

# Sijpesteijn, Pieter Johannes

---

## Some corrections on some papyri

---

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 22, 57-62

---

1992

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](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Pieter J. Sijpesteijn

## SOME CORRECTIONS ON SOME PAPYRI

This article is dedicated to the memory of Zbigniew Borkowski, a friend who died too young. Zbig loved papyrology! Several interesting texts were published by him but he did not neglect the other duty of a papyrologist, to improve the understanding of published texts by correcting them either. I am convinced that he would have enjoyed to read the following corrections.

### 1. BGU I 74

On page 355 of BGU I the imperial titulature in the first four lines of BGU I 74 has been reconstructed (cf. BL I 15). P. Bureth, *Les Titulatures impériales* ("Papyrologica Bruxellensia" 2), Bruxelles 1964, lists this unique title on p. 81. Remarkable is the fact that in the lacuna at the end of line 1 only 65 letters are restored but 82 letters in the lacuna at the end of line 2 and 70 in the lacuna at the end of line 3<sup>1</sup>. It is also astonishing that Marcus Aurelius would not be styled ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος<sup>2</sup>. It will be obvious that in the lacuna at the end of line 1 of BGU I 74 also ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος has to be supplemented between Σεβαστός and δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας which brings the supplement of the lacuna at the end of the line to also 82 letters. The lacuna at the end of line 4 has to be supplemented with θείο[υ]3 Νέρουα ἀπόγονοι and the addressee (cf., e.g., P. Würzb. 9, 46).

### 2. BGU III 873

This papyrus consists of three fragments and contains a sale for future delivery<sup>4</sup>. In lines 9-10 of fragm. III the editor reads: ἔσχων τὴν τιμὴν λινοκαλάμης

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Verus were styled θεοῦ Αἰλίου Ἀυτωνίου υἱοί (cf. P. Bureth, op. cit., 76f.) which would bring the supplement of the lacuna at the end of line 3 to 76 letters. Θεὸς Αἴλιος Ἀυτωνίος is much more often attested than θεὸς Ἀυτωνίος.

<sup>2</sup> When Marcus Aurelius associated after the death of Antoninus Pius on March 7, A.D. 161 Verus to the throne he made him partake in the *tribunicia potestas* but did not make him also *pontifex maximus* (*Der Kleine Pauly*, volume V, column 1222). The latter fact is significant for Verus' position, since in imperial times the reigning emperor hold the post of *pontifex maximus*. The emperor Flavius Gratianus (A.D. 367-383) was the first emperor to refuse this post.

<sup>3</sup> For θεός instead of θεός, see, e.g., P. Cairo Goodspeed 29 III 4; P. Corn. 16 II 10; P. Ryl. II 77 V 43 (θειότατος).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Jördens, *Vertragliche Regelungen von Arbeiten im späten griechischsprachigen Ägypten*, Heidelberg 1990, 296ff.

δεκάτω ἢ τρισ|χίλιον τετρακοσίων - - -. Instead of the incomprehensible δεκάτω ἢ the papyrus has δεμάτων as inspection of the original revealed. Also on the verso one can read δεματ.Ι after λινοκαλάμ(ης).

At the end of line 10 and at the beginning of line 11 the papyrus has the expected<sup>5</sup> πρωθ|εισ|μία (read προθεσμία).

In the lacuna in line 12 a very probable supplement which would fill out the lacuna is: παρόντος<sup>6</sup>.

### 3. P. Flor. III 298

When M. N o r s a published P. Flor. III 298 in 1915 she could, due to the First World War, not take notice of a similar document published as P. Cairo Masp. III 67325. With the help of the latter document and a set of photographs kindly put at my disposal by R. P i n t a u d i I was able to correct P. Flor. III 298 in the following places:

- line 6: although the *a* and *o* are rather small a reading *ὁ αὐτὸς σεισιμί(ωται)*<sup>7</sup> does not seem excluded;
- line 9: read Τῆβ(ι) κδ (= 19/20 January) instead of Τ[ὴ]β(ι) ιδ;
- line 12: the correct reading of the papyrus is [† δε]δῶκ(ασι) κλ(ηρονόμοι)<sup>8</sup> Βη[χ] κ' ου<sup>9</sup>;
- line 13: read ἐξ ἐπιστάλμ(ατος) instead of ἐν ἐπιστάλμ(ατι);
- line 14: there is no space in the lacuna at the beginning of the line for παγάρχ(ου);
- line 15: read ἰλλ(ούστριος) (καὶ) πάγαρχ(ος)<sup>10</sup>;
- line 27: supplement in the lacuna at the beginning of the line: [γί(νεται) κ(εράτια) sd ζ(υγῶ). Χρι]στοδῶρος κτλ. After στοιχ(εῖ) there is a cross (†) on the papyrus;
- line 28: supplement in the lacuna at the beginning of the line: [γί(νεται) κ(εράτια) sL ζ(υγῶ). ὁ (αὐτὸς) σ]τοιχ(εῖ). After ζ(υγῶ) the papyrus has: γί(νεται) κ(εράτια) s ζ(υγῶ) κτλ.
- line 38: at the end of the line the correct reading is: τοῦ (αὐτοῦ) ὀνό(ματος);
- line 41: read and supplement at the beginning of the line: Μ[ακάρ]ιος;

<sup>5</sup> Cf. A. J ö r d e n s, op. cit., 329, footnote 281.

<sup>6</sup> Cf., e.g., SB VI 9280, 26 + BL VII 205. I want to thank G. P o e t h k e who checked the original at my request. He informs me that the papyrus has in line 12 of fragm. III ὠντος. Dr. P o e t h k e also informs me that below line 12 of fragm. III two more lines contain the subscription of the notary which possibly is identical with subscription 22.5.2 (Arsinoite nome; Tafel 16) in J. M. D i e t h a r t - K. A. W o r p, *Byz. Not.*, Wien 1986. In the Berlin text the name of the notary in Greek is missing.

<sup>7</sup> Read *σσημι(ωται)*. Here, and in lines 5, 10, 11, 16, 33, 38, 41, 46, 64, 67, 71 and 73, the scribes Gennadios and Makarios write *σεισιμ*. Through the second iota a horizontal stroke is drawn to indicate abbreviation.

<sup>8</sup> Although the papyrus has κλ( ) and not κλλ( ) the plural is intended. Cf. P. Cairo Masp. III 67325 VII v. 23 n.

<sup>9</sup> The proper name Μήκιος (F. P r e i s i g k e, NB 215 with the wrong "explanation" = Μαίκιος [quo videl]) can also be deleted.

<sup>10</sup> Read in line 25 also ἰλλ(ούστριος) (καὶ) πάγαρχ(ος). Supplement in the lacuna at the beginning of line 20: [(καὶ) πά]γαρχ(ος). In line 37 the papyrus has ἰλλουστρίου and in line 45 ἰλλουστρίου.

- line 65: perhaps Φανῆ (cf. P. Cairo Masp. III 67288 III 6) is the correct reading instead of Φένη;
- line 70: read Φαῶφ(ι) κζ (= 24/25 October) instead of Φαῶφ(ι) ιζ;
- line 75: read γί(νονται) instead of σί(του) and cf. BL IV 31 for the correct readings after ρδ<sup>11</sup>.

#### 4. P. Matritensis 45<sup>12</sup>

The second line of this mutilated text of five lines which is only complete at the top and the left-hand side is transcribed as follows by the editor: 'Απολλωνίωι 'Απολλωνίου τῶι καὶ [ . This is strange! If Apollonios son of Apollonios had an alias we would expect τῶι καὶ to be written after *his* name, not after the name of his father. Inspection of the text with the help of plate III revealed that at the end of line 2 τῶν [ instead of τῶι καὶ [ is the correct reading. The text originates from Oxyrhynchos and is dated by its editor to the IIIrd century A.D.<sup>13</sup> The editor uses the opportunity to give a useful list of the known (ex-)ἀρχιερεῖς of Oxyrhynchos (pages 15–16)<sup>14</sup>. It is striking that with the exception of Anthes-tius Primus qui et Lollianos mentioned in P. Oxy. IV 718, 2–4 no other (ex-)ἀρχιερεῖς shows a function before (ἀποδεδειγμένος) ἀρχιερεῖς/ἀρχιερατεύσας. Apollonios son of Apollonios may have been a former *cosmetes* (read at the end of line 2 τῶν κλεκοσμητευκότων<sup>15</sup>), or *exegetes* (read *ibidem* τῶν [ἐ]ξ[η]γητευκότων. ἐξηγητεύσας seems, however, to be the normal expression for a former *exegetes*). The addressor of this document may also have been a former magistrate, since in line 5, before ὀμολογ... I read [.]...κως.

#### 5. P. Med. I 65<sup>16</sup>

This Milanese text (cf. BL VI 77; VII 103), to be dated between A.D. 138–149<sup>17</sup> is interesting for the history of the imperial estates in Roman Egypt<sup>18</sup> and it is

<sup>11</sup> Some minor corrections may be added: line 1: † δέδωκ(εν), it is likely that most receipts (if not all) started with a cross; line 18: σοφία pap.; line 23: read and supplement: [(ὑπὲρ) δημο]σί(ων); line 24: κυρ( ) pap.; line 62: μοι( ) pap.

NB: in P. Cairo Masp. III 67286, 1, 12; 67325 II r. 6, III v. 1 and 67347 I 1, 17 the correct reading, resolution or supplement, is ἐνεβάλετο. P. Cairo Masp. III 67325 III v. 2 should be checked for a reading 'Αφρόδ( ) instead of Αφ/τα. For lines 3 and 4 of P. Cairo Masp. III 67325 III v., see BL I 450 ad P. Cairo Masp. III 67325 II r. 9.

<sup>12</sup> = no. 3 in S. D a r i s, *Dieci Papyri Matritenses. Edizione e commento* (= "Fondación Pastor de Estudios Clásicos" 36), Madrid 1990.

<sup>13</sup> May-be the absence of the *nomen gentile* Αὐρήλιος in front of 'Απολλωνίωι in line 2 points to a date before A.D. 212.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. K. R i g s b y, *On the Highpriest of Egypt*, BASP 22, 1985, 279ff. with relevant literature.

<sup>15</sup> Add τῶν in the lacuna at the end of line 8 of text no. 2 before κεκοσ-||μητευκότων.

<sup>16</sup> I wish to thank O. M o n t e v e c c h i who provided me with an excellent photograph of this papyrus.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. G. B a s t i a n i n i - J. W h i t e h o r n e, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt* (= "Papyrologica Florentina" XV), Firenze 1987, 127.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. G. M. P a r á s s o g l o u, *Imperial Estates in Roman Egypt*, ASP 18, Amsterdam 1978.

one of the few texts which mentions the village Epipolis<sup>19</sup>. Since the calculations in lines 6–8 (line 6 is separated from line 5 by a horizontal stroke) made me wonder, I reread the papyrus and deciphered these lines as follows:

6. (δραχμαὶ) Ἄϋος (τριώβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον) (δίχαλκον) προσδ(ιαγραφόμενα) (δραχμαὶ) ρκς (ὀβολός)
7. συμβολ(ικόν)<sup>20</sup> (δραχμαὶ) ξς (ὀβολός), (γίνονται) προσδ(ιαγραφόμενα) (δραχμαὶ) ρθβ [(τριώβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον) (δίχαλκον)] (δυσώβολον)<sup>21</sup>,
8. (γίνονται) ἀργυρίου (δραχμαὶ) Ἐρξθ.

126 drachmae, 1 obol (line 6) + 66 drachmae, 1 obol (line 7) make 192 drachmae, 2 obols (line 7). 1.976 drachmae,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  obols, 2 chalkoi (line 6) + 182 drachmae, 2 obols (line 7) make 2.169 drachmae<sup>22</sup>.

In line 11 the payment amounts to (δραχμαὶ) χλβ (τριώβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον).

In line 15 the correct reading is: (γίνονται) φόρων (δραχμαὶ) Ἐϋ<sup>23</sup>.

In line 4 I read: οὐσίω<sup>24</sup> Οὐεσπασιανοῦ Πάλλα[ντ]ος<sup>25</sup>.

#### 6. P. Lond. III 1170 (pp. 92ff.)

This London papyrus preserves a part (18 columns numbered 76 through 93) of an originally much longer tax-list originating from the Fayum (to be dated around A.D. 144, cf. BL VII 89). Line 436 (p. 99) is transcribed as follows: Τρυφῶνος α μ[.ελλη]ο[ι]ς. No explanation is offered but on p. 311a of the index of proper names the name Μ-ελλης(?) is listed. Several ἀπάτορες appear in the preserved part of this tax-list (pp. 98–101). There can be no doubt that Thryphon

<sup>19</sup> Cf. A. Calderini - S. Daris, *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto greco-romano* II.2, Milano 1975, 152, *Supplemento* I, Milano 1988, 108. It is to be noted that although Epipolis was situated in the Herakleïdion division of the Arsinoite nome the present declaration is submitted by the royal scribe of the Themistumēris (read and supplement at the end of line 2: --- Θεμιστο[ν] μεριδ[ος]).

<sup>20</sup> Or συμβ(β)ολ(ικόν). If συμβολ(ικόν) is the correct reading the scribe wrote the μ and the β in each other.

<sup>21</sup> At the end, underneath line 6 and line 7, small curved strokes are still visible. Are they the remains of a bracket to delete line 7? At the beginning of line 7 the papyrus is broken away.

<sup>22</sup> The total is thus (not abnormally) slightly rounded up. The deletion at the end of line 7 may be connected with this fact. The προσδιαγραφόμενα in line 6 are somewhat higher than the normal  $\frac{1}{16}$ th.

<sup>23</sup> The total of line 8 and the lost total of line 14 are obviously added in this line. The total of amounts listed in lines 10–12 is 3.324 drachmae,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  obols, (supplement in the lacuna at the end of line 14 at least Ἄ). The amount lost at the end of line 13 (read: Ἀλεξάνδρου Σίμωνος (δραχμαὶ) [ ] ) can, therefore, never have been higher than 505 drachmae,  $2\frac{1}{2}$  obols.

<sup>24</sup> Not οὐσίας as suggested in P. Petaus, p. 274, footnote 8. After all, there follow three usiai. It is not very likely that we have to supplement in the lacuna at the end of line 4 another [καὶ], since the sigma of Πάλλα[ντ]ος is prolonged so as to fill the line.

<sup>25</sup> Some minor corrections may be added: line 9: πτό pap.; line 16: ]ωμετ..s (δραχμαὶ) ..[ ]. There is a trace of one more line below line 17. There is, however, no question of a second hand.

too was an ἀπάτωρ. On the micro-film I read line 436 of the London text as follows: Τρύφωνος ἀπ(άτορος)<sup>26</sup> μη(τρὸς) Ταμή[ο]υς<sup>27</sup>.

## 7. SB V 7667

Like BGU III 873 (cf. above no. 2) this text is also a sale for future delivery<sup>28</sup>. In lines 12–13 the editor deciphered: - - - καὶ τ[α]λύτης ἀπαιτήσεως | γίν[ο]μένης - - -. The absence of the definite article is striking<sup>29</sup>. Parallels reveal that the wording at this place is either καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπαιτήσεως γινομένης - - - τῆς πράξεως (cf., e.g., P. Cairo Isid. 90, 9ff.) or (καὶ) ἐπὶ (δὲ) τῆς ἀπαιτήσεως γίνεσθαι - - - τὴν πράξιν (cf., e.g., P. Cairo Isid. 91, 12ff.; P. Col. VII 177, 15ff.). R. A. Cole inspected at my request the original and confirmed my suggestion that ἐπὶ τῆς instead of τῆς ἀπαιτήσεως is a very probable reading for SB V 7667, 12.

## 8. Some Proper Names

a. D. For a boschi, *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum* 84a<sup>30</sup> lists the proper name Γάιος Ἰούλιος Μάρκος from P. Marm. IX 6. Marcus is attested as a cognomen<sup>31</sup>. Inspection of the photograph revealed, however, that the papyrus has μαρκοῦ, i.e. there is a question of an abbreviation. It, therefore, seems more likely that the person in question bore a cognomen based on Marcus: Μαρκοῦλος being the most likely candidate<sup>32</sup>.

b. Index I of PSI XIV lists from the very incomplete text no. 1439, 7 the proper name Οὐάλευς Ἀυτωνίνος (cf. *Onom. alt. pap.* 217a). Both names are, however, cognomina<sup>33</sup> and it might, therefore, be safer to assume the appearance of two different persons, asyndetically connected, in this Florentine papyrus.

<sup>26</sup> Cf., e.g., H. C. Youtie, *Scriptiunculae* II, Amsterdam 1973, 998f. for the form of the π.

<sup>27</sup> For the genitive, see F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar* II, Milano 1981, 72ff. The name Ταμής occurs in P. Strassb. II 122, 8.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. BASP 18, 1981, 49f. for the date of this papyrus.

<sup>29</sup> Although the definite article is sometimes omitted with οὗτος κτλ. (cf. F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar* II, Milano 1981, 174. Gignac assumes — rightly in my opinion — haplography). The editor of P. Köln VII 319, 5 has to provide another example instead of P. Berl.Zill. 8, 5f. for his correct reading ταύτης Ἡρακλέους) π(όλεως) without a definite article in the cited passage, since inspection of the original for which I thank again G. Poethke revealed that in the Berlin text the correct reading is : ταύτης | τῆς Ἀρσινοϊτῶν πόλεως.

<sup>30</sup> Without much discussion we can eliminate from the *Onom. alt. pap.* Μάρκος [Ἀμμο]ναρῖν ὁ καὶ Σωκράτης (188a). From PSI VII 776, 3–5 the Index I correctly listed the proper name [Ἀμμο]ναρῖων ὁ καὶ Σωκράτης Μαρ. I (cf. *Onom. alt. pap.* 29a); Φλάουιος Μανρίκιος Τιβέριος (*Onom. alt. pap.* 335b), since the emperor of that name is involved. BL III 125 reads regarding P. Oslo III S. 58 B 25: [Μά]ρκος Π[ε]θ[ρ]ώνιος [Μ]αμερτεῖνος (cf. *Onom. alt. pap.* 190b). Ἀτολά (*Onom. alt. pap.* 59b) > Ἀτολάς (cf. P. Col. VII). SB VI 9100 fragm. a Col. II 12 should be checked again for the reading Δημαροῦτος instead of Δημαροῦτις (cf. *Onom. alt. pap.* 91a). It would give us the normal genitive of the well attested proper name Δημαροῦς.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 173.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. I. Kajanto, op. cit., 174. Kajanto cites only one example of the cognomina Marcunus, Marcussus and Marcutius each.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. I. Kajanto, op. cit., 247 and 161 respectively.

c. On p. 84b of *Onom. alt. pap.* the proper name Γάιος Κασμαζέτρης appears<sup>34</sup>. Γάιον is, however, a part of the dating formula. In the SB-text we read only the curious proper name Κασμαζέτρης.

d. There is no reason to assume the existence of a proper name Μαρου. In all the examples cited by F. Preisigke (NB 207) and D. Foraboschi (*Onom. alt. pap.* 191a [read there: O. Tait 1251]) we are dealing with a short genitive<sup>35</sup> of the often attested proper name Μαρους<sup>36</sup>.

e. Α κναμών is a field of beans. F. Preisigke, NB 188, lists from P. Lond. III 1170 verso (pp. 193ff.) the proper name Κναμών. In the London text (lines 20, 22, 24, 29, 31 and so on) there is a question of a κλ(ήρος) Κνα(μώνος). Although κλήροι are often named after their (original) possessors<sup>37</sup> this κλήρος derived its name not of a person called Κναμών but of a κναμών<sup>38</sup>.

f. F. Preisigke, NB 67, lists only one attestation of the proper name Αὐρσίμαχος: P. Lond. III 1179, 395 (p. 98). Inspection of the micro-film revealed that the correct reading of the papyrus is Μαρσισούχου<sup>39</sup> instead of Αὐρσιμάχου.

g. The proper name "Αγνων can be deleted. Inspection with the help of the micro-film of line 519 of P. Lond. III 1170 (p. 100), the only attestation cited by F. Preisigke, NB 7 [the same person occurs, however, in line 521], revealed that the correct reading of the papyrus is 'Απίωνος.

h. Δανύριος (F. Preisigke, NB 83) is a ghost-name. In line 55 of P. Lond. III 1170 (p. 94) the correct reading is Σενυρίου as inspection of the micro-film showed<sup>40</sup>.

[Amsterdam]

Pieter J. Sijpesteijn

<sup>34</sup> The reference should be SB V 8623, 1-2 where we read: ε (ἔτους) Γάιου Κασμαζέτρης(?). Also in SB V Abschn. 7, Abt. 1 (p. 421) appears a Γάιος Κασμαζέτρης(?).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. ZPE 64, 1986, 119f.

<sup>36</sup> In a note on line 4 of O. Tait 1251 it is stated: "Μαρου from Μαρῆς." F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar II*, Milano 1981, 74 does, however, not list a genitive Μαρ(ρ)ου for Μαρ(ρ)ῆς and in O. Tait III p. 86a Μαρου is listed as father of Καλλίας.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. F. Zuckerr, *Beobachtungen zu den permanenten Klerosnamen* [in:] *Studien zur Papyrologie und antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Bonn 1964, 101ff.

<sup>38</sup> In P. Vindob. G. 39882 (to be published as CPR XVII), fragm. 40, 6 there is a question of a κλήρος λεγόμενος περσεάς, a κλήρος deriving its name from a persea-tree. Cf. P. Merton I 10, 6-7 and 33-34: κλήρον --- ἐπικαλούμενον ἡμιαρούριον.

<sup>39</sup> μα is written very closely together. The first omikron is corrected from an iota.

<sup>40</sup> In line 678 of P. Lond. III 1170 (p. 102) the correct reading of the papyrus is Μεγχείους instead of Μεσου.... In line 133 (p. 95) Ἀρπ[ά]λου instead of Ἀρπ[έ]ως should be read and the proper name Ἀρνεύς (cf. F. Preisigke, NB 51) can be deleted. Also Ἀρνεύς in P. Princ. I 13 XVII 34 (cf. *Onom. alt. pap.* 50b) disappears (cf. A. E. Hanson, *P. Princeton I 13: Text and Context Revised* [in:] *Miscellanea Papyrologica in occasione del bicentenario dell'edizione della Charta Borgiana* ("Papyrologica Florentina" XIX), Florence 1990, 259ff. [XVII 484]). In line 84 (p. 94) Νέωρ[ο]ς seems a better reading than Νέως.