



TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Band 9, 1994

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

1994

BOLEK & CO. G.M.B.H.



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 9

1994


H O L Z H A U S E N

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

In Zusammenarbeit mit:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Johannes Diethart, Wolfgang Hameter, Bernhard Palme
Georg Rehrenböck, Hans Taeuber

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1,
A-1010 Wien. Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer
Sprache werden angenommen. Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgeschickt werden.
Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden besprochen.

Auslieferung:

Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in
Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 1994 by Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Wien

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien.
Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien
Hersteller: Druckerei A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien.
Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Raffaella C r i b i o r e (New York), A Homeric Writing Exercise and Reading Homer in School (Tafel 1)	1
Johannes D i e t h a r t (Wien), Denis F e i s s e l (Paris), Jean G a s c o u (Strasbourg), Les prôtokolla des papyrus byzantins du V ^e au VII ^e siècle. Édition, prosopographie, diplomatique (Tafel 2–7)	9
Michael G r ü n b a r t (Wien), Stempel in Mondsichelform. Ein Beitrag zur frühbyzantinischen Stempelkunde (Tafel 8–9)	41
Heikki K o s k e n n i e m i (Turku), Einige Papyri administrativen Inhalts aus Turku (Tafel 10–15)	51
Nico K r u i t (Leiden), Three Byzantine Sales for Future Delivery (SB XVI 12401 + 12402, SB VI 9051, P.Lond. III 997) (Tafel 16–17)	67
Metodi M a n o v (Sofia), Eine neue Inschrift auf zwei silbernen Schöpfkellen aus Thrakien (Tafel 18)	89
Arietta P a p a c o n s t a n t i n o u (Strasbourg), Conversions monétaires byzantines (P.Vindob. G 1265) (Tafel 19)	93
Marjeta Š a š e l K o s (Ljubljana), The Embassy of Romulus to Attila. One of the last citations of Poetovio in classical literature	99
Mustafa H. S a y a r, Peter S i e w e r t, Hans T a e u b e r (Wien), Asylie-Erklärungen des Sulla und des Lucullus für das Isis- und Sarapisheiligtum von Mopsuestia (Ostkilikien) (Tafel 20–24)	113
Ralf S c h a r f (Heidelberg), Der Iuthungenfeldzug des Aëtius. Eine Neuinterpretation einer christlichen Grabinschrift aus Augsburg	131
Oliver S c h m i t t (Jena), Die <i>Buccellarii</i> . Eine Studie zum militärischen Gefolgschaftswesen in der Spätantike	147
Pieter J. S i j p e s t e i j n (Amsterdam), Four Papyri from the Michigan Collection (Tafel 24–26)	175
J. David T h o m a s (Durham), 1) Epistrategoi in P.Rainer Cent. 68 — 2) A Note on CPR XVIIIA 16	181
Ruprecht Z i e g l e r (Düsseldorf), Aigeai, der Asklepioskult, das Kaiserhaus der Decier und das Christentum (Tafel 27)	187
Sophia Z o u m b a k i (Athen), Ῥωμαῖοι ἐγγαλιούντες. Römische Grundbesitzer in Elis	213
Bemerkungen zu Papyri VII (<Korr. Tyche> 130–147)	219
Buchbesprechungen	227

James C. A n d e r s o n jr., *The Thomas Ashby Collection of Roman Brick Stamps in the American Academy in Rome*, London 1991 (B. Lörincz: 227) — W. R. C o n n o r, M. H. H a n s e n, K. A. R a a f l a u b, B. S. S t r a u b, *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*, Copenhagen 1990 (W. Hameter: 227) — Nicola C r i n i t i, *La Tabula Alimentaria di Veleia*, Parma 1991 (W. Scheidel: 229) — D i o d o r o s, *Griechische Weltgeschichte*, Buch I–X. Übers. v. G. Wirth & O. Veh, Stuttgart 1992–1993 (G. Dobesch: 230) — Peter G r e e n, *Alexander to Action. The Hellenistic Age*, London 1990 (I. Kertész: 232) — Dieter H ä g e r m a n n, Helmuth S c h n e i d e r, *Landbau und Handwerk 750 v. Chr. bis 1000 n. Chr.* Frankfurt a. M. 1991 (W. Scheidel: 234) — Gerhard H o r s m a n n, *Untersuchungen zur militärischen Ausbildung im republikanischen und kaiserzeitlichen Rom*, Boppard a. Rhein 1991 (B. Palme: 234) — Anne K o l b, *Die kaiserliche Bauverwaltung in der Stadt Rom. Geschichte und Aufbau der cura operum publicorum unter dem Prinzipat*, Stuttgart 1993 (E. Weber: 236) — Jens-Uwe

K r a u s e, *Die Familie und weitere anthropologische Grundlagen*, Stuttgart 1992 (W. Scheidel: 237) — Venceslas K r u t a, *Die Anfänge Europas von 6000 bis 500 v. Chr.*, München 1993 (G. Dobesch: 238) — L. P. M a r i n o v i c, E. S. G o l u b c o v a, I. S. S i f m a n, A. I. P a v l o v s k a j a, *Die Sklaverei in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Reiches im 1.–3. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1992 (W. Scheidel: 239) — Paul S c h u b e r t, *Les archives de Marcus Lucretius Diogenes et textes apparentés*, Bonn 1990 (B. Palme: 240) — M. W. H a s l a m, H. E l - M a g h r a b i, J. D. T h o m a s, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LVII*, London 1990 (B. Palme: 244) — John R. R e a, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LVIII*, London 1991 (B. Palme: 245) — Aules P e r s i u s F l a c c u s, *Satiren*. Hrsg., übers. u. erkl. v. W. K i ß e l, Heidelberg 1990 (G. Dobesch: 247) — Marc R o z e l a a r, *Lukrez — Versuch einer Deutung*. Nachdruck, Hildesheim 1989 (G. Dobesch: 248) — Ulrich S c h m i t z e r, *Zeitgeschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen. Mythologische Dichtung unter politischem Anspruch*, Stuttgart 1990 (G. Dobesch: 250) — Reinhard S c h n e i d e r, *Das Frankenreich*, München ²1990 (G. Dobesch: 252) — Reinhold S c h o l l, *Corpus der ptolemäischen Sklaventexte*, Stuttgart 1990 (B. Palme: 253) — Charlotte S c h u b e r t, *Die Macht des Volkes und die Ohnmacht des Denkens. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mentalität und Wissenschaft im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart 1993 (H. Heftner: 256) — Julia S ü n s - k e s T h o m p s o n, *Demonstrative Legitimation der Kaiserherrschaft im Epochenvergleich. Zur politischen Macht des stadtrömischen Volkes*, Stuttgart 1993 (E. Weber: 256) — Paul V e y n e, *Brot und Spiele. Gesellschaftliche Macht und politische Herrschaft in der Antike*, Frankfurt 1988 (G. Dobesch: 257) — Hans V o l k m a n n, *Die Massenversklavung der Einwohner erobelter Städte in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*, 2. ... u. erw. Aufl. v. G. Horsmann, Stuttgart 1990 (G. Dobesch: 259) — Ingolf W e r n i c k e, *Die Kelten in Italien. Die Einwanderung und die frühen Handelsbeziehungen zu den Etruskern*, Stuttgart 1991 (L. Aigner-Foresti: 259) — Wolfgang W i l l, *Julius Caesar. Eine Bilanz*, Stuttgart 1992 (G. Doblhofer: 261)

Indices (J. Diethart) 263
Tafeln 1–27

1) Epistrategoī in P.Rainer Cent. 68 — 2) A Note on CPR XVIIIA 16

1) Epistrategoī in P.Rainer Cent. 68

P.Rainer Cent. 68, which was edited by Dr John Rea, is a republication, with additional fragments, of CPR V 5 (also edited by Rea). It is a very interesting, indeed unique, text, which concerns the appointment of guarantors for the payment of a surety (πρόστιμον) in cases of appeal against nomination to municipal offices. A sizable fragment discovered since the publication of CPR V 5 contains new information on lines 20ff. The passage which I wish to consider in this note consists of lines 16–24:

16 Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ καὶ Ἰσιδώρος Διδύμης Ἀπολλωνίου Ἀντινοέως [± 12
 17 Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ καὶ Χαρισίου καὶ Ἀπολλωνίου Λουκίου ὀνομασθεῖς[.....
 18 κρατίστη βουλῇ τῆς Λυκοπολιτῶν πόλεως ἐκκαλεσάμενος παρέσχεν τοῦ προστίμου
 19 [ἐν (δρ.)] Ἐρκε ἐγ[γ]νητὰς Ἐρμίαν τὸν καὶ Φιλαντίνοον Ἀπολλωνι[± 22
 20 Λο...[.]ς ἀμφοτέρους Ἀντινοέας. πρὸς δὲ τὴν α...[± 22
 21 των τῶ α (ἔτει) ὑπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου Τείρωνος ὁ Ἀπολλώνι[ος ± 6 τοῖς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπαί-
 22 τησιν ἀποσταλεῖσι ἀντίγραφον ὑπομνήματος .[± 25
 23 ἐπιστρατήγου ἐπὶ τοῦ ιγ (ἔτους) Μεσορῆ ἰ ἀναπεμπ[± 25
 24 Κίμων ἐπίτροπος σκεψάμενος εἶπε[ν ± 35

In the introduction to P.Rainer Cent. 68 Rea puts forward three hypotheses with regard to this text which, when taken together, appear to pose a problem. He proposes (1) that Kimon who is mentioned in line 24 is the epistrategos who is referred to in the previous line; (2) that Tiro, the κράτιστος mentioned in line 21, is likely to be the man known as epistrategos from several texts from Hermopolis dating from the reign of Gallienus¹; and (3) that the text is most likely to date from c. AD 235. The problem which these assumptions seem to pose is the difficulty of fitting in two new epistrategoī at this period, when we already know of two, if not three, epistrategoī functioning in the period AD 232–235 (see below).

The first of the above hypotheses is scarcely open to doubt. In my book on the epistrategos I discussed whether epistrategoī were ever referred to simply as ἐπίτροποι². At that time there appeared to be no good instance of this occurring, but the new evidence of P.Rainer Cent. 68 seems, as Rea says (note to lines 20–24), to provide a clear case where it does happen. We can hardly doubt that line 24 begins a citation from the minutes of the epistrategos mentioned in the previous line, which clearly shows that Kimon, who is here called an ἐπίτροπος, was in fact an epistrategos³. Whether Tiro is an epistrategos is less certain, but seems to be more likely than not.

¹ SPP V (CPH) 57, 59, 61, 62, and XX 64.

² J. D. Thomas, *The epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt: Part 2, The Roman epistrategos* (Papyrologica Coloniensia VI), Opladen 1982, 47–50. Henceforth this work is referred to as *Roman epistrategos*.

³ Epistrategoī were of course Roman procurators and so it is quite correct for them to be described as ἐπίτροποι; cf. *Roman epistrategos*, 47–50. In general, however, the discussion in these pages of the

We may now turn to the date of the text. As can be seen from the passage quoted, Kimon's activities are attested for Mesore of a year 13, for which the only possibilities are regnal years of Severus Alexander or Gallienus⁴, and Rea shows reasons why we should accept the former, i. e. Kimon was in office as epistrategos in August of AD 234. Tiro's activities belong in a year 1 which ought to be later than the year 13 when Kimon was in office, and the most natural assumption is that it is the first year of the succeeding reign, that of Maximinus; i. e. Tiro was in office in AD 234/35. If we compare this with the List of epistrategoi given in *Roman epistrategos*, 191, we find the following:

68 Severus Vibius Aurelianus	December 231/January 232	SB V 8312
69 Hieracio	t. p. q. January/February 234	P.Flor. I 58
70 Iulius Iulianus	14 December 235	PSI XII 1248

Even if we ignore Hieracio, for whom we have only a *terminus post quem*, it is apparent that it is very difficult to find room for both Kimon and Tiro in this short space of time.

There is, however, a way out of this difficulty. The names given above of epistrategoi, nos. 68–70 in the List, are epistrategoi of the *Heptanomia*. The entry in P.Rainer Cent. 68 which relates to the activities of both Kimon and Tiro is clearly concerned with the Lycopolite nome (see line 18) and the Lycopolite was not in the Heptanomia but in the Thebaid. Kimon, therefore, and Tiro too, if he was also an epistrategos, were most probably epistrategoi of the *Thebaid*. The apparent problem thus disappears and we can add the names of one or perhaps two epistrategoi to those known for the Thebaid. This is particularly valuable as we did not hitherto know the name of any epistrategos from this region later than soon after AD 216/17⁵.

The removal of this problem, however, does re-open the question of the date of P.Rainer Cent. 68; and the hypothesis referred to above, that Tiro in the present text is identical with Aurelius Tiro known from texts in SPP V, also needs to be reconsidered⁶. Aurelius Tiro in SPP V is attested as a former epistrategos with authority in Hermopolis and was therefore an epistrategos of the Heptanomia. If our Tiro is the same man, he must have been at different times epistrategos of the Thebaid and epistrategos of the Heptanomia. This is certainly possible. Indeed, a parallel can be adduced for a man who was at different times epistrategos in two different sections of Egypt⁷.

If we accept this, there is an obvious attraction in assigning year 13 in P.Rainer Cent. 68 to the reign of Gallienus. We could suppose that Tiro, after having been epistrategos of the Heptanomia prior to year 15 of Gallienus (the year which is mentioned in the texts in SPP V cited in n. 1), became epistrategos of the Thebaid in a year 1 later than year 13 of Gallienus (when Kimon was epistrategos of the Thebaid), most probably the first year of Gallienus'

use of ἐπίτροπος for an epistrategos (e.g. p. 49) needs to be modified in the light of the new evidence of P.Rainer Cent. 68.

⁴ The text belongs in the third century, after the introduction of the boulai, and the only emperors to attain thirteen years in this century were Septimius Severus, Severus Alexander and Gallienus. We can reject Septimius Severus because of the reference in line 28 to μήμηξ 'Ακύλου (see Rea's comment in the introduction).

⁵ See nos. 26–27 in the List given in *Roman epistrategos*, 186–7. There is no real doubt that there continued to be epistrategoi of the Thebaid down to the reign of Diocletian, as the evidence of P.Amh. II 137 suggests (cf. *Roman epistrategos* 65f.), but no names are known for the bulk of the third century.

⁶ Aurelius Tiro is no. 76 in the List in *Roman epistrategos*, 191.

⁷ Bassus, nos. 16 and 82 in the List in *Roman epistrategos*, 186 and 192, is known to have been epistrategos of the Thebaid and epistrategos in Lower Egypt in the first half of the second century (ILS III² 9506).

successor, AD 268–269⁸. However, Rea acutely noted (see the introduction to P.Rainer Cent. 68) that in PSI XII 1247.25 there is a reference to τῶι κρατίστῳ Κιμ[. Since names beginning Κιμ- are very unusual in the papyri and this man is a κράτιστος, he suggested that the man occurring in PSI 1247 should be identified with the Kimon of P.Rainer Cent. 68. Though PSI 1247 is undated, it belongs to the papers of the well-known strategos Sarapion also called Apollonios, whose career is documented for the period AD 207–238. This led him to prefer to assign year 13 in P.Rainer Cent. 68 to the reign of Severus Alexander rather than to the reign of Gallienus. While obviously not conclusive, this argument seems to me to be a very strong one. This makes it most natural to suppose that the year 1 occurring in line 21 is the first year of Severus Alexander's successor Maximinus, and that the text dates from this year, AD 234–5, or soon after.

A Note on CPR XVIII A 16

This text was first published by Dr Klaas A. Worp as P.Vindob. Worp 3 and subsequently republished by him as CPR XVIII A 16, since it forms part of the archive of Aurelios Adelfios. It is written in two columns, both in the same hand, and it is certain, as Worp says, that we are dealing with copies not original documents⁹. A photograph is given in P.Vindob. Worp (Tafel 3). The tops of both columns are lost, but the content of the second column is clear: it is a report by village police officials concerning damage done to crops made in response to a petition sent by Adelfios. The first column is more enigmatic since there are several lacunae. Worp argues that it is a copy of the instructions from the official to whom the petition was addressed, which led to the report of which a copy survives in the second column. This is certainly correct¹⁰; but the actual wording of these instructions remains somewhat problematical. Worp's suggested reading and restoration, which he stresses is only tentative, is as follows¹¹:

1	τὰ [βιβλίδια] ὑπὸ Ἀδελφ[ίου
2	ἀναγνό[ντες ποιήσα]τε ἀκόλουθα τ[
3	τοῖς προ[σταχθ(εῖσι) πάντ]ες μεμημή[έ-
4	νοι τῆς [τού]το[υ ἐπιμ]ελείας τουτέστιν
5	τίς εἴη ὁ τὴν σ[ποράν] συνκομισάμε-
6	νος ἦτοι τοῖς χορτάσμασιν τὰ κτήνη
7	ἐαυτοῦ ἐπαφείς.

His argument that the subject of the first four lines is the village police officials has a convincing ring. What is much less easy to accept is his proposal to read προ[σταχθ(εῖσι) in line 3. There is not room for the word to appear in full, as he recognises, but an abbreviation at this point is not expected and hard to justify¹². In his note in P.Vindob. Worp (p. 29) he considers supplying before this τ[ού]το[ις] but rejects this on the grounds that we should then expect the

⁸ In his note to lines 20–4 Rea argued that year 13 of P.Rainer Cent. 68 could not belong to the reign of Gallienus if we accept the identity of Tiro in this text with the epistrategos of SPP V. This argument is, of course, no longer valid if Tiro was epistrategos of a different section of Egypt in P.Rainer Cent. 68 from the one he controlled in SPP V.

⁹ The *subscriptio* at the end of the report in the second column (lines 27–8) is explicitly described as an ἀντίγραφον.

¹⁰ The addressee of the petition and the sender of the instructions was most probably the strategos/exactor as Worp suggests. The praepositus pagi is another possibility.

¹¹ See p. 44 in CPR XVIII A and cf. pp. 27–8 in P.Vindob. Worp.

¹² Elsewhere in the text the only word to be abbreviated is προκ(εῖμενος) in lines 27–8.

article before *προσταχθεῖσι*; but if we reject *προσταχθεῖσι* this argument no longer applies. *τούτοις* in fact looks almost inevitable. We do of course need a word preceding to which it can refer. This could well be *[βιβλίδια]*, which Worp restores in line 1. However, it is not a possible reading in this line. What can be read here is *τὰ ἐ[π]ι[δοθέντα μοι] ὑπὸ Ἀδελφίου*¹³. Before this we probably need to supply *τὰ βιβλία* or *τὰ βιβλίδια* in the previous line¹⁴, unless we should simply understand *βιβλί(δι)α* with *τὰ ἐπιδοθέντα*; in any case the sense produced will be the same¹⁵.

After *ἀναγνό[ντες]* a second-person plural imperative makes very good sense. Also possible is a subjunctive, supplying *ἵνα* in the section lost before *τὰ ἐ[π]ι[δοθέντα]*. We must, however, consider at the same time how to fill the lacuna in line 3. Here we have *προ[]* and a space of some 8–9 letters before *ε[ς]*. My suggestion is to supply the participle *προ[σφωνούν]ε[ς]*. There is no doubt that the police officials are being ordered to produce a report and there are numerous examples in the papyri of the use of the verb *προσφωνέω* in connection with such a report, normally made in writing. For the main verb preceding, *ποιέω* is certainly one possibility; compare P.Erlang. 25 (as emended in ZPE 80 [1990] 218), where a strategos sends a copy of a petition to a subordinate *ἵνα τὰ ἀκόλουθα ποιή[σῃς]*. Another possibility which occurs to me is *δηλώω*, taking this, together with *προσφωνούντες*, as introducing the indirect question beginning *τίς εἶη* and treating the words between as parenthetical. There is strong support for this suggestion in the editor's reading of P.Athen. 34, a report submitted by a public doctor, who, in the reading of the ed. pr., has been ordered to carry out an inspection *καὶ ἐγγράφως δηλώσαι προσφων[ῶ]ν* (line 12). The last word, however, is obviously doubtful and has been emended by Wilcken to *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*¹⁶. Nevertheless, even if we reject *προσφωνῶν*¹⁷, the text does offer some support for supplying the imperative (or subjunctive) of *δηλώω* rather than of *ποιέω* in line 2.

μεινήμενοι following this can only refer to the police officials. If we adopt Worp's suggestion for the rest of this phrase, we must, as he says, understand *ἐπιμέλεια* to mean "Sorge, Aufgabe". This may indeed be the right solution¹⁸. A quite different approach is suggested by the expression used by the strategos to *νυκτοστράτηγοι* in P.Beatty Panop. 1, 345, where he tells them he is passing on orders which they must carry out *μ]εινήμενοι τοῦ ἑαυτῶν κινδύνου*. If we are to look for a similar warning in our text, we can perhaps produce it by reading *μεινμημ[έ]νοι τῆς [ἑαυ]τῶ[ν ἀσφ]αλείας*¹⁹. There is an interesting parallel for the use of *ἀσφάλεια* to refer to an official's safety (from punishment for failing to do his duty) in P.Col. VII 175, 34–6 = SB XVI 12692: what, asks the speaker in court, could the *praepositus pagi* do? His

¹³ I owe the reading *ἐ[π]ι[δοθέντα]* to Dr J. M. Diethart, who very kindly consulted the original for me; he also informs me that there is room to supply *μοι* in the lacuna.

¹⁴ At an earlier period the normal form is *βιβλίδια* but either form is acceptable by the date of this text (AD 321).

¹⁵ There are some marks on the photograph above line 1 which look like writing. Dr Diethart confirms that they are indeed ink, but I cannot offer a plausible reading. This ink does not appear to be part of any letters of the words *τὰ βιβλί(δι)α*.

¹⁶ Archiv 14 (1941) 161; see BL III.

¹⁷ It is far from certain that Wilcken's emendation is correct (note that his suggested emendation, *ibidem*, to line 7 is to be rejected: see BL VII); despite Wilcken's confidence, the letter after *προσ* seems to me, to judge from the plate, to be a phi, as the editor suggested.

¹⁸ In P.Beatty Panop. 2, 5? the procurator tells the strategoi that as soon as they receive his letter *δι' ἐπιμελείας ὑμῶν* ἔστω to take action.

¹⁹ Either *τῶ[]* or *τῶ[]* can be read in the middle of the line; see Worp's note in P.Vindob. Worp, p. 27. There is of course no difficulty in *ἑαυτῶν* being used of the second person: cf. the passage from P.Beatty Panop. 1 cited in the text and the note to P.Vindob. Worp 13, 13.

answer is τῆς ἀσφαλείας ἑαυτοῦ προνοούμενος ὁμοῦ τε καὶ τῶν δημοσίων εἰσφορῶν ... ἐκδέδωκεν ταύτας τοῖς ἀγροίκοις πρὸς γεωργίαν²⁰. The phrase is then to be understood as parenthetical; it does not directly introduce the words following.

The above suggestions, which are of course only tentative, would result in the following reconstruction:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | τὰ ἐ[π]ι[δοθέντα μοι] ὑπὸ Ἀδελφ[ίου] |
| 2 | ἀναγνό[ντες δηλώσα]τε ἀκόλουθα τ[ρού-] |
| 3 | τοῖς προ[σφωνοῦντ]ες μεμνημ[έ-] |
| 4 | νοι τῆς [ἑαυ]τῶ[ν ἀσφ]αλείας τουτέστιν |
| 5 | τίς εἴη κτλ. |

“... having read the petition presented to me by Adelpbios, submit a report in accordance with it, bearing in mind your own safety, namely who it was who ...”.

39 Wearside Drive
Durham DH1 1LE
England

J. David Thomas

²⁰ Cf. also P.Hermop. 18, 17 and P.Oxy. XXXVIII 2849, 20.