Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.
La deuxième série (N°s 13—87) contient — à l’exception du N° 40 des années 180—191 de n. è., du N° 53 du Ier siècle de n. è., du N° 59 du IIe siècle de n. è. et du N° 73 du IIIe siècle de n. è. — textes très mutilés et d’importance secondaire) des manuscrits publiés antérieurement, la plupart dans AEGYPTUS, au cours des années 1933—1964, par différents auteurs et édités pour la seconde fois dans SB. Nous sommes très reconnaissants à Monsieur Daris d’avoir rassemblé tous ces textes et de les avoir fait suivre de récentes références bibliographiques, la littérature en question s’étant sensiblement accrue depuis la date de la première édition.


[Warszawa] Anna Świderek


Doctor H. Maehler publishes several documents (Nos. 2012—2054) from the collection of Ägyptischen Museum (Charlottenburger Schloss — West Berlin). Indices to the present texts will appear in the fascicule 2.

No. 2012: Draft of the petition to the prefect, Alexandria, the middle of the 2nd cent. A.D. The petitioner is C. Iulius Agrippinus and the papyrus belongs to the dossier concerning his lawsuit against Drusilla. Unknown up to now iuridicus Hierax is mentioned here.

No. 2013: Fragment of the petition of C. Iulius Agrippinus to the iuridicus Marcus Crispus belonging to the same dossier.

No. 2014: Fragment of the petition in which the names of the prefect Petronius Mamertinus and of the iuridicus Claudius Neokydes occur. Dated 2nd cent. A.D., provenance uncertain. According to the editor’s opinion possibly connected with the same lawsuit as the foregoing.
Nos. 2015 and 2016 are two orders for arrest (2nd cent. A.D.) addressed to archephodos of Soknopaiou Nesos and to hegoumenos and archephodos of Philadelphia respectively.

No. 2017: Declaration of a purchase of an oliveyard (and not a vineyard — "Rebenland", "Rebenpflanzung" as in the title, commentary and translation) from Arsinoe (88 A.D.). Petheus, son of Ptolemaios also called Petheus, declares to bibliophylakes enkteseon of the Arsinoite (both of them already known: Sokrates and Antipatros) 1/4 of a catoecic olivesyard purchased by him from Didymos also called Diodoros son of Akysilaos. The sale itself is already known from P. Lond. II, 141 (p. 181).

No. 2018: Census return from Karanis, 188/9 A.D. Petsoraipis aged 50 declares at his home himself, his daughter Soeris aged 13 born by Tapeteus, and other persons whose relationship to Petsoraipis is not clear. According to the editor, Ptolemais aged 25, Tkoll... aged 15 and Thaesis aged 4, all apatores, are illegitimate children of his former wife (undeclared to the census). This interpretation is based on the reading of 1.10: κλεις συγγενείς (cf. the note). The reading seems impossible because the ages of the three pre-suppose a very strange family situation. Since Petsoraipis declares himself and των ἔμων (l.6) professor Youtie advised me to try to read e.g. τέκνα (ἔργα) συγγενείς which might be a description of daughters of a deceased sister or a female cousin.

No. 2019: Census return of Heracleia freedwoman of Senamounis from Moithymis of the Memphite (188 A.D.). The document is addressed to Dionysios, an official whose title is damaged, of the Memphite nome. According to the editor’s note the traces of letters “στρα(τηγω) nicht auszuschliessen scheinen”, another possibility would be the title of basilikos grammateus of the nome, however the editor does not say whether this is possible. The woman, beside herself, declares to the census also her illegitimate daughter: Σεναμούνιν Αβί (ετών) κ (1.21). The second word is unclear — it cannot be the father’s name; transcript and translation seem to indicate that the editor takes it as alias without being certain whether it is an abbreviation. Notes do not explain it. Line 22 was added by the 2nd hand: Ταστωούς ἀδελ(φή) (έτων) The editor does not explain why he maintains that Tastoous is the daughter of the declarant and not her sister. Col. II contains the beginning of another declaration addressed to the same official.

No. 2020: Notice of birth. Arsinoite, 124 A.D. Four children aged six, five (the twins) and four are declared by their mother acting, in absence of her husband, through her brother. Pl. I allows to correct reading in l.6 to: ὅντας το αὐτύ ενεστος

No. 2021: Notice of death from Talei dated 215 A.D.

No. 2022: Notice of not inundated land. Neilou Polis, 202 A.D.
No. 2023: Notice of land, probably also inundated, from Karanis (198—201 A.D.). The declarant Gemellus Horion is known from previously published papyri (cf. introduction to P. Mich. VI, 422).

No. 2024: Receipt for barley for the army issued by centurio to sitologi of Perseon Kome (Arsinoite, 204 A.D.). The document is a basis for dating the prefecture of Claudius Iulianus at 204—205/6 (and possibly also 203) A.D. In ll. 11—12 the editor reads: \( \varepsilon \xi \delta \nu \upsilon \pi\nu\chi\iota\omicron\grave{\eta}\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\upsilon\varepsilon\eta\nu\sigma\nu \ \rho\eta[j]/ \) διαφόρου μέτρου καινού. Whatever the διάφορον μέτρου καινού means, its rate is expressed in what Doctor Maehler transcribes \( \rho\eta[j]/ \) at the very beginning of l.12. Since 23/48 art. of barley deducted for the διάφορον μ. κ. are 1\( \frac{1}{2} \) p.c. of the total of 32 11/12 art. (cf. Maehler’s own calculation in commentary ad loc.) one should expect this rate to be written in the said place. Professor Youtie whom I asked for opinion on this supposition has kindly informed me by letter that the photo (Pl. II) has \( \rho\gamma\zeta \) which is good for expected 1\( \frac{1}{2} \) p.c.

Nos. 2025A-B and 2026 are three receipts of sitologi. 2025A-B both written on the same piece of papyrus, issued at Euhemeria(?) 144 A.D. on Epeiph 7th and 8th, 2026 from Karanis, 2nd cent.

No. 2027: Receipt for grain issued by dekaprotoi at Theadelphia in the 2nd year of Domitius Domitianus (296 A.D.). Names of the dekaprotoi are the same as in P. Thead. 26 and 27, in spite of the partial damage of the text. The document throws new light on the problem of the array of the body of dekaprotoi. In my opinion the editor is too cautious saying that it cannot be decided whether the body consisted of three or four members (p. 27) and in consequence the transcript reads: ‘\( \Lambda\theta\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma \delta \ (\ ?) \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \Phi\upsilon\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\sigma\omicron\varsigma \) Φιλαδελφος (as proposed by Jouguet in P. Thead. 26,4 see Maehler’s note ad loc.) while the translation has: “(Athanasiou) und (?) Philadelphos” (l. 3—4). These three documents ought to be reconsidered as follows: P. Thead. 26 \( \begin{array}{l} \left\{\H\rho\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu\varsigma \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \Lambda\theta\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \Phi\upsilon\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\sigma\omicron\varsigma \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \Sigma\epsilon\rho\gamma\iota\nu\iota\nu \ \alpha\mu\rho\varphi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\varsigma \ \varepsilon\xi\gamma\iota\varsigma. \ \Lambda\lambda\epsilon\zeta. \ \delta\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\pi\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu. B.G.U. 2027 \ \begin{array}{l} \left\{\H\rho\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu\varsigma \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \Lambda\theta\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma \ \delta \ (\ ?) \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \Phi\upsilon\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\sigma\omicron\varsigma \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \Sigma\epsilon\rho\gamma\iota\nu\iota\nu \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \Sigma\epsilon\rho\gamma\iota\nu\iota\nu \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \Sigma\epsilon\rho\gamma\iota\nu\iota\nu \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \alpha\mu\rho\varphi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\varsigma \ \kappa\alpha\]i \ \delta\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\pi\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu. \end{array} \end{array} \)

Heroninos, Philadelphos and Serenion — there is no signature of Athanasiou. Jouguet’s suggestion Φιλαδελφος δ καὶ Αθανάσιος makes no difficulties only in P. Thead. 27, in the two other it makes us to suppose the wrong order of names or to accept that Athanasiou signed the document with his second name. The clue to understanding the motives behind the suggestion of Jouguet is his translation of the both texts and his commentary to P. Thead. 26,4. Jouguet translates άμφοτεροι “tous les deux” which in P. Thead. 27 makes sense and explains the lack of Athanasiou’s signature. However, it does not explain why άμφοτεροι in P. Thead. 26 stands after four (or according to his suggestion, after three) names. New papyrus material supplies enough proofs for the use
of ἀμφότεροι in the meaning ἀπαντες, “all together” (W.B. ed. 1 and 2, L.S.J., see also note to P. Mert. II, 88, col. X, 4). The fact that documents were not necessarily signed by all the members of the body of dekaprotoi is also already known (e.g. P. Cairo Isid. 38, P. Fay. 85). Thus the document refutes previous interpretation of both papyri from Theadelphia and shows that so far there are not enough proofs that we deal with the situation when there are exceptionally three dekaprotoi instead of four for two joined toparchies. Such interpretation, after Jouguet, was recently accepted by N. Lewis in his Inventory of Compulsory Services in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, New Haven 1968; δεκαπρωτεία 6.

No. 2028: Two receipts for chomatikon from Soknopaiou Nesos (168 A.D.)

Nos. 2029—2030: Toll-receipts. 2029 from Dionysias for λιμένος Μέμφεως (161—169 A.D.) Zosimos exports 9 metretae of oil on two camels (cf. P. Lond. III, 1265d, p. 37: 2 camels carrying 9 metretae of oil and P. Grenf. II, 50g: 1 camel — 4 1/2 metretae). In line 4 we cannot expect any other load, but read [τελ(ούσας) δραχ(μάς) τεσσαράκοντα] i.e. 5 dr. per metretes. The same fee is confirmed many times in customs accounts from Bakchias (P. Wisc. 16 = SB 7365—P. Merton I, 15) dated 114 A.D. 2030 for ρ' και ν', Philadelphia, 2nd—3rd cent. A.D.

No. 2031: Application for registration (παράσεις) of the transfer of right to a part of catoeic land and other immovable property. Karanis, 180—192 A.D.

No. 2032: Offer for lease of διάφορον ζυτείων being a tax or monopoly. The editor thinks of ζυτηρά or ζυτοποιία but rejects both on the paleographical ground, since according to his words τ is excluded and the letter is rather σ or μ. What the photo (Pl. III) shows can be θ as well and ζύθος and the related forms are attested in the Roman period. Arsinoe, 113 A.D.

No. 2033: Offer for a lease of a store-house (θησαυρός) and its appurtenances. Heracleia, 94 A.D. Another offer for a lease of the same object in the same year is published in P. Lond. II, 216 (p. 186).

No. 2034: Offer for a lease of a house. Arsinoe, 2nd—3rd cent.

No. 2035: Purchase of crops (possibly olives) in form of an offer for lease. The land is situated in the vicinity of Psenarpsensis. Karanis (?), 129 A.D.

No. 2036: Sublease of a state land for one year. The land is situated in τόπος Τεφρίδις (l. 18) or Τεφρίδιος “da x und β hier sehr ähnlıch sind”. On the ground of the editor’s statement a question arises whether other combinations, e.g. Τεφρίδιος, are possible. The last, if not excluded paleographically, has good analogies in toponomastic.

No. 2037: Surety of payment of rent. Soknopaiou Nesos, 2nd cent. Nos. 2038—2040. Three receipts for rent of land, 2038 and 2040 from Theadelphia dated 2nd cent. and 223 A.D. respectively, 2039 from Euhemeria (211 A.D.). The amount of rent is given in 2040 only. It was 9 artabae from 3 arurae of land.
No. 2041. Apprenticeship to a weaver dated 201 A.D. probably from Arsinoite. Isidoros gives his son Heracles to the weaver Zosimos for three years of apprenticeship. The boy is to be clothed by his father in the first year of apprenticeship, and fed for the whole period by the master. In case of break of the contract the penalty is to be 200 dr. and the same to Treasury.

No. 2042: Contract of deposit (παραθήκη) of 200 dr. Soknopaiou Nesos, 105 A.D.

No. 2043: Loan secured by hypallagma. 840 dr. are borrowed by priestess Segathis (already known from other documents enumerated by the editor in the commentary) and a slave girl of hers is put in pledge. Soknopaiou Nesos, 150 A.D.

Nos. 2044—2046 are loans of money. 2044 from Soknopaiou Nesos (46 A.D.), 2045 from Theadelphia (215 A.D.) and 2046 from Heracleia (2nd cent. A.D.)

No. 2047: Receipt for repayment of a loan of 3000 dr. from Arsinoe from 8 A.D. Receipt is issued by freedman Gaius Eros whose full name is not known. In 1.3 amendment ἀπελευθέρος "Ερως is unnecessary. Praenomen points out that Eros is a freedman of a Roman citizen, thus Γάιος (Nomen Gentile) τοῦ δεῖνα ἀπελευθέρος "Ερως should be read. The document ought to be considered taking into account the group of documents from the time of Augustus from Alexandria (B.G.U. IV, cf. Schubert, Alexandrinische Urkunden aus der Zeit des Augustus, Arch. V, pp. 35—131). There is no evidence to identify the person of Eros. He is a rich freedman, perhaps a freedman of the emperor, and ought to be looked for among such persons as G. Iulius Eros (B.G.U. IV, 1125), "Ερως Κάσπρος (B.G.U. IV, 1118) or "Ερως δ τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτω διοικῶν (Plutarch, Reg. et imp. apoph. 207, 4).

No. 2048: Loan of corn. Hermopolite, 217 A.D.

No. 2049: Sale of a horse from Heracleia (2nd cent.) Soterichos son of Satyros sells the horse for 120 dr. to Taouetis d. of Tesenouphis, acting through her husband Panphremmis son of Anchophis.

Nos. 2050—2054 are sales of a cathectic land. 2050 dated 107 A.D., 2051—2nd cent. both from Arsinoite. 2052 possibly from Heracleia (2nd cent.), 2053 Arsinoite, early 2nd cent. and 2054 from Arsinoe (175—192 A.D.).