

ADNOTATIUNCULAE, I

To Prof. S. G. Kapsomenos
in memoriam

1. *P. Flor. II 116*

]Ηρακλειου ρητορος[
ρ]ητορος υποβατου[
ου]τως Αθηνοκλε[ους
ει]ποντος ουτως[
υ]ποβατον τοσουτ[
Ηρακ]λειου ρητορος υπ[οβατ
? Ηρωδι]ανος ειπεν περ[ι
ο]υτως Ερμολαου[

This is the entire document, as published by D. Comparetti, who dated it to the end of the third century A.D.¹ and introduced it with the remarks: «È notevole questo frammento di uno scritto retorico, certamente non molto più antico del ms., per soggetto di cui in esso si tratta, che è il vocabolo ὑπόβατον di cui non abbiamo esempio nell' antica tecnologia retorica a noi nota. (. . .) Non sappiamo per qual tropo e di qual genere fosse da un qualche tecnico formato il nome ὑπόβατον; si può pensare ad una qualche maniera di posposizione.»

If anything, ὑποβατόν (sic) should be the opposite of ὑπερβατόν, something rather difficult to conceptualize. It is true that this new technical term does not figure in *LSJ*⁹, but the fragment is called «rhetorical treatise» by Pack who, following Comparetti, further states that it «discusses the figure hypobatōn; cites or quotes Athenocles (of Cyzicus?); one 'Heraclius rhetor'; Hermolaus; Herodianus (?)»².

1. I would rather date it to the first half of the fourth century.

2. R. A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, Ann Arbor ²1965, p. 124 no. 2299.

The photograph, however, which is published alongside the Greek text clearly shows that what Comparetti read as τ is in fact a λ with its right leg raised so as to enable the scribe to write the following ο without lifting his pen¹; an identical λ may be seen in Ερμολαου, which was read correctly.

The text, therefore, is not a rhetorical treatise; it does not discuss the new figure ὑποβατόν; and it does not cite ancient rhetoricians. In all likelihood it is an extract from a report of proceedings², and the names are those of advocates (the presiding official apparently makes a comment in line 7). The text reads:

]Ἡρακλείου ῥήτορος [
]ῥήτορος ὑποβαλόν[τος
 ο]ὔτως Ἀθηνοκλέ[ους
 ὑποβ]αλόντος οὔτως [
]ὑποβαλόντος οὔτ[ως
 Ἡρακ]λείου ῥήτορος ὑπ[οβαλόντος
].ανδὸς εἶπεν· περ[
 ο]ὔτως Ἐρμολάου [

2. P. Med. II 37

In this census declaration of A.D. 216/7 an Aurelia Demetria declares that she possesses in Hermopolis Magna, besides an entire house, a δ[ω]δέκα|[τον πατρικὸν (aut sim.) μέρος] οἰκιῶν συνεχ(ουσ)ῶν δύο (lines 12-13). The correction to συνεχουσῶν is due to O. Montevicchi in the first edition of the text³ and has been accepted by S. Daris in his re-edition of the papyrus in P. Med. II. But οἰκίαι συνέχουσαι δύο cannot possibly mean «due case confinanti», and I suspect that συνεχ(ομέν)ων is the emendation Prof. Montevicchi must have had in mind. This would give the required sense but would still be a hyper-correction, for οἰκίαι συνεχεῖς is

1. Professor M. Manfredi, who was kind enough to examine the original at my request, informs me that G. Vitelli had himself corrected υποβατον to υποβαλον- on his personal copy of P. Flor. II, now in the library of the Istituto Papirologico in Florence that is named after him.

2. The recurring formula Ν ῥήτορος ὑποβαλόντος οὔτως (meaning?) is unexampld in the documents discussed in R. A. Coles, *Reports of Proceedings in Papyri*, Brussels 1966.

3. *Aegyptus* 32 (1952) 35.

perfectly correct Greek meaning adjoining, contiguous houses. Cf. Thuc. 3.21.2, τὸ οὖν μεταξύ τοῦτο τοῖς φύλαξιν οἰκήματα διανενημένα ἄκοδόμητο, καὶ ἦν ξυνεχῆ ὥστε ἐν φαίνεσθαι τεῖχος παχύ, and Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 2.11.60 [143], ξύλινον δημιουργήσας ἔργον μέγιστον (. . .) καὶ συνεχῆ κατασκευασάμενος ἔνδον οἰκήματα, ἐπίπεδα καὶ ὑπερῶα, τριώροφα καὶ τετρώροφα¹.

3. *P. Med. II 80*

In this third century letter a Nikanor writes to his sister, among other things (lines 8-11):

γεινώσκιν σε θέλω ὅτι ἔγραψά σοι διὰ
Πασίωνος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Διοσκωράτος
ὅτι τι θέλεις πράξω καὶ οὐδέν μοι ἀν-
τέγραψας.

As published the text leaves some doubt as to what precisely Nikanor had written in his previous epistle. It would be better to print: ἔγραψά σοι (. . .) ὅτι «τί θέλεις πράξω;» καὶ οὐδέν μοι ἀντέγραψας. For this use of ὅτι recitativum with direct questions cf. SB II 6262 (= Sel. Pap. I 133). 11-14, καὶ αὐτὸς οὖν καθ' ἡμέρα(ν) σχεδοῦ τι πυνθάνετε περὶ σοῦ [ἑτοίμως] ὅτι «οὐπω [ἦλθεν] ἔρχεστε;» καὶ γὰρ οὖν λέγω [ὅτι] ἐν· «νέ.»

4. *P. Med. II 81*

Sometime in the fourth century, a certain Gelasios wrote a letter to his sister Isidora in which, after a string of greetings, he requested the following (lines 15-24):

ἀξιωθείς,
κυρία μου ἀδελφή, σοι ἦ
συνσαρωθῆναι καὶ ῥαν-
θῆναι τὸ(ν) μέγα(ν) οἶκος
τοῦ γεούχου Περικλέους
ἕως ἔλθω· ἀξιωθείς,
πέμψον μοι ἀργυρίου
τάλαντα δισχειλία
ἄλλα πάντα, οἶδα γὰρ
τὴν σὴν φι[λαδ]ελφείαν.

1. See also Preisigke - Kiessling, *Wörterbuch*, II, s.v. συνεχῆς 1.

Such is the text published by L. Bandi¹ and republished by S. Daris in P. Med. II. D. Hagedorn has already observed that σοι ἤ συνσαρωθῆναι is not Greek² and has succeeded in establishing the correct text on the basis of the published photograph: ποίησεν (= -σον)³ σαρωθῆναι. Unless I am mistaken, the first order for the sweeping and sprinkling of a house recorded in Greek literature is that given by Eurykleia to the slavewomen of the palace in Ithaca (*Od.* 20.149-50), ἀγρεῖθ', αἶ μὲν δῶμα κορήσατε ποιπνύσασαι, / ῥάσσατέ τ'⁴.

Commenting on τὸ(ν) μέγα(ν) οἶκος (= οἶκον) Bandi observed that «la mancanza del ν può essere un errore dello scrivente; il σ in οἶκος invece di ν può essere dovuto all'affievolamento di -σ, -ν finali». A better solution would be to recognize in τὸ οἶκος another example of the well known phenomenon of change of gender⁵; if this is so, then τὸ οἶκος was probably formed on the analogy of such neuters as τὸ οἶκημα, τὸ δῶμα, etc. In the contemporary P. Lond. II 418 (p. 302) (= P. Abinn. 7). 4-5 we read: ἵνα περισσέυῃ τὸ φόβος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν σοί, διὰ τὸ φόβος γὰρ πάντα γίνετε, where τὸ φόβος is a neuter formed, as the editors very plausibly suggested, on the analogy of τὸ δέος.

The phrase πέμψον μοι ἀργυρίου τάλαντα δισχειλία (!) ἄλλα πάντα is not Greek, let alone good Greek, and does not mean «mandami tutti gli altri 2000 talenti d'argento» as Bandi translated it⁶. An examination of the published plate reveals that what has been read as α at the end of πάντα is in fact the first half of an ω, and that, the surface of the papyrus having been rubbed off, there is a blank space after it sufficient for

1. *Aegyptus* 15 (1935) 252; republished as SB V 8000.

2. *Gnomon* 40 (1968) 781: «Der Konjunktiv in σοι ἤ ist ungriechisch, die gesamte nachfolgende Konstruktion unklar, das Kompositum συνσαρώ nicht bezeugt.»

3. For the contamination -(σ)ον × -(σ)εν Hagedorn refers the reader to S. G. Kapsomenakis [= Kapsomenos], *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit*, Munich 1938, 27-9.

4. Ὁμπρός, τὰ χέρια σας κοινᾶτε τα, τὴν κάμαρα σαρωῶσατε, / ραντίσατε τῆ is the apt way in which N. Kazantzakis and J. Th. Kakridis have rendered the Homeric phrase (*Ὀμήρου Ὀδύσσεια*, Athens 1965, 271).

5. See, e.g., N. G. Hadzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1892, 354-73 [= *Μεσαιωνικά καὶ Νέα Ἑλληνικά*, II, Athens 1907, 47-70]; W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*, Leipzig 1903, 174-8; E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, I.2, Berlin 1938, 45-50.

6. What Bandi actually translates is πέμψον μοι πάντα τὰ ἄλλα ἀργυρίου τάλαντα δισχειλια, which is Greek but not what Gelasios wrote — or meant to write.

yet another letter. What Gelasios wrote, then, is nothing else than ἀλλὰ πάντω[ς], a phrase often encountered in private letters added to commands or requests. The best illustration of its use may be found in the Heroninos archive, P. Flor. II 262.7-12, ἔργον μὲν ποιήσον τάχα εὐρησ μοι αὐτόν (scil. τὸν ἄξονα) ἐπὶ (= ἐπει) ὁ κῆπος ἀργεῖ. ἀντίγραφόν μοι οὖν περὶ τούτου ἵνα πέμψω τὸ ταυρικὸν ἐπὶ αὐτόν. ἀλλὰ πάντως. ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ σήμερον¹.

The text, therefore, should read: ἀξιωθείς², κυρία μου ἀδελφή, ποιήσεν σαρωθῆναι καὶ ῥανθῆναι τὸ μέγα οἶκος τοῦ γεούχου Περικλέους ἕως ἔλθω. ἀξιωθείς πέμψον μοι ἀργυρίου τάλαντα δισχειλία, ἀλλὰ πάντω[ς]. οἶδα γὰρ τὴν σὴν φι[λαδ]ελφείαν.

5. P. Med. inv. 69.59

Lines 4-5 of this first century census declaration³ have been printed as follows:

ὑπάρχει μοι οἰκία ἐν τῇ Δωρίωνος
 . . ατηλνου ἀμφοδαρχία.

Commenting on the unread word the editor writes: «Incerta la lettura delle prime due lettere. Si può pensare al genitivo di un nome proprio, forse Ματήλνου con λ al posto del ρ», i.e. Ματήρνου = *Materni*. An examination of the published plate leads me to suggest that Ἐλληνίου is the correct reading, the name of two well attested ἄμφοδα, one in Memphis and the other in Arsinoë⁴.

1. More examples in Preisigke-Kiessling, *Wörterbuch*, II, s.v. πάντως, and H. A. Stein, *Classica et Mediaevalia* 1 (1938) 154-5.

2. For the use of a masculine participle with reference to a feminine noun see Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen*, 40-2 (n. 2), and B. G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*, Athens 1973, § 877. W. Crönert, in *Raccolta di scritti in onore di G. Lumbroso*, Milan 1925, 500, considers the use of a masculine participle such as ἐπερωτηθείς, παρακληθείς, ἀξιωθείς, placed at the head of a request addressed to a woman an instance of verb adverbialization.

3. Published by A. di Bitonto in *Aegyptus* 54 (1974) 20.

4. See A. Calderini, *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto greco-romano*, II. 2 (ed. by S. Daris), Milan 1975, 143.

6. *P. Med. inv. 73.06 recto*

Towards the end of this letter from Sosibios to Archias¹, written probably in A.D. 2, we read (lines 11-13):

καὶ σπεῖρον τῆι β' τοῦ
 Ἀθῶρ διὰ σοῦ καὶ γὼ δ' αὐτὸς
 καταβαίνω πρὸ τοῦ Ἡλίου (= Ἡλίου).

Although «come tale Ἡλίου non è attestato in questa forma», the editor considers it not only a personal name but also the nominative thereof, although the construction clearly requires an accusative. In fact Ἡλίου is neither a nominative nor one word: what we should read is καταβαίνω πρὸ τοῦ Ἡλίου (scil. καταβῆναι)².

7. *P.S.A.Athen. 40*

In line 14 R. Rémondon³ was right and I⁴ wrong. For Petropoulos's Λέοντος read κέ||λεϋ[σ]ίω, a reading verified on the original.

8. *P. Oxy. XVI 1929*

Sometime in the fourth or the fifth century, a certain Asklas wrote to his secretary Abonas a business letter abounding in errors and concerning boats and the transportation of goods. Since its phraseology makes it quite clear that it had originated in a Christian milieu, the letter was included in the two recently published collections of Christian epistles, by J. O'Callaghan⁵ and M. Naldini⁶.

1. Published by G. Zecchini in *Aegyptus* 54 (1974) 104.

2. As opposed to πρὸ τοῦ + aor. inf., πρὸ τοῦ Ἡ + aor. inf. (formed by analogy of πρότερον Ἡ and πρὶν Ἡ) is very rare; see Mayser, *Grammatik*, II.1, Berlin 1926, 152-3, 319, and II.2, Berlin 1934, 391. The form Ἡλιος (or Ἡλιος?) is attested; see Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, and D. Foraboschi, *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum*, Milan 1971, s.v.

3. *Chronique d'Égypte* 42 (1967) 185-6.

4. *Ελληνικά* 29 (1976) 53. I should like to thank Dr. David Thomas for bringing this error to my attention.

5. *Cartas cristianas griegas del siglo V*, Barcelona 1963, no. 7.

6. *Il cristianesimo in Egitto. Lettere private nei papiri dei secoli II-IV*, Florence 1968, no. 91.

The beginning of the letter runs as follows (lines 2-4):

+ τὰ γράμματά σου ἔδεξάμην περὶ τοῦ πλοίου Καλῶλ. διὰ τὸν θεῶν
 μὴ ἀμελήσης τοῦ ῥωῆσαι τοῦτω,
 ἐπιδὴ ἄλλω (= ἄλλως?) κερὸς ἔστιν μάλιστα καὶ χρίαν ἔχομεν τὰ
 πλοῖα. φρόντισαι¹ οὖν τοῦτω
 πάραυτα ῥωῆσαι.

In their edition of the text in P. Oxy. XVI, B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and H. I. Bell indicated with a question mark their inability to make sense of ῥωῆσαι. O'Callaghan suggested that it is but an incorrect formation of the aorist infinitive of ῥώννυμι, i.e. ῥῶσαι, and concluded that «el mismo sentido de la frase admite que ῥωῆσαι provenga de ῥώννυμι, en cuanto que este verbo significa 'vigorizar' 'fortificar' 'activar'». Naldini observed, with reason, that ῥωῆσαι «è forma che appare più unica che rara», wondered whether it was intended for ῥῶσαι, and suggested that it might be connected with ῥώησις — a mistake, since it has been shown that such a word does not exist².

A better explanation might be to consider ῥωῆσαι the aorist infinitive of ῥογάω, i.e. ῥογῆσαι. The interchange of ο and ω occurs so frequently in documents of the Roman and Byzantine periods that it does not require documentation, and both ῥόγα and ῥογεύω are often written with ω in the papyri³. The loss of γ before a frontal vowel can also be paralleled in a host of instances⁴. What is more interesting is the first appearance of ῥογάω side by side with the well attested ῥογεύω⁵. Both verbs derive of course from ῥόγα (late Latin *roga* (*rogo* (*erogo*)) but cannot have the same meaning, for in the letter under discussion the secretary cannot have been asked to «distribute» the boat, which is the meaning ῥογεύω has. Rather,

1. In line 8 the form φρόντισων (= -σον) is employed.

2. P. Louvre inv. 10593 (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 2, 1903, 515-6) lines 9-10, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχητε πλοῖον, συνεμβήσητε ἅμα ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν ῥώησιν. U. Wilcken, *Mélanges Nicole*, Geneva 1905, 587, read the last word as ῥώμισιν, for Egyptian *rms*, «boat»; cf. UPZ I 81.ii.6-7, πλοῖον παπύρινον, ὃ καλεῖται ἀγυπτιαστει ῥώψ, and see E. Lidén, «Ein ägyptisches Wort bei Hesych», *Glotta* 2 (1910) 149-51.

3. E.g., ῥόγα in P. Lond. V 1660.9 and BGU I 304.11; ῥογεύω in BGU I 304.15 and P. Cair. Masp. I 145.1.

4. See F. Th. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, I, Milan 1976, 71-2.

5. References to ῥογεύω in the papyri (five in all) may be found in S. Daris, *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto*, Barcelona 1971, s.v.

ῥογάω must have the meaning of modern Greek ρογιάζω¹, in which case Asklas was asking his secretary to «hire» the boat for his needs.

9. P. Wisc. II 41

Three separate receipts for poll-tax, written by the same hand, are published by P. J. Sijpesteijn as P. Wisc. II 41. In all three after the date, Μεσορή ιγ (6 August 189)², comes the phrase ἀριθ(μήσεως) Παῦνι (meaning that the payment was entered in the account of the month of Payni) followed by the verb ἐδίκη(γραψεν) and the name of the tax-payer. The editor has overlooked, however, a serious divergence from the norm, for when payment was made for a tax the collectors of which kept monthly accounts, such a payment was registered either in the account of the month during which it was made or in that of the previous month³. Payni, of course, is not the month immediately before Mesore, there being Epeiph between them; yet παυνι is the unmistakable reading on the papyrus, as may be seen on the published photograph.

Commenting on ἐδίκη(γραψεν) Sijpesteijn correctly observes that «there are examples in the papyri of compounds with both internal and external augment», but the same photograph shows that what has been read as εδιη is in fact επειφδι — very cursively written, to be sure, but all there. Such a reading not only eliminates the monstrous ἐδίκηγραψεν but also supplies us with the missing month. The formula now acquires a familiar look: ἀριθ(μήσεως) Παῦνι Ἐπειφ δι(έγραψεν) and the name of the tax-payer⁴.

10. P. Wisc. II 67

The opening phrase of this sixth century complaint has been tran-

1. See D. Dimitrakos, *Μέγα Λεξικὸν ὅλης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης*, Athens 1958, and N. P. Andriotis, *Ἑτυμολογικὸ Λεξικὸ τῆς Κοινῆς Νεοελληνικῆς*, Thessaloniki 1967, s.v.

2. A full stop should be placed after, not before, Μεσορή ιγ.

3. On ἀριθμησις see J. Day and C. W. Keyes, P. Col. V, pp. 28-9, with bibliography.

4. Obviously a bi-monthly, not a monthly, account was kept; cf. WO II 660, ὕπ(ερ) ἀριθ(μήσεως) Φαμενώθ και Φαρμούθι. For the asyndeton cf. P. Vindob. Sijpesteijn 13.11-12, ἄσπερ σοι ἀποδώσοι (= -σω) μησι Ἐπειφ Μεσορή.

scribed by the editor as follows (line 2): + 'Ανοῦπ καὶ 'Αβραάμιος οἱ ἀπὸ Ταρουθίνου ἦνθεν αἰτιώμενοι Εἰρήνην. Sijpesteijn takes ἦνθεν as an incorrect spelling of ἔνθεν and is therefore «forced to accept a kind of an elliptic construction: Anup and Abraamius have seen what Irene does and thereupon/from that cause accuse—». This of course leaves αἰτιώμενοι depending on nothing and the editor is further forced to assume «that εἰσὶν has been left out and that we are dealing with a periphrastic construction».

All these difficulties disappear if we read, as the published photograph shows, ἦλθεν (= ἦλθον)¹ instead of ἦνθεν.

11. P. Wisc. II 69

In a letter written in A.D. 101 Antonius requests some blankets from his «mother» Valerias in the following words (lines 3-7):

ἔρωτηθίς περὶ τῶν λωδικι-
 ὄνων σοι γράφο ἢ ἔχεις μοι
 αὐτὰ διὰ Οὐαλερίου καὶ ἐρῖς
 αὐτῷ τὴν τιμὴν ὥτι χιμῶν
 ἐστίν.

This partly incomprehensible Greek has been translated by the editor as follows: «Being asked about the blankets I am writing to you if you have them for me through Valerius and you will tell him the price because it is winter.»

If we realize that the subject of ἐρωτηθίς is not Antonius but Valerias² and that ἐρῖς is not a predictive but an imperatival future³, much of the meaning becomes clearer. If we further remove the mysterious ἢ ἔχεις and read instead πέμισις (= πέμψεις⁴, also imperatival future) as the

1. For the incongruence in number see Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen*, 105-6, and Mayser, *Grammatik*, II.3, Berlin 1934, 30-4.

2. See above, p. 66 n. 2.

3. See Mayser, *Grammatik*, II.1, Berlin 1926, 212-13, and Mandilaras, *The Verb*, §§ 396, 719.

4. For μψ)μσ see Mayser, *Grammatik*, I.1, Berlin 1970 (rev. by H. Schmoll), 185, and A. Deismann's note on P. Meyer 20.12. The form πέμισις occurs frequently in the missives of L. Bellenus Gemellus; see P. Fay. 113-20, where it is found at least once in each document.

published photograph shows, we are left with only one difficulty, λωδικίων. As Sijpesteijn observes, «in the papyri the forms λῶδιξ and λωδικί(ο) are found» and «the present form presupposes the existence of the form λωδικίων, -ονος». This unwelcome addendum to the lexica can, however, easily be dealt with if we divide the word and read *περὶ τῶν λωδικίων*¹ ὧν σοι γράφω; cf. P. Oxy. XXXIII 2682.9-13, *πέμψον μοι τὸ μαφόρτιον καὶ τὸ δερματῖκιον λινοῦν καὶ παῖρι οὗ ἔρηκά σοι λωδικίου*, and P. Oxy. I 113.19-21, *περὶ ὧν σοι γεγράφειν διὰ Κορβόλωνος πέμψαι μοι θαυμαζῶς πῶς οὐκ ἐδικαίωσάς μοι πέμψαι*.

Antonius, then, wrote: *ἔρωτηθις περὶ τῶν λωδικίων ὧν σοι γράφο, πέμισις μοι αὐτὰ διὰ Οὐαλερίου καὶ ἔρις αὐτῶ τὴν τιμὴν, ὥτι χιμῶν ἔστιν*, i.e. «With regard to the blankets that I have been writing to you, please send them through Valerius and tell him their price, for it is winter.»

12. P. Mich. XIII 671

In this sixth century deposit the following legal clause occurs (lines 10-13):

ὁμολογῶ κινδύνῳ ἐμῷ καὶ πόρῳ τῆ[ς ἐμῆς ὑπο]-
[στάσεω]ς γενικῶς καὶ ἰδικῶς τὴν προδεδηλωμ[ένην ἄρουραν]
[φυλάξαι] καὶ ἀποκαταστῆσαι ὑμῖν ἀύλαμη καὶ ἀκίνδυ[νον καὶ ἀνυπό]-
[λογον . . .]τεῖ ἤτε ἐν ᾧ βούλεσθε τούτῳ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κ[ώμῃ Ἀφροδίτῃ].

Commenting on ἀύλαμη P. J. Sijpesteijn writes: «perhaps to be read ἀύλα(κισ)μ(έν)η(ν) or do we here have a new adjective? In any case there is a connection with ἀύλαξ.» In fact, as the published photograph shows, the depository is promising to return the aroura ἀύλαβῆ (= ἀβλαβῆ)², this being a condition that appears with regularity only in sixth century agreements³.

With regard to . . .]τεῖ the editor observes: «it is hardly possible to read a ρ instead of a τ, and to supplement ἐν θέ]ρει. The scribe meant

1. The ο is not quite like the other ο's in the letter, and could be the left half of an ill-formed and unfinished ω.

2. For αυ instead of αβ (and vice versa) see Mayser, *Grammatik*, I.1, Berlin 1970 (rev. by H. Schmoll), 92; Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen*, 10-11; Gignac, *A Grammar*, 68-70, 226-34.

3. E.g., PSI VIII 963.26, P. Oxy. XVI 1963.12, 1968.9.

to say: ἦτε ἐν ζῷ βούλεσθε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ», which is hardly better Greek than what the scribe supposedly wrote. Now it is a known fact that the characteristic feature of a deposit, the feature that sharply differentiates it from a loan, is that the object given a person for custody may be demanded back at any time¹. We may further observe that the letter partially preserved immediately after the break is neither a ρ nor a τ but the upper part of a θ, which suggests that]θείητε should be read instead of]τει ἦτε, and this in turn leads one to think of ὀπόταν βουλη]θείητε² as an appropriate supplement.

If we further observe on the photograph that τόπω and not τούτω is what the scribe wrote, we may read and restore lines 12-13 as follows: καὶ ἀποκαταστῆσαι ὑμῖν ἀβλαβῆ καὶ ἀκίνδυνον ὀπόταν βουλη]θείητε ἐν ζῷ βούλεσθε τόπω ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κ[ώμῃ Ἀφροδίτῃ].

Thessaloniki, The University

G. M. PARÁSSOGLOU

1. See briefly R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, Warsaw 1955, 350. A collection and analysis of the surviving contracts of deposit may be found in K. Kastner, *Die zivilrechtliche Verwahrung*, Erlangen - Nürnberg 1962.

2. Cf. Stud. Pal. XX 123.17-18, ἀποδώσω σοι ὀπόταν βουληθείης; P. Oxy. VII 1038.31, ὀπόταν βουληθείης ἀντιπαραδώσω; XVI 1963.10-12, ὀπόταν βουληθείηται (= -τε) παραδώσω τὴν νομὴν τῆς αὐτῆς οἰκίας ἀβλαβῆ; XVI 1968.8-10, τὴν δὲ νομὴν τῶν [προδεδηλωμένων π]ραγμάτων ἄτρωτον ἀβλαβῆ φυλάξω καὶ παραδώσω τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ ὑπερφυεῖα [ὀπόταν (ἔταν edd.) βουληθεί]η.