

(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.

56. P.Berol. 25855²

This list of names of the third century appears to attest four names described as ‘*addend[a] onomasticis*’. 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 , l. 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 $\text{Ἰ δούλω Ἀπολλωνίου}$ 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, ἀνεπέμφθη was revised to ἀνεπεμφθ[] ; the abbreviation was not resolved, but we should no doubt read ἀνεπέμφθη(η) . More interesting is l. 7, where the new version has $\text{ὑ(πὲρ) ναυβίων ἄν ἐκ (δηναρίων μυριάδων) ρι (γίνονται) (δηναρίων μυριάδεσ) ρνθ φ}$ [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, $(\text{δηναρίων}) (\text{μυριάδεσ}) (\text{μυριάδων}) \text{ιε } \theta\phi$; for this type of calculation, cf. P.Laur. III 70.4 (Oxy.; 367). The end of the line is very abraded, but $\text{[] [] [] .ιε } \theta\phi$ 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 [] ε ἰνδ(κτίονος) 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 $\text{[name στοι]χεῖ μοι +}$.

59. P.Genova II 72

This is an order addressed $\text{Ἰωάννη φροντιστῆ ἀπ’ οὐσίας}$ (l. 1). ἀπ’ οὐσίας is curious, but the plate (Tav. IX) shows that απ should be read as αν (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, *RSON*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.

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

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,] $\zeta\omicron\nu\theta$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ 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). 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 εἰν [.] 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]αυτα πέμπει; in the same line, ὑγιάνομεν 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[υ 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[υ καὶ δεσπότου] Ἰ[ησοῦ
 Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σ[ωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ
 τῆς δε[σποίν]η[ς ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας
 θεοτ[ό]κου κ[αὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, ἔτους
 5 Διο[κλητιανοῦ
 τῶ []
 []
 - - - - -

Back:

† ὁμολ(ογία) γενομέ(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 Ἐρμοῦ 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]στρα[τη]γῳ Ἐρμοῦ πόλεως (P.Lips. I 56.4ff.). Images⁴

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.

of P.Herm. 52–53 show that Petros and the notion of two brothers are ghosts: Κύρω (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 ἔματοῦ | ποιήσασθαι τῆ τάξει, ἐπειδὴ ἐκελεύσθη | πέρας [c]ταθῆναι ὑπ[ὸ] τῆς ἐξουσίας τ[ο]ῦ | κυρίου μ[ο]ν τ[ο]ῦ λαμπροτάτου | 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' ἐμοὶ | πέρατ[ο]ς 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 ἡγεμον[ί]α[c] (scil. ἡγεμονίας).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 Boh*θου.

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 4903–4904 (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 be repositioned.

Lines 29–31 were transcribed as follows:

] ἐξακολούθησα□□
30]ν ἄνδρα πρὸς δ[]εξονα σου ἀσφάλ(ειαν)
]ελοσ

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

] □□□ δικάϊω σκοπῶ π□□□ ἐξακολουθησάσης

⁵ I append a minor correction: in l. 6, read νικόν(των) (νικω □ 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.

30 ἵν' ἄνδρα πρὸς δὲ μείζονά σου ἀσφάλ(ειαν)
τῆν [β]ασιλικὴν ζωτηρίαν εἰ τέλος

An oath began in 31, e.g. [ἐπωμοκάμην τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ ὁμοούσιον τριάδα καὶ τῆν [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, misunderstood for ἀπαιτ(ηθεὶς) 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 read by S. Kovarik); in l. 23, the papyrus has καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν (τά was not transcribed); in l. 42, read ἐλέει θεοῦ πρεσβ(ύτερος), not ἐλεε(ινὸς) θεοῦ πρεσβ(ύτερο); at the end of the line, the editor's παρούχη is only the regularized version of what was written, viz. παροσει.

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 Πινηγέως τοῦ Ἡρακλεοπ[ο]λ[ίτου νομοῦ] (l. 6). M.R. Falivene, *The Herakleopolite Nome* (1998) 180, knew this village only from this text, but noted that one of 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 Π Ν Ο Σ Β Ε Ψ Ι Ν (SB Kopt. I 36.149, 155, 158, cf. 22), which Falivene associated with Φέβιχις ἡ μεγάλη (op. cit. 244). The village in SB 8987 is no doubt the same; on the online image⁸ I read the toponym as Πιβήγεως, which goes back to the same Egyptian word as Φεβίχεως (cf. the name Πίβηχις or Φίβηχις, from Egyptian *Pzy-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, ἐπερωτηθεὶς ὠμολόγησα ἐνεπληρῶσθαι.¹⁰ The editor assumed an error for πεπληρῶσθαι, 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 ὠμολογήσαμεν πεπληρῶσθαι. ἐπερωτηθεὶς was correctly read; we should probably 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. πρεσβύτερος (ll. 46, 48, 49). One other witness who is a priest is Ἰακῶβ υἱὸς Ἀνανίας (l. 44), who wrote □ = προ(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,

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 Πεβίχον, since all other villages in this list are Arsinoite (the image shows that Α[λμυ]ρᾶς, already doubted by C. Kreuzsaler, *SPP* III².5, p. 182, is not a possible reading).

¹⁰ The line begins [. . . .]ροτιμης in ed. pr., for which [όλοκλή]ρου τιμης 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.'

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 on these below, though they cannot be verified.

The text is an Oxyrhynchite loan of money dated 21 September 131. After μηνὸς Σεβαστοῦ κδ, the text continues ἐν κώι[[μη Ταλα]ῶι (ll. 2–3). Hunt read Σεβαστῆ | [ἐν Ταλα]ῶι, 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. Hunt's διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γρ(αφείου) (γρ□ pap.) τῶι αὐτῶι μηνὶ Σεβαστῆ is attractive, even if the phrase cannot be exactly paralleled.

The loan was secured on 1½ arura of katoikic land, ἦνπερ κατακειμένην ἐν δη[[μοσίωι] κατοίκων τὴν ὄλην μίαν ἤμισυ τῆ δὲ φύσει κα[[τὰ τῆ]ν μὲν ἄρουραν μίαν χερσαμπέλου <τῆς> δὲ ἀρούρης ἡμίσεως κτλ. (ll. 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 ἐδή[[λωσεν; there are several instances of the phrase κατὰ πλάνην, and Hunt referred to SPP XX 85.7. After that, Hunt read κα[[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(ος), whereas Hunt had read Τεφερκοῦτ(ος); the name is not otherwise attested in either form. At the beginning of l. 19, 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]ά[κιο]ν, while Hunt had εἰς τὴν τῶν ἐγκτῆσεων βιβλιο[[θήκη; 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)]αδ δ Αἰνέα(ς), Καβόριο(ς) καὶ Ἡλία(ς)
] καὶ Ἰωναθαῶς, Ἔλιος, Ἐρος υἱὸς Παρμόν(θου)
] Λεύκαρος, Ἀλίτιος κα(ὶ) Μαρεῦ(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)]της ἰν(δικτίωνος) //
 (m. 2) Πέ]λεκτις υἱὸς Ἀβουρίου καὶ Ἡλία
] καὶ Ἰωνᾶς πρεσβύτερος υἱὸς Παμοῦν
 4]□λευ καὶ Ἀνοῦπ υἱὸς Καλλαρεν

The name Πέλεκτις 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

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

name in l. 4; if we restore Π]αλευ, there are two other instances of this name, also from late Arsinoite texts.¹³ The name Καλλαρευ 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

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).