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 Ἀρφευτήν ὑιόν τοῦ μακριάν Μηνα, was not included in the *PGB* plate. An image of the whole is now available on line, and shows that Ἀρφευτή, a name that has remained without a second reference for well over a century, is a ghost: read ἀρδευτήν (for the shape of delta, cf. διά 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 ἀρδευτήϲ 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 ὄξυρχητοι καὶ ὑδροπάροχοϲ (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, πῶμαρίτηϲ).

54. BGU III 728
Line 11 of this sixth/seventh-century letter currently reads ἀπαν ἡ ἡ τοϲαύτηϲ ἀθυμίαϲ. ἀπαν ἡ is dubious; the index lists it under ἀπανάπτειν, adding a question mark. Preisigke, *WB* I 154, to whom ἀθυμίαϲ 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 (προχρεία) were printed as follows:

διοριζ[ ] ὁντοϲ τῷ ῾ιδίῳ δεκατῇ τῷ αὐτοῦ πανευφή思想政治
This is part of the common Menas-formula of Apionic documents; on an image1 I read:

σπορίζοντοϲ τῷ ῾ιδίῳ δεκατῇ τῷ αὐτοῦ πανευφή思想政治

διὰ Μηνα 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 θαυμαϲιωτάτοϲ Κυριακοῦ τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]τ[.]tau]. Since the money was given διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ θαυμαϲιωτάτοϲ Κυριακοῦ | προνοητοῦ (ll. 11–12), we may read προνοητοῦ | τοῦ after the name in l. 3, and perhaps supply διὰ αὐτοῦ 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 ἀντιτρὲοϲ 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. LXXIII 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.

This list of names of the third century appears to attest four names described as 'addenda or onomastis'. For three of them, however, this unique status disappears upon closer study of the image. In l. 2, the papyrus does not have Κακενίς but Θεσσαλίος (there is an ink smudge affecting the reading of the putative theta, possibly the result of a correction). In l. 3, in place of Απόλλωνα κ ψευδοσ; Απόλλωνας is not a common name. In l. 7, for Βερούμενις read Βερούμενις, I. Βασιλιουτής; for the spelling cf. P.Harr. II 220.23 (in bc) or P.Laur. I 11r.A.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.

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 another prosopographical link between P.Daris 38 and Oxyrhynchus in the 360s, what was read as ] δούλῳ Απολλωνίου 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 πι(αρό) Θεοδούλωρ, P.Oxy. LXVII 4607.ii.10 (362/3), a tax account of πολίται, refers to a θεοδούλωρ Απολλωνίου. A Θεοδουλος alias Απολλωνίως 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 ἀνεπεμφθε; the abbreviation was not resolved, but we should no doubt read ἀνεπέμφθη. More interesting is l. 7, where the new version has υ(πέρ) ναυβίων Ἀυν ἐκ (δηναρίων μυριάδων) ρι (γίνονται) (δηναρίων μυριάδες) ρι[θ] [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, (δηναρίων) (μυριάδες) (μυριάδων) τε θρ; for this type of calculation, cf. P.Laur. III 70.4 (Oxy.; 367). The end of the line is very abraded, but *δῆ λοκθεύοντας 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.

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, Τυψι ο[δήν]ικ(ιο)νος ε, followed by [ ] ινι(κτίονος) in l. 13. The second reference to the indication is anomalous, but inspection of the photograph shows that this line preserves the end of the signature of someone whose name is lost: read [ name ινιος] ιεγι μοι +.

This is an order addressed Ἰουκάννη φροντιστῇ ἄρτος ὀύιας (l. 1). ἄρτος ὀύιας is curious, but the plate (Tav. IX) shows that ς π should be read as ν (for a similar misreading, see above, note no. 54). This yields Ἀνούκιας, an Oxyrhynchite toponym; cf. the επόχειον Ιερέων in l. 2 (with BL X 279). The approximate position of Hierreon is known (Benaissa, RSON2 113), which gives us an idea about the location of Ανουςιας as well as of Neophytou, the latter mentioned in Anousias in P.Oxy. LVII 3914.6.

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, ] κυνι θεο εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν (ναυς) 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, [ἐνομόμεται τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου ήσοι] 2. Χρυστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ζωτήρος ήμῶν . . . . . . 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 ὑπομηκτί τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου ήσοι
Χρυστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ζωτήρος ήμῶν καὶ τῆς δε[σπον][ή]ς ήμῶν τῆς ἁγίας
Θεοτόκου καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, ἐτούς
5 Διογκλητιανοῦ

Back:
† ὑμωλί ογια γενομένη [ὑπὸ - - - ]

This combination of a Christian invocation (4A; see CSBE2 101) and date by the Diocletianic era is common in Arsinote 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).

61. P.Got. 96

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

Fragment théologique. (...) Prov. inconnue. VIe–VIIe siècle. 1. + ἐν ὑπομηκτί τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου ήσοι 2. Χρυστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ζωτήρος ήμῶν . . . . . . 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 ὑπομηκτί τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου ήσοι Χρυστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ζωτήρος ήμῶν καὶ τῆς δε[σπο[ν][ή]ς ήμῶν τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, ἐτούς 5 Διογκλητιανοῦ

Back:
† ὑμωλί ογια γενομένη [ὑπὸ - - - ]

This combination of a Christian invocation (4A; see CSBE2 101) and date by the Diocletianic era is common in Arsinote 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 Φιλάμωνῳ πολιτευομένῳ ἑνάρχῳ λυκτοστρατήγῳ ἕρμου πόλεως (52.2f.; sim. 53.3f.) on 4 July 398. The name of this person, Πέτρῳ (P[ηρ] in P.Herm. 53.3), makes one pause. A certain Κύρος son of Φιλάμων is attested in several Arsinote texts of the 390s, and a document dated 28 January 398 is addressed Αὐρηλίῳ Κύρῳ Φιλάμῳ[μω]ν[ας] πολιτευομένῳ ἑνάρχῳ λυκτοστρατήγῳ ἕρμου πόλεως (P.Lips. I 56.3ff.). Images4 of P.Herm. 52–53 show that Πέτρου 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 nystostrategus, 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 καφαλαιωτής swears τὴν ἑμφάνιαν τὴν ἑματού τοι ἐκελεύοντο τῇ τάξει, ἐπειδὴ ἐκελεύθη τῆς ἐκεκαθήμενα νῦν τῆς ἐξομοίας τοσοῦ τοῦ κυρίου μοῦ τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ τῇ
N. Gonis

A rare numismatic term was thought to appear in lines 2–3 of this fifth-century letter: διζῳνομιϲματιων ἑκατὸν ἕξηκον. The image shows that δι at the start of l. 3 is a misreading, and the papyrus has something unexceptional: τῶν νομιϲματῶν 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 Bohθου.

The text has attracted a fair amount of critical attention, but the endorsement has received no comment. It starts παραϲταθῆναι, ‘be produced’ . The same procedure is described in P.Lips. I 48.11f. κελευϲθέντα ἀπαντῆϲαι εἰϲ τὴν τάξιν (scil. ἡγεμονίαϲ).

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:

| ] ἐξακολούθηϲα . . .
| 30 ἃνδρα πρὸϲ δὲ εξοναϲου ἁϲφάλ(ειαν)
| ] ἔλοϲ

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

| ] . . . δικαίῳ εκορω π . . . ἐξακολούθηϲαϲηϲ
| 30 ἃνδρα πρὸϲ δὲ μεζοναϲου ἁϲφάλ(ειαν)
| ] ἄρα [βασιλικὴ ωτηρίαις εἰ τέλοϲ

An oath began in 31, e.g. [ἐψωμοϲάμην τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ ὁμοούϲιον τριάδα καὶ τῇγ] [βασιλικὴ ωτηρίαιϲ] 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 νικών(τον) Γεωργίου ἀπαιτηθεὶϲ μαρτυρῶν. 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 ὑπεράγωνα. We should read ἀπατητηϲ(ητηϲ); for the abbreviation,
misunderstood for ἐπαντὶ(θείες) 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 Ἀπόφλωνος τοι δοξα ... α (πάντα ?) τά δοξάντα (the first part was read by S. Kovarik); in l. 23, the papyrus has καὶ τά εξ ἀμφοτέρων (tā was not transcribed); in l. 42, read ἐλέει (θεοί) πρεςβύτερος, not ἐλέει (νύσ) θεοί) πρεςβύτερος; at the end of the line, the editor’s παρούση is only the regularized version of what was written,viz. παροει.

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 in κόμη Πινηχέως τοῦ Ἑρακλεοπ[η]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 ΠΙΒΗΧΙϹ (SB Kopt. I 36.149, 155, 158, cf. 22), which Falivene associated with Φήβχις ἡ μεγάλη (op. cit. 244). The village in SB 8987 is no doubt the same; on the online image I read the toponym as Πιβήχεως, which goes back to the same Egyptian word as Φεβίχεως (cf. the name Πίβηχος or Φίβηχος, from Egyptian Pyy-βκ).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, ἐπερωτηθεὶϲ ὀμολόγηϲα ἐνεπλήρωϲθαι.10 The editor assumed an error for πεπληρώϲθαι, 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 ὀμολογητέϲας ἐνεπληρώϲθαι. ἐπερωτήϲας was correctly read; we should emend to ἐπερωτηθείϲ(ας).

Three witnesses to this sale call themselves προ( ), which P. J. Sijpesteijn, ZPE 19 (1975) 273 (cf. BL VII 200), resolved as προ(βύτερος), I. πρεβύτερος (l. 46, 48, 49). One other witness who is a priest is Ἰακώβ νιὸς Ἀνανίας (l. 44), who wrote Ἰ╬ = πρ(εβύτερος) 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 κόμη Ταλα[θ]ὶ (l. 2–3). Lobel and Hunt read Σεβαϲτῆ | ἐν Ταλα[θ]ὶ, 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 γραμ[θεί]ου τοί μην Σεβαϲτοῦ, but noticed the ‘unusual word-order’ of τοῖ μην Σεβαϲτοῦ. Lobel’s and Hunt’s διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γράμ[θε]ου (γράμ[θ]ει) τοῖ αὐτῶι μην Σεβαϲτῆ is attractive, even if the phrase cannot be exactly paralleled.


9 It is not likely that the same locality is to be recognized in SB I 5338.11 Pibigov, since all other villages in this list are Arsinoite (the image shows that Λ[μ]υρ[δ]ὲς in l. 15, already doubted in SPP III:5, p. 182, is not a possible reading).

10 The line begins [ . . . ]; ἰστρίη[(ς)] in ed. pr., for which ἰστρίη[(ς)] was later suggested (BL VII 200). Traces not reported in ed. pr. suit the upper parts of κ and ι, but there is no ν after o (a slight thickening at the top of o is not ν).

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, ἡπερ κατακεμέγην ἐν δη[μοσίων] κατοίκων τὴν ὄλην μίαν ἡμίου τῆς δὲ φύσει καὶ[τά] τῆς μὲν ἀρούραν μίαν χερσαμπέλου (τῆς) δὲ ἀρούρης ἡμίους κτλ. (11. 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: ἡπερ κατὰ πλάνην ἐδή[λασε]; there are several instances of the phrase κατὰ πλάνην, and Hunt referred to SPP XX 85.7. After that, Hunt read κα[λάμου] μὲν ἀρούραν μίαν χερσαμπέλου δὲ κτλ., which must be right.

Some other discrepancies cannot be settled without access to the papyrus. In l. 1, Wegener read Σιμ, and noted that ε might be considered instead of μ; Hunt transcribed εξ. In l. 5, Wegener’s text has Νεφερούτο(ος), whereas Hunt had read Τεφερούτ(ος); the name is not otherwise attested in either form. At the beginning of l. 19, Lobel and Hunt restored τὴν κατάχην; Wegener did not supply the article. In ll. 19–20, Wegener read εἰς τὸ τῶν ἐγκτήσεων βιβλίον[φυλ] ἡμίς, while Hunt had εἰς τὴν ἐγκτήσεων βιβλίον[θήκης]; 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 grammatici, in quanto ora collega i nomi con καί, ora si limita a giustapporli.’ The first four lines (the fifth is very damaged) were edited as follows:

(m. 1) Πτηκα δ ἄρχετοι(ς), Σαβδόριο(ς) καὶ Ἡλίο(ς)
(m. 2)] καὶ Ἰωνᾶθας, Ἑλία, Ἑροῦ παρμόν(θου)
] Λεόκαρος, Ἀλίτιος καὶ(ι) Παμεν(υ)ς

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) Πέλεκς(ις) ὕδως Αβουρίου καὶ Ἡλία
(m. 2) Πέλεκς(ις) ὕδως Αβουρίου καὶ Ἡλία
] καὶ Ἰωνᾶς πρεβυτέρος ὕδως Παμοῦγ
] λευ καὶ Άνοῦ ὕδως Καλλαρεὺ

The name Πέλεκς 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 Πάλευ, there are two other instances of this name, also from late Arsinoite texts.13 The name Καλλαρεὺ in l. 4 is new, even if we read the last letter as tau (Ἀρετεῖς is attested).

70. SB XX 14672

The entry in l. 6 of this grain account of the fifth/sixth century begins ἐκ τοῦ Παθωκε( ). The published photograph (Tyche 3 [1988] Taf. 2) suggests reading Παθωκέ, 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).