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**PREFACE**

The papyri which form the subject of the present volume were obtained in the spring of 1902 from the Ptolemaic necropolis of El-Hibeh, partly by purchase, partly from our first excavations at that site, as is recorded in the Introduction. On p. 5 will be found an explanation of the remarkable fact that some of the literary papyri here edited belong to MSS. of which fragments were published by us in 1897. The papyri were, with one exception (no. 23), derived from mummy-cartonnage, and all belong to the third century B.C.

In editing the classical fragments we have continued to avail ourselves very largely of the most generous assistance of Professor F. Blass, whose weighty judgement we have followed in the authorship suggested for most of the new pieces (nos. 1-18), and to whom is due much of their reconstruction and interpretation, besides many suggestions on difficulties arising in the fragments of extant authors (nos. 19-26). With regard to the non-literary texts we have received much help from Professor J. G. Smyly, who has not only placed at our service his intimate acquaintance with the contemporary Petrie papyri, but has in many cases revised our decipherments of the texts and made suggestions for their interpretation. His knowledge of ancient mathematics has materially assisted in the elucidation of the astronomical calendar (no. 27), and without his aid we should certainly not have ventured, as we have done in Appendix I, upon the difficult, perhaps even hopeless, task of attempting to solve the perplexing problems connected with the Macedonian calendar. Our proof-sheets have also had the advantage of having been read through by Dr. J. P. Mahaffy, to whose liberality we owe the insertion of a facsimile of the calendar (Plate VIII). Some assistance which we have received from other scholars on special points is acknowledged in connexion with the individual papyri.

For the interpretation of several demotic dockets appended to the Greek texts we are indebted to Mr. F. Ll. Griffith, who has generously allowed us to utilize his forthcoming edition of demotic papyri in the John Rylands Library.
A few words of explanation are due concerning the alternative years B.C. on the Julian calendar into which for the convenience of our readers the dates by the king's reign are converted. Apart from the difficulties caused by the frequent employment of the Macedonian in preference to the Egyptian months for dating purposes, an element of uncertainty is introduced into the conversion of practically all early Ptolemaic dates into their equivalents on the Julian calendar owing to the fact that at least two systems of reckoning the king's years were in common use, while papyri rarely provide any indication which method is being employed in a particular case. The nature of these different systems is discussed in Appendix II, but the evidence is unfortunately at present insufficient for a satisfactory explanation. Accordingly we have converted the dates by the king's years into what (granting the correctness of the Canon of Ptolemaic kings) are their equivalents on the Julian calendar, firstly on the conventional assumption that the king's years were reckoned from Thoth 1 of the annum vagus, the balance of days between his accession and the next Thoth 1 being counted as his 1st year, and secondly on the assumption (which is likely to be correct in many cases) that another system of reckoning the king's years was employed, according to which the dates when expressed by the Julian calendar may be a year later than they would have been if the first system had been employed. The dates B.C. which result or may result from the use of the second system are enclosed in brackets.

In conclusion we have to beg the indulgence of subscribers to the Graeco-Roman Branch for presenting them with a memoir which on account of its length is to count as a double volume. The next memoir of the Branch, Part V of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, in which we shall begin the publication of the very important literary texts discovered in 1905–6 (cf. The Times, May 14, 1906), is already in hand, and we hope to issue it in June, 1907.

BERNARD P. GRENFELL.
ARTHUR S. HUNT.
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<td>261</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Payment of Physician-Tax</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Receipt for Physician-Tax and Police-Tax</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Receipt for Various Taxes</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Receipt for Police-Tax</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Receipt for Beer-Tax</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Receipt for Beer-Tax</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Receipt for Bath-Tax</td>
<td>258 or 248</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Receipt for ádýmaipa</td>
<td>247-6</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Accounts. Postal Register</td>
<td>c. 270-c. 255</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>List of Cases and Fines</td>
<td>c. 250</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Taxing-List</td>
<td>c. 260</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Banker’s Account</td>
<td>c. 260</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Official Account</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Account of Taxes on Sacrifices and Wool</td>
<td>c. 250</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Account of Bath-Tax</td>
<td>c. 245</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Return of Corn Revenue</td>
<td>239 or 214</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Account of Olyra</td>
<td>c. 250</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Account of Rent</td>
<td>c. 260</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Account of Goats</td>
<td>250–49</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Private Account</td>
<td>251–0</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122–171</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Documents</td>
<td>3rd cent.</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The general system followed in this volume is that of its predecessors. Literary texts are printed as they appear in the originals, except for division of words, capital initials in proper names, and reconstruction, where practicable, of lacunae. Additions or corrections by the same hand as the body of the texts are in small thin type, those by a different hand in thick type. Non-literary documents are printed in modern style with accentuation and punctuation: abbreviations and symbols are resolved, while additions and corrections are usually incorporated in the text, their occurrence being recorded in the critical notes; but where special considerations make this method inconvenient, alterations in the original have been reproduced, later hands being distinguished, as in the literary texts, by thick type. Faults of orthography, &c., are corrected in the critical apparatus wherever they seemed likely to cause any difficulty. Iota adscript is printed when so written, otherwise iota subscript is used. Square brackets [ ] indicate a lacuna, round brackets ( ) the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets ⟨ ⟩ a mistaken omission in the original, braces { } a superfluous letter or letters, double square brackets [[ ]] a deletion in the original. Dots placed within brackets represent the approximate number of letters lost or deleted; dots outside brackets indicate mutilated or otherwise illegible letters. Letters with dots underneath them are to be considered doubtful. Heavy Arabic numerals refer to the texts of the present volume, ordinary numerals to lines, small Roman numerals to columns. On the numeration of the different mummies from which the papyri were obtained see pp. 11–12; and on the alternative years B.C. in expressing dates according to the Julian calendar see the Preface.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used in referring to papyrological publications are practically the same as those adopted by Wilcken in *Archiv für Papyrussforschung*, I, pp. 25-8, viz.:


Archiv = Archiv für Papyrussforschung.


P. Cairo = Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the Cairo Museum, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.


P. Leyden = Papyri Graeci Musæi antiquarii Lugduni-Batavi, by C. Leemans.


P. Petrie = The Flinders Petrie Papyri, Parts I and II by the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, Part III by the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy and J. G. Smyly. Our references are to Part II wherever texts previously published are reprinted there.


P. Tor. = Papyri Graeci Regii Taurinensis Musei Aegyptii, by A. Peyron.


INTRODUCTION

In February and March, 1902, while we were excavating in the Fayûm, a dealer who had been travelling in Upper Egypt brought us a large quantity of broken papyrus-cartonnage, amongst which we noticed the presence of numerous literary fragments of the third century B.C. Our work in the Fayûm was at that time drawing to an end, the available sites for the discovery of Ptolemaic papyri being exhausted, and we were naturally anxious to take at once the opportunity of finding Ptolemaic papyrus-cartonnage in a different district. With some difficulty we ascertained that the provenance of the papyri brought to us was Hibeh, on the east bank of the Nile between Benisuéf and Shêkh Fadl (Cynopolis); and as the Director-general of Antiquities most obligingly gave us permission to proceed thither at once, we were able to start work on March 24. The excavations were carried on until April 11 (Arch. Report, 1901-2, pp. 4-5), and resumed in January, 1903, for nearly a month (Arch. Report, 1902-3, pp. 1-3). In February, 1903, after examining several sites between Hibeh and Shêkh Fadl, we returned to Behnesa, which has occupied us for the last three and a half seasons.

The ruins of the ancient town of Hibeh are situated on the river bank facing the villages of Feshn and Fent. The high desert at this point approaches the river edge, leaving only a narrow strip a few yards in width available for cultivation, and providing suitable places for quarrying limestone. The town was built on rising ground, which reaches its highest point at the north-west corner of the site. The most conspicuous feature is the massive wall of crude brick, some metres thick, which protects it from attack on the north and east sides, the east wall running in a south-westerly direction to meet the river, so that the area enclosed forms with the river a kind of acute-angled triangle. Stamped bricks with the names of the princess Estemkheb, her husband Menkheperrê or their son Pinotem II, show that the walls were built under the XXIst Dynasty. Near the south end of the site stood a small temple (36 x 16½ metres), built by Shishanq and Osorkon of the XXIInd Dynasty, the picturesque ruins being now overgrown with palms. The principal entrance to the town was through the north wall, near its east corner; west of the entrance the wall becomes more than usually strong as the ground rises to a peak, and it is probable that here was the citadel. The west face of this peak has been cut away for stone; and
it is not clear whether the wall was ever continued down to the river, which, moreover, has apparently encroached slightly upon the south end of the site, washing away the original south corner of the wall. Opposite the ruins, and separated only by a channel which becomes dry in the summer, is an island about 2 miles long, which was already there in early times, for it is mentioned in the demotic papyri from Hibeh of Darius’ reign (cf. p. 7). The modern village of El-Hibeh is a poor hamlet a few hundred yards to the south of the ruins, and is combined for administrative purposes with another village on the island which contains a few hundred feddans of cultivated ground, while on the main land there is practically none. The extensive necropolis of Hibeh lies round the ancient city to the north, east, and south of the walls, and dates from New Empire to Roman times. By far the greater part of it had been dug out before our arrival, principally in 1895-6, when, as report states, an Arab dealer from the Pyramids, known as Shékh Hassan, excavated the cemetery on a large scale. From the assertions of an inhabitant of Hibeh who was then employed as a reis, it appears that the dealer met with much success, especially in the discovery of scarabs, amulets, ushabtis, statuettes, faience and alabaster vases, and other objects such as would be found in the later tombs of the New Empire. Quantities of mummies of the Ptolemaic period with papyrus-cartonnage were also unearthed, but thrown away as worthless. This is the usual fate of cartonnage found in the Nile valley proper, where, except at one or two places, native tomb-diggers until quite recently attached no value to papyrus apart from large rolls. A handful of small fragments, however, found their way to Cairo, where they were bought by us in 1896; cf. p. 5. During the next few years much plundering continued at Hibeh, among the chief finds being a number of large demotic papyrus rolls, which were discovered together in a pot inside the town close to the east wall in the southern portion of the site. These were bought in Cairo by Lord Crawford, and having passed with the rest of his papyri into the possession of the Rylands Library are now being edited by Mr. F. Ll. Griffith in the Demotic Papyri of the John Rylands Library, pp. 38 sqq. The site, especially the necropolis, had thus been thoroughly ransacked before Ahmed Bey Kamal in the year preceding our excavations was sent by the authorities of the Cairo Museum to investigate the place. His excavations, which lasted only a short time, produced no results of importance; cf. his report in Annales du Service des Antiquités, ii. pp. 84-91.

We had taken the precaution of bringing thirty workmen with us from the Fayûm, and our anticipations that the local inhabitants would not be satisfactory were fully justified. The villagers of Hibeh, having hardly any land to cultivate, earn their living by antiquity-plundering or salt-digging in the neighbouring
desert; for regular work at the normal rate of wages they were not in the least disposed, while the inhabitants of the village on the island were not sufficiently intelligent to be of much use in the rather difficult task of clearing out the remains of a much plundered cemetery. We had no hesitation in deciding at which part of the necropolis to begin operations. The tomb which had produced the papyri brought to us in the Fayum was about 150 yards outside the town, in a rocky ridge which faced the north wall and ran from almost the river bank towards a square brick-walled enclosure near the north-east corner of the town; and the report of ShékH Hassan's ex-reis that *wus̱hâš waraq* ('faces of paper,' the Arabic term for papyrus-cartonnage) were to be found in this quarter was confirmed by the presence of many broken Ptolemaic mummies and limestone sarcophagi strewn about in the vicinity. The area bounded on the south by the town wall, on the north and north-east by the rocky ridge just mentioned, forms a triangular depression, of which the base is the margin of cultivation on the west, and the apex the brick enclosure on the east. The surface of the desert, which rises in an easterly direction, was to a large extent covered with loose debris, consisting partly of rubbish thrown out from the town between the time of its foundation in the XXIst Dynasty and the Ptolemaic period, with occasional accumulations of later date above the earlier mounds, partly of bricks which had fallen down from the wall or belonged to the buildings that had stood there before the Ptolemaic period, partly of limestone chips from the rock-tombs scooped out in the ridge to the north and underneath the wall itself, of which we shall speak presently. Throughout this debris at intervals were Ptolemaic burials, mostly in plain limestone sarcophagi, sometimes in rudely painted or plain wooden ones, rarely in pottery coffins, and occasionally without any sarcophagus at all. The bodies were mumified and generally ornamented with detachable cartonnage, either of cloth or papyrus, very similar in the style of decoration to the Fayum cartonnage. In many cases the Hibeh mummies are externally indistinguishable from those from the Fayum; but in the Hibeh cartonnage the lower border of the head-pieces more commonly has a white band with a red check-pattern, and in the breast-pieces, though these are sometimes very large, the interstices between the figures or other objects painted have not infrequently been cut out, while foot-pieces are generally absent, but where found are of the larger kind and do not degenerate into the two small pieces of cartonnage attached to the soles which are so common in the Fayum. The burials in the debris were very shallow, usually not more than two or three feet from the surface, occasionally only a few inches below it, though in some parts it was necessary to dig through six or seven feet of Roman rubbish to reach the Ptolemaic level. In the lower ground,
which had been much dug by sebakhîn, near the river bank damp had proved fatal to the cartonnage, and even higher up the rise was often insufficient to protect the mummies from the moisture soaking through the soil from below, particularly when they had not been buried in the stone chips. In the process of digging through the rubbish of the late New Empire period to find the Ptolemaic sarcophagi, a few antiquities, such as scarabs and amulets, were found, and in the accumulations of the Roman period some small pieces of papyrus, none of which is later than the third century. In the Roman rubbish mounds and in some places in the earlier debris we also discovered a number of plain mummies very heavily draped, especially round the face, and tied with red bands. From the levels at which these were lying and the occurrence of similarly draped mummies in the neighbouring cemetery of Maghagha (Arch. Report, 1902-3, p. 3), it appears that this style of burial continued down to the sixth century, but most of the Hibeh examples were probably earlier; for in one spot near the west end of the rocky ridge, where a large number of these later burials had been made, we also found, not far from each other, two admirably preserved portrait-mummies similar to those discovered at Havâra and Rubayyât in the Fayûm. One of these (a woman) is now in the Cairo Museum, the other (a man) in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge. A plain mummy found in the same group was inscribed Εὐδᾶς Πρεφορᾶτος (του) ἀντὶ Τραίανος Γερτισκεκίς (a place-name?), and the portraits too no doubt belong to the second century; cf. the authoritative discussion of the dating of the Fayûm portraits by C. C. Edgar in Journ. Hell. Stud. xxv. pp. 225-33. An inscription rudely carved on a block of limestone measuring 50 x 30 cm. records the death of Ἰ' οὶ ὑιοὶ ὑγειοῦστος Ἀπώνος τῶν ὑπὸ κώμης Φυλονίκου (τῶν) γ.

The Ptolemaic burials in the depression between the rocky ridge and the north wall of the town were mainly those of the poorer classes; wealthier persons were buried in rock-tombs. Of these the south side of the rocky ridge contained a double row, one at the foot, the other a little higher up. They consisted of one or more low chambers scooped out of the rock where a convenient ledge projected, and generally had plain doors. The upper row of tombs had in places been altogether destroyed owing to stone-quarrying; and nearly all the rest, as would be expected, had been plundered anciently, while many of them had been reopened in modern times, principally by Shêkh Hassan, so that such cartonnage as we obtained from them was for the most part very fragmentary. A few untouched tombs, however, were discovered. One of these was in the west face of the corner of the ridge facing the cultivation, and contained four very large limestone sarcophagi with painted wooden coffins inside, containing early Ptolemaic mummies. The head-piece
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(of cloth) was detachable, but the other decorations were in accordance with the pre-Ptolemaic practice painted on the mummy. Another tomb had escaped the plunderer through being covered up by the debris of a house which had been built, probably at the same date as the town walls, on a depression between two peaks of the ridge. This contained eight painted wooden coffins and two of limestone, and in the debris itself numerous other mummies had been buried either with or without sarcophagi; many of these contained papyrus-cartonnage, except in one room of the house, which was filled up with mummies mostly ornamented with cloth head-pieces alone.

The tomb which produced the papyri bought by us in the Fayûm was one of the lower row of this group of rock-tombs. It had five chambers, of which four were said to have been opened by Shèkh Hassan, while the fifth, which had been walled up, escaped detection until the beginning of 1902. This information fits in very well with the remarkable coincidence that some of the literary fragments from this tomb are actually parts of the same papyri as certain literary fragments bought by us in Cairo in 1896, and published in P. Grenf. II. Of the papyri in the present volume 4 belongs to P. Grenf. II. 1, 5 to 8 (b), 11 to 6 (c), 20 to 3, 21 to 2, 22 to 41; and there are numerous additional fragments of P. Grenf. II. 7 (b), which remain unpublished. It is clear that the mummies from which these literary fragments were derived had been originally discovered in 1896 in Shèkh Hassan’s excavations, but that his workmen only took the trouble to remove a few small pieces, the remainder being left behind in the tomb until attention was redirected to it in 1902. The much damaged character of the cartonnage containing these literary fragments indicates that the mummies to which they belonged had been broken up anciently, probably in Roman times, while the comparatively well-preserved pieces of cartonnage bought with them no doubt came for the most part from the chamber which remained intact until 1902.

Opposite these two lines of rock-tombs were two other similar rows, excavated underneath the foundations of the city wall between the entrance and the north-west corner. These were also Ptolemaic, and had contained mummies with the usual cloth or papyrus cartonnage. The lower line of tombs at the foot of the rock on which the wall stands had been thoroughly plundered in Shèkh Hassan’s time, but the upper line, placed in the ledge of desert on which the lower tier of the wall rested, had escaped notice because the entrances were covered over with the debris of bricks which had fallen down from above. These tombs had in every case been opened and sometimes re-used anciently,

1 We are informed by M. S. de Ricci that in 1899 he identified a few additional fragments belonging to P. Grenf. II. 4 in the Heidelberg collection. It is to be hoped that these will soon be published.
for not only were the mummies more or less broken up, but some scraps of Roman papyri were found in one tomb, and an inscription rudely scratched above the door of another, Τάφος 'Ασφό . Πέτεχό/ιτος) Κινό(ίου?) a . . . . , also probably dates from the Roman period. Some fairly well preserved pieces of cartonnage were nevertheless obtained; and in one spot we found in a recess under the wall a group of twenty mummies, nineteen buried in stone sarcophagi, one in a wooden one, of which fourteen contained papyrus-cartonnage. A passage led from this recess to a subterranean chamber filled with thin painted wooden sarcophagi, but the cartonnage of the mummies inside these was uniformly cloth.

This series of rock-tombs came to an end at the town gate; underneath the remaining piece of the north wall and the outside of the whole of the east wall there were no suitable ledges under which to excavate chambers. A few isolated stone or wooden sarcophagi had been laid here and there against the wall, and there were numerous burials of the Roman period, but no papyrus-cartonnage was found. The most important discovery here was an untouched tomb beneath a small brick building adjoining the east wall near its north corner. In the debris of this building were many inscribed bases of funerary statuettes and a wooden figure of Isis, probably of the Persian period. Below the floor of one of the rooms was a square shaft eight feet deep, leading to three rudely cut chambers in the rock, the chamber on the north being divided by a wall from one beyond. Here were found several sarcophagi, some of plain limestone shaped like a mummy, others of wood. The painting on the outside of the latter approximated in style to that on Ptolemaic coffins, but some of the sarcophagi were also painted inside, a rare phenomenon in the Ptolemaic period. Two well-preserved specimens of these were brought away; one, belonging to Khonsu-tek-Nekt, is now at Brussels, the other at Cairo. The mummies had no cartonnage and were bound in thick white wrappings. Sometimes a network of small blue beads had been placed on the breast, but often the beads were merely painted on the cloth. The tomb also contained a set of four Canopic vases, a good-sized bronze statuette of Osiris, and numerous very coarse ushabtis. From the style of the sarcophagi and other objects it is clear that this burial belonged to one of the last two or three centuries before the Ptolemies.

Near the north-east corner of the wall is, as has been said, a brick-walled enclosure measuring about 75 x 65 metres, of which a photograph is given in Petrie's *Methods and Aims of Archaeology*, fig. 6. Report states that antiquities were found underneath the walls, a rumour which gains some confirmation from the circumstance that they have been extensively dug about in recent times.
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Within the enclosure is a natural hillock with several convenient ledges for placing rock-tombs, which have all been plundered. Ahmed Bey Kamal (Annales, ii. p. 90) states that crocodile-mummies were found in them; but some at any rate of the burials were human. The tombs, like the surrounding wall, are no doubt anterior to the Ptolemaic period; and we conjecture that they formed a private cemetery belonging to one of the chief families of Hibeh in its early days, being walled off for greater protection, like the enclosures to be found in many modern Egyptian cemeteries in the desert.

In the ground to the east of the town, along the path which leads to the modern village of Hibeh, are numerous rock-tombs under low ridges or shallow shafts leading to subterranean chambers. Previous diggings show that dogs and cats were buried in this part as well as human mummies, generally without sarcophagi, and rumour is probably correct in stating that no antiquities of value have been found there. Probably the tombs belong to the later Ptolemaic period. They are now being again used for burial purposes by the Copts. Further south beyond the town walls are more rock-tombs, chiefly in low hillocks along the margin of cultivation. Papyrus-cartonnage is reported to have been found here, but spoiled by damp; and other burials in stone sarcophagi laid only a few inches under the surface are also frequent in this quarter. No part of the south-eastern necropolis seemed promising for our purposes, and the only find of any interest was an elaborately decorated Ptolemaic mummy (now at Cairo) in a painted wooden sarcophagus inside another of heavy limestone.

A few days were devoted to the investigation of the town ruins, where, except for the group of demotic papyri found in a pot (cf. p. 2), not much seems ever to have been discovered either by antiquity-seekers or by sebakhin, who visit Hibeh in large numbers during the summer. As we had expected, the mounds were not at all productive of papyri. In the northern part near the wall the houses were filled up with debris of bricks and contained no afsh, and the mounds further south near the river were far too much affected by damp to yield papyrus, even in the upper strata. A few houses on higher ground in the south-east quarter of the town had some afsh, but had already been much dug; and we found little save some second or third century fragments. Underneath the east wall on the inside was a series of funerary chambers cut in the rock, which had been plundered long ago. These were probably used by the pre-Ptolemaic inhabitants.

That the old Egyptian name of Hibeh was Teuzoi in the Heracleopolite nome is known from the demotic papyri found there and now being edited by
Mr. Griffith (Dem. Pap. of the John Rylands Library, p. 40); but its name in Graeco-Roman times, during which it undoubtedly continued to be inhabited, remains undiscovered. Papyri from mummy-cartonnage give little help towards the identification of the site at which they happen to be found, since mummies were often carried a long distance to be buried in a particular place. Very few of the pieces of cartonnage found in the Hibeh cemetery are likely to have been manufactured at Hibeh itself, and from internal evidence it is clear that many of the mummies came from villages on the west bank in the Oxyrhynchite nome. It is, therefore, necessary to depend mainly on the evidence provided by the scanty papyri of the Roman period found in the town and by the statements of ancient geographers; the funerary inscription mentioning the village Φιλονίκου (cf. p. 4), which in Arch. Report, 1901-2, p. 5, we provisionally identified with Hibeh, may, like the cartonnage, have been brought from elsewhere, and is therefore not a sound basis for argument.

The evidence of the Roman papyri is as follows. One petition was written by a person Ἀπό Κόρμης Φύξεως τοῦ κάτω Κωϊτου; a receipt mentions the κωμαρχαί Αγκυρωίων, and another document Ἀρσία τοῦ Κωϊτου τοῦ ὑπὲρ Μέμφιν (Πρακλεοπάλτων (probably, cf. C. P. R. 6. 4, Æc.; but τοῦ ὑπὲρ Μέμφιν might agree with Κωϊτου; cf. 95. 5 εἰς 'Οξηργύχων πόλει τῆς ὑπερθε Μέμφιδεος). A taxing list of payments arranged according to villages mentions Ἀγκυρωίων, Φιλονίκου (cf. the funerary inscription, p. 4). Περών, Ἰππάρων, Ταμαρόν, Μωνίχεως, Τάλης, Ἀσσύας, Μουχίθησία( ὁ), Κερκεσίφεως, Κόβα, and Ψεθονέμαζι (cf. 33. 7). Probably all these villages were in the Κωϊτης τόπος; cf. 117, where Τάλης and Ἀσσύα occur in an account concerning villages in the Κωϊτης, and 112. On the verso of this papyrus is a long list of Heracleopolite villages including Ἀλλαδείας, Κολασού( ς), Πετάχ( ὁ), Σάβδο( ὑς), Πενεταμή( δες), Τερπονῆς( ὁ), Μωνύχεως( ῆς), Τοπάς( ως), Θελφάδι( ὑς), Θακάδι( ῆς), Νόηρες( ῆς), Ωμονώμιθε( ως), Ψεθονέμας( ς) (corr. from Ψεθονέμας), Χονίως, Πενεταμήσ( ως), Κόμια, Κρήκεως, Βουσέρ( ως), Τέρτονα( ως), Τέχθοι( ως), Θομέκας( ῆς), Νεκάν( ως), Σπάν( ως). Several of these villages are already known from published papyri, e.g. Σάβδος, Πενεταμής, Νόηρες, Ωμονώμιθες, Θελφάδις, Θακάδις, from C.P.R., Ψεθονέμας, Ωμονώμιθες, Κολασού( ς) from C.R., Επιείκες from P. Amh. 147. 2, P. Gen. 10. 2, and P. Brit. Mus. 171 b. 7, 8, where l. εἰς Ψεθονέμας τοῦ Κωϊτου (Κωϊτου has already been suggested by Wilcken; it can also be recognized in C. P. R. 82 (1. 4). where l. Κωϊτου κάτω [τοῦ ὑπ. Μέμφι, Πρακλ.] for Κωϊ τοῦ κατωτέρων ὑπ. Μέμφι, Πρακλ.). but most of the names are new.

Combining the evidence of these Roman papyri with the frequent references to several of the same villages (e.g. Ψεθονέμας, Περών, Κόβα, Ἀσσύα) in the early Ptolemaic papyri of the present volume, it is certain that Hibeh was situated in the Κωϊτης τόπος of the Heracleopolite nome. This toparchy must therefore
have comprised the south-east portion of the nome, where it adjoined the Cynopolite, the cemetery of Cynopolis itself being only twenty-five miles south of Hibeh. That the Κωίτης, which was subdivided like many toparchies into a lower and upper division, included the whole of that part of the Heracleopolite nome which lay on the east bank is very likely, and it may even have extended to the southern portion of the Heracleopolite nome on the west bank. The references to it in the present volume, especially 78. 12–4, indicate that for some administrative purposes it was distinct from the rest of the Heracleopolite nome and almost treated as a nome itself, though owing to the absence of the Κωίτης from the two lists of nomes in Rev. Laws, it cannot have ranked officially as such. The name of the district Κωίτης suggests that there was a town called Κω or Κώς which was its capital, and in fact the existence in this part of Egypt of a town called Κω or Κώς is attested in the second century by Ptolemy, and in the fifth by Stephanus of Byzantium; cf. maps iv. and viii. of Parthey’s Zur Erdkunde des alten Aegyptens (Abh. d. k. Akad. in Berlin, 1858). Both these authorities place Κω close to Cynopolis and on the west bank; Ptolemy’s statement (Geogr. iv. 5) is εἰσα ὁμοῖος νομός Κυνοπολίτης καὶ μητρόπολις ἀπὸ δυσμένην τοῦ ποταμὸν Κω ... ἡ αὐτίκαιται ἐν τῇ νήσῳ (sc. the island which was formed by the division of the Nile and contained the Heracleopolite nome) Κυνοῦ πόλις. Müller, however, suggests in his note ad loc. that Ptolemy has created two separate towns out of the two ancient names of the capital of the Cynopolite nome, Πη-εἰμηρ (‘city of Anubis,’ i.e. Κυνοῦ πόλις) and Κα-σα (Coptic Kais, the modern Kēs near Benimazar). That Ptolemy’s Κω, if it was the metropolis of the Cynopolite nome, is really Cynopolis under a different name is fairly certain; but in view of the new evidence for the existence of a toparchy called Κωίτης in the vicinity of the Cynopolite nome, it is possible that there was a town called Κω or Κώς in the south-eastern part of the Heracleopolite nome, and this Κω may have been confused by Ptolemy with Kais-Cynopolis. Papyri, however, provide no evidence for the existence of Κω, and there are in any case no grounds for identifying it with Hibeh.

Two other towns mentioned by ancient geographers have a claim to be considered as perhaps identical with Hibeh, ’Αγκυρῶν πόλις and Ίππωνος, ’Αγκυρῶν πόλις, which is referred to in 67. 4, 112. 74, and 117. 15, as well as in two of the Roman papyri under the form ’Αγκυρῶν (cf. p. 8). is placed by Ptolemy about midway between Aphroditopolis and Cynopolis, while Hibeh is only about 12 miles north of the point half-way between Aftih and Kēs (Cynopolis). Stephanus of Byzantium, on the other hand, places the town much further north in the same latitude as the Fayyum; but the quarries at Hibeh (cf. p. 1) would well accord with his explanation of the name ’Αγκυρῶν πόλις.
HIBEH PAPYRI

(cf. Ptol. Geogr. iv. 5, cd. Müller) 'Αγκ. πόλ. ὃς 'Αλέξανδρος ἐν ᾿ Αἰγυπτιακῶν ὀνόμασται δὲ οὕτως ἐπειδὴ λιθάνας ἐτερμον ἀγκύρας ἐκ τῆς παρακειμένης λατομίας. The position assigned by the Itinerarium Antonini to Hipponon, midway between Aphroditopolis and Speos Artemidos, corresponds very well with the relation of Hibeh to Atfih and Benhasan, and the identification of Hibeh with Hipponon (which has already been proposed, mainly on account of the similarity of the names) would suit the fact that Hipponon was a military post of some importance; cf. the Notitia Dignitatum, which shows that the ala Apriana was stationed there, and P. Amh. 142. 16, where l. τῇ ἄριστος ἱεράς κατὰ τὸν Ἰππόνον. The chief objection to this identification is the silence with regard to Hipponon not only of Ptolemy, but of the Ptolemaic papyri in the present volume, although so many villages of the Κωίτης are mentioned. If the existence of Ἰππόνον as a place of some importance in the Ptolemaic period is ever proved by new evidence, the probability of the identification with Hibeh would be greatly increased; but in the meantime it must be regarded as very doubtful, and the grounds for identifying Hibeh with Ἀγαμημόναν πόλις are quite as strong. So far as can be judged from the Ptolemaic papyri in this volume, the most important village of the Κωίτης was Φεβίχώς, which seems to have been a kind of administrative centre; cf. 106. 3 τό ἐν Φεβίχω λαυετήμον τοῦ Κωίτου. But the fact that Φεβίχως is so often mentioned in the Hibeh papyri may well be due to a mere accident; and in any case there is little justification for identifying it rather than any other village of the Κωίτης with Hibeh, especially as the principal deity of Φεβίχως appears from 72. 2 to have been Heracles, i.e. Hershef, the ram-headed god of Heracleopolis, while the principal deity worshipped at Hibeh in, at any rate, ancient Egyptian times was Ammon, as is shown both by the sculptures in the temple there and by the demotic papyri from Hibeh which Mr. Griffith is editing.

The papyri published in the present volume consist partly of Hibeh papyri bought by us in the Fayûm, partly of the papyri discovered in our first season’s excavations in March–April, 1902. These came either from the central depression or from the rock-tombs in the ridge to the north of it (cf. pp. 3–5). The cartonnage found in the second season’s excavations in January–February, 1903, which approximately equals in bulk that found in the preceding year, and was obtained either from other parts of the central depression or from the rock-tombs under the town wall, has not yet been examined. The present volume by no means exhausts the first season’s results, though all the larger literary fragments and most of the better preserved documents have been included. There still remain numerous small literary fragments, some of which, if they can be fitted together, may turn out to be of value, and a
certain quantity of non-literary documents, the publication of which is postponed for various reasons. Another selection, together with the Ptolemaic papyri found in the second excavations and the Roman papyri, will form the subject of a future volume.

It was to be expected that cartonnage from an ordinary Graeco-Egyptian site in the Nile valley would prove to consist more largely of demotic papyri than cartonnage from the Fayûm, where the Greek element in the population was particularly strong. And though the papyri of the present volume show the presence of numerous Greek settlers in Middle Egypt outside the Fayûm, the proportion of Greek to demotic in the Hibeh cartonnage is distinctly smaller than in that discovered by Flinders Petrie at Gurob and Hawâra, and apparently smaller than in that found by Jouguet and Lefebvre at Magdola, though it is larger than in the cartonnage found by us at Tebtunis, the demotic papyri from which outnumber the Greek by two to one. In point of date the bulk of the Hibeh papyri cover the same period (from the middle of Philadelphus' reign to the end of that of Euergetes I) as the bulk of the Petrie papyri: but the Petrie papyri contain a certain admixture of documents belonging to the reigns of Philopator, Epiphanes and even Philometor, and the oldest document in that collection is dated in the 16th year of Philadelphus (P. Petrie I. 24 (2) = III. 52 (b)), whereas the latest certain date yet discovered in the Hibeh papyri is the 25th year of Euergetes I (90; 7, 91, and 117 for palaeographical reasons may perhaps belong to the reign of Philopator); and there are not only several documents dated in the earlier part of Philadelphus' reign (30, 97, 99, and 100), but a unique specimen of a Greek document dated in the reign of Soter (84 a).

To know which papyri belonged to which mummy is often a matter of importance in determining the place where they were written, the identity of individuals with the same names, and the range of undated pieces, since the papyri from a particular mummy tend to form a group written in the same district, often concerning the same persons, and as a rule not widely separated in date; and in the case of a number of mummies found together, parts of the same papyrus are sometimes obtained from more than one of them. We therefore append a classification of the papyri in the present volume arranged according to the mummies in the cartonnage of which they were found. The bought papyri, which all or nearly all came from a single tomb (cf. p. 5), are distinguished from the others by having A prefixed to their numbers, or, in the case of smaller fragments of cartonnage, by being called simply Mummy A. These numbers accompanying A refer not to the collective cartonnage of one mummy (as the numbers elsewhere of course do), since the different parts were not kept together
by the native finders, but to the separate pieces from which several documents have been extracted. It may therefore occasionally happen that though two 'A' papyri have different numbers, the same mummy was actually their source. Like the great majority of the papyri discovered in the excavations, the bought papyri were partly written in the Koitns topos of the Heracleopolite nome, partly in the Oxyrhynchite nome. From the presence of such a large quantity of literary fragments, it is clear that the papyrus used in making up the cartonnage of several of the mummies (unfortunately those which have suffered most at the hands of plunderers, both ancient and modern) was obtained from a library of classical literature. It is not unlikely that this had belonged to one of the Greek settlers at Oxyrhynchus, a town at which, as its papyri of the Roman period show, Greek literature was particularly widely studied. The mummies from the first season's excavations are distinguished by numbers only. Nos 62, 64–5, 67, 73–8, 101, 116, and 127 were found together, as were Nos. 79–100. Smaller groups of mummies from the same tomb are (a) Nos. 109–12 and 121; (b) Nos. 68–72; (c) Nos. 118–20. 23, which was discovered in the debris outside the north wall, stands apart from the following list.

A. 2. 131.
A. 4. 121, 134, 135.
A. 5. 133.
A. 6. 95.
A. 7. 72.
A. 8. 57.
A. 9. 51, 3, 56, 58, 62, 93, 119, 124, 160, 8, and probably 37, 54, 5, 125, 7, 130.
A. 10. 6.
A. 11. 71.
A. 13. 78.
A. 14. 32.
A. 15. 36, 75, 105, 7, 138, 44.
A. 17. 88, 96, 99, 128.

No. 5. 31, 39, 84 (a)–(b), 97, 100–1, 147 8.
No. 6. 30.
No. 10. 66 70 (b), 90, 103–4, 160 5.
No. 12. 116.
No. 13. 40–4, 85, 150–1.
No. 18. 9, 63, 65, 94, 110, 157 9.
No. 25. 114.
No. 40. 113.
No. 63. 83.
No. 68. 27 (part).
No. 69. 13 (part), 17, 27 (part) 34 (part), 73 (part), 111.
No. 70. 13 (part), 34 (part), 73 (part).
No. 83. 89, 109.
No. 84. 115.
No. 87. 79.
No. 97. 23–9, 64, 92, 146.
No. 98. 81 2, 152.
No. 117. 80, 98, 153 6.
No. 126. 87.
I. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1. Epicharmus, Γνώμαι.

Mummy A. 16.9 x 14 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240, Plate I.

This is an introduction in trochaic tetrameters to a gnomic poem (I. 11), for which the authorship of Epicharmus is expressly claimed in I. 13. The Γνώμαι of Epicharmus were popular at an early period, and quotations from these gnomic verses are found in Xenophon (Mem. ii. 1. 20) and Aristotle (Rhet. ii. 21. 1394 b, 13). But there were doubts even in ancient times regarding their authenticity, and according to Philochorus the collection was the work of a certain Axiopistus; cf. Apollodorus, ap. Athen. xiv. 648 d Φιλόχορος δ’ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ μαντικῆς ’Αξιόπιστον τὸν εἶτε Λωκρὸν γένος εἶτε Σικυώνων τὸν Καρνά καὶ τὰς Γνώμας πεποιηκέναι φησίν. Following this criticism recent editors (Kaibel, Com. Gr. Fr. i. pp. 133 sqq., Diels, Vorsokratiker, pp. 91 sqq.) class this section of the fragments among the ψευδεπίχαρμεα, although it is acknowledged to include some genuine elements. What Axiopistus seems to have done is to have edited in the poet’s name a number of floating extracts from the comedies of Epicharmus, with additions from other sources; and the contents of our papyrus may be recognized as part of his preface to the work. Diels supposes that Axiopistus lived in the fourth century, perhaps in the circle of Heraclides Ponticus; the papyrus (provided that Philochorus was correct, and that Axiopistus was the author) shows that he must have lived at least as early as B.C. 300, since its own date cannot be later than about B.C. 250, and should probably be placed earlier in the reign of Philadelphus. It is written in finely formed upright uncials, and shows to the best advantage a common literary hand of this period. The τ with its broad and carefully finished crossbar is a noticeable feature.
In this, as in the other new classical fragments, many of the restorations of lacunae and suggestions in the commentary are due to Professor Blass.

Here are phrases many and various for you to use on friend or foe, when speaking in court or in the assembly, on a rascal, on a gentleman, on a stranger, a bully, a drunkard, or a boor, or if any one has other bad qualities for these too here are goads; here also are wise maxims, obedience to which will make a man cleverer and better in all things. A man has no need for many words, but only just one of these verses, bringing
to bear upon the matter in hand that verse which meets the case. For the reproach was made against me that, though I was clever in other ways, I was prolix and could not utter maxims tersely; so on hearing that I composed this work of art in order that men may say “Epicharmus was a wise man who put many witty sayings of every kind into single verses, giving proof of his talent for terse . . .”'

4. ἐτε:  ἀτε is the correct dialectical form.
5. ἐνύ was a Doric and Aeolic form of ἔστι; cf. Anecd. Ox. i. 160. 26 ἐξό ῥῆμα παρὰ Δωριέων ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔστιν, 176. 12 (ἐν) παρά τὴν Διόλιδα καὶ Δωρίδα διάλεκτον ἐνδ ὀντεῖν, ὀπόταν καὶ ἀντὶ ῥῆματος.
11. μακρολογος δ:  ὀν.
20. There would be room for a quite narrow letter like i between ϖρ and η.
22. An alteration has been made in this line, possibly by a second hand; the letters γα are much smaller than usual and is of τούτως are added above them. There are also traces of ink below υτ which may represent part of the original writing, and perhaps all the letters between γτ and κακι are in an erasure.
23. γέγενε: the dialect requires γεγαθε.

2. Epicharmus (?), Γνῶμαι.

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 9 × 9.2 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240.

Four fragments from a trochaic poem, apparently of a gnomic character, and quite possibly coming from a later part of the work of which 1 is the preface. The MS. however is certainly not the same; the calligraphic hand is similar in some respects to that of 1, but the letters are larger and more widely spaced, and in some cases the formation is different. In the second column of Fr. (c), where the beginnings of a few lines are preserved, the verses are divided off by paragraphi, indicating that they were μονόστιχοι, each complete in itself. The only alternative would be to suppose that those lines were part of a dialogue, which is here much less probable. A curious approximation occurs in l. 6 to a verse attributed to Epicharmus by Stobaeus (Kaibel, Fr. 258) ὁ τρόπος ἀνθρώπους δαίμων ἀγαθός, όσ δὲ καὶ κακός. The papyrus has εὐτρόπος ἀνθρώπους δαίμων, apparently in the same position of the verse (cf. note ad loc.), but the letter following δαίμων is not a; probably, therefore, εὐτρόπος is not a mistake and the line ended quite differently. This verbal coincidence is therefore an insufficient argument for assigning the fragments to the Γνῶμαι of Epicharmus; it is moreover to be observed that they fail to show the Doric dialect appropriate to that work (cf. l. 5 ἀγνης, l. 8 εἴπατηκεν). The
objection, however, is inconclusive, for dialect is frequently obscured (cf. notes on 1. 4 and 23); and, apart from Epicharmus, we are at a loss for an author of γνώμαι μονόστιχοι in trochaic tetrameters. On the verso are the remains of a cursive document.

Fr. (a).

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]οντι προς το\[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]οδυσσε\[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]εστι χρησ\[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]εικαλυπτεται το φαυλον [ \]
5 \] εις το συντυχειν αρδης εστινο[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]εντροπο και ρωποιοι δαιμων π[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]οι και ορθως βραβευσαι διανε[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]νους εξηπατηκεν αδικος ο[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]εσις πονηρα περι πονηρο[ν\]
10 \[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\] \[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\] \[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]πο\[\]

Fr. (b).

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]ολα[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]επι[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]θεραπ[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]οστεν[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]δεσεντ[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]ες στι[\]

Fr. (c).

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]

Fr. (d).

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]

Fr. (e).

Col. i. Col. ii.

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]

26 \] αυτωι π[\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]
\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots.\]

25 εα[\]

4–6. The three initial epsilons are in a vertical straight line, and it therefore seems practically certain that they are the first letters of the verses; for although, so far as the metre goes, the first foot in each might be the third of the verse, it is most unlikely that the two preceding feet would have occupied exactly the same space in three consecutive lines. Of the first ε of εικαλυπτεται only a small speck of the base remains, but this suits ε; the letter following appears to be ν, not π. The cyclic dactyl at the beginning of 1. 6 is very unusual.
3. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

3. **Sophocles, Tyro (†).**

Mummy A. Fr. (c) 9.9 x 11.4 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240. Plate II (Fr.s 6 and f).

A number of fragments containing tragic iambics, but in very bad condition. This is largely due to the fact that the breast-piece from which they are derived, instead of being left in a solid sheet, was, according to a not uncommon fashion, cut into an open-work pattern, causing large gaps, and rendering the remainder much more fragile than it would otherwise have been. The pattern has assisted us in assigning their position to a few of the pieces, but the others remain unplaced and the total result is disappointing. This is the more regrettable since it appears not improbable that, as Prof. Blass has suggested, the play in question is the *Tyro* of Sophocles. Tyro was the mother of twin sons, Pelias and Neleus, by Poseidon, and was persecuted by her step-mother Sidero, who was eventually killed by Pelias. In l. 39 of the new fragments there is a mention of the river Alpheus, which is in keeping with the fact that the adoptive country of Tyro's father, Salmoenus, was Elis. Indeed, Elis may well have been the scene of one of the two dramas written by Sophocles on the subject of *Tyro*. The extant fragments from the two plays amount only to twenty-seven lines, so that the absence of a verbal coincidence with our bare sixty is not at all remarkable. But allusions to the same circumstances are perhaps to be recognized. There is more than one reference in the papyrus to bad dreams, e.g. l. 37 [φο]βος τις αυτην δεωμα τ εννυχομ πλαναι; cf. l. 9. It is remarkable that in the extant fragments similar references are found;—Fr. 580 προστηραι μεσην τραπεζαν ἀμφι σίτα καὶ καρχησία, where the subject (according to Athenaeus) was τοὺς ὅρακοντας, and a dream is apparently meant; cf. Fr. 581 πόλιν ἐν κακοίσι λυθὼς εὐηθέις ὀρῷ, and Fr. 584 τίκτωσι γάρ τοι καὶ νόσους βουθίας. A still stronger argument for the identification proposed is supplied by ll. 52-3 ... ας (?) ἀρωγον πατερα λισσομαι μολέιν? ανακτα ποντον μητρι. This prayer is entirely appropriate in the mouth of one of the sons of Tyro, and, if ανακτα is right, must be addressed to Poseidon. Moreover it is just possible, though very hazardous (see note ad loc.), to read the mutilated word before ἀρωγον as [Πελ]ιας, which would of course be decisive. But even if that supplement be not adopted, the case for the *Tyro* may be considered fairly strong. A consideration of the style and diction does not materially assist in forming a conclusion, but they are at least consistent with a Sophoclean authorship.

The text is written in a small and not very clear hand, the decipherment of which is rendered difficult by a coat of plaster and brown stains. A peculiar
feature is the occasional indentation of the lines, apparently to indicate alternations in the dialogue (cf. l. 23, note). This expedient is sometimes employed in papyri to distinguish quotations (e. g. P. Oxy. 200) or fresh sections (P. Oxy. 665), but we are not aware of another instance of its use for dramatic purposes.

Frs. (a), (b), and (c).

Col. i.

Fr. (a).

\[\sigma\tauο\rhoεις\]
\[\chiρωμ απαν\]
about 4 lines lost.

Fr. (b).

\[\xiωσαν\]
\[δέμα νυκτέρος\]
\[μεν ουδ' αυ εις ελθοι πελας\]
\[υστον δεμας\]
\[ν ποτμος\]

Fr. (c).

\[πων\]
\[παθος\]
\[μενον\]
\[π'δροσυνω\]

Frs. (a) and (c).

Col. ii.

\[14 \text{ letters}\]
\[\tauον \chiαριν \φοβουμε\ ευ\]
\[. . . . . . . . \lambdaλοις ους ει\]
\[\tauεταγμ[\varepsilon]υα\]
\[20 \alphaπων \epsilonαμ \muη \betaρα\]
\[\pi\varepsilon λογοις\]
\[οραις \gamma \alphaρα \omega \deltaεςπο\varepsilonινα\]
\[ματα\]
\[\sigmaτειχε\varepsilonιν \οτρυ\varepsilonι\]
\[15 \text{ letters}\]
\[\dot{\rho}ει \θυρωνος \ει\]
\[17 "\]
\[\alphaμφοιν \ακου\sigmaι\tauα\]
\[25 \tauην \ειντος \οικων \tauι\varepsilon\varepsilonι\]
\[\varepsilon\nu\nuς \de\varepsilon\varepsilonια \tauα\varepsilon\varepsilonια\]
\[\pi\varepsilonιν \θητρι\varepsilonι\]
3. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

ορω τ[.. . . . ]δα . . . μητε πηματι
μητ . . . . . . . . . υσουσαν αλγεινων πα[]
[ 18 letters ]ν αμ μονον λε[

30 [ 17 " ν τε και κακοι[ καιν . . . . . . . ] ωνος τοσον [
eι και θανειν χρη προτων εκτρα[ξ[ [. . . . . . ] αοτ[. . . . ντ αυτων ευ φερο[ [. . . . . . ] μεμ μη κενου χ]

Fr. (d).

Col. i.

35 [. . . ]ρ . νδ[
[ . . . . os χαριζει της π[ . . . . . ] [. .
[φο]ρος τις αυτην δειμα τ εννυχωμ πλαναι [. . . . . . ] υσ εν τωτε κοινωνεi ταδε [. . . . . . . καλ]λιρουν επ Δλφειου πορον

40 [ 24 letters ] . γανος

Col. ii.

λιαγ γαρ ησ [. .
/ αλλ εκ κακων ει[
αλλ ω τεκνον [. . ]μ [. .
kouφως φερειν εγωδο ετ[

45 [. . . . . . . . . η δεσπο[ [. . . . . . . .

Fr. (e).

[ . . . . . . . iκ[ [. .]
] αγαν οδυρμα[ [. .
] θων τρυχει τ[ 50 [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . [ C 2
Fr. (f).

... 

... ωσὼν αἱ μετοίβασιν

... ας αρωγον πατερα λισσαμαι μολειν

... αλικτα παντον μπητρι της τειλιχει

... ντα παιδας εισπερ [.]χει

.

.

.

.

Fr. (g).

53... [....] ανετος ουν ενεστι

τι δεσθενιην ετε ενδει σε κυριοι [.

ελικτοσ [. . . . . . ] τρυχος [.

νεω προσ [.

ετ... [.

.

.

.

.

1 sqq. The position of Frs. (a) and (b), which contain ll. 1-2 and 8-12, is suggested by the appearance of the papyrus, but it is not at all secure. Fr. (a) also contains the first five letters of l. 20, which do not fit the context there particularly well; neither is it certain that l. 1 is the first of the column. In Fr. (b) (ll. 8-12) there is a junction of two sheets of papyrus. Hence, if this fragment is rightly placed here, the first column of Fr. (d) and Frs. (f) and (g), which show no similar junction, cannot be referred to the same column. A junction occurs in the second column of Fr. (d) just before it breaks off, but this comes earlier in the verse than is the case in ll. 8-12.

20. Cf. the previous note.

23. This line will be metrical if it is supposed to have projected slightly to the left, as is the case with ll. 26 and 41. The purpose was probably to indicate a change of speaker; cf. ll. 26-7, which are evidently a question and answer. The syllable ω in l. 26 is indeed written rather below the level of the rest of the line, and may have been added later; but since the hand is identical, and other lengthened lines occur, it is unlikely that this is merely a case of accidental omission.

26. πείρωθη ρασις (cf. Eurip. Hippol. 805) refers to the Chorus; the supplement is a trifle long for the space, but is just possible.

33. There is a gap in the papyrus before this line, which may therefore have had two or three more letters at the beginning than we have supposed; cf. l. 23, note.

44. The i of εγωιδ is very doubtful; there may be nothing between the ω and δ. For κοινων φερειν cf. e.g. Eurip. Med. 1018 κοινων φερειν τω δωτα ομοθομησις.

48. Perhaps των οτι των εγαν απερημα των οτι σιω. This fragment probably gives the latter halves of the lines.

52. Apart from any context the traces on the papyrus before αρωγον would most suitably represent a rather wide ω. But ω is excessively awkward at this point, and we accordingly prefer the possible though not very satisfactory alternative ας, preceded by a letter which conceivably might be an i, though if so the three letters were crowded together in an unusual manner. Blass's ingenious suggestion τιλικτος may, therefore, just be read, and it admirably fits both lacuna and context. The palaeographical difficulty, however, has made us hesitate to introduce it in the text.
54. The first word is probably a participle.
56. The first letter after the lacuna is really more like ω than ν, but if these verses are iambics the second foot of l. 56 must be a tribrach.
57. The ε at the beginning of the verse projects slightly beyond the lines above and below, and a narrow letter might be lost in a hole in the papyrus before ε. So perhaps this line should be classed with l. 23, &c. (cf. note ad loc.). Πελαί ∈ does not seem a possible reading.

4. EURIPIDES, Oeneus (?).

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 6 × 11·11 cm. Circa B.C. 300-280. Plate I (Fr. a and c).

The very archaic and delicate handwriting of these fragments of tragedy is obviously the same as that of the three small pieces previously published by us in P. Grenf. II. 1 (cf. the facsimiles), and there can be no doubt that they are all derived from a single MS.; cf. p. 5. Concerning the identity of the author there was previously no evidence, but a clue is now provided by the occurrence at l. 5 of the words ἀδελφος, Μελεγερ, which suggest that the drama may be the Meleager or the Oeneus of Euripides. The context makes the latter the more probable. The verses in Fr. (a), Col. i. (ll. 1-9; cf. Blass's reconstruction in the note ad loc.) would suitably form part of a speech by Diomedes, who after the successful expedition of the Epigoni against Thebes went to Aetolia to avenge Oeneus, his grandfather. Oeneus was the king of Calydon, and had been dispossessed by his nephews, the sons of Agrius; Diomedes killed the usurpers and restored Oeneus (cf. the ἴπδεθεως in Schol. ad Aristoph. Acharn. 418). Meleager, the uncle of Diomedes, is assumed by the speaker in ll. 5 sqq. to be dead, but his grave is to be honoured by some of the spoils from Thebes. A certain similarity in sense may further be detected, as Blass suggests, between ll. 22 sqq. and Oeneus Fr. 569 (Nauck), quoted in the note ad loc. The suggestion of O. Rossbach (Berl. Phil. Woch. 1899, p. 1630) that the fragments published in 1897 came from the Chryses of Sophocles is not to be reconciled with the new evidence.

This papyrus along with 6 and 9, the Petrie fragment of the Adventures of Heracles (P. Petrie II. 49 (f); cf. I. p. 65), and the Timotheus papyrus are the oldest specimens of Greek literary writing that have been recovered. There seem to be no sufficient grounds for assigning the Timotheus to an appreciably more remote period than the rest. The archaeological evidence is inconclusive, and if the archaic appearance of the letters is more striking than in other cases, that is to no small extent due to their size and comparative coarseness. The argument from single characters is no doubt precarious; but the forms of
in 4 and Ω in 6 and 9 are more distinctly epigraphic than in the Timotheus papyrus. We should therefore include it in the group named, and refer all five papyri approximately to the reign of Soter (B.C. 305-284). The other literary pieces in this volume most probably belong, like the dated documents found with them, to the reign of Philadelphus (B.C. 284-246), or to the earlier years of the reign of Euergetes I (B.C. 246-221), mainly to the former.

For convenience of reference we add a revised text of the fragments published in 1897.

Fr. (a).

σιδηρον μ. [. . . . . . .] τες φονωi
ν ανεξον [. . . .] [. . . .]
ς γαρ των ε[μ]ων λογων εχεις
ει πραξιν [ο]ρμησω ποτε

Col. i.

Col. ii.

τι ποτ αρ ακουσαι προι
ος εκπεπληγυμ
ειεν τινη
οσον ταχος κι

Fr. (b).

αδωνιος ου [. . . . . . .] πι
ον μανθανω σου τον λογον
αλλα ως συνησεις ραδιως εγω φιρασω

Fr. (c).

δυσπραξιας
ν τλημονων βροτων
ν τεθυκε[τα]

Fr. (d).

ο πως γενηται
τυχη δ αγωνη
ωσπερ τυρανη

χορον μια
οσον ταραγμων κι

ψευχαισιν εμι
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μοινης

κακοις

φατοσ βλεπει

vendors

eγω γαρ[:...:] o [

ςτ... γε [

τις εστι θ[

[0]χλει []

[. . .] οσθυ[)

Fr. (c).

α[.] απ [ ]

ες [.

τεται χρονοις

ς γεγως

τυχανει

ταισιμων [.

Fr. (f).

ησση[

βουλομ[]

[.] .[.] [.

Fr. (g) = P. Grenf. II. 1 (α). 1.

αγοντα γαρ [ ]

γι. . μν σε μαντε[ ]

ανδρεω ω φρενοθλαιβεις

φθειρονιν ως κακομ με[γα

] εμπολωσιν ηδονης

ι προς σε δεξιας χερος

[ .[. . . . . .] .[.

Fr. (h) = P. Grenf. II. 1 (α). 2.

μετλημ[ ]

ημελ[ ]

γα[.

Fr. (i) = P. Grenf. II. 1 (β).

Col. i.

σε .

κλων

με[γα σθενει]

λε

Col. ii.

κα[.
1-2. The reference is probably to the capture of Thebes.

3-8. Blass proposes the following restoration of these lines:

δ' οὖν, τέλος γὰρ τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων ἔλεις,
ἐφ' ὑπ' προσήκει πράξεις ὑπημένα ποδί,
ός πατριάδ' Ἀδρωπιον Μελείγρος δ' ὀρήματα
φθινό προθομίω, κασποληρωθ' τάφος
πίντων ἐκεῖνον τῶν κεκαλλυστεμένων
ἄτοισι κλίνοντες ἀνδρίσιν | νείμαι προτετεί.

For δ' ὀρήματα cf. Oret. 123 νετέρον δωρήματα, and for κεκαλλυστεμένων in the middle voice see Med. 947 δόρ' ἄ καλλυστεττα τῶν νῦν ἐν αὐθρόποισιν. άδελφοι Μελείγρον occurs in the same position of the verse in Suppl. 904.

10. Perhaps προὶ ἄδεξωμεθ', with ἑκτελήγμεθ' in the next line.

15. The marks in the margin, two horizontal strokes and a comma-shaped sign below, perhaps indicate the close of a scene; cf. l. 35.

16. This line is on a small detached strip; its position here is only suggested by the appearance of the papyrus and is not at all certain.

21. This line was the last of the column.

22 sqq. The speaker is probably Oeneus and the sense of the passage seems to have been similar to that in Oeneus Fr. 569 (Nauk):

Δι. σῦ δ' ὄμνων ἔρμοσελόδων ἄποδλυσα;
Οἴ. οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἵκετ' εἰσίν, οἱ δ' ἄντε κακοί.

l. 22 is perhaps the first of a column; ll. 1. 19, 32, and 66 certainly are so.

35. The letters of this heading, no doubt a stage-direction, are rather spaced out. If μ α is right the play had a female Chorus.

5. Philemon (?).

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 10.4 x 24.5 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240. Plate III (Fr. a, Cols. ii–iii).

It has been the subject of much speculation upon what Greek original the Aulularia of Plautus was based. Plays of Poseidippus and, of course, Menander have been suggested, but with little plausibility, and the general verdict has been that of not proven. Happily a small portion of the original comedy now appears to have come to light in the fragments below, which belong to the same
5. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

MS. as P. Grenf. II. 8 (b), and the author of which Blass has identified with great probability as Philemon. This identification rests upon the occurrence at l. 28 of the name ἀράυσι in the same position of the verse as in a quotation from Philemon in Eustath. ad Hom. p. 1701. 6 τὰ Ταυτάλων τάλαυτα, ἐπεὶ πλοῦτος πότε ἤν, ὡς δήλοι, φασί. Φιλύμων εἰπὼν 'Κροίσω λαλῶ σοι καὶ Μίδα καὶ Ταυτάλω (Kock, Fr. 189). This argument is really stronger than it may seem at first sight to be: for there is apparently no other reference to Croesus in the extant remains of Attic comedy. Moreover the line fits in well with the supposed situation, the key to which is provided by the name Strobilus in ll. 20-1. In the Aulularia Strobilus is the slave who discovers and carries off the treasure concealed by the old miser Euclio, and so brings about the desired union of his master Lyconides with Euclio’s daughter. We suppose that the discovery has just preceded the scene disclosed in ll. 13 sqq. of the papyrus. The slave Strobilus (l. 21 τα ... Στρήβελε) is almost beside himself with delight (ll. 15-19, 22), and is anxious to get away with the utmost speed (ll. 13-14); while the interlocutor, who arrives on the scene and is presumably his master, is astonished at Strobilus’ behaviour (l. 15), and thinks that he must have gone mad (l. 21 τα ὄφιστοι). This interpretation is strengthened by some other coincidences. An echo of the line ἄραυσι λαλῶ σοι κ.τ.λ. may be recognized, as Blass points out, in Aul. 702-4 ἰστος ρέγες κετερος Μενοράρε νόλο, ἱσομεν μενομενικάθρα. Ego sum ille rex Philippus. L. 58 εφις πατηε (?) suggests Aul. 781 filiam cx te tu habes. Further, the fragments published in our Greek Papyri II. 8 (b), of which we append a revised text, undoubtedly belong to the same MS., and there too, in spite of much obscurity, are phrases which harmonize with the plot of the Aulularia. The anxiety of Lyconides to marry Euclio’s daughter is aptly expressed in l. 77 ει δύνατον εστὶ τῆς κορῆς αὐτῶν τυχεῖν, and τεκεῖν two lines above is quite in keeping with the situation in the Plautine play (cf. Aul. 691 sqq., &c.). Lines 79-80 ευχον οκιαν αδύνατον ην (to enter?) may well refer to the house of the miser Euclio, which he kept carefully shut up; cf. Aul. 98-9 Profecto in aedibus meae absente neminem Volo intrinmiti, and 274 aedisc occludo. The mention of a nomarch (l. 81), who was an Egyptian but not an Athenian official, suggests that the scene was laid at Alexandria, where Philemon is thought to have spent some time on the invitation of Ptolemy Soter; cf. Alciphr. Epist. ii. 3-4. If so, Plautus did not here follow his original, for the scene of the Aulularia is certainly Athens; cf. l. 810.

The text is written in a good-sized cursive hand which is not easy to read where the letters are incomplete; it may date from the reign of either Philadelphus or Euergetes. Alternations of the dialogue are marked by paragraphi, and where a line is divided between two speakers the point of division is marked.
by a short blank space. On the verso of Fr. (a) are three lines in a different
hand giving explanation of words:

αός Αρης [.] . . . . . σ . . . [ 
λαμπρος τα πολεμ'ι]κ]α πε 
ζενει βανει.

At some distance to the right of this are the beginnings of lines of another
column in the same hand, and perhaps of the same character.

Fr. (a). Col. i.

[τεσ] . . . . . eφ .
[δωσο] . . . . .
] . νυν . . . . . eι
] . τι ταχα
5 |γ καλα
|λειαι τινα
]
] την οδον
]μαι χαρειν βοαι
10 ] μοι ποιει
|πυχηματων
]πο[.]v . . .
]
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Fr. (b). Col. i.  
35 εμοι δ[  
...[.μωνο[  
... [.μαχα[  
]... ουν  
...[.ουβεν τοιου'[  
...[.ποεσ δικ...[  
40 ο[.φιλτα'[  
...[.υν δε τις μ[  
[k]αυτος...[.βε[  
45 [.δ ε[σ']τιν...[.ε[  

Fr. (c). Col. i.  
...[.πισα  
55 εγω γαρ[  
...[.απο[  
...[.συν[  
...[.εφυς πα[  
50 [.μην άνθρωπων απα[  
]...[.ε[φΣ][...[.εν[  
].[.τροφιμων[  
].[.αν[...[.ον[  

Fr. (d). Fr. (e). Fr. (f).  
60 [.τω[  
].[.πορ[  
].[.κειστ[  
].[.αςασα[  
].[.σεμ[  
65 γ[.μνον[
Fr. (g) = P. Grenf. II. 8 (b).

Col. i.

75 ὑπαινόντα μετέ...τεκείν
σκόπεσιν προσείναι πασί πε...κη
eι δυνάτων ἑστι τῆς κορῆς αυτῶς τιναίν
οτί τῆς αιρείας μεστός ἂν τῇ...ν

Col. ii.

85 ἀντι...προστ...

80 αἴσην ἀνομαιρόν...

Fr. (h) = P. Grenf. II. 8 (b).

εὐθύς συλλαβής μιας τι πυρ
ἐν ζηλοτυπ[αι]

13-23. 'Strobilus. Imagine that you are running...at Olympia! If you make your escape you are a lucky fellow! Lyconides. O Heracles, what ever can have happened? Strob. Now I know certainly that of all the world this spot alone is clearly sacred, and here all the gods have made their home and still are, and here have they been born. Lyc. Strobilus! Strob. Apollo and the gods, what breath! Lyc. You miserable slave, Strobilus! Strob. Who called me? Lyc. I. Strob. And who are you, most mighty of the Gods? Lyc. How fortunately I have seen you.'

13-4. ἀλ... suggests ἀλ(ε)πτων, which is palaeographically possible, but would occupy all the space before τρέχων and so leave a syllable missing. Perhaps ἀπὸ has dropped out; but with the reading so uncertain this can hardly be considered a satisfactory hypothesis. Strobilus is apostrophizing himself.

18. κατοκήσατι without τοῦς is unsatisfactory. 1. κατοικήσατι.

20. πνευμάτος may refer either to the loudness of Lyconides' shout, or, as Dr. Mahaffy suggests, to the supposed effluence of an approaching god; cf. e.g. Eur. Hippol. 1392 ὁ θεῖος ὄμης πνείμα.

21. 1. Στροβίλα.

22. τῶν θεῶν: Strobilus keeps up the idea of ll. 16 sqq., and affects to think that his master is a divine apparition.
6. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

23. The restoration is due to Prof. Leo,—who does not accept the attribution of these fragments to Philemon or their supposed connexion with the *Aulularia*.

50. The second α of στοι is below the ε of ἑφος in l. 58, and it is doubtful to which column the letter belongs. There would be room for a very small o between the π and α, so that the line might be made to end with στοί. But since the π is of the usual size, it is more probable that the α belongs to ασ (e.g. ασαώ or ασάξ), and that the corresponding line in the next column was begun further to the right.

59. The doubtful α at the end of l. 55 may belong to this line; cf. the previous note.

65. This was the last line of a column.

68-9. There are about 1½ cm. of papyrus to the left of ό τις and ὅν, but the surface, though stained, appears to have been never written upon. Probably, therefore, it was covered by another sheet which was joined on at this point.

75 sqq. The identity of the speakers here is not very clear. Strobius is probably one of them, and προστατευεν in l. 79 indicates that the speaker there at least is a slave; but ll. 75-8 would also be appropriate to Strobius. With σχοταν cf. *Aul.* 605 ἰς το πεπεθεμένo διήκειται. The first two letters of l. 75 are very doubtful; ἐκ ἀκ or τας or τῃς is not impossible. In l. 76 the word after πασί (?) may perhaps be πεπεθεμένοι.

78. The t appears to be the end of the line, but this is hardly certain.

79. α of μοι has been rewritten.

88-9. There are short spaces between μας, τι, and πυρ in l. 88 and ὄντω, τοῦτο, πυρ, and ἄρκου in l. 89, like those which in ll. 20-3 indicate a change of speaker.

90. There is a hole in the papyrus as well as a space between ει and την, so εις may well be read; but cf. the previous note.

93. The first α has been corrected from ει or vice versa. The reading ἐλλαβότοι is given in P. Grenf-s, is unsatisfactory, the letter before δ being more like ε than α.

---

6. **Comedy.**

Mummy Λ. 10. Height 12.7 cm. Circa B.C. 300-280. Plate IV (Fr. a, Cols. i-iii).

The style of these mutilated remains of a comedy suggests Menander or some contemporary dramatist, but in spite of their considerable extent both author and play remain unidentified. Apparently no coincidence with extant fragments occurs, and other clues are not forthcoming. The proper names Νομιμός (l. 7) and Σώστρατος (? l. 122) give no assistance; Δημέας (l. 40) was one of the characters of Menander’s Δημιούργος (Kock, Fr. 123), but that play is supposed to have been the original of Plautus’ *Bacchides* (Ritschl, *Parerg.* 405), with which, so far as can be seen, these fragments have nothing in common. A more positive idea of the plot is however difficult to obtain. Apart from the characters mentioned above there are a master and a slave (ll. 5-8), the former of whom seems to take part in the dialogue throughout Fr. (a), Cols. ii-iii; he had a wife (l. 32), and was about to dispatch some friends on a journey, for
which preparations were to be made (ll. 33 sqq.). A child and an old woman, perhaps a nurse, figure rather prominently (ll. 20, 43, 46, 52, 59).

The principal fragment, (a), contains parts of four consecutive columns, but the first of these contains mere vestiges and of the last only the beginnings of the lines are preserved. There is no indication of the relation of this piece to Fr. (b), comprising two very imperfect columns; and a large number of smaller pieces have resisted repeated attempts at combination. The text is written in short columns in a medium-sized, rather heavy uncial hand of a most archaic type. The regular capital shape of Ω and the square E are especially noticeable; and though these forms are here accompanied by a round sigma this papyrus must claim to be ranked among the earliest specimens of the Greek literary script; cf. introd. to 4. Alternations of the dialogue are marked by paragraphi, and double dots are also inserted when a line is divided between two speakers. One or two corrections have been made by the original scribe.

Fr. (a).

Col. i. 

Col. ii.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{τί γαρ πλεον τῷ δ ἔγραφηκεν ἡ θυρα} \\
\text{ἐξερχομαι της την [σ]πυρίδα ταυτην εν [η]} \\
\text{ενταυθα των αρτους εκομισας αποφέρε} \\
\text{[αποδύσ τε τωι χρησαντι τωι Νουμηνω]} \\
\text{[...]} \text{δε τα ... οι δευρ αναστρεψας παλιν} \\
\text{[...]} \text{τι λεγετε : τι δ αν εχουμεν αλλο πλην} \\
\text{[...]} \text{πος [..] α[π]ηλθεν : η[...]' επισχετε} \\
\text{ω ταυ [..] [..] [..] νοι λα . ειν [τα]υτην εγω} \\
\text{[...]} \text{πρω[αν ... ... ...]} \text{εκ πολεμιωι φευγετε} \\
\text{[ρ]} \text{το δη[... [..]α : ταυτα πρατθ ατ . δε[.]} \\
\text{[]} \text{ουκ εστι [..] λωσ : ειτα πως αυ[.] ... [αι} \\
\text{[3]} \text{αι} \text{πυχον ... ... ...} \text{δ όσι ουν ληψομ αν [..]} \\
\text{[15 letters]} \text{ρ δ[ειρ αυτην α[...]} \\
\text{[20]} \text{14} \text{,} \text{[..] γραν : την τημερον} 
\end{align*} \]
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[Col. iii.]

εἰς αὐριον δ ἡδη πολεμιος γινομαι νη

25 [γ]ενίτο δ εἰρη ποτ ω Ζευ δεσποτα

[δι]ατους [. . . . . .] η τιμα . . . επο′[ο]μεν αυ

30 το χρυσιον δε [λ]αμβανε ; ου τ . [ . . . . . . .]

35 ευομεν απαιτα∶ Απολλον ως αγροικος ει

νη την Ἀθηνηνγ και θεους αγωνιο

ουκ ο[δ ο]πως [νυ]ν αυτος επι τω πραγματι

ξελλν . . . δε . [. . .] φαινεται τις τους τροπους

40 ο Δημεας αυ[θρο]πος αλλα τη τυχη

ουθεν δις[φερειν] φαινε[θ] ομ π[ο]ει κακως

gυναι τι βουλ[ει . . . ]εμβ[. . . .]ητα γε

γυμ πρωτο[ν . . . ]ρικ[. . . .] παιδιον

κλαεις περ[. . . ]κε[. . . .]τ[. . . .] προεσαι

15 εξω φερετ[ε] αυτο δευ[ρο μοι πι] τας θυρας

tον ημετε[ρομ] μεμ πα . [. . . . .]ων γραυς εχει

Col. iv.

κακ]

μη τα . [ ]

ιδου σκο[. . . . .]

χριστων νι[ ]

επειτα τημ μεν [ ]

η γραυς δ εκομι[ε]

60 και προς σεαντ[ ]

εγω φρασω σοι . [ ]
32
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τις ληψεθ [. . .]ο[]
to παϊδίουν δʹ η : [
εμομ [ . [ oblivious
οὐκ οἶδ [ . . .]ρ[]
53 τι χρη ποιεῖ α [ autos δ μη ουθένους
λαβησ προελθω[ν]

σ[ωτηριαν [ . . .]
. [. . . .] μη τι [. . .]
ομοι σ[. .]

05 η [ . . .]
η [ . . .]
η [ . . .]

Col. ii.

ημω[ν . . .]δ[ . . .]
ω Ἡρ οκλε[ις ω Ζεν]
o τοτ[ε α]|μ[βιμ[ . . .]
85 ελεο[μ] παλαι[]
και της [δΥ]κης τ [ .
αυτος γαρ ημιν . εν [ .
εδικας e ] τ ου με σφητι[ .
tουτ εφτι . . . ]ωι παλ[ .
90 . . . εσμι . . . ]λωντα[ i
πουτ εφτι . . . ]β ηττν [ .
δακνοντ[ . . . . . ]] κα [ .
και τα [. . . . . . ]λε[ντα[ .
ουτος σα . φσε [. . . .]
95 επι στρατοπεδ [. . . ]π[ .
συναρπ[ η]σου[ . . . . ]] τ [ .
ti λεγ[οντες ου . . . ]]π[ .
ουχ ωμ[ολ]ογη[σ]
to π[αγ]μα τ[ .
100 ουκ[ . . . . . ]] τ [ .
ω Ἡρ[πα]κ[ε]ς [. . .]
. . . . ατα[ . . . .]

Fr. (c).
.
. .
[ ]
. .
μη

Fr. (d).
.
. .
[ ]
. .
φ [ . . .]
ποτελ[ ]
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Fr. (e). 110 ε]πειδή δι[
]τεσκρι[
]οισ[ [ ]] [ ] 120 ]ς ηξει τ[ ]ις φιλοις [ ]Σιωστρατω[ι] ]δ η γνω[η] [ ] οικιας [ ]
115 ]...[ ] ]ΛΧ[ ]ο[.] [ ] ]π[...]. ε[ [ ] ]με . φ . [ ]
125 ]το γε π[ ]της λ[ ]τησι[δε] [ ] [ ]
130 ]...ν[ ] [ ]

Fr. (f).

Fr. (g).

Fr. (h).

Fr. (i).

Fr. (k).

150 ] εσ . πραγμα ποιησ[ ] ] ριψον αυταις [ ]μη ταραξης οικιαν
160 ]ον . . . . . . ] α[ ]
Fr. (l). τὸς παροδίς

| ηκο| | εγὼ |
| dη  | ημφα| τολλοι|

155 γνφ

Fr. (m). ε

| ησυ  | σομπ| η[ ] [|
| ασνυ| 170 κυσο |

Fr. (n). τη

165 [ε | η | ησυ | σομπ | ασνυ | 170 κυσο |

Fr. (p). αλε[ ουμ | ιας θ | . ο | τεμο |

175 [αινονν | κτιστ |

180 τ ονρ

Fr. (r). ροθ | πο | η |

186 [η | η | η |

1-3. The ends of these lines and the beginnings of ll. 12-23 are contained on a separate fragment, which is only conjecturally placed in this position.

4. Cf. the line quoted by Suidas and Schol. ad Aristoph. Nub. 132 to illustrate the distinction between κόπτειν, applied to a person entering a house, and ψορθεῖν to a person coming out (Menander, Fr. 861, Kock) ἀλλ' ἐφάφηκεν ἡ δύσα τις οὐκίων (so Cobet: ἐφάφηκε καὶ τις τὴν δύσα κτιστ, Suid.; ἐφάφηκε τὴν δύσα εἰσίων, Schol.). The papyrus supports Cobet's emendation of the verse as against Kuster's ἐφάφηκε τὴν δύσα τις εἰσίων. Cf. also Plautus, Bacch. 234 Sol foris concrepit nostra: quinam exit foras, which exactly corresponds to Cobet's version and would almost justify its attribution to the Διὸς εὐπαρτῶν, the supposed original of the Bacchides.
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The o which is written rather large and some little way above this line is possibly a numeral referring to the number of the column. The margin above the other columns is imperfectly preserved.

8. τα...ων: perhaps another proper name, e.g. Ταυρω; but the letters between α and ω are so blurred and rubbed that they can no longer be identified.

9. [......] τι λέγετε is apparently addressed to the new arrivals referred to in ll. 4-5; ἡμιος. τι.

12. ο[...]ται: the supposed π may be μ, but there is not room for ὡδεμως.
14. Either λαθετω or λαβετω might be read.
15. Blass suggests μεν οππερ for the lacuna.
16. If πορθ is right α is very likely the relative δ. γ might be read in place of τ, but the θ seems certain. The letter following α must apparently be τ, κ, or χ, and the doubtful δ is possibly λ.
17. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish α from δ in this MS., but even if δυ were read after πωσ the other vestiges do not suit δυπερμα.
18. The lower of the two dots after γαρ though very indistinct is fairly secure. There is no example in the papyrus of the use of a single point.
19. l. αρχεμου. Possibly the missing μ was inserted above the line (cf. l. 25); the papyrus is much rubbed at this point, and if a correction had been made it would hardly be visible.
33. γ(ε): or perhaps τ(ε), the sentence being interrupted by l. 35.
34. παριατ]ων, 'from her stores'; cf. the Homeric phrase χαριζομενα παρειονων.
39. μα might be read in place of μ, but μα seems impossible, otherwise μεμαως, as Blass suggests, would be attractive. For Ἐλληνς cf. P. Oxy. 211. 33 (Menander, Περικαιρομενη) τεκμηριων τουτω εστιν Ἑλληνος τρόπων.
44-6. A small fragment, which we have after some hesitation assigned to the bottom of this column, is not shown in the facsimile. Both the contents of the fragment and the appearance of the papyrus suit this position, though the broken edges do not join particularly well.
51. There may be nothing between τι and λ, but there is a space sufficient for a narrow letter, and also a faint trace of ink which is consistent with ε.
89-90. A paragraphus may be lost between these two lines.

7. ANTHOLOGY.

Mummy A. Fr. (β) 15.6 x 19.2 cm. Circa B.C. 250-210. Plate VII (Fr. β and ι).

The verso of the papyrus containing the speech of Lysias against Theozotides (14) was used for writing a series of extracts from different authors, such as are not uncommonly found in papyri of the Ptolemaic period, e.g. P. Petrie I. 3 (1), P. Tebt. 1 and 2. Among them are (ll. 10-22) a passage of thirteen iambic lines from the Electra of Euripides, and (ll. 91-4) an extract of four iambic lines, including the well-known verse, 'Evil communications corrupt good manners,' quoted by St. Paul. These are also probably Euripidean; but the other pieces cited are...
not iambics, and seem to be chiefly of a lyrical character, if we may judge by the occurrence of such collocations as βρομοι κομποί (l. 8), υχετον ουτατεί (l. 47). They are however very badly preserved and in places seem to be corrupt, so that they remain quite unintelligible.

Two hands are found, the first being more cursive than the second, and approximating more towards the late third and early second century B.C. scripts than is the case with any of the other literary fragments in this volume. The anthology is therefore not likely to have been written as early as the reign of Philadelphus; but, especially since the Lysias text has no appearance of being later than the other classical fragments from Mummy A (cf. p. 22), which belong to the middle or early part of the third century B.C., there is no reason for assigning 7 to a later date than Philopator’s reign; and in view of the fact that the 25th year of Euergetes (90) is the latest certain date in the Hibeh papyri, it is more probable that these extracts were written before that year than after it.

The text of the Electra passage presents some variations from the later MSS., of which there are but two for this play. In the most important place (l. 14 = El. 371), where the MSS. are probably corrupt, the surface of the papyrus is unfortunately much damaged and the reading uncertain.

Fr. (b).
Col. i.
Col. ii. Plate VII.

36  

HIBEI PAPYRI  

10 [ουκ εστιν ακριβες ουθεν εις ευανδριαν]

El. 367  

[εχουσι γαρ ταργιγμον αι φυσεις βροτων]

ηδη γαρ ειδον ανδρα γειναιον πατρος  

[το] [μηδεν ουν] αρχιτατα τε κακων τεκνα  

370  

χρηστα φυριον ην τε [ν α]νδρος πλονιου πνηματι
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15 γνωμην Π[ε μ]γαλη[ν] ε[ν] πενητι σωματι
πως [ου] τις αυτα διορισας ορθως κρινει
πλουτω π[ο]γηρω ταρα χρησεται κριτη
η τοις εχουσι[ι] μηδεν αλλ εχει νοσον
πενια διδασκαι δ [α]ναρα τη χρεια κακοιν
20 αλλ [εις οπ]λα ελθω [τις] δε προς λογχην [βλεπων]
μαρτυρι[α] [γενο]τι αν [οστις εστιν αγαθος]
] .. a

8. i of δεi corr.

14. ν of ηματι corr. from o

18. First ε of εχου corr. from a.

Fr. (c).

Col. i.

Col. ii.

37 . [ ]

[ ]

...[ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ]

]αις
]

40 φ . . . . [ ] . [γ] . ] . ε[ ]

] . [ ] . εμ

δαν . . [ ] . μη[ ] . [ ]

25 ] . λειψω

[πτων

] . [.μ]σομαι

καιρω μουμοματα . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ]

] δε συμμειξω

γλωσσα αρ . α ανθρωπων [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ]

] . άσα μορφαις

ουκ επανειμι πυθοςθαι [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ]

30 δαν ουδ εσει

οχετων ουταξει σ . . ν . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ]

] ν φυσιν ζη

λογοις ινα η . . νε . . α[ . . . ] επι τοις ετυ[μο]γς . [μ η]

] μωι ποτερον :

σαι με . μας κα . [. ] . [. ] . [. ] . υψηλου δομοι πον . [ ]

] . ε . [.α . οι : 50 παρα [. . . ] [. . . ] . . [. . . ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ]

3 lines lost.

[ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ]

[18 letters α]κοιτις θαυματι . νοια[ ]

Fr. (c).

Fr. (h).

]ισοπτ[ . . . . .

55 ]σευαυ[ . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ] . [ ]
Fr. (m).

67 ἰς ρῶ...[...
] α...[...
] δὲ γαρ ἀπὸ[...
70] ποίς τοῖ...[...

(2nd hand)
Fr. (f).

75] ὠν
] αἰ λεγὼ πλ[...
] εβαν...[...εἰσ[...
] προι...[...π...[...
] ἓν...[...εἰ[...
80]...
] ν...[...δ[...
] ευ...[...ε...[...
]...π[...
]...[...
85] πν...[...

Fr. (g).

97] σφ...[...
98]...[...

Fr. (a).

Fr. (i). PLATE VII.

86]...[...]
90 χρη]
91 επείτα χρησθαί[
92 αὐτοὶ δοκοῦσιν ο[...
93 εἰδὼς οὗτος ἡμε[...
94 φθειροῦσιν ἡθ[...
95 ὡστ ἐμῖν δοκ[...

12 = EL. 369. ἀνὴρ: so both MSS., Murray. παίδα W(cklein) following Herwerden.
8–12. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

13 = 370. τ: so MSS. 8' Stob. Flor. 87. 10 and Orion, Anth. 8. 7, M., W.

14 = 371. The MSS. have λμων τ' εν ἀνδρός πλουσίου φρονήματι. For λμων, λοιμων (Scaliger), ρφνων (Nauck), λιρον (Rauchenstein), δεμων (Keene), and πινων (W.) have been suggested. The papyrus certainly did not have λμων, for the first letter must be δ or ζ, and the second, if not η, must be read σ or νη, while the third is certainly μ or ν, and the vestiges of the last two letters suit νω, δεμων, if really the reading, must be wrong, and is much nearer to Keene's δεμων than to any other of the conjectures. δεμων, however, is not at all satisfactory. The last word of the line seems to have been originally ποιματι (possibly ποιματι), which has been altered to φρονηματι by inserting φρο over the line and apparently correcting o to ν, but whether the π was erased is uncertain.

16–22 = 373–9. These lines are bracketed by W. following Wilamowitz, who considers that they were introduced from another play.

16 = 373. δορίσας: διαλαβών MSS. δορίςας, being the commoner word in this sense, is more likely to be a gloss on διαλαβών than vice versa.

17 = 374. τοπα: γ' ἄρα MSS., γ' ἄρα W.

19. δ': so L (W., M.), γ' P.

20 = 377. ελθω τις: so MSS., M.: ελθων τις W. following Heath. There is just room for ν in the lacuna, but it is more likely that the papyrus read ελθω.

22 = 379. This line is quoted as from the Auge by Diog. Laert. ii. 33.

32–3. For the two dots placed at the ends of these lines in order to divide them from the writing of the next column cf. 9. 1 and 27. 34.

65. ε is very likely the beginning of the name of the author of the following extract; cf. 1. 9. Similar headings probably occurred in ll. 75 and 80.

91–4. The well-known line which apparently occurred in l. 94 is quoted by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 33) and many other Christian writers. Socrates (Hist. Eccl. 3. 16) assigns the authorship to Euripides, Photius (Quaest. Amphil. 151) and Jerome (vol. iii. p. 148, ed. Basil.) to Menander; cf. Nauck's Eurip. Fr. 1013. The remains of ll. 91–3 certainly suggest tragedy rather than comedy, and since another extract from Euripides occurs in this anthology, it is probable that he was the author of ll. 91–4. But φθείρουσιν ἢθη κ.τ.λ. may, of course, have been found in Menander as well.

95. οὔτι: as γ cannot be read. The Doric form ἵμων and the apparent character of the metre suggest that this may be an extract from Epicharmus.

8–12. **POETICAL FRAGMENTS.**

Some small unidentified fragments of poetry may here be conveniently grouped together; two are Epic, two Tragic, and the last is from a comedy.

8 (Mummy A) contains the beginnings and ends of lines from the upper parts of two columns of hexameters, written in a sloping cursive hand having a general similarity to that of the epic fragment P. Grenf. II. 5, especially in Col. ii, where the lines are much closer together than in Col. i. But there are some points of contrast: the letters in P. Grenf. II. 5 are less sloping, and some of them are rather differently formed; the papyrus is also of a lighter colour than 8. We therefore hesitate to assign them to a single MS.; if they belong to the same work they must at any rate come from different parts of it.
HIBEH PAPYRI

On the verso of 8 is some much effaced small cursive writing; the verso of P. Grenf. II. 5 as now mounted is invisible. In Col. i a combat is described, while Col. ii contains a dialogue; 'Ἀχαῖοι and 'Αργείοι are mentioned (ll. 9 and 24). The occurrence of the new compound ὀμφοτερήκης (= ὀμφήκης) may be noted in l. 8.

9 (Mummy 18) consists of seven small fragments, also in the Epic style. Phegeus, whose death at the hands of Diomedes is described in Iliad E 11 sqq., occurs here in connexion with Ajax in l. 2. Phegeus was one of the sons of Dares, the priest of Hephaestus (E 9-10), and the mention of this name suggests the possibility of a relation between these fragments and the Iliad attributed in antiquity to Dares, which according to Aelian was extant in his day (Var. Hist. xi. 2 οὗ Φηγεύαν Ἰλίαδα ἤτι καὶ τὸν σωζομένην οὖδα), and upon which the Latin prose work bearing the name of Dares professes to be based. The careful rather small hand is of an extremely archaic character; E and Σ are square, and Ω has the capital shape as in 6. The only example of Ξ (l. 3) is imperfectly preserved, but probably had only a dot between the two horizontal strokes, not a vertical connecting line as in 4. We should assign the fragments to the reign of Soter; cf. 4, introd. The dated documents found with 9 in Mummy 18 range from about the 14th year of Philadelphus (110 recto) to the 28th (94). Two corrections occur, one of which at least (l. 14) is due to a different scribe.

10 (Mummy Λ). Four fragments of Tragic iambics, apparently all from the same text; there is little doubt of this except in the case of Fr. (a), which though very similar (cf. Plate V) is so small that it affords but slight material for comparison. The hand, which is of a somewhat common early third century B.C. type (cf. e.g. 12), is much like that of the longer pieces published in P. Grenf. II. 6 a (cf. the frontispiece of that volume; Fr. c. 2 may belong to a). But the evident resemblance is hardly strong enough to justify us in referring those fragments to the same MS. as 10. Moreover, as Blass has shown (Rhein. Museum, lv. pp. 96 sqq.), they are probably to be referred to the Niobe of Sophocles, whereas the subject of 10 is apparently different; there is a mention of Achilles in l. 5. The metre indicates that Fr. (a) comes from the right side of a column while Fr. (b) occupied a more central position.

11 (Mummy Λ). The script of this fragment is on the other hand closer to that of P. Grenf. II. 6 c than to that of 10. The Μ and Υ have the deep depression which is absent in 10, and the head of the Κ is bent over towards the cross stroke in the same way as in P. Grenf. II. 6 c. 11 is therefore, we think, to be connected with that group of fragments, which, if Blass is right (cf. introd. to 10), belong to Sophocles' Niobe; J. Sitzler (Neue Phil. Rundsch. 1897, p. 386) would refer them to some play of Euripides. The contents of the fragment, so far as
8–12. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

they go, suit the attribution to the Νιόβη (l. 4 τὲπεισα, l. 7 ομαί, l. 9 ἰδος παρθεν). The metre is perhaps partly or entirely lyrical; and the fragment is from the bottom of a column.

12 (Mummy A) consists of four small pieces of a comedy, written in medium-sized upright uncialis similar in type to those of 10 and 11. The character of the fragments is quite doubtful; a slave is addressing his master at l. 5, and Antiphon is mentioned in l. 6; but that is too common a name to be of much assistance towards identification. A point in the middle position is used, but whether for purposes of punctuation or to mark a change of speaker is not clear.

8. 13.7 x 6.7 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240.

Col. i.  
] . iοα  
]εσσον  
].  
]οτες  
]. . . . κεςσιν  
]ν αμφι δε πηλης  
] εμπεδος αει  
αμφοτερηκες  
]α δ Αχαιοι

Col. ii.  
χωρι[  
αυτο[  
εσκε δι[  
20 ευθη[  
διος εν[  
εντε[  
ιει πε[  
Αργειοδι[  
25 ταυτα πτα . [  
τα προσθ[  
ετλημε[  
ως φατο . [  
πευσομαι . [  
30 ειροντο αμ[  
και θειοι[  
ηδη Ζει[  
[ε]κποθεν ε[ . [  
ποι τ[  
. . . . .
### 9. Fr. (a) 4.8 x 8.6 cm. Circa B.C. 300-280. Plate V (Fr. b).

Fr. (a). Col. i. Col. ii.

| μανων : | 2 Φηγευς Αιαντος [α. .]πα[ |
|  | δεε[ι.τ][α.]ρην [ |
|  | ν[υ]ν δ[η] του φιλο' |

5 α. [. . .]ιτοι |

Fr. (b). Fr. (c). Fr. (d).

| . α | 12 | ν | 15 | ἵστρι |
| . σατ ερυνυς | ἤ τυ φιλα[ | μα[ |
| . ασκε | δεκο[ |
| 10 | [. . .] |

Fr. (e). Fr. (f). Fr. (g).

| ονσι | 22 | ἡμτο | ωμα |
| . μ | κιοωσι' | 25 | νοι |

20 | . ητα |
| . μ . α β |

1. The two dots at the end of the line are to separate it from the first verse of the next column (l. 2), to which it nearly reaches; cf. 7. 32 and 27. 34.

7. Perhaps αρρηστρι; cf. Homer, Od. 8. 135 μή την στυγεράς ἄρρηστι ερυνες.

Frs. (e)-(g). These three fragments may succeed each other immediately. ἡμτο in l. 22 seems to be the end of the verse. In l. 23 the reading is apparently not σκιοωστο.

### 10. Fr. (a) 1.5 x 4.2 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240. Plate V (Fr. a and d).

Fr. (a).

| μον ωρισα[ς] πον[ |
| . [. .]δε τους ανθαιπερ[ους |

30 | οτι' |

Fr. (b).
8-12. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

νομίζειν ἵσα. [ 
ομοιώς ὡς ἐμ.

35 ] τοῖς απώθεν αντειπ[ 
εγγον[ 

] τῆς [[ἐναμι]]οίς ἐφει[σ . . ] [ 
]

] αντα τας δε δαιμονω[ν 
] μπεις συμφοραις δ[ 
]. χων εστιν οι πεπρ[ 
]

] .. χει περγαμων κατ[ 
] ν κρυπτος α . . . θ . [ 
] νεβλαστεν [ 
]

] . . . . . .

Fr. (c).

] . [ 
45 ] περμ[ 
] ν' χρη[ 
] μεμη[ 
]

] τε ὦτ[ 
] ἰδε θυμ[ 
]

50 ] ἱστινα[ 

Fr. (d).

. . . . .
34. The letter below the superscribed ο was perhaps deleted; cf. l. 36.
36. ἐναίμως, which is unmetrical, seems to have been the original reading, though the second ι is further away from the μ than would be expected. ἕμαίμως is found in Pindar, Νεμ. 6. 29, but ἐναίμως is apparently new.

11. 6·2 x 2·8 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240.

2. If the lines are lyrical, ἀδε may be ἀ δέ or ἀδε.
5. The letter apparently deleted between ι and π may be ν or μ.
8. The first letter is possibly Ρ, but θ is more probable.

12. Fr. (a) 4·1 x 5·9 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240.
13. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

[epemfve] Αὐτίφωμ με επτεωτησοντα σε
[. . . . . . .]κει της κορης κατηκοα
[. . . . . ο'φειλομ μοι δοκει καμ]

Fr. (b). . . . . Fr. (c). . . . . Fr. (d). . . . .
|συμ|] |μο|[ |ον |
|οταπ|] |οι |
|μοον οτα[ |ψετα |
|αυτον ηδ[ |σομα[i |
|μο φυσει γ[ | |
|δε α δρασ[ |τ[ |
|ος |
|κατηκο|[ |δε |
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
of comparison is therefore available; but the contents of this papyrus, if they be not by Hippias, represent what he might well have written.

The substance of the two columns is an attack upon certain musical theorists, who attributed to different harmonies and rhythms different moral effects. This is the view maintained by Plato in the well-known passage of the Republic 398–400, where some kinds of music are characterized as having a voluptuous or depressing tendency, and are therefore to be excluded from the ideal state. Hippias will have none of this theory, though it cannot be said that the arguments with which he opposes it are very convincing. He also ridicules the more extreme lengths to which it was carried by partisans who professed to express in music the attributes of natural objects, and whose perceptions would seem to have been even finer than any possessed by the writers of some of our modern programmes. Perhaps the person principally aimed at in this diatribe was Damon, the famous Athenian musician and contemporary of Hippias. Damon seems to have given more attention to the theory than to the practice of music (cf. ll. 7 sqq. below); and he was a believer in the effects of music upon character (Athen. xiv. 628 C., Aristid. Quint. ii. 14), and probably the views of Plato on this subject were to a large extent influenced by his teaching; cf. Rep. 400 B. and especially 424 C. ὧδαμον γὰρ κὺνήται μονοικής τρόποι ἄνευ πολιτικῶν ρώμων τῶν μεγίστων, ὃς φησὶ τε Δάμων καὶ ἐγὼ πείδομαι. There is indeed some evidence for the existence of a work on music by Damon in the form of a speech to the Areopagus (Rhein. Mus. xl. pp. 309 sqq.). The Herculaneum fragments of the treatise of Philodemus De Musica, as Dr. Mahaffy reminds us, take the same side in the controversy as Hippias.

The short, broad columns of the text are carefully written in good-sized uncials of an ordinary type; the lines show a noticeable irregularity of length. Punctuation is effected by means of two (in l. 9 three) dots, which are sometimes combined with marks resembling a small coronis, e.g. in l. 13. On the verso is a good deal of badly damaged cursive writing, probably by more than one hand and running in contrary directions.

Col. i.

[πολλάκις επηλθέ μοι ὑμμασαι οἱ ἀνδρεὶς Ἑλληνες
[εἰς άλοτριας τινὲς] τας ἐπιδείξεις των ὁμοιων τε
[Χρ]ονοὶ ποιομεν[οί] λανθανουσιν υμις Λεγοντες γαρ
[ο]ῖ τι αρμονικοί εἰς καὶ προχειρισμενοι ο[ίδας] τινας
5 ταυτας συγκρινουσιν τω μεν ως ετυχεν
κατηγοροντες τας δὲ εἰκης εγκομιαζοντες]
13. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

καὶ λεγοῦσι μεν ὡς οὐ δει αὐτοὺς οὐ[τε ψ]αλτας
οὔτε ὁδοὺς θεωρεῖν περὶ μὲν γαρ τ[αντ]α ἑτεροῖς
φασιν παραχωρ[ε]ῖν : αὐτῶν δὲ ἱδιον [εἰ]ναι το θε

10 ὥρητικον μέρος φαίνονται δὲ περὶ μὲν ταύτα
ων ἑτεροῖς παραχωροῦσιν οὐ μετριως εσπονδάκο
τες εν οἰς δὲ φασιν ισχυειν εν τούτοις σχ[ε]ιδα
(φοντες )—: λεγοῦσι δὲ οὐ τοιοι μελων τ[α] μεν
ἐγκρατεις τις δὲ φρονίμους τα δὲ δικαιούς

15 τα δὲ ανδρείους τα δὲ δειλοὺς ποιει )— κακοὶ εἰδοτες οτι
οὔτε χρωμα δείλους : οὔτε αρμονια αν ανδρείους
ποιησειεν τοὺς αὐτης χρωμενοὺς )—: τις γαρ οὐκ οἰδεν

Col. ii.

[Αντ]ωλοὺς καὶ Δολοπας : και παντας τους Θε[ρ]
[μοπυλ]ησι διατονω μεν τη μουσικη χρωμενος μα

20 [αλον] δε των τρειοδους οντας ανδρεο[υς των δι]
[α παρος ειθωτων εφ αρμονιας αιδειν )—: [ὡστε]
[ουτε] χρωμα δείλους ουτε αρμονια ανδρειους ποι
[ει εις τουτο δε ερχονται τολμης ωστε [ολον τον βιον κα[tα]
[τριβ]ειν εν ταις χορδαις : ψαλλοντες μει [πολυ χ][ερον των]

25 [ψαλ]των : αιδοντες δε των ωδων : συνκρινοντες δε
[του τυχοντος ρητορος παντα παντων χει]ρον ποιοντες
[και περι μεν των αρμηνικων καλουμ[ενων] εν οις δη
φ[ασιν] διακεισθαι πως : ουθ ηντινα φων[ην] εχοντες λεγειν :
ενθουσιωντες δε : και παρα τον νυθ[ον δε] παιοντες

30 το υποκειμενον σανιδιον αυτοις [αμα τοις] άπο ου τον
ψ[αλ]τηριου ψυφοις : και ου[θε αισχυνομενοι] εξειπ[ειν]
τοι[ν] μελου τα μεν δαφνης εξειν [ιδιον] τι τα δε κιτ[το]
ε[. . . ]ρεισθαι : και οι σατυροι προς [αυλον] χορενοντες

A fragment, possibly belonging to this papyrus:

35 ] . [ ]
' It has often been an occasion of surprise to me, men of Hellas, that certain persons, who make displays foreign to their own arts, should pass unobserved. They claim to be musical, and select and compare different tunes, bestowing indiscriminate blame upon some and praise upon others. They assert that they ought not to be regarded as harpers and singers, for these subjects, they say, they concede to others; while their own special province is the theoretical part. They appear, however, to take no small interest in what they concede to others, and to speak at random in what they say are their own strong subjects. They assert that some tunes make us temperate, others wise, others just, others brave, others cowardly, being unaware that enharmonic melody would no more make its votaries brave than chromatic will make them cowards. Who is there who does not know that the Aetolians and Dolopes, and all the folk round Thermopylae use a diatonic system of music, and yet are braver than the tragedians who are regularly accustomed to use the enharmonic scale? Therefore enharmonic melody makes men brave no more than chromatic makes them cowardly. To such lengths of confidence do they go that they waste all their life over strings, harping far worse than the harpers, singing worse than the singers, making comparisons worse than the common rhetorician,—doing everything worse than any one else. With regard to the so-called harmonics, in which, so they say, they have a certain state of mind, they can give this no articulate expression; but go into ecstasies, and keeping time to the rhythm strike the board beneath them in accompaniment to the sounds of the harp. They are not even ashamed to declare that some tunes will have properties of laurel, and others of ivy, and also to ask whether . . . '

2. οἱ ἠτολοὶ is very doubtful; the first letter may be ε or σ or possibly τ or ν.
18. If ὀερμοπελλάς is right, l. 18 was remarkably short; but the letter before τ in l. 19 is almost certainly σ, and the preceding vestiges suit η. ὄερμοπελλάς would include e.g. the Aenianes and Oeotaeans, the eastern neighbours of the Dolopes and Aetolians.

The mention of the Aetolians here, as Blass remarks, is appropriate in the mouth of Hippias of Elis, the Eleans and Aetolians being closely related.

19–20. The division μὰ άλων is not usual, but άλων seems insufficient for the lacuna at the beginning of l. 20, while μαλλων is too long.

28. Of the supposed dots after ἀκριῶν only the upper one is preserved, and that not very clearly.

29. παρὰ might also mean 'in defiance of.'
30. τ of ἀπὸ is not quite satisfactory, and ν would in some respects be more suitable.

31–4. There can be little doubt that the small detached fragment μ ἐξευτελ. κτλ. contains the concluding portions of these lines, but its exact position is uncertain and the restoration proposed is highly conjectural. ἐδῶν τι in l. 32 is suggested by ἔδα in the next line; but the supposed α before ἔδα is quite doubtful, and may be e.g. λ. τ of τι is represented only by the tip of the crossbar, which would also suit γ or ν, but these letters are far less likely here. Compared with ἀμενο in l. 31 the supplement ἐδῶν τι is somewhat long, but with three iotas may perhaps be admitted. ἀναλοιμ in l. 34 corresponds well with ἀμενο. Of the letter before εῷδα all that is left is part of a vertical stroke, which would be consistent also with μ.
14. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

14. **LYSIAS, In Theozotidem.**

Mummy A. Fr. (b) 15·6 x 19·2 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240. Plate II (Fr. c, Cols. ii–iii).

The recto of this papyrus, of which there are twenty fragments, contains a speech of an Attic orator directed against a certain Theozotides. This, as was observed by Blass, must be the oration of Lysias κατὰ Θεοζωτίδου mentioned by Pollux 8. 46; cf. Sauppe, *Fr. Orat. Att.* p. 189. The script is a good-sized uncial, a thick pen being used and the lines written close together. On the verso are a series of poetical extracts (7) in two hands, of which one is a somewhat later type of cursive than most of those found in this volume. But, though the writing on the verso may perhaps belong to the reign of Philopator, the oration does not present any appearance of being appreciably later than the other literary fragments found with it, which probably belong for the most part to the reign of Philadelphus, or at latest to the early part of the reign of Euergetes. No stops are used; but the paragraphus is found, and a blank space is sometimes left at the beginning of a new sentence.

The three principal fragments, (a), (b), and (c), contain the lower portions of columns and clearly do not admit of any combination. The order of the three is uncertain, but Fr. (a) more probably precedes (or follows) the other two than comes between them, because the writing on the verso is different from that on the verso of Frs. (b) and (c). Of the small pieces, Frs. (e), (h), (m), and (p), on account of the writing on the verso, may be connected with Frs. (b) and (c), while Frs. (f), (g), and (u), of which the writing on the verso is in another hand, cannot be combined with Frs. (b) and (c), but may be connected with Fr. (a). Frs. (d), (i), (k), (l), (o), (g)–(x) have no writing on the verso, and to which part of the roll they belong is quite obscure.

It is difficult to glean much information about the nature of the speech from these scattered fragments, connected sense being only obtainable in a few passages. That the accusation against Theozotides was a γραφὴ παρανόμων is however clear. From Frs. (a) and (b) it appears that he had proposed to exclude illegitimate and adopted sons of citizens fallen in war from the benefits which the State conferred upon orphans, while Frs. (e) and (d) are concerned with a proposal, which was apparently carried by Theozotides, to reduce the pay of the ἵππες from 1 drachma to 4 obols per diem, while raising that of the ἵππος ἄρτα, an inferior class of soldiers, from 2 obols a day to 8. The description of this measure, which was obviously directed against the richer classes in the interests of the poorer, supplies some interesting information on the pay of the Athenian cavalry; cf. note on II. 72–81. How the two seemingly distinct questions of legitimate
ancestry and pay of cavalry soldiers were connected is not evident. The text is not very accurate, several corrections being necessary; cf. notes on ll. 29, 41, and 85.

Fr. (a). Col. i. Col. ii.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\{15 \text{ letters} \} & \{15 \text{ \textmu}os\} \\
\{14 \text{ letters} \} & \nu\nu\nu \\
\{10 \text{ \textnu}s \textnu} & \textnu
\end{array}
\]

Fr. (b). Col. i. Col. ii.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\{25 \text{ \textnu}s\} & \{25 \text{ \textnu}s\} \\
\{30 \text{ \textnu}s\} & \{30 \text{ \textnu}s\} \\
\{35 \text{ \textnu}s\} & \{35 \text{ \textnu}s\}
\end{array}
\]
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πατριδος ανδρες οντες αγαθοι
[και] τουτους η πολις ετρεφε με
[χρι] ηβης ενταυθα ποτερα χωρις
περι των ποιητων και των νο

40 [θ'ων ανερεις λεγων οτι τουσδε
δια θεοτοιδην ουκ ετρεφον
η παντας αναγορε]ων ομοιως
. [ ΙΙ letters των] ποιητων
και των [νοθ]θων . . . . [ψευσε

45 ται περι της προφης υποσιθων
ταντα ουχ υβρις και [μμ]εγαλη διαβο
[λα] η [ Ι4 letters επειδη δε Κλε]
[ομενης . . . . . ο ανδρες δικασται
[. . . . . την ακροπ]ολιν κατελαβε
60 . . . . αληθι δι]

Fr. (ε). Col. i. Col. ii. PLATE II.

70 . . . . [ ΙΙ letters ουτος ει πρεσ
. [ ΙΙ " ] περι φυλακης
. [ 12 " ] . . . . [σαμ περι πο
[λαμεου θεοτ]ιδες ουτος

61 . . . .
] μω
[ απο
[ ν υστε
65 ρ
] τωι κ",
[ αι και
[ . . απο
τ]ημ μισ
θοφοριαν
]

75 τους μεν ιππεας αντι δρα
χμης τεσσαρας οββ]ολους μιο
θοφορειν τοι]ν] δ iπ]ποτοξο

70 . . . . [ ΙΙ letters . . . . περι φυλακης
. [ ΙΙ " ] περι φυλακης
. [ 12 " ] . . . . [σαμ περι πο
[λαμεου θεοτ]ιδες ουτος

61 . . . .
] μω
[ απο
[ ν υστε
65 ρ
] τωι κ",
[ αι και
[ . . απο
τ]ημ μισ
θοφοριαν
]

80 γνωμην ε . . . . . . . . . . . . .
ενικεσεν εν τωι δημωδι δυι
ου και μι . . . . . . . . . . . .

Col. iii. PLATE II.

απασαν τους ιππεας η υπερ
του παροντος και του με[λλον
υπαρχοντων αλλα προφυλατ
τειν οπως πλειω των ουγτον

E 2
85 τοις συντεινεῖν τὴμ μισθ[οφο]]
ριαν ενῷ δὲ το πορίζειν οὐκ η
ποστερεῖν ομήν ειναι των [ ]

90 η μηδὲν ελαττω των υπ[παρ]
χοντον εσται τοιοῦτο . [ ... ]
[τ]ουτον ουχ οκνειν χρη [ ... ]
[. . . ]ν αλλα . . . [ . . . ]

Fr. (d). Fr. (e). Fr. (f).

| οφειλο[ | 101 | ιστε | 111 | τ[ |
| η | 100 | καทดลอง | 8 lines lost. |
| μ[ | 105 | ειτε οι ν | [ |
| δοβ[ | 121 | γ[ |
| η ] | |
| 110 | ι [ |
| η[ | . . | . . |
| ον | [ |
| ρια | |
| 125 | . . | . . |
| λων | [ |
| συγκα | |
| 1 or 2 lines lost. |

Fr. (g).

| υσαν | 128 | [ |
| ιππευς | |
| ρφαν . | 130 | [ |
| αη | |
| πολ . | 143 | [ |
| η | 145 | [ |
| ου | 152 | [ |
| μηδ | |
| 152 | [p] | |
| η | |
| 153 | ιον . | |
| ρ | |

Fr. (h).

| δημη | 142 | [ |
| τα το δειν | |
| η | 152 | [ |
| η | |
| 152 | ιον | |
| η | |

Fr. (i).

| ασαν ευτελη | 135 | [ |
| σ | |
| ρ | |
| 150 | παραινει | |
| οι | 160 | [ |
| η | |
| 160 | [μ | |

Fr. (k).
14. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

140. Fr. (m). Fr. (n). ..
] .. . . ων π[ ... 169 ] ..
]αν [.] ηαπ[ ..
]ποι[.] .. [ 164 [. . .]]μ[ 170 [ ..
 .. 165 και τους [ ..]
Fr. (l). .. .. ηγαφιστα[ .. . ευν[ .. .. μακ[ 161 ]τιτωμ[ ..
]μεν η δικ[η 170 εσαι της ε[ [ ..
]πατω[ [ο]μεν απ[ ]υγκαταβει[ 170 .. .. .. .. .. ..
Fr. (o).
Col. i. Col. ii. Fr. (p). (Fr. (q)).
176 [. . . .] .. [ 182 [. . . .]]ωμ[ .. 188 ]φορ[ 175 .. 180 τα [. .. ] .. [ ] .. [ .. ..
[.] . ν επηρεο[ [. . . .]]ωματι [ .. 190 ]με[ [. . . .]]ρυ [ 175 .. 180 Τ[ ] [ ] .. [ .. ..
μεγ γαρ κλε [. ] . λον [. 185 της μισθοφοριας [ .. ] . πο[ 180 Τ[ ] [ ] .. [ .. ..
193 [. . . ] .. [ 197 [. . .]]π[ 195 .. ουστο[ [ .. πρ [. 200 ]ρηπ[ 193 ..
] .. [ 200 [ .. 200 λε[ 195 .. .. .. .. ..
Fr. (r). Fr. (s). Fr. (t).
193 [. . . ] .. [ 197 [. . .]]π[ 195 .. ουστο[ [ .. πρ [. 200 ]ρηπ[ 193 ..
] .. [ 200 [ .. 200 λε[ 195 .. .. .. .. ..
Fr. (u). Fr. (w). Fr. (x).
205 ]ευσ[ 208 [ .. [ .. ..
]ολ [. 211 ]πο[ 205 .. [ .. 210 ]μιν [ .. [ .. ..
] .. [ .. .. .. ..
The ἵππεις, who in the Peloponnesian war numbered 1000, received from the State (1) on enrolment a κατάστασις, i.e. a sum of money for equipment, which, as some think, had to be restored when their liability for service ended and (2) a yearly μεσοβός for the maintenance of their horses (Schol. ad Dem. In Timocr. p. 732. 6); but they probably received no personal pay, at any rate in times of peace (Ar. Εἴρ. 577 πρώτα γενναίως ἀμώνει); cf. Boeckh, Staatsausaltung (3rd ed.), i. p. 317, and Gilbert, Staatsalt. i. p. 362, note 2. The sum of about 40 talents, which according to Xen. Hipp. 1. 19 the State paid annually εἰς τὸ ἵππεις, is identified by Boeckh and Gilbert with the allowance for the horses. It is tempting at first sight to connect this payment of 40 talents, which makes 4 obols a day for each ἵππεις, with the 4 obols a day which Theozotides' scheme substituted for the previous drachma; but Xenophon was speaking of times of peace, while it is fairly certain that the payments in the Lysias passage refer to time of war. For the payments to the knights during war the only piece of evidence is Dem. 1 Phil. 28, from which it appears that they received 30 drachae a month, i.e. 1 drachma a day, so that in the interval between the speech against Theozotides and the first Philippic the rate which prevailed before Theozotides'
15. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

law seems to have been restored. The scale of payments to the ἵπποςότατοι was previously unknown; if our reading of ll. 78–9 is correct (neither διδραχμον nor διαρχμαν can be read), Theozotides raised their daily pay from 2 obols to 8. They were a body of 200 men, of inferior rank to the ἰππεῖς and probably drawn, like the τοξότατοι, from the lower classes of citizens, since it may be inferred from Lysias xv. 6 that service as a ἵπποςότατος was despised; cf. Gilbert, op. cit. p. 363. The proposal to pay them twice as much as the ἰππεῖς was evidently a democratic measure. The μυσθοφορία of which the papyrus speaks must have been independent of the allowance for keeping a horse, since 2 obols would be ludicrously insufficient for that purpose.

85. συντεκνευ seems to be an error for συντεκνευν: cf. Thuc. viii. 45 τὴν τε μυσθοφορίαν εὐνετεμεν.
92. l. ouk.
151. This line was very likely the last of a column.

15. RHETORICAL EXERCISE.

Mummy A. 19.2 x 38.3 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. Plate II (Part of Cols. i–iii).

Though in point of size the second of the literary papyri from Hibeh, this piece proves to be disappointing. It contains six consecutive columns, some in excellent preservation, from an oration which in Blass’s judgement—and his opinion on such a point is not likely to be challenged—was never really delivered, but is only a rhetorical composition. The supposed occasion is considered by Blass to be the situation resulting from the death of Alexander the Great, and the speaker, who is addressing an Athenian audience and advocating a forward policy, to be Leosthenes. That orator and soldier was with Hyperides the most active opponent at Athens of the Macedonian dominion, and played the principal part in the movement which resulted in the defeat of the Macedonian general Antipater in Thessaly. Antipater threw himself into Lamia, and there Leosthenes, who commanded the Greek allies, met his death. The phraseology of the papyrus is somewhat colourless, but references occur which suit this interpretation, e.g. the mention of a sudden change in the position of affairs (l. 43), the allusion to the speaker’s office as general (l. 116), and his personal risk in the cause he championed (l. 61) (a danger which as events were to prove he did not over-estimate), the possible reference to Taenarum (l. 58), and the exhortations to make a bold bid not only for freedom but for the leading position which freedom, if gained, might bring (ll. 73 sqq., 166 sqq., &c.). The composition is a favourable specimen of its class, and the early date gives it a certain interest. In spite of frequent confusion between ι and ει and other misspellings, there is no doubt that this text, which is carefully written in a handsome hand of medium size, is of approximately the same date as the bulk of the literary papyri in this
volume, and it is most unlikely to be later than the reign of Philadelphus. The formation of omega, in which the second curve is unfinished and an intermediate stage between ω and ο is shown, should be noticed; cf. 26, which illustrates an earlier stage in the transition. Punctuation is effected by a paragraphus, which, when the pause comes within the line, is accompanied by a horizontal dash marking the exact point. The text has been corrected with some care, apparently by the original scribe. There is some illegible writing on parts of the verso; cf. note on Fr. (a).

Col. i. **Plate II.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[ ]} \\
\text{[ ]} \ldots \text{αρων} \\
\text{[ ]} \ldots \text{[ ]} \\
\text{[τ]ε} \\
\text{[σ]}: \ldots \\
\text{[ε]]} \\
\text{[γα]} \\
\text{μ]ικραν} \\
\text{[ν]} \\
\text{[α]} \\
\text{[γαρ} \\
\text{[τ]} \\
\text{[ωτίαν} \\
\text{[παναί]} \\
\text{[πανει} \\
\text{[ν των} \\
\text{[τ]ην} \\
\text{[στ[ ]} \\
\text{[δημιαν} \\
\text{[ροι εμοι} \\
\text{[γα] \\
\text{[ε]]} \\
\text{[τας} \\
\text{ευρις}
\end{align*}
\]

Col. ii. **Plate II.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ρεστοτερος σύμμαχος} \\
\text{έξετε καὶ φανερὸν ἀπασι} \\
\text{καταστησετε διωτι το της} \\
\text{30 πολεως ηθος ουτω μακραν} \\
\text{[α]πεχει του κακως τινα ποειν} \\
\text{των μηθεν αδικουντων} \\
\text{Ελληνων — ωστε και τουσ} \\
\text{φανερωσ εξημαρτηκοτας} \\
\text{35 αθωνος αφιησιν δια την} \\
\text{υπερβολην της φιλανθρω} \\
\text{πιας — μαλιστα δε λογι} \\
\text{ζεσθε προσ των θεων ω αν} \\
\text{δρες Αθηναιοι [δ]ιοτι το βρα} \\
\text{40 δυνειν τοις νυν καθεστω} \\
\text{σιν ηκιστα συμφερον εστιν} \\
\text{οξεις γαρ εικος ευαι τους ε} \\
\text{κ των μεταβολων καιρονς} \\
\text{λαβει} \\
\text{ων αντ[αληψεω]θε και παυσασ} \\
\text{45 [[σ]]θε προσεχουτε τοις την} \\
\text{ραδιμιαν ασφαλειαν} \\
\text{αποκαλουσιν — και μη φοβη} \\
\text{θευτες τι[. . . . .]ειτε} \\
\text{την σωτηριαν αλ[λα] και θαρ} \\
\text{50 σησαντες τοιαυτα βουλευν} \\
\text{σασθε δι ων μηδεποτε μ[η]θεν}
\end{align*}
\]
Col. iii.  **Plate II.**

α[ι

αλλ[α] γ[δ]... [. . .]γαθε των [...] π [. . .]ονων τ[οι]ς μεν αλ

55 λοις επ [. . . . .] νον υμιν
de μπ[ε]ίμεισθαί καθήκον εστίν
κ[α]ί λογιζεσθαί με η[κ]ίστ αν
εν Ταυ[αρω καθη]μενον
και μηθενος αυτ[ερουν]τα

60 των εν τηι πολει σ [. . .] γον
ουτως αμ φιλοκιν[δ]νων επι
στηναι το[ι]ς π[α]γμασιν ει μη
tα των καιρων ηπισταμην
κατεπειγοντ[α] και κριςιν εω

65 ρων ουσαν της ημετερας
σωτηριας — και τ [. . . . . . . .]
tων εφοβ[ο]μην [. . . . . . . .]
καθεστηκοτων [. . . . . . . .]
eν υμ[ε]ίν αυτοις [. . . . . . . .]

70 και ταπεινος υπ[ολ]ηφθειν
ος μηθεν των συμφεροντων
προιδειν αν δυνηθεις
αλλα και νυν προ[ο]ρο τα μελ
λοντα και παρακαλω προς τα

75 πραγματα υμας και [ [παρα
καλω] την τυχην ην

Col. iv.

[ μη κα]

ταλειπειν — και δεομαι

μαλιστα των εστερων

80 των παρ υμ[ε]ίν εκ παδος τα
περὶ τον πολέμον ἴκανον
παιδευθείτων — ἀκμασάι·
ποτὲ ταῖς διανοίασι καὶ χρή
σασθαί τοῖς οἷ[κὲ]ιοις σωμασίν

85 εὐκαίρως τὴν ἀποδείξειν
ποιησαμενοι τῆς αυτῶν
ἀρετῆς — ἵνα, νομίζωνται
καὶ τον ἀλλὸν χρόνον
ησυχαζεἳν μὴ δι ἀνανδριαν

90 ἀλλὰ δι' ευλαβείαν — καὶ μη
θέεις ὁ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναίοι
χωρὶς τῆς ὑμετέρας δύνα
μεὸς επὶ τα πραγματα
καταδεικτερον βαδίζωμεν

95 μὴ νῦς αναγκαζήσθε
δυνών θατερον ἡ ποιτε ετερ[ῷ][ς]
τὸ κελευομένον ἡ μετ' ελατ
τὸν ὀστρατοπεδον κινδύν
νεεὶν ἡμῶν ἀλλως πῶς

Col. v.

100 καὶ ταῖς εὐ[ἱ]ς . . . . . . . .
ἀποχρησάθε καὶ τὴν εὐ
tοι πραττείν όρθως ασφα
λειαν ελέσθε μετὰ πλειονῶν

105 τὴν σωτηρίαν νη[[κ]]ε[ι]ν αὐτῶς
παρασκευαζόντες — ὡς
ἀναξίον εστὶν ὁ ἄνδρες
Ἀθηναίοι τῶν εἵ Μαραθωνι
καὶ Σάλαμιν κινδύνου διὰ

110 τελειω ἡμῶς τῷ συνόλον
απογινωσκοντας την η
γεμοιαν — η νομιζοντας
ταυτην εσεσθαι ποτε μιν
απο ταυτοματον μηδ οτι

115 ουν αυτοις πονοσιν

εγω με ουν επει στρατηγου
ην μη της ειδιας ασφαλειας και
χειροτονιας φροντιζειν
αλλα της νυν ετερας σωτη

120 ριος τουτο πραττων εναστε
ληλυθα προταξας εις αυτον
υπερ της κοινης ελευθεριας

Col. vi.

[
ωσθ][

125 εκ [
τοιτε []
ο καιρος [.ai [. [. .
ελθειν επι τ [. [. .
ριων και την [. .

130 μιας εκκηριου [. .
την τε της πολεως αρχη
γετιν [δ] και τους αλλους [εγ
χωριους θεους ]οις [. [. ai [. .
εσεσθαι εχι [. .

135 ταις ελπις δ [. .
μηνης λα [. . [. .
 [. . [ .
 δουλειας φε [. . [. .
 ελευθεριας o [. . [. .
 νον ειρ [. . [. . Αθη

140 ναιος υπερ [. .
θεους ερισαι μι [. . .
HIBEH PAPYRI

γα οινητ [. . . . . . . . . . .
υπηκουν ουτι[ας . . . . . . .
ζεται μεγα [. . . . . . . .
145 [. . . . ικα]

Fragments.

(a) . . . . . . .
]αται τους κ[ι
] . αλλα[ν] με[ι
]αβασ π[ι
]τερον μεν [1
150 ]του κα[ι
. . [αλλα ει προτερ [η
. . .

(b) . . . . . . . .
]μενων [. . .
. .
155 ]ς δε ημεις εαν
[ειν νυν δε ημας
. . [η]
. . . .

(c) . . . . . . .
160 ]τα[ι
]ποτε[ι]
. . .

(d) . . . . . . .
162 ]αλλας . . [η
163 ]και θι

(e) . . .
165 ] [ατ[. . .]
. . .

(f) . . . . . . .
. .

(g) . . . . . . .
166 ]κρ[ι

. . .

17. The letters παν are on a separate fragment placed here conjecturally.

26-51. . . you will have more contented allies, and will make it plain to all that the temperament of the State is so far from doing an injury to any one of the innocent Greeks that in the excess of its kindness it leaves unpunished those who are plainly guilty. Most of all, by heaven, consider, men of Athens, that delay in present circumstances is fatal, for the opportunities arising from the change are likely to be short. Seize them then, and give ear no longer to those who misname inaction safety. Do not miss your salvation through fear, but take courage, and adopt resolutions by means of which you will never . . .

43. των μεταθωλων: i.e. the situation created by the death of Alexander.
44. παύσαι[σθε] has been altered to παύσαι[βε]; with combinations of ο both methods of division are frequent.

54. The first word does not seem to be πλιονον, though των may be the last word in l. 53. γι may be read in place of π, but γιτόνων is unsuitable.

55-66. '...you ought to imitate ...and reflect that although I am inferior to no ...in the city, I should not have stationed myself at Taenarum and courted danger so freely in my conduct of affairs, if I did not know that the occasion was pressing, and that the turning-point of our salvation was at hand.'

58. For εν Ταυ'αρω καθή μενον cf. Diod. xviii. 9 μεθοδόρους, ὅτας μὲν ἀκταικαλιότες, διατριβοντας δι περὶ Τάυαρον τῆς Πελοποννήσου. The reading Ταυ'αρω is however very uncertain.

60. Cf. ll. 116 sqq. At the end of the line the vestiges of the letter before ων would suit η, and ΕΛ ηνων is a possible reading; but this is not satisfactory in itself, and moreover the initial letter is much more like σ than ε. στρατηγον is inadmissible.

73-99. 'But now I foresee the future, and urge you to take action and not to neglect the good fortune which ...Especially the younger men, who have had among you a sufficient military training from their youth, I entreat to exert all their powers of mind and to employ their bodies in a timely display of their prowess, in order that their tranquillity in the past may be ascribed not to unmanliness but to prudence; and that we, men of Athens, may not proceed to action with inadequate numbers and without the aid of your power, nor yourselves be forced to the alternatives of either obeying the orders of others, or with an inferior force risking an engagement ...'

78. τα of καταλείπετεν was at first omitted owing to homoioteleuton, but was added before the insertion of the paragraphus.

90. l. μηθ (ἡμεῖς (sc. the mercenary troops), balancing μηθ νομεῖ in l. 95.

96. l. ποιει γορ ποιει.

101-122. 'Make use of ...and choose the safety which lies in right conduct, working out your own preservation in larger force. For it is unworthy of the daring deeds at Marathon and Salamis, men of Athens, that you should persevere in the complete renunciation of the hegemony, or in the idea that it will ever come to you of its own accord without a single effort on your part. I therefore, since it was the duty of a general not to consider his own safety or chances of election but your preservation, have come forward with that object in view in championship of general liberty ...'

107 sqq. Cf. Diod. xviii. 10 καὶ πρότερον μὲν ὁ δῆμος ...τοὺς εἶπὶ δουλεῖα στρατευσάμενοι βαρβάρους ἡμῶν κατὰ διάλαταν, καὶ νῦν οίετι δεῖν υπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτηρίας ...προκειμένων.

131. πόλεως αρχηγετον: i.e. Athena; cf. C. I. G. 476 'Ἀθηνᾶ ἀρχηγετίδι καὶ δ' εἰς, &c.

Fr. (a). The shape of this fragment suggests that it should be placed at the top of Col. vi, so that l. 124 combines with l. 148, but to this there are two objections, apart from the difficulty of finding suitable readings:—(1) the column would then be higher by a line than the others; (2) on the verso of this column there is some half-effaced writing, while the verso of Fr. (a) seems to have been left blank. The verso of Frs. (b) and (c) on the other hand has been used, and they may well belong to Col. vi, though we have not succeeded in placing them. Fr. (c), judging from its colour, is likely to belong to Col. i.
16. Theophrastus (?)

Mummy Α.  

13.3 x 19.5 cm.  

Circa B.C. 280-240.

One nearly complete column of twenty-two lines, and parts of two other columns, from a philosophical work, the subject of the fragment being a discussion of Democritus' atomic theory, particularly in relation to the composition of the sea. The author is, as Blass suggests, very likely Theophrastus, a passage in whose works affords a close parallel to part of the papyrus; cf. note on l. 41. The treatise to which the papyrus belongs may have been that peri فذاتوس (Diog. Laërt. v. 45) or one of his other numerous works on Natural Philosophy.

The text is written in a thick inexact hand of a somewhat cursive character. It formed part of the same piece of cartonnage as Cols. ix–xi of 26, and belongs more probably to the reign of Philadelphus than to that of Euergetes. The paragraphus is employed, and a blank space is left before the beginning of a new section in the middle of a line.

We are indebted to Prof. H. Diels for some suggestions in the interpretation of this papyrus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 στα</td>
<td>peri της γενεσε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ows</td>
<td>οι μεγ γαρ υπο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τα παντα συνενε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 λιβανωτου ουτε θειον ουτε σιλφιον</td>
<td>35 αλλο σκεφτασθαι διοτι μερος ποιων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ουτε νυτρον ουτε στυπτηριαν ουτε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ασφαλτον ουτε οσα μεγαλα και θαμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>στα πολλακον γενεσθαι της γης του</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>του μεν ουν προσειρον ει και μηθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23-43. '... he says that in a wet substance like is (drawn) to like as in the whole creation, and thus the sea was created and all else that is... through the combination of homogeneous atoms; and that the sea is composed of homogeneous atoms is also evident in another way; for neither frankincense nor sulphur nor siphthium nor nitre nor bitumen nor any other important and wonderful things occur in many places in the earth. In this way, therefore, it is easy to perceive this at any rate, that by making the sea a part of the world he maintains that it is produced in the same manner as the wonderful and most unexpected things in nature, on the view that there are not many differences in the earth; for to one at any rate who considers that flavours originated by reason of atom-forms, and saltiness out of large and angular particles, it is not unreasonable...'

22. Probably ση|πεδωνος, as Diels suggests. 

26. α'...]. τα: αλμυρα is inadmissible. Diels' suggestion αλ|ροκοτα (cf. ll. 32 and 38) is possible, but the vestiges before τα (which is nearly certain) do not suit ακο at all well.

17. Sayings of Simonides.

Mummy 69. $27.7 \times 15 \text{ cm.}$ Circa B.C. 280–240.

A single column, written in cursive, containing a series of wise sayings, which according to the heading at the top were by Simonides, on the subject of expense. This heading suggests that the collection is a fragment of an anthology, but whether the papyrus itself formed part of an extensive work is doubtful; for there are 3 cm. of margin on one side of the column and 2½ on the other, without any signs of adjacent columns; on the left side however there is the junction of another sheet. The hand is a clear cursive which grows smaller in the last few lines; on the verso are parts of two columns of an account, which may be by the same writer. The date of the papyrus is about B.C. 250.

This Simonides, as the reference to the wife of Hiero (l. 4) at once shows, is Simonides of Ceos, who enjoyed a great reputation as a practical philosopher, and is ranked by Plato with Bias and Pittacus (Rep. i. 335 E). One of the sayings here recorded, which alludes to the poet's well-known miserly tendencies, explains a reference in the Rhetoric of Aristotle (cf. note on ll. 10–13). The others we have not traced, though some illustrations will be found in the commentary. A Vienna papyrus (Wessely, Festschr. f. Th. Comperz, pp. 67–74) contains part of a similar collection of anecdotes about Diogenes.

ανηλωματων

Σημουνιδου
ευδοκιμει δ αυτου προς αληθει
αν και το προς την Ιερωνος γυ
ναικα λεχθεν ερωτηθεις γαρ ει παντα γηρασκει ναι
εφη πληγ γε κερδους ταξισ τα
δε αι ενεργεσιαι και το προι τον πυθανομενον δια τι ει
η φειδωλος εφη δια τουτ ειναι
φειδωλος ο τι μαλλον αχθοι
to tois ανηλωμενοι η tois
περιουσιν τοιμωτον δε εκα
τερον ηθος μεν εχειν φαν

ανο ταρα δε τας οργας και
Expenses: Simonides. Esteemed also for its truth is his remark to the wife of Hiero: being asked whether everything grows old, he replied, “Yes, everything except love of gain, and benefits quickest of all”; and his answer to the question why he was frugal, which was that he was frugal because he disliked expenses more than savings. Each of these habits had a bad side, but was... owing to the passions and... of men. Therefore one was neither (harm) nor strictly speaking benefited by them. But it was irksome to use other people’s property and not one’s own. Expenditure is reckoned of slight account, and twice as much is spent again; so one should draw back the counters (?). A man borrowed his own money when he used only necessary and natural food, as the animals do.

4-5. About the last ten years of Simonides’ life were spent at Hiero’s court in Syracuse. Another reply made to Hiero’s wife is recounted by Aristotle, Rhet. ii. 16.

6-7. Cf. Plut. An Seni, p. 786 B Συμωνίδης ἔλεγε πρὸς τοὺς ἐγκαλοῦντας αὐτῷ φιλαργυρίαν, ὅτι τῶν ἄλλων ἀπεστερημένοι διὰ τὸ γῆρας ἡδονῶν, ὡπο μᾶς ἐτί γνησιοποιήσει τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ κερδαίνει. 10-13. This is evidently the saying of Simonides referred to in Arist. Rhet. iv. i εἰκονωνιτότος ἐστιν ὁ ἑλευθερος εἰς χρήματα δίνεται γὰρ ἀδικείσθαι μὴ τιμῶν γε τὰ χρήματα, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀξιόμενος, εἰ τι δεόν μὴ ἀπέλλωσε, ἢ λυποῦμενος, εἰ μὴ δεόν τι ἀπέλλωσε, καὶ τῷ Συμωνίδῃ οἰκ ἄρεσκόμενος. Love of money was a favourite reproach against Simonides; cf. e.g. Aristoph. Pax 697-9.

17. Perhaps νυστελέων. π or σ may be read in place of λ.

18. An infinitive having the sense of ‘injured’ is lost in the lacuna; the first letter may also be γ or μ, or perhaps α or λ.

20-2. The unpleasantness of dependence upon others is apparently here the point. Cf. Stob. Ecl. x. 61 Συμωνίδης... εἶπεν, βουλοίμην ἐν ἁπαθανῶν τῶν εὖχροις μᾶλλον ἀπολείπειν ή εἰς δεύτερα τῶν φίλων.

25. εἴκεν τας ψηφους is perhaps a technical phrase derived from account-keeping, but we have found no other example of it. According to Hdt. ii. 36 the Greeks in counting with ψηφοι moved the hand from left to right, so ‘drawing in the ψηφοι’ might mean ‘keep
on the credit side of the account.' Prof. Smyly makes an alternative suggestion that the phrase may be equivalent to the Latin *calcitum reducere*, to take back a move (at draughts), to retire from a position, the meaning practically being διό δει μὴ ἀναλώσατι. But the expression would be extraordinarily fanciful and obscure if that is the sense. τὰς ψήφους ἐλεύθερα occurs in P. Petrie II. 13 (6), 15, but since that papyrus relates to quarrying the meaning there is probably quite different.

26. It is not very clear whether δανείζωσθαι also is governed by δει or whether καὶ το begins a new sentence, the inf. δανείζωσθαι reverting to the oblique construction of ll. 13–22; on the whole the latter view seems to give the better sense. Cf. Seneca, *De Benef.* v. 7 *M. Cat. ait*, 'quod tibi deril, a te ipso mutuare', Ep. Mor. 119, §§ 2 and 12 (Smyly).

29. The short oblique stroke after ἀπλησία apparently represents a stop.

18. **LITERARY FRAGMENT.**

Mummy A. Frs. (a) + (b) 9·2 × 5·9. Circa B.C. 280–240.

The following small pieces of a literary work of uncertain character remain unidentified. Frs. (a) and (b) both come from the top of a column, but their relation is doubtful; the combination suggested in our text seems likely, but is far from certain. The resulting lines, so far as they go, will scan as the latter parts of iambic verses, and Blass seems to be right in regarding the fragments as derived from a comedy. The hand is slightly larger than that of 10–12, but is of a similar appearance, and probably dates from about the middle of the third century B.C.

Frs. (a) and (b).

] . ρωθὲς καθ[... ]ηκυσαρ[}
] ε[... ]πεφυκεν [αρμ]ονα τρό[ ]
] ης και σκ[... ] α και βα[ ]
] μοιαν ταυτ[... ] των γεν[ ]

5 ] ξι παντα [τα] σοφα γινε[ται
cα[... ]τεργαζομεν]α και επιθ[ ]
] υσει μικρον [α]υξησαι μ[ ]
] ψευδει τ[... ] αι διαπ[ ]
] μοις τιθ[... ] ν. α ηπ[ ]

10 ] και ουχ ε [... τρ]οπων [ ]
] υπασ δε[... ]μασο[ ]
II. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

19. Homer, Iliad II and III.

Mummy A. Fr. (l) 11.1 x 11 cm. Circa B.C. 285-250. Plate VI (Fr. 1).

Twenty-three fragments, of which nine very small ones remain unidentified, containing parts of 105 lines from Books ii and iii of the Iliad. The writing is a handsome uncial, Ω still retaining a tendency to approximate to the epigraphic form, ε and Ω being written very small, Μ and Π very large. It represents one of the earlier types of literary hands in the present volume and, like 26, much more probably belongs to the reign of Philadelphus than to that of Euergetes.

In common with 21 and 22, both of which are fragments of MSS. already in part known from other pieces published in P. Grenf. II (cf. p. 5), 19, of which no published fragments exist, is remarkable for its variations from the ordinary text of the Iliad, especially in the insertion of additional lines, of which there are at least 12 or 13. Four of these expand a line describing the impartiality of Zeus (Γ 302), and three the description of Menelaus arming himself (Γ 339). As is the case with most of the additions in early Ptolemaic Homer fragments, where the 'new' lines in 19 are sufficiently well preserved to be intelligible, they are generally found to have been derived with little or no alteration from other passages in Homer; and many of the variants are also due to the influence of parallels, one conventional phrase being substituted for another, e.g. in Γ 361. Of the readings peculiar to 19 some are probably errors, e.g. the nominative
HIBELI PAPYRI

\( \epsilon \rho \rho \eta \eta \) in B 797, the amusing variant \( \epsilon \nu \sigma \rho \rho \omega \omega \) for \( \dot{\alpha} \psi \ \dot{\alpha} \rho \omega \omega \) in \( \Gamma \ 325 \), and \( \eta \chi \varepsilon \) for \( \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta \varepsilon \) in \( \Gamma \ 357 \); but others are quite defensible, e.g. B 826 \( \tau \omega \nu \ \omega \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \rho \mu \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \) for \( \tau \rho \nu \varepsilon \ \tau \omega \nu \ \omega \dot{\alpha} \theta \), \( \dot{\eta} \chi \varepsilon \), and \( \Gamma \ 304 \ \Delta \rho \delta \alpha \alpha \eta \dot{\eta} \dot{\nu} \varepsilon \omega \rho \theta \eta \) for \( \dot{\epsilon} \pi \gamma \kappa \omega \nu \rho \theta \eta \) for \( \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \eta \mu \dot{\nu} \dot{\mu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\mu} \dot{\varepsilon} \) \( \dot{\alpha} \chi \alpha \omega \alpha \); and though none of the new readings can quite definitely be called an improvement, one of the additional lines inserted after \( \Gamma \ 302 \) \((302 \ b)\) tends to support a conjecture of Nauck in B 39, from which \( \Gamma \ 302 \ b \) is derived.

Comparing the text of the papyrus with what is known about the readings of the Alexandrian critics, 19 has three lines \((B \ 673-5)\) of which two were at hetized and one omitted by Zenodotus, and two other lines \((B \ 724-5)\) which he athetized, but agrees with him in reading \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \nu \rho \varepsilon \) \((\Gamma \ 280)\), where Aristarchus had \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \nu \rho \varepsilon \), while in \( \Gamma \ 295 \) 19 agrees with Aristarchus in reading \( \alpha \phi \nu \sigma \sigma \sigma \omega \mu \varepsilon \), not \( \alpha \phi \nu \sigma \sigma \sigma \omega \mu \varepsilon \), but contains five lines \((B \ 791-5)\) oblized by him; and no particular connexion is traceable between this text and that of the chief Alexandrian grammarians.

Nor does 19 exhibit any marked affinity to the text of other and later Homeric papyri which partly cover the same ground, the most important being the Bodleian Homer discovered in the Fayûm, P. Brit. Mus. 126 and P. Oxy. 20. It is specially noteworthy that the new line inserted in P. Oxy. 20 after B 798 is absent in 19, which also differs from P. Oxy. 20 in B 795 and 797. Among other peculiarities of the papyrus are its preferences for augmented forms, e.g. \( \Gamma \ 295 \ \eta \chi \alpha \sigma \tau \varepsilon \), \( \Gamma \ 370 \ \epsilon \iota \lambda \kappa \varepsilon \), \( \Gamma \ 371 \ \eta \chi \varepsilon \), and for \( \phi \eta \) in place of \( \eta \) \((\Gamma \ 355 \ and \ 309)\).

The supplements of lacunae in 19-21 and 23 follow the text of Ludwich; in 22 that of La Roche.

In P. Grenf. II. pp. 12-13 we gave, in connexion with those fragments belonging to 20, 21, and 22 which were published in 1897, our views upon some of the problems arising from the great variations in early Ptolemaic texts of Homer. Our contentions, in common with the much more far-reaching claims advanced by some critics upon the earlier discovery of the Petrie and Geneva fragments, were subjected to a searching examination by Prof. A. Ludwich in his exhaustive discussion of the subject, *Die Homercunlagna als voralexandrinisch erwiesen.* The main objects of that work were (1) to dispose of the idea that the texts of the early Homeric papyri represented the pre-Alexandrian condition of the poems, out of which the vulgate was produced by the labours of the Alexandrian critics; (2) to show from a detailed investigation of the Homeric quotations in writers of the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. that the texts used by them substantially agreed with the vulgate; and (3) to deny practically any critical value to the early papyrus fragments, which exhibit neither the vulgate nor the critical texts, but an ‘erweiterte oder wilde’ category of Ptolemaic MSS. \((p. \ 66)\). We take the present opportunity therefore of restating our views in the light of Ludwich’s criticisms and the new evidence.
The present volume supplies additional fragments (20-22) of P. Grenf. II. 2-4, and pieces of two previously unknown Homeric papyri, 19 and 23. In the case of 21 and 22 the published fragments had already proved with sufficient clearness the existence of great divergences from the vulgate, and the newly discovered pieces merely provide further illustrations of the same tendency, which is particularly marked in the case of 21. 20, however, of which there are now extant parts of 71 lines in all, enables us to form a fairer estimate of the real nature of the MS. hitherto represented only by P. Grenf. II. 3, parts of Δ 109-13 containing no variations from the vulgate. So far as the insertion of new lines is concerned, 20 still seems to be more free from expansions than 19, 21, and 22, since the insertion of a line after Δ 69 is more than balanced by the omission of three lines which are found in the ordinary texts. The total number of lines is thus two less than in the corresponding portions of the vulgate, but on the other hand the existence in this MS. of numerous variations similar in character to those found in 19, 21, and 22 is now clear; for although the fragments of 20 are very small and most of the lines are represented by a few letters only, there are several noteworthy variants. Considering that additional lines tend to be very unevenly distributed, especially in 19 and 21, the circumstance that only one happens to occur in the extant pieces of 20 is quite compatible with the possibility that this text presented the same characteristics as those found with it; but the prima facie evidence is in favour of drawing a marked distinction between 20 and its companions, and probably that papyrus represents either a text which has been subjected to critical revision, especially by the omission of many superfluous lines, or else a tradition which from its origin was relatively free from interpolations, being in this respect perhaps superior even to the vulgate. In any case 20 certainly cannot be claimed to represent the vulgate. Both the two new papyri, 19, with 12 or 13 new lines out of 105, and 23, with 3 out of 30, exhibit the same degree of divergence from the vulgate as 21 and 22, 23 being of particular importance because it is the only early Ptolemaic fragment of the Odyssey, the text of which seems to have been in as fluctuating a condition as that of the Iliad. With regard to the later Ptolemaic period there is now a little more evidence for determining the date at which the vulgate superseded other texts. P. Fay. 4 (Θ 332-6 and 362-8) and P. Tebt. 4 (B 95-210, with Aristarchean signs) both belong to the latter part of the second century B.C., and agree fairly closely with the vulgate, at any rate as to the number of lines, whereas the numerous Homeric fragments of the Roman period published in recent years very rarely contain new verses, and serve to illustrate only too well the overwhelming predominance of the vulgate. Since the Geneva fragment, which is a MS. of the same type as the third century B.C.
fragments, belongs to the second century B.C., probably the earlier half of it, the dividing line, after which the tendency for Homeric papyri to vary from the vulgate rapidly diminishes, would seem to be best placed about B.C. 150 or even earlier, rather than at the end of the Ptolemaic period.

Briefly, therefore, the situation is as follows. There are extant fragments of six different papyri earlier than B.C. 200; most of them certainly, and perhaps all, earlier than B.C. 240 (the doubts expressed by Ludwich, op. cit., pp. 9-10, as to the early date of the Petrie fragment, though justified by some remarks of the first editor, have become, through the advance in knowledge of the palaeography of early Greek papyri, quite baseless). Of these six, one comes from the Fayûm, four from either the Heracleopolite or Oxyrhynchite nome, not improbably Oxyrhynchus itself, one (23) from the Heracleopolite nome. Five of them belong to the Iliad, one to the Odyssey; and all six exhibit very marked divergences from the text of the vulgate, particularly in the insertion of new lines. These are distributed through five of the papyri unevenly, in proportions ranging from one new line out of four in 21 to one line out of about twelve in 22, but are much less conspicuous in the sixth (20), which, so far as it goes, exhibits a shorter text than the vulgate. In the fragments of the second century B.C. there is only one which shows similar characteristics to the same extent; and by the end of that century the vulgate, so far as can be judged, seems to have almost attained to that pre-eminence which is attested by plentiful evidence in the Roman period.

From these facts we should draw the following conclusions:

(1) The effect of the new evidence afforded by the present volume is to confirm and amplify the evidence regarding the characteristics already known to exist in early Ptolemaic Homeric fragments, and to reduce still further the probability that the prevalence of these divergences is due to chance. It could formerly be maintained that, side by side with the 'eccentric' traditions represented by the papyri, there were circulating in the Fayûm (the supposed provenance of all the previously known fragments) as many or even more texts representing the vulgate, and that, taking the Homeric papyri earlier than B.C. 150, the majority of 4 to 1 in favour of the 'eccentric' traditions gave quite an unfair idea of their preponderance. The majority in favour of the 'eccentric' traditions has now become 6 to 1, while even the one exception (20) is not the vulgate text; and the area in which there is evidence for their currency has been extended, so that the probability that the extant fragments illustrate not unfairly the prevailing texts in Upper Egypt is greatly strengthened. Whoever and wherever the readers of the vulgate in the third century B.C. may have been, they certainly do not seem to have included more than the minority, if any at all, of the Greek settlers in Upper Egypt. Accordingly we adhere more strongly
than ever, in spite of Ludwich's objections (op. cit., p. 188), to the view (P. Grenf. II, p. 12) that 'if there was any one tradition generally accepted in Egypt in the third century B.C., it was at any rate not our vulgate... It is clear that the rise of the vulgate into general acceptance took place in the interval (between B.C. 150 and 30). The point of view implied by that sentence is rather seriously misunderstood by Ludwich. He supposes (ibid.) that we wished to maintain 'dass unsere Homervulgata... erst in der zweiten Hälfte der Alexandrinerzeit entstanden ist,' a hypothesis which runs counter to the main argument of his book, that the vulgate was in existence long before the third century B.C. But though his presentation of the case against the position that the vulgate was not yet in existence when the early papyri were written leaves nothing to be desired in thoroughness, it does not affect our contention which was something quite different. What we meant and what in fact we said in the passage quoted above, though perhaps with insufficient clearness, was not that the rise of the vulgate took place after B.C. 150, but that its rise into general acceptance occurred after that date, i.e. that it did not supersede the 'eccentric' traditions until then, the evidence indicating that the text generally accepted in Egypt in the early Ptolemaic period was not the vulgate. And this we believe more firmly than before. The question how and when the vulgate, whether identical or not with the text called by Didymus and Aristonicus the kouř, took its origin is another point; and even granting Ludwich's contention that the vulgate is substantially the text quoted by the fifth and fourth century Greek authors (which is by no means certain), so far from there being any evidence that in the earlier Ptolemaic period the vulgate was the normal text in circulation through Egypt apart from Alexandria, there is now fresh proof to the contrary.

(2) A more satisfactory comparison of the 'eccentric' texts with those of the chief critical editions is now possible, because among the Homeric fragments contained in the present volume, unlike those in P. Grenf. II, there are several passages in which the readings of the Alexandrian critics are known. On the whole the new evidence does not suggest any particular connexion between the 'critical' and the 'eccentric' texts, and supports our previously expressed view that, beside the enormous differences between the vulgate and these papyri, its disagreements with the text of Zenodotus and Aristarchus appear comparatively insignificant. Through the publication of Ludwich's most valuable collection of Homeric citations in fifth and fourth century B.C. authors, the position which these occupy in relation to the vulgate and the 'eccentric' texts can now be estimated. Ludwich's statistics (op. cit., pp. 140-1) show that out of 480 verses quoted by various authors before B.C. 300 only 9-11 are not found in the vulgate; from which he concluded (1) that the text used by the pre-Alexandrian writers

---
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71
was much nearer to the vulgate than were the 'eccentric' traditions, and (2) that so far from the Homeric tradition being in a chaotic condition before the time of the Alexandrian grammarians, most of the pre-Alexandrian writers (24 or 25 out of 29) already used the vulgate, not the 'eccentric' texts. Without advocating the extreme position maintained on the appearance of the Petrie Homer fragment by some critics who denied the existence of the vulgate text at all before the Alexandrian period, and admitting that the fifth and fourth century B.C. quotations are on the whole slightly nearer the vulgate than are the 'eccentric' texts, we have less confidence than Ludwich in the inferences which he bases upon his figures. It is quite true that the average of new lines in the 'eccentric' texts (about 70 in 547 lines ¹, i.e. 1 in every 8 approximately) is higher than that in the quotations (about 1 in 48), and if the new lines in the 'eccentric' text had been at all evenly distributed the argument from the difference in the averages would have considerable weight. But, as we pointed out in P. Grenf. II. p. 13, and as is again clearly illustrated by 19 and 21, the additional lines are distributed very unevenly. They tend to come at points where the thread of the narrative is loose, and to occur in batches; and between the premiss that there are few of them to be found in the pre-Alexandrian quotations and the conclusion that the texts from which those quotations are derived were free from extensive insertions of new lines, there is a broad gap, over which Ludwich's bridge is very insecure, as will appear more clearly from an instance. In 19 there are 12 additional lines out of 105, but of the 13 fragments (treating Frs. (m) and (z) as one) 7 have no additional lines at all, and 8 out of the 12 additional lines occur on 2 fragments. Similarly in 21 (9) there are (including P. Grenf. II. 2) at least 26 new lines out of 105, a proportion of 1 in 4; but 9 of these occur after l. 65, 4 before and 4 after l. 55, and 4 after l. 52: throughout the other paragraphs additional lines are scarce. It is obvious that several citations might be made from the extant fragments of 10 and 21, particularly quotations of 2 or 3 lines such as figure largely in Ludwich's list, without in the least betraying the fact that the average proportion of new lines in 10 is 1 in 8 or 9 and in 21 is actually 1 in 4, and that if only one or two short quotations were made from 10 or 21 the chances against the true average being indicated are very considerable, especially as the additional lines are seldom very striking. Moreover, of the 29 authors who appear in Ludwich's list, and 25 of whom he claims as supporting the vulgate, those who are represented by more than 3 quotations and 10 lines in all (when the evidence is less than that it is really too slight to be of much value) number only 7, and 2 of these 7 (Aeschines and Aristotle),

¹ In this calculation we omit 20 for the reasons explained on p. 69, but include the Geneva fragment, which contains 9-13 new lines out of 77.
and possibly a third (Diogenes of Sinope), make quotations containing extra lines, indicating that if they sometimes quoted from the vulgate they also at other times quoted from the ‘eccentric’ texts. The question of the relation of the quotations in fifth or fourth century B.C. authors to the vulgate can only be decided satisfactorily if a sufficient amount of the ‘eccentric’ traditions is recovered to make possible a direct comparison between it and the quotations. Passages in which the pre-Alexandrian quotations happen to coincide with the extant fragments of the ‘eccentric’ texts are naturally very rare, but one occurs in Θ 20–2, where Aristotle (π. ἓφθον κ.π. 4. p. 699 B, 35) transposes ll. 20 and 22 of the vulgate, whereas 21 agrees with the vulgate with regard to the order. There is however a quotation in Plutarch (Consol. ad Apoll. 30) of a passage which is partly preserved in P. Grenf. II. 4 (Ψ 223), and in this it is curiously significant that Plutarch’s text had an additional line which is also found in the papyrus. And if a writer as late as Plutarch was using a text which apparently resembled the ‘eccentric’ class long after the pre-eminence of the vulgate was unquestioned, have we the right to believe in the widespread circulation of the vulgate any earlier than the date attested by strong and direct evidence? The papyri, as we have shown, lend no support to the vulgate until the second century B.C.; and the quotations from fifth and fourth century B.C. authors are for the most part so small and so easily reconcilable with an inference exactly opposite to that drawn from them by Ludwich, as to be quite inconclusive. To maintain, therefore, as Ludwich proposes, in the face of the four additional lines added to Θ in the Pseudo-Platonic Alcibiades II and the quite different version of Ψ 77–91 in Aeschines’ speech against Timarchus, in spite of the consensus of the early Ptolemaic papyri and notwithstanding the obviously hazardous character of an argument from averages based on comparatively few instances, the thesis ‘dass es ganz unmöglich ist, die Existenz und die überwiegende Herrschaft dieses Vulgärtextes für die voralexandrinische Zeit zu leugnen,’ seems to us a considerable exaggeration. In this, as in several other respects, the truth would seem to lie between the two extremes represented by Ludwich and the critics whom he was chiefly opposing. However unwelcome it may be, the fact remains that the history of the Homeric vulgate prior to B.C. 150 is still involved in very great obscurity, and dogmatism of any kind is to be deprecated. Before B.C. 200 we can distinguish a certain number of texts, represented either by papyri or by quotations, which certainly were not the vulgate, and a much larger number of texts, represented however only by quotations, which may or may not have been the vulgate. Until we know what were the readings of the ‘eccentric’ texts in the passages corresponding to these quotations, and whether they coincided or not with the
vulgate, the agreement between the quotations and the vulgate do not prove much, since the 'eccentric' texts often agree with the vulgate in the matter of lines throughout quite long passages. The extreme view that the vulgate was the creation of Alexandria is rightly rejected by Ludwich; for there is evidence to show that much of the Alexandrian criticism failed to influence the vulgate, and it is on general grounds unlikely that the vulgate could have attained its pre-eminence by B.C. 150 if it had only come into existence in the previous century. That some of the texts represented by the fifth and fourth century B.C. quotations were of the same character as the vulgate is likely enough. But that it had any right to the title of the 'common' text before the second century B.C. is extremely disputable. So far as the evidence goes at present, the use of the vulgate text seems to have been rather the exception than the rule down to B.C. 200.

(3) This brings us to another point. What were the causes of the rise of the vulgate into pre-eminence? For Ludwich, who regards the vulgate as already firmly established when the text of Homer first emerges from the mists of antiquity in the fifth century, the answer is easy. But if we are right in thinking that in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. the text which became the vulgate was fiercely competing with other texts which tended to be much longer, and that it only achieved the victory about B.C. 200, something more than its intrinsic merits would seem to be required to account for its success. If the 'eccentric' texts, which are, we think, as old as the vulgate, were good enough not only for Aeschines and the author of *Alecibiades II*, but for the first three generations of Greek settlers in Upper Egypt, why were they abandoned by the succeeding generations? It is very difficult to acquit the Alexandrian Museum of having had some part in the matter, at any rate in Egypt itself, and to disconnect entirely, as Ludwich wishes, the foundation of the chief University of antiquity from the great changes wrought during the next century and a half in the ordinary copies of the text of that author who was more studied than any other. Of the general teaching received by students of Homer at the Museum very little is known except the views of particular grammarians on particular points; and the fact that very few of the readings preferred by the great critics seem to have affected the text of the vulgate is by no means inconsistent with the hypothesis that the influence of the Museum, as a whole, in some way tended to foster the reproduction of the vulgate in preference to the 'eccentric' editions. Here too, as we have stated, we have endeavoured to strike a mean between the position of those who contended that the Alexandrians created the vulgate and that of Ludwich, who denies that they were in any way responsible for its general currency.

(4) With regard to the value of the variants in the early papyri, the new
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lines are in many cases no doubt interpolated from other portions of the poems, and the other differences are often due to the unconscious influence of parallel passages. Some of the new readings, however, especially the omissions in 20, are at least defensible, and in themselves as good as those of the vulgate, though none of those found in 19 and 21-3 has so strong a claim to be considered superior as that much-discussed variant ωκα δε ιπις (Ψ 198), found in P. Grenf. II. 4, in place of ὤκεα δ’ ιπις. That Ludwich rejects this is not surprising in view of his threefold classification of Ptolemaic Homeric MSS. (cf. p. 68) and his anxiety to deny any critical value to the ‘erweiterte oder wilde’ category. But in his continued preference for ὤκεα δ’ ιπις in the face of the other reading Ludwich has not commanded general support (ὠκα δε ιπις is accepted, e.g. by Monro and Allen, though not by Leaf); and the attempt to limit the knowledge of the truth to particular families of MSS. to the exclusion of the rest is not likely to be more successful in the case of Homer than in that of other authors. One of the most valuable results of recent discoveries is the proof of the fallacy of pinning one’s faith to one tradition. A comparison of the papyri of extant Greek authors with the corresponding portions of the mediaeval MSS. shows that the early texts (cf. e.g. 26 introd.) hardly ever favour in a marked degree any one of the later MSS. or families of MSS., while in the case of some authors, e.g. Xenophon (cf. P. Oxy. III. pp. 119–20), the papyri show that modern critics have often gone too far in preferring one family of MSS to another, and prove clearly, what is apt to be sometimes forgotten, that the proper guiding principle in the reconstruction of the text of any ancient author is a judicious eclecticism. And though from the point of view of Homeric criticism of the twentieth century it may be convenient to label the texts of the early papyri as ‘eccentric’ or ‘wilte,’ it should be remembered that there was a long period during which this class probably formed the majority of texts in circulation, and that the similar variants existing in several of the quotations of Homer in the fifth and fourth century B.C. writers are now freed by the evidence of papyri from much of the suspicion of error which formerly attached to them. As was pointed out by Mr. Allen (Class. Rev. 1899, p. 41), it is now known that Aeschines and the author of Alcibiades II neither were the victims of imperfect recollection nor adapted passages to their own ends, but were quoting copies more or less resembling the texts of the early papyri.

Fr. (a).

B 174 [οντο δη οικον δε φιλην εσ πατριδα γαιαν
175 [φευζεσθ εν νησοι πολυκλησι πεσοντ]ες .
176 [καὶ δὲ κεν εὐχωλὴν Πριαμῷ καὶ] Τροιῶ Χιτότε
177 [Αργείην Ἐλευθήν ης εἰνεκα πολλοί] Αχαῖων
178 [ἐν Τροιῇ απολοντο φίλης ἀπο πατ']μίδος αἰνές
179 [ἀλλ ἰδὶ νυν κατὰ λαον Αχαιον μηδὲ] τ [ερωεὶ

... ... ...

179. For μηδὲ τ ερωεὶ the first hand in P. Brit. Mus. 126 has χιλκοχιτωνων, which is possible here.

Fr. (b).

... ... ...

B 204 ουκ ἀγαθὴ πετουκοιρανη εἰς κοιρανός εστώ
205 εἰς βασιλεὺς οἰς εἰδὼκε Κρονοῦ παις ἀγκυλομητεω

204. ἀγαθὴ: ἀγαθὸν MSS.
205. εἰδὼκε: so most MSS. ἤδωκε Aristarchus and a few MSS.

Fr. (c 1).

... ... ...

B 621 [μέσος ο μὲν Κτεατοῦ ο δ αρ Ευρυτοῦ Ακτορίωνος]
622 [τον δ Αμαργυκεφῆς Διωρῆς ὕρχεν α]μμυρῶν
623 [τον δε τεταρτων ἦρχε Πολυξείνως θεοτείδης]

The position assigned to this fragment, which was suggested by Blass, is almost certain. The remains of the first and third lines suit B 621 and 623, and though ἀμμυρῶν in 1. 2 conflicts with the termination of B 622 in the MSS., the variant presents no difficulty. θεοτείδης occurs at the end of a line in B 876, but the ends of the other two lines are there different.

621. Ακτορίωνος: the MSS. are divided between Ακτορίων (Aristarchus) and Ακτορίωνος.
622. Διωρῆς ἠρχεν αμμυρῶν: ἦρχε κρατέρος Διωρῆς MSS. The reading of the papyrus avoids the spondaic ending of the verse.

Fr. (c 2).

... ... ...

B 673 [Νίρευς ος καλλιστὸς αυτῷ] ὑπ' ιον ηλθε
674 [τον αλλων Δαναων μετ' αμμυμοία Πηλείωνα]
675 [ἀλλ αλαπαδίος εἶν πατηρὸς δε οι εσπ[ετο λαος]
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676 [οι θαρ Νισυροὶ τε εἰχον [Κρα]παθον τε Κασον τε
677 καὶ Κων Ευρ]πυπλοιο πολιν [νησους τε Καλυδνας
678 [των αι Φειδ]ιπος τε και Αντ[ι]φοι ηγησασθην
679 [Θεσσαλου και δυ[ν]ω [Ηρα]κλειδαο [ανακτος

673. This line and 675 were athetized by Zenodotus, who omitted 674.
675. επικέρα: επικέρα MSS. (except one which has επικέρα).

Fr. (d).

B 715 [Αλκηστις Πελιαο θυγ']ατρων [ειδοι αριστη]
716 [οι δ αρα Μηδωνην και Θαμακιν ερατεινην
717 και Μελιδοιαν εχον και Ολιξωνα τρη'ξιαν
718 των δε Φιλοκτηνης ηρχεν τοξων ευ [ειδο][s]
719 [επτα νεων ερεται δ εν εκαστη πε]υ]τει[ν]ηκοντα
720 [εμβεβασαν τοξων ευ ειδοτες ωθ ημαξισθα]ι
721 [αλλ ο μεν εν νησωι κειτο κρατερ αλγεα πασ]χ[ων
722 [Αημινω εν ηγαθει οθι μιν λιπον υπε Αχαιων [
723 [ελκει μοχθιζυντα κακωι ολοοφρονου] νυν
724 [ενδ ο γε κειτ αξεων ταχα δε μι]η]ςεισθαι εμε]λν

716. ερατεινην: ενμυοτο MSS.
718. Zenodotus read here των αν ἰγαθεὶν Φιλοκτῆτης ἀγῶν ἀνδρῶν.
722. The reading οινων is very doubtful, especially the α, and 31 letters are rather long for the lacuna; in l. 723, which has 31 letters in the corresponding space, there are 7 omicrons, and in l. 724 only 21 or 22 letters are lost in the corresponding space.
724. This line and 725 were athetized by Zenodotus.

Fr. (e).

B 794 [δεμενος οππο]τε μα]υφιν αφορμηθειεν Αχαιοι
794 a εις πεδιον Τρωεσι φωνον και κηρα φερουντες
795 [τωι] μιν αρ ειδομενη προ[σε]φη ποδας ωκεα Ιρις
796 [ω γερον] αει τοι μυθοι φιλ[οι] α[κριτοι εισιν
797 [οις τε πο]τε ειρηνη πολεμ]ους δ αλιαστος οροφειν
798 [ηδη μεν] μαλα πολλα μας εισηλυθον ανδρων
794. For the new line inserted after this cf. B 352 Ἄργιοι Τρώοις φύον καὶ ἕρα

795. ἔν αὐτῇ εἰσαμένη: ἔν εἰσαμένη the Bodleian papyrus discovered at Hawara (collated in Leaf’s edition), σ.ο. P. Oxy. 20, ἔν εἰσαμένη other MSS. Cf. l 241, where ἄρα εἰδόμενος is found in a Vienna MS. in place of ἄρα εἰσάμενος. Lines 791-5 were obelized by Aristarchus.

796. ἐν: so X; αἰεὶ other MSS. Cf. l 296.

797. ὡς τε ποι'ε τ' εἰρήνη: the restoration of the lacuna is uncertain. The beginning of this line seems to have given much trouble in early times. P. Oxy. 20 has ὡς τε ποι'ε τ' εἰρήνη which will construe but not scan, the Bodleian papyrus ὡς τε ποι'ε τ' εἰρήνη which will scan and is defensible. The vellum MSS. mostly have ὡς ποι'ε τ' εἰρήνη, with the unmetrical variant ὡς τ' εἰρήνη in three instances, and δοσπερ' εἰρήνη in one. 19 is unique in having the nominative εἰρήνη, which can hardly be justified and may represent a corruption of the reading ὡς τε ποι'ε τ' εἰρήνη.

798. After this verse P. Oxy. 20 inserts from Γ 185 a new line εἰσα ἐλών τ' ἀλεστοὺς Φρυγας ἀνερας αὐτ' λοπωλονς.

Fr. (f).

B 813 Τιθὴν η τοι αὐτρές Βατειαν κικλησκουσιν 814 αδαν'ατοι δε τε σήμα πολυσκαρβῳδῳ Μυρνις 815 εἰθα [τοτε Τροῖς τε διεκριθεν ηδ' επικουροι 816 Τροσι μεν ηγεμονευε μεγας κορυθαυλος Εκτωρ 817 [Π]ρ]ιλαμίδης αμα των γε πολυ πλεστοι και αριστοι

Fr. (g)

B 826 τον αυ' ηγεμονευε Λυκαιων αγλαος νιος 827 [Πανδ]ροσ ωι και τοξ'ον Αθολλων αυτος εδωκεν 828 [οι δ] αρ [Α]δρηστειαν να'ιον και δημων Απαιου 829 [και Πιτ'νειαν εχου και Τηρεις ορος αιτυ 830 [τον ηρ' χε Αδρήστος τε [και Αμφιος λυνθωρης

826. τον αυ' ηγεμονευε: the doubtful ϑ might be η, but there is not room for τον αυ'η. Most MSS. (including the Bodleian papyrus) read Τροῖς τον αυ' ηρ' ηρυ, a few having the
variants τ’ αδ’ or τ’ αδ. The papyrus version can be defended against that of the vulgate; for οἱ δὲ Ζελειαν ἐναντίον in 824 are in any case contrasted with Τρώαι τινὲς ἱππομόνευν in 816 and Δαρδανίων ἀντ’ ἱππεῖν in 819. But Ἰτρώες is, as Blass observes, in accordance with E 200 and 211, where Pandarus calls his people Ἰτρώες.

282. ap: so A and some other MSS.; the Bodleian papyrus and the rest omit it.
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Frs. (h) and (i).

Plate VI.

Γ 277 [Ἡλίος θ ος παντερ εφοραί καὶ παντες επακοῦει]
Γ 278 [και ποταμοι] και γατα και οι υπενερθε καμοντας
Γ 279 [24 letters]
Γ 280 [μειεις μαρτυρες εστε φυλασσεσε δ όρκια πίστα]
Γ 281 [ει μεν κεν] Μενελαον Αλεξανδρος κατα'πεφυμη
Γ 282 [αιωνες ετειθ Ελευθν εχεω και κτηματα παντα]
Γ 283 [ημεις δ εν υπεσαι νεωμεθα κουροι Αχαιων]
Γ 284 [αιωνες ειπποβοτον καὶι Αχαιδα καλλιγυν’αικα]
Γ 285 [Τρωας επειθ Ελευθν και κτηματα παντες αποδουναι]

277. εφοραί ... ἔπακονει: so P. Brit, Mus. 126 (-pa corr. from -pae) and Sch. Apoll.; εφοράς ... ἔπακοιες other MSS. Cf. λ 109, μ 323 'Ἡλίον δε πάντες ἐφόραδ καὶ πάντες ἔπακονει.'

279. Lines 277–8 are on a separate fragment, the position of which in relation to the following one is not certain. The vestiges of the line preceding 280 are not reconcilable with any letters from the middle of l. 279 as given in our texts ἀνθρώπους τίνος ὑποῦ εἰς κ’ ἐπιρκον ὑμάσοδι, but whether the papyrus merely differed from the vulgate in that line or contained it and inserted one or more new lines afterwards cannot be decided. The combination γατα και οι υπενερθε καμοντας is not admissible.

280. μαρτυρες: so Zenodotus and a few MSS.; μάρτυροι Aristarchus and the majority of MSS.

283. κουροι Αχαιων: ποινοπόρωι; most MSS. The line is not infrequently omitted.

284. The MSS. have εἰ δ’ κ’ Ἀλεξανδρον κτεῖνη ξανθὸς Μενελαος. The papyrus reading simply repeats l. 283 with the fewest necessary changes.

Fr. (k).

Γ 295 [οινον δ εκ κ’ ἐρημηροίς α’φυσσαφ’μενοι δεπασσιν]
Γ 296 [ἐκχεον η’δ ηνχοντο θεως αειγενετησιν]
297 [οδε δε τις ειπασκεν Αχαιων τε Τρωών τιε

295. αφυσαιμεν: so Aristarchus, A (second hand) and other MSS.; αφυσαιμενοι
P. Brit. Mus. 126, A (first hand) and others.
296. ημοιοτο: ευχατο MSS. Cf. p. 68.
αιρενειςια: αιρενειςιαν MSS. Cf. B 796.
297. ειπασκεν: the doubtful a might be δ or λ, but there is hardly room for even
a narrow letter such as i between it and σειν. ειπασκεν is uniformly found in the MSS.

Fr. (l). Col. i.

Γ 302 [ως εφαν ευχαλαμεναι μεγα δ εκτυπε μητετα Ζευς
302 a [ες Ιδης βροντων επι δε στεροπην εφεκτα[εν
302 b [θησεμενι γαρ εμελλεν ετ αλγεα τε στοναχας τε
302 c [Τρωας τε και] Δαναοις δια κρατερας υσμουνας
302 d [αυταρ επειρ ο’μοσεσε τε τελεντησεν [τε] τον ορκον
302 [ντοι δε Δαρδανοι δης Πριαμος προσ μυθον εεπι[εν
302 εκκλυτε μεν Τρωες και Δαρδανοι ηδ έπικουροι
302 a [οφρ ειπω] τα με θυμοσ εις στηθεσιν ανωγει[ει
302 [ητοι εγων ειμι προτεν] Ιλιον γημεοσαν
302 [οιν γαρ κεν] πλαιην τον εφ οφθαλμωις ορασαει
302 [μαριμε]νον φιλοιν ιον Αρμιφιλωι Μενελαοι
302 [Ζευς μεν πο]ν τετ[οι] γε οδε και αθανατο θεοι αλλοι
302 [οπποτεροι βα]ραντου τεκλος πεπρωμενον εστιν
302 [ειρανας θετο ισοθεος φως

Col. ii.

325 εισορομιων Παριος δε θως εκ κληρος ορουσεν
326 οι μεν [επειδ’ ιςοτο κατα στιχας ης εκαστον
327 [επιπολοι αερσιποδες και ποικιλα τευχε εκειτο

302. For this the MSS. have δε εφαν ου δ’ αρι πο οτι οτι σεκραιμαν Κρονιων, which
is expanded in the papyrus into five lines. The papyrus version of l. 302 comes from
O 377 δε εφανε ενχυμενοι μεγα δ εκτυπε μητετα Ζεις.
302 a-d. For the restoration ες Ιδης βροντων cf. O 170 τρις δ’ αρι υπ’ ιδαιων δρων κτυπε
μητετα Ζεις and O 75 ατου δ’ ες Ιδης μεγαλ εκτυπε. The supposed τ might be combined
with the supposed tail of the v of ε'χομενος in the line preceding so as to read ήφων, but this arrangement is less satisfactory. επι followed by εφηκεν is awkward, but the reading is almost certain; επι is inadmissible. The next two lines, [θησεμενα γ]αρ ... υ[α]ρμινας, are derived from H 39-40 θήσεων γάρ ἔτε έμελλεν ἐπὶ ἀλέξα κ.τ.λ., where Nauck had conjectured θηςέμενα γάρ έμελλεν ἔτε, which seems to have been found in the papyrus. For the stock line [απαρ επι] ρ ο'μοσεν κ.τ.λ. cf. Ε 280, &c.

303. προσ: μετά MSS.

304. Δαρβανος ηδ [ε]πικουρουν: εἰκενήμεδε 'Αχιοί MSS. For the papyrus reading, which is as appropriate as that of the vulgate, cf. Γ 456, &c. The line which follows, δφρ' ειπ'ω κ.τ.λ., occurs (with -σι κελεύει for -σιν ἄνωντει) in H 68, 349, 369, and Ὃ 6, being omitted in the last two instances by the better MSS. For the variant ἄνωγει cf. Γ 703 θυμος εἶν αὑτήθησαιν ἄναγ'.


310. δφρονον αρ[νατ: the reading is very uncertain. Perhaps the papyrus had a new line here.

325. εισορο[ων: ἄψ ὀρόων MSS. The variant, which makes Hector behave in a very unheroic manner, is probably a mere error.

Frs. (m) and (x).

Γ 337 a [13 letters]την
338 έιετ[το δ' ἀλκιμα] δουρε δυ[ω] κεκουρωμαν Χαλκων
339 ος δ α[ιτως] Μεν[η]λαος Αρης [τευχος ευνεν
339 a άσπιδα κα[ι πηλη]κα φαεινη[ν και δυν δουρε
339 b και καλα[ς κη]μιδας επισφιριοις αραριας
339 c αμφι δ α[ρ ωμοισιν] βαλετο ει[φοσ αργυρηλον

337 a. The remains of this line are inconsistent with l. 337 ἵπουρων δεινον δε λόφος καθ'περθεν ένειν. Perhaps the papyrus elaborated the description of the helmet in one or more new lines.

338. Here the MSS. have ειετο δ' ἀλκιμον ἐχος δ' οι παλάμυθιν ἀρίμη, with an ancient variant άκαμμαν δ' ἀλκίν Χαλκος (cf. Κ 135) attested by Schol. A, and perhaps ειετο δ' ἀλκια, κ.τ.λ. is a new line altogether, l. 338 occurring previously. Zenodotus athetized ll. 334-5 and inserted after 338 αμφι δ' άρ ὠμοιον βαλετ' άσπιδα τερανόςασαν. For κεκουρωμαν Χαλκων cf. Γ 18, Α 43 δουρε δυο κεκουρωμενα Χαλκος.

339. Αρης [τευχος ευνεν: Ἀρηος έστε] ευνεν MSS. For the papyrus reading cf. Ζ 340 'Αρης τεύχεα διό. The three new lines expand the description of Menelaus arming himself. For άσπιδα κα[ι] κ.τ.λ. cf. a 256 ἐχον πηληκα και άσπιδα και δυο δουρε. 339 b και καλα[ς κη]μιδας επισφιριοις αραριας=Σ 459 (cf. Γ 331), and 339 c αμφι δ άρ ω κ.τ.λ. repeats l. 334.
82
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Frs. (γ) and (π).

Γ 351 Zε[ν ανα δος τε]σαθαθ’ι ο με προτερος κακ ευρη
dioν Αλεξανδρον κα[ι] ε[μη]σι υ[πο χεροι δαμασον
352 of[π]ρι τις εργηισι και ο[ψι]γονον [ανθρωπων
353 [ξεινο]δοκ[ο]ν κακα ρεξαι ο τις μιμοτητα παρασχη
354 θη ρα κα[ι] αμπεπαλον προει δ[ο]λιχοσκιον εγχος
355 και β’αλε [Π]ρομιδαο κατ αστιδαι παντοσ ειςν
356 δια με’ν αστιδος ηκα φαεινης [οβριμον εγχος
357 [και δια] θωρηκος πολυδαιδαλου ηρηειστο
358 [α]ντικρυ δε παραι λαπαρην διαμισε χειτωνα
359 [ε]γχος ο δ εκλυθη και αλενατο κηρα μελαιναν
360 Ατρειδης δ αορ οζι ερυσαμενος [παρα μηρου
361 πληζεν επαίξας κ[ορο]νοι φαλ[ων] επιδοαςειν
362 a χαλκεινα δεινον [δε κορυς λακειν αμμι δ αρ αυτη
363 [τ]ριχα τα και τετραξα διατρυφεν εκπεσε χειρος
364 Ατρειδης δ ομωξεν ιδων εις ουρανον ευρν
365 Ζεν πατερ [ου τις σειο δεων ολωσεος αλλος
366 η τε εφαμη’ν τεισασθαι Αλεξανδρον κακοηθητο;
367 διον Αλεξανδρον Ελενης ποσιν ηνκομοιο
368 νυν δε μ’οι εν χειρεσιν αγη ξιφος εκ δε μοι εγχος
369 ηιχ[θη] παλαμηφιν εωσιοιν απδ εβαλον μιν
370 φη και επαιξ’ας κορυθος λαβεν επιδοαςειν
371 ειλκε δ επεξ[γομενος μετ ευκνημιδας Αχαιος
372 ηγχε δε [μιν πολυκεστος ιμας απαλην υπο δειρην

352. This line was athetized by Aristarchus.
354. τις: κεν MSS.
355. φη: η MSS. Cf. l. 369.
357. ηκη: ηλθε MSS. The use of ηκεν in such a context is not Homeric.
361. For this line the MSS. have Ἀτρείδης δε ἐρυσαμένος ξίφος ἀργυρίηλον. The papyrus reading corresponds to Φ 173, with the substitution of Ἀτρείδης for Πηλείδης.
362. επαίξας: ἀνασχορέως MSS. Cf. l. 369. After φάλων the MSS. have ἀμφί δ’ ἀρ’ αὐτῷ (αὐτῷ Aristarchus and αἱ χαριστεραί) which probably came at the end of l. 362 a. For χαλκείη as an epithet of κόρος cf. M 184, Y 398, and for επιδοάσεια Π 369, Δ 459, &c. For δεινον δε κορυς λακεν (suggested by Blass) cf. Δ 420 δεινον δ’ ἐξοράξε χαλκός, and Σ 25 λάκε δε σφι περι χροι χαλκος.
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363. After this line there is a break in the papyrus, and Fr. (u), containing ll. 364-71, does not quite join Fr. (j), but it is improbable that any line is lost in the interval.

366 a. This new line comes from γ 329. Whether the papyrus had Ἀλεξανδρον κακοτητος in l. 366 is very doubtful.

369. ψη: η MSS. Cf. l. 355.
370. εἰκε: so P. Brit. Mus. 126 and Eustathius. ἐκκε MSS.
371. ηγχε: ἦγχε Eust., ἡχε MSS.

Fr. (o).

| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |

Fr. (p).

| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |

Fr. (g).

| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |

Fr. (r).

| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |

Fr. (s).

| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |

Fr. (t).

| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |

Fr. (u).

| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |

Fr. (ω).

| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |

Fr. (x).

| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |
| . . . . . |

Fr. (o) 2. Perhaps [ἡμη'σαυτο δε λα ο] should be restored, as Blass suggests, and this line identified with γ 318 which begins λα ο δε ἡμῆσαυτο. The supposed τ in l. 1 would suit [οπποτες], the first word of l. 317; but after [ἡμη'σαυτο δε λα ο] the papyrus must have continued quite differently from the MSS., which proceed θεωσι δε χειρας ανέσχον δε δε τις εἴσεσκεν Ἀλεξανδρον τε τριών τε.

Fr. (g) 1. Probably στρατον; but the fragment does not suit β 207, 439, or 779. It is from the bottom of a column, as apparently are also Frs. (r), (t) and (ω).

Fr. (u). It is tempting to read ἐκπιστευε in l. 2 with εις in the next line and place this fragment at γ 363-4, but the vestiges of other letters do not suit διαπέφευ and ουρανον.

Fr. (x), from the top of a column, was probably in immediate proximity to Fr. (ω).
20. Homer, Iliad III–V.

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 8 x 4 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. Plate VI (Frs. d, f, h).

Twelve small fragments containing parts of 66 lines from Books iii–v of the Iliad, forming part of the same MS. as P. Grenf. II. 3, a small fragment containing parts of 5 lines with no variants. 20 is much less remarkable than 19 and 21–3 for the presence of additional lines; only one is found (after Δ 69), and this is more than balanced by the omission of Γ 389, Δ 89, where the papyrus exhibits a striking agreement with Zenodotus, and E 527. The total number of lines is thus two less than in the corresponding portions of the vulgate, and, though most of the 71 lines are represented by only a few letters, there are several marked divergences from the ordinary text, e.g. in Γ 388, Δ 57, E 530 and 797. Owing to the rarity of additional lines 20 can hardly be placed in the same class as the other Homeric papyri in this volume (cf. p. 69); but it is clear that it differed widely from the vulgate.

The papyrus was probably written during the reign of Philadelphus.

Fr. (a). Col. i.

Γ 347 [καί βαλεν Ἀτρείδαο κατ' ασπίδα πάντως εἰσε]νή
348 [οὐ δ ἐρρηξέν χαλκὸς ανεγναμφῆ δε οἱ αἰχα]μή
349 [ασπίδ εἰεν κρατερην ο δε δευτερος ωρυντο χαλκ]κωι
350 [Ἀτρείδης Μενελαος επειξαμενος Δι ι πα]τρι
351 [Ζευς ανα δος τισασθαι ο με προτερος κακε]ς εργά

Two lines lost,

354 [ἐλινοδοκον κακα ρεξαι ο κεν φιλοτητα παρασχ]η
355 [η ρα και αμπεπαλον προιε δολιχοσκιον εγχο]χοσ
356 [και βαλε Πρειαμιδαο κατ' ασπίδα πάντως εἰσ]η

354–6. It is not absolutely certain that the ends of these three lines, which were originally on a separate fragment, are to be placed here. But ἦι followed after an interval of one line by η εἷ only suits this passage in Books iii–v. The difficulty lies in l. 355. εγχοχοσ, for the traces of the χ are very faint and the supposed ο is not joined at the top. But as no other letter is more suitable than ο and the surface of this fragment has suffered a good deal εγχοχοσ is probably right.
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Col. ii.

Γ 383 [αυτή δ ανθ Ελενήν καλεούσι ει την δε κιχανε
384 πυργῳ εφ υψηλωι περι δε Τρωαι αλια ησαν
385 χειρι [δε νεκταρευ έκανω ετιναξε λαβουσα
386 γρ[η]ι [δε μιν εικου παλαιγενει προσεειπεν
387 ειροκιμωι η οι Δακεδαιμοι ναιετασην
388 ειρια – — ω μαλιστα δε μιν φιλεςκε
389 δευρι ιδ Αλεξανδρος σε καλει οικον δε νεσεθαι
390 κενιοσ ο γ εν θαλαμωι και δινωτοις λεξεσι
391 καλιει τε στιλβων και ειμασιν ουδε κε φαιης
392 ανδρι μαχησαμενον τον γ ελθειν αλλα χορον δε
393 ερχεισθ ης χοροιο νεοι ληγοντα καθιειν

388. The MSS. have ησκει (or ησκει) ευρια καλα, μαλιστα δε μιν φιλεςκε with τη μιν
εκσαμενη προσεφωνε δι Αφροδιτη in l. 389, which is omitted by the papyrus and is quite
unnecessary since Aphrodite is the subject throughout ll. 380 sqq. If the papyrus had
προσεειπεν in l. 386, it probably had μαλιστα δε μιν φιλεςκε in l. 388, in which case
the beginning of l. 388 may have been ειρια ησκει καλα or ευρια καλ ησκεσκε or ειρι επιεικεν καλα
(cf. σ 316 ευρια Πεικετε), though none of these suggestions is satisfactory. An alternative
to this arrangement is to read ευρια καλ ησκει προσεφωνε δι Αφροδιτη in l. 388 with another word
instead of προσεειπεν at the end of l. 386.

Fr. (b).

Δ 19 [αντις δ Αργεινη Ελενην Μενελαος α]γοι[το
20 [ως εφαθ αι δ επεμυξαν Αθηναιη τε και] Ηρη
21 [πλησται αι γ ησθην κακα δε Τρωσσι μεθεσθην
22 [η τοι Αθηναιη ακεων ην ουδε τι ειπε

22. ειπε: the vestiges do not suit π very well, especially as the space is rather
narrow for this usually broad letter.
Frs. (c), (d), and (i), Col. i.

Plate VI (Fr. d).

\[55\] [ei per garte phonevo te k]ai [o,uk [eiw diasterai]  
\[56\] [ouk anw phoneous] estei \(\eta\) [poluma ferteros esoi]  
\[57\] [alla xre kai emov k]rhnai [pown ouk ateleston?]  
\[58\] [kai gare egw theos eimi] genos de\'e moi evdeis obei\'n soi  
\[59\] [kai me presbuntan] teketo [Kronos] aukulomyp\'etis  
\[60\] [amfoterou ganei te kai ouveka] sth parakoit\'is  
\[61\] [keklymata su de pacei met abanat]oisin anass\'eis

55-6. These lines were athetized by Aristarchus.

57. \(k\)rhnai; or \(\phi\)rui. \(\alpha\)lla xre\'i kai \(\epsilon\)m\'on \(d\)h\'emai \(p\)\(\omega\)n \(\epsilon\)\(\omicron\)k at\(\epsilon\)\(\omicron\)\(s\)\(\tau\)\(o\)n MSS. How the line should be restored is quite uncertain. \(p\)\(\omega\)n \(\epsilon\)\(\omicron\)k at\(\epsilon\)\(\omicron\)\(s\)\(\tau\)\(o\)n may, as Blass observes, come from \(\Delta\) 26 \(\pi\)\(\omega\)s \(\epsilon\)\(\omicron\)\(\upsilon\)\(\epsilon\)\(\omicron\)s \(\epsilon\)\(\omicron\)\(\upsilon\)\(\omicron\) \(\theta\)\(\omicron\)n \(\theta\)\(\omicron\)n \(\epsilon\)\(\omicron\)\(\upsilon\)\(\omicron\) \(\theta\)\(\omicron\)n at\(\epsilon\)\(\omicron\)\(s\)\(\tau\)\(o\)n.

Frs. (c) and (f).

Plate VI (Fr. f).

\[67\] [arxovsi protetroi] \(v\)\(\iota\)\(pe\)r orki\(a\) \(d\)\(e\)\(l\)\(h\)\(s\)\(a\)\(s\)\(\theta\)\(a\)i  
\[68\] [oes efat ou\(\delta\) \(\alpha\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)\(\theta\)\(\iota\)\(s\)\(\epsilon\) \(p\)\(a\)\(t\)\(e\)r \(a\)\(i\)\(d\)\(r\)\(w\)\(n\) \(t\)e \(\theta\)\(e\)\(w\)n \(t\)e  
\[69\] [autik \(A\)\(\theta\)\(n\)\(n\)ai\(\iota\)\(n\) \(e\)\(p\)\(e\)a \(p\)\(\tau\)\(e\)r\(\o\)\(n\)\(t\)a \(p\)\(r\)\(o\)\(s\)\(h\)\(u\)\(d\)a  
\[69\] a [osse \(A\)\(\theta\)\(n\)\(n\)ai\(\iota\) \(k\)\(i\)\(\upsilon\)\(d\)\(e\)\(i\)\(c\)\(\eta\) \(T\)\(r\)i\(t\)\(\iota\)\(g\)\(e\)ne\(i\)a  
\[70\] [aip\(h\)a \(m\)\(a\)l \(e\) \(s\)\(t\)\(r\)a\(\pi\)\(a\)\(\tau\)\(o\)\(n\) \(e\)\(l\)\(b\)e\(i\) \(m\)\(e\)ta \(T\)\(r\)\(w\)\(a\)s \(k\)\(a\)\(i\) \(A\)\(\chi\)\(i\)\(s\)\(o\)\(i\)\(s\)  
\[71\] [pe\(i\)\(r\)an \(d\) \(o\)\(s\) \(k\) \(T\)\(r\)\(w\)\(a\)s \(u\)\(p\)\(e\)r\(k\)\(\nu\)\(d\)\(a\)\(\tau\)\(a\)\(s\) \(A\)\(x\)\(a\)\(i\)\(s\)\(o\)\(i\)\(s\)  
\[72\] [arxovsi protetroi \(u\)\(p\)\(e\)r orki\(a\) \(d\)\(e\)\(l\)\(h\)\(s\)\(a\)\(s\)\(\theta\)\(a\)i\(i\)

69. For \(k\)\(i\)\(\upsilon\)\(d\)\(e\)\(i\)\(c\)\(\eta\) \(T\)\(r\)i\(t\)\(\iota\)\(g\)\(e\)ne\(i\)a cf. \(\Delta\) 515 \(\delta\)\(\omicron\)\(s\)\(\omicron\) \(\Delta\)\(\omicron\) \(\theta\)\(u\)\(n\)\(e\)\(t\)\(e\)r \(k\)\(u\)\(\omicron\)\(s\)\(t\)\(a\)h \(T\)\(r\)i\(t\)\(\iota\)\(g\)\(e\)ne\(i\)a. Considerations of space are against the restoration \(\kappa\)\(r\)\(\omega\)\(s\) \(\theta\)\(u\)\(n\)\(e\)\(t\)\(e\)r \(k\)\(y\)\(n\)\(\omicron\)\(s\)\(t\)\(a\)h, and it is not satisfactory to make Zeus address his daughter as \(\Delta\)\(\omega\)s \(\theta\)\(u\)\(n\)\(e\)\(t\)\(e\)r.

Frs. (g).

\[80\] [\(T\)\(r\)\(w\)\(a\)s \(\theta\)\(e\)] \(\iota\)\(\pi\)\(\omicron\)\(\omicron\)\(a\)\(m\)\(o\)\(s\) \(k\)\(a\)\(i\) \(e\)\(u\)\(n\)\(k\)\(h\)\(m\)\(\iota\)\(d\)\(a\)h\(s\) \(A\)\(x\)\(a\)\(i\)\(s\)\(o\)\(i\)\(s\)  
\[81\] [\(\omega\)\(d\)\(e\) \(d\)] \(t\)\(i\)\(s\) \(e\)\(i\)\(p\)\(e\)\(s\)\(k\)\(e\)\(n\) \(i\)\(d\)\(o\) \(e\) \(p\)\(l\)\(h\)\(s\)\(i\)\(o\) \(a\)\(l\)\(l\)\(o\)\(n\)  
\[82\] [\(\eta\) \(\rho\) \(a\)\(u\)\(t\)\(i\)s\] \(p\)\(o\)\(l\)\(e\)\(m\)\(o\)\(s\) \(t\)e \(k\)\(a\)\(k\)\(o\)\(s\) \(k\)\(a\)\(i\) \(f\)\(i\)\(l\)\(o\)\(p\)\(i\)\(s\) \(a\)\(i\)\(n\)  
\[83\] [e\(s\)\(e\)\(t\)\(a\)i \(\eta\)] \(f\)\(i\)\(\lambda\)\(\eta\)\(t\)\(a\) \(m\)\(e\) \(a\)\(m\)\(f\)\(o\)\(t\)\(e\)\(r\)\(o\)\(i\)\(s\) \(t\)\(i\)\(h\)\(\eta\)\(s\)
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Fr. (k).

Plate VI.

Δ 86 [η δ ανδρι ικελη Τρωων κατεδυσεθ ομι[λον
87 [Λαοδοκων Αντινοριδη]ν κρατερωι αιχμητης
88 [Πανθαρων αυτων διςηιες ηυρε δ[ε] ι[ονδε
90 [εσταοι αμφι δε μιν κρατεραι στιχες ασπιωταιων
91 [λαοι οι οι εποντο απ Αισιη]τιοι ροαων

88. ηυρε δ[ε] ι[ονδε': so Zenodotus, omitting l. 89 like the papyrus; ει ουν εφευρε | εύρη
 Ανκιώνοι υιον ἀμημονι τε κρατερόν τε (= E 168–9) Aristarchus, P. Brit. Mus. 126, MSS.

Frs. (i), Col. ii, and (k).

Δ 98 [αι κεν ιδη Μενελαον Δρη[ιον Δτρεως υιον
99 σοι βελει δμη[θε]ντα πυρ[ης επιβαιντ αλεγεινης
100 α[λα αγ οιστ]ευσον Μενε[λαον κυδαλιμοο
101 εψε ι[απο]λλωι λυ[κηγενει κυτωτοζοι
102 α[ρμων πρωτογονων ρε[ξειν κλειτην εκατομβην

Fr. (l) = P. Grenf. II. 3.

Δ 109 [του κερα] εκ κεφαλης εκκαι δεκαδωρα πεφυκε
110 [και τα μ]εν ασκισας κεραοδοσ [ηραρε τεκτων
111 [παν δ ευ λ]ειη[νας χρι]σεην ε[πεθηκε κορωνην
112 [και το μεν εν κατεθηκε] ταυτο[σαμενοι ποτι γαιη]
113 [αγκλινας προσθεν δε σα]κεα σχε[θον εσθλοι εταιροι

Fr. (m).

Ε 525 [σαξρεων ανεμων οι τε νεφεα σκιων]τα
526 [πνοησιν λιγυρησι διασκιδυσιν αε[ν]τες
528 [Ατρειδης δ αν ομιλον εφοιτα πολλα κελευ[ζων
529 [ω φιλοι ανέφες εστε και αλκιμον ητορ ελε[σθε
530 [αληλους τ αιδεσθε κεδασθεισης (?) υσμι]ς
531 [αιδομενων ανδρων πλεονεσ σοι ηε πεφαιωται
532 [φευγοντων δ ουτ αρ κλεος ορνυται ουτε σε [αλκη

526. After this line the MSS. have ως Δωροι τρώας μενον ἐμπεδον οὐδὲ φέβουστο, which is not necessary and may have come from o 622.


Fr. (n).

Ε 796 [ιδροσ γαρ μιν ετειρεν υπο πλατεος τελαμωνος
797 [ασπιδος αμφιβροτης 
798 [αν δ ισχων τελα]μων]α [κελαινεφεσ αιμ απορογουν
799 [ιππειου δε θεα ζηνοι ηη]σατο φωνησεν τε
800 [η ολιγον οι παιδα εοικοτα γεινατο Τυδευς
801 [Τυδευς τοι μικρος με]ν εη[ν] δεμας αλλα μαχητης
802 [και ρ οτε περ μιν] εγω [πολεμιζειν ουκ ειακον
803 [ουδ εκπαιφασειν] οτε τ ηλυθε νοσφιν Αχαιων

797. αμφιβροτης: εικύκλον MSS.; εικύκλον η ἀμφιβροτης Eustathius. ασπιδος ἀμφιβροτης occurs in B 389, M 402, and Y 281.

21. Homer, Iliad VIII.

Mummy A. Height 22.7 cm. Circa B.C. 290-260. Plate VI (Frts. and m).

A single fragment of this MS. also (cf. 20) was published in P. Grenf. II. 2, and was remarkable for several new lines. We are now able to add a number of other pieces, all from the earlier part of the book, and one of them actually joining the fragment which appeared in 1897 (cf. note on l. 216 α). That fragment proves to have been a very fair sample of the MS., for the newly recovered pieces differ widely from the accepted text, which is frequently expanded. As many as 21 new lines are inserted at intervals between l. 52 and l. 66, one of the additions consisting of 9 verses. This extraordinary rate of augmentation is not maintained, but it remains high throughout. The average
for the surviving fragments is about one new line in every four verses; for indications concerning some of the lost columns see note on l. 180. There are also a certain number of otherwise unrecorded variants, some of which are unobjectionable in themselves, though none is a definite improvement, unless ὅτιντο in l. 58 may be so considered. The scribe as usual makes occasional mistakes; he wrote a small and rather curious sloping uncial hand, in which the archaic Ω is conspicuous. A specimen is given in Plate VI, in addition to the piece figured on the frontispiece of P. Grenf. II. We should assign the papyrus to the earlier part of the reign of Philadelphus.

Fr. (a).

Θ 17 [γνωστ ἐπείδ οὖσαν εἰμὶ θεῷ ὁ καρπιστὸς} ἀπαντῶν
18 [εἰ δ' αγὼ πειρήσασθε θεοί] πασαί τε θεαναι
19 [σειρὴν χρυσείην εἰς οὐρανόθεν] κρεμασάντες
20 [παντες δ' ἐξαπτώσθε θεοί] πασαί τε θεαναι
21 [αλλ' οὐκ ἂν ερωσαίτ] εἰς οὐρανόθεν πεδίον δὲ
22 [Ζήνα ὑπατον μηστορα] οὐδ [εἰ μαλα πολλα καμοιτε

Fr. (b).

24 [αντὴν κεν γαῖῃ ερωσαιμ αντῇ] τε θαλασση (Col. ii)
25 [σειρὴν μεν κεν επείτα περὶ προν Οὐ]λυμπ[οιο
26 [δησαίμην τα δὲ κ αντε μετηρα] παντ[α γενοιτο
27 [19 letters] ανθρωπ]ον τε [θεων τε
28 [ως εφαθ οί δ' ἄρα παντες ακην εγε]ριτ[ο σιωπη

Fr. (c).

29 [μυθον αγασαμενοι μαλα γαρ κρατερ[ως] αγορευσεν
30 [οψε δ' δη μετεειπε θεα γλαυκωπ]ις Αθηνη
31 [ω πατερ ημετερ Κρονιδη υπατ[ε κρειοντων
32 [ευ νυ και ημεις ιδιεν] τοι σθενος ο'υ[κ] επιεικτον
Frs. (d), (c), (f), and (g).  

Col. i.

38 [ος φάτο μειδῆσεν δὲ παρατηρήσει αυτής ρως τη θεων τε] (Col. iii)
38a [χειρὶ τε μν ἔκει θῃς κατεργάζου ἐπος θετεκ τέ [ου]ομαι[χε]
39 [θαρσεὶ Τριτόγενεια φιλον τεκος ων μν τι] θημι[ω]
40 [προφροι μυθομα]ι εβελω δε του ηπιος ει'ναι
41 [ος εισον υποκεφαὶ τετυφηκε]το χαλκί]σοπο δ [ιπω
42 [ωκυπτα] κρυσεαισιν θε[ιρησ]ιν κομ[ω]οιτε
43 [χρυσαν δ ου]τοις εδύνε περι [χροι γεν]το δ [ι]μασθη
44 [χρυσειν εῦνουκτον εου δ] [επεβησετο διφρων
45 [μαστιγεν δ ε'λααν τω δ ου[κ] αεκουτε πε]πασθὴν
47 [Ἰδην δε ικανε]μονυπιθ[ακα μητερα Γ]ηρων
49 [ενθ ιππους εστιςε Κρονον παις αγκυλομητεω
50 [λυσας εξ οχεων κατα δ] [ηρα πουλιν ε]χευν
51 [αυτος δ εν κορυφηςι καθεκετο κυδει γαιων]
52 [εισοροσων Τρωων τε πολιν και της Αχαιων]

4 lines lost.

53 [οι δ αρα δειπνων ελοντο καρη κομωντες Αχαιω]
54 [ριμβα κατα κλισιας απο δ αυτου θωρηςουν]το
54a [28 letters]
54b [16 letters]
54c [ομαται και κεφαλην ικελοι Δι τερ]πικεραινου
54d [Αρει δε] [ξωνυν ςτερον δε Ποσειδων]ν
55 Τρωες δ [αυθ]ετερωθεν ανα πτολιν ωπλι[ξο]ντο
55a Εκτορα τ [αμβι] μεγαν και αμμονια Πο[λ]λυνδαμαντα
55b [Αυειαν θ]ας Τρωωτ θεος ως τιετο δημω
55c τρεις τ Α[ντινοριδας Πολυβον και Αγνωρα διο

Frs. (d), (c), and (h).  

Col. ii.

55d [η]θεον τε Ακαλμαντ επεικελου αδανοτοισιν (Col. iv)
56 παρατεροι μερισαν δε και ως νυσιν μαχεσθαι
57 χρημι αναγκα[η]ι προ τε παιδων και προ γυναι[ων]
58 πασαὶ δὲ ωιγοντο πυλαι εκ δ εσυντο λαος
59 πεξίθε θ επιπήδες τε πολυς δ ωρμαγδος ωραρει
60 οι δ οτε [δη] ρ ε[ς] χορον ενα εξυποντες ικοντο
61 συρ ρ εβαλον ρινους συν δ εγχεα και μενε ανδρων
62 χαλκεοθορηκων αταρ ασπιδες ομφαλοεσσαι
63 επιληντι αλληλησι πολυς δ ωρμαγδος ωραρει
64 ενθα δ [αμ] οιμωγη τε και ευχωλη πελεν ανδρων
65 ολλυντων τε και ολλυμενων ρεε δ αιματι γαια
65a εν δ Ερις [εν] δ Κυδοιμος ομιλεον εν δ ολοη Κηρ
65b αλλον ζω[ον] εχιουσα νευτατον αλλον αουτον
65c αλλον τε[θ]υηστα κατα μοθων ελκε ποδωιν
65d' ν. [.]?

4 (?) lines lost

65 ε... []
66 οφρα [μεν ην] [ους] [και αεξετο ερον ημαρ
67 τοφρα μαλ αμφωτερων βελε ηπτετο πιπτε δε λαος
68 ημος δ [ης]ιος μεσον ουρανον αμφιβεβηκε
69 και τοτε δη χρυσεια πατηρ εσταινε ταλαντα
70 εν δ ετιθει δυο [κηρε ταυηλεγος θανατοι]
71 [Τρω]ων θ [πι] ποδαμον και Αχαιων χαλκοχιτωνων
72 [ελκε δε μεσα] [λα]βων ρεποδε αιςημον ημαρ Αχαιων
73 [αι μεν Αχαιων [κηρε] επι χθονι πουλυβοτειρη

Fr. (i).

180 [αλ]λ οτε κεν δη νησιν επι γλαφυρη[σ]ι γενωμαι [θ]
181 [μημοσυνη τις επειτα πυρος δηιοι] γενεσω
182 [ως πυρι νησις ευπρησω κτεινω δε και αυτον[ς]
183 [Αργειους παρα νησιων ατυχομενος] υπο καπνου
184 [ως ειπων ιπποις εκεκλετο φαιδιμος] Εκτωρ

Fr. (k).

187 [Ανδρομαχη θυγατηρ μεγαλητορος Η[ετιων]ος
188 [ὑμιν γαρ προτεροσὶ μελι[φ]ρ'ονα πυρο[ν] εθηκεν
189 [οινον τε εγκερασασα πιειν στε] δυμο[ς ανωγοι
190 [η εμοι ος περ οι θαλερος ποσις] ευχομα'ι ειναι

Fr. (l).
203 [οι δε σοι εις Ελικ[ηη] τε και Διγας δωρ αναγουσι
204 πολλα τε και χαριεντα συ δε σφισι βούλεο νικην
204 α [. . . . . .] και μμ
205 [ει περ γαρ κ εθε]λοιμεν σοι Δαναοισιν αρωγοι
206 [Τ]ρωας απ'ωσασθαι και ερυκμεν ευρυπα Ζην
206 α [. . ]μμ

Fr. (m) with P. Grenf. II. 2. Col. i.
216 α [ενθα κε λοιγοσ εην και αμηχαν]α εργ εγ[ε]νοτο
217 [και νυ κ ενεπρηςεν πυρι κηλεω ν]ης Αχ[αι]ων
218 [ει μη επι φρεσι θηκ Αγαμεμνον]ι ποπ[ι]α Ηρη
219 [αντω ποιπνυσαντι θωο]ς στρυνα εταιρους
220 [βη δ ιειαι παρα τε κλιςιας και νης εις]ας
221 [πορφυρεον μεγα φαρος ε]χων εγ χ[ε]πι π'αχειη

Col. ii.
249 παρ δε Διος βωμοι περικαλλει καββαλε νεβρον
250 ενθα πανομφαου Ζην ρεζ'εσκον Αχαιοι
251 οι δ ως ουν ειδοντο Διος τερας [αιγιοχαιο
252 μαλλον ετπ Τρωεσι θορομ μι'ησαντο δε χαρμην
252 α Ζευς δε πατηρ οτρυνε φιαλαγγας κυδει γαιων?
252 η ειςαν δε Τρωες τυτθον δα[ι
253 ενθ ου τις [προτερος Δαυαων πολλων περ εουτων

Plate VI.
(Col. x)
Plate VI.
(Col. xi)
21. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Fr. (n).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
255 a? [21 \text{ letters}]. \text{kev[} \\
256 \text{[all\ alpha p\ om\ pro\ to\ s T\ ro\ w\ \ e\ l\ e\ i\ n\ a\ n\ d\ br\ a\ k\ or\ u\ st\ n]} \\
257 \text{[\phi\ r\ a\ d\ m\ o\ n\ i\ d\ n\ \ A\ g\ e\ la\ o\ n\ \ o\ m\ e\ i\ m\ f\ i\ n\ g\ a\ i\ d\ e\ t\ r\ a\ p\ e\ n\ i\ p\ p\ o\ u\ s]} \\
258 \text{[t\ o\ i\ d\ e\ m\ e\ t\ a\ s\ t\ r\ e\ f\ b\ e\ n\ t\ i\ m\ e\ t\ a\ f\ r\ e\ n\ i\ o\ w\ i\ e\ n\ d\ o\ r\ u\ p\ i\ s\ e\ n]} \\
\end{array}
\]

Fr. (o).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{e\ n\ o\ l\ e\ r\ o\ p}[ \\
\text{e\ u\ s\ t\ o\ n}[ \\
\text{e}[ \\
\text{t}[ \\
\end{array}
\]

18. The line should end \textit{\emph{\textit{\na e\ i\ d\ e\ t\ e\ pa\ n\ t\ e\ s}, in place of which the papyrus evidently repeats \textit{\textit{\textit{\pi\ o\ s\ a\ t\ e\ \ b\ e\ a\ n\ o\ i\ f\ t\ l\ o\ m\ o\ a}}\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{from} l. 20. This is no doubt to be regarded as a mere blunder.}}}}}}}}}

22. Even if the final \textit{\emph{\textit{\alpha}} of \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\nu\ p\ r\ a\ t\ o\ s T\ r\ o\ w\ o\ w\ \ e\ l\ e\ i\ n\ a\ n\ d\ br\ a\ k\ or\ u\ st\ n}}} be left unelided (cf. e.g. l. 58), the supplement at the beginning of this line is shorter by two or three letters than in the foregoing verses. The difference, however, is not sufficiently marked to necessitate the inference that there was a variant here. Plutarch, \textit{\textit{De Is. et Os.}} 371 B, has \textit{\textit{\kappa\ a\ i\ m\ u\ s\ t\ o\ r\ o\ p}}, which is unmetrical. In a quotation in Arist. \textit{\textit{p\ e\ r\ i \ \z\ i\ f\ o\ w\ \ k\ i\ n\ v.}} 4, p. 699 B 35 l. 20 is placed after l. 22.

25-6. These lines were athetized by Zenodotus.

27. The ordinary version of this line is \textit{\textit{\tau\ o\ s\ o\ n \ \e\ g\ o\ p\ e\ r\ i\ t\ \e\ i\ m\ \i\ o\ w\ p\ e\ r\ i\ t\ \e\ i\ m\ \i\ o\ w\ o\ p\ r\ o\ s\ o\ w}}; but in the papyrus the letter after \textit{\textit{\mu}} is clearly \textit{\textit{\tau}} not \textit{\textit{\pi}}, and, moreover, \textit{\textit{\tau\ o\ s\ o\ n \ \o\ w}} would not fill the lacuna, which is of the same length as in the preceding lines. The verse therefore probably ended with \textit{\textit{\a\ n\ d\ r\ o\ p\ o\ s\ o\ w \ \o\ w \ \p\ e\ r\ i\ t\ \e\ i\ m\ \i\ o\ w}} was replaced by some synonymous phrase, e.g. \textit{\textit{\tau\ o\ s\ o\ n \ \e\ m\ o\ k\ r\ e\ i\ s\ s\ o\ w \ \o\ w}}; cf. \textit{\textit{\Phi 190 \tau\ o\ k\ r\ e\ i\ s\ s\ o\ w \ \o\ w \ \z\ e\ s\ i\ s.}}


30. The \textit{\textit{\nu}} of \textit{\textit{\a\ b\ h\ i\ f}} has been corrected; the scribe apparently began to write a \textit{\textit{\tau}}.

38-9. The vulgate here has \textit{\textit{\tau\ i\ m \ \e\ p\ m\ i\ e\ d\ \h\ o\ s\ a\ s \ \p\ m\ o\ r\ a\ t\ e\ \h\ e\ f\ e\ l\ r\ e\ t\ a \ \z\ e\ s\ i\ s \ \h\ a\ r\ o\ s \ \z\ i\ l\ a}}. In the papyrus l. 38 apparently \textit{\textit{\e\ 426, O 47}}, and it is followed by the verse found also in A 361, E 372, Z 485, O 127. These two verses are not combined elsewhere in Homer. The margin is lost above both l. 38 and the corresponding l. 55 \textit{\textit{\d}}, but if, as is practically certain, l. 55 \textit{\textit{\d}} directly succeeded l. 55 \textit{\textit{\e}}, ll. 38 and 55 \textit{\textit{\d}} were the first of their respective columns. This conclusion, however, produces a complication with regard to the first column of the roll, which if it agreed with the ordinary text would have contained 37 lines, or 7 more than the column following it. Col. ii of Frs. (d)-(h) also apparently contained 30 lines, l. 73 being opposite l. 55 \textit{\textit{\a}}; and though a certain variation is admissible, this will hardly account for a difference of 7 verses. Perhaps, therefore, there was an omission of three or four lines; or ll. 1-37 of the book may have been divided between two columns of which the first was a very short one, and the second contained several new lines, though none occur in what remains of it; or, again, the roll may have originally included Book vii. At the
end of l. 38, near the bottom of the final ε, is a short diagonal stroke, which may be accidental.

39. The supposed θ of θυμιω has perhaps been corrected. The vestiges remaining of the ends of this and the next line are very slight.

41. l. πτωκετο, cf. Ar. ibid., as is normal.

42. χρυσαίιον: χρυσαίιον vulg., attr. Lesbian

43. πετασθην: this form is not found elsewhere, the aorist being always of the syncopated type ἔπταμεν &c. πετασθην MSS.

44. The ρ of θυμων is not very satisfactory, but as the ρ is nearly certain, and the traces of the other letters suit well enough, we hesitate to suppose a variation from the accepted text here. Similarly with regard to τεμένος in l. 48, the vestiges hardly suggest με, but they are too slight to be conclusive.

49. According to the ordinary version this line ends πατηρ ἄνδρον τε θεόν τε, in place of which the papyrus gives the synonymous stock phrase Κρωνος παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεος (Δ 75 &c.); cf. ll. 38–9.

52. There is a break in the papyrus below l. 50, and one line at least is lost between l. 50 and the vestiges which we have attributed to Λαμιων in l. 52. Between these vestiges and l. 53 there were four more lines, as is shown by the height of the margin. It is thus necessary to suppose the insertion of at least 4 new lines at some point between ll. 50 and 53. If Λαμιων is right, they occurred between ll. 52 and 53; but that reading is quite uncertain, and they may equally well have been inserted e.g. between ll. 50 and 51. Their source is in any case obscure, for the passage would admit of many forms of expansion; perhaps one of the additional lines was οι, which was added before l. 53 by Zenodotus. It is possible that the loss between ll. 50 and 52 (?) is larger than we have supposed. But the column is already rather tall, and it is safer not to assume the insertion between ll. 50 and 53 to be longer than necessary. The corresponding passage in Col. ii gives no assistance, for the break there occurs in the middle of a series of additional lines, the precise number of which is uncertain; cf. note on ll. 65 a sqq.

54 a–d. 54 b μετὰ δὲ... 54 d correspond to B 477–9. These lines are preceded in B (476–7) by ὡς τῶν ἑτερῶν ἑκάστου ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα ἑτερον δ’ ἐνα, and it is of course possible that ἑτερον δ’ ἐνα stood at the beginning of l. 54 b; but ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα cannot be read at the end of l. 54 a, nor would the commencement of B 476 be suitable to the present passage without some alteration. The connecting link between ll. 54 and 54 b must therefore be sought elsewhere. Unfortunately the remains of l. 54 a offer a very slender clue; the final letter is possibly ν. 55. ὀπλαῖοντο: so most MSS.; ὀπλ Aristarchus.

56. a–d = Λ 57–60, where the beginning of the preceding line τρῶν δ’ άλλ’ ἐτεροθεν ἐπὶ θρωμορφ πεδίων coincides with that of l. 55 in this book. There is not much doubt about the identity of l. 55 d, although none of the letters except the τ is perfect; cf. note on ll. 38–9.

57. χρη: χρειά most MSS., but there is considerable authority for χρεία, for which χρη would be an easy clerical error. χρη, however, is itself defensible, since χρη is attested by Hesychius as an Ionic form of χρεία.

58. ὀργεντο: ώργεντο MSS., but ω(τ)ργντο is preferable as the older form; cf. the Lesbian infin. ὀργντρ.

61. The first ρ, if it be ρ, has been corrected; σνω cannot be read. Such an attraction of ν to ρ, though natural, is unusual.

65 a sqq. The identification of ll. 65 a–c, which are found in Σ 535–7 (cf. Hesiod, Scat., 156–8), is due to Blass. The scanty remains of ll. 65 d do not suit Σ 538, nor would that verse be likely to appear in the present passage. The extent of the lacuna between
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ll. 65 d and i depends on that at the corresponding point in Col. i between l. 50 and the supposed vestiges of l. 52. If only one line is there lost, not more than 4 lines are missing here, but the lacuna may be larger in both cases; cf. note on l. 52.

73. This line and 74 were athetized by Aristarchus. There would be room for two more lines in this column, l. 73 being opposite l. 55 a.

180. This line is to all appearances the first of a column. Since the last line of the preceding column was probably l. 75 (cf. the previous note), there are 104 lines to be accounted for in the uncertain number of columns intervening between Frs. (d)-(b) and (i). If the average length of a column is taken as 30 lines (cf. note on ll. 38-9), three columns would contain 90 lines, four columns 120. That the papyrus version was shorter than the vulgate is highly improbable, its tendency being decidedly in the opposite direction. There were therefore four columns between ll. 75 and 180, containing additions which amounted to approximately 16 lines. Similarly there must have been an addition of about 7 lines between l. 184 and l. 203, which is again the top of a column.

183. The majority of the MSS. omit this line, which is printed in small type by Ludwich.

184. φωλίους| Εκτώρ: φωλίους τε MSS., a variant μακρὸν άulos being recorded by U.

The new reading of the papyrus is in itself as good as either of these.

189. This line was rejected by Aristophanes and Aristarchus; cf. l. 73, note.

203. This line is the first of a column; cf. note on l. 180.

δὲ σαι: δέ τοι (δέ τι, δ' ἐτι, δὲ τ') MSS.

204. All that remains of the κ of και is the vertical stroke, which could be read as an i; but the second half of the κ may be supposed to have disappeared, as the papyrus is evidently rubbed.

204 a. Another new line, of which the remains are hardly sufficient for identification. There may, of course, have also been a variation in the termination of l. 204.

206 a. The vestiges of this line are inconsistent with l. 207 αὕτω κ' ἐνθ' ἀκὶχατο καβήθενος οἰος εὖ τὸν. The doubtful μ is possibly an α, in which case κ or ρ might be read in place of i.

216 a sqq. The discovery of a new fragment which joins on to the first column of the piece published in 1897 in P. Grenf. II. 2 confirms the restoration there proposed. For the line ἐνθα κε κ.τ.λ. which precedes l. 217 cf. Θ 130 and Λ 310, where it occurs in a precisely similar context, ἐρχα γένοντο is the common reading, but ἐγένοντο, as in the papyrus, is found in two MSS. at the latter passage.

217. νησις Λχιοΐων: if ἐντσπηργεων was written in l. 217 νησις is a mistake for νησις as in l. 220; but it is possible, as Blass suggests, that ἐντσπηργεων was substituted. εἰσας vulg. for Λχιοΐων, with Λχιοίων at the end of l. 220. The papyrus transposes the epithets.

219. l. οὐρων, οὔτηρος: Λχιοίων MSS.

220. νησις εἰσα[ς: cf. note on l. 217. εἰσας is found also in Vrat. b.

245. εἰσαστο κ.τ.λ.: cf. Ε ὦ 741-2 Λοργείη κεφαλή . . . Δίος τέρας αἰγ. The ordinary reading is ἐδοθ' ὅ τ' ἀρ' ἐκ Δίως ἡμεθέν ὦρις.

252 a-b. These two lines are not found elsewhere in Homer. The supplement in 252 a is that proposed by Ludwich, Homervulgata, p. 58; for φάλαγγας cf. Λ 254 and Ν 90, where the word follows ὄτρυμε. But the verse may be completed in various other ways, e.g. φ' ὄσον ἤτοισαν ἐνάρχας, as suggested by van Leeuwen. In l. 252 b the papyrus has ἐισαν, not εἰσαω as printed in P. Grenf. II. 2. ἐισαω . . . τυτθῶν, however, makes a very unsatisfactory combination, and εισαβ may well be a mistake for εἰσαν. In that case the line may be completed Δαλνατος ὀπισσα (Ludwich) or Δαλνατος απο ταφρον (van Leeuwen).

256. εἰλῦρ αὖ δρα: or perhaps αὖ ἄρα κ' ἐφονταπν, though this does not suit the spacing so well. The remains of the previous line do not agree at all with l. 255 in the vulgate, τάφρον τ' εξελάσας καὶ ἐναρτίζον μαχήσαται.
Fr. (e). This fragment from the bottom of a column remains unidentified. ἀλέθρος, which is the only certain word, is found nowhere in the eighth book; either ἵππ or ἴππ may precede. In the second line either ἱεροντος or ἱεροντον may be read. The first letter is very indistinct, but does not seem to be σ.

22. Homer, Iliad X.XI—X.XIII.

Mummy A. Fr. (e) 13.3 × 11 cm. Circa n.c. 280—240.

This series of fragments of the Iliad, Books xxi—xxiii, as in the case of 20-1, belongs to a MS. of which other pieces have previously been published in P. Grenf. II. (no. 4)1. In all there are parts of about 190 lines, a number which affords a sufficiently accurate estimate of the general character of the text. New verses appear sporadically, though never more than two are found together, and the proportion of them—at least 11 lines, perhaps 9 or 10 more, out of the 190, or about 1 in 13 probably—is much smaller than in 21. Other variations from the accepted text are not infrequent, the more remarkable being those at Φ 426, X 102, 110, 393, 442, 462, Ψ 129. Cf. introd. to 19.

The three books were written in the same hand, an upright rather large uncial, of which facsimiles are given in P. Grenf. II, Plates II and III, and which is probably of the reign of Philadelphus. The scribe was somewhat careless, and is guilty of several obvious slips. A correction by a second hand occurs in at least one passage (Ψ 129).

Frs. (a) and (b). Book xxi.

Φ 421 καὶ [δη ανθ η κυνμανια αγει βροτολοιγον Αρηα
422 δηιον εκ ποιλεμοι κατα κλονον αλλα μεταλθε
423 ος φατ Α[θην]αιη δε μετεσσουτο χαιρε δε θυμω
424 και ρα [. . .] ὀσαμενη προσ στηθα χερι παχεινη
425 ηλασε της δ αυτου λυτο γωνιατα και φιλον ητορ
426 τω μεν αρ αμφω θεινε ποτι χοοιν πουλβοτειρη
427 [η δε αρ] επευχομενη επιεα πτεροειν αγορευε
428 τοιοτοι ηνν πιαντει οσοι Τροιεσσιν αρωγοι

1 There are also a few small pieces at Heidelberg; cf. footnote on p. 5.
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429 [eiεν οτ Ἀργειοις μακ]χοιατο κυδα[λιμοισιν]
430 [οδε τε θαρσαλει] και πλημονες [ως Αφροδιτη]

Φ 422. There are horizontal marks like paragraphi below this line and 424, but there is other superfluous ink on this fragment, and a paragraphus below l. 424 would be out of place. Moreover, there are no other cases of its use in this MS.

424. και ρ' ἐπιεισαμεν ΜSS., but this is certainly not to be read in the papyrus. The supposed σ before σαμεν cannot be correct, and was perhaps deleted; or it might be explained as a blotted σ, which would be more intelligible. Possibly επιεισαμεν was written and the first σ afterwards cancelled; επιμασαμεν is unsuitable. There are ink marks above the line here, but they are more probably to be regarded as accidental than as an interlinear correction; cf. note on l. 422.

426. θεων ποτι: κειται επι MSS., though some read ποτι for επι. For θεωε (sc. Ἀθηναίη) cf. 1 459 θεωμένου πρὸς οἴδηει.

429. κυδαλιμοισιν: θαρητήσιν ορ θαρητοίσιν MSS.

Frs. (c) and (d').

Book xxii.

Col. i.

X ? [ ] . . . . . . . . .
? [ ] . . . . . [. . . . . . .]
77 ἡ ρ ο γερων πολιας δ αρ ανα τριχας ελκετο χεραν

Col. ii.

X 96 [ως Εκτωρ ασβεστο]ν εχ[ων μενος ουχ υπεξωρει
97 [πυργο]ι επι προυχοντι φαεινην ασπιδ ερειας
98 [ο]χθησας δ αρα ειπε πρ[ο]σ ον μεγαλητορα θυμον
99 ομοι εγων η με[ν] κε πυλας και τειχεα διω
99 α λωβητος κεν ιο[ιμι?
100 Πουλυδαμας μοι πρωτος ελεγχειν αναβησει
101 ος μ εκελευεν Τρ[ωια]ν ποτι πτολιν ηγησασθαι
102 νυκτα ποτι δνοφ[ερην οτε τ ωρετο διος Αχιλλευ
103 αλλ εγω ον πιθομην η τ αν πολιν κερδιον ηεν
104 νυν δ επει ωλεσα λαον[ν ατασθαλησιν εμψισιν
105 [α]δεομαι Τρωιας κα[ι] Τ[ρωιαδ]ας ελκεσιπεπλουν

II
106 μ[η] ποτε τις εἰπήσει κακῶς [ερός αλλὸς εμείς]
108 [ερεοσιν ε]μοι δε . . . δ [αυ πολυ κερδιον η]υ
109 [αυτὴν η] Α[χ]ιλη[ς] [κατακτειναντα νεεσθαι]
110 η [αυ]των π[ρο πολ]ης ευκλειως απολεσθαι
112 [και κορ]βαθα βρασιμ δ[ορ]ε δ[ρο]ς τειχος ερεισας

Col. iii.

X 137 ανθι μενειν ὁπιστ' δε πυλας λιπε βη δε φοβηθεις
138 Πηλειθ[ης] δ̲ επορου[σε] ποσι κρατινουσι πεποθως
139 νυτε κερκος ορεσφιν [ελαφροτατος πετενων
140 καρπαλμ[ιως] ὁρμη[σε] μετα τρηρωνα πελειαν
141 η δε τταπ[θα] φοβε[ται] ο δ̲ εγγυθεν ουν λεηκως
142 ταρ[φε]α επαισσει ν[]
143 [ως αρ τα γ εμμ]αωνς ιδους πετετο τρεβε δ̲ Εκτωρ

Fr. (e).

X 197 [τουσακι μιν προπαροθεν αποστρ]ψασκεν Α[χ]ιλλει[ε]νς
198 [προσ πεδιον αυτος δε ποτι πτολιος πετετ α']ει

Fr. (f).

X 232? η[υ] δ̲ αυτε πρισεεπε μεγας κορυθαιολος Εκτωρ
233? Δηιφοβ [η μεν μοι το παρος πολυ φιλτατος ησθα

Fr. (g).

X 247 [ως φαμειν και κερδοσυνη ηγησα]τ̲ Α[θ]η[η]
248 [οι δ̲ οτε δη σχεδον ησαν επ̲ αλλη]λοισιν ιοντες
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249 [τον προτερος προσεειπε μεγας κορυφαιολος Εκτωρ
250 [ου σ ετι Πηλεος υε φοβησομαι ως το] παρος περ
251 [τρις περι αστυ μεγα Πριαμου διες ουδε ποτ ετλησ
252 [μειναι επερχομενον γνω αυτε με] θυμος ανωγει
253 [στημεναι αντια σειο ελοιμι κεν η κεν αλ]οιησ
254 [αλλ αγε δευρο θεους επιδωμεθα τοι] γαρ αριστ[οι
255 [μαρτυροι εσσονται και επισκοποι] ερμοι[ιαων
256 [ου γαρ εγω σ εκπαγλον αεικιω αι κε]υ εμοι Ζ[ευ]s

Fr. (l).

X 326 τη ρα ετι [οι μεμαωτ ελασ εγχει διος Αχιλλεινς
327 [αντικρυ δ απαλβαι ι δι ανχενος ηλυθ ακοκη
328 [ουδ αρ απ ας]φι[αραγον μελη ταμε χαλκοβαρεια

Fr. (i).

Col. i.

X 392 α [και τ]εθνοτα περ τοσα γαρ κακ εμη[σατ] Αχαιους
393 [· · · · · ·]ν μεγα κυδος επεφομεν Εκ[τ]ορα διον

Col. ii.

426 Εκτορος ως οφελεν θανειν εν χερσιν εμηισι

Fr. (j).

X 441 [διπ]ακα πορφυρεν εν δε θρονα ποικιλ επασσε
442 [αι]ψα δ αρ αμφι[πολοις εκεκλετ ευπλοκαμοις
443 [αμφι π]υρι στη[σαι τριποδα μεγαν οφρα πελοιτο
444 [Εκτωρ]ι θερμα λοετρα μαχης εκ νοσησαντι
445 [νη]πινη ουδ ενοι[σεν α] ω μιν μαλα τηλε λοετρων
446 [χερσ] σατ Α[χιλ]ηος δαμασε γλανκωτις Αθηνη
447 [κοκυτο]γιδ ηηκουσε και οιμωγην απο πυργου
448 [της δ ελ]ειξθη γυιηα χαμαι δε οι εκπε[σε κερκις

11 2
X 458 [η μιν εχεσκ επει ου ποτ ενι πληθυν μ. επειν [ανθρων
459 [αλλα πολυ προθεσκε το ου μενος ουδεν εικιων
460? [ 29 letters ] ... [

Frs. (l), (m), and (n).

X 462 [αυταρ επει Σκαιας τη πυλαις και] πυργον ικανεν
463 [εστη παπτηνας επι τειχει] τον δε νομησεν
464 [ελκομενον προσευαν πολεως τ]'αχεες δε μυν ἵππ[]οι
465 [ελκον ακηδεστ]'ως κοιλας [επι] νε[η]ς Αχαιων

Fr. (e).

X 513 [ουδεν σοι οφειλον επει ουκ εγκεισαι αυτοις
514 [αλλα προς Τροουων και Τρωιαδων κλεος ειναι
515 ος αρα εφη κλαιονυ επι δε στεναχοντο γυναικες
Ψ 1 [ως οι με]ν στεναχοντο κατα πτολιν αυταρ Αχαιοι

Χ 77. Whether the two preceding lines are to be identified as ll. 75–6 is doubtful. The traces at the end of the former of them are not inconsistent with a η, but the conclusion of the second diverges from l. 76, which is τοιτω δη ἀδεστων πελεσαι δειλαι βρατοις. Before τα]πη is what appears to be the top of a tall vertical stroke, like that of κ, φ or ψ. Perhaps κε]ψ (?) εη is only a variant for πελεσαι, and the line, according to this version, may have run τοιτω δη ἀδεστων δειλαι βρατοις κεν εη]. The construction would be irregular after ηε... αἰσχυνσι, but cf. e.g. Υ 250 ὁπποϊν κ' εἰπηθα ἐπο τούων κ' ἐπακούσας. But it is remarkable that l. 73 ends with φανη (so C, &c.; φανη other MSS., Aristarchus); and since in the papyrus φ α α]η is so suitable a reading and χαλακλ in the preceding line is quite possible, there is a considerable probability that ll. 74–6 were omitted. The three verses are not essential here; but they do not occur elsewhere in Homer. For another instance of omission in this MS, cf. note on Ψ 129.

99. ομυα: δ' μου (ὁμυα, ὠμου) MSS. 1. ε γορη.
99a. A new verse, not found elsewhere in Homer. The adjective λωβητας only occurs in Ω 531 λωβηταν ζηκες. Any round letter, e.g. θ or σ, may be read after the η.
101. εκελευ: though the final letters are broken, there is not much doubt as to the reading. Εκελευ MSS.
102. νοικα ποτε δινουρ: νιχθ' ὑπο τηρθ' ὁλον ΜSS., ὑπο λυγαιν Εt. Mag. 571. 22. For the temporal use of ποτε cf. ρ 191 ποτε ἐσπερα, Hes. Ορ. 550 ποτε ἐσπερον.
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105. Τρώει: so L; Τρώεῖ most MSS.

106. There is some ink above κακοπερος which might represent a correction, but is more probably accidental.

108. The remains of the middle of this line are very difficult to decipher. εμοί δὲ may just be read, but apparently not τοῦ, which would be expected to follow. Possibly τοῦ was written; but the papyrus may have been quite different from the common text here. The doubtful δ before αν could be ε.

110. The ordinary reading here is ἥ κεν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι εὐκλεῖστον πρὸς πώλησιν. The arrangement in the papyrus avoids the long syllables shortened in hiatus. ἀπολεσθαί seems preferable to κεν ὀλέσθαι; κεν is superfluous here and hardly parallel to the other uses of ἥ κεν. αὐτῷ, which is found in most MSS. (v. 1. αὐτῶν), was read by Aristarchus.

113. ἥσι is on a small fragment originally adhering, but of which the correct position is doubtful; the reading is very uncertain.

140. καπηλί μως] αφηρμίτη: ῥµάδως ὀφηρμίτη (hếμε C) MSS.

141. τ νταὶ[θ]α: l. θ τ.; but all the letters except the two alphas are very doubtful.

142. ἐπαύσει, ἔλεεν τι ἔθυσο ἁώγητι vulg., but the letter after ἐπαύσει in the papyrus is certainly either ὅ or ῦ. Perhaps there was a variant μασειν or μαρτινω, as Blass suggests; or ἐπαύσειν may have been written owing to a confusion with ἔλεευν.

143. The letters preserved are on a small detached fragment, which seems to be rightly placed here.

197-8. The identification of these two lines seems tolerably certain, notwithstanding the discrepancy from the vulgate, which has ἀποστρέψασσες παραβάς ὅτι παροιταί.

232-3. On the whole it is more probable that the remains of these two lines are to be referred to 232-3 than to 226-7. The slight vestiges indicate that the letter above Δ had a vertical stroke, the position of which suits an initial τ rather better than an η.

251. l. ἐπην. The error is easily intelligible, as Mr. T. W. Allen remarks, if the papyrus had δίς, the reading of αἰ χαρίστεροι (Didymus) and Vat. 10, in place of the vulgate δίον.

252. ἀνωγεῖ: ἀνήκε MSS. Cf. φ 396 (P. Grenf. II. p. 6), where the papyrus has ἀνωγας for the vulgate reading ἀνήκας.

255. l. ἀριστοινων.

327. The scribe seems to have miswritten the π of σπαλημ, which has a vertical stroke too much; otherwise the letters must be read σπο αλ[ ὁ or σπελα', but both of these readings are difficult to deal with, and the π would still be not quite satisfactory.

392 a. This additional line probably followed directly upon 392. τεθνῶτα seems to be required, but can only be read by ignoring a tiny fragment loosely adhering to the papyrus and having a vertical stroke which gives the supposed θ the appearance of a ρ; it may, however, be misplaced. Cf. Ω 20, where καὶ τεθηνήτα πηρ occurs in the same position of the verse. The latter part of the line is found in κ 52.

393. The letter before μεγά is certainly a ν, and is preceded apparently by an τ, or at any rate by not an ε; perhaps ημιν. ἡμᾶθα MSS. Aristarchus athecized ll. 393-4.

442. Here again, though the sense of the line is the same, there is a marked divergence from the vulgate, which has κεκλεμένο δ' ἀμφιπολοῦσιν εὐπλοκάμοις κατὰ δόμα. The verse may, of course, be completed in many other ways than that suggested in the text, e.g. εὐπλοκάμοις εὐκλεῖσθε.

446. ξεριν' Ἀχαλλήσ MSS.; but ὕπ' ξεριν is the regular Homeric phrase, and may well be right here. For ξεριν' ὕπο in the same position cf. Π 420, 452, Φ 208. 1. Ἀχαλλήσ; the same error occurs in CD.

447. κακοτοιος: κακοτοι... οἰμωγῆς MSS. The letter before the δ can hardly be read otherwise than as ε, and there is a spot of ink low down before it which suits the tail
of a ν. The accusative is quite unobjectionable (cf. e.g. Φ 573 ωλαγμῶν ἄκοιντυ), but
the plural is somewhat suspicious, and it may be doubted whether this is a genuine
variant, and not rather a mistake on the part of the scribe. An alternative would be to
suppose that the line began with some feminine synonym of κοκυτίς.

448. Though the margin below this line is incomplete, it has quite the appearance of
being the last of a column; but if so the column must have contained an unusually large
proportion of new lines. L. 448 is only the twenty-second line, according to the vulgate,
from the end of the preceding column, whereas the average length of other columns is about
30 lines. A column which covers only 25 lines of the vulgate is, however, shown by a
comparison of Fr. (ρ) l. 168, which is probably the last of a column, with P. Grenf. II.
4 (e). Fr. 2, where l. 195 is the second of a column; and the more lengthy columns may
to some extent be due to omissions; cf. notes on X 77 and Ψ 129.

458–60. This identification is doubtful; l. 459 is fairly satisfactory, but the scanty
vestiges of the preceding and following lines give small support. Those below ουδέν might
be read as ιού, i.e. μακρά δε, but something nearer the end of the line would be expected.

462. The ordinary version of this line is αυτάρ ἐπεί πῦργον τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἔδειν ὄμλον.
Blass is probably right in suggesting the restoration of Σκαίως τε πῦλος καὶ Φυγῆν ἔκανεν,
though the reading must be admitted to be very doubtful. τε is satisfactory, but of the other letters as far as -ον only the merest vestiges remain. They
seem, however, to support πυργον as against φυγον.

463. τειχ[ε]ι; τειχ[ει] would suit the space better.

464. πολ[ε]ως: πολιος MSS., though πολέως is well supported in other passages, e.g.
Α 168.

513 sqq. That these lines are rightly identified hardly admits of doubt. The variant
in l. 515 causes no difficulty, and the absence of any division between the end of one book
and the beginning of the next has a parallel in the Geneva papyrus (Nicole, Rev. de Phil.,
1894), Α 848–M 1.

513. If the indistinct vestiges are correctly read as οβελος, the γ', which precedes in the
common text, was probably omitted, since ουδέν σου amply fills the lacuna. γ' is
absent also in D.

515. ος ἐφαρσο vulg. It suits the space better to suppose that the final α of αρα was
unelided.

Ψ 1. Cf. note on X 513 sqq. The space between this line and the preceding one is of
the usual width, but there may, of course, have been a coronis or marginal note indicating
the commencement of a new book.

Fr. (ρ). Col. i.

Ψ 129? [ 28 letters ]ας εκέλ[ευσε
131? [ " " ]τε[ι'] [.εντ[ 132 [ἀν δ εβαν εν διφροσι παραβαται ηνι]χοι τε
133 [προσθε μεν ἰππης μετα δε νεφος ε]πετο πε[γον
134 [μυροι εν δε μεσοιτι φερον Πατροκλου ετ]αροι
135 [θριξι δε παντα νεκυν καταεινουσαν α]ς επεβαλλον
136 [κειρομενοι οπιδεν δε καρι εχε διοι Αχιλ]λευς
136 a [αμφοτερησι] δὲ χερσὶ κορνην ησχυν]ε δαίγων
137 [αξινμενος εταρον γαρ αμμονα πεμπτ] Αίδος δὲ
138 [οι δ οτε χωρον ικανον οθι σφισι πεθραδ καμιλλε]ς
139 [καθεσαν αισφα δει οι μενοεικα νηεον] υλην
140 [ενθ αυτ αλλ ενοισε ποδαρκης διος καμιλλε]ς
141 [στασ απανυθε πυρης ξανθεν απεκεφατ]ο χα[ιτ]ην

Col. ii. (with P. Grenf. II. 4 (c), Fr. 1).

Ψ 165 ? [. . .] . ε [. ]ραλυ [. .] μεκρο[...
165 a μυ[σ]ι ονει]ατα χερσιν αμησα]μενοι
166 πολλα δε [ιφια [. .] μη]ελα [και ειλιποδας ελικα]ς βους
167 προσθε πυρης [εθερον τε και αμφετον εκ δ αρα παντων]
168 δημον ελων [εκαλυψε νεκυν μεγαθυμος καμιλλε]ς

Fr. (q).

266 [εξετε αμη]τη]ν βρεφως] ημιονον κνουςα[ν
267 [αυταρ τωι τρι]ατα απρου] υπερου κατηθηκε λεβι[ηα

Fr. (r).

277 αθανατοι τε [γαρ εινι Ποσειδαων δε πορ] αυτους
278 πατρι εμωι Πηλη[ι] ν δ αυτ εμ]οι εγγυαλιξε[ν]
278 a ως τω γ αθανατοι κ[αι αγηραι] ουδε ενικε
278 b δ[eηητους] αθανατοις] [δε]μας και ειδος εριζε[ν]
279 αλλ τωι μεν εγω μ[ενεω και μωνυχ]εις ι]πποι
280 τοιον γαρ σθενος εσθλουν απωλε]σα]ν ημιο]χιοι
281 ηπιον ο σφωιν μαλα πολλακις νγρον ελαιον

Ψ 129?. It is clear that the papyrus differed considerably here from the ordinary text.
Iσε κεκλευτε (?), which apparently corresponds to the end of l. 129 αὐτίκα Μυρμιδώνασι φιλοπο-λέμουσι κέλευσε, has been inserted close above l. 131 (?) by a different hand, and seems to have been originally omitted altogether. Iσε suggests Μυρμιδώνασι, with a lengthened α, or some variant for φιλοπολέμουσι, e.g. αυτίκα κλέσασι; cf. Π 155—6 Μυρμιδώνασι . . . βορθην 'Δικλείς πώτας αυτί κλήσας. If this be so, 130—1, χαλκον ξόνναθαν, ξενίσμα δ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ὀ χειρίν ἐκατον ἱππων' οί δ᾽ ὀρντών καὶ ἐν τείχεσιν ἔδωκεν, would seem to have been reduced to a single verse. ev' at the end (the τ is quite doubtful) suggests a termination parallel to τ᾽ 339 ἑντε ἔδωκεν, preceded possibly by τε καί, though there is barely room for καί. The letter before ε, if not τ, must be a γ. But in the absence of the line above με κεκλευτε these suggestions must be regarded as merely tentative.

136 a. The proposed restoration, which is due to Blass, is based on Σ 23 ἀμφιτέρησι δὲ χεριν ἐλών κόλαν αἰσθαλάσσαν and Σ Μ 27 φίλησι δὲ χεραὶ κύμαν ἰσχυραν δαίναν.

139. The vestiges of the supposed ν suggest rather τ or π, but this may be due to smearing.

165 a. We give a revised text of this line, which is found in P. Grenf. II. 4 (ε), Fr. 1. The doubtful ρ might be τ or ν.

165 a, 166. These two lines combine with the last two of P. Grenf. II. 4 (ε), Fr. 1. For the restoration μυλίν ὁμαίσασι (Blass) cf. ι 9 and ο 316 ονείσασι μυλία. In l. 166 a short space remains unaccounted for between φιλια on the new fragment and the μη of μηλια on P. Grenf. II. 4 (ε), Fr. 1. The reading of these two words is not very certain, but we can find no other epithet which suits the vestiges, and μηλια seems right. In the facsimile in P. Grenf. II, Plate II, μηλία κα'αλι [ looks possible, but the original shows this to be a less likely alternative.

168. This line was probably the last of the column, though it is slightly higher than l. 141. Cf. note on X 448.

278 a, b. These two additional lines have been restored by Blass from ε 212—3 οἱδέ ἐστι θυγατέρι αἰσθαλάσσαν δέμας καὶ εἰδον ἐρίζειν.

280. τοιοῦ γαρ σθενος: τοιοῦ γὰρ κλεος most MSS., but σθενος occurs in DGLS Syr., and is recorded as a variant in ΔΕ. τοιον, which is new, may be defended, but is unconvincing.

281. This line is the last of the column. The final s of πολλάκιε is very close to the τ, and was perhaps originally omitted; π was also first written in place of γρ and subsequently altered, another γρ being added for the sake of clearness above the line. These corrections may be by the first hand.

For o most MSS. have ὤς, but ὤ is attested by Didymus, who refers to Λ 73, where ὤ σφην was read by Aristarchus. ὤ is adopted by La Roche and Leaf, ὤς by Monro and Allen.

Unidentified fragments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. (s)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fr. (t)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. aπι μετα πι</td>
<td></td>
<td>. αμφιν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοιπ</td>
<td></td>
<td>. γητοι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. νοιτοτ</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>. ελον</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. θερης</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>. γημ</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>... τ</td>
<td></td>
<td>... τ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fr. (t). The most suitable place for this is perhaps X 117–20, but though in l. 1 φιλικα is possible, l. 2 is irreconcilable with X 118, and if λως in l. 3 were λωματι it should come further out to the right. In l. 2 κ is possibly σ, with which reading the preceding η would be π, and ο may also be ε; in l. 3 ζ or ο may be read for ω.

Fr. (y). This may well be φιλικα in X 461, but Fr. (y) does not actually join Fr. (m).

Fr. (dd). Not Ψ 584–6.

Fr. (gg). l. 2 seems to be the beginning of a verse, but this is not certain. Καὶ ομονοία might be read, but the fragment cannot be identified with Φ 360–1 or 375–6.
23. Homer, Odyssey XX.

19 x 6.2 cm. Circa b.c. 285-250. Plate VI.

This fragment, containing parts of ll. 41-68 of Book xx of the Odyssey, was found not in mummy-cartonnage but loose in the debris outside the north wall of the town, where so many sarcophagi were buried; cf. p. 3. The writing is a delicate uncial of the early or middle part of the third century b.c., Z and Ω in particular preserving a decidedly archaic appearance.

Unusual interest attaches to this papyrus, which is the first early Ptolemaic fragment of the Odyssey to be discovered, and exhibits much the same scale of divergence from the vulgate as that with which the fragments of the Iliad have made us familiar. This passage in the ordinary text contains 28 lines, but in the papyrus 30, three new lines being inserted (after 51, 55, and 58) and one line of the vulgate omitted (53); while in several other places also the papyrus presents hitherto unknown readings, the list of which would no doubt be increased if the lines had been completely preserved. As it is, all of them are represented by less than half of the total number of letters, and some by 5 or 6 letters only. Hence the restoration of the new lines is very difficult, especially as they differ from most of the additional lines in the Iliad fragments in being not at all obviously derived from other passages in Homer. We are indebted to Mr. T. W. Allen for some suggestions. On the chief problems raised by these early Ptolemaic papyri see pp. 68 sqq.

\[\begin{align*}
v 41 & \quad [\pi\rho\sigma\delta \ \eta\iota \ \kappa\iota \ \tau\delta\epsilon \ \mu\varepsilon\iota\sigma\nu \ \varepsilon\iota \ \varphi\rho\varepsilon\sigma\iota \ \mu[\varepsilon\rho\mu\eta]\theta[i]\zeta\omega] \\
42 & \quad [\epsilon i \ \pi\epsilon r \ \gamma\alpha r \ \kappa t\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota\mu i \ \Delta i o\iota \ s \ \tau e \ \sigma e\iota\nu \ \tau e \ \epsilon k\eta\tau i] \\
43 & \quad [\pi\theta\iota \ \kappa e n \ \upsilon\pi e\kappa\pi\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\gamma\omicron] \mu i \ \tau a \ [\sigma e] \ \varphi\rho\alpha\xi\varepsilon\sigma\tau i \ \alpha n\omega\gamma a] \\
44 & \quad [\tau o n \ \delta \ \alpha u\tau e \ \pi r o\sigma e\epsilon i\epsilon \ \theta i e a \ \gamma l a\iota k\kappa\omega i s \ \Lambda \theta \eta \eta \eta] \\
45 & \quad [\sigma x e\tau\lambda i e \ \kappa a n \ \mu e n] \ \tau i s \ \tau [\epsilon] \ \chi e r e i o\iota \ \omicron \ \theta a r r e i \ \epsilon t a\iota r o\iota] \\
46 & \quad [\omicron o \ \pi e r \ \theta\nu n\iota t o s \ \tau \ \epsilon o\iota \iota] \ \kappa a i \ [\sigma o n \ \tau o s s a \ \mu \theta e a \ \epsilon i [\delta \ldots] \\
47 & \quad [\alpha u\tau a r \ \epsilon g o \ \theta e o s \ e i] \mu i \ \delta i a[\mu] \pi e r e s \ \eta \ \sigma e \ [\phi \nu l a][\sigma o o w] \\
48 & \quad [13 \ \text{letters}] \ \pi o w n \ \epsilon r e o \ \delta e \ \sigma o i \ \epsilon \xi a[\iota \nu a\phi \nu \delta o n] \\
49 & \quad [\epsilon i \ \pi e r \ \pi e n\theta t k o v] \ \tau a \ \lambda o c h o i \ \mu e r[\nu o] \pi o w n \ \alpha \nu \theta r o s t o w n] \\
50 & \quad [\nu o i \ \pi e r i s t o t a i e n \ k] \ \tau e i n a i \ \mu e[\mu a\omega t e s \ \alpha r n i] \\
51 & \quad [k a i \ \k e n \ \tau o n \ \epsilon l a s] \ \alpha i o \ \beta o a s \ \k a i [\ldots] \tau a \ldots \ldots \\
51 & \quad [13 \ \text{letters}] \ \epsilon i a s \ a r f]
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52 [αλλ ἐλετὼ σε καὶ υ]πνος ε ᾗ][ν επικ[. . . . . . . . . .
54 [δος φατο καὶ ρα οι υ]πνον επι βλεφαρο]σιν εχενεν
55 [αυτὴ δ αψ εσ Ολυμπ'νον απεστιχε δια [θεαω]
56 a [ 14 letters ][οσ με[ 20 letters
56 [ευτε τον υπνοι ε]μαρπτε [λυνω μελέθματα θυμον
57 [λυσιμελης αλοχος δ] αρ επεγρετο κ[εδν ειδια
58 [κλαε δ] αρ ευ λεκτρο]σι καθεζομενη [μαλακοιοιν
58 a [ 15 letters ]σθεν ακιην εχον οι .[
59 [αυταρ επει κλαιουσα] κορεσατο ογ κατα θυμον
60 [Αρτεμιδι πρωτιστον επενξατο [δια γυναικων
61 [Αρτεμι ποτινα θεα] θυγατερ Διοσ αιθ[ε μοι ηνη
62 [ιον ενι στηθεσι β]αλουσα εκ θυμον [ελοιο
63 [αυτικα νυν η επ]ειτα με αναρπαξασα θυελλα
64 [οιοιτο προφερουσα] κατ ηροετα κελευθα
65 [εμ προξοηις δε β]αλου αψορρ[ο]ου Ωκεανοιο
66 [ωο δ οτε Παινδαρε]ου κουρα[ς] ανελο]φτο θυελλαι
67 [τησι τοκησα με]υ φθεισαν θεου αι δε λιποντο
68 [ορφαναι εμ μεγαρο]ου κομι[ε δε Αθροδη]

45. σχέλιε και μὲν τὶς τε χερειου πείθεθο ἑταῖρο MSS. χερείου is fairly certain, though ω is cramped into a very narrow space, and at the end of the line the tops of the six letters after ε suit ταιρω. The difficulty is the intervening word ϑαρσει, suggested by Blass. The second letter is much more like α than λ or ω, which are the only possible alternatives, and the first letter must have been a rather narrow one. All that remains of it is a speck of ink near the bottom of the line. The third letter can be either ε or ρ, and ε suits the vestiges at the end of the word much better than σι or θ; but the supposed σ is more like ο, and ϑαρσει is not very satisfactory, especially as this use of ϑαρσει with a dative is not found in Homer.

46. ειδεν MSS. θ could be read instead of ε, but not σ. It is difficult to account for the ε except by the hypothesis that the scribe wrote ειδος or ειδεν by mistake.

48. τον: εν παντεσσι πάνοις (οτ πάνοιοι) ἐρέω κ.τ.λ. MSS.

51. βας καὶ [δι]μα μῆλα MSS. κα]ς after βας is very doubtful. The second letter might be e.g. τ. ψ]α is inadmissible, the letter after the lacuna being either τ, π or γ. The supposed α which follows is quite uncertain, but the vestiges do not suit ε, so that ασ]πε[τα is not satisfactory. The new line 51 a may have expanded the description of the prospective plunder; απ] may be, as Mr. Allen suggests, απ']αγοω, but to read λ]ειας would introduce a word not found in Homer. Blass proposes [αυτους τε τεω']ειας, comparing ξ 47 πιν πυρι νησα ευπρῆσαι κτειναι δε και αυτοις.

52. υπνοις: ανὴ καὶ τὸ φυλάσσειν | πάνυνοι] ἐγρήγορενα κακών δ ὑποδύσεια ἴδη MSS. The papyrus, instead of this, has only half a line, but soon makes up for the omission of l. 53 by inserting a line after 55. The word following υ]πνος was perhaps εων, though the space between ε and ν is rather broad for only one letter.
55. ἀπεστίχη: ἄφικτο MSS. except the Monacensis (of the fourteenth century), which has ἀπεστίχη corrected to ἄφικτο. ἀπεστίχη ἕως θείων is the vulgate reading in μ 143.


58 a. The subject of εὔνω is probably, as Mr. Allen remarks, the διάμαι of Πενελοπε. The phrase αὐτον εὔνω does not occur in Homer, εὔνων, εὔνων, ἐμενα or εὔνοντο being the only verbs found with ἀκότ. οὔδε εὔνω, followed by τί εὔνω (cf. Δ 22, ἕ τοι 'Αθηναί άκότον ᾗ οὖδε τί εἵπε), does not suit the vestiges after εὔνω.

67. ψεισαν: on the spelling of this word with ε or ϵ MSS. and grammarians differ.

68. κομιστε: κόμιστε (v. l. κομιστε) MSS. The imperfect is quite in place.


Mummy A. Height 16.8 cm. Circa B.C. 280–240. Plate VI (Figs. k and m).

These small and scattered fragments of the Iphigenia in Tauris are written in a medium-sized flowing and slightly sloping hand, which is the precursor of the oval style of the second and third centuries after Christ. Though showing none of the markedly archaic characteristics displayed by some of the other literary papyri in this volume, the MS. belongs to the same find as most of the oldest pieces, and is very unlikely to be later in date than the reign of Philadelphus. The only letter calling for any comment is the ω, the second loop of which is not raised to the same height as the first, but is left very shallow and has sometimes hardly any curve at all. The lines of one column are partially preserved throughout the 29 verses of which it is composed.

In spite of its fragmentary condition the text is decidedly interesting, and its nearness to the age of the poet gives it additional weight. In ll. 252 and 618 conjectures of Reiske and Bothe are confirmed; and in ll. 587 and 621 valuable readings occur, one of them unanticipated, the other nearly coinciding with an emendation of Machly. But the papyrus is as usual not impeccable, and one or two small errors are found, while some other variants are more questionable. The division of the lines for the chorus (ll. 173–91) follows a new method. In the collation below we have made use of the editions of Prinz-Wecklein and of G. Murray, but in filling up lacunae have followed the text of the two MSS., except when obviously wrong.

Fr. (a).

174 [α. [ 175 Κήλο[θ] [ 176 ε']], [ 180 ]
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177 σφακθείς είσεις α τλάμων
179 μνήμον τε Α[σιταν]
180, 181 αχάν δ[εποινα]
182 θρήνοις μου[σαν]
184 μο]λπαίς Α[ιδας]
185, 186 παίανω]ν οιμ[α]τ]ων
187 φ]ως σκηπτ]ρων
189 ευ]ολβον []
191 μοιχθών δε εν μι]χθοις αισσει

Frs. (d) and (c).

245 [ουκ αν φθανοις] αν ευτρ[επη ποιομμενη]
[ποδατοι τινοις γης ονομ [εχουσιν οι ξενοι]
[Ελληνες εν το]υθ οιδα κ[ι]υ περαιτερω
[ουδ ονομ] ακό]υνασ [οισθα των ξενων φρασαι]
[Πυλαδης εκ]λη]ξε]θ ατερος προς θατερου
250 [του ξυ]φυγογε δε [του ξενου τι του]ν ην
[ουδεις το]δ οιδεν ου γ]αρ [εισηκουσα]ν
[πος δ ειδητ αυτους και]νυχοντες ει]λετε
[ακραις επι ρηγ]μισιν Ειξε]νου πορου
[και τις βαλασου]ς θουκολ[ις κοινωνια]
255 [βους ηλθομεν νι]φουντες ευ[αλιαι δροσωι]

Fr. (d).

η Νηρεως α[γαλμαθ ος τον ευγενη]
ετικτε πε[υηκοντα Νηρηδω]ν Χορον
275 αλλος δε [τις ματαις ανομία θρασυς]
εγελκα]σει ειξ[χα]σ ναυτιλους δ εφαρμε]νους
θ]ασσειν φαραγγ εφασκε του νομου φοβοι
[κλοντας ως θυσιμεν ενθα]δε ξενους]
εδ[οξε δ ημων ευ λε]γειν τois πλεοσι
280 θ]ηραν τε τη]ι θεω σφαγια ταπιχωρια
καὶν τωδε πετραν ατερος λυπων ξενουν
εσ[η] καρα τε διετιναξ ανω κατω
[καπεστεναξεν ολενας τρεμουν ακρας]
μηναισ αλαινων και βοαι κυναγος ως
285 πυλαδη δεδορκας τηνδε τηνδε δ ουχ οραις
Α[ιδου δρακαναν ως με βουλεται κτανειν

Frs. (c), (f), (g), and (h).

[ει παρι ταυτον πραγμ αρεσκοντως εχει
[θελουσ αν [ει σωσαμι σ αγγειαι τι μοι
[προ]ς Α[ργος ελθον τοις εροις εκει φιλους
[θελ]τον τ ε]ν]γκειυμην ην τις οικτειρας εμε
585 [εγρα]ψεν αι]χμαλωτος ουχι την εμην
[φορεα νομι]δων] χειρα ποι τοις νομου δ]ν το
[θυσιευς] τα ποι θεου παδε δικαι ηγουμενον
[ουσενα γαρ] ειχον οστης [αγγειαι] μολων
[εις Αργους αυ]θος τας εμας επιστολας
590 [πεμψε]ει [σωθεις των εμων φιλων τωι
[σα]ν δ] ει] γαρ [ως εουκες ωυτε δυσγενης
[και] τας Μυκηνας οις[θα χους καιγυ θελω
φοιτη]και ει ου μιασθεν ωυ σαξρον λαβων
κουφων ε]κατι γραμματων σωτηριαν
595 [ο]υτος δ] [επειπερ πολις αναγκαζει ταδε

Frs. (i), (k), (l), and (m).

Col. i. Col. ii. PLATE VI (Frs. k and m).

600 ουτος δε συμπλη των εμων μοι]θουν χαιρειν
ουκω[ουν δικαιον επ ολεθρου τιου τουδ εμε]

. . . χαι]ρειν τιθεσθαι καυ]τον] εκδυναι κακων

. . . αλ[ως γενεσθω τωδε μεν] διελθον διε]θου

. . . πε]μπει γαρ Αργους οστε σοι και]λω[ς εχειν

605 η]μας δ ο χρησιων κτεινετω τι]α τωι φιλων
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[αισχιστον οστις καταβαλων] eis συμφορας
[αυτος σεσωσται τυγχανει δ ο] δ ωμ φιλος]
[ον ουδεν ησυν η με φως οραν θ]ελω
[ω λημ αριστον ως απ ευγενοι]ς τινοσ

610 [μιχας πεφυκας τοις φιλοις τ ορθως] φιλος
[τοιουτος ειη των εμω]υν ομοσπορων
[οσπερ λειπεται και] γαρ ουδ εγω ξενοι
[αναδελφος ειμι] πλην οσα ουχ [ο]ρωσα νιν
[επει δε βουλει τα]νυτα τονδε πεμψουμεν

[προθυμια σε] τουδ εχουσα τυγχανει
[ουσει δε τις με] και τα δεινα τλησε]αι
[εγω θεας γαρ] τηνδε συμφοραν ε[χω
[αξηλα γ ω] νεανι και] αυκ]ενοιν ευποιμονα

620 [αλλ εις αναγκη]γε κει]μεθ ην φυλακτευν
[αυτη διφε]ξεις κτεινουσα θη]λυς αρπανας
[ουκ αλλα] χαιτην αμφι ση]ν χερνιψομαι
[εσω δομον τονδ εισι]ν [οις] μελει ταδε

625 [ταφος δε ποιος δεξε]ται με στοι [θανω
[πυρ ιερον ενδον χασ]ματα ευρωπ]—ω—

627 [φευ πως αν με α]δελφης χειρ περιστειλειεν αν

629 [. . . . μακραν γα]ρ] βαρβαρον ναι]ει χθονος

A fragment perhaps belonging to this papyrus.

[. . . .
]. με[. . .
]. ρατ[. . .

174—91. This fragment is too small to indicate clearly the point of division in the lines or the principle upon which that division was based. The lines were longer than they are according to the arrangement of either the older or the more modern editions—to which we owe the highly inconvenient system of numbering four lines as if they were five. Perhaps the lyrics were written continuously like prose in lines of approximately equal length, as in 25. That hypothesis would at any rate account fairly well for the sizes of the various lacunae.
The vestige after α would suit v, i, or κ, and so the two letters may belong equally well to δικέρον, χιρία, or δικαία.

The reading is very doubtful; τυχόντες τρεῖρα MSS.

σφαλθεῖ σα α is not a very satisfactory reading, since it does not account for a speck of ink between the σ and the top of the supposed first α, which is moreover itself quite dubious. σφαλθεῖσα, however, is not a better alternative, for the ε would be too far from the σ, and again a speck of ink in the intervening space would remain unexplained. The traces before α τάς would perhaps best suit an α followed by a broad π or, possibly, μ; but they are too slight to necessitate the supposition of a departure here from the MSS. tradition—which, however, is corrupt in this passage.

The papyrus supports the traditional reading, for which Bothe's conjecture εύομαν τ' Αποντίων is adopted by Murray).

θηρνος: so a corrector of P; θήρνοις LP, θήρνοις Markland, on metrical grounds. The vestige in the papyrus is not indeed inconsistent with ν, but is more suggestive of σ.

It is impossible to judge whether l. 188 πατρόφων ἀκέων, which is bracketed by W(ecklein), following Hartung, stood in the papyrus or not. If, however, it be assumed that these lines were more or less equal in length (cf. note on ll. 174–91) it will be necessary to suppose an omission of some kind between l. 187 and l. 189.

The first letter is most probably ν; ας cannot be read. The line is metrical if ανασα be written as a trisyllable, as it is in LP, which have μύχους δ' ἐκ μύχθων.

ομην α: the papyrus upholds the MSS. tradition; αχηδί Μonk, whose conjecture is accepted by W. and M.

τοῦθε: l. τουτ.

Keiske’s conjecture καὶ τυχόντας (so W. and M.) for the MSS. reading καὶ τυχόντας is confirmed by the papyrus.

Ekeíνον: so Plut. Doc clad. p. 622; δέσιν MSS. Cf. l. 125, where LP have εκείνου and Markland conjectures δέσιν (so M.), and l. 395, where W. and M. read δέσιν (with Markland) for εκείνου (LP) or εκείνου (l). δέσιν is probably right here.

The MSS. here have θηράκεων γε, τῆς θεοῦ ταύτα δίκαι ἡγομένης; W. and M. print θηράκεων σφα, τῆς θεοῦ τάδε, adopting conjectures of Markland and Pierson. The papyrus substitutes τοῦ θεοῦ for τῆς θεοῦ, and before τοῦ has a clear α preceded by a letter of which all that remains is a projecting tip on the level of the top of the α, which would suit γ or τ. Hence, since θηράκεω sufficiently fills the remaining space, the word before τοῦ is most likely τά, which implies a quite different construction from that found in the MSS. We venture to suggest that the true reading is τοῦ νόμου δ' ἐπι τοῦ δοκότος τῶν ταύτα δίκαι ἡγομένην. This is more logical than the accepted text, for the will of the goddess would have been ineffectual unless enforced by the law; cf. l. 38 νόσος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει, and l. 595 ἄριστος πόλεος ἀνακάζον τάδε. The substitution of ἡγομένης for ἡγομένον would be a particularly easy confusion (the papyrus shows the converse error of τοῦ for τῆς), and the alteration of τά would inevitably follow. It would also be possible, as Mr. Murray remarks, to keep ἡγομένης and connect ταῦτα τῆς θεοῦ τάδε δίκαι ἡγομένων. More logical, however, and in the sense of ‘the victims of the goddess’ with θηράκεω instead of with τάδε. θηράκεω probably had no iota adscript; cf. l. 249 ἐκ λαξίδθω.

588–90. These lines are rejected by Dindorf and Monk.

589. τοα: so the MSS.; τοᾶς (τ') Μ. following Elmsley.

593. Though the letters of σφαλθεί are broken, they are all quite consistent with the ordinary reading except the τ, which is unusually cramped; perhaps σφαλθεί was written (cf. l. 247 τοῦδ'). In any case the papyrus lends no support to the conjecture σφαλθεί καίετα, though it may of course have had Keiske’s more probable emendation σφαλθεῖ for σφα.
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to ll. 573-4 μονῶν and λογιᾶς or ll. 575-6 εἰδωσίων and γενετορεῖς. The υ is opposite l. 603, which is the 26th line from the bottom of the column; ll. 573 and 575 would be respectively the 27th and 25th from the bottom.

600. μοιχεῖαν: or -θωγ, but the former is more probable.
606. εἰς συμφοράς: εἰς ξυμφοράς MSS.

614. Perhaps περισσομεν was first written and then altered to περιψομεν. The upper part of the vertical stroke of υ is clear, but in place of the tip of the crossbar there is another short vertical stroke which would suit e.g. μ or π.

615. δανείοι: δανη MSS.
618. τησδὲ MSS., τησδὲ Pap., confirming Bothe’s conjecture, which is accepted by W. and M. συμφοράν, which is an unknown variant, is intelligible in itself, but does not well accord with the following line. προστροπήν (MSS.) is more likely to be genuine.

619. The space indicates that the crasis of κοίμ here was neglected; cf. the absence of elision in ll. 613, 625, &c.

621. The new reading of the papyrus κτεινοῦσα is preferable to the traditional θίνονα. The first two letters are much damaged, but the vertical stroke of the τ is plain. Maehly's acute conjecture θεινοῦσα, though not actually confirmed, is thus shown to have been on the right track.

622. The supposed ε of ξεφεῖ is above χ of χατερν which would approximately correspond with ε of σφαγες. There is, therefore, scarcely room in the initial lacuna for ουκον, the unmetrical reading of the MSS., corrected in L to οικ.

626. χασματα is probably only a clerical error for χασμα τ(ε). It is, however, noticeable that with Diodorus' variant (xx. 14) χανον for πέτρας, the plural form χάσματε εὐρωπά would at least scan. But there is no ground for suspecting χάσμα τε εὐρωπῶν πέτρας, the version of the MSS.

629. LP here read μᾶταιον εὐχῆν, ὡ τίλας, ὅτις ποτ’ εἶ, ἤξω μακρῶν γάρ κτ.λ. There seems to have been an accidental omission in the papyrus, though without knowing how the critical first foot of the line was filled up a definite decision on the point is difficult.

25. **Euripides.**

Mummy A. 8 x 5.7 cm. Circa B.C. 280-240.

On this fragment is written in a large cursive hand of the middle of the third century B.C. the favourite chorus of Euripides which closes the Alcestis (1159-63), Andromache (1284-8), Bacchae (1388-92), and Helena (1688-92), and, with a difference in the first line, the Medea (1415-9). Whether anything preceded the chorus here is uncertain; in any case the fragment is probably a school exercise, not part of a literary manuscript. The division of the lines is determined apparently by their length, and in no way corresponds to the metre or to the division found in the MSS. of Euripides. At least two new variants occur. The colon-shaped stop is found in l. 4.

\[
[\text{πολλαί} \ \muο]φαι \ \text{των}
\]
1. The restoration of this line is very doubtful: if the vestiges really belong to 
\( \mu \sigma \rho \alpha \), \( \tau \nu \) would project to the right beyond the following lines. \( \lambda \nu \) \( \mu \rho \beta \) could equally well be read; but \( \pi \alpha \) must in that case be transferred to a line above, which
would involve the inference that the extract contained more than the final chorus.

3. \( \alpha \nu \lambda \pi \tau \rho \omega \alpha \) MSS. in all five places, but \( \delta \) cannot possibly be read here, and \( \alpha \nu \lambda \pi \tau \rho \omega \alpha \) does not accord with the vestiges very well. The traces before \( \tau \nu \) suit \( \sigma \) better than \( \lambda \pi \).

4. \( \delta \kappa \varepsilon \rho \alpha \nu \) : \( \delta \kappa \varepsilon \zeta \beta \varepsilon \nu \) MSS. The active is preferred by Blass on the ground that
\( \epsilon \kappa \varepsilon \beta \varepsilon \nu \), apart from this chorus of Euripides, is a late form.

7. \( \epsilon \rho \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon [\nu] \) : the \( \nu \) is much fainter than the surrounding letters and seems to have been intentionally smudged out. \( \epsilon \rho \varepsilon \) is generally found in the MSS., but \( \epsilon \rho \varepsilon \) occurs as a variant in \( \text{Hei.} \ 1691 \).

26. \textbf{Anaximenes (?), 'Ρητορική πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον.}

\textit{Plate III} (Cols. ix-xi).

This, the longest of the Hibeh literary papyri, consists of seventeen fragments
from the so-called 'Ρητορικὴ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον, a treatise on rhetoric which already
in the time of Athenaeus and perhaps even as early as the end of the third
century B.C. passed as the work of Aristotle. The traditional view of its
composition was decisively rejected in 1840 by Spengel, who endeavoured to
substitute Anaximenes of Lampsacon, an older contemporary of Aristotle, as the
author; and with so much success that for half a century his conclusions with
regard to the Anaximenean authorship were hardly disputed. In 1892, however,
Susemihl (\textit{Gesch. d. Alex. Litt.} ii. pp. 451-7) re-examined the whole subject, and
in opposition to the generally received view argued for a third century B.C.
date for the treatise. Hammer, who re-edited the text after Spengel in 1894,
leaves the question of authorship undecided. The new discovery, as we shall
presently show, goes far to overthrow Susemihl's position and weaken his
objections to the previously accepted conclusions of Spengel.
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Parts of eighteen columns are extant, but of these only one (Col. x) is quite complete, and Cols. iii, iv, vi, viii, xii, xv, and xiii are represented by the merest fragments, while the rest are all much disfigured by lacunae. The MS. falls into three main divisions, (A) Cols. i–viii, which are continuous, then after a gap of several columns (B), comprising Cols. ix–xi, followed after a loss of one column by (C), Cols. xii–xviii. In (B), which originally formed part of a small breast-piece together with 16, the surface of the papyrus is clean and the ink perfectly clear (see Plate III); but in the other two sections the writing had mostly been covered with plaster and is in parts much obliterated. The columns contain from 20 to 23 lines, which are decidedly irregular in length, varying from 20 to 30 letters with an average of 26. Since the columns lean over somewhat towards the right, the lines near the top tend to project at the ends, those near the bottom at the beginnings. Paragraphi mark the commencements of new sections, and where these begin in the middle of a line a blank space is left three or four letters in width.

The handwriting is an unusually small uncial with a tendency to cursive forms in certain letters, particularly N, the last stroke of which projects far above the line; Ω retains much of its epigraphic character. A later date than the reign of Philadelphus is extremely improbable. On the verso is some third century B.C. cursive writing, too much damaged for continuous decipherment. Since this MS. of the 'Πηροσ' itself thus belongs to the first half of the third century, the treatise can hardly have been composed later than B.C. 300, and a fourth century date for it may now be regarded as established. This does not of course prove that its author preceded Aristotle, as has been generally maintained by those who support the idea of the Anaximenean authorship; the contemporary papyrus 16 is probably the work of Theophrastus who was Aristotle’s disciple. But now that the antiquity of the treatise is shown to have been somewhat underestimated by Susemihl, and the terminus ante quem can be fixed at B.C. 300 instead of 200, the older theory that the 'Πηροσ' πρὸς Ἀλέξαιδρον was the work of Anaximenes regains much of the ground which it has lost in the last fifteen years.

The extant MSS. of the treatise, which all belong to the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries, are divided by Spengel and Hammer into two classes, the better one composed of the MSS. called CFM, to which Hammer added OP, and the worse comprising ABDEGV. The existence of considerable interpolations in the treatise is generally suspected, in particular the introductory letter from Aristotle to Alexander, which has been long regarded as a later addition, and several passages chiefly towards the end, the true character of which was detected by Ipfelkopfer. On these the papyrus (henceforth called II), since it
only covers the latter part of chapter 1 and most of chapters 2 and 3 (about \( \frac{1}{2} \) of the whole work), does not throw any direct light, but it shows clearly that interpolations do not extend in any serious degree to those chapters; for, apart from an apparent omission in Col. xv probably due to homoioteleuton, there is only one considerable collocation of words found in the MSS. which is wanting in Π (l. 296, note), whereas in several passages Π supplies words or clauses which are omitted by the MSS. As would be expected with texts removed from each other by no less than seventeen centuries, the number of divergences in Π from the extant MSS. is very large; in fact two or three consecutive lines, where Π is at all well preserved, seldom pass without a new variant. Upon the merits of these it is sometimes difficult to decide owing to the incompleteness of the context, but in many cases Π unquestionably supplies the right reading. In particular several conjectures of the earlier editors are now confirmed, e.g. l. 3 η ὑπ αὐθητον (η ὑπ εἰράνων) for η ἀνθητον (ἐνδόξων) (Spengel); 17 τούτων τοῦ τρόπουν τοῦ τοῦτον (Spengel); 117 τριττος for περιττος (Bekker); 121 the substitution of a phrase like δέι μεθαπαται (μεταστητον Π) for τος (Spengel); 293 διελθωμεν for διελθωμεν (Spengel); 313 ο νομος for ρυμος (Spengel); 317 τμοςων for ἑισαχων or εἰράσων (Spengel); cf. also notes on ll. 23 and 27. Other improvements in the text introduced by Π occur in ll. 30-1 αυτον τε τον διαγερεναιτα νομον λαμβανειν for αυτον τε τον ἀγορεύουτα καλ τον νομον λαμβανειν; 67-8 Λακεδαιμονιος συμμαχιαν ποιησαμενος for το Λακεδαιμονιος συμμάχους ποιησαμένον; 116 τους λογους χρησειν for χρησασθαι ου λόγω χρησασθαι; 140-1 δαπαναν φιλοτιμιαν for έκοινων άπασαν φιλοτιμιαν; 219 αιδε for αυται δει (δε); 220 καιρων παραπτωκοτων for καιρων παραπτωκωκων; 233 the insertion of πολεμοντες; 299 εξηγησις for εξωγελεσις; 302 νοππενθεντον for καθυποππενθεντον; 311 ναιρημενον for ἀδεικνυμον; cf. also notes on ll. 35. 142. 148-9. 164. 197. 231. 250. 271-6, and especially 316-8, where a whole clause is inserted. The numerous other variants in Π largely consist of minor alterations which hardly affect the sense; and though a text of this antiquity, written within a century of the composition of the work in question, naturally outweighs in many cases the evidence of MSS. which are so much later, confidence in Π is somewhat shaken by its inaccuracies. Not only are there several serious scribe’s errors, l. 146 γενομενων for πενεμενων; 160 εις misplaced; 162 καιτα πασιν for κα τοις παισι; 175 υβριζουσιν for ύβριζειν; 267 εικος for εικος, and ou for αυτον or by a dittography: 280 κα for κακα; 281 καυ μεν for (apparently) δε (ον δ) ειρηκαιεν; 294 ὀμοτρόπως for ὀμοτρόπος; 296 συνετάκηκι for συνετάκηκεν; 304 exiones for εξωτων or εκωτων; but, to say nothing of the probable omission of several lines through homoioteleuton in Col. xv (cf. ll. 246-50, note), there are several places where Π’s reading, if not absolutely wrong, is distinctly inferior to that of the MSS., e.g. l. 72 αυτο for αδε;
115 ἀναγκαίων ... διαφωλαττέων for διαφωλακτέων; 137 the transference of μεν; 170 the omission of μεν; 269 the insertion of μεν.

Compared with the divergence of Π from both groups of MSS., the differences between the latter appear trivial; and since the variations between the two families do not happen to be very strongly marked in the passages where Π's readings are preserved with complete or tolerable certainty, the evidence of the new find does not greatly assist towards deciding the merits of the MSS. As commonly occurs with papyri, the text of Π is of an eclectic character. In seven cases it agrees with the so-called 'better' codices, CFMOP (or most of them) against ABDEGV (or most of them) which Spengel and Hammer call the 'worse'; l. 108 τας αλλὰς against ἀλλὰς; 115 περὶ τῶν εὐθέται against εὐθέται περὶ τοῦτων; 178 στερομένων against στερούμενον; probably 223 αὐτῶν against ἐαυτῶν; 279 τοῖς λογίοις against τὸν λόγον; 304 ταῦτας against τὰς αὕτας; 315 ὁποῖος against ὁποῖος ἄν. Where the MSS. of that group are divided Π tends to favour CF (especially F) against MOP whether these are supported by the 'deteriores' or not; cf. the notes on ll. 11, 35, 82, 86, 147, 191, 229, 244, and 266, and the numerous slips in M, O, and P, e.g. in ll. 93, 102, 114, 145, 162, 191, 218, 237, 276, and 306. On the other hand Π supports the so-called 'deteriores' against the other group in l. 127 (apparently) δυντι against δι, 234-5 ευπνικαν against εὐφυκαν, and 254 προτερον against πρότερον; and in three instances the 'deteriores' or some of them alone preserve Π's reading in a corrupt form, l. 116 λόγῳ χρήσασθαι against χρήσασθαι (τοὺς λογίοις χρήσαται, Π), 231 ὅτι πλείστα τοῦτων against ὅτι τὰ πλείστα τοῦτων (τοῦτων οἱ πλείστα, Π), and 241 τοιοῦτων ὅμουτρότως against τοιοῦτων (τοιοῦτοι ὁμοιοτροπῶς, Π). On the whole the new evidence indicates that Spengel and Hammer were right in thinking F to be the best MS., but that Hammer, who pays less attention than Spengel to the 'deteriores,' somewhat underestimates their relative importance, since the preference of Π, so far as it goes, for the reading of the CFMOP group is very slight, and some of the apparent errors of the 'deteriores' seem to be due to their partial preservation of genuine readings, which by a process of correction have disappeared from the other family. Our restorations of the lacunae are taken, when Π provides no definite indications to the contrary, from the text of Hammer, to whose edition the pages and lines mentioned at the head of each column refer.

Frs. (a), (b), and (c). Col. i, p. 15, 3-17.

[ω'] [α']υτοῖς λέγειεν καὶ τ'ον εναντὶ
[ω']υ αυτοῖς κα'ι των ἡδής κε[ε]κρ[ι]με
[ν']ων η̄ ὑπὸ θ'ε'ων [η] γῦν ανθρωπωνισων
[η] 

5 [αντιγρωνιστών ημιν τοι μεν ὅν ὁ
[δικαιον οιον εστι προτερον ημιν]
[δεδηλωται το δε ομοιον τοι δι]
[καίωι τοιοιδε εστιν ὁσπερ γα[ρ]
[δικαιον νομίζομεν το τοις γο[ν]τεν
[σι πείθεσθαι τοιν αυ]τον τροπον
[προσηκει τοισ υ[ieis μιμεισθαι]
[καθαπε]ρ τ]ους ε]ν ποιησανται αν
[τενερ]γετειν [δι]καιον εστιν αυτω

10 [του]ς μ[η]θεν κακον ἐργασαμένους
[μη]μας δ[ι]καιον εστι μη βλαπτειν
[το]ν τοιν τροπον δει λαμβανειν
[εκ δ' ε]ς τ]ων εναντιων χρη κατα

15 [φανε]σ ποιειν το αυτο παραδειγμα]
[καθαπε]ρ γαρ τους κα]κουν τι ποιη
[τω κα]'αι τους ευρεγητησαντι[α]'ς . . .

Frs. (b), (d), and (q). Col. ii, p. 15, 20—16, 7.

4 lines lost.

Ἄθροισαι καὶ Ἀκαδάμιοιοι

25 [δικαιον κρινὼν]ς[ις] τῶν ἐχθροὺς τι
[μορεῖςθαι το μὲν δὴ δικαίον οὐ]τοι
[μετιον πολλ'αχ]ως ληψηθεί τ]ο] δε
[νομιμων α]υτο μεν ο εστι[ν] ὁρισται
[η]μ[ι] [προτε]ρον δει δ' ὁπο]ταν [χρη

[τα νο]μον λα]μβανειν ειτα το [ομοι
[ὁν] τοιν γεγρ]αμμενοι νομοι εξι] τε
[αν τοιονδε ο]σπερ γαρ ο νομοθετης
[τιασ μεγια]τας ἡμιαις τοις
35 κλεπτοίτας κολαξείς ουτω δει κα[ι]
tους εξαπατωντας μαλιστα
τις μωρε[ισθαι] κα[ι] γαρ ουτωιοι κλε
πουσι την διανοιαν και καθαπερ
ο νου'μοθετ[ης] κλη[ηρο]ς[ους] εποι
40 ης τοις εγγυταω γενουσι ον
tas τοις απα[ισ]ων αποθνησκουσιν
ουτω των τι[ου] απελευθερου χρη[

Frs. (d) and (e). Col. iii, p. 16, 13–22.

[νοις αυτα παντας αδικειν ο νομις][
[θετης εκρινεν ει γαρ τιμα]σθαι
45 [οι νομοι προστιττουσι τογ]καλως[
[και δικαιωσ των κοινων επιστατης]αγ[τ]
[tas δηλον ωσ και τους τα δημοσια][
[διαφθεραντας τιμωριας] αξι
ους νομικουσιν . . . . . . . . . κακ]
50 [των εναντιων το νομιμον κατα][
[Φαινεις ουτω γινεται . . . . εκ δε των][
[κεκριμενων ωδε και ου μονον] εγω[
[του νομου τουτων ενεκα τουτων][
[φημι του νομοθετην θειναι αλλα] και
55 [προτερου οι δικασται παραπλη][

Fr. (e). Col. iv, p. 17, 10–11.

και ταις πολεσιν ομονουσαι
57 προσκοπεων μη στασιασωσι


tα μεν ουν ομοια τωι συμφεροντι του
του των τροπων μετω[ον] [πολλα]
60 ποιη[σ]εις εικ δε των εναντιονων ωδε]
[ρ]ον α[ν ει]η Δ[ακεδαιμονιοι] συμμα
[Χ]ρη λαμβανειν Δα]κεδαιμονιοι
[τε γαρ Αθηναίοις καταπολε
70 τιο[ν] ουτω το συμφερον κατα
[ν]υ]πο [εινδοξον κ]ριτων ουτω
[Χρη λαμβανειν Δα]κεδαιμονιοι
[τε γαρ Αθηναίοις κα]ταπολε
75 [μενσαντες συμφι]ρειν αυτοις
[ωρ]ηθησαν μη την πολ]ιν αυτω
[εξαινδραποδίςα]σα[σ]θαι και
[παλιν Αθηναίοι μετα] Θηβα]ιων
[εξ]ον ανοικισαι την Σ]μπαρτην

Frs. (f) and (g).  Col. vi, p. 17, 25—18, 14.

80 [συμφερειν σφισιν ω]ρηθησαν περι]
παλιν Αδακεδαιμονιους περι
με[ν] του δικαιου και του νομιμου και
του [συμφεροντοι ουτω μετιων ευπο
ρη]ςεις το δε καλον και το ραιδιον και
85 τ[ο] ηδυ και το δυνατον και το αναγκαι
ο[ν ομοιοτροπων τουτως μετιωθαι και]
περι μεν τουτω ενευθεν ευπο
ρηςομεν παλιν δε διορισωμεθα και
[περι πασον και ποιων και την εν τε]
90 τ[οις οου]λευηηριοις και ταις εκκλη
σιαις συμβουλευομεν αι γαρ του
τ[οιν εκαστα σφαγος επιστομε]θα
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τὸν μὲν ἰδίους λογοὺς αὐτὰ τὰ
περὶ γαμμάτα καθ' εκαστὴν ημῶν
95 τῇ[ν συμβου]λιαν παραδώσει τὰς
dὲ [κοινὰς ἰδεὰς ἐκ πολλοῦ προείδῳ
[τῆς εἰπερεῖν] ἐφ' εκαστὰς τῶν
πραξεών παιδίων διὸν ἦσομέθα τὸν
tῶν οὖν εὐκα διαιρετέου ημῶν
100 περὶ κοινὰ βουλευόνται πάν
tεσ [ἐν κεφάλαιοι μὲν οὖν εἰπεῖν

Frs. (g) and (h).

Col. vii, p. 18, 14—19, 4.

[eisiv epsta ton] arid'mon prothēseis
[peiri oiv òhμηνορντευν αναγκαι
[on gar esti] bo'ilévenothai kai le
105 [gein ἡμας εν βούληι η εν òhμωι
[peiri ieroun η νομον η] peiri ths poli
[ti'khs katasteusηs η] pe[ri t]ων prō[s]
[tas allas polies σ]umma'χio[v] kai
[sympholaioun η peiri pol]ēμ[ων η
110 [eirhnhs η peiri pōrou xrh]mo[tων] ai
[mev ouv prothēseis autai twn]xanou
[si peiri oiv bo'v]enevouμeθα [kai òhμη
[gyrhso]mev ekasthn ðe prothēsin
dielowmēda kai skopowmen ev ois
115 trpotes peiri touton evdēxetai
tois logois xrhsthai peiri mev [oun
ieron trittos [a'vagkaio[v] le
gein η γαρ ερημεν ως αναγκ]aio[v
ta kαθεστωτα δ]ia]φυλαττειν
120 η ou epι to megaloprepesste
[ron metaσtateun η ou epι to ta{ta}
pevosteron otao mev ouv legw
mev ou dei ta kαθεστωτα διαφυ
122  
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Frs. (g) and (h).  

Col. viii, p. 19, 5-10.

λατ[τείν ευρησομέν αφορμασ εκ μεν
125 τού δικαιον διοτι παρα πασι τα πα
tria [εθη παραβαίνειν αδικον εστι
kai διοτι τα μαντεια παντα τοις
agθροποις προστατευκαταντα
πατρια ποιεσθαι τας θυσιας
130 και τ[ων πρωτων οικιζοντων
tas poleis kai tois theois idρυ
10 lines lost.

κι
ατ
σι

135 π'

Frs. (i) and (k).  

Col. ix, p. 22, 3-17.  

**PLATE III.**

[ειν ουληβδην δε δει παραφυλατ
[τειν οπως οι μεν] νομοι το πληθος
[αποτρεψουσι τοις τας ουσιας εξουσιαν
[επιβουλευειν τοις δε πλουτουσιν
140 [εις τας κοινας λειτουργιας δαπαναν
[φιλοτιμιαν εμποριοσουσιν τουτο
[δε ουτος αν τις π]μαθευσομεν ει
[tois μεν τας ουσιας εξουσιαν αντι
[tων εις το κοινον δαπανωμενοι τι

145 [μαι τινας απο τ]ου νομουν αφωρι
[σμ]ει[αι τυν]γρα[νοεν των δε γενομε
[ν]ων τοις τ]ην χαραν εργαζομενος
[τε] και τους [ναυτικοι] μαλλο

150 [οι μεν πλουτουντες ε]κοντες τη
[pολει] λειτουργιοσουσιν το δε πλη
[θος ου συκοφαντιας αλ]α εργασιας επι
[θυμησει .............]ν και περι του
Fr. (i).  
Col. x, p. 22, 17—23, 4.  

 Plato III.

epikeiṣthai tiμωρίας τοις παρα βαίνονσιν ταύτα χρη καὶ τοῖς εν τοι τοιτείως τελευτήσας ταφήν δημοσίων χωρίων εγ καλω προ της πολέως αφορίσθαι κατοι πασίν αὐν τοιν εως ηβησονει εἰς τροφὴν διδόναι των μεν οὖν εν ταῖς δημοκρατίαις νομοὺς τοιαύτην δει την θεσιν ποιεῖσθαι περὶ δε τας ολιγαρχίας τας μεν αρχας δει τους νομους κατανεμεῖν εξ ἵσον πασὶ τοις της πολιτείας μετεχουσίν τούτων

deinai τας πλείστας κληροτας τας δε μεγιστας κρυφαίας ψήφωι μεθ ορκων καὶ πλειστὴς ακριβεὶ ας διαψηφίστας δεί δε καὶ τας ζη μιας εν ταῖς ολιγαρχίαις] μεγί

Fr. (ı).  
Col. xi, p. 23, 4—17.  

 Plato III.

exei baseos υ[βριζομενον χρη δε t[as διαφορας τ[ων πολιτων στ[αξιστα διαλυ[ειν . . . . . .

και μη [σ]υναγ[ειν εκ της χωρας τον ωξ[ον ει]ς t[ην] πολιν εκ γαρ τοιν
ποιοτά υστεροφορεται

τα πληθή καὶ καταλυει τας ολι
γαρχιας καθολοιν δε ειπειν δει
ει μεν τας δημοκρατιας κωλυειν
tous pollois tais tous plousiouν
ousiais epiboulievein en de tais

ολιγαρχαις αποτρεπειν tous
tης πολιτειας μετεχοντας
υβριζειν τους ασθενεστερους
και συκοφαντειν τους πολιτας ων
μεν οιν ορεγεσθαι δει τους νομους

και την πολιτικην κατασκευ
ην εκ τοινων ουκ αγινησεις
δει δε συναγορευοντα μεν νομωι
dεικνυαι τουν ισον ουτα τοισ
πολιταίσις ομολογουμενοι τε

Frs. (l).

Col. xii, p. 24, 14–19.

και πλησιον τοις τοποις κατοι
κοντας ει δε μη τουτων απερ αν υ
παρχη συναγεϊν οταν δε διακωλυ
ηις την συμμαχιαν εμφανιζειν
ενδεχεται πρωτομ μεν ου ου

και αναγκη ποιεισθαι, υνω αυτην
επειθ ως ου δικαιοι τυγχανουσιν ουτ[es]

Frs. (l), (m), (n), and (o).

Col. xiii, p. 24, 19—25, 8.

ειθ ως προτερον ημας κακως ποιη
σαμιτες 14 letters ει δε μη
ως μακραν τοις τοποις απεχοιτες
και α δυνατοι οντες κατα τους προση
κοιτας παραγενεσθαι καιρους ταης
[μ]εν ουν 18 letters εσιν
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τὰς περὶ τῶν συμμαχῶν εκ τούτων
καὶ τῶν τοῦτοις ομοίως τροπῶν ευπο

215 ἡσομίην χρησθαί περὶ πολέμου
[δὲ καὶ εἰς τις τοῦ] αυτοῦ τρόπουν
τὰς μεγάλας ἑ диας εγκαθισμένοι
[πρὶς] ομοίως μεν] οὖν εἰσὶν τοῦ πολέμου
[εκφέρειν πρὸς τὶνας αἰδὲ πρῶτε

220 ἀδικηθεῖτος νῦν καὶ ὀραν παρὰ
πεπτωκότοις αμυνασθαί τοὺς
[ἀδικήθη ὑπάς η] νυν αδικομενοὺς ὑπὲρ
αυτῶν πολέμειν η ὑπὲρ συγγενῶν η
[ν] ὑπὲρ ἐνεργετῶν η συμμαχοῖς

225 αἰδικουμενοῖς βοήθειν η τοῦ της
πολεμεῖν οἱ συμφέροντος ενεκέν η εἰς

Fr. (o).

Col. xiv, p. 25, 10-18.

2 lines lost.

[ἐπὶ τὸ πολεμεῖν παρακαλωμέν τοὺς
τοὺς] τῶν τις φοβήσεων στὶ πλείστας
[συμ] ἀκτέον καὶ μετὰ ταύτα δεικτεῖν

230 ὡς εἶ οὖν εστὶν περιγενεσθαί τοῦ
πολέμου τούτων στὶ πλείστα τοῖς
παρακαλουμενοῖς εστὶ υπ' αὐτὸς χοντα
περιγενοῦται δὲ πάντες πολεμεῖν
τέσ η δια τήν τῶν θεῶν ευνοιαν [ην] ευ

235 τυχίαν ἡμείς καὶ οὐχὶ η διὰ σωμα
τῶν πλήθων καὶ ρωμήν η διὰ χρή
ματων [ενπορίαν] η διὰ στράτη
γων ψ' ὑπονήσιν η δια συμμαχων
αρετῆς η διὰ τοπῶν . . . . .

240 εὑρίσκων τούτων οὐν καὶ τῶν
τοῦτοις ομοιοτροπῶν τα τοῖς πρά
γμασιν οικειοτάτα λαμβα
Fr. (p.).

Col. xv, p. 29, 15—30, 8.

[φανονται μείζους ἧταν πρὸ [β]παχυν
τερους παραστωσιν εσται δε χαι

243 ὦδε αὐξεῖν εἰ κεκριταί, μέγα
[ἀγαθον . . . . . . . . . . . μέγα . .

18 letters μ . . . . . .

23 , . . . .

24 , . .

250 τουτοις ενεχειρησεν ως μετα
τουτων επραξε μεθ ων ο'υδεις αι λ
λος ως επι τουτοις μεθ ους ου,
δεις ετερος ως εκοιν ως ε'κ προ
νοιας ως ει παντες . . . ποιωιμεν

260 ευθαμονομεν αν η πραττοιμεν
φαιλως χρη δε και ει'καζον
τα συμβιβαζειν και εποικοδομουντα
[το ετερον ως επι το ετερον αυξειν
[τροπωι τοιωδε οτις δε των φιλων] κη

Fr. (p.).

Col. xvi, p. 30, 8 21.

265 δεται ερικος και τους γονει[σ] τιμαν ου
και την πατριδα την [εαυτ]ου β[ο]ν
λη[σ]ται ευ τοιεωσ συλληβδην δ] εαν
μεν πολλων αιτιον αποφαινης ε

270 αυ τ [γ]ον[θ]ο[ν] εαν τε κακων μέγαλα
φανεται σ[κοπειν δε . . . .]μεν
ποτερον μειζον φαίνεται το προσφορον τον τροπον αν
για κατα μερη διαφορομενον η κα
θολων λεγομενον ο[π]οιερος αν ο[ν]ν
275 μειζον η τον τροπον τον τροπον αν
το δει λεγειν τα[σ] μεν ών αυξη
σεις ουτως μετιων πλειστας και
μεγιστας ποιησεις ται[ν]πεινωσεις
δε τοις λογοις και ταγαθα και τα
280 κα τον εναντιον τροπον μετιων
ευρησεις και μεν επι τωμ μεγα
λων και μαλιστα μεν μηθενος
αιτιον επιδεικνυειν ει δε μη ως ελα
χιστων και μικροτατων ως με
285 τουν εγκωμιαξοντες και[ι]ψευστες

Fr. (p).

Col. xvii, p. 30, 21—31, 8.

αυξησομεν και ταπεινωσομεν απερ
αν εκφερομεν εκ τοιων ισομεν
χρησιμαι δε των αυξησων εισιν αι
[α]φορμαι και ειν τοις αλλοις ειδεσιν αλ
290 λαι [η πλειστη] δυναμις εν τοις εγ
καιροις και τοις ψυγοις εστιν αυταις
περι μεν ουν τουτων εντευθεν
ευπορησομεν διελθομεν δε ε
παλιν τουτοις ομοιοποιος το [τε
295 κατηγορικοι και απολογικοι ειδιος]
εξ αυ νυστηκην και [ω]ς αυτοις
dei χρησιμαι εστι δε το μεν κατηγο
ρικου συλληβδην επειν αδικη
ματων και αμαρτηματων] εξηγησις
300 το δ απολογικου αδικηματων
και αμαρτηματων κατηγορη
θεντων η υποπτευθεντων δια
λυσεις εκατερου δε των ειδων
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Fr. (p).

Col. xviii, p. 31, 14-20.

1-5. (ομοιο)ν κ.τ.λ.: the whole sentence in the MSS. runs εἰςπορήσωμεν δὲ περὶ τοῦτων λέγειν ἐξ αὐτῶν τε τῶν προημιμένων καὶ τῶν ὑμών τούτων καὶ τῶν ἐναντίων αὐτοῖς καὶ τῶν ἡδύ κεκριμένων ὑπὸ θεῶν ἡ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐνδόξων ἡ ὑπὸ κριτῶν ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνταγωνιστῶν ἡμῶν. The papyrus (II) exhibits several variations. λέγειν is placed later in the sentence, after ομοιον [αὐτοῖς, which, owing to considerations of space, is more likely to have stood in the text than ομοιον ταύτας. Possibly καὶ should be restored in place of καὶ in l. 1, but the supplement is already rather long for the lacuna. Before υπὸ θεῶν Π inserts ἡ, and before ἀνθρώπῳ adds υπ, while ἐνδόξων is transferred from ἀνθρώπῳ to κριτῶν, whether υπ ἐνδόξων κριτῶν [κριτων] is read, as we propose, or υπ [κριτων ἐνδόξων, which is also possible if the supposed τ is regarded as ink that has come off from a different layer in the cartonnage. The transfer of the epithet is an improvement; cf. l. 72, where Π has υπ [ἐνδόξων κριτων in place of ἐνδόξων of the MSS, in a passage which develops in detail the general statement in l. 4. ἀνθρώπῳ by itself makes a better antithesis to θεῶν than ἀνθρώπῳ ἐνδόξων, and Spengel (p. 111) had already remarked that ἡ ὑπὸ θεῶν ἡ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπῳ would be expected—which is what Π actually has.
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9. το: om. MSS.
11. τους εις μεμεισθαι: so Hammer with CFM and the deteriores; μμεισθαι τοις νιοις OP Ald.
15. κακων εγραματευον [ημας: ημις κακων εγραματευον MSS, except V which has κακων ημις 
εγραματευον.
17. τσυτον τον τροπου: τον τροπου τοιτον MSS. Spengel had already proposed to place τοιτον first.
22. ουσω καλι: so Hammer following Spengel; the MSS. place ουσω after ευεργετης-
σατας. The reading of the papyrus is not quite certain. Lines 21, 22, and 23 as far as σατα are on a separate fragment (c), and the exact position of the two parts of l. 23 cannot be determined by external evidence. Adopting the arrangement in the text, according to which only α is supposed to be lost between σατα and σ., it is necessary to supply ουσω between τσυτον τον τροπου and καλι, as ευεργετηςατας ουσω cannot be read. But a difficulty is caused by the last three letters of the line: the surface of the papyrus is much damaged at this point, and it is hard to distinguish what is the original ink from what has come off from a different layer. The vestiges following the σ, which is clear, do not suit the beginnings of either προσφει or αυτεργεταιν, the two last words of the sentence in the MSS., for though ρο is possible there is not space for π between that and the σ.
25. Διακαιον κρινον τσυτον MSS., which is too long for the lacuna.
26. μεν δη: μεν ον MSS.; but Π's reading is very uncertain. The letter before υ could equally well be υ, i.e. υυυ, but then it is very difficult to account for the following δ (or α), unless the beginning of διακαιον was written twice by mistake. There are some very faint traces of the penultimate letter before υυυ or υυ, but not sufficient to help in deciding between το μεν or μεν ουν.
27. Πολλαξιος: so Spengel; πολλαξιος MSS., Hammer. But Π's reading is very uncertain.
28. ο: oιν MSS.
29. οπαταν: οποιον ου MSS., but the letter preceding αυ is more like τ than υ. οπατα αυ might also be read.
29-30. Χρησιμον εις αυτον: τον χρησιμον αυτον MSS., avoiding the hiatus. It is not certain that the order was different in the papyrus, but the lacuna in l. 30 corresponds to νερατοπ in l. 29 and ομοφαυς in l. 31, so that [νατο] is rather short for it, while [ηχρη] would make l. 29 rather long.
30-1. αυτον τε τον διαγορευται δια νομον λαμβανειν: αυτον τε τον γινομενον και τον
νομον λαμβανειν MSS., which will hardly construe, and is probably a corruption of the true reading found in Π.
34. ται: om. MSS.
35. κλεπτωτας κολαζει: κλεπτας κολαζει τοιτον MSS. κλεπτωτας makes a better contrast than κλεπτας with εξαπατοται in l. 36.
36. δει: so Hammer with CF and the deteriores; δη MOP Ald.
39. επιγινε: επιφικε MSS.
42. των: και των MSS.
43-7. The vestiges of these lines are very slight and the reconstruction very uncertain.
48-9. ους νομας with a paragraphus below is on the fragment (d) containing most of Col. ii, but the position of those letters in relation to Fr. (e) containing Cols. iii and iv is rendered certain by the writing on the verso, although Col. iii proves to be shorter by 3 lines than Col. ii. After νομας there may have been a blank space of 3 or 4 letters, so that the lacuna before μα may be reduced from 10 letters to 6. The MSS.
proceed ἐκ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐννιῶν, and οὖν would be expected at the end of the line, but the two letters that remain are almost certainly ικ. Since ἐκ must have occurred somewhere in l. 49, we propose και, i.e. καὶ ἐκ, though this goes far to necessitate the alteration of μὲν οὖν, which would almost fill up the lacuna between νομίζωνις and και. It is just possible that ἐκ μὲν οὖν καὶ τῶν ἐννιῶν should be read, but the vestiges suit καὶ much better than ικ.

50-1. The order of words in the MSS. is ἐννιῶν καταφάνεις οὖτῳ γίνεται τῷ νόμῳ, from which the papyrus must have varied, since only 20 letters are available in l. 51 between καὶ and the end of the sentence. The vestiges before [καὶ] γίνεται μ and are not easily reconcilable with the termination of ἐννιῶν or γίνεται. There is room for 3 or 4 letters more than our supplement of the lacuna in l. 51, but there may well have been a blank space left between γίνεται and ἐκ.

54. The supplement, 26 letters, is rather long for the lacuna; in the corresponding space in the other lines the letters lost do not exceed 23.

55. πωραν πλησίον: διεξόων αυτοικονομία MSS. Π either omitted διεξόων αυτοικονομία or, more probably, placed the words later in the sentence.

56-7. Working back from τα μὲν in l. 58, the π in l. 57 seems to be the initial letter of προσκαταστάθην which is found in ABDV in place of ακοικίαν (CEFMOF, Hammer), and καὶ in l. 56 must belong to καί. There is not room in l. 56 for the reading of the MSS. καὶ ταῖς πολείσιν ἄρμωνοισιν συμφέρων ἄστι and probably συμφέρων ἄστι was omitted or placed before καί or a shorter phrase, e.g. δὲ, substituted.

60. οὖν: οὖν οἷς MSS.

61. τοι συμβορροῦν: so Hammer with CFMP and the deteriores; om. O.

62. τιμών τῶν πολιτῶν τῶν MSS.

64. τοῦ οὖν: so Hammer with CFMO and the deteriores; om. P.

65. οὖν συμβορροῦν εἶναι: αὐτόμερον MSS. Cf. l. 210, note.

67-8. Λακεδαιμονίων συμμάχων συμμάχων ποιησάμενον άμισ MSS. το is not essential, and in other respects the new reading, which avoids the ambiguity of subject and object in that of the MSS., is preferable.

70. συμβορροῦν: so Hammer with CFMP and the deteriores; om. O.

72. τοῦ εὐδοκοῦ καταστάθην: ἐν τοῦ εὐδοκοῦ συμφέρων MSS.; cf. note on ll. 1-5.

76. οὖν: οὖν MSS., which is better. οὖν has just occurred twice previously, in ll. 68 and 70.

77. τὰ ὁπιστάντα ἀνά τι συμβορροῦν: ἀναποστάσεως, the reading of the MSS., is too short for the initial lacuna, which requires 11-13 letters.

78. μετά τοῦ Ὑμησίων: om. MSS., which insert αὐτόν after ἐξῆν in the next line. For the occasion referred to in ll. 78-81 cf. Dem. De Cor. pp. 258-9.

82. μὲν οὖν τοῦ: so CF; μὲν οὖν τοῦ οὖν Hammer with the other MSS. The insertion of οὖν would make a line of 32 letters, which is unlikely; possibly Π had καὶ περὶ μὲν τοῦ τοῦ.

86. τοῖς is omitted by MOP, but probably stood in Π. The restorations of ll. 82, 85, and 86 involve lines of 29 letters, that of l. 84 a line of 30 letters, which is 2 or 3 letters more than the average length of ll. 87-101; but it is fairly certain that l. 83 had 28 letters, and it is better to suppose that the lines at the top of this column were slightly longer than those below in spite of the fact that the beginnings of lines tend to slope away to the left, than to suppose that Π differed extensively from the MSS. in ll. 80-86.

88. If there was no space before παύω there is just room for the reading of the MSS. παύω δὲ διαφορῶν (or σημαίνει) καὶ in this line. But elsewhere, when the writer inserts a paragraphus and the new sentence had begun in the line above, a space of from 2-4 letters is left. Hence it is not unlikely that Π had ὁμοσποιέω (as conjectured by
Spengel) or omitted και at the end of l. 88. Line 89, as restored, is already quite long enough, so that και cannot be transferred to it without omitting some other word.

93. τοὺς μὲν εἰς...: so Hammer with CFMP and the deteriores; om. τοῦ Ο.
95. τοῦ: om. MSS.

παραδίδωσι: so Hammer with CFMO and the deteriores; παραδίδωσι P.
97. εκκατάτοι: εκκατάτοι MSS. It's reading may be right.
102. τον] ἀρμόν: so H. with CFM and the deteriores; τῶν ἀρμῶν P; om. O.
103. διηγημάτων: δημηγορίσαρος MSS.

αναγκαίον: ανάγκη MSS.
104. βούλευσθαι: καί βούλευσθαι MSS., but there is not room for both καί and εστι in the lacuna. The reading βούλευσθαι is very uncertain. The traces following the supposed β (which might be read ο) would suit τ better than υν.

105. ἡ εν δημοί [περὶ τεραν ἡ νομον]: καί δήμῳ ἡ περὶ τεραν ἡ περὶ νομον MSS. Possibly [ἡ περὶ should be read in l. 106, but the supplement is already quite long enough, and for περὶ before νομον there is certainly no room; cf. 109-10, note.

108. [τας ἀλλας: so Hammer with CFM (and OP?); om. τας the deteriores. The size of the lacuna makes it practically certain that Π had τας.

109-10. CFOP and the deteriores have ἡ περὶ εἰρήνης ἡ περὶ πάρου, which is 4 or 5 letters too long for the lacuna here, while M omits ἡ περὶ εἰρήνης, with which reading Π cannot be brought into agreement. The simplest course is to suppose the omission of περὶ before either εἰρήνης or πάρου, preferably the former; cf. l. 105. note.

111. The supplement is rather long for the lacuna, and μεν or ον may have been omitted; cf. l. 82, note.

τυγχάναται: τυγχάνουσιν οὔτε MSS. It would be just possible to restore τυγχάνουσιν [νοσαν περὶ ων ζων]; but this would make l. 111 unusually long, and the lacuna at the beginning of l. 112 suits 11 or 12 letters better than 14. οὔται is quite unnecessary.

114. διελομέθη: so H. with CFMP and the deteriores; διαλυομέθη Ο.
115. περὶ τούτων ενδέχεται: so H. with CDFMOP; ενδέχεται περὶ τούτων the rest of the deteriores.

116. τοις λογοις χρησθαι: χρήσασθαι Η. with CF (first hand) MP; λάγα χρήσασθαι F (second hand) Ο and the deteriores. Π's reading is the best; cf. l. 279.

117. τριττος: so H. from a conjecture of Bekker; περιττος (περιττος C) MSS.
[ἀναγκαὶ λέγειν : so H. with CFMP and the deteriores; λέγειν ἀναγκαίον Ο.

118-9. ἀναγκαίον τα καθεστώτα διὰ φυλακτῶν: τὰ καθεστώτα διαφυλακτῶν MSS., except O which adds ἑρᾶ after διαφ. The repetition of ἀναγκαίον which has occurred in the previous line is inelegant, and διαφυλακτῶν is preferable, though this sentence has become corrupt in the MSS.; cf. the next note.

121. μεταστάτων: πὼς MSS. (except δυτικος V, δυτικος D), a reading which makes no sense and is justly bracketed by H. following Spengel. The insertion of μεταστάτων is a great improvement. With the MSS. reading a verb like μεταστάτων had to be supplied out of its opposite διαφυλακτων, making a very harsh construction. Spengel (p. 121) had proposed the insertion of δει μεθύσαται.

125-6. After δικαίων the MSS. have λέγοντει τὰ πάτρια ἐθνῆ παρὰ πᾶσι παραβαιν tease ἱδικών ἑστι καὶ, thus having 48 letters corresponding to what should occupy (allowing 28 letters for a line) not more than 46 letters in Π, and clearly placing τα πάτρια ἐθνη earlier in the sentence than Π. παρὰ πᾶσι, which is constructed with ἱδικῶν, is awkwardly situated in the MSS. reading between ἔθνη and παραβαινεῖν, and the simplest restoration of ll. 125-6 is to keep all the words found in the MSS. and transpose τὰ πάτρια ἐθνη and παρὰ πᾶσι. This results, however, in giving 30 letters to l. 125, which is unlikely; and since out of the three illustrations the MSS. introduce the second and third by ὅτι . . . ὅτι (v. l. διδότι . . . ὅτι),
omitting δια before, we suggest, that II had δια in place of λέγωτες to introduce the first. The edicio Basil, of 1539, based on an unknown MS., inserted δια after λέγωτες. If παρὰ πασι is not placed before τα πατρια εὑρʹ then (δια) λεγωτε is much too long paraβαινειν τα πατρια [εὐρ para πασιν αδικων εὐτι is preferable to διατι αδικων εὐτι τα πατρια [εὐρ para πασι paraβαινεν. Blass prefers to restore l. 1.25 τιναλ λεγωτες διατι τα πα. omitting παρὰ πασι on the ground that παρὰ πασιν αδικων εὐτι is not satisfactory in the sense of παρὰ πασιν αδικων νομίζει.

127. διατι: the traces of the letter after κ suit δ and are irreconcilable with ο or τ. διατι C and the detiores; διατι H. with FMOP.

130. καὶ τιων: καὶ δια τιων MSS. Cf. note on ll. 125-6.

137. καὶ μεν νομιμο το πλῆθος: δια νομιμο το μεν πλῆθος MSS., which is the better reading.

138. [ἀποστρέψειν: ἀποστρέψειν (ἀποστρέψειν ΟΥ) MSS., but cf. l. 1.141 ἐμπορίησουσιν where they have εμπορίησουσι.

140-1. διαταν [φιλοτιμων εμπορίησουσι: ἐκοινωνίᾳ ἰσακων φιλοτιμων ἐμπορίησουσι MSS. II probably represents the true reading, ἰσακων being a corruption of διαταν and ἐκοινωνίᾳ a gloss.

142. τις πιθανουσειν: κατασκευαζειν MSS.: κατασκευαζειν (sc. δια νομιμο) H., adopting a conjecture of Spengel. In the reading of the MSS. κατασκευαζειν had no subject to refer to; but their error is now shown to have consisted not in the use of the singular but in the omission of the subject, which is probably τις, since there is room for 3 or 4 letters between αν and πιθανουσειν.

145. καὶ των νομιμων: so H. with CFOP and the detiores; om. M.

146. γνωριμων: πενομην MSS. The reading of Π is probably a mere error; cf. note on ll. 148-9.

147. ἐργαζομενοι: so H. with CFO and the detiores; ἐργαζομένων MP.

148-9. τις καὶ των ναυσικα τω μελλων [των, αγοραϊων προτιμαι: καὶ ναυκληρουται των ἀγοραϊων μελλων προτιμουν MSS. The letter before ε in l. 148 was certainly not α and the vestiges suit ν. It is clear that II varied considerably from the MSS. in this sentence, and the difficulty of restoring ll. 147-9 is increased by the fact that there is an error in l. 146 and probably another in l. 149. The reading of the MSS. is thus translated by Bekker sigque et agricolas pueritibus et navium gubernatores recti erat anhippon, which is correct but yields no satisfactory sense; for how would the poor be prevented from plotting against the rich by the laws favouring cultivators at the expense of the poor and shipowners at the expense of merchants? A meaning more relevant to the context is that suggested by St. Hilare, 'dans les rages des pauvres ceux qui cultivent la terre ou qui montent les navires soient entourés de plus d’estime que les marchands de la place publique.' This construction of των πενομην as dependent on των ἐργαζομενοι is in any case preferable to Bekker’s view that it depends on μελλων, but ‘qui montent les navires’ is an impossible translation of ναυκληροται—which apparently no one has proposed to emend to ναις πληροιται. II did not have ναυκληροσουσι, and though ναυκληροσ would fit the lacuna, ναυτικον, suggested by Blass, is much more likely. The earlier parts of ll. 146-9 are on a separate fragment, the position of which is fairly certain since there is no other place among the extant columns to which it can be assigned. There remains the difficulty of the infinitive προτιμαι in l. 149. There is no room to insert in ll. 148-9 a verb in the optative which would govern it, and the choice seems to lie between supplying a verb or, better, altering προτιμαι to προτιμουν (sc. δια νομιμο) or προτιμων (sc. τις or whatever was the subject of πιθανουσειν in l. 1.42). The frequency of infinitives after δει and χω throughout this chapter may account for the error.

149-51. ενω γαρ ... λειτουργουσιν in: διοι ... λειτουργουσι MSS.

152-3. επεθεραμει επεθεραμει MSS.; cf. the previous note.
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153. ......... ἵνα δὲ πρὸς τοῦτο MSS. Perhaps δὲ τοιντιν should be restored, but the construction of ll. 153–9 is not clear. ἑκ[α]验收 κεινην νομος in l. 156 may depend on χρη in l. 159 (cf. note ad loc.).

154. *ἀνάδαστον ποιεῖν: ποιεῖν ἀνάδαστον MSS.*

155–6. τῶν [15 letters σαντων: τῶν τελευτῶν MSS., which will not do. Usener had suggested τῶν ἰδιώτων, Wilamowitz τῶν πλούτοισιν; and Π now shows that some word has dropped out in the MSS., and an aorist, not a present, participle is the correct reading. [ἰδιώτων τελευτῶν is possible, but τελευτῶν may come from the next clause (cf. l. 160, note).] Blass proposes τῶν 'τὴν πολυν μη αδικηντων.

159. χρη καὶ: χρη δὲ MSS. Π thus makes επικεισθαι in l. 158 and perhaps κεισθαι in l. 157 (cf. l. 153, note) depend on χρη, as well as the two verbs that follow, αφορισθαι and διδωθαι, whereas in the MSS. the words preceding χρη depend on δει at the beginning of the sentence, and χρη is connected only with what follows. The position given to χρη in Π is not very satisfactory, but without knowing what stood in the lacuna in l. 153 it is impossible to say whether the omission of δε is intentional or a slip.

160. τωι: om. MSS. τωι may be right; cf. e.g. 14. 34 and the passage of Aeschines quoted ad loc.

τελευτησαί: τελευτῶν MSS.; cf. note on l. 156.

ταφην: εἰς ταφην MSS. The scribe has placed before τροφην in l. 163 the εἰς which ought to have come before ταφην here.

161. δημοσιον χωριον: τι χωριον δημοσιον MSS.

162. αφορισθαι: so H. with Ald.; ἀφορισμένον MSS. (Hammer’s apparatus assigns ἀφορισθαι to a, his sign for the family CFMOP, but cf. Spengel’s notes ad loc. ἀφορισμένον] adde ειναι, edit ex Ventic ἀφορισθαι, and ἀφορισμένοι, sic librí omnes’).

καιτο παισιν: a corruption of και τοις παισιν (MSS.).

αυτων: so H. with CFM and the deteriores; om. OP.

163. εος ἡθσωσι εἰς τροφην διδωσι: ἔως ἡθσωσι τροφην διδωσι MSS. Π is corrupt, the scribe having inserted before τροφην the εἰς which ought to have come before ταφην in l. 160 (cf. note ad loc.). But εος ἡθσωσι may be right, for ἐος with the genitive is a late use, while ἐως with the subjunctive without ἐω is parallel to the similar construction occasionally found with πρῶς and μέχρι in Attic prose; and though -ωσι may have its origin in the omitted δημοσιαί, the insertion of that word is not necessary, especially as δημοσιαί χωριον occurs in l. 161.

164. τοις δημοκρατίαις: τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ MSS.; cf. l. 174, note. Π’s reading is the better; cf. εν μίν ταις δημοκρατίαις in p. 23. 10 (= l. 187).

165. τοιαύτην δει την δεισιν ποιεσθαι: τὴν δείσιν τοιαύτην δει ποιεσθαι MSS. The order in Π is preferable.

168. κατασκευή: ἀποφιγέν MSS. EG omit πάσι.

της: so H. with CFMO and most of the deteriores; om. P; την followed by πολειτείων DV.

170. τας πλειστας: τὰς μὲν πλειστας MSS., which is preferable.

171. κρυφάη: κρυπτῇ MSS.

172. μεθ; so H. with CFMP and the deteriores; καὶ μεθ’ O.

173. καὶ: om. MSS.

174. τας ἀληγρηξαις: τῇ ἀληγρηξῃ MSS.; cf. note on l. 164.

175. υβρίζονειν: υβρίζειν MSS. Π’s reading is a blunder.

178. στερούμενον: so H. with CFGMOP; στερούμενον the rest of the deteriores.

179. χρη δὲ: χρη δὲ καὶ MSS., but a supplement of 18 letters is rather long for the lacuna, not more than 15 being lost in the corresponding space in this column, so that καὶ, which Π inserts in l. 173 where the MSS. omit it, was probably omitted here.
181–2. διαλύειν . . . . . . . καὶ μὴ ἀναγέων: διαλύειν καὶ μὴ χρωτίζομαι μηδὲ συνάγειν MSS. Π probably substituted a phrase meaning ‘without delay’ for the second infinitive.

183. τὸν οὐκ οὖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν: ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν τῶν ὁχλῶν MSS.

186. καθεξῆς δὲ εἰπεῖν δεῖ: καθαῦν δὲ εἰπεῖν δεῖ τοῖς νόμοις MSS. There is not room for both εἰπεῖν and τοὺς νόμους in l. 186, but Π may equally well have omitted εἰπεῖν and kept τοὺς νόμους.

191. τῆς πολιτείας: so Π, with CFO and the deteriores; πολιτείας MP.

194. οὖν: so Π, with CFMP and the deteriores; om. O.

197. συναγωρίσατε μεν νομοῖ: τὸν συναγωρίσατε ἐδέλουσα νόμο MSS. For our restoration cf. the antithesis ἀντὶ δέλουσα δέ σκοπεῖν (p. 23, 22), where δέ has been corrupted in most MSS. to δὲ. [συναγωρίσατε νομοί by itself is too short for the lacuna, and the insertion of μεν is an improvement. The omission of τῶν in Π may be an error, but τῶν is not necessary.

198. δεκινω' αἰ: δεκιν' MSS.

201. αὐτὲν ἐν ψηφήρη: ἀπέρ ἐν ὑπάρχῃ ταῦτα Π, with CF and the deteriores; ἀπέρ ὑπάρχει ταῦτα MOP; but ἀπέρ ψηφήρη is also possible, though for ταῦτα in any case there is no room. If Π had read ψηφήρη we should have to suppose a lacuna of 10 letters instead of 13 before the first ν of l. 202, and hence diminish by 3 the size of the initial lacuna throughout. This would cause no trouble in l. 200–1, where κατοικοφυτής would suit equally well, but would lead to difficulties in l. 205, where the lacuna could not be restored without cutting down the text of the MSS. (cf. note ad loc.). Line 206 is hard to reconcile with the ordinary reading, even with the longer lacuna; with the shorter some alteration would be imperative. The only serious objection to the view of the size of the initial lacinae in this column upon which we have based our restorations occurs in l. 204, where 18 letters would be expected instead of 14 before the μ of πρωτομ. The supplement [εὐδεχέται πρωτομ], however, contains several broad letters, and it is not, we think, necessary to insert anything.

204–5. οὐκ ἀναγή: so FMOP and the deteriores; οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον Π, with C, and there would be room for ἀναγκαίων in the lacuna, but cf. l. 204. If the lacuna were supposed to be smaller (cf. note on l. 201), χρὴ or δεῖν would have to be substituted for ἀναγή.

206. The MSS. reading (20 letters) is rather long for the lacuna, for which 17 letters are sufficient, and the line as restored contains 32 letters, which is a quite exceptional length, though in any case l. 206 projects considerably into the right-hand margin. Perhaps εἰδή should be read in place of επεθ. With a smaller lacuna at the beginning [επεθ ὡς οὖν τυχῆ] λαμβανόμεν νηπί' εἰς δικαία would be necessary; cf. note on l. 201.

207–8. πουρησάτες: πεπορησάτες MSS., which proceed εἰ δὲ μὴ κ.τ.λ. There is no clue to what the lacuna of 14 letters in Π contained.

210. αὐτὸν αὐτῶν: αὐτὸν ὑπάρχοντες βουκτα MSS. Cf. l. 65, note.

212. ἵλω: after μὲν οὖν the MSS. have τὰς ἀντιλογίας καὶ τὰς συναγωρίας, for which Π substituted something much shorter (22 letters instead of 33), the second substantive (if there were two) being a word ending in -ας.

213. τοῖς: so MSS. The reading is very doubtful; περὶ would suit the traces better, but would leave only 10 letters for the lacuna, which requires 14–16.

215–6. περὶ πολέμου [δὲ καὶ εἰρήνης]: περὶ εἰρήνης δὲ πόλεων καὶ πολέμου MSS. The order in Π is supported by that in II. 199–10.

217. εἰσαλομεν has been corrected from εἰσαλομεν by writing λ above the β, which is crossed out, and β through the λ.

218. πολέμου: so Π, with CFMP and the deteriores; πολέμου by a slip O.

219. αἰδῆ: αὖτα δὲ εἰ δὲ CFMOP; αὖτα δὲ Π, with the deteriores. αἰδῆ is better than
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...and εί is quite unnecessary; Π probably preserves the original reading, of which those of the MSS. are corruptions.

220. ιερον παραπτετ' ὠκοσις: ιερον παραπτετακώτων MSS. The singular is better.

222. The MSS. vary between διδοκομέων (the deteriores) and διδοκομέως (CFMOP), but whichever tense be adopted the supplement is rather long, being 21 or 22 letters instead of 18 or 19 as would be expected; perhaps νν was omitted.

223. αὐτῷ: αὐτῶν FMOP; αὐτῶν C; ἀπότων H. with the deteriores. It is highly improbable that Π had εἰ αὐτῶν, which would make an unlikely division at the end of a line more than average length (cf. the preceding note).

229. [συν]ἀκτεῖνον: the ε is corrected from ο(?) GV read συντεκτήνων, which is out of the question here.

μέτα: so H. with CF and the deteriores; κατά MOP.

230. [ος]: om. MSS. Cf. note on l. 231.

του: πολέμωι: so H. with ABCEF (first hand) MOP; τοῦ πολέμου F (second hand) and DV.

231. τοῦτων στὶ πλεῖστα: ὧν πλεῖστα τοῦτων ΑΒ; ὧν τα πλεῖστα τοῦτων H. with the other MSS., thus making ὧν dependent on δικτοῦν, while Π clearly connects it with πλεῖστα, στὶ πλεῖστα being parallel to στὶ πλεῖστα in l. 228. A conjunction is then required, and accordingly we have inserted ως in l. 230. Of the two rival readings either might easily be corrupted into the other, but that of Π makes the sense clearer, and seems preferable.

232. εὐτυχία: ἐπάρχει ἐστι MSS. The reading of Π is no improvement, especially as εὐτυχία has no ν ἐφελκυσθικόν, but the vestiges, though slight, do not suggest any alternative to ἐπάρχει ἐστι.

233. πολεμάνας: om. MSS., probably through an error.

234-5. εἰ τυχαν ημειῖς: καὶ ἀν ἐν ὑπὲρ: εὖ τυχαν προσαγορεύομεν H. with most of the deteriores; εὐφυκαν προσαγορεύομεν CDFMOP.

237. στρατηγός: so H. with CFMO and the deteriores; στρατὸς P.

239. τοῦτον . . . . . . . . . εὐφυκαν: τοῦτον εὐφυκαν H. with CFOP and the deteriores; τοῦτον εὐτυχίαν M. The lacuna may have contained an adjective for τοῦτον or a substantive coupled by ἤ or καί to εὐφυκαν.

241. τοῖς ομοστροφίωσι: τοῖς ομοστροφίωσι M. DV add ὁμοστροφίωσι, apparently intending τοῖς ὁμοστροφίωσι, which was probably Π’s reading; cf. l. 214.

243. The scanty remains of Col. xv are so much obliterated that only a few letters can be deciphered with certainty, and the restorations are very doubtful in many cases. It is clear that between ll. 245 and 252 Π varied extensively from the MSS. in being considerably shorter. Very likely there were some omissions due to homoeoteleuton, for the passage is a particularly confusing one for a scribe. In l. 243 ο is the only certain letter, but the vestiges of the two preceding letters suit πρ. βραχυτεροίνυς is inadmissible; and προσ seems to be the word meant, though if the next word was intended to be βραχυτερον either προσριχ or προσρίνχ must have been written, for the space between ο and the supposed ρ is barely sufficient for even one narrow letter. προβραχυτερον is not satisfactory, and since the reading πραχ is extremely doubtful Π may have had something quite new here.

244. κατά: so H. with Α (second hand) BFG; om. other MSS.

245. The MSS. have ὄόδε πάντωσ (πάντως DV) ἀνέχειν εἰ κέκριται, with which the reading of Π cannot be reconciled. The vestiges of this line will not suit any part of εἰκεκρηπ, and there is not room for 22 letters in the lacuna, which, taking the tolerably certain supplements of ll. 254-6 as the standard and allowing for the slope of the column to the left, should contain 16 or 17 letters. The omission of πάντως, which is not necessary, leaves 16 letters.

246-50. The MSS. have ἀγαθὸν τοῦτο τοῦτῳ τι ἑναντίον ἐάν λέγηται μέγα κακὸν φιλείτα.
allowing even 28 letters for a line, has but 140. Probably there were some omissions owing to homoioteleuton, as in P, which omits μέγα κακών φαινεται... ἐναντίων λέγεται. μέγα, which is fairly certain in l. 246, comes too soon. The vestiges preceding it are reconcilable with λεγέ·ς, but do not suggest it. The ν in l. 247 perhaps belongs to νομίζεται, and that in l. 248 to ἐναντίων, but the traces of other letters lend no assistance.

250. "a: working back from ζων in l. 251, the MSS. reading εἶν ἀποφαίνεις αὐτῶν ἐκ διανοίας συμβαδίζουν does not produce an α at the right place. Perhaps εἶν ἀποφαίνεις αὐτῶν was omitted and the α belongs to αγαθὰ or κακὰ, or we might change the order and restore ἐκ διανοίας αὐτῶν. But the MSS. reading is very unsatisfactory (Usener proposes αὐτῶν for αὐτῶν), and α may represent a participle such as πραβατία, the insertion of which would be a great improvement.

252. The supplement (22 letters) is a little long, when judged by the standard of ll. 254 and 256, which have 19 in the corresponding space; but cf. l. 253 and l. 255, which apparently has 21.

πολλὰς τρίπτειν MSS.

253. The supplement (23 letters) is again rather long, and not more than 19 would be expected; cf. l. 252, note.

254. πρότερον: so ABEG; πρότερον H. with CDFMOPV.

257-8. The supplements of these lines are rather short. Possibly II inserted επραξεν again after επι τούτων.

259. . . . ποιοὶ μὲν: τοῦτο ἴσως ποιοὶ μὲν MSS., which is too long if μὲν is correctly read. Those letters, however, are very uncertain, and ποιοὶ is possible, in which case τοῦτον ἴσως could be retained in l. 259. But difficulties would then arise in the restoration of l. 260, which seems to end in εν, the vestiges being inconsistent with προτέρως, φι̂ ι̂ χαι̂ ρ οβολας ἡς. On the whole, therefore, it seems preferable to suppose that II had some variant (om. τοῦτο; ?) for τοῦτο ἴσως.

260-1. πράττομεν [φαῦδος]: φαῦδος πράττομεν MSS., which cannot be reconciled with II; cf. the preceding note. If our restoration of l. 261 is correct, there must have been a blank space before χορ.

264. The supplement is rather long; perhaps δὲ was omitted. But the supposed ν in l. 263 is very doubtful, and if there was an omission in II it may have occurred in ll. 262 or 263, where ὡς is really superfluous.

265. εἰκος: τοῦτων ἕκοσ MSS. εἰκος must be wrong.

γοιεις: τιμαὶ οὐ: αὐτοὶ γοιεῖς τιμὰν MSS. (except P, which has αὐτὸν by mistake). οὐ, which makes no sense, may be a survival of αὐτοί, but is more likely to have been caused by the occurrence of τιμαὶ αὐτῶν immediately afterwards.

266. ὃς τις: so H. with F (and OP ?); ὃς CM (so Spengel; from II. it would be inferred that they read ὁτις) and the deteriores.

γοιεις MSS., though reading γοιεῖς in l. 265.

267. βλαγηθεὶς: ἐν ποιεῖν: εν ποιεῖν βουληθεῖσα τοι MSS.

269. μὲν: om. MSS., rightly. Whether II had ε at the end of the line is very doubtful.

271-6. II here differs considerably from the MSS., which have σκοπεῖν δὲ καὶ τὸ πράγμα ὅπων φαινεται κατὰ μέρη διαρμοίμενον καὶ (ἡ the deteriores) καθὼς λεγόμενον καὶ ἀπόστερος (ἀπὸ τοῦν ΓΟ) ἀν μείξον ἡ τόνδε τῶν τρόπων αὐτὸς λέγειν. II's version is superior in several respects; πότερον... ἡ... brings out the contrast between κατὰ μέρη καί καθὼς λέγεων better than ὅπων... καί... and τοῦτο is much preferable to τόνδε. μὲν in l. 271 is probably the termination of a verb in the future or subjunctive governing σκοπεῖω, and the insertion of this and of δε in l. 276 is an advantage. the infinitives σκοπεῖων and λέγεων in the MSS. reading
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being dependent on χωρι supplied from χωρ δε καὶ εἰκόνωτα, although a different sentence συνελήφθοι, ... φανεται has intervened.

276. αὐξήσει: so H. with MSS., except M which has αὐξήσεις.

277. πλείστα καὶ μεγαστα ποιήσει: πλείστα ποιήσει καὶ μεγιστὰς MSS.

279. τοῖς λόγοι: so H. with BCFMOP; τῶν λόγων ADEG. Cf. l. 116, note.

280. καὶ is a mistake for κακα. G and E (first hand) invert ἀγαθὰ and κακὰ. D omits μετὰ.

281. εἰρήκαμεν MSS., which insert ἄν after μέν in l. 282, and in place of εἰσείδεικνύοι in l. 283 have εἰσείδεικνύεις (C), εἰσείδεικνύεις (EO) or εἰσείδεικνύς (the rest; so H.). εἰρήκαμεν, which makes ταπεινωσεῖς a substantive instead of a verb, as it is on the MSS. reading, may in itself be right; but καὶ μέν ... εἰσείδεικνύοι must be wrong, and εἰρήκαμεν looks somewhat like a corruption of ὁς εἰρήκαμεν, due to a misunderstanding of ταπεινωσεῖς. Whether εἰρήκαμεν be retained or not, καὶ μέν must be altered to ὁς (or ὁ) εἰρήκαμεν and εἰσείδεικνύοι corrected, either by reading ἄν ... εἰσείδεικνύοι with the majority of the MSS., or by the simpler substitution of the participle εἰσείδεικνύοι.

284. μικροτάτων: σμικροτάτων MSS.

287. εἰκερφιμεν: εἰκερφιμεν MSS.; εἰκερφιμεν, 'bring forward,' is more pointed.

288. χριστομὶ MSS.

291. τῶν αὐξήσεων εἰσιν αἱ αἱφορμίαι: δὲ αἱ τῶν αὐξήσεων αἱφορμίαι εἰσι MSS., and it is possible to read [θ α] τῶν αὐξήσεων εἰσιν αἱφορμίαι, though the other restoration seems more probable.

290-1. δυναμις εἰς τῶν εὐκαίριων καὶ τῶν ψογοί εἰσιν αὐτίς: δυναμις αὐτῶν ἑστιν ἐν τοῖς ἐγκώμιοι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ψογοὶ MSS.

292. οὐς: so H. with most MSS.; om. C (B, not C Spengel).

293. διαλἱμενο: so H. adopting a conjecture of Spengel. διαλἱμεν MSS.

294. τούτων ομοιωτος ὄρους: ομοιωτοὶ τούτως MSS.

295. κατηγορίκοι: so H. with most MSS.; κατηγορικοὶ GM. Cf. l. 297.

296. απολογικον: τὸ ἀπολογικόν H. with MSS., except O which omits τά. Cf. l. 300. After εἶδος the MSS. have ὃ περὶ τήν δικαίωσιν ἕστι πράγματας αὐτά τε, which is omitted by Π. The words are probably an interpolation; cf. p. 116.

αὐσετήκεν: I. αὐσετήκεν. G has αὐσετήκε, and E has κε in an erasure.

αὐτοὶ δέ: δέ αὐτοῖς MSS.

297. κατηγορίκοι: so H. with most MSS.; κατηγορικοὶ M. Cf. l. 295.

299. ἐξήγησις: ἐξαγέλεσις MSS. ἐξήγησις is the more natural word.

300. ἀπολογικοὶ: ἀπολογικοὶ MSS. Cf. l. 295.

301. αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπολογικοῖς MSS.

302. ἐπιστευθέντων: καθιστοπεπηθέντων MSS., probably by an erroneous repetition of the initial syllable of κατηγοριθέντων.

303. εκατορων: ἐκατορό MSS.

304-5. ταῦτα: so CDFMOP. τὰς αὐτὰς H. with the dureiores.

ἐχορτεῖ: ἔχωντον the dureiores and Ald.; ἔχωντος H. with CDFMOP. ἔχωντας is required in Π if εκατερων is anything more than a mistake for εκατερον, and above the second ε of εχορτεῖς which must in any case be wrong) is some ink which may represent ω. But of the 2 or 3 letters after ἔχωντα that project into the margin beyond any other line in this column of which the end is preserved, the first is certainly not ν, and they are probably to be connected with the following words.

τῶν κατηγοριστικά τὸ ὅτη . . . : κατηγοροῦσα μὲν MSS., except C which has κατηγορῶ μὲν. The restoration of Π is very uncertain. The insertion of τῶν is rather an improvement, but the reading is quite doubtful, and though κατηγοροῦσα seems necessary, the vestiges at the beginning of l. 305 do not suit κα very well. The lacuna after κα is large
HIBEH PAPYRI

enough for 11 or even 12 letters, but hardly for τηγαροφυτα μεν. τουτο α μεν might be read, but is not satisfactory; for τουτο λεγεν there is not room. In place of the second doubtful τ, π or γ can equally well be read.

306. μεν: so H. with CFMO and the deteriores; δε P.

307. The vestiges of the first letter would suit π equally well (i.e. παρατηρευ), but a line of 20 letters would be unusually short.

308. The π of παμε seems to have been corrected.

κατηγορηματων: αδικηματων MSS.

309. οἱ νομοι: so H. with most MSS.; om. μ.

311. ημαιρήμενων: αδικηματων MSS., probably an erroneous repetition. Cf. the contrast of αδικηματων and αμαρτηματων in ll. 298-301.

313. ο νομος διωρικος τη: μη τυχος διωρικος MSS. Π's reading is better; Spengel had already suggested the insertion of the article before τυχος.

314. κατηγορυθο ροι: o does not fill the space between ρ and ν, which would accommodate two letters, but it is difficult to see what these could have been, unless indeed the scribe wrote κατηγοροι(θ).

315. στοιχε: so H. with CF (first hand) MP; στοιχε δυ F (second hand) Ο and the deteriores.

316-3. Π here preserves a much better text than the MSS., which have υπων (δε Η. with C) δε αν δικαστα το κατηγορομενον ισαιν (ειδοσις Α (second hand) EG) αυξητων εστι τα αδικηματα και μιλωτα μεν δεικτων ως εκων κ.τ.λ. For the unsatisfactory ισαιν or ειδοσις Spengel had acutely conjectured τμωσιν, the verb found in Π, and divined that το κατηγορομενον was wrong. Π inserts, no doubt rightly, a clause contrasting the preliminary proof of the facts with the subsequent magnifying of the crime. After κατηγορομενα it probably continued στοιχε αυξητων κ.τ.λ. For άναγκη in l. 317 cf. l. 103, note; δει makes the line hardly long enough.

III. CALENDAR

27. CALENDAR FOR THE SAITE NOME.

Mummies 68 and 69. Height 16-8 cm. B.C. 301-240. Plate VIII (Cols. iii and iv).

On the recto of this long papyrus, which is in 16 fragments, is a calendar for a year, preceded by an introductory treatise in which the writer explained for a pupil's instruction the source of his information, and gave a general sketch of his astronomical system. Of the calendar the larger portion is preserved, but the remains of the introduction probably represent only a small portion of it. Two hands, both a large clear semi-uncial, are found in the main text, the first being responsible for Cols. i-iii, the second for the rest. A few corrections in Col. iv sqq. are due to a third hand or, perhaps, to the writer of Cols. i-iii. On the verso of Fr. (a) is some demotic writing, on that of Fr. (d) a brief account, and
on that of Fr. (m) part of a list of names, while on the verso of Fr. (c) is another short list of names headed (ἐτος) τῆς Μεσοπόταμου. The king in question is presumably Ptolemy Soter, to the early part of whose reign we assign 34 and 78, from the same mummies as 27; and we regard B.C. 240 as the latest possible date for the writing on the recto. This, however, is probably a few decades older, and may even be as ancient as B.C. 301-298, the period to which the calendar apparently refers (v. inf.). At the conclusion of that period the dates of the recorded phenomena would cease to apply, and it is not easy to account for a copy of the calendar being made after the information contained in it had become antiquated and useless. The handwriting, though presenting no special signs of exceptional antiquity, is not inconsistent with the view that the calendar was written at the very beginning of the third century B.C., and the Hibeh collection has provided one document written in the 5th year of Ptolemy Soter I (84 a). Cols. i–iii each have 18 lines and very narrow margins between the columns, while Cols. iv–xiv range from 13 to 15 lines in each and the margins are sometimes narrow, sometimes (as between Cols. vi and vii) as much as 7.5 cm. in breadth.

Fr. (a), containing Cols. i–iii, appears to come from a point near the actual commencement of the text, and it is possible that χαρακτήρισμα in l. 1 is the termination of χαρακτήρισμα, and belongs to the opening sentence of the introduction, which is in any case couched in an epistolary form. Nothing further is to be gleaned from the scanty remains of Col. i; in Cols. ii and iii the compiler, who was in the Saite nome (l. 21; cf. note), explains that he had been receiving instruction on astronomy from a certain wise man (ll. 19–33), and announces his intention of summarizing the teaching for his pupil's benefit (ll. 34–41). Accordingly in l. 41 he begins with a description of the different years in use in Egypt; this, so far as it goes (l. 54), corresponds closely to a passage in the account of the Εὐδοκίου Πίνακα which was written by one of that astronomer's followers, and is preserved in P. Par. 1; cf. p. 143, and ll. 41–54, note. To the interval, extending probably to at least 6 or 7 columns, between Frs. (a) and (b) may be assigned the small Frs. (n)–(q), which do not belong to the calendar portion of the papyrus, and are not likely to have followed Col. xiv, since that column may well be the last of the whole text. The subject of Frs. (n) and (o), which seem to be connected, though the relative position assigned to them in our text is not certain, is the seasons; that of Fr. (g) the length of the year.

Turning to the calendar, the year under discussion is an ordinary Egyptian annus vagus of 365 days beginning with Thoth 1. The account of the first three months is missing; but Frs. (b)–(m), containing Cols. iv–xiv, which are continuous, preserve with some lacunae the entries from Choiak 1 to the end
of the year, Col. xiv probably giving, as we have said, the conclusion of the papyrus. The details recorded under the various days are (1) the changes of the seasons indicated by the equinoxes and solstices; (2) the passing of the sun at its rising from one of the 12 great constellations to another; (3) the risings and settings of certain stars or constellations; (4) prognostications concerning the weather, such as are commonly found in ancient calendars; (5) stages in the rising of the Nile (ll. 126, 168, and 174); (6) certain festivals, which in two instances (ll. 76 and 165) took place at Sais; (7) the length of the night and day.

For the following remarks on the place of observation and date of the calendar, and its connexion with Eudoxus, to which we have already alluded, we are indebted to Prof. J. G. Smyly, who has greatly assisted us in the elucidation of this text.

'Place of observation. The length of the longest day is given by the papyrus (l. 115) as 14 hours, and that of the shortest night as 10 hours; if then we take the inclination of the ecliptic to have been 24° and \( l \) denote the latitude, we can determine \( l \) from the equation \( \cos 75° = \tan 24° \tan l \), from which we obtain \( l = 30° 10' \): cf. Ptolemy, Syn. Math. ii. (ed. Heiberg, p. 108) ἐν \( \alpha \) τοῖς ἐστὶ παράλληλοις καθ' ὑπὸ ἀν γένος τῆς ἡμέρας ἡμέρας ἔριον ἀνθρώπων ὁδ. αὐτέχει δ' οὗ τὸν ἴσημερον χώρας ἀν καὶ γράφεται διὰ τῆς κάτω χώρας τῆς Λιγύπτου. This agrees very well with the statement of the papyrus (l. 21; cf. ll. 76 and 165) that the calendar was drawn up in the Saite nome, probably at Sais itself.

'Date. Since the calendar is constructed according to the vague year of the Egyptians, it would have been possible to determine its date within four years from the dates assigned to the equinoxes and solstices, had these been correctly given. In the following table the Julian dates for the early part of the third century B.C. are taken from Unger (I. Müller's Handb. I, p. 823):—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring equinox</th>
<th>Summer solstice</th>
<th>Autumn equinox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Tubi (l. 62)</td>
<td>24 Pharmouthi (l. 120)</td>
<td>23 Epeiph (l. 170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March.</td>
<td>27 June.</td>
<td>27 September.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The date of the calendar deduced from the equations Tubi 20 = March 25 and Pharmouthi 24 = June 27 would be B.C. 301-298; that given by the equation Epeiph 23 = September 27 is B.C. 313-310. These results do not agree (see below), and we cannot be certain of the accuracy of the observations; but we may safely deduce B.C. 300 as an approximate date.

'Connexion with Eudoxus. 1. The interval between the spring equinox and summer solstice is correctly given by the papyrus as 94 days, that between the summer solstice and autumn equinox as 89 days; the whole interval between the spring and autumn equinoxes is thus 183 days, which is about 3 days too
few. The writer of the papyrus evidently belonged to a school of astronomers who supposed that the equinoxes divided the year into approximately equal parts; cf. G. V. Schiaparelli, Memorie del Real. Inst. Lomb. xiii. p. 129, Nov., 1874. If we may trust P. Par. i. 525 sqq., the interval between the autumn equinox and the spring equinox according to Eudoxus was $92 + 91 = 183$ days, while according to Democritus it was $91 + 91 = 182$ days, thus leaving for the period of 183 days given by the papyrus 182 days according to Eudoxus, and 183 according to Democritus. So far this would point to Democritus rather than Eudoxus; but there are other striking resemblances to the theories of Eudoxus.

2. According to the papyrus the spring equinox took place on Tubi 20 and the sun entered Taurus on Mecheir 6, so that the equinox took place when the sun was in the middle or at the 15th degree of Aries. Now according to Hipparchus the placing of the equinoxes and solstices at the middle of the signs was peculiar to Eudoxus; e.g. Hipp. i. 6. 4 ταύτης (τῆς Μικρᾶς 'Αρκτοῦ) γὰρ ὁ ἐσχάτος καὶ λαμπρότατος ἀστήρ κεῖται κατὰ τὴν ὑ' μοῖραν τῶν ἱχθυῶν, ὥστε ἐν τούτῳ διαμέτρου τῶν ζῳδιακῶν κύκλων, κατὰ τὴν γ' μοῖραν τοῦ Κριοῦ. Thus the 1st degree of Aries according to Eudoxus' division of the Zodiac coincided with the 15th degree of Pisces according to Hipparchus, and the equinox, which according to Hipparchus was at the 1st point of Aries, would according to Eudoxus occur at the 15th degree of Aries. Again Hipp. ii. 1. 15 says πρῶτειοι ὑπὸ δὲ πρῶτον ὅτι τὴν διαμέτρου τοῦ ζῳδιακοῦ κύκλου ὁ μὲν 'Ἀρατος πεποίησε ἀπὸ τῶν τροπικῶν τε καὶ ἵσθιμον γεγομένων σημείων ἀρχόμενον ὡστε ταύτα τὰ σημεῖα ἄρχας εἶναι ξυπών, ὥστε τὰ εἰρήμενα σημεῖα μέσα εἶναι, τὰ μὲν τοῦ Καρκίνου καὶ τοῦ Λιγόκερω τὰ δὲ τοῦ Κριοῦ καὶ τῶν Χηλῶν; cf. ii. 1. 19 καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων δὲ μαθηματικῶν πάντων σχεδὸν ἡ τῶν πλεῦστων τούτων τῶν τροπῶν (i.e. as by Aratus) ὁ ζῳδιακὸς κύκλος διύμητο. ὅτι δὲ Εὔδοξος τὰ τροπικὰ σημεῖα κατὰ μέσα τὰ ζῳδία τίθησε δὴλον ποιεῖ διὰ τούτων κ.τ.λ.

As is clear from these quotations, Hipparchus considered that Eudoxus stood almost alone among ancient astronomers in putting the equinoctial and solstitial points at the middle of the signs. It was for a long time supposed that Eudoxus had used an ancient globe, many centuries older than his own times, constructed at a period when the spring equinox was really in the middle of the dodecatemory called Aries by Hipparchus, and that Eudoxus himself never even looked at the sky. This absurd theory was controverted by Ideler in Abhandl. der b. Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin, 1830, p. 58, who gives the true explanation that the dodecatemory called Aries by Eudoxus extended from the 15th degree of Pisces to the 15th degree of Aries according to Hipparchus. It may be remarked in this connexion that the correspondence of the signs κατὰ συναγών described, but wholly misunderstood, by Geminus, El. Astr. ii. 27 sqq., depends upon placing the equinoctial points in the middle of the signs.
'If we measure $15^\circ$ back from the position of the equinox at the time of Eudoxus we find that the first point of Aries according to him very nearly coincided with the star $\zeta$ Piscium. This coincidence is very remarkable, and should prove of considerable importance in the difficult question as to the origin of the signs of the Zodiac. E. Burgess and Prof. Whitney, *Sûrya-Siddhânta*, *Journal of American Oriental Society*, vi. p. 158, write:—"The initial point of the fixed Hindu sphere, from which longitudes are reckoned, and at which the planetary motions are held by all schools of Hindu astronomy to have commenced at the Creation, is the end of the asterism Revati, or the beginning of Açvini. Its position is most clearly marked by that of the principal star of Revati, which, according to the Sûrya-Siddhânta, is $10^\circ$ to the west of it, but according to other authorities exactly coincides with it. That star is by all authorities identified with $\zeta$ Piscium, of which the longitude at present, as reckoned by us, from the vernal equinox, is $17^\circ 54'$. Making due allowance for the precession, we find that it coincided in position with the vernal equinox not far from the middle of the sixth century or about 570 A.D. As such coincidence was the occasion of the point being fixed upon as the beginning of the sphere, the time of its occurrence marks approximately the era of the fixation of the sphere, and of the commencement of the history of modern Hindu astronomy." Now the exact correspondence of the initial points of the spheres of Eudoxus and of the Hindu astronomers cannot be an accidental coincidence, and seems to invalidate the theory that the Hindu sphere was fixed by the position of the spring equinox. In these circumstances we are at liberty, or rather are compelled, to reject the deduction that "the point from which longitudes are reckoned, and at which the planetary motions are held by all schools of Hindu astronomy to have commenced at Creation" was first fixed at about 570 A.D. This is not the place to discuss the question as to the relation of Eudoxus to Indian astronomy, but my own belief is that the Indian sphere was fixed at a very early period and adopted from Indian astronomers by Eudoxus.

'The length of time occupied by the sun in passing through the constellations presents considerable difficulty; the details are as follows:—

1. 62. Aries, 
   Tubi 5—Mecheir 6,  
   31 days.
1. 66. Taurus, 
   Mecheir 6—Phamenoth 4,  
   28 days.
1. 88. Gemini, 
   Phamenoth 4—Pharmouthi 3,  
   29 days.
1. 107. Cancer, 
   Pharmouthi 3—Pachon 6,  
   33 days.
1. 129. Leo, 
   Pachon 6—Pauni 4,  
   28 days.
1. 137. Virgo, 
   Pauni 4—Epeiph x,  
   58 days.
   Libra,  
   Epeiph x—Mesore 2,  
1. 181. Scorpio, 
   Mesore 2—?
The spring equinox is given as 15 days in Aries, the summer solstice as 21 days in Cancer, and the autumn equinox 10 days only before the sun enters Scorpio. If the signs of the papyrus are true dodecatemories, the dates of entering the different signs must be wrong; for the spring equinox being in the middle of the sign so also should the autumn equinox be.

3. The stars or constellations whose risings and settings according to Eudoxus are given in the calendar assigned to Geminus (Lydus, *De Ostentis*, &c., ed. Wachsmuth, pp. 181 sqq.) are Aquila (Άετός), Capella (Αἰξ), Arcturus, Delphinus, Lyra, Pleiades, Scorpio, Sirius (Κύων), Corona Borealis (Στέφανος), Hyades and Orion; all of these, except Αἰξ (which can be restored with certainty in ll. 88 and 177), are mentioned in the papyrus, and the only star in it not contained in the list of Eudoxus is Προτρυγητήρ (= ε Virginis), the statement about which (l. 130) is obviously erroneous.

The agreement on this point between the papyrus and Geminus' references to Eudoxus is very striking. The intervals between the several entries (which in Geminus are measured by degrees, not, as in the papyrus, by days) are naturally different owing to the difference of latitude between Sais and the place in Asia Minor from which Eudoxus took his observations. But the order is the same in both, and there is only one clear instance in which the papyrus omits a reference to the rising or setting of a star that Geminus had inserted in his list from the calendar of Eudoxus (l. 107, note). Hence Geminus' list provides certain restorations for those lacunae in the papyrus which mentioned risings or settings, while conversely two corruptions in the text of Geminus can be restored from the papyrus; cf. notes on ll. 187 and 194.

The papyrus is therefore to be regarded as a composition for teaching purposes, written at Sais about B.C. 300 by a follower of Eudoxus' theory of astronomy, and is somewhat older than the analogous treatise based on Eudoxus in P. Par. 1. In the passage common to both texts (ll. 41–54) may be recognized a more or less direct quotation from Eudoxus himself, but the presentation and application of his system are much disfigured in both papyri by frequent blunders, especially in regard to figures. The inconsistent dates in connexion with the equinoxes and the passing of the sun through the constellations, and the erroneous mention of Προτρυγητήρ have already been mentioned. Cols. ii and iii of the introduction are very carelessly written, though some of the slips have been corrected by the writer himself. Mistakes in figures occur in ll. 62, 73, 91, and several times in the fractions of hours. Words are left out in ll. 88 and 199; cf. ll. 78 and 87, where an omission by the first hand is supplied by the corrector. The account of the summer solstice (ll. 120–2) is very inaccurately expressed, and other errors can be detected in ll. 79 and 83. All these mistakes are due
to the compiler or the scribe; and the compiler was, more probably than Eudoxus, responsible for the system of reckoning the changes in the length of day and night, which is only a rough approximation to the truth. The difference between the longest and shortest day being $14 - 10 = 4$ hours, and five days being deducted from the year on account of the solstices, the change in the length of the day and night is treated as uniformly $\frac{2}{180}$ or $\frac{1}{36}$ hour, which is a convenient fraction for purposes of calculation, but ignores the obvious fact that the changes are much greater at the equinoxes than at the solstices. The uniformity of the changes, however, simplifies the restoration of many lacunae, since, where the figures relating to the day or night are preserved, they are sufficient to indicate the day of the month, when lost, and vice versa.

Amongst the most valuable features of the papyrus are its references to Gracco-Egyptian festivals observed at Sais, of which we append a list:

(1) 1. 60. Choiaik 26, Festival of Osiris.
(2) 1. 62. Tubi 20, Festival of Phitoriouis.
(3) 1. 76. Mecheir 16 (19), Assembly at Sais in honour of Athena (Neith).
(4) 1. 85. Mecheir 27, Festival of Prometheus-Iphthimis.
(5) 1. 92. Phamenoth 9, Festival of Edu (?)..
(6) 1. 112. Pharmouthi 11, Feast of Hera (Mut?).
(7) 1. 145. Pauni 16, Festival of Bubastis (Bast).
(8) 1. 165. Epeiph [13 ?], Assembly at Sais in honour of Athena (Neith).
(9) 1. 170. Epeiph 23. Festival of Anubis.
(10) 1. 186. Mesore 2, Festival of Apollo (Horus).
(11) 1. 205. 4th intercalary day, Birthday of Isis.

Festivals in honour of deities whose names are lost also occurred on a day between Pauni 24 and Pauni 26 (1. 156) and on Pauni 27 (1. 154). The dates of most of these festivals, and even the names of the deities connected with nos. (2), (4), and (5), were previously unknown; and except in the case of no. (11), which was universally observed, there are but few points of correspondence between the papyrus and other lists of festivals preserved in the Papyrus Sallier IV of Ramesside times (Chabas, Le Calendrier des jours fastes et néfastes), and the Ptolemaic calendars of Edfu, Esneh, and Denderch (Brugsch. Drei Festkalender), while the list of festivals observed in Roman times at the temple of Socnopaeus in the Fayûm (Wessely, Karanis und Soknopaiû Nesos, p. 76) is altogether different. On comparing the list in the papyrus with the statements concerning festivals in the Canopus Inscription, the two are consistent concerning the date of no. (1), the voyage of Osiris, but disagree in a curious manner with reference to no. (7), the festival of Bast. It is clear that there was much local variation
with regard to the dates of the same festivals; and though in the above list only nos. (3) and (8) are actually stated to be specially Saite feasts, and nos. (1) and (11) are known to have been observed on the same days elsewhere, it is uncertain how far those remaining were observed outside the Saite nome on the days specified. The mention of a general illumination in connexion with no. (8) is particularly interesting, since this was the festival described by Herodotus ii. 62; cf. i. 76, note.

Fr. (a), Col. i. 1 |n, 2 |ous, 3 |ous, 4 |, 5 |pas, 6–12 lost, 13 |a, 14–15 lost, 16 |a, 17 |w', 18 |w.

Fr. (a) | Col. ii.

20 | ον φός καὶ ἡμῶν χρείαν

25 | τοῦ ἑργον ἑδίκνουν ἑ-

30 | ἡλίου μία(μ) μὲν τὴν 

35 | βέστατά ἐν ἐλαχίστοις 

3. | ἐν Σάι πάνυ ἀνήρ

20. ημῶν Pap. This is a very early instance of the placing of a dot both above and below a letter in order to indicate that it was to be omitted; cf. 15. 44, where dots are only placed above the cancelled letters.
Fr. (b), 2nd hand.  

Col. iv.  Plate VIII.

53 ἵνα κεκράτηκα τετραγωνικά ἦν.  

55. ἱνδ for ἵνδ.  

60 ἵνα ὑμᾶ无论 ὅπως ἀνέρχομαι ἔτην.  

65 ἵνα ἵνα κεκράτηκα τετραγωνικά ἦν.  

68. ἵνα ὑμᾶ无论 for ἵνα ὑμᾶ无论.  

Fr. (c).

Col. v.

70 καῦ. καὶ ἐπὶ ὑπημαίνει καὶ  

80 ἵνα ὑμᾶ无论 ὅπως ἀνέρχομαι ἔτην.  

78. ἵνα ὑμᾶ无论 for ἵνα ὑμᾶ无论 above the line.
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Fr. (d).

Col. vi.

κε Δύρα ἀκρόνυχος δύνει,
η νυξ ὤρων ιασ', η 8' ἡμέρα ιββ'(<χ')με',
85 Προμηθέως ἐορτή δν καλοῦσιν
'Iφθίμων, καὶ νότος πνεί, ἐὰν δὲ
πολὺς γίνηται τὰ ἐκ τῆς γῆς κατακαίει.
Φαμενώτ [.] δ ἐν τοῖς Διδύμοις. (Αἰξ εἰώια)
ἀνατέλλει, ἤ νυξ ὤρων ιαε μ',
90 ἢ 8' ἡμέρα ιββ'δ'κ'χ'. ε Σκορπίος εἰώιος
[άρχ]εται δύνειν, ἢ νυξ ὤρων ιγ
[ή 8' ἡμέρα ιγ. θ παρὰ τοῖς Ἁλ-
[γυπτίοις] εδν ἐορτή. ιβ Σκορπίος
[εἰώιος δόλος] δύνει, ἢ νυξ ὤρων ιβ'ζ'χ',
95 [ή 8' ἡμέρα ιγ.][ν]λ'χ{χ}'με'. ιγ Πλειάδες
[εἰώιαι ἐπιτελέσθουσιν.

87. γινηται above the line. 89. 1. μ' for εμ'. 90. 8' corr. 91. 1. ια for ιγ.
95. The scribe apparently began to correct the superfluous λ' into μ.

Frs. (e) and (f).

Col. vii.

4 lines lost.

101 [ 23 letters ]ου
[ , ] . χ'χ'
[ , ] να
[ , ] ..
105 [ , ]

σται α[. . .]. . . . . . . . .ς ἔξουσα.
Φαρμουδί δι ην τοι Κ[α']ρκίων γ. Αετός
ἀκρόνυχος ἐπιτελέει, ἢ νυξ
ὀρων ιγ'χ', ἢ 8' ἡμέρα ιγζ'με'.

109. 1. εμ' for ιμ'.

L 2
110 α Ἀθῆνας ἀκρόπολις ἐπιτελλεί,

η νυξ ὁρῶν ιε', ἢ δ' ἡμέρα ἐγβ᾽ \\
[κ]αι τὴν Ἡρας [. . .] ξεια.

115 κ η νυξ ὁρῶν ι, ἢ δ' ἡμέρα ιδ,

καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει

δ ἡμιος ἡμέρας γ. (κα) η νυξ ὁρῶν ι,

η δ' ἡμέρα ιδ. κβ η νυξ ὁρῶν ι,

η δ' ἡμέρα ιδ. κγ η νυξ ὁρῶν ι,

120 η δ' ἡμέρα ιδ. κδ ἡλίων τροπαί

εἰς θέρος καὶ η νυξ μείζων(γ) γίνεται

τῆς ἡμέρας ὀρας δωδεκατημόρου με'.

125 ἐτησίαι ἀρχονταὶ πνεῖν

καὶ δ' ποταμὸς ἄρχεται

ἀναβαίνειν, η νυξ ὁρῶν ιλα'

η δ' ἡμέρα ἐγβ' δ' Χρίπτ'.

Παχώς ζ ἐν τοῖ Αἰεντί.

130 Προκενητής ἀνατέλλει,

η νυξ ὁρ[δ]ν ι[δ] Χρίπτ'?

η δ' ἡμέρα ἐγβδ' Χρίπτ'. θ Ἑρίων (ἐῶν)

ὅλος ἀνατέλλει, ἢ νυξ

ὁρῶν ιγμε', ἢ δ' ἡμέρα ἐγβΛ' Χρίπτ'.

135 τη Κύων (ἐῶν) ἀνατέλλει, ἢ νυξ

ὁρῶν ιλλαμ' ιγμε',

123. 1. με' for εμ'.
Frs. (i), (k), (l).

27. CALENDAR

Col. x.

[η δ'] ημέρα ιγγ'δ'. Παύνε δ' 
[δύνε, ἢ νὺξ. ὁρᾶν] ς ιβ'έχ'α',

[η δ'] ημέρα ιββ'ε'χ'ιε',

145 Β'ουβ'άςτιος ἑορτή.
κ. Δαλφίς ἐώιος
δύνε, ἢ νὺξ
ὠρῶν ιαγ' . . . ,
(heap').
η δ' ημέρα ιβζ[. . . ,

137. 1. δ' for δ'.

Fr. (m). Col. xi.

150 [ . . . . . . . . έ]ορτή.
[kξ Λιρα έωια] δύνει,
[η νυξ ὅρων] ιαγ'ίμε'ε',
[η δ' ημέρα] ιβζ'έχ'α',
[. . . . . . . . έ] o[rτή].

155 [λ . . . . . ]α μεγάλα
[. . . έπισι[μ]αίνει,
[η νυξ ὅρων] ιαγ'ίμε'ε',
[η δ' ημέρα] ιβζ]λ'α',
[Eπε[φ. ἐν τ]αισ

160 [χηλαίς του Σ]κορπίου,
[. . . Άρκτούρος έωιος
[έπιτελλει,

152. 1. έε'ε' for έμε'ε'.

Fr. (m). Col. xii.

165 καὶ ἐν Σαῦ πανήγυρις
Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ λύχνους
κάουσι κατὰ τὴν χώραν,
καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ἐπισημαίνει
πρὸς τὴν ἀνάβασιν.

170 κυ ισημερία φθινοπωρίνη,
η νυξ ὅρων ιβ,
η δ' ημέρα ιβ,
tου Ἄνοββιος έορτή,
καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ἐπι-

175 σημαίνει πρὸς τὴν
ἀνάβασιν.

Fr. (m). Col. xiii.

[kξ Αίξ ἀκρόνυχος
]
[έπιτελλει,
[η νυξ ὅρων ιβζ]ε'ε'

180 η δ' ημέρα ιαβ'έχ'α'.
Μεσορεῖ β ἐν τῶι
Σκορπίωι. Πλειάδες

Fr. (m). Col. xiv.

[ἀρχεται δύνειν,]
[η νυξ ὅρων ιβζ'με',]
[η δ' ημέρα ιαλ]λαχ'δ',
id Σκορπίως ὄλος δύνει,

195 η νυξ ὅρων ιβζ'ιχ',
η δ' ημέρα ιαλχ'.

158. 9 corr.
άκρωνυχοι ἔπιτέλλουσιν,
ή νῦξ ὅρων ἰβε',
185 ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ἰαβ' ἵλ',
'Απόλλωνος ἔορτή.
δ' Στέφανος ἐώιος ἐπι-
τέλλει, ἠ νῦξ ὅρων ἰβε' ἵλ',
ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ἰαβ' ἵλ', ἐ'ε'.
190 Θ' Σκορπίος ἀκρώνυχος

Frs. (n) and (o). Col. i.

τα[υτικός] ὀμοιο[ν] περί τὸν ἐοὺς
ta[υτικός] ὀμοιο[ν] περί τὸν ἐοὺς
210 τρόπ[ων] θερμ[ων ...]ην
τρόπ[ων] θερμ[ων ...]ην
κυ τον[...] σιν
κυ τον[...] σιν

Fr. (p).

τάν ἔρχοντα· [ ... ] [ ... ]
πέντε τ[οιν ἐπ'] ἀγομέν[ων]
220 ἐν τῶι ἐνιαυτῶι ἐν αἰσ: [ ... 
τῶν ἠλιον ἀνατέλλειν
ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ τῇ διορι-
ζούσηι

Frs. (q).

τά ν ὅταν
τα[υτικός] ὀμοιο[ν]
225 ν ἄγαν
τα[υτικός] ὀμοιο[ν]
τα[υτικός] ὀμοιο[ν]
τα[υτικός] ὀμοιο[ν]
230 ν ἄγαν
ν ἄγαν
ν ἄγαν
ν ἄγαν
235 ν ἄγαν
19–54. ‘... at Sais a wise man and a friend of mine, for I have been in the Saite nome for five years. He expounded to me the whole truth, and illustrated it in practice from the stone dial which is called in Greek a "gnomon." He said that the courses of the sun were two, one dividing night and day and one dividing winter and summer. Accordingly, to summarize his information as accurately as I could in the shortest space, in order that the intricacy of the fractions may not appear to you a long and unfamiliar thing to understand (?), I will divide the necessary days. The astronomers and sacred scribes use the lunar days for the settings and risings of the stars. They therefore keep most of the festivals annually on the same day, without alterations owing to the setting or rising of a star; but some festivals they keep ...

19. ἀνήρ: a disciple of Eudoxus is probably meant; cf. introd.


34–41. The construction of this passage, which seems to be all one sentence and to require some correction, is obscure. The μέρος apparently refer to the fractions of the hours of the nights and days, and the general purport of the sentence seems to be that the writer, in order to avoid proximity and a multitude of complicated fractions, would mention in his calendar only the more important days. This is in actual agreement with the calendar, which rarely notices days on which there was nothing more remarkable to record than the length of the night and day. The supplements proposed for ll. 38–40 will make lines 37–9 longer by two or three letters than ll. 41 sqq. Perhaps some letters at the end of those three lines were first omitted and then supplied in the margin, as has happened in ll. 34–5. The future tense μεροῖμεν in the apodosis after the imperfect ἴδων is awkward, but the alteration of ἱσναγεῖν to ἱσνάγειν would make the connexion of μεροῖμεν with the preceding lines still more difficult.

41–54. Cf. P. Par. i. 71–80 οἱ δὲ ύπο τοῦ Λόγου καὶ οἱ ἑρωγραμματεῖς ἥρων ταῖς κατὰ σελήνην ἡμέραις καὶ ἄγονες πανδημίας καὶ ἐφιστίκες τινῶν μὲν ὡς ἑνωμένα τὰ δὲ καταχρηστὰ καὶ κυνὸς ἀναστάσις καὶ σεληνία κατὰ θείου (I. θέω, Blass) ἀναληφόμενοι τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκ τῶν Ἀλγυπτίων, a passage which agrees closely with our papyrus and clearly indicates their common source. Combining the information from both, the meaning is that the days on which the risings or settings of stars took place were designated by the ordinary months, and were therefore continually changing. Most of the annual festivals in Egypt were kept according to the annum vagus of 365 days without reference to the stars, the movements of which took place a day later on the calendar every four years. Certain festivals, however, were observed according to the sidereal year of 365.4 days. The Paris papyrus specifies three of these, the fêtes at the Nile rising, the rising of Sirius, and some festival connected with the moon; and 27 may have done the same in the next column, which may also well have contained a passage corresponding to P. Par. i. 80–85, concerning the day to be intercalated once in every four years. The use of the adjective πλαίσια for the festivals observed on the annum vagus confirms the view that the employment of the year of 365.4 days in Egypt, however ancient, remained quite exceptional, in spite of the efforts of Euergetes, down to the reform of the calendar by Augustus; cf. Dittenberger's note Orientis Gr. Inscri. I. p. 102. The phrase ταῖς κατὰ σελήνην ἡμέραις is rather difficult. The extract from the Paris papyrus quoted above, in which it also occurs, immediately follows a passage describing the difference between the lunar year of 354 days and the solar year of 365. But if 'the days according to the moon' are connected with the lunar year, the statement concerning the astronomers and sacred scribes is not only obviously incorrect but has no relation to what follows. It is therefore preferable to suppose that the phrase αἱ κατὰ σελήνην
\textit{Hibeh Papyri}

\textit{y}î\textit{mi\textit{na}} is in both passages used loosely for 'the days of the month' without any real reference to the moon.

53. \textit{\{\gamma\}t\textit{rios}: for another example in this volume of \gamma inserted between vowels cf.

62. 8 \textit{\delta\rho\gamma\\gamma\gamma\\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\pi}. The practice is common in the Tebtunis papyri of the second century B.C.

55-205. 'Choik 1st:) ... The night is 1345 hours, the day 1045, 16th, Arcturus rises in the evening. The night is 1245 hours, the day 1145, 26th, Corona rises in the evening, and the north winds blow which bring the birds. The night is 1245 hours and the day 1145. Osiris circumnavigates, and the golden boat is brought out.

' Tula 5th, the sun enters Aries. 20th, spring equinox. The night is 12 hours and the day 12 hours. Feast of Phitroïs. 27th, Pleiades set in the evening. The night is 1145 hours, the day 1245.

' Mecheir 6th, the sun enters Taurus. Hyades set in the evening. The night is 1129 hours, the day 1245; and Hera burns (?), and there are indications, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 19th (16th 7), Lyra rises in the evening. The night is 1145 hours, the day 1245; and there is an assembly at Sais in honour of Athena, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth. 24th, Orion (?) rises (sets?) in the evening. The night is 115 hours, the day 12 hours, ... 27th, Lyra (Canis ?) sets in the evening. The night is 1145 hours, the day 1245. Feast of Promethesus whom they call Iphthimis, and the south wind blows. If it becomes violent it burns up the fruits of the earth.

' Phamenoth 4th, the sun enters Gemini. Capella rises in the morning. The night is 1145 hours, the day 1245. 5th, Scorpio begins to set in the morning. The night is 11 hours, the day 13. 9th, feast of Edu (?) among the Egyptians. 12th, Scorpio sets completely in the morning. The night is 1038 hours, the day 1345. 13th, Pleiades rise in the morning. (The night is 1045 hours, the day 1345)...

' Phlamouthi 3rd, the sun enters Cancer. Aquila rises in the evening. The night is 1045 hours, the day 1345. 11th, Delphinus rises in the evening. The night is 1045 hours, the day 1345, and there is the ... of Hera. 17th, Orion rises in the morning. The night is 1045 hours, the day 1345. 20th, the night is 10 hours, the day 14, and the sun rises in the same place for 3 days. 21st, the night is 10 hours, the day 14. 22nd, the night is 10 hours, the day 14. 23rd, the night is 10 hours, the day 14. 24th, summer solstice, and the night gains upon the day by 15 of an hour which is 12 of an (equinoctial) day; and the night is 1045 hours, the day 1345. 25th, the eetesian winds begin to blow, and the river begins to rise. The night is 1045 hours, the day 1345.

' Pachon 6th, the sun enters Leo. Vindemitor rises (?). The night is 1045 hours, the day 1345. 9th, Orion rises completely in the morning. The night is 1045 hours, the day 1345. 18th, Canis rises in the morning. The night is 105 hours, the day 134.

'Pauni 4th, the sun enters Virgo. Aquila sets in the morning. The night is 1045 hours, the day 1345. 16th, Corona sets in the morning. The night is 1145 hours, the day 1245. Feast of Bubastis. 27th, Delphinus sets in the morning. The night is 115 hours, the day 12. 27th, Lyra sets in the morning. The night is 1145 hours, the day 1245. Feast of ... 30th, great ..., there are indications. The night is 1145 hours, the day 1245.

' Epeiph 11, the sun enters the claws of Scorpio. 13th?, Arcturus rises in the morning. The night is 11 hours, the day 12; and there is an assembly at Sais in honour of Athena, and they burn lamps throughout the country, and the river gives indications of rising. 23rd, autumnal equinox. The night is 12 hours, the day 12 hours. Feast of Anubis, and the river gives indications of rising. 27th, Capella rises in the evening. The night is 1245, the day 1145.
27. CALENDAR
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Mesore 2nd, the sun enters Scorpio. Pleiades rise in the evening. The night is 12½ hours, the day 11¼. Feast of Apollo. 4th, Corona rises in the morning. The night is 12¼ hours, the day 11¾. 9th, Scorpio begins to set in the evening. The night is 12²¾ hours, the day 11½. 14th, Scorpio sets completely. The night is 12₂³⁴ hours, the day 11⅞. 17th, Hyades rise in the evening. The night is 12½ hours, (the day 11⅞). In the 5 intercalary days: 4th, Arcturus sets in the evening. The night is 12⅛ hours, the day 11⅜; and the birthday festival of Isis takes place.'

55. The length of the night and day shows that the day in question must be Choiak 1, since the compiler of the calendar treats the difference in length between two successive nights or days as uniformly ¾ hour; cf. l. 122 and p. 144.

56. Cf. Geminus ('ιλθες δ.) Είδοξος ἐν Ἀρτούχοις άφρονχοι ἐπιστῆλει καὶ ἕτος γάντευ καὶ χελίδων φαίνεται καὶ τὰς ἐπομένας ἡμέρας Χ' βορέας πυήνους καὶ μάλιστα αἱ προορθέια καλόφευγα. άφρονχοι ἐπιστήλει: whatever the technical meaning of άφρονχοι (as it is generally spelled) in later Greek astronomers may have been, there is no doubt that Eudoxus, as both the papyrus and Geminus bear witness, used it as equivalent to ἐστερός, and that the risings and settings recorded in the papyrus mean the apparent or heliacal ones, not the true. No technical distinction is intended by the compiler of the calendar between ἐπιστῆλεως and ἀναπλάζεις, which occurs in ll. 89, 116, 130, &c.


60. On the περίπλος of Osiris see Plut. De Iside et Osiride, 13. The ἔγγυη of the sacred boat took place according to the papyrus on Choiak 26, while according to the Canopus Inscr. l. 51 the ἄναγης τοῦ ἱεροῦ πλοίου τοῦ Ὀσεύρας occurred on Choiak 29. The two statements are perfectly consistent on the view that the festival lasted 4 days; the papyrus refers to the beginning of the voyage, the Canopus Inscr. to the return of the sacred boat at the end of the festival. Plutarch, op. cit. 39, states that the mourning for Osiris occupied four days, but refers the production of the sacred boat to the third day. His date for the festival, Athur 17–20, nominally differs widely from the Ptolemaic evidence owing to his employment of the Julian calendar (a fact which Wiedemann seems to leave out of account in his discussion of the date of the Osiris festival, Herodot.zweites Buch, pp. 261–2); but the divergence is really slight, for Athur 17 on the Julian calendar coincided with Choiak 26 of the vague year in A.D. 128, which is not long after Plutarch. At Esneh the feast of Sokar, the Memphite god of the dead, identified with Osiris in later times, also took place on Choiak 26.

62. Τοῦτο ἐν τῇ (ε) ἔν τῇ: it is clear from the parallel passages (ll. 66, 88, 129, 181) that a number has dropped out after Τοῦτο, and ε, which would easily have been omitted owing to the εν following, can be restored with practical certainty because, firstly, the sun entered Taurus on Mecheir 6 (l. 66), and it must therefore have entered Aries about 30 days (possibly 29 or 31) previously, and, secondly, the equinox, which took place on Tubi 20 (l. 62), was placed by Eudoxus in the middle of Aries (15°; cf. introd.), so that the sun must have entered Aries about 15 days before the 20th. In l. 107 we read Ἀφροὶ ἐν τῶι Ἁλάκινας γ. Ἀστώς κ.τ.λ., and suppose that γ is misplaced and ought to have preceded ἐν τῶι Ἀρκίναν. The size of the lacuna after Ἀφροὶ suits 3 letters much better than 4, and if Ἀφροὶ ἐν ἐν ἐν ἐν or Ἀφροὶ ἐν ἐν (εν) εν (the figure would have to be a or β) be read, the already considerable disparity between the times during which the sun was in Gemini and Cancer respectively would be still further increased; cf. p. 142.

64. Φιστοράγοι: the name of this deity is new. There is very likely a connexion between this festival and the 'festival of the child at the town of Sais' which took place on
Tubi 20 according to the Esneh calendar. Was Phitorosis the son of Neith, the principal deity of Sais?


69. ᾪπα καίει, καὶ ἐπισημαίνει: after καίει is a smudge, and the letter between it and καί may have been intended to be erased; but the ink has run in several places in this column. 112 τῆς Ίπαρα seems to refer to the goddess, but ἞παρ is here more probably the planet Venus or a constellation; cf. Arist. de Mundo p. 392 A 27 ὁ τοῦ Φωσφόρου ὁ 'Ἀφροδίτης οὗ Ἡπαρ προσαγορεύειν, P. Oxy. 731. 6 τοῖς ἀστροῖς Ἡπαρ. For the archaic form of καίει cf. κατακαίει in II. 73 and 79, and καίωσι I. 167. ἐπισημαίνειν, which occurs in II. 168 and 174 ὁ ποσταίμον ἐπισημαίνει πρὸς τὴν ἀνάβασιν, not in connexion with an astronomical phenomenon, means here probably, as often in the calendars of Ptolemy and Geminus, an indication with regard to the weather (sc. wind, thunder, rain, &c.). The word in this sense seems always to be used absolutely, without a subject.

73. ἦ: this conflicts with the numbers in I. 75, which indicate the 16th; probably therefore εὐ should be read here.

76. Athena at Sais was the goddess Neith (cf. Wiedemann, op. cit., p. 259), also identified in Roman times with Isis; cf. Plut. De Iside et Osiride, 9. The papyrus mentions another assembly in her honour in Epeiph (I. 165-6), when there was a general λαμπαδησφορία; and no doubt that was the festival to which Herodotus was referring in his description of the λαμπαδησφορία at Sais in II. 62, which is to be connected closely with his general statement in II. 59 ἕς Σάιν πολὺν τῇ Ἀθηναίᾳ πανηγυρίζουσι rather than, as has been done by Wiedemann and others, with the illuminations at the festival of Osiris in Choiax. The day of general illumination, as now appears clearly from the papyrus, was in honour of Neith, not of Osiris.

The festival of Neith on Mecheir 16 was not known previously, but the Esneh calendar mentions one on Mecheir 8. That found in I. 165 is to be connected with another feast of Neith on Epeiph 13, also mentioned in the Esneh calendar; εὐ may even be the number lost in I. 161.

79. Καὶ refers to the date, which may be any day between the 20th and 26th; cf. I. 83. Geminus does not quote from Euodoxus at this point any star rising in the evening soon after Lyra, but 'Ὅριον ακρόνυχον δύναι, Κώνων ἀκρόνυχον δύναικας καὶ Λίξ ἐφα ἐπιτελλεῖ occur between the evening rising of Lyra (cf. I. 73) and the morning setting of Scorpio (cf. I. 90). The setting of Canis and rising of Capella are probably referred to in II. 83 and 89, where in both cases the papyrus is corrupt; and here too, probably, there is an error and 'Ὅριον ἀκρόνυχος δύναι, not ἐπιτελλεῖ, was meant.

82. Perhaps καὶ τὰ τήν χώραν; cf. I. 167. A festival is probably referred to, possibly that of 'the strong one'; cf. note on I. 85.

83. Λύρα ἀκρόνυχος δύναι: this statement cannot be correct in view of the fact that the evening rising of Lyra had taken place only 8 days previously (I. 73). Probably Κωνων should be substituted for Λύρα, and the papyrus brought into conformity with Geminus' statements about the sequence of the risings and settings on Euodoxus' calendar at this point; cf. II. 79 and 89, notes.

85. The identification of Prometheus with an Egyptian deity and the name of the latter, Iphthimis, are both new. Mr. F. Ll. Griffith would explain ἰφθίμης as a Graecized form of Nefertem, son of Ptah, whose name occurs as -εντήμασ at the end of compound names; he supposes that Nefer- was cut down to Ef- and the name pronounced Efeme, giving rise to two slightly different transliterations into Greek, as e.g. in the parallel forms Irraros and -μαρονος. The calendars of Esneh, Edfu, and Dendereh mention
no festival on Mecheir 27; but the Papyrus Sallier IV mentions a festival of Sokar on that day, and the Edfu calendar a festival of Ptah on Mecheir 28 and 29, while all three Ptolemaic calendars refer to a festival of 'the strong one' (the translation is doubtful according to Griffith; the word might mean 'victory' or 'battle') on Mecheir 21, the Edfu calendar adding that it was observed throughout Egypt. It is possible that there is some connexion between the festival of 'the strong one' and the ceremony referred to in l. 82, but the feast of Iphthimis is in any case probably different.

89. The name of the star rising has been omitted before ἄναστέλλει. We restore ἀνέω from Geminus; cf. l. 79, note. ἄναστέλλειν and ἐπιστέλλειν are sometimes distinguished by later astronomers, and referred respectively to the true and apparent risings, but it is clear that the papyrus uses the two terms indiscriminately, meaning the apparent rising in both cases; cf. l. 2, note.

90. Cf. Gem. (ταύρος) μ. Σκορπίων ἐφος δύνειν ἄρχεται. In the case of constellations with several very large stars, it was necessary to distinguish the beginning from the end of the rising or setting; cf. l. 93.

92-3. ἔθνος or ἔτος seems to be the name of a unknown Egyptian deity. [γυνειώτικός] is quite sufficient for the lacuna, but it is possible that one more letter is lost.


95-6. Cf. Gem. (ταύρος) κα. Πλειάδες ἐπιστέλλονται καὶ ἐπιστομάινει. The length of the night and day can be restored: ἦ νύχτα ὑπὸν ὀλύμπικου, ἦ δὲ ἡμέρα οὔτε ὀὔτε ἦν.

107. Cf. note on l. 62 and Gem. (Δίδυμοι) ζ. 'Αρτέσι ἀκφόντος ἐπιστέλλει. Between this and the entry corresponding to that in l. 110 Geminus inserts from Eudoxus (Δίδυμοι) γ. 'Αρτέσι ἐφος δύνει, the only certain reference to the stars on Eudoxus' calendar which is omitted in the papyrus.


112. In place of ο in the other, η. Δοριον ἄρχεται ἐπιστέλλειν.

116-22. Cf. introd. and the account of the ἐκλογὴ πορεία in P. Par. i. 8-51. Lines 121-2 are very inaccurately expressed. What the writer meant was that from the 24th of Pharamouthi the nights begin to lengthen and the days to diminish by \(\frac{1}{2}\) hour per diem, but his actual statement ή νύχτα (which on the 23rd is \(10\) hours long) μεῖξαθ ἐπεται τῆς ἡμέρας (which on the 23rd is \(14\) hours long) is highly ambiguous. Nor does he seem to be justified in his use of διδυκτημάρων δόρας. An hour might be \(\frac{1}{12}\) of the period of light irrespective of its length or \(\frac{1}{12}\) of the average, i.e. equinoctial, day, and it is of course \(\frac{1}{12}\) hour in the latter sense which throughout the calendar the writer actually adds to or subtracts from the length of days, though this system is inaccurate; cf. p. 144. But then ἱερεροsumer would be the right word to use here, not διδυκτημάρων, especially as the 'day' in l. 122 contains \(14\), not \(12\) hours.

124-7. On the view that the papyrus dates refer to the years 301-298 B.C., Pharamouthi 25, on which day the river is stated to have begun to rise, is June 28. The attainment of its greatest height nearly two months later is apparently referred to in ll. 168-76. The Canopus Inscr. ll. 37-8 makes the rise begin on Pauni 1, i.e. July 19.

130. Προτρυγνητή ἄναστέλλει: Geminus has no entry concerning the stars on Eudoxus' calendar between the beginning and completion of the rising of Orion (cf. ll. 113 and 132), and nowhere mentions the star Προτρυγνητή (the more usual form) in connexion with Eudoxus. From Smyly's calculations (cf. p. 143) it appears that this statement of the
papyrus must be erroneous, whether ἐκοίμηθεν or ἀκμαίωσα be supplied. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xviii § 310 (Wachsmuth, Lydos, &c., p. 328), says correctly that in Egypt Vindemitor rose on Sept. 5, or two months later than the date found in the papyrus.


The first day of a festival of Bast at Esneh; the statement that the Esneh calendar mentions a festival in her honour on Pauni 30 (Dittenberger, *Orient. Gr. Inscr.* I, p. 103) is erroneous. The Canopus Inscr., which in l. 37 mentions a μετα and μεγάλα Βουκίστα, gives a different date, Pauni 1, for both, which is remarkable seeing that Pauni 16 is attested both before and after the date of the inscription.

146. κ.]: the earliest day in Pauni on which 2 appears as a fraction of the night is the 23rd, the earliest on which 3 disappears as a fraction of the day is the 24th. The date in question therefore must be the 24th, 25th, or 26th.


150. Cf. note on l. 154.


154. This festival is to be assigned to Pauni 27 rather than to Pauni 30, the day to which the figures in l. 157–8 refer, for throughout the papyrus the mentions of festivals follow the details about the length of night and day. The Denderah calendar mentions a great feast of Hathor and Horus on the last four days of Pauni, and Ἀφροδίτης or Ἀπόλλωνις may have occurred here or in l. 150. The Esneh calendar mentions a festival of Sochet on Pauni 30, there having been already a festival of that goddess on Pauni 16.

156. For ἐπισημαίνει; cf. Gem. (Λέων) κα. ἐπισημαίνει, and note on l. 69.

159. The number lost is β, γ, or δ; cf. l. 137 and 181, and p. 142. The 'claws of Scorpio' take the place of Libra; cf. Gem. (Σελήνης) ε. Καλλιττιπο χράλι ἄρχονται ἀναστέλλονται.

161. Perhaps (Επειφ) εγ should be restored at the beginning of the line, there being a festival of Neith at Esneh on that day; cf. l. 76, note.


166. Λέωνος κάιμως: cf. Idu. ii. 62, and note on l. 76.

168–9. This entry 'the river gives indication of rising,' which is repeated in l. 174–6, refers apparently to the flood reaching its full height, which it usually does early in October. Epeiph 23, the date to which ll. 174–6 belong, being the day of the autumn equinox, was probably Sept. 27.

173. This date of the Anubis festival, Epeiph 23, was previously unknown.


186. Ἀπόλλωνος ἐτητή: this date, Mesore 2, for the Horus festival is new.

187. Cf. Gem. (Σελήνης) εν δὲ τῇ 1 Εὐδώδρ ἑώς ἐπιστέλλει. The entry clearly corresponds to that in the papyrus, and the omitted name of the constellation is to be restored Στέφανος, as Pontederia had already proposed.

190–1. Cf. l. 90, note, and Gem. (Σελήνης) ε. Σκορπίων ἀκρωνυσος ἄρχεται δύνειν.

194. Cf. Gem. (Σελήνης) ε. Σκορπίων ἀκρωνυσος Δίς ἑώς δύνει, which requires correction.

The papyrus confirms Wachsmuth's view that Δίς is to be omitted.


199. The length of the day has been omitted; insert (ἡ δ' ἡμέρα ἅγι'ια').


205. The birthday of Isis on the 4th intercalary day is mentioned in the Papyrus Saltier IV, the Esneh, Edfu, and Denderah calendars, and by Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 12.
209. Τοίξις: cf. l. 62.
211. Ἐπείπθ is a probable restoration before κύριος or after ἀπειροῦ, since the autumn equinox took place on Epeiph 23; cf. l. 170.
212. The traces of a letter would suit γ with a stroke over it, i.e. the figure 3.
217-23. This fragment at first sight seems to be concerned with the five intercalary days at the end of Mesoic, but it is difficult to connect these with the ποιήσεις of the sun, which divides either summer and winter or day and night (cf. ll. 29-33). Hence we are more disposed to regard the five days as the three days at the summer solstice (cf. ll. 116-20) and the two at the winter solstice, upon which the sun rises ἐκ τῶν ἄντων (l. 116); these have to be added to the 360 days upon which the day or night increased by 4½ hour (cf. ll. 121-2 and introd.) in order to make up the full year of 365 days. But if a figure followed ἡμερῶν in l. 218 the meaning would be something quite different. It is not certain that any letter was written after δ in l. 220, though φιναί is possible.

IV. ROYAL ORDINANCES

28. CONSTITUTIONAL REGULATIONS.

Mummy 97. Breadth 6·7 cm. About B.C. 265.

Notwithstanding its unfortunate condition this papyrus, which refers to the tribal organization of some civic polity, is of no small interest. The style is that of an ordinance (ll. 7-8); and the natural inference is that these fragments belong to a royal edict regulating the constitution of one of the Greek cities of Egypt. The alternative is to suppose that they come from some literary work in which a municipal law was quoted at length. Palaeographical considerations do not materially assist a decision between these two possibilities. The sloping handwriting, which is of a good size and, like other papyri from Mummy 97, of an early period (cf. 64 and 92), is clear and careful; but not more regular than that of many other non-literary papyri, and certainly not of a marked literary character. The feature which is least suggestive of an edict is the narrowness of the column, which is not usual in non-literary documents of any length. But that is a quite inconclusive argument; while in favour of the more obvious hypothesis it is worth noting that a fragment of another series of ordinances (29) was obtained from the same mummy as this. Assuming then that we have here part of an ordinance promulgated in Egypt, the question remains to what city did it refer. The choice lies between Alexandria and the still more recent foundation
Ptolemais, and, so far as existing evidence goes, turns largely upon the interpretation of a fragment of Satyrus, Περὶ δῆμων Ἀλεξανδρείων, quoted by Theophilus, Ad Autolyc. II. p. 94 (Müller, Hist. Gr. Frag. III. p. 164). In the constitution described by the papyrus the tribes were five in number, each tribe containing twelve demes, and each deme twelve phratries (II. 10 sqq.). The number of tribes at Alexandria and Ptolemais is unknown (cf. Kenyon, Archiv, II. pp. 70 sqq.); but Satyrus in the passage cited enumerates eight demes of the Alexandrian tribe Διονυσία, and if his meaning be that it contained only eight then our papyrus cannot refer to Alexandria. But this is not a necessary inference from Satyrus' words. His point is that Ptolemy Philopator, claiming descent from Dionysus, gave precedence to the Dionysian tribe, and that the eight deme-names mentioned were all connected with the god. But it is not stated that all the demes of the tribe were so connected, and had others existed in which the connexion could not be traced, there would have been no occasion to refer to them. The excerpt from Satyrus therefore hardly does more than create a slight presumption in favour of Ptolemais as the subject of these ordinances, though the presumption is somewhat strengthened by the consideration of a priori probability; for Soter's creation was still so young that regulations like the present concerning it might be expected to occur. The apparent allusion in II. 1–3 to previous ordinances forbids us to regard 28 as forming part of Soter's original legislation. On the other hand in favour of Alexandria can be adduced the fact that the city is known from Ps. Callisthenes i. 32 to have been divided into five regions numbered A, B, Π, Δ, E, with which the five tribes mentioned in the papyrus may have been connected.

Frs. (a), (b), and (c).

άγνωσιν τὰ τε γενήμε-
να αὐτοῖς τε καὶ . . . . . . . . .
γραφέτα . . . . . . . . . .
. . . . . . . . . .
5 ταῖς φρατρίας καὶ
γνωρίζηται ὑπὸ τῶν
φρατρὸν θυέτωσαν καὶ
συνέστωσαν τοῖς... . . . . . . . . . .
. . . . . . . . . . .

<to the three there mentioned, Διονύσιος, Προπαπποσβάστης, and Πτολεμαῖος, with perhaps a fourth Φιλαδελφάστης, may now be added Μοσοπατήρειος, which occurs in P. Tebt. II. 316.>
28. ROYAL ORDINANCES

10 ἡμέρας φράτραι δύο. ἐπ' εις δὴ γὰρ [ὑ]πάρχουσιν φυ[λαί μὲν πέντε τούτων 'δὲ ἐν ἐκα[τ' η]μι φυλὴ δὴ μοι μὲν ὑ[δώ]δεκα φράτραι δὲ

15 ὑ[δὼ]δεκα τῶ[ι δήμω[ι [ἐκα- [στωι]] ὡστε γίνεσθαι μ[ὲν δήμους ἐξήκοντα φ[ρά- τρας δὲ ἐπτακοσίας εἰκοσι, ὑπαρχουσῶν 'δὲ εἰς τὸν


25 δύο τοῖς [.] [. . . . . . . . nois κ' 15 letters σκε'] " " Χετ' " "

Fr. (d). Fr. (e). Fr. (f).

μ' 30 ισμα . γφα .

Fr. (g). Col. i. Col. ii. Fr. (h).

. . .

πι' 35 ε[ . ωςαν οἱ [ ] . ρυτα[ ] . σιν [ ] . . .

]ο το' 40 ματο' . . . . .

. . .
'... (in order that) they may not be ignorant of what has been done and written affecting them ... to the phratries and be recognized by the members of the phratries, let them sacrifice, and let 2 phratries from a tribe associate each day. For since there are 5 tribes, and in each tribe 12 demes, and in the deme 12 phratries, it follows that there will be 60 demes and 720 phratries; and as the year consists of 360 days it will result that 2 of the 720 phratries will ... each day ...

1. ἤνα μῆνα may be supplied before ἐπωδισμὶν.
4. There is a break below this line, and the extent of the gap, if any, is not ascertainable. It is not even certain that ll. 1–4 belong to the same column as ll. 5 sqq.
5. τὰς φράτριμα (cf. ll. 14 and 17) is very insecure. τὰρ may be στρ or στρι, and the letters preceding and following are rather cramped. The phratry as a subdivision of the Graeco-Egyptian tribe is a novelty, and it must have been relatively unimportant. There is no mention of phratries in the description in P. Tebt. II. 316 of the formalities attending the incorporation of epheloi in the demes. The occurrence of the form φράτριμα (cf. Homer and Herodotus φράτρη), which is also found in Dion. Hal. A. R. 2. 7, 4. 12, is interesting; in l. 23 the Attic φράτρια is used.
8–9. Another break occurs between these two lines, but the edges of the papyrus join satisfactorily, and the connexion of ἀναστωμῶν with φράτριμα δῶο suits the sense. The doubtful π may be μ, and τὸν μὲν ἐν ἀντώνω is a possible reading; but ἀντών is somewhat long for the lacuna in l. 9, and μὲν is not wanted.
16. The letters at the beginning of the line are blotted and seem to have been intentionally deleted.
20–1. The statement that the year consisted of 360 days is curious. The Macedonian year, like other Greek years, probably contained 354 days apart from intercalations, and there is some evidence that half the months contained only 29 days; cf. p. 334. Perhaps, however, an average of 30 days was reckoned here for the sake of symmetry. The length of the Egyptian annum vagus was 365 days, and if that be the year meant, the 5 intercalary days were left out of account. Possibly on each of them there was a general festival of a whole tribe. As Smyly remarks, the organization revealed by the papyrus seems to rest on an astronomical basis.

Frs. (i) and (c). These two small fragments are each from the top of a column.
40–3. There is a space after σω in l. 43, which suggests that this fragment contains the ends of lines. The letter before σω has been corrected and deleted, and there is an ink spot above it which may belong to an over-written letter. Line 40 was possibly the first of a column.
Mummy 97.  
12.6 x 23 cm.  
About B.C. 265.

Both sides of this papyrus are inscribed with royal ordinances, but they are too fragmentary to be of very much value. The subject of the recto, which is fairly preserved so far as it goes, is the farming of a tax upon slaves; these were to be registered by their owners at the offices of the agoranomi, and penalties are provided for any attempt at evasion or concealment. Of a general slave-tax at this period nothing is at present known; P. Petrie II. 39 (b) and (c), to which Wilcken refers (Ost. I. p. 304), are shown by the republication of them in III. 107 (a) and (b) to have no bearing upon the question. It is noticeable that the word here used for slave is not δοῦλος or σώμα but ἀνθρώπωπον, which strictly signifies a captive or enslaved prisoner. Perhaps this ordinance was called forth by some considerable increase in that class as a result of one of the wars of Philadelphus,—to whose reign rather than that of Euergetes the papyrus is to be assigned. The prisoners (αἰχμαλώτοι) brought from Asia by the latter monarch are expressly alluded to in P. Petrie III. 104. 2; cf. II. 29 (c). 2. The papyrus apparently indicates that the captives were disposed of by the government to private persons, who, besides no doubt having to pay for such appropriation, were subject to a special tax.

The verso is in a much worse case. It is unfortunately divided between two columns, and the amount lost at the beginnings and ends of the lines cannot be precisely fixed. In the text given below the numbers of letters assigned to the lacunae are based upon ll. 22–3 and 36–7. But these numbers are chiefly designed to show the relation of the lines to each other, and the loss may easily be greater than we have supposed. In parts of Col. i restoration seems very difficult with a gap at the beginning of only about a dozen letters. The hand is smaller and more cursive than that of the recto, but the writer may well have been the same person; he was not over-accurate, and several corrections occur. The subject is again tax-farming, but to the nature of the tax there is no clear clue. There is a question of registration (l. 17), but that by itself is of course insufficient to establish a definite connexion with the recto. The most significant word is κτήμα (l. 20), which is often used technically of a vineyard (cf. e. g. 113. 20), and suggests a possible reference to the ἀπόμοιρα (cf. 109 introd.); but there is nothing in the context to confirm this.

The papyrus probably dates from about the middle of the reign of Philadelphus; cf. 64 and 92, which came from the same mummy.
Fr. (a), Recto.

πέρ καὶ τ...λη ὅταν δὲ κ[,]...[,] τὸ ἀνδρόποδον καὶ δειπλοῦν ἀπο-
tινέτω. εάν δὲ τις ἄλλα[,]...[,] ν ἡ μῆ ἀπογράψηται διὰ τῶν
ἀγορανομίων [ἡ τ]ὰ τέλη [διαφυγῶν τιν]ὲ καταφάνη ἐπὶ βλάβη] ὑπὸ
tελ[ῶν]ου στε-
ρέσθω τοῦ ἀ[ν]δρ[ό]ποδο[ῦν], εάν δὲ ἀν[η]πλήγη κριθήτωσα[ν ἐ]π[ὶ] τοῦ ἀ[ποδε-
tοῦ ἀνδραπόδου εάν δὲ ὡ[π]ο[τε]θείς μηνύσῃ ἐλεύθερος ἔστω καταβαλ[ῶν]
tὰ γι-
nόμενα τέλη. γραφέσθωσαν [δ]ὲ καὶ ταῦτας τὰς υποθέσεις ὅ τε γραμμ[α]τευ

Fr. (b).

Fr. (c).

12 ἃομε[ι]

eos [15]αιτ[ε]

Fr. (a), Verso.

Col. I.


20 [.] ετελ...τῆς ἀρχῆς ὥ[.]ν στερεόθω τοῦ κτήματος

καθίστω ὁ τε[λ]ό[ν]ής [κ]ηρύσσῃ


τεταγμένα ἀπο]τείσει (δραχμάς) ὅ προσκαταβάλλειν δὲ παντ[α]σ[ι]...
Fr. (b). . .  Fr. (c). . .  Fr. (d). . .

tôôî têîlei [ ]  ]tau k[ ]
|[mêvon[  46 ]oî[ ]

32. 1. γρα'φοντων?

36. χ of εἰσπρ[α]χθητω added above the line.

1-11. . . . and when . . . the slave, he shall forfeit double. If any one (alienate?) or fail to register (a slave) through the agoranomus-offices or be discovered evading the taxes to the detriment of the tax-farmer, he shall be deprived of the slave. If he dispute the decision they shall be tried before the appointed tribunal, and the third part of the value of
the slave when sold shall go to the informer. If the slave (assigned?) give information, he shall be free on payment of the usual taxes. The scribe of the slaves and the anti-
graphus and the tax-farmer shall write out these assignments (i), and the tax-farmer shall
write this document upon a notice board in large letters and expose it in front of the
agoronomus-office every day, and for every day that this exposure does not take place he shall pay a fine of . . drachmæ, and shall further pay . . .'

1. Probably καθαρπορ, and perhaps τὴν . . ην after καί. The λ may be μ, but there is
not room for τιμωρ. τέλος cannot be read.

2. If ἀλλα, [ is a verb, it can only be some part of ἀλλάσσειν, and ἀλλάξησα gives an
appropriate sense; but the η is not very satisfactory. A more definite expression than
ἀλλα (ποιήσῃ) is, however, expected; ἀλλαξῆς is not impossible. The problem of the
supplement is complicated by the doubt whether Fr. (c) should not be assigned to ll. 1–2.
If so, [αιρετί must be inserted about midway between ἀλλα. [ and ], ν. This position is
suggested by the verso, which contains the last two letters of a line and might be placed
at the end of l. 28, and, adopting that arrangement, we might read ἀλλάξῃ ἡταί τ. . .]. υ'πο-
tεθέων (τῷ ὅπερ τ'δ' ὑπάρχειν; is rather long); cf. the next note.

6. ἅτε must be an aorist participle passive, and the faint trace before εἰς would
suit θ or perhaps φ. ἦποτε; λέος is suggested by ἦποτεσσεις in the next line; but the technical
meaning of those words here is uncertain. For ἦποτεσσειν in the sense of 'make subject to'
cf. Plato, Polit. p. 308 Α δ' ὁ χν�新 the ἑρθοῖς ἦποτεσσεῖν τὰς αὐτῶν πατρίδας;

7. The τέλος are the taxes on emancipation rather than those which the owner was
attempting to escape, and for which he would naturally remain responsible. For the taxes

16–21. The first letters of these lines, [ειρ', [απα', [δικαι', . ετθ', and ]ον', are on a
detached fragment, the position of which is not certain. The recto is blank, as it should
be if placed here; but the necessity of supposing a misspelling in δικαι 'α'σταί is not quite
satisfactory, though δικαι[ is difficult to interpret in any case. A suitable reading of l. 20
is also not easy to obtain; the third letter is more like τ than η, but ] δ' τέλει is as little
convincing as δ' εξελθη. For the δικαιστής and δικαιστικὸν (l. 24) cf. 106, introd. and
110. 31, note.

22. κρύισαι seems intended to replace ὑποτεθεΐτη, but that word was apparently not
deleted in any way; cf. ll. 32–4, note. If ὑποτεθεΐτη were read, as is just possible, κρύισαι
then would have been inserted before it; but this is an awkward collocation, and the final
letter of ὑποτεθεΐτη is hardly high enough for a ν.

23. The infinitive προακτισώμεθα is unexpected and is perhaps an error for προσκατισύλιται.

24. εἰσὶς τοῦτον can hardly be right; οὐσ might be read for the first το.

26. ὑπόλαθον in this phrase is a masculine substantive; cf. 85. 24, note.

28. Perhaps εἰς ὑπὸ τίλα; cf. notes on ll. 2 and 46.

30. Perhaps ὑπ' ἡμεταίρα, though this division is unusual.

31. The top of a letter after κ suit τ better than α; possibly κτῆματα (cf. l. 20).

32–4. Cf. ll. 8–10. The scribe apparently intended to alter (?)μηικράνεσαι to γραφώντων,
but he neglected to delete ου; cf. note on l. 22.

37 sqq. The general sense clearly is that the tax-farmer was to produce the amount
he had collected, while the banker was to make a statement of accounts. ὁ τραπεζητής is
probably to be supplied at the end of l. 39, but εἴ τού τῆς is too long for the lacuna at the
beginning of l. 40.

46. These two letters should perhaps be placed at the end of l. 28; cf. note on l. 2.
47–8. The recto of this fragment is blank.
V. LEGAL DOCUMENTS


Mummy 6. Fr. (d) 9·4 x 10·6 cm. b.c. 300–271.

This papyrus affords a specimen of a formal summons (γκλημα) served by a plaintiff in a civil process upon his adversary. A longer but less well preserved example has lately been published in P. Petrie III. 21 (g). 12–35, where the same characteristic formulae appear; and the two documents well illustrate the procedure of the time in the preliminary stages of an action at law.

The papyrus is in four fragments which refer to more than one suit. The summons contained on Fr. (d) is complete in itself, and lacks only a few letters at the beginnings of the lines. The three smaller pieces are however certainly in the same hand, and probably came from the upper part of the same sheet. The document is therefore a copy of the original summonses actually presented, though the claimant, whose name is lost, may have been the same person in both cases. Both were actions for recovery of a debt, and in both the plaintiff and defendant belonged to the same military troop. In Fr. (a) the debt was 330 drachmae, in (d), the more complete specimen, principal and interest amounted to 1050 drachmae. A declaration is first given of the fact of the debt, and that applications for payment had been fruitless; then comes a formal announcement of the institution of judicial proceedings (διδ δικαζωμαι σου, cf. P. Petrie, ibid., l. 27), and a statement of the sums involved, followed by the names of the witnesses to the summonses (κλητορες), who are two in number according to the usual Attic practice. At the end is the date and a notification concerning the court at which proceedings were to be instituted. Precisely the same scheme, except that the witnesses are placed last, is followed in the Petrie papyrus, where the point at issue was not a debt, but, apparently, an assault. The constitution of the court was in that instance a board of nine dicasts under a president, and may have been the same here. The papyrus is written in a small neat hand of a decidedly early type. The fact that the gods Adelphi were not yet associated with Alexander shows that the year is prior to the 15th of Philadelfhus (cf. 99, introd., and p. 368); and the reign may even have been that of Soter.

Fr. (a).

Mak'dw τον Άλιξ'ανδρου

Fr. (d).
... decurion of the troop of Alexander to Perdiccas, Macedonian of the troop of Alexander. I give you notice that you owe me by a contract... drachmae, for which Antigonus son of Limnaeus is surety, and that notwithstanding frequent demands from me you do not repay this sum nor were willing to acknowledge the debt to the collector; I therefore am taking legal proceedings against you for principal and interest amounting to 1050 drachmae; the assessment of damages is 1050 drachmae. Witnesses
of the summons: [.]caphusius, Coan, private of the troop of Alexander, and ... laus son of Menon, Thracian of the Epigone.

The ... year, in the priesthood of Philiscus son of Spoudaeus, the 14th of the month ... The case will be drawn up against you in the court at Heracleopolis in the presence of ... (Signed) Through Epimenes.'

1. There are traces of ink near the edge of the papyrus; but the document really begins with l. 2.

5. κατὰ συγγραφήν: cf. l. 15. Smly is, we think, wrong in interpreting κατὰ συγγραφήν ὡμολογίας in P. Petrie III. 21 (a)–(f) as an agreement of the parties ratified by the court (p. 43). κατὰ συγγραφήν there, as here, probably refers to the contract out of which the case arose. There is nothing to show that 21 (b) concerns an action for assault; ασέως (i) in l. 11, if μετὰ κυρίαν is right, must be a feminine proper name.

13. δεκανικὸς: cf. 96. 21, &c. This military title has not previously been found written out in full, though it can now be recognized in P. Petrie III. 54 a. (4) 5 and 114. 1, where l. δεκανικός. δεκανοὶ φιλακτίων occur in the second century in P. Tebt. 27. 31, and a δεκανὸς in P. Tebt. 251. Other military titles mentioned in this volume in connexion with the Greek settlers are λοχαγὸς (81. 7, 15), λιβρὴς (105. 3), ἱγμὼν (44. 2), all of which are familiar from the Petrie papyri, ἰδιώτης (30. 21, 89. 7, &c.), which is not used elsewhere in papyri to denote a military rank, and a new (?) title of which the plural ends in θυτη (96. 13). τῶν (in 110. 72 τῶν πρῶτων), followed by the name of the captain of the particular troop, is added in many instances, sometimes preceding the word denoting rank, sometimes following it, as is more usually the case in the Petrie papyri. The absence of the title κληροῦχος in the Heracleopolite and Oxyrhynchite papyri from Hibeh (the κληροῦχοι in 82. 16 were in the Fayum), and the comparative rarity of the titles ἐκαστοτάραπος, ἐγκδηκτόν-τάραπος, &c., afford another point of contrast with the Petrie papyri. ἰδιώτης serves to distinguish the lowest rank of military settlers from that of 'decurion' (δεκανικὸς) and of higher officers such as the λοχαγός, λιβρὴς, and χιλιαρχός. This use of the term anticipates our technical military sense of 'private'; cf. Xen. Anab. i. 3. 11, where ἰδιώτης is contrasted with στρατηγὸς. λειτουργὸς in 96. 14 and 31 probably has no military signification; cf. note ad loc.

15. The title of Perdiccas, e.g. ἰδιώτης, may have stood in the lacuna, but the syntax is improved by supplying some verb like δῆλον.

19–20. ἰδιώματα κατὰ τόκον: cf. 92. 15–16. The τίμημα demanded seems to be additional to the sum due on account of the actual loan, and represents the penalty which was no doubt provided by the contract in case of non-payment. To suppose that this penalty was equal to the amount of the debt accords with other evidence for this early period; cf. 84 (a). 9 and note on 88. 13.


22. The space below this line is slightly wider than elsewhere, but there was probably nothing between ἐπιγραφὴς and the date.

24–5. The publication of the details of the charge at the court before which it came was part of the normal procedure at Athens. For ἐνωπίων cf. P. Petrie III. 21 (g). 34, where ἐνώπιος (or ἐνωπίων ?) is to be read.

26. ἐκπλοῦ: cf. P. Petrie III. 21 (c). 5, where, however, the reference is equally obscure.
The contents of this papyrus are a short summary of the details of a judicial suit, but owing to lacunae and the involved construction the situation is not easy to grasp. The text, according to a common custom at this period (cf. 36, &c.), is given in duplicate, and nothing is lost above l. 1 or below l. 23; but there is a gap in the middle, and unfortunately the commencement is defective in both copies. Thrason and Pasis, the parties in the case, seem each to have accused the other of having lost 7 jars of wine from a store-place which had been leased by the owner Pasis. Affidavits were entered on both sides, and evidence was given that the store had been opened. The nature of the judgement, if indeed a judgement is recorded by the papyrus at all, depends upon the view taken of a mutilated passage, but there is reason to think that Pasis was condemned to pay compensation to Thrason to the extent of 56 drachmae; cf. note on ll. 6–7.

The papyrus is written in a rather large clear cursive, and is unlikely to be later than the first half of the reign of Philadelphus. The mummy from which it came produced also 84 (a) and 97, the earliest dated documents in this volume.

Fr. (a).

[ 22 ] ὀν αὐτ[ῶν] [...
διακο[ν] ... ... ... ... ... ὁ[μένον Θρά[σ]ων[ος τὸν ὄρκον] καὶ Π[ιάσ]τος δόντος ἀνομόστημ[ον
5 Θρά[σ]ων[α] ἀπολωλεκένας ἐκ τοῦ ταμιε[ῖον ὦ]νυν κεράμια ζ ᾳ[ποδοῦναι ... ... ... ... ... ... συμ τῶν ἐπτὰ κεραμ[ίων τιμὴν ὡς ἐξ η[ἀρχιμῶν], / (δραχμαί) ν[τ], ἀ ἐνεκάλεσεν ἀ[πολωλεκέναι ἐκ τοῦ ταμιείου οὗ ἐξεμ[ιθός]ον Π[άσ]ίς [προσ-]
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Fr. (b).

7...α.
μένου Θράσωνος τὸν ὁρκον καὶ Πάσιτος
15 δόντος ἀνομόσημον Θράσωνα ἀπολωλεκέναι ἐκ τοῦ ταμιείου οἶνον, κεράμων δὲ τῶν ἐπτὰ κεραμίων τιμὴν ὡς ἐξή ἑ (δραχμῶν), (δραχμαί) ν-', ἀνεκάλεσεν ἀπολωλεκέναι ἐκ τοῦ τα-
20 μείου οὗ ἔμεισθωσεν Πάσις προσμαρτυρήσαντος Ἀσκληπιάδου Νικάρχου ἄλλου Ἀσκληπιάδου γεγενήθαι τὴν ἐπάνοιξιν τοῦ ταμιείου.

Fr. (c)...

5. ἀπολωλεκέναι. 9. α of πασις corri. from 1. 12. α of πασις added above the line.

ll. 2-12. "...having heard (?)...", after Thrason had made an oath, and after Pasis had given a contradictory declaration that Thrason had lost from the store-place 7 jars of wine, gave judgement that Pasis should pay to Thrason (?) the price of the 7 jars at the rate of 8 drachmae per jar, making 56 drachmae, which jars he accused Pasis of having lost from the store-place leased by Pasis, further testimony that the store had been opened having been given by Dionysius, Asclepiades, Nicarchus, and another Asclepiades."

1-2. ? πρὸς | Πάσιν.
4. δόντος ἀνομόσημον: sc. ὁρκον. ἀνομόσημος is a new compound.
6-7. For ἀποδοῦναι cf. l. 17, where ἀποδοῦναι seems almost inevitable. If ἀποδοῦναι be granted, it must depend on a finite verb which we think is to be found in ἀπεκρίνω to in Fr. (c). The first question is where this fragment is to be placed. It does not suit the end of l. 6, for it would quite fill up the line, and νω in l. 7 would be left suspended; moreover a discrepancy would result in l. 17 where the σ before ν is quite certain. Fr. (c) therefore belongs to the beginning of the document, and may be placed either in ll. 1-3 or in the corresponding place of the second copy. It remains to find a suitable restoration of the words between ἀποδοῦναι and τῶν, upon which the interpretation of the document largely depends. νω in l. 7, if right, can hardly be anything but a place-name; in l. 17, however, the letter before τῶν is not ν but almost certainly ι. This might no doubt be explained as an iota adscript which in l. 7 was omitted; but in view of the other inaccuracies on the part of this scribe we are disposed to expect a more
serious error, and suggest that σμω is a slip of the pen for σωμ, i.e. θρίσωμι. θαυ in l. 17 will then of course be Πά σωμ and Πά σωμ θρίσωμι just fits the length of the lacunae in both copies. If this rather bold solution is correct, απεκρίνατο (or -νατο;) ἀποδοίηνι will be the verdict and not a statement by one of the parties, a view which is supported by διακούσας (?) in l. 3.

8. If the interpretation proposed in the previous note be on the right lines, the subject of εἰνεκάλεσσαν should be Θρασων; for it would be hardly reasonable to make Pasis pay Thrason if Pasis had himself incurred the loss. The rate here fixed, 8 drachmas for a κεράμων, is just equivalent to the highest price found for a κεράμων in the Tebtunis papyri (4000 dr., P. Tebt. 253) if the ratio of the values of silver and copper drachmas be taken as 1:500. But prices of κεράμων are deceptive; cf. P. Tebt. 113. 36, note.

10. Διονυσίων is omitted in the second copy, l. 21.

32. Sequestration of Property.

Mummy A 14. 34.5 x 12 cm. B.C. 246 (245).

The purport of this document, which concerns the sequestration of sheep belonging to a military settler, is somewhat obscure owing to the mutilation of the chief verb in l. 4. If our interpretation is correct, the papyrus records the sequestration by Heraclitus, an Alexandrian citizen, of 38 sheep, the property of Neoptolemus, a Macedonian settler, who had been condemned by default to pay a fine for an act of δράμας committed against Heraclitus. The relation of the last four lines, which are dated a week later, to the main text is uncertain. The writing is a large, handsome cursive; the second year no doubt refers to Eucrgetes.

("Ετοὺς) β δίων κε, διὰ Τηλε-μάχου. 'Ηράκλειτος 'Ηρ[ακλει- του Καστόρειος τῶν ὀσπο [ε]πηγμένων παρεδέξατο?
5 ὑπάρχοντα Νεοπτολέμου Ἡμαθήνος ἰδ[ω]τού τίνων Ἀντιόχου πρὸς καταδί-κην ἐρήμων δράμας καὶ τοῦ ἐπίδε-
32. **LEGAL DOCUMENTS**

On the verso

ἐνεχυρασία.

'The 2nd year, Dius 25, through Telemachus. Heraclitus son of Heraclitus, of the Ca stronian deme but not yet enrolled, has taken over (?) property of Neoptolemus, Macedonian, a private in Antiochus' troop, who had been condemned by default for violence to a fine of 200 drachmae and the extra tenth, 20 drachmae, namely 38 sheep, of which 8 are rams, 13 lambs, 17 covered with skins and half-shorn, of which (17) 1 is whitish grey and shorn, 3 are of Egyptian breed and half-shorn, 10 are shorn and half-bred, 1 is half-shorn, 2 are of Egyptian breed and shorn, total 38. Apellaeus 2. Menippus son of Menemachus, Mysian of the Epigone, excused himself on oath (?), saying that he ...' (Title) Pledge.'

1. **Δίου Κρ.:** this day probably corresponded to some date in Choiak at this period; cf. App. i.

3. Καστόρειος κ.τ.λ.: the formula in the Petrie papyri is fuller, e.g. III. 11. 27 'Αλέξαν-

4. If paréβλησα is right, there is hardly room for τά after it.

9. ἐπιδείκτου: this is a clear instance of the use of that term, which occurs also in

19. Probably nothing is lost after ἐπιγονής.
VI. DECLARATIONS AND PETITIONS

33. Property-Return of Sheep.

Mummy A.  11.6 x 8.2 cm.  b.c. 245 (244).

An ἀπογραφή of sheep, drawn up by a military settler; cf. P. Petrie III. 72 (b). Like the property-return in P. Petrie II. p. 33, 33 omits any mention of the official addressed, and the formula begins with ἀπογραφὴ instead of ἀπογράφομαι. P. Petrie III. 72 (b) is addressed in duplicate to the oeconomus and topogrammateus, and 33 is also apparently in duplicate; but it is unlikely that the two copies were intended for different officials, since the practice of writing documents twice over on the same papyrus is common at this period, e.g. 36–7.

The papyrus was written in a cursive hand; the second year might refer to Philadelphus' reign, though more probably that of Euergetes is meant.

["Ετούς β Παμενώτ.] ἀπο-
[γραφὴ λείας . . . . Τ . . !
[. . . . εἰς τὸ τρίτον ἐ-
tος Π[α]ρ[α]θ[ε][ρ][ο][κ][α][σ][υ][μ][ή][ό][τ][ο][ν
5 Θραίκος ἰδιώτου τῶν Ἀτ-
tοῦ. ἅπαρχει μοι πρόβατα ἴδια ἐν κόμη Ψε-
πθονέμβη τοῦ Κωτίτου ὄγδόηκοντα.

10 (ἐτοὺς) β Παμενώτ. ἀπογρα-
φὴ λείας εἰς τὸ τρίτον ἐ-
tos παρ' Ἀρομητοῦ Θραί-
kος ἰδιώτου τῶν Ἀττοῦ.
ἁπαρχεῖ μοι πρόβατα ἴδια
15 ἐν κοίμῃ Ψεπθονέμβη
toῦ Κωτίτου ὄγδοηκοντα.

6. v of -τοῦ corr. from v.
34. DECLARATIONS AND PETITIONS

The 2nd year, Phamenoth. Return of a flock (?) for the third year from Aroimeotes, Thracian, a private of Actus’ troop. I own eighty sheep as my private property at the village of Psephonembe in the Koite district.

2. The sense of λέια here is obscure. For the word at this period in reference to sheep cf. P. Petrie III. 111. 8 φιλακτικῶν λέιας προδίκην, and 112 (c). 11, &c, where the φιλ. λέιας is contrasted with the φιλ. ιερέων, i.e. animals destined for sacrifice. In those instances, as here, the λέια of sheep occurs in connexion with military settlers, and it would be possible to suppose that they had received from the state a grant of sheep either taken as plunder or in lieu of plunder. But λέια occurs in Frs. (1), (3), and (6) of Rev. Laws in connexion with the ἐνήμων, or tax for the use of the royal pastures (cf. 52, introd.); and it seems probable that in reference to sheep the word had lost the connotation of plunder, though it is noticeable that λέια has its ordinary sense in 62. 4, and P. Petrie III. 28 (c). verso 3, and (apparently, though the context is not quite clear) 64 (c). 11–2.

The vestiges at the end of the line do not suit any part of προδίκην, and the word, whatever it was, did not recur in l. 11. Perhaps there was a dittography or some other mistake.

34. PETITION TO THE KING.

Mummies 69 and 70. Breadth 32 cm. B.C. 243–2.

A petition to Ptolemy (Euergetes) from Antigonus, probably a phylacites, complaining that Patron, the archiphylacites of the lower toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome, had prevented him from carrying out his duties, and asking for redress. 78 is a letter from Antigonus on the same subject to Dorion, the epistates. Both documents are mutilated; but they supplement each other, and the sequence of events is clear. Callidromus, a Cyrenian settler, had obtained unlawful possession of a donkey belonging to a certain Dorion, and Antigonus has been directed by Dorion the epistates to compel Callidromus either to restore the animal to its owner or to pay its value. Antigonus accordingly arrested Callidromus and lodged him in a prison at the village of Sinaru. Patron then intervened, and not only released Callidromus from prison but himself took possession of the donkey (73. 13–4).

The most interesting feature of these two documents is their illustration of the practice of personal execution, and their references to the edict (διάγραμμα) authorizing it. According to Diod. Sic. i. 79, execution on the person of a debtor was abolished in Egypt by Bocchoris in the eighth century; but it was re-introduced under the Ptolemies and, as we now know, quite early in their regime; cf. P. Petrie II. 21 (d). 15. Wenger’s inference from P. Amh. 43. 12 sqq. (B.C. 173), ἃ πρᾶξις ἐστώ... πράσσοντι κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα καὶ τῶν νόμων, that the date of the διάγραμμα was probably not far removed from that of the Amherst
papyrus (Archiv, II. 53), thus proves to be mistaken. Personal execution being a common institution in the Greek world (Mitteis, Reichsrecht u. Volksrecht, p. 446), its reappearance in Egypt is likely enough to have followed close upon the establishment of the Ptolemaic dynasty.

The papyrus is a good deal broken, and the ink in the lower lines of the first fragment is very faint and blurred. The frequent corrections show that this document, like 73, is only a rough draft. The writing (which is across the fibres) gradually becomes more cursive as it proceeds.
34. DECLARATIONS AND PETITIONS

11 τὸ ἀργυρὸν κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα ἵνα [[διὰ σὲ βασιλεὺς]] διὰ σὲ βασιλεὺς τὸν δικαίου τύχω.

12 (ἐτοὺς) Διομοῦθε ἓπτ[ traces of 1 line. 

Fr. (c). . . . . . 

14 ] ai ἐπαναγκασ[ 

Fr. (d). . . . . . . 

17 ] αἱ ῥαβανία ἕν [ 

] . μὴ κομισα[ 

] τρόπον ἕυνάμην τὰ τοῦ[ 

Fr. (e). . . . . . 

20 ] . γ[ 

Δησμωτηρι[ 

10. First a of ἔξαγγελος corr. from η.

II. 1–4. 'To King Ptolemy, greeting. I, Antigonus, am unjustly treated by Patron the phylacites of the lower toparchy. For when I had removed Callidromus son of Callicrates, a Cyrenean of the Epigone, in Mecheir 25 of the 4th year to the prison at Sinaru in accordance with an order of Dorion the epistates, wherein it was written that I should either compel Callidromus to restore the donkey to its owner or else its value, 20 drachmae, Patron paying no heed to this released Callidromus from the prison at Sinaru . .' 

1. χαίρειν. Αὐτίγονος κ.τ.λ.: we prefer this method of punctuation, which has been adopted by the editors of the Magdola papyri, to that still supported by Wilcken (Archiv, III. p. 308) according to which the full stop is placed after the name of the petitioner. The formula gains nothing in respectfulness by the mere transposition of χαίρειν and the name, but it does distinctly so gain if the name is kept out of the salutation altogether. Cf. 35. 1–2, where the punctuation after χαίρειν is indicated by the division of the lines, and the new Magdola papyrus in Mélanges Nicole, pp. 281 sqq., with the editors' note.

[φιλα]κιτ[ ψφιστ]: in 73. 10 Patron is called the ἀρχιφυλακίτης of the lower toparchy. At this period therefore the ἀρχιφυλακίτης might be much more than a mere village official, which he sometimes certainly was in the second century B.C.; cf. P. Tebt. 43. 9. He was, however, subordinate to the ἐπιστάτης (φυλακιτῶν), as 73. 19 shows. If ἀρχιφυλακίτης is to be restored in P. Petrie III. 130 ἐπιστάτης φυλακιτῶν καὶ ἀρχι[, the two offices were sometimes combined in one person. The note on P. Tebt. 5. 139 requires modification in the light of the new evidence.
2. Σωματιν': the reference to Τακώνα in 73. 14 as well as to the lower toparchy (cf. e.g. 52. 4) proves that this is the Oxyrhynchite Sinaru (P. Oxy. 373. &c.) rather than the Heracleopolite (p. 8).

4. έξιγαγεν is supplied from l. 10 and 73. 11. If ωστε is right the line may have continued μη δώσω δια, as in 73. 12.

5. The latter part of this line is puzzling; ασπάζονευ does not seem admissible. The interlinear insertion may have been something like 'άδικον βλαβ αυτών είναι τού μη πρότερον με δίκαιαι αυτών ἐπιστρατιά το ὑποζύγον ἁπωδόναι (cf. 73. 18-9); but the papyrus is here so much damaged that verification of the reading is hardly possible.

6 sqq. The position of this fragment in relation to that preceding is unknown, but the gap between them is unlikely to be large. If the fragment be so placed that the lacuna at the beginning of ll. 6-9 coincides with that in ll. 1-4, the loss at the ends would amount to about 20 letters.

7. πρίκτωρ τῶν ἱδιωτικῶν: this is the first occurrence of this title which is a natural antithesis to the πρίκτωρ ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν προσώπων τετεγμένος in P. Petrie II. 22. 15. The relation of the πρίκτωρ ἱδιωτικῶν to the πρίκτωρ ἱερικῶν, who is also found in the third century B.C. (Ἡρώκος πρίκτωρ, P. Magd. 41. 5), remains doubtful. The πρίκτωρ ἱερικῶν certainly collected private debts, but he may have been distinguished from the πρίκτωρ ἱδιωτικῶν by dealing with a special class of debtors; cf. P. Tebt. 5. 221, note. His peculiar functions, however, have not yet been clearly ascertained.

Above τ of τῶ is what appears to be a large γ, to which we can attach no meaning.

8-10. This passage apparently implies that according to the provisions of the διάγραμμα a person who prevented or obstructed an execution was liable for three times the amount of the debt. At the beginning of l. 10 ἀποδ. εἰζω might possibly be read.

9. The letters added above αλλα are coarsely written and imperfectly preserved. They are not more intelligible than the γ above l. 7.

12 sqq. There are clear indications of another line where the papyrus breaks off below l. 12, and the similarity of handwriting and phraseology (ἐπαναγιαν; cf. l. 3) strongly suggests that Frs. (c) and (e) belong to the lower part of the petition. But Fr. (c) must be placed below l. 12, for there is a schis between ll. 15 and 16, which does not occur in Frs. (a) and (b). Whether Fr. (d), containing ll. 17-9, also belongs to 34 is more doubtful. ἱπαθία seems irrelevant, but we are ignorant of the context and the hand is extremely similar. Line 19 was the last of the document.

35. Petition of Hieroduli.

Mummy A. 11.5 × 8.6 cm. About B.C. 250.

This papyrus contains on the recto the beginning of a petition addressed to Sonnophris, no doubt an official, by the ἑρεβοῦντος of a temple of Thoeris, reminding him of the protection which he had previously afforded them in connexion with the collection of the temple revenues, and apparently complaining of the conduct of a coarchon; but the papyrus breaks off before the point of the letter is reached. On the verso is a partly effaced document in 7 lines.
written in a large, thick cursive hand of an early type. The petition is to be assigned to the latter part of the reign of Philadelphus.

Σουνώφρει χαίρε[ειν.]
Πετοσίρις Ποκώτος καὶ 'Οννώ-
φρις Πετήσιος ἱερόδουλοι Θυν-
ριος μεγάλης καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ

5 ἱερόδουλοι διατελο[ῦ]μεν
tοὺς φόρους εὐτακτοῦντες
eἰς τὸ ἱερὸν διὰ τὴν παρ᾽ ὑμῶν
σκέ[πη]ν, καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τοῖς
ἐμπροσθε χρόνοις ὑπὸ ὑ-
10 [μῶ]ν σκεπασάμενα[θ]α.

ἐπεὶ Πετοσίρις ὁ κωμαρχῶν

'To Sonnophis, greeting. We, Petosiris son of Pokoüs, Onnophris son of Petesis, hieroduli of the great Thoeris, and the rest of the hieroduli, have long administered with regularity the revenues of the temple on account of your protection, and now as in former times we are protected by you. Whereas Petosiris the comarch . . .'

1–2. For the punctuation adopted cf. 34. 1, note. We have found no other instance of the occurrence of the name Σουνώφρει, and the initial letter is not quite certain, the middle part having disappeared. The ink representing the two ends of the supposed Σ might perhaps be regarded as accidental, but if so I. 1 was begun further to the right than the lines following.

3. Θυρίος : perhaps the temple of Thoëris at Oxyrhynchus, known from P. Oxy. 43, verso iv. 13, is meant.

5–6. That the ἱερόδουλοι were particularly concerned with collecting the revenues of the temples is a new fact. Very little is known about their position; the title ἱερόδουλος is applied to the Twins at the Serapeum, and in P. Tebt. 6. 25 the ἱερόδουλοι are distinguished from the κατὰ μέρος θυν of the regular priests, from which passage Otto (Priester und Tempel, i. p. 118) infers that the word was applied to the lower branches in general of the priesthood.


Mummy A 15. 14 x 10·2 cm. B.C. 229 (228).

A notice of the loss of a sheep, addressed in duplicate to Harmiusis the φυλακίτης of Talaē in the 19th year of, probably, Euergetes. Cf. 144, a fragment of another notice addressed to Harmiusis, 37, which is also
in duplicate, and P. Petrie II. p. 33 (= III. p. x). The text, written in a large rude semi-uncial, is on the verso; the recto has a few traces of obliterated writing.

(ʾEtovs) iθ Θωντ β. προσαγγέλει Ἀρμιύσι ψυλακίτην
Ταλέους Σάτοκος ἀπολωλεκέναι ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς
5 νυκτὸς πρόβατον θῆλυ
dασὺ Ἀράβιον ἄξιον (δραχμῶν) η.

(ʾEtovs) iθ Θωντ β. προσαγγέλλει
Ἀρμιύσι ψυλακίτην Τάλη
Σάτοκος ἀπολωλεκέναι
10 ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς νυκτὸς
πρόβατον θῆλυ Ἀράβιον
dασὺ ἄξιον (δραχμῶν) η.

'The 19th year, Thoth 2. Satokos announces to Harmiusis, the guard of Talaë, that he has lost from the pen at night an unshorn ewe of Arabian breed, worth 8 drachmæ.'

3. Ταλέους: for this form of the genitive cf. 37. 4. The genitive Ταλάους occurs in 157 and Τάλη in l. 8, 144, and again in Roman times (p. x), and the dative Τάλη (?) in 117. 8, while Ταλάς is the form used in the more correctly written papyri 106-7 and 138-142. The accusative Ταλάρων and dative Ταλάρων are found in 75. 1 and 5. This village, which was in the Κοινή τόπος, is to be distinguished from Ταλαώ (55. 2) in the Oxyrhynchite nome.


37. **Notice of Loss.**

Mummy Λ (probably Λ 9). 11.6 x 10 cm. B.C. 235 (234).

Notification to the ψυλακίτης of Talaë of the loss of two goats; cf. the preceding papyrus. The hand is of a similar type to that of 36, and is probably to be referred to the reign of Euergetes, but the year is very uncertain.

(ʾEtovs) ʾβ μηνδός Φαρμοῦδη η.
προσαγγέλλει Στράτιος Στράτω-
38. DECLARATIONS AND PETITIONS

vos Θραϊξ της ἐπιγονῆς Πτολε- 179
μαίων φυλακίτη κώμης Ταλέως
5 ἀπολωλεκάναι νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ
Ἡρακλείτου κλήρῳ αἰγας δασεῖ-
ς δύο ἔρσενα καὶ θήλεαν ὃν τει-
μῆ δραχμαὶ τέτταρες.

(ἐτος) 16 μήνος Φαρμουθί η. προσ-
10 αγγέλει Στράτιος Στράτωνος
Θραϊξ τῆς ἐπιγονῆς Πτολεμαί-
ων φυλακίτη κώμης Ταλέ-
ους ἀπολωλεκέναι νυκτὸς
ἐν τῷ Ἡρακλείτου κλήρῳ
15 αἰγας δασεῖς δύο ἔρσενα καὶ
θήλεαν ὃν τειμῆ δραχμαὶ
tέτταρες.

5. 1. ἀπολωλεκέναι. 7. 1. θῆλεαν.

'The 12th year, the 8th of the month Pharmouthi. Stratius son of Straton, Thracian of the Epigone, announces to Ptolemaus, guard of the village of Talaē, that he has lost at night-time in the holding of Heraclitus two thick-haired goats, a male and a female, worth 4 drachmæ.'

4. Ταλέως: cf. 36. 3. note.

38. DECLARATION ON OATH.

Mummy A. 25·6 x 21·6 cm. b.c. 252-1 (251-0).

A declaration on oath concerning a shipwreck, probably made by the captain of one of the government transports; cf. P. Magd. 11 (of which P. Magd. 37 is the beginning), a petition to the king by a ναῦκλήμος of one of these boats, who had been delayed by a storm off Aphroditopolis (Atfih), near the scene of the disaster which is the subject of 38.

Below the oath are 5 more lines, and 9 or 10 narrow lines have been added in the right-hand margin, which are too incomplete for continuous decipherment,
but conclude with the date, the 34th year (of Philadelphus). The writing is extremely cursive.

5. τὸν θρόνον τῶν Ἀφροδίτου πόλεως: the site of Aphroditopolis is only 1½ miles from the Nile, and its port does not seem to have borne a separate name of its own. P. Magd. 37. 1 has γενομένων χειμώνος περὶ Ἀφροδίτης πόλεως. The θρόνος τῶν Ἀρτανόιτου mentioned in l. 4 of that papyrus is probably, as the editors remark, Ptolemais θρόνος.

13. The gods Soteres are also mentioned in another βασιλικὸς θρόνος written in the 34th year (unpublished), of which only the ends of lines are preserved; but they are omitted (apparently) in P. Petrie III. 56 (a). 4 (16th-27th years) and 56 (b). 7 (after the 26th year). In 56 (a). 3, where the editor restores ημερίοις βασιλεία Πτολεμαίων καὶ τὸν νῦν Πτολεμαίων, we should prefer βασιλεία Πτολεμαίων preceded either by a title of the person taking the oath or by a name in the dative; cf. 56 (b). 5. The deification of Soter and Berenice took place in the earlier part of Philadelphus' reign, but the year is not known. Otto (Priester und Tempel, i. pp. 143-6) places it between the 7th and 15th years.
A letter authorizing the embarkation upon a government transport of a quantity of corn, which was due from certain κλήρου. Xanthus and Euphranor, the two principals here concerned, recur in 100 and the latter also in 101, and on the analogy of those two documents the corn which is the subject of the present order is no doubt to be explained as rent. It is evident that the government frequently resumed possession of land which had been granted to military settlers, after whose names it nevertheless continued to be called; cf. 81 and 52. 26, note. The official status of Xanthus and Euphranor is not given, but they must both have been connected with the State granaries. The corn was apparently delivered in the first instance to Euphranor and was forwarded by him to Xanthus, who was of superior rank and probably occupied a position similar to that of Semnus in 101. As that document is the latest of the series it is even possible that Semnus was Xanthus' successor. The mention of the village of Peroë in 84 (a). 7 indicates that the district both here and in 100–1, which came from the same mummy as 84 (a), was the Κωῖτης.

On the verso

Eὐφράνορι.
'Xanthus to Euphranor, greeting. Give orders for the delivery through Killes to Horus on the State barge, of which the master and pilot is the said Horus, of the corn levied upon the holding of Alexander and Bromenus and Nicostratus and Pausanias; and let Killes or the ship-master write you a receipt and seal a sample, and bring them to me. Good-bye. The 21st year, Thoth 1. (Addressed) To Euphranor.'

3. Killes was perhaps παρά τῶν βασιλείων γραμματέων, like Nechthembes in 98. 10.
15. Cf. 98. 12. The object was of course to prevent the corn from being tampered with during its transit.

40. Letter of Polemon to Harimouthes.

Mummy 13. 32.7 × 11 cm. b.c. 261 (260).

This letter is one of a group (40-4) addressed to Harimouthes, who in 44. 9-10 is called the toarch of the lower toarchy (i.e. of the Oxyrhynchite nome), while in 85. 10, written like 40-3 several years earlier than 44, he is described as nomarch. Unless we are to assume that one of these descriptions is incorrect, or that the Harimouthes in 85 is a different person, it must be concluded either that Harimouthes combined the two offices of nomarch and toarch, or, what is the more natural inference, that he was first one and then the other, which suggests that the office of toarch was the superior. In Rev. Laws, however, the nomarch is regularly given precedence (cf. e.g. xxxvii. 3), though the passage in xli. 16-7 τῶν προεστηκότων τού τομοῦ τομαρχῆς ἡ τοπαρχῆς suggests that their functions differed little. Cf. note on P. Tebt. 61 (b). 46. The present letter and 41 are both from Polemon, whose position is not stated but was apparently above that of Harimouthes. He here writes somewhat obscurely about the sale of some barley.

The correspondence of Harimouthes, as is shown by 44. 9 and 85. 3, belongs to the latter part of the reign of Philadelphus.

Πολέμων Ἀριμούθη
χαίρειν, περὶ τῶν
σιμβόλων γεγραφαμεν
Κρίτων καὶ Καλλικλεί
tίνα γείναι ὡς ἐπεσταλκας. ἐπίστασο
μέντον ἀκρίβως

δραχμὴν μίαν οὐθεὶς
σοι μὴ πληρὴν οὐχὶ καὶ γάρ
οἱ παρὰ Κερκίωνος
ἔχουσιν ήδη ἐμὶ παρα-
15 γραφῆι ἐκ τοῦ λογι-
στηρίων.

ἐρρωσο. (ἔτους) κἀ Ἐπίφφ κα.
Letter of Polemon to Harimouthes.

Mummy 13. 31.7 x 10.8 cm. About b.c. 261.

Another letter to Harimouthes from Polemon, notifying him of the arrival of Mnason, a δοκιμαστὴς, who was to collect certain arrears and sell some oil. Harimouthes is directed to obtain security for Mnason to the value of 1000 drachmae, and to assist him in the performance of his duties. The nature of the arrears in question is not stated, but very likely they too were connected with the oil-monopoly, and it is evident that Mnason was personally responsible. In other papyri in this volume the δοκιμαστὴς is closely associated with the τραπεζής (cf. 106, introd.), but he appears here in a somewhat different capacity, though still in connexion with the royal bank (l. 25).

Πολέμων 'Α[ριμο]νθη δια-ρεις, ἀπετε[άλκ]αμεν πρὸς σὲ Μνάσωνα [τὸν δοκιμασ-τὴν μετὰ φυ[λα]κῆς. διεγ-5 γνῆσας οὗ[ν] οὐγιόν παρα-

15 εἰσαχθὴναι πάντα, καὶ ήμῖν ἐπὶστειλὼν ὅτι παρεὶληφας αὐτὸν παρὰ τῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῶν μαχ[ί]ων καὶ ὃτι διεγγυῆσεις αὐτὸν
μονής (δραχμῶν?) 'Α ἀφ[ε]ις αὐτῶν
εἰσαγαγεῖν τά ὀφειλή-
ματα κα[θ]ὰ σύγκειται
πρὸς ἡμᾶς[ς] τῷ πρόστιμον
10 αὐτῶι συμβαλὼν παρὰ σαν-
τοῡ οσσοῦ. μ. ἐπιτρέψει
ἀποβιάζοντα αὐτῶι καὶ
... σ[ε] [.μ] ... καὶ συνεπι-
λαμβάνων αὐτῶι πρὸς τὸ

20 τῶιν Ἀ (δραχμῶν), ἑπιμέλειαν ἐδὲ
πολίσαι ὅποι καὶ τὸ ὑπάρ-
χον ἔλαιον δὲ αὐτῶι ήθη
πραθή καὶ ἣ τιμὴ ἀνα-
κομισθεῖσα πέση ἐπὶ τῆν
25 [βασιλικῆν] τράπεζαν.

On the verso
'Αριμοῦνη.

' Polemon to Harimouthes, greeting. I have sent to you Mnason the controller under
guard. Obtain security of 1000 drachmae for his remaining, and allow him to collect the arrears
as agreed upon between us; and contribute the penalty out of your own funds... Assist
him also so that everything be collected, and send me word that you have received him
from my soldiers and that you will obtain the security of 1000 drachmae for him; and be
careful to see that the existing store of oil be now sold by him, and the price be collected
and paid into the royal bank... (Addressed) To Harimouthes.'

4–5. διεγγυόμενοι... παραμονῆς: cf. 92–3, which are specimens of contracts made with
sureties for the appearance of accused persons. For μετὰ φυλακῆς cf. e.g. 59. 4.
6. ἀφ[ε]ις is somewhat short for the space.
9–10. The arrears apparently involved a penalty upon Mnason himself; the precautions
taken against his absconding show that he was in difficulties.
11. The traces suggest οσσοῦ μη or οσουδῆρ; the apparent ν prevents us from reading
ὅποι μη, with which ἐπιτρέψει would have to be a middle future.
12. ἡμᾶς ε[ might be read at the beginning of the line.
18. For μονήμοι in attendance upon officials cf. P. Tebt. 113, 81, &c.
21 sqq. The καὶ perhaps indicates that the ὀφειλήματα had arisen in connexion with
the oil-industry. According to the provisions of Rev. Laws xlviii, the manufactured oil
was sold to the retail traders by the ὀικονόμος and ἀντιγραφεῖς, while the δοκιμαστής plays no
part. But that ordinance had probably not yet been issued; and in any case the appearance
of the δοκιμαστής here may be due to some special circumstances.

42. Letter of Callicles to Harimouthes.

Mummy 13. 19.8 x 8.1 cm. B.C. 262 (261).

This letter and 43 were written to Harimouthes by Callicles, an official
superior whose title is nowhere stated. The subject of the present, rather obscure,
note is the delivery of some corn which was due from Harimouthes.

Καλλικλῆς Ἄριμοῦθην
χαίρειν. τὸν σῖτον ὃν
43. OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE

43. OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE

43. OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE

43. OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE

éφης μεταβαλείσθαίν

5 γινόν δομού μεν ἀνεννώ-

χασί ἐως Φαώφι καὶ παρα-

dεξάμεθα, τὸν δὲ λοιπὸν

ἐὰμ μὴ μεταβάλησιν

τοὶ Δευκῶι ἐν ὁφειλήματι.

ἐρρωσό. (ἐτοὺς) καὶ

Ἄθυρ δ.

On the verso

2nd hand Ἄθυρ δ, παρὰ Καλλι-

κλέους περὶ τοῦ σιτοῦ.

1st hand Ἀρμούθης.

5. ι of ανεννροχαί cor. from ι.

7. υ of τοῦ above the line.

'Callicles to Harimouthes, greeting. With regard to the corn which you said you would transfer to the agents of the sitologi, the amount which they have paid (?) up to Phaophi 30 we will accept; but the rest, if you do not transfer it before Athur 8, we shall give to Leucius as a debt. Good-bye. The 24th year, Athur 4. (Addressed) To Harimouthes. (Endorsed) Athur 4, from Callicrates concerning the corn.'

3. For μεταβάλλειν in connexion with corn cf. 45. 6.

43. LETTER OF CALLICLES TO HARIMOUTHES.

Mummy 13, 16.7 x 8.6 cm.

A second letter from Callicles (cf. 42) to Harimouthes, asking for some sesame to be delivered at Pela for the manufacture of oil. As the Revenue Papyrus shows, the nomarchs and toparchs were among the officials responsible for the management of that industry, so that it is natural to find Harimouthes acting in this connexion; cf. 40, introd.

Καλλικλῆς Ἀρμούθης

χαίρειν. σῶνταξον μετρήσαι

to σήσαμον τὸ ἐμὶ Πέλαι

Πρωτομάχω καὶ τοῖς σιτολόγοις, οὐ γὰρ ἐστίν

5 ἐν τῇ πόλει σήσαμον. ῧνα ὅν

53. LETTER OF CALLICLES TO HARIMOUTHES.
44. LETTER OF DINON TO HARIMOUTHES.

Mummy 13.  12.4 x 33.3 cm.  B.C. 253 (252).

A letter to Harimouthes from an official named Dinon, giving urgent orders for the native soldiers in Harimouthes' district to be sent up under a captain, and also for the dispatch of some labourers for harvesting purposes. No reason is assigned for the movement of the soldiers, and its object cannot be guessed. The document is written in a fine hand across the fibres of the papyrus.

 Δείγων Αρμούθη χαίρειν. ἐγράφαμέν σοι πρότερον περὶ τῶν μαχιμῶν τῶν ὁμίων ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ σε τόποσ ὤπως ἀποσταλῶσιν μετὰ Βιθελμεύιον τοῦ ἡγεμόνος καθότι γράφει Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ διοικητής, ὦσαίτωσ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐπιγραμμεύομενος θεριστάς κατὰ τὴν δοθείαν σοι γραφῆν, ὥρωντες δὲ σε καταραθυμοῦντα

5 οὕμνη δειν καὶ τίν ἐπιστείλαι σοι. ὡς ἀν ὦν λάβης τὴν ἐπιστολήν πάντα πάρεργα
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ποιησάμενος ἀπόστειλον πρὸς ἴμας τοὺς μαχίμους ἡδή, τοὺς δὲ θεριστὰς ὡς ἀν
ἐτοίμως ποιήσης ἐπίστειλον ἴμιν' ὁ γὰρ ὡς ἐτυχεῖ περὶ τούτων τὴν
σπουδὴν
ποιεῖται ὁ διοικητὴς. ἔρρωσο. (ἐτούς) λβ Μεχείρ ἱγ.

On the verso

tοπάρχης (in demotic) 'Αριμοῦθη

10 τῆς κάτω Mecheir 14

In the reverse direction, above 'Αριμοῦθη,

2nd hand Μεχείρ ἱς,

περὶ μαχίμων

καὶ θεριστῶν.

1. ν of τῶν corr. from μ. 2. α of βιθῆλμενος corr. from γ. 3. σι was inserted above καὶ and again crossed out. 4. σι added above the line. 9. τ of τοπάρχης corr. from ι.

'Dinon to Harimouthes, greeting. I have written to you before concerning the native soldiers in the district under you, that they be sent with Bithelminis the captain in compliance with the letter of Apollonius the dioecetes, and similarly that the harvesters be sent who have been levied in accordance with the list given to you; but seeing that you are negligent I thought it my duty to send to you instructions again now. Therefore as soon as you receive this letter put everything else aside and send me the soldiers at once, and so soon as you can get the harvesters ready let me know; for the dioecetes is showing no ordinary anxiety with regard to this. Good-bye. The 32nd year, Mecheir 13. (Addressed) To Harimouthes, toparch of the lower toparchy. (Endorsed) Mecheir 14, concerning soldiers and harvesters.'

3. This is the same Apollonius who is mentioned in 95. 10, 110. 43 al., P. Petrie II. 4 (3). 1, &c. The earliest date at which he is known to have held the office of dioecetes is the 27th year of Philadelphus (Rev. Laws xxxviii. 3; cf. P. Amh. II. 33. 28 and 37); the latest is supplied by the present document (32nd year, Mecheir 13).

ἐπιγραμμένος indicates compulsory labour; cf. 47. 12.

---

**45. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LYSIMACHUS.**

Mummy A 16. 12.7 x 7.5 cm. B.C. 257 (256).

This and the following five documents (46–50) are all letters written by Leodamas, an official connected with the corn-revenues, probably in the Oxyrhynchite nome since the Oxyrhynchite village Sephtha is mentioned in
45. 5. Four of the letters (45–8) are addressed to a subordinate called Lysimachus, who seems to have been specially concerned with the collection and transport of grain; and the correspondence, which covers the 28th to the 30th years of Philadelphus, consists chiefly of instructions on official matters. Leodamas was a careless writer, and mistakes are more frequent than usual at this period of comparatively correct Greek.

In 45 on reaching the bottom of the papyrus Leodamas turned it over and finished his letter on the verso; cf. 48.

ός ἀ[ν] λάβητε τὴν ἐ[πι-]
[στολή]ν παραγίνεσθε
5 [ἰ]α [τ]ὸν ἐν Σέφθαι σῖτον
μεταβάλ[ησ]θε πρὸ τοῦ
τὸ... τὸ ἐμβαλεῖν,
καὶ εἴ τι κερμάτιον
λελογεύκατε φέρε-
10 τε εὐθέως. καὶ τὰ
λοιπὰ πειράσθε
συνάγειν καὶ μὴ
ὑπολιμπάνεσθε,
καὶ τὸν παρὰ Φίλωνος

On the verso
15 σῖτον ὅπως μὴθεν
ὑπολείψεσθε εὰν αὐ-
τῶι ἄλλα πάντα παρα-
μετρήσασθε. καὶ ὅπως
μὴ λογεύσετε παρεἰρέσθε.

On the verso
20 μηδεμιᾶι τὸ ἄρ. [. ἐ]κὸν
καὶ ἵππιατρικὸν, [ἀ]λα ἐῖ
τι λελογεύκατε κατα-
χωρίσατε εἰς τὸ χωμα-
τικὸν. [ἐρ]φωσο.
25 (ἔτους) κη Χο[ι]ὰχ.

6. ὡς of τοῦ corr. from ὡς?

‘Leodamas to Lysimachus, greeting. As soon as you receive this letter, come here in order to transfer the corn at Sephtha before lading ... , and if you have collected any money bring it at once, and try to levy the rest, and do not leave any arrears; and take care that you do not leave the corn from Philon still owing from him, but secure payment of everything, and take care that on no pretext whatever you collect the ... and horse-doctors-tax; but if you have collected anything credit it to the embankments-tax. Good-bye. The 28th year, Choiak. (Addressed) To Lysimachus.’

14. Φίλωνος: he is also mentioned in 47. 6 and 49. 10.
21. A tax for doctors at this period, called ἱατρικὸν, is known, e.g. from 102; but an impost for maintaining veterinary surgeons is new. The reading ἵππιατρικὸν is nearly certain, but that of the first three letters of the tax which is coupled with it is very doubtful.
23. χωματικὸν: cf. 112. 13, note.
46. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LYSIMACHUS.

Mummy A 16. 13:1 x 6:2 cm.  b.c. 258 (257).

Another letter from Leodamas to Lysimachus on official matters; cf. 45, introd.

Δευδάμας Λυσί-    ι.  πράσσεις ἄλλα βα-
μάχου χαίρειν.    θυμαίτε. ἐδει δὲ
οὶ τι ἀν πρῶτον λο-
γεύσῃ δῶς Κράτη-
5 τι τὰ λοιπὰν τοῦ ν[αύ-
λου (δραχμᾶς) οὲ υπολογή-
sας (δραχμᾶς) δ', καὶ σύμβο-
λου ποίησαι ἀπε-
χοντα αὐτὸν τὰς
10 οἰς πλῆρεις. καὶ    ἐπώς πραθῇ.
τοὺς λοιποὺς ὡκ ἑισ-

On the verso

Λυσιμάχῳ.

11. ι. of εἰσπράσσεις corr. from εἰς.  12. l. ἡδυμεῖτε.

'Leodamas to Lysimachus, greeting. As soon as ever you collect anything, pay Crates the rest of the freight charges, 75 drachmas, subtracting 4 drachmas; and get a receipt stating that he has received the 75 drachmas in full. You do not exact payment from the others, but are neglectful. Their securities ought to have been here long ago and sold; now therefore at length either collect the money or send their securities to be sold. Good-bye. The 28th year, Phaophi 20. (Addressed) To Lysimachus.'

47. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LYSIMACHUS.

Mummy A 16. 22:6 x 7:3 cm.  b.c. 256 (255).

Another letter to Lysimachus from Leodamas, giving him various directions concerning his official duties. The letter is written with more than usual carelessness, syllables and even whole words being sometimes omitted, and the
damaged surface of the papyrus renders several passages very difficult to decipher.

\[\text{Δεωδάμας Λυσιμάχου χαίρειν. Δημητρίου τοῦ τοῦ Παρμενίωνος νῦν σύνταξον τοῦς καρποὺς πάντας συνεχεῖς, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τῖς ἀλλοι τῶν [...]τῇ ἐκείνῃ... συντέτακται γὰρ ἤδη ἐως τοῦ Πανῆμου μηνὸς, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐως τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ. θερίζειν δὲ καὶ ἀμαίν καὶ λεπταγόννυματα... ὡς καθήκας. εἰ δὲ τις πυρὸς παρ᾽ ἑστηκεν καθαρὸς παρ᾽ ὧστιν ἄποδοι ἓνα τιμίαν... ρ... σομεν τῶν γυναικῶν, τῶν ἐπανάγκων, τῶν ἐν τοῖς πατρίσιν οὖν μετανείπον τοὺς μάξους τοὺς παρὰ Φίλωνος τοῦ Λυσανίου καὶ τὸν παρὰ Φίλωνος καὶ Στοιχείους εἰ μὲν ἀπὸσταλμὰς εἰς Δικωμίαν, εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀπόσταλμα. τεῖχον τ... ν Ἡδη ἕνα ἄποδοθώσιν Δικωμίδην, οὕτω γὰρ συντέταχεν. καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀπὸστείλον Δημητρίῳ. ἐν τάχει ἕνα μὴ πάις ἀποσταλῆ. ἔρρησο. (ἐτοὺς) κῷ Μεχείρ κ.

On the verso

\[\text{Λυσιμάχου.}

\[12. ζ̂γ of θερίζειν corr. 15. τ of παρ᾽ ἑστηκεν above θ (?). 20. ω of λοιπον corr. from ι of ρ.

'Leodamas to Lysimachus, greeting. Give instructions to (collect?) the crops of the son of Parmenion unremittingly, and likewise those of the others... since instructions have already been given to do so by the mouth of Panemus, and likewise those of the rest up to the full number, and to mow and reap them and... If there is any sifted wheat to hand with any one, sell it in order that we may pay over the value of the necessary dues, but... the rest, for it is wanted...; and prepare both olyra and barley in order that we may measure it to the State. With regard to the calves from Philon son of Lysanias and the calf from Philon and Spokes, if you have sent them to Dicomia (it is well); but if not send them at once that they may be delivered to Lycomedes, for those are his instructions. And send the letter to Demetrios immediately in order that a slave may not be sent. Goodbye. The 29th year, Mecheir 20. (Addressed) To Lysimachus.'
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4. It is not clear whether σύνταξον governs καρποῦς or an infinitive is to be supplied. On the former hypothesis σύνταξον might mean ‘assess,’ a sense which would suit this context but is rare, and, in view of both the other instances of συντάξεως in ll. 8 and 32, where the ordinary meaning ‘instruct’ is appropriate, and the frequency of σύνταξον followed by an infinitive (e.g. 39, 2), decidedly difficult, especially as the infinitives in l. 12 seem to depend on σύνταξον. It seems preferable, therefore, to supply an infinitive meaning ‘collect’ or ‘assess’; cf. the omission in l. 29.

9. Panemus corresponded approximately to Pauni at this period; cf. App. i. The action which Lysimachus was told to perform had to be carried out before the end of the harvest.

13. λεπτάγιος seems to be equivalent to λεπτογείος, meaning ‘barren land.’ The beginning of the next word suggests only ὅν, ‘plough-share,’ but the third letter is certainly τ, and probably ς has been omitted and the word is some form of συντάξεως. λαν in l. 14 is the termination of an infinitive, perhaps αὐμ ἄν (cf. l. 12), but the first letter could be almost anything.

17. The verb following τιμήν very likely began with para, possibly παρὰ στράτους.

20. ἀρχων is probably the termination of an imperative following μῆ; but the form seems to be erroneous.

23. παραμετρήσωμεν: cf. 45, 17 παραμετρήσασθε.

29. Δικομίαν: this village (cf. Δικομία in the Arsinoite nome) is not otherwise known. Leodamas has omitted the apodosis to έτι μὲν ... Δικομίαν. ἁποιτιον ... must be meant for ἑπιδοτειλον, but it is difficult to reconcile the vestiges of the termination with εἶλον. Perhaps Leodamas made a mistake and wrote ἀποιητικὸν ... ἑπιδοτειλον.

35. παῖς: or Πάς; cf. 112, 57, P. Petrie III. 65 (a). 1.

36. Possibly ἀποστολῆς, but Leodamas generally omits an adscript with subjunctives, e.g. 46, 4 and 20.

48. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LYSIMACHUS.

Mummy Λ (probably 16). II·5 X 7·1 cm. B.C. 255 (254).

Another letter from Leodamas to Lysimachus, asking for information with regard to advances of seed-corn. After concluding the letter with the customary salutation and date, Leodamas changed his mind and erased them, continuing the letter on the verso; cf. 45. The writing on the recto is across the fibres.

Λεωδάμας ἄνω στράτους ἄχων
χαίρειν. τὰ σφέρματα τῶν διηγγυμένων κλήρων τίνι γράφεις;
ψαλτὴς ἐδόκας; οὔ γὰρ εὐφράκω ἐν τοῖς βυβλίοις. πάλιν οὖν γράφειν.
HIBEH PAPYRI

ψας ἀυτῶν τῶν σπερμάτων ἀπόστειλόν
10 μου ἡδη, καὶ δός τῷ παρ’ Ἀντιπάτρου, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ καταλαμμάνῃς ἀλλὰς δός ἵνα μὴ ἑπικωλύσωμεν τὸν λόγον
15 συνθείναι. [[ἐρροσο (ετοὺς) λ] 
[[Μεσορ(η) κη]]

On the verso

καὶ ὡσαύτως μετρη-
4 obliterated lines.

22 ἐρροσο[γ] (ετοὺς) λ Μεσορ[γ] κη.

8. 1. τὰ σπέρματα. 12. 1. καταλαμβάνεις.

‘Leodamas to Lysimachus, greeting. To whom did you give in writing the seed for the holdings which have been taken in pledge? I cannot find the entry in the books. Write another list, therefore, of the seed issued for them and send it to me at once; and give it to the agent of Antipater or, if you cannot catch him, to some one else, that I may not be prevented from making up my account. Likewise measure . . . Good-bye. The 30th year, Mesore 28.’

3. διαγραμμάτων κλήρων: for an example of a deed placing a κλῆρος in pledge cf. Wileken, Aktenstücke, no. 11.

49. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO LAOMEDON.

Mummy A 16. 11·2 x 8·6 cm. About B.C. 257.

A short letter from Leodamas to Laomedon, another of his subordinates, giving him directions about the transport of corn and olives. The reference to the latter is interesting, since olives are not mentioned either in Rev. Laws or in the Petrie papyri.

Λεωδάμας Λαομέδοντι χαί-

ρελ. πορεύθητι ὧδ ἀν ἀκοβόσης

Λυσίμαχον καὶ ἐπισπούδασον ὅπως
50. OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE

Leodamas to Laomedon, greeting. Go to whatever place you hear that Lysimachus is at, and take care that the corn is embarked as quickly as possible, and bring it down with him. Tell him that, as I wrote to him, he is to put the olives into jars or μῶια for embarkation, and try to bring them as unbroken as possible. Remind him that he is to receive from Philon son of Lysanias the fine olives, as I wrote to him. Good-bye.

(Addressed) To Laomedon . . ., at the city.'

2. πορείθητι: the reading of the penultimate letter is very doubtful, but it is as much like τ as θ, which is the only likely alternative.

8. μῶια are receptacles of some kind, either boxes or jars; cf. P. Petrie III. 65(b). 6 and P. Grenf. I. 14. 13-16, βίκοι occurring both times in the same context, as here. From P. Grenf. I. 14 it appears that a small μῶιον could contain 6 πίθου, and that 2 μῶια of Parian marble could be inside a lamp-stand. μῶια, which are mentioned in P. Grenf. I. 14. 5 immediately after a βίκος, seem to be allied to μῶια, which are also found in ostraca (e.g. Sayce, Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch., xxiii, p. 214) as a measure of ἄχρινον; cf. the μοιά(ος) in P. Oxy. 146. 3.

15. The πόλις is probably Oxyrhynchus; cf. 45, introd.

50. LETTER OF LEODAMAS TO THEODORUS.

Mummy A 16. 8·8 × 8 cm. About B.C. 257.

A short letter from Leodamas (cf. 45, introd.) to Theodorus, another official, giving him instructions about the delivery of olyra to Lysimachus. The date is probably the 28th or 29th year of Philadelphus.
Theoðòrōi.

2. νε of ανενηριχαμεν above the line. 6. ω of λυσιμάκων corr. from ov.

'Leodamas to Theodorus, greeting. I have paid over (?) to the State 1834/3 artabae of olyra. Do you therefore leave this olyra for yourself and measure out the rest to Lysimachus, that it may be . . . Good-bye. The 2. th year . . . (Addressed) To Theodorus.'

51. LETTER OF DEMOPHON TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A 9. 9·9 x 3·5 cm. B.C. 245 (244).

The following twelve documents (51–62; cf. 167–8), which are dated in the closing years of the reign of Philadelphus or the first few years of his successor, are all addressed to Ptolemaeus, the holder of some minor post in the Oxyrhynchite nome. His title is not mentioned, but his sphere was a village (59. 11), where he apparently exercised the functions of an officer of police (59–62), and had also financial duties (51. 2–4, 58. 7). He was probably subordinate to the archiphylacites (56, introd.), and may have been a phylacites. Whatever his position, he did not always fill it to the satisfaction of his superiors, and on more than one occasion he received a reprimand (56. 7–8, 59. 9–12).

In the present letter, as also in 52–3, the correspondent of Ptolemaeus is Demophon, who here sends instructions for the collection of dues upon green crops and for the purchase of 'Syrian cloths' (cf. note on 1. 3), in accordance with an order, a copy of which is enclosed, from Apollodotus, a higher official.

Δημοφόνον Πτολεμαίων χαίρειν. ἵππογέγραπταί τῆς παρ' Ἀπολλοδότου ἐλθούσης μιοὶ ἐπιστολῆς
51. OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE

περὶ τῆς λογείας τῶν χλωρῶν τάντιγραφ[ον.] π'ράττε οὐν τοὺς [ . . ] πρὸς ἀργύριον ἡγηρακότας.

ἡδη καθάπερ γ[ε]γρατταί, τὰς δὲ συρίας ὡς ἔξισιν σοι παραβαῶν· ταί πρειά-

μενοι λάμβανε ἀρειάτας.

τέλοιων τῶν ὑπογεγραμμένων. ἐρρωσο. (ἔτους) β Μεξίρ 1β.

5 Ἀπολλόδοτος Δημοφώντι χαίρειν. πρὸς τῇ τῶν χλωρῶν λογεία τῆς ἡδη καὶ συρίας λάμβανε.

ἐξαδράχμους καὶ ἐπιπλληγης τοῦ ἡμίσου τῶν δ (δραχμῶν) (ὀβολῶν) (ἡμιω-

βέλιον), τοσοῦτο γὰρ ἐκείται ἐγ βασιλικοῦ. ἐρρωσο. (ἔτους) β Μεξίρ 1β.

On the verso

Πτολεμαῖοι.

2. ἡγηρακότας.

'Demophon to Ptolemaeus, greeting. Appended is a copy of the letter which has come to me from Apollodotus about the collection of green-stuffs. Do you therefore exact payment now from the purchasers on the silver standard, in accordance with his instructions; and any Syrian cloths that may be deposited with you accept, if satisfactory, and buy at the prices below written. Good-bye. The 2nd year, Mecheir 12.

'Apollodotus to Demophon, greeting. Take in hand now the collection of the green-stuffs, and accept Syrian cloths at 6 drachmae with an agio on half the sum at the rate of 1½ obols in 4 drachmae, for that is the rate published by the government. Good-bye. The 2nd year, Mecheir 12.

'(Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

2. By the λογεία τῶν χλωρῶν, as the following sentence shows, is meant the collection of the value of the green crops, not the crops themselves. What these particular χλωρά were and who are signified by τῶν πρὸς ἀργύριον ἡγηρακότας is, however, obscure. The latter phrase rather suggests the farming of a tax, and seeing that 52-3, which are also letters from Demophon to Ptolemaeus, not improbably refer to the ἐννόμον, that impost might be supposed to be also the subject here. Or the χλωρά may well be the produce of royal domains sown with this class of crops, the share of which accruing to the government as rent had been sold; cf. P. Tebt. 27. 54 sqq. μηθεία τῶν γεωργῶν τῆς βασιλικής καὶ τῆς ἐν ἀφάσει [γῆς] ἐφιάλεθαι τῶν χλωρῶν πλῆρ... τῶν ἐγχειρηθησομένων ὄν αἱ τειμαὶ καὶ ταύτων αἱ ἀσφαλεἰα χαὶ δὲ θεία καταστάθονται ἐπὶ τῶν τραπεζῶν πρὸς τὰ καθόμενα εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν. If ἐγχειρηθησομένων there means 'to be collected' as the analogy of other passages suggests, the expression would be very similar to λογεία τῶν χλωρῶν in 51.

3. συρίας: cf. Hesych. συρίας ἡ παρεῖχε χλών, ὅτι ἄπο τοῦ σταύρους, ἡ ὅτι εὐ ἐν Καππαδοκία γίνεται, ὅτι δὲ Ἐσρα, καὶ Pollux 7. 61 ὅτι δὲ συρίας αἱ πολλοὶ, ταύτων αὐτόπτων ἐμάστων αἱ κομμικοί. Besides 38. 7 συρίας are mentioned in a mutilated papyrus of about this period belonging to Dr. Mahaffy, 'Αλκιστωρ δὲ ὁ οἰκονόμος [ ὑπ' ἀρχαῖον συρίας προδιδόμει ἐκκατοστῷ εἰς τὸ ὀβολὺ. The συρίας were apparently included among the fabrics monopolized by the government, the producers of such fabrics, as is shown by 67-8, being paid on a scale similar to that
fixed in the present passage. The mention of an ἐπαλλαγή in l. 6 is another point of connection between the three documents. In 67 and 68 the rate of the ἄλλαγῇ or ἐπαλλαγῇ is \( \frac{3}{4} \) obol to the stater, while here it is \( \frac{1}{2} \) obols to the stater, reckoned upon half the amount, which comes to the same thing.


52. Letter of Demophon to Ptolemaeus.

Mummy A (probably A 9). Fr. (a) 11.7 x 25, Fr. (b) 10.2 x 9.8 cm. About B.C. 245.

Another letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus (cf. 51, introd.), enclosing a list of persons who are generally assessed at the rate of 1 drachma 4 obols per aroura (a lower rate occurring in l. 23). Owing to the incompleteness of the introductory letter the purport of the whole document is somewhat obscure; but apparently the list refers to the amounts payable by certain inhabitants of Tholthis, a village of the Oxyrhynchite nome, who had pastured their flocks upon Crown lands in various parts of the lower toparchy. Whether the impost in question is connected with the λογεία χλωρῶν in 51, 2, or is identical with the tax called εἰρύμον (132; cf. P. Petrie III. 109 (a)) or εἰς τὰς νομὰς, levied for use of the royal pastures (Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 191 and 265), is not clear. From references in receipts for εἰρύμον to the number of the sheep Wilcken (l.c.) infers that that impost was proportionate to the number of sheep turned out to graze, whereas in 52 the tax is clearly proportionate to the area of the pasturage. The terms of the introductory letter in 52, especially the references to the ‘using up’ of the pastures and the securities to be obtained in consequence, suggest that the proceedings of the persons mentioned in the list had been irregular (cf. P. Tebt. 66. 75 sqq.); but this hypothesis does not accord very well with 53, another letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus enclosing a precisely similar list of persons who are mostly assessed at 1 drachma 4 obols on the aroura (cf. 130, a fragment of a third document of the same character). The phrase προσάγγελμα τῆς πρῶτης δεξημέρου applied to the list in 53, 2 recalls the terminology employed in regard to the collection of ordinary taxes, and on the whole it seems preferable to identify the payments in 52 and 53 with the εἰρύμον.

In ll. 24–33, which are on a separate fragment, Demophon’s handwriting is smaller, and perhaps this piece, which in any case is not part of Cols. i or ii. belongs to 130 or another similar list, though not to 53.

Fr. (a).

Col. i.

Διημορίον Πτολεμαίων χαίρειν.

\( \text{iπ} \)ογέγραφά σοι τῶν ἀπὸ Θόλθεως
[ο[ε[κα]τανενεμήκασιν ἐκ τῆς βασι-
λικής γῆς τῆς ἐν τῇ κάτω το-
παρχίαι τὰ ὄνοματα καὶ τὰ
πλήθη κ[αί ὁ]ντινων κλήρων
ἀποκέχρηται ταῖς νομαῖς. σὺ
οὗν πειρῶ ὡς ἀσφαλέστατα
dιεγγυῆσαι ὡπως μηθὲν διᾶ-
πτωμα ἐξ ὕστερου γίνηται,
obῆμαι γάρ σε.... ν....    

Col. ii.

[...ο[ω[ς Βαρκαίος ἰδι(ῶτης) ὀνομάς (δραχμαῖ) ἰς (τετρ[ώβολον) (ἡμιω-
βέλιον),
Π[...][ας Κυριακὸς τῆς ἐπιγονῆς (δραχμαί) θ (δυ[όβολοι),
Δ[η[ήμητρος Φίλωνος Κυριακοὶ τῆς
15 [ἐπί]γονῆς (δραχμαί) η (πεντ[όβολον) (τέταρτον),
[...] ν... Τ[ε]ρότος ποιμήν καὶ Πετερ-
μοῦθης Κοματίως (δραχμαί) θ (τέταρτον),
Ωρος Πνάτος ἴσεως γόπτως ἰς (ὄβολος) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
ἄλλας ὁ αὐτὸς (ἀροῦρας) β (δραχμαί) γ (δυ[όβολοι),
20 Πετοσεῖρις Φανῆτος καὶ Πετοσεῖρις
Πασιγόνους καὶ Ἰππόλυτους (ἀροῦρας) βδ (δραχμαί) γ (πεντ[όβολον),
ἄλλας Πετοσεῖρις Ἀδρωμώτους ἀράκου
[ἀ]ροῦρας ε (δραχμαί) ε (τρι[όβολον),

19. This line was inserted later. 22. εἰρίς of πετοσεῖρις above the line.

Fr. (d).

[...[...[... τῆς ἐπιγο[νής
25 [ἀράκου (ἀροῦρας) ε (δραχμαί) ἵ...
[ἐκ τοῦ Πτο[λεμαίον Πραγ[ίας Καλλιδρ[όμου
[... τῆς ἐπιγονῆς ἄρακ(ου) (ἀροῦρας) τ[α]ν(α) α (τετρ[όβολον) (δραχμαί) ε,
HIBEI\ PAPYRI

Demophon to Ptolemaeus, greeting. I have written below the names of the inhabitants of Tholliis who have used pasturage in the Crown land in the lower toparchy, and the amounts, and the holdings in which they have used up the pastures. Do you therefore try to obtain as good security as possible, in order that there may be no subsequent loss, for I think that you...

...os, Barcean, private, likewise 17 dr. 4½ ob.; P...ias, Cyrenean of the Epigone, 9 dr. 2 ob.; Demetrius son of Philon, Cyrenean of the Epigone, 8 dr. 5½ ob.; ... son of Teos, shepherd, and Petermouthis son of Komopais, 9 dr. 3 ob.; Horus son of Pnas, priest... 17 dr. 1½ ob., and on 2 more arouare the same Horus 3 dr. 2 ob.; Petosiris son of Phaues and Petosiris son of Passigonis and Hippolysus on 2¼ arouare 3 dr. 5 ob.; on 5 more arouare of aracus Petosiris son of Auphmois 5 dr. 3 ob.,... In the holding of Ptolemaeus: Praxias son of Callidromos,... of the Epigone, on 6 arouare of aracus at 1 dr. 4 ob. 10 dr.;... on 14 arouare of aracus at 1 dr. 4 ob. 23 dr. 2 ob.;... and Harmiuis, shepherds, on 10 arouare of aracus 16 dr. 4 ob.;... son of... rchonis on 1 aroua of aracus 1 dr. 4 ob.;... son of Paous, cultivator, ... 2½ artabae of wheat.'

6. Possibly καί εὐνιμων, but ν does not suit the vestiges after the lacuna very well. Cf. note on l. 26.
9. διεγγυήσα: the object understood is probably τοις ἀπὸ Θέλλων (cf. 41. 5 and 53. 3), not the κλήρου, though διεγγυημένοι κλήρου occur in 48. 3. ἀδφάλληι in connexion with the revenues derived from χλωρί also occur in an obscure passage in P. Tebt. 27. 55–9; cf. 51. 2, note.
13. (διάβολοι): this, the early Ptolemaic expression for 2 obols, is written out in P. Petrie II. 44. 25 and the London Bilingual papyrus of Philopator's reign (Pal. Soc. II. 143).
18. γήρας: if this is a genitive, we must suppose the existence of a deity called 'the Wizard'; if a nominative (of an unknown form), it is a very curious epithet to apply to a priest.
26. ἵκ τοῦ Πτολ. εμαῖον: sc. κλήρου; cf. 53. 14 and 18, and 117. 8, note. It is probable that this κλήρος was βασιλείαι like those called βασιλείαi in 85. 13 and 101. 5, and really formed part of the βασιλεία γῆ (cf. l. 3 above), having returned to the possession of the State either at the death of the original holder (cf. 81, introd.) or for some other reason. The name of the original holder continued, however, to be attached to it, as was still the case even in Roman times; cf. P. Oxy. 483. 5, note, and 118. 2, note. This view of the κλήρος βασιλείαi also suits 39, 100, and 119, where the State apparently receives a rent upon such holdings, and is confirmed by 75, which refers to the sale by government officials of part of the Φιλοξενον κλήρου, though a difficulty arises in connexion with 99; cf. 99. 8, note. In 112. 9, however, where an impost upon χλωρί is apparently found, the land seems to be really cleruchic, and the same may be true of the κλήρου in 52, though
the βασιλικός κλάπου are in any case to be explained as land which had reverted to State ownership.

33. The sign for ½, here applied to an artaba, instead of being angular is semicircular and identical with that employed at this period for ½ obol; cf. notes on 53. 20 and 119. 17.

53. LETTER OF DEMOPHON TO PTOLEMAEUS.


Another letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus, dated in the last year of the reign of Philadelphus, and enclosing a list of persons at Tholthis and Mouchinaruo (in the Oxyrhynchite nome), who are for the most part rated at 1 drachma 4 obols on an aroura; cf. introd. to 52 and 130.

5 Θαυξις Θεόδωρος Καλλικράτους εκ τῆς παρειμένης (ἀρούρας) εν' (δραχμαί) η (τριώβολον) (τέταρτον),
Πετενείς πωμην καὶ Πανῆς ἐλαιοπόλης (ἀρούρας) γλη' (δραχμαι) 5 (τέταρτον),
Ἀρμινίας Πανησίου καὶ Πάσις Τεώτος (ἀρούρας) γ (δραχμαι) εν',
Πανῆς Φίβιος δ' (τριώβολον), Πασιμιμούς δ'η' (δύοβολοι),
Ὡμος Ôμωτος (ἀρούρας) δ (δραχμαι) δε, / (ἀρουραι) 14δ'η' (δραχμαι) κβ (δυόβολοι) (ήμιωβέλιον).

10 ἐκ τοῦ Με[ν]ων
Ωρ. [.] τοῦ

/ []

ἐκ τοῦ Κυνδρέους .

15 . . . τῶν Ὀρ. . Ἕ
Πενενεῖς φυλακήδης ἀράκ(ου) δ' [(τριώβολον ?) .]αρ . . ε . [.]ελασ [. . . . . . . .
ἀράκ(ου) δ' (τριώβολον), / ἀράκ(ου) αδ' (δραχμαι?) [β (τριώβολον) χ]δρτ(ου)
< (δραχμη) α, / (δραχμαι) γ [(τριώβολον)]
ἐκ τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου Ὀνάρχης [. . . . ] [. . ] . ἀρσ . . καὶ
Εὐνομος ἐκ Μουχυναρῳ ἀράκ(ον) γ', (δραχμαι) ε.
20 Σιφᾶς Ἀρενδώτου Λ' (δραχμή) ᾧ, (ὁβολὸς ?) (ἡμιμωβέλιον), Ωρος Ωρον
φυ(λακίτης)
Μουχυναρῳ Λ (πεντάβολον), Πετομήχιος Πετοσείριος
Μου'χι(γ')αρω ἀράκ(ον) Λ' (δραχμή) ο (ὁβολὸς ?) (ἡμιμωβέλιον),
/ ἀράκ(ον) (ἀρουραί) ε (δραχμαι) η (δυόβολοι). / της κώμης ἀράκ(ον)
κβλη' (δραχμαι) λε (ὁβολὸς) (ἡμιμωβέλιον), χορτον βλ (δραχμαι) ε (ἡμιμωβέλιον),
/ (δραχμαι) μ (δυόβολοι).

5. καλλικρατος added above the line. 24. The sign for δραχμαι was inserted
after /μ was written.

'Demophon to Ptolemaeus, greeting. I have sent you the report of the first ten days
of Athur. Do you therefore endeavour to obtain good security, knowing that you will be
held accountable. Good-by. The 39th year, Athur 16. At Tholthis: Theodorus son of
Callicrates on the 3/4 arourae of the concessional (?) land 8 drachmæ 3/4 obols,' &c.

3. Cf. 52. 9, note.
4. The year being the 39th must be the 'revenue' not the 'regnal' year (cf. App. ii).
Athur 16 of Philadelphus' 39th regnal year would almost certainly fall within his 40th revenue
year, which he did not live to enter; cf. p. 245.
5. της παρεμένης: cf. P. Oxy. 713. 25 περὶ δὲ Πεννῳ ἐκ τῆς Ῥασμάχου παρεμένης. As
53 also refers to the Oxyrhynchite nome the same land is probably meant, and παρεμένη in
P. Oxy. 713 is then a survival from Ptolemaic times like the names of the αὐρωποί; but the
precise sense of the term is obscure.
10. Perhaps ἐκ τῶν Πτολεμαίων; cf. 130, where Πτολεμαίον precedes Κυθρέους (l. 14).
17. The figures are restored from the total in l. 24; cf. note ad loc.
19. ἀράκ(ον) γ is restored from the number of drachmæ, on the assumption that the
rate is the usual one of 1 dr. 4 ob. on the aroura. But if 3 arourae is correct here, the items
making up the number 5 in l. 23 will be complete, and therefore Θάρχης and Εὐνομος must
be partners.
20. The symbol for 3/4 aroura here and elsewhere in this papyrus is a half-circle like
that representing 3/4 obol; cf. notes on 52. 33 and 119. 17.
23-4. The amounts of land given in ll. 9, 17, and 23 add up correctly to the total of
22 3/4 arourae. A half-aroura of χόρτος also occurs in l. 17, leaving only 2 arouræ of χόρτος
to be accounted for between ll. 9 and 14. This indicates that the loss between ll. 9 and 10,
if any, is very small.

54. LETTER OF DEMOPHON TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy Α (probably Α 9). 25 X 7.2 cm. About B.C. 245.

An undated letter from Demophon to Ptolemaeus (cf. 51, introd.) on private
matters. The first part of it gives some interesting instructions about the
provision of musicians for a festival at Demophon's house; then follow messages about a kid (ll. 17-9), a fugitive slave (ll. 20-3), and various articles wanted by the writer (ll. 23-8), with a postscript concerning the mode of sending them (ll. 30-2).

Δημοφών Πτολε-  

μαίων χαίρειν. ἀπόσ-  

τελον ἡμῖν ἐκ παν-  

tός τρόπον τὸν αὐ-  

τοὺς τε Φρυγίους αὐ-  

λίσιον καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς, καὶ ἔ-  

ὰν τι δέθη ἀνηλώσαι  

dός, παρὰ δὲ ἡμῶν κομ-  

ίνοις καὶ τῇν κάλυβίν τῶν μαλα-  

κῶν ἔχοντα πρόμπαν καὶ  

κύμβαλα καὶ κρόταλα, χρεί-  

α γὰρ ἐσι ταῖς γυναιξίν πρὸς  

τὴν θυσίαν ἐχέτω δὲ  

καὶ ἱματίσμον ὡς ἀσ-  

On the verso  

πολεμαίων.

10. λ of ἀποστελον corr. from ν.

'Demophon to Ptolemaeus, greeting. Make every effort to send me the flute-player Petous with both the Phrygian flutes and the rest; and if any expense is necessary, pay it, and you shall recover it from me. Send me also Zenobius the effeminate with a drum and cymbals and castanets, for he is wanted by the women for the sacrifice; and let him wear as fine clothes as possible. Get the kid also from Ariston and send it to me; and if you have arrested the slave, deliver him to Semphtheus to bring to me. Send me as many cheeses as you can, a new jar, vegetables of all kinds, and some delicacies if you have any. Good-bye. Put them on board with the guards who will assist in bringing the boat. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

11. μαλακὸς may be merely a nickname, but probably refers to the style of Zenobius' dancing. Smyly well compares Plautus, Mil. 668...cum ad saltandum non cinaedus malacius aequest altum ego.

26. καὶ ἱματῶν: or perhaps κεφῶν. κέραμον can also have a collective sense, 'earthenware.'
55. LETTER OF SCYTHES TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A (probably A 9).  9-3 x 12 cm.  B.C. 250 (249).

A short letter from Scythes, a superior official, to Ptolemaeus (cf. 51, introd.), ordering him to come to Talao, a village in the Oxyrhynchite nome (cf. P. Oxy. 265. 15), with a shepherd who was to give evidence. The writing is across the fibres.

Σκύθης Πτολεμαίων χαίρειν.
παραγενοῦ εἰς Ταλαών ἥδη
ἀγων καὶ τὸν ποιμήν τὸν ἑλέγχω
ξοντα περὶ ὧν μοι εἴπας. ἔαν δὲ
5 βραδύτερον ποιήσει σαυτὸν βλάβην
ψεῖς, ὅποι γὰρ σχολάζω μένειν πλέον
κρότον. ἔρρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) λε Χοίαχ ἕ.

On the verso

Πτολεμαίων.

'Scythes to Ptolemaeus, greeting. Come to Talao at once, and bring with you the shepherd in order that he may give evidence in the matter about which you told me. If you are remiss you will injure yourself, for I have no leisure to remain longer. Goodbye. The 35th year, Choiak 6. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

56. LETTER OF PATRON TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A 9.  12-1 x 4-6 cm.  B.C. 249 (248).

A peremptory note to Ptolemaeus from Patron, perhaps the ἀρχιφυλακίτης mentioned in 34. 1 and 73. 9-10, ordering him not to molest a certain Nicostratus; cf. 59. 9-12 and introd. to 51.

Πάτρων Πτολεμαι.
[μα]ίων χαίρειν. παραγενομένος πρὸς
ἡμᾶς Ἰλων ἐφη εἰς-
5 πράσσειν σε Νικό-
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στρατὸν ἐκ Κόβα
(δραχμᾶς) β. σὺ οὖν μὴ ἐνο- χλεί [ἀυτῶν. [οὺ]]

7 lines erased.

ἐρρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) λξ

Φαώφι Ιξ.

On the verso

Πτολεμαίων.

'Patron to Ptolemaeus, greeting. Ilon has come to me and said that you were exacting 2 drachmae from Nicostratus of Koba. Do not molest him. Good-bye. The 37th year, Phaophi 17. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

6. Κόβα was in the Κωτίς τόπος (cf. p. 8); but Nicostratus must have been for the time being in the Oxyrhynchite nome, since he had come within reach of Ptolemaeus. Whether this Κόβα is identical with the village called Κόμα in the Roman and Byzantine periods (p. 8, P. Oxy. 142 and 150) is doubtful.

9-10. These two lines are over the erasure.

57. LETTER OF DIONYSODORUS (?) TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A 8. 7.7 x 32.2 cm. B.C. 247.

A letter to Ptolemaeus ordering a person who had brought the writer a petition to be sent to him. The writer's name is doubtful, but is perhaps Dionysodorus, as in 58. The writing is across the fibres.


ἐρρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) λῃ Πανήμου [.]

On the verso

Πτ[ο]λεμαῖοι.

'Dionysodorus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. As soon as you receive this letter send to me Demetrius who brought me a petition against Evagoras to the . . . of Alexandria. Good-bye. The 38th year, Panemus . . . (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'
3. There is not room for παρε ὑπάλληλον.

4. Panemus at this period probably coincided approximately with Epeiph (cf. App. i), in which month the numbers of Philadelphus' regnal years were still one in arrear of those of the revenue years; cf. 80. 13-4, note. Since 57 is dated by the Macedonian calendar, Panemus-Epeiph would be expected to fall within the 38th regnal rather than the 38th revenue year; cf. p. 367. But it is difficult to refer Panemus-Epeiph to the 39th revenue year, for Philadelphus was almost certainly dead before that date; cf. p. 364.

58. Letter of Dionysodorus to Ptolemaeus.

Mummy A 9. 19.5 x 7.5 cm. B.C. 245-4 (244-3).

A letter to Ptolemaeus from Dionysodorus, asking for an advance of 8 drachmae. If this Dionysodorus was also the writer of 57, he was the official superior of Ptolemaeus.

Διονυσίος Πτολεμαῖος Παλαιος ὑπάλληλος ἔστω ὑπάρχειν. ὡς ἄν
τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκόπησε τοὺς ἀλβητικοὺς
δῶς Τελεστὸν τοῖς παρὰ
5 Διοδότου τοῦ ἱπποκράτη
δώσον ἀφ' ὑμῶν λείπον
γενέσθαι Ἀργυρίον ἐπαλλικά ἡ, τοῦτο ἔσοντο προσδέξομαι.

ἀναδεδεκται γὰρ
10 ἡμῖν ἀπομετρήσεων
στίτου. μὴ ὑμῶν ἀλλοις
ποιήσομαι.

ἐρρωσίον (ἐτοὺς) γ᾽ . . . .

7. ἀργυρίον added above the line.

‘Dionysodorus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. As soon as you receive this letter give Telestus the agent of Diodotus son of . . . 8 drachmae of silver out of what you have collected, and for this sum I will be responsible (?) to you; for he has undertaken to measure us out some corn. So do not neglect this. Good-bye. The 3rd year . . .’
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59. LETTER OF ZENODORUS TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A 9. 17.2 x 8.8 cm.  

About B.C. 245.

A letter from Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus, directing him to send up a woman who had been found in the illicit possession of a quantity of oil, and adding a sharp warning to Ptolemaeus himself. A Zenodorus is known from an unpublished Hibeh papyrus to have been oeconomus of one of the toparchies of the Oxyrhynchite nome at this period, and he is probably to be identified with the writer of this and the following letter; cf. also 60 and 124–7.

Zenódoros Πτολεμαίω
χαίρειν. ὡς ἀν λάβησ
τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀπόστειλον πρὸς ἡμᾶς μετὰ
5 φυλακῆς, τὴν παραδόθεισάν σοι ἔχονσαν τὸ
κλέπτιμον ἑλαίον
καὶ τὸν παραδόντα σοι ἀπόστειλον καὶ εἰ ἡ
10 παῦσει καὶ κοσμοῦν
ἐν τῇ κώμῃ[ε] μεταμελῶ
λήσει σοι.

ἔρρωσο. (ἔτους) [.] Ἐπείφ τι.

On the verso


'Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. As soon as you receive this letter, send to us under guard the woman who was delivered to you with the contraband oil in her possession, and send also the person who delivered her to you; and if you do not stop your malpractices in the village you will repent it. Good-bye. The ... year, Epeiph 10. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

7. κλέπτιμον: this adjective is unknown, but is a much more satisfactory reading here than κλέπτιμον. The same word is no doubt to be recognized in Rev. Laws iv. 20 ἡν δὲ ... βοθιοίοιται ζητεῖν φαμέναι ἐκ αὐν παρατε-τις ἐπάρχειν κλέπτιμον, which suits the sense far better than καρπιμον. On the smuggling of oil cf. also P. Tebt. 38 and 39.
60. Letter of Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus.

Mummy A 9. 12.8 x 7 cm. About B.C. 245.

Another order from Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus (cf. 59) for the arrest of a man named Ctesicles if he failed to make a payment within a certain period.

\[ \text{Ze}n\text{od}o\text{ros \ Ptolem}a\text{i}o\]
\[ \chi\text{a}r\text{e}v. \ \text{e}\text{a}m \ \mu\hbar \ \dot{a}p\text{o}\text{-te}l\text{h}i \ \text{Kt}h\text{s}i\text{k}l\hbar s \]
\[ \epsilon\text{i}s \ \Sigma\text{n}\text{a}r\text{u}n \ \text{p}r\text{o} \ \dot{e}k\text{t}h\hbar s \]
\[ 5 \ \dot{a}r\text{p}as \ \tau\hbar \ i \ \theta \ (\delta\text{rak}h\mu\hbar s) \ \kappa \]
\[ \dot{a}p\text{o}st\text{e}l\text{on} \ \text{a}u\text{t}\dot{a}n \ \text{p}r\text{o}s \]
\[ \h\text{m}\hbar s \ \text{m}et\dot{a} \ \phi[\upsilon]\lambda\alpha-\]
\[ \k\hbar s \ \h\dot{a}\eta, \ \k\acute{a}i \ \dot{o}p\text{w}os \]
\[ \mu\hbar \ \dot{a}l\text{l}\text{w}os \ \pi\text{o}i\text{h}seis. \]
\[ 10 \ \text{e}r\text{h}\text{r}wso. \ \text{e}t\text{ous}. \ldots \]

On the verso

\[ \text{Ptolem}a\text{i}o. \]

6. \text{a}t\text{ov} added above the line.

'Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. If Ctesicles does not send 20 drachmae to Sinaru before the sixth hour on the 19th, send him to me under guard at once, without fail. Good-bye. The ... year ... (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

61. Letter to Ptolemaeus.

Mummy A 9. 13.1 x 9.7 cm. B.C. 245 (244).

An order to Ptolemaeus to produce a number of persons before Ammonius, a superior official. The name of the writer is lost, but was perhaps Zenodorus; the hand is similar to that of 59, but not certainly identical with it.

\[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \ P[\tau\rho]\text{le}m\i\dot{a}i\omega'i \]
\[ \chi\text{a}r\text{e}v. \ \dot{a}s \ \dot{a}n \ \lambda\acute{a}b\text{h}\eta\iota \ \tau\hbar \iota \]
\[ \text{e}p\text{i}st\text{e}l\hbar \eta \ \kata\dot{a}\pi\text{st}\text{e}\text{s}\hbar \text{on} \]
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[. . . . . . . . .] πρὸς Ἀμμόνιον
5 [. . . . . . . .] Πετοσίρμων
Σενύχιος καὶ Πετοσίρμων Πασιπότως, Ἀρνούφιων Πανήτως,
Ἀρνοῦτην τῶν λαξῶν.
ἐρωστο. (ἔτους) β Παχώνων ἦς.

‘... to Ptolemaeus, greeting. As soon as you receive this letter produce ... before
Ammonius ... son of ..., Petosiris son of Senuchis, Petosiris son of Pasipos, Harnouphis
son of Paues, and Haruotes the stonemason. Good-bye. The 2nd year, Pachon 16.’

4. A place-name may have stood in the lacuna either here or in l. 5; cf. 62. 13-5.

62. LETTER OF PHILIPPUS TO PTOLEMAEUS.

Mummy A 9. 18.4 x 8 cm. B.C. 245 (244).

A letter from Philippus, whose official status does not appear, to Ptolemaeus,
directing him to bring before Philippus the accuser in a case of robbery.

Φίλιππος Πτολε-
μαῖος χαίρειν.
κακοῦργον τὸν τίμι
λείαν ποιήσαντα
5 ἐπικαλεῖ Τνάς
Ἀρνούφιος, ὅν συν-
tέταχα τῶν
ἀρχιγερεί τῶν ἐν
Θώλτει παραδόθη-
10 ναὶ σοι. ὅσο ἃν λάβης
tὰ γράμματα
λαβὼν αὐτὸν τὸ
tάχος ἀποκατά-
'στησον πρὸς ἡμᾶς
15 [ἐν] Ὀξυρύγχων π[ό]λι[ε]ι,
[καὶ δ]'το[ς] μὴ ἄλλως ἐσταί.
ἐρωστο. (ἔτους) β Παῦνι κ.
On the verso

Πτολεμαίω.

'Philippus to Ptolemaeus, greeting. The criminal who did the pillage is accused by Tnas son of Harnouphis, whom I have instructed the chief priest at Tholthis to hand over to you. As soon as you receive this letter take him at once and produce him before me at the city of Oxyrhynchus; and be careful to carry out these directions. Good-bye. The 2nd year, Pauni 20. (Addressed) To Ptolemaeus.'

2. There would be room for τῶν after χαίρειν, but it is unnecessary.
8. ἐφύερα: another instance of the insertion of γ in this word perhaps occurs in P. Petrie III. 53 (p). 2. Cf. 27. 33 and P. Tebt. 63. 7, note.

63. LETTER OF CRITON TO PLUTARCHUS.

Mummy 18. 17.8 x 8 cm. About B.C. 265.

A letter from Criton asking Plutarchus to settle accounts, in order that Criton might meet a demand to pay for some seed which had been sown upon a cleruchic holding. It is probable that this Plutarchus is the same person as the Plutarchus addressed by Paris in 64, although the two documents were obtained from different mummies; for another connecting link is provided by 65, which comes from the same mummy (18) as 63, and is also concerned with a Paris. Moreover, the three letters deal with similar topics and are undoubtedly close together in date. 64 belongs to the 21st year of Philadelphus, while the dates in the papyri from Mummy 18 range from about the 15th to the 28th year of that reign. Criton and Plutarchus recur in 110. 13 and 17 (cf. 159), and seem to have been minor revenue-officials at or near Ἰερὰ Νῖφανον, a village in the division of Polemon in the Arsinoite nome; cf. 63. 19, 110. 21, 80. 3-4, 81. 16. The position of Paris was probably similar.

On the verso are parts of 7 much effaced lines, but no signs of an address.

Κρίτων Πλούταρχῳ
χαίρειν. παραγενὸς τινεὶ
πρὸν μὲ Νίκαιος ἄπνητει
τὴν τιμὴν τὸν σπέρματι
τὸν ἐφ’ ἐμβεβληκέν
ν αἰ t a t oν Προταγόρον
κ.’ληρον (ἐτῶν) γ’ (ἀρτάβας) λγ’,
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[ε] ε' μη ἐφε καβέζειν

τὸν χόρτον μου τὸν ἐν

10 τῷ πεδίῳ, εἰ οὖν ὠὐ-

τος πολιτευομέθα

ἀλλήλοις καλῶς ἄν

ἐχω. σὺ οὖν διόρθωσαι

ἀυτοῖς τὸ Νοίτπον δ’ προσ-

15 οφείλεις μοι. ἰσαν δ’

(δραχμαί) οβ’ τούτων ἀφελε

(ἀρταβῶν ?) μ τιμήν κς (τετράβολον)

καὶ [.....]γ’ δ’ [ἐλ]αβον πα-

ρά σοῦ ὠστε Θευδόρω κ’.....[.....] s ἐφ’ Ιερᾶς Νήσου [(δραχμᾶς) δ’,

20 / (δραχμαί) λ (τετράβολον), (λοιπόν) μα (διόβολοι),

λαβὼν παρὰ Τιμάρχου

........................................................................

19. ὠστε [.....]. s added above the line.

‘Cритon to Plutarchus, greeting. Nicaeus has come to me demanding the price of the seed which he said he had ordered for the holding of Protagoras during three years, namely 33 artabae, otherwise he said he should lay claim to my hay in the fields. If we are going to hold such relations it will indeed be well. Do you therefore settle with them the remainder owing from you to me. The sum was 72 drachmae; deduct from this the price of 40 artabae, 26 drachmae 4 obols, and for... which I received from you for Theodorus... at Hiera Nesus, 4 drachmae, total 30 drachmae 4 obols, remainder 41 drachmae 2 obols. Take from Timarchus...’

5-7. The meaning of ἐμβεδληκέναι here is not quite clear. If it be ‘imposed upon,’ as e.g. in P. Tebt. 37 7 ἐμβεδληκέναι (ἐγγα) εἰς τὴν γῆν, Nicaeus must be supposed to be an official who first ordered the loan of seed and then himself advanced it on behalf of Criton. This seems more likely than that ἐμβάλλειν is used literally of sowing, for which σπέίρειν would be the word expected. The land in question may have been one of the βασιλικοί κλήροι, as in 85. 12-3; but loans or presents of seeds were also made to cleruchs, e.g. 87.

10-3. We suppose ἀλλήλοις to refer to Criton and Nicaeus, and καλῶς ἄν ἐχω to be ironical. The construction of πολιτεύομεθα with a dative is unusual.

17. The lowness of the price (4 obols per artaba) shows that the grain was of some inferior kind, very likely olyra. An artaba of olyra was worth 3/2 artaba of wheat (85. 14-5, note), of which the normal value was 2 drachmae (84 a. 8-9, note).

18. Perhaps [(ἀρταβῶν)] γ’, but δ’ is then unsatisfactory; a neuter antecedent would be more appropriate. The stroke which we have considered to be the top of a γ may be a mark of abbreviation. The following letter is rather more like σ than ο, but ὅ cannot be read.

P
21. There are some blurred ink marks immediately in front of λαβων, but they are outside the line and probably accidental. They might, however, be taken to represent an inserted και.

64. LETTER OF PARIS TO PLUTARCHUS.

Mummy 97.  Breadth 7.3 cm.  B.C. 264 (263).

A letter from Paris asking for an advance of 60 drachmae on account of a large amount of olyra which was due to him from Plutarchus. The mutilation of the latter part of the letter has obscured some of the details of the proposed transaction. The writer is probably identical with the Paris mentioned in 65, and his correspondent with the Plutarchus to whom 63 is addressed; cf. 63, introd.

Πάρις Πλουτάρχωι
χαίρειν. γέγραφέν σοι
'Αντίπατρος μετρήσαι,
[σ']αλ μοι διαρρόω (ἀρτάβασι) Ἀυν
5 [δών] δείξεις λαβέω (ἀρτάβασι) σοι
τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐμοὶ μετρήσαι. χρείαν οὖν
ἐχω (δραχμών) ἧν, καλῶς
ἀν οὖν ποιήσαι δοῦσι

ΠΣευμοντι τῷ άποδι-
[δόντι σοι τὴν ἐπιστο-
-
τον σήτων ἀπόστει-

On the verso
Πλουτάρχωι.

13. τ of σήτων corr.?
22. κα corr. from κα or vice versa.

'Paris to Plutarchus, greeting. Antipater has written to you to measure out to me 1450 artabae of olyra, of which you ought to take 250 artabae and to measure out the rest to me. Now I am in want of 60 drachmae; you will therefore do well to give Psenomous,
the carrier of this letter, ... Send me the 60 drachmae and on the 2nd I will bring ... tes ... who will pay ... And you must write to me about anything which you require. Good-bye. The 21st year, Pauni (?). (Addressed) To Plutarchus.'

10. There is a break in the papyrus below l. 10, and several lines may be lost between ll. 12 and 13. Perhaps ll. 23-5 come in here.

13. The τ of στόρων is very doubtful; the letters τοῦ στόρων and λοὺρ with part of the μ of μου in the next line are on a separate fragment, and its position is not quite certain.

16. τήν is the termination of a personal name, e.g. Ἀρνώνη.

65. LETTER CONCERNING PARIS.

Mummy 18. 34·2 × 5·8 cm. About B.C. 265.

The purpose of this letter, the commencement of which is lost, was to secure the immediate delivery to Paris (cf. 64) of 80 artabae of aracus, in part-payment of a debt of 100 artabae of wheat. The writer proposed to obtain the remainder by purchase from the State. His correspondent, who is desired to pay over the aracus, was perhaps Plutarchus, the recipient of 63-4; cf. introd. to 63.

\[ \text{... \άπεστειλα πρὸς σὲ} \text{...} \]
\[ \text{δόσω αὖ παραγενό-} \text{μενος συνστα-} \]
\[ \text{θῆς Πάριτι} \text{...} \]

5 [ι]να μετρῆσης

αὐτῶι τὰς π τ ἀρτάβας

tοῦ ἀράκου, ἐγὼ

γὰρ ὁρκοῦ συγγέ-

γραμμαὶ μετρῆ-

10 [σ]αι τῇ τετρά-

[δ]ι πυρὼν ἀρτάβας ὅ.

[ἐπ]έλ οὖν ὦκ ἔγε-

[στα]μοι σφρερί

[μετ]ρέω καλῶς

15 [ἀν] ποιήσαι παρα-

[γε]νόμενοι εἰς σῇ...
I have sent you so that you may go and meet Paris in order to measure out to him the 80 artabae of aracus; for I have engaged under oath to measure out on the 4th 100 artabae of wheat. So since you will not be able to measure it to-day, you will do well to go to... on the 5th to measure out to Paris the 80 artabae of aracus. If this is not done I shall be liable to the consequences of my oath and shall be mulcted of 4 drachmae per artaba. I wish to purchase the remainder of the corn from the State, in order that there may be no arrears against me. Good-by. The...th year, Athur 4.'

8. A fragmentary specimen of such an oath is P. Petrie III. 56 (a).
10. τῇ τερπάθι: i.e. the day on which this letter was written; cf. L. 31.
21 sqq. The oblique construction is probably a reminiscence of the actual contract, from which this sentence is a more or less exact quotation. Above the first few letters of L. 22 are some thin strokes which resemble ꞌο and may represent an insertion.

66. LETTER OF PROTARCHUS TO CLITARCHUS.

Mummy 10. 11 x 32-8 cm. B.C. 228 (227).

The following documents (66-70 (b)), with 160-3, belong to the correspondence of Clitarchus, who, as is shown by their contents as well as by the endorsement on 66, was a government banker, his district being the Κωτῆς τόπος. They belong to the reign of Euergetes and are close together in date, the only years mentioned being the 18th and 19th.

The present text consists of a letter from Protarchus informing Clitarchus that he had undertaken the collection of the tax of 100 and 100, an impost probably connected with the ἐγκύκλιον or tax on sales and mortgages of real estate (cf. note on L. 1), and requesting Clitarchus to collect the dues on his account. The writing is across the fibres of the papyrus.
On the verso

2nd hand τραπεζητης Κωί-
tου (1st hand) Κλειτάρχων.

'Protarchus to Clitarchus, greeting. I have contracted for the one per cent. and half per cent. with the managers of the δωρεάς. Since therefore the 5 per cent. tax is paid to you in your district, you would do well to order your agents to collect the other taxes too, as Asclepiades also has written to you; and so soon as I arrive from the delivery (?) of the copper I will have a conversation with you, so that you shall not oblige me to no purpose. Good-bye. The 19th year, Pachon 14. (Addressed) To Clitarchus, banker of the Koīte district.'

1-2. The character of this tax of 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and its relation to the δωρεάς and the εἰκοστή are not quite clear. τὴν δωρεὰν here might be interpreted as τὴν ἐν δωρεᾷ γῆς, as e.g. in P. Petrie II. 39 (g). 14 ὑπάρχει ἐν τῇ δωρεᾷ χώρας ικανός, P. Magd. 28 τῆς Ἐυρυστέρου δωρεάς. As Rev. Laws show (xxxxvi. 15, xliii. 11, xliv. 3), large tracts of land were held ἐν δωρεᾷ, chiefly perhaps by tax payers and the holders seem to have had special treatment in respect of taxation. The εἰκοστή in l. 2 might then be compared with that in P. Petrie II. 11 (2). 4, a 5 per cent. tax on the rent of an ὕποπεδον, while the 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. would be some similar impost of which the present is the first mention.

But δωρεά may have another sense which is more suitable to the context in 66. In the first place πραγματεύεσθαι is the word commonly used at this period for the farmers of a tax. Secondly, in the London Bilingual papyrus of the 13th year of Philopator (Proceed. Soc. Bibl. Arch. xxiii. p. 301, Pal. Soc. II. 143), appended to a demotic contract of sale is a banker’s receipt in Greek, in which there appears, coupled with 8 drachmae 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ obols for ἐγκύκλων, a payment of 3 obols for δωρεάς. Now the commonest form of εἰκοστή was the ἐγκύκλως (cf. 70 a); and if this be the εἰκοστή in 66, 2 there will be here the same collocation of δωρεάς and ἐγκύκλως as in the London text. Moreover, the 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of l. 1 recalls the ἐφ'κοστή and εἰκοστή of the Zois papyrus which were paid on the occasion of a sale through the government of land given in security for a tax; cf. the extra charges amounting to $\frac{3}{10} \times 2$ (τὰ καθήκοντα τέλα δικαίως), added to the πρόστιμον in P. Amb. 31, of B.C. 112. It thus seems possible to find a link between the 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the δωρεάς, and the 5 per cent. by means of the supposition that they were all three connected with sales. Another passage in which δωρεά signifies a tax is P. Petrie III. 53 (a) ἀφείκαμεν ἐκαὶ τὸ γραφεῖον τῶν Λιγνίτων συγγραφών, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τὰ ὄντων πρότερον πεῖστον διδάσκατον παρ’ αὐτοῦ τὸν εἴχασι τὴν δωρεάν. The γραφεῖον, a tax paid for drawing up contracts (?), is here remitted, and the proceeds previously derived from it are transferred to the ‘holders of the δωρεά.’ ἐχομεν at first sight suggests land-holders rather than tax-farmers; but it is very difficult to see what the former could have to do with the γραφεῖον, and the view that ἐχομεν τὴν δωρεάν here means much the same as πραγματεύεσθαι τὴν δωρεάν in 66 is supported by P. Oxy. 44. 22, where the impost γραφεῖον is coupled with ἐγκύκλως, with which, as we have seen above, the δωρεά was closely connected. We should therefore explain the ρ’ καὶ σ’ as a percentage upon sales, being an addition to the ordinary εἰκοστή and resembling the δωρεά, within which it may even have been included.

With regard to the 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and the analogous percentages of the P. Zois, it is singular that in P. Petrie III. 57 (b), where some land is sold by the government under conditions similar to those in P. Zois, the tax paid is the ordinary ἐγκύκλως of 5 per cent. J. C. Naber, Archiv, I. p. 90, explains the difference in the rate as a remission. That is no
doubt possible, and in the absence of further evidence it is difficult to find a better theory. But the idea of lightening the burden of taxation does not seem to have played much part in the policy of the Ptolemies; it is possible that, so far from representing a remission, the percentages in the Zois papyrus may mark an augmentation, the \( \frac{1}{100} \) and \( \frac{1}{10} \) rising to \( \frac{1}{10} \) and \( \frac{1}{10} \), and perhaps subsequently to the \( \frac{3}{4} \) of P. Amb. 31. An analogy for such an increase is provided by the history of the \( \epsilon\gamma\xi\kappa\lambda\iota\omega\nu \), the rate of which was doubled towards the end of the second century B.C. But the absence of the \( \epsilon\gamma\xi\kappa\lambda\iota\omega\nu \) in P. Zois then remains unexplained.

3. Asclepiades is probably identical with the writer of 67-9.

4. Perhaps \( \pi\alpha\rho\rho\mu\iota\delta\sigma\iota\omega\varsigma \) or \( \pi\alpha\rho\rho\mu\iota\delta\chi\iota\varsigma \), but the reference is obscure. The fourth letter, if not \( \alpha \), might be e.g. \( \gamma \), \( \pi \), or \( \tau \). \( \sigma\nu\nu\lambda\iota\h\iota\sigma\omega \kappa\tau\lambda \). means that Protarchus was prepared to give a \( \acute{q}u\text{id }pro\text{ }q\text{uo} \).

67. Letter concerning Payment of Cloth-workers.

Mummy 10. 32.8 x 8.6 cm. b.c. 228 (227).

This papyrus and 67 are letters to the banker Clitarchus (cf. 66, introd.), officially authorizing him to pay different sums to certain weavers at \( \Lambda\gamma\kappa\nu\rho\omega\nu \pi\omicron\lambda\iota\varsigma \) and \( \chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\delta\nu\tau\mu\omicron\varsigma \) in the Heracleopolite nome for a variety of fabrics manufactured on behalf of the government. As Rev. Laws lxxxvii sqq. (cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 267-9) and P. Tebt. 5. 63-4, 238 sqq. combine to show, the weaving industry was, at any rate in its more important branches, a government monopoly. The persons actually employed in it had of course to be paid for their work, and the scale of prices found here may be compared with those fixed in Rev. Laws xlvi. 18-20 for the production of the various kinds of oil; cf. the regulation of the price of \( \sigma\nu\rho\iota\varsigma \) in 51. 5-6 (note on l. 3), and P. Tebt. 5. 248 sqq., where it is forbidden to make the cloth- weavers, byssus-workers, and robe-weavers work \( \delta\omicron\rho\epsilon\alpha\nu \mu\nu\delta\epsilon \mu\nu\sigma\theta\omega\nu \upsilon\epsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu \). The finer processes of manufacture seem to have been centred in the temples; but it is not at all likely that the whole weaving industry was under their control (P. Tebt. 5. 63, note), and there is no hint either in 67-8 or 51 that priests were in any way concerned. The formula of the two authorizations closely resembles that found in P. Petrie III. 87 (a) verso, (b), and 89. Asclepiades, the official by whom they were sent and who appends his signature in 67. 28, was probably the local \( \omicron\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\phi\omega\omicron\nu\varsigma \), the principal revenue official of the nome, or his \( \alpha\nu\tau\gamma\tau\iota\alpha\phi\epsilon\varsigma \); cf. the frequent mentions of the \( \omicron\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\phi\omega\omicron\nu\varsigma \) in the section of the Rev. Laws which concerns the \( \omicron\theta\omicron\nu\omicron\rho\alpha\nu \), lxxxvii. sqq. Asclepiades’ order to Clitarchus in 69 to bring an account is quite in keeping with such a position.

The names of the various fabrics are usually abbreviated both in 67 and 68, and are difficult to identify. They are all classed as \( \omicron\theta\omicron\nu\omicron\alpha \), and are also in-
cluded under an abbreviation which may be either ω( ) or συ( ). On the whole we think ισ(τοι) 'webs' more probable than συ(νδόνες), since ιστός also occur in Rev. Laws xcv. 2 and 5, where a ιστός is rated at 25 drachmæ, though that passage is too mutilated to be conclusive; cf. also Ps. Aristeas ed. Schmidt, p. 69. 16 βυσσίνων θυσίων ιστοὺς ἐκατόν. Other abbreviations are μη( ), πρ( ), βυσ( ), and ίμά(τια ?), but it is doubtful, except in the case of πρ( ), what is the correct order of the letters. σοφωία (67. 14, in other places abbreviated σοφωί) may be connected with σοφός and denote a kind of cloth used for burials.

'Ασκληπιάδης Κλειτάρχω
χ[ια]ρείν. [δός] ἀπὸ τῶν πιτόντων [ν εἰς τὸ ιθ(έτος)]
τοῖς ἐν Ἀγκυρῶν πόλει
5 [υ]πογεγραμμένοι υφάνται
διά... εως τοῦ παρ’ Ἀπολλωνίου
[kαι Πέτρειμοθοῦ τοῦ Τε]-
[..... τ]πογεγραμματέως
[kαι.....] κωμογεγραμματέως
10 [εἰς τιμά]ς θυσίων τῶν
[συντελεύμενοι εἰς τὸ] βα-
σίλικὼν μη( ) καὶ πρ( ) ζ, / ισ(τοι ?) κη,
(δραχμὰς) τκς (τετράβολον), βυσ( ) ζ ζε (δυνοβόλους),
σοφωίων ζ ντ, / ισ(τοι) μβ
15 (δραχμαί) μη, καὶ ἀλλὰ(γῆς) ιδ, / νξβ, καὶ σύμβολον ποίησαι πρὸς
αὐτοὺς. ἐρωσθ. (ἐτούς) ιθ Ἀθηρ κβ.
τούτων ἐκάστων τῶν ὑπο-
γεγραμμένων: Θοτομοῦτι
20 Πετοσίριος μη( ) γ πρ( ) α, / δ,
(δραχμὰς) μς (τετράβολον), βυσ( ) α θ (δυνοβόλους), σοφωί(ου) α η,
/ ισ(τοι) ζ (δραχμαί) ζθ, ἀλλ[α(γῆς)] β, / ξζ.
Ἀρμήνει Χισάτοτος ὦςαύτως,
Πετευνύτει Πάσιτος,
25 Τεῶι Ἀθεμέως, Πετοσίρι觜
Ἀρχήβιος, Ἀμενεῖ
Νεκτοσίριος, Τεσάμει].
2nd hand Ἀσκληπιάδης Κλειστάρχων Χαίρετα. Χρημάτων 30 τισον χαλκοῦ τετρακοσίας ἐξίκοντα δύο καθέτι γεγραμμέναι .

[... ]βοι βι [...], 35 γράμιαν ζ.

'Asclepiades to Citarchus, greeting. Give out of the sums paid in for the 19th year to the weavers at Ancyronpolis below written, through ... agent of Apollonius, and Petimouthes son of Te ... topogrammateus, and ... komogrammateus, for the prices of cloths supplied to the Treasury, namely for 21 me ... 7 pr ... total 28 webs, 326 drachmae 4 obols, for 7 buo ... 65 drachmae 2 obols, for 7 soroia 56 drachmae, total 42 webs 448 drachmae, and for argio 14 drachmae, total 462 drachmae; and make out a receipt with them. Good-by. The 19th year, Athur 22. To each of the following: to Thoiomous son of Petosiris for 3 me ... and 1 pr ... total 4, 46 drachmae 4 obols, for 1 buo ... 9 drachmae 2 obols, for 1 soroia 8 drachmae, total 6 webs 64 drachmae, and for argio 2 drachmae, total 66. To Harmonis son of Sisois similarly, and to Petenoupis son of Pasis, Teos son of Athenmeus, Petosiris son of Harchebis, Ammeus son of Necleitosiris, Tesomis son of ...'

'Asclepiades to Citarchus, greeting. Pay 462 drachmae of copper, as above written ...


7. In 68. 5 the topogrammateus is Petimouthes son of Thotortaeus; but the patronymic here is certainly different, and since the villages are not the same in the two papyri and Petimouthes is not an uncommon name, it is unlikely that a single person is meant.

9. Perhaps ταύτι κομογραμματέως; cf. 68. 5-6, note. But there would be room for a short name like τιμων.

10-1. A papyrus belonging to Prof. Gradenwitz, containing a receipt issued by the παράληπται δημοσίων ἵματων for differently coloured cloths, indicates that the government control of the supply of such materials continued into the Roman period.

12-4. The abbreviation µη( ) consists of a µ with an η written above (the µ being square in l. 12 and rounded in l. 20), πρ( ) of a π with a ρ drawn through it; the former possibly stands for µηρωμά (cf. note on ll. 34-5), the latter might be connected with the πρωσκεφάλαμα which occur in Rev. Laws cii. 7. The σ of ιασ(τοί;) is written in the form of a capital as in the symbol for 200, the ε being a long stroke drawn through it. In the case of βσι( ) the three letters are written one above the other, the v being a good-sized curve immediately over the β, and the third letter a small thick mark which at l. 21 is slightly elongated, suggesting a β or an e rather than an o; in 68. 7 it is a mere dot. In l. 21 the curve is slightly turned over and thickened at the left end and might be interpreted as ω; but this feature is not noticeable in l. 13 or 68. 7. βσι( ), i.e. βσι(τίμων), can certainly not be read. The prices of the different fabrics work out as follows: —µη( ) and πρ( ) cost 11 dr. 4 ob. each, βσι( ) 9 dr. 2 ob., and σορώσια 8 dr.; in 68 the scale is the same and ιωλ(τα;) also appear, costing 7 dr. apiece.
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15. διλλα(γῆ): the rate is 3/4 obol on the stater, which is identical with that in 68. 9 and 51. 6, where the word ἐπάλλαγη is used. The prices are calculated on a silver basis (πρῶς αργύριον), and in making payment in copper (cf. l. 30) the government allowed a small agio. The usual rate of the agio on payments in copper at this period was about 2 1/2 obols on the stater; cf. P. Petrie III. p. 86, where the data are collected (add P. Petrie III. 67 (a). 2, (b). 14, 117 (e). 12, 15). The difference is probably to be accounted for by the fact that in the present case the government was not receiving, but paying.

34-5. The numbers suggest that the reference is again to different sorts of cloth and that -βων and -γμάτων may be the termination of two of the words abbreviated in ll. 12 sqq. The figures, however, do not help to identify them, since the number 2 does not occur in the foregoing list, and so ll. 33-5 cannot be a repetition of it. -γμάτων might possibly be μηργμάτων, though that term means the thread rather than the material woven from it; cf. Hesych. μήργμα, σπείραμα ἤ ἐκτεινόμενον, and μήρσμα, κάταγμα ἢ στάσμα ἐρίων. As for -βων, there is one β if not two (cf. note on ll. 12-4) in βων( ), but we can find no likely word. Line 35 is probably, though not certainly, the conclusion of the document.

68. LETTER CONCERNING PAYMENT OF CLOTH-WORKERS.

Mummy 10.  
Breadth 11 cm.  
About B.C. 228.

A letter, similar to 67, from Asclepiades to Clitarchus, authorizing payment to be made to a number of weavers for cloths of various kinds manufactured by them; cf. 67, introd. The writing is across the fibres of the papyrus.

[Ἀσκληπ] ἀδησ Κλε[ιτά]ρχω χα[ίρειν].
[
δό sü ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων εἰς τί δ . . (ἔτος)

Ἄθωρ τοίς ἐν Χαἰβνώτης ὑπογεγραμμένοις
ὑφάνταις διὰ Διονυσίου τοῦ παρ'[Ἀπό[Λλω]νιο[ν]

καὶ Πετειμονίου τοῦ Θεοστρατίου τοπογρ(ἀμματέως) θ[α]
κωμογρ(ἀμματέως) εἰς τιμᾶς ὄθονίων τῶν συντελουμένων
εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν μη ( ) ὁδ ὦκο (διόκολος), βυ( ) κα ῶς,
σορο(ων) μβ τλς, ἰμα(τίων) κα μρς, / ἱσ(τοι) ῶ(δραχμαί) Ἀμμ[β]
[διόκο-
βολοί],
ἐπαλ(λαγής) μη (διόκολος) (τέταρτον), / Ἀμ(τριῶβολον) (τέταρτον), σύμ-
βολον δὲ ποίησα[i]

πρὸς αὐτῶν, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦτων ὕπόλο(γον) π[οίησαι

ἀνθ' οὖ γράφει Ἀπολλώνιος ἔξειν Εὐθράγιορα

παρὰ τῶν α . . εἰσιν παλι . . . ἰτ . σι . . . [ . . .

τιν Πασσωτ[ . . . .], τ . [ . ]φ . . . [ . . . . .]
[ε]ίς τὸ βασιλικ[ῶν] 21 letters
15 τιμ. ἔστε [ " " ]
[...]. [ 30 " ]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]

μη( ) κ ς λχ (δυοβόλους), βιω( ), βι η (τετρώβολον), σορω(ων) δ λβ, ἵ[μα(τιων)] β io, / ια(τοί)] κη σην, ἐπαλ(λαγής) θ (δβολδν) (ἡμιωβέλιον) (τέταρτον) χ(αλκοῦν), / τκ (δβολδς) (ἡμιωβέλιον ?) (τέταρτον) χ(αλκοῦς).

"Ὀρω Πετ[ο]σρίος μη( ) β κιγ (δυοβόλους), βνς( ) α θ (δυοβόλους) σορω(ων) β ις, 20 ἵμα(τιων) α ξι, / ια(τοί) ς νε (τετρώβολον), ἐπαλ(λαγής) θ (τετρώβολον ?) χ(αλκοῦς) γλζ, / νκ (δυοβόλοι) χ(αλκοῖ) γλζ.

Σεμβέλε Πασώτος .... ρ χος τουτόπα [. .
[...] Θοτεύτος [. .]. ροχ [. .] τουτόπ [. .]
[...]. [. .]. [. .]. [. .]. Πετογ[ρ]ρ . .


5-6. The offices of topogrammateus and komogrammateus here seem to have been combined in a single person, as at a later period in P. Oxy. 251 and 252. There is hardly room at the end of l. 5 for τοῦ, still less for a proper name. Perhaps, however, τοῦ was abbreviated or written very small; it is noticeable that in the corresponding passage in 67. 9 there is only a very short space between καὶ and κομογραμματέως.


10 sqq. This passage, ordering a deduction to be made for reasons which are obscure by the mutilation of the papyrus, has nothing corresponding to it in 67.

16. There is a break below this line, and it is quite uncertain how many lines are missing.

17-8. The total number of ἵστοι and their value being preserved in l. 18, and the prices of the different units being known (cf. 67. 12-4), a calculation shows that the items here must be either (a) 20 μυ( ) at 11 dr. 4 ob. = 233 dr. 2 ob., 2 βν( ) at 9 dr. 2 ob. = 18 dr. 4 ob., 4 σορωάδια at 8 dr. = 32 dr., 2 ιμα(τιων) at 7 dr. = 14 dr., total 298 dr.; or (β) 19 μυ( ) = 221 dr. 4 ob., 4 βν( ) = 37 dr. 2 ob., 4 σορωάδια = 32 dr., 1 ιμα(τιων) = 7 dr., total 298 dr. The first set of figures suits the vestiges of l. 17 the better.

21-2. The second halves of these two lines seem to be identical. τοῦ τοπογρ[ν] might possibly be read, but it is difficult to see why the toparch should be introduced in this context.
69. Letter of Asclepiades to Clitarchus.

Mummy 10. 15.6 x 7 cm. B.C. 230 (229).

A short letter from Asclepiades (cf. 67-8), directing Clitarchus (cf. 66, introd.) to come to him bringing an account and the balance of some money. The writing is across the fibres of the papyrus.

'Ασκληπιαδής
Κλειτάρχῳ χαίρειν.
παραγίνου τῇ
η τοῦ 'Αθήναι κομίζων
5 τῶν τε λόγων τοῦ
Φαώφη καὶ τὰ περὶ-τὰ χρήματα,
[καὶ] μὴ ἄλλως ποιή-
[σης.]
10 ἔρρωσο, (ἐτοὺς) ἦν Ἀθήναι εἰ.

3. οὐ of paraginou corr. from ἔψει.

Asclepiades to Clitarchus, greeting. Come up on the 8th of Athur bringing both the account of Phaophi and the balance of the money, without fail. Good-bye. The 18th year, Athur 5.'

70 (a). Letter of Zoilus to Clitarchus.

Mummy 10. 15.4 x 7.6 cm. B.C. 229-8 (228-7).

A letter from Zoilus telling the banker Clitarchus (cf. 66, introd.) that a payment of 10 drachmae was due from another Zoilus for the 5 per cent. (ἐγκύκλιον) tax on a purchase of land. 70 (b) and 168 are similar notifications of payments due to the bank for the ἐγκύκλιον. The writer was most probably the farmer of the tax, and these documents represent the διαγραφαὶ which figure in the common formula of ἐγκύκλιον receipts, τέτακται ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ἐγκυκλίον κατὰ διαγραφὴν τελωνίων; cf. e.g. P. Amh. 52.

The view of Revillout (Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch. xiv. p. 120 sqq.) that the rate of the ἐγκύκλιον tax, which according to him was fixed by Psammetichus at ἱ,
was reduced in the 9th year of Epiphanes to \( \frac{1}{2} \), has already been refuted, as Wilcken points out (Ost. I. p. 183), by P. Petrie III. 57 (o), which proves that the rate of \( \frac{1}{2} \) existed in the 4th year of that king. The Hibeh papyri now carry this rate back to the reign of Euergetes I, and we suspect that Revillout's account of the early history of the tax is altogether erroneous. It is very unlikely that the Ptolemies lowered a rate which they found already established; the tendency of their finance was rather in the opposite direction.

5. The letters at the beginning of this line are broken, but it is clear that the abbreviation for \( \delta \rho \nu \omega \rho \omega \), if that be the word meant, is written in an abnormal manner, the usual stroke above the line being replaced by a small o; the supposed a and p are also very doubtful. But both the tenor of the document and the analogy of 70 (o) and 163 make \( \delta \rho \nu \omega \rho \omega \) here almost indispensable. \( \lambda \pi \tau \omega \) in l. 6 is also a difficulty; we can find no parallel for the application of the adjective \( \lambda \pi \tau \omega \) to land. There is, however, hardly any doubt about the reading; the only possible substitutes for the first two letters are a and p, but these are much less satisfactory.

9. \( \chi \lambda \kappa \nu \pi \tau \delta \nu \pi \delta \) : i.e. copper at a discount. An agio of about 10 per cent. was usually charged for payments in copper which ought to have been in silver; cf. 67. 15, note, and 109. 6.
70 (b). Letter to Clitarchus.

Mummy 10. 7.5 x 7.1 cm. About B.C. 228.

Conclusion of another notification, no doubt addressed like 70 (a) to Clitarchus, that 2 drachmae were due to the bank for the ἐγκύκλιον tax on a purchase of land. The vendor is described as a Perso-Egyptian (Περσαϊγυπτιος), i.e., presumably, the son of a mixed marriage.

μάχιμος Ἡρακλεσιός
οπολίτης ἄμπτειος
λου (ἀρωφας) αδ’ [ηisible] ἦν
ἐπριάτο κατ’ [ΑΪ]
5 γυπτίας συγγραμματικώς
φάς παρὰ Ἀσφείᾳ
"Ορου Περσαϊγυπτιος
ον περὶ κόμην Τμουνεθύμιν (δραχμῶν) μ’ β.
10 [ἐρρωσο. (ἐτοὺς)...]

‘(Payment is due from) . . ., native soldier, of Heracleopolis, on account of I½ arourae of vine-land bought by him in accordance with Egyptian contracts from Aspheas son of Horus, Perso-Egyptian, near the village of Tmoinethumis for 40 drachmae, the twentieth, namely 2 drachmae. Good-bye. The ...th year . . .’

1. The formula must have differed slightly from that in 70 (a). Probably ὃφείλει took the place of δέξαι παρά.
8. Τμουνεθύμιν: cf. 163; in 80. 7 the name is spelled with an initial Θ.

71. Correspondence concerning a Strike.

Mummy A 11. 8.5 x 11.7 cm. B.C. 245 (244).

A fragment of a series of official letters concerning a strike of slaves employed in a stone-quarry. Lines 4-11 contain a copy of a letter from Antiochus to Dorion forwarding a letter from Aenesidemus, of which only the beginning is preserved (ll. 12-4), and ordering the immediate arrest of the offenders. Lines 1-3 are the conclusion of a letter which may be from Dorion.
to the φυλακὴ. From 72, in which Antiochus and Dorion recur, it appears that the latter was an epistates (sc. φυλακητῶν) probably at Phibichis, and the quarry in question was most likely on the east bank in the neighbourhood of that village, possibly at Hibeh itself; cf. pp. 9–10. The third year, in which the correspondence took place, no doubt refers to the reign of Euergetes.


'Aντίοχος Δωρίων χαίρειν. τῆς ἐπιστολῆς 5 ἢς γέγραφεν ἡμῖν Αἰνησίδημος περὶ τῶν ἀνακεχωρηκότων σωμάτων ἐκ τῆς ἐ[ν]

Κεφαλαίων λατομίας ἀπέσταλκα σ[o] τὰν-τίγραμα. ὥς ἄν οὖν λάβῃς τὰ γράμματα τῆς πάσαν σπουδὴν ποίησαι ὅπ[ως] ἀνα-

10 γυνηδέντες ἀποσταλὼσι πρὸς [ἡμᾶς]

μετὰ φυλακῆς. ἔρρωσο. (ἐτούς) γ Θ[ω]ῦ[. . .]

Αἰνησίδημος Αντίοχου χαίρειν. Α. δ [. .

Πάσιτος Ἀφροδιτοπολίτης ἴκαι . . . . . . .

. . . ἵπτος Ἡρακλειοπολίτης .]

4–11. 'Antiochus to Dorion, greeting. I have sent you a copy of the letter which Aenesidemus has written to me about the slaves who have deserted from the stone-quarry at Cephalae. As soon as you receive this letter use every effort to search for them, and send them to me under guard. Good-bye. The 3rd year, Thoth.'

6. σωμάτων: slaves were also employed in the quarries in the Fayûm near Lake Moeris (cf. P. Petrie II. 4 (2). 5 and 4 (9). 4), but there the λατομοί proper were free wage-

earners; cf. P. Petrie II. 13 (1). 1 ἀλεθέροι λατομοί. For ἀνακεχωρηκότων cf. P. Tebt. 26. 18 and 41. 14, where strikes of βασιλικοὶ γεωργοί are referred to.

72. CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING A TEMPLE SEAL.

Mummy A 7. 17 × 35 cm. B. C. 241 (240).

The subject of this lengthy text is the disappearance of the official seal belonging to the temple of Heracles at Phibichis. A large piece is unfortunately missing from the upper part of the papyrus, but the sense except in one or two
passages is nevertheless clear. The body of the document is occupied by a copy of a petition from Petosiris, high-priest of the temple, addressed to Dorion the epistates. The seal, it appears, had been missing for five months; and Petosiris had written previously to Dorion accusing a certain Chesmenis, a priest, and his son Semtheus of having stolen it. Information had also been given to the basilicogrammateus, but inquiries had led to no result. Dorion was therefore requested to take further steps. An official was accordingly sent, and the petition is succeeded by a copy of his report. Chesmenis on being questioned denied that he had the seal, but the next day four other priests volunteered the information that it was all the while in the sanctuary—of which Chesmenis seems to have been in charge—but said that they were afraid that if they gave it to the high-priest, he would use it for a common indictment against them. These two documents are inclosed in a short covering note from Dorion to Antiochus, who also appear in conjunction in 71. 4. It is noticeable that there Antiochus' name precedes that of Dorion, while here the positions are reversed. Since the papyri are practically contemporary and belong to the same find (cf. p. 11), there is good reason for assuming the identity of the persons. It will follow that the position of the names of writer and addressee is no surer guide to their relative dignity in the third century B.C. than in the second; cf. P. Tebt. 13. 2, note, and 22, introd. Except in formal petitions, the writer of a letter seems to have usually placed his own name first.

It is remarkable that in II. 6–7 the high-priest accuses Chesmenis of having abstracted the seal in order to use it for letters to Manetho. The manner in which this name is used indicates that its bearer was a well-known man, and seeing that the persons concerned are priests, it is not impossible that we here have a reference to the famous writer on Egyptian history and religion, who was himself a priest, probably of Sebennytus. If that be so he lived later than has been generally supposed. Hardly any details concerning Manetho's life are known, but according to Plutarch (De Is. et Osir. 28) he was consulted by Ptolemy Soter. That he should be still alive and active in the 6th year of Euergetes is surprising, but not absolutely inconsistent with Plutarch's statement, if Manetho lived to a great age.

Δωρίων Ἀντίόχου χαίρειν. τοῦ πρὸς [μὲ] 15 letters ὑπομνήματος παρὰ Πετοσίριος τοῦ ἀρχιερῶς τοῦ ἐμ Φεβίχει Ἡρακλέους Ἐὐθεὶς . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .  ἴερον, καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ δεινῶν παρὰ τῶν ἴερεων ὑπογέγραφα σοι τὰ ἀντίγραφα ἀξιῶ σε ἐν. [ 22 letters ] ἔρρωσο. (Ετούς) Ἡ Φαμενὸθ ἦ.

72. OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE 223
ὑπόμνημα. Δωρίων ἐπιστάτη παρὰ [Πετοσίριος ἀρχιερέως. πρὸς]ερών
σοι ἐνεφάνισα ἐν τῷ Χοῖαχ.

5 μηνὶ περὶ τῆς σφραγίδος τοῦ ἱεροῦ διότι [ . . . . . . . . . αὐτῆς Χεσμῆνις]
καὶ Σεμθέος ὁ νίς ἐν τῷ Ἀδηρ μηνὶ
ἀπὸ ἐνάτης, τοῦτο δὲ ἐπ[ρ]άξεν πρὸς τὸ σ[22 letters] ὄν [δ]ν βού-
λονταὶ γράφειν Μανε-
θώι καὶ οἶς ἄν βούλονται. προσαγγέλλω οὖ[ν] 18 letters ἐπεὶ] ο[ῦ]
δινάμεθα χρήσασθαι ἄλλη
[σφ]ραγίδι, ἐδοκαμεν δὲ ἐν τῷ Χοῖαχ μη[ν] 21 letters ] [. .] τοῦ παρὰ
Ἀρνώτου βασιλικῶι
[γρ]αμματεῖ περὶ τούτων ὑπόμνημα [ἀξίων 19 letters ] [. .] μον ἀπε-
σταλκότα πρὸς

10 [Ἀρνώτ]ν Νεχθεμέως τὸν πρότερον [ἐν τῷ ἀδύτωι ὅντα καὶ τὸν νῦν]
ὑπάρχοντα Χεσμῆνιν
[. . . .] [. .] πιθέσθαι περὶ τῆς σφραγίδος [ 24 letters ] ας παρὰ Σεμ-
θέως τοῦ Χεσμῆ.
[ν]ο|[σ . ] π[. ]ει[. . . . . .] η ψπρ. τ[. .] ν[. . . . . .] [. .] 14 letters ει-
ληφθεῖναι. καλώς οὖν ποιήσεις
τοῦ Νεχθεμέως περὶ τούτων καὶ γράφα[ε] ἡμῖν π[ρὸς . . . . . ]ν τὸν στρα-

15 (ἐτου) Σ. Φαμενώθ σ. ἀποσταλεῖς Ἀριστόνικος πρὸς τὸν [ἐν τῶι] ἀδύτωι
Χ[ε]σμῆ[ν] ἐπηρῶτα εἰ ὑπάρχει ἐν τῷ
στολάς, Χεσμήνος δὲ οὖν ἑφε ἔχειν.
τῇ δ[ε] ζ παραγενόμενοι Θεορταίοις Ἄ[ρ]μαχόρου Ἄρμαχορος Νεχθεμέ-
[ο]ν[ς] Ἰμούθης Πινάσιο[ς] Ἀρνώτης Νε-
χθεμέως τῇ μὲν σφραγίδα ὤμολόγοιν ὑπάρχειν ἐν τῶ ἀδύτωι, τῶ[ι δὲ] ἀρχιερεῖ οὐ[κ] ἐφόσον πιστεῦειν
ἐνα μὴ κυρεύσας κοινὴν ἐπιστολὴν κατὰ πάντων γράψας σφραγίσῃ[ται
αὐτή] τῇ σφραγίδι.

On the verso

20 Ἀντιόχου [ ]

2. Second ε of φεβιαinserted after i was written. 8. l. βασιλικοὶ γραμματέως?
Dorion to Antiochus, greeting. I have written below for you copies of the memorandum addressed to me by Petosiris the high-priest of the temple of Heracles Eu ... at Phebichis and the declaration presented by the priests. I beg you to (take cognizance of the matter?). Good-bye. The 6th year, Phamenoth 7.

Memorandum. To Dorion. The epistles from Petosiris, high-priest. I made a previous statement to you in the month of Choiaik about the seal of the temple, that it was abstracted by Chesmenis and his son Semtheus on the ninth of the month Athur, which he did in order to (seal?) anything they may wish to write to Manetho and any other persons they please. I therefore report the matter to you, since we cannot use any other seal; and in the month of Choiaik I presented a memorandum on the subject to ... agent of Haruotes the basilico-grammateus (?), requesting him to send ... to Haruotes son of Nechthemmeus, who was formerly in the sanctuary, and Chesmenis, who is now there, to inquire about the seal; and he (reported, having learnt ?) from Semtheus son of Chesmenis, that ... had (not?) taken it. You will therefore do well, if it please you, to send some one to them ... son of Paous, and Haruotes son of Nechthemmeus concerning this matter, and write for me to ... the strategus. Farewell.

The 6th year, Phamenoth 6. Aristonicus having been sent to Chesmenis who is in the sanctuary asked him if the seal which the priests used for the letters that they had to write was in the temple; and Chesmenis denied that he had it. On the 7th, however, Thotortaeus son of Harmachorus, Harmachorus son of Nechthemmeus, Imoutes son of Pnasis, and Haruotes son of Nechthemmeus came and confessed that the seal was in the sanctuary; but they said they did not trust it to the high-priest, lest when he obtained possession of it he should write a letter accusing them all and seal it with the actual seal. (Addressed) To Antiochus.'

1. Petosiris the high-priest is also mentioned in 131.

2. Eide ... seems to be an unknown epithet of Heracles; the third letter looks like θ but this may be due to some ink having come off from another papyrus, in which case σ might be read. Perhaps, however, ἔρωι did not follow, and εῦθε . i need not then refer to Ἡρακλίουs at all. For the cult of Heracles, i.e. Hershef, cf. the mention of a Ἡρακλίου in 110. 5.

3. δὲὶ σε ἐν. .: or perhaps δὲὶ ὁσας ν. .: The doubt is caused by some extraneous ink; cf. note on l. 2.

6. αἱφαγίσαθαι is the natural word, but the genitive ὅν is not easy to account for.

9. There remains only the tip of the letter before μον, but it is sufficient to exclude μάχιμον.

10. The supplement after πράτερ ὁν is suggested by l. 15.

11-2. This passage is too much damaged for complete reconstruction. Something like δ ἄρτι αὐτοὶ ἀπήγειλεν ἀκόουσας παρὰ Σεμβεών . . . τούτοις μὴ ἐλλεῖφαί (sc. τῆς σφραγίδα) or τῶν δεινα ἐλλεῖφαι may have been written.

13. After π.ρος] αὐτοι[s some such supplement as πεντομένων παρά suggests itself, but the traces of letters are so scanty that they can hardly be identified.

14. π[ρος ... την] στράτης ν. . is not very satisfactory, but στρα cannot be avoided, and the other letters, though not certain, suit the vestiges.

16. γραφ[ε[ν] χαρίμενος : the future is not wanted, but γραφ[ε] χαρίμενα does not fill the space. Possibly, however, there was a flaw in the papyrus, which the writer left blank.
73. LETTER OF ANTIGONUS TO DORION.

Mummies 69 and 70. 23.5 x 12.9 cm. B.C. 243-2.

A letter from Antigonus to the epistates Dorion (who is different from the Dorion in 72) recounting the same events which are the subject of 34, a petition of Antigonus to the king; cf. introd. to that papyrus. This document, like 34, is only a draft, and is full of additions and corrections; it is written on the verso, the recto being blank.

\[ 'Αντίγονος Δωρίων χαίρειν. ἔγραψεν περὶ Καλλιδρό-
\[ τῃν Καλλικράτην
\[ μον ὄψετε ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐπαιναγκάσαι αὐτῶν τὸν ὄνων
\[ τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῖς
\[ ἀποδοθὼν αὐτῇ τῇ μήνι αὐτῶι [ ... 17 letters
\[ ὁ Καλλιδρόμος δὲ τὸν Δωρίωνια 16 "
\[ ὅπως [ ... ] ἐνέγχει
\[ 3 [καὶ εαυτ. [ ... ]πη] 8, ὡς ἀπολυ[ 17 "
\[ πράξαι δὲ αὐτῶν τιμήν τοῦ ὄνων (δραχμᾶς) κ. ἐγὼ οὖν ἔνθα-
\[ χάρι ταῖς τῇν [περὶ] γραφεῖσαι μοὶ ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐπιστολῆν
\[ ἀπῆγαγον τὸν Καλλιδρόμον εἰς τὸ ἐν Σινάρῳ δεσμω-
\[ τὴρον ἵνα τὸ ὑποτεύχησιν ἀποδοὺ Δωρίων, Πάτρων δὲ
\[ ἄρχι τῷ [πάσῳ] τοπαρχίας
\[ 10 οἱ φυλακῆσις παρὰ[αγε]νόμενοῖς, εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον
\[ τῷ ἐν Σινάρῳ
\[ ἐγγαγεῖν τὸν Καλλιδρόμον ἐκ τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου
\[ ὡς κατὰ τὸ
\[ ὅτε μὴ δύνασθαι τὴν πράξιν πιοιήσασθαι [ἐκ τοῦ
\[ διάγραμμα
\[ [σαματος] τὸν τέ ὄνων ἀναγαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν
\[ ἐν Τακώαν
\[ καὶ ἔχουν παρ' αὐτῶι ἐγὼ μέσον ᾧ φήμηςκεν αὐτῶι.
\[ 15 εἰ ὃν μὴ ἤρωστήσαμεν εἰς 16 letters
\[ [ον] ἐνδήθησιν ἐν παρ' αὐτῶι διὰ τίνος μαχαιροφό-
\[ ροι τῇν ἔγραψεν ὡς οἱ περὶ τοῦ τοῦ ὅπως εἰδῆς εἶναι
\[ αὔτων τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι τοῖς Δωρίωι ἀπόδοσιν τὴν
\[ Πάτρων βίαιν, δὲ ἀπεθάνω διὰ τῆς τοῖς πα-
\[ 20 ρὰ σοῦ προστάγμασιν. ἐ[πρωσο]. (ἐτοὺς) δ ... .

17. Ῥω. Ράπ.
'Antigonus to Dorion, greeting. You wrote to me about Callidromus, now at last to compel him either to give up the donkey to its master or to pay him its value. But Callidromus... to exact from him the value of the donkey, 20 drachmae. I therefore in accordance with the letter which you wrote to me removed Callidromus quietly to the prison at Sinaru in order that he might restore the animal to Dorion. But Patron the archiphylacites of the lower toparchy came to the prison at Sinaru and released Callidromus from the prison, so that I was not able to carry out the execution according to the edict; and he took away the donkey to his house and has removed it from my reach by keeping it with him at Takona. If I were not unwell I should have taken it from him through one of the sword-bearers. So I write to you about it in order that you may know that the reason why restitution has not been made to Dorion is the violence of Patron, who has continued to disobey your orders. Good-bye. The 4th year...' 

2. The insertion above the line suggests a patronymic, and cf. 34. 2 Καλλιδρόμου Καλλι-κράτους; but τοῖς Καλλικράτους (cf. e.g. III. 32 [Θηραμένου]) is rather long for the lacuna.

3. τῶι κυρίωι: cf. 34. 3.

4-5. The construction and sense of these two lines is obscure. With regard to the insertion above l. 5, there is a space both after ἐνάω and before ἐνέγκη. It is doubtful whether the erasure below extends beyond η; at any rate ηα was left untouched, though perhaps if ηα was written the interlinear ἐνάω was intended to replace it. Above the end of l. 4 there are slight traces of ink which may represent another insertion.

6. (δραχμάς) κ.: cf. 34. 3. ἴσον χήμ is written with an iota adscript also in P. Petrie I. 19. 5 and III. 8. 5.

7. ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐπιστολήν: cf. 34. 2 κατὰ πρόσταγμα Δωρίωνος.

9-10. Cf. note on 34. 1.

12. [ἐκ τοῦ σωμάτος]: cf. 34. 8.

16. μαχαραφόν: μαχαραφόροι are frequently met with in the second century B.C. (cf. P. Tebt. 35. 13, note), but there seems to be no other mention of them in the third. ῥων might also be the termination of a proper name; but the supplement we have suggested is more suitable to the context.

74. Order for Payment.

Mummy A. 8 x 24.2 cm. About B.C. 250.

A letter from one official to another, authorizing a payment of olyra (durra) to three persons who are probably minor officials. The conclusion of the document, which belongs to the reign of Philadelphus or Euergetes, is lost. An interesting conversion of artabae on the δοχικῶν measure into artabae on the ἀνήλωτικῶν measure occurs in II. 2-3, but the proportion of 40:38 which is found here brings the evidence of this papyrus into conflict with that from other sources; cf. note on l. 2. The writing is across the fibres.

1 [· · · · · · ] 12 letters Χαϊρεῖν. μέτρησον Νοβάνχι χιριστή καὶ Q 2

Ο ῦ ρωί
Λδ' μέτρων δοχικων,
το μὲν ἐν εἰς τὸ Κλεομάχου ὄνομα
4. (ἀρτάβων) Ἀχ ὃ γίνεται ἀνηλοτικῶν [(ἀρτάβαι) Ἀχ πδ, τὸ δ' ἔτερον εἰς
τοῖμὸν ὄνομα (ἀρτάβων) ψηλήδ',
5. ὡστε γίνεσθαι ἀνήλωτικῶν (ἀρτάβας) ωἰς, τὰ δὲ σύμβολα ποιῆσαι πρὸς
αὐτῶν καθὰ ὑπογέ.
7. ... 18 ... ατι 28 letters [κοι[.] ... [.] π

On the verso
κε.

3. ὡστε added in the margin. ἀνηλοτικῶν above the line. 4. l. τοιμῶν.

'... greeting. Measure to Nobonchis the agent, and Horus son of Semtheus, and
Harsenplais the subordinate of Teos 2368 3 4 artabae of olyra on the receiving measure,
which are on the spending measure 2500, and make two receipts with them, one in the
name of Cleomachus for 1600 artabae, equivalent to 1684 on the spending measure,
the other in my name for 768 3 4 artabae, equivalent to 816 on the spending measure,
and make the receipts with them as herein instructed ...'

2. 2368 3 4 artabae on the δοχικὼν measure were equivalent to 2500 on the ἀνηλοτικῶν
measure, being subdivided in ll. 4–5 into 1600 δοχ., (which = 1684 ἄγλ.) + 768 3 4 δοχ., (which
= 816 ἄγλ.). The missing figures are supplied by the arithmetic. As often happens in
conversions from one standard to another, the ratios implied are not quite consistent,
being approximately 71 : 75, 400 : 421, and 161 : 171 in the three cases respectively.
A proportion of about 20 : 21 seems to be that aimed at, i.e. 1 art. δοχ. = 1 2 1 6 ἄγλ.
The sizes and names of the different kinds of artabae mentioned in papyri give rise to many
problems; for the most recent discussions of them cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 232–3, and Hultsch,
Archiv, III. pp. 426–9. On the one hand there is a series of artabae ranging from 40 (or
42) to 24 choenices, and on the other a series of artabae on measures which bear the names
δράμων, ἀνηλοτικῶν, Γάλλου, Φιλίππου, 'Ερμοῦ, χαλεοὺς, φωρικῶν, ἑρατικῶν, and δοχικῶν, to which
may now be added the artaba μέτρων τῶν χιῶ τῶν βασιλικῶν (84 (a). 6, 90. 11), and the art.
μετρών α. ( ) of apparently 40 choenices in 119. 18. The main difficulty lies in the
fact that although the relative sizes of the first six of the artabae in the second series are
known from P. Brit. Mus. 265, in no case hitherto has there been direct evidence to
connect any of these six with an artaba of the first series. In order therefore to determine
the number of choenices in the artaba of the second series it is necessary to start from
an assumption that one particular artaba in it is identical with an artaba in the first,
or at any rate has a definite number of choenices. In P. Tebt. 1. c. we took as our
starting-point the supposed identity of the artaba δοχική, which was known to be
an official measure and was shown by P. Tebt. 61 (b), 390 to be 6 9 of an artaba δράμων, with
the artaba of 36 choenices often found in official corn-accounts in P. Tebt. I. From that primary assumption we concluded that the art. δρόμω in P. Tebt. 61 (b) and P. Brit. Mus. 265 contained 42 choen., the art. ἀνυλιστικό 31½ choen., and the art. χαλκό 32½ choen. Hultsch on the other hand, starting from the assumption that the art. δρόμω contained 40 choen. attributes 31½ choen. to the art. χαλκό and 29½ choen. to the art. ἀνυλιστικό. The art. δοχικό, which in P. Tebt. 61 (b), 390 stood at a ratio of 6 : 7 to the art. δρόμω, is not taken into consideration by Hultsch; it would on his view of the size of the art. δρόμω contain 34½ choen. Applying these rival theories to the present passage, which gives the relative sizes of the art. δοχικό and ἀνυλιστικό, the ratio of 21 : 20 there indicated is equally inconsistent with our proposed ratio of 36 : 31½ and Hultsch's ratio of 34½ : 29½; and it is clear that whatever view be taken of the number of choenices in the artabae δρόμω and δοχικό in P. Tebt. 61 (b), 383, it is impossible to combine the evidence of that passage with 74. 2 and P. Brit. Mus. 265 except by supposing either that there are one or more errors in the arithmetic of the conversions, or, what is more likely, that one at least of the three artabae δοχικό, δρόμω, and ἀνυλιστικό, was capable of variation in size. The inconsistency between the ratio of the art. δοχικό and ἀνυλιστικό found in 74 and the ratio found by combining P. Tebt. 61 (b), 383 with P. Brit. Mus. 265 is easily intelligible, if e.g. the art. δοχικό in 74 is not the same as the art. δοχικό in P. Tebt. 61 (b), 390, or if the art. δρόμω in P. Tebt. 61 (b), 390 is different from the art. δρόμω in P. Brit. Mus. 265, or if the art. ἀνυλιστικό in 74 is different from the art. ἀνυλιστικό in P. Brit. Mus. 265. But without further evidence it is impossible to detect by which of these three possible entrances the inconsistency has crept in. The ratio of 21 : 20 between the art. δοχικό and ἀνυλιστικό found in 74 is thus irreconcilable for the present with the other evidence for the relation of those two measures, but does it correspond to the ratio of the art. ἀνυλιστικό to any other known artaba? The answer to that question is in the affirmative. The ratio of the art. χαλκό to the art. ἀνυλιστικό in P. Brit. Mus. 265 is also 21 : 20; and from this correspondence it follows that, provided that the art. ἀνυλιστικό is the same in both papyri, the art. δοχικό in 74 is approximately identical with the art. χαλκό. Cf. also P. Petrie III. 129 (a), 4 δαίφορον ἀνυλιστικό (πιροί) ρ decoding ρ/α, where '5 per cent on 135 art.' seems to correspond, as Smyly remarks, to the ratio of 21 : 20 between the art. χαλκό and ἀνυλιστικό in P. Brit. Mus. 265, though how the total of 135 artabae was reached is quite obscure. The present volume supplies some important evidence as to the size of the art. χαλκό: cf. 85. 18 μέτρων τών (ἐνεκακι- κωσί) τών πρώτων τών χαλκών. The phrase τών πρώτων τών χαλκών, which is also found e.g. in P. Amb. 43. 10 and P. Cairo 10250 (Archiv, II. p. 80) without any previous specification of the number of choenices, suggests that this art. of 29 choen. is the art. χαλκό of P. Brit. Mus. 265. This inference is, however, far from certain, because the standard measures, whatever their size, were probably all made in bronze (cf. P. Tebt. 5. 85 τά ετοικοθεμένα ἐν ἐκάστῳ νομίμῳ ἑπαδεδεμένα χαλκά, sc. μέτρα), and the art. χαλκό may well have varied in size, as we have found reason to believe was the case with one at any rate of the art. δρόμω, δοχικό, and ἀνυλιστικό. But assuming that the art. χαλκό in P. Brit. Mus. 265 contained 29 choenices we can deduce the approximate sizes of the other artabae in that papyrus as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artaba</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χαλκό</td>
<td>25 : 32</td>
<td>37½ choen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δρόμω</td>
<td>21 : 20</td>
<td>31½ choen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαλκό</td>
<td>10 : 11</td>
<td>31½ choen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνυλιστικό</td>
<td>200 : 207</td>
<td>30½ choen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying this to the three artabae, φορικό, δησιαρικό, and another unnamed, in P. Brit.
Mummy A 15. 10.5 X 10.3 cm. B.C. 232 (231).

A letter from Theodorus, probably an ἀρχιφυλακίτης or ἐπιστάτης φυλακίτων (though cf. 105. 1, note), to the φυλακίται of Talaē in the Κώπτης τόπος (cf. 36. 3, note), ordering them to survey and deliver to the purchaser part of a κλῆρος, which had reverted to the ownership of the State and was now being sold; cf. 52. 26, note. Amongst other fragments from the same piece of cartonnage is part of a letter from Theodorus to Harmiusis, who is probably identical with the Harmiusis in 36. 2: the 15th year in l. 10 is therefore more likely to refer to Euergetes than to Philadelphus; cf. also l. 3, note.

*Theódores tois en Talaēi φυλακίταις χαί-ρειν. γέγραφεν ἦμιν Πετοσίρις ὁ το-πάρχης καὶ Πετείρομούθης ὁ το-πογραμματείς) πεπράκειαι Φιλάμμοιν
5 ἐκ τοῦ Φιλοξένου κλῆρον) περὶ Ταλάθιν
χορταράκης (ἀροῦρας) γ jdbcTemplate. παραλαβώντες
οὖν τὸν κωμογραμματέα) περιμετρήσατε*

75. **LETTER OF THEODORUS TO THE PHYLACITAE.**
Theodorus to the guards at Talaë, greeting. Petosiris the toparch and Petimouthes the topogrammateus have written to me that they have sold to Philammon out of the holding of Philoxenus at Talaë 3/₃ arourae of grass-aracus land. Take the komogrammateus therefore with you, and measure the area to him, but do not part with any more, knowing that you will be held responsible. Good-bye. The 15th year, Tubi 2.¹

3. This Petimouthes is probably identical with one or other of the topogrammateis mentioned in 67. 7 and 68. 5 in the 19th year of Euergetes.

5. Φιλοξένου κλήρος: a Φιλοξένου κλήρος in the Oxyrhynchite nome is mentioned in 85. 13, where it is called βασιλικός, implying that it had reverted to the Crown like the Φιλοξένου κλήρος in 75; cf. 52. 26, note. Hence in spite of the difference of situation Philoxenus may be the same person in both cases.

6. χρηταρίκη is a new compound, for which cf. 130 χρηταρίκου.

76. **Order for Payment.**

**Mummy A.** 9.8 x 10 cm. b.c. 248 (247).

A letter to Docimus, who is probably identical with the Docimus in 86 and was most likely a sitologus or other official connected with the State granaries, from Eupolis, probably a higher official, authorizing a payment of durra to be made to the lessee of a κλήρος. This proceeding is stated to be in accordance with the terms of the lease, and the durra was perhaps required as an instalment of rent due to the landlord, but the mutilation of the important word in 1. 8 leaves the object of the payment uncertain. The writing, which is very ill-formed, is across the fibres, and apparently on the verso.

Εὐπολίς Ζωπυρίων (ος) Δοκίμου
χαίρειν. προοὖ Τειμοκρά-
tη κατὰ τὴν συγγραφὴν
τοῦ κλήρου οὖ ἐμισθώσατο
5 παρὰ Κρέοντος τοῦ Αὐτονό-
μου πυρῶν ἀρταβάν τρι-
ακοσίων πεντήκοντα [. .
εἶ[ς], τὴν [. . .] αφορίαν [ὁ]ν
On the recto

Δοκίμωι.

'Eupolis son of Zopyrion to Docimus, greeting. Pay to Timocrates, in accordance with the contract concerning the holding which he has leased from Creon son of Autonomus for 350 artabae of wheat, for the ... 25 artabae of olyra. Good-bye. The 38th year, Thoth 25. (Addressed) To Docimus.'

4-5. ἐμισθώσατο is doubtful, but is preferable to ἐμίσθωσεν, although the middle and active forms of μαθίζω are occasionally confused in later papyri, e.g. P. Gen. 69 and 70. It would no doubt also be possible to translate ἐμισθώσατο in the normal way by connecting παρά Κρεότος with προθυτ and making προθυτ ... πεντήκοντα a partitive genitive; and this would of course account for the payment to Timocrates. But the general structure of the sentence and the absence of ἀπό before πυρόν are in favour of the other interpretation.

7. Possibly πεντήκοντα ἡς, but more probably the line ended with πεντήκοντα.

8. None of the known words ending in -αφορία suits the context, and there is no sufficient justification for altering -αφορία to -αφορίαε or -αφορία, though it is possible that the word is e.g. ἀναφορία, having the same meaning as ἀναφορία. There might then be some connexion between it and the β ἀναφορία found in P. Tebt. 109. β ἀναφορία, however, does not fill the space required here, and there is no stroke above the first letter to indicate that it is a figure. The mention of the 350 artabae of wheat for rent in 1. 6 shows that the 25 artabae of olyra were in some way connected with that amount, perhaps forming part of it.

77. Letter concerning the Priestly Revenues.

Mummy A. 15·2 × 21·8 cm. B. C. 249 (248).

Conclusion of a circular addressed very likely by the dioecetes or some other high personage to officials in, probably, the Heracleopolite nome (cf. l. 1 and 110. 5), securing to one or more temples the due payment of their revenues; cf. the similar decree by Euergetes II in P. Tebt. 6. A double date of particular importance occurs in 1. 8; cf. App. i. p. 341.
A letter to Argaeus from Nicias requesting that two persons should be released from some public service, the nature of which is not specified. As the scene was Alabastropolis, it was probably connected with quarrying. The writer and addressee no doubt occupied official positions, but there is no indication of their rank. The 4th year (l. 24) refers no doubt to the reign of Euergetes.

Nīkias Ἄργαιῳ ἔαρειν. πλεονάκις μοι γεγραφηκότος σοι περὶ Ζωίλου καὶ Πραξιμάχου ὅταν λειτουργία προσπέση ἀπολύ- 5 εἰν αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐδέποτε ὑπακόη ἡμῶν. ἔτι οὖν καὶ νῦν ἐπιμελέσοι σοι ἐστὼ ἀπολύ- ειν αὐτοῖς τῆς νῦν εἰς Ἀλα- βάστρων πόλιν λειτουργίας

diὰ τὸ μὴ ἐκπεσεῖ[ε]ν αὐτοῖς τὸ 10 νῦν λειτουργῆσαι, καὶ ἔαν ἐκ τοῦ Ὀξυρυγ[χ]τοῦ ἐπιλέ- γωνται Ζωίλου ἀπολύσας ἕαν δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Κωίτου Πρα- 15 ἐξιμαχοῦ. ἔαν δὲ μὴ δυνα-
NICIAS to Argaeus, greeting. Though I have often written to you about Zoilus and Praximachus, to release them when they are called upon to serve, you have never listened to me. So now at last be careful to release them from their present service at Alabastropolis because it is not at present their turn to serve; and if people are being chosen from the Oxyrhynchite nome release Zoilus, if from the Koite toparchy, Praximachus. If, however, you are unable to release them, write to me and get the document from Dorion without me, so that I may be the means of giving the men the order. Good-bye. The 4th year ... (Endorsed) The 4th year, concerning Zoilus.

8. Cf. P. Petrie II. 47. 37–8 λειτουργεῖν ἐν Ἀλαβαστρων πόλει. Ἀλαβαστρων πόλει is presumably identical with the village in the Hermopolite nome which in Roman times was called Ἀλαβαστρία; cf. B. G. U. 553. B, iii. 1. Alabastropolis is placed by Ptolemy at some distance from the river, to the south-east of Cynopolis and immediately opposite Hermopolis. λειτουργα as a title occurs in 96. 14.

10. ἐκπεραίεῖν, if right, must have much the same sense as προσπέραν in l. 4. The word has apparently been corrected; cf. critical note.

16. ἰδα for ᾷς is a grammatical curiosity, perhaps due to a confusion caused by the use of ἰς for ᾷς.

18. Two persons called Dorion held the office of ἐπιστάτης φθαλακτῶν in the Oxyrhynchite and Heracleopolite nomes respectively at this time (cf. 34. 2, 72. 4), and the Dorion in 78 may be identical with one of them or with the Dorion at Phebichis (if he be a distinct person) who occurs in 106. 9, &c.

79. LETTER OF PTOLEMAEUS TO HERACLIDES.

Mummy 87. 16.2 x 8.5 cm. About B.C. 260.

This fragment of a letter is noticeable for its elaborate introductory formula, which resembles, though it does not quite coincide with, that in P. Petrie III. 53 (τ). cf. II. 13 (6). 1–3. The date is probably within the reign of Philadelphus.
80. OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE

Πτολεμαῖος Ἡρακλείδει
χαῖρειν, εἰ ἐρρωσαὶ καὶ
ἄν πρόνοιαν ποιεὶ καὶ
tάλα τοι κατὰ λόγον ἑστίν
5 εἴ(ῇ) ἄν ὡς ἔγω θέλω καὶ
tοῖς θεοῖς πολλῆς ἥν
ψάλλειν δὲ καὶ ἀντίκα.

On the verso

Ἡρακλείδει.

‘Ptolemaeus to Heraclides, greeting. If you are well, and if the objects of your care and other concerns are to your mind I should be glad, and much gratitude would be due to the gods; I myself am also in good health. You will oblige me...’

8. The letters above the line are very blurred and may have been cancelled. ἴδεως is unsatisfactory.

80. Export of Wine.

Mummy 117.

17.3 x 12.1 cm.  
B.C. 250.

A notice from Epichares to Chaeremon that Horus and another person (cf. note on II. 2-3) were each exporting two jars of wine from villages in the Heracleopolite nome to Hiera NESUS, and that the tax of \(\frac{1}{2} \) had not been paid. This Hiera NESUS is no doubt the village of that name in the south of the Fayum (cf. e.g. 81. 16), where Chaeremon presumably held an official post; and the tax of \(\frac{1}{2} \) is probably to be regarded as an export duty analogous to those known in the Roman period. It may be conjectured that these tickets were given to the persons exporting the commodity, and that they had to produce them on reaching their destination. At the end is a signature in demotic, having an important date by two different systems of reckoning the king’s years; cf. note ad loc. 154-5 are similar notices passing between the same officials. The writing is across the fibres of the papyrus.

Ἐπιχάρης Χαῖρειν χαῖρειν.
On the verso

6-14. ‘Epichares to Chaeremon, greeting. Horus son of Teos is exporting from Thmoineuthus in the Heracleopolite nome to Hiera Nesus 2 jars of wine, on which we have not exacted a 24th. Good-bye. The 35th year, Epeiph 4.

(Signed in demotic) Written by Haruotes, 2 measures of wine... Written in year 34 which makes year 35, Epeiph 4.'

2-3. We are unable to reconcile the vestiges at the beginning of l. 3 with Ὄμονεβέμεως, neither do the very indistinct letters in l. 2 suit Ὄμος Τεώτος, and a longer name seems to be required. It is therefore preferable to suppose that this is not a single notice in duplicate, but two distinct notices written on the same sheet. Perhaps Horus and the other person were going in company. 154-5 also are not in duplicate.

13-4. For the transcription and translation of the demotic signature of the scribe we are indebted to Mr. Griffith. It contains the earliest extant mention of the two different methods of counting the king’s years, which is found also in P. Petrie III. 58 (a) and P. Magd. 35: cf. Smyly, Hieroxathina, X. No. xcv, p. 432, and our discussion in App. ii. pp. 358-367. The ‘revenue’ year, which in those two papyri is explicitly called the year ὡς αἱ πρώται, began, we think, on Thoth 1, and the figures denoting it were sometimes one unit in advance of those of the ‘regnal’ year. In the present case the 35th is the revenue year, the 34th the regnal; and the papyrus shows that the 35th regnal year of Philadelphus must have begun later than Epeiph 4, i.e. more than 10 months after the beginning of the 35th revenue year.
This papyrus and the next both belong to the correspondence of Asclepiades, an official of some importance in the Arsinoite nome in the 9th year (of Euergetes). 81 contains a series of letters from Artemidorus, giving information of the death of certain cavalry soldiers, and directing that possession of their holdings should be resumed by the government. The language of Artemidorus plainly implies that the reversion of such κλῆρου to the State at their owner's death was the usual course at this period. That fact was not before definitely ascertained, though it had been inferred from the apparent inability of cleruchs to dispose of their holdings by will. In the second century B.C. it became customary for the cleruchic holding to pass from father to son, and it is possible that at the date of our papyrus also sons of cleruchs commonly received their fathers' holdings by a fresh grant from the State; but this practice has yet to be proved. Even in the later period a cleruch's rights of ownership were by no means complete; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 555-6.

Besides the column printed there are the ends of lines of the preceding column, which, as the words μερίδοις and κλῆροις indicate, was of a like character. Adhering on the right is part of a new sheet containing the beginnings of lines of another letter from Artemidorus, with an enclosure addressed to Nicanor similar to that in ll. 5-10; one of the holdings referred to was εν Φαράγιδοις, i.e. the Arsinoite village. There is also a separate strip having the first letters of lines preceded by a rather broad margin, which may have been the commencement of the roll; possibly it belongs to Col. i of the main fragment. Θε(μίστον) occurs in the margin; cf. l. 15 below. On the verso are parts of three much effaced columns in a small hand.

Col. ii.

[Omitted]


[(ἐτους) θ. Φαρδής κ. θ.]

HIBEH PAPYRI

1. The day of the month, referring to the date on which the letter was received, was no doubt prefixed as in ll. 11 and 19.

7. λο(χαγός): cf. P. Petrie III. 4 (2). 29 τῶν Δάμωνος λο(χαγός. The Damon mentioned there and elsewhere in the Petrie papyri was doubtless identical with the Damon in l. 15 below. The marginal entries below this and the next line give the μερίδες of the villages, Bubastus being in that of Heraclides, and Theogenis and Tebetnu in that of Polemon: cf. l. 15.

10. The first word of this line should be a title, perhaps ἱγμιονί. 

16. The abbreviation of δεκακικός (cf. note on 30. 13), recurs in 103. 7, and consists of a Δ with the right side omitted, followed by an ε.

18. The troop of Lichas, like that of Damon (l. 15; cf. note on l. 7), also occurs in the Petrie papyri, e.g. l. 16 (1). 12.
82. **OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE**

Mummy 98.  
33 × 38.4 cm.  
B.C. 239–8 (238–7).

This papyrus, like 81, contains copies of a series of letters addressed to Asclepiades, but though written in the same hand it is part of a different roll. In this case the letters are copied on the verso of a demotic document, and there are other points of difference. The dates in 81 are on the Egyptian calendar and in chronological order; in 82 the calendar used is the Macedonian, and the chronological order is reversed. There the letters were from a single person and dealt with one subject; here the writers, in at least two cases out of the three, are different, and their subjects miscellaneous. The first correspondent, whose name is lost, writes commending to the care of Asclepiades a letter which was to be delivered in the Heracleopolite nome. The second letter, which is sent by Aphrus, announces the appointment of a scribe of those cleruchs who had been sent to the Arsinoite nome in the 6th and 7th years (of Euergetes). Those two years were therefore marked by new settlements in the Fayum on a considerable scale. The subject of the third letter is some timber, which the writer, Sopater, wished to be sold for the benefit of the Treasury.

---

**Col. i.**

```
[..][..] Αςκληπιάδει χαίρειν. Φιμήνει τοῖν
[ἀποδόντι τὴν] παρὰ σοῦ γραφείσαι ἡμῖν
[ἐπιστολὴν] περὶ τοῦ ἀντιλεγομένου σίτου
5 ὅν ἀπέσταλκας πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐν τε τῷ
[καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐδόκαμεν ἐπιστολὴν
μετακόμισαι πρὸς Νύσιον τὸν σιτολόγον
τοῦ Ἡράκλεεστάινος. καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις
10 φροντίσας ὅπως ἐπιμελῶς ἀποδοθῆι,
ἔστιν γὰρ ἀναγκαιότερα περὶ δὲ γεγραφαμέν αὐτῶι.
(ἐτοὺς) ὁ Ὀπερβερεταίον κς.

ις.

Ἀφρος Ἀςκληπιάδει χαίρειν. καθεστήκαμεν
15 γραμματέα Ἰσοκράτην τῶν ἀπεσταλμένων·
```
240

*Hibeh Papyri*

eis tōn Ἀρσηνοίτην κληρούχων ἐν τοῖς ἔτει (ἔτει)
καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔτει Ἀδαισίων. καλῶς οὖν ἤπειροσ
συναιτήσεις ὑπαρχόμενος προθύμος περί τῶν
eis ταῦτα συγκυριότερα ἵνα κατὰ τόπον

20. ἔργηται τὰ κατὰ τὴν γραμματείαν
καὶ μηθέν παραλείπωται τῶν τοῦ βασιλέω
χρησίμων.

(ἔτους) θ' Γορπιαίου Ι.Ε.

Col. ii.

Σώπατρος 'Ἀσκληπιάδει χαίρειν.

25 καλῶς ποιήσεις τοῖς ἔτει καὶ τοὺς εἰσισμένους ἄποδοτές ἔτος
ὑπάρχουσα ξύλα χρησίμων λέγειν ἐν τοῖς . . . . . .


(ἔτους) θ' Αὐτοῦ κλ.

... to Asclepiades, greeting. Phimenis, the bearer of the letter written from you to
me about the disputed corn which you sent to us in the boat of... and another boat,
has been given a letter by me to be forwarded to Nysius, the sitologus of the Heracleopolite
nome. Kindly see that it is carefully delivered, for the matter on which I have written to
him is rather urgent. The 9th year, Hyperberetaeus 27.

17th. Aphrus to Asclepiades, greeting. I have appointed Isocrates as scribe of the
cleruchs sent to the Arsinoite nome in the 6th and 7th years from Daisius. Please
therefore to give your zealous co-operation in all that concerns this, in order that the duties
of the scribe’s office may be performed in the district and none of the king’s interests may
be neglected. The 9th year, Gorpiaeus 15.

12th. Sopater to Asclepiades, greeting. Kindly take... our scribe and the other
acquainted persons, and deliver the 32 good logs which are in the... in order that their
value may be paid to the king. The 9th year, Lous 24.


8. Cf. 83. 2–3 τοῖς στελεχοῖς ὑπαρχόμενος προθύμος περί τῶν ὑπερχάλεμάν.

... whether in these cases
stress is to be laid upon the article or not, i.e. whether the person named was the sitologus
in chief or only one of a number of subordinates.

12. In the 9th year of Euergetes 1Hy erberetaeus approximately coincided with Athur,
Gorpiaeus (l. 22) with Phaophi, and Lous (l. 31) with Thoth; cf. App. i.

15. γραμματεῖ... κληρούχων: cf. the ἐπιστάτης καὶ γραμματεῖς τῶν κατοίκων ἵππων in P.

Tebt. 32. 15, &c.
25. [π]π[ρα]ῶσ[ω], if right, was perhaps followed by the name of the χρηστατεύς.
27. ἀποδότης cannot be read; but ἀποδοῦς is suitable enough in the sense of ‘delivering’ for the purpose of the sale implied by l. 30.
28. The doubtful λ might be the α of χρηστά; but it is written quite close to the β, and two logs only would hardly have formed the subject of a letter.

83. LETTER CONCERNING A PAYMENT OF CORN.

Mummy 63. II-II x 8.8 cm. About B.C. 258-7.

Conclusion of a letter in which the addressee, probably an official connected with the royal granaries, is urged to lose no time in making a considerable payment in kind. The payment is described as a σιτομετρία, a term not infrequent at this period in the sense of allowances or salaries from either the State or private persons; cf. 118. 37, P. Petrie III. 87 (a). 17, 141. 15. The 27th and 28th years (of Philadelphus) are referred to in ll. 5-6.

[..] Ρ [..]
[..] κράτει τοι σιτο-
λογ[ο]ντι τὸν Ὀ[ξυρυνγ]
χίτην μετρήσαι τὴν
5 σιτομετριάν τού κ’,
καὶ κη (ἔτους) (πυρών) (ἀρτάβας) πγῗ
καὶ κριθῶν (ἀρτάβας) πγῗ.
εἰ οὖν μὴ με[με]τρηκας νῦν μέτρησον αὐτῶι,
καὶ τοῦτο μὴ ἐλκύσης,
10 οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτήδειος ἐστὶν.
ἐρρωσο.
[(ἔτους) .....

8. This line inserted later. 9. ης of ἐλκυσῆς written above θετω (which is not crossed through), and the first σ corr. from θ. 10. ἐπιτήδειον?

‘... to ... crates the sitologus of the Oxyrhynchite nome to measure out the allowance of corn for the 27th and 28th years, 83¼ artabae of wheat and 83¼ artabae of barley. If, therefore, you have not yet measured it to him do so now, and do not let this be delayed, for it (?) is inconvenient. Good-bye.’

R
2–3. τῶν σταλογγίου: cf. note on 82. 8, and for the phrase cf. e.g. P. Oxy. 246. 4 τῶν γράφουσι τῶν ναμνάμ.
8. αὐτῶν: i.e. the person who was to receive the σιτομερία, not the sitologus.
10. If ἐπιτήδειος is right, it must refer to αὐτῶν, 'he is a disagreeable person'; but the correction to ἐπιτήδειον gives a more natural sense.

VIII. CONTRACTS

84 (a). Sale of Wheat.

Mummy 5. 22.5 x 17.5 cm. B.C. 301–0. Plate IX.

The following contract between two Greek settlers at Peroë in the Koite toparchy for the sale of 30 artabae of wheat claims the honour of being the first dated Greek papyrus of the reign of Soter. All the documents derived from Mummy 5 are remarkably early (cf. 97, 100–1); but the present is by far the most ancient of them, being actually dated in the 5th year of 'the reign of Ptolemy,' by whom only Ptolemy Soter can be meant. As the contract is fortunately in duplicate the possibility of a mistake on the part of the scribe, such as the omission of 'the son of Ptolemy,' is very remote. The cursive handwriting however, though obviously of the earliest type, gives little indication of its extreme antiquity, and without the date could not have been judged to be appreciably older than other examples in this volume, e.g. 97. Curiously enough, demotic papyri of Soter's reign are almost equally rare; not more than two are known to Mr. Griffith (Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library, p. 123).

The precise year in which Soter assumed kingly power is not certain. The Canon of Ptolemy assigns 20 years to his reign, and it has been generally supposed (cf. Strack, Dynastic der Ptolemäer, pp. 189–91) that he became king in B.C. 304 before Nov. 7, and abdicated in the course of his 21st (revenue) year, i.e. between Nov. 2, B.C. 285 and Nov. 1, B.C. 284. The Rylands demotic contract to be published by Mr. Griffith was written in Phamenoth of his 21st year, and can easily be reconciled with the received chronology if the year in question was a revenue year; for the month in which Philadelphus' accession took place is unknown, and there is no difficulty in placing that event later than Phamenoth (May) B.C. 284, provided that it be not later than Nov. 1. But there is good reason to believe that in dating ordinary contracts the revenue
year was not employed (cf. App. ii. p. 362), and if the 21st year in the demotic papyrus is a regnal year, various difficulties arise. From other instances in the reigns of Philadelphus, Euergetes, and Philopator it appears that the regnal years of the sovereign were sometimes, perhaps always, one in arrear of the revenue years; and if the 21st regnal year of Soter corresponded in whole or part to his 22nd revenue year, the Canon of Ptolemy seems to be wrong in assigning him only 20 years, and his assumption of kingly power must, unless the date of Philadelphus’ accession be altered, be put back a year or more, i.e. to B.C. 305 or earlier; cf. Mahaffy, *The Ptolemaic Dynasty*, p. 44. In 84 (a), in which the months are Macedonian, the year, whether calculated by a Macedonian or Egyptian system, is not the least likely to be a revenue year (cf. p. 365); and owing to the prevailing uncertainty as to the methods of reckoning non-revenue years in the 3rd century B.C., the 5th year of Soter may fall within B.C. 301–0, 300–299, or even earlier than B.C. 301.

The most interesting point in the papyrus is the occurrence of εψ’ ἱερέως κ.τ.λ. in the date-formula. This disposes of a much disputed question, for ‘the priest’ here can be no other than the priest of Alexander, and therefore the official cult of Alexander was already established in Egypt at this early period; cf. App. iii. p. 368. The delivery of the wheat sold by the contract was postponed until after the harvest (l. 5), so that many of the provisions of the document follow the formula of loans.

HIBEH PAPYRI

[β]ασ[λ]ένοντος Πτολ[ε][μ]αίου ἐφ᾽ ἱερέως Μενελάου τοῦ Δαμά-
[χο]ν ε ᾠον[ς Δίων.] ἀπέδοτο Ἐπιμένης Ἀθηναῖος Τιμό-
[κλέ]ι Χαλκιδεί πυρ[δ]ας ἀρτάβας τριάκοντα καὶ τὴν τιμὴν
[ἀπέχ]ει Ἐπιμένης παρὰ Τιμοκλέους ἀμα τῆι συγγραφῆι.

20 ἀποδότω δὲ Ἐπιμένης τῶν σίτων Τιμοκλεῖ [ἐγ νέ][νυ] τῶν
[ἐπ]ιώτων ἀ[π'] ἀλῳ ἐν μηνὶ Πανήγυς σίτων καθαρῶν [ἀ]πὸ
ἐὰν δ[ὲ] μὴ ἀποδοθῇ ἀποτεισάτω Ἐπιμένης Τιμοκλεῖ
[τιμὴν τὴς] ἀρτ[ῆ]ς ἑκάστης δραχμας τέσσαρας, καὶ ἦ

25 πράξεις ἑστὼ Τιμοκλεῖ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων τῶν Ἐπι-
[μένους πράσσοντι] τρόποι δὲ ἄν βούληται. ἦ δὲ συνγραφῆ
[ὑπὲρ Τ]ιμοκλέους πράσσον καὶ τὰ τ[α] ὑτα. μάρτυ-
[ρες]

On the verso

30 ] Ἔπιμέν[νους
ο[ν]οὶ Μ[ελι] . . . . . . . . . . . .

Διομή[σιο]ν

Τιμο[κλέους


"In the reign of Ptolemy, in the priesthoood of Menelaus son of Lamachus, the 5th year, in the month Dios. Epimenes, Athenian, has sold to Timocles, Chalcidian, 30 artabae of wheat, and Epimenes has received the price from Timocles concurrently with this contract. Epimenes shall deliver the corn to Timocles out of the coming new crops from the threshing-floor in the month Panemus free from all adulteration by royal . . . measure at the village of Peroé; and if he fails to deliver it Epimenes shall forfeit to Timocles as the value of each artaba 4 drachmae, and Timocles shall have the right of execution upon the property of Epimenes and may enforce it in any manner he chooses. This contract shall be valid whenever produced by Timocles or any other person on Timocles' behalf, executing it as aforesaid. The witnesses are . . . Dionysius, Aristomachus, Mili . . . , Stasippus, C . . . us. The keeper of the contract is Dionysius son of Heracles."

2. Δίων is restored here and in l. 17 as best suited to the space.
4. ἀποδότω here refers to the delivery of the corn. The use of the same verb in two different senses within three lines is somewhat awkward.
5. Since the month Panemus coincided with the period of harvest, it must have partially or completely corresponded with one of the Egyptian months Pharmouthi, Pachon, or Panni. For the significance of this equation cf. App. i. p. 339.
6. χοι: cf. 90. 11, where this obscure measure apparently occurs again, μετροι χοι τῶι . . . In the present passage χοιτοῦ or χοιτοῦ might be read and explained as a mis-
spelling for Κωῖτος, but 90 shows that this is inadmissible. The form suggests a connexion with χόες, but since the χόες was a liquid measure, that explanation also is unsuitable.

8-9. 4 drachmae (cf. 85. 24) represent twice the normal value of an artaba of wheat in Middle Egypt; cf. 100. 6, 110. 6, P. Petrie III. 80. 16, &c. In 99. 14 the price is 2 dr. 1 obol, and in 90. 15 the penalty value is fixed at 5 dr. For corn transported to and sold at Alexandria the high price of 4 dr. 5 ob. is found in 110. 11.

12. ταύτα: or ταύτα?

14. The αὐγγαραθοῦλαξ (cf. P. Tebt. 105. 53, note) here occupies the second position in the list of witnesses, as in 96. 12. He is sometimes placed first, e.g. P. Tebt. 104. 34, 105. 53, but there was no regular order; in P. Petrie II. 47. 39-3 the αὐγγαραθοῦλαξ comes fourth or fifth. The name Μαλιόν, ροσ (?) probably recurs on the verso l. 30, but the termination is not decipherable.

30-31. If Ἐπεμένειν vs and Τήμοκλίους are rightly read, a fourth pair of names is lost at the beginning of these lines.

84 (b). Date by a Ptolemaic Era (?)

Mummy 5.

2·4 x 6·4 cm. B.C. 272-1 (?) Plate VII.

From the same cartonnage as 84 (a) comes a fragment bearing the following remarkable date from the commencement of a document.

(Ετους) μ μηνος

... ...

The writing is large and clear, and there is not the faintest doubt about the figure. But according to the accepted chronology, Philadelphus, to whom the Canon of Ptolemy assigns 38 years, died in his 39th year (cf. p. 364); and the only Ptolemy who reached his 40th year, Euergetes II, is of course quite out of the question here. Hence without disturbing to an unjustifiable extent the ordinary view of the length of Philadelphus’ reign 84 (b) cannot be referred to the 40th year, whether revenue or regnal (cf. App. ii), of the second Ptolemy, so that apparently this date refers to some era. An era κατὰ Δαυνύσιον which started from the 1st year of Philadelphus is cited by Ptolemy (cf. Bouché-Leclercq, Hist. des Lagides, I. p. 99); but from the company in which the fragment was found and the character of the hand a date in the first half of the reign of Philadelphus would be much more suitable. Such a date may perhaps be obtained by identifying this era with that found on a large series of coins struck in years ranging from the 42nd to the 117th. Svoronos (Les Monnaies de Ptolémée II qui portent dates, pp. 52 sqq., Τὰ νομίσματα τῶν Πτολεμαίων, pp. 193 sqq.) supposes that the starting-point is the year B.C. 311-10, in which
the death of Alexander IV left Soter practically the monarch of Egypt, and that the coins come from Cyprus or Palestine. Svoronos’ classification of Ptolemaic coins marks a great advance upon that of Poole, but many of his proposed dates for different series are very uncertain (cf. G. Macdonald’s criticisms in the footnotes to the section concerning Ptolemaic coins in *Catal. of the Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection*, vol. iii, and A. Willers’ review of Svoronos in *Liter. Zentralbl. 1905*, nos. 17–8 and 19); and with regard to this series in particular several of the arguments which originally led Svoronos to fix upon B.C. 311 as the starting-point (*Les Monnaies, l. c.*) are tacitly (and quite rightly) abandoned in *Tà roµiômata, l. c.*. But an era starting from B.C. 311 is also attested by two inscriptions, one from Cyprus, the other from Tyre (C. I. Sem. I. 109, no. 93; 37, no. 7; cf. Strack, *Rhein. Museum*, liii, p. 417), and the commencement of the rule of Soter in Paros is dated in the year 311–10 in the recently discovered fragment of the Parian Chronicle (*Ath. Mittheil. xxii. p. 188*). The 40th year of this era brings us to the year B.C. 272–1, which is a thoroughly suitable date for the fragment; though the appearance in an Egyptian papyrus of a system of dating of which the other examples are all external to Egypt itself is certainly remarkable.

85. **Loan of Seed-corn.**

Mummy 13. 26½ x 9 cm. B.C. 261 (260).

Contract for the loan of seed of different kinds from the government, as represented by the nomarch Harimouthes (cf. 40, introd.), to the lessee of a κλήρος βασιλικός, i.e. land which had been cleruchic but had reverted to the State, upon which see introd. to 39 and 52. 26, note. The loan was to be repaid after the next harvest before the rent; cf. 87, where an advance of seed is made without such provision. The lacunae are supplied from 150, a duplicate copy of the contract.

_Basiléwōntos Ptolemaíou tou_  
Ptolemaión kai toû vnoû Pto[λ]ε-  
maíou (êton) kai [epi] lepēs 'Aριστονι-  
kou toû Pεριλάou 'Αλεξάνδρου  
5 kai òthwón 'Aδελφῶν kai[η]φόρου 'Aρσι-  
vónos Ψιλαδέλφου Xa'ρέas, tês 'Aπι-  
ou mênos Mεσορῆ.  Ἕχει Π[σις] T...
In the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy, and his son Ptolemy, the 24th year, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being Aristonicus son of Perilaus, the canephorus of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Charea daughter of Apius, in the month of Mesore. Pasis, son of . . . , priest, has received from Paris son of Sisybaeus, agent of Harimouthes the nomarch from the lower toparchy, as seed for the 25th year, being included in the lists of receipts and expenditure, for the royal holding of Philoxenus in the (troop?) of Telestes 40 artabae of wheat, 38\frac{1}{3} of barley which are equivalent to 23 of wheat, and 67\frac{1}{2} of olyra which are equivalent to 27 of wheat, making a total of 90 artabae of wheat, in grain pure and unadulterated in any way, according to just measurement by the 29-choenix measure on the bronze standard. Pasis shall deliver at the royal granaries in the 25th year the rent of the land for which he has received the seed, in accordance with the terms of the lease, in full, making no deduction for unwatered land; and he shall return the seed, which he has received, before the rent, from the new crops.

'(Signed in demotic) I, P . . . son of . . . , have received the stock above written.'
disputed; cf. Bouché-Leclercq, Hist. des Lagides, I. p. 183. We prefer the view of Wiedemann and Mahaffy that he was Ptolemy Euergetes I.

7. τοῦ Απώς is unsatisfactory, especially as there is a lacuna after ἵππος, which may have contained the name of the god. . . . αἰτιός is more probably the name of the father of Πάσης, but it is apparently not Ἀλχιτίδας or Κομιάτιδας.

8. Πάσης: this is unlikely to be the Paris in 64–5, which refer to the Arsinoite nome.

11. τὸ γραφ[α]τ[ε]ρ[ε]ίν κ.τ.λ. : the reading is assured by 150. The meaning of the phrase seems to be that this loan of seed duly appeared in the official statement of accounts; cf. 48. 4.

13. φιλοξένου : cf. 75. 5, note.

14. τῶν Τελέστων : if these words apply to Φιλοξένου (i.e. ‘of Telestes’ troop’) they are out of place, though cf. 109. 4–5, note. It is probable that they here qualify κληρον βασιλικόν and serve to indicate the locality in some way, though Telestes was in any case probably a military officer of high rank; cf. 99. 7–8 ο[δ][ο]μός Τελέστων and note ad loc. We refer Τελέστων to the common nominative Τελέστης, though the dative Τελέστων apparently occurs in 58. 4.

14–5. The ratio of the value of wheat to barley is the usual one of 5 : 3, as in P. Tebt. 246 and 261, and approximately also in 119. 16 ; cf. 102. 2, note.

18. An artaba of 29 choenices occurs also in P. Grenf. I. 18. 20. The mention of πρώς τὸ χαλκοῦν in the present passage suggests that this artaba may be identical with the artaba χαλκὼ in P. Brit. Mus. 265 ; cf. 74. 2, note.

24. ὑπόλογος here is clearly a masculine substantive, as in 29. 26 ; in the Tebtunis papyrus of the next century the substantival form, wherever its gender can be distinguished, is τὸ ὑπόλογον. In P. Petrie II. 39 (a). 5 and 18 εἰς τούς ὑπόλογους the substantive ὑπόλογος may also be meant.

28–9. The demotic signature has been translated for us by Mr. Griffith. P . . . can hardly be other than Pasis, though that name is apparently not recognizable.

86. Loan of Corn.

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 13.5 × 7.4, (b) 4.8 × 4.6 cm. B.c. 248 (247).

Two acknowledgements with the same formula (or very likely one acknowledgement in duplicate) of loans of 15 artabae of olyra, another specimen belonging to the series being 129, where the borrower is a Mysian of the Epigone; cf. also 124–6. The lender in each case, Docimus, occupied an official position in connexion with the corn-revenue (cf. 76); and it is not unlikely that the loans are for seed, though this is not stated as in 85 and 87. Since repayment was to take place after the harvest of the 38th year (of Philadelphus), the papyrus was no doubt written in the 37th year or early in the 38th. Lines 14–26 are perhaps in a different hand.

Fr. (a) . . . . .

[ἀρτάβας δικαίωσε,]

[ταύτας δὲ σοὶ ἀποδόσῳ] 15 μοι χαίρειν. ἔχω παρὰ
1-13. '(... to Docimus, greeting. I have received from you) 15 artabae of olyra, and I will return it to you in the month Daisius of the 38th year in grain that is pure and unadulterated, measured by the royal measure, and I will restore it at the cabin at my own expense. If I fail to repay it, I will forfeit to you the value of each artaba, 2 drachmae. Good-bye.'

3. Δαισίων: in the 38th year of Philadelphus this month probably corresponded approximately to Pauni, since in the 36th year it began on or about Pachon 29; cf. App. i.

tῶι: τῶι could equally well be read both here and in l. 19, but would have no construction. τῶι is omitted in 129.

8. σκηνή: cf. a second century B.C. papyrus in the Louvre published by Revillout, Mélanges, p. 335, which is a receipt for 2 talents 2500 drachmae of copper paid by a banker εἰς τιμήν οίνου π[αλ]μον ωστε υπὸ σκηνήν οίνου κεραμίων ἐκοι πίνει. Revillout translates σκηνή there 'tent,' and supposes that the wine was destined for soldiers, whose pay is the subject of another receipt made out to the same bankers. This interpretation, however, is very doubtful, and in any case there is no indication that the olyra in 86 was required for military purposes. Judging by the use of σκηνή in 38. 7, we prefer to translate it here also 'cabin,' and to suppose the phrase ἐπὶ σκηνήν to indicate that the grain was to be repaid on board a government corn-transport.

12. Two drachmae are the penalty value of an artaba of olyra also in 102. 4 and 124; cf. 90. 15, where it seems to be 4 drachmae, and 102. 2, note.

21. The letters following βασιλικῶι are certainly not καὶ (cf. l. 7). Perhaps ἕν, sc. δὲ μὴ ἀποδώσῃ κ.τ.λ., should be read, but ἕν, sc. a repetition of βασιλικῶι, is possible.

25-6. This sentence differs from the usual formula ἐγραφα συντάξαστος (Πατής) found at this period, e.g. in 124. The word following τῆν is apparently not σ' ἔγγραφην or ἀ'ποχήν.
Mummy 126. 17 × 9.8 cm. B.C. 256 (255).

An acknowledgement by several cleruchs, each of whose holdings contained 25 arourae, to a sitologus, of the receipt of $79\frac{3}{4}$ artabae of wheat and $33\frac{1}{4}$ artabae of barley for seed; cf. 85-8. Nothing is said about repayment (cf. 85. 25 and 86. 2), and probably the seed was in this case a present rather than a loan from the government; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 226-7. Since it was required for the sowing of the 30th year (of Philadelphus), the papyrus was no doubt written late in the 29th or early in the 30th year.

4. (eikosiipseitárouroi) corr. from €ι.

4. eikosiipseitárouroi are not mentioned elsewhere except in the name of the Arsinoite village 'I3ίων Εικοσιπεισταράουρων.

6. την τῶν Παστοφρήνων, sc. κόμην, does not occur apart from this passage (except perhaps in 118. 6; cf. note ad loc.), and it is uncertain to which nome it belonged.

12. μέτροις παραδεχόμενος: more usually called δοχίκη; cf. 74. 2, note.
extremely small addition to the rate of 24 obols for a stater found in the case of those taxes in which the government accepted copper at par is in accordance with the evidence of P. Par. 62. v. 19, that in the second century B.C. the ὑπηρά was an ὀμη πρὸς χολκὸν ἱσόνωμον. The extra \( \frac{1}{4} \) obol per stater or approximately 1 per cent., which is levied in the Hibeh texts, probably corresponds to the extra charges of 1 per cent. for ἔπωκευ and 2 per cent. for transport which are mentioned in connexion with the ὑπηρά in the Paris papyrus. Above each receipt is a brief summary, and at the end of each are a few words of demotic. The writing is in most cases, including 106, across the fibres.

\[ \text{"Ετούς} \beta \text{'Ἀθὺρ λ. (δραχμαί) κ.} \]

\[ \text{("Ετούς)} \beta \text{'Ἀθὺρ λ. πέπτωκεν} \\
\text{ἐπὶ τὸ ἐμὸν Φεβίξιοι λογευτήριον} \\
\text{τὸν Κώτουν Πάσον τραπε-} \]

5 ξύτη καὶ Στοτοτή δοκι-
\[ \text{μας τῇ παρὰ 'Αρενδώτου το(ν) παρὰ Ταεμβέου} \\
\text{ἐκ Ταλάνη ὑπηράς εἰς τὸν} \]
\[ \text{'Αθὺρ χα(λκοῦ) εἰς κδ (τέταρτον ?) (δραχμάς) εἰκοσι, / κ.} \]

2nd hand \[ \text{[π} \text{ρώντος} \text{Δωρίωνος.} \]

1 line of demotic.

6. \text{αρενδωτον το(ν) παρα above the line.}

'The 2nd year, Athur 30: 20 dr. The 2nd year, Athur 30. Harendotes, agent of Taēmbes from Talaē, has paid into the collecting office of the Koite toparchy at Phebichis, to Pason, banker, and Stotoēis, controller, for the beer-tax on account of Athur twenty drachmae of copper at 24\( \frac{1}{4} \) obols (for a stater), total 20. In the presence of Dorion.'

8. κδ (τέταρτον): very little of the δ is left; but the traces are inconsistent with ε or ζ, and cf. 107. 7, where δ is certain. There is more doubt about the fraction; all that remains is a piece of a horizontal stroke joining the sign for drachmae. If it represents \( \frac{1}{4} \) obol, which is usually written 7, the writer must on reaching the end of the horizontal stroke have drawn his pen back a little way before making the down stroke, just as he usually does in writing τ. The only alternative is to read (ἡμωβελων), but we hesitate to introduce a rate which would be necessarily different from those found in 107. 7 (cf. note) and 188; and if, as is likely, the rate is the same in all three cases, 24\( \frac{1}{4} \) is the only suitable number.
4. Λωδ: the day of the month was very likely not given (cf. e.g. 81 (a) and 85), in which case there was probably a blank space before ἑδάνεισεν. Λούις probably corresponded approximately to Paumi in the 23rd year; cf. App. i.

6. οίων: probably Κυρηναῖοι (cf. 89, 6, &c.) or perhaps Ιουνίων (cf. 98, 4).

7. For ἄμα τῷ αὐτῷ γραφή cf. 84 (a). 4. καὶ ἀπέχει probably occurred earlier in the line.

9. This line refers to the interest, and τόσον is to be restored somewhere in the lacuna.

The restoration of ll. 2–5 is based on two other fragmentary contracts not yet published. The only name concerning which there is any doubt is 'Ονομάστος. 'Ονομᾶ has been confirmed by one of the other contracts, but 'Ονομάκριτος is a possible alternative. The traces in l. 2 would suit κ rather better than σ, but there seems to be insufficient space for ρι.

89. Loan of Money.

Mummy 83. Height 17·5 cm. b.c. 239 (238).

A contract for the loan of 500 drachmae of silver from a woman, Theodote, to Zenion; cf. 88. The loan was without interest, probably on account of the special conditions attached, which the mutilation of the papyrus renders obscure. Several insertions have been made in the text, and a blank space has been left in l. 17.

The restoration of ll. 2–5 is based on two other fragmentary contracts not yet published. The only name concerning which there is any doubt is 'Ονομάστος. 'Ονομαί is confirmed by one of the other contracts, but 'Ονομάκριτος is a possible alternative. The traces in l. 2 would suit κ rather better than σ, but there seems to be insufficient space for ρι.
89. CONTRACTS

On the verso

3. The second τῶν added above the line.
4. ν of εὐεργετῶν corr. from : ?

In the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy and Arsinoë, gods Adelphi, the 8th year, Onomastus son of Pyrgon being priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi and the gods Euergetae, Archestrata daughter of Ctesicles being canephorus of Arsinoë Philadelphian, in the month Peritius, at Tholhis in the Oxyrhynchite nome. Theodote, Cyrenean, daughter of Leon, with her guardian her father Leon son of . . . , private of Zoilus’ troop, has lent to Zenion son of Dinias, private of Α . . . ’s troop, 500 drachmae of silver produced to view in the presence of the witnesses below written, without interest. In lieu of the 500 drachmae which he has received from Theodote (Zenion shall pay on account) of the sum imposed upon her . . . , either at the (collecting office?) at . . . or at Oxyrhynchus within 10 days from the date on which Theodote gives Zenion notice to do so. If he does not (pay) after the period aforesaid, Zenion shall forfeit to Theodote twice the amount of the loan of 500 drachmae, and shall have the right of execution upon Zenion in accordance with the edict. This contract shall be valid wheresoever produced. The witnesses are Euymenedon . . .

5. Περιτίου: this month probably corresponded in the 8th year of Euergetes to parts of Mecheir and Phamenoth; cf. App. i.
8. ἄτοκα is the usual adverb in the later contracts. It is not possible to have a ν before ἄτοκα, which therefore cannot be used adjectively here.
10-2. ἐπιθετέος αὐτῆς (?) and ἀντὶ τῶν πεντακοῦν δραχμῶν appear to indicate that Zenion was undertaking to perform some service for Theodote in consideration of the loan, and this would well account for the absence not only of interest, but of a provision for repayment; cf. the next note.
12-4. These lines do not seem to contain provisions for the repayment of the loan (cf. 88. 11), for it is very difficult to see where ἀποθάνειον k.t.l. can be brought in. Probably, therefore, the word lost in l. 13 after μή is not ἀποθάνειον but the verb which occurred in l. 10.


17. For δισπλοὺς cf. 30. 19-20 and 88. 13, notes. A space is left for the name of the person to whom right of execution was reserved. Perhaps there was some doubt as to whether it should be Theodote herself or her κύριος.

18. κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα: cf. 90. 16, 91. 13, and 34, introd.

19. For the supplement cf. 90. 20, &c.

20-1. This endorsement looks like the title of the document, but we have failed to find a suitable reading of the latter part of it. It would perhaps be just possible to read συγγραφέος(φιλάξ) Πρώθης with 'Αρσινίων below, and suppose that these are the names of two of the witnesses, but such an abbreviation of συγγραφέος(φιλάξ) is not satisfactory, nor is the word itself likely in this position. On the back of the fragment which contains the beginnings of ll. 1-10 there are also traces of ink, which may represent names.

90. Lease of Land.

Mummy 10. 11.1 x 16.6 cm. B.C. 222 (221).

A contract for the lease for one year of an island, which formed part of a cleruchic holding in the Oxyrhynchite nome. The rent is fixed at 4 aratabae of olyra in addition, apparently, to a quarter of the wheat grown; but whether wheat constituted the whole or only a portion of the crop is not stated, neither is the acreage of the land specified. The lease was drawn up in the 25th year of Euergetes, the latest certain date in this volume; cf. note on l. 2. The papyrus is in parts much discoloured and worn, and the small cursive hand is in consequence sometimes very difficult to read. The verso is covered with plaster, which, owing to the extremely brittle condition of the document, we have not ventured to remove.


dελφῶν Βερενι-κῆς τῆς Πυθαγγέλου μηνός Γορπισίου ἐν Θώλθι τοῦ Ὀξυρνγχείου τοῦ. ἐμύσοσθεν

κοστῶι ἐτεί Δ[ίδωρος] Μακέ[Δω]ν ν[ῶ]ν Φίλωνος δεκανικός Εὐκ[ράτει]
κατα 
καὶ τὴς ἐπίγονῆσ
ἐκ τοῦ ἱδίου κλήρου τὴν νήσου τὴν ἐμ Μένα τοῦ Ὄξυρυγχίτου νο[μὸ]
πᾶσαν
ῥυρῶν
ἀρταβῶν τεσσάρων, [τὰ δὲ ἐκ]φόρια τὰ συγγεγραμμένα ἀποδόθησα Ἐν]-
κράτης Διοδώ-
10 ρω ἐμ μηνὶ Ξαν[δ]ικῷ τοῦ ἐβδόμου καὶ ἐκοστοῦ ἐτούς σῖτον καθαρὸν καὶ ἄδολον

tὸν γενόμενον [ἐ]ν τῇ γ[η]ί μέτρωι χοίρε δικαιῶν μετρήσει δι[]καίως, παρα-
στησάτω (δὲ) εἰς τὰ Δ[ιδω]ν ἱδίῳ[ι] ἀναλώματι, δότω δὲ καὶ τοῦ πυρὸν τὸ
tέταρτον
dὲ μὴ ἄ-
tῆς ἀρτα-
tέντες[ε], καὶ
ἡ πράξεις ἐστ[ῶ] Διοδώρῳ παρὰ Εὐκράτους πράσ[σ]οντι κατὰ τὸ δ[ι][ά-
γραμμα.
ἡ δὲ καλάμη ἐστῶ Διοδώρου. βεβαιοῦτο δὲ Διῦ[ι]δωρος καὶ τοὺς
cat . . . . . .
καρποὺς καὶ ἂ μεμίσθωκεν, εἀν δὲ μὴ βεβαιόσθη κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα
ἀπ[οτισιάτω] Διόδωρος Εὐκράτ[ῆς] ἐπὶ[t]ιμὼν ἄργυρων δραχμάς πεντακοσίας, ἐὰμ μὴ [τι βα-
20 σιλικῶν κόλυμμα γένηται.] ἢ δὲ συγγραφή ἢδὲ κυρία ἐστῶ οὔ ἄν ἐπι-
φέρηται.
μάρτυρες Ἐντα[. . . . . . . κ]αὶ Κόλλας Κυρηναῖοι οἱ δ[ῦο] ἱδίωται Πάμ .
[. . . . .]
Χαλκ[δ]εὺς Χι. . . . . . Πέρσης τῶν Φίλωνος Κτήσιππος Καλλικράτους
. . . . . .
In the reign of Ptolemy son of Ptolemy and Arsinoë, gods Adelphi, the 25th year, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi and the gods Euergetae being Dositheus son of Drimylus, the canephoros of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Berenice daughter of Pythagelus, in the month Gorsiaeus, at Thothis in the Oxyrhynchite nome. Diodorus, Macedonian and decurion of the troop of Philon, has leased for one year, for one seed-time and harvest, from the seed-time in the 26th year of Eucrates, ... of the Epigone, out of his own holding the island at Mena in the Oxyrhynchite nome all except any parts of the dry land which may be irrigated according to the survey, at a rent ... of 4 ar tabae of olyra. The rent agreed upon Eucrates shall pay to Diodorus in the month Xandicus of the 27th year in pure and unadulterated grain grown upon the land by true... measure according to just measurement, and shall deliver it at the house of Diodorus at his own expense. He shall further give the fourth part of the wheat, which he shall also deliver at Diodorus' house at his own expense. If he do not pay as aforesaid Eucrates shall forfeit to Diodorus for the value of each ar taba of olyra 4 drachmae, and for the wheat 5 drachmae, and Diodorus shall have the right of execution upon Eucrates in accordance with the edict. The straw shall belong to Diodorus. Diodorus shall guarantee the ... crops and what he has leased, or if he fail to do so Diodorus shall forfeit to Eucrates a penalty of 500 drachmae of silver, if there be no obstacle on the part of the State. This contract is valid wherever produced. The witnesses are Eupa ... and Collas, Cyreneans, both privates, Pam ..., Chalidian. Chi ..., Persian of Philon's troop, Ctesippus son of Callicrates ..., Straton son of ..., Thracian, Euclion son of Ammonius, Cyrenean of the Epigone.'

2. The names of the priest and canephoros coincide with those of the 25th year, as known from an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus and a demotic contract; cf. p. 376. The period of the lease commenced from the sowing of the 26th year (l. 5), i.e. the autumn; so the present document being dated in Gorsiaeus which probably = Choiak-Tubi (cf. App. i), i.e. about February, of the 25th year, must have been drawn at some time in advance. If, as seems to be not improbable, the 25th and the other years mentioned by the papyrus are Macedonian years beginning on Dins i, which at this period fell near the end of Mecheir, Gorsiaeus fell near the end of the 25th year, and the interval between the date of 90 and the sowing of the 26th year was at least 7 months. On the analogy of P. Tebt. 71, which shows that the sowing of crops in the Fayûm had just commenced on Nov. 9, B.C. 114, the notos in l. 5 probably means November, which at the end of Euergetes' reign began on Thoth 15 and approximately coincided with Daisius. On this view the interval between the date of 90 and the sowing of the 26th year is 9 months, and the harvest would be completed by Xandicus (equivalent to Epeph-Mesoré, i.e. about September) of the 27th year (l. 10). We forbear to enter on a discussion of the complications which would ensue if the 25th and other years in 90 do not begin on Dins 1, or if ἔκτωρ be read in place of περὶκτωρ in l. 2. The very slight traces at the beginning of the line can be reconciled with either; and if 90 be assigned to the 26th year instead of the 25th, Dositheus and Berenice may be supposed to have held office in both these years. There is a parallel for this in the case of the priests of the 9th and 10th years, but 2ο β, which would then be expected after Περὶ[ἀγγέλων in l. 4, is absent; cf. p. 374. It is, moreover, very doubtful whether Euergetes actually reached a 26th year except on the revenue system of calculating the king's years, which is not at all likely to have been employed in a contract mentioning only Macedonian months; cf. App. ii.
In the Tebtunis papyrus the name of Dositheus' father may be read as either Δρυμύλος or Δρυμύλων. According to Spiegelberg's decipherment the demotic has Tripiris, which is in favour of Δρυμύλων. On the other hand that name is unknown, whereas Δρυμύλος is attested (Luc. Gall. 14).

7. ἑσος as an epithet of κληρος does not imply full proprietary rights, as Meyer, Heeren, p. 42, assumes. All that need be meant here is that Diodorus was letting his own land, not sub-letting some one else's. Other instances, e.g. 105. 5, are capable of a similar explanation.

8. Above εκφορίον an insertion has been made, but the letters are too indistinct to be read.

11. μέτρων χων: cf. 84. 6, note. The letters after τῶι are very small and illegible, but do not suit βασιλικοί (84. 6) or δησαυροῦ. An erasure below is not likely, though the writing is somewhat blurred. μετρήσει δικαίων is not very satisfactory, for the supplement hardly fills the lacuna, and a conjunction is missing. The final α of δικαίων is more like a π, but to read άς και and suppose that the π of πυραστήρ[α]ω was written twice is not an attractive solution, although the scribe makes other mistakes, e.g. πρώτοι in l. 16.

15. ὁπρώον: cf. l. 8, though there too the reading is doubtful. πυρών is possible in both places, but would be very unsuitable in l. 15 with του δὲ πυρών immediately following. 4 drachmae an artaba is twice the ordinary penalty price of olyra; cf. 102. 2, note.

17. κατ... may be a participle like καταγγέλλων or some adjectival phrase with κατά. The remains of the letters are too faint for recognition.

19. δραχμάς πεντακοσίων: cf. P. Petrie III. 74 (a). 14-5, which is to be restored on the analogy of the present passage. The 500 drachmae for failure in the βεβαιόωσις was no doubt a conventional penalty, and this suggests a new explanation of P. Amh. 43. 12, where it is stipulated that if the borrower did not repay a loan of 10 artabae of wheat he should forfeit τιμήν δραχμάς πεντακοσίων. The largeness of the sum is no longer a valid reason for supposing that the drachmae are not silver, but copper, and represent the price of a single artaba. On the other hand, if the 500 drachmae in P. Amh. 43. 12 is a conventional penalty, it is somewhat remarkable that they are not stated to be silver and that τιμή, not ἐπίτιμον, is used.

For the clause ἡμὶ μὴ [τι κ.τ.λ. cf. 91. 5 sqq., where the same phrase occurs, also in reference to an ἐπίτιμον. Similarly in P. Petrie II. 44, which is rather a contract of partnership than an ordinary lease, ll. 13 sqq. may now be restored ἡμὶ δὲ μὴ ψεβαιώσωσι κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἀποσεισώσωσιν Μητροδώρων καὶ ἔπικουρον δραχμάς πεντακοσίων καὶ ἕναν ἤ καὶ τούτην Μητροδώρωι καὶ ἔπικουρῳ ἡμὶ μὴ τις βασιλικὸν κάλυμα γέιηται, τῶν δὲ καρπῶν κυριευτώσωσι... In 91. 8-10 a further provision is made in case the κάλυμα did occur; according to 90 and P. Petrie II. 44, if the βεβαιόωσις was prevented by any action of the government, the penalty was simply foregone.

22. If Xi. is a proper name, the number of witnesses is seven, as in 96. 12 sqq. But since Περοτης is uncertain, it is possible that χη... Φιλανός is all part of the description of Pam... the Chalcidian; ἐτης, e.g. ἐτάμητης might be read. A less probable method of reducing the number from seven to six would be to treat παμ... in l. 21 as part of the description of the two preceding witnesses and Χαλκεῖβες as a personal name.

23-4. Κυρμαῖος and [ἐπίγονος are both very doubtful. There would be room for about six letters at the end of the line after Κυρμαῖος.
Mummy A. 11.2 x 14.5. B.C. 244-3 (243-2) or 219-8 (218-7).

Conclusion of a contract for a lease of land from Eupolis to Cleopatra at a rent of 30 artabae of corn, with the names of the witnesses, who were six or seven in number, and part of the protocol of what was probably a duplicate copy on the same papyrus; cf. 90. The handwriting, which is extremely cursive, resembles that of P. Petrie I. 18 (1), and the 4th year in l. 19 no doubt refers to either Euergetes or Philopator, more probably the former.

If she fail to guarantee the lease in accordance with the aforesaid provisions, Cleopatra shall forfeit to Eupolis a fine of 100 drachmae of silver, unless some hindrance
occur on the part of the State. If any hindrance occur on the part of the State, Cleopatra shall pay Eupolis the 30 artabae of wheat, or if she fail to pay she shall forfeit as the value of each artaba of the wheat, drachmae; and Eupolis shall have a right of execution against Cleopatra, exercising it in accordance with the edict. This contract is valid wheresoever it be produced. The witnesses are Polyaeus, Cyrenean, private, and Th... decurion, both members of Zoilus' troop, Diocles son of Hippolys... son of Apollonius from Hesperis, Nicanor son of Evagoras from Barca..."

2. Perhaps δικω[ια] μει | σκυτάλη; cf. 98. 19 and note.

8. Cf. 90. 19, note.

11. Probably ὑπαχμῆς δ, i.e. double the ordinary price (cf. notes on 84(a). 9 and 88. 13); or perhaps ὑπαχμῆς ε; cf. 90. 15.

13. οὗ ἄν ἐπιφήμηται; cf. 90. 20, &c.

16. Ἐσπερίτης: i.e. from Ἐσπερίς (= Βερενίκη) in the Cyrenaica.

92. Contract of Surety.

Mummy 97.

Both this and the following papyrus are contracts of surety for the appearance of a person in court, and are of much interest as being by far the oldest examples of such agreements yet recovered; so far as we are aware, the only other specimen anterior to the Roman period is P. Brit. Mus. 220. ii, of the reign of Euergetes II, which is misunderstood by the editor. In their general purport and even in phraseology 92 and 93 show striking points of agreement with the later specimens, which have been discussed at length by L. Wenger in his Rechtshistorische Papyrusstudien. His view that the cases concerned are civil rather than criminal is supported by 92, where the suit is an action for debt. The sum involved was altogether 400 drachmae; and the two sureties bound themselves either to produce the defendant Timocles for trial before the strategus, or to pay the plaintiff Apollonius the amount of his claim. The agreement is made directly with the plaintiff, contrasting in this respect with the later examples in which an executive official is addressed.


S 2
HIBEI PAPYRI

εμ Μουχιναρω ν του 'Οξυρυγχιτου. ἕγγυοι Τιμοκλέους του Σίμου Ὄρακος τῆς ἐπιγονης

10 Μνάσων Ζύμιου Θράτης τῆς ἐπιγονής Ἡγέ-
[μον...]. Κρῆς τῆς ἐπιγονής ἐφ' ἔτι πα-
[ραδ' ὄνται αὐτῖν ἐν Ὁ Ῥακλέους πόλει ἐπὶ
Κρῆς[ίππον]
τῳ [σ]τ[ρ]αγγ[ε]λῇ ἔως γνώσεως περί τῆς
dίκης ἢ {ε}γ' ἑνεγύησεν αὐτῶν Ἀπολλωνίους

15 κατὰ σφυγρο[φη]ν πρὸς τὸ ἀρχαῖον δρα-
χμᾶς τριακοσίας καὶ τόκων δραχμᾶς
ἐκάτον. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ παραδόθιται κατὰ
τὰ γεγραμμένα ἀποτεισάτωσιν τὰ τε
τρί[α]κοσίων δραχμᾶς καὶ τὰ ἐπτάκοσία
της [κ]α[λ]

20 τ'α] γνώμενα, καὶ ἡ πράξις ἔστω τῶν Ἀπολλωνίων
ἡ ἀλλων τῶν [Κρ]σίππων [ἡ] τοῦ πράκτο-
ρος ὑπηρετῶν κατὰ τὸ [διάγραμμα].

3. 4. σ of ενεγυηθεν inserted later.

In the 22nd year of the reign of Ptolemy son of Ptolemy, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being Pelops son of Alexander, the canephorus of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Mnesistrate daughter of Tisarchus, on the 14th of the month Xandicus which is Mecheir of the Egyptians, at Mouchinaroō in the Oxyrhynchite nome. Mnason son of Simus Thracian of the Epigone and Hegemon son of . . . imus, Cretan of the Epigone, are sureties for Timoecles son of Simus, Thracian of the Epigone, on the condition that they shall deliver him up at Heracleopolis before Crisippus the strategus until the decision of the suit in which Apollonius placed him on bail according to the contract for a principal of 300 drachmae and interest of 100 drachmae; and if they do not deliver him up as above written, they shall forfeit the 500 drachmae and the extra tenths and other charges, and Apollonius or any one besides of the attendants of Crissippus or of the collector shall have the right of execution in accordance with the decree. '3-6. Cf. P. Petrie III. 52 (α), where the names of the priest and canephorus can now be correctly restored.

7. Unfortunately at this critical point the papyrus is much rubbed and stained, and the correctness of the reading μηρο[φ]ίοις Meχ[ι]π is open to grave doubts, for the vestiges of the supposed μ of μεχ, which is the clearest of the letters, suggest rather η or κ. The traces of the other letters are very slight, and palaeographically Me[σ]ο[φ]ί ρι η[η] would be possible, though ρ is less suitable than ιχ; but ηι is not necessary (though cf. 93. 6), and, since the equation of Gorgias to Mesore only five years later is certain from Rev. Laws lvi. 4-5, to read Mesor[φ]ί here would produce a most serious inconsistency; cf. App. i. pp. 339-40. For the spelling Meχιρ at this period cf. 34. 2, 51. 6, &c.

8. The name of this village is spelled Μουχιναρω in 53. The Μουχλώρ of P. Oxy. 491. 3 may be identical.
10. Mnason was most probably the brother of Timocrates.

12. It is noteworthy that although the agreement was drawn up in a village of the Oxyrhynchite nome, the case was to be tried at Heracleopolis, as also in 30. 14 and 93. 3. The two latter papyri are not known to be Oxyrhynchite, but 93 was probably written in that nome like the other documents from Mummy A 9. The fact that in all three instances Heracleopolis is specified as the scene of the trial may be a mere chance, but it suggests the possibility that for judicial purposes the two nomes were combined under a single administration. There is evidence that in the time of Psammetichus Heracleopolis was the centre of government for Upper and Middle Egypt (Griffith, Demotic Papyri of the John Rylands Library, pp. 75 sqq.); and the city may well have still retained some of its pre-eminence in the early Ptolemaic period.

13. Κροσίσπου: cf. l. 21, where it seems more natural that the name of the strategus should be given than that of a πράκτωρ, and something more than [Κροσίσπου] is necessary to fill the space. Moreover, there are very few possible names ending in -ισπους, and that the first letters of one of them should occur in the name added above l. 13 seems to be more than a mere coincidence. In 93 also the judge was to be the strategus, and it is to that official that the earlier Roman examples of similar undertakings are addressed.

14. For the active ἤφηγησεν cf. the use of διεγγαλῶν in 41. 4, &c. The superfluous εν is apparently due to a confusion on the part of the scribe, who also originally omitted the σ. ἤφηγησεν can hardly be read, and besides gives a wrong sense.

15. The meaning probably is that the debt was κατὰ συγγραφήν (cf. 30. 5, 15). Clearness has been rather sacrificed to compression.

19. ἐπίδεικτα: cf. 32. 9, note. For τὰ γυνῶνα cf. 111. 33–4, where they amount to 30 drachmae 1½ obols on a principal sum of 50 dr.

21. Cf. note on l. 13. ἄλλως, of course, does not imply that Apollonius was himself a ἄρηστος, but is an example of a common idiom.

93. Contract of Surety.

Mummy A 9.

9·5 x 11 cm. About B.C. 250.

Conclusion of a contract of surety similar in character to 92, but following a different formula. By its terms Diodorus, the surety, undertook to produce his friend on a given date before the strategus, but the nature of the case at issue is not stated as in 92. Some kind of inquiry was evidently to be held; but that any civil action had been instituted is doubtful, and the agreement is perhaps more likely to have been made with an official than with the plaintiff in a suit. The person for whom security is given may have been in a similar situation to that of the δοκιμαστής in 41, or of the prisoner released on bail in P. Oxy. 259. The papyrus most probably belongs to the reign of Philadelphus, and is likely to have been written in the Oxyrhynchite nome; cf. 92. 12, note.

σοχωίς Διοδώρῳ Στρατάωνος Πέρσηί τῆς
HIBEH PAPYRI

επιγονής ἐγγύου μονής ἐφ’ ὑπὶ παρέ-
ξεται αὐτὸν ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει ἐν
τῷ ἐμφανεί ἔξω ἱερῷ καὶ πάσης
5 σκέψης ἐπὶ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ μηνός
Φαρμοδίῃ τῇ ἐν τοῦ ὁ[ντοῦ ἐτοὺς
ἐὰν δὲ ἀποκαταστήσῃ . . . . .
Διονύσιον ἀκυροὶς ἑτο . . . .
λοι, ἐ[ά]υ δὲ μη [ἀποκαταστήσῃ εἰς ἐκ-
10 τεισιν ἡ διάγγεισίς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐσ-
τω πρὸς βασιλικά.

‘... to Diodorus son of Straton, Persian of the Epigone, who is surety for appearance on condition that he shall produce him at Heracleopolis openly, outside of a temple or any other shelter, before the strategus on the 13th of the month Pharmouthi of the same year. If he cause Dionysius to appear (?), proceedings against him shall be invalid; but if he fail to cause him to appear for payment, decision about his case shall be made with reference to the royal decrees.’

1. The first letters of the line suggest only a proper name. How the dative Διονύσιος was governed is doubtful; perhaps ἐνέγυσεν or παρέδωκεν preceded.
2. ἐγγύοι μονής: cf. 41. 5 διεγγυότατα . . . παραμονής.
3-5. Cf. P. Tebt. 210, which may now be read ἔξω ἱερῷ βωμῷ τεμένους σκέψης πάσης (with probably ἐ[τί τῶν τὰ]ποιν preceding), and P. Oxy. 785 παρέδωκα ἐν τῶι ἐμφανεί ἐκτὸς ἱερῶν βωμῶν κ.τ.λ. These instances offer a good example of the persistence of such formulae. The elaborate explanation of ἀκυροὶν παντὸς κυριόνου in B. G. U. 1053. ii. 4 sqq. is couched in somewhat similar language.

7-9. The restoration of these lines depends upon the identity of Dionysius, who may have been either the person admitted to bail or the person permitting bail to be given. In the former case Διονύσιος or εἰς ἐκτίσια (cf. l. 9), in the latter αὐτὸν πρὸς may be read. ἡ ἔφωνος or some equivalent word is required with ἀκυροὶς ἑτο, but this cannot be put into l. 7, since πρὸς Διονύσιον not Δομήνιον would be expected. The syllable at the beginning of l. 9 may be the termination of a name in the dative, but it does not seem to be the same as that in l. 1. For ἀποκαταστήσῃ cf. P. Oxy. 259. 7.

10-1. Cf. the common phrase ὁ βασιλεῖς περὶ αὐτῶν (κ.τ.λ.) διαγγέλεται, e.g. P. Amh. 29. 18. πρὸς βασιλικά, which is found also in 94. 3 and 15. 95. 14. and 124-6 in connexion with πράξεις or πράσεως, is apparently only a rather more general equivalent of κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα.

94. Contract of Surety.

Mummy 18. 19 X 8 cm. b.c. 258-7 (257-6).

The two following texts are also contracts of surety, but of a kind of which examples belonging to this period are extant. The persons for whom surety is here given were contractors for the collection of taxes, as in P. Petrie III. 57
94. CONTRACTS

Contraction (a), (b), 58 (c), (d). The name of the tax in the present instance is unfortunately lost. The contractor was Semphtheus, a brewer, but since the amount involved is only 10 drachmae for a whole year, the tax is not likely to have been the \( \zeta \nu \eta \rho \alpha \) at a considerable village such as Tholthis, unless Semphtheus was one of a large company, of which there is no indication. In P. Petrie III. 58 (d) the sum is also small, 20 drachmae. The sureties, two in number, were military settlers. Prefixed to the agreement is what appears to be an abstract of the contents, as in some other early Ptolemaic papyri (cf. 98, P. Petrie III. 58 (d), &c.), and in many of the later period.

\[
\text{[......] (δραχμῶν ?) i αύ[t]\lambda[έκτων ἐπὶ πᾶσι}
\text{[τοῖς ὑπάρ]|χουσιν αὐτῶι, κα[ι] ἢ πρᾶξι}
\text{[πρὸς βασιλικὰ]κά.}
\]

\[\text{[βασιλεύοντ]ος Πτολεμαίου [τοῦ Πτο-}
\text{5 [λεμαίου Σω]τήρος (έτους) κη ἐφ' ἵ[ρ]ος}
\text{[...... τ]οῦ Δυκίγου Ἀλεξάνδρου}
\text{[καὶ θεὸν 'Α]δέλφον κανη[ρ][]ου 'Αρο[ων-}
\text{[ς Φιλαδέ]λφου Νῦμφης τῆς Μάγονος}
\text{[......] κ]ὴ ἐν Θώλθει. ἐγγυνος ε[ἰς}
\text{10 [ἐκτεισιν] Σεμφθέως Ὕρου ξυτοποιοῦ}
\text{[κόμης Θώ]λθεως καθὰ ἐξ[ε]λαβεν πα-}
\text{[ρά]..... [ς οἰκονόμου ξοιδ[.]....[.]βο.].....}
\text{[......] εἰς τὸ κή (έτος) Πο[λ][υκλῆς Θραῖς]
\text{[τῶν Ζωίλου (δραχμῶν)] δέκα ἀνατ[τιλὲ]κτων, κα[ι]}
\text{15 [ἤ πρᾶξις πρὸς βασιλικὰ ἐπὶ πᾶσι] τοῖς ὑπάρχου-}
\text{[στ. (2nd hand)..... Κυρ[η]ναίος ἱδιώτης τῶν Ζ[ωί]-
\text{[γυνώματι. Πο[λ][υκλῆς Θραῖς ἱδιώτης τῶν Ζωίλου χείρο-
\text{[γραφὼ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ὦτι ἐγγυνᾶται εἰς ἐκτεισιν ἕμεθε·}
\text{[α "Ωρου ἐκ Θόλτιος δραχμῶν δέκα κατὰ τὸ σύμ-}
\text{20 [βολον τοῦτο. ]}
\]

4–20. 'In the 28th year of the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy Soter, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being ... son of Lucinus, the canephorus of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Nympha daughter of Magon, ... 27th, at Tholthis. Polycles, Thracian of the troop of Zoilus, is surety on behalf of Semphtheus son of Horus, brewer of the village of Tholthis, in accordance with his contract made with ... oeconomus, for the ...
the 28th year, for payment of 10 drachmae, about which there is no dispute; and execution shall be made with reference to the royal decrees, at the risk of all his property. (Signed) I... Cyrenean, private of the troop of Zoilus, am surety together with him. I, Polycles, Thracian, private of the troop of Zoilus, attest on his behalf that he is surety for Sem-phleus son of Horus, of Tholthis, for payment of 10 drachmae, in accordance with this deed.

2. ἑισδήκεισα: cf. l. 15 and note on 93. 10-1.
3. Ποτδειμίων τοῦ Ποτδειμίου Σωτῆρος: this formula replaced Ποτδειμίων τοῦ Ποτδειμίου καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος (cf. e.g. 85) in the 27th year (Rev. Laws i. 1 and introd. pp. xix sqq.); the formula in the early part of the reign was Ποτδειμίων τοῦ Ποτδειμίου simply (cf. 97 and 99), and of this the latest extant example is of 100. 8, written in the 19th year, in which the change to the second formula took place; cf. 100, introd.
4. The word following οἰκονόμοι may be a place-name, but the name of the tax would be expected. Neither ἤντιμος nor ὀδηγοχιτός can be read.
5. Θεόλατρος: cf. 62. 9 Θεόλατρα. Elsewhere (e.g. 55. 2) this village is spelled Θεόλατρα.
6. Below this line are some marks in fainter ink which could be read ἣ / ἀ / κ; but they are more likely to be either part of a line in demotic or blottings from another document.

95. **Contract of Surety.**

**Mummy A 6.**

**Breadth 11.1 cm.**

**B.c. 256 (255).**

An agreement of surety for a tax-farmer similar to 94 (cf. introd.), but with some peculiar features. The person for whom security was given was not himself the principal contractor, but apparently occupied a secondary position by an arrangement with the principal. The tax was the '24th upon four-footed animals at Oxyrhynchus,' which is not known from other sources. Perhaps this was an export duty, which in the case of wine at any rate, as is shown by 80, was at the rate of ½ of the value. But the name is hardly a natural one for a customs duty, although such duties, in the Roman period at least, are now shown by P. Brit. Mus. 929 and 1107 to have been computed upon the number of laden animals, not the quantity which each carried. An alternative is to make this 24th a general impost on property in four-footed animals, the φόνος προβίτων, which is known from an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus to have existed in the third century B.C., being perhaps a branch of it. A tax of ½ without further qualification occurs in 112 and 132; cf. 112. 38, note.

The papyrus is broken into two pieces, and two or three lines are missing in the middle, besides minor defects.

**Βασιλεῖας ὁ τολμημίων καὶ τοῦ Ποτδειμίου Σωτῆρος ἤτοις καθ ἐφ᾽ ἰερέως Ἀντίοχου τοῦ . . . 'Ηλεξάν-**
In the 29th year of the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy Soter, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being Antiochus son of . . . , the canephorous of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Demonica daughter of Philon, on the 24th of the month Pauni, at Oxyrhynchus above Memphis. Pas . . . son of . . . onis . . . is surety on behalf of . . . of the Oxyrhynchite nome, for the 24th upon four-footed animals at the city of Oxyrhynchus, in accordance with . . . 's agreement for the security of the person who contracted for the 24th in the 29th year with Apollonius the dioecetes, at the risk of all his property, for the payment of . . . drachmae about which there is no dispute, and the execution shall be made with reference to the royal decrees.'

2. The name of the priest in dem. P. Leyden 379 is read by Revillout as 'Antimachus son of Cebes,' which our papyrus shows to be inaccurate. The first name is 'Antiochos,' and we cannot reconcile the vestiges of the second with 'Kebitos.' The last letter is, however, probably s rather than v, and the termination may be -tʰ[s] or -tʰ[s].

5. ὑπερθέν Μέμ[φ]ιοι: the Heracleopolite name is similarly described as being ὑπερ Μέμφιν in papyri of the Roman period, e.g. C. P. R. 6. 4.; cf. p. 8.

7. τεταρταεικοστής: τεταρταεικοστής would be the normal form at this period; cf. e.g. P. Petrie I. 25 (2) 2.

9. The fact that ἐξελάβεν was first written (cf. 94. 11) shows that the subject of τυπάξατο is the person whose name is lost between l. 6. and 7. and for whom security was given. σκέπην at the end of the line is extremely doubtful; ἐπί may be ἀπό, and three letters instead of two may precede.

10. Ἀπολλωνίοι: cf. 44. 3, note.

11-2. Πασ . . . may be either the name of the surety, whose description is then continued in the next line, or the name of the ἐγκαθίστης, in which case that of the surety would come in l. 12, Λε . . . . The addition above l. 11 looks more like an intentional insertion than ink which has blotted off from another papyrus. If it were ignored Πασι'γ Θεόνος would be a possible reading.

RENUNCIATION OF CLAIMS.

Mummy A 17.  Fr. (a) 10 x 11.7 cm.  B.C. 259 (258).

An agreement in duplicate between two military settlers at Phebichis, one of whom at least was a Jew, for the settlement of a dispute between them, the nature of which is not specified. Each of the two parties withdraws his claims against the other; and the bulk of the contract is the earliest Greek example of the stereotyped formula found in P. Tor. 4, an agreement of a similar character (ὀμολογεῖν συνελέυσθαι), and in cessions of land and repayments of loans, e.g. P. Grenf. II. 25, 26, 28, 30. The title of the agreement is συγγραφὴ ἀποστασίων, which throws some light on the meaning of the latter term; cf. l. 3, note. At the end are the signatures of the witnesses, whose names are also given on the verso and who seem to have been seven in number; cf. note on l. 13. The papyrus is in three fragments which do not join, and both copies of the contract are very imperfectly preserved; but by combining them the body of the document emerges nearly complete. The writing is across the fibres.

[Basileuontos Ptolemaion tōu Ptolemaion k]ai tōu vīōu Ptolemaion] étois ēktou kai eikostou
[ēph' ieréos 22 letters Ἀλεξάνδρου kai Ætov 'Αδελφ(ῶ)ν κανηφόρου Ἀρσινόης
[δέ]λφou 22 letters μηνὸς Δ]υστρου em Φεβ[ξ][χι του Κωιτ[ου] synygraphī
[Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ 15 letters τῆς ἐπιγονῆς και 'Αλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου
'Ἰουδαίου μετά
5 [ 20 letters τῶν Ζωίλου δεκαι[κοῦ. ὁμολογοῦσιν διαλεύσθαι πρὸς ἄλ-
l ylabelous πάι-
[τα τά ἐγκλήματα περὶ δὸν ἐνεκάλεσαν ἄλληλοις τῶν ἐπάνω χρόνων, μή
έ[ξ]σ[τω] δὲ Ἀνδρονίκω
[ἐπεθείμ.] ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου μηδ' Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπὶ Ἀνδρονίκου μηδ' ἄλλωι
μηδ' ἄλλωι
[ρέσει μηδεμία περὶ μηθενὸς τῶν προγεγομένων αὐτοῖς πρὸς ἄλληλους
έ]γ[κ]καλ[μάτων] ἐως
[ἐτοὺς ἐκτοῦ καὶ εἰκοστοῦ καὶ μηνὸς Δύστρου.] ἐὰ[ν] δὲ ἐπέλθῃ ὁποῖ[τ]ερος
[. .] [. .]. ἐπὶ τῶν ἐτε-
10 [ρον ἡ τ' ἐφόδος τῷ ἐπιπορευομένῳ ἀκυρος...] τ. ἐστ[ω, ἐ]κτεισάτω [δ' ὁ ἐπί]πορευόμεν[ος] ὦι ἔναν
[ἐπέλθη 33 letters ἡ συγγραφὴ ἤδε κυρία ἐστο πανταχοῦ ὅτι ἄν ἐπί-
[φέρθηκ. 24 letters μά]ρτυρ[ες] Νικόβιος Χαλκιδεύς, Διονυσόδωρος
Κρομνί-
[της? 32 letters ]. ουσι τῶν Ζ[ωίλου, Στράτων . . . . ]κλεοὺς Ἐρυ-
[ 10 „ συγγραφοφύλαξ Διονυσόδωρος.]}

[βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ τοῦ νιῶν Πτολεμαίον ἔτου[ς]
ἐ]κτοῦ καὶ εἰκοσ-
[τοῦ ἑφ' ἱερῶς 22 letters Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἀ]δελφῶν κανηφόρου Ἀρσι-
[νός Φιλαδέλφου 22 letters μηνὸς Δύστρου ἐ]μ Φεβίχι τοῦ Κ[ω]ροῦ.
20 [συγγραφὴ ἀποστασίων Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ 15 letters τ]ῆς ἐπιγονῆς καὶ Ἀλεξ-
-άνδρου
tοῦ Ἀνδρον[ίκου Ἰ]ουδαίου με[τά 20 letters τῶν] Ζω[ίλου δεκανικοῦ. ὅμολο-
γοῦσιν διαλείπονται πρὸς ἀλ[λα]ῆς πάντα τὰ ἑγκλήματα πε]ρ[ι] δὲν ἐνε-
kάλεσαν ἀλλήλοις
μην Ἀλεξά-
-νδρων ἐπ'[Ἀνδρονίκου μην] ἀλλ[ῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν] ἐπιφέροντο[ῡ] τι ἑγκλήματα πα-
παρευ[ρέσει μηθεῦ] [ἀι] περὶ μηθεῦδος
καὶ εἰκοστοῦ
κα[ὶ μηνὸς Δ]ύστρου. ἐὰν δ[ὲ ἐπέλθη ὅποτερος . . . . ] ἐπὶ τῶν ἔτερον ἡ
τ' ἐφόδος τῶι
ἐ[πιπορευομένωι ἀκυρο[. . . . ἐστω, ἐκτεισάτω δ' ὃ ἐ]πιπορευόμενοι ὦι ἔναν
ἐπέλ-
[θη 33 letters ἡ συγγραφὴ ἤδε] κυρία ἐστο πανταχοῦ ὅτι ἄν ἐπι-
[φέρθηκ. 24 letters μάρτυρ[ες] Νικόβιος Χαλκιδεύς, Διονυσόδωρος
30 [Κρομνίτ[ης 34 letters ]οι τῶν Ζωίλου, Στράτων
[. . . . κλεοὺς Ἐρυθρ[ίτ̃ης 28 letters ]οτης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς λειτουργός,
[ 48 letters ] Διοξάνδρου Βοιώτ[ιος τῆς ἐπιγονῆς
[λειτουργός. 30 letters συγγρα]φοφύλαξ Διονυσόδωρος.]}
On the verso

\[ \text{Ἀνδρονίκο[ν]} \]

\[ \ldots \varepsilon \tau \ldots \]  

\[ \Delta \gamma \omega \nu\mu\sigma \theta \iota\nu\iota \iota \iota \]

\[ \text{Ἀλεξάνδρο[ν]} \]

\[ \Phi \iota \lambda\omega \nu\iota\sigma \]

\[ \Sigma\theta\tau\acute{a}t\omega\nu\sigma \]

7. \( \eta \mu \delta \ldots \alpha \uomicron \omicron \omicron \omega \) above the line.

10. \( \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \varepsilon \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \) above the line.

27. \( \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \varepsilon \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \) above \( \varepsilon \omicron \omicron \) erased.

'In the 26th year of the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy and his son Ptolemy, … being priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi, the canephorus of Arsinoe Philadelphus being …, in the month Dystrus, at Φεβίχις in the Koite district. Contract of renunciation between Andronicus … of the Epigone, and Alexander son of Andronicus, Jew, with … of Zoilus’ troop, decurion. They agree that they have settled all the claims which they made against each other in former times; and Andronicus has no right to proceed against Alexander nor Alexander against Andronicus, nor may any other party on their behalf bring any claim on any pretext with respect to any of the claims which they made against each other up to the 26th year and the month Dystrus. If either of the two parties proceed against the other, both the act of aggression shall be invalid for the person making it, and the aggressor shall forfeit to the injured party a fine of … drachmae. This contract is valid wheresoever it be produced … The witnesses are Nicobius, Chalcidian, Dionysodorus, Cromnian, …, all three … of Zoilus’ troop, Straton son of … cles, Erythrian (?), … of the Epigone, on special duty, … son of Dioxander, Boeotian of the Epigone, on special duty. The keeper of the contract is Dionysodorus.'

3. \( \sigma \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma \varphi \alpha \varphi \acute{a} \tau \tau \sigma \sigma \omega \iota \iota \omega \) : this expression has hitherto always been found in connexion with the translations of demotic deeds concerning the renunciation of rights of ownership, the \( \sigma \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma \varphi \alpha \varphi \acute{a} \tau \tau \sigma \sigma \omega \iota \iota \omega \) being contrasted with the \( \pi \rho \acute{a} \varsigma \), the contract concerning the receipt of the purchase-price; cf. Wilcken, Archiv. II. p. 143 and pp. 388-9. The close similarity between the formula of 96 and that of cessions of land (e. g. P. Grenf. II. 25) fully supports Wilcken’s explanation of the distinction.

3. \( \Delta \acute{a} \acute{i} \sigma \tau \rho \omega \) : this month corresponded approximately to Mecheir in the year after that in which 96 was written; cf. App. i.

4. Probably \( \text{Ἰονωμίου τῆς Ἐπιγόνης} \), even if this Andronicus is not identical with the father of Alexander.

9. The word following \( \acute{o} \rho \acute{o} \tau \acute{e} \tau \rho \epsilon \varsigma \) is not \( \alpha \iota \tau \omega \), and in l. 26 there is certainly not room for 8 letters between \( \acute{o} \rho \acute{o} \tau \acute{e} \tau \rho \epsilon \varsigma \) and \( \epsilon \tau \iota \iota \), the restoration being in fact there sufficient without supposing the loss of any word after \( \acute{o} \rho \acute{o} \tau \acute{e} \tau \rho \epsilon \varsigma \). It is quite possible that in l. 9 \( \acute{o} \rho \acute{o} \tau \acute{e} \tau \rho \epsilon \varsigma \) was written twice over by mistake. P. Tor. 4 has \( \acute{e} \tau \rho \acute{o} \tau \varsigma \, \tau \iota \iota \iota \alpha \iota \tau \omega \) at this point.

10. \( \acute{a} \kappa \iota \rho \\varepsilon \sigma \tau \omega \) would be expected on the analogy of e.g. P. Grenf. II. 25. 20; but the traces at the beginning of the line are inconsistent with \( \alpha \kappa \iota \rho \) and the initial lacuna should contain about 40 letters. Either, therefore, a word was inserted between \( \acute{a} \kappa \iota \rho \) and \( \varepsilon \sigma \tau \omega \), or a longer verb than \( \varepsilon \sigma \tau \omega \) was employed. The supposed \( \epsilon \) of \( \varepsilon \sigma \tau \omega \) is not very satisfactory.

11-2. \( \epsilon \tau \iota \acute{\varphi} \acute{e} \rho \acute{r} \rho \eta \mu \iota \rho \alpha \) would be expected to end the body of the contract; cf. 90. 20, 91. 13. Perhaps a blank space was left after it both here and in l. 29; or possibly \( \kappa \iota \, \tau \approx \tau \iota \iota \, \tau \acute{e} \acute{\varphi} \acute{e} \rho \acute{r} \rho \eta \mu \iota \rho \alpha \) was added, as in papyri of a later period, e. g. P. Oxy. 269. 13. The reading \( \mu \alpha \rho \gamma \iota \eta \iota \iota \iota \) is, however, very doubtful, and it is not quite certain that \( \text{Νικόβις} \) is nominative. In two instances at least (11. 13 and 15) the fathers’ names are given; but on the other hand \( \kappa \rho \omega \mu \omega \nu \) suggests an adjective meaning ‘from Kromna’ (in Paphlagonia) rather than
a personal name, and cf. 91. 1.4–6, where the father’s name is omitted in the case of the first witness, but not in that of the 3rd, 4th, and 5th.

13. ἐν τῷ is the termination of some military title not found elsewhere in these papyri. οἱ τρις probably preceded, if the name of a third witness occurred in the lacuna, as its length suggests. That the witnesses to this contract were seven—not, as usual, six—in number, is further indicated by the list of them on the verso, where the συγγραϕοφυλάξ Dionysodorus does not occur among the six mentioned. Probably his name followed next after that of the two principals of the contract, as is the case with the συγγραϕοφυλάξ in the lists of names on the verso of P. Tebt. 104 and 105. Seven witnesses are apparently found in 60 also; cf. 90. 22, note.

Ἐρυθήσις, if correct, probably means a settler from Ἐρυθήα ἀκρα in the Cyrenaica.

14. λειτουργός, which at this period can mean simply a ‘workman’ (e.g. P. Petrie III. 46 (3). 5), is a novel title of a military settler. Probably λειτουργός has no definitely military significance, but this settler had some special duties assigned to him. The tax called λειτουργικὸν which was paid by Ptolemaic cleruchs (P. Petrie III. 110, P. Tebt. 102. 3) may have been in lieu of performing these duties; cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 382. For λειτουργίας imposed on Greek settlers cf. 78.

16. There was very likely a blank space before συγγραϕοφυλάξ both here and in l. 33.

---

IX. RECEIPTS

97. Receipt.

Mummy 5. 8 x 7.8 cm. B.C. 279–8 (278–7) or 282–1 (281–0). Plate X.

Commencement of an acknowledgement of receipt, dated either in the 4th or the 7th year (cf. note on l. 2) of Philadelphus. In either case this is the earliest date in that reign yet found in a Greek papyrus, and ranks next in antiquity to that of 84 (a), which came from the same mummy. There is much similarity in the handwriting of the two documents. On the verso is an impression of Δαισίων from another papyrus.

Βασιλεύοντος Π[τολεμα]ίου
tοῦ Πτο[λεμαί]ου (ἐτους) ζ ἐφ' ιε-
ρέως A[μ]ναίον τοῦ Ἀπ[ο]λ-
λοῦ μην[ῶ]ι Ἀπελλαίου κτ.
5 ὡ]μολογεῖ ἀπέχειν K . . [.
[. . .]οῖ τ[ῶν Ἀ-
2. The figure is broken and may be read either as δ or ζ, according as some traces of ink to the left of the diagonal stroke are regarded as accidental or not.


4. Apellaeus probably corresponded approximately to Mesore or Thoth at this period cf. App. i. p. 339.

6. A blank space is left for Κ...’s nationality.

---

98. RECEIPT OF A CAPTAIN.

Mummy 117. 22.3 x 9.8 cm. B.C. 251 (250).

Acknowledgement by a captain of a transport that he had received 4800 artabae of barley to be delivered at Alexandria; cf. 39, 100, 156 (which was found with 98), and P. Petrie II. 48. The contract is preceded by a short abstract of its contents, as in 94.

[... . . . . . . (έτος)] λδ Μεσορή [κθ. ὤμολο-
γει [Διούνσιος, ν[αύ]κληρος ἐμ[β]ε[θ]α[λ]ης-
[θα διὰ Νε[χ]θ[ε][μ]βέους τοῦ παρὰ τῶν βα[σιλ]ε-
[κῶν γραμμ][[θ]α]τέων εἰς κέρ(κουρον) Ξεινοδόκου [καὶ]
5 Ἀ[λεξάνδρου] κριθ[ῶν] (ἀρτάβας) 'Δω.

[βασιλεόντως Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαί[ου]
[Σω]τήρος (έτος) λδ ἐφ’ ἱερείως Νεοπτολέμου
toῦ Φριξίου Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν
'Α[θ]έλφιων καὶ[πόροι] Ἀρσινόης Φιλαδέλ-
10 φοῦ Ἀρσινόης τῆς Νικόλαου μηνὸς
Μεσορῆ κθ. [ὁ]μολογεῖ Διούνσιος
ναύκληρος ἐμβεβλησθα[ί] εἰς κέρ(κουρον)
Ξεινοδόκου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐφ’ [οδ] [κ(υ)βερνήτης]
'Εκτεύρις Πάσιτος Μεμφίτης διὰ
15 Νε[χ]θεμβέους τοῦ παρὰ τῶν βασιλικῶν
gραμματέων ὡστε εἰς ἈΛ[ε]ξάνδρειαν
eἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν ἐν δείγματι [κριθῶν}
271 The 34th year, Mesore 24. Dionysius, captain, acknowledges that he has embarked through Nechthembes the agent of the basilicogrammateis on the boat of Xenodocus and Alexander 4800 artabae of barley.

In the 34th year of the reign of Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy Soter, the priest of Alexander and the gods Adelphi being Neoptolemus son of Phrixius, the canephorous of Arsinoë Philadelphus being Arsinoë daughter of Nicolaus, the 24th of the month Mesore. Dionysius, captain, acknowledges that he has embarked upon the boat of Xenodocus and Alexander, the pilot on which is Ecteuris son of Pasis, of Memphis, through Nechthembes the agent of the basilicogrammateis, for transport to the royal granary at Alexandria, with a sample, 4800 artabae of barley, being pure, unadulterated and sifted grain, by the measure and smoothing-rod which he himself brought from Alexandria, with just measurement, and I make no complaint.'

1. Even if (τροις) was written out, the space at the beginning of the line would not be filled. Perhaps ἀντέγραφον preceded.

4. For κέρκουρος cf. 82. 6. The abbreviation consists of a tall stroke slightly thickened at the top and joined to an ε, and might be read ὑ( ); but this suggests nothing, and the first stroke is really too large for an ι. Moreover, the abbreviation κέρ( ), more plainly written, occurs in some unpublished similar documents from Tebtunis. The same compendium is apparently repeated in l. 12 below, with a larger curve for the ι.

13. ἐφ' ὑ[ε] [ἐν(Βερυήτης)] : the reading of the last word is very doubtful, but cf. 39. 5-6, P. Petrie III. 107(ε). 4, &c. Xenodocus and Alexander were the owners of the boat, and Dionysius the acting principal. A similar distinction between ράκληρος and owner occurs in the Tebtunis papyri referred to in the note on l. 4, and P. Magd. 37. 1-2.

16. P. Petrie II. 48. 4-5 may now be restored on this analogy ὅστε [εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν εἰς τὸ βασιλείου], ἐμπιέσθησα, having preceded at the end of the previous line.


21. σὺ[θ]' ἐν ἑγκαλῶ : cf. 87. 13-4 and P. Petrie II. 48. 10. The same phrase also occurs at the end of some of the Tebtunis receipts referred to above.

99. Receipt for Rent.

Mummy Λ 17. 14·5 × 9 cm. b. c. 270 (269). Plate X.

An acknowledgement of the payment of rent, partly in olyra partly in a money equivalent of wheat, by two γεωργοί; cf. 100. The land in question seems to have belonged to one of the βασιλικοί κληροί (85. 13 ; cf. 52. 26, note),
i. c. to be really βασιλική γῆ; cf. note on l. 8. The protocol contains the earliest extant mention of the association of the gods Adelphi with Alexander in the Alexandrian cult, and the latest instance of the absence of the canephorus of Arsinoë. A comparison of this passage with 110. 40 and 44 shows that the association of the gods Adelphi took place between the 13th and 15th years of Philadelphus; cf. App. iii. p. 368. The canephorus first appears in a papyrus of the 19th year; cf. App. iii. p. 369. 128 is perhaps part of a duplicate of 99.

6. Δαισίων: this month probably corresponded in the 15th year of Philadelphus to parts of Phanemoth and Phormouthi; cf. App. i. p. 339.

8. Τέλεστον: cf. 85. 13–4 Φαινοµένον κλήµαν βασιλικών τῶν Τέλεστον, and note. Telestes was probably captain of a troop, but what position this ὀικόνυµος Τέλεστον occupied is not clear. If he was an ordinary ὀικόνυµος, Τελεστον would on the analogy of e.g. 169 be expected to refer to the district under his control, and it is possible that Τελεστον here and τῶν Τελεστῶν in 85. 14 means the district which was or had been governed by a military official called Telestes; cf. the use of the military term ἀγηµα as the name of a topharchy in
101. 3. On the other hand, the mention of Paramenes' nationality suggests that he was not an ordinary ὀἰκουμένιος, but a military settler acting as agent for his captain, Telestes. If so, however, the rent of Protogenes' κληρὸς would seem to be paid not to the State, but to the leader of a troop of military settlers, whereas it is more satisfactory to regard Protogenes' κληρὸς as one of the κληρον βασιλικοὶ which are so often met with in the volume (cf. 52. 26, note). We prefer, therefore, to suppose that Paramenes was a government official.

10. The supposed ο of δρούς is very doubtful, and δρυς (or ἀρυς) can equally well be read, and might be combined with the following ες as one name; but cf. 100. 11 εἰς τὰ ἐκφύμα

14. 2 drachmae 1 obol for an artaba of wheat is slightly higher than the ordinary rate (2 dr.) found at this period; cf. 84(a). 8–9, note.

100. Account. Receipt for Rent.

Mummy 5. 14 × 7.9 cm. B.C. 267 (266). Plate X (recto).

On one side of this papyrus is a short account in drachmae, on the other an acknowledgement by an agent of Xanthus that he had received from Euphranor some barley which was the rent of a κληρὸς, and was being forwarded by river; cf. introd. to 39, where the same persons are also concerned, and 98. It is not quite certain which side is recto and which verso; but the smoother side seems to be that occupied by the account, which will then be earlier than B.C. 267 (266). In any case, however, the interval between the two documents is small, since they were almost certainly written by the same person, whose hand is a characteristic example of the more cursive writing of this period (see Plate X). The receipt on the verso was not completed, and blank spaces were left for some of the details. The writing on both sides is across the fibres.

The most interesting point in the papyrus is the date in ll. 8–9, where the absence of καὶ τὸν νῦν Πτολεμαῖον shows that Euergetes (if he is meant by τὸν νῦν in that formula) was still not generally known to have been associated in the sovereignty on Phaophi 11 of the 19th year (Dec. 6, B.C. 267 if it was a revenue year, probably B.C. 266 if it was regnal; cf. p. 367). On the other hand, according to a Louvre demotic papyrus (Revillout, Chrest. dém. pp. 231–40), the association had taken place before Athur 30 (Jan. 24) in the 19th year (B.C. 266 or 265). Hence, assuming that our papyrus may be trusted—and in the absence of other evidence there is no ground for doubting its accuracy—the date of the association can now be more narrowly determined than previously. If the 19th year in 100 and the demotic papyrus is in both cases a revenue year, the limits are Dec. 6, 267, and Jan. 24, 266; if it is in both cases a regnal year, they are
HIBEH PAPYRI

Dec. 6, 266, and Jan. 24, 265; if the 19th year in 100 is a revenue year and that in the demotic a regnal (which is the most likely hypothesis), the limits are Dec. 6, 267, and Jan. 24, 265; the converse hypothesis would produce an inconsistency between the two papyri and need not be considered. Bouche-Leclercq (Hist. des Lagides, I. p. 184) rather arbitrarily adopts the year B.C. 268 as the terminus ante quem for the date of the association, a view which is no longer tenable.

Recto.

\[\text{[\upsilon]ερανήλωκας [κη,}
\text{[εἰς] τὸ τοῦ κομίζει}
\text{[πα]ρὰ τῶν τὰ ἀωλίας ε,}
\text{[κ]αι παρὰ τῆν κατάλ-}
\text{5 [λα]γὴν γ,}
\text{[τι]μὴν (ἀρτάβων) ≤ ἵ,}
\text{[κ] κ, λ(ουσαί) η.}

Verso.

Βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου
(ἐτοὺς) ιθ μηνὸς Παώφι ια. ἔχει Παούτης
10 ὁ σιτομέτρης Ξάνδρου παρ' Εὐφράντος ἐόρος
ἂντιπατροῦ εἰς τὰ ἐκφόρη τοῦ Ἀλε-,
Ξάνδρου κλῆρον εἰς τὸ ιθ (ἐτος) ἔξ Ἀνατίβων
κρίθω(ν) (ἀρτάβας ?) ἔσ πρ( ) εἰς βάριν ἔφ' ἵσ κτ.
βερνήτης ναύκληρος

1. ὁ ερανήλως: τὸ ἐπεραν(ήλως) occurs in the account on the verso of 112.
3. Λ' ἀωλίας is shown by Smyly in P. Petrie III. pp. 345 sqq. to have been a volume equal to the cube of which the side was a royal double cubit. Following the letter ε at the end of the line is a circular mark resembling that used as an abbreviation of π, and it would be possible to regard επ( ) as a participle governing τὰ ἀωλίας. But a 5 is much wanted here for the arithmetic, and the mark in question is somewhat indistinct and may be accidental. With the reading adopted in the text a participle must be supplied.

4. καταλαγή seems here to have much the same sense as ἐπαλαγή, a use of the word found also in classical writers.
6. (ἀρτάβων): sc. πηνοῦ possibly, 2 drachmae being the normal price of an artaba of wheat at this period; cf. note on 84 (ι). 8–9.

8–14. 'In the 19th year of the reign of Ptolemy son of Ptolemy, the 11th of the month Phaophi. Paoutes the corn-measurer of Xanthus has received from Euphranor
through Antipater for the rent of the holding of Alexander for the 19th year, from Anatieu (?), 30 artabae of barley, which have been embarked (?) upon the boat whose pilot is and whose captain is .

10. The space before στομάτρης was intended for a further specification of Paoutes, e.g. ἐν with a place-name.

11–2. The Ἀλεξάνδρου κλήρος recurs in 39. 9. 'Ἀνατεύ is apparently the name of a place, probably in the Κωίτης τόπος; cf. 39, introd.

13. The meaning of the abbreviation is obscure; the ρ (or i) is written through the π, which may also be read as μ. A participle would suit the sense.

14. This line was probably the last, but the margin below is not broad enough to be quite decisive.

101. RECEIPTS
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through Antipater for the rent of the holding of Alexander for the 19th year, from Anatieu (?), 30 artabae of barley, which have been embarked (?) upon the boat whose pilot is and whose captain is .

10. The space before στομάτρης was intended for a further specification of Paoutes, e.g. ἐν with a place-name.

11–2. The Ἀλεξάνδρου κλήρος recurs in 39. 9. 'Ἀνατεύ is apparently the name of a place, probably in the Κωίτης τόπος; cf. 39, introd.

13. The meaning of the abbreviation is obscure; the ρ (or i) is written through the π, which may also be read as μ. A participle would suit the sense.

14. This line was probably the last, but the margin below is not broad enough to be quite decisive.

101. RECEIPT FOR RENT.

Mummy 5. 13.7 x 9.9 cm. B.C. 261 (260).

A receipt, similar to 100, for a large quantity of barley delivered by Euphranor to a superior official as rent of cleruchic land; cf. introd. to 39.

’Ἐτος καὶ μηνὸς Τοῦβη. ἕξει
Λίβανος ὁ παρὰ Σέμνου σιτο-
λόγος τοῦ Ἀγήματος παρὰ
Εὐφράνορος ὑπὲρ Πλάτωνος
5 εἰς οἷς γεωργεὶ κλήρους βασιλικοὺς
Ἄρρητος ἐν Σισίνη ὑπὲρ
[. . . . . . .]οῦ εἰς τὸνα ᾠμαστί.
μέτρωι ἀνηλωτικοὶ κριθῶν ἀρτάβας ἐπτακοσίας
ἡγούμενα τέταρτας
10 ἡμισὺν τέταρτον ἡγοῦν.

8. μέτρωι ἀνηλωτικοὶ above the line.

‘The 24th year, in the month of Tubi. Libanus, agent of Semnus and sitologus of the *Agema*, has received from Euphranor on behalf of Platon for the royal holdings cultivated by Harendotes, at Sisine on account of . . . for the . . . 784 7/8 artabae of barley by the spending measure.’

2–3. σιτολόγος τοῦ Ἀγήματος: apart from the present passage ἀγήμα only occurs among papyri of this period in P. Petrie III. 11 and 12 in personal descriptions, e.g. 12. 16 Μάκεδων τῶν Πάτρων σύνταγμα τοῦ ἀγήματος. On that analogy τοῦ ἀγήματος here might be dissociated from σιτολόγος and explained as a description of Libanus. But this seems a strange addition after the specification of his office, and another explanation is suggested by a passage in C.P.R. 6. 3–4 δι’ ἐπιτηρητὼν ἀγορασμίας μερῶν τοπωρχίας Ἀγήματος τοῦ ὑπερ.
Mēμήν Ἡμαλεοπολίτην, Ἀγήματος there clearly designates a locality; and it is significant that the name is, most probably, the same as in our receipt (cf. 39, introd.). We are accordingly disposed to regard τῶν Ἀγήματος as a geographical term (with τόπος understood) defining the sphere of Libanus, which would be a perfectly natural addition. The origin of the term remains obscure; perhaps a large grant had been made in this neighbourhood to members of the bodyguard.

5. κλήρους βασιλείου: cf. 85. 13 and 52. 26, note.

7. The word lost at the beginning of the line is most probably the name of the place near which the κλήρος were situated, and at which the payment would be expected, whereas it was actually made at Sisine; cf. P. Petrie III. 78. 2 ἐν Ἀπειδῇ ὑπὲρ Ἀνωμαχίδος, &c. σμοῦ after τῶν is puzzling. The last is the only doubtful letter, and not more than two or three more are lost after it, if indeed there is anything missing at all. There may, however, have been an abbreviation, as in l. 5. A break occurs in the papyrus below this line, and it is possible that we are wrong in supposing the second fragment to join it directly, in which case l. 7 might end with αὐτῷ; but there is a stroke in the lower fragment which just suits the tail of the ν before εἰς. Perhaps εἰς τοὺς Ἀμάξιων (sc. κλήροις) should be read; cf. 117. 8 and 118. 2.

8. μέτρων ἄνθρωπικά: cf. 74. 2, note.

102. PAYMENT OF PHYSICIAN-TAX.

Mummy Λ. 12.3 x 16.5 cm. b.c. 248 (247).

An undertaking, addressed in duplicate to a physician by a military settler, to pay 10 artabae of olyra or 4 drachmae for the ιατρικόν of the 38th year of Philadelphus. This impost for the maintenance of public physicians occurs amongst other taxes levied by the State upon military settlers in P. Petrie III. 110 and 111, where 2 artabae of wheat are paid for it, and in 103. 9, where the charge is 5 artabae of olyra; but 102 is the only instance of the ιατρικόν being paid direct to the physician, though payments to ιατροί occur in private accounts of the Ptolemaic period, e.g. P. Tebt. 112. The note on the verso probably refers to the same transaction, in which a loan of some kind seems to have been involved. The writing is across the fibres.

[. . . . Κυρηνη]φ[αίνοι τῶν Ζωίλου ιδιώτης Εὐκάρπων] i ιατροὶ χαίρειν.
[τετακται (?) σο]ι άποδώσεων ὄλυρ(ῶν) (άρτάβασι) η ίδια χρημάτα τέσσαρα τὸ ιατρικόν.
[κών τῶν λη (έτους),] ταῦτας δὲ σοι ά(ποδώσω) έμ αμι ιασιών έαν δέ σοι] μη ά-
[ποδώ άποθήεσω] σο[ῦ] τιμήν τῆς άρτάβης ἐκάστης (δραχμάς) β. ερωσο. 5 []

(έτους) λέ Παύνι σ.
103. RECEIPTS

103. RECEIPT FOR PHYSICIAN-TAX AND POLICE-TAX.

Mummy 10.

12.4 × 7.3 cm.

B.C. 231 (230).

Receipt for the payment, on behalf of a military settler, probably in the Koûtûs tópos, of 5 artabae of olyra for the istorikûn, or tax for the maintenance of physicians, and 9 artabae for phylakostikûn, the police-tax; cf. introd. to 102.
and 105, and 165, a similar receipt issued to the same person. The reign is no doubt that of Euergetes; cf. 66-70 (b), which came from the same mummy.

(Ετους) ἵ Φαώφι β, δια(υρῶν) ἱδ.

Ἀπολλοφάνης Θε-
οφίλων χαίρειν. με-
μετρήμεθα παρά
5 Στρατίου ὑπὲρ
Διοδόρου Κεφάλλω-
νος δε(κανικοῦ) τῶν Ζωϊλου
διὰ κωμο(γραμματέως) Εὐπόλεως
(Ετουσ) ἵ Ιατρικῶν δια(υρῶν) ε,  
10 φυ(λακτικῶν) δια(υρῶν) ἐννέα, / δια(υρῶν) ἱδ.

ἐρρωστ. (Ετουσ) ἵ 
Φιαζόφι β.

'The 17th year, Phaophi 2: 14 artabae of olyra.
'Apollophanes to Theophilus, greeting. We have had measured out to us by Stratus on behalf of Diodorus son of Cephallon, decurion of Zoilus' troop, through the comogrammateus Eupolis for the 17th year, 5 artabae of olyra as the physician-tax and 9 artabae of olyra as the police-tax; total 14 artabae of olyra. Good-bye. 'The 17th year, Phaophi 2.'

1. The abbreviation of δια(υρῶν) here and in ll. 9-10 is a rounded λ surmounted by a small ο.
6-8. Diodorus and Eupolis reappear in 104 and 165. For the abbreviation of δεκανικός cf. 81. 16, note.

104. Receipt for various taxes.

Mummy 10. 8.9 × 7.3 cm. B.C. 225 (224).

A receipt in duplicate issued by Eupolis the comogrammateus to Diodorus (cf. 103) for the imposts called τριψαρχῆμα and διαχωμα, the police-tax (on which see 105, introd.), and the tax on horses. These four taxes are found together with some others in P. Petrie II. 39 (c). The horse-tax is there mentioned but once under the name φόρος ἵππωρ, the amount paid being lost. Here it is simply called ἵππωρ, and 1 drachma 5 obols are entered under that head. It belonged to the category of taxes on property, and was no doubt paid by
Diodorus on the horse which his military duties obliged him to keep. The meaning of τριηράρχημα and διάχωμα is unknown. Smyly is probably right (P. Petrie III. p. 277) in doubting whether the former has any naval signification, and in connecting it rather with the use of τριηράρχος in e.g. P. Petrie III. 43 (3). 21, where the word apparently means an overseer of workmen. In P. Petrie II. 39 (e) the sums paid for these two taxes are 5 drachmae and 4 drachmae 1 obol respectively. The corresponding amounts in 104 are 6 drachmae 4½ obols and 6 drachmae.

(Έτους) βκ Παυνι ι. ἔχει Εὐ-
πολις παρὰ Διοδόρου
eis tò βκ (ήτος) τριηράρχημα
[(δραχμὰς)] τ (τετράβολον) (ήμιωβέλιον), διάχωμα (δραχμὰς) Σ, 5 φυλακιτικὸν) (δραχμὰς) Σ, ἵππων (δραχμὴν) α (πεντώβολον).

(Έτους) κβ Παυνι ι. ἔχει Εὐ-
pολις παρὰ [Διοδόρου]
Κεφαλλωνο[ς εἰς] tò βκ [(ήτος)
τριηράρχημα (δραχμὰς) τ (τετράβολον) (ήμιωβέλιον),
10 [διάχωμα (δραχμὰς) Σ, φυλακιτικὸν) (δραχμὰς) Σ, ἵππων (δραχμὴν) α (πεντώβολον).]

' The 22nd year, Pauni 30. Eupolis has received from Diodorus for the 22nd year for τριηράρχημα 6 drachmae 4½ obols, for διάχωμα 6 drachmae, for police-tax 6 drachmae, for horse-tax 1 drachma 5 obols.'

1. βκ: other examples of this order are found e.g. in 110. 37, P. Petrie II. 13 (17). 3, P. Magd. 3. 3.
2. The omission of Κεφαλλωνος (cf. l. 8) was an oversight.

105. RECEIPTS

Mummy A 15. 7.1 × 7 cm. B.C. 228 (227).

A receipt for 2 artabae of wheat paid by a military settler belonging to the troop of Zoilus, probably at Phebichis, for the maintenance of the police. This impost is frequently mentioned in the Petrie papyri, where, besides the tax on land called φυλακιτικὸν γῆς (III. 112 (4). 3–8) or simply φυλακιτικὸν which
corresponds to the φυλ. τοῦ ἱδίου κλήρου here, we hear of a φυλακιστικῶν levied upon sheep (λείας προβάτων, III. 111. 8), animals for sacrifice (λεπίδων, III. 109 (a). iv. 13), associations and workshops (ἐθνῶν καὶ ἐργαστηρίων, III. 32 (f). 2), and geese (χινών, III. 112 (a). ii. 5). When levied upon land it was sometimes paid in money, 1 drachma per aroura being the rate found in III. 70 (a). i. 4, but more often in corn, as here, the annual amounts ranging from 1½ artabae of wheat (III. 54 (b). d, verso 3) to 3 artabae (II. 39 (c). 2). Cf. 143, another receipt with the same formula, 103. 10, where the charge is 9 artabae of olyra (equivalent to nearly 4 artabae of wheat; cf. 85. 15), and 104, where 6 drachae are paid for φυλακιστικῶν. The 19th year in l. 1 refers more probably to Euergetes than to Philadelphus.

('Ετους) ἐθ Παυάνι κη. ὀμολογεῖ Θεό-
δωρος μεμετρησθαι παρὰ
'Ερκάμος τοῦ Χ. μιν ἱλ(άρχου) τῶν
Ζωίκου τὸ γινόμενον φυλα-
5 κιτικῶν τοῦ ἱδίου κλ(ήρου) πυρ(ῶν) δύο.

'The 19th year, Pauni 28. Theodorus agrees that he has had measured to him by Herkamis son of Ch . . ., captain of Zoilus' troop, the due amount of the police-tax upon his own holding, two artabae of wheat.'

1. Θεόδωρος is perhaps identical with the Theodorus in 75. 1, though the Theodorus here would be expected to be an official of the δησαυρός, a position which does not suit the Theodorus in 75.

3. ἱλ(άρχον): this abbreviation consists of a large λ with a small i underneath, and recurs in 143; cf. P. Petrie III. 54 (a). (4) ii. 5, where it appears to mean ἱλ(άρχος). The circumstance that in 103. 7 the payer of ἵππημίων and φυλακιστικῶν is a δε(κανικός) makes ἱλ(άρχον) much more probable here than e.g. Λι(θυσ).

5. ἱδίον: cf. 90. 7, note.

106. Receipt for Beer-Tax.

Mummy Α 15. 10.2 x 7 cm. B.C. 246 (245).

This and the following papyrus together with 136–142 form a series of receipts for the payment of ζυηρά in the second and third years of a king who is no doubt Euergetes. The payments are made into the λογευτήμιον at Phebichis, which village seems to have been a kind of centre of the finance administration of the Κωτής. The λογευτήμιον, a term hitherto known only from
Rev. Laws xi. 13, in these receipts (cf. 108. 2, 114. 7) occupies the place of the royal bank, and seems to be hardly distinguishable from it, since the recipient of the tax is the τραπεζίτης, with whom is coupled the δοκιμαστής. The close association of these two officials (cf. 109. 4, where the δοκιμαστής is apparently found acting for the τραπεζίτης) and 41, a letter concerning a δοκιμαστής) casts a new light on the functions of the δοκιμαστής, who up to now has only been mentioned in P. Leyden Q and P. Petrie III. 50. 2. From the Leyden papyrus, a receipt for 20 drachmae on account of ἀπώμοια (cf. 109) paid over by a δοκιμαστής to a πράκτωρ in circumstances which are rather obscure, it has been supposed that the δοκιμαστής was particularly concerned with the ἀπώμοια, especially with conversions of payments in kind into money (Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 361–2). The Hibeh texts, however, indicate that his functions were much wider, and that he acted as a check on the τραπεζίτης in the same way as the ἐπιστάτης controlled the οἰκονώμος, thus affording another illustration of a favourite Ptolemaic practice. In 41 the collection of arrears of taxation and the selling of oil manufactured by the government appear among the duties of a δοκιμαστής, and δοκιμασταῖ are mentioned in 29. 19 in an obscure context. An impost called δοκιμαστικῶν, apparently a charge for the maintenance of δοκιμασταῖ, occurs in 110. 44 and perhaps in 29. 24.

Besides the τραπεζίτης and δοκιμαστής who issue this series of receipts, other officials were generally present; in one instance (107. 5) the οἰκονώμος, but in most cases Dorion, whose title where it occurred in 107. 4 is lost (but may have been ἐπιστάτης if he is identical with the Dorion in 72. 4), and whose signature has usually been appended at the end of the receipts. The payments are made by different persons who are all agents of an inhabitant of Talaë called Taëmbes. Whether he was the tax-collector or the tax-payer is not clear; but from 108, in which the general formula is similar and the person in l. 5 corresponding to the agents of Taëmbes here is the tax-payer’s representative, not the tax-collector, we prefer to suppose that Taëmbes is the person upon whom the ξυπηρά is levied, and to make these payments parallel to those mentioned in P. Petrie III. 37 (b). verso iv. 15 sqq., where καὶ παρὰ τῶν ξυτοποιῶν πέπτωκεν παρὰ Παμάτως ... χαλ(κῶ) ρων κ.π.λ. is found in an account of, probably, a royal bank. This interpretation will fit in very well with the generally-received view of the ξυπηρά (cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 369–73), that it was a tax on the profits of beer-manufacture, but a good many points connected with the taxes upon that important industry are still in doubt. The sums paid by Taëmbes’ agents consist of monthly instalments ranging from 8 drachmae (138) to 20 (106. 8) in copper, the rate of which is three times (106. 8, 107. 7, and 138; in 137 the figures are obliterated) given as apparently 24¼ obols for a stater. This
extremely small addition to the rate of 24 obols for a stater found in the case of those taxes in which the government accepted copper at par is in accordance with the evidence of P. Par. 62. v. 19, that in the second century B.C. the χυτηρά was an ὀβόλῃ πρὸς χαλκῷ Ὀδόμον. The extra ¼ obol per stater or approximately 1 per cent., which is levied in the Hibeh texts, probably corresponds to the extra charges of 1 per cent. for ἐπισκεφθη and 2 per cent. for transport which are mentioned in connexion with the χυτηρά in the Paris papyrus. Above each receipt is a brief summary, and at the end of each are a few words of demotic. The writing is in most cases, including 106, across the fibres.

(Ἐτοὺς) β’ Ἀθὺρ λ. (δραχμαί) κ.

(ἐτοὺς) β’ Ἀθὺρ λ. πέπτωκεν
ἐπὶ τὸ ἔμυ Φεβίχι Λογεντύριον
tοῦ Κωίτου Πάσσων τραπε-
5 χίτη καὶ Στοτώτι δοκι-
μαστῆ παρὰ ‘Ἀρενδῶτον τοῦ(δ) παρὰ Ταεμβέον
ἐκ Ταλάγ χυτηράς εἰς τὸν
’Ἀθὺρ χα(λκοῖ) εἰς κδ (τέταρτον ?) (δραχμάς) εἴκοσι, / κ.
2nd hand [πα]ρών[τος Δωρίωνος.

1 line of demotic.

6. ἀρενδῶτον τοῦ(ν) παρὰ above the line.

‘The 2nd year, Athur 30: 20 dr. The 2nd year, Athur 30. Harendotes, agent of Taëmbs from Talae, has paid into the collecting office of the Koite toparchy at Phebichis, to Pason, banker, and Stotoëtis, controller, for the beer-tax on account of Athur twenty drachmae of copper at 24½ obols (for a stater), total 20. In the presence of Dorion.’

8. κδ (τέταρτον): very little of the δ is left; but the traces are inconsistent with ε or τ, and cf. 107. 7, where δ is certain. There is more doubt about the fraction; all that remains is a piece of a horizontal stroke joining the sign for drachmae. If it represents ¼ obol, which is usually written ⅞, the writer must on reaching the end of the horizontal stroke have drawn his pen back a little way before making the down stroke, just as he usually does in writing τ. The only alternative is to read (ἡμιοβδλον), but we hesitate to introduce a rate which would be necessarily different from those found in 107. 7 (cf. note) and 138; and if, as is likely, the rate is the same in all three cases, 24½ is the only suitable number.
107. RECEIPTS

Mummy A 15.  6·5 x 7·2 cm.  b.c. 244 (243).

Another receipt for beer-tax similar to 108, but mentioning in ll. 3-4 the presence of two officials; cf. 106, introd. The writing is across the fibres.

\[(\text{έτους}) \gamma \, \Piαύι \lambda, \, (δραχμαί)\]  
\[(\text{έτους}) \gamma \, \Piαύι \lambda, \, \piεπτ' \omega \, \kappaε\nu \, \epsilonπί \, \tauό \, \epsilonν \]  
\[\Phiεβίχει \, \lambdaο' \gammaευτήριον \, \Νικολάωι \, \tauρ(\text{απεξπτή}) \, \[\kα\i \, \Sigmaτοτο\i τε\i \]  
\[\deltaο\i (κιμαστή) \, \piαρώντος \, \Deltaφρίωνος \, \ldots \ldots \, \kα\i \]  
5  Ζηνοδόρου \, οικονόμου \, παρά \ldots \ldots \]  
\[\sigmaτιος \, \tauο(\upsilon) \, \παρά \, \\text{Tαεμβέους \, \epsilonκ \, [\text{Tαλάνη} \, \gammaινηράς} \]  
eiς \, \tauόν \, \Piαύι \, \epsilonις \, \kδ\i (\text{τέταρτον}) \, (δραχμάς) \, \epsilon\i \ldots \ldots \]  
2nd hand (\text{έτους}) \gamma \, \Piαύι \lambda, \, \piαρώντος \, \Δφρίωνος.  
1 line of demotic.

4. The missing title is perhaps \text{ἐπιστάτου}; cf. 106, introd. In 108, 3 the \text{βασιλείας} \, γραμματέας is associated with the \text{οικονόμος} in a similar context, but is named second.

7. The supposed sign for \(\frac{1}{3}\) obol has the horizontal portion longer and more curved than usual; but it is certainly not the symbol for \(\frac{1}{4}\) obol, nor can it be satisfactorily regarded as a combination of the two, especially since \(\frac{1}{3}\) is certainly the only fraction found in 138 where the preceding \(\delta\) is doubtful, and in 106, 8 the doubtful symbol may represent \(\frac{1}{2}\) or \(\frac{1}{4}\) obol, but not both; cf. note \textit{ad loc}.

108. RECEIPT FOR BATH-TAX.

Mummy A 16.  8·2 x 6·3 cm.  b.c. 258 (257) or 248 (247).

A receipt with a formula very similar to that of 106-7, issued by a \text{λογευτήριον} for the payment of 10 drachmae on account of the bath-tax, probably a general impost levied for the construction and maintenance of public baths; cf. note on l. 7. The papyrus comes from the same piece of cartonnage as the correspondence of Leodamas (45-50), and the date is probably the 27th or 37th year of Philadelphus.
IIIBEH PAPYRI

("Etous; [...] Φαρμοτθί... πέπτωκεν ἐπὶ τὸ
ἐν Φύς λογευθήσουν δί' οἰκονόμου
Διοδόρου καὶ βασιλικοῦ γραμματέως) [...] 
[Θεοδόρου τραπέζι[τη] διὰ [δόκι-
5 [μάστοι] "Ωρου παρὰ Πή', 

υπέρ Δημοφώντος [...] 

βαλανείου τοῦ(ν) πεισκ[αι] 

[(δραχμὰς) δ'έκα).

'...7th year, Pharmouthi... P... has paid on behalf of Demophon into the collecting office at Phus through Diodorus, oeconomus, and..., basilicogrammateus, to Theodorus, banker, through Horus, controller, for the bath-tax of the...5th year 10 drachmae.'

2. Φήτ: a village of the Heracleopolite nome, probably in the Kōιτης; cf. C. P. R. 64. 12.
7. βαλανείον: cf. 112. 96 and βαλανεῖων as the title of a tax in P. Petrie III. 37 (b). verso 7. 119 (a). 2, and 121 (a). 14. On the bath-tax, which was in Roman times called βαλανεῖον, see Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 167-70. His argument from the silence of the ostraca, that this impost was introduced by Augustus, is now shown to be incorrect. Wilcken hesitates between two interpretations, (1) a general tax for the maintenance by the State of public baths, (2) a charge for the use of public baths levied in the form of a tax upon only those persons who used them. The former view seems to us much more likely, especially as small charges for the use of baths (generally 1/4 obol) are common in private accounts of the earlier Ptolemaic period, e.g. P. Petrie III. 132-42, and are clearly distinct from the tax called βαλανεῖον. That public baths were not in all cases owned by the government appears from 116, where the tax τρύγη βαλανείων occurs. This, on the analogy of e.g. τρύγη περιστεράων, seems to be an impost of 1/4 upon the profits of privately owned baths. The supply of bathing-establishments in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt must have been surprisingly large.

109. Receipt for ἀπόμοιρα.

Mummy 83. 4.5 x 10.9 cm. b.c. 247-6.

Two receipts for payments of 10 and 5 drachmae respectively on account of the tax of 1/4 on the produce of vineyards and gardens, otherwise called the ἀπόμοιρα. For the history of this impost, the benefit of which was transferred in the 23rd year of Philadelphia from the temples to the deified Arsinoë (whence the name ἐκτη Φιλαδέλφων, e.g. in 132), cf. Rev. Laws pp. 119 sqq., Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 157 sqq. and 615, P. Tebt. 5. 51, note, and Otto, Priester und Tempel, I. pp. 340-56. In the present case the tax was levied upon a palm-garden, and therefore in money, and the two payments were for a single year.
Col. i.

[. . oĭκονὸ]μοῦ 'Αριστογένη[ῆς] καὶ
[. . . . . . . tὸ] παρ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν
[μετόχων] εἰσὶ τὴν ἢ τοῦ Τεισάν-
[δρου φοι]νικὼν τοῦ πρὸς τῇ
5 [διοικήσει] εἰσὶ τὸ λόΘ (ἔτους) χαλκόβ
[πρὸς ἄργυριον (δραχμάς) δέκα, / (δραχμαί) i.

Col. ii.

τραπ[εζίτη καὶ . . . . . . . δοκι-
τὸ παρ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν μετόχων
10 εἰσὶ τὴν ἢ τοῦ Τεισάνδρου φοινικ[ῶ-
νος τοῦ π[ρο]ς [τῇ] διο[ικήσει] εἰσὶ τὸ λόΘ [(ἔτους)]
χαλκόβ πρὸς ἄργυριον (δραχμάς) πέντε, / (δραχμαί) e.

ll. 7-12. 'Aristogenes and . . . (have paid to) . . . , banker and . . . , controller, the amount due from them and their partners for the tax of ¼ upon the palm-garden of Teisander, the finance official, for the 39th year, in copper on the silver standard five drachmae, total 5 drachmae.'

1. Either διὰ . . . oĭκονὸ]μοῦ or παρόστος . . . oĭκονὸ]μοῦ may be restored; cf. 107. 5-6, 108. 2.

4-5. τὸ πρὸς τῇ [διοικήσει] may refer to φοινικῶν, but is more easily explained if connected with Τεισάνδρου; this use of πρὸς in describing officials is extremely common; cf. e.g. P. Tebt. 30. 18 τῶν δὲ πρὸς ταῖς γραμματείαις. ὁ πρὸς τῇ διοικήσει may well be, like ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως in Rev. Laws, a periphrasis for διοικήτης. Aristogenes and his partners were probably lessees of Tisander.

5. λόΘ (ἔτους): the last (revenue) year of Philadelphus; cf. 53. 4, note and App. ii. p. 364.

5-6. χαλκόβ [πρὸς ἄργυριον]: cf. 70(a). 9, note. Down to the reign of Epiphanes the money payments for ἀπόμοιρα had to be made either in silver or in copper at a discount. Later in the second century B.C., as is shown by Wilcken, Ost. no. 1518, copper was accepted at par.

X. ACCOUNTS

110. ACCOUNTS: POSTAL REGISTER.

Mummy 18. 19.4 x 30.5 cm. Recto about B.C. 270; Verso about B.C. 255.

The recto of this papyrus contains a long account apparently of a private or semi-private character, but kept by some person in the government service, since the document on the verso is clearly official. The account is in three columns; but of the first only ends of lines remain, and these are almost all occupied with a list of σώματα which are reckoned at sums varying from 1 obol to 2½ obols, e.g. σώματα ἄρ (άνοβολον) / (δραχμαί) γ (δυνοβολον), ἄλλα δ (δραχμη) a . . . τως σώματα κη ἄρ (άνοβολον) (ημιοβόλων) / (δραχμαι) ια (τετράβολον),—no doubt a wages account. Near the top of the column occurs ἦρων κλῆμων and at the bottom a mention of . . . Τπαων (δραχμαι) κ and φωνίκων. Col. ii and the upper part of Col. iii are occupied with an account of corn, some of which was transported to Alexandria, and interesting details are given of expenses en route. The lower portion of the third column contains a few short money accounts, and concludes with three lines which belong to the document on the verso.

This is of a more novel and important character. It is a record of the arrival at and departure from some intermediate station of letters and other documents sent to or from the king or high officials, and affords a most interesting glimpse into the management and nature of the State postal-service. Careful note is made of the day and hour of the arrival of each messenger, his name and that of the clerk who received and issued letters at the office, the number and addresses of the packets, and the names of the messengers to whom they were handed on. The day-book in the registered letter department of a modern post-office can hardly be more methodical and precise. The documents forwarded are mostly described as κυλιστοί (usually abbreviated κ, but written out in ll. 51, 73, and 110), i.e. 'rolls,' which are apparently distinguished from ἐπιστολαί, 'letters' (ll. 57, 98, 107); but the difference was perhaps one of size rather than of contents. That the register on the verso was not separated by any wide interval of time from the account on the recto, which was drawn up soon after the 14th year, is shown by the mention of
Apollonius, the well-known dioecetes in the 27th–32nd years; cf. 44. 3, note. The locality of the postal bureau is not clearly defined. The writer of the recto had business concerns at Hiera Nesus in the south of the Fayûm, and Plutarchus and Criton, who are mentioned in Col. ii, are known from other papyri to have been connected with that neighbourhood; cf. introd. to 63. But Phebichis in the Κωτίνης τόπος is referred to in l. 36; and that is a much more suitable scene for the composition of the official register, which points decidedly to some town in the Nile valley as its provenance. Preceding the two columns of the verso which we print there remain the ends of a few lines of another much effaced column, but they add no information.

Recto. Col. ii.

εχω παρά Πολέμωνος (πυρὼν) (ἀρτάβας) ρ, καὶ παρὸ Αγάθωνος [ρ]φ[δ], παρὰ Σίμου κ, καὶ ὑπὲρ Εὐβοῦλου κ.

5 / τλα. | εἰς τὸ Ἡρακλείων α, καὶ εἰς τὸ ναύλον i (δραχμῶν) κ[ ]
Πλούταρχου κ, λοιπαὶ τ.

tοῦτων ἐγένοντο δ . . [ . . . ] | . . . [ον]ν
ἐγβολὴν [ ]ον χ. μονος . . [ . . ]ν[.] . ευν α,

10 Φιλοκλεῖ εἰς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια [ει] / σφ.
ἐπράθησαν ἀν(α) (δραχμας) δ (πεντώβολον), / (δραχμαί) Ἀυκα.
ἐλαβον δὲ καὶ κριθὴν παρὸ Αγ[ά]θωνος μι.
tοῦτων Πλούταρχου κ, λοιπαὶ ρ.
tοῦτων διάμετρα αἱ στιςμετρικῶν [Λ,]

15 λοιπαὶ πη. ἐπράθησαν ἀν(α) [(δραχμην)] α (πριῶβολον) (ήμω-βέλιον), / (δραχμαί) ροθ (δυόβολοι).
ἐλχον δὲ καὶ Κρίτων τῶν κ (ἀρταβῶν) τῶν (πυρὼν) (δραχμας) μ, καὶ ναύλον μ[των] τῶν πυρῶν καὶ κριθῶν ἐχω (δραχμας) τε.
εἰς ταῦτα ἔχει Κρίτων χρυσίων πν,

20 ἀργυρίον (δραχμας) νηπι.
ἀνήλωμα τοῦ σιτ[ον]ν ἔφ' Ἰεραὶ Νήσωι σάκκους β (πετρώβολον), φυλακικὰ ἄφ' Ἰερὰς Νήσου ἑως Ἀλεξανδρείας (δραχμαί) ῥ,
ἐπὶ φυλακῆς γραμματικῶν (δραχμαί) δ', τῶι παρεπ... ἡμίαρ(.,) (δραχμή;) α', ἐμ Μέμφει γραμματικῶν (δραχμὴ;) α', ἐπὶ τῆς κάτω φύλακῆς
25 [ἐν] Σχεδία (δραχμαί) δ', [...]; [...]. [δραχμαί] τ', ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρείᾳ
Τείσιδος (δραχμαί) ε', γραμματικῶν (δραχμαί) [... ... ... ...] (πυρὸν)
τήν (ἀρτάβην) (ἡμιβέλειον?), / (δραχμαί) καὶ (τρίωβολοι), [...] νετ... α
κριθῆς (δραχμαί) ζ' ((δυόβολοι),

14. διαμέτρα: Ραπ.

Col. iii.

τέλος (δραχμαί) οσ', ναυλίων (δραχμαί)..., ἀντι-
γραφεῖ τῶν Φιλοκλέους... ... ... ... ...
τραπεζῆς δοκιμαστικῶν... ...
ἀπὸ Σχέδιας ναυλίων εἰς πόλιν [(δραχμαί)... ,
ἀναπλέοντες ναυλίων (δραχμαί) β'][
εἰς τὸ τοῦτο εἶχον παρὰ Κρίτωνος (δραχμάς)...
(ἔτους) ὁ Ἕπειρτς β.
35 λόγον γενομένου Πλούταρχοι
ἐν Φεβίχι. προσώφησι τῶν [ἀνηλόμα-
σιν καὶ φυλακικοῖς τοῖς γνί (ἦν) ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ......
110. ACCOUNTS

2nd hand κυλιστοί σ', λ βασιλί γ καὶ ἐπισ- 
τολῆν, Θευχρῆν χρηματαγωγῶι ὁ, 
"Ἀπολλωνίω[ι] [δ][αι[κ][η][τῇ]] [.] ....... 

48. (δραχμας) & above the line.

Verso. Col. ii.

Πτο[λ]εμαίων κυ(λιστῶς) α, Ἀπολ[λ]ων[ι]ῶ[ι] δ[ιοι-
[κ]η[τῇ] κυ(λιστῶς) α, ἐπιστολαὶ δύο πρὸς τῷ 
[κυ]λιστῶν προσδεδεγχέναι, Ἀντιόχῳ Κρητὶ κυ(λιστῶς) α, Μη[η]θ[
δι[ώρο]; κυ(λιστῶς) α, Χ[ε]λ[.]ω [.]αι ἐν ἀλλῳ κυ(λιστῶς) α,

60 Ἀ[λ]εξάνδρος δὲ παρέδωκ[εν Ν]ικοδήμῳ.

15 ὁρᾶ ἐωθινῆς παρέδωκεν Φοίνιξ Ἡρα-
kleitou ὁ νεότερος Μακεδὼν 
(ἐκατοντάρους) Ἀμίν(ον)ι κυ(λιστῶν) α καὶ τὸ ἄξιον Φανία[ι]
'Ἀμί[ν][ο]ιν 
δὲ παρέδωκεν Θευχρῆστῳ.

65 ὁρᾶ πρῶτης παρέδωκεν Θευχρ[η]σ-
tos ἀνοθεν Διναί κυ(λιστῶς) γ, λ βασιλί 
Πτολεμαίων κυ(λιστῶι) β, Ἀπολλωνίω 
διοικητῆι κυ(λιστῶς) α, Δινάς δὲ παρέ-
dωκεν Ἰππολύσωι.

70 ὁρᾶς τοιουτού ὁ πρεσβύτερος Μακεδῶν (ἐκατοντάρους) 
"Ἡρακλεοπλήτου τῶν πρῶτων Ἑσσ[.] [. [. 
κυλιστῶν α Φανία, Αμίνων [δ]ὲ παρέ[δ]ωκ(ε) 
Τιμοκράτηι.

kάτοθεν Ἀλεξάνδρωι κυ(λιστῶι) ὁ, παρα[λ] 
βασιλέως Πτολε(μαίου Ἀντιόχῳ εἰς 
"Ἡρακλεοπλήτην κυ(λιστῶι) α, Δημητρίω[ι] 

U
HIBEH PAPYRI

τῶι πρὸς τῇ· χορηγία[ι τ]ῶιν ἐλεφάντω[ν
eis τῇν Θηβαίδα κυ(λιστὸν) α, 'Ιπποτέλ[η]
tōi par' Ἀντιόχου κατὰ Ἀνδρο[ν]ίκου
ἐν 'Απολλωνίων πόλι τῇ· μεγάλὴi
cυ(λιστὸν) α, τορ Βασίλεως Πτολεμαῖο[ν
Θευγένης χρηματα[γω]γω[ν] κυ(λιστὸν) α,

85 Ἡρακλεοδόρω τε τῇ· Θηβαίδα [κυ(λιστὸν) α,]
Ζωῖλω τραπεζίτης Ἐρμοπολίτ[ου] κυ(λιστὸν) [α,
Διονυσίωι οίκου ὅµων τον Ἀρσινοίτη[ν κυ(λιστὸν)] α,

58. προσθέσθηκεν(εν) added above the line. 60. This line inserted later. 61. το of ἡρακλείτου corrig. 66. 1. ἀνοῦθεν: so in I. 107, 109. 71. κ of μακεδων corrig. from δ.
75. ὥρα over an erasure. 76. 1. κατάθεν: so in I. 98.

Col. iii.

Vestiges of three lines.

91 κ. ὥρας [.] παρε[δω]κ[έν] Ἀμ[ίνων]
κυ(λιστὸν) γ, λ [β][α][οι] [Πτο]λεμ[αί]οι [.] τῶι ἐλεφά[ντω
τῶι κα[τ]ὰ Θα[.] . σου κυ(λιστὸς) α, 'Ἀπολλω[νῖοι
πληροματός κυ(λιστὸς) α, Ἀμίνων δὲ παρέδω-
κεν 'Ιππολύσωι.

κα. ὥρας κ παρέδωκεν [.]ἐναλε . [.] . .
κάτοθεν Φανίαι ἐπιστο[λα]ς δύο [.] . . . ,
'Ωρος δὲ παρέδωκεν Διο[π]ρίσιω . [.] . . . .
100 κβ. ὥρας πρώτης πα[ρ]έδωκεν Ἀ[.]οιν [Δινιαί]
κυ(λιστὸν) ιε, λ βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαί[ω]ι κυ(λιστοῖ).
παρὰ τῶι ἐλεφάντων τῶι κατὰ Θα[.] . σου,
'Ἀπολλωνίωι διοκητὴ κυ(λιστοῖ) δ . [.] . . . ,
'Αντιόχου Κρήτη κυ(λιστοῖ) δ, Δινιάς δὲ [παρέδω-
κεν Νικοδήμωι.

κβ. ὥρας ιβ παρέδωκεν Δέων Ἀμίνων
ἀνοῦθεν βασιλῆ Ἐπτολεμαῖωι [κυ(λιστοῖ). ,
Ἀμίνων δὲ παρέδωκεν [Ι]π[ολύσωι.
110. ACCOUNTS

κυ. ἐωθίνης ἀνοθεν παρέξω[κεν . . .

I

Timokrátēs kūliσtovs, Ἀλέξανδρων,
oriously [πολεμαῖοι ψι(λιστὸι), Ἀπολλωνίων
dioiktēn ψi(λιστὸς) α, Π. . . . χρηματα-
γωγοῦς ψi(λιστὸς) α, Παρικ[. . . . . ψi(λιστὸς),
Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ παρέξωκεν . . .

97. κ οὶ παρέξωκεν above a θ.

1-50. 'I have received from Polemon 90 artabae of wheat, and from Agathon 194, from Simus 27, and on behalf of Eubulus 20, total 331; of which 1 was paid to the temple of Heracles, 10 for freightage at 20 drachmae, and 20 to Plutarchus, remainder 300. Of these were expended for . . . 1, to Philocles for necessaries 5, total 294. They were sold at 4 dr. 5 ob., making 1421 dr. I also received barley from Agathon to the amount of 110 artabae, of which Plutarchus had 20, remainder 90. Out of these were expended for difference on measure 12, measuring fee 3/3, remainder 88. They were sold at 1 dr. 3½ ob., total 139 dr. 2 ob. I also had for Criton, for the 20 artabae of wheat, 40 dr., and I have as freights the amount of wheat and barley 15 dr. For this Criton has 950 dr. in gold and 448 dr. in silver. Expense of the corn at Hiera Nesus, 2 sacks 4 ob., guards' fees from Hiera Nesus to Alexandria 14 dr., at the guard-house for scribes' fees 4 dr., to . . . 1 dr., at Memphis scribes' fees 1 dr. [.] ob., at the lower guard-house at Schedia 4 dr., . . . 10 dr., at Alexandria to Tisarchus 5 dr., scribes' fees . . . dr., . . . on the wheat at 3½ ob. the artaba 24 dr. 3 ob., . . . on the barley 7 dr. 2 ob., tax 76 dr., freights . . . dr., to the antigrapheus of Philocles . . ., to the banker for controller's fees . . ., freights from Schedia to the city . . . drachmae, sailing up, freights 2 dr.; for this I had from Criton . . . dr.

The 14th year, Epeiph 2. Account taken with Plutarchus at Phebichis. I owed an additional sum, with expenses and guards' fees for the 13th year . . . and Aristarchus, of altogether 3½ drachmae and 15 artabae of barley.

'The 12th year, in the priesthood of . . . son of Callimedes, in the month Dystrus. . . . has from Plutarchus 60 drachmae at the interest of 1½ ob. a month, which sum he paid to . . . and Mnæistratus. He also has in the 13th year in the priesthood of Nea . . . son of . . . ocles, in the month Lioiûs, 60 dr. more, at the interest of 4 dr. a month, which he gave to Apollonius. He also had in the same year in the month Hyperberetaeuς 60 drachmae more, which he paid to Apollonius the guard, at the interest of 5 dr. a month.'

6. If there is nothing lost after & the price will be the common one of 2 dr. the artaba;

9. Perhaps τοῦ χρῆσανεν, but the is not satisfactory and the meaning quite obscure.

14. διάμετρον is used of soldiers' allowances, 'rations' in Plut. Vit. Dem. 40, and some such sense would not be inappropriate here. But διάμετρα may well be equivalent to διάφορα μέτρα; cf. e.g. P. Petrie III. 129, 3 διάφορον ἀνθρωποστ. The στοματικόν was no doubt a payment for the services of the στοματήσης, and thus analogous to the φιλαικικά and

U 2
γραμματικῶν which follow; cf. P. Tebt. II. 520, where 3 art. of wheat are paid στιωμέτρου, and P. Oxy. 740. 25.

17–20. The meaning of the dative κρίτων and the connexion of these entries with what precedes are not clear. If χρυσίων 950 means the value in gold of 950 dr. of silver, the two sums named in ll. 19–20 together go far to make up the total price of the wheat and barley in ll. 11 and 16. They may therefore perhaps represent the balance left after deducting the expenses enumerated in the next section, ll. 21 sqq.; but as the items are imperfectly preserved verification is not possible.

21. στάκκους Β: these may be either empty sacks which were bought for 4 obols, or full sacks which together with the 4 ob. had to be expended. 4 ob. could not represent the price of two full sacks.

22. The context shows that φιλακτικά here do not mean the tax so-called (cf. 105, introd.), but payments for the services of φιλακτικοί in charge of the boat; cf. 54. 30.

23. γραμματικῶν: this impost is found in a variety of contexts, and is to be explained as a charge for the benefit of the numerous γραμματικός; cf. P. Tebt. I. 61 (β). 342–5, note, and 97, introd. The word before (δρυμαί) may be a proper name preceded by παρ ορ παρά.

25. Σχεδία was a place of some importance on the canal connecting Alexandria with the Canopic branch of the Nile, and had a custom-station in Strabo’s time; cf. Strabo, xvii. 800. In P. Fay. 104. 21, an account somewhat similar to this, Σχεδίας should also be read. The word before (δρυμαί) ι is possibly ναύλον, but if so the space after the preceding numeral is broader than usual.

26. Τεσσάρες ρχ' ωι: a proper name seems likely, but the reading is doubtful. The first letter if not τ may be π or σ, and the termination may be ας.

27. A charge of ½ ob. on the artaba reckoned on 294 art. (l. 10) and 88 art. (l. 15) produces 24 dr. 3 ob. and 7 dr. 2 ob. The name of this impost was given in the lacuna before (πυρήνα) in l. 26, and probably coincided with the mutilated word before κρ(ίθης) in l. 27. The abbreviation for κρ(ίθης) is written as a κ with a loop at the top of the vertical stroke.

30. δοκιμαστικὸν: a charge for the δοκιμαστής, on whom cf. 106, introd. The δοκιμαστικῶν is also found in 29. 24 and P. Leyden Q. 12; cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 361–2.

36. απολλωμαίον: cf. l. 21.

42. For καὶ τέξκλε με cf. l. 48, but δ is awkward with (δρυμαίς) following.

44. Νείροις τοῖς Νείροκλίους would be about the right length. γ in the number of the year is rather tall, but to suppose that some other figure, e.g. a, was written with a stroke above it, is less satisfactory.

51–3. These lines form part of the register on the verso, but there is no date or other indication of their intended position. We restore καὶ ἐπιστολήν on the analogy of l. 57, but the construction requires ἐπιστολή. Θεογένες the χρημασαγωγὸς recurs in l. 84; the title appears to be new.

55–114. 1... delivered to Alexander 6 rolls; of these 1 roll was for king Ptolemy, 1 roll for Apollonius the dioecetes and two letters which were received in addition to the roll, 1 roll for Antiochus the Cretan, 1 roll for Menodorus, 1 roll contained in another (?) for Chel... and Alexander delivered them to Nicodemus. The 17th, morning hour, Phoenix the younger, son of Heracleitus, Macedonian owning 100 arouae, delivered to Aminon 1 roll and the price for Phanias; and Aminon delivered it to Theochrestus. The 18th, 1st hour, Theochrestus delivered to Dinias 3 rolls from the upper country, of which 2 rolls were for king Ptolemy and 1 for Apollonius the dioecetes, and Dinias delivered them
to Hippolysus. The 18th, 6th hour, Phoenix the elder, son of Heraclitus, Macedonian owning 100 arourae in the Heracleopolite nome, one of the first company of E... delivered i roll for Phanias, and Aminon delivered it to Timocrates. The 19th, 11th hour, Nicodemus delivered from the lower country to Alexander [.] rolls, from king Ptolemy for Antiochus in the Heracleopolite nome 1 roll, for Demetrius, the officer in charge of supplies for the elephants, in the Thebaid i roll, for Hippoteles the agent of Antiochus accusing Andronicus (?) at Apollonopolis the Great i roll, from king Ptolemy to Theogenes the money-carrier i roll, for Heracleodorus in the Thebaid i roll, for Zollus, banker of the Hermopolite nome, i roll, for Dionysius, oeconomus in the Arsinoite nome, i roll. The 20th, ... hour, Lycoicles delivered to Aminon 3 rolls, of which i roll was for king Ptolemy from the elephant-country below Th... i roll for Apollonius the dioecetes, i roll for Hermippus, member of the staff of workmen (?), and Aminon delivered them to Hippolysus. The 21st, 6th hour, ... delivered two letters from the lower country for Phanias, and Horus delivered them to Dionysius ... The 22nd, 1st hour, A ... delivered to Dinias 16 rolls, of which [.] rolls were for king Ptolemy from the elephant-country below Th... 4 rolls for Apollonius the dioecetes, 4 rolls for Antiochus the Cretan, and Dinias delivered them to Nicodemus. The 22nd, 12th hour, Leon delivered to Aminon from the upper country [.] rolls for king Ptolemy, and Aminon delivered them to Hippolysus. The 23rd, morning hour, Timocrates delivered to Alexander [.] rolls, of which [.] rolls were for king Ptolemy, i roll for Apollonius the dioecetes, i roll for P ... the money-carrier, [.] roll for Par ... and Alexander delivered them to ...

54. The traces at the beginning of the line do not suit ἡρας or παρεθακεν. ἀναθεν probably occurred somewhere in the line, since one of the letters was for the king; cf. II. 66 and 107.

55. Possibly κυλιστοὺς) stood as usual before the numeral, but there is no trace of it and the space is somewhat narrow. Alexander, Aminon, Dinias, and Horus occupy an intermediate position in the transmission of letters, as contrasted e.g. with Hippolysus and Nicodemus, who only bring in letters or take them away. Probably the former were officials at the postal-station.

59. ἐν ἄλλω appears to mean ' contained in a second roll,' and if this packet is counted as 2 rolls the number 6 in I. 55 is correct.

63. τὸ δὲνω appears means the sum paid by Phoenix at the office for postage. Such payments do not occur elsewhere in the document, and high officials would naturally have had the services of State messengers gratis. The sender of this particular letter may therefore be supposed to have been some unauthorized person, who would have to pay for the privilege of utilizing the messenger's services. There is, however, no mention of a payment in connexion with a letter sent by the brother of Phoenix (II. 70-4).

72. τῶν πρῶτων Ἑσσο...: a similar military title is found in an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus of the third century b.c. τῶν Μενελάου πρῶτων ἐκ τοῦ Ἰρμοσολίτου καὶ (ἐκατονχάρουν).

79. Cf. II. 91-2 and 102, P. Petrie II. 20. iv. 8 ἐν Μεσφέει ἐλέφασιν, 40 (α). 22 ἡ ἐλεφαντηγοί ἔν Ἐβερίκης, III. 114. 16 τῆς ὑπορείας τῶν ἐλεφάντων. An inscription found at Edfu is dedicated to Philopator by the στρατηγός ἀποσταλεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπεραν τῶν ἐλεφάντων; cf. Dittenberger, Or. Gr. Inscri. I. 82, with his note ad loc., and I. 86.

81. Λορδόνεικον is doubtful, especially the termination. ἀν may be αυ and the second ν could well be μ.

83. Between α and παρά is a diagonal stroke with a rounded top, the meaning of which is obscure.

84. χρηματισμοὺον: cf. II. 51-3, note.
92-3. [παρά] τῶν ἀριστῶν would be expected; cf. l. 102 and παρά βασιλέως in l. 83. But there is not room for παρά in the lacuna, the size of which requires παρ(α) or ἀπό. ὕστερα...[σον], which recurs in l. 102, seems to be a geographical name; the second letter may be η.

95. πλήρωμα is used in several of the Petrie papyri for a company of workmen, e.g. III. 43 (3). 12; but whether the term has a similar sense here is doubtful.

97. The κ of παρίδωκεν is a correction; possibly the syllable κεν was written twice and the name of the messenger was Ἀλέξανδρος. He would, however, be different from the Ἀλέξανδρος in ll. 55 and 114, who was one of the clerks at the office. Ὠροι may have occurred at the end of the line; cf. l. 99. To read εὖ Ἀλέξανδρεία, which at first sight looks attractive, is inadmissible on several grounds: (1) it would imply that this register was kept in the immediate neighbourhood of that city, which is a most unlikely hypothesis; (2) there is no part of Egypt which could be described as κάτωθεν (l. 98) relatively to Alexandria; (3) παρίδωκεν requires a subject.

100. Α[σίων might be read after πα[ρ]ίδωκεν, but Leon could hardly have arrived from the south twice on the same day (cf. l. 106).

### III. List of Cases and Fines.

**Mummy 69.**

**Breadth 15.3 cm.**

**About B.C. 250.**

This is a record, kept by some official connected with the judicial administration, of cases which had come up for decision, with the addition in some cases of particulars concerning amounts due to or from the different parties. These sums are sometimes followed by the word πράξαν, signifying that they were still to be paid; and it is likely that the keeper of the account was the πράκτωρ who had to collect them. The items are arranged under the three villages of Takona, Tholthis, and Septhta, all in the Oxyrhynchite nome. The document appears not to have extended beyond the two columns of which parts are preserved; it belongs to the close of Philadelphus' reign or the first few years of his successor.

Col. i.

'Εν Τακώναι:

τὰ πρὸς Μελάνθιον
περὶ τῆς βίας ἐπὶ
Δημητρίαν ἥ (δύοβολοι) (ἡμιω-βέλιον),
καὶ Εὐνοκράτηι ἵπτ.

Col. ii.

Θώλθισ.

τὰ πρὸς Ζηνόδωτον καὶ

Καρνεάδην.

Αρίστωνοις μονής Καλλι-

dρόμου Θηραμένου δ.

Δημήτριον (δραχμαί) ν καὶ τὰ

gυνόμενα λ (ὀβόλος) (ἡμιωβέ-

λιον).
11. **ACCOUNTS**

33 Δόκιμος πρὸς Μυρτοῦν
   βιωρξ... ου...

10 κοῦν οἶκον(μ), τα πρὸς Πόλ.
   Πολιάνθην (δραχμαί) β, πρᾶξαι.
   Πάτρων πρὸς τοὺς
   λοιποὺς μεταγράφαι

15 πρὸς Πολύδαρχον καί
   Σωσιφάνην ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ.
   Ἀπολλωνίων πρὸς Ἀπίαλ-
   λώνιον (δραχμαί) κ, πρᾶξαι.
   Κοννάρου (δραχμαί) β, πρᾶξαι.

20 τα πρὸς Νικόλαον καί
   Ἀμφίλοχου οἰκονο(μ).
   Σέφθας.
   τα πρὸς Τίμαιον (δραχμαί) κ.
   Ἄπει εἰς π[ό]λιν καί

25 περὶ Θεοφίλου καί Με-
   λανθίου Φίλωνος γ (τριῶβολον ?) (τέταρτον ?).
   [Θωλ[θ]ίς]

11. π (or μ?) of πολώμα cor. from λ.

'At Takona: the case against Melanthius for violence to Demetria, 7 drachmae 2½ obols, and to Xenocrates 16 dr., to Andromachus 9 dr. To Xenocrates in the case against Ptolemaeus ... to the oeconomus (?), to be collected. Polianthes in the case against Polon 2 dr., to be collected. To Patron against the rest, to be transferred to Polyarchus and Sophanes out of the number. To Apollonius against Apollonius 20 drachmae, to be collected. Connarus 2 drachmae, to be collected. In the case against Nicolaus and Amphilochnus, to the oeconomus (?). At Sephtha: the case against Timaeus, 20 drachmae. For Apis to the city and concerning Theophilus and Melanthius son of Philon 3 dr. 3½ ob. At Tholthis: the case against Zenodotus and Carneades. Ariston for the appearance of Callidromus son of Theramenes 4 dr. Demetrius 50 dr. and costs 30 dr. 1½ ob. Docimus against Myrtous daughter of ... Demetrius concerning the donkey of ... 6 dr. Leontas concerning the sheep of Nechthenibis 1 dr.'

5. Ζεύς(κράτη): the first name may be either in the nom., acc., gen., or dat. case, but probably these varieties do not all imply a corresponding distinction of meaning. Where the dative occurs, payment was presumably to be made to the person; the acc. and
gen. on the other hand might both be used of the persons who paid. The nom. is also more likely to represent the payer than the recipient.

10. oikonomus: cf. l. 21. The meaning possibly is that the fine was to be paid to the oikonomus. In both cases there is a short space before oikonomus.

13-16. The sense seems to be improved by connecting ll. 15-16 with the two preceding lines, notwithstanding the fact that πρὸς projects somewhat to the left like the other lines which commence a new sentence. None of the other entries begins with πρὸς, and ἐκ τοῦ ἄρθρου is more intelligible if constructed with μεταγράφων than if l. 15 begins a new entry, in which case a verb has to be supplied.


24. [πτόλεμος: sc. ὄξυρων ἀνδρίνων.]

27. The name θάλας, which is repeated at the top of the next column, is faint, and was probably partly erased.

34. γυνώμενα: cf. 92. The large amount of these 'costs' as compared with the first sum is remarkable; the ἐπιδέκτην were perhaps included.

41. This line, which is written in large letters across the fibres, looks like a regular endorsement, but its relation to the contents of the recto is not clear. An ὁσὸς is mentioned in l. 38.

112. Taxing-List.

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 22·2 x 19, Fr. (b) 9·2 x 14·1 cm. About B.C. 260.

Three fragments of a long taxing-list, perhaps written at the λογευτήριον of Phebichis (cf. 106, introd.), recording money payments for various taxes at different villages of the Κωστής by individuals who are in most if not all cases the tax-payers, not the tax-collectors. Among the imposts are (1) a tax on pigeon-houses (l. 1, note); (2) payments for oil sold by the government (l. 2, note); (3) a new tax called δωδεκακαλλία, which was apparently a charge of 12 chalcii per aroura on cleruchic and temple land (l. 8, note); (4) a tax upon green-stuffs (l. 9, note); (5) the beer-tax (ll. 11, 25, &c.; cf. 106, introd.); (6) the ἐπαρκέριον, a charge on certain kinds of land, with which is coupled (7) the tax on embankments, amounting to about 1/8 of it (l. 13, note); (8) the tax on sales (l. 22, note); (9) a tax of 1/25, which can be explained in several ways (l. 38, note); (10) a tax of 1/1, probably that levied upon the salting and milling industries (l. 45, note); (11) a new tax connected with carpet-weaving (l. 76, note); (12) a new tax called φακῆς (l. 77), the nature of which is obscure; (13) a tax on gardens, perhaps the ἄρθρον (l. 92, note); (14) the bath-tax (l. 96; cf. 108. 7, note). The villages mentioned (in several instances for the first time) are generally in the nominative, but sometimes in the accusative or genitive; they include Κερκές, Φεβίχις, Ἀσσύνα, Ψειχίς, Περόν, Ψεβδον (ἐμβη?) (l. 25, note), Χουζινώτις, Μοῦχις (l. 27, note), Ψελεμάχις, Ὀμοτόθις, Τοσέγους.
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(?; cf. l. 43, note), Περχύφες, Θουούθης and 'Λγκυρῶν πόλις. The papyrus probably belongs to the latter part of Philadelphus' reign. In some places the ink of another document to which it had been gummed has come off, and occasionally there is a difficulty in distinguishing this from the writing of 112. On the verso are parts of another account, mentioning large sums of money but without indicating the nature of the payments. We omit Fr. (c), which contains only the beginnings of lines, and Col. i of Fr. (a), of which only a few figures from the ends of lines are preserved.

Fr. (a).

Col. ii.

[Κε]ρκές[θης Θοτορ[tauio]ς ἐλαίου] λ,
ὁ αὐτὸς ἀλικής ξ.
Φεβίχες Διογένης [.....] ῥ.
5 [Ἀ]σσύας Πετοσίρ[ι]ς [.....] λ.
Κερκές[θης Ἡρακλ[είδης [.....] [(δω]δεκα[χ(αλκίαν
τοῦ Πολεμάρχου [τ, χα[λκοῦ]] τ.
Διοκής (δωδεκα)(αλκίαν) τ[οῦ] Ἡροδότου (τριάβολον), χα[λκοῦ] (τριάβολον).
Σωσίτατρο[ς χι]φρών τοῦ Πο-
10 λεμάρχου η.
Ψύχες Ἀμαννευς ξυνήρας σ (τετράβολον).
'Ασσύας ὁ αὐτὸς κς (τετράβολον).
Φεβίχες Δίφιλος ἐπαρού[ριον] δ (τετράβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον), χω(ματικὸν)
(τριάβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον).
Περόνθ Θαγομβής (δυοβόλου) (τέταρτον), χω(ματικὸν) (τέταρτον),
15 [. ]χων[θς Θοτορταίον α (τριάβολον), χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμιωβέλιον) (τέταρτον),
[Θοτορ][ταιος καὶ Δημόστρατος α, χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμιωβέλιον) (τέταρτον),
[...]μ[... ]υ
[.....]κ[... ] (τετράβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον), χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
[.....]τρίος (δυοβόλους) (τέταρτον), χω(ματικὸν) (τέταρτον),
[.....] Με[σίος] (τετράβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον), [χω(ματικὸν) (ἡμιωβέλιον).
2 lines lost.
22 [ 18 letters ]ψ βοδς
Ταμάνιος ὡς ἐπτάτο παρά
Εἰρήνης δ (δβολῶν).
25 Ψεβθον(ἐμβη;) Πενοῦτις Αὐγχις ζι(τηρᾶς) ΙΑ (τετράβολον). Χοιβνωῦμις Πετωῦς ζι(τηρᾶς) ζιγ (δυοβόλους).
Μοῦχιν Πάσις Τετοβάστις ἔπαραούριος (δυοβόλους) (τεταρτον), χωμα(τικον) (τεταρτον), καὶ Τεῶς (τριώβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον) (τεταρτον), χω(ματικον) (ἡμιωβέλιον).
30 Ψεβίχις Τεωίς (δωδεκαχαλκίαν) τοῦ Δημητρίου (τετράβολον) (τεταρτον), χα(λκοῦ) (τετράβολον) (τεταρτον).

Col. iii.

35 κλήρῳ βασιλικῷ περὶ κώμην
Ψελεμάχιν εἰς τὴν καθήκουσαν
αὐτῶι ἀναφορὰν ἔως τοῦ Παῦ[νι?] κη.
Ψεβίχις Διογένις κ' ιε (ὀβολὸν).
Θομιοτόθις Θάσις ἐλαίου 1β.
40 Ψεβίχις Ἀντιγένης Πέρσης υπὲρ
Ποσειδωνίου δωδεκαχαλκίαν οὐ γεωργεῖ κλήρου
τῶν πρὸς ἀργύριον ιγ, [χα(λκοῦ)] ιγ.
Τοιεγόμεν Θοτορταῖος . . . . .
Θηῆς ἐπαροῦμιν δ (τριώβολον), [χω(ματικον) .
45 Μοῦχιν 'Εμηὴς 'Αρνώτης δ'[ .
Περκύφις Κολλοῦθης κ' δ'[ ]
καὶ τετάρτης β (τριώβολον) [.
Ψεβίχις Ψεγχώνις (δωδεκα)χ(αλκίαν) τοῦ Κόμψι-
νος καὶ Ἑνοφαίντου ε, χα(λκοῦ) ε,
50 Σενῦρις ἐπαροῦμιν (τετράβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον), χω(ματικον) (ἡμιωβέλιον). [']Ετφέδς Εἰσιγήνου (τετράβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον), χω(ματικον) [(ἡμιωβέλιον).
'Ασσύας Διογένης τὸ παρὰ τῷ . . .
'Αρτώνιος (δωδεκάχλικα) τοῦ Κλέωνος γ., [χαλκοῦ] γ.
Φεβίχις Πετοβάστις κλήρων τῷ
55 πρὸς ἀργύριον τοῦ Φιλησίου . . .
Θομούθης [.]. οσίρις η'. . . .
Ψύχης Πάνε εἰς τὴν Διονύσιον εὖ·?
γύνη κ'δ'
Πετοσίρις δ'
60 Φεβίχις Στοτοῆτις Σεν'. . . .
ἐπαρούριον φοινίκων .[.]
'Απολλώνιος χαματικῶν τοῦ α',
Στοτοῆτις (δωδεκάχλικα) τοῦ . . .
κλήρου []
65 . [
καὶ τοῦ . . . [
'Ωρος Μίνισιος τη'. []
. [.][.]τίτ[]
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
41. δωδεκαχλικαν above the line. 60. στοτοῆτις above petosiris erased.

Fr. (b).

Parts of four lines.

73 [. . . . .]ς 'Αγατίτητος ε.
[阿富κρών τ'δι' οι ωρος ελαι(ον) ρ].
75 [. .].κλῆς Φαμής κ'δ'
καὶ ταπιδωφαντῶν ε,
καὶ φακῆς δ',
καὶ δ' ὁ αὐτὸς ι.
Φεβίχις Θανώς Φα. [.].άκουτου
80 εἰς Ψιντήν β.
Κερκέσης Στέφανος Σατόκου
. [.].πτ[.]. . Απ' ὀλλοδώρου κδ,
. [.]. . [. . . Σ]ατόκου κδ.
... a pigeon-house 8 dr. At Kerkeses, Thotortaeus for oil 30 dr., the same for salt-tax 60 dr. At Phebichis, Diogenes for 16 dr. At Assua, Petosiris for 30 dr. At Kerkeses, Heracleides for the (12 chalci-tax?) on Polemarchus' holding 10 (?) dr., 10 (?) dr. of copper. Diocles for the 12 chalci-tax on Herodotus' holding 3 obols, 3 obols of copper; Sosipater for the green-stuffs (?) of Polemarchus' holding 8 dr. At Psuchis, Ammenes for beer-tax 6 dr. 4 ob. At Assua, the same (Ammenes) 26 dr. 4 ob. At Phebichis, Diphilus for land-tax 4 dr. 4½ ob., for embankments-tax 3½ ob. At Peroë, Thagombes 2½ ob., for embankments-tax ½ ob.; ... chonis son of Thotortaeus 1 dr. 3 ob., for embankments-tax ¼ ob.; Thotortaeus and Demostratus 1 dr., for embankments-tax 3½ ob.; ... 4½ ob., for embankments-tax ½ ob.; ... trius ... 2½ ob., for embankments-tax 3 ob.; ... son of Miusis 4½ ob., for embankments-tax ½ ob. ... on the cow of Tamanis which he bought from Eirene 4 dr. 1 ob. At Psæbthonembe (?) Penoupis son of (?) Aunchis for beer-tax 11 dr. 4 ob. At Choibnotmis, Petouis for beer-tax 63 dr. 2 ob. At Mouchis Pasis son of (?) Tetobatis for land-tax 2½ ob., for embankments-tax ½ ob., and Teos 3½ ob., for embankments-tax 3½ ob. At Phebichis, Teos for the 12 chalci-tax upon the holding of Demetrius 4½ ob., 4½ ob. of copper. At ... is, Horus ... 27 dr. 1 ob.; ... son of ... nubis 2½ ob. ... for the 12 chalci-tax on the holding of ... 11 dr., 11 dr. of copper. ... the royal holding near the village of Pselemachis for the instalment due from him up to Pauni (?) 28 dr. At Phebichis, Diogenes for the tax of 2½ 1½ dr. 1 ob. At Thmoiothos, Thasis for oil 12 dr. At Phebichis, Antigenes, Persian, on behalf of Posidonius for the 12 chalci-tax upon the holding which he cultivates among those which are valued in silver
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13 dr., 13 dr. of copper. At Toënegous (?), Thotortaeus ...; Theos for land-tax 4 dr. 3 ob., for embankments-tax ... At Mouchis, Emges (?), son of (?) Harpotis for the tax of \( \frac{1}{3} \) ... At Perchuphis, Kollouthes for the tax of \( \frac{1}{3} \), and for the tax of \( \frac{1}{3} \) 2 dr. 3 ob. At Pheobicis, Psenchonsis for the 12 chalcis-t also upon the holdings of Comon and Xenophantus 5 dr., 5 dr. of copper; Senuris for land-tax 4 \( \frac{1}{3} \) ob., for embankments-tax \( \frac{1}{3} \) ob.; Étheus son of Isiégis (?), \( \frac{1}{3} \) ob., for embankments-tax \( \frac{1}{3} \) ob. At Assua, Diogenes the sum due from ... son of (?) Harpotis for the 12 chalcis-t also upon the holding of Cleon 3 dr., 3 dr. of copper. At Pheobicis, Petobastis for the (12 chalcis-t also upon) holdings valued in silver, upon the holding of Phileusis ... At Thmoiouthis ... At Psuchis, Pais for surety of Dionsisus on account of the tax of \( \frac{1}{3} \) ... Petosiris for the tax of \( \frac{1}{3} \) ... At Pheobicis, Stotoéis son of Sen ... for land-tax (?) upon palms ...; Apollonius for embankments-tax upon ...; Stotoéis for the 12 chalcis-t also upon the holding of ... ; Horus son of Miusis ... Fr. (β), '... of Agatís 5 dr. At Ancyronpolis, Horus for oil 160 dr. At (?) ... Phames for the tax of \( \frac{5}{2} \) 50 dr., and for carpet-weavers 5 dr., and for lentil-cake 4 dr., and the same for the tax of \( \frac{3}{4} \) 10 dr. At Pheobicis, Thanos son of Pha ... akoutes to the credit of Psintaés 2 dr. At Kerkoses, Stephanus son of Satokus for ... of Apollodorus 24 dr.; ... son of Satokus 24 dr. At Pheobicis, Ptolemæus for the 12 chalcis-t also upon the holding of ... 1 dr. \( \frac{1}{3} \) ob., 1 dr. \( \frac{1}{5} \) ob. of copper ... At Choibnotmis ... upon holdings valued in silver ... At Thmoiouthis ... of Stotoéis for the 12 chalcis-t also upon the sacred land of Ammon ... At Pheobicis, Apollonius ... the sum due from Psenchonsis on account of the sixth (?) upon his garden which formerly belonged to Diphilus 9 dr. 5 ob., and ...; for bath-tax ... son of Philon ...

1. περιστεραῖον: a τρίτη περιστερών, i.e. a tax of \( \frac{1}{3} \) on the profits of pigeon-houses, is known in Ptolemaic times from Wilcken, Ost. II. no. 1228 (cf. I. p. 279), P. Petrie III. 119 recto, and P. Tebt. 84. 9 (cf. note ad loc.); but the impost here may be different. The preceding words may be [δ'] αυτ' ρόδα'; cf. l. 3.

2. ἐλαιόν: cf. II. 39, 74, and I13. 12-4. Thotortaeus was probably an ἑλαιοκόπτης; cf. Rev. Laws xlvi. 3-12.

3. ἀλήθυς: cf. P. Petrie III. pp. 273-4 and Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 141-4. That the salt industry was a government monopoly is practically certain, but the principles upon which it was managed are not clear.

4. Near the end of the line is an i somewhat above the level of the other letters, probably part of the abbreviation for δωδεκακάλκης; cf. the next note. With τοῦ before Πολεμάρχου in l. 7, as in l. 9, supply κλήρου; cf. l. 41 and notes on 52. 26 and 117. 8.

8. (δωδέκα)χ(αλκίαν): this new word, which usually in 112 is abbreviated in the form χβ over χ, is written out in l. 41. The name indicates a tax of 12 chalci (1\( \frac{1}{2} \) obols) upon, probably, the aroura; and it generally occurs in connexion with cleruchic land, being paid by the γεωργοί on behalf of the cleruchs (cf. II. 30, 33, 41, &c.), but in one case (l. 89) the land in question is ἑρδα. Payment is made in copper, except perhaps in II. 42 and 55 (cf. I. 87), where the κλήρου are said to be τῶν πρῶτοι ἀργύριον, sc. διακουμένων or some such word (cf. e.g. P. Tebt. 60. 41). A peculiarity of the entries concerning this tax is the fact that the amount is stated twice, χα(λεον) being prefixed in the second instance. If the unit of taxation was the aroura, as would be expected, this impost of 1\( \frac{1}{2} \) obols, which = about \( \frac{3}{4} \) artaba of wheat (cf. 84. (a). 8-9, note), may well correspond to the imposts ranging from \( \frac{1}{3} \) artaba to 1 artaba upon cleruchic and sacred land found in the Tebtunis papyri of the next century; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 430-1. Whether πρῶτοι ἀργύριον in II. 42 and 55 is contrasted with payments in copper or with payments in kind is not clear.

9. For χαλκίων cf. the λογεία χαλκίων in 51. 2, and the payments for χαλκίων in 119. 17 and for χαλκίων εἰς σπέρμα in 117. 4.
13. ἐπαροφίστων: this is the first occasion on which the name of this impost upon the aroura of, probably, palm-, vine-, and fruit-bearing land (cf. l. 61 ἐπαροφίστων) has been found in the third century B.C.; but cf. P. Petrie III. 20 (a), i where the tax of 8 drachmae per aroura on, apparently, vine-land may well be the ἐπαροφίστων. In the second century B.C. it is mentioned in several ostraca (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 193) and in P. Tebt. 209, and frequently in the Roman period, payments being, as here, uniformly in money. In 112 the χωματικοῖς or tax on embankments is regularly associated with the ἐπαροφίστων, and in the present instance is about 1/8 of it. In l. 15 the χωματικοῖς is only 1/12 of the ἐπαροφίστων, but in the other cases (ll. 14, 16–9, 28–9, 50) the proportion of the amounts paid for the two taxes is nearly the same as in l. 13. Since the χωματικοῖς at this period was often 1 obol per aroura (P. Petrie III. 108, 2, &c., and p. 273), the ἐπαροφίστων in 112 was very likely about 8 obols per aroura.

14–9. The first of the two payments in each of these entries refers to the ἐπαροφίστων; cf. the preceding note.

19. Perhaps [Προς] Μίσσιος; cf. l. 67. For the supplement of the final lacuna cf. l. 17.

22. Perhaps τέλος βωσ; cf. P. Fay. 62. 3 τέλος βωσ ... ἃς ἑώρητα. The impost in question is the ἐγκύλων of 5 per cent., on which cf. 70 (a), introd. The value of this cow was therefore 83 dr. 2 ob.

25. Ψεμθων(εμψιν): cf. 33. 7 and p. 8. The names of the villages are, however, not abbreviated elsewhere in this papyrus; and it is quite possible that Ψεμθωνευσίτης should be read, especially as this combination would avoid the difficulty with regard to Αξικύλως, which if Πεμνότης is the tax-payer has to be treated as a genitive, i.e. for Αξικύλως. The fathers' names of the tax-payers are sometimes found in 112, e.g. in l. 81; but it is not very satisfactory to suppose the omission of o in the termination -ως in a papyrus so early and in other respects so well written as 112. A precisely similar difficulty arises in ll. 27 and 45, and on the whole it seems best to suppose that in all these cases two nominatives are found together, the second being a mistake for the genitive or καί being omitted.

27. Μαυκήν: cf. p. 8, and for the accusative l. 14 Περών. But if Μαυκήν Πάτης be two words ἡμιδάστης must be corrected (cf. l. 25, note), and perhaps the name of the village was Μαυχιστάτης; cf. the form Μαυκαθήν( ... ) on p. 8, and l. 45, note.

29. The 3/4 obols are for ἐπαροφίστων; cf. l. 27 and note on l. 13.

30. For the supplement (δωδέκα) ἀλκίων) cf. l. 8, note.

35. κλήροι βασιλικῶν: cf. 52. 26, note. What this payment of 28 dr. was for does not appear.

37. There is hardly room for Περών, unless αὐτός was very cramped.

38. κʾ: several impost called κʾ τα are known in the Ptolemaic period; cf. 80. 4, κʾ on goods exported from the Heracleopolite to the Arsinoite nome, 95. 7 τετραμικευκουστή (stë) τετραμικόδων, P. Petrie I. 25 (2), 2 τετραμικευκουστή πυρῶν, 115 introd. κʾ ἐρίων, and the τετραμικευκουστή paid in kind by βασιλικοὶ γεωργοί at Kerkeosiris (P. Tebt. I. 93, introd.). Which of these taxes is meant here is uncertain.

41–2. Cf. note on l. 8.

43. ΢ετίνγους seems to be a village rather than a personal name.

45. Μαυκήν Ἐμγή: cf. ll. 25 and 27, notes. Εμγή is a proper name Ἐρυθῶν; but perhaps Μαυκήν Ἐμγή should be read.

δʾ: cf. l. 47 and τετάρτη as the heading of a tax-list in P. Petrie III. 117 (b), ii, 1, where it means the τετάρτη ταμεχηρῶν and στιτοποιῶν. That is very likely to be the impost meant in 112, though a τετάρτη ἀλκίων is also known, on which cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 137–41, and P. Tebt. I. pp. 49–50. For the τετάρτη ταμεχηρῶν and στιτοποιῶν cf. P. Fay. 15, 3 (where l. τὴν δʾ (so Wilcken) τῶν στιτοποιῶν καὶ [τῶν] ταμεχηρῶν), and P. Petrie III. introd., p. 8 and 58 (a). 2.
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It seems to have been a tax of \( \frac{1}{4} \) on the profits of the salting and milling (or perhaps baking) industries.

50. Σενύρης may be a village-name, in which case Ξεγγύνησις must be supplied from l. 48.

51. Είσιγγηος: though the \( \gamma \) may well be superfluous (cf. 27. 53, note), this word would seem to be the name of the father of Ἐρφεῖος rather than of a place (sc. Ἱστείον; cf. 167).

52. τὸ παρά : cf. l. 92 and 109. 9.

54. δωδεκαχάλιαν is probably to be supplied before κλῆρων from l. 53; cf. ll. 41-2 and l. 8, note.

57. For ἕγγυν cf. the payments for διεγγύησις in 114-5.

61. Cf. note on l. 13. The χωματικόν was in the present case paid by a different person (l. 62).

74. [Ἄγκυρων π' δαίμ.]: cf. pp. 9-10.

75. [. . .]κλῆς, if not a place-name, affords another example of two nominatives together; cf. l. 25, note.

76. ταπεινόφαντων : the name of this impost 'for carpet-weavers' is new. Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 177) resolves the abbreviation δαπ( ), which occurs in one of his ostraca as the name of a tax, as δαπ(ίδφων), i.e. ταπεινόφων, and regards it as a branch of the χειρωνιξίου or tax on trades; but this explanation of δαπ( ) is not very likely. Whether ταπεινόφαντων here means merely a tax on that trade, or is connected with the ἄθυτηνα monopoly (on which cf. 87, introd., and Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 266-9) is uncertain.

77. φακές : this too is a new name of a tax; but cf. ἐπωνύμων φακέψισ εἰς the description of an impost in P. Par. 67. 16. φακέψισ is also to be read above βαλανείον in P. Petrie III. 37 (b). verso 6, but seems to have been intentionally rubbed out. The nature of this impost connected with lentil cake is quite obscure.

80. Ψωτήρ seems to be a man rather than a place.

86-7. Cf. ll. 41-2 and note on l. 13.

89-90. Cf. l. 8, note.

92. For the supplement ἐκτής (i.e. the ἄποιμορα) cf. 109. 10. But the ἐπαρούριον may be meant; cf. l. 13, note.

93. For τὸν αὐτὸν παράδειγμαν meaning 'his garden' instead of 'the same garden' cf. e.g. P. Petrie III. 117 (g). 38 and 40.

113. **Banker's Account.**


Two incomplete columns of an official account of sums paid or owing, resembling P. Petrie III. 93, verso. Judging by the miscellaneous character of the entries, which refer amongst other things to deficiencies in connexion with the revenues from the oil and beer industries (ll. 12-5), and a present from the State to distressed cultivators (ll. 18-20), it is probable that the writer was connected with a royal bank or λογεντήριον (cf. 106, introd.). The handwriting is a small, very flowing cursive of a distinctly early type, and the papyrus is
certainly not later than the end of Philadelphus' reign. We omit the second column which is much obliterated.

5 kal tò ἐπιγραφέν τόiś . . . . . . . . .
   tois tò ē̄stos μή εἰλη[φ]όσιν
   en τῇ τῶν κομῶν . . . . . . . . . . . . . χα(λκοῦ) ηα (ημιωβέλιον).
kai tò en Πάσιτι . . . . . . . . . . . .
   λογευτή̂ των παρ[α . . . . . .]τί

10 Βότρωι τοῖς φυλακητ[ηὶ καὶ ?]
   ἀναχωρήσαντι ξυτή[ρας] χα(λκοῦ) λδ (ημιωβέλιον) (τέταρτον),
   καὶ ἑλακή̂ς χα(λκοῦ) ρζξ (ὁβολὸς) (ημιωβέλιον).
kai en tois ἀντιλέγονσιν μή εἰλη-
   φέναι ἑλαίον χα(λκοῦ) σ.

15 en Totō̂i Πάσιτος λογευτή̂
   οὐ μηθέν ὑπάρχει ξτ (τριώβολον) (τέταρτον).
kai tò δοθεν τοῖς ἀσθενοῦσιν
   τῶν γεωργῶν εἰς τὰ ἔργα τῶν
   κτημάτων ἀργ(υρίων) κ.

2. s of os above the line. 5. etp of ἐπιγραφέαν above awa erased. 6. o of tois
corr. from a.

8-19. 'Item, owed by Pasis son of . . . , tax-collector, who . . . Botrus the guard and disappeared, for the beer-tax 34 dr. 3/4 ob. in copper, and for the oil-tax 167 dr. 1/2 ob. in copper. Item, owed by the persons who deny that they have received it, for oil 6 dr. in copper. Owed by Totoës son of Pasis, tax-collector, who has no property, 66 dr. 3/4 ob. Item, given to the distressed cultivators for operations in their vineyards, 20 dr. in silver.'

5. The persons meant are probably the beer-sellers, though ξυτηράς is too long; cf. ll. 13-4 which seem to refer to the ἑλακή̂ς.

7. If κομῶν is right a word meaning 'list' or 'distribution' would be expected after it; but the initial η is doubtful, and μ or γ might be read.

9. Perhaps παρασταντι. It is not clear whether ἀναχωρήσαντι refers to Πάσιτι or to Βότρωι.

11-2. ὁνή̂ς is to be supplied with both ξυτηράς and ἑλακή̂ς. The sum owed by Pasis under the latter heading probably refers to the payments by ἑλακάπηλοι to the government
officials for oil supplied; cf. Rev. Laws xlviii. 3–12 and the next note. The ζυγήρα probably means the tax levied on the beer-manufacturers; cf. 106, introd.

13–4. τοῖς ἀντιλέγοντας μὴ εἴληφέναι is ambiguous. If the object to be supplied for ἐληφέναι is the 6 drachmae, the ἀντιλέγοντες are λογοευάλ like Πῶς in l. 8. But on the analogy of l. 6 the object of ἐληφέναι is more likely to be θαλαοί, in which case the εἰλουκάτηδος are most probably meant; cf. the preceding note.

19. For κτήμα in the sense of a 'vineyard' cf. P. Petrie III. 28 (c). 4, 67 (b). 10, &c. The abbreviation of ἀμφύπιον forms a symbol resembling that for ἀμφύβις (which is of course nothing but a combination of αμφ), as in P. Petrie III. 114. 9.


Mummy 25. 23.5 x 19.8 cm. B. C. 244 (243).

An account of payments made at Cynopolis by Apollonius and Onnophris, contractors for the πλύνος καὶ στίβος (or -ον; the gender is in both cases doubtful), in the 3rd year of a king who is probably Euergetes. The precise meaning of these two words, upon which the interpretation of the papyrus turns, is not easy to determine. πλύνος occurs in two Ptolemaic ostraca published by Wilcken, Ost. II. 329 (third century B.C.) and 1497 (second century B.C.), which are receipts for 60 drachmae and 500 drachmae for τυρικής πλύνον, and also on the recto of 110 in proximity to an account concerning νίτρον. There was therefore a close connexion between νίτρον and πλύνος, and the question arises whether πλύνος and στίβος could signify some preparation of νίτρον. The production of natron was most probably a government monopoly, and the market may have been supplied through contractors, in the same way as in the case of oil. But there is no other trace of any such sense for πλύνος or στίβος. πλύνος should mean either a place for washing or the articles washed; cf. Suid. πλύνος δευτόνος τὸ ἀγγείον αὐτό, παροδευτόνος δὲ τὸ πλυνόμενον. It is in the latter sense that Wilcken understands the word in the combination τυρικής πλύνον (Ost. I. p. 264). στίβος ordinarily means 'path' or 'footstep,' but in this context is obviously to be connected with the sense of 'washing,' which the same root has in στείβειν and στείβετε. On the whole we are inclined to think that Apollonius and Onnophris were contractors for washing and fulling carried out in a place or places under State control, though whether the words πλύνος and στίβος have themselves a local signification—which is not really incompatible with the ostraca—or are equivalent to τὰ πλυνόμενα καὶ στείβομενα, has still to be determined. Another possible alternative would be to suppose that πλύνος and στίβος are loosely used, and that the subject of the contract was not the industry itself but the tax upon it. The tax upon the fuller's trade (γυμφίκιι) is well known in the Roman period, but there is as yet
no evidence concerning it in Ptolemaic times. Between the several alternative explanations a decision is hardly attainable without further evidence. The document is written in a large calligraphic hand. The order of the months in which the instalments are paid gives rise to a difficult chronological problem; cf. note on II. 3-5.

Col. i.

Παρὰ Ἀπολλονίου καὶ Ὅμων ὄφρεως
tὸν ἑκκαλλφάτων τὸν πλύνον
καὶ στίβου εἰς τὸ γ (ἐτος) (δραχμῶν) 'Β...
ἑσσὶν δὲ ἡ ἀναφορὰ ἀπὸ Μεκείρ
ἔως Ἀφαώμη μηνῶν θ (δραχμαί) 'Βις (δύουδολοι) (ἡμιωβέλιον).
εἰς τοῦτο πέπτωκεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἐν Κυ(νών) πό(λει)
λογεντήριον
Μεκείρ πλύνον (δραχμαί) ρ μδ,
στίβου λς,

Col. ii.

ὁμὴ
cαι ἀπὸ διεγγυήσεως (δραχμαί) ε,
πλύνου σμγ.
στίβου ρος,
γίνεται σμγ.
φαώμη πλύνου ρνς,
στίβου [ξΣ,
γίνεται Ἀωη,
λαπαι ρθ (δύουδολοι) (ἡμιωβέλιον).

6. του of τούτο inserted above the line.
13. τ of ὅμωτ corr. from θ.

'From Apollonius and Onnophris, the contractors for the washing and fulling (?) in the third year at 2... drachmae. The instalment for the 9 months from Mekeir to
Phaophi is 207 drachmae 2½ obols: to meet this there has been paid into the collecting-office at Cynopolis, in Mecheir for washing 144 dr., for fulling 37 dr., total 181 dr... Thoth 238 dr., and as surety-money 5 dr., total 243 dr. For washing 177 dr., for fulling 66 dr., making 243 dr. Phaophi for washing 156 dr., for fulling 66 dr., making 232 dr. Total 1898 dr.; remainder 119 dr. 2½ ob.'

3-5. If the amounts due each month were equal, the monthly instalment would amount to 224 dr. ½ ob., and the total to 2689 dr. 5½ ob.; but those figures cannot be read in l. 3. The instalments may therefore be assumed to have differed; cf. 116. 3-4. That the series begins with Mecheir is worth noting in connexion with 115. 5 and 116. 3; cf. notes ad loc. It is impossible to be certain in the present case whether the fourth quarter of the year was reckoned as preceding Mecheir or following after Phaophi. But whether Arthur or, as is more likely, Mecheir is here the beginning of the financial year, this does not coincide with the ordinary revenue year starting in Thoth, in spite of the fact that in l. 3 the two taxes are stated to be farmed 'for the 3rd year' of a king. We defer to App. ii. p. 361 a discussion of the possible solutions of this complicated problem.


12. The lower half of the column which contained details for the five months from Pharmouthi to Mesore is lost.

14. The meaning of this item is that the payments being in arrear one of the sureties for the contractors had to make up the deficiency. At the end of the nine months there was still a considerable sum owing. Similar entries occur in 115. 15 and 34.

16-7. These are the details for Thoth, the 5 dr. ἀπὸ διαίγγυρεως being included in one of the items; the total given in l. 15 is repeated in l. 18.

115. ACCOUNTS

Mummy 84. Fr. (a) 24.7 × 11 cm. About b.c. 250.

Some fragmentary taxing accounts, of which the two columns given below are in a fair state of preservation. The first of these relates to the μῦςχωρ ἰδεκάτη, or 10 per cent. duty upon sacrificial calves, which is here first met with in the Ptolemaic period. The fragment published in P. Petrie II. p. 37, from which Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 377) infers the existence in the third century B.C. of a tax on sacrifices, is shown by the republication in P. Petrie III. 112 (a) not to justify that conclusion. The tax is also called a ἰδεκάτη in P. Tebt. II. 307 and 605-7, of about the year A.D. 200, where the amount is 20 drachmae, paid in two cases at least by priests. The impost was probably levied by the State upon the profits which the priests derived upon the sacrifices offered by private persons; cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 384-5.

The subject of the next column is a tax of 5 per cent. on wool, apparently a property-tax, of which the present is the first mention. A tax of ½ on wool (κ' ψ' ἐρώτω) is found in another (unpublished) Hibeh papyrus; but whether
that represents the same impost at a lower rate or is something distinct, e.g. an export duty (cf. 80), is not clear. Concerning the wool-tax in Roman times information is even scantier, though P. Cairo 1c449 (Wilcken, Archiv, I. p. 552), in which ἐρμά occurs, proves that it continued to exist.

Both accounts are arranged on the same plan. At the head of the column are the names of the tax and the tax-farmers, which are followed by estimates of the amounts expected in different months and statements of the sums actually paid; cf. 116.

The papyrus belongs to about the middle of the third century, but no date occurs. Col. iii is written over some earlier writing which has been washed out.

Col. ii.

μῦχων δικάτης I...... καὶ
Νικάιωρ  
ἐποβάλλει τῶν µηνι...
ἐῖς τοῦτο γράφουσι γε[ίνεσθαι]
5 Μεχρό (τριώβολοι),
Φαμενώθ (τριώβολοι) (ἡµιωβέλιον),
Φαρμοῦθι οὐθὲν,
Παχώνε (δραχµάς) ἐδ [δυνατοῦ],
/ (δραχµαί) ἐς (δυνάβολοι) (ἡµιωβέλιον).
10 πέπτωκε Μεχρό οὐθὲν,
Φαμενώθ (δραχµή) α (ἡµιωβέλιον),
Φαρμοῦθι οὐθὲν,
Παχώνε (δραχµαί) νη (πεντώβολον) []
Παύνι ἀπὸ (δραχµῶν) ἐς (δραχµαί) γ (τριώβολον) (ἡµιωβέλιον) (τεταρτον ?), [λο(παι) (δραχµαί) ἐβ (δυνάβολοι) (τεταρτον).
15 καὶ διεγγύσεις ύπ’ Αρµ. ......... [δραχµαί] κε,
καὶ προσκαταστήσονσι ....], ῥον (δραχµὰς) ε,
/ (δραχµαί) λ
Παύνι γεῖνεται
ἐς .... ι
115. ACCOUNTS

Col. iii.

20 ἐκοστὴς ἔρεων Τρ[.]ν. [ καὶ
'Iναρωῦς Ἀμμωνίου [ εἰσι δὲ τούτο γράφουσι γείνε[σθαι
Μεξιρ (δραχμὰς ?) λγ (τριώβολον ?),
25 Φαμενόθ (δραχμὰς ?) τλβ (δοβολῶν) (τέταρτον ?),
Φαρμώθυ [ (δραχμὰς) . .α (τριώβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
Παχοῦς [ (δραχμὰς . .α (δοβολῶν ?) (ἡμιωβέλιον) (τέταρτον ?),

πέπτωκεν Μ[εξιρ
30 Φ[αμενόθ [ 
Φαρμώθυ [ 
Παχοῦς (δραχμαί ?) [ 
... σια (δραχμαί) μια [ 
[καὶ] διεγγύησις ι̃ το [ 
35 καὶ ἕπερ 'Ιναρωῦτ'ος [ 
[ 
36 Παῦνι γείνε[ται [ 

37 [ ...] δα νι. [ 

'[For the tenth upon calves, I . . . and Nicanor . . . The instalment due for the month is . . .; for this they write that there is (or was?) paid, in Mecheir 3 obols, in Phamenoth 3½ ob., in Pharmouthi nothing, in Pachon 64 dr. 2 ob., total 65 dr. 2½ ob. Receipts: in Mecheir nothing, in Phamenoth 1 dr. ½ ob., in Pharmouthi nothing, in Pachon 5½ dr. 5 ob., in Pauni, out of 66 dr., 3 dr. 3½ ob., leaving 62 dr. 2½ ob. Also as surety-money from Arm . . . 25 dr., and they will in addition provide . . . 5 dr., total 30 dr. In Pauni is paid . . .
'The twentieth on wool, Tr . . . and Inarōús son of Ammonius. The instalment due every four days is . . .; for this they write that there is (?) paid, in Mecheir 33 dr. 3 ob., in Phamenoth 332 dr. 1¼ ob., in Pharmouthi [. . .] dr. 3½ ob., in Pachon [. .] 5½ dr. 1¼ ob., total . . . Receipts: in Mecheir, &c.'

1-2. The ends of these two lines and of ll. 14-6 are upon the piece of papyrus
containing Col. iii, and are combined with Col. ii on the basis of the arithmetic in ll. 15-7; but there is nothing to determine the precise length of the lacunae. The names here and in ll. 20-1 are those of the tax-farmers.

3. Cf. l. 22, where της (τετρ)ήμ(ήπου) takes the place of τὸς με ηπι ( {? ). The reading there is not very certain, and the letters might be read μη, i.e. (τετρ)μη(νου); but the former alternative is confirmed by the occurrence of the same abbreviation in the remains of the first column, and there the last letter is plainly μ (or π), not η. Apparently ll. 3 and 22 give purely hypothetical estimates, gained by a simple process of arithmetical division, of the amount falling due within the period named; cf. 116, 5, where after a statement of amounts payable in the two halves of the year the papyrus proceeds δεὶ σεν αὐτῶν τάκασσαι τῆς (τετρ)ήμ(ήπου) . . . The estimates which follow in ll. 4-9 and 23-8, on the other hand, though also hypothetical, have obviously a closer relation to facts, and may be conjectured to be the amounts paid in the corresponding periods of the preceding year. This point would be clearer if the word after γράφωνει in ll. 4 and 23 were definitely ascertainable. An infinitive is expected, and on the whole γείσανθον or γείσαθοι seem most suitable; if the latter were adopted the reference to a previous occasion would be more necessary.

5. Μειρα: this month perhaps began the financial year; cf. notes on 114, 3-5 and 116, 3-4, and pp. 360-1.

14. This mention of Pauni, which month does not occur in the list of estimates in ll. 5-8 and apparently belongs to the next group of entries (l. 18), is curious. Perhaps these 3 dr., 3⅔ obols paid in Pauni were reckoned with the account of Mecher—Pachon in order to diminish the difference between 65 dr., 2⅛ obols, the total of the estimate (l. 9), and 59 dr., 5⅔ (or 5⅞) ob., the sum of the actual receipts in ll. 10-3. A somewhat similar difficulty arises in the corresponding passage of the other account at l. 33, where there is an additional entry of an obscure character after the sums relating to the 4 months; but Pauni cannot be read there.

Some of the figures in l. 14 are by no means certain. The first number is probably εξ or εξ; and the question arises whether the figures at the end of the line represent the difference between these 66 or 67 drachmae and the 3 dr., 3⅔ ob. actually paid, or the sum of the 3 dr., 3½ ob. and the preceding items in ll. 10-3. We have been led to adopt the former supposition owing to the circumstance that the obols and fractions in l. 14 add up to a drachma, as apparently they should do if λο(πτην) is supplied in the lacuna, whereas the sums in ll. 10-3, which amount to at least 59 dr., 5⅛ obols, added to 3 dr., 3⅔ ob. make 63 dr., 3⅛ ob., and the number at the end of l. 14 is not 3⅛ but 2⅛ obols. But the blurred vestiges at the end of the line do not suggest εξ or εξ.

15. Perhaps 'Αρμείανας (?), a name which occurs in the first column. For διεγγύωνος cf. 114, 14, note. The size of the lacunae in the middle of ll. 15-6 is uncertain; cf. note on ll. 1-2.

16. The vestige of the letter before ροιν would suit α or ο.

22 sqq. Cf. note on l. 3.

33. The supposed ε might be η and the preceding letter ε or η. Neither γείσανθο nor λοντι can be read; cf. l. 14, note.

37. There are traces of five lines between this and l. 36, but they apparently all belong to the erased document; cf. introd.
116. **ACCOUNTS**

**ACCOUNT OF BATH-TAX.**

Mummy 12.  
16.8 x 16.8 cm.  
About B.C. 245.

Part of an account dealing with the tax of a third upon baths, for the collection of which at Busiris (the modern Abusir) the large sum of 1320 drachmas was paid by Aristander. This impost, which is to be distinguished from the ordinary tax *βαλανείων*, was apparently a percentage of 1/3 levied upon the profits of privately owned baths; cf. note on 108. 7. An estimate is first given (cf. 115) of the amounts (which are not equal) accredited to the two halves of the year, and of the sum falling due every four days; and an account of the actual payments follows. It is remarkable that the half years commenced with Mecheir and Mesore; cf. note on 1. 3.

The column printed is preceded by the ends of lines from another column, which contained a similar account relating probably to a different tax; cf. 115. These two columns are written on the verso of the papyrus. On the recto are two more columns of official accounts, unfortunately both fragmentary, written in a different hand and referring to *νίτρων* and *πλύνον* (cf. 114). Col. i shows that *νίτρων* was priced at 4 drachmas the talent, e.g. ll. 10–11 *νίτρων* (τάλαντα) ῥηγγ' ἀν(ά) δ (δραχμαί) φληγ (δυσβολοί), | *νίτρων* (τάλαντα) Ἀτληγγ' ἀν(ά) δ (δραχμαί) 'Εργή (δυσβολοί). In P. Tebt. I. 120 3 minae of *νίτρων* are valued at 50 copper drachmas, which on a ratio of silver to copper of 1 : 450 exactly corresponds with the price here. The three preceding lines contain the entry *νίτρων* ? (τάλαντα) ν, εἰσόδεια τής | [14 letters?] εἰκ τῷ ἑπτάμιλλοντος | [αὐτοῖς (?) κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα ἀν(ά) κ. Col. ii, in which *πλύνον* ἐκκ. occurs, mentions διεγγύθησις [ (cf. 114. 14, 115. 15), and τῷ παρὰ τὸν οἰκονόμον ἐγγαθώτι . . . | ἐγγύσιν εἰς ἐκτίσιν (cf. 94–5).

The papyrus may belong to the latter part of the reign of Philadelphus or the earlier years of Euergetes; it was the only Greek document from Mummy 12.

Col. ii.

*βαλανείων γ'*

Βουσείρεσις 'Αρίστανθρος Θιβρωνος (δραχμαί) Ἀτ[.κ.]

diaίρεσις Μεχίρ ἐως Ἐπειθ ἀν(ά) ἄ (τετρώβολον) (δραχμαί) φυ,

Μεσορή ἐως Τιβίθ ἀν(ά) ῥηκ (δυσβόλους) (δραχμαί) ψυ, πιλήρεσι (?) [ 5
dεὶ οὖν αὐτὸν τάξασθαι τῆς (τετρ)ήμ(έρου) ἐγ (τετρώβολον).

πέπτωκεν
Meχιρ β β (τετράβολον) τέταρτον, γ β (τετράβολον) η (δύο βολοί),
i θ (δύο βολοί) τέταρτον, ια β (πεντάβολον) [(ήμιωβέλιον),
iδ β (τριώβολον), ιζ δ, ιη ζ (δύο βολοί), κς κε, / ξ β (πεντάβολον).

Φαμένω

ζ α (δοβόλος) (ήμιωβέλιον), ! ιβ, !' ιη, !ζ (τετράβολον) (ήμιωβέλιον),
iζ κ', κ'.

κδ δ, κς δ (τετράβολον), ζ ιζ (τετράβολον) / ζα (τριώβολον) (ήμιωβέλιον), και τιού

Παύνιον ζα (τετράβολον),

/ σκ (ήμιωβέλιον), λ(οιπαί) ρλτ (τριώβολον) (ήμιωβέλιον). και τιού

πε(πτωκε) Παύνι / / μτ,

λ(οιπαί) ρπβ (δοβόλος) (ήμιωβέλιον). [εἰς τ]ουτ'ο πε(πτωκε) ?

The third upon baths. At Busiris: Aristander son of Thibron 1320 drachmae. The period from Mecheir to Epeiph at 91 drachmae 4 obols, 550 dr.; from Mesore to Tubi at 128 dr. 2 ob., 770 dr. He ought therefore to pay for every four days 13 dr. 4 ob.

Paid: on Mecheir 2nd, 2 dr. 4½ ob.; 3rd, 2 dr. 4 ob. &c.

3-4. Since the two half-yearly periods commenced with Mecheir and Mesore the year must have been reckoned from one of those two months. Mecheir being put first would be more naturally regarded as the starting-point, and that view is to some extent corroborated by 114. 4, 115. 5, 24; cf. 114. 3-5. note. On the other hand Mesore as the beginning of a financial year is supported by the evidence of 133 and Rev. Laws lvi. 5. In any case it is strange that in matters directly relating to taxation the regnal or at any rate some year which differed from the revenue year beginning on Thoth i was so often employed; cf. pp. 360-1.

4. For πλ(ήρει) after a figure to indicate that nothing is wanting cf. e.g. P. Petrie III. 109 (c). 6. But πλ( ), if that be the right reading, may also stand for πλέων, and a figure would then have followed, perhaps σκ, i.e. the difference between the two totals.

5. (τετρα)μη(νον) or (τετρα)μή(νον), but the former seems preferable on the analogy of 115. 3; cf. note ad loc.

6. (τριώβολον) or (τετράβολον) may be read at the end of the line in place of (πεντάβολον), in which case another entry would follow for the 12th or 13th of the month.

12. The figure from which σκ (ήμιωβέλιον), the sum of the actual receipts from Mecheir to Pachon, is subtracted is the total due for those four months calculated on the scale given in l. 3: 91 dr. 4 ob. X 4 = 366 dr. 4 ob. 230 dr. ½ ob. subtracted from this leaves 136 dr. 3½ ob., which were still owing. To this deficiency is added the estimated total for Pauuni in accordance with the scale in l. 3, making 228 dr. 1½ obols, from which are deducted the actual receipts for Pauuni, 46 dr., leaving 182 dr. 1½ ob. still owing at the end of that month. How this deficiency was met was being explained when the papyrus breaks off.
117. **ACCOUNTS**

**117. RETURN OF CORN REVENUE.**

Mummy A.  

24 x 15.2 cm.  

b.c. 239 (238) or 214 (213).

An account of corn received during Epeiph, rendered by an official in charge of the State granaries of the Koitn; cf. the monthly returns of sitologi to the strategus in Roman times, e.g. B. G. U. 835. The total is curiously small, only 138½ ar tabae of olyra and 12 of wheat, the olyra being apparently the repayments of loans of seed for green crops, while the wheat was for the crown-tax, an impost levied on special occasions; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 223-4. The papyrus is dated in the 8th year of a king who is certainly not earlier than Euergetes, for the handwriting, which is extremely cursive, approximates more than that of most documents in this volume to the second century B.C. style; the reign may be that of Philopator, though the latest certain date found in these papyri is the 25th year of Euergetes (90). On the right are the beginnings of lines of another document in a different hand, and on the verso is part of another account.

["Ετός η, παρὰ Ἀρωνώφριος  
τοῦ τοῦ θη(σαυροῖς) τοῦ Κωίτου.  
σῖτου τοῦ μεμετρημένου  
ἐν τῷ 'Επείφ. χλωράων εἰς σπέρμα  
5 η (ἐτούς) πυρ(ῶν) ḍ, ζ (ἐτούς) πυρ(ῶν) η, / πυρ(ῶν) ιβ,  
ὁμοίων ῥηθ'ι, ῥ ιτὸ καθ' ἐν.  
ἐν Τάληι εἰς τοὺς περὶ Ψῦχιν  
Χαρῆς τοῦ Καλλιστράτου περὶ  
10 Ψῦχιν χλωράων σπ(έρμα) ὀλ(υρῶν) μζλ,  
ὁ αὐτὸς τοῦ Παρμενίωνος χλ(ωρῶν) σπ(έρμα) ὀλ(υρῶν) μζλ,  
[Σ]τράτων τοῦ Φιλίππου περὶ Ἀσσύναν  
χλ(ωρῶν) σπ(έρμα) ὀλ(υρῶν) μγδ',  
εἰς ταῦτα ἤκουσεν σπέρματος ὀλ(υρῶν) ρηθ'.  
15 ἐν Φεβίῳ Χεῖ Θεόδωρος τῶν ἐξ Ἀγ.  
κυρῶν πάλεως, α στεφάνου πυρ(ῶν)  
η (ἐτούς) πυρ(ῶν) ḍ, ζ (ἐτούς) πυρ(ῶν) η,  
Traces of 3 more lines.  
8. This line inserted later.
'The 8th year, from Haronnphris, superintendent of granaries of the Koîte district. Account of corn measured in Epeiph: for green-stuffs for seed 138½ artabae of olyra, for the crown-tax of the 8th year 4 artabae of wheat, for that of the 7th year 8 artabae of wheat. Total 12 artabae of wheat, 138½ artabae of olyra. Of this the details are: paid at Talae on account of holdings at Psuchis... charis on account of the holding of Callistratus at Psuchis for green-stuffs for seed 47½ artabae of olyra; the same on account of the holding of Parmenion for green-stuffs for seed 47½ artabae of olyra; Straton on account of the holding of Philippos at Assua for green-stuffs for seed 43½ artabae of olyra; total for green-stuffs for seed 138½ artabae of olyra. At Phebichis, Theodorus from Ancronpolis for the crown-tax paid in wheat of the 8th year 4 artabae of wheat, for that of the 7th year 8 artabae of wheat...'

4. χλωρῶν εἰς σπέρμα: cf. 119. 17, where 40½ artabae of wheat are paid for χλωρῶν among various items of receipts from a κλήμος, and the payments for χλωρά in 51. 2 and 112. 9.

8. Τάλημ: cf. 36. 3, note.
eἰς τοὺς: sc. κλήμος; cf. τοῦ Καλλιστράτου (sc. κλήμος) in l. 9, and notes on 52. 26, 112. 6, and 118. 2. Whether these κλήμος were really owned by cleruchs or had reverted to the Crown is not clear.

15-6. ἀγκευρὸν πόλεων: cf. pp. 9-10, 67. 4, and 112. 4. Very likely one or both words were abbreviated, unless the word before στεφάνου (of which the last letter may be λ instead of α) was an abbreviation. πυρ(ῶν) after στεφάνου seems superfluous; cf. ll. 5-6.

118. Account of Olyra.

Mummy A. Fr. (a) 17·8 x 26, Fr. (b) 26·2 x 20·8 cm. About B.C. 250.

Two fragments of an account of olyra, written probably by a sitologus or other official of the θησαυρός, in a large and clear hand over an obliterated document. Lines 1-15, which begin a new section headed σπέρμα and may be the actual commencement of the account, give a list of seed issued to or repaid by cultivators of crown or cleruchic land (cf. l. 2, note). Lines 17-36 give various details of expenditure for horses and other purposes; and in l. 37 begins a list of (apparently) payments to various persons from Pharmouthi to Mesore, the names of women being placed after those of men.

Fr. (a). Col. i. Col. ii.

σπέρματε
Πανείης εἰς τὸν Ἴασσων ὀλυρῶν λγζ, ἱπποὺς ὀλυρῶν β',
Πολέμων εἰς τὸν Ὀδηδόρου ροσ' η ἱπποὺς ὀλυρῶν β',
Ἀντικράτης εἰς τὸν Πολυαίνου νζ, 20 ἵδ ἱπποὺς ὀλυρῶν β'.
5 Ποκωῖς εἰς τὸν Τιμιοκράτου ρκε,
Ποκώθς εἰς τὴν Θεοχρήστον
dιώρυγα ἵη',
eίστε Ἰάσωνον ὀλ(υρών) ζ.ζ.,
Pαούτης με,
10 Νεχθωθς ἔγις,
Σουτεύς εἰς τῶν Θεοκ' . . . . . . ,
Σισώς εἰς τῶν Παρά', . . . . . . ,
καὶ ἤν ἐστειραν Θ' . . . . . .
[. . . . . . . ]
15 [ ] ὀλ(υρών) ὁμηθ'.
[. . . . . . . ]

Fr. (b).

Παχὼν ε ἰπποίς ὀλ(υρών) α,
β ὀλ(υρών) β, ἵστ αλ, κγ αλ,
κ' αλ, / ὀλ(υρών) ζ.ζ.
35 Παυνί β ὀλ(υρών) αλ, ἵσ αλ,
η αλ, ιε ζ ] / ὀλ(υρών) ε.

Φαρμούθη σιτομετρία:
Μαῖθωτής ὀλ(υρών) γ,
Κρατίνος ὀλ(υρών) γ, [ / δ(ωρών) ζ.
40 Παυνί σιτομετρία:
Κλίτος γ,
'I στήσος γ,
Πσῶν γι,
Μελανθίος δ.,
[Κεφάλων δ.,
[Θωρταῖος γ,]
[Πασίς γ,]
[Θόργων γ,]
'Απολλώνιος γ,]

Col. i.

Col. ii.

60 [Ἐπείφ']

Θοργων γ, Κλίτος γ,
Κεφάλων δ., Θωρταῖος γ,
65 Πωνος γ,
/ ὀλ(υρών) ις.

Μεσορή:
Μαῖθωτής ὀλ(υρών) γ,
Κρατίνος γ,
70 Μελανθίος δ., Κεφάλων δ.,
Θωρταῖος γ,
Κλάδος γ,
Κλίτος γ,
75 Νικᾶς γ, Πάσις γ,
Θόργων γ,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50</th>
<th>Κρατίνος γ, Νικίας γ, Πλάτων γ, Μαξιθωύτης γ, Κλάδος γ, Αμιθός γ, Μιριή β, Βουβάλιον β, γνυρῶν ν.η.</th>
<th>Απολλώνιος γ, Ἰστιής γ, Πλάτων γ, Ἀρμῦσις γ, Ποῦν γ, Διονύσεια ζ, Μυρρηνίς β, Βουβάλιον β, Σίμων β, γνυρῶν ζ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>ε of o corr. from γ, and ε at the end of the line corr. from ζ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. εἰς τὸν Ἴασωνα: sc. κλῆρος, as we think, though in P. Petrie III. 100, an account resembling the earlier part of 118, the editors supply λόγων with εἰς τὸν. But κλῆρος is more easily coupled with διόργανα (ll. 7 and 14) than λόγων; and cf. 117. 8, where with εἰς τοὺς περὶ Ψίχων probably κλῆρος is to be supplied, and P. Petrie II. 39 (ii). 10, where seed is ordered to be issued εἰς τὸν Διώκτον κλῆρον (cf. ll. 13-4 εἰς τὸν Ἀσκλήπεως καὶ Σωτάρου προσβοτέρων κλῆρον). It is not clear whether the account in ll. 2-15 refers to repayments of loans or to the actual advances of seed-corn, like P. Petrie III. 90. The Ἴασωνας κλῆρος must have been very large, since besides the 37½ artabae issued to Panetis, 97½ artabae are advanced to another of its γεωργοὶ (l. 8), and probably the entries in ll. 9-10 also refer to it. The advances of seed altogether in this section seem larger than would be expected in the case of regular cleruchic holdings which rarely exceeded 100 arourae, and the κλῆρος here are probably in reality βασιλικαί; cf. 52. 26, note. It is not certain whether 118 concerns an Oxyrhynchite or a Κόττα village, but if the village is Oxyrhynchite the Ἴασωνας κλῆρος here may be identical with the Ἴασωνας κλῆρος in P. Oxy. 265. 4.

6. The issue of seed for a canal is curious; cf. ll. 13-4. It must have been a deep cutting with sloping sides. Θεοχρήστου is more likely to have been the constructor (cf. the Κλέωνας διόργας in P. Petrie II. 6. 5), or some person after whom it was called, than the owner.

12. Παρὰ is very likely Παραμίνον; cf. 99. 7.

13. Perhaps ὄνομα ἄργυρου; cf. l. 6. But there was plenty of room for Θεοχρήστου in l. 13.

16. This line is probably a heading like l. 1. [Παρτόφώρον, sc. κόμη (cf. 87. 6), is possible. ἔκ φόρων is unlikely, for the letter after φορ resembles ω more than o, and a heading would be expected to project to the left.

37. αὐτομετρία: this word, which in itself might mean simply a measuring out of corn, is the technical term used for official payments from the State granaries to individuals for
119. **ACCOUNTS**

salaries, &c. (cf. 83. 5, introd.); and it is probable that the persons in the following lists were recipients, not payers. The grants may have been for κάτεργα (wages); cf. 119. 4, where κάτεργα is coupled with ἐκφόριον and σπέρμα in connexion with a κλήρος.

42-9. These names are restored from the list in ll. 68-86, which apparently agreed with that in ll. 41-58 with the addition of one more woman (Σιμον Β, l. 86).

88-90. These lines are probably from the bottom of Fr. (a), Col. i or ii.

---

119. **Account of Rent.**


A statement of the rents due from a cleruchic holding, with an account of the amounts paid. It is not clear whether the land was really in the occupation of a cleruch or belonged to the category of βασιλικοῦ κλήρου, on which see introd. to 39 and 52. 26, note. The latter is perhaps the more likely alternative, for the style is rather that of an official than a private document. The rent is classified under three heads: grain, which is reckoned in wheat and paid in olyra; green-stuffs, reckoned in wheat; and sesame, reckoned in sesame with its equivalent in wheat. The sesame was measured by an artaba of 40 choenices (cf. 74. 2, note); and the ratios of the values of wheat and olyra and wheat and sesame were given as approximately 2½:1 and 1:3½. 166, a more imperfect duplicate of this papyrus, supplies the figures in ll. 6-8. Both copies were probably written in the latter part of the reign of Philadelphus.

"Εστιν τὸ ἐκφόριον τοῦ Ἁπολοξωνίου
κλήρου (πυρῶν) τυ, [σπέρμα i,
κατε[ργο]υ i, / [το, l
5 μεμέτρησαι
Φαμενώτ κυ ὀλυ[ρῶν] ρ[πη]
Φαρμοδίδ δ ὀλυ[ρῶν] ρ[λ[γη],
ια ὀλυ[ρῶν] ρ[ζ;α,]
κ ὀλυ[ρῶν] σ,
10 κσ ὀλυ[ρῶν] ρι,
Παξώς κ ὀλυ[ρῶν] κελ
Παύνι iβ ὀλυ[ρῶν] [, i
Ἐπεὶπ κσ ὀλυ[ρῶν] [, .
καὶ ὀλυ[ρῶν] .
15 Χοίαχ ειθ ὀλυ(ρόν). \\
/ ὀλυ(ρόν) Τνλγζς, / (πυρῶν) τογζό'.
καὶ χλωρῶν (πυρῶν) μξ.
καὶ σημάτων μέτρων α. ( ) ξς, / \\
καθαροις ζς, \\
σπέρμα ζ χοί(νικέσ) δ.
λ(οιπαί) ζ χοί(νικεσ) ζ, /
χωματικόν ς, λ(οιπαί) ες χοί(νικέσ) ς, / ες χοί(νικέσ) ς, \\
a(πυρῶν) ξς, / [(πυρῶν) η]. \\
/ εις ταύτο (πυρῶν) ιωαζδ.'

κηδ.

1. The rent of the holding of Apollonius is 35ο artabae of wheat, for seed 1ο art., for wages 1ο art., total 37ο art.; of which there has been measured:—on Phamenoth 23rd 188 art. of olyra, on Pharnouthi 4th 136½ art., on the 11th 161⅔, on the 20th 20o, on the 27th 11ο, on Pachon 20th 25½, on Pauni 12th 1ο, on Epeiph 26th . . . and . . . , on Choik 11th . . . , total 933⅔ art. of olyra, which are 373⅔ art. of wheat. On account of green-stuffs 40⅔ art. of wheat; and of sesame by the . . . measure 7½ art., from which deduct ⅔ art. for cleaning and ⅓ art. 4 choenices for seed. Remainder 6 art. 6 choen., of which the embankments-tax is ⅓ art., remainder 5½ art. 6 choen.; total 5½ art. 6 choen., which are 17½ art. of wheat, total 58 art. of wheat: making altogether 431⅔ art. of wheat.

4. κατέργασον: as the 1ο artabae reckoned under this head are evidently additional, they must have been due to the owner, whether the State or a cleruch (cf. introd.), for labour supplied. For κατεργασον in the sense of wages cf. e.g. P. Petrie III. 39. ii. 5, 63. 3. 166 has τακτες at the end of this line in defiance of the arithmetic; ται in l. 2 is there quite certain.

6. In the abbreviation of ὀλυ(ρόν) here and in 166 the three letters are written one above the other, λ below, then ο, and last ν, which consists of a shallow curve.

12. It is doubtful what was written between ὀλυ(ρόν) and ι, and whether there was any erasure. In the corresponding place in 166 ὀλυ(ρόν) ι seems to have been written twice, and ὀλυ(ρόν) may have been similarly repeated here.

16. This ratio of the value of olyra and wheat, approximately 1 : 2½, agrees with that given in 85. 14-5; cf. note ad loc.

17. The absence of any dates of payments in the following section suggests that it is only an estimate like that in ll. 2-4. But the deductions on account of καθαροις, &c., and the improbability that the whole of the rent in grain would have been paid before any of that on other crops, are in favour of supposing that these items had also been paid. The figure after μ in l. 17 is uncertain; for ⅔ artabae is elsewhere in this papyrus and 166 written as a half-circle, like the symbol for ⅔ obol (cf. also notes on 52. 33 and 53. 20), while in this place it is square and might be taken for ζ with the upper stroke rubbed off. But to read μζ here causes difficulties in l. 23.

χλωρῶν: for payments on account of χλωρίδι cf. notes on 51. 2, 52. 26, and 112. 9.

18. The abbreviation of the name of the measure consists of an a, immediately above which is a horizontal stroke with a short vertical one depending from it to the right of the
apex of the א. The general effect is very like the common sign for דַּּרָּשְׁנָה; but 아( ) may be meant. Whatever the name, the arithmetic of the following lines shows that this measure contained 40 choenices: $\frac{7}{2}$ art. = $\frac{1}{1}$ art. 4 choen. = 6 art. 6 choen., $\cdot$ $\cdot$ $\cdot$ $\frac{6}{4}$ art. = 4 choen. = 6 art. 6 choen., $\cdot$ $\cdot$ $\cdot$ $\frac{3}{2}$ art. = 4 choen. = 6 choen., $\cdot$ $\cdot$ $\cdot$ $\frac{1}{2}$ art. = 10 choen.


20. The abbreviation of χοίλουκες is written as a χ having an o above and an i below.

22. This deduction for χωματικῶν, if the land was a βασιλικὸς κλήρος, is rather strange; but the meaning may be that a special allowance equivalent to the value of $\frac{1}{2}$ artaba of sesame was made to the lessee in connexion with the tax on dykes. In any case $\frac{1}{2}$ art. of sesame cannot represent the amount of the tax on the whole κλήρος, which may be guessed from the amount of the rent to have been nearly 80 or even 100 arourea. The rate of the χωματικῶν was often 1 obol per arourea (P. Petrie III. 108. 2, &c., and 112. 13, note), whereas the value of $\frac{1}{2}$ art. of sesame according to the ratio given in l. 23 would be about $1\frac{1}{2}$ art. of wheat, or slightly over 3 drachmae, which at the rate of 1 obol per arourea represents a taxing-area of about 20 arourea.

23. The conversion of $5\frac{1}{2}$ art. 6 choen. of sesame into $17\frac{1}{2}$ art. of wheat implies a proportion in values of about $3\frac{1}{2} : 1$. The value of sesame is here lower than that in Rev. Laws xxxix. 3, liii. 16, where an artaba of sesame is priced at 8 dr., ordinarily equivalent to 4 art. of wheat. Moreover, the artaba of sesame in Rev. Laws contained only 30 choenices, that in 119 40 choen.; cf. l. 18, note.

25. The meaning of this number, which is written at the bottom of the papyrus some distance below l. 24, is not clear.

120. ACCOUNTS.

Mummy A. Height 15 cm. B.C. 250-49 (249-8).

An account rendered to Hipponicus, probably by his steward, of the changes that had taken place in a herd of goats during a period of several months in the 36th year of Philadelphus. The papyrus is broken into numerous fragments of which we print three, the rest providing no new information of interest. The goats are classified by colours as white, black, brown, streaked, grey, and mole-coloured (l. 15, note); cf. the list of horses in P. Petrie II. 35. At the beginning the herd numbered 80, and it increased partly through the birth of kids, partly through presents to the owner; cf. 123. Lines 30-33, which perhaps end the document, state that Botrys (the goat-herd?) had reported three deaths.

Fr. (a). Fr. (b). Col. i.

(Ενοικος) λευκός, λόγος Ἰππονίκωι,
τῶν ὑπαρχοντῶν
σίγων καὶ πράγμων·
λευκάι τε.

| Αθυρ       |
| προσεγένωντο |
| αἰγες ἀπὸ ἕνειόνων |
| παρὰ Ζηνοδόρουν |
mēlaiνai 'I.
πυρραί 'I.
ποικίλαι 'I.
... καὶ Θ
σπόδιαι 'I.

/ π.

15 σπάλακα α,
λευκή 'α.
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς
ἐπιγονῆς
μέλαινα 'I.
ποικίλαι 'I.
... 'α
πυρρά 'α.
ἀπὸ ξενίων λευκή 'α,
/ δ.

Fr. (b) Col. ii.

Δοξάχ
προσεγένοντο
ἀπὸ ξενίων παρὰ
Κρίτωνος ἐρσενέες.
λευκόι 'I.

... ... ... ...

30 ἄρηνεγκεν δὲ
Βότρυς τετελευ-
τήκνιας αἰγας
τρεῖς.

13. ξενίων: for the burdens entailed by the custom of giving presents to officials cf. P. Petrie II. 10 (1) and P. Tebt. 5. 184, note.
15. σπάλακα: this form, which should be nominative sing, fem., is probably an error for σπάλακη; cf. P. Petrie II. 35 (a). iii. 2, where Wilcken reads σπάλακ. ν πῶλ(ων); in (d) 5, where σπαλάκος occurs, the context is obscure. Hesychius says that σπαλακεφι, properly 'moles,' was used for εἰδος ἐπιών.

121. Private Account.

Mummy A 4. Fr. (a) 30·5 x 8·5, Fr. (b) 10·8 x 9 cm. B.C. 251–0 (250–49).

An account, probably rendered by a servant to his master, of expenditure for various purposes. The two groups of entries on the recto are separated by a long space left blank. On the verso is a detailed account of miscellaneous household expenses from the 14th to the 19th days of a month, like P. Petrie III. 137–40. The handwriting is a large irregular cursive, probably of the reign of Philadelphus, though the reading of the date in l. 1 is not quite certain. Whether the writing on Fr. (b) is part of the same column as that on Fr. (a)
or of a second column is not clear; but the interval between ll. 45 and 46 is in any case trifling, since both refer to the same day.

Fr. (a). Recto.

\[\text{["Etovs]}\] λε, παρὰ Ἀγχώφιος (πυρῶν ?) \(\nu\)
(δραχμαι ?) \(\rho\), ὡν ἐγραψας
Ἄθροι ἀλύσιον (δραχμᾶς) \(\mu\),
πο. ἐρι.ο\(\nu\) (δραχμᾶς) \(\lambda\)β,
5 Ἀλεξάνδρωι (δραχμᾶς) \(\eta\),
καὶ ἐμοὶ διὰ Π[δ]ᾶλης (δραχμᾶς) \(\delta\),
καὶ παρὰ Τεωτ.ο\(\iota\)ς (δραχμᾶς) \(\delta\),
καὶ ἀλλας [.]

ἐλαβές (δραχμᾶς) \(\epsilon\), ἐμοὶ [\[ε\]\]κε,
10 Ἰσιδώρωι \(ι\)β, Διονύσῳ \(\eta\),
ἐπὶ τὸν καυνάκην (δραχμᾶς) \(\delta\),
[Ζω]λωίου (δραχμᾶς) \(\delta\), Διὸ (δραχμᾶς) \(\eta\),
[\[. . . .\] \(\delta\) (δραχμᾶς ?) \(\delta\).

Verso.

Col. i.

πο\[ 15 letters \] \(\nu\) [ ,
15 Πεπευσθ( ) (τέταρτον), ἐλαίον χοι( ) [ ,
καὶ εἰς τὸν συνδονεῖτην [ . ,
θερμὸν (τέταρτον), κ[\(\epsilon\)κε (τέταρτον), \(\eta\) [ . . . ] . . . ,
oιν[ο\(\iota\)]ς (δβολὸς) (τέταρτον),
/ (δραχμῆ) α (τετράβολον) (τέταρτον).
20 ιε. ἐλαίον πα[\(\iota\)δίοις) (ήμιοβέλιοι), καὶ πα[\(\iota\)δίοις) (ήμιοβέλιοι),
Ἡρακλε[\(\delta\)ι] υψον (δβολὸς), κίκι (τέταρτον),
θερμὸν (τέταρτον), ξύλα (τέταρτον),
ἐλαίον χοι( ) (τέταρτον), ὄνυχ\(\epsilon\)\(\iota\)τ( ) \(\tau\)ε .. [(δβολὸς),
oίνος (δβολὸς) (τέταρτον),
/ (πεντάβολον) (τέταρτον).
15. ἐλαίον πα[\(\iota\)δίοις) (ήμιοβέλιοι), καὶ παδ[\(\iota\)δίοις) (ήμιοβέλιοι),
\(\chi\)
θερμην (τέταρτον), ἔλαιον χοι( ) (τέταρτον),
'Ἡρακλείδη (ἡμιωβέλιοι), χόρτος (τέταρτον),
κίκι (τέταρτον), οἶνος σοί (δ' θόλος) (ἡμιωβέλιοι),

30 ἐργάτη (ἡμιωβέλιοι), κράμβη (τέταρτον),
καὶ ἔλαιον (τέταρτον), ἀρτος μοι (τέταρτον),
ἐύλα (τέταρτον),

/ (πεντάβολοι) (ἡμιωβέλιοι).

ι. ἐρίθοις ἔριων (πετρώβολοι) (ἡμιωβέλιοι), ἔύλα [, ,

35 ἔλαιον παι(δίοις) (ἡμιωβέλιοι), καὶ παιδίος (ἡμιωβέλιοι),
κίκι (τέταρτον), θερμ.οῦ (τέταρτον), χ. [. ] . α (τέταρτον ?),
 [. . .]. χόρτος (τέταρτον), [. ] . επ. [. ] . [.  . .]
 [. . .]. α[ . . .] ἔλαιον ὑγωι (τέταρτον),
[οἶνος] σοι (δ' θόλος ?) (ἡμιωβέλιοι) (τέταρτον), φόρεθρα (δύθοβολοι),

40 Ῥάφα(νία) [. ] ἔλαιον εἰς ( ) (τέταρτον),
καὶ εἰς τὰ ὄριθια (τέταρτον),

/ (δραχμαὶ) β (ἡμιωβέλιοι).

[η]. ἔλαιον παι(δίοις) (ἡμιωβέλιοι), παιδίος [(ἡμιωβέλιοι),
[. . .]. (τέταρτον), Ῥάφα(νία) (τέταρτον), κίκι . ,


. . . . . . . . . .

Gr. (b).

'Ἡρακλείδη (ἡμιωβέλιοι), οὐν' ὡς σοι (δυὸβολοι),
ὄψοι (ἡμιωβέλιοι), ἄλφιτα (ἡμιωβέλιοι), ἔλαιον σοι (τέταρτον),
[ἔλαιον ὑγωι (ἡμιωβέλιοι), παιδίοις κύαθος) (τέταρτον),

/ (δραχμη) α (τριοβολοι) (ἡμιωβέλιοι) (τέταρτον).

50 Ῥ. μάνητες (ὄβολος) (ἡμιωβέλιοι), κράμβη (τέταρτον),
καὶ ἔλαιον (τέταρτον), ἐύλα (ἡμιωβέλιοι) (τέταρτον),
ο낍 σοι (ὄβολος) (ἡμιωβέλιοι), ρίσαι (ὄβολος), σ . θ . [. . ,
ἔλαιον ὑρν(δίοις) (τέταρτον), καὶ εἰς βαλα(νείων) (τέταρτον),
κριθαὶ (τέταρτον), μέλι (ὄβολος) (τέταρτον), λιβα'dο(τὸς) . ,

55 γυγγυλίς [
τεύτ.] λον
ῥοιὰ (τέταρτον), [ ]

. . . . . . . . . .
48. (ημωβελιον) corr. from (τεταρτον).

55. l. γογγυλις.

57. o of ροια above the line.

'The 35th year, from Anchophis for 50 artabae 100 drachmæ, of which you wrote off on account of Athur for a ring 40 dr., for a cup (?) 2 dr., to Alexander 8 dr., to me through Polle 4 dr.; 23rd, from Teos 4 dr.; 26th, in addition [] dr.

'You received 60 dr., of which 15 were given to me, to Isidorus 12, to Dionysus 8, for the cloak 4 dr., to Zoilus 4 dr., to Didis 8 dr., to ... 4 dr.

'(14th)... to Petese ... ½ ob., oil ... , and for the linen garment ... , hot water 1/2 ob., castor oil 2 ob., ... wine 1/2 ob. Total 1 dr. 41/2 ob. 15th, oil for the children 1/2 ob. and to the children 1/2 ob., to Heracleides for sauce 1/2 ob., castor oil 1/2 ob., hot water 1/2 ob., wood 1/2 ob., oil ... 1/2 ob. of onyx (?) 1 ob., wine 1/2 ob. Total 5 ob. 16th, oil for the children 1/2 ob. and to the children 1/2 ob., hot water 1/2 ob., oil ... 1/2 ob. to Heracleides 1/2 ob., grass 1/2 ob., castor oil 2 ob., wine for yourself 1/2 ob., to a labourer 1/2 ob., cabbage 1/2 ob. and oil 1/2 ob., bread for myself 1/2 ob., wood 1/2 ob. Total 5 ob. 17th, to the wool-weavers 4 ob., wood ... oil for the children 1/2 ob. and to the children 1/2 ob., castor oil 1/2 ob., hot water 1/2 ob., ... grass 1/2 ob. ... oil for a sauce 1/2 ob., wine for yourself 1/2 ob., transport 2 ob., radishes [• ob.], oil for ... 1/2 ob. and for (cooking) the birds 1/2 ob. Total 2 dr. 1 1/2 ob. 18th, oil for the children 1/2 ob. to the children 1/2 ob., ... 1/2 ob., radishes 1/2 ob., castor oil ... , to Heracles 1/2 ob., wine for yourself 2 ob., sauce 1/2 ob., meal 1/2 ob., oil for yourself 1/2 ob., oil for a sauce 1/2 ob., a cup for the children 1/2 ob. Total 1 dr. 3 ob. 19th, bowls (?) 2 ob., cabbage 1/2 ob., and oil 1/2 ob., wood 3 ob., wine for yourself 1/2 ob., roots (?) 1 ob. ... oil for the birds 1/2 ob., and for a bath 1/2 ob., barley 1/2 ob., honey 1/2 ob., frankincense ... turnip ... beet ... pomegranate 1/2 ob. ...'

4. Perhaps ποτηρίων, i.e. ποτήριον.

8. It is very doubtful whether a figure was ever inserted after ἄλας.

15. χολ( ) is more probably a substantive in the dative than an adjective agreeing with ἄλας. Perhaps χολ(ρων), i.e. 'oil for (cooking) the pig'; cf. l. 53 ἄλας ὀφθις(<τί). The sign for 1/2 obol in this papyrus is the same as the writer's τ, the right-hand portion of the cross-bar being omitted.

17. βερμών: sc. ὑδρήρ probably; cf. P. Petrie III. 140 (c). 6 ὑδρήρ βερμύλια. It might also mean a lupine. At the end of the line 'Ηφι(ρος[λ])ι(δην) (τεταρτον) is a possible, but not very satisfactory, reading.

23. The doubtful τ may be the sign for 1/2 obol (cf. note on l. 15), in which case ὀνύχιον, and ς ... (ημωβελιον) (τεταρτον) must follow. With the reading adopted in the text, ὀνύχιον is more likely to be an abbreviation of the adjective ὄνυχιος.

36. Possibly χυτάρα (τεταρτον); cf. P. Petrie III. 140 (a). 5 χύτρα χ(αλκοίς).

40. Cf. P. Petrie III. 140 (d). 2 ῥαφάνων ὀφτε ἐψηγα. After εἰς a word has been omitted which was contrasted with τά ὀφθια in l. 41.

50. μάρτυς appears to be a plural of μάρτης (or μαρτῆς), meaning an earthenware vessel (cf. ll. 4 and 48), a sense found in a passage quoted from Nicon by Athenaeus, p. 487 c. The existence of the genitive in -ητος from this word has been a matter of doubt, which the present passage will remove.

52. ρητα is an unknown word; possibly ρῆτα was meant.

56. τευτήρων: σευτήρων and σευτήλων are the forms used in the Petrie papyri.
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122. Mummy A. 7 × 14.7 cm. Beginning of an account of corn. Lines 1–5 Διάλογος ὁ πρὸς Ὡμον διὰ Κάτσου κράτης (ἀρτάζας) β, Ποτειωμένων ὄλυσον (ὑπεράσπας) ε, Κήτσου ὄλυσον (ὑπεράσπας) γ, ἄλλας Κήτσου ὄλυσον (ὑπεράσπας) γ, Κράτης (πυρών) (ὑπεράσπας) η, Ἀπολλοδώρων (πυρών) (ὑπεράσπας) ι. The writing is across the fibres. About B.C. 250. 8 lines.

123. Mummy A. 8.3 × 8.6 cm. A short account of sheep received by the writer from different persons, some being bought. The text is Παρ’ αὖν ἐχω προβασα’ Ἀπολλωνίου α, Σωπάτρου α, Ἀλεξάνδρου α, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ νύμφη τοῦ Δεμάου τιμῆς α, παρὰ Δημητρίου ἐκ Κύθαι (cf. 56. 6) α, Ζευκόπουλος πιμήςα, Νικαρίδος α. Written probably between B.C. 265 and 245. Complete. 10 lines.


125. Mummy A (probably A 9). 12.9 × 8 cm. Conclusion of another similar loan from Zenodorus to Menonides (cf. 124) for 31½ artabae of olyra with signatures of Archippus and Menonides. On the verso (δραχμαί) μδ and below Μενωνίδου (ἀρτάζας) λα[δ’. Written across the fibres about B.C. 250 in the Oxyrhynchite nome. 17 lines.

126. Mummy A (probably A 9). 4.5 × 9.2 cm. Fragment of another similar loan from Zenodorus to Menonides (cf. 124), beginning Ζηνοδώρου καὶ ἄλλω ὑπὲρ Ζηνοδώρου παρὰ Μενωνίδου πρὸς βασιλικά. [Μενωνίδος also occurs in the signature of Archippus. but Μενωνίδος in that of Menonides himself. On the verso Μενωνίδου σύμβολα (ἀρτάζας?) (δραχμαί) νθ (θ' corr.). Written about B.C. 250 in the Oxyrhynchite nome. 9 lines.
127. Mummy A (probably A 9). 9.5 x 10.3 cm. Beginnings of lines of a letter from Zenodorus (cf. 59) to Cresilas, ordering him to send certain persons under arrest; cf. 59-62. The text is (1) Ζηράνοιρός [Kρησιλάω] χαίρειν. [πεφέβγασαν εἰς 'Οξυ-] (2) ρυγχύτον κόμην Ὑωλίου. καλὸς ἄν νῦν πούσατι ] (3) αὐτῶς πέμψας πρὸς ἤμας μετὰ φυλακῆς ἐπεί οὖν ὀλι[-] (4) γον ἀργυρὸν ἀθημπακότες εἰ . . . [ (5) συ περὶ ἄν ἄν ἦμιν γράφῃ . . . . . [ On the verso Kρησιλάω. Written across the fibres about B.C. 250 in the Oxyrhynchite nome. 6 lines, of which probably only about ½ is preserved.

128. Mummy A 17. 4 x 8.5 cm. Beginning of a contract dated in the 15th year of Philadelphus (B.C. 271-0 or 270-69), corresponding to 99. 1-4 and probably written by the same person, perhaps a duplicate of 99. 4 lines.


132. Mummy A. Fr. (a) 8.5 x 15.5 cm. Two fragments containing parts of two columns of a list of payments for various taxes, including the ἐννόμου (cf. 52, introd.), the tax of τρίς (κ’)[’] ; cf. 80, 95, and 112, 38, note), and the σ’ (i.e. ἐκτη) Φιλαδέλφων (cf. 109) for which 3 obols are paid at Ταλαῖο by Πτολεμαίος καὶ Ἀνδρόμαχος, and 1 dr. 3 ob. at Σεμπρίον by Σεμφθεύς,
besides οἴνον τιμήν (i.e. the value of wine paid for the ἐκτην), for which 4 drachmae are paid at Συκαὶββ by Ἀρφικαῖτις and another person respectively. The village of Μουκναρινω, the proper name Ψωφώται, and the 36th year (of Philadelphus) are also mentioned. Written about B.C. 255.


134. Mummy A 4. 7-5 x 4-4 cm. Fragment of the beginning of a contract written between the 19th and 27th year of Philadelphus; cf. 94. 4-5, note. The text is Βασιλεί]ω[τος Πτολεμαίον τοῦ Πτολεμαίον καὶ Τοῦ νόιον] Πτολεμαίον[ν ἔτους . . . ἕφι] ἵππεως 21 letters] Ἀλεξίαρ[ὴν καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν καπηφόρου Αρσινόῃς Φιλα]δέλφου Φιλωντέρας τῆς 30 letters, ἐν Ἀφροδίτῃ[ς κόλει 31 letters] Ἀρμαίος Αρ'].

135. Mummy A 4. Fr. (a) 9-5 x 4-4 cm. Two fragments of an account, containing a list of names and sums of money, each entry in Fr. (a) beginning with κε, i.e. the 25th of the month. The names Τεραδῆς (v corr. from s?) and Πετεαρμώ]σ occur. Written about B.C. 250. On the verso part of another account.

136. Mummy A 15. 10-5 x 8-8 cm. Receipt, having the same formula as 106, for 20 drachmae paid by Petosiris (cf. 137, 139, and 141), agent of Ταχῆμβ, for ξυπηρά, 11 drachmae (δεκαμίων) being on account of Pharmouthi, and 9 on account of Pachon, to Νικωλαὸς τρ(απεζίης) and Στοσούιτις δο(κυματής) at Phebichis; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion (παρ[υντος Δωρίδων τὸ ανύτ (δραχμαι) εἰκαστ), and a line of demotic. Dated Pachon 13 of the 3rd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 244 (243). The writing is across the fibres. Practically complete. 9 lines.

137. Mummy A 15. 10-3 x 7 cm. A similar receipt for 18 drachmae χα(λκο) εῖς κ . . (the figures are hopelessly effaced but were probably κὸ (τέταρτον); cf. 106. 8) paid by Petosiris, agent of Ταχῆμβ, for ξυπηρά on account of Pachon to Nicolaus and Στοτοκίτις; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Dated
Pachon 30 of the 3rd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 244 (243). The writing is across the fibres. Nearly complete, but much obliterated. 9 lines.

138. Mummy A 15. 9:7 x 7:5 cm. A similar receipt for 8 drachmae χορ(κοί) εἰς κό (téptarou) paid by Ἄρενδώτης, agent of Taёмbes, for ζύηρά on account of Athur to Πάσσων τραπεζίτης and Στοτόητις δοκιμαστὴς at Phebichis; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Dated on Athur 24 of the 2nd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 246 (245). Practically complete. 9 lines.

139. Mummy A 15. 9:5 x 6:3 cm. Another similar receipt for 9 drachmae of copper for ζύηρά on account of Παράφει φέρες [τραπεζίτη καὶ Νικόλαω δοκιμαστὴ] at Phebichis by Petosiris, agent of Taёмbes, from Ταὲμβες; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Written across the fibres about B.C. 247. Incomplete, the beginnings of the first 5 lines being lost. 11 lines.

140. Mummy A 15. 15:7 x 8 cm. Another similar receipt for 19 dr. 5½ obols for ζύηρά on account of Παράφει paid to Πασόν and Στοτόητις by Λίθος, agent of Taёмbes; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic, and on the verso is a line of demotic. Dated on Athur 16 of the 2nd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 246 (245). Written across the fibres. Practically complete. 14 lines.

141. Mummy A 15. 11 x 6:7 cm. Another similar receipt for 15 dr. 3 ob. paid for ζύηρά on account of Pachon by Petosiris, agent of Taёмbes, to Νικόλαω and Στοτόητις; cf. 106, introd. At the end are the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Dated on Pachon 22 of the 3rd year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 244 (243). Written across the fibres. Complete. 10 lines.

142. Mummy A 15. 11:1 x 6:7 cm. Another similar receipt for 12 dr. for ζύηρά paid [Ὑρ]ακλείων τραπεζίτη καὶ [Νικόλαω δοκιμαστῆι]; cf. 139 and 106, introd. At the end is the signature of Dorion and a line of demotic. Written across the fibres about B.C. 247. Nearly complete, but much obliterated. 10 lines.

143. Mummy A 15. 4:7 x 6:5 cm. Receipt for φυλακιτικῶν paid by a military settler probably at Phebichis, similar to 105. The text is ('Ετοὺς) ὑπὸ Μεσορῆ ἱγ. ὤμολογε Ὑρακλείδης μεμετρήθαι παρὰ Μενεκράτους Ἀρήνου ἱλ(άρχου) (cf. 105, 3, note) τὸ φυλακιτικῶν . . . The 16th year probably refers to Euergetes (B.C. 232-1 or 231-0). Incomplete, the end being lost. 5 lines.

144. Mummy A 15. 4:3 x 7:9 cm. Beginning of a notice of loss, similar to
36 and 37. Lines 1–4 ("Ετος") η Παχών . . .] προσάγγειμα παρα Ἀρενεύου[ζ] Ἀρμύσει φυλακήτη κόμης Τάλη (cf. 36. 3, note) ἀπολογείχ' ἱκάρι (l. -κέναι ; cf. 37. 5). The 18th year probably refers to Euergetes (B.C. 230–29 or 229–8). 5 lines.

145. Mummy A. Fr. (a) 4.8 x 9.3 cm. Seven fragments of a contract, of which one contains part of the protocol, [Βασιλεύοντος Πολεμαίον τοῦ Πολεμαίου καὶ Ἀρμύσου] θεωρ Ἀθελφών έτους) τρίτου (εφ') ἱερεῶς Αρχείας τοῦ Δήμου τοῦ Άλεξάνδρου καὶ θεωρ Ἀθελφῶν κατηγόρου Αρ' Πρινθής Φιλαδέλφου Αρσυνίου] τῆς Πολεμικράτου, μη[δε] Ἀρ[τεμισίου . . . , i.e. B.C. 245–4 (244–3). The restorations of the priests' names are taken from Revillout's edition of dem. P. Louvre 2431 (Chrest. dém. pp. 265 sqq., Rev. Εύπ. I. p. 7), where they are assigned to the 4th year; cf. p. 373. On the absence of the mention of the θεοὶ Εὐεργέται here cf. 171, which was written in the 5th year and mentions them, and p. 369.


147. Mummy 5. 12.7 x 6 cm. Conclusion of a letter, of which the text is χειρογραφ' ήσε, ὡν γάρ διαπιστεύοντες ἡμῖν. Διονυσωδόρος δὲ οὐκ ἐστιν ἄκολος, ἀλλὰ σύντασσε [τοῦ] παρὰ σοὶ φύλακας φυλάσσει καὶ προ[σ] κείμεν ὅσα μὴ συμβῆ ἡμῖν πα . [. . .] ὧν. On the verso are the beginnings of 3 lines, and on a detached fragment parts of 3 more. Early third century B.C.

148. Mummy 5. 5.3 x 24 cm. Fragment of a contract of apprenticeship. Lines 3–6 ἔλαυν δὲ τι κλέπτων . . . . . . . παρεῖς ἄλλοστε προσποτεστάτῳ τῷ βιλάσιῳ διπλόν, μὴ ἐξονοία ὦ ἐστῳ Πόρῳ μήτε ἀποκτείνεις μήτε ἀφημερεύεις ἄνευ τῆς Ἐπιμέλειος γνώμης, εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀποτεθάμετά τός μὲν ἡμᾶς προσφέρον (προσφέρον) τῆς ἐν νῦν κτος . . .] ἐξονοία ὦ ἐστῳ Ἐπιμέλειε ἐὰς μὴ ἁρεγς κ. . . . Early third century B.C. 6 lines.

149. Mummy A. Fr. (a) 1.4 x 10.8 cm. Two fragments of an account, consisting of a series of names grouped under different days, with a few lines of another account in a different hand. The names Σαρτσλάγα, Δαλίκος, Ὁρράβις and Ὀτείς occur. Written about B.C. 250. On the verso parts of two much obliterated columns of a document.

150. Mummy 13. 15.1 x 9.5 cm. Duplicate of 85, written in a different hand, in B.C. 261 (260). Practically complete (but without the demotic note). 21 lines.

151. Mummy 13. 7.5 x 10.5 cm. Fragment of a letter, of which the text is μὴ παραγήγεσθαι αὕτη . . . . .] κα Ἀπί οἱ ἀλλωτήριον τριγυρήσοντα τῷ ἐμπελώνα. ei οὖν
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των ἐπιχώρησιν ποιεῖ ἐντυχεί ἑκεῖνωι καταλάβησον, συντετάχαρεν γὰρ ... Written about B.C. 250. 6 lines.

152. Mummy 98. 8·8 x 9·2 cm. Beginning of a letter, of which the text is Χαρικλῆς Μικτείς χαίρειν. έμμαθον εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἁλᾶς καὶ λωτῶν ὡποὺ ἔχωσιν [οἱ] ναυπηγοῖ, καὶ πε[...] τῶν ἱλῶν δὲν ε[...] On the verso Μικτείς. Written about B.C. 250. 6 lines.

153. Mummy 117. 10·7 x 10·2 cm. Account of sums collected by an agent of two government officials, beginning ('Ετούς) β Φαύφι κθ, λόγος ἀργυρίου τοῦ [εἰς] ἀργυρίου δίᾳ Ἁρεινώτην (I. -δότου) τοῦ παρ[α] Ἠρωίφιος οἰκονόμου καὶ Πάτβεθν [τῶν βασιλικῶν γραμματέων] (P. Πατβεύτος τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γραμματέως), followed by a list of six persons who pay 1 dr. or 3 obols. The 2nd year no doubt refers to Euergetes (B.C. 246 or 245). Written on the verso, the recto being blank. Nearly complete. 10 lines.

154. Mummy 117. 7·8 x 8·6 cm. A notice from Epichares to Chaeremon similar to 80, but with Πασίς Αρ ... in the place of Ὡρος Τεότος. Written probably in the 35th (revenue) year of Philadelphus (cf. 80, 5 and 13–4, note), i.e. B.C. 251–0. Nearly complete. 9 lines, of which the last two are demotic.

155. Mummy 117. 8·2 x 9 cm. Another similar notice from Epichares to Chaeremon, much mutilated. Dated in the 35th (revenue) year (of Philadelphus), Athur (B.C. 251). 7 lines, the demotic note being omitted.

156. Mummy 117. Fr. (a) 4·1 x 8·6 cm. Two fragments of an acknowledgement by a ναύκληρος to 98. The text is Fr. (a) τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γραμματέως ὄστε εἰς Ἀλεξίον [δέο] τοῦ βασιλικοῦ [κ]ριβών] (ἀρτάβας) ἐπτακασσάλαι πεντακας[ίας] ὁτ' έναν καθαράν καὶ ἄδω[λον] κεκοσκινεμένον (cf. 98. 11–4), Fr. (b) [.....] ἀσκεμι ... [.....] ἐσφραγισμ' εν ... μέτρων καὶ σκυτάλης ὀτ' [άποτος] ἡμέρακτο ... (cf. 98. 20). Written about the 34th year of Philadelphus (B.C. 252–1 or 251–0).

157. Mummy 18. 4·7 x 16·1 cm. Parts of two columns of an account, of which the text is (Col. i) ('Ετούς) κβ. εἰσενήσοχα [ε]ν τῶν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ [σ]τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ ἱλίου σφόρου ὀλυ[ρῶν] (ἀρτάβας) οὖ, [καὶ ?] ἐκ τοῦ ἵππου ἄστραγαλε ... (Col. ii) ('Ετούς) κβ. πα[...] [σ ... εἰσενήσοχα (πυρόν) παρὰ ... (with [φιλο] ... above the line) Πολύμονος τοῦ ἐκ [Τα]λαύνος (cf. 36. 3, note) ... The 22nd year refers to Philadelphus (B.C. 264–3 or 263–2). On the verso two lines of another account.

158. Mummy 18. 8·5 x 19 cm. Fragment of a letter or memorandum concerning wheat and olyra of the 32nd, 33rd, and 34th years (of Philadelphus). Written about B.C. 251. 10 lines, of which the last
four are complete. In the right-hand margin and on the verso is some effaced writing.


160. Mummy 10. 11 × 6·9 cm. Receipt issued to Clitarchus (cf. 66, introd.) for a money payment, of which the text is Ἡρακλεόδωρος Κλειστάρχωι χαίρειν. ἔχω παρά Πτολεμαίῳ τοῦ Νικολάου χαλκῷ (δραχμαῖς) τριεκατσίας τεσσαράκοντα. Addressed on the verso Κλειστάρχω. Written about B.C. 230. Apparently nearly complete. 8 lines.

161. Mummy 10. 7·2 × 7 cm. Fragment of a letter to Clitarchus similar to 69. The text is ἙΚ Κλειστάρχωι χαίρειν. παραγίνου τῇ κὸ τοῦ Φαμεινώθ . . . Written about B.C. 230. 4 lines.

162. Mummy 10. Fr. (a) 24·5 × 8·7 cm. Two fragments of another letter to Clitarchus, concluding τῆς ἀποθήκης τῶν Ἐ (δραχμῶν) ὃν ἄναφέρεις δεδομένως εἰς ἐπισκευὴν ἑπταρθυμίων, καὶ μὴ ἄλλως ποιήσῃς. ἔρρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) υἱὸ Παῦλ. (B.C. 228 or 227.)

163. Mummy 10. 8·2 × 7·9 cm. Conclusion of a letter to Clitarchus similar to 70 (a) and (b), ending περὶ κώμην Τμουεθίμων τοῦ Ἡρακλεοπολίτου (δραχμῶν) καὶ (i.e. εἰκοστῆς) (δραχμῶν) α. ἔρρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) υἱὸ Ἀδύρ κ (B.C. 230 or 229). Cf. 70 (a), introd. 6 lines.

164. Mummy 10. 16·3 × 8 cm. A demotic document of 9 lines, below which is Κόσμας Ψυτέσσωτος (δραχμαί?) ρ . . . Πεσοῦτει (ἐι corr. from ἰος) καὶ Θορταῖος. Written about B.C. 230.

165. Mummy 10. 13·3 × 7·7 cm. Receipt, similar to 103, from Apollonides to Εὑπόλεμος, acknowledging the payment of 11½ artabae of wheat (probably for φυλακικῶν and λατρικῶν) from Στράτιτον on behalf of Diodorus, paid through Εὐπολίς κομίω (γραμματεύς). Dated Phaophi 11 of the 16th year (of Euergetes), i.e. B.C. 232 (231). Nearly complete. 8 lines.


167. Mummy A 9. 4 × 7·6 cm. Beginning of a letter from Demophon to Πτολεμαῖος (cf. 51, introd.), of which the text is Δημοφῶν Πτολεμαῖω χαίρειν. ἀνάγγει μετὰ Ἀρμινίος τοῦ ἀπὸ τὴν Ἰσεῖον φυλακίτου καὶ μετὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ ἐκ Ταλαύ τὰ Πρωτογένους καὶ Γάστρων πρόβασα πάντα εἰς . . . Written about B.C. 245. 7 lines.

169. Mummy A 9. 6 x 14.2 cm. Part of a letter to some officials with regard to the collection of money-taxes, mentioning οἰκονομοῦντος τὴν κἀτο τοπαρχίαν (sc. of the Oxyrhynchite nome). Dated Thoth 8 of the 31st (?) year (of Philadelphus) (B.C. 255 or 254). The writing is across the fibres. 5 lines, of which about half is preserved.


171. Mummy A. 6.1 x 12.5 cm. Beginning of a contract written in B.C. 243–2 (242–1), of which the text is Βασιλεύουσα Πτολεμαῖος τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ Ἀρσινόης θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν (ἔτους) ε ἐφ' ἱερέως Ἀριστοβοῦλον τοῦ Διοδότου Ἀλκιάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν καὶ θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν καὶ αὐτοὺς Ἀρσινόης Φιλαδέλφου τῆς Ἰμπέας τῆς Ἰππο ... [.....] μηνὸς Λωίων ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει. This is the earliest instance of the association of the θεοὶ Εὐεργεται with Alexander and the θεοὶ Ἀδελφοί; cf. 145, where the θεοὶ Εὐεργεται are not yet mentioned in a papyrus of the 3rd year, and p. 369. The writing is across the fibres.
APPENDIX I

THE MACEDONIAN AND EGYPTIAN CALENDARS.

Of all the problems connected with Ptolemaic Egypt few are more obscure than the relation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian calendar before the reign of Euergetes II, when the Macedonian year starting from Dius was finally equated to the Egyptian annum vagus of 365 days. So perplexing and apparently contradictory were the items of information gained from double dates on both calendars in papyri and inscriptions, that in 1898 Strack (Rhein. Mus. liii. pp. 399-431), when trying to introduce order into the chaos, took refuge in the extremely complicated hypothesis that two different sets of both Egyptian and Macedonian months with the same names were in current use. The evidence available to Strack was however very imperfect, since out of 14 double dates within the period under review only 6 could be certainly assigned to particular years, and even in these 6 there were several doubtful readings of the figures. In 1903 J. Krall (Festschr. f. O. Hirschfeld, pp. 113-122) was able to show from some fresh double dates in the Amherst papyri and a Berlin papyrus that an attempt was made during the early part of Philometor's reign to equate the Macedonian to the Egyptian months; but though justly rejecting the views of Strack, he could make nothing of the relations of the Egyptian and Macedonian calendars before the time of Philometor. Now, however, with the large additional material provided by the Magdola, the new Petrie and the present Hibeh papyri together with unpublished Tebtunis papyri deciphered by Professor Smyly, who will collaborate with us in the publication of them, the conditions of the problem are quite altered. Professor Smyly (Hermathena, 1905, pp. 393-8) has recently discussed the double dates in the reigns of Epiphanes and Philometor, and proved that for a period of at least 16 years (from the 24th year of Epiphanes to the 5th year of the joint reign of Philometor, Euergetes II, and Cleopatra, which = the 16th of Philometor) the Macedonian months starting...
from Dystrus were assimilated to the Egyptian months of the vague year starting from Thoth. Our object in the present appendix, in which we have had the benefit of Professor Smyly's assistance, is to collect the evidence for the whole period from Alexander to Euergetes II, and to show that (1) it is unnecessary to suppose the existence of more than one Egyptian and, until the reign of Epiphanes, one Macedonian set of months in order to explain the double dates; (2) the general tendency of the movements of the Macedonian year was to lose in relation to the Egyptian, i.e. to revolve more slowly, though some exceptions occur owing to the irregularity of intercalations; (3) the character and limits of the variations in the Macedonian year are now so far determined that from about the middle of Philadelphus' reign to the 4th year of Philopator Macedonian months can, if the year of the reign is known, henceforth in most cases be converted into their approximate equivalents on the Egyptian calendar.

While the truth of any general hypothesis with regard to the relations of the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars can only be thoroughly established by verification through new evidence, the first test which must be applied to it is its ability to form the extant double dates into an intelligible and more or less consistent series. To attempt to prove uniformity of relation between the two calendars would be of course out of the question; our aim is to show that, in spite of the irregularities which must be conceded in any case, the trend of their relations to each other can now to a large extent be determined. Accordingly, in opposition to Strack's hypothesis that there were throughout two sets of both Egyptian and Macedonian months, we start from the far more probable and simpler assumption that there was originally but one set of each. This being granted, the Egyptian calendar year of 12 months can be no other than the ordinary vague year of 365 days beginning with Thoth I. Though the knowledge of the true solar year of 365½ days was of extreme antiquity in Egypt, and an attempt was made in the reign of Euergetes I, as is shown by the Canopus Inscr., ll. 40 sqq., to substitute it for the vague year, there is no evidence that it ever penetrated, as Strack supposes, from the field of astronomy and religion into common use under the Ptolemies; and it is now almost universally admitted that the vague year continued its course uninter rupted until the introduction of the Julian calendar into Egypt by Augustus in B.C. 23. With regard to the length of the Macedonian year nothing is definitely known. Following the ordinary view, which has much probability, that it was like other Greek calendar years lunar, we suppose it to have contained apart from intercalations 12 months of alternately 29 and 30 days, making 354 days in all. Recently some confirmation of this view has been obtained from its suitability to the double dates grouped together as no. (16)
on our Table; cf. p. 345. In these Tubi 12 corresponds to Gorpiaeus 28, but Tubi 13 of the same year to Gorpiaeus 30. As Dittenberger has pointed out (Orient. Gr. Inscr. I. p. 650), it is probable that there is here no inconsistency, and that the last day of a month containing only 29 days was called the 30th. Since Gorpiaeus is the 11th month of the Macedonian year, it is most likely that the months with 29 days were the 1st, 3rd, 5th, &c., rather than, as Strack supposes, the 2nd, 4th, 6th, &c. If the 29th day was omitted in months with 29 days, the mention of Peritus 29 in P. Petrie III. 21 (b). 8 and of Hyperberetaeus 29 in 146 indicates that these months (the 4th and 12th) had 30 days. A year of 360 days seems to be implied by 28. 20-1; but this is not likely to be connected with the Macedonian year.

Assuming therefore an Egyptian year of 365 days and a Macedonian year of 354, we have, at Professor Smyly's suggestion, constructed a chronological table of correspondences, which shows the days of the Egyptian months on which the 1st of each Macedonian month would, apart from intercalations, fall in every instance of a double date by both calendars. This Table much more clearly than a mere list of the double dates exhibits the variations which took place between any two points, and illustrates at a glance both the general tendency of the Macedonian months to lose, i.e. fall later in the Egyptian year, and the occasional instances in which this tendency is reversed, and the Macedonian year moves from one point to another more rapidly than the Egyptian. Since the Macedonian year was apart from intercalations 11 days shorter than the Egyptian, it would, if left to itself, gain this amount each year. The fact that on the contrary it tended to lose shows that intercalations were so frequent and so far in excess of the 11 days required to restore the balance between it and the Egyptian year, that the average length of the Macedonian year was more than 365 days. How the number of days to be intercalated was determined, and at what point or points they were inserted in the Macedonian year is involved in much obscurity. Papyri give surprisingly little help on the subject, the only reference to intercalation in the Macedonian calendar being in P. Petrie III. 22 (f). 2, where μηνὸς ἐμβολίου apparently indicates that a whole month had been inserted. But that intercalation of a whole month in the Macedonian calendar was not uncommon is shown by the story (Plutarch, Vit. Alex. 16) concerning Alexander who, in order to satisfy the religious objections of some of his soldiers to fighting in Daisius, inserted a second Artemisius. This, as Smyly remarks, seems to imply not only that the Macedonians inserted a whole month at a time, but that they called the intercalated month by the name of the preceding month; for unless such intercalation had been customary, Alexander could hardly have quieted the
superstition of his followers. Unfortunately, however, the hypothesis of intercalations of months of 29 or 30 days even at irregular intervals is not sufficient by itself to account for all the relations between the Egyptian and Macedonian months established by the evidence, and it is necessary to postulate the existence of other, at present unknown, disturbing elements which caused the Macedonian years to vary in length.

The Macedonian year being so uncertain, it must be remembered that in each column of our Table the correspondences for which there is no direct evidence are only meant to be approximate, and that the chances of error owing to the presence of intercalations increase the further the supposed correspondences in the year move away from the known correspondence. The months in which the correspondence is directly attested are in each column of the Table distinguished from the others by being printed in italics. Where the reign is not actually given and cannot be inferred with complete certainty, it is enclosed in brackets. The queries after some of the months in italics mean either that the reading of the month is not certain, or that there are special grounds for suspecting an error in the correspondence. That errors have crept into the extant double dates is, considering the complicated system of two independent calendars, unfortunately only too likely; but the hypothesis of a mistake is, as a rule, only to be resorted to in the last extremity. In the case of no. (23), however, which almost certainly falls within the period of the first assimilation of the two calendars, a correction of the reading or interpretation of a group of hieroglyphic signs is necessary, and we have placed the wrong series of correspondences in brackets after the right ones. Where, as in nos. (2), (20), (30), and perhaps (4), double dates mention two months but only one day, which uniformly follows the Egyptian month, we have not assumed that the writer intended to imply that the number of the day of the Macedonian month was the same; cf. the discussion of no. (2). Still less is there any justification for supposing in the correspondences of Egyptian and Macedonian months in which no days are mentioned at all, nos. (3), (11), (12), and (15), that these months exactly coincided. That such correspondences were not intended to be more than approximate is in itself far more likely, and is indicated not only by the evidence of nos. (12) and (15) but still more clearly by P. Magd. 32, where Δαυσίον Αἰγυπτίων ἔξι Αθώρ occurs in l. 4 of the petition, while in the docket on the verso Daisius 27 = Athur 29. Hence in the Table the figures of the days are purposely omitted in connexion with those two classes of double dates.

From the Egyptian calendar year of 12 months and 365 days beginning on Thoth 1 and the Macedonian year of 12 months and 354 days (with an uncertain number of intercalary days in addition) beginning on Dius 1, must
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dius</td>
<td>14 Meso.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>Phao.</td>
<td>12 Athu.</td>
<td>3 Athu.</td>
<td>12 Choi.</td>
<td>11 Tubi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apellaeus</td>
<td>8 Thot.</td>
<td>Phao.</td>
<td>Athu.</td>
<td>11 Choi.</td>
<td>2 Choi.</td>
<td>11 Tubi</td>
<td>1 Mech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Audnæus</td>
<td>8 Phao.</td>
<td>Athu.</td>
<td>Choi.</td>
<td>10 Mech.</td>
<td>1 Mech.</td>
<td>10 Pham.</td>
<td>1 Pham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peritius</td>
<td>7 Athu.</td>
<td>Choi.</td>
<td>Tubi</td>
<td>9 Pham.</td>
<td>9 Pham.</td>
<td>9 Pham.</td>
<td>10 Pham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Xandicus</td>
<td>6 Tubi</td>
<td>Mech. (?)</td>
<td>Pham.</td>
<td>7 Meso.</td>
<td>7 Meso.</td>
<td>2 Thot.</td>
<td>2 Thot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Artemisius</td>
<td>6 Mech.</td>
<td>Pham.</td>
<td>Phar.</td>
<td>6 Meso.</td>
<td>6 Meso.</td>
<td>6 Meso.</td>
<td>6 Meso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Daisius</td>
<td>5 Pham.</td>
<td>Pach.</td>
<td>Paun.</td>
<td>5 Pham.</td>
<td>5 Pham.</td>
<td>5 Pham.</td>
<td>5 Pham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Panemus</td>
<td>5 Phar. (?)</td>
<td>Paun.</td>
<td>Epei.</td>
<td>4 Epei.</td>
<td>4 Epei.</td>
<td>4 Epei.</td>
<td>4 Epei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loius</td>
<td>4 Pach.</td>
<td>Epei.</td>
<td>Meso.</td>
<td>3 Epei.</td>
<td>3 Epei.</td>
<td>3 Epei.</td>
<td>3 Epei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gorpiacus</td>
<td>4 Paun.</td>
<td>Meso.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>2 Thot.</td>
<td>2 Thot.</td>
<td>2 Thot.</td>
<td>2 Thot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hyperberetaces</td>
<td>3 Epei.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Athu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dius</td>
<td>25 Mech.</td>
<td>12 Phar.</td>
<td>22 Pham.</td>
<td>18 Pach.</td>
<td>Pach.</td>
<td>18 Thot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apellaeus</td>
<td>24 Pham.</td>
<td>11 Pach.</td>
<td>21 Phar.</td>
<td>17 Paun.</td>
<td>Paun.</td>
<td>17 Phao.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Audnæus</td>
<td>24 Phar.</td>
<td>11 Paun.</td>
<td>21 Pach.</td>
<td>17 Epei.</td>
<td>Epei.</td>
<td>17 Athu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peritius</td>
<td>23 Pach.</td>
<td>10 Epei.</td>
<td>20 Paun.</td>
<td>16 Meso.</td>
<td>Meso.</td>
<td>16 Choi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dysclus</td>
<td>23 Paun.</td>
<td>10 Meso.</td>
<td>20 Epei.</td>
<td>11 Thot.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>16 Tubi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Xandicus</td>
<td>22 Epei.</td>
<td>4 Thot.</td>
<td>19 Meso.</td>
<td>10 Phao.</td>
<td>Phao.</td>
<td>15 Mech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Artemisius</td>
<td>22 Meso.</td>
<td>4 Phao.</td>
<td>14 Thot.</td>
<td>9 Choi.</td>
<td>Choi.</td>
<td>15 Pham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Daisius</td>
<td>16 Thot.</td>
<td>3 Athu.(?)</td>
<td>13 Phao.</td>
<td>9 Tubi</td>
<td>Tubi</td>
<td>14 Phar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loius</td>
<td>15 Athu.</td>
<td>2 Tubi</td>
<td>12 Choi.</td>
<td>8 Pham.</td>
<td>Pham.</td>
<td>13 Paun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hyperberetaces</td>
<td>14 Tubi</td>
<td>1 Pham.</td>
<td>11 Mech.</td>
<td>7 Phar.</td>
<td>Phar.</td>
<td>12 Meso.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Meso.</td>
<td>9 Thot.</td>
<td>2 Epag.</td>
<td>Meso.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>19 Thot.</td>
<td>(20) Thot.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Thot.</td>
<td>9 Thot.</td>
<td>27 Thot.</td>
<td>Thot.</td>
<td>Athu.</td>
<td>19 Phao.</td>
<td>(19) Phao.</td>
<td>Phao.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be carefully distinguished the years of the king's reign, which were with the apparent exception of the rare use of eras (cf. 84 (b)) the only kind of years employed for dating purposes. It has been shown by Professor Smyly (Her-mathena, X. xxv. p. 432) from two Petrie papyri of Euergetes I's reign dated (ἐτος) αυτοῦ πρώτου (ἐτος) Ἰβ (cf. p. 359) that at any rate in the earlier Ptolemaic period two different systems of reckoning the king's years were in vogue. All that is quite certain about them is that one was employed for revenue purposes (ὅς αὐτοῦ πρώτου), and that when the two systems occur together the figure of the revenue year was sometimes larger by one than the figure of the other, which we may call the 'regnal,' year. Smyly is, we think, right in identifying the 'revenue' year with the Egyptian vague year of 365 days beginning with Thoth 1, the balance of days between the king's accession and the following Thoth 1 being reckoned, in accordance with ancient custom, as his 1st year. The starting-point and length of the 'regnal' year are still quite uncertain, and in addition to the revenue and regnal years found in connexion with the Egyptian months there may have been yet another system of reckoning the king's years employed in connexion with the Macedonian months. These intricate questions are discussed in App. ii.

How far the revenue year penetrated into common use in the third and second centuries B.C. is a question which at present cannot be decided. It is noteworthy that even in papyri concerning the revenue administration the revenue year is by no means always found (cf. pp. 360-1); and it is probable that, down to the reign of Epiphanes at any rate, the regnal year was more often employed in dating ordinary documents than the revenue year. There is not a single instance among the dates in our Table in which the king's year is known for certain to be a revenue year; and, since only nos. (3), (4), (6) and (9) occur in documents concerned with the revenues, the presumption with regard to the third century B.C. instances is that in most or possibly even all of them either the regnal or some kind of Macedonian year is meant by the year of the reigning sovereign. This distinction of the regnal from the revenue year, however, does not greatly affect our Table except in the case of dates such as (5) and (6), (13), (14) and (16), (17), and (18), which are close together; but owing to the inevitable complications which surround the conversion of Ptolemaic dates into dates on the Julian calendar (cf. p. 367), we have generally avoided converting the dates in our Table into years B.C. except where the question is of particular importance.
Notes on the Table of Correspondences.

(1) The day of Alexander's death, which took place in B.C. 323, is given by Aristobulus ap. Plutarch, *Vita Alex.* 75 as Daisius 30, by the royal ἐφημερίδες (Plutarch, *op. cit.* 76) as Daisius 28 (τρίτη φθινότος), and by Cod. A of Pseudo-Callisthenes (Müller, *Anhang zu Arrian*, 151) as Pharmouthi 4; cf. Strack's note (*Rhein. Mus.* liii. pp. 416-7). Apart from the questions whether these dates are to be trusted, and how the two conflicting statements found in Plutarch are to be reconciled, it is quite possible that on the establishment of the Ptolemaic regime some modifications were introduced into the Macedonian calendar, and since B.C. 323 falls outside the period with which we are immediately concerned, there is no need to bring this double date into line with those following. But it is worth noting that the correspondence of the two calendars in B.C. 323, which results from the equation of Daisius 30 to Pharmouthi 4, is only different by two months from their correspondence 65 years later found in (3); and the hypothesis that the Macedonian year had in the interval moved the whole way round the Egyptian year (as it nearly does between the 27th year of Philadelphus and the 9th of Epiphanes) is vetoed by 84 (a). Line 6 of that papyrus, written about B.C. 300, indicates that Panemus, the month in which a payment is to be made from the new corn-harvest, then corresponded to Pharmouthi, Pachon or Pauni, an equation which agrees remarkably closely with the correspondences of Panemus with Pharmouthi in B.C. 323, and with Pauni and Epiphe in the latter part of Philadelphus' reign, as shown by nos. (3), and (4); cf. 86. 3, note. It is fairly certain that between B.C. 300 and the middle of Philadelphus' reign the general tendency of the Macedonian months to fall later in the Egyptian year was less marked than in the rest of the third century B.C., and that Soter was more successful than the next three Ptolemies in making the Macedonian year approximately keep pace with the Egyptian. Hence it is not unreasonable to suppose that between B.C. 323 and 300 the average length of the Macedonian year was also maintained at approximately 365 days, though for the reasons stated above we do not wish to lay any stress on the double dates of Alexander's death.

(2) 92. 6 μὴνὸς Εὐαρδικὸν Ἀφινηπών μηνὸς Μεσοσκαδέκατη in the 22nd year of Philadelphus. The decipherment of the Egyptian month is very doubtful (cf. note *ad loc.*), but in view of the correspondence of Xandicus with Phamenoth only 5 years later Mecheir would be expected, and no satisfactory alternative reading suggests itself. Με[ορ]ο[ή] τῆ[ nymph] in place of μη[νὸς] Μεξ[οίρ] would necessitate the inference that in these 5 years the Macedonian year gained or lost as
much as 6 months in relation to the Egyptian, a change far more rapid than even that which took place in the reign of Philopator; cf. nos. (18) and (21). But not much reliance can be placed upon this double date until fresh evidence is discovered for the relation of the two calendars about the 22nd year. The omission of the number of the day of the Macedonian month probably does not indicate that it was the same as that of the Egyptian month, i.e. the 14th. The day of the month is often omitted in the dates of early Ptolemaic contracts, e.g. 84 (a) and 85; and in most of the instances in which the day is only given once, nos. (2) and perhaps (4), and the undeciphered protocol of the papyrus discussed in connexion with nos. (11) and (15), there is no independent reason for thinking the days of the two months coincided. It is also significant that in nos. (24)-(28), when the two calendars were temporarily assimilated and the days of the Macedonian and Egyptian months coincided throughout the year, the day of the Macedonian month as well as that of the Egyptian is given in each of those five instances. Even after the final assimilation of the two calendars in the reign of Euergetes II there is as yet no example earlier than the reign of Ptolemy Alexander (P. Leyden 0) of a single mention of the day doing duty for both the Macedonian and Egyptian months. With regard to (30) there is some reason for supposing that the day applies to both months, though the inference is far from certain. The only case in which there are really strong grounds for thinking that the number of the day of the Macedonian month, though not stated, coincided with that of the Egyptian month is nos. (20), which is almost certainly a remarkably early instance of the use of the assimilated Macedonian calendar introduced by Philopator or Epiphanes. But it would be highly unsafe to generalize from these two examples, which both belong to a period when as regards the Macedonian calendar the conditions were quite different from those which prevailed, so far as is known, until after the 4th year of Philopator.

(3) Rev. Laws lvii. 4-5 = lx. 3-4 μηρος Γορπιαίου τοί ; ... Αὐτοπτίων Μεσορόθ; cf. Fr. 6 (c). 9-10, where, as Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 782) suggests, μηρος Δύσπτρων was probably equated in the same way to μηρος Μεχύρ. The year in which Rev. Laws were written was the 27th of Philadelphia, and probably that is the year to which these double dates refer (it was most likely stated in the lacuna after Γορπιαίου τοί; but possibly in the case of one or both of them the 28th year may be meant). From the fact that Gorpiaeus and Dystrus are equated to Mesore and Mecheir respectively it must not be inferred that the correspondence was exact, for nos. (12) and (15) clearly show that when the days are omitted the equations are only approximate, and it is very unlikely that if the days in the two calendars at this period were the same in one month,
they would continue to be precisely the same several months later. To suppose that an exact correspondence was maintained throughout a whole year before the first assimilation of the two calendars introduced in the time of Philopator or Epiphanes is so much at variance with the evidence as to be out of the question.

(4) P. Leyden I. 379, a docket on a demotic contract dated in Tubi of the 29th year of Philadelphus, where 1. (ἔτους) κθ Περιτίου (ἔτους) κθ Τετζι (so Smyly from a photograph). The date is generally quoted incorrectly as (ἔτους) κθ Περιτίου κθ Τετζι β, but the figure, if any, after Τετζι is wholly uncertain, and between Περιτίου and κθ the sign for (ἔτους) is repeated. The day of the month was therefore not given more than once, if at all, so that the only safe inference to be drawn is that Peritius approximately corresponded to Tubi in the 29th year. This gives the same equation as that found in (3) for the 27th, and shows that no considerable change in the relation of the two calendars had taken place in the interval.

(5) 146 (ἔτους) λε Ἐπερβερεταίου κθ Πιάρσπι κθ, the reign being certainly that of Philadelphus. In the interval of 6 years between this and (4) the Macedonian year had lost in reference to the Egyptian to the extent of a number of days which is not likely to exceed 30, since in the 29th year Hyperberetaeus probably coincided in part with Thoth.

(6) 77. 8 (ἔτους) λς Ἀρτεμίσιου κγ Παχών κβ, the reign being certainly that of Philadelphus. This date is particularly instructive, because it is the earliest of several exceptions to the general tendency of the Macedonian year to revolve at a slower rate than the Egyptian. In the interval between (5) and (6), which may be either 7 months or 1 year and 7 months or 2 years and 7 months (the uncertainties with regard to the use of regnal and revenue years have to be reckoned with; cf. App. ii), the Macedonian year had gained about 9 days at the expense of the Egyptian. This circumstance fits in very well with the view (cf. p. 334) that the Macedonian year, when not subjected to intercalation, was shorter by some days than the Egyptian. If the Macedonian year when left to itself contained 365−9 = 356 days, the absence of any intercalation at all between the dates of (5) and (6) might, on the assumption that those documents were written in successive Macedonian years, bring about the correspondence found in (6); on the supposition, which is on general grounds more probable, that it contained 354 days, there remains a difference of two days (11−9 = 2) to be accounted for by intercalation in the Macedonian year or otherwise.

(6 a) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 8) (ἔτους) η Γορταίου β [Φ]ά[άφι] ζ. This double date was deciphered by Smyly too late to be included in our Table. The reign is no doubt that of Euergetes, for the correspondence implied by (6 a) only differs by four days from that implied by (7), which was written in
his 9th year. In the 8th year of Euergetes therefore the approximate dates for the beginnings of the Macedonian months are Dius 1 = Choiax 16; Apellaeus 1 = Tubi 15; Audnacenus 1 = Mecheir 15; Peritius 1 = Phamenoth 14; Dystrus 1 = Pharmouthi 14; Xandicus 1 = Pachon 13; Artemius 1 = Pauni 13; Daisius 1 = Epeiph 12; Panemus 1 = Mesore 12; Loius 1 = Thoth 6; Gorpiaeus 1 = Phaophi 6; Hyperberetaces 1 = Athur 5. In the interval of 10 years between (6) and (6 a) the Macedonian year had lost about 43 days, which indicates that the intercalations had been larger than those in the period before the middle of Philadelphus' reign, but much smaller than those in the next 7 years of Euergetes; cf. (1) and (9).

(7) Canopus Inscr. l. 3 μηνὸς 'Απελλαῖον ἐπθάμην Αἰγυπτίων δὲ Τῆβι ἐπτακαί-δεκάτην in the 9th year of Euergetes. As in the case of (5) and (6), which are separated only by a short interval, the Macedonian year had gained 9 days instead of losing; so here a comparison of (7) with (6 a) shows that the Macedonian year had gained 4 days in the interval, which may be 3 months, 1 year and 3 months, or 2 years and 3 months.

(8) P. Petrie l. 24 (1) Δαισίων καὶ Θωίδ β. As will be seen from the Table, the most suitable place for this third century date is between the 10th and 15th years of Euergetes; but between the 16th year and the 21st the Macedonian year regained some of the days which it had lost, and if the correspondence implied by (11) ever took place and occurred between the 16th and 25th years, (8) may also belong to that period. This is however less probable; cf. our remarks on (11).

(9) P. Petrie III. 53 (s). 13-4 (ἐτός) ις Γορπιαίου ὦ Χολαχ 1a. The reign is probably that of Euergetes. In the 7 years therefore which had elapsed between (7) and (9) the Macedonian year had lost 66 days.

(10) P. Petrie III. 21 (g). 11 (ἐτός) καὶ Διστροφ' ἦν ις Πάνθρο 10, the reign being certainly that of Euergetes. The reading of the second figure of the year is not certain. It is more like β, but in l. 11 of the fragmentary second copy of 21 (g) κα is clear, so that it is safer to adopt the 21st year, especially as the figures of the reign at the beginning of the papyrus in l. 1 are probably κβ, not κε, and the date in l. 11 occurs in a quotation from an older document. In the interval of about 5 years between (9) and (10) the Macedonian years instead of losing had gained 12 days. This marked exception to their usual tendency is more striking than the three similar instances in nos. (6), (7), and (16), which are separated by probably less than two years from nos. (5), (6 a), and (14) respectively.

(11) In Fr. (a) of an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 107), partly deciphered by Professor Smyly, Διστροφ Αἰγυπτίων Παχ安全事故 occurs in a contract.
This long papyrus is in several pieces, of which the order is uncertain. On the recto are a series of copies or abstracts of contracts, each headed by the number of the day and in some cases by the month, but with no statement of the year. In Fr. (6) is an agreement for a loan of wheat and money in which the sentence ἄς ἀποδώσει ἐν Ξανδίκωι Αἰγυπτίων ὑπὲρ Μεσορῆ occurs. The same correspondence as Xandicus = Mesore is also implied by ἐν μηνὶ Δυστρῳ Αἰγυπτίων ὑπὲρ 'Επείφ in a contract in Fr. (c), and by Περετίων Παυνί found in Fr. (d). These three equations form our no. (12), and are different by two months from the correspondence found in (11). On the verso of Fr. (c) is a lease dated in the 25th year of Euergetes, in the protocol of which the months were given in both calendars but have not yet been deciphered, the day being τετράδι ταὶ εἰκάδι, while one of the provisions of the contract is that the rent shall be paid ἐν μηνὶ Ξανδίκωι Αἰγυπτίων ὑπὲρ 'Επείφ (no. (15) of the Table). Probably this clause refers to the 26th year, not to the 25th, since in the preceding line Ξανδίκωι Αἰγυπτίων ὑπὲρ 'Επείφ τῶν ἐκτῶν καὶ εἰκοστῶν ἔτους occurs. The equation of Xandicus to Epeiph in the 26th year causes no particular difficulty; cf. our remarks on (15). But the question of the period to which the several equations on the recto of the papyrus, Dystrus = Pachon, our no. (11), and Dystrus = Epeiph, our no. (12), belong is more obscure, and is complicated by the fact that, as in (15), the correspondences are probably anticipatory. The circumstance that the series of contracts in which they are found is dated only by days of the month suggests that these documents were drawn up at no distant time from each other; and seeing that a lease written in the 25th year occurs on the verso, the dates to which the documents on the recto refer are probably not later than that year. There would be no difficulty in assigning no. (12) by itself to about the 25th year, since, though Dystrus then apparently began in Pauni, the greater part of it coincided with Epeiph, so that it might be equated to either Pauni or Epeiph. On the other hand no. (11), in which the general correspondence of the months in the two calendars is the same as that implied by no. (8), is most conveniently placed, like no. (8), between the 9th and 16th years of Euergetes; but in that case, if (12) belongs to the 25th year, there is a difference of several years between the dates of the contracts on the recto of the papyrus, which is not at all a satisfactory hypothesis. The inconsistency of 2 months between the equations in nos. (11) and (12) can however only be explained in two other ways. One of the two correspondences may be wrong (which would be certainly (11), an equation attested by only one instance against three for (12)); or the interval between (11) and (12) may be quite short, but in the course of it an intercalation of about 60 days was introduced into the Macedonian year in addition to the number of days (11, as we suppose)
necessary to make up the difference between the Macedonian and Egyptian year. Seeing that in both (11) and (12) the correspondences are probably approximate and anticipatory and need not have actually taken place, there is more justification than usual for supposing a miscalculation in one of them. But considering the irregularities of the Macedonian calendar, the possibility of a sudden large intercalation cannot be excluded; and provisionally (11) and (12) may be assigned to some year or years between the 6th and 25th of Euergetes. The period from the 9th to the 21st years would not be so appropriate as that from the 21st to the 25th, because the latter period suits (12), which has better evidence than (11), and less disturbance is caused by placing (11) after (10) than by placing (12) before (10). The correspondences implied by (11) and (12) being in any case approximate are quite consistent with those found in (10) and (13) respectively; the whole difficulty is caused by the apparent shortness of the interval between (11) and (12) and the uncertainty as to which of the two is the earlier.

(12) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 107), Fr. (6) Ξανθικω Αιγυπτίων δι Μεσοπόταμοι, confirmed by two other correspondences; cf. (11).

(13) P. Magd. 2, 4 and 6 (cf. Deuxième Série, p. 205) (ἐτούς) κε Λωτοέπου κε Χοίακ υά, the reign being certainly that of Euergetes, since Diophanes is mentioned; cf. (14). The Macedonian years had thus in the 4 years' interval between (10) and (13) resumed their tendency to lose, the amount of the loss being 22 days, though if (11) and (12) are rightly placed between (10) and (13) and the correspondence implied by (11) is trustworthy (which is far from certain), some rapid changes seem to have taken place in the interval; cf. our remarks on (11). The relation of the calendars is only different by the trifling amount of one day from that found in (14). But what is the interval between (13) and (14), and which of the two is the earlier? Both papyri were written in the 25th year, and of course if this year was in both cases the revenue year which began on Thoth 1, the answer would be easy, viz. that (13), which was written in Choiak, was 4 months earlier than (14), which was written in Pharmouthi. But unfortunately since neither papyrus is concerned with revenues, the presumption is that the 25th year is in both cases regnal, or at any rate not a revenue year. The question of the priority of (13) or (14) will then depend upon the starting-point of the 25th regnal year. If it was Thoth 1, (13) is still 4 months earlier than (14); if it was Dies 1 or Dies 25, the probable date of Euergetes' accession (cf. p. 364), (14) being written in Apellaeus is 8 months older than (13) which was written in Loius. And since the starting-point of the 25th regnal year is not confined to those alternatives, it is wholly uncertain whether (13) or (14) is the earlier.
(14) P. Petrie II. 2. (2) (= III. 28 (b)), verso 1 (ἐτόνσ) κε Ἀπελλαίον κα Φαρμοῦθις 
γ; cf. II. 2. (3) (= III. 28 (c)), verso 1 (ἐτόνσ) κε Ἀπελλαίον κα Φαρμοῦθις 
γ. The reigning sovereign was supposed by Mahaffy to be Philadelphus, by Grenfell 
(Rev. Laws, p. 162), and P. M. Meyer (Hee r w es c o n , p. 51) to be Euergetes I, by 
Strack (Rhein. Mus., l. c.) to be Epiphanes. The Magdola papyri frequently 
mention the same strategus, Diophanes, who occurs in P. Petrie II. 2. (2) and (3), 
and he appears in a papyrus (Deuxième Série, no. 23, p. 174; cf. p. 205) in 
which the 26th year is clearly shown to be the last of a reign, and which 
therefore leaves no doubt that the 25th and 26th years in connexion with 
Diophanes refer to Euergetes I and the 1st and 4th years to Philopator. 
It is possible that (14) is really earlier than (13) ; see above.

(15) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 107, Fr. (c), verso); cf. no. (11). 
The equation Ξανδικών... Ἐπείφ refers to the 26th year, but the contract in 
which it occurs was written in the 25th year, the day of the month in the 
protocol being given only once, and the names of both months being illegible. 
If the person who drew up the contract expected Xandicus to correspond 
exactly with Epeiph, his expectation was almost certainly not fulfilled, for 
the dates in (13), (14), and (16), which are very close to (15), combine to indicate 
that Xandicus in both the 25th and 26th years began after Epeiph 20; it is 
therefore probable that the equation of Xandicus to Epeiph was not intended 
to be more than approximate. The equation would become more natural if 
we could infer from the absence of the day of the Macedonian month in the 
protocol that it was the same as that of the Egyptian. But the evidence does 
not just if that inference ; cf. our remarks on (2).

(16) P. Magd. 16, 20–3, and 33 (ἐτόνσ) α Γορπιαίων κη Τῆβη 13 and P. Magd. 14, 
15, 18, 19, 25, and 34 (ἐτόνσ) α Γορπιαίων κα Τῆβη 17, the reign being certainly that 
of Philopator; cf. nos. (13) and (14). The apparent discrepancy of a day in 
these two series of double dates is probably due to the fact that Gorpiacus 
contained only 29 days and that the last day of the month was called the 30th; 
 cf. p. 334. Comparing (16) with (13) and (14) the Macedonian year has, instead 
of losing, gained 2 or 3 days upon the Egyptian, a phenomenon which con-
idering that the interval is in any case very short is not surprising; cf. the 
9 days' difference in the calendars implied by (5) and (6). The question of 
the interval between (14) and (16) is embarrassed, as usual, by complications 
casued by the two systems of reckoning the king's years; cf. App. ii. Jouguet 
and Lefebvre (P. Magd. Deuxième Série, p. 205) follow the ordinary practice 
of editors in regarding (ἐτόνσ) α as the balance between Philopator's accession 
and the following Thoth 1, and hence naturally infer that Philopator came to 
the throne before Tubi 12, i.e. Feb. 26, B. C. 221. But, as in the case of (13) and
(14), the presumption is rather that the regnal not the revenue year is meant by (ἐτος) a, and if so we cannot, owing to the uncertainty concerning the starting-point and length of Philopator’s 1st regnal year, attribute Τὸ βῆθι β to B.C. 221 rather than to B.C. 220. Some stronger evidence for determining the date of Philopator’s accession would now seem to be available in P. Petrie III. 141, which indicates that this event took place after Choiak of Euergetes’ 25th regnal year and not later than the following Pauni: cf. p. 363. The interval between (13) and (16) may be 1 month or 13 months or even 2 years and 1 month; that between (14) and (16) 9 months or 1 year and 9 months or even 2 years and 9 months.

(17) P. Magd. 7, 8, 13, and 26–32 (ἐτος) δ. Διόνυσιον Καί Ἄθιφρ θ, the reign being certainly Philopator’s; cf. (14). In the interval of about 3 years between (16) and (17) the Macedonian year had apparently lost 47 days. There is, however, a notable inconsistency between the double dates in (17) and (18) which both belong to the 4th year, and the correctness of the figures θ in (17) is open to doubt; cf. (18).

(18) P. Magd. 12, 14 and verso 1, and 39. verso 1, where in all three cases I. (ἐτος) δ. Διώνυσος Ὁμαρεῖδ θ θ (θ corr. from η), the originals having been revised by Smyly and Grenfell. As in the case of (13) and (14), so with regard to (17) and (18) it is uncertain not only what is the interval between the pair but which of the two dates is the earlier. Assuming that the ‘4th year’ is the same in both instances, which is probable in any case, since the double dates in the Magdolos papyri were written in the same office, (18) may be either about 4 months later than (17) or about 8 months earlier, according to the day on which the 4th year is supposed to have begun. If (17) comes before (18) the Macedonian year would seem to have gained 20 days in about 4 months; if (18) precedes (17) it would seem to have lost 20 days in about 8 months. To account for so large a discrepancy between the relations of the two calendars in what is, apparently, so short an interval is very difficult; and it is therefore tempting, as Smyly suggests, to make (17) consistent with (18) by supposing that Ἄθιφρ θ in (17) is an error for Ἄθιφρ θ, due perhaps to the presence of θ in the number of the Macedonian month, or else to suppose an error in (18) where the figures of the Egyptian month have certainly been altered. But there are no less than ten instances of Ἄθιφρ θ, and though they are all written by the same person, the repetition of the date goes some way to confirm its correctness. Moreover, although with so complicated a system of reckoning as that which prevailed before the assimilation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian year the extant double dates are unlikely to be free from errors, the evidence is still too imperfect and the irregularities of the Macedonian calendar too
numerous to make the supposition of error a satisfactory explanation of inconsistencies.

(19) Inscr. on a vase found at Alexandria, Nerutsos, Rev. Arch. 1887, p. 62, (ἐτος) ὁ Ἐπερθεραῖον α Φαρµοβίς. The day of the Macedonian month has been read as both α and λ; we adopt α, which Strack prefers. The reigning sovereign was considered to be Euergetes by Nerutsos, Philadelphus by Merriam (Amer. Journ. of Arch. i. p. 22), Wilcken (Gött. gel. Anz. 1895, p. 142), and Strack, partly on the ground that the Delphic Soteria mentioned in another inscription of the same year found with this one were instituted shortly before the 9th year of Philadelphus, partly because that festival took place in every 4th year of an Olympiad (Dittenberger, Syll. 1 149 and 150), and the 9th years of Euergetes and Philopator were considered not to be the 4th years of an Olympiad, while in the 9th year of Eiphanes, which was, the relation of the two calendars was shown by the Rosetta Inscr. to be different. The reign of Euergetes may now be dismissed as quite unsuitable, but there are good reasons for attributing the inscription to Philopator or Eiphanes rather than to Philadelphus. The second argument in favour of Philadelphus proceeds on the assumption, which until recently was unquestioned, that this 9th year began on Thoth 1, and was what is now known as a revenue year. It is true that the 9th revenue year of Philopator, i.e. according to the ordinary reckoning b. c. 214-3, was not the 4th of an Olympiad, but his 9th regnal year, which probably corresponded in the main to his 10th revenue year, i.e. b. c. 213-2 (cf. p. 367), fulfils, as Smyly remarks, the required condition. The other argument for attributing the inscription to Philadelphus' reign, the circumstance that the Soteria at Delphi were instituted shortly before the 9th year of Philadelphus, is not at all conclusive, and the choice between the reigns of Philadelphus and Philopator must be decided mainly by the double date. In the absence of any direct and certain evidence of the relation of the calendars before the 27th year of Philadelphus, any correspondence is possible in his 9th year; but if (19) is placed in that reign it is necessary to infer that the Macedonian year lost over 4 months in the 18 years' interval between it and (3). This would imply more extensive intercalation than is attested for any other period of 18 years before the reign of Philopator, and moreover such evidence as we possess with regard to the movement of the Macedonian year before the 27th year of Philadelphus indicates that its changes in regard to the Egyptian were gradual and comparatively slow; cf. nos. (1) and (2). On the other hand a comparison of (17) or (18) with (21) suggests that in Philopator's reign the Macedonian year changed very quickly its relation to the Egyptian, and that the relation of the two calendars found in (19), when Dias fell in the middle of Pachon, is one which is extremely
suitable as an intervening stage between the 4th year of Philopator when
Dius I fell in Phamenoth or Pharmouthi and the 9th of Epiphanes when it
fell in Thoth. Hence, if the choice lies between Philadelphus and Philopator,
we prefer to regard (19) as written in the 9th regnal year of Philopator on
May 19, B.C. 212, and to suppose that in the 5 years' interval between (19)
and (18) the Macedonian year lost 36 days, or, comparing (17) with (19), 36 days.
But the great divergence in the relation of the two calendars indicated by (19)
and the Rosetta Inscr., our no. (21), respectively is no longer a sufficient reason
for refusing to attribute (19) to the 9th year of Epiphanes, since the discovery of
(20); for in that surprising double date of the 4th year of Epiphanes the relation
of the Egyptian to the Macedonian calendar is nearly identical with that shown
by (19). (20) is best explained (see below) on the view that the first attempt
to reform the Macedonian calendar in Egypt by equating Dystrus to Thoth
and the other months to correspond had then already been made, although
the omission of the number of the day in the case of the Macedonian month
prevents us from being absolutely certain that (20) is an example of the
assimilated Macedonian calendar. From the 4th to the 9th years of Epiphanes,
therefore, the reformed and unreformed Macedonian years seem to have been
running side by side; and if in (19) the days of the Macedonian and Egyptian
months were the same there would be no difficulty in assigning it to the 9th
year of Epiphanes, and treating it as an example of the reformed calendar, while
in the Rosetta Inscr. the Macedonian month is given on the unreformed
calendar. There is, as stated above, a doubt about the reading of the figure of
the Macedonian month in (19), but it seems unlikely to be the same as the
figure of the Egyptian month; and since to attribute (19) to the reign of
Epiphanes without at the same time supposing that the Macedonian month is on
the reformed calendar would produce much complication, the reign of Philopator
is on the whole the most suitable.

(20) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus (Mummy 6) βασιλεὺντος Πτολεμαίων τοῦ
Πτολεμαίων καὶ Ἀραμών θεῶν Φιλοπατόρων ἔτους τετάρτου . . . μηνὸς Αἰγυπτίων
Δευτέρων ἐπειθ [περὶ] τεκαδεκάτη. It is unfortunate that in this very remark-
able double date the omission of the number of the day in connexion with the
Macedonian month introduces a slight element of uncertainty into the precise
relation of the calendars implied. But in view of the complete coincidence of
Auddnecus with Epeiph on the assimilated Macedonian calendar, which had
certainly been introduced by the 24th year of Epiphanes (cf. (24)), and probably
by the 18th year (cf. (22)), there is not much doubt that in (20) [περὶ] τεκαδεκάτη
applies to both months, not merely to the Egyptian, in spite of the fact that in
the earlier instances where the figure of the day is only stated once a similar
inference is unjustifiable; cf. our remarks on (2). This being granted, two conclusions are almost inevitable: firstly, the date at which the Macedonian calendar was first assimilated to the Egyptian by equating Dystrus to Thoth and the other months to correspond must now be put back into the period preceding the 4th year of Epiphanes, which is the date of (20); secondly, on account of the wholly different relation of the Macedonian and Egyptian months found in the Rosetta Inscr., which is 5 years later than (20), the reformed and unreformed Macedonian calendars must for some years, perhaps throughout the whole period of the first assimilation, have run on concurrently. These conclusions present no special difficulty, for the fact that the earlier identification of the two calendars ultimately failed and irregularities again occur in the reign of Philometor shows that the obstacles to a reform of the Macedonian calendar were very serious; and the new system according to which the Macedonian months from Dystrus to Peritius became mere equivalents of the Egyptian months from Thoth to Mesore may well have failed to command universal acceptance, and to deprive even temporarily the old Macedonian year of independent existence. In any case this explanation of (20) as an example of the assimilated calendar, a view which is based on the assumption that \[ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\alpha\delta\epsilon\kappa\acute{a}n\nu \] applies to both months, is more satisfactory than the rival hypothesis that the figures were really different or, if identical in Audnaeus-Epeiph, were yet different in the other months. If that were the case, not only must the nearness of the relation of the two months in (20) to their relation under the assimilated calendar be regarded as a mere accident, but since there would no longer be any reason for supposing that the earlier reform of the calendar was introduced before the date of the Rosetta Inscr., it would be necessary to maintain that in the interval of about 5 years between (20) and (21) Dius I moved on from some date in Pachon to the middle of Thoth, i.e. that the Macedonian year had lost more than 100 days. That in the interval of about 21 years between the 4th year of Philopator, as illustrated by (18), and the 9th year of Epiphanes, to which (21) belongs, the Macedonian year shifted its position in relation to the Egyptian to an extraordinary extent must be admitted on any theory; for the difference between the approximate dates of Dius I at the beginning and end of that period amounts to no less than 181 days, of which 125 have to be accounted for in the last 16 years of it, if (19) is correctly dated by us; cf. our remarks on (21). But to suppose a difference exceeding 100 days in the relation of the two calendars within about 5 years would imply a far graver disturbance than can be traced in the same length of time at any other point during the third and second centuries B.C. The choice of a month in the middle of the old Macedonian year instead of Dius to serve as the equivalent of Thoth is remarkable. Perhaps when the two calendars were
identified Dystrus nearly or quite coincided with Thoth. If so, the change would seem to have been introduced not long after the 4th year of Philopator, when, as is shown by (17) and (18), Dystrus fell near the end of the Egyptian year. In the 9th year of Philopator, if (19) is to be attributed to his reign, Dystrus began about Thoth 11. It is possible, though not at all likely, that (22), which is an example of the assimilated calendar, belongs to the 18th year of Philopator. But the earlier limit of the period within which the assimilation took place cannot at present be fixed more definitely than Philopator’s 4th year, before which there is no evidence of any attempt to equate the Macedonian to the Egyptian months. The later limit of the period is, we think, fixed by (20) at the 4th year of Epiphanes.

(21) Rosetta Inscr. ii. 4–6 ἐτους ἑνάτου (of Epiphanes) μηνὸς Ἑλενικοῦ τετράδι Λειψυτίων ἢ Μεθείρ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτη. This double date shows that, despite the efforts of the government to reform the calendar by equating the Macedonian months to the Egyptian, the old Macedonian year continued, at first at any rate, to have a separate existence; cf. (20). The changes of the Macedonian year in the two preceding decades had been extraordinarily rapid, for it had lost about 4 months in the 16 years’ interval between (19) and (21), and even if (19) is wrongly dated by us, about 6 months in the 21 years’ interval between (18) and (21), unless indeed it had gained 6 months. The latter hypothesis is by no means out of the question; for since the reign in the case of (19) is uncertain and in (20), as we have shown, the reformed Macedonian calendar was probably employed, the movements of the Macedonian year in those two decades are extremely obscure; and though from its previous tendency it would be expected to continue to lose ground, absence of intercalations would, on the assumption that it contained 354 days (cf. p. 334), more than account for a gain of 6 months in 21 years. Whether the 6 months were lost or gained, it is clear that some abnormal causes were at work to cause so great a change in the relation of the two calendars in a comparatively short period. That the government had already several years before the date of (21) undertaken the reform of the Macedonian calendar is now made probable by the discovery of (20), and the relationship of the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars in (21) may well be due less to a gradual process of divergence than to a sudden arbitrary alteration in the Macedonian year.

(22) Inscr. of Thera (Dittenberger, Or. Gr. Inscr. i. 59) ἐτους η την Ἑλενικων ἢ Ἐπετέφα ἢ. This much discussed date has been assigned to the reign of Euergetes on palaeographical grounds by Hiller von Gastringen, who is followed by Strack and Dittenberger, and to that of Soter I by Mahaffy and formerly Smyly, who recently in Hermathena, 1905, pp. 393–8, showed good reasons for attributing
it to the reign of Epiphanes. The correspondence implied by (22) is the same as that which is known to have existed from the 24th year of Epiphanes to the 5th of the joint reign of Philometer, Euergetes, and Cleopatra (which = the 16th of Philometer); and since this can hardly be the result of accident, and the 18th year of Philometer is for various reasons unsuitable, the reign of Epiphanes seemed to be indicated with practical certainty, for the evidence of the Rosetta Inscr. appeared to negative the supposition that the assimilated Macedonian calendar, with which (22) was in accordance, was introduced before the 9th year of Epiphanes. The situation is, however, somewhat altered by the discovery of (20), which shows that in spite of the Rosetta Inscr. the introduction of the assimilated Macedonian calendar probably took place between the 4th year of Philopator and the 4th of Epiphanes; and though the difficulties involved in assigning (22) to the reign of any of the first three Ptolemies are still insuperable, it is possible that (22) belongs to the 18th year of Philopator. This monarch is generally supposed to have entered (though not completed) his 18th year reckoned on the system according to which his years were counted from Thoth 1, and the balance between his accession and the following Thoth 1 was treated as his 1st year. There are, however, several objections to this date for (22). In the first place if his 18th year be reckoned from Thoth 1 it is very doubtful whether Philopator survived as late as Epeiph; cf. p. 362. Secondly, since the system of reckoning the king’s year under which Philopator is considered to have entered his 18th year was, as is generally supposed, employed principally for revenue purposes, and the Thera Inscr. is not concerned with the revenues, the presumption is that the 18th year in (22) is calculated on some other system, either Egyptian or Macedonian; cf. App. ii. But if the 18th year in (22) is a ‘regnal’ year, Philopator is still more unlikely to have been the reigning sovereign, for his 18th regnal year would almost certainly coincide for the greater part, perhaps throughout, with his 19th revenue year, and the received chronology of Philopator’s reign is inconsistent with the hypothesis that he entered upon his 19th revenue year at all. Hence we adhere to Smyly’s view that (22) belongs to the 18th year of Epiphanes, that being the only reign to which it can be assigned without raising a host of difficulties. From this year up to the 5th year of the joint reign of Philometer, Euergetes II, and Cleopatra, which is illustrated by (28), a period of about 22 years, all the extant double dates are on the assimilated calendar, but irregularities again occur soon after Philometer’s return from exile; cf. (29), (30), and (31).

(23) Hieroglyphic stele of Damanhûr (Bouriant, Recueil de Travaux, 1885, p. 1) ‘Year 23 (of Epiphanes) Gorpiaeus 24 = Pharmouthi 24.’ This date, if correct, conflicts with (22) and (24) to the extent of 1 month, but, as Smyly
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(l. c.) has shown, probably either the hieroglyphic symbols which are supposed to mean ‘the fourth month’ of its season, i.e. Phamenoth, ought to be interpreted as ‘the third,’ i.e. Phamouthi, or the stone-cutter has repeated a sign once too often, and has carved ‘the fourth’ in place of ‘the third.’ (23) then falls into line with (22) and (24)–(28).

(24) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus έτους τετάρτου και εἰκοστοῦ (of Epiphanes) μηνὸς Δύστρου όγδοη και εἰκάδι Θωῦδ όγδοη και εἰκάδι; cf. Smyly, l. c. This is the earliest absolutely certain instance of the assimilation of the two calendars, which probably took place between the 4th year of Philopator and the 4th of Epiphanes; cf. (20).

(25)–(27) (25) P. Amh. 42. 21 έτους δευτέρου (of Philometer) μηνὸς Δίου εὐαργθηναι και εἰκάδι Παχων [εὐαργθηναι καὶ εἰκάδι], as restored by Krall and Smyly. (26) Unpublished Berlin papyrus quoted by Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 782, Artemisius 7 = Athur 7 in the 5th year of Philometer. (27) P. Amh. 43. 1 έτους όγδοην (of Philometer) μηνὸς Λοιών τριεσκαιδεκάτη Μεχείρ τριεσκαιδεκάτη; cf. l. 8 ἀξιοῦτω . . . ἐν μηνὶ Λιδουραίῳ Λευττίων ἐπειδή. Cf. (20).

(28) Unpublished Tebtunis papyrus [έτους] πέμπτου (of the reign of Philometer, Euergetes II, and Cleopatra) μηνὸς Ἀπελλαίων ἐνεακαιδεκάτη Πανι ἐνεακαιδεκάτη; cf. Smyly, l. c. This year, which corresponds to the 16th of Philometer, provides the latest certain date for the continuance of the assimilation introduced by Philopator or Epiphanes; but a still later example is perhaps found in (30).

(29) P. Par. 63. xiii. 14 (έτους) η Περιτίου δ Μεσορή κε. The reign has generally been supposed to be that of Philometer, since Cols. i–vii (which have no connexion with Col. xiii) were written in the 6th and 7th years of the joint reign (which = the 17th and 18th of Philometer), and it has been assumed that Col. xiii was later than Cols. i–vii. It would in that case appear that in the interval of little more than 2 years between (28) and (29) the Macedonian year had broken away from the Egyptian, and that in Peritius–Mesore the Macedonian year was once more behind the Egyptian to the extent of 21 days. Smyly (l. c.) objects to this conclusion, and wishes to refer (29) to the reign of Philopator, supposing it to be a copy of an older document. This is a perfectly legitimate hypothesis in the case of a document like P. Par. 63. xiii (a royal rescript) which is anyhow a copy. not an original; but it seems to us unnecessary in the light of nos. (30) and particularly (31), both of which offer prima facie corroboration of the view that disturbances reoccurred in the Macedonian calendar after Philometer’s return from exile. Smyly disposes of (30) by postulating an error of the stone-cutter similar to that which creates a difficulty in connexion with (23), and of (31) because ‘it is assigned to
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Philometor on conjectural grounds only.’ The reasons for considering (31) to be later than the reign of Epiphanes are nevertheless very strong. The date occurs in a second century B.C. papyrus, which is less likely than (29) to be a copy of a much earlier document; secondly, the mention in l. 5 of ‘the queen’ in addition to ‘the king’ indicates a second century B.C. date, when the official status of queens was more important than in the third; thirdly, neither Philopator nor Epiphanes entered their 26th year, and the relation of the calendars in the 26th years of Philadelphus and Euergetes I was, so far as is known, different from that implied by (31). Hence the choice of reigns with regard to (31) is practically limited to Philometor and Euergetes II; and if the admission, which in our opinion is absolutely necessary in the case of (31), be once made, that the Macedonian year differed from the Egyptian in the interval between the 16th year of Philometor and the final assimilation of the Macedonian months to the Egyptian, there seems to be no sufficient reason for refusing to admit that (29) also belongs to that interval, especially since the introduction of the reformed Macedonian calendar failed, as (21) shows, to bring about the complete abandonment of the unreformed system, at any rate until after the 9th year of Epiphanes. It is quite possible that both systems continued in use until the second and final assimilation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian calendar took place, although from the 18th year of Epiphanes to the 16th of Philometor the present evidence indicates the employment of only one set of Macedonian months. We prefer therefore to adhere to the ordinary view that (29) belongs to the reign of Philometor, and consider either that in the interval between (28) and (29) the Macedonian year resumed its ancient tendency to lose, or else that the unreformed calendar had never fallen into desuetude, and reasserted itself in (29)-(31). In the Table of correspondences we have proceeded on the hypothesis that during the second period of irregularity the Macedonian year had reverted to its supposed former number of 354 days supplemented by intercalations.

(30) Hieroglyphic Inscr. at Philae (Lepsius, Denkmäler, IV. 27 b) ‘Year 24 (of Philometor) Peritius = Epeiph 1’. In the absence of a distinct mention of the day of the Macedonian month it is not clear that it coincided with the day of the Egyptian month; cf. p. 340. Smyly (l. c.), however, wished to regard it as the same, and brought this correspondence into conformity with those found in the earlier period of assimilation by supposing an error of the stone-cutter similar to that which, as there is good reason to believe, occurs in (23), and by substituting ‘the fourth month’ (Mesore) for ‘the third month’ (Epeiph). We, however, are less anxious to get rid of irregularities in the Macedonian year at this period, and prefer to admit that in the 6 years’ interval between
(29) and (30) the Macedonian year may have gained considerably upon the Egyptian. The limits of this gain are if Peritius 1 was the day in (30), 51 days, if Peritius 30, as is conceivable since the figure is omitted, 80 days. Less disturbance, therefore, would be caused if the figure 1 refers to both Macedonian and Egyptian months than if the days are different; but on either view it would seem that several years passed without intercalations, or a large deduction was made from the Macedonian year at one or more points. If Smyly’s suggestion that Epeiph in (30) is an error for Mesore be combined with our view that the calendar again became irregular in Philometor’s reign, the first assimilated calendar may be supposed to have continued in use until the introduction of the second.

(31) P. Par. 60. recto 4 (ἐτος) καὶ Εἰνίδικος α Θωθ κύ. The day of the Macedonian month might be λ or, less probably, δ. The view of Brunet de Presle, the first editor, that the reign of Philometor is meant, is supported by Strack, but has recently been called in question by Smyly (l. c.). As we have stated in connexion with (29), the objections to referring (31) to an earlier reign than Philometor’s seem to be overwhelming, and on the other hand, since both the 26th year of Ptolemy Alexander is palaeographically, though possible, not a very suitable date for the papyrus, and an extant double date in that year (P. Leyden O) is in accordance with the later assimilation of the two calendars, the choice really lies between the reigns of Philometor and Euergetes II. Brunet de Presle justly prefers Philometor on the ground that the Dioscurides and two Dorions mentioned in P. Par. 61 may well be identical with the dioceses Dioscurides and epimeletes Dorion who are mentioned in other Serapeum papyri in the 24th year of Philometor, and the Dorion who is known from P. Par. 63 as hypodioecetes in the 7th year of the joint reign of Philometor with his brother and sister (which = the 18th of Philometor). But since the 26th year of Euergetes II is only 11 years later than the 26th of Philometor it is impossible to decide between the two reigns with any degree of certainty. Contrasting (31) with (29), which is a little more than 7 or perhaps 18 years earlier, the Macedonian year had reverted nearly to its relation towards the Egyptian year under the assimilated calendar.

(32) P. Tebt. 25. 7 ὑπὸς Εἰνίδικος ᾿Εβρής ᾿Ιτάκου ὡς Μεχεὶρ ᾿Ιτ. This is the earliest instance yet found of the second and final assimilation of the two calendars, introduced probably by Euergetes II, who with greater success than the author of the first assimilation deprived the Macedonian year of a separate existence by equating Dios to Thoth and the other months to correspond. Henceforth the Macedonian months, though often inserted in contracts far into the Roman period, became a useless appendage of their Egyptian equivalents.
We give below in tabular form a list of the differences between the relations of the Macedonian and Egyptian years implied by the double dates, leaving out of account those correspondences in which the day is not given on both calendars, and those which are on the assimilated calendar introduced in the interval between (18) and (20). The losses or gains of the Macedonian year (the sign for minus means that it had lost, i.e. gone slower than the Egyptian year, the sign for plus that it had gained, i.e. gone faster) are calculated on the hypothesis that it contained apart from intercalations 354 days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval between</th>
<th>Approx. no. of Egyptian years</th>
<th>Gain or loss of Macedonian year in days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) and (5)</td>
<td>73 years</td>
<td>-93 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) and (6)</td>
<td>1 year and 7 months (?)</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) and (6a)</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6a) and (7)</td>
<td>1 year and 3 months (?)</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) and (9)</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) and (10)</td>
<td>5 &quot;</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) and (13)</td>
<td>4 &quot;</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) and (14)</td>
<td>4 months (?)</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) and (16)</td>
<td>1 year and 1 month (?)</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) and (17)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) and (18)</td>
<td>4 months (?)</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) and (19)</td>
<td>5 years (?)</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) and (21)</td>
<td>16 &quot; (?)</td>
<td>-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) and (21)</td>
<td>22 &quot;</td>
<td>-181 or +184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) and (29)</td>
<td>24 &quot;</td>
<td>+119 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) and (31)</td>
<td>7 &quot; (18 years ?)</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We conclude with a summary of the chief results of our inquiry into this complicated subject.

1) The irregularities of the Macedonian calendar fall into two main sections, according as they are earlier or later than the introduction of the temporary system by which the Macedonian months beginning with Dystrus were equated to the Egyptian months beginning with Thoth.

2) The earliest certain example of the use of this system is no. (24), which belongs to the 24th year of Epiphanes, but there is good reason to believe that it had already been introduced by the 4th year of Epiphanes; cf. no. (20). Since there is no indication of its employment in the evidence down to the 4th year of Philopator, the date of the first assimilation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian months is to be attributed to the period of 18 years between the 4th year of
Philopator and the 4th of Epiphanes. The latest certain example of the use of the assimilated Macedonian calendar is provided by no. (28), written in the 5th year of the reign of Philometor, Energetes II, and Cleopatra, which is the 16th year of Philometor; but possibly no. (30), which is 8 years later than (24), is on the same system, and that system may even have survived until the introduction of the second assimilation by which the Macedonian months from Dius onwards were equated to the Egyptian months beginning with Thoth.

(3) There is no justification for such a hypothesis as Strack's that there were two sets of Egyptian months with the same names, making (1) the ordinary vague year of 365 days which starts from Thoth 1, and (2) a fixed year of 365\frac{1}{4} days reckoned from the rising of Sirius on July 19, and two sets of Macedonian months with the same names making years of unknown length starting approximately from the spring and autumn equinoxes, a hypothesis which accounts for dates on two calendars only by throwing all dates on one calendar into chaos. The view of Krall that the Egyptian months in documents of the Ptolemaic period are, so far as we know, all reckoned by the vague year of 365 days is sound, and there is no reason to suppose the existence of more than one set of Macedonian months before the introduction of the first assimilated Macedonian calendar between the 4th year of Philopator and the 4th year of Epiphanes.

(4) The Macedonian year was probably a lunar one of 354 days, the 12 months from Dius to Hyperberetacus containing alternately 29 and 30 days. Without any intercalations or deductions, it was thus 11 days shorter than the Egyptian vague year.

(5) In order to make up for this difference between the two calendars the Macedonian year was subjected to frequent intercalations, the effect of which was to make it on the average longer than the Egyptian year. Hence, before the first period of assimilation, the general tendency of Dius 1 is gradually to fall later in the Egyptian year, so that at the end of the 32 years' period, between the 35th year of Philadelphus (5) and the 4th of Philopator (17) the relation of the Macedonian calendar to the Egyptian was different by 150 days from what it had been at the beginning.

(6) No consistent method of intercalation in the Macedonian year was maintained through a series of years; the irregularities are such that the number of intercalated days seems to have varied from year to year. The principles on which the number was fixed by the government and the place in the year at which the days were inserted are quite uncertain; but a whole month was sometimes intercalated; cf. p. 334.

(7) In opposition to the general tendency of the Macedonian year to lose,
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There are before the first assimilation four cases, (6), (7), (10), and (16), and perhaps three more, (11), (13), and (18), in which the sequence of Egyptian days corresponding to Dius 1 is broken, and the Macedonian year has in comparison with the immediately preceding correspondence gained instead of losing. Of these seven apparent exceptions to the general rule nos. (6), (7), (10), and (16) cause no great difficulty, because the number of days gained by the Macedonian year is in all four instances less than the amount that it would necessarily gain if there had been no intercalations in the year or, in the case of (10), the years preceding. The exceptional character of (11) is caused by its being placed after (9); but the correspondence is of an anticipatory character which may never have actually occurred, and the position assigned to this date, on the ground of the supposed shortness of the interval between it and (12), which is most conveniently placed immediately before (13), is very uncertain. The correspondence in (11), moreover, being only approximate, may be the same as that indicated by (10), and if (10) and (11) refer to the same year, (11) would cause no more difficulty than (10). As for (13), the break which it makes in the sequence is more apparent than real, for since in the year to which it refers Dius 1 fell near the end of Mecheir, the fact that in (12) Dius approximately corresponded to Phamenoth is in no way inconsistent with the hypothesis that between (12) and (13) the Macedonian year was, as usual, losing or at least not gaining. By far the most serious exception to the rule that the Macedonian year tends to lose would seem to arise in (18), which, if it is 4 months later than (17), indicates that in that interval the Macedonian year had gained no less than 20 days. Whether this is due to an error in the figures in (17) or (18) or to the sudden omission of 20 days in the Macedonian year is doubtful.

(8) The changes in the relation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian year are more rapid in the early parts of the reigns of Euergetes and Philopator than in the later parts of the reigns of Philadelphus and Euergetes.

(9) After the assimilation of the Macedonian months to the Egyptian introduced between the 4th year of Philopator and the 4th year of Epiphanes, irregular correspondences, which imply the existence of a distinct Macedonian year, are occasionally found. Of these (21), of the 9th year of Epiphanes, is best explained on the hypothesis that, side by side with the reformed Macedonian calendar, the old Macedonian year was still running, its movements in relation to the Egyptian year during the interval between (17) and (21) having been exceptionally rapid. After (21) there follows a period of about 21 years (from the 18th year of Epiphanes to the 5th year of the joint reign of Philometor, Euergetes II, and Cleopatra), during which, if Smyly's correction in no. (23) be
accepted, all the extant double dates, (22)-(28), exhibit the assimilated calendar, and the old Macedonian year may have then fallen into complete disuse. But soon after Philometor’s return from exile irregular correspondences are found once more in (29)-(31). Whether these are to be explained on the view that the old Macedonian year reasserted itself, or that the Macedonian year broke away from the assimilated calendar in the interval between (28) and (29), is not certain.

(10) The existence of a distinct Macedonian year cannot be detected with any degree of certainty after the 26th year of Philometor, but owing to the doubt as to the exact date of (31) it may have continued beyond the 26th year of Euergetes II. Between the year in which (31) was written and the 53rd of Euergetes II the Macedonian year beginning with DIUS was finally assimilated to the Egyptian vague year beginning with Thoth.

If the general theory which by the aid of much new evidence we have suggested is on the right lines, and in all the extant double dates there was but one Egyptian year of 365 days and, until the introduction of the earlier of the two assimilated calendars, only one Macedonian year which on the whole tended to lose in relation to the Egyptian, the problems caused by the use of the Macedonian calendar will henceforth be somewhat simplified, for it is possible from our Table to predict within certain limits the Egyptian month with which a Macedonian month at any period from about the middle of Philadelphus’ reign to the 4th year of Philopator corresponded. If these predictions are fulfilled by fresh instances of double dates, the correctness of our explanation will be verified; while on the other hand, if e.g. in the future DIUS in the 31st year of Philadelphus is found equated to Pharmouthi, or in the 18th year of Euergetes to Mesore, or in the 3rd year of Philopator to Choiak, the proposed theory and the inferences based upon it must be abandoned. The irregular correspondences which occur after the first attempt to assimilate the Macedonian to the Egyptian calendar are still too few to admit the possibility of a satisfactory theory with regard to the movements of the unreformed Macedonian year in the second century B.C.

APPENDIX II

THE SYSTEMS OF DATING BY THE YEARS OF THE KING.

We have had frequent occasions in the course of the present volume to allude to the difficulties caused by the use of more than one system of calculating the years of the reigning king. Our object in this appendix is to discuss in the
light of the new evidence the relationship of the king's years to the ordinary Egyptian vague years of 365 days beginning on Thoth 1. Until 1891 it was generally supposed that the method of reckoning the years of the king in the earlier Ptolemaic period was the same as that employed in the later Ptolemaic and the Roman periods. According to this system the interval between a king's accession and the next Thoth 1 was counted as his 1st year, while his 2nd and succeeding years began on Thoth 1; and in spite of the discovery of some disconcerting evidence, nearly all editors and historians continue to convert early Ptolemaic dates into the corresponding years of the Julian calendar upon the assumption that the years of the king were reckoned on that method. In 1891, however, it was shown by a Petrie papyrus (Part I, 28 (2)=Part III, introd. p. 8 and 58 (c)) that in Euergetes I's reign two different systems of calculating the king's years were in vogue. The correct restoration of the mutilated date-formula in that papyrus, which in its imperfect form was discussed by Revillout (Mélanges, p. 350), and Strack (Rhein. Mus. liii, p. 410), was first established from a parallel text in the Petrie papyri (Part III, 58 (d)) by Smyly (Hermathena, 1899, p. 432), who showed that the formula was in both cases ἔτους ἀα ὅσ ὅ' ἀἴ προσόδοι ἐτοὺς ἱβ, the day being in one case Phamenoth 25, in the other case lost. To those two instances have now to be added (3) P. Magd. 35. 2 (re-edited by Th. Reinach in Mélanges Nicole, pp. 451-9) τοῦ γὰρ ἐ (ἔτους) ὅσ αἴ προσόδοι Φαμενω[θ]. the reign being that of Philopator; (4) 80. 13-4, where the demotic docket to a Greek receipt written on Epeiph 4 of the 35th year of Philadephus is dated 'year 34 which makes year 35'; (5) an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus from mummy 8, containing part of a petition to the king, in which (ἔτους) ἱβ ὅσ αἴ προσόδοι ἵγ occurs; (6) the British Museum bilingual papyrus of Philopator's reign (Griffith, Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch. 1901, pp. 204-302), in which the inconsistency between the date of the demotic contract ('Year 12, Tubi') and that of the Greek docket ('Year 13, Tubi 4') is probably to be explained by the hypothesis that the king's years are calculated by two different methods.

Combining the evidence for the double system of reckoning the king's years, three inferences are certain:—(1) the double system extended over the reigns of Philadephus, Euergetes I, and Philopator, (2) one of the two systems was employed for revenue purposes, (3) the figures of the 'revenue' year were sometimes one in advance of those of the other, which we shall henceforth call the 'regnal' year. Beyond these three inferences we enter the region of conjecture, though a few steps may be taken with fair security.

In the first place it may be taken for granted that one of the two different years corresponds to the ordinary vague year, the second year of the reign commencing with the next Thoth 1 after the king's accession, as in later
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Ptolemaic times and apparently under the XXVIth Dynasty (Spiegelberg, *Dem. Pap. der Strassburger Bibliothek*, p. 15; Krall, *Festschr. f. O. Hirschfeld*, p. 115). If any proof of this assumption is required it is supplied by e.g. P. Petrie III. 112, a taxing-list in which the 2nd year of Philopator is treated as the next after the 26th and last year of Euergetes, the incomplete 26th year of Euergetes being combined with the incomplete 1st year of his successor so as to make a single year; cf. also P. Petrie 119 verso, ii. 9] τῶν τῶν κεραυνοὺς 
α (ετῶν).

Assuming therefore that either the revenue or the regnal year is the vague year, with which of the two is it to be identified? Revillout, who in spite of reading εἰσοδοὺς for πρόσοδοὺς had divined that P. Petrie I. 28 (2) referred to a financial year, identified this with the ordinary vague year; and the same hypothesis was maintained by Smyly (*l.c.*), and is accepted by Th. Reinach, although all three hold different views as to the nature of the regnal year. This identification is indeed a natural corollary of the preceding assumption, if it be also admitted that a revenue year should be fairly stable; for a year of 365 days regularly beginning on Thoth 1 fulfils this requirement far better than a year of which the duration and starting-point may have been irregular. We have no wish to depart from this generally received view that the revenue years were ordinary vague years calculated as in later Ptolemaic times. Of the numerous papyri and ostraca concerning πρόσοδοὺς the great majority accord very well with it, especially the taxing-list for the 26th year of Euergetes and 2nd year of Philopator mentioned above, which is very difficult to reconcile with any other view of the revenue year. But the presence of numerous exceptions to the rule that for revenue purposes the years were reckoned from Thoth 1 must be admitted. In the regulations for the payment of the ἀπώλευσε in Rev. Laws xxxiv. 5 the Egyptian calendar is ignored altogether, and the year is reckoned ἀπὸ Δίου ἠῶν [Ὑπερβεταλοῦν (cf. Wilcken, *Ost. I. p. 519)]; and in Rev. Laws lvii. 4-5 the king sells the ἐλάuchί for two years reckoned from Gorpiaeus-Mesore, not from Thoth. In 114 the persons who are farming two taxes ἐις τὸ γόνυ (ετῶν) of a king present a list of 9 monthly instalments reckoned from Mecheir to Phaophi, ignoring Thoth 1 as the beginning of a new financial year. In 116 the year which is the subject of the tax-farming account in question is divided into two halves beginning at Mecheir and Mesore respectively, and though no year is mentioned in this case, the normal practice in farming taxes was to buy the right of collection for a particular year of a reign; cf. Wilcken, *l.c.* A financial year beginning in Mecheir would also suit 115, another tax-farming account dealing with the period from Mecheir to Pachon, while 133 suggests a financial year beginning in Mesore. Neither of the last two instances, however, is very
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strong, and it would be possible to explain away some of the other apparent exceptions. The case of the ἀπώμωσα might be accounted for, as Wilcken (l. c.) suggests, by supposing that ἀπὸ Δίου ἔως Ἡπείρου ἐπιστάτου applied only to Alexandria, and that in the χώρα the words would be understood as equivalent to ἀπὸ Θεόθ ἔως Ἑσσαρία, though this explanation is admitted by its proposer to be unconvincing, and in the light of the frequent use of the Macedonian calendar in the Petrie, and still more in the Hibeh, papyri Wilcken seems to us to under-estimate largely the extent of its employment for official and ordinary purposes. The fact that the ἐλαϊκῆ was sold from Gorpiaeus—Mesore may well be due to special circumstances, or the regulations concerning the year for tax-farming purposes may have been different in the case of the oil-monopoly from what they were in the case of ordinary taxes (Wilcken, l. c.); in any event the two years for which the ἐλαϊκῆ was sold are not stated to have coincided with two definite years of the king’s reign. The difficulty caused by 116, in which Mecheir begins the financial year, might also be evaded by supposing either that for some exceptional reason the year for the collection of this particular tax was spread over parts of two revenue years instead of the whole of one, or that the 12 months from Mecheir to Tubi were, contrary to custom, only part of a larger period extending originally from Thoth 1, for which the tax was farmed. We do not however wish to bring 116 into conformity with the ordinary revenue year, for even if all the other apparent exceptions were explained away, there would still remain 114, where no exercise of ingenuity can make the year in which the instalments were paid (Mecheir to Tubi or, less probably, Athur to Phaophi) coincide with an ordinary revenue year, in spite of the fact that the taxes in question were farmed εἰς τὸ γάρ (ἔτος). This papyrus indeed leads to a serious dilemma: for either τὸ γάρ ἔτος is a loose expression for a period covering two parts of successive revenue years, which is not at all a satisfactory hypothesis, or else τὸ γάρ ἔτος began in Mecheir (or Athur). The latter inference is undoubtedly the more natural; but the adoption of it implies not merely that the taxing year in this particular case failed to coincide with an ordinary revenue year, a phenomenon for which there are other parallels, but that on the system of reckoning the king’s years employed in the case of τὸ γάρ ἔτος Mecheir (or Athur) was the first month of the year—a result which might have an important bearing on the question of the starting-point of the non-revenue or regnal year. Whichever alternative be chosen, it is clear that 114 is an exception to the rule that in documents concerning the revenue the year is reckoned from Thoth to Mesore. Our conclusion, therefore, with regard to the revenue year is that, although there is good ground for identifying it with the ordinary vague year, and in most cases where the years of a king’s reign occur in documents relating
to the revenues these are to be considered revenue years, nevertheless in some departments of finance the accounts were kept without reference to the beginning or close of the revenue year, and when the year of a king's reign is mentioned in a revenue document this is not in itself a sufficient guarantee that it is a revenue rather than some other kind of year, whether Egyptian or Macedonian.

With regard to the system of calculating the regnal years the central fact is that where the regnal and revenue years are known to differ, the figures of the revenue year are in some cases (probably in all) one in advance. The circumstance that when both kinds of years are mentioned together the revenue year stands second and is in all the Greek instances defined, indicates that the undefined year which is mentioned first was the more important; and it is probable that down to the accession of Epiphanes at any rate the regnal year was more often employed than the revenue year in dating documents which are not concerned with the revenues. With regard to private contracts and wills there are some special grounds (cf. p. 374) for thinking that it was not customary to date them by the revenue year. The identification of the revenue year with the annus vagus (the balance of days between the king's accession and the following Thoth 1 being reckoned as his 1st year) necessitates the conclusion that the regnal year was calculated differently, but a more definite view of it is very difficult to obtain.

Smyly (Hermathena, 1899, p. 432) proposed to regard the regnal years as Egyptian years of 365 days calculated from the king's accession and succeeding anniversaries of it, according to which system the numbers of the regnal years would be one behind those of the revenue years in the period between Thoth 1 and the anniversary. The question then arises—In what months did the accession of the earlier Ptolemies take place? Epiphanes, if the hieroglyphic version of the Rosetta Inscr. may be trusted (the Greek is unfortunately defective on the point), and if παρέλαβεν τὴν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός in l. 47 refers, as is generally supposed, to the king's accession, came to the throne on Phaophi 17, but unfortunately no document belonging to his reign has yet been discovered in which the revenue are distinguished from the regnal years. With regard to the month of Philadelphus' accession nothing is known. From 80. 13 it would be necessary on the accession theory of regnal years to infer that he came to the throne after Epeiph 4; and this hypothesis would accord very well with the fact that a demotic papyrus now being edited by Mr. Griffith (cf. 84 (a) introd.) is dated in Phamenoth of the 21st year of Soter. The Canon of Ptolemy assigns only 20 years to Soter, and if that statement is accurate and the 21st year was not only his last year but a revenue year, the evidence would point to Philadelphus' accession having taken place between Phamenoth and the
following Thoth 1. If the 21st year of Soter is a regnal year, the received chronology of Soter's reign is in danger of being upset, and amid the general uncertainty which would result it would no longer be possible to be sure that the 21st year was his last. But either view is consistent with the hypothesis that Philadelphia's reign began in Epeiph or Mesore.

Next with regard to Philopator P. Magd. 35. 2 would on the accession theory indicate that this event took place between Phamenoth and the following Thoth, and if Jouguet and Lefebvre are right in inferring from the Magdola papyri written in the 1st year of Philopator (P. Magd. Deuxième Série, p. 205) that he came to the throne between Thoth 1 and Tubi 12, it would be impossible to harmonize these inferences. But the conclusion that Philopator's accession took place before Tubi 12 rests on the assumption that in the Magdola papyri written on Tubi 12 of the 1st year of that reign the 1st revenue year, which ended on the 5th intercalary day, is meant. If (as is on the whole more probable) they are dated by the regnal year, they do not, until the beginning and end of Philopator's first regnal year have been determined by other evidence, prove more than the fact that his 1st regnal year included Tubi 12. Though Euergetes is known from P. Petrie III. 112 to have died in his 26th revenue year, we have been unable to discover any document actually dated in that year which would indicate how far into the 26th year his reign lasted. Some better evidence for the month of Philopator's accession is provided by P. Petrie III. 141, an account dated at the beginning (ἐτῶς) καὶ Χο[ι]λαὶ and ending with Thoth of the 1st year. Palaeographical considerations render it practically certain that the reigns of Euergetes and Philopator are meant, and the form of one of the entries, (ll. 24–5) καὶ ὄψινιον τόῦ α (ἐτῶς) ἀπὸ Παῦν ἐως τῶν Θαυτ ἡμῶν δ (δραχμαί) 15, implies, as Smyly remarks, that the whole of this period of 4 months was included in the 1st year. From this it is necessary to infer that the 1st is not a revenue year; and it becomes probable that the 25th year mentioned in the heading is the last regnal year of Euergetes, and that Philopator came to the throne between Choiak and Pauni. Since the accession theory only requires that Philopator should have come to the throne between Phamenoth and Mesore inclusive, it is perfectly in accord with the evidence of P. Petrie III. 141. But a great objection to this theory arises out of the data for the accession of Euergetes. The Canopus Inscr. I. 6 τήν πέμπτην καὶ εἰκάδα τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηδός (sc. Dius) ἐν ἕν παρέλαβεν τήν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός has been almost universally interpreted as meaning that Euergetes' accession took place on Dius 25th. The inference is not free from doubt, for the Rosetta Inscr. uses the phrase παρελαβεὶ τήν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός in connexion with two different days, Mecheir 18 (ll. 7–8) and Phaophi 17 (l. 47;
The first date is supposed to refer to the king's coming of age, the second to his actual accession when an infant (cf. Dittenberger, *Orientis Græci Inscr.* I. p. 145), and it is not quite certain that in the Canopus Inscr. the phrase refers to the king's accession rather than e.g. to his coronation; but we are disinclined to depart from the ordinary interpretation of the passage. The information, however, that Euergetes came to the throne on Dios 25 is not of much service unless that date on the Macedonian calendar can be converted into its approximate Egyptian equivalent. The general tendency of the Macedonian months to fall later in the Egyptian year, coupled with the fact that in the 36th year of Philadelphus Dios approximately coincided with Athur and in the 9th year of Euergetes with Choiak-Tubi (cf. Table), requires that the accession of Euergetes on Dios 25 should fall in the months Athur, Choiak or Tubi, or at any rate within the period from Phaophi to Mecheir inclusive. This is in accordance with the evidence of papyri dated near the end of Philadelphus' reign, for the latest recorded date in his 39th year is Athur 16 (53. 4). It is also consistent with Smyly's interpretation of the date in the heading of P. Petrie III. 141. In itself, therefore, the hypothesis that Euergetes' accession occurred in Athur-Tubi is quite satisfactory; but Smyly himself remarks that it is irreconcilable with his former explanation of regnal years, which requires that the revenue years should be in advance of the regnal years only in the period from Thoth 1 to the anniversary of the accession, whereas P. Petrie III. 58 (c) shows that the period during which the revenue years were in advance extended as late as Phamenoth 25. To suppose, as the accession theory requires, that Dios 25 in the 1st year of Euergetes corresponded to some day in the period between Phamenoth 25 and the end of Mesore would hopelessly break the sequence which we believe to be traceable in the months of the Egyptian year corresponding to Dios in the latter part of the third century B.C.

Another explanation of the regnal years has recently been suggested by Th. Reinach (*Mélanges Nicole*, p. 456), who proposes to regard them as ordinary Egyptian vague years of 365 days like the revenue years, but calculated from Thoth 1 after the king's accession, the balance of days between the king's accession and the following Thoth 1 (which constituted the 1st revenue year) being attributed to his dead predecessor. On this theory of the regnal years, their numbers were invariably one behind those of the revenue years, and so far as the papyri dated by both systems are concerned (which, it may be noted, with one exception fell in the second half of the Egyptian vague year), they are consistent with Reinach's explanation. But Reinach's view is open to grave objections. In the first place it is a priori improbable that people would continue to date documents by the reign of a king who was known to be
dead; and, not to mention 116 and the other instances quoted on pp. 350-1, P. Petrie III. 141 seems to us in itself sufficient to remove Reinach's inability to believe (l. c.) 'qu'à aucune époque les années régnales aient été officiellement comptées à partir d'une autre date que le 1er Thoth,' for a year in which Thoth comes after Mesore cannot have begun with Thoth. In order to reconcile Reinach's explanation of regnal years with P. Petrie III. 141 it seems necessary to suppose that the whole period from a king's accession to the end of his 2nd revenue year was counted as his first regnal year. From this it would follow that in a 1st regnal year some months occurred twice over, which is a very unsatisfactory hypothesis. Secondly, if Thoth 1 was New Year's day on both the revenue and regnal systems, the only intelligible justification for having a separate system for budget purposes is removed, and the distinction between the two systems would seem to have been designed for the purpose of creating confusion. If the regnal years ignored Thoth 1 altogether, it is perfectly natural that the Ptolemies maintained for financial purposes the observance of a year with a fixed number of days and a fixed starting-point which remained unaffected by the succession of sovereigns. But if the regnal year was of the same character as the revenue year, there seems to be no adequate reason for having a separate year for financial purposes which only differed from the regnal year by having its numbers one in advance.

Thirdly, if the regnal as well as the revenue year was regulated by the Egyptian calendar, it is practically necessary to postulate the existence of a third system of reckoning the years of a king employed in documents dated on the Macedonian calendar; for it is hardly credible that e.g. in royal edicts, which usually ignore the Egyptian months altogether, the commencement and duration of the years of the reign should be fixed with reference to an Egyptian system; cf. Strack, Rhein. Mus. liii. p. 422. Moreover Rev. Laws xxxiv. 5 (cf. p. 360) shows that a Macedonian year from Dius to Hyperberetaeus was sometimes taken into account, even in matters relating to finance; and the evidence of the double dates proves that the relation of Macedonian months to the Egyptian was subject to perpetual alterations. It is of course not only a legitimate but no doubt the safer course to leave the question of Macedonian years on one side in discussing the distinction of the Egyptian revenue and regnal years; but to suppose that in documents dated by the Macedonian calendar the years meant are also Egyptian regnal years would greatly simplify the problem by reducing the number of systems in common use from three to two.

The view that the Egyptian regnal years were really Macedonian years calculated from the date of the king's accession and succeeding anniversaries of it was suggested by Revillout (Mélanges, p. 350) in connexion with P. Petrie
1. 28 (2) (= III. 58 (c)), but so long as the relation of the Egyptian and Macedonian calendars was involved in complete obscurity remained incapable of proof or disproof. Now, however, granting that Euergetes' accession took place on Dius 25, it is worth while to inquire how far the view that his regnal years began on Dius 25 avoids the principal difficulty (cf. p. 364) which arises if the regnal years are supposed to have commenced on anniversaries of that day on the Egyptian calendar with which Dius 25th corresponded at Euergetes' accession. In order to make Phamenoth 25 of Euergetes' 12th revenue year fall within his 11th regnal year, as is indicated by P. Petrie III. 58 (c), it is necessary, on Revillout's theory of regnal years, to suppose that Dius 25, the first day of the 12th regnal year, fell later than Phamenoth 25, i.e. that Dius 1 fell later than Phamenoth 1. But the evidence of double dates in the 9th and 16th years of Euergetes (cf. App. i, Table) suggests that Dius 1 in the 12th year fell in Choiak or Tubi, and the hypothesis that it fell later than Phamenoth 1 in the 12th year would therefore disturb the sequence of double dates not much less than the view that it fell later than Phamenoth 1 at Euergetes' accession. Nor is the date in P. Petrie III. 58 (c) easier to explain by supposing that the regnal years began on Dius 1, the balance of days between the king's accession and the following Dius 1 being reckoned as his 1st regnal year: for in that case Dius 1 of the 12th regnal year must have begun later than Phamenoth 25, a conclusion which increases rather than diminishes the difficulty referred to above.

The theory of a Macedonian origin of the Egyptian regnal years can indeed be reconciled with the extant evidence concerning both the divergence of the regnal and revenue years in the reign of Euergetes and the relation of the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars in his reign by supposing that the regnal years were reckoned from Dius 1, but that the 1st regnal year either began on Dius 1 following his accession or included the period from his accession up to the next but one Dius 1. The former alternative is, however, open to the objection already urged against Reinach's view (cf. p. 364), viz. the difficulty of supposing that documents would continue to be dated by the years of a king who is known to be dead, and the latter would lead to the conclusion that Euergetes' first regnal year contained two whole Macedonian years less 24 days; while from either theory it would follow that the numbers of the regnal years were in certain months two in arrear of those of the revenue years, which is unlikely.

We are reduced therefore to the conclusion that none of the suggested explanations of the distinction between revenue and regnal years can be regarded as satisfactory, and that the present evidence is inadequate to provide a solution of the problem. In these circumstances the only course is to fall back upon the one certain fact connected with regnal years that their numbers were sometimes
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one in arrear of those of revenue years; and since the distinction between a revenue and regnal year is maintained in Philadelphus' reign as late as Epeiph and in the reigns of Euergetes and Philopator as late as Phamenoth, for practical purposes regnal years may be regarded as approximately a year in arrear of the revenue years. This consideration has an important bearing on the conversion of early Ptolemaic dates into years of the Julian calendar, since any date in which the year of the king is regnal is likely to fall within the year B.C. following that within which it would fall if the king's year were a revenue one; and the conventional system, which still prevails, of converting early Ptolemaic dates into years B.C. on the assumption that the king's years are reckoned on the revenue system is certainly in need of modification. With regard to the system of calculating the king's years employed in documents which are dated by Macedonian months, there are some reasons for thinking that the years correspond with regnal rather than with revenue years (cf. p. 374); and in the absence of any direct evidence for more than two systems of reckoning the king's years we are inclined to identify the official Macedonian years with the regnal years, and hence to connect the difficulties concerning the latter with the use of a Macedonian instead of an Egyptian year, although the fresh evidence adduced in this volume with regard to the Macedonian calendar does not render that connexion easier to unravel.

APPENDIX III

THE EPONYMOUS PRIESTHOODS FROM B.C. 301-221.

The list of the eponymous priesthoods during the Ptolemaic period in Otto's Priester und Tempel, pp. 175-96, can now be largely supplemented as regards the third century B.C. from the new volume of the Petrie papyri and the present series of texts, and a revised table of the priesthoods during the reigns of the first three Ptolemies may be found useful. The most striking feature of the new evidence is that which proves the extreme antiquity of the priesthood of Alexander at Alexandria, the origin of which cult has been in its various bearings one of the most widely discussed problems in the history of the Diadochi. Hitherto the earliest year to which the priesthood of Alexander could be carried back was the 16th year of Philadelphus (B.C. 270-69 or 269-8), to which P. Petrie I. 24, until now the oldest dated Greek papyrus, belongs; two earlier demotic contracts in the Louvre, dated in the 13th year of Soter
and the 8th year of Philadelphus respectively, made no mention of any priesthoods. Though the dangerous character of the argumentum a silentio when based upon date-formulae of contracts is by this time generally admitted, the evidence of these two demotic papyri that the cult of Alexander was not instituted till some years after the accession of Philadelphus seemed to be supported by the circumstance that, when that cult made its appearance, the gods Adelphi were uniformly associated with Alexander; and it is not surprising that the latest critic (Otto, op. cit. pp. 138-52) strongly supports the view of e.g. Wilamowitz and Wilcken, who regarded Philadelphus as the creator of the Alexander cult at Alexandria, against that of Kaerst and Kornemann, who mainly on the evidence of Pseudo-Callisthenes (III. 33) wished to credit the foundation of the cult to Soter. Kaerst and Kornemann nevertheless were right, and one more proof is given of the historical elements interwoven into the romance of Alexander. Though we need not accept its statement that the priesthood of Alexander was instituted by the will of Alexander himself, that assertion was not very wide of the mark. The Hibeh papyri fortunately include several date-formulae earlier than P. Petrie I. 24; and not only in 110. 40 and 44 dated in the 12th and 13th years of Philadelphus, and 97. 3 dated in the 7th (or 4th) year of the same reign, but even in 84 (a) which was actually written in the 5th year of Soter, i.e. about B.C. 300, is the mention of the year of the reigning monarch followed by the entry ἐφ' ἐπέκοιτο Α ἕως Β. It is true that this priest is in no instance stated to be the priest of Alexander; but even if it were not known independently that the cult of Ptolemy Soter at Alexandria was first introduced in the reign of Philopator (cf. Otto, op. cit. p. 180), no official cult but that of Alexander could have obtained such importance in Egypt by B.C. 300 that it was unnecessary to specify the deity to which 'the priest' was attached. It was only when, in some period between the 13th year and Daisius (i.e. Phamenoth or Pharmouthi probably) of the 15th year of Philadelphus (cf 110. 44 and 99. 3), that sovereign associated the cult of his sister and himself with the worship of Alexander, that a more precise description of the greatest official priesthood was ordained, and the brief formula of the early documents took the first step in the direction of those interminable lists of priesthoods of deified Ptolemy which finally exhausted the patience of the later Ptolemaic scribes. Since Arsinoë Philadelphus died in the 15th year of her brother's reign before the month of Pachon (cf. the date of the Mendes stele quoted by Bouche-Leclercq, Histoire des Lagides, I. p. 180), the association of the gods Adelphi with the cult of Alexander may well have been one of the many divine honours paid to her by Philadelphus after her death, although the evidence does not exclude the
possibility that the association took place one or two years previously. To the 
interval between 99, written in Daisius of the 15th year, and dem. P. Louvre 2424, 
written in Athur of the 19th (if Revillout’s decipherment of it is to be trusted), 
is to be assigned the creation of the canephorate of Arsinoë; and the institution 
of this priesthood at any rate is no doubt closely connected with her death.

Besides their new evidence for the existence of the priesthood of Alexander 
in B.C. 300, the date of the association of the gods Adelphi with Alexander, 
and the date of the institution of the canephorate of Arsinoë Philadelphus, 
the Hibehe papyri also serve to limit the date at which the association of the 
gods Euergetae in the Alexander cult took place to the 3rd, 4th, or 5th years of 
Euergetes; cf. 145 with 171 and our remarks on no. (21).

In the following Table the names of the priests and priestesses are given 
in Greek (in the genitive case) when the evidence for them is in that language, 
but in Roman characters when the evidence is derived from demotic documents. 
It is often difficult to recognize a Greek name in its demotic form, even when 
that is correctly deciphered; few, therefore, of the names which rest on the 
evidence of demotic are likely to be quite correct, while many of them are 
obviously wrong. Where, as in all the demotic and some of the Greek papyri 
which mention the priests, the months are given on the Egyptian calendar, the 
king's years may be either 'revenue' or 'regnal' years (cf. App. ii.); since 
most of the names of priests are derived from private documents, it is probable 
that the 'regnal' years largely predominate, but only in one case, no. (27), 
can it be determined with certainty which of the two years is meant. Where, 
as in most of the Greek evidence, the months are given on the Macedonian 
calendar, the presumption is that the king's years are calculated on a Macedonian 
system, which we are disposed to regard as identical with or approximating to 
the system employed in reckoning regnal years; cf. our remarks on (27). 
In converting the dates into years on the Julian calendar, the date B.C. which 
is probably implied if the year in question is regnal is placed in brackets after 
the date implied if the year is a revenue one. The priesthoods were annual 
ofices, though sometimes renewable for a second term, e.g. nos. (25) and 
(26). Probably the year in question was the official Macedonian year, whatever 
that may have been. It is noticeable that inconsistencies with regard to the 
dates of particular priests are rare (cf. nos. (21) and (32)), and the evidence forms 
several consistent series covering a number of consecutive years, e.g. from the 
8th to the 13th years of Euergetes. This strongly indicates that the priest's year 
of office coincided with the year (Macedonian or regnal, rather than revenue, as 
we think) employed in dating the great majority of the documents from which 
the list of priests is drawn up.

APPENDIX III
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year of reign.</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Priests.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>301-0 (?)</td>
<td>$\text{Mενελάον τοῦ Λαμάχου.}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7 (or 4)</td>
<td>279-8 (278-7) or 282-1 (281-0)</td>
<td>$\text{Λιμαίων τοῦ Ἄπολλω.}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (3) | 12 | 274-3 (273-2) | [... ... ... τοῦ Καλλιμηθίους.]
| (4) | 13 | 273-2 (272-1) | $\text{Νεα[ ... τοῦ ... ὄκλεος.}$ |
| (5) | lost | 300-271 | $\text{Φιλίσκου τοῦ Σπουδαίου.}$ |
| (6) | 15 | 271-0 (270-69) | $\text{Πατρόκλου τοῦ Πάτρωνος.}$ |
| (7) | 19 | 267-6 (266-5) | $\text{οἰμμενον τοῦ Ἀλκάτον.}$ |
| (8) | 21 | 265-4 (264-3) | $\text{Πέλοπος τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου.}$ |
| (9) | 22 | 264-3 (263-2) | $\text{Ἀριστοκράτους τῆς Τεταρτοῦ.}$ |
| (10) | 23 | 263-2 (262-1) | $\text{Ἀριστοκράτους τῆς Τεταρτοῦ.}$ |
| (11) | 24 | 262-1 (261-0) | $\text{Χαράκος τῆς Ἀπίου.}$ |
| (12) | 20-27 | 267-58 | $\text{lost.}$ |
| (13) | 28 | 258-7 (257-6) | $\text{Συμφυρα τῆς Μάγους.}$ |
| (14) | 29 | 257-6 (256-5) | $\text{Δημοτίας τῆς Φιλίους.}$ |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year of reign</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Priests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>253-2</td>
<td>(252-1) Aëtus (?) son of Apollonius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(251-0)</td>
<td>Demetria daughter of Dionysius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>252-1</td>
<td>Νεοπολέμου τού Φρεξίου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(250-49)</td>
<td>'Αρσινόης τῆς Νικολάου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>250-49</td>
<td>Apinatus (?) son of Apinatus (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(249-8)</td>
<td>'Εξετήμης τῆς Μεινέου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>27-39</td>
<td>259-46</td>
<td>[.....] τού Λα... ὁρος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(248-7)</td>
<td>Ματέλας τῆς Ἀναθ... κάδους.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Μεγίστης τῆς [.....]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Energetes I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year of reign</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Priests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>246-5</td>
<td>Τηπολέμου τοῦ 'Αρταπάτου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(245-4)</td>
<td>Πτολεμαιός τῆς Θεώνος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>245-4</td>
<td>'Αρχειάδου son of Demus (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(244-3)</td>
<td>Αρσίνος τῆς Πολεμοκράτους.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>4 (?)</td>
<td>244-3</td>
<td>Archelaus son of Demus (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(243-2)</td>
<td>Αρσίνος daughter of Polemocrates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formula: 

\[ \varepsilon \phi ' \text{i}{\text{r}} \varepsilon \omega ' \text{'A}{\text{l}}\text{e}{\text{x}}\text{á}{\text{n}}\text{d}{\text{r}} \omega \text{ r} \text{a} \text{v 'A}{\text{d}}\text{e}{\text{l}}\text{f} \varepsilon \omega \text{v kai te}{\text{wv E}{\text{n}}\text{e}{\text{r}}\text{g} \text{e}{\text{t}} \omega\text{v} \text{ka}{\text{n}}\text{e}{\text{p}} \text{r} \text{o}{\text{r}} ' \text{A}{\text{r}}\text{si}{\text{n}}\text{o}{\text{s}} \text{F}{\text{i}}\text{l}{\text{a}}\text{d}{\text{e}}\text{l}{\text{f}} \varepsilon \text{w}.} \text{ } \]

(23) 5 243-2  
| (24) 8 240-39  |
| (25) 9 239-8  |
| (26) 10 238-7  |
| (27) 11 236-5  |
| (28) 12 236-5  |
| (29) 13 235-4  |
| (30) 15? 233-2  |
| (31) 17 231-0  |
| (32) 20 228-7  |

Bb 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year of reign.</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Priests.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>227-6 (226-5)</td>
<td>(\text{Γαλέστον του Φιλιστώνος.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>226-5 (225-4)</td>
<td>(\text{Βεοείκης της Σωσιπόλου.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>224-3 (223-2)</td>
<td>(\text{Αλεξικατος του Θεοεινου.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>223-2 (222-1)</td>
<td>(\text{Βεοείκης της Καλλιάνακτος.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{Αλκετας (?) son of Iasos (?).})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 84 (a). 1, 16.
(2) 97. 2. \(\text{Α[θηνα]β[ανόν]υ may be read for Α[μαραπόν].}\)
(3) 110. 40.
(4) 110. 44. The figure 3 in the number of the year is not quite certain; cf. note ad loc.
(5) 30. 23.
(6) 99. 3 and 128.
(8) Dem. P. Lond. (Revillout, Rev. Égypt. I. p. 6). 'Democrites' may be \(\text{Δημοκράτης or Δημόκρατος, and 'Αξιοπολου is obviously wrong.}\)
(9) 92. 3; cf. P. Petrie III. 52 (a). 3, where in l. 2 (\(\text{έτους}\)) \(\kappa\beta\), l. 3 \(\text{Πέλοπος, and 1. 5 τής Τεισάρχου should be read.}\)
(10) 88. 2 and Hibeh unpubl. pap.; cf. 88, introd.
(11) 85. 3 and 150.
(12) 134. The papyrus was written while the \(\text{νίστος}\) was associated with Philadelphus, i.e. after Phaophi 11 of the 19th year when Philadelphus was still reigning alone (100, introd.), and not later than the 27th, in which year the \(\text{νίστος}\) disappeared from the date-formula (Rev. Laws i. 1). 134, therefore, belongs to the 26th, 23rd, 25th, 26th or, less probably, the 27th year.
(13) 94. 3.
(14) 95. 2; cf. dem. P. Leyden 379 (Revillout, Rev. Égypt. I. p. 13; Krall, Sitz. Wien. Ak. ev. p. 357). Revillout and Krall give the name of the
canephorus correctly, and call the priest of Alexander Antimachus son of Cebes. Kββητος does not, however, suit the traces of letters in 95. 2, though -τος is possible; cf. note ad loc.

(15) Dem. P. Louvre 2433 (Revillout, Chrest. dêm. pp. 241 sqq., Rev. Égypt. i. p. 6). In P. Petrie III. 42 F (a), written probably in this year, occurs the earliest extant example of τοῦ ὑπνός and τῆς ὑπνοῦς in place of the names of the priest and canephorus.

(16) 98. 7.

(17) The name of the canephorus is preserved in P. Petrie I. 22 (1). 2 and dem. P. Louvre 2443, that of the priest of Alexander only in the latter (Revillout, Chrest. dêm. pp. 246 sqq., Rev. Égypt. i. p. 6). Apinatus is not likely to be right. Revillout deciphered the canephorus as Atis daughter of Mennas.

(18) P. Petrie III. 56 (b) (= Rev. Laws p. 187). The year is lost (Otto wrongly assigns it to the 27th), but is not earlier than the 27th, in which the formula Πολεμαίων τοῦ Πολεμαίων Ἐρμής was introduced (Rev. Laws i. 1). The papyrus therefore belongs to the 27th, 30th, 31st, 32nd, 35th, 37th, 38th, or 39th years.

(19) P. Petrie III. 54 (a). 2. The papyrus is later than the 30th year and probably belongs to the 31st, 35th, 38th, or 39th years rather than to the 32nd or 37th; cf. Smyly's note.

(20) P. Petrie III. 43 (2). ii. 1 et saecp.; cf. dem. P. Louvre 2438 (Revillout, Chrest. dêm. pp. 257 sqq., Rev. Égypt. i. p. 7), where the names were deciphered as Tlepolemos or Triporimos son of Altibios, and Ptolemaea daughter of Theon or Thian.

(21) 145 preserves the names Ἀρχέλαος and Πολεμοκράτους; cf. for the rest the names of the priests in the 4th year in dem. P. Louvre 2431 (Revillout, Chrest. dêm. pp. 265 sqq., Rev. Égypt. i. p. 7), where they have been deciphered as Archelaos or Alecrros son of Demos and Arsinoë daughter of Polemocrates. 145 was written probably in Arctemisius, which then corresponded approximately to Pauni (cf. App. i); the demotic papyrus is dated in Mecheir. It is possible to refer the two dates to the same year of office on the hypothesis that the Greek papyrus is dated by the regnal, the demotic by the revenue year; cf. App. ii. Or, if the 3rd and 4th years are really distinct, and there is no error in the demotic, Archelaos and Arsinoë may have remained in office for two years, like the priests of the 9th and 10th years.

(22) Dem. P. Louvre 2431; cf. note on (21).

(23) 171.
HIBEI PAPYRI

(24) 89. 2 and Hibeh unpubl. pap. 'Ὀρομακρίτων is a possible alternative for 'Ὀρομάστων; cf. 89, introd.

(25) Inscr. Canop. i. Cf. the next note.

(26) P. Petrie III. 5 (a). 2, 6 (a). 17, &c.; it is uniformly stated in these documents that Apollonides and Mencratia held office for the second year.

(27) P. Petrie III. 58 (e). 7 (introd. p. 8) and 58 (d). 7. These two papyri are dated in the 11th regnal and 12th revenue year (cf. p. 359), and are therefore free from the uncertainty attaching to dates in which the two systems of dating are not distinguished. Since regnal years so far as can be judged (cf. p. 367) begin or may begin about a year later than revenue years having the same numbers, and the conventional system of converting early Ptolemaic dates into years of the Julian calendar probably applies only to the revenue years, we assign these two papyri to B.C. 236-5, not to B.C. 237-6. A comparison of the evidence concerning Seleucus and Aspasia, who are known to have held office in the 11th regnal and 12th revenue years, with that concerning Eucles and Stratonice, no (28), is instructive. There are no less than six instances in which the latter are mentioned in wills of the 12th year (excluding those cases in which the figure is lost), and seeing that different priests were in office during part at any rate of the 12th revenue year, it is very unlikely that the 12th year in connexion with Eucles and Stratonice was a revenue year, especially as none of these six papyri is concerned with revenues and the months, where their names are preserved, are given on the Macedonian, not the Egyptian, calendar. Whether the king's years reckoned on the Macedonian system are distinct from the Egyptian regnal years is uncertain (cf. p. 366); but even if the two systems are independent and the 12th year in those six instances is not identical with the twelfth regnal year, the circumstance that the priests mentioned in them are different from those who are known to have held office in the 11th regnal year and 12th revenue year suggests that the 12th Macedonian year corresponded much more closely to the 12th regnal year than to the 12th revenue year.


(29) P. Petrie III. 18. 1 and 55. 1; cf. dem. P. Marseille correctly deciphered by Revillout, Rev. Égypt. 1. p. 134. Since the 12th year in (28) is probably a regnal, not a revenue year, the fact that the priests in (29) are different from those in (28) indicates that the 13th year in (29) also is a regnal year; cf. our remarks on (27).

APPENDIX III

The grandfather's name of the priest of Alexander ('Euphratōros,' Revillout) seems to be given, but we suspect an error either in the text or the decipherment. Otto (op. cit. p. 177) proposes 'Ελλάδικος 'Ελλαδικου τοι Ευφράτωρος. The year is not quite certain, being lost in the demotic contract and restored from the Greek docket. Otto prefers (ἐτος) ιε to (ἐτος) ιε, but in the facsimile ιε is more suitable. Neither 'Σοια' nor 'Λικοτας' can be right.

(31) Cf. three demotic papyri in the British Museum (Revillout, Chrest. dém. p. cxxxvi, and Rev. Égypt. I. pp. 115, 119, and 135), and dem. P. Berl. 3089 (Spiegelberg, dem. P. Berl. p. 6). Revillout gives the forms Mennas, son of Menetios, and Berenice (twice; elsewhere Cleonica and Cerdica) daughter of Atis (or Adaues), Spiegelberg Mnäs son of Mnīlas (the last s being doubtful) and Brnīgā (i.e. Berenice) daughter of Atis (Aētios?).

(32) In dem. P. Louvre 2425 (Chrest. dém. pp. 278 sqq., Rev. Égypt. I. p. 8), dated in Mesore of the 20th year, Revillout gives the priests' names as Calistos son of Philistion and Berenice daughter of Sosipatros. These persons are obviously the same as the priests of the 21st year, known from P. Petrie III. 21 (a). 1, 5, (b). 1, 6, (g). 29, as was pointed out by Wilcken (Gött. gel. Anz. 1895, p. 143), who in P. Petrie I. 27 (= III. 21 (b)) proposed to insert το β (ἐτος) after Φιλιστίων, but wrongly; cf. Smyly's note on III. 21 (b). The Greek documents therefore, unlike those mentioned in connexion with (26), give no indication that the 21st was the second year in which Galestes and Berenice held office, and another demotic papyrus (dem. P. Lond., Chrest. dém. p. 131, and Rev. Égypt. I. p. 118), which mentions them, is dated in Epeiph of the 21st year. Hence we think the attribution of a second year of office to Galestes and Berenice is erroneous. The conflict of evidence with regard to them can be reconciled by the hypothesis that the 20th is a regnal, the 21st a revenue year; cf. no. (21). But we are more inclined to suspect an error in the text or decipherment of dem. P. Louvre 2425, especially as Revillout from another demotic papyrus in London (Aegypt. Zeitschr. 1880, p. 111) gives Actitos and a daughter of Alexilaos as priests in the 20th year.

(33) Cf. note on (32).

(34) P. Petrie III. 19. (c). 1, 9, (f). 9, &c. and several demotic papyri. P. Petrie III. 21 (g). 1–3, where the priests' names are omitted, also belongs to this year; cf. note on no. (36). The demotic names were deciphered by Revillout as Alexicrates son of Diogenes or Theogenes and Berenike daughter of Cleonicus, and by Spiegelberg as Algsigirts son of Thugns and Berenike daughter of Griangs.

(36) 90. 2 and an unpublished Tebtunis papyrus; cf. note on 90. 2. The names occur in dem. P. Berl. 3096, where they were deciphered by Revillout (*Rec. Égypt. IV.* p. 152) as Dositheos son of Dositheos and Berenike daughter of Ph... tim... krs, by Spiegelberg (dem. P. Berl. p. 6) as Tusitus (Dositheos) son of Tripirus (Tryphilos) and Berenike daughter of Phitimigirs (or Khitimigirs). In P. Petrie III. 21 (g), where the editors read in ll. 1–3 (ἐτούς) κε [ἐφ' ἱερέως]Πνευματικόν τοῦ... ἦν Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελ. καὶ θεῶν Εὐσεβ. καὶ Θεο. Ἀρσ. Φιλ. Τιμ... τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου... we read (ἐτούς) κρ [ἐφ' ἱερέως] τοῦ ὄντος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείαι Ἀλεξάνδρου κ.τ.λ. καὶ Θεο. Ἀρσ. Φιλ. τῆς οὐσίας ἐν Ἀλεξανδρεία. This protocol therefore provides another early example of the omission of the priests' names; cf. no. (15).

(37) P. Petrie II. 25 (i). 5.
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σίδηφος 16. 30.
Σιμωνίδης 17. 2.
σκέπτεσθαι 16. 35.
σκοτείνω 5. 76.
σοφίας 1. 6, 13 ; 18. 5. σοφώ.
σπουδάζειν 13. 11.
σπυρίς 6. 5.
στείχεις 3. 22.
στρατηγός 15. 116.
στρατόπεδον 6. 95 ; 15. 98.
Στράτας 5. 20, 21.
στυγνήμα 16. 31.
σ' 3. 47, 56 ; 4. 18, 54, 58 ; 5. 22, 23 ; 6. 61, 78 ; 7. 61 ; 11. 6 ; 12.
σιγάγμασ 10. 12.
συγγελή 6. 108.
συγκρίνεις 13. 5. 25.
συλλαδή 5. 88.
σύμμαχος 15. 27.
συμμετέχω 7. 28.
συμφέρω 1. 9 ; 15. 41, 71 ;
συμφορά 6. 137 ; 10. 38.
συναπατέω 6. 96.
συνείναι 4. 19.
σύνων 15. 110.
συστήματος (συστήματο) 14.
στυγνήμα 1. 12.
συνεχείμασι 2. 5.
συναπατέω 6. 34, 36.
συνεδρίατος 13. 12.
σύμπα 16. 41.
σύνα 15. 84.
Σώστρατος 6. 122.
σωτηρία 6. 62 ; 15. 49, 66, 105, 110.
Σώστρατος 15. 58 (?).
τάναρ 3 τ. 6. 14.
τασειάδος 15. 70.
ταραχής 4. 36.
ταράσσεγ 6. 159.
τάσεσλ 3. 19.
τάφος 4. 6.
τάχυος 5. 4.
τάχυστα 17. 7.
τάξιος 4. 13.
τε 1. 3 ; 7. 30, 37 ; 6. 7, 88 ; 14. 6 ; 15. 131.
τείχες 1. 1. 5. 6.
τέκνον 3. 43 ; 6. 136, 180.
τέσσαρες 14. 76.
τέχνη 1. 12 ; 13. 2.
τίκτεν 5. 75.
τίς 3. 56 ; 4. 10, 12, 16, 40 ;
5. 13 el sacp ; 6. 4 el sacp ;
13. 17 ; 17. 9.
τίς 1. 4 el sacp ; 3. 37 ; 5. 6, 48 ; 6. 5, 39, 63, 78, 13.
τίς 2, 32 ; 18. 31.
τλήματα 4. 23.
τλόρα 8. 27.
τοί 6. 12 ; 9. 4.
τοιότος 5. 42 ; 14. 91 ; 15.
τοί 50 ; 16. 57.
τοίλημα 13. 23.
τοίός 3. 31 (?). 
τοιότος 6. 31.
τοίς 6. 84.
τραγοφόδος 13. 20.
τρίβεις 14. 37, 41.
τρίχες 5. 13.
τρόπος 6. 39 ; 18. 37 ; 18.
τρόπος 10.
τροφή 14. 45 ; 17. 28.
τρόφιμος 5. 52.
τρύγος 3. 49, 57.
τυχαίων 4. 33, 47 ; 5. 77 ;
6. 18 ; 18. 5, 26.
τύπτειν 11. 4.
τύμπανος 4. 34.
τύχη 6. 40 ; 15. 76.
τύμπανος 14. 46.
τύμπανος 16. 23.
τύχης 16. 12.
τύχης 16. 13.
I. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Alexander.

Ἄλεξανδρος 85. 4; 88. 3; 89. 3; 90. 2; 92. 4; 94. 6; 95. 2; 96. 2, 18; 98. 8; 99. 4; 134; 145; 171.

Ptolemy I.

βασιλείους Πτολεμαίου ἐτ. ε 84 (α). 1, 16.

θεσ Σατυρές 38. 13.


**INDICES**

**Ptolemy II.**

basileúontos Ptolemaion tou Ptolemaion ετ. ζ (3?) 97. 1. ετ. μ 99. 1; 128. ετ. ιθ 100. 8.
basileúontos Ptole. tou Ptole. kai tou vnoV Ptolemaion ετ. κζ 92. 1. ετ. κυ 88. 1. ετ. κδ 85. 1. ετ. κζ 96. 1, 17. Year lost 134.
basileúontos Ptole. tou Ptole. Sosthénos ετ. κη 94. 4. ετ. κβ 95. 1. ετ. λδ 98. 6.
basileis Ptolemaios kai Arsinóphys Filadelfos theoi 'Adelphi 38. 11.
basileis Ptole. 110. 55 ει μαερ.
ο basileús 77. 4. basileus 110. 51.
theoi 'Adelphi 85. 5; 88. 3; 89. 3; 90. 3; 92. 4; 94. 7; 95. 3; 96. 2, 18; 98. 8; 99. 5; 134; 145; 171.
'Arsinóphys Filadelfos 85. 5; 88. 3; 89. 4; 90. 3; 92. 5; 94. 7; 95. 3; 96. 2, 18; 98. 9; 134; 145; 171. Filadelfos 132.
Years to be referred to this reign: ω 110. 40. γυ 110. 44; γ 110. 37. φ 110. 34. 1ο 110. 12. κζ 50. 8. κα 39. 17; 64. 22. κζ 157. κδ 40. 17; 42. 11; 43. 10, 11; 101. 1. κε 85. 21; 108. 7 (?). κζ 96. 9, 25. κζ 83. 5; 108. 1 (?). κη 45. 25; 46. 21; 83. 6; 94. 13. κζ 47. 37; 95. 11. λ 48. 22; 87. 8; 132. λα 169. λβ 44. 8; 158. λγ 158. λδ 98. 1; 158. Year 34 = year 35 80. 14. λΚ 55. 7; 80. 5, 11; 108. 7 (?); 121. 1 (?); 146; 154–5. λζ 120. 1. λξ 56. 9; 102. 5, 10; 108. 1 (?). λη 57. 4; 76. 10; 86. 4, 19; 102. 3, 8. λθ 53. 4; 108. 5, 11; 129; 170.

Year of a Ptolemaic era (?) ετ. μ 84 (λ). 1.

**Ptolemy III.**

basileúontos Ptolemaion tou Ptolemaion kai Arsinóphys theow 'Adelphow ετ. γ 145. ετ. θ 91. 18 (?). ετ. ε 171. ετ. η 89. 1. ετ. κε 90. 1.
basileis Ptolemaios 34. 1.
ο basileús 82. 21, 30.
theoi Euergetai 89. 3; 90. 3; 171.
Years to be referred to this reign: β 32. 1; 33. 10; 51. 4, 6; 61. 9; 62. 17; 106. 1, 2; 138; 140. γ 58. 13; 71. 3, 11; 107. 2, 8; 114. 3; 136–7; 141; 153. δ 34. 2, 12; 78. 24. ε 72. 3, 15; 82. 16. ζ 82. 17; 117 (?). 6, 17. η p. 139; 117 (?). 1, 6, 17. θ 81. 4, 10, 18, 22; 82. 12. 22, 31. ω 37. 1, 9. υ 75. 10. ις 143; 165. κζ 103. 1, 9, 11. υυ 69. 10; 144; 163. υδ 36. 1, 7; 66. 6; 67. 3; 70 (α). 12; 105. 1; 162. κζ 104. 6; βκ 104. 1, 3, 8. κζ 90. 10.

**III. MONTHS.**

(a) Macedonian and Egyptian.

Σανδικόν Μεχύρ (?) ϊδ (22nd year of Philadelphus) 92. 6.
Τ'κτερθηρεμαίον κβ Παπώνι κβ (13th year of Philadelphus) 146.
Ἄρτεμισιον κφ Παλών κζ (36th year of Philadelphus) 77. 8.
III. MONTHS

(b) Macedonian.

Δίος 32. 1; 84 (α). 2, 17.
'Απελλαίος 32. 17; 97. 4.
Παρίσιος 89. 5.
Δύστρος 96. 3, 9, 10, 26; 110. 41.
Σανδικάς 90. 10; 92. 6.
'Αρτέμισιος 77. 8; 145.

Δύνατος 82. 17; 86. 3, 18; 97, introd.; 99. 6; 102. 3, 9; 129.
Πάννους 47. 9; 57. 4; 84 (α). 5, 21.
'Ανδρέας 82. 31; 88. 4; 110. 45; 171.
Γορσιάδος 82. 22; 90. 4.
'Υπερβεργείας 82. 12; 110. 47; 146.

(c) Egyptian.

Θωίθ 39. 18; 71. 3, 11; 169-70. Θωίτ 36. 1, 7; 76. 11; 114. 13.
Φαώφι 42. 6; 56. 10; 69. 6; 81. 4, 10; 103. 1, 12; 114. 5, 19; 131; 139-40; 153; 165.
Πασίφα 100. 1. Παιάτη 46. 21; 146.
'Αδρία 42. 9, 13; 53. 3, 4; 65. 31; 68. 3; 69. 4, 10; 73. 5; 81. 19; 106. 1, 2, 8; 120. 11; 121. 3; 130; 138; 140; 155; 163.
'Χνάχ 45. 25; 55. 7; 73. 4, 8; 81. 11, 22; 118. 17; 119. 15; 120. 25.
Τίζη 27. 62, 209; 75. 10; 101. 1; 116. 4.
Μεξίφ 27. 66; 44. 8; 47. 37; 114. 4, 8. Μεξίφ 34. 2; 44. Π; 51. 4, 6; 92. 7; 115. 5, 24. 29; 116. 3, 6.
'Φαμενώθ 73. 3, 15; 114. 11; 115. 6, 25, 30; 116. 8; 161. 'Φαμενώθ 27. 88; 119. 6.
'Παμενώθ 33. 10.
'Φαρμακίθ 27. 107; 34. 12; 37. 1, 9; 93. 6; 115. 7, 26, 31; 116. 10; 118. 37; 119. 7; 136.
'Παχών 27. 129; 61. 9; 66. 6; 115. 8, 27, 32; 118. 32; 119. 11; 136-7; 141; 144. 'Παχών 77. 8; 116. 11.
'Παιών 27. 137; 62. 17; 95. 5; 102. 5, 10; 104. 1, 6; 105. 1; 107. 2, 7, 8; 112. 37 (?); 115. 14, 18, 36; 116. 12, 13; 118. 35, 40; 119. 12, 162.
'Επείφ 43. 10, 11; 58. 13; 80. 5, 12; 116. 3; 117. 4; 118. 60. 'Επείφ 40. 17. 'Επείφ 110. 34; 119. 13.
'Μεσορή 139; 48. 22; 85. 7; 98. 1, 11; 116. 4; 118. 67; 133; 143.
'Επαγόμεναι ἡμέραι 27. 201, 219.

IV. PERSONAL NAMES.

'Αχίλλων 110. 2, 12.
'Ακάτίτης 112. 73.
'Αθάνατος 121. 1; 153.
'Ασατός 35. 5, 13.
'Αθέμενος 67. 25; 113. 4.
'Αθήνα 27. 77, 166.
'Αθήνας 130.
'Ανησίδημος 71. 5, 12.

'Αλέξανδρος 30. 2 et saep.; 39. 9; 92. 4; 96. 4, 20; 97. 6; 98. 5, 13; 100. 11; 110. 55 et saep.; 121. 5; 123; 167.
'Αλκέτας 88. 3.
'Αματτίς 101. 7 (?).
'Αμελίνων 110. 63 et saep.
'Αμενεύος 67. 26; 112. 11; 144.
'Αμυνων 112. 90.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Άριστοσ 61. 4; 81. 10; 90. 23; 115. 21; 168.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άριστοπλος 111. 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άνδρομήκος 111. 6; 132.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άνδρόπων 96. 4; 110. 81 (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άνδρος 27. 17.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άντεγγεξ 112. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άντιγόνος 30. 1; 34. 1; 73. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άντερφάτης 118. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρπάγων 32. 7; 71. 4; 12. 72. 1; 20; 95. 2; 110. 58; 71; 81; 104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άντίφατος 48. 11; 64. 3; 100. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπειρος 85. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπειρος 111. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπειρον p. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπολλωνις 51. 1. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπολλώνιος 112. 82; 123.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπολλώνιος 103. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπολλων 27. 186.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπολλωνίδης 151: 165.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπολλώνιος 44. 3; 53. 18; 67. 6; 68. 4; 11; 91. 16; 92. 14; 20; 95. 10; 110. 45; 110. 17; 112. 62; 91; 114. 1; 118. 49. 78; 119. 1; 123; 129; 133.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άπολλώνιος 97. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άργιλος 78. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άργυρδής 53. 20; 101. 6; 106. 6; 138; 153.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άργως 143.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρμονίας 40. 1, 18; 41. 1, 26; 42. 1, 13; 43. 1, 12; 44. 1, 9; 85. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρμόσταδρος 116. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρμόσταχος 110. 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσινι 54. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 171.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 109. 1, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 84 (p). 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 72. 15; 85. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 111. 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 134.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 72. 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 67. 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 86. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 36. 2, 8; 52. 29; 53. 7; 118. 55. 81; 114; 167. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 61. 7; 62. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 33. 1, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 117. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 112. 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άρματσίδας 74. 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. PERSONAL NAMES

93. 8; 96. 34; 98. 2, 11; 110. 87, 99 (?); 112. 57.
Δουνοσάφωρος 57. 1; 58. 2; 96. 12 et saep.; 147.
Διόνυσος 121. 10.
Διουσαφάνης 81. 16.
Δίφαλος 112. 13, 94.
Διάζωνδρος 96. 15, 32.
Δίδαμος 76. 1, 12; 86. 14; 111. 35; 129.
Δριμόλος 90. 2.
Δράφων 34. 2; 71. 4; 72. 1, 4; 73. 1, 4, 18; 78. 18; 106. 9; 107. 4, 8; 118. 27; 130-42.
Δωσίθεος 90. 2.

'Ενεδρίμες 81. 18.
Εδω 27. 93.
Είρήνη 112. 24.
Εισεγέρος (= Εισαγός) 112. 51.
'Εκτέινας 98. 14.
'Εμεγής (?) 112. 45.
'Επιμενής 80. 26; 81. 7; 84 (a.) 2 et saep.; 148.
'Επιτάρχης 80. 1, 6; 154-5.
'Ερέας (?) 105. 3.
'Ερρίμπος 110. 94.
'Εστείνας 112. 51.
Ευαγρός 57. 2; 91. 16; 118. 26.
Εὐθαλος 110. 4.
Εὐθάς r. 4.
Εὐκαρπός 102. 1, 6.
Εὐκλείων 90. 23.
Εὐκρίτης 90. 6 et saep.
Εὐνύμος 53. 19.
Εὐτόκειος 165.
Εὐπόλος 76. 1; 91. 1 et saep.; 103. 8; 104. 1, 6; 165.
Εὐρυμεδών 89. 19.
Εὐτυχιας 133.
Εὐφράδης 38. 1, 19; 68. 11; 100. 10; 101. 4.
Ζηνίων 89. 7, 14, 15, 16.
Ζηνίατος 54. 11.
Ζηνάδωτος 111. 29.
Ζηνάδωρος 59. 1; 60. 1; 107. 5; 120. 14; 124-7.
Ζηύγορος (?) 81. 18.
Ζωίλος 70 (a.) 1, 3; 74. 6; 78. 3, 13, 21; 88. 6; 89. 7; 91. 15; 94. 14, 16, 17; 96. 5, 13, 21, 30; 102. 1, 6; 103. 7; 105. 4; 110. 86; 121. 12 (?); 124; 159.
Ζωπυρίων 76. 1.

'Ηγέμων 92. 10.
'Ημα 27. 69, 112.
'Ημακλείδης 79. 1, 9; 84 (a). 15 (?); 87. 1; 112. 6; 121. 21, 28, 46; 143.
'Ημάκλειτος 139; 142.
'Ημάκλειδωρος 110. 85; 160.
'Ημακλής 72. 2.
'Ημάκλετος 112. 8.

Θαγμάς; 112. 14.
Θανός 112. 79.
Θάσος 112. 39.
Θάρων 116. 2.
Θανείτης 89. 6, 12, 14, 16.
Θανάτωρ 50. 1, 9; 53. 5; 75. 1; 105. 1; 108. 4; 117. 15; 118. 3. Θεόδωρος.
63. 19.
Θεοκτήτης 118. 11.
Θεόδωρος 103. 2; 111. 25.
Θεόχροπτος 118. 6. Θεόχροπτος 110. 64, 65.
Θεογέις 110. 52. 84.
Θηραμίης 111. 32 (?).
Θης 112. 44.
Θόργας 118. 48, 61, 77.
Θοτείς 68. 22.
Θοτομοίς 67. 19.
Θοτορράντος 68. 5; 72 17; 112. 2, 15, 16 (?); 43; 118. 46, 64, 72; 104.
Θράσων 31. 1 et saep.
Θυμής 35. 3.

'Εμεία 171.
'Ελατος 118. 2, 7.
'Ελασίων 56. 4.
'Εμείς 72. 17; 131.
'Εμείς 115. 21, 36.
'Επικώνιος 52. 21; 91. 15; 110. 69, 96, 108 (?).
'Επικώνιος 121. 1 (?).
'Επιστέλης 110. 80 (?).
'Επιστάμονος 121. 10.
'Εστιες 27. 205.
'Εστιατόριος 82. 15.
'Εστιός 118. 42, 79.
'Εστίμις 27. 86.
Καλλιόμορφος 34. 2-5 ; 52. 26 ; 73. 1, 4, 8, 11 ; 111. 31.
Καλλιέργης 40. 4 ; 42. 1, 13 ; 43. 1, 12.
Καλλικράτης 31. 2 ; 53. 5 ; 73. 2 ; 90. 22.
Καλλιμάχος 110. 40.
Καλλιτεχνός 99. 12.
Καλλιστράτος 117. 9.
Καρπάθος 111. 30 ; 168.
Κέρκος 40. 13.
Κέφαλας 118. 45, 63, 71.
Κέφαλλον 103. 6 ; 104. 8.
Καλλίς 39. 3, 14.
Κέρκων 88. 2.
Κάττακος 122.
Κλάδος 118. 54, 73.
Κλέοτάρχος 66. 1, 8 ; 67. 1, 28 ; 68. 1 ; 69. 2 ; 70 (a). 1 ; 160-3.
Κλεόμαχος 74. 3.
Κλεοπάτρα 61. 3 ; 6, 9, 12.
Κλέον 112. 53.
Κλέους 113. 41, 62, 74.
Κάμπα 164.
Κάμης 90. 21.
Καλλιέργης 112. 46.
Κανώτατες 52. 17.
Καμάκιων 112. 48.
Κάνναβος 111. 19.
Καράς 49. 4 ; 122.
Κρατίφινος 118. 39, 50, 69.
Κράτων 76. 5.
Κρασίλας 127.
Κρασίτιτος 92. 13, 21.
Κράτος 40. 4 ; 63. 1 ; 110. 17, 19, 33 ; 120. 28.
Κρηστιάδης 60. 3 ; 89. 5.
Κρήτηππος 90. 22.
Κρήνης 53. 14 ; 130.
Λίκανος 81. 8.
Λύκανθος 84 (a). 1, 16.
Λυκομίλας 49. 1, 16.
Λύγμος 81. 15.
Λαοκός 111. 59.
Λείξιος 42. 10.
Λεοντάρχος 45. 1 ; 46. 1 ; 47. 1 ; 48. 1 ; 49. 1 ; 50. 1.
Λέων 89. 6, 7 ; 110. 106.
Λιβάδες 101. 2.
Λίδες 140.
Λιμνὸν 30. 16 ; 97. 3 (¿).
Λίκανος 81. 18.
Λυκόνος 94. 6.
Λυκοκλῆς 110. 91.
Λυκομίλας 47. 31.
Λυσαίας 47. 26 ; 49. 11.
Λυσίμαχος 45. 1, 26 ; 46. 1, 22 ; 47. 1, 38 ; 48. 1 ; 49. 3 ; 50. 6.
Μάγνος 94. 8.
Ματθώιτης 118. 38, 53, 68.
Μανεθός 72. 6.
Μαχάτος 130.
Μελάνθιος 111. 2, 25 ; 118. 44, 70.
Μελ. . νος (¿) 84 (a). 13, 30.
Μενεκρίτης 143.
Μένελαος 84 (a). 1, 16.
Μένεμαχος 32. 18.
Μένιππος 32. 18.
Μερίδος 87. 3.
Μένων 30. 22 ; 53. 11 ; 126.
Μενωνίδης 124. 6.
Μηνιδώρος 110. 58.
Μίνας 112. 19, 67 ; 152.
Μινασίας 97. 8.
Μινάσων 41. 3 ; 92. 10.
Μηνιστράτης 92. 5.
Μηνιστράτος 110. 43.
Μηνιστράτης 118. 57, 84.
Μηνιστράτης 111. 35.
Νείν 110. 44.
Νεκρείς 110. 45 (¿).
Νεκταλέμος 99. 7.
Νέατος 130.
Νέβεριζης 98. 3, 15.
Νέβερεμένης 72. 10, 14, 17.
Νεβερίζης 111. 39.
Νεβεριζής 67. 27.
Νεβερίτης 118. 10.
Νεκρασός 63. 3.
Νεκταρίδος 123.
Νεκτάριος 30. 3 ; 81. 1, 5 ; 21 ; 91. 16 ; 115. 2.
Νέκταριος 31. 11, 21.
Νέκταρ 78. 1 ; 118. 51, 75.
Νέκταριος 96. 12, 29, 35.
Νεκτάριος 110. 60, 75, 105.
Νέκταριος 98. 10 ; 107. 3 ; 111. 20 ; 136-9 ; 141-2 ; 160.
Νεκτάριτατος 30. 11 ; 56. 5.
Νεκταρίας 71. 1.
IV. PERSONAL NAMES

Némphi 94. 8.
Néstos 82. 8.

Σάνθος 39. 1; 100. 10.
Σενάδους 98. 4, 13.
Σενάδους 123.
Σενοκράτης 34. 7; 111. 5, 7.
Σενοφάντης 112. 49.

Οίμας (?) 53. 9.
'Οπάργος 53. 18.
'Οπονάγος 35. 2; 114. 1; 118. 22.
'Ορόμαστος 89. 2.
'Οπιές 149.
'Οραθεφαίος τ. 4.
'Ορομούς 149.
'Ορφίς 27. 60.

Παβός 133.
Πάντος 112. 57.
Πακάμος 130.
Πανείς 118. 2.
Πανήσ 53. 7.
Παισις 52. 3; 72. 13.
Πασινής 100. 9; 118. 9.
Πασίμηνη 99. 7; 118. 12 (?) ;
Παρές 64. 1; 65. 4. 20; 85. 8.
Παρρετίων 47. 3; 117. 11.
Πατζις 154.
Πασίμαδος 53. 8.
Παστιγιώς 52. 21.
Πασπάς 61. 6.
Πατες 31. 4, 9, 14, 20; 53. 7; 67. 24; 71. 13; 85. 7, 20; 98. 14; 112. 27; 113. 8, 15; 118. 47, 76.
Πάτών 106. 4; 138; 140.
Πασίς 68. 13, 21.
Πατζέδις 153.
Πατής 86. 14. 25.
Πατροκλος 99. 3.
Πατρώος 34. 1, 7, 10; 56. 1; 73. 9, 19; 99. 4; 111. 13.
Πατής 53. 6, 8; 61. 7.
Παυσάνιας 39. 12.
Πελοψ 92. 3.
Περινέως 130.
Περατίς 112. 25.
Περαδίκας 30. 1, 4.
Περίλοκας 85. 4.
Πετεφαρμώς 135.

Πεταγῆς 53. 6.
Πετεμούθης 67. 7; 68. 5; 75. 3.
Πετευάς ( ) 121. 15.
Πετενόπης 67. 24.
Πετερμούθης 52. 16.
Πετρέχως τ. 6.
Πετρής 35. 3.
Πετροχάστις 112. 54; 118. 25.
Πετρούχως (?) 53. 21.
Πετρούριος 35. 2, 11; 52. 20, 22; 53. 21; 61. 5, 6; 67. 29, 25; 68. 19, 23; 72. 1, 4; 75. 2; 112. 5, 59; 131; 136–7; 139; 141; 164.
Πετρός 54. 5; 112. 26.
Πεπερείς 53. 16.
Πλάτων 101. 4; 118. 52, 80.
Πλακαρχός 63. 1; 64. 1, 26; 110. 7, 13, 35. 42; 159.
Πνεύμα 52. 18.
Πνεύσ 72. 17.
Πνεύμωνς τ. 4.
Ποκούς 35. 2; 118. 5, 6.
Πολέμαρχος 112. 7, 9.
Πολεμοκράτης 88. 4; 145.
Πολέμου 40. 1; 41. 1; 110. 1; 118. 3; 157.
Πολίωνης 111. 11.
Πόλη 121. 6 (?) ;
Πολίων 91. 14; 118. 4.
Πολίκαμος 111. 15.
Πολυκλής 94. 13, 17.
Πόλων 111. 11.
Πόλος 148.
Ποσειδώνοις 112. 41; 122.
Πούδς 118. 43, 65, 82.
Πραξιας 52. 26.
Πραξίμαχος 78. 3, 14.
Προμηθείς 27. 85.
Πρωτευγόρας 63. 6.
Πρώταρχος 66. 1.
Πρωτογενής 99. 10; 167.
Πρωτόμαχος 43. 4, 13.
Πτολεμαῖος 37. 3, 11; 51. 1, 7; 52. 1, 26; 53. 1; 54. 1, 33; 55. 1, 8; 56. 1, 11;
57. 1, 5; 58. 1; 59. 1, 14; 60. 1, 11;
61. 1; 62. 1, 17; 70 (x). 3; 79. 1; 111.
8; 112. 84; 130; 132; 160; 167–8.
Πνεύγγειος 90. 4.
Πνήγγος 89. 3.

Σάτοκος 36. 3, 9; 112. 81, 83.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τάσαρχ'</td>
<td>92. 6; 110. 26 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τυάς</td>
<td>62. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τοκετιόνιος</td>
<td>112. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τοτοὺς</td>
<td>113. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τ... απει</td>
<td>85. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαμίς</td>
<td>112. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαίνει</td>
<td>110. 63, 73, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαύς</td>
<td>52. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φα... ακοής</td>
<td>112. 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φίβει</td>
<td>53. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλάμμων</td>
<td>75. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλάμμων 70 (a). 8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλάμμιος</td>
<td>112. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλίππος</td>
<td>62. 1; 117. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φίλισκος</td>
<td>30. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλοκήλει</td>
<td>110. 10, 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλόξενος</td>
<td>75. 5; 124; 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φίλων</td>
<td>47. 26, 27; 48. 10; 52. 14: 90. 6. 22; 95. 4; 96. 35; 111. 26; 112. 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλανθίδης</td>
<td>81. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιλανθίδα</td>
<td>134.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιμίης</td>
<td>82. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φιταρίδος</td>
<td>27. 64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαίνει</td>
<td>110. 61, 70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φρίδζος</td>
<td>98. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαρέμιον</td>
<td>80. 1, 6; 154-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαρέα</td>
<td>85. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαρικλῆς</td>
<td>152.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χελ... ω... ω</td>
<td>110. 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χεσαμίνης</td>
<td>72. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χ... μοῦ</td>
<td>105. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψευχάντας</td>
<td>112. 48, 92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψευδομίς</td>
<td>64. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψευτίς</td>
<td>112. 80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψευτσσίσ</td>
<td>104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψευδὰς</td>
<td>132.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ωρος</td>
<td>30. 4, 7; 52. 18; 53. 9, 20; 68. 19; 70 (b). 7; 74. 1; 80. 7, 15; 94. 10, 19; 108. 5; 110. 99; 112. 31, 67, 74; 122.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>απει</td>
<td>102. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱκανοτάς</td>
<td>30. 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰχώσας</td>
<td>52. 31.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. GEOGRAPHICAL

(a) COUNTRIES, NOMES, TOPARCHIES, CITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. GEOGRAPHICAL.</th>
<th>84 ((a))</th>
<th>2, 17.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. 92; 32. 14, 16; 70 ((b)) 4; 93. 6.</td>
<td>57. 2; 98. 16, 20; 110. 22, 25; 158. (\text{ἡ πόλις}) 110. 31.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>27. 92; 32. 14, 16; 110. 22, 25; 158. (\text{ἡ μεγάλη}) 110. 82.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>36. 6, 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>82. 16; 110. 87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>134.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>38. 6; 71. 13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>52. 12; 91. 16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>96. 15, 32.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>70 ((a)) 9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>110. 86.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>96. 13, 31.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>91. 16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>81. 7; 133.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>83. 1, 2; 71. 14; 80. 3, 8; 82. 9; 110. 72, 78; 163.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>30. 25; 92. 12; 93. 3; 171.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>96. 4, 21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>110. 93, 102.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>91. 14, 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>80. 5, 85.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>30. 22; 33. 5, 12; 37. 3, 11; 90. 23; 92. 9, 10; 94. 13, 17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>96. 4, 21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>92. 11 ((?)); 110. 58, 104.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>96. 12, 30.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>114. 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>34. 2; 52. 13, 14; 86. 23; 89. 6; 90. 21, 23; 91. 14; 94. 16 ((?)); 99. 7; 102. 1, 6 ((?)); 124.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>33. 8, 16; 66. 7; 78. 14; 88. 5; 93. 3, 19; 106. 4; 117. 2. (\text{kάτω Κωίτης}) p. 8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>30. 21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>30. 2, 3, 14; 32. 6; 96. 6; 110. 62, 71.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>80. 21, 23; 91. 14; 94. 16 ((?)); 99. 7; 102. 1, 6 ((?)); 124.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>33. 8, 16; 66. 7; 78. 14; 88. 5; 93. 3, 19; 106. 4; 117. 2. (\text{kάτω Κωίτης}) p. 8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>30. 21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. 17.</td>
<td>54. 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) VILLAGES.

1. Arsinoite.

| Βοβάστων | 81. 7. |
| 987. | 81. 14. |
| Θεσσαλί | 81. 8. |
| Ιερά Νήσος | 63. 19; 80. 4, 9; 81. 17; 110. 21, 22. | 133. |
| Τεμένες | 81. 9. |
| Φαρσάλα | 81, introd. | 110. 21, 22. |
2. Heracleopolite. (Villages in the Κωτις τόπος are marked by an asterisk.)

*'Λγκρι ὁν πόλις 67. 4; 112. 74; 117. 15.
*Λγκριάποιον p. 8.
*Αλαδία p. 8.
*Ανατιτεί (:) 100. 12.
*Λασίνα p. 8; 112. 5, 12, 52; 117. 12.

Βουσέρις p. 8; 116. 2.

Οδοίκανθάνει p. 8.
Ομώνυμα p. 8.
Ομώνυμεις 80. 7. Τρων. 163.
Ομώνυμος p. 8.
*Ομώνυμες 112. 56, 88.
*Ομώνυμες 112. 39.

*Ιππώνων p. 8.

*Κερκεσθή 112. 2, 6, 81.
*Κερκεσθής p. 8.
*Κερκεσθήσα p. 8.
*Κόστα p. 8; 56. 6; 123.
*Κοινούσι ( ) p. 8.
Κόμια p. 8.
Κρίτια p. 8.

*Μουχάνθη ( ) p. 8.
*Μούχις p. 8; 112. 27 (?), 45 (?).

Νίκος p. 8.
Νόμις p. 8.
Πεεύκη p. 8.
Πεεύκης p. 8.
*Περί p. 8; 84 (') 7, 22: 112. 14.

*Περιχίψα 112. 46.
Πεταλ( ) p. 8.
Συλάμ p. 8.
*Σιούν 101. 6.
Στάθη p. 8.

*Σταμορού p. 8.
*Σταλή (Στάλη) p. 8; 36. 3, 8; 37. 4, 12;
75. 1, 5; 103. 7; 107. 6; 117. 8; 139;
144; 157.
Σάν p. 8.
Στροφής p. 8.
Στροφήτης ( ) p. 8.
Στροφήτη ( ) p. 8.
Στέκχω p. 8.
*Στεινέγους (:) 112. 43.
Τοκάς p. 8.
Τοσοχ( ) p. 8.

*Φεβίχης p. 8; 72. 2; 88. 5; 96. 3, 19;
103. 3; 107. 3; 110. 36; 112. 4 εύσεβ.;
117. 15; 131: 136; 138-9.
*Φιλανίας pp. 4, 8.
Φιλάνιας p. 8.
*Φίς 102. 2.

*Χανίζοντιμ 68. 3; 112. 26, 86.
Χάνας p. 8.
*Ψεβίδνεμη (Ψεβ. ) p. 8; 33. 7, 15; 112.
25 (').
*Ψεβίμης 112. 36.
*Ψύκη p. 8; 112. 11, 57; 117. 8, 10.

3. Hermopolite?

*Αλιαχώστρων πόλις 78. 8.

4. Oxythynchite.
VI. RELIGION.

(a) GODS.

θεός 77. 4; 7; 79. 6. Cf. Index II.
Θυμίας 35. 3.

'Ισίως 27. 205.
'Ιφθίμως 27. 86.

Προμηθεύς 27. 85.

Φιλοπόις 27. 64.

| Τάκλα 73. 14; 111. 1.
| Τάλαω 55. 2; 132; 167.

5. Indeterminate.

| Πασαφόρων 87. 6; 118. 16 (?).

(c) MISCELLANEOUS.

| παρεμένη 53. 5; 130.
| ποταμός 27. 126, 168, 174.

(d') κληρον.

| Νικοστράτου 39. 11.

| Παραμήνου? 118. 12.
| Παρμενίων 117. 11.
| Πανσανίου 39. 12.
| Πολυνάου 118. 4.
| Πρωταγόρας 63. 6; 110. introd. (?) .
| Πρωτογένες 99. 10.
| Πτολεμαῖον 52. 26; 130.

| Τυμοκράτου 118. 5.
| Φιλίππων 117. 12.
| Φιλοξένου 75. 5; 85. 13.

(c) Deme.

Καστόρειος 32. 3.

VI. RELIGION.

(a) GODS.

'Αθανάτιος 27. 77. 166.
'Αμμών 112. 93.
'Αποδίδων 27. 173.
'Απόλλων 27. 186.

Boustias 27. 145.

εδών? 27. 93.

'Ηρω 27. 112; cf. 27. 69.
'Ηρακλής Εύθεσ. [ 72. 2.

Γερσεκέκ (?) p. 4.
INDICES

(b) PRIESTS AND PRIESTesses.

ἀρχιερεῖς 62. 8; 72. 2, 18; 118. 24; 131.

ἱερέως 52. 18; 72. 2, 16; 85. 8. ἱερέως (sc. Ἀλεξάνδρου), Μεσέλας Δαμιάνος (5th Soter) 84 (a), 1, 16. Λυμάιος (?) Ἀπολλών (7th or 4th Philad.) 97. 2. ... Καλαμίδου (12th Philad.) 110. 40. Νεά ( ... ) οκλάων (13th Philad.) 110. 44. Φιλικοσ Σπουδάων (b.c. 300-271) 30. 23. ἱερέως Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν, Πατρικίου Πατρώνου (15th Philad.) 99. 3; 128. Πέλοπ Ἀλεξάνδρου (22nd Philad.) 92. 22. Κινέω Ἀλκέτου (23rd Philad.) 88. 2. Ἀριστόκριου Περιόλου (24th Philad.) 85. 3; 150. Name lost (26th Philad.) 96. 2. 17. ... Λεόν (28th Philad.) 145. 5. Ἀτρικη ( ... ) Ἕρα (29th Philad.) 95. 2. Νεωπόλεως Ἐρεύνου (?) (34th Philad.) 98. 7. Ἀρχείου Δημοτού (3rd Energ.) 145. ἱερεῖς Ἀλεξ. καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελ., καὶ θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν, Ἀριστάκλου Διοδότως (5th Energ.) 171.

κασαφόρος Ἀρσενίδος Φιλαδήλφου, Μηνιαστήριον 
Τεισάρχου (22nd Philad.) 92. 5. ... 
Πολεμοκράτους (23rd Philad.) 88. 4. 
Χαρία Ἀπίου (24th Philad.) 85. 5; 150. Name 
lost (26th Philad.) 96. 2. 17. Φιλο τέρα ... 
(16th-27th Philad.) 134. Νέμφη Μάγους 
(28th Philad.) 94. 7. 
Δημοκρίτη Φιλωνοῦ 
(29th Philad.) 95. 3. Ἀρατής Νικόλαου 
(34th Philad.) 98. 9. Ἀρειά, Πολεμοκράτους (5th Energ.) 145. Ἧμανε 
Ὑπο ... (5th Energ.) 171. Ἀρχεστρατήγα 
Κηρσελεύσ (8th Energ.) 89. 4. Βερεικὴ 
Pιθηγέλου (25th Energ.) 90. 3.

Παστοφόρος 77. 2; cf. 87. 6.

(c) MISCELLANEOUS.

ἀδυτον 72. 10, 17, 18.

γενέθλια Ἰσως 27. 205.

ἐπτά 27. 47, 53, 64, 85, 93. 145. 150, 154, 173, 186.

Ἱππολείον 77. 1; 110. 5.

ἱερί (τὰ?) 112. 89.

ἱερῶν 35. 7; 72. 5, 16; 93. 4; 157. τὰ 
ἱερί 77. 7.

πανήγυρος 27. 76, 165.

VII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TITLES.

ἀντιγραφεῖς 29. 8, 27, 32; 110. 28.

ἀρχαφυλακίς 73. 10.

Βασιλικὸς γραμματέας 72. 8; 98. 3, 15; 108.

3; 153; 156.

γραμματέως 74. 6; 82. 26. Βασιλικὸς γρ. 
Sec. Βασιλείως, γρ. ἀνθρακών 29. 7, γρ.
κληρον.ων 82. 15.

ἐκκλησίας 30. 13; 81. 16, 18; 90. 6; 91.

15; 96. 5; 103. 7.

διοίκητας, ὁ πρός τῷ διοίκητα, 
Τεισαρχόν 109. 4, 11.

dioikhtis, Apollonios 44. 3, 8; 95. 11; 110.

53; 50, 68, 94, 103, 112. 
ἐκτάριος 133. (?).

diakonimasths 29. 10; 41. 3; 106. 5; 107. 6;

108. 4; 109. 7; 136-42.

ἐπιστάτης 34. 2; 72. 4.

ἰγερμόν 44. 2.

ὁσιαρχός, ὁ πρός τοῖς ἡθ. 117. 2.
VIII. WEIGHTS, MEASURES, COINS

(a) Weights and Measures.

άρωμα 52. 19 et saep.; 53. 5 et saep.; 70 (a). 5; 70 (b). 3; 75. 6.
άρταζη 50. 3; 63. 7, 17; 64. 4, 5; 65. 6, 11, 19, 24; 74. 2 et saep.; 76. 6, 9; 83. 6, 7; 84 (a). 3, 8, 18, 24; 86. 1, 11, 16; 90. 9, 14; 91. 10, 11; 98. 5, 18, 99. 11, 13, 14, 15; 100. 6, 13; 101. 8; 102. 2, 4, 7, 10; 110. 1 et saep.; 122; 124-6; 129; 150-7. 
άωδιλων 100. 3.
κεράμων 31. 6, 7, 16, 18; 80. 4, 10.

μέτρων ἀνθλωτικῶν 74. 3, 4, 5; 101. 8. μ. a. ( ) 119. 18. μ. βασιλικῶν 86. 6, 21; 124; 129. μέτρων τῶν χοιρ τῶν βασιλ. 84 (a). 6, 22. μέτρων χοιρ τῶν ... 90. 11. μ. δοχικῶν 74. 2. μ. ἐννεακαιεισθ. χαιρικῶν πρὸς τὸ χαλκὸν 85. 18. μ. παραδοχικῶν 87. 12. μ. ὁ αὐτὸς ἡρέγκαθαι ἐξ Ἀλεξανδρείας 98. 19; cf. 156.

tάλαντων 116, introd.

χώνες 110. 20, 21, 22.

(b) Coins.

ἀργυρίων 34. 9, 11; 46. 17; 51. 2; 58. 7; 70 (a). 10; 89. 8, 90. 4, 19; 91. 7, 11; 109. 6, 12; 110. 20; 112. 42, 55; 113. 19; 118. 89; 127. 4; 153.

δραχμῆ 29. 11, 23, 35-6; 30. 5, 16, 20; 31. 7, 8, 18; 32. 9, 10; 34. 3; 36. 6, 12; 37. 8, 16; 40. 11; 41. 6, 20; 46. 6, 7; 51. 6; 52. 12 et saep.; 53. 5 et saep.;
INDICES

53. 7; 58. 7; 60. 5; 63. 16. 19; 20.
64. 8. 14; 65. 24; 67. 13 et ssc.; 68.
8; 70 (a) 11; 70 (b) 6; 84 (a) 8. 24.
86. 12; 88. 8; 89. 9. 16; 90. 15. 19.
91. 7; 92. 15. 19; 94. 1. 14. 19; 95.
13; 99. 15; 102. 2. 4. 7. 10; 104. 4. 5.
100. 1. 8; 107. 1. 7; 110. introd.
et ssc.; 111. 12 et ssc.; 114. 3 et ssc.;
115. 8 et ssc.; 116. introd., 2 et ssc.; 121.
et ssc.; 124-6; 136-42; 160; 162-4.
(δέξαμαι) 52. 13. 19. 28; 53. 8. 9. 23. 24;
63. 20; 67. 13. 21; 68. 7 et ssc.; 110,
et ssc.; 111. 4; 112. 14 et ssc.; 114.
et ssc.; 115. 8 et ssc.; 116. introd.,
et ssc.; 121. 20 et ssc.

εξαδράμειον 51. 6.

(ήμιχαλείων) 68. 20.
(ήμιχαλετών) 51. 6; 52. 12. 18; 53. 9. 22.
et ssc.; 111. 4. 34; 112. 13 et ssc.; 113.
et ssc.; 114. 5. 23; 115. 6 et ssc.; 116. 6
et ssc.; 121. 20 et ssc.

μεν 88. 9.

IX. TAXES.

αλκη 112. 3.
αλληγη 67. 15. 22.
αρ. |, ικεν 45. 20.

βολανεων 108. 7; 112. 96.
βολανεων τριτή 116. 1.

γαμόμενα, τα γ. 92. 20; 111. 34.

δέκατη μύηχων 115. 1.
διακωνιστή (μ' και ε') 66. 1.
διάμετρα 110. 14.
διάξωμα 104. 4. 10.
dοκιμαστικων 29. 24; 110. 30.
dοδακαχαλίκα 112. 6 et ssc.;
dωμά 66. 1.

(αξιολός) 51. 6; 52. 12; 53. 20. 22. 24; 68.
et ssc.; 60. 18; 99. 14; 111. 34; 112. 38 et ssc.;
113. 12; 116. 14; 121. 18 et ssc.

(αντωξαλων) 52. 15. 21; 53. 21; 104. 5.
et ssc.; 110. 11; 112. 94; 115. 13; 116. 6
et ssc.; 121. 25 et ssc.

(τέταρτων), i.e. 4 obol. 52. 15. 17; 53. 5
et ssc.; 68. 9 et ssc.; 111. 26; 112. 14
et ssc.; 113. 11. 16; 115. 14 et ssc.;
119. 6 et ssc.; 121. 15 et ssc.

(πεταύξαλων) 52. 12 et ssc.; 63. 17. 20; 67.
et ssc.; 110. 4; 112. 14 et ssc.; 115.
et ssc.; 116. 7 et ssc.; 121. 49; 148.

χαλκός 112. 7. 8. 30. 34. 42. 49. 53. 85;
113. 7. 11. 12. 14; 160. χ. εἰς καθ (τέταρτων)
106. 8. 107. 7. 138. χ. πρὸς
ἀργυρίουν 70 (a) 10; 109. 5. 12.
χαλκοὶ 68. 18. 20.

Χρυσιόν 110. 19.
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abl̄onos 85. 25.
ágion 27. 48, 54, 82; 55. 3; 64. 16.
ágma 101. 3.
ángan 28. 1.
ánganōn 51. 2.
ánganōn 29. 3, 10.
údike 34. 1; 133.
údios 34. 5; 147.
údulos 85. 17; 86. 6; 90. 10; 91. 2; 98. 19; 156.
údulos 72. 10, 15, 18.
'Aróstos 27. 107; 138.
áix 37. 6, 15; 120. 3; 13; 32. Áiç 27. 88, 177.
áteín 113. 2.
alía 43. 8.
alía 73. 18.
álisafítos 49. 9.
ákouen 49. 2.
ákriðos 40. 7. úkrêtstata 27. 34.
ákr̄wios 27. 56 et al. sapf.
ákuros 29. 28; 93. 8; 96. 10, 27.
álēthea 27. 23.
alētheia 38. 15.
álko 112. 3.
alēskexei 148.
álλaγ̄ 67. 15, 22.
álλ̄on 63. 12; 96. 5, 6, 8, 22, 25.
álλo 31. 11. 22; 34. 12; 48. 13; 52. 19.
álλos 72. 7; 79. 4; 82. 6; 84. (a). 12, 27.
álλos 92. 21; 96. 7, 24; 110. 44, 47, 59; 121. 8; 122; 124; 126. álλos 58. 11; 60. 9; 62. 16; 69. 8; 162.
álλος, álλος 152.
alústos 121. 3.
alφιτα 121. 47.
alos 84. (a). 5, 21.
alos 84. (a). 4, 19; 88. 7; 168.
alos 47. 12.
álπelos 70. (a). 2.
álπelos 151.
alαβινειν 27. 127.
alαβινειν 27. 169, 176.
alνιειν 73. 13; 167.
alγινινειν 168.
alγακοι 27. 40. áalγακοιτηρ 82. 11.
alγαρίζειν 30. 24.
alγεικειν 58. 9.
alαμπτειν 71. 9.
alαμφειθείνειν 41. 23.
alαλαβιθείνειν 38. 4; 81. 6, 13.
alαλακτείνειν 54. 8.
alιλωμα 85. 11; 86. 8; 80. 12, 13; 110. 21, 36; 118. 21, 39.
alαλαλατιΐνοι 74. 3, 4, 5; 101. 8.
alαλαλαλατιΐνοι 94. 1, 14; 95. 13.
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ἀναφέρεται 57. 1.
ἀναφέρεσθαι 110. 32.
ἀναφέρεσθαι 27. 52, 89, 91, 116, 130, 137, 221.
ἀναφέρεται 27. 45.
ἀναφέρεται 28. 37; 39. 16; 42. 5; 50. 2, 71. 3; 120. 30; 162.
ἀναφέρεσθαι 112. 37; 114. 4.
ἀναφέρεσθαι 71. 6; 113. 11.
ἀναφέρεσθαι 29. 1, 4, 6, 8.
ἀνεμος 38. 6.
ἀνεφαρακτικός 94. 72.
ἀνεφαρακτικός 72. 59, 58, 7, 130, 90, 97, 91, 34.
ἀνεφαρακτικός 52. 22 et sacc.; 53. 16 et sacc.; 65, 7, 19.
ἀνεφαρακτικός 52. 7.
ἀνεστέλλων 52. 7.
ἀνεστέλλων 27. 56, 161, 202.
ἀνεστέλλων 32. 11.
ἀνεστέλλων. See Index VIII (a).
ἀνεστέλλων 73. 15.
ἀνεστέλλων. See Index VIII (a).
ἀνοιγματικός 121. 31.
ἀνοικτόν 30. 19, 92. 15.
ἀνοικτόν 27. 91, 125, 126, 191.
ἀνοικτόν 29. 20.
ἀνοικτόν 52. 3, 130. ἀνοικτόν 52. 8.
ἀπεκριθή 89, 98.
ἀπεκρίθη 36. 4, 19.
ἀπεκρίθη 54. 4.
ἀπεκρίθη 54. 6.
ἀπεκρίθη 53. 3; 130. ἀπεκρίθη 52. 8.
ἀπεκρίθη 69, 88.
ἀπεκρίθη 36. 4, 19.
ἀπεκρίθη 157.
ἀπεκρίθη 54. 4.
ἀπεκρίθη 54. 6.
ἀπεκρίθη 63. 16; 73. 14.
ἀπεκρίθη 127. 4.
ἀπεκρίθη 148.
ἀπεκρίθη 41. 6.
ἀπεκρίθη 159.
ἀπεκρίθη 160. 3.

βαδεύσεως 108. 7; 112. 96; 116. 1; 121. 53.
βαδεύσεως. See Index II.
βαδεύσεως. See Index II.
βαδεύσεως. (τὸ) βαδ. 47. 24; 50. 3; 51. 6; 67. 11; 68. 7; 14: 81. 6, 14; 98. 17;
96. 15, 14; 124; 126. βαδ. ἀποδέχομαι 85, 20. βαδ. γεγ. 52, 3. βαδ. γραμματεῖς. See
Index VII. βαδ. κλάμος 85. 13; 101. 5;
112. 35. βαδ. κατωτέρων 39. 5. βαδ. κάλεσμα
90. 10; 91. 8. βαδ. μετέρων 84 (a). 6,
22; 86. 6, 21; 124; 129. βαδ. τραπέζηα
29. 39, 40; 41. 25(?).
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βάρις 100. 13.
βεβαιοῦν 90. 17, 18; 91. 6.
βια 34. 5; 73. 19; 111. 3.
βιβλίον 48. 6.
βίκος 49. 8.
βλάβη 29. 3.
βλάπτεται 55. 5.
βρήχος 27. 59.
βούς 112. 22.
βουλεύσαν 30. 18; 72. 6, 7; 84 (a) 10, 26.
βραδύτερον 55. 5.
βρίζειν 90. 8.
βυσ( ) 67. 13; 68. 7, 17, 19.

genvēlia 27. 205.
gεωμετρία 80. 8.
gεωργεῖν 101. 5; 112. 41.
gεωργίας 52. 32; 113. 18.
γά 27. 72, 79, 87; 52. 4; 85. 22; 90. 11.
γέγραπτα 27. 72, 78, 87, 121, 123; 28. 1, 16; 29. 6; 31. 11, 22; 38. 6; 40. 5; 47. 18; 51. 5; 52. 10; 71. 2; 73. 18; 74. 3, 4, 5; 90. 11, 20; 91. 8, 9, 92.
20; 105. 4; 110. 8, 35; 111. 34; 114. 10, 18, 22; 115. 4, 18, 23, 36.

γεώντας 148.

γεώργος 27. 28.

γεωργία 28. 6.

γεωργίας 92. 13.

γεγονός 121. 55.

γένος (γ) 52. 18.

γενεσί 38. 14.

γράμμα 29. 9; 62. 11; 71. 8.

γραμματεία 82. 20.

γραμματισμός 29. 9.

γραμματικός. See Index VII.

γραμματικών 110. 23, 24, 26.

γράφειν 28. 3; 29. 7, 9, 32, 36, 41; 34. 3, 7, 12; 39. 13; 40. 3; 44. 1, 3; 48. 4; 49. 6, 13; 51. 3; 64. 2, 20; 66. 3; 67. 32; 68. 11; 71. 5; 72. 6, 14, 16, 19; 73. 7, 17; 75. 2; 78. 2, 16; 82. 3; 11; 85. 11; 86. 26; 90. 14, 18; 91. 6; 92. 18; 115. 4, 23; 121. 2; 124; 127. 5; 170.

γράφθη 44. 4; 78. 18.

γνη 54. 14.

doξεῖν 88. 5.

dιάδοχον 89. 16.

dιαιτεῖν 36. 6, 12; 37. 6, 15.

δέιγμα 39. 15; 98. 17.

δεικνύειν 27. 25.

δειν 44. 5; 46. 13; 54. 8; 64. 5; 116 5.

δεικτής 136.

δεικτικός. See Index VII.

δεικτή 115. 1.

δήλος 27. 110, 146.

δέξας 38. 8.

δεσμοτήριον 34. 2; 4, 8, 21; 73. 8.

δέχεται 70 (a) 2.

δέχόμενος 53. 2.

δήμος 26. 13, 15, 17.

δημόσιος 65. 25.

διάγραφος 93. 10.

διάγραμμα 34. 7, 9, 11; 73. 13; 88. 14; 89. 18; 90. 16; 91. 13; 92. 22; 116, introd.

διαιρέσις 116. 3.

διακομίζειν 54. 22.

διακοσμητήσωτος (στί) 63. 1.

διακοίτευν 31. 3.

διάλογος 122.

διαλέξειν 86. 5, 22.

διάμετρα 110. 14.

διαπιστεύειν 147.

διάπτωσα 52. 9.

διάπτωσαν 35. 5; 73. 19.

διάχωμα 104. 4, 10.

διδάσκαλος 116. 4; 40. 10; 42. 9; 44. 4; 46. 4; 49. 5; 10, 13; 54. 9; 58. 4; 64. 9; 67. 2; 68. 2; 72. 8; 73. 21; 82. 7; 90. 12; 110. 45; 113. 17; 118. 28; 159; 162.

διδόμενος 27. 88.

διεγγέραν 41. 4, 19; 48. 3; 52. 9; 53. 3.

διεγράφειν 114. 14; 115. 15, 34; 116, introd.

δικαίωσθαι 30. 19.

δικαστήριον 80. 25.

δίκαιος 30. 20, 24; 92. 14.

δίδ. 30. 19.

διακήρυξ 109. 5, 11.

διακήρυξ. See Index VII.

διαφέρων 63. 13.

διαφέρειν 27. 30, 32, 222.

διαφέρειν 72. 5.

διπλοίς 29. 1, 34; 148.

διϊδ. 118. 7, 14.

δικέϊν 27. 37; 72. 13.

δοκιμάσθη. See Index VII.
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ἐπιδάλλεως 89. 10; 115. 3, 22; 116, introd.
ἐπγονή 30. 22; 32. 19; 34. 2; 37. 3, 11; 52. 13, 15, 24, 27; 86. 24; 90. 6, 24; 92. 9, 10, 11; 93. 2; 96. 4, 14, 15, 20; 31, 32; 120. 18; 124; 129.
ἐπιγράφεισιν 44. 3; 113. 5.
ἐπίδεκατον 32. 9; 92. 9.
ἐπιδιδάσκαλος 72. 2.
ἐπιδίπανον 84 (a). 5, 21.
ἐπικαλεῖν 62. 5.
ἐπικόλληται 159.
ἐπικόλλιον 48. 13.
ἐπιλέγων 78. 12.
ἐπιμελεία 41. 20.
ἐπιμελής 78. 7. ἐπιμελὸς 82. 10.
ἐπιποτεφθαί 96. 10, 27.
ἐπισημαίνειν 27. 70 et sacp.
ἐπισκέπτες 162.
ἐπισπουδάζειν 49. 3.
ἐπίστασα 40. 6.
ἐπιστάσης 34. 2; 72. 4.
ἐπιστέλλειν 40. 5; 41. 16; 44. 5, 7.
ἐπιστολή 34. 12; 44. 5; 45. 3; 47. 23; 51. 1; 57. 1; 58. 3; 58. 3; 61. 3; 71. 1, 4; 72. 16, 19; 81. 2, 21; 82. 7; 110. 51
et sacp.
ἐπιστάσεως 34. 7.
ἐπιστέλλειν 27. 50 et 50. φ.
ἐπιτίθεσιν 83. 10; 110. 10.
ἐπιτίθεμαν 29. 11; 90. 1); 91. 7.
ἐπιτρέπειν 41. 11.
ἐπιφέρειν 84 (a). 11, 27; 90. 20; 91. 13; 96. 7, 11, 24, 28.
ἐπιχαράζεται 151.
ἐργάζεται 121. 30.
ἐργῶν 27. 25; 113. 18.
ἐργά 115. 20.
ἐρήμος 32. 8.
ἐρήμος 121. 34.
ἐρών 121. 34.
ἐρόφος 54. 18.
ἐρωτήρια 32. 11; 37. 7, 15; 120. 28.
ἐροποιία 61. 1.
ἐρείπως 74. 4; 96. 9, 26.
ἐρημία 27. 125.
ἐρί 46. 16; 73. 2; 78. 6; 131.
ἐρτομίεσιν 47. 23.
ἐρυθρός 44. 7.
ἐψείδας 45. 10.
ἐψίθακες 48. 6; 118. 29.

ἑακτησίων 35. 6.
ἑάθυεν 72. 14.
ἑάλαστειν 66. 5; 79. 8.
ἕφασα 96. 16, 26.
ἕκαι 27. 21, 106, 206; 40. 14; 43. 8; 54. 5; 12, 15, 28; 59. 6; 63. 13; 64. 8, 21; 68. 11; 72. 16; 73. 14; 85. 7; 86. 15; 87. 4, 5; 99. 8; 100. 9; 101. 1; 104. 1, 6; 110. 1 et sacp.; 123; 129; 152; 160.
ἕκαστα 170.
ἕωδιν ὥρα 110. 61, 109.
ἕφασ 27. 88 et sacp.
ἕφας 38. 5; 42. 6, 9; 47. 9, 11; 92. 13; 96. 8, 25; 112. 37; 114. 5; 116. 3.

ζυτρόδ. See Index IX.
ζυτοποίος 94. 10.
ζῦτος 113. 6.

ἡγεμόν 44. 2.
ἡδόν 40. 14; 41. 22; 44. 6; 47. 8, 30; 48. 10; 51. 3. 5; 55. 2; 60. 8.
ἡμιος 27. 30, 117, 120, 221.
ἡμέρα 27. 31 et sacp.; 28. 10, 20, 24, 20. 18, 34; 88. 11; 89. 14, 15; 148; 168.

ἵμικοιρός 32. 12, 14, 15.
(ἵμιχαλκον) 68. 20.
(ἵμιωβάλλειν). See Index VIII (6).
"Τίρα (star?) 27. 69.
"Ησυχά 73. 6 (?).
"Ηφως 27. 138.

θανατίζειν 159.
θέλειν 65. 25; 79. 5.
θεός. See Indices II and VI (a).

βερίκειν 47. 12.
βερυσίμος 90. 5.
 βερυσυτήσις 44. 4, 6, 13.
βέρος 27. 33, 121.
βερνίδος 121. 17 et sacp.
βήλας 36. 5; 11; 37. 7, 16.
βεσαυρός 117. 2.
βάτειν 25. 7.
βοσία 54. 15.

ιπτρικόν 102. 2, 8; 103. 9.
ιπτρός 102. 1, 6.
INDEXES

καθά 27. 208; 41. 8; 74. 5; 77. 7.
καθάτευρ 49. 6; 13; 51. 3; 77. 4.
καθαρός 47. 15; 84 (a). 6, 21; 85. 16; 86.
καλέων 27. 70, 167.
καλεί 49. 12, 25; 50, 32; 63. 12; 64. 8; 85.
καλέων 29. 27, 85.
καλέτει 49. 12, 25; 50, 32; 63. 12; 64. 8; 85.
καλεδίον 27. 70, 167.
καταγγέλλω. See Index VI (b).
Κατάκόπος 27. 107.
κατάφιλον 27. 107.
κατάστασις 10. 18; 91. 4.
κατάταξις 105. 3; 143.
κατασκευασμένοι 68. 8, 18; 20.
κατασκευή 54. 16.
κατάρτιον 81. 5, 13.
κατατακτικόν 45. 21.
κατάτυπος 104. 5, 11; 110, introd.; 118. 18, 19.
κατάτυπος 20, 32.
κατατυποφυσία 162.
κατηγορία 27. 63, 170, 209.
κατηνότεις 67. 12, 14, 22; 68. 8, 17, 18, 20.
κατεβαίνω 119. 19.
κατεχόμενοι 112. 36.
κατείχονες 47. 14 (?).
κατείχεσθαι 29. 21; 61. 3; 82. 14; 133.
κατοίκησις 44. 3: 66. 3; 67. 32.
κατευθέν 27. 70, 167.
κατευθύνομαι 54. 26.
κινεῖται 59. 10.
κινείται 62. 3.
κινήτης 90. 17.
κινούεται 27. 27, 85.
κόσμος 49. 12, 25; 50, 32; 63. 12; 64. 8; 85.
κόσμος 14; 66. 2; 72. 12; 82. 9, 17, 25; 127.
κόσμος 2; 131.
κοπηκλόματι. See Index VI (b).
Κυρίαρχος 27. 107.
κυρίαρχος 47. 5; 90. 18; 91. 4.
κυρίαρχος 117. 7.
κυρίαρχος 29. 6; 64. 17; 110. 42, 48.
κυρίαρχος 49. 10.
κυρίαρχη 32. 7.
κυρίαρχη 58. 9.
κυρίαρχη 27. 73, 79, 87.
κυριαρχεῖν 151.
κυριαρχεῖν 48. 12.
καταλλαγῆ 100. 4.
κατανάλωσις 52. 3: 130.
κατανάλωσις 27. 38 (?).
καταναλώσιμος 44. 4.
καταναλώσιμος 29. 3.
καταναλώσιμος 45. 22.
κατάργησις 119. 4.
καταργεῖν 63. 8.
κατώτερον 34. 1; 44. 10; 52. 4; 85. 10; 110.
κατώτερον 24; 169.
κατωθύνει 100. 76, 98.
κατωθύνει 121. 11.
κατωθύνει 80. 25.
κατώτερον 66. 7.
κατωθύνει 80. 4, 10.
κατωθύνει 54. 20.
κατωθύσιμος 82. 6; 98. 4, 12.
κατωθύσιμον 45. 8.
κίάριον 29. 21.
κιάριας 29. 22.
κιάριας 121. 17 el συμφ.
κίάριον 59. 7.
kίάριας 41. 14.
κίάριας 59. 10.
κίάριας 62. 3.
κίάριας 90. 17.
κίάριας 27. 27, 85.
κίάριας 49. 12, 25; 50, 32; 63. 12; 64. 8; 85.
kίάριας 14; 66. 2; 72. 12; 82. 9, 17, 25; 127.
kίάριας 2; 131.
κίάριας 29. 4.
κίάριας 27. 62.
κίάριας 29. 5.
kίάριας 54. 13.
kίάριας 29. 20; 113. 19.
kίάριας 121. 48.
kίάριας 39. 6; 98. 13; 100. 13.
kίάριας 110. 51 el συμφ.
kίάριας 54. 13.
kίάριας 72. 19.
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κύριος (adj.) 84 (a). 11, 27; 90. 20; 91. 13; 96. 11, 28.
κύριος (subst.) 34. 3; 73. 3; 89. 7.
Κώνων 27. 135.
κόλαμσ 90. 20; 91. 8, 9.
κωμαργών 35. 11.
κομή 33. 7, 15; 37. 4, 12; 53. 23; 59. 11; 70 (b). 8; 84 (a). 7, 22; 112. 35; 113. 7; 127. 2; 163. Cf. Index V (b).
kωμογραμματεύς. See Index VII.

λαμβάνειν 44. 5; 45. 3; 49. 12; 51. 3, 5;
57. 1; 58. 3; 59. 2; 61. 2; 62. 10, 12;
63. 18, 21; 64. 5; 71. 8; 72. 12; 73. 16; 85. 22, 26; 110. 12; 113. 6, 13; 121. 9.

λαβός 61. 8.
λατομία 71. 7.
λάχανον 54. 26.
λέγει 27. 28; 49. 6; 55. 4.
λεία 33. 2, 11; 62. 4.
λειτουργεῖν 78. 11.
λειτουργία 78. 4, 9.
λειτουργός 96. 14, 15, 31, 33.
λειπαγος (=λειπόγειος?) 47. 13.
λευκός 120. 4, 16, 23, 29.
λευκόφασις 32. 13.
λευκόματα 29. 9.
λέων 27. 129.
λήμμα 55. 11.
λιβανωτός 121. 54.
λιθάνον 27. 26.
λιτός 70 (a). 6 (i).
λογεία 51. 2, 5.
λογείειν 29. 38; 45. 9, 19, 22; 46. 3; 58. 6; 77. 3, 4; 153.
λογοειδέων 106. 3; 107. 3; 108. 2; 114. 7.
λογοεύθης 113. 9, 15; 168.
λογοευθύνων 29. 41; 40. 15.
λόγος 29. 40; 34. 4; 48. 14; 53. 4; 69. 5; 75. 9; 110. 35; 120. 1; 153.
λοιπός 35. 4; 42. 7; 45. 11; 46. 5, 11; 47. 10, 20; 50. 6; 54. 7; 63. 14, 20; 64. 6; 65. 26; 100. 7; 110. 7 el sacr.; 111. 14; 114. 23; 115. 14; 116. 12, 14; 118. 80; 119. 21, 22.
λογογραφίας 81. 7, 8, 15.
λύρα 27. 73, 83, 151.
λύρος 27. 166.
λωτός 152.

μακρός 27. 37.
μαλακός 54. 11.
μάσθι 121. 50.
μάρτυς 84 (a). 13; 28; 89. 9, 19; 90. 21; 91. 14; 96. 12, 29.
μαχαιροφόρος 73. 16 (?).
μάχης 41. 18; 44. 1, 6, 12; 70 (b). 1.
μέγας 27. 155; 29. 9; 35. 4; 110. 82.
μέισων 27. 121.
μέλας 120. 5, 19.
μέλι 121. 54.
μέν 27. 47.
μένειν 55. 6.
μέντοι 40. 7.
μερίζειν 27. 41.
μερις 81. introd., 15; 133.
μέρος 29. 5, 26; 90. 13.
μέσος 73. 14.
μεταβάλλειν 42. 3, 8; 45. 6.
μεταγράφειν 111. 14.
μετακομίζειν 82. 8.
μεταμελεῖν 59. 11.
μέταχος 109. 3, 9.
μετρεῖν 39. 3; 43. 2; 64. 3, 6; 65. 5, 9, 14; 18, 21; 74. 1, 6; 83. 4, 8; 103. 3; 105. 2; 117. 3; 119. 5; 131; 143.
μέτρησις 85. 17; 90. 11; 91. 2; 98. 21.
μέτρων. See Index VIII (a).
μηκέτες 170.
μη 30. 23; 34. 2; 47. 9; 72. 5, 8; 84 (a). 1, 5, 17, 21; 84 (b). 1; 85. 7; 83. 3; 18; 88. 4, 9, 10; 89. 5; 90. 4, 10; 92. 6; 95. 4; 97. 4; 98. 10; 99. 5; 100. 9; 101. 1; 102. 3, 9; 110. 41, 43, 45, 46, 50; 114. 5; 115. 3; 129; 131; 145; 171.
μηνέων 29. 5, 6.
μήν (μυγμα?) 67. 12, 20, 35 (?) : 68. 7, 17, 19.
μισθοῦν 76. 4; 90. 4, 18; 91. 5.
μισθώσεις 85. 23.
μνά 88. 9.
μονή 93. 2; 111. 31.
μόριον 27. 39.
μόσχον 47. 25; 115. 1.
μού 49. 8.
νάκλησι 39. 5, 14; 98. 2, 12; 100. 14; 116. 23.
νάζλον 46. 5; 110. 6, 18, 28, 31, 32.
ναυπηγός 152.
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νέμειν 168 (i).
νεώς 84 (a). 5, 20; 85. 27. νεώτερος 110. 62.
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