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This edition of ten unpublished Greek Papyrus documents preserved in the Egyptian Museum of Cairo. The first eight of them dates back to the ptolemaic period, while the ninth and tenth to the Roman period. The documents No. 1-7 are from Pathyrite nome, the document No. 8 is from Gurob (Fayoum), The provenance of the document No. 9 is unknown. The last one No. 10 is from Diopolite nome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>P.Cairo.mus. C.G.No.</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10389</td>
<td>A fragment of a contract of sale</td>
<td>113-112 B.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10353</td>
<td>A fragment an agreement for the surety of sale</td>
<td>107-98 B.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10385</td>
<td>A small fragment of Papyrus</td>
<td>107-98 B.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10358</td>
<td>A fragment of a contract of sale</td>
<td>109-98 B.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10355</td>
<td>A fragment from the archive of Dryton</td>
<td>114-111 B.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10365</td>
<td>A fragment of an unknown agreement</td>
<td>Later half of 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. B.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10390</td>
<td>A fragment of a loan of wheat</td>
<td>Later half of 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent B.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10298</td>
<td>A fragment of a private letter</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} cent. B.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10583</td>
<td>A fragment of an unknown contract</td>
<td>AD 166-167 or 198-199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10685</td>
<td>A fragment of a petition to the strategos</td>
<td>AD 222-235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Master in Papyrology Supervised by Prof. Dr. Alia Hanafi Hassanien Prof. of Papyrology and classical studies.
A Fragment of a contract of sale

P.Cair. Mus. C.G. 10389.
Pathyrite nome.

The papyrus lost from its left and right hand sides a strip which hold the beginning and the end of the lines. The upper and the lower margins are preserved, where there a piece of blank space at the upper one (ca. 4 X 7.7cm) and at the bottom (ca 4.2 X 15.8cm). At the end of line 7 there is a rounded spot of ink on the letters ρη of the word τετρημένῳ. At the end of line 11 there is a very small strip cut off horizontally but without damage of the text.

The papyrus preserved to us 11 lines, written by two hands. The lines 1-9 by one hand where the letters are of medium-size, cursive, and very clear, while lines 10-11 are written by another hand, where the letters are of small-size.

The letter Ψ of the patronymic Ψεμμύναος (line 4) is too long that it attached the letters of lines 3 and 5. The verso is blank.

The date and the provenance of the papyrus are not mentioned, we can suggest that it dates between ca 113 to 112 B.C. and the provenance is the village Παθύρις the capital of Παθυρίτης Nome. Because we know that ᾿Αμμόνυος the scribe of this papyrus who is mentioned in line 9 as the agent of the ᾿Αγορανόμοι ᾿Ηλιοδώρος held his post at Παθύρις during this time (see P. W. Pestman, Agoranomoi et Acts Agaronomiques-Krokodilopolis et Pathyris 145-88, av. J.C., P. L. Bat. Vol. XXIII, Leiden. (1985). pp. 18-19.

The papyrus is a fragment from contract of sale. We suggest that the contract is sale of half-house. According to our study on the contracts of sale from pathyris the terms έκοδοξήμηκεν καὶ ἐστεγασμένῃς built and roofed" (line. 1) and γείτονες τῆς ἄλης ὁκεάς (line 3) are used in this kind of contracts (see the discussion on lines 1-3).

The names of the parties are not preserved in the text, the purchaser is described in line 6 as a Persian of the mercenaries cavalry. The dimension of the house and the price of the sale are not preserved in the text too.
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The names of the parties are not preserved in the text, the purchaser is described in line 6 as a Persian of the mercenaries cavalry. The dimension of the house and the price of the sale are not preserved in the text too.

The form of the contract here is belongs to that type of the objective notarial documents which are known as ἀπέδοτο A — ἐπικρισίω B “so sold and so purchased”. This form is used in numerous sale-contracts from Πιθοσίς (see F. Pringshim: The Greek Law of Sale, Weimar, (1950), p. 103. and note 1). It consists three main items as the following:

I- The docket: which is contain date, ἀπέδοτο, name of the seller, the sold property, and the price the of sale. The docket was written in a separate column from the body of the contract (see as example P. Lond. III. 1204. p. 10 (113 B.C), P. Strassb. II. 87 (107 B.C.); 90 (99 B.C).

II- The body of the contract: "begins with the date, the place of the transaction, and the name of the acting official, who is introduced by the preposition ἐπί. Next follow a statement concerning the person of the vendor in the form ἀπέδοτο ὁ δεῖνα, the identification by situation, size, and neighbors of the property sold and the naming of the purchaser: ἐπικρισίω ὁ δείνα. The conclusion of the document is a brief remark concerning the προσωλήθης καὶ βεβαι-ωτής and his acceptance by the purchaser, and the whole is usually covered by the agoronomic's note: κεχρηματικά (see H. J. Wolff: Registration of the Conveyances in Ptolemaic Egypt, Aegyptus, Vol. 28, (1949), pp. 21-22).

III- The ἑγκύκλιον receipt: is the last item. It was "a tax on transfer of the real property, and of certain other types of property" (see Wallace: Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian, Princeton. (1938) pp. 227-228). The ἑγκύκλιον contains: the date, place of bank, names of the banker and purchaser, the sold property, its site and dimension, name of the vendor, the price of the sale, and the sum of the tax. The ἑγκύκλιον receipt comes after the signature of the ἀγορανόμους either in the same column of the body of contract as in P. Lond. Vol. III. 1204. P10 (113. B.C.) or in a separate column as in BGU. Vol. III. 994 (113. B.C.); 996 (113 B.C.). as. Pringshim says “from 140-88 B.C. these notarial documents show no change in from” (see. F. Pringshim op. cit. p. 103).
For close parallels see:


The scribe 'Αμμώνιος has abbreviated some words in the text by different ways thus:

1. Putting a sloping dash over the last letter of the word such as ἀρ(ιστερόν) in line 7.

2. Writing the last letter of the word either over the preceded one such as 'Αμμώνιος; and κεχρημάτικα) in line 9, or under the preceded one such as Ἡλιόδωρου in the same line. The witness has abbreviated also the word προγεγραμμένης in line 11 by writing the letter α over the letter ρ. Likewise the witness used common symbol in line 10 for the word (ἐτῶν) "years". The papyrus ends with the signature of the witness (lines 10-11).

Corrections:

6. ἔπεσεν[ν.] 7. οὖν.

Abbreviation:


9: κεχρημάτικα). 11: προγεγραμμένης)

Symbol:

10: L. (ἐτῶν).
Translation:

“…. [of a house], built, and roofed ….. [which] is situated in the northern division [of Pathyris ….. the boundaries of the whole] house: on the south, the house of Sp ….. [the house of …] echoutes son of Psemminis, ….. [or whatever] the boundaries may be all round ….. so called son of ….. a Persian, of the <mercenary> horsemen [aged ….. years …..] the left ear is pierced, purchased it […] of all the terms of this deed of sale”. “I Ammonios the agent of Heliodorus have registered”.

(2nd. Hand) “Tastes daughter of Phageris a Persian woman, aged about …… years [had written …..] of the aforesaid sale”.

Notes:

Lines 1-2:

[ἡμισὺν οἶκιας ὡκο]δο<μη>μένης καὶ ἔστεγας[μένης -----
tῆς σο]ῦσης ἐν τῷ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ μέ[ρει Παθύρεως -----] ["half of a house], built, and roofed …….. which is situated in the northern part [of Pathyris"].

The first line of the fragment here is not the beginning of the contract since it contains only the description of the sold property, and preceded with a blank space (ca. 4 X 7.7cm). So the fragment here is a separate column of the contract, According to the order of the sale’s contracts of this type, we can suggest that it is the third column, where second one is the beginning of the contract; while the docket is the first one, if it was written in a separate column (see the introduction).

[ἡμισὺν οἶκιας]. The property which is described here as ὡκο]δο<μη>μένης καὶ ἔστεγας[μένης "built and roofed" may be either οἶκια (house) as in B.G.U. Vol. III. 999, line. 5 (99 B.C.) where we have: οἶκιαν (L-οἶκιας) ωκοδομημένης καὶ ἔστεγαςμένης. Or ἡμισὺν οἶκια (half of a house as in P. Strassb. Vol. II. 87, lines. 4-5 (107 B.C.) where we have: ἡμισὺν οἶκιας ωκοδομημένης). But since the mention to the boundaries of the sold property here is introduced in line 3 by γείτονες τῆς ὀλῆς οἰκίας, which is used only in a case of sale half of
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house (see note on line 3). So the suitable word for the lacuna here is ἡμιστο σωκρ and the lacuna can contain it.

οἰκίας: Should be put in genitive case as it is followed by ὥκοδο ρημαίμενης καὶ ἐσταγασμένης.

ὁκοδομήμενης: Here the scribe Ἀμμονίῳ wrote ὥκοδομήμενης instead the correct form ὥκοδομημήμενης. The same omission is found in P. Lond. Vol. III. 880, p. 8, col. II. Line 27. (Pathyris 113 B.C.).

ὁκοδομήμενης καὶ ἐσταγασμένης. This is a part of the description of the house (cf. B.G.U. Vol. III. 999, line. 5. (99 B.C.). The lacunae at the end of line 1 and at the beginning of line 2, should contain the rest of the description of the house which may be:


2 - ὥκοδομήμενης καὶ[|] ἐσταγασμένης καὶ τεθυρωμένης καὶ προσούσαν σωκρ. ("built, and roofed, and furnished with doors and with the attached courtyard") (see. BGU. Vol. III. 996. col. II, lines. 2-3 (113 B.C.).

3 - ὥκοδομήμενης καὶ ἐσταγασμένης καὶ κεκαμαρω[μ]ένης καὶ τεθυρωμένης καὶ τὴν προσούσαν σωκρ. ("built, and roofed, and furnished with doors and vaults and with the attached courtyard") (see. BGU. Vol. III. 997, col. II, lines. 6-7 (103 B.C.).

4 - ὥκοδομήμενης καὶ ἐσταγασμένης διστε[γον καὶ τε]θυρωμένης καὶ τῆς προσούσας σωκρ. (L. τὴν προσούσαν σωκρ.) καὶ εἰσόδου (L. εἰσόδου καὶ ἐχώρου (καὶ εἰσόδου). (“built, and roofed, furnished with two storeys and doors and with the attached courtyard and with entry and exit”) (see P. Koln. 51, lines. 4-5 (99 B.C.).

A part from our concerned contract, there are another description for houses such as:

1 - ὥκοδομήμενης καὶ κεκαμαρω[μ]ένης ("built, and furnished with vaults") (see. P. Adler. Gr. 9. col. II. line.7 (104 B.C.).
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3 - ὃκοδομημένης καὶ τῆς προσούσχης σύλης ("built, and furnished with the attached courtyard"). (see. P. Strassb. Vol. II. 87. col. II. lines. 11-12 (107 B.C.)

4 - ὃκοδομημένην "built" (see. P. Strassb. Vol. II. 90. col. II. lines. 15-16 (90 B.C.).

**Line 2:** [ --- τῆς οἴσχης ἐν τῷ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ μέρει Παθύρεως ----] ("...... which is situated in the northern division of [Pathyris ...... ]") After the description of the house the mention to its site, follow it.

μέρει Παθύρεως: The name of the village which should put here is Παθύρεως. Because Αμμωνιος the scribe of this contract who is mentioned in line 9 as the agent of Ηλιοκόρος, held this post at this village during 113–112 B.C. (see. P. W. Pestman. op. cit. pp. 18-19.) And for the reconstruction see B.G.U. Vol. III. 998, line. 8 (Pathyris 101 B.C.) where we have: τῆς οἴσχης ἐν τῷ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ μέρει Παθύρεως.

The village Παθύρεως was the capital of the Παθυρίτης nome. During this time it occurs in Strabo under the name Aphroditopolis. In ancient Egypt it was Pr-H-t-Hr, in demotic Phathor, it was also known in ancient times as Inti “the two redges” like Gebelen itself “the two hills” (see. The Adler papyri introduction p.65). This village “is stated in Smith’s Dictionary of Greek and Roman geography Vol. II. Lond. (1889.) to be the western suburb of the Thebes on the opposite bank of the Nile to the main city” (see P. Lond. Vol. II. 218. P.15, note on line 1).

After Παθύρεως the lacuna at the end of this line should contain the dimension of the house and some special details concerning it. See P. Lond. Vol. III. 1204. P. 10. III. lines. 19-20. (113) where we have: τὴν οὐσίαν (L.τῆς οὐσίας) ἐν τῷ ἀπὸ νότου μερεὶ τοῦ ἐν Πα θύρει ὁχύρ-ωματ ὡς πῆχυν (L.πῆχους) στερεοῦ(ἠμίσου) οὐ μέτεστι τῷ ἄλλο (ἡμίσου) Πανοθρόξου ὑπὲρ Τοτοσέου (L.Τοτοστίου) ἀδιαρέτου. "which is situated in the southern division of the fortress of Pathyris half of a cubit, the other undivided half is own by Panobchounis son of Totoes".
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**Line 3:** [---γείτονες τῆς δῆλης οίκίας ["the boundaries of the whole] house"].

The lacuna at the beginning of this line should contain the mention to the boundaries of the house by the introductory words γείτονες τῆς δῆλης οίκίας before δικίας. For the reconstruction see *P. Lond.* Vol. III. 1204. p. 10, lines. 19-20. (113 B.C.) where we have: γείτονες τῆς δῆλης οίκίας.

According to my study on the contracts of sale from the *Pathyrite nome* the using of γείτονες τῆς δῆλης οίκίας is used only in the sale’s contracts of half a house. See *P. Lond.* Vol. III. 1204. p. 11. col. III. lines. 18-20. (113 B.C.) where we have:

ημισυ δικίας --- γείτονες τῆς δῆλης οίκίας, and see also *P. Adler.* Gr. 9. col. II. lines 5-7. (104 B.C.); *P. Strassb.* Vol. II. 87. col. III. lines. 11-12. (107 B.C.); 90. lines. 15-18. (99 B.C.). While ἡγείτονες is used in the sale's contracts of a house as in *BGU.* Vol. III. 997. col. II. lines. 6-7. (103 B.C.) where we have: οίκιας --- ἡγείτονες. So we can say that the sold property here is half of a house.

**Lines 3-5:** νότου δικία Σπ[--- οίκια ---]ἐχούσου Ψεμμίνιος [-----] "on the south, the house of Sp[......, the house of] ... echoutes son of Psemminis.

The lines here preserved to us the first boundary of the house (νότου) "south". So the lacunae should be contain the rest of the boundaries, see *BGU.* Vol. III. 996. Col. II. lines 4-7 (113 B.C.) where we have:

νότου οίκια Πετούσιος τοῦ ἑρέως καὶ Νεχούτου ἅδελφου βορρᾶ, οἱ οίκια Πετούσιος τοῦ Ἐρέως ἀπηλιώτου οίκια Πατητος τοῦ Πελαιοῦ λιβός οίκια Πασιντος τοῦ Πελαιιου, "on the south, the house of Petoiris son of the priest and his brother Nechoutis, on the north, the house of Patous son of Ieris, on the east, the house of Pates son of Pelaies, on the west the house of Paous, son of Pelaia, “ and see also *P. Koln.* Vol. I. 51. line 7 (99 B.C.)
where we have:

νότου και ἀπηλιώ(του) σικία Εριέως τοῦ Πατοῦς, βορρά σικία Ἰμουνόυ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, λιβός σικία Σιηποῦτος “on the south and east the house of Ηρίες son of Πατοῦς, on the north the house of his brother Ιμούνος, on the west the house of Σιηπόους”.

Σπ[-----]: The two letters Σπ are the initial letters of someone whose house is situated in the south of the sold-property. We have over 140 names which begin with Σπ (see. Preisigke. Namenbuch: Heidelberg. (1922), pp. 393-394, and D. Foraboschi: Onomasticon Alterum Papyrologicum, Milano (1971), pp. 298). We can not suggest an exact name here.

[--]εχουτου: The initial letters of the name have fallen in the lacuna at the beginning of line 4. The names which end with -ἐχουτου are: Νεχρύτης and Ψενεχρύτης (see. B. Hansen: Rucklaufiges Worterbuch der Griechisen Eigennamen, Berlin, (1957). P. 178).

The name Ψεμμίνης is an Egyptian name meaning “son of Min”, parallels with the name Ψεμμοντής meaning “son of Mont”; it equalized with the Greek name Παινίσκος (see P. W. Pestman, Les Archives Privees de Pathyris a l’époque Ptolemaïque, P. L. Bat. Vol. XIX. Brill, 1965. pp. 59-60).

The first attestation of the name Ψεμμίνης is in O. Bad. I. 310 (3 rd cent. B.C.).

**Line 5:** [----- ἢ οἱ ἄν ὡ]σιν γείτονες πάντοθεν "or whatever the boundaries may be all round”.

The lacuna at the beginning of line 5 should contain this final clause of the boundaries For the reconstruction see B.G.U. Vol. III. 996. col. III, line. 7. (113 B.C.) where we have: ἢ ἵ οἱ ἄν ὡσιν γείτονες πάντοθεν.

**Lines 5-7:** [ἐπίριστο -- Πέ]ρας τῶν-μισθοφόρων ἱππείω[ν (Ἱ]ππέων)κός (ἐτῶν) ---] ὂς (ς οὐκ ἐχρ(ιστερόν)τερημέν[ον -----] ”a Persian, of the mercenary horsemen [aged … years ....] the left ear is pierced, purchased it”. The lines 5-7 contain some of the personal description of the purchaser. According to the contracts of sale from Pathyris. The lines here should contain the introductory verb ἐπίριστο “purchased”, the name of the purchaser, his age and his personal description such as his height, skin-
color, hair, head, face, nose, and any distinguished scar see. B.G.U. Vol. III. 998, lines. 10-11 (101 B.C.) where we have: ἐπίριστος Πετησίς Ὀνήσης Πέρσης ὡς ἐτῶν μέσος μελίχρως θυκάλαστος σύλλημετώποι "Peteesis son of Ones, a Persian, aged forty years, of medium-height, honey-coloured, curly-hair, with a scar on the forehead, purchased"; and see also P. Adler. Gr. 5. col. II, lines. 9-10. (108 B.C.) where we have:
[ἐπίριστο Ὀφρο Νεχοῦθου (L. Νεχοῦθου) Πέρσης] τῆς ἐπιγονῆς ὑζ(ετῶν) λας μέσος μελίχρως ὑπόκαλαστος ὀνοφάλεανθός μακροπρόσωπος ἑθύρων ὡς (L. Ὀφρο Νεχοῦθου) τετρημένοι "Horos, son of Nechoutes, a Persian, of the Epigones, aged about thirty six years, of medium-height, honey-coloured, curly-hair, bald on the forehead, long-faced, straight-nosed, the left ear is pierced purchased".
Πέρσης: The letters Πε of the epithet Πέρσης has fallen in the lacuna at the beginning of line 6.
Πέρσης τῶν μισθοφόρων ἰππέων. "Persian of the mercenary horsemen". The scribe forgot to write the word μισθοφόρων "mercenary" between the epithet Πέρσης and the word ἰππέων. it should be put here for these reasons:

1. we know that the regular troops of the Ptolemaic army were composed from Macedonian and many elements of the Graeco-Macedonian citizens of Alexandria and Ptolemais. While the mercenaries troops were composed from elements recruited by some condottiere at one of the soldiers-market of the Greek world such as Taenarum in the Peloponesus or Aspidus in Asia Minar, and from certain kind of national troops known by their experience of a certain weapon or by their nationality (see: E. Bevan: A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. London. (1914). pp. 166-168).

2. All the documents from the Παθιµίτης nome prove that all the Persian whom served in the cavalry troops were μισθοφόροι such as Ἰμμώνους Ἀρείου (the scribe of this contract); Ἐρµίας Ἀσκληπιαδός and Πτολεμαίος Ἀσκληπιαδός (see. S.B. Vol. XVIII, 13168, lines. 25-26. (123 B.C.); Αρκέννησις Φιλήρος (see. P. L. Bat. 19. doc. 4, lines 22-23. (126 B.C.); Ερµιούφις Ψεκµίνιος (see P. Lips.7, lines. 7-8. (107 B.C.). While those
whom served as regular ἵππεὺς in the cavalry were from Macedonian or Greek origin such as Δρύτων Παμφίλου; Πτολεμαῖος Πτολεμαῖοι (see P. Grenf. Vol. I. 12, lines. 15,30. (148 B.C.); Ἡρακλείδης Θεοδώρου (see. S.B. Vol. VI. 9366, lines. 2-3. (124 B.C.) and Ἰσιδώρος Θεούς (see. p. Ryl. Vol. IV. 581. col. II, lines. 6. (121 B.C.). For the names of the mercenary and regular of the cavalry troops and their nationality see W. Peremans & E. Van T. Dack: Prospographia Ptolemaica, vol. II (Studia Hellenistica. 8. (1952), pp. 80-100, and J. Lesquire: Institutions Militaire de Egypte sous les Lagides. Paris. (1911), pp. 348-349). Since the purchaser is described here as Πέρσης so he belongs to the μισθοφόροι ἵππευς. Accordingly the word μισθοφόροι should put here between Πέρσης τῶν and ἵππευς.

The omission of a word is found in the documents which are written by Αὐτακόντος see for example:

1. P. Strassb. Vol. II. 84. col. II, line 18. (114 B.C.) where we have: Τακμήτος μέν ἄνδρος; Στεπμοῦτος <δὲ> ἄνδρος.

The μισθοφόροι in the ptolemaic army were divided into two kinds of troops: the infantry (πεζοί); and the horsemen “ἵππευς”; they were furnished with armour from the royal armouries, and their horses from the royal studs, they were received pay in kind-corn and forage for the horses (see: E. Bevan. op. cit. P. 174).

τετρημένον. After the description of the purchaser, the lacuna at the end of line 7 may contain the price of the sale, see P. Adler. Gr. 5. col. II, line 10. (108 B.C.) where we have:
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ως (L.σύς) ἄρ (ιστερόν) τετρη(μένων) χά(λκου) (τάλαντων) ἔξ, and see also P. Lond. Vol. III. 882. P.13. col. II. Line 17. (101 B.C.) where we have: ως (L.σύς) ἄριστερόν τετρημένων χάλκου (τάλαντου) ἕνος.

For the price of the houses at Παθόρις during this time, here a list of contracts of sale in chronological order:

I- sale of half of a house:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date B. C.</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3- P. Adler. Gr. 9.</td>
<td>3 Sep. 104.</td>
<td>3000 Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- P. Strassb. Vol. II. 90.</td>
<td>19 Sep. 99.</td>
<td>2000 Dr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II- sale of a house:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date B. C.</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Lines 7-8: [προσωλητὴς καὶ βεβαιωτὴς τῶν κατὰ] τὴν ὑνὴν <ταύτην> πάντων ["the negotiator and guarantor of all the terms of this deed of sale"].

The lacuna at the end of line 7 and at the beginning of line 8 should contain the clause of confirmation βεβαιωτης τῶν κατὰ τὴν ὑνὴν <ταύτην> πάντων.

For the reconstruction (see. P. Lond. Vol. III. 1208. P. 19. col. II, lines. 15-16. (97 B.C.) where we have: προσωλητὴς καὶ βεβαιωτὴς τῶν κατὰ τὴν ὑνὴν ταύτην πάντων
The clause προσωλητής καὶ βεβαίωτης τῶν κατὰ τὴν ὕψη ταύτην πάντων was the usual ptolemaic sale-clause against eviction. The βεβαίωσις is a promise of the vendor. Firstly, not himself to intrude upon the buyer’s possession and to defend his possession against challenge by third parties (see: F. Pringshin. op. cit. pp. 121; 357).


**Line 8:** [--- ὁ ἀποδόμοιος ὑπὲρ ἔδεχατο ὁ πριάμενος] ["N.N, the vendor has been accepted by N.N, the purchaser"].

This final clause should put in the lacuna at the end of line 8, see. P.Amh. Vol. II. 51. col. II, lines 28-30. (88 B.C.). where we have: Πετεῆς ὁ ἀποδόμοιος ὑπὲρ ἔδεχατο Πελαίας ὁ πριάμενος. “Thought originally in Egypt a buyer seems to have had a right to a warranty by προσωλήτης (warrantor), he became more and more willing to accept the warranty of the vendor and eventually this acceptance became stereotyped. (see: F. Pringshin. op. cit. p. 440).

**Line 9:** Ἄμμων ὁ παρ’ Ὑλι(οδόρος) κεξρή (ματίκα) Ἔμιον ο, Ἡλει(οδόρος) have registered”. For the reconstruction see. P. Adler. Gr. 3. col. III, line. L. 4. (112 B.C.). where we have: Ἄμμων ὁ [παρ’ Ἡ] λι(οδόρος) κεξρή (ματίκα).

**Lines 10-11:** [ἐγραψεν] Ταστῆς Φαγόριος Περσίνη ἀξιετοῦ. [κατὰ τῆς] προσεγγείᾳ (μμένης ὅς ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ }
the tax was acknowledged on separate sheets as was done as in the case of
*P. Strassb.* Vol. II. 81, and 82, (see. *H. J. Wolff.* op. cit. p. 50).

[ἔγραψεν]: Should put here before the name of the witness. See. *P. L. Bat.*
Vol. XIX. doc. 4. col. II, lines. 10, 14, 22. (126 B.C.) where the witness
signs thus: ἔγραψεν Πατοῦς Ερίευς; ἔγραψεν Πατοῦς Ἡροῦ;
ἔγραψεν Ἀμμώνιος Ἀρείου.

I think that this is the first time to meet a subscription of a witness on a
contract of sale from Παθορίτης nome. The witnesses had appeared only in
the testaments of *P. Grenf.* Vol. I. 12, lines. 26-31. (151-145 B.C.); *P.L. Bat.*
Vol. XIX. doc. 4, lines. 10-22. (126 B.C.); *S.B.* Vol. XVIII, 13168 lines. 24-

Ταστής: Fortunately the name of the witness is preserved in the text
completely but it lost in *P.Grenf.* Vol. I. 20, lines 6-7: (127 B.C.) where we
have: καὶ [.........] Φογήριος Περσίης μετό κυρίου τοῦ ..... The editor suggested
that the average of the lost letters of the daughter's name is six letters. It
is corresponded with the name Ταστής here.

The witness Ταστής has been appeared in *P. Grenf.* Vol. I. 20 (127 B.C.)
with her sons Σλῆς and Αρμωίς, sons of Ὡρς as debtors of a loan of 2.
Talent and 4000 Drachma from Ἀπολλωνία wife of Δρύτων (for
Δρύτων see. Pap. No.V. note on line 5).

Φογήριος: According to our search in *Duke. Data. Bank* the name
Φογήριος appeared only in five citations of the documentary papyri and
Ostraca (see: Ostraca. Cairo. 1, line 3. (150-139 B.C.); *P.Grenf.* Vol. I. 20,
line. 6. (127 B.C.); *P.Strassb.* Vol. II, line. 21 (115 B.C.); *P.Adler.* Gr. 12,
line. 3. (100 B.C.); 14. l3 (100 B.C.).

Περσίη "Persian woman". Is the same epithet which described Ταστής in
*P. Grenf.* Vol. I. lines. 20, l6 (127 B.C.).

ός (ἔτων); Here the witness used the common symbol for the word
ἔτων "years". For the reconstruction see. *B.G.U.* Vol. III. 994. col. II, line.
10. (113 B.C.) where we have: Τοθώτις Φίβιος Περσίη ώς (ἔτων) ν.
After the symbol there is a dot of ink. It should be a trace of a letter refers to the age of Ταστής unfortunately her age is not mentioned in *P. Grenf*. Vol. I. line. 20. (127 B.C.) so we can not give any suggestion. It seems that the huge form of the symbol for ἔτων may indicate that the line came at its end. (i.e the witness is satisfied with the mention of the epithet Περσίνη and here age just as in *P. Grenf*. Vol. I. line. 6. (127 B.C.).

From the papyrus here and from *P. Grenf*. Vol. I. 20 (127 B.C.) and the mention of P.W. Pestman to the family of Ταστής in *Aegyptus*. Vol. XLIII (1963), pp. 22, 31, 46, 53, we can configure the family tree of Ταστής as the following:

```
Φογήρις X --
       ↓
Ταστής X' Ωρος
          ↓
'Αρμαῖς
(Sόλων) ~ Σληῖς X --
          ↓
Χεσθώτης
```


We have no exact parallel to reconstruct the lacuna here. We suggest that it may contain the preposition κατ' and the article τής for προγεγραμμένης parallels with *P. Strassb*. Vol. II. 83, line. 30. (114. B.C.); 85. col. II, line 28. (113 B.C.) where we have κατά τά προγεγραμμένα.

[κατά τής προγεγραμμένης ωνής: We have no exact parallel to reconstruct the lacuna here. We suggest that it may contain the preposition κατ’ and the article τής for προγεγραμμένης parallels with *P. Strassb*. Vol. II. 83, line. 30. (114. B.C.); 85. col. II, line 28. (113 B.C.) where we have κατά τά προγεγραμμένα).
προγεγραμμένης: The abbreviation should be resolved as singular feminine in the genitive case as it qualifies ὅνης.
**Pap. No. II.**

**A Fragment of an agreement for the surety of sale**

*P.Cair.Mus.C.G. No.10353.* 17.5 X 16.3 cm.  
*Ca 107-98 B.C.?*

The papyrus cut off on all sides, except the upper one, where there is a large piece of blank space (ca. 5.5 X 11.7 cm) partly preserved. There is a vacant space between the lines 2 and 3 (ca. 1.7 X 9.2 cm), the papyrus has suffered of many small gaps on the lines 1, 6, 9 and under the lines 1, 10.

The papyrus has preserved to us 10 lines, but the vacant space between the lines 2 and 3 may bear the rest of line 2 that has been lost in the lacuna. The last line of the papyrus has preserved to us traces of some letters.

The letters of the papyrus are of medium-size, cursive, very clear for reading. The writing on the recto runs along the fibers. The scribe put a horizontal dash over the letter θ in line 1 as the usual mention for number nine. He wrote the two letters γγ of the word συγγραφή in line 8 as if it is the letter πλ. He used also various forms for writing the letter upsilon. (cf. lines 8-10). The verso is blank.

The date of the papyrus is mentioned in line 1 as the ninth of the month *Thout* but the year is lost in the lacuna. However we may suggest that the year is between ca. 107 to 98 B.C. because the scribe of the papyrus is the ἄγορανόμος Πανίσκος (see note on line 2), held this post at Κροκοδίλων πόλεις of the Παθορίτης nome during this date (see. P.W. Pestman, *Agoranomoi et Acts Agoranomiques-Krokodilopolis, Pathyris. 145-88, av. B. C, P. L. Bat. Vol. XXIII. Leiden, (1985). p.12.

The provenance of the papyrus as mentioned in line 1 is Κροκοδίλων πόλεις of the Παθορίτης nome.

The papyrus is an agreement for the surety of sale half of house. (see the discussion on line 9). The vendor is Τορτώμημις daughter of Σχώτης with her son Πανομχρύσις, son of Άρταξίς who acted as her guardian, and the purchaser is Πετεσσόρχις son of Πετεαρσιμπός. The dimension of the sold property and the price of the sale are not mentioned in the text. It should be mentioned in the original contract of this sale.
The important term of the text here, is the site of the sold property, it mentioned in line 9 as ἐν τῷ προχείλωτι, which is meaning literality with a prominent lip, i. e. prominent place. (see, Liddell & Scott, A Greek English Lexicon. Vol.II.Oxford.1939. προχείλως. S.V.).

We had checked in the Duke. Data. Bank but unfortunately we did not find exact parallel for this agreement

For further parallels see:


There is only one abbreviation in the text (line 5) where the scribe has abbreviated the word κυρίου "guardian" by writing the second letter υ over κ.

| έπος | μηνός Θ θ ον Κροκόδιλου πόλει |
| έπι Πανισκον | χοροαυόμου τής ἀνω τοπαρχ[ας] |
| τοῦ Παθηρίτου | ναα |
| όμολογει Πετεσούχος Πετεαρεσμέθως |
| 5 | [Τορτόμισε Σχωτον Περίτη τής κυρίου |
| τοῦ] | [κυρίας υπὸ Δανεβχούνιος τοῦ Ἀρπανήτους] |
| [ἐκ τῶν ] | φρουρῶν περὶ τοῦ ἐκαθαρώστη |
| [αὐτής ὁ εἰσνήκαται παρ ἀυτῆς μέρος ἠμισύ |
| [οἰκίας] ] | ἐν τῷ προχείλωτι κατὰ συγγραφήν |
| 10 | [ὅν] τὴν τεθεῖσαν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἄρχειου [----- ] |
| [------- ] [±4] [------------------------ ] |

Correction:
6: L. Πανισκον
10: L. τιθέεσαν

Abbreviation:
5. Pap. κυρίου

Translation:
"[The ...... year] the ninth of month Thout, at Crocodilopolis. [Before Paniscus], the public-notary of the upper toparchy [of Pathyrite nome]."
Pestouchus son of Peteharsemtheus agrees with [Tor]tomminis daughter of Schotes, Persian woman, with guardian, her own son Panobchounis son of Harpaesis, [one of the] guards, concerning of whatever will be guaranteed [for him], what he had purchased from her half share [of a house] at the prominent place, according to a contract [of sale] which was deposited through the same record - office …… “.

Notes:

Line 1: [ὅτι] μηνὸς θ’ θ’ ἐν Κροκόδιλων πόλει. This line contains the date of the agreement. So ἐντος should be preceded θ’ θ’. The space of the lacuna here can contain it since the lacuna at the beginning of line 3 contains τοῦ Παθυρίτου. For the reconstruction see p. Lips. 7, line. 1 (107. B.C.) where we have: ἐν τοῦ Χοίαχ κς ἐν κροκόδιλων πόλει.

ἐν Κροκόδιλων πόλει: The Κροκόδιλων πόλις here is not the town of that name in the Arsinoite nome. This one lies about 30 km. south of Thebes near Pathyris. (see. P.W. Pestman, The new papyrological primer, The 5th ed., Leiden, (1990), p. 90). This city was situated in north probably as far away as the eastward band of the river at Rizequat, about fourteen kilometres from Pathyris and not more than ten kilometres from Hermonthis (Armant) ……., Crocodilopolis is so named alike in the Greek papyri, and in Strabo. In demotic it was Amwr, representing the very ancient name Iw-m-itri “island in the river (see. The Adler Papyri, introduction. pp. 64-65).

Line 2: ἐν Πανισκοῦν ἄγορανόμου τῆς ἄνω τοπαρχίας] ”Before Panicos,” the public-notary of the upper toparχy”.

[ἐν Πανισκοῦν]: The lacuna at the beginning of this line should be contain Πανισκοῦ as the name of the ἄγορανόμου for two reasons:

1. The ἄγορανόμοι who held this post at Κροκόδιλων πόλις and bore the title ἄγορανόμος τῆς ἄνω τοπαρχίας τοῦ Παθυρίτου are:

Σώσσα and Πανισκ耘 (see. P. W. Pestman, Agoranomoi. op. cit. pp. 9, 12).

2. The hand writing of the papyrus here is similar to the hand of P.Adler Gr. 13 (100 B.C.) which is written by Πανισκ耘, where the form of the letters especially the clause ἐν Κροκόδιλων πόλει ἐπὶ Πανισκ耘
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άγορανόμου τῆς ἀνωτοπαρχίας τοῦ Παθυρίτου So the name of the ἀγορανόμος Πανίσκου should be fill the lacuna at beginning of line 2, preced with ἐπὶ. For the reconstruction see. P. Adler. Gr.13. col. II, line 3. (100 B.C.): ἐν Κροκόδιλων πόλει ἐπὶ Πανίσκου ἀγορανόμου τῆς ἀνω τοπαρχίας τοῦ Παθυρίτου.

Line 3: [τοῦ Παθυρίτου] ["of the Pathyrite nome”]. The word τοπαρχίας[ς] at the end of line 2, should be followed by its proper name. As we know Κροκόδιλων πόλεις of this document is situated in the τοπαρχίας τοῦ Παθυρίτου (see. P. W. Pestman, The New. op. cit. p. 90). So the name Παθυρίτου should be put in the lacuna between lines 2-3 followed by a vacant, since lacuna at the end of line 2 can contain only the rest of the word τοπαρχίας. For the reconstruction see. p. Lips. 7, lines. 1-3 (107 B.C.), where we have: ἐν Κροκόδιλων πόλει ἐπὶ Πανίσκου ἀγορανόμου τῆς ἀνω τοπαρχίας τοῦ Παθυρίτου, and see also P. Lond. Vol. III. 678. p. 18, lines. 3-4. (99-98 B.C.); P. Amh. Vol. II. 5 lines. 1-3 (106 B.C.).

The Παθυρίτις nome is known in ancient times as “the two hills” and in Demotic by a name pronounced as Intaiye but written Ntr-wy (see, The Adler papyri introd. p. 65). The two nomes περὶ Ὑβρας and Παθυρίτης were at the beginning one nome and about the middle of the second century B.C. they separated into two nomes. In the first century B.C. the Παθυρίτις nome was known by the name Hermonthes (Arment now) (see, Ibrahim Noshy: History of Egypt in the Period of Ptolemies, Vol. II. 5th. Arabic ed. Cairo. 1981. p. 386). For it’s capital Παθυρίς see pap No. I. note on line 2.

There are “a group of more than 600 Greek and Demotic papyri, Ostraca and wooden labels which were found in Pathyris, they cover a period of about 60 years” (see, P. W. Pestman: The new pap. op. cit. p. 90).

Line 4: [ὁμιλου]γεῖ Πετεσούχῆς Πετεραρσεμθῆς “Petesouchus son of Peteharsenthus agrees”.

[ὁμιλο]γεῖ: The beginning of the verb of the agreement has fallen in the lacuna. For the reconstruction see, P. L. Bat. Vol. XIX. doc. 7. A, B. line 2. (109 B.C.), where we have: ὁμιλοῦγει
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[τοῦ] τόμμιναι Σχώτου Περσίνη μετὰ κυρίου “with Tortommīnis, daughter of Schotes, Persian woman with guardian”.

The initial letters of the name have fallen in the lacuna. The names which end in -τομμινίς is Τορτόμμινις only. (see. B. Hansen, Rucklaufiges Worterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen, Berlin. (1957), p. 109).

The name Τορτόμμινις is a rare name. It appeared only in P. Petrie. Vol. II. 28, col. V, line 19, col. VIII, line. 8. (3rd. cent. B.C.): Τορτόμμινις Φοράτου. So it is the second time in the documentary Greek papyri to meet a person bearing this name, and the first time as a new inhabitant from Κροκοδίλων πόλις during this period.

The name Τορτόμμινις is an Egyptian name. It connects with the Egyptian god Min as the name Ψέμμινις (see. P. W. Pestman, Les Archives, op. cit. p. 60).

[τοῦ] εαυτῆς ύσου Πανοβχούνις (L. Πανοβχούνις) τοῦ Ἀρπαήσ[ιος] “here own son Panobchounis son of Harpaesis”.

The article should be put in the lacuna here before εαυτῆς ύσου. For the reconstruction see, P. Strassb. Vol. II. 86. col. II, lines. 15-16. (111. B.C.) where we have:


[ἐκ τῶν] φρουρῶν περὶ τοῦ ἑαυ βεβαιώση “one of the guards, concerning of whatever will be guaranteed”. 
We have no exact parallel to reconstruct the lacuna before the word φρονρόν, but as the lacuna here can contain about five letters (this is based on the length of line 4). So we can put the preposition ἐκ and the article τῶν for the word φρονρόν which goes grammatically with it and also with the context. The construction ἐκ τῶν φρονρόν is similar to that in P.S.I, Vol. IX. 1025. b. line. 14. (104 B.C.):

Πίκος ψέμμινος τῶν ἐκ τῶν Μεμομείων παστοφόρων "Pikus son of Psemminis one of the idols-carries of Memomeion".

φρονρόν: According to our study on documents from this nome. This is the first time to meet with a name of person belonging to the φρονρόι "guards". For the names of the guards in Ptolemaic period see, P. W. Peremans, E. Van. T’Dack Prosopographia Ptolemaica. Vol. II, (Stud. Hell. Vol. 8, (1957), pp. 176-178. The φρονρός was a guard served in a garrison "φρονρά" which was the second main class in the Ptolemaic army during the peace times. The garrison was placed at the strategic points within the Ptolemaic empire both at home and abroad for the defence of Egypt and its possession in abroad. We hear of soldiers on duty at Diopolis magna, Diospolis parva, Ptolemais; Hermopolis, and Aswan. These garrisons were composed from the mercenaries. (see, Ibrahim Noshy, op. cit. Vol. I, pp. 403-404. The commandant of the φρονρά was called φρονραρχός. We has met Δημήτριος in Κροκοδιλίων πόλις (P.Grenf. Vol. II. 11, col. I, line. 12, II, line 10.(157 B.C.) who was acted as φρονραρχός. He was the only person bore this title during the Ptolemaic period from this nome.

For the names of the φρονραρχός in Ptolemaic times see J. Lesquire, Institutions Militaire de Egypt sous les Lagides, Paris, (1911), pp. 332-333, and W.Peremans. op. cit. pp. 34-36. "It seems probable that considerable forces were kept in camps near Gebelen to watch Thebes and Upper Egypt after the suppression of Ankhamakhi, and that the soldiers and veterans acquired land built houses in more or less derelict communes of the Pathyrite nome" (see, The Adler papyri. Introd, p. 63.

βεβαιώστε: Here the verb βεβαιώστε is used after ομολογεί (line 4) as a fact of future shall be perform by the vendor. The Aorist active subjunctive is used in the place of the future indicative. This due to the assimilation between them and also to the similar function in some cases of this two
tenses which created the feeling that the two tenses were identical (see: B.G. Mandilaras, The Verb in the Greek non-Literary Papyri. Athens, (1973), pp. 245-246. I think that this is the first time to meet an ὁμολογία from this nome dealing with the surety for a contract of sale.

Line 8: [αὐτ]ῷ ὁ ἐκὼνται παρ’ αὐτῆς μέρος ἡμῖν
"[for him], what he had purchased from her half share".

[αὐτ]ῷ: Unfortunately we have no parallel to reconstruct the lacuna here, but we can put the reflexive pronoun [αὐτ]ῷ as a dative of advantage. This based on two reasons: First, the guarantee that will be accomplished by the vendor Τορτόμιμις is for the purchaser Πετεσσοῦχος (i.e. for αὐτῷ). Second, we have after ὁ the construction ὁ ἐκὼνται "what he had purchased" which refers to Πετεσσοῦχος. So [αὐτ]ῷ here is instead of the name Πετεσσοῦχος.

Line 9: [οἰκίας ἐν τῷ προχείλωι κατὰ συγγραφὴ φήμ "of a house in the prominent place according to a contract".

The lacuna at the beginning of line 9 should contain the kind of the sold property. As the lacuna here can contain five letters. (this is based on the length of line 4.). So we put the word [οἰκίας. We have five contracts of sale half of a house form the same Nome (see, Pap. No. I. (113-112 B.C.), P. Lond. Vol. III. 1204, P. 10 (113 B.C.), P. Strass. Vol. II. 87 (107 B.C.), 90 (99 B.C.) and P. Adler. Gr. 9 (104 B.C.).

Line 10: [ὡν]ῆς τὴν τεθείσαν (L. τιθείσαν) διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀρχείου "of sale which was deposited through the same record-office".

[ὡν]ῆς: The lacuna here should be contain the rest of line 9, concerning of the type of the contract which has deposited in the ἀρχεῖον. As the verb ἐκὼνται "has purchased" is mentioned in line 8 so the contract here is contract of sale. Accordingly [ὡν]ῆς should be put here. For the reconstruction see, P. Heid. 1278, lines. 5-6. (111 B.C.) where we have: κατὰ συγγραφήν ὡνῆς and see also P. Adler. Gr. 2, line. 8. (124 B.C.).

τεθείσαν (L. τιθείσαν): Here the scribe wrote the first ε instead of η. It is known that "After the document was drawn up and registered by the
ἀγορανόμος, a copy was deposited in the local archive” (see. J. G. Milne. op. cit. p. 8).
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A small fragment of papyrus

P.Cair. Mus. C.G. 10385. 5.8 X 4.2 cm.
Pathyrite nome? Ca. 107-98 B.C.?

A small fragment of a papyrus sheet, cut off on all sides except at the upper margin, where a small piece of blank space (ca 2.8 X 3.2 cm) is preserved. It contains 4 incomplete lines. There is a dot of ink under line 4, seems to be a trace of a letter from lost line. There is lacuna in the middle of line 4. The letters are of a small-size, cursive, and the writing on the recto runs along the fibers. The verso is blank.

The date and the provenance are not preserved. According to our study on the documents from Παθυρίτης nome from (ca. 151 B.C.) (P. Grenf. Vol. I. 12) to 88 B.C. (P. Amh. Vol. II. 51) we can suggest that the date may be between 107 to 98 B.C, and the provenance is the village Παθυρίς. The capital of the Παθυρίτης nome. This suggestion is based on the following facts:

(1) The hand-writing here is similar to the hand of P. Adler. Gr. 8. (104 B.C.) which is written by the agent Ερμίτας (see the photo of this papyrus in the Adler papyri, plate No. III) where the forms of the letters of βασιλέως and και κατηγόρου correspond to those here in line 1-2.


(3) The space of the lacunae at lines 1-2 is suitable to contain only the titles of the king Ptolemy X Alexander I whose regenal years dates from (ca. 107 to 88 B.C.) (see A.E. Samuel. Ptolemaic Chronology, Beitrag, zur. Pap. Vol. XXXIV. Munchen. (1967). pp. 32-37). So the date should be between ca. 107 to 98 B.C., and the provenance is the village Παθυρίς.

The exact nature of the fragment is unknown, owing to its fragmentary condition.
For further parallels see:


---

**Notes:**

**Lines 1-2:** [---] βασιλεύς Π[τολεμαίου] ------- ἐτοὺς ---- του καὶ ---- εφ’ ἱερεῶν καὶ ἱερείων]καὶ κανηφόροι[ τῶν δυτῶν καὶ οὐσῶν -------]

[---]θυσ ψευνήσιος[ ------------------------]

4 [-------] ζ[θαλμόν] ---------------------------------

[-----------------][ -----------------------------]

[“The … year which is the …... year of the reign of …...] the king [Ptolemy when the priests and priestesses and the canephorus”].

The beginning of these lines should contain the royal title of the Ptolemaic king (who is mentioned in the first line as βασιλεύς Π[τολεμαίου], the date of year, and the priests, priestesses of Alexander and the Ptolemies.

As the scribe of this document, held his post as agent at Ποσθόρις from (ca. 109 to 98 B.C.), so the royal titles here may be of the king *Ptolemy IX Soter II* and his mother *Cleopatra III* (ca. 114-107 B.C.), or the king *Ptolemy X Alexander I* with his mother *Cleopatra III* (ca. 15 Nov 107/14. Oct. 101 B.C.) or with his wife *Cleopatra Berenike* (ca. 26 Oct. 101 to 6 Sep. 88 B.C.). For the regnal year of these rulers see, A. E. Samuel. op. cit. pp. 32-37.

[ἱερέων καὶ ἱερείων]: These are “the priests and priestesses of Alexander the great, and the deified Ptolemies. They officiate for one year. Originally they were named after the officiating priests (as the Roman did with consuls)” (see, P.W. pestman, *The New Papyrological Primer, 5th ed.* Leiden, (1990), p. 93.

**Lines 2-3:** καὶ κανηφόροι [τῶν δυτῶν καὶ οὐσῶν μηνός ------- ἐν
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Παθόειφ Ἕρμιον τοῦ παρὰ Πανίσκου ἄγορανόμου] “and the canephorus [being now in the office, on the .... of the month .... at Pathyris before Hermias, the agent of the agoranomos Paniscus ...”].

The lacuna at the end of this line after the word κανηφόρον, should contain the rest of the formula: των δυτιῶν καὶ σύστων, the name of the month, date, the name of the village, and that of the scribe. For the reconstruction see: P. Strassb. Vol. II. 88, line. 16. (105 B.C.) where we have: καὶ κανηφόρον τῶν δυτιῶν καὶ σύστων μηνὸς Φαρμοῦθι καὶ Παθόειφ Ἕρμιον τοῦ παρὰ Πανίσκου ἄγορανόμου. For the village Pathyris (see Pap. No. 1. note on line. 2).

Line 3: [------ θυς Σεννησιος[----] “thys son of Psennesis”. This line contains the mention to the first party of the document.

θυς: The initial letters of the name are lost in the lacuna, while his patronymic is preserved. The lacuna at the beginning of this line before the name, may contain one of the following items:


3- ἐκάντες συνεγράψαντο ὁμολογεῖ (+name+hisdescription) + διειρήσθαι as in the deed of gift in P. Lond. Vol. III. 880. p. 8, lines. 9-10. (113 B.C.).

4- ἀπέδοτο as in the contract of sale in P.Adel. Gr. 5. lines. 6-7. (108 B.C.).

[------ θυς: For the names which end in- θυς we have: Βαθύς, Βεθύς, Βιθύς, Βραδέμωνις, Ειθύς, Ἡθύς, Κρίθυς, Νεφθύς, Πεθύς, Ραθύμωνις, Σανταβίθυς, Τηθύς (see, B. Hansen: Ruklauffiges Worterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen, Berlin, (1957), p. 306. Beside the previous names we have the name Συνεβθύς which appeared for the first time in pap. No. IV, line 9.

Σεννησιος: The patronymic here is an Egyptian name meaning “son of Isis”. The name of the goddess Isis is attested also in others proper names.
belonged to this nome (Παθρίτης) during this time, such as the name Σεννήσις ("daughter of Isis"), and Ταρσήσις ("that who is made by Isis"). The worship of goddess Isis was known in the Παθρίτης nome. Her chapels and temples are mentioned in the Demotic and Greek documents. Her priests were called Ισιονόμοι (see: P. W. Pestman, Les Archives, privees de pathris al’epoque ptolemaique = p. L. Bat. Vol. XXIII. Brill, (1985). pp. 54, 89-90, 100). As the name Σεννήσις is connected with the goddess Isis, it was very common in the documentary Greek papyri, Ostraca, and inscriptions, its first attestation is in S. B. Vol. XVI, 12772, line 2 (157 B.C.).

Lines 3-4: Ψεννήσις [--] ±4 [δ]φαλμού[--] The lacunae at the end of line 3, and at the beginning of line 4, should contain the complete personal descriptions of the second party of the document such as: his age, height, colour, hair, face, nose, and his special feature, see for example B.G.U. Vol. III. 997, lines. 4-6 (103 B.C.) where we have: Ψεννήσις Ποκεκάτον Πέστρα τής ἐπιγόνης ὡς μέσος μέληρος τεταρτ prixos ἀναφάλλακρος μακροπρόσωπος ἐπιθύμητος ἐπισχάζων (Λ.πισκάζων) τὸν πόδα δεξιῶν [ο]ύλη παρ’ ὀφθαλμὸν ἄριστερὸν "Psenmenkhes son of Panekhaytes, Persian of the Epigone, aged forty years of medium-height, honey-coloured, straight-hair, bald, long-faced, straight-nosed, the right foot is lame, with a scar near the left eye".
A Fragment of a Contract of sale

P. Cair. Mus. C.G. No. 10358. 10.7 X 11.2 cm.
Pathyrite nome. ca. 109-98, B.C.?

A fragment of a papyrus sheet, cut off on all sides except at the lower margin, where there is a blank space (ca. 1.7 X 10.5 cm). It contains 9 lines. The writing on lines 1-3 is somewhat not clear. There are two gaps on line 4. The letters are of medium-size, cursive, and the writing on the recto runs along the fibers. The verso is blank.

The date is not preserved in the text, but we suggest that this fragment may date to (ca. 109-98 B.C.) Our suggestion is based on the following facts:

1- The hand writing is similar to the hand of the agent Ἐρμίας (see the photo of P. Adler. Gr. 8. Plate. No. III, which is written by Ἐρμίας, where the form of the letters are the same as here, and see also the photo of P. Strassb. Vol.II. No.88, and 90).

2- The abbreviated forms μελιχρως “honey-coloured”, λιθ “west”, and ἀπηλ “east” which are mentioned here in lines 3-4, 6-8 were very common in the contracts written by Ἐρμίας (see notes on lines 6-7).


The provenance as mentioned in line 5, is the village Παθύρις.

The exact nature of the contract is unknown, but the using of the word λιθ “west”, and the word οικία “house” twice in lines 6-7 may indicate that the fragment here is from contract of sale two parts of vacant-ground or two houses.

The dimension of the sold-properties, and the price of the sale are not preserved in the text.
The name of the vendor is Συνέβθυς. The names of her guardian, and that of the purchaser are not preserved in the text, but some of their personal descriptions such as age, height, skin-color, face, are mentioned.

The contract belongs to the common type from Παθύρις during this time which is known as ἀπέδοτο A --- ἐπριαστο B “so sold-so purchased. This type consists three main items:

(1) The docket.
(2) The body of the contract.
(3) The ἕγκυκλιον “tax-receipt”.

For more details about the contents of these three items see. the introduction of Pap. No. I.

For close parallels see:

Correction:
5. L. Παθύρις

Abbreviation:
7. ἀ[πήλ(ωτος), λι(βος). 8. μελί(χρως).
Symbol:
3.8. (ἐτῶν).

Translation:
“…. [Persian woman] aged about … years, of short-height, honey-coloured, [long-faced … of good-height], honey-coloured, curly-hair, [long-faced … in the] plain near Pathyris, <belonging to her> and her …. Esthoutis, son of Pakoimis, on the west,[ the house of] … , on the east, the canal, on the west, the house of Pakoi- … , [Persian] aged about thirty-five years, of medium-height, honey-coloured, straight-hair …. of all the terms of [this deed of sale] Snebthus, daughter of Kan “…“.

Notes:
Lines 1-2: These two lines do not consitute the beginning of the contract. since the upper margin is not preserved here. It contain traces of letters and some unclear letters, which made the reading of the contract is difficult and doubtful too. However the beginning of the contract, should run according to the contracts of the same type from the village of Παθύρις during this time containing the name of the Πτολεμαίκης king (either Πτολεμαίκης IX. Soter. II (ca. 116-107 B.C.) or Πτολεμαίκης X. Aelxander I (ca. 107-88 B.C.) since the scribe Ἐρμίας who wrote this contract held his post at Παθύρις (ca. 109-98 B.C.) (see, P. W. Pestman, op. cit. pp. 13, 20-23), followed by his titles, date of year, the name of month, date of day, name of the village and the name of the ἀγαρανόμος, see for example the beginning of the contract in P. Adler.Gr. 12, lines 1-3. (101 B.C.) where we have: [βασιλεῖς] ὑπό τοῦ Πτόλαμου εὐπέπιστον Ἀλεξάνδρου Θέου Φιλο- μήτορος ἔτους Τίτου καὶ τερεφύ[ν] καὶ καθήφων τῶν ὅσων καὶ σύνων μήνως Φασίφης εἰν Παθύρει εφ᾽ Ἐρμίας τοῦ παίρνει λαόν ἀγορ- ανόμου ἀπεδότο Κολλούθης Φαγήριος Πέρσης ζώς (ἔτων) ἐς μέσος μελίχρω (ζ.), in the reign of Πτολεμαίκης also called Alexander god Φιλομετορ. “The 14th year, when the priests and priestesses and the caneophorus now in office, on the 10th of the month Paophi, at Pathyris. Before Hermias, the agent of the agoranomos Paniscus. kollouthes, son of Phageris, Persian aged about thirty-five years, of medium-height, honey-coloured … had sold”.

Line 3: [ἀπεδότο Σνεβθύς Καυ ---- Περσίς] ἡ ὁμῇς (ἔτων) [. Ἐλ.] μεσσίος <ον>
This line which contains the personal descriptions of the vendor, should preced the verb ἀπέδοτο “sold”, the name of the vendor, and the common epithet Περσίνη “Persian woman”, and the lacunae at the end of this line should contain the rest of the description such as the face, nose, and any special feature. See P. Lond. Vol. III. 1204. p. 10. lines. 15-16. (113 B.C.) where we have: ἀπέδοτο Ταελολύς Τοτοεύς Περσίνη ὥς (ετων) λ. ἐλάσσον μελίχρως μακροπρόσωπος εὐθύριν. "Ταελολύς, daughter of Totoes, Persian woman, aged thirty years, of small-height, honey-colored, long-faced, straight-nosed, sold". And see also P. Adler. Gr. 7, lines 5-7. (104 B.C.) where we have: ἀπέδοτο Θαίβες Φ[ιτς] βίος Περσίνη ὥς (ετων) μέση με [λι]χρως μακροπρόσωπος εὐθύριν ὑπόσκιψις “Θαίβες, daughter of Phibus, a Persian woman, aged fifty-eight years, of medium-height, honey-colored, long-faced, straight-nosed, rather short-sighted, sold”.

Line 6-7: [ ------- ] Ἐσθούτος τοῦ Πακοίμιος λι(βός) σ[ικίο---α]ηλι (ὅτου) διώρυξ λι(βός) σικία Πακοι[-----] “…… Esthoutis, son of Pakoimis, on the west the house of [……], on the east a canal, on the west the house of Pakoi [……]”

Ὑσθούτος: This name may be preserved in the text completely, because it is found in this village. (P. Lips. 104. line. 21. (104 B.C.), or the initial letters of the name have fallen in the lacuna. In this case the names which end with-εσθοτης are: Χεσθοτης, and Σενχεσθοτης (see. B. Hansen, Rucklaufiges Worterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen. Berlin. (1957), p. 74). According to Duke Data Bank there is also the name Νεσθοτης. As I know, the name Χεσθοτης has found already at the village Παθορις during this time see for example P. Lond. Vol. III. 1206. p. 15. col. II. line. 20. (99 B.C.) where we have: Χεσθοτος του Μελιπατος, while the names Σενχεςθοτης and Νεσθοτης are not attested there.

Πακοίμιος: The left foot of the first letter is not clear in the text. In my opinion the reading of the name as feminine Τακοίμιος seems unreasonable, because we deal here with a name of a man (i.e father of so
called) not with a name of a woman. The name Πακοίμις, is a rare one, it has appeared already only once in *P. Cairo. Zenon*. Vol. II. 5917. lines 8,27 (255 B.C.).


ο[ικία ⋯ ⋯ ]: “house”. The half circle here is a remnant of the letter ο, and the dot of ink under line may be a remnant of the letter τ. So the word here is οἰκία as in line 7.


dι[όρυχ; “canal”. There were two canals at the village Παθορίς. The first is the canal of Τέλων which is mentioned in *P. Strassb*. Vol. II. 85. line. 15. (113 B.C.), *P. Adller. Gr*. 13. col. II. line. 12. (1100 B.C.), 16. line. 10. (99 B.C.), *P. Lond*. Vol. III. 880. p. 8. line. 14. (113 B.C.), *B.G.U*. Vol.III.1000,line.6 (98 B.C).It was called also διόρυξ βασιλική as mentioned in *B.G.U*. Vol.III.993,col.III,line.8 (127 B.C). This canal was parallel to the edge of the desert of Παθορις to the westward. The second canal is the canal of Πμός which is mentioned in *P. Lond*. Vol. VII. 2191. col. III, line. 20. (116 B.C.), this canal runs along the land of Τέλων near Παθορίς. Both two canals run alongside an enclosing dyke (see the sketch cited by P. W. Pestman in: *Les Archives*. op. cit. p. 18, and see also idem: A Greek Testament from pathyris = J.E.A. Vol. LV (1969), p.142.

Πακο[⋯⋯]: The last letters of the name has fallen in the lacuna at the end of this line. The names which begin with Πακο-are: Πακοβίς, Πακοβί-κης, Πακούμης, Πακούρης, Πακοσίς, Πακοσίς (see. F. Preisigke: *Namenbuch*, Heidelberg (1922). p. 258, D. Foraboschi: Onomasticon,Alterum Papyrologium Mailano. (1971), pp. 225-226). As I know there are two names from the previous ones which has found in Παθορίς, during this times: Πακοβίς (*B.G.U*. Vol. VI. 1259. line. 8. (100 B.C.), and Πακοίμις (here in line 6 here).
Line 8: [ἐπρίατο --- Πέρσης ὦς (ἐτών) λε μέσος μελίχρως τετανός]

"N.N .... Persian, aged about thirty-five years, of medium-sized, honey-coloured, straight-hair, purchased ....". This line contains the mention of the age and some of the personal descriptions of the second party of the contract (the purchaser). So the lacuna at the beginning of this line should be contain verb ἐπρίατο (purchased), the name of the purchaser, the epithet Πέρσης, and the lacuna at the end of this line after the word τετανός should be contain the rest of the personal descriptions of the purchaser, such as, his head, face, nose, and the price of the sale, see B.G.U. Vol. III. 1000. lines. 7-8. (98 B.C.) where we have: ἐπρίατο Εὔνους Ἀσκληπιάδου Πέρσου (L.Πέρσης ὦς (ἐτών) μέσος μελίχρως τετανός [μακ]πρόσωπος ἐυθυρίῳ χαλκῶĭ δραχμὰĭ δισχίλιαίς κ[αί] ] [δι]ακοσίας Ἐουνοῦs, son of Asklepiades, Persian, aged forty-five years, of medium-height, honey-coloured, straight-hair, long-faced, straight, purchased it, for two thousand and two hundred of copper drachmae" and see also P. Lond. Vol. III. 1207. p. 16. col. II. lines. 21-23. (99 B.C.), B.G.U. Vol. III. 1259. line. 8.(100 B.C.), P. Strassb. Vol. II. 89. line. 10. (99 B.C.)
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Pap. No. V

A fragment from the archive of Dryton

P. Cair. Mus. C.G. No. 10355. 9.9 X 12.3 cm. Pathyrite nome. Ca. 114. 111 B.C.?

The text here is a fragment of papyrus sheet, cut off from all sides, except at the bottom, where there a piece of blank space (ca. 3.2 X 12.3 cm) is preserved.

The text contains 7 lines. The first line contains only traces of two or three unclear letters. There is a small vacant space in line 3 between the words γνώμης and ἀλλά. The letters are of medium-size, cursive, very clear for reading, except some letters in line 2. The writing on the recto is run along the fibers.

The scribe of the text did not follow one method in writing the same letter, see for example the letter α of ἀλλά (line 3), αὐτῷ (line 5), and προσαποτι[σάτω] (line 6). As well as the letter κ of κατι (line 6), and of κυρία (line 7). Otherwise the letters τι of ἀκετικῶν (line 4) looks as the letter π. The letter ζ of the verb προσαποτι[σάτω] looks as the letter Omicron. The verso is blank.

The date and the provenance are not preserved in the text. We may suggest that the text may be date between (ca.114 to 111 B.C.) and the provenance is the village Παθύρις, the capital of the Παθυρίτης nome. This suggestion is based on two reasons. Firstly: the scribe of the text is the ἀγορανύμος Ἀμμώνιος, where the form of the letters here is very similar to the hand of pap. No. I. which is written by him (see Plate. No. I.). Moreover, the text has a certain marked characteristic as to the scribe’s use of language, that the ἀγορανύμος Ἀμμώνιος is the only scribe of the Pathyrite nome who uses the particle δὲ in the construction: καὶ μηδὲν]

ς’ ἠττου which is mentioned in line 7. He used it already in P. L. Bat. Vol. XIX. doc. 7. A. line. 17. (109 B.C.), while the other scribes used the construction καὶ μηδὲν ἦσσον such as the ἀγορανύμος Σώσος in P. Grenf. Vol. I. 27. col. III. line. 15. (109 B.C.) and the ἀγορανύμος Ἐρμίακς in P. Grenf. Vol. II. 28. line. 21. (103 B.C.). Secondly: we know that the ἀγορανύμος Ἀμμώνιος held
his office at the village Παθόρις as acting ἀγορανόμος, then as ἀγορανόμος. From (ca. 114) to (ca. 97 B.C.) (see P. W. Pestman: Agoronomoi et Acts Agoranomiques-Krokodilopolis et Pathyris (145-88. av. J. C.), P. L. Bat. Vol. XXIII. Leiden. (1985), p. 13). Finally: we know that the well known Greek officer Δρύτων, who is mentioned in line 5 died at Παθόρις (ca. 113-111 B.C.) (see. N. Lewis: Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt, Oxford, (1986), pp. 88, 92). As the scribe Ἀμμόνιος held his office at Παθόρις (ca. 114 to 97 B.C.), and the death of Δρύτων dated (ca. 113-111 B.C.) Accordingly the date of the text may be (ca. 114-111 B.C.) and the provenance is Παθόρις.

The text belongs to the archive of Δρύτων son of Πάμφιλος. This archive contains some forty documents, including five Greek Ostraca, and a twelve Demotic papyri. the half of the Greek papyri are in London and the rest of the documents are distributed among collections in Berlin, Cairo, Chicago, Freibourg, Giessen, Heidelberg, Mainz, Manchester, New York, Paris, and Strasbourg. The documents were written (ca. 150-99 B.C.), in the Thebaid, in the area from Ptolemais to Pathyris (see. N. Lewis. op. cit. p. 88). We studied the documents of the archive, unfortunately the text here do not complete any document of them.

The text is an end of an agreement. Its exact nature is unknown, owing to the fragmentary condition of the papyrus, and to the contents of the text which has not preserved to us any term that can help us to determine the exact nature of the agreement. However the subject of the agreement is concerning the house-hold slaves ὑικετικῶν σωμάτων (line 4) of Δρύτων. We can suggest that the text may be a deed of gift or cession or renunciation of sale, and it may be also a deed of testament.


[ --------- ] ±3 [ ------------------------------- ]

2 [ ----- ], δ ±3 διαγραφή [ -------------------------- ]

[ ----- τής γνώμης ανε ἀλλα κυρ[ ------------------ ]

4 [ ----- ] ὑικετικῶν σωμάτων αὐ[ ------------------- ]

[ ----- ] ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν Δρύτων ἢ τοῖς[ --------- ]

6 [ ----- ], ἄκυρο κέστω καὶ προσαποτ[σάτω -- ]

[---------και μηδ' ἤττον. κυρία κέστω ἢ δε ὑμν[σογία --- ]
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Correction:
6. Δ. ἀγανωρος.

Notes:

Line 1: This line contain traces of two or three letters, unclear for reading.

Line 2: [--------]. δ + ι διαγραφή[η]--------] This line and the following one (line 3) contain the details of the agreement. Unfortunately we have no parallel to reconstruct the lacunae of line 2. At the beginning of line 2 there is a dot from a trace of a letter, then the letter δ and three or four unclear letters, we can not suggest any reading for the word here. For the word διαγραφή it may be read as a noun διαγραφή. The διαγραφή is a receipt given to the purchaser by the προπεζήτης "banker" acknowledging that the purchaser had paid the sum due, so the purchaser regards the διαγραφή as his title deed to the property (see. P. Lond. Vol. VII. 2188. P. 297. note on lines 238-239). For the mention of διαγραφή in the contracts from Pathyris see the contract of sale-house in B.G.U. Vol. III. 999. col. II. lines. 1-2. (Pathyris.113 B.C.) where we have: τοὺς ζε Φαρμούφθης κακτέειται ἐπί τὴν ἐν Κρόμοκαιτον πόλει παρακατα τῇ ἐν Ἑλλάδι Παγκόσκοπος ἠγελικός. For the mention of παράδοσις in the contracts see the contract of sale house in B.G.U. Vol. III. 999. col. II. lines. 1-2. (Pathyris.113 B.C.) where we have: τὸὺς ζε Φαρμούφθης κακτέειται ἐπί τὴν ἐν Κρόμοκαιτον πόλει παρακατα τῇ ἐν Ἑλλάδι Παγκόσκοπος ἠγελικός. For the mention of διαγραφή in the contracts from Pathyris see the contract of sale-house in B.G.U. Vol. III. 999. col. II. lines. 1-2. (Pathyris.113 B.C.) where we have: τοὺς ζε Φαρμούφθης κακτέειται ἐπί τὴν ἐν Κρόμοκαιτον πόλει παρακατα τῇ ἐν Ἑλλάδι Παγκόσκοπος ἠγελικός. For the mention of παράδοσις in the contracts see the contract of sale house in B.G.U. Vol. III. 999. col. II. lines. 1-2. (Pathyris.113 B.C.) where we have: τὸὺς ζε Φαρμούφθης κακτέειται ἐπί τὴν ἐν Κρόμοκαιτον πόλει παρακατα τῇ ἐν Ἑλλάδι Παγκόσκοπος ἠγελικός.

In a word the term διαγραφή may be used here to assert the ownership of Δρότων for his house-hold female-slaves.

Line 3: [----- τ]ης γνώμης ἀλλά κυ[-----] We have no parallel to reconstruct the lacunae of this line.

τ]ης γνώμης "of will". Before the word γνώμης there is a clear ζ. preceded with a trace of a letter. It may be the right foot of the letter Ιτα.
So the lacuna should be contain the letter τ as the initial letter of τῆς, the feminine definite article in the singular genitive case to agree with the word γνώμης.

όλλα κυρ[---]: The reading here is uncertain. It may be ἀκυρος as mentioned in line 6 (ἀκυρος Λ.ἀκυρος), or κυρια as mentioned in line 7. If the first reading is ἀλλ’ ἀκυρος as will mean “but invalid”, and if the second one is ἀλλα κυρια the meaning will be “but valid”.

**Line 4:** [----- τῶν] σικετικῶν σωμάτων αὐ [-----]

“….. of the house-hold slaves …….“.

Unfortunately we have no exact parallel to reconstruct the lacunae of line 4.

The line here may contain special details of the agreement, concerning the house-hold slaves of Δρύτων. We can not determine their role in the agreement, This owing to the fragmentary condition of the papyrus. According to N. Lewis, (op. cit. pp. 88-92) who has been studied the archive of Δρύτων, we knew the following facts about his σικετικῶν σωμάτων:

They divided among his descendants, according to his last testament, his son Εσθαλίας took two and his five daughters took two. See. *Wilck. Chr* 302. Lines. 6-7 (126 B.C.) where we have: καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σικετικῶν σωμάτων δ ὑπὸ νόματα Μυρσίνην καὶ ταυτης [θυγατέρας; τα δὲ [καὶ β] οἱ συμμαχούσαις Εἰρήνην καὶ Άμπελιον Ἀπολλωνιακαὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς] συστοὶ ε ἔναν τους [συστοίς] σωμάτων, the ones named Μυρσίνη and her daughter, and the remaining two females whose names are Irene and Ampelion, to Apollonia and her sisters being five in all”.

(2) From the petition of *P. Lond.* Vol. II. 401. (116-111 B.C.) which sent by the daughters of Δρυτων, we know that they have inherited actually their share of the two female slaves. In this petition they ask the strategos of the Thebaid for the restitution of property inherited by them from their father, see *P. Lond.* Vol. II. 401. lines. 8-10. (116-111 B.C.) where we have:

μέρησοις ἡμᾶς τῶν πατρικῶν ἐγγαίων δύναμιν δ ἐν τῷ Περὶ Θῆβαις καὶ Παθερίπτη ὁμοιὸς δὲ καὶ τῶν σικετικῶν σωμάτων “half share of lands belonging to our father. situated both in Thebes and Pathyrite nome, and the same of the house-hold slaves”.
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(3) The house-hold slaves are not freed by their master Δρύτων by a testament (see, S. B. Pomeroy: Women in Hellenistic Egypt from Alexander to Cleopatra, New York, (1980). p. 112). Accordingly we suggest that the οἰκετικῶν σωμάτων of Δρύτων here, may be a subject of deed of cession "παραχώρησις" or deed of gift "δόσις" or deed of renunciation of sale "ἀποστάσιον" made by Δρύτων to his descendants. Otherwise we know that "Δρύτων holds the record for the number of wills written by one person in Ptolemaic Egypt. They are no fewer than four" (cf. S. B. Pomeroy, op. cit. p. 106). So we suggest also that the text here may be the fourth will which was lost.

οἰκετικῶν σωμάτων"The house-hold slaves". The general term which refers to slave in the Greco-Egyptian period is δοῦλος, less frequently ἀνδράποδον, while the term παῖς or παιδίσκη is used for the house-slave, otherwise there are the words σώμα with the adjective δουλικόν or οἰκετικόν and rarely ὁ ἐμὸς or ὁ ἴδιος are employed. In the Roman period the same terminology is used with the exception of the term ὁ ἐμὸς or ὁ ἴδιος. The sources of slavery were various, such as the captives in war, the birth from a slave-mother, the founding children picked up from the rubbish-heap, and the enslavement for debts. The ownership of slaves under Greco-Egyptian-law were divided into three groups: royal, privately owned and temple slaves, while under Roman law were divided into imperial, privately owned, and church slaves. (see. R. Taubenschlag: The Law of Greco - Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri 332 B.C - 640 A.D. 2nd ed. Warszawa. (1955). pp. 69-78.

Line 5: οι ἐπελευσόμενοι υπὲρ αὐτῶν Δρύτωνη ταῖς [παρ’ αὐτῶν "the prosecutors on their behalf for Dryton or his assigns". This line contains one condition of the agreement. The reconstruction here is based on a similar expression found in the agreement of sale of P.Strassb. Vol. IV. 585. line. 10. (153 B.C.) where we have: [ὁ] ὑ[πὲρ] αὐτοῦ ἐπελευσόμεν] ὁς τῷ ὄνομωμεν ἢ ταῖς παρ’ αὐτοῦ "the prosecutor on his behalf for the purchaser or his assigns"

Δρύτων: is the son of Pamphilus, born (ca. 195. B.C.), as a citizen of the city of Ptolemais in upper Egypt. He belongs to the Politeuma of Cretans. He had one, possibly two brothers. Dryton spent his entire life as a soldier in
a garrison and police duty at posts just north and south of Great Diospolis. (see. N. Lewis. op. cit. pp. 88-89). The documents of his archives prove that he could read and write Greek, but there is no evidence that he learned to read or write Demotic (see. S. B. Pomeroy. op. cit. p. 118). He wrote by his own legible hand a loan for two illiterate persons, see. P.Grenf. Vol. II. 17. lines 9-10 (137 B.C.), where we have: έγραψεν Δρύτων Πομήλιον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν διὰ τὸ φάσκειν αὐτούς μὴ εἰδὴ νοι γράμματα “Dryton son of Pamphilus wrote for them through their assert, that they are illiterate”.

**Line 6:** ἄκυρος (ἄκυρος) ἔστω “shall be invalid”. The ἄγορανόμος Ἀμμώνιος used here the neuter gender ἄκυρος instead of the correct form of the feminine gender ἄκυρος, which must use here as it qualifies the feminine word ἡ ἔφοδος. The correct form ἄκυρος is used by Ἀμμώνιος in P. L. Bat. Vol. XIX. 7. A. line. 14. B. line 14 (109 B.C.).

**Line 7:** ἠπτῶν “the less”, is one of the words which were fluctuate between the two spellings στο and τε. During the Ptolemaic period the common spelling was ἃσσον, while during the Roman and Byzantine periods the spelling was ἃσσον and ἠπτον (see. F. T. Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. Vol. I. Milano, 1975. pp. 146-147). The first attestation of using ἠπτον in the Ptolemaic Papyri appeared in P.Petrie. Vol. II. 11. line. 26 (208 B.C.). (see: E. Mayser op. cit. p. 223).

**Line 7:** κυρία ἔστω ἡ δὲ ὀμολ[ογία ἡδὲ πανταχοῦ ὅ ὡς ἐπιφέρηται. “and this agreement shall be valid wherever it is produced”. The lacuna at the end of line 7 should be contain the rest of the final clause of the agreement concerning its validity. For the reconstruction. See. P. Adler. Gr. 2. lines. 18-19. (124 B.C.) where we have: ἡ δὲ ὀμολ[ογία] ἡ (ἄμολ[ογία] ἡ δὲ κυρία ἔστω πανταχοῦ ὅ ὡς ἐπιφέρηται]. ὀμολ[ογία]: the left foot of the letter λ is preserved at the end of line 7.
A fragment of an unknown agreement

P. Cair. Mus. C. G. No. 10365  18 X 16.5. cm.

Pathyrite nome?  Later half of 2nd cent. B.C.?

A fragment of papyrus sheet, cut off from its left and lower sides. There is a piece of blank space at the right hand side (ca. 18 X 1.3 cm), and at the upper one (ca. 6 X 16.5 cm). It contains 9 lines, full of many gaps, of small and large-sized at lines 1, 3-4, 8-9, and at the end of line 5. The letters are of large-sized, cursive, very clear for reading. The writing on the recto runs along the fibers.

The scribe did not follow one method in the writing, That he wrote the same letter in different style, such as the letter τ (cf lines 1, 3-4, 7) the letter ρ, (cf. lines 2, 5, 7) the letter ω (cf lines 2-3, 6) and the letter α (cf lines 1-2, 5). The verso is blank.

The date, and the provenance of the fragment are not preserved in the text. According to the description of B. P. Grenfell & A. S. Hunt, Catalogue General des Antiquites Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Oxford, (1903). P. 47, This fragment dates to the later half of the second century B.C., and belongs to the village Παθρις (For this village see Pap. No. I. Note on line 2). The form of the letters here are similar to those of P.Cairo. Mus. C. G. No. 10364 = BCPSI. Vol. XVIII, 2001, Plate. No. VIII. P. 121. Which belongs to the same date and provenance as the fragment here.
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The end of the name of the first party of the agreement is preserved as-ατούτι (see line 7). The name of the second party is not preserved but the using of the third person plural of the verb προσαποτε[σ]άτωσαν (Lπ] προσαποτ[σ]άτωσαν) "they shall pay" (line 3), indicates that they are more than one person.

For close parallels see:

The scribe has used the common symbol for the word (δραχμάς) in line 7.

[ὑπὲρ] δὲ <αὐ>τον ἄκυρος ἔσται
[καὶ π]ροσαποτε[σ]άτωσαν
[χαλακοῦ] (τάλαντο) δέκα κα[λ]ί]ερας <τῶι> βασιλεί
[Πτολ. ἐμα[ω]ι ἄργυροι ἐπι-
[σήμου]δραχμας] τριάκοσιας καὶ μηθὲν
8 [ήσου] επάναγκον <αὐτος] ἔστω> ποιεῖν
[κατά] τὴν ὁμολογίαν

Correction:
3: L. προσαποτε[σ]άτωσαν

Symbol:
7: (δραχμάς).

Translation:
“…… and the proceedings by them on their behalf, shall be invalid, [and] they shall pay to …….. atous, in addition a penalty of ten [talents of copper], and three hundred drachmae of silver-coined, consecrated to the king ptoley, and none [the less], shall be bound before them to act [in accordance with] the agreement ……..“.

Notes:

Lines 1-9: These lines are containing a mention of a condition concerning the agreement, and to a penalty of money (10 talent of copper, and 300 drachmae of silver), which shall paid by some persons (as one party of the agreement) to someone (as the other party). According to the similar agreements from Παθόρις, during this time, the formula here were coming at the end of agreements of any kind. As line 1 is preceded here with a margin of large blank space, so the lines here are the rest of the agreement, written on a separate column, just as the case in P.Strassb. Vol. II. 85. col. II, lines. 26-29. (113 B.C.), P. Grenf. Vol. I. 27. col. III, lines. 14-16. (109 B.C.), B.G.U. Vol. III. 998. col. II, lines.10-13 (101 B.C.).

Lines.1-2: [±4] εις [πελευσεσθαι] σε επερ νοτον ἀκυρος ἔσται."and the proceedings by them on their behalf, shall be invalid".

These lines contain the mention of the invalid proceedings which can be taken by one party of the agreement against the other on behalf of the objects concerning their agreement.

For the lacuna at the beginning of line 1, we have no parallel to reconstruct it. However the lost letters are about four or five. This is based on the length of line 3.

The construction: και <αντος> εις [πελευσεσθαι] <[υπερ]> δε <αντων> is similar with that of P. Cairo. Mus. C. G. No. 10364, line. 5. (Later half of 2nd, cent. B.C.) where we have: και μη ἐπελεύσεσθαι σε επερ αντων “and not to proceed against you on his behalf”, and of P. Grenf. Vol. I. 21. line. 21 (127 B.C.) where we have: οι επικελεύσοντος επι αντων περι τουτων "and any one takes proceed-ings against her about these”. Most of the documents of Παθόρις are
using the common clause:


ἄκυρος ἢσται: The scribe here used the future active indicative of the verb ἐμιλεῖ, as in P. Cairo. Mus. C.G. No. 10364, line.

7. (Later half of 2nd cent. B.C.) while in most of the similar documents from Παθύρις, the present active imperative ἢστω is used, see for example P. Grenf. Vol. II. 25. line. 19. (103 B.C.), 26. line. 12. (103 B.C.), 28. lines.17-18 (103 B.C). In documents out of Παθύρις such as P. Oxy. Vol. XIV. 1644. line. 13 (63-62 B.C.) we have: ἄκυρος ἢσται.

Lines 2-3: ἄκυρος ἢσται [καὶ π]ροσαποτεῖ[σάτωσαν (L.π]ροσαποτεῖ [σάτωσαν)] “shall be invalid and in addition they shall pay”.


π]ροσαποτεῖ[σ]άτωσαν (L.π]ροσαποτεῖ[σ]άτωσαν: “They shall pay”. The usage of the third person plural indicates, that the other party whose name is not preserved in the text is more than one person.


αὐτοῖς ἐπι[λ].τ[μ]ον [χεῖρ(λ.κοῦ)(τάλαντ) δ]εκα “and they shall pay to atous in addition a penalty of ten talents of copper”.

The lines here contain the mention of the amount of money as penalty, which shall be paid by some persons (as one party of the agreement) to someone (the other party) whose name is not preserved in the text completely. Although this fragment belongs to Παθύρις, the lines here are...
not follow the order of the similar documents from this village. For example in *P. Lond.* Vol. VII. 2191, lines 50-51. (116 B.C.) where we have: καὶ προσαποτεισάτω (L. προσαποτισάτω) ἐπιπερευθόμενος ἐπὶ τιμὸν παραχρῆματί ἐν Κοβαῖταις θάλαντα ἕτοι. "and the claimant shall straightway pay to Kobaëtesis, in addition, a penalty of twenty copper talents”, *P. Grenf.* Vol. II. 33, line. 12. (100 B.C.): εἰ δὲ μη αποτεισάτω (L. αποτισάτω), Ἀρσεῖς ἐπὶ τινὸν παραχρήμα χαλκοῦ (τάλαντα) ἐ ὅθε ως, “otherwise, he shall straightway pay to Harsesis, in addition a penalty of five copper talents”, and see also *P. Cairo. Mus.* No. 10364, lines. 7-8. (Later half of 2nd cent. B.C.): προσαποτείσομαι (L. προσαποτίσομαι) σοί χαλκόν τάλαντα πέντε “and I shall pay to you in addition five copper talents”.

The lines here run similar somewhat to *B.G.U.* Vol. VI. 1249, which belongs to Syene and dated between ca. (148 to 147 B.C.) where we have in lines 10-11: καὶ προσαποτεισάτω (L. προσαποτισάτω Ἰσίας Ἰσαροῆρει καὶ Ταγότι ἐπὶ τιμὸν [χαλκοῦ τ]άλαντα πέντε “and Isias shall pay to Esaroeris, and to Tagous, in addition a penalty of five copper talents”.

[±2] αὐτοῦ: The initial letters of the name have fallen here in the lacuna. As the name is declined here in the dative case it ends in σου, so it should end in the nominative case in σος (see: E. Mayer: Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemaerzeit. band II. 2. Leipzig. (1938), p. 34). For the names which end in αὐτοῦ (and the dative in-ατοῦ) we have: Θαρτοῦς, Ἰσαροῆς, Καλατοῦς, Λατοῦς, Πατοῦς, Σερατοῦς, Στατοῦς. Τατός (see: B. Hansen: Rücklaufiges Worterbuch der Grieschen Eigennamen, Berlin. (1966). pp. 293, 309). I think that the suitable name for the lacuna here may be: Καλατοῦς or Σερατοῦς.

ἐπὶ τιμὸν: “penalty”. The penalty of money was paid by the injured party who breaches the warranty of the agreement or fails to accomplish his duties towards the other party. (see F. Pringshimm: The Greek Law of Sale. Weimar. (1950). p. 545. It is noteworthy that the word ἐπὶ τιμὸν was mentioned in the most similar documents from Παθύρις, except in *P. Grenf.* Vol. I. 27. col. III. line. 14 (109 B.C.).

**Line 5:** [χαλκόν (τάλαντα) δέξα. “ten talents of copper”. The lacuna at the beginning of this line should contain the amount of the penalty. As the space of the lacuna here can not contain more than five letters (as that at the
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beginning of line 7 which contains [-σμου]), so the scribe should use the abbreviated form χα for the word χα(λκοῦ) "copper", and the symbol for the word (τάλαντα) "talents". For the reconstruction see P. Grenf. Vol. II. 26. line. 20 (103 B.C.), 30. line. 22 (102 B.C.), P. Adler. Gr. 14. line. 25. (100 B.C.) where we have χα(λκοῦ) (τάλαντα).

**Lines 5-7:** καὶ τεράς <τών> βασιλεῇ [Πτολ.] εμαίω ἄργυρίου ἔπι [σμου] δραχμαῖς τριακοσίας "and three hundred drachmas of silver-coined, consecrated to the king Ptolemy".

The lines here contain the second item of the penalty which was devoted to the king Ptolemy. “According to the Demotic texts this sacred money was used for libations and burnt offerings” (see, P. W. Pestman: A Greek Testament from Pathyris. JEA. Vol. LV. (1969). p. 151. The reconstruction here is based on the similar construction of P. Adler. Gr. 2. lines. 17-18. (124 B.C.) where we have: καὶ ἵερας τοῖς βασιλεύσαι [ἀργυρί] οὐ ἐπισήμου δραχμάς τριακοσίας. P. Lond. Vol. VII. 2191. V. lines. 51-52. (116 B.C.) where we have: καὶ ἵερας <τοῖς> βασιλεύσαι ἄργυρίου ἐπισήμου δραχμάς τ. and see also P.L. Bat. Vol. XIX. doc. 7. A. lines. 16 - 17 (109 B.C.).

**Lines 7-8:** καὶ μηθέν (L. μηδέν) [ἡσου] ἐπάναγκον <αὐτίς ἔστω> ποιεῖν "and none the less, shall bound before them to act". For the reconstruction see P.Grenf. Vol. II. 25. lines. 23-24 (103 B.C.) where we have: καὶ μηθέν ἡσου ἐπάναγκον αὐτίς ἔστω, and see also P. Strassb. Vol. II. 85. col. II. line. 28 (113 B.C.).

μηθέν (L. μηδέν): The scribe here confused between θ and δ. For the confusion between them, see, E. Mayser. op. cit. pp. 180-182. It is noteworthy that the form μηθέν used in the most documents of Πτολεμαίος. The editor of P.L. Bat. Vol. XIX. doc.7. A. line. 17 (109 B.C.), B. line. 17 (109 B.C.) has corrected it as μηδέν. According to Gignac the spellings μηθεῖς, συμείας, etc., do not represent an actual interchange of δ and θ. They represent the assimilation of /d/ before a rough breathing (the feminine
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is always σωθήμια etc.). These spellings diminish in frequency from Ptolemaic to Roman times, and are rare after the second century A.D., with sporadic recurrences in Byzantine documents, both the spellings sometimes occur in the same document as in S.B. Vol. V. 8034. (A.D. 52) where we have in line 20: μήθεν and in line 33: μήθεν, and in P. Oxy. 2349 (A.D. 70) we have in line 13, μηθενός and in line 16 μηθενός (see, F.T. Gignac: A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. Vol. I. Milan. (1975). p. 97.

ἐπάναγκον: "This term is used in the Ptolemaic clause (cf. B.G.U. 1128 (114 B.C.) that the party who has forfeited a penalty shall nevertheless necessarily perform the contract. There are certainly no liabilities created. (see, F.Pringshie: op. cit. p. 177. Note 3)

<αὐτός ἐστω>: The scribe forgot to write it here. The same case is found in P. L. Bat. Vol. XIX. doc.7. A, line.18. (109 B.C.) where we have: ἐπάναγκον αὐτό <ἐστω>. The pronoun αὐτός here refers to the other party who shall pay the penalty of money.

Line 9: [κατὰ] τὴν ὄμολ[σχίαν] "in accordance with the agreement". We have no exact parallel for this citation. The construction here is similar to the construction of P. Strassb. Vol. II. 83. l. 30 (114 B.C.) where we have: κατὰ τὰ προγεγραμμένα “in accordance with the above mentioned”.

As the text ends here with the word ὄμολ[σχίαν], and there is no other traces of writing of this line after ὄμολ[σχίαν], so the following lines which are lost may contain the signature of the scribe as in P.Strassb. Vol. II. 85. col. II. lines. 28-29. (113 B.C.) where we have: κατὰ τὰ προγεγραμμένα ἡ δὲ ὅμολογία ἦτε ὀμολόγιος ὁ παρὰ Ἱερασίων κτερα[τ]ίκα. "in accordance with the above mentioned. I Ammonius the agent of Heliodorus have registered". Or ends as in B.G.U. Vol. III. 998. col. II. lines. 12-14 (101 B.C.) where we have: κατὰ <τὰ> προγεγραμμένα ἡ δὲ ὅμολογία ἦτε ἦτε Ἰλεονίσιος ἐστω πανταχῇ ὡς ἐπιφέρεται Ἰεριμίας ὁ παρὰ Παντικ-κου κτερα[τ]ίκα. "in accordance with the above mentioned. This agreement shall be valid wherever it produced. I Hermias the agent of paniscus have registered".
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Pap. No. VII
A fragment of a loan of wheat

P. Caire Mus. C. G. No. 10390. 11.5 X 8.8 cm.
Pathyrite nome.?
Later half of 2nd Cent. B.C.?

The papyrus is cut off on all sides, except at the left one, where there a margin (ca 11.5 X 8.8 cm). is preserved. There is a gap on line 1. The writing on the recto runs along the fibers.

The papyrus has preserved to us 6 incomplete lines, the letters are of medium-size, cursive, very clear for reading. The verso is blank.

The date, and the provenance are not preserved in the text.

According to the description of B. P. Grenfell & A. S. Hunt, Catalogue General des Antiquities Egyptiennes du Mus du Caire, Oxford, (1903), p. 50, It dates back to the later half of the second century B.C. and belongs to Ποθορις. It seems to me that this opinion may be right because the forms of the letters are similar to that of P. Cairo Mus. C. G. No. 10364= BACPSI. Vol. XVIII, Cairo, (2001), plate No.VIII. p. 121, which belongs to the same date and provenance. Moreover, the construction and the arrangement of the text here follows the same pattern which was used by the ἀγαθομοιοι of Ποθορις during this time.

The text is a fragment from a contract of loan advanced by someone whose name is not preserved completely. It is mentioned in line 5 as Ποθορις. The name of the debtor is Πη[τ]εσσοχος (see line 1).

The kind, and the quantity of the loan is not preserved, but the using for the adjective ἀδολον “without fraud” which is mentioned at the beginning of line 3, and the arrangement of the contract, which is, similar to P. Amih. Vol. II. 46. (113 B.C.), 47. (113 B.C.) and P. Grenf. Vol. I. 28 (108 B.C.), we can suggest that the loan here is of wheat (see the discussion, note on lines 5-6).

For close parallels see:
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Πε[τ]εσούχ[ος Πατ ----- ἐν μηνὶ --- ]
2 τοῦ αὐτοῦ [ἕτοις πυρὸν νέον καθαρὸν]
ἀδόλον [μέτρῳ ὠ καὶ παρεῖληφέν]
4 καὶ ἀποκαθ[εσταμένον εἰς σικόν]
πρὸς Πατ [ ------- τοῖς ἱδίοις ἀνή]-
6 λάμασι [-------------------------- ]

Notes :

Line 1 : Πε[τ]εσούχ[ος Πατ ----- ἐν μηνὶ Παχών]

"Petesouchos to pat ... in the month Pachon".

Πε[τ]εσούχ[ος: The name which is mentioned here is the name of the debtor. So the lacuna should contain the rest of his name (in the nominative case), the name of the creditor (in the dative case), followed by the name of the month in which the loan shall be repaid. See P. Amh. Vol. II. 46. line. 5. (113 B.C.), where we have: Θαηήςις Ναομισήσει ἐν μηνὶ Παχών. "Thaesis to Naomseis in the month Pachon".


Παχών: May be reconstructed here. According to the contracts of loans of kind (wheat and barley) which are known to us from Παχών during this time, the month Παχών was the month in which the loans were repaid, because it was one of the harvest’s months (see the introduction of P. Lond. Vol. II. 218. p. 15). It is mentioned in:


**Lines 2-3:** τοῦ αὐτοῦ [ἐτος πυρὸν νέου καθαρὸν ἄδολον [μέτρῳ ὧ καὶ παρεῖληψεν] “of the same year, new, pure, without fraud wheat, according to the measure by which he received it”. After the mention to the month in line 1, the lacunae at the end of lines 2-3 should contain the mention of the year and some conditions concerning the quality and quantity of the debit which is repaid. For the reconstruction see *P. Amh*. Vol. II. 47. lines. 5-6. (113 B.C.) where we have: τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐτος [πυρὸν νέου καθαρὸν ἄδολον μέτρῳ ὧ καὶ παρεῖληψεν] “of the same year, new, pure, without fraud wheat, according to the measure by which he received it”.

τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐτος, “of the same year”. According to our study on the various contracts of loans from Παθώρες during this time, the date of repayment was the same year in which the loan had advanced (except in the loans of *P. Lond*. Vol. III. 1203. p. 9. (113 B.C.), *P. Amh*. Vol. II. 48. (106 B.C.), 50 (106 B.C.), *P. Grenf*. Vol. I. 29. (106 B.C.) where the repayment is in the next year. The mention to the same year is expressed by one of the following ways:

(1) τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐτος “of the same year”. As mentioned here in line 2, and in *P. Amh*. Vol. II. 47. line. 5. (113 B.C.), *P. Adler*. Gr. 10. line. 13. (101 B.C.), *P. Grenf*. Vol. II. 21. line. 12. (113 B.C.), 29. line. 13. (102 B.C.), and sometimes the cardinal number of the same year is add as in *P. Grenf*.
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(3) Using the same date of the year which is mentioned in the beginning of the contract as in P. Grenf. Vol. I. 18 (131 B.C.) where the date in line 1 is mentioned as ἐτοὺς λθ and the date of repayment in line 15 is also τοῦ λθ (ἐτοὺς). and in P. Grenf. Vol. II. 8. (127 B.C.) in line. 1: ἐτοὺς μδ. and in line 13: τοῦ μδ (ἐτοὺς)

[πυρὸν νεὸν καθαρόν] ἀδόλον “new, pure without fraud wheat”. The construction and the arrangement of the contract indicates that the loan here is of wheat. The loan of wheat must be repaid by the debtor with some qualities. Usually they are: πυρὸν νεὸν καθαρόν as it is mentioned in P. Amh. Vol. II. 46. lines. 5-6. (113 B.C.), and in P. Lond. Vol. II. 218. p. 15. line. 6. (111 B.C.) in others contracts it is mentioned as πυρὸν νεὸν καθαρόν ἀδόλον as in P. Grenf. Vol. I. 18. line. 16. (131 B.C.), 28. lines. 1-2 (108 B.C.), S. B. Vol. VI. 9366. line. 7. (124 B.C.), P. Amh. Vol. II. 47. lines. 8-9. (113 B.C.).

Line 3: [μέτρῳ καὶ παρεληφθεν] “according to the measure by which he received it”. The quantity of the loan must be repaid according to the same measure by which the debtor received. This expression was common in all loans of wheat such as in P. Grenf. Vol. I. 18. line. 18. (131 B.C.), 23. lines. 13-14. (117 B.C.), 28. lines. 2-3. (108 B.C.), P. Amh. Vol. II. 46. 7-8. (113 B.C.), 47. lines. 9-10. (113 B.C.), P. Lond. Vol. II. 218. p. 15. line. 8. (111 B.C.).

Line 4: καὶ ἀποκαθεσταμένον εἰς σῖκον] “and delivered at the house”. The lacuna at the end of this line should contain the mention to the place at which the loan is delivered. For the reconstruction see: P. Grenf. Vol. I. 28. lines. 3-4. (108 B.C.) where we have: καὶ ἀποκαθεσταμένον εἰς σῖκον, and see also P. Grenf. Vol. I.31. line. 7 (101-100 B.C.), Vol. II. 29, lines.15-16. (102 B.C.).
According to the contracts of loans (wheat and barley) from Παθύρις during this time, the place at which the loan was delivered, is the creditor's house. It is mentioned in the loans of wheat as in *P.Amh.* Vol. II. 46. line. 6. (113 B.C.), 47. line. 10. (113 B.C.), *P.Grenf.* Vol. I. 18. lines. 16-17. (131 B.C.), 23. line. 11. (117 B.C.), 28. lines. 3-4. (108 B.C.), *P.Lond.* II. 218. p. 15. line. 6. (111 B.C.). In the loans of barley as in *P.Grenf.* Vol. I. 31. line. 7. (101-100 B.C.). In other types of contracts such as loans of money (*P. Grenf.* Vol. I. 20. (127 B.C.), Vol. II. 18. (127 B.C.), 21 (113 B.C.), 27. (103 B.C.), *P. Amh.* Vol. II. 50. (106 B.C.), *P. Adler. Gr.* 10 (101 B.C.), loan of salt *P. Grenf.* Vol. I. 29. (105 B.C.), loans of *croton* (*P. Adler. Gr.* 6 (106 B.C.), and loans of wine (*P. Grenf.* Vol.II. 24. line. 10. (105 B.C.), the place of delivery is not mentioned (except in *P.Amh.* Vol. II. 48. line. 10 (106 B.C.) where the delivery of the wine is mentioned as at the creditor's house.

**Lines 5-6:** πρός Πατ [--- τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀνηλὼμασι] "to Pat [..... at his own] expense. “After the mention to the place of delivery, in line 4 the lines here should be contain the mention to the creditor's name and that the expense of delivery is at the debtor. This expresses by using the preposition πρός (“to, towards”), the reflexive pronoun αὐτόν “him”, αὐτήν “her” or αὐτούς “them” followed by the clause: τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀνηλὼμασι “at his (or here, or their) own expense”, see for example *P. Lond.* Vol. II. 218. p. 15. lines. 7-8. (111 B.C.), where we have: πρός αὐτόν τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀνηλὼμασιν “To him at his own expense”, *P. Amh.* Vol. II. 46. line. 7. (113 B.C.): πρός αὐτήν τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀνηλὼμασιν “to her at her own expense”, *P. Grenf.* Vol. I. 31. line. 8. (101-100 B.C.): πρός αὐτούς τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀνηλὼμασι, "to them at their own expense”. But the scribe has used here after the preposition πρός the name of the creditor Πατ—instead of the reflexive pronoun αὐτόν. As I know, such usage is mentioned here for the first time in the contracts of loan belonging to Παθύρις during this time.

Πατ---- The last letters of the creditor’s name have fallen in the lacuna at the end of line 5. We have over 300 names begin with Πατ- (see, F. Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, Heidelberg, (1922). pp. 282-292. & D. Foraboschi,
Onomasticon Alterum Papyrologica, Milan, (1971), pp 239-241. As I know the names which appeared in the documents from Παθορίς beginning with Πατ are: Πατερός (P. Strassb. Vol. II. 87. col. II. line. 11. (107 B.C.), Πατερότης (P. Adler. Gr. 10. line. 5 (101 B.C.), Πατήφις (P. Strassb. Vol. II. 85. col. II. line (114 B.C.), Πατός (P. Adler. Gr. 3. col. II. line. 14. (112 B.C.), Πατυτίς (P. Lond. Vol. III. 1207. p. 16. line 20. (99 B.C.). As the lacuna can contain five or six letters (this based on the length of line 4), so the name of the creditor may be Πατερότης.

It is to be noted that the terms which used here in lines 2-6 concerning of the quality, quantity, place, and expense of delivery the loan, are used also in the loans of barley as in P. Grenf. Vol. I. 31. lines. 6-9. (101-100 B.C.) where we have: νέον καθαρόν και ἀδόλου ἀπὸ παντὸς καὶ ἀποκαθεσμένα εἰς σίκον πρὸς αὐτὸς τοῖς ἰδιοῖς ἀνηλώμασι μέτρῳ ὦ καὶ παρεῖληφέν. "new, pure, and without fraud from all, and delivered at the house to them at their own expense according to the measure by which they received it. But as the arrangement of the lines here run as the loan of wheat of P. Amh. Vol. 47. II. lines. 8-10. (113 B.C.) where we have: (πυρὸν) νέον καθαρὸν ἀδόλου (μέτρῳ ὦ καὶ παρεῖληφέν ἀπὸκαθεσμένον εἰς σίκον πρὸς αὐτής <τοίς> ἰδιοῖς ἀνηλώμασιν) "new, pure, wheat without fraud, according to the measure by which he received it, and delivered at the house to her at his own expense". and as P. Grenf. Vol. I. 28. lines. 1-4. (108 B.C.) where we have: πυρὸν νέον καθαρόν ν ἀδόλου μέτρῳ ὦ καὶ παρεῖληφέναι καὶ ἀπὸκαθεσμένον εἰς σίκον πρὸς αὐτής ὦ ἰδιοῖς ἀνηλώμασιν. "new, pure, wheat without fraud, according to the measure by which he received it, and delivered at the house to her at his own expense". So as we mentioned before the loan here is of wheat.

[ἀνηλώμασι: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀποδῷ ἐν τοῖς]: The lacuna at the end of line 6, and the lost part of the contract should run as the similar contracts containing the mention of the penalty if the debtor did not repay the loan at the stated time, and ends with the signature of the scribe, see. P. Amh.

Vol. II. 47. lines. 11-18. (113 B.C.), where we have: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀποδῳ ἐν τοῖς ὕρισμεν χρόνοι ἀποτεισάτω (L. ἀποτεισάτω) παραχρήματι ἡμιολίου τὴν ἐσομὲν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τιμὴ ὄδραξ ἐστοι Ναομεσῆσει ἐκ τοῦ
Πατσεότος καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἱπαρχόντων αὐτῶι πάντων καθαπερέγ δίκης Ἡλιοθωρος κεχρημάτικα “if he does not repay at the stated time he shall forfeit forthwith the current market price increased by one half and Namesesis shall have the right of execution upon Patseos and upon all his properties as if in accordance with a legal decision”.
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Pap. No. VIII
A fragment of a private letter
from Pyrrandrus to Heracleides

P. Cair. Mus. C.G. No. 10298. 13.5 X 21.3 cm.
Gurob (Fayom).? ca. 3rd.cent.B.C.? 

The papyrus is cut off from all sides, except at the upper margin where there is a piece of blank space (ca 3.3 X 18.5 cm.) is preserved.

It contains 5 lines, full of gaps on lines 1-2, 4-5, and over line 1. The letters are of large-size, semi-uncial. The writing on the recto run along the fibers. The verso is blank.

The date and provenance are not preserved in the text. According to the description of B.P. Grenfell & A.S. Hunt: Catalogue General des Antiquites Egyptiennes du Musee du Caire, Oxford. (1903). p. 39, the text dates to third century B.C. and belongs to Gurob (fayom). It seems that this description is correct, because the paleographical ground and the name [Π]υρρανδρος (see line 1), which appeared only in P. Petrie. Vol. II. 29. A. lines. 6, 9, 10 (Gurob. Fayom), 3rd. cent. B.C.) assert this opinion.

The text is a fragment from a private letter sent by Πυρρανδρος to Ηρακλειδης. We do not know the details of the letter, owing to the fragmentary condition of the papyrus. However it seems to be concerning a produce of crop.

According to B.P. Grenfell & A.S. Hunt. op. cit. p. 39, the produce here is of a vineyard.

It is to be noted that there is no a word in the text indicating that the produce here is of a vineyard. It seems to me that the description of Grenfell & Hunt is based on the account-tax of vineyards which is recorded in P. Petrie. Vol. II. 29. A (Gurob. 3rd. Cent. B.C.), where there are two persons called Πυρρανδρος have paid a tax on their vineyards. So the produce which is mentioned here in line 3 may be of a vineyard.

For close parallels see:
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[Πύ]ρρανδρος Ἡρακλείδης χαίρειν. ἐπὶ ἑρρωσαί ...]

2 [±2] ἔχοι ἀν ὡς ημεῖς βουλόμεθα ἡρρώμεθα ------
   [πε]ρὶ γενής ὅτι εἰ μὴ διὰ σε ἀπω[νήσο]ν[ται ------
   [±3] α[----------------] α ψφράς [--------------------------]

Translation:

“Pyrrandrus to Heracleides greeting.[If you are well]....... It would be as we wish. We too are well ....... [about] the produce, that if they shall not purchase (it) through you .... to us ..... and .....”.

Notes

Line 1: [Πύ]ρρανδρος Ἡρακλείδης χαίρειν.
“Pyrrandus to Heracleides greeting”.

The epistulae usually begin with the names of the addresser in the nominative case, and the addressee in the dative case, then followed by the word ξαίρειν (greeting), see for example P.Cairo. Zenon. Vol. I. 59060. line. 1. (257 B.C.) where we have: Ἱεροκλῆς Ζήνων[ι] χαίρειν “Hierocles to Zenon greeting”.

[Πύ]ρρανδρος: The initial letters of the addresser’s name have fallen in the lacuna at the beginning of line 1. For the names which are ended in-ρρ ανδρος we have: Θέρρανδρος and Πύρρανδρος (see. B. Hansen: Ruckläuf-iges Worterbuch Der Griechischen Eigennamen, Berlin. (1957). p. 280).

The name here is [Πύ]ρρανδρος because the remenant of the letter which has preserved at the beginning of line 1, seems to be the upper right angle of the letter Upsilon.
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According to our search in *Duke Data Bank*, the name Πυρρανδρος has appeared in the papyri only once in the account tax on vineyards which recorded in *P. Petrie* Vol. II. 29. A. lines. 6, 9-10 (*Gurob*), 3rd cent. B.C., where we have: Πυρρανδρος Δημοσθένους μισθοφόρος ἰππεύς τοῦ ἐν τῷ ἴδιῳ κλήρῳ Ἀλεξάνδρου νησοῦ λθ Πυρρανδρος Πυρρανδοῦ τοῦ ἐν τῷ Πυρρανδροῦ κλήρῳ ὄσαυτως κά (γυνοτατί) ξθ "Pyrrandrus son of Demosthenes a mercenary horse-man in the private land of Alexander's island thirty nine, Pyrrandrus son of Pyrrandrus in the land of Pyrrandrus in like manner twenty four island sixty-nine”.


Lines 1-2: χαίρειν εἰ ἔρρωσαι ------- ] ἐξοι ὡς ἡμεῖς βουλόμεθα (greeting. If you are well……. It would be as we wish).

Lines 1-2: are containing the salutation from the addressee to the addressee.

χαίρειν εἰ ἔρρωσα: The word χαίρειν "greeting" should be followed by the usual word that expresses salutation ἔρρωσα "if you are well". For the reconstruction see: *P. Eleph.* 13. line.1 (223-222 B.C.) where we have: χαίρειν εἰ ἔρρωσα; and see also *P. Petrie* Vol. II. 2. line. 1 (3rd Cent. B.C.) where we have: χαίρειν [εἰ ἔ]ρρωσα.

εἰ ἔρρωσα ------- ] ἐξοι ὡς ἡμεῖς βουλόμεθα: After the word ἔρρωσα the lacunae at the end of line 1 and at the beginning of line 2 should contain the rest of the salutation.

Line 2: [±2] ἐξοι ὡς ἡμεῖς βουλόμεθα: “it would be as we wish”. In others private letters we find similar expressions such as in *P. Cairo. Zenon*. Vol. I. 59135. lines. 1-2 (256 B.C.) where have: εἰ ο εὖ ὡς ἡμεῖς βουλόμεθα, and see also *P. Cairo. Zenon*. Vol. I. 5956. l. 2 (257 B.C.) where we have: εἰ ο εὖ ὡς ἡμεῖς [ς θ]έλομεν “it would be as we want”, and see also *P. Goodspeed*. 4. (= S. Witkowski. op.cit. p.70. No 42.) l.4 (3rd. cent. B.C.): εἰ ο εὖ ὡς οἰρομεθα “it would be as we prefer”.
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Lines 2-3: [ερ]ρωμ[εθα δε και αυτοι γινωσκε δε πε]ρι γενης δτι ει μη δια σε απω[νησ]ον[ται --------]. "we too are well. I would like you to know about the produce that, if they shall not purchase (it) through you …".

[ερ]ρωμ[εθα δε και αυτοι]: After the salutation, the lacuna at the end of line 2 may contain as usual, the mention that the addressee is in good condition. For the reconstruction see P. Cairo. Zenon. Vol. I. 59056. line. 2. (257 B.C.) where we have: ερρωμεθα δε και αυτοι "We too are well".

[γινωσκε δε περι γενης δτι: The conjunction δτι indicates that it was preceded with an introductory verb but it was lost in the lacuna at the end of line 2. We suggest that the verb here may be γινωσκε. See for example the private letter of P.I.F.A.O. 24. lines. 2-4. (14 B.C.) Where we have: Γινωσκε δτι εαν μη εξηλθης παραποδιζομαι εν ἀπασιτοις εν τῇ πρακτορείᾳ "I would like you to know that, if you did not came, I impede among all those who are in the office of tax". The reconstruction γινωσκε δε περι here is based on the private letter of P. Tebt. Vol. I. 56, (= Selected Papyri. 102) lines. 5-7. (Late 2nd Cent. B.C.) Where we have: γειν[ωσ]κε (L.γειν[ωσ]κε) δε περι τοι κατακεκλυσθαι το πεδιον ημων (L.ημων) "I would like you to know that our plain has been flooded".

ει μη δια σε απω[νησ]ον[ται --------]: The conditional particle ει μη should be followed by a verb. As we see here the verb is preserved as απω[νοι]ον[ται --------]. For the verbs which are begin with απω- we have: ἀπωθεσκε meaning "to drive away", ἀπονεσκει "to purchase", ἀπορυγηξω "to dig up", ἀπωχροικε "to make pale" (see. Liddell & Scott: A Greek-English Lexicon. Vol. I. Oxford, (1939). S.V.).We suggest that the most suitable verb for the lacuna is ἀπωνέσκει because it goes with the context "i.e. the produce (γενης) which is mentioned in line 3 as an object for purchase". The verb here may reconstructed as ἀπω[νησ]ον[ται] in the future indicative middel, third person plural. "The future indicative is occasionally used in protasis, after ει to express warning or threat" (see. B.

Line 4: \([±2]\). \(.abs\.\) \(\pm 4\)\(\nu\) \(\kappa α\frown\) \(\epsilon\).[-----]: The horizontal stroke after \(\nu\) may be a trace of the letter \(\pi\) or \(\tau\). We can not reconstruct the lacunae of this line as we have no exact parallel.

Line 5: [-----]\(\alpha\ \varphiο\frown\). There are two suggestions for the reading here. The first reading is \(\varphiο\frown\) from \(\varphiο\frown\)- meaning “payment, rent, load, crop. (see. Liddell & Scott. S.V."

The second reading is- \(\alpha\varphiο\frown\) as an ending, where the initial letters has fallen in lacuna. In this case we have the words: \(\alpha\nuα\varphiο\frown\)”report, payment”, \(\deltaι\alpha\varphiο\frown\)”difference” \(κ\alpha\tauα\varphiο\frown\)”conveyance, payment”, \(με\tauα\varphiο\frown\)”transport”, \(\piα\varphiο\frown\)”distraction” (see. G. Otto: Heidelberg Kontrarindex Der Grieschischen Papyrus-Urkunden. Berlin, (1931), p. 13). I think that the suitable word for the lacuna may be \(\α\gammaα\varphiο\frown\) or \(\kappaα\tauα\varphiο\frown\).

After the details of the letter, it may end with the word \(\epsilonρ\sigmaο\)”goodbye” as in P. Petrie. Vol. II. 13, 19. (= Selected Papyri. 94) line.14 (255 B.C), and sometimes followed by the date as in P.Cairo. Zenon. Vol. II.59192 (= Selected Papyri..92) lines. 11-12. (255 B.C.) where we have : \(\epsilonρ\sigmaο\ \(\epsilon\tauο\frown\) \(λα\ \můντα\frown\) \(\Delta\ι\ν\frown\) \(\beta\)”goodbye. in the thirty first year, on the twelfth of month \(\Deltaι\us\). Otherwise the letter may end with the word \(\epsilonντύχει\)”farewell” as in P. Cairo. Zenon.Vol. III. 59426. (= selected Papyri. 19) line. 8. (260-250 B.C.).
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Pap. No.IX

A Fragment of an unknown Contract

P. Cair. Mus. C. G. No. 10583

18.4 X 16.4 cm.

Provenance unknown.

A.D. 166-167 or 198-199.

The text here is a fragment of papyrus sheet of moderate quality, cut off on all sides, except at the bottom margin, where a large piece of blank space (ca. 7.7 X 17 cm) is partly preserved.

The text contains 10 lines. The first line bears only a trace of 6 or 7 feet-letters. There is a vacant space in line 9 before the word ἔτος. The ink is faded in the middle of lines 5-6. The letters are medium-sized, cursive. The writing on the recto runs along the fibers.

The scribe did not follow one method in writing the same letter, see for example the letter Πτ of the word δίπο (lines 2-3), and of the word πεποιημένη (line 7). The letter Κατα of the conjunction κατ (lines 3, 7, 10). As well as the letter Νυ of the word ἰδιωτικῶν (line 3) and of the adverb νῦν (line 4).

The scribe wrote the second ιωτα of the word ἰδιωτικῶν (line 3) underline. The letter Ομικρόν of the word δεσπότης (line 4) is very small, that it looks like a dot. The letter Σεικ of the word ἔτος looks as the letter Ομικρόν. The letter Αλφα of τα at the beginning of line 6 looks as the letter Δελτα. The letter Επίστολος of the word ετος (line 9) is too long. The verso is blank.

I think that the date which is mentioned in line 9 as: ἔτος ἱπτομενοι Αὐτοκρατῳρὶν "The seventh year of emperors" can only be A.D. 166-167, during the reign of emperors Marcus Aurelius and Verus (A.D. 161-169) or A.D. 198-199, during the reign of emperors Septimius Severus and Caracalla (A.D.193-209), because they are the only emperors who reign together for more than seven years. For the regnal years of those emperors see. F.Preisigke, Worterbuch Der Griechischen Papyrusurkunden. Vol. III. Berlin, (1931). pp. 53,58), and see also P. Lond. Vol.II. 335. introduction. p. 191, which dated as the suggested date of our text to A.D. 166-167 or 198-199, where the date is mentioned in line 10-12 as:
"The seventh year to the sixteenth year of the lords emperors").

The provenance of the papyrus is not preserved in the text, and there is no indication to determine it.

The text constitutes an end of a contract. Its exact nature is unknown. This owing to the fragmentary condition of the papyrus. We have checked in the Duke Data Bank, but unfortunately we do not find an exact parallel for this contract.

H. A. Rupprecht kindly examined this text, as he said in his letter to me: "Es kann sich um pacht handeln oder um ein Geschäft mit Übertragung des Grundstücks-Kauf, Hypothek, Parachoresis-(Darlehen nur in Verbindung mit Hypothek). Es ist wohl eher eine Übertragung des Landes auf Dauer, also auf, Parachoresis". ("It may be a contract of lease or a transaction of land by sale or mortgage or by cession, and it may be also a transaction of land by sale or by cession").

I tend to consider this contract as a transaction of land by sale or by parachörēsēs "cession", because the parts of the ἐβεβαιώσθης "confirmation" -clause that preserved in line 3 as: ἀπὸ δὲ ἰδιωτικῶν καὶ πάσης ἐ [μπουήσεως ἐπί τὸν ἀπαντὸν χρόνων] was common in these types of contracts (see the discussion on line 3).

The names of the parties of the contract are not preserved in the text.

For further parallels see:


[---] ±7 [-----------------------------------------------]
[---[ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν χρόνων μ]έχρι [-------]
[---]κυρίου ἀπὸ δὲ ἰδιωτικῶν καὶ πάσης ἐμποιήσεως -------]
Notes

The beginning of the contract which is lost should contain as usual the date; the names of the parties and the details of contract.

**Lines 1-2:** [------- ] ±7 [ -------] ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν χρόνων. "of former times".

The first line which bears only a trace of 6 or 7 feet-letters, can not help us for suggesting any reading. However this line and the lacunae at the beginning of line 2 may contain before ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν χρόνων, the confirmation (βεβαιώσεις) of the contract, Which shall undertake by the first party towards the second one. See for example *P. Michigan. Vol. II.* 121. recto. II. col. IX. lines. 3-4. (A. D. 42). Where we have: καὶ βεβαιώσεις αὐτῶν τε Χαρονίωςκα) καὶ τοὺς παρ' αὐτῶ(ν) τῶν Πάτρων καὶ εὰν ἀρίθμησαι καὶ τοῖς παρ' αὐτῶ τὴν παραχώρησιν πάσῃ βεβαιώσειν<ν> ἀπὸ τῶν δημοσίων τελεσμάτων πάντων ἀραβίεις τε καὶ ιοῦ και ἀρίθμησικοῦ καὶ παντὸ (ς) τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν χρόνων) ("And Charonion himself and his heirs shall guarantee the cession to Patron and whomever he may choose and his heirs with every guarantee from all public taxes, the *arabia* and *naubian* and *arithmetikon* and every public tax, of former times"), and see also *S. B. Vol. XIV.* 11533. lines. 17-18. (A. D. 104) where we have: καὶ βεβαιώσεις καθαράς ἀπὸ δημοσίων καὶ παντὸς έδιδος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν χρόνων) ("And the guarantee free from public-taxes and from all kinds, of former times").

**Lines 2-3:** ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν χρόνων μ[έ]χρι τοῦ -- ἔτους καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ -- ἔτους -- Καίσαρος τοῦ·κυρίου. "of former times up to .... year which also the .... year of .... Caesar the lord".

The lacunae at the end of line 2 and that at the beginning of line 3, should contain the mention of the date in which the term of the contract shall end.
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See for example, S. B. Vol. XVIII. 13764. lines. 20-21 (A.D. 148-161) where we have: ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν χρόνων μέχρι τοῦ διεληλυθότος --- ἔτους καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ --- ἔτους Ἀντωνίου] Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου (“of former times up to the next year which is also the .... year of Antonius Caesar the lord”), and see also S.B. Vol. XIV. 11533. line. 18 (A.D. 104) where we have, [ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν χρόνων μέχρι] τοῦ ἑνεστῶτος ἔ τους καὶ αὐτοῦ [πό τοῦ τριαντα τοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου). (“of former times up to present fifth year which also the fifth year of Trajan Caesar the lord”).

Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου: The word κυρίου here is the last title of one of the two emperors. As the date of the contract is mentioned in line 9 as ἔτους ἐρωύδου Αὐτοκράτορος (“The seventh year of emperors”). So the lacuna may contain the imperial titles of Marcus Aurelius and Verus: Ἀντωνίου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου καὶ Οὐχρου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου “Antonius Caesar the lord and Verus Caesar the lord”. (see. B.G.U, Vol. I. 54. lines 16-17. (A.D. 161).


Line 3: ἀπὸ δὲ ἰδιωτικῶν καὶ πάσης ἐμποιήσεως ἐπὶ τὸν ἄκαντα χρόνον: “and from private dues and all claims for all times”.

The lacuna at the end of line 3, may contain the rest of the clause concerning of the confirmation (βεβαιώσεις). For the reconstruction (see. S. B. Vol. XVIII. 13764. line. 21. (A.D. 148-161) where we have: [ἀπὸ δὲ ἰδιωτικῶν καὶ πάσης ἐμποιήσεως ἐπὶ τὸν ἄκαντα χρόνον].
This clause of confirmation was used in various types of contracts. It is used in the contract of sale of *P. Michigan*, Vol. II. 121. recto. II. col. IX. lines 4-5. (A.D. 42), in the contract of sale by cession of *B.G.U*. Vol. II. 666. lines 22-23. (A.D. 175-176), and the contract of sale by mortgage in *P.S.I*. Vol. VIII. 910. lines 12-13. (A.D. 48).

**Lines 4-7:** 

[----]ὴν δεσπότην ἐξουσίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐργ[ού] ---]ην προθεσμία [πρ]οσκο-μιζόμενο[ν] ---]στα ποιούσαν ο[.....] μει. ταί εμερ. [---]. ἡ πεποιημένη ἐργα. The meaning here is not clear, owing to the fragmentary condition of the lines. However the general meaning here is about the authority ἐχουσίαν of works ἔργα which performance πεποιημένη by someone in appointed time προθεσμία.

H. A. Rupprecht in his note on these lines inquired “Gestattung der Bearbeitung? Fruchtziehung? Kommt wohl nicht bei der pacht vor” (“Is it a promise of work? Does it mean a gathering of fruits? These terms however are not mentioned in the contracts of lease”). Unfortunately we have no exact parallel to reconstruct the lacunae of these lines.

ἐργ[ού] Should be put in genitive as it preceded with τοῦ προσκομιζόμενο[ν: “the receiver”. The word may be put in the accusative case as it may refer to δεσπότην (“the master”) which is mentioned in line 4.

**Lines 7-8:** 

[---] ἐαν δὲ καὶ [---]εσθαί σε τού ἀραβ[ώνος: “and if …. you …. of the earnest-money”.

The lacunae at the end of line 7 and at the beginning of line 8, may contain the mention of a penalty concerning the ἀραβ[ών, which should be paid by the parties of the contract in case of failure to accomplish their duties. See for example the contract of sale by cession (παραχόρησις) in. *P. Lond*. Vol. II. 334 (= *Selected Papyri*. No. 76) lines. 23-24 (A.D. 166) where we have: ἐαν δὲ μη [λ.μη] καταγράψωι ἔκτισιν (ἔκτισειν) αυτὸς τον ἀραβ[ων]α διπλῶν μεθ’ μοιλίας καὶ τοκων: (“and if they fail to make the conveyance, they shall forfeit double the earnest-money with an additional one half and interest”).
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If Gaius Iulius Ammonius did not make the conveyance he shall to forfeit double of the earnest-money according to the laws of earnest-money. And if he had made the conveyance readily and Statoetis did not pay the rest of the price and the sum of cession, he shall be deprived of the earnest-money.

In B.G.U. Vol. II. 446. lines. 17-19. (A.D. 158-159). we have: ἐὰν δὲ ἡ Σωτηρία ἐτοῖμως ἔχουσα καταχράσαι μὴ [ἀποδίδω ὁ Στοτούτης τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς τιμῆς] στερίσκεσθαι αὐτῶν τοῦ ἄρραβῶνος: ἢ "If Soteria had made the conference readily and Stotoetis did not pay the rest of the price, he shall be deprived of the earnest-money”).

In the contract of labour of P. Fay. 91. (= Selected Papyri.17). lines. 27-30. (A.D. 99). we have: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ποιήσῃ ἡ Θενητούς κατὰ τὰ προγεγραμμένα ἀποδώσῃ αὐτήν πλήρως τὸν ἄρραβωνα διπλοῦν. "If Thenetkouis does not act in accordance with the conditions above written, she shall pay back to Lucius double the earnest-money”.

[----------] ἐσθαι σε τοῦ ἄρραβῶνος: The five letters ἐσθαι is an and of a verb. Its initial letters has fallen in the lacuna. We may suggest that the verb here may be στερίσκεσθαι: "to be deprived” as in B.G.U. Vol. II. 446. lines. 18-19. (A.D. 158-159), where we have: μὴ [ἀποδίδω ὁ Στοτούτης τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς τιμῆς] στερίσκεσθαι αὐτῶν τοῦ ἄρραβῶνος. Or it may ἀπολέγ- ἐσθαι: "to be renounce” as in C.P.R. Vol. I. 19. line. 24. (A.D. 330) where we have: εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσῃ ἀπολέγεσθαι αὐτὴν τοῦ ἄρραβῶνος (L. ἄρραβ- ὑνος) (If she will not do this, she is to renounce the earnest-money”).

Line 8-9: τὸ χειρόγραφον τούτο διασόν γραφέν ὑπ᾽ ἐμοῦ κύριον ἔστω ὡς ἐν δημοσίῳ κατακεχωρισμένον "This bond, [which written by me in two copies, shall be valid as if recorded in public registry]”.

The lacunae at the end of line 8, and at the beginning of line 9 should be contain the final clause of the contract concerning of its validity.
For the reconstruction see the contract of sale (by cession) of *B.G.U.* Vol. II. 666. lines. 27-29. (A.D. 175-176) where we have: τὸ χεὶ[p]όγραφον τοῦ (L.χεὶ[p]όγραφον τοῦ) δισσὸν γραφὲν (L.γραφὲν) ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ κύριον ἐστὼ ἐν δημ[σίω κατακεχωρίσμενον].

Apart from our concerned contract, there are various forms of this clause, for example we have: κύριον τὸ χεὶ[p]όγραφον δισσὸν γραφὲν παντ-αχὴ πανταχὴ ἐπιγραφὲνον”This bond, which is written in two copies, is valid wherever produced”. (See. *P.Oxy.* Vol. III. 507. lines. 37-38. (A.D. 169).

τὸ δὲ χεὶ[p]όγραφον τοῦτῳ ἐστὶν (L.τοῦτῳ ἐστὶν) ἀλώφαδος καὶ ἐπιγραφῆς ὅ καὶ κύριον ἐστὶν πανταχὸ καὶ παντὶ τῷ ἐπιφανεῖτι ὡς ἐν δημοσίῳ κατακεχωρίσμενον.

("This bond is written in my own hand, in two copies, without erasure or addition, and it shall be valid wherever produced and whosoever produces it, as if recorded in public registry"). (see. *P. Hambourg.* Vol. I. 70. lines. 24-29. (Middle of 2nd cent. A.D.).

τὸ δὲ χεὶρόγραφον [διὸ] ἐπιγραφῆς διεζεύγησαν χωρὶς ἀλώφαδος καὶ ἐπιγραφῆς δισσὸν γραφὲν κύριον ἐστὼ ὡς ἐν δημοσίῳ κατακ-εχωρ[1] (ισμενον) (“This bond, which I have given written in my own hand in two copies without erasure or addition shall be valid as if recorded in public registry”) (see: *P.Princeton.* Vol. III. 149. lines. 10-12. (A.D. 176-180).

τὸ δὲ χεὶρόγραφον (L.χεὶρόγραφον) τοῦτο κύριον (ἑστὶν σο) ἐπιγραφῆς ἐπιγραφὲνον [ὁ] ὡς ἐν δημοσίῳ κατακεχωρίσμενον (L.κατακεχωρίσμενον) (“This bond shall be valid for you wherever produced as if recorded in public registry”). (see. *B.G.U.* Vol. I. 50. lines. 18-20., (A.D. 115).

“A sale concluded by a private document did convey full property rights with validity *adversus omnes* but only with validity *inter partes*. Therefore private documents of this kind used to be followed by public ones” (cf. R. Taubenschlag: *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri* (332 B.C.- 640 A.D.), Warszawa, (1955), p. 324).

**Lines 9-10:** ἐτοὺς ἐβδόμου Αὐτοκ[π]ατέρων ὧν ἡμινὸς ἥνω ἐξουσία.

"The seventh year of emperors ..... on the second day of the month ....."
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The lacunae at the end of line 9 and at the beginning of line 10, should contain the names of emperors and their titles followed by the name of the month. As the date here is the seventh year (ἐτους ἕβδομος). So the lacunae may contain one of the following imperial titles of emperors Marcus Aurelius and Verus:

1. Αὐτοκράτορων Αὐρηλίων τῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν "of the emperors Aurelii the lords Augusti". (see. O.Wilck. 925. Lines. 1-2 (A.D. 167).

2. Αὐτοκράτορων Καισάρων Αὐρηλίων Ἀντωνίου καὶ Οὐήρου Σεβαστῶν "of the emperors Caesar Aurelii Antonius and Verus Augusti". (see. S.B. Vol. V. 8318. lines 3-4. (A.D. 164).


Or one of the following imperial titles of emperors Septimius Severus and Caracalla:


For the imperial titles of those emperors (see. P.Bureth. op. cit. pp. 77-81, 95-98).

[--- μηνὸς ---] ν δευτέρα: After the imperial titles, the lacuna at the beginning of line 10 should contain the word μηνὸς "month", and the name of the month. For the letter ν, it may be the last letter of month’s name. See for example. P. Michigan. Vol. III. 199. lines. 1-2. (A.D. 126) where we have: έτους δεκατου Αυτοκράτορος [Καίσαρος] Τραϊανοῦ Αδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ μηνὸς Γορπ[ια]ου δ[ευ]τέρα] "The tenth year of emp-eror Caesa Trajan Hadrian Augustus, on the second day of the month Gorpiaius”.

**Line 10:** καὶ ἕστιν καθαρὸν ἀπὸ ἐπιγραφῆς "and it is free from addition”.

The lacuna at the end of line 10 my contain the word ἐπιγραφῆς ("addition"). The reconstruction here is based on B.G.U. Vol. II. 666. line 31. (A.D. 175-176) where we have: καθαρὸν ἀπὸ ἀλείψατος (L.ἀλείψας) καὶ ἐπιγραφῆς (“Free from erasure and addition”).
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Pap. No. X
A fragment of a petition to the Strategos

P. Cair. Mus. C.G. No. 10685. 17 X 20 cm.
Diopolite Parva. ca. A.D. 222 - 235.

The papyrus lost from the left and right hand sides a strip which hold the beginning and the end of the lines. The upper and the lower part of the papyrus are lost also.

The text contains 13 lines, the first two of them hold only a trace of writing. There is a vacant space in line 7 (between the words στρατηγὸς and Διοσκόρ[ί]τον), and in line 8 (between the words Διοσκόρ[ό]ςως and ς τοῖς πολύχ[έρσι]. The writing on the recto runs along the fibers.

The first six lines are written by one hand, where the letters are of medium-size, and cursive, while the rest of lines (7-13) are written by another one, where the letters are of medium-size and seems as if written in semi uncial.

The first hand wrote the last letter υ of Σεσο[ή]ρου (line 5) over the letter ο, the last letter υ of Ἀλεξάνδρου (line 5) is written over the first letter ε of Εὐσκέος (Εὐσκέος), the last letter ζ of Εὐσκέος (line 5. Εὐσκέος) is underlined. The long letter ρ of Αθώρ (line 6) is noticeable, the letter ε at the end of line 6 is ended with a long stroke. He wrote the letter υ in two styles, the first of the word Εὔτυχ[είς] (line 5), and the second of the word Αθώρ (line 6).

The second hand did not observe one method in writing the same letter, see for example, the letter π of the word Διοσκόρ[ί]τον (line 7), and of the word Ἀσπίδα (line 8). The letter ζ of the definite article τοῖς (line 8) looks as the letter Omicron. He put two dots over the letter υ of the word ὄβρεις (line 10). He used two ways for the abbreviations. The first is by putting the last letter of the word over the preceded one as in line 7 of the word Διοσκόρ[ί]τον, and in line 8 of the word Διοσκόρ[ό]ςως. The second way by putting an oblique stroke beside the last letter of the word, as in line 7 of the word Θηβ[ί]ς αἱδος). There are two marks over the word ηττον (see line 9), it may be an abbreviation. Unfortunately I can not resolve it. The verso is blank.
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The text has preserved to us the date of the month only (line 8. Ἀθυρ κε = the twenty fifth of Hathyr), while the date of the year is lost. We suggest that the date of the year may be between ca. A.D. 222 to 235, during the reign of emperor Severus Alexander. This suggestion is based on two reasons: Firstly, the titles of the emperor Severus Alexander are mentioned in line 5, where we have: Σεσουήρον Ἀλεχάβρου Εὐσβέως (L.Εὐσβεβούς) Εὐσβής. Secondly, we know that the emperor Severus Alexander ruled with the emperor Elagabalus ca. (A.D. 221-222), but the last two titles here: Εὐσβέως (L.Εὐσβεβούς) Εὐσβής are added to the titles of emperor Severus Alexander, when he became absolute ruler. Accordingly the date of the text may be between ca. (A.D. 222-235). For the titles and the regnal years of the emperors Elagabalus and Severus Alexander see. P.Bureth, Les Titulatures Imperials dans les Papyrus, les Ostraca et les Inscriptions d’Egypte (30 A.C. 284 P.C), Bruxelles. (1964). pp. 107-110).

The provenance is the Διοισόλϊς nome of the Θηβαίδιος, as mentioned in line 7.

The text is a fragment of petition, addressed to Ἰσχαρίων the σφατηγός of Διοισόλϊς nome (line 7).

The name of the petitioner is not preserved in the text. He is described in line 8 as a descendant of the village Ἀσπίδα, from Διοισόλϊς (the capital of the Διοισόλϊς nome).

The exact nature of the petition is not clear, owing to the fragmentary condition of the text. From the context, it seems that the petitioner is subjected to violences and attacks (line 10: ὑβρεῖς καὶ ἐφόδιοις), by some persons (line 8: τοῖς πολύς [ἐροτ.] “with many men”.

[ -------- ] .... [ ---------------------------------- ]
[ -------- ] .... [ ---------------------------------- ]
[ ------ ] ισοὶ ἐμοὶ τε περὶ τ[...] τ. [ -------- ]
[ -------- ] ἑξιστατὰι συ. ξι. αὐν

5 [ ------ ΣεσούΗρον Ἀλεξάνδρου Εὐσβέως Εὐσβής [σύς
Σέβαστού -------]
[ -------- ]’ Ἀθυρ κε
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2nd hand.

[ -------- τῷ] καὶ Ἰσχύρωνι στρατηγῷ ναὸς
Διοσπόλ(ίτου)Θηβ[(χαίδος) παρὰ --------]
[ - - - τοῦ] γένους Ἀσπίδα ἀπὸ Διοσπόλ(εως) ναὸς εἰ
τοῖς πολύχερσι --------------------------
[ -----] αἰ τὰς ψυχὰς οὐκ ἥττουν τεθημένας, [------]

10 [------]. ὦ ὄβρεις καὶ ἐφόδους ------------------------
[ ------] ὑ μη σὺ ό νόμος συν. ο[ -----------------]
[ ------] εσεσθαί νῦν μᾶλλον [ ------------------]
[ ----- τὴν ἄποθιμωσαν ἀγανάκτη[σιν ------------------]

Correction:


Abbreviations:

7: Διοσπόλ(ίτου)  7: Θηβ[(χαίδος)]  8: Διοσπόλ(εως)

Translation:

“…… Severus Alexander Pius Felix [Augustus] .... the twenty fifth of
Hathy, (2nd hand) To ...., also called Ischyron, strategos of the Diopolite
nome of Thebaid, ...., descendant of Aspida, from Diospolis. Whether by
many men, ..... the souls which have been excited much ....... violences
and attacks, ..... the law, ..... especially now ..... the sufficient irritation
.....”.

Notes:

Lines 1-4: These lines contain conclusion of a document, separated from
the petition, because it ends with the titles of emperor Severus Alexander
and the date (line 6: Αθῶρ κε), while the following line 7 is the beginning
of the petition.

The exact nature of this document is unclear owing to its fragmentary
condition. According to our study on various texts of petitions, we can
suggest that, it may be a conclusion of an order by the strategus directing his
assistant to transmit a copy of the petition (see lines 7-13), in accordance to
the requisition of petitioner, see for example the petition of P. Ryl. Vol. II.
117. lines 1-4. (A.D. 269), which preceded by: Ἀβρήλη(ως)Τυράννω[ς] [ο] κ
Aurelius Tyrannius also called Ammonius, strategos of the Hermopolite nome, to Hermes (his) assistant ...... A copy is forwarded to you of the petition of Aurelia Tinoutis also called Theodora daughter of Pinoution in order that you make it known to the person there in stated". The second suggestion is that, the document may be an official correspondence relating to the petition, see for example the petition of P. Oxy. Vol. VIII. 1119. lines 1-3 (A.D. 254), which preceded by: [στρατηγὸς Ὀξυρυγχεῖτον] Αὐρήλιος Ἡρω-φυλάρχῳ τοῦ εἰσίτων τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. [επιστέλλεται σοὶ τὸ βιβλεῖδιον (L. βιβλείδι- ιον) Αὐρήλιον Θέους καὶ Αἰσιπποῦ αὐτοτέρους Θέους Σεβαστείου τῶν καὶ Διοσκουρείων Αὐτοκόλλοιν ἐντεταγμένοι καὶ αὐτογράφοις ἐπιστολῶν δύο Strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome, to Aurelius Hera, phylarch for the coming fourth year, I send you the petition of Aurelius Theon and Aurelius Arsinous, both sons of Theon, Antinoetes of the Sebasteian tribe and Dioscureian deme, enclosed in which are copies of two letters.

Lines 5-6: [έτους ----- Σεού]ήρου Ἀλεξάνδρου Εὐσβέως (L.Εὐσβε- ύς) Εὐστηχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ -----] Αὐτίρ κὲ

"The year .... of .... Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus ...... the twenty fifth of Hathyr".

The lacunae of lines 5-6 may contain the date of the year, followed by the complete titles of the emperor Severus Alexander. As we have no complete line in the text, we can not determine the exact titles which are lost here.

Αὐτίρ κὲ: "The twenty fifth of Hathyr": After the word Αὐτίρ, there is a trace of a letter where the ink is faded. It can be read as κ, then followed by a clear ε. So the date is Αὐτίρ κὲ is the twenty fifth of Hathyr. It corresponds to 21st of November. (see. Alan.E Samuel, Greek and Roman Chronology, Munchen. (1967). p. 177).
**Line 7:** [------- τῶι] καὶ Ἰσχυρίωι στράτηγῷ νας Διοπλ (ίτου) Ὀηβ [αίδος] --] “to ... also called Ischyrion strategos of the Diopolite nome, of Thebaid ...”.

This line is the beginning of the petition. It begins with the name of the official and his title both in the dative case. See for example the beginning of the petition in *P. Oslo.* 22. line. 1. (A.D. 127) = *J.E.A.* Vol. XL. (1954). p. 33 where we have: Ἡρῴδη τῶι καὶ Τιβερίωι στρατηγῷ Ἀρσ(νείτου) Θεμ(ιστοῦ) μερίδος “to Herodes also called Tiberius, strategos of the Themistes division of the Arsinoite nome”.

[------- τῶι] καὶ Ἰσχυρίωι: “to .... also called Ischyrian”: Before the conjunction καὶ, there is the letter τ. It may be the last letter of the definite article τῶι. If this suggestion is correct, the lacuna at the beginning of line 7, may contain another name for the strategos Ἰσχυρίων. The using of another name for the strategos found in so many petitions, see for example: *P. Lond.* Vol. II. 358. P. 172. line. 1. (ca. A.D. 150) where we have: Δημητρίῳ τῷ κ [αί] Ἀρποκρατίῳ στρατηγῷ Ἀρσ(νείτου) Θεμιστοῦ καὶ Πολ[εμ]ῶι μὲ ρίδων “to Demetrios also called Harpo-kration, strategos of Themistes and Polemon division, of the Arsinoite nome”, and see also *P. Oxy.* Vol. LVIII. 3926. lines. 1-2. (A.D. 246) where we have: Ιουλίῳ Ἀμμονίῳ τῷ καὶ Εὐαγγέλῳ στρατηγῷ Θείτου “to Julius Ammonius also called Evangels, strategos of the Thinite nome”.

Ἰσχυρίωι: To my knowledge, the name Ἰσχυρίων is not attested elsewhere except here, as στρατηγός of Διοπλιτῆς


**Lines 7-8:** [παρὰ --- ἐκ τοῦ] γενοῦς Ἀσπιδά ἀπὸ Διοπλ(εως) “From
..., from the descendant of Aspida from Diospolis”. After the name of the strategos and his titles, the lacunae at the end of line 7, and at the beginning of line 8, should contain the preposition para, then followed by the name of the petitioner, and the place of his residence (which is mentioned here as ἀπὸ Διοσπόλ(εως). see for example the petition of P. Lond. Vol. II. 358, p. 172. lines 1-3. (ca. A.D. 150) where we have: Δημητρίῳ τῷ κ[αί] Ἀρσικρατίωνι στρατηγῷ Ἀρσινοεῖτῳ Θεμίστου καὶ Πολ[λε]ωνος μερίδων para Στοτήτιος ἀπὸ κόμης Σεγγουεύτου (L.κόμης Σκονοπαιου[νήσου τῆς Ἡρακλείδου μερίδος τοῦ Ἀρσινοείτου [νο]μοῦ) "Το De-
metrios also called Harpokration, strategos of the Themistes and Polemon division, of the Arsinoeite nome, from stotoes son of Stotoes, from the village of Soknopaiou[nes], of Herakleides division, of the Arsinoeite nome”.

εἰς τοῦ γένους Ἀσπίδα: “From the descendant of Aspida”. We have no exact parallel for this citation, but we can suggest that the lacuna before the word γένους, may contain the definite article τοῦ pereceded by the preposition εἰς. The reconstruction εἰς τοῦ γένους here is based on a similar expression found in P.Σ.I. Vol. V. 457. lines. 4-5. (A.D. 269) where we have: εἰς τοῦ[ν] γυμνασίου ἡ εἰς[ν εἰς] τοῦ γένους τούτου “from the gymna-
sium or from this descendant”.

[εἰς τοῦ] γένους Ἀσπίδα ἀπὸ Διοσπόλ[εως]: “from the descendant of Aspida from Diospolis”. The petitioner is described here as a descendant of (the village) Ἀσπίδα from Διοσπόλις (the capital of the Διοσπόλιταις nome). According to A.Calderini, Dizionario die Nomi Geografici e Topografici dell Egitto Greco-Romano. Milano, (1935). p. 241), the village Ἀσπίδα was situated in the Oxyrhynchite nome.

Line 8: εἰ τοῖς πολὺ[χερσὶ] —— "whether by many men". πολύ[χερσι]. The end of the word has fallen in the lacuna at the end of line 8. We had checked in the Duke Data Bank for a masculine word begin with πολύ[χερσι] used in the texts of petitions, unfortunately we found only the feminine gender πολύχερσι. see the petition of S.B. Vol. 5238. line.12 (A.D 114) where we have: ἐλθὼν μετά πολύχερσις ἀπη[ν]έκατο "He is coming carried with a multitude of assistants”. However the word here may be
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πολύχερσι, from πολυχειρ”with many men”. (see. Liddle & Scott’s, An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford. (1880). πολυχειρ. S.V.). In my opinion the word πολύχερσι is suitable for the lacuna here, as it goes grammatically with the article τοις, and with the context also. (i.e. these πολύχειρσι “many men”, may be the accusers who are directed the violences and attacks (line 10: ὑβρείς καὶ ἐφόδιονες) against the petitioner.

Line 9: [--------]καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς σῶκ (Σοῦχ) ἤπτον τεθημένας. “the souls which have been excited much”. Unfortunately there is no exact parallel to reconstruct the lacunae of this line.

τὰς ψυχὰς: “the souls”. The using of the plural case for the word ψυχή, may indicate that the violences and attacks (line 10: ὑβρείς καὶ ἐφόδιονες) are directed against more than one person.

σῶκ (Σοῦχ) ἤπτον “much” Here the second hand has used the negative particle σῶκ instead of σῶχ. The suitable particle here is σοῦξ because it is followed by the word ἤπτον which begins with an aspirated letter η, see for example the petition of B.G.U. Vol. I. 157. lines 8-10 (A.D. II-III), where we have:


τεθημένας: “which have been excited”. The description of the souls as σῶκ (Σοῦχ) ἤπτον τεθημένας “which have been excited much” may indicate that the violences and attacks (line 10: ὑβρείς καὶ ἐφόδιονες) were enough so much that they made the souls excited.
Ten Greek Papyri from Cairo Museum

**Line 10:** [----.]ω ὀβρεῖς καὶ ἐφόδιος[ος]--- Meaning “violences and attacks”. This line contains the mention to the unlawful action which was done by the defendants. Unfortunately we have no parallel for this citation.

ἐφόδιος “attacks”: The end of the word has fallen in the lacuna at the end of line 10. We have no parallel for this citation. However we can suggest that, the word here may be ἐφόδιος from ἐφόδος ( Decompiled “attack” (see Liddelle & Scott. op. cit. ἐφόδος. S.V.). In my opinion the word ἐφόδιος “attacks” is suitable for the lacuna here, as it goes grammatically with ὀβρεῖς “violences” and goes with the context also, as it gives more details for the description of the unlawful action which are made by the defendants. For the using of the word ἐφόδος in petitions see for example, *P. Cairo. Maspero*. Vol. I. 67002. Page. III. lines.15 where we have: ληστρικῶν ἐφόδων ἐπικειμένων ὑμῖν νυκτέρις[ιῶ(.)] κατημέρευα ἡ the piratical attacks which press upon (or annoy) us by night and by day”.

**Line 11:** [--]ν μὴ σοὶ νόμος σοι[...] There is no parallel for this citation. I try to reconstruct the lacunae of this line, unfortunately all my efforts were in vain. The letter ο before νόμος is doubtful. It may be an abbreviation of the preceded word νῦ μησο. The line may read also as ἐκαὶ ν μὴ σοὶ νομός.

**Line 13:** [--- τὴν ἀπὸχρώσαν ἀγανάκτη[σιν] ---] “…The sufficient irritation …”.

τὴν ἀπὸχρώσαν: “the sufficient”. The initial letters of the word have fallen in the lacuna at the beginning of line 13. It seems to me that the form ἀπὸχρώσαν may be present active participle (-singular feminine accusative). In this case this form is either from the verb ἀποχράω or προχράω (see: G. Otto, *Heidelberg Kontrarindex Der Griechischen Papyrus Urkunden*. Berlin, (1931). p. 88). In my opinion verb ἀποχράω “to suffice” is more suitable here than προχράω “to lend”. So the lacuna can reconstruct as ἀπὸχρώσαν, and the participle here may be preceded with the definite article τὴν as attributive participle qualifies the noun ἀγανάκτη[σιν] “irritation”. According to B. G. Mandilas: *The Verb in the Greek non Literary Papyri*, Athens. (1973). p. 360.) “The participle with article stands occasionally as adjective followed by the noun which it qualifies”.
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ἀγανάκτησις “irritation”. The end of the word has fallen in the lacuna at the end of line 13. It can be reconstructed easily as ἀγανάκτησις (feminine singular in the accusative case after ἀποχρώσαν), from ἀγανάκτησις-η meaning irritation. (see. Liddell & Scott. op. cit. ἀγανάκτησις. S.V.).
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