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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 . . . τῶν . . . . The online image shows that the papyrus reads τῶν πόδας ύμῶν (ὑμῶν), ‘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 . . . ὧξιόσῃ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐμαυτοῦ καταλαμβάνω ταῖς ἐξομήθασις. P.Oxy. LXXXI 5289.7 (vii/viii) κάργῳ ἠλθον εἰς τοὺς πόδας ύμων. Before καὶ, the edition has ζωής; I read ζωής 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 δεξιότης. 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 ἀπῆλθον εἰς τοῦ ποιμάριν, ἐφ’ ὁ θεωρ.-
ἐι τὴν λαχανήα +

The word division is odd, and the construction ἐφ’ ὁ + 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’ ὁ θεωρῆϲαι. We would expect to find ἐπιθεωρῆϲαι rather than θεωρῆϲαι, but is seems unlikely that φωϲ conceals the first part of the compound.

The gardener would come μετά τῆς ὑπηρέ[τους] (l. 2). This term for a female servant has not occurred in papyri; perhaps ὑπηρέϲαϲιϲ 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 παῖδευϲιϲ (ll. 4, 6, 7), indicate learning, and are typical of scholastici. This however is not mirrored in the address:

± 10 πρ(εβοτέρου) καὶ Σοφίαϲ(ϲ) υπ(νακοϲ) αὐτ(οϲ) ☘ 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:

ἐπὶ δ(οϲ) τῷ πάντωϲ(ῳ) λαμπρ(ωτῇϲ) καὶ σοφώτατ(ωϲ) σχοι(αϲτικῷ) ☘ 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 [δ,Yes] καὶ ορι καὶ τε̣ ... ς ἐνετειλάμεν ... τι ἐν [ἐν] ... (ll. 4–5). What follows ὅτι is not a smooth piece of Greek, and the common periphrasis δεῦϲ ἢ is normally preceded by εἰϲ. The plate shows that what was read as λ stands on a loose fragment that may not belong there. I propose to read [ἐν] ... δεῦϲ ἢ (it would be too bold to propose α[ϊ] ...).

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 \( \gamma \)ίνεται νό(μιϲματο) ν π(αρά) ς (γίνεται) κ(αθ)φ(αρά) ν(ομίϲματα) λε ς/β (l. 9): 50 solidi minus 240 carats make 35\( \frac{1}{2} \) ‘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 35\( \frac{1}{2} \)?

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) ς̣(αρὰ) ςο(μίϲματα) λε (l. 9): 50 solidi minus 240 carats make 35\( \frac{1}{2} \) ‘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(αθ)φ(αρά) νο(μίϲματα) λε;

what follows λ, read by the editor as ες/β, 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 \( \frac{1}{8} \) fraction cannot be reconciled with ‘clean’ solidi.

76. P.Got. 31
‘[O]rthograph[ie] très mauvaise’, remarked the editor of this late letter, and some passages are obscure. διλοππιϲμοι πολλά [ in l. 10 was recently discussed by J. Diethart, ZPE 204 (2017) 208, who divided διλοππιϲ, and took διλοππιϲ 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 ν. I juxtapose a clipping of the passage with one that shows πάλιν in l. 9:

πάλιν διλόννιϲ μοι πολλά [ διλόννιϲ is a phonetic version of δηλόννιϲ, the late form that corresponds to δηλοῖϲ. In Byzantine Greek, ‘most of the old contract verbs in -όω acquire[ed] parallel presents in -όνω, thus δηλόννω … 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] 217ff., §853). These forms are not common in papyri; another example is P.Oxy. XVI 1863.19 (624) πληρόννω.

77. P.Laur. II 36
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 υς (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.

78. P.Laur. III 91
What remains of l. 7 of this fragmentary Oxyrhynchite document of 606 (cf. CSBE² 214) was printed as [.]. οιδαδ [.]. 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 τ[π]ῳ οιδε(ς)ιμων; cf. POxy. LVIII 3942.7 (606) τῷ οιδεσίμῳ Σεργίῳ χαρτούλαρῳ κτλ.

The endorsement is said to describe the text as a πληρ(οτική) ἀποχ(ή). 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 ἀποχ(ή) but one of its synonyms: οιδω 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: οιδόδ[ε]ςξ(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:

Ἀύρηλιος Διογένες [I Καβί], ὡς χρησματίζω [εὐκτείας] θησαυρίζω

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

This is a loan of money on security, dated to 581. The debtor states, ἐὰν δὲ ἀγνώσιμα ἐπεβλητὰ [ἐπεβλητὰ] τοῦ [τοῦ] κοῦμόττος [κοῦμόττος] Κρημίου(υ), contains an error: the name should be read as Ιερήμιος. This is probably the same comes as in P.Oxy. XIX 2244.80 διοίκησις[ις] τοῦ κοῦμ(ετος) Ιερ[εισ][μου] ἐπί [της] η[υ][ν] ὑπόκτησιον κατασχέσω[ν] ἡ[π] ζ, a document that cannot be later than 558; see ZPE 150 (2004) 201, and cf. P.Oxy. LXXXIII 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 Ἀρκησίου in l. 62. This is preceded by (και), and a small break in between. The same break affects the next line, where the edition prints ὡς ὀπτά[πλινθων], but the papyrus has ὡς[π]το[πλινθων]. We should thus reckon with one letter lost before οπτάει, and read Ναρκήσιου. The same place occurs in l. 216, spelled Ναρκίσσου; 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, κτήματος [κτήματος] Βασιλείου. The papyrus has Μεστοιμα, known from a handful of other documents. It was probably located not far from Pangouleioeu (they were part of the same Apionic prooctasia in the seventh century), mentioned three times here: in l. 99, where for Ποσογουλείου read Ποσογουλείου; in l. 101, where after γεωργοῦ the text continues ἀπὸ [Ποσογο][γουλείου] ὡτόπλινθη [θ]; and in l. 119, where for ετοὶ(μέτρου) Ποσογο[γουλείου] ἐτοὶ(μέτρου) ἡ[κ]τοῖον. The reading of ἡκτοῖο is probably due to the fact that the part of the account was written by a different hand.

An unnoticed toponym seems to occur in l. 102, [ ] , α[α] μείζων(voc) Ec[ ]λ[λ]ω. Before μείζων(voc), read [Μη]ν[ν]άθι. Ec[1,]λ[λ]ω must be a place name, but the reading is doubtful. A. Benaisa notes that what was read as E is “sigma with a diagonal abbreviation stroke from above (abbreviating ὁμοιότατον). If so, the toponym begins with Κτήματος. Then there is a trace of a descendant 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(εις) τοῦ [ ] , Ἰ[ικ]ς( ) καλωρίας(ἔνων) Ἰ[ι], where it is possible to read τοῦ κτήματος Καλωρίας. The same location is mentioned in l. 34, κτήματος Καλωρίας. Even though there is some damage, this cannot be the other toponym beginning Καλωρίας, which was read in ll. 145 and 163 as Καλωρίας and Καλωρίας respectively. In both passages the papyrus does not have ὡ
There is only blank space after XIX 2244.28, and P. Princ. III 158.8 (I missed that in my note in 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 [ἐ]πὸ κτῆμα (ατοκ) Τάλλιδο(ις). The reading of the toponym was later revised to Παλίδο(ις) (BL VI 106), but the papyrus has Παλιάδου, as in P.Oxy. XIX 2243A.52 and 53. Before it, there is no trace of [ἐ]πὸ κτῆμα (ατοκ); 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 (ο)φ (ανής) θεό κλῆρος (οντ) read μὴ (ο)φ (ανής) Ἴηκλῆ (ι- pap.). The same locality recurs in l. 201 μη (ονής) καλουμένης Ἴηκλῆς (Iηκλ[... ed. pr.).

In l. 179, μη (ονής) καλουμένης Βευράρω (ις), the name of the μηχανή is τῶν ὧν Ἡμοῦ. A comparable name occurs in l. 180, μη (ονής) καλουμένης τῶν [... ](υνφοιρου; read τῶν ὧν Ἡμοῦ Ανουθίων.

A more complicated passage comes up in l. 7, [εἰς χρείαν τοῦ λάκκου τῆς μηχανῆς Παλπλουκτῆς (και προκόψωσεν τοῦ στήριζεσκοτοῦ). I propose to read Παμπλουκτῆς (προκόψωσεν τοῦ; the abbreviation used for τῆς suggests the article, and there is no room for και. The resulting sequence is not smooth, but it could have been an attempt to correct an entry that should have started εἰς χρείαν τῆς προσώπου τοῦ λάκκου, as in ll. 4 and 109.

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

The reading of a number of personal names requires some slight revision: l. 115, Ἀνέπτροτος Ανουσίων; l. 132, Ὀλυμποφροσύνου καλαυρίας (ου); l. 135, Ἀρβρακίον (τοῦ Ἀρβρακίου (I. -άμον); l. 134, Λάκτου καλαυρίας (τοῦ Λακτοῦ; l. 155, Κόμιτος Κομιτοῦ (cf. l. 160).

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

In l. 64, [ἐ]πό τοι(ο)ν is followed by — , i.e. οὐ(τος); cf. ll. 35 and 146, where the edition prints — .

In l. 96 the edition has Παμπλουτή(ου) Λάκτου (προκάτεστας όπτιόπλησθο Β), but we should read Παμπλουτή(ου) (και) Λάκτου (προκάτεστον) Β (ς, φράμ. pap.).

In l. 147, βοσκεστείου should be read in place of βοσκεστείου.

In l. 151, we find τοῦ(ο)ν λάκτου καλαυρίας τοῦ(ο)ν δυσκολία(α) ἐπὶ(l) τῆς(α) πύλης(α) καὶ(ο)ρ[... ](ρ). Καὶ(τῆς)μήχανας 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 πύλη(α) τοῦ(ο)ν καὶ(τῆς)μήχανας (τῆς πύλης) Καὶ(τῆς)μήχανας (φράμ. pap.)

82. PSI XIV 1421

This third-century petition contains the phrase μὴ φέρων ἡ τοιοῦτη φθονορίαν (ll. 9–10). The word φθονορία is rare in papyri, attested only in P.Mich. I 23.4 (257 BC), and not here: the image shows that this papyrus has the much more common πληροσεισίαν.

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: Ἀρπάχτη Αθηνοδόρου λαχνίςας πατετής (δραχμαί) πρ. F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch s.v. μεστος, questioned πατετής, and suggested that μεστής be read instead (= BL VIII 306), comparing P.Oxy. XII 1449.35 λύχνος μεστος(είς). Yet P.Lond. II 191.9 (II) λυχνίας πατετής χαλκῆ indicates that the correction is unnecessary; Preisigke did not question the reading, and translated πατετής (s.v.) as ‘Gehäuse, Behälter’. The reading πατετής has been confirmed on the original,2 but the meaning of the word remains evasive. P.Freib. IV 52.4 (υ/π νεκ) λυχνία πατετής χαλκίς(ας) 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 παστί 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 Sammelbucb, they introduce their narrative thus (ll. 3–5):


There are several difficulties. The supplemented ἐν ἑπτα[ε]κατ[ε]κεὶᾳ 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 ἔγγραφα, which is a misreading for ἔγγραφον, as the image shows. The text then becomes unobjectionable:

τῇ(ν) οἰκείαιαν ἀγαθὴ ἡμέραν ... καὶ ἔγγραφον ἐπιδοὺϲ τῇ ἡμᾶϲ ἔπειτείκειᾳ ἦμᾶϲ 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 ἐπιδιδόναι with ἔγγραφον, 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:

[άπο]γράφω(φομε).Center ... ( ) αὐτῇ ἕγγραφα
[ , , ] C. 11 (ἐτῶν) λβ
[ , , ] Μαρίτις( ) θυγ( ) ( ) ἕξ ἐμου
40 [ , , ] , . . . , . . . ( ) ἔγγραφον γ, ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
[ , , ] , . . . , . . . , . . . ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

Some progress is thanks to the online image. The unread word in l. 39 is χρη(ματίζουϲα) (. ρη 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 νικ(τ)οῦ Πλουτίωνον(ς) ἐν ἀξιζή(ς) χρη(ματίζουϲοϲ), with αὐτίϲ(ς) referring to Ploution’s mother. The name of this daughter may be Ἀριϲτ(ί)ουϲ, 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 αὐτή( ) read ετή ( ), i.e., ἐτ(ίϲοϲ) θυγ(άτηρ); this corresponds to ἀλλη θυγάτηρ (or ἀλλαϲ ὑιοϲ in Arsinotype 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 -ουϲ. In the same line, I read ὁτεϲ(voc) before (ἐτῶν) λβ.
άτεχ(νος) 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots \ldots & \text{συγχ (νος) (έτων) λβ} \\
\ldots \ldots & \text{νορίτ (ή) θυγ(άτηρ) χρη(ματίους) έξ έμοι}
\end{align*}
\]

Another minor point: in l. 42, οπάρδιδει τοί δέ μοι ἐπὶ \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 estate 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 παρε(έκ) Φοιβά(άμμων) πρε(βύτερος) ἕπο(χορίου) Αλαβαντίδ(ος) ἀπὸ ἐν(οοδιδίον) οὐκ(ίας) Πεττηρίδ(ο) (καί) Μαροῦ(δ) δ(οκ)4 τὸ(ν) ἐνδ(οξοτάτων), I propose to read

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[...]} \text{ότ[ό]} & \text{πρ(οοδιδ[δον])? οὐκ[ίας] Πε[ττηρίδ(ο)] (καί) Μαρ[οῦδ]}\end{align*}
\]

in l. 2. We may consider reading Αλαβαντίδ[δος] before οπάρδιδει, but the name of the village could also have stood in l. 1, where there is a clear λ. However, Α[λαβαντ] ον[δος] 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 παρε(έκ) Φοιβά[μοιο] πρε(βύτερος) Πεττηρίδ(οι) (καί) Μαροῦ(δ) ἐνδ[οξοτάτων] - - - \ldots \text{ότ(ος) Πετ[τηρίδ(ο)] (καί) Μαροῦ(δ)}\end{align*}
\]

The text lost after Φοιβά[μοιο] may be supplied from SPP VIII 869.1–2. In l. 3, the image shows that Ν stands before the break: read νο(μίζουσα) ἐλκο(κότα) γ(νοντα) νο(μίζουσα) [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):

We should read οὐκί(ας) Μαροῦ(δος): an estate headed by Marous, acting independently of Petterios (it is not likely that the text continued [καί Πεττηρίδου]. This is the first explicit reference to her estate, though this had been surmised from SPP III 246–52, orders issued by Φλα(κού) Μαροῦ(δος ἐνδοξοτάτη), and SB I 4659, a deed of surety addressed to her.

Nikolaos Gonis, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London, London WClE 6BT

n.gonis@ucl.ac.uk

---


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