



---

Four Duke Papyri concerning Pesouris, "Basilikos Grammateus"

Author(s): Joshua D. Sosin and John Bauschatz

Source: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 141 (2002), pp. 177-190

Published by: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20191546>

Accessed: 05-04-2017 15:38 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



*Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

## FOUR DUKE PAPYRI CONCERNING PESOURIS, *BASILIKOS GRAMMATEUS*

Pesouris, the *basilikos grammateus* of the Herakleopolite nome, came to light almost a decade ago.<sup>1</sup> 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).<sup>2</sup> In the light of recent publications it seems an opportune moment to present four papyri housed in the Special Collections Library of Duke University<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

### 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 Bichinthôyth, which mentions a visit by the *stratêgos* Euphranôr—we republish that text here, adding the previously unpublished verso; *P.Heid.* VIII 418, an *entolê* from Pesouris to the *topogrammateis* under him; P.UB Trier S 125-21, a document concerning enrolment into the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 Bichinthôyth 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 *archiphylakitês* 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

<sup>1</sup> P. Van Minnen, "Taking Stock: Declarations of Property from the Ptolemaic Period," *BASP* 31 (1994) 89–99, at 91–94 (pl. 20) [*SB XXII 15369*]. We are grateful to John Oates and Kent Rigsby for helpful criticism and especially to Professor D. Hagedorn and Dr. J. Cowey not only for providing information on P.Heid. inv. G 4866, 4741, 4763, 4925 (= *P.Phrur. Diosk.* 6, forthcoming), but also for their generous and incisive suggestions which have improved the paper significantly.

<sup>2</sup> N. Quenouille and L. Willms, "Die Aufnahme des Herakleios in den Katökenstand (P.UB Trier S 125-21)," *ArchPF* 47 (2001) 55–70, at 61 (pl. VI).

<sup>3</sup> Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library, Duke University, <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu>>, 2002; Duke Papyrus Archive, <[http://papyrus](http://papyrus.duke.edu)>, 2002. Abbreviations: J. F. Oates *et al.* (eds.), *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, <<http://papyrus/texts/clist.html>>, 2002. Dates of papyri: *Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens*, <<http://aquila.papy.uni-heidelberg.de/gvzFM.html>>.

<sup>4</sup> Pesouris is mentioned in P.Heid. inv. G 4866 (see *P.Heid.* VIII p. 258 with n. 112) and apparently in P.UB Trier 125-24 (see Quenouille and Willms, *ArchPF* 47 [2001] 66). M. R. Falivene, *The Herakleopolite Nome: A Catalogue of Toponyms* [*Am.Stud.Pap.* XXXVII] (Atlanta 1998) 17–20, esp. 19, has conjectured that the Duke texts derive from an *oikonomos*' archive. This seems possible, but not necessarily likely. The Duke texts could have come, as we suggest below, from the office of Pesouris himself.

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 *apographê* 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.

### Euphranôr, *Stratêgos*, and the Date

P.Duk. inv. 598 contains a forwarded copy of a letter written in a 32<sup>nd</sup> regnal year to Euphranôr, the *stratêgos* of the Heracleopolite nome. A Euphranôr is known from *SB XVIII 13304* to have overseen disposition of troops in a 33<sup>rd</sup> 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 33<sup>rd</sup> year, “doubtless that of Euergetes II,”<sup>5</sup> and contains at its bottom a memorandum addressed to a Euphranôr. Falivene (p. 19) has pressed for a connection between the two documents, suggesting that they refer to the same Euphranôr and that *SB XVIII 13304* must, therefore, be dated to 138 B.C. The association seems warranted. Both texts belong to a 33<sup>rd</sup> regnal year; both feature a Euphranôr 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.<sup>6</sup> At *SB XVIII 13304.4–5*, Euphranôr is called ἰσότημος τοῖς πρώτοις φίλοις καὶ ἰ 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.<sup>7</sup> Thus, *SB XVIII 13304* must be dated to the reign of Euergetes II, 138/7 B.C., as was observed over a decade ago.<sup>8</sup> So must *P.Tebt.* III.1 723, and also P.Duk. inv. 598, which can be assigned to the 32<sup>nd</sup> year of Euergetes II, 139/38 B.C. The letter forwarded in inv. 598 is addressed to Euphranôr and concerns a report made by Pesouris. Thus, if Euphranôr 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.<sup>9</sup> P.UB Trier S. 125-21 is dated to the reign of Euergetes II on the likely identification of Apollonios τῶν πρώτων φίλων and *dioikêtês* with the man of the same title and name attested as early as 134 B.C.<sup>10</sup> 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 τὸν ταγέντα παρὰ Πολεμαίου πρὸς τῆ ὑποστρατη[γία]. The name Polemaios is both dubious and rare. At *P.Tebt.* III.1

<sup>5</sup> *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.

<sup>6</sup> See L. Moeren, *La hiérarchie de cour Ptolémaïque* (Leuven 1977) 61–73; J. D. Sosin, “Abduction at the Threshing Floor,” *ZPE* 127 (1999) 131–140, at 135.

<sup>7</sup> J. F. Oates, “Equal in Honor to the First Friends,” *BASP* 32 (1995) 13–21.

<sup>8</sup> G. Schwendner, “P.Duke Inv. G 1974.5 Again: A Ghost Name and a New Date,” *ZPE* 72 (1988) 275–276, at 276.

<sup>9</sup> *P.Heid.* VIII pp. 258–259.

<sup>10</sup> 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*.

815.fr1r.ii.46 (228–221 B.C.) the editors have emended a Polemaios to Π(τ)ολεμαῖος; so also at *P.Tebt.* III.1 815.fr2r.iii.51 (223–222 B.C.) and *O.Joach.* 10.12 (Ombos, 68 B.C.).<sup>11</sup> The petitioner in *P.Enteux.* 55 (222 B.C.) calls himself Polemaios in line 1, but Ptolemaios in the address on the verso (v.2).<sup>12</sup> If we can find a contemporary Ptolemaios whose rank might entitle him to appoint someone πρὸς τῆι ὑποστρατηγίαι, we might reasonably emend P.Duk. inv. 598.7 to τὸν ταγέντα παρὰ Π(τ)ολεμαίου. The most visible Ptolemaios with the authority to appoint a civil official would of course have been the king. It is unlikely, however, that the author of the forwarded letter in inv. 598 would have referred to the king by the name Ptolemy alone. Known *hypostratēgoi* are few and for the most part found in the Herakleopolite.<sup>13</sup> That they commonly assisted in police actions seems clear from the evidence,<sup>14</sup> and the title alone suggests that they operated “in strikter Abhängigkeit vom Strategen.”<sup>15</sup> Absent decisive evidence, we might speculate that *stratēgoi* appointed men to the *hypostratēgia*.

*P.Berl. Zill.* 1 and 2, dated to a 26<sup>th</sup> regnal year, contain copies of correspondence from and concerning a Ptolemaios, *archisōmatophylax* and *stratēgos* of the Herakleopolite nome.<sup>16</sup> The papyri are securely dated to the reign of Philometor (156/5 B.C.).<sup>17</sup> This Ptolemaios is not likely to be the person mentioned in inv. 598, as the span between his dates and Euphranor’s is too large. Moreover, one Têrês τῶν φίλων καὶ στρατηγός was *stratēgos* after Ptolemaios and before Euphranôr. Têrês is attested as early as 155<sup>18</sup> and as late as 146 B.C.<sup>19</sup> It seems improbable that Euphranôr was confronted, in Euergetes II’s 32<sup>nd</sup> year (139/8 B.C.), with a crime perpetrated by someone appointed two administrations and almost two decades before him. However, no Herakleopolite *stratēgos* appears to be attested between Philometor’s 35<sup>th</sup> year (147/6, Têrês) and Euergetes II’s 32<sup>nd</sup> (139/8, Euphranôr at P.Duk. inv. 598). Thus, we offer the tentative suggestion that the Ptolemaios who at P.Duk. inv. 598.7–8 appointed someone to the *hypostratēgia* was *stratēgos* of the Herakleopolite nome some time between 146<sup>20</sup> and 139/8 B.C.; that this Ptolemaios was the successor of Têrês and the predecessor of Euphranôr.

If this conjecture should prove correct, then when Euphranôr succeeded to the *stratēgia* he inherited the problems of his predecessor. We cannot say when this Ptolemaios might have ended his term as *stratēgos* or when Euphranôr began his, but with the end of Euphranôr’s tenure we are on firmer ground. In *P.Tebt.* III.1 810, a ship’s captain declared an oath before Πολεμάρχῳ | [ . . . . . κ]αὶ στρατηγῳ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων (12–13).<sup>21</sup> The text is dated to a 36<sup>th</sup> regnal year, which,

<sup>11</sup> The Polemaios in *P.Tebt.* I 105.27 (103 B.C.) is clearly in error for Ptolemaios, which he is called everywhere else in the text (e.g. 10, 19, 21, 23, 25).

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

<sup>13</sup> *BGU* VIII 1778.6 (66–44 B.C.), 1780.1 (after 56/50 B.C.), 1783.19–20 (80–30 B.C.), 1797.2 (64–44 B.C.), 1827.6–7, 23 (after 51 B.C.); *SB* V 7609.11 (47 B.C.). Elsewhere, too: *P.Rain. Cent.* 50.9, 51.16 (Phthemphouth, I B.C.); *P.Zen. Pestm.* D.4 (248 B.C.); *UPZ* I 124.33–34 (Memphis, 175 or 165 B.C.).

<sup>14</sup> H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie* III 62–64 [*Münch.Beitr.* 36].

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.* 63.

<sup>16</sup> *Pros.Ptol.* I and VIII 315; Mooren, *Aulic Titulature* 096; G. Mussies, *Pap. Lugd.Bat.* XIV 22. He is mentioned also at P.Heid. inv. G 4741.

<sup>17</sup> 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.

<sup>18</sup> *P.Berl. Zill.* 2.3 with *BL* VIII 64. According to P.Heid. inv. G 4741 Ptolemaios was still *stratēgos* in Phamenoth of Philometor’s 26<sup>th</sup> year (March/April, 155) and Têrês had become *stratēgos* by Pauni of the same year (June/July).

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

<sup>20</sup> 3 November 146 B.C. according to P.Heid. inv. G 4925 (= *P.Phrur. Diosk.* 6, forthcoming).

<sup>21</sup> As to the lacuna, the editors suggested (p. 266), “Perhaps ἀρχισωματοφύλακι, or another of the court titles at the beginning of the line.” Mooren, *Aulic Titulature* no. 098, p. 108 and *La hiérarchie* p. 103, proposed [τῶν ἀρχισωματοφύλακων instead, on grounds that it better fit the space and “parce que les stratèges de l’Héracléopolite 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 (πρώτων) φίλων κ]αὶ, and also

according to the full prescript of the oath, must fall under Euergetes II, in 135/4 B.C.<sup>22</sup> 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 *stratêgos* of the Herakleopolite.

### Consequences or Exakôn?

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 (καλῶς οὖν πο]ήσεις συντάξας τὸν μὲν ἄνθρωπον κατα[στήσαι ἐπὶ — — — ]ν). The request is boilerplate,<sup>23</sup> but the purpose of the hearing is rendered less clear by lacuna: ὅπως ἐξελεγχθεῖς περ. [ . . . ] θηι τωι εξακο, “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,” τύχωσι τῶν ἐξακολουθούντων.<sup>24</sup> Thus, if περ. [ . . . ] θηι should be taken to indicate a verb (aorist passive subjunctive) that means “be submitted to” and governs a dative, we might posit τοῖς ἐξακολουθοῦσι 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 θηι with ἐπιστολῆ[ς] (1), τοῦ (4), τοῦ τόπου (6), τὸν (7), τὸ (11), or any other pairing of *tau* with a subsequent letter, suggests that the letter following *tau* in line 8 may not be an *omicron*. The *tau* 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 *tau*'s horizontal bar. Moreover, the letter after τωι is so badly abraded as to indicate possible erasure. Traces seem to suggest an *epsilon*, perhaps erased as dittographic before εξακο, or perhaps a *sigma*. If we read τῶι [ε] then εξακο cannot be explained as the number 600 (ἐξακο[σι-]). 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 ἐξακο[σίαις], 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 τῶι [ε] then we might imagine ἐξακο[λουθοῦντι ἐπι-/προστίμωι<sup>25</sup> (*vel sim.*), or if we read τοῖς at the expense of palaeographical considerations, then τοῖς ἐξακο[λουθοῦσι

---

[τῶν πρώτων φίλων κ]αὶ, on the grounds that both fell short by a few letters. But if Mooren's restoration be accepted, then this would be the only Herakleopolite text in which a *stratêgos* in the reign of the restored Euergetes II was an *archisōmatophylax*, not a “member of the first friends.” Barring new evidence, prudence suggests we restore Πολεμάρχωι | [τῶν πρώτων φίλων κ]αὶ στρατηγῶι at P.Tebt. III.1 810.12–13. Perhaps the letters and spacing of this important title, which fell at the start of a line, were somewhat outsized—a common enough phenomenon.

<sup>22</sup> W. Clarysse and G. Van der Veken, *Pap. Lugd.Bat.* XXIV #156, pp. 32–33. This same Polemarchos is attested in P.Heid. inv. G 4763, which is securely dated to 136 B.C., as Dr. J. Cowey kindly informs.

<sup>23</sup> *E.g.* BGU VIII 1844.23 (Herakleopolite, 50/49 B.C.); P.Enteux. 24.8 (Arsinoite, 221 B.C.); P.Koeln VI 272.14; P.Oxy. XII 1465.12 (I B.C.); P.Ryl. IV 577.15 (Arsinoite, 147/136/83 B.C.); PSI IV 366.5 (Philadelphia, 250/49 B.C.); P.Tebt. I 13.18 (114 B.C.), 183 no line numbers (late II B.C.); UPZ I 5.48–49 (Memphis, 163 B.C.), 6.35 (Memphis, 163 B.C.), 124.34 (Memphis, 176/5 or 165/4 B.C.).

<sup>24</sup> P.Dion. 10.15–16 (Hermoupolis Magna, 109 B.C.); PSI III 168.32–33 (Thinite, 118 B.C.); P.Ryl. IV 577.16–19 (Arsinoite, before 147/136 B.C.): [ἴ]ν[α] | τύχω τῶν δικαί[ω]ν, ἀν[τοῖ] δὲ | τῆς ἐξακολουθούσης ἀπὸ τοῦ προ[σ]τάγματος εὐθύνης. Cf. also P.Tebt. I 5.132–133 (118 B.C.): ἀπολύεσθαι τῶν ἐξακολουθοῦν[τ]ρων προστίμων; 5.203: τῶν ἐξακολουθούντων προστίμων; P.Tor.Amen. 8.82–83 (Thebes, 116 B.C.): τιθέμε[ν]ος τὰ ἐξακολουθούντα αὐτῶι ἐπίτιμα; P.Tor.Choach. 12.ii.20 (117 B.C.): τῶν ἐξακολουθούντων αὐτοῖς ἐπίτιμων. The basic formula occurs in many variations: P.Oxy. XII 1465.13–14 (I B.C.), P.Ryl. II 65.12 (Oxyrhynchus?, 67 B.C.); P.Würzb. 5.13–14 (Oxyrhynchus, 31 B.C.): τυχεῖν ὧν προσήκει; P.Tebt. I 45.34–35 (113 B.C.); 183 no line numbers (late II B.C.); P.Tebt. IV 1096.22 (113 B.C.): τυχεῖν τῆς ἀρμοζούσης ἐπιπλήξεως. UPZ I 8.29–31 (Memphis, 161 B.C.): ὅπως περὶ | ἁπάντων τούτων τύχωσι τῆς προσηκούσης μισοποληρίας.

<sup>25</sup> Though the singular would be unusual; cf. P.Tebt. I 5.132–133; P.Tor.Amen. 8.82–83; P.Tor.Choach. 12.ii.20 cited above.

would be a possible restoration. In either case we would have to restore  $\text{περ. [ ] θηι}$  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;<sup>26</sup> or, he might be bound (or perhaps paraded,  $\text{περιαχθεῖς}$ ) and hanged from a post,<sup>27</sup> remanded to the king,<sup>28</sup> or dispatched to forced labor at the oar of a ship.<sup>29</sup> That the missing verb should mean “suffer” is contingent on the restoration  $\text{τοῖς ἐξάκοι[λοθοῦσι}$ , which is by no means secure. After  $\text{ἐξάκόσιος}$  and  $\text{ἐξάκολουθέω}$  we are left with the personal name  $\text{Exakōn: τῶι [ε] 'Εξακόι[νι}$ .<sup>30</sup> As the name would be preceded by the definite article the putative  $\text{Exakōn}$  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  $\text{Exakōn}$  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:  $\text{ὅπως ἐξελεγχθεῖς περιπ[εμ]φθῆι(?) τῶι [ε] 'Εξακόι[νι}$ , “so that, if he should be proven (guilty) under examination, he may be remanded (?) to  $\text{Exakōn}$ .”

The verb  $\text{περιπέμπω}$  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  $\text{ἐὰν γὰρ φαίνεται κατ' ἀλήθειαν ἰὸ 'Αμηννεὺς}$  (a beermaker accused of wrongdoing)  $\text{εἰρηκῶς ἂ ἔγραψας πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἰ περιαχθεῖς κρεμήσεται}$ , “If Ammeneus appears truly to have said what you wrote to me, he shall be bound and hanged.” Scholars have debated whether to take  $\text{πρὸς ἡμᾶς}$  with  $\text{ἔγραψας}$ , or with  $\text{περιαχθεῖς}$ ; 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.<sup>31</sup> Whether the precise restoration  $\text{περιπ[εμ]φθῆι}$  is correct or not, it does give plausible sense; if not  $\text{περιπέμπω}$  then something similar.

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

For now we leave the identification of this putative  $\text{Exakōn}$  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.

<sup>26</sup> *BGU XVI* 2629.17–18 (Herakleopolite, 4 B.C.):  $\text{παρρησίασθαι ἐποίησα}$ .

<sup>27</sup> *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59202.9 (254 B.C.)  $\text{περιαχθεῖς κρεμήσεται}$ . See also E. G. Turner, “The Hanging of a Brewer: *P.Cairo Zenon* II 59202,” *Am.Stud.Pap.* I 79–86.

<sup>28</sup> *P.Amh.* II 33.34–35 (Soknopaiou Nêsos, ca 157 B.C.):  $\text{αὐτόν τε ἰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς μετὰ φυλακῆς ἀποστείλατε}$ .

<sup>29</sup> *P.Hib.* II 198.91 (?), 242–222 B.C.):  $\text{ἀποστελλέσθωσαν ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς}$ .

<sup>30</sup> The abbreviation at *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59367.43 (241 B.C.) should be resolved ( $\text{ἐξηκοντάρουρον}$ ), not ( $\text{ἐξακοντάρουρον}$ ).

<sup>31</sup> *Am.Stud.Pap.* I 79–86, with discussion of previous views.

<sup>32</sup> 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:  $\text{Καλλιάνακτος τῶν ἐκ τοῦ [Ἡρ]ακλεοπολίτου πραγματικῶν προσαγγείλαντος δι' ἐντεύξε[ως] ἕτερα τε καὶ 'Εξακῶνα τὸν ταγέντα ἰ πρὸς τῆι προσλήψει τῶν [εἰς τ]ῆν ἐν τῶι νομῶι κατοικίαν ἀνδρῶν ἰ ἐπὶ τῆι μερισθείσει [γῆι] παραελογευκ[έναι]....$

<sup>33</sup> On  $\text{Exakōn}$  and family see B. E. Nielson, “Apollophanes Son of Exakon in *P.Köln V* 223,” *BASP* 28 (1991) 179–183.

Phanêsis, author of inv. 605r and the forwarded letter in inv. 599, calls himself *kômogrammateus* of Thmoinausiris καὶ τῶν συγκυρουσῶν κωμῶν.<sup>34</sup> The phrase is somewhat rare in the papyri. It most commonly modifies Roman Tebtynis,<sup>35</sup> but also Oxyrhyncha, and (Arsinoite) Tebetny and Kerkêsis.<sup>36</sup> 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 Bêsas, also known as Sôtêrichos, *kômogrammateus* of (Pathyrite) *Krokodeilôn 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 Hôros, *kômogrammateus* of Mouchinpagei, no doubt a small village,<sup>37</sup> and the adjacent villages (1–3). In his subscription, however, Hôros calls himself *kômogrammateus* of Ankyrôn, a place substantial enough sometimes to have been called a *polis*,<sup>38</sup> 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 Phanêsis as the *kômogrammateus* of Rodônos Nêsos. This doubtless small village, which appears also at inv. 605r.5 but is otherwise unattested,<sup>39</sup> must have been among the constellation of villages under Phanêsis' administration. But Phanêsis calls himself (inv. 605r.2) *kômogrammateus* of Thmoinausiris, a substantial village, and the adjacent villages. These three texts suggest formal administration of multiple villages by the same *kômogrammateus*.<sup>40</sup> 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 *kômogrammateus* had a single base of operations, and that Hôros' and Phanêsis' were Ankyrôn and Thmoinausiris, respectively.<sup>41</sup>

*P.Duk.* inv. 598

18 x 23 cm.

21 August 138 B.C.

<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/598.html>

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. ὑποστρατη-, 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

<sup>34</sup> See inv. 599.4 and inv. 605.2.

<sup>35</sup> 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).

<sup>36</sup> Receipt for taxes paid by millers in Oxyrhyncha and the adjacent villages: *P.Tebt.* III.2 840.2–3 (113 B.C.). Sale (?) of oil from Oxyrhyncha and the adjacent villages: *P.Tebt.* III.2 932.5–6 (late II B.C.). Fishery tax from Tebetny, Kerkêsis, and the adjacent villages: *P.Tebt.* II 329.9–10 (A.D. 139).

<sup>37</sup> Mouchinpagei is otherwise unattested; Calderini, *Diz.geogr. s.v.*, 3.3 p. 300; Falivene, *Am.Stud.Pap.* XXXVII p. 131.

<sup>38</sup> Calderini, *Diz.geogr. s.v.*, 1.1 pp. 11–13.

<sup>39</sup> The *Rhodônos* [*klêros*] attested at *BGU* IV 1193.4 (8 B.C.) belongs to the περὶ Κόμα toparchy: περὶ Κόμα ἐκ τοῦ Ῥόδων[ος κλήρου]. Thmoinausiris, and presumably Rodônos Nêsos, belongs to the Peran toparchy. On Herakleopolite toparchies see *P.Heid.* VIII 418 with pp. 254–256; also F. Mitthof, “Zur Pagusordnung des Herakleopolites,” *Tyche* 14 (1999) 211–218. For a list, see Falivene, *Am.Stud.Pap.* XXXVII Index 1 pp. 293–294.

<sup>40</sup> On the sphere of administrative competence of *kômogrammateis* see L. Criscuolo, “Ricerche sul *Komogrammateus* nell’Egitto tolemaico,” *Aegyptus* 58 (1978) 3–101, esp. 29–39.

<sup>41</sup> Falivene, *Am.Stud.Pap.* XXXVII, does not comment on the phrase at 39–43, s.v. Ἀγκυρῶν πόλις, or at 131, s.v. Μουχινπάγει, except to translate it (131) “and villages under the same administration.”



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. κατα[στῆσαι ἐπὶ — — ]ν: A few options for restoration present themselves. (1) ἐπὶ *Name and/or title in the accusative*; (2) ἐπὶ σὲ / ἐμέ *Name δὲ + infinitive ending in -ει]ν* (with the sense κατέχει]ν or ζητεῖ]ν?), 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)*....” καταστῆσαι ἐπὶ σὲ / ἐμέ (or another official) καὶ *Name ending in nu (accusative)*. The first seems most likely.
8. According to LSJ ἐξελέγχω, “strengthd. for ἐλέγχω,” 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 at *BGU XVI* 2629.14–18 (Herakleopolite, 4 B.C.) was “proven so on examination” (ἐξελεγχθεις) by Eurylochos 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” (ἐξελεγχθέντες) as opposed to “convicted” (so *P.Hib.* II p. 98). At *UPZ* II 113 (Memphis, 156 B.C.) Dioskouridēs the *dioikêtês* warns Dōriōn that he has had heard grumblings about Dōriōn and Dōriōn’s underlings. He warns that it would be unwelcome if “anyone should be proven on examination to have injured anyone” (τις ἐξελεγχθῆι λελυπηκώς 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 ἐβουλήθην ἀκριβῶς ἐξελένξαι. At *SB XX* 15036.37 (A.D. II/III), ἐ[κ δευτέρου] δὲ ἐξελε[γθῆ]ναι δ[ύ]ν]ηται, 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 ἐλέγχω 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 (?; IV/V A.D.) too fragmentary to allow certainty as to the meaning of ἐξελέγχω.
- 8–9. For the restoration and interpretation of περ [ . . . ] θῆι τωι ἐξακολ[ — — — see discussion above. The name Exakōn is attested with genitive in -ωνος (or -ῶνος): e.g. *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59417.21 [restored] (254 or 252–246 B.C.), 59527.5 (middle III B.C.); *P.Köln* IV 187.10 (Herakleopolis, 146 B.C.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 739. 3, 9, 11, 13, 15 (Tebtynis, 145 B.C.), III.2 910.2 (162 B.C.), III.2 1006.13 (late II B.C.); -ωντος (or -ῶντος): e.g. *P.Dion* 15.14 [restored] (Akorios, 109 B.C.); *P.Giss.Univ.* I 7.3 (Euhemeria; II B.C.); *P.Köln* V 222.2, 4 (cf. 223.3: Herakleopolite, after 145 B.C.); -όντος (or -οντος): e.g. *BGU XIV* 2441.149, 171; 2443.23; 2444.92; 2449.117 (Herakleopolite, I B.C.); *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59442.6, 13 (III B.C.); *P.Dion* 14.16 (Akorios, 110 B.C.), 15.14 (Akorios, 109 B.C.) [restored]. We suggest above the possibility of restoring Ἐξακῶν[ι] (i.e. for Ἐξακῶνι), since Ἐξάκολ[ντι] would give a word that does not break at the syllable.
- 10–11. The victims of the *paralogeia* are the subject of δύνωνται. 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 ταῖς καθ[ε]σταμέναις χρεῖαις (at their appointed tasks) or πρὸς ταῖς καθ’ ἐ[κ]άστην κώμην χρεῖαις (at their tasks, village by village) *vel sim.* For τελεῖν τ]ὰ καθήκοντ’ εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν see *P.Tebt.* I 5.170–174 (118 B.C.). Cf. also *P.Tebt.* III.2 961.5–9 (150/139 B.C.): ἀ[ξιῶ] οὖν | σε συ]ντάξαι γράψαι καταστήσαι τοῦ[ς] αἰτίους (?) | ἐπὶ σέ, δ]πως διαλάβης περὶ αὐτῶ[ν] μισο-πότη[ρω]ς(?), δύ]νωμαι δὲ τὰ καθήκοντα [εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν πα]ραδοῦναι.

P.Duk. inv. 602

4 x 6 cm.

23 October 138 B.C.

<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/602.html>

Herakleopolite

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 Euphranōr the *stratēgos* passed through Tekmi on the 25<sup>th</sup> of Thoth. We know from the docket on the verso that the memorandum had been received and logged by the 27<sup>th</sup>. The verso, published here for the first time, confirms the reading of the *editio princeps* at r.2.

### Text

Announced R. L. B. Morris, *Pap. Congr.* XVII 3.918. R. Morris and J. Oates, “An Official Report,” *BASP* 22 (1985) 243–247 (with photo p. 247); G. Schwendner, “P.Duke Inv. G. 1974.5 again: A Ghost Name and a New Date,” *ZPE* 72 (1988) 275–276 (lines 1–5) [*SB XVIII* 13304].

Cf. D. Hagedorn, “Bemerkungen zu Urkunden,” *ZPE* 68 (1987) 81–86, at 84–85.

recto

- (m.2) Λ λγ Θωὺθ [..]  
 (m.1) παρ' Ατιτος κωμογραμματέως Τέκμι  
 καὶ Βιχινθῶυθ. τῆι κε τοῦ Θωὺθ  
 4 τοῦ λγ Λ παρεγένετο Εὐφράνωρ  
 ἰσότιμος τοῖς πρώτοις φίλοις καὶ  
 στρατηγὸς περὶ ὥραν ἦ εἰς  
 Τέκμι ἄγων μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ τοῦς  
 8 μετακθέντας εἰς Πάπα φρουρούς.

verso

- [Λ λγ] Θωὺθ κζ Ατιτος. Τέ(κμι).  
 2 [περὶ] τῆς μετηγμένης  
 [φρου]ρᾶς εἰς Πάπα εἰς Τέκμι.

recto 2. Παρὰ Μυὸς Schwendner. 3. Βιχινθῶυθ Hagedorn; κε Θωὺθ Schwendner. 4. τοῦ .. Λ Hagedorn: τοῦ λγ Λ Schwendner. 8. Read μετακθέντας. verso 1. ἔ papyrus.

Year 33 Thoth .... From Atis, *kômogrammateus* of Tekmi and Bichinthôyth. On the 28<sup>th</sup> of Thoth of the 33<sup>rd</sup> year Euphranôr, equal in honor to the first friends and *stratêgos*, 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 [κζ], as at v. 1.
2. The reading on the verso, which is perfectly clear, confirms Ατιτος here. This appears to be the genitive of Ατις. The name seems to occur elsewhere only at *O.Mich.* 351.2 (Karanis, III/IV A.D.), there Ατις (nom.).
3. Βιχινθῶυθ 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 *lambda* 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 *kappa*; the year cannot have been κγ. Euergetes' first year, on restoration to the throne, was reckoned his 25<sup>th</sup>. If the document were dated to Philometor's 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 *gamma* breaks and is connected to L by a downward-dipping stroke.
8. On Herakleopolite garrisons see the introduction to *P.Phrur. Diosk.* (forthcoming).
- v.3. The receipt docket reiterates εἰς Τέκμι from the recto (5–6). There εἰς 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 dangling accusative, ἐπιλαβόντα[ς] τοῦς ... φυ[λ]ακίτας (3–4), which is followed by a finite verb, ἀ[ν]ήχθη (4); the text gives Νῆσον (4) where grammar demands a dative, and an infinitive that construes only by extreme ellipsis, [παραλαβ]εῖν (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



- papyri: Mayser, *Gram.* I.1 137; for κάλλα see *SB XVIII* 13226.11 (Hawara, I B.C.). [Διονυσίου]: P.Duk. inv. 605v, apparently addressed to Dionysios, in describing these same events refers to Agathinos and Philammôn as π[α]ρὰ σοῦ (8); this suggests that Dionysios might be restored here.
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.Tebt.* III.2 1040.Fr2.8 (early II B.C.): Φᾶβις Ἀβαβίκιος. The name appears in the third century B.C. at *P.Petr.* III 59C.Fr1.23 (Gurob), and twice in the Roman period: *P.Oxy.Census* 327 (A.D. 91/2?) and *O.Deiss.* 14.2 (Arsinoite, 5 B.C.). [κατεγένετο]: or perhaps [παρεγένετο]; cf. n. on inv. 605v.9.
  9. ἄνευ τῆς ἡμετέρας γνώμης; *BGU VI* 1252.18-19 (Arsinoite, II B.C.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 793.x.19-20 (183 B.C.); *UPZ II* 215.6 (Thebes, 130 B.C.). Also *P.Münch.* III.1 62.10 (?), II B.C.): ἄνευ τῆς Μενεκράτου γνώμης; *SB III* 7188.42 (Arsinoite, 154 B.C.): ἄνευ τῆς τῶν μεμ[ισθωκ]ότων γνώμης.
  10. ἔστιν δὲ τὸ καθ' ἑν: for variations on the phrase, employed to introduce lists, see *P.Dion.* 10.19 (Hermopolis Magna, 109 B.C.), *P.Tebt.* 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 Hôriôn stole.” But δεδ[ω]κεν 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:” ἐπι[δεδ]ωκεν [Name πρὸς ἐμ]έ? cf. *PSI IV* 325.4 (Philadelphia, 261/0 B.C.): δίδοτε πρὸς ἡμᾶς. There seems to be space for three letters between ε and δεδ[ω]κεν, 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[α]ρεγέν[ο]σ[υ]το at the end of the line. At inv. 605v.16-17, a report to Dionysios the *archiphylakitês*, φυλακίται? οἱ (?) παρὰ σοῦ are reported as having gone to Herakleopolis. Phanêsis was a *kômogrammateus* and so probably did not send guards, but perhaps the sense, if not the precise text, is οἱ π[α]ρ' ἁμῶν (cf. παρ' ἁμῶν, inv. 599.10 with note) [ἄνθρωποι?].

P.Duk. inv. 605v

on/after 9 May 137 B.C.

<http://SCRIPTORIUM.LIB.DUKE.EDU/PAPYRUS/RECORDS/605V.HTML>

Herakleopolite

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 *archiphylakitês*. The author, apparently Pesouris, recounts the matters reported to him by Phanêsis 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**

→ ( . ο [.....] σ η λ σε [.....] [.....] ε νο σ τ ε ω σ [.....] ρ ο σ [.....] η ρ ν σ  
τ σ [.....] [.....] φ υ λ α κ ί τ ο υ τ ῶ ν [.....] τ [.....] ε ω σ ι [.....] .  
*vacat?*

4 *traces?*

Διονυσίωι ἀρ(χι)φ(υλακίτηι)· δι' ἧς ἔπεμψεν [ἐπιστολῆς Φ[α]νῆσις κ(ωμογ)γρ(αμματεὺς) τῆς Ῥόδω-  
νος Νήσου ἀ[νενήν]εκται

τῆι ἱς μη(νός) Φαρ(μουθι) ἀναχθέντος Ὠρίω[νος] [τῶ] (?) ἐκ τῆς κώ(μης) [.....] γεωργού ὑπὸ τῶν  
[α]υτόθι

[φ]υλακίτων ἐπ(ι) Κομανὸν τὸν ἐπι(στάτην) τῶν φ(υλακίτων?), μεταξὺ ἐπιπαράγενομένου Ἀγα-  
θίνου καὶ

8 Φιλάμμονα τοὺς π[α]ρὰ σοῦ παρασφραγίσασθαι [.....] ἄνευ τῶν ἄλλ[ων?]



- ἀνευ τῶν ἄλλ[ων?]. 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 filed with Pesouris, or was this contradiction simply an error?
9. Or perhaps παρ[αγεν]έσθαι. P.Duk. inv. 599.9 and 605r.8 (restored) seem to employ κατεγένετο to describe Hōriōn and Petesouchos' presence in the house of Ababikis. Here, the scribe writes ὅπου in place of ἐν ἧι (cf. inv. 605r.8). The traces after ὅπου clearly indicate an infinitive (-θαι), perhaps attracted to the mood by indirect discourse.
  10. Restore ὦν οἶμαι σε μη]θὲν ἀγνοεῖν (the antecedent of ὦν being the preceding report)? For the phrase see *Chr. Wilck.* 166.ii.11 (Arsinoite, 218 B.C.): οἶμαι γὰρ μηδὲ σ[ε] ἀγνοεῖν, ὅτι ...
  - 10–11. Restore ἴνα [οὖν ἔρχονται] | εἰς συνέδριον *vel sim.*? Cf. *P.Tor.Choach.* 11bis.i.21–22 (Thebes, 119 B.C.): [ἔ]ρχεσθαι εἰς τὸ | [συνέδριον. For πρὸς τὴν [ἐ]σομένην ἐπίσκε(ψιν) cf. *P.Amh.* II 35.37–39 (Soknopaiou Nēsos, 132 B.C.): πρὸς τὴν ἐσομένην ἡμῖν πρὸς τὸν Πετεσοῦχον τὸν λισώνιν | κατάστασιν; *SB V* 7609.18–19 (Herakleopolite, 47 B.C.): πρὸς τὴν ἐσομένην διάκρισιν; *SB X* 10254.14 (Euhemeria?, 145–116 B.C.): τὰ πρὸς τὴν κατάστασιν δικα[ιώματα. Also *P.Fouad* 16.8 (Oxyrhynchos, 68 B.C.): πρὸς τὴν ἐπ[ί]σκεψιν; *P.Tebt.* III.2, 895.96 (ca 175 B.C.): πρὸς τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν.
  12. The traces do not appear to accommodate ἀσφαλίσασθαι, but might indicate ἀσφαλιζ[ό]μενος or ἀσφαλισ[ά]μενος. The verb sometimes appears in petitions to law enforcement officials, referring to detention of individuals: e.g. *P.Hels.* I 2.22–25 (Arsinoite, ca 195–192 B.C.): ἀξιῶ συντάξει | ἀσφαλίσασθαι τὸν Φίλωνα καὶ τοὺς | μεθ' αὐτοῦ μέχρι τοῦ ἐπιγνωσθῆναι | τὰ κατ' ἐμέ; *P.Tebt.* III.1 798.24–27 (II B.C.): ἀξιῶ οὖν | ἐάν φαίνεται ἀσφαλισάμενος (read: ἀσφαλίσασθαι) τοὺς | αἰτίους μέχρι τοῦ εἰς κοινὸν συνέδριον ἔλθειν.
  - 13–14. Cf. *P.Tebt.* III.1 703.99 (ca 210 B.C.): [μὴ πα]ρέργως φρό[νι]ζε; *UPZ I* 110.185–186 (Memphis, 164 B.C.): προνοεῖσθε μὴ πα[ρ]έργως.
  15. For the basic formula, πρὸς τὴν περὶ τούτων διεξαγωγῆν, see *P.Amh.* II 35.41 (Soknopaiou Nēsos, 132 B.C.) and *P.Tebt.* III.1 739.10 (145 B.C.). Variants: *P.Tebt.* I 14.6–7, 15–16 (114 B.C.); *P.Ryl.* II 65.9–10 (Oxyrhynchos?, 67 B.C.?); *P.Anag.* p. 88a.FrB.1 (Magdola, III B.C.?).
  16. δ(ια)λεχθ(ῶσι ?): διαλέγω usually denotes examination of a document for or at a trial: e.g. *P.Erasm.* I 1.33–35 (Oxyrhyncha, 148/7 B.C.): ὅπως διαλέξαντες αὐτήν (i.e. τὴν ἔντευξιν) εἰς κατάστασιν καὶ ἀνακαλεσάμενοι τὸν τε Ἡρακλείδην καὶ Ὠρίωνα δι[ὰ] θεοδώρου τοῦ τῆς | κόμης ἐπιστάτου προστάζωσιν [α]ὐτοῖς, ... 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 ὑπό μου. But the traces before Πεσοῦρει could conceivably accommodate μου.
  17. The line must begin with ποησαν preceded by parenthesis, not ἐπο(ί)ησαν; compare ( πάντων at 19. φυλακ(ίται?) οἱ (?) παρὰ σοῦ is far from legible. If we have correctly resolved (οὖν?) then some verb, perhaps an abbreviated imperative, should occupy the two spaces between σοῦ and (οὖν?).
  19. The mark that preceded πάντων also appears at the start of 17 and at 15 before ὥστ'. 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 *epistatēs* of the police, began here. Cf. inv. 605r.1: γρ(άψον) τῶι ἐπ(ι-στάτη) τῶν φυλακ(ιτῶν) καὶ τῶι ἀρχιφ(υλακίτη). The traces after φ(υλακ(ιτῶν) are difficult to read. The restoration ἐν Ἡρ(ακλέους) πό(λει) would fit the space as well as the sense. The reading is difficult, however. For a similar abbreviation for πόλις, 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, 7, 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 Phanêsis sent to Pesouris.

### Text

↑ [Ἀμμενεὺς Πεσοῦρει (?) χαίρειν· ἧς γέγραφε]ν ἡμῖν Φ[α]νῆσις κωμογραμματεὺς  
 [Θμο]ιναυ-  
 [σίρεως τοῦ Πέραν (?) ἐπιστολῆς τὸ ἀντίγ]ραφον ὑποτετάχαμεν ὅπως εἰδήσις.  
 [ vac ] ἔρρωσο (ἔτους) λγ Φαρμοῦ[θ]ι ις.

- 4 [Φανήσις κωμογραμματεὺς Θμοιναυσίρε]ως καὶ τῶν [σ]υγκυρουσῶν κωμῶν Ἀμμενεὶ  
χαίρειν·  
[τῆι ις τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος μηνὸς ἐπιλαβόντω]ν τῶν ἐ[κ] τῆς κωμῆς φυλακितῶν Ὠρίωνα τῶν ἐκ  
τῆς  
[αὐτῆς κωμῆς γεωργῶν, ἀνήχθη εἰς Ἡρα]κλέους πόλιν ὡς ἐπὶ Κομανὸν τὸν ἐπιστάτην τῶν  
[φυλακितῶν· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τῆι αὐτῆι ἡμέραι ἐ]πιβαλὼν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν κωμὴν Ἀγαθίνος  
8 [καὶ Φιλάμμων οἱ παρὰ Διονυσίου (?) σ]ὺν ἄλλοις ποιούμενο[ι] παρασφραγισμὸν τῆ[ς]  
Ἀβαβίκιος  
[οἰκίας ἐν ἧι ὁ προγεγραμμένος Ὠρίων κατεγ]έ[ν]ετο καὶ Πετεσοῦχος τῶν βασιλικῶν  
γεωργῶν  
[τῶν τῆς αὐτῆς . . . . . ἄνευ τῆς] ἡμετέρας γνώμης ἢ παραλαβεῖν τινὰς τῶν παρ' ἁμῶν.  
[ἔστιν δὲ τὸ καθ' ἐν ᾧ ἐπιδέδωκεν . . . ] τε· χῆχα ταριχηρὸν <sup>ννν</sup> α <sup>ννν</sup> προσκεφάλαια <sup>ννν</sup> β  
12 [ — — — — <sup>ca 30?</sup> — — — — ] L λγ Φαρμούθι ις.

Readings restored from P.Duk. inv. 605r underlined. 5. cf. inv. 605r.3–4 ἐν(εσ)τῶτος [μ]ηνὸς {μηνὸς} ἐπιλαβόντα[ς] τοὺς | ... φυλ[α]κίτας. 7. read ἐπέβαλον?: ἐπέβαλον inv. 605r.6. 9. Cf. inv. 605v.9 κατ[α]γεν[ε]σθαί. 10. read ἡμῶν. 11. Cf. inv. 605r.10 ἐ[πι]δέδ[ω]κεν[ — <sup>ca 12</sup> — ]ε; read χῆνα: χηχα papyrus.

Ammeneus to Pesouris(?) greetings. We have appended a copy of the letter that Phanêsis, *kômogrammateus* of Thmoinausiris [of the Peran toparchy?], wrote to us so that you may know. Farewell. Year 33, Pharmouthi 16.

Phanêsis, *kômogrammateus* of Thmoinausiris and the adjacent villages, to Ammeneus, greetings. On the 16<sup>th</sup> of the present month, with the police from the same village having seized Hôriôn, one of the royal farmers from the same village, he (?) was sent to Herakleopolis so that (he might go?) before Komanos, the *epistatês* of the police; and after this, on the same day, falling upon the same village, Agathinos and Philammôn, with others from Dionysios (?), *archiphylakitês*, putting a seal on Ababikis' house, in which the aforementioned Hôriôn 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: Phanêsis 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 grammateus* (inv. 599). This Ammeneus cannot be identified with confidence with an Ameneus who was *basilikos grammateus* 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 Ameneus 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 κωμο- are nearly impossible to read.
- 1–2. Cf. *P.Hels.* I 11.10–11, 14.7–8 (Herakleopolite, 163 B.C.): περὶ κόμην Θμοιναυσίριν τοῦ Πέραν.
3. On the date, see 605r, note on line 3.
7. inv. 605r.5 also lacks a verb after ὡς. Presumably ἐπιβαλὼν agrees with Ἀγαθίνος alone.
8. On restoring Dionysios see note on 605r.6. Here, παρὰ Διονυσίου τοῦ ἀρχιφυλακίτου (cf. inv. 605r.6–7) is too long for the space, but παρὰ Διονυσίου seems short. Perhaps we should restore παρὰ Διονυσίου τοῦ ἀρχι(φυλακίτου), *vel sim*, as suggested by 605v.5.
9. Or perhaps παρεγ[έ]νετο: see on inv. 605v.9.
10. In 605r.9, there is no gap between αὐτῆς and ἄνευ; here, up to ten letters have been lost. Perhaps Ammeneus inserted κωμῆς after αὐτῆς, but the remainder of the gap is uncertain. παρ' ἁμῶν: The reading is absolutely clear (cf. π[α]ρ' ἡ[μῶ]ν, inv. 605r.10). Such exchange of *alpha* and *eta* seems to be otherwise unattested.
11. Traces do not appear to accommodate πρὸς ἐμέ. Cf. note on inv. 605r.10. ταριχηρὸν: The *eta* is cursive, unlike every other *eta* in the text, looking rather like a one-hooped *omega*.
12. The lacuna will not accommodate restoration of the parallel section from 605r.11–13.