

---

---

## Additional remarks

### on the magical papyrus, Pap. Leid. V.

---

**D**uring a short stay at Leiden this spring I had the opportunity of looking at the two Greek magical papyrus preserved in the Museum of Antiquities. I was principally concerned in the difficult V, especially in the corrupt passages so much discussed. The papyrus was first read by Reuvens and was lately examined with great accuracy and skill by mr. Preisendanz (Rhein. Mus. LXVIII 1913, 312 sqq.).

I have to thank Professor Boeser, Director of the Egyptian Department of the Museum, for the extreme liberality with which he allowed me to study these papyri at my leisure in the Reading Room of the Museum. Here I also used the first copy by Reuvens so indispensable to us (see Preisendanz l. l.).

Col. I 7 φερθελιωχ (or φερθεγιλωχ), the rest as Pr(eisendanz).

L. 9 ἄν δ]έ ὄνειρ[ο]πομπεῖ — this is quite clear so in the papyrus, and this is required by the consistency of the text: ὄνειροπομπεῖ, i. e. ὄνειροπομπῆι. It is the deity invoked that « brings the visions and the dreams », so e. g. Pap. Bibl. Nat. 2441 about the remedy to be used to that end: ἀναιρεῖ ἰσχυρῶς, ὄνειροπομπεῖ καλλίστως, ὄνειραιτητεῖ θαυμαστῶς. Reuvens (or Leemans) read ον.ρ.π. . . πει, by Dietrich falsely corrected into ὄν[ε]ρ[ο]πομπ[ῆ]ς].

L. 10. Pr. reads καὶ ἀν[ε]λεῖ σοι τὰς λαμπάδας, taking ἀνελεῖ as the fut. med. (Helbing, Gramm. der Sept. 88). The papyrus seems to have: καὶ γ. . . [.]λεῖ σοι τὰς λαμπάδας — the letter indicated by the parenthesis is not necessary, and instead of -λεῖ I have noted -αει, instead of γ at the beginning x as possible. The mea-

ning must be: « you give her the sword, and she will give you the torches ». We therefore expect something like ἀφήσει or παραχωρήσει σοι τὰς λαμπάδας, but the proper word is difficult to devise. I do not think that either ἀνελεῖ (Pr.) or καθελεῖ will do (at any rate the latter seems to fit better to the traces left than the former). We may supplement: καὶ κ[ατα]λεῖ(πει) σοι τ. λ. (if the simple καὶ λ[εῖ]πει — as I conjecture after my return home — is not too hazardous). The σοι was first read by Pr.

L. 11 where Reuvens (Leemans) read σὺ εἰπὲ [α]ὐ[τῆ] προσκεισθαι τὰς λαμπάδας, I have read .υειπ . ., and I think the text ran thus: σὺ εἶτα [π]ρ[ο]ί[ει] προσκεισθαι τὰς λαμπάδας: « you make the torches to be at her side », sc. at her return with the bloody sword.

L. 12 the papyrus has: καὶ φεύξεται. [π]ρὸ[ς] ἀν[α]τολήν λέγε, as I proposed supra Aeg. IV 59.

L. 13. I have copied thus: φυλακτήριον οἰ . . αψας, and I think now that we have to read φυλακτήριον περὶ[ρ]ιάψας δε[ξ]ιᾶ [χειρὶ κ[αί] ἀρι[σ]τερᾶ χειρὶ νυκτός. It decidedly would be better as to the meaning to supplement: φυλακτήριον φέρει (φόρι) περιάψας etc. or φυλακτήριον ἔχε or simply φυλακτήριον περιάψαι (in the med.); what sort of amulet is to be used we are not told, it must perfectly have been dropped by the copyist. As to περιάπτειν, περιάμματα see the references in the Index I of Wessely (Wien. Denkschr. 1888); Pind. Pyth. III 24 γυίοις φάρμακα περάπτων.

L. 15 πο[ι]εῖ δὲ πράξεις ταύτας — not, as Pr. proposed, ισχύει. Already Reuvens (Leem.) has read πο[ι]εῖ.

L. 15/16 καὶ ὄνει[ρο]πομπεῖ, ἀναγρυπνίαν ποιεῖ — probably (π)αγ-αγρυπνίαν ποιεῖ. Preisendanz himself referred to Pap. Bibl. Nat. 3274 δὸς αὐτῆ [π]αναγρυπνίαν, as he himself supplied, but here he takes αν to ὄνειροπομπεῖ and suggests the impossible ὄνειροπομπεῖαν. However it may be that a verb \*ἀναγρυπνεῖν is formed after the analogy of ἀνεγείρειν — ἀναγρυπνία.

— κα[ί] διαλλάσσει κ[α]κῶν φω[ν]ῶν. διαλλάσσει: in the copy of Reuvens we see that he first put down καὶ διαμ-ει, then he lined it through and wrote αλλασσει above, after αλλασσει R. has κ -- ομμ ---. Preisendanz read διαλλάσσει, which according to my view too is preferable to ἀπαλλάσσει, *although* it is very difficult to say it for certain.

— ἂν ὀρθῶς αὐτῷ χρήσῃ καὶ ἰ ἀγνώως· ἔστιν γὰρ ἔχων παῖ..  
[. ?] γ π ρ ᾶ ξ ι ν, I suppose παν[τοί]χῃ πρᾶξιν; for the παιωνίαν  
πρᾶξιν (Pr.) there should not be space enough, aside from the extra-  
vagance of meaning.

L. 20 τέλει τ..τον ὡς Ἐρωτα· π[ά]ντα ταῦτα ἀποτελέσας etc.

L. 22 Reuvens has: ἀμιλτώ[τους] -- και -- α μικρα διπα -. The  
ἀμιλτώ[τους ζ' of Pr. is very good, but there is not room enough  
for διμύξους, although I read myself δι... after ἀμ. ζ'; then perhaps  
only: εἶτα μικρὰ αἰπα..τα.

L. 23 Pr. is quite right in reading οἰνομέλιτι, but I am in-  
clined to take οἶνο as οἶνω (cfr. the Index of Dietrich in his  
edition of this papyrus p. 819).

L. 26 and 29, see Pr.

L. 30 the right reading here is: ἀπόπνιξον ζῶα ζ' ἄσπιλα·  
ἀλεκτρούνα etc. This word we find once more col. VIII, 13; pap  
Berol. II 25 ἀλέκτορας ἀ[σ]πίλους β'.

L. 33 [μέχ]ρις οὐ ἕκαστον τῶν ζώων ἀποπνιγῆ καὶ [τὸ] π[νεῦ]μα  
αὐτῶν εἰς α[ὐ]τὸν ἔλθῃ.

L. 34 καὶ [[επ]]επιτίθει -- it seems to me that επ has been  
written twice and that it therefore has to be cancelled once.

(to be continued).

Kristiania, July 1923.

S. EITREM.