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1. Jews in Soknopaiou Nesos?

Recently published in [P.Messeri](https://papyri.info/biblio/95728) is a small fragment from the Musées royaux d’Art et d’Histoire de Bruxelles containing the very end of one column and the beginning of the next column of a list of names, most of which have Jewish associations ([P.Messeri 32](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.messeri;;32), I – early II; Tav. XXVII). In column 2, line 9, the editor reads σοκ, expanded as the heading Σοκ(νοπαίου Νῆσος), which is followed by the name Ἰακούβιο[ς …] (the last two letters are difficult to confirm on the plate). While such an abbreviation of the village name finds parallels (e.g. [BGU 3 762](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;3;762).1), the sigma in this case sits awkwardly apart from the following letters, and the presence of line ends suggests that the letter instead belongs to the previous column: οκ is then left as the common abbreviation ὁ κ(αί), indicating that Iakoubios was a second name (his first is presumably lost at the end of the previous line). With this new reading, the document loses its association with Soknopaiou Nesos and the Arsinoite nome (though not its onomastic and cultural interest).

The editor notes that a Jewish resident of Soknopaiou Nesos is listed in the geographical appendix to [C.Pap.Jud. 3](https://papyri.info/biblio/6641) (App. III, p. 206), an entry based on a Vienna papyrus first edited as [SPP 22 178r](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/stud.pal;22;178r) and republished as [C.Pap.Jud. 3](https://papyri.info/biblio/6641) 464 (II). This connection, however, does not hold up under scrutiny: while the [verso](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/stud.pal;22;178v) of SPP 22 178 mentions a liturgist from Soknopaiou Nesos, and the papyrus itself was no doubt found there, the recto text, with references to Jewish tenants, comes from a longer roll that was cut for reuse, and the individuals listed therein need not be more than incidentally associated with this village.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The other document considered by the editor of the Brussels papyrus is [BGU 13 2319](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;13;2319) (Soknopaiou Nesos, 126), a customs receipt issued to a man named Ἰούδα̣ς according to the edition. The routine appearance of a Jewish exporter so shortly after the disastrous revolt of 115-117 would surely be noteworthy,[[2]](#footnote-2) but an examination of the [image in BerlPap](https://berlpap.smb.museum/04553/) shows that the reading is untenable, without, however, revealing a satisfying solution (the snippet includes the following ἐξάγων as well (printed as ἐξάγω(ν) in the edition):

The purported delta looks acceptable at first glance, albeit obscured by ink that must be ignored, but there is no trace of the dotted alpha. It seems that some sort of correction has taken place, and if the fourth letter was simply canceled, we are left with the rare name Ἰοῦς ([TM Nam 22007](https://www.trismegistos.org/name/22007)), which is found once in the Roman Fayum (in the Charta Borgiana, [SB I 5124](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;1;5124), col. 11.332, Tebtynis, 193). Another possibility, palaeographically less convincing, would be to consider the fourth letter corrected and the following faded traces of an apparent vertical and raised dot to be iota and omicron, suggesting Ἰούλ̣ι̣ọς. In any case, the name Ἰούδα̣ς cannot be read here.

Other names of possibly Semitic origin are found in Soknopaiou Nesos,[[3]](#footnote-3) but a Jewish presence in the village still awaits clear evidence.
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2. Jewish *Sitologoi*: [BGU 3 715](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;3;715) = [C.Pap.Jud. 3](https://papyri.info/biblio/6641) 428 (101/2)

This document is entitled γραφὴ σιτολ(όγων) for Trajan’s fifth year, and there follows a list of individuals in two columns, both cut off at the bottom. The last legible line of the second column reads ̣ ̣ ̣ κωμογρ̅ δι̅ λαγραφ[, which can perhaps be expanded to ̣ ̣ ̣ κωμογρ(αμματεὺς) δι(ὰ) λα⟨ο⟩γράφ[ων] on the understanding that this is the subscription of the village scribe, attesting that he has submitted (ἐπιδέδωκα) or signed (σεσημείωμαι) the list through the village laographoi.

Of primary interest are the numerous Jewish names found in the list,[[4]](#footnote-4) which makes it especially unfortunate that the village cannot be identified. The onomastic profile of the non-Jewish names points clearly to the Arsinoite nome, but despite a number of rare names, I have not been able to identify any individual in other texts. The edition in [C.Pap.Jud.](https://papyri.info/biblio/6641) incorporated corrections from BL 1 61 and added a dubious conjecture to col. 1.7. G. Messeri (2021, 130) has just now made important corrections to the names in col. 1.4 and 7, to which I add comments and further corrections.

Col. 1

4: Ἰωσῆ̣ς ὁ καὶ Τεύφιλο(ς) α̣μ( ) Δό̣σθωνο(ς) 🡪Ἰωσῆπ καὶ Τεύφιλο(ς) ἀμ(φότεροι) Δοσθίωνο(ς) Messeri. Joseph and Teuphilos are brothers. Their father’s name is a shortened form of Δωσίθεος, unattested in this declension, but cf. [P.Harrauer 33](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.harrauer;;33).1 etc. (with comm. ad l. 1), where Δωσθ( ) is expanded as Δωσθ(ῆς) / Δωσθ(οῦ) on the model of [O.Edfou 2 286 = C.Pap.Jud. 2 313](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/o.edfou;2;286).

7: Στράτων ἐ̣π̣ικαλ{λ}ο̣ύ(μενος) Ἰσάκ(ις) 🡪 Στράτων ὁ κ(αὶ) Καλλικ(ράτης?) Ἰσάκ(εως) Messeri, thus solving the desperate ἐ̣π̣ικαλ{λ}ο̣ύ(μενος) of C.Pap.Jud., which replaced the unintelligible ουκ αλλιυ of the ed. pr. The same writing of ὁ κ(αί) is found in ll. 12 and 14. Besides Καλλικράτης, the other main possibility for the second name is Καλλικλῆς.

12: Ὀννῶφ[ρι]ς Χαιρημ ̣[ ̣] Φαυσᾶ 🡪 Ὄννω(φρις) ὁ κ(αὶ) Χαιρήμων Φαυσᾶ. The abbreviation of the first name is unmarked, then the left part of ὁ and the right part of κ(αί) are visible. For the writing of ὁ κ(αί), cf. ll. 7 and 14.

14: Πααῦς ὁ κ(αὶ) Σοκον[ί]ων Σ ̣ ̣ ̣ε ̣ ̣ς 🡪 Πααῦς ὁ κ(αὶ) Σοκόνωπις Ὥ̣σεω̣ς.

Col. 2

3: Ἀμφ ̣[ 🡪 ἀμφό(τεροι). In col. 1.4, the word was abbreviated αμ̅; here it is αμφο̅.

4: The patronymic is perhaps Λ̣ε̣ω̣[ν]ί̣[δου].

5: Πρεσβ̣ο̣ῦς in [C.Pap.Jud. 3](https://papyri.info/biblio/6641) 428 is just a typo for Πεσβ̣ο̣ῦς. The purported beta is wide and shallow, which might suggest kappa instead, but the reading is possible. A variant of the name is found in [BGU 2 560](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;2;560) col. 2.16 (Arsinoite, II; cf. [TM Nam 17462](http://www.trismegistos.org/name/17462)).

10: Νείλων 🡪 Ἡγήμων. This reading of the ed. pr. is not possible, as the first letter is unlikely to be nu in this hand, and no account is taken of the horizontal coming off the purported iota. In my reading, the gamma is a little wavier than expected, but the shape is fairly similar to that in λαγραφ[ in col. 2.14. Hegemon is a rare name ([TM Nam 4524](http://www.trismegistos.org/name/4524)) last found with this spelling in the Nemesion archive.
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3. [SPP 22 22](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/stud.pal;22;22) (Philopator-Theogenous, 142)

In this donkey sale drawn up in the Arsinoite grapheion of [Philopator-Theogenous](https://www.trismegistos.org/place/1776), the seller’s name was printed as Πτο|λεμαῖος Ὥρου (ll. 6-7), but the patronymic is dubious, especially in comparison with the same name in l. 8. Instead, the editor’s rho should be read as theta, which leads to Ἄνθου (for the alpha-nu combination, cf. παντός, l. 18). The name is rare ([TM Nam 24526](https://www.trismegistos.org/name/24526)), and one might consider whether a second name was left out (i.e. ἀνθ’ οὗ ⟨ ⟩), but it reappears in the subscription, written by the seller himself (l. 20: [Ἄ]νθου).

Before the subscription, there is no room for the editor’s ἐπιλημψομέ|[νου] (ll. 18-19) to be written out in full: the papyrus has ἐπιλημψομένο(υ) and π[άσ]ῃ at the beginning of the next line. Then, I read lines 19-20 as follows:

καὶ ὁμολ(όγησα). ἴδια γράμμα

[τα Πτολεμαίου] Ὥρου ὁμολογῶι πε[πρακέναι]

🡪

ὑπο(γραφεὺς) ⟨τοῦ ὁ⟩μολ(ογοῦντος) ἴδια γράμματα.

[(2nd hd.) Πτολε]μ̣[α]ῖ̣[ος Ἄ]νθου ὁμολογῶι (l. ὁμολογῶ) πε-

[πρακέναι] …

The writer committed haplography in the formula introducing the subscriber, using the omicron of ὑπο(γραφεύς) as the beginning of ὁμολ(ογοῦντος). The seller was literate and thus served as his own ὑπογραφεύς: “subscriber for the acknowledging party: his own letters.” The somewhat awkward expression would be alleviated if we expanded ὑπο(γραφή) instead, but the phrase is found in [BGU 11 2046](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;11;2046).3-4 (Herakleia, II: ὑπογραφεὺς τ̣[οῦ ὁ]μολογοῦντο(ς) ἴδ̣[ια] | [γράμματ]α̣), which, though damaged, is a secure reading. A first century contract likewise has ὑπογραφεὺς τῶν ὁμολογούντων τριῶν ἴδια in two copies ([P.Mich. 5 323 and 324](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.mich;5;323/324/325qrpl).27-28; ἰδία ed. pr.) and probably in a third as well ([PSI 8 903](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/psi;8;903dupl).26, all Tebtynis, 47), with slightly different word order.[[5]](#footnote-5) We can also compare [BGU 2 538](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;2;538).24-27), where the first party’s subscriber is introduced ὑπογραφεὺς τῶν μεμισ|θωμένω[ν οὐκ] εἰ[δότω]ν̣ γράμμ̣ατα …, while the other party employed “his own letters,” τοῦ δὲ ἄλλ[ο]υ ἴδια γράμματα. The same phrase is restored in [BGU 2 446](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;2;446).19 (BL 1 46), and other passages are susceptible to correction.[[6]](#footnote-6) In all of these examples, ἴδια γράμματα is predicate to ὑπογραφεύς, a convention that is probably best explained by force of habit. Subscribers were almost invariably introduced by ὑπογραφεύς (-εῖς),[[7]](#footnote-7) often abbreviated, and self-subscribers did not have to be identified in the body of the contract: when they were, contract writers clung to the formulaic ὑπογραφεύς, even with the predicate ἴδια γράμματα.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Ptolemaios’ subscription is mostly lost: the formula beginning ὁμολογῶι πε|[πρακέναι] (there is no room for the rest of the infinitive in l. 20) would have continued for a few lines, recapitulating the terms of the sale. The lack of space for the subscriptions means that the two fragments are positioned too closely together. There must be a panel or two missing since the bottom fragment contains only traces of a line and the registration mark of the grapheion.
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4. The *Oikogeneia* in [SB 24 16256](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;24;16256) = *P.Lond.* 2 294 descr. (105)

This papyrus contains a dossier related to property and personal status that was drawn up some time after the census of 117/118. Copies of three documents are found: 1) a marriage agreement and division of property (col. 1.1-2.59, 24 July, 109); 2) a declaration of house born slaves (col. 2.60-3.83, 28 Aug., 105); 3) an extract from the census of 117/118 (col. 3.84-91). The [back](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=papyrus_294_f001v) contains an unpublished account related to Soknopaiou Nesos, where the papyrus was likely found.

The title of the second document (col. 2.60) must be corrected from ἀντίγραφον δ̣η̣μοσ(ιώσεως) to the expected ἀντίγραφον ο[ἰ]κ̣ογ(ενείας). For οἰκογένεια as the name of the declaration itself, see [Bieżuńska-Małowist 1977](https://papyri.info/biblio/8963), 45 and [Straus 1988](https://papyri.info/biblio/59538), 886.

This oikogeneia was drawn up through an agoranomos,[[9]](#footnote-9) but lines 62-63 presented an otherwise unattested notarial title, which is in fact spurious:

διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀρσι|[νοε]ί̣του διαθηκ[ῶ]ν̣ ἀ̣γ̣ο̣ρανόμου

🡪

ἐν Πτολεμαίδι Ε̣ὐ̣ρ̣γ̣[έ]τ̣ι̣δ̣ι τοῦ Ἀρσι|[νοε]ί̣του ν̣ο̣μ̣ο̣ῦ̣ ἐ̣[π’] ἀ̣γ̣ο̣ρανόμου

For a correction to line 85 of this papyrus, see [Borrelli 2022, §8](https://journals.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/index.php/pylon/article/view/89338/84263#p8).
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5. [BGU 1 76](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;1;76) (Soknopaiou Nesos, ca. 150-200)

This contract is an excerpt from the βιβλιοθήκη ἐγκτήσεων. It is broken at the right, with a minimum loss of some 13-15 letters, and at the bottom along what was probably the horizontal fold roughly halfway down the papyrus. I offer some improvements to the opening lines, but the substance of the contract itself is more fragmentary and remains elusive.

The first line announces the source of the excerpt and can be supplemented as follows: ἐκ βιβλιοθήκ(ης) ἐνκτήσεων Ἀρσι(νοίτου) ἐξ ε̣[ἰρομ(ένου) γρα(φείου) Σοκνοπ(αίου) Νήσου]:[[10]](#footnote-10) see [P.Bas. 2](https://papyri.info/biblio/95467) 22.1 n. for parallels. The writing office of Soknopaiou Nesos is supplied because of the anaphoric reference in line 3 (whether or not τῆς προγεγραμμένης was in the original contract).[[11]](#footnote-11)

The acknowledging parties to the contract are Thases, daughter of Stotoetis, and her son Stotoetis, who also serves as her kyrios. Reference to the second party should follow, so instead of τῆς ὁμ[ολογούσης] in l. 7 suggested at BGU 1, p. 356, we can reconstruct as follows (ll. 7-9):

τῆς (l. τῇ) ὁμοπ̣[ατ(ρίῳ) καὶ ὁμομητ(ρίῳ)]

ἀδελφῇ Σαβαι̣αιτοῦς (l. -οῦτι) ὡς (ἐτῶν) νε ἀσ[ήμῳ καὶ τῇ τοῦ Στοτο-]

ήτ[ε]ως θίᾳ (l. θείᾳ) διὰ φροντιστοῦ Σ[

The second party is thus the full sister of Thases, and her relationship to Thases’ son is tacked on after the personal description. Her name, Σαβαι̣αιτοῦς, has a diaeresis above the first iota, which is mostly lost. The name is otherwise unattested and may be Semitic (cf. [TM Nam 26606](https://www.trismegistos.org/name/26606)). A related name might be that found with the genitives Σεβάιος and Σεβάιτος in two Theban ostraka ([O.Bodl. 2 1549](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/o.bodl;2;1549).5 and [O.Leid. 256](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/o.leid;;256).5: see [TM Nam 24354](https://www.trismegistos.org/name/24354)).

Minor corrections: μη at the end of l. 2 looks to have traces of an abbreviation stroke above it, so μη(τρός) [ … ] rather than μη[τρός … ]. In l. 5, the copyist began the papponymic with Σο, then wrote tau over omicron.
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6. [SB 8 9906](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;8;9906) (193/4) and [P.Freib. 2 10](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.freib;2;10) (196)

These two contracts were drawn up in the notary office of Ptolemais Euergetis in the last decade of the second century.[[12]](#footnote-12) A noteworthy feature of the first document is the cancellation of Pescennius Niger’s name and replacement with Septimius Severus’ in red ink. In the top margin, above Severus’ name, is a large notation, which the editor recognized as a docket but read as αποχ ̣( ). Instead, this is the deposition formula κ̣ατεχω(ρίσθη), with only the lower part of the final, curved stroke of kappa visible: although not as round as this stroke must have been, cf. the kappa of κατεχώ(ρισα) in P.Hamb. 1 15.22 (Ptol. Euerg., 209 CE). The same formula is found at the top of the Freiburg papyrus, where the editor’s κε̣χά̣ρακ̣(ται) Παῦ(νι) ιθ can be corrected to κ̣α̣τ̣ε̣χω(ρίσθη) δ (ἔτους) Παῦν̣ι̣ ιθ.

For the expansion as an aorist passive, cf. [SB 4 7379](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;4;7379).1 (177), where the verb is written in full. Editors have generally opted for the passive voice when the verb is not preceded by the official’s name.[[13]](#footnote-13) Contrast the just mentioned [P.Hamb. 1 15](https://d.docs.live.net/4a4d1d36a87a8c5a/Articles_current/Corrections/p.hamb;1;15).22, where the heavily restored formula requires an active form of the verb, and [P.Hamb. 3 220](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.hamb;3;220).17 (223/224): [Αὐρήλιος] Δ̣ίδυμος κατεχώ(ρισα) γ (ἔτους).
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7. The Notary of [P.Sakaon 59](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.sakaon;;59) (305) and [SB 16 12289, col. 2](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;16;12289colii/) (309)

Both of these contracts from Ptolemais Euergetis are registered by an official who styles himself as a veteran, a status which to my knowledge is otherwise unparalleled in the public notary offices of Roman Egypt.[[14]](#footnote-14) A comparison shows that the same man signed both contracts in a nearly identifical fashion:

P.Sakaon 59.19

Αὐρήλιος Σ̣εύ̣ι̣ο̣ς οὐετρανὸς κεχρη(μάτικα). χρό(νος) ὁ̣ π̣ρ̣οκ(είμενος) α(ὐτοῦ) ἐξοδ(ιασμοῦ)

🡪

Αὐρήλιος Ṇέπω̣ς οὐετρανὸς κεχρη(μάτικα). χρό(νος) ὁ̣ π̣ρ̣οκ(είμενος). α/ ἐξε̣δ(όμην).

SB 16 12289, col. 2.43

Αὐρή(λιος) Νέπως οὐετραν[ὸ]ς κεχρη(μάτικα) ὡς πρόκ(ειται) καὶ ἐξεδ(όμην).

🡪

Αὐρήλιος Νέπως οὐετρανὸς κεχρη(μάτικα). χρό(νος) ὁ̣ π̣ρ̣οκ(είμενος). α// ἐξεδ(όμην).

ἐξεδ(όμην): in both cases, the notary signifies that he had given out one copy of the contract. For the verb in notarial dockets, cf. [SPP 20 15](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/stud.pal;20;15).32 (Ptolemais Euergetis, 189) ἐξεδό(θη), and [P.Tebt. 2 397](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.tebt;2;397).1 (Ptolemais Euergetis, 198) ε ̅ἐξεδό(θησαν) ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ. In these parallels, the abbreviation used, ἐξεδο̅, might point to the expansion ἐξεδόμ(ην), but this is not guaranteed. I have adopted the first person in the present examples due to the first person registration Αὐρήλιος Νέπως οὐετρανὸς κεχρη(μάτικα), even though χρό(νος) ὁ προκ(είμενος) intervenes. For a contemporary use of the first person, cf. [O.Berl. 63](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/o.berl;;63).1-2 (Thebes, 195-196): ἀντίγραφον ἧς καὶ ἄλλοτε ἐξεδό|μην ἀποχῆς α.
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8. The Dyke of Psei in the Herakleides Meris

In the Karanis penthemeros certificate [P.Mich. 21 845](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.mich;21;845) (87/88),[[15]](#footnote-15) I hesitated about the reading ἐν χώμ̣(αται) Ψ̣ε̣ι̣(ναλίτιδος) (?) in line 2 and noted that Pseinalitis is most associated with the Themistos meris. An unpublished papyrus in the British Library (P.Lond. inv. 2698) has prompted me to return to this problem, which can be solved with evidence long at hand.

In [BGU 7 1531](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;7;1531), a Ptolemaic ostrakon from the Philadelphia cellar archive ([TM Arch 160](https://www.trismegistos.org/archive/160)), we find a settlement known simply as τὸ Ψει, which was presumably an epoikion (given the article) located in the vicinity of Philadelphia and Tanis (the latter also mentioned in the text). The editors connected this place to the ὑποδοχεῖον Ψει found in [BGU 2 571](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;2;571).2 and 6 (Arsinoite, 151/152), while in another Berlin document published shortly thereafter, Ψει is found as part of the administrative compass of an epiteretes ([P.Berl.Möller 5](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.berl.moeller;;5).2-3, 145).[[16]](#footnote-16)

The obvious reading in the Karanis penthemeros certificate is thus ἐν χώμ(ατι) Ψει, and this dyke can be recognized in several other certificates issued to workers from villages of the Herakleides meris:[[17]](#footnote-17)

[P.Mich. 21 845](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.mich;21;845).2 (Karanis, 87/88): ἐν χώμ̣(ατι) Ψ̣ε̣ι̣(ναλίτιδος) (?) 🡪 ἐν χώμ(ατι) Ψει

[P.Grenf. 2 53g](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.grenf;2;53g).3-4 (Philadelphia, 190): ἐν χώμ(ατι) Ψε̣(ναρψενήσεως) (BL 6 46) 🡪 ἐν

χώμ(ατι) | Ψει

[P.Mich. 6 420](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.mich;6;420).6 (Karanis, 206): ἐν Ψε̣( ) 🡪 χώ(ματι) Ψει

[P.Brookl. 11](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.brook;;11).6 (Philadelphia, 206): ⟨ἐν⟩ χώ(ματι) Ψεν̣(νώφρεως) 🡪 χώ(ματι)[[18]](#footnote-18) Ψει

[P.Alex. 17](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.alex;;17).5 (non vidi) (Philadelphia, 206): [ἐ]ν χώ(ματι) Ψει( ) 🡪 [ἐ]ν χώ(ματι) Ψει

In contrast, evidence for the χῶμα Ψ(ε)ιναλίτιδος ([TM Geo 1985](http://www.trismegistos.org/place/1985)) comes exclusively from the Themistos meris.
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9. P.Col. inv. 497 (Oxyrhynchite / Alexandria, 130)

This papyrus edited in [Yiftach](https://papyri.info/biblio/95880) 2021 would benefit from restoration. Some of the text is still folded over, including parts of lines 21-23 of the recto. After digital unfolding, the editor’s text can be updated, including a slight emendation to l. 22:

21: ὑπ]ερ̣θέσ[ε]ω̣ς 🡪 ὑπ]ερ̣θέσεως

22: παρέ̣[ξ]εσθαι 🡪 παρέ̣χεσθαι

23: [ἐμπ]οιήσεως 🡪 [ἐμ]π̣οιήσεως

On the verso, which contains an apparently unrelated address, I read Κοκκηίου (κοκκηιου pap.) Θέωνος in l. 2 for the editor’s κεκλημ(έν - - ) τ̣οῦ (?) Θέωνος. Cocceii are few in Egypt, and those that do appear generally have Roman cognomina (see [TM Nam 27028](https://www.trismegistos.org/name/27028)).
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1. Though not mentioned in either edition of the text, the ends of several lines from the previous column and the beginning of one line of the next column are visible in the [image](http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/RZ00008024) available through the Austrian National Library. The well-preserved column in the middle contains a list of landowners with mostly Roman names, along with several tenants (including Simon, l. 4, and Ezekial, l. 24). The location of the land is not known, but in l. 10 a tenant is noted to be “in Bakchias.” Τhe landowners and tenants in this list should likely be associated with a nearby settlement with a strong veteran presence and known Jewish population, such as Karanis or Philadelphia. The roll was later cut and the verso re-used for a list of candidates for the χωματεκβολία (on which see [Lewis 1997](https://papyri.info/biblio/14864), 50), two from Neilopolis, one from Soknopaiou Nesos. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See Claytor 2020a with further references. For Jews in Egypt after the revolt, see now Papaconstantinou 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. S.L. Lippert and M. Schentuleit, [P.Dime 3](https://papyri.info/biblio/79288), p. 115, n. 515. The name of the daughter in P.Dime 3 8 (23 CE) appears as Srȝ at DG 2 (restored at DA 2) and Σαρα{σσ} at GH 6. The editor of the Greek subscription notes that instead of the Hebrew name Sara, Σαρα could represent an otherwise unknown hypocoristic of Σαραπιάς. The rejection of the final two letters is made without comment but is presumably influenced by the Demotic rendering of the name. I wonder if the second-to-last sigma can instead be read as a flattened upsilon. Σαραῦς would be an addendum onomasticis, but cf. similar names, such as Σαραυ (once: [O.Kellis 143 inner side](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/o.kell;;143inner), IV CE), the better-attested Σαραεύς ([TM Nam 7578](https://www.trismegistos.org/name/7578), largely Oxyrhynchite but with some Arsinoite examples), and other forms discussed by Maravela and Mangerud 2019, 321. There are also a handful of instances of “Sabbath” names in Soknopaiou Nesos, such as Σαμβαθίων and the hypocoristic Σαμβᾶς, but while Semitic in origin, the name found currency among non-Jews in Egypt: see [C.Pap.Jud. 3](https://papyri.info/biblio/6641), Sec. XIII, “The Sambathions,” pp. 43-56. For another possibly Semitic name in this village, see below, section 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Other documents with overlapping nomenclature (though not the same individuals) include [SB 14 11426](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;14;11426) and [P.Harrauer 33](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.harrauer;;33). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The editor printed ὑπογραφ̣ὴ ἰδία at [PSI 8 903](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/psi;8;903dupl).26, but the eta does not have the expected h-shape found elsewhere, and the reading does not take into account the horizontal leading into ἴδια. I would therefore read ὑπογραφε̣ύ̣ς̣ here, in line with the copies (cf. the corrections to this copy already made in papyri.info: BOEP 4.1). The Michigan editor comments on l. 27: “the writer is confused; the word ἰδία shows that he should have written ὑπογραφή.” In isolation, this makes sense, but the other evidence presented here suggests that ὑπογραφεύς can be accepted and that we should understand ἰδια as ἴδια (γράμματα). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. In [P.Mich. 10 584](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.mich;10;584).33, the editor prints ὁ δὲ Ἑρμᾶς ἰδίᾳ γράφω(ν). On [the black-and-white image in Michigan APIS](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/a/apis/x-1299/102R_NEG.TIF) (the best currently available), we can see clearly that Ἑρμ( ) was abbreviated; the article ὁ, moreover, is open at the top and has a small point of ink at the end of the stroke, which suggests το(ῦ) (cf. how the tau of τῶν is written earlier in the line). I can see how the editor read γράφω(ν) (influenced obviously by the nominative ὁ δὲ Ἑρμᾶς), but I would expect the phi to come up higher and the omega to be raised in abbreviation. Instead, the hasta of phi could be the first stroke of a v-shaped tau, which leads to seeing γράμματα inVerschleifung. Putting this all together, I suggest: το(ῦ) δὲ Ἑρμ(ᾶ) ἴδια γράμματα. The Michigan editor cites [BGU 3 709](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;3;709).22 as a parallel to his reading: Γ̣έ̣λ̣λιος Οὐάλης ἰδίᾳ γρ(άφων). In this passage, however, the preceding τοῦ μέν shows that the name must be corrected to the genitive (l. Γελλίου Οὐάλεντος). The following phrase can then be understood as ἴδια γρά(μματα), in line with our other examples. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. This formula must be distinguished from section headings in copies, where we find the phrase ἀντίγραφον ὑπογραφῆς vel sim.: cf. e.g. [M.Chr. 159](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/chr.mitt;;159).29-30, where the subscriber is introduced by the standard phrase ὑπογραφεὺς τῶν ὁμολογού(ντων), while the subscription itself is marked by the heading ἀντίγραφον ὑπογραφῆς. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. It is only in the Byzantine period that the phrase ὑπογράφων ἰδίᾳ χειρί becomes popular in the contracts of Egypt. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Cf. [SB 3 6995](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;3;6995) (124), an oikogeneia drawn up in the grapheion of Tenis and Kerke of the Memphite nome. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The composite suggestion ἐξ ἐ[πισκέψεως εἰρομένου] of BL 1 15 can safely be laid aside. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. If in the original contract, it refers to ἐν τῇ Σοκνοπαίου Νήσῳ in the omitted opening protocol of the contract; otherwise, it is was added by the copyist to refer to l. 1 of the present exemplar. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. For developments in the notarial offices of the Arsinoite nome at this time, see [Claytor 2020b](https://papyri.info/biblio/95843). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. There is a concentration of abbreviated examples between 173 ([PSI 13 1324](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/psi;13;1324).36) and 198 ([P.Tebt. 3 397](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.tebt;2;397).1). Earlier, [Micucci’s (2022)](https://papyri.info/biblio/96042) new edition of [SB 22 15472](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;22;15472) (134) has κατακεχώρισται μηνὸς Νέου Σεβαστοῦ λ atop the contract. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. For a later soldier-notary in the archive of Flavius Patermouthis son of Menas ([TM Arch 37](https://www.trismegistos.org/archive/37)), see [Keenan 1990](https://papyri.info/biblio/60707): 149-150. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Originally published in [Claytor 2013](https://papyri.info/biblio/95472), 53-56. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. ἐπιτηρητῶν Ἐξωπύλης | καὶ ἐ̣χανοδέσμου Ψεῖ. The word before Ψει is obscure. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. In [P.Strasb. 3 157](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.stras;3;157).5 (Bakchias, 123; image supplied by Paul Heilporn), printed as [ἐ]ν̣ τ̣ῇ Ψε[ ̣] ̣( ) [διώ(ρυγι)], since the feminine article precedes the name and the epsilon does not ligature into an iota, a different canal is likely recorded: I would suggest ἐν τῇ Ψεν̣[νώ(φρεως)] (for the abbreviation and lack of διώ(ρυγι), cf. [BGU 3 879](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;3;879).6, with my correction reflected in Papyri.info). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. ⟨ἐν⟩ does not need to be supplied; cf. the previous example and e.g. P.Sijp. 42h (Narmouthis, 223). [↑](#footnote-ref-18)