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EMOTIONAL LANGUAGE AND FORMULAE OF PERSUASION IN GREEK PAPYRUS LETTERS*

Eleanor Dickey

INTRODUCTION

One of the most fundamental rules of English politeness is the importance of saying ‘please’ when making a request. Using a bare imperative without ‘please’ or a similar modifier, for example saying ‘Give me ten pounds’, is likely to cause anger and resentment as well as a refusal to comply with the request – unless, of course, the addressees are so much in the speaker’s power that they are not in a position to object. In fact the way English speakers make requests is subject to considerable variation depending on both the identity of the addressee and the magnitude of the request. Someone about to make a short train journey with a good friend, if he cannot make his bank card function in the ticket machine, might say something like ‘Bob, can you lend me 10 pounds?’ But if the speaker’s fellow-traveller is someone he does not know well, or someone with power over him, he would phrase the request rather differently. And if the amount needed is the price of an expensive long-distance ticket, even the request to a good friend would be phrased differently.

Linguists have been working on this phenomenon for a long time, so there are a number of different theoretical frameworks available for predicting and explaining how requests are made. The oldest and best-known of these is that of Brown and Levinson, who argue that there are two kinds of politeness, positive and negative.¹ To oversimplify grossly, positive politeness consists of being actively nice to one’s interlocutors and negative politeness consists of not inconveniencing or imposing on them. Which strategy is chosen depends on the relationship between

---

* This paper is based on a larger body of research carried out in 2006 and 2007 and orally presented in numerous places since then; responses from audiences at the University of Toronto, University of Manchester, Cornell University, and University College Dublin were particularly valuable in helping me build and refine the section of the research presented here. Some of my conclusions match those in the excellent recent book by Camille Denizot (2011); they were reached independently, and I hope this fact will aid the scholarly world in accepting them. I am grateful to Ed Sanders and Matthew Johncock for persuading me finally to publish this work, to Marina Terkourafi for introducing me to her theory, helping me understand it, and kindly checking a draft of this essay; and to Philomen Probert for constant help and encouragement; any mistakes that remain are my own.

¹ Brown and Levinson (1987); for some other theories see Eelen (2001) and Watts (2003), and for examples of the use of Brown and Levinson in work on ancient politeness see Hall (2009) and Lloyd (2004).
speaker and addressee and the magnitude of the request, but essentially negative politeness is, from the perspective of an English speaker, ‘more polite’ than positive politeness: positive politeness is used more for minor requests and to social inferiors, and negative politeness for major requests and to social superiors.

The extreme end of negative politeness, of course, consists of not asking for a favour at all, but this level of deference can be impractical if the speaker really needs the favour. The next level down consists of asking obliquely, in such a way that the utterance does not have to be taken as a request at all. For example the person in need of money for a train ticket might say, ‘Oh dear, this machine isn’t taking my card, and I haven’t got any cash on me. What do you think I should do?’ In those circumstances most friends will get the hint and offer the money, but if someone does not want to do so he is not faced with the awkwardness of refusing: he can simply not take the hint. This strategy too is useful for maintaining good relationships with one’s superiors, but it can be impractical if the result is not getting something that one really needs.

The next level in the negative-politeness hierarchy consists in asking very, very nicely for whatever is needed, making it clear that the addressee is under no actual obligation to provide it. For example our hypothetical traveller might say, ‘Oh dear, the machine isn’t taking my card, and I haven’t got any cash. I don’t suppose there’s any chance you could lend me £10, is there? I’m so sorry to ask you, but there isn’t any other way that I’m going to be on that train with you otherwise.’ Brown and Levinson’s theory predicts that a traveller using this strategy is addressing someone who either is not a close friend or is so poor that £10 is a lot of money to ask him for.

Even further down the hierarchy come the phrases that one normally uses to make requests, such as ‘Please could you lend me £10?’, ‘Can you lend me £10?’, and ‘Would you mind lending me £10?’. These phrases are very common and as a result have become highly conventionalized, so that their meaning is not the same as the sum of their parts. The utterance ‘Can you read Greek?’ is a question, and the addressee of such a question will probably answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ rather than producing a copy of the Iliad and reading Greek. But the equivalently phrased utterance ‘Can you lend me £10?’ is a request, and it would be peculiar for the addressee to answer ‘yes’ without actually providing the money. The fact that this way of phrasing a request is considered more polite than the imperatival ‘Lend me £10’ may have a historical basis: it is possible that at one time ‘can you?’ was not a direct request at all but an oblique one that did not actually ask for the money, but by now that etymological meaning has been superseded.

GREEK LITERATURE OF THE CLASSICAL PERIOD

Brown and Levinson claimed that their rules were universal and worked for all languages, and as we have just seen the rules seem to work for English, at least in
most situations. But they work much less well for Greek of the Classical period,\(^2\) because throughout the literature of that period there is an overwhelming lack of markedly polite language in the making of requests. Regardless of the identity of the addressee or the magnitude of the request, speakers’ normal tendency is to use the bare, unsoftened imperative,\(^3\) as illustrated in table A.\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare imperative</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other with similar meaning</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markedly polite</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total requests</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% markedly polite</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A**: Linguistic forms used for requests in Greek of the Classical period

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the use of the imperative in Greek does not seem to be determined either by status or by the magnitude of the request; although some non-imperative request strategies can be explained using Brown and Levinson’s theory,\(^5\) the unsoftened imperatives used even in situations that ought to call for considerable mitigation are not explicable using this model of politeness. See for example passages 1 and 2.

1) ὦ βασιλεῦ, τὰ μὲν οἰκότα εἴρηκας, σὺ μέντοι μὴ πάντα θυμῷ χρέο μηδὲ πόλιν ἀρχαίην ἐξαναστήσῃς (Herodotus 1.155.3, Croesus urging Cyrus not to destroy Sardis)

2 Throughout this paper I shall use ‘Classical period’ in a broad sense, to run from Homer (eighth/seventh century BCE) to Menander (who died at the beginning of the third century BCE).

3 This point has also been made by Denizot (2011) 488, on the basis of a corpus of 6,314 verb forms (and an unspecified number of requests made in ways that do not involve verb forms) taken principally from Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Lysias and Herodotus.

4 The figures in table A are based on a hand search of the following corpus of texts: Homer, *Odyssey* 1–4; Sophocles, *Philoctetes, Antigone*; Euripides, *Hippolytus, Medea*; Aristophanes, *Acharnians, Knights*; Menander, *Dyscolus, Aspis, Epitrepontes*; Herodotus (all); Plato, *Symposium*. It is not practical to include references to all the passages involved here, but the raw data (for this and all subsequent tables) are available on request. Under ‘other with similar meaning’ are included prohibitive subjunctives (aorist subjunctives used instead of aorist imperatives in the negative), infinitives for imperatives, and ὅπως + future indicative, all of which are clearly not polite in these texts. Under ‘markedly polite’ are included the strategies illustrated in examples 5–14 below and a few others. ‘Requests’ is used here (as a replacement for the linguistic technical term ‘directives’) to include all utterances in which the speaker tries to get the addressee to do something, whatever the linguistic form of the utterance.

5 See for example Lloyd (2004), but note Denizot’s (2011: e.g. 483, 487) vigorous and well-founded arguments that questions and certain other indirect ways of phrasing requests are not necessarily polite in Greek.
'O king, what you say is reasonable, but nevertheless do not act entirely on your anger, and do not destroy an ancient city...'  

2) τὴν παρ’ ἐμοῦ λαβὼν ἰθι. (Menander, Dyscolus 375, slave to free man)  

‘Take this [mattock] from me and go.’

Of course, Greek literature from this period also contains examples of other ways of phrasing requests, but those are overwhelmingly in the minority compared to the use of the imperative alone, whereas in English the imperative by itself is used much less often than an imperative softened with ‘please’, ‘can you’, etc. For this reason many translators systematically replace bare, unmodified imperatives with more polite request formulae when translating Greek into English: see table B and passages 3 and 4.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Bare imperatives in Greek</th>
<th>Bare imperatives in English</th>
<th>English bare imperatives as % of Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plato, Symposium</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon, Symposium</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menander, Dyscolus</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B: Comparison of bare imperative usage in three Greek texts and their English translations

3) ἄλλος γάρ τίς μοι διηγεῖτο ἀκηκοὼς Φοίνικος τοῦ Φιλίππου, ἔφη δὲ καὶ σὲ εἰδέναι. ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐδὲν εἶχε σαφὲς λέγειν. σὺ οὖν μοι διήγησαι· δικαιότατος γὰρ εἶ τοὺς τοῦ ἑταίρου λόγους ἀπαγγέλλειν. (Plato, Symposium 172b)  

‘I’ve already had a report from someone else (who’d been told about it by Phoenix the son of Philip), but his account wasn’t very clear. He did mention, though, that you knew about it as well. So please will you tell me? I mean, Socrates is your friend, so it’s perfectly appropriate for you to report what he says.’

4) τῆς Ἀττικῆς νομίζετ’ εἶναι τὸν τόπον, Φοίλην, τὸ νυμφαῖον δ’ ὅθεν προέρχομαι Φολασίων. . . ταῦτ’ ἐστὶ τὰ κεφάλαια, τὰ καθ’ ἕκαστα δὲ [ὄψεσθ’] ἐὰν βούλησθε – βουλήθητε δὲ. (Menander, Dyscolus 1–3, 45–6)  

‘Imagine, please, that the scene is set in Attica, in fact at Phyle, and that the shrine I’m coming from is the one belonging to that village…. There, that’s the outline. Details you’ll see in due course, if you like – and please do like.’

Fortunately, Brown and Levinson’s theory is not the only model of politeness, merely the best-known one; there are a large number of others, each of which has been claimed to replace Brown and Levinson’s model. Indeed Brown and Levinson’s theory ought to have been completely discredited by now, as for decades

6 Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.
7 The figures in table B are based on translations by Waterfield (1994), Tredennick (1970) and Miller (1987).
8 Trans. Waterfield (1994) 3; note Waterfield’s addition of ‘please’.
studies refuting it have appeared regularly – but the fact that such studies are still produced at frequent intervals suggests that Brown and Levinson’s theory still has enough adherents to be worth refuting. The reason it has adherents is that despite its flaws it is often useful, particularly in combination with other theories;\textsuperscript{10} therefore it must be kept in mind when looking at the Greek data, but at the same time another theory is needed to provide the main explanation of those data.

Space forbids a discussion of all the other politeness theories here, as they are numerous and complex; suffice it to say that in my opinion the most useful model for dealing with Greek is that of Terkourafi.\textsuperscript{11} To oversimplify grossly again, Terkourafi argues that there is no simple relationship between the literal meaning of a phrase and how polite it is. Politeness depends entirely on what is usual in a given context, and this system works because people are consistent and formulaic about how they make requests. Therefore a researcher or language learner wanting to understand the politeness or impoliteness of a particular phrase needs to look not at its linguistic form or the literal meanings of the words involved, but at the phrases used in other examples of the same type of interaction. If the example being examined is typical, it is polite, regardless of its linguistic form; if unusual, it may be polite or impolite, and more interpretive work is needed to find out which.

Terkourafi’s theory makes the Greek data easy to understand. The normal way to make requests was to use a bare, unsoftened imperative, and therefore that formulation of requests was polite. Within the culture concerned, it had the same force as our ‘please’, which is our normal way to ask for things; that is why a good translator often adds ‘please’ to an unsoftened imperative when rendering Greek into English. The small number of Greek passages in which a more elaborate polite request is used should be equated not with our ‘please’ but with what we would do in circumstances where ‘please’ or ‘can you’ is not enough.

For those circumstances there were no set expressions in the Greek of the Classical period, but rather a set of strategies that varied widely in their meaning and application. One is the strategy of making the request indirectly, as illustrated in passage 5. Here Socrates does not actually ask Diotima to explain what she means, but she takes the hint that he would like an explanation and agrees to provide one.

5) μαντείας . . . δεῖται ὅ τί ποτε λέγεις, καὶ οὐ μανθάνω (Plato, Symposium 206b)
‘Whatever you say requires divination, and I do not understand.’

I have argued this point at length in Dickey (2012b), where four different theories are tested on the same corpus of requests to establish their respective helpfulness.\textsuperscript{10} See e.g. Terkourafi (2002), (2004), (2005), (2008) and (forthcoming). For a detailed argument that Terkourafi’s theory works better for ancient evidence see Dickey (2012b).
Another polite strategy is the use of the optative with ἄν, such as in passages 6 and 7.12

6) καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν, ἔφη, πάνυ ᾧ ἡδέως, ὦ Συρακόσιε, μάθοιμι τὰ σχήματα παρὰ σοῦ. (Xenophon, Symposium 2.16)

‘And I for one, he said, would very gladly learn the figures from you, Syracusan.’

7) ἄγοιτ’ ᾧ μᾶταιον ἄνδρ’ ἐκποδῶν . . . (Sophocles, Antigone 1339)

‘Would you lead me out of the way, a useless man . . .’

These two strategies are by their very natures not formulaic; in addition, Greek of this period has several strategies that could in theory be formulaic but in practice are not. One is the strategy of indicating that it would be good to do something, illustrated in passages 8 and 9. This strategy could be formulaic, and (as we shall see) in the Greek of some periods it actually is formulaic, but in the Classical period it is not, for this idea can be expressed with a wide variety of different words.

8) ὦ Ἐρυξίμαχε, δίκαιος εἶ ἢ παῦσαί με τῆς λυγγὸς ἢ λέγειν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ἕως ἂν ἐγὼ παύσωμαι. (Plato, Symposium 185d)

‘Eryximachus, you ought either to stop my hiccups or to speak for me while I stop them.’

9) μέχρι δὲ τούτου, ἐπείτε οὕτω μετέδοξε, φυλάσσετε τὴν σχεδίην, πᾶσαν προθυμίην σωτηρίης τε καὶ φυλακῆς παρεχόμενοι. ταῦτα δὲ ποιεῦντες ἐμοὶ μεγάλως χαριεῖσθε. (Herodotus 4.98.3)

‘But until that time, since I have changed my mind, guard the bridge and show all possible care for its safety and protection. If you do this you will greatly please me.’

The same is true of the strategy illustrated in passage 10, that of softening a request with a phrase meaning ‘if you agree’. This is an obvious negative-politeness strategy, in Brown and Levinson’s terms, because it mitigates the force of the request by pointing out that the addressee does not have to comply and indicates deference to his opinion. We might expect it to be frequently used, but in fact it is very rare in Greek of the Classical period.

10) σὺ δ’ αὐτὸς αὐτὴν ἐίσαγ’, εἰ δοκεῖ, δόμου. (Euripides, Alcestis 1112)

‘But you take her yourself into the house, if it seems best to you.’

Some of the most important strategies involve the expression of heightened emotion. When a Greek is really desperate, he sometimes uses a verb meaning ‘I beg’ or ‘I entreat’, and/or an indication of something by which the addressee could be entreated, such as the gods or his knees or beard. This strategy is fairly common in literature, but that frequency may not reflect real life. Entreaty is a

12 Denizot (2011) 455 found on the basis of a different set of data that the optative was not necessarily polite and could even be disrespectful; although in my data this disrespectful usage does not appear, it is worth keeping in mind that the possibility of such implications also existed.
high-risk strategy: by putting the addressee under pressure to grant the request it is excellent for getting what one needs but poor from the perspective of maintaining good relations with the addressee. Hence the entreaty strategy is normally reserved for situations in which the speaker is fairly desperate – but those situations occur not infrequently in some literary genres. This strategy is illustrated in passages 11–14.

11) ἐγὼ δὲ πείθομαι ἐκείνην εἶναι πασέων γυναικῶν καλλίστην, καὶ σεο δέομαι μὴ δέξασθαι ἀνόμων. (Herodotus 1.8.4)
   ‘I believe that she is the most beautiful of all women, and I beg you not to ask [me to do anything] inappropriate!’

12) ἀλλ’ ἰκετεύω, … ὦ πάππε, δός μοι τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἄρξαι αὐτοῦ. (Xenophon, Cyropedia 1.3.11)
   ‘But I entreat you, grandfather, grant me to rule over him for three days!’

13) δέομαι δ’ ύμων ἁπάντων καὶ ἀντιβολῶ καὶ ἰκετεύω μετ’ εὐνοίας ἀποδέχεσθαί μου τοὺς λόγους. (Isaeus, De Menecle 2)
   ‘I ask you all, and entreat you, and supplicate you to receive my words with good will.’

14) μή, πρὸς γενείου, κρύπτε σύνδουλον σέθεν· στηήν γάρ, εἰ χρή, τῶνδε θήσομαι πέρι. (Euripides, Medea 65–6)
   ‘By your beard, don’t hide it from your fellow-slave; if necessary I’ll keep silent about it.’

It is debatable whether this strategy should count as politeness. In Brown and Levinson’s theory entreaty is the exact opposite of negative politeness and would often not count as positive politeness either (though some examples do constitute positive politeness, depending on how they are phrased). Many linguists would argue that what the expressions in passages 11–14 convey is urgency, which is not a form of politeness. At the same time the emotional expressions have something in common with other request strategies that are clearly polite, because these expressions put the addressee in a position of superiority vis-a-vis the speaker. Saying ‘I beg you to lend me £10’ is very different from using the imperative and saying ‘Lend me £10’; the request has been elaborated with something designed to acknowledge and overcome the problem that the addressee might not want to comply. Although in one sense this issue of classification is irrelevant to our understanding of the effects achieved by these phrases, in another sense it matters, because the strategy of entreaty is very common in Greek literature of the Classical period: about half the requests classed as ‘markedly polite’ in table A belong in this category.

13 For the theoretical debate on whether such a strategy should be considered part of politeness see e.g. work on Latin request formulae, among which such expressions figure prominently. Risselada (1993) esp. 253–5 argues that oro and obsecro (meaning ‘I beg’) are not polite although related expressions such as rogo and quaeso (meaning ‘I ask’) are, but Hall (2009) and Dickey (2012a) and (2012b) esp. 323–5 argue that this entire group of Latin request formulae is polite.
HELENISTIC PAPYRI

What happened to the Classical request system in later periods? To answer that question one cannot really look at literature from the Hellenistic and Roman periods, because the Greek literature of those periods was consciously Classicizing. In literature there appears to be no change in the way requests are made at any period of antiquity, just as there appears to be no change in Greek grammar or spelling, but it is unlikely that that situation reflects what happened in the ever-changing conversational language. The usual way to find out what really happened in post-Classical Greek is to look at papyrus documents, as these are far closer to everyday conversational language and so give us a chance to see various types of changes taking place. And in this case, papyrus documents show dramatic changes from their very beginnings, as illustrated in table C.¹⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents in sample</th>
<th>Bare imperative</th>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% markedly polite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.Enteux (body of petitions)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Enteux (response of officials)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Cair.Zen. I–III</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C: Linguistic forms used for requests in papyrus letters and petitions from the third century BCE

Already¹⁵ in the third century BCE papyrus documents reveal a very different type of request system from the one visible in earlier literature. Bare imperatives are still used, but much less often and only to social inferiors. When the recipient of a petition writes on the petition what his decision is, with instructions to officials about what to do in response to the petition, he almost invariably uses unsoftened imperatives. But the body of the petition never contains bare imperatives: petitioners in Hellenistic Egypt consistently use linguistic politeness strategies to make their requests. The same is true of papyrus letters from the third century BCE, which show strong internal consistency in the way requests are made, depending on the relative status of writer and addressee: for example, P.Cair.Zen. 1.59036 consists of a letter containing four requests, all bare imperatives, enclosing a copy of another letter to a different addressee, which has three requests, all using markedly polite language. Clearly, if a Greek-speaking writer in third-century Egypt wanted a superior to do something, he asked nicely using a markedly polite linguistic form – and if he wanted an inferior to do something, he used the bare imperative. That bare imperative was probably still not generally perceived as rude, as it would be in English; in situations where it was normal, it must

¹⁴ The figures in table C are based on a hand search of 113 petitions to the king (P.Enteux) and 531 assorted other documents (mostly letters but also including petitions to lower officials) from P.Cair.Zen. 1–III. The passages concerned can be found in the Appendix to this chapter.

¹⁵ That the request system in documentary Greek texts from later periods differs from the Classical one has already been established – see e.g. Leiwo (2009).
have still been seen as polite. But in situations where the imperative was no longer used, it was no longer polite.

Moreover, as marked politeness became more common it also became more formulaic: third-century documents abound in polite request formulae. These formulae appear to be derived from the polite request strategies present during the Classical period. Of course, not all those Classical strategies resulted in Hellenistic request formulae; as already noted, some strategies, such as indirectness and the use of the optative, were by their very natures non-formulaic. But of the strategies that had the capacity to become formulaic, the majority made that transition.

For example, the most common request formula in third-century papyri is the phrase καλῶς ἂν ποιήσαις + conditional participle ‘you would do well if’, derived from the strategy seen in passages 8 and 9 and illustrated below in passage 15. This optative formulation alternates with a variant using the future instead of the optative, καλῶς ποιήσεις + conditional participle ‘you will do well if’. The formulaic nature of these phrases is evident not only from the fact that these two linguistic forms are consistently used, but also from the fact that the request itself (which of course cannot be formulaic, as the exact action requested naturally varies from person to person) is regularly expressed with a conditional participle rather than via a subordinate clause introduced by εἰ ‘if’. Taking the optative and future variants together, this request formula is attested more than 140 times in letters and petitions from the third century BCE.

15) καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσαις ἐπιστείλας ἡμῖν ὡς βούλει γενέσθαι, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς οὕτω κατα-γορίσωμεν. (P.Cair.Zen. I.59036.15–16)

‘You would do well if you wrote to us about how you want it to be, so that we too can record it that way.’

Another Classical strategy to turn into a formula in the Hellenistic papyri is the one seen above in passage 10, the use of a phrase meaning ‘if you agree’. There are two different formulae for expressing this strategy in the Hellenistic period, as illustrated in passages 16 and 17: εἰ δοκεῖ and ἐὰν φαίνηται (both meaning literally ‘if it seems’, i.e. ‘if it seems best to you’). The former phrase is sometimes used in the Classical period, though not frequently, and the latter is not. The two are not completely equivalent in the third century: ἐὰν φαίνηται is more common, being attested more than 60 times in a wide variety of different contexts, while εἰ δοκεῖ is restricted almost entirely to petitions to the king. In these petitions it is always paired with the same verb, δέομαι, to make the formula δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἰ σοι δοκεῖ, which occurs more than 40 times on such petitions.

16) εἰ σοι φαίνηται σοι, διεγράψῃς Μηδείῳ εἰς τὰ ἰατρικὰ, ἐὰν τε βούλῃ. (P.Cair.Zen. I.59036.13)

‘If it seems best to you, pay [the money] to Medeios into the medical tax fund, if you want.’ [The phrase ἐὰν βούλῃ is rare and was probably not formulaic at this period.]

17) δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἰ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξῃ Διοφάνει τῷ στρατηγῷ γράψῃ[1] Ἡραστίωι τῷ ἐπιστάτῃ ἀποστεῖλας Πετοβάστιν καὶ Ἡρων τούς ἐγκατέμενους εἰς Κροκοδίλων πόλιν, ὅπως διακριθῶ αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ Διοφάνως, καὶ, εἰν ἑνδείξῃ αὐτοῖς
κατακεκλυκότας μου τὸν σπόρον, ἐπαναγκαθῆναι αὐτοὺς τὸν ἐμὸν σπόρον ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ
tάξασθαι αὐτοὺς τὰ ἐχφόρια, ἀπὸ δὲ τὸν ἱκανὸ γεωργο ῦσιν γῆς ἀντιδοθῆναι μοι τὸ ἴσον
πλῆθος ἀνθ’ ἥς καὶ τῇ κατακεκλύκασιν. (P.Enteux 60.6–11)

‘So I ask you, king, if it seems best to you, to order Diophanes the strategos to write to
Hephaestion the epistates [and tell him] to send Petobastis and Horus, the accused, to
Crocodilopolis, so that a judgement may be made between them and me before Diophanes,
and if I prove that they flooded my seeded field, [I ask] that they be compelled to
take over my seeded field and pay the charges on it, and that an amount of land
equivalent to that which they flooded be given to me in exchange from the land that they
themselves work.’

The third major source of third-century polite request formulae is verbs with
meanings such as ‘I beg’. In contrast to the large number of such verbs available
for expressing entreaty in the Classical period, only one, δέομαι, went on to
become a Hellenistic formula. Δέομαι is common in third-century papyri, especi-
ally in petitions to the king, where it is almost always found with the same other
words, as in passage 17 above. It no longer gives the impression of conveying
emotional force as in the Classical period (see passages 11 and 13 above, with
preceding comments), and indeed it no longer seems to be used to put pressure on
the addressee to fulfil the request, because it is systematically combined with εἰ
dοκεῖ ‘if it seems best’, which as we have seen points out to the addressee that
there is no obligation to comply with the request. As noted above, the use of
δέομαι in the Classical period may not be classifiable as a politeness strategy at
all; this element of doubt is gone by the third century, when it is clearly an ele-
ment of formulaic politeness because it is the standard way of making certain
requests.

The other Classical verbs with this same general meaning do not become
Hellenistic formulae; for example ἀντιβολῶ, seen in passage 13 above, is not used
for requests at all in the third century. The position of ἱκετεύω is particularly
interesting, because this verb is indeed used for requests, but it does not appear to
become a formula. That is, ἱκετεύω is found only occasionally in the third century,
and in later centuries it disappears altogether from papyrus documents, whereas
the formulae already discussed all continue into the second century and usually
well beyond that. Moreover ἱκετεύω seems to carry emotional force even in third-
century petitions, as illustrated in passage 18 where the rest of the sentence shows
the writer’s level of emotion and desperation.

18) δέομαι οὖν [σο]υ καὶ ἱκετεύω, εἰ καί σ[οι] δοκεῖ, μὴ περιιδεῖν με καταφθειρόμενον
ἀδίκως ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ. (P.Cair.Zen. III.59520.8–9)

‘So I ask and implore you, if it seems best to you as well, not to overlook me perishing
unjustly in the prison.’

Another verb in this category, ἄζω, is never used to make requests in the Class-
ical period but nevertheless becomes a common request formula in the Hellenistic
period, as illustrated in passage 19. The use of ἄζω starts off slowly, for the verb
is significantly less common than δέομαι for requests in documents of the third
century, but it rapidly gains ground and is more common than δέομαι by the
second century. The use of ἀξιῶ is also more flexible than that of δέομαι, for ἀξιῶ is found in a wider range of documents and with a variety of different other words.

19) ἀξιῶσε, ἐάν σοι φαίνηται, συντάξαι γράψαι Ἡρακλείδῃ τῷ ἐν τῷ Ἡρ(ακλεο)πο(λίτῃ) ἀρχιφυ(λακίτῃ) διέσθαι αὐτούς, ὅπως γίνωνται πρὸς τῇ [χρ]είᾳ καὶ μὴ ἀργῇ τὰ πλοία. (Chr. Wilck. 166.2.9–10a)
‘I ask you, if it seems best to you, to order (someone) to write to Herakleides the archiphylakites in the Herakleopolite nome (and tell him) to release them, so that they may do what needs to be done and the ships may not lie idle.’

Thus our evidence suggests that between the Classical and early Hellenistic periods there was an abrupt and massive shift in the way Greek speakers made requests. They went from a system without any specific formulae for making polite requests to one with a set of different formulae specialized for use in different contexts. Why did this happen?

One possible answer is that the shift did not happen in practice but is an illusion arising from the changing nature of our evidence. The Hellenistic evidence used above is all documentary, taken from letters and petitions; this type of source simply does not survive to any significant extent from the earlier period. Our Classical evidence is all literary, and if one discounts post-Classical literature as not representative of conversational usage, there is by definition no literary evidence for Greek of the Hellenistic period. Is it possible that the polite request formulae seen in Hellenistic letters and petitions were already used as request formulae in earlier centuries and that our ignorance of that usage comes from the loss of the equivalent documents from the Classical period?

At first glance this objection seems unanswerable, but on closer inspection it can be shown to be incorrect. In the first place, if the Hellenistic request formulae had existed in the Classical period we should see more of them in literature of that period. Of course some literary genres actively avoided ordinary conversational language, and many good authors even in other genres made a point of varying their language to avoid formulaic repetition; such considerations would undoubtedly make formulae that were common in conversational language difficult to detect in the writings of authors like Aeschylus or Aristophanes. But other genres and authors were far more tolerant of formulae, repetition and conversational language: for example Xenophon and Menander are, with respect to other features of the Greek language, both repetitious and predictable. With use of various vocatives, for example, there were set rules in the Classical period that led to repeated use of the same formulae over and over again, and both Menander and Xenophon were happy to follow those rules in their works: vocative usage in both these authors is highly predictable.16 But in their phrasing of requests too polite to use the imperative the same two authors are entirely unpredictable and show no trace of formulaic usage. This fact strongly suggests that there were no fixed request for-

formulae in the conversational language of Xenophon’s or Menander’s day, i.e. the later Classical period.

The other reason to believe that the Hellenistic request formulae are genuine products of the Hellenistic period has to do with the use of verbs of emotional entreaty such as δέομαι. The Classical examples of such verbs nearly all occur in contexts where genuine emotion appears to be present, but the Hellenistic examples largely do not (with the exception of ἱκετεύω, which is notably different in other ways as well). When a term becomes formulaic it inevitably loses its emotional force in the contexts where the formulaic usage appears: thus ‘dear’ at the beginning of an English letter carries no emotional force, though the same word can be emotional in other contexts. Yet the use of δέομαι to make requests in Classical passages such as those seen in 11 and 13 above clearly does carry emotional weight (i.e. evoking pity). If the formulaic, non-emotional use of δέομαι seen in third-century documents had already existed in the Classical period, the word could not have been used by Classical writers in the way it was in fact used.

Therefore the shift in request strategies seen in our evidence must reflect a genuine change in the Greek language. Why would a language that for centuries had had not a single polite request formula suddenly develop an entire set of them, with firm conventions for their use? One possibility is massive influence from a foreign language, such as might take place if the writers of the third-century documents were non-native speakers of Greek – but that cannot be the answer here, for the writers clearly were native Greek speakers. Of course, Egyptian Greek documents sometimes show the influence of other languages even when written by native Greek speakers; at most periods there is occasional influence from the Egyptian language,\(^{17}\) and at a later period many documents show significant influence from Latin,\(^{18}\) but the usual markers of such influence are absent from these third-century documents. They are far too early for significant Latin influence,\(^ {19}\) and they come from too high a social setting for significant Egyptian influence.\(^ {20}\)

The unlikelihood of direct linguistic influence from another culture does not, however, rule out the possibility of cultural influence; indeed the abrupt shift in language usage seen between Classical Greece and Hellenistic Egypt must be connected to the equally sharp cultural transition between those two worlds. When the Greek language came to Egypt it was transplanted into a society with a radi-

\(^{17}\) Cf., e.g., Fewster (2002) and Muhs (2009).

\(^{18}\) There is a vast literature on Latinisms in the Greek papyri; see for example Cavenaile (1951) and (1952), Daris (1991), Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser (1996–), Dickey (2004), Filos (2009) and, most relevantly to the present investigation, Dickey (2009).

\(^{19}\) Latin influence on Egyptian Greek was, unsurprisingly, rare before the annexation of Egypt by Rome at the end of the first century BCE; even after the annexation it took some time for Latin influence to reach the level that would plausibly account for the type of shift investigated here. See Dickey (2003) and (2004).

\(^{20}\) Direct influence from the Macedonian language is unlikely, because most of the documents do not come from a high enough social level to have been written by speakers of Macedonian, but indirect influence cannot be completely ruled out, particularly given how little we know about linguistic politeness in Macedonian.
cally different social structure. The Classical Greek world was in many ways a fundamentally egalitarian one, particularly in democracies like Athens but also even in cities that were not officially democratic, like Sparta where kings ruled but not as autocrats. But Egyptians, like most of the peoples conquered by Alexander, had never been egalitarian; they had a highly stratified social structure, as did the Macedonians who took control of Egypt after the conquest. Even if all the writers and addressees of the requests in our third-century documents were native Greek speakers, they are unlikely to have been Greeks either in the sense of having grown up in Greece or (for most writers, at least) in the sense of having ancestors who had grown up in Greece (as opposed to Macedon).

The Greek speakers of Ptolemaic Egypt needed a request system that fitted their culture by reflecting the difference between asking a favour of a superior and giving an order to an inferior, and that naturally led them to restrict the use of the bare imperative to the latter type of request. But of course that restriction enormously increased the number of requests that did not use the bare imperative, necessitating the frequent use of strategies that Greeks of the Classical period had used much more sparingly in such circumstances. As long as those strategies were used rarely and in special circumstances such as heightened emotion, they naturally did not become formulaic, but as soon as they became common there was a natural tendency for them to turn into formulae. In doing so the Greek request formulae followed the same path as English expressions like ‘can you?’: just as ‘can you?’ has effectively ceased to be a question in English, so Greek δέομαι effectively ceased to be an entreaty once it turned into a request formula.
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APPENDIX: DATA ON HELLENISTIC REQUESTS

Note: passages consisting mainly and even entirely of supplements are recorded here for the sake of completeness if they occur in editions, but those where too little is left for the supplement to be reliable are not counted in the statistics used in the article. Requests counted for statistical purposes have an indication of their classification (‘bare imperative’, ‘polite’, ‘other’); if there is no such indication they have not been counted. Each passage is considered a single request unless otherwise specified; where a passage contains two requests as restored but only one is really present on the papyrus, only the one securely attested on the papyrus has been counted. Expressions phrased as requests that do not really function as requests are excluded altogether from these data (i.e. the data are ‘directives’ in the speech-act theory sense); these excluded expressions are greeting formulae (e.g. χαίρειν ‘greetings!’), farewell formulae (e.g. ἔρρωσο ‘be well!’) and expressions introducing information being conveyed (e.g. γίνωσκε ‘know!’).

**P. Enteux. (body of petitions, 78 polite requests):**
1.10–11 δέοµαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, τὴν ἔντευξίν µου/ ἀποσταλῆναι (polite)
2.6–7 [δέ]οµαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
3.6 [δέοµαι οὐ] σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, συντάξαι (polite)
4r.7 [δέοµαι οὖν σοῦ, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
5r.6–7 ἀξοῦµέν σε δεόµενοι, βασιλεῦ (polite)
6.4 δέοµαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
7.3–4 [δέοµαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, π[ροστάξαι]
8.19–20 δέοµαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι
9.6 δέοµαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
10.6 δέοµαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
11.3–4 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
12.5 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
13.6 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξα[ι] (polite)
14.6 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
15.6 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
16.3 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
17.5 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
18.6 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, συντάξαι (polite)
20.6 [δέομαι] οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
21.6 δεόμεθα οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
22.6 δεόμεθα οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
23.7 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι]
24.5–6 [δέομαι οὖν σου,] βασιλεῦ, ἐπὶ σὲ τὴν καταφυγὴν ποιουµένη, προστάξαι (polite)
25.9–10 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
26.10 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, [μή] περιπεθεῖν με (polite)
27.13 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
28.8 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
29.12–13 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, μὴ ὑπεριδεῖν με (polite)
30.8 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
31.5 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι]
32.9–10 δεόμεθα οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
33.6–7 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
34.6 [δεόμεθα οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, μὴ] περιπεθεῖν με (polite)
35.5 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
36.3 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
37.6–7 δεόμαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
38.7–8 δεόμαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
40.5 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, ἀποστεῖλαι (polite)
41.5 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, ἐπι βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
42.8–4 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
43.2 δεομαι[α] οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
44.4 [δε]όμεθα οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
45.6 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
46.4–5 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
47.6 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, μὴ περιπεθεῖν (polite)
48.7 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
49.5–6 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἰ σοι δοκεῖ, συντάξαι (polite)
50.3–4 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
51.3–4 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, ἑκαστῇ ὁ[ικεῖ]τὸς ἐκτὸς ὁ Σάτυρος τοῦ Θεογένους, ὁ δὲ Θεογένης τετελεύτηκεν, προστάξαι (polite)
52.7 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, [προστάξαι (polite)]
53.6–7 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite) οἱ δὲ Θεογένης τετελεύτηκεν, προστάξαι (polite)]
54.9 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
55.14 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
56.4 [ . . . βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι]
57.5 [δέομαι οὖν σου,] βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
58.15 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ . . . ) (polite)
59.8–9 δεόμεθα οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
60.6 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
61.7 [δέομαι οὖν] σου, βασιλεῦ, εἴ καὶ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
62.8–9 [δεόμαι οὖν σου,] βασιλεῦ, προστάξαι (polite)
64.10 [δέομαι οὖν, βασιλεῦ, προστάζατε]
65.12 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξαι (polite)
66.6–7 δέομαι οὖν σο[υ], βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
67.3 [δέομαι σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δο[κεῖ, προστάξα]τι (polite)
68.12 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξα]τι (polite)
69.4–5 δέομαι οὖν σού, βασιλεύ, προστάξαι (polite)
70.9–10 [δέομ]αι οὖν σου, βασ[ιλεύ, εἴ σ]οι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
71.6 [δέομαί σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξα] (polite)
72.6 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα (polite)
73.9 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα (polite)
74.13–14 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξα (polite)
75.10–11 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα (polite)
76.5–6 δέομαι οὖν σού, βασιλεύ, προστάξα (polite)
77.4–5 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξα (polite)
78.12 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα] (polite)
79.9 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, μὴ περιιδεῖν (polite)
81.20–21 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξα] (polite)
82.6–7 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, ἱκέτις ἐπὶ σὲ καταπεφευγυῖα, μὴ περιιδεῖν (polite)
83.8 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα (polite)
84.24 δέομαι οὖν σο[υ . . . ] (polite)
85.7–8 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα]
86.10–11 δέομαι οὖν σε, βασιλεύ, δεοµένη προστάξα (polite)
88.4 [δέομαι ο]ὖν σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξα (polite)
89.8–9 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξα (polite)
90.5 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξα (polite)
91.12 δέομαι [ο]ὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα (polite)
92.9 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, ἀποστεῖλαι]
93.2 δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ [ . . . ] (polite)
102.1 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ [ . . . ]
106.4 [δέομαι ο]ὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα (polite)
109.10–11 [δέομαι οὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα]
112.3 [δέομαί ο]ὖν σου, βασιλεύ, προστάξα (polite)

P. Enteux. (response of officials, 91 bare imperatives and one other form):

4r.13 ἐπισκέψαµενος φρόντισον ὅπως τύχῃ τὸ δίκαιον (bare imperative)
6.9–10 παραλαβὼν τὸ δίκαιον ἐπιστάτην καὶ τὸν κω[µο]γρ(αµµατέα), ἐπί(σκεψαι) καὶ, ἐὰν ἦθη ἃ
γράφει ἀληθῆι παρὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν ὑστερήσω τοῦ δικαίου καὶ ἀπολ[ . . . προ]στάξα (polite)
8.24 ἀπό(στειλον) ὅπ(ως) κατὰ τοὺς νό(µους) τὸ δί(καιον) λάβωσιν (bare imperative)
9.12 µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐ(τούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον) (2 bare imperatives)
10.9 µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτοίς (bare imperative)
11.7 µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτοίς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον) (2 bare imperatives)
12.9 παράδειξον αὐ[τούς· εἰ δὲ µή, πρὸς ἡµᾶς ἀπ(όστειλον) (2 bare imperatives)
13.10 µάλιστα αὐ[τούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον) (2 bare imperatives)
14.13 διασάφησον ἡµῖν περὶ τούτων (bare imperative)
15.9 ἀπόστειλον πρὸς ἡµᾶς (bare imperative)
18.10 [µάλιστα µὲν διάλυσον] αὐτοίς· εἰ δὲ µή, πρ[ὸς ἡ]µᾶς ἀπ(όστειλον) (2 bare imperatives)
20.9–10 ἐπανάγκασον τὰ δίκαια ποιῆ[σαι . . . ἐὰ]ν δὲ τί ἀντιλέγωσιν, ἀπό(στειλον) (2 bare
imperatives)
21.11 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐ(τούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον) (2 bare imperatives)
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24.11 μάλιστα [διάλυσον] αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ἄπο(στεῖλον) (bare imperative)

25.15–16 μάλιστα μὲν αὐτοὺς σὺ διάλυσον τὸν στρατό πρὸς τὸν Στρουβόν· ἐὰν δὲ τι ἀντιλέγητι, ἄπο(στεῖλον) αὐτὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ὅπως μὴ ἄλλος ἔσται. (2 bare imperatives and 1 other)

28.12 [ἐπὶ(σκεψάμενος) φρόν(τισον)] ὅπως τὸν δικαιόν τύχῃ ηµῖν (2 bare imperatives)

29.17 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐ(τούς)· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)]

31.8 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)]

32.16 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

36.6 [ἐπι(σκεψάμενος) φρόν(τισον) ὅπως τῶν δικαίων τύχηι (bare imperative)

37.12 µάλιστα µὲν διάλυσον αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, πρὸς ἡµᾶς [ἀπ(όστειλον)] (bare imperative)

38.14 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)]

41.8 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

42.7 ἐπι(σκεψάμενος) φρόντισον ὅπως τῶν δικαίων τύχηι (bare imperative)

43.8 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)]

44.9–10 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)]

45.14 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, πρὸς ἡµᾶς ἄπ(όστειλον)] (bare imperative)

50.10 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

51v.1–2 ἀνακαλεσάµενος [τὸν Σάτυρον] ἦµεν [ . . . ] ἦµεν (2 bare imperatives)

52.11 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

53.11 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

54.14 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

56.7 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπ(όστειλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

57.11 [µά(λιστα) διαλύσεως αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπό(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

58.24 [µά(λιστα) διαλύσεως αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἀπό(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

59v.1 [µάλιστα] διάλυσεως αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, πρὸς ἡµᾶς ἄπο(στεῖλον) (2 bare imperatives)

60.13 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσο) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

62.14 διασάρῃσαν ἡµῖν περὶ ὧν γράφει/ [ . . . ] [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς . . . ] (2 bare imperatives)

64.14 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον)]

65.19–20 [µάλιστα] διαλύσεως αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον) (2 bare imperatives)

66.13 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

69.9 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

70.16 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

71.11 ἐπι(σκεψάμενος) φρόντισον ὅπως τῶν δικαίων τύχηι (bare imperative)

72.10 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

73.12 [µάλιστα] διαλύσεως αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, πρὸς ἡµᾶς ἄπο(στεῖλον) (2 bare imperatives)

74.20 [µάλιστα] διαλύσεως αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον) (2 bare imperatives)

82.12 ἄπο(στεῖλον) τὸν ἐνκαλούµενον (bare imperative)

83.13 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

85.11 διασάρῃσαν ἡµῖν περὶ ὧν γράφει/ [ . . . ] (2 bare imperatives)

88.8 [ . . . ἐπὶ(σκεψάμενος) πρὸς τούτον (bare imperative)

89.12 ἐπι(σκεψάμενος) φρόν(τισον) ὅπως τὸν δικαιόν τύχῃ (bare imperative)

91.16–17 [µάλιστα] διαλύσεως αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον) (2 bare imperatives)

93.5–6 νόµον ἐπανάγκασον ὅπως τὰ δίκαια ποιήσωσιν . . . ἐὰν δὲ τι ἀντιλέγωσιν, ἄπο(στεῖλον)

95.13 [µά(λιστα) δι(άλυσον) αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον)] (2 bare imperatives)

97.1 [µάλιστα] διαλύσεως αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ µή, ἄπο(στεῖλον) (2 bare imperatives)
Eleanor Dickey

98.1–2 Φ(ρό)ν(τισον) ὅπως ὑπὸ µηδενὸς ἀδικηθ[ . . . ] ἐὰν δὲ τινὲς ἀντιλέγωσιν, ἀπόστειλον αὐτοὺς θη[ς ἡµὲς] (2 bare imperatives)

101.9 ἐπισκεψάµενος φρόντισον [ὅπως τύχῃ τοῦ δικαίου] (bare imperative)

P. Caur. Zel. 1 (47 bare imperatives, 59 polite forms and 7 other forms):

59002.2 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
59015v.6–7 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσαις τὴν πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιησάµενος (polite)
— 9–10 τοῦτο γὰρ ποιήσαις εὐχαριστήσεις [εἰς ἡµὺν] (polite)
— 12 ἐπισκεψάµενος δ'/ θης ἂν ποιήσαις (polite)
— 22 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσαις τὴν πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιησάµενος (polite)
— 34–5 διὸ καὶ σὺ διὸ δὲ εὐχαριστήσεις ἂν γράφωσι (polite)
— 43 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσῃς σ]'υντάξας (polite)
— 47 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσῃς γράφωσι (polite)

59016.2 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσῃς δοὺς (polite)
— 4 φρόντισον (bare imperative)
— 6 γράψον (bare imperative)

59019.7 γράψον (bare imperative)
— 11 πειρά δὲ μου ὅτι τάχος γράφειν (bare imperative)
59021.37–9 γέγραφα οὖν σοι ταῦτα ἵνα εἰδῆις καὶ ἐάν σοι φαίνηται ἡµῖν σοι, διελθὼν εἰς ἐµπόριον καὶ ἀγοράσας (other)
— 49–50 γράψον (bare imperative)
59023.1–5 καλῶς ἂν ποίησαις . . . δοὺς Ἰατροκλεῖ (polite)
59024.2 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
59025.6–10 πρὸς ∆ιὸς οὖν καὶ θεῶν µὴ ὀκνήσῃς διελθὼν εἰς ἐµπόριον καὶ ἀγοράσας (other)
— 14 λαβὲ (bare imperative)
— 19–21 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσῃς ἀποστέλλουν (polite)
— 24–5 ἐάν δὲ καὶ ἐν δυνάτῳ ἦς, ἀγόρασον (polite)
59026.14–15 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσῃς σοι (polite)
— 49–50 γράψον (bare imperative)
59030.2 καλῶς ἂν ποίησαις καὶ περὶ τοῦτων ἐπισκεψάµενος, εἰ καὶ σοι δοκεῖ (polite)
59032.2 χαρίζοι δ' ἄµ µε [ . . . ] (polite)
59034.21 'ις σοι/ µὴ καταπλαγῆις (other)
59035.1 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσῃς δοὺς (polite)
59036.3 διάγραψον (bare imperative)
— 6–7 διάπεµψον . . . ἐπιµελέσῃς ὡς διαγράψῃ (2 bare imperatives)
59038.17–20 [ἐάν οὖν] σοι φαίνηται, καλῶς ἂν ποιήσῃς . . . κομισάµενος (polite)
— 24–5 χαριεῖ µοι ὡς ἐνδέχεται µάλιστα (polite)
59039.6 χαριεῖ µοι ὡς ἐνδέχεται µάλιστα (polite)
59041.18–22 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσῃς φιλοτιµηθείς, ὡς [πρὸς ἑαυτόν] ἐπίστησι, ὡς [ὁµῶν] παρὰ τοῦ
Θεοδώρου λάβηις τὰ ἐπιστ[όλια] καὶ ἀποστείλη[σ] ἡµῖν (2 polite)

59042.3–4 χαριεῖ οὖµ µοι συσπουδάσεις, εἰ ἔστιν ἐν δυνατῶι, ἀφεθῆναι αὐτόν (polite)

59043.3–4 [καλός ὁ νους ποιήσεις γ]ράφας ἡµῖν

59044.5–6 καλός ὁ νους ποιήσεις ἀπεκεφαλήματιο (polite)

— 16–18 δὲ µὴ φαίνηται ἡµῖν ἀποδούναι, Δημητρίου γε [ἐπ]µελόµενοι χαριζέσθε µοι (polite)

— 35–8 καλός δ' ἂν ποιώς καὶ συγγνώµην ἡµῖν ἔχων (polite)

59045.3–4 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσαις ἐπισκέψαµεν (polite)

59046.8–9 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιής δοὺς αὐτῶι (polite)

59047.2–3 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσαις [ 6ἀποστείλων 6ἀποστείλων 6ἀποστείλων 6ἀποστείλων 6ἀποστείλων 6ἀποστείλων τε ἐπιστολὴν ἀποδούς (polite)

59048.1 µνησθῆναι (other)

59049.1 ἀπόστειλον (other)

— 2 ὑποµνήσον

59050.1 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσεις γινώσκεις (2 polite)

59052.3 ὅπως εἰδὼς ἀναφέρῃς (other)

59056.5 καλῶς δ' ἂν ποιήσαις καὶ σὺ ἐκείνοις τε γράψας (polite)

59057.2–3 σὺ δὲ καλῶς ποιήσεις ἐκπονήσας (polite)

59058.15–16 γράψον (bare imperative)

59093.15–16 γέγραφα ὅτι τὸν Ἀπολλοφάνην µηθὲν εἰς τὸ σὸν ὄνοµα ἀπογράφεσθαι, ὡς µὲν ἂν δοκέεις χρήσιµον εἶναι (polite)

— 19 καλὸς δ' ἂν ποιώς καὶ σὺ ἐπιµελόµενος σαµ[το]ὸ δῶσος ὑγιαίνηις (polite)

59096.2–3 καλὸς ἂν ποιήσεις γράφας (polite)

59097.3 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)

59098.8 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)

59101.3–4 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσεις καὶ σὺ λαβὼν ἀποδοὺς εὐκαίρως καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ συνσπεύσεσσας . . . καὶ φανερὸν αὐτῶι ποιήσας (4 polite)

59105.1–3 τοῦ ἐρεβίνθου καὶ τῆς µήκων ὅσοµ µὲν πλῆθος εἰς σπέρµα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ συνεπερχόμενα . . . τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν διατηρεῖτε (bare imperative)

59106.2–4 σὺ δὲ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ νοµοῦ συναγοράζει καὶ εἰς τὸν Μεµφίτην ἀποστεῖλον (2 bare imperatives)

— 6 συναγοράζει (bare imperative)
59107.5 γράψον (bare imperative)
59109.2 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
59120.2–4 ἐξελεύσονται καὶ συμβολά, ἀποδοθήτω αὐτοῖς καὶ κόμισαι 
τὰ β[α]τικὰ παρὰ 
Διονυσοδόρου (2 bare imperatives)
— 5 δός (bare imperative)
59124.4–5 σπούδασον ὅτι ἐδοθήτω \[ο||ν ἀποστεύ|||αι (bare imperative)
— 6 [κ]αλὸς δὲ ποιήσεις καὶ αὐτός παραγενόμενος (polite)
— 8 [ἀπόστειλον]
59129.8 σύνταξον (bare imperative)
— 20 ἀπόστειλε (bare imperative)
59130.4–5 καλὸς ἢ ἁπλὸς σύνταξόν (bare imperative)
— 18–20 τοὺς γεωργοὺς τοὺς ἐν Ταπτεία µὴ ἐνοχλεῖτε καὶ δοὺς τῶι παιδί (2 polite)
59132.8–9 ἢ ἃν ὅτι σοι φαίνεται καὶ περὶ τούτων καλὸς ἢ ἁμην καὶ ἡµῖν 
γράφων ὡς ἢν ἔχῃς (2 polite)
59134.7–8 ὡς ἢν σοι φαίνεται, γράψον ἡµῖν (bare imperative)
59135.3–5 χαρέσω σῷ ὡς ἢν καὶ ἑπισκεφτέσθης (polite)
— 13 γράψον (bare imperative)
59142.3 σύνταξον (bare imperative)
59145.11–13 δός σῷ ὡς ἢν (polite) καὶ δοὺς τῶι παιδί (2 polite)
59146.4 γράψον (bare imperative)
59147.1–3 καλὸς καὶ ἡµῖν καὶ σοι ἑπισκεφθής (2 polite)
— 12 γράψον (bare imperative)
59148.3–4 σῷ ὡς ἢν καὶ ἡµῖν καὶ σοι 
ποιήσας καὶ ἀποστείλας (2 polite)
59149.3–4 καλὸς ἢ [ὁν 
ποιήσας ρι]ναγκάσας (polite)
59150.11 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας (polite)
59152.12 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας (polite)
59153.1–2 [καλὸς] καὶ 
ῥῆσεις ἢ ἐπισκεφθής (2 polite)
59154.3 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
59155.3 πότισον (bare imperative)
59156.2 παρακαλόμουσον (bare imperative)
— ἢ ἡµῖν ἢ ἐπιμελήσης (2 bare imperatives)
59157.1 φρόντισον (bare imperative)
59158.2 [φρόντισον (bare imperative)
59159.4 σύνταξον (bare imperative)
59160.2 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας (polite)
59161.2 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας, ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας, ἢ 
καὶ δοὺς τῶι παιδί (2 polite)
— 11 γράψον (bare imperative)
59169.7 ἐμφάνισον (bare imperative)
59170.2 φρόντισον οὖν
— 3 [δός]

P.Cair.Zen. II (70 bare imperatives, 47 polite forms and 6 other forms):
59142.3 σύνταξον (bare imperative)
59145.11–13 δός σῳ 
ποιήσας (polite)
59146.4 γράψον (bare imperative)
59147.1–3 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας, ἢ 
καὶ δοὺς τῶι παιδί (2 polite)
59148.3–4 σ-reply σῳ 
ποιήσας προσόν ἤματον καὶ ἄλλο θερινὸν (χιτῶνα) Πτολεμαῖοι 
καὶ δοὺς τῶι παιδί (2 polite)
59149.3–4 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας καὶ ἑπισκεφθής (2 polite)
59150.11 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας (polite)
59152.12 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας (polite)
59153.1–2 [καλὸς] καὶ 
ῥῆσεις ἢ ἐπισκεφθής (2 polite)
59154.3 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
59155.3 πότισον (bare imperative)
59156.2 παρακαλόμουσον (bare imperative)
— 3 λαβέ (bare imperative)
59157.1 φρόντισον (bare imperative)
59158.2 [φρόντισον (bare imperative)
59159.4 σύνταξον (bare imperative)
59160.2 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας (polite)
59161.2 καλὸς ἢν σῳ 
ποιήσας, ἢ 
καὶ δοὺς τῶι παιδί (2 polite)
59169.7 ἐμφάνισον (bare imperative)
59170.2 φρό−ντισον οὖν
— 3 [δός]
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4 [γράψον (bare imperative)]
59171.3 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσας παραγενόμενος (polite)
59177.1 ἀπόστειλε [ὁ]ν (bare imperative)
59179.11 καλῶς ποιήσας συντάξας (polite)
— 17–18 [Επιμελέσα τοι για να γενήσει το συναντήστι] (bare imperative)
59181.1–2 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσεις ἀποστείλας (polite)
59184.2 λαβέ (bare imperative)
— 6 [κατασκηνί]άμην (bare imperative)
59188.2 συντάξαι (other)
— 7 συντάξαι (other)
59189.3–4 [δέοµαι οὖν σου], εἰ σοι δοκεῖ . . .
59190.2 σύνταξα (polite)
— 3 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
59191.4–5 [συνάγει]ον (polite)
59192.5–6 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσας εὐχαριστήσας ἡµῖν (polite)
59193.6 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσας συντάξας (polite)
59194.5 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσας συμπέψας (polite)
59195.4 παράδοτε (bare imperative)
59197.1 προσάγαγε (bare imperative)
59198.2 συντάξαι (other)
— 4 γράψε (bare imperative)
59200.1 δότε (bare imperative)
59201.10 συνανάγκασον (bare imperative)
59202.6 κατάστησον (bare imperative)
59203.10 συναντήσας (polite)
59204.2 παράδειξα (bare imperative)
59212.2 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσας συναντήσας (polite)
— 4 γράψε (bare imperative)
59217.3–4 [χαρεῖς] ἂν ἦµιν τὸ τε πλοιάριον χρήσας τὸ [ . . . ] μα καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων
— 5 συ [δοῦναι], εἰ σοι δοκεῖ (2 polite)
59224.6–7 [καλῶς] οὖν ποιήσας γράψας (polite)
59225.4–5 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσας μᾶλλον μὲν ἄγοράς (polite)
— 7 χαρεῖς μοι γράψας τὴν ταχίστην (polite)
— 10 καὶ περὶ τούτων οὖν μα ἑπιστέψασα καλῶς ἂν ποιήσας (polite)
59228.11 γράψας (bare imperative)
59229.9 δότε (bare imperative)
59230.1 καλῶς ποιήσας ἀποστείλας (polite)
— 3 προδιείλας (2 polite)
— 4 συμπέψας (bare imperative)
59233.2 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσας ἀποστείλας (polite)
— 3 ἀποστείλον (bare imperative)
59240.4–8 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσαις εἰ μὲν ἐπιμελήσῃς, εἰ δὲ μὴ, φροντίσας ὅπως ἀσφαλῶς μετὰ τῶν ὑμετέρων ἀποσταλόνοις ὡς δυντείς Ἀπολλωνίου, ἣν μὴ τι κατὰ τὰ τέλη ἐνοχλήθησιν, καὶ ἓν μὲν αὐτὸς παραγνύνει, εἰ δὲ μὴ, γράψε (3 polite)

59241.2 λαβέ ... καὶ ἀπέγδος (2 bare imperatives)

59243.6–7 εἴ σοι δοκεῖ ἐλθὲν πρὸς μέ, εἵνα εὐφράνθῃς (polite)

59244.5 ἐπίσκεψαι (bare imperative)

59247.4–5 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις Ἡδύλον παραγενέσθαι (polite)

59251.3–4 χαριεῖ οὖµ µοι σαυτοῦ τε ἐπιµελόµενος ἵνα ὑγιαίνηις καὶ ἡµῖν γράφων ἐάν τί σοι βούληι γίνεσθαι ὧν ἡµεῖς δυνάµεθα (2 polite)

59254.3 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις καταλυµάτιόν µοι ἑτοιµάσας (polite)

59259.1 ἐπανάγκασον (bare imperative)

59262.3 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις ἀποστείλας (polite)

59264.10 γράψον (bare imperative)

59270.8 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)

59271.5–6 σὺ οὖν ἀπόστειλόν µοι (bare imperative)

59273.3 σὺ οὖν προαπόστειλόν τινα (bare imperative)

59275.12–14 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις ἐντυχὼν Ζήνωνι ὑπὲρ τούτων (polite)

59277.5 διάγραψον (bare imperative)

59279.6 σὺ οὖν ἔντυχε Ζήνωνι (bare imperative)

59282.3 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσαις, ὡς ἄν σοι ἀποδῶι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, γνωριμώτερόν σε ποιήσας αὐτῶι καί, ἐάν τινα σου χρείαν ἔχηι, ποιῶν αὐτῶι ὅσα ἔστιν σοι ἐν δυνατῶι (2 polite)

59285.2 δός (bare imperative)

59286.4 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)

59290.3 καλῶς οὖν σηµειώσεις µὴ παρέργως (polite)

59291.6–8 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσεις ἐπισκεψάµενος ἡµᾶς καὶ µὴ περιειδεῖν παραπολλυµένους τὴν λειµῶι, ἀνακαλεσάµενος Ὡρον διαλογίσεσθαι ἡµῖν (3 polite)

P.Cair.Zen. III (91 bare imperatives, 106 polite forms and 8 other forms):

59298.1 γράψον (bare imperative)

59301.4 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσεις διέµενος (polite)

59303.5–6 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις µὴ παρέργως (polite)

59304.5–6 ἐάν οὖν καί νῦν καλῶς ποιήσης, εἰ µὴ ἀπέσταλκας ἐπ' αὐτῷ, νῦν γε ἀπεστήλαξα καὶ ἡµῖν ἐπιστολὴν γράψας (2 polite)
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59306.9–10 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις γράψας (polite)
59307.15–16 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις δοῦς (polite)
59308.5 οὐ οὖν σύνταξέων (bare imperative)
59309.3–4 καὶ νῦν δὲ καλῶς ποιήσεις πρὸ τοῦ Διότιμον ἀναπλεύσαι φροντίσας (polite)
— 6–7 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις διαθέμενος (polite)
59310.4 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις συντάξας (polite)
59311.4–5 καλῶς οὖν σύνταξο (bare imperative)
— 6–7 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσαις διαθέμενος (polite)
59312.6 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσαις συντάξας (polite)
59314.3 ποίησον (bare imperative)
— 8 ἂν ποιήσαις (bare imperative)
59315.3–4 καὶ νῦν δὲ καλῶς ποίησε ἐπιµελὲς ποιησάµενος (2 polite)
59317.6 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσαις (polite)
59318.8 σὺ οὖν µὴ ἐπίτρεπε αὐτοῖς (bare imperative)
59319.5 γράψον (bare imperative)
59320.7 σὺ οὖν µὴ ἐπίτρεπε αὐτοῖς (bare imperative)
— 10 σύνταξε (bare imperative)
59322.6 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις φροντίσας (polite)
59324.5 γράψων (bare imperative)
59329.2–3 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις γράψας (polite)
59331.3 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις (polite)
— 10 σύνταξα (bare imperative)
— 13 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
59332.9 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις εὕλοµθεις (polite)
59334.5 γράψων (bare imperative)
59335.6 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις ἀποστέλλων (polite)
59336.1–2 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις σύμβολον μοι λαβὼν (polite)
59336a.27–8 εἰ οὖν σοι δοκεῖ, καλῶς ποιήσεις γράψας (polite)
— b.3–4 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις καὶ συναντήσων ἡµῖν (2 polite)
— b.12 µνήσθητι (bare imperative)
— c.7 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις γράψας (polite)
59335.3 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσεις συντάξας (polite)
59336.10 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσεις ἐπιµελόµενος ἡµῖν (2 polite)
59336b.3–4 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσεις µῆνας Ζήνωνι (polite)
59336c.7 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις γράψας (polite)
59335.5–6 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσεις ἀξιώσας τὸν Ἕλενον ἀποδόσθαι (polite)
59335a.8 γράψη (bare imperative)
59335b.10–11 ἀξιοῦµεν ὑµᾶς ἀνενέγκαι ἐπὶ Χρύσερµον (polite)
59335c.11–12 ἀξιοῦµεν ὑµᾶς ἀνενέγκαι ἐπὶ Χρύσερµον (polite)
59336.1–2 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις γράψας (polite)
59335.7–8 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις (polite)
59336.1–2 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις (polite)
59336b.3–4 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσεις µῆνας Ζήνωνι (polite)
59336c.7 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις γράψας (polite)
59337.5 γράψων (bare imperative)
59338.1 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις γράψας (polite)
59339.2 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις δοῦς (polite)
59340.5–6 δέοµαι οὖν σου, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
59341.3–4 δέοµαι οὖν σου, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι (polite)
59342.6–8 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσεις, ἐπαναγνοὺς καὶ ἀντιγραψάµενος, ἀποστείλας (polite)
59343.5 γράψας (polite)
59344.1 καλῶς οὐσίας γράψας (polite)
59344b.3–4 καλῶς οὐσίας γράψας (polite)
59345.7 ἀγόρασε (bare imperative)
59346.3–7 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις, ἐπαναγνοὺς καὶ ἀντιγραψάµενος, ἀποστείλας (polite)
59348.8 γράψη (bare imperative)
59350.3–5 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις, ἐπαναγνοὺς καὶ ἀντιγραψάµενος, ἀποστείλας (polite)
59352.6–8 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις (polite)
59352b.3–4 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις (polite)
59353.5–6 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις, ἐπαναγνοὺς καὶ ἀντιγραψάµενος, ἀποστείλας (polite)
59355.107 ἀξιοῦµεν ὑµᾶς ἐνενεγκαὶ ἐπὶ Χρύσερµον (polite)
59355.11–12 καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσας ἐν τάχει χαριεῖ µοι (polite)
— 17 γράψε (bare imperative)
59355a.9–10 εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, ἡµῖν ἐπειδὴ διῆλθεν οὐθ' ἡµῖν ἐκποεῖ ἀποδηµεῖν οὔτ' ἐκείνοι ἐνθάδε παραγενέσθαι,
γράψαι (polite)
59369.4–5 καὶ λῶς ὦν] ποίησεις γράψας (polite)
59371.11–14 ἐὰν οὖν εὐκαίριον σοι ἢ, παραγενοῦ, ὡς ὑποστόμην καθά ἄν συγκρίνης (polite)
59373.4 συνεχέωθο (bare imperative)
— 5 ἐπίδος (bare imperative)
59374.2 ἄφες (bare imperative)
59375.8 φρόνισον (bare imperative)
— 9 μὴ ἀμελήσης (other)
— 14 ἐπισταθ(λον) (bare imperative)
59377.2–6 ἀξιοῦμέν σε, ἐπειδή . . . νῦν οὖν ἀξιοῦµέν σε ποιεῖν (polite)
— 10 ἀπόφαν (bare imperative)
59378.2–4 καλῶς ποήσεις τὰ παιδάριά µοι ἀποδούς (polite)
59379.7 γράψον (bare imperative)
59380.1–2 καὶ ἵλλοις σὺ ποιεῖ· εἰ δὲ µή, ὀργιούµεθά σοι (bare imperative)
59382.2–3 ἐπιµελέσθω (bare imperative)
59383.3–4 τὰς ἐξαγωγοὺς δεῖ ἀνακαθᾶραι (other)
— 10 µὴ οὖν ἄλλως σὺ ποίει· εἰ δὲ µή, ὀργιούµεθά σοι (bare imperative)
59384.5 σύνταξον (bare imperative)
59385.2–4 γράψον (bare imperative)
59388.5 σύνταξον (bare imperative)
59390.16–18 δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰς µυρίκας καὶ τὸν κάλαµον ἐπικόψαι (other)
59392.16–18 δεῖδας, ἐνευχόµενος (polite)
59395.8 φρόνισον (bare imperative)
59399.2 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
59402.2–3 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις (polite)
59403.9 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσαις . . . αδικούµενον, ... αὐτὸς σου (polite)
59407.1–3 καλῶς ποιήσεις, περὶ ὧν σοι Εἰρηναῖος ἐνετείλατο, δούς (polite)
59410.1–11 δεόµεθα οὖν σου, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, γράψον (polite)
59414.2 δός (bare imperative)
59418.5 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις συναποστείλας (polite)
59420.2–3 σὺ δὲ ποιήσεις καὶ τοὺς Ἀράβας εἰσίπραξας (polite)
59424.4 κέλευε (bare imperative)
59425.1 ἀξιοῦµέν σε . . . (polite)
59426.5 σύνταξον (bare imperative)
59427.4 γρ(ά)γων (bare imperative)
59428.8–13 σὺ οὖν, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, . . . σὺ οὖν περί µου γράψαν πρὸς αὐτὸν (polite)
59433.10–11 σὺ δὲ καλῶς ποίησεις γράψας (polite)
— 22–3 καλῶς ἂν ποιήσεις καὶ τοὺς Ἀράβας εἰσίπραξας (polite)
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59442.12 δός (bare imperative)
59443.13–14 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις μεταπεµψάµενος (polite)
59446.5 µάθε (bare imperative)
— 10 γράψον (bare imperative)
— 15 ἐπιστει6d'ῃnἠζἠζ〈h'Χnὧὀ'ὥλο[ν] (bare imperative)
59447.3 ἀξιῶ δέ σε, εἰ καί σοι φαίνοµαι µέτρια λέγειν, τάξαι µε (polite)
— 8 ἐµοὶ δὲ καλῶς ἂν ποιήσαις συντάξας (polite)
59449.5 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσετε µισθωσάµενοι (polite)
— 10 συντάξατε (bare imperative)
59451.15–19 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσαις, καθὰ καὶ ὁ βασιλ6d'ῃnἠζἠζ〈h'Χnὧὀ'ὥς6d'ῃnἠζἠζ〈h'Χnὧὀ'ὥς καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ διοικητὴς
συντέταχεν, καὶ σὺ ἐπακολουθήσας ὡσαύτως (polite)
59454r.9 ἐµὲ δὲ, ἐάνπερ δύνηι, καὶ ὕβριζε καὶ ἀπάγε (2 bare imperatives)
59455.12–15 ἐµὲ δὲ, ἐάνπερ δύνηι, καὶ ὕβριζε καὶ ἀπάγε (2 bare imperatives)
59457.16–17 ἐµὲ δὲ, ἐάνπερ δύνηι, καὶ ὕβριζε καὶ ἀπάγε (2 bare imperatives)
59458.1 χαριεῖ οὖµ6d'ῃn_AHBν办好 µοι στηθοδεσµίδας ποίησας6d'ῃn_AHBν办好 αλακὰς λεπτὰς δύο καὶ ἀποστείλας (polite)
59469.3 ἄγορ[άσαι (other)
59470.5 πέµπε . . . πρός[άξεν] (2 bare imperatives)
— 6 γράψον (bare imperative)
— 9 γράψοµ µοι . . . ἐπίστειλον (2 bare imperatives)
59474.2–4 ἐνεύχοµαι οὖν σου κατὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως οἰκονοµῆσαι τὰ περὶ ἐµέ (polite)
59477.4 ἀξιῶ σε προχρῆσαι ἡµῖν (polite)
59482.2–6 ἐναρῶµαι τὴν Ἀπολλωνίου σ6d'ῃn_AHBν办好 ω6d'ῃn_AHBν办好 τῆρι6d'ῃn_AHBν办好 καθάπ6d'ῃn_AHBν办好 ἀφεὶ6d'ῃn_AHBν办好 τὴν γυναῖκά
µου (polite)
— 19–20 ἐµὲ δεόµενόν σου ἐλέησον (polite)
59488.2 εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, συντάξαι (polite)
59489.8 σύνταξον (bare imperative)
59490.2 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
— 3 ἀποδότω (bare imperative)
— 4 καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις ἵνα µηθείς αὐτὸν ἀδικῆι (polite)
— 4–5 πρόντισον (bare imperative)
59491.22–4 καλῶς ποιήσεις μεταπεµψάµενος (polite)
59492.4 ἀνάγγελλε (bare imperative)
— 10 µὴ οὖν περιίδῃς (other)
— 12–13 ἐξελοῦ µε (bare imperative)
59494.10 ἐργάζεσθε (bare imperative)
— 18–19 εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, δοθῆναι ἡµῖν µέρος τι τοῦ µισθοῦ (polite)
59495.1–2 δεόµεθα οὖν σου, ἔλθεσθον ἡµᾶς (polite)
— 4 λαβέ (bare imperative)
— 8–9 σοι ὕποκεισαι εἴ σοι δοκεῖ ἄρειναι (bare imperative)
59496.6 σὺ οὖν καλῶς ἂν ποίησις γράψῃς (polite)
  — 7 γράψον (bare imperative)
59497.11 φρόντισον (bare imperative)
59498.2–4 καλῶς ἂν ποίησις, εἰ καὶ σοι δοκεῖ, συντάξῃς (polite)
  — 12–14 δέομαι οὖν σου, εἰ καὶ σοι δοκεῖ, 'συντάξῃς' δοθήναι (polite)
59499.32–3 εἰ σοι δοκεῖ, δότωσάν μοι (polite)
  — 49–50 εἰ οὖν [σοί] δοκεῖ, ἀγοράσαι (polite)
  — 58 ἐφότεσον (bare imperative)
59500.8 κέλευσον (bare imperative)
59501.2–3 καλῶς ποιήσεις, ἐὰν καί Ἀπολλωνίωι ἀποστέλλῃς (polite)
59502.9 ἀπὸ[σ]τελον (bare imperative)
  — 12 γράψον (bare imperative)
  — 14–15 καλῶς δὲ [ποίησ]ις ἀποστέλλας (polite)
59507.14–18 καλῶς οὖν ποίησις τοῦτο τε [δὲν] τοῦ χρόνου ἔδει/ σοι φαίνηται ἀποδοθήναι μοι
  — καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν γράφον (polite)
  — 22–4 ὅμως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς μητρὸς, ἐὰν σοι φαίνηται, φρόντισον (bare imperative)
  — 27–30 γράφει δοῦναι [σοί] ἡμῖν τὸ Ἀπολλοδώρου τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ σιδήρου γενοµένου οἰκήµάτιον,
  — εἰ σοι δοκεῖ (other)
59508.4–5 καλῶς ἂν οὖ/ ποίησις προσ[τάξε]ις (polite)
  — 7 γράφε (bare imperative)
59509.3 μὴ ἀδικηθῶ ὑπὸ Ἐπεμέχου (other)
  — 5 [καλῶς ἂν οὖ]γ [ποίησις] γράψῃς
  — 9 προσκατασκεύασον (bare imperative)
59513.2–3 καλῶς ποίησις γράψῃς (polite)
  — 6 προσπυθοῦ (bare imperative)
59514.3 δὸς (bare imperative)
  — 8 δὸς (bare imperative)
59516.9–10 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
  — 24 λαβὲ (bare imperative)
  — 26 κόµισαι (bare imperative)
  — 26–9 καὶ εἰ σοι δοκεῖ, ἀνακαλεῖσθαι µὲ περὶ τοῦτον ἐπερώτησον (bare imperative)
59519.5–6 καλῶς οὖν ποίησις ἀποστέλλας (polite)
59520.8 δύοµαι οὖν [σοί] καὶ ἱκετεύοι, εἰ καὶ σο[ί] δοκεῖ, µὴ περιµόριζον (polite)
59522.10 διατήρησον (bare imperative)
  — 15 λαβὲ (bare imperative)
59517–18 ἀπόστειλον (bare imperative)
  — 20 δίδοι (bare imperative)
  — 24–5 ἐπιµέλου αὐτοῦ (bare imperative)
59524.2–5 καλῶς ἂν ποίησις τὰ λίνα τὰ δορκάδεια ἀποστείλας μοι (polite)
  — 5 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποίησις γράψῃς (polite)
59526.3 καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποίησις συντάξῃς (polite)
  — 4–5 γράφει... καὶ µὴ ἐπιλανθάνω ήµῶν (2 bare imperatives)
59527.10–11 καλῶς οὖν ποίησις δοὺς αὐτοῖ (polite)
59528.5–6 [δύοµαι οὖν] σου, εἰ σοι δοκεῖ, γράφατι (polite)
59531.2 µὴ προσπορεύεται (bare imperative)