

Herausgegeben von:

Thomas Corsten
Fritz Mitthof
Bernhard Palme
Hans Taeuber

TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

HOLZHAUSEN

Der Verlag

Band 34, 2019

Impressum

Gegründet von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert, Ekkehard Weber

Herausgegeben von

TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich

Vertreten durch

Thomas Corsten, Fritz Mitthof, Bernhard Palme, Hans Taeuber

Gemeinsam mit

Franziska Beutler und Wolfgang Hameter

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat

Angelos Chaniotis, Denis Feissel, Jörg Fündling, Nikolaos Gonis,
Klaus Hallof, Anne Kolb, Michael Peachin

Redaktion

Chiara Cenati, Tina Hobel, Sandra Hodeček, Katharina Knäpper,
Guus van Loon, Theresia Pantzer, Christoph Samitz

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie
und Epigraphik, Universität Wien, Universitätsring 1, 1010 Wien, Österreich.

E-Mail: franziska.beutler@univie.ac.at

Richtlinien unter <http://www.univie.ac.at/alte-geschichte>

Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung

Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien

E-Mail: office@verlagholzhausen.at

Online Bestellungen Print & TYCHE–Open Access

www.verlagholzhausen.at

<https://shop.verlagholzhausen.at/de/buch-reihe/tyche>

<http://tyche-journal.at>

Umschlag: Militärdiplom aus Carnuntum (ZPE 172, 2010, 271–276;

Photo: P. Böttcher), Inschrift aus Ephesos (ÖJh 55, 1984, 130 [Inv. Nr. 4297];

Photo: P. Sängner), P.Vindob. G 2097

(= P.Charite 8).

Bibliografische Informationen der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek und der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die ÖNB und die DNB verzeichnen diese Publikation in den Nationalbibliografien; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet abrufbar. Für die Österreichische Bibliothek: <http://onb.ac.at>, für die Deutsche Bibliothek: <http://dnb.ddb.de>

Eigentümer und Verleger

Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien

Herausgeber

TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik,
Universität Wien, Universitätsring 1, A-1010 Wien.

E-Mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder bernhard.palme@univie.ac.at

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Verlagsort: Wien — Herstellungsort: Wien — Printed in Austria

ISBN: 978-3-903207-49-3 ISSN: 1010-9161

Copyright © 2020 Verlag Holzhausen GmbH — Alle Rechte vorbehalten

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Lincoln H. B l u m e l l — Kerry H u l l : An Inscribed Statue of Tyche in Kyoto, Japan (Taf. 1).....	1
Ines B o g e n s p e r g e r — Lucian R e i n f a n d t : Textile Termini und Dinar-Zahlen auf einem arabischen Papyrus des 9. Jahrhunderts (Taf. 2) ..	5
Anna D o l g a n o v : Reichsrecht and Volksrecht in Theory and Practice: Roman Justice in the Province of Egypt (P.Oxy. II 237, P.Oxy. IV 706, SB XII 10929)	27
Patrice F a u r e : <i>Accepta pariatoria</i> et primipilat. Nouvelles hypothèses sur un monument inscrit de <i>Nouae</i> (Taf. 3–4)	61
Angela K a l i n o w s k i : A Re-discovered Inscription from Ephesos: a Funerary Monument for Vedia Kalliste.....	81
Peter K r u s c h w i t z — Victoria G o n z á l e z B e r d ú s : Nicht auf den Kopf gefallen: Zur Wiener Versinschrift <i>AE</i> 1992, 1452 = <i>AE</i> 2015, 1102 (Taf. 5).....	89
Kallia L e m p i d a k i : Constructing Commemoration in Imperial Aphrodisias: the Case of Apollonios	95
Federico M o r e l l i : <i>She</i> (ϣϵ): il nome copto del <i>dodekanoummion</i>	115
Amphilochios P a p a t h o m a s : SB XIV 11961: Fragment eines spät- antiken Geschäftsbriefes (Taf. 6).....	125
Amphilochios P a p a t h o m a s — Eleni T s i t s i a n o p o u l o u : Der Gebrauch von Gnomen in den griechischen privaten Papyrusbriefen der römischen Kaiserzeit bis zum Ende des 4. Jh. n. Chr.	129
Niklas R a f e t s e d e r : Das Stadtgesetzfragment von Vindobona (Taf. 7)	141
Benoît R o s s i g n o l – Jean-Marc M i g n o n , Un nouveau procureur ducénaire anonyme à Orange. Avec la collaboration de Guillaume H a i r y (Taf. 8).....	151
Georg-Philipp S c h i e t i n g e r : Das Jahr 129 v. Chr.: ein Senator im politischen Abseits? Alternative Deutungen der letzten Lebensjahre des Scipio Aemilianus	159
Peter S i e w e r t : Bruchstück eines Kultgesetzes von Olympia aus der 1. Hälfte des 6. Jh. v. Chr. (BrU 9) (Taf. 9).....	193
Salvatore T u f a n o : The Epitaph of Leuktra (<i>CEG</i> II 632) and Its Ancient Meaning(s) (Taf. 10)	201
Manfredi Z a n i n : <i>Servilia familia inlustris in fastis</i> . Dubbi e certezze sulla prosopografia dei <i>Servilii Gemini</i> e <i>Vatiae</i> tra III e I secolo a.C. (Taf. 11–16).....	221

Bemerkungen zu Papyri XXXII (<Korr. Tyche> 886–949)	237
Adnotationes epigraphicae X (<Adn. Tyche> 85–115)	269
Buchbesprechungen	287
<p>Thomas B a c k h u y s, <i>Kölner Papyri (P. Köln) Band 16</i> (Pap.Colon. VII/16), Paderborn 2018 (G. van Loon: 287) — Nathan B a d o u d, <i>Inscriptions et timbres céramiques de Rhodes. Documents recueillis par le médecin et explorateur suédois Johan Hedenborg (1786–1865)</i> (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, Series in 4^o, 57), Stockholm 2017 (D. Dana: 288) — T. B e r g, <i>L'Hadrianus de Montserrat (P.Monts.Roca III, inv. 162→–165)</i>. <i>Édition, traduction et analyse contextuelle d'un récit latin conservé sur papyrus</i> (Papyrologica Leodiensia 8), Liège 2018 (M. Capasso: 290) — Henning B ö r m, Nino L u r a g h i (eds.), <i>The Polis in the Hellenistic World</i>, Stuttgart 2018 (F. R. Forster: 291) — Katharina B o l l e, Carlos M a c h a d o, Christian W i t s c h e l (eds.), <i>The Epigraphic Cultures of Late Antiquity</i> (Heidelberger Alt-historische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 60), Stuttgart 2017 (S. Remijsen: 295) — Anne D a g u e t - G a g e y, <i>Splendor aedilitatum. L'édilité à Rome (I^{er} s. avant J.-C. – III^e s. après J.-C.)</i> (Collection de l'école française de Rome 498), Rome 2015 (E. Theodorou: 298) — Julien F o u r n i e r, Marie-Gabrielle G. P a r i s s a k i (eds.), <i>Les communautés du Nord Égéen au temps de l'hégémonie romaine. Entre ruptures et continuités</i> (Μελετήματα 77), Athen 2018 (F. Daubner: 301) — Katharina K n ä p p e r, <i>Hieros kai asylos. Territoriale Asylie im Hellenismus in ihrem historischen Kontext</i> (Historia Einzelschriften 250), Stuttgart 2018 (Ch. Michels: 303).</p>	

Tafeln 1–16

933.–949. Peter van MINNEN

Notes on Latin and Bilingual Texts from Hermopolis

In preparing texts from Hermopolis for inclusion in the corpus of Latin and bilingual papyri (ed. M.C. Scappaticcio), I made a series of observations that are better presented separately than in the confines of the corpus itself.⁴⁵

I reviewed 20 papyri, mostly from Late Antiquity. In some cases, the provenance is not beyond doubt and there are also several other papyri that are unprovenanced, but with a likely origin in Hermopolis (the alternative being Antinoopolis or Heracleopolis). This is especially the case with bilingual reports of proceedings before the governor of the Thebaid, who resided in Antinoopolis and could most easily be approached by inhabitants of Antinoopolis itself or of nearby Hermopolis. With few exceptions, the proceedings took place in Antinoopolis, but the parties involved often originated in Hermopolis.

933. The abbreviation *d(ixit)*

In the earlier reports of proceedings (ChLA XLI 1187, P.Kramer 11, ChLA XLI 1189, SB XXVIII 17038, and, the latest, ChLA X 463 [ca. AD 349]), *d(ixit)* is abbreviated as *d* with a diagonal stroke through the vertical hasta, whereas in the later reports of proceedings (the earliest ChLA XII 520 [AD 390], ChLA XII 518, and ChLA III 213), it is abbreviated as *d* with a diagonal stroke below the line. Exceptionally, in ChLA XII 525.2.8 (AD 368), in a quotation from an earlier ruling, *d(ixit) ei* appears with a diagonal stroke through the hasta of *i*, but below the line.

934. Scribes in court proceedings

The Greek and Latin in the bilingual reports of proceedings are written by the same scribe, not just in copies such as ChLA III 213. This is perhaps hard to demonstrate conclusively in each instance, but the alternative, that two scribes worked on the report of proceedings, and that one would have handed over the papyrus to another each time after finishing a section in one language, is much harder to swallow, let alone the idea that one scribe would have written everything in one language first, leaving appropriate blanks for the other scribe. This is just not practicable. Occasionally, a scribe dipped his pen in ink after finishing a section in one language, so that the next section in the other language starts darker, but this is not an indication of a change of scribe. Fortunately we do not have to indicate any of this in our transcriptions, because the switch from Latin to Greek and *vice versa* is clear from the typography used.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Over the course of three summers (2016–2018) I was able to study several papyri from Hermopolis in Berlin, Leipzig, London, Manchester and Vienna, and I would like to thank all those in charge of the papyrus collections there (Marius Gerhardt, Nadine Quenouille and Reinhold Scholl, the staff at the British Library, Roberta Mazza, and Claudia Kreuzsaler and Bernhard Palme) for making it possible for me to see the originals of some of the papyri. I did not see all of the papyri in Leipzig and London, and I was not able to see the papyrus in the Theresianum in Vienna.

⁴⁶ J.-L. Fournet has suggested at the 29th International Papyrological Congress of Papyrology in Lecce (2019) that we insert “(s. 2)” (etc.) each time there is a change of style rather than a change of hand. I suggest that we do no such thing. Surely, “(s. 2)” (etc.) will be mistaken for “second scribe” (etc.), and there is no problem in English, where “in another hand” may well mean “in another hand (= style of writing) by the same scribe,” even if the corresponding French does not allow this ambiguity. Given that the identification of different scribes is uncertain (even more so after A. Sarri, *Material Aspects of Letter Writing in the Graeco-Roman World, 500 BC*

935. Latin scripts in court proceedings

The date in the opening line of reports of proceedings is written in a Latin script that is (even) more artificial than in the rest of the text, although it is written by the same scribe. The script of the dates, where preserved (in the original reports of proceedings P.Kramer 11.1, SB XXVIII 17038, and ChLA XII 520, and, in an even more hybrid form, in ChLA III 213, a copy of a report of proceedings), resemble the second alphabet in P.Worp 11 (early V AD), which provides two alphabets, one for “ordinary” bits of Latin, such as the introduction of the governor, one for dates. This second type of Latin script shares some of the characteristics of the earlier Latin cursive, but is not as far removed of the contemporary cursive as the so-called *litterae caelestes*.

936. ChLA III 213

For this papyrus, we only have Marichal’s edition of this copy of a report of proceedings (V AD), but thanks to N. Gonis, I was able to use a provisional transcript by H. I. Bell as well. Marichal detected *litterae caelestes*, presumably in line 1, but the Latin script used for the date there is a mixture of the ordinary Latin cursive used in the rest of the text and the more artificial script used for the dates in original reports of proceedings (P.Kramer 11.1, SB XXVIII 17038, and ChLA XII 520). Marichal reads the first line as follows:] Aug(usto) cos(ulibus) die Non(as) Ian(uarias) in Antino . vac. exempl(um) l(itterarum) vacat. Let us start with *cos(ulibus)*. What is written on the papyrus is actually *coc*, thus *co(n)c(ulibus)* for *co(n)s(ulibus)*. In the rest of the text there are similar mistakes. Before *coc*, there is indeed *Aug*, but above the *g* there is another *g*, added *après coup*. We should therefore transcribe *Aug’g(ustis)*. This is important, because it narrows down the date to when two emperors shared the consulate. In the fifth century that would be the first few decades, when Theodosius II and his co-emperor shared the consulate on and off (until 436, so it seems). Before *Aug’g* there are two two-letter composites repeated one after the other. The lower letter is presumably a somewhat archaizing *p* known from the second alphabet in P.Worp 11 (early V AD), the one typically used for the initial dates in reports of proceedings. Above the *p*, there is a somewhat archaizing and rather artificial *r*. The combination of *p* and *r* is an abbreviation for *p(e)r(petuis)*, so we can read *p(e)r(petuis)* before *Aug(ustis)*. Before *p(e)r(petuis)* there is a trace, probably a numeral rather than the final *-o* of the name of one of the emperors. We now turn our attention to what follows *coc*. After a possible abbreviation mark, we see, with Marichal, *die*. What follows must be a date, but I cannot recognize a number (*I, V, or X*). So, it has to be *pridie* in some form. We can see indeed another archaizing *p* — if we want to. This could be an abbreviation for *p(ridie)*. What follows it is *c*. After the *c* there is a vertical hasta and a small gap. Below the gap, the end of an elaborate abbreviation mark is visible, such as we find later on in the line (where we will see it attached to an *l*). I want to read *Ca[l](endis)*, but the vertical hasta, which is not topped by a horizontal stroke, cannot be read as *a*, even in the somewhat archaizing script expected in the dates of reports of proceedings. *Non liquet*. At any rate, *Idus* and *Nonas* are nowhere to be seen. After the small gap, Marichal read *Non(as) Ian(uarias)* — somewhere. I can see an *i*, but only before in *Antino-*. I do not see an *n* anywhere, as the concave curve at the end, typical of the *n* in the Latin script used in dates, is nowhere to be seen. Somewhere in the middle, I can see a small *on*, but I rather think it is *in*, because it looks the same as *in* before *Antino-*. Before the first *in*, then, there is again no *n*, as the typical concave

– AD 300, Berlin 2017, than before), it is better not to try to be too precise. One can always use typography to bring out certain features (e.g., italics for more cursive portions of a text written by the same scribe or just a larger font size for portions of a text written by the same scribe in the same style but larger, as is sometimes the case for the remarks of the governor in the reports of proceedings).

curve at the end is again not in evidence. We rather expect the name of the month there instead, and I can indeed read *augg* for *Aug(ustas)*. After that, as I just said, there seems to be *in*, followed by a further specification of time, perhaps, but I have not been able to decipher it. After two or three letters (*pri*-?), I see again *gg* (for *nc* or *ng*?), topped by a small swirl (a letter?), and then a *ti* combination, also in evidence in *Antino*-. It could conceivably also be a building in Antinoopolis, where the proceedings would have taken place, but again, I have not found anything suitable. *Non liquet*. What follows is a bit clearer: *in Antinou* (so Bell), perhaps to be transcribed as *Antinou(poli)*. Following that, Bell read *depl*(), and this is undoubtedly correct. It should be expanded as *de pl(ano)*, “from the level ground,” not from a tribunal. This refers to more informal sessions, and in what follows we indeed see that the plaintiffs (if that is what they are) do not present a written petition, and the governor has to find out first what exactly they want from him. After a brief space, Marichal read *exempl(a) l(itterarum)*. It is indeed *exempll*, and I think the double *l* (with a diagonal abbreviation mark through each) indicates a plural: *exempl(a)*, “copies.” The text is not a letter, so *l(itterarum)* is unexpected.

Marichal read the second line as follows:] *§[ilv]anus monachis et ceteris* *et d(ixerunt)*: δέομεθα ἐλεῆσαι. *vacat*. Tjäder (ChLA XLVIII, p. 25) read *manachis* (also for *monachi*, just as *ceteris* stands for *ceteri*), and recognized *et* as part of a verb form ending in *-cisset* (so did Bell). Bell read, correctly, ἐλέησον at the end. I read, after *ceteris*, [*c]um r(oga) an seceicisset*. The reading is not really in doubt. The abbreviated *r(oga)* looks like the *r* in *p(e)r(petuis)* in line 1, and with its cross stroke through the *hasta* it is not unlike the *r* in *r(espondit)* in other reports of proceedings, except that we do not expect *r(espondit)* with the following *an*. The intended form is more likely *r(ogavisset)* or *r(ogasset)*, in which case I assume an officer of the court is here reported as having asked the following question. Note that the beginning of the line is missing, and such an officer may have been introduced there, perhaps the *executor* mentioned in the next line (see below). The question itself is at any rate difficult to make out. The form *seceicisset* may stand for *secessisset*. But in that case the question would be very odd: “Whether he (Silvanus, the “ring leader”) had revolted.” The monks may have presented themselves in a rather uproarious state, to impress the governor with their plight. Their response is, at any rate, in style: “Please, have mercy on us.” After this, there is a huge space left blank, because, as we have seen often before, it is now the turn of the governor, and he has to be introduced in a new line, line 3.

Marichal read line 3 as follows:] . σαν τι βουλόμενοι προσέρχονται οἱ μονάζοντες. *vac. Silvanos et Iohanne et cetesis monachis terni continos exec(rantes?) d(ixerunt)*: ὥστε μὴ α . αις εἰς ἄει. Here, Bell’s provisional transcript helps us get a bit further. He read *προσέρχονται* instead of *προσεύχονται* and at the end of the line *ἀπαιτεῖσθαι*. Instead of *terni continos*, Tjäder, ChLA XLVIII, p. 25 (and Bell) read *per Nicantinos* (for *Nicantinoum*, a very good name for an officer of the court in Antinoopolis), and Tjäder recognized what follows as *exec(utorem)* for *ex<s>ec(utorem)*, a Latin title for an officer of the court. I would read the earlier part of the line as *τί βουλόμενοι προσέρχονται οἱ μονάζοντες*, “what the monks want that they come here for.” Then Silvanus (whose name is here spelled *Silvanos*) and Iohannes (spelled *Iohanne<s>*, not *Iuhanne<s>*, as Tjäder suggested) and the other monks (*cetesis* instead of *ceteris* for *ceteri* and *monachis* for *monachi*) respond through the officer of the court. I think they do this, because, beyond the set formula at the end of line 2, they do not know how to express themselves in Greek. They talk to the officer of the court in Coptic, and he translates it into Greek for the governor, so that it can be properly entered into the *commentarii*.

Marichal read line 4 as follows:] α . . ρμ . σαντα τη θεια φ . [.] . ι εν κεκτημεν[.] τοκ χορηγήσαντα. *vacat*. Bell provides a superior reading of this line:] . ἀγιερώσαντα τῇ θείᾳ ἀρ[. . .] α[. . μ]ηδὲν κεκτημέν[ον . . τὰ χρήμ]ατα ἑαυτοῦ τοῖς δεομέ[ν]οις χορηγήσαντα *vacat*. I cannot read *πρ[ονο]ῖα* after *θεία*. It is perhaps safer to read

κεκτημέν[instead of κεκτημέν[ov. The complaint is about taxation. The monks are being taxed on property that was given to them for a charitable purpose. After χορηγήσαντα there is a considerable space left blank, because the governor's reaction has to be introduced in a new line. There are several corrections to make in the Greek of line 6, the last preserved line (e.g., read ἀποδίδωσει (l. ἀποδίδοσι) for Marichal's]ω διδ . ει at the end of the line), but they do not clarify the details of the case.

The new reading of lines 1–4 goes as follows:

[---] . p(e)r(petuis) Aug(ustis) co(n)c(ulibus) die . C . [I](endas) Aug(ustas) in . . . gg .
i() in Antinou de pl(ano). vacat exempl(a) vacat

[---] Σ[ilv]anus manachis et ceteris [c]um r(oga) an †seceicisset† d(i)xerunt): δεόμεθα
ἐλέησον. vacat

[---]σαν τί βουλόμενοι προσέρχονται οἱ μονάζοντες. vac. Silvanos et Iohanne<s> et
cetesis monachis per Nicantinos ex<s>ec(utorem) d(i)xerunt): ὥστε μὴ ἀπαιτεῖσθαι

[---] . ἀγιερώσαντα τῇ θεῖα . ρ[. . .]α[. . . μ]ηδὲν κεκτημέν[. . . τὰ χρήμ]ατα ἑαυτοῦ
τοῖς δεομέ[ν]οις χορηγήσαντα.

“In the consulate of . . . the eternal Augusti, on the day before (?) the Kalends of August, in the . . . in Antinoopolis. Copies (?) . . . Silvanus the monk and others, when he asked (?) whether he . . . , said: ‘Please, have mercy.’ . . . ‘. . . what the monks want that they come here.’ Silvanus and Iohannes and the other monks said, through Nicantinous assistant of the court: ‘To not be taxed . . . dedicated . . . to the divine . . . while owning nothing, supplied those in need . . . his own money . . .’”

937. ChLA X 425

For this early text (II AD), only R. Marichal's edition is available. He treats the Latin text as written on the *recto*, and an unpublished Greek text as written on the *verso*. In reality, the Latin is on the *verso* of this reused papyrus. In line 3, Marichal read, rather adventurously, *Amidea*[, as if derived from Amida in Armenia. But *amidea*[can be divided up in a number of ways, and it is safer to just print *amidea*[.

938. ChLA X 463

This report of proceedings (ca. AD 349) is, as far as it goes, well preserved. There are two columns: the first is broken off to the left, but the second is almost perfectly preserved. Confusingly, the *editio princeps* refers to the two columns as “Fr. A” and “Fr. B.” But the papyrus was merely cut in two for framing. Before the first preserved column, at least one more column preceded, with the opening statement by the lawyer, which ends in col. I 9.

The following improvements can be made on the *editio princeps*:

Col. I 1: The line begins with]ίου ἄρξαντ[ο]ς Ἑρμ[οῦ πόλε]ως.

Col. I 5 and 9: The opening of l. 5 surely has to be οἰκονό[μ]ον τῆς πόλεως (read as] . . . μον τῆς πόλεως earlier). The same individual is mentioned in l. 9, where οἰκ[ονό]μον instead of κληρ[ονό]μον should be supplied. where the same individual is mentioned for the first time. The lawyer asks the governor to make sure that the οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως appears in court, because, thanks to his involvement in an earlier investigation, he can be made to testify.

Col. I 7–8: The end of l. 7 and opening of l. 8 were read as πρὸ δὲ [τοῦ γενέσθαι ταῦ]τα, which would give us the width of the line (much shorter than in col. II), but it is better to be agnostic and read only πρὸ δὲ | [---]τα instead.

Col. I 10: The opening of this line was read as] . . . εἰαν . . . ἔνταῦθα. In between both words, I read a Latin *r* with a diagonal stroke through it, and this stands for *r(espondit)*. The governor's remark ends in] . . . εἰαν (or rather] . . . σεἰαν), and after a blank space, the lawyer who has been

interacting with him in col. I (not Theodosius, who is introduced only in col. II 19) is introduced with *r(espondit)*.

Col. II 24: At the end of col. II 24, a plus sign has been read, as if it were a cross, but there is no apparent reason for a cross at the end of that line. If we read carefully, we recognize that col. II 23–24 is spoken for the governor, and he is again quoted in col. II 26–27. Col. II 25 must therefore be an intervening remark made by the lawyer who has been interacting with the governor in this part of the text, Theodosius. His remark must have been introduced by *r(espondit)*, and this can indeed be read at the end of col. II 24 instead of the + sign. The “economy” of the scribe, who knows that the lawyer’s remarks should immediately follow those of the governor, is at work here. It is just that in this case there was no more room for the actual remark in Greek after *r(espondit)*, and we therefore find it in col. II 25. At the end of that line the scribe leaves a generous space, because the governor has to be introduced in a new line.

Col. II 27–28: The Latin in these lines is by two different scribes. The “signature” of the *exceptor* (stenographer) in col. II 28 was written first: *Fl(avius) Antirus obtuli*, “I, Flavius Antirus, produced the text” (via an assistant, because the Latin in the body of the text is different). This identifies the text as an authentic copy of the report of proceedings. The governor then added his “signature” in col. I 27, authorizing the issuing of the text (*edantur*). His Latin hand is distinctly less neat than that of the *exceptor*, let alone his assistant. In other texts, not from Hermopolis, *edantur* was also added by the governor, and in ChLA XLIII 1245 it *follows* the authentication by the *exceptor*.

939. ChLA XI 484

Again, for this early text (II–III AD), only Marichal’s edition is available. The text should be printed in two columns. The first column is written in Latin capitals. The second column may be in Greek, but Marichal transcribes only one Latin letter there (*o*[]) that may, in fact, be the top of a *phi*. At the end of the lines in the first column, there is not much missing. I suspect that the text of lines 2–3 as given by Marichal (*An]tonium · cri[|] · num*) should be restored as *[An]tonium · Cri[s][p]inum*, which would also show how little is missing from the beginning of the lines, and how narrow the first column was.

940. ChLA XII 518

This is a long report of proceedings (before AD 399). A few bits of papyrus have gone missing from the end since Mitteis and Wilcken first edited the text in APF⁴⁷ (and later in P.Lips. I 40). Marichal was told that the text was missing, so there is no plate in ChLA, where the text given is basically that of Mitteis-Wilcken. A German translation accompanies the edition in P.Lips. I 40, and an English translation was recently produced by Keenan.⁴⁸ The case involves battery. A councilor from Hermopolis, Asyncritius, was beaten up at night by a slave and his accomplices. Asyncritius is represented here by his father Philammon, the owner of the famous codex with the fictional lawsuits before the prefect of Egypt, recently reedited as P.Philammon. We know that he was dead by AD 399 (see P.Giss. 104), and ChLA XII 520 must therefore be from the end of the fourth century, not the early fifth century.⁴⁹ There is at least one column missing before what

⁴⁷ L. Mitteis and U. Wilcken, *P.Lips. 13*, APF 3 (1906) 106–112.

⁴⁸ J. G. Keenan in J. G. Keenan, J. G. Manning, and U. Yiftach (eds.), *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest*, Cambridge 2014, 508–516.

⁴⁹ R. P. Salomons, *P.Harrauer*, p. 161, n. 25, wants to date the text before AD 381/2, because of the use of the word ἀρετή for the governor, but for a late instance of this, see now P.Bagnall 27.9 of ca. AD 397/8.

is now the first column, and after the present col. 3 at least one more column with the verdict of the governor originally followed. In col. II 10 I think the unread participle in τοῦτον <τὸν> Ἀσυνκρίτιον ἐ . [.] . μενον καὶ τυπτόμενον is just ἐ[λκ]όμενον. Various longer attempts at reading it are recorded in BL II.2 79 (ἐν[δ]εόμενον and ἐν[ελ]κόμενον).

In col. II 9 and 13 and col. III 7, 13, and 16, following the titles of various officials, there appear two horizontal strokes, the upper one concave, the lower one convex, that were interpreted by Mitteis-Wilcken as standing for an abbreviated word beginning with ε(). Quenouille and Scholl⁵⁰ have pointed out that these strokes are merely a mark of abbreviation. I think they are more particularly a mark of abbreviation for the ending *-(or)*. This works well with the first two instances (*curat(or)*) and the last instance (*adiut(or)*), but in fact also fits the other two instances: where Mitteis-Wilcken read *superstat(ionarius)* (?) we should no doubt read *superstat(or)*, the equivalent of Greek ἀρχιστάτωρ in texts of the Roman period, a kind of police officer. Here, the police officer is representing the owner of the slave, and he seems to be an old curmudgeon, who makes a lot of irrelevant remarks and repeats himself a lot. One would almost think that ChLA XII 520 is itself a fictional account, given that the *superstat(or)* is called Senecion (*nomen est omen*)! But that would be too clever.

941. ChLA XII 525

This is a *litis denuntiatio ex auctoritate* (AD 368), which means that if the defendants do not show up in court (as they have done, more than once, after earlier *litis denuntiationes* — just not *ex auctoritate*), they will be held in contempt of court. This requires the approval of the governor, which is quoted here in Greek in col. II 7–8. Interestingly, an earlier ruling by an earlier governor (about how often a lawsuit can be “renewed”) is quoted as well, in both Latin and Greek. It runs in Latin (col. II 8–9): *reperabuntur [t]empora si semel negotium is t[] | vac. evol[u]tum est*. In Greek (col. II 9–10): ἀν[α]νεοθήσονται οἱ χρ[ό]νοι εἰ ἅπαξ | ἡ δίκη ἐξ[έ]πε]σεν. Instead of *semel* I see *simel* (*l. semel*) and for the ending, where little is missing, I suggest we follow V. Arangio-Ruiz, who suggested in FIRA III,⁵¹ p. 547, n. 1, *ist[ud]*, “that (lawsuit) of yours.” This is distinctly better than P.M. Meyer’s *is* (*l. iis*) *t[]* (Jur.Pap. 88, n. on col. II 8), let alone Girard-Senn’s *is* (*l. iis*) *t[unc]* (*Textes de droit romain*, 6th ed., p. 913, in their “translation”).⁵²

In col. II 3 one of the defendants is identified as Ἰσ[τ]ῶρφ ὀφ(φικιαλίω). In the *editio princeps* L. Mitteis had dotted the initial *omicron* of ὀφ(φικιαλίω), but by the time he reedited the text as M.Chr. 97 the dot had disappeared. Unfortunately, this part of the text was damaged since Mitteis edited the text, and only Ἰσ[τ]ῶ[] is now visible. There is therefore no way to decide whether the recent suggestion to read the title as β(ενε)φ(ικιαρίω) instead of ὀφ(φικιαλίω) (BL XII 98) is correct. This also applies to a suggested reading in the *editio princeps* for col. II 25, where Mitteis printed just ὀ . [.] . . v in M.Chr., but earlier suggested reading ὀ ἡ[γεμὸν], before rearranging the fragments somewhat.⁵³ I read ὀ followed by a vertical *hasta*, most likely an *eta*,

⁵⁰ Apud J. Gascou, *Procès-verbal d’audience du juge Ammonius*, ZPE 170 (2009) 153 n. on l. 6 with n. 14.

⁵¹ The appendix in the second edition of 1969 does not add anything on this text. It also does not appear in G. Purpura (ed.), *Revisione ed integrazione dei Fontes iuris romani anteiustiniani (FIRA): studi preparatori 1–2*, Torino 2012.

⁵² (P. F. Girard and) F. Senn, *Textes de droit romain*, 6th ed., Paris 1937. This part does not appear in the seventh edition (of which two volumes appeared in 1967 and 1977).

⁵³ Note that the text of an unplaced fragment in P.Lips. I, pp. 98–99, was afterwards placed and integrated in the text reedited as M.Chr. The Papyrological Navigator erroneously includes the text of the once unplaced fragment separately.

but after that the papyrus is now in disarray, and the ending cannot be confirmed. Since the text at this point mentions the *commentarii*, a reference to the *auctor* of these *commentarii*, the governor, is expected, and Mitteis' initial suggestion should be taken seriously.

942. ChLA XLI 1187

This text was relatively recently published, and earlier appeared as SB XVIII 13295. It is one of the earliest examples of a report of proceedings (AD 298–300), together with P.Kramer 11 (AD 299) and the undated ChLA XLI 1189 (late III/early IV AD). It shows a number of characteristics that are also familiar from later reports of proceedings.⁵⁴ There is small problem in the remark of the governor in lines 7–9: does the expression ἐντὸς πεντεκαίδεκα ἡμερῶν go with what precedes (ἐπειδὴ καὶ κούρατωρ ὀνομάσθη τῇ ἀφήλικι καὶ λοιπὸν δύναται νομίμως συστήναι τὸ δικαστήριον) or with what follows (ἄκουσον τοῦ πράγματος)? The translation in the *editio princeps*⁵⁵ is somewhat misleading, but correct, I think, in taking ἐντὸς πεντεκαίδεκα ἡμερῶν with what follows: “Since a guardian was named for the girl minor, then the court can be legally convened which will hear the case within fifteen days.” This should be: “Since a guardian (*curator*) was named for the female minor, and it is henceforth become possible to legally convene the court, hear the case within fifteen days,” the imperative being addressed to the *strategos* as local judge.

943. ChLA XLI 1189

The editor of this early report of proceedings (late III/early IV AD), T. Dorandi, asserts that the hand is the same as in ChLA XLI 1187, but the *editio princeps* argued against this, and I think rightly so.⁵⁶ The Greek is somewhat less rounded, and the Latin is also somewhat different. Compare the way *Thebaid(os)* is abbreviated: here with a squiggle (read as *-os* in the *editio princeps*, but rightly, I think, transcribed as *-(os)* in ChLA XLI 1189), with a raised dot in ChLA XLI 1187. It is, however, possible that ChLA XLI 1187 and P.Kramer 11 were written by the same scribe. There is not enough Latin available to compare in P.Kramer 11, but the Greek there is much more like that in ChLA XLI 1187 than that in ChLA XLI 1189.

944. CEL 222

This and CEL 223 are two letters of recommendation for Theophanes for his official business trip to Antioch (AD 320–324 or, more specifically, 322–323?).⁵⁷ CEL 222 is almost perfectly preserved. I have not seen the original in Strasbourg, but on an excellent scan I was able to read the address on the *verso* somewhat different from what has hitherto been read there. Before Marichal had a go at it in ChLA XIX 687, the address was read as *domino suo Achillio ἡγεμ(όνι) Φουεΐκης | Vitalis*. Marichal detected *F(avi)* before *Achillio* and also noticed that the ending of Φουεΐκης was added below the line: Φουεΐκης\̄. I see *F(avius)* also before *Vitalis*, and the correct transcription of the Greek is ἡγεμ(όνι) Φουί\̄κης\̄. More importantly, I think that all of the address was written by the same scribe as the body of the text on the *recto*. Various editors have asserted that the various bits of Latin and Greek in the address were written by different

⁵⁴ See most recently J.-D. Rodríguez Martín, *Protocolos procesuales en dos lenguas: un ejemplo en un papiro de Montserrat*, Index 44 (2016) 123–140, and especially B. Palme, *Libellprozess und Subskriptionsverfahren*, in: G. Thür, U. Yiftach, and R. Zelnick-Abramovitz (eds.), *Symposion 2017*, Wien 2018, 257–275.

⁵⁵ R. Coles, *Julius Athenodorus*, praeses Thebaidos, BACPS 1 (1985) 51–54 at 53.

⁵⁶ Coles, *Julius Athenodorus*, praeses Thebaidos, BACPS 1 (1985) 55.

⁵⁷ See, comprehensively, J. F. Matthews, *The Journey of Theophanes*, New Haven 2006.

scribes — the Greek even by Theophanes himself. This is impossible in light of his known handwriting, exemplified by P.Ryl. IV 625 and, more formally, P.Bagnall 55. P. Cugusi, the editor of CEL, already identified all of the address as having been written by one scribe, just not the same as the scribe who wrote the body of the text on the *recto*. The writing of the address, although also with the fibers, is somewhat less careful than the writing on the *recto*, and the second line of the address is even less careful than the first, but not really different.

945. CEL 223

The other letter of recommendation can be made to resemble CEL 222 even more than has been the case in editions so far. In line 7, the reading is *Hermu[po]litanoru[m]* as in CEL 222, 7, not *Hermo[po]litanoru[m]*. Earlier in that line, in the supplement, we should restore the “Greek” ending *Theofanen*, as in CEL 222, 7, not *Theophanem*.

946. CEL 242

This is an official letter from the *comes Thebaici limitis* to a military tribune in Hermopolis (AD 505, the consulate mentioned in line 8). The *comes* instructs the tribune to enlist a recruit from Hermopolis, if there are no objections. I have only a few corrections to make, in the address in line 1. This reads: (the *comes*) *vac. Fl(avio) u. rte sive Theodoti* in CEL. The editor, Cugusi, is right to retain *Fl(avio)*, which J. R. Rea, CPR V 13, 1n. rejected in favor of *fl()l()*. Technically, only the *l* has a mark of abbreviation, and it is just too much of a coincidence that the abbreviation *fl()*, if it is not *Fl(avio)*, would appear right above a blank space, because that is what comes in between the title of the *comes* and the name of the addressee, which starts with what Cugusi read as *u*. What he transcribes as has no traces of ink at all. The scribe who wrote the letter may have been unsure about the exact name of the addressee: did he have a *gentilicium*, and if so, which? Flavius would, of course, be a safe bet for a military man. The clue to the situation may be in the name of the addressee, not convincingly read so far. After initial *U* (or *V*) I see the top of a rounded letter, most likely *e*. The *r* that follows seems secure, as is the *t* above it. Again, we see that the scribe hesitated in writing the name of the addressee. I assume the hesitation stemmed from the fact that it is a “foreign” name, most likely of Germanic origin. Soldiers at this time were often hauled from the border areas in the West to serve in the East. The name can thus be read as *Verte*, but I have not been able to trace this as a Germanic name. His alternative Greek name at the end of the line may well be *Theodoti[o]* instead of *Theodoti*, as it is written on the right edge of the papyrus.

Corrections to lines 9–10 of this text appear in G. Iovine, *Preliminary Inquiries on Some Unpublished Documentary Papyri* (P.Vindob. inv. L 74 recto; 98 verso; 169 recto), in: A. Nodar, S. Torallas Tovar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 28th International Congress of Papyrology*, Barcelona 2019, 638–43 at 641.

947. P.Kramer 11

This early report of proceedings (AD 299) does not appear in ChLA, because the Latin in lines 1–2 was only recently read by F. Mitthof in P. Kramer 11. I have only one correction to make to his excellent edition. In l. 5 he reads] . ov. ἐν πα γάρ καὶ γυμνα[σ]μαρχία καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀξιώ[μασι]. The position of the particle γάρ in the sentence is unexpected. It is also heavily dotted. Inspection of an excellent scan revealed τῆς rather than γαρ, and τῆς is part of ἀϋτῆς. What precedes is more easily recognizable as πάτηρ. What Mitthof articulated as two sentences (one ending in] . ov and one starting with ἐν) is in reality one sentence, and the beginning can be read as γέ]γονεν and the whole sentence as γέ]γονεν πατήρ ἀϋτῆς καὶ γυμνα[σ]μαρχία καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀξιώ[μασι], “(Polydeukes) was her father, in both the gymnasiarchy and the other positions of honor” (the syntax is lost).

948. P.Lips. I 35 (= ChLA XII 524)

This text (AD 373) was relatively recently reviewed by Mitthof, who was able to confirm many of U. Wilcken's readings, which Marichal had not put in his text, and corrected several others.⁵⁸ The text is a petition written by a professional scribe for an *officialis*, Flavius Isidorus, who submitted it to the governor, who asked for more details. Isidorus then set down to revise the text himself with the help of various deletions and interlinear and marginal additions, which have not all been read. We have a later version of the petition, which adopts some of the corrections in evidence here (P.Lips. I 34). The Latin in lines 24–25 does not fill the complete width of the papyrus, and its scribe may have tried to “center” his text, leaving generous blanks before and after each line. Line 25 is on the lower edge of the papyrus and almost illegible.

Line 24 has been read as *[aurum qu]od alius tibi . . . [. . .] perferr[e . . .] di ma [. . .] non poposçisse*. I think I see, after *tibi, çessit* and I think the following gap is wide enough to contain two letters, thus *[ut]*. Instead of the infinitive *perferr[e]*, we need a subjunctive, as follows: *[aurum qu]od alius tibi çessit [ut] perferr[es]*. What follows is difficult to read, but Marichal's *d* is surely an *r*, and Mitteis read the traces following *ma* as *n*, no doubt correctly. Before *ri* I see a round letter, perhaps *a*, itself preceded by a long letter, perhaps *d*. Between *perferr[es]* and *. . . ri* (*dari?*), there is room for about two letters, so perhaps we should read *er] dari man[davi]t*. The connection with the following infinitive is unclear, but perhaps we should understand: “To not have asked for the gold that another gave you to convey and ordered to be handed over” (is interpreted by the governor, whose remark is here quoted, in a certain way as laid out in line 25, but not recoverable for us). Note that, contrary to what has been maintained so far, line 25 is in the same hand as line 24, just a bit faster and more cursive.

On the *verso* I read the beginning of the first line as τούτο <τό> χρυσίον rather than τὸ ὑπό(λοιπον) χρυσίον. There is no mark of abbreviation, and abbreviation is unexpected in such a note (which copies the final remark by the governor, asking for more information). By this time τούτο χρυσίον itself is “correct” Greek, so there may not even be need for the <τό>.

949. P. Lips. I 38 (= M. Chr. 97; ChLA XII 520)

This papyrus contains a report of proceedings in two columns (AD 390), which were cut up for framing. The second column has just five lines and survives in its frame. Unfortunately, the first column, with the bulk of the text, is lost. There is, however, a plate of this column in the *editio princeps*, P.Lips. I 38.

In the lacuna in col. I 2, instead of Marichal's *decurione Hermupolis*, I expect *decurione civitatis Hermupolitanorum* in abbreviated form, perhaps without *civitatis*.

In col. I 10, where P.Lips. I 38 had *[I]os]eph(us)*, M.Chr. 97 . . . [. . .] . . . and ChLA XII 520 [.], I suspect *[At]res*, because *ad(vocatus)* does not follow, and the only person present who is not a lawyer, or does not have another title, is the representative of the defendant, *Hatres*. Wilcken had rejected *[I]os]eph(us)*, pointing out that the trace before the lacuna belonged to the preceding *nu*.⁵⁹

J.-O. Tjäder thought he could read the name of the governor as *Esuthius* in col. I 15 (or rather *Esuthiu(s)*, as the final *-s* is lacking in all instances where the name can be read on the plate or the original) instead of *Esychiu(s)*. The *y* is written exactly the same as *u*, and the *ch* combination, if that is what it is, does look a lot like *th*, but the name of the governor is Ἡσύχιος in Greek texts, e.g., P.Lips. I 66, 15. The *H-* of *Hesychius* is left out in the Latin rendering of the name, and this is paralleled by the spelling *Atres* for Ἄτρης, the representative of the defendant in this case. At

⁵⁸ F. Mitthof, *Bemerkungen zu den Kaiserpetitionen P.Lips. I 34 und 35 (ChLA XII 524)*, ZPE 139 (2002) 139–142 [= BL XIII 61f.].

⁵⁹ U. Wilcken, *Zu den Leipziger Papyri*, APF 4 (1908) 472.

the end of col. I 15 there is a bit of Latin (P.Lips. 1.38 read it as *εἰς . . . ἀστέριον*). Marichal connects it with the beginning of the next line, where there is a lacuna, as follows: *εἰς ἀστέριον ἀστέριον* (?) | [*ing(ressus) f(uisset)*]. But in the next line, the governor is introduced, and his name should start at the beginning of the line. We can do no better than to revert to the reading in P.Lips. I 38.

After col. II 5 there is a kind of *paraglyphus* (two wavy lines). Marichal read one of the wavy lines in combination with the vertical *hasta* of *rho* of *τέτοις* in col. II 5 as a word in what he thought was a sixth line: *ἐξ(emplum)* (?), but this is impossible.

The *verso* is blank, but editors after the *editio princeps* have persistently read *λίβελλος* there.⁶⁰ The text is, however, not a *libellus*, but a report of proceedings. In fact, the word *λίβελλος* should instead be read on the *verso* of P.Lips. I 37, as pointed out by Wilcken long before the reeditions.⁶¹

⁶⁰ Jur.Pap. 91; FIRA III 174; ChLA XII 520.

⁶¹ U. Wilcken, *Zu den Leipziger Papyri*, APF 4 (1908) 469 n.1.