ; 112. 96.

Λυξίνης 81. 16.
Λυξίνης 184.
Λυξίνης 82. 2.
Λυξίνης (?) 27. 64.
Λυξίνης 110. 61, 70.
Λυξίνης (?) 98. 8.

Χαρήμων 80. 1, 6 ; 154–5.
Χαρέας 85. 6.
Χαρικήρης 152.
Χελ. .. οικιάς 110. 59.
Χερσάμην 72. 5 et saec.
Χ. .. μοι 105. 3.

Ψευχώνυμος 112. 48, 92.
Ψευχώνυμος 64. 10.
Ψυχάς 112. 80.
Ψυχάτρος 164.
Ψωμῆς 132.

οις 39. 4, 7 ; 52. 15 ; 53. 9, 20 ; 68. 19.
70 (a). 7 ; 74. 1 ; 80. 7, 15 ; 94. 10, 19 ; 108. 5 ; 110. 99 ; 112. 31, 67, 74 ; 122.

απίς 102. 11.
[
ι] κρισίς 90. 21.
ι] κρις 52. 31. Cf. 112. 15.
V. GEOGRAPHICAL

(a) COUNTRIES, NOMES, TOPARCHIES, CITIES.

Θανάτος 84 (a). 2, 17.
Αλέγνατος 27. 92; 32. 14, 16; 70 (δ); 19; 93. 6.
'Αλεξάνδρεια 57. 2; 98. 16, 20; 110. 22, 25; 158. ἢ πόλις 110. 31.
'Ἀπόλλωνες πόλεις ἡ μεγάλη 110. 82.
'Αράβος 36. 6, 11.
Ἀρσινή 82. 16; 110. 87.
'Αφροδίσι τόπος 134.
'Αφροδίτισσας 38. 6; 71. 13.
Βαρκάδας 52. 12; 91. 16.
Βαϊνώτους 96. 15, 32.
'Ερέτρειες 70 (α). 9.
'Ερμοπόλεις 110. 86.
'Ερυθρά 96. 13, 31.
'Εσπερίτις 91. 16.
'Ηρακλείδου (μερίς) 81. 7; 183.
'Ηρακλεόπολεις πόλεις 3 (β); 70 (δ). 1; 71. 14; 80. 3, 8; 82. 9; 110. 72, 78; 163.
'Ηρακλίδου τόπος 30. 25; 92. 12; 93. 3; 171.
Θά... στὰς 110. 93, 102.
Θεμίστου (μερίς) 81, introd., 15.
Θεσσαλία 110. 80, 86.
Θραξ 30. 22; 33. 5, 12; 37. 3, 11; 90. 23; 92. 9, 10, 94. 13, 17.
'Ιωνίας 96. 4, 21.
Κέδρος (β) p. 6.
Κρήτη 82. 11 (β); 110. 58, 104.
Κρωκίτης 96. 12, 30.
Κυκάδων πόλεις 114. 6.
Κυρηναίος 34. 2; 52. 13, 14; 86. 23; 89.
6; 90. 21, 23; 91. 14; 94. 16 (β); 99, 17; 102. 1, 6 (γ); 124.
Καλλιτής 33. 8, 16; 66. 7; 78. 14; 86. 5, 96. 3, 19; 106. 4, 117. 2. κάτω Καλλιτής p. 8.
Κάπας 30. 21.
Μακεδόν 30. 2, 3, 14; 32. 6; 90. 6; 110. 62, 71.
Μέδεις p. 8; 95. 6; 110. 24.
Μεμφίτης 98. 14.
Μυσός 32. 19; 129.
νομαρχία (β) 74. 6.
'Οξυγμητής 78. 12; 83. 3; 89, 6, 90. 4, 7; 92. 8; 95. 7, 127.
'Οξύγμηκχων πόλεις 62. 15; 89. 13; 95. 5, 8; 168. (α) πόλεις 43. 3; 49. 15; 111. 24.
Περαιγέπτωτος 70 (δ). 7.
Πέρας 90. 22 (β); 93. 1; 112. 40; 124.
Πολύμωνος (μερίς) 81. 8, 17.
πόλις = 'Αλεξάνδρεια 110. 31. = 'Οξύγμηκχων πόλεις 43. 5; 49. 15; 111. 24.
Σάου 27. 19, 76, 165.
Σαίτης 27. 21.
Σινωπεῖον 70 (α). 4.
Σεκείδα 110. 25, 31.
τοπορχία, "Αγγα (β) (Heracleopolite) 101. 3. ἡ κάτω τοπ. (Oxyrhynchite) 34. 1; 52. 4; 73. 10; 85. 10; 169. ἡ κάτω 44. 10.
Φρύγιος 54. 6.
Χαλκιδεῖς 84 (α). 2, 18; 90. 22; 96. 12, 29.

(β) VILLAGES.

1. Arsinoite.

Βούδαστος 81. 7.
'Ηράκλεια 81. 14.
Θεσσάλιος 81. 8.
'Ιρά Νήσος 63. 19; 80. 4, 9; 81. 17; 110. 21, 22.

Σεβείωτος 133.
Τεθέντος 81. 9.
Τεθέντος 81. introd.
2. Heracleopolite. (Villages in the Κωστης τόπος are marked by an asterisk.)

"Αγκυρών πόλει 67. 4; 112. 74; 117. 15.
"Αγκυρώνων p. 8.
'Αλλάια p. 8.
*Ανατέντ p. 100. 12.
*Ασσια p. 8; 112. 5, 12, 52; 117. 12.

Βουϊνίρι p. 8; 116. 2.

Θελβόνθε p. 8.
Θομοντά p. 8.
Θομοντάμα 80. 7. Τιμων. 163.
Θομοντάς p. 8.
*Θομοντάς 112. 56, 88.
*Θομοντάς 112. 39.

*Ιππώνων p. 8.

*Κερκόστ p. 112. 2, 6, 81.
*Κερκοστάς p. 8.
*Κεφάλαι 71. 7.
*Κία p. 8; 56. 6; 123.
Κολανοφ(?) p. 8.
Κόπα p. 8.
Κοΐκια p. 8.

*Μούχηθα( ) p. 8.
*Μούχης p. 8; 112. 27 (?), 45 (?).

Νίσος p. 8.
Νορίς p. 8.

Πενεάδα p. 8.
Πενείβα p. 8.
*Περάδ p. 8; 84 (σ). 7, 22; 112. 14.

*Περάχθ p. 112. 46.
Πεταχ( ) p. 8.

Σιλά p. 8.
*Σισίνη 101. 6.
Σόλιθα p. 8.

*Σαμωρον p. 8.
*Σαλή (Σαλη) p. 8; 36. 3. 8; 37. 4, 12;
75. 1, 5; 106. 7; 107. 6; 117. 8; 139;
144; 157.
Τάει p. 8.
Τεροπή p. 8.
Τεροπή( ) p. 8.
Τεροπή( ) p. 8.
Τέχθων p. 8.
*Τοτεσάνο (? ) 112. 43.
Τοτούς p. 8.
Τοσάκ( ) p. 8.

*Φεξίχ p. 8; 72. 2; 88. 5; 96. 3, 19;
106. 3; 107. 3; 110. 36; 112. 4 et sacr.;
117. 15; 131.; 136; 138–9.
*Φίλονικον pp. 4, 8.
Φεμίς p. 8.
*Φύς 102. 2.

*Χαλβάτσιμος 68. 3; 112. 26, 86.
Χάννα p. 8.

*Ψεβίονεμέθ (Ψεβ. ) p. 8; 33. 7, 15; 112. 25 (?).
*Ψελπάχος 112. 36.
*Ψέχ p. 8; 112. 11, 57; 117. 8, 10.

3. Hermopolite?

"Αλαβιότρων πόλει 78. 8.

4. Oxyrhynchite.

Δικομία 47. 29.

Θωλθύ 52. 2; 53. 5; 62. 9; 89. 5; 90. 4;
94. 9, 11, 19; 111. 27, 28; 127; 130.

Μένα 90. 7.
Μούχαρνω (–ων) 53. 19, 21, 22; 92. 8; 132.

Πολλ 43. 3.
VI. RELIGION

5. Indeterminate.

Γερνισκεῖνς (? p. 4.

(c) MISCELLANEOUS.

'Ἡρακλεῖον 77. 1; 110. 5.
Ἰσιδών 167. Cf. 112. 51.

(d) κλῆροι.

'Αλεξάνδρου, 39. 9; 100. 11.
'Ἀπαξλαστάτου 53. 18; 119. 1; 130.
Βρομένου 39. 10.
'Ἡρακλείου 130.
'Ἡρακλεῖτου 37. 6, 14.
Θεσσάλου 118. 3.
Θεοκ[ 118. 11.
Θεοχρήστου 118. 6.
'Ιάσονος 118. 2, 7.
Καλλιστράτου 117. 9.
Κυδριών 53. 14; 130.

(e) DEME.

Καστόριας 32. 3.

VI. RELIGION.

(a) GODS.

'Αθηνᾶ 27. 77. 166.
'Αμιν 112. 90.
'Απαξλαστάτου 27. 173.
'Ἀπόλλων 27. 186.
Βουθάστης 27. 145.
εδω ? 27. 93.
'Ἡρα 27. 112; cf. 27. 69.
'Ἡρακλῆς Εὐθείας 72. 2.

θεϊς 77. 4, 7; 79. 6. Cf. Index II.
Θυήμας 35. 3.

'Ισις 27. 205.
'Ισθίμων 27. 86.

Προφητεύς 27. 85.

Πτωράπος 27. 64.
(b) Priests and Priestesses.

ιερεύς 52. 18; 72. 2, 16; 85. 8; ιερεύς (sc. 'Αλεξάνδρων), Μενελάος Λυμάχων (5th Soter) 84 (a). I, 16. Λυμάχων (7) 'Απολλώ (7th or 4th Philad.) 97. 2. ... Καλλιμήδους (12th Philad.) 110. 40. Νεα[...]. οικίας (13th Philad.) 110. 44. Φίλικος Σπουδαίος (B.C. 300–271) 30. 23. ιερεύς 'Αλεξάνδρων καὶ θεὸν 'Αδελφών, Πάτρουλος Πάτρων (15th Philad.) 99. 3; 128. Πλοῦς 'Αλεξάνδρων (22nd Philad.) 92. 22. Κυνᾶς 'Αλεξάνδρου (23rd Philad.) 88. 2. 'Αριστοκόντων Περίλαύο (24th Philad.) 85. 3; 150. Name lost (26th Philad.) 96. 2, 17. ... Δικίων (29th Philad.) 94. 5. 'Αριστοκόντων ... e ... (29th Philad.) 95. 2. Νεαστόλεμος Φρείου (?) (34th Philad.) 98. 7. 'Αρχέ- [λαος Δίμων] (3rd Euer.) 145. ιερεύς 'Αλεξ., καὶ θεῶν 'Αδελ., καὶ θεῶν 'Εδεργετών, 'Αριστοδάουνος Διοδότου (5th Euer.) 171.

κανθάμενος Αρανίας Φαλαδίφου, Μνησιμαδή Τεμάρχου (22nd Philad.) 92. 5. ... Πολεμοκράτους (23rd Philad.) 88. 4. Χαρία 'Απίου (24th Philad.) 85. 5; 150. Name lost (26th Philad.) 96. 2, 17. Φιλοτέρα ... (16th–27th Philad.) 134. Νύμφη Μάγνως (28th Philad.) 94. 7. Δημοκινή Φίλωνος (29th Philad.) 95. 3. 'Αριστοκός Νικολάου (34th Philad.) 98. 9. ['Αρανίας] Πολεμο- κράτους (?) (3rd Euer.) 145. 'Ιαμνέα 'Υπό ... (5th Euer.) 171. 'Αριστοκράτη Κτιστικέλων (8th Euer.) 89. 4. Βερενίκη Πυθαγούλου (25th Euer.) 90. 3.

Παστοφόρος 77. 2; cf. 87. 6.

(c) Miscellaneous.

άδυτον 72. 10, 15, 18.

gενεθλία 'Ισίως 27. 205.

ἐορτή 27. 47, 53, 64, 85, 93, 145, 150, 154, 173, 186.

Παναγύρι 27. 76, 165.

VII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TITLES.

ἄντιγραφεὺς 29. 8, 27, 32; 110. 28.

ἀρχηγολοικὴς 73. 10.

βασιλικὸς γραμματέως 72. 8; 98. 3, 15; 108. 3; 153; 156.

γραμματέως 74. 6; 82. 26. βασιλικὸς γρ. See βασιλικὸς. γρ. ἀνδραπόδων 29. 7. γρ. κληρονόμος 82. 15.

ἐκακόν 30. 13; 81. 16, 18; 90. 6; 91. 15; 98. 5; 103. 7.

dioikημενος, ὁ πρὸς τῇ διοκ., Τεκτάνδρος 109. 4, 11.

dioikητής, Ἀπολλώνιος 44. 3, 8; 95. 11; 110. 53, 56, 68, 94, 103, 112. δυτίκος 133 (?) δοκιμαστὴς 29. 19; 41. 3; 108. 5; 107. 6; 108. 4; 109. 7; 138–42.

ἱεράς 72. 4.

εὐγεμών 44. 2.

θησαυρός, ὁ πρὸς τοὺς θη. 117. 2.
VIII. WEIGHTS, MEASURES, COINS

(a) Weights and Measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. 21</td>
<td>30. 6; 33. 5; 52. 12; 89. 7; 90. 21; 91. 14; 94. 16; 97. 7; 102. 1; 124.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. 3</td>
<td>143.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. 5</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. 9; 88. 6; 75. 7; 103. 8; 165.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. 9; 15; 168.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. 18; 44. 1; 61, 12; 70 (b). 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. 16 (?.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. 6 (?.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. 12; 99. 7; 107. 5; 108. 2; 109. 1; 110. 87; 116. introd.; 131; 153; 168.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133; 169.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. 19 et sacf.; 53. 5 et sacf.; 70 (a). 5; 70 (b). 3; 75. 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. 3; 53. 7; 17; 64. 4; 5; 65. 6; 11; 19; 24; 74. 2 et sacf; 76. 6; 9; 83. 6; 7; 54 (a). 3; 8; 18; 24; 86. 1, 11, 16; 90. 9; 14; 91. 10; 11; 98. 5; 18; 99. 11; 13; 14, 15; 100. 6, 13; 101. 8; 102. 2, 4, 7; 110. 1 et sacf.; 122; 124-6; 129; 156-7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 6, 7, 16, 18; 80. 4, 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Coins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. 9</td>
<td>11; 46. 17; 51. 2; 58. 7; 70 (a). 10; 59. 8; 90. 19; 91. 7; 110. 6, 12; 110. 20; 112. 42; 55; 113. 19; 118. 89; 127. 4; 153.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29. 11 | 23; 35-6; 30. 5; 16; 20; 31. 7; 8; 18; 32. 9, 10; 34. 3; 38. 6; 12; 37. 8, 16; 40. 11; 41. 6; 20; 46. 6; 7; 51. 6; 52. 12 et sacf.; 53. 5 et sacf.;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56. 7</td>
<td>58. 7; 60. 5; 63. 16, 19, 20; 64. 8, 14; 65. 24; 67. 13 et saep.; 68. 8; 70 (a). 11; 70 (b). 9; 84 (a). 8, 24; 58. 12; 88. 8; 89. 9, 16; 90. 15, 19; 91. 7; 92. 15, 19; 94. 1, 14, 19; 95. 13; 99. 15; 102. 2, 4, 7, 10; 104. 4, 5; 9–11; 106. 1, 8; 107. 1, 7; 110, introd. et saep.; 111. 12 et saep.; 114. 3 et saep.; 115. 8 et saep.; 116, introd., et saep.; 121. 2 et saep.; 124–6; 136–42; 160; 163–4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. 1</td>
<td>(σναχεμένω) 68. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. 20</td>
<td>(σναχεμένω) 51. 6; 52. 12, 18; 53. 9, 22, 24; 68. 18; 104. 4, 9; 110. introd. et saep.; 111. 4, 34; 112. 13 et saep.; 113. 7 et saep.; 114. 5, 23; 115. 6 et saep.; 116. 6 et saep.; 121. 20 et saep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. 9</td>
<td>μω 88. 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**IX. TAXES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Taxa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112. 3</td>
<td>ἀλική</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. 15, 22</td>
<td>ἀλλαγή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. 20</td>
<td>αρ. [.] κοινον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. 7</td>
<td>βαλανίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. 9b</td>
<td>βαλανίων τρίτη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. 1</td>
<td>γνήμενα, τά γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. 23, 24, 26</td>
<td>γραμματικόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. 1</td>
<td>δεκάτη μόσχων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. 1</td>
<td>διανοηητή (ψ' καὶ σ')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. 14</td>
<td>διάμετρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. 4, 10</td>
<td>διάμετρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 24</td>
<td>δοκιμαστικόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. 30</td>
<td>διδασκαλία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. 1</td>
<td>δωρά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. 2</td>
<td>εἰκοστή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 (a). 11</td>
<td>70 (b). 9; 183. εἰκ. ἐρέων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. 20</td>
<td>εἰκοστή (ψ' καὶ σ') 66. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. 3, 10</td>
<td>ἐκτη 109. 3, 10. ἐκτη Φιλαδέλφεις 132.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. 12</td>
<td>ἀλακή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. 2, 39, 74</td>
<td>ἀλανόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. 14</td>
<td>ἐπόμον όν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. 6</td>
<td>ἐπιλαλαγή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. 9, 18, 20</td>
<td>ἐπαρκοτρίχων 112. 13, 27, 44, 50, 61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. 9</td>
<td>ἐπιδέκατον 32. 9; 92. 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. 7</td>
<td>ζυγηρά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. 6</td>
<td>112. 11, 25, 26; 113. 11; 133; 138–42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. 2</td>
<td>ιατρικόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. 9</td>
<td>ἱππιατρικόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. 21</td>
<td>ἱππών 104. 5, 11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X. GENERAL INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λογία</td>
<td>397.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χλωρίων</td>
<td>51.2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαδράσης</td>
<td>74.3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνωθεν</td>
<td>54.2, 11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλήλων</td>
<td>63.12, 96.5, 6, 8, 22, 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>άγραφος</td>
<td>85.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άγνωστοι</td>
<td>27.48, 54, 82, 55.3, 64.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άγνωστός</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άγροι</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άγοράζων</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άγοραμάνων</td>
<td>29.3, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άδικείς</td>
<td>34.1, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άδικας</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άδολος</td>
<td>85.17, 86.6, 90.10, 91.2, 99.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άδυτον</td>
<td>72.10, 15, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντίς</td>
<td>27.107, 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αίζε</td>
<td>37.6, 15, 120.3, 13, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αίζε</td>
<td>27.88, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αίτων</td>
<td>113.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αίτια</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αίτους</td>
<td>73.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ανεπιστάτας</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ανευόν</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκριβῶς</td>
<td>40.7, ἄκριβεστατα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκριβογύμος</td>
<td>27.56 el saep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκέφαλος</td>
<td>29.28, 93.8, 96.10, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκέφαλα</td>
<td>27.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκέφαλής</td>
<td>38.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀληθής</td>
<td>112.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλακτήθηκα</td>
<td>148.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλαγή</td>
<td>87.15, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλάλων</td>
<td>63.12, 96.5, 6, 8, 22, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταπεινωθάντων</td>
<td>112.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέλος</td>
<td>29.3, 7, 24, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τελωνία</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τετάρτη</td>
<td>112.45, 47, 59, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τετρακαιεκατόρτη</td>
<td>(κ’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τετρακαιεκατόρτη</td>
<td>(sic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| τετρακαιεκατόρτη | (sic) | tetra-
| κατόν | 95.7, 10 |
| τετράφρυς | 104.3, 9 |
| τριτή | 118.1 |
| φακός | 112.77 |
| φόρος | 35.6 |
| φολακτικόν | 103.10 |
| φολακτικόν | 110.22, 37 |
| χλωρίων | 112.9 |
| λογία | χλ. | 51.2, 5 |
| χωρακτικόν | 45.23 |
| έλλ. | 112.13 el saep |
| 119.22 |
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90. 14. 18; 91. 6; 92. 15; 102. 4. 9; 124; 148.

ἀποχή 162.

ἀποκρήμα 52. 7.

ἀρακός 52. 22 et saep.; 53. 16 et saep.; 65.

7. 19.

ἀργυρί. See Index VIII (b).

ἀράσκευς 148 (?).

ἀρεστός 51. 3.

ἀρθιμός 47. 11; 111. 16.

Ἀρτακώρος 27. 56, 161, 202.

ἀρόσ 32. 11.

ἀρωμα. See Index VIII (a).

ἀρρωστένος 73. 15.

ἀρτάφη. See Index VIII (a).

ἀρτος 121. 31.

ἀρχαῖον 30. 19; 92. 15.

ἀρχασθα 27. 91, 125, 126, 191. • ἀρχὴ 29. 20.

ἀρχηρεῖξ. See Index VI (b).

ἀρχιφολάκη 73. 10.

ἀσθενεῖν 118. 17.

ἀστειώτατος 54. 16.

ἀστρολόγος 27. 43.

ἀστρον 27. 46, 51.

ἀσφαλῶς 53. 3. 130. ἀσφαλέστατα 52. 8.

ἀτοκός 89. 8.

ἀυλή 36. 4. 10; 157.

ἀυλητής 54. 4.

ἀυλός 54. 6.

ἀφαίρετι 63. 16; 73. 14.

ἀφαρμαί 127. 4.

ἀφημενεύειν 148.

ἀφετέρου 41. 6.

ἀχρίδος 159.

ἀώλιον 100. 3.

βαλανίκον 108. 7; 112. 96; 116. 1; 121. 53.

βασιλεύων. See Index II.

βασιλεὺς. See Index II.

βασιλικός. (ῥ) ἤσσ. 47. 24; 50. 3; 51. 6;

67. 11; 68. 7, 14; 81. 6, 14; 98. 17;

166. πρὸς βασιλικό 93. 11; 94. 3, 15;

95. 14; 124; 126. ἤσσ. ἀποδοχία 85.

20. ἤσσ. γῆ 52. 3. ἤσσ. γραμματεία. See

Index VII. ἤσσ. κλήρος 85. 13; 101. 5;

113. 35. ἤσσ. κοσματόν 39. 5. ἤσσ. κόλυμα

90. 19; 91. 8. ἤσσ. μέτρον 84 (a). 6,

22; 86. 6, 21; 124; 129. ἤσσ. τραπέζα

29. 39, 40; 41. 25 (?).
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θέμα 100. 13.
θεσμόν 90. 17, 18; 91. 6.
θλή 34. 5; 73. 19; 111. 3.
θηλίου 48. 6.
θίας 49. 8.
θάλας 29. 3.
θάλαττα 35. 5.
θορίο 27. 59.
θων 112. 22.
θωλίσθαι 30. 18; 72. 6, 7; 84 (a). 10, 26.
θραδύτρον 55. 5.
θρέχειν 90. 8.
θνο( ) 67. 13; 68. 7, 17, 19.

γενίθλα 27. 205.
γεωμετρία 90. 8.
γεωργείν 101. 5; 112. 41.
γεωργός 52. 32; 113. 18.
γη 27. 72, 79, 87; 52. 4; 85. 22; 90. 11.
γύρεσθαι 27. 72, 78, 87, 121, 123; 28. 1,
16; 29. 6; 31. 11, 22; 38. 6; 40. 5;
47. 18; 51. 5; 52. 10; 71. 2; 73. 18;
74. 3, 4, 5; 90. 11, 20; 91. 8, 9; 92. 20; 105. 4; 110. 8, 35; 111. 34; 114. 10, 18, 22; 115. 4, 18, 23, 36.

gνάφι 148.
gνάμων 27. 28.
gναρτίζειν 28. 6.
gνδος 92. 13.
gναγγέλλει 121. 55.
gνήστον (?) 52. 18.

γονείς 18. 14.

gράφειν 29. 8; 62. 11; 71. 8.
gραμματέας 82. 20.
gραμματέων 29. 9.
gραμματεῖς. See Index VII.
gράφειν 28. 3; 29. 7, 9, 32, 36, 41; 34. 3,
7, 12; 39. 13; 40. 3; 44. 1, 3; 45. 4,
7; 49. 6, 13; 51. 3; 64. 2, 20; 66. 3;
67. 32; 68. 11; 71. 5; 72. 6, 14. 16,
19; 73. 7, 17; 75. 2; 78. 2. 16; 82. 3,
11; 85. 11; 86. 26; 90. 14, 18; 91. 6;
92. 18; 115. 4, 23; 121. 2; 124. 124;
127. 5; 170.
gραφή 44. 4; 78. 18.

γην 54. 14.
gνεῖζειν 88. 5.
gνεῖτεν 89. 16.

δάνειον 36. 6, 12; 37. 6, 15.

dέγγυα 39. 15; 98. 17.
dεηκύναι 27. 25.
dεῖν 44. 5; 46. 13; 54. 8; 64. 5; 116. 5.
dεκαίος 186.
dεκαίον. See Index VII.
dεκάτη 115. 1.
dεκάριος 27. 110, 146.
dεξίος 38. 8.
dεξιματήριον 34. 2. 4, 8, 21; 73. 8.
dεξισθαί 70 (a). 2.
dεξιμέρος 53. 2.
dήμος 28. 13, 15, 17.
dημοσίων 65. 25.
dιαγγείσας 93. 10.
dιαγγέλλειν 34. 7, 9; 73. 13; 88. 14;
89. 18; 90. 16; 91. 13; 92 22; 116. introd.
dιαφέρειν 118. 3.
dιακοίτειν 54. 22.
dιακοισιστή (π') 68. 1.
dιακοίτειν 31. 3.
dιάλογος 122.
dιάλυεις 96. 5. 22.
dιάμετρα 110. 14.
dιασπορεῖειν 147.
dιάστομα 52. 9.
dιαστελεῖν 35. 5; 73. 19.
dιάχυμα 104. 4, 10.
dιάδοχοι 31. 4, 15; 40. 10; 42. 9; 44. 4;
46. 4; 48. 5, 10; 13; 54. 9; 58. 4;
64. 9; 67. 2; 68. 2; 72. 8; 78. 21;
82. 7; 90. 12; 110. 45; 113. 17; 118.
– 28; 159; 162.
dιήθην 27. 88.
dιηγεῖν 41. 4, 19; 48. 3; 52. 9; 53. 3.
dιηθένται 30. 19.
dιήθεις 34. 11; 85. 18; 90. 11; 91. 2.
dιηθμήρων 30. 25.
dεἰς 30. 20, 24; 92. 14.
dδα 30. 19.
dιοικητής 109. 5. 11.
dιοικητής. See Index VII.
dιορθούν 63. 13.
dιορίζεται 27. 30, 32, 222.
dδότα 72. 5.
dιπλαῖος 29. 1, 34; 148.
dδιώρως 118. 7, 14.
dδικεῖν 27. 37; 72. 13.
dδοκιμαστής. See Index VII.
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\[ \text{δοκιμαστικό}^{\text{α}} 29. 24; 110. 30. \]
\[ \text{δοχικό}^{\text{α}} 74. 2. \]
\[ \text{δραμή. See Index VIII (b).} \]
\[ \text{δύνασθαι 27. 34; 34. 19; 54. 25; 72. 7; 73. 12.} \]
\[ \text{εναστάσες 78. 15.} \]
\[ \text{εὔνωμα 27. 52 et saep.} \]
\[ \text{εὔνωμος 27. 45.} \]
\[ \text{διδασκάλους 27. 122.} \]
\[ \text{διδασκάλια 112. 6 et saep.} \]
\[ \text{διορισμός 27. 63, 209.} \]
\[ \text{ἐγγὺς 92. 14; 94. 18.} \]
\[ \text{ἐγγύση 112. 57 (b).} \]
\[ \text{ἐγγυόμονα 30. 10; 92. 8; 93. 2; 94. 9; 95. 6; 97. 3.} \]
\[ \text{ἐγκαλεῖν 31. 8, 19; 87. 14; 96. 6, 22.} \]
\[ \text{ἐγκλήμα 96. 6, 7, 8, 22, 24, 25.} \]
\[ \text{ἐθνοῖς 77. 5; 82. 27.} \]
\[ \text{ἐθνόποια 81. 3, 21.} \]
\[ \text{(εκκοσμείωσα) 87. 4.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκείστη 66. 2; 70 (a). 11; 70 (b). 9; 115. 20; 163.} \]
\[ \text{εἰσάγεναι 41. 7, 15; 46. 18.} \]
\[ \text{εἰσόδια 116, introd.} \]
\[ \text{εἰσπράσσειν 29. 36; 46. 11; 56. 4; 65. 23.} \]
\[ \text{εἰσφάρομεν 157.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκαστός 28. 9, 13; 29. 10; 67. 18; 84 (a). 8, 24; 86. 11; 88. 9, 10; 90. 15. 91. 11; 102. 4, 10; 124.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκάτερος 29. 36.} \]
\[ \text{(ἐκατοντάρφους) 110. 63, 71.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκατοστή (p') 66. 1.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκδολή 110. 9.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκεῖνος 151.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκεῖθεσις 29. 10.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκκειθαί 51. 6.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκλαμβάνει 66. 1; 84. 11; 95. 9, 10; 114. 2; 116, introd.; 133.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκμισθούν 31. 9, 20.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκπίπτει 78. 10.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκπολύει 30. 26.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκτη 108. 3, 10; 132.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκτιναί 27. 24; 29. 9.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκόντως 96. 10, 27.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκτισίς 93. 9; 94. 18; 116, introd.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκφάρον 85. 21, 26; 90. 8, 9; 99. 10; 100. 11; 119. 1.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλαία 49. 8, 12.} \]

\[ \text{ἐλαίες 113. 12.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλαχίστος 41. 22; 59. 7; 112. 2, 39, 74; 113. 14; 121. 15 et saep.; 131.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλασπώλης 53. 6.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλασυργός 43. 7.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλασύργος 43. 8.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλασύργος 28. 17; 118. 29.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλάχιστος 27. 35.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλέγχει 55. 3.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλέδέρος 29. 6.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλέφας 110. 79, 92, 102.} \]
\[ \text{ἐλεκτρισμός 83. 9.} \]
\[ \text{'Ελληνιστή 27. 27.} \]
\[ \text{ἐμπάλλελα 45. 7; 49. 4, 7; 54. 30; 63. 5; 98. 2, 12; 152.} \]
\[ \text{ἐμπορία 35. 9.} \]
\[ \text{ἐμφανίζεται 72. 4.} \]
\[ \text{ἐμπυγήν 89. 9.} \]
\[ \text{ἐνεχρύσια 32. 21.} \]
\[ \text{ἐνέχυρον 46. 14, 18.} \]
\[ \text{ἐναυτός 27. 48, 220; 28. 20; 90. 5.} \]
\[ \text{ἐνως 27. 53.} \]
\[ \text{(ἐντευκαεικοσιον)χ(άινκος) 85. 18.} \]
\[ \text{ἐνοίμα 152.} \]
\[ \text{ἐνοκλείων 56. 7.} \]
\[ \text{ἐνόχος 65. 22.} \]
\[ \text{ἐντευξις 57. 2.} \]
\[ \text{ἐντυγχάνει 151.} \]
\[ \text{ἐνώπιος 30. 25.} \]
\[ \text{ἐφώτη 27. 47 et saep.} \]
\[ \text{ἐφύτευ 27. 61; 34. 4, 10; 73. 11; 80. 2, 7; 82. 20.} \]
\[ \text{ἐξαδραχόμενος 51. 6.} \]
\[ \text{ἐξιδύ 29. 27; 65. 12; 96. 6, 23.} \]
\[ \text{ἐξομαίνει 32. 17.} \]
\[ \text{ἐξομολογεῖ 30. 18.} \]
\[ \text{ἐξουσία 29. 36; 148.} \]
\[ \text{ἐξω 34. 10; 93. 4.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπάγεις 32. 4.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπαγορεύει ἡμέρα 27. 201, 219.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπαλλαγή 51. 6; 68. 9, 18, 20.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπαναγέλζεις 34. 3, 5, 14; 73. 2.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπάνωγερον 47. 19.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπάνω ηζεὶ 31. 12, 23.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπάνως 96. 6, 23.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπαρθροῦς 112. 13, 27, 44, 50, 61.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπει 35. 11; 65. 12; 66. 2.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπείδη 28. 10; 34. 7.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπίρροχεσθαι 96. 7 et saep.} \]
\[ \text{ἐπερωτή 72. 15.} \]
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émuállelou 89. 10; 115. 3, 22; 116, introd.
émuóvp 30. 22; 32. 19; 34. 2; 37. 3, 11;
52. 13, 15, 24, 27; 86. 24; 90. 6, 24;
92. 9, 10, 11; 93. 2; 96. 4, 14, 15, 20,
31, 32; 120. 18; 124; 129.

émuádrëw 44. 3; 113. 5.
émukaxwou 32. 9; 92. 9.
émudíow 72. 2.
émía 84 (a). 5, 21.
émíkav 82. 5.
émíkástwv 159.
émíkav 48. 13.
émílgeu 78. 12.
émímela 41. 20.
émimélh 78. 7. émimélw 82. 10.
émínei 96. 10, 27.
émíndae 27. 10 et saep.
émírkev 163.
émíndvídże 49. 3.
émíntnáv 40. 6.
émíntáv 34. 2; 72. 4.
émíntlev 40. 5; 41. 16; 44. 5, 7.
émíntlev 34. 12; 44. 5; 45. 3; 47. 23; 51.
1; 57. 1; 58. 3; 59. 3; 61. 3; 71. 1, 4;
73. 16, 19; 81. 2, 21; 82. 7; 110. 51
et saep.
émíntíxev 34. 7.
émíntllev 27. 56 et saep.
émíntlevos 83. 10; 110. 10.
émíntmu 29. 14; 90. 19; 91. 7.
émíntpræev 41. 11.
émíntprévw 84 (a). 11, 27; 90. 20; 91. 13;
96. 7, 11, 24, 28.
émíntprévw 151.
émuáptw 121. 30.
émuon 27. 25; 113. 18.
ému 115. 20.
émuvos 32. 8.
émuov 121. 34.
émuov 121. 34.
émuvos 54. 18.
émuv 32. 11; 37. 7, 15; 120. 28.
émuxo 74. 4; 96. 9, 26.
émuw 27. 125.
émw 46. 16; 75. 2; 78. 6; 131.
émuxmázev 47. 23.
émuxmázev 44. 7.
eviów 45. 10.
evióso 48. 6; 118. 29.
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ідов 33. 7, 14; 86. 8; 90. 7, 12, 13; 105. 5; 157.
ідот. See Index VII.
ідостідіа 34. 7.
ір(Ì. г) 112. 89 (?).
іркл. See Index VI (b).
ірограматева 27. 44.
ірівіс. 35. 3, 5.
іріву 35. 7; 72. 5, 16; 77. 7; 93. 4; 157.
іларіко 105. 3; 143.
іма(тіо) 88. 8, 18, 20.
імакіса 54. 16.
іпіеві 81. 5, 13.
іпіотрікіі 45. 21.
іпост 104. 5, 11; 110, introd.; 118. 18, 19, 20, 32.
іпіострофія 162.
іпіміра 27. 63, 170, 209.
іпіспіс (тіо) 67. 12, 14, 22; 88. 8, 17, 18, 20.

іліда 27. 208; 41. 8; 74. 5; 77. 7.
ілісанг 49. 6, 13; 51. 3; 77. 4.
ілідехі 47. 15; 84 (а). 6, 21; 85. 16; 86. 5, 20; 87. 12; 90. 10; 98. 19; 129; 156.

ілідарис 119. 19.
іліхіам 112. 86.
іліхіам 47. 14 (?).
іліхіан 29. 21; 61. 3; 82. 14; 133.
іліді 44. 3; 69. 3; 67. 32.
іліхіеві 27. 70; 167.
іліхіос 54. 26.
іліхіщевін 59. 10.
іліхіщевін 62. 3.
іліхіо 90. 17.
іліхіо 27. 27, 85.
іліді 49. 12. іліді 63. 12; 64. 8; 65. 14; 66. 2; 72. 12; 82. 9, 17, 25; 127. 2; 131.
іліхіпір. See Index VI (b).

Ілігіві 27. 107.
ілігіві 47. 5; 90. 18; 91. 4.
ілігіві, ків 117. 7.
ілігівінлі 29. 6; 64. 17; 110. 42, 48.
ілігівін 49. 10.
ілігівін 32. 7.
ілігівін 33. 9.
ілігівін 27. 73; 79, 87.
ілігівін 161.
ілігівін 48. 12.

ілігівін 100. 4.
ілігівін 52. 3; 130.
ілігівін 27. 39 (?).
ілігівін 44. 4.
ілігівін 29. 3.
ілігівін 45. 22.
ілігівін 119. 4.
ілігівін 83. 8.
ілігівін 34. 1; 44. 10; 52. 4; 85. 10; 110. 24; 169.
ілігівін 100. 76, 98.
ілігівін 121. 11.
ілігівін 86. 25.
ілігівін 66. 5.
ілігівін 31. 6, 7, 16, 18; 80. 4, 10.
ілігівін 54. 26.
ілігівін 82. 6; 98. 4, 12.
ілігівін 45. 8.
ілігівін 29. 21.
ілігівін 22.
ілігівін 121. 17 et sapf.
ілігівін 59. 7.
ілігівін 148.
ілігівін 37. 6, 14; 39. 10; 48. 4; 52. 6; 63. 7; 75. 5; 78. 4; 81, introd., 6, 14.
ілігівін 55. 13; 87. 7; 90. 7; 99. 11; 100. 12; 101. 5; 105. 5; 110, introd.; 112. 35, 41.
ілігівін 54; 64; 119. 2.
ілігівін 82. 16.
ілігівін 30. 21 (?).
ілігівін 38. 8.
ілігівін 72. 19.
ілігівін 34. 16; 54. 9, 17; 57. 2; 69. 4; 100. 2.
ілігівін 39. 4.
ілігівін 98. 19; 156.
ілігівін 121. 30, 50.
ілігівін 40. 8; 47. 22; 83. 7; 85. 14; 87. 10; 98. 5, 17; 100. 13; 101. 8; 110.
ілігівін 12, 18, 27, 39; 121. 54; 122; 156.
ілігівін 29. 4.
ілігівін 27. 62.
ілігівін 29. 5.
ілігівін 54. 13.
ілігівін 29. 20; 113. 19.
ілігівін 121. 48.
ілігівін 39. 6; 98. 13; 100. 13.
ілігівін 110. 51 et sapf.
ілігівін 54. 13.
ілігівін 72. 19.
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κόρος (adj.) 84 (a). 11, 27; 90. 20; 91. 13; 96. 11, 28.
κόρος (subst.) 34. 3; 73. 3; 89. 7.
Κόσω 27. 135.
κόλυμμα 90. 20; 91. 8, 9.
κομμαχών 35. 11.
κομή 33. 7, 15; 37. 4, 12; 58. 23; 59. 11; 70 (δ). 8; 84. (α). 7, 22; 112. 35; 113. 7; 127. 2; 163. Cf. Index V (δ).
κομμαγματεῖα. See Index VII.

λαιμάδενν 44. 5; 45. 3; 49. 12; 51. 3, 5; 57. 1; 58. 3; 59. 2; 61. 2; 62. 10, 12; 63. 18, 21; 64. 5; 71. 8; 72. 12; 73. 16; 85. 22, 26; 110. 12; 113. 6, 13; 121. 9.
λαξίς 81. 8.
λατσώμα 71. 7.
λάχανον 54. 26.
λέγων 27. 28; 49. 6; 55. 4.
λεια 33. 2, 11; 62. 4.
λειτουργεί 78. 11.
λειτουργία 78. 4, 9.
λειτουργός 96. 14, 15, 31, 33.
λεπτάγος (= λεπτάγιος?) 47. 13.
λευκός 120. 4, 16, 23, 29.
λευκόφιας 32. 13.
λευκόμαν 29. 9.
λεύκω 27. 129.
λίμμα 85. 11.
λικνατός 121. 54.
λίθωμος 27. 26.
λιπόνα 70 (α). 6 (δ).
λογεία 51. 2, 5.
λογοί 29. 38; 45. 9, 19, 22; 46. 3; 58. 6; 77. 3; 143.
λογοντήρον 106. 3; 107. 3; 108. 2; 114. 7.
λογοντή 113. 9, 15; 188.
λογοντήρον 29. 41; 40. 15.
λόγος 29. 40; 44. 4; 48. 14; 53. 4; 69. 5; 75. 9; 110. 35; 120. 1; 153.
λοιπὸς 35. 4; 42. 7; 45. 11; 46. 5, 11; 47. 10, 20; 50. 6; 54. 7; 63. 14, 20; 64. 6; 65. 26; 100. 7; 110. 7 et saec.; 111. 14; 114. 23; 115. 14; 116. 12, 14; 118. 89; 119. 21, 22.
λοχαγός 81. 7, 8, 15.
Λύρα 27. 73; 83. 151.
λύρος 27. 160.
λωτός 152.

μακρός 27. 37.
μαλακός 54. 11.
μάρσης 121. 50.
μάρτυς 84 (α). 13, 28; 89. 9, 19; 90. 21; 91. 14; 96. 12, 29.
μαχαμιοφόρος 73. 16 (δ).
μάχος 41. 18; 44. 1, 6, 12; 70 (δ). 1.
μέγας 27. 155; 29. 9; 35. 4; 110. 82.
μήδος 27. 121.
μέλας 120. 5, 19.
μέλι 121. 54.
μέν οὖν 27. 47.
μένει 55. 6.
μέντοι 40. 7.
μερίζεται 27. 41.
μερίς 81. introd., 15; 133.
μέρος 29. 5, 26; 90. 13.
μέν 73. 14.
μεταβάλλεται 42. 3, 8; 45. 6.
μεταγράφειν 111. 14.
μετακομίζεται 82. 8.
μετατηκέλευσ 59. 11.
μετερεῖν 39. 3; 43. 2; 64. 3, 6; 65. 5, 9, 14; 18, 21; 74. 1, 6; 83. 4, 8; 103. 3; 105. 2; 117. 3; 119. 5, 131; 143.
μέτρησε 85. 17; 90. 11; 91. 2; 98. 21.
μέτρον. See Index VIII (α).
μηδέν 170.
μήν 30. 23; 34. 2; 47. 9; 72. 5, 8; 84 (α).
1, 5, 17, 21; 84 (δ). 1; 85. 7; 83. 3, 18; 88. 4, 9, 10; 89. 5; 90. 4, 10; 93. 6; 95. 4; 97. 4; 98. 10; 99. 5; 100. 9; 101. 1; 102. 3, 9; 110. 41, 43, 45, 46. 50; 114. 5; 115. 3; 129; 131; 145; 171.
μηνών 29. 5, 6.
μή (μηνών ?) 67. 12, 20, 35 (δ); 68. 7, 17, 19.
μικτῶν 76. 4; 90. 4, 18; 91. 5.
μίσθωσι 85. 23.
μύα 88. 9.
μυθή 93. 2; 111. 31.
μύριον 27. 39.
μύχος 47. 25; 115. 1.
μύθον 49. 8.

ναικελήθρος 39. 5, 14; 98. 2, 12; 100. 14; 118. 23.
ναύλων 46. 5; 110. 6, 18, 28, 31, 32.
ναυπηγός 152.
INDEXES

νέας 169 (i).
νέας 84 (a). 5, 20; 85. 27. νέωτερος 110. 62.
νήρες 90. 7.
νόρων 116. introd.
νόθος 32. 15.
νομαρχία 74. 6 (?).
νομάρχης 85. 10.
νομή 52. 7.
νομίζων 77. 3.
νομός 27. 22; 80. 3, 9. Cf. Index V (a).
νοτός 27. 71; 77, 86.
νύξ 27. 31 et saep.; 36. 5, 10; 37. 5, 13; 148.

ζήτω 120. 13, 23, 27.
ζήτω 27. 38.
ζύλου 82. 28; 121. 22, 32, 34; 51; 152.

διδασκ. See Index VIII (δ).
διδάων 67. 10; 68. 6.
διδασκαλία 44. 5; 52. 11.
διδάσκαλοι 133; 169.
διδάσκαλος. See Index VII.
διδάσκαλον ( ) 111. 10, 21.
διδασκόν 31. 6, 16; 80. 4, 10; 121. 18 et saep.; 132.

δίλογος 127. 3.
δίφων 27. 36.
δισ. 27. 94, 133, 194.
δισωρα 47. 22; 50. 3, 5; 64. 4; 74. 2; 76. 8; 85. 15; 86. 16; 90. 8, 15; 99. 11, 13; 102. 2, 7; 103. 1, 9, 10; 117. 5 et saep.; 118. 2 et saep.; 119. 6 et saep.; 122; 124; 125; 129; 157.

διμείροι 38. 11.
διμετρικογιγοι 72. 18; 96. 5, 21; 97. 5; 98. 1; 11; 99. 6; 105. 1; 143.

δημα 53. 5; 74. 3. 4.
δημά 34. 3; 73. 6, 13; 111. 38, 41.
δήμου ο (ον) ? 123. 23.
διπύρης 96. 9, 26.

διπός 41. 21; 44. 2; 45. 18; 46. 20; 49. 3, 7, 11; 52. 9; 54. 22; 60. 8; 62. 16; 65. 2; 71. 9; 73. 5; 78. 17; 81. 3, 21; 82. 10, 30; 152; 169; 170.

δραμά 44. 4.
δρόμος 31. 4, 14; 65. 8, 22.
δρόμος 38. 5.
δρομέας 27, 59.
δρομήδων 121. 41, 53.
δροσος 42. 5; 54. 25; 90. 8.

δρόσις 52. 6. δρύσιςος 29. 19; 47. 16.
δρυσ 27. 225; 28. 1; 78. 3; 94 (a). 11, 27.
δηδότευτος 78. 5.
δύναμεν 170.
δύνας 32. 3.
δύνας (ε) 47. 32; 63. 10.
δύναμεν 29. 42; 30. 5, 15.
δύναιμα 41. 7; 42. 10.
δύναμιστική 88. 8.
δύον 54. 28; 121. 21, 38, 47, 48.

παθή ον 121. 20, 26, 35, 43, 48.
παίε 47. 35 (?).
πάθη 46. 14.
πάθη 48. 7.
πανήγυρις 27. 76, 165.
πανταγοι 96. 11, 28.
παντοδαπός 54. 27.
πάν 27. 19.
παράγγελμα 78. 19.
παραγγέλθαι 45. 4; 55. 2; 56. 2; 63. 2; 65. 2, 15; 66. 4; 69. 3; 72. 17; 73. 10; 151; 161.
παραγραφή 40. 14.
παράδεισος 112. 93.
παραδέχεσθαι 32. 4; 42. 6.
παραδόθαι 54. 21; 59. 5, 8; 62. 9; 92. 11, 17; 110. 60 et saep.
παραδοχίας 87. 13.
παρακείμενοι 170.
παραλλαγές 41. 17; 75. 6; 82. 25.
παραλλαγές 82. 21.
παραλλάσσει 27. 50.
παραμετρεῖι 45. 17; 47. 23.
παραμορφή 41. 5.
παραπτάδηά 51. 3.
παρεκάει 106. 9; 107. 4, 8; 136.
παρέγγελμα 44. 5. παρέγγελμα 168.
παρέχεις 29. 19; 45. 19; 96. 7, 24.
παρέχεις 93. 2; 168.
Παράβουλος 27. 138.
παρεκά, παρεμεία 53. 5; 180.
παρεμεία 47. 15; 60. 11, 13.
παρευμόρος 77. 2. Cf. 87. 6.
πατήρ 89. 7.
παύεσθαι 59. 10.
πείθων 83. 10.
πειράθαι 45. 11; 49. 9; 52. 8; 53. 3.
πέπειται 54. 10; 127. 3.
πεντώθσωλον. See Index VIII (δ).
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τετράδιον 65. 10.
τετράμερος 115. 22; 116. 5.
τεύχος 121. 56.
τίμη 31. 7; 34. 3; 37. 7, 16; 40. 10; 41. 23; 47. 17; 61. 4; 63. 4, 17; 67. 10; 68. 6; 73. 3; 82. 30; 84 (α). 3, 8, 18; 24; 88. 11; 90. 14; 91. 11; 89. 13; 100. 6; 102. 4, 10; 128; 124; 132.

tίμημα 30. 20.
τιμητός 29. 21 (?).
τοίχος 98. 8.
τόκος 30. 20; 92. 16; 110. 43, 46, 49.
tοπάρχει 44. 9; 75. 2.
tοπορράχημα 104. 3, 9.
tριπλούσιο 34. 9.
tρίγωνον 116. 1.
(tρίμοιος). See Index VIII (5).
tρίττη 121. 56.
τρίττος 34. 4. 8; 84 (α). 10, 26.
tρίγανον 151.
tριγάνει 44. 7.
tριγύμανον 54. 12.
tρύος 54. 24.

τ' Ύλες 27. 67, 197.
τέρας 32. 8.
τήραιεν 79. 7.
tιλαιον 118. 2 (?).
υός 47. 4; 72. 5; 85. 2; 88. 1; 92. 2; 96. 1, 17; 123.
υπακοείν 78. 5.
υπάρχων 28. 11, 19; 32. 5; 33. 6, 14; 41. 21; 72. 10, 15, 18; 82. 28; 84 (α). 9, 25; 94. 2, 15; 95. 12; 113. 16; 120. 2.
υπερακλάδωαν 100. 1.
υπερθύμνησις 95. 5.
υπερτερεν 29. 22.
υπερτήτη 29. 21, 30 (?); 92. 22.
υπογράφει 51. 4; 52. 2; 67. 5, 18; 68. 3; 72. 3; 74. 5; 81. 2, 5, 12, 20; 89. 9.
υποδιθέρος 32. 12.
υποξύμονον 34. 3; 5; 73. 9.

υπόθεσιν 29. 7.
υπολείπεσιν 45. 16; 50. 4.
υπολογίσκειν 45. 13.
υπολογεῖν 46. 6.
υπόλογος 28. 26; 68. 10; 85. 24.
υπομμαθέον 49. 11.
υπόμομμα 72. 1, 4, 9.
υποτίθεται 29. 6.
υστερά 29. 33.
υστερεῖν 43. 7; 65. 29.
υστερος 52. 10.
υσταίνουσα 67. 5; 68. 4.

φακὴ 112. 77.
φαινεσθαι 131.
φάναι 32. 20; 42. 3; 56. 4; 63. 5, 8; 72. 16, 18.
φερεῖν 45. 9; 73. 5; 98. 20.
φθησοποιοῦσθαι 27. 170.
φυλί 170.
φοινικῶν 109. 4, 10.
φοινίκες 110. introd.; 112. 6.
φόρεται 121. 39.
φόρος 35. 6.
φράτρα 28. 5, 10, 14, 17.
φρατρία 28. 23.
φράτωρ 28. 7.
φροντίζων 43. 8; 82. 10; 170.
φυλακὴ 41. 4; 59. 5; 60. 7; 71. 11; 110. 23, 24; 127. 3; 168.
φυλακτείων 34. 1.
φυλακτής. See Index VII.
φυλακτικῶν. See Index IX.

φυλαξέων 147.
φυλάσσει 147.


χαίρων 34. 1; 35. 1; 39. 2; 40. 2; 41. 1; 42. 2; 43. 2; 44. 1; 45. 2; 46. 2; 47. 2; 48. 2; 49. 1; 50. 2; 51. 1, 5; 52. 1; 53. 1; 54. 2; 55. 1; 56. 2; 57. 1; 58. 2; 59. 2; 60. 2; 62. 2; 63. 2; 64. 2; 66. 1; 67. 2, 29; 68. 1; 69. 2; 70 (α). 2; 71. 4, 12; 72. 1; 73. 1; 74. 1; 75. 1; 76. 2; 78. 1; 79. 2; 80. 1, 6; 81. 12, 20; 82. 2, 14; 86. 15; 102. 1, 7; 103. 3; 127. 1; 128; 152; 160; 161; 197; 168.
χαλκός. See Index VIII (5).
χ(αλκοί) 68. 18, 20.
XI. INDEX OF PASSAGES DISCUSSED

(a) Authors.

Aristotle, Rhet. iv. 1 . . . 65
Athenaeus, p. 487 C . . . 323
Demosthenes, i. Phil. 28 . . . 54
Epicharmus, Fr. 258 (Kaibel) . . . 15
Geminus (Lydas, De Ostent.) Zovos i, & . . . 156
Herodotus, ii. 59, 62 . . . 154
Menander, Fr. 861 (Kock) . . . 34
Philemon, Fr. 189 (Kock) . . . 25

Plutarch, De Is. et Osir. 28 . . . 223
Vit. Alex. 16 . . . 334
Ps. Callisthenes, Cod. A . . . 339
Ptolemy, Geogr. iv. 5 . . . 9
Satyrus, Ad Autolyce. II. p. 94 . . . 164
Xenophon, Hipp. i. 19 . . . 54

(b) Inscriptions.

Alexandrian vase, ap. Nerutsos, Rev.
Arch. 1887, p. 62 . . . 347
Canopus, l. 3 . . . 342
l. 6 . . . 363
l. 37 . . . 156
l. 51 . . . 153

Damanhurst Stele (Hierogl.) ap. Bourriant, Recueil de Travaux, 1885, p. i . . . 351-2

Philae (Hierogl.) ap. Lepsius, Denkmäler IV. 27 (b) . . . 353-4
Rosetta, ll. 4-5 . . . 348-50
ll. 7-8 . . . 363
l. 47 . . . 362-4
Thera, ap. Dittenberger, Orientis Graeci Inscr. I. 59 . . . 350-1

This index does not include the passages of extant authors covered by the literary fragments 19-26.
XI. INDEX OF PASSAGES DISCUSSED

| P. Amh. 31 | PAGE | P. Petrie III. 21 (g). 29 |
| 33. 28–37 | 213 | 21 (g). 34 |
| 42. 21 | 171 | 28 (b) and (c) verso |
| 43. 1, 8 | 352 | 37 (b) verso 6 |
| 43. 12 | 173, 257 | 52 (a) |
| P. Brit. Mus. 265 | 228–9 | 52 (a). 3 |
| 171 (b). 7–8 | 8 | 53 (c) |
| C. P. R. 6. 3–4 | 275–6 | 53 (g). 13–4 |
| 82 (1). 4 | 8 | 54 (a). (4) 5 |
| P. Fay. 15. 3 | 302 | 54 (a). (4) ii. 5 |
| 164. 21 | 292 | 55 (a). 13 |
| P. Grenf. I. 14 | 193 | 56 (a). 3 |
| P. Leyden, No. 379 | 341 | 56 (b) |
| Q | 281 | 57 (b) |
| P. Louvre (Revillout, Mélanges 335) | 249 | 364, 366, 374 |
| P. Magd. 2, &c. 7, &c. | 344 | 58 (d) |
| 12. 14, &c. | 346 | 236, 359, 374 |
| 14, &c. | 345 | 70 (a). 1 |
| 23 | 345 | 74 (a). 14–5 |
| 32 | 335 | 100 |
| 35 | 236, 359, 363 |
| Deuxième Série p. 205 | 363 | 110–11 |
| P. Oxy. 713. 25 | 200 | 111. 8 |
| P. Par. I. 71–80 | 151 | 112 |
| 24 (1) | 342 | 112 (a). 11 |
| 60. recto 4 | 354 | 114. 1 |
| 63. xiii. 14 | 352–3 | 119. verso ii. 9 |
| P. Petrie I. 24 | 367 | 360 |
| 28 (2) | 359, 366 | 129 (a). 4 |
| II. 2 (2), (3) | 345 | 229 |
| 30 (a). 5, 18 | 248 | 364, 366–7 |
| 44. 13 sqq. | 257 | xlvi |
| 48. 4–5. 9 | 271 | lv. 20 |
| 49 (f) | 21 | 205 |
| III. 21 (a)–(f) | 167 | lvii. 4–5 |
| 21 (a). 1, 6 | 375 | 340, 360 |
| 21 (b) | 167 | lx. 3–4 |
| 21 (b). 1, 6 | 375 | 360 |
| 21 (b). 8 | 334 | P. Tebt. 5. 189 |
| 21 (g). 1–3 | 375–6 | 183 |
| 21 (g). 11 | 342 | 25. 7 |
| 28 (a) and (c) verso | 345 | 354 |
| 37 (b) verso 6 | 323 | 25. 54 sqq. |
| 52 (a) | 260 | 341 |
| 52 (a). 3 | 372 | 61 (b). 383 |
| 53 (c) | 213 | 61 (b). 390 |
| 53 (g). 13–4 | 342 | 228–9 |
| 54 (a). 13 | 252 | 210 |
| 54 (a). 14–5 | 257 | 262 |
| 55 (a). 13 | 277 | Timotheus Papyrus |
| 56 (a). 3 | 180 | Wilcken, Ost. II. 329 |
| 56 (b) | 373 | 1497 |
| 57 (b) | 213, 220 | P. Zois |
| 58 (c). (cf. introd. p. 8) | 359, 364, 366, 374 | 213 |
| P. Zois | 375 | Dem. P. Berlin 3096 |
| 257, 376 | Dem. P. Leyden 379 | 265, 372–3 |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>démem.</em> p. 131</td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>374-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Égypt.</em> I. p. 6</td>
<td>2443</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem. P. Louvre 2424</td>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2425</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem. P. Louvre, <em>ap.</em> Revillout, <em>Chrest.</em></td>
<td><em>démem.</em> 231</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) UNPUBLISHED.

| Gradenwitz                               | 316                | 158, 160|
| Hibeh                                    | 605-7              | 307  |
| Mahaffy                                   |                     |      |
| Dem. Rylands                              | 242-3              | 341-5, 348, 352, 359, 376 |
|                                      |                     |      |
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GRAECO-ROMAN BRANCH.

THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND, which has conducted Archaeological research in Egypt continuously since 1882, in 1897 started a special department, called the Graeco-Roman Branch, for the discovery and publication of remains of classical antiquity and early Christianity in Egypt. It is hoped to complete next year the systematic excavation of the site of Oxyrhynchus.

The Graeco-Roman Branch issues annual volumes, each of about 250 quarto pages, with facsimile plates of the more important papyri, under the editorship of Dts. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.

A subscription of One Guinea to the Branch entitles subscribers to the annual volume, and also to the annual Archaeological Report. A donation of £25 constitutes life membership. Subscriptions may be sent to the Honorary Treasurers—for England, Mr. H. A. Grueber, British Museum; and for America, Mr. Gardiner M. Lane, Pierce Building, Copley Square, Boston.
PUBLICATIONS OF
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MEMOIRS OF THE FUND.


VIII. BUBASTIS. For 1889-90. By Edouard Naville. Fifty-four Plates and Plans. 25s.

IX. TWO HIEROGLYPHIC PAPYRI FROM TANIS. An Extra Volume. Containing:
   II. THE GEOGRAPHICAL PAPYRUS (an Almanack). By W. M. Flinders Petrie. With Remarks by Professor Heinrich Brugsch. (Out of print.)


XIII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part I. For 1893-4. By Edouard Naville. Plates I-XXIV (three coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.

XIV. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part II. For 1894-5. By Edouard Naville. Plates XXV-LV (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.


XVI. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part III. For 1896-7. By Edouard Naville. Plates LVI-LXXXVI (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.

XVII. DENDEREH. For 1897-8. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Thirty-eight Plates. 25s. (Extra Plates of Inscriptions. Forty Plates. 10s.)

XIX. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part IV. For 1899–1900. By Edouard Naville. Plates LXXXVII-CXVIII (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.


XXI. THE ROYAL TOMBS OF THE EARLIEST DYNASTIES, Part II. For 1900–1. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Sixty-three Plates. 25s. (Thirty-five extra Plates, 10s.)


XXVI. EHNASYA. For 1903–4. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Forty-three Plates. 25s. (ROMAN EHNASYA. Thirty-two extra Plates. 10s.)


ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Edited by F. Ll. Griffith.


GRAECO-ROMAN BRANCH.


VI. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part IV. For 1903-4. Eight Collotype Plates. 25s.


ANNUAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS.
(Yearly Summaries by F. G. Kenyon, W. E. Crum, and the Officers of the Society, with Maps.)
Edited by F. Ll. Griffith.

THE SEASON'S WORK. For 1890-1. By Ed. Naville, Percy E. Newberry, and G. W. Fraser. 2s. 6d.
For 1892-3 and 1893-4. 2s. 6d. each.
" 1894-5. 2s. 6d. Containing Report (with Plans) of D. G. Hogarth's Excavations in Alexandria.
" 1895-6. 3s. With Illustrated Article on the Transport of Obelisks by Ed. Naville.
" 1896-7. 2s. 6d. With Articles on Oxyrhynchus and its Papyri by B. P. Grenfell, and a Thucydides Papyrus from Oxyrhynchus by A. S. Hunt.
" 1897-8. 2s. 6d. With Illustrated Article on Excavations at Hierakopolis by W. M. Flinders Petrie.
" 1898-9. 2s. 6d. With Article on the Position of Lake Moeris by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.
" 1899-1900. 2s. 6d. With Article on Knossos in its Egyptian Relations by A. J. Evans.
And five successive years, 2s. 6d. each.

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS.

AORIA IHXOY: 'Sayings of our Lord,' from an Early Greek Papyrus. By B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 2s. (with Collotypes) and 6d. net.

NEW SAYINGS OF JESUS AND FRAGMENT OF A LOST GOSPEL. By B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 1s. net.

ATLAS OF ANCIENT EGYPT. With Letterpress and Index. (Second Edition) (Under revision.)

GUIDE TO TEMPLE OF DEIR EL BAHARI. With Plan. (Out of print.)

COPTIC OSTRACA. By W. E. Crum. 10s. 6d. net.
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