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The present issue of "Cahiers" contains an edition of five Copenhagen papyri. This is a preliminary edition continuing Papyri Hafnienses I (Copenhagen 1942), but it is not meant to substitute the scheduled Papyri Hafnienses II. It is our hope that this edition will elicit from competent papyrologists comments and corrections to the benefit of the final edition. All suggestions will be gratefully received at the following address:

Institut for græsk og latinsk Middelalderfilologi
Gråbrødrestræde 6
DK 1154 Copenhagen K
Denmark

We are infinitely indebted to Mr. Tage Larsen, lecturer in papyrology and keeper of the papyrus collection in the University of Copenhagen. He has taught us much of what we know about papyrology, and without his patience and generous permission this preliminary edition would never have appeared. To him we owe numerous suggestions and corrections which we have gratefully accepted, except for a few instances where we have ventured to disagree.

The work was distributed between the editors as follows:

The establishment of the text was carried out jointly, much assistance being obtained from Mr. Tage Larsen, who, however, cannot be held responsible for any of the defects that necessarily will appear.

The translations and the introductions are the common work of the editors.

The linguistic treatment is due to Sten Ebbesen.

The palaeographical comments and the indices are the work of Adam Bülow-Jacobsen, who has made the photographs as well.

Finally we want to express our gratitude to Professor, dr. phil. P. Johs. Jensen, director of the Institutum Medii Aevi Graeci et Latini Universitatis Hafniensis, for his kindness in letting this work appear in the "Cahiers".
This document seems in some way to be connected with the family archive edited by B.A. van Groningen (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batavia vol.VI, A Family Archive from Tebtunis, 1950) and especially with No. 48 = B.M.Pap.1902 (AD 202/3). There appears the name of Sarapias, daughter of Eudaimonis. Professor van Groningen reads the father's name Π.οξ[...]του Κρονίωνος but is not satisfied. We have not inspected B.M.Pap.1902, but hope that the traces in the beginning of line 17 do not exclude the reading Ενασενοὺ. It is fairly certain that Sarapias is the name to be supplied in the present papyrus line 12: a) mother's and grandfather's name agree. b) her age seems to fit. In B.M.1902 she is 57 years old. In Pap. Hafn.24 we read μ = 40 with certainty and the traces of the next letter do not in any way disfavour a γ = 3. c) the slave Sarapamon, son of Isis/Memphis, of whom Didymos in the present papyrus is joint owner with Kronia and Taorsis, is owned by Sarapias and the same two women in B.M.1902, 14 years later. Here Didymos is not mentioned. It therefore seems probable that Sarapias was widowed or divorced from Didymos at some time between 189 and 202.

It is, however, a difficulty that in B.M. 1902 she is said to have been returned in the Syriakes Quarter in the lost census which ought to be that of 188/89, but must refer to that of 174/75. Didymos, son of Kallinikos, is not mentioned in van Groningen's genealogical table, although some 15-18 persons of that name are recorded.

We append a table showing the recognizable family connections between persons mentioned in Pap. Hafn. 24 and the related papyri, v. infra.

The papyrus is somewhat rough and rather damaged. Written along fibres. 240 by 183 mm.

The left side has been torn so that 3-20 letters have disappeared from each line, no line being complete. The right margin is intact, but the last 2-5 letters of each line in the lower part are damaged, some of the fibres in the upper layer being displaced. Upper and lower margins are intact as regards the writing.

The writing is large and clear without being beautiful. Almost certainly it is that of a professional scribe. At first sight it might even look like a literary hand, but in details it is too irregular, and though most letters have their regular form, cursive elements are frequent, e.g., the ligatures Χ, Ψ, Σ, Ψ = κω, ζτ = στ. Ν shows the rounded cursive form η besides the regular one. The second stroke of σ is very often extremely long, and on the whole the vertical aspect of the letters is stressed. Note, e.g., the drawn-out base of θ = ξρος/ξτον, and the impression conveyed by words like αναπορος (line 15) and the long cross-strokes of θ, π, τ. Further, most lines seem to end in a long vertical stroke.
means "freedwoman of".

Persons found only in Pap.Tebt.322 are printed in minuscule letters.

Persons found only in Pap.Hafn. 24 are printed in CAPITAL LETTERS.

Those found in both are Underlined.

Those found both in van Groningen No. 48 and in Pap.Hafn.24 are Encased.

In Pap.Tebt. 303 (A.D. 176/80 -also in Loeb Select Papyri) is mentioned a Kronion, son of Sabeinos, whom we have tentatively inserted here.
v is dotted three times in the beginning of a word. στρατηγὸς is abbreviated στρατ. ετών (or ὡς ετών?) regularly and ετώς once § (line 9). In line 25 μνησοῦ seems to be abbreviated §, the "normal" abbreviation being §. According to the Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Kgl. Mus. zu Berlin (1895) the first sign should mean 1/2+1/3 =5/6, but this would be an impossible reading here. The cross-stroke must be a lapsus calami or a dark fibre.


On the verso-side are 12 short lines which although they are undoubtedly Greek, we have not been able to read. Most of the letters seem recognizable, taken one by one, but together they do not yield any sense. Possible readings are:
1. 4 .ιοθωρα..  
1. 6 ....αντίνο 
1. 7 .... εκ

We should be most grateful for help.

Orthography is good, language neither impressively good nor particularly bad. There is, however, a flagrant example of anachronism: the sentence that begins in line 10 with the words εὑμι Δίδυμος is continued in line 11 with a καὶ την συνούσαν μει γυναίκα as if the first sentence had run:"I register myself" not:"I am". The items in the rest of the document are governed by this unexpressed "I register" and in the accusative case, even Sarapammon (24), who ought to have been in the genitive case (regular construction: I register one half of S.) becomes accusative by attraction.

1. The name of the strategos is known from other documents to be Ammonios, but the difference in the forms of the name is hardly significant. Cf. on a similar problem the note ad l. 26.

5. ἡσαρχὸν. Iotacism. There are no other instances of iotacism in this document. The ει in Ἐσβεσιοῦ (1. 12) is the common Hellenistic spelling of a long ι (Sabinus).

10. The normal formula is καὶ εὑμι... Here there is too little room for καὶ, but εὑμι alone does not quite fill in the lacuna.

10. λαγγραφουμένος may be a scribal error for λαογραφουμένος but it could also be that it reflects actual pronunciation, in which case we have a late development αοια comparable to, but not, presumably, derived from the earlier Dorian development of ἀο into ἄ (Schwyzer: Griechische Gramm. 250f). Cf. Debrunner: Gesch. d. Griech. Sprache, vol. II §80, Berlin 1954 (Sammel. Göschen).

11. ὁθαλ-μει is written with only three arches. The dative is a little hard to understand, but not unique. Cf. οὐλή in B.M. Pap. 1968 (= van Groningen: A Family Archive No. 2) lines 4,5,8 (though once γυνή), B.M. Pap. 1954 (v. Groningen No. 4) lines 6, 7,10,24 (no other errors of this type) and van Groningen No. 9
lines 4, 7, 8, 10 (though line 13 αντιτιμέτων). So maybe a sort of “descriptive dative” had come into use in the documents. Cf. note ad Pap.Hafn. 28. There is, of course, always the possibility of a scribal error for λευχον ὀφαλμω ἀριστερω (suggested by T.Larsen).

14830. γενδέμενος conforms to the Late and Modern Greek tendency to form most non-perfect participles in -δέμενος/-ούδέμενος (Schwyzer:Griech.Gramm.753f) cf. Modern Greek λεγόμενος.

15. ερμιανῆς After the μ one letter (?) after this room for one or two letters, depending on how much the fibres around the lacuna have been stretched. Possibilities are ερμιανῆς, ερμιονῆς, and ερμιανῆς (mentioned once by Pape's dictionary, which also gives three examples of the masc. form).

16625. ενεπίγενεμενον In line 16 the reading is certain, in line 25 it can hardly be doubted either. Linguistically the word cannot give rise to objections (ἐνεπίγενεμενον with the Modern Gr. form of the participle). But there is one thing about these readings which might offend, namely their close resemblance to the formula known from elsewhere, e.g. BCG 55 τέκνα ... μη ἀναγεγραμμένα ἐν ἐπίγενεμενοις. If -γενεμένος is to be a form of γένομαι there is a faulty spelling due to the loss of distinction between single and double consonants (Modern Greek does not distinguish either).

17. εὐρέπτεν may be read εὐρέπτεν.

17. εὐγγονον, 24 εὐγγονον Obviously two ways of spelling the same word. This evidence impairs the thesis of LSJ s.v. ἐγγονος that "ἐγγ- may represent ἐγγ-". A diminutive ἐγγόνι "grandchild" survives in Modern Greek.

18. (ἐτων) λῆ - λ is fairly certain, β very uncertain.

22. ημίονον The form is attested in a series of papyri (e.g. Pap.Amh. II,91,16). In ancient Laconian and in its modern offspring Taeconian the pronunciation of υ as an u survives. But such Spartan influence is hardly to be expected in the language of Egypt. More probably the phenomenon is related to the one observed in the dialects of Megara, Aegina, Athens, Cyme (pronounced 'kumi'), and the Mani in the 19th century, where ω and υ were pronounced υ (presumably developed from the common Hellenistic pronunciation υ). Cf. 'Ιστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης κατὰ τὰς παράδειγμας τοῦ κατηγορείνος Ν.Π. 'Ανδριάτη,Πανεπιστήμιον Θεσσαλονίκης (no date, c.1969) p. 82-86.

24. σαραπαμμανύ or maybe -ναν as there is a little too much room before μή.

26. Κρονία In van Groningen No. 48 the lady is called Κρονί- αινα. The difference is hardly significant, it would seem that the two forms are just inflectional variants, being different ways of forming the feminine of Κρονίων. Concerning the pair Κρονίων- Κρονίανα cf. Φίλων-Φίλαννα (Schwyzer:Griech.Gramm.473). On the variation -αίνα/ανα cf. Modern Greek Γεώργια (andronymic) - Γεωργία (Christian name), both derived from the masc. Γεώργιος/Γεώργος.
27. The scribe obviously considers \textit{ἀξοκελεγμένος} the correct form, as he corrects himself in line 30 where he had omitted one of the \textit{γ}'s. In line 14 the reading is uncertain.

32. The supplement is mere conjecture. We do not know anything about the man, neither his name nor his dwelling-place. It may even be that this part of the line was left blank.
2 ἀντιγραφὸν κατ’ οἰκ[αν] [ἀπογ]ραφῆς κη’ (ἐτοὺς) κολλήμφ[ος] ἄριστος.

3 Μώμωνι στρ(αγγ)ων Ἀρσινοείτου Ἡρακλείδου ἡ[ε]ρύδος
4 πα]ρῇ Διδύμων Καλλινίκου τοῦ Διδύμου μητρὸς Τ[α]φρασείτος
 ἄριστος.
5 μητροπόλεως ἀναγραφόμενος ἐπὶ ἀμφότερος ο[υ]πάρχει μοι
6 ἄφτο Αμφότερον Μοῖρων [...].] μέρος οἰκίας ἐν ὧ ἀπογράφομαι ἐμαυ−
7 τὸν καὶ τὸν τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διελθοῦσος κη’ (ἐτοὺς)
Ἀδρηλίου Κομμόδου.
8 Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου κατ’ οἰκίαν ἀπογραφῆν ἐπὶ
τοῦ αὐτοῦ.
9 Μώμωνος ἐφ’ ὅδε καί τῇ τοι[θ] ἱδ’ (ἐτοὺς) κατ’ οἰκίαν ἀπογραφὴ
ἀπεγραφήν.
10 εἰ]μι Διδύμου ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἐδώστης λαγραφόμενος
11 (ἐτόν). [...].] ἰερακῶ ὀρθαλμῷ φροστερῶ καὶ τὴν σημανθάν μοι γυναῖκα
12 Σαρκιάδα] ἅβελενον τῷ Κρονίωνος μητρὸς ἕπιστευμονίδος
(ἐτόν) μη’
13 ξηθοῦν ἦ] ἀπαγόρασθε[ν] ̣τῇ προτέρα ἀπογραφὴ [ἐ]κ’ ἀμφότερον
Σωρίας[ης]
14 καὶ τὸν γε]γαμένον μοι ἐκ τῆς ἐγνωμένης καὶ ἀποκεπλεγμέ−
15 νης μοι γ]υναῖκος ἑρμηνεύον ἀπάτορος μητρὸς ἥμω[φος]
16 ύψον δ[ο]μον ἀναγεγραμμένον ἐνεπιγενθυμένον (ἐτόν) ι’ καὶ
17 τὰ δούλοι]χυ φωίματα ζ.’ ἐμοϑ καὶ τοῦ Διδύμου Εὐσθείου ἐγγονον
(ἐτόν) καὶ’
19 καὶ ἐγγονον Τ[α]μαῖτας (ἐτόν) [...].]χ’ καὶ
ψηθὴν παρὰ
ἐκ’ καὶ τὰς
21 ἀλλας δόμι ἐωνημένας] ἐν τῷ ἐνεστῶτι κθ' (ἐτεὶ) φ..χ[ι ἄλλον δ]φύλον ψψ
22 αὕτας ἐωνημένον ὀδηγή] φυτιγγημέω ἄριστερῶ καὶ ἑμίσου
μέρος φυ-
23 λιθῶν σωμάτων τῶν ἱππογεγ]ραμμένων ἱσίοντος τῆς καὶ Μέμφ[ιό]ος
ἐγγύ-
24 νης καὶ τῷ ταύτης ἔγγονον σαρακαμάμανα µή ψψ-
25 γεγραμμένον ἐνεπιγε]νυμένον (ἐτῶν) στ' φη τῇ ἔτερον (ἡμίσου)
μέρος
26 ἀπεγράψατο ἐκ' ἀμ[ι]φόδου συριακῆς ὑπὸ Κρονίας χρ[ι] τα[φροσ]εψ
27 καὶ τὸν γενάμενὼν] μοι ἐκ τῆς ἀποκεκληγγμένης [γυναικὸς]
28 Ἀντινοείδος υἱὸν Θεοφών[α (ἐτῶν) .
29 δὲ ἀπεγράψατο σὺν τῇ] µητρὶ ἐν τῇ ἀντινόου πόλει τα[υτῆς
30 τὰ µὴ ἐξ ἐμοῦ ἀλλ' ἐκ το[ῦ] γεναμένου καὶ ἀποκεκληγ' ἡμένου
αὐτῆς
31 ἀνέρος ]φυς τέκνα ἀπεγράψαντο σὺν τῷ κατρι
32 ἐν τῇ ἀντινόου πόλει] οἶ' θ' ἐπιθεώμει τῆν ἀπογραφήν
Copy of census-return
from the 28th year
from sheet 165.

To Ammon, strategos of the district of Herakleides in the Arsinoite nome.

From Didymos
Father's name: Kallinikos, son of Didymos
Mother's name: Taforsaeis
From: the Metropolis
Registered in: the Gymnasium Quarter

I own:

a [?] part of a house in the Moeris Quarter, where I return myself and my family, in the house-to-house census of the past 28th year of His Majesty Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Caesar, in the same quarter in which I was also returned in the house-to-house census of the 14th year.

I, the said Didymos, am a private person, subject to poll-tax, aged [9], with a white left eye.

And I register my wife, who lives with me
Name: [Sarapias]
Father's name: Sabeinos, son of Kronion
Mother's name: Eudaimonis
Age: 43

[Specific marks: none]

who was returned in the former census in the Syriakes Quarter.

[And a son,] born to me by [my] former and divorced wife Hermiane, daughter of Herois and an unknown father.
Name: Didymos
Age: 10

This son has been registered as a new member of the family.

And seven slaves of my, Didymos', own:

1. Eurepos
   Mother's name: [?]
   [Age: 32]

2. Ammon
   Born by the same
   Age: 29

3. [?]
   [Mother's name: Tapaeis]
   Age: [39]

4. One Alexandrian slave-woman
   Bought from: [?]
   Age: 29

5-6. [Two others]
   [Bought: In the present 29th year

7. [Another] slave
   [Bought: Together with [them]
   [Specific marks: A scar on the left shin]
And half-part of the following slaves:

1. Isis alias Memphis
   Mother's name: [?]
   [Age: ?]

2. Sarapammon
   Born by the preceding
   Not registered as a new member of the household
   Age: 6
   The other half of whom is returned in the Syriakes
   daughter by Kronia and Taorsis.

And a son
   Name: Xenophon
   Age: [?]
   Born to me by my former and divorced wife [name: ..... her's name:....] From Antinooupolis. The children [she has got, by me, but] by her former and divorced [husband, name:..... her's name:....] are returned together with the father [in Antinooupolis?]

I accordingly hand in this statement.
HOMOLOGIA

The contents of this document are those of a will, the form being that of an agreement. A close parallel is BGU 86 (reedited by P. Meyer and discussed by L. Mitteis in Mitteis-Wilcken: Grundzüge u. Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, vol. 2 p. 349).

The full text runs from line 1 to 19, the six witnesses are mentioned in lines 20–24, thereupon the contents of l. 1–19 are repeated. A pedigree of the members of the family may be drawn like this:

```
  Ἡρᾶς
  |  Κάστωρ  Σοκυήνις
  Κάστωρ  |  θαῆς  |  Πάκυδας
  θαῆς  |  ?  |  Σοκυήνις  Κάστωρ  Θερμοδάδης
  Σωκράτης  Κάστωρ  Μελανᾶς
```

Fine and smooth papyrus of good quality, which has mostly withstood being folded tightly and screwed, as the regular holes and the waved surface shows that it has been. Very faint ink-traces in the upper margin (Abklatsch?) are not counted in the line indicators. The lower part has been cut off sharply between two lines. It could be hoped that it was sold separately and still exists.

Written across fibres. 240 by 190 mm.

The writing belongs to a long tradition dating back at least to the time of Augustus, and probably back to the 2nd century B.C. As this type of writing is treated at length by W. Schubart in his Griechische Paläographie (v. pp. 48–65 passim) we shall only give an inventory of the letter-forms, as letters may be difficult to single out owing to their minuteness and compression

```
α αυ, αυ = άξε, έμι 
β 
γ γ 
δ δ, δ = δέ, 
ε ε 
ζ ζ 
η η 
θ δ θ 

γ ι, ι = ιε, 
ξ 
ο ο 
π π 
ρ Π 
σ σ 
τ τ 
μ μ 
ν ν 
π π 
φ 
χ χ 

```

p 1, b = ιε, r ι
x ι 
λ λ 
τ τ, το = το, τε = τε, η = τε
μ μ 
ν ν 
μ μ 
φ 
χ χ 
ω ω
For comparison see:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 b</td>
<td>Ber1.P.9078</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>127 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ber1.P.13070</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 a</td>
<td>Ber1.P.7206</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>(BGU 912</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 b</td>
<td>Ber1.P.7882</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>(BGU 350</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ber1.P.7018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>(BGU 697</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>145 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the most striking similarity is to B.M.Pap. 142 (=PS II. 147) A.D. 95. This document also comes from Karanis, and though it is some 30 years older, we have no doubts that they were written by the same scribe. This can also be said of B.M.Pap. 143 (=PS II. 148) A.D. 97, also from Karanis, but here the general impression is a little different.

These three pieces also demonstrate that we shall never be able to date a piece of writing on its appearance alone with the amazing precision of the archaeologists. Dating within a century, sometimes within half a century, is probably the best we shall ever be able to do if no further evidence is available.

The 2nd hand is clearly that of a person who does not write much. The writing is larger and somewhat inexperienced. Letters appear more or less in their regular forms and are hardly linked at all, which makes it more legible to us.

Unless the last part of the papyrus is found, we shall never know whether this is the handwriting of Thaesis herself or if the last line ran Ρακύσις ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ τῆς γυναικὸς μου.

The language is straight, orthography good - especially in the first half of the document. A few iotaisms occur: 2. παρακλήσον, the infinitives in 1. 18-19 alternate between -ειν and -ειν. Sometimes it is difficult to decide which was meant because of the minute handwriting. The iota adscript is employed correctly in most of the 1st and 2nd declension nouns, it is superfluously added in σκέπα (40), whereas the form ουλη (3 etc.) can hardly be called a mistake. It is so common in the papyri from this period that it seems probable that it was considered the correct form.

Anyhow, pronunciation would not distinguish between the nominative and the dative. o in stead of ω and vice versa occur in a number of places: 25&26 μετόης, 25&27 σωμηνεως, 28&29 δόω, (i.e. mainly in the 2nd half of the document). Double consonants are reduced to one in two cases: 1 ἀπελεξοῦ, 30 βορᾶ (M2).
τετελευτηκοῦς in lines 13 and 35 is probably a hypercorrect form, based on the analogy of δέξα-δέξης which in common speech will have been inflected δέξα-δέξας as in Modern Greek.

The declension of proper names in -ις is unstable, the genitive of Σοκμήνις being now Σοκμήνεως now Σοκμήνιως (but it should be remembered that the quantity of the ο's being the same, the difference in actual pronunciation is negligible, especially when the ε/ι is unstrressed). The professional scribe declines correctly τοῦ Πακύςλος, the lay (wo)man in line 25 writes τοῦ ἄνδρος Πακύςλις but in 3c τοῦ ἄνδρος Πακύςλως.

The word αὐλόδριον (8&29) is not found in LSJ. It is formed from αὐλή with the diminutive suffix -δριον.

16f. The expression is somewhat compressed. In stead of "if it should happen that any of them, i.e. either Sokmenis or Kastor, dies...." the text says "if it should happen that any of Sokmenis and Kastor dies....".

11&33. The name Κερκεσσοῦχα is usually treated as a neuter pl., and so it probably is here in line 11, but in line 33 it is a fem. sg. Notice the changed vocalization Κερκεσσοῦχαν. It could also be that Κερκεσσοῦχα in line 11 is an accusative sg. that has dropped its final -v, but perhaps this possibility is ruled out by the early date and the generally correct language of this document. An analogous example in Modern Greek is Olympia which in official language is called η Ολυμπία whereas the local people say τα Ολυμπια.

26. The word after οὐλη may be another οὐλη (dittography).

The argument in favour of a common scribe for Pap.Hafn. 28 (M1) and B.M.Pap.142 and 143 is corroborated by considerations of language and orthography. It is exactly the same manner we meet in all three cases: in general it is flawless, but a few slips and peculiar spellings such as μετού, μη, σκευή betray imperfect instruction in orthography. All 3 papyri use the iota adscript in the majority of the datives, incorrect use or omission occurs, but not often. The following table shows some points of contact in the field of orthography:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pap.Hafn.28</th>
<th>B.M.Pap.142</th>
<th>B.M.Pap.143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. ἡρακλῆδου</td>
<td>2. ἡρακλῆδου</td>
<td>3. ἡρακλῆδου or ἡρακλῆδους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.σκευή</td>
<td>12.μη</td>
<td>18.μη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.οὐλη μετοπώ μεσώ</td>
<td>6. οὐλη μετοπώ μεσώ</td>
<td>8. οὐλη μετοπώ μεσώ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. συνκεκριμέναι</td>
<td>17.ἐγκρατεύω, ἐνρεοσθένε</td>
<td>23.ἐγκρατεύω, 24.ἐνρεοσθένε</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The transcription in P.S.II is wrong in printing Πακυλῆδου.
Μ1 1 ἔστους ἐκτος αὐτοκράτορος Καλαρας Τραγιανοσ Ἀριανοῦ
ζεβεβετίῳ μ[η]γὸς ἄλεαιον θαυμι χξ.
2 ἐν] Καρανδίδος τῆς Ἰρακλίδου μερίδος τῆς Ἱσσινος[υ]
τοῦ νομοῦ ὅμολογον θαυμις Κάστορος τοῦ.
3 Ἡρᾶ ἄρω τῆς προφητεμένης κάμης Καρανδίδος ὡς ἐτῶν ἔξηκοντα
δυὸ ὀδηὴι μετοπῖ εἰς ἄριστερῶν
4 μετὰ χυρίου τοῦ ἐαυτῆς ἄνδρος Πακύσιος τοῦ Σοκμήνιος ὡς
ἐτῶν ἔξηκοντα ἐπὶ οὐλῆι
5 ἀντιχνημιῶι δεξιῶι συνήχωρηκέναι μετὰ τήν ἐαυτῆς τελευτῆν
ἐναι τῶν γεγονότων(ων)
6 αὐτῆι ἐκ τοῦ Πακύσιος τέχνων Σοκμήνεως ἐστρατευμένου καὶ
Κάστορος καὶ
7 Θερμοῦθιος τοῦ μὲν Σοκμήνιος ἐστρατευμένου καὶ Κάστορος
τῶν δύο κοινῶς
8 ἐς ἱσοῦ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῆι ἐν Καρανδίδι οἰκίδια δύο καὶ
αὐλόδρια δύο ἄντα ἄρω νότου καὶ
9 μορρὰ τῆς ὑπαρχόντος τὸ πατρὶ Πακύσι οἰκίας καὶ αὐλης καὶ
τὰ ἐαυτῆς ἀπολειφθοσόμενα
10 ἐπιζελο αἰτὶ σκευη καὶ ἐνομιμεναν χ(φι) ἐνοφ[ει]λόμενα
 αὐτῆι καὶ' δὲν όριοτε ὀὐν τρόκον
11 τοῦ δὲ Κάστορος μόνον τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῆι περὶ Κερκεσούχα
χλήρου κατοικικοῦ
12 δρουμαν μέαν τέταρτον χξ οὐ τῆς Θερμοῦθιος ἅγιοι δραχμαὶς
ἔξηκοντα καὶ τῶν τῆς θαυματος)
13 τετελευτηκυλὴς θυγατρῶς θατρητός τῆς Κάστορος τέχνων
Σωκράτους καὶ Κάστορος
14 καὶ Μελανατος τῶν τριῶν κοινῶς ἐς ἱσοῦ ἄργυριον δραχμᾶς
ἔξηκοντα ἀσπερ ἐπὶ τὸ
15 αὐτῷ ἄργυρίῳ δραχμάς ἐκατὸν εἴχοσι ἀποδώσουσι αὐτοῖς ὁ τε Σοκυῆς ἡ στρατευμένος καὶ
16 ὁ Κάστορ πονῆς ἐξ ίσου ἕν ἰδὲ συμβῆ τίνα τοῦ Σοκυῆς εὐχαριστέων καὶ
17 Καῖτορος άτεχνον καὶ ἀδίστερον τελευτῆσαι εἶναι τὰ τοῦτον ὑπάρχοντα τοῦ περὶ ντος
18 ἀπ' φύτων ἐφ' ἰδὲ καὶ χρόνον περίεστιν ἡ ὁμο[λο]γοθα θαῆς ἔλειν ἀπάγ[τω]ν ἐξουσίαν
19 κωλεῖν καὶ αὑραψεῖν ὑποτιθεσθαι μεσιτεύων μεταβιβάσθαιν εἰκονομεῖν ὡς εἶπαν αἵρηται
20 μάρτυρες Ἀυτοὺς Σοκυῆς ἐπάνω ὡς ἔτοιν ἐβδομῆχοντα ἡγγήσαν ψι[λ]ῆν
[.]ῃ.......ἀριστερ.;
21 καὶ Σοκυῆς Σαταβουτὸς ὡς ἔτοιν τριάκοντα ἡχτῆς οὐλῆς ὀξτύλωι μικρῷ χειρ(ῶς) ἀριστερᾶς καὶ Πατριμοῦθις
22 Κάστορος ὡς ἔτοιν τεσσαράκοντα πέντε οὐλῆς ὡς ὁφθαλμόν δεξιὸν καὶ Σαταβῦς Ἀγκάρωφως ὡς ἔτοιν τριά(χοντα)
23 πέντε οὐλῆς μετόπωι μέσῳ ὡς ὁφθαλμόν τρίχα καὶ Χαΐρῆμων Φαμῆς ἐπάνω ὡς ἔτοιν πεντήχοντα οὐλῆς μηλών
24 ἀριστερῶς καὶ Χαϊρῆμων Πτολεμαῖον ὡς ἔτοιν τεσσαράκοντα ὡς ἔτοιν πεντήχοντα οὐλῆς μηλών
Μα 25 Θησίως Κάστορος μετὰ κυρίον τοῦ ἄνδρὸς Πακύριος τοῦ Λαμηνεῖος
26 ὡς ὁμολογῶ συνεχωρηκέναι μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν μου εἴναι
27 τῶν τέχνων μου τοῦ μὲν Σοκυῆς ἐπηρετευμένου
28 καὶ Καῖτορος τῶν δύο φύνων ἐξ ίσου τα ὑπάρχοντα μοι ἐν
29 καὶ ἡμικλίδα δύο καὶ ἀκλάδρια δύο ἔντα καὶ καὶ τα ἐξελλοῦσα
30 καὶ πρὸς τῆς τοῦ ἄνδρος Πακύριος οἰκίας καὶ ἀείκης καὶ τὰ ἐξελλοῦσά
31 ἡ μοι καὶ σκέφθη καὶ ἔνδομεν καὶ ἐνοφειλέμενοι καὶ τα πρὸς
32 ὁπότεν οὐν τρίπον τοῦ οὐ Κα[σ]τρ[οῖς]ς μῆν[σ]ον τοῦ ἔν τὸν χῶρον-
33 οὖν μοι πτ[ε]ρὶ κερκανοῦχαν κλήρου ἄρουρ[α]ν μὲν τέ]τρητον
καὶ τῆς θερμούθιος ἄργυρ[ὲν ὥ]ραχμὰς ἐξήχοντα καὶ τῶν
τῆς τετελευτηκυής μην θυγατρῆς θατρητος τῆς Κά[σ]
τορας Σεκράτους καὶ Κάστορος καὶ Μελανάτος τῶν τριῶν
καὶ ἵνας ἔτσι ἠγόρασεν ὅραχμας ἐξήχοντα ἀπερ ἐπὶ τὸ
αὐτὸ ἄργυρίου ὡραχμᾶς ἐκατόν εἴχει ἀποδώσουσι αὐτοῖς
Thaesia, daughter of Kastor son of Heras, from the aforesaid village Karanis, aged 62, with a scar on the left side of the forehead, having with her as guardian her husband Pakysis, son of Sokmenis, aged 67, with a scar on the right shin, acknowledges to have assented to the following division of her belongings after her death among her children by Pakysis, to wit: Sokmenis, enlisted in the army, and Kastor, and Thermouthis:

To Sokmenis, enlisted in the army, and Kastor, jointly and equally:

1. Two small houses and two small yards, which she owns in Karanis, situated to the north and to the south of their father Pakysis' house and yard.

2. Whatever she will leave of moveable property, implements, furniture, and debts owed to her in any way.

To Kastor alone: 1 1/4 autra of settler's land, which she owns near Kerkesoucha.

To Thermouthis: 60 drachms of silver.

To the children of the deceased Thatreis, Thaesia's daughter by Kastor, namely Sokrates, Kastor, and Melanas, jointly and equally: 60 drachms of silver.

The said silver drachms, making a total of 120, Sokmenis, enlisted in the army, and Kastor, jointly and equally, will give to them.

If it should happen that any of the two, Sokmenis, enlisted in the army, and Kastor, dies without issue and intestate, his belongings shall be transferred to the surviving one of them.

As long as the said Thaesia lives, she shall have authority over everything to sell, cede, mortgage, pledge, alter her dispositions, and administer in the way she may choose.

Witnesses:

Anytos, son of Sokmenis, aged 79, with a scar on the left...

and Sokmenis, son of Satabous, aged 37, with a scar on the little finger of the left hand,

and Parermouthis, son of Kastor, aged 45, with a scar below the right eye,

and Satabous, son of Anchophis, aged 35, with a scar in the middle of the forehead below the hair,

and Chairemon, son of Phaes, aged 50, with a scar on his left cheek,

and Chairemon, son of Ptolemaios, aged 48, with a scar on the left side of the forehead.

The six.
(2nd hand) I, Thaesis, daughter of Kastor, having with me as guardian my husband Pakysis, son of Sokmenis, acknowledge to have assented that after my death my belongings in Karanis shall be divided as follows:

To my children Sokmenis, enlisted in the army, and Kastor, jointly and equally, two small houses and two small yards situated to the north and to the south of my husband Pakysis' house and yard, and my moveable property, implements, furniture, and debts owed to me in any way.

To Kastor alone: 1 1/4 aroura of land which I own near Kerkesoucha.

To Thermouthis: 60 drachms of silver.

To the children of the deceased Thatres, my daughter by Kastor, namely Socrates, Kastor, and Melanas, jointly and equally: 60 drachms of silver.

The said silver drachms, making a total of 120[Sokmenis, enlisted in the army, and Kastor, jointly and equally] shall give to them...

THE REST OF THE PAPYRUS IS LOST.
Pap.Hafn. Inv. No. 317

PRIVATE LETTER.

Neither sender nor receiver is known, nor do we know where they lived or which was their social position.

The original width of the papyrus cannot be determined with certainty. The translation is based on the supposition that only a few letters are lost at the end of each line. However, some of the lines cannot be joined in a satisfactory manner on this supposition. If we suppose that much more has been lost, we shall have the same problem for the lines that can somehow be joined at present.

Papyrus of fairly good quality, and in good condition except for the right margin, which is both cut off and damaged.

Written across fibres. 300 by 105 mm.

The writing is spidery. Letters are loosely jointed, but linked in groups. This might be the handwriting of a man who in some period of his life has been used to writing much. The high number of ligatures shows that the writer is thinking ahead while writing, not drawing the letters one by one, as he often shapes a letter according to what is going to follow. Note e.g. the group δια; 1.4 δια τα εριδια, 1.5 δια τα [τυρ], 1.6 δια την απαιτησιν, 1.8 αρχαια: everywhere it is written in the same way. With this we may compare the group δε where the δ is shaped in another way: 1.1 μηδενος, 1.2 ει δε μη, βλεπε δε ει, 1.6 αμελησης δε και, 1.7 τεμψον δε. Other groups in regular use are: αρ, αι, τι,-note αρ made unusually line 3: ιαργγγιλεν.

This goes to show that this is somehow an experienced writer, but on the other hand the general impression is one of clumsiness: strokes do not meet where they ought to, often making it very difficult to recognize a letter, e.g. δ in line 2 ηδι was meant as the normal three-stroke letter but became as the second stroke was misplaced. In line 3 ημας and line 7 ο γεουχος something went wrong with the reed, but the writer did not notice it at once.

1.1 συντομως and μαλατα the misshaped μ gives us certainty that this letter was not begun from below but from above.

(We believe that M can still be written in this way in modern Greek handwriting). Here it became:

Compare the ligature ευ (1.7 τεμψον)
All this makes it probable that we have here the handwriting of a formerly fluent writing man, who is now old and presbyopic.

γ has both forms: Γ, γ, δ has the triangular form, open to the right. η is shaped like h. ο varies from a fair-sized oval to a mere dot (1.8 ομοιοτητα). χ, ϖ, κ, τ have their regular forms. ι is dotted once (1.8 ἰωάννου). Apostrophe is used twice, for dividing ρ’κ in στις’κα (1.4), and for marking the elision in καθ’ομοιοτητα (1.8). L.5 πλεον is corrected, probably from πλεσεν. L.6 απατησιν the σ is corrected from ν.

As all personal handwriting, this is difficult to date, but taking into account the use of apostrophe and the mentioning of monks, late 6th or early 7th century does not seem unreasonable.

The style is very abrupt and orthography not very good, iota-isms are frequent.

1. λέβω must be regarded as equivalent to a future indicative if the preceding phrase ει δε μη is considered an elliptic expression (as it usually is). Other examples of the use of the aorist subjunctive as a future indicative are listed by V. Magnien in his doctoral thesis from 1912 "Emplois et origines du futur grec" pp. 146ff (Paris). It is a common phenomenon in the Septuaginta.

2. συστούη if the reading is correct, two possibilities of interpretation occur: a) συ means "you" in which case the position is a little awkward. b) συστόυη. The ν has become σ by virtue of assimilation (this type of assimilation is common to Ancient and Modern Greek, cf. Lejeune: Traité de phonétique grecque §329, 2nd ed., Paris 1955) and next the double consonant is reduced to one as in Modern Greek. One might compare the treatment of Modern Greek δέν in such examples as δέν εύμαι, δέν πάω [δέμβ'αω], δε σπούδαζω. Or else one might compare Lejeune op.cit. §121. It might be discussed whether we ought to write συστούη in one or two words.

2. the palaeographically most obvious reading is εύμαι which must be an iotaism for έτοιμα. But unless we suppose an extensive loss of papyrus and text in the right margin this will yield no sense, so maybe one should adopt the less easy reading έστι μοι which gives some sense.

3. αριου = 'Αρείου. παρηγγελεν=παρηγγειλεν.

3-4 we have no idea of how to combine the two lines.

4. απενεγχιν= απενεγκειν. στιςκα=στυπεσια

5. φοντέω διδ Modern Greek construction, cf. ἀμελεὶ διδ (6).

5. τα τυρδ not in LSJ, but the form is not unknown from papyri. Taken at face value this is just a neuter variant of τυρδς but one could also think of a phonetic variant of τα τυρδς with shift of stress, τυρδ as the Modern Greek form, and disappearance of the ι which has been transformed into a palatalization of the preceding consonant. Even the disappearance of the palatalization is not improbable considering Modern Greek evidence. According to
Browning: Medieval and Modern Greek, London 1969, p.80, however, the shift of stress in this type of words is so late as ca. 1100-1400.

5-6 we have no idea how to interpret the end of line 5 and the beginning of line 6.

6 the last word of the line is probably 1st pl. or 3rd sg. of the verb ἔλυς. The latter is the most attractive reading if we do not suppose the papyrus to have been much broader.

10. it is not likely to be anything but just a lapsus calami when θ in ἔρωσθαι has been dropped.

10. πολλίς χρόνις=πολλοῖς χρόνοις

11. τιμωστατε=τιμωστατε

11. we do not know, of course, how the sender of the letter pronounced the vocative, whether ἄδελφε or ἄδελφε.
1 ἡμέλησας μὴ πέμψας συντόμως τὸν σέ τοῦτον μάλιστα μηδὲνδε ἐνταῦθα ὁμος καὶ γὰρ ἐφ᾽ ἑκάστης [...]ψθ[..],ος
2 ἐρχεται πρὸς ἡμᾶς λέγων ὅτι εἶ μὲν πέμπει μοι ετίμαι εἰ δὲ μὴ λάβω ἄλλη βλέπε δὲ εἰ ὄνη πηδησαί γιγ γιγγγ
3 πρὸς τὸν γεωργὸν ἁρίου ἐπεὶ ἠλθὲν πολλὰ λέγων ὃτι καρῆγγιλέν μοι μὴ ἀπελθεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς μήδε[..]ο[.][φφ]ι
4 ἀπενεγχὼν αὐτοῖς μὴ οὖν ἀμελήσῃς περὶ τούτου ἐτί γε μὴν φροντίσον διὰ τὰ ἐρίδια καὶ τὰ στιππία λέγας[ο]γγγ γέγ
5 οἱ μοναχοὶ ὅτι εἶ τοιαῦτα εἶσιν τὰ τυρά πλέον μὴ ἐνέγχη ἡμῖν ἐτὶ ἀποιῆται γὰρ εἰσιν καὶ διὰ τὰ τυρ[..]..η.
6 τὰ τρυγητικὰ καὶ εἶπερ ἄγοράζεις ἡμῖν μὴ ἀμελήσῃς δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀπαίτησιν ἐνδὸς ἑκτὸς ἑρτ[ι]ν
7 ὁ γεωρχὸς οἶδας γὰρ αὐτὸν ὄκοτός ἐστιν πέμψον δὲ ἡμῖν εὐλα καὶ γὰρ ἡ ὄδος καθαρὰ ἑστὶν λέγει γέγ
8 Ἀρχαδία ὅτι ἄγορασον μοι τὸλην καθ᾽ ὁμοφώτητα τῆς σου τὰ τυρᾶ δὲ Ἰωάννου τὰ εἰπὶ ταμῆςψψ
9 πέμψον αὐτῶ
10 ἐρρῶς<θ>αλ γε εὐχομαι πολλὲς χρόνις τιμιότατε ἀδελφέ
You have shown negligence by not sending quickly the grain, especially as there is nothing here, and Anthistos? 1-2 also comes every day to us saying that "if he sends it to me, they are ready (?) otherwise I shall get it elsewhere". And see to it if you can hurry to Areios' serf, for he has come and said a lot that "he has ordered me not to go to you (?) neither .......

3 bring to them", so do not be neglectful about this, and take also care of the wool and the rope. And 4-5 the monks say that "if the cheeses are like that he shall not bring us any more, for they are not yet ripe". And concerning the.....

6 the harvest-money and if you buy to us, and do not be neglectful about the claim either, while 6-7 the land-owner is away, 7 for you know how he is. And send us wood -the road is also free.

7-8 And Arkadia says that "buy me a cushion like yours", and as to Iohannes' cheeses, those in the store-room (?),

send them to him.

10 I wish you to enjoy good health for many years

11 most honoured brother.
This document poses three main problems: 1) how is the relation between senders and receivers to be conceived of? The senders may be either inhabitants of Karanis themselves, or they may be inhabitants of a neighbouring village. 2) what is Thanasesmen? The name would seem to be Coptic, and should probably be analysed into ΘA (=TA) "at" + NE "definite article pl." + ΚΑΜΝΤ which is not recorded, but might be a corruption of ΚΑΜΝΤ "pool, tank (and: collecting-place?)". Thus δασκαλημν seems to mean "at the pools", but the word must have been corrupted by the transcription into Greek. We thank Dr. theol. S. Giversen, University of Copenhagen, who has suggested to us the above interpretation as a possibility. 3) is the water involved a spring, a pond, a canal or a well?

Papyrus in good condition except for a few worm-holes. Writing along the fibres. 31o by 215 mm.

This specimen is palaeographically interesting by dating with certainty from the fifth century, from which there are so few examples. If it had not been securely dated, one might easily have put it a hundred years earlier knowing e.g. Brit. Mus. Pap. 234 (=Pal. Soc. II, 188=Schubart: Gr. Pal. p. 88, =Thompson: Intr. p. 175) dating from the middle of the fourth century.

This large, upright, and laterally compressed hand is at first sight impressive, but the handwriting of Aurelius Serenus is much like his language and his orthography, i.e. he has apparently seen documents like B.M. Pap. 234 but has no real education in this style. Many letters have two or three forms that are used indiscriminately. α has at least two forms, the regular closed rounded one, and an open (e.g. line 1o δασκαλημν). δ has everywhere the closed triangular form whereas one might expect the "Latin" form. η is sometimes written Η, sometimes h (e.g. 1.15 κωμης, τηνες), θ is written both ϑ (e.g. 1.1 θεοδοσιου) and θ (1.3 -θεος), and once in a curious form (1.1o δασκαλημν). ι is mostly very small and rudimentary (e.g. 1.1o δασκαλημν), but once it appears in the large C-form (1.16 Αμφοτερον). υ is mostly V-shaped, sometimes with a stem, twice only it is a bow above the line (1.1 αγγους-and 1.12 συμπληρων). Twice the υ is dotted (1.1 Υπατιαν, 1.17 εγραφα υπερ). ι once, quitemeaninglessly (1.4 ειςωνων).

The initial letters of each line and the ω of μαρτυρω (1.18), which was originally meant to be the final letter, are slightly enlarged.

In the hand of Flavius Ioannou one may note the cursive ν (1.2o νομοστρωος) and the "Latin" δ in αρκαδιας.

We have not been able to explain the φ at the end of line 7.
The language is that of a man with no grammar-school education. Iota insertions are abundant, the scribe does not know where to write omega and where omicron etc. The date is expressed in a despe-
ately confused way. Uncertainty in the use of cases is apparent in lines 8-9, 11, 13, 15, in short: the scribe does not master the type of Greek he is supposed to write. On the other hand, the very ignorance of the scribe makes the document extremely valuable as an early source of information about characteristic developments from Ancient to Modern Greek.

1. The Theodosius mentioned is Th.II, A.D. 408-450, his colleague in the consulship was Faustus, so θεοδόσιου το ιβ και θεοστου should be expected, but cannot be read. The δεσποτων of line 1. and the λαμπροτατων of line 2. presuppose the mention of the other consul. The άγοιουστω in line 1-2, on the other hand, implies that no other person has been named. An orderly dating from the same period is found in P. Oxy. 1880 (also in Loeb Select Papyri vol.II p.180): μετὰ την υπατίαι των δεσποτων ημων θεοστου το ιβ και ουαλεντιλανου το β των αιωνων άγουστων φαμενωθα α.

2-3 Τιμώθεις=Τιμόθεος
4. ειςωνος=Ισωνος
8.εις εις ειν εις ες ες
8.8 εξουσευει. εξουσευω is a verb which is found neither in LSJ nor in Λεξικον Μεγα Λεξικον της Ελληνικής Γλώσσης, but the formation is intelligible and the reading certain. In line 8 it is construed with the infinitive, in line 9 presumably with the genitive (it seems less attractive to consider κληρων των a bad spelling for κληρον τόν ).

8. There would seem to be 3 possibilities of grammatical inter-
pretation: a) άναληθι is a subjunctive, in which case we should expect an άνα to precede it. b) άναληθι is the Modern Greek gerund and the construction is parallel to the (now obsolete) άξαλω γράφει construction. c) άναληθι is = άναλάβειν, the υ having been dropped due to the following ν. In modern pronunciation two contiguous like consonants are reduced to one. This interpretation seems the most attractive and has been adopted here.

8.8.13. νείρων is the ancestor of Modern Greek νερό. V. LSJ ν. νερός.
8.8.14.8.18. εις means "in, at" as in Modern Greek.
8. τάτο
8.8.9. θανεσμην is neuter in 8. and fem. in 9 (if the reading is correct).
9. ηνα It looks as if this accusative is meant to be the subject of έξουσευση.
9. εμπροστα Rather an early evidence for the Modern Greek μπροστά than a late evidence for the Ancient Aeol. and Doric εμ-
προσθα. On the etymology v. 'Ανδριώτη 'Ετυμολογικό λεξικό της
κοινής Νεοελληνικής, Θεσσαλονίκη 19672.
10.8.15. τούτο τούτο
10.8.15. χρινει Regular Late Greek formation. (The 3rd declen-
sion merges with the 1st. The nominative will be χρινος or χρινα.) Cf.

11. θανατωρατωr The word does not belong to the everyday vocabulary, therefore it has not acquired a popular form. The learned nominative, on the other hand, does not appear to the uneducated man as a form of a declinable word, so he does not inflect it at all. The same phenomenon is met with in Modern Greek lower class speech, where people baptized ξενοφῶς or some other Ancient Greek name treat their own name as an indeclinable noun. An oath very similar to the one sworn here, is found in P.Oxy. 1880 έπομν- μένος θεόν τῶν θανατωράτων καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν τῶν τὰ πάντα νικών- των ἡμῶν θεοδοσίαν καὶ Ὀδαλεντνιανοῦ τῶν αἰώνων αὐγό- στων.

12. οὐαλεντιανοῦ in stead of οὐαλεντινιανοῦ is hardly more than a casual error. - Cf. ADDENDUM p. 221.

12. ζωνόν = αἰώνόν
12. τι should probably be cancelled as a ditto.
12. εὐρήσκε = εὕρησκε - It can hardly be settled whether the mood of the verb here and in line 14 is indicative or subjunctive. Phonetically there is no difference.

13. κατικων Maybe = κατινῶν cf. Modern Greek κάτι "some". The literal translation would then be "if we find anyone of any of those from the said village...". But one is tempted to emendate into κατικων = κατόικων "inhabitant".

13. αναλαμβάνων = ἀναλαμβάνων The participle is indeclinable as often in Late Greek.

14. The verb συγκλω does not seem to be attested elsewhere. The translation "give a beating" is merely conjectural.

15. μαρανα The accusative in Medieval Greek is used after all prepositions (even ἐκ τῶν τάφων).

16. ἤμας probably = ὄμας. To judge from all analogous examples this must be a genitive. Cf. Modern Greek εὔμεδ which cannot, however, be construed possessively in this way.

16. συμφονεί = συμφωνεί, πρόκειται = πρόκειται
18. βοσκούν = βόσκουν ΕΚ and ΕΧ in Later Greek have the common pronunciation sk.

18. μονας May be a lapsus calami for νομάς (the conjecture is due to Mr. T. Larsen).

19. The reductor of the document seems to have felt ἐξαρχής to be one word.

19. ἔρην = ἔλεν as in Modern Greek. The form is most remarkable in so early a document.

19. ἡμᾶν = ἡμῶν The form is common in Medieval and Modern Gk.

19. εὔτεος = εὑτοῦ The form is known from Modern Gk. dialects. Initial unstressed α-s and ε-s are unstable.

18.-19. Concerning sense and syntax there are many obscure points: a) is the herdsman tending his cattle near the monasteries (μονάς) or on the pastures (νομάς presumably around Thanessam? ) b) who are the αὐτῶν ? c) who is the μηδές, any of the herdsmen or of the villagers ? d) does ἔρην ἡμᾶς εὔτεος mean "come over him" i.e. "attack him", or does it mean "come up there" ?
Pap. Hafn. inv. No. 318

1 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Θεοδοσίου τὸ Ιοτ. ἡγεῖται ἀνθρώπος.

2 του λαμπροτάτων κάρων καὶ τῆς ἐβδομῆς ἐν (εἰς) ἰάνος αὐρήλιος Τιμώ-

3 θεος Παπείερ η Ἐμμαγ Πεννοῦζου καὶ Ουδέναφρος Δευνίδου καὶ

4 Ατησίδος Πολ-

5 λου καὶ Καλαμνι Εἰσίνωνος καὶ Όλ Δηνει καὶ Ουδέναφρος Σαμβέ καὶ

6 Σερή-

7 νος Ἱδοδύρου καὶ Παννοῦθιος Ἀμμει ταὶ Ὀλ Ἡρωνος καὶ Ἀπροῦς καὶ

8 Σεραηίων

9 πρεσβυτέροις καὶ Παπείτους καὶ Σαβίνοις καὶ Ἰσάκ καὶ Σωκράτης καὶ

10 Ἀστυ δια-

11 κόνοις καὶ λοιποῖς μικροῖς καὶ μεγάλοις τῶν ἀπὸ κόμης Καρανύδους

12 μηδὲς τῆς κόμης ἐξουσιώθην ἀναλαβῆ νειρῶν εἰς τῷ Θεονσαμὴν μηδὲ

13 τινὰ τῆς αὐτῆς κόμης ἐξουσιώθη κλήρων τῶν ἐμπροστὰ τῆς θυεῖς

14 θεονσαμὴν διὰ τοῦτω πεποιήθη τὴν ἔστη τὴν ἁράν όνυστοντες

15 θεν παντωκράτωρ καὶ νίκην τῶν δεσποτῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης

16 Θεοδοσίου καὶ ὁθαλεντίκινονος τῶν αἰώνιων ἀνθρώπων εἰ [τὶ]

17 τινὰ εὐρήσιον-

18 μὲν κατοικὸν τῆς αὐτῆς κόμης Καρανύδους ἀναλυμβάνου νειρῶν

19 εἰς θεονσαμὴν καὶ συνκλάδομεν αὐτῶς οὐχ ἔχομεν μέμψιν

20 καὶ τινὰ τῆς κόμης καὶ διὰ τοῦτω πεποιήθη τὴν ἔστη τὴν χήραν

21 πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀσφάλειαν καὶ συμφωνεῖ ὡς πρόκειται αὐρήλιος

22 Ἰερήνος γραμματέ φοίς τῆς αὐτῆς κόμης ἐγραφα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν

23 παρόντων ἀγαμμάτων καὶ μαρτυρῶ καὶ ὅ βόσχον εἰς τὰς μο-

24 νὰς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ ἑαυτῆς ἡμὸς ἐρῆ ἀπὸ ἀνάσταυ τῷ (μή) θεονσαμὴς

Ἰωάννου

20 νομισμάτιον τῆς ἡγεμονικῆς τάξεως ἑπαρχίας Ἀρχαδίας καρῆμαν

21 καὶ μαρτυρῶ

Verso:

dεξιέως τῶν ἀπὸ κόμης Καρανύδους εἰς θεονσαμὴν
After the 16th consulate of our Lords Theodosius .... Augustus their Serene Highnesses Pachon 20th of the 7th indiction.

The Aurelii Timotheos Papeei and Psammau Pekysiou and Venafrius Leonidou and Atesios Paulou and Kalaoni Isionos and OI Leein and Venafrius Sambe and Serenus Isidorou and Papnouthis Ameei and OI Heronos and Apphous and Serapion to the presbyters, and Paeieous and Sabinus and Isac and Socrates and Asem to the deacons and the rest, small and great, of those from the village of Karanis:

No one from the village shall be entitled to draw water in Thanesamen, nor shall anyone from the said village be entitled to the lots that are in front of the said Thanesamen, therefore we have drawn up this document swearing by God the Almighty and the victory of the Lords of the World, Theodosius and Valentinianus the Perpetual Augusti: If we find anyone from the said village of Karanis drawing water in Thanesamen and beat them up, no one from the village shall blame us for it, and therefore we have drawn up this document for our (your?) security, and it is agreed as stated above.

I, Aurelius Serenus, secretary of the said village, have written on their behalf in their presence as they are illiterate, and I witness. And he who tends his cattle near the monasteries(?) of them(?) from days of old, no one shall come over him(?).

I, Flavius Ioannou, numerarius of the bureau of the praeses in the province of Arcadia was present, and witness.

------------------------

Verso: Instructions of those from the village of Karanis at (concerning?) Thanesamen.
CONCERNING A PUBLIC BATH

The nature of this document is somewhat obscure. A possible explanation is: The ... ν ὑ of line 1 is the superior officer of Flavius Kollouthos. Kollouthos informs him that he has issued a requisition of something (firewood?) for the public bath. This notice in a subscription carries the acknowledgement of receipt by the clerk of the public bath. On this hypothesis the present document must have been entered as a voucher into the accounts of Flavius Kollouthos' superior.

Ur: The document is a requisition. The mutilated name in line 1 is the name of the person who is to supply the required goods. They have been delivered, and the clerk of the public bath has acknowledged receipt. In this case the receipt will have been entered into the accounts of the authority responsible for supplying the goods in question.

The papyrus is in fairly good condition. The "recto"-side is rather smooth, the "verso" rough. Written across fibres. 185 by 85 mm.

At some time the papyrus has apparently been folded along line 4 which is badly damaged. The writing is large, irregular, and careless. But it cannot be denied that this hand, though ugly, has a certain fluency, and it must be that of a man who is used to writing much, though probably not a professional scribe. Letters are linked in all possible ways. Note e.g. the linking of δ to the preceding ε (1. 4: εὐδοκωκα). η has its late form of a minuscule Latin h. ι is very long and often looped, once dotted (ουξηίλαριον 1. 1). The ligature ολ (1. 1 κολλονθον and ουξηίλαριον) is found already in the 4th century. The 1st stroke of μ has a tendency to drop below the line. ν has its regular form. Ω has the same size as other letters except 1. 1 δημοκρύον where it is only a dot. ρ appears both in its regular form and with an open bow in the common ligature ρδ (e.g. 1. 3 ρδικαρίου). τ can be linked both to the preceding and to the following letter (1. 3 δικαίον). υ is large and pointed without stem, sometimes rather flat, rounded, and a little above the line. Notice the linking of υ to τ, ι, and ρ (1. 1 ουξηίλαριον, 1. 2 λογορον, του ρι-καριον). Compare Pap. Gr. BeroI. 41 (4th-5th cent.), 42a (4th-5th cent.), 42b (A.D. 441) and 49a (7th cent.). A dating to the 6th century does not seem unreasonable, but 5th cent. is also possible.

The 2nd hand is very inexperienced, and does not link letters at all. it is completely useless for dating purposes, but interesting because it probably shows us in which forms letters were taught at school.
A striking feature of this document is the series of Latin titles it contains, viz. vexillarius, riparius, exactor, tabularius. Furthermore the name Flavius and the term indictio are Latin. These terms date the papyrus before the Arab conquest (c. 640). The orthography ουξιλλαριος is probably due to iotaism, the correct form would be ουξιλλαριος reflecting a long ε in the Latin word. Cf. βιξιλατιον and ουξειλλα[πτιον] cited in LSJ Suppl.

1. -νι Dative of some name in -ν, most probably in -ων, indicating the person to whom the document is addressed.

2. The σισ is not quite certain, but at least palaeographically acceptable, and it seems to meet the requirements to sense.

3. The ω at the beginning of the line is reasonably certain. The only evident supplement is then σιτω but that leaves us with very little space to indicate the things of which there were eight. One would expect it to be loads of firewood.

4. The object governed by έξεδωκα should be expected to be some word meaning "requisition" or the like. In spite of the extensive remains of the word we have not been able to read it. σιοχνυ cannot be read. The traces look more like γονυ[. . .]y which does not seem to fit any known word.

5. The verb of the clause cannot be read with certainty, έξεδωκα does not fit the actual remains of the letters. έξεδέξη(μηνυ) θασ(ημειωμαι) seems possible though not quite satisfactory to account for the corrected letter that looks roughly like a Τ with a X written over it (or vice versa).
Pap. Hafn. inv. No. 406

Μ1 1 8 νι π(αρά) Φλ(αουήου) Κόλλουθου οβιξιλλαρ(ίου) καὶ ἐπικειμένου δήμους—
2 ού λουτρ]ου φης(ἐμείωμα) εἰς τὸ δήμοιον λουτρὸν διὰ τοῦ ῥιπαρίου
3 .......όχτ]ῶ καὶ ὀχικατον ὑπὲρ ἐξακισώμων τῆς λε' ἱνδικτί(ῶνος)
4 Φλ(αουήου) Κόλλου]ῇφος οβιξιλλαρ(ίου) ἔξεδωξα τὴν .....ν
5 ὡ[ς π]ρόχ(ειταί)

Μ2 5 8 ὡς ταρουλάριος τοῦ δήμου που λουτρὸν ἔξεδ[.]. ... τὴν ἀποχήν.

To [.....]a from Flavius Kollouthos vexillarius and in charge of the publ[ic bath], I have signed: to the public bath through the officer [.....eight]t and one tenth to the tax-collectors of the 15th indication. [I, Flavius Kollou]thos have issued the .... as stated above. (2nd hand) [I, .....]s, book-keeper of the public bath, have .... the receipt.
INDICES

There are three indices: 1) index nominum personarum, 2) index nominum topographicorum, 3) index verborum generalis.

All words have lemmata according to normal practice, except for a few Egyptian names that have been treated as indeclinables.

Conjectures and words of which a part has been restored by conjecture are marked with an asterisk *.

Uncertain readings are marked (?) .

Figures in () refer to words that are much abbreviated in the papyrus.

Numerals are omitted when they indicate age or date of amounts of money.

"ling.comm." refers to the linguistic commentary included in the introduction to each papyrus.

"comm.pal." refers to the palaeographical comments in the introductions.

In the index nominum titles are only given when certain.

INDEX NOMINUM PERSONARUM

'Αγχωφις — εσφ 28.22
'Αδριανός ν. Τραίανός
'Αμετο (GEN.) 318.5
'Αμνευ (slave) — α 24.18 — ι (στρατηγος) 24.3
'Αντος 28.20
'Αποφος (nom.) 318.5
'Αρείος γεωργόν 'Αρίου 317.3
'Αρχάδια 317.8
'Ασημ (nom.) 318.6
'Ατησιος (nom.) 318.3
'Αγεύστου — ου 318.1-2 — ων 318.12
'Αυρήλιος cf. ind. verborum
Αυρηλίου Κομιδόπου 'Αντωνίου
Καίσαρος 24.7-8
Δέμος 24.10 — ου 24.16 — ου 24.4,4.17
Εἰσών — ους 318.4
Ερμανη — ης 24.15
Εὐδαμονίς — έδος 24.12
Εὐρέπος (slave.) — ου 24.17
'Ηρᾶς — Ω (gen.) 28.3
'Ηρώς — έδος 24.15
'Ηρων — ωνός 318.5
Θατής — ζος 28.13,35
Θεόδωρος (δεσπότης) — ου 318.1,12
Θερμονός — ζος 28.7,12,34
'Ισαχ (nom.) 318.6
'Ισις (slave) — έδος 24.23
'Ισίδωρος — ου 318.5
'Ισίων ν. είσιων
'Ιωάννης — ου 317.8; 318.19
Καίσαρ cf. ind. verborum
Καίσαρος Τραίανον 'Αδριανό
Σεβαστος 28.1
Καλαμνις (nom.) 318.4
Καλλίνικος — ου 24.4
Κάστωρ 28.16 — ορος 28.2,6,7,
11,13,13,17,22,25,28,32,35—
36,38
Κάλλουθος (οὐζελλάριον)
406.84 — ου 406.1
Κόμομος ν. Λαρκίλιος
Κρονία — ας 24.26 (v.ling.comm.)
Κρονίων — ωνος 24.12
Λεωνίδας — ου 318.3
Λησί (gen.) 318.4
Μελανάς — άτος 28.14,36
Μέσφις (slave) — έδος 24.23
'Οι 406.1
Ξενοφον — άντα 24.28
'Ολ (nom.) 318.4,5
'Ονος 24.31
Οὐαλεντινιανός (δεσπότης)
Οὐαλεντινλ'ιανος 318.12
Οὐαλεντινλιος 318.3,4
'Οφινους (nom.) 318.6
Πακυσίς -ι 28.9 -εως 28.30
-τος 28.4,6 -ις (gen.) 28.25
Πατεεί (gen.) 318.3
Παννούθος 318.5
Πατριμουθίς 28.21
Παύλος -οῦ 318.3-4
Πενύσιος -οῦ 318.3
Πελεμάδος -ου 28.24
Σαβείνως -οῦ 24.12
Σαβίνος 318.6
Σαμβε (gen.) 318.4
Σαρπαμων (slave) -α 24.24
Σαρπιάς -άς 24.4.12
Σαταθός 28.22 -οῦτος 28.21
-ςες 24.20
Σερπιών 318.5
Σερφύνος 318.4-5
(γραμματεύς) 318.17
Συχαπηνίς 28.15,21 -εως 28.6,
16.20,25-26,27 -τος 28.4
Σωκράτης 318.6 -ους 28.13,36
Σαπεείς (slave) -είτος 24.19
Σαρσίς -εως 24.26
Σαφροσαίς -είτος 24.4
Σημίδεος Σημίδεος 318.2-3
Στρατιώτης Καλλιάρου Στρατιών
'Αδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ 28.1
Φατζ -πος 28.23
Φλάουν (νουμεράριος) 318.19
τον. Κάλλους κ. Κάλλους
Χαλκήνων 28.23,24
Υαμαν (nom.) 318.3

INDEX NOMINUM TOPOGRAPHICORUM

"Αμφοδόν Γυμνασίου 24.5
"Αμφοδόν Μονήρως 24.6
"Αμφοδόν Συριακής 24.13,26
"Αντινοείς -είδος 24.28
"Αντινόου τέλες -εί 24.29,432
"Αρκαδία (ἐπαρχία) -ας 318.20
"Αριστοκράτης νομός -ου νομοῦ
24.3; 28.2
"Ηρακλείδου μερίς 24.3
"Ηρακλίδου μ. 28.2
θανεσαμην τω θ. 318.8
τῆς αὐτῆς θ. 318.9-10
εἰς θ. 318.14
Καρανίς -τοί 28.2,8,29 -ζός
318.7,13; 28.3
Κερκεσσοχων 28.11
Κερκεσσοχαν 28.33
INDEX VERBORUM

ἀγοράζω -ζεὶς 317.6 -σον 317.8
ἀγράμματος -αν 318.18
ἀδελφος -εις 317.11
ἀδιάθετος -ον 28.17
ἀδρέω -νται 28.19
ἀδόνις -ον (=-ων) 318.12
ἀλεξανδρός -αν 24.20
ἀλλά -ἀλλ' 24.20,21; 317.2
ἀλλος -ον 24.21 -ας 24.21
ἀμελεῖ -ήσεις 317.4,6
ἀμελήσας 317.1
ἀμφότερον -ον 24.5,6,9,13,26
ἀναγράφω -όμενος 24.5
-άδειμον 24.29
-γεγραμμένον 24.16,24
ἀναλαμβάνω -ον (ευν) 318.13
-λαβί (=λαβείν) 318.8
ἀνάφηρον ἀνάφρον 24.2,31; 28.4,25,30
ἀντίγραφον (2) 24.2
ἀντικυμήνου -γνημίω 24.22
-κνημίω 28.5
ἀπαίτησις -εὶς 317.6
ἀπάνω 318.19
ἀπεσ --ντον 28.18
ἀπέραντος -ορος 24.15
ἀπετάλα τος ἀπεταλοῦ 28.1
ἀπερύμνησις -ειλείν 317.3
ἀπή 24.4; 318.7,19; 28.3,8,29
'ἀπ' 28.18
ἀπηγράφω μια 24.6 ἀπηγράφων
24.9 ἀπηγράφωτο 24.13,26,29
ἀπηγράφων 24.31
ἀπηγραφή -ην 24.8,32 -η 24.9,13
-ης 24.2
ἀποδόσις -δοσιμος 28.15,33
ἀποκτήτως -α 317.5
ἀπολέξις -φιλοκέμανα 28.9
ἀποκλάπσεως -επελεγμένου 24.30
-εκελεγμένης 24.14-15
-εκελεγμένης 24.27
ἀποφέρω ἀπενεχκεῖν (σείν) 317.4
ἀποχή -ην 406.5
ἀργύριον -ου 28.12,14,15,34,37,38
ἀριστερός -άς 28.21 -ά 24.11.
22 -ω 28.20,24 -ῶν 28.3,24
ἀρουρα -αν 28.12,33
ἀσημος -ον 24.213
ἀπάξεια -αν 318.16
ἀπήν -ης 28.9,30
ἀπελεύστων -α (v. ling. comm.)
28.8,29
ἀργήλοις 318.16 -οι 318.2
ἀτεκνος -ον 28.17
ἀυτοκράτωρ -ορος 28.1
ἀύτος -ος 317.9 -ος 24.8
ειτεv (v. ling. comm.) 318.19
-ος 318.14 -οις 317.4;
28.15,38 -ῶν 318.17,19;
28.18 -ης 28.6,8,10,11
-ης 24.18,30; 318.9,9,13,17
-ας 24.22 -δ 28.15,38
βλέπω -εις 317.2
βορρᾶς -α 28.9 βορρα 28.30
βδομοι βδομον (εβδομον)
(v. ling. comm.) 318.18
γάρ 317.1,5,7,7
γε 317.4
γένομαι γενόμενον 24.14,27
γεναιμένου 24.8 γεναιμένης
24.14 γεναιμένων 28.5
γενοχος 317.7
γεωργιος -ον 317.3
γράμματες 318.17
γράφω γράφα 318.17
γυμνη -αίξα 24.11 -αεις
24.15,27
δακτυλος -ως 28.21
δε 317.2,3,4,5,6,7,8,7,8; 28.11,
16,18,32
δέκατος -ον 406.3
δεξιοτης -δι 28.22 -δι 28.5
δεξιότης -δι 318.1,11
δημοσιος -ον 406.2 -ου
406.1,5
δηκοτε 28.10,32
δια cum aen. 317.4,5,6; 318.
10,15 δι' 24.32
cum gen. 406.2
διάκονος -ος 318.6-7
διέρχομαι -ελκυόμεθα 24.7
διώκον -ά 24.17 -ῶν 24.23
διος -ον 24.21 -ην 24.20
δραχμη -άς 28.12,14,15,34,37,
δύναμιν δύνη 317.2
δύο 24.421,28.7,8,8,29
δώρα 28.28,29
δύνα 28.16 είδον 28.19
εάνοις -ής 28.4,5,9
εξάθος -νσ 318.2
εξαγωγος -ον 24.24
εξαγωγον 24.17,18,19
εξάγωνης 24.23-24
εξόμολος μοι 24.24,5,11,14,27; 317.2, 3,8; 28.28,21,33 εμοὶ 24.17, 23 μοι 24.15; 28.26,27,31, 35 ήμαις 317.2,3(όμμες ?); 318.16 (γεν. ?), (όμμες ?) ήμαιν 317.2,5,6,7 ήμων 318.1
εὲ 317.2,2,25, 318.12
εἶπεν 317.6
εἶπε 24.10 έστών 317.7,97
έστων ? 317.6 εἶ δέν 317.5, 3 ών έναν 28.6,29 ών τος 317.1 εἶναι 28.5,17,26
εἶς 24.7, 318.8,14; 406.2
εἶς μίαν 28.12,33
έξ 24.14,27,30; 28.6 έξ 24.130; 28.3,8,14,16,24,28,37
έκατος -ής 317.1
έκδοσις έκδοσα 406.4
έκτος 317.6
έκτος -ου 28.1
έκατόν 24.6-7
έκμος -ούς 24.7
έκπροστά 318.9
έκν 24.6,21,29,32; 28.4,6,28
έκδομενα -αν 28.10,31
έκπειγόμενοι -ον (cf. ling. comm.) 24.16,25
έκφυσιν -εστάτη 24.21
έκφύσω 317.6
έκφυσέ ές -ήμενα 28.10,31
έκφυσέ θα 317.1
έξ έξε (sc. μέτρυπις) 28.24
έξεκτωρ -έγρων 406.3
έξερχεται 318.19
έξουσιον (v. ling. comm.) -σει
318.8,9
έξουσία -αν 28.18
έξερχεται -ας 318.20
έπείς 317.2
έπείς cum acc. 28.14,37 έφ' 28.18
έπείς dat. 317.8 (؟)
έπείς gen. 24.8 έπ' 24.5,6,9, 13,426; έφ' 317.1
έπιδέομι 24.32
έπικειμα -μένου 406.1
έπιπλα cf. έπιπλα
έπιπλα (έπιπλα) 28.10,30-31
έπιπλον -α 317.4
έρωτας η ν. ἀνώνυμη
έρχομαι -εται 317.2 έρχη
(έξέλθη) 318.10 ήλεν 317.9
έτερος -ον 24.25
έτι 317.4,5
έτωμαι -εις (έταμαι) 317.2
έτος έτους 28.1 (ήτω) 24.2, 7,9,11,12,16,18,19,20,21,25, 28 cf. 'ός έτων εὐρήκασσα εὐρήκασσεν 318.12-13 εὐτού ν. αὐτός
έσχομαι 317.10
έχω -ομέν 318.14 -είν 28.18 ή 317.2
ήγεμονικός -ής 318.20
ήμαι etc. v. έγω
ήμενος -ου (εκμενον)(v. comm. ling.) 24.22,25(v. comm. pal.)
θεός -ον 318.11
θρίξ τρίχα 28.23
θυγάτηρ ή τρός 28.13,35
ίδιότης 24.10
ίνοικοι -ονος 318.2(2);
406.3)
ώσος -ον 28.8,14,16,28,37
καθάρος -ας 317.7
κας 24.7,9,11,14,14,16,18,19,19,20,20,22,23,24,24,26,27, 30; 28.6,7,8,9,9,10,10, 10,12,12,13,14,15,16,17,21, 21,22,23,24,28,29,29,30,30, 31,31,31,34,34,36,36; 317.1, 4,5,6,7; 318.3,3,3,4,4, 4,5,5,5,5,5,6,6,6,6,6,7,7,11, 14,15,16,18,18,18,21; 406.1, 3
καλος -ος 28.1 cf. ind. nominum
κατά  κατ' 24.2,8,9
καθ' 317.8; 28.10,31
κατινον  sens. dub. (v. ling.com.)
318.13
κατοικητός  -οο 28.11
κλήρος  -ου 28.11,33 -ον 318.9
κοινός  -ῶς 28.7,14,16,28.37
κόλλημα  -ατος 24.2
κόρος  -ου 28.8; 28.4,25
κώμη  -ης 318.7,8,9,13,15,17;
28.3
λαγραφούμενος  v. λαγραφέω
λαμβάνω  λάθω 317.2
λαμπρός  -οτάτων 318.2
λαγραφέω  λαγραφούμενος  (v. ling. comm.)
24.10
λέγω  -ει 317.87 -ουσιν 317.4
-ων 317.2,3
λευκός  -ος 24.11
λοιπός  -οτις 318.7
λοιπόν  406.2 -οο 406.42,5
μάλιστα 317.1
μαρτυρέω  -οι 318.18,21
μάρτυς  -ρες 28.20
μέγας  -άλος 318.7
μείζον  μηνός 28.1
μέμψις  -ειν 318.14
μέν 24.17; 28.27; 317.2
μερός  -ζος 24.3; 28.2
μέρος 24.6,22,25
μεσιτεύω  -εν (=ειν) 28.19
μέσος  -ως 28.23
μετά  cum acc. 318.1; 28.5,26
cum gen. 28.4,26
μεταδίδασσω  -ειν (= -ειν)28.19
μετάκινων  μετάκινω 28.3,23,24
μή 24.24,30; 317.1,2,3,4,5,6;
μηδέν 318.4
μηδένας  μηδένας 318.8,19
μηδένος 317.1
μηλών  -ως 28.33
μήν,δ v. μείζον
μην 317.4
μεθαόρω  -εως 24.5
μετάπτω  -τρές 24.29 -τρός 24.4,
12,15
μετρός  -ως 28.21 -οτις 318.7
μοι ν. ἐγὼ
μοναχός  -οις 317.5
μονή  -άς (=νομίς ?) 318.18-19
μου ν. ἐγὼ
μόνος  -ου 28.11,32
μειράν 318.8,13
μηρός ν. μειράν
νέκκη  -ην 318.11
νομός  -οο 28.2
νόστος  -ου 28.8,29
νουμεράριος 318.26
ξυλον  -α 317.7
28.410; 28.15,16; 317.7;
318.18 τον 24.24,24,27;
317.1,3 το 28.31,28.9
τον 24.4,12,17,30; 28.2,
2,4,4,6,7,11,16,17,25,29,27,
30,32; 406.2 οι 28.24;
317.5 τονε 24.7 τον 24,
#23; 28.7,14,28,36,318.1,
7,9,11,12 η 317.7; 28.18
τον 24.7,11,32; 28.5,11,26,
32; 317.6; 318.1,10,15,
406.4,5 το 24.9,13,29,
29,32 τον 24.4,14,18,23,
27; 318.8; 318.2,6,9,9,11,
13,15,17,20,406.3,28.2,
3,9,12,13,30,34,35,35
τας 24.20 το 24.25; 28.14,
37; 318.1; 406.2 το (το)
318.8 το 24.21 τον 24.7,
8,9; 406.5 το 24.17,30; 28.8,
9,17,28,30; 317.4,4,5,
5,6,8,8 τον 28.5,12,27,34
ξύλον  τονε 318.10,15
δέξε  ην 318.10,15
δέξιον 317.7
οίδα  -ας 317.7
οίκια  -αν 24.2,7,9 -ας 24.6;
28.9,30
οικείον  -α 28.8,29
οικουμένω  -ειν 28.19
οικουμένη  -ης 318.11
δύναμι ν. ὅμως
δύνων  -οντες 318.10
δύναμιν ἢ 28.26 -εν 28.2
-οσα 28.18
δυνατός  -ετα 317.8
δύσεως 317.7
δς  24.29 ος 28.10,18,31
32 ος 24.6 ος 24.9
δοσις cf. ἐνάσω
δοτερ ἀπέρ 28.14,37
δτι 317.2,3,5,8
οὐξιλλάριος (v. ling.comm.)
406.4 -ου 406.1
οὐκ 318.14
οὐλη -η 24.422 -ηι 28.3,4,20,
21,22,23,24
οὖν 28.10,32; 317.4
429 τοῦτω (=τούτο) 318.10,15
τούτο 317.4
dηθαυμα -όν 28.22 -ό 24.11
παντοκράτωρ παντοκράτωρ (v.
ling.comm.) 318.11
παρά -cum acc. 318.15 (cf.
ling.comm.)
cum gen. 24.4,19 (?);
406.1
παραγγέλλω -ηγιηεν 317.3
παρακρόμω -ειν 28.19
πάρειμι -ηκεν 318.20 -όντων
318.18
πατήρ -τρι 24.31; 28.9
πάχων 318.2
πέμπω -ει 317.2 -φων 317.7,9
-φας 317.1
ποιεῖον τεποιημέθα 318.10,15
ποίημα -ηκαί 317.2
περί -cum acc. 28.11(?),33(?)
cum gen. 317.4
περείημι -εστιν 28.18 -όντος
28.17
πολύς πολλῆς (=πολλαῖς)317.10
πολλά 317.3 πλέκω 317.5
πόλει -ει 24.29,432
πρεσβύτερος -ος 318.6
προγράφω -γεγραμένος 24.10
-γεγραμένης 28.3
πρόκειμαι -ται 406.4 -κιταί
318.16
πρός cum acc. 317.2,3,3; 318.
16
πρότερος -α (dat.fem.) 24.13
παλέω -ειν 28.19
παλίδρος -ου 406.2
πάνων μετακειμένων 317.10
πρωτείους σεπριερίουμαι 406.(2)
στός -ου 317.1
σκευός -η 28.31 -ηι 28.10
σκοπεύσι σκοπεύ (?) 317.2
στυπτέων στυπτά 317.4
στρατεύω ἐστρατευμένος 28.
21,22,23,24
στρατηγός -ό 24.3
συ cf. σύ
σύ se 317.10 σε 317.8
ὑμᾶς (=ομάς) 317.3; 318.16
συγκλάδω συγκλάδοις (v. ling.
comm.) 318.14
συγκερωμένω συγκεκερωμένων
28.5,26
συμβάλων συμβαί 28.16
συμφωνεῖον -φωνεί 318.16
σύν 24.21(?) 429,31 συμποπέδ
317.2 (v. ling.comm.)
συνεκμί -οθαν 24.11
σύντομος -ως 317.1
σώμα -τα 24.17 -των 24.423
ταμουλάριος 406.5
ταμιεύον -ω (? 317.8
τάξις -εως 318.20
τε 28.15
tέχνον -α 24.31 -ων 28.6,13,
27
tελευτάω -ῆσαί 28.17
tετελευτημένης (v. ling.comm.)
28.13,35
tελευτή -η 28.5,26
tέταρτος -ον 28.12,33
tίμιοι -οτατε 317.11
tις τις 318.9,12,15; 28.16
ti 318.12
τοιοῦτος τοιαύτα 317.5
tρεῖς τριῶν 28.14,36
τρόπος -ον 28.10,32
tρυφημός -ος 317.6
tύλη -ην 317.8
τυνι [1] ....... 317.5
tυρόν (?) (cf.ling.comm.)
-ν 317.5,8
dóms cf. νειρων
υλός -ν δν 24.416,28
ὑπάρχω -ι (-ει) 24.5 -ουνα
28.8,17,28 -ουνα 28.11,32-
33 -ούνι 28.9
ὑπατεία -ται 318.1
ὑπέρ cum gen. 318.17; 406.3
ADDENDUM

318.12 ουαλεντιανου. A similar error exists in our M. Antoninus tradition. In M. Ant. (= Marci Aurelii In semet ipsum) 1.5.1 we read μητε Πραςιανδος μητε Βενετιανδος μητε Παιμουλαδρος η Σκουταριος. There the correct reading must be Πραςινανδος, prasinianus being derived from prasinus as venetianus from venetus. The form is, of course, of Latin origin and in Latin the Green seem to have been called prasini, not prasii. Actually the form Prasinianus is the one found in Historia Augusta, Vita Veri 6.6.