

SB 14.12098: another ‘curious prescript’

What survives of this document, called ‘Anfang einer Quittung’ and assigned to the sixth century, was edited as follows:¹

- 1] ἡμῖς Φῖβ πρεσβ(ύτερος) καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Σουχίων ὁμόγνησοι ἀδελφ(οἰ) υἱοὶ
2 καὶ] Πτολωμέος ὁ καὶ Παθαεὶ ἀπὸ κόμης Κερκεσούχ(ων) γράφωντες
3 διὰ] Φῖβ πρεσβ(υτέρου) (ὑπὲρ) τοῦ κλήρ(ου) ὃν ἔχεις παρ’ ἡμῶν εἴ . . οἴκε

1 l. ἡμεῖς ... ὁμογνήσιοι 2 l. Πτολεμαῖος ... γράφοντες 3 ὃν, P.: ὠν

υἱοὶ at the end of line 1 ought to have been followed by the name of the father of the two brothers; otherwise, the use of the word would be pointless. The text in the next line continues with a restored καὶ and the name of a person; this name must be the father’s name, mistakenly given in the nominative instead of the genitive. The line will have started with Πτολωμέος; line 1 also appears to be complete, unless a cross was lost at the beginning. [διὰ] Φῖβ in line 3 would suit the space, but we have to read Ἰωσ]ήφ, as the image shows.² Ἰωσ]ήφ would occupy most of the space, and there would still be room for a couple of additional letters. At this point we may compare the prescript of another Arsinoite document of this period, SB 16.12943.1 (with BL 13.215): ἐγὼ Γεώρ]γιος σιδηροχαλκεὺς τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας γράφων σοι Πέτρῳ τέκτονι. Thus I propose to read the following text:³

-] ἡμῖς Φῖβ πρεσβ(ύτερος) καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Σουχίων ὁμόγνησοι ἀδελφ(οἰ) υἱοὶ
Πτολωμέος ὁ καὶ Παθαεὶ ἀπὸ κόμης Κερκεσούχ(ων) γράφωντες
σοι(?) Ἰωσ]ήφ πρεσβ(υτέρῳ) (ὑπὲρ) τοῦ κλήρ(ου) ὠν ἔχεις παρ’ ἡμῶν εἴ . . οἴκ[

1 l. ἡμεῖς, ὁμογνήσιοι 2 l. Πτολεμαίου τοῦ, γράφοντες 3 ὠν: ὦν or l. ὄν

In an article published in an earlier issue of this journal,⁴ I used SB 12943 as the starting point to discuss the prescripts of certain Greek documents of this period. These begin with the construction ἐγὼ + *name in nominative* + γράφω + *name in dative*, which corresponds to the Coptic epistolary formula ‘I, *name*, write to *name*.’ These documents are few; SB 12098 and 12943 are the only ones from the Fayum.

In the same article I proposed to emend γράφων in SB 12943.1 to γράφω{ν}, but γράφωντες in SB 12098.2 shows that the participle was meant. I cannot explain this feature, which is dubious in terms of grammar; SB 12943 contains a finite verb in l. 2, but this belongs to a different sentence. It does not seem to be the result of bilingual interference.

University College London

Nikolaos Gonis

¹ I reproduced the text of the *ed. pr.*, ZPE 23 (1976) 215. The text in SB contains three small changes, two of them problematic: it prints ὁμογνήσ<ι>οι in l. 1; Πτολεμέος in l. 2, with Πτολωμέος (the reading of the papyrus) in the apparatus; ὄν (the editor’s emendation) in l. 3 but with no corresponding entry in the apparatus.

² <http://bibd.uni-giessen.de/papyri/images/piand-inv660recto.jpg>

³ I have also made a few minor changes in l. 3. It is unclear whether there are traces of two or three letters between εἴ and οἴκ[; ἐν τῷ οἴκ[ω is not an easy reading. As for ὠν, it is impossible to be certain whether it is correct or has to be emended, as in the *ed. pr.*

⁴ “Some Curious Prescripts (Native Languages in Greek Dress?),” *BASP* 42 (2005) 41–44.