

NIKOLAOS GONIS

NOTES ON MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS V

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 208 (2018) 187–192

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS V*

53. BGU I 255

This Memphite deed of surety of 599 has been known to many generations of papyrologists from its partial reproduction as Schubart, *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses* 46. The extant beginning of line 6, read as καὶ Ἀρφευτὴν υἱὸν τοῦ μακ[αρίου Μηνᾶ, was not included in the *PGB* plate. An image of the whole is now available on line, and shows that Ἀρφευτὴν, a name that has remained without a second reference for well over a century, is a ghost: read ἄρδευτὴν (for the shape of delta, cf. διὰ in l. 4). The word is otherwise known only from a literary text, Manetho 4.258 (LSJ render ‘waterer’), though we find the term ἐπαρδευτής in some Ptolemaic papyri and C.Pap.Gr. II App. 1.4 (Oxy.; 178). The tasks of the ἄρδευτής were presumably the same as those of the ὑδροπάροχος, a more common term in other areas – papyri from Memphis are very few. This was the second part of this man’s occupation; we do not know what the first was, though we may compare the Oxyrhynchite γεωργοὶ καὶ ὑδροπάροχοι (P.Köln XI 459.8 [436?], P.Oxy. L 3582.3 [442], VI 902.3 [464]). This ‘waterer’ is the person under surety; it may be relevant that one of the guarantors is a gardener (4, πω[μαρίτης]).

54. BGU III 728

Line 11 of this sixth/seventh-century letter currently reads ἀπανήψα τῆς τοσαύτης ἄθ[υμίας. ἀπανήψα is dubious; the index lists it under ἀπανάπτειν, adding a question mark. Preisigke, *WB* I 154, to whom ἄθ[υμίας is due (BL I 440), translates, ‘ich bin sehr mutlos geworden (?)’. But the papyrus has a different word, and the meaning of the phrase is the opposite to that assumed. On the image I read ἀνανήψω; translate, ‘I will recover from such a great depression’. The verb ἀνανήφω has not occurred in any other papyrus, but is well attested in literary Greek.

55. P.Amh. II 149

The first two lines of this loan or rather advance of money (προχρεῖα) were printed as follows:

διορίζ[
ἀνδρὶ τ[.] υ ρ[

This is part of the common Menas-formula of Apionic documents; on an image¹ I read:

σπορίζ[οντος τῷ ἰδίῳ δεσπότη τῷ αὐτῷ πανευφύμῳ
ἀνδρὶ τ[ὴν ἀγωγή]ν κ[αὶ ἐνοχήν]

διὰ Μηνᾶ οἰκέτου τοῦ ἐπερωτῶντος καὶ προ- will have been written in the line lost immediately above. What follows the formula is less straightforward. Line 3 was read as θαυμασιωτ[άτου] Κυριακοῦ τ[. . .] ς[. . .] τ[. . .]. Since the money was given διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ θαυμασιωτάτου Κυριακοῦ ἢ προνοητοῦ (ll. 11–12), we may read π[ρονοη]τοῦ after the name in l. 3, and perhaps supply διὰ σοῦ τοῦ at the lost end of l. 2, though this will not fill the lacuna. The appearance of an intermediary after the Menas-formula is unusual. Only in P.Oxy. XXIV 2420 (614) do we find something comparable, but the intermediary is an ἀντιγεοῦχος and the document is later in date than P.Amh. II 149.

There is no reference to a date in the extant part of the text, but we may gain an idea about it from the type of solidi used. The advance concerns two solidi minus 8 carats. In Oxyrhynchus, the same rate of deduction, minus 4 carats per solidus, is found in SB XVI 12472 (525 or 526), P.Oxy. LXXXIII 5368 (530s?), PSI I 77 (551), and P.Oxy. I 145 (552). The hand would suit a date in the mid sixth century. The magnate addressed in the lost part of the text was either Strategius II or his son Apion II.

* Continued from *ZPE* 191 (2014) 198–202. Unless indicated otherwise, the images mentioned in this article are accessible through www.papyri.info. My thanks to Sophie Kovarik, with whom I discussed some of these notes.

¹ http://corsair.morganlibrary.org/collimages/3/350410v_0001.jpg.

56. P.Berol. 25855²

This list of names of the third century appears to attest four names described as ‘*addend[a] onomastici*’. For three of them, however, this unique status disappears upon closer study of the image. In l. 2, the papyrus does not have Κακενῆς but Θεαγένης (there is an ink smudge affecting the reading of the putative theta, possibly the result of a correction). In l. 3, in place of Ἀπόλλων Ἀπανελ() read $\text{Ἀπ[ο]λλωνᾶς ἀπελ(εύθερος)}$; Ἀπολλωνᾶς is not a common name. In l. 7, for Βαχιώρης read Βαχιώτης , i. Βακχιώτης ; for the spelling cf. P.Harr. II 220.23 (III BC) or P.Laur. I 11rA.9 (248 or 258). This is someone from Bakchias who was outside his village; cf. P.Yale III 137.91 n. The papyrus may come from the Fayum.

57. P.Daris 38

This is a revised edition of SB XVI 12757, an account assigned to the fourth/fifth century. I briefly touched upon it in *ZPE* 143 (2003) 164, where I discussed Asclepiades son of Achilles, a ship owner in P.Harr. I 94.10, ‘attested as prytanis, (ex-?)gymnasiarch and bouleutes of Oxyrhynchus in 360 ... [who] may recur in the unprovenanced and undated SB XVI 12757.4’. There is one other prosopographical link between P.Daris 38 and Oxyrhynchus in the 360s, what was read as δούλω Ἀπολλωνίου in l. 2. A reference to a slave immediately before an important Oxyrhynchite is odd, but the papyrus is damaged; comparison with the next entry, two lines below, suggests that some four letters were lost to the left. I propose to read π(αρά) Θεο]δούλω ; P.Oxy. LXVII 4607.ii.10 (362/3), a tax account of πολίται , refers to a $\text{Θεόδουλος Ἀπολλωνίου}$. A Theodoulos alias Apollonios was *curator civitatis* of Oxyrhynchus in 359 (P.Oxy. LI 3623): could this be the same person, with the father’s name used as an alias?

Two other textual points require attention. In l. 6, ἀνεπέμφθε was revised to ἀνεπεμφθ' ; the abbreviation was not resolved, but we should no doubt read ἀνεπέμφθ(η) . More interesting is l. 7, where the new version has $\text{ὑ(πὲρ) ναυβίων ἄν ἐκ (δηναρίων μυριάδων) ρι (γίνονται) (δηναρίων μυριάδων) ρνθ φ}$. 1450 naubia at 110 myriads/naubion make 159500 myriads; but the sum given is 159 myriads 500, which is impossible. In the accounting conventions of that time, 159500 myriads would be expressed as 15 myriads of myriads + 9500 myriads, $(\text{δηναρίων}) (\text{μυριάδων}) (\text{μυριάδων}) \text{ ιε } \theta\phi$; for this type of calculation, cf. P.Laur. III 70.4 (Oxy.; 367). The end of the line is very abraded, but $\text{*ρνθ ιε } \theta\phi$ may just be made out. These figures are useful, but there is no contemporary evidence to compare. CPR VIII 22.37 of 314 reflects different monetary realities, while P.Herm. 69 of 412 refers to a payment of salaries for 1500 naubia but gives no financial details.

58. P.Daris 42

This is a new version of SB XII 11163, with no changes in respect to the first edition but accompanied by a photograph. Line 12 contains the date, $\text{Τῷβι κθ ἰνδικ(τίονος) ε}$, followed by $\text{[] ε ἰνδ(ικτίονος)}$ in l. 13. The second reference to the indiction is anomalous, but inspection of the photograph shows that this line preserves the end of the signature of someone whose name is lost: read $\text{[name] τοι]χεῖ μοι +}$.

59. P.Genova II 72

This is an order addressed $\text{Ἰωάννη φροντιστῇ ἀπ' οὐσίας}$ (l. 1). ἀπ' οὐσίας is curious, but the plate (Tav. IX) shows that $\alpha\pi$ should be read as $\alpha\nu$ (for a similar misreading, see above, note no. 54). This yields Ἀνουσίας , an Oxyrhynchite toponym; cf. the ἐποίκιον Ἱερέων in l. 2 (with BL X 279). The approximate position of Hiereon is known (Benaissa, *RSO*² 113), which gives us an idea about the location of Anousias as well as of Neophytou, the latter mentioned with Anousias in P.Oxy. LVII 3914.6.

60. P.Got. 37

This is a fragmentary letter assigned to the seventh century, but a date in the sixth is more likely. The most interesting aspect is the endorsement, $\text{[] ζὼν θεῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν (vac.) τῶν ἐμῶν}$. This is the address proper of the letter, as shown by the seal-like design inked between οἰκείαν and τῶν (see online image).

² For bibliographical details and digital images see <http://berlpap.smb.museum/15857>.

Instructions for delivery are not common in papyrus letters (see *ZPE* 136 [2001] 116–18 for references), and are very rare in this period.

Also noteworthy is l. 8,] εὐπρεπεστάτου ἄρχοντος κάτω. The papyrus has μ]εγαλοπρεπεστάτου. The absence of the article after ἄρχοντος rules out supplying χώρας in the lost part of l. 9.

There are several other textual problems, but most of them can be removed. In l. 1, for ειν [.] ηντου τῶν read εἶνα [.] γιν τούτων (not ἐ[ντ]άγιν);³ in l. 4, for ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶ read παρ' ἑαυτῶ; in l. 5, for] .απερ .πει read]αντα πέμπει; in the same line, ὑγιᾶνόμεν in place of ὑπεννομεν is an easy thought, but the reading is difficult. The letter is headed by π, not reported in the edition.

61. P.Got. 96

This is another fragmentary papyrus from Gothenburg, published as a short description:

‘Fragment théologique. (...) Prov. inconnue. VI^e–VII^e siècle. 1. + Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ] 2. Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ [σωτήρος ἡμῶν 3. τ. [4. θε. [’

The fragment was later recognized as the beginning of a document (BL II.2 71), but it seems to have received no other notice. On the basis of the online image, I read the following text:

† ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου] Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ [ωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ
τῆς δε[σποίν]ης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας
θεοτ[ό]κου κ[αὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, ἔτους
5 Διο[κλητιανοῦ
τῶ [. [

Back:

† ὁμολ(ογία) γενομένη (νη) [ὑπὸ - - -

This combination of a Christian invocation (4A; see *CSBE*² 101) and date by the Diocletianic era is common in Arsinoite documents of the second half of the seventh century; the closest parallels are P.Berl.Zill. 8 (662) and P.Eirene II 10 (681). The only problem is that l. 3 is short as restored, but it is hard to see what else might have stood in the lacuna (there is no room for καὶ ἀειπαρθένου in l. 4, and it is unlikely that ἀειπαρθένου was written in l. 3).

62. P.Herm. 52–53

These are two copies of a petition addressed Αὐρηλίῳ Πέτρῳ Φιλάμωνος πολιτευομένῳ ἐνάρχῳ | νυκτοστρατήγῳ Ἑρμοῦ πόλεως (52.2f.; sim. 53.3f.) on 4 July 398. The name of this person, Πέτρῳ (Π[έ]τρῳ in P.Herm. 53.3), makes one pause. A certain Kyros son of Philammon is attested in several Hermopolite texts of the 390s, and a document dated 28 January 398 is addressed Αὐρηλίῳ Κύρῳ Φιλάμ[μω]ν[ο]ς | πολιτευομένῳ ἐνάρχῳ ν[υ]κ[το]στρατήγῳ Ἑρμοῦ πόλεως (P.Lips. I 56.3ff.). Images⁴ of P.Herm. 52–53 show that Petros and the notion of two brothers are ghosts: Κύρῳ (without dots or brackets) has to be read in both passages. The new readings remove the problems associated with the tenure of the office of nyctostrategus, discussed by J. Gascou, P.Bagnall 27 introd. (p. 107) and 5 n.

63. P.Lips. I 52

In this deed of surety of 372, a former κεφαλαιωτής swears τὴν ἐνφάνιαν τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ | ποιήσασθαι τῇ τάζει, ἐπειδὴ ἐκελεύσθη | πέρασ [c]ταθῆναι ὑπ[ὸ] τῆς ἐξουσίας τ[ο]ῦ | κυρίου μ[ο]ν τ[ο]ῦ λαμπροτάτου |

³ L. Berkes contributed this reading and that in l. 5.

⁴ The starting point for the search is <http://enriqueta.man.ac.uk/luna/servlet/ManchesterDev~93~3>; the inv. nos. are P Herm Rees 52 and 53.

ἡγεμόνος (ll. 9–13). ἐκελεύσθη πέρας [c]ταθῆναι are readings proposed in BL I 209, but the expression is singular, even if πέρας might appear to look forward to 15f. ἕως ἂν τὰ κατ' ἐμοῖ | πέρατ[ος] τύχη. Inspection of the online image results in a less remarkable reading: παρασταθῆναι, 'be produced'. The same procedure is described in P.Lips. I 48.11f. κελευσθέντα ἀπαντῆσαι εἰς τὴν | τάξιν (*scil.* ἡγεμονία).⁵

64. PSI V 479

A rare numismatic term was thought to appear in lines 2–3 of this fifth-century letter: διζω]δίων νομισματίων ἑκατὸν ἐξήκον[τα. The image shows that δι at the start of l. 3 is a misreading, and the papyrus has something unexceptional: τῶν νομισματίων κτλ.

65. P.Wisc. I 10

Notarial signatures in fifth-century documents from Oxyrhynchus are notoriously difficult to read, but the editor's transcription of the signature in this loan of 468 is remarkably full and certain: δι' ἐμοῦ Βοήθου (l. 22). Byz. Not. p. 89 (= BL VIII 201) questioned the reading, especially of the notary's name, and printed 'di emu - -' in its place. In my view, however, the original reading is essentially correct, only that it is written in Latin characters except for the last three letters: *di emu Bohthou*.

The text has attracted a fair amount of critical attention, but the endorsement has received no comment. It starts παρὰ Κολλούθου λα(χανοπώλου) (l. 23), which is implausible. The papyrus is abraded at this point, and the online image is not optimal, but I do not see anything that would prevent us from reading γρ(αμμάτιον), as in other loans of this period; cf. e.g. P.Oxy. LXXII 4903–4 (417), VI 914 (486), XVI 1975 (496), XIX 2237 (498).

66. SB VI 8986

In *ZPE* 166 (2008) 199 n. 2, I wrote that 'the edition [of this papyrus] is generally more problematic than the printed text implies', but in that article I only engaged with the dating formula. Ten years later, the appearance of an image on line⁶ gives me the opportunity to return to the other problems, although I cannot remove all of them. This is partly due to the way the papyrus is arranged inside the frame, which makes lines 15 and 29 difficult to read and 22 largely illegible; it is to be hoped that one day the frame will be opened and the fragments of the papyrus will be repositioned.

Lines 29–31 were transcribed as follows:

30] ἐξακολουθήσα . .
]ν ἄνδρα πρὸς δ[] ἐξονα σου ἀσφάλ(ειαν)
]ελος

Abrasion and other surface damage make decipherment difficult, but the papyrus seems to have:⁷

30] . . . δικαίῳ σκοπῷ π . . . ἐξακολουθησάσης
]ν ἄνδρα πρὸς δὲ μείζονά σου ἀσφάλ(ειαν)
τ]ὴν [β]ασιλικὴν ζωτηρίαν εἰ τέλος

An oath began in 31, e.g. [ἐπωμοσάμην τὴν ἀγίαν καὶ ὁμοούσιον τριάδα καὶ τ]ὴν [β]ασιλικὴν ζωτηρίαν; for the construction cf. P.Münch. I 8.34–5 (c. 540), and for the formula SB VI 8988.78–9 (647).

Another new reading of some interest can be made in l. 39, where one of the witnesses appears to have written υἱὸς Γεωργίου ἀπαιτηθεὶς μαρτυρῶ. The papyrus has ἀπαιτ; the absence of brackets is a minor oversight, and the resolution of the abbreviation was probably influenced by the subscription of the amanuensis in l. 38, which ends αἰτηθεὶς ὑπέγραψα. We should read ἀπαιτ(ητή); for the abbreviation,

⁵ I append a minor correction: in l. 6, read νικόν(των) (νικῶ pap.), not νικντων.

⁶ Accessible at http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Papyrus_2019.

⁷ S. Kovarik contributed the new readings in l. 30 and the first part of l. 29.

misunderstood for ἀπαιτ(ηθείς) in several ostraca from Edfu (Edfu is the origin of SB VI 8986 too), see B. Palme, *ZPE* 64 (1986) 91–5.

Other problems: in l. 15, for Ἀπόλλωνος ται δοξα . . . α read Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπειδὴ π . . . α (πάντα ?) τὰ δόξαντα (the first part was read by S. Kovarik); in l. 23, the papyrus has καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν (τά was not transcribed); in l. 42, read ἐλέει θεοῦ πρεβ(ύτερος), not ἐλεε(ινός) θεοῦ πρεβ(ύτερο)ς; at the end of the line, the editor's παρούς is only the regularized version of what was written, viz. παροεῖ.

67. SB VI 8987

In this document of 644/5, two sisters who sell a part of a house in Oxyrhynchus are said to reside ἐν κώμῃ Πινηχέως τοῦ Ἡρακλεοπ[ο]λίτου νομοῦ (l. 6). M. R. Falivene, *The Herakleopolite Nome* (1998) 180, knew this village only from this text, but noted that one of the persons in the dossier to which SB 8987 belongs lived in 'Great Beshin (possibly the Coptic name of Phebichis)' for some time; the reference is to ΠΙΝΟΔ ΒΕΨΙΝ (SB Kopt. I 36.149, 155, 158, cf. 22), which Falivene associated with Φέβιχis ἡ μεγάλη (op. cit. 244). The village in SB 8987 is no doubt the same; on the online image⁸ I read the toponym as Πιβήχως, which goes back to the same Egyptian word as Φεβίχως (cf. the name Πίβηχis or Φίβηχis, from Egyptian *Pxy-byk*).⁹

Except for small losses at the beginnings of the lines, the papyrus is generally well preserved and textual problems are not very many, and most of them have already been addressed (entries in BL V, VII, VIII, IX, XI). One of those remaining is the new sentence that starts in l. 26, ἐπερωτηθεῖς ὁμολόγησα ἐνεπληρώθαι.¹⁰ The editor assumed an error for πεπληρώθαι, but did not comment on the grammatical number of the two other verb forms, which is not the first person plural used throughout the document. A closer look at the image yields the sequence ὁμολογήσαμεν πεπληρώθαι. ἐπερωτηθεῖς was correctly read; we should emend to ἐπερωτηθεῖς(αι).

Three witnesses to this sale call themselves προ(), which P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 273 (cf. BL VII 200), resolved as προ(εβύτερος), l. πρεβύτερος (ll. 46, 48, 49). One other witness who is a priest is Ἰακὼβ υἱὸς Ἀνανίας (l. 44), who wrote ⲓⲁ = πρεβύτερος after his name, but this was omitted from the published text.

68. SB VI 9190

This papyrus once belonged to Heythrop College, a Roman Catholic institution located in Oxfordshire between 1926 and 1970, when Heythrop moved to London; its present whereabouts are unknown.¹¹ It was published by E. P. Wegener, *JEA* 23 (1937) 204, who noted: 'A. S. Hunt, ..., as Mr. Lobel told me, studied this document with the intention of publishing it ... Unfortunately his transcript was not to be found.' Hunt's transcript has been found (now in the Papyrology Rooms, Sackler Library, Oxford), as well as one made by Lobel earlier. There are several differences between these transcripts and the published version, and in certain cases Hunt's readings seem superior or at least merit consideration. I report these below, though they cannot be verified.

The document is an Oxyrhynchite loan of money dated 21 September 131. After μηνὸς Σεβαστοῦ κδ, the text continues ἐν κώμῃ Ταλαῳί (ll. 2–3). Lobel and Hunt read Σεβαστῇ | [ἐν Ταλαῳί], which looks plausible except for the fact that no august day is known to have fallen on the 24th of any month.

In l. 9, Wegener read διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γρ[α]φ[ε]ίου τῷ μηνὶ Σεβαστῷ, but noticed the 'unusual word-order' of τῷ μηνὶ Σεβαστῷ. Lobel's and Hunt's διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γρ(αφείου) (γρς pap.) τῷ αὐτῷ μηνὶ Σεβαστῇ is attractive, even if the phrase cannot be exactly paralleled.

⁸ http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Papyrus_2018.

⁹ It is not likely that the same locality is to be recognized in SB I 5338.11 Πεβίχων, since all other villages in this list are Arsinoite (the image shows that Α[λμυ]ρῶς in l. 15, already doubted in SPP III².5, p. 182, is not a possible reading).

¹⁰ The line begins [. . .]ροτιμης in ed. pr., for which [όλοκλή]ρου τιμῆς was later suggested (BL VII 200). Traces not reported in ed. pr. suit the upper parts of κ and η, but there is no υ after ο (a slight thickening at the top of ο is not υ).

¹¹ I quote from an email of Chris Pedley SJ, Librarian of Heythrop at that time, dated 29.iii.2010: 'I am afraid ... our attempts to find it a few years ago were unsuccessful and I have not come across either the papyrus or any record of it since. I think we have to conclude it is missing.'

The loan was secured on 1½ arura of katoikic land, ἦνπερ κατακειμένην ἐν δη[μοσίῳ] κατ'οίκων τὴν ὅλην μίαν ἡμῖν τῇ δὲ φύσει καὶ [τὰ τῇ] μὲν ἄρουραν μίαν χερσαμπέλου (τῆς) δὲ ἀρούρης ἡμῖν κτλ. (Il. 13–15). This is not immediately intelligible, especially with a verb lacking from the relative clause. Hunt's transcript offers a different text, arrived at after several tentative readings: ἦνπερ κατὰ πλάνην ἐδὴ[λωσεν; there are several instances of the phrase κατὰ πλάνην, and Hunt referred to SPP XX 85.7. After that, Hunt read καὶ [λάμου] μὲν ἄρουραν μίαν χερσαμπέλου δὲ κτλ., which must be right.

Some other discrepancies cannot be settled without access to the papyrus. In l. 1, Wegener read Σμ, and noted that ε might be considered instead of μ; Hunt transcribed εκ[. In l. 5, Wegener's text has Νεφερκοῦτ(oc), whereas Hunt had read Τεφερκοῦτ(oc); the name is not otherwise attested in either form. At the beginning of l. 19, Lobel and Hunt restored [τὴν κατ]οχήν; Wegener did not supply the article. In ll. 19–20, Wegener read εἰς τὸ τῶν ἐ(γ)κτῆσεων βιβλιο[φυλ]ᾶ[κιο]ν, while Hunt had εἰς τὴν τῶν ἐγκτῆσεων βιβλιο[θήκη]ν; either is possible.

69. SB X 10738

The text was published as a writing exercise, assigned to the sixth century. The editor noted: 'Il discente ha trascritto, probabilmente, i nomi dei suoi compagni di classe, e comunque dei suoi amici, con bella irregolarità stilistica, oltre che grafica, in quanto ora collega i nomi con καὶ, ora si limita a giustapporli.' The first four lines (the fifth is very damaged) were edited as follows:

- (m. 1)]τησιν δ(ραχμαὶ) σγ'
 (m. 2)]αc δ Αἰνέα(c), Καβόριο(c) καὶ Ἡλία(c)
] καὶ Ἰωναθᾶc, Ἔλιoc, Ἐρoc υἱὸc Παρμόν(θου)
] Λεύκαροc, Ἀλίτιoc κα(ὶ) Μαρεῦ(c)

Most of the names are unusual but seem to have received no notice. The reading of the drachmas in l. 1 was questioned by K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 172 (2010) 170, and with good reason. An image¹² shows that this line preserves the end of an indictional date, which would have been preceded by a consular formula. We have the top right-hand corner of a contract that probably dates from the first half of the sixth century. I read the following text:

- (m. 1)]της ἰν(δικτίωνoc) //
 (m. 2) Πέ]λεκτιc υἱὸc Ἀβουρίου καὶ Ἡλία
] καὶ Ἰωνᾶc πρεcβύτεροc υἱὸc Παμοῦν
 4] λευ καὶ Ἀνοῦπ υἱὸc Καλλαραευ

The name Πέ]λεκτιc in l. 2 (read by S. Kovarik) is only known from three Arsinoite documents of late date, which may offer a clue to the origin of this text. Another potential clue is the partly preserved name in l. 4; if we restore Π]αλεν, there are two other instances of this name, also from late Arsinoite texts.¹³ The name Καλλαραευ in l. 4 is new, even if we read the last letter as tau (Αρετ is attested).

70. SB XX 14672

The entry in l. 6 of this grain account of the fifth/sixth century begins ἐκ τοῦ Παθω(). The published photograph (*Tyche* 3 [1988] Taf. 2) suggests reading Παθαει, a name attested in this spelling also in SB XIV 12098.2. The latter text is Arsinoite; SB 14672 is of unknown provenance – could it be that it is Arsinoite too?

Nikolaos Gonis, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London, London WC1E 6BT
 n.gonis@ucl.ac.uk

¹² Accessible at <http://www.pug.unige.net>, under PUG 1162.

¹³ CPR IX 66.8 and P.Rain.Unterricht 109v.20. The former was thought to be Hermopolite on the basis of its inventory number, but onomastic considerations point to an Arsinoite origin; see J. Gascou, *BiOr* 43 (1986) 96 (not reported in BL).