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FOUR DUKE PAPYRI CONCERNING PESOURIS, BASILIKOS GRAMMATEUS

Pesouris, the basilikos grammateus of the Herakleopolite nome, came to light almost a decade ago. Now he has turned up in one fascinating text in the Heidelberg collection (P.Heid. VIII 418) and another at Trier (P.UB Trier S. 125-21). In the light of recent publications it seems an opportune moment to present four papyri housed in the Special Collections Library of Duke University that shed light on Pesouris’ career (inv. 598, 599, 602r+v, 605r+v). We hope that they will help to bring additional relevant documents to light.

The Dossier

To date, four papyri bearing directly or indirectly on the activities of Pesouris have been published: SB XXII 15369 (P.Duk. inv. 600), an apographê of wheat sent to Pesouris; SB XVIII 13304 (P.Duk. inv. 602r), a memorandum from the kômogrammateus of Tekmi and Bichinthýth, which mentions a visit by the stratêgos Euphranôr—we republish that text here, adding the previously unpublished verso; P.Heid. VIII 418, an entolê from Pesouris to the topogrammateis under him; P.UB Trier S 125-21, a document concerning enrolment into the katoikia.

In P.Duk. inv. 598, one unknown official forwards to another (perhaps Pesouris) a letter, which an unknown official (perhaps the same) had sent to Euphranôr, the stratêgos of the Herakleopolite nome. We are missing the left side of the papyrus (perhaps one third of the original text), but the document evidently concerns misappropriation of wine. The author of the document requests the detention of an individual (or individuals) for questioning before the stratêgos. Euphranôr re-appears a few months later in inv. 602, a memorandum from Atis, the kômogrammateus of Bichinthýth and Tekmi, concerning Euphranôr’s transfer of a garrison from Tekmi to Papa.

P.Duk. inv. 605r, 605v, and 599 concern a police action that took place roughly seven months later. Hôriôn, a basilikos geôrgos, was for some reason seized and brought to Herakleopolis to stand before Komanos, the epistatês of police. On the same day, Dionysios the archiphylakites sent men to put the house of Ababikis, where Hôriôn was staying, under seal. In the course of this action, the men apparently seized some property. Phanêsis, kômogrammateus of Thmoinausiris and the adjacent villages, sent a letter (inv. 605r) reporting these events to Pesouris. Pesouris, or someone on his staff, then composed drafts of two reports (inv. 605v), that concerned legal proceedings to be initiated over the police action and were to be sent to Dionysios and Komanos respectively. Phanêsis also sent a...
slightly modified copy of the letter that he had sent to Pesouris to an Ammeneus; Ammeneus then forwarded a copy (inv. 599) to another official, perhaps Pesouris himself. All of the Duke papyri concerning Pesouris were extracted from the same cartonnage. P.Duk. inv. 605r contains a letter written to Pesouris and 605v two drafts of memoranda evidently written by Pesouris or a member of his staff. SB XXII 15369 (P.Duk. inv. 600) is an apographē addressed to Pesouris. Lacuna has removed the addressee of inv. 599, but Pesouris is a highly plausible candidate. The author of inv. 602, did not name the addressee, but Pesouris is again a possible candidate. Thus, it is worth speculating that these texts belonged to an archive of documents kept by Pesouris.

Euphranór, Stratēgos, and the Date
P.Duk. inv. 598 contains a forwarded copy of a letter written in a 32nd regnal year to Euphranór, the stratēgos of the Herakleopolite nome. A Euphranór is known from SB XVIII 13304 to have overseen disposition of troops in a 33rd regnal year, which in the second century B.C. can only have belonged to Philometor (149/8) or Euergetes II (138/7). P.Tebt. III.1 723, a fragmentary order to pay soldiers, is also dated to a 33rd year, “doubtless that of Euergetes II,”5 and contains at its bottom a memorandum addressed to a Euphranór. Falivene (p. 19) has pressed for a connection between the two documents, suggesting that they refer to the same Euphranór and that SB XVIII 13304 must, therefore, be dated to 138 B.C. The association seems warranted. Both texts belong to a 33rd regnal year; both feature a Euphranór whose duties involve oversight of soldiers. But nothing in P.Tebt. III.1 723 would preclude a date under Philometor (149/8 B.C.).

If the identification holds, SB XVIII 13304 controls the date of P.Tebt. III.1 723, not the other way around. On his re-accession in Autumn, 145 B.C., Euergetes II re-calibrated the system of aulic titles.6 At SB XVIII 13304.4–5, Euphranór is called ἱστόμης τοῖς πρώτοις φίλοις καὶ 1 στρατηγός. If the text were dated to Philometor’s reign, it would give the sole occurrence of this aulic title before Euergetes’ re-accession. It is reasonable to assume that the title was introduced by Euergetes II.7 Thus, SB XVIII 13304 must be dated to the reign of Euergetes II, 138/7 B.C., as was observed over a decade ago.8 So must P.Tebt. III.1 723, and also P.Duk. inv. 598, which can be assigned to the 32nd year of Euergetes II, 139/38 B.C. The letter forwarded in inv. 598 is addressed to Euphranór and concerns a report made by Pesouris. Thus, if Euphranór belongs to the reign of Euergetes II, so must Pesouris, and so must P.Duk. inv. 599 and 605r.

P.Heid. VIII 418 cannot be dated beyond doubt without reference to the Duke papyri.9 P.UB Trier S. 125-21 is dated to the reign of Euergetes II on the likely identification of Apollonios τῶν πρώτων φίλων and dioikētēs with the man of the same title and name attested as early as 134 B.C.10 In any case, the Duke papyri now leave no doubt but that Pesouris’ activity as basilikos grammateus belongs to the reign of Euergetes II.

Ptolemaios
P.Duk. inv. 598.7–8 refers, in a lacunose sentence, to an official designated τῶν ταγέντα παρὰ Πολεμαίον πρός τῇ ὑποστρατηγ[γία]. The name Ptolemaios is both dubious and rare. At P.Tebt. III.1 127: “The papyrus is written in a good second-century hand, and the 33rd year mentioned is doubtless that of Euergetes II, the documents accompanying 723 ranging from the 31st year to the 36th. One of them at least (812) came from the Heracleopolite nome.” The reference to P.Tebt. III.1 812 is apparently an error; 810, not 812, was extracted from mummy 38, and concerns Heracleopolite affairs.

5 P.Tebt. III.1 p. 127: “The papyrus is written in a good second-century hand, and the 33rd year mentioned is doubtless that of Euergetes II, the documents accompanying 723 ranging from the 31st year to the 36th. One of them at least (812) came from the Heracleopolite nome.” The reference to P.Tebt. III.1 812 is apparently an error; 810, not 812, was extracted from mummy 38, and concerns Heracleopolite affairs.


9 P.Heid. VIII pp. 258–259.

10 Quenouille and Willms, ArchPF 47 (2001) 59. See P.Tebt. III.1 917.4 with BL III 247 (Pros.Ptol. I and VIII 18, 26); also UPZ II 202.1 and passim.
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11 The Polemaioi in *P. Tebt. III* 1105.27 (103 B.C.) is clearly in error for Polemaioi, which he is called everywhere else in the text (e.g. 10. 19, 21, 23, 25).

12 Recto and verso were evidently written by the same scribe and so the latter must be an address, not a receipt docket.


17 They refer also to a Dioskourides dioikêtês, who is known to have served under this ruler (*P. Berl. Zill.* 1.22); see commentary at pp. 5–6.

18 *P. Berl. Zill.* 2.3 with *BL* VIII 64. According to *P. Heid. inv.* G 4741 Polemaioi was still *stratègos* in Phanemoth of Philometer’s 26th year (March/April, 155) and Têrês had become *stratègos* by Pauni of the same year (June/July).

19 *P. Gen.* III 131 (Herakleopolite, 146 B.C.) [SB XX 15113], *P. Heid. inv.* G 4925 (= *P. Phur. Diosk.* 6, forthcoming); *P. München.* III 50 can be dated to the term of Têrês, but not more precisely.

20 3 November 146 B.C. according to *P. Heid. inv.* G 4925 (= *P. Phur. Diosk.* 6, forthcoming).

21 As to the lacuna, the editors suggested (p. 266), “Perhaps ὁρχησοματοφυλάκι, or another of the court titles at the beginning of the line.” Mooreen, *Aulic Titulature* no. 098, p. 108 and *La hiérarchie* p. 103, proposed τῶν ὁρχησοματο-

φυλάκων instead, on grounds that it better fit the space and “parce que les stratèges de l’Héracleopolite ne sont pas attestés avec le titre d’archisomatophylaque au singulier” (*La hiérarchie* p. 103, n. 2); neither argument seems very strong. He also rejected the restoration proposed by H. Henne, *REA* 42 (1940) 176 n. 17, [*patronym* τῶν (προέτων) φιλῶν κ.α.], and also
according to the full prescript of the oath, must fall under Euergetes II, in 135/4 B.C.22 Thus, at the time of Euphranôr’s appearance in the Duke papyri, he was no more than a few years away from the end of his career as strátegos of the Herakleopolite.

Consequences or Ξακων?
The author of P.Duk. inv. 598 asks (7–8), “Please arrange to have the man appear before N,” where N seems to be a magistrate with judicial authority (κατ’ ἕκαστον τοῦ δικαστήριον, εἴπερ [...], ἵνα τοι, ἔξακω, “so that, if he should be proven (guilty) under examination, he may be...”). Petitioners sometimes ask that their adversaries be brought to trial so that “they may suffer the consequences,” τύχοσι τῶν ἔξακολουθοῦντων.24 Thus, if per [...], ἵνα should be taken to indicate a verb (aorist passive subjunctive) that means “be submitted to” and governs a dative, we might posit τοῖς ἔξακολουθοῦσιν at 8–9: “Please arrange to have the man appear before N so that, if he should be proven (guilty) under examination, he may be submitted to the consequences.”

Such an interpretation, however, is not without difficulties. First, comparison of the two letters after θην with ἐκτεινομελής (1), τοῦ (4), τοῦ τόπου (6), τοῦ (7), τοῦ (11), or any other pairing of ταύ with a subsequent letter, suggests that the letter following ταύ in line 8 may not be an omicron. The ταύ would be wide, the omicron distant. Traces might suggest, instead, the right hoop of an omega. Its open top is clear, as is the faint trace of the left hoop, just starting to descend from the right end of the ταύ’s horizontal bar. Moreover, the letter after τοῦ is so badly abraded as to indicate possible erasure. Traces seem to suggest an epsilon, perhaps erased as dittographic before εξάκω, or perhaps a sigma. If we read τοῦ [ε] then εξάκω cannot be explained as the number 600 (ἔξακολοθοῦντων). While we might imagine that the crime involved 600 keramia (cf. lines 6–7) of wine, the singular article would be impossible to reconcile. If we ignore palaeography and read τοῖς ἔξακολοθοῦσιν, then context becomes difficult. The 600 keramia would already have been mentioned so that one would have referred simply to “the wine,” not “the 600 jars.” If we read τοῦ [ε] then we might imagine ἔξακολοθοῦντι ἐπί-προστίμωι (vel sim.), or if we read τοῖς at the expense of palaeographical considerations, τοῖς ἔξακολοθοῦσιν...
would be a possible restoration. In either case we would have to restore περι...[...] θητι with a verb meaning “be submitted to” and governing a dative. We have been unable to find a suitable candidate.

Context may suggest an alternative. A person who has been proven guilty under examination can be made to do many things besides “suffer the consequences.” He might be compelled to tell the truth; or, he might be bound (or perhaps paraded, περισσαθείς) and hanged from a post,27 remedied to the king, or dispatched to forced labor at the oar of a ship.29 That the missing verb should mean “suffer” is contingent on the restoration τοῖς ἔξακολοθοῦσι, which is by no means secure. After ἔξακολοθείς and ἔξακολοθεύεται we are left with the personal name Exakōn: τῷ [ε] Ἐξακόλουθεν.30 As the name would be preceded by the definite article the putative Exakōn would have to have been mentioned previously. The only place in the document where such mention might have appeared is at line 4, so that this Exakōn might have been the person, perhaps an official, who issued report of the crime to Pesouris. Sense might then be restored to the text as follows: ὅπως ἔξακολοθεύει περισσαθήσητε (τῆς) τῶι [ε] Ἐξακόλουθεν, “so that, if he should be proven (guilty) under examination, he may be remanded (?) to Exakōn.”

The verb περισσαθήμετο does not appear to occur in the papyri, and its meaning here is admittedly strained. A parallel might lie in the ambiguous phrase at P.Cair.Zen. II 59202.7–9 (254 B.C.), in which Apollonios tells Zenon that ἐὰν γὰρ φανερωθῇ κατ’ ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Ἀμμανείου (a beermaker accused of wrongdoing) ἐξηγάγως ὕπαγα λέγω ἵνα περισσαθέητε κρεμήσεται, “If Ammeneus appears truly to have said what you wrote to me, he shall be bound and hanged.” Scholars have debated whether to take πρὸς ἡμᾶς with ἔρωσας, or with περισσαθείς; on the latter construction the sentence would mean, “If Ammeneus appears truly to have said what you wrote, he shall be led round to me and hanged.” Turner has argued for the former interpretation, though the correct interpretation is not obvious.31 Whether the precise restoration περισσαθήσητε is correct or not, it does give plausible sense; if not περισσαθήμετο then something similar.

The name Exakōn is not common in the papyri. In 145 B.C., an Exakōn who was appointed to oversee enrolment of katoikoi in the Herakleopolite nome was implicated in charges of paralogeia.32 This Exakōn was well connected. His brother Apollophanēs was stratēgos of the adjacent Oxyrhynchite and Kynopolite nomes (P.Tebt. III.1 739.12–13).33 Herakleopolis and Oxyrhynchos were close, and bureaucrats talked to each other. Could it be that Apollophanēs pulled strings and helped his brother obtain a post in the Herakleopolite?

For now we leave the identification of this putative Exakōn and the restoration of the line open in the hope that new texts or fresh interpretation may uncover a solution.

Topography

Thanks to the industry of Maria Rosaria Falivene we are well informed as to the topography of the Herakleopolite nome. The village of Thmoinausiris appears in P.Duk. inv. 599, 605r, and 605v.

---

26 BGU XVI 2629.17–18 (Herakleopolite, 4 B.C.): παρηγορισθαι ἐκοῖσσα.
29 P.Hib. II 198.91 (? 242–222 B.C.): ἀποστειλέσθωσαν ἐπὶ τῶν ναυῶν.
30 The abbreviation at P.Cair.Zen. III 59367.43 (241 B.C.) should be resolved (ἐξηκοντάρουρον), not (ἐξακοντάρουρον).
32 Date: P.Hels. I pp. 31–32; C.Ptol.Sklav. II 244 p. 977; P.Kroll p. 3 n. 4. Charges: P.Tebt. III.1 739.2–5: Καλλιάνακτος τῶν ἐκ τῶν ἸΠαλεοπολίτων πραγματικώς προσφυγείλαντος δι᾽ ἐντύπωσε[...] ἐπερὰ τέκας καὶ Ἐξακόντα τὸν ταγέντα ἵνα τῇ προσλήψει τῶν [εἰς τῇ ἐν τῷ νομῷ κατοικίᾳ ἄνδρον ἐπὶ τῇ μερισθείσῃ [...] παράκειτοντες τέκναν....
Phanēsis, author of inv. 605r and the forwarded letter in inv. 599, calls himself kōmogrammateus of Thmoinausiris καὶ τῶν συγκυρουσῶν κωμῶν. The phrase is somewhat rare in the papyri. It most commonly modifies Roman Tebtynis, but also Oxyrhyncha, and (Arsinoite) Tebetny and Kerkēsis. It usually appears in the context of tax concessions, apparently indicating a group of villages to which tax collectors had right of collection. That tax collectors bid for rights to presumably adjacent villages as a block need imply nothing about village governance.

Two additional texts, however, may. In P.Lond. III 604A Bēsas, also known as Sōtērichos, kōmogrammateus of (Pathyrite) Krokodeilōn polis and the adjacent villages (1–3), declares arable land in his district that has been inundated in Claudius’ seventh year. C.Pap. Gr. II.1 3 (Herakleopolite, A.D. 19), a notification of death, is addressed to Hōros, kōmogrammateus of Mouchinpagei, no doubt a small village, and the adjacent villages (1–3). In his subscription, however, Hōros calls himself kōmogrammateus of Ankyrōn, a place substantial enough sometimes to have been called a polis, and the adjacent villages (15–16). P.Duk. inv. 605 shares a particular detail with this other Herakleopolite text. At P.Duk. inv. 605v.5 another party appears to refer to Phanēsis as the kōmogrammateus of Rodōnos Nēsos. This doubtless small village, which appears also at inv. 605r.5 but is otherwise unattested, must have been among the constellation of villages under Phanēsis’ administration. But Phanēsis calls himself (inv. 605r.2) kōmogrammateus of Thmoinausiris, a substantial village, and the adjacent villages. These three texts suggest formal administration of multiple villages by the same kōmogrammateus. It is tempting to conjecture, on the strength of C.Pap. Gr. II.1 3 and P.Duk. inv. 605, that within such administrative groupings of villages the kōmogrammateus had a single base of operations, and that Hōros’ and Phanēsis’ were Ankyrōn and Thmoinausiris, respectively.

P.Duk. inv. 598 18 x 23 cm. 21 August 138 B.C. Herakleopolite

The document consists of three joined pieces and is broken at the left and top. The text is written against the fibers on the recto. Faint blotches of ink appear above the first and below the last lines. The verso is, except for a few smudges, blank. The hand is large, clear, and generally angular. The scribe employs two-hooped omegas and standing nus throughout. He writes almost to the right margin, so that word-ends are frequently compressed (e.g. ὑποστρατηγός, 5).

The left side of the papyrus is missing. The loss is significant, though its extent cannot be gauged with precision, as no line can be fully restored with certainty. The surviving portion of the papyrus is 18 cm. wide, suggesting that as many as 12 cm. of papyrus and 10 cm. of text (assuming a left margin of

34 See inv. 599.4 and inv. 605.2.
35 Tebtynis and the surrounding villages: P.Fam.Tebt. 46.5–6 (A.D. 195); P.Giss.Univ. VI 47.r3.4–5, r4.2–3, v3.2 (A.D. 213–217) with SB XIV 11627.3 (A.D. 212–217); P.Mich. V 245.12–13 (A.D. 47); PSI X 1139.3, 9 (A.D. 134/5); P.Tebt. II 305.4 (A.D. 137); SB XII 10985.4 (A.D. 156); 10986.4 (A.D. 161), 10987.2 (A.D. 171).
37 Mouchinpagei is otherwise unattested; Calderini, Diz.geogr. s.v., 3.3 p. 300; Falivene, Am.Stud.Pap. XXXVII p. 131.
38 Calderini, Diz.geogr. s.v., 1.1 pp. 11–13.
41 Falivene, Am.Stud.Pap. XXXVII, does not comment on the phrase at page 39–43, s.v. Ἀγκυρών πόλις, or at 131, s.v. Μουχινπαγεί, except to translate it (131) “and villages under the same administration.”
roughly 2 cm.), or roughly 22–28 letters, may have been lost at left. The loss of the left side is such that we must for now leave many important questions of interpretation open (see introduction above). Nevertheless, we include this text as it contributes directly to our expanding portrait of Pesouris.

Text

X to Y, greetings. I have appended a copy of the letter to Euphranor. ... Farewell. Year 32, Epeiph 29.

To Euphranor ... greetings. Pesouris the basilikos grammateus [reported to me] on the basis of the things reported by ..., on the 26th of Epeiph, concerning how ..., appointed by Ptolemaios to the hypostratêgia [of the ... toparchy], misappropriated from those from the region ... jars of wine .... Please arrange, therefore, to have the man appear before ... so that, if he should be proven (guilty) under examination, he may be ... the extortion ... to render account, nor in any way [to ...] so that in remaining together at their ... they may be able to pay what is due to the crown.

Notes

1. Sender and recipient are unknown. If the Duke texts derive from an archive kept by Pesouris, then we might cautiously posit Pesouris as the recipient of P.Duk. inv. 598. The sender of 598, perhaps another high official such as the dioikêtês (?), may also have forwarded the copy to Euphranor.

2. υποτετάχθημεν: Or υπέστηται vel sim. όπως εἰδής; possible but not necessary.

3. Or, perhaps [— ca 9–12 — Εὐφράνορι χαίρειν.]. The main verb, of which Pesouris is the subject, must appear in the lacuna at the start of line 7. The phrase ἐκ τῶν ... ἀνενεχθέντων (3–4) is a logical unit within which the verb cannot fall. So also per τοῦ ... παραλογεύεται (4–6). The sense must be "reported to me" (διασαφέω, ἀναφέρω vel sim.).

4. If we are to read τὰ [ἐ] Ἐσακὸν vel sim. at 7–8, then we might restore Ἐσακὸν as the source of Pesouris' information: ὑπὸ Ἐσακὼν χαίρειν (6). For phrasing cf. P.Tor.Chooach. 12.iv.5–8 (Thebes, 117 B.C.): παρὰ δὲ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γραμματέως ἑνεμένης τῆς ἀναφορᾶς ἐπὶ τοὺς χρηματιστὰς ἐκ τῶν παρὰ τοῦ τοπογραμματέως καὶ κυμαγματεωτῶν ἀνενεχθέντων ἐν περὶ τοῦ ἀναγράφεσθαι τὴν γῆν. Line 4 ought to have contained the name and rank of a scribal official. ἐπὶ τῶν: The preposition seems to govern, also on the example of P.Tor.Chooach. 12.iv.5–7, an articulare infinitive, παραλογεύεται (6); see also P.Grenf. I 13.2–3 (Arsinoite, 152/141 B.C.).

5. The size of the lacuna suggests that two names be restored, of which the second is described as παραλογεύεται (5). Or, perhaps the appointee to the hypostratêgia was further identified by patronym.

6. παραλογεύεται: Were the victims of the extortion tax collectors?
7. The lacuna should contain the number of extorted keramia and the main verb of reporting, writing, or informing, followed by a full stop.

7-8. καταστήσασθε ἐπὶ — — — — νῦ: A few options for restoration present themselves. (1) ἐπὶ Name and/or title in the accusative; (2) ἐπὶ σὲ ἐμὲ Name δὲ + infinitive ending in -ειν (with the sense καταστήσασθε νῦν; τιτειλ renters, though space may not permit and sense does not require another verb; (3) line 5 seems to suggest that there were two perpetrators, so that perhaps the sense was “please arrange to stand the man before you, as well as N (the other man). . . .” καταστήσασθε σὲ/ἐμὲ (or another official) καταστήσασθε ἐπὶ (or another official) καταστήσασθε ἐπὶ Name ending in nu (accusative). The first seems most likely.

8. According to LSJ ἔξελέσασθα, “strengthen’d. for ἔλεγαμ,” means primarily “convict.” That is, it describes in the first instance the ruling of a judicial magistrate or jury. This meaning is not confirmed in the papyri. At P.Cair.Zen. II 59202.5 (Philadelphia, 254 B.C.) the verb means “submit someone to examination,” and the examiner was the plaintiff, not a judge. The lying scribe himself, not by an adjudicating magistrate or jury (the editor translates “convicted”). Context at P.Hib. II 198.90 (Arsinoite?, after 242 B.C.) does not show whether court action was at issue, so that the putative delinquent guardsmen may have been “proven so on examination” or “interrogated” (ἔξελέσασθε) as opposed to “convicted” (so P.Hib. II p. 98). At UPZ II 113 (Memphis, 156 B.C.) Dioskourides the dioikêtês warns Dōrôn that he has had heard grumblings about Dōrôn and Dōrôn’s underlings. He warns that it would be unwelcome if “anyone should be proven on examination to have injured anyone” (τις ἔξελεσαν τελεσθῆ θληστήριον τινα, 13), a general threat that need not imply conviction in court. In his famous letter to the Alexandrians Claudius claims not that he was unwilling to “convict” a population that was not even present, but that he was unwilling to test the competing claims in detail: P.Lond. VI 1912.77 (Philadelphia, A.D. 41) οὐκ ἐβούληθην ἀκριβῶς ἔξελεσάται. At SB XX 15036.37 (A.D. II/III), ἔχει δευτέρου δὲ ἔξελεσαν γίνεται δὲ ὑπενθηκα, a petitioner lodges a complaint against a woman who had slandered her in the past, without issue, not so “that she may be able to be convicted a second time” (transl. J. R. Rea, ZPE 79 [1989] 201–206, at 205), but so “that she may be caught (lying) a second time;” for precisely this meaning in ἔλεγαμ see Hdt. 1.124.7, 117.2. P.Tebt. I 25.12–14 (117 B.C.) is too confused and P.Mich. XV 726.5 (?; IVN A.D.) too fragmentary to allow certainty as to the meaning of ἔξελέσασθα.

8-9. For the restoration and interpretation of πειρατής ἐξεστασε ἐξέσπασι — — see discussion above. The name Exakfh is attested with genitive in -ωνος (or -ωνος: e.g. P.Cair.Zen. III 59417.21 [restored] (254 or 252–246 B.C.), 59527.5 (middle III B.C.), P.Kön IV 187.10 (Heracleopolis, 146 B.C.); P.Tebt. III.1 739. 3, 9, 11, 13, 15 (Tebytynis, 145 B.C.), III.2 910.2 (162 B.C.); P.Giss.Univ. I 7.3 (Euhemeria; II B.C.); P.Cair.Zen. Ill 59482.6, 13 (III B.C.); P.Dion 14.16 (Akrorois, 110 B.C.), 15.14 (Akrorois, 109 B.C.) [restored]. We suggest above the possibility of restoring ἐξεστασεν (i.e. for ἐξέσπασεν), since ἔξελεσαν would give a word that does not break at the syllable.

10-11. The victims of the paralogeia are the subject of ὑποκαταστήσασθαι. The sense of 10–11 seems to be “so that in remaining together at their jobs they may be able to pay what is due to the crown;” we might restore πρὸς τὰς καθήκοντας ταῦτας ἐξεστασε ἐξέσπασι ζητοῦσαι (at their appointed tasks) or πρὸς τὰς καθήκοντας (at their tasks, village by village) vel sim. For ταῦτα ἐξεστασθεν GK, P.Dion 15.14 (restored) [Akrorois, 109 B.C.]: ἔξελεσαν ἐξεστασθεν see P.Tebt. I 150.170–174 (118 B.C.) Cf. also P.Tebt. III.2 961.5–9 (150/139 B.C.): ἐξεστασθεν (ὅτι καταστήσασθαι τοῖς καθήκοντας) ἐξεστασθεν (ὅτι καταστήσασθαι τοῖς καθήκοντας) ἐξεστασθεν (ὅτι καταστήσασθαι τοῖς καθήκοντας) ἐξεστασθεν (ὅτι καταστήσασθαι τοῖς καθήκοντας).

P.Duk. inv. 602
4 x 6 cm.
23 October 138 B.C.
Heracleopolite

This small scrap of papyrus contains a memorandum from Atis to an unnamed recipient. The hand is neat and squared, similar to that of inv. 598. A second hand has scrawled what appears to be the date above the body of the text. Atis alerts the recipient that Euphranòr the stratēgos passed through Tekmi on the 25th of Thoth. We know from the docket on the verso that the memorandum had been received and logged by the 27th. The verso, published here for the first time, confirms the reading of the editio princeps at r.2.

Text

Four Duke Papyri concerning Pesouris, Basilikos Grammateus

recto

→ (m.2) Λ Ὡφύθ [..]  
→ (m.1) παρ' Αττος κοιμογραμματέως Τέκμι 
και Βιχγνθοῦθ. τῇ κε τοῦ Θωῦθ  
4 τοῦ λγ Λ παρεγένετο Εὐφράνωρ 
ίσοτιμος τοῖς πρώτοις φίλοις καὶ 
στρατηγὸς περὶ ὥραν ἥ εἰς 
Τέκμι ἡγοῦν μεθ᾽ ἐαυτοῦ τοὺς 
8 μετακοκήντας εἰς Πάπα φρουροῦσ.

verso

→ [L λγ] Θωῦθ κξ Αττος. Τέκμι.
2 [περὶ] τῆς μετημενής 
[φρουρίζας εἰς Πάπα εἰς Τέκμι.

recto 2. Παρὰ Μως Schwendner. 3. Βιχγνθοῦθ Hagedorn; κε Θωῦθ Schwendner. 4. τοῦ L Hagedorn: τοῦ λγ L 
Schwendner. 8. Read μετακόκηντας, verso 1. ἕ papyrus.

Year 33 Thoth .... From Atis, κομογραμματεύς of Tekmi and Bichinthōyth. On the 28th of Thoth of the 
33rd year Euphranor, equal in honor to the first friends and στρατεύς, arrived around the eighth hour at 
Tekmi, leading with him the troops that had been transferred to Papa.

verso: Year 33 Thoth 27. (From) Atis. Tekmi. Concerning the garrison transferred to Papa, at(?) Tekmi.

Notes

1. If the date was logged on receipt we should restore [κξ], as at v. 1.
2. The reading on the verso, which is perfectly clear, confirms Αττος here. This appears to be the genitive of Αττις. The 
name seems to occur elsewhere only at O.Mich. 351.2 (Karanis, III/IV A.D.), there 'Αττις (nom.).
3. Βιχγνθοῦθ is attested elsewhere only at BGU VIII 1771.16 (Herakleopolite, 62 B.C.); cf. Falivene, Am.Stud.Pap. 
XXXVII 59.
4. The year, λγ, first read by Schwendner (from Morris and Oates, pl. on p. 247), is confirmed on autopsy. The λαμβδα is 
all but missing; the bottom tip of the right stroke and nothing more is barely visible. The downward stroke cannot have 
come from a καππα; the year cannot have been κγ, Euergetes' first year, on restoration to the throne, was reckoned his 
25th. If the document were dated to Philometor's 23rd year (159/8) it would produce the sole occurrence of the aulic title 
"equal in honor to the first friends" from before the reign of Euergetes II (see above). The horizontal stroke of the 
γαμμα breaks and is connected to Λ by a downward-dipping stroke.
5. On Herakleopolite garrisons see the introduction to P.Phrur. Diosk. (forthcoming).
6. The receipt docket reiterates eἰς Τέκμι from the recto (5–6). There eἰς goes with παρεγένετο (3), "arrived at." Here it is 
clumsy but accurate.

P.Duk. inv. 605r 30.5 x 20.7 cm. 9 May 137 B.C.
http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/605r.html Herakleopolite

The papyrus consists of six joined fragments. The recto contains 13 well preserved lines, written against the fibers with generous interlinear spacing. The scribe often extends letters at line-ends with a horizontal flourish (e.g. 4, 5, 6, and 10). The hand and layout are highly presentable, and stand 
in marked contrast to the sometimes weak grammar; the text begins with a danging accusative, ἐπιλαξ-
βόντας[τ] τοὺς ... φυ[λακίστας (3–4), which is followed by a finite verb, ὥ[ν]ίζον (4); the text gives 
Νήσσον (4) where grammar demands a dative, and an infinitive that construes only by extreme ellipsis, 
[παραλβ]είν (9).

Above the body of the text a second hand (that of Pesouris?) has added a memorandum urging that correspondence be sent to the archiphylakitês and the epistatês of police. The verso seems to contain

This content downloaded from 150.135.24.78 on Wed, 05 Apr 2017 15:38:39 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms
drafts of such documents, and refers (605v.5) to the letter sent to Pesouris by Phanésis, i.e. to the
document on the recto. Thus, we can establish that the text on what we have called the recto was written
first, in spite of the fact that its script runs against the fibers.

Text: Recto

\[ \text{Text restored from P.Duk. inv. 599 underlined.} \]

Write to the epistatís of the police and the archiphylakités, so that (?) .... Year 33....

Phanésis, kômogrammateus of Thmoinausiris and the adjacent villages, to Pesouris, greetings. On the
16th of the current month, the guards in Rodônos Néos, having seized Hórió, one of the farmers from
the same village, he was sent to Herakleopolis in order (to appear?) before Komanos, the epistatís of
the police. After this, on the same day, Agathinos and Philammon and others, from [Dionysios?], archi
phylakités, set upon the same village, (and) putting a seal on the house of Ababikis, in which the
aforementioned Hórió was staying, as well as Petesouchos, one of the royal farmers from the same
(village), without our permission, or (our permission) to bring along some of our men. There follows the
list (of items) that ... submitted ...: 1 pickled goose, 2 pillows. ... having made a seal, they went to
Herakleopolis. I have written to you so that you may know. Farewell. Year 33, Pharmouthi 16.

Notes

1. Though badly worn, the first line appears to be an intra-office memorandum of the type “imperative + purpose clause +
date,” common in the Ptolemaic period (P.Enteux. passim). Kal xcoi ?p%i(p(i)A,aK?xr|i) is difficult to read, but epistatai
and archiphylakitai are routinely addressed together and in this order, with or without other addressees: e.g. P.Lond. VII
2188.142 (Philadelphia, 148 B.C.); P.Mich. XV 688.1-2 (Soknopaiou Néos, II/I B.C.). Moreover, the verso appears to
contain a draft addressed to Dionysios the archiphylakitês, which also mentions Komanos the epistatís of the police.
The purpose of the command is obscure, as we are unable satisfactorily to construe the verb after cb? (or possibly ckco?): apa
4. Or should we understand something like Ypcx|/ov ... cb? xcx%ioxa?

2. Three rough contemporaries shared Phanésis’ name and office, but in different villages: kômogrammateus of Koitai
(P.Tebt. III.1 734.1–2, 21–22 [141–139 B.C.]), of Philadelphia (SB IV 7351.1–2 [after 200/176 B.C.]), of Theognis (SB
XVIII 13618.3 [187 B.C.]).

3. For the day of the month, we read ic, though n (so that the date would be 1 May 137) is perhaps possible. The same
ambiguity appears at P.Duk. inv. 605v.6 and P.Duk. inv. 599.3 and 12.

4. None of the approximate contemporaries named Hórió was staying, as well as Petesouchos, one of the royal farmers from the same
(village), without our permission, or (our permission) to bring along some of our men. There follows the
list (of items) that ... submitted .... 1 pickled goose, 2 pillows. ... having made a seal, they went to
Herakleopolis. I have written to you so that you may know. Farewell. Year 33, Pharmouthi 16.
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8. Ababikis: Cf. P.Duk. inv. 605v.9 and 599.8. The name occurs only once elsewhere in the second century B.C., at P.Tebe. III.2 1040.Fr.2.8 (early II B.C.): δοκειται Ἀβαβικὸς. The name appears in the third century B.C. at P.Petr. III 59C.Fr.1.23 (Gurob), and twice in the Roman period: P.Oxy.Census 327 (A.D. 91/2?) and O.Deiss. 14.2 (Arsinote, 5 B.C.). [κατεγέννετο]: or perhaps [παρεγέννετο]; cf. n. on inv. 605v.9.


10. ἔστιν δὲ τὸ καθ’ ἐν: for variations on the phrase, employed to introduce lists, see P.Dion. 10.19 (Hermopolis Magna, 109 B.C.), P.Tebe. I 47.34 (113 B.C.), IV 1096.27 (113 B.C.), and SB XVIII 13839.17 (Mouchis, 220/19 B.C.), all of which append lists of stolen goods. It would be attractive to understand the sense of the second half of the line as, “there follows a list of the things that Ηόριον stole.” But δεῖ(α)κεφ is quite legible, and no verb meaning “steal” would appear to fit those traces, so that we should perhaps understand something different: “there follows a list of the things that X handed over to me:” [Name πρὸς ἑμὲν?] cf. PSI IV 325.4 (Philadelphia, 261/0 B.C.): διδοστε πρὸς ἡμᾶς. There seems to be space for three letters between ε and δει(α)κεφ, but the papyrus is fragmentary at this location so that accurate measurement of distance between letters is difficult.

11. Grammar requires a subject for π[αρέγγελον[ν]]το at the end of the line. At inv. 605v.16–17, a report to Dionysios the archiphylaktês, κατὰ[κεύ]τει(?): oi (?) παρά σοι are reported as having gone to Heracleopolis. Phanesis was a kómos-grammateus and so probably did not send guards, but perhaps the sense, if not the precise text, is οἱ π[αρ'] ἁμῶν (cf. παρ' ἁμῶν, inv. 599.10 with note) ἐνθρωποι?].

P.Duk. inv. 605v on/after 9 May 137 B.C.
http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/605v.html

The verso contains 23 (perhaps 24) very poorly preserved lines. The text is written inverse to that of the recto, with the fibers, and in a different hand. The writing becomes cramped near the bottom of the papyrus. A generous left margin (ca 4 cm.) contains stray marginal notations (lines 1–3, 9, and 15). Interlinear spacing varies considerably; some lines (e.g. 8, 13, and 14) deviate widely from the horizontal, undulating across the sheet. The hand is rapid and cursive; the scribe makes frequent use of abbreviation and interlinear insertion and correction. These characteristics combine to suggest that the text was a draft.

Traces in the first four lines of the verso are too damaged to construe. Lines 5–19 contain a memorandum to Dionysios the archiphylaktês. The author, apparently Pesouris, recounts the matters reported to him by Phanesis and appears to give instructions concerning the arrest and impending trial of the perpetrators. The two features of the memorandum, report and instructions, appear to be interwoven, with the result that restoration of the text from the corresponding sections of inv. 605r and 599 is not simple; the draft paraphrases, and even modifies, but does not quote verbatim. Lines 20–23 seem to contain a draft of a separate memorandum to Komanos, the epistatês of police. The battered text seems also to refer to the impending trial. Composition of these two drafts was urged at 605r.1, apparently an internal reminder.

Text: Verso

To Dionysios, archiphylakitês. Through the letter that Phanêsis, komogrammateus of Rodônos Nêosos, sent it has been reported that on the 16th of the month of Pharmouthi, Horion, a farmer from the village, having been brought up before Komanos, the epistatês of the police by the guards there, meanwhile, your men Agathinos and Philammon, who were present, without the [others?], put a seal on the house of Ababikis, where both Horion and Petesouchos were, <and?> seized from(?) the aforementioned ... to know something. [Wherefore?] so that ... to court concerning these matters for the upcoming inquiry, we have clarified the matter to Komanos.

[12] Wherefore please, detaining the aforementioned man (i.e., Horion) until the hearing, see carefully to the restoration of the seized property; and (?) having transferred those with Agathinos ... for the hearing of each, for thus, as they are at variance with each other, (even so) they may be examined by ... Pesouris ... and without the permission of the komogrammateus, having made a seal, your guards went to Herakleopolis. ... therefore, according to the things reported to the komogrammateus as having been seized (?). Wherefore, it is clear even ... from the decision (?)...

[20] To Komanos, epistatês of the police... for the upcoming inquiry, and so that....

Notes

1-3. The tattered first three lines appear to form a document (perhaps a later annotation) distinct from the text beginning “Διονυσίου” (5). They are distinguished by a marginal parenthesis at the left, perhaps marked for deletion.

5. ἀφ(χη)ψ(υλακτίπιτι?): Probable, given the reading in 605r.7. Only the alpha is clearly visible.

6. Three characters seem to be have been cancelled after Ωμη[νο], but perhaps they have been badly smudged.

7. μεταξῆς: Here apparently in place of μετὰ τάς; cf. 599.7 (restored) and 605r.5. For a similar usage, see UPZ I 50.13–15 (162/1 B.C.); also Mayser, Gram. II.2 532–533. ἐπιμερισθέντος: The initial epsilon is especially difficult to read.

8. At P.Duk. inv. 599.8 (στύλοι) ἀλλας) and 605r.6 (καὶ λέοντα) we read that Agathinos and Philammon had the assistance of “others” in sealing Ababikis’ house. Here the scribe seems to write that they sealed the house without the other men.
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The reading is not absolutely clear, but it seems impossible to read μετὰ in place of ἀνευ. Was the scribe correcting a mistake in the report with Pesouris, or was this contradiction simply an error?

9. Or perhaps παρ[αγει]βαί. P.Duk. inv. 599.9 and 605r.8 (restored) seem to employ κατεγέννητο to describe Ἑροίς and Petouschos' presence in the house of Ababikis. Here, the scribe writes ὄποιος in place of ἐν ἑνὶ (cf. inv. 605r.8). The traces after ὄποιοι indicate an infinitive (-θαι), perhaps attracted to the mood by indirect discourse.

10. Restore ἀν ὀμμία σε μὴ Ἐθνὲν ἄργονεν (the antecedent of ἄν being the preceding report)? For the phrase see Chr. Wilck. 166ii.11 (Arsinoite, 218 B.C.): ὀμμία γὰρ μηδὲ νῦν ἄργονεν, ὅτι ....


15. For the basic formula, πρὸς τὴν περὶ τοῦτον διεξαγόσθην, see P.Amh. II 35.41 (Soknopaiou Néos, 132 B.C.) and P.Tebt. III.1 739.10 (145 B.C.). Variants: P.Tebt. III.1 14.6–7, 15–16 (114 B.C.); P.Ryl. II 65.9–10 (Oxyrhynchos?, 67 B.C.?); P.Anag. p. 88a Fr.B.3 (Magdala, III B.C.?).

16. ὑστεροβιοῦσα (?): διαλέγεται usually examination of a document for or at a trial: e.g. P.Erasm. I 133–35 (Oxyrhyncha, 1487 B.C.): ὅπως διαλέξαντες αὐτήν (i.e. τὴν ἑντεύξιν) εἰς κατάστασιν καὶ ἀνακαλεσάμενον τὸν τῇ Ἡρακλείδῃ καὶ ὤμων διὰ θεοδόρων τῆς ἑνίκης ἑπιστᾶτον προστάξαμεν θεοτόκος.... Here, if the admittedly difficult reading is correct, the scribe seems to suggest that people, the men with Agathinos (14), are to be examined. Pesouris or a subordinate most likely wrote the draft. The presence of the basilikos grammateus' name here suggests the latter, as Pesouris would presumably have written ὄνωμα μου. But the traces before Πεισόυης could conceivably accommodate μου.

17. The line must begin with τὸν παντὸς preceded by parenthesis, not ἐν παντῶ; compare ( παντῶν at 19. φιλακτίατο;) οἴ? (;) παρὰ σοῦ is far from legible. If we have correctly resolved (όνα?) then some verb, perhaps an abbreviated imperative, should occupy the two spaces between σοῦ and (όνα?).

18. The mark that preceded πάντων also appears at the start of 17 and at 15 before ἀντίτο. At 15 it appears to indicate a portion of text superseded by the text inserted above. Its meaning here and at 17 is not so transparent.

20. It is not clear whether text ever occupied the right half of the papyrus, which is almost completely effaced. It appears that a draft of a memorandum to Komanos, the epistatés of the police, began here. Cf. Inv. 605r.1: γράφον τὰς ἐπίστασις τῶν φιλακτίων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιφιλακτίων. The traces after φιλακτίων are difficult to read. The restoration ἔν Ἡρ(ακλέπους) πολεμεῖ ὡς fit the space as well as the sense. The reading is difficult, however. For a similar abbreviation for ἐξωτικός, see P.Polit.Iud. 18.13 (Herakleopolite, 142 B.C.) with note on p. 144 and pl. 25b; also P.Hels. 11.4 (Herakleopolite, 163 B.C.) with pl. 15.

P.Duk. inv. 599 18 x 23 cm. 9 May 137 B.C. http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/599.html Herakleopolite

The recto of this papyrus contains 12 lines of text, written against the fibers by an able and practiced hand. The left side is broken; perhaps one third of the text is missing. The scribe occasionally extends letters at line-ends into the right margin (e.g. 5, 1, and 8). As with P.Duk. inv. 605r the text is attractively presented. Letter shapes and sizes are uniform. On the verso, three to four lines of text have been smudged and blurred, such that they cannot be deciphered.

The forwarded document is a close copy of inv. 605r, which Phanésis sent to Pesouris.

Text

↑ ["Ἀμμενεύς Πεσούρει (?) χαίρειν ὲς γέγραφεν ἡμῖν Φ[α]γήνης κωμογραμματεύς [Θομ.[ι]])[γαν.-
[σίρεως τοῦ Πέραν (?) ἐπιστολής τὸ ἀντίγραφον ὑποτετάχθημεν ὅπως εἰδής.
[ν[ας...
[ἐρρωσὸ (ἔτους) ἐγ‚ Φαρμοδ[ή]Τι ὑ.]
Ammeneus to Pesouris(?), greetings. We have appended a copy of the letter that Phanésis, kômogrammateus of Thmoinauris [of the Peran toparchy?], wrote to us so that you may know. Farewell. Year 33, Pharmouthi 16.

Phanésis, kômogrammateus of Thmoinauris and the adjacent villages, to Ammeneus, greetings. On the 16th of the present month, with the police from the same village having seized Hórión, one of the royal farmers from the same village, he (?) was sent to Herakleopolis so that (he might go?) before Kömanos, the epistatês of the police; and after this, on the same day, falling upon the same village, Agathínos and Philammon, with others from Dionysios (?), archiphyllakités, putting a seal on Ababíkis' house, in which the aforementioned Hórión was staying, and Petesouchos, one of the royal farmers of those from the same village ... without our permission, or (our permission) to take along some of our men. There follows the list of what X (?) submitted...: 1 pickled goose, 2 pillows. ... Year 33, Pharmouthi 16.

Notes

1. Ammeneus' identity is not known. Perhaps he was a topogrammateus, so that the chain of letters proceeded up the hierarchy: Phanésis the kômogrammateus sent, in addition to the letter that he sent directly to Pesouris (inv. 605r), a letter to Ammeneus the topogrammateus (see inv. 599.4-12); Ammeneus forwarded the letter to Pesouris the basilikos grammatæus (inv. 599). This Ammeneus cannot be identified with confidence with an Ammeneus who was basilikos grammatæus two decades later (P.Tebt. I 12.3-4 [118 B.C.] 43.21 [117 B.C.], and 40.2 [117 B.C.]) or an Ammeneus who may have been an agent of the dioikêtês Eirênaios (P.Tebt. I 28.1 [117 B.C.], with p. 110). The traces of ink after kcouo are nearly impossible to read.


3. On the date, see 605r, note on line 3.

4. In 605r.9, there is no gap between auvthi and òneu; here, up to ten letters have been lost. Perhaps Ammeneus inserted koymhs after auvthi, but the remainder of the gap is uncertain. par evam: The reading is absolutely clear (cf. π[αρό] ήμαν), inv. 605r.10). Such exchange of alpha and eta seems to be otherwise untested.

5. Or perhaps παρεγ[λε]το: see on inv. 605v.9.

6. In 605r.9, there is no gap between auvthi and òneu; here, up to ten letters have been lost. Perhaps Ammeneus inserted koymhs after auvthi, but the remainder of the gap is uncertain. par evam: The reading is absolutely clear (cf. π[αρό] ήμαν), inv. 605r.10). Such exchange of alpha and eta seems to be otherwise untested.

11. Or perhaps 7iap'to: see on inv. 605v.9.

12. The lacuna will not accommodate restoration of the parallel section from 605r.11-13.