

Aneta Skalec

**P. CAIR. CAT. 10368:
A FRAGMENTARY AGORANOMIC SALE
FROM PATHYRIS**

THE PAPYRUS EDITED IN THIS PAPER,¹ was discovered in Pathyris (modern Gebelein), a Ptolemaic town located about 30 km to the southwest of Luxor, on the western bank of the Nile in Upper Egypt.² It was described by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt in their catalogue of Greek papyri from Cairo.³ In the introduction to this volume, the authors indicated that a few late Ptolemaic documents from

¹ This papyrus was edited in M. Kashaf's 1997 Ain Shams dissertation (no. 5, pp. 38–46; see U. GAD, *A Checklist of the Egyptian Museum's Unpublished Greek Papyri*, Cairo 2016, p. 5). Unfortunately, I could not consult this dissertation and check the original editor's readings. I contacted professor Noha Salem from Ain Shams University for a copy of Kashaf's PhD. However, she failed to find it in both the faculty and the central library. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to professor Noha Salem for her help.

I studied the papyrus from images kindly provided on behalf of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo by Wojciech Ejsmond, who personally supervised the taking of the photographs. Therefore, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to him for his irreplaceable help and to the Egyptian Museum for their permission to publish the document. My thanks go also to Marcin Kotyl and an anonymous reviewer for their elaborate comments on the earlier draft of this paper. Their feedback has proven to be most helpful.

² W. EJSMOND, A. SKALEC, & J. M. CHYLA, 'The topography of the town of Pathyris in the light of the current research', [in:] *PapCongr. XXIX*, p. 331.

³ B. P. GRENFELL & A. S. HUNT, *Greek Papyri: Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Nos. 10001–10869*, Oxford 1903, no. 10368.

Gebelein, including the aforementioned papyrus, were part of the Cairo Museum collection already before the year 1897. Moreover, they stated that these documents belonged to the same find as those published in *P. Grenf.* I and II.⁴ Unfortunately, there is no additional information identifying the person of the finder or the precise date of the discovery.

The image (fig. 1) shows a light-brown fragment in three pieces. Between the sheets two and three, a small piece of papyrus is missing, containing one to three letters. Two columns of the text seem to have been written in two different hands (as in some other agoranomic contracts, although it is not always easy to decide whether the hand is different or just written more quickly and cursive⁵). The first column (4.8 cm in width) is written in small and rapid cursive hand; the second column (19.5 cm in width) in upright and neat cursive hand. Both the first and the second hands of the discussed document are extremely similar to the one found in *P. Batav.* 6 (Pathyris, 110 BC).⁶ It can be seen especially in the specific writing of *Ἀλεξάνδρου* and the final *nu*. Also Pestman, in his edition of *P. Batav.* 6, had the impression that the document had been written in two different hands.⁷ However, we need to remember that in general the hands in the agoranomic documents do not differ much from one another.⁸

The text runs along the fibres. The margins of the papyrus are preserved on the left and upper sides. Below, a substantial portion must be lost. The overall length of what remains, as well as the fact that the right margin is not preserved, makes it impossible to determine whether there may have been a third column in the present text or not.

The papyrus is mounted on beige card paper, which implies that no writing would have been visible on the back. It bears the note ‘Gebelein’

⁴ GRENFELL & HUNT, *Greek Papyri* (cit. n. 3), p. vii.

⁵ M. VIERROS, *Bilingual Notaries in Hellenistic Egypt. A Study of Greek as a Second Language*, Brussels 2012, p. 74; P. W. PESTMAN, ‘Agoranomoi et actes agoranomiques: Krokodilopolis et Pathyris, 145-88 av. J.-C.’, [in:] IDEM (ed.), *Textes et études de papyrologie grecque, démotique et copte* [= *Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* 23], Leiden 1985, p. 34; *P. Batav.*, p. 56.

⁶ See the photo online at <<https://berlpap.smb.museum/02578/>> (accessed 10 January 2022).

⁷ *P. Batav.*, p. 56.

⁸ VIERROS, *Bilingual Notaries* (cit. n. 5), p. 91; PESTMAN, ‘Agoranomoi’ (cit. n. 5), p. 34.

in pencil and the inventory numbers of the papyrus. The papyri found in modern Gebelein were written not only in Pathyris but also in Krokodilopolis (whose precise location in the Greco-Roman times is unknown⁹). However, almost all Krokodilopolis' contracts concern the inhabitants of Pathyris.¹⁰ Certain linguistic features suggest that the document in question was indeed written in Pathyris.

The papyrus contains a fragmentary preserved agoranomic contract of sale.¹¹ The first column, which contains a summary of the contents of the contract in five lines (the so-called *scriptura interior*), is complete; of the full contract in the second column (the so-called *scriptura exterior*) six lines of the dating formula are preserved. The *scriptura interior* consisted normally of a short date and a summary of the contents of the contract, and all those elements are preserved in the papyrus under discussion. The *scriptura exterior* usually encompassed the protocol, contract proper, and signature of the *agoranomos*.¹² The protocol had a form of one sentence including the dating formula, the place of writing, and the name of the *agoranomos*. In the *scriptura exterior*, after the dating formula, there would be a detailed description of the seller and the sold object together with its location and neighbours. After this, the name of the buyer, the sum paid for the purchase, the clause concerning previous ownership and warranty, as well as the final signature of the *agoranomos* would have followed.¹³ None of these is preserved. Sometimes such documents contain a receipt for the tax on sales (*ἐγκύκλιον*), but not always.¹⁴

⁹ EJSMOND, SKALEC, & CHYLA, 'The topography' (cit. n. 2), p. 332 n. 1.

¹⁰ PESTMAN, 'Agoranomoi' (cit. n. 5), p. 10.

¹¹ On the format of agronomic acts, see PESTMAN, 'Agoranomoi' (cit. n. 5), pp. 33–44; VIERROS, *Bilingual Notaries* (cit. n. 5), pp. 74–76.

¹² VIERROS, *Bilingual Notaries* (cit. n. 5), p. 75; PESTMAN, 'Agoranomoi' (cit. n. 5), pp. 33–34.

¹³ J. M. S. COWEY, 'VBP II 10 and P. Lond. III 682 reassembled', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 120 (1998), p. 160.

¹⁴ See PESTMAN, 'Agoranomoi' (cit. n. 5), pp. 37–39; P. W. PESTMAN, 'L'impôt *ἐγκύκλιον* à Pathyris et à Krokodilopolis', [in:] E. BOSWINKEL & P. W. PESTMAN (eds.), *Textes grecs, démotiques et bilingues* [= *Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* 19], Leiden 1978, pp. 214–222.

col. i

(hand 2) (ἔτους) δ Μεχεῖρ δ

ἀπέδοτο Χολῶς Σάμιος

πή(χεις) ιγ ½ ἐμβαδοῦ

4 ἐπρίατο Πατῆυς Πύρου

χα(λκοῦ) β

col. ii

(hand 1) βασιλευόντων βασιλίσσης καὶ βασιλέως Πτολεμα[ί]ου

θεῶν Φιλομητό[ρ]ων Σωτήρων

ἔτους δ ἐφ ἱερείως βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου θεοῦ Φιλομήτορος

Σω[τῆ]ρος Ἀλεξάνδρ(ο)υ

καὶ θεῶν Σωτήρων καὶ θεῶν Ἀδε[λφ]ῶν καὶ θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν

κα[ὶ θε]ῶν Φιλοπατ(ό)ρων

4 καὶ θεῶν Ἐπιφ[α]νῶν καὶ θεοῦ Εὐ[πάτο]ρος καὶ θεοῦ

Φιλ[ο]μήτορος κα[ὶ θε]οῦ Φιλοπά-

τορος νέ[ου καὶ θε]οῦ Εὐεργ[έτ]ου κα[ὶ θεῶ]ν Φιλομητ[ό]ρων

Σωτήρων, ἱεροῦ πώλου

Ἰσιδ[ος, μεγάλης μη]τρ[ὸς θεῶν, ἀθλοφόρου Β]ερενίκ[ης

Εὐεργέτιδος, καν]ηφόρου

i.1. δ pap. || i.2 l. Σαμίου || i.3 π^η pap. || i.5 χ^α pap. || ii.2. l. ἱερέως

In year 4, Mecheir 4, Cholos son of Samios sold 13 ½ square cubits. Pateus son of Pyros bought for 2,000 copper (drachmae).

In the 4th year of the reign of the Queen and King Ptolemy, gods Philometores and Soteris, in the priesthood of King Ptolemy god Philometor Soter as the priest of Alexander, and the gods Soteris, and the gods Adelphoi, and the gods Euergetai, and the gods Philopatores, and the gods Epiphaneis, and the god Eupator, and the god Philometor, and the god Philopator Neos, and the god Euergetes, and the gods Philometores Soteris, and of the Sacred Foal of Isis, the great mother of the gods, and of the Prize-Bearer of Berenike Euergetis and the Basket-Bearer [---]



Fig. 1. Papyrus *P. Cair.* Cat. 10368. © The Egyptian Museum in Cairo

Col. i

1. The date here corresponds to 18 February 113 BC. The daily date in the text is a bit problematic. What I see here is a *delta* open from the top corner, unlike the one found in the year date. Such an open *delta* is, however, clearly visible also in the word ἀπέδοτο and is common with some scribes from Pathyris (e.g. *P. Lond.* III 881 [108 BC]; Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* [cit. n. 5], p. 95). What raises some doubts is the stroke protruding to the right, which one would expect in a combination of letters. However, this particular form of *delta*, with the projecting stroke, can be seen also in the dating formula in *scriptura exterior* (l. 2) in the discussed papyrus, and *P. Lond.* III 880, l. 1, dated to the same year (15 March 113 BC).

As our document dates to 113 BC, it was almost certainly written under the *agoranomos* Heliodoros, who appears as the main *agoranomos* in the documents from Krokodilopolis and Pathyris in the years 124–112 BC (the main office was in Krokodilopolis, with that in Pathyris being only a branch where the name of the main notary would always be mentioned in texts as well: Pestman, ‘Agoranomoi’ [cit. n. 5], p. 10; Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* [cit. n. 5], p. 82). The document might have been written directly under his supervision in Pathyris, as Heliodoros is quite often found there, where he himself drew up a series of contracts (Pestman, ‘Agoranomoi’ [cit. n. 5], p. 11). It might have also been signed by one of the subordinate *agoranomoi* operating directly in Pathyris under Heliodoros – the first of those was Areios (131–113 BC), followed by Ammonios (113–109 BC); see Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (cit. n. 5), p. 83. The year 113 BC was a time of transition between the two in the Pathyris office (Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* [cit. n. 5], p. 91). It is impossible to indicate which of them is more likely, as both appear in documents from the same day, namely 15 March 113 BC, a month later than the discussed papyrus: Areios in *P. Lond.* III 1203, Ammonios in *P. Strasb.* II 85. On these two individuals, see P. W. Pestman, ‘L’agoranomie: un avant-poste de l’administration grecque enlevé par les Égyptiens?’, [in:] H. Maehler & V. Strocka (eds.), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposiums, 27.–29. September 1976 in Berlin*, Mainz am Rhein 1978, pp. 208–209; Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (cit. n. 5), pp. 84–85; G. Fogolari, ‘Gli “agoranomi” di Pathyris-Crocodilopoli (Tebaide)’, *Aegyptus* 3/4 (1921), pp. 334–335.

2. Χολῶς: It might be either an Egyptian name Χο(λ)λῶς, -ῶτος or a quite rare variant (TM NamVar 15348) of a more commonly-found Greek name Χῶλος, -ου (TM Nam 2635). According to Trismegistos the form Χολῶς is attested sixteen times for eight individuals in documents dating from the third century BC to the second century AD, usually of Fayumic provenance. The variant Χολλῶς (TM NamVar 15345) is attested nine times, also for eight individuals, in documents dating from the first to the fourth century AD. In most cases it occurs in Thebes. Until now, this name has not been confirmed in the papyri from Pathyris, but its reading does not raise any doubts.

Σάμιος: It can be interpreted in two ways, as either an ethnic designation or a patronymic. Σάμιος (man of Samos) is an ethnic designation rarely attested in Egypt. According to C. A. La'da, *Foreign Ethnicities in Hellenistic Egypt*, Leuven 2002, pp. 281–282, it occurs thirteen times, usually in Lower Egypt or the Fayum. So far it has not been confirmed in documents from Pathyris. However, even if the interpretation of Samios as the ethnic designation is very tempting, it seems fairly unlikely. In the *scriptura interior* of other agoranomic documents from Pathyris, only the names of the seller and the buyer are indicated, often with the patronymic, but never with the ethnic designation. The last element appears in the *scriptura exterior*, but the part containing it, unfortunately, has not survived in the discussed document.

Because of the above-mentioned reasons, it seems much more likely that Σάμιος in the papyrus is a patronymic, although the name Σάμιος (TM Nam 23287) is very rare, being papyrologically attested only twice: *P. Tebt.* III 722, i, l. 1 (Arsinoites, 199–175? BC) and *BGU* I 46, iii, l. 3 (Krokodilopolis [Arsinoites], AD 193). However, the writing is clear. Such an interpretation requires assuming that the scribe mistakenly wrote the name in the nominative instead of the genitive, as the name unequivocally ends with a *sigma*. Even if this is quite a rare mistake – usually the patronymics are systematically formed – we find examples of such mistakes also in other documents from Pathyris (Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* [cit. n. 5], p. 163). This may be explained in two ways. Firstly, it is possible that the genitive ending was confounded with the nominative one, as the nominative singular of the second declension masculine has the same ending as the third declension genitive (Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* [cit. n. 5], pp. 140, 158–159, 163). Σάμιος belongs to the second declension, of which genitive would be Σαμίου. It can be that the writer thought that the ending -ος indicated the genitive even though in the second declension the word Σάμιος marks the nominative (Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* [cit. n. 5], pp. 158–159). The second explanation might be the confusing usage of the endings -ις / -ιος of the names ending in -ις in the nominative. The nominative is sometimes used for the genitive, and the genitive (-ιος) is sometimes used in place of the nominative. It must be remembered that the ending -ος is a very common nominative ending in masculine nouns (second declension). Thus, taking that into account, it is not very surprising that it might have been confused with the genitive -ιος (Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* [cit. n. 5], p. 170).

It cannot be completely ruled out either that the name in question would be Σάμις, -ιος, declined like, for instance, the Theban name Πέρμαμις, Περμάμιος. However, such a name is not attested papyrologically.

3. ἐμβαδοῦ: ἐμβαδόν has a double meaning, ‘surface, area’ or, as an adjective, ‘square’ (LSJ, *s.v.*). This term is quite uncommon and among other documents from Pathyris appears only in two of Dryton’s wills, which contain the formula πῆ(χεις) ἐμβαδοῦς δ εἰς κλιβάνου τόπον, ‘4 square cubits for the site of an oven’:

P. Dryton 3, l. 24 (126 BC), where it is reconstructed, and *P. Dryton* 4, l. 14 (126 BC).¹⁵ In addition, for the Ptolemaic period the term is also attested in *P. Enteux*. 66 (Magdola, 218 BC), ll. 9–10: *πήχεις ἑβδομήκοντα κ[ατ'] ἔμβαδόν*, ‘seventy square cubits’, indicating a measure of a piece of *ψιλὸς τόπος*, ‘building ground’, occupied against the contract by Theodosios, and in *SB XXIV* 15973 (unknown provenance, 132 BC), l. 4: *μὴ τασσομένωι ἔμβαδόν*, ‘not to pay tax’. In the first three documents, *ἔμβαδόν* clearly occurs in connection with a measure of area. In the last one, it is interpreted by Kramer as a synonym to *ἔμβαδικόν*, that is a tax paid by land tenants (B. Kramer, ‘Der κτίστης Boethos und die Einrichtung einer neuen Stadt. Teil I. P. UB Trier’, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 43 [1997], p. 325). In Roman times, this term was also used to denote an area (eg., *SB XIV* 11878 + *P. Vindob. G* 59.529 [unknown provenance, 2nd cent. AD]). Given that in the discussed document it appears in connection with the word *πήχεις*, it almost certainly refers to such measurement. It seems probable that the correct version here would be a reversed word order, namely *πή(χεις) ἔμβαδοῦ ιγ λ*. It cannot be excluded that the scribe added *ἔμβαδοῦ* after the number of cubits on second thought, having realised that he had forgotten it. Then the phrase might be translated as ‘square cubits’. If, however, *ἔμβαδοῦ* was intentionally placed after the number, it might be translated as ‘of area’ (see a similar phrase in demotic *P. Ryl. Dem.* 23, l. 3 [Pathyris, 115–108 BC]). Regardless of the translation, *ἔμβαδόν* refers to a measure, most probably corresponding to the demotic *mbḥt*, ‘square cubit’, measuring about 0.275 m² (*CDD, M*, pp. 190–191; S. P. Vleeming, ‘Demotic measures of length and surface, chiefly in the Ptolemaic period’, [in:] Pestman [ed.], *Textes et études* [cit. n. 5] p. 213 n. 42). It should be clearly distinguished from *πήχυς στερεός*, occurring more often in documents from Pathyris and Thebaid. A *πήχυς στερεός* was ground or standard cubit, equivalent to 100 square cubits (*ἔμβαδόν* in the discussed document), demotic *mb-itn*, which means 1 standard cubit amounts to 1/100 aroura = 27.56 m² (Kramer, ‘Der κτίστης’ [cit. above], p. 337; *CDD, M*, p. 186; Vleeming, ‘Demotic measures’ [cit. above], p. 221, § 16).

Therefore, the property addressed in *P. Cair. Cat.* 10368 measured merely 3.7125 m². As such, it was quite small. Except for the dimensions, the *scriptura interior* does not provide any details on the object of sale. This would be pointed out in the *scriptura exterior*, which was not preserved. Hence, it is unknown what kind of property was involved. One can practically exclude the sale of a house or arable land, as in such cases within the Pathyris documentation the sold item would always be indicated in the *scriptura interior*. Only in *ψιλὸς τόπος* sales, the exact object of the contract was not usually defined in the *scriptura interior*, being reduced only to the specification of the number of cubits. However, in these

¹⁵ Translation after K. VANDORPE, *The Bilingual Family Archive of Dryton, his Wife Apollonia and their Daughter Senmouthis*, Brussels 2002, p. 85.

cases, $\pi\eta\chi\upsilon\varsigma$ $\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ was always used as a unit of measure (*P. Grenf.* I 25 [114 BC]; *P. Strasb.* II 85 [113 BC]; *BGU* III 994 [113 BC]; *P. Strasb.* II 86 [111 BC]; see K. Maresch, *Bronze und Silber. Papyrologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Währung im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten bis zum 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* [= *Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 25], Wiesbaden 1996, pp. 207–208). In the period in which the document under discussion was written, the usual price for one standard cubit of $\psi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma$ was 1,000 drachmae. In *P. Cair. Cat.* 10368, the price is, however, much lower. Taking all of the above into account, it should be assumed that the papyrus refers to a different type of property. Looking at other documents from the Ptolemaic period, it seems likely that this could have involved some unusual use of a small portion of land, such as in *P. Dryton* 3 and 4 – a site of an oven, or *P. Enteux.* 66 – a long and narrow part of a $\psi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma$.

4. $\Pi\alpha\tau\eta\upsilon\varsigma$: Grenfell and Hunt pointed out that the name of the buyer was Pates (*P. Cair. Cat.*, p. 48), which is a common name attested in Pathyris ($\Pi\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$: TM Nam 772). However, in my opinion, between the *eta* and the final *sigma* there is an additional letter, namely an *upsilon*. Therefore, the name in question should be read $\Pi\alpha\tau\eta\upsilon\varsigma$. The same writing is confirmed papyrologically only once, in *P. Corn.* 21, l. 177 (Philadelphia, AD 33). However, this document contains the patronymic in the genitive ($\mathcal{A}\tau\rho\eta\varsigma$ $\Pi\alpha\tau\eta\upsilon\varsigma$). According to Trismegistos, the name in question (TM NamVar 3568) would thus be a variant of $\Pi\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$, which seems plausible, as in Roman times the genitive form of this name was often $\Pi\alpha\tau\eta\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$: for example *O. Bodl.* II 474 (Thebes, AD 41); *O. Strasb.* I 260 (Thebaid, AD 23). In the case of *P. Cair. Cat.* 10368, however, the situation is different, because the buyer's name occurs in the nominative. Since the transcription of this Egyptian name from *Pa-tw* as $\Pi\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$ is well-established in documents written in Pathyris and Krokodilopolis, and there is no exemption from this writing there, it seems unlikely to me that the buyer's name is a variant of $\Pi\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$. In my opinion, it is much more likely to see it as a variant of the name $\Pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ (TM Nam 4946). Checking other names with the ending *-ηυς* in the nominative revealed that it generally occurred in transcriptions of Egyptian names whose standard Greek version ended in *-ευς*. Such a phenomenon is attested only twice in the Ptolemaic period (*UPZ* I 98 [Memphis, 158 BC], v^o, l. 98: $\mathcal{A}\mu\omicron\nu\mu\eta\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM NamVar 67051] < $\mathcal{A}\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM Nam 34]; *P. Ryl.* II 72 [Arsinoite, BC 99–98], ll. 98: $\Sigma\omicron\kappa\eta\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM NamVar 43445] < $\Sigma\omicron\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM Nam 1129] and 103: $\Theta\omicron\tau\eta\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM NamVar 10089] < $\Theta\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ [TM Nam 1388]) and slightly more often in the Roman times (e.g. *PSI* VIII 901 [Tebtynis, AD 46], ll. 8: $\Pi\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\eta\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM NamVar 43510] < $\Pi\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM Nam 735] and 19: $\mathcal{O}\rho\sigma\epsilon\eta\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM NamVar 43488] < $\mathcal{O}\rho\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM Nam 569]; *O. Ashm.* 79 [unknown provenance, 3rd cent. AD?], ll. 4 and 7: $\mathcal{X}\epsilon\mu\pi\eta\eta\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM NamVar 43451] < $\mathcal{X}\epsilon\mu\tau\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ [TM Nam 121]; *P. Corn.* 18 [Oxyrhynchus, AD 291], l. 29: $\mathcal{T}\alpha\eta\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM NamVar 43495] < $\mathcal{T}\alpha\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ [TM Nam 6012]). These are rare cases, which likely occurred, because the opposition between the long and short vowels

probably did not exist in Egyptian (A. I. Blasco Torres, *Representing Foreign Sounds. Greek Transcriptions of Egyptian Anthroponyms from 800 BC to 800 AD*, Leuven 2017, p. 606). Πατεύς is papyrologically attested only eleven times for ten individuals from 175 BC to AD 317, never in Pathyris. However, its variants are quite similar to the one found in the discussed text: Πατηεύς (TM NamVar 12556; BGU XVI 2673, iii, l. 88 [Herakleopolites, 25–1 BC]), Πατηοῦς (TM NamVar 12557; O. Heid. 396, l. 5 [Arsinoites, 2nd half of the 2nd cent. AD]).

Πύρον: Πύρος (TM NamVar 13523) is a variant of a much more common name Πύρρος (TM Nam 5381), confirmed in Trismegistos twenty-nine times for eighteen individuals, in the period from 332 BC to AD 295. However, it never appeared in Pathyris. The clearest letter of the name is the *rho*, followed by the *omicron* and the *upsilon*. The two last letters are analogous to their writing in ἐμβαδοῦ in the preceding line, with the final stroke of the *upsilon* strongly elongated. The beginning of the name is somehow awkward, especially because of the quite atypical *sigma* of the preceding name. There are three hooks which might be both *pi-epsilon*, *epsilon-pi*, but also *tau-eta*. The second possibility can be excluded, as in Trismegistos there is no name beginning with those letters. The most likely seems to be the first option and, actually, the only name that corresponds to these letters is Πύρος. However, it cannot be ruled out for the discussed document that the name is Τήρον. Τήρης (TM Nam 6236) is a name confirmed in Trismegistos forty-one times for thirty-two individuals, in documents dating from 332 BC to AD 276 and originating from various parts of Egypt, but never from Pathyris.

Col. ii

1. The long dating formula of agoranomic contracts present in the discussed document is usually divided into four parts: the regnal date with the regnal year, the eponymous priesthoods of dynastic cults in Alexandria, the eponymous priesthoods of dynastic cults in Ptolemais, and the actual date with the month and the day (Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* [cit. n. 4], p. 247). The dating formula breaks in *P. Cair. Cat.* 10368 after the two first elements. However, they are sufficient to conclude that it is typical for Cleopatra III and Ptolemy IX Soter II (Lathyros), known from other documents written under the *agoranomos* Heliodoros. It is characteristic of the use of the term βασιλίσσης instead of Κλεοπάτρας, even if the last occurs sometimes in documents from this period, so the two are interchangeable and cannot be used for precise dating. Dating formula with the use of βασιλίσσης occurs only in documents from Pathyris written under Heliodoros or Sosos, whereas in documents from other places in Upper Egypt, like Diospolis Megale (*P. Stras.* II 81 [115 BC]) or Hermonthis (*UPZ* II 180 [113 BC]), written under other *agoranomoi* the term Κλεοπάτρας was always used.

2. ἱερείως for ἱερέως is customary in Pathyris, but not in the documents written in Krokodilopolis (Pestman, 'Agoranomoi' [cit. n. 5], p. 11; idem, 'A Greek tes-

tament from Pathyris (P. Lond. Inv. 2850)', *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 55 [1969], p. 138 *ad* l. 8). This points to Pathyris as the place of redaction of the discussed text. There are fifteen documents with this variation, noted by Vierros, *Bilingual Notaries* (cit. n. 5), p. 118 and n. 48, mostly in the documents of Heliodoros and Ammonios.

Ἀλεξάνδρου: The *omicron* is missing here. I have not found any other document from Pathyris with this kind of error. This word is additionally characterised by use of a 'flying *nu*' – it has the form of a hook with a raised leg, connected with the preceding *alpha*. The identical writing can be found in *P. Batav.* 6, ii, l. 2.

3. Φιλοπάτρων: A similar error can be found in *P. Strasb.* II 83 (Pathyris, 113 BC), l. 5: Φιλοπάτρος > Φιλοπατ(ο)ρος.

Aneta Skalec

La Sapienza University
 Faculty of Humanities
 Department of History, Anthropology,
 Religions, Art History, Media
 and Performing Arts
 Piazzale Aldo Moro, 5
 00185 Rome
 ITALY
 e-mail: anetaskalec@gmail.com