

Herausgegeben von:

Thomas Corsten
Fritz Mitthof
Bernhard Palme
Hans Taeuber

TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

HOLZHAUSEN

Der Verlag

Band 33, 2018

TYCHE

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

Band 33

2018

HOLZHAUSEN
— *Der Verlag* —

Impressum

Gegründet von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert, Ekkehard Weber

Herausgegeben von

TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich

Vertreten durch

Thomas Corsten, Fritz Mitthof, Bernhard Palme, Hans Taeuber

Gemeinsam mit

Franziska Beutler und Wolfgang Hameter

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat

Angelos Chaniotis, Denis Feissel, Jörg Fündling, Nikolaos Gonis,
Klaus Hallof, Anne Kolb, Michael Peachin

Redaktion

Chiara Cenati, Tina Hobel, Sandra Hodeček, Katharina Knäpper,
Guus van Loon, Theresia Pantzer, Christoph Samitz

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und
Epigraphik, Universität Wien, Universitätsring 1, 1010 Wien, Österreich.

E-Mail: franziska.beutler@univie.ac.at

Richtlinien unter <http://www.univie.ac.at/alte-geschichte>

Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung

Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien

E-Mail: office@verlagholzhausen.at

Online Bestellungen Print & TYCHE–Open Access

<https://shop.verlagholzhausen.at/hhshop/buch.wissenschaft/Tyche/Jahresbaende.htm>

<http://tyche-journal.at>

Umschlag: Militärdiplom aus Carnuntum (ZPE 172, 2010, 271–276; Photo: P. Böttcher),
Inscription aus Ephesos (ÖJh 55, 1984, 130 [Inv. Nr. 4297]; Photo: P. Sängler), P.Vindob. G 2097
(= P.Charite 8).

Bibliografische Informationen der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek und der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die ÖNB und die DNB verzeichnen diese Publikation in den Nationalbibliografien; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind
im Internet abrufbar. Für die Österreichische Bibliothek: <http://onb.ac.at>, für die Deutsche Bibliothek: <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

Eigentümer und Verleger

Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien

Herausgeber

TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik,
Universität Wien, Universitätsring 1, A-1010 Wien.

E-Mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder bernhard.palme@univie.ac.at

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Verlagsort: Wien — Herstellungsort: Wien — Printed in Austria

ISBN: 978-3-903207-31-8 ISSN: 1010-9161 eISSN: 2409-5540

Copyright © 2019 Verlag Holzhausen GmbH — Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Stadt Wien
Wien ist anders.

Diese Publikation wurde durch die
freundliche Unterstützung der
Stadt Wien ermöglicht.

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

Bernhard W o y t e k: Theodore V. Buttrey †	1
Aitor B l a n c o - P é r e z: <i>EPINIKIA</i> : Celebrating Roman Victory in the Eastern Provinces of the Empire	9
Elena C h e p e l: P.Tbilisi inv. 344v: Extract from Memphite Land Register (Taf. 1–2).....	43
W. Graham C l a y t o r: Rent Receipts for Temple Land in Theadelphia (Taf. 3).....	49
Lucia C. C o l e l l a: Copia frammentaria di un protocollo di apertura di testamento in lingua latina (Taf. 4).....	55
Snežana F e r j a n č i ć – Nemanja V u j č i ć – Veselinka N i n k o v i ć: Fragments of Latin and Greek Inscriptions from the National Museum in Belgrade (Taf. 4–9)	61
Duccio G u a s t i: Il κόλλυβος è un sottomultiplo del χαλκοῦς?	75
Herbert H e f t n e r: Das Große Verfahrenstechnisch-Historische Scholion über den Ostrakismos [Philochoros FGrHist 328 F 30 / Theophrast fr. 640ab Fortenbaugh]. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion.....	79
Marek K r a m á r: Lysimachos, Byzantion und Athen.....	113
Eddy L a n c i e r s: The Career of Some Officials in the Arsinoite Nome in the Early Second Century BC.....	119
Dimitrios P a p a n i k o l a o u: On the Reluctant Orator of Ephesos.....	131
Federico R u s s o: La legislazione <i>de ambitu</i> a Roma e le norme contro la corruzione elettorale della <i>Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae</i>	145
Georg-Philipp S c h i e t i n g e r: Die <i>lex Papiria de tribunis reficiendis</i> . Anmerkungen zu einem Machtkampf zwischen Scipio Aemilianus und der gracchischen Ackerkommission.....	167
Peter S i e w e r t: Fragment einer hocharchaischen Bronzetafel aus Olympia mit Nennung der Eleer und des Mantis-Amtes (BrU 8) (Taf. 10).....	177
Ignazio S i m ó n C o r n a g o – Carlos J o r d á n C ó l e r a: The Celt- iberian S. A New Sign in (Paleo)Hispanic Epigraphy	183
Marja V i e r r o s: Copying practices in Ptolemaic Egypt. A discussion based on Greek agoranomic contracts from Pathyris (Taf. 11)	207
Bemerkungen zu Papyri XXXI (<Korr. Tyche> 855–885)	231
Adnotationes epigraphicae IX (<Adn. Tyche> 74–84)	249

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Buchbesprechungen	265
-------------------------	-----

Guido B a s t i a n i n i, Simona R u s s o (Hrsg.), *Comunicazioni dell'Istituto papirologico «G. Vitelli» 12* (Edizioni dell'Istituto Papirologico «G. Vitelli» 5), Firenze 2015 (Á. T. Michálykó: 265) — Graeme B o u r k e, *Elis, Internal Politics and External Policy in Ancient Greece* (Cities of the Ancient World), London, New York 2018 (P. Siewert: 267) — Alberto D a l l a R o s a, Cura et tutela. *Le origini del potere imperiale sulle province proconsolari* (Historia Einzelschriften 272), Stuttgart 2014 (F. Hurlet: 270) — Jonas G r e t h l e i n, Antonios R e n g a k o s (Hrsg.), *Griechische Literaturgeschichte. Traditionen, Probleme und Konzepte*, Berlin, New York 2017 (J. W. G. Schropp: 272) — Josef W i e s e h ö f e r, Sabine M ü l l e r (Hrsg.), *Parthika. Greek and Roman Authors' Views of the Arsacid Empire / Griechisch-römische Bilder des Arsakidenreiches* (Classica et Orientalia 15), Wiesbaden 2017 (F. Alidoust: 276).

Indices	281
---------------	-----

Eingelangte Bücher	285
--------------------------	-----

Tafeln 1–12

Die *Annona Epigraphica Austriaca* erscheint auf der Homepage des Instituts für Alte Geschichte der Universität Wien (<http://altegeschichte.univie.ac.at/forschung/aea/>) und wie bisher auch in der Zeitschrift *Römisches Österreich*.

MARJA VIERROS

Copying practices in Ptolemaic Egypt

A discussion based on Greek agoranomic contracts from Pathyris*

Plate 11

Introduction

The public notaries (*agoranomoi*) and the documents produced in the agoranomic offices in the Pathyrite area have been discussed from several points of view over the previous decades.¹ Four duplicates and some single copies of contracts have been preserved in the Pathyris archives, but they have not previously been studied from the point of view of copying practices.² Therefore, a closer examination focusing on this aspect is warranted. This article is an addition to the — still rather thin — general discussion on copying practices in the documentary papyri from Egypt.³

When discussing copies and copying practices, the term ‘copy’ implies at least a predecessor, even an ‘original’ (often called a *Vorlage* in manuscript studies), based on which the copy is made. With documentary papyri, we run into problems if we do not define these terms and their meaning accurately in their different contexts. Since the terms ‘copy’ and ‘original’ are defined based on their relationship with each other, the

* This paper has been written as part of the project Act of the Scribe: Transmitting Linguistic Knowledge and Scribal Practices in Graeco-Roman Antiquity, funded by the Academy of Finland (287386).

¹ For the *agoranomoi*, see G. Messeri Savorelli, *Lista degli agoranomi di età tolemaica*, in: R. Pintaudi (ed.), *Miscellanea Papyrologica* (Papyrologica Florentina 7), Florence 1980, 185–271 and P. W. Pestman, *Agoranomoi et actes agoranomiques: Krokodilopolis et Pathyris 145–88 av. J.-C.*, in: P. W. Pestman, *Textes et études de papyrologie grecque, démotique et copte* (Pap. Lugd. Bat. 23), Leiden 1985, 9–44. M. Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries in Hellenistic Egypt. A Study of Greek as a Second Language* (Collectanea Hellenistica V), Brussels 2012, offers an overview of the agoranomic officials and a linguistic analysis of the Greek language use of the *agoranomoi*.

² A short discussion is provided by Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 98–100.

³ One such study is R. Yuen-Collingridge, M. Choat, *The Copyist at Work: Scribal Practice in Duplicate Documents*, in: P. Schubert (ed.), *Actes du 26^e Congrès international de papyrologie*, Genève 2012, 827–834. In a recent article G. Mirizio, *Archetypes and antigrapha in the papyrological documentation: preliminary considerations*, *Analecta Papyrologica* 28 (2016) 255–271, discusses the interesting process of cascade letters, where officials copy a text on the same sheet where they add some new information.

‘copy’ meaning a reproduction of a predecessor, i.e. an ‘original’,⁴ we must determine how to identify these in the papyrological material. The easiest cases are those, where we have two or more versions of the same texts, i.e. duplicates, triplicates or even more.⁵ In these cases, it must be determined which one of the versions is the ‘original’ and which is the reproduction and on what basis this decision can be argued. The so-called double documents are a special practice within Greek papyri. The same contract was written twice on the same papyrus in identical copies by the same scribe and the other one was sealed for later check-ups.⁶ In that case both versions can be considered as ‘originals’, but still, one of them was written first and the second was made on the basis of the first. In the Pathyrite material however, the practice of double documents had developed further so that the *scriptura interior* was only a short summary of the contract proper, and therefore cannot be considered as a duplicate in a real sense.

It is also possible that we have several reproductions, but the ‘original’ is lost.⁷ However, a different version of a contract or a petition can also be a draft, which arguably is an earlier, and therefore more ‘original’, version than the final text which was sent to the officials or which was considered as the official, legally binding version of a contract. The official version, in fact, is a reproduction of the draft, albeit it may contain corrections and changes. In this paper, however, drafts are not under discussion, since nothing identifiable as such has been found in the Pathyris archives. Below, we will see that in all cases we cannot be certain whether a particular version is in fact a copy or the original. Naturally, this does not prevent us from comparing the differences in each version, but we must be careful in declaring any version more correct, original, or official.

The need to study features in copies compared to their originals for further understanding of scribal behaviour has been amply discussed by Yuen-Collingridge and Choat⁸. They created a preliminary typology of scribal features to be evaluated in studying duplicates, which could assist us in further analysis, e.g., recognising what range of features can be attributed to a particular writer’s repertoire in textual production.⁹ Our

⁴ Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. copy, n. (II) “A transcript or reproduction of an original” and (II 2) “A writing transcribed from, and reproducing the contents of, another; a transcript”; s.v. original, n. (2) “The thing or person in relation to which something else is a copy, imitation, or reproduction”.

⁵ A catalog of over 300 papyri from Hellenistic and Roman Egypt that exist in duplicate, see B. E. Nielsen, *A Catalog of Duplicate Papyri*, ZPE 129 (2000) 187–214. Nielsen uses the terms “source” and “duplicate” in his catalog. ‘Source’ may escape some problems of the term ‘original’, but it still places one text over another. See also L. Criscuolo, *Copie, malacopie, copie d’ufficio e il problema della titolarità di un archivio nell’Egitto tolemaico*, in: M. Faraguna (ed.), *Archives and Archival Documents in Ancient Societies*, Trieste 2013, 245–257.

⁶ See Yiftach-Firanko, *Law in Graeco-Roman Egypt: Hellenization, Fusion, Romanization*, in: R. S. Bagnall (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, Oxford 2009, 541–560, esp. 544.

⁷ See e.g. J. Stoop, *Two Copies of a Royal Petition from Kerkeosiris, 163–146 BCE*, ZPE 189 (2014) 185–193.

⁸ *Copyist* (n. 3).

⁹ In their case study, Yuen-Collingridge and Choat, *Copyist* (n. 3), concentrated on only a few well preserved exemplars of substantial length where two copies were written by the same

project *Act of the Scribe*¹⁰ is further interested in what types of linguistic features can be assigned to the scribe vs. the author of the document. In this process, studying copies can help: it is easier to study what kind of variation writers can produce in separate copies of one model; to what extent the copyist seems to follow the orthography, morphology, and word order of the original, and where he retains his individual habits even when he is seemingly following another text, not creating his own. The method of copying, usually divided into visual copying vs. dictation, is not taken as a specific issue in this article, since it has been shown that even when visual copying was used, the writer could produce independent orthography (influenced by the phonetic reality) via internal dictation.¹¹

We have four instances of duplicate documents from the Pathyris archives. In two cases, we apparently have the original document and a copy (**1** and **4**), and in two cases we seem to have two copies, but no original (**2** and **3**). We also have copies without a surviving or known parent or sibling text, and therefore I will call these “orphan copies”. The first five in the list (**a–e**) are copies of contracts, and can be identified as copies with certainty. The last four (**f–i**) are testaments, and their status as copies is uncertain. In the following, I will discuss the contents and the identification of original vs. copy for each case of the duplicates, as well as the nature of the orphan copies below (where the numbers and letters in bold refer to these lists). In the second part of the paper, I will describe the findings in the duplicates, adding evidence from the orphan copies, when possible, partly following the typology of Yuen-Collingridge and Choat but also taking the linguistic aspect into account as far as possible.

*Duplicates within the Pathyrite agoranomic documents*¹²

1. A: BGU III 993
B: Berlin inventory P. 9079 (127 BCE, Hermonthis)
2. A: P.Dryton 3
B: P.Dryton 4 (126 BCE, Pathyris)
3. A: UPZ II 180a
B: UPZ II 180b (113 BCE, Hermonthis)
4. A: P.Mil. I 2
B: P.AdI. 7 (104 BCE, Pathyris)

scribe, preferably on the same papyrus. This very limited data gave good grounds for the basic typology, which can be extended to different directions in other types of cases.

¹⁰ See the note in the beginning of the article.

¹¹ R. Criboire, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Atlanta 1996, 92–93, see also Yuen-Collingridge, Choat, *Copyist* (n. 3) 829–830. H. Halla-aho, *Scribes in Private Letter Writing. Linguistic Perspectives*, in: J. Cromwell, E. Grossmann (eds.), *Scribal Repertoires in Egypt from the New Kingdom to the Early Islamic Period*, Oxford 2017, 227–239 also makes the point that dictation does not take us closer to spoken language even outside the phonetic level.

¹² The details such as the Trismegistos ID (TM) numbers, other ID numbers, and information on images on the items of this first list are presented in the discussion below.

Orphan copies within the Pathyrite agoranomic documents

- a. SB XVIII 13848 (128 BCE, Pathyrite area(?), *homologia*)¹³
- b. SB VI 9366 (124 BCE, Pathyris, loan)¹⁴
- c. P.AdI. 2 (124 BCE, Pathyris, *homologia*, *apostasion*)¹⁵
- d. BGU III 997 (103 BCE, Pathyris, sale)¹⁶
- e. SB I 428 (99 BCE, Krokodilon polis, sale)¹⁷
- f. P.Dryton 1 (164 BCE, Diospolis Mikra, the first will of Dryton)¹⁸
- g. P.Dryton 2 (150 BCE, Laton polis, the second will of Dryton)¹⁹
- h. SB XVIII 13168 (123 BCE, Pathyris, the will of Pachnubis)²⁰
- i. P.Lond II 219b *verso* (2nd cent., Itos, the will of Paniskos alias Peteminis)²¹

Part I. Descriptions of the duplicate documents and the orphan copies from Pathyris

1. In the third volume of the BGU collection, the document number 993 is an edition published in 1903 by W. Schubart of the inventory number P. 9078, a papyrus of 15,5 by 83 cm, written by a cursive hand in 127 BCE and coming from Gebelên (i.e. Pathyris).²² It contains four columns of text. At the beginning of the edition Schubart

¹³ Edited by G. Messeri, *Frammenti di documenti agoranomici tolemaici della British Library*, Yale Classical Studies 28 (1985) 73–83 (no. 3 p. 79–83). There is no image available of this papyrus, but I have seen the original papyrus in the British Library on May 16th, 2018. The TM ID is 256 and the ID number used in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) for this document is 143.

¹⁴ Edited by C. Préaux, *Prêt de blé et d'argent de Pathyris*, CE 25 (1950) 277–282. Images in Préaux and in U. Kaplony-Heckel, *Pathyris II*, *Enchoria* 21 (1994) 49–52. The TM ID = 5738 and Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) ID = 20.

¹⁵ The papyrus now carries the inv. no. P.Carlsberg 829. I thank warmly Kim Ryholt (Copenhagen) for sending me an image of the papyrus. The TM ID = 1 and Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) ID = 21 (at that time no image was available).

¹⁶ An image has been recently made available at <http://ww2.smb.museum/berlpap/index.php/02579/> [Accessed May 25th, 2018]. The TM ID = 242 and Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) ID = 90.

¹⁷ A print illustration in ODVF (= Oversigt over det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab Forhandlinger [Bulletin de l'Académie royale des sciences et des lettres] København 1901–1902) 3, 1901, pl. I after p. 118. The original publication was Chr. Blinkenberg, *Un contrat de vente de l'époque ptolémaïque* pp. 119–126 in the above publication. The TM ID = 6463 and Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) ID = 119.

¹⁸ Plate 1 in P.Dryton. The TM ID = 44872 and Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) ID = 2.

¹⁹ Plate 2 in P.Dryton. The TM ID = 248 and Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) ID = 3.

²⁰ Image available online in the Photographic Archive of Papyri in the Cairo Museum: <http://ipap.csad.ox.ac.uk/4DLink4/4DACTION/IPAPwebquery?vPub=APF&vVol=1&vNum=p.62> [Accessed May 25th, 2018]. Translation in R. S. Bagnall, P. Derow, *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*, Malden, MA, Oxford 2004, no. 149. Demotic on the verso. The TM ID = 468 and Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) ID = 22.

²¹ Print illustration, P.Lond. II pl. 1. The TM ID = 8143 and Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) ID = 106.

²² The Trismegistos number of BGU III 993 (TM) is 232; in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) ID no 15A; in Nielsen, *Catalog* (n. 5), this pair is no. 13. The dating formula (*Aktpräskript*) of the text has also been published as Chr. Wilck. 107. Photographs are published in Schubart, *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses*, Berlin 1911, pl. 9 and D. Cohen, *Schets van het notariaat in het oude Egypte*, Amsterdam 1955, document 6 (neither photo has the third column).

mentions that a copy of the columns 2–4 is found in papyrus P. 9079. The differences between P. 9078 and P. 9079 are presented in the notes (“in der Anmerkung”) of the BGU III 993 edition. These notes have thus far been the only way P. 9079 was published. Since the notes only state the differences in how some words were written in the copy but do not take into account differences in abbreviations or the writing of numerals, nor give any other information, for example the size of the papyrus, the hand(s), the line divisions, or the text on the *verso*, the copy will be published in a forthcoming BGU volume by the present author, and in this article I will be able to take all these elements into consideration, see also Plate 11.²³

The document BGU III 993, our **1A**, is a will of Psenthotēs son of Horos (technically a “division of property after death”), written in the agoranomic office of Hermonthis in January 9, 127 BCE. The *agoranomoi* signing the document are named Apollonios and Sarapion.²⁴ All the different parts of the document were written by different hands, the *scriptura interior* (col. 1, hand 1), the document proper (col. 2 and 3, hand 2), the signature of the *agoranomoi* (end of col. 3, hand 3), and the receipt for payment of the transfer tax (*enkyklion*), written in the bank of Hermonthis nine months later (col. 4, hand 4) when the property was transferred i.e. after Psenthotēs’ death. The existence of these different hands, as well as the addition of the tax receipt to this papyrus when the tax was paid, suggests that BGU III 993 is indeed the original contract. The inventory number P. 9079, our **1B**, (15,5 × 54 cm), then, was a copy, because it does not contain the *scriptura interior* at all, and the rest, including the document proper, the signature of the *agoranomoi* and the tax receipt, were all written by one hand. This also means that the copy was produced only after the bank receipt was written on September 10, 127 BCE. The copy does not seem to have included the word “copy” (ἀντίγραφον) at the beginning, although a small lacuna exists above the first line of the document proper.²⁵

The copy has one line of text on the *verso* written by another hand (the *verso* was not mentioned in the BGU III 993 edition). That hand somewhat resembles the hand which wrote the bank receipt in the original, and it may be a note of the banker or taxation official made for filing purposes. My suggestion is that the copy was made for filing purposes, either for the bank or for the files of a tax collector (the two possibly

²³ My warmest thanks go to Fabian Reiter for providing me with digital scans of the copy, P. 9079, and to Marius Gerhardt for letting me study the old b/w photo of the original, P. 9078, in Staatliche Museen zu Berlin in its entirety in November 2014, including also column 3 (due to the width of the papyrus the photo is in two parts, the cut being in the third column. This is most likely the reason the photograph of column 3 has not been published). Neither of the original papyri were available for study due to conservational reasons during my visit.

²⁴ Only six documents written in the Hermonthis agoranomic office have survived, see e.g. Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 87–88.

²⁵ The tear could only fit approximately five letters, thus the word “copy” would have needed to be abbreviated. The word is abbreviated in BGU III 997, but followed by a genitive attribute of the type of the contract: ἀντίγρα(φον) ὀνής; in P.AdI.Gr. 2 it is also followed by a genitive attribute: ἀντίγραφον ὀμολογίας. The word “copy” alone is also found in SB XVIII 13848 (a) and SB I 428 (e), but not abbreviated.

being the same institution).²⁶ It was not likely a copy meant for the agoranomic register (as those lack the dating formula, for instance).²⁷ In any case, the copy was written after the payment of the transfer tax, since the original receipt was also copied.

According to S. Waebens the original text (P. 9078) belongs to the small archive of Psenenouphis, son of Horos, who was in possession of the will because he was the closest male relative of the beneficiary Tasemis, unmarried at the time.²⁸ Waebens does not discuss whether the copy (P. 9079) belonged to the same archive or not.²⁹ The papyri and ostraca from Pathyris derive both from legal and illegal excavations, and therefore it is often difficult to trace the find spots and the archives to which the texts belonged.³⁰ It is difficult to tell when and by whom the original text and the copy were joined so that they ended up in Berlin with subsequent inventory numbers. Although it is not impossible that they ended up in the same family archive already in antiquity, and travelled together to the Berlin collection, it seems more likely that the copy was originally in possession of some other party.

2. The third will of the cavalry officer Dryton has been found in two copies, P. Dryton 3 and 4, our **2A** and **2B**.³¹ Katelijjn Vandorpe's edition discusses the copies and their differences in detail, so in this paper it is not necessary to pinpoint all of them (and the

²⁶ For banks in Egypt in the Ptolemaic period, see W. Clarysse, K. Vandorpe, *Egyptian Bankers and Bank Receipts in Hellenistic and Early Roman Egypt*, in: K. Verboven, K. Vandorpe, V. Chankowski (eds.), *Pistoi dia tèn technèn. Bankers, Loans and Archives in the Ancient World. Studies in Honour of Raymond Bogaert* (Studia Hellenistica 44), Leuven 2008, 153–168 and W. Clarysse, D. J. Thompson, *An Early Ptolemaic Bank Register from the Arsinoite Nome*, APF 55/2 (2009) 230–260, and W. Clarysse, D. J. Thompson, L. Capron, *An Early Ptolemaic Bank Register from the Arsinoite Nome Revised*, APF 57/1 (2011) 35–54; an edition of a register apparently made in the bank where revenues of several different civilian and military taxes of one month were listed and counted.

²⁷ K. Vandorpe, *A Greek register from Pathyris' notarial office. Loans and sales from the Pathyrite and Latopolite nomes*, ZPE 150 (2005) 161–186.

²⁸ Trismegistos Archive ID 491; S. Waebens, *Archive of Psenenouphis son of Horos* in <http://www.trismegistos.org/arch/archives/pdf/491.pdf> (2011). Cf. K. Vandorpe, S. Waebens, *Reconstructing Pathyris' Archives. A Multicultural Community in Hellenistic Egypt* (Collectanea Hellenistica III), Brussels 2009, 197–199.

²⁹ Unfortunately, the copy of BGU III 993 is referred to as inventory number P. 9074 both in Vandorpe, Waebens, *Reconstructing* (n. 28) n. 152 and in Waebens, *Archive of Psenenouphis* (n. 28) n. 2. This mistake was most probably caused by misreading the handwritten 9 as 4 in the inventory number in the BGU *editio princeps*.

³⁰ K. Vandorpe, *Museum Archaeology or How to Reconstruct Pathyris Archives*, EVO 17 (1994) 289–300, esp. 290 on Borchardt's excavations for Berlin. However, Vandorpe, Waebens *Reconstructing* (n. 28) 197, mention that the papyri of Psenenouphis archive from Pathyris turned up in the antiquities market as a result of illicit trade and got mixed up with the Pelaias group; in p. 72 the Pelaias group is discussed and the collection C of Greek papyri is said to have been bought by L. Borchardt in 1899.

³¹ P. Dryton 3 (TM 268) was ID 18A in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1); P. Dryton 4 (TM 258) as ID 18B in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1). Photographs in P. Dryton pl. III and IV. Nielsen, *Catalog* (n. 5) no. 89.

first copy is very fragmentary, so we lack most points of comparison). The will was written in the notary's office of Pathyris in June 126 BCE. The responsible *agoranomos* was Asklepiades (notary in Krokodilon polis), but the original will was probably written by Areios, a representative of the *agoranomos* in Pathyris and Asklepiades' brother. **2A** is considered to be an agoranomic copy, and was probably written by Areios himself or by his son and apprentice Ammonios (who, in fact, was one of the witnesses).³² **2A** has a list of witnesses with their physical descriptions, and the mention that four of the witnesses had written their names/witness statements in Demotic in the original. **2A** lacks the long dating formula, contrary to P.Dryton 1 (**f**) and P.Dryton 2 (**g**). It is possible that the dating was written in a separate column to the left of the preserved part, of which we have no traces. Vandorpe recognised that the second copy, **2B**, was written by the hand of Esthladas, son of Dryton. It was therefore a private copy of the beneficiary. It does not include the witness list at all, and it also has a short dating formula. Neither of the copies bear an agoranomic signature.³³

3. UPZ II 180a (**3A**) and 180b (**3B**)³⁴ is a record of the sale and division of an inheritance of several parts of several houses and liturgies by Horos, son of Horos to his children (three sons and a daughter), written in Hermonthis in the name of the *agoranomos* Hermias (not the same Hermias who worked in the office at Pathyris). **3A** is followed by a long list (47 columns) of names of mummies and tombs connected to the liturgies also divided between Horos's children although they are not an object of sale in the agoranomic sale document. The list is apparently a translation of a Demotic list, the beginning of which has been survived (P.Berl.dem. 3116 = TM 43617). **3B** has the title "copy of a sale" ([ἀντί]γραφον ὀνής) in the beginning of the text, and it contains only a copy of the sale and the tax receipt, not the burial list. Ulrich Wilcken's introduction in UPZ II 180a gives details of the papyri, and also discusses at length whether 180a is the original contract or another copy. The papyrus includes the tax receipt (which follows the list of burials), written in a different hand than the contract, which Wilcken first thought to signify that **3A** is the original; but because there are other differences, e.g. the contents of **3A** and **3B** do not exactly match (a house in Memnoneia is mentioned only in **3B**), it seems that they cannot be copies of a same original.³⁵ **3A** also lacks the agoranomic signature and *scriptura interior*, and Wilcken thus concluded

³² P.Dryton, p. 70, Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 93–94 and for the agoranomic family 101–103.

³³ Only two copies of wills in Pathyrite archives preserve the agoranomic signature: P.Dryton 2, l. 33 (**g**) and SB XVIII 13168, 32 (**h**).

³⁴ UPZ II 180a (TM 3582), originally P.Par. 5: a facsimile is found in P.Par. pl. XIII–XVI; UPZ II 180b (TM 3581), originally Leiden papyrus (Leid. gr. 416) with a facsimile in Leemans, P.Leid. pl. V [Pap.M]. In P.Choach.Survey, these two are discussed as no. 54a and 54b; in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 180a as ID 37A and 180b as ID 37B (where I mistakenly mentioned that both would have been written on the same papyrus); Nielsen, *Catalog* (n. 5) no. 335.

³⁵ See also P.Choach.Survey 54 (pp. 180–182), where P. W. Pestman considered 180a to be the original and 180b the copy, but also mentions that "there must have existed a second exemplar of the original" which mentioned the house as in 180b.

that **3A** was also a copy, and the tax receipt was simply copied later by a different hand. It is also noteworthy that the tax receipt speaks of the agreement as a donation (δόσις), not a sale, while the copy clearly states that the text is a copy of a sale, and the agreement text includes the sale formula “sold – bought” (ἀπέδοτο – ἐπρίατο). Given the fact that the list of mummies and tombs were translated from Demotic to Greek and were included in this “sale” referring to a transfer of inheritance from Horos to his children, it is possible that the “original” was a Demotic contract (or there were several of them for each child individually); for the parts of houses, a Greek agoranomic contract, including tax payments, was apparently needed. Interestingly, **3B** begins, after the statement “copy of a sale” and a short date, with the words μετὰ τὰ κοινὰ τὰδε λέγει. The first phrase, μετὰ τὰ κοινὰ / καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ κοινὰ (“with the usual clauses”) was often used in abridgements, and the latter, τὰδε λέγει, in Greek translations of Demotic contracts (corresponding to the Demotic *ḏd*).³⁶ The editor Wilcken considered the words τὰδε λέγει as superfluous after μετὰ τὰ κοινὰ; however, their presence strengthens the argument that the original contract was a Demotic one.

The handwriting in **3A** (“eine sehr ausgeschrieben Kursive”) is different than in **3B** (“eine große Kursive”). The long dating formula has been written out in **3A** but not in **3B**. The layout of the text in **3A** is also similar to the original agoranomic contracts: the dating formula is written in longer lines, and the paragraph with the contract proper is indented. The lack of the notarial signature and the *scriptura interior* seems to be the strongest argument for **3A** also being a copy, but neither is a secure marker of a copy. If **3A** was a copy, it most likely was made in the agoranomic office.

4. P.Mil. I 2 (= SB III 6645),³⁷ our **4A**, is a sale of a sixth part of a palm grove by Thabis, daughter of Phibis, to two of her sons (Phibis and Horos, sons of Nechouthes), made in the agoranomic office in Pathyris. The notary is Hermias, and the contract has been written in the so-called “Hermias-hand”.³⁸ The papyrus size is 37 × 15 cm, and it only contains the document proper in one column with a signature of the notary, but no *scriptura interior*, nor bank receipt. Therefore we cannot judge the “originality” of the document by different handwritings, like with **1A**. The copy **4B**, P.AdL.Gr. 7,³⁹ is

³⁶ See e.g. P.Giss. 36, UPZ II 175 and UPZ II 177. Of the last, a new edition of both the Demotic and Greek versions is R. Mairs, C. J. Martin, *A Bilingual ‘Sale’ of Liturgies from the Archive of the Theban Choachytes: P. Berlin 5507, P. Berlin 3098 and P. Leiden 413*, *Enchoria* 31 (2008/2009) 22–67.

³⁷ The Milan papyrus (TM 7) was ID 83A in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) and photographs are found in P.Mil. I tav. III; O. Montevicchi, *Papirologia*, Torino 1973, tav. 23; I. Gallo, *Avviamento alla papirologia greco-latina*, Napoli 1983, 14; vgl. R. Seider, *Paläographie der griechischen Papyri*, Stuttgart, vol. 3.1., 398–399 (part). Nielsen, *Catalog* (n. 5) no. 160; Nielsen includes here P.Ryl. IV 581, apparently because it belongs to the same group of fragments (P.Med. I 2 = P.Mil. I 2), which are related to the archive of Horos, cf. below, n. 40. P.Ryl. IV 581, however, is not a version of the same text, but a sale of its own.

³⁸ See Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 95–96.

³⁹ P.AdL. 7 (TM 6) was ID 83B in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) and photographs are in P.AdL. pl. II; II. 11–14: *Scrittura & Civiltà* 3 (1979) tav. II, after p. 48.

smaller (14,9 × 10,5 cm), but the right side is damaged and the ends of the lines are missing. The bottom of the papyrus is also broken, thus we cannot be sure if the signature of the *agoranomos* was there. The words ἀντίγρα(φον) ὄνης written in the upper margin, clearly separate from the document proper, identify it as a copy. It has been written in a different hand than **4A**. The Adler papyri form an exception in the Pathyris archives as a closed find, from a single jar. They form the archive of Horos, son of Nechouthes. However, later some papyri coming from other sources were discovered as also connected to the archive of Horos, the Milan papyrus being one of them.⁴⁰ Since the copy without a doubt belonged to the archive of Horos, the second buyer in the text, it is likely that it is Horos' copy of the contract. This sale was apparently soon annulled with the document SB XX 14198 (not very well preserved).⁴¹ Thaibis also made a very similar sale ten days later (P.AdI. 8) to her third son, Panebchounis, son of Nechouthes for one talent and 2000 drachmas, whereas in **4** the price was 2 talents 4000 drachmas; i.e. all three boys paid an equal sum. P.AdI. 8 was also made in the office of the *agoranomos* by Hermias, but it seems that **4** was not used as a model for it, since some words differ in e.g. Thaibis's physical description and in other parts; the neighbours are also listed differently, so the plot does not seem to be exactly the same.⁴²

The first five in the list of orphan copies (**a–e**) are copies of contracts, and can be identified as copies with certainty because of the survival of the word “copy” (ἀντίγραφον) at the beginning of (**a**, **c**, **d**) or inside the text (**b**).⁴³ In **e**, the word “copy” was written in the left margin.⁴⁴ The notarial signatures were also usually present at the end of the copy in the same handwriting as the copy proper, which was also the practice in the original contracts. The three first contracts (**a–c**) are types of documents which were written in a short format even as “original” documents (as far as we know), thus not including a long dating protocol or *scriptura interior*.⁴⁵ Of the copies of the two sales (**d–e**), **d** has the *scriptura interior*, but **e** does not, and neither have the sales tax receipt copied. It is clear that the elements present in the copies depended on the one hand on

⁴⁰ See Vandorpe, Waebens, *Reconstructing* (n. 28) 127–141; they do not count the Milan papyrus as Horos' archive text in the table (p. 139), but rather assume that the papyrus should have belonged to archive of Phibis, son of Nechouthes, the first buyer and Horos' brother.

⁴¹ G. Messeri Savorelli, *Un nuovo documento dell'archivio di Horos figlio di Nechutes*, *Analecta Papyrologica* 2 (1990) 53–62.

⁴² Messeri Savorelli, *Nuovo documento* (n. 41) considered it as the same plot; that was the basis of the dating of the annulment of the first sale.

⁴³ The text **b** was written on an ostrakon, and the word “copy” is not at the beginning of the text. It is a palimpsest; Demotic was written over the Greek.

⁴⁴ In SB I 428, the published photograph of the papyrus does not show the word “copy”; Blinkenberg, *Contrat de vente* (n. 17) stated that the word is located to the left of the text proper and, due to technical reasons, that part was left out of the photograph. A photograph kindly provided to me by Adam Bülow-Jacobsen shows that this is indeed the case. The papyrus has extensive margins on the left and right.

⁴⁵ See Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 74–79 for the formats and elements in the agoronomic documents.

the document type and on the other hand on the purpose of the copy; therefore any single element present, or not present, cannot be used as evidence for the text being a copy.⁴⁶

The testaments (f–i) have been presented as copies by some scholars, which is the justification to include them in this study even though they do not bear the word “copy”. The first three have been identified as copies because the witness statements were written by the same scribal hand as the document proper.⁴⁷ However, M. Nowak has argued against the identification of f and g, Dryton’s first and second will, as copies.⁴⁸ From the testaments in Pathyris, only g and h have the agoranomic signature, but since many of them are poorly preserved (2A, f, i), we cannot make direct conclusions from that. The will h may perhaps be taken as a copy, since it has been reused (Demotic on the verso). The fourth (i) seems to be a copy or a draft, because it was written on the backside of a papyrus where the *recto* has a list of names. Different types of documents which could all act as testaments were drawn up in the Ptolemaic period.⁴⁹ E.g. our 1A was a division of property and P.Lond. VII 2191 (116 BCE, Pathyris) was a *sunchoresis*, both of which had a *scriptura interior*, document proper and the sales-tax receipt all written in different hands, and are thus evidently originals; however, this type of document did not need witnesses; so they do not help us in assessing whether Dryton’s wills (*diathekai*) were copies or not.

Part II. Copying practices in the Pathyrite agoranomic contracts

1) Handwriting, scriptio continua and syllabification

All the above-mentioned duplicate pairs have different handwriting in each version. The writing is very fluent and careful in the copy of the pair 1, but writing practise differed in that the copyist used *scriptio continua*, whereas the writer of the original left spaces between words. The writers also differed in dividing words between the lines; in the original a word was never split, but in the copy words were divided several times at the beginning of the document.⁵⁰ With pairs 3 and 4, the copyist’s hands were slightly less practised, or their writing implements were not in such a good shape. The hand of 4B could belong to a beginner scribe since the lettering is uneven and the ink is very thick at places. 3B, while clearly written by a practised professional, seems to have

⁴⁶ See Table 1 in this article for the notarial elements (signatures, *scriptura interiors*, etc.) as well as some visual features present in these copies; cf. Table 9 in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 100. The odd missing signature in copy d (Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* [n.1] 99) is in fact not missing: when examining the original, I noticed that the signature had been there, but was torn out (see M. Vierros, *Traces of a notarial signature in BGU III 997 – a deliberate removal?*, APF 63/1 [2017] 25–28).

⁴⁷ See Vandorpe, P. Dryton, pp. 51 and 61.

⁴⁸ M. Nowak, *Dryton’s Wills Reconsidered*, RIDA 59 (2012) 241–251, esp. 248.

⁴⁹ See W. Clarysse, *Ptolemaic Wills*, in: M. J. Geller, H. Maehler (eds.), *Legal Documents of the Hellenistic World. Papers from a Seminar arranged by the Institute of Classical Studies, the Insitute of Jewish Studies and the Warburg Institute, University of London, February to May 1986*, London 1995, 88–105.

⁵⁰ Divided words in the copy: ll. 2/3: στρατο-πέδω[ι], 4/5: Εὐερ-γέτιδος, 5/6: βασι-λέως.

been written quickly (more hasty ligatures), and the writer occasionally leaves spaces between words, but not nearly as often as the writer of **3A**. In the only copy we can certainly identify as a private one (**2B**), the hand of Esthladas is also practised and consistent.⁵¹ Esthladas, like the writers of **2A** and **4B**, used *scriptio continua*.

All the orphan copies seem to be written by skilled notarial hands, and most, if not all, of them are “agoranomic” copies. Text **c** is written clearly by a notarial hand (the signature is Areios under Heliodoros). The writer, however, leaves spaces quite consistently between the words, an uncommon practice among the *agoranomoi*, although also the writer of **b** occasionally leaves spaces between words. The handwriting of **d** is the so-called “Hermias-hand”, that is, the hand that wrote the majority of the notarial texts written in the name of *agoranomos* Hermias.⁵² As for syllabification, in **a** the line ends and beginnings are not preserved, but the editor’s supplements assume syllabification at the ends of lines 9 and 12. In **b**, **c**, **e**, **g**, **h**, and **i**, the words are divided between lines when necessary; **d** is the only one where this does not happen even once.

2) Physical appearance and layout

It is worthwhile to study whether the copies and original differ from one another in their physical appearance, their inclusion of certain elements of the text types, and their layout (see also Table 1). As can be expected, the copies employ a more condensed appearance than the originals, trying to fit in more text in a smaller space. The line divisions are never the same. In pair **1**, the copy is quite large, consisting of two columns plus a tax receipt and the papyrus has ample margins. The original, however, is even bigger. The copyist has fit in more words per line than what the original text has in the second column (the third column has longer lines, as the line 11 in the copy shows).⁵³ The layout is different, too. In the original, the dating formula is clearly one paragraph, and the contract proper begins a new paragraph with a small *paragraphos* mark in the left margin. It also has a wider margin than the dating paragraph, i.e. the whole paragraph is indented. The copy merely has a small blank space in the line between the dating (the long dating formula was copied) and the contract proper and only the end of the contract is marked with a *paragraphos* before the tax receipt (which was separated by indentation), see Plate 11.

Similar differences in the layout are found in pair **4**. The dating formula is written as a separate paragraph, and the contract proper — starting with the word “sold” (*ἀπέδοτο*) — begins a new, indented, paragraph with the *paragraphos* mark at the end,

⁵¹ See Vandorpe, P. Dryton, pp. 415–419 for the study of handwritings in general and the hands of Dryton and Esthladas in particular. Esthladas and Dryton were an exception in Pathyris in being literate in Greek. That was due to their Greek background. They and the notarial officials were practically the only ones able to write Greek in the area, see Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 56–71.

⁵² Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 95–96.

⁵³ The photographs of the original in Schubart are 1:1 scale (the b/w photos in Berlin include the scale); the lines in dating protocol (col. 2) are approximately 20 cm and the third column has longer lines, ca. 27 cm. In the copy, the length of the line is 23 cm in col. 1 and 22 cm in col. 2.

after which the signature of the notary is written in a separate line, located clearly more to the right than the beginnings of the lines of the contract. The copy also includes the dating formula, but the contract proper begins in the same fourth line where the dating ended, with only a small empty space left in between. The lines of the copy are shorter than in the original (ca. 60 vs. 90 letters per line)⁵⁴, and the copy thus needed 15 lines where the original has 10 plus the beginning of an 11th. The last line of the copy has not been preserved, so we do not know where the agoranomic signature was located (if it was copied).

Concerning pair **3**, **3A** could be thought of as an original, if the criteria was the layout of the document. It has a similar layout to the originals in **1** and **4**; the dating formula as a separate paragraph and the document proper beginning a new paragraph with wider margin. The whole first column is also very wide; the second column is only about half of its width. A *paragaphos* marks the end of the contract, and then the list of funerary rights begins; these continue in even narrower columns. The copy, **3B**, is also written in two columns, both of which are considerably narrower than in **3A** (the first column in **3A** has ten lines and the second five lines of the contract, whereas **3B** has 26 lines in the first column and eight in the second, excluding the bank receipts in both).

As for the layout of pair **2**, the agoranomic copy is so poorly preserved that it is difficult to say much. However, the restorations in the agoranomic copy are made on basis of Esthladas' copy, and thus the line divisions can more or less be deciphered because some fragments with traces of several lines are preserved. The length of the lines in Esthladas' copy is significant, his lines contain mostly over 100 letters (towards the very end of the document the letters take more space, since e.g. line 19 only has 90 letters). The agoranomic copy seems to have shorter lines: lines 5 and 10 have 64 and 65 letters. Since the first line has 86 letters, it seems that lines 1 and 2 began more to the left than the rest of column 1. The witness statements in the agoranomic copy are best preserved, and they were written as a separate narrow column, with a "hanging first line", i.e. each statement begins with the first line slightly more to the left than the rest of the lines. Esthladas' copy is lacking the left side, so we do not know if he indented anything, but it is unlikely since the lines contain more or less the same amount of letters (l. 1: 106; l. 5: 107, l. 10: 108). His text block is rather condensed and he underestimated the space available to him, since a lot of empty papyrus remains at the bottom margin. He would have had the space to copy the witness statements too, had he wanted to do so. He has written a short date in a separate line after the text proper, although the date seems to have been in the beginning, too, in a short form. The restoration in **2A** considers the date written in the short form.

⁵⁴ Lines 1, 5, and 10 have 69, 53, and 59 letters per line respectively in the copy (P.AdI. 7), and lines 1, 5, 9 have 91, 93, and 85 letters per line in the original (line 10 has only 67 letters even though it is a whole line and the text continues to the 11th line; the writer had expanded the size of his letters towards the end of the document for some reason).

Concerning the orphan copies, the texts **a–c** were all text types that were usually written in a shorter format, i.e. loans and *apostasia*, so the physical format of the originals would not have been very different (i.e., not the wide column format).⁵⁵ However, **b** is written on an ostrakon, so the copy seems to be of less value. The copy **c**, where the margins are preserved, does have quite ample margins.

The copy of a sale, **d**, is written in the wide column format and it looks in every way like an original agoranomic sale document, even carrying the *scriptura interior*, which was usually not present in copies. It is possible that this text was originally written with the intention of it being the final and original, but then “downgraded” to be a copy by adding the words ἀντίγρα(φον) ὀνής “copy of a sale” above the first line. We cannot see any clear reason for such downgrading, though, as there are no apparent corrections by the writer in this copy. The only deviant feature is the “missing” notarial signature, which, however, was not originally missing, but was torn away at some later stage for reasons unknown to us.⁵⁶

The other copy of a sale contract, **e**, was also written in a wide column (ca. 80 letters per line), but there was no *scriptura interior*. The word copy (ἀντίγραφον) was written to the left of the contract proper (see above). Some techniques concerning the layout were used: the first three lines consisting of the dating formula and the place of writing are longer. The paragraph of the document proper, beginning with the word ἀπέδο[το], is indented by approximately a space of nine letters. There is also an unexpected blank space on l. 9 in the middle of the list of the neighbours of the sold plot of land (perhaps it was left there to be filled in later, specifying more clearly the neighbours in the east, but was never filled in). The notarial signature in the name of Paniskos is on its own line on the right hand side of the papyrus.

The uncertain orphan copies, **f–i**, were wills. Two are preserved in a fragmentary state (**f** and **i**), and **g** does not preserve the left or right margins. None of them seem to be written in the wide column format, although the lines are not that narrow either (**g** has an average of 70 letters per line and **h** has 62). Some visual aids can be detected in them, e.g. in **g** a small empty space is left between the dating formula and the will proper, and there is an empty space worth of several lines before the witness list begins. The agoranomic signature at the end is also separated by empty space. In **h** the first line is written 4 letters more to the left than the rest of the lines (hanging first line), the witness list begins as a new paragraph and the notarial signature is separate at the end.

3) Writing of numbers

Especially in **1**, most numbers that were written in words in the original were written with numeric symbols (i.e. in Greek, the letters of the alphabet as ciphers) in the copy.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ See Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 74.

⁵⁶ See Vierros, *Traces* (n. 46).

⁵⁷ E.g. ἔτους τρίτου καὶ τεσσαρακοστοῦ (**1A**, col. 2, l. 2) was rendered as ἔτους μυ (**1B**, 2), or the day of the month ὀκτωκαιδεκάτη (**1A**, col. 2, l. 8) was written ιη̄ in **1B**, 7; the age of the contracting party was ἐτῶν πεντήκοντα ὀκτώ in **1A**, col. 2, ll. 10–11, but (ἐτῶν) νη̄ in **1B**, 9.

This practice seems to have been applied especially to the numbers indicating dates (year and day) and a person's age, but in the contract proper the numbers relating to the divided property were also written in words several times in the copy.⁵⁸

In **2B**, Esthladas wrote all the numbers with numeric symbols. The same usage is assumed for the agoranomic copy in the restorations by the editor. None of the preserved parts of the latter contain numbers. In **3**, both versions have the year and the day of the month and ages of the contracting parties shortened, but they differ in the size of property: μέρος ἕβδομον (**3A**, 7) vs. μέρος ζ' (**3B**, 9), 'the seventh part' and πήχεως τρίτον πεντακαίδέκατον (**3A**, 8) vs. πήχεως γ' ἰε' (**3B**, 13) '1/3 and 1/15 of a cubit'. Later, in **3A**, the numeric symbols are used for the "fourth part": τὸ δ' and when πήχεως γ' ἰε' is repeated. Also the price of two talents is referred to only with symbol β in both texts.

In **4**, the original and the copy both follow the same usage: the year and the day of the month and ages of the contracting parties are shortened, but the parts and the price are written out (μέρος ἕκτον 'sixth part'⁵⁹, τρίτην μερίδα 'third part' χαλκοῦ τάλαντα δύο δραχμὰς τετρακισχίλι[ί]ας 'two talents and four thousand drachmas of the bronze standard').

The orphan copies usually have the numerals concerning the date or the ages of the people written with numeric symbols, but an exception to the rule is **e**, where the year in the dating is written out as a word (ἔτους [πεν]τεκαίδεκάτου), even though the day of the month is in numeric symbol (μηνὸς Ἐπι[ε]φ θ). The prices and numerals concerning the property, the objects of the contracts, were either written out in words (**c**, **d**) or with numeric figures (**b**, **f**). A mixture of both usages is also found (**e**, **h**). In **e**, the size of the plot was written in figures (ἀρούρας δ ζ), but the price in words: χαλκοῦ(ῶ) τα(λάντου) ἑνός. In **h**, when describing cattle and land, the copyist writes the numbers in words: πρόβατα μὲν ὀκτώ βόες δύο; (ἀρούρας) δεκαδύο, but the sum of drachmas is in figures ([δρα]χμὰς ΑϚ).

In conclusion, we can say that writing out numbers as words was obviously more secure, and leaving less room for doubt, mistake, or forgery, and was thus used in the original document in all cases, or at least in the important parts concerning the object of the transaction and the price. In the copies, using less space and writing more quickly was more appreciated, but the important sums and numbers could still be written out as words.

4) Other abbreviations

In **1A**, the writer of the document proper (second hand) does not use a single abbreviation. In the other parts, the *scriptura interior* (hand 1), the agoranomic signature (hand 3), and the bank receipt (hand 4), abbreviations are used. The copyist, however,

⁵⁸ In the copy: l. 14: ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ('120 purificatory days'; ll. 15, 16, 17: τὸ ἕβδομον μέρος, 'the seventh part') and the amount of purificatory days in l. 15 ἡμέραι δεκαεπτὰ [[πεντε]] (see below on the scribe's self-correction).

⁵⁹ This is not preserved in the copy, but there is space for it.

did abbreviate some words in the contract proper as well.⁶⁰ His way of abbreviating also sometimes differed from the practices of hand 4 (tax receipt) in the original, and surprisingly we have one instance, where the copyist has written out in full the word τέλος (l. 28), which was abbreviated in the original.⁶¹

In **2B**, Esthladas uses a significant amount of abbreviations. Vandorpe has accepted most of the same abbreviations in her restoration of the **2A**, even though I would suspect that the notarial copyists would not have used so many abbreviations.⁶² For example, it can be expected that Esthladas himself was prone to abbreviate recurring and familiar personal names, e.g. Ἐσθλά(δου), Ἀπολλω(νία), but for a notarial scribe that would seem a bit daring (and, in fact, Esthladas writes his own name out in two places where in the agoranomic copy it has been restored as abbreviated: P.Dryton 3, ll. 14 and 15; 4, ll. 9 and 10. The list of witnesses in the agoranomic copy contains many abbreviations, especially in the physical descriptions, where it is quite expected. It does not support the idea that the copyist would have used so many abbreviations in the contract proper, however.

In pair **3**, the first text, **3A**, uses abbreviations sparingly in the contract proper: only the words (ἐτῶν) and μακροπρόσω(πος), in the physical descriptions of the parties to the contract, and Διὸς πό(λεως). The list that follows the contract includes some more abbreviations. The writer of the copy, however, has abbreviated many more words: the same words in the physical descriptions, and some more: μέ(σος), μελίχρω(ς), τετα(νός), and then many phraseologic words in the contract proper, e.g. οἰκ(ίας) ἠκοδο(μημένης); points of compass βο(ρρᾶ), νό(του), ἀπη(λιώτου); γείτο(νες) and also names of some of the neighbours of the plot: Ζμανρέ(ους) τοῦ Ψεμνέ(ους) etc. Since both versions have the banker's receipt, it is interesting to see that the copyist of **3B** has partly abbreviated the same words in the same way, but occasionally abbreviated some more: Ἀμμώ(νιος) l. 36 and χα(λκοῦ) l. 39, forgot some words (Πτολεμαίου l. 36 and δόσεως l. 38), and abbreviated in a slightly different way the sequence -γρα-:

⁶⁰ L. 9 (ἐτῶν) was abbreviated with the “year” sign (the usual L-shaped symbol) raised a little bit on the line; μακροπρ(όσωπος) εὐθύρ(ιν) = μακροπρόσωπος εὐθύρριν in orig. (col. 2, l. 11); μακροπρ(όσωπος) is abbreviated by the rho being underneath the triangular pi. εὐθύρ(ιν) is abbreviated by an upsilon above theta and rho. L. 13 ἀδ(ελφῶι) is abbreviated by writing the delta above the alpha. The copyist may have felt it unnecessary to write the same phrase τῶι ἔαυ[το]ῦ ἀδελφῶι again in full, as it appears just in the line 12 above, almost directly above in the papyrus. L. 13 (ἦμισυ) was abbreviated with the half-sign in the copy; the word was written out in full in the copy in l. 11. In l. 20 διῶρυξ βα(σιλική) is quite faded where the alpha is, so it is difficult to see how the abbreviation was made.

⁶¹ E.g. l. 25 in the copy: τρά(πεζαν) abbreviated by rho below tau and alpha above tau; in the original tau and rho are side by side and the alpha is above the rho. ἐνκυ(κλίου) abbreviated by writing the upsilon above the kappa, in the same way as in the original. L. 26 οἰκονό(μου) is abbreviated with the first omicron above the kappa and the second above nu. In the original it only has οἰκο with the omicron above kappa. These, and the rest of the abbreviations will be discussed in the forthcoming edition.

⁶² Vandorpe presents (P.Dryton, p. 80) two preserved differences between the agoranomic copy and Esthladas's copy. Esthladas abbreviated the name of the Ammonieion-quarter (l. 15), but he did not abbreviate the word ἀνέγκλητος (l. 18).

διαγρα(φήν) **3A**, col. 50, l. 2 vs. διαγρα(φήν) **3B**, 36 and ἀντιγρα(φεύς) **3A**, col. 50, l. 3 vs. ἀντιγρα(φεύς) **3B**, 37.

In **4**, interestingly, the copy seems to have less abbreviations than the original. Both have the words (ἐτῶν), μελίχρω(ς) in the physical description of the parties abbreviated, but the word μακροπρόσωπος is written out in **4B** while it is abbreviated in **4A**. From the points of compass only ἀπηλιώ(του) is abbreviated in **4A**, but also that is apparently written out in **4B** (it is in the lacuna both times, but there is enough space to not require abbreviation).

The orphan copy **a** does not contain any abbreviations other than numerals, but the text is quite poorly preserved. The copyist of **b** uses abbreviations widely, in denoting, e.g., grain and money: (πυρῶν), (τάλαντον), and even the lender's name was abbreviated: Ἡρα(κλείδης). The only abbreviation besides some numerals preserved in **c** is (τάλαντα). In **d**, abbreviations are mainly used in the *scriptura interior*, which had to fit into a smaller space, but also some words in the physical descriptions and the word 'years' in denoting age were also abbreviated in the main text: μελίχρω(ς), μακροπρόσω(πος), (ἐτῶν). This tallies well with the idea that **d** was originally not meant to be a copy. In **e**, abbreviations are used in physical descriptions, but not always in the same way: e.g. l. 4 μακρ[ο]π[ρό]σω(πος) vs. l. 5 μακρο(προσώπου); l. 10 μελί(χρω)ς, but unabbreviated on ll. 4 and 5; abbreviation for the word 'year' on l. 5 but not on l. 4.; it is important to have evidence showing that even the same writer differed in his abbreviating habits. In **f**, the use of abbreviations is attested for 'talents' and 'drachmas', and they were presumably also used in the physical description and the word 'year', but these are all supplied by the editor. In **g**, **h**, and **i**, we find words in the physical description of the testator in the document proper and for witnesses as well as the word 'year' in denoting age, all occasionally abbreviated. It is noteworthy that the word ἔτους in the beginning of a document/date was written out in full every time it is preserved (**b**, **c**, **d** [*scr. int.*], **e**, **g**, **h**).

5) Omissions and additions

In **1**, the copyist has occasionally been sloppy and forgot some words. In several cases the omission does not change the message and is thus harmless, like leaving out the participles καλουμένη in l. 19⁶³ and σημαυνομένη in l. 20⁶⁴ or the title of Isis.⁶⁵ At l. 10 from the original phrase Σεννήσιος τῆι ἑαυτοῦ γυναικί ἦι σύνεστι κατὰ νόμους the copyist left out ἦι σύνεστι "with whom he lived (i.e. was married)". The omission is not serious, since the remaining phrase still include the words "wife according to the laws". In l. 20 the customary ending in phrasing the neighbours ἢ οἱ ἄν ὄσιν γείτονες πάντοθεν "or whoever the neighbours are" was left out in the copy. Sometimes the

⁶³ The original has νήσου καλουμένης Πιτβιος and the copy νήσου Πιτβ; the participle καλουμένη was left out before the name apparently as redundant; the copyist was also approaching the end of his line. For the difference in the name, see below.

⁶⁴ The original has τῆι σημαυνομένηι αὐτοῦ γυναικί, but the copy τῆι ἑαυτοῦ γυναικί.

⁶⁵ Ἴσιδος μεγίστης θεᾶς **1B**, 15 vs. Ἴσιδος Νεμήτος θεᾶς μεγίστης **1A**, col. 3, l. 4.

omissions do make understanding harder, e.g. in l. 12 where the word *υἴων* “sons” was forgotten.⁶⁶ The omission of the preposition *κατὰ* at ll. 23–24 could make understanding more difficult, but since it is in a legal phrase, it is unlikely that it would.⁶⁷ A grave mistake was leaving a whole line out between lines 21–22 in the copy. The omission begins from the last word of column 3, line 10 *πάν<τα>*, and extends through the whole line 11: *καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο ὑπάρχον αὐτῶι ἐστὶν ἢ<ο>ι κατὰ συνβόλαια ἢ κατ’ ἐπενέχυρον καὶ ἔντισιν ἐν πίστει πυροῦ τε καὶ κριθῆν*. Line 22 of the copy picks up the line 12 of the original from the beginning. This could be taken as an argument in favour of proposing that the copying was performed visually. However, it is also possible that somebody else was reading the original document out loud to the copyist(s) and the reader’s eyes skipped line 11 in the original. In either case, **1A** was obviously the exemplar upon which the copy based.

In l. 23 the copyist of **1B** added the word *ἄλλου* to a phrase where it was not used in the original: *περὶ ἄλλου μηδενός*. It does not fit the sentence very well, since *περὶ μηδενός τῶν προγεγραμμένων* covers “of anything written above” better than than “of anything *else* written above.” Its addition may have been caused by typical legal phraseology, and that *ἄλλων υἴων* was mentioned just before in the same sentence.

In **2**, it is difficult to estimate if words were left out from Esthladas’ copy, since the agoranomic copy is so poorly preserved. The word *τόποι* must have been forgotten by Esthladas, however, since the adjective *ψιλοί* makes no sense on its own (**2B**, 9). Vandorpe also notes that the definite article *τόν* was left out in l. 11, and that something must be missing from l. 9 since the agoranomic copy has more space than what Esthladas’ version could fill in.⁶⁸ Esthladas also left out the last line of the first column of **2A**, as well as the second column altogether. The last line of column 1 is an announcement of who the testator was,⁶⁹ and the second column contains the names and descriptions of the witnesses.

3A has a long dating formula of four lines, which has been replaced by a short date in **3B**. In addition, both versions have some words missing which appear in the other version, strengthening the idea of different or Demotic *Vorlage*. In **3A**, 8, the neighbours’ list is missing the word ‘house’ (*λιβδός <οἰκία> Ἀσῶτος*), which is there in **3B**, 15. **3B** has more omissions, like the word ‘bald’ in the physical description of Horos on l. 5 (*ἀναφάλαντος*), an article in l. 8 (*ἐν <τῶι> ἀπὸ νότου μέρει*), a preposition in l. 15

⁶⁶ The text refers to Psennesis’ sons, but without the word “sons” it seems to refer to Psennesis himself (*παρὰ Ψεννήσιος τοῦ Ὀρου υἴων*).

⁶⁷ The phrase in the original states: ... *κυριευέτωσαν δ’ ἐκάστη κατὰ τὴν σημαυνομένην διαστολήν*, ‘each should have the legal power according to this declared division’. The copyist wrote *ἕκαστα τὴν σημαυνομένην διαστολήν*; it is likely that his eyes were already at the end of *κατὰ* when he was writing *ἕκαστα*, hence the alpha and the omission of the preposition, which would have started a new line in the copy.

⁶⁸ Vandorpe, P. Dryton, p. 80. The omission of the definite article can be due to the previous word ending in same letters (*ψιλὸν τόπον <τὸν> εἰς [π]ερὶστερῶνα* **2B**, 11).

⁶⁹ [⁵ *Ἦν δὲ ὁ διατιθέμενος Δρύτων Παμφίλου Κρής τῶ]ν διαδόχων καὶ τῶν τοῦ ἐπιτάγματος ἰπ(πάρχης) ἐπ’ [ἀνδρῶ]ν*. “Testator was Dryton, son of Pamphilos, Cretan, of the diadochoi and cavalry officer over men, at the head of those of the epitagma-unit.”

(<ἀπ> οἰκίας) and one word in a phrase: ἢ οἱ ἄν ὧσιν γείτο(νες) <πάντη> πάντ(οθεν). This phrase also appears in l. 26 in **3B** without the word πάντη, but there the editor has not added it, since that part is altogether missing in **3A**. In the warranty clause, the writer of **3B** has omitted the pronoun τούτων, which is not usually present in the clause.⁷⁰ A longer omission concerns the house in Memnoneia, as mentioned already earlier. This part is in **3B** starting from the end of the line 22 until end of l. 26 (at the same time the end of column 1); in **3A** the text is silently omitted, and it picks up the text of **3B** from the beginning of the column 2, the total sum: χαλκοῦ (ταλάντων) β. It remains a mystery why this part was missing from one version, but it seems to be an intentional omission.

In **3**, we also have a replacement of one verb into a different phrase; **3A** has a reference to the list which follows the contract: ὧν τὸ κατ' ἄνδρα ὑπόκειται (col. 2, l. 4). Understandably, the verb ὑπόκειται, 'is written below' has been replaced in **3B** with the phrase διὰ τῆς συγγραφῆς δεδή(λωται) 'is manifested through the contract', since no list is written below this copy.

With pair **4**, the copyist in **4B** has not omitted anything from the original, except a superfluously repeated article τοῦ in l. 8 of **4A**, so it can be considered as a correction. On the contrary, the copyist has an extra word in the dating formula: Σωτήρων is missing from **4A** after Φιλομ[ητ]όρων. It is noteworthy that in the similar sale ten day later, P.AdI. 8, also written by Hermias like the **4A**, the same Σωτήρων is missing. Thus, the *agoranomoi* and their apprentices had their own exemplars for the dating formulas (in their head); and the copyist did not slavishly copy the original formula.

6) Self-corrections

In **1B**, 15 the numeral "seventeen", δεκαεπτά, was first written δεκαπέντε "fifteen", but the mistake was noticed at some point as πέντε was crossed out and ἐπτά was written above it. In the original text δεκαεπτά in col. 3, l. 5 was not far from the ἡμερῶν πέντε in the following line, so the reader's (be it the copyist himself or not) eyes may have wondered there first. Later, he noticed his mistake. The copyist had also forgotten the first letter of a word which he later added above the line \μ/έρος (l. 15), and a whole word ἄλλης was forgotten at first, before μιᾶς and then added above it (l. 16). These three self-corrections prove that the copyist was checking what he wrote at some point. However, it seems that he did not check the whole document at the end of his task, since he did not notice the other omissions, especially the most prominent one of a whole line.

In **3**, the copyist of **3B** has forgotten one point of the compass in the neighbour list on l. 13, and adds it over the line: βο(ρρᾶ), and the word 'house' in the same list, are also added above the line β[ορρ]ᾶ \οἰκία/ Π[ο]ήβιος. He also corrects his writing of φάφους instead of τάφους by inserting the letters τα above φα on l. 29.

⁷⁰ 180a, col. 2, 4–5: Προπωλητῆς καὶ βεβαιωτῆς τούτων τῶν κατὰ τὴν ὄνην ὦρος ὁ ἀποδόμενος. The phrase is more often Προπωλητῆς καὶ βεβαιωτῆς τῶν κατὰ τὴν ὄνην (ταύτην) πάντων ..., cf. Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 178.

In **a**, there is an insertion between the lines 16 and 17, not notified in the edition, which prints l. 17 as [- ca.? - τὴν ὑπ]άρχουσας. The article τὴν is, in fact, above the line over the letters αρχ.

7) *Copyist choosing different forms than original*

Graphemic / phonological level. It is interesting that the copyist in **1B** consistently uses the digraph <ει> in ἐφ' ἱερείως (l. 2), ἐφ' ἱερείων (l. 6) in the dating formula, even though **1A** would have provided the correct forms with only <ε> (col. 2, ll. 3 and 7). This shows that the use of <ει> forms had a strong support among selected officials and in their education.⁷¹ Also, the same copyist wrote once a standard verb form ἐποίησατο (l. 28) where the original bank receipt had non-standard form ἐποίησατο (col. 4, l. 4). However, the original had a stroke which looked very much like the *iota* had been written. Thus we cannot confirm that the copyist “corrected” a mistake from the original; he may have read it as a correct form all along.

In **2B**, Esthladas wrote τάτε (P.Dryton 4, l. 1), when obviously τάδε was meant, and the agoranomic copy has τὰδ[ε] (P.Dryton 3, l. 1). The interchange of voiceless and voiced stops is a feature often connected with native Egyptian writers, but Esthladas clearly had Greek roots,⁷² and he otherwise writes good Greek. This difference, in fact, points to the direction that the copy was perhaps performed via dictation; whoever was reading the text may have pronounced the voiced stop voicelessly (the difference is not present in Egyptian), and Esthladas probably was not very familiar with the phraseology of testaments, and has thus interpreted the post-positioned enclitic -δέ as a separate enclitic particle τε. Esthladas also forgot the final sigma in ταῖς β νεωτέραι(ς) ‘to the two younger (daughters)’, which turns the dative plural into the nominative plural, but does not make understanding more difficult.

Morphological and lexical levels. The phrase ἰσιείωι λεγομένης Ἰσιδος Νεμῆτος θεᾶς μεγίστης in **1A** (col. 3, l. 4) was written quite differently in **1B**, 14–15: ἰσιείου ἔσονομης Ἰσιδος μεγίστης θεᾶς. The missing title is discussed above, and the different word order below. The genitive used in **1B**, ἰσιείου, is the correct case here, rather than the dative ἰσιείωι of **1A**. The dative may be attracted from the immediately preceding ἐν Παθῦρει. The form ἔσονομης is more difficult to understand. Perhaps it was difficult to see what was written in **1A**, since it has a fold at this point and the papyrus is dark, especially around the letters ομέν of λεγομένης; the *lambda* is very clear though. Or perhaps the copyist was aiming for another word, e.g. ἐσομένης meaning roughly the same as λεγομένης, i.e. ‘signifying, being’ vs. ‘said, called’. Also in **1**, the copyist rendered — perhaps just through carelessness — a strange form Ἰσιδισος (**1B**, 8), whereas he gets it right the second time he uses it (l. 15); the normal genitive Ἰσιδος appears in **1A** in both places (col. 2, l. 10; col. 3, l. 4). The copyist also chose not to decline the Egyptian place name Πιτοβ in l. 19 even though it was declined in the original (col. 3, l. 8).

⁷¹ See the discussion in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 118–121.

⁷² See, e.g., Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 66–68.

In **3**, the bank receipt in **3A** has the nominative form of the name Ὀσοροῆρις, while in **3B** the copyist uses the genitive Ὀσοροῆριος. The latter genitive may be a mistake of the type where words ending in -ος are interpreted as nominative forms, or this is a confusion between the endings -ις/-ιος with a phonological basis; or the copyist may simply not have been really paying attention to which case would have been needed here.⁷³ As mentioned already above in the section on abbreviations, the copyist of **3B** has some differences and omissions in the receipt which were not present in the receipt in **3A**, so the copyist either had a different model (**3A** is not necessarily the original) or he was just careless.

Verbal inflection: Verb forms that differ in number between the two versions can be found in **1** and **3**. In **1B**, the copyist wrote the 3rd person plural form συνεγράψαντο (l. 8) instead of the singular in the original (col. 2, l. 10), but the visual appearance is not clear,⁷⁴ and the copyist possibly chose the plural form agreeing with the plural participle ἐκόντες. It can be discussed whether the singular makes sense with the prepositional prefix συν-, but syntactically the subject making the donation was just Psenhotēs. In **3**, the verb in the relative clause of the warranty clause was in the plural in **3A** (ἐδέξαντο), but in singular (ἐδέξατο) in **3B**. Since the subject consists of Osoroeris and his brothers (Ὀσοροῆρις καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ οἱ πριάμενοι), the plural could be seen as more correct, but with coordinated subjects this is a slippery case; in Ancient Greek literature both partial agreement and resolved agreement appear.⁷⁵ In Pathyris, the singular is used in three other documents in the warranty clause with a coordinated subject.⁷⁶

8) Not using different forms i.e. repeating mistakes

In **1**, the copyist does not correct the masculine participle ὑπαρχόντων (l. 14) into the feminine ὑπαρχουσῶν, but follows the original's variant. The phrase is ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶι ἡμερῶν ἀγνευτικῶν.

9) Differences in word order

In **1**, some instances of different word order are found, but they are quite minimal, e.g. the adjective attribute position was different in **1**: μεγίστης θεᾶς (**1B**, 15) vs. θεᾶς μεγίστης (**1A**, col. 3, l. 4); however in **1B** it was in the other order θεᾶς μεγίστης on l. 8, when Psenhotēs was first introduced. The possessive pronoun was placed differently by the copyist on ll. 22–23: ἄλλων υἰῶν αὐτοῦ vs. ἄλλων αὐτοῦ υἰῶν in the original (col. 3, l. 12).

⁷³ See Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 167–173.

⁷⁴ In the *ed. princeps* of the original, Schubart first read it as συνεγράψαντο (and corrected in the apparatus: *l. συνεγράψατο*). But he corrected himself later, indicating that the original papyrus actually reads συνεγράψατο (BL I, 86). According to the photo it is the singular, in my opinion. However, the handwriting is such that, with only a quick glance, the *alpha-tau* combination looks like a *nu*.

⁷⁵ F. Mambrini, M. Passarotti, *Subject-Verb Agreement with Coordinated Subjects in Ancient Greek. A Treebank-Based Study*, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 16 (2016) 87–116.

⁷⁶ P.Lond. III 881 (p. 12), 108 BCE; P.AdI. 9, 104 BCE; SB XX 14393, 100 BCE.

A very minor interchange in the placement of the definite article and the attribute can be found in **3**: ὅλης τῆς οἰκίας (**3A**, 7) and τῆς ὅλης οἰκίας (**3B**, 10).

10) Egyptian names

The spelling of Egyptian names in Greek was to some extent standardized,⁷⁷ but the same name could have many written variants, as a quick look at any Egyptian name in the Trismegistos People database can verify. Was the choice of a certain variant made by the writer by his own preference and did he always stick to one written form of a name, or could one writer use several different variants (in the same document or in his whole production)? Looking at copies can answer these questions to some extent.

In **1**, the name Σενησις (*T3-sr.t-n-Īs.t*) is consistently written as Τσεννησις in the original (col. 2, l. 13; col. 3, l. 9; also in the bank receipt, col. 4, l. 3), but without the /t/-element in the copy, as Σεννησις (ll. 10, 20); the copyist does vary the nasal element by writing Σενησις in the bank receipt (l. 27).⁷⁸ Place names were also spelled differently in **1**: Τιμονεβιτει (1B, 17) vs. Τιμοντμενιβιτει (1B, col. 3, l. 7).⁷⁹ In **3**, a place name also has slightly different variants: ἐν Πιμουνεμούνει in **3A**, 9 and ἐν Πιμονεμούνει in **3B**, 15.

In **4**, the writer of the original text wrote the name Νεχουτης (*N3-nht=f*) with the letter *tau* in all three instances it occurs (ll. 7, 8, 9), but the copyist has used the variant with letter *theta* in all instances (ll. 10, 12, 13). In general, the variant Νεχουτης is more common (85 occurrences) than Νεχουθης (34).⁸⁰ All other names were written the same way in both versions.

11) Iota adscript

The custom of writing the *iota adscript*, which no longer was pronounced, varied greatly in the Pathyris agoranomic contracts, but tendencies with respect to individual writers as well as time and place can be detected.⁸¹ In **1**, the writer of the **1A** uses the *iota adscript* consistently and the copyist follows suit. Esthladas in **2B** has written the *iota adscript* very systematically in all places where it can appear, and in addition three times hyper-correctly (**2B**, 2, 4, 20); these have not survived in the original, so we do not know if it was his own decision to use the *iota* that way.⁸² In **3**, the writer of **3A** has written the *iota adscript* regularly, but the copyist in **3B** has only written it in the pronoun

⁷⁷ B. Muhs, *Language Contact and Personal Names in Early Ptolemaic Egypt*, in: T. V. Evans, D. D. Obbink (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford 2010, 187–197.

⁷⁸ Trismegistos People database stable URL: www.trismegistos.org/name/1065 [accessed May 25th, 2018], the most frequent Greek variant of this name is Σεννησις.

⁷⁹ Trismegistos Places stable URL: <http://www.trismegistos.org/place/7648> [accessed May 25th, 2018].

⁸⁰ Trismegistos People database stable URL: www.trismegistos.org/name/502 [accessed May 25th, 2018].

⁸¹ See the discussion on writing the *iota adscript* in Pathyris in Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (n. 1) 121–137.

⁸² Vandorpe suspects (P. Dryton, p. 80) that the agoranomic copy did not use the *iota* e.g. in εἴη, whereas **2B**, 2 has εἴη.

αὐτῶι (ll. 7 and 9). In **4**, the copyist consistently chose not to write the *iota adscript*, but the writer of the original wrote it once and omitted 2 times: τῶι (**4A**, 7) vs. τῶ (**4B**, 9 and 10: **4A**, 6) and αὐτῆ̄ (**4A**, 6; **4B**, 9).

The practise of writing the *iota adscript* also varies in the orphan copies: some writers did not use it at all (**a**, **d**, possibly **i**), or used it correctly (**b**, **e**, **f**, **g**), or used it hypercorrectly (**c**) or inconsistently (**h**).

Conclusions

One thing can be said for all the duplicate pairs in the Pathyris agoranomic documents: the stichometry (line divisions) was never identical in the two versions, as was also noted by Yuen-Collingridge and Choat in their material.⁸³ Moreover, copies usually had a more condensed physical format than the original, although this does not apply to all copies (exceptions to the rule may derive from texts that probably were not originally meant to be copies, but were later downgraded as such, see **d**). The changes in handwriting for different parts of the document (especially in sales documents) are usually a reliable indicator, but perhaps not a 100% certain sign that we have an original (cf. **3**). The presence or absence of certain parts of a document is not a definitive marker either, e.g. even a sale document with *scriptura interior* can be a copy (**d**), even though that part is more often lacking in copies. Naturally, not all document types even have many different parts that can be present or absent.

Differences in writing the *iota adscript* or in the spelling of Egyptian names can point to auditory perception as the medium through which the copyist received the text he wrote down (since the *iota* was not pronounced, the writer had to rely on his education to write or not write the *iota*), and same applies to the not-so-standardised Greek orthography of Egyptian names (whose original Egyptian form was no doubt familiar to the mostly bilingual notaries). But, then again, each writer could have had their own fixed way of writing or not writing the *iota adscript*, or a certain orthography for an Egyptian name anyway, so that he would not necessarily change his habit even if he saw a different way of writing in the *Vorlage*. He may have had the opinion that his own way of writing was a more correct one. These two groups of differences merely reveal to us that this type of variation in orthography was common.

Abbreviations and numerals were often written differently by the copyist and the original writer. Usually the copy had more abbreviations, and used ciphers rather than the numbers written out as words. This was clearly to save space and time; it also shows that the copy was not considered to be as important evidence as the original, and it was not considered vital to follow the *Vorlage* letter by letter. Again, we cannot decide whether a text is a copy or an original merely on the basis of abbreviations or numerals, since some copyist also wrote out the numerals in full.

For morphological and syntactic differences, we can only mention a few cases. Some copyists did not care if the word order differed to some extent, but we do not have attestations of significant changes in word order. Some omissions of words happened

⁸³ Yuen-Collingridge, Choat, *Copyist* (n. 3) 831.

in the copying process, but some morphological corrections were also made when there was a mistake in the original (but not always, cf. 1). However, the morphological differences exist mainly in forms that are very close to each other, i.e. only one letter difference and the forms either sound or look alike. We find therefore different levels of grammatical knowledge, but it may be noted that very large differences were not apparent. Also, the copyists did check and correct their text (at least to some extent).

In sum, we have no easy way of telling that a text is a copy, unless the text itself indicates that explicitly. In the case of duplicates, it may be difficult to be sure which one is the original. Despite this, we do have many pointers which add to the probability of a text being a copy, such as extensive use of abbreviations, writing numbers as ciphers instead of words, condensed layout, and a lack of certain formulaic, administrative parts of the document, if the document type usually had these.

When we identify a copy, we must remember that the linguistic outcome of our text has a more complex source than an original text (which was not necessarily produced in only one person's brain either). The orthography may be a mixture of the original scribe's and the copyist's versions, although in most of our agoranomic contracts the orthography differed very little in the duplicates, most prominently in the Egyptian names. Most of the morphology and syntax comes from the author of the text via the scribe via the copyist. However, in the agoranomic contracts, it is possible and even likely that the scribe *was* the author, albeit following a set standard of contract formulae. The copyist most likely did not alter the syntax and morphology to any large extent (unless he omitted certain important or longer parts), although the word order may have some differences from what the author had intended.

Department of Languages
University of Helsinki
P.O.Box 24 (Unioninkatu 40A)
00014 Helsinki, Finland
marja.vierros@helsinki.fi

Marja Vierros

Doc.	Doc. type	Word 'copy'	Scriptura interior	Long protocol	Columns ⁸⁴	Hands	Indentation	Scriptio continua	Hyphenation	Notarial signature	Tax receipt
1A	Division of property (will)	No	Yes	Yes	4	4	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
1B	Division of property (will)	No (?)	No	Yes	2	1	Yes ⁸⁵	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2A	Will	Not preserv.	–	?	2 (+?)	1	Yes (?)	Yes	Yes	No	–
2B	Will	Not preserv.	–	No	1	1	No (?)	Yes	No	No	–
3A	Sale	No	No	Yes	50	2	Yes	No	Yes ⁸⁶	No	Yes
3B	Sale	Yes	No	No	2	1	No	Almost	No	No	Yes
4A	Sale	No	No	Yes	1	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
4B	Sale	Yes	No	No	1	1	No	Yes	No	Not preserv.	Not preserv.
a	Homologia	Yes	–	–	1	1	?	?	Yes	Not preserv.	–
b	Loan (ostrakon)	Yes	–	–	1	–	No	No	Yes	Yes (?) ⁸⁷	–
c	Homologia, apostasion	Yes	–	–	1	1	No	No	Yes	Yes	–
d	Sale	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	1	No	Yes	Yes (scr.int.)	Yes ⁸⁸	No
e	Sale	Yes	No	Yes	1	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
f	Will	No (?)	–	Yes	1 (+?)	1	?	Yes (?)	No (?)	Not preserv.	–
g	Will	No	–	Yes	1	1	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	–
h	Will	No	–	No	1	1	Yes ⁸⁹	Yes	Yes	Yes	–
i	Will	No	–	No (?)	1	1	?	No	Yes	Not preserv.	–

Table 1. Duplicates and orphan copies from Papyri agoranomic texts and the elements found within.

⁸⁴ All text blocks written side by side are counted as separate columns (e.g. the *scriptura interior* or the witness list).

⁸⁵ Very small indentation after first line, but no other visual separation after the protocol.

⁸⁶ Only twice, both times in the columns listing mummies and tombs, i.e. not in the sale document.

⁸⁷ Line 15: Ἡραδὸν[ou, (?)] could perhaps rather be interpreted as the agoranomic signature, since the *agoranomos* mentioned in line 1 is Heliodoros. Thus line 15 could be restored

Ἡραδὸρο[ς, κτην(τάμνα)].

⁸⁸ The signature had been written, but at some stage it was torn out, see Vierros, *Traces* (n. 46).

⁸⁹ Hanging first line only.



zu M. Vierros, 211 und 217

© Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung
Scan: Berliner Papyrusdatenbank, P 9079