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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 Όρθελία Θεαροῦτι τῇ μὴτρὶ 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 Θεανῶ see F. T. Gignac, Grammar ii 87), and delete Θεαροῦς from our repertory of personal names from Graeco-Roman Egypt.1

Πανουπταείοм

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 Πανουπταείομ. It has been thought to occur twice in the text. First in the prescript:

Πανουπταείομ τῇ κυβ[ή]ν πλίντα 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 Ταιοῦ τῇ κυβ[ή]ν ‘Panoup to Taeiom, his wife’.2 The name Ταιοῦ, clearly female, is an addendum onomasticis; it means ‘she of the sea’ (from Copt. (ε)ιομ ‘sea’). Its male counterpart is known, however, from both Greek and Coptic sources: Παύομ,3 παιομ or παιαμ (cf. G. Heuser, Die Personennamen der Kopten 15, 65; further examples in W. E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary s.v. ειομ [77b]).4 It should also be noted that Ταιοῦ is equivalent to names such as Ταπιαμ/Ταιπαμ (cf. Heuser, op. cit. 65 n. 6), Ταιπαμις (cf. P.Neph. 1.2n.), or Ταπιαμις (cf. U. Wilcken, APF 2.1 (1902) 17).

The presumed second occurrence of the name Πανουπταείομ 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 Τειροῦς (Τειρωοῦς). 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 Υπαργος, attested in P.Tebt. III 931.2 (136 BC).


3 Compare also the names Πειαμις and Ποιμ, or the place name Βησπαυος. It should perhaps be said that Preisigke’s spelling Πειαμις 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) κλ[η]ς[ο]ς] τοιμ, and SPP X 216.1 (vi/viii) λαύρας Ποιμ( ). 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 τοιμ 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 Abbreviatu”. As for SPP X 216.1, he reported that Ποιμ( ) 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(μνων), a name attested for a number of λαύρας 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 λαύρ(α) Ποι-μέ(μνων) πολ(εος) Ἡρακλ(εος) Ποιμ(μνων) of the contemporary SPP VIII 1183.1 (vi/viii).
[Παν-]
απταείωμι συβίωμι = 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 παρὰ Παν[ους. 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 παρὰ Παν[ους ἀνδρῆς (or ἀνδρὸς, 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) Ταίειοιμι συβίωμι = παρὰ Παν[ους ἀνδρῆς -
= ρός (?) αὐτῆς.

‘Deliver to Taeiom, my wife, from Panoup, her (husband?).’
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