**Some remarks on the recently published P.Carlsberg inv. 555 ro + PSI inv. D 111 ro[[1]](#footnote-1)\***

ABSTRACT – The article presents new readings on P.Carlsberg. inv. 555 ro + PSI inv. d 111 ro, a Latin document of second century AD. The main fragment (fr. *a*) contains a list of mostly Egyptian names and a few Greek ones. The whole document, the typology of which is still unclear, was probably drafted within a military *milieu*.

Two Latin texts, written on papyrus fragments split among collections in Florence, Berlin and Copenhagen, have been published in last year’s *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* by Dr Hilla Halla-aho.[[2]](#footnote-2) The second item, P.Carlsberg inv. 555 ro + PSI inv. D 111 ro,[[3]](#footnote-3) is particularly challenging because of its damaged state and the script, an old Roman cursive characterized by groups of distinct letters with similar features, which makes reading difficult. The papyrus comes from the Tebtynis Temple Library, but the Latin document was not drafted there. That library clearly contained documents that originated elsewhere, such as several papyri written on the *verso* in Demotic and Hieratic that were written somewhere else in Greek or (twice only) in Latin on the *ro*, and then re-used in the temple at Tebtynis.[[4]](#footnote-4) This is also the case for P.Carlsberg inv. 555 + PSI inv. D 111, which contains a Demotic text on the *verso*, published by Kim Ryholt,[[5]](#footnote-5) and the Latin text on the *ro* published by Halla-aho. This Latin document is therefore of unknown origin, and can be dated to the second century AD only on a palaeographic basis. It mentions ships (*naues*), canoes (*monoxyla*), ironsmiths (*fabri ferrarii*) and contains a probable reference to the Roman army (*ad kastra*).[[6]](#footnote-6) This paper offers a palaeographical assessment of the manuscript, with a focus on peculiar letters (1); then a textual revision on the main fragment (fr. *a*) with some new readings and a commentary to the text of the first edition (2); some remarks are also done on the smaller fragments (3); then some tentative conclusions are provided (4).[[7]](#footnote-7)

1. *Paleographical notes*.

Halla-aho describes the old Roman cursive used to draft the document as a ‘cursive hand with certain distinctive characteristics[[8]](#footnote-8)’. Indeed this hand is noteworthy among all the samples of old Roman cursive from Latin papyri. The scribe distinctly avoids ligatures, and despite employing letterforms of clearly cursive origin, he strives to imitate capital script.[[9]](#footnote-9) Notable letters are *n*, with its oblique stroke invariably upwards like that of *a* (but not that of *r*); and *h*, elaborately drawn in a quasi-majuscule shape (l. 5 *Eup****h****rosynus*) or in a more cursive form (l. 4 *Collut****h****i*). Even more relevant is the *upsilon*, a letter not Latin in origin and a rare occurrence in Latin documents from Egypt[[10]](#footnote-10), which is used appropriately in almost every instance of Greek names (all in l. 5: Euphrosynus, Dionysius, and – mistakenly – Anoybammon for Anubammon). Moreover, the scribe draws *upsilon* in a shape not yet seen among the attested *y*’s in those very documents: instead of the expected wide triangular shape, open to the top and pointing to the bottom, he draws a serpentine-like oblique stroke, reaching the height of the oblique strokes of *a* and *n*, and then adds a much shorter stroke on the right side, pointing in the opposite direction.

|  |
| --- |
| P.Carlsberg inv. 555 ro + PSI inv. D 111 ro(courtesy of the Papyrus Hauniensis Collection) |
| Two *n*’s, one wider, one narrower (to the left); two *h*’s, both incompletely preserved   The *y*’s in ***Diony****sio*, *Dio****nysio Euty****che* and *Euphr****osyn****us*[[11]](#footnote-11):   |
| Similar *n*’s and *h*’s are to be found in other Latin documents on papyrus from the I and early II AD: |
| *PSI* 6.729 (AD 77[[12]](#footnote-12)) | *P.Freib.* 1.2a ro (second century AD[[13]](#footnote-13)) | *P.Mich.* 7.434 + *P.Ryl.* 4.612 (second century AD[[14]](#footnote-14)) |
|  |  |  |
| *P.Berenike* 2.123 (late first century AD)[[15]](#footnote-15) | *O.Berenike* 3.291 (first century AD)[[16]](#footnote-16) | *O.Berenike* 3.439 (first century AD)[[17]](#footnote-17) |
|  |  |  |
| P.Berol. inv. 8334 (AD 83–86)[[18]](#footnote-18) |   |

Halla-aho rightly dates this writing approximately to the second century AD.[[19]](#footnote-19) From the purely palaeographical point of view, it seems possible to include the late first century AD within the chronological fork.

2. *Remarks on P.Carlsberg inv. 555 fr. a*

Halla-aho’s text runs as follows:

— — —

1pẹṭ ̣ạọ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ *traces* [

2 Psenọṣịrei Saṛạp̣ịọn ṭ ̣ ̣oṣịṛẹị ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣sciṣạṛạ ̣ ̣ ̣[

3p ̣̣ ̣t ̣oịḍịs sạṛạ ̣ ̣ ̣ṇ Iṣịḍori i ̣ ̣ṣ f̣ḷọrhị Ṣitọẹs ̣ ̣ạ ̣osṣ[

4p[± 2/3] ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣o ̣i · P[s]enosịṛịṣ c ̣liuṣ ṛ[± 9] ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[

5ạạ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ṃon ̣ ̣ ̣ẹ ̣ ̣f ̣ ̣ọṣỵnuiạṛḅp̣ · Ḍịọnysiuṣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[

6 p̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[ ] ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ạṃussiṣ ṣạ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[

7p̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[ ] ̣ *traces* [

8 p̣ạṇ[ ̣] ̣[

9 ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[

10 *traces* [

— — —

1 *Pet* is certain; what follows might be interpreted as *peteṇị*. I prefer *n* over *a*, since if *a* is chosen, one is left with a large, narrow, elliptical figure immediately following *a*, which cannot be traced back to any letter. On the other hand, *n* – assuming the third stroke is visibly bent upwards, as in l. 3 -*o****n****is* – yields the Egyptian name Peteniesis⁓ Πετενίηϲιϲ[[20]](#footnote-20), perhaps followed by the beginning of the patronymic (*Peteṇịẹṣịṣ Ṇ* ̣[ ̣] ̣[ ̣ ̣] ̣[). The name was so far only attested in the early Ptolemaic period (no later than 138 BC). A less likely possibility is Peteniphis ⁓ Πετενῖφιϲ, followed by the bottom of an oblique stroke (perhaps *e*: *Peteṇịp̣ḥịṣ* *Ẹ*[ ̣] ̣[ ̣ ̣] ̣[)[[21]](#footnote-21).

2 This line seems to have mainly personal names with patronymics; there are difficulties in telling individual names apart. The first two, visible in the left part of the line, are *Psenosirei* and *Sarapionis*, at first sight the genitive or dative (mistakenly written for a nominative[[22]](#footnote-22)?) of Psenosiris[[23]](#footnote-23) and the genitive of Sarapion[[24]](#footnote-24). Above the name *Psenosirei* one can see some strokes of pen, which recall one or more erased letters: it may be an interlinear addition, referring to this line or to the line above, and quickly cancelled after it was started. What follows *Sarapionis* is very uncertain. I read *tortaei*[ ̣] ̣[ ̣]*n* ̣[, the first uncertain letter resembling the lower portion of *s*, the second consisting only of dots. Halla-aho interpreted the last two letters of *Sarapion****is*** as ***ti***, and thought of *Titosirei* or *Tetosirei*;[[25]](#footnote-25) I am not convinced that after to one can read *s*. One is reminded of the Egyptian name Thotortaios[[26]](#footnote-26) (‘Thot is the one who has given him/her’), which after the Ptolemaic period is sometimes found written Θορταῖοϲ:[[27]](#footnote-27) perhaps *Tortaei*? However, one ought to suppose *t* rendered for *th*. The end of the line is puzzling as well. One can read [ ̣ ̣]*ẹ ̣ ̣ịsci*, and then *Sarap[i]o[n]* ̣ ̣[: I refrain from reading *Sarap[i]o[n]ịṣ* as I would not be able to explain the succession of a patronymic and a papponymic here (NN son of …iscus son of Sarapion). As for the name in -*iscus*, I am tempted to read *H]ẹṛṃịsci* or *H]ẹṛạịsci*. The first name, Hermiscus, from a palaeographical point of view the most likely, is very seldom attested, and only in Italy;[[28]](#footnote-28) Heraiscus,[[29]](#footnote-29) on the other hand, is more widespread in Egypt.[[30]](#footnote-30)

3 From Halla-aho’s *Iṣịḍori*, one can confirm what she had already hypothesized,[[31]](#footnote-31) i.e. the fully readable name + patronymic *Sạṛạp̣[io]n Isidori*. At the beginning of the line, after *p*, one sees blurred traces of two letters, and then the genitive ending -*tionis*, which suggests that the name is the patronymic of another name at the end of the preceding line. With all due caution, I think of *Pọṇtionis*, from the Greek name Ποντίων ⁓ Pontio.[[32]](#footnote-32) The remains of the letter before *t* are scanty: nevertheless, one can see the lower portion of an upright, and from the upper portion of it, a departing oblique stroke. After *Isidori*, two further couples name + patronymic can be found. In the first, the genitive *Flori* (from Florus ⁓ Φλῶροϲ,[[33]](#footnote-33) attested in early Roman Egypt) is clear; not so for the preceding name. The initial letter might be *p*, but is different from all other initial *p*’s in the document; also *f* could be thought of. What follows might be read as *ịụṛọs*, *ịụṛụs*, *ṛẹịọs* or *ṛẹịụs*. Perhaps *P̣ịụṛọs*, reminiscent of Egyptian names Πιῦριϲ[[34]](#footnote-34) and the much rarer, and very suspect, Πιῦϲιϲ;[[35]](#footnote-35) or *F̣ṛẹịụs*, attested in an inscription from Moesia as a *lixa* ‘sutler’ of a legion.[[36]](#footnote-36) Then comes the second couple, *Tiṭhoes Ịṣạṭos*. The name is a widespread variant of Τοτοῆϲ, and attested in Roman Egypt;[[37]](#footnote-37) the patronymic appears to be a transliteration of Ἰϲᾶτοϲ, the genitive of Ἰϲᾶϲ.[[38]](#footnote-38)

4 Most of the letters in this line are blurred and illegible. The name already identified in the middle of the line by Halla-aho (Psenosiris) is most likely followed by *C̣ọlḷutḥị*, the genitive of Colluthus ⁓ Κολλοῦθοϲ.[[39]](#footnote-39) The second *l* is quite puzzling, being an upright with only a hint of a protruding stroke from its bottom; nevertheless, -*tḥị* is readable. After this genitive, traces are impenetrable. Also before Psenosiris son of Colluthus very little can be read. At the beginning of the line one is tempted to interpret something like *P̣[anemp]ḥị* or *P̣[etoup]ḥị* (a patronymic), then *Ṭṣẹṛẹṣ* (Τϲέρη[[40]](#footnote-40)), a rarely attested female name; but this being the case, the ending -*es* would point to another genitive (Τϲέρη is inflected like a regular feminine Greek name in -η), so there is no real certainty here. The name before Psenosiris ends in -*sioti* and is followed by an interpunct. Perhaps *Ṇịsioti*, a variant or a mistake from Nesiotes ⁓ Νηϲιώτηϲ,[[41]](#footnote-41) but the genitive is odd (*Nisioti* instead of the expected *Nesiotis*) and the name is rarely attested.

5 The line opens with *an*, rather than *aa*. After *n*, one sees a trace of a circular stroke in the upper portion of the line (consistent with *o*), and then – much above the line – the small portion of an oblique stroke, going down. The position of that stroke closely recalls that of the initial stroke of *y* in this papyrus (see the table above). At the end of the name, the reading *mon* by Halla-aho is confirmed; after it, only dot-like traces. This suggests the genitive *Anọỵ[b]ạ[m]monịṣ* from the Graeco-Egyptian name Ἀνουβάμμων.[[42]](#footnote-42) It probably represents the patronymic of a now lost name, which was placed last in the preceding line. The name has only one other attestation, in a much later papyrus (a list of names): *P.IFAO* 3.47, l. 8 Ἀνουβάμμ̣ων̣ Ἄρουϲ (fourth century AD, TM 33490). More generally, Dunand has remarked how Graeco-Egyptian compound names in -αμμων are not found in Egypt before the end of the first century AD and are still rare in the following century, which is not at odds with the proposed dating of the present papyrus.[[43]](#footnote-43) The scribe has apparently transcribed the Greek diphthong ου mistakenly, i.e. with the Latin characters *oy* instead of simple *u*. Among the surviving portions of the document, this error is made only here and in P.Carlsberg inv. 555 fr. *c*, l. 2 (see below).

What follows can be read as the name *Ẹụp̣hrosynus* (Euphrosynus ⁓ Εὐφρόϲυνοϲ[[44]](#footnote-44)), followed by the sequence (already in Halla-aho) *arbp*, then by an interpunct. The name is apparently not followed by a genitive, but by one or more abbreviated words, perhaps indicating Euphrosynus’ professional qualification.[[45]](#footnote-45) The sequence *ar* might be split from *bp* and interpreted as an *arcarius* ‘treasurer’.[[46]](#footnote-46) Extant evidence (mainly on stone) from Rome and Roman provinces as well shows *arcarii* as *serui publici*, keeping the accounts of the town which owned them, their duty being mainly to supervise and register incomes and outcomes from the public treasury.[[47]](#footnote-47) In their capacity of accountants they also served individual *domini*, such as bankers[[48]](#footnote-48) or Emperors,[[49]](#footnote-49) or worked in military units[[50]](#footnote-50) and outposts (*stationes*[[51]](#footnote-51)). Latin documents on papyrus feature *arcarii* twice:

- in *P.Wisc.* 2.50 (AD 165),[[52]](#footnote-52) a collection of Latin legal formulae; in col. 2.11–17 an *arcarius* is mentioned in the framework of the enfranchisement of a slave (*manumissio*): |11  ̣ ̣[- - -] |12 *Orfito et Pudente co(n)s(ulibus)* [- - -] |13 *C. Iulius Monimus mil*[*es legionarius* - - -] |14 *profiteor apud ueim*[- - -] |15 *et Eutuche arkar(iu-) u* ̣` ̣´ [- - -] |16 *seruam meam maior*[*em* - - -] |17 *nec habere eam plus*;

- in *BGU* 2.628 vo (AD 185),[[53]](#footnote-53) probably a receipt for the payment of the manumission tax; at l. 3 an *arcarius* is mentioned, and below in the column the *uicesima libertatis populi Romani*.

Both the documents are apparently connected with the manumission tax, i.e. the *uicesima libertatis*, suggesting that in the provinces *arcarii* were also required to handle the incomes and outcomes of that particular section of the *fiscus*. A noteworthy coincidence: an *arcarius* called Euphrosynus appears also in *CIL* 10.3942 (Capua, second half of the first century AD). As for the remaining abbreviation, *bp*, one is driven to a more speculative solution. In Latin documents on tablet and papyrus this abbreviation normally indicates the Roman institution of *bonorum possessio* (διακατοχὴ ὑπαρχόντων).[[54]](#footnote-54) However, the office here envisaged of *arcarius bonorum possessionis* is completely absent from the extant evidence, nor can we resort to solutions such as *b(ona)* *p(raetoria)*, or *b(ona) p(raefectorum)* or *p(rincipalium)*, all unattested and apparently non-existent.[[55]](#footnote-55) Given that treasurers charged with collecting (for the *fiscus populi Romani*) taxes such as the *uicesima hereditatum*[[56]](#footnote-56)or the *uicesima libertatis* for the *manumissiones*[[57]](#footnote-57) are attested in several areas of the Roman world, one is tempted to suppose that they could also be charged with collecting a tax (or at any rate overseeing the gathered tax money) from those who were granted *bonorum possessio* over their relatives’ estate. If testaments, to be fully functional, required the heir to pay to the Roman state the percentage envisaged by Augustus with the *lex Iulia de uicesima hereditatum et legatorum* (AD 6), nothing prevents the same from have happened when a dead person’s estate was transmitted to his/her heir through *bonorum possessio*, rather than through *hereditas*.[[58]](#footnote-58)

The name following this problematic abbreviation has been correctly identified by Halla-aho as *Dionysius*. Also this individual is not marked by his father’s name in the genitive case, but from something pointing to his profession. One can read scanty traces of *n*; the top of a curved stroke, suggesting *c*, *e* or *p*; the long oblique stroke of *a*, and then the blurred but readable sequence *taf*. This suggests *ṇ(umeri) c̣ạtaf(ractariorum).* Dionysius is a soldier: he belongs to a unit – *numerus*, abbreviated *n* – of *cataphractarii*, i.e. soldiers clad in armour (here written with *f* for *ph*[[59]](#footnote-59)). For the syntagm and the abbreviations, see e.g. *CIL* 13.3493 *Val(erius) Durio* | *circit(or*[[60]](#footnote-60)*)* ***n(umeri) cata***|***fr(actariorum)*** *vix(it) an(nos) XXX*[ ̣ ̣ ̣] (from *Samarobriua*, in *Gallia Belgica*: date not reported). The mention of cataphracts, allegedly introduced in Roman army by Hadrian – if *CIL* 11.5632 is proof enough – can narrow down the chronological fork for this document from late first-second century AD to a post-Hadrianic period.[[61]](#footnote-61) At the end of the line, *a* or *r* and then perhaps *o*.

6 The ink at the beginning of the line is blurred. *P* is certain, then a lacuna precedes traces of *n*; a large and badly damaged letter, which resembles an open and angular *u*; dot-like traces of perhaps *p* or *t*, and then *hi*; before the first lacuna, dot-like traces. With some difficulty, one can think of *P[a]ṇụp̣hi*, *P[e]ṇụp̣hi*, or *P[a]ṇụṭhi*, perhaps followed by -*s*. The Egyptian names involved would be Πανοῦφιϲ or Πανούφιοϲ (including the attested variant Πενοῦφιϲ)[[62]](#footnote-62), Πανοῦθις or Πανούθιοϲ (attested variants from Παπνοῦτιϲ).[[63]](#footnote-63) The following name, probably a patronymic, is completely lost, but for what seems to be a final -*ẹṣ*. Then I see an *s*, the bottom of *c*, *e* or *p*, the two long oblique strokes of *a* or *n*, and the top of *s*; an *m* follows, and – as Halla-aho surmised – *muṣṣis* or *muṣṭis*. This can be construed into the name + patronymic *Sẹṇạṣ Muṣṭis*, Senas (Ϲενᾶϲ or Ϲηνᾶϲ[[64]](#footnote-64)) son of Mustes. *Mustis* is probably a Latinate genitive for the Greek name Μύϲθηϲ[[65]](#footnote-65), here transliterated ‘Mustes’ without the aspiration.[[66]](#footnote-66) The last legible names appear to be another couple of name + patronymic: the initial *ṣạ* read by Halla-aho can be expanded in *Saṛap̣ịon Ạrpọc̣ra[tio]ṇ[is*, Sarapion son of Harpocration[[67]](#footnote-67) (here written without the aspiration).[[68]](#footnote-68)

7 After *p*, *s* and *e* appear to be certain, then the blurred traces of *n*. Perhaps once again the name Psenosiris, for the third time (also in ll. 2 and 4); but given the rich set of Egyptian names in Psen-, no real certainty is possible here. Two further letters can be read, separated by a lacuna of about 12 letters. The letter before the wide lacuna, immediately following *Psen-*, might be the bottom of *r* or *s*. The letter in the middle of the line might be *a, d* or *n*.

8 The reading of Halla-aho is confirmed. Any Graeco-Egyptian name beginning with Pan- could fit here. The letter after the first lacuna has a long protruding oblique stroke and is probably *a, d* or *n*; the following letter is represented only by a dot at the bottom of the writing line.

9 A small improvement can be made here. After traces of six letters (two of which in two small lacunas), one sees a final –*i* and then an *interpunctum*. The name before the interpunct is almost certainly in the genitive case and represents a patronymic. Only the bottom of the three letters before *i* survives; the first visible letter, visible instead only at the top, is *s* or *c*. An ending in ]*ṛẹṣi* or ]*ṭẹṣi* is possible. After the *interpunctum*, either *n* or traces of two letters.

10 Only weak traces here.

I give below the text after the new readings:

— — —

1Peteṇị ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[ ̣] ̣[ ̣ ̣] ̣[

2 Psenosirei Sarap̣ịonis tortaei[ ̣] ̣[ ̣]n ̣[ ̣ ̣]ẹ ̣ ̣ịsci Sarap[i]o[n] ̣ ̣[

3Pọṇtionis Sạṛạp̣[io]n Isidori ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣s Flori Tiṭhoes Ịṣạṭos S ̣[

4P̣[ ̣ ̣ ̣]ḥ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ẹ ̣ ̣ ̣sioti · Psenosiris C̣ọlḷutḥị [ ̣] ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[ ̣ ̣] ̣ ̣ ̣ọ[

5Anọỵ[b]ạ[m]monịṣ Ẹụp̣hrosynus ar(carius) b- p- · Dionysius ṇ(umeri) c̣ạtaf(ractariorum) ̣ ̣[

6 P[ ̣]ṇụ ̣hi ̣ ̣[ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]ẹṣ Sẹṇạṣ Muṣṭis Saṛap̣ịon Ạrpọc̣ra[tio]ṇ[is

7Pseṇ[ ̣] ̣[ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣] ̣[

8 P̣ạṇ[ ̣] ̣ ̣[

9 [ ̣] ̣[ ̣] ̣ ̣ ̣ ị · ̣ ̣[

10 [ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣] ̣ ̣[ ̣ ̣] ̣[

— — —

3. *Remarks on the smaller fragments.*

A few further improvements, most of them of little import, can be made to the smaller fragments, namely those belonging to P.Carlsberg and those from the PSI inv. D 111:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| P.Carlsberg inv. 555 fr. *b1*, l. 1 | fa]bris ferrar( ) ̣i ạ · ạ[ ] ̣ ̣ |

One way to solve the problem of the unusual width of the letter *r* in *ferrar*, which prompted Halla-aho to assume an abbreviation and traces of a further letter, is to understand the word as mistaken, both from the orthographic and the syntactical point of view: *ferrar{ṛ}ia·* or *ferrar{ẹ}ia* instead of *ferrariis*, governed by *fabris*. After the interpunct one can see ̣[ ̣] ̣ ̣[, the three partially preserved letters being either *a*’s or *n*’s, less likely *r*’s.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| P.Carlsberg inv. 555 fr. *b1*, l. 2 | ] ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[± 4] ̣s monoxyl( ) n(umero) XỊII ẹ[ |

Before *monoxyl(a)* or *monoxyl(orum)* one can read a difficult sequence: ]*n ẹ ̣ ̣n*̣[ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣] *̣s*. Perhaps the Roman name *‹A›eḷịn*[*us*?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| P.Carlsberg inv. 555 fr. *b1*, l. 6 | ] ̣[ ]ạ[d]f̣ixuṃ ̣ḅ[ |

After *] ạ[d]f̣ixum*, perhaps *[o]ḅ* rather than *[a]ḅ*, for in this case one would be able to see the long protruding oblique stroke of the letter above the lacuna. It is also possible, since usually *m* does not have two protruding strokes of the same length in this document, that we may read the sequence *] a[d]fixuṣ ạḍ [o]ḅ[*, perhaps *[o]ḅ[olos*, less likely *[o]ḅ[icem* or *[o]ḅ[eliscum*.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| P.Carlsberg inv. 555 fr. *b2*, ll. 1–2 | ] ̣e ̣ X̣X̣Ṿ [ ] ̣i nauisita[ |

Instead of *e* surrounded by traces of two letters, I would see ]*ṣf̣*- (an abbreviation) or ]*ṣẹ*, and then immediately *XXV*; in the following line, ]*ḷi* is quite certain.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| P.Carlsberg inv. 555 fr. *c*, ll. 1–2 | ]ịt · XV K(alendas) Iụṇ(ias) ̣ ̣[] ̣ corṇạss ̣ ̣ị y ̣ ̣[ |

After *Iụṇ(ias)* *ạḍ* is possible, perhaps referred to some other day in the following lacuna: e.g. ]*it* · *XV K(alendas) Iụṇ(ias)* *ạḍ* [*diem* … *K(alendas) easdem* (or with the genitive, *Kalendarum earundem*). In l. 2, Halla-aho’s hypothesis is correct: I can see an interpunct after *corn* precisely over an erased ⟦*a*⟧, then *s* *s* – resulting in a *corn(icularius) s(upra)s(criptus)*.[[69]](#footnote-69) The last letters before the lacuna can be interpreted as the name following that of the *cornicularius*, i.e. *Psẹytḥ*[*is* – incorrectly written like Anoybammon above, for Pseuthis ⁓ Ψεῦθιϲ.[[70]](#footnote-70)



courtesy of the Papyrus Hauniensis Collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PSI inv. D 111 fr. *d*, l. 3 | ] ạ Ḍiọṇyṣịo Eutyche ̣· e[ ] ̣eo nauạ ̣[ |

This line can be partially improved: ] *a Dionysio Eutyc̣ḥe · ẹ*[*t*] *Leona u ̣*[, the last letter being *ạ* or *ḍ*. The personal name Leonas ⁓ Λεωνᾶϲ, here in the ablative case and coordinated with Dionysius Eutyches, is attested in Egypt[[71]](#footnote-71). My only perplexity is the *ẹ* of *ẹ*[*t*], which is blurred and might well also be *ḳ*, giving Kleonas ⁓ Κλεωνᾶϲ. In this case, however, *k* would hardly fill the whole space between its upright and the *l* of *leona*.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PSI inv. D 111 fr. *e* | ] ̣ ̣[ ]ṣdf̣ṃ[*traces*] ̣[ ]naual ̣[*traces* |

In the first line one can read ] *ạḅ ẹ*[*iu*]*sdem*, perhaps followed by a noun in the ablative case in the lacuna. L. 3, on the other hand, can be probably be construed *ạḍ* [·] *naual(ia) b*̣[ or *naual(e) ḅ*[, referring perhaps to a dockyard. This abbreviation is not attested for the noun *nauale*, -*is*, but it is found for the adjective *naualis*.[[72]](#footnote-72)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PSI inv. D 111 fr. *g* | ] ̣ṛc̣ion[] ̣a ̣[ |

In the first line one can read ]*ḍacion*[, which in turn is probably part of the name Dacio, -onis. The name is seldom attested in the extant evidence: in *CIL* 3.13058 (*Salona*, AD 175–250) where one clearly sees an Ulpius Dacio, and in P.Lund inv. 2049 *ro*[[73]](#footnote-73), where a Dacio is styled as a *conseru(us)*. Notably, the hand in the P.Lund is remarkably similar to that in the present papyrus, so much as to make us wonder whether it is the same scribe who drafted both documents.

|  |
| --- |
| PSI inv. D 111 fr. *g*, l. 1 (courtesy of the Papyrus Hauniensis Collection) |
|  |
| P.Lund inv. 2049 ro, l. 2 |
|  |

4. *To sum up*.

The revised decipherment of the document, despite providing more clarity for the largest fragment – more names, in particular – does not get us closer than before to identify its overall typology. One can recognize meaningful features only in portions of it. The sub-set of fragments represented by P.Carlsberg inv. 555 frr. *b1*, *b2* and PSI inv. D 111 *a*, *b*, *d*, *e* and *f* appears clear enough: as Halla-aho already surmised,[[74]](#footnote-74) we are dealing with documents from the *milieu* of a Roman military unit, perhaps the report of a *fabrica legionis* where the scribe(s) would have noted how many people were working at the moment, their ranks (*fabri ferrarii*, for instance), and what they were working at – in our case, ships and boats – with precise numbers.[[75]](#footnote-75) But the sub-set in which P.Carlsberg inv. 555 frr. *a* and *c* are included complicates the picture.

One is presented with a non-columnar list of names, mainly Egyptian in origin (only a few Greek ones are extant) and the individuals are noted with name and patronymic;[[76]](#footnote-76) exceptions are made for people connected with the Roman administration (the treasurer Euphrosynus) and the army (the mail-clad cavalryman Dionysius, the unknown *cornicularius*). The dating formula in fr. *c* – if fr. *c* and *a* were part of the same section – might have introduced this list. These non-columnar lists of individuals in Latin documents usually appear in reports, rather than proper lists, but no known specimen of this group fits the bill for the present papyrus.[[77]](#footnote-77) Bearing in mind that at present there is no way to know the distance between the two sub-sets in the original document, therefore – as Halla-aho already suspected – that the sub-sets might represent completely different typologies of document within a larger one,[[78]](#footnote-78) one is tempted to resort to Halla-aho hypothesis that the listed people in fr. *a* were private contractors, providing raw material and other services for the Roman army;[[79]](#footnote-79) and to think of frr. *a* and *c* as part of a list of debtors or contributors to the military unit, who might have come from different social standings.[[80]](#footnote-80) The exact amount of what they owed, or gave, might have been inserted in another register, or at the top or at the bottom (both lost) of fr. *a*. One is reminded of *PSI* 2.119 ro + *ChLA* 4.264[[81]](#footnote-81), a Latin register pertaining to an unspecified Roman unit in Egypt, originally accommodated on the *ro* of a later re-used roll, where details and provenance of several incoming quantities of money were given in a chronological fashion. A resemblance in general appearance between the two papyri was already noticed in Halla-aho (n. 1) 229. One might suspect, from the dating formula in P.Carlsberg inv. 555 fr. *c*, that frr. *a* and *c* contained an entry listing a large number of private individuals perhaps giving a specific sum (detailed only once at the bottom or at the top of the entry, and now lost) to the funds of the unit: see e.g. *PSI* 2.119 ro fr. *a* ll. 13–19 for a typical entry. Long lists of names are absent from this register, but it cannot be ruled out that there were some in the enormous lost portions of the papyrus. Notably, at ll. 15 and 19 of the *PSI*, the notation *ad k(astra)* appears, as it also apparently does in the smaller fragments of the presently discussed papyrus, PSI inv. D 111 fr. *b1* l. 3 and fr. *a* l. 4.

To conclude: so far only partial explanations and only partially convincing parallels can be offered to explain the peculiarities of P.Carlsberg inv. 555 ro + PSI inv. D 111 ro. Whereas portions of it appear to be recognizable, others are still puzzling. The typology of the whole original document escapes us for the time being. One can at least date the document, thanks to the *catafractarius* Dionysius, to the Hadrianic or post-Hadrianic period.
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70. TM Names 25582. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. TM Names 10140. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
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77. One recalls e.g. *PSI* 13.1321 (1st half of the first century AD, TM 25149) containing accounts from a Roman bank or firm in Egypt where the names – mostly of Roman citizens, since they bear the *tria nomina* and the name of the tribe – are not listed in columns, but one after the other. The comparison, however, is defective: after every name there is a sum of money, for these people owed money to (or received money from) the bank; nowhere in frr. *a* or *c* can one find a quantity of money or other goods, not even a number. Another similar layout is in *acta diurna*, or morning reports, drafted in the *officia* of Roman legions and auxiliary units: after each duty or mission a list is appended of the soldiers involved, whose names are written one after the other. (These morning reports normally present a number of entries, marked by the day and the month and very freely laid out in wide columns and irregular paragraphs, in which everyday activities, number and ranks of the soldiers are reported (the most detailed and recent outline is in O. Salati, *Scrivere documenti nell’esercito romano. L’evidenza dei papiri latini d’Egitto tra I e III secolo d.C.*, Wiesbaden 2020, pp. 10–25). This can be seen e.g. in *PSI* 13.1307 ro (AD 65, TM 25148), P.Louvre inv. E 10490 (no TM number yet: recently published in Salati [n. 76] 195–200), *P.Dura* 82 (AD 223–232, TM 44813) or *P.Dura* 89 (AD 239, TM 44820). But this comparison is defective as well. One should assume that the individuals listed in the P.Carlsberg were all Roman soldiers, and yet only one of them is styled as such (Dionysius, from a *numerus catafractariorum*); another appears to be connected with civil administration (Euphrosynus, an *arcarius* perhaps *bonorum possessionis*). It may be objected, that in *acta diurna* soldiers without a specific rank or profession were listed with only their name and patronymic (e.g. in the aforementioned *P.Dura* 82 or 89). This would make sense if Dionysius were provided with a specific notation indicating his rank or duty within the unit. Instead, he is only qualified as coming from a cavalry unit, as if what mattered for the scribe was the mere fact that he was a soldier, in contrast with Euphrosynus, a treasurer and (presumably) a slave, and with the other individuals who were *not* provided with the same notation – and therefore, one might surmise, were *not* soldiers. One might even think of an association (*collegium* ⁓ ϲύνοδοϲ), but once again there is no clear evidence for it. The matter is further complicated by the fact that there seems to be no specific order in the presentation of names: they appear to be randomly distributed; moreover, the scribe interrupts the name + patronymic sequence in three cases at least (Euphrosynus, Dionysius and the *cornicularius*), which are well within the list, without separating them from the other ones, or without any sign of internal division. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. Halla-aho (n. 1) 229. The apparent divergence could in fact be explained if the original document was laid out in more than one column, or at any rate large enough to contain distinct texts written by the same scribe in different moments, perhaps both in a military *milieu*, but not necessarily both related to the internal proceedings of the military unit they referred to. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. Halla-aho (n. 1) 229. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. A possible parallel is *SB* 12.10796 (AD 198, TM 14339), a list of debtors which provides only names and – at the bottom – their provenance (l. 13 ἀπὸ Ταμείων), without noting quantities of money. However, that was a list drafted for private use; furthermore, the non-columnar layout of P.Carlsberg would still have to be accounted for. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. Early second century AD, TM 69879. A full re-edition with detailed commentary in O. Salati, “Un ‘dimenticato’ registro latino. *PSI* II 119 *ro* + *ChLA* IV 264”, *Aegyptus* 97 (2017) 71–111. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)