TWO UNPUBLISHED PAPYRI

BY

K. A. WORP

I. P. Amsterdam inv. 53: Thucydides V 82, 5-6

Provenance unknown. 10.2 × 5.1 cms. Lightbrown papyrus of good quality. The papyrus is evenly broken off at the top, the left side and the bottom. The right side is partially broken, and partially cut, off. The writing runs parallel with the fibres. The verso is not inscribed. The handwriting, which may be dated to the second half of the 2nd century A.D., displays the same characteristics as that of B. M. Pap. 2068 (= P. Oxy. IX 1074). Two accents seem to have been added by a different hand, judging by the colour of the ink (l. 7 ἡ; l. 9 τῶν). In l. 8 there is a middle stop before the eta of ἔν and a rough breathing above the article ἔ. In l. 11 there is a high stop before ξυνδεσμ (see note) and in l. 14 a high stop before ναί. Between ll. 6-7 at the left side are traces of ink which cannot be identified.

A division of the missing parts of the text over the lines has been tempted, starting from the most probable division in ll. 9-10 and working backwards and forwards. Each line should have accounted for some 18-20 letters. Lower numbers of letters occurring are 16 (l. 2; 1) and 17 (l. 10).

R. A. Pack mentions 3 fragments on papyrus from the fifth book of Thucydides, viz. Packa 1523; 1526; 1527. None of these publications contains the passage on the papyrus under discussion.

1) See E. G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World (Oxford 1971), pl. 34.
2) The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt (Ann Arbor 1965).
3) Pack’s list has been brought up to date by P. J. Sijpesteijn, A New Papyrus Text of Thucydides (1 90,3-91,9), Aeg. 51 (1971), 221-223. For the Thucydides papyri see also Fr. Fischer, Thucydidis reliquiae in papyris et membranis Aegyptiis repertae (Leipzig 1913). For the manuscript tradition see B. Hemmerdinger, Essai sur l’histoire du texte de Thucydide (Paris 1955); P. Focardi, Il testo di Tucidide nei mss Vatic. Gr. 126 e Paris Gr. 1734 in rapporto anche ai papi Tucididei, Aeg. 35 (1955), 43-62; P. J. Sijpesteijn, o.c., 222.
The text of the papyrus has been compared with the Teubner edition of K. Hude (Leipzig 1898-1901), the O.C.T. edition of H. Stuart Jones-J. E. Powell (Oxford 1942) and the Budé edition of J. de Romilly (Paris 1967). It presents two variant readings (see notes on ll. 5 and 16).

Greek Text (Pl. I)

1 και φδισμονο[ς και τήν
2 τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔργα
3 χρῆσαν τελικο[σκοφόμενος
4 τε] και νομιζόμεθα [μεγιστών
5 δὲ]γι σφάζω ὁφελεῖται [τε]τείχει
6 μακρὰ τείχη ἐκ θᾶλασσαν
7 δὴ]ως ἢ]ν τῆς γῆς εἰς[γεγον-
8 ταί]. ἡ κατὰ θᾶλασσαν [σφάζω
9 με]τὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπι-
10 γογγ]ι]ν τῶν ἑπταθε[ιων
11 ὡρε]λῆ]γενε[ξιν ἔννηθεσαν [ἐδὲ
12 τῶν] τείχων καὶ τῶν ἐν
13 Πελο]ποννήσου τιν[ὲς τό-
14 λεω]ν· χ[αλ]ι]ς μὲν Ἄργε[ῖνι
15 πανδημέ]ν καὶ αὐτοὶ [καὶ
16 γυναῖκας καὶ οἱ]α]χ[ε]ταί
17 ἐτείχοι[σ]οι]χυ ποι[έ] 

Notes

L. 5. The papyrus presents an interesting variant reading. The MSS., except for Gεατ: ὁφελῆσαι, read ὁφελῆσειν. The reading ὁφελῆσειν offers an instance of fut. inf with ἄν, which construction has been defended by L. Herbst 4). Only one instance of ἄν/καν with the fut. has come down to us on a papyrus text, which un-

I. P. Amsterdam inv. 53: Thucydides V 82, 5-6
II. P. Cairo inv. 10466: Copy of an Order of Arrest
equivocally supports the legitimacy of part of the medieval manuscript tradition, viz. Pindar, *Ol. i, 110* (see the Teubner edition by B. Snell-H. Maehler). There are two other cases of the fut. with &v, but there the papyrus is defective in some way, viz. P. Oxy. X 1245, 93 (= Thuc. I 140, 5), where after &v the verb is lost in the lacuna, and P. Lond. Lit. 131 (= Isocr. *De Pace*, 82), where the reading λυπήσωντα seems to have been corrected on the papyrus itself into λυπήσαντα. If we accept the fut. inf. with &v as the original reading in the present passage, our papyrus offers a textual variant which may be regarded palaeographically as a case of lipography (ἀφελήσειν > ἀφελεῖν; one letter-group has been left out by the writer).

As regards the other instances of the fut. inf. with &v in Thucydides, the manuscript tradition is as follows:

Π 80, 8: προσχωρή + G; προσχωρήσαν Jα1; προσχωρήσειν ABCEFM VI 66, 1: λυπήσαι G; λυπήσειν ABCEFM VIII 25, 5: προσχωρήσαν G (litt. αι in rasura); προσχωρήσειν ABCEFM VIII 71, 1: ήσυχάζειν M; ήσυχάσειν ABCEFG (ex -σει factum f)

We see that in four out of the five passages, where the fut. inf. with &v occurs, the manuscript G (or its corrector(s)) tends to alter the fut. inf. into the inf. aor.*). I am inclined to consider the variant readings of G as a matter of conjecture. For Π 80, 8 the manuscript G is followed by Jα1.

L. 10. The tau of ἐπιτηδείκων has been corrected; maybe from a gamma?

L. 11. Before ξυνήδεσαν the papyrus presents a small vertical dash, which has a knob at the bottom. I tend to see in this a high stop, on top of which a iota adscriptum has been placed. The iota adscriptum belongs, of course, to ἀφελήν (*). For iota adscriptum in the present papyrus compare also L. 13 Πελοποννήσου.

*) In P. Oxy. VII 1016, 21 (= Pl. *Phdr. 227 b 10*) the papyrus reads ποθοῦσαι instead of ποθοῦσαι (see de Vries ad loc.).


L. 16. The reading ὀ[ἱ]κ[ἱ]κ[ἱ] has to be regarded as a case of ditto-graphy, as there seems no point in interpreting the first ὀ as the article. See for a similar phrase Thuc. I 90, 3.

II. P. Cairo inv. 10466: Copy of an Order of Arrest

Hermopolites. 15 × 8.6 cms. ca. 325 A.D. Lightbrown papyrus of good quality. The top and the right side are complete. The left side and the bottom are irregularly broken off. There is a margin of 1 cm. at the top. The papyrus was three or four times folded. The handwriting shows a cursive written with black ink. The papyrus is pasted on to cardboard.

Greek text (Pl. II)

1 Τοῦητα παρε'ο'στη τῷ κυρίῳ μο'υ'
2 ἡγεμόνι ἐπ' οίς ἀνήνεχεν
3 ἧγατος.
4 Οὐκιλείριος Διονύσιος (ἐστάνταρχος) ὄρ(δινάτος) πρίνκεφ
5 ἡγεμονίας Θηβαίδος ἐξάχτορι
6 Ἐρμοπολίτο'υ' χάρειν. Τά ὑποτεταγ.
7 μέγα πρόσωπα καλεσμένα ὑπὸ τῆς
8 ἀνδρείας τοῦ κυρίο'υ' μο'υ' διασημητάτο'υ
9 ἡγεμόνος Οὐκιλείρι'υ' Οὐκ[τ]οριναν'υ'
10 παρ[αστήγαι] τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀποδίκασον παρα-
11 στήσαι τῇ ὑποτετάλεντ. Εἰσὶ δὲ·
12 ἱ.μωτίου
13 ἱ.σιάτ'ρ'ψ'
14 ἱ.προσ[

Translation

These (persons) appeared before my lord the praeses, concerning whom N.N. has submitted a report.

Valerius Dionysius, leading centurio, chief of staff of the praeses of the Thebaid, to the exactor of the Hermopolites, greetings.

Make haste to produce the following persons whose presence at
his office has been ordered by his noble excellency the praeses Valerius Victorinianus, before the person whom this concerns. They are: - - - -

The brief description of this text by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt has given rise to a discussion of the position of the hegemōn (= Lat. praeses) Valerius Victorinianus among the leading governmental officials of Egypt in the first quarter of the fourth century A.D. 8).

Lallemand assumed that the above mentioned praeses Valerius Victorinianus could be identified as the prefect of Egypt Οὐκτωρει[ mentioned in P. Lond. inv. 2226, 15 (308 A.D.) 10). However, since the publication of P. Oxy. XXXIII 2674 (308 A.D.) in 1968 it has become known that the name of the prefect of Egypt in that year was in fact Valerius Victorinus 11).

The publication of P. Strasb. 296 has shown that in 326 A.D. a Valerius Victorinianus officiated as praeses Thebaidos. His term of office falls between 323 A.D. (P. Köln Panopolis 27, published in ZPE 10, 1973, 126) and 326 A.D. (P. Strasb. 296). The start of his term of office may be placed about 321 A.D. (cp. P. Vindob. Worp 8, p. 74). Due to the lack of any specific date in the Cairo text we can give only an approximate dating for this papyrus.

The text seems to fall into two parts. Lines 4-14 contain an order of the leading centurio Valerius Dionysius, chief of staff of Victorinianus, to an anonymous exactor of the Hermopolite nome to produce certain people whose presence had been ordered by the praeses. In the same handwriting lines 1-3 seem to contain the confirmation that the people summoned have in fact appeared.


10) An abstract of P. Lond. inv. 2226 has been published by Lallemand, o.c., 265.

11) See the editor's note to P. Oxy. XXXIII 2674, 3 for some revised readings of P. Lond. inv. 2226, 15; O. Montecchi, La papirologia (Milano 1973), 134, wrongly calls the prefect of Egypt in 308 A.D. Valerius Victorini-
Key-word for this interpretation is θεία (l. 1), which cannot be understood except in relation to πρόσωπα (l. 7). Apparently the writer has written a—very short—report on the summons of these people and has copied in extenso the order of Valerius Dionysius.

Notes

L. 1. The sigma above παρόντα can be explained in various ways: a) it represents the number six. The papyrus could have formed part of a roll containing copies of letters, orders, etc.; b) the writer has—incorrectly!—doubled the sigma of παρόντα by writing the second letter as an afterthought above the line. A parallel of this kind of gemination can be found in P. Amsterdam inv. 37 Col. II, 62 (published in ZPE 14, 1974, 145 ff.), where the reading ἀναφέρουσα has to be corrected as ἀναφέρουσα 13). According to the editor of P. Mich. X 589-591 (49, n. 11; 50) the use of παρόντα in 'orders of arrest' is very rare. See, however, F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden, s.v., 2, where many examples of παρόντα with the meaning 'present, produce' are given.

L. 2. ἀναφέρω means 'to tender a document to the authorities' (cp. Preisigke, o.c., s.v. 7). A written charge could possibly be meant in this passage (cp. P. Oxy. I 66, 17).

L. 3. ἐγκαθίστας presumably forms the subject of ἀνήγγειλεν; perhaps the personal name Gennadius is meant.


14) See S. Daris, Il lessico latino nella lingua greca d'Egitto (Barcelona 1971), s.v.
15) See Wilcken, Grundzüge . . ., 406; P. Vindob. Sijpesteijn 1, 15-16.
L. 5. For the office of the *exactor* see Lallemand, o.c., 118 ff.
L. 8. 'Ἀνδρεῖα as a title of honour for the *praeses* also occurs in P. Strassb. 296 verso, 11 10).

L. ii. The word ὑποσταλέντι presents some palaeographical problems and its meaning in this context is not absolutely clear either. After ὑπο- and before -ολέντι there is virtually space for only one letter, whereas for the reading ὑποσταλέντι we need space for two letters. We have to suppose that the writer wrote the combination -στ- very compactly. A semantic problem is that according to Preisigke (o.c., s.v.) the meaning of the verb ὑποστάλλω is ‘herunterziehen i) (Med.) sich aus Furcht zurückziehen, aus Furcht unterdrücken, verschweigen, auslassen, ausser Betracht lassen’. However, these meanings are of no help in interpreting the word in this context. In addition Preisigke gives the translations ‘wozu gehören, sich erstrecken, wohin entfallen’ (see also P. Groningen 103829). Starting from these translations the use of ὑποσταλέντι can perhaps be explained on the analogy of some verbs which take a dative in the active voice but allow a personal passive construction, e.g. βοηθεῖν τινί ~ βοηθοῦμαι 17). A similar construction is known of the verb ἐπιστάλλω. A correction of ὑποσταλέντι into ἀποσταλέντι (ὁ ἀποσταλέος = ὁ ἀπόστολος) seems attractive, but can hardly be accounted for 18).

AMSTERDAM, Archeologisch-Historisch Instituut

18) I should like to thank Prof. C. J. Ruijgh and Dr. P. J. Sijpesteijn, with whom I discussed some problems. I am especially indebted to Prof. Gamal Mokhtar (President of the Egyptian Organisation of Antiquities) and Prof. Abdel Quadr Selim (General Director of the Egyptian Museum) for giving me access to this and other papyri in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. Through the most efficient assistance of Mr. W. F. G. J. Stoetzer (Director of the Nederlands Instituut voor Archeologie en Arabische Studiën in Cairo) they also made a photograph of the Cairo papyrus available to me.