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 Ἰμηῖς Φίβ πρεσβ(ύτερος) καὶ Ἰωσῆφ καὶ Σουχίων ὁμογνησοι ἀδελφ(ο)ι υἱοι
2 καὶ Πτολεμεός ὁ καὶ Παθαεὶ ἀπό κόμης Κερκεσούχ(ων) γράφοντες
3 διὰ] Φίβ πρεσβ(ύτερου) (ὑπέρ) τοῦ κλήρ(ου) ὄν ἔχεις παρ’ ἡμῶν εν. . . ρικ [1 l.
11. Ἰμηῖς . . . ὁμογνήσιοι 21. Πτολεμαίος . . . γράφοντες 3 ὄν. Ρ.: ὄν

υἱοί 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 Πτολεμέως; line 1 also appears to be complete, unless a cross was lost at the beginning. [διὰ] Φίβ in line 3 would suit the space, but we have to read Ἰωσήφ, as the image shows. Πτολεμέως 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 Γεώργιος σίδηρου κλητὸς τῆς μεγάλης ηλικίας γράφων σοι Πέτρῳ τέκτων. Thus I propose to read the following text:3

[ Ἰμηῖς Φίβ πρεσβ(ύτερος) καὶ Ἰωσῆφ καὶ Σουχίων ὁμογνησοι ἀδελφ(ο)ι υἱοι
Πτολεμέως ὁ καὶ Παθαεὶ ἀπό κόμης Κερκεσούχ(ων) γράφοντες
κοι(?) Ἰωσήφ πρεσβ(ύτερο) (ὑπέρ) τοῦ κλήρ(ου) ὄν ἔχεις παρ’ ἡμῶν εν. . . ρικ [1 l.
11. Ἰμηῖς. . . ὁμογνήσιοι 21. Πτολεμαίος τοῦ. . . γράφοντες 3 ὄν: ὄν ή 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 ἐγώ + name in nominative + γράφω + name in dative, which corresponds to the Coptic epistolary formula ‘I, name, write to name.’ These documents are few; SB 12909 and 12943 are the only ones from the Fayum.

In the same article I proposed to emend γράφον in SB 12943.1 to γράφω{ν}, but γράφοντες in SB 12943.2 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.
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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 ὁμηγνησίου in l. 1; Πτολεμεός in l. 2, with Πτολεμέως (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 εν and ρικ[ι]. Ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ is not an easy reading. As for ὄν, 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.