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Back to Oegstgeest
The von Scherling Papyrus Collection
Some von Scherling Texts in Minnesota

Marja Bakker, Alette Bakkers, and Klaas Worp
Leiden University

Abstract
Survey of the dispersal of the von Scherling papyrus collection and edition of eleven von Scherling texts in the University of Minnesota collection.

Part 1: The von Scherling Papyrus Collection

The website of the Department of Special Collections and Rare Books at the University of Minnesota University Libraries contains scans of a small but interesting collection of two ostraka, numbered 1 (a Greek text) and 2 (an Egyptian text), and almost two dozen papyrus fragments. The latter are numbered consecutively 1-21 and most of them are written in Greek. But #19 is actually written on leather, while #3 is a papyrus with Egyptian hieroglyphs. A few items were bought from Maggs Brothers in London, but most came from Egypt to Minnesota via the Netherlands. They were bought before or after WW II from Erik von Scherling, a rare book dealer of Swedish descent selling, among various collectibles, papyri and manuscripts from his office in Oegstgeest (a suburb of Leiden) through a private journal called Rotulus (on this, see below). When visiting Egypt in 1935/6 he apparently bought from

---

1 This paper derives the first part of its title from a novel, Terug naar Oegstgeest, by the well-known Dutch author Jan Wolkers. We owe many thanks to our colleague B.P. Muhs for polishing our English. Moreover, he gave a decisive impetus to this paper by his discovery of the website mentioned in n. 2.
3 Papyri nos. 7-9a-b.
4 Ostraka nos. 1-2; papyri nos. 1-6, 10-21.
several persons, from fellahin in Hibeh and Achmim and from Maurice Nahman in Cairo, a substantial number of inscribed objects, in particular ostraka and fragments of papyrus and parchment. Von Scherling sold these objects to customers all over the world, including at least some private individuals and academic institutions in the East and Midwest of the United States. Furthermore, after von Scherling’s death some of his texts came into the hands of other dealers (i.a. Maggs Brothers, mentioned above, and Laurence Witten, Southport, Connecticut) who sold these to customers of their own. Nowadays, papyri once belonging to the von Scherling collection are located in the libraries of the University of Minnesota-Minneapolis, Indiana University-Bloomington (see n. 9), the University of Colorado-Boulder (see n. 17), Yale University (cf. P.Turner 27-28 introd.), and Duke University, as well as in the British Library, the Belastingmuseum in Rotterdam, and the National Museum of Antiquities and the Papyrological Institute in Leiden.

I have attempted to reconstruct the contents of von Scherling’s collection, especially as far as the Greek papyri are concerned. This attempt is based first and foremost on data in von Scherling’s journal Rotulus, in fact a sales catalogue published at irregular intervals for potential buyers. These sales catalogues contain concise descriptions of various objects for sale, and from volume 5 onwards the descriptions also feature an inventory number connected with von Scherling’s collection. As he sometimes re-offered in a later Rotulus volume an object already offered previously in an earlier volume, it is possible to add to the earlier descriptions an inventory number found only with a later description. In the case of inv. 235 below, the inventory number is visible on the back of the original kept in the Leiden Papyrological Institute.


For the latter two collections, see the information provided by A. Verhoogt and N. Krui to S. Clackson and reported by her in P.Mon.Apollo, pp. 13-14. For another Greek papyrus in the collection of the National Museum of Antiquities see the ed.pr. of SB 18.13631 in OMRO 67 (1987) 25 (= inv. F1948/3.4). To the kindness of Dr. M. Raven I owe the information that the Museum’s inventory numbers F 1942/10.6-17, and F 1948/3.1-5 all refer to Greek papyri coming from the collection of E. von Scherling. It is hoped that some of these texts may be published elsewhere in a forthcoming article.

I record here with gratitude the permission given by my colleague P. van Minnen to make use of some notes collected by himself long ago in Leiden on E. von Scherling’s collection.

Between 1931 and 1954 there appeared volumes 1 (1931); 2 (1932); 3 (1933); 4 (1937); 5 (1949); 6 (1952); and 7 (1954).
An analysis of the contents of various volumes follows.  

*Rotulus* 1 (1931) does not mention any papyrological material.  
*Rotulus* 2 (1932) mentions several Egyptian papyri and ostraka (#1412-1416, 1513-1515, 1521-1526, several of them [1515, 1521-1524] featuring drawings), six Greek papyri (#1502-1507), two Greek ostraka (#1508 [= #1419], 1509), and two Coptic texts on parchment (#1417, 1418). Some of these papyri and ostraka (cf. #1414, 1503, 1504, 1509, 1514) went to Minnesota.  

*Rotulus* 3 (1933) mentions #1599-1602, 1613-1614, 1696 (Egyptian and Coptic papyri and ostraka), and #1607-1609, 1701, 1726-1729 (Greek papyri). At present there is no clear evidence as to who bought these objects.  

*Rotulus* 4 (1937) mentions #1883-1899, 2007-2008 (Greek), 2009 (Coptic), 2043-2045 (Egyptian). Some of these went to Minnesota; one object ended up at Indiana University-Bloomington (#1883; for this item, cf. also *Rotulus* 6 [1952] #2351). #1897 (a drawing on papyrus) was offered again for sale in *Rotulus* 6 (1952) as #2352.  

*Rotulus* 5 (1949) mentions #2181-2193 (Greek literary papyri), 2194, 2194a, 2195-2207, 2261 (Greek letters and documents); 2208-2259, 2262 (various Coptic religious, magical, and documentary texts, among which inv. C 100, 48, 26, 77, 23, 109, 1, 4, 16, 3, 92, 89, 91, 24, 107, 98, 47, 90, 2, 19, 15, 3, 85, 10, 117, 39, 45, 27, 38, 72, 25, 29, 36, 6, 37, 99; Cm 13, 4, 11a/b, 12, 8, 6, 15, 14; Ca 18). #2194a, 2197, and 2206 were acquired by the Belastingmuseum in Rotterdam.  

*Rotulus* 6 (1952) mentions #2346-2347, 2349-2352 (offered for sale already in *Rotulus* 4 [1937] as #1897), 2353 (12 pieces in one batch), 2447-2457 (all Greek documents); 2354-2356 (Coptic texts, inv. C 32, 21, 138). Some of these objects (i.e. the 12 texts offered for sale under #2353) went to Minnesota; #2351 and 2451 (both in fact bilingual Greek-Latin texts) were bought by Mr. Poole, a printer from Chicago, and came later on to Indiana University-Bloomington.⁹ NB: for some unknown reason, the number 2348 was not assigned.  

*Rotulus* 7 (1954) mentions #2523-2526, 2584-2598, 2598a, 2599 (all Greek documents); 2599a (a Demotic document).  

A consolidated list of von Scherling inventory numbers reported in volumes of *Rotulus* 5–7 follows. (NB: *Rotulus* 4 does not yet present inventory numbers, but if objects were re-offered for sale in a subsequent volume of *Rotulus* with an inventory number, the entry number of the object in *Rotulus* 4 has been given within [ ].)  

---

⁹I owe this information to a personal communication from Ms. Becky Cape, librarian at Indiana University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>2584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2598a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>2189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>[1886]</td>
<td></td>
<td>2346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>[1889]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2598&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>2184</td>
<td></td>
<td>2598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>10</sup> NB: the description in Rotulus 7 (1954) 2598 for G 110/111 distinguishes this object from the descriptions for ##G 110 and G 111 in Rotulus 4 and 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>2451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>2353 #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>2591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td>2182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td>2198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td>2194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>2186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>2194a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>2202&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>2197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td>2190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td>2200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[235]</td>
<td>2261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>2353 #9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
<td>2181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>2188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>11</sup> The same number G 206 was also given sub #2208 to a Coptic fragment.
For only a limited number of von Scherling texts is it possible to give publication details (I add the original price asked by von Scherling):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotulus</th>
<th>inv. G</th>
<th>Publication/Catalogue</th>
<th>Offered for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (1933) #1726</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>SB 5.7524 (present location?)</td>
<td>US $95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (1937) #1883</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ChLA 11.1648 (Indiana University-Bloomington; cf. LDAB #9080)</td>
<td>GB £50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (1937) #188613</td>
<td>[99]</td>
<td>SB 20.14590 + Pack2 1189 (present location?)</td>
<td>GB £22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (1937) #188914</td>
<td>[110]</td>
<td>SB 26.16607 + Pack2 2274 (present location?)</td>
<td>GB £45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (1949) 36 #2194a</td>
<td>203</td>
<td><em>P.Batav.</em> 8 (Belastingmuseum Rotterdam inv. 95)</td>
<td>Dfl. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (1949) 36 #2197</td>
<td>210</td>
<td><em>P.Batav.</em> 11 (Belastingmuseum Rotterdam inv. 93)</td>
<td>Dfl. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (1949) 38 #2206</td>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>P. Batav.</em> 24 (Belastingmuseum Rotterdam inv. 94)</td>
<td>Dfl. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (1952) 23-24 #234615</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>SB 20.14590 + Pack2 118916</td>
<td>Dfl. 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (1954) 32 #2524</td>
<td>526</td>
<td><em>P.Select.</em> 24 (joins <em>P.Turner</em> 19)</td>
<td>Dfl. 240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other references to von Scherling papyri are found in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition/Catalogue</th>
<th>inv.</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

12 This same text was again offered for sale (again without an inventory number) in _Rotulus_ 6 (1952) #2351 for Dfl. 450.
13 This same text was offered for sale again in _Rotulus_ 6 (1952) #2346; see below.
14 Another text carrying the inventory number G 110/111 was offered for sale in _Rotulus_ 7 (1954) #2598 for Dfl. 26. Its present location is unknown.
15 For vol. 6 (1952) #2351, see above, n. 12.
16 This text was offered for sale in _Rotulus_ 4 (1937) #1886. In the summer of 2006 the object was auctioned by Christie’s in New York City and bought by a private collector. A photo is available at http://lhpc.arts.kuleuven.be/img/LDAB_1460.jpg.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition/Catalogue</th>
<th>inv.</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{P.Select.} 23</td>
<td>G 525</td>
<td>\textit{P.Select.} 23 introd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{SB} 5.7524 (present location ?)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>\textit{SB} 5.7524 introd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{SB} 6.9426 (Boulder, Colorado)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>\textit{CÉ} 34 (1959) 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{SB} 10.10569-10570 (British Museum)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>\textit{P.Turner}, p.93, n.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{ZPE} 119 (1997) 167, n. 1 (now in a private collection in the USA)</td>
<td>G 301</td>
<td>Inventory number not reported in \textit{ZPE}, but the text is stated to have been offered for sale in \textit{Rotulus} 5 (1949), #2193; the original inv. no. G 301 is given there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The collection of the Leiden Papyrological Institute also has a few von Scherling papyri:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPI inv.</th>
<th>von Scherling inv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>G 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>G 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>G 530 (the highest inventory number in the von Scherling collection?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>G 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sine numero</td>
<td>G 235 = \textit{Rotulus} 5 (1949) #2261, where it was offered for sale for Dfl. 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have not been able to match the first four items with any descriptions given in \textit{Rotulus}.

\[\text{[K.A. Worp]}\]

\[^{17}\text{See}\ http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/specialcollections/collections/archivalcolls.htm\ for\ Ms\ 105;\ on\ the\ other\ hand,\ Ms\ 106 = \textit{SB} 6.9426.\ I\ cannot\ escape\ the\ impression\ that\ ultimately\ both\ papyri\ came\ from\ the\ same\ original\ source\ mentioned\ for\ \textit{SB} 6.9426\ in\ \textit{CÉ} 34 (1959) 289.\]
Part 2: Some von Scherling Texts in Minnesota

Some of the scans of the University of Minnesota papyri on the website (see n. 2) can be read easily enough. With the kind permission of Mr. Tim Johnson of the Department of Special Collections and Rare Books of the University of Minnesota University Libraries we present a selection of texts with translation and commentary. Ms. M.J. Bakker prepared texts 3, 8, and 9 for publication, Ms. A.V. Bakkers performed this service for text 7. The remaining texts, 1, 2, 4-6, 10, and 11, were prepared for publication by K.A. Worp.

1. P.Minnesota 4: Declaration to a Strategus of the Oxyrhynchite Nome

Oxyrhynchus 9.5 (H.) x 5.7 (W.) cm AD 89-93/4

The papyrus was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling on December 22, 1937, after he had offered it for sale in Rotulus 4 (1937) #1893. It now carries the accession #762402. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Greek papyrus, portion from a document containing the name of the Emperor Domitian, verso blank, Egypt. Date: about 90 CE. Note: the dealer catalogue reads: ‘Claudios…Gajus Julius… to the Emperor Domitianus Germanicus.’” The verso is empty.

1 Κλαυδίῳ Ἀρείῳ [στρατηγῷ Ὀξυρυγχίτου]
2 Γάιος Ἰούλιος Κε . . . [ . . . · ὀμνύω Αὐτοκράτορα]
3 Καίσαρα Δομιτιαν[ὸν Σεβαστὸν . . . . . . .]
4 Γερμανικὸν ε . [ ca. 23 letters ]
5 Τανεχῶτιν Δι . [ ca. 18 letters ]
6 [ ] ἐν Ὀξυρύγ[χων πόλει. ca. 11 letters ]

---

18 We are most grateful to Mr. Johnson for his permission (by e-mail, 21 July 2006) to publish the texts on the basis of the images of papyri nos. 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21, and of ostrakon no. 1 as presented on the University of Minnesota Special Collections Library’s website (see n. 2).

A previous publication of a Minnesota papyrus is W. Nichipor and L. Ricketts, “A Ptolemaic Letter at the University of Minnesota,” BASP 18 (1981) 131-132 (= SB 16.12330; P.Minnesota 6, accession number 762404). This papyrus is said to come from Uppsala, but this must be the result of confusion, as at the same time it is indicated that it was purchased, along with two other texts from Uppsala (= our texts 1 and 2), from Erik von Scherling’s firm.
“To Claudius Areios, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite (nome), Gaius Iulius Ke--; I swear by Imperator Caesar Domitianus Augustus ... Germanicus, that ... Tanechotis, daughter of Di-, ... in the city of Oxyrhynchus ...”

The transcript above bears out the description in Rotulus 4 (1937) #1893. The name “Claudios” occurs in l. 1; l. 2 mentions a “Gajus Julius,” and “the Emperor Domitianus Germanicus” occurs in ll. 3-4, but not in the dative as the translation “to the Emperor ...” in Rotulus suggests. Moreover, in l. 4 there occurs a woman's name, Tanechotis, while l. 6 indicates that something happened in Oxyrhynchus. Unfortunately, little can be said about the precise content of this declaration on oath sent by Gaius Iulius Ke– to Claudius Areios, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome. The epsilon preserved at the end of l. 4 can be taken as the beginning of the infinitive expected to depend from ὀμνύω in l. 2, but one cannot tell whether it is simply the beginning of a present infinitive like εἰναι/ἐχειν, a perfect infinitive, or the beginning of a prefix like εἰσ-, ἐπι-, ἐκ- or ἐν-.

1 For the strategus Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Ἄρειος, see J.E.G.Whitehorne, Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt (Firenze 2006) 93: he was in office as strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome between 89-93/4 (cf. the date “ca. 90 A.D.” assigned to the piece in Rotulus), then became strategus of the Herakleides district of the Arsinoite nome (where he is attested between 98-101). The present supplement in the lacuna counts 19 letters, but it is conceivable that the original text featured some abbreviated words.

2 The present supplement of this line counts 16 letters, hence the three dots in the lacuna are meant to make up for the remainder. Supply, e.g., Κέλ[ρ, Κεφα[λας or Κεφα[λων. The traces of the third letter are, however, not easily compatible with either a lambda or a phi.

3-4 In comparison with ll. 1 and 2, the present supplement in l. 3, only 10 letters, does not fill the lacuna, but no word is needed between Σεβαστόν and Γερμανικόν. It is a counsel of despair to suppose a duplication of the word Σεβαστόν.

4 The women's name Tanechotis may be compared with two entries in B.W. Jones and J.E.G. Whitehorne, Register of Oxyrhynchites, 30 B.C.—96 A.D. (Chico 1983) #4611: Tan...is (P.Oslo 3.130.7, 2nd half1), and #4611: Tanechotes son of Horion, landholder in P.Oxy. 2.290.15 (83/4). The latter text reads in fact Τανεχω( ); hence the personal name may also be resolved as Τανεχῶ(τις). There is every reason to prefer an Egyptian female name in Τα-, and there is no ground for thinking that this person is the son rather than the daughter of Horion.
5 Perhaps one could read at line end Διδ̣, suggesting a name such as Didymos.

[K.A. Worp]


Provenance unknown 8.9 (H.) x 3.2 (W.) cm III AD

The papyrus was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling on December 22, 1937, after he had offered it for sale in *Rotulus* 4 (1937) #1891. It now carries the accession #762403. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Fragment from a private letter, end of lines missing, verso blank, Egypt. Date: 3rd century CE.”

---

1 traces
2 Αὐρηλία Ρ[. . . . . . . . . . . . . ομολο-]
3 γώ ἀπηλάχ[θαι πρὸς Αὐρήλιον]
4 Ὡρίωνα σ[. . . . . . καὶ ἀπεσχηκ-]
5 ναι μαι πα[. . . . . . καὶ οὐδέ-]
6 να λόγον ἔχ[ω καὶ οὐδὲν ἐγκα-]
7 λώ οὐδαί [ἐγκαλέσω ώς πρό-]
8 κείται καὶ ἐ[περωτ(ηθείσα) ψυμολόγησα.]
9 Αὐρήλιος Π[. . . . . . . . . . η]?
10 ἀδελφ[η μου [καὶ ἀπέσχομεν]
11 τὰ ἡμαίται[α πάντα καὶ ἔγρα-
12 ψα ύπερ αὐτή[ς μὴ εἰδυίης γράμμα-]
13 τὰ vacat

3 ἀπηλλάχ[θαι 5 με? 7 οὐδέ 11 ἡμέτερα 12 ψα: ψ corr. ex κ; αὐτή]ς: or αὐτῶ[ν?

“I, Aurelia R-, acknowledge to have become divorced from Aurelius Horion ... and that I have received (everything?) and that I have no claim and shall have no claim as stated above, and after I have been asked the formal question I have agreed. I, Aurelius P-, ... for my sister, and we have received our belongings, and I have written on her behalf as she does not know letters.”

This third-century text (note the use of Aurelius and the palaeography) apparently presents a receipt for certain goods returned to a woman Aurelia
R- (ll. 2), after she was divorced from her husband, Aurelius Horion (ll. 2-4). Apparently she stated that she had no further claim against him for now and in the future, and this part of the text concludes with the usual *stipulatio* formula (ll. 5-8). Then a man, Aurelius P-, occurs in l. 9; he apparently assisted his sister (ll. 9-10) in recovering “our belongings” (l. 11) and wrote for her as she was illiterate (ll. 11-13). For such receipts see H.-A. Rupprecht, *Studien zur Quittung* (München 1971) 43ff.

3 For the expression ἀπαλλάττομαι πρός τινα used by a woman divorcing from her husband, see *P.Münch*. 1.14.22.

4 Is this initial σ[ . . . . .   the beginning of a patronymic, or the beginning of the word σύμβιον?

5 Read: ναι με πάν[τα τὰ πράγματα, πάν[τα τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ, vel sim.?

9 After Αὐρήλιος Π, the ink trace on the edge of the papyrus might come from an alpha or a lambda. Supply in the lacuna συνέστηκα τῇ], συμπαρήμην τῇ], vel sim.?

[K.A. Worp]

3. *P.Minnesota 11: Request for the Payment for πυρὸς συναγοραστικός*

Oxyrhynchus 7.5 (H.) x 4 (W.) cm AD 99/100

The papyrus was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling in or after 1952, after he had offered it for sale in *Rotulus 6* (1952) 26, #2353.2 (his own inventory number was “G 25”). It now carries the accession #1381983. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Papyrus fragment, petition, Egypt, 1st cent. CE.” Light brown papyrus of medium quality, broken off on the left and at the bottom. The lacuna on the left contains 14-15 letters. 13 lines of writing are preserved. The hand is rather big and the letters are often separated from one another. In l. 14 a second, more cursive hand left only a few traces. The papyrus is glued to a piece of cardboard, which makes the verso inaccessible; probably it was empty.
8 [Τραιανοῦ Καίσαρος] τοῦ κυρίου
9 [άκολούθως τούτον ὑπὸ Πομπηίου
10 [Συνάντησε τοῦ κρατίστου ἡγεμόνι
11 [νος κελευθεῖσι] διά στὸν τολόγον ᾲφεως
12 [ca. 14] σὺν ταῖς εἰς
13 [ca. 14] ἔδει Ἰπποδάμου
14 (m.2) [ca. 14] Θμοινεψβ(θ)ως . [   ]
15 [ca. 15] [. . .] [. . .] . . . [   ]

3 δέομαι 5 τιμῆς 14 Θμοινεψβ[θ]ως Παρ.

“To Dius, strategus (of the Oxyrhynchite nome?), from N.N. son of Eudaimon, native of the city of Oxyrhynchus. I request authority for the payment out of the public treasury of the (drachmas) owed to me on account of the price of the requisitioned wheat which I measured out into the state granary from the crop of the 2nd year of Traianus Caesar the lord in accordance with the orders of Pompeius Planta, the most excellent prefect, through the sitologoi of Ophis … chile of Hippodamus … of (?) Thmoinepsobthis …”

The papyrus contains a request for the refund of the price of πυρὸς συναγοραστικός, addressed to the nome strategus. Other documents of this type listed in the HGV (accessed November 2006) are: P.Oxy. 41.2958-2960, 47.3335, and 57.3910, where further literature on πυρὸς συναγοραστικός is cited. P.Oxy. 41.2958-2959 are very similar to this text. For Dius strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome and Pompeius Planta prefect of Egypt, see P.Oxy. 57.3910 introd. and, most recently, J.E.G. Whitehorne, Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt2 (Firenze 2006) 94. This papyrus can be added to the so called “archive” of the strategus Dius (P.Oxy. 57.3910 introd.).

In this text the amount concerned is not preserved, nor is an exact date. The “second year” mentioned in l. 7 is probably the past year of the reign of Trajan, as in P.Oxy. 41.2958-2959 and 47.3335. The papyrus can then be dated in his third year, 99/100.

1 In the lacuna there is space for the supplement Ὀξ(υρυγχίτον), as in P.Oxy. 57.3910.1 and 67.4584.2. There are, however, also cases in which Ὀξ(υρυγχίτον) is left out (P.Oxy. 41.2958-2959.1 and 47.3905.1); hence it is uncertain whether Ὀξ(υρυγχίτον) was really written.

2 Eudaimon is the patronymic of the sender whose name, if the present restoration is accepted, should contain no more than approximately eight letters. For possible identification of Eudaimon, see B.W. Jones and J.E.G. White-
Some von Scherling Texts in Minnesota

horn, Register of Oxyynchites, 30 B.C. – 96 A.D. (Chico 1983) 87-88, e.g. ##1642, 1644, 1665, or, in case the article τοῦ was left out and the sender had an even longer name, ##1649, 1652.

2-3 For τῶν ἀπὸ Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως, cf., e.g., P.Oxy. 49.3466.3.

6 In P.Oxy. 41.2958-2959 γενήματος τοῦ διελθόντος β (ἐτους) follows πυροῦ συναγοραστικοῦ.

7 For εἰς δημόσιον θησαυρόν after οὗ ἐμέτρησα, see P.Oxy. 41.2960.21-22; in P.Oxy. 57.3910.14-15 one finds ἐμετρήσαμεν(ν) εἰς δημό(σιον), not followed by θησαυρόν. Based on the size of the lacuna, I have abbreviated δημ(όσιον) instead of δημό(σιον) (as in P.Oxy. 57.3910.15), but at the same time it is possible to fill the lacuna with [εἰς τὸ δημόσιον γ]ενήμα(τος).

Probably we are dealing with the past (διελθόντος) second year, as in P.Oxy. 41.2958-2959. Cf. P.Oxy. 47.3335.10, where διελθόντος is not written either. There it is certain that it is the past second year, because the text is dated in the third year of Trajan in l. 24.

8 A rather short title is used here; cf. P.Oxy. 41.2960.20-21, where only θεοῦ Νέρουα is written. Besides Καίσαρος, Αρίστου may be considered (cf. P. Bureth, Les titulatures impériales [Brussels 1964] 48-49), but the formula with Καίσαρ is much more frequent, while the epithet Ἀρίστος is not expected before September 114 (= Trajan’s 18th year); cf. D. Kienast, Römische Kaiserbelle (Darmstadt 1996) 123. The supplement here (16 letters) seems rather long, but the lacuna is in fact 1-2 letters bigger in ll. 8-10. Moreover, no other titles better suit the lacuna and the following τοῦ κυρίου.

10-11 At the end of l. 10 there is some space left after ἡγεμ. This suggests that the word ends here and is abbreviated. The last three letters of ἡγεμόνος are needed, however, to fill the lacuna in l. 11. Perhaps the scribe knew he could not fit in voς at the end of line 10 and decided to stop after ἡγεμο, to avoid the awkward break ἡγεμόνος?

11 Ophis is a village in the ἀπηλιώτου τοπαρχία of the Oxyrhynchite nome; see P. Pruneti, I centri abitati dell’Ossirinchite (Firenze 1981) 227; Calderini, Dizionario 5:182-183, Supplemento 2:248, 3:167, and 4:147. The Minnesota text provides the earliest dated attestation of the villag so far.

12 One expects the amount of drachmas requested, as in P.Oxy. 41.2958.13 and 47.3335.15-16, or the month in which the wheat was paid, as in P.Oxy. 41.2959.13-14. Neither seems to fit the preserved letters. It is not clear what this passage is referring to. For the combination σὺν τὰῖς εἰς + a personal name in the accusative, see P.Coll.Youtie 1.29.4; P.Fam.Tebt. 26.4.9; P.Mich.
4.1.223.1622, 2906; 224.4913; 4.2.358B.19. However, in all these cases one is dealing with men paying taxes, in the name of women. Σὺν ταῖς εἰς then means: “(N.N. paid the taxes) together with the (taxes) chargeable to N.N. (female).”

13 Hippodamus is probably the name of the father of N.N., whose name ends in ]δην (accusative). To fill the whole lacuna (of 14-15 letters) with the beginning of one long masculine name ending in -δης is problematic (a female name in -δη is theoretically conceivable). Various possibilities are listed in the Konträrindex that comes with the WörterListen (long names in -δης, like Αριστονικίδης or Ταηρακλείδης, both of which are still too short, and one name in -δη, Ρόδη, which is much too short). Another possibility is that we are dealing with two names, combined with καί, “also known as;” cf. P.Coll. Youtie 1.29.5: εἰς Ὀνήσιμον τ(ὸν) καὶ Ἡρακλείδην. For Hippodamus, cf. Jones and Whitehorne, Register of Oxyhynchites, #2385, although it is uncertain if this is the same Hippodamus.

14 Thmoinepsobthis is a village in the ἀπηλιώτου τοπαρχία of the Oxyrhynchite, attested from 57/8 (P.Köln 3.141.11); see Pruneti, I centri abitati, 57.

[M.J. Bakker]

4. P.Minnesota 12²: Receipt for the Price of Green Fodder

Provenance unknown 3.8 (H.) x 3 (W.) cm AD 120/1

The papyrus was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling in or after 1952, after he had offered it for sale in Rotulus 6 (1952) 26, #2353.3 (his own inventory number was “G 63”). It now carries the accession #1381984. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Papyrus fragment. Receipt for green (fodder?). Date: 5th year of Hadrian, 120-121 CE”. The verso is empty.

1 (Έτους) ε Ἁδρ[ιανοῦ Καίσαρος]
2 τοῦ κυρίου [month + day]
3 Ἐσχομεν [tò αἱροῦν σοι]
4 μέρος ἀ[πὸ τιμῆς χόρτου]
5 χλωροῦ . [ ]

“Year 5 of Hadrian Caesar the Lord, [month, day]. We received the part falling to you from the price of green fodder …”
For similar receipts of an amount of money as payment for (green) fodder, see, e.g., *O.Bodl.* 2.1689-1692 (II-III), *BGU* 19.2794 (VI), *P.Charite* 15 col. 1.11-15 (330), *P.Col.* 7.141 cols. 2, 4, ii,iv (310), *P.Flor.* 3.336 (VII), *P.Hamb.* 1.71 (149), *P.Herm.* 26.9 (V), *P.Köln* 3.146 (10 BC), and *P.Lond.* 2. 287 (pp. 202-203; AD 90).

[K.A. Worp]

5. *P.Minnesota* 13: Declaration of Exemption from Prosecution

Provenance unknown 8 (H.) x 5 (W.) cm AD 140/1

The papyrus was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling in or after 1952 after he had offered it for sale in *Rotulus* 6 (1952) 26, #2353.4 (his own inventory number was “G 24”). It now carries the accession #1381985. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Papyrus fragment. Contract. Date: 4th year of Antoninus Pius, 141 CE”. The papyrus is now pasted on paper or cardboard, and therefore the verso is inaccessible; probably it was uninscribed.

4 μηδενὸς 12 ανε]γκλησιας Pap.; γράμματα

(ll. 7-15) “… to make use of neither … nor the subscriptions in any way whatsoever. And having been interrogated by you about whether this settlement has been reached in correct and acceptable form I have agreed. This
document of exemption from prosecution is authoritative … Year 4 of Imperator Caesar Antoninus Pius Augustus …”

Apparently one is dealing with a declaration of exemption from prosecution, an “indemnity” (l. 12). The University of Minnesota collection has another such document, text 7 (q.v.). Unfortunately the original is much mutilated, and the wording of the text cannot be fully restored with confidence, as exact parallel documents seem to be lacking. Lines 1-5 feature word combinations occurring occasionally in clauses about claims no longer (to be) made by one party against another party in connection with a divorce and the division of goods (= διαίρεσις) resulting from it, but it is also possible that we are dealing with the settlement of a dispute (= διάλυσις).

1 Should ἐγκαλεῖν or ἐγκαλέσιν be read? Cf. l. 3n.

2 At line end, read τὸ or τῷ ν?

3 The phrase here occurs, e.g., in P.Berl.Möller 1.11: μήτε περὶ βιβλιδίων ἡ[ ca. 8 μήτε περὶ μηδενός ἀπαξαπλώς ἐγ]γράφου <ἡ> ἀγράφου πράγματον (I. πράγματος) τρόπῳ μηδενὶ κατὰ μηδεμιᾶν παρεύρεσιν; PSI 7.775.10-14: καὶ μηδὲν ἐ[γκαλεῖν] | | [σοι μηδὲ] ἐγκαλέσιν (I. ἐγκαλέσιν) μηδὲ ἐπε[λεύσεσθαι] | [μήτε περὶ τοῦτον μήτε πε[ρὶ ἄλλου] | [μηδενὸς ἀ]πλώς ἐνγράφου ἢ ἀγρά[φου πράγμα] | [ματος. Similarly phrased are P.Stras. 6.512.6-8; P.Fam.Tebt. 20.30-3; P.Harris 1.141.4-6; cf. also P.Oxy. 2.268.16-7; 14.1645.11; 31.2583.17; 35.2970.13; 43.3139.8ff.; P.Wash.Univ. 1.19.10; M.Chr. 162.27; BGU 4.1113.16; 1155.29; 1165.23; 1168.16.

3-4 Read δἱ[αμέσεως or δἱ[αλύσεως?

4 Though interchange between τ/δ and ε/ι is common enough in the papyri (cf. Gignac, Grammar 1:82, 251ff.) I cannot convince myself that δενὸς is an error for τινος.

9 Cf. P.Stras. 6.512.13: μηδένα τρόπον, before which the preposition κατὰ should be restored.

13 Probably the start of this line contained a clause concerning the number of copies written, i.e. ἀπλά, δισσά or even τρισσά γραφέντα.

15 One expects at the end of the line the name of a month (abbreviated by a horizontal dash?).

[K.A. Worp]
6. P. Minnesota 16: Fragments of Two (?) Epikrisis Applications

Oxyrhynchus 12.5 (H. x 8.5 (W.) cm in/after AD 188/9

The papyrus was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling in or after 1952, after he had offered it for sale in *Rotulus* 6 (1952) 26, #2353.7 (his own inventory number was “G 107”). It now carries the accession #1381988. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Papyrus fragment. Census return. Date: 188 CE.” The verso is empty.

1 [ ] . . . ( ) β . . . ρ ( )
2 [ ] . αὐτῶν Ἀρσινό[ι?]?
3 [ ] ἐπ’ ἀμφόδ(ου) Μυροβ(αλάνου), καὶ τόν [ ]
4 [ ] . ου ἐπικ(ερίσθαι) ψφ’ ἃν καθή[και καὶ ἀναγράφεσθαι
ev τῇ πρός τό ]
5 [ ] κ[θ] Αὔρηλιου Κοιμόδου [ κατ’ οἰκίαν ἀπογραφή ]
6 [ ] ἐπ’ ἀμφόδ(ου) Θοη(ρ ) ἐξ α[τό]υ(ου), καὶ τόν [τοῦ πατρός τῆς μητρός τοῦ]
7 [ ] μου π[ρο]ποππο[ν] ἐπικ(ερίσθαι) ἐν εἴδι τῶν τῷ [γ καὶ δ ἐτεί Νέρωνος ὑπὸ Κουρτίου Παυλίνου χιλιάρχου ἐπικεκριμένων]
8 [ ] ἐπ’ ἀμφόδ(ου) [, καὶ τόν πατ(έρα) αὐτῆς Λμόιν [proσβ(άντα) εἰς (τρισκαιδεκαετεῖς) τῷ έτει θεοῦ N.N.]
9 [ ] ἐπικεκρίσθ(αι) ἐπ’ ἀμφό[δ] δ(ου) Δεκάτης vacat [ ]
10 [ ] µη. Ἡρώου vacat [ ]
11 [ ] Ἐτάγη ]ος Διονυσίου τοῦ Πλούταρχου μ[ητρός N.N.]
12 [ ] αὐτοῦ[συν]ηνεψις Πτολλά[ρ]χου[τοῦ Πλούταρχου όθεν παραγενόμενος εἰς τήν τούτου ἐπίκρισιν δηλώ κατὰ τήν γενομένην]
13 [ ] ἐν τῷ ε[έτει] Θεοῦ Ο[ξεσα]πασιοῦ(α) ἐπίκ(ερίσθαι) τόν τοῦ προσβ(αβίνοντος) πρόσ(αππον) Π[ ] ἐπ’ ἀμφόδ(ου)
14 [ ] ἀκολούθως α[ί]ς αὐτοῦ ἐπήνεγ[κ(εν) ἀποδ(είξεσι)] ώς ὃ πάππ(ος) αὐτοῦ [ ] ἐστιν
15 [ ] ἐν τῇ τοῦ λ[ί] θεοῦ Ο[ξεσα]πασιοῦ(α) προσβ(αβίνοντος) πάππ(ον) Πτολλα[ ] προσβ(άντα) εἰς (τρισκαιδεκαετεῖς) τῷ έτε[ι Θεοῦ N.N. ἐπικεκρίσθαι] ἐπὶ ταῖς προκ(ειμέναις) ἀποδ(είξεσι)
16 [ ] ἐπ’ ἀμφόδ(ου) τοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸν πατ(έρα) αὐτοῦ[υ] Διον(ύσιον) προσβ(άντα) εἰς (τρισκαιδεκαετεῖς) τῷ x έτει Θεοῦ N.N. ἐπικεκρίσθαι]
[ἐπὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς] ἀποδ(είξεσι) ἐπ’ ἀμφόδ(ου) τ[ο]ῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν τῆς μη[τρὸς πατ(έρα) ]

18 Διόσκορον προσβ(άντα) εἰς (τρισκαιδεκαετεῖς) τῷ ιβ ἔτει θεοῦ ἐπικεκρίσθαι ἐπὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς ἀποδ(είξεσι) ἐπ’ ἀμφόδ(ου)

7 εἴδει 11 Διονυσίου: ν over a horizontal dash? 12 συγγενής

(2) “... of them, Arsino[ë (?) ... (3) ... in the town quarter of Myrobalanos and that the ... (4) ... was selected by the persons in charge and was registered in the (5) house-to-house census for the 29th year of Aurelius Commodus ... (6) ... in the town quarter of (the dromos/temple of) Thoëris according to the first roll, and that the (7) great-grandfather of the father of the mother of my ... was selected (and mentioned as such) in a document of those who were selected in the years 3 and 4 of Nero by Curtius Paulinus, tribune, (8) in the town quarter of (…), and that her father Amois, when he became 13 years old in the xth year of the deified emperor N.N. was selected in the town quarter of Dekate (10) (…) town quarter of Heroon. (11) There was registered -os son of Dionysios son of Ploutarchos, his mother being N.N. ... (12) ... his relative Ptollas son of Saras son of Ploutarchos ...; therefore, coming to the examination of this person I report that during the examination that took place (13) in the fifth regnal year of the deified emperor Vespasian the great-grandfather of the candidate, P-, was selected in the town quarter ... (14) according to the documents of proof which he produced to the effect that his grandfather N.N. figured (already) (15) in the list drawn up in the 34th year of Augustus, and that the grandfather of the candidate, Ptolla-, after having become 13 years old in the xth year of the deified emperor N.N. was selected on the basis of the aforementioned documents of proof (16) in the same town quarter, and that his father Dionysios, having become 13 years old in the xth year of the deified emperor N.N. had been selected (17) on the basis of the same documents of proof in the same town quarter, and that his maternal father ... (18) ... Dioskoros having become 13 years old in the 12th year of the deified (emperor) A- was selected on the basis of he same documents of proof in the town quarter of ...

Though the description in Rotulus states that this fragment is a census return, this is in fact part of one or two epikrisis applications from Oxyrhynchus; see the frequent use of the (abbreviated) perfect infinitive ἐπικεκρίσθαι (ll. 4, 7, 13), the (also abbreviated) noun ἐπίκρισις (l. 13), and various Oxyrhynchite amphoda (cf. ll. 3, 6, 9, 10 and the notes ad loc.). The most comprehensive study of this type of document is given by C.A. Nelson, Status Declarations in Ro-
man Egypt (Amsterdam 1979). The selection (epikrisis) of civilians concerned mainly the categories of the metropolites (cf. Nelson, Chapter II, esp. pp. 16-19 + addenda, p. vi), the gymnasial class (cf. Nelson, Chapter III, pp. 26-30 + addenda, p. vii), and the council of the elders (gerousia; cf. Nelson, Chapter VIII + addenda, p. viii). Similar status declarations from Oxyrhynchus are (in chronological order):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolites</th>
<th>Gymnasial class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 22.15210 = P.Ryl. 2.278 (67-79p)</td>
<td>PSI 7.731 (88/9p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. 2.258 = W.Chr. 216 (86/7p?)</td>
<td>P.Oxy. 2.257 = W.Chr. 147 (94/5p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. 7.1028 (86p)</td>
<td>P.Oxy. 10.1266 (98p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. 67.4584 (100/1p)</td>
<td>SB 14.11271 (117p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Wisc. 1.17 (106p)</td>
<td>P.Oxy. 12.1452 col. 2 (127/8p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. 4.714 (122p)</td>
<td>P.Oxy. 46.3276-3284 (148/9p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. 12.1452 col. 1 (127/8p)</td>
<td>P.Oxy. 22.2345 (224p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. 3.478 = W.Chr. 218 (133p)</td>
<td>P.Oxy. 18.2186 (260p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. 8.1109 (160/1p)</td>
<td>PSI 5.457 (269p or 276p?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. 67.4585 (189p)</td>
<td>P.Turner 38 (274/5p or 280/1p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI 12.1230 (203p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 22.15211 = P.Oxy. 10.1306 (215/6p)</td>
<td>SB 6.9161 (212-269p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 6.9162 (212-269p)</td>
<td>SB 22.15626 (276-282p)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the Oxyrhynchite applications for admission to the gerousia are P.Wisc. 2.56 (209p); PSI 12.1240 (222p); P.Oxy. 43.3099-3102 (225/6p); P.Ryl. 4.599 (226p); and SB 8.9901 (235p).

A comparison between the formulas found in the much damaged text above and various better preserved texts shows that our text(s) apparently contained one or more applications for admission to the status of the gymnasial class (cf. below, notes to ll. 13, 15). At the same time, the rather incomplete state of the present papyrus raises questions, the more so as the precise size of the lacunae at either side of a line is unknown, and restored elements can be moved from the end of a given line to the beginning of the next line.

---

In its preserved form the papyrus contains two sections, ll. 1-9 and ll. 11-18. I will first analyze second section.

Line 11 apparently contains the name of the applicant/candidate himself: N.N., son of Dionysios and mother N.N., grandson of Ploutarchos.

Line 12 apparently presents the name of a relative of the preceding person, i.e. Ptollas, son of Saras, grandson of Ploutarchos. One may assume that the relative represented the interests of the person in l. 11, because that person was still a minor. The exact nature of the relation between these two people is not known, but if the two men named Ploutarchos were in fact one person, their grandsons may have been nephews/cousins. Thereafter, the application itself presents the lineage of the applicant.

Lines 13-15 mention an application presented in the fifth regnal year of the emperor Vespasian (72/3) by the applicant's great-grandfather and stating that the grandfather of that great-grandfather had already been mentioned in a list drawn up in the year 4/5.

Lines 15-16 mention an application presented by the applicant's grandfather in an unknown year, one generation later than that of the preceding generation (perhaps for the epikrisis of the year 98 or 117?).

Lines 16-17: an application sent in by the applicant's father in an unknown year that is presumably again a generation later.

Reckoning one generation as approximately 35 years on average (cf. the lapse of time between the application of 72/3 and the list of 4/5) and adding 3 x 35 = 105 years to the year 72/3 would take us to 177/8, not far from the 29th year of the reign of Commodus (= 188/9) referred to in line 5 (cf. note ad loc.).

Lines 17-19 refer to an epikrisis of the applicant's maternal grandfather in a 12th regnal year in the second century which cannot be pinpointed more closely than Hadrian 12 or Antonius Pius 12 (see note to l. 18).

I will next attempt to analyze the even more fragmentarily preserved first section of the text (ll. 1-10).

Lines 2-3 contain a reference to a person in the Oxyrhynchite town quarter of Myrobalanos. Line 2 seems to mention a woman named Arsinoe; she may have been an applicant’s mother.

Lines 3-4 contain a reference to an epikrisis of an unknown person belonging to an unknown (earlier?) generation; reference seems to be made to the census of the 29th year of Commodus, i.e. 188/9.

Lines 6-8: reference to the epikrisis of a great-grandfather (= the great-grandfather of the father of the applicant’s mother?) in an epikrisis under Nero.

Lines 8-9: reference to the (much later) epikrisis of the father of the applicant’s mother.
Line 10 presents a reference to the Oxyrhynchite town quarter Heroon, but its link with the preceding lines and the context in general is not quite clear; is this line rather to be taken as a kind of “header” preceding the following lines 11ff., where no name of a town quarter can be read?

Unfortunately, the precise position of l. 5 (cf. the note ad loc.) within the part of an *epikrisis* application that seems to give the maternal lineage of an applicant over a series of earlier generations (starting in l. 3 with the grandfather of the father of the applicant’s mother?) remains unclear. Likewise, the precise nature of the link between the two sections in this text, ll. 1-9 and ll. 11-18 is hard to pin down.

2 As the document appears to come from Oxyrhynchus, there is no reason to assume a toponym Arsinoe vel sim. Probably the preserved Αρσινόη is part of the well-known woman’s name Αρσινόη; cf. l. 8n.

4 Cf. *P.Oxy*. 22.2345.4, where the reading ἀφ’ ὧν [προσέ]βην καὶ τετάχθαι proposed by P.J. Sijpesteijn (see *BL* 7:148) should be reconsidered. The photo now available on the Internet allows me to read here ψφ’ ὧν [καθ]ήκε[,] a reading paralleled by the text of the Minnesota papyrus. The restoration of the infinitive τετάχθαι in the lacuna then becomes redundant.

5 Apparently this is a reference to a regnal year of the emperor Commodus while he was sole emperor (180-192; the lack of a word θεός seems to indicate that he is not yet deified). Indeed, one finds his regnal year 29 = 188/9 connected with a census year in Egypt.

6 Θοή(ρ): for the Oxyrhynchite town quarters Δρόμου Θοήριδος and Θοηρείου Θενεπί, see S. Daris in *ZPE* 132 (2000) 215, 216; in his view, both names refer to the same topographical entity. If the first name is intended here, its element Δρόμου was appently omitted for some reason (or one could resolve Θοή(ριδος Δρόμου)); if the second name is intended, its second element should also be included in the resolution of the abbreviation.

For the phrasing εξ α τόμ(ου), “according to the 1st roll,” in such an *epikrisis* document, see the application for the gerousia in *P.Wisc*. 2.56.2, 5, 26 (209).

6-7 For the supplement in the lacunae at the right-hand side of l. 6 and the beginning of l. 7, see *P.Oxy*. 22.2345.5.

7 The expression ἐν εἴδι (l. εἴδει) occurs only in two applications for admission to the Oxyrhynchite gymnasial class: *P.Oxy*. 46.3279.19 (148: ἐν εἴδει τῶν τῷ γ (ἔτει) καὶ δ (ἔτει) Νέρωνος ὑπὸ Κουρτίου Παυλείνου χιλιάρχου ἐπικεκριμένων) and *P.Mich*. 14.676.12 (272; ἐν εἴδει τῶν τῷ γ (ἔτει) καὶ δ (ἔτει) Νέρωνος ὑπὸ Κουρτίου Παυλείνου χιλιάρχου ἐπικεκριμένων (for the corrected
reading of the second year numeral as \textit{delta} rather than \textit{epsilon}, see michigan. apis.1549 on the \textit{APIS} website.

8 For the phrasing καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῆς, see \textit{P.Oxy.} 18.2186.9. Somewhere in the preceding part of the document a woman (most probably the applicant’s mother) appears to have been mentioned. This may be the Arsinoe in l. 2 (cf. the note \textit{ad loc}.)


10 For the Oxyrhynchite town quarter Ἠρῴου, see S. Daris \textit{ZPE} 132 (2000) 216. Is this preceded by an abbreviation for μη(τροπόλεως)?

13 For references to the fifth year of \textit{divus} Vespasianus (72/3) in applications for admission to the Oxyrhynchite gymnasial class, see \textit{P.Oxy.} 2.257 = \textit{W.Chr.} 147.13 (94/5), \textit{P.Oxy.} 10.1266.4, 24 (98), \textit{SB} 14.11271.2 (117), \textit{P.Oxy.} 12.1452 col. 2.44 (127/8), 46.3276.10, 3278.13, 3279.13, 3282.14, 3283.10 (all five 148/9), 22.2345.6 (224), 18.2186.7 (260), \textit{P.Mich.} 14.676.4 (272), \textit{PSI} 5.457.8 (269 or 276?), \textit{P.turner} 38 col. 1.8 (274/5 or 280/1). The name missing in the lacuna could be Π[λούταρχον (cf. l. 11) or Π[τολλάν (cf. ll. 12, 15).

15 For the wording ἐν τῇ τοῦ λδ (ἔτους ) Καίσαρος γρα(φῇ) in applications for admission to the Oxyrhynchite gymnasial class, see \textit{P.Oxy.} 2.257 = \textit{W.Chr.} 147.21, 37 (94/5), 10.1266.11 (98), \textit{SB} 14.11271.5 (117), \textit{P.Oxy.} 12. 1452 col. 2.54 (127/8), 66.3276.16, 3283.15 (both 148/9), 18.2186.4 (260), and \textit{PSI} 5.457.10 (269 or 276?). This list of people belonging to the gymnasial class was drawn up in year 34 of Augustus = 4/5.

18 Which 12th regnal year is meant here? Probably the present text was written sometime during the reign of Commodus (cf. l. 5n.), so this 12th year should refer to a deified predecessor whose name starts with an \textit{alpha}, i.e. Hadrian (year 12 = 127/8) or Antoninus Pius (year 12 = 148/9) or – for various reasons unlikely – Marcus Aurelius (year 12 = 171/2). Given, however, that both Hadrian’s year 12 and Antoninus’ year 12 are connected with \textit{epikrisis} applications (cf. the list above), it is impossible to make a choice between these emperors.

[K.A. Worp]
7. *P.Minnesota 17: Declaration of Exemption from Prosecution*

Provenance unknown 7 (H.) 7 x 11 (W.) cm 5 May AD 191

The papyrus was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling in or after 1952, after he had offered it for sale in *Rotulus* 6 (1952) 26, #2352.8 (his own inventory number was “G 12”). It now carries the accession #1381989. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Papyrus fragment, Act of indemnity, reign of Commodus, 10th Pachon of the 31st year. Date 191 CE.”

Fragment of a medium brown papyrus of medium quality, broken off at the top and on the left-hand side. There is a lower margin of ca. 3 cm and a space of ca. 0.8 cm between ll. 3 and 4. One horizontal and at least three vertical folds are visible (the left-hand fold only partially preserved, in ll. 5-6); the latter divides the papyrus into three parts. Presumably a quarter of the papyrus is missing at the left-hand side. There are small holes in the papyrus, and a large one on the third fold in ll. 1-4, offering space for 2-3 letters in l. 4 and (at the most) 7 in l. 1. There are four hands, of which the first two look similar in their inexperience and broad, loose lettering. The second hand probably started at the end of l. 1; the third hand begins in l. 2. The latter features bigger, more fluidly written letters, while it consumed more ink. The fourth hand (in l. 4) looks like the third; it is a reasonably experienced hand with some ligatures, but again most letters are detached and in a wider format. Because of the different hands the number of letters in the left-hand lacuna varies. By restoring the dating formula in l. 6 it appears that ca. 5 letters are missing in ll. 5-6 (in fact, there is only a minimal trace of the dotted alpha in l. 6); comparing the amount of space taken by five letters in the fourth hand, it appears that in l. 1 ca. 7 letters, in l. 2 ca. 12 letters, in l. 3 ca. 9 letters, and in l. 4 ca. 7 letters are missing. The papyrus is glued to a piece of cardboard, making the verso inaccessible.

---

1 [. . μοι ἡ ἀνεγκλησία ώς πρ[όκειται. (m. 2) N.N. ]
2 [. . . . . . . μοι ἡ ἀνεγκλησία ώς πρόκειται. (m. 3) Σω. [. . . . ] o . . . [ ]
3 [. . . . . . . . . . μοι ἡ ἀνεγκλησία ώς πρ[όκειται.
4 (m. 4) [. . . . . . . . . . .] νης κεχρημάτικα [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . αση . [ ]
5 [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Έστους λα Αὐρηλίου Κομμόδου
6 [Καίσ]βαρος τού κυρίου, Παχών δεκάτη.

6 Παχών: χ corr. (ex u?)

“… the act of exemption from prosecution (came to me) as aforesaid. N.N.: the act of exemption from prosecution (came to me) as aforesaid. So- son of
N.N. (?): the act of exemption from prosecution (is agreeable/came) to me as aforesaid. I, -nes, have registered … In the 31st year of Aurelius Commodus Caesar the Lord, on the tenth of Pachon.”

As the body of the contract is missing, one can only speculate about its contents, while using two parallels: P.Stras. 4.280 and (probably) PHarr. 2.228. Both are ἀνεγκλησίαι, i.e. a type of document used for resolving a dispute. The word ἀνεγκλησία is found predominantly in papyri; see LSJ s.v., where only its attestation in P.Lips. 1.29.13 (295) is mentioned. So far there are 12 attestations in the papyri, all from II-IV AD, and we can now add 5.12 (140/1) and 7.1-23 (191). The TLG gives only Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica 6.10.10.5, and Oecumenius, Fragm. in Epist. ad Philippienses, p. 453.10.12. The word ἀνεγκλησία is often translated as “act of indemnity,” but the English is ambiguous. On the basis of the entries “indemnify” and “indemnity” in The Concise Oxford Dictionary (Oxford 1964) two interpretations of the word “indemnity” seem possible: (1) Party X writes out a contract for party Y to secure the latter from harm or loss, or to compensate for losses incurred; (2) Party Y has already been compensated in some way and now writes out a document for party X, to secure, exempt party X against, from (further) legal responsibility (i.e. party X will no longer be sued by party Y to pay). The Greek term ἀνεγκλησία, however, does not allow both interpretations of the English term. It is a negative noun derived from ἐγκαλέω, “to bring a charge or accusation against someone, to prosecute, take proceedings against.” An ἀνεγκλησία therefore only covers the second interpretation of the English term and is thus to be seen as only an “act of exemption from prosecution.”

In its original form the present text will have described: (1) the conflict between two parties, i.e. an acknowledging party (one or more unknown in-
dividends) and a sued party (comprising here at least three persons), (2) the ensuing legal actions taken, (3) the settlement reached, (4) the clause in which the ὁμολογῶν party agrees not to proceed against the other anymore, and (5) the kyria clause (the ἀνεγκλησία is “authoritative”). Thereafter both parties subscribed the agreement, one (lost) in the active form as in P.Stras. 4.280 (οὐδὲ ἐνκαλέσω), the other three in a passive form, “the ἀνεγκλησία came to me” (see below, ll. 1-3n.).

1-3 It is likely that all three preserved subscriptions followed the same formula. Which verb had ἀνεγκλησία as its subject (cf. the article ἡ in l. 3) and governed the dative μοι (restored in ll. 1 and 2 after the model of l. 3)? When searching the parallels (see n. 21) for verbs used in connection with the term ἀνεγκλησία, only P.Lips. 1.29.13 produces ἔθετο (in PSI 8.951.9 θέσθαι is supplemented in the lacuna; cf. n.), but this is not in the subscription. Moreover, no form of τίθημι fits the trace in l. 3 here, which can only be ε or (less likely) σ. A more likely possibility is the verb γεγονε23 or the phrase συμφωνεῖ μοι ἡ ἀνεγκλησία; see P.Oxy. 22.2348.51 (224), συμφωνεῖ μοι πάντα. The three subscribers in this papyrus were (part of) the party against whom, according to the lost part of the document, no more charges would be brought; cf. the situation in P.Lips. 1.29 and probably P.Harr. 2.228; this document was not a mutual agreement to stop proceeding, as seems the case in P.Stras. 4.280.24

2 At the end there may be a personal name in So-, followed by a patronymic. The penultimate letter has a long descending stroke; one may consider here a reading σ ο προ[γεγραμμένον/-κείμενον/-δηλωθείς, vel sim. It is not likely that more letters were written in l. 2 after the omicron, and as there are only approximately 9 letters missing to the left in l. 3, which included at least the verb, it cannot have been written in full (like πρόκειται).

---

23 The phrase “(name + patronymic) γέγονε εἰς με (Noun) καθώς πρόκειται” is used in numerous subscriptions. The fact that in our text μοι is used instead of εἴς με should pose no problem; see P.Tebt. 2.388.35-37, where, after the subscription of the ὁμολογῶν party, the beneficiary subscribes with Ζω[ίλος | Ἁρμιύσις γέγονέ μυ ἡ ὁμολογία | καθώς πρόκειται. μυ has been corrected in the DDBDP to μοι; the photograph on the APIS website shows this to be correct. K.A. Worp, in “P. Oxy. I 37.8-9: Who got the contract?,” BASP 33 (1996) 69-72 takes the phrase as an expression of the physical possession of (a copy of) a document by the beneficiary. This interpretation was rejected by D. Hagedorn, “Noch ein Mal: Who got the Contract?,” ZPE 123 (1998) 177-180. For other attestations of γέγονε + μοι, see P.Ross.Georg. 5.22.17 and O.Claud. 1.166.6.

24 They agree not to proceed etc. against each other ever again (ll. 11-19), cf. ll. 11-12: καὶ μὴ ἐγ’ καλείν ἀλλη; comparing a frequently enough occurring formula this phrase can be supplemented in the lacuna, to: μὴ ἐγ’ καλείν ἀλλη|λοις μηδὲ ἐγ’ καλέσειν.
At the start of the line one expects a personal name in -νης as the subject of the following verb κεχρημάτικα. It is unclear what followed after this verb. Among the 23 cases from Roman Egypt found in the DDBDP (between 30 BC and AD 800) just “(name) κεχρημάτικα” at the end of the document is most common (attested ten times; see, e.g., P.Oxy. 9.1208). In some cases, however, it is followed by (1) ως πρόκειται (see PWisc. 2.58.22, 59.23 [298]; SB 18.12289 col. 2.34 [309]), (2) χρ(όνος) ὡς προκ(είμενος) α(ὐτοῦ) (P.Sakaon 59.19 [305]; cf. SB 6.9618.28 [192], omitting α(ὐτοῦ)), or (3) a dating formula (P.Coll.Youtie 1.19.30 [44]; P.Vindob.Tandem 10 cols. 2.24, 3.27, 4.83 [54]; P.Stras. 9.886.15-16 [ca. 100]). Furthermore, P.Freib. 2.10 = SB 3.6293.14 (195/6) adds επα . . + traces. Cf. also the situation in ChLA 43.1247.9 (V), where after the verb there is a lacuna.

In this text, the letter preceding the alpha in ] . . αση [ is either a iota or a rho and one might read ] . ρασης [. I have considered the possibility of a personal description of the scribe after κεχρημάτικα (e.g. ἄσημ(ος)), but the trace before α that comes out under the lacuna and curves to the left is most likely ρ, which makes it hard to read (e.g.) ως ἐτων in the lacuna. Furthermore, among the attestations of κεχρημάτικα in the DDBDP, there is no example of a description of the registering official.

For the emperor’s title see P. Bureth, Les titulatures impériales (Brussels 1964) 87.

[A.V. Bakkers]

8. P.Minnesota 19: Fragment of a Regnal Formula on Leather
Provenance unknown 7 (H.) x 4 (W.) cm AD 256-260

This piece of leather was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling in or after 1952, after he had offered it for sale in Rotulus 6 (1952) 26, #2353.10 (his own inventory number was “G 133”). It now carries the accession #1381991. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Fragment on leather with remains of a date in the reign of Valerian, Gallienus and Saloninus. Date: 253-260 CE.” Light brown piece of leather of mediocre quality, broken off at top, left, and right. On the so-called front side fragments of seven lines are preserved. Dark red-brown stains (of ink?) on the upper half of the fragment, which make the first two lines mostly illegible. The end of l. 6 and the beginning and the end of l. 7 are severely faded or washed away. The lines contained approximately 43-47 letters, of which about a quarter is preserved. The writing on the back is mostly faded or washed away.
For the use of leather as writing material see E.G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (Oxford 1980) 8-9; R. Reed, *Ancient Skins, Parchments and Leathers* (London 1972). The HGV lists (as of February 2007) 27 documents on leather, among which there are 14 from Egypt (these are mostly late, i.e. VI-VII) and 2 with unknown provenance. The other 11 texts have a definitely non-Egyptian provenance (Parthia, Dura-Europos, Palestina).

The first two lines of this fragment seem to form the end of a document. Unfortunately they are mostly illegible, so it is not possible to determine the precise nature of the text. Lines 3ff. contain part of a dating formula of the joint reign of Valerian, Gallienus, and Valerian Caesar or Saloninus (for these emperors, see D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle* [Darmstadt 1996] 218-222). According to W.H.M. Liesker, the accession of Valerian as a Caesar can be dated August-September 256, and his death became known in Egypt between 21 January and 26 March 258. Therefore, if in our text the dating formula indeed refers to Valerian, this document can be dated between the end of 256 and the beginning of 258. If, on the other hand, the titulature of Saloninus is intended, the text dates between the beginning of 258 and June-July 259/60. Cf. also P. Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales* (Brussels 1964) 118-119. Of the regnal formulas mentioned by Bureth, the sixth is too short; more letters are needed in between the name of Γαλληνοῦ and the epithets Εὐσεβῶν Εὐτυχῶν. Therefore, this must be one of the formulas including Γερμανικῶν Μεγίστων, listed under number 7 on pp. 118-119.26

Because of the space between ll. 2 and 3, it is likely that the regnal formula started at the beginning of l. 3. It is, however, uncertain whether the formula started with ἔτους abbreviated or written in full, and the year numeral could have been written in full or as a cipher. Due to this uncertainty, the width of the lacuna at the left could vary from 21 to 32 (in case of the fourth year) letters. At the right-hand side, the size of the lacuna is uncertain as well. This situation makes it hard to establish the exact distribution of the letters over the lines, and a perfect distribution of the letters of the regnal formula is not immediately apparent. Therefore, the transcription of the fragment is given first, followed

---


26 Unfortunately, Bureth conflates the two Caesars, Valerian Caesar and Saloninus. According to Liesker (n. 25) 459, the only difference between the titulature of the two brothers is the proper name Saloninus (formulas nos. 1 and 3 in Bureth, 118). As the proper name Saloninus is lacking in Bureth, formula no. 2, this title must then refer to Valerian Caesar. The year 7 of *P.Lond.* 2.211 (p. 266) is very uncertain and could also be read as ε (checked on a microfilm by me).
by two possible reconstructions, one with the titulature of Valerian Caesar in ll. 5-6, the other with that of Saloninus.27

1 [ ca. 21-25 letters ] ... ετής [ ca. 18 letters ]
2 [ ca. 20-24 letters ] ... γυν [ ca. 18 letters ]
3 ίν Ποπλίου Λικ
4 νίου Ούαλεριανο(ū) Γα[...]
5 γυν Εύτυχιων και [...]
6 Ούαλεριανοῦ τοῦ [...]
7 ca. 4-5 λιαν ca. 4-5 [...]

Option 1: Valerian Caesar
3 [(ἔτους) αὐτοκρατόρων Καισάρων] Ποπλίου Λικ[ινίου Ούαλερ-]
4 [ιανοῦ καὶ Ποπλίου Λικινίου Ούαλεριανοῦ(ū) Γα[λλιηνοῦ Γερ-]
5 [μανικῶν Μεγίστων Εὐσεβίων Εὐτυχίων καὶ [Ποπλίου]
6 [Λικινίου Κορνηλίου] ΟΥΑΛΕΡΙΑΝΟΥ τοῦ [ἐπιφανεστά-]
7 τοῦ Καίσαρος Σεβαστῶν] ca. 4-5 λιαν ca. 4-5 [ ca. 9 letters ]

“In the fourth (or fifth) year of the Emperors and Caesars Publius Licinius Valerianus and Publius Licinius Valerianus Gallienus, Germanici Maximi Pii Felices and Publius Licinius Cornelius Valerianus, the most noble Caesar, Augusti, month + day ... -lianus ...’

Option 2: Saloninus
3 [(ἔτους) αὐτοκρατόρων Καισάρων] Ποπλίου Λικ[ινίου Ούα-]
4 [Ιανοῦ καὶ Ποπλίου Λικινίου ΟΥΑΛΕΡΙΑΝΟΥ(ū) Γα[λλιηνοῦ Γερ-]
5 [οῦ Γερμανικῶν Μεγίστων Εὐσεβίων Εὐτυχίων καὶ [Ποπλίου]
6 [Λικινίου Κορνηλίου Σαλωνίνου] ΟΥΑΛΕΡΙΑΝΟΥ τοῦ [ἐπιφαν-]
7 [ΕΣΤΑΤΟΥ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΝ ca. 2] ca. 4-5 λιαν ca. 4-5 [ ca. 9 letters ]

“In the sixth (or seventh) year of the Emperors and Caesars Publius Licinius Valerianus and Publius Licinius Valerianus Gallienus, Germanici Maximi Pii Felices and Publius Licinius Cornelius Saloninus Valerianus, the most noble Caesar, Augusti, month + day, ... -lianus ...”

---

27 Assuming a more or less regular vertical break at the left side, at least the number of letters to be supplemented in the left lacuna should be about equal in each line. If this assumption is correct, Option II could perhaps be preferred to Option I which is rather short in l. 6.
3 The joint reign of Valerian Caesar with his father Gallienus and grandfather corresponds to year 4 (δ or τέταρτος) or 5 (ε or πέμπτος), cf. Bureth, 118-119. In the case of the joint reign of Valerian, Gallienus and Saloninus, we are dealing with year 6 (ζ or ἕβδομος) or 7 (θ or ἕτος).

7 A month and day probably follow after Σεβαστῶν; in order to fit in the lacuna the month name must have been rather short (Θώθ, Τῦβι or Ἀθύρ). Thereafter, the letters ωιαν might belong to a personal name, such as Αἰμιλίανος, Αὐρηλίανος, or Ἰουλίανος.

[M.J. Bakker]

9. *P. Minnesota 20: Fragment of an Official Letter or Petition*

Oxyrhynchus? 5 (H.) x 3 (W.) cm AD 304-307

The papyrus was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling in or after 1952, after he had offered it for sale in Rotulus 6 (1952) 26, #2353.11 (his own inventory number was “G 149”). It now carries the accession #1381992. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Papyrus fragment; petition or official letter, joint reign of Constantine, Maximinus and Maximianus. Date 305-306 CE.” Light brown papyrus of mediocre quality, with quite a lot of wormholes, broken off on all sides. On the recto six lines of writing are preserved, written along the fibers. The verso is empty. There are rather large spaces between the lines.

```
1  ]λαβί ου πε [?
2  ] Οξ(υρυγχιτῶν) πόλεως καὶ ὡς [χρηματίζει?
3  ]γ̣δι̣ ε̣μο̣υ̣ τῶν[?
4  ]τω̣ν̣ ε [] καί αὐ̣τή̣ ε[?
5 (ἔτους)? τῶν κυρίων Κωνστ[αντίου καὶ Μαξ̣ιμα̣νοῦ Σεβαστῶν καὶ
6 (ἔτους)? Σεουήρου κ]αὶ Μαξ[ιμα̣νοῦ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Καισάρων
```

1 Or read ]λακίου Γέ [?

“(l. 2ff.) of the city of Oxyrhynchus and however (s)he is styled … through me of the … and to her? …. In the xth year (?) of our lords Constantius and Maximianus, Augusti, and the xth year (?) of Severus and Maximinus, the most noble Caesars, (month + day?).”

---

28 For the correction of year 2 in CPR 1.176.1 (p. 119) into year 4, see BL 8:99.
-λαβιο is probably the end of a name, probably Φλάβιος (occurs in Egypt before 324, according to the DDBDP, accessed February 2007). The other possible names in -λάβιος mentioned in F. Dornseiff and B. Hansen, Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen (Berlin 1957) 227 (Ἀβλάβιος, Καλάβιος, Αἰσχλάβιος), are hardly attested. It is not clear if this is a patronymic or the name of the sender in the genitive after παρά. In the first case, the next word would probably be a patronymic. In the second case, the next word might refer to a profession. The only possibility for the latter starting with πε- mentioned in Preisigke, WB 3:41, is πεδιοφύλαξ, but a delta is difficult to square with the traces. The reading of πε itself is problematic as well. The first letter might be a gamma, and I considered reading γευ- or Τευ-, but there are no names or professions starting with γευ-.

1 One might consider restoring τῆς λαμ(πρᾶς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης) Ὀξ(υρυγχιτῶν) πόλεως; cf. 10.3-4 and note ad loc. The combination of πόλ- and καὶ ὡς in the fourth century (18 occurrences in the DDBDP, accessed February 2007) leads to the restoration of χρηματίζει in the lacuna at the end of the line (17 occurrences concern the formula καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει). This formula occurs normally in the address at the beginning of a document; see, e.g., P.Lips. 1.6.3 (Hermop., 306), P.Oxy. 41.2998.3 (Oxy., late III).

2-4 These lines probably contained the body of the text. If the first two preserved lines belong to the opening and ll. 5-6 refer to a date by regnal years at the end of the document, the body of the text was rather short. Too little is preserved to give a clue about the content of the text. The use of the regnal formula tends to make me think of an official letter or petition.

In an attempt to explain the rather short body of the text, one might also consider the possibility that the formula in ll. 5-6 refers to an imperial oath formula instead of a dating formula; see, e.g., P.Oxy. 44.3192. Cf. also the note to ll. 5-6.

4 The letter before καί looks like ε with an abbreviation curl, and the same seems to be written after αὐτηι in the same line. It is uncertain whether the abbreviation curl represents a letter (π?) or not, and what the abbreviation stands for.

The reading of the iota of αὐτηι is uncertain: a γ or τ (with the horizontal stroke in the hole) can be considered, but there are no words attested starting with αυτηγε or αυτητε (no occurrences in the DDBDP, accessed February 2007). I do not believe that the uncertain iota (the late occurrence of an adscript iota is remarkable) should be replaced by an even more uncertain sigma.

29 Ἀβλάβιος, e.g., is not attested before 331 (DDBDP, accessed February 2007).
Most attestations of the regnal dating formula of these emperors are dated to 305/6, the 14th regnal year of Constantius and Maximianus and the second regnal year of Severus and Maximinus; see R.S. Bagnall and K.A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (Leiden and Boston 2004) 242-243, Appendix F, form E.2. Since year 13 = 1 and 15 = 3 are also attested a few times, a date in the years 304/5 or 306/7 cannot be excluded.

If, however, the formula in these lines concerns an imperial oath formula, as suggested in the note to ll. 3-4, the reconstruction of these lines would be something like the following (cf. Bagnall and Worp, *CSBE* Appendix G, forms III-V, pp. 272-273): [όμνυω τὴν τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Κωνστ[αντίου καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ Σεβαστῶν καὶ]| [Σεουήρου καὶ Μαξιμίνου τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Καισάρων τύχην]. This formula does not need to follow directly after the address, e.g., as in *P.Oxy.* 36.2766.6 or *P.Wisc.* 2.61.5. Perhaps in ll. 3-4 the reason why the oath is sworn is briefly described, as in *P.Oxy.* 44.3192. Since the papyrus is broken off at the bottom and there are no visible traces after l. 6, it remains uncertain if the formula concerns a regnal dating formula and formed the end of the document, or an oath formula, in which case the dating formula is lost. An argument against the imperial oath formula might be the fact that αὐτοκρατόρων is lacking after ἡμῶν; see Bagnall and Worp, *CSBE* Appendix G, III-V: in most of the texts from Oxyrhynchus αὐτοκρατόρων occurs in the imperial oath formula.

[M.J. Bakker]

### 10. *P.Minnesota 21: Beginning of a Document*

Oxyrhynchus 10 (H.) x 18 (W.) cm 29 October-27 November AD 443

The papyrus was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling in or after 1952, after he had offered it for sale in *Rotulus 6* (1952) 26, #2353.12 (his own inventory number was “G 52”). It now carries the accession #138199. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Papyrus fragment. Prescript of an agreement. The only name preserved is that of Aurelius Theodorus of Oxyrhynchus. Date: the year after the consulship of Falvius *sic* Eudoxius and Dioscorus, Hathyr, 442 CE.” The verso is mostly empty; there is only a trace of a fairly large lunate *σιγμά* (?)

1 Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν Φλαουίων Ἐὐδοξίου καὶ
2 Διοσκ[όρου τῶν λαμπροτάτων, Ἀθὴνα][χ]
3 Αὐρήλιος Θεόδωρος Εὐλογίου ὤ[τι]ο τῆς λαμπ[ρᾶς]
4 καὶ λαμπροτάτης Οξυρ[υγχιτῶν πόλεως] [καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει, . . . [
6-7 traces

2 ὑπατείαν

“After the consulate of the Flavii Eudoxios and Dioskoros, *viri clarissimi*, Hathyr x. Aurelius Theodoros son of Eulogios, from the illustrious and most illustrious city of the Oxyrhynchites, … and however he is styled, son of N.N. …”

1-2 These names are those of the consuls of 442; hence, their postconsulate fell in 443, a leap year (the date given in the description of the papyrus on the Minnesota website [see above] is ambiguous).

3 An Aurelius Theodoros son of Eulogios does not yet appear in the DDBDP.


4-5 In the lacuna in l. 4 after πόλεως (itself an uncertain reading) one expects the name of an addressee (N.N.), followed in l. 5 by καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει. The phrasing καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει rarely occurs in late documents; the DDBDP reports in 400-600 only three instances: *P.Lond*. 2.153.4 (pp. 318-319), *P.Heid*. 5.343.5 (both texts are in fact dated to the fourth century; *P.Heid*. 5.343.5 = *P.Col*. 10.284.24, AD 311); and *SB* 1.6000.v.7 (VI).

[K.A. Worp]

11. *O.Minnesota #1: Receipt*

Southern Thebaid? ca. 10.2 (H.) x 7.6 (W.) cm AD V-VI

The ostrakon was acquired by the University of Minnesota from Erik von Scherling on 6 January 1933, after he had offered it for sale in *Rotulus* 2 (1932) 62 #1509. It now carries the accession #554185. Described on the Minnesota website as follows: “Ostrakon, red pottery, Egypt. Date: 4th to 5th century CE.” Against this it may be remarked that for various reasons (palaeography; the staurogram) a dating to the fourth century seems unlikely; on the other hand, a sixth-century date cannot be excluded. Though there is no indication of the precise provenance, the colour of the sherd seems to connect it with the southern Thebaid.
1 (staurogram) Μέτρ(ημα) τετάρ(τη) καρπ( ) πέμπτη.
2 τωπ( ) Λασταπ[ ]ρα, δι(ά) Πιτρος
3 (καϊ) Ἰερημίας (καϊ) κοι(νων ), σι(του) ἀ(ρταβ.) κϚ.

1 Or read πενπτη? 2 τοπ(), Πέτρου? 3 Ἰερημιας Ostr.

Most probably we are here dealing with a receipt for the delivery of an amount of 26 artabas of wheat, but it is unclear whether this is a fiscal payment or a payment of rent vel sim. So much seems certain that the wheat was delivered by (cf. l. 2: δι(ά)) two men, Peter (?) and Jeremiah, accompanied by their associates (cf. l. 3: κοι(νων )).

1 A phrasing μέτρ(ημα) τετάρ(τη) καρπ( ) πέμπτη does not make sense. Comparing WO 2.1224.4-5: ἐπὶ κατασπορ( ) θ καρπῶν i <ἰνδικτίωνος>, one may consider a phrasing μέτρ(ημα) <κατασπορᾶς> τετάρ(της) καρπ(ῶν) πέμπτης <ἰνδικτίωνος>, “delivery from the sowing of the fourth, harvest of the fifth indiction,” but I do not know of a parallel for such a phrasing in any Byzantine ostrakon.

2 At the start we probably have a Greek word starting in τοπ( ) indicating a fiscal district vel sim., but then the question is, which one. After the middle of the fourth century the term τοπαρχία is excluded (cf. P.Herm.Landl., pp. 9ff.). Is this perhaps a τόπος = “monastery” for which a delivery was made or ordered?

The reading of the letter after the lambda was suggested by R.S. Bagnall. Or read λασγατ;? There is some space between the following iota and rho, but reading a broader letter for the rho, e.g. a phi, seems less likely, as there is nothing left of the upper structure of a phi which would be expected to be visible. The reading of Πιτρος seems certain, but the double error in the form (l. Πέτρου) is irritating.

3 Ἰερημίας is evidently written as an undeclined name; the normal genitive would be either Ἰερημία or Ἰερημίου. The reading κοι(νων ) was suggested by R.S. Bagnall.

[K.A. Worp]
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