

# Świderek, Anna

---

"Papyrusurkunden aus ptolemäischer Zeit", bearb. von Wolfgang Müller, "Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Staatlichen Museen Berlin. Griechische Urkunden", Bd. X, 1970 : [recenzja]

---

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 18, 245-248

---

1974

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](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

## SURVEY OF PAPYRI

*Papyrusurkunden aus ptolemäischer Zeit*, bearbeitet von Wolfgang Müller, *Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden* X. Band, Akademie Verlag, Berlin 1970, pp. 147, Plates 24.

Dr Wolfgang Müller presents in the 10th volume of BGU 110 documents (1901—2011), all from the Ptolemaic period, in majority papyri from the so-called *alter Bestand* of the Berlin collection, mostly from the Oxyrhynchite nome.

No. 2901 presents a small fragment of a decree, dated by the editor for the middle of the 3rd cent. It concerns the importation of crops (καρποί) "in a town" (εἰς τὴν πόλιν), but it is not sure into which polis, as the term may also designate the metropolis of a nome.

Nos. 1902—1904 bring very small scraps of *enteuxeis*. The two first are dated to the 3rd cent, the third and last *ca.* to the middle of the 2nd cent.

No. 1905 is a request, in form of a *hypomnema*, addressed to the *hipparches* Philo and concerning a private corn loan. The identification of the addressee with an officer-eponym, known towards the end of the 3rd cent., based only on the identity of names, does not seem very reliable, as this name occurs often in Egypt.

The next four numbers (1906—1909) bring successive scraps of a *hypomnema* from the Oxyrhynchos nome, dated to the 3rd cent., a slightly more important fragment of a similar document (dated to 167/6 A.D.), addressed to Daimachos strategus of Perithebas, a fragment of a complaint about an assault, of the 2nd cent. and a *hypomnema* to the strategus Apollonios about an overdue loan (*ca.* beginning of the 1st cent.).

The editor classifies under No. 1910 four fragments. They are parts of a badly preserved document from Upper Egypt (middle of the 2nd cent.), already partly published by M. Letronne (cf. J. Passalacqua, *Catalogue raisonné et historique des Antiquités découvertes en Egypte*, pp. 277f. = P. Par. 70 p. 413), probably judicial proceedings.

The fragments designed as Nos. 1911—1916, come presumably from the office of a higher official (strategus or *oikonomos* according to the editor), called Kallistratos, from the middle of the 3rd cent. Nos. 1912—1914 are of

one hand, and Nos. 1911, 1912, 1915 and 1916 are all addressed to Akesios. Introducing No. 1911 the editor informs that three papyri from the Jena collection belong to the same correspondence. Should they be in a better state as those from Berlin, they might then help to identify the position of Kallistratos.

Nos. 1917—1923, which are mere fragments, were included into the archives of Nikanor, *trapezites* from Oxyrhynchos (middle of the 3rd cent.), hitherto known only from P. Hamb. II 171, written according to the editor, by the same hand as Nos. 1920 and 1921.

No. 1924 brings the scraps of four poems, dated (with an interrogation mark) to the first half of the 2nd cent. The editor admits that their proposed restoration is "very uncertain".

Nos. 1925 and 1926 are two documents, already found on the recto of respectively UPZ II 199 dated 131 A.D. and UPZ II 200 dated 130 A.D. They belong to the records of the Royal Bank in Thebes.

As Nos. 1927—1931 are classified very slight fragments of official letters, dated by the editor to the 3rd and 2nd cent.

The document published as No. 1932 is most interesting, but unfortunately badly preserved. It constitutes a fragment of an official report, dated to the middle of the 2nd cent., about building operations in the harbour of Herakleopolis.

About No. 1933, a receipt issued by a *naukleros* from the 2nd cent., cf. actually H. H a u b e n, *ZPE* VIII, 1971, pp. 272—275.

Nos. 1934—1942 bring various fragments of different official registers and accounts. Worthy of a special mention are among them: No. 1936: a very slight scrap from the 3rd cent., mentioning a Mithraeum; a document about the supply of horses for cavalry, unhappily very obscure (middle of the 2nd cent.); No. 1942: a list of women, probably slaves, presumably occupied in weaving industry, already published by W. Müller in *Acta Antiqua Philippopolitana (Acta historica et philologica)*, Sofia 1963, pp. 27ff.

An important group of documents concerns the cleruchs from Tholthis in the Oxyrhynchite nome during the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator. Nos. 1943—1949 are contracts concerning the lease of land; we could probably add to this group very fragmentary texts, classified as Nos. 1950—1955.

Two fragments of similar contracts (Nos. 1956 and 1957) are slightly later and date to the reign of Ptolemy V Epiphanes; the provenience of No. 1956 from Tholthis is uncertain and No. 1957 was issued in the Arsinoite nome.

Further documents belong again to the Tholthis group: Nos. 1958 and 1959 are receipts for rents paid in advance; Nos. 1960—1963: loans of money; Nos. 1969 and 1970: loans of corn. We might probably add to this group No. 1964 bringing a fragment of the document which was published for the first time in *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, pp. 358f. (= SB V 7569), then as P. Hamb. II 190 (anti-

chresis, cf. H. J. Wolff, *ZRG Rom. Abt.* 73, 1956, p. 397) and the very fragmentary No. 1956. Cf. also Nos. 1973 and 1974.

A similar type of loan of money is also mentioned in two small fragments, published as No. 1966 (reign of Ptolemy III?) and No. 1967 (reign of Ptolemy V).

No. 1968, dated 184 B.C.: loan bearing no interest, by Mousaios from Kios to Kallikrates the Thracian (ethnikon restored!). This papyrus comes from Upper Egypt. The editor who supposes that it might be from Ptolemais, does not even try to justify his opinion which is not confirmed by any detail of the text.

No. 1972, dated by the middle of the 1st cent. and coming probably, according to the editor, from the Herakleopolite nome, brings also a loan of money.

The two next fragmentary documents, Nos. 1973 and 1974, from the Oxyrhynchite nome, are concerned with the acquisition of land. In both the buyer has an Egyptian name and the vendor a Greek one (cleruchs?), and both contracts are dated for the time of Philopator's reign. Nevertheless the editor does not justify this datation in any way.

Nos 1975—1977 are very small fragments of contracts, concluded according to the editor during the reign of Philopator (this datation is at least dubious for No. 1977) in Tholthis in the Oxyrhynchite nome. It should be noted that No. 1976 (fr. A 1.2) might effectively be issued in Tholthis, but the provenance of the two remaining fragments is difficult to state. It is namely impossible to agree with the editor, when he says that Horos, mentioned in No. 1975, 4, must be "identisch mit dem Hierodulen Horos (*PPt* III 7320)". The name Horos is too frequent to authorise such an identification, and the document does not bring any other data for the characteristic of the person involved.

The reasons which allowed to date the fragment published as No. 1978 for the reign of Ptolemy III, seem rather unconvincing too.

Nos. 1979—1987 bring prescripts of documents from the 3rd cent. probably from the Oxyrhynchite nome. No. 1988 presents a rather long list (from *ca.* the second half of the 3rd cent.) of almost exclusively Egyptian names. Small fragments of other rolls and accounts dated to the 3rd and 2nd cent. are published under the Nos. 1989—1992.

Nos. 1993—1995 are documents from the Zenon archives, formerly published by W. Müller in *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* XIII, 1961, pp. 75f. The editor supposes that the fragments published as Nos. 1997 and 2010 may also belong to these same archives.

No. 1996, dated to 241 B.C. contains the document of a hitherto unknown Nikolaos addressed to Horos, about some corn due to Theukles. This document too was already published by W. Müller *loc. cit.*

The remaining texts, published in B.G.U. X are thirteen small fragments of private letters (Nos. 1998—2009 and 2011) from the 3rd and 2nd cent. The

most interesting among them is No. 2009 which brings an unusual quantity of Jewish names.

The volume contains indexes and 24 beautiful and in general easily readable plates.

In spite of bringing texts which in their majority constitute only small fragments, the *Papyrusurkunden aus ptolemäischer Zeit* continue worthily the great series of B.G.U. One is only sometimes inclined to regret that the editor was so very brief in his commentary and did not, by many documents, discuss more extensively for instance the reasons which inclined him to a particular datation of the texts. The reader is sometimes perplexed when he tries to guess if the decision was here taken on the basis of paleographic motives, or perhaps other arguments were also involved (cf., e.g. Nos. 1901—1904, 1906, 1908, 1909; 1911—1916, 1928—1931, 1966, etc.).

[Warszawa]

*Anna Świderk*

*Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Staatlichen Museen Berlin. Griechische Urkunden* XI. Band, 2. Hälfte. *Urkunden römischer Zeit*. Edited by Herwig M a e h l e r, Berlin 1968, pp. 75—261, Plates V—VIII.

After the first part volume XI BGU published in 1966 and containing the documents Nos. 2012—2054 (cf. *JJP* XVI—XVII, pp. 189—193) doctor H. M a e h l e r published further texts (Nos. 2055—2131) from the collection of Ägyptisches Museum (Charlottenburger Schloss—West Berlin). Besides the indexes (pp. 226—257), the fascicle contains a list of supplements and emendations of the texts published in the first fascicle (p. 258) and a definite list of documents published in both parts of this volume (pp. 259—261).

The publication method is that generally applied in standard papyrological works. I mention in the detailed part some inconsequences in transcription—not many other publications are completely free from them. The reader, however, is unsatisfied with the dating of documents in the introductory commentary to each text and, consequently, in the register of papyri (*Verzeichnis der Texte*, pp. 259—261). The purpose of placing the date together with the provenance of the text (or a clear statement that it is not known!) before the introduction to each text is obvious. It helps the reader to find immediately the documents which are for him of particular interest.

Dating to century only seems to be based on paleographical ground. It is always better to give a concrete date obtained from the text (e.g. after A.D. X), even if it is impossible to define accurately the *terminus ante quem*. A list of dates becomes useless if we must read the document or the commentary to state that a text dated to the 2nd cent. was not written before 169 A.D. (2058).