Fragment of a Report of Proceedings (?)
Panagiota Sarischouli

P.Berol. 21396 Plate I 20.2 x 7.2 cm (fr. 1)

Late 2nd cent. CE Hermoupolis?

P.Berol. 21396 consists of one main fragment (Fr. 1) and five minor unplaced scraps of the same sheet with few – mostly illegible – traces of script. The scribe wrote along the fibers. The verso of the papyrus bears an anonymous astrological treatise\(^2\) written upside down in relation to the text on the recto; on palaeographical grounds we may assume that the recto preceded the verso.

An informal, round, neat book-hand with a tendency to lapse into documentary cursive forms, especially in the letters \(\varepsilon, \xi\) and the rounded \(\kappa\). Writing is mostly bilinear. The scribe tends to connect letters; ligatures esp. from \(\varepsilon, \theta\) and \(\zeta\) to following letters. \(\sigma\) and \(\omega\) are especially large and rounded. The hand is similar to that of \(P.Oxy.\ VI 8533\) or \(P.Beatty\ VI fasc. V, Pl. 5\);\(^4\) and should be assigned to the latter part of the second cent. CE; the script is not likely to be later than 200 CE. Also the fact that the speeches are introduced by the \(\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu\-formula\) (ll. 7, 11) suggests a dating of the text anywhere from the early 2\(^{nd}\) to the early 3\(^{rd}\) cent. CE.\(^5\)

The text is provided with lectional signs written by the original hand (same ink). Two oblique strokes of doubtful significance are placed over \(\tilde{\tau}\) in line 3, possibly to distinguish the utterances of the presiding official.\(^6\) An apostrophe after \(\varepsilon\tau\rho\ [\_]\) in line 7. The scribe uses the high point once (l. 24). A decorative space-filler is visible in line 31 apparently in order to close a period.

The subject of this text is clearly a trial before some Roman authority; the particular court is not specified as the fragment is broken off on all four sides. There are at least two litigants. The exchanges are

---

1 The papyrus belongs to the \(Papyrussammlung\) of Berlin’s Egyptian Museum. It was found presumably during the excavations conducted by Otto Rubensohn in Eschnunna (Hermoupolis) on 26 May, 1905, though the museum’s records are not clear on this point. I would like to thank Professor Dietrich Wildung, director of the \(Papyrussammlung\) in Berlin, for his kind permission to publish this papyrus text and Margarete Büsing for the excellent photograph of the papyrus. My sincere thanks are due to Professors Herwig Maehler and Hans-Albert Rupprecht as well as to Dr. Claudia Kreuzsaler for reading through and commenting on a former draft of this manuscript; special thanks also to Professor Katelijn Vandorpe for her helpfulness concerning bibliography inaccessible to me.


3 W. Schuhart, \(Palaepigraphie, I. Teil: Griechische Palaeographie\) (Munich 1925) 130f., Pl. 86.

4 R. Seider, \(Palaographie der griechischen papyri, II: Literarische Papyri\) (Stuttgart 1970) n. 28, Pl. XIV.


6 Ibid., 54, n. 3, with several examples. In literary texts strokes usually serve to mark off either the whole phrase or an individual word (cf. E.G. Turner and P.J. Parsons, \(Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World. BICS Suppl. 46\) [London 1987] 7–8). Furthermore, the double pen-stroke occasionally marks a citation (cf. K. McNamee, \(Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri. Pap.Brux. XXVI\) [Brussels 1992] 25 n. 96).
relatively brief: apparently short questions from the presiding official and short answers from the defendants. Both the beginnings and ends of lines are lost throughout and the papyrus is increasingly damaged towards the last lines where the recovery of the text is more or less hopeless as the horizontal fibers are, for the most part, badly distorted or even stripped (l. 30). The decipherment of the text presents a lot of difficulty as the ink is at places completely faded.

The text fits the structure and some of the formulae of a report of proceedings. However, the elaborate appearance of the text as well as the vocabulary, which tends to be literary, raise the question whether this fragmentary text might preserve an extract from the *Acta Alexandrinorum.* The parallels to the *Acta* cited in the notes to the lines (see esp. ll. 5, 6, 15) are puzzling. Nonetheless, against this assumption should be set the occurrence of some form of βιβλιοφυλαξ in lines 4 and 7, on the one hand, and the absence, on the other hand, of any allusion to an emperor or other personalities attested in the *Acta* – for what it is worth in such a fragmentary text – as well as of any clearly defined incidents proving either the ascription of our fragment to any of the known *Acta* or at least the Alexandrian background of the text: indeed, there is no indication in the preserved part of the text of any Greek-Jewish confrontation. Consequently, the idea of identifying this text as part of the *Acta Alexandrinorum* must be abandoned, at least till additional fragments eventually turn up and thereby clarify and elucidate the points that are still obscure.

Owing to the mutilation of the papyrus, the precise nature of the question at issue is not clear. However, provided that the supplement of some form of βιβλιοφυλαξ (ll. 4, 7) is correct, we might surmise that the text refers to a transfer of property. The subject of the trial is dimly seen to be a dispute over an estate or estate land that was probably confiscated due to unpaid debt (l. 15). A lien on the property of a person who was in debt was a common practice in Roman Egypt. But also common was the practice of placing property under lien as a surety for the fulfillment of office (κατοχή) in regard to state liturgies and posts. Unfortunately, the fragmentary state of the papyrus denies us a clear perception of the events described.

---

7 The dating of the papyrus in the late second cent. CE would fit our hypothesis, as the *Acta* are for the most part dated in the late second to the third cent., and only occasionally in the first or third cent. CE (see P.Schub. 42 introd., 83). The occurrence of the εἰπευ-formula in our text should not be set against this assumption, as the εἰπευ-form of introduction is attested in some of the early fragments of the *Acta Alexandrinorum* (Coles, op.cit. [above, n. 5] 42 n. 1). Nonetheless, the lectional signs are no further evidence for identifying this text as part of the *Acta*, as they occur frequently also in judicial proceedings (*ibid.*, 54 n. 3).

8 The hostility between Jews and Greeks in Alexandria or more probably the hostility of the Alexandrians to the Roman government was the essential topic of the *Acta*; however, charges involving money or property occur in the *Acta Appiani* and the *Acta Maximi*. Though the subject of the trial on our papyrus recalls similar charges, nothing further can be made out.

9 Cf. e.g. the judicial proceedings in *P.Bingen* 78 (late 2nd cent. CE) and *P.Oxy.* XL 2955 (218 CE).


11 Cf. e.g. *P.Oxy.* I 3560; this practice is discussed by C.A. Nelson, *P.Coll.Youitie I*, 209ff., who cites further bibliography.
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Fr. 1

| νομ[ 1. νον δειν μη[  
| νε[ 1. νυ εστιν α λέγων[  
4 | φων[ | φωνως ο βιβλ][φυλαξ[  
| ηραπ[ | ηερα π[±3]εια τα[|πι[ 1...[  
| νεικλ[ | ν ειςεθοντος του ωμη[  
| ετερ[ | ετερω[ (vac.?) βιβλ]φ[  
8 | θαρατ[ | θαρα όθαρα τα[|φυλακτα[  
| ουδικαιωτηπ[ | ουδικαίωστεπ][�α[|μ[  
| επικρα[ | επικρατειν α[±3]τω[  
| τεαπ[ | τε απ[|±3] εινοειεπ[  
12 | . . . δον νον[ 1. . . δον νον[  
| [. . . υπαρχοντας[ 1. [. . . υπάρχοντα α[  
| τραστου[ | τραστου[ [εανικτ[  
| βεντηγουσια[ 1. βεντηγουσια[  
16 | ο[| . θοραμιονον[ 16 | ο[| . θοραμιονον[  
| τραταυταςτειν[ | τραταυταςτειν[  
| ηπαιεσιθεν[ | ηπαιεσιθεν[  
| ναυτακαθαρα[ 1. ναυτακαθαρα[  
20 | ειςγεγονωνανα[ 20 | ειςγέγονα ανα[  
| υπερκατ[ | υπερκατ[  
| ω[ ]| ω[ )| ωναγανως[  
| .] ηπην[ | .] ηπη[  
24 | [. . ] δικ[ | [. . ] δικ[  
| κοντ[ | κοντ[  
| (vac.?) οκ[ | (vac.?) οκ[  

---

Fr. 1
1] ο[±3]c: Though the traces of a short descender as of p at line beginning are barely visible, the restoration of παρόντος seems suitable. The "presence" formula, a common convention in the judicial proceedings, precedes the "participants" when used with reference to legal advisors of the presiding official and follows the participants when it refers to persons assisting the participants or other non-official figures such as witnesses (see Coles, op.cit. [above, n. 5] 33 and n. 3). The restoration παρόντος would mean that our fragment begins with the introductory formulae preceding the opening speech in the main body of the trial. In this case only a small portion of the text is missing; the basic pattern includes the "extract" phrase (εξ οποιονματισμον vel sim.) followed by the names and title of the presiding official, the date and the location, and finally the names of the parties involved in the case, i.e. the "participants" (see Coles, op.cit. [above, n. 5] 29–38). However, we might also consider other possible restorations for ο[±3]c, since it is impossible to ascertain how much of our text is missing.

[±2]ωνον[?]: After the "presence" formula comes probably the ending of a name in genitive, possibly belonging to one of the legal advisors of the presiding official or other functionaries of the trial. F. Dornseiff and B. Hansen (eds.), Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen (Berlin 1957) and P. Kretschmer and E. Locker (eds.), Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache (Göttingen 1963) cite numerous names (attested also in F. Preisigke’s, Namenbuch, and D. Foraboschi’s, Onomasticon) that could be considered as possible supplements: e.g. [Αρ]ωνος, [Ασ]ωνος, [Ατ]ωνος, [Ακ]ωνος, [Αι]ωνος, [Βι]ωνος, [Αι]ωνος, [Θ]ωνος, [Πι]ωνος, [Χι]ωνος etc.

3]γενισαλεω[ω: I see two possibilities (i) γόριντς τις λέγω [ (ii) γόρις τις λέγω or ]γόρις τις λέγω [ .

4]φωνως ὁ βιβλιοφύλαξ[?]: At line beginning a longish upright with upper traces suggesting φ or ψ; ρ in this hand has a shorter downstroke. After v left side of round letter, rather ω than ρ, followed by a damaged c; then the upper right quadrant of round letter, possibly σ (not α). There are many possible supplements: an adverbial phrase like τοῖς πρότερον δηλουμένως / εἰρημένως vel sim. συμφώνως ὁ βιβλιοφύλαξ εἰπεν vel sim., "in agreement with the aforementioned the property registrar said," or a participial construction like γράφω [φωνως ὁ βιβλιοφύλαξ εἰπεν vel sim., "writing that the property registrar said."
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5 τερα: Possibly the μέθ’ ἑτερα-phrase that usually indicates omissions in reports of proceedings; cf. Coles, op.cit. (above, n. 5) 48–49; see also P.Ryl. II 102.10 note.


τά[...]π[...]...[ ]: After the lacuna ink at bottom, low enough for descender of ρ, followed by the left arm of χ and negligible traces of two more letters; τά [ὑ]π[α]ρχον[τα] (as in l. 8) seems a likely reading. If the supplement <ἐτ>π[ω]λη[σα] is correct, it would mean that one of the parties involved sold his possessions (τά [ὑ]π[α]ρχον[τα]) in order to get out of debt; but, perhaps, due to his failure to settle all the claims, his property seems to have been let to another person (see l. 15 note).

6 ἐν εἰσελθόντος τοῦ ωμη[ ]: Though i is covered by a blob of ink, the reading of the Genitive Absolute participle construction εἰσελθόντος seems secure. εἰσέρχομαι (cf. also l. 18), "come into/before the court" (see LSJ s.v. III), is used as a law-term in judicial and literary oratory; cf. e.g. the instances in Demosthenes LIX.5.91; Lysias XIII.37; Isaeus V.8; Dinarchus I.58. The verb occurs several times in the Acta Alexandrinorum (Musurillo, op.cit. [above, I. 5 note] II 29; III col. II 14 ( ?); VIII 28f.; 32f.; XI B col. IV 3; XVIII col. II 30; P.Oxy. XLI 3021.4; cf. also προσήλθεν in P.Oxy. XLII 3023 col. I 8, proceedings before an emperor, 2nd cent. CE) but is rarely attested in the judicial proceedings, at least in the aforementioned sense: the only instances known to me occur in the bilingual protocol P.Lips. 40 (= ChLA XII 518) l. 12f.: ἀξιω τὸν σκριβα εἰσέλθειν καὶ εἰπεῖν, l. 21 and l. 31 (4th/5th cent. CE).13 We find, however, the ἔξηλθεν ὁ δείνα ύπρήτης formula in the concluding section of the reports (see Coles, op.cit. [above, n. 5] 52). Furthermore, παρέρχομαι occurs in P.Oxy. XVII 2110.3 (proceedings of the Senate, 370 CE), and προσέρχομαι in P.Oxy. II 237 col. VII 21 (proceedings, 186 CE); XVI 1880.7 (abandonment of legal proceedings, 427 CE).

τοῦ ωμη[ ]: After ω possibly a ν in some way unlike those of the rest of the text, but μ not ruled out; then the lower part of an upright with a horizontal extending at mid–level as of η. τοῦ ωμη[σεμένου or
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\(\text{ωνη[του δούλου vel sim.] seems to be a plausible supplement. But also other possibilities might be considered, e.g. a noun like του ωνη[του or the later form του ωνη[τορος, \"buyer, purchaser.\" Though the adj. ωνητος, \"bought,\" is attested well in papyri, the noun ωνητης occurs rarely (cf. P.Dryton 31.7 [140–131/130 BCE]); P.Cair.Masp. I 67057 col. I 11, [6th cent.]), whereas ωνητωρ is unknown from papyri. However, such a supplement would make good sense with the emended \(\langle\varepsilon\rangle\pi[ωλη]σα\) in l. 5. Furthermore, we could take ωνη[ to be part of a name, though I was unable to find a completely satisfactory supplement. Papyrological \textit{Onomastica} cite only one name beginning with \(\text{ων}-\), i.e. \(\text{ωνησ}\), for which we should expect the gen. \(\text{ωνέους}\). In P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews (eds.), \textit{A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names} (Oxford 1987–2005) vol. I s.vv. we find \(\text{ωνηδιλεως}\) and \(\text{ωνησιφόρος}\), both unknown from papyri. No name beginning with \(\text{ωμ}-\) is hitherto attested. At any rate, it is commonly known (cf. E. Mayser, \textit{Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit} [Berlin-Leipzig 1934] II.2 §54) that proper names omit articles (cf. Musurillo, \textit{op.cit.} [above, l. 5 note] XI B col. IV 2–3: \(\text{Ἀππιανὸς εἰσελθὼν εἶπεν}\) unless previously mentioned or specially marked as well known (cf. \textit{ibid.}, II col. II 42f.: \(\varepsilon\πιλθεν \text{ο Φλάκκκος}\)). Since at line beginning there are traces of an upright, as of \(\nu\), it is impossible to read the ending \(-ο\nu\) or \(-ο\.\); in this case the name could not have preceded \(\text{εἰσελθόντος}\). Hence, either \(\text{ωνη-}\) had already been mentioned in the lost portion of the text or is a well known personality.

7] \(\text{ἐτέρω[i]}\) εἰπεν (vac.?) \(\text{βιβλιοφ[\upsilon\lambda-]}\): At line beginning the end of a leg arching out at lower right, as of \(\alpha\) or \(\mu\) ligatured to \(\varepsilon\); hence, the restoration of the common \(\text{μεθ’ ἐτερα-}\) phrase (see l. 5 note) is impossible here. After \(\pi\) there is the left side of round letter (\(\omega\) or \(\alpha\), not \(\alpha\), suggested) followed by damaged papyrus. Reading omega, we could restore \(\tau\alphaυτικα̃\ \text{ἐτέρω[i]}\) εἰπεν or \(\varepsilonγεμονι \text{ημετέρω[i]}\) or \(\rhoητορι\ η-, \text{υμετέρω[i]}\) εἰπεν. On the εἰπεν-formula see the introduction to the text. εἰπεν c. dat. occurs e.g. in the following reports of proceedings: \(P.Oxy.\) IV 706.11 (115 CE): καὶ \(\tau\omega\ Ναυμαρίωνι εἰπεν;\) \(P.Oxy.\) XXII 2431 col. ii 24 (208 CE): \(\text{Διδύμων στρατηγῷ εἰπεν;}\) \(SB\) V 7696.6 (250 CE): \(\alpha\\upsilonτω\ \text{εἱπ(ειν)};\) \(P.Oxy.\) XXXI 2612.7 (3rd cent. CE): \(\alphaυτικω \text{εἰπ(ειν)};\) \(P.Vind.Tand.\) 8.3.4 (3rd/4th cent. CE): \(\alphaυτω \text{εἰπ(ειν)}\). However, traces and spacing do not rule out an ending like \(\text{ἐτέρο[ς]}\) or \(\etaμ-, \text{υμετέρο[ς]}\).

At line-end there is a tiny remnant of ink below bottom line, perhaps a deep descender as of \(\phi\); it is impossible to read the rest of the letter as the horizontal fibers are stripped. Some form of \(\text{βιβλιοφ[\upsilon\lambdaας}\) seems a likely supplement. Noticeable is the space employed between εἰπεν and \(\text{βιβλιοφ[\upsilon\lambda-}\) (as indicated in the transcript above); it is difficult to say whether the script was abraded or word-spacing is interposed. If we suppose that the script was abraded after εἰπεν, we might well supplement εἰπεν [\(\omicron\)] \(\text{βιβλιοφ[\upsilon\lambdaας}\). But εἰπεν \(\text{βιβλιοφ[\upsilon\lambdaας}, \text{βιβλιοφ[\upsilon\lambdaας}\) is also possible.

8 καθαρὰ τα[\(\text{υνατα}\) τα υπάρχοντα []: \"These possessions (are) clear of debt or other liabilities\" (e.g. υποθήκη, κατοχή, υπάλλαγμα etc.). It remains uncertain whether this statement derives from the keeper of the property register or from one of the defendants. A similar construction in \(BGU\) I 112.10–12 (60/61 CE): τα υπάρχοντα μοι δυνα καθαρὰ ἀπὸ τε ὄρειλης καὶ \(\upsilonτοθήκης\) καὶ παντὸς διεγγυηματος; cf. also \(BGU\) I 197.14–15 (17 CE). υπάρχοντα is frequently attested in the sense of \"property, possessions\"; c. e.g. \(P.Hamb.\) IV 244.10 (3rd cent. CE); \(P.Oxy.\) XII 1417.5fl. (proceedings from the early 4th cent. CE): τὼν υπαρχοντων καὶ πάντα μου τα υπάρχοντα; 8: όσα υπάρχοντα υπόκειται.

9] \(\omicron\) δικαιως πέπρατα[i] μι [ ]: At line beginning traces of an upright, \(\eta\) or \(\iota\) suggested. After \(\omega\) an unusually rounded c. The letter at line-end could be taken for \(\mu\) or \(\nu\).
10 ] ἐπικρατεῖν τοῦ [±3]τῶ[ : At line beginning a horizontal extending stroke ligatured into following π, most likely ε. ἐπικρατέω c. gen. (LSJ s.v. II.4) occurs frequently in the sense "to be in possession of": cf. e.g. P.Oxy. XXXVIII 2582.8–9 (104/105 CE); Stud.Pal. XXII 36A.7 (148 CE); P.Münch. III 74.7–8 (158 CE). The verb, however, is attested also in the sense "prevail over" (LSJ s.v. II.2). It is difficult to decide which meaning applies here, as the restoration of the rest of the line remains doubtful: ἐπικρατεῖν τοῦτ[ων τῶν ὑπαρχόντων] would make good sense in this context. However, after τοῦ there are traces of a round letter (ε, ω, ο′ or ο′ suggested) whereas the letter after the lacuna might be also taken for γ. Provided ἐπικρατεῖν is attested here in the sense "prevail over," the restoration of a name in genitive after τοῦ seems suitable. In this case it is tempting to infer that the phrases ἐπικρατεῖν τοῦ NN as well as οὖ δικαίως πέπρατα[ι] in the previous l. 9 might be indications for a rehearing of the case; see E. Berneker, "Das wiederholte Prozessieren in den antiken Rechten," JJP 4 (1950) 253–264; on ἀναδικία cf. D. Kalsas, P.Heid. VIII 412 introduction, and note to l. 15.

11 ] τε απ[τ] [-3]. εἰνος εἴπεν τοῦ π[ : The restoration of this line is a doubtful matter. After π a speck of ink; after the lacuna ghost of an upright, curving slightly out at bottom, most likely κ, but μ, π or ν not excluded. Reading κ, we could restore ] τε ἀπ[λ][ω]ς [ἐ[κ]εῖνος εἴπεν; cf. Arist. Pol. 1285a31: ὃς ἀπλω[ς εἴπεν. Spacing does not allow the longer supplement ] τε ἀπ[λ][ω]ν ἐ[κ]εῖνος εἴπεν that would make good sense in this context. On the other hand, reading μ in a construction like ] τε ἀπ[λ][ω]ς με[εῖνος εἴπεν also seems plausible. Reading π or ν after the lacuna, we might consider many possible restorations, e.g. τοῦ NN τε ἀπ[λ][ω]ς με[εῖν, ἀπ[λο]υ[σ]αι, ἀπο[κτ][ε]ιε[ν etc. ὃς εἴπεν.]

At line-end traces of a round letter; perhaps ω, ο or ε (not α). πω[ς might be a suitable restoration (as in Musurillo, op.cit. [above, l. 5 note] XI B v.2: ἄντ[ορπάτωρ πω[ς;]), though there are many other possibilities, e.g. ρι. On εἴπεν see l. 7 note.

12 ] ... δοὺ[ν] νο[υ[ : After ν cross-bar with descender dipping below, possibly η? But I have not found a restoration which satisfies spacing and traces.

13 Perhaps ] τ[α] ὑπάρχοντά [σοι?

14 ]τραστού: Possibly the ending of a name in genitive. Dornseiff and Hansen, op.cit. (above, l. 1 note) and Kretschmer and Locker, op.cit. (above, l. 1 note) cite no name ending in −τραστος. But we might have a misspelling for ἄδραστος, a well-known name from papyri and inscriptions; cf. e.g. BGU XVI 2577 passim (30 BCE–14 CE); P.Oxy. II 3690.3, 5, 10; 3691.3 (both dated in 139 CE). F. Bechtel, Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit (repr. Hildesheim 1982), cites also the Athenian name Εὐδραστός (not in Preisigke, Namenbuch, op.cit. [above, l. 1 note] or in Foraboschi, Onomasticon, op.cit. [above, l. 1 note] or in WörterListe).

[δ][ε]ς ἀνιστ[άμενος εἴπεν?: For similar phrases cf. the following reports of legal proceedings: P.Tebt. II 286.15ff. (131 CE): ἀνασ[τα]ς ε[ις [σ][μ]υ[β]ουλίων κ[α]κ[α] κ[ε]σκ[α]μ[ε][ν][ος με]τά [τ]ῶν [π]αρ[ρ][ο][τ][ω][ν ὑπηγόρ]με[νος ἀπό[φασιν; P.Oslo III 80v.16 (161 CE): ]ον ῥήτορος ἀναστάτος. Similar constructions occur frequently in judicial and literary oratory (cf. e.g. Demosthenes XIX.117; Andocides I.70; 115; Lysias XIII.9; XXII.3) and at least once in the Acta (cf. the Acta Isidori in Musurillo, op.cit. [above, l. 5 note] IV A col. I 2.8]). However, traces and spacing do not rule out a completely different reading like ]τρας τοῦ [ν[ε][α]νίκ]ο[υ?

15 ?μετέλα-, ἀνέλα-, ἀπέλα]βεν τὴν οὐσία[ : After α ghost of a descender (ν or κ suggested); hence both τὴν οὐσία[ and τὴν οὐσίακ]ὴν γῆ[ν are palaeographically possible. "NN got a share of /
confiscated / retrieved / received / the estate or the estate land." Though οὐσία is normally expected in judicial proceedings, it occurs at least once in the Acta Alexandrinorum in a very similar phrase; cf. Musurillo, op. cit. [above, l. 5 note] VII col. IV 97–100: τήν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν ἀναλημφθῆναι κελεύεις. On estate land see H.-Chr. Kuhnke, Οὐσιακὴ γῆ. Domänenland in den Papyri der Prinzipatszeit (Diss. Köln 1971).

16 ]ο[ . ]θορά μοι τόν [ : At line beginning traces of a round letter, most likely o, but c cannot be ruled out; after the lacuna traces of a round letter with a faint cross-bar as of θ. Perhaps καθόρα (imp.) or καθόρα (indic. or subj.) μοι τόν [. But ϕθορά is also possible, though I cannot think of a connected sense to complete the line. The noun ϕθορά is well attested in papyri in the sense "destruction," "damage" (cf. e.g. PSI VIII 893.19: μάρτυρα τῶν φθορῶν), or even "death" (cf. e.g. P.Sarap. I 52.26, 29, 34, 40, but also Strabo, Geography XII 3.40).

17 ]ρια ταυτά έστιν [ : Cf. exempli gratia κριτήρια ταυτά έστιν [. Or alternatively we could suppose the beginning of a new sentence with ταυτα; cf. e.g. μαρτυρία or κατηγορία: ταυτά έστιν [. At any rate, the latter construction (frequently used in Attic prose) presumes a rather rhetorical style.

18 ]οτα εἰσήλθεν: For εἰσέρχομαι cf. the instances quoted in line 6 note.

19 ] γ αυτά καθαρά [ : The text refers presumably once again to property free of debt or other liabilities; see l. 8 note.

20 ] εἰσγέγονα ἀνα[ : After ει upper part of a bowl as of c falling forward. εἰσγήγομαι, "arrive," is attested e.g. in P.Giss. III 69.17 (118/119 CE): ταχέως [. . . . ], <ε>ισγέγονται. After εἰσγέγονα perhaps a participial construction like ἀνα[πεμφθείς, ἀνα[ξιτῶν?, ἀνα[φθεγγόμενος? etc.

22 ] ω άναγνωσ[θέντ- : At line beginning traces of a short descender, as of τ or ρ, followed possibly by ω. A plausible supplement might be ὁ δὲ παιρόν<ν> followed by the Genitive Absolute participial construction άναγνωσ[θέντος (e.g. τοῦ βιβλιδίου) or άναγνωσ[θέντων (e.g. τῶν ὑπομνηματικῶν) and a verb like εἶπεν / ἐσιώτησεν vel sim. (cf. e.g. P.Oxy. II 237 col. V 13: ὁ δὲ παρών άναγνωσθέντος τοῦ βιβλιδίου πρὸ βήματος ἐσιώτησεν). Line 22 apparently preserves the so-called "reading-phrase," a common form in the judicial proceedings of the first two centuries CE, that indicates the reading of written evidence or other documents in the court (Coles, op. cit. [above, n. 5] 47 n. 2, quotes numerous examples in judicial proceedings; cf. also Musurillo, op. cit. (above, l. 5 note) XVIII col. I 24; II 5.24). The "reading-phrase" forms part of the intermediate narrative passages that were generally brief, recording only essential details; on the subject cf. Coles, op. cit. (above, n. 5) 46–47. The restoration of the closing formula μετά τήν άναγνωσιν (cf. P.Oxy. XXXI 2562.4 note), a third common phrase, which is usually found after the two Genitive Absolute forms mentioned above, should be excluded as I see no way of reading the traces at line-beginning as τήν.

23 ]γο . . . . [. . ]ξιν[ : After γο no shortage of traces but nothing distinct. After the lacuna είξην might be a suitable restoration; cf. e.g. Musurillo, op. cit. (above, l. 5 note) IX C col. III 24; col. IV 29. Noteworthy is the documentary cursive form of ξ that runs into the following line.

24 ] . . ]δικ (·) ϕ[ : At line beginning only indistinct traces here and there. After ϕ a high point crossed through the tail of ξ from the previous line. Perhaps some form of αδρξ[ι]δικ(αστής) would suit the traces; a similar case, where the archidikastes is involved in a conflict over the ownership of property, in P.Coll.Youtie I 65. However, archidikastes is attested also in the Acta Alexandrinorum; cf. Musurillo, op. cit. [above, l. 5 note] VII A.146; VII B.55. On archidikastes cf. P. Jörs, "Erzrichter und Chrematisten,"
Fragment of a Report of Proceedings (?)  


26 ] (vac.? ) οκ[ : Though spacing suggests at least three more letters before ο, the ink is totally faded.
27α Perhaps ?μετε−, ἀνε−, ἀπε[λαβε[ ] : See l. 15 note.
28 ] . . . ϕηα[ : Though the traces before ϕ are illegible, ό δ[ ϕη ς[υτχς, −σις might be a plausible restoration; cf. e.g. Musurillo, op.cit. (above, l. 5 note) III col. II 11, 12; X 65; XXII 46, 53; P.Oxy. XXV 2435.9 (Acta Alexandrinorum?, dated in the early first c. CE). The form ϕηού occurs e.g. in P.Oxy. XXII 2340.16 (judicial proceedings, 192 CE); P.Berol. inv. 7347.8 (3rd c. CE, ed. J.R. Rea, "Proceedings before Q. Maecius Laetus, Praef. Aeg., etc.,” JJP 19 [1983] 91–101). On the occurrence of ϕη as a rather dubious indicative verb in report of proceedings see Coles, op.cit. (above, n. 5) 43 n. 1.
31 Με[οφρ] ζ——[ : At line beginning traces of a round letter followed by descender slightly below bottom line with traces of a tiny bowl on its top, as of ρ; then feet of two uprights (η suggested). The ending of the Egyptian month Mesore seems a suitable restoration at the end of a section supported also by the presence of ζ (possibly numeral) at line-end. Egyptian month names are attested in the Acta Alexandrinorum (cf. Musurillo, op.cit. [above, l. 5 note] IV A col. I 20; XXI 19) and most frequently in judicial proceedings.
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