



## Notes on letters

### Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

### Citation for published version (APA):

Sarri, A. (2014). Notes on letters: Korr. Tyche 754–761. *TYCHE - Contributions to Ancient History, Papyrology and Epigraphy*, 29, 264-265.

### Published in:

TYCHE - Contributions to Ancient History, Papyrology and Epigraphy

### Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact [uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk) providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.



## 757.–761. Antonia SARRI

## Notes on letters

## 757. P.Corn. 49

This letter probably comes from the Fayûm and dates from the first century AD. After the prescript (ll. 1–2), it begins with a common formulaic expression, [πρὸ π]άντων ἀναγκαῖόν | [ἔστι]ν δεῖ (l. δι') ἐπιστολῆς σε | [ἀσπ]άσσεσθαι (ll. 3–5), as read in BL II.2 50. ἐστίν is unparalleled in this position, and in this context ἀναγκαῖόν normally construes with verbs in the aorist: cf. P.Oxy. LV 3806.3 (AD 15) ἀναγκαῖον ἔγνω; P.Köln VI 278.3f. (1<sup>st</sup> c. AD) ἀναγκαῖον ἠγη[σάμην; sim. P.Freib. IV 57.3–4 (1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> c.), P.Herm. 4.3 (ca. 317–323). In view of the available space, we should probably restore [ἔγνω]ν. [ἔστι]ν may have been influenced from the infinitive [ἀσπ]άσσεσθαι, but this may be an error for ἀσπάσασθαι (cf. BGU II 451.9).

## 758. P.Eleph. 13 = Sel.Pap. I 96

In this letter of 223/222 BC<sup>12</sup> Andron informs Milon that a certain Philon has not received twenty drachmas, because they have not found Pistokles: περὶ δὲ τῶν εἴκοσι δραχμῶν οὐπω ἐκεκόμιστο Φίλων, Πιστοκλῆς [γ]ὰρ οὐχ εὐρήκειμεν (ll. 4–5). Πιστοκλῆς was normalized into Πιστοκλέα in *ed.pr.* and into Πιστοκλήν in Sel.Pap. I 96. On the online image<sup>13</sup> it appears that what was read as the final sigma of Πιστοκλῆς is a small right-facing curve, followed by abraded space. This is similar to the left leg of nu, which in this hand is sometimes curved, especially at the end of words; see the final ν of χαίρειν (l. 1), ὑγίαινον (l. 2), ἐκομισάμην (l. 2), οὖν (l. 3). We may thus read Πιστοκλήν; the accusative ending -ήν instead of -έα is common in the *koine* (see Mayser, *Grammatik* I.2, 40–41; Gignac, *Grammar* I, 71–2).

## 759. P.Heid. III 234

The body of this first/second century letter starts πάντη Παν[σέ]ως ἐπιτυχῶν τοῦ πρὸς | ἡμᾶς γινομ[έ]γου περὶ τῶν παρὰ σοὶ παραχθέντων καὶ πρᾶσσομένων ταχέως δήλωσον (ll. 3–6). Παν[σέ]ως, a rare name, was presumably introduced into the text on the assumption that the participle that followed needed an antecedent, but this is unnecessary. It would be preferable to read πάν[τ]ως, i.e., the formula πάντη πάντως; cf. e.g. P.Oxf. 17.8 (2<sup>nd</sup> c. BC), where it is used with the imperative, or SB VI 9026.10 (2<sup>nd</sup> c.), with jussive subjunctive. Inspection of the original also allows reading γεινομ[έ]γου in place of γινομ[έ]γου in line 4.

Another correction may be suggested for line 8: instead of Πᾶρις, on the original one may read the common female name Τραπις<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> It belongs to the archive of the *praktor* Milon, which was excavated at Elephantine but is related to Apollonopolis; see W. Clarysse, *The archive of the praktor Milon*, in K. Vandorpe, W. Clarysse (eds.), *Edfu, an Egyptian Provincial Capital in the Ptolemaic Period*, Brussels 2003, 17–27.

<sup>13</sup> <http://ipap.csad.ox.ac.uk/4DLink4/4DACTION/IPAPwebquery?vPub=P.Eleph.&vVol=&vNum=13>.

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.trismegistos.org/nam/detail.php?record=1226>.

## 760. P.Mich. I 22

This letter, sent from Dionysodoros to Zenon in 257 BC, has an address on the back that was not transcribed in *ed.pr.* The online image<sup>15</sup> shows that at the lower right edge of the back side of the letter it is possible to read Ζήνωνι.

## 761. SB XXVI 16462

Only the lower right part of this first/second century letter has survived. In lines 4–6, the sender requests that the addressee do something (δὲς ἐργασίαν) that would probably benefit the person whose name the editors proposed to restore as Σ]αβείνω (?). This would have some (positive) effect for the sender himself: ἵνα καὶ | [ ? ]νος γένωμαι (ll. 5–6). I suggest restoring [ἀμέριμ]νος, perhaps preceded by αὐτός (less likely ἐγώ); cf. SB XIV 11372.14–15 (5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> c.) εἶνα (l. ἵνα) | ἀμέριμνος γένωμε (l. γένωμαι). The ἐργασία that the sender asked the addressee to undertake for the benefit of Sabinos would relieve the sender from his own worries.

Antonia SARRI

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://wwwapp.cc.columbia.edu/ldpd/apis/item?mode=item&key=michigan.apis.1808>.