

JAMES M.S. COWEY

REMARKS ON VARIOUS PAPYRI III  
(SB V, VI, VIII, X, XII, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XX)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 132 (2000) 241–247

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



**REMARKS ON VARIOUS PAPYRI III\***  
(SB V, VI, VIII, X, XII, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XX)

**SB V 7987**

In the dating formula in lines 14-15 the emperor Domitian appears with the victory title Γερμανικός. This title comes into use in the third year of Domitian (A. Martin, Domitien Germanicus et les documents grecs d'Égypte, *Historia* 36, 1987, 73-82 and cf. my correction to SB VIII 9830 below), which allows us to confine the dating of this text to 20 August of the years AD 84-96.

**SB VI 8978**

In Column II line 11 we read καὶ Παῦν[ι] ἄριθ(μήσεως) Παχών (as was printed in the ed.pr. of the text in *Aegyptus* 20, 1940, 304-305). This is a misprint for καὶ Παῦν[ι] ἡ ἀριθ(μήσεως) Παχών, as can be seen by reference to the tabulation of the dates in this papyrus provided by E. Bayer in *Aegyptus* 20, 1940, 306. Incidentally the seventh entry in this tabulation is wrong: Pharmouthi 3 (Column II line 1 of the text) corresponds to 29 March, AD 155, not 28 March, AD 155, as stated there.

**SB VI 8981**

Lines 4, 6 and 8 contain dates. Line 4 has Mecheir 9, year 17 of Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta. This corresponds to 3 February, AD 209 and is the earliest of the dates. The dating that is given in the ed.pr. in *Aegyptus* 20, 1940, 313 and was followed by SB is 2-6 February, AD 209. This is incorrect by one day, because the only dates in the text are 3, 5 and 6 February, AD 209.

**SB VI 9050**

In the edition of this papyrus in MH 2, 1945, 54-58, the date given to the text by the editor was "I./II. Jahrh. n.Chr", which then found its way into SB. The editors of P.Amh. II 65 (= Col. III and IV of SB VI 9050) had previously dated two columns of the text to the early second century AD and there are indeed reasons for doing so. Reference is made to decisions made and to orders given by various prefects of Egypt, who are to be dated to the beginning of the second century (A. Kränzlein presented a list of the dates in the texts in JJP 6, 1952, 202-203). It appears, however, that the significance of the dating formula θεοῦ Τραϊανοῦ (Col. II 1, Col. III 10 and Col. VI 9) has not been noted. The adjective θεός in conjunction with the name of an emperor is only used when an emperor is dead. Thus the texts, which are referred to in SB VI 9050 and contain the adjective θεός in their dating formula, must have been written after the death of Trajan, i.e. sometime after August, AD 117. The fact that Trajan is not spoken of as being deified in Col. I 2 and that the information concerning the hands of the text (MH 2, 1945, 54) makes it possible that Col. I (that is the document, which is introduced as a copy - ἀντίγραφον in Col. I 1) and Col. II line 1 was written before the rest of the text. However as Col. II 1 refers to the deified Trajan then it is the case that the first column and the first line of the second column of the text was written after the emperor's death and the retrospective change of the emperor's title which should have been made in Col. I 2 was simply overlooked.

On the verso there are eight columns of various accounts that were published as P.Sarap. 79 e (= SB VIII 9732). These accounts are to be dated to year 12 of Hadrian (127-128), see P.Sarap. pp. 303 and 17 with note 1 (cf. C. Préaux in CE 37, 1962, 397). On the basis of the terminus post quem of August AD 117 provided by internal evidence from the wording of SB VI 9050 and the terminus ante quem provided by the verso of the papyrus (AD 127-128) SB VI 9050 must have been written between AD 117-127.

---

\* This continues a series of articles concerning minor corrections to questions of dating. The previous articles are to be found in ZPE 84, 1990, 75-78 and ZPE 101, 1994, 79-82.

**SB VI 9055**

The document is dated in year 3 of an unnamed emperor. As we know that the text belongs to the Heroninos archive, because Heroninos is addressed as phrontistes on the back of the papyrus, we can conclude that year 3 is that of either Valerianus and Gallienus (AD 255-256) or of Gallus and Volusianus (AD 252-253, cf. D. Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-Century A.D. Egypt*, Cambridge 1991, p. 423). During year 3 of Valerianus and Gallienus allowance has to be made for a leap year, which means that Thoth 16 corresponds to 14 September, AD 255, not 13 September, AD 255, as given in the edition. During year 3 of Gallus and Volusianus the date should be converted to 13 September, AD 252.

**SB VI 9142**

Year 14 of Trajan is AD 110-111. In this year Choiak 20 corresponds to 16 December, AD 110, not 16 December, AD 111, as given in the edition. It has been suggested that the emperor's name should be read as Ἀδριανῶν instead of Τραϊανῶν in line 5 (BL V 109). In this case the corresponding date would be 16 December, AD 129.

**SB VIII 9775**

In R.S. Bagnall - K.A. Worp, *Christian invocations in the papyri*, CE 56, 1981, 112-133, this text was listed as an instance of the Christian invocation categorised by them as 4 A under those texts which lack a firm dating (p. 127). Later in the same article the authors make the point that no example of this type of invocation to Christ, Mary and the saints (4 A) can be dated securely before AD 641 (p. 131). Thus to date SB VIII 9775 to the second half of the seventh century seems to be a better course of action than to date to the sixth century as was done in SB. The two persons named in the text do not seem to appear in J.M. Diethart, *Prosopographia arsinoitica* I, Wien 1980 (MPER N.S. XII).

**SB VIII 9830**

For several corrections made to the text see ZPE 71, 1988, 287 (= BL IX 265-266). In the dating formula the emperor Domitian appears with the victory title Γερμανικός. This title comes into use in the third year of Domitian (A. Martin, *Domitien Germanicus et les documents grecs d'Égypte*, *Historia* 36, 1987, 73-82 and cf. my correction to SB V 7987 above), which allows us to confine the dating of this text to the 26 January (or 27 January in cases where allowance for a leap year has to be made) of the years AD 84<sup>1</sup>-96.

**SB VIII 9906**

In line 4 it is stated clearly that the text was written in Ptolemais Euergetis, the metropolis of the Arsinoite nome. The land which is ceded is near Theadelphia (line 8-10), but the document was written in Ptolemais Euergetis.

**SB X 10218**

In line 5 reference is made to ἀπὸ τοῦ διεληλυθότος πρώτου [. As the editor of the ed.pr. notes ἔτους should probably be supplemented. The emperor Trajan ruled for twenty years and during this period πρώτου (if the reading is correct) can only refer to his very first year. Thus the document can be dated more accurately to AD 98-99.

---

<sup>1</sup> If this text was in fact written in year 3 and thus on 27 January, AD 84, it would be the earliest instance of the use of the title Germanicus in papyrological documentation from Egypt (P.Flor. I 92 from 25 March AD 84 is the earliest one up till now). For the introduction of the title and its use in documents see A. Martin, *La titulature épigraphique de Domitien*, Frankfurt am Main 1987, pp. 7-8 and A. Martin, *Domitien et les documents Égyptiens de l'an 3*, in: *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology*, Athens 25-31 May 1986, Athens 1988, Volume II, pp. 465-470.

**SB X 10230**

With the publication of P.Palau Rib. 3 (a re-edition of SB X 10231), which has been redated on the basis of the handwriting and parallel texts to the 3rd/4th century AD, there are consequences for SB X 10230, because it was written on the verso of P.Palau Rib. 3. As the text on the verso will have been written after the text on the recto we should date SB X 10230 (an amulet) to the 4th century AD.

**SB X 10253**

This text was originally published in APF 18, 1966, 40-41. In that edition line 8 has Μεχέιρ ἰϑ̄ which was correctly converted to 12 March, 131 BC. Line 8 in SB X 10253 presents Μεχέιρ ἰδ̄ which is presumably a misprint.

**SB X 10256**

The day and the month of the document are known: they correspond to 11 (or 12, if allowance has to be made for a leap year) September. Nero reigned from 13 October, AD 54 until 9 June, AD 68. Thus the document belongs to 11 (or 12) September of any of the years AD 55-67, not AD 54-68, as given in the edition.

**SB X 10521**

It seems likely that the writer of this letter came from the Oxyrhynchite nome. Lines 3-5 preserve παρὰ Πιτύρω[νος ? | καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας [ | τοῦ Ὁξυρυγγίτου νομοῦ. This will have consisted of the normal elements at the beginning of a letter: name and possibly status to judge by the equivalent section in line 2 and place of origin. The editor considers the likelihood of being able to supplement ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ὁξυρυγγι]-τῶν πόλεως in lines 2-3. All this points to the place of origin being the Oxyrhynchite nome, rather than Hermopolis Magna as given in SB. That the ostrakon was found in Ashmunein does not necessarily exclude Oxyrhynchite origin.

**SB X 10527**

In lines 5-6 year 14 of Antoninus is referred to as the previous year. This means that the document was written in year 15 of Antoninus, which was AD 151-152, not AD 152-153, as given in the edition. The wrong dating is perpetuated in G.M. Parassoglou, *Imperial Estates in Roman Egypt*, Amsterdam 1978, p. 89 and H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romain*, Suppl., Paris 1982, p. 137 in the lists including the procurator usiacus Aelius Socraticus, who appears in this text.

**SB XII 10896**

In lines 6-7 the Greek text has Μεσο(ρη) | κζ̄. In JJP 16/17, 1971, p. 100 this has been incorrectly translated as “26. Mesore”. This mistake led to an incorrect date being given. It should be Mesore 27, which yields the corresponding date as 20 August, AD 110.

**SB XII 10961**

If this text is to be dated to the late second century AD, then year 4 in line 6 can only be that of Septimius Severus. It is likely that Ἐπίφ in line 6 corresponds to 25 June - 24 July, AD 196, but of Χυάκ in line 8 one cannot be sure. It could be 28 November - 27 December, AD 195, but is more likely to be 27 November - 26 December, AD 196, that is in the following year. However it is safe to date the papyrus very close to AD 195-196.

**SB XII 11053**

Using the system developed by L. Koenen in *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemäische Königsfeste*, Meisenheim am Glan 1977, one may convert Dystros 26 of year 19 of Ptolemy II Philadelphos to its Julian equivalent of 22 March, 267 BC.

I should perhaps draw attention to a minor, but, perhaps, at times perplexing mistake in Koenen's book, especially as it has not, as far as I can see, been noted in reviews. On p. 90 he provides two

examples of how his system should be used. In the first example the imaginary date is year 16, Gorpaios 12. In the second stage of his system the numeral representing the day of the month has to be added to the number taken from the tables (as described in stage 1.). In the example the number 16 has been used, which is, of course, the numeral, which represents the year and not the day. Thus the calculation is wrong. Instead of coming to the corresponding date of “8. September 270 v. Chr.” we should have 4 September, 270 BC.

#### **SB XII 11062**

In the introduction to the publication of this text in APF 22/23, 1974, 151, the editor mentions that the number written after Ἐπίφ (in line 7) was probably represented by two letters. I would agree having looked at the photograph. Thus he concludes correctly that “the document was probably written between 11 and 29 Epeiph (4 - 23 July), A.D. 168.” The corresponding dates of 4 - 23 July contain a tiny mistake, it should read 5 - 23 July.

#### **SB XIV 11847 (= P.Oxy. X 1317)**

This text is to be dated between 21-29 (there is an unidentifiable letter after the kappa) Soterios (= Payni) of year 10 of Domitian. This can be converted to 15-23 June, AD 91, not 16-25 June, AD 91 as stated in SB which follows the dating given in the edition of P.Oxy. X 1317, in J. Bingen, *Au temps où on lisait le grec en Égypte*, Bruxelles 1977, p. 14 (P.Oxy. X 1317 had originally only been described before it was sent to the collection in Brussels).

#### **SB XVI 12274**

BL IX 281 reported the corrections made to this small fragment by W. Clarysse in CE 65, 1990, 353. The conversions of the date given by Clarysse were relayed into BL. One of the conversions was wrong. Payni 15 of year 29 converts to 11 July, 152 BC in the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor, not 11 July, 149 as given in CE 65, 1990, 353. This correction has already been made by colleagues in Louvain in their data-base of Ptolemaic texts.

#### **SB XVIII 13611**

In the ed.pr. of this text references are made to Mecheir 6, which is then used as the basis for the conversion to the Julian date of 27 February, 131 BC. The Greek text presents Μεχείρ ε! In APF 17, 1962, 119, F. Uebel cites this text as “P. Giss. Bibl. Inv. 199: 6. Mecheir 39. Jahr (= 27. 2. 131a)”. I expected that line 5 should probably have Μεχείρ c. At my request Prof. M. Landfester kindly sent me an excellent photograph. The upper portion of the letter after Μεχείρ is very close to the existing edge of the papyrus. As a result it is possible to suppose that an Epsilon once stood there, but has now lost its upper circular portion. After a closer examination, however, it seems quite clear to me that what could appear to be ink on the photograph is, in fact, only a slightly darker bit of papyrus. The letter is Stigma and not Epsilon. As all references are to Mecheir 6 (except for the Greek text) in the original publication as well as elsewhere, I assume that a simple typing error produced Μεχείρ ε in the Greek text, which in turn found its way into SB.

#### **SB XVIII 13674-13677**

In CE 61, 1986, 332-333, J. Bingen discusses various reasons for placing these inscriptions in the first century BC. The exact date presented by SB XVIII 13675 (Epeiph 16, year 30) can only belong to the reign of Ptolemaios IX Soter II and corresponds to 26 July, 87 BC, not 26 June, 87 BC, as given in the article and accepted in SB (nor 27 June, 87 as converted in SEG XXXVI 1412) - both wrong dates were presumably calculated on the basis of Pauni 16 (Pauni is normally the month mentioned in these texts) rather than Epeiph 16. This also affects SB XVIII 13674 and 13676, both of which are taken to predate Epeiph 16 of year 30.

In the case of SB XVIII 13677 line 3 has Τρυφά[ίνη]ς, (ἔτους) ι[- - -]. As noted by J. Bingen (CE 61, 1986, 333, note 3) year 10 converts to 108-107 BC (SEG XXXVI 1414 dates 13677 to 108-107

BC). It is, however, possible that a second letter was written after the Iota (after the Iota the surface of the stone is damaged and cracked) to make any year from 10 to 19 possible. In this case the last possibility would be year 19 of Ptolemaios X Alexander I, which lasted from 96-95 BC. It seems to be the case in SB that the time span of “108/7-99/8 v.Chr.” comes from continuing to count the regnal years of Cleopatra III as if they had been continued (year 19 would be 99/8 v.Chr.) after Ptolemaios X Alexander I had murdered her and chosen Cleopatra Berenice as his wife (G. Hölbl, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches*, Darmstadt 1994, p. 187 and 189, J.E.G. Whitehorne, *Cleopatras*, London-New York 1994, p. 143 and 149). The time span given for the dating of this text ought to be 108/7-96/5 BC.

#### **SB XVIII 13682-13683**

In the ed.pr. of SB XVIII 13682 in M. El-Saghir - J.-C. Golvin - M. Reddé - H. El-Sayed - G. Wagner, *Le camp romain de Louqsor*, Cairo 1986, p. 107, G. Wagner converted the date correctly. It is 17 March, AD 126 (cf. also SEG XXXVI 1419), not 7 March, AD 126, as given in SB. The date 17 March, AD 126 seems to have been transferred mistakenly to SB XVIII 13683, which carries no date at all.

#### **SB XVIII 13730**

In lines 27-28 we read Ἰουλιανὸς γενόμενος ἀρχιερέυς. As noted by R. Pintaudi in the introduction to O.Narm. (p. 12 with note 10, where references to lists and literature are given) this Ioulianos can be identified with Salvios Iulianos known to us in BGU I 82 (from AD 185). Thus the years 23 to 30, which are mentioned in lines 23 and 28-29, can only really refer to those of Commodus. The date in lines 28-30 can be converted to 17 June, AD 190. In lines 23-24 and 28-29 we read τριακόντου ἔτ[ου]ς and τριακόντου ἔτους respectively. Although no longer verifiable on a photograph, τριακοστοῦ ἔτ[ου]ς and τριακοστοῦ ἔτους should surely have been read instead.

#### **SB XVIII 13731**

The last dated basilikos grammateus is Aurelius Achilleus in AD 245 (BGU IV 1069.3, G. Bastianini - J.E.G. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt*, Firenze 1987, p. 126). The disappearance of this office is likely to have been a result of the reforms of Philippus Arabs (P.J. Parsons, *Philippus Arabs and Egypt*, JRS 57, 1967, 134-141) during the years of his reign AD 244-249, as has been referred to in J.D. Thomas, *The Introduction of the Dekaprotai and Comarchs into Egypt in the Third Century A.D.*, ZPE 19, 1975, 119, note 41. It is thus almost certain that the text, which mentions basilikoi grammateis in line 4, can be dated no later than the middle of the third century AD: cf. also my correction to SB XX 15145 below. As a dating for the text late second to mid-third century AD seems best (cf. R. Pintaudi in O.Narm. p. 12 concerning the paleographical dating of the hands of the ostraca found in Narmouthis).

#### **SB XVIII 13910**

In the ed.pr. of this text in ZPE 61, 1985, 49 note on line 7 the date Pachon 19 of year 54 of Ptolemaios VIII Euergetes II was incorrectly converted to 5 June 116, BC. It should have been 6 June, 116 BC.

#### **SB XVIII 13996 (= CPR I 74 + CPR I 93)**

It is clear from lines 3 and 6 that both parties come from Herakleopolis, which should therefore be given as the provenience, instead of Arsinoites, which was the place where the papyrus was found (see CPR I, p. 191 and 198 where “erster fayumer Fund” is applied to both CPR I 74 and CPR I 93).

#### **SB XVIII 14034**

The date is Hadrianos 9 of year 9. In ZPE 66, 1986, 142-143 the editor says that year 9 is that of “Antoninus Pius (167/168) or of Septimius Severus (200/201) or of Severus Alexander (229/230)”. “Antoninus Pius (167/168)” is mistaken: if year 9 of Antoninus Pius is intended, then the year in question is AD 145-146. I think it more likely that year 9 of Marcus Aurelius und Verus is meant, in which case AD 168-169 is the year in question. The year 167/168 was used as the basis for the

conversion of the dates in SB, p. 494, which was in turn followed by BL IX 310 without making the necessary corrections. The date can be converted to 5 December of the years AD 168, 200 and 229.

### SB XX 15009

Reference is made in line 5 of this text to a present second year. Assuming that Appianus is indeed still alive (for his death between 12 June AD 258 and 29 September AD 259 see ZPE 94, 1992, 124 and cf. D. Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-Century A.D. Egypt*, Cambridge 1991, p. 45, who prefers a date “in the later part of A.D. 260”) and that this text can be classed as a document concerned with the running of the Appianus estate (cf. ZPE 77, 1989, 222 and Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism*, p. 44, where the earliest document mentioning Appianus as owner of the estate dates to April AD 248), there are no fewer than four possibilities for the year 2 within the period between AD 250 and AD 255 (see Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism*, p. 423). Year 2 of Macrianus and Quietus (AD 261-262) can, however, most probably be ruled out, because by this time Appianus was dead. Thus the document can be dated to the period AD 250-255.

### SB XX 15145

The papyrus contains a circular letter addressed to strategi and royal scribes. An official letter which appears to concern the authorisation for the collection of tax was appended. This official letter, which begins in line 12 of the whole text, contains the names of the emperor Gordian on the basis of which the whole text was dated to AD 238-244 (i.e. the reign of Gordian) or later. We can be slightly more accurate, as Thomas Kruse informed me, if we attend to a piece of evidence that appears to have escaped attention so far. The circular letter was addressed to the strategi and the royal scribes. As has already been mentioned in connection with my correction to SB XVIII 13731 above, the disappearance of the office of the royal scribe is likely to have been a result of the reforms of Philippus Arabs during the years of his reign AD 244-249. Thus it is unlikely that SB XX 15145 postdates AD 249 and it can, therefore, be dated to AD 238 - c. 249.

In the following table I have listed corrections to dates, which have come into being through minor slips, for which I have no explanation.

Edition	Date in the edition	Corrected date
SB VIII 9749 <sup>2</sup>	25 January - 24 February, AD 642	26 January - 24 February, AD 642
SB VIII 9912	23 May, AD 270	23 May, AD 271 <sup>3</sup>
SB X 10263	25 October, AD 205	25 October, AD 204
SB X 10274	AD 99	28 September - 27 October, AD 98
SB X 10308	AD 11	30 June, AD 15
SB X 10509 <sup>4</sup>	20 December, 273 BC	21 December, 273 BC
SB X 10549	27-31 March, AD 204	27-31 March, AD 201
SB X 10565	26 May, AD 155	16 May, AD 155
SB XII 10788	26 July, AD 64 <sup>5</sup>	25 July, AD 64

<sup>2</sup> In J.B. Simonsen, *Studies in the Genesis and Early Development of the Caliphal Taxation System*, Copenhagen 1988, p. 82, SB VIII 9749 is referred to as PERF 553 and dated to 29 January, AD 642. The conversion was carried out on the basis of the receipt being dated 4 Mecheir. I assume that some slip has led to the introduction of the numeral 4, because in the text only the month Mecheir is mentioned.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. D. Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-Century A.D. Egypt*, Cambridge 1991, pp. 55 and 79, where reference is made to P.Chept. 11 (= SB VIII 9912) as dating from May AD 271.

<sup>4</sup> The conversion made by Fr. Uebel in APF 19, 1969, 69 was wrong.

<sup>5</sup> This conversion is to be found in the introduction to the ed.pr. of the text in BASP 7, 1970, 87.



Edition	Date in the edition	Corrected date
SB XII 10872	12 July - 12 August, 218 BC	14 July - 12 August, 219 BC
SB XII 10899	4 December, AD 134	4 December, AD 133
SB XII 10911 <sup>6</sup>	10 November, AD 146	10 October, AD 146
	6 March, AD 147	9 March, AD 147
	5 April, AD 147	8 April, AD 147
SB XII 10967	9 November, AD 150 <sup>7</sup>	9 December, AD 150
SB XVIII 13180	6 August, AD 75	6 August, AD 76
SB XVIII 13182	4 April, AD 88	3 April, AD 88
SB XVIII 13184 <sup>8</sup>	26 May, AD 167	26 May, AD 168
SB XVIII 13189	15 April, AD 146	18 April, AD 146
SB XVIII 13194	12 July, AD 189	13 July, AD 189
SB XVIII 13206 <sup>9</sup>	2 September, AD 146	2 September, AD 145
SB XVIII 13301	14 January, AD 195	9 January, AD 195
SB XVIII 13606	19 October, AD 38	19 October, AD 37

Cases where allowance for a leap year has to be made or where allowance has been made incorrectly for a leap year (\*) are listed below.

Edition	Date in the edition	Corrected date
SB VI 9061	22 January, AD 260	23 January, AD 260
SB VI 9317 a 36-38	1 December, AD 148	2 December, AD 147
SB VI 9317 b 49-52	1 December, AD 148	2 December, AD 147
SB XII 10795	28 January, AD 28	29 January, AD 28
SB XII 10955	5 February, AD 188	6 February, AD 188
SB XII 11133	20 February, AD 196 <sup>10</sup>	21 February, AD 296
SB XVIII 13199	12 February, AD 120	13 February, AD 120
SB XVIII 13582	20 September, AD 184 *	19 September, AD 184
SB XVIII 13637	17 September, AD 99	18 September, AD 99

Heidelberg

James M.S. Cowey

<sup>6</sup> These are corrections to the three dates, all of which were slightly wrongly converted by P.J. Sijpesteijn in his book *Customs Duties in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, p. 112, where SB XII 10911 is listed as no. 202.

<sup>7</sup> Correction to the conversion of the date in line 29 of this text in the ed.pr. in ZPE 6, 1970, 274.

<sup>8</sup> AD 167 from this text is also to be found in the list of ἐπιτηρητὰ ἱερῶς πύλης Σοῦνης in O.Cair. GPW, p. 132.

<sup>9</sup> AD 146 from this text is also to be found in the list of πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν in Memnoneia in O.Cair. GPW, p. 130.

<sup>10</sup> A typing error in SB XII must have led to AD 196 instead of AD 296.