868. P.Nekr. 15: ἥ μὲν ἢν

The text is a petition dated to 260 CE concerned with a dispute περὶ μέρους νεκροταφί[κῆς τάξεως ἐν κόμῃ Πμουνψιν τῆς | [αὐτῆς Κύστεως ἥ μὲν ἢν ψφ’ ἡμῶν ἢτι ἀπὸ | [του Ἡ. (Ετους] θεοῦ] Γορδιανοῦ (II. 7–10). So the text is given in the first edition; but as the editor remarks in his note on l. 9, the particle μὲν in that line is prima facie unsuitable: it ‘has no later balancing δὲ, whether through forgetfulness or some more substantial error’. Even if μὲν did suit the context, we would require not ἥ μὲν ἢν, with the particle immediately following the relative pronoun, but ἥ ἢν μὲν. I suggest restoring ἥ ἡμενημενη(η) ἢν, ‘which had been managed’, with the expected verb, for which cf., besides l. 14 ἢν τῇ νοµῇ and l. 16 ἢν τῇ νοµῇ, P.Nekr. 23.6–7 (c. 290–92) τάξεις ἑνταφιαστικῆς, ἣνπερ καὶ αὐτῶς | πα[ρέ]ληφεν ἅκ γονέων, κη[λ] περίοντι ἐνέμετο, and 47.11–12 (early fourth century) νεκροταφικῆν [τάξιν ἦν δεξάμενοι ἀπὸ τοῦ] πατέρων καὶ πρ[ο]γά[γ] ἡμῶν νεμῶν [εθα]. The tongue-twister ηνενεµενηνης was simplified by saut du même au même (ΗνενηΗµεν) and haplography (µενΗη).

869. SB XVIII 13949

Corrections in ll. 12 and 16 of this Oxyrhynchite deed of surety dated to 541 CE were published in the first edition of P.Oxy. LXXXIII 5371 in the notes on ll. 15 and 16–17 respectively. Here are three more, checked on the online image.

In l. 5, the unique Πηνοθής is a ghost-name. The papyrus has the familiar Άνουθος.

For the αν ligature, cf. e.g. l. 2 ὑπατίαν.

In l. 7, in place of νίκ(ην), a word apparently not abbreviated elsewhere, we can print νίκην, though the traces of the final letters could not be read in isolation with any confidence.

Finally, in ll. 8–9, we have not the seemingly unique phrase τὸν ὠμο[γ]ής[ιν] ἀδηλφόν but rather the expected τὸν ὤμογης[ιν] μοῦ ἀδηλφὸν, for which there are parallels in SB VI 9201.10 (Oxyrhynchus, 203) and P.Oxy. XXXI 2584.30–31 (211).
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