Author: MARIO C.D. PAGANINI

CAPInv. 672: U-EGY-012

i. Geographical area Egypt

ii. Nome Pathyrites (U04a)

II. NAME

i. Association with unknown name U-EGY-012

III DATE

i. Date(s) 140 - 130 BC

IV. NAME AND TERMINOLOGY

iii. Descriptive terms σύνοδος, synodos (?)Note Synodos: P.Dryton 31, 1. 4

V SOURCES

i. Source(s) P.Dryton 31 (140-131/0 BC)

Note Other editions: P. Ryl. II 67

 Online Resources
 P.Dryton 31

 TM 286

i.a. Source type(s) Papyrological source(s)

i.b. Document(s) typology & language/script Fragmentary Greek petition to the *epimeletes* by Dryton (?).

i.c. Physical format(s) Papyrus.

VI. BUILT AND VISUAL SPACE

ii. References to buildings/objects

Reference to τόπος συν[όδου, topos synodou in 1. 4.

VII ORGANIZATION

iii. Members

If we are dealing with an association here, the members may be be referred to as ἄνδρες, *andres* (ll. 6 and 7)

VIII PROPERTY AND POSSESSIONS

•••	D 1.		• •
11	Realty	The association probably owned a $\tau \circ \pi \circ \varsigma$, topos (1. 4)	١١
11.	1 Carry	The association probably owned a tolog, topos (1.	<i></i>

iii. Income

If it is indeed the question of an association here, it seems that the petitioner Dryton (?) had been forced to pay some very high sum of money to the association. The reason for the payment is not indicated; what appears from the fragmentary state of the text is that Dryton had been enlisted in the category of wealthy people, and for this reason was expected to pay. However, he was unable to pay off the entire expected amount; therefore, his son Esthladas bought the properties from Dryton (who would then be without properties and thus not any more liable to pay) and took over the administration of his property, together with the incumbency of the payment of the sum of money.

IA. MEMDERSHIF

ii.	Gender	M	1en

Note If the members of the supposed association are referred to as ἄνδρες, and res (II. 6 and 7), they were all

men.

iii. Age Adults

Note As ἄνδρες, andres (ll. 6 and 7), the association's members were adults.

vi. Proper names and physical features $[\pi\alpha]\rho[\grave{\alpha}\; \Delta(?)]\rho[\acute{\nu}\tau\omega\nu\circ\tau\circ\hat{\nu}\; \Pi\alpha\mu\phi\hat{\nu}\omega\nu(?)]\dots \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\phi\epsilon\delta\rho\epsilon]\acute{\nu}\omega\tau\circ\varsigma\; K\rho\eta\tau\grave{\circ}\varsigma\; \delta\acute{\eta}\mu\omega\nu\; \Phi[\imath\lambda\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}\omega\nu(?)]$

XII. NOTES

i. Comments

The fragmentary state of the text prevents a full understanding. It is uncertain whether we are dealing with an association here: the term $\sigma\dot{v}v\delta\sigma c$, synodos is restored and not certain. Equally uncertain is whether the term $d\dot{v}\delta\rho\varepsilon c$, andres refers to the members of the association and indicates a same-age club of the users of the gymnasium (as the editor of P.Dryton 31 seems to suggest). The provenance of the papyrus is unknown. However, on the basis of the other texts in the so-called

The provenance of the papyrus is unknown. However, on the basis of the other texts in the so-called Dryton archive, it may be likely that the text comes from the Pathyrite nome.

XIII. EVALUATION

i. Private association

Possible

Note

Given the fragmentary state of the text we cannot be sure that we are dealing here with a private association: the restoration σ_{ij} [$\delta\delta\sigma_{ij}$, synodou in l. 4 is doubtful and the mention of $\delta v\delta\rho \epsilon c$, andres (ll. 6 and 7) does not unequivocally indicate the members of an association.

