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The two ostraca published here were found during the excavations conducted at the two Roman praesidia of Dios and of Xeron Pelagos in the Eastern Desert (fig. 1).¹ The first was found in 2007, the second in January 2012.² Both come from the rubbish deposits in front of the gates of the forts.³

These two ostraca are of particular interest as it is the first time to have a letter and the answer to it, each of them found in its intended destination. There is however another example from Didymoi, but the letter and the answer were both found in the same place and the answer was perhaps a draft or an original that was never sent.⁴

The first letter, found at Dios, was written on the 24th of Mesore and sent by Longinus at Xeron to Niger at Dios asking him to send him a *mulokopion* (for a discussion about the definition of *mulokopion*, see infra). The answer was written by Niger only after three days. It is possible that Longinus wrote his letter on the 24th at night, the horseman left with it on the morning of the 25th, arrived the same day at Dios, gave a day of rest to his horse⁵ on the 26th, and left on the 27th, on which day Niger wrote his answer.

¹ The excavations are funded by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ifao in Cairo, and are directed by Hélène Cuvigny to whom I am very grateful for allowing me to publish these two ostraca. I am grateful to Hélène Cuvigny for looking through an earlier version of this paper and to Adam Bülow-Jacobsen for correcting the English.
² See map (fig. 1). Dios and Xeron are successive praesidia on the Berenike Road (Bi'r Bayza should not be taken into account, because Dios was built in 114/115 to replace it). The distance between Dios and Xeron is about 60 kms.
³ The stratigraphical analyses of the two deposits are not completed yet. Therefore, no date more precise than 2nd cent. AD can be offered.
⁵ Couyat, who travelled on the Koptos-Berenike road, counted 37 kms between Dios ("Abou-Graia") and Xeron ("Ports gréco-romains de la mer Rouge et grandes routes du désert Arabique", *CRAI*, 1910, p. 537). According to my own calculations on Google Earth, there are about 47 kms by going through the wadis. Perhaps it was better for the small horses of antiquity to get some rest between two journeys that long (explanation proposed by A. Bülow-Jacobsen).
The identity of the correspondents and their position in the two praesidia cannot be established with certainty. We can only be sure that they are soldiers, since Longinus at least had a horse. It is not impossible that they are both curatores of their respective praesidia: in O.Krok. 14, the person responsible for such matters was the curator praesidii. No curator called Longinus or Niger is known in the documents found in Dios or Xeron, apart from a curator called Niger, who wrote a graffito in the chapel of Dios.\(^6\)

1. Letter from Longinus to Niger

O. Dios inv. 636

The shard is a fragment of AE3 amphora. Written in an inexperienced hand with many errors of spelling and grammar. The *formula valedicendi* has been forgotten.

Λονγῖνος Νίγερ
tὸ τιμιότατον χαίρειν.
ἐρωτηθεὶς πέμψα τῷ µοι
µηλοκόπιν διὰ τοῦ ἵππεος

5
tοῦ φέροντος (σ)ου τὸ ὀστρακὸν
καὶ εὐθέος (σ) [ο]ι πέμψο αὐτὸ
μετὰ τῆς ἑρχοµένης vac.

πρότης.

ἀσπάζοµε ἡµᾶς πάντες.

10

Μεσορὴ κδ.

---

1 l. Νίγερ || 2 l. τῷ τιμιοτάτῳ || 3 l. ἐρωτηθεὶς, l. πέµψαν || 4 l. µηλοκόπιον, l. ἵππεος || 5 l. σοι || 6 l. εὐθέως, l. πέµψα || 7 l. ἑρχοµένης || 8 l. πρότης || 9 l. ἀσπάζοµαι ἡµᾶς πάντας

Longinus to Niger, his most honoured, greetings. Could you please send me a mulokopion through the horseman who is bringing this ostracon to you, and I will send it (back) to you at once with the (coming) first <shuttle?>. I greet you all. Mesore 24.

3. For the use of ἐρωτηθεὶς see M. Leiwo, “Imperatives and Other Directives in the Greek Letters from the Mons Claudianus,” in T.V. Evans, D. Obbink, *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford, 2010, p. 97-119. Although the expected form of the verb after the participle ἐρωτηθεὶς is the imperative πέµψον, Longinus erroneously used the aorist infinitive (πέµψαν, l. πέµψαι) as if he used ἐρωτῶ σε. Another example of grammatical error after

---

The writer used the future indicative πέμψεις which is also frequently used after ἄρωτον σε.

6. There appears a vertical stroke just after the break. The only possibility that I can think of and fit the meaning is to read [σο], but it is difficult to accommodate two letters in the lacuna. Therefore there must be a haplography as in line 5.

8. The expected feminine noun after ἐρχομένης has not been written. According to similar context the expected feminine noun is πορείας “caravan of supplies” or προβολῆς, the meaning of which is not clear: it could be the local shuttle between two neighbouring forts. The phrases μετὰ τῆς πορείας or μετὰ τῆς προβολῆς are well attested in the Eastern Desert. Reading προβολῆς is tempting because of πρ, but does not seem possible because it would be too long. Therefore I would rather read πρό̣τ̣η̣̣ς l. πρότης, which has been added under ἐρχομένης as if to correct or to precise it, and then the scribe forgot to write the noun for which he had left the space after ἐρχομένης. There is one instance where πρότης πορείας is used in a mutilated context (O.Dios inv. 883); πρότης and ἐρχομένης are found together in the same type of context in O.Xer. inv. 754: καλῶς οὖν ποιή{ι}σις δο{ι}⟨ς⟩ αὐτῷ τῷ πρό̣τ̣η̣̣ς ἐρχομένῳ μετὰ ἐπιστολῆς. For a full discussion about the transportation on the Berenike road see H. Cuvigny (ed.), Didymoi, II, FIFAO 67, 2012, p. 6 ff. and especially p. 10-15 for the poreia and the probole.

2. Answer from Niger to Longinus

O. Xer. inv. 858 15,5 × 16 cm II AD

Written on the neck of brownish Egyptian amphora AE3. Niger was a better writer than his colleague Longinus, with a practiced hand. Noteworthy is the formatting of the text especially the last three lines which contain the formula valedicendi and the date, and are justified to the center.

Νίγερ Λονγίνῳ τῷ τιμιωτάτῳ
χαίρειν.
ἐκομισάς σου ἐπιστόλειον
δι᾽ οὗ μοι γράφεις πέμψεις σοι μυλοκόπ(ιον).

5 εἶδεν Ἡρακλαῖας ὅτε ἦν ἄχρηστον ἔγραψαμεν αὐτὸ ἐν Ἡρκλείανοῦ ἐάν ἔνεκ-χήθῃ, εὔθεως σοι ἀποπέμψω.

10 ἀσπασάς τοὺς φιλοῦντές σε πάντες.

ἐρρῶσθαι σε εὖχομαι
σὺν τῷ ἁβασκάντῳ
উপώ σου. Μεσορ(ή) κζ.
Niger to Longinus, his most honoured, greetings. I received your letter in which you wrote to me to send you a mulokopion. Hephaistas saw that it was out of order and we have sent it off with Heraklianos to Coptos in order to be repaired. When it is brought back I will immediately send it to you. I greet all those who love you. I pray for your health and that of your horse, may it be safe from the evil eye. Mesore 27.

4. The reading μυλο- is paleographically ambiguous and could be read μελο- as well. See infra.

5. έπιστολιον. Spontaneously one reads οἰδεν, which is not satisfactory for the meaning, unless we suppose that the writer did not know the pluperfect (with the meaning of an imperfect) of οἶδα, when he should have written ἦδειν: “Hephaistas knew that it was out of order and we have sent it...”. But, if we examine the ductus of the letter closely, we observe that it could suit an epsilon, which is closed on itself. The hypothesis of an epsilon is strengthened by the presence of another ambiguous epsilon with the same shape at the following line (the last ε of διεπέμψαμεν). When Niger asked Hephaistas to take the mulokopion in order to send it to Longinus, Hephaistas noticed that it was not usable and they decided to send it to Koptos to have it repaired.

7. For γίγνομαι = ‘repair’ see O.Krok. 14, 8n. Although the word-order suggests that Heraklianos is the smith who will repair the mulokopion, I rather prefer to take δία as a repeated preposition of the compound verb διεπέμψαμεν in the preceding line, to mean, as an afterthought, that Heraklianos is the courier who took it to Koptos. This usage of δία after διαπέμψεις ἀυτὴν is attested for example in BGU I 93, 19-21: διαπέμψεις αὐτὴν διὰ τῆς μητρὸς μου ἢ το[ῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς ἢ τῆς μητρὸς ἢ ὡς θέλεις. It happens quite often in private letters that ἐάν means “when”, not “if”. About this phenomenon see H. Cuvigny, “Quand Hèroïs aura accouché... ἐάν = ὅταν dans l’expression de l’éventuel”, BIFAO 112, 2012, p. 97-99.

9-10. Horses are often mentioned in the formula valetudinis (see J.-L. Fournet, in H. Cuvigny (ed.), La Route de Myos Hormos, vol. II, FIFAO 48, 2006, p. 482 and n. 7). It is less frequent in the formula valedicendi (O.Claud. I 165; M150; M1318). In O.Florida 15 the horse is mentioned in both formulas. One cannot avoid thinking that Niger wanted to make a show of his epistolary skill, when the clumsy Longinus had forgotten the formula valedicendi.

What is a mulokopion?

In O.Dios inv. 636 the scribe wrote μηλοκόπιν, and in O.Xer. inv. 858 the word could also be read μελοκόπιν- which would suggest the reading of a word of the family μελ-. There exist a word μελοκόπος, which is only attested in the glossatores (CGL II 23, 39.), translated into Latin articulator: a tool which is used to dismember (one could imagine that Longinus had a dead camel to cut up and needed a special tool for that).
If we give up the idea of an articular, we come back to a word of the family of μύλος. μυλ- is confused with μυλ- in the λίθων μυλοκοπικών, l. μυλοκοπικών, in PSI III 237, hence the tentative translation in LS: “for pulping fruit (unless μυλοκοπικός is meant)”. The word μυλοκόπιον is attested only once, in a scholia to Oppian’s Halieutica, as the name of a fish, being a diminutive of μυλοκόπος = μύλλος. In the present case it is the diminutive of τὸ μυλοκόπον which is attested in the glossatores where it is translated acisculus = adze7, and marculus (small hammer); CGL III 23, 23 has the equivalence μυλοκόπον acisculum. While μυλοκόπον is rare, the related trade-name μυλοκόπος is well attested in the papyri and it means a stone-cutter specialized in making and repairing millstones (contrary to what is sometimes written, for instance in the WB or in PKellis IV 96, ad 776, it does not mean a miller).

The equivalent acisculus reminds at once of O.Krok. 14, where the curator Capito writes to the prefect of the desert (who resides in Koptos) that he sends him a horseman with a broken iron object, the name of which was read by the editor: ὁ ἀκίσκος τοῦ μύλου τὸ σιδήρειν, but John Rea (per litt.) proposed to read rather: ὁ ἀκίσκος τοῦ μύλου τὸ σιδήρειν, a reading which is possible and which fits the syntax better (“the acisculus, that is the iron part of the mill”). The only iron part of a rotative mill is the axis, but David Peacock suggests that the mill mentioned by Capito could be of the Olynthian type, which was in use as well in the praesidia of the Eastern Desert.8 Whatever the type of mill, it is strange that the iron piece is called acisculus in O.Krok. 14, which normally means a stone-mason’s tool. However, it is certain that this broken iron object is a part of the mill since Capito also asks for lead to solder it into the mill.

But this meaning is not applicable in the present case: the mulokopian cannot be a part of a mill since Longinus promises to send it back at once. In that case, the meaning “iron tool to repair a mill”, which in any case fits better the etymology, is suitable. It is possible that Longinus wanted a tool to redo the beams of the millstone, as is the case in O.Claud. II 287 and 288 where not only the tool but also the stone-mason (σκληρουργός) is wanted. Adam Bülow-Jacobsen, whom I have consulted, remarks: “The stone-mason’s point that was used for dressing mill-stones must have been fitted with a steel-core or tip called stomoma like all tools that were used on hard stone.9 The tool was sharpened in an ordinary small forge or even, when no forge was available, on a whetstone, but when the stomoma was worn away the tool had to undergo stomosis, fitting of a new tip. For this operation one needed a forge capable of welding-temperatures (white-hot steel) as in the stomoterion at Mons Claudianus, which was surely not available in the small desert forts. The stone-mason’s point which probably served no other purpose in the fort than occasionally dressing the mill-stones would thus have to be sent away for stomosis from time to time, and this was apparently done in Koptos”. According to A. Bülow-Jacobsen, a μυλοκόπιον is thus a tool, probably a stone-mason’s point, but possibly an acisculus, used for dressing mill-stones.

---
7 For the meaning of acisculus, ἀκίσκος see A. Bülow-Jacobsen, Mons Claudianus Ostraca Graeca et Latina IV. The Quarry Texts, DPFAO 47, 2009, p. 251.
8 “If operated in oscillatory mode it would have rod, a pivot and a fitting to attach it to the stone – iron set in lead” (per litt., 7/03/2012).
9 For a more detailed description of stomoma, see A. Bülow-Jacobsen, op. cit., p. 257-259.
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