

NIKOS LITINAS

CORRIGENDA VARIA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 117 (1997) 210-212

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## CORRIGENDA VARIA

1. In P.Ryl. IV 675, 4-6 instead of ὡςτε ἐν τῷ δια||χημοτάτωι τῆ[|c πόλεως τό]||πωι ἐκτεθῆν[αι read ὡςτε ἐν τῷ ἐπι||χημοτάτωι τῆ[|c πόλεως τό]||πωι ἐκτεθῆν[αι; cf. this adjective in the same context in P.Mil.Congr. XVII, p.35, 7; BGU IV 1086, ii 4; P.Oxy. XII 1408,18; P.Oxy. XVII 2108, 7; P.Oxy. XXXIV 2705, 11; P.Oxy. XLVII 3364, 22; P.Yale I 56, 9; SB XIV 11651, 7; SB XIV 11651, 15; P.Iand. VII 140, 10; OGIS 194, 27. Cf. also the adjective φα]νερωτάτοις τόποις in P.Oxy. 1100, 3.

2. Dizionario 3, p.165 and 2, p. 221 regards the cities Κυνῶν and Ἡρακλέους which are attested in P.Oxy. XIV 1749, 8 and 7 respectively (IV A.D.) as the cities in Middle Egypt. The document is an account for transporting ἐπιβάται<sup>1</sup> from Chaereou (near Alexandria) to Nikiou (near the apex of the Delta, on the west), Herakleous polis and Kynon polis. It provides the following piece of information: The ναῦλον from Chaereou to Nikiou is 1 tal. 2000 dr., from Chaereou to Herakleous polis 1 tal. 3000 dr., from Chaereou to Kynon polis 2500 dr. The two latter amounts do not make sense in the context if one assumes the cities Herakleous and Kynon polis in Middle Egypt: The difference of 1000 dr. between the fare to Nikiou and Herakleous and the amount of 2500 dr. itself as a fare to Kynon are too small. However, if we consider Kynon and Herakleous polis as the cities in the Delta, we can explain these fares. From the above mentioned cities the nearest to Chaereou is Kynon polis (in the middle of the triangular area of the Delta) and the most distant is Herakleous (near the base of the Delta, on the east).

3. In P.Oxy. XXIV 2415, 9 instead of ἀπὸ τοῦ Κ]υνοπολ(ίτου) read ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἄνω Κ]υνοπολίτου; cf. also l. 29.

4. In P.Lugd.Bat. XI 26, 5 and Verso 1, (cf. J. Bingen, CE 38 (1963), p.166 and BL 5, p. 63) a place named Κυνῶ seems to be considered by the editor as a village in the Oxyrhynchite nome (although his commentary is not very clear in this respect), but the mention of a strategos in Verso 1 (although Κυνῶ is to be connected not with the στρατηγός, but with the name Ἱερακόμμωνι) may indicate a capital, and this could only be the capital of the Kynopolite nome. Moreover, we need not write Κυνῶ(ν), as the form Κυνῶ is well attested in the beginning of the fourth century A.D.; see N. Litinas, Κυνῶν πόλις and Εὐεργέτις, APF 40/2 (1994), p.149.

5. In PSI X 1119, 18 instead of διαθήκην ἢ [περ] | ἐλύθη read διαθήκην ἢ [καὶ] | ἐλύθη; for the phrase διαθήκη ἢ καὶ λυθεῖσα cf. P.Oxy. IV 715, 18; ibid. IX 1208, 11; ibid. XIV 1721, 13; is it also in PSI X 1101, 10 ἀκολουθῶς [τηκε ελυ[.]...[.]] διαθήκη possible to read τῆ καὶ λυθεῖση διαθήκη? All these examples come from Oxyrhynchos, but cf. the same phrase without καὶ in SB VI 9296, 22 and P.Fouad I 36, 14, both from Oxyrhynchos and SPP XX 29, 13 from the Heracleopolite nome.

6. πρὸς (δραχμάς); in most of the cases the word δραχμαί in this phrase is denoted by its usual symbol. Only in P.Gen II 101, ii 27; P.Hamb. II 192, 21; P.Lond. VII 2017, 7; P.Mich. III 173, 21; ibid. XI 625, 5; P.Oxy. X 1269, 26; ibid. L 3560, 23 is it attested written out fully and it is always in the accusative; so πρὸς (δραχμῶν) in P.Bub. 4, 55, 7 and πρὸς (δραχμαί) in PSI V 529, 5 should be corrected to πρὸς (δραχμάς). Note that until the first century A.D.<sup>2</sup> the phrase πρὸς ἀργυρίου δραχμάς is also attested.

7. In P.Sakaon 54, 13 πώλου μού[λου λ]ευκοῦ is a possible restoration, because mules, as well as donkeys, camels etc. were described by their colour; see O. Montevicchi in Aegyptus 19 (1939), p. 41 and CPR VI 2, p. 19 for the colours of donkeys.

<sup>1</sup> For ἐπιβάται and ναῦλον see A.J.M. Meyer-Termeer, Die Haftung der Schiffer im griechischen und römischen Recht, Stud. Amst. XIII, 1978, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> Very seldom later; cf. BGU VII 1573, 27; P.Oxf. 7, 9; P.Oxy. X 1269, 25.

8. In BGU XIII 2323, 3 we should supply at the end of the line [ἐπὶ κομήλω] because of the contrast with l. 6 ὁ αὐτὸ[ς] ἐπὶ ὄνοις δυόμι. Moreover 4 1/2 metretres of oil were carried only by camels, not by camel foals or donkeys (see P.Customs, p.53).

9. P.Oxf. 7 (= P.L.Bat. III): In l. 7 instead of σὺν τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ the papyrus has σὺν τοῖς οὐκ ἐν αὐτῷ; in l. 9 instead of καὶ τόκους read ἐντόκους (checked on photo).

10. SB XVIII 13619, 12; instead of ...ζαμου read [ἐ]π[ι] τῆς Θαλλοῦ; θ is written in the same way as the θ in Σεμθέως in l. 6 and ἀλλ as in ἐμβαλλομένου in l. 11 (checked on original).

11. In P.Lond. III 839, 6 (p. 140; = P.Sarap. 11) (A.D. 128) instead of πυρον χρ[ω]μα read πυρόν-χρ[ω]μ(ον) (= πυρρόχρωμον); cf. P.Sarap. 10,4 which perhaps concerns the same cow. There is a horizontal stroke above and on the right of μ (checked on original).

12. In PUG III 103, 12 there is a cleruch named Σποκῆ with his father's name written above the line. The editor prints `...αμιος` with the comment (see n. ad loc.) that it is written in the nominative by mistake. From the photograph of the papyrus (Tav. XV) and the examination of the original by the editor herself, very probably the end of the name should be read as -ζέλιος, genitive of a name ending in -ζέλιος. λ before μ is the same as in Πτολεμαίου in line 9. ζ and ε are clear. The beginning of the name seems to have two or three letters, which I cannot read from the photograph<sup>3</sup>. Names ending in -ζέλιος are of Thacian origin<sup>4</sup>.

13. In P.Mich. XV 711, 5 instead of Πμοῦμις the well known name Παμοῦνις (see NB, Onomasticum, s.v.) can be read. π is clear in the beginning of the line, then the next letter is α, made with a small round head similar to that of Ἰναροῦ(τος) of the same line and Πάλλαντος in l.11. Moreover the letter μ normally has no loop in its left leg. At the end of the right leg of μ there is a small o; cf. the o of the words Καραπίωνος (l. 4), Τύραννος (l. 8), Ἰέρακος (l. 18), ὁμοίως (l. 20).

14. In SB XVIII 13142, 5 instead of ]ης αὐτὸν ἐξ ὀνόματος τ[ read ] εἰς αὐτὸν ἐξ ὀνόματος τ[; in l. 6 instead of ἐπ' αὐτῷ, we can also read εἰς αὐτῷ; in l.9 instead of τοῦ Πεβίου, read αὐ]τοῦς ἐξ ἴσου; in l.14 instead of κ[ι]: read κ[. or ι[. P.Oxy. II 247, 30-31; 249, 9-10; 250, 10-11 (all of which are property-returns) attest the phrase κατηντηκότα εἰς δεῖνα ἐξ ὀνόματος τοῦ δεῖνα. So, could we supply in l.5 κατηντηκότα ] εἰς αὐτὸν ἐξ ὀνόματος τ[οῦ (or τ[ῆς) and in l.9 κατηντηκότα εἰς αὐ]τοῦς ἐξ ἴσου ἐξ ὀνόμα[τος. The text obviously refers to a testament.

15. A "Request to an Oracle?" In ZPE 111 (1996), pp. 183-185 G. Messeri-Savorelli and R. Pintaudi published P.Firenze, Museo Egiziano inv. 10082. They called the text a "domanda oracolare" and printed it as follows:

εἰ Θαλλος ὄλα ἔλαβ' ἐγτλέγοι  
διὰ Τερποῦς τῆς Πτολεμαί-  
ου θυγατρὸς.

The editors translate "se Thallos ha presso tutto, estrai per mano di Terpo, la figlia di Ptolemaios" and state that the text as a request to an oracle presents some difficulties and peculiarities: The lack of the initial invocation to a god, the use of the preposition διὰ with the name of a person (priestess?), the seal, the Ptolemaic dating (third century B.C.), the provenance (Tebtynis), the request itself (for a theft).

On plate VIa, however, one can see that the text runs as follows:

Εἰ Θαλλος ὄλα ἔλαβεν τὰ ἐνοί-  
δια Τερποῦς τῆς Πτολεμαί-  
ου θυγατρὸς.

<sup>3</sup> It is either λ or η with a vertical stroke following, which seems to belong to the letter in line 11 corrected in μ (in the word Μόσχου), or ι, σ, ι, i.e. Ληζέλιος or Ἰσιζέλιος: the former name is attested in P.Ent. 30, 6 (= CPJ I 129) (217 B.C.), but it is not certain because before it there is a δε, which could be either a conjunction or a part of the name Δελήζελιός. The name Ἰσιζέλιος is not attested, but there is the name Ἰσάζελιός, for which see CPR XVIII 3, 46n.

<sup>4</sup> See CPR XVIII 3, 46n.

The final  $\nu$  of the verb ἔλαβεν is clearly formed with the middle stroke drawn horizontally as in the papyri of the third century B.C. Then  $\tau$  is undoubtful; the following letter resembles an  $\alpha$  rather a  $\lambda$ . Then the letter  $\nu$  is similar to  $\nu$  of ἔλαβεν. Just below the final horizontal stroke of the  $\nu$  there is a small  $\omicron$ <sup>5</sup>. For the phonological interchanges of the consonants and vowels in the word ἐνοίδια (= ἐνώδια = ἐνώτια), earrings, see Sven-Tage Teodorsson, *The Phonology of Ptolemaic Koine*, *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* XXXVI, 1977, p. 39, for  $\omega \rightarrow \omicron$ , where two examples are cited from the papyri. In P.Petrie<sup>2</sup> I 13, 24 (238-237 B.C.) we find the same word written wrongly as ἐνώδια. The addition of  $-\iota$  to the letter  $\omega$  is very usual in the Ptolemaic papyri; see Teodorssen, o.c., pp. 162-168 (269 examples). For the interchange of  $\omega \rightarrow \omicron$  see Teodorssen, o.c., pp. 160-161 (20 examples). Cf. also the form of the word ἐνοίτιον in papyri of the Roman period, P. Dura 30, 21 (A.D. 232), SB VIII 9882, 2, 1 (II-III A.D.). For the interchange of  $\tau$  and  $\delta$  see Teodorssen, o.c., pp. 177-178<sup>6</sup>.

Since the case concerns a woman, a reference to jewelry could certainly suit the context. Moreover, we have to note the use of the hyperbaton ὄλα ἔλαβεν τὰ ἐνοίδια, which is not very often found in other papyri of the Ptolemaic period<sup>7</sup>.

A result of the new reading is that the text can be understood more easily and we can translate “if Thallos received all the earrings of Terpo, Ptolemaios’ daughter”. It is an indirect interrogative sentence. This provide the following possibilities: 1. From the marriage contracts we learn that jewelry (usually earrings) was part of the dowry received by the husband. Could this piece of papyrus be a question by someone to get informed if Thallos, the husband, has received all the jewelry from his wife Terpo? In that case we can assume that this note was sent by Terpo’s parents. 2. We might suppose that the text is a personal “memorandum” written on the verso of a small piece of papyrus, leaving its recto blank. 3. A question to an oracle, but not the piece of paper itself which was given to the priests of the oracle. Rather we can assume that this question was sent to a person at Tebtynis by someone to ask the oracle there on his behalf. The former would then have been written on a new piece of papyrus and would have used the proper formula: Invocation (e.g. Κυρίῳ Κοκνοπαίῳ), the question and the request (τοῦτό μοι ἐξένεγκε).

Rethymnon

Nikos Litinas

<sup>5</sup> Certainly the first letter of the second line is not a  $\kappa$  to read ἐνοί | κια. This letter looks like an  $\alpha$ , but a form ἐνοιάια (= ἐνιαία?) does not give sense.

<sup>6</sup> The form ἐνώδια is attested in P.Petrie<sup>2</sup> I 13, 24 (238-237 B.C.), P.Ryl. II 124, 30 (I A.D.), P.Laur. IV 177, 2 (A.D. 435), P.Got. 14, 4 (VII A.D.).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. PSI IV 361, 3 (251-250 B.C.) πᾶν ποιήσω τὸ δειον (l. δέον).