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I present here four papyrus documents housed in the Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library at Duke University. The documents belong to a cache of papyri (P.Duk.inv.s 313–323) of apparently Arsinoite provenance, of which several have been published. I offer a few minor additions to this corpus.

P.Duk.inv. 319  
21.4 × 9.5 cm.  
II B.C.  
Arsinoite?

The recto of this papyrus contains 22 lines written along the fibers. It is broken at the top, where at least two lines (and probably more) have been lost. Margins are as follows: bottom .5–.8 cm.; left 1.2–1.8 cm.; right .5–1.5 cm. Lines are spaced approximately .5 cm. apart. The verso contains 7 lines of text written against the fibers. Its top margin measures 1.2–1.5 cm.; its left, approximately 1.4 cm. At right .2–1.2 cm. of space is left. The extant text is inverse and continuous from recto to verso.

The hand is fairly clear but clumsy at times. Worthy of note are the scribe’s occasionally very lengthy descenders and ascenders, which sometimes threaten to intrude into preceding and succeeding lines. The general circumstances of the letter are as follows: the (unidentified) addressee is to have a slave girl, Tenemas, watch after the writer’s house in his absence (2–3; 20–22); instruct another man to meet up with the writer, or perhaps meet up with the writer himself (7–11); inform the writer of any items he may need (11–16); and obtain a sum of money for the purchase of a necklace (23–28).

The papyrus is undated. Many of the other documents extracted from cartonnage along with P.Duk.inv. 319 are dated to the late third or early second centuries B.C. On palaeographical grounds it is probable that P.Duk.inv. 319 was written in the second century: see P. Bad. IV 48 (Hipponon, 127 B.C.) for a comparable letter.


3 I owe a debt of gratitude to Christopher Fuhrmann for his assistance in establishing the text of P.Duk.inv. 319, and to Klaus Maresch and Charikleia Armoni for their many improvements.


5 Plate at <http://www.rzuser.uni-heidelberg.de/~gv0/Papyri/VBP_IV/048/VBP_IV_48.html>.
therefore, is only suggested and based on the fact that a number of the other papyri discovered with P.Duk. inv. 319 have close connections with a number of Arsinoite villages. The text provides the sole attestation of the name Tenemas, and the Hippalos mentioned in line 19 is potentially a well-known Ptolemaic official (see note).

Text and Translation

recto

πρόκειται τ[εα 6–7] συμπαραγενέσθαι μοι, γράφων μοι ὅπως παραγένωμαι. καὶ ἐὰν τινός

verse

ζήτει δὲ κα[θ]έμα


verse 23. ζήτει: ζ from corr.

---

6 E.g.: P.Duk.inv. 318, a letter from a stratēgos to a basilikos grammateus, contains instructions regarding some allotments in Eleusis and Tebetyn; P.Duk.inv. 320r, an official letter, concerns the sesame harvest in Ptolemais Melissourgon and Oxyrhyncha.
(recto) “… until the 9th. Therefore, send Tenemas to me, so that I, having obtained leave from Stratonikos, may be at hand on the 9th. And if you intend … also to meet up with me, write me so that I can be at hand. And if you need anything else to be sent to you, pertaining to jewelry and fine linens, make it clear straightaway. For … (to) Stratonikos to go off to the Arsinoite to Hippalos. Thus, so that the house is not left abandoned, by all means send the slave girl.”

(verso) “Find a necklace (costing) up to 60 drachmas, and … of silver. Receive from Samos, [son of X (?)], 60 drachmas of bronze, so that you may have it for the necklace, if there is need. Farewell.”

Notes
recto
1. A few letter-bottoms are all that remain. Perhaps as many as 10 to 15 lines of text, including the names of the addressee and author and the salutation, have been lost above this line. See Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome (2nd ed.: Oxford, 1951), p. 51, where F. G. Kenyon suggests that the heights of conjoined sheets in Greek papyrus rolls rarely exceeded 13 inches (approx. 33 cm).
2. τῆς: The scribe has superimposed the sigma over an iota.
3. It seems reasonable to conjecture Τενεμᾶς as the Nominative of Τενεμᾶν. Τεμαὶς was a common name for a man, e.g.: BGU II 392.1.i, ii.3 (Arsinoite, A.D. 208), with BL 7.12: O.Mich. II 803.2 (Karanis, II b.c.); SB XII 11164.9 (?). A.D. 189/90). In addition, the name Πενεμᾶς for a man occurs in a number of texts, e.g.: P.Cair.Zen. V 59827.4 (Philadelphia, 250 b.c.); PSV 544.22 (Philadelphia, III b.c.); P.Tebt. I 83.ii.26 (Tebtynis, II b.c.). In Tenemas we perhaps see a female version of Penemas. At the very least, Tenemas is a woman’s name. I am very grateful to Heinz J. Thissen for confirming this.
4.–5. παραιτησάμενος: The participle must mean “obtaining leave/asking for permission from” here. In his letter, the writer is making a number of arrangements which are all contingent upon obtaining permission to leave his post. Stratonikos seems to be the authority empowered to grant his departure.
5. Men named Stratonikos appear in a handful of documents from the third and second centuries b.c., e.g.: P.Petr. III 114.1 (Gurob, 223–222 b.c.); P.Köln III 144.1–2, 15–16 (Arsinoite, 152 b.c.); SB V 7574.1 (Elephantine, II b.c.). Our Stratonikos may have been an official of some sort, as the writer of the letter seems to express the desire to contact Stratonikos about a meeting. He was perhaps of intermediate rank, if we are correct in assuming that in line 17 the lacuna contained something along the lines of παρὰ τὴν γεγειλήνα (see note, below), and thus that he could be dispatched to another nome at will. One possibility for his identity is presented by SB XIV 11860.1–3 (Arsinoite, II–I b.c.), where a man writes to Stratonikos, archiphylakítês of those around Arsinoe, to report that he is being enrolled in the police forces of Onniton Koite.
6. τ[ε]κτά: A temporal expression such as τ[ε]κτά (“on the eleventh”) or τ[ε]κτά (“on the same day”) is likely here. If so, the writer suggests that the addressee meet up with him at a given date. We should punctuate with a comma (or nothing) after μοι (9). The clause introduced by γράψον (10) will serve as the apodosis of the condition begun by εἰ (7).
7. ὄ: The ascender of the ϑ of παραπεμφήναι runs to the right of the body of the letter.
8. fi.[6–7]: A temporal expression such as τ[ε]κτά (“on the eleventh”) or τ[ε]κτά (“on the same day”) is likely here. If so, the writer suggests that the addressee meet up with him at a given date. We should punctuate with a comma (or nothing) after μοι (9). The clause introduced by γράψον (10) will serve as the apodosis of the condition begun by εἰ (7).
9. The ascender of the ϑ of παραπεμφήναι runs to the right of the body of the letter.
10. μῖα: For the meaning “pertain to” (+ Genitive) in the middle voice, see LSJ s.v. C.1.5.
11. The ascender of the ϑ of παραπεμφήναι runs to the right of the body of the letter.
12. μῖα: For the meaning “pertain to” (+ Genitive) in the middle voice, see LSJ s.v. C.1.5.

17. παρ[ca 6–7]: The context suggests a verb form with the meaning “tell, order,” *vel sim.*, and παραγγέλλω seems a likely candidate. A number of Ptolemaic parallels survive, e.g.: *P.Anh*. II 30.40–42 (Soknopaiou Nesos, II b.c.): παραγγέλλουμεν τῷ Θεμβώτῳ (read Θεμβώτα) ἐκχωρεῖν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας; *P.Hamb*. I 25.14–16 (Tholthis [Oxyrhynchite]?, 238 or 213 b.c.): τὸ ἀκολούθιον παραγγέλλωμεν συναντάντας πρὸς σὲ; *P.Tebt*. III.1 739.9–10 (Tebtynis, 163 or 145 b.c.?): παραγγέλη | [παραγγέλθη] πρὸς τὴν περὶ τούτων διεξαγωγήν. Willis, *GRBS* 32 (1991): 331, n. 1 emended this lacuna to παρ[ηγγέλλα], which conveys the required sense (“I ordered Hippalos…”). Alternatively, a passive construction (in the third person) could be supplied: παρ[ηγγέλθη]. “Hippalos was ordered ….” A dot of ink sits under the *π*. The dotted character on the line is most probably an *α*. As Thomas demonstrates (26–32; 80–86), Hippalos had power over the epistrategoi of the Thebaid. On this man see J. D. Thomas, *The epistrategoi in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt I: The Ptolemaic epistrategoi* (Opladen, 1975): 87–91 with *Pros. Ptol*. 193 with add. (= 1919 with add. = 5155 with add.); L. Mooren, *The Governors General of the Thebaid in the Second Century B.C.* (I), *AncSoc* 4 (1973): 115–132 (118–121 on Hippalos); and now G. Gorre, *Une première mention d’Hippalos, stratège de la Thébaïde?*, *CE* 85 (2010): 230–239. *P.Tebt*. III.2 895 (Berenikis Thesmophorou, ca 175 b.c.) shows that Hippalos held the office of epistrategoi by 175 b.c. at the latest. Thomas concludes that he had probably been epistrategos as early as 185 b.c., and perhaps until 169 b.c. (88–90), well in line with the suggested dating of P.Duk.inv. 319 to the early second century. Further, the identification of our Hippalos with the famous epistrategos is not ruled out by the fact that the author of our text explicitly states that he will be with Hippalos in the Arsinoite, not the Thebaid where most epistrategoi seem to have held office. As Thomas demonstrates (26–32; 80–86), Hippalos had power over the entire chôra. Travel to the Arsinoite for such an important official would thus not have been unusual. Yet in spite of the suggestive temporal and geographical evidence, it is impossible to demonstrate conclusively that the man mentioned here is the epistrategos.

19. Hippalos is a fairly common name, but it is tempting to suggest (as Willis did, *GRBS* 32 [1991]: 331) that our Hippalos is the well-known epistrategos of the Thebaid. On this man see J. D. Thomas, *The epistrategoi in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt I: The Ptolemaic epistrategoi* (Opladen, 1975): 87–91 with *Pros. Ptol*. 193 with add. (= 1919 with add. = 5155 with add.); L. Mooren, *The Governors General of the Thebaid in the Second Century B.C.* (I), *AncSoc* 4 (1973): 115–132 (118–121 on Hippalos); and now G. Gorre, *Une première mention d’Hippalos, stratège de la Thébaïde?*, *CE* 85 (2010): 230–239. *P.Tebt*. III.2 895 (Berenikis Thesmophorou, ca 175 b.c.) shows that Hippalos held the office of epistrategoi by 175 b.c. at the latest. Thomas concludes that he had probably been epistrategos as early as 185 b.c., and perhaps until 169 b.c. (88–90), well in line with the suggested dating of P.Duk.inv. 319 to the early second century. Further, the identification of our Hippalos with the famous epistrategos is not ruled out by the fact that the author of our text explicitly states that he will be with Hippalos in the Arsinoite, not the Thebaid where most epistrategoi seem to have held office. As Thomas demonstrates (26–32; 80–86), Hippalos had power over the entire chôra. Travel to the Arsinoite for such an important official would thus not have been unusual. Yet in spite of the suggestive temporal and geographical evidence, it is impossible to demonstrate conclusively that the man mentioned here is the epistrategos.


23. κόσμος: κόθμημα appear in only five texts, three of which are Ptolemaic. In *P.Mich*. XVIII 773 (Oxyrhynchus or Krokodilopolis, ca 194 b.c.) and 774 (Oxyrhynchus, ca 194–193 b.c.), a goldsmith complains to an unknown official (773) and then the epimelêtês (774) that he has been arrested and deprived of a lump of silver and a necklace. In *P.Tebt*. III.1 761 (Tebtynis, III b.c.), a private letter, a man requests that an unknown recipient obtain a necklace and some muslin. Two documents from the Roman period (*P.Oslo* II 46.11 [?; α.δ. III]; *SB* VIII 9834a.6, 20 [?; after a.d. 200 or 229?]) mention κόθμημα in lists of belongings. Further attestations for the term can be found in the commentary on *P.Oslo* II 46.11. See also Russo (1999) 75–78.

24.–25. ... ζι ὡτρίῳυ: It would appear that this phrase must modify κόσμος in line 23, as there is no further mention of silver (or silver money) in the papyrus. It looks as though the necklace was made of silver.

26. Σαμῶς, ρ.1, [ca 4–5]: Or perhaps read Σαμῶντος? The names Σαμῶς and Σαμῶν are not especially common, but the restoration seems likely. The lacuna perhaps contained the name of Samos’ father.

27. χαλκῳτ: ξι: I have restored the *xi* here based on context – as mention has already been made of 60 drachmas above (line 24) – as well as the fact that the dotted character appears to be flanked by tick-marks to the lower left and right, as well as one to the upper left (after Σαμωτός on line 26). These ticks are likely the residue of an original, oversized *xi.*
main verb. It is also within the realm of possibility that the scribe wrote and intended χρείαν, but mistakenly as an object for ἔχῃς (27).

29. έρροςι. The epsilon is oversized. εὐτύχεῖ is also possible, though the traces suggest that έρροσι is correct. It is possible, however, that the farewell was abbreviated.

P. Duk. inv. 321

The recto of this papyrus contains 15 lines written along the fibers. It is broken at bottom. Margins are as follows: top 3.2 cm.; left 2.75 cm.; right 1–2.5 cm. Lines are spaced approximately .5–.7 cm. apart. The verso contains 1 line of text written along the fibers and in large characters. There are a number of small ink blots and smudges in the marginal areas of both recto and verso, though none appears to preserve traces of writing, with the possible exception of the traces in the left margin of line 15. The papyrus is undated, but on palaeographical grounds it is probable that P. Duk. inv. 321 was written in the 2nd century B.C. The hand bears a resemblance to a number of other second-century hands, especially in the forms of its abbreviations and numeric characters: compare, for example, the abbreviation for talents and the characters for 400 (upsilon) and 4000 (capital delta) in UPZ II 114, I (Memphis, 150 B.C.; plate at Seider, Paläographie III.1.2 p. 375).

The document is a letter from an unknown addressee to a certain Lysanias. The writer reports on the amounts owed by (apparently) two debtors. The text is of interest for the possible occurrence of a new name, Ammenemeus.

Text and Translation

recto

→ , [, , [, , ]]

[ευσανίαι , , ]

[ca 11–13]

4 ὡφελεῖ [ , , , ]

tιμὴν ο[ι][υ] τοῦ

Ἀμμενεμέους

ἀμπελῶνος

8 Λαυλγ = καὶ

ὑπὲρ Νουμηνίου

tοῦ Δωρίανος τάγη =

καὶ Ἰμουθη[ς] ὁ Πατηρ-


verso

→ Λυσανίαι

(recto) “(X) to Lysanias, (greetings?). … (Y) owes the price for the wine from the vineyard of Ammenemeus, 1 talent, 433 drachmas, 2 obols; and instead of Noumenios, son of Dorion, (Y owes) 333 drachmas, 2 obols;
and Imouthes, son of Paterios, (owes) 4633 drachmas, 2 obols, altogether 1 talent, 5400 drachmas. Therefore you will do well . . . ."

(verso) “To Lysanias.”

Notes

recto
1. The name of the writer was likely preserved in this line.

2. Men named Lysanias appear in only a handful of second-century texts. As our Lysanias seems to be receiving instructions concerning the collection of debt, he is probably not the Arsinoite stratēgos mentioned in P.Mil.Vogl. III 128.1 (Tebtynis, 119 b.c.), P.Tebt. I 41.11–12, 35–36 (Kerkeosiris, 105–90 b.c.) and elsewhere; see Pros. Ptol. 277 with add. = 7917b with add. A Proitos, logeutēs of Tanchais and son of Lysanias appears in a Herakleopolite text from the first century (BGU VIII 1825.3–4, 7 [Herakleopolite, ca 61–60 or ca 53–52 b.c.?]), and a Lysanias seems to have been responsible for placing an agent on board a ship in P.Tebt. III.2 1035.3 (Tebtynis, 182–181 or 158–157 b.c.?).

6. Ἀμμενεμέους: The name Ammenemeus is otherwise unattested in the papyri. Read Ἀμμενεμέους for Ἀμμενέους?

11.–12. Ἰμούθος τοῦ Πατηρίου: Imouthes was a fairly common name in the Ptolemaic period. Paterios, on the other hand, is rare: see AnalPap 14/15 (2005): 174–176 and n. on 6. We should possibly restore Ἰμούθος τοῦ Πατηρίου here, if we are to understand Imouthes as the object of an understood ὑπὲρ (cf. ὑπὲρ Νουμηνίου, 9), and translate “and instead of Imouthes, son of Paterios, (Y owes)”. The Nominative is more likely if we accept the join of P.Duk. invs. 321 and 323 (see below), as a plural subject is required in 323 and this is conveniently supplied by the subject of ὀφείλει (4) and Ἰμούθος (11). The ονείρου of Πατηρίου may be the work of a second hand.

15. [ca 5–6] vac . . . ; The traces are puzzling. The space to the left of the three dotted characters is wide enough to accommodate perhaps 4–5 letters. Did the author of the letter not begin his instruction to Lysanias on line 15? Did he wait until the end of the line to start writing?

P.Duk.inv. 323

14.9 × 8.1 cm.  II B.C. Arsinote

http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/323.html

The recto of this long papyrus contains 7 lines written along the fibers. It is broken at top and right. Margins are as follows: at left, 2.75 cm.; at bottom, a generous 7.5 cm. Lines are spaced approximately .5–.7 cm. apart. The verso is blank. The papyrus is undated, but on palaeographical grounds it is probable that P.Duk. inv. 323 was written in the 2nd century b.c.

The document appears to be the end of a letter from an unknown addressee to an unknown recipient, with instructions to send someone or something to the city (ἀποστελλεσ ca ? | πόλιν, 4–5). The papyrus seems to preserve a negative purpose clause (ὁπως μή [ca ?], 1) with at least one verb in the subjunctive ([ca ?] | ζωνται, 1–2) followed by two others (περισπασθ | Ἀποστελλεσ [ca ?], 3–4) of indeterminate mood. At end, there is a farewell, a year, and then (lost) a month and a day. More than anything else, restoration is hampered here by the fact that the amount of text missing at right is uncertain.

Yet this is perhaps not as uncertain as might initially appear, as there is a possibility that P.Duk.inv. 323 and P.Duk.inv. 321 are two halves of the same papyrus. This possibility becomes clear when the two are laid out in sequence (321 at top, 323 at bottom; see photo, below).7 What strikes the viewer immediately are the generous margins of the hypothetical composite papyrus: 3.2 cm. at top, 7.5 cm. at bottom and at left a regular 2.75 cm. on every line of text. A number of other consistencies also argue in favor of a join. Lines are spaced approximately .5–7 cm. apart throughout. A right margin is only preserved for P.Duk.inv. 321, but it is irregular, varying from 1–2.5 cm. If a join should be made, therefore, anywhere from 3–8 charac-

---

7 I would like to thank Jake Butera and Joshua Sosin for their help in establishing the possible join of P.Duk.invs. 321 and 323. They provided valuable autopsies of the papyri as well as an initial composite image of the recto. Thanks also to Klaus Maresch and Charikleia Armoni for their observations on both texts and many helpful suggestions.
ters may be missing at the end of P.Duk.inv. 323.1–4, and between 2–3 characters at the end of P.Duk.inv. 323.6–7. Assuming lacunae of such small size, restoration of these lines becomes possible. Whereas there is writing on the verso of 321 (the delivery instruction written with the fibers, Δυσανίκια), there is nothing on the verso of 323. Finally, there is the argument from content/context: P.Duk.inv. 321 ends with the beginning of an instruction to an official (καλῶς ὁν ποιήσεις, 14). P.Duk.inv. 323 begins with what is probably a purpose clause (ὁπώς μή, 1) followed by at least three different verb forms, one of which is likely subjunctive (ὁπώς οὐ ποιήσεις, 1–2), one of which may be subjunctive (περισπάσ[ ca ? ], 3), and one of which could be an infinitive (ἀποστέλλεσ[ ca ? ], 4).

On the other hand, there are problems with a potential join, as well. One of the most immediately obvious of these is that the two pieces of papyrus (321 and 323) are distinctly different shades of tan. This, however, can be explained away as the effects of time or differing states/places of preservation. One might also argue, after an initial examination, that the handwriting of P.Duk.inv. 321 is not an obvious match for that of P.Duk.inv. 323. Yet closer inspection reveals that the hands are in fact quite close. When assessing them, one must keep in mind that much of the text of 321 is abraded. In addition, a number of the more clearly drawn characters in 321 represent symbols or numbers likely written somewhat more slowly and carefully than the characters in 323, which appear in continuous Greek prose. In addition, one also cannot fail to note that some of the characters found in both P.Duk.invs. 321 and 323 come in multiple, but also similar, varieties. For instance, the scribe of 323 has at least two different forms for pi: that of ἀποστελλεσ[ ca ? ] (4) and πόλιν (5) resembles a small mound and looks nothing like the more traditional three-stroke pi one finds in ὁπώς (1) or περισπάσ[ ca ? ] (3) as well as in 321 (ἀμπέλῶνος, 7). Nu comes in both rearing (πόλις, 5) and non-rearing (ὁπώς οὐ ποιήσεις, 1–2) varieties in 323, as it also does in P.Duk.inv. 321 (rearing: τιμήν, 5; non-rearing: δωρίωνος, 10; non-rearing followed by rearing: Νουμηνίου, 9). Alpha also has at least two forms in 323: one with a high, looped ascender (περισπάσ[ ca ? ], 3; ἀποστέλλεσ[ ca ? ], 4; α[ ca ? ], 7) and one which resembles more closely a capital “A” (ὁπώς οὐ ποιήσεις, 1–2); the latter is all that occurs in 321. Perhaps in this case, at least, hand should not play a decisive role in determining authorship, since whether we posit one scribe or two, a great deal of flexibility with the pen is visible in the two papyri.

There remains really only one major obstacle to proposing a join of P.Duk.invs. 321 and 323: the fact that no completely satisfactory text can be constructed at the hypothetical point of join. The last line of P.Duk.inv. 321 contains a lacuna of 5–6 characters in width, followed by a blank space of some 4–5 characters in width, then 2–3 indistinct characters and finally a wide right margin. How should this line be understood as part of a hypothetical whole? Is this all that remains of the line before the beginning of P.Duk.inv. 323, or should we assume that the text preserved here is actually the end of 323.1? Either way, how do we explain the blank space in 321? Having found no satisfactory solution to any of these problems, I print P.Duk.invs. 321 and 323 as separate texts. The reader will find possible restorations for P.Duk.inv. 323 as part of a hypothetical joined document in the notes which follow.

recto

— ὁπώς μή[ ca ? ]
ζονται οἱ[ ca ? ]
περισπάσ[ ca ? ]
4 ἀποστελλέσ[ ca ? εἰς]
πόλιν.

— ἔρρωσο. [year, month, day ca ? ]
α[ ca ? ]

(recto) “… so that the ___s not … harrassed (?) … send to the city. Farewell. Year [xx, Month yy] … .”
recto

1.–5. If P.Duk.inv. 323 does, in fact, belong to the end of P.Duk.inv. 321 – and 323 follows directly after 321 without an intervening lacuna – the following restoration is possible:

→ ὃπος μὴ τῇ ἐνεχυράτῃ
ζωνταί οἱ [β μῆτε]
περισπασθῇσιν.

4 ἁποστέλλεσθαι εἰς πόλιν.

(recto) “[Therefore, you will do well, (from P.Duk.inv. 321.14)], so that the two may neither be seized for debt, nor be harrassed, to send them to the city.”

The restoration follows a handful of parallels where the verbs ἐνεχυράζω and περισπάω are paired, e.g.: P.Enteux. 87 (Alabantis, 222 B.C.; 3: ἐνεχυράζει με και περισπάει μοι τὸν χηνοβοσκόν; 5–6: μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν τῷ Μυσσέα ἐνεχυράζειν μὲ μὴ περισπάν] τοὺς παρ’ ἐμοῦ) and P.Stras. VII 625 (Herakleopolite?, II B.C.; 2–4: πλεονάκις ύποι[. . .] (ca ?) περισπάσθαι καὶ ἐνεχυράζεσθαι). Other restorations are certainly possible: for example, ὃπος μὴ [κοιμώ-κρημμυτί-]ζωνταί οἱ [δύο δῶ] περισπασθῆ[ντα], “so that the two may not take possession of/profit from the things they have drawn off.” It should be noted that both of the hypothetical reconstructions proposed here involve a slight irregularity in construction: after καλλος οὖν ποιήσεις (P.Duk.inv. 321.14), one would normally expect a participle, and then the purpose clause. Instead, if the restoration is correct, we have no participle, but a purpose clause and then an infinitive (ἀποστέλλεσθαικαί). Such a change is unusual, but not unparalleled: see (e.g.) P.Coll.Youtie I 17.2–8 (?; 37 B.C.?), P.Kön longer text.

On the other hand, if P.Duk.inv. 323 preserves the end of P.Duk.inv. 321 and there is a lacuna of a line or more between 321 and 323, the change in construction is not an issue, but restoration becomes more difficult. In this case, there is no reason not to expect a participial phrase after the end of P.Duk.inv. 321, followed perhaps by a purpose clause which has been lost, e.g.: “Therefore, you will do well [to ___, so that ___.]” We might then imagine that the beginning of P.Duk.inv. 323 preserves the remains of two shorter sentences of the form imperative + purpose clause, perhaps along the following lines: [φρόντισθαι] | ὃπος μὴ [ἐνεχυράτῃς]ζωνταί οἱ [β. ἐνόν μη] περισπασθῶσιν (ca 1–3), ἁποστέλλει εἰς τῆν πόλιν. (“See to it that the two are not seized for debt. So that they are not harrassed, send them to the city.”) I owe a debt of gratitude to Charikleia Armoni for this alternative interpretation, in which it should be noted that the change of infinitive (ἀποστέλλεσθαικαί) to imperative (ἀποστέλλει εἰς τῆν πόλιν) in line 4 also (likely) requires a reading of epsilon before the lacuna instead of sigma.

As the reader will notice, in all of the hypothetical restorations above I assume that the two men for whom debts are recorded in 321 – an unknown man and Paterios – are the implied subjects of the purpose clause with which P.Duk.inv. 323 begins. Yet this is unclear. All that appears certain is that the subject of the clause must be plural and masculine.

6.–7. Here any possible restoration is more limited by space than in lines 1–5, as both of these lines are indented much further from the left margin than the rest of the text, and more of the papyrus survives at right on these two lines than anywhere else. Thus it is likely that fewer characters are lost in the lacuna at right. In addition, if P.Duk. inv. 323 belongs to the end of P.Duk.inv. 321, there can only be 1–2 characters lost at the end of each line before we come very close to the right edge of the papyrus. The natural – and perhaps only – explanation is that we find here is the year, month and day:

ἔρρωσον. L [ca 1–2]
Ἄθηγρο [ca 1–2]

“Farewell. Year [..], Hathyr [..].”
P.Duk.inv. 321 + 323 recto (left) and verso (right)
P.Duk.inv. 322

19 × 4.5 cm.

III–II B.C.

Arsinoite

http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/322.html

The recto of this papyrus contains 14 lines written along the fibers. It is broken at top, bottom and right; perhaps as many as 13 lines have been lost. The left margin measures 1.3–2.3 cm. Lines are spaced approximately .8 cm. apart. The verso seems to have been left blank, at least in so far as it has been preserved. The papyrus contains no written date and little text to examine for palaeographical clues to its dating. Judging by the dates of the other texts in the same cache, P.Duk.inv. 322 was probably written at some point in the late third or early second century B.C.

It is difficult to say with certainty what sort of document is preserved in P.Duk.inv. 322, though the first two lines of the document suggest that the text is an official letter or a petition addressed to an official named Ptolemaios, *vel sim.*

### Text

recto

```plaintext
→ Πτολ[\(\ldots\)
παρα[\(\ldots\]
τ[\(\ldots\)
επ[\(\ldots\)
το[\(\ldots\)
πληρ[\(\ldots\)
εγλ[\(\ldots\)
αδυ[\(\ldots\)
εισι[\(\ldots\)
το[\(\ldots\)
```

### Notes

1.–2. If our text begins at line 1, then it may preserve the name of the addressee (Ptolemaios, Ptolemos, Ptolais *vel sim.*) in the Dative followed by his title, with the writer’s name, ethnic, *etc.* following in the Genitive in line 2 after παρά. The name Ptolemaios turns up elsewhere in the cache of Arsinoite papyri to which P.Duk.inv. 322 belongs (P.Duk.invs. 313–323). P.Duk.inv. 317v (b) (Arsinoite, II B.C.) is a petition to the *stratēgos* Ptolemaios from Petosiris, *kômogrammateus* of Oxyrhynchus, regarding extortion. In P.Duk.inv. 318 (*P.Thomas* 2 [Arsinoite, 180 B.C.]), this same *stratēgos* orders a *basilikos grammateus*, Nechoutes, to measure out some allotments of land to three cavalrymen. On the dating of Ptolemaios (*Pros.Ptol.* 312 + add. = 4316 + add.) see *P.Thomas* 2 p. 77 n. 2. While it is not outside the realm of possibility that P.Duk.inv. 322 is addressed to this same *stratēgos*, one can not be certain.
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