

SPP XX 74: The Last Preserved Bank-Diagraphé

(Tafel 1)

The text of this bank-diagraphé for the purchase of land (= P.Vindob. G 2073), described by Carl Wessely as „fragmenta duo mutila“, has never received any specific attention, although it is a document of some significance, described by Hans Julius Wolff as „die letzte erhaltene selbständige Diagraphé“¹. As no new fragments have been found to add to the papyrus, it is in many ways still intractable, but we believe that significant progress can be made in correcting some misreadings by Wessely, restoring some of the lacunas, and establishing the overall shape of the document, thanks in large part to published parallels².

1. The Papyrus

The two surviving strips are about 4.1 (left) and 5.5 (right) cm wide, and about 16.5 cm tall. The left strip contains about 15 letters in the upper part (lines 1–6), about 14 in lines 7–9 of the lower, where the hand is somewhat larger; further down the number of letters preserved per line becomes irregular because of various mutilations. To its left appear to have been lost about 30 letters at the top and from line 7 onwards 25 or so in the lower part. The loss at top is securely established by the regnal formula in line 1. As we assume the papyrus was broken along original fold lines, it becomes likely that two folds about the width of the left-hand strip have been lost to its left.

Between the two surviving strips is a lacuna of about 20–22 letters in the upper part; in the lower, from line 10 onwards, the left and right sides are both irregularly preserved, making a comparable estimate difficult, but it should be roughly in line. The right-hand strip contains some 21–25 letters in the upper part (lines 1–6), 17–19 below in lines 7–9. It seems probable, therefore, that one strip close in size to the right-hand one stood between the two surviving ones, containing the lacuna between them. Finally, at right the gap is nowhere definable with complete certainty. Wessely's limited restorations suppose a gap of about 20–25 letters, and some of the document can be restored on that hypothesis. But in a number of places, discussed in the line notes, there is no possibility of accommodating the usual formulas in that size lacuna. Moreover, the fact that the missing middle panel seems to have been the same size as the right-hand one may point to the left edge of the right-hand panel as the mid-point of the original text, where it received its first fold. In this case, we should suppose three missing panels, each with about 4–4.5 cm, to the right of the right-hand panel.

In all, then, it seems most probable that the original document was folded up into eight panels, folding first in the middle and then twice more, and that only two of these, the third and fifth, survive. The total width would have been perhaps about 35–40 cm, or substantially less than the 59 cm width of *P.Lips.* 3 (reedited as *M.Chr.* 172) — but this, to be sure, has two co-

¹ *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens II: Organisation und Kontrolle des privaten Rechtsverkehrs*, Munich 1978, 105 n. 112. We thank H. Harbauer for an excellent photograph of the papyrus.

² We have listed in the apparatus only divergences from Wessely's („W“) readings, not from his restorations or lack thereof.

lums (cf. its introduction, p. 5). It is impossible to say in the present state of the papyrus fragments whether there was further text below what survives. The height of *P.Lips.* 3 was 24 cm, and it contains elements not present in the Vienna papyrus as it stands; these are discussed in the next section.

Two final uncertainties remain. First, at several points in the notes the reader will observe that the parallels suggest restorations at the ends of lines longer than even our wider, 8-panel restoration allows. This is particularly true from lines 12 to 19 (but cf. also 5–6). There is, therefore, an obvious temptation to imagine a still wider original. Probably the strongest argument against this possibility is the restoration of lines 7–8, together with the fact that the amount by which the restorations suggested by parallels for lines 12–19 exceed the space available is not even approximately constant, ranging from roughly 20 to 100 characters. And no two of the parallels run quite the same throughout. But we remain conscious that the possibility of a wider line still remains open.

Second, it is also conceivable that instead of being folded the papyrus was rolled up from left to right, then at some point flattened. The outcome of such a procedure would differ from folding mainly in that the pattern of sizes would probably be one of straightforward increase from left to right and that the number of panels might be odd rather than even.

2. The Bank-Diagraphé

A thorough description of the diagraphé is given by Wolff (above, n. 1) 95–105. Our papyrus is an example of the „selbständigen“ variety³, which documents along with the payment through the bank its basis and consequences, i. e., in this case the sale of property and perhaps, below or in a second column to the right of what is now preserved, a notice of the transaction to the βιβλιοφύλακες ἐγκτήσεων (as in *P.Lips.* 3). By contrast, some other diagraphai („unselbständigen“) simply refer to other documents relevant to the payment. The oldest example surviving of the independent diagraphé go back to the time of Domitian and Trajan, but it disappears early in the Arsinoite, never appears in the Oxyrhynchite, and, after a late start (179), continues until the late third century at Hermopolis and Antinoopolis; our text, as noted already, is the last known example⁴. Wolff argues that the divergent practices of the various nomes are difficult to reconcile with any notion that this method of documentation was officially required at any time.

The form of the Hermopolite third-century diagraphé can be seen from the parallels, of which *P.Lips.* 3 is a good example. The first part is the diagraphé itself, which contains the following elements: Date, diagraphé through the bank in (Hermopolis). The purchaser (full description), to the seller (full description), who has sold (her) the property, for a price which the seller has received herewith in accord with this diagraphé; there follow clauses about control and enjoyment of the property, the stipulation (cf. note to lines 5–6 below), and the banker's signature. The second part is a summary of the sale: The seller (full description) ἐπικολούθηκα this diagraphé and πέρασα to the buyer (full description) the property (full description), and has received herewith the price from the buyer according to this diagraphé; there follow clauses about the buyer's rights, lack of recourse, penalties, validity, and the stipulation, then a date.

³ Wolff (above, n. 1) 96 n. 71 points out that the distinction, entirely one of modern scholarship, goes back to Gradenwitz; the papyri themselves do not distinguish two types.

⁴ Wolff (above, n. 1) 101 n. 91 lists a supposed twelve Hermopolite examples known to him. One is a duplicate, however, and his lists includes one misprint of a number. The correct list is as follows: *P.Flor.* I 28 (partly repr. as *M.Chr.* 238), *P.Ciss.* 32, *P.Ryl.* II 176, *P.Flor.* III 380 = *SB* I 4298, *P.Lond.* III 932 (p. 148), *P.Lond.* III 1158 (p. 151) = *M.Chr.* 256, *P.Lond.* III 1298 (p. 152), *P.Vindob. Bosw.* 6, *P.Lips.* 3 = *M.Chr.* 172, *P.Ryl.* II 165, and *SPP* XX 74.

After this come the seller's signature and the purchaser's (the latter here lost). Where, as in *P.Lips.* 3 and the present text, one or both parties are women, there may be separate signatures for males accompanying them, even if they are free of a tutor because of the *ius trium liberorum*.

The high degree of abbreviation in the surviving examples of diagraphai, particularly those which, like this, are connected with sales, and the damaged condition of most surviving examples, make detailed restoration difficult, particularly where we do not know how much abbreviation was used by our scribe; he in fact does not appear to abbreviate very much, and we have not assumed abbreviations except where they could be documented. Previous editors of diagraphai have mistaken some key elements of the grammatical structure of these texts; these are discussed in notes to lines 3 and 5.

3. Text

- 1 [Ἔτους αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου] Κλαυδίου Τακίτου Εὐσεβ[οῦς] Εὐτύχουδ[ος]
Σεβαστοῦ Παῦ]νι κθ'. Διαγραφή δι(ὰ) τῆς ἐν Ἐρ[μοῦ] πόλει -- τραπέζης. *vacat*
- 2 [Αὐρ(ηλία) α ἢ καὶ Ἀρμενία Ἐρμίνου (?) τοῦ] καὶ Διδυμάμμωνος ἄρ[ξι(αντος) -
18 - Αὐρ(ηλία) Κορ]νηλία Ἐρμίνου τοῦ καὶ Μέλανος γε[νομένου - 38 -]
- 3 [- 5 - ἀναγραφομένη ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ (?) ἀμ]φόδου πεπρακὴ αὐτῆ [τὰ ὑπάρχοντα
αὐτῆ περὶ Μαγδῶλα] Βουκόλων ἐκ τοῦ Διοκλέου[ς] κλήρου - 39 -]
- 4 [- - 29 - - ὕ]δροδοχείῳ καὶ λάκκοις - 10 - καὶ ὀργάνῳ ὕ]δραντλητικῷ καὶ
πωμαρίοις καὶ τῆ [
- 5 [- 5 - τιμὴν ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν ... -α]κισχειλίων — ἂ κ[αὶ] αὐτόθι ἀπέσχευ
παρὰ τῆς ἄνουμ(ένης) κατὰ τήνδε τὴν διαγρ[αφήν] καὶ εἶναι περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν
ἄνουμ(ένην) καὶ τοὺς παρ' αὐτῆς]
- 6 [τὴν τούτων κυριεῖαν καὶ κράτησιν καθὼς γέγρα(σται). (2. H.) Αὐρήλ(ιος) Ἰσί-
δ[ωρος] τραπεζίτης σεσημ[είωμαι].

ca. 1.2 cm blank

- 7 (3. H.) [Αὐρηλία Κορνηλία Ἐρμίνου τοῦ καὶ Μ]έλανος γενομέν[ου] - 13 - Ἐρμ[οῦ]
πόλεως τῆς μεγάλης [ἀρχαίας καὶ λαμπρᾶς καὶ σεμνοτάτης χρηματίζουσα]
- 8 [χωρὶς κυρίου τέκνων δικαίῳ κατὰ] τοὺς νόμους συνεστ[ῶτός] μοι τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ[ν] μου
Αὐρηλίου Ἐρμοφίλ[ου] ἐπικολούθηκα τῆδε τῆ διαγραφῆ καὶ πέπρακα ἀπὸ τοῦ]
- 9 [νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον Αὐρ(ηλία)] α τῆ καὶ Ἀρμενία [Ἐρμίνου (?) Ἐρμο-
πολίτ]ου εὐθηνιαρχήσαντος [τῆς λαμπροτάτης πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξ(ανδρέων)
συμπαρόντος αὐτῆ]
- 10 [- - 27 - -] ἄρξαντος Ἀλεξ[ανδρείου] τοῦ ὑπάρχον[τος] μοι περὶ Μαγδῶλα Βου[κόλων]
- - 40 - -]
- 11 [- - 27 - -] μενον σὺν τοῖς ἐνοῦσι - 13 - κα[ὶ] τῆ ἐν αὐτῷ καλαμίᾳ οὐ[- - -
- 45 - - -]
- 12 [- - 22 - - περιστ]ερεῶν καὶ βοσκ[ήματι] καὶ τοῖς συγκυ[ροῦσι] πᾶσι, ὃ
παραδ[ώσω] - - 42 - -]
- 13 [- - 24 - - οἰκ]οπ(εδ-) Δημητρίας Φλα[- 15 - τὴν δὲ πρὸς] ἀλλήλας συν-
πεφωνη[μένην] τιμὴν ἀργυρίου δραχμᾶς ... ακισχιλίας αὐτόθι ἀπέσχεον]

- 14 [παρὰ τῆς ὄνουμ(ένης) καὶ εἶναι τὴν τῶν πεπραμένω[ν - 14 - κυριεῖαν κα] κράτ[ησι]ν περὶ τὴν ὄ[νουμένην, χρωμένους καὶ οἰκονομοῦντας περὶ αὐτῶν καθ']
- 15 [ὄν ἐὰν αἰρῶνται τρόπον, καρπιζο]μένους καὶ ἀποφε[ρομένους τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν κατ'] ἔτος γε]νήματα καὶ περισσ[όμενα, πάντων δὲ τῶν δημοσίων καὶ ἐπιμερισμῶν τῶν μὲν]
- 16 [ἔμπροσθεν χρόνων μέχρι τοῦ διελ(θόντος) ςS// (ἔτους) ὄ]ντων πρὸς ἐμέ τ[ῆν πε-
πρακυῖαν, τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεσ]τῶτος αS// ὄντω[ν πρὸς σὲ τὴν ὄνουμένην, τῆς
βεβαιώσεως διὰ παντὸς πρὸς πᾶσαν βεβαίωσιν ἐξακολουθούσης μοι τῆ πω-
λούσῃ]
- 17 [καὶ μὴ ἐπελεύσεσθαι ἐπὶ σὲ τὴν ὄ]νουμένην μηδ' [ἐπὶ τοὺς παρὰ σοῦ περὶ μηδενὸς
τῆσ]δε τῆς πράσεως τρ[όφω μηδενί, ἐὰν δὲ ἐπέλθω ἢ μὴ βεβαιῶ, ἢ τ' ἔφοδος
ἄκρου ἔστω καὶ προσποτίσω τῆ ὄνουμένην τὰ τε βλάβη καὶ]
- 18 [δαπανήματα καὶ ἐπιτίμου ὡς ἴδιον] χρέος διπλῆν τὴν [τιμῆν καὶ εἰς τὸ δημοσίον
τὴν ἴσην κ]αὶ μηδὲ[ν ἧσσον ἢ πράσις κυρία, καὶ ἐπερω(τηθεῖσα) ὠμολ(όγησα).
(ἔτους) α Αὐτοκρά(τορος) Καίσ(αρος) Μάρκου Κλαυδίου
- 19 [Τακίτου Εὐσεβ(οῦς) Εὐτυχ(οῦς) Σεβ(αστοῦ) Month] β 7. (4. H.) Α(ὐρηλία) Κορν[ηλία
'Ερμίνου τοῦ καὶ Μέλαν]ος πέπ[ρακα καὶ ἀπέσχον τὴν τιμὴν καὶ βεβαιώσω ὡς
πρόκειται.]
- 20 [Αὐρ(ήλιος) 'Ερμόφιλος - 15 -]ν συμπάριμι[καὶ ἔγραφα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς γράμματα μὴ
εἰδύης ?]

3 πεπρακυῖη pap. 5 τῆς ὄνουμ(ένης)· ἡσωνου^λ W. 6 ἰσιδ pap.; Αὐρηλία) Ἰσιδ W. 11 καλαμεία
12 βοοστασίω καὶ W.: ὄ ex ἄ 14 κρατ[ε]ῖν W. 15 βοσ[κ]ήματα καὶ περισσε[ι]ράς W. 20 ν συμ[π]ασι μι [W. .
I. συμπάριμι

4. Translation

„Year 1 of Emperor Caesar Marcus Claudius Tacitus Pius Felix Augustus, Pauni 29. Payment through the (lessees' ?) bank in Hermopolis. Aurelia ---a alias Armenia, daughter of Herminos (?) alias Didymammon, former magistrate of (Alexandria? Hermopolis?), (registered in the --- amphodon?), to Aurelia Cornelia daughter of Herminos alias Melas, former ... (of the same city? of Hermopolis?), registered in the same (?) amphodon, who has sold her the property belonging to her at Magdola Boukolon, from the kleros of Diokles ... including a reservoir and cisterns ... and water-lifting machine ... and orchard ... the price of n thousands of silver drachmas which she has received herewith from the purchaser in accordance with this diagraphic ... as has been written. (2. H.) I, Aurelius Isidoros, banker, have signed.

(3. H.) I, Aurelia Cornelia daughter of Herminos alias Melas, former ... of Hermopolis the great, ancient and brilliant and most reverend, acting without a guardian by the *ius trium liberorum* in accordance with the laws, with my brother (?) Aurelius Hermophilos present with me, have assented to this diagraphic and have sold from now for all time to ---a alias Armenia, daughter of Herminos (?), Hermopolite, former eutheniarch of the most brilliant city of the Alexandrians, with her ... former magistrate of Alexandria, present with her, the ... belonging to me at Magdola Boukolon ... with the included ... and the reed plantation in it ... dovecote and pastureland and all appurtenances, which I shall hand over ... the neighbours being ... house lot(s) of Demetria Fl- --, the price mutually agreed upon I have received herewith from the purchaser, and the purchaser of the sold (property) is to have the ownership and control of

the sold property, using and managing them in whatever manner they choose, harvesting and appropriating the crops and produce each year, the taxes up to the past 6th year being the responsibility of me the seller, those from the present first year being the responsibility of you the purchaser; the guarantee in every respect for every guarantee pertaining to me the seller, and I shall not proceed against you the purchaser or your representatives on account of any matter concerning this sale in any way, (otherwise I shall pay the damages) and as penalty, as private obligation twice the price, and to the treasury an equal amount, and the sale shall nonetheless remain authoritative, and having been asked the question I agreed. (Date) 2nd. (4. H.) I, Aurelia Cornelia daughter of Herminos alias Melas, have sold and have received the price and shall guarantee as aforesaid. I, Aurelius Hermophilos ..., am present with her and have written on her behalf because she is illiterate“.

5. Notes

1. At the start, (ἔτους) πρώτου is also possible. Perhaps one or more of the epithets of Hermopolis could be restored in the lacuna at right, where there is room for more letters. It would be possible to restore τῆ μεγάλης καὶ σεμνοτάτης καὶ λαμπροτάτης, cf. N. Litinas, APF 41 (1995) 66–84 at 81–82. But *P.Lips.* 3 is restored without epithets at this point, and they are similarly lacking in *P.Vindob. Bosw.* 6. A stronger possibility is that the bank had some descriptor, most likely μισθωτῶν as in *M.Chr.* 256, *P.Vindob. Bosw.* 6, *P.Lond.* III 932 and 1298, and *SB XVI* 12242. A state bank at Hermopolis was so described between 211 and 279/280, cf. R. Bogaert, *Trapezitica Aegyptiaca* (Pap.Flor. 25, 1994) 87 (= *Studi in onore di Cesare Sanfilippo* III, Milan 1983, 53). But this may not be the only possibility; Bogaert (92–93) shows that private banks did exist in Hermopolis. He cites no instances after 219, however, and it is precisely in the documentation after that date that the leased bank is consistently found. The uncertainty leads us to omit the restoration from the text. The date given here is 23 June 276.

2. The missing patronymic may be Ἑρμίνου if the father is the Herminos alias Didymammon mentioned in *SPP XX* 66.16 (Gallienus); it is an uncommon name, but other evidence for the identification is lacking. The seller's name ended in iota or rho and is partly preserved in 9, but there does not appear to be any means of recovering it (Isidora. Ammonia, and similar names seem required by the fairly brief space). If, as appears necessary, the city of which he was former magistrate is mentioned in the middle lacuna, the space is extremely tight for a full ἀναγραφόμενη phrase here, even though there are signs of one in line 3 for the seller. (The word order there, with ἀμφόδου last in the identification, points to ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀμφόδου; otherwise the name of the amphodon should follow that word.) This suggests a high degree of compression. The father was, if our understanding of line 9 is correct, a Hermopolite who had held office as eutheniarch in Alexandria. It seems most likely that such a man had also held office in his home city. We could restore here, then, either Ἄλεξ(ανδρείας) or Ἑρμού(πύλωνος), followed by ἀναγρ(αφομένη) ἐπ' ἀμφ(όδου) Πόλ(εως) λιβ(ός), although even this is a bit long for the space (particularly if the city mentioned was Hermopolis). Cf. for such abbreviation *M.Chr.* 256, πόλ(εως) ἀπηλ(ιώτου).

3. Depending on the degree of abbreviation of each element, it is likely that Herminos alias Melas' title ended with either Ἑρμοῦπύλωνος or τῆς αὐτῆς πόλωνος, depending on what was written in line 2. In line 7 the probable size of the lacuna would allow either for full writing of a single title like γυμνασιάρχου or for abbreviated forms of two offices. The space seems too much for a simple βουλευτοῦ.

πεπρακνῆ αὐτῆ is clear here; it agrees with the name of the seller in the dative. The universal belief of editors of parallel texts, however, is different. In *P.Lips.* 3.3 the pertinent passage was restored as πεπρα[κ(έναι) αὐτῆ]; in the recension as *M.Chr.* 172 this was altered to πεπρα[κ(έναι) ἀ]π[ο]τῆ without comment. Similarly in *P.Lond.* III 1158.2 (p. 151) we get abbreviated πεπρακ() αυτ(), resolved by Mitteis (*M.Chr.* 256) as πεπρακ(έναι) αὐτ(όν). (*P.Lond.* III 1298.2, p. 152, has the identical abbreviations). In *P.Vindob. Bosw.* 6.4, πεπρα[κ(έναι) αὐτ(ούς)] is restored. The infinitive has also been restored in *P.Ryl.* II 165.14 (phrase entirely lost); the passage is lost in *P.Flor.* III 380.2 = *SB I* 4298. Where translations are supplied, editors appear to assume that a verb of declaring is omitted, but this would be very odd, because the subject is the buyer, not the seller. One would expect that the seller would be declared that she had sold, not the buyer that the seller had sold. The correct resolution established by the Vienna papyrus shows that the understood verb of

the diagraphé is one of paying, and that the property is the direct object of a participle dependent on the seller as recipient of the payment. All other texts cited above must be corrected accordingly.

The *kleros* of Diokles is listed from this papyrus in M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, Missoula 1979, 92. A homonym at Moirai (Drew-Bear, *loc. cit.*) is referred to as the *kleros* of Dionysios and Diokles in two Leipzig papyri, and both times as τοῦ Διονυσίου καὶ Διοκλέους κλήρων, the singular article disagreeing with the plural noun. It is just possible that something similar happened here and that a second name was mentioned.

4-5. One might restore here τὴν συμφερωμένην or τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλας συμφερωμένην comparing line 13, but we do not know how much space remains for such an optional restoration after the description of the property.

5. The parallels are uniformly restored or resolved with τιμῆς, based on the editors' assumption that the structure was one of „NN declares that she has sold to NN property for a price of X.“ Now that this is seen (above, note to line 3) to be incorrect, it follows that τιμὴν is more plausibly the direct object of the understood verb of paying. Whether the scribe actually wrote the accusative here, however, we cannot be certain. It is likely that a few letters stood before τιμὴν, and that only four more letters were used for the beginning of the number of drachmas (4000-9000 are possible, but 6000 and higher are likely to have been given in talents plus drachmas; thus only τετρ- and πεντ- are likely), but the precise numbers of letters in each place cannot be determined.

5-6. The parallels here are typically fuller, with a phrase like χρωμένους καὶ οἰκονομοῦντας περὶ αὐτῶν καθ' ὃν ἕαν αἰρῶνται τρόπον ἐπὶ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ... καὶ ἐπρατηθέντες ὁμολόγησαν. There is usually, however, a considerable degree of abbreviation. We cannot establish exactly what abbreviations have been used here, if any, and exactly what has been left out; what we print here, *exempli gratia*, represents a kind of minimum. The parallels (above, n. 4), however, do require the text before the banker's signature to end with καὶ ἐπερω(θηθεῖσα) ὁμολ(όγησα) (with whatever degree of abbreviation), but the remains do not resemble that.

6. Wessely read the signature as Ἀρη(λία) Ἰσιδ, supposing this to be the signature of the purchaser, but all parallels have the banker's signature here (cf. the list in note 4 above). It is possible that τρα(εζίτης) was, instead of being written in full, abbreviated and accompanied by another title, e. g., βουλ(ευτής).

7. Abbreviation of Ἀρη(λία) here is possible. See the note to line 3 on the titles of Cornelia's father. The restoration of the end of the line is rather short without another epithet in the lacuna here, but its presence is not certain and it could have been abbreviated. For the titles of Hermopolis as restored here see *P.Vindob. Bosw.* 6.8.

7-8. For χωρὶς κυρίου χρηματίζουσα cf. most recently *P.Mich.* XV 719.5-6n.

8. ἀδελφοῦ is just a shade short for the space, but the other possibilities for relationships here (υἱοῦ, θεῖου, νιωτοῦ) are even shorter. Marie Drew-Bear (*Le nome Hermopolite* 159, cited in *BL* 8.465 with an erroneous reference to *SPP* III, p. 33) has suggested that this Hermophilos could be the father of Aur. Pasion son of Hermophilos, γεωργῶν ἐν κόμη [Μαγδῶλα] Βουκόλων in *SPP* II, p. 33 (as restored by Drew-Bear). This seems most unlikely, for the Hermophilos in the present document is certainly a metropolitan, not a cultivator (γεωργῶν could not refer to a landowner) in a village.

8-9. The restoration at the end of line 8 and the beginning of line 9 is virtually guaranteed by the parallels (especially *P.Lips.* 3 and *P.Vindob. Bosw.* 6).

9. For the restoration of the middle lacuna see *SB X* 10289.2-3. Some difficult questions remain. The father's name is known from line 2 to have been a name of perhaps 8 characters (possibly Ἐρμίνου, cf. note ad loc.) plus the alias Didymammon, yielding a 25-character patronymic for which the lacuna is already too small. The upsilon after the lacuna, moreover, cannot be the ending of this patronymic. It has no abbreviation mark and is not raised; there is thus no reason to think it is part of an abbreviated word (e.g., γετυ(μνασιαρχηκότος)). It must then be the ending of a genitive; βουλετωῖϋ yields a highly improbable sequence of titles (cf. F. Preisigke, *Städtisches Beamtenwesen im römischen Ägypten*, Halle 1903, 33ff. and P. Jouguet, *La vie municipale dans l'Égypte Romaine*, Paris 1911, 292ff.), and the use of the aorist participial form for eutheniarch excludes restoring γενομένοϋ. But Ἐρμοπολιτοϋ, supported by the parallel, does make the constraints on the restoration of names very tight. The most likely solution is that which we have adopted, that the alias was omitted entirely. Some of what is restored in the lacuna at the end of this line could have been in line 10 instead.

11-12. Perhaps restore ἐξηριτωμένον or something similar. It is clear that we are dealing here with a well developed country property with ample facilities, passing from one member of the elite

to another, but it does not appear possible to restore the detailed description. Some of it appears in line 4 and was perhaps repeated here. The price, certainly not less than 4000 drachmas, is very substantial. The comparable documents show prices ranging from 300 (*M.Chr.* 256) to 1600 (*P.Ryl.* II 165), but we do not always know the size of the parcels.

12-13. At the end of the preceding line, we are evidently at the start of the clause undertaking to hand over the property measured and unburdened, found in *P.Ryl.* II 165.16 and *P.Vindob. Bosw.* 6.12. We need then to restore something like παραδῶσω κατ' ἄγρον σκορίμας πλήρεις τῷ τῆς κατοικίας δικαίῳ σχοινίῳ καθαρὰς ἀπὸ βασιλικῆς καὶ παντὸς εἰδοῦς ἀπλῶς, ὧν γείτονες⁵. This, without any description of the neighbours, runs about 100 letters, where we appear to have only 66 letters of space for it. We do not know what abbreviation of the phraseology to suggest. At this point, then, we are apparently into the description of the neighbouring properties. The omicron at the start of line 13 is followed by a stroke like a round right bracket, suggesting that the word was abbreviated after pi. This suggests the restoration given. We may then suggest that Δημητρία Φλα[- was the owner of the οἰκόπεδον (or οἰκόπεδα) in question. Φλα[- may more likely be the beginning of a cognomen than of a patronymic.

13-14. The parallels would suggest at this point adding (γίνονται) (δρ.) - - after the price, and κατὰ τήνδε τὴν διαγραφὴν after ὠνούμενην, for neither of which there appears to be room. Naturally some small variation in wording and abbreviation is possible, and in particular it is possible that sharp abbreviation here could have allowed the full phrasing.

14. In the middle lacuna, perhaps ὡς πρόκειται ἀρουρῶν, as in *P.Flor.* III 380.14; it is, however, a bit too long, so probably abbreviate πρόκειται.

14-15. The standard phrasing here includes ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον, for which no space is available. The parallels do not abbreviate any of this phraseology.

15. The restoration here depends on *P.Flor.* III 380.5, 14-15.

15-16. The restoration is a slightly shortened version of *P.Vindob. Bosw.* 6.15, omitting καὶ αὐτοῦ ς (ἔτους); the precise wording is *exempli gratia*, but the space does not allow anything fuller and even what is printed here may have been slightly abbreviated.

16-17. This appears to be the only place where the guarantee clause can have stood in the sale, but as given here it is 30 characters too long for the space, even though it is somewhat shortened from what is given in the parallels. Clearly some further abbreviation must have been made, but we cannot tell what.

17-18. Here one needs something like *P.Lips.* 3.13-14: εἰάν δὲ ἐπ[έ]λθω ἢ μὴ β[εβα]ίῳ, ἢ [τ' ἔ]φ[οδος] ἄκυρος ἔστω [καὶ προσαποτίσω ἢ ὁ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ἐπελευ]σόμενος τῇ ὠνούμενῃ ἢ [τοῖς παρ' αὐτῆς] τὰ τε β[λ]άβη καὶ δαπανήματα καὶ ἐπιτίμου κτλ. But even as shortened here this runs to 83 characters, almost double the available space. We cannot tell what further abbreviation or shortening was used.

18-19. Restoring the regnal formula here requires a fair amount of abbreviation, but the parallels all have the titulature here and its omission is very unlikely.

Roger S. Bagnall
606 Hamilton Hall
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
U.S.A.

Klaas A. Worp
Archaeologisch-historisch Instituut
University of Amsterdam
Oude Turfmarkt 129
NL-1012 GC Amsterdam

⁵ In *P.Ryl.* II 165.15, the editor has restored παραδῶ[σει], third person; where it actually survives, in *P.Vindob. Bosw.* 6, however, it is first person.