

W. CLARYSSE – N. KRUIT

NOTES ON P. PRINCETON II 42

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 82 (1990) 123–125

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

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 (II.2,7) and Enteiis (I.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) Ἀθῦχ(ις) (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβας) ις χβ̄
1.7 Θεῶνις Ἀρπαήσι(ος) Ἀθῦχ(ις) (ἀρτάβας) σζχ[]

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

ἡ ἀ(ὕτῃ) Ἐντεῖις πρό(ερον) Ἡρακ(λείδου) Διονυ(σίου) καὶ τῆ(ς) ἀδελ(φῆς) (ἀρτάβας) μδ¹.

L.6 is read by the editor as follows:

ἡ ἀ(ὕτῃ) Θμοι(νεψῶβθις?) Θῶθ ις

The reading of the village name Θμοι(νεψῶβθις), 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 Enteiis, 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 Θμοιθῶθις³. This village has but a single entry in Pruneti's book: Τμοιθωυτ in P.Hib. II 248 fragm. 2 I.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 II.3-4.

Διονύσια Πετοσί(ριος) Ἀθῦχ(ις) (πυροῦ) (ἀρτ.) ις χβ̄[

ἡ ἀ(ὕτῃ) Παῦνις

ἡ ἀ(ὕτῃ) πρότερο(ν) Κλαυδία(ς) Ἡρακλεία(ς)⁴ Παῦνις (ἀρτάβας) ιβζ[χζ̄]

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 Ἀθῦχ(ις), Ἐντεῖις and Θμοι(θῶ-

¹ Editor Προταρ() Ἡρακ(λείδῃ) Διονυ(σίου) καὶ τῆ ἀδελ(φῆ).

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 I.6, where the editor reads Θμουνεψ(), which is then expanded to Θμουνέψ(ις) by Calderini, *Dizionario* and by Pruneti.

³ The same correction should be made in I.22 and I.37.

⁴ Editor Προταρ() Κλαυδίῃ Ἡρακλεί(δου). For the correction, see *Bibl. Orient.* 42 (1985), col.341 no.895. For Claudia Herakleia, see also Pap. Lugd.-Bat. 25 no.27 I.11 (forthcoming).

⁵ For the palaeographical difference between αυ and ου, compare Κλαυδία(ς) in I.4.

τις) all recur, we find Πῶ(νις) as a variant form of the expected Ποῦ(νις) (l.18). That Πῶ(νις) and Ποῦνις refer to the same village is clear from the figures in l.18 on the back, where the total for Ἀθῦχ(ις) καὶ Πῶ(), 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 Πῶ(.)νις was corrected into Παξινις (l. Παξιμίς) by Pruneti, *op. cit.*, p.158. On our request Mrs. Pruneti once again checked the original in Firenze, and she is now convinced that Πῶ[.]νιν 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 Enteiiis, 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 ἰδ(ἔτους) ρκεή καὶ ἦ.δ. (γίνεται) ρκεδή. The addition $125 \frac{1}{8}$ and $\frac{1}{8} \cdot \frac{1}{4} = 125 \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{8}$ is impossible and, as the editor remarks, it is not easy to find an explanation for the occurrence of a 14th year here⁷. We therefore suggest the following reading: Ἐντε(ῖς) ἰδ(ιωτικῆς) ρκεή κληρου(χικῆς) δ. (γίνεται) ρκεδή⁸. The only remaining problem is the connection of the figure ρκεδή 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. μδ[.]. 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 ($88 \frac{3}{4}$, 8 choinikes) from the total given in l.8 ($89 \frac{1}{4}$, 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 ($6 \frac{1}{2}$ χ[.]) finds its counterpart in l.26 ($6 \frac{1}{2}$). 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 (= $\frac{1}{4}$ artaba, 3 choinikes) have to be supplemented at the end of l.5. If we add the maximum number obtainable in l.5 ($44 \frac{1}{4}$ artabas, 3 choinikes) of Enteiiis to the figure mentioned for that village in l.20 (71 artabas, 1 choinix), we reach the total amount of $115 \frac{1}{4}$ artabas, 4 choinikes. This total closely resembles the $125 \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{8}$ artabas (= $125 \frac{1}{4}$ artabas, 5 choinikes) of l.9. We therefore think that l.9 in fact contains the total amount for the village Enteiiis, miscalculated by 10 artabas. The rounding off of 4 choinikes to $\frac{1}{8}$ 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 καή). 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 $21 \frac{1}{8}$ 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 $21 \frac{1}{8}$ of ll.2-3 and the $21 \frac{1}{8}$ of l.32. Ll.2-3 now refer to Athychis and Pounis, l.32 to Enteiiis and Athychis (cf. l.33).

⁶ In P.Oxy VI 966 the reading Πουχεως is certain and cannot be changed into Πουνεως (original checked by R.Coles). In P.Oxy X 1285 l.12 and 105 the village Που[.]εω belongs to the μέση τοπαρχία and cannot therefore be identical with Pounis. The Που[.]ν κτήμ(α) 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. ΑΘΥΧΙΣ, n.1.

⁸ For the reading Ἐντε(ῖς), cf. the same word in l.20; ἰδ(ιωτικῆς) recurs in l.31 (read as by the editor), also in connection with the village Enteiiis.

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 καή) 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 κλη) instead of καή). The bracket at the end of the line is an abbreviation mark for κλη(ρουχικῆς). 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.

Leuven
Leiden

W. Clarysse
N. Kruit