

## 8

# Two Greek Documents from Provincia Arabia

NAPHTALI LEWIS

One of the most productive archaeological sites of the Judean desert was the northern cliff of Naḥal Ḥever. Cave 5/6 (so designated for its two entrances) was first explored in 1953. During the 1960 campaign there was found in it a bundle of fifteen letters—14 in Hebrew and Aramaic, 1 in Greek—relating to the famous Bar Kochba<sup>1</sup> revolt of A.D. 134. The following year “the Cave of the Letters,” as it was now dubbed, yielded thirty-five more documents—6 Nabatean, 3 Aramaic, 17 Greek and 9 Greek with Aramaic or Nabatean signatures. These range in date from A.D. 93 to 132, i.e., the last dozen years of the Nabatean monarchy under King Rabel II and the first quarter century during which the area formed part of the new Roman province of Arabia.

Brief summaries of some of the documents were given in the reports of the finds.<sup>2</sup> Three of the Greek texts have since been published in toto, with translation and commentary in modern Hebrew.<sup>3</sup> No. 1, dated in A.D. 125, is a double document drawn up before witnesses; in it a mother proposes to the guardians of her orphan son an arrangement which would result in tripling the amount of money spent on his maintenance. No. 2, dated seven years later, is a receipt issued by the same mother to one of the guardians for three months’ maintenance money. No. 3 is a Greek

<sup>1</sup> These letters use his real patronymic, Bar Kos(e)ba. A simple velarization of the sibilant produced the more familiar Bar Kochba, “son of a star,” his messianic sobriquet as leader of the revolt.

<sup>2</sup> *Israel Exploration Journal* 11 (1961) 36–52, 12 (1962) 227–262; *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 17 (1963) 227–241. See also E. Koffmahn, *Die Doppelurkunden aus der Wüste Juda (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 5, 1968).

<sup>3</sup> H. J. Polotsky, *Eretz Israel* 8 (1967) 46–51. A privately produced English translation of some of Polotsky’s notes was made available to me through the kind offices of Professor Gerald M. Browne. *SB X* 10288 reprints the Greek texts together with English translations (by Y. Yadin) of the Aramaic and Nabatean signatures.

rendering—in duplicate—of the Latin formula of an *actio tutelae*, paralleling the examples recorded in Gaius 4.40–51.

The many-faceted interest and importance of the three documents were promptly signaled in a review (the only one to date, as far as I know) by E. Seidl,<sup>4</sup> who concluded his brief account by calling on paleographers, philologists and historians to join in the study of these unique texts. But until now only jurists have responded to his appeal, and their principal concern, understandably, has been with No. 3.<sup>5</sup> The present article considers No. 3 only incidentally and concentrates on Nos. 1 and 2.

I. *The Hands.* The hands of the three documents show no essential differences from those of contemporary documents written in Egypt. This observation comes as no surprise, but adds new confirmation to what had become apparent early in the history of papyrology: as Schubart put it fifty years ago, the Avroman parchments and a Berlin papyrus (*BGU* III 913) from Myra in Asia Minor had revealed “dass die Schrift überall in der griechischen Welt sich annähernd gleich weiter gebildet hat.”<sup>6</sup> This is not to deny, as Schubart immediately added, the evidence of local or individual characteristics.

Each of the three documents under discussion is clearly the work of a skilled writer of Greek. Nos. 1 and 2, though not by the same hand, are both upright scripts making limited use of ligature, not unlike *P.Gr.Berol.* 22a in general appearance but less elegant or regular. No. 3 is a more rapid and slanting cursive.

II. *The People.* The men and women who appear in these documents are not Roman citizens but provincials, *peregrini*. With the possible exception of the writer of No. 2, they all bear Semitic names. The one exception may be more apparent than real: since his father's name was Judas it is more than likely that Germanos, as he signs himself, was but a Hellenization of a Semitic given name.

Some of the names are simply transliterated into Greek, e.g., Βαβαθα, Βαβελί. Others, like Μαναήμος and Ἐλεάζαρος, are familiar Biblical

<sup>4</sup> *SDHI* 33 (1967) 550–552. A concise and penetrating appraisal is the one-paragraph bibliographical notice by J. Modrzejewski, *RHD* 46 (1968) 159 (quoted in part below, note 10).

<sup>5</sup> E. Seidl, *Studi in onore di G. Grosso* II (Turin, 1968) 345–361; M. Lemosse, *The Irish Jurist* 3 (1968) 363–376 and *RHD* 47 (1969) 291–293; A. Biscardi, *Studi in onore di G. Scherillo* I (Milan, 1972) 111–152 and *Atti del seminario romanistico internazionale* (Perugia, 1972) 45–61; H. J. Wolff, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II (forthcoming: cf. *Sav. Zeitschr.* 91 [1974] 409 n. 11 and 412 n. 24). [See Postscript.]

<sup>6</sup> W. Schubart, *Griechische Paläographie (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* I.4, 1925), p. 72.

names which, while indeclinable in the LXX and in the NT when referring to OT figures, appear here with Greek declensional endings, in keeping with normal contemporary practice.<sup>7</sup> The names *Ἰουδας*, *Ἰωάνης*, *Ἰωσήπος* and *Σίμων* appear in their familiar declensional forms, but *Ἰησοῦς*, which in the NT has the genitive *Ἰησοῦ*, appears here in two other declensions, *Ἰησοῦτος* and *Ἰησοῦου*.<sup>8</sup> Interesting also is the form *Χαθουσίων*, which renders Ktushion (as it appears in an Aramaic signature) by a metathesis of aspirates.<sup>9</sup>

III. *The Language*. However its presence among these papers is interpreted, No. 3 constitutes startling evidence of Roman law being invoked or applied in a remote Semitic milieu of Rome's remotest eastern province. Other elements in these proceedings, as the legal commentators have emphasized, do not conform to Roman procedure and are presumably governed by or attributable to Greek or local practice.<sup>10</sup>

The Greek idiom of these documents displays a similar mixture, containing some demonstrable Semitisms and some turns of phrase that look strikingly like translations of Latin.

A. Semitisms. The most obvious Semitism occurs in No. 1.3-5 and 17-20, *ἐμαρτυροποιήσατο Βαβαθᾶ . . . λέγουσα*. The addition of the participle is one of the most familiar Hebraisms of the LXX and NT.<sup>11</sup> Equally striking is the repeated omission of the definite article in places where normal Greek usage requires it, e.g., *ὑπὸ βουλῆς* in Nos. 1.5 and 19 and 2.7. Again, in lines 6 and 21 of No. 1 we read *τροφῖα πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν τόκου ἀργυρίου αὐτοῦ*, "maintenance in proportion to the amount of interest on his money." The omission of the article with nouns governing a genitive is a Semitism found in the LXX and NT,<sup>12</sup> and the quoted phrase—the more striking as the text continues in normal Greek

<sup>7</sup> So already in Josephus and the NT: cf. e.g., R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* §§53, 55; A. Debrunner, *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* II, 2d ed. by A. Scherer (Sammlung Göschen 114/114a), p. 90.

<sup>8</sup> According to Y. Yadin, *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 17 (1963) 235, one of the unpublished documents has the variant *Ἰησοῦου*.

<sup>9</sup> Normally, of course, the Greek simply drops the Semitic aspirations, for which it has no counterpart: thus Yeshua *Ἰησοῦς*, Yohana *Ἰωάνης*, etc.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. E. Seidl, *loc. cit.* (note 5) 356; M. Lemosse, *The Irish Jurist* 3 (1968) 367 and *RHD* 47 (1969) 291. In the words of J. Modrzejewski, *RHD* 46 (1968) 159, "Ces textes grecs . . . témoignent, par leur langue, d'une forte hellénisation et, quant au fond, d'une pénétration très poussée du droit romain dans les milieux juifs de Palestine à la veille de la révolte de Bar Kochba."

<sup>11</sup> See e.g., R. W. Funk, *op. cit.* §§397(3) and 420 (cf. esp. John 1:32, *ἐμαρτύρησεν λέγων*).

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* §259.

with the article (*καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῦ*)—is perhaps an instance of that usage. Both in literature (e.g., Polybius 3.14.10) and in the *koine* of the papyri from Egypt, corresponding expressions generally omit the article before *δύναμις* or its equivalent but include it before the following nouns. This is not, however, an absolute rule: in *P.Lond.* 1164k.10 (A.D. 212), for example, a debt is described as *κεφαλαίου δραχμῶν διαχειλίων καὶ τόκων [α]ὐτῶν*.<sup>13</sup> Later in No. 1 (lines 7, 9, 22–23 and 26) we find *τόκον τοῦ ἀργυρίου*, where the first noun remains without the article but the second has it in the normal Greek style. Again, lines 12 and 30 have *εἰς δικαίωμα κέρδους ἀργυρίου*, with no articles. The expression *μακαριωτάτοις καιροῖς* omits the article in line 10 but has *τοῖς* in line 27.

Another kind of Semitism found in the NT is the omission of the article with an abstract noun.<sup>14</sup> This usage may explain the following locutions in No. 1 where the want of the article is felt: *πρὸς ὀμειλίαν* (6 and 22), *καιροῖς ἡγεμονείας* (10 and 27), *περὶ τῆς ἀπειθαρχείας ἀποδόσεως* (11 and 28). Also suggestive of non-Greek influence is the grammatical construction of the body (lines 5–13 = 20–31) of No. 1, a series of clauses loosely strung together, seemingly into a single clumsy sentence. See further below, 8 = 24–25 n.

B. Possible Latinisms. In attempting to discern the reason or reasons for such frequent omission of the Greek article, consideration should also be given to the possibility that some of the relevant expressions were translated from, or influenced by, Latin originals, where there would of course be no articles. However unexpected or startling the information may be, No. 3 leaves no room to doubt the presence of legal Latin in the area; to which we can add, of course, the Latin of the governor's office and of his army of occupation.

In addition to the omission of the definite article, other elements in documents Nos. 1 and 2 that may reflect Latin influence are the following:<sup>15</sup>

a) 1.1 and 14–15, 2.1. Dating by the Roman consuls and calendar was uncommon in the Greek East prior to the middle of the third century. In the papyri from Egypt there are more than two dozen consular dates from 43 B.C. to the death of Hadrian, and all but three are in Latin documents (mostly relating to military affairs). Of the three Greek documents, two (*BGU* IV 1074, *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2476), though they refer to the consuls of A.D. 43, were actually written in the middle of the third century; and the

<sup>13</sup> The article is also omitted when the rate of interest is specified: *τόκων δραχμιαίων, τόκων τριωβολείων*, etc.

<sup>14</sup> Funk, *op. cit.* §258.

<sup>15</sup> I must leave to the competence of others to say whether any of these can be traced to local language or custom.

third (*BGU I 140* = *Chrest.Mitt.* 373 = *FIRA I 78*; A.D. 119), Hadrian's letter to the prefect Rammius Martialis regarding inheritance rights of the children of soldiers who die intestate, identifies itself at the outset as ἀν[τί]γρα(φον) ἐπιστ[ολ](ῆς) τοῦ κυρίου με]θηρμ[ην]ευμένης [ἐκ τῶν 'Ρω-μαικ]ῶν.

Thus, the dating by the Roman consuls in these transactions among non-Romans may reflect a wider and earlier use of Latin formula, perhaps under the impact of a military occupation (see also *e*, below), than papyri and inscriptions from other parts of the Roman East would lead us to expect. Two Greek documents from the Murabb'at caves, drawn up in the neighboring province of Judaea some 150 kms. from the Ma(h)oza of Nos. 1 and 2, also have consular dates. *P.Jud.Des.* 114 (A.D. 171?), a loan between parties at least one of whom is a soldier λεγεῶνος δεκάτης (and hence also a Roman citizen), has only the consular dating; *P.Jud.Des.* 115 (A.D. 124), a marriage contract between Jews, has the regnal year of Hadrian (in the same titulature as 1.1 and 14, cf. note *ad loc.*) followed by the consular dating.<sup>16</sup>

b) 1.6 and 21. In the papyri from Egypt (which regularly have the idiomatic κατὰ δύναμιν) the expression πρὸς δύναμιν does not occur before the fifth century, by which time the Greek *koine* shows many Latin intrusions. Does πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν in 1.6 and 21 render the Latin *ad valorem*? In *Corp.Gloss.Lat.* κατὰ δύναμιν is equated with *pro viribus*. While the expression δύναμις χρημάτων is not unknown in Greek,<sup>17</sup> our text may be rendering *vis argenti*, a Latin expression that occurs, for example, in Cicero.<sup>18</sup>

c) 1.7 and 23. To express a rate such as "one half-denarius (τροπαικόν) per hundred denarii" the *koine* uses ἀνά, ἐκ and ὡς (as in lines 9 and 26), never εἰς.<sup>19</sup> Nor can our text be explained in terms of classical Greek usage, where εἰς preceding a numeral expresses an upper limit or approximation.<sup>20</sup> Is εἰς here perhaps a translation of Latin *ad*?<sup>21</sup>

d) In the documents from Roman Egypt the legal guardian of a child is called ἐπίτροπος (= *tutor*), but a (non-Roman) woman transacts

<sup>16</sup> The texts are reprinted in E. Koffmahn, *op. cit.* (note 2), pp. 90 and 126. Comparable evidence from Dura-Europos is later in date, the excavation having yielded no Greek documents from the first Roman occupation of A.D. 115-117. The earliest relevant document is *P.Dura* 25, of A.D. 180, which is dated by the consuls, the emperor's regnal year and the local (Seleucid) era.

<sup>17</sup> It occurs, for example, in Herodotus 7.9, and is restored in *Chrest.Mitt.* 284.

<sup>18</sup> *De prov. cons.* 2.4 and *Tusc. disp.* 5.32.91.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. E. Mayser, *Grammatik* II.2, 44 and index s.vv.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *LSJ* s.v. III.2.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. εἰς ἔτος = *ad annum*, *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* s.v.

business *μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ δεῖνα*. This *κύριος* is normally her husband if she has one and he is on the scene, but we find the role filled by all manner of men, including even sons who are minors. In the Babatha archive only her husband is styled *κύριος*,<sup>22</sup> apparently a literal use of the term, since he alone is her "lord." In Nos. 1 and 2, where she is a widow, her transactional guardian is styled *ἐπίτροπος*, the same term that is used for the guardians of her young orphan son. This identity of terminology corresponds to Roman usage, where the same word, *tutor*, serves in both kinds of guardianship, *tutor impuberis* and *tutor mulieris*.

ε) 1.38. *Librarius* is not only a Latin word, but its only previous occurrences in papyri earlier than the fourth century have been as military secretaries.<sup>23</sup> It is thus at least possible, and perhaps likely, that there was a military detachment in the immediate area and No. 1 was drawn up for the illiterate parties by the secretary of the detachment adding to his income by a bit of "moonlighting."<sup>24</sup>

IV. *The Provincial Administration*. Arabia, annexed to the empire in A.D. 106 after being seized by a Roman army under A. Cornelius Palma, is the Roman province about which our information is scantiest. The new information contained in the documents from "the Cave of the Letters," as outlined in the preliminary reports, includes distinct evidence of administrative changes introduced when the area passed from Nabatean to Roman rule.<sup>25</sup>

If—and it is still a very big if—the language of these documents does turn out to reflect Latin influences, the establishment of such a fact, coupled with the undoubted element of Roman law recorded in No. 3, would amount to a quantum leap in our knowledge of the provincial administration, suggesting a significant parallelism between Arabia and the other new province that Trajan organized at almost the same time,

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Y. Yadin, *loc. cit.* (note 8) 239.

<sup>23</sup> *BGU* 423 = *Chrest. Wilck.* 480.29; *P. Mich.* VIII 466.27 and 29; *SB* X 10530.11-12.

<sup>24</sup> The legionary headquarters were at Bostra, but detachments were garrisoned at other strategic points in the province: cf. *R-E* 12, col. 1511, *P. Mich.* VIII 466, and for the same practice in Roman Egypt see now R. S. Bagnall, *BASP* 12 (1975) 135-144, esp. 138, and *O. Florida (GRBS Monograph 7, 1976)*, pp. 23-29. On the identity of the legion in Arabia at this time (previously thought to be the III Cyrenaica [*R-E* 12, col. 1510, *P. Mich.* VIII 466.29 note]), see now below, note 25.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. above, note 2, and esp. Y. Yadin, *loc. cit.* (note 8) 231. The evidence on the annexation date and the identity of the initial garrison of the new province was recently reviewed by G. W. Bowersock, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 37-47. He concludes that the date was in fact A.D. 106, and that Legio III Cyrenaica, still attested in Egypt in A.D. 127, was transferred to Arabia a few years later, "in connection with the revolt of Bar Kochba" (p. 43).

Dacia. Although Dacia lay east of the Adriatic, adjacent to that half of the Roman empire which remained Greek in language and institutions, its peoples had been but lightly touched by Hellenic influences; it was, accordingly, organized like the Latin-speaking western instead of the Greek-speaking eastern provinces. For Arabia the first published documents from "the Cave of the Letters" offer a suggestion of a similar, though not identical, pattern of organization: the *lingua franca* of the area was of course and remained Greek, but Roman legal institutions—expressed in Greek and adapted to local custom, to be sure—were spread into this hitherto sparsely populated region along with the new Roman military presence.<sup>26</sup>

TEXTS<sup>27</sup>

*N.B.* Interchange of *ει* and *ι*, frequent in both documents, is not separately noted in the apparatus.

No. 1

Ca. 33 × 30 cm.

October 11 or 12, A.D. 125

- [<sup>1</sup> Ἔτους ἐν]άτου Ἀυτοκράτορο[ς] Τραιαοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ  
ἐπὶ ὑπάτων Μάρκου Οὐαλερίου Ἀσιατικοῦ τὸ β̄ καὶ Τιτίου Ἀκυλείνου πρὸ  
τεσσ[ά-]  
2 [ρων εἰ]δῶν Ὀκτωβρίων, κατὰ δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῆς ἐπαρχείας Ἀραβίας  
ἔτους εἰκοστοῦ μηνὸς Ὑπερβερεταίου λεγομένου Θεσερεί τετάρτη καὶ  
εἰκά-  
[δι, ἐν Μα]ωζα περὶ Ζοαραν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιβεβλημένων μαρτύρων ἐμαρτυρο-  
ποίησατο Βαβαθᾶ Σίμωνος τοῦ Μαναήμου κατὰ Ἰωάνου Ἰω-  
4 [σήπου το]ῦ <καὶ> Ἐγλᾶ [κ]αὶ Ἀβδοοβδᾶ Ἐλλογθα ἐπιτρόπων Ἰησοῦ  
Ἰησοῦτος υἱοῦ αὐτῆς ὀρφανοῦ κατασταθέντων τῷ αὐτῷ ὀρφανῷ ὑ[πὸ]  
[βο]υλ[η]ῆς {β[ου]λῆς} τῶν Πετραίων, π[α]ρόντων τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιτρόπων,  
λέγουσα διὰ τῶ ὑμᾶς μὴ δεδωκέναι τῷ υἱῷ μ[ου] ± 6 ]  
6 [ ± 8 ] τροφία πρὸς τῆν δ[ύ]ναμιν Ἰ[σ]ακίου ἀργυρίου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν  
λοιπῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῦ καὶ μάλιστα πρὸς ὀμειλίαν ἦν .ικο. [ 2-3 ]  
[ ± 8 ] ον [κ]αὶ μὴ χ[ο]ρ[η]γ[εῖν] αὐτῷ τόκον τοῦ ἀργυρίου εἰ μὴ τροπαι-  
εικὸν ἓνα εἰς ἓκατὸν δηνάρια, ἔχουσα ὑπάρχοντα ἀξιώ-  
8 [χρεα τούτ]ου τοῦ ἀργυρίου οὗ ἔχετε τοῦ ὀρφανοῦ, διὸ προεμαρτυροποίησα  
ἵνα εἰ δοκεῖ ὑμῖν δοῦναι μοι τὸ ἀργύριον

<sup>26</sup> Such an organizational concept would explain at least some of the apparent legal anomalies of the documents, e.g., "la condition des parties, qui ne sont pas citoyens romains et qui s'adressent à la juridiction du légat d'Arabie, la procédure utilisée . . . qui, à Rome, est en droit classique du ressort de la procédure *extra ordinem* et non de *l'actio tutelae*" (M. Lemosse, *RHD* 47 [1969] 291).

<sup>27</sup> In addition to the plates of the *ed. pr.* (above note 3), I was able to use a pair of excellent photographs very kindly lent me by Professor H. J. Polotsky. My text does not seriously differ from that of the *ed. pr.* in No. 2; the differences in No. 1 are noted in the appropriate places.

- [δι' ἀσφαλείας περι ὑποθήκης τῶν] ὑπαρχόντων μου χορηγοῦσα τόκον τοῦ ἀργυρίου ὡς ἑκατὸν δην[α]ρίω[ν δηνάριον ἔν]
- 10 [ἦμισυ, ὅθεν λαμπρῶς διασωθῆ] μου ὁ υἱὸς εὐχ[αρι]στοῦντα μακαριωτάτοις καιροῖς ἡγ[ε]μων[ε]ίας 'Ι[ουλι]ῶ[ν] 'Ιουλιανὸς ἡγε-  
[μῶνος ἐπὶ οὐδὲν περι τῆς ἀπειθαρχε]ίας ἀποδόσεως τῶν τροφίων παρ-  
η[γ]ειλ. τ. ἡ Βαβαθᾶ 'Ιωάνη [τ]ῶ προγ[ε]ρ[α]μμένω]
- 12 [ἐνεί τῶν ἐπιτρόπων τοῦ ὄρφαν]οῦ. [[καί]] 'εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἔσται' τοῦτο τὸ μαρτυροποίημα [[ἐγένετο]] εἰς δικαίωμα κέρδους ἀργυρίου τοῦ ὄρφα-  
[νοῦ] vacat
- 14 ['Ἐτους ἐνάτου Αὐτοκράτορος] Τραιανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ ἐπὶ ὑπάτ[ω]ν [Μάρκου Οὐαλερίου] Ἀσιατικοῦ τὸ β' καὶ Τιτίου Ἀκυλείνου πρὸ τ[ε]σσάρων ἐξιδῶν [Ὁκ]τ[ω]-  
βρίων, κατὰ δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῆς ἐπαρχείας]
- 16 [Ἀραβίας ἔτους εἰκοστοῦ μηνὸς 'Υ]περ[β]ρη[ε]ταιοῦ λεγομένου Θεσερ[ε]ῖ [τ]ε[τ]άρ[η] καὶ εἰκάδι ἐν Μαωζα περι [Ζοαραν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιβεβλη]μένων μαρτύρων ἐμαρτυροποίησατο Βαβαθᾶ Σίμωνος τοῦ Μανα-
- 18 [ἦμου κατὰ 'Ιωάνου 'Ιωσή]που τοῦ <καί> 'Εγλᾶ καὶ Ἀβδορβδα 'Ελλουθα ἐπιτρόπων 'Ιησοῦ 'Ιησοῦτος [υἱοῦ αὐτῆς ὄρφανοῦ κατασ]ταθέντων τῶ αὐτῶ ὄρφανῶ ὑπὸ βουλῆς τῶν [Πετραίων, παρόντων]
- 20 [τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιτρόπων,] λέγουσα διὰ τὸ ὑμᾶς μὴ δεδωκέναι τῶ υἱῶ [μου] . . . δ. [ 1-2 ]. [ vacat? ]  
[τροφία πρὸς τὴν δύν]αμιν τόκου [ἀ]ργυρίου [αὐ]τοῦ [κ]αὶ [τῶν] λοιπῶ[ν] ὑ[πα]ρχόντων αὐτοῦ]
- 22 [κ]α[ὶ] μ[ε]τὰ [ἴ]στα πρὸς ὀμειλία[ν] ἦν [ ± 10 ]ορ[ ± 6 καὶ μὴ χορηγεῖν αὐτῶ τόκον] τρ[ὶ] ἀργυρίου εἰ μὴ τροπαι[ε]ικὸν ἕνα εἰς ἑκατὸν δηνάριον, ἕ[χουσα] ὑπ[ε]ρχο[ν]τα ἀξί[ο]χρεα]
- 24 τρ[ὶ]ορ[ ± 6 καὶ μὴ χορηγεῖν αὐτῶ τόκον] οὐ ἔχετε τοῦ ὄρφανοῦ, διὸ προεμαρτυροποίησα ἵνα εἰ δοκεῖ ὑμῖν δοῦναι μ[οι] τὸ ἀργύριον δι' ἀσφαλείας ' . . . ' περι ὑποθήκης τῶν ὑπαρχόντων μου χορη-
- 26 [γ]οῦσα τῶν τῶν ἀργυρίου ὡς ἑκατὸν δηνάριον δηνάριον ἔν ἡμισυ, ὅθεν λαμπρῶς διασω-  
θ[ῆ] μου ὁ υἱὸς εὐχ[αρι]στῶν τοῖς μακαριωτάτοις καιροῖς ἡγεμων[ε]ίας 'Ιουλι[ο]ῦ 'Ιουλιανοῦ
- 28 ἡγεμῶνος ἐπὶ οὐδὲν περι τῆς ἀπειθαρχείας ἀποδόσεως τῶν τροφίων παρήν-  
γειλα ἐγὼ Βα-  
βαθᾶ 'Ιωάνη τῶ προγεγραμμένω ἐνεί τῶν ἐπιτρόπων τοῦ ὄρφανοῦ. εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἔσται
- 30 τοῦτο [τὸ μαρτυρο]ποίημα εἰς δικαίωμα κέρδους ἀργυρίου τοῦ ὄρφανοῦ εἰ διδόντες ἡ . . . εμα[ ± 4 ἐμαρ]τυροποίησατο ἡ Βαβαθᾶ ὡς προγεγραπται διὰ ἐπιτρόπου αὐτῆς τοῦδε

10 l. εὐχριστῶν (cf. line 27).

10, 11, 27, 28 l. ἡγεμον-.

24 ἵνα Pap.

27 ἰουλιου

Pap.



- 32 τοῦ πράγματο[ρ]ς Ἰούδου Χα]θουσιώνος ὃς παρῶν ὑπέγραψεν. (2nd hd.)  
 Βαβαθᾶς Σίμωνος ἐμαρτυροποιησάμη<ν>  
 κατὰ Ἰωάνου Ἐγλᾶ καὶ Ἀ<βδ>αοβδα Ἐλλουθα ἐπιτρόπων Ἴησοῦς  
 υ<ι>ο<υ> μου ὄρφανοῦ δι' ἐπιτρόπου μου Ἰούδα
- 34 Χαθουσιώνος ἀκολ[ο]ύθως τα<ι>ς προγεγραμμένα<ι>ς ἐρέσασιν. Ἐλεάζ-  
 αρος Ἐλεαζάρου ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς  
 ἐρωτηθεῖς διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς μὴ ε<ι>δένα<ι> γράμματα. *vacat*
- 36 (1st hd.) καὶ ἐπεβάλοντο μάρτυρες ἑπτά. Aramaic signature  
Nabataean signature
- 38 ὁ δὲ γράψας τοῦτο Θεενᾶς Σίμωνος λιβλάριος. Aramaic signature

32 ὑπέγραψεν: ψ corrected. 33 l. ἐπιτρόπων, Ἰησοῦ. 34 l. αἰρέσασιν. 35 l. αὐτήν.

#### TRANSLATION

In the ninth year of Emperor Traianus Hadrianus Caesar Augustus, in the consulship of M. Valerius Asiaticus for the second time and Titus Aquilinus four days before the Ides of October, and according to the reckoning of the province Arabia in the twentieth year the twenty-fourth of the month Hyperberetaios (locally) called Thisri, in Maḥoza-by-Zoara, before the attesting witnesses,

Babatha daughter of Simon son of Menaḥem testified against John son of Joseph *alias* Egl(a)s(?) and Abdobdat son of Illuta, guardians of her orphan son Jesus son of Jesus appointed for the said orphan by the town-council of Petra, in the presence of the said guardians, declaring:

In view of the fact that you have not provided my orphan(?) son with suitable(?) maintenance money in proportion to the quantity of interest on his money and the rest of his property—and especially in relation to . . .—and that you allocate to him no interest on the money except one half-denarius per hundred denarii—

Now, I have property equivalent in value to this money of the orphan that you hold (in trust), wherefore I previously testified to the effect that, if you agree to give me the money on security of a mortgage of my property, I will furnish interest on the money at one and a half denarii per hundred denarii, whence my son can be maintained splendidly, rendering thanks to the(se) most blessed times of the governorship of the governor Iulius Iulianus, before whom I, Babatha, sought a summons against the aforementioned John, one of the guardians of the orphan, for his refusal to pay out the (appropriate) maintenance money. Otherwise, this attestation will serve as legal evidence of profit from the money of the orphan if they give . . .

Babatha has testified as aforestated through her guardian for this matter, Judas son of Ktushion, who was present and subscribed. (2d hand)

I, Babatha daughter of Simon, have testified through my guardian Judas son of Ktushion against John son of Eglā(s?) and Abdobdat son of Illuta, guardians of my orphan son Jesus, according to the aforesaid conditions. I, Eleazar son of Eleazar, have written for her at her request, in view of the fact that she is illiterate. (1st hand) And there were applied (the signatures of) seven witnesses.

(Aramaic) Yehudah son of Ktushion "lord of Babatha" in his presence testified Babatha according to the written above. Yehudah has written this.

(Nabatean) Abdobdat son of Illuta, in my presence and in the presence of my colleague Yoḥana the son of Eglā, we wrote this testimony according to the above written. Abdobdat has written this.

(Aramaic) Yehohanan the son of Alex in the hand of Yehoseph his son. He who wrote this is Theēnas son of Simon, *librarius*.

#### NOTES

1 (and 14) This version of Hadrian's nomenclature is found only here and in *P. Jud. Des.* 115, the closest parallels elsewhere being *ὁ κύριος Τραιανὸς Ἀδριανὸς Καῖσαρ* and Imp. Traianus Hadrianus: cf. P. Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales*.

On the consular dating see above, §IIIB.

1-2 There is a discrepancy of one day in the date. In the calendar of Rome "four days before the Ides" designates October 12th; in that of the province of Arabia, Hyperberetaios 24th corresponds to October 11th (cf. *R-E* 10, col. 1595; A. E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology* [*Handb. d. Altertumswiss.* 1.7] 177). A note in the *ed. pr.* suggests that the discrepancy may be due to the fact that A.D. 124 was a leap year. It is hardly likely, however, that the intercalary day would still affect the calendar ten months after the end of the leap year.

2 *εἰκά[s ed. pr.*, noting the occurrence of the nominative in another (unpublished) document written on the same day.

3 (and 16) The village name Ma(h)ozā is new. Zoara, here a first-declension feminine, appears in No. 2 as Zoora, apparently neuter plural. According to Ptolemy's map, it lay southeast of and not far from Petra. Details (including a different localization by some modern scholars) are summarized by M. Lemosse, *The Irish Jurist* 3 (1968) 366 n. 3.

3 (and 17) *ἐπιβάλλω* does not occur in this context in the papyri from Roman Egypt (where we find e.g., *διὰ τῶν ὑπογεγραμμένων μαρτύρων*, *P. Oxy.* 2131. 3), but *P. Dura* 26.5 has *ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιβεβλημένων καὶ ἐσφραγισμένων ἀνδρῶν*, and in *P. Dura* 18.34 there is among the witnesses' signatures the notation *ἐπεβαλόμην*: see further the Dura editor's comments pp. 103, 140.

3-4 (and 18) *'Eglā*: a new name, with nominative presumably in *-as* (but the Nabatean signature in line 38 has Eglā).

The filiation stated here is John son of Joseph son of Eglās. Everywhere else, both in Greek and in Aramaic (1.33 and 38, 2.6 and 11-12), he is styled John son of Eglās or John son of Joseph. This suggests that Joseph and Eglās are alternative names, and that we should accordingly read *'Ιωσήπου τοῦ <καὶ> 'Eglā* in 1.3-4 and 18.

4 (also 12, 18-19, 29, 33) *ἐπιτρόπων . . . ὄρφανοῦ*: There is no indication of how old

the boy was at this time, but he was still under guardianship seven years later, when No. 2 was written.

4-5 (and 19-20) In Roman Egypt guardians were appointed by the grammateus (metro)poleos, the strategos, or the exegetes (usually acting for a higher official): see most recently *BASP* 7 (1970) 116-118. At Rome and elsewhere appointment was normally by municipal magistrates, but possible involvement of the municipal council is suggested by a quotation from Ulpian in *Digest* 27.8.1. pr., *si a magistratibus municipalibus tutor datus sit, non videtur per ordinem electus*. Thus, while the present instance of appointment by the boule of Petra is unprecedented in extant documents, it may not be "une règle tout-à-fait particulière" (M. Lemosse, *loc. cit.* 368; similarly "jamais d'un conseil," 369). Cf. E. Sachers' monograph-length article "Tutela" in *R-E* 7A, esp. col. 1514.

5 (and 20) M. Lemosse's suggestion (*loc. cit.* 366 n. 4), however qualified, that the words *λέγουσα* *διὰ* may indicate a sworn declaration seems far-fetched. On *λέγουσα* see above, §III A.

5 At the end supply perhaps *ὄρφανού*, paralleling the expression in lines 4 and 33. See further below, 20 n.

5-6 (and 20-22) The obligation that Babatha here charges the guardians with violating is succinctly expressed in one of the *Adriani sententiae* (*Ἀδριανού ἀποφάσεις*): *Adrianus dixit curatori: "propter hoc ergo datus es, ut fame neces pupillum? pro modo ergo facultatis alimenta ei praesta."* (*Ἀδριανὸς εἶπεν τῷ φροντιστῇ· διὰ τοῦτο οὖν ἐδόθ(η)ς, ἵνα λιμῶ πν(ί)ξης τὸν ὄρφανόν; κατὰ δύναμιν οὖν τῆς ὑποστάσεως τροφία αὐτῷ παρέχε.*) *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* III, 36, 5-14.

6 The restoration *ἐπιτήδεια*] is suggested by the sense and perhaps by the remnants at the corresponding point in line 20.

6 (and 22) After *ὀμείλιαν* in line 6 eta is clear. The following letter, according to the indications of line 22, ought to be nu; if so it is a curiously distorted nu, the only such example of a letter that is formed quite regularly throughout. In what follows the letters *κο* stand out clearly, preceded by a letter, clear but with its top gone, which may be gamma or sigma or tau, and followed by the bottom tip of a letter that may be iota, sigma, tau, upsilon (most likely) or even chi. The attempt to read the beginning as *ει* (yielding e.g., *εἰκότ[ως]*) finds its obstacle in the fact that the presumed iota does not descend below the line, which it does everywhere else in the *ει* combination. [See Postscript.]

The loss of what follows leaves unclear whether *ὀμίλια* refers here to general local practice or more specifically to this wealthy family's social standing (compare *ὑπόστασις* in the *Adriani sententia* above).

7 (and 23) The word for one-half denarius, here masculine, has previously occurred as a neuter.

Assuming that the interest is here stated *per mensem* (the standard Greek and Roman practice),<sup>28</sup> Babatha's complaint is that the guardians, who are presumably receiving interest at least at the standard rate of one per cent per month, are spending only half of that on her son's maintenance. See further below, 12 n.

8 (and 24-25) As Polotsky points out in a footnote of the *ed. pr.*, the *ἵνα* clause is a hybrid conflate of two constructions, (1) *εἰ δοκεῖ ὑμῖν δοῦναι* and (2) *ἵνα, εἰ δοκεῖ ὑμῖν, δώτε*.

9 (and 26) On the Greek ending *-ν* for *-ιον*, in evidence from at least the third century B.C., see E. Mayer, *Grammatik* I.2, pp. 15-16.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. e.g., *WB* s.v. *τόκος*, *CIL* III p. 930 no. 3 = *FIRA* III 123.

9-10 (and 26) In contrast to the guardians, whom she accuses of spending far less than the interest actually received on the invested funds (cf. above, 7 n.), Babatha here offers to pay out three times as much if the administration of the funds is turned over to her. It may be that this higher-than-normal rate is evidence of frontier conditions, with investment capital scarce and at a premium. See further below, 12 n.

10 (and 27) Although Iulius Iulianus "cannot be identified with certainty with any of the known bearers of that name,"<sup>29</sup> it is at least worth noting that he may have been a son or grandson (*R-E* 10 col. 158, no. 61) of Ti. Iulius Alexander. Favoring such an identification are the longstanding business interests of the family in the Red Sea region,<sup>30</sup> and evidence of prominent governmental careers exercised wholly or nearly so in the Egypt-Judea-Arabia geographical triangle: We have long known, for example, that Ti. Iulius Alexander was first epistrategos of the Thebaid and then procurator in Judea before becoming prefect of Egypt; and now we find in one of the unpublished documents from "The Cave of the Letters" that the governor of Arabia in A.D. 130 was named Haterius Nepos,<sup>31</sup> no doubt the son of the prefect of Egypt of A.D. 120-124. Such a regional policy in governance may well have been the concomitant or counterpart of Hadrian's well-known regionalization of Rome's far-flung military units. Such a policy may also be reflected in the shuffle of legions that took place between ca. A.D. 120 and 140, when the III Cyrenaica, which had been stationed in Egypt from Augustus to Hadrian, was moved to Arabia, to be replaced in Egypt by the II Traiana, which had probably been stationed in Syria under Trajan and Hadrian.

11 (and 28) *παράγγελλω* normally expresses the action of the presiding judge in issuing a summons: cf. *WB* s.v. Here, with Babatha (the complainant) as its subject, the verb presumably conveys that the summons was issued at her request.

11-12 (and 28-30) *παρήγγελα ἐγώ ed. pr.* This reading is clear in line 28, but line 11 had something different, related to the crossed-out words of line 12. Of the seven letters before *Βαβαθᾶ* in line 11 the middles are lost in a break caused by a horizontal fold of the papyrus. The very bottoms of the letters are preserved, together with dots of ink from the tops of four of the letters. The three letters before *Βαβαθᾶ* cannot be *εγω* but look most like the remnants of *τεη*. The letter before those three ought—as in line 28, and because the statement has since line 5 = 20 been in the first person—to be alpha, i.e., the ending of *παρήγγελα*, but if so it is an alpha smaller than normal for this hand; epsilon would fit the space and remaining trace of ink much more comfortably.

In sum, it appears that the scribe first wrote *παρήγγελέ τε ἡ Βαβαθᾶ Ἰωάνη . . . καὶ τοῦτο τὸ μαρτυροποίημα ἐγένετο εἰς δικαίωμα*. He then drew a horizontal line through *καὶ* and *ἐγένετο*, canceling those words (whether he also canceled anything before *Βαβαθᾶ* cannot be determined because of the horizontal break in the papyrus), and inserted *εἰ δὲ μή, ἔσται* interlinearly. In lines 28-30 he wrote only the corrected text.

According to a note in the *ed. pr.*, the *παραγγελία*, written on the same day, is extant among the as yet unpublished documents: cf. above, 2 n.

12 (and 30) *εἰς . . . ὄφρανοῦ*: The meaning is far from clear. I suspect that Babatha, after chiding against the guardians for spending on her son's maintenance only a fraction of the interest yielded by his money (cf. above, 7 n., 10 n.), is here accusing the guardians of profiting from their trust by pocketing the rest of the interest themselves. Some such

<sup>29</sup> H. J. Polotsky, *Israel Exploration Journal* 12 (1962) 259.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. A. Fuks, *JJP* 5 (1951) 214-216, or the brief summary by E. G. Turner, *JRS* 44 (1954) 59.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. H. J. Polotsky, *loc. cit.*

malversation was presumably the basis of the *actio tutelae* envisaged in document No. 3. But the matter was presumably settled out of court, since No. 2 shows the guardians paying for the boy's maintenance seven years later.

20 *ad fin.* β . . . δω[ . . . *s ed. pr.* Of the first letter only the top loop or hook is left. The ductus of the ink stroke seems to me to give φ as another possible reading: ὀρ]φφορῶ? [See Postscript.]

25 The interlinear insert is blurred. The second letter may be lambda, less likely delta.

31 η at the beginning of the line may be π.

32 According to a note of the *ed. pr.*, after πράγματος some of the documents of the Babatha archive have and others omit χάριν (for which the lacuna here has no room).

33 Ησουου, *ed. pr.*

36 The statement calls for seven witnesses, but the signatures that follow name at most five men.

## No. 2

Ca. 13 × 19 cm.

August 19, A.D. 132

ἐπὶ ὑπάτων Γαίου Σερρίου Αὔγουρέϊου καὶ Πουπλίου Τρεβίου [Σεργ]ί[ανο]ῦ  
 [π]ρὸ  
 δεκατεσσάρων καλανδῶν Σεπτεμ[β]ρίων κατὰ τὸν τῆς νέας ἐ[π]αρχίας  
 Ἀραβί-  
 ας ἀριθμὸν ἔτους ἐβδόμου εἰκοστο[ῦ] μηνὸς Γορπιαίου πρώτ[η] ἐ[ν] Μᾶωζα  
 περιμέτρῳ Ζοορων. Βαβαθα[s] Σίμων[ν]ος, συμπάροντος αὐτῇ [ἐπιτρόπου]  
 κ[α]ῖ  
 5 ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ὑπογράφοντος Βαβελί[s] Μαναήμου, ἀμφοτέ[ροι τ]ῆ[ς] αὐτῆς  
 Μᾶω-  
 ζας, Σίμωνι κυρτῶ Ἰωάνου Ἐγλαῖ [τῆ]ς αὐτ[ῆ]ς Μᾶωζας χαίρι[ν.] σου  
 δευτέρου ἐπι-  
 τρόπου κατασταθέντος [± 16] ὑπ[ὸ] βουλῆς Πετρ[α]ίων Ἰησο[ύ]-  
 ου Ἰησοῦ ὀρφανοῦ υ[ι]οῦ μου, ἀπ[ὸ] ἐσχ[ο]ν π[α]ρὰ σ[ο]ῦ ἰς λόγ[ο]ν τ[ρο]φίων  
 καὶ ἀμφι-  
 αζμοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ υ[ι]οῦ μ[ου] ἀργυρίου δηναρίων [ἑξ] ἄ[π]ὸ μηνὸς  
 10 Πανήμου πρώτ[η]ς τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔτους [s] ἐβδόμου εἰκοστοῦ μέχρι Γορπι-  
 [αί]ου τριακά-  
 δι, μηνῶν τελίων τρις. ←————— Aramaic signature ←—————  
 ←————— Aramaic signature ←—————  
 ←————— Aramaic signature ←—————  
 ←————— Aramaic signature ←—————  
 15 ἐρμηνεία[s] Βαβαθᾶς Σίμωνος· ἀπέσχον παρὰ Σίμωνι κυρτῶ Ἰωάνου  
 ἐπιτροπος Ἰησοῦ υἱῶ μου ἰς λόγ[ο]ν τ[ρο]φίων καὶ ἀμφιαζμοῦ αὐτοῦ  
 ἀργυρίου δηναρίων ἑξ ἀπὸ μηνὸς Πανήμου πρώτης μέχρι Γορπιαίου  
 τριακάδι ἔτους  
 ἐβδόμου εἰκοστοῦ, αἷ εἰσιν μῆνες [τέλειοι τρ]ῖς. [διὰ ἐπιτ]ρόπου αὐτῆς  
 Βαβελίς Μαναήμου.  
 Γ[ε]ρμαν[ὸ]ς Ἰουδ[ο]υ ἔγραψα.

1 Αὔγουρίνου. 4 περιμέτρον. 8-9 ἀμφιασμοῦ. 9 δηνάρια. 10-11 τριακάδος.  
 11 τριῶν. 15 Σίμωνος κυρτοῦ. 16 ἐπιτρόπου, υἱοῦ, ἀμφιασμοῦ. 17 δηνάρια, τριακάδος.

## TRANSLATION

In the consulship of C. Serrius Augurinus and P. Trebius Sergianus fourteen days before the Kalends of September, according to the reckoning of the new province Arabia in the twenty-seventh year the first of the month Gorpaios, in Maḥoza-by-Zoora. Babatha daughter of Simon, with her guardian present and subscribing for her, both of the said Maḥoza, to the hunchback Simon son of John son of Eglas, greeting. You having been appointed by the town council of Petra to be [in place of your father?] the second guardian of my orphan son Jesus son of Jesus, I have received from you, toward the account of maintenance and clothing of the said Jesus my son, six denarii of silver (for the period) from the first of the month Panemos of the said twenty-seventh year up to the thirtieth of Gorpaios, three complete months.

(Aramaic) Babatha the daughter of Simeon has received from Simeon the son of Yohana the son of Yehoseph the epitropos of my son Yeshua for clothing and food of my son Yeshua, six silver dinars, from the first of Tamuz until the thirtieth of Elul year twenty-seven, which are three full months. Babeli the son of Menahem has written this.

Translation of (the statement of) Babatha daughter of Simon: I have received from Simon the hunchback son of John, guardian of my son Jesus, toward the account of his maintenance and clothing, six denarii of silver (for the period) from the first of month Panemos up to the thirtieth of Gorpaios of the twenty-seventh year, which are three complete months. By her guardian Babeli son of Menahem.

I, Germanos son of Judas, have written (this).

## NOTES

4 *Zooron*: presumably the genitive of a neuter plural form (cf. above, 1.3 n.).

6-7 On the duration of the boy's guardianship see above, 1.4 n.

5 (and 18) *Βαβελίς*: As the Aramaic (line 14) gives the nominative of Babatha's guardian's name as Babeli, the ending in *-ίς* is apparently intended as a genitive (presumably following the homophonous *-ης, -ης* declension).

7 Perhaps the lacuna had something like *ἀντί τοῦ πατρός σου*. The substitution of the son raises interesting questions. (1) Had the father died, or simply asked the boule to appoint his son in his stead? We have no way of knowing, but a priori the former seems likelier. (2) Greek and Roman practice was normally content with a single guardian, but the orphan Jesus appears to have been under the constant tutelage of two (so too in *P.Cattaoui verso* = *Chrest.Mitt.* 88 I.26-28, II.13-15). Was this required by local custom (each to serve as a check on the other?), or merely an ad hoc arrangement here, perhaps at the insistence of one of the parties? Again we have no way of knowing, but a priori the former again seems likelier.

8-19 and 16 *ἀμφιαζμού*: on zeta for sigma see E. Mayser, *op. cit.* I, p. 204.

10 *πρώτη*: In contrast to the general tendency in postclassical Greek for datives to be replaced by genitives (cf. e.g., A. Debrunner, *op. cit.*, pp. 110–113), here and later (10–11 and 17 *τριακάδι*, 15 *Σίμωνι κυρτῶ*) the writer of No. 2 uses a dative where a genitive is required. In the numerals *πρώτη* and *τριακάδι* the error is readily understandable, since days of the month on which documents are drawn up are expressed in the dative.

15 *έμηνία* defines what follows as a Greek translation of the acknowledgment of receipt that Babatha, acting through her guardian (cf. line 18), made in her native tongue.

16 *νίῳ*: om. *ed. pr.*

#### POSTSCRIPT

A preprint of the forthcoming article by H. J. Wolff (cf. above, note 5) became available to me after the preceding pages had been written. In that article—leaving aside here the extensive legal commentary—Wolff offers the following points of textual interest in document No. 1.

Line 20 (= 5–6): Wolff thinks that the end of line 20 can be read and restored as [*μου τ*]ᾶ *δέροντα* [*αὐτῶ*], which gives excellent sense and fits the space well. Unfortunately, the vertical stroke that he takes as completing a nu is really the bottom of the rho of *παρόντων* in the line above.

Lines 6–7 (= 22): Wolff reads the visible end of line 6 as ἦν *ηκου*], which may be right: the nu still remains troublesome (cf. above, note to line 6 [= 22]), but the eta, while not in its usual form, can be paralleled elsewhere in the document (e.g., in *δηάρια*, line 7).

Wolff then restores *όμελιαν ἦν ἦκου*[σα *είχον ὑμῖν*, translating “auf das Gespräch hin, das ich (zu euch) kommend mit euch hatte,” and citing the “ähnliche Sprachwendung” *τοὺς νόμους ἦκεν ἔχων* of Demosthenes 37.45. Cf. also *P. Oxy.* 1588. 6–8, *τὰ ἀργύρια περὶ ὧν πολλάκις σοι ἀπαντήσας ὀμείλισα*. See now also Wolff’s article in *RIDA* 23 (1976) 271–290.

*The City University of New York*