

deleted. For ὄσου ἐστὶν ἀρουρηδοῦ cf. H.H.July, o.c., p.42; P.Vindob.Salomons 8, 5 n.

85. ἐφ' ἡμισίῳ: vgl. P.Vindob.Salomons 9 introduction.

86. κληρ(ονόμ ): one or more heirs?

87. ἐκ τοῦ Πρωταγόρου: the same κληρός is mentioned in line 64.

καλαμ( ): this abbreviation has to be connected with καλάμη or a derivative thereof.

88. κελύω(v): this is a kind of reed; cf. P.Ryl.IV 627, 192n.

96a. This line belongs to the entry which ends in P.Flor.I 64, 96; cf. P.Flor.I 64, 31-34.

97. [ε]ῖ: cf. our correction in line 36.

100. The rent of 6 talents is arrived at on the basis of 3.000 drachmae per aroura; therefore, the number of arouras should be 12.

102. The number of the arouras (ἡ) seems to have been corrected from 5. If this is right the total of χέρσος land is 12 arouras. The total of the plot was 24 arouras. We are, however, unable to read the amount ιβ at the ends of lines 97 and 98.

Amsterdam

P.J.Sijpesteijn

K.A.Worp

#### REMARKS ON SOME PAPYRI

(1) It has often been said that names attested only once should be checked and rechecked as there is every chance that we are dealing with ghost-names.

In P.Wisc.II 63,2 the editor reads with much misgiving a new proper name: Πλου-τόμη. Studying the photograph again we came to the conclusion that the papyrus has in fact a very common proper name: Ὀλυμπία.

For the proper name Χωειλᾶς Preisigke's *Namenbuch* can only cite P.Lond.III 929 (p.43), 65. A check of the original convinced us that this is a ghost-name. The papyrus has Ζωεῖλος.

In Foraboschi's *Onomasticon* the only documentary evidence given for the proper name Θεραμοῦσις is P.L.Bat.XI 13,4-5. On a photograph kindly provided by our Vienna colleagues we were able to read the name of the mother of the borrower as Θεναμοῦνεως. Θεναμοῦνις is a well-known proper name.<sup>1)</sup>

The proper name Εὐτρηγεῖος occurs only in PSI III 200,3. Everybody who has ever worked on Byzantine papyri knows that τ and γ look often deceitfully identical in these late papyri. We suppose, therefore, that Εὐτρηγεῖος has to be read which made unrecognizable by itacism is the common name Εὐτρυγίος.<sup>2)</sup>

(2) In our institute copy of E.Boswinkel-P.J.Sijpesteijn, *Greek Papyri* we found the right transcription of lines 10-11 of P.Wisc.II 65 written in the margin of plate 43. It was made long ago.

10 ἄμα τῆ ἀπογομῶσι λαβῆν με παρ[ᾶ σοῦ τὰ λοιπὰ νομίσματα/κεράτια. κερῖα]  
11 ἡ ναυλωτικὴ κ[αῖ] ἐπερωτηθε[ῖς ἀμολόγησα.]

What the editor took as the symbol for τάλαντα is in fact part of a kind of paragraphos continued horizontally above αρηγίω in line 12. The purpose of such a paragraphos is to separate the body of the text from the signature (cf. Tafel VIII b in ZPE 20, 1976 for the same phenomenon).

(3) P.Jand.IV 61 is a λόγος βύσεως οἴνου from an unknown κτῆμα. The contents of 6 winevats are given. In line 5 the editor reads: γ̄ λήνου ζρνα. This is an

1) The proper name Πραοῦτος can be deleted from Foraboschi's *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum*. For an unknown reason the editors of PSI VIII listed in index B 1 Πραοῦτος φροντιστοῦ from text no.954.44 and from there it was taken over by Foraboschi as a separate proper name. The editor of P.Laur.I 4 reads in line 13 the name of a town-councillor as Διαδέλιος. This name is not attested in the papyri. A check of the plate convinces us that the name reads in fact as Διάδελφος. The new name in Foraboschi's *Onomasticon* Ὀρσενούφιος occurring only in P.Ross.-Georg.IV 27 should be deleted. The text has δι(ᾶ) Ὀρσενούφιος, so we are dealing with the genitive of the well attested name Ὀρσενούφιος. The elsewhere unattested patronymic Πιταύριος (gen.) in P.Leit.12.21 should be read as Πιτεῦριος, genitive of the well attested name Πιτεῦρις.

2) We are not able to decipher the badly mutilated lines 4 and 5 of P.Wisc.II 42

impossible number. On a photograph kindly sent to us by H.G.Gundel we saw that the correct reading is Αρνα (= 1.151). Probably just a misprint.

(4) The editor of P.Wisc.II 67 is very much troubled by his reading ἦνθεν in line 2. On plate XXII one can see that ἦνθεν is not an impossible reading but that the reading ἦλθεν is slightly preferable (cf. the λ of θελήσων in line 4). If the reading ἦλθεν is accepted the interpretation of this text changes. ἦλθεν stands for ἦλθον (or ἦλθον)<sup>3)</sup> and line 2 has to be translated as follows: "Anup and Abraamius of Taruthinus came and accused Irene - - -." The person who wrote this note must in that case have been the person to whom Anup and Abraamius complained. This does not necessarily imply that the reading of the verso is wrong but the original should be checked again. Instead of the dubious reading [Ἄ]ν[οῦπ] καὶ Ἀβραμοῦ the name of the sender of this note may be found there.

(5) CPR V 10 is a letter of a strategus. In line 4 the cognomen of a hitherto unknown praeses Thebaidos defied reading. The detailed and clear description of the traces still discernible and the help of a still unpublished papyrus of the Vienna collection<sup>4)</sup> where the name can be more easily read enabled us to find the solution. The papyrus has Φλαυῖου Ἡ[ο]λυασίου.<sup>5)</sup>

(6) The clear description by the editor of the traces at the beginning of line 6 of P.Wisc.II 75 and the realization that the superposed letter was a γ helped us to solve the riddle which baffled the editor. In lines 4-5 the papyrus has πρὸς στιγμῆς ὄρον. The word στιγμῆ has not occurred before in the papyri and although the expression στιγμῆς ὄρον is not attested LSJ cite several examples of comparable nature which fit the required meaning of P.Wisc.II 75 exactly: (ἐν) στιγμῆ χρόνου/καιροῦ. The writer of P.Wisc.II 75 wants to say that he needs the assistant Aμοίς for a very

completely, but we are convinced that in line 4 after Ἡρασιδίδος κλη( ) instead of Αλη( ) has to be read. There is in this document a question of κλη(ρονόμος/-μοι).

3) For ἦλθον instead of ἦλθον cf. B.G.Mandilaras, The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri, Athens 1973, § 317 (6); ibidem, § 896 for the construction ἦλθεν αἰτιώμενοι. For ο>ε cf. F.T.Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, Milano 1976, p.289; ibidem, pp.278ff. for a > ε.

4) P.Vindob.Gr.Inv.Nr.35459 from 339 A.D. This text will be published by K.A.Worp.

5) For the personal name Evasius cf. W.Schulze, Zur Geschichte der lateinischen

short moment only and that he will send him back in no time.<sup>6)</sup>

(7) P. Amh. II 82 is a very interesting but unluckily heavily mutilated text. N. Lewis<sup>7)</sup> improved the text in several regards already. We have one small contribution to make which will, however, not help very much to forward the understanding of this text. In line 15 the papyrus can be read/restored as τὸν [ἀν]τ' ἐμοῦ ἐπιτήδει[ον].<sup>8)</sup>

(8) P. Oxy. XLV 3265 was in the first instance published with a photograph (plate XXIX) in *Collectanea Papyrologica. Texts Published in Honor of H. C. Youtie II* (= PTA 20), no. 81. On the plate one can see that line 16 runs as follows: (γίνονται) κεντ(ηάρια) Ε, (γίνονται) ὁμοῦ (τάλαντα) Ἄτκ.<sup>9)</sup>

(9) Text no. 93 in *Collectanea Papyrologica II* is a sale for future delivery of vegetable seed and wine.<sup>10)</sup> Several sales for future delivery of wine are known.<sup>11)</sup> They all contain the provision that the seller will compensate the buyer in good wine if by a certain month the wine is found to be sour, unfermented or musty. The same promise is made by the seller in the text under review (lines 12ff.). Disturbing is the circumstance that, according to the editor, without any connecting particle a new sentence starts with ἀλλάσω. On pl. XXXIV one can see that the papyrus has in fact ἀλλασον = ἀλλάσωων.

*Eigennamen*, Berlin 1904, index s.n. and p. 161, n. 6 (we owe this reference to J. R. Rea).

6) Another small correction to P. Wisc. II 52 may be added. Supplementing π[αρ] αὐτοῦ] | [εἰς σπέρματα in lines 9-10 of this text removes the curious word order.

7) CdE 58, 1954, pp. 290ff.

8) Two small corrections may be added: line 1: read τῶι; line 11: read ἀλλὰ ἐπι-στάματι.

9) P. Oxy. XLV 3266 was also previously published in *Collectanea Papyrologica II*, no. 82 (cf. pl. XXX). The symbol for τάλαντα in line 8 has a curious form. If, however, we read (γίνονται) (τάλαντα) φ the remaining symbol looks like the usual one for (τάλαντα).

10) Cf. for this kind of documents R. S. Bagnall, *Prices in "Sales on Delivery"?*, GRBS 18, 1977, pp. 85ff.

11) Cf. P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Addenda et Corrigenda zu Wiener Texten*, ZPE 24, 1977, pp. 105-6.

(10) In P.L.Bat.XI 13.15-17 the editor transcribed τοῦ δ' ἐκτε[ί]σεως δυν[α]τος χρόνου καὶ τῆς ἀποδ[ό]σεως μὴ γενομένης ἀπ[ο]πέ[ι]ω κτλ. However, in similar contexts the expression τοῦ ὑπερπεσόντος χρόνου is often used.<sup>12)</sup> On a clear photograph, provided by our colleagues from Vienna, we are able to read and restore: τοῦ δὲ ὑπερπεσόντος<sup>13)</sup> χρόνου . καὶ τῆς ἀποδ[ό]σεως μὴ γενομένης τελήσῃ<sup>14)</sup> κτλ. These readings, however, do not eliminate all difficulties:

a) We fail to see, which meaning (if any) the ink trace before καὶ has. It might be possible to see ε, but this yields no meaning.

b) As it seems, the scribe mixed up things. Either one needs twice a genitive absolute (τοῦ δὲ χρόνου ὑπερπεσόντος καὶ τῆς ἀποδόσεως μὴ γενομένης) or one expects a formula like τῆς δὲ ἀποδόσεως μὴ γενομένης τελέσῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὑπερπεσόντος χρόνου τοὺς τόκους κτλ.

(11) P.L.Bat.XI 9, the verso of which seems to have been mentioned by C. Wessely in MPER V, 1892, 86 (he dates the text to 424 A.D.), is a baffling document because of its dating formula. Some smaller misreadings may be corrected here. In lines 14-15 the papyrus has ἀποδώσῃ σοι μέχρι τῆς δλων[ί]ας.<sup>15)</sup> In line 9 ἀνό- (ματος) instead of δ(ιὰ) τοῦ should be read. The exact reading of the papyrus in line 8 is ὕμιου (in line 13 the η is corrected from υ) and in line 12 μετοξὺ (there might have been an attempt on the part of the scribe to correct the ο). In line 2 one has to read ἐ[π]οικίου instead of τ[οῦ] καί. However, we have not succeeded in reading the name of the village completely satisfactorily. As the text stands now, one has to understand ἐποικίου perhaps as a mistake for ἐποικίων, but villages of these names in the Heracleopolite nome are unknown to us. Anyway, the personal name Αὐ-εῶνις δ καὶ Ἰσὰν δ καὶ Ὀσυτῆς in Foraboschi's Onomasticon Alterum Papyrologicum should be deleted.<sup>16)</sup>

12) Cf. P.Oslo II 41, 16n.; H. Kühnert, Zum Kreditgeschäft in den hellenistischen Papyri Ägyptens bis Diokletian, diss. Freiburg/Br. 1965, p. 73ff.

13) In SB VI 9270 (a republication of SB VI 9191) we propose to supplement in the lacuna at the beginning of line 11 ὑπερπεσόντος instead of ἐξελεθόντος/ἐνασάντος.

14) An alternative reading might be τελαίῳ (lege τελέσῃ).

15) δλωνία has in this text the meaning of "threshing"; cf. P.Harr. 81, 3; P.Oxy. XVI 1976, 19; 1977, 6.

16) The name Μηλοίπων Σερένος Ὀχδης in Foraboschi's Onomasticon is a ghost-name too. For this text (SB III 6209) cf. BL II, 2, p. 121.

(12) P.Cairo inv.10585 (published by us in Stud.Pap. 16, 1977, 16) was assigned to the Hermopolite nome (?). Three place-names are mentioned in this text, viz. Ἰβίων (line 7), Πανίσκου(υ) (line 10) and Ἰσιδώρου (line 11). Of these, the first two can be situated in the Arsinoite nome and the third in the Hermopolite nome (cf. our note to line 7). A check of the plate will convince the reader that instead of Πανίσκου Τιτωῶ(εως) has to be read in line 10. This points to a Hermopolite village of that name (cf. Preisigke, WB III, Abschn. 16a, s.n.). For place names with Ἰβίων, many of which are attested for the Hermopolite nome, see A. Calderini, Ἰβίων nei nomi di luogo dell' Egitto graeco-romano, Mém. Maspero, II, p.345-355. The provenance of this text was already indicated by Grenfell-Hunt (Catalogue général ..., X, no. 10585) as "probably from Ashmunein". They date the text to the 3rd or early 4th century A.D.

The editor of P.IFAO III 51 reads in line 2 the name of a village as Σαραπίνου and situates this papyrus in the Hermopolite nome. In an extensive note he defends the view that this village should be identified with a village of the same name occurring in SB VI 9219, 15. Two remarks are in order here:

a) P.IFAO III 51, 2 reads ἀπὸ κώμης Σαραπιήου, as the plate shows. This village is frequently attested (cf. Preisigke, WB III, Abschn. 16a, s.n.).

b) SB VI 9219, 15 raises a problem. One should like to read here Σαραπιήου too, of course. However, a clear photograph of the papyrus provided by our colleagues from Vienna showed that this is a rather difficult reading. The shape of the letter before -ου resembles in this hand a ny much more than an eta. However, it does not seem absolutely excluded to read -ηου. Either one has to accept the original reading Σαραπίνου (and admit the occurrence of a village-name not attested elsewhere) or one does not admit its occurrence and reads Σαραπιήου. Quis diiudicabit?

(13) In P.S.A. Athen 34, 3 the editor prints δημοσίου ἰατροῦ τῆς [μητρ]οπόλεως. The word μητρόπολις is not expected here. A check of the plate (no. 13) convinces us that αὐτῆς πόλεως should be read/restored.

In P.Lips 42, 8 restore likewise [αὐτῆς πόλεως]. In lines 10-11 of this papyrus one has to restore ἐ[πέ]λευσιν πεπονηθέναι (cf. P.Cairo Isid. 63, 3).

(14) Several new names occur in P.Mert. I 34. A check of the plate has enabled us to suggest some new readings:

line 4: the curves after the numerals are just numeral markings, not symbols for (καί).

line 5: we prefer to read "Ἡρω[ι? (cf. ed. note), because the names 'Αποῦτ and 'Ἡρωτᾶς disappear; cf. infra;

line 7: read ἀπὸ (ταλάντων) τ τὸ (ἡμισυ)" instead of 'Αποῦτ τοῦ Σ"; (ἡμισυ) is corrected from υ.

line 10: instead of 'Ἡρωτᾶ read Πρωτᾶ.

line 11: instead of ἀλδς ἐν τῷ read ἐν Σεντώ; for this village cf. Preisigke, WB III, Abschn. 16a s.n. The restoration ἀλδ]ς in line 10 can no longer be founded on the reading of line 11 and has to be discarded.

(15) The correct reading in P.L.Bat.XI 7 (cf. above, n.1) in line 10 is ἀμπελουργός instead of ἄμα λειτουργός. In line 12 we read ]σοῦ" instead of α]ϑῆις; supplement at the beginning of this line [τοῦ ἐργα]σίου? At the end of the same line ἀπὸ is not on the papyrus; it should be deleted. The personal name at the beginning of line 9 might well be read as Πραυοῦς. The first letter of the name has been corrected.

List of papyri for which corrections are proposed

P.Amh.II 82 (7)	P.Lond.III 929 (p.43) (1)	SB VI 9219 (12)
P. Cairo Inv.10585 (12)	P. L.Bat.XI 7 (15)	SB VI 9270 n.13
P. Coll.Youtie II 93 (9)	P. L.Bat.XI 9 (11)	P.Wisc.II 42 n.2
CPR V 10 (5)	P. L.Bat.XI 13 (1), (10)	P.Wisc.II 52 n.6
P.IFAO III 51 (12)	P. Mert.I 34 (14)	P.Wisc.II 63 (1)
P. Jand.IV 61 (3)	P.Oxy.XLV 3265 (8)	P.Wisc.II 65 (2)
P. Laur.I 4 n.1	P.Oxy.XLV 3266 n.9	P.Wisc.II 67 (4)
P. Leit.12 n.1	PSA Athen.34 (13)	P.Wisc.II 75 (6)
P. Lips.42 (13)	PSI III 200 (1)	

Amsterdam

P.J.Sijpesteijn

K.A.Worp