

864. O.Wilck. 343: Παθαύτης

In l. 2 of this receipt, Wilcken reads the genitive Παμυτου, which is indexed as Παμύτης. This is accepted in Preisigke's *Namenbuch*, where Pamytes is considered a variant form of Pamouthios. During a visit to the British Library I had the opportunity to check the original, which clearly reads Παθαύτης. This is a new variant of Pathotes, though the undeclined form Παθαυτ is already listed in both the *Namenbuch* and the *Onomasticon alterum*.

Willy CLARYSSE

865. P.Prag. II 197: περιστέρια

In diesem Brief aus dem 6. Jh. findet sich eine Aufzählung, die in Z. 5 mit den Worten ἐγὼ ἀπέστιλα τῆ ὑμετέρα ἐξου[σίᾳ] eingeleitet wird. Es folgen mehrere Produkte im Akkusativ, unter anderem in Z. 6–7 κ[α]ὶ δέκα | περιστερεά („e dieci colombe“). Der Begriff wurde im Kommentar ad loc. zu περιστεράς korrigiert und im Index unter (ἡ) περιστερά verzeichnet. Der Editor nimmt also an, dass am Wortende ein ε zu viel steht, dafür aber das Schluss-Sigma fehlt. Die Annahme einer so fehlerhaften Schreibung ist jedoch nicht notwendig, wenn man das Wort περιστέρια akzentuiert und somit als phonetische Variante von περιστέρια, Plural des Diminutivs περιστέριον, ansieht. Diese Form begegnet ausgeschrieben auch in der Lebensmittelrechnung SB I 5301 (byzantinische Zeit), wo in Z. 5 und Z. 11 jeweils steht: περιστέρια δ. Ein weiterer Beleg könnte in der Liste CPR X 60 (6./7. Jh.) vorliegen, wo ich in der Edition vorgeschlagen habe, das Wort περιστέρα in Z. 5 zu περιστέρ<ι>α zu korrigieren.

Johannes DIETHART

866. Two hidden wives

BGU II 395, an Arsinoite contract of 600, refers to Αὐρήλιος Ἀβραάμιος υἱὸς | Φίβ Κατωήτου το[. . .] | μεγηθην θυγάτη[ρ . . .]ρα (ll. 7–10); Κατωήτου is a correction (BL VIII 26) of what ed. pr. read as καγωκτου, but the understanding of the passage has remained elusive. Something similar occurs in another Arsinoite text, CPR VII 50.11–13 (636): υἱὸς Ποῦσι Καποήτου |αρσ .θ .της | Νεφεράς. Inspection of the online images of the two papyri results in the following sequences:

BGU II 395.8ff. κἀγὼ ἡ τοῦτο[υ γα]||μετὴ Θηυ, θυγάτη[ρ Νεφε]||ρᾶ
CPR VII 50.11ff. κἀγὼ ἡ τοῦτ[ου] | γαμετὴ Μαρία, θυγάτηρ | Νεφερά

For the construction, cf. BGU III.725.7–8 (Ars.; 618) κἀγὼ ἡ τοῦτου | γαμετὴ Εὐπρ[αζί]α, θυγάτηρ Πέτρου. The name Θηυ does not seem to be attested elsewhere.

867. P. Erl. 127 revised

The papyrus was published as a ‘Namenliste aus byz[antinischer] Zeit’ among the descriptions of smaller fragments in the Erlangen collection. The online image shows that many of the names, especially some of the unusual ones, should be read differently. We offer a new text below. The document dates from the seventh century, and after the Arab conquest, as suggested by χωρίο(υ) at 5. The name of the village would have been mentioned in the part now lost. To judge from the personal names, this may have been located in the region of Oxyrhynchus; see below, 4 n. and 9 n.

— — — — —
[Ἀνου]π ὁ ψί[δ](ς) . . . ξ[
Ἴ[ασ]μουν γαμ(ετὴ) Πλουτσαν
Ἱερημίας υἱὸ(ς) Ἐπιμάχου
4 Στεφανοῦ(ς) γαμ(ετὴ) Ἄπα Σιρίου
Ποῦσι(ς) Ἰούστου μεῖζο(νος) τοῦ αὐτ(οῦ) χωρίο(υ)

- Σοφία γαμ(ετή) Μουσήσ
 Σιβαλλε θυγ(άτηρ) Ἀπολλῶ
 8 Μαρία γαμ(ετή) Ἰωσήφ
 Τεγραμπε γαμ(ετή) Ἄνουπ
 Ἰασμουν θυγ(άτηρ) Ἀπαωρ
 Φιλόθεος υἰδ(ς) Β[ί]κτωρ(ος)
 12 Σάρα γαμ(ετή) Πατι [. .]
 Βίκτωρ ὁ υἰδ(ς) Ἄφου[
 [] . . . \α´ . υἰδ(ς) Ἀπολλ[ῶ
 — — — — —

- 1 This line was not transcribed in ed. pr.
 2 Πλουτσαν: Ἀσλουτ . . ω ed. pr. The name is new.
 3 Ἐπιμάχου: [Λυ]σιμάχου(υ) ed. pr.
 4 Απα Σιριου: ἄπα Ἰρσο() ed. pr. The name is predominantly attested in Oxyrhynchite documents.
 5 Πούσι(ς): Ποσι() ed. pr.
 μείζο(νος): μείζ(ων) ed. pr.
 7 Σιβαλλε: Σικαλλε ed. pr. Another new name.
 Ἀπολλῶ: ἄπα Λω ed. pr.
 9 Τεγραμπε: This female name, more often spelled as Τεκραμπε, has occurred exclusively in Oxyrhynchite documents; see P.Oxy. LXX 4787.9 n. (Τεκράμ[πε] should be read in place of Τεκράμ[τε] in P.Erl. 37.7). Τεγραπε occurs in P.Col. X 290.3, 10, a letter of unknown provenance.
 Ἄνουπ: Ἄνοσπ() ed. pr.
 11 Β[ί]κτωρ(ος): Β ed. pr.
 12 Πατι [. .] : Πα ed. pr. The onomastic repertories offer no match.
 13 υἰδ(ς) Ἄφου[: Ἄφω[ed. pr. Restore Ἀφού[τος, Ἀφοῦ, or even Ἀφου[ᾱ; l. Ἄφρ-
 14 Not transcribed in ed. pr. The last character of the unread name is an oblique stroke of the kind used for abbreviations with iota. If this holds, the supralinear alpha earlier may not indicate an abbreviation.

Nikolaos GONIS – Sophie KOVARIK

868. P.Nekr. 15: ἦ μὲν ἦν

The text is a petition dated to 260 CE concerned with a dispute *περὶ μέρους νεκροταφι[κῆς τάξ]εως ἐν κόμη Πιμουνην τῆς [αὐτῆς Κύσ]εως ἦ μὲν ἦν ὄφ' ἡμῶν ἔτι ἀπὸ [τοῦ . . (ἔτους) θεο]ῦ Γορδianoῦ (ll. 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 *δέ*, whether through forgetfulness or some more substantial error’. Even if *μὲν* did suit the context, we would require not *ἦ μὲν ἦν*, with the particle immediately following the relative pronoun, but *ἦ ἦν μὲν*. Restoring *ἦ* (νενεμη)μὲν(ῆ) ἦν, ‘which had been managed’, with the expected verb, for which cf., besides l. 14 *ἐν τ[ῆ] νομη* and l. 16 *ἐν τῇ νομη*, P.Nekr. 23.6–7 (c. 290–92) *τάξις ἐνταφιαστικῆ, ἦνπερ καὶ αὐτὸς | πα[ρ]είληφεν ἐκ γονέων, κα[ὶ] περιόντι ἐνέμετο*, and 47.11–12 (early fourth century) *νεκροταφικῆ [τάξιν ἦν δεξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶ]ν πατέρων καὶ πρ[ο]γ[ό]νων ἡμῶν νεμόμ[εθα*. The tongue-twister *ηνενεμημενην* was simplified by *saut du même au même* (Hνενεμημεν) and haplography (μενHHν).