71. BGU II 547
This is a letter written sometime in the earlier part of the seventh century (‘Byz.’ ed. pr.), addressed to a person of much superior status to the sender. The edited text generally flows, but a part of l. 5 remained undeciphered: καὶ καταλαμβάνω τοῦ . . . . . . . καταλαμβάνω τοῦ . . . . . . . . . . . . . The online image shows that the papyrus reads τοὺς πόδας υμῶν (ū-), ‘and I come to your feet’ (for this sense of καταλαμβάνω, cf. Lampe, PGL s.v. 4). There is a reference to a future meeting and the recipient’s feet in ll. 9–10, ὁ κύριος τῶν αἰώνων . . . ὀξιόση τήν ἐμὴν | μετριότητα προκοσμύνησαι τοὺς πόδας υμῶν; for the idea, cf. also P.Cair.Masp. I 67091.19–20 (528?) καταλαμβάνω | τά ἤχη τῆς ϑυμῶν ἐξομισσᾶς. P.Oxy. LXXXI 5289.7 (ν’/νπ) κάγῳ ἦλθον εἰς τοὺς πόδας υμῶν. Before καὶ, the edition has ἐμὸν ψις; I read ἐμὸν, ζωῆς but I cannot reconstruct the context.

72. BGU II 643
This letter too should be assigned to the earlier seventh century (‘5–6 Jh.’ ed. pr) and is addressed to a superior, called δεσπότης. The writer reports that a gardener was due to arrive tomorrow, and requests that the ‘master’ might ask the gardener to inspect the vegetable garden, since the writer himself had gone to the orchard. The last two lines of the text (3–4) were read as follows:

ἐπεὶ δι’ ἐμαυτοῦ ἀνήλθον εἰς τὸ πομάριν, ἐφ’ ὅ θεωρ-
ἐῖ τήν λαχανήα +

The word division is odd, and the construction ἐφ’ ὅ + present indicative is peculiar. A check of the image reveals the foot of an upright after ρ at the end of l. 3 (the fibres are stripped after it), while the first two letters in l. 4 should be read as ας; we have ἐφ’ ὅ θεωρῆσαι. We would expect to find ἐπιθεωρῆσαι rather than θεωρῆσαι, but is seems unlikely that εφα conceals the first part of the compound.

The gardener would come μετά τῆς ὑπνρέ(πιδοκ’) (l. 2). This term for a female servant has not occurred in papyri; perhaps ὑπνρε(πιδοκ) was intended, referring to an unspecified number of servants.

73. BGU XVII 2728
This sixth-century letter has already received a fair amount of attention, excerpted in BL XIII 41, but some problems remain. The abstract nouns referring to the addressee, ἐλλογιμότης (l. 1) and παίδευσις (ll. 4, 6, 7), indicate learning, and are typical of scholastici. This however is not mirrored in the address:

‡ 10 πρ(εβυθέρου) καὶ Σοφία(α) γυ(νακώς) αὐτ(οῦ) ☑ Βίκτορι

It appears that there are two senders, but this sits oddly with the fact that the writer uses the first person singular throughout the letter (ll. 1, 2, 6, 7). Inspection of the online image yields a different text, more in line with our expectations:

ἐπίδ(ος) τῷ τὰ πάντα(α) λομπρ(οτάτῳ) καὶ σοφωτάτ(ος) καὶ σχολ(αστικῶ) ☑ Βίκτορι

Victor the scholasticus does not seem to be known from elsewhere.

74. P.Daris 48
The body of this private letter, previously known as SB XX 14102, begins [ὁ] καὶ [καὶ] ὅψιν ἐνετειλάμην ὅτι λέγειν δέον ἦν ἡμερήσιος γράφει μοι (ll. 4–5). What follows ὅτι is not a smooth piece of Greek, and the common periphrasis δέον ἦν is normally preceded by ἔνν. The plate shows that what was read as λας stands on a loose fragment that may not belong there. I propose to read [ἐ]γεῖν δέον ἦν (it would be too bold to propose αἱ[η]γεῖν).

1 Continued from ZPE 208 (2018) 187–92. Unless indicated otherwise, the images mentioned in this article are accessible through www.papyri.info.
The total in this list of payments of the sixth century (cf. Th. Kruse, APF 59 [2013] 223) is given as (γίνεται) νό(μιϲματα) ν π(αράλ) ζ (γίνεται) κ(αι) θ(αράλ) ν(υομίϲματα) λε ως// (l. 9): 50 solidi minus 240 carats make 35½ ‘clean’ solidi. The published photograph indicates that the number of solidi is 40: we have μ instead of ν. But in theory 240 carats equal 10 solidi; how do we obtain 35½?

The payments in ll. 1–8 are made in solidi of the ‘minus 6 carats’ variety, uniformly expressed as νό(μιϲμα) απ(αρά) ς (αρὰ νος 35⅔) of ‘clean’ solidi. The ‘minus carats’ number of 40 such solidi would have been 240. These convert to 10 sol. at 24 car. per sol.; deducted from 40 sol., they make 30 ‘clean’ solidi, i.e., κ(αι) θ(αρά) ν(υομίϲματα) λε; what follows λ, read by the editor as εας//, must be something else, not part of the number of solidi. In fact it has been suggested that ‘the last symbol in line 9 is ηʹ (1/8) rather than 2/3’ (P. van Minnen, BASP 50 [2013] 321); the ⅛ fraction cannot be reconciled with ‘clean’ solidi.

‘[O]rthograph[ie] très mauvaise’, remarked the editor of this late letter, and some passages are obscure. διλόννιϲιοι πολλά [ in l. 10 was recently discussed by J. Diethart, ZPE 204 (2017) 208, who divided διλόννιϲι, and took διλόννιϲ as an idiosyncratic version of δηλοποιεῖϲ. The verb is rare but the reading is incorrect. The editor had already observed, ‘possible aussi -νν- pour -ππ-’; the online image shows that the double letter is μ. I juxtapose a clipping of the passage with one that shows πάλιν in l. 9:

διλόννιϲιοι πολλά [ διλόννιϲ is a phonetic version of δηλόννιϲ, the late form that corresponds to δηλοῦϲ. In Byzantine Greek, ‘most of the old contract verbs in -όω acquir[ed] parallel presents in -όνω, thus δηλόννιϲ … replaced δηλόω ‘I reveal’ etc.’ (G. Horrocks, Greek: a History of the Language and its Speakers [2010] 305; cf. also A. N. Jannaris, An Historical Greek Grammar, Chiefly of the Attic Dialect [1897] 217f., §853). These forms are not common in papyri; another example is P.Oxy. XVI 1863.19 (624) πληρόννω.

This account lists quantities of meat presumably bought in connection with feasts of saints. In all but one case, the price is 160 talents per pound: 3 lb. = 480 tal. (l. 2); 5½ lb. = 880 tal. (l. 5); 2 lb. = 320 tal. (l. 7); 4 lb. = 640 tal. (l. 9). The exception is 4 lb. = 608 tal. in l. 3, which suggests a slightly lower price, 152 talents. The note ad loc. queries whether χη(608) was an error for χμ(640), the price of 4 pounds in l. 9, but there is one more instance of this same price: in l. 2 the papyrus has υςζ(456), not υπ(480). The first two expenditures for meat are priced at 152 talents per pound, and the other three at 160. It is a pity that the text may be dated only palaeographically to the fifth century.

What remains of l. 7 of this fragmentary Oxyrhynchite document of 606 (cf. CSBE 2 214) was printed as [ ]. οινας[. This is the first line after the date clause; at this point of the text, we expect to find the beginning of the address. On the online image it is possible to read τιον αιδής; cf. P.Oxy. LVIII 3942.7 (606) τοι αιδής ως Σεργίῳ χαρτουλαρίῳ κτλ.

The endorsement is said to describe the text as a πληρωθ(οτική) ἀποχή(η). Its omission from the edition is apparently a typographical error; it receives comment, and the text is supplied in DDbDP. Yet the papyrus does not have ἀποχή(η) but one of its synonyms: απο is followed by the basis of δ (the rest is lost), an upright, an upright hooked upwards to right at the foot, and another upright: απόδε[ε]ξις(ης).
79. P.Oxy. VI 977

Only lines 4–19 of this receipt of 252 were transcribed. The subscriptions of two councillors were said to be ‘followed by a similar signature by an exegetes’. On a photograph I read this signature as follows:


It is unclear whether this Aurelius Diogenes, former exegete and councillor, is to be identified with any known Oxyrhynchite official named Diogenes. The relevant part in the ‘Prospopographie der Exegeten’ in P.Hamb. IV, p. 233, shows a gap between 225 and 270 (or 265: BGU IV 1093.16, with BL XI 24).

80. P.Oxy. XVI 1892


81. P.Oxy. XVI VIII 2197

This is an account of bricks used for various constructions in the Apionic estate. In P.Oxy. LXX 4792.10 n., I suggested that it covers the years 581/2 – 584/5 (indictions 15 – 2), but this date range now seems late. The heading of the account on the back, l. 172, τῆς διοικήςεως τοῦ κόμ(η)τος Κρησία(ου), contains an error: the name should be read as Ιερημίου. This is probably the same comites as in P.Oxy. XIX 2244.80 διοικήςεως τοῦ κόμ(η)τος Ιερημίου(ου) επὶ τῆς βουλ[ευτῆς] (cf. P. Vesp. 79.141: SB XI 505f. 19), a document that cannot be later than 588; see ZPE 150 (2004) 201, and cf. P.Oxy. LXXIII 5378.4 n. It has also been pointed out (BL XII 144) that the potter Abraamios in l. 135 may be the same as the one in P.Oxy. XVI 1913.33, an account that probably dates from around 555. Therefore it seems preferable to assign P.Oxy. XVIII 2197 to 551/2 – 554/5 or 566/7 – 569/70.

There is much in the text of this account that requires correction. Among other things, it appears to offer the sole attestations of several place names. One of them is Ἀρκικου[ϲ] in l. 62. This is preceded by (καί), and a small break in between. The same break affects the next line, where the edition prints ὅσιο(οπλίνθων), but the papyrus has ὅπ(ο)σιο[ϲ]ο(πλίνθων). We should thus reckon with one letter lost before αρκικοῦ, and read [N]αρκίκου. The same place occurs in l. 216, spelled Ναρκίκου; the different spelling is probably due to the fact that this part of the account was written by a different hand.

Another singleton appears in l. 218, κτήτης(ετος) Βασιλείου. The papyrus has Ματρευ, known from a handful of other documents. It was probably located not far from Pangouleioou (they were part of the same Apionic proostasia in the seventh century, mentioned three times here: in l. 99, where for Παγγουλείου read Παγγουλείου; in l. 101, where after γεωρ(γοῦ) the text continues ἀπὸ Παγγουλείου ὁπτύπλινθου) θ; and in l. 119, where for ετο(μέτρου) Παγγουλεῖου(ο) read ἀπὸ Παγγουλεῖου. The reading of ἀπὸ gave difficulty also in l. 40, producing δοῦ(λος) Ματρεύ(ῶ); read ἀπὸ Ματρεύ(ῶ).

An unnoticed toponym seems to occur in l. 102, [ ] , μειζο(νος) EC[ ] λ. Before μειζο(νος), read [Μ]η[ν]ν. EC[ ] λ. must be a place name, but the reading is doubtful. A. Benaisa notes that what was read as E is “σίγμα with a diagonal abbreviation stroke from above (abbreviating ὁκνολάκτη[ϲ])”. If so, the toponym begins with Ce[ ]. Then there is a trace of a descender after omega, which suggests that the toponym does not end with that letter – or that there is another word after it, and there is a high horizontal trace further to the right (raised upsilon?).” There is no obvious candidate; the reading of λ is also uncertain.

An unread place name occurs in l. 185, τῆς ἐκκλησίας ι(ϲ) τοῦ [ ] , πα(ο)λου(μου) ἔνου[ ] , where it is possible to read τοῦ κτήτης(ετος) Κάλλη(ϲ). The same locality is mentioned in l. 34, κτήτης(ετος) Καλλή(ϲ). Even though there is some damage, this cannot be the other toponym beginning Κάλ-, which was read in ll. 145 and 163 as Κολλωρίας and Κολλωρίας respectively. In both passages the papyrus does not have ω.
but αν: Καλαυρίας and Καλαυρίας (there is no textual loss at the end). Inspection of images of the other papyri where this locality occurs shows that the name should be read as Καλαυρίας: P.Oxy. XVI 2025.3, XIX 2244.28, and P.Princ. III 158.8 (I missed that in my note in Tyche 30 [2015] 226).

Another minor spelling issue may be settled in l. 220, where the edition has [ἀ]πὸ κτήμι(ατος) Τάξιδ(ος). The reading of the toponym was later revised to Παλπλουϲτῆ(ς) (BL VI 106), but the papyrus has Παλπλουϲτῆ, as in P.Oxy. XIX 2243A.52 and 53. Before it, there is no trace of [ἀ]πὸ κτήμι(ατος); perhaps a piece was detached after the papyrus was transcribed.

Besides settlements, numerous μηχαναί are mentioned in the text; the names of some of them should be read differently:

In l. 123, for μὴ(ανής) ιθ κλῆ[ρ(ου)] read μὴ(ανής) Ιεκλή (ι- pap.). The same locality recurs in l. 201 μη[χ(ανής)] καλουμένης Ιεκλή[ν] (Ιεκλ[…] ed. pr.).

In l. 179, μη(ανής) καλουμένης Βευραρά (.), the name of the μηχανή is τῶν νῦν Ὄρους. A comparable name occurs in l. 180, μη(ανής) καλουμένης τῶν […] ιουραρά: read τῶν [νῦν Ἀρνουθίον.

A more complicated passage comes up in l. 7, [εἰς] χρείας τοῦ λάκκου(ας) τῆς μηχανῆς Παλπλουϲτῆ(ς) [καὶ προ]κόψη(ως) σὺ(ν) τῆ(ς). I propose to read Παμπλουϲτῆ (τῆς) [προκόψη(ως); the abbreviation used for τῆ(ς) suggests the article, and there is no room for καὶ. The resulting sequence is not smooth, but it could have been an attempt to correct an entry that should have started εἰς χρείας τῆς προκόψης τοῦ λάκκου, as in ll. 4 and 109.

The name of the μηχανή was not supplied in l. 217: the edition has καλουμένης [……. ὧ]πο, but there is only blank space after καλουμένης.

The reading of a number of personal names requires some slight revision: l. 115, Ἀνέπ → Ἀνους; l. 132, Ὀννωφ[ρ]έο(υς) → Ὀννωφ[ρ]ίου; l. 135, Ἀβρααμίο(υς) → Ἀβρααμίου (l. -άμον); l. 154, Λάκο[υ] → Λακά[υ]; l. 155, Κόμτ(ος) → Κομτί(ό) (cf. l. 160).

Of other points of detail, we may note the following:

In l. 64, [ ]ιτίο(υς) is followed by σ-, i.e. σῆ(τως); cf. ll. 35 and 146, where the edition prints ‘—’.

In l. 96 the edition has Παμουθ[θίου] Ἀβρααμίου[ίου] φρ(οντιτοῦ) ὀπτι(όπλινθοῦ) β, but we should read Παμοῦθ[θίου] καὶ Ἀβρααμίου[ίου] φρονιττών) β (τ., φφρ pap.).

In l. 147, βοοστατεύου στ στι ρεαστετας.

In l. 151, we find το(ῦ) λά[κκ(οι)] το(ῦ) ὄντοι(κ) ἔπ[ϊ] τῆ(ς) πύλης[κ] κ[…] ἔπ[ϊ] (κ[τῆς]μι(ατος) has been suggested for the end of the line (K. A. Worp, APF 59 [2013] 382), which is along the right lines, but some slight further improvements are possible: ἐν τῇ πύλης τοῦ ἔπ[ϊ] τῆς μι(ατος) (τῆς κ[τῆς]μι[ατος] με[τος] μεν_parent) με[τος] μεν

82. PSI XIV 1421

This third-century petition contains the phrase μὴ φέρων ἑ[γερίας τοῦ]άνους II. 9–10. The word φθορία is rare in papyri, attested only in P.Mich. I 234 (257 BC), and not here: the image shows that this papyrus has the much more common πλεονεξίαν.

83. SB I 1987b

This is a wooden tablet found by Grenfell and Hunt in Oxyrhynchus, who published the following text in Egypt Exploration Fund. Archaeological Report 1905/6, p. 15: Ἀρπάχθη Ἀθηναίων ἔκτασιν πολλάκις (ὑποκατα) ρ. F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch s.v. μεστός, questioned παντίτικ, and suggested that μεστός be read instead (= BL VIII 306), comparing P.Oxy. XII 1449.35 λύχνιος μεστός(ας). Yet P.Lond. II 191.9 (Π) λυχνίας παντὶτικς χαλκῆ indicates that the correction is unnecessary; Preisigke did not question the reading, and translated παντίτικ (s.v.) as ‘Gehäuse, Behälter’. The reading παντίτικ has been confirmed on the original,2 but the meaning of the word remains evasive. P.Freib. IV 52.4 (ι/ν eos) λυχνία παντίτικς χαλκῆ(ς) offers another

2 The tablet is now housed in the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery (inv. no. 1969W4327), where I examined it in April 2015. It was part of the collection of Henry Wellcome, and was presented to the Museum by the Trustees of the Wellcome Trust in 1969. It remains to determine how the tablet reached the collector’s hands.
example but does not solve the problem. In his note ad loc., R. W. Daniel wrote: "LSJ, following Preisigke, Wörterbuch, render παστή in the London text as ‘case, container’, but in my opinion the precise meaning of this word is not apparent.”

84. SB XVIII 13158

Two men petitioned the curator civitatis of Oxyrhynchus about their false imprisonment some time around 400. In the version printed in the Sammelbuch, they introduce their narrative thus (ll. 3–5):

[Αὐρήλι]ος Ἀειών τῇ(ν) οὐκείειν ἀμυ’ ἡμεὶς[ἐν] ἔξων ! [ἐν ἐποικιῶ . . οἰκλ]]. θὸ καὶ ἐγγραφὲ ἐπιδοὺϲ τῇ ὑμὸν ἔπειτεικεῖ (θβλίδια ε. γ. καὶ) (?) ἔπιστάϲσο ἡμᾶϲ

There are several difficulties. The supplemented ἐν ἐποικιῶ is gratuitous. The petitioners state that they originate from Oxyrhynchus, so that there is no need to assume that their opponent lived with them in a hamlet; but there is no way of telling what the papyrus had at this point. Apart from this, the grammar appears to be faulty, and the editor reckoned with textual omissions. The scribe, however, may only be blamed for the itacistic spellings. The problem stems from ἐγγραφὲ, which is a misreading for ἔγγραφο, as the image shows. The text then becomes unobjectionable:

τῇ(ν) οὐκείειν ἀμυ’ ἡμεὶς ἔξων . . . καὶ ἐγγραφὸ ἐπιδοὺϲ τῇ ὑμὸν ἔπειτεικεῖ (ἡμίάσσατο) ἡμᾶϲ

καὶ connects two participles (but it could have been omitted), and these are followed by the main verb (spelled correctly), while ἐπιδοὺϲ does not lack an object; for the construction of ἐπιδοὺϲ with ἔγγραφο, cf. e.g. P.Oxy. LXIII 4382.13 (383).

85. SB XX 14310 ii

This is a revised edition of P.Princ. III 129 ii, an Oxyrhynchite census declaration of 189 submitted by a woman. ‘The household is apparently completely preserved, but damage at the crucial point makes it unclear exactly who is declared. The first person is almost certainly the declarant, and it appears that the two following persons are daughters. But they are in inverse age order, and the description of them is evidently more complex than one would expect.’ (R. S. Bagnall – B. W. Frier, The Demography of Roman Egypt, 1994, 283). This problematic part of the text is the following:

⇔[ἀπὸ]γράφ(φομαϲ) κῶν . . . ( ) αὐτὴ ἐγγράφ[. . ] c. 11 (ἐτῶν) λβ

[. . ] ναρής [, ] θῆγ( . . ) ἐγγραφὰ


Some progress is thanks to the online image. The unread word in l. 39 is χρη(ματίζωυϲϲ) (, ῥῆ pap.), which means that the daughter was ‘fatherless’ and officially described as a child of her mother; cf. P.Oxy. LXXIV 4989.3–4 (175) μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ νύμῳ(napshot) ἔξω αὐτῆς(ϲ) χρη(ματίζωυϲϲ) χρη(ματίζωυϲϲ), with αὐτής(ϲ) referring to Ploution’s mother. The name of this daughter may be Ἀριϲτ(ϲ), but I am unclear about what preceded it.

The order of the daughters’ ages is the expected one; this is one of the very few points where the text of ed. pr. should have been retained. The first daughter is not 3 but 13 years old: l. 40 ends ὡϲ (ἐτῶν) γ, as had been read in ed. pr.; the year sign is fused with sigma and written high in the line, while iota is written over part of xi from the line above. ὡϲ is also written before (ἐτῶν) in l. 41 (so already ed. pr.). The reference is to another daughter: in l. 41, for αὐτ( . ) read ἐτ(. . ), i.e., ἐτ(ἔροϲ) θῆγ(ἐτηρ); this corresponds to ἀλλὰ θηγάτης (ἢ ἀλλάϲ νυϲ) in Arsinoite census declarations.

The declarant’s name has proven evasive; the prescript is lost, and what remains of her name in l. 38 is still to be deciphered in full; it seems to end in -ουϲϲ. In the same line, I read ἀτεχ(vοϲ) before (ἐτῶν) λβ.
άτεχ(ος) is also to be read after the lacuna in l. 40, referring to the first daughter. In sum, ll. 38–41 may be presented as follows:

\[
[\ldots] \ldots \οὐτις \άτεχ(ος) \(\έτων\) \lambda \beta \\
[\ldots] \\text{ναιριτι(\ }) \\text{θυγ(άτηρ) \ χρη(ματιζουσα) \ εξ \ εμου}
\]

40 \[
[\ldots] \text{άτεχ(ος)} [\\text{i(τη(μος)} \ \\text{ώς} \ (\\text{έτων}) \ \ \iota,
\]

Another minor point: in l. 42, υπάρχου(τι) δέ μοι ἐπί \ldots ( ), the re-edition omits καί after μοι; but I have not been able to read what follows.

86. SPP III 600, 877, 786

SPP III 600 is a fragmentary receipt for 16 solidi, assigned to the sixth century and said to come from the Fayum. An interesting point is the reference to the property of Petterios and Marous to mind,3 and a closer look essentially confirms it. Here are clippings of the edition and of the image:

Comparing SPP VIII 869.1–2 παρ(ις)χ(ε) Φοιβ(άμμων) πρε(βύτερος) από χ(ιορίου) Αλαβαντίδιο(ς) από l πρ(οιοδίου) οὐ(ικό(ς)) Πεττηρίου) (καί) Μαροῦδ(ος)\(4\) τῶν(ν) ἐνδ(οξοτάτων), I propose to read

\[
\text{ὅσι(ας) Πε(ττηρίου) (καί) Μαρ(οῦδος(ς))}
\]

in l. 2. We may consider reading Αλαβαντίδιο(ς) before ἀπ[ο], but the name of the village could also have stood in l. 1, where there is a clear λ. However, Α(λαβαντίδιο(ς) Πεττηρίου) (καί) Μαροῦδος(ς) should be excluded, since the textual loss between lines 2 and 3 is fairly extensive.

A similar receipt that concerns the same estate is SPP VIII 877, whose first three lines run παρ(ις)χε Φοιβ(άμμων) - - - | Πεττηρίου(καί) Μαροῦδος(ς) ἐνδ(οξοτάτων) - - - | εἴκοσι \οκτῶ γί(νεται) . . . .

The text lost after Φοιβ(άμμων) may be supplied from SPP VIII 869.1–2. In l. 3, the image shows that Ν stands before the break: read νοῦς(ματωσα) εἴκοσι \οκτῶ γί(νεται) νοῦς(ματωσα) [κη].

Another text that belongs to this dossier is the rent receipt SPP VIII 786, but this was not recognized in the edition (l. 3):

\[
\text{οὐςι(ας) Μαροῦδος(ς)}
\]

We should read οὐςι(ας) Μαροῦδος(ς): an estate headed by Marous, acting independently of Petterios (it is not likely that the text continued [καί Πεττηρίου]). This is the first explicit reference to her estate, though this had been surmised from SPP III 246–52, orders issued by Φλαντοία Μαρούδος ἐνδ(οξοτάτη), and SB I 4659, a deed of surety addressed to her.

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

---


4 See BL VIII 448, which however gives Μαροῦδος(ς), a slight misunderstanding of Wessely’s drawing.