CRITICAL MISCELLANIES

1. Emending ancient scribes

Conjectural emendations were common in the early years of papyrology, partly because of the philological traditions of the nineteenth century, and partly on account of the novelty of the material. In very many cases the guesswork remained in the realm of phantasy, but sometimes it revealed editorial oversights or otherwise helped to find a solution, functioning as a kind of ‘diagnostic emendation’. One such instance occurs in P. Grenf. I 64, a letter of the late sixth or early seventh century. In lines 5–6, Grenfell first read καὶ σὺν θεό εὐρύσκω ἐγκαίρειν | προσαναφέρω (l. –ειν) τῇ αὐτῶν ἐξοπλίσια. Wilcken proposed εὐκαίριον ὃν προσαναφέρω, and noted that the adverb ‘εὐκαίριον (zur rechten Zeit) ist den Lexicis fremd’.

Wilcken’s reading is recorded in BL I 184; a footnote (n. 12) adds, ‘anders Crönert, Stud. Pal. IV S. 86,’ but offers no further detail. Preisigke’s decision to silence Crönert was rather unfortunate. Crönert had suggested κα〈ν〉 σὺν θεό εὐρύσκω εὐκαίριον, προσαναφέρω, and adduced parallels for the expression εὐκαιρίαν εὑρίσκειν. The parallels have since multiplied, and the Greek of Crönert’s text is less exceptional than Wilcken’s, though κα〈ν〉 is far-fetched. A photograph shows that the papyrus has εὑρίσκω εὐκαιρι(α)ν, προσαναφέρω, (l. -ριαν). Unless the construction is asyndetic, we have to read εὐρύσκων, προσαναφέρων. A similar expression occurs in l. 3, οὐκ εὐρύσκω προσαναφέρων, for which ed. pr. noted: ‘ἐγκαίρειον is to be supplied, cf. line 5’; but the text can be left as it is.

The scribe of this letter may have made mistakes, but these did not affect the meaning of the text. Yet sometimes our texts will yield little sense unless we assume errors on the part of the ancient writers. One such case is PSI VIII 888, a short letter of the first century. The writer added a postscript: περὶ τοῦ σεβεννίον ἢ (l. εἰ) θέλεις | αὐτῶι γε . . σθε δευκτηρίας (l. ξεν-). But this relies on a misunderstanding of θέλεις, for which ed. pr. noted: ‘ἐγκαίρειον is to be supplied, cf. line 5’; but the text can be left as it is.

The sense would then be smooth: ‘regarding the palm-fibre, if you want it to become yoke- straps, let me know’. The scribe’s orthography is poor, and there are parallels to the presumed error. But the ground is slippery, as it may well be the modern reader’s fault, stemming from the difficulty to understand what may contradict our expectations. I give two examples from private letters published recently.

In P.CtYBR inv. 1559,7 assigned to the early first century, Asklepiades writes to Dionysios, τυγχάνω σεσημανκὼς σοι ὑπὲρ ὃν | ἱνοχλοῦ (ll. 4–5), rendered, ‘I happen to have...

---

1 « APF » 3 (1906), p. 121. The word is not mentioned in LSJ and Suppl. (LSJ9 records εὐκαίριη, ‘favourable opportunity’, dub. in POhx.123.3’, but this relies on a misunderstanding of ed. pr., corrected in the re-edition of the text as Sel. Pap. I 159, where the original εὐκαίρη τής was rightly printed as εὐκαίρητης, l. εὐκαίρηθες. The correction has not been recorded in the Berichtigungsliste.)

2 Crönert made numerous textual suggestions in his article Zur Kritik der Papyrstexte, SPP IV, pp. 84–107; some of them are palmares, but many others plainly fanciful.

3 The omission of final -v is common; see GIGNAC, Grammar I, p. 111. Cf. P. Oxy. XVI 1875.15–16 τά δέ κεφαλωτά | εὐρύσκον πλοίον πέμπω. (I owe this point to Ben Henry.)

4 A misprint in ed. pr. may be corrected here: in I 2 the papyrus has εὐδοκιμοιτήτω, not εὐδοκιμάτω.

5 Originally assigned to the fourth century with some reservations, but the image shows that the hand cannot be much later than the end of the first century; see <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/psi;8;888>.

6 Cf. O.Claud. II 249.4 and SB V 8002.24, both of them letters of the second century.

indicated to you those things about which you were troubled’. ἵνανωῦ was taken as a phonetic form of ἵνανοῦ, but the published photograph indicates that the papyrus has ἵνανοῦ. Is that also a misspelt form of ἵνανοῦ? It seems more natural to think that the writer speaks of his own feelings at this point, the matters that trouble him, than of what used to trouble his correspondent. This would entail emending ἵνανοῦ to ἵνανοῦ ἵματι, assuming that the scribe inadvertently omitted the last syllable of the verb.  

But I may well be wrong.

On the other hand, emedation seems inescapable in the case of PSI inv. 1604 verso, a letter of the third century. We find a strange phrase in lines 20–21, ἔρις δὲ Ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἀνακαὶ αὐτὸς ἀναβῇ, translated as ‘Una lice con (?) Plution ... lui venga su’. The editor associates αὐτοῦ with spellings such as αὐτακιον, l. ἀναγκαῖον, but offers no other comment. It is possible to take things further. In place of the noun ἔρις, we should read the verb ἔρις, I. ἔρεις, once described as ‘a standard expression in private letters ... virtually equivalent to an imperative’. There are similar iotasims (ει > 1) in lines 4, 5, 10, 13, 19, and 24. As for αὐτοῦ, the division αῦ καὶ seems inevitable, but the passage will not become intelligible unless we emend it. I suspect that αῦ is a mistake for ἵνα; the spelling would be due to the following ἵνα-: ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸς ἀναβῇ would look back to γενοῦ πρὸς τὸν Πολίωνα τὸν κυρτόν ὑπὸ ἀναβῇ in lines 14–15; Ploution and then Polion were to be told to ‘go up’. ἵνα occurs in lines 19 and 24, so that another ἵνα here would be in line with the scribe’s usage.

2. Abbreviated totals and carats

A small archive of receipts for merismos from Kerkosoucha Orous, datable to the early years of the Arab conquest (cf. BL XII 236), was dispersed in three different collections in the 1920s and published at different times over the years. There is something noticeable about the payments in three of these texts, made in carats and summarized as (γίνεται) + number:

P. Mert. II 99r.3–4 (cf. BL X 121) κερ(άτια) ἐπτά, (γίνεται) ζ
P. Princ. II 90.2–3 (cf. BL X 121) κερ(άτια) ὑπὸ τέταρ(τον), (γίνεται) κβ δ’
SB XXII 15814.3 (cf. BL X 121) κερ(άτια) ἑνδέκα, (γίνεται) τα

The lack of a reference to carats in the summary and the abbreviation for (γίνεται) are curious. The use of the oblique stroke to indicate the total, γίνεται, common in earlier periods, is very sporadic in the late sixth and seventh centuries, with the gamma-iota combination being the norm at this time. But inspection of the images shows that the obliques in P. Princ. 90 and SB 15814 are something else; they have a club-like appearance, with the characteristic leftward turn at the top indicative of the carat-symbol:

P. Princ. II 90

SB XXII 15814

---

8 A minor point: in l. 3, the papyrus has ὑμαίνειν, not ὑμίνειν.


10 J.R. REA, P. Oxy. LI 3642.29–30 n. ερις gave difficulty also in P. Turner 43.13; see BL XIII 258.


12 Image at <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.princ;2;90/images>.

13 Image at <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/a/apis/x-1535>.

14 See e.g. the index of symbols in SPP III.1, p. 258. SPP III.1 46.3 (Heracl.; viii in.) would be a very late example, but in that passage a long oblique is joined with the following chi.
In both texts we should read (κεράτια) in place of (γίνεται). In *P. Mert.* II 99r.4, however, the oblique is a plain dash. Still, there is no need to assume that it represents anything but (κεράτια); parallels to such plain carat-symbols are not lacking.\(^{15}\)

Another text in this dossier is *P. Princ.* II 91, which appears to attest a more ordinary sequence: κερ(άτια) τριά τέταρτ(ον) | ὄγδο(ον), γί(νεται) (κεράτια) γ δ´ (ll. 3–4). But this is an illusion: the carat-symbol was correctly transcribed, but the purported γί(νεται) should be read as nu: ὄγδον, l. ὄγδοον.\(^{16}\)

In sum, the scribes of these receipts did not write (γίνεται). Among other texts,\(^{18}\) we find a comparable omission in another assemblage of Arsinoite receipts for *merismos* of this period, viz. SB XVIII 13105.4, 13106.4, and 13152.5; an exception is SB 13104.3, which as read offers (γίγνονται) (κεράτια), but the papyrus has γι, i.e., γ(νονται), before the carat symbol.\(^{19}\)

### 3. Other abbreviation issues

*BGU* II 680 = *SPP* VIII 782

This is an Arsinoite rent receipt for a room belonging to the church τῆ(ς) ἁγί(ας) θεοτόκο(υ) (l. 2), signed δ(ι’) ἐμοῦ Θεωνίδου (ll. 5–6), some time around the middle of the seventh century. On an image (a clipping is reproduced below),\(^{20}\) one can read τηγ(α)τι, i.e., τη(ς) ὄγδο(ου); the same abbreviations occur in l. 2. What comes before τη(ς) is more difficult. Lambda cannot stand on its own, and it looks as if the tau of τη(ς) started from a high hook or wedge, which can hardly be part of tau. I have considered whether this is gamma, i.e., read λ(ό)γ̣(ῳ); cf. τητ = λ(ι)τ(ά) in l. 4. But parallels to a similar construction at this point are lacking. An alternative would be to take the raised writing as a superscript upsilon, and read δούλ(ο)υ̣; if so, this would be the second such ‘slave’ after Stephanos, δοῦλος τῆς θεοτόκου, in *CPR* X 1, 3, 4, etc. But this is not the way the scribe writes final ου, and we would have to assume that Θέωνι is a mistake for Θέωνος.

© Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung, Scan: Berliner Papyrusdatenbank, P 2869)

*P. Got.* 18

One of the entries in this seventh-century account of payments of oil concerns τοῖς νεωτέρ(οις) τοῖς ἀπελθοῦσι | ἐν Θήβ(αις) (ll. 3–4). The few references to ‘Thebes’ in texts of this date do not necessarily refer to the city; cf. also *CPR* X 15.4 n. It is more likely that these

\(^{15}\)*E.g.* *SPP* III 668.4; image at <http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/RZ00007418>.

\(^{16}\)Image at <http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/7p88ck132>.

\(^{17}\)I discussed *P. Princ.* II 90–91 with the participants of the *Summer Institute in Papyrology* at Princeton in July 2014. The corrections were entered onto the Papyrological Navigator (www.papyri.info) by one of them, but were not approved by one of the Editors because no supporting evidence was adduced. It is debatable whether the PN is an appropriate platform for discursive notes: hence this miscellany.

\(^{18}\)From seventh century Fayum, cf. e.g. *P. Lond.* I 1113,9c.3, *P. Prag.* II 152.3, or SB XX 14504.5 (another receipt for *merismos* in the Princeton collection).


\(^{20}\)<http://berlpap.smb.museum/01102>
young militarism went to the Thebaid, and we have to expand Θηβ(αϊδ). cf. P. Oxy. XVI 1921.15 (621?) Φοιβάμμων(τ) παιδ(αριῷ) ἕπερχομ(ένω) ἐν Θηβαϊδ. 

P. Princ. II 64
This is an account of money assigned to the late third century. The edition prints sinusoids followed by numbers in the fragmentary first column; presumably these were taken as amounts of drachmas. What was reproduced as a sinusoid, however, is the talent symbol. The sums range from 20 to 374 talents; these are very large sums, unless the text dates from the fourth century. The hand could well be placed in the first half of the century.

P. Princ. III 126
This document from Cynopolis refers to a purchase of land ‘for the planting of a vineyard from the six aruras transferred’: ἀφ’ [ὦν παρεχόμην] ἐν Θηβαϊδι (ll. 7–8). παρεχομήθη does not square with a plurality of aruras, but this relies on a misreading: as an online image shows, there is a sinusoid where the editors transcribed ζ, so that we should read (ἀρούρης), ‘½ arura’.

P. Sijp. 36
This Arsinoite ‘Zahlungsliste aus früharabischer Zeit’ contains numerous personal names and professional descriptions, several of them uncertainly read. In certain cases this is partly due to the abbreviations used:

22 Ξρ or Ξρ[·ο(υ)θ] → Ἀβρ[(αύμ)]; cf. 50 Αβρ(αύμ) (Αβρ ὄποιος; Ἀβραάμ ed. pr.).
30 {λ} δ(ι) Ἀνδρ[υ] ῥ(εό) → λαχανοπρ(άτου); all references to this term in papyri come from Arsinote documents of the fifth–seventh centuries.
59 Ιαπα Γ(αργη)οῦ → ἀπὸ Φεντ(εμιν) in l. 58.
65 Neίλ(ου) → Neίλ(άμμωνος) (Νείλ ὄποιος; the type of abbreviation used admits α but rules out οὐ); likewise, in l. 67 read Νείλ(άμμωνος).
83 Σιλπο(ς) Ουμείδ → Σιλπο(ς) μείζονος; thus the paradox (for that time) created by the father’s purported Arabic name disappears.
101 ἀρκαδ(ς) → ἀρτ(ο)π(ός) (ἀρτοκόπος; for the abbreviation, cf. SPP X 60.ii.10, 11; *ἀρκαδζ, though plausibly formed, is a ghost occupation.

PSI V 480
In l. 9 the edition has τῶν ἀρταβῶν, with a note that the unread part would be the symbol for ἀρταβῶν. This could have been put in the text, since the traces match the shape of the artaba-symbol used in this period. What was not recognized is that the sinusoid (= ½) is followed by γ’, ½.

SB I 5112

21 <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.princ;2;64/images>
22 See P. Sijp. 21a.1 n.
23 <http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/kp78gj96x>
24 The edition contains two misprints: in l. 2, for Εὐεργετίδεων read Εὐεργετῖδον, and in 4 for ἀναπεμπθεῖσι read ἀναπεμφθεῖσι.
The entry on l. 78 of this papyrus in BL XIII 193 reads ‘πρ(εσβύτερος) → πρι( ) (nach dem Photo), K.A. Worp, Z.P.E. 151 (2005), S. 150’, but this does not convey the full picture. Two dots follow πρ(εσβύτερος) in the edition; in Worp’s words, ‘one should read πρι[ ], the character following the iota probably to be taken as a sign of abbreviation; and πρι( ) can be expanded into a (transliterated) Latin term like πριμπιλάριος, πριμκήριος, or πρίωρ’. The last of the three options is what the papyrus has, with no abbreviation, and in phonetic spelling: πρίορ.26

SB VI 8988
κληρο(νόμων) ρο( ) at the end of l. 13 is a misunderstanding of the abbreviation κληρο[ ]ο[ ]ο[ ] = κληρο(νόμων).27

SPP X 197
The papyrus contains three demand notes (entagia) issued in the name of Rāshid b. Khālid at Heracleopolis in 719.28 There are some questionable features in the sums payable.

The first entagion concludes as follows—I juxtapose a clipping of a digital image29 with Wessely’s transcript:

The first visible remains of l. 1 must refer to the sum mentioned in the summary in l. 3; on this basis and comparing l. 6 (second entagion), we may read ἀ[φ(ι)θ(μίου) νο(μίσματος) ιβ̣´μη̣´]]. This would have been followed by δωδέκ(α)τ(ον) τεσσαρακ(όν) (however spelled) at the end of the line, and ὄγδον (l. ὄγδοον) in l. 2. The traces at the end of l. 1 are not clear, but I seem to make out [ ][ ], which would be δωδέ]κ(α)τ(ον) θ[αρ(κακ)οςτόν]; for the spelling of the putative σαρακοστόν, see P. Pintaudi 27.5 n. Another small point that requires correction is the date of the month: it is Π(α)υ(νι) β, not α.

Another problem is ρ(ναρόν), a term not attested with money in the eighth century and not expected in this place, which is normally occupied by μόνον. I would read μ(όνον), even if the shape of the top of μ is odd; the double slash is also characteristic of this abbreviation.

Finally, a curious sequence occurs in l. 12 (third entagion): γ(ι)ν(εται) δ̣δ[´]. The reference ought to be to solidi, but these are not mentioned. Here is a clipping of this passage:

28 I discuss other aspects of this text in a forthcoming paper, ‘Rāshid b. Khālid: An amīr in Middle Egypt under the Umayyads’.
29 http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/RZ00004593
If we compare the writing with l. 3 (reproduced above), where the text runs γί(ν.) νο(μ.) ἵβ´ μη´, we may read γί(ν.) νο(μ.) δ´, ‘total 4 sol.’.  

**SPP XX 258**

ἀπὸ Ἐκκοσίου was read in l. 5 of this text, and we can guess how this reading was arrived at:

The name was later corrected to Πιεκκοσίου (BL VIII 475), but there is one other change to be made: read δ(ιά) before the name. There are several examples of δ(ιά) + name in the rest of the text.

**SPP XX 260**

Line 9 in this account begins ‘παιδδ´ (l. -σι´)’ in the edition, but the abbreviation should be resolved as παιδ(αρίοις).

The suggestion recorded in BL IX 350 to read λαξ(ῷ) in place of Φιλοξ(ένου) in l. 11 should be abandoned; an image makes it clear that the letter before ζ is ο.

### 4. Some personal names re-read

**BGU II 673**

The female name Κου[τ] λωτει was read in l. 6 of this Hermontite document of 525. BL VIII 32 refers to P. Mon. Epiph. 2, p. 242 (336 n. 2), for discussion of this name, which at that time had appeared in Coptic as ၒ thậpτ and ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ. To judge from the online image, the papyrus has Κου[τ] λωτει, a form close to ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ in O. Medin. Habu Copt. 72 and ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ ၒ in O. Mon. Phoimammon 7.

**BGU III 737**

To judge from the image, the name transcribed as Αγες, οζ in this mid seventh-century document from Arsinoe may be read as Αγένιος.

**CPR VIII 78**

This is an *entagion* of Fl. Atias issued to a person whose name is given in l. 2. Over Ἠλι(α) Ψεειου, the scribe added what the editors transcribed as αρον(υ). I propose to read Αιουλ(ιου), a name typical of the Fayum. The combination of α and ι gave the latter the illusory appearance of ρ; see Tafel 40 and the online image.

In l. 5, for Παμου, ( ) read Παμουν; ν is tiny and attached to υ.

**P. Flor. III 349**

π(αρύ) Ανουφορ προνοητ(ο) stands at the top of this receipt of the sixth century, said to come from Hermopolis. The form of the name is unusual, but the papyrus has the common

---


31 <http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/RZ00001786>

32 <http://berlpap.smb.museum/01605>

33 <http://berlpap.smb.museum/01035>

34 <http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/RZ00003554>
Ἀνουφίου; the ink of the unread iota is faded, but the reading is not in doubt, as the image shows. The name was left unresolved in the signature in l. 4: Ἄνουφ( ); read Ἄνουφ(ίου).

P. Got. 39
The edition printed υἱοῦ υε[. . . ]ονοῦ in l. 5. BL XI 85 records that the father’s name should be read as Νεπωτίανοῦ, but this is only a conjecture; inspection of the image shows that the papyrus has Γε[p]μανοῦ.37

PSI VIII 894
One of the parties to this Oxyrhynchite contract of 624 is called Ἄβραὰμ υἱὸς Φραμήγες. . . | σίμου ἀπ’ Ὀξ[. . . ]ονοῦ. BL XI 85 records that the father’s name should be read as Νεπωτίανοῦ, but this is only a conjecture; inspection of the image shows that the papyrus has Γε[p]μανοῦ.37

SB XVIII 13916
The names of the fathers of two Oxyrhynchite men in this text of 386 were read as Ἀνισίου (9) and Πινοῦτος (10). The first could be a iotacistic version of Ἀνυσίου; the second is not very common. Both names should be read differently, as the image shows:40 Ἀπίδος and Πιηοῦτος.

5. Florentine trivia

P. Flor. I 38
This Hermopolite lease of a house, possibly of 649, contains the phrase [ἐπὶ τὸν ὅλον χρόνον δι’ ὅσον διακατέχω (l. 9). The edition appeared in more than a century ago; in view of parallels published since then, we may now read [ἐφ’ ὅσον χρόνον διακατέχω (diα instead of διο̣γ̣υ̣ can be confirmed on an image). Cf. P. Stras. VI 600.6 (vii), which attests the same phrase, and generally BGU XII 2202.7–9 n., where P. Flor. 38 is associated with similar formulations.

P. Flor. III 303
The writer of this fifth-century letter requests that his addressee send him μίαν ἀρτάβην ἡμειλιον (l. 8). To judge from the image, the enigmatic word should be read as φασηλίων, ‘beans’; the same form is attested in P. Oxy. LVI 3862.25 (λ/κ).

35 <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/pflor;3;349>.
36 <http://papyri.info/apis/gothenburg.apis.29>
37 The other conjecture mentioned in BL XI 85 is to read τὰς νῦν διάγοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀρσινοείτων πόλεως in place of ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀρσινοείτων πόλεως. This is correct, but with some minor adjustments needed: τὰ νῦν διάγοντος (l. διάγοντος) ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀρσινοείτων πόλεως.
38 At http://www.psi-online.it/documents/psi;8;894. My thanks to Sophie Kovarik for comments on my readings.
40 <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/a/apis/x-2052>
41 <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/p-flor;i-38>
42 <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/pprag;3;303>
There is nothing objectionable in the phrase ὑπὲρ δὴν | δὲ βούλεται σ[ο]ῦ | ἡ χρηστότης (II. 2–3) until we compare the text with the image: instead of ὑπὲρ the papyrus has περὶ.

P. Flor. III 377v
The back of the papyrus contains shorthand and what was read as κατὰ τὴν π., λ. . . . ην καὶ τὴν ύποτεταγμένην ἡμέραν (see P. Flor. III, p. xi). On the image it seems to me possible to read κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν καὶ ύποτεταγμένην ἡμέραν. This was a pen trial: nothing was written after it.

PSI III 301
This is a letter of the fifth century from Oxyrhynchus. The text is problematic in several places. Some progress is possible, though other difficulties remain. 43–8 καὶ ἐπέμψαμεν τὸν Χεκουλ: the dubious reading conceals Χεκουλ, a male name typical of the area of Oxyrhynchus (the tentative suggestion in BL VIII 397 may be ignored). The use of the article before the name is not unusual at this time.

17–18 ἵνα δοθῇ τὰ Ἀγουστάλιαν: Vitelli subsequently read τὰ Ἀγουστάλιαν, but this is not an improvement. The scribe did not write τα but το, and later added ϊ over the right-hand part of o: read τοῦ Ἀγουστάλιαν, I. τῷ αὐγουστάλιανῳ. The use of the genitive instead of the dative is very common.

University College London  
Nikolaos Gonis (n.gonis@ucl.ac.uk)

---

43 Ed. pr. placed it in the sixth, but to judge from the image the hand is not so late: <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/pflor;3;348>.
44 <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/pflor;3;377>
45 <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/psi;4;301>
46 Another correction recorded ibid. is to read ἀγορά(σαι) instead of ἀγορα| (so in ed. pr.) in l. 13. The papyrus has ἀγοραι: ἀγορά|<σα>i.
47 Lex. Lat. Lehnw. I, p. 120, lists the word under αὐγουστάλιος, but the noun *αὐγουστάλιον, τό, is not attested elsewhere.