

NIKOLAOS GONIS

TWO FEMALE GHOST-NAMES

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 119 (1997) 155-156

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

TWO FEMALE GHOST-NAMES*

Θεαροῦς

F. Preisigke recorded this name in the *Namenbuch* on the sole authority of P.Oxy. VI 963. The papyrus preserves the upper part of a second/third-century letter, whose prescript is printed as Ὀφελία Θεαροῦτι τῇ μητρὶ χαίρειν. The name Θεαροῦς has not subsequently appeared in any other text. On a photograph the rho of Θεαροῦτι is hard to read; the papyrus has suffered from damage at this point. But in the address on the back, which was not mentioned in the edition, one can clearly read Θεανοῦτι. We should thus modify Θεαροῦτι to Θεανοῦτι in line 1 (for the declension of the name Θεανώ see F. T. Gignac, *Grammar* ii 87), and delete Θεαροῦς from our repertory of personal names from Graeco-Roman Egypt.¹

Πανουπταεῖομ

P.Ant. I 43, a late third/fourth-century 'letter from husband to wife written on what was a triangular piece of parchment', is the only reference given by D. Foraboschi, *Onomasticon* for the female name Πανουπταεῖομ. It has been thought to occur twice in the text. First in the prescript:

Πανουπταεῖομ τῇ συβ[ίῳ] πλῆστα χαίρειν.

This name of the writer's wife, not attested by other sources, is astonishing: its first component is a male personal name, viz. Πανουπ. This is hardly credible. Evidently, one should divide Πανουπ Ταεῖομ τῇ συβ[ίῳ] 'Panoup to Taeiom, his wife'.² The name Ταεῖομ, clearly female, is an *addendum onomasticis*; it means 'she of the sea' (from Copt. ⲈⲚⲜⲠⲟⲙ 'sea'). Its male counterpart is known, however, from both Greek and Coptic sources: Παῖομ,³ ΠΑΙΟΜ or ΠΑΙΔΜ (cf. G. Heuser, *Die Personennamen der Kopten* 15, 65; further examples in W. E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* s.v. ⲈⲚⲜⲠⲟⲙ [77b]).⁴ It should also be noted that Ταεῖομ is equivalent to names such as Ταπιαμ/ΤΑΠΙΑΜ (cf. Heuser, op. cit. 65 n. 6), Ταπιαμικ (cf. P.Neph. 1.2n.), or Ταφιωμικ (cf. U. Wilcken, *APF* 2.1 (1902) 17).

The presumed second occurrence of the name Πανουπταεῖομ is in the address on the back of the letter:

* I wish to thank Dr R. A. Coles, who read an earlier draft of this paper; Prof. H. Harrauer, who kindly checked two papyri for me at Vienna; and Dr. M. L. Smith for his help with Coptic.

¹ But note that papyri do attest the female name Τεαροῦς (Τεαρωοῦς). Hunt was so sure of the reading that he pencilled cross-references in the margin opposite each entry on his own copy of the *Namenbuch*. Cf. also the male name Θέαρος, attested in P.Tebt. III2 931.2 (136 BC).

² I have left Egyptian names unaccented following W. Clarysse, 'Greek accents in Egyptian names', available at <http://www.kuleuven.ac.be/facdep/arts/eng/research/class/Accentuation.sit> on the World Wide Web.

³ Compare also the names Πεῖωμικ and Πιομ, or the place name Βησπαῖομ. It should perhaps be said that Preisigke's spelling Πεῖωμικ with diaeresis ignores the etymology of the word and should be abandoned (but the name is correctly spelled in PSI Cong XXI 15.16).

⁴ Search for parallels revealed two problematic occurrences of -ιομ, both in papyri belonging to the collection of the Austrian National Library (Vienna): SPP X 206.10 (vi) κλι[ῆ]ρος Πιομ, and SPP X 216.1 (vii/viii) λάυρας Πιομ(). Professor Harrauer was kind enough to examine the two papyri at my request, and informed me that in SPP X 206.10 the mu of Πιομ should be interpreted differently: 'Der letzte Buchstabe ist zwar undeutlich erhalten, hat aber die für diese Zeit üblich Gestalt, die man als Alpha deuten kann oder einfach als Abbrueviatur'. As for SPP X 216.1, he reported that Πιομ() is a misreading (or misprint) for Ποιμ() (accordingly, the relevant entry in the A. Calderini, S. Daris, *Dizionario Geografico* should be deleted). I believe that this probably stands for Ποιμ(ένων), a name attested for a number of λάυραι in various locations in Egypt: Euhemeria, Herakleous polis, Oxyrhynchos. The provenance of the document is not stated in the edition, but given its late date, which excludes Euhemeria and Oxyrhynchos, it is tempting to identify it with the λάυρα(α) Ποιμέ(ων) πόλ(εως) Ἡρακλ(έου)ς of the contemporary SPP VIII 1183.1 (vii/viii).

[Παν-]
 απταείωμ κυβίω ≡ παρά-
 δος αὐτῆς

The layout of the address strikes one as odd. In the light of the above discussion, we may safely discard [Παν-]; then απ is very likely to correspond to ἀπ(όδος), which we often find in this position in many other similar texts. This makes the layout less exceptional. As for the end of the line, the writer obviously ran out of space and continued in the next line, a well-known phenomenon. But oddities still remain: what is the curious sign after αὐτῆς? And why did the writer add παράδος αὐτῆς, which is clearly otiose? Such an expression has never occurred in a similar context, and the editor's translation 'deliver to her in person' does not remove the difficulty. Inspection of the papyrus (kept in the Papyrology Rooms of the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford) shows something very different. In the second half of the first line of the prescript we should read παρά Παν[ουπ]. In the next line, the curious sign after αὐτῆς is a sigma, whereas it is hard to discern any letter before the omicron of the editor's δος; some ink is visible, but I am not sure whether it belonged to a letter. Dr. R. A. Coles suggested παρά Παν[ουπ ἀνδ]ρὸς (or ἀνδρ]ὸς, with false division) αὐτῆς, which is attractive, although the collocation has not hitherto occurred in the address of a letter. To conclude, I propose that the address of P.Ant. I 43 be edited as follows:

ἀπ(όδος) Ταειωμ κυβίω = παρά Παν[ουπ ἀνδ-]
 = ρὸς (?) αὐτῆς.

'Deliver to Tæiom, my wife, from Panoup, her (husband?).'