JOHN SHELTON

Some Recent Abbreviations

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 90 (1992) 224

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

Some Recent Abbreviations

1. O.Eklab 89.3. Between the name and the year of a tax payment and the amount given occur traces the editor read as $\epsilon\pi$ (). The same abbreviation is found in the corresponding position in e.g. the Cambridge ostraca 42 l. 5 and 53 l. 4 which I published in ZPE 80 (1990) 229. I interpreted it there as $\epsilon\pi(\lambda \lambda \delta \gamma 0 \nu)$, which would also suit the Elkab piece; some other abbreviations of similar type are listed in P.Oxy. XLIV 3168.2-3 note. Whether the same explanation would do for O.Elkab 89.4, where the context and palaeography are rather different, I cannot say.

2. P.Freib. IV 53.18, (γ ívov $\tau\alpha\iota$) σ ($\dot{\upsilon}\mu\pi\alpha\nu$?) ($\tau\dot{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$) β 'A $\psi\nu\epsilon$. Problematic palaeographically is σ ($\dot{\upsilon}\mu\pi\alpha\nu$). The editor writes that "the slash representing (γ ívov $\tau\alpha\iota$) runs into a piece of writing which looks like a sigma, though it might be merely an idiosyncratic end of the slash." I see on the plate not sigma but tau, and over it an ink smudge which represents a degenerate omicron. This is an abbreviation for $\tau\dot{\upsilon}$ ($\pi\dot{\alpha}\nu$). It is common in the Tebtunis tax lists, but not, as it happens, in one of them for which an illustration has been published. Many examples are listed under $\pi\dot{\alpha}\zeta$ in the indexes to P.Tebt. I and IV.

3. P.Wash. II 76 is identified as an account of landholdings and revenue. The beginning of line 19 helps specify this further: the plate shows $\lambda\iota(\beta\delta\varsigma)$ $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\delta(\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota)$, 'adjacent on the west', instead of $\epsilon \chi\delta(\nu\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma)$. The list was therefore made in topographic order and so falls into the category of land survey represented best by P.Tebt. I 84-85 and IV 1116-1123.

I should read the start of l. 20 as ($\dot{\omega}\nu$) $\dot{\upsilon}\pi(o\lambda \dot{o}\gamma o\nu)$ instead of $\dot{\upsilon}\dot{\upsilon}\pi(\dot{\epsilon}\rho)$: the line then contrasts non-productive with grain-bearing land, a common opposition in land lists. In l. 14 I see $\varphi\alpha(\kappa\hat{\omega}\iota)$ instead of $\dot{\alpha}\rho(\tau\dot{\alpha}\beta\alpha\iota)$. Such a statement of present crop is extremely frequent in surveys and suggests that three passages in which the editor prints $\chi o((\dot{\nu}\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma)$ should likewise be altered to the crop $\chi \dot{o}(\rho\tau\omega\iota)$ (ll. 3, 6 and 14). Finally, the context now rather favours $\delta\iota(\dot{\alpha}) \sigma \chi o\iota(\nu \iota o\nu)$ as opposed to $\delta\iota(\dot{\alpha}\varphi o\rho o\nu) \sigma \chi o\iota(\nu \iota o\mu o\hat{\upsilon})$ in l. 18. Parallels are cited in the editor's note.

Trier

John Shelton