Some ghost-names

Ἄλιής

One of the entries in SB 24.16143, a seventh-century Arsinoite account of money, concerns ἁδὸς Ἀλιέως (8). Ἀλιέως was taken as the genitive of Ἄλιής, a name not attested elsewhere; the editor(s) excluded the possibility that it is a form of ἀλεύς on the assumption that the case would be wrong, but this is not conclusive. The word occurs in this spelling in the nominative in another Arsinoite text of this date, SPP 8.816.1 Ἰωάννης ἀλεύς. 2 This also suits the context: three other entries in the account refer to occupations: ὄνελα(άτης) (5), λοροτόμος (6), τέκτων (7); only in l. 9 do we find a sequence of two names -]ρη(ος) Κυρακάλη. 3

Ἄταυλος, Σαρόθεος

Numerous unusual and unique names occur in P.Prag. 2.136, an Arsinoite tax register of the later sixth century (‘VII’ ed. pr.). On closer inspection some of them turn out not to be unique, but still not very common. Thus Σαρμάτα Σαρόθεος Ἀταύλος in l. 23 (col. i) would seem to attest two new names, Σαρόθεος and Ἀταύλος, the latter also found in ll. 24 and 30. A different division produces Σαρμάτας Ἀρόθεος, and does away with the first of the two presumed novelties. Σαρμάτας, a spelling of Σαρμάτης, is known from several documents of the later period. Ἀρόθεος, variously spelled, is also fairly well attested; one example comes from l. 30 of the same text, κληρ(ονόμα) Ἀρόθεος Ἀταύλος (cf. also next note). It seems that ll. 23 and 30 record the son and heirs of the same person, but it is unclear why these were mentioned separately.

Also in need of correction are the endings in -ος where genitives are expected: the scribe in fact wrote -ου, but in an idiosyncratic fashion, with υ in the form of a left-facing curve reaching below ο, like final σιμα in Roman cursive; this was understood as such only in some parts of the text. Thus read Ἀροθέου (ll. 23, 30) and Ἀταύλου (ll. 23, 24, 30; more on this below), but also Ἄγεμου (l. 6, for Ἀγεμη), Μακαρίου (l. 17, for Μακάριος), Κονσταντίου (l. 27, for Κονστάντιος).

To return to Ἀταύλος or rather Ἀταύλου, the reading seems acceptable in l. 30, less so in l. 24, but very difficult in l. 23, where we seem to have απ- and not ατ-; this receives support from comparison with απ- in Ἀπαύλος in l. 11. I propose to read Ἀπαύλος, a name previously known from SPP 3(2).5 549.3, whose editor compared it with names such as Ἀιούλιος, Ἀνειλός, or Ἀκαλαυλος; Ἀγούνθος probably belongs to the same category of names, as perhaps also does Ἄλαλωσ; and Ἀπέτρου in P.Ross.Georg. 5.66.16 does not need to be emended to Ἀπ<α> Π>έτρου.

1 I am grateful to Federico Morelli for a critical reading of these notes.
2 The reading is mine, checked on the original by F. Morelli; ed. pr. has ἀλεύς, later changed to ἀλεύς (BL 8.447), but -ος seems clear. (According to BL 8.447, this is followed by ἀπό Τιν, which however cannot be confirmed on the image.) ἀλεύς is also read in CPR 9.51.17, 18, 19, 24 (Herm.; 640s), but the case is uncertain (nominative or genitive?), and some of the letters are dotted. F. Morelli reports (email of 29.i.19) that “a l. 17 direi che c’è αλεύς con qualcosa soprascritto; negli altri casi può bene essere αλεύς, con c soprascritto, o forse a l. 19 e 24 non soprascritto.”
3 Κυρακάλη (Καρακάλη ed. pr.) was cautiously suggested by D. Hagedorn in B. Kramer, APF 47 (2001) 358, and is recorded in the apparatus of the SB edition. The reading is certain.
This seems to be an Arsinoite phenomenon of unclear origin.\(^4\) I wonder whether Α- goes back to Απα: it is an easy thought that the common Απαούλαος and Ατουλιος might derive from the same mold; cf. also Ανευλος and Απανελος. The presence of Απα Παύλος and Απαδόλος in the same text would not necessarily be a problem. But contrast the case of Αολ (see below, under SPP 8.833), which is probably not a derivative of Απαολ.

A small slip affects the reading of another name: in l. 22, for Τερεόυς read Τηρέους.

Δελφάκιος, Περενοβή, Τεγρεπαι

These names are recorded in Foraboschi’s Onomasticon from P.Erl. 128, a text described as a list of names of the 6\(^{th}/7\(^{th}\) century, and published only in part. A look at the online image may explain this editorial choice; not everything is clear, and I limit myself to the unique names reported in the edition:

In l. 4, for Αροθεί Περενοβή read Αροθ[ι]έ ιπερ (ο- pap.) ἐνοικ(ίου).
In l. 6, for Πίος Τεγρεπαι read τοῖς γεωρ(γοῖς) ἐποικ(ίου) Πι . [.]
In l. 7, Δελφακίου is surely a noun (‘piglet’), not a personal name; this text records more than names.

’Ισέρμης, ’Ισώρος

These two names occur in SB 6.9595, a seventh-century list of witnesses published as of unknown provenance, though several names suggest a Hermopolite origin. Foraboschi, Onomasticon s.v., considers ’Ισώρος a possible corruption of ’Ισιώρος, but both this and the other name stem from misunderstandings. The edition has ’Ιωσήφ ’Ισώρου (l. 7) and ’Ιωσήφ ’Ισέρμης (l. 8), but in both cases we should opt for a different division: ’Ιωσήφως ’Ωρου and ’Ιωσήφως ’Ερμῆς.

Κοντπᾶς, Κοπτρᾶς

Κοντπᾶς made its way to the Namenbuch from the Arsinoite SPP 10.139.5 (6\(^{th}\) cent.), Ἡλία Κοντπᾶ. The name has remained an unicum, as it often happens with misreadings; the papyrus has Κοπταρᾶ:

In its turn, the name Κοπταρᾶ is not a singleton; it recurs in BGU 2.608, a list of men from Karanis of c.342,\(^5\) but under the guise of Κοπτρᾶς, another unicum since its edition. At ii.11, in place of Ἄνν . τις Κοπτρᾶ read Ἀννουτίς,\(^6\) Κοπταρᾶ.\(^7\)

---

\(^4\) SPP 3(2).5.549.3 n. implies that the addition of A- before the usual form of the name is a Copticism, but the reference to Coptic “α-Präformativ” is dubious. G. Heuser, Die Personennamen der Kopten (Leipzig 1929) 105 with n. 2, only mentions that there are Latin names in which “α- wird vorgesetzt” (Ἄβιον, Ἀκλαμαῖος), and notes: “Die Bedeutung dieses α ist mir nicht bekannt.”

\(^5\) See R.S. Bagnall, K.A. Worp, BASP 17 (1980) 5f. = BL 8.30. The suggestion that the text may date from the first half of the fifth century, also recorded in BL 8.30, is wrong; cf. already Bagnall and Worp, ibid. The text is written by the same hand as BGU 2.539 (see BL 8.28); the sign for the thousands at r.15 and v.13 of the latter text is the Roman one, rarely attested after the middle of the fourth century, when a dash took over this role.

\(^6\) Conjecturally proposed already by J. Diethart, Prosopographia Arsinoitica I (Wien 1980) 349 n. 71.
Λαμασάς

*BL* 9.184 questions the reading of Λαμασάς[τ?] in *P. Oxy.* 10.1320.4, a contract of 497. The name is not attested elsewhere. An online image allows reading Λαμάσω[ν], a typical Oxyrhynchite name (TM Nam 10930).

Πένιος

The names of the addressees of *SPP* 20.236, a sixth-century letter ('V/VI' *ed. pr.*), were read as Ἀπολλόδος Πένιο (καὶ) Παρφνοθί(ω). Πένιο was taken as the genitive (in phonetic spelling) of Πένιος (Preisigke, *NB*), a name not attested elsewhere (Πένιος in TM Nam ID 33516). A closer look turns it into a ghost: as the online image shows, the papyrus has (καὶ) (ἡ *pap.*) Ἀγενίω. The letter is addressed to three people.

Other hidden or mistaken identities

*BGU* 1.317

One of the contracting parties in this Arsinoite dialysis of 580/81 signs through an amanuensis: [ c.20 Τιβέριον Κυρίλλου γραμματέως | [ c.16 ἔγραψα υπὲρ αὐτῆς παρόντος ἀγράμμάτου ὄντος[σ] (l. παρόντης, οὔτης) (ll. 14–15). This led to the entry ‘Τιβέριος Σ. d. Κύριλλος, γραμματέως’ in *Pros. Ars.* , no. 5178, which is problematic: at this point, we expect the name of the amanuensis followed by his father’s, with or without υἱός in between, and two successive names in the genitive are hard to explain. My suspicion that Τιβέριοι was a misreading for μακαρίου has been confirmed on the online image: what was read as ις is compatible with the top of the upper arm of κ, while the traces under it suit the upper right part of the αρ combination; cf. παρόντος in 1.15.7

μακαρίου Κυρίλλου

We could reconstruct the amanuensis’ signature as [Αὐρήλιος name υἱὸς τοῦ μα]καρίου Κυρίλλου γραμματέως. The lacuna at the beginning of l. 15 could have taken away [ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως].

*BGU* 3.750

The guarantor in this Arsinoite deed of surety of 655 describes himself as [κοραίτις ταρσικάριος υἱός Γεωργίου (l. 5).] κοραίτις is enigmatic. The online image shows that what was read as κ is broken above, so that it is impossible to tell whether the first stroke extends upwards, as expected from κ, or not, in which case the letter would be β. The latter will yield Βοραίτις, a

---

7 Credit for image clipping: © Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung; scan: Berliner Papyrusrdatenbank, P 8080 R.
8 It was wrongly resolved in *P. Mert.* 1.41, but this has been corrected (*BL* 8.208).
9 Credit for image clippings: © Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung; scan: Berliner Papyrusrdatenbank, P 2615 R.
phonetic version of the name Βο(υ)ράδι(ο)ς, attested in several documents of this period.\textsuperscript{10} We should supply [Αὐρήλιος] before it.\textsuperscript{11}

\textit{P.Herm. 69}

The person who signs on behalf of an illiterate canal-worker in this Hermopolite text of 410 calls himself Αὐρήλιος[ eius . . . ] ἀδελφὸς Βησρίως. A self-description with reference to one’s brother is strange, but inspection of the original at Manchester (John Rylands Library)\textsuperscript{12} reveals something unexceptional: Αὐρήλιος Τριάδελφος Βησρίως.

\textit{P.Laur. 4.175}

The first line in this list of names, assigned to the third/fourth century, was read as Εὐτροφίς, l. Εὐγράφις. To judge from the photograph, the reading is possible but not inescapable; Εὐγράφις, which assumes no spelling error, seems more likely. There are only three other attestations of the name Εὐγράφις (TM Nam 9335) in Egypt, in documents dated between the first and the late third century.

\textit{P.Nag Hamm. 44}

This is a name list of the late third or early fourth century. The editor read Πακύρας Σέρβιος in l. 4, and noted: “both names are new if rightly read, but there is considerable doubt about the first … Σέρβιος, though genitive, may have been derived from Latin Servius.” The plate suggests that the papyrus has Σάρβιος. This may be a phonetic version of Σάρφιος, genitive of Σάρφις, a name known from the Theban area, not too far away from Nag Hammadi.

\textit{SB 5.7634}

The subscription to this Oxyrhynchite document of 249 closes in a peculiar fashion; after the names of four persons, the edition has δι’ ἐμοῦ Αὐρήλιο(ιοῦ) κ(αί) τὸ χαρτίδιον ἐπιδέδωκα καὶ ὁμοσα τὸν ὄρκον (II. 55–6). κ(αί) gave the editor difficulty, not resolved by the alternatives suggested in a note (\textit{JEA} 20 \textsuperscript{[1934]} 22); and a name ought to follow Αὐρήλιο(ιοῦ). The online image\textsuperscript{13} reveals a different text: Αὐρήλιο(ιοῦ) Κλεοχάρους | Διονυσίου. There are not many instances of the name Κλεοχάρης in papyri, but most of them come from Oxyrhynchus.

\textit{SB 8.9931}

The name of the amanuensis in this Hermopolite document of 405 was not deciphered: [ ] η . . . μονή[ . . ] π . [ἐγράφα] (l. 23). On the basis of the online image,\textsuperscript{14} I propose to read Πινουτίων Η[ . . ] . . . , but I find it hard to match the traces with the expected Αὐρήλιος

\textsuperscript{10} See \textit{P.Gascou} 32.63 n.; to the literature cited there add D. Dana, \textit{Onomasticon Thracicum} (Athens 2014) 71f.

\textsuperscript{11} This gives rise to another problem. The text is addressed to a dux of Arcadia, taken to be Fl. Ioannes (see \textit{CPR} 24, p. 205 n. 14), but [Φλ. Ἰοάννη τῷ] in l. 4 would be too long in comparison, if lines 4 and 5 were aligned. Another small correction is needed in l. 7: for εὐκλε[εστάτης] ὑπεροχῆς read εὐκλε[οῦς] ὑπεροχῆς.

\textsuperscript{12} First checked by me (June 2018), and rechecked by Antonia Sarri (March 2019), whom I thank.

\textsuperscript{13} \<http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=papyrus_2554_f001r>\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{14} \<https://www.altegeschichte.uni-bonn.de/die-abteilung/bonner-papyrus-und-ostrakonsammlung/Papyri/p.bonn-020-rto/image_view_fullscreen>\textsuperscript{1}
before it. The father’s name may be Πατροῦ[θ]ο, but the traces at the end of the line are ambiguous. At any rate, there is no [ἔγραψα] in this line.

**SB 16.12422**

This is an Arsinoite acknowledgement of debt by Αὐρῆλος Σενούφιος | [υίος] Κ., σύλ τοῦ καὶ Π[.] (ll. 3–4), assigned to the sixth century. “Je ne peux pas lire Κιμιοῦλ,” commented the editor on the partially read name (Hellenika 32 [1980] 134). The online image shows that the papyrus has Κίρμουλ, a name known exclusively from the Fayum.15 The debtor also appears in the endorsement, not mentioned in ed. pr.:

χ(ρόγραφον) Σενουφ(ίου) υίοις Κίρμουλ τ(ο)ν [κα Π. . . - - ].16

**SB 18.13948**

What is preserved of the second column of this document lists persons from whom grain was collected17 somewhere in the region of Memphis in 407. Some of the names are remarkable, but not all of them stand to scrutiny. Σαρματίο[v] in l. 8 would be a new by-form of a common name, but the online image allows reading the ordinary Σαρμάτης. Έρσος in l. 12, taken as the genitive of the rare Ἕρσις, should be read as Ἄρσις. In l. 19, for Ἀρτεμίσ[ί]ου read Ἀρτεμίδιο[ρ]ος (the top of δ is lost, and of ω only a vestige remains).

The editor read or restored every name in the genitive, but the entries are given in the nominative (cf. P.Mich. 20.809 or 813). Apart from the names discussed above, Παίσιος in l. 9 can be taken as a nominative. More difficult is Βησάτ[v]ος (sic) in l. 15; I cannot see ταυ nor the expected sigma.

**SPP 8.710**

The name of the payer in this late Arsinoite tax receipt was read as Κ[οσ]μα [ . . . ] | Μ[ . . . ]νου (ll. 2–3). The papyrus is in a poor state of preservation, but the online image suggests reading δ(ια)18 Δαμια|νοῦ | διαγόνου (l. διακόνου).

**SPP 8.744**

Wessely read the first part of name of the payer in l. 2 of this late Arsinoite poll-tax receipt, and added a drawing of what followed: Α[κα] Κρ. This has been changed to Ἰσάκ Ἐψιλ( ).19 but the name of the father gives difficulty. The parchment has από, which I read as Ἰσάκ Σαι (or Σαεί). Though the nominative Σα(ε)ς is attested, Σαι may have been treated as indeclinable; cf. CPR 10.65.39 (Ars.; 6th c.) δ(ι)θ(ο) | ἄπα Σαεί, P.Oxy. 16.2045.7 (612) Πέτρῳ Σαεί.

---

15 In BGU 3.739 = SPP 8.713.2, the first editor correctly read Κιμιοῦλ; Κιμιοῦλ (BL 1.440) is wrong.
18 F. Morelli kindly checked the original and reported (email of 29.i.19): “direi che sopra il δ di δέκα della linea successiva si vedono davvero resti di un trattino che deve essere la abbreviazione di δ(ια) .”
19 See Diethart, Prosopographia Arsinoitica nos. 1783 and 2403, with n. 278 (p. 356). This was excerpted in BL 8.446 but with no reference to no. 2403, so that “Εσάκ ( ), wohl Εψιλ(όγος)” was given as the reading of the entire passage.
SPP 8.833

Μ[ν]νᾶ Ὀλ[ was read at the end of l. 2 of this seventh-century (‘VI’ ed. pr.) receipt from Arsinoe. The reading was later revised to Μο[νά]ο(πα) Ὀλ (BL 8.447), which however is no less problematic than the earlier version. We do not expect απα to be abbreviated, and it was not: as we can tell from the image, the short stroke that links α with ο is not of the kind used for abbreviations. The name Ὀλ, also spelled Ὀωλ, is not very common (TM Nam 24294); it is tempting but not necessary to relate it to Ἀπαολ (on such names see above, p. ), since it is found already in the mid fourth century (P.Αbinn. 73.7). More difficult is the name before it: α is preferable to ο, and the tops of the putative η and ε may well belong to the top of a wide κ, such as the κ of ἔκτης in the same line. I have considered Μάκρου, but there is hardly any space for ρ in the lacuna; Μακ[ρ]ού would be even more difficult to fit.

This person is said to come ἀπὸ Ἡρακλ[; there is more writing after λ, the top of ε with ι under it. I propose to read Ἡρακλεί[ζ, an Arsinoite village (TM Geo 772) attested also in this period. The phrasing of this text also points to this area. This settles the issue of provenance, previously thought to be unknown.

There is one other problem to tackle: the text in the edition begins παρέσχ(ε) ὁμοῦ, but what was read as upsilon is iota intersected by a long oblique stroke; read ὁμ(ι).  

SPP 8.1291v

This is an account of tax payments, written on the back of a fragmentary tax receipt. Its provenance was given as ‘Hermopol.?’, but the material (parchment) and the name Ἀπα Ἰούλ(ιος) (l. 5) point to the Fayum. I reproduce lines 3 (which is crossed out) and 5 as they appear in the edition, followed by a clipping of an image of the first part of these lines:

In l. 3 we have names and money; although Wessely did not resolve the abbreviations, he would not have objected to reading Ἰερε(µιας) Μερκου(ρίου). At the beginning of the line, there is Πκώµης δι(άκονος). The name (< ι-κοµης) in this spelling is also known from SPP 10.281.9, 10 (Ars.; 7th/8th c.); other spellings are attested in other regions. As for the mysterious writing in l. 5, delta should be read as sigma, which would give Σερις, an indeclinable name previously known from two documents from Roman Fayum (TM Nam 17520). This is followed by [ν]ο(µ.) α[. 

SPP 10.55A

Ναρµοῦθα(ως) δ(ια) Οὐρ[ is what survives of l. 6 of this Arsinoite fiscal register, assigned to the sixth century but clearly of the seventh. Given the text’s origin, the name should be restored

---

20 For similar problems, see SPP 10.122v.8 with BL 8.457, or SPP 3(2).5.549.3 n.
either as Οὐρ[γένους or as Οὐρ[ίωνος, with the latter by far the likeliest candidate. A namesake from this village, about a century later, occurs in SPP 10.74v.ii.4 χωρ(ίον) Ναρ[μ][υθ][ιων(ος) δ(υ) Οὐρίων(ος) Ἀπα Ἰουλ(ίου). The reading of the name in the latter passage was questioned, and Συρίων(ος) was suggested instead (CPR 23, p. 88f.), which would remove what was then the last occurrence of the name. The omikron, however, is secure, even if it has suffered some damage. Furthermore, the recent publication of P.CtYBR inv. 461 has provided two unambiguous examples (ll. 3 and 6), one of them a man from Narmouthis; three of the four instances of the name are now associated with this village. This must be a by-form of Ῥιων, and should therefore bear the rough breathing; cf. CPR 34.12.+5 ζογριων. γριων in P.Poethke 26.4, an ostracon from Narmouthis, is the same name.22

Misunderstood apostrophes

It was recently claimed23 that certain readings of the names Πετσε(ι)ρις and Τετσε(ι)ρις (various cases) have to be emended into others going back to Πετοσε(ι)ρις and Τετοσε(ι)ρις, on the assumption that the editors failed to recognize “a little omicron between the tau and the sigma.” This, however, is a misconception: in all these cases, the scribes added an apostrophe between tau and sigma, a fairly common convention in the writing of two successive consonants, especially from the third century onwards.24 J.R. Rea, the editor of P.Oxy. 43.3109.9, 51.3621.21, and 3638.18 and 31, did not miss any omicron, but recorded the apostrophes in the apparatus. It is true that the apostrophe resembles omikron on P.Oxy. 51.3638.18, but its shape is clear in l. 31. The scribe of P.Oxy. 51.3638 was also inconsistent: Τετσείρι in l. 3 has no apostrophe. Likewise, the editorial apostrophes in PSI 10.1112.19 and 20 should not be seen as omikron and iota respectively (the apostrophe in the second passage is very large and occupies the space of a letter). The diacritic in P.Giss. 101.13 has lost its lower part, and was represented as a circumflex-like sign in the edition, but was correctly recognized as an apostrophe in the DDbDP version. Πετσείριος in W.Chr. 206.2, 3, and 13 seems to have escaped notice. All these texts are Oxyrhynchite.

University College London

Nikolaos Gonis

22 I owe this reference to Lajos Berkes, who also informs me that there are several additional examples in unpublished texts in the Michigan collection, which may well come from Narmouthis.
24 See E.G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World (BICS Suppl. 46; 1987) 11 n. 50; W.B. Henry, P.Oxy. 82, p. 24 with n. 1.