

C. P. Herm. 6. 11-12 as restored by Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, p. 522 ἐπ[εὶ οἱ σοὶ ἐπίτροποι τοὺς καλο]ρμένους ἀποστόλους [13 letters δι'] ὃν κελεύειν αὐτοῖς ἔθος [τῆν] τοῦ σείτου ἐμ[β]ολὴν ποιέσ[θ]αι. Mitteis has aptly cited *Dig.* xlix. 6. 1 *litteras dimissorias sive apostolos*. In 522 λόγος ἀποστόλου Τριαδέλφου, &c., a somewhat different sense is required.

17-20. The purport of this additional sentence was broadly to fix the identity of the ναύτης. In l. 18 ἐν[] . . . is not improbably a verb, but whether Sarapion is the object or the subject is uncertain. The word preceding δέ in l. 17 is apparently not ὄνομα. [διάδ]οχον δέ ναύτου ἐν[έστ]ησα would be a possible reading, but is not at all convincing.

1198. NOTIFICATION OF DEATH.

26.2 x 7.2 cm.

A. D. 150.

A notice addressed to the comogrammateus by an inhabitant of the Oxyrhynchite village Teis (cf. 1200. 14) of the death of his father and his paternal uncle; cf. e. g. 79, 262, 1030. The present document is peculiar in mentioning that these deaths, which had occurred in the previous year, had been too late to be included in the periodical return of the comogrammateus relating to that year; and the notice was delayed till the last day of Tubi. In P. Brit. Mus. 281 a decease is similarly reported the year after it had taken place, but there is no analogous explanatory statement.

Σαραπάτι κωμογρα(μματεῖ)
 παρὰ Ἀντεῖτος Ἀμμωνίου
 τοῦ Ἀντεῖτος μητρὸς Ταπε-
 ηῖτος τῶν ἀπὸ κωμῆς Τῆε-
 5 ως. ὁ πατήρ μου Ἀμμωνᾶς
 Ἀντεῖτος τοῦ Ἡρακλήου
 μητρὸς Τανετβέως καὶ ὁ
 τούτου ὁμογνήσιος ἀδελ-
 φὸς Ἀντεῖς ὑπερετεῖς
 10 ἄτεχνοι ἀναγραφόμε-
 νοι εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν Τῆειν
 ἐτελεύτησαν τῶι διελθόν-
 τι δωδεκάτῳ ἔτι Ἀντωνεῖνου
 Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου μετὰ κα-
 15 ταχωρισμὸν λόγων. διὸ
 ἀξιώ τούτους ἀναγρα-
 φῆναι τῇ τῶν τετελευ-
 τηκότων τάξει διὰ τῶν

ὑπὸ σοῦ καταχωρισμέ-
 20 νων δημοσίων λόγων,
 καὶ ὁμνύω Αὐτοκράτορα
 Καίσαρα Τίτον Αἴλιον
 Ἀδριανὸν Ἀντωνεῖνον
 Σεβαστὸν Εὐσεβῆ ἀλεθῆ
 25 εἶναι [τὰ γε]γ[ρ]αμμένα κα[ὶ]
 μῆθὲν διεψεῦσθαι, ἢ ἔνε-
 χος εἶην τῷ ὄρκῳ. ἔτους
 τρισκαιδεκάτου Αὐτοκράτορος
 Καίσαρα Τίτου Αἰλίου
 30 Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνεῖνου
 Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς Τῦβι λ.
 2nd hand Ἀντεῖς Ἀμμωνίου ἐπιδέδω-
 κα καὶ ὁμώμεκα τὸν ὄρκον.
 Θέων Ἀμμωνίου ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ
 35 αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰδότες γράμματα.

16. υς of τουτους corr. from ν. 21. Final α of αυτοκρατορα corr. from ο (?). 24. l. ἀληθῆ.
26. l. ἔνοχος. 29. l. Καίσαρας. υ of τιτου and αιλιου corr. from ν.

‘To Sarapas, comogrammateus, from Anteïs son of Ammonius son of Anteïs, his mother being Tapeïs, of the village of Teïs. My father Ammonas son of Anteïs son of Heraclæus, his mother being Tanetbeus, and his full brother Anteïs, who were past age, had no trade, and were registered in the said village of Teïs, died in the past twelfth year of Antoninus Caesar the lord after the presentation of the accounts. I therefore request that they be registered in the list of dead persons through the public accounts presented by you, and I swear by the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius that the above declaration is true and that I have made no false statement, otherwise let me be liable to the consequences of the oath.’ Date and signature of Anteïs written for him by Theon son of Ammonius.

2. Ἀμμωνίου: in l. 5 the name is given as Ἀμμωνᾶς.

9. ὑπερετίς: cf. 1030. 8, note, and B. G. U. 1140. 22 τὸ τῶν ἐξήκοντα (?).

14-15. Cf. ll. 19-20, P. Brit. Mus. 259. 92 τ[ετ]ελευτηκότ(εσ) ἰ[β] (ἔτει) μ[ε]τὰ τὸν καταχ(ωρισμὸν) τῶν λόγ(ων), 95, &c., and e. g. 514. 4, P. Fay. 35. 9, B. G. U. 1062. 17-18.

1199. NOTIFICATION OF PURCHASE.

12.4 × 10.5 cm.

Third century.

A notice, addressed to the βιβλιοφύλακες ἐγκτήσεων, of the purchase of a house, with a request for the proper official recognition of the change of ownership. The document is not in the form of the usual ἀπογραφή, but is a ὑπόμνημα or memorandum asking for a παράθεσις to be made. It is thus akin to P. Tebt. 318, B. G. U. 243, P. Gen. 44, Class. Phil. 2, Hamb. 16; but there is a certain distinction. According to the usual view of that group of documents, which all come from the Fayûm, the reason for the substitution of what may be called the παράθεσις-form for an ἀπογραφή was the fact that the previous owner had not made an ἀπογραφή; cf. Eger, *Äg. Grundbuchwesen*, pp. 131 sqq., Mitteis, *Grundzüge*, pp. 103 sqq. That explanation will not apply to the present case, since in ll. 24-5 it is distinctly stated that the vendor had declared her ownership in an ἀπογραφή. Why the παράθεσις-form was nevertheless adopted by the purchaser remains obscure; the lost conclusion of the papyrus perhaps gave the solution.

· · · · · τὸρ · [· · · · ·] γυ[μ(νασιαρχήσαντι) τ]ῆς λα[μ-
προτάτης Ὁξ(υρυγίτων) π(όλ(εως) κα]ὶ τῆ σὺν αὐτῆ ἀμφο-
τέροις [β]ιβλιοφύλαξι
παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Ἰουλίας Ἀρποκρατίετι Θέωνος
5 τοῦ καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδου ἐπικαλουμένου Ζωίλου