

868. P.Nekr. 15: ἡ μὲν ἦν

The text is a petition dated to 260 CE concerned with a dispute *περὶ μέρους νεκροταφι[κῆς τάξ]εως ἐν κόμῃ Πμουνησιων τῆς | [αὐτῆς Κύσ]εως ἡ μὲν ἦν ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔτι ἀπὸ | [τοῦ . (ἔτους) θεο]ῦ Γορδιανοῦ* (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 *ἡ μὲν ἦν*, with the particle immediately following the relative pronoun, but *ἡ ἦν μὲν*. I suggest restoring *ἡ <νενεμη>μὲν(η) ἦν*, ‘which had been managed’, with the expected verb, for which cf., besides l. 14 *ἐν τ[ῆ] νομῆ* and l. 16 *ἐν τῆ νομῆ*, P.Nekr. 23.6–7 (c. 290–92) *τάξις ἐνταφιαστική, ἦνπερ καὶ αὐτὸς | πα[ρεί]ληφεν ἐκ γονέων, κα[ὶ] περιόντι ἐνέμετο*, and 47.11–12 (early fourth century) *νεκροταφικὴν [τάξιν ἦν δεξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶ]ν πατέρων καὶ πρ[ο]||γ[ό]γων ἡμῶν νεμόμ[εθα*. The tongue-twister *νηνεμημενην* was simplified by *saut du même au même* (Hνενεμημεν) and haplography (μενHHν).

869. SB XVIII 13949

Corrections in ll. 12 and 16 of this Oxyrhynchite deed of surety dated to 541 CE were published in the first edition of P.Oxy. LXXXIII 5371 in the notes on ll. 15 and 16–17 respectively. Here are three more, checked on the online image.

In l. 5, the unique Πῆνούθιος is a ghost-name. The papyrus has the familiar Ἀνούθιος. For the *αν* ligature, cf. e.g. l. 2 *ὑπατίαν*.

In l. 7, in place of *νίκ(ην)*, a word apparently not abbreviated elsewhere, we can print *νίκηγ*, though the traces of the final letters could not be read in isolation with any confidence.

Finally, in ll. 8–9, we have not the seemingly unique phrase *τὸν ὄμο|[γν]ήσιον ἀδελφόν* but rather the expected *τὸν ὄμογνή|σιόν μου ἀδελφόν*, for which there are parallels in SB VI 9201.10 (Oxyrhynchus, 203) and P.Oxy. XXXI 2584.30–31 (211).

W. B. HENRY