

Peter van Minnen

THE DIPLOMATICS OF *SYNCHORESEIS* THAT ARE NOT DRAFTS

1. INTRODUCTION

IN THIS PAPER I REVIEW THE FORMAL CHARACTERISTICS of the *synchoreseis* ('settlements, agreements', almost all drawn up in Alexandria)¹ that are not drafts and were not retrieved from cartonnage unlike the draft *synchoreseis* from the reign of Augustus.² It is worth making a separate

¹ The best discussion of *synchoresis* is still H. J. WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemäer und des Prinzipats* II, Munich 1978, pp. 91–95, which incorporates and transcends all earlier literature on the subject. For a summary, see the introduction (pp. 215–217) to *P. Bingen* 45, a text that is not itself a *synchoresis* (see P. VAN MINNEN, 'An official act of Cleopatra (with a subscription in her own hand)', *Ancient Society* 30 [2000], pp. 29–34). Wolff's discussion is the basis for what we find about *synchoreseis* in *Grammateus* and *Synallagma*, two databases devoted to documents and contracts on papyrus respectively, <<https://grammateus.unige.ch/>> and <<https://synallagma.tau.ac.il/>> (last accessed 6 September 2023). The speculations about a possible Egyptian origin of the *synchoresis* in S. ALLAM, 'Zum Aufkommen der notariellen Urkunde (Syngraphie und Synchoresis) im griechisch-römischen Ägypten', *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 11 (1984), pp. 175–181, can best be left for what they are.

² English translations online at <https://classics.uc.edu/users/vanminnen/ancient_alexandria/index.html> (accessed 6 September 2023). For revised or new texts, see P. VAN MINNEN, 'An antichretic [sic] loan from early Roman Alexandria revisited (*BGU* IV 1053)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 199 (2016), pp. 144–154, and W. G. CLAYTOR & P. VAN MINNEN, 'An antichretic loan from early Roman Alexandria', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 217 (2021), pp. 158–164.

study of *synchoreseis* that are either originals or copies, because we may assume that they are more complete than drafts. This paper contributes to the ‘diplomatics’ of documents from Graeco-Roman Egypt by focusing on a relatively rare document type from Alexandria, which is attested for over three centuries from the later first century BC to the end of the third century AD (the chronological outlier, *P. Mert.* II 59, ll. 11–28, of 154 or 143 BC, is the only *synchoresis* not from Alexandria). At the same time, this paper provides an updated and much expanded list of *synchoreseis* that are not drafts³ and makes a series of textual observations improving the reading and interpretation of many of them.⁴

In discussing individual *synchoreseis* I consider whether they are exemplars, originals issued to one of the two parties (originals addressed to the *archidikastes* would be archived in the *katalogeion*, the archive of the *archidikastes*, in Alexandria), or copies made from exemplars. I also consider the layout of such *synchoreseis*, whether they are in ‘portrait’ (taller-than-wide) or ‘landscape’ (wider-than-tall) format, and their script, whether the script is more or less ligatured. I discuss the presence or absence of key elements, such as the addressee (almost always the *archidikastes* in Alexandria), the closing formula (ἀξιούμεν, ‘we request [registration]’), the date, and the subscription by the clerk (almost always κατακεχώρισται, ‘it has been registered’ in the office of the *archidikastes*). Copies imitated the layout of the exemplars they were copied from, and ‘landscape’ format was used for longer, more complex contracts. More ligatured hands were not just used for copies, but also for exemplars. Occasionally incomplete exemplars were issued to one of the two parties.

The draft *synchoreseis* from the reign of Augustus that were retrieved from cartonnage share some of these formal characteristics but not all.

³ English translations online at the same address as in n. 2. I have not included *P. Vindob. G 40454 r^o* (P. VAN MINNEN, ‘Model *synchoreseis*’ *Tyche* 37 [2022], pp. 203–208), which contains model *synchoresis* without address and, presumably, closing features (ἀξιούμεν, date, subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes*).

⁴ Corrections to draft *synchoreseis* retrieved from cartonnage from the reign of Augustus appear in P. VAN MINNEN, ‘Notes on papyri from early Roman Alexandria’, *Tyche* 35 (2020), pp. 230–234 (*Korr. Tyche* 978–986) and IDEM, ‘More notes on papyri from early Roman Alexandria’, *Tyche* 36 (2021), pp. 191–210 (*Korr. Tyche* 1035–1094).

Many are written in very cursive hands, with lots of *Verschleifung*, or at least have many interlinear corrections and additions. All are in ‘portrait’ format: they are never very wide, and all are tall. This distinguishes them from the drafts of other types of texts (petitions, letters) retrieved from the same cartonnage, which are much wider. Unlike the *synchoreseis* that are not drafts, which are almost all addressed to the *archidikastes*, those retrieved from cartonnage are almost all addressed to the man in charge of the *kriterion* ‘in the court’ (ἐν τῇ ἀλῆϊ), either Achaïos or, in most cases, Protarchos. These two men are known to have been in charge of the *kriterion* ‘in the court’ from 19 to 15 BC and from 14 to 4 BC. They were no doubt acting under the supervision of the *archidikastes* at the time.⁵ The *archidikastes* himself is indeed the addressee of one draft *synchoresis*, BGU IV 1111 (15 BC); the same *archidikastes*, Artemidoros, is incidentally also mentioned in BGU IV 1155 (10 BC) and 1108 (5 BC) – there apparently was not as yet the quick turnover of *archidikastai* we find later.

The *archidikastes* is the addressee of almost all the *synchoreseis* that are not drafts. His full title shows that he was indeed in charge of the *kriterion* ‘in the court’ as well: ἀρχιδικαστῆς καὶ πρὸς τῇ ἐπιμελείᾳ τῶν χρηματιστῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κριτηρίων. The πρὸς τῇ ἐπιμελείᾳ τῶν χρηματιστῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κριτηρίων may have been a separate official in the first half of the second century BC,⁶ but from the first century BC onward the title is exclusively used for the *archidikastes*, which suggests that the offices were collapsed at some point in the later Ptolemaic period. In the Roman period,

⁵ WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), pp. 29–29, thought that the *kriterion* was the same as the *katalogeion* or at least its *Geschäftsstelle*. The *kriterion* is rather a court in Alexandria, which had its own archive and survived for a while into the Augustan period. When the *kriterion* was eventually abolished, its remaining functions were absorbed by the *archidikastes* and his *katalogeion*. Note especially BGU IV 1124 (Alexandria, 18 BC), mentioning *synchoreseis* made through the *kriterion* (l. 7) and through the *katalogeion* (l. 27), and BGU IV 1158 (Alexandria, 9 BC), ll. 7–8, where the scribe wrote κριτ first, then corrected it to καταλογεῖον. The *katalogeion* and the *kriterion* were not (yet) the same thing in the Augustan period. See also F. BURKHALTER, ‘Archives locales et archives centrales en Égypte romaine’, *Chiron* 20 (1990), pp. 203–206. In l. 9 of *P. Lond.* II 142, p. 203 (Karanis, AD 95), γραφείου is written instead of καταλογεῖον by mistake. There were no *grapheia* in Alexandria, at least not of the kind we find in the *chora*, where notarial documents were drawn up.

⁶ *P. Tarich.*, pp. 7–9.

at least after Augustus, there were no *chrematistai* in the *chora* anymore,⁷ but we still find two or three *chrematistai* at a time involved in handling petitions in Alexandria.⁸ In the Augustan period, an age of transition, there was at least one other *kriterion* in Alexandria, the one ‘in the court’, in addition to the *kriterion* of the *archidikastes* himself. The official in charge of the *kriterion* ‘in the court’ was also the addressee of *synchoreseis*, just as the *archidikastes*. After Augustus, there were no other *kriteria* anymore. (I am not concerned with the courts of Roman officials such as the prefect here.) The full title of the *archidikastes* in the Roman period, with *κριτηρίων* in the plural, is therefore a leftover from the Ptolemaic period, when there were multiple *kriteria*.

The *synchoreseis* that are not drafts are actually two groups: one *synchoreisis* from the mid-Ptolemaic period and all other *synchoreseis* from the later first century BC onwards. The mid-Ptolemaic *synchoreisis*, *P. Mert.* II 59,

⁷ In the third and early fourth century individual *chrematistai* occur, who are (public) notaries in the *chora*. See *P. Panop.* 22 (Panopolis, AD 336), l. 17; *P. Coll. Youtie* II 71 (Panopolis, AD 281), l. 23 (also the duplicate, *P. Coll. Youtie* II 72, ll. 6–7); and *P. Nokr.* 4, frag. 4, l. 7; 6, l. 16; 7, l. 3; 8, l. 10; and 21, l. 24 (all Great Oasis, c. AD 240–241). *P. Bodl.* 32, l. 16 n., already pointed out that there is no link between these later *chrematistai* and the *archidikastes* and *chrematistai* in Alexandria.

⁸ Three *chrematistai* handling petitions in Alexandria: *P. Oxy.* XXII 2349 (Oxyrhynchus, AD 70), ll. 20–21, and *P. Flor.* I 55 (Hermopolites, AD 88), ll. 10–12 (see *BL* I, p. 455 for the third *chrematistes*, who, unlike the two first, is an Alexandrian rather than a Roman citizen; I suspect it is one of the two *Ἀλθαεῖς* in *P. Oxy.* XXII 2349, ll. 20–21; there is no need to supplement *ὁ καὶ* in *P. Flor.* I 55, l. 11, as *BL* I, p. 455 has it). Two *chrematistai*: *P. Berl. Leihg.* I 10 (Arsinoites, AD 120), ll. 9–10, *P. Fam. Tebt.* 29 (Arsinoites, AD 133), ll. 6–7, *BGU VII* 1573 (Philadelphia, AD 141), l. 21, and *P. Aberd.* 19 (Arsinoites, 2nd–3rd cent. AD), ll. 5–6. Oddly enough, the two first *chrematistai* in *P. Flor.* I 55, Titus Flavius Apollodoros and Titus Flavius Poplianos (Publianus), seem to reappear together in *P. Berl. Leihg.* I 10 and *P. Fam. Tebt.* 29. They would in other words be attested as *chrematistai* over a 45-year period. I have no real explanation for this. Maybe the office of *chrematistai* was held by members of the same family from c. AD 80 onwards. After a while, say, Titus Flavius Apollodoros Sr. may have been replaced by Titus Flavius Poplianos Jr., while Titus Flavius Poplianos Sr. may have been replaced by Titus Flavius Apollodoros Jr. (I even suspect that the same pair of names occurs in *BGU VII* 1573, l. 21, and *P. Aberd.* 19, ll. 5–6, both times in a lacuna.) Note that the name of the second Titus Flavius is *Ποπλιανός* as in *P. Berl. Leihg.* I 10, l. 10, not *Ποπλιενός* as read in *P. Flor.* I 55, l. 10 (see *Scrivere libri e documenti nel mondo antico*, Florence 1998, no. 155, pl. 108), and as restored in a lacuna in *P. Fam. Tebt.* 29, l. 7.

ll. 11–28, is the only one not drawn up in Alexandria and not addressed to the *archidikastes* there but to the *chrematistai* in the Arsinoite nome. All other *synchoreseis* are addressed to the *archidikastes* in Alexandria and are either exemplars issued to one of the parties and taken by them to Middle Egypt or copies made from them. Sometimes both parties happened to be visiting Alexandria on business, but in most cases at least one of the two parties resided in or near Alexandria (e.g. Roman soldiers stationed near Alexandria).⁹

The latest dated *synchoresis* is from AD 295. There are none from the fourth century AD, and we may assume that the institution that made these *synchoreseis* possible, the office of the *archidikastes*, was abolished during the tetrarchy.

2. WHAT MAKES A *SYNCHORESIS* A *SYNCHORESIS*?

A *synchoresis* can be securely identified as such if it follows the *Schema* (format) established by Hans Julius Wolff:¹⁰

addressee (often the *archidikastes*) in the dative
 παρὰ + genitive (= party 1) καὶ παρὰ + genitive (= party 2)
 ‘consideration clause’ (optional)
 a form of the verb συγχωρέω, introducing the agreement
 infinitives (mostly), making up the agreement proper
 ἀξιούμεν, requesting registration of the agreement
 date
 subscription by the clerk, confirming registration

First the addressee: in almost all *synchoreseis* that are not drafts but exemplars or copies made from them this is the *archidikastes*. (The mid-Ptolemaic *synchoresis* is addressed to the *chrematistai* in the Arsinoite nome.)

⁹ WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), p. 95 n. 67, pointed to the frequency of Romans or Alexandrian citizens or at least of links with Alexandria in *synchoreseis*.

¹⁰ WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), pp. 93–94.

BGU III 1001, whose date (late Ptolemaic or Augustan) is uncertain, is addressed to the *archidikastes*. He is also the addressee of other types of communications, especially petitions *stricto sensu* and notifications¹¹ of changes that need to be made in ‘the record’, which can be the archive of the *archidikastes* in Alexandria itself or that of other officials who need to be informed of changes by him. Such changes include changes of ownership or also (temporary) liens on property used to secure a loan. The addressee is occasionally left out in *synchoreseis* that are not drafts. This is perhaps not surprising in copies (but in fact quite rare: only *P. Oxy.* XLI 2989), but occasionally even an exemplar does not have the address (*P. Oxy.* XXXIV 2723 and perhaps *PSI* VIII 875). Incomplete exemplars were sometimes issued to (one of) the two parties. There is a large margin at the top of such texts, which would have accommodated the address, which was, however, never written. *P. Oxy.* XXXIV 2723 also leaves blanks in the text itself for details not known when the exemplar was issued to one of the two parties, blanks that were never filled out.¹² It is possible that the various parts of a *synchoreisis* were not all written in one go, from top to bottom, but that certain elements (e.g. the two parties involved) were written first, leaving space for other elements (e.g. the address) to be written later. The address is usually written in *ekthesis*.

Next comes *παρά* + genitive *καὶ παρά* + genitive, identifying the two parties involved. Each party can consist of more than one person. In that case the second etc. person in a party is in the genitive also but not immediately preceded by *παρά*. The presence of two parties addressing an official at the same time makes the identification of the text as a *synchoreisis* certain, because it is unique to such texts. *Synchoreseis* were originally true settlements, which had to come from both parties. Other documents emanate from one party only. Unfortunately, the two *παρά*’s are not always preserved in damaged texts, which may make their identification as *synchoreseis* somewhat problematic.

¹¹ Others sometimes identify such texts as ‘applications’.

¹² The only other exemplar without an address, *P. Oxy.* LXVII 4586 lacks the address and does not have a very large upper margin, even if a short address could have been accommodated. This text is, however, suspect on other grounds (see below, pp. 90–91).

Before the agreement proper, a ‘consideration clause’ is sometimes inserted, giving the background to the actual agreement, which is made in the form of infinitives. The ‘consideration clause’ takes the form of ἐπεὶ + finite verb,¹³ usually in the perfect, or of a participle, also usually in the perfect (the participle is in that case in the accusative to match the subject of the following infinitives): ‘In consideration of the fact that (one party) has (e.g.) received ...’ (that party now agrees to etc.).¹⁴

The agreement proper in each *synchoreseis* invariably starts with a form of the verb συγχωρέω. This verb is not limited to *synchoreseis*; it occurs in other text types as well (cessions, *donationes mortis causa*, other testamentary arrangements, etc.). But in *synchoreseis* it is unavoidable. Early on the verb can be συγχωροῦμεν in the first person plural, as in the Ptolemaic example *P. Mert.* II 59, ll. 11–28, in the late first century BC example *BGU III* 1001, and in seven more cases between AD 44 and 144.¹⁵ (The first person singular συγχωρῶ is only used in subscriptions by the two parties.¹⁶) The third person can also be used in the text itself: it is then συγχωροῦσιν or συγχωρεῖ.¹⁷ The plural is used when one party consists of more than one person or when ὁ μὲν ... ὁ δὲ ... separating the two parties followed. The third person occurs eleven or twelve times between AD 66 and 144 and is exclusively used from the middle of the second century AD until the end of the third century (thirteen or fourteen cases). The form of the verb συγχωρέω can be followed

¹³ There is a discussion of ἐπεὶ (or ἐπειδὴ) clauses in documents in the introduction (pp. 268–269) to *P. Bagnall* 47 (Ieme, end of 1st – beginning of 2nd cent. AD; see also the appendix on pp. 273–275).

¹⁴ When ‘we agree’ *vel sim.* is left out, I have added it in parentheses in the translations I put online (see n. 2).

¹⁵ Also in the unpublished model *synchoreseis* *P. Vindob.* G 40454 r^o (cit. n. 3).

¹⁶ In draft *synchoreseis* from Alexandria from the reign of Augustus: *BGU IV* 1113 (14 BC), ll. 26 and 28; *IV* 1126 (9 BC), ll. 29 and 33; *IV* 1145 (5 BC), ll. 19 and 21; *IV* 1170 (10 BC), ll. 17 and 20; *C. Pap. Gr.* I 6 (13 BC), ll. 30 and 33; *I* 9 (5 BC), l. 29; and in the mid-Ptolemaic example *P. Mert.* II 59, ll. 29–30. In *P. Oxy.* LXVII 4586, the subscriptions do not use συγχωρῶ, another indication that this text may not be a real *synchoreseis* (see below, pp. 90–91).

¹⁷ See WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), p. 93. *Grammateus* (cit. n. 1) treats all *synchoreseis* as if they are ‘objectively’ styled. This ignores the *synchoreseis* that use the first person, as well as the ἀξιούμεν formula.

by *πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐπὶ τοῖσδε ὥστε*, which is then followed by infinitives that form the substance of the agreement, or such infinitives follow a form of the verb *συγχωρέω* immediately. In draft *synchoreseis* retrieved from cartonnage, a form of the verb *συγχωρέω* is sometimes preceded by *περὶ τῶν διεσταμένων*, ‘about the points at issue’, a reminiscence of the origin of the *synchoresis* as a settlement. This seems to be echoed only once in a *synchoresis* that is not a draft, in the sale of a slave SB VI 9145, where line 19, just before *ἀξιοῦμεν*, reads: *ὥς ἐν ἀγ[ῶν]ι δ[ι]έστησαν*, ‘(just) as they “stood apart” [= “had an issue”] in (the) trial’. This sale of a slave would hardly have been an ‘issue’ to take to court. The expression is more likely a fossil.

The agreement proper of each *synchoresis* consists of various clauses. These are mostly infinitives, but the scribes occasionally lapse into finite verbs. Various penalty clauses follow the infinitives that make up the agreement proper. Sometimes these penalty clauses include a reference to a *ὀρισμένον πρόστιμον*, a penalty, presumably set by a Ptolemaic *diagramma*, that the party that ‘transgressed’ (= did not abide by) the terms of the contract had to pay to the state, in addition to any fine (called *ἐπίτιμον*) they had to pay to the other party. Such fines or penalties would be in addition to other payments the ‘transgressing’ party had to make to the other party, such as one and a half times the amount exchanged in the agreement proper, the *ἡμιολία*.

Another fixture of *synchoreseis* is the verb *ἀξιοῦμεν* (often abbreviated: *αξιοῦ*, *αξι*, *αξι*, and *αξ* occur, *αξι*° being the most common) that concludes the text addressed to the *archidikastes*. It is *ἀξιοῦμεν* even when the main text is in the third person.¹⁸ The verb is sometimes followed by additional text, and this suggests that *ἀξιοῦμεν* is the abbreviated form of a (much) longer expression not written out in full in most *synchoreseis*. A full text occurs in *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26, ll. 20–21:

ἀξιοῦμεν οὖν σὲ συντά[ξα]ι [τ]οῖς πρὸς τούτοις οὖσι προσδεξαμένοις παρ’ ἡμῶν τὴν συνχώρησιν τὰ ἄλλα ἐπιτελεῖν ὡς καθήκει καὶ πέμψαι

¹⁸ See *BGU* IV 1173 (after 7 BC) and *C. Pap. Gr.* I 9 (5 BC), l. 28, and perhaps *BGU* IV 1113 (14 BC), l. 24, where *ἀξιοῦμεν* is written out in full, while the main text is in the third person. The verb *ἀξιοῦμεν* is also written out in full in *BGU* III 1001, l. 14, *P. Oxy.* II 268, l. 19, and *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26, l. 20, where the main text is in the first person plural.

αὐτῆς ἀντίγραφον τοῖς τῶν ἐγκτήσεων τοῦ Ἀρσινοεῖτου νομοῦ βιβλιοφύ-
[λα]ξιν, ἵν' εἰδῶσι διὰ τ[ὸ] διεστρώσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ τοῦ Διοσκόρου
ὄνομα τὰς παρακεχωρημένας ἀρούρας

We therefore request you to order those who are in charge of these things upon receipt of the *synchoresis* from us to complete the other (steps) **as is fitting** and send a copy of that *synchoresis* to the record keepers of the property in the Arsinoite nome, in order that they know, inasmuch as the ceded arouras have been registered at their office in the name of Dioskoros.

Shorter formulae that add something to ἀξιοῦμεν include ὡς καθήκει (*P. Oxy.* II 268), which I put in bold in the quotation from *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26, and the more substantial but still abbreviated οὖν τὰλλ' ἐπιτελεῖν (*BGU* III 1001), which are spaced there. Occasionally ἀξιοῦμεν is left out, which is perhaps not surprising in copies (*BGU* III 741; I 241; *P. Oxy.* XLI 2989; also the copy included in the notification *SB* XIV 11705). It is not included in the mid-Ptolemaic *P. Mert.* II 59, ll. 11–28, which is an exemplar that was incorporated in a notification from the *chrematistai* (addressed in the *synchoresis*) to the *praktor xenikon* of the Arsinoite nome. This text also does not have the date, which would have immediately followed ἀξιοῦμεν in stand-alone *synchoreseis*. But *SPP* XX 10 and *P. Giss.* I 51, both identified as *synchoreseis* for lack of an alternative, also leave out ἀξιοῦμεν, as does *P. Oxy.* LXVII 4586, a dubious *synchoresis*. The only exemplars that lack ἀξιοῦμεν but are otherwise unimpeachable as *synchoreseis* are *P. Oxy.* XII 1471 and *P. Oxy.* LXXXVI 5568. The former may actually have had ἀξιοῦμεν (abbreviated) in a lacuna. The latter, one of the latest dated *synchoreseis*, is not a 'pure' *synchoreseis* anymore in that elements from other texts have been incorporated, especially towards the end, where the text ends with a *stipulatio*, which is otherwise rare in *synchoreseis*. *P. Oxy.* XLI 2989 and perhaps *P. Oxy.* XIX 2236 also include a *stipulatio*, and the former also does not have ἀξιοῦμεν; the latter breaks off, so we cannot tell. Perhaps, then, the *stipulatio* made the ἀξιοῦμεν formula redundant.¹⁹

After the ἀξιοῦμεν formula the date immediately follows. The date is lacking in the mid-Ptolemaic *synchoresis* *P. Mert.* II 59, ll. 11–28, which does

¹⁹ On the *stipulatio* in Greek papyri, see most recently U. YIFTACH, 'Olim tradita fuerunt: On the obsolescence of the *sollemnia verba* in *Inst.* 3.15pr', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 51 (2021), pp. 169–187.

not have the ἀξιούμεν formula either. The date is also lacking in a few copies: *BGU* III 1001 and *P. Oxy.* XLI 2989. The only exemplar without a date is *P. Oxy.* LXVII 4586, a most dubious *synchoreisis* also in view of the next criterion.

The date is often followed by the subscription by the clerk (*grammateus*)²⁰ in the office of the *archidikastes*, so-and-so, declaring: κατακεχώρισται, ‘it has been registered’ (rarely something else).²¹ This clerk is not to be confused with the scribe of the main body of the text. The subscription by the clerk is lacking in the mid-Ptolemaic *P. Mert.* II 59, ll. 11–28, which is a kind of exemplar included in a notification. In the few notifications from the Roman period this note is also missing, as far as we can tell: *BGU* III 825, ll. 1–12, and *SB* XIV 11705, ll. 1–20. It is also lacking in other copies: *BGU* I 241; II 542; III 741; III 1001; *P. Fam. Tebt.* 20 (but see below, p. 102); *P. Oxy.* XLI 2989; and *P. Tebt.* II 31. *P. Fouad* 44 also does not have it, and this was most likely a copy. The only exemplar, not included in a notification the way *P. Mert.* II 59, lines 11–28, is, that does not have the subscription by the clerk is *P. Oxy.* LXVII 4586, the dubious *synchoreisis* just mentioned. Perhaps elements of the *synchoreisis* format were used in that text together with elements from other text types for a contract actually drawn up in Oxyrhynchus and not in Alexandria. *P. Oxy.* LXVII 4586 is one of only two cases where both parties originate in a village in Middle Egypt (here: Nesmimis in the Oxyrhynchite nome). In the other case, *P. Heid.* IV 326, the two parties originate in a village in the Heracleopolite nome (Ankyron kome), but the way that nome is identified in that text, as the one ὑπὲρ Μέρμφων, shows that the text was drawn up from the perspective of Alexandria. *P. Heid.* IV 326 also bears the subscription by the clerk in the office of

²⁰ On the clerks responsible for ‘notarising’ *synchoreseis* or otherwise ‘authenticating’ petitions and notifications, see now P. HEILPORN, ‘Les hommes de l’archidicaste: remarques de prosopographie et de paléographie’ (paper given at the 30th International Congress of Papyrology in Paris in 2022). I thank Paul Heilporn for having shared his PowerPoint presentation with me.

²¹ WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), p. 94 n. 64, thought that κατακεχώρισται (‘it has been registered’) also functioned as authentication (*Beglaubigung*) of the exemplars to which they were added. Registration would be in the *katalogeion* of the *archidikastes*.

the *archidikastes*.²² *P. Oxy.* LXVII 4586 is also the only *synchoresis* not from the reign of Augustus that includes the subscriptions of the two parties. Such subscriptions do occur in *P. Leid. Inst.* II 27 (not from cartonnage) and several drafts retrieved from cartonnage, all from the reign of Augustus.²³

In some cases *synchoreseis* even refer to themselves as *συγχωρήσεις*. This can be in a note on the back of the papyrus, identifying the document on the front as a *synchoresis*. This is, however, rare: only the as yet unpublished *P. Berl. inv.* 11755 and *P. Rain. Cent.* 69 have such notes on their back. The noun *συγχώρησις* can also be used in the course of the text, in expressions referring to the text itself as ‘this *synchoresis*’ *vel sim.* This is somewhat more common and is not limited to *synchoreseis* (see, e.g., *CPR* I 156 [Arsinoites, 1st half of 3rd cent. AD], l. 10, where *συγχώρησις* refers to a cession not in the form of a *synchoresis*).²⁴

3. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

In reviewing the *synchoreseis* that are not drafts but either exemplars or copies, scans or print illustrations of only three papyri were ultimately not available to me: one in Cairo, published without an inventory number (*P. Congr. XV* 16, which could also be a petition or notification; in the

²² Occasionally one of the parties in a *synchoresis* originates in a village in Middle Egypt, but there is good reason to assume that they or their representatives were in Alexandria when the *synchoresis* was drawn up. See *PSI* VIII 875; *P. Oxy.* XLI 2973, an exemplar; *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26, an exemplar, also the notification that includes a copy of it, *P. Mil. Vogl.* VI 266; *PSI* VIII 962 a & b; and *BGU* I 241. On *P. Col. inv.* 497, see below, p. 103.

²³ See *BGU* IV 1113; IV 1126 (crossed out); IV 1136; IV 1145, ll. 1–25; IV 1170, ll. 1–23; *C. Pap. Gr.* I 6; I 9 (crossed out).

²⁴ For such expressions in draft *synchoreseis* from the reign of Augustus, see *BGU* IV 1053, col. ii, ll. 24–24; IV 1106, l. 4; IV 1115, ll. 47–48; IV 1126, l. 26; IV 1127, l. 33; IV 1129, ll. 25–26a; IV 1156 v^o, ll. 47–48 (CLAYTOR & VAN MINNEN, ‘An antichretic loan’ [cit. n. 2], pp. 160–161); and IV 1168, ll. 3–4 (see also *BGU* IV 1131, l. 46: ἡ προκ(εμμένη) συγχώρησις[ις]). For such expressions in other *synchoreseis*, see *P. Bad.* II 22, l. 10–11; *P. Congr. XV* 16, ll. 7–8 (see below, p. 101); *P. Hamb.* I 94, l. 5 (see below, p. 104); *P. IFAO* III 18, l. 9; *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26, l. 3 = *P. Mil. Vogl.* VI 266, l. 4; *P. Oxy.* IV 727, l. 14; and *PSI* VI 704, l. 5. The notification *P. Mert.* II 59, l. 32, also refers to the preceding *synchoresis* as a *συγχώρησις*.

Appendix I include three other texts that could be either *synchoreseis* or petitions or notifications); one in Berlin, presumably lost (*SB* I 424); and one in Florence (*PSI* VI 704, which appears without an image on the *PSI* Online website).

The ‘materiality’ of such *synchoreseis* deserves closer scrutiny. There is first of all the line width (included in the table at the end). In some cases, the full line width is preserved. In other cases, I had to estimate the probable line width based on plausible supplements in incomplete documents. Among the 48 texts in ‘portrait’ format, either exemplars or copies made from them, the line width ranges from 7.5 to 23 cm. There is an outlier (*P. Oxy.* XXXIV 2706), with a variable line width of 5–6 cm, but it is a pen trial and should not be included here. In two thirds of the remaining 47 texts the line width ranges from 9.5 to 19 cm. I have included two uncertain cases (*P. Mich.* IX 528 and *P. Oxy.* XLI 2978) in these calculations, where the text may also be a petition or notification. Their line widths are 9 and 9.5 cm. Excluding them from the calculations makes little difference (two thirds would then range from 10 to 19 cm). There are at any rate no real outliers, because at the lower end we find line widths of 7.5, 8, 8.5, and 9 cm, at the higher end line widths of 20, 21, 22, and 23 cm.

Among the nine texts in ‘landscape’ format we find longer line widths, ranging from 25–30 to 70–90 cm. In two thirds of the texts the line width ranges from 26 to 46.5 cm. Actually, 25–30 and 70–90 cm are the only two outliers, and there are problems with both texts. Of the first (*P. Congr.* XV 16) it is not certain that this is a *synchoresis* rather than a petition or notification. The last is a very incomplete copy (*P. Mil. Vogl.* VI 266, ll. 3–11), and I am adopting the estimate in the edition for the line width. But what I can add to strengthen the impression *synchoreseis* in ‘landscape’ format make is to introduce the two texts, both copies, in two columns here, *P. Fam. Tebt.* 20 and *P. Tebt.* II 319. If we measure the width from the beginning of the lines in the first column to the end of the lines in the second column in these two texts, the widths are 29.5 and 45 cm, which sits nicely with the range of line widths attested in the texts that are more properly in ‘landscape’ format. I wonder whether the scribes in copying texts in two columns were trying to reproduce the ‘look’ of the exemplars, even if the exemplars were written in one wide column.

If we now concentrate on exemplars only, we reduce the number of cases, but the results are not different. The line width in the eighteen *synchoreseis* that are exemplars in ‘portrait’ format ranges from 7.5 to 22 cm. The three exemplars in ‘landscape’ format have line widths of 30.5, >30, and 46 cm. The first is the *synchoresis* from the mid-Ptolemaic period (*P. Mert.* II 59, ll. 11–28). The second is *P. Leid. Inst.* II 27, which is anomalously written against the fibres. The third (*P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26) is still somewhat of an outlier compared with the copies of *synchoreseis* in ‘landscape’ format, if we disregard *P. Mil. Vogl.* VI 266, ll. 3–11, which is a copy of *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26, but less so if we include *P. Tebt.* II 319, which is in two columns and is of similar width if we take the two columns together.

In the table at the end I have also briefly characterised the script used in exemplars and copies made from them. I have used the terms uncials and cursive as a kind of shorthand instead of more complicated characterisations of the script. Uncials are in theory written separately, and there should be no ligatures. Cursive means that the script is ligatured throughout. The difficulty is that there are virtually no texts that have no ligatures whatsoever, and that there are virtually no texts that are fully ligatured. I classify carefully written texts with few ligatures as written in uncials and classified all other, more but never quite fully ligatured texts as written in cursive script. Uncials tend to appear in exemplars. There is one exemplar written in uncials in ‘landscape’ format, the only text from the mid-Ptolemaic period (*P. Mert.* II 59, ll. 11–28). The others are in ‘portrait’ format. We have two copies in uncials, *P. Fam. Tebt.* 20 and *P. Freib.* II 8. All other copies are written in cursive script. Because of these two copies in uncials, I have refrained from identifying texts as exemplars based on the use of uncials alone. Texts in uncials that are exemplars have been identified as such on the basis of other criteria (subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes* in another hand, cancellation of a text presumably following repayment of a debt, etc.).

Cursive script is once used for an exemplar in ‘landscape’ format (*P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26), but also rather frequently for exemplars in ‘portrait’ format (11 cases). There are three copies in ‘landscape’ format in cursive script (four if we add a copy in two columns, *P. Tebt.* II 319), while eight or nine more in cursive script are in ‘portrait’ format. Overall, one can say

that the 'portrait' format was standard and that the script was either uncials or cursive.

We can also consider the 'materiality' of *synchoreseis* that are not drafts by looking at the various types of contract separately. This reduces their number and any statistical relevance their number may have, but it is perhaps worthwhile as an exercise. Among slave sales²⁵ we find four exemplars (P. Bonn. inv. 54 [Alexandria?, AD 249/50],²⁶ P. Oxy. LXXXVI 5568 and 5569 [Oxyrhynchus, AD 290 and 295], and SB VI 9145 [Arsinoites, AD 184–192]), all in 'portrait' format and only one (P. Oxy. LXXXVI 5569) in uncials. There is one copy, in 'landscape' format and in uncials (P. Freib. II 8). Two texts in uncials and in 'portrait' format (P. Turner 40 and P. Yale IV 172) are either exemplars or copies.

There are not enough true settlements to make meaningful observations. The exemplar from the mid-Ptolemaic period (P. Mert. II 59, ll. 11–28) is in 'landscape' format and in uncials, while the copy from the Roman period (P. Fam. Tebt. 20) is also in uncials but in two columns, which may be regarded as equivalent to 'landscape' format. (The uncertain settlement P. Oxf. 14 is in 'portrait' format and in cursive script.) P. Oxy. II 268 is a kind of settlement. It is a copy in cursive script but in 'landscape' format. Perhaps, then, settlements were preferentially written in 'landscape' format. Settlements would normally require more narrative and more details than straightforward contracts such as loans, and this may have made the 'landscape' format seem more appropriate for settlements.

There are more loans. Two (three if we add BGU III 729) exemplars are in uncials and in 'portrait' format (P. Berl. inv. 11755 and P. Oxy. XII 1471). Does this mean that we can identify the three uncertain texts in uncials and in 'portrait' format (P. Oxy. XXVII 2471 and PSI VIII 962 a & c) as exemplars also? Hardly. But three copies are in cursive script and in 'portrait' format (BGU III 741, SB XIV 11705, ll. 1–20, and P. Col. inv.

²⁵ See, on the *synchoreseis* documenting slave sales, J. A. STRAUS, *L'achat et la vente des esclaves dans l'Égypte romaine* [= *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete, Beibef. 14*], Munich – Leipzig 2003, pp. 94–96.

²⁶ F. MITTHOF & A. PAPATHOMAS, 'Ein Sklavenkauf aus der Zeit des Decius in Form der Synchoreseis', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 45 (2015), pp. 93–119, at 102–104.

497²⁷), and the two uncertain texts in cursive script and in ‘portrait’ format (*P. Fouad* 44 and *P. Rain. Cent.* 69) may well be copies also. But it seems on the whole better to abstain from classifying the uncertain texts as exemplars or copies solely on the basis of their script. *P. Leid. Inst.* II 27 is anomalous in that it is an exemplar written in uncials against the fibres in ‘landscape’ format. All other loans are in ‘portrait’ format. Loans were rather straightforward affairs and did not require a long text. The ‘portrait’ format may therefore have been the logical choice for loans.

The same goes for labor contracts or related texts such as service and apprenticeship contracts. All four such texts (*P. Bad.* II 22, *P. Heid.* IV 326 and 327, and *PSI VIII* 962 b) are in ‘portrait’ format. But one exemplar (*P. Heid.* IV 327) is in uncials, one in cursive script (*P. Bad.* II 22), making it impossible for us to classify the two other cases, one in cursive script (*P. Heid.* IV 326), one in uncials (*PSI VIII* 962 b), as an exemplar or a copy.

Sales of property other than slaves and related documents such as divisions of property can be complicated affairs, and it is perhaps not a surprise to find a few texts in ‘landscape’ format: an exemplar, *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26, and its copy, *P. Mil. Vogl.* VI 266, ll. 3–11, as well as another copy, *BGU III* 1001. The one other such text in ‘landscape’ format (*P. Oxy.* XXXIV 2723) is an exemplar. Another copy (*P. Tebt.* II 319) is in two columns, which we may regard as equivalent to ‘landscape’ format. That makes five texts in ‘landscape’ format as against eleven other texts in ‘portrait’ format. There are three texts in ‘portrait’ format that we cannot securely identify as exemplars or copies (*P. Oxy.* XIX 2236, *PSI VI* 704, and perhaps *PSI VIII* 875). One thing seems to stand out among texts involving the sale or division of real estate: they are all in cursive script.

4. REMARKS ON INDIVIDUAL *SYNCHORESEIS*

These remarks follow the same order as in the table in the appendix, where more details can be found.

²⁷ U. YIFTACH, ‘Experimenting security: P. Col. inv. 497 and the mortgage regime in early second century Oxyrhynchos’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 219 (2021), pp. 167–182, at 175–176.

The only mid-Ptolemaic *synchoreisis*, addressed to the *chrematistai* (*P. Mert.* II 59, ll. 11–28), is a settlement. It is included in a notification, but it was written first on the papyrus and is therefore a kind of exemplar recycled in a notification. Generous space before and after the *synchoreisis* was left, which was then used for the notification proper. Note that the edition numbers the hands in the order in which they appear on the papyrus, not in the order in which they were written. The core of the text, the *synchoreisis* itself (ll. 11–28), was written first, so instead of it being in the second hand, it is actually in the first hand. The note in what the edition calls the third hand (ἀνέγνωσται) in l. 29)²⁸ was the second to be written. The first hand of the edition was the last or third to be written. Also note that the third hand (the first hand in the edition) wrote the ‘subscriptions’ for the two parties (ll. 29–31) to the right of the ἀνέγνωσται note in line 29. These ‘subscriptions’ are in fact the record of the assent the two parties gave orally. It is possible that the third hand then wrote lines 4–10 and 32–33, the *hypographe* (decision) of the *chrematistai*, and then added his ‘agency’ note as *eisagogeus* of the *chrematistai* (ll. 34–35). At the top he finally added a ‘cover letter’ to the *xenikon praktor* of the Arsinoite nome (ll. 1–3).

As usual in ‘interdepartmental’ correspondence in the Ptolemaic period, the ‘cover letter’ only identifies the addressee, not the sender (who that was would have been sufficiently clear from what followed). Note that a *paragraphos* also appears below the third ‘subscription’ (not marked in the edition). There is in fact also a *paragraphos* below line 2 (the date in line 3 was meant to be part of line 2: the ἔτους symbol starts at the end of that line). Note that a new line starts in the middle of what was printed as line 32 (line 33 starts with τῶι). Line 33 actually has a *paragraphos* below it. The plate in the edition suggests that small lines were added below each line of the agency note (ll. 34–35), perhaps two each.

P. Mert. II 59 was sent by the *eisagogeus* directly to the *praktor xenikon*. In notifications including *synchoreseis* of the Roman period, it was up to

²⁸ ἀνέγνωσται is the common term in the Ptolemaic period. In *BGU VIII* 1795 (Heracléopolites, 47 BC), l. 1, ἀνέγνω(ν) can be corrected to ἀνέγνω(σται). ἀνέγνω is the common term in the Roman period. One wonders whether ἀνέγνωσται in Ptolemaic texts means ‘read out’ rather than ‘read’. In the Roman period ἀνέγνω means ‘read’ (for accuracy).

one of the two parties to send a copy of the instruction of the *archidikastes* to the local authorities together with a copy of the *synchoresis*. Exemplars from which these copies were made would have been brought in as well (see *SB XIV 11705*, l. 22).

*P. Theon. App. C*²⁹ may be a *synchoresis* or a petition or notification to the *archidikastes*. We cannot decide whether the text was in ‘portrait’ or ‘landscape’ format, because there is a problem in the address in lines 1–2.

BGU III 1001 is a contract of some sort. It is a copy and appears alongside a copy of another text (*BGU III 1002* [55 BC]) on the same papyrus. *BGU III 1001* has been rather confidently redated to the Augustan period in *BL I*, p. 86, probably because of the similarity of the text to the Augustan *synchoreseis* published in *BGU IV*.³⁰ In *BGU III 1001* a woman and a man represent one party. She is called Hermione alias Tathotis. In line 9 it should therefore be τὴν Ἑρμιόνην τὴν καὶ Τ]αθώτιν, not τὴν Τ]αθώτιν. The man is called Apollophanes. He must also be the woman’s guardian. I therefore suspect in line 3 [μετὰ κυρίου (τοῦ relationship term αὐτῆς) Ἀπολλοφάνους τοῦ . . . καὶ α]ῦ[τοῦ Ἀπολλοφάνους (the *upsilon* of α]ῦ[τοῦ is just visible but was not read earlier). The other party was mentioned first. Note that the edition leaves out a line between lines 1 and 2. The end of the address in line 1 followed in the next line (unnumbered in the edition), which was otherwise left blank. Then in the third line (l. 2 in the edition), the two parties addressing the *archidikastes* were mentioned: [παρὰ the first party καὶ παρὰ Ἑρμιόνης] τῆς καὶ Ταθώτιος etc.

The main text begins with a ‘consideration clause’ (ἐπεὶ ...) in the lacuna in what is now line 4 in the edition, followed by a relative pronoun just before the preserved text continues with καταγράφαν. The relative pronoun may have been feminine, because the object it represents seems to be referred to in line 7 as αὐτῆς. This is not certain, however, as the text later on refers to an object as αὐτοῦ (l. 10). αὐτῆς in line 7 could conceivably refer

²⁹ The editor (p. 129, no. 6) dates *P. Theon. App. C* to the early first century BC, but he may have meant the late first century BC (no. 6 follows no. 5 from 15 BC). The date in papyri.info (2nd cent. AD) is wrong.

³⁰ See the references in WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), p. 92 n. 51.

to Ἐρμιόνη ἥ καὶ Ταθῶτις instead. The relative pronoun in line 4 would then have been either masculine or neuter. The ‘consideration clause’ at any rate continues in lines 7–8 (‘and now, having ... [perfect participle matching the subject of συνχωροῦμεν and governing βε]βαίωσιν in line 8] on the spot’) until we get to συνχωροῦμεν and the agreement proper. The second party will have been mentioned in the lacuna in line 4.

P. Leid. Inst. II 27 is a loan. The addressee, presumably the *archidikastes*, will have been mentioned in the lacuna in the line preceding line 1 in the edition.³¹ There is a large lacuna to the left, which may have taken up twice as much space as the preserved text. This would have been enough even for an elaborate address, leaving the rest of the line preceding line 1 blank. In what is line 1 in the edition, the usual will have followed: ‘from X and from Y. Y agrees to have received from X’ a certain amount of cash as a loan. Then, in what is line 5 in the edition, the text ends with a promise on the part of Y not to appeal to ‘safeguards’ or else they will be ineffective. Instead of ἀξιοῦμεν and the date we then get the subscriptions of the two parties in other hands. The first, presumably that of X, starts in line 5 and takes up two lines. Someone else may have written for X. This subscription is anomalous in that it includes the physical description of X. (The text as a whole is anomalously written against the fibres, in ‘landscape’ format, not otherwise used for loans.) The second subscription, presumably by Y, starts in line 7 in a third hand and may have continued in what is now the lacuna to the left in line 8. Both subscriptions will have run: ‘I, so-and-so, agree’. The edition includes a trace at the end of line 8, after a blank space, and this may be the beginning of the subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes* but is more likely the beginning of the date.

P. Fouad 44 is also a loan. There is a *paragraphos* below line 32 (not marked in the edition). Note that lines 1–2 were written in considerable *ekthesis*: the lacuna in line 2 ([καὶ τῶν ἄλλων] κριτηρίων) sticks about eight letters out, which suggests either that *archidikastes* had a double name or

³¹ I expect [Ἀρτεμιδώρῳ ἀρχιδικαστῇ καὶ πρὸς τῇ ἐπιμελείᾳ τῶν χρηματιστῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κριτηρίων] *vac.* in the space above line 1 in the edition, unless the addressee was Protarchos, in which case one may consider [Πρωτάρχῳ τῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ κριτηρίου] *vac.* there.

that *ἱερεῖ* preceded his title in line 1. In line 8, there is a vertical stroke below the lacuna before *τῆς Διδύμης*. It must be the *rho* of *παρά*, which is too big for the lacuna. I do not have a real solution for the earlier part of the line, but at least the proposal in *BL* V, p. 32 cannot be right. I suspect that *ὥστε πα[* is in fact *ὥστ' ἐπέ[* [, which would have been followed by *ὁ Λούκιος* and a finite verb form governing *παρά*. Before the lacuna before *τῆς Διδύμης* I can see *-εν*, which could be the ending of a finite verb, followed by what could be a *pi*, which could be the beginning of *παρά*. *π[α]ρ[ά]* may therefore be read before *τῆς Διδύμης* after all. The proposal listed in *BL* V, p. 32 for line 10 may be correct, but it assumes that no other number preceded *upsilon* in the lacuna in line 21.

P. Oxy. XXVII 2471 is a loan.

P. Oxy. II 268 is a copy (*ἀντίγραφον* in ll. 1 and 20) of a return of a dowry and renunciation of an inheritance. It has a generous left margin (7.5 cm), which is filled in part by a marginal note written against the fibres from the bottom upward. This seems to belong to the end of the *synchorexis*, because it is a ‘reservation’ clause (*μὴ ἐλαττουμένου . . .*), which would have immediately preceded the *ἀξιοῦμεν* formula in line 19. Before *ἀξιοῦμεν* here, a note appears instead that does not seem to belong to the *synchorexis* at all but may be comment made by a scribe (*ἐν τοῖς προκειμένοις οὐκ ἔνεστι σωματισμός*), ‘NB: there is no *somatismos* here’) that crept into the text of the copy and was perhaps meant to be replaced by the marginal note. (The marginal note may also relate to another text and have nothing to do with this *synchorexis*.)

There is a problem in lines 7–9:

ἀνθ' ἧς προσ-

[*ηνέγκατο τ*]ῷ τοῦ μὲν Ἀντιφάνους πατρὸς ἀδελφ[ῶι] δὲ τῆς Ὠφελο[ῦ]τος
πατρὶ ἐ[*αυ*]τῆς δὲ γενομένῳ
καὶ [*μετηλλ*]αχότι ἀνδρὶ Ἡρακλᾶτι Ἀντιφάνους τῷ[*ν*] ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς Ὀξυ-
ρύγχων πόλεως φ[*ε*]ρν[*ῃ*]

BL I, p. 320 records a correction of *ἀδελφ[ῶι]* in line 8 to *ἀδελφ[οῦ]*, and this was adopted in *papyri.info*. The editors had assumed that *δὲ τῆς* was a mistake for *τῆς δέ*. The text in *papyri.info* would have to be translated as: ‘in lieu of the dowry she provided to the father of the father of

Antiphanes, who was also the father of the brother of Ophelous, and who was also her own former and deceased husband, Heraklas son of Antiphanes from Oxyrhynchus'. This would be very odd, because the father of the brother of Ophelous would also be the father of Ophelous, otherwise Ophelous herself would not be a party to the dispute about the inheritance of Heraklas. The editors must have been right to suspect a transposition of τῆς δέ. Their text can be translated as: 'in lieu of the dowry she provided to the brother of the father of Antiphanes, who was also the father of Ophelous, and who was also her own former and deceased husband, Heraklas son of Antiphanes from Oxyrhynchus'. Antiphanes is a nephew who has some claim on the inheritance of Heraklas. The text is in any case a kind of settlement of claims between heirs.

P. Berl. inv. 11755 is an as yet unpublished³² loan of money between two soldiers of the *legio III Cyrenaica*.

C. Pap. Gr. I 22 is a wet-nursing contract. The edition is only tentative.

P. Oxy. XII 1471 is a loan. High above the address, near the upper margin, is a note identifying the text as a loan, if the reading ὀφ(είλημα) in line 1 is correct. The edition does not have ἀξιοῦμεν, but there may just be enough room for it, if heavily abbreviated, in the lacuna at the end of line 32, after καθάπερ ἐκ δίκ[ης].

P. Athen. 15 is a contract of some sort. The text has not been illustrated. A scan kindly put at my disposal by the Archaeological Society at Athens shows that the script of the main text consists of crudely executed uncials. The edition hesitatingly read the note at the bottom (l. 13; in another hand) as διὰ τοῦ Κερκεσσοῦχων γρ(αφείου), but this cannot be right. *BL* III, p. 216 proposed διὰ τοῦ καταλογείου (or δι' ἐμοῦ Κ..... γρ(αμματέως)) κατεγρ(άφη) instead. We rather expect the name of the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes* in the nominative followed by κατακεχώρι(σται). On the scan I can indeed read κατακεχώρι(σται) at the end, preceded by Διοσκουρίδης.

³² The text is mentioned by A. ŚWIDEREK, 'Les BGU de Varsovie', [in:] *PapCongr.* XIII, pp. 393–396, at 395. P. Berl. inv. 11755 was on temporary loan to Warsaw and has since been returned to Berlin (information provided by Tomasz Derda). The edition by W. Graham Claytor and myself is in preparation.

P. Heid. IV 326 is related to *P. Heid. IV 327* of the following year, which refers to it as an apprenticeship contract in line 38, although that is not clear from the text itself, which sounds more like a service contract.

P. Heid. IV 327 is at any rate an apprenticeship contract. There may be a *paragraphos* below line 42, if the horizontal stroke that seems to go through the descender of the initial *phi* can be interpreted in that way.

P. Congr. XV 16 was edited without an illustration and without an inventory number, which makes the papyrus impossible to trace in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. The text may well have been a *synchoresis*, given the likely supplement in lines 7–8 (below), but it may at a pinch have been a petition or notification likewise addressed to the *archidikastes*. The script is described in the edition as slow, clear, and of a considerable size. The lines were originally very wide: the size of the left margin is not given, but the preserved text is about 16 letters to a line, while the missing text to the right is about 23 letters to a line. The width of the papyrus is 15.5 cm.

What is preserved is probably only the prescript of the text. After the address in lines 1–3, the text continues with the (first) person from whom the text issues (*παρά* has been plausibly restored in the lacuna in l. 3). This person is a priest from Oxyrhynchus, who is not him- or herself present in Alexandria to hand in the text, but who is represented by someone sent (ll. 6–7 can be restored as *δια||πεμφθείς*) by him or her, perhaps to ‘complete this *synchoresis*’, if we supplement *πρὸς τὴν τελείωσιν τῆςδε τῆς συγ||χωρήσεως* in lines 7–8. This is followed by a reference to yet another priest from Oxyrhynchus, whose role is unclear. In the lacuna in line 9, I expect another *παρά*, introducing the second person from whom the text issues (this would make it a *synchoresis*): presumably a woman, daughter (or granddaughter) of Thoonis with her *κύριος* (after *Θοώνιος* in l. 10 *μετα* ..[is most likely *μετὰ κυ[ρίου]*). The editor states that the bottom margin is preserved. Perhaps there was a small space between the prescript (ll. 1–10) and the actual text, which would have followed lower down, but this is most unusual, and the matter cannot be resolved without access to (a scan of) the papyrus.

PSI VIII 875 r^o is a sale of property. The address is missing at the top, where there is a generous margin (4.5 cm). Someone added *ἀχρεῖ[ον]* in that margin, and the text of the *synchoresis* was crossed out so that the

papyrus could be reused. Perhaps the address was supposed to be added after the main text was written, but in this case this did not happen. We cannot be certain as to whether *PSI VIII 875 r^o* was an exemplar or a copy.

P. Mich. IX 528 is addressed to the *archidikastes* and may have been a *synchorexis* or a petition (as the edition has it) or notification.

P. Oxy. XLI 2973 is a lease. The subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes* (l. 33) is written in another hand in the blank space between the main body of the text ending in line 32 and the date in lines 34–35.

P. Bas. II 18 is a contract of some sort, because the text was crossed out when the obligation was met.

P. Fam. Tebt. 20 is a copy (*ἀντίγραφον* in l. 1, written in *ekthesis* [not marked in the edition]) of a settlement in two columns.³³ There may be enough room for the subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes* in the lacuna in line 48, after the date, but it may well not have been included, as the edition tacitly assumes.

P. Bad. II 22 is a kind of service contract (the note on the back calls it an *ἀσφάλεια*). The subscription was misread in the edition (see *BL VIII*, p. 14), and below the text proper, underneath line 14, is a *paragraphos*. Where the text picks up, *BL VIII*, p. 14 already corrected [ἐπιτ]ελέσαι to [ἐκτ]ελέσαι. It will have been preceded by εἶναι παραχρήμα ἀγώγιμον μέχρι τοῦ ἑκάστα *vel sim.* We therefore do not expect ἑκάστα again later on, and we certainly do not expect the first person as the edition has it in lines 1–2 (καὶ ἐκτεῖσ[αί μ]ε ἑκα[στα] ὡς πρόκ[ει]ται). Instead of μ]ε ἑκα[στα] I rather see π]άντ[α ...] but cannot come up with a satisfactory reading.

P. Mil. Vogl. I 26 is a sale. The subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes* is written in another hand below the date, about halfway into line 22 (not clear from the edition).³⁴ Note that in line 1 the papyrus has γενομενομενου. The edition prints γενο[μενο]μένου. According to papyri.info the first μενο was crossed out, but in older Italian editions [] stands for { }. We should print γενο{μενο}μένου or rather γενομένης. At the end of line 1, it appears that the *sigma* of χρηματισ- was

³³ For a scan, see <<https://berlpap.smb.museum/record/?result=0&Alle=13993>> (accessed 12 September 2023).

³⁴ The reading of the subscription has been corrected in *P. Oxy. LXXXVI 5568*, l. 40 n.

crossed out. The scribe may have corrected the incorrect hyphenation *χρηματισ-τῶν* to the correct *χρηματι-στῶν*, but the beginning of line 2 is not preserved.

P. Mil. Vogl. VI 266, ll. 3–11 is a copy of *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26 included in a notification. The papyrus has not been illustrated, but a scan was kindly put at my disposal by Francesco Cetera of the Università degli Studi di Milano. The editors estimate the original line width to have been between 70 and 90 cm. If, as seems very likely, *P. Mil. Vogl.* VI 266, ll. 3–11 was copied from *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26 directly, it may show that when such a text was copied, the format of the exemplar (here: ‘landscape’) was retained, even if the resulting lines were at least half as long again as those in *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26.

P. Col. inv. 497³⁵ is a loan of money on the security of land. The copy was made in the Oxyrhynchite nome, which appears in abbreviated form in the text (ll. 7 and 14). The editor thinks that the exemplar could have been drawn up in the Oxyrhynchite nome, because the creditor originates there³⁶ and the Alexandrian debtor happens to own land in the Oxyrhynchite nome, ten arourae of which are used as security for the (short-term) loan of 4,000 drachmae. But the exemplar was no doubt issued in Alexandria. The security is introduced as follows (ll. 12–13): ἐφ’ ὑπο|[θήκη πάντων τῶ]ν αὐτῶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπὶ νομοῖς ὑπαρχ(όντων). Line 14 then continues: [ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῶ]ν ὑπαρχόντων ἐν νομῶ Ὀξυρυγχ(ίτη). Since the Oxyrhynchite nome is part of the Heptanomia, ἐτι δὲ καί, ‘in addition’, is not strictly correct. ‘Especially’ (μάλιστα δε) or ‘specifically’ (ἄλλως τε καί) would have been better, but the supplement ἐτι δὲ καί is no doubt preferable: it often occurs in the description of securities in draft *synchoreseis* from the reign of Augustus, specifying which part of ‘all’ the debtor’s property is ‘especially’ (ἐτι δὲ καί) put up as security (see *BGU* IV 1053, col. i, l. 47; 1147, l. 23; 1151, l. 39; and 1167, l. 59).

³⁵ YIFTACH, ‘Experimenting security’ (cit. n. 27), pp. 167–182.

³⁶ In ll. 6–7, τῶν ἀπὸ [...] τοῦ Παγγᾶ Ἰ]σίδου (?) τοῦ Ὀξυρυγχ(ίτου) νομ(οῦ) is somewhat suspect. Villagers do travel to Alexandria, but how many of them would have 4,000 drachmae on hand to lend to an Alexandrian there? I wonder whether τῶν ἀπὸ | [τῆς μητροπ]όλεως τοῦ Ὀξυρυγχ(ίτου) νομ(οῦ) can be read instead. Such an expression occurs, e.g., in the *synchoresis* *P. Oxy.* XLI 2973, l. 5.

This use of ἐτι δὲ καί is strictly speaking ‘illogical’. In *BGU* IV 1149, ll. 31–32, [καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς πάντων, ἐτι δὲ] | καὶ ἐκ τοῦ δούλου Ζωσίμου καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων αὐτ(οῦ)ς ὑπαρχόντ(ων), the scribe corrected it deftly.

P. Hamb. I 94 is a contract of some sort. The description in the edition is incomplete. In line 4 it gives [παρὰ τοῦ δεῖνος] Ἀντινοέως The online image shows that, after the lacuna, line 4 reads Ματιδίου τοῦ καὶ Πλωτεινίου Ἀντινοέως and that the line ends there. The text continues in line 5 as follows: [e.g. ὑπὲρ οὗ πάρεστιν (as in *P. Mil. Vogl.* I 26, l. 3) πρὸς τὴν τε]λείωσ[ιν] τῇσδε τῇς [σ]υνχωρήσεως Μᾶρ[κος]. This shows that the text is a *synchoreasis* and not a petition (as the edition has it) or notification. There are two more, illegible lines. Also note that the description in the edition mixes up height and width.

PSI VIII 962 a–c are preserved on one papyrus. The papyrus may be part of a *tomos synkollesimos*, and the *synchoreseis* are therefore expected to be exemplars, but no other formal elements are preserved that could decide the issue. The texts are not obviously related to one another, a and c being loans, b being a kind of labour contract, and the reason for including them in a *tomos synkollesimos* together therefore has to remain uncertain.³⁷

P. IFAO III 18 is a copy (ἀντίγραφον in l. 1) of a contract of some sort. (It is not a petition, as the edition has it.) There is another text glued to the left.

BGU III 741 is a copy (ἀντίγραφον in l. 1) of a loan.

P. Freib. II 8 is a copy (ἀντίγραφον in l. 1) of a sale of a slave. The subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes* in line 32 is in the same hand as the rest of the text, even if the edition assigns it to another hand. The verb should be κατακεχώρι(σται) rather than κατακεχώρι(κα), as the edition has it. Another hand did correct a mistake in line 26 between

³⁷ Both the edition and WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), p. 95, n. 64, thought that the *tomos synkollesimos* was official rather than private. Official documents glued together do not have to relate, and one expects private documents glued together to relate somehow (we just do not know in this case). But it would be odd to find an official *tomos synkollesimos* (from Alexandria) in Middle Egypt. Among the texts from Augustan Alexandria we do find texts glued together, but these are not from a *tomos synkollesimos*. Rather, odds and ends were glued together to create a new writing surface for yet another draft.

the lines. The hand is in uncials with a peculiar *alpha* (with an elongated body) at the beginning of words (not just at the beginning of lines). The address is written in *ekthesis* (not marked in the edition).

BGU III 729 is a loan (really the receipt of a dowry). The subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes* in another hand in line 22 has not yet been read.

P. Med. I/2 44 is not a petition, as the edition has it, but a *synchoresis*, a contract of some sort, involving two parties. A scan kindly put at my disposal by Paolo Senna of the Università Cattolica in Milan shows that the text is written in uncials.

P. Oxf. 14 is a kind of settlement. The incomplete state of the papyrus makes it difficult to decide whether this is a *synchoresis* or merely a contract including a settlement of sorts.³⁸

PSI VI 704 is a sale of property. The text has not been illustrated, and the script is not described in the edition. There is a notation of some sort to the left of line 1, described as a *chi* followed by abbreviation marks. This may be the remains of an (abbreviated) ἀντίγραφον. This text relates to property in the Arsinoite nome, but the edition states that the papyrus was found in Oxyrhynchus. In such cases one wonders whether the papyrus was acquired during the excavations but in fact bought from someone selling papyri from the Fayum. One of the parties may alternatively have taken the papyrus to Oxyrhynchus. In line 9 we can read συνεστῶ]τος ἀντῆ for]τος αὐτῆ.

P. Oxy. IV 727 is a power of attorney. The address was written in *ekthesis* (not marked as such in the edition).

BGU II 542 is a sale of property. There is a *paragraphos* below line 23 (not marked in the edition). In line 22, ἀξιοῖ should probably be ἀξιοῦ(μεν).

SPP XX 10 is a sale of property. It is not quite certain whether the text is a *synchoresis*.³⁹ The date in line 25 is given as Παῦνι β. The scan rather suggests Παῦνι κ followed by another digit. The vertical stroke below the small gap at this point may be part of that digit, in which case the day

³⁸ See WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), p. 93 n. 54.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 93 n. 54: 'Dahingestellt bleibe ... ob auch ... hier zu nennen ist' (referring to CPR I 5, the *ed. pr.*).

date is $\kappa\eta$. The small gap also makes it impossible to decide whether there was an overstroke over the day date. If $\kappa\eta$ is read and the downward stroke is not part of the subscription in the next line, it is more difficult to read a *kappa* where the editor read $\bar{\kappa}\rho\alpha\tau()$ in line 26, but reading $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu(\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma)$ instead of $\bar{\kappa}\rho\alpha\tau()$ seems impossible. At the end of line 26, $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\acute{\omega}(\rho\iota\sigma\alpha)$ is presumably *verschliffen* for $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\epsilon\chi\acute{\omega}(\rho\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota)$.

BGU I 282 is a sale. The last line, at some distance below the text, has not been read but seems to be in another hand. It was in any case the subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes*. In line 2, $\lambda\alpha\sigma\gamma\rho\alpha]\varphi\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon[\nu\omicron\upsilon$ in the prescript cannot be right. Probably read $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda]\varphi\omicron\upsilon\ \bar{M}\epsilon[$. In line 29, [...] $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\eta$ can be restored as $[\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta]\ \omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\eta$. At the beginning of line 40, following the expression $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\upsilon}\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in the previous line, we should read $\kappa[\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau] \alpha\hat{\upsilon}\tau\alpha$: irrespective ($\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma$), the party concerned should act ‘in accordance with these things’ (as spelled out in the contract). In line 41, **BGU III**, p. 2 read $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota\hat{\omega}$. It should instead be $\acute{\alpha}\xi[\iota\omicron]\hat{\upsilon}(\mu\epsilon\nu)$ followed by the beginning of the date, $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\upsilon}[\varsigma]$. Line 42 started with the ordinal of the year rather than with the $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ symbol, as the edition has it: [... $\delta]\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ($[\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\alpha\iota\delta]\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon$, AD 175/6, would fit best).

BGU I 241 is a division of property. In the supplement in line 10 we expect $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, not $\chi\acute{\eta}\rho\alpha\varsigma$. Whether her husband was still alive or dead is irrelevant. Also in the supplement in line 20 we do not expect $\sigma\varphi\rho\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$ but rather $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$, and the place is called $II[---]\eta\ddot{\upsilon}$ at the end of line 19. In the Hermopolite nome there is a place called $T\alpha\nu\alpha\mu\eta\nu$, and $II[---]\eta\ddot{\upsilon}$ will have been something similar in the Arsinoite nome.

P. Oxy. XLI 2978 may have been a *synchoresis*, but it may also have been a petition or notification addressed to the *archidikastes*. The address is written in *ekthesis* (not marked in the edition).

SB VI 9145⁴⁰ is a sale of a slave. The subscription reads differently from other such subscriptions, $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho(\alpha\psi\alpha)$ instead of $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\epsilon\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$.⁴¹ The

⁴⁰ H. LEWALD, ‘Eine Synchoresis aus der Zeit des Commodus. Papyrus Rainer G. 25.817’, [in:] *Studi in onore di Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz* III, Naples 1953, pp. 429–438, on which see E. P. WEGENER, ‘Miscellanea papyrologica’, *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 9–10 (1955–1956), pp. 97–116.

⁴¹ WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), pp. 94–95 n. 64, thought that the verb meant that the information was transmitted for the $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}$ of the sale.

edition in *SB* format does not make it clear that the address was written in *ekthesis* and that the subscription by the clerk was indented. In line 6, the patronymic needs to be *Μέλανο*[s, not *Μελάνο*[v. In line 20, the articles in [διὰ τῆς τοῦ Ἰουλίου Σαραπίωνος ἐπιδί]δοντες make no sense. [διὰ Ἰουλίου Σαραπίωνος ἐπιδί]δοντες, if the verb is correct, would make Iulius Sarapion the intermediary for the two parties, and he is again mentioned in line 26 as the person in whose presence the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes* has made the transfer of ownership in the record. This Iulius Sarapion is not to be identified with the banker in lines 15–16, Tiberius Iulius Sarapion.⁴² The expression in lines 15–17 is itself also suspect. Salvius Symmachos has received 2,600 drachmae in cash and διὰ τῆς Τιβερίου Ἰουλ[ί]ου Σαραπίων[ο]ς διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων τραπέ[ζιτων] οὔσας ἐ[κ λ]όγου of the buyer Aphrodisios. We expect τραπε[ζης, and]ουσας could also be the end of a longer verb. The expression διὰ (‘acting through’) τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων refers to the assistants of the banker, who are not bankers themselves.

BGU III 825, ll. 1–12 is a sale of property included in a notification.

P. Stras. VI 512 is a receipt according to the note on the back. The papyrus has not been illustrated, but Paul Heilporn kindly shared a scan with me. He also pointed out (*per litt.*) that the verb in the subscription is a *verschliffen* κατακεχώ(ρισται), not κ(ατ)εχω(ρίσθη) as the edition has it. See also the notes on *SPP XX 10* above.

SB I 424⁴³ is a contract of some sort. The text has not been illustrated and no dimensions are given. The papyrus is presumably lost. The script is described in the *editio princeps* as rather good.

P. Giss. I 51 is a sale of property. The text was identified as a *synchoresis* by eliminating all other possibilities (see the introduction to the edition), and it must remain somewhat uncertain whether this really is a

⁴² *Ibidem*, pp. 94–95 n. 64, thought that the subscription was ‘anscheinend von einem Angestellten des alexandrinischen Bankiers Tib. Iulius Sarapion angefügt’, but it was added merely ‘in the presence of’ (ἐπι) the representative of the two parties who happened to have a similar name.

⁴³ G. PARTHEY, ‘Frammenti di papiri greci, asservati nella Regia Biblioteca di Berlino’, [in:] *Nuove memorie dell’Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica* II, Leipzig 1865, pp. 438–462.

synchoresis.⁴⁴ It shares features with *P. Oxy.* XLI 2989 and *SB* XIV 11705, ll. 1–20, which have also been identified as *synchoreseis* with some reservation, and *P. Oxy.* XIX 2236. There is no ἀξιοῦμεν in line 21 unless what was read immediately after the lacuna as a *sigma* (καὶ δαπάναι]s in *P. Giss.* I, καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης]s in *BL* I, p. 170; the *sigma* is underlined in *P. Giss.* I, which means it is damaged; it is invisible on the scan) is in fact part of ἀξιοῦμεν abbreviated.

SB XIV 11705, ll. 1–20⁴⁵ is a loan included in a notification. It has been identified as a *synchoresis* solely on the basis of the reference to an *ekdosimon* of ‘the’ *synchoresis* in lines 22–23 in conjunction with an *epistalma* (ἐπιφερομένου τοῦ τῆς συνχωρήσεως ἐκδοσίμου καὶ τοῦ ἐπιστάλματος ὑπογεγραμμένων). The *ekdosimon* would have had the subscription by the clerk in the office of the *archidikastes*, but the copy quoted in the text itself would have left it and ἀξιοῦμεν out. There remains an air of uncertainty about this text.⁴⁶ Note that a new line begins in what is printed in *SB* as the middle of line 25. After Θεόδωρος follows a *vacat*. ἀντίγραφον ὑπόκειται begins a new line. What was read as Ἀὐρ(ήλιος) at the beginning of what should be line 27 is more likely the day date in Phaophi, which could not be written at the end of the previous line. It is presumably in two digits with an overstroke. The name Aurelius was not yet in common use (the *synchoresis* is from Phaophi 2 = 29 September 29 AD 213; the notification is from a few days or weeks later, but still in Phaophi).

P. Turner 40⁴⁷ is a sale of a slave.

P. Yale IV 172⁴⁸ is another sale of a slave. The address is written ever so slightly in *ekthesis* (not marked in the edition).

⁴⁴ WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), p. 93 n. 54, treats it as such only with reference to the introduction to the edition.

⁴⁵ F. T. GIGNAC, ‘A document from the reign of Caracalla in the Michigan Collection’, *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 13 (1976), pp. 93–97.

⁴⁶ Cf. WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), p. 93 n. 54: ‘wahrscheinlich auch ...’.

⁴⁷ *P. Turner* 40 was re-edited by A. BENAÏSSA, ‘Two slave sales revisited’, *Pylon* 1 (2022), <<https://doi.org/10.48631/pylon.2022.1.89340>> (accessed 1 September 2023).

⁴⁸ For a scan, see <<https://findit.library.yale.edu/catalog/digcoll:2792434>> (accessed 1 September 2023).

P. Oxy. XIX 2236 is a sale of half a house.

P. Oxy. XLIX 3499 is a contract of some sort. The text was tentatively dated to AD 298, based on a prosopographical identification. The script rather points to the early third century AD.⁴⁹

P. Oxy. XXXIV 2723 is a sale of property. The text starts *medias in res*, with the two parties. The address is missing, but there is a generous space at the top (5 cm). Perhaps the address was meant to be added later. That this text is also otherwise unfinished follows from the blanks left in lines 5–6 (the name of the son) and 16 (the exact amount in myriads of drachmae). It may nevertheless have been issued as an exemplar to one of the two parties. The large initial *pi* is written in *ekthesis* (not marked in the edition).

P. Tebt. II 319 is a copy in two columns of a division of property. Towards the end of the text the scribe writes *καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς* in line 34 instead of the *ἀξιοῦμεν* formula⁵⁰ and also abbreviates the date in line 35. The script also gets rather sloppy towards the end of lines and especially towards the end of the text.

P. Rain. Cent. 69 is a loan. A note on the back identifies the text as a *synchoresis*. This is a re-edition of *SPP* XXII 80, where the text is assigned to Soknopaïou Nesos. The re-edition does not give a provenance, and it would be the latest dated text from Soknopaïou Nesos. The text was at any rate originally drawn up in Alexandria, because it is a *synchoresis*. In *P. Heid.* IV 244, l. 8 n. (reported in *BL* XI, p. 184 as the introduction to *P. Heid.* IV 244), the provenance is tentatively identified as Oxyrhynchus, based on a formula that appears frequently in texts from Oxyrhynchus. But such formulae ultimately derive from Alexandria, and the text of *P. Rain. Cent. 69*, which is either an exemplar or a copy, was undoubtedly drawn up in Alexandria. The address was written in *ekthesis* (not marked in the re-edition).

P. Bonn. inv. 54⁵¹ is a sale of a slave.

BGU IV 1071 is a contract of some sort.

P. Oxy. XXXIV 2706 is a mere pen trial of the address of a *synchoresis* or a petition or notification to the *archidikastes*.

⁴⁹ Doubt was already cast on the date in *P. Oxy.* LXXXVI, p. 119 n. 1.

⁵⁰ So WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (cit. n. 1), p. 94 n. 62.

⁵¹ MITTHOF & PAPATHOMAS, 'Ein Sklavenkauf' (cit. n. 26).

P. Oxy. XLI 2989 is a sale of property. The *παρά* with which the text opens is written in *ekthesis* (not marked in the edition). Note that in line 21 *ἔως αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους* is irregular. The scan shows that *καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους* was written, ‘and including the present year’. *μέχρι τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους* would have been written in the previous line.

P. Oxy. LXVII 4586 is a sale of property. It has – unique in *synchoreseis* from after Augustus – the subscriptions of the two parties in different hands from the hand of the main text. Dots were put below the main body of the text to indicate where the two parties had to subscribe. The text is a most dubious *synchoreseis* (see above, pp. 90–91).

P. Oxy. LXXXVI 5568 is a sale of a slave.⁵²

P. Oxy. LXXXVI 5569 is another sale of a slave⁵³ and the latest dated *synchoreseis* published so far. It seems that this flexible document form, which developed from legal settlements proper and came to cover all kinds of legal arrangements between two parties and which survived from the Ptolemaic into the Roman period, did not survive the age of the tetrarchs.

Peter van Minnen

University of Cincinnati
 Department of Classics
 410 Blegen Library
 Cincinnati, OH 45221-0226
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 e-mail: vanminp@ucmail.uc.edu

⁵² Scans of this papyrus are available at <https://portal.sds.ox.ac.uk/articles/online_resource/P_Oxy_LXXXVI_5568_Sale_of_a_Cretan_Slave/21186688> (accessed 1 September 2023).

⁵³ Scans of this papyrus are available at <https://portal.sds.ox.ac.uk/articles/online_resource/P_Oxy_LXXXVI_5569_Sale_of_a_Mauretanian_Slave_Woman/21186691> (accessed 1 September 2023).

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE
OF *SYNCHORESEIS* THAT ARE NOT DRAFTS

Synchoreseis that are part of notifications can be identified in the table by the presence of line numbers following the reference (see at *P. Mert.* II 59, *P. Mil. Vogl.* VI 266, *BGU* III 825, and *SB* XIV 11705). In the section ‘Remarks on individual *synchoreseis*’ above, one can find further discussion of these texts in the same order as the table.

* = print illustration only

** = unpublished scan

*** no illustration or scan

? = could also be a petition or notification

<i>Text</i>	<i>Dating</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Layout</i>	<i>Script</i>	<i>Line width</i>	<i>Address ἀξιούμεν</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Clerk</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
* <i>P. Mert.</i> II 59, ll. 11–28	154 or 143 BC	exemplar	landscape	uncials	30.5	yes	no	no	
<i>BGU</i> III 1001	reign of Augustus?	copy	landscape	curse	>30	yes	yes	no	
? <i>P. Theon.</i> App. C	late 1st cent. BC	?	?	uncials	?	yes	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Leid. Inst.</i> II 27	11/10 – c. 5 BC	exemplar	landscape	uncials	>30	yes?	no?	no?	broken off at left
<i>P. Fouad</i> 44	44 AD	copy?	portrait	curse	12.5	yes	yes	no	
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XXXVII 2471	c. 50 AD	?	portrait	uncials	15	yes	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Oxy.</i> II 268	58 AD	copy	landscape	curse	<30	yes	yes	yes	
** <i>P. Berl. inv.</i> 11755	66 AD	exemplar	portrait	uncials	20	yes	?	?	text breaks off; cancelled
* <i>C. Pap. Gr.</i> I 22	70 AD	?	portrait	uncials	11?	?	?	?	broken off top /bottom
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XII 1471	81 AD	exemplar	portrait	uncials	7.5	yes	no	yes	text breaks off; cancelled
** <i>P. Athen.</i> 15	83–95 AD	exemplar	portrait	uncials	12.5	?	yes	yes	broken off at top
<i>P. Heid.</i> IV 326	98 AD	?	portrait	curse	9	?	?	?	broken off top /bottom
<i>P. Heid.</i> IV 327	99 AD	exemplar	portrait	uncials	7.5	?	yes	yes	broken off at top
***? <i>P. Congr.</i> XV 16	late 1st/early 2nd cent. AD	?	landscape	?	25–30?	yes	?	?	text breaks off
<i>PSI</i> VIII 875	1st–2nd cent. AD	?	portrait	curse	15	no	?	?	text breaks off; cancelled
? <i>P. Mich.</i> IX 528	early 2nd cent. AD	?	portrait	uncials	<9.5	yes	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XLI 2973	103 AD	exemplar	portrait	curse	13.5	yes	yes	yes	
<i>P. Bas.</i> II 18	c. 117/18 AD	exemplar	portrait	uncials	>10	yes	?	?	text breaks off; cancelled
<i>P. Fum. Tebt.</i> 20	120/1 AD	copy	2 columns	uncials	18/10	yes	yes	no?	
<i>P. Bad.</i> II 22	126 AD	exemplar	portrait	curse	8	?	yes	yes	broken off at top
<i>P. Mil. Vogl.</i> I 26	128 AD	exemplar	landscape	curse	46.5	yes	yes	yes	

** <i>P. Mil. Vögl.</i> VI 266, ll. 3–11	128 AD	copy	landscape	curse	70–90	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
* <i>P. Col.</i> inv. 497	130/1 AD	copy	portrait	curse	11	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Hamb.</i> I 94	after 130 AD	?	portrait	curse	19	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>PSI</i> VIII 962a	131/2 AD	?	portrait	uncials	8.5	yes?	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>PSI</i> VIII 962b	131/2 AD	?	portrait	uncials	8.5	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>PSI</i> VIII 962c	131/2 AD	?	portrait	uncials	?	yes?	?	?	?	text breaks off
* <i>P. IFAO</i> III 18	136 AD	copy	portrait	curse	21	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>BGU</i> III 741	143 AD	copy	portrait	curse	11	yes	no	yes	no	
<i>P. Freith.</i> II 8	144 AD	copy	landscape	uncials	31	yes	yes	yes	yes	
<i>BGU</i> III 729	144 AD	exemplar	portrait	uncials	10	yes	yes	yes	yes	
** <i>P. Med.</i> I/2 44	2nd cent. AD	?	portrait	uncials	10?	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Oxf.</i> 14	2nd cent. AD	?	portrait	curse	11.5	?	?	?	?	broken off top/bottom
*** <i>PSI</i> VI 704	2nd cent. AD	?	portrait	?	15?	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Oxy.</i> IV 727	154 AD	exemplar	portrait	curse	13	yes	yes	yes	yes	
<i>BGU</i> II 542	165 AD	copy	portrait	curse	21	?	yes	yes	no	broken off at top
<i>SPP</i> XX 10	168 AD	exemplar	portrait	curse	12	?	no	yes	yes	broken off at top
<i>BGU</i> I 282	175/6 AD?	exemplar	portrait	curse	16	?	yes	yes	yes	broken off at top
<i>BGU</i> I 241	177 AD	copy	portrait	curse	13	yes	no	yes	no	
? <i>P. Oxy.</i> XLI 2978	c. 185/6 AD?	?	portrait	curse	9	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>SB</i> VI 9145	184–192 AD	exemplar	portrait	curse	19	yes	yes	yes	yes	
<i>BGU</i> III 825, ll. 1–12	190/1 AD	copy	portrait	curse	10	?	yes	yes	no	broken off at top

<i>Text</i>	<i>Dating</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Layout</i>	<i>Script</i>	<i>Line width</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>ἀξιούμεν</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Clerk</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
** <i>P. Stras.</i> VI 512	196 or 197 AD	exemplar	portrait	cursive	10	?	?	yes	yes	broken off at top
*** <i>SB</i> I 424	2nd–3rd cent. AD	?	portrait	?	?	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Giss.</i> I 51	202 AD	exemplar	portrait	cursive	12.5	?	no	yes	yes	broken off at top
<i>SB</i> XIV 11705, ll. 1–20	213 AD	copy	portrait	cursive	14	?	no	yes	no	broken off at top
<i>P. Turner</i> 40	c. 215 AD	?	portrait	uncials	17.5	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Yale</i> IV 172	215–217 AD	?	portrait	uncials	13	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XIX 2236	early 3rd cent. AD	?	portrait	cursive	<10	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XLIX 3499	early 3rd cent. AD	?	portrait	cursive	20	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XXXIV 2723	1st half of 3rd cent. AD	?	landscape	cursive	>26	no	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Tebt.</i> II 319	248 AD	copy	2 columns	cursive	24.5/17.5	yes	see note	yes	no	καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς
<i>P. Rain.</i> Cent. 69	c. 248 AD	?	portrait	cursive	13	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
<i>P. Bonn.</i> inv. 54	249/50 AD	exemplar	portrait	cursive	22	?	yes	yes	yes	broken off at top
<i>BGU</i> IV 1071	3rd cent. AD	?	portrait	cursive	23	yes	?	?	?	text breaks off
? <i>P. Oxy.</i> XXXIV 2706	3rd cent. AD	see note	portrait	cursive	5–6	yes	see note	see note	see note	pen trial of address only
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XLI 2989	3rd cent. AD	copy	portrait	cursive	16	no	no	no	no	
<i>P. Oxy.</i> LXVII 4586	3rd cent. AD	exemplar	portrait	cursive	10	no	no	no	no	
<i>P. Oxy.</i> LXXXVI 5568	290 AD	exemplar	portrait	cursive	17.5	yes	no	yes	yes	
<i>P. Oxy.</i> LXXXVI 5569	295 AD	exemplar	portrait	uncials	16.5	yes	yes	yes	yes	