FOUR DUKE PAPYRI CONCERNING PESOURIS, BASILIKOS GRAMMATEUS

Pesouris, the basilikos grammateus of the Herakleopolite nome, came to light almost a decade ago. Now he has turned up in one fascinating text in the Heidelberg collection (P.Heid. VIII 418) and another at Trier (P.UB Trier S. 125-21). In the light of recent publications it seems an opportune moment to present four papyri housed in the Special Collections Library of Duke University that shed light on Pesouris' career (inv. 598, 599, 602xv, 605xv). We hope that they will help to bring additional relevant documents to light.

The Dossier
To date, four papyri bearing directly or indirectly on the activities of Pesouris have been published: SB XXII 15369 (P.Duk. inv. 600), an apographe of wheat sent to Pesouris; SB XVII 13304 (P.Duk. inv. 602v), a memorandum from the komogrammateus of Tekmi and Bichinthayth, which mentions a visit by the strategos Euphranar—we republish that text here, adding the previously unpublished verso; P.Heid. VIII 418, an enevol from Pesouris to the topogrammateus under him; P.UB Trier S 125-21, a document concerning enrolment into the katakou.

In P.Duk. inv. 598, one unknown official forwards to another (perhaps Pesouris) a letter, which an unknown official (perhaps the same) had sent to Euphranar, the strategos of the Henekleopolite nome. We are missing the left side of the papyrus (perhaps one third of the original text), but the document evidently concerns misappropriation of wine. The author of the document requests the detention of an individual (or individuals) for questioning before the strategos. Euphranar re-appears a few months later in inv. 602, a memorandum from Atis, the komogrammateus of Bichinthayth and Tekmi, concerning Euphranar's transfer of a garrison from Tekmi to Papa.

P.Duk. inv. 605v, 605xv, and 599 concern a police action that took place roughly seven months later. Horalis, a basilikos georgos, was for some reason seized and brought to Herakleopolis to stand before Komano, the epistates of police. On the same day, Dionysios the archiphiylakites sent men to put the house of Ababikis, where Horalis was staying, under seal. In the course of this action, the men apparently seized some property. Phanesis, komogrammateus of Thmoinausiris and the adjacent villages, sent a letter (inv. 605c) reporting these events to Pesouris. Pesouris, or someone on his staff, then composed drafts of two reports (inv. 605v), that concerned legal proceedings to be initiated over the police action and were to be sent to Dionysios and Komano respectively. Phanesis also sent a...
sightly modified copy of the letter that he had sent to Pesouris to an Ammeneus; Ammeneus then forwarded a copy (inv. 599) to another official, perhaps Pesouris himself.

All of the Duke papyri concerning Pesouris were extracted from the same cartonnage. P.Duk. inv. 605r contains a letter written to Pesouris and 605v two drafts of memoranda evidently written by Pesouris or a member of his staff. SB XXII 15369 (P.Duk. inv. 600) is an apographē addressed to Pesouris. Lacuna has removed the addressee of inv. 599, but Pesouris is a highly plausible candidate. The author of inv. 602, did not name the addressee, but Pesouris is again a possible candidate. Thus, it is worth speculating that these texts belonged to an archive of documents kept by Pesouris.

**Euphranôr, Stratêgos, and the Date**

P.Duk. inv. 598 contains a forwarded copy of a letter written in a 32nd regnal year to Euphranôr, the stratêgos of the Herakleopolite nome. A Euphranôr is known from SB XVIII 13304 to have overseen disposition of troops in a 33rd regnal year, which in the second century B.C. can only have belonged to Philometer (149/8) or Euergetes II (138/7). P.Tebt. III.1 723, a fragmentary order to pay soldiers, is also dated to a 33rd year, "doubtless that of Euergetes II,"5 and contains at its bottom a memorandum addressed to a Euphranôr. Falivene (p. 19) has pressed for a connection between the two documents, suggesting that they refer to the same Euphranôr and that SB XVIII 13304 must, therefore, be dated to 138 B.C. The association seems warranted. Both texts belong to a 33rd regnal year; both feature a title was introduced by Euergetes around.

If the identification holds, SB XVIII 13304 controls the date of P.Tebt. III.1 723, not the other way around. On his re-accession in Autumn, 145 B.C., Euergetes II re-calibrated the system of aulic titles.6 At SB XVIII 13304.4-5, Euphranôr is called ισότιμος τοῖς πρῶτοις φίλοις καὶ στρατηγὸς. If the text were dated to Philometer's reign, it would give the sole occurrence of this aulic title before Euergetes' re-accession. It is reasonable to assume that the title was introduced by Euergetes II.7 Thus, SB XVIII 13304 must be dated to the reign of Euergetes II, 138/7 B.C., as was observed over a decade ago.8 So must P.Tebt. III.1 723, and also P.Duk. inv. 598, which can be assigned to the 32nd year of Euergetes II, 139/38 B.C. The letter forwarded in inv. 598 is addressed to Euphranôr and concerns a report made by Pesouris. Thus, if Euphranôr belongs to the reign of Euergetes II, so must Pesouris, and so must P.Duk. inv. 599 and 605v.

P.Heid. VIII 418 cannot be dated beyond doubt without reference to the Duke papyri.9 P.UB Trier S. 125-21 is dated to the reign of Euergetes II on the likely identification of Apollonios τῶν πρῶτων φίλων and διοικέτης with the man of the same title and name attested as early as 134 B.C.10 In any case, the Duke papyri now leave no doubt but that Pesouris' activity as basilikos grammatēs belongs to the reign of Euergetes II.

**Polemaios**

P.Duk. inv. 598.7-8 refers, in a lacunose sentence, to an official designated τῶν ταγέντα παρὰ Πολεμαίου πρὸς τὴν ὑποστρατηγ[ή]τα. The name Polemaios is both dubious and rare. At P.Tebt. III.1 812, n01812, was extracted from mummy 38, and concerns Herakleopolite affairs.

---

5 P.Tebt. III.1 p. 127: "The papyrus is written in a good second-century hand, and the 33rd year mentioned is doubtless that of Euergetes II, the documents accompanying 723 ranging from the 31st year to the 36th. One of them at least (812) came from the Herakleopolitan nome." The reference to P.Tebt. III.1 812 is apparently an error; 810, not 812, was extracted from mummy 38, and concerns Herakleopolite affairs.


9 P.Heid. VIII pp. 258-259.

10 Quenouille and Wilkins, ArchPF 47 (2001) 59. See P.Tebt. III.1 917.4 with BL III 247 (Pros.Prol. I and VIII 18, 26); also UPZ II 202.1 and passim.
815.fr.1r.ii.46 (228–221 B.C.) the editors have emended a Ptolemaios to Π(τ)ολεμαίος; so also at P.Tebt. III.1 815.fr.2r.iii.51 (223–222 B.C.) and O.Joach. 10.12 (Ombos, 68 B.C.).11 The petitioner in P.Enteux. 55 (222 B.C.) calls himself Ptolemaios in line 1, but Ptolemaios in the address on the verso (v.2).12 If we can find a contemporary Ptolemaios whose rank might entitle him to appoint someone πρὸς τὴν υποστρατηγίαν, we might reasonably emend P.Duk. inv. 598.7 to τὸν ταγέντα παρὰ Π(τ)ολεμαίον. The most visible Ptolemaios with the authority to appoint a civil official would of course have been the king. It is unlikely, however, that the author of the forwarded letter in inv. 598 would have referred to the king by the name Ptolemy alone. Known hypostrategoi are few and for the most part found in the Herakleopolite.13 That they commonly assisted in police actions seems clear from the evidence,14 and the title alone suggests that they operated “in strikter Abhängigkeit vom Strategen.”15 Absent decisive evidence, we might speculate that strategoi appointed men to the hypostrategia.

P.Berl. Zill. I and 2, dated to a 26th regnal year, contain copies of correspondence from and concerning a Ptolemaios, archisōmatophylax and stratēgos of the Herakleopolite nome.16 The papyri are securedly dated to the reign of Philometor (156/5 B.C.).17 This Ptolemaios is not likely to be the person mentioned in inv. 598, as the span between his dates and Euphranor’s is too large. Moreover, one Tērēs τῶν φίλων καὶ στρατηγῶς was stratēgos after Ptolemaios and before Euphranōr. Tērēs is attested as early as 15518 and as late as 146 B.C.19 It seems improbable that Euphranōr was confronted, in Euergetes II’s 32nd year (139/8 B.C.), with a crime perpetrated by someone appointed two administrations and almost two decades before him. However, no Herakleopolite stratēgos appears to be attested between Philometor’s 35th year (147/6, Tērēs) and Euergetes II’s 32nd (139/8, Euphranōr at P.Duk. inv. 598). Thus, we offer the tentative suggestion that the Ptolemaios who at P.Duk. inv. 598.7–8 appointed someone to the hypostrategia was stratēgos of the Herakleopolite nome some time between 146 and 139/8 B.C.; that this Ptolemaios was the successor of Tērēs and the predecessor of Euphranōr.

If this conjecture should prove correct, then, when Euphranōr succeeded to the strategia he inherited the problems of his predecessor. We cannot say when this Ptolemaios might have ended his term as stratēgos or when Euphranōr began his, but with the end of Euphranōr’s tenure we are on firmer ground. In P.Tebt. III.1 810, a ship’s captain declared an oath before Πολεμαίρω όλοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων (12–13).21 The text is dated to a 36th regnal year, which,
according to the full prescript of the oath, must fall under Euergetes II, in 135/4 B.C.22 Thus, at the time of Euphranor's appearance in the Duke papyri, he was no more than a few years away from the end of his career as strategos of the Heracleopolite.

Consequences or Exakon? 

The author of P.Duk. inv. 598 asks (7–8), “Please arrange to have the man appear before N,” where N seems to be a magistrate with judicial authority (καλῶς οὖν πολίτευσες συντάξας τὸν μὲν ἄνθρωπον κατα[στήσα ἐπὶ — — — v]. The request is boilerplate,23 but the purpose of the hearing is rendered less clear by lacuna: ὅπως ἔξελεγχεις περὶ [ . . . θητὶ τοῦ ἐξακολουθοῦντος, "so that, if he should be proven (guilty) under examination, he may be...." Petitioners sometimes ask that their adversaries be brought to trial so that "they may suffer the consequences," τέχνισαι τῶν ἐξακολουθοῦντων.24 Thus, if περὶ [ . . . θητὶ should be taken to indicate a verb (aorist passive subjunctive) that means "be submitted to" and governs a dative, we might posit τοῖς ἐξακολουθοῦσιν at 8–9: "Please arrange to have the man appear before N so that, if he should be proven (guilty) under examination, he may be submitted to the consequences."

Such an interpretation, however, is not without difficulties. First, comparison of the two letters after θητὶ with ἐπιστολὴ[ς] (1), τοῦ (4), τοῦ τόπου (6), τοῦ (7), τοῦ (11), or any other pairing of τῶν with a subsequent letter, suggests that the letter following τῶν in line 8 may not be an omicron. The τῶν would be wide, the omicron distant. Traces might suggest, instead, the right hoop of an omega. Its open top is clear, as is the faint trace of the left hoop, just starting to descend from the right end of the τῶν's horizontal bar. Moreover, the letter after τῶν is so badly abraded as to indicate possible erasure. Traces seem to suggest an epsilon, perhaps erased as ditto-graphic before εξάκολοθον, or perhaps a sigma. If we read τῶν [ς] then εξακόλουθον cannot be explained as the number 600 (ἐξακολούθον[ς]). While we might imagine that the crime involved 600 keramia (cf. lines 6–7) of wine, the singular article would be impossible to reconcile. If we ignore palaeography and read τοῖς ἐξακολούθοσι, then context becomes difficult. The 600 keramia would already have been mentioned so that one would have referred simply to "the wine," not "the 600 jars." If we read τῶν [ς] then we might imagine ἐξακολουθοῦντα ἐπὶ-προστηθεὶς (vel sim.), or if we read τοῖς at the expense of palaeographical considerations, then τοῖς ἐξακολούθοσι

\[ \text{[τῶν πρῶτον φιλῶν κ]οι, on the grounds that both fell short by a few letters. But if Mooren's restoration be accepted, then this would be the only Heracleopolite text in which a strategos in the reign of the restored Euergetes II was an archon-matrophylus, not a "member of the first friends." Barring new evidence, prudence suggests we restore Πολεμάρχου [τῶν πρῶτον φιλῶν κ]οι στρατηγῷ at P.Tebt. III 801.12–13. Perhaps the letters and spacing of this important title, which fell at the start of a line were somewhat ouiwsized—a common enough phenomenon.} \]

22 W. Clarysse and G. Van der Veken, Papy. Lugd.Bat. XXIV #156, pp. 32–33. This same Polemarchos is attested in P.Heid. inv. G.4763, which is securely dated to 136 B.C., as Dr. J. Cowey kindly informs.

23 E. e. BGU VIII 1844.23 (Heracleopolite, 50/49 B.C.); P.Entexa 24.8 (Arsinoite, 221 B.C.); P.Koeln VI 272.14; P.Oxy. XII 1465.12 (I B.C.); P.Ryl. IV 577.15 (Arsinoite, 147/136/83 B.C.); PSI IV 366.5 (Philadelphia, 250/49 B.C.); P.Tebt. I 1476.23 (114 B.C., line numbers late II B.C.); UPZ I 5.48–49 (Memphis, 163 B.C.), 6.35 (Memphis, 163 B.C.); 124.34 (Memphis, 176/5 or 165/4 B.C.).


would be a possible restoration. In either case we would have to restore περ...[ ] θη with a verb meaning "be submitted to" and governing a dative. We have been unable to find a suitable candidate.

Context may suggest an alternative. A person who has been proven guilty under examination can be made to do many things besides "suffer the consequences." He might be compelled to tell the truth; or, he might be bound (or perhaps paraded, περισσοθείς) and hanged from a post,273 remanded to the king,28 or dispatched to forced labor at the oar of a ship.29 That the missing verb should mean "suffer" is contingent on the restoration τοῖς ἐξάκοι|λαθοῦσι, which is by no means secure. After ἐξακόστος and ἐξακολουθεῖα we are left with the personal name Exakòn: τοι [ε] ᾿Εξακόλυν.30 As the name would be preceded by the definite article the putative Exakòn would have to have been mentioned previously. The only place in the document where such mention might have appeared is at line 4, so that this Exakòn might have been the person, perhaps an official, who issued report of the crime to Pesouris. Sense might then be restored to the text as follows: ὅπως ἐξελεγχθεῖς περισσε[μι]θητι(? ) τοί [ε] ᾿Εξακόλυν, "so that, if he should be proven (guilty) under examination, he may be remanded (?) to Exakòn."

The verb περισσέμπο is does not appear to occur in the papyri, and its meaning here is admittedly strained. A parallel might lie in the ambiguous phrase at P.Cair.Zen. II 59202.7-9 (254 B.C.), in which Apollonios tells Zenon that έκαν γὰρ φανεραί κατ’ ἀλήθειαν | ὁ ᾿Αμενεύς (a beermaker accused of wrongdoing) εἰρήνας ἐπὶ ἑγαμας πρὸς ἡμᾶς περισσεθεῖς κρημήπεσεν, "If Ammeneus appears truly to have said what you wrote to me, he shall be bound and hanged." Scholars have debated whether to take πρὸς ἡμᾶς with ἑγαμας, or with περισσεθεῖς; on the latter construction the sentence would mean, "If Ammeneus appears truly to have said what you wrote, he shall be led round to me and hanged." Turner has argued for the former interpretation, though the correct interpretation is not obvious.31 Whether the precise restoration περισσε[μι]θητι is correct or not, it does give plausible sense; if not περισσέμπο then something similar.

The name Exakòn is not common in the papyri. In 145 B.C., an Exakòn who was appointed to oversee enrolment of κατοικοί in the Herakleopolite nome was implicated in charges of παραλογεία.32 This Exakòn was well connected. His brother Apollophanès was στρατηγός of the adjacent Oxyrhynchite and Kynopolite nomes (P.Tebt. III 1 739.12-13).33 Herakleopolis and Oxyrhynchos were close, and bureaucrats talked to each other. Could it be that Apollophanès pulled strings and helped his brother obtain a post in the Herakleopolite? For now we leave the identification of this putative Exakòn and the restoration of the line open in the hope that new texts or fresh interpretation may uncover a solution.

Topography

Thanks to the industry of Maria Rosaria Falivene we are well informed as to the topography of the Herakleopolite nome. The village of Thmoïnausiris appears in P.Duk. inv. 599, 605r, and 605v.

Phanēsis, author of inv. 605r and the forwarded letter in inv. 599, calls himself kōmogrammateus of Thmoinausiris καὶ τῶν συγκυρουσίων κωμῶν. The phrase is somewhat rare in the papyri. It most commonly modifies Roman Tebtynis, but also Oxyrhyncha, and (Arsinoite) Tebetyni and Kerkēs. It usually appears in the context of tax concessions, apparently indicating a group of villages to which tax collectors had right of collection. That tax collectors bid for rights to presumably adjacent villages as a block imply nothing about village governance.

Two additional texts, however, may. In P.Lond. III 604A Bēsas, also known as Sōtērichos, kōmogrammateus of (Pathyrite) Krokodeilōn polis and the adjacent villages (1–3), declares arable land in his district that has been inundated in Claudius' seventh year. C.Pap. Gr. II.1 3 (Herakleopolite, A.D. 19), a notification of death, is addressed to Hōros, kōmogrammateus of Mouchinpaei, no doubt a small village, and the adjacent villages (1–3). In his subscription, however, Hōros calls himself kōmogrammateus of Ankyrōn, a place substantial enough sometimes to have been called a polis, and the adjacent villages (15–16). P.Duk. inv. 605 shares a particular detail with this other Herakleopolite text.

At P.Duk. inv. 605v.5 another party appears to refer to Phanēsis as the kōmogrammateus of Rodōnos Nēsos. This doubtless small village, which appears also at inv. 605r.5 but is otherwise unattested, must have been among the constellation of villages under Phanēsis' administration. But Phanēsis calls himself (inv. 605r.2) kōmogrammateus of Thmoinausiris, a substantial village, and the adjacent villages. These three texts suggest formal administration of multiple villages by the same kōmogrammateus. It is tempting to conjecture, on the strength of C.Pap. Gr. II.1 3 and P.Duk. inv. 605, that within such administrative groupings of villages the kōmogrammateus had a single base of operations, and that Hōros' and Phanēsis' were Ankyrōn and Thmoinausiris, respectively.

P.Duk. inv. 598
18 x 23 cm.
21 August 138 B.C.

http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/598.html

Heraeleopolite

The document consists of three joined pieces and is broken at the left and top. The text is written against the fibers on the recto. Faint blotches of ink appear above the first and below the last lines. The verso is, except for a few smudges, blank. The hand is large, clear, and generally angular. The scribe employs two-hooped omegas and standing nus throughout. He writes almost to the right margin, so that word-ends are frequently compressed (e.g. ὑποστροφή, 5).

The left side of the papyrus is missing. The loss is significant, though its extent cannot be gauged with precision, as no line can be fully restored with certainty. The surviving portion of the papyrus is 18 cm. wide, suggesting that as many as 12 cm. of papyrus and 10 cm. of text (assuming a left margin of 1 cm.) remain.

See inv. 599.4 and inv. 605.2.

35 Tebtynis and the surrounding villages: P.Fam.Tebt.46,5–6 (A.D. 195); P.Giss.Univ. VI 47,r.3,4–5, t.2,–3, v.3,2 (A.D. 213–217) with SB XIV. 11627.3 (A.D. 212–217); P.Mich. V 245,12–13 (A.D. 47); PSI X 1139,3, 9 (A.D. 134/5); P.Tebt. II 305.4 (A.D. 137); SB XII 10985.4 (A.D. 156); 10986.4 (A.D. 161), 10987.2 (A.D. 171).


37 Mouchinpaei is otherwise unattested; Calderini, Diz.geogr. s.v., 3,3 p. 300; Fativene, Am.Stud.Pap. XXXVII p. 131.

38 Calderini, Diz.geogr. s.v., 1.1 pp. 11–13.


41 Fativene, Am.Stud.Pap. XXXVII, does not comment on the phrase at 39–43, s.v. Ἀγκυρων πόλεως, or at 131, s.v. Μουχινπαγίου, except to translate it (131) "and villages under the same administration."
roughly 2 cm.), or roughly 22-28 letters, may have been lost at left. The loss of the left side is such that we must for now leave many important questions of interpretation open (see introduction above). Nevertheless, we include this text as it contributes directly to our expanding portrait of Pesouris.

**Text**


c

To Euphranor ... greetings. Pesouris the *basilikos grammateus* [reported to me] on the basis of the things reported by me. If Pesouris was appointed by Ptolemaios to the *hypostratēgia* [of the ... toparchy], misappropriated from those from the region ... jars of wine .... Please arrange, therefore, to have the man appear before ... so that, if he should be proven (guilty) under examination, he may be ... the extortion ... to render account, nor in any way ... so that in ... 3-4. If we are to read τῶν [ε] ἐξακολουθητικῶν at 7-8, then we might restore ἐκακολουθήσατε (4-6). The sense must be "reported to me" (διακόλοφος, ἀνέφερα vel sim.).

4-6. If the Duke texts derive from an archive kept by Pesouris, then we might cautiously posit Pesouris as the recipient of P.Duk. inv. 598. The sender of 598, perhaps another high official such as the dουθετές (?), may also have forwarded the copy to Euphranor.

3. Or, perhaps [--- in 6-12 ---]. The main verb, of which Pesouris is the subject, must appear in the lacuna at the start of line 7. The phrase ἐκ τῶν ... ἀνένεχθηντων (3-4) is a logical unit within which the verb cannot fall. So also πέρι τοῦ ... παραλογισμοῦ (4-6). The sense must be "reported to me" (διακολοφέως, ἀνέφερα vel sim.).

4. Or, perhaps the appointee to the *hypostratēgia* was further identified by patronym.

5. If the size of the lacuna suggests that the second names were restored, the name and rank of a scribal official. Peri τοῦ: The preposition seems to govern, also on the example of P.Tor.Choch. 12.iv.5-7, an articular infinitive, παραλογισμὸς (6); see also P.Grenf. 1132.2-3 (Arsinoite, 152/141 B.C.).

5. The size of the lacuna suggests that two names were restored, or perhaps another appointee to the *hypostratēgia*. Four Duke Papyri concerning Pesouris, Basilikos Grammateus

---

**Notes**

1. Sender and recipient are unknown. If the Duke texts derive from an archive kept by Pesouris, then we might cautiously posit Pesouris as the recipient of P.Duk. inv. 598. The sender of 598, perhaps another high official such as the dουθετές (?), may also have forwarded the copy to Euphranor.

2. υποτετάχθησας: Or ὑπόκειεται vel sim. ὧς εἰδής; possible but not necessary.

3. Or, perhaps [--- in 6-12 ---]. The main verb, of which Pesouris is the subject, must appear in the lacuna at the start of line 7. The phrase ἐκ τῶν ... ἀνένεχθηντων (3-4) is a logical unit within which the verb cannot fall. So also πέρι τοῦ ... παραλογισμοῦ (4-6). The sense must be "reported to me" (διακολοφέως, ἀνέφερα vel sim.).

4. If we are to read τῶν [ε] ἐξακολουθητικῶν at 7-8, then we might restore ἐκακολουθήσατε (4-6). The sense must be "reported to me" (διακολοφέως, ἀνέφερα vel sim.).

5. The size of the lacuna suggests that two names were restored, or perhaps another appointee to the *hypostratēgia* was further identified by patronym.

6. Or, perhaps the appointee to the *hypostratēgia* was further identified by patronym.

---

**Four Duke Papyri concerning Pesouris, Basilikos Grammateus**

---

183
7. The lacuna should contain the number of extorted keramia and the main verb of reporting, writing, or informing, followed by a full stop.

7–8. κατάφσησαν ἔπι. — — — ἕν: A few options for restoration present themselves. (1) ἔπι Name and/or title in the accusative; (2) ἔπι ση ἐν infinite ending in -επε (with the sense κατέφτευς or κατέστης), though space may not permit and sense does not require another verb; (3) line 5 seems to suggest that there were two perpetrators, so that perhaps the sense was “please arrange to stand the man before you, as well as N (the other man)...” κατάστησαν ἔπι ση (or another official) κατ' ἐν ( accusative). The first seems most likely.

8. According to LSJ εἰκέλαγω, “strengthened, for ἐλέγαμον,” means primarily “convict.” That is, it describes in the first instance the ruling of a judicial magistrate or jury. This meaning is not confirmed in the papyri. At P.Cair.Zen. II 59202.5 (Philadelphia, 254 B.C.) the verb means “submit someone to examination,” and the examiner was the plaintiff, not a judge. The lying scribe at BGU XVI 2629.14–18 (Herakleopolite, 4 B.C.) was “proven so on examination” (ἐκείλαγω) by Eurylochos himself, not by an adjudicating magistrate or jury (the editor translates “convicted”). Context at P.Hib. II 198.90 (Arsinote, after 242 B.C.) does not show whether court action was at issue, so that the putative delinquent guardsmen may have been “proven so on examination” or “interrogated” (ἐκείλαγω) as opposed to “convicted” (so P.Hib. II p. 98). At UPZ II 113 (Memphis, 156 B.C.) Dioskourides the dioikêtês warns Dörion that he has had head grumblings about Dörion and Dörion’s underlings. He warns that it would be unwelcome if “anyone should be proven on examination to have injured anyone” (τις εἰκέλαγω λέληπηκαὶ ἐν ἕνα, 13), a general threat that need not imply conviction in court. In his famous letter to the Alexandrians Claudius claims not that he was unwilling to “convict” a population that was not even present, but that he was unwilling to test the competing claims in detail: P.Lond. VI 1912.77 (Philadelphia, A.D. 41) σὺν ἔξωκολην ἄκριβῶς ἐξέλαγας. At SB XX 15036.37 (A.D. II/III), ἐκ δευτέρου ἔκελαγαν ἐν ἕνηγάς. A petitioner compiles a complaint against a woman who slandered her husband, not in the absence, without issue, so that “she may be able to be convicted a second time” (transl. J. R. Rea, ZPE 79 [1989] 201–206, at 205), but so “that she may be caught (lying) a second time;” for precisely this meaning in ἐλέγαμον see Hdt. 1.124.7, 117.2. P.Tebr. 1 25.12–14 (117 B.C.) is too confused and P.Mich. XV 726.5 (?; IV/V A.D.) too fragmentary to allow certainty as to the meaning of ἐκείλαγον.

9. For the restoration and interpretation of τὰς ἐξουκολ — — — see discussion above. The name Exakón is attested with genitive in -ωφος (or -ωφος) e.g. P.Cair.Zen. III 59417.21 [restored] (254 or 252–246 B.C.); 59527.5 (middle III B.C.); P.Köln IV 187.10 (Herakleopolite, 146 B.C.); P.Tebr. III 1739. 3, 9, 11, 13, 15 (Tebynis, 145 B.C.); III, 2 910.2 (162 B.C.); III, 2 1006.13 (late II B.C.); -ωφος (or -ωφος) e.g. P.Dion 15.14 [restored] (Akorios, 109 B.C.); P.Giss.Univ. 1 7.3 (Euhemeria; II B.C.); P.Köln V 222.2, 4 (cf. 223.3; Herakleopolite, after 145 B.C.); -ωφος (or -ωφος); e.g. BGU XIV 2441.149, 171; 2443.23; 2444.92; 2449.117 (Herakleopolite, I B.C.); P.Cair.Zen. III 59442.6, 13 (III B.C.); P.Dion 14.16 (Akorios, 110 B.C.); 15.14 (Akorios, 109 B.C.) [restored]. We suggest above the possibility of restoring ἐξουκολον (i.e. for ἐξακολον), since ἐξουκόλον would give a word that does not break at the syllable.

10–11. The victims of the παραλειψη are the subject of δύναμαι. The sense of 10–11 seems to be “so that in remaining together at their jobs they may be able to pay what is due to the crown;” we might restore πρός τας καθεστασιάνσας χρεías (at their appointed tasks) πρὸς τάς καθ' ἐν πάντας κόρμη χρείασι (at their tasks, village by village) vel sim. For τέλειν τίς καθήκοντ' eis τὰ τοῦ βασιλικῶν see P.Tebr. I 15.170–174 (118 B.C.). Cf. also P.Tebr. III.2 961.5–9 (150/139 B.C.): οἱ ἔξωκολ σὺν αὐτὸν ἔγραψε καταστήσας τοὺς αἰτίους (11 ἔπι ση, ἄρα διαλλάξεις περὶ αὐτῶν μυστικοποιήσεως, δύναμαι δὲ τὰ καθήκοντα [eis τὰ βασιλικῶν παραθέδων].

P.Duk. inv. 602 4 x 6 cm. 23 October 138 B.C.

http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/602.html

Herakleopolite

This small scrap of papyrus contains a memorandum from Atis to an unnamed recipient. The hand is neat and squared, similar to that of inv. 598. A second hand has scrawled what appears to be the date above the body of the text. Atis alerts the recipient that Euphranor the stratēgēs passed through Tekmi on the 25th of Thoth. We know from the docket on the verso that the memorandum had been received and logged by the 27th. The verso, published here for the first time, confirms the reading of the editio princeps at r.2.

Text


recto

(2) Λγ Θωηθ [· · ·]

παρ’ Αττος κωμογραμματέως Τέκμι
καὶ Βιγουθοθ. τῇ κε τοῦ Θωηθ

4 τοῦ λγ Λ παρεγένετο Ευφράνωρ
ισότιμος τοῖς πρώτοις φίλοις καὶ
στρατηγός περὶ ὄραν ἥ εἰς
Τέκμι ἄγων μεθ’ ἑαυτοῦ τοὺς

8 μετακινήτων εἰς Πᾶπα φρουρός.

verso

([L λγ] Θωηθ κς Αττος. Τέκμι).

2 [περί] τῆς μετηγμένης

[φρουράς] εἰς Πᾶπα εἰς Τέκμι.

recto 2. Παρά Μοῆς Schwendner. 3. Βιγουθοθ Hagedorn; κε Θωηθ Schwendner. 4. τοῦ L Hagedorn: τοῦ λγ L Schwendner. 8. Read μετακινήτων. verso 1. Ερατος.

Year 33 Thoth .... From Atis, kòmogrammateus of Tekmi and Bichinthōyth. On the 28th of Thoth of the 33rd year Euphranor, equal in honor to the first friends and stratègos, arrived around the eighth hour at Tekmi, leading with him the troops that had been transferred to Papa.

verso: Year 33 Thoth 27. (From) Atis. Tekmi. Concerning the garrison transferred to Papa, at(?) Tekmi.

Notes
1. If the date was logged on receipt we should restore [κς], as at v. 1.
2. The reading on the verso, which is perfectly clear, confirms Αττος here. This appears to be the genitive of Αττος. The name seems to occur elsewhere only at O.Mich. 351.2 (Karanis, III/IV A.D.), there ‘Αττος (nom.).
3. Βιγουθοθ is attested elsewhere only at BGU VIII 1771.16 (Herakleopolite, 62 B.C.); cf. Fulvene, Am. Stud. Pap. XXXVII 59.
4. The year, λγ, first read by Schwendner (from Morris and Oates, pls. on p. 247), is confirmed on autopsy. The lambda is all but missing; the bottom tip of the right stroke and nothing more is barely visible. The downward stroke cannot have come from a kappa; the year cannot have been Κε. Euergetes’ first year, on restoration to the throne, was reckoned his 25th. If the document were dated to Philometer’s 23rd year (159/8) it would produce the sole occurrence of the aulic title “equal in honor to the first friends” from before the reign of Euergetes II (see above). The horizontal stroke of the gamma breaks and is connected to Λ by a downward-dipping stroke.
5. On Herakleopolite garrisons see the introduction to P.Phrur. Diosk. (forthcoming).
6. The receipt docket reiterates εἰς Τέκμι from the recto (5–6). There εἰς goes with παρεγένετο (3), “arrived at.” Here it is clumsy but accurate.

P.Duk. inv. 605r 30.5 x 20.7 cm. 9 May 137 B.C.
http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/605r.html Herakleopolite

The papyrus consists of six joined fragments. The recto contains 13 well preserved lines, written against the fibers with generous interlinear spacing. The scribe often extends letters at line-ends with a horizontal flourish (e.g. 4, 5, 6, and 10). The hand and layout are highly presentable, and stand in marked contrast to the sometimes weak grammar: the text begins with a dangling accusative, ἐπιλαβόντος [·] τοὺς ... φυλακάτος (3–4), which is followed by a finite verb, ἄν[ν]ήχθη (4); the text gives Νησον (4) where grammar demands a dative, and an infinitive that construes only by extreme ellipsis, [παραλαβε] εἰν (9).

Above the body of the text a second hand (that of Pesouris?) has added a memorandum urging that correspondence be sent to the archiphylakitès and the epistateis of police. The verso seems to contain
drafts of such documents. And, refers (605v.5) to the letter sent to Pesouris by Phanēsis, i.e. to the document on the recto. Thus, we can establish that the text on what we have called the recto was written first, in spite of the fact that its script runs against the fibers.

**Text: Recto**

(605v.5) 4. None of the approximate phylakites, aforesaid Hōriōn was staying, as well as Petesouchos, one of the royal farmers from the same Herakleopolis. I have written to you so that you may know. Farewell.

5. To the police. After this, on the same day, Agathinos and Phil... 4. 4.

8. The note to write to the komogrammateus of Thmoinaissiris and the adjacent villages, to Pesouris, greetings.


Write to the epistates of the police and the archiphylakites, so that (?) .... Year 33....

Phanēsis, komogrammateus of Thmoinausiris and the adjacent villages, to Pesouris, greetings. On the 16th of the current month, the guards in Rodōnos Nēsos, having seized Hōriōn, one of the farmers from the same village, he was sent to Herakleopolis in order (to appear?) before Komanos, the komogrammateus. Moreover, the verso appears to have been carried out, at least in draft, on 605v. The purpose of the command is obscure, as we are unable satisfactorily to construe the verb after ἀφησε (or possibly ἀφῆσα): ἀφησε ὁ Θησεῖος εἰς Ἁρμακλέος πολιτας [...]. The reading ἀρχιφυλακίης does not seem to correspond to any attested word.

**Notes**

1. Though badly worn, the first line appears to be an intra-office memorandum of the type "imperative + purpose clause + date," common in the Ptolemaic period (P.Enl. 122, p. 103), and the archiphylakēiētēs is difficult to read, but epistatai and archiphylakēiētai are routinely addressed together in this form, with or without other addressees: e.g. P.Lond. VII 2188.142 (Philadelphia, 148 B.C.); P.Mich. XV 688.1–2 (Soknopaiou Nēsos, II B.C.). Moreover, the verso appears to contain a draft addressed to Dionysios the archiphylakēiētai, which also mentions Komanos the epistates of the police. The note to write to the epistates and archiphylakēiētai appears to have been carried out, at least in draft, on 605v. The purpose of the command is obscure, as we are unable satisfactorily to construe the verb after ἀφησε (or possibly ἀφῆσα): ἀφησε ὁ Θησεῖος εἰς Ἁρμακλέος πολιτας [...]. Or should we understand something like φάγων αὐτό; ἀφῆσα ἀφῇσα ἀφησε [...]. Or should we understand something like φάγων αὐτό; ἀφῆσα ἀφῇσα ἀφησε [...]. Or should we understand something like φάγων αὐτό; ἀφῆσα ἀφῇσα ἀφησε [...].

3. Three rough contemporaries shared Phanēsis' name and office, but in different villages: komogrammateus of Koitai (P.Teh. III 734.1–2, 21–22 [141–139 B.C.]), of Philadelphia (SB IV 735.1–2 [after 200/176 B.C.]), of Theognis (SB XVIII 13618.3 [187 B.C.]).

4. For the day of the month, we read ἡ, though η (so that the date would be 1 May 137) is perhaps possible. The same ambiguity appears at P.Duk. inv. 605v.6 and P.Duk. inv. 599.3 and 12.

5. Komanos cannot be identified securely with any contemporaries so named.

6. These two agents of the archiphylakēiētai, Agathinos and Philammon, do not seem to correspond to any attested contemporaries of the same name. The reading καὶ καὶ λαμανιδος is far from certain. Crisis of xri before α is not infrequent in the
papyri: Mayser, *Gren.* I.1 137; for κάλλα see SB XVIII 12326.11 (Havara, I B.C.). [Διονυσίον]: P.Duk. inv. 605v, apparently addressed to Dionysios, in describing these same events refers to Agathinos and Philaminon as π[α]ρά σοι (8); this suggests that Dionysios might be restored here.

8. Abasbikis: Cf. P.Duk. inv. 605v.9 and 599.8. The name occurs only once elsewhere in the second century B.C., at P.Tebt. III 2 1040.Fr.28 (early II B.C.): Φθίβη Αρβάνιτους. The name appears in the third century B.C. at P.Pet. III 59C Fr.41.23 (Garbou), and twice in the Roman period: P.Oxy. Census 327 (A.D. 91/2?) and O.Deiss. 14.2 (Arsinoite, 5 B.C.): [κατεγένετο]; or perhaps [παρεγένετο]; cf. n. on inv. 605v.9.


10. ἐστὶν δὲ τὸ κόσμον ἔν: for variations on the phrase, employed to introduce lists, see P.Dion. 10.19 (Hermopolis Magna, 109 B.C.), P.Tebt. I 47.34 (113 B.C.), IV 1096.27 (113 B.C.), and SB XVIII 3839.17 (Mouchis, 220/19 B.C.), all of which append lists of stolen goods. It would be attractive to understand the sense of the second half of the line as, "there follows a list of the things that Ἅρων stole." But δὲδ[α]κεῖν is quite legible, and no verb meaning "saying" would appear to fit those traces, so that we should perhaps understand something different: "there follows a list of the things that Χ. handed over to me." [τί]δὲδ[α]κεῖν [Name πρὸς ἔμμενε; cf. PSI IV 325.4 (Philadelphia, 261/0 B.C.): διδότε πρὸς ἡμᾶς. There seems to be space for three letters between ε and δὲδ[α]κεῖν, but the papyrus is fragmentary at this location so that accurate measurement of distance between letters is difficult.

11. Grammar requires a subject for παρεγένευσανας γιάτι at the end of the line. At inv. 605v.16–17, a report to Dionysios the archiphalakjmitês, φυλακτίνωτε; οί (?) παρά σοι are reported as having gone to Herakleopolis. Phanesis was a κομο-grammateus and so probably did not send guards, but perhaps the sense, if not the precise text, is οί παρ' ὧμιν (cf. παρ' ὧμιν, inv. 599.10 with note) ἐνθραποτε;]

P.Duk. inv. 605v

http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyri/records/605v.html

Herakleopolite

The verso contains 23 (perhaps 24) very poorly preserved lines. The text is written inverse to that of the recto, with the fibers, and in a different hand. The writing becomes cramped near the bottom of the papyrus. A generous left margin (ca 4 cm.) contains stray marginal notations (lines 1–3, 9, and 15). Intercursive spacing varies considerably; some lines (e.g. 8, 13, and 14) deviate widely from the horizontal, undulating across the sheet. The hand is rapid and cursive; the scribe makes frequent use of abbreviation and interlinear insertion and correction. These characteristics combine to suggest that the text was a draft.

Traces of the first four lines of the verso are too damaged to construe. Lines 5–19 contain a memorandum to Dionysios the archiphalakjmitês. The author, apparently Pesouris, recounts the matters reported to him by Phanēs and appears to give instructions concerning the arrest and impending trial of the perpetrators. The two features of the memorandum, report and instructions, appear to be interwoven, with the result that restoration of the text from the corresponding sections of inv. 605r and 599 is not simple; the draft paraphrases, and even modifies, but does not quote verbatim. Lines 20–23 seem to contain a draft of a separate memorandum to Komanos, the epistates of police. The battered text seems also to refer to the impending trial. Composition of these two drafts was urged at 605r.1, apparently an internal reminder.

Text: Verso

\[ \text{Διονυσίων φίλως(φίλακτης) ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκπεμβα} \\
\text{γενήταις [επιστολῆ]ς Φ[α]τ[α]νήςς [κισ]ωμόγραφου(συμμαθεύς] τῆς Ῥῶδων} \\
\text{Νήσου ἡμῶν ἑνενεκότα} \\
\text{τῇ ἐν μνήμει Φωκυδίῳ ἐνενεκότας Ὀριανὸν [τοῦ] ἐκ τῆς καμίνης [..] γεωργοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν} \\
\text{[α]νὴρθι] \\
\text{[ϕ]υλακτέον ὑπ[ι] Κομάνον τῆς ἐπιστασίας τῶν Φ[α]λακτῶν [..] ἀνευ τῶν ἄλλων?} \]
9. 

To Dionysios, archiphylakités. Through the letter that Phanésis, kommogrammateus of Rodônos Nêssos, sent it has been reported that on the 16th of the month of Pharmouthi, Hóriôn, a farmer from the village, having been brought up before Komanos, the epistates of the police by the guards there, meanwhile, your men Agathinos and Philammôn, who were present, without the [others?], put a seal on the house of Ababós, where both Hóriôn and Petesouchos were, <und?> seized from(?) the aforementioned … to know something. [Wherefore?] so that to court concerning these matters for the upcoming inquiry, we have clarified the matter to Komanos.

12. Wherefore please, detaining the aforementioned man (i.e., Hóriôn) until the hearing, see carefully to the restoration of the sealed property; and (?) having transferred those with Agathinos … for the hearing of each, for thus, as they are at variance with each other, (even so) they may be examined by … Pesouris … and without the permission of the kommogrammateus, having made a seal, your guards went to Herakleopolis. … therefore, according to the things reported to the kommogrammateus as having been seized (?). Wherefore, it is clear even … from the decision (?) …

20. To Komanos, epistates of the police... for the upcoming inquiry, and so that…

Notes
1–3. The tattered first three lines appear to form a document (perhaps a later annotation) distinct from the text beginning “Ἀπονεισία” (S). They are distinguished by a marginal parenthesis at the left, perhaps marked for deletion.

5. ἀριστοφαίλιτη: Probable, given the reading in 605r.7. Only the alphais is clearly visible.

6. Three characters seem to have been cancelled after Ωπρηλον, but perhaps they have been badly smudged.

7. πετατός: Here apparently in place of μετά τῶν; cf. 599.7 (restored) and 605r.5. For a similar usage, see UPZ I 50.13–15 (162/1 B.C.); also Mayer, Grum. II.2 552–533, ἐπαραγογενάνοις. The initial epsilon is especially difficult to read.

8. At PDuk. inv. 599.8 (σν[ι]ν ἅλλον) and 605r.6 (καὶ[ι]ν ἴλλοι) we read that Agathinos and Philammôn had the assistance of “others” in sealing Ababikis’ house. Here the scribe seems to write that they sealed the house without the other men:
The traces do not appear to accommodate ἀσφαλίσσω, but might indicate ἀσφαλικ[...]νοσορ ἀσφαλισ[...]νος. The verb sometimes appears in petitions to law enforcement officials, referring to detention of individuals: e.g. P.Helis. 1 2.22–25 (Aristoteles, ca 195–192 B.C.): αὐξώντα ἦν ἀσφαλισθοῦσα τὸν Φίλιδον καὶ τοὺς μὲθ᾽ αὐτὸν μέρη τοῦ ἐπιγνωθήθη ἃ τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ; P.Tebt. III.1 798.24–27 (II B.C.): αὐξών ὅν ἐὰν φανερωθῇ ἀσφαλισθόμενον (read: ἀσφαλίσσων) τοὺς αὐτῶν μέρη τοῦ ἐτοιμοῦ ποιθείνθην.

11. For the basic formula, πρὸς τὴν περὶ τῶν ἡμῶν διαψευσθῆναι, see P.Amnh. III.5 35-41 (Soknopaiou Néosis, 132 B.C.) and P.Tebt. III.1 739.10 (145 B.C.). Variants: P.Tebt. I 14.6–7, 15–16 (114 B.C.); P.Ryl. II 65.9–10 (Oxyrhynchos, 67 B.C.); P.Anag. p. 88a Fr.H. I (Magdela, III B.C.)?


11. For the basic formula, πρὸς τὴν περὶ τῶν ἡμῶν διαψευσθῆναι, see P.Amnh. III.5 35-41 (Soknopaiou Néosis, 132 B.C.) and P.Tebt. III.1 739.10 (145 B.C.). Variants: P.Tebt. I 14.6–7, 15–16 (114 B.C.); P.Ryl. II 65.9–10 (Oxyrhynchos, 67 B.C.); P.Anag. p. 88a Fr.H. I (Magdela, III B.C.)?


11. For the basic formula, πρὸς τὴν περὶ τῶν ἡμῶν διαψευσθῆναι, see P.Amnh. III.5 35-41 (Soknopaiou Néosis, 132 B.C.) and P.Tebt. III.1 739.10 (145 B.C.). Variants: P.Tebt. I 14.6–7, 15–16 (114 B.C.); P.Ryl. II 65.9–10 (Oxyrhynchos, 67 B.C.); P.Anag. p. 88a Fr.H. I (Magdela, III B.C.)?


11. For the basic formula, πρὸς τὴν περὶ τῶν ἡμῶν διαψευσθῆναι, see P.Amnh. III.5 35-41 (Soknopaiou Néosis, 132 B.C.) and P.Tebt. III.1 739.10 (145 B.C.). Variants: P.Tebt. I 14.6–7, 15–16 (114 B.C.); P.Ryl. II 65.9–10 (Oxyrhynchos, 67 B.C.); P.Anag. p. 88a Fr.H. I (Magdela, III B.C.)?

   [τῷ ἰς τοῦ ἐνεστότοις μηνὸς ἐπιλαβόντος] τῶν θής κωμῆς φυλακίτων Ὄρμωνα τῶν ἐκ τῆς
   [αὐτῆς κωμῆς γεωργῶν, ἀνήγγη] εἰς Ἰρα[κ]λέος[ς] πόλιν ὡς ἐπί Κομανὸν τὸν ἐπιστάτην τῶν
   [φυλακίτων] καὶ μετὰ τάκτα τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιβαλέων εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν κωμὴν Ἀγαθίνος
8. [καὶ Φιλάμμιοι οἱ παρὰ Διονυσίου (?)] σὺν ἄλλοις ποιούμενοι παρασφραγισμὸν τῆς[ς]
   Ἀβαβίκος
   [οἰκίσις ἐν ἡ προγεγραμμένος Ὄρμων κοτῆγε[ν]το καὶ Πετεσούχος τῶν βασιλικῶν
   γεωργῶν]
   [τῶν τῆς αὐτῆς . . . . . . . . . . . . οὖν τῆς ἡμετέρας γυμνῆς ἡ παραλαβεῖν τινὰς τῶν παρ᾽ ἀμῶν.
   οὕτωσιν δὲ τὸ καθ᾽ ἐν ὧν ἐπιδέδοκεν . . . . τε ἵππα ταρηχημὸν τοῦ α΄ προσκεφάλαια τοῦ β΄]

Readings restored from P.Duk. inv. 605r underlined. 5. cf. inv. 605r.3-4 ἐν (εστότοις [μηνὸς [μηνὸς] ἐπιλαβόντος] τοῦς
1. . . ψυχα[γοῦς]. 7. read ἐπιβαλέων: ἐπιβαλέων inv. 605v.6. 9. Cf. inv. 605v.9 καταγεγράφηκα. 10. read ἡμῶν. 11. Cf.
inv. 605r.10 ἐπιδέδοκεν [ἀ] - [ι] αἰ: read ἵππα: χίλια paperas.

Ammeneus to Pesouris (?) greetings. We have appended a copy of the letter that Phanēsis, κωμογραμ-
mateus of Thmoinausiris [of the Peran toparchy?], wrote to us so that you may know. Farewell. Year
33, Pharmouthi 16.

Phanēsis, κωμογραμματεύς of Thmoinausiris and the adjacent villages, to Ammeneus, greetings. On the
16th of the present month, with the police from the same village having seized Hōrōn, one of the royal
farmers from the same village, he (?) was sent to Herakleopolis so that (he might go?) before Komanos,
the epistatēs of the police; and after this, on the same day, falling upon the same village, Agathinos and
Philammon, with others from Dionysios (?), archiphylakites, putting a seal on Ababikis’ house, in
which the aforementioned Hōrōn was staying, and Petesouchos, one of the royal farmers of those from
the same village ... without our permission, or (our permission) to take along some of our men. There
follows the list of what X (?) submitted...: 1 pickled goose, 2 pillows. ... Year 33, Pharmouthi 16.

Notes
1. Ammeneus’ identity is not known. Perhaps he was a topogrammateus, so that the chain of letters proceeded up the
   hierarchy: Phanēsis the κωμογραμματεύς sent, in addition to the letter that he sent directly to Pesouris (inv. 605r), a
   letter to Ammeneus the topogrammateus (see inv. 599.4-12); Ammeneus forwarded the letter to Pesouris the basilikos
   grammateus (inv. 599). This Ammeneus cannot be identified with confidence with an Ammeneus who was basilikos
   grammateus two decades later (P.Teh. 1 12.3-4 [118 B.C.] 43.21 [117 B.C.] and 40.2 [117 B.C.]) or an Ammeneus who
   may have been an agent of the dioketēs Eirenaios (P.Teh. 1 28.1 [117 B.C.], with p. 110). The traces of ink after κω-
   mi are nearly impossible to read.

3. On the date, see 605r, note on line 3.
7. inv. 605r.5 also lacks a verb after ἀνέχετο, Presumably ἐπιβαλέων agrees with Ἀγαθίνος alone.
8. On restoring Dionysios see note on 605r.6. Here, παρὰ Διονυσίου τοῦ ἀρχιμαλκίτου (cf. inv. 605r.6-7) is too long
   for the space, but παρὰ Διονυσίου seems short. Perhaps we should restore παρὰ Διονυσίου τοῦ ἀρχιμαλκίτου, vel
   sim, as suggested by 605r.5.
9. Or perhaps παρὰ: see on inv. 605v.9.
10. In 605r.9, there is no gap between αὐτῆς and ἐδείξαν: here, up to ten letters have been lost. Perhaps Ammeneus inserted
    ἐδείξαν after αὐτῆς, but the remainder of the gap is uncertain. παρ᾽ ἰμαυν: The reading is absolutely clear (cf. παρ᾽ ἰμαυν]
    ἐμεῖς, inv. 605r.10). Such exchange of αὐτὸς and ἐδοκεῖ to seem to be otherwise unattested.
11. Traces do not appear to accommodate προκόρε, ἐμεῖς. Cf. note on inv. 605r.10. γεραυχαῖ: The ἐμεῖς is cursive, unlike every
    other ἐμεῖς in the text, looking rather like a one-looped omega.
12. The lacuna will not accommodate restoration of the parallel section from 605r.11-13.
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