



Three Duke Petitions

Author(s): John Bauschatz

Source: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 152 (2005), pp. 187-196

Published by: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20192027>

Accessed: 05-04-2017 15:37 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.

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

THREE DUKE PETITIONS

I present here three Greek petitions of Ptolemaic date housed in the Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library at Duke University.¹ All three concern the wrongdoing of unscrupulous individuals: usurpation of land, tax evasion, robbery, murder and fraud all figure prominently. Each petition was addressed to an official with a different administrative domain: in the first case the king, in the second an *epimelêtês*, and in the third instance an *epistatêts*. The literature on petitions and the petitioning process in Ptolemaic Egypt is extensive. For a few treatments of the subject see M. Hombert/C. Préaux, *CdÉ* 17 (1942): 259–286; A. di Bitonto Kasser, *Aegyptus* 47 (1967): 5–57; 48 (1968): 53–107; and 56 (1976): 109–143; and M. Parca, *CdÉ* 60 (1985): 240–247. On petitions to the Ptolemaic police, see now J. Bauschatz, *Policing the Chôra: Law Enforcement in Ptolemaic Egypt* (diss. Duke, 2005): 65–102.

P.Duk. inv. 698

8 x 29.5 cm.

III B.C.

<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/698.html>

Oxyrhyncha

The recto of this papyrus contains 10 lines of text written across the fibers. A small upper margin (.9 cm.) is preserved at top left. The papyrus is broken on all sides. The first six lines have lost their left margin, and most of them (1, 2, 3?, 6?) have consequently lost a character or two. Lines are spaced approximately .25 to .5 cm. apart. Only slight traces of writing remain after line 7. The amount of text lost at left and right is uncertain. Yet given the document's great width (29.5 cm.) it would be surprising if more than an additional centimeter or two has been lost. In *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (2nd ed.: Oxford, 1951): 51, F.G. Kenyon suggests that the heights of conjoined sheets in Greek papyrus rolls rarely exceeded 13 inches (approx. 33 cm.). The calculation applies to our text, as it was written across the fibers. If we allow for a small original left-hand margin (*i.e.*, less than 1 cm.), perhaps less than 2 cm. of text and margin have been lost at right.

The hand is generally clear, with thick and usually curved lettering. Palaeography and parallels of grammar and syntax suggest a third-century date (see notes). The scribe's grammar is fairly poor. The petition begins with a pair of Genitives absolute (Θοτομοῦ[τος]... γεωργοῦντ[ος] αὐτοῦ, 3–4) followed by a finite verb (ἀνωικοδόμησεν, 4) with the subject of the Genitives absolute as its subject. This consequently calls the restoration of the case of the ensuing participle (προκαταλαβόμενο[ς], 4) into question.

The petition tells the story of an underage woman whose legal guardians have passed away. As a consequence she has been left at the mercy of a predatory land-grubber. *P.Tebt.* III.1 780 (Tebtynis, 171 B.C.) tells a similar tale, though in this document the complainant is a male, and the offending party a woman: the accused, a certain Thareus, built a tower (πυργίον, 11) on the petitioner's inherited land. Thareus had since died, but her relatives remained on the property, much to the chagrin of the owner. For similar situations, see (*e.g.*) *P.Dryton* 33 (?; 136 B.C.), a petition to an *epistratêgos* from four orphaned sisters whose inherited home had been forcibly occupied and whose inherited belongings had been stolen; and *SB* VIII 9790 (Herakleopolite, I B.C.), a fragmentary petition from the orphaned daughter of a cavalry cleruch which clearly demonstrates that before the beginning of Roman rule in Egypt a daughter was legally permitted to inherit her father's allotment in the absence of male heirs. Yet

¹ <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu>>, 2002. Duke Papyrus Archive: <.../papyrus>, 2002. Abbreviations after: J. F. Oates *et al.* (eds.), *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, <.../papyrus/texts/clist.html>, 2005. Dates of papyri after: *Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens*, <<http://aquila.papy.uni-heidelberg.de/gvzFM.html>>, 2004. I would like to thank Joshua Sosin and John Oates for their helpful comments on an early draft of this paper, as well as Dieter Hagedorn for his many improvements to the current version.

as the evidence suggests, the letter of the law was not enough to dissuade opportunists from taking advantage of an orphan. As was true elsewhere in the ancient world, life in Ptolemaic Egypt could be very difficult for resourceless children.

Text and Translation

recto

↑ βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ χαίρειν Θ[...] ca ? Θοτομοῦτος ca ? . ἀδικοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ταάρ-
μωτος]

Στεφήνιος τῶν κατοικούντων ἐν Ὁξυρ[ύγχοις τῆς Πολέμωνος μερίδος. vacat?]

Θοτομοῦ[τος] γὰρ τοῦ πατρός μου εἰς τὴν προειρημένην κώμην [ca 14–24?]

4 γεωργοῦντ[ο]ς αὐτοῦ γῆν βασιλικὴν ἀνωικοδόμησεν οἰκίαν προκαταλαβόμενο[ς] μο[...]
[ca 0–5?]

μετὰ δέ τινα χρόνον τελευτήσαντος αὐτοῦ, οὕστης μου νεωτέρας καὶ τοῦ ἀδε[λφοῦ μου]

Μιθρῆτος, ὃς τετελεύτηκεν, Ταάρμωνος ὁ ἔγκαλούμενος εἰσωικίσθη εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν[ca 0–3?]

[ca 24–34?]. ἐ[πι]δούσης μου κατ' αὐτοῦ πλειονάκ[ις ca 0–2?]

8 [ca 30–40?]. ε[...]. ταιδ[...]. ιοει[...]. [ca 0–3?]

[ca 30–40?]. [....]. τ[ca 7–17?]

[ca 30–40?]. [....]. [ca 7–17?]

verso

→ [ca ? L (?)]ζ Μεχείρ ιζ.

recto 2. Read Στεφήνιος? 6. Read Μιθρῆτος.

(recto) “To king Ptolemy, greetings, (from) Th [...], daughter of Thotomous, I am being wronged by Taarmous, son of Stephenis (?) of those living in Oxyrhyncha of the Polemon *meris*. For my father, Thotomous, ... into the previously mentioned village, while he was farming his crown land, (he?) built a house, having previously occupied But after a certain period of time, he died; (and) since I was not of legal age, (nor) my brother, Mithres, who has (since) died, Taarmous, the accused, moved into the house ...; (and) although I have submitted (a petition) against him many times,”

(verso) “[... year (?)]6, Mecheir 16.”

Notes

recto

- Θ[...]: The second character is ω, α, or ε. Of the the third character, only a descender is preserved: hence one might restore ρ, ι, φ, ψ, or κ. It seems likely that these letters preserve the beginning of the petitioner's name; if so, the possibilities are too numerous to propose a supplement. Aside from what has been restored, it is likely that the two (possible) *lacunae* in this line contained a total of 6–16 characters.

Θοτομοῦτος: See n. on 3. There appears to be room in the *lacuna* after her father's name for the petitioner to have identified herself with an ethnic.

Ταάρμωνος: See n. on 6.

- Στεφήνιος: The name is otherwise unattested. It seems likely that the scribe intended to write either Στεφήνιος or (less likely) Εστφήνιος. Both versions are attested in ten third-century documents from the Apollonopolite nome (*P.Eleph.* 6.2, 10 [225 B.C.]; 15.1 [223 B.C.]; 17.7–8 [223 B.C.]; 18.1 [Apollonopolis?, 222 B.C.]; 19.5, 6–7, 8 [ca 223–222 B.C.]; 21.4 [Apollonopolite?, 222 B.C.]; 23.16 [222 B.C.]; 24.4 [ca 223–222 B.C.]; 25.5 [ca 223–222 B.C.]; and 27.4, 6, 11 [223 B.C.]).

Οξυρ[ύγχοις]: The description of Taarmous must run to the end of 2, for the narrative of the petition clearly begins with Θοτομοῦ[τος] at the start of 3; hence the long restoration Οξυρ[ύγχοις τῆς Πολέμωνος μερίδος]. It is likely that the remaining space (if any) after μερίδος was left blank.

3. Θοτομοῦ[τος]: This name and variations on it are attested in a number of Ptolemaic documents, including three of third-century date and Arsinoite provenance: *P.Cair.Zen.* IV 59568.6 (Arsinoite, after 249 B.C.); *P.Lille I* 59.9, 36–37 (Magdola, after 211 B.C.); and *SB XII* 10860Fr3.i.57 (Ghoran, III B.C.). All of the preserved letters save the initial *theta* are clear, and the supplement [τος] fits the space well. The missing participle doubtless sat at the end of the line.
4. προκαταλαβόμενο[ς]: There are only two Ptolemaic attestations of this verb. In neither case are the reasons behind its employment clear. *P.Mich. I* 80.4–6 (Arsinoite?, III B.C.), a letter concerning an upcoming court case, reads: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀμφότεροι [ι ca ?] | [τ]οὺς τοῖς ἀντι[δίκοις] προσλαλοῦντας, προκαταλαβόν οὖν [ca ?] | Ιον ὅπως [. . .] κα]ταγωνίσωνται. The editor translates the imperative as “intervene” (p. 159). *P.Genova III* 116.6–7 (Arsinoite, III–II B.C.), witness testimony on behalf of a certain Straton, has: [ca ?] | την δὲ καθ' ο[μαρτυρῶ οὐκ] [οιδα Ηρακλ] προκατελαβ[ι] [ca ?] (but see *P.Heid. VIII* p. 49, n. 41). The editor proposes an interpretation “nel significato di «sorprendere», «cogliere» qualcuno” (p. 67). More assistance comes from *P.Lond. VII* 2189.4–7 (Krokodilopolis, 209 B.C.), a receipt for *enkyklion*: κατὰ τὸ ἐκτεθὲν | πρόσταγμα περὶ τὴν ἐκ | προκαταλάηψις οἰκίαν | τὴν οὖσαν ἐν Φιλ(αδελφείᾳ). The original editor suggested that the cognate προκαταλάηψις was here to be understood as “previous occupation” or possibly even “original ownership” (T.C. Skeat, *JEA* 45 [1959]: 77; see also C. Armoni, *ZPE* 132 [2000]: 226). As both this text and our papyrus deal with houses, perhaps a similar meaning is to be assumed for προκαταλαβόμενο[ς]. I have chosen to restore a Nominative participle under the assumption that its subject is to be identified with that of ἀνωικοδόμησεν. It is entirely possible, however, that the form is actually Genitive (προκαταλαβούμενο[υ]).
μο[.]: The *mu* is difficult, as much of its top and left have been lost. Read τοῦ [or τούς?]
5. οὗσης μου νεωτέρας: The phrase implies that the petitioner was still a minor at the time of her father’s death. Compare *P.Enteux.* 15.8–10 (Magdola, 218 B.C.): ἵνα μὴ συμβῇ, νεωτέρου μου οὗτος, ἐπικαταβολὴν γενέσθαι τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος καὶ ἀποστερθῶ πλείονος ἀξίου οὗτος; and *P.Tebt. III.1* 780.3–11 (Tebtynis, 171 B.C.): ἐπεὶ τοῦ πατρός μου | μεταλλάξαντος τὸν βίον ἔτι νεωτέρου | μου οὗτος Θαρεῦς τις Θηβαία | βιασαμένη με... | (line 9) ... φόκοδόμησαν | ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ πατρικῷ ψιλῷ τόπῳ | πυργίον (δεκά)πηχνον παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον. The petitioner’s young age may provide an explanation for the intervention of her brother (καὶ τοῦ ἀδε[λφοῦ μου]) at this point in the narrative.
κοὶ: The *kappa* is missing a stroke. Compare κατ’ αὐτοῦ (7).
6. Μιθρῆιτος: See *P.Heid. VI* 379.11–12 (Boubastos [Arsinoite], 204 B.C.) with commentary for the only other Ptolemaic attestation of this name.
Ταάρμωνς: Every letter is clear and certain. The name is otherwise unattested in the papyri. For the accent see W. Clarysse, *ZPE* 119 (1997): 182–183; cf. E. Mayser, *Gram.* I, 1 117.
εἰσωικίσθη: For the use of passive compounds of οἰκίζω in an active sense, see *P.Tor.Choach.* 12.iv.28–29 (Thebes, 118 B.C.): περὶ τοῦ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς Διὸς πόλεως | ταριχευτὰς μετοικισθῆναι εἰς τὰ Μεμνόνεια; and 33: ἡξίου τοὺς ἀντιδίκους ἔξοικισθῆναι.
7. ἐ[πι]διόσης: We certainly have a participle here, and most likely a compound of δίδωμι. ἐ[πι]διόσης seems to be the best restoration. ἐπιδίδωμι is routinely employed to signal the submission of a petition, e.g.: *Chrest.Wilck.* 262.4–6 (Arsinoite, after 223 B.C.): ἐπέδωκά σοι ἥδη | ὑπομνήματα κατὰ Φίλωνος τοῦ | μετέχοντός μοι τὴν μερίδα; *P.Stras. II* 91.25–28 (Tebtynis, 86 B.C.): ἐπεὶ οὖν δι’ αὐτοὺς | κινδυνεύομεν ἐνκαταλιπεῖν | τὸ ιερόν, ἐπιδίδομεν τὸ ὑπόλιμνημα; and *P.Tebt. III.1* 790.12–14 (Oxyrhyncha, 127–124 B.C.): καταπλεύσαντες εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν | ἐπ[ειδόμεν] ἐν[τειχί]ν τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τῇ β[ασιλίσ]σῃ. The traces suggest that our participle began with an ascender. The scribe occasionally writes his *epsilon* in such a way as to make the top of the character almost vertical (cf. μετὰ δέ, 5; τελευτήσαντος, 5; εἰσωικίσθη, 6). Other compounds of δίδωμι (and perhaps simply δόσης) are possible but less likely.

P.Duk. inv. 676

14.5 x 31 cm.

196/5 B.C.?

<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/676.html>

Arsinoite

The recto of this papyrus contains 35 lines of text written with the fibers, the verso six lines of mirror-image text diagonally imprinted from another document as well as a number of additional smudges. Margins for the recto are as follows: 2–2.3 cm., top; 1–1.5 cm., left; 1–2 cm., right; 6.2–6.5 cm., bottom. The papyrus consists of three joining pieces and is frayed at right, obscuring the ends of a few lines (3, 10, 12). A substantial section of text (10.5 x 8.5 cm.) has been neatly cut away from lines 12–25. Line spacing ranges between .3 and .5 cm. The hand is bulky and somewhat difficult to read. In addition, much of the upper half of the papyrus has been abraded and smudges occur throughout the document. The hand has a few distinct letters, among the most striking of which are a hemispherical *tau* (e.g.: τό, 5; κατοικοῦντος, 7; τετευχότες, 33) and a very b-like *beta* (e.g.: βασιλικόν, 30; βοηθήας, 32–33; βασιλικόν, 33). The scribe’s grammar in the preserved text is good, and orthographic variants are few (ει for ει: ἐπεί, 4; ἀρχιφυλακείτον, 6; μερείδος, 7; η for ει: βοηθήας, 32–33).

Palaeography and parallels for grammar and syntax suggest that the text dates to the second century B.C. The tenth year mentioned in line 5 might therefore be that of Epiphanes (196/5), Philometor (172/1), Soter II (108/7) or Alexander I (105/4). P.Duk. inv. 676 was recovered from cartonnage along with P.Duk. inv. nos. 674, 675 and 677.² 674 is dated securely to a regnal year 14, Choiak 17 and 675 to a year 11 (line 16).³ 677 was written soon after Epeiph 1 of year 3 (line 9). The date of 677 is secured by palaeography and prosopography to the 3rd year of Epiphanes, 203/2 B.C.⁴ Therefore, it seems most likely that 674 should be dated to his 14th year (January 24, 191 B.C.), 675 to his 11th year (195/4 B.C.), and our document to his 10th year (196/5 B.C.).

Further evidence that P.Duk. inv. 676 is to be dated to 196/5 B.C. is provided by prosopography. An *archiphylakîtēs* named Philon, active in the early second century is known from a number of documents. The *Pros.Ptol.* (4604) cites four texts that mention this official: *P.Athen.* 8.11–12 (Arsinoite, 193–192 B.C.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 741.25–26 (Tebtynis, 187–186 B.C.); 796.1 (Tebtynis, 185 B.C.) and *SB* VI 9104.14–15 (Arsinoite, 195 B.C.). The editors of *P.Mich.* XVIII 778–779 identify the Philon, *archiphylakîtēs* found in their texts (778.35 [Mouchis, after 193–192 B.C.] and 779.10 [Mouchis, after 192 B.C.]) with the *archiphylakîtēs* mentioned in *P.Athen.* 8 as well as the official mentioned in the present document, the only text in which Philon is given an administrative domain.⁵ Finally, date and provenance suggest that the Philon, *archiphylakîtēs* of *P.Hels.* I 2.1 (Arsinoite, ca 195–192 B.C.) is the same man. If these identifications are correct, Philon had a very long career as a police chief: at least ten years (195–185 B.C.). Similar terms of service were not unparalleled among the Ptolemaic police: cf. Patron, *archiphylakîtēs* of the *Katô* toparchy (*Pros.Ptol.* 4592 with *P.Yale* I pp94–97), who may have filled the post for eight years or more, and Apollonios, *archiphylakîtēs* and *epistatîs* of Oxyrhyncha (see *ZPE* 146 [2004]: 167–169), who may have served anywhere from 17–25 years.

Our petition contains a complaint to the Arsinoite *epimelêtēs*, Theodoros from a pair of collectors for taxes on various flowers. They report that the *archiphylakîtēs* of the Polemon *meris* and a resident of Krokodilopolis, Philon, has not paid the requisite amount of tax on a rose garden he owns in the village of Arsinoe in the Themistes *meris*. Few details of the circumstances remain, but one assumes from context that Philon had somehow evaded or cheated the collectors. At end, the petitioners request that Theodoros have Philon arrested and arrange for an examination. If their complaints prove true, the rogue police chief is to pay a penalty of 6000 drachmas, a sum to be counted as a tax payment in their favor. We know nothing more of the case.

The document is noteworthy for its prosopography and for the information it provides on the collection of tax revenues for specific types of flowers in the Ptolemaic period. On tax collection and farming in Ptolemaic Egypt see C. Préaux, *L'Économie royale des Lagides* (Brussels, 1939); M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (2nd ed.: Oxford, 1953): 327–330; and D. Thompson, *ACTS* XXII (2001): 1255–1263. On ancient botany in general see H. Baumann, *Greek Wild Flowers and Plant Lore in Ancient Greece* (London, 1993) and J. E. Raven, *Plants and Plant Lore in Ancient Greece* (Oxford, 2000). There is also an extensive treatment of the subject in the *OCD* (3rd revised ed.): 255–256.

² Publications: P.Duk. inv. 675 = J.D. Sosin and J.G. Manning, “Palaeography and Bilingualism: P.Duk. inv. 320 and 675,” *CdÉ* 78 (2003): 202–210; 677 = *SB* XXIV 16285 = J.D. Sosin, “P.Duk. Inv. 677: Aetos: from Arsinoite *Strategos* to Eponymous Priest,” *ZPE* 116 (1997): 141–146.

³ On the date of P.Duk. inv. 674, see <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/674.html>>.

⁴ For a discussion of the date of P.Duk. inv. 677, see *ZPE* 116 (1997): 142–143.

⁵ See *P.Mich.* XVIII pp94–96.

Text and Translation

recto

- Θεοδώρωι ἐπιμελητῇ παρὰ Ἀπολλό-
δότου καὶ Διογυσίου *vac*
τῶν ἐπέργων τῷ συνεξειληφότων τὴν . ξ
ἐπεὶ τὴν ἔκτην
- 4 τοῦ ῥόδου καὶ λευκοίου καὶ τῶν ἑτέρω[ν]
στεφανωμάτων εἰς τὸ Ι. ὀδικούμε-
θα ὑπὸ Φίλωνος ἀρχιφυλακείτου τῆς Πο-
λέμωνος μερεΐδος κατοικοῦντος Κρο-
- 8 κοδίλων πόλιν τοῦ Ἀρσινοίου νομοῦ.
ὑπάρχοντος γὰρ αὐτῷ ῥοδῶνος περὶ Ἀρ-
σινόν τῆς Θε[μίσ]του μερίδος εκ ...
ε δι' αὐτὸν υ[... ... δι]αγραψάμ{ι}ενον
- 12 καὶ συν[...] μ. c. τὴν
ἀπόμο[ιραν] *ca 21*]
οδού[*ν*] *ca 25*]
προστ[*ρ*] *ca 25*]
- 16 γηγ[*ν*] *ca 26*]
τοῦ ῥόδ[ου / ῥοδῶνος *ca 20–22*]
οὐγγει[*ν*] *ca 25*]
γραμ[μ] *ca 25*]
- 20 μενα[*ρ*] *ca 26*]
μαν[τ] *ca 26*]
ταδε[*ρ*] *ca 26*]
τῶν χρ[*ρ*] *ca 25*]
- 24 μενα[*ρ*] *ca 26*]
ε[...] [*ρ*] *ca 25*]
εἰς κρίσιν μεταπεμψάμεν<οι> τὸ[ν]
Φίλωνα ἐπισκέψωνται καὶ ὃν ἢ ἂ γρά-
- 28 φομεν ἀληθῇ πραχθῆναι αὐτὸν τὸ
κατὰ πρόστα<γ>μα ἐπίτιμον Λέ
καὶ τοῦτο διαγραφῆναι εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν
- 32 ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν ὧνήν. τοῦ δὲ γενο-
μένου ἐσόμεθα τῆς πάσης βοηθή-
ας καὶ δικαίου τετευχότες, τῶν τε
εἰς τὸ βασι<λ>ικὸν ὀνηκόντων οὐθὲν μὴ
διαπέσῃ. *vac* εὐτύχει. *vac*

4. Read ἐπί. 6. Read ἀρχιφυλακίου. 7. Read μερίδος. 28. Read ἀληθῆ. 32.–33. Read βοηθείας.

“To Theodoros, *epimelētēs* from Apollodotos and Dionysios, *epergoi* who have contracted to perform the collection of the sixth on roses and snowdrops and the other garland-flowers for the tenth year. We have been wronged by Philon, *archiphylakitēs* of the Polemon *meris*, who lives in Krokodilopolis of the Arsinoite nome. For as there is a rosebed belonging to him in Arsinoe of the Themistes *meris* ... paying and [We ask, therefore, that ... so that,] summoning Philon to trial, they may investigate; and if what we write is true, (we ask) that you level the fine of 6000 drachmas against him, as specified by the

prostagma, and submit this to the crown as a tax payment on our behalf. With this having taken place, we will have encountered full aid and justice, and nothing owing to the crown will be forfeited.. Farewell.”

Notes

recto

1. Θεοδώρωι ἐπιμελητῇ: This official is otherwise unattested. A roughly contemporaneous Arsinoite *toparchēs* of the same name is known from *P.Genova* III 95.2–3 (Arsinoite, 216 B.C.?). *Epimelētai* were frequently the recipients of petitions concerning financial matters, e.g.: *Chrest.Wilck.* 166 (Arsinoite, after 218 B.C.); *P.Coll.Youtie* I 12 (Krokodilopolis, 177 B.C.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 782 (Tebtynis, ca 153 B.C.). On the Ptolemaic *epimelētēs* see B.C. McGing, *Archiv* 48 (2002): 51–64.
3. ἐπέργων: All but two of the Ptolemaic instances of this term occur in texts from the third century and at least 20 years prior to our document. In *P.Tebt.* III.1 774.1–2 (Tebtynis, ca 187 B.C.), a statement of official business written (ostensibly) to a government addressee (name not given), a Krokodilopolite man named Ammonios identifies himself as βασιλικὸς | γεωργὸς καὶ ἐπεργος. As is clear from additional evidence, Ammonios had a lengthy career in the Ptolemaic financial sphere, serving first as an *antigrapheus* (*Pros.Ptol.* 1752) and later as a *sitologos* (*Pros.Ptol.* 1329). *SB* XXII 15558.2–8 (Arsinoite, 209–208 or 192–191 B.C.) provides a closer parallel to our text. The document, a copy of a petition to the king concerning a man who had not paid the *apomoira* on an orchard (*paradeisos*), was written by: Πτολεμαῖος τοῦ | [Ἄσκληπιαδου], Πέρσης τῶν ἐπέργων ὁ ἔξ[ει]ληφὼς μ]ετὰ Ἰμούθου εἰς τὸ ιδ L τὴν ὀ[πό]ι|[μοιραν] τῆς Φιλαδέλφου καὶ τ[ῶν] Φ[ιλο]λοπ[ατόρων] | [Θεῶν τ]ῶν οἰνικῶν γενημά[των] καὶ [ἀκρο]|[[δρύων] τῶν περὶ Κερκευσίριν καὶ ἄλι[λων] | [ca 5] τόπων τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου [νομο]οῦ. The original editor of the text noted that the term *epergos* is of uncertain meaning, though it always applies to financial officials (G.W. Schwender, *Literary and non-literary papyri from the University of Michigan collection* [diss. Michigan, 1988]: 108–109, n. on 3). For a more detailed treatment of *epergoi* (with a similar conclusion) and a list of Ptolemaic texts that mention them, see D. Kaltsas, *ZPE* 142 (2003): 214–220, especially 215–217. The *epergoi* mentioned here, Apollodotos and Dionysios, are otherwise unknown, though it is possible that the latter is the same Dionysios mentioned in *P.Tebt.* III.2 895.7, 60–61, 64–66, 109 and 114 (Berenikis Thesmophorou, ca 175 B.C.) who may have served as a *sitologos* for the Polemon *meris* (*Pros.Ptol.* 1352).
- 3–4. τῶν συνεξειληφότων τὴν ξ | ἐπεὶ τὴν ἔκτην: The wording is unparalleled. Cf. *BGU* VI 1310.1–2 (Apollonopolite, 146 or 135 B.C.): Ἰσίδωρος ὁ ἔξειληφὼς τὴν c' τῶν | ἀκροδρύων τοῦ Ἀπολλωνοπο(λίτου) εἰς τὸ λθ L; *P.Hels.* I 36.3–8 (Herakleopolis, before 159 B.C.): Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ ἔξειληφότος | μετὰ μετόχων τὸ εἰσαγώγιον | τοῦ οἴνου καὶ τὴν c' τῶν | παραδείσων καὶ τὴν γ' τῶν | βα[λ]ανείων; *P.Tebt.* III.1 811.12 (Krokodilopolis, 165 B.C.): Διογένει τῷ ἔξειληφότι τὴν τοῦ ἐγκυκλίου ὠνήν; *SB* VI 9552.i.1–3 (Koptos, 138–137 B.C.): Μνήσαρχος καὶ Ἐρμό[φιλος] οἱ ἔξειληφότες | τὴν ὠνήν τῶν κασοποιῶν καὶ γναφαλλούρων | εἰς τ[ὸ] λγ L. Here the writer lays special stress on the fact that the petitioners have received the contract for the *apomoira* jointly. On the use of συνεκλαμβάνω to designate the receipt of a tax contract, see *LSJ*, which cites *UPZ* I 114.I.16–17 (Memphis, 150 B.C.): Δωρίωνος | τοῦ [συ]νεγλαβόντος ἄλλοις τὴν αὐτὴν ἔγληψιν (specifically τῆς νιτρικῆς τοῦ κθ L, line 15); cf. 114.II.16–17 (Memphis, 148 B.C.); also *Chrest.Wilck.* 262v.i.5–7 (Arsinoite, after 223 B.C.): [Φίλωνος τοῦ συνεξειληφότος | μοι (sc. τὸ φυλακιτικὸν) ἐθύων καὶ ἐργαστρίων τῆς Θεμίστου μερίδος εἰς τὸ κε L, lines 3–4)]. On the Ptolemaic *apomoira* see W. Clarysse and K. Vandorpe in H. Melaerts (ed.), *Le culte du souverain dans l’Égypte ptolémaïque au III^e siècle avant notre ère* (*Studia Hellenistica* 34 [1998]): 5–42. The writing at the end of line 3 is puzzling, though the sense (“tax”) is clear. One might reasonably expect τὴν ὠνήν or τὴν c', but neither seems to correspond to the traces preserved. I have no explanation for the xi (if correct).
4. τοῦ ρόδου: Roses (*rhoda*) are mentioned in only four other Ptolemaic texts: *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59269.6–7 (Philadelphia?, after 252 B.C.), IV 59735.5 (Philadelphia, III B.C.), 59736.23–24 (? III B.C.) and *P.Hels.* I 11.13 (Herakleopolite, 163 B.C.); rose-gardens (*rhodōnes*) nowhere else. The flower was employed to make perfume (*myron rhodonon*): *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59009A.4 (with *BL* 11.54), D.12 (Palestine, ca 259 B.C.); 59011.17 (with *BL* 11.54) (Palestine?, ca 259 B.C.); II 59196.9 (?) (? 254 B.C.); *P.Lond.* VII 2141.39 (Ptolemais? [Palestine], 258 B.C.); *P.Mich.* I 3.5 (? 260–256 B.C.); *P.Petr.* II 34.ii.6 (Arsinoite, III B.C.). Roses were also used for garlands: cf. Theocritus 7.63–64, where there is mention of a crown of roses or *leukoīa* (ἡ ρόδοεντα ἡ καὶ λευκοῖον στέφωνον). Such a use seems to be the one implied in our text, judging from lines 4–5: καὶ λευκοῖον καὶ τῶν ἐτέρων | στεφανωμότων. Additional evidence that roses were subject to the *apomoira* is found in *P.Hels.* I 11.13–17 (Herakleopolite, 163 B.C.), a declaration in which a taxpayer notes that he possesses ρόδον καὶ συκᾶν καὶ ροσᾶν | καὶ μηλέαι β ἐπὶ τοῦ χώματος, ὃν τάξομαι | τὴν ἔκτην ἐν τῷ | δέοντι καιρῷ.
- λευκοῖον: The term *leukoīon* (literally “white violet”) is new to the papyri, though a *leukoīon*–colored pattern (δεῖγμα λευκοῖον) occurs in *P.Oxy.* I 113.5 (Oxyrhynchus, II A.D.). Attestations of the flower in Greek literature are many (e.g.: Aristotle, *Problemata* 909a; Athenaeus 8.1.8; Polybius 34.8.5.1). The term seems to have stood for at least two different flowers in antiquity: the gilliflower or hoary stock (*matthiola incana*) and the snowdrop (*galanthus nivalis*) (see *LSJ*; also A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* [Cambridge, 1950] vol. 2, p. 148 n. on 64 and Baumann, *loc.cit.* 84). The plant

was well-known to the medical writers and botanists, in one form or the other (e.g.: Dioscorides Pedianus, *De materia medica* 3.123.1.1; Hippocrates, *De mulierum affectibus* 46.7; Theophrastus, *Historia plantarum* 4.7.8.3). Theophrastus (*Historia plantarum* 6.8.1) notes that the *leukoion* was the first flower to appear after the rainy season (εὐθὺς τοῦ χειμῶνος) in milder climes, later in harsher climes, and that it, as well as a flower known as the *agrion*, was by far the best flower for use in garlands. The mention of *stephanomata* in line 5 as well as another attestation for the flower's use in garlands (also alongside roses: Theocritus 7.64) suggests that it was this use for which the plant was harvested in Egypt.

4.-5. τῶν ἔτερο[ν] | στεφανούματων: Though the term is well-attested in the literary sources (e.g.: Euripides, *Hercules Furens* 355; Pindar, *Isthmian* 2.15; Theognis 1.1001), *stephanomata* occur nowhere else in the papyri. Context (cf. ρόδου καὶ λευκοίου, 4) suggests that the term is to be understood as a catch-all for a class of flowers employed in weaving garlands. Theophrastus gives a comprehensive description of the various plants considered fit for this use (among these the *leukoion* [see n. on 4]) in his *Historia plantarum* (6.6–7).

6.-7. Φίλωνος ἀρχιψυλακέτον τῆς Ποιλέμωνος μερεύδος: See the introduction. Where provenance is given, *archiphylakitai* are most commonly attested for villages (e.g.: *BGU* VIII 1798.1 [Herakleopolite, 64–44 B.C.]; *P.Enteux.* 82.5 [Trikomia, 221 B.C.]; *P.Giss.Univ.* 7.1–2 [Euhemeria, II B.C.]) but they also supervised villages and surrounding areas (e.g.: *P.Tebt.* III.1 795.2–3 [Tebtynis, II B.C.]: ἀρχιψυλακίτηι Κροκοδίλων πόλεως | καὶ τῶν μεμερισμένων τόπων; *SB* XIV 11860.1–3 [Arsinoite, II–I B.C.]: Στρατονίκωι | ἀρχι[φ]υλακίτηι τῶν | περὶ Ἀρσινόην κ[ά]μη[ν]), *merides* (e.g.: *P.Bürgsch.* 22.13–14 [Ghoran, 243 B.C.]; *P.Tebt.* III.1 731.4 [*Ibion Eikosipentarouron* or Tebtynis, 153–152 or 142–141 B.C.]), toparchies (e.g.: *P.Hib.* I 73.9–10 [Oxyrhynchite, 244–243 B.C.]; *UPZ* II 187.1–3 [Thebes, 127–126 B.C.]), nomes (e.g.: *P.Lond.* VII 2188.91–92 [Hermonthis, after 148 B.C.]; *P.Dryton* 33.14 [?, 136 B.C.]) and even temples (*UPZ* I 5.6 and 6.6 [Memphis, after 163 B.C.]).

9. ρόδωνος: See n. on 4.

10.-11. εκ ... | ε: A number of restorations suggest themselves. A finite verb would fit at this point, and ἔκτισε (aorist indicative active of κτίζω, “build” or “found,” also, and more likely here, “plant”) would fit the space and context well. If this is correct, we should understand something along the lines of “he (i.e., Philon) planted (something, ostensibly roses) throughout (or ‘because of’) it (i.e., the rose-garden).” An adverb of place would also fit: ἐκεῖ δέ/τε or ἐκεῖσε would both imply activity in the rose garden. ἐκεῖ is well-attested in the Ptolemaic period, though the somewhat awkward combination ἐκεῖ δέ/τε is unparalleled; ἐκεῖσε is only attested in one other Ptolemaic text: *Chrest.Wilck.* 1.ii.4 (Arsinoite, ca 246 B.C.). A Genitive form of the article with ἐκ and δέ/τε is also a possibility: ἐκ τοῦ δέ/τε, ἐκ τῆς δέ/τε or ἐκ τῶν δέ/τε. Yet in this case one would expect a Genitive noun at some point in what ensues, and it seems unlikely that such a form stood in the *lacuna* in line 11 or at the beginning of line 12. Each possibility is also perhaps a character too long. A similar problem arises with another possibility, the supplement ἔκτης δέ/τε or ἔκτην δέ/τε, both of which otherwise fit the nature of the complaint nicely. Finally, one might suggest the restoration ἐκ τοῦδε, where the demonstrative refers back to ρόδωνος (9), but such usage is unparalleled in the Ptolemaic period.

12.-14. συν[...] μ. c. τὴν | ἀπόμο[ιραν ca 21] | ὥδου: Restore συν[γραψάμενον δώσ]ειν εἰς τὴν | ἀπόμο[ιραν ca 11 ἀπὸ τῆς προσ] | ὥδου νε[τ] sim.? If so, the sense seems to be “he agreed that he would pay ____ from the proceeds of ____ towards the *apomoira*.” Cf. *P.Hamb.* II 172.4–7 (Oxyrhynchite, 246 B.C.): διά[γραψον] | ἀπὸ τῆς προ[σόδου] τοῦ φυλακίτι[κοῦ] | τοῦ λθ εἰς τὸ προσφειλόμενο[ν τῶν] | ὄψω[ν]ίων τῶν ἀρχιψυλακιτικῶν; *P.Köln* V 220.4–9 (Arsinoite, 208 or 191 B.C.): [ό]μοιλον ἐσχηκή[έναι παρ' ὑμῶν | τοὺς τε[σσαρο]β[ά]κοντα πέντε | μετρητὰς τοῦ οἴνου οὓς συνεγραψάμην δώσειν εἰς τὴν ἀπό[μοι]ραν; *P.Lond.* VII 2008.46–48 (Philadelphia, 247 B.C.): συνεγράψαντο δώσ(ε)ιν (sc. Λνε —) εἰς τὰ | ἀργυρικὰ τοῦ λς Λ. On the *apomoira* see n. on 3–4.

15. προστ[ι]: See n. on 28–29.

26.-27. εἰς κρίσιν μεταπεμψάμενοι τὸ[ν] | Φίλωνα ἐπισκέψωνται: For parallels, see (e.g.) *P.Diosk.* 7.19–21 (Herakleopolite, ca 153 B.C.): συντάξαι μεταπεμψάμενον τοῦτον | ἐπισκέψασθαι; *P.Tor.Choach.* 8A.38–41 (Thebes, after 127 B.C.): δόπως χρηματίσαντες [αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν ἔντευξιν, 35)] | εἰς κρίσιν καὶ μεταπεμψά[μενοι] τοὺς | ἐγκαλουμένους δι' Ἀντιφάνουν φρουράρχουν | ἐπισκέψωνται (cf. 8B.36–39); and *SB* XXIV 15938.13–15 (Oxyrhyncha [Arsinoite], 209 or 192 B.C.): συντάξαι μεταπ[έμψασθαι] αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ Πετοσίριν τὸν κωμογραμ[ματε]α καὶ ἐπισκέψασθαι | περὶ ὧν ἡνόμηματι. *P.Gur.* 10.11–12 (Arsinoite, III B.C.) furnishes a similar misspelling of μεταπέμπω: συντάξαι μετα-πέμψα^{θαι} [μεν] αὐτ[ὸν καὶ ...] | ἐπισκέψασθαι.

28.-29. πραχθῆναι αὐτὸν τὸ | κατὰ πρόστα^γμα ἐπίτιμον ∠ ε: For the form of the *stigma* see *SB* V 8008.42 (?), 260 B.C. (= *C.Ord.Ptol.*² 22.10) with plate at *Pap.Flor.* XXVII, Tav. IX. This text is a royal proclamation concerning the purchase of indigenous Syrians and Phoenicians as slaves. Those who obtained slave labor from the native populations of these areas were required to present their purchases to the local *oikonomos* within 20 days or be subject to slave-confiscation and a fine of 6000 drachmas per slave. For the assimilation in πρόστα^γμα see E. Mayser, *Gram.* I,1 156–157.

31.-35. Cf. *P.Hels.* I 9.13–14 (Herakleopolite, 163 B.C.): τούτου δὲ γενομένου | οὐθὲν τῶι βασιλεῖ μὴ διαπέσσῃ. The correction at the end of 31 perhaps emended τοῦ to τούτου, but it is impossible to tell. The *epsilon* of the ensuing δέ is difficult, though the *delta* is clear.

verso: It is unclear what is preserved on the back of the petition. The six lines of text bear resemblances to one another at certain points, suggesting the possibility that the original document imprinted here was a writing exercise. The lines perhaps contained a name and title. Little else can be determined, save that the text seems to have been the work of a second hand.

P.Duk. inv. 360 10.5 x 14.75 cm. (top); 8.2 x 9.4 cm. (bottom) II B.C.?
<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/360.html> Herakleopolite?

The recto of this papyrus contains 18 lines of text written with the fibers. There are margins on all sides. A generous amount of space is left at top (1.8 cm.) and bottom (3.2 cm.) with a regular margin of 1 cm. at left. The right margin, which varies in width but hovers around .5 cm., is regularly invaded by cramped letter forms (7, 12, 15 etc.). Lines are spaced approximately .5 to .75 cm. apart. The papyrus is broken after line 12 and the remaining fragments do not fit perfectly, though no lines of text appear to have been lost. The lower section of the document has suffered abrasion and is difficult to read. The text on the verso, written with the fibers, consists of a large X followed by what appear to be the remains of the name of the addressee, Hegesandros. Traces from the recto and a few smudges are also visible.

The scribe's grammar is fairly poor. After an initial pair of Genitives absolute (*τοῦ γὰρ... ληιστῶν*, 3–4; *καὶ ἐνὸς... ἔξενέγκαιοντος*, 5–6), he appends a finite verb (*ἀποδίδσωιν*, 8) followed by a participle in the Nominative case (*λαβόν*, 9), neither of which has an expressed subject. P.Duk. inv. 360 comes from a large cache of Duke papyri (P.Duk. inv. 324–434) that appears to have originated in the Herakleopolite nome and to date to the second century B.C.⁶ Given the lack of a regnal year and any indication of provenance, the date and place of origin of P.Duk. inv. 360 are uncertain.

The petitioner in this case, a certain Empedion, relates that his father had been robbed and murdered by brigands. The thieves had made off with a contract of loan which one of them, a certain Seuthes, had recently sold to the original recipient of the loan, a certain Imouthes. Empedion asks the *epistatēs* Hegesandros to intervene. The evidence demonstrates that robbers and robbery were a fact of everyday life in Ptolemaic Egypt: see B.C. McGing, "Bandits, Real and Imagined, in Greco-Roman Egypt," *BASP* 35 (1998): 159–183 with N. Lewis, "Brief Footnotes on Banditry in the Papyri," *BASP* 37 (2000): 95–96 for citations and bibliography. Murder, on the other hand, seems to have been comparatively rare. Very few texts make reference to killings. In *P.Tebt.* III.1 730 (Tebtynis, 178 or 167 B.C.), a report to a *basilikos grammateus*, a police (?) official (without name or title) notes that he had encountered a great deal of blood (*ἔκχυσιν αἵμα[τος]*, 3) near the village, but no body, and that a villager who had set off in that direction had not returned to the village. In *BGU* VIII 1857 (Herakleopolite, 64–44 B.C.), petitioners note that their missing brother had been discovered dead (*τέλος ἔχοντα*, 7) in a field, with his severed body parts cast into a road. On the crime of homicide in Ptolemaic Egypt, see A. Hélmis, *Crime et châtiment dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque. Recherches sur l'autonomie d'un modèle penal* (diss. Paris, 1986): 17–20.

Text and Translation

recto

→ [‘H]γησάνδρῳ ἐπιστάτῃ
 παρὰ Ἐμπεδίωνος. ἀδικοῦμαι
 ὑπὸ Ἰμούθου. τοῦ γὰρ πατρὸς μου
 4 τελευτήσαντος ὑπὸ ληιστῶν,
 καὶ ἐνὸς αὐτῶν, Σεύθου, ἔξενέγ-
 καντος συγγραφὴν δαγείσου Λ. ξ
 κατὰ Ἰμούθου τοῦ προγεγραμμένου,
 8 ἀποδίδωσιν αὐτῷ ἐνώπιον Ἀρ-
 ψάλιος καὶ Παῦτος, λαβὼν Λ. ις.
 ἀξιώ οὖν σε ἀνακαλεσάμενον
 [τ]όν τε Ἰμούθην καὶ Ἐργάλιν

⁶ See <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/360.html>>.

- 12 [καὶ Παῦτ-ον/-α?] .. [..] .. [..] καὶ ἐ[ὰν] ḥ τὰ
 [δι]ὰ τοῦ ὑπομνήματος
 [ὸν]τα ἀληθῆ, ἀπαγγείλασ[α]
 αὐτὸν τὸ δίκαιόν μοι ποιῆσα[ι.]

16 [τ]ούτου δὲ γενομένου, τεύ-
 [ξ]ομαι τῆς παρὰ σου φιλαν-
 [θρ]ωπίας. ερρωσο.

verso

→ X [‘Ηγησάνδρωι (?).

^{recto} 9. Or Παῆτος. 11. Read Ἀρψάλιν. 12. Or Παῆτ-ον/-α. 13. Read ἐπαναγκάσαι (?).

(recto) "To Hegesandros the *epistatēs* from Empedion. I am being wronged by Imouthes. For my father, having died at the hands of robbers, and one of them, Seuthes, having made off with a contract of loan for 60 drachmas outstanding against the aforesaid Imouthes, he (Seuthes) sold it to him (Imouthes) in the presence of Harpsalis and Paus, (Seuthes) having received 16 drachmas (for it). Therefore, I ask that you summon Imouthes and Harpsalis [and Paus (?)...]; and, if the things in this petition prove true, force him (Imouthes) to do me justice. For if this comes to pass, I shall encounter your humanity. Farewell."

(verso) "X To Hegesandros (?)."

Notes

- [Γ]ησάνδρωι: Ptolemaic *epistatai*, civil officials who had supervisory and police powers over villages (most commonly) but also (occasionally) over *merides*, toparchies, and nomes were frequently the recipients of petitions, e.g.: *BGU* III 1012 (Philadelphia, 170 B.C.); *P.Tor.Choach.* 11 (Thebais, 119 B.C.); *SB* XVI 12552 (? [Arsinoite?], III B.C.); see especially E. Lavigne, *De epistates van het Dorp in Ptolemaisch Egypte* (Louvain, 1945); also E. Van 't Dack, *Aegyptus* 29 (1949): 39–43; *Studia Hellenistica* 7 (1951): 20–29, 47; *AncSoc* 20 (1989): 147–158; and *P.Enteux.*, introduction. The *epistatēs* Hegesandros is otherwise unknown. The name occurs in only one other Ptolemaic text: *P.Cair.Zen.* IV 59651.8 (? , III B.C.).
 - 'Εμπεδίωνος: The name occurs in eight papyri from the third century B.C. and nowhere else. In every instance, it refers to the grandfather of Ptolemais, *kanēphoros* of Arsinoe Philadelphos in the year 214/3 B.C. (see *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* XXIV 16–17 n. on #77 for citations).
 - 'Ιμούθου: The name is common. Seven texts of Herakleopolite origin mention an Imouthes, all but perhaps one of them from the first century B.C.: *BGU* VIII 1869.1 (64–44 B.C.); XIV 2370.26 (after 84–83 B.C.); 2435.7 (I B.C.); XVI 2573.4 (3 B.C.); 2577v.51, 68 (30 B.C.–A.D. 14); 2673.10, 71, 93 (I B.C.); and 2674.116 (I B.C.).
 - ληιστῶν: See the introduction. The word and its cognates occur in only a handful of Ptolemaic texts, e.g.: *BGU* VIII 1832.10 (Herakleopolite, 51 B.C.), where a petitioner complained that a group of men had broken into his home and left thievishly (ληστ[ρικῶς]) with some fodder; *P.Cair.Zen.* IV 59659.4 (Philadelphia?, after 245 B.C.), in which crooks (ληισταί) bound a petitioner and made off with two pack animals laden with goods; and *P.Tebt.* I 53.11 (Kerkeosiris, after 110 B.C.), a similar incident involving a shepherd assaulted in a thievish manner (ληιστικῶι τρόπῳ) and deprived of 40 sheep. That the prevention of brigandage was considered a matter of great importance by the central government is clear from *P.Hib.* II 198.52–140 (Arsinoite?, after 242 B.C.), a series of royal ordinances concerning the apprehension of robbers, the safeguarding of ports and punishments for those caught aiding and/or abetting criminals. On this text see C. Kunderewicz, *JJP* 15 (1965): 139–143; N. Lewis, *AJP* 89 (1968): 465–469; and R.S. Bagnall, *BASP* 6 (1969): 73–118.
 - Σεύθου: The name occurs in one other second-century text of Herakleopolite provenance: *P.Polit.Jud.* 7.3, 12 (Herakleopolis, before 134 B.C.). Identification of the Seuthes of that document with the robber of P.Duk. inv. 360 is impossible.
 - συγγραφὴν δανείου Λ̄ ξ: Loans attested in the Ptolemaic period were for grain (e.g.: *SB* VI 9405.9–10 [Ibion Eikosi-pentarouron, 75 B.C.]: κατὰ συγγραφὴν δανείου ἔξαμάρτ[υρον] | κριθῆς ὀρτάβας δεκατρεῖς γ γ σὸν ἡμιολίοις) or money (e.g.: *SB* VI 9420.5–6 [?, ca 129 B.C.]: κατὰ συγγραφὴν Αἰ[γνπτί]αν δανείου | [χαλ]κοῦ τάλ(αντα) c Λ̄ Δ). 60 drachmas was not an enormous sum in the second century B.C.; cf. *P.Tebt.* III.1 796.6–13 (Tebtynis, 185 B.C.).

where a petitioner reports the worth of two cloths for wiping perspiration (*ἰδρῶια*, 11) as 120 drachmas (total) and the value of a basket (*σφυρίς*, 8–9) as 20 drachmas. It seems excessive that Empedion would write a petition seeking the return of such a meager sum. One may speculate that he had perhaps been unable to achieve satisfaction at law in the aftermath of his father's death and was determined to have the guilty parties pay, in any possible way, for both of his losses.

- 8.–9. Ἀριψάλιος καὶ Παῦτος: Παῦτος is also possible. Forms of all three names ('Αρψάλις, Παῦνς, Παῆς) occur elsewhere in the Ptolemaic period, but no identification with the individuals mentioned here can be made.
12. [..] [..]: It is very likely that Seuthes is mentioned here (*i.e.*, restore καὶ [i Σ]εύ[θην] *vel sim.*). Empedion nowhere else explicitly requests that Hegesandros have the accused arrested, and such a request would seem only natural. There does not appear to be sufficient room for an imperative or infinitive verb form, unless it was abbreviated.
- 12.–18. The traces are difficult to make out, but the lines appear to be formulaic. Cf. SB X 10271.21–28 (Magdala, 231 or 206 B.C.): καὶ ἐὰν ἦ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὑπομνήματος ὄντα ἀληθῆ, | ἐπαναγκάσαι αὐτὴν | τὰ δίκαια μοι ποῆσαι. | τούτου γὰρ γενομένου, | ἔσομαι τετυχνία τῆς | παρὰ σὸν φιλανθρωπίας. | [ε]ύτυχει.

verso: The traces here are especially difficult to read. Two descenders at the end (presumably) of the string suggest that the verso contained the name of the addressee, but the reading is uncertain.

Durham, NC

John Bauschitz