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SPP XX 74: The Last Preserved Bank-Diagraphe
(Titel)

The text of this bank-diaphragm for the purchase of land (= P. Vindob. G 2073), described by Carl Wesseyly as „fragments du moulins“, has never received any specific attention, although it is a document of some significance, described by Hans Julius Wolff as „die letzte erhaltene selbständige Diagraphe“. As no new fragments have been found to add to the papyrus, it is in many ways still intractable, but we believe that significant progress can be made in correcting some misreadings by Wesseyly, restoring some of the lacunas, and establishing the overall shape of the document, thanks in large part to published parallels.

1. The Papyrus

The two surviving strips are about 4.1 (left) and 5.5 (right) cm wide, and about 16.5 cm tall. The left strip contains about 15 letters in the upper part (lines 1–4), about 14 in lines 7–9 of the lower, where the hand is somewhat larger; further down the number of letters preserved per line becomes irregular because of various mutilations. To its left appear to have been lost about 30 letters at the top and from line 7 onwards 25 or so in the lower part. The loss at top is securely established by the regnal formula in line 1. As we assume the papyrus was broken along original fold lines, it becomes likely that two folds about the width of the left-hand strip have been lost to its left.

Between the two surviving strips is a lacuna of about 20–22 letters in the upper part; in the lower, from line 10 onwards, the left and right sides are both irregularly preserved, making a comparable estimate difficult, but it should be roughly in line. The right-hand strip contains some 21–25 letters in the upper part (lines 1–6), 17–19 below in lines 7–9. It seems probable, therefore, that one strip close in size to the right-hand one stood between the two surviving ones, containing the lacuna between them. Finally, at right the gap is nowhere definable with complete certainty. Wesseyly’s limited restorations suppose a gap of about 20–25 letters, and some of the document can be restored on that hypothesis. But in a number of places, discussed in the line notes, there is no possibility of accommodating the usual formulas in that size lacuna. Moreover, the fact that the missing middle panel seems to have been the same size as the right-hand one may point to the left edge of the right-hand panel as the mid-point of the original text, where it received its first fold. In this case, we should suppose three missing panels, each about 4–4.5 cm, to the right of the right-hand panel.

In all, then, it seems most probable that the original document was folded up into eight panels, folding first in the middle and then twice more, and that only two of these, the third and fifth, survive. The total width would have been perhaps about 35–40 cm, or substantially less than the 59 cm width of P. Lipp. 3 (recolored as M.Chr. 172) — but this, to be sure, has two co-

1 Das Recht der griechischen Papiere Ägyptens II. Organisation und Kontrolle des privaten Rechtsverkehrs, München 1978, 105 n. 112. We thank H. Horace for an excellent photograph of the papyrus.

2 We have listed in the apparatus only divergences from Wesseyly’s (W„W“ readings, not from his restorations or lack thereof.
lumns (cf. its introduction, p. 5). It is impossible to say in the present state of the papyri, fragments whether there was further text below what survives. The height of P.Lips. 3 was 24 cm, and it contains elements not present in the Vienna papyrus as it stands; these are discussed in the next section.

Two final uncertainties remain. First, at several points in the notes, the reader will observe that the parallel suggestions restorations at the ends of lines longer than even our wider, 8-panel restoration allows. This is particularly true from lines 12 to 19 (but cf. also 5–6). There, it is, therefore, an obvious temptation to imagine a still wider original. Probably the strongest argument against this possibility is the restoration of lines 7–8, together with the fact that the amount by which the restorations suggested by parallels for lines 12–19 exceed the space available is not even approximately constant, ranging from roughly 20 to 100 characters. And no two of the parallels run quite the same throughout. But we remain conscious that the possibility of a wider line still remains open.

Second, it is also conceivable that instead of being folded the papyrus was rolled up from left to right, then at some point flattened. The outcome of such a procedure would differ from folding mainly in that the pattern of sizes would probably be one of straightforward increase from left to right and that the number of panels might be odd rather than even.

2. The Bank-Diagram

A thorough description of the diagram is given by Wolff (above, n. 1) 95–105. Our pa- pyrus is an example of the "self-balanced" variety 1, which documents along with the payment through the bank its basis and consequence, i.e. in this case the sale of property and perhaps, below or in a second column to the right of what is now preserved, a notice of the transition to the bødskoofvælki eða/lgon (as in P.Lips. 3). By contrast, some other diagraphs ("unself-balanced") simply refer to other documents relevant to the payment. The oldest ex- ample surviving of the independent diagraphs go back to the time of Domitian and Trajan, but it disappears early in the Arxinoite, never appears in the Oxyrhynchites, and, after a late start (170), continues until the late third century at Hermopolis and Ancyropolis; our text, as noted already, is the latest known example 2. Wolff argues that the divergent practices of the various names is difficult to reconcile with any notice that this method of documentation was officially required at any time.

The form of the Hermopolite third-century diagraph can be seen from the parallels, of which P.Lips. 3 is a good example. The first part is the diagraph itself, which contains the following elements: Date, diagraph through the bank (in Hermopolis). The purchaser (full de- scription), to the seller (full description), who has sold (the) property, for a price which the seller has received (in) accordance with this diagraph. There follow clauses about enjoyment of the property, the stipulation (cf. note to lines 5–6 below), and the banker’s signature. The second part is a summary of the sale. The seller (full description) communicates the diagraph to the buyer (full description) through the bank (full description), and has received (in) accordance with this diagraph. There follow clauses about the buyer’s rights, lack of recourse, penalties, validity, and the stipulation, then a date.

3 Wolff (above, n. 1) 96 n. 71 points out that the distinction, entirely one of modern scho- larship, goes back to Gradenz. The papyrists themselves do not distinguish two types.

3 Wolff (above, n. 1) 103 n. 91 states a supposed twelve Hermopolite examples known to him. One is a duplicate, however, and his lists includes a misprint of a number. The correct list is as fol- lows: P.Flor. I 18 (partly repr. as M.Chr. 328), P.Citt. 32, P.Rhy. 176, P.Flor. III 380 = 20 (for 4258), P.Lond. II 925 (p. 148), P.Lond. III 1128 (p. 151) = M.Chr. II 256, P.Lond. III 1298 (p. 152), P.Vindob. Ausk. 6, P.Lips. 3 = M.Chr. 172, P.Rhy. II 165, and SPP XX 74.
...
the diaphragn is one of paying, and that the property is the direct object of a participial dependent on the servient as recipient of the payment. All other texts cited above must be corrected accordingly.

The kleres of D. 596 is listed from M. Draw-Bears, Missolinum 1979. 92. A homonym of M. Draw-Bears, etc. critic is referred to as the hermis of Dionysos and Diokritos in the other papyri, and both times as αυτόν δυσπραγιάς καί τὸν στρατηγόν, the singular article disagreeing with the plural noun. It is just possible that something similar happened here and that a record was mentioned.

4.5. One might restore here εἷς συμπροσωποῦν πατριάς οὖν the word ἀλάλος συμπροσωποῦν comparing line 3, but we do not know how much space remains for such an optional restoration after the description of the property.

5. The parallels are uniformly restored or resolved with τῷτο, based on the editors' assumption that the structure was one of "NIN: where she has sold to NN: property for a price of." Now that this is seen (above, note to line 3) to be incorrect, it follows that τῷτο is more plausibly the direct object of the understood verb of paying. Whether the scribe actually wrote the accusative here, however, we cannot be certain. It is likely that a few letters stood before τῷτο, and that only four more letters were used for the beginning of the number of drachmai (4900-6000) are possible, but 6000 and higher are likely to have been given in talents plus drachmai, thus only ταγής and ἀκαταγής are likely, but the precise numbers of letters in each place cannot be determined.

5-6. The parallels here are typically fuller, with a phrase like γεμίσας καὶ κεκοιμισάς. But τῶν ἀλίμων τρίκον τῆς ἄκηκος χρώνον ... καὶ αὐθεντευτέοντος παρθενίας. There is usually, however, a considerable degree of abbreviation. We cannot establish exactly what abbreviations have been used here, if any, and exactly what has been left out. What we print here, exempli gratia, represents a kind of maximum. The parallels here no doubt are not exhaustive, and we do not ask the text before the banker's signature to end with καὶ αὐθεντέοντος παρθενίας (with whatever degree of abbreviation), but the remains do not resemble that of the signature of the purchaser, but all parallels have the banker's signature here (cf. the list in note 4 above). It is possible that τῶν ἀλίμων τρίκον was, instead of being written in full, abbreviated and accompanied by another title, e.g., βουλευτής.

7. Abbreviation of ἀλίμων here is possible. See the note to line 3 on the titles of Comellis's father. The restoration of the end of the line is rather short without another epithet in the lacuna here, but its presence is not certain and it could have been abbreviated. For the titles of Hermophilus as restored here see P.Vindob. Bever. 6.8.

7-8. For γεμίσας κηλοῦν cf. most recently P.Mich. XV 719.5-66. οὐδὲν is just a shake shake for the space, but the other possibilities for relationships here (vaccinae, vaccinae) are even shorter. Marie Draw-Bears (Le nom Hermopolis Vindob. 8.845 with an erroneous reference to SPP III, p. 33) has suggested that this Hermophilus could be the father of Anc. Passion. son of Hermophilus, θυσιάσας on ἐν εὐνοία, (Beowulf) Beowulf in SPP II, p. 33 (as restored by Draw-Bears). This seems most unlikely, for the Hermophilus in the present document is certainly a metropolitan, not a cultivator (γεμίσας could not refer to a landowner) in a temple.

8-9. The restoration at the end of line 8 and the beginning of line 9 is virtually guaranteed by the parallels (especially P.Lips. 3 and P.Vindob. Bever. 5). For the restoration of the middle lacuna see St X 1029.2-3. Some difficult questions remain.

The name of the father is known from line 2 to have been a name of perhaps 8 characters (possibly Ἐπισκόπος, cf. note to lac. ad loc.) plus the alias Didymnemon, yielding a 25-character patronymic for which the lacuna is already too long. The addition after the lacuna, moreover, cannot be the ending of this patronymic. It has not been restored, nor is there reason to think that it is part of abbreviated word (e.g., γεμίσας τὸν ἀλήθους). It must be the ending of a genitive; βουλευτής yields a highly impossible sequence of titles (cf. P. Preissig, Stadtische Beamtenen am Kaiserthum Ägypten, Halle 1903, 21ff. and P. Ingaas, La vie municipale dans l'Egypte Romaine, Paris 1911, 292ff.), and the use of the acractic participial form for euthenicctis excludes restoring τερακένταν. But Ἐπισκόπος, supported by the parallel, does make the constraints on the restorations of names very tight. The most likely solution is that which we have adopted, that the alias was omitted entirely. Some of what is restored in the lacuna at the end of this line could have been in line 18 instead.

11-12. Perhaps restore ὕποκεισθαι or something similar. It is clear that we are dealing here with a well developed country property with ample facilities, passing from one member of the elite to another, but it does not appear possible to restore the detailed description. Some of it appears in line 4 and was perhaps repeated here. The price, certainly not less than 4000 drachmai, is very substantial. The comparable documents show prices ranging from 300 (M.Chr. 256) to 1600 (P.Ryl. II 165), but we do not always know the size of the parcels.

12-13. At the end of the preceding line, we are evidently at the start of the clause undertaking to hand over the property measured and undisturbed, found in P.Ryl. II 165.16 and P.Vindob. Bever. 6.12. We need then to restore something like παραθέον καί ἀργόν σαρκίας ἅμα τῆς κοινωνίας, ἐναίθεον καταπλάσσοντα καὶ συνών εἰς ἀλῆθος, ἡ ἐν γενεσίᾳ. This, without any description of the neighbours, runs about 100 letters, where we appear to have only 66 letters of space for it. We do not know what abbreviation of the phraseology to suggest. At this point, then, we are apparently into the description of the neighbouring properties. The mention at the start of line 13 is followed by a stroke like a round right bracket, suggesting that the word was abbreviated after it. This suggests the restoration given. We may then suggest that Ἐπισκόπος Ἐπισκόπος was the owner of the οἰκέων (οἰκείους) in question. Φαντ. may more likely be the beginning of a cognomen than of a patronymic.

13-14. The parallels would suggest at this point adding (παρασει). 5.6.5. - after the price, and κατὰ δῶμα τὴν διάδοσιν after ἀνακαίνισις, for neither of which there appears to be room. Naturally some small variation in wording and abbreviation is possible, and in particular it is possible that sharp abbreviation here could have allowed the full phrasing.

14. In the σείκον lacuna, perhaps ὑπερεξέπεμι ἐρωτάως, as in P.Flor. III 380.14; it is, however, a bit too long, so probably abbreviation precedes.

14-15. The standard phrasing here includes ὑπερεξέπεμι ἐρωτάως ἐναίθεον, for which there is no space. The parallels do not abbreviate any of this phrasing.


16. The restoration is a slightly shortened version of P.Vindob. Bever. 6.15, omitting καί ἀνακαίνισις καταπλάσσοντα. The precise wording is exempli gratia, but the space does not allow anything fuller and even what is printed here may have been slightly abbreviated.

16-17. This appears to be the only place where the guarantee clause can have stood in the sale, but as given here it is 30 characters too long for the space, even though it is somewhat shortened from what is given in the parallels. Clearly some further abbreviation must have been made, but we cannot tell what.

17-18. Here one needs something like Π. Πλ. 3.13-14: ἐν τῇ ἐξαφανίσκῳ ἢ τῇ ἐξαφανίσκῳ ἢ τῇ ἐξαφανίσκῳ ἢ τῇ ἐξαφανίσκῳ ἢ τῇ ἐξαφανίσκῳ ἢ τῇ ἐξαφανίσκῳ ἢ τῇ ἐξαφανίσκῳ ἢ τῇ ἐξαφανίσκῳ. But even as shortened here this runs to 33 characters, almost double the available space. We cannot tell what further abbrevia- tion or shortening was used.

18-19. Restoring the regular formula here requires a fair amount of abbreviation, but the parallels all have the titulature here and its omission is very unlikely.
zu Hoogendijk, S. 13H.