

19
Reprinted from

THE JOURNAL OF
EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

VOLUME 61, 1975

IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD



P. Tebtunis 8

Courtesy Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley

PTOLEMAIC FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE IN P. TEBT. 8

PTOLEMAIC FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE IN

P. Tebt. 8¹

By ROGER S. BAGNALL

WHEN Grenfell, Hunt, and Smyly published the first volume of *The Tebtunis Papyri* in 1902, perhaps the most remarkable document in that rich volume was *P. Tebt.* 8, 'a series of drafts of letters written to different officials and containing directions concerning the collection of the foreign revenues of Egypt', as the editors put it. It had no parallel then, and it has not found one in the seventy years since; what connections the Zenon papyri offer with the non-Egyptian possessions of the Ptolemies are of a very much more informal sort. The papyrus has naturally attracted some attention from historians, but there has been no critical text of it since Wilcken's *Chrestomathie* in 1912, and no discussion of its problems since D. Cohen's dissertation on the administration of the Ptolemaic empire in the same year.² Furthermore, the second column of the papyrus, partly pictured on the plate published by the editors but not included in their transcription, has never been edited, although it has, despite its fragmentary condition, some significant information bearing on the dating of the text. These gaps I hope to fill here, but my discussion of the first column leads in many places to the conclusion that we know much less about the text and meaning of the papyrus than previous editors and historians have thought, and it can hardly be claimed yet that all of the major problems are solved.

1. The Text

Column I

[. . .]αχιω[. . . .] ειλημ[. . . .].ψ[. . .]
 λει[. . .]ρτου γρα() ἐπιδε[δω]κότος

¹ I am indebted to the Rare Books Collection of the Bancroft Library at the University of California at Berkeley for the photograph printed here (pl. 24) and to the Director for permission to publish it and the text of Column II. Much of the preparation of this article was made possible by the generous support of the Canada Council Doctoral Fellowship that I held in 1969-72. James G. Keenan has throughout my work on the papyrus given generously of his time and thought in alleviating the problem of my not being able to see the original papyrus, by repeatedly looking at it in Berkeley for me and in discussing many of the issues that I treat below. E. G. Turner, A. E. Samuel, and J. C. Shelton have also read drafts of the article and contributed suggestions, some of which are mentioned individually below. William H. Willis also discussed many of the problems in the papyrus with me and helped to clarify several points. To all of these I offer my thanks.

² In the discussion below I refer to three works by the names of their authors: Ulrich Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde* (1912), I, 2, no. 2; D. Cohen, *De Magistratibus Aegyptiis externas Lagidarum regni provincias administrantibus* (Diss. Leiden, 1912), 55-63; and W. Crönert's discussion of *P. Tebt.* 8 in *Wochenschrift klass. Phil.* (1903), 455. I may point out that Cohen's many restorations have never been registered in the *BL*.

- 4 φειλ[. . .] 'Εψιβ (τριώβολον) είσα[.]. . .
(δραχμὰς) 'Βω[. . . ὄ]πως καὶ τὰ λο(ιπὰ) .[.] . .
- [] ιε
Ἄφροδισίωι χρημάτων καὶ σίτου
καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φό(ρων) τῶν ὑπαρξάντων
8 ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Λέσβον καὶ Θράικην
τόποις διασαφή(σαι) εἰ μετείληφεν
καὶ τοῦ 'Ηρακλείτου καὶ τῶν γρα()
ἀποσ(τείλαι) ὅπως διεξαχθῆι.
- 12 Καλλιμήδει· τ(ὸ) ἀν(τίγραφον) καὶ συναποσ(τείλαι) τοὺς ἀπὸ κα().
κδ
Νικοστράτωι 'γεγρά(φαμεν) τὴν εἰς τὸ δ (ἔτος) διάπρα(σιν)
16 τῶν κατὰ Λυκίαν ἀργυ(ρικῶν) προσόδων
ἐπιτετακέναι (τάλαντα) σ Ἄτιβ (τετρώβολον)
ἐπηνεκέναι καὶ εἰς τ[ὸ] λοιπόν.
- 20 ἄλ[λ]η· διαπυλίου οὐ γεγρ(άφαμεν) ἀφευρηκέναι
τὴν ὠνήν (τάλαντα) β Ἄτξς γραφήν
[ἀ]ποσ(τείλαι) ἀπὸ τοῦ ις (ἔτους) τοῦ εἰσηγμέ(νου)
[δι]ὰ τῶν π[ωλ]ητῶν οἴνου κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν
[ὠ]ς ἀντι[τεθ]ῆι πρὸς τὸ ἀφεύρεμα.
- 24 [.]ου γεγρ() 'μῆ' πεπρα(χέναι)
[.]των ἢ διαπεφωνηκέναι
[.]αι τῆς ξυλικῆς καὶ
[τῆς]ης φό(ρ--) ὅπως μὴ καταλυθῆι
28 [. . . διασ]αφή(σαι) τὴν γενομένην οἰκονο(μίαν)
[.]τωι κατὰ Ζῆθον καὶ .[. .]. . .ην
[τοῦ]ς ἐγλαβόντας τὴν κατὰ Λυκίαν
[πο]ρφυρικὴν εἰς (ἔτη) ε οὗς ἐγράφη
32 [πρ]ᾶξαι τὸν φόρον κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν
[ἀργ]υρίου (τάλαντον) α Ἄω καὶ τὸν τοῦ δ (ἔτους)

Column II

Traces of 13 lines adjacent to upper part of Column I:

- 39 β[44 δρρ[46 λ[
47 'Ιππομε[δοντ
τε.η.[
πεμ[.]ρα() [
Βα . . ιαι απ[
ξα[
52 Θεαγένους φ[
. . α[

line, but there is no more than a trace of it (it was dotted in the first edition), and it may well belong to the marginal scribblings of the left side of the papyrus. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that the alignment of line 4 and the *paragraphos* below it (not noted by the editors) indicate a margin which would run to the right of the supposed letter; the same is true of the supposed *omicron* in line 3, which is only a trace projecting from the margin. In line 3, also, the *alpha* at the end of the line, not read by the editors, is clear; following traces are not readable. In line 4, λo(ιπα), dotted by the editors, is clear. The third letter of what follows might be either a *tau* or an *epsilon*.

A number of restorations and interpretations have been proposed for this passage. Crönert restored the beginning of line 2 as Ἀγεμ[ό]ρτου γρα(μματέως), but the *gamma* and *mu* of his name are impossible, and the difficulty of the opening letter has already been discussed. Cohen more ambitiously restored almost all of the paragraph:

[. . .] αχιω[ι γραφήν] εἰλήμ[μεθα περὶ]
 ἄλει[φα]ρ τοῦ γρα(μματέως) ἐπίδε[δω]κότος
 ὀφέιλ[ειν] Ἐψιβ (τριώβολον) εἰς [τὸ γ' ἔτος]
 (δραχμάς) Βω[ες ὄ]πως καὶ τὰ λο(ιπα) [οὔτω]

This restoration encounters a number of problems. The *upsilon* of line 1 mentioned above excludes Cohen's restoration there. Line 2 is yet more difficult, since the initial *alpha* is, as we have seen, very dubious. The sense of ἄλειφαρ, a rare word cited by *LSJ* mostly from poetic contexts, is not very suitable, unless the use of the word by Theocritus (7. 147) for resin for sealing wine jars is meant; this is not impossible, but the use of the word in a documentary context would be at least remarkable. In line 3, there is the opening-letter problem again, and in addition the fact that the *alpha* at the end of the line again excludes Cohen's restoration. Neither Cohen's restoration of the end of line 4 nor Crönert's [διεξ(αχθῆι)] is palaeographically excluded.

Cohen thought that the paragraph, as he restored it, meant that the writer had received the account of unguent, 2,856 drachmas, and that later the secretary had reported that the inhabitants owed 5,712 drachmas for the third year. This view seems to distort sentence order beyond reason, and the lack of coherence of the contents more likely belongs to this restoration than to the original text.

Under the circumstances it is dubious if any attempt to restore this paragraph can be essayed with a chance of demonstrable success. One can create various conjectural restorations, but there is no way of telling which, if any, is correct. Line 1 might well have contained [τῶν] εἰλημ[μένων], 'the receipts'⁶—but it might not have. We do not know how to resolve γρα() in line 2, because we do not know whether the subject of ἐπίδε[δω]κότος is to be sought in line 2 or line 3. The end of line 3 might have been εἰσάγειν, 'pay in', but the conjecture cannot be verified.

5. There is no reason to think that any letters are lost in the bracketed space in this line; cf. line 14. Following the numeral are traces of letters ignored by the editors as falling into the category of marginal scribblings (discussed by them on pp. 67–8),

⁶ *WB.* gives 'Geld vereinnahmen, Steuern erheben' as a possible meaning of λαμβάνω.

unrelated to the text. Cohen, however, presented the following text of these letters:

	τρ(ί)τη	
ιε		ιζ
	μ(οί)ρα	

For this text he provided a detailed explanation. But the writing is upside down, a fact Cohen did not notice. The first line in fact reads *Ξηνω*,⁷ the second apparently *λιβαν*.

6-11. The text of this letter abstract is perhaps the clearest of the papyrus. Aside from expansions of verb forms (see above), the only problems of restoration are the resolution (line 7) of φo() (as in line 27) and of γρα() in line 10. The editors read for the first φό(ρων), while M. Rostovtzeff⁸ suggested φo(ρτίων). The following points may be adduced in favour of the editors' suggestion: (1) φόρος is used unabbreviated in line 32 in a context like those of lines 7 and 27; (2) φόρος is a far more common word than φορτίον, and is therefore more likely to have been written in abbreviated form; (3) φόρος in fact makes good sense here; the mentions of χρημάτων and σίτου refer to the media in which the revenues were received rather than to the names of taxes. I would translate the first part of the paragraph, 'To Aphrodisios: about the money and grain and other revenues in the places in Lesbos and Thrace, to let us know if he has received part of them.'⁹

The last two lines are more difficult: 'About Herakleitos and the ?, send so that it may be carried out.' The editors resolved γρα(μματέων), but Keenan points out that γρα(φών) is also possible, and perhaps more likely. One might envisage a problem about Herakleitos and his accounts more readily than about Herakleitos and the secretaries.

12-13. These lines are the most cryptic of the text, and their interpretation is difficult. The editors restored the end of line 13 as συναπόσ(τειλον) τοὺς ἀπὸ Κα(ρίας?). For the beginning, Crönert suggested τ(ὰ) ἀν(ήκοντα), but this does not yield a useful sense. Cohen, on the other hand, proposed τ(ὰ) ἀν(άλογα) καὶ συναποσ(τειλάτω) τοὺς ἀπολ(). He interpreted the first two words as meaning that the secretary was writing the same things to Kallimedes as to Aphrodisios, plus what followed. Wilcken adopted Cohen's reading at the start, but retained the word-division in line 13. The sense of Cohen's supplement is suitable and attractive, but he cited no evidence to support such a usage of τὰ ἀνάλογα, and I find no attestations of this word in the neuter plural to mean 'the analogous things'. John C. Shelton suggests to me the words τ(ὸ) ἀν(τίγραφον),

⁷ Changed from *Zηνω* (Keenan observes that the change seems certain to have gone in that direction rather than the reverse, despite logic). H. I. Bell, *Cl. Rev.* 28 (1914), 199, pointed out Cohen's mistake here.

⁸ *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 335.

⁹ This translation is supported by Mayser, who, in citing the passage (lines 6 ff.) as a possible instance of a partitive genitive with μεταλαμβάνω ('teilnehmen') in *Grammatik*, II. 2 (1933), 197, remarks in n. 2 that it is doubtful that this classification is correct: 'Es ist sehr fraglich, ob die Genitive χρημάτων καὶ σίτου usw. hier direkt von μετέληφεν in Abhängigkeit zu bringen sind. Dem aphoristischen Charakter des Briefauszugs entspricht eher die S. 134, 21 gegebene Auffassung, wonach es sich wie in der angeschlossenen Wendung καὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου καὶ τῶν γραμματέων ἀποσ(τείλαι) ὅπως διεξαχθῆι um selbständige Genitive des Sachbetroffs handelt.' On p. 134, in fact, Mayser classifies these lines 6-9 as a 'Genitiv des Personen- und Sachbetroffs'.

which seem to me to be almost certainly correct: a copy of the letter to Aphrodisios is to be sent to Kallimedes with the additional instruction to send the (revenues?) from Ka—— (whether the editors' restoration of this as Caria is correct defies demonstration at present). The procedure of sending a copy of a letter to someone other than the addressee, coupled with a covering letter and some further instructions, is so common in the Ptolemaic bureaucracy as to need no elaborate justification. The connection of this letter with the preceding one is perhaps strengthened by the fact that although a *paragraphos* (not noted by the editors) stands above line 12, the first word of that line begins only just to the left of the regular margin, rather than being aligned with the opening words of the other letters (as it is printed by the editors).

14. Cohen claimed that a *delta* was to be seen under the κδ in this line. This is not the case; the strokes that Cohen saw are part of the abbreviation of γεργ() in the next line.

15–18. Two problems exist in these lines. In line 15, the editors resolved γέγρα(φε) (they do not indicate that the word is written above the line); in the commentary they state that Nikostratos 'is told that information has been received to the effect that the sale of the money-taxes in Lycia for the 4th year had yielded an increase of 6 talents 1312 drachmae 4 obols'. On their interpretation, evidently, γέγρα(φε) is left without a subject. But one may ask who the subject could be, who would notify the *dioiketes* about the sale of a tax-farming contract; one would expect, rather, that the contract would have been let in an auction in Alexandria under the direct supervision of the *dioiketes*.¹⁰ It is possible, then, (as Keenan suggests) that γέγρα(πται) is meant—'To Nikostratos: it has been written that the sale of the contract for the money taxes in Lycia for the 4th year, etc.' The solution of this problem, however, depends on the understanding we attach to line 18.

The verb ἐπηνεκέσαι in that line has created problems. The editors took it to be ('it seems most natural to suppose') the perfect infinitive of ἐπανήμι, a rare form; the advantage of this supposition and their interpretation of the meaning as 'to decline' is that the verb can then, correctly, depend on γεργ() in line 15 (like ἐπιτετακέσαι, which is seemingly parallel). They remark, however, that the use of καί instead of δέ after the infinitive is strange on this view, and Cohen pursued this opinion to the conclusion that the verb is a perfect infinitive of ἐπαινώ, a solution rejected by the editors on the grounds that no sense was possible.

Wilcken also accepted ἐπηνεκέσαι (printing it with an *iota* subscript, unlike the editors), but did not discuss the problem. Mayser,¹¹ LSJ,¹² and WB.¹³ have also

¹⁰ Cf. the story of Joseph in Josephus, *A. J.* 12. 154 ff., where the subject goes to Alexandria just before the great auction in which the taxes for Syria and Palestine were to be sold.

¹¹ *Grammatik*² 1 (1923), 372.

¹² LSJ's treatment of the word is curious. S.v. ἐπαινώ (I. 4) it states 'agree to or undertake to do, ῥώμην μ' ἐπαινώ λαμβάνειν E. *Andr.* 554; εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν P. *Tebt.* 8. 18 (iii B.C.).' When one turns to the work cited by the dictionary, the form in question is not to be found, for the editors of P. *Tebt.* 8 do not print the *iota* subscript that would justify this reference; it is to *W. Chr.* 2 that the editors of LSJ should have referred. Their interpretation is thus passed off as if it belonged to Grenfell, Hunt, and Smyly when in fact it does not. The reference to the *Andromache* of Euripides is no sounder: cf. the edition of P. T. Stevens (Oxford, 1971), who observes (p. 163), after discussing the many proposed emendations for this line, 'if the text is right, the verb is

[Notes 12 and 13 continued on page 174]

followed this interpretation. None of these has indicated any reluctance to accept that line 18 is an integral part of the sentence of lines 15–17; but if it is, the infinitive must depend on *διάπρα(σιν)* as a subject, and must consequently have a perfect meaning. But it is quite impossible that if *ἐπηνεκέσαι* from *ἐπαινώ* is the verb, the subject of that verb should be *διάπρα(σιν)*, for no sense emerges. The avoidance of any translation of the complete phrase by Wilcken, *LSJ*, and *WB*. prevents us from knowing how any of these understood the passage and what they took to be the subject of the second infinitive.

Two other possible solutions should be considered. The first (suggested to me by Shelton and Turner) is that we are to understand here *ἐπηνε<γ>κέσαι*, a falsely formed infinitive (aorist stem, perfect ending) from *ἐπιφέρω*. The sound changes required (ϵ to η , dropping of γ) are not impossible for this time (late third century),¹⁴ although the combination might give pause, but other considerations seem to me to weigh heavily against it: (1) the scribe was secretary, it appears, to the highest official in the land; he writes carefully in this document and uses perfect infinitives correctly and frequently. The likelihood that he would make a type of mistake extremely rare in this period appears to me small.¹⁵ (2) There is no obviously suitable meaning of *ἐπιφέρω* to be understood here, for most technical use of the word in the Ptolemaic period has to do with producing contracts.¹⁶

The other possibility (and perhaps it is what some earlier scholars supposed without so indicating) is that we are to understand a new subject for *ἐπηνεκέσαι*, in which case *ἐπαινώ* becomes a plausible source for the form.¹⁷ One must in this instance consider

used like *παραινῶ* in the sense “advise, recommend”.¹⁸ And L. Méridier, in the Budé Euripides (II, 1927), gives to this line the translation ‘je m’exhorte à recouvrer la vigueur de mes jeunes ans’. This meaning of *ἐπαινέω* should therefore be deleted from *LSJ* in its entirety.

¹³ *WB*. interprets *P. Tebt.* 8 (which, like *LSJ*, it cites for the form *ἐπηνεκέσαι* when *W. Chr.* would be the correct reference) as an only example of a meaning ‘versprechen, in Aussicht stellen’.

¹⁴ For η in place of ϵ , see Mayser, *Grammatik*² (rev. H. Schmoll, 1970) I. 1, 39–40, with numerous examples especially from the Hibeh and Zenon papyri; for disappearance of the nasal, p. 164, citing precisely several compounds of *φέρω* in the third and second centuries.

¹⁵ Mayser, *Grammatik*² (Schmoll) I. 2, 162–4, discusses these forms, remarking, ‘Das Gebiet unorganischer Zwitterformen mit Kreuzungen der Tempusstämme und Endungen ist in der ptolemäischen Papyri in Verhältnis zur Masse des überlieferten Materials klein, weitaus kleiner als in der späteren *κοινή* der römischen Kaiserzeit.’ The only third-century example cited, in fact, is *ἀνεγκόσι* in *BGU* 1010. 5 (dated by the editor to 219 B.C., but the year 29 mentioned is surely 257/256), where Mayser concedes that the word is at least as likely to be the dative plural of the participle (the fragmentary condition of the papyrus prevents argument from context). Cf. B. G. Mandilaras, *Studies in the Greek Language* (Athens, 1972), 12: ‘When a certain writer produces a hybrid verbal form it means that he confuses the tenses involved in it.’ Mandilaras also notes, pp. 18–19, that the perfect is well known and accurately used, especially in official contexts, in the Ptolemaic period. For late Roman documents, cf. S. Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen*², 90–1, esp. p. 91 n. 2, who notes the growing commonness of such forms in later papyri.

¹⁶ *WB*. I cites meanings of bringing up water, making a complaint, and (frequently) producing a contract; *WB*. Suppl. I cites for the same meaning *inter alia* *P. Sorb.* 15 (where the editor, p. 63, refers to M. Haessler’s discussion of validity clauses).

¹⁷ The omission of *iota* adscript in papyri of this period, particularly in the initial position as here, is not common, but it is attested: cf. Mayser, *Grammatik*² (Schmoll) 103–4, citing *P. Athen.* 8. 7 (III–II). The scribe is usually careful with such things (cf. line 8, *Θράκιην*), but it is a less remarkable occurrence than those supposed in a form of *ἐπιφέρω*.

that line 18 begins a new clause; although there is no physical evidence that this is so,¹⁸ the absence of a conjunction (as we have seen, the position of *καί* essentially excludes its having this function) lends support. If the verb *γεγρα()* is resolved, as Turner suggests, as *γεγρά(φαμεν)*, a common enough idiom of official correspondence, one may then suppose that with a certain amount of liberty in the use of parallel infinitives with different subjects the author of the letter is the subject of *ἐπηνεκέναί*. The whole passage would then be translated, 'We have written that the sale of the contract for the money revenues for Lycia for the fourth year has increased to¹⁹ 6 talents, 1312 drachmas, 4 ob.; and that we have given approval also for the future.' The intransitive use of *ἐπαινώ*, while far less common than the transitive with a direct object of person or thing commended, is not unknown.²⁰

19–23. It is probable, in line 19, that the restoration adopted for the previous letter is to be understood here also; that is, one should resolve *γεγρ(άφαμεν)* (again, on the assumption that tax contracts would be let in Alexandria and not by the provincial correspondent). The last three lines of the letter then represent the current instructions in response to the situation outlined in 19–20. I translate, 'another (letter:) about the gate toll, about which we have written that the sale was short 2 talents 1366 drachmas, to send the account of the wine imported by the merchants yearly from the 16th year, so that it may be balanced against the shortage.' It is probable that the reference here is to a scrutiny of the accounts rather than to a payment of money in compensation. In line 20, [τ]ῆν edd.; but part of the *tau* is visible (and confirmed by Keenan on the papyrus).

24–28. The problems of this letter make a connected translation impossible. In 24, the editors read as follows: [. σί]του γέγρ(αφε) μὴ πεπρ(αχέναί). As to the first word, the *tau* is not certain; it resembles the final *upsilon* of *διαπυλίου* in line 19, and the same type of construction, with *οὐδ* *γεγρ(άφαμεν)*, may well have stood here originally. (The editors do not indicate that *μὴ* is written above the line). The *alpha* of the next line, the first letter read in the editors' text, is far from certain, and their restoration [καὶ χρημ]άτων is thus highly uncertain. In line 26, the editors restored [τούτων κ]αί, but Wilcken omits this, properly, for it is neither certain nor useful. In line 27, the editors read *φό(ρος)*, but the case and number do not seem to me certain, inasmuch as the word would appear to go with the two preceding tax names. Unless the grammatical structure of the entire letter can be clearly discerned, it is hard to see why one case should be preferred.

And the structure of the letter is highly uncertain. Cohen, restoring [*ἄλλη*· *φόρους* ()

¹⁸ The photograph shows what looks like a *paragraphos* after line 17, but Keenan tells me that this is a 'mirage—a hairline crack in the papyrus which is shaded on the photo, and so looks like ink.'

¹⁹ The verb *ἐπιτρένω*, while better attested than *ἐπανήμι*, is not common in the papyri (cf. *WB.* 1 etc.). The passage in *P. Tebt.* 8 is cited in *WB.* 1 and translated 'er [showing that *γέγραφε* was accepted here] schrieb, dass die Steuerverpachtung sich erhöht habe auf x Talente'. The translation seems to me preferable to the editors' assumption that 6 talents etc. is the amount of the increase.

²⁰ *LSJ* cites an absolute sense of *ἐπαινώ* meaning consent or agree from Aristoph. *Av.* 1616 and Thuc. 4. 65 (*ἐπαινεσάντων δ' αὐτῶν*); similar is the passage of *P. Eleph.* 13. 4 (223/222 B.C.) cited by *WB.*, *ὁ δὲ ἐπήνκει μόνον, ἐπέταξεν δ' οὐθέν*. (The citation of this verb by *WB.* Suppl. 1 from *P. Col. Zen.* 118a. 5 is in error; this Ptolemaic text reads *επανω*.)

. . .]του γέγρα(αφε) μὴ πεπρᾶ(σθαι), followed much of the editors' indicated structure. But if the reservations indicated above are correct, the first part of the letter may have said something quite different. The adoption of a first-person-plural verb in line 24 would indicate that the first part of the letter summarizes information previously sent by the *dioiketes* to the official, as was the case in lines 19–20 in the previous abstract. Lines 25–26 are extremely difficult; perhaps ἦ in 25 co-ordinates with a second perfect infinitive in 26 ending -κέν]αι. Or, perhaps more likely, the -αι ended an aorist infinitive giving (in the manner we have supposed earlier) the instructions of the present letter. But the impossibility of demonstrating the correctness of a full restoration here makes it unfruitful to offer one.²¹ It may be, actually, that φο() in 27 is the subject of the second perfect infinitive, and that a partial stop should be placed after it. Some alteration would then be necessary in 28. I am far from suggesting that the difficulties of this passage are solved, but these suggestions may indicate the direction in which a solution might be found. That one is possible in the state of the papyrus and our lack of parallels is by no means certain.

29–33. In 29, Cohen, Crönert, and Wilcken all restored [Νικοστρά]τωι. The reason for the restoration (not made by the editors) is that the letter should be addressed to him because it concerns Lycia. But there can have been many officials in the area; and there is no evidence that Nikostratos did not have a supervisory position over a larger area than Lycia. Since the restoration gives us no additional knowledge, and since the evidence is not strong that it is correct, it seems best to omit it. I translate the text as follows: 'Concerning Zethos and —es, who took the purple contract in Lycia for five years, and about whom it was written that they had collected the revenue of 1 talent 1800 drachmas per year and the (revenue) for the 4th year . . .'

Column II

50. I have not succeeded in restoring this name, evidently (as Turner remarks) originally ending in -ιας, for the *alpha* after the *iota* evidently begins a new word.

56. If the *sigma* is read correctly, only this genitive can be restored.

Column III

I do not print a photograph of this column, which preserves the left margin of another series of abstracts, with two or three paragraph beginnings apparently starting with Απ[. To the left is more of the small cursive scribbling found to the left of Column I, but it is not upside down here. Little of this column seems readable.

²¹ On the meaning of διαπεφωνηκέναι, uncritical use of *LS*⁸ by the editors resulted in the following remark (p. 67): 'διαφωνεῖν (l. 25) is used by Polybius of accounts which do not balance, but it seems better in this place to interpret the word in the sense in which it is used by Diodorus, xvi. 3 γέγραφε βιβλούς ὀκτώ πρὸς ταῖς πενήτ' κοντα, ἐξ ὧν πέντε διαφωνοῦσι.' The attestations are both taken from *LS*⁸ (1897, unchanged from 7th edn. of 1882), which reads '2 . . . διαφωνεῖ τι τῶν χρημάτων the accounts disagree, are not balanced, Polyb. 22. 26. 23. *LS*⁷ cites the same passage, saying 'generally, disagree, . . . διαφωνεῖ τι τῶν χρημάτων there is a discrepancy in the accounts, Plb. 21. 43. 23.' L. and J. Robert have pointed out in *La Carie*, II, 310, n. 10, that the passage means 'disappear, be missing', and thus belongs in section 3 of *LS*⁷'s article. As Thomas Drew-Bear points out in *Glotta* 50 (1972), 67, the *Supplement* (1968) to *LS*⁷ does not register this change.

3. The Date of the Papyrus

The editors assigned *P. Tebt.* 8 to the last part of the third century B.C. on the basis of the palaeography. The date was further narrowed by the mention of a year 4 (lines 15 and 33) which is evidently imminent or present; the choices available are the reigns of Philopator (219/218) or of Epiphanes (202/201). The editors chose the latter on the basis of the correspondence that they saw in the contents of the papyrus with the historical situation about 202. The instructions issued, they argued, showed a state of crisis readily explicable in the face of Philip's moves in Thrace and elsewhere in 202. But what these abstracts really show is relentless activity on the part of the *dioiketes* to attend to the size and security of the revenues from every area of the empire and every possible source. There is nothing startling in this picture, which reminds us of the activity of Apollonios in the middle of the century. If we had comparative material from the files of an earlier year, it might be possible to assert that the differences here, if any, showed a state of crisis. In the absence of such material, a claim that the instructions of this papyrus reveal an emergency is unjustified. One might as well suppose that the government was in preparation for the campaign of Raphia and gathering its resources. Nothing here, then, points to one date or the other with certainty.²²

More recently, P. M. Fraser has sought to provide further support for a date of 202 through the use of prosopography. The figure in question is Kallimedes, the addressee of the abstract beginning in line 12. Fraser pointed out that Livy records that Ainos was surrendered to Philip V in 200 by its commandant, one Kallimedes.²³ The preceding letter to that addressed to Kallimedes here is concerned with affairs in Lesbos and Thrace, and if the interpretation τ(ὸ) ἀν(τί)γραφον is correct, Kallimedes would seem to be localized in this region in the papyrus.²⁴ Fraser reasoned from this possible identification that a date close to the surrender in 200 would be preferable to an earlier one for this appearance of Kallimedes.

Fraser expressed some diffidence about the identification, however, asserting that 'it should be noted that the name Kallimedes is frequent in Ptolemaic Egypt'. This is not the case. Aside from the reference in *P. Tebt.* 8, only seven references to men of this name are registered in the *Namenbuch* and the *Onomasticon*, and Professor Peremans tells me he has no others listed in his files. Of these, four are private citizens in the second half of the second century, two of whom are alleged to be perpetrators of injustices suffered by petitioners.²⁵ Of the remaining three, two belong to papyri mentioning an eponymous priest (of year 12 of Philadelphos) named Leontiskos son of Kallimedes.²⁶

²² No more can one accept the argument of K. J. Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*² iv. 2, 345 n. 1 (followed by D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, 936-7) that Philip had already taken these Ptolemaic possessions by 202. and that the letters must be earlier than that date; cf. the rebuttal of this position by P. M. Fraser, *JEA* 39 (1953), 91-2 n. 5.

²³ Livy 31. 16. 4, cited by Fraser (n. 22, above). Ainos is otherwise known as a Ptolemaic possession through *Asylieurkunden aus Kos*, no. 8 (*Abh. Berl.*, 1952, nr. 1).

²⁴ The editors' resolution *Ka(ρί)ας* would thus be definitely excluded.

²⁵ *P. Grenf.* I. 17; *UPZ* 180a Col. 19. 2; *SB* 428 and 4638.

²⁶ *P. Hib.* 110. 41, and *P. Cair. Zen.* 59001 (the latter a double of *PSI* 321).

The last is also a patronymic, the father of the eminent official and companion of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, Lochos.²⁷ The sum total, then, is two fathers of important sons and four private citizens of the late second century. For more than a century the name is not attested; and it is in the middle of this century that our Kallimedes falls. It would seem, therefore, that some of Fraser's diffidence over the identification is unwarranted.

The father of the eponymous priest is part of a cluster of figures in third-century Ptolemaic history who seem to form a family group. The first Kallimedes, father of the priest, must have been born in the mid fourth century, his son a generation later.²⁸ It is likely that the Perigenes son of Leontiskos who was an Olympic victor in 272 and appears on Siphnos in the 270s (providing entertainment for the Siphnians on the occasion of the announcement of the well-being of the king and his army)²⁹ was a son of the eponymous priest, an active young man when his father was middle-aged. Another Perigenes appears as the Ptolemaic admiral of the campaign of Raphia; it was probably his daughter Iamneia who served as *athlophore* in 211/210 and as *canephore* in 210/209. It is not unreasonable to suppose that he was a son, or at least a relative of the other Perigenes.

It would also not be unreasonable to suppose that the commandant of Ainos, Kallimedes, came from this family. There is no evidence to provide him with a stemma, but if he belonged to the generation of the children of the second Perigenes, his period of activity might have spanned the period *c.* 220–180. If the Kallimedes of 200 was a middle-career officer well up the military hierarchy, he might well have been a lower officer a decade or two earlier. While the identification by Fraser has much verisimilitude, then, and although it points to a later date for the papyrus, it is by no means conclusive evidence for the late date.³⁰ While Kallimedes may thus be said to contribute to the solution of the problem, his place is not entirely clear.

Column II, fragmentary though it is, contributes two new names for consideration. We may take Theagenes first. There are only four Ptolemaic occurrences of this name, two of them from Tebtunis texts of the late second century that cannot concern the man of this papyrus.³¹ The third is a somewhat dubious patronymic in a third-century Petrie papyrus.³² The fourth, however, is of some interest. He dedicated a statue of his father, —n son of Apollodoros, in Alexandria.³³ The father, an Alexandrian with the

²⁷ For Lochos, see the study of W. Peremans and E. Van't Dack, *Prosopographica*, 40–5.

²⁸ The evidence for the members of this supposed family is gathered by J. IJsewijn, *De Sacerdotibus*, 63, no. 12, who makes these connections as far as the second Perigenes.

²⁹ This text is best consulted at *IG XII Suppl.*, p. 111, from G. Klaffenbach's revision on the stone, but the essential discussions are those of M. Holleaux, *BCH* 29 (1905), 319 ff., and L. Robert, *BCH* 60 (1936), 184–9; cf. his notes to M. Holleaux, *Études* VI, 25–6 n. 74; also the remarks of J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1965, 6, p. 75, on M. Vandoni's recent reprinting of the text.

³⁰ It is possible that our Kallimedes was the father of the Kallimedes who was the father of Lochos; the sequence of generations would fit reasonably well.

³¹ *P. Tebt.* 94. 25 and 116. 19.

³² *P. Petr.* III 59. c. 1 recto III. 18, Περευοῦντις Θεαγ[], in a list of names all of which are Egyptian; I owe the reference to Professor Peremans.

³³ The inscription, then in the Lyceum Hosianum of Braunsberg (now perhaps in Warsaw) was published by W. Schubart in *Klio* 12 (1912), 365–73, with a thorough commentary; the text is reprinted as *SB* 5021.

demotic Athenaius, had these titles: τὸν [γε]νόμενον ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις φίλοις καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ λογιστηρίου τῶν νομαρχικῶν καὶ πρὸς τῇ ἐπιστατείαι τοῦ ξενικοῦ ἐμπορίου. He had evidently retired from the very top level of the Ptolemaic bureaucracy, as head of accounting for nome accounts and chief of the customs service and export supervision in Alexandria—one of the highest subordinates of the *dioiketes*. His court rank was in keeping with these dignities. At the time of the dedication, he must have been well past the age of active service. His son, now τῶν πρώτων φίλων himself, is τῶν ἐφημερευόντων τοῖς βασιλευσιν εἰσαγγελέων. Theagenes must be a courtier of middle age himself, and with a comfortable court position is perhaps past his own most active days; perhaps he lacked his father's distinction as an administrator and was kept on, for the sake of his father's feelings, as a minor court official.³⁴

The date of the inscription cannot be established with certainty. Schubart suggested the second century on the basis of the hand.³⁵ The presence of court rank suggests only that the text dates after the early part of Epiphanes' reign. If we identify this Theagenes with the official in *P. Tebt.* 8, we arrive at little more certainty about the date of the latter than was the case with Kallimedes. The earliest date at which the son of a man who was retired and aged, like Theagenes' father, could have been active—if we assume the earliest possible date for the inscription, in the 190s—would have been *c.* 225–220. We thus have, as before, a *terminus post quem* of the papyrus of about 220, a date that accommodates either of the possible dates of composition.

The last name is the most significant: Hippomedon. Aside from some legendary figures,³⁶ scarcely any bearers of this name are known, none of them in Ptolemaic Egypt except Euergetes' governor of Thrace and the Hellespont.³⁷ With a name of this rarity, and with at least a rough coincidence of dates and of spheres of activity, there can be no doubt that the Hippomedon of the papyrus is the same as the already known *strategos*. In order to extract the import of his appearance here for the chronology of *P. Tebt.* 8, it is necessary to examine in some detail the evidence for his life.

(1) Hippomedon, Polybius tells us, was alive in 219 and at that time had a daughter with two living sons.³⁸ Hippomedon was the son of the Spartan Agesilaos, the advisor of Agis in the late 240s, and we know that his daughter married king Archidamos. Archidamos was dead by 227 or shortly thereafter, so that his wife's child-bearing must have begun *c.* 230, if not earlier.³⁹ Plutarch tells us that Spartan women married late,⁴⁰

³⁴ Schubart shows that Theagenes' title of usher at court was a real position, and not purely honorary, but it is not exceptionally prominent.

³⁵ He remarks (p. 365), 'Die Schrift, vom Steinmetzen vorpunktiert, gibt sich auf den ersten Blick als ptolemäisch zu erkennen, ist aber nicht besonders charakteristisch.'

³⁶ See the list by H. Zwicker in *PW* 8. 2 (1913) s.v. Hippomedon. The Hippomedon whose name appears in *Un Livre d'écolier* line 102 is, from the proximity in this list of polysyllabic names to Polyneikes and Eteokles, probably the member of the Seven against Thebes. (D. Foraboschi informs me that the reference to *P. Cair. Zen.* v in the *Onomasticon* s.v. Hippomedon is an error for this occurrence.)

³⁷ Several are listed by Zwicker (n. 36), and to his list may be added *SEG* xxii 508, a dubious restoration by W. G. Forrest of the name in a Chian inscription; and the epitaph at Odessus of Artemidorus son of Hippomedon and his wife, *SEG* xxiv 990.

³⁸ Polyb. 4. 35. 13.

³⁹ Cf. Walbank's comments in the *Commentary* to Polybius, I, 568 ff.

⁴⁰ *Lycurgus* 15. 10.