

LUCIUS SILIUS SATRIANUS

BY

ARTHUR S. HUNT.

The papyrus with which I am here concerned is one of a small collection formed, I think some 15-20 years ago, by the late E. P. Warren. In the absence of provision for the systematic publication which had been contemplated by the owner, I am permitted by his executors to edit the texts piecemeal as opportunity offers; and I am very glad to be able to include in a volume dedicated to M. Victor Loret the following specimen, which though much disfigured by mutilation is not without some historical interest.

It is a petition addressed to L. Silius Satrianus, *vir egregius*, by a citizen of Antinoë, C. Valerius Marinus, who was involved in a dispute over some property and had been authorized to make application to Satrianus (ll. 23-25). Marinus thereupon took the requisite steps and presented a petition (ll. 16-37), setting out the facts of the case and requesting that his opponent, Sar..., who lived in the Arsinoïte nome (l. 12) and seems in the absence of the petitioner to have taken the law into his own hands, should be sent for. Satrianus by a subscription (ll. 5-6, 37-39) directed the local strategus to safeguard the interests of the fiscus pending a settlement, but gave no further order; and he was presently approached by Marinus in a second petition (ll. 1-14), in which the facts were recalled and the request for a decision was repeated.

The question arises, who was this L. Silius Satrianus, whose name is, apparently, otherwise unrecorded? Can he be a hitherto unknown praefect of Egypt? The first petition of Marinus bears the date Pachon 17 of the 4th year of Marcus and Verus, i. e. May 12, A. D. 164. M. Annianus Suraeus was still praefect at the beginning of the previous year, and T. Flavius Titianus had succeeded to the office before August, A. D. 164. If therefore the second petition of Marinus followed the first at a short interval, the possibility that Satrianus intervened between Suraeus and Titianus is not excluded on chronological grounds. But what can be gleaned from the papyrus about the subject

of dispute may be taken to point in another direction. Section 18 of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* reads : — τὰς κατὰ πίστιν γενομένας κληρονομίας ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων εἰς Ῥωμαίους ἢ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων εἰς Ἕλληνας ὁ Θεὸς Οὐεσπασιανὸς [ἀ]νέλαβεν, οἱ μὲντοι τὰς πίστεις ἐξ(ο)μολογησάμενοι τὸ ἡμισ[υ ε]ίληψασι. One of the parties in this present case bears a Roman name; and to the passage just quoted there is evident resemblance in his statement in ll. 18 sqq. : — ἀντικατέσ[την . . . πρὸς Σ.] τινα περὶ πίστewς . . . ἦν[?] ἐξομολογήσαμενος . . . κληρονομικῶν δικαίων εἰς ἐμὲ κατήνησ[ε . . . ὑπάρχον]τά μοι κατὰ τὸ τῆς ἐξομολογηθείσης πίστewς δίκαιον(?). Apparently then the matter was one which would come within the competence of the idiologus; and since it was referred by the lower authority to Satrianus because a *πίστις* was involved (ll. 24-25), the view that his office was that of idiologus has at least a certain plausibility. No valid objection can be based on the mention of the *ταμείον* in ll. 6 and 39; cf. PLAUMANN, *Der Idioslogos*, pp. 30-1.

The papyrus, which was evidently folded from the bottom upwards, measures 26 × 9.4 cm. A large piece is missing on the right-hand side, and possibly this has partially survived in some other collection, though the irregularity of the broken edge is doubtless due to worms. The extent of the loss can be gauged from ll. 2, 17, 36-37, where the supplements are assured; those suggested elsewhere claim no more than a sufficient measure of probability. Though well written, and signed by the petitioner (l. 40), it is clear from the numerous corrections in ll. 7-12 that the document is only a draft.

Λουκίωι Σειλίω[ι] Σ[ατριανῶι τῶ κρατίστῳ πρὸς τῶ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ(?)]
 παρὰ Γαίου Οὐαλερίου Μ[αρείνου Ὀσειραντινοεῖου τοῦ καὶ
 Μαρκιανεῖου. ἀνέτεινά [σοι, κύριε ἐπίτροπε, βιβλίδιον τῆ ἰζ
 τοῦ Παχῶν μηνὸς τοῦ ἐνεσιῶτος(?) δ ἔτους, οὗ ὑπογραφή·
 5 ὁ σίρατηγὸς φροντιεῖ ἕως ἂν τὸ πρᾶγμα πέρασ λάβῃ μηδὲν
 ἐπὶ περιγραφῇ τοῦ τ[αμείου γείνεσθαι. [[ἐγὼ δὲ τούτοις ἀ-]]
 [[κολούθως προσ[. ἀναφόριον τῶ σίρατηγῶ(?) Οὐε-]]
 [[γέτω ἀνέδω[κα δηλώσας ὅτι οὐ μόνον]]
 [[ἀλλὰ καὶ ηπ. . [about 35 letters
 10 [[το.]] ἐπεὶ οὖν [[κέρ[ιε
 [[μετ[— 33 —

- ^{τούτο}
 [[βιβλίδιον]] ^{σὺν ἄλλοις} [about 30 letters
 γραφῆναι [[τῷ Ἡρακ(λείδου) μερίδος [σφραττηγῶ
 δικὸν ἐπὶ τὴν σὴν δ[ι]άγν[ωσιν, ἵνα τὸ πρᾶγμα πέρασ ἤδη
 λαβεῖν δυνηθῆ καὶ ᾧ εὐεργ[ετημένος. διευτύχει.
 15 ἔστι δὲ τοῦ β[ιβλιδίου] τὸ ἀντίγραφον·
 Σειλίωι Σατριάνωι τῷ κρατί[σ]ω πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ(?) παρὰ
 Γαίου Οὐαλερίου Μαρείνου Ὁ[σειραντινοεῖου] τοῦ
 καὶ Μαρκιανείου. ἀντικατέσ[την] τῷ ἐνεστώτι δ(?) ἔτει
 Ἀντωνίνου καὶ Οὐήρου τῷ[ν] κυρίων Σεβασίων πρὸς Σαρ. . .
 20 τινὰ περὶ πίστεως [22 letters ἦν
 ἐξομολογησάμενος α[23 letters
 κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα δι[. κληρονομι-
 κῶ δικαίῳ εἰς ἐμὲ κατήνησ[εν] ἐπὶ 16 letters σφρα-
 τηγήσαντος, κ[αὶ ἄ]πεφῆναι[το] οὕτως· ἐπεὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα περὶ πίσ-
 25 τεῶς ἐστίν, δύνασθε ἐντυ[χεῖν] τῷ κρατίσ]ω πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ(?).
 ἐγὼ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἀκόλουθον [κατέπλευσα εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν(?)
 μηνὶ Ἀδριανῶ κῆ καὶ ὑπε[20 letters τὴν κατα-
 σποράν. ἐπεὶ οὖν, κύριε, τα[17 letters ὁ ἀντίδικός(?)
 μου ἐξετόπισεν καὶ οἰκίαν [καὶ 17 letters ὑπάρχον-
 30 τά μοι κατὰ τὸ τῆς ἐξο[μολογηθείσης] πίστεως δίκαιον
 ἐν τοσοῦτῳ καὶ τὰ μὴ ἐξ[24 letters ἀποδεί-
 ξω πίστι ὑποστέλλειν ἐκ[28 letters
 ἀξιῶ, ἐάν σοι δόξη, κελεῦσαι γρ[αφῆναι] τῷ τῆς Ἡρακλείδου μερίδος
 σφραττηγῶ ἐκπέμψαι τὸν Σαρ[27 letters
 35 ἐν τοσοῦτῳ δὲ μηδὲν αὐτ[ὸν] νεωτερίζειν μέχρι τῆς σοῦ τοῦ κυ-
 ρίου διαγνώσεως. διευτύχει. Γάιος Οὐαλέριος Μαρείνος ἐπιδέδω-
 κα, (ἔτους) δ̄ Παχῶν ιζ̄. ἀν[τίγραφον] ὑπογραφῆς· ὁ σφραττηγὸς
 φροντιεῖ ἕως ἂν τὸ πρᾶγμα πέρασ λάβῃ μηδὲν ἐπὶ περιγρα-
 φῆ τοῦ ταμείου γείνεσθαι.
- 2nd hand. 40 Γάιος Οὐαλέριος Μαρε[ῖνος] ἐπιδέδωκα. (ἔτους) δ(?) . . .

On the verso

Ἐντευξις(?) × Σατριάνοῦ.

2-3. Cf. l. 17, where the first letter of Ὀσειραντινοσίου is certain. That this tribe as well as that named after Matidia included a deme-name Μαρκιάν(ε)ιος was not previously known. 5. For πέρας λάβη cf. ll. 13-14 and *P. Oxy.*, 237, VIII, 16. 6. ἐγὼ δέ : cf. l. 26. 7-12. The letters κολουθως προσ. [, γετω ανεδω[, αλλα και ηπ. . [and το are enclosed within a line which has been drawn round them; κυρ[, μετ[, βιβλειδιον, and τω Ηρακ() μεριδος [have been crossed through. In l. 7 τῶ στρατηγῶ is suggested by τῶ αὐτῶ σίρ[ατηγῶ in l. 12, though the interlinear insertion there introduces a complication. The δ of ἀνέδω[κα in l. 8 has been altered. In l. 9 the vestiges do not suggest ἡ πίσ[ις. 19. Σαρ. . . : cf. l. 34. Perhaps Σαρᾶν : a short name is indicated by the space. 20-22. ἦν seems probable in the lacuna before ἐξομολογησάμενος, and possibly something like ἀ[πεγραψάμην . . . δι[ὰ . . . ὅσα κληρονομι]κῶ followed, or e. g. δι[δοὺς τὸ ἥμισυ ᾧν, if the case was covered by *Gnomon*, § 18. 23. σίρα|τηγήσαντος : or ἐπισίρ. 27-28. Cf. *P. Oxy.*, 486. 13-14 ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ ἀντίδικος [ο]ὕδὲ νῦν πᾶρεσίη ἢ δὲ [κα]τασπορὰ ἐπείγει. Hadrianus (Choiak) 28 would be late for ordinary sowing; cf. SCHNEBEL, *Landwirtschaft*, pp. 137 sqq. Perhaps therefore, e. g., ὑπέ[μεινα, ἐπιτελέσας τὰ κατὰ τὴν κ. 34. In l. 13 ἐπὶ τὴν σὴν δ[ι]ἀγν[ωσιν follows ἐκπέμψαι, but since διαγνώσεως occurs in l. 36, some other phrase, e. g., ἵνα ἀκούσης μου πρὸς αὐτόν, is preferable here. 35. Cf. e. g. P. Giessen 34. 37 μηδενὸς νεωτεριζομένου μέχρι τῆς παρ' ἐμοὶ κρίσεως.

ARTHUR S. HUNT.