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Notes on P.Princeton 1142

P.Princ. II 42 is a grain-account on land from the twelfth year of Domitian. On the basis of the outstanding plates of both recto and verso in the edition some corrections are here suggested in the reading of the personal names, the toponyms and the figures of the text.

The recto lists payments on land in several Oxyrhynchite villages, a.o. Athychis (ll.2,7) and Enteis (l.5) in the upper toparchy. As a rule the text gives the name of the owner, the name of the village (in the nominative), and the amount to be paid,

e.g. 1.2 Διονύσια Πετοσί(ριος) ‘Αθύχης (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαςς) ἵ πληρ. |
1.7 Θαούνις ‘Αρπακσίς(ος) ‘Αθυχ(ις) (ἀρτάβαςς) στ.χ[ | ] |

In l.5 mention is made of a previous owner and the pattern is expanded as follows:

η α(ὐτή) Ἑντείτις πρό(ερον) Ἡρακ(λείδου) Διονυ(σίου) καὶ τή(ς) ἀδελ(φῆς) (ἀρτάβαςς) μδ.1.

L.6 is read by the editor as follows:

η α(ὐτή) Θμοι(νςβθης?) Θμοθ ἵ ς

The reading of the village name Θμοι(νςβθης?), drastically abbreviated, was already doubted by the editor and by P.Pruneti2. Thmoinepsobthis, however, is a locality in the eastern Oxyrhynchite toparchy, unlike Athychis and Enteis, which are in the upper toparchy. The date "16 Thoth" is unexpected after the pattern of the account and the absence of the horizontal stroke which is expected above the day number confirms our suspicions.

In fact, we should simply read the village name Θμοιθοθης3. This village has but a single entry in Pruneti’s book: Θμοιθοθης in P.Hib. II 248 fragm. 2 l.17 (ca. 250 B.C.) in a list of villages of the upper toparchy. A few more instances, recently added by J.E.G.Whitehorne in his note to l. 9 of P.Oxy XLIX 3489, confirm this localization.

A second date is mentioned in ll.3-4.

Διονύσια Πετοσί(ριος) ‘Αθυχ(ις) (πυροῦ) (ἀρτ.) ἵ πληρ. |

Instead of a date we again expect a place name. And again the horizontal stroke above the day-indication is missing. From the plate it is clear that we should not read Παῦνις, but Ποῦνις, which must then be the name of a village5. On the verso, where ‘Αθυχ(ις), Ἑντείτις and Θμοι(θω-

---

1 Editor Προτ(αρο--) Ἡρακ(λείδης) Διονυ(σίου) καὶ τή ἀδελ(φῆς).
2 P.PRUNETI, I centri abitati dell’ ossirinchite. Repertorio toponomastico, Papyrologica Florentina 9 (1981), p. 57 n.1. The same village name should no doubt be supplemented in SB I 1945 l.6, where the editor reads Θμομονεψ( ), which is then expanded to Θμομονεψ(ις) by Calderini, Dizionario and by Pruneti.
3 The same correction should be made in 1.22 and 1.37.
4 Editor Προτ(αρο--) Κλαυδία Ἡρακλείδου. For the correction, see Bibl. Orient. 42 (1985), col.341 no.895. For Claudia Herakleia, see also Pap. Lugd.-Bat. 25 no.27 l.11 (forthcoming).
5 For the palaeographical difference between ήνω and ήνο, compare Κλαυδία(ς) in 1.4.
All recur, we find Πούνις (νις) as a variant form of the expected Πούνις (νις) (l.18). That Πούνις (νις) and Πούνις refer to the same village is clear from the figures in l.18 on the back, where the total for 'Αθυχίς (νις) καὶ Πούνις (νις), as was already seen by the editor, "corresponds exactly to the sum of the three entries recorded on the recto, lines 2-4". Line 2 deals with Athuchis, ll.3-4 with Pounis.

This village is hitherto not attested with certainty outside the present text, but it may appear in PSI IV 315 l.8, where the editor's reading Πούνις (νις) was corrected into Πούνις (νις) by Pruneti, op. cit., p.158. On our request Mrs. Pruneti once again checked the original in Firenze, and she is now convinced that Πούνις (νις) is the most likely reading of this passage. The deleted letter is probably upsilon 6.

The correspondence of the figures in ll.3-4 with the total in l.18 is paralleled further on in the text: l.6 corresponds to l.22 and l.7 matches, with minimal difference, ll.25-26. For Enteiis, however, the figures in l.5 do not correspond to those of l.20.

Another problem is the reading and interpretation of l.9, written by the second hand and transcribed as follows by the editor: π.ε iδ (έτους) ρκεϊ καὶ η δ., (γίνεται) ρκεϊ. The addition 125 1/8 and 1/8 . 1/4 = 125 1/4 1/8 is impossible and, as the editor remarks, it is not easy to find an explanation for the occurrence of a 14th year here 7. We therefore suggest the following reading: Ἐντείνις iδ (στιχάκις) ρκεϊ κλήρου (χιχής) δ., (γίνεται) ρκεϊ. The only remaining problem is the connection of the figure ρκεϊ with the rest of the text.

In order to reach this solution we have to take a closer look at the incomplete figure of l.5, viz. μδί. The fraction(s) of artabas or the choinikes which were written in the lacuna at the end of l.5 and/or l.7 can be obtained by subtracting the total of ll.2-7 (88 3/4, 8 choiinikes) from the total given in l.8 (89 1/4, 1 choinix). The difference of 13 choinikes has to be divided between l.5 and l.7. As stated above, the figure of l.7 (6 1/2 χι) finds its counterpart in l.26 (6 1/2). We are not able to decide which of the two figures is exact. It cannot therefore be excluded that the scribe, after having written a chi by mistake, did not write a number at all in the lacuna of l.7. In that case all 13 choinikes (= 1/4 artaba, 3 choinikes) have to be supplemented at the end of l.5. If we add the maximum number obtainable in l.5 (44 1/4 artabas, 3 choinikes) of Enteiis to the figure mentioned for that village in l.20 (71 artabas, 1 choinix), we reach the total amount of 115 1/4 artabas, 4 choiinikes. This total closely resembles the 125 1/4 1/8 artabas (= 125 1/4 artabas, 5 choinikes) of l.9. We therefore think that l.9 in fact contains the total amount for the village Enteiis, miscalculated by 10 artabas. The rounding off of 4 choiinikes to 1/8 artaba causes no problem.

We append a few remarks on the first column of the verso (ll. 10-17). In l. 13 the editor reads κοη. In his commentary he points to a connection of the accounts on the recto and verso (col. 1): "The total in l.13 exactly corresponds to the sum of the entries in lines 2-3... An entry of 21 1/8 art. is found also in l.32." As a result of our corrections in ll.3 and 4 this note is rather unsatisfactory now. First of all, there can no longer be any relation between the total 21 1/8 of ll.2-3 and the 21 1/8 of l.32. Ll.2-3 now refer to Athychis and Pounis, l.32 to Enteiis and Athychis (cf. l.33).

6 In P.Oxy VI 966 the reading Πουνεως is certain and cannot be changed into Πουνεως (original checked by R.Coles). In P.Oxy X 1285 l.12 and 105 the village Πουνεως belongs to the μειστα τοπορχία and cannot therefore be identical with Pounis. The Πουνεως κτίμα (ς) in P.Oxy XVIII 2197 l.212 (6th cent.) has probably nothing to do with our village.
7 The dating in a 14th year was preferred to that of the 12th year by P.PRUNETI, op.cit., p.25 s.v. ἈΘΥΧΙΣ, n.1.
8 For the reading Ἐντείνις, cf. the same word in l.20; Ἐντείνις recurs in l.31 (read as by the editor), also in connection with the village Enteiis.
Secondly, there is no obvious reason why we should add up the amounts of the villages Athychis and Pounis (ll.2-3), leaving out the other amount of Pounis in l.4.

The connection of the recto and the verso, therefore, cannot be established by the reading $\kappa\varphi\eta\iota\iota$ of l.13. The connection between ll.14-15 and l.4a on the other hand remains unaffected, and proves a certain relationship between the recto and the verso. This relation can be upheld for l.13 as well if we read $\kappa\lambda\eta$ instead of $\kappa\varphi\eta\iota\iota$. The bracket at the end of the line is an abbreviation mark for $\kappa\lambda\eta(\rho\upsilon\upsilon\chi\kappa\eta\varsigma)$. Thus l.13 can be connected to the revised reading of l.9. If this interpretation is correct, column I of the verso listed the payments according to the respective categories of land on which they were due.