



1995

Remarks on Some Tebtunis Papyri in SB XVIII

James G. Keenan

Loyola University Chicago, jkeen@luc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/classicalstudies_facpubs



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Keenan, JG. "Remarks on some Tebtunis papyri in SB XVIII" in *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 32, 1995.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classical Studies: Faculty Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
© 1995 James Keenan.

Remarks on Some Tebtunis Papyri in *SB XVIII* (Plates 5-7)

Twelve Tebtunis papyri from the University of California collection were included in Elbert Wall's 1983 Duke dissertation, *New Texts in the Economy of Tebtynis*. Previously accessible as *P.Tebt.Wall* on CDROM 6 of the Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri, the texts were recently printed in hard copy in *SB XVIII* under numbers 1382-1393. I first saw the *SB* texts during a visit to Leuven in March 1995 and realized that they included some papyri that I had worked on during my years in Berkeley, 1968-1974. They were to be part of a lukewarmly projected fifth volume of *Tebtunis Papyri*; but the late John Shelton's move to Germany and my own move to Chicago and near simultaneous rededication to Byzantine studies allowed the project to lapse. Thus there is no sense in which either John Shelton or I would have argued for an extended claim to these and other Berkeley papyri. In fact, their publication is most welcome. Nevertheless, when back in Chicago I reviewed the *SB* transcripts against the ones I had made years ago, I noted a fair number of differences, some significant. Those for all but one of the six papyri discussed here (*SB XVIII* 13784 = *P.Tebt.* II 502 = *P.Tebt.Wall* 3), I could quickly check against photographs I had brought with me from Berkeley to Chicago in 1974; subsequently, a photograph of *P.Tebt.* II 502 was obtained through the good graces of Anthony S. Bliss, Rare Book Librarian of the Bancroft Library. Wall's dissertation includes plates of all twelve papyri, but copies of the dissertation obtainable through interlibrary loan have of course only Xeroxes of these. In some places these can be helpful, in others not. I therefore publish here, for the readers' convenience and in anticipation of possible further improvements to the texts, plates of five of the six papyri under discussion; the sixth, *P.Tebt.* II 527, is far too large to be easily and economically reproduced in *BASP*'s format.

I offer these proposed corrections in the interests of scholarly accuracy, with the assurance that, although arrived at over twenty years ago, they are based on repeated examinations of the originals. Fresh review in preparing these notes, with Dr. Wall's transcripts in hand, have brought a few more refinements. In this exercise I found that there were quite a few times when Dr. Wall had produced correct readings for ones I had gotten wrong, and—more important—times when he persisted where I had given up. Generally speaking, my transcripts tend to show brackets where his and the corresponding *SB* transcripts have dotted letters. Without immediate access to

the original papyri, it is hard to tell what adjustments should be made here. At times I have had to rely on my original transcripts for these and for other points of detail, especially when the photographs have seemed indecisive.

1. *SB XVIII 13784 (P.Tebt. II 502, P.Tebt.Wall 3)* Plate 5

For this papyrus my transcript shows the most serious differences from its *SB* equivalent: the name of the creditor's guardian and the debtor's patronymic (lines 8-10 and 22) are recovered, the loan amount (108, not 120 drachmas) is different, the reading of lines 16-17 is radically altered, and a fuller restoration of the closing lines (26-28) is proposed. My old transcript differs in these and in so many other points that it seems advisable to print the text anew, with appropriate brief comments for the more important emendations. Minor changes are tacitly reported in the transcript. The text of the papyrus implies changes of hand at lines 21 and 28, but palaeographical differences, especially between the first and (presumed) second hands, are hard to identify. It is tempting to consider this a privately made copy of a Tebtunis record-office document, but if so, it is not labeled as such.

- 1 Ἔτους ἑπτακαιδεκάτου
 Ἀυτοκράτ[ο]ρος Καίσαρος Τίτου
 Αἰλίου Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνεῖνου
 Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβ[οῦς Παῦ]νι γ̄ ἐν Τε[π-]
 5 τύνι τῆς Πολέμωνος [μερί]δος τοῦ Ἀρσι(νοίτου)
 νομοῦ. ὁμολο[γεῖ] Cαραπιάς ὡς <ἐτῶν>
 εἴκοσι ἄσημος μ[ε]τ[ῆ] ἀ κυρίου τοῦ πατρ[ός]
 Ἡρωνο(ς) τοῦ Πευκ[έ]στου ὡς (ἐτῶν) τεσσερά-
 κοντα ὀκ[τώ] οὐλ[ῆ] ἀν[τι]κνημί(ω) δεξιῶ
 10 Ἡρακλῆ Ἡρακλ[ή]ου ὡς ἐτῶν
 τεσσεράκοντα ἐπ[τά] οὐλή χει[ρι] ἀρ(ικτερᾶ)
 ἀπέχιν παρ' αὐτοῦ Ἡρακλήου δ[ι]ὰ χειρ(ός)
 ἀργυρί(ου) δραχμ[ᾶς] ἑκατὸν [ὀκτ]ῶι
 καὶ τοὺς τόκους ἃς ὄφιλεν αὐτῇ
 15 καθ' ὁμολ(ογίαν) χρήσεως τετελει[ωμέν]ης
 διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γραφ[είου] τῶ πε[ντε]και-
 δεκάτῳ ἔτε[ι] Ἀντ[ωνεῖ]νου Κ[αί]σαρ[ο]ς τῶ
 μηνι Θῶ[θ] , ἦν [καὶ] ἀ[να]δέδωκεν
 αὐτῶι [εἰς] ἀκ[ύρω]σιν καὶ μὴ ἐπελ(εύσεσθαι)
 20 τῆ<ν> Cαραπιάδα ἐπὶ τὸν Ἡρακλῆν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀπέχει.
 Cαραπιάς μετὰ κ[υρίου] τοῦ πατρὸς
 Ἡρωνο(ς) τοῦ Πευκ[έ]στου ἀπέχω παρὰ

- τοῦ Ἡρακλή[ου τὰς δραχμὰ]ς ἑκατὸν
 ὀκ[τῶι καὶ τοὺς τ]όκους ἄ]ς ὠφιλέ μοι
 25 κα[τὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν] κα[ὶ μὴ ἐπ]ελεύεσθαι
 κα[θὼς πρόκει]ται. [..... ἔγρ]αψε ὑπ(ἐρ) αὐτ(ῆς)
 ἀγρ[αμμάτου.]
 28 [(Ἔτους) ἰζ]// Π[α]ῦν[ι γ ἀναγέγ(ραπται) διὰ
 28 τ]οῦ αὐτ(οῦ) γραφεῖ(ου).

1-4 Payni 3 of Hadrian's 17th year = 28 May 155.

4-5 Τε[π]τύνι : more likely than Τε[β]τύνι for Tebtunis documents of the mid-second century (references in *P. Tebt.* II, p. 445).

6 <ἐτῶν>: the writer first omits any notation for the word "year," then apparently uses the symbol (line 8), then the whole word (line 10).

8 Ἡρωνο(ς): here, as elsewhere (lines 9, 12, 13, 22), the ed.pr. fails to recognize the writer's fondness for abbreviation.

9 ὀκ[τῶι]: for the adscript, see line 13, cf. 24 (restored).

12 χειρ(ὸς): not χειρ[ὸς]. See above, line 8 note.

13 [ὀκτ]ῶι: not [εἰκ]οῖ as in ed.pr. Cf. line 24: ὀκ[τῶι, not εἰκ]οῖ, ed.pr. With these changes, the ed.pr.'s dots beneath the letters become largely unnecessary.

15 τετελειωμένης: sic (despite ed.pr.), no doubt by attraction to the genitive case of χρήσεως (see *P. Kronion* 13.15, cf. 11.14). Read τετελειωμένην.

16-17 The ed.pr. reads the date of the original loan agreement as: ἔτους ἐπ[τ]ακαὶ ἰ δεκάτου Ἀντωνεῖνου Σεβ[α]στοῦ; but this, among other problems, does not conform to the usual way of expressing year dates at this point in return-of-loan documents, that is, with the regnal year cast in the dative case, cf. *SB XVIII* 13785 (= *P. Tebt.* II 521), 13787 (= *P. Tebt.* II 498).

18 After the short lacuna there can be seen a superlinear horizontal stroke, indicating that the month name was followed by a cipher for the day.

20 I owe the middle part of this line to the ed.pr., but read the beginning and end differently. I have far less confidence in the changes I bring to the end than the detail at the beginning, where the editor's -θαι, extending an abbreviated word from line 19, ἐπελ(εύεσ)-, is clearly impossible.

25-28 Restorations *ad sensum*. Ed.pr. records only traces for 26-27. For details that cannot be made out on the photograph I fall back on my original transcript. The lacuna in line 26 allows for a short name; perhaps the creditor's father, Heron, writes for her.

2. *SB XVIII 13785 (= P.Tebt. II 521, P.Tebt.Wall 4)* Plate 6

Line 5: ἀκύρωσις: the papyrus has ἀκοίρωσις (l. ἀκύρωσις).

Line 8: the second half of the line is problematic. At the end perhaps read μια, or (more boldly and far from certainly) μηδεμιᾶ; but theta before second mu looks possible, too.

Line 9: Εὐτύχου: both epsilon and tau seem unlikely. The former is too circular in shape, the latter lacks any leftward extension of its horizontal stroke. Read: Αὔχου, which, besides resolving the palaeographical problems just noted, produces a patronymic better suited for a daughter with a rare Egyptian name like Taapharsis.

Line 18: from διά onward the printed transcript looks difficult, but acceptable. Before that, instead of (Χειρόγραφον) ἀναγέ(γραπται), read: Ἐντέτακ(ται). To begin with, this is a grapheion document, and not a chirograph in form. Here epsilon and nu are written gigantically (relatively speaking)--almost like a signature monogram. What follows is written small and quick; the right stroke of kappa (in suspension) runs into the top of the following delta of διά.

3. *SB XVIII 13787 (= P.Tebt. II 498, P.Tebt.Wall 6)* Plate 6

There is an extra line at the beginning of the papyrus. Line 1 begins with Ἐ[τους, with the initial epsilon written huge and florid. Analogous (for size if not shape) is the initial epsilon in *SB 13785 (= P.Tebt. II 502)*. I take the bottom horizontal stroke of the epsilon in *SB 13787* as the swerve that intersects the first phi of Phaophi and runs across the top of that word. After Ἐ[τους should come the ordinal number for the year, spelled out in full, followed by Αὐτοκράτορος. Accordingly, Καίσαρος--which I read as Κα[ί]σαρος--marks the beginning of line 2, indented a bit because of the big, intrusive epsilon from the line above. Read lines 1-2 as follows:

1 Ἐ[τους (number) Αὐτοκράτορος]

Κα[ί]σαρος Τραιανοῦ [Ἀδ]ριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ.

The resulting imperial title is standard for Hadrian, and the one most frequently found in his document headings: P. Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales* (Brussels 1964), pp. 61-63.

In line 3 (old line 2), it is certain that τῆς (not τοῦ) is the article before Πολέμωνος. Dots are unnecessary. At the end of line 5 (old line 4) ὦς precedes ἐτῶν; it has dropped out of the *SB* transcript, but is present in Wall's text. In line 11 (old line 10), instead of αὐτοῦ, with its grammatically troublesome genitive case, read: ὁ τοῦ.

4. *SB XVIII 13788 (= P.Tebt. II 440, P.Tebt.Wall 7)* Plate 7

Line 2: for]...[7]ν μηνὸς Μεσ[ορῆ, read: Εὐε]βοῦς [Cεβακτῶ]ν μηνὸς Μεσ[ορῆ. The collocation Εὐεβοῦς Cεβακτῶν removes this piece chronologically from the mid-second century and places it (with some likelihood) at the very end of the second century or beginning of the third, during the joint reign of Septimius Severus and Caracalla: see P. Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales*, p. 96, for possible supplements.

Line 8: for δύο, read: δυτὶ. Remove the dots from under the preceding τ]οῖς.

Line 10: restore (probably) καὶ τῶν τόκ]ων at the beginning of the line.

Line 16: for βι..[at the end of the line, read: βιβλ[ιοθήκης. The first beta looks like our B; the second is open-topped.

Line 17: for κατὰ ..ν[, read: κατὰ πάν[τα.

Line 18: for μηδὲ ἐ..[, read: μηδένοσ [.

5. *SB XVIII 13789 (P.Tebt. II 546, P.Tebt.Wall 8)* Plate 7

In line 1, for Ἡρωνίωνι, read: Κρονίωνι. In line 4, as the ed.pr. notes, ἔσχον, which already appears in line 1, is superfluous; it should be so printed. Toward the end of the line, my old transcript shows: ὀκτῶι followed by the γίνεται stroke. But ὀκτῶ γί(νεται) now looks better. In line 5, for (δραχμας), read: (δραχμαί). These changes seem sufficient to warrant a new, cleaned-up transcript of this little text:

Ἡρώδης Κρονίωνι χαίριν.
 ἔσχον παρὰ [c]οῦ ἀφ' ὧν ὀφί-
 λισ μοι δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν
 {ἔσχον} δραχμας ὀκτῶ γί(νεται)
 (δραχμαί) ἦ.

6. *SB XVIII 13793 (= P.Tebt. II 527, P.Tebt.Wall 12)*

This is an enormously long and, especially toward its upper half, badly damaged division of property. Connected sense is rarely recoverable. Nevertheless, further close study may serve to advance Dr. Wall's valiant efforts. For now, I offer suggestions only for changes that look secure and that are important enough to advance understanding of the text.

18 For].οι τριςχοίνων, read:]. οἱ τρις (read: τρεῖς) κοινῶς. In other words, there are three parties to this property division, as assured by the

names recovered toward the top of the text (Galates, Taonnophris, and Thenherakleia) and by the corresponding signatures below.

20 I read this line as follows (with many borrowings but also many differences from ed.pr.): [c. 5] τῶν ἐννέα ἀρουρῶν διῶρυξ δι' ἧς φέρεται τὰ ὕδατα μέχρι τῆς ἀπὸ νότου τῶν τεσσάρων ἀρουρῶν διώ[ρυγ]ος [ποτι]τρᾶς πρὸς τὸ εὐθεν[ε]ῖν τὰ ὕδατα ταῖς ἐν ὑψηλῶ ἀρούραις.

22 αὐτῶς : probably read οὕτως.

24-25 For λέλογχεν τῶν, read: λελογχέντων. The phrase becomes: ὦν μὲν λελογχέντων τεσσάρων ἀρουρῶν. At the end of the line 24, ed.pr. fails to record ὦν δὲ. Restore the beginning of the next line with: [λελογχέντ]ων.

31 For ἀπὸ μέρου[ς ἐ]ννέα ἀρουρῶν, read: ἀπὸ μὲν τ[ῶν ἐ]ννέα ἀρουρῶν. (The second nu in ἐννέα stands in correction.) After ἀπηλιώτου, read: μέ[ρο]ς instead of: ..[...]ς.

34 For πρὸς λιβὸς, read: ἀπὸ λιβὸς.

36 For [τῷ γρα(φείω).αι, read [τῷ γρα(φεί)ωι. For μην(ὸς), read: Σεβ(ακτοῦ). After Παῦνι there is a stroke over the right side of the following kappa (= 20), extending in such a way to guarantee that the cipher for the date requires, as ed.pr. indicates, one more digit.