

Borkowski, Zbigniew

Some 'ghost-names' to disappear from Egyptian onomastic

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 18, 223-226

1974

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez **Muzeum Historii Polski** w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

SOME "GHOST-NAMES" TO DISAPPEAR
FROM EGYPTIAN ONOMASTIC

ἈΠΑΤΩΝΙΣ — ἈΠΕΨΩΝΙΣ P. LOND. III (P. 235) 870, 10

The document comes from Panopolis in the 4th c. A.D., and concerns a loan of money secured by a pledge on the borrower's part of a house. The boundaries of the property are specified, and we read in l. 10 that the next house south of this one belongs to a certain *Τασαιτος* *Απ.τωνατος*. The transcript of what the editor had taken for a patronym was subsequently corrected to Ἀπεψώνεως by Grenfell and Hunt, who informed U. Wilcken, engaged on a critical survey of the volume, of their corrections. The correction published in Arch. IV p. 558 was then reprinted in BL, along with the annotation that Bell preferred to read Ἀπατώνεως (A footnote was added to the effect that his reading was checked on the original, and communicated to the editors by letter).¹

Both readings are given in Preisigke's NB. Both are taken from recognised authorities, and Bell propounded his version already knowing the opinion of his learned colleagues. The difference between the two readings is extremely slight: Bell sees an *alpha* (certain?) where G. and H. perceive a damaged (or doubtful) *epsilon*. *Tau* and *psi* are often extremely similar to each other, and the difference of opinion that has arisen between the two scholars mentioned above shows that evidently the letter was written in such a way that it cannot be identified for certain. Thus the only way to settle the question is to look for arguments other than palaeographic ones that will support one or other of these readings.

There is a village called Ψώνις in the Panopolite nome, situated on the opposite bank of the Nile not far from the metropolis.² It may be assumed

¹ BL I p. 292: Bell zieht die Lesung Ἀπατώνεως vor. Footnote: Bell, briefl., laut Orig.

² Modern Bassuna, see H. Gauthier, *Notes géographiques sur le Nome Panopolite*, BIFAO IV, 1905, pp. 72—73 and X, 1912 111—112. Certified in papyri listed in L. C. Youtie, D. Hagedorn, H. C. Youtie, *Urkunden aus Panopolis*, ZPE 7, 1971, p. 33 (Papyrus No. 13, note ad 1.2). Apart from the other authors listed there, T. C. Skeat, in: P. Göt. 4, 16 recognized the village name. See: P. Beatty Panop. p. XXXIII and note 1. See also the next footnote.

that people from this village lived in the capital of the nome. As a matter of fact, two examples of this are known.³

In G.—H's Ἀπεψώνεως if we change one letter denoted as uncertain, we are left with ἀπὸ Ψώνεως, and thereby remove from the onomastic vocabularies two "ghost names".

ΠΑΣΙΝΕΜΟΣ AND ΧΟΘΥΤΗΣ SB I 5376

The text reprinted in the *Sammelbuch* is mummy-label, of which Spiegelberg published a facsimile without a transcription.⁴ There are two lines of script on the label, each taken in SB as representing one proper name. Indexed in SB II they were repeated in Preisigk's *Namenbuch*. If we divide the text differently, we read the second word as μοςχοθύτης and what is left must be looked on as a proper name Πασινε (there is nothing to indicate that it was abbreviated). Spiegelberg also interpreted the text in the same way. Although he did not publish a transcript of the text, he gives the word μοςχοθύτης in the index of occupations and titles.⁵

ΣΕΣΚΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ P. FOUAD 80,19

This papyrus, which is a private letter dating from the 4th c., contains an interesting allusion to the priestess of Tripheion, a sanctuary of Triphis near Panopolis.⁶ The transcript of l. 19 shows that the reading of the first letter of this name is not certain. Undoubtedly here we have a case of a bipartite name, the second part of which contains the name of Apollo. But owing to the damaged state of the papyrus and the absence of analogies, the editor could do no more than merely transcribe what he saw on the papyrus. An unpublished papyrus P. Berol. inv. 16365, also coming from Panopolis at the beginning of the 4th c.,⁷ contains a hitherto unattested name Δισκαπόλλων. The reading is certain,

³ SB 9902 = P. Gen. inv. 108 published by V. Martin, *Recherches de Papyrologie II* 1962 pp. 37—73 fragm. C 5 (house-owner) and in a papyrus from Cologne, cited above: *Urkunden aus Panopolis I* No. 13, 7, 1971 (tenant of a house).

⁴ *Ägyptische und griechische Eigennamen auf Mumienetiketten*, Leipzig 1901, Taf. 20 No. 59.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 72. Index IV No. 14. Other μ. are known from P. Mich. IV 225, 1814; Sijpesteijn, ZPE 9, 1972 p. 49 and SB 9902, L 6, M 6 (and other examples in the Berlin part of the same text).

⁶ Cf. V. Martin, *Relevé topographique des immeubles d'une metropole. Recherches de Papyrologie II* 1962 p. 59, Note 2.

⁷ This papyrus forms part of the same document as P. Gen. inv. 108 = SB 9902 published by V. Martin (see foregoing note). The author of these notes edited the combined texts as his doctor's thesis; the document will be published in the near future.

and the connection between the disc and the myths about Apollo is obvious. Moreover the names Δίσκος (ptolemaic only) and Δισκᾶς (from Roman times) are fairly common.⁸ Obviously a damaged delta can be taken as a sigma, especially when its upper part slopes up to meet the following letter when written from top to bottom. Since there is no doubt that we have to do with the same name, I suggest that we should read Δισκαπόλλωνος. On the other hand if the second letter was an *epsilon*, then nothing more would be involved here than a simple variant of spelling. The name Σεσκαπόλλων should disappear from future lists of names (at present it is given only in the *Onomasticon* of Foraboschi).

ΝΡΟΥΨΡΟΣ and ΤΡΥΝΨΤΟΣ, SB 9902

On the aforesaid papyrus from Panopolis,⁹ damaged lines 9—10 of fragm. A col. I contain a description of a property that at one time belonged to a man called Claudianus. Νυνί at the end of l. 9 must mean that the next line gives the name of the new owner. It reads (according to the editor): ? π]αλαι Σενρουρού Κλαυδιανου. The name Claudianus is an uncommon one, although in this particular text we come across it repeatedly: in the same column (l. 33) we read that a property belongs to his secretary, while another property of his is mentioned in fragm. M 16. The Berlin part of the text mentions the following items with the same name: unbuilt-on sites (XII 26), a demolished house (XV 25—26), and, even more interesting, οἰκία μεγάλη of Ulpianus Claudianus (XIV 28—29). Altogether there is much evidence suggesting that here we have to do with one person belonging to the municipal aristocracy.

The text of A I 10 as read by the editor indicates that Senrouros is the daughter of Claudianus. Although one cannot *a priori* exclude the form of the name itself, nor can one rule out the possibility that the daughter of a person belonging to high society had an Egyptian name, nevertheless it is rather unusual, and compels us to approach the editor's reading with caution. The letters ...ρουρου which at the end of the name are transcribed as certain, are equally applicable to θυρουρουῶ “door-keeper”, or “porter”, which like “secretary” also number among the servants of a local man of position. Plate VII would seem to fully to bear out this supposition, but it was only later that examination of an excellent photograph kindly delivered to me proved that the proposed reading is certain.¹⁰ What is visible in the line should be transcribed

⁸ Examples in *NB* and in the *Onomasticon* of Foraboschi.

⁹ See note 7.

¹⁰ I am greatly indebted to Professor Denis Van Berchem for giving me access to this photograph, as a result of which I was able to revise all the doubtful readings.

as follows:]λα.ε θυρουρουῦ Κλαυδιανοῦ. The letters at the beginning of the line obviously constitute the ending of the undeclinable Egyptian name of the porter.

The name Τρυνίτος appears in B II 18. The previous lines (B II 16—17) mention a house with an empty piece of ground belonging to Neilos and to the sons of Eudaimon. According to V. Martin, l.18 reads ἐλ(λη) υἱῶν Φανᾶ-σχ Τρυνίτου ἀο(ικητος). Abbreviation of the last word is unusual, since elsewhere it is written in full (A I 29) or is reduced to ζοικ (A III 1). The same applies to an unpublished part from Berlin. What the photograph shows is *alpha* with an abbreviation mark written above it. This last might very well be an *ypsilon* extending left and upwards to indicate that the word is not written in full. But it is certainly not *omicron*. What the editor thought were *tau* and *rho* of Τρυνίτου is really *nu* written upon *tau*. The papyrus reads νυλι τοῦ ἀ(τοῦ).

The item says that the house belonged to the sons of Phanasch (the reading is sure). The way *chi* is written does not indicate that the name was abbreviated, although this possibility cannot be ruled out. The house is now the property of "the same", i.e. of Neilos, proprietor of the foregoing building. In this papyrus numerous examples occur, where neighbouring houses belonging to one and the same person are described as "the house of X" and "another of the same". The scribe was probably inclined to follow the same practice here. After putting the name Phanasch he started to write τοῦ ἀ(τοῦ). This, however, made the text ambiguous. Νυλί was indispensable, so he changed *tau* to *nu*, leaving the left part of the horizontal bar facing left. Together with the remaining part of the latter (with a small loop in the upper part), this looks like τρ (but in this text *rho* is always drawn far down).

So far, both names, Senrouros and Trynitos, are only given in the index to SB, and it is to be hoped that they will not figure on any other list.

ΨΕΝΠΑΤΟΥΡΙΣ O. Edfou 456

In the transcription of the text the editor gives Ψενπατούριος (gen.). The discrepancy between this form and that noted in the index is probably due to a printer's error. This name is not given in Preisigke's Namenbuch. Fortunately it is not given in the *Onomasticon* of Foraboschi, either.¹¹ Without doubt the ostrakon reads Ψενσενούριος. This is a name well confirmed by several Roman ostraca.¹²

[Warszawa]

Zbigniew Borkowski

¹¹ It is a mystery why, of the three volumes of P. Edfou — *Fouilles franco-polonaises* vol. I 1937, vol. II 1938 and vol. III 1939 — the *Onomasticon* mentions only the first two.

¹² Cf. texts listed in the NB and in the *Onomasticon* of Foraboschi.