REMARKS ON PRIVATE LETTERS III*

BGU II 449

Some time in the second century, Apollos wrote to Theon, his ‘brother’. The address on the back was read as ... ἀρρην ... Άφροδιτον. Examination of the original, now supported by the online image, has shown that the first part of the address runs ἀρρην Ἄφροδιτη. After the common saltire pattern, it is possible to make out εἰς, which should be taken with Άφροδιτον. This is the name of a place, probably one of those called Aphrodite; there is a tall upright after δ, which could be iota, but the traces that follow are not compatible with της.

CPR VI 80

This letter has received some critical attention but several problems remain; some of the smaller ones will be addressed here.

The prescript as edited runs Εὐδαίμων Ἀπολλῶνι τῷ κυρίῳ μου | ἀδελφῷ ἵππῳ εἶναι, but the first line seems too cramped, and this form of prescript is unusual in a text of the second century (PWisc. II 73 is an exception). κυρίῳ μου probably never stood in the text; the writer left blank spaces between each word of the prescript, which would allow a less generous estimate of the textual loss in l. 1.

In ll. 11–12, ed. has Χρυσερῖάς πιστὸν χτονάριον ύφανθῆναι, but context and space make the dative, Χρυσερᾶς, preferable to the accusative: ‘have a little tunic woven for Chryseros’.

The letter ends, ἐρρῶϲϲθα | ἐρρῶϲϲθα ἱϲπεται | ἀδελ[,]οϲ μου (ll. 23–4), but μου is unnecessary; it may be paralleled only by PHaun. II 38.11 (iii), but there the reading is not entirely certain.

P.Ant. I 43

This is a letter assigned to the third/fourth century, and tentatively associated with the turbulent political events of the 290s. This seems likely: μνᾶϲ | παλαίον (lines 4–5) probably refers to ‘old coinage’, an expression attested between the 260s and 290s (see POxy, LXXIX 5209.11, 19 n.); at any rate, a fourth-century date is excluded in view of the 40 drachmas quoted as a salary (l. 22), a very low sum for this date. The text is written in ungrammatical and misspelled Greek, which obscures the sense at various points. A very few gains are possible if some of the forms are properly normalized:

In ll. 9–10, the editor read εἰς πεται | ἐρχομαίνου, (restored but plausible; see Mandilaras, Verb §770, on infinitives of purpose with verbs of motion). Then, τῶν ἀνθρώπων requires no correction: ‘then he went off to fetch that fellow’. After that, the edition has ... | [ἐπὶ] Καὶ | καὶ; Ben Henry plausibly suggests reading ἐπὶ 'έτε. Then, I have considered reading ἐπὶ έτε, but the sense is unsatisfactory, though cf. l. 23 τοῦ ἐρχομαίνου ἐπὶ 'έτε.

In l. 11, the editor read εἰς πεται μνᾶϲ, and commented, ‘possibly some form of αἰτεῖν is concealed here’. This is a misunderstanding: read εἰς πέντε μνᾶϲ, ‘approximately five minas’. πέντε is pέντε misspelt; for πέντε written as πέτε or πέντα, see Gignac, Grammar i 117 and 193 respectively. Cf. περὶ τῶν

* Continued from ZPE 142 (2003) 163–70. Unless indicated otherwise, the images mentioned in this article are accessible through http://aquila.zaw.uni-heidelberg.de (Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens) or www.papyri.info. I am grateful to Ben Henry for helpful comments.

† In July 1997; my thanks to Günter Poethke for arranging access.

‡ I first discussed my views on this letter with John Rea in September 1995, who tempered some of my wilder ideas at that time. I published a note on its prescript and the address in ZPE 119 (1997) 155f. (= BL XI 6); a further correction is suggested by Dr Henry: in l. 1, for της κυρίου read της κυρίου μου, given the length of the break.
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tεκκάρων μνό[ν] in l. 14. A similar construction may be detected in l. 22, where Dr Henry proposes to read ἔφερε εἰ(ς) (δραχμὰς) μ, with sigma omitted ‘by haplography before the similar drachma symbol (cf. P.Oxy. LXXX 5243 ii 17 n.’; ed. pr. has ἔφερε[ς].

In ll. 15–16, we find οὗ[γ] χρή γάρ κυ λαλίν ἡ ἐπο[η]γένοι | ce, translated as ‘For you ought not to gossip about what he did to you’. κυ was taken as ce, but this is an odd error, especially with ce following. We surely have to understand κυ = coi; the same spelling occurs in l. 6, ἐν κυ, where curiously the editor printed κυ in the text. κυ is the indirect object of λαλίν; as Dr Henry points out, the woman ‘knows all too well what the fellow did to her (i.e. the story of the four mnas to which he has just alluded) and there is no need for the writer to tell her about it’.

P.Harr. I 162b
The address of this sixth-century letter was read as . . . εἰον [† Θεόδωρος . . . On a photograph I read:
] τιμ(ης) ἀζι(ω) Ἀείωνι [† Θεόδωρος ἀλί(άχιςτος).

P.Lond. II 157a (p. 255)
This short text, assigned to the second century, was described as ‘A letter from a master to some slaves, saying that they have been doing violence to the house of one of their fellow-slaves, a camel-herd, and commanding them to restore to him his property or else bring it to himself (the master)’. It was read as follows (I have added accents except for ἵδὲ in l. 2):

παρὰ . . . κέλλου ἵδὲ τήν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἱ συνδούλῳ σου τοῦ καμήλειτροφοῦ πρεῖβων ἐπηρεάζεται καὶ ἰσχοῦς ἢ αὐτοῦ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐνέγκε ἵδὲ ἀψίς ἐπέκει.

The second person plural in ll. 2 and 5 does not square with the second person singular in 3 and 6. καμήλειτροφοῦ is also curious. Study of the original with the help of a powerful microscope removes most of the difficulties and gives a smoother text:

παρὰ Γεμέλλου. ἵδε (l. εἰ-) τήν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἱ συνδούλῳ σου τοῦ καμήλειτροφοῦ τοῦ πρεῖβον ἐπηρεάζεται καὶ ἰσχοῦς ἢ αὐτοῦ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐνέγκε ἵδὲ ἀψίς ἐπέκει.

In l. 5, the traces after ἰσχοῦς are not compatible with ε; ας would be marginally better (and grammatically correct), but I cannot confidently put it in the text. Then, for l. 7 Kenyon noted that it ‘is so faint as to be almost invisible, and there seems to be room for one or two letters between αυτα and προς’. I cannot see the putative second alpha of αυτα; there are two letters between αυτ and προς, the first of which is almost entirely abraded, and of the second only the top of an upright survives; read αὐτός;? In that case, Gemellos orders that either the wronged slave’s belongings be restored to their owner or the slave himself be brought to him – why, we cannot tell.

The text is unprovenanced but it is tempting to associate it with P.Aberd. 60, a summons addressed to an official (see BL VIII 1) of Soknopaiou Nesos who is ordered to send up a [δ]ουλὸν Γεμέλλου.

P.Lond. II 453 (p. 319)
‘This is a private letter from a father, named Marcus, to his son Sabinus. It is considerably defaced, especially at the beginning and end, and is not very intelligible even where it is legible, since the style is illiterate and the allusions obscure. The writing appears to be of the early part of the fourth century.’ Some of the problems that appear in the edition can be removed upon closer scrutiny.

The first five lines were printed as follows (I reproduce the accentless version of ed. pr.):

Μο[ρκ] . . . . . ζεβείνω τῷ
νῦν . . . . . . χαίρε
ἐν[ν] ἐλαιον τῶν
Συμπολειτῶν σοῦ . .

5 ζελέεις αὐτό καὶ εἰσελθῇ
Study of the original as well as of an image (reproduced on the previous page) shows that the name of the sender is not Μαρκιανή (Makriaioν ed. pr.) as proposed by Gignac, but Μαρκιανή (Makriaioν ed. pr.) as proposed by Gignac, it is Markiane who writes to her son Sabinos. There may well be a reference to her in ll. 13–14, γράφατε μοι ἵνα τί καὶ τί ἐλλαβαί τῇ μητρί. The address on the back should accordingly be revised to read ἀπὸ Μαρκιανῆς (Makriaioν ed. pr).

The papyrus is abraded after υἱῷ in line 2; with some hesitation, I propose to read πληίτεσσα. A trace after χαρι suggests χαρί[v]: there is no need to assume an idiosyncratic word division at this point. In ll. 4–5, read ἐμίθα, 'go into', 'board' (this form of the imperative also occurs in P.Mich. VIII 515r). eί σοῦ should refer to ἐλλαβαί, but it requires some imagination to explain why someone would be told to step into oil. I suggest reading τὸ πλούον. A verb would have stood at the start of l. 3; δίδων would fit the space, but can only be a stopgap. In sum, the opening of the letter may be presented as follows:

Μαρκιανή Καβείνο τῷ υἱῷ πληίτεσσα χαρί[v].
ε. { 2–3 τό πλούον τῶν συμπολειτῶν σου. ἐμί-
5 βα είς σοῦ καὶ εἰςελθέ.

The understanding of the rest of the text is difficult in places, although not as much as the editor thought. In ll. 14–15 for εὐκευτονέω read εὐκευτονέω, i.e., οὐκ εὐκευτονέω. For παντα replaced by παντα, see Gignac, Grammar i 216; on the sense of εὐτονέα, see S. Kapsomenos, EETh 7 (1957) 366.

In his note to l. 18, the editor writes, ‘The remaining lines are hopelessly damaged’. They are mostly represented by series of dots, except for l. 21, whose end is read as τον οἶκο. In l. 20, one can make out άκπάζομαι, followed by traces that might conceiv τοῦ ἡμῶν, though that would be tight for the space. Line 21 is inset, and may start πάντας, l. πάντας. Then, κατ’ ὀνόμα is clear, and so is l. 22: ἐρώτσθαί σε εὐχωμαι.

An afterthought was added in the left margin, which begins ἐπιμελησάτω σοι περὶ τῶν περιχυτῶν according to the first edition. περιχυτῶν was understood as περιχυτῶν, but the error assumed is strange; ἐπιμελησάτω is also curious. The papyrus has something less exceptional: καὶ μελησάτω σοι περὶ τῶν πελμάτων.

The writer uses -ες for -ασ throughout: apart from the instances in ll. 15 and 21 (see above), we find τοῖς τέκνοις στατήρες in 8–9 (P-Herm. 43 ed. pr.), and πεποίηκε in 17 (Pepoīke ed. pr.). In l. 12 the papyrus has Σεράτος, not Σαράτος (these three new readings were contributed by Ben Henry). Finally, in l. 11 read ἐνέγκη (ed. pr. represented the apostrophe as a supralinear bar).

P.Palau Ribes 31

This is a scrap from a second-century letter. Lines 3–4 were printed as ] εἰς . γιγνόμενα καὶ τὸ προσκύνημα . . . [καθ’] ἐκάστην ἡμέραν. This is a common formula, and the putative γιγνόμενα has no place in it. Read εὐχομαι] εἰς γιγναί[ειν] (see http://dvctvs.upf.edu/foto/134/PPalauRib_inv_189r.jpg). The sentence would have begun with a phrase meaning ‘before everything’, but the exact wording is unclear.

P.Palau Ribes 39

The prescript of this letter, assigned to the fifth century, was reconstructed as [τῷ κυρίῳ θαυματουργῷ τῷ κυρίῳ θαυματουργῷ τῷ κυρίῳ θαυματουργῷ Θανασίῳ. The collocation μοι λαμπροτάτῳ is implausible; Λαμπροτάτῳ strictly indicates senatorial rank at this time, and cannot be combined with a dativus ethicus. The likeliest restoration would be τῷ μικρῷ τάτῳ cf. e.g. P.Herm. 43.1f., P.Haun. II 25.2f., P.Oxy. LV1 3864.2f. The other supplements are also dubious, but I have not been able to find anything that would suit both the sense and space. In l. 2 we could have [ὡς ἀληθῶς].

---

3 Cf. also PIFAO II 14v.3 ἐπιμελησάτω δὲ σοι, but there is no reason to restore the compound.
What is extant at the top of this sixth/seventh-century was presented as follows:

\[ \alpha \mu \varepsilon \ldots \chi \alpha \iota \rho e \nu \]

From what I see on the on-line image (http://dvctvs.upf.edu/foto/147/PPalauRib_inv_240r.jpg), there is only one line, which reads \[ \alpha \mu \varepsilon \ldots \chi \alpha \iota \rho e \nu \] i.e., \[ \gamma \nu \varepsilon \tau o \nu \tau o \ gamma \] (\[ \alpha \varepsilon \gamma \rho o r a c o n \]), \[ \mu \varepsilon \tau o \zeta \ldots \] \[ \varepsilon \chi o \tau o \sigma t o \nu \tau o \t i m e m a \ o \tau o t e \ o \theta o s u m i a i o \omega t o t o s \ Y (p a i t i o n \ e i p e n \ \hat{h} \mu [i n]

Two other minutiae: l. 8, for τ\[ \eta \] read τ\[ \pi a r h \eta \]; l. 12, \[ \epsilon u \] λογ \[ \epsilon \] ςω is not inescapable.

This letter probably comes from the area of Oxyrhynchus (BL XII 164). It was assigned to the sixth century, but a date in the late fifth may be considered. The recipient is asked ‘to secure wine for the writer, who has given him two solidi for the purpose. … The addressee is further instructed either to despatch a boat to the city in order that the writer may send back some (empty) jars or to purchase \[ \tau o \mu \eta r t o \nu \] (\[ \chi o \tau o \sigma t o \nu \tau o \] \[ \tau o \tau i m e m a \ o \tau o t e \ o \theta o s u m i a i o \omega t o t o s \ Y (p a i t i o n \ e i p e n \ \hat{h} \mu [i n]

An image (http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/96023213) allows for a smoother text to be obtained:

\[ \dot{\iota} \ p e \mu \iota \ s o n \ \mu o i \ p l o i o n \ \varepsilon r \chi \omicron o o n e n e i c \ t i n \ | \ \pi \o l e i n \ \iota \ k a t \a c \ g o \ \k o \iota \s f a \ \dot{\iota} \ \acute{a} \gamma \omicron o a c o n \ . \ [ \ \mu \varepsilon \tau o \zeta \ldots \] \[ \varepsilon \chi o \tau o \sigma t o \nu \tau o \t i m e m a \ o \tau o t e \ o \theta o s u m i a i o \omega t o t o s \ Y (p a i t i o n \ e i p e n \ \hat{h} \mu [i n]

The recipient of the letter asks for a boat so that he can load the empty jars. Alternatively, a purchase should be made. The object of the purchase is unclear (\[ \mu \varepsilon \tau o \zeta \ldots \] was placed in doubt (BL XII 164); \[ \varepsilon t r e \] is certain), but the price obtained for the wine would be used for this purpose.

The letter ends with a reference to the recipient’s servant, \[ \tau o \ \pi \chi \iota \delta a r i o \gamma \ o u \] (line 6), but the servant is the sender’s: the pronoun should be read as \[ \mu o u \].

This is another letter whose date has to be revised slightly: it was dated to Year 9 of Domitian, \[ \mu \nu o c \ \Gamma e r m a n i c o \nu \] \[ \iota \] α. The on-line image (http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/8p58pg53b) indicates that the papyrus has \[ \mu \nu o c \ N \epsilon \o o \nu \] \[ \Sigma e b a s t o \nu \] \[ \iota \] α, which corresponds to 7 November 89.

Another textual difficulty comes up in ll. 3–5: \[ \dot{\iota} \ p e \mu \iota \ s o n \ \mu o i \ p l o i o n \ \varepsilon r \chi \omicron o o n e n e i c \ t i n \ | \ \pi \o l e i n \ \iota \ k a t \a c \ g o \ \k o \iota \s f a \ \dot{\iota} \ \acute{a} \gamma \omicron o a c o n \ . \ [ \ \mu \varepsilon \tau o \zeta \ldots \] \[ \varepsilon \chi o \tau o \sigma t o \nu \tau o \t i m e m a \ o \tau o t e \ o \theta o s u m i a i o \omega t o t o s \ Y (p a i t i o n \ e i p e n \ \hat{h} \mu [i n]

This letter is dated to Year 19 of Tiberius, \[ \mu \nu o c \ \Sigma e b a s t o \nu \] \[ \iota \] α (line 14) An image indicates that there is no room in the lacuna for \[ \Sigma e b a s t o \nu \] \[ \iota \] α (http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/5425kd27v). There seem to be some traces that would be part of \[ \Sigma e b a s t o \nu \] \[ \iota \] α, but I cannot assign them with confidence to any letters. The date converts to 18 September 32.

If the estimated length of this lacuna was exaggerated, another lacuna was ignored, to the detriment of the grammar: the phrase \[ \epsilon i c \ t o \ \nu e \o f y t o n \ p a t r i k o \nu \] (ll. 6–7) is problematic, but the image reveals a break between \[ \nu e \o f y t o n \] and \[ \p a t r i k o \nu \], where the article would just fit: \[ \epsilon i c \ t o \ \nu e \o f y t o n \ [\tau o] \ p a t r i k o \nu \].

This is another letter whose date has to be revised slightly: it was dated to Year 9 of Domitian, \[ \mu \nu o c \ \Gamma e r m a n i c o \nu \] \[ \iota \] α. The on-line image (http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/8p58pg53b) indicates that the papyrus has \[ \mu \nu o c \ N \epsilon \o o \nu \] \[ \Sigma e b a s t o \nu \] \[ \iota \] α, which corresponds to 7 November 89.

Another textual difficulty comes up in ll. 3–5: \[ \dot{\iota} \ p e \mu \iota \ s o n \ \mu o i \ p l o i o n \ \varepsilon r \chi \omicron o o n e n e i c \ t i n \ | \ \pi \o l e i n \ \iota \ k a t \a c \ g o \ \k o \iota \s f a \ \dot{\iota} \ \acute{a} \gamma \omicron o a c o n \ . \ [ \ \mu \varepsilon \tau o \zeta \ldots \] \[ \varepsilon \chi o \tau o \sigma t o \nu \tau o \t i m e m a \ o \tau o t e \ o \theta o s u m i a i o \omega t o t o s \ Y (p a i t i o n \ e i p e n \ \hat{h} \mu [i n]

The letter is dated to Year 9 of Domitian, \[ \mu \nu o c \ \Gamma e r m a n i c o \nu \] \[ \iota \] α. The on-line image (http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/8p58pg53b) indicates that the papyrus has \[ \mu \nu o c \ N \epsilon \o o \nu \] \[ \Sigma e b a s t o \nu \] \[ \iota \] α, which corresponds to 7 November 89.
ii 326), but I suggest reading something else: ἐπεὶ βουλής ἐμι εἰς Ἀλεξ[άν]δρεῖον πλεύσας, ‘because I intend to sail to Alexandria’. The phrase βουλής εἰμι is not attested in any other papyrus but is known from later sources: Miracula xiv sancti Artemii 73.9–10 βουλής εἰμι ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου; Theophanes 448.6–7 βουλής εἰμι τοῦ ἐκφυγεῖν καὶ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σέ.

P. Princ. III 190


The beginning of l. 5 was first read as μετὰ ύβ... ἐμὲ, later corrected to μετὰ υ (... (= ύ[iōν] ?) δι’ ἐμὲ (BL IX 223). Inspection of an image (http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/7d278w61h) shows that one should read μετ’ αὐτ(...) (αὐτής παρ.).

P. Princ. III 191

According to the editors, ‘The chief interest in this fragment is the illiteracy of the writer’, but it is more interesting that the writer says, ἀπέρχομαι ἐν Κοστανδινοπόλεος, ‘I am off to Constantinople’ (l. 8).

This is an Oxyrhynchite letter addressed τῷ δεξιῶτι μοι ὡς ἀληθῶς κατὰ πάντα μοι θεσμοσωτρέται καὶ ἐναρέτῳ γεοῦχος Λεοντίῳ. It was assigned to the sixth century, but this type of address does not suit such a late date, and the hand is a typical sixth-century one.

Before the text breaks off, it reads: ἐφημερεθῇ πάσα ἡ κόμη ἡ ἡμετέρα (?); ἐν τοῖς καταξιωτάτοις τοῖς ὧν ἐστι μεγαλοπρέπεια? | [ ... ] ἐντωθά δύο συμμέτρου ? (II. 11–13). ἡ ἡμετέρα is dubious, but what disturbs one most is ἐκ τῶν in l. 12. This, however, is a false reading: the papyrus has θαυμαϲιωτάτῳ, since this abstract is not implied by the prescript. One could think of θεσμοσωτρέταις, to match the prescript, but the traces at the end of l. 12 (not in the edition) do not suit theta; ἐναρέτῃ, corresponding to ἐναρέτῳ, is somewhat less difficult in this respect; cf. SB XVI 12485.6 τῆς ἐς ἀρέτης, in a letter with a prescript very similar to that of PSI 71 and which also comes from the region of Oxyrhynchus.4

PSI I 71

This is an Oxyrhynchite letter addressed τῷ δεξιῶτι μοι ὡς ἀληθῶς κατὰ πάντα μοι θεσμοσωτρέται καὶ ἐναρέτῳ γεοῦχος Λεοντίῳ. It was assigned to the sixth century, but this type of address does not suit such a late date, and the hand is a typical fifth-century one.

Before the text breaks off, it reads: ἐφημερεθῇ πάσα ἡ κόμη ἡ ἡμετέρα (?); ἐν τοῖς καταξιωτάτοις τοῖς ὧν ἐστι μεγαλοπρέπεια? | [ ... ] ἐντωθά δύο συμμέτρου ? (II. 11–13). ἡ ἡμετέρα is dubious, but what disturbs one most is ἐκ τῶν in l. 12. This, however, is a false reading: the papyrus has θαυμαϲιωτάτῳ, since this abstract is not implied by the prescript. One could think of θεσμοσωτρέταις, to match the prescript, but the traces at the end of l. 12 (not in the edition) do not suit theta; ἐναρέτῃ, corresponding to ἐναρέτῳ, is somewhat less difficult in this respect; cf. SB XVI 12485.6 τῆς ἐς ἀρέτης, in a letter with a prescript very similar to that of PSI 71 and which also comes from the region of Oxyrhynchus.4

SB XVIII 13112

This is a fragmentary letter from Oxyrhynchus. The image indicates that it should be placed in the fourth or early fifth century, not in the fifth/sixth. Line 11 was inadvertently omitted from the transcript; it reads: οὐκοῦδαίον ἐγράφωμεν [,].

One other small point: in l. 4, τῷ γράφωματα τῆν κε[ ], read τῆς [,] at the end of the line.

---

4 The γεοῦχος is not named and the sender is a different person. The hand is also different but of the same date (ed.’s sixth century is too late). The tentative association of the text with the ‘Apion archive’ is unwarranted. The back was said to contain illegible traces of an address, but τῷ δεξιῶτι μοι ὡς ἀληθῶς can be read in the on-line image.

5 This and the next two items were first published in P. J. Sijpesteijn, Fragments of Byzantine Texts from the Michigan Collection, Aegyptus 66 (1986) 71–84 (without plates). They belong to a purchase of papyri predominantly from the Oxyrhynchite nome. I discussed some of them in the first instalment of these ‘Remarks’ (the gist in BL XI 223), before images were published on line. I take the opportunity to correct an apparent misprint in one of them: in SB XVIII 13111.4 for καθελθὲν read καθέλθυν.
SB XVIII 13113

As with the previous item, we only have the middle parts of the lines of the letter, assigned to the fifth/sixth century, this time correctly. The image shows that the text is to be modified in several places:

In l. 1, there are remains of 2–3 letters to the left of what is printed as ἐντο. in the edition.

In l. 2, instead of ἱοματο τοῦς αὐτής τῆς read ὅλης τοῦς αὐτής πίνακας; cf. e.g. POxy. XVI 1855.17 ἀπάξιαἵναι τοῦς τιμίους αὐτής πόδας.

In l. 3, for οὐ δέξιαἵναι perhaps read οὐδέν.

In l. 7, for πίμας τοῦς νημιᾶς. The word νημιᾶ is not common in the papyri. It recurs in l. 9, where for ἵπερθος πίμας τοῦς νημιᾶς.

In l. 10, for εὐχαριστό περὶ, which suits what follows (διὰ τοῦ ἀκατίου).

SB XVIII 13116

This is another fifth/sixth-century letter. The text is problematic in certain places, but progress is again possible thanks to an image, kindly supplied by B. Haug.

In l. 5, we have remains of 2–3 letters to the left of what is printed as ἐντο. in the edition.

In l. 6–7, the phrase καὶ ἐποίκειτον ὑμᾶς φιλοῦντας ἐντοί σωτηρίας. This would have been governed by a verb in the damaged second half of line 6.

There are further problems in ll. 11–12, which can, however, not be read). The idea is correct: the papyrus has προκύνησιν. Read τὰ φέρονα τῆς σωτηρίας, a common expression; cf. e.g. POxy. I 158.5. This would have been governed by a verb in the damaged second half of the line. σωτηρίας cannot be confirmed.

SB XVIII 1359

This is another fragmentary letter from Michigan, assigned to the sixth/seventh century. The image indicates that the hand is rather of the sixth century; more importantly, it helps solve some textual problems.

In l. 3, the edition has ἑνιά μη μεῖνη τὸ κ. . . . μεν ἀφέει, with κτήματα suggested as a possibility in the note. Read ἑνιά μη μεῖνη τὸ κτήματα ἐν ἀφέεϊ, for the expression, cf. CPR XXX 18.5 [ἐν] ἀφέει μένουσι τὰ γθία (and see n. ad loc. on the sense).

Line 4 as printed runs τῶν ἐποικετῶν εὐταξίας ἐνεκεν ἡνέχετο δοῦναι τὰ δύο νομίματα. ἐποικετῶν is an oversights or misprint for ἐποικετωτῶν, and is followed not by εὐταξίας but by ἐγγαρίας (for the form of ἐρ εἰρείας).