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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 πάντων ἁναγκαῖον | ἐστὶν δὲ (l. 2')] ἐπιστολῆς σε | [ἀσφάσσεται (ll. 3–5), as read in BL II.2 50. ἐστὶν is unparalleled in this position, and in this context ἁναγκαῖον normally construes with verbs in the aorist: cf. P.Oxy. LV 3806.3 (AD 15) ἁναγκαῖον ἔγνων; P.Köln VI 278.3f. (1st c. AD) ἁναγκαῖον ἂν ἂν δει (ll. 1–2). ἐστὶν may have been influenced from the infinitive ἀσφάλεσθαι, but this may be an error for ἀσφάλεσθαι (cf. BGU II 451.9).

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

In this letter of 223/222 BC12 Andron informs Milon that a certain Philon has not received twenty drachmas, because they have not found Pistokles: περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐκεκόμιστος Πιστοκλῆς γὰρ οὐχ ἐὑρήκειμεν (ll. 4–5). Πιστοκλῆς was normalized into Πιστοκλῆα in ed.pr. and into Πιστοκλῆν in Sel.Pap. I 96. On the online image13 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 ν, 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 Πιστοκλῆς; the accusative ending -ῆν 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 πάντῃ Παν[σ]έως ἐπιτυχὼν τοῦ πρὸς Ἰμᾶς γνομ[έ]γου περὶ τῶν παρὰ σοι πραγμάτων καὶ πρασσόμενών ταιχέως δήλωσον (ll. 3–6). Παν[σ]έως, 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]έως, i.e., the formula πάντῃ πάντως; cf. e.g. P.Oxf. 17.8 (2nd c. BC), where it is used with the imperative, or SB VI 9026.10 (2nd c.), with jussive subjunctive. Inspection of the original also allows reading γνομ[έ]γου in place of γνομ[έ]γον in line 4.

Another correction may be suggested for line 8: instead of Πάρις, on the original one may read the common female name Ταπίς.14

---

12 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.
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\(^{15}\) shows that at the lower right edge of the back side of the letter it is possible to read Ζήνονι.

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 (δὸς ἐργασίαν) that would probably benefit the person whose name the editors proposed to restore as Σμβείνῳ (?). This would have some (positive) effect for the sender himself: ἵνα καὶ | [ ? ] νος γένωμαι (ll. 5–6). I suggest restoring [ἀμέριμνος], perhaps preceded by αὐτός (less likely ἐγώ); cf. SB XIV 11372.14–15 (5\(^{th}/6\(^{th}\) c.) ἵνα (l. ἵνα) | ἀμέριμνος γένομαι (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.
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