

EDDY LANCIERS

THE DATE OF P. TEBT. I 8

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 89 (1991) 71–74

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## The Date of P. Tebt. I 8\*

The famous P. Tebt. I 8, which contains several outlines of letters about revenues from Lesbos, Thrace and Lycia, was dated to the 4th year of the reign of Ptolemy V Epiphanes (202/1) by Grenfell and Hunt. The papyrus later belonged to the papers of Menches, who wrote a receipt on the verso in the 51st year of the reign of Ptolemy VIII (P. Tebt. I 11: 120/19)<sup>1</sup>. The village scribe of Kerkeosiris thus re-used a papyrus which was at least about 80 years old<sup>2</sup>. In 1975 R.S. Bagnall supplied a detailed commentary on P. Tebt. I 8; after a lengthy discussion of the date he concluded that the papyrus was probably not written under Ptolemy V but in the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopator (219/8)<sup>3</sup>. This would make the papyrus a century old at the time it was in the hands of Menches. Bagnall reached his conclusion mainly via the prosopographical route. Kallimedes in col. I l. 12 was identified by Fraser with the *praefectus Ptolomaei* in Ainos, who according to Livy XXXI 16.4 surrendered the city to Philip V in 200<sup>4</sup>. Bagnall accepted this identification but in his opinion Kallimedes might already have been a lower officer in the northern Aegean in the first years of the reign of Ptolemy IV. Col. II of the papyrus, which was published for the first time by Bagnall<sup>5</sup>, contains the names Theagenes and Hippomedon. Whereas Theagenes cannot be identified with certainty, Hippomedon is doubtless the well-known strategos of Thrace and the Hellespont<sup>6</sup>. Using all the available data on the career of Hippomedon Bagnall concluded that this official must have been over seventy by 202 and therefore was probably no longer in active service. For this reason he preferred to date the papyrus to the reign of Philopator. One cannot, however, avoid the feeling that the data concerning Kallimedes and Hippomedon seem to point in a different direction.

Bagnall's argumentation rests on the assumption that col. I and col. II of the papyrus are closely linked and must have been written at the same time. T.C. Skeat, however, drew attention to the very compressed writing in col. I, particularly at the end of the lines<sup>7</sup>. He explains this palaeographical feature by the fact that col. II was written before col. I: the scribes, who for some reason had not copied the drafts onto the roll in their proper places, inserted them in the blank space between the beginning of the papyrus-roll and the already existing col. II. It cannot be established

---

\* This article was written during a stay at the "Dipartimento di Storia Antica" of the "Università degli Studi di Bologna". I want to thank Prof. G. Susini - Chairman of the Department -, Prof. Lucia Criscuolo and Prof. G. Geraci for their kind hospitality.

<sup>1</sup> W. Clarysse points out to me that the formula (ἔτους) να Παχών can be recognized in the note written upside down on the recto to the left of col. I; this year must also refer to the reign of Ptolemy VIII: 20 May - 18 June 119.

<sup>2</sup> On the re-use of papyri by Menches see P.W. PESTMAN, in *P. Rainer Cent.*, p. 130.

<sup>3</sup> *Ptolemaic Foreign Correspondence in P. Tebt. 8*, in *JEA*, 61 (1975), pp. 168-180 (cf. *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition*, 4, Leiden, 1976, p. 108, 162).

<sup>4</sup> P.M. FRASER, *JEA*, 39 (1953), pp. 91-92 n. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Both columns are now also reprinted as SB XIV 11943.

<sup>6</sup> For Hippomedon see PP VI 14605; S. ŞAHİN, *Ehrendekret für Hippomedon aus Priapos (Karabiga) Statthalter des Ptolemaios III. Euergetes ?*, in *EA*, 4 (1984), pp. 5-7 (= SEG XXXIV 1256; cf. Ph. GAUTHIER, *REG*, 100, 1987, pp. 332-333 nr. 280). It is to be noted that there are no signs that grandsons in this family received the same name as the grandfather: the grandfather of the *strategos* was called Eudamidas (Polyb. IV 35.13).

<sup>7</sup> T.C. SKEAT, *A Note on Tebtynis Papyrus 8*, in *BASP*, 18 (1981), pp. 141-144.

precisely how much time elapsed between the redaction of col. II and that of col. I<sup>8</sup>. One may even wonder whether the scribes of col. I did not use an older roll to write down their outlines. Anyway, it seems preferable to use only the information contained in col. I to date this part of the document. I will discuss the following points<sup>9</sup>: a) prosopographical data, b) the Ptolemaic possessions which are mentioned, c) the years which appear in the text.

Kallimedes is the only person in col. I for whom an identification can be proposed. The question arises, however, whether the Kallimedes mentioned by Livy and the homonym in the papyrus are really identical<sup>10</sup>. The first editors printed l. 12-13 of the papyrus as follows: Καλλιμήδει· τ( ) αν( ) καὶ συναπόσ(τειλον) τοὺς ἀπὸ Κα(ρίας?). This restoration, which implies that Kallimedes was active in Caria<sup>11</sup>, is extremely doubtful. Elaborating on the remarks of Bagnall and Lewis, Skeat proposed to read: Καλλιμήδει· τ(ὸ) ἀν(τίγραφον) καὶ συναποσ(τέλλαι) τοὺς ἀποκα(τασταθέντας) (sc. λόγους) ("To Kallimedes. Copy of the above, and to send with it the reconstructed accounts")<sup>12</sup>. Kallimedes, then, must have been stationed in one of the κατὰ Λέσβον καὶ Θράκιην τόποις mentioned in ll. 8-9. It is not surprising that the city commandant of Ainos received a copy of a letter concerning the levy of taxes in his territory<sup>13</sup>. But Kallimedes might even have been a higher ranking official. Livy used the title *praefectus* not only for officers but also for military governors (*strategoi*)<sup>14</sup>. It is therefore not totally excluded that Kallimedes supervised the financial affairs of the northern Aegean as the Ptolemaic strategos of this region residing in Ainos<sup>15</sup>.

The Ptolemaic possessions mentioned in the papyrus do not offer a solution for the dating problem. Lycia remained a Ptolemaic province till it was occupied by Antiochos III in 197. On Lesbos Ptolemaic influence is attested in Eresos (and maybe also Methymna) between 210 and 204 and there is no reason to assume that the Ptolemies had lost control there at the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy V<sup>16</sup>. The attack by Philip V on the Ptolemaic possessions in Thrace did not start until 200<sup>17</sup>. The fact that the Hellespont is not mentioned was used by Bengtson as an indication

<sup>8</sup> Bagnall himself remarked that the entries in col. I and col. II are not of the same type (*JEA*, 61, 1975, p. 170 n. 4).

<sup>9</sup> The small sums for the taxes seem to point to the silver standard, but cf. T. REEKMANS, *Studia Hellenistica*, 5 (1948), p. 22: "The state bookkeeping kept to the silver standard even after 210".

<sup>10</sup> R.S. BAGNALL, *JEA*, 61, 1975, pp. 177-178, tried to substantiate this identification, but his prosopographical arguments are not conclusive.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. M. ROSTOVITZ, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, I, Oxford, 1953<sup>2</sup>, p. 335; PP VI 15731.

<sup>12</sup> *BASP*, 18 (1981), pp. 143-144 (cf. N. LEWIS, *BASP*, 16, 1979, pp. 205-206).

<sup>13</sup> The city commandants also had civic duties and powers: R.S. BAGNALL, *Ptolemaic Possessions*, pp. 221-224. I see no compelling reason why Kallimedes should be regarded, with T.C. SKEAT, *loc. cit.*, p. 144 n. 5, as an *antigraphus*.

<sup>14</sup> H. BENGTSON, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht*, II (*Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte*, 32), München, 1964<sup>2</sup>, pp. 331-332.

<sup>15</sup> H. BENGTSON, *op. cit.*, III (*Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte*, 36), München, 1967<sup>2</sup>, pp. 181-182, suggested that Aphrodisios in l. 6 was the *strategos*, but he may just as well have been an *oikonomos*. The *oikonomos* and the *strategos* shared duties in the economic administration of the provinces: R.S. BAGNALL, *Ptolemaic Possessions*, pp. 224-227.

<sup>16</sup> IG XII Suppl. 122 (Eresos); on the date of IG XII suppl. 125 from Methymna see now F. BRUN, *ZPE*, 85 (1991), pp. 106-109: Ptolemy II or IV ?

<sup>17</sup> K.J. BELOCH, *Griechische Geschichte*, IV.2, Berlin-Leipzig, 1927<sup>2</sup>, pp. 345-346 n. 1, and D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, II, Princeton, 1950, pp. 936-937 n. 1, wrongly dated P. Tebt. I 8 to the reign of Ptolemy IV because they assumed Philip

for a date under Ptolemy V<sup>18</sup>. According to Polybios Ptolemaios IV at the beginning of his reign controlled a large part of the coast of Asia Minor ἕως Ἑλλησπόντου καὶ τῶν κατὰ Λυσιμάχειαν τόπων (V 34.7), but by 202 Lysimacheia was an ally of the Aetolian League (XV 23.8, XVIII 3.11-12). The inference from Polybios' expression that Lysimacheia itself was a Ptolemaic city is, however, not beyond doubt<sup>19</sup>, and there is no other evidence that the Ptolemies lost strongholds on the east coast of the Hellespont or on the Thracian Chersonese during the reign of Ptolemy IV<sup>20</sup>. The absence of the Hellespont may simply be due to a lack of rigidity in Ptolemaic administrative language<sup>21</sup>.

Two different years are found in the papyrus. In l. 15 mention is made of the sale of the money taxes in Lycia for the 4th year; a 4th year also appears in l. 33. Another year is mentioned in the draft on ll. 19-23:

ἄλλη· διαπυλίου οὐ γεγραφέμεν ἀφευρηκέναι τὴν ὠνὴν (τάλαντα) β' Ἀτξς γραφὴν [ἀ]ποσ(τεῖλαι) ἀπὸ τοῦ ις (ἔτους) τοῦ εἰσηγγέ(νου) [διὰ τῶν πωλητῶν οἴνου κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ὡς ἀντιτεθῆ] πρὸς τὸ ἀφεύρεμα.

The exact meaning of this phrase is not clear. Several papyri show that when a buyer, lessee or farmer did not fulfil the obligations stipulated in the contract, a new auction could be held (ἐπαναπιπράσκω), or that the property could be re-let (ἀναμίσθωσις, ἐπαναμισθῶ, ἐπαναμίσθωσις); when this second transaction yielded a lower price (ἀφευρίσκω, ἀφεύρεμα) the original contractant had to make up for the loss<sup>22</sup>. UPZ I 112 provides for such a penalty in case a tax-farmer did not produce guarantees in time and the state lost money when the tax was farmed out a second time (col. III l. 11-14, VI l. 7-10). In the passage under discussion, however, we are probably not dealing with such an immediate re-auction of a tax for the same year, since it was apparently only after the first tax-farmer had completed his business that an ἀφεύρεμα came to be

V had conquered Ptolemaic Thrace by 202. R.S. BAGNALL, *JEA*, 61 (1975), p. 177, on the other hand, rightly refuted the view of Grenfell and Hunt that the papyrus is to be dated to the reign of Ptolemy V because it reflects a state of crisis in the northern Aegean caused by the operations of Philip V.

<sup>18</sup> H. BENGTON, *op. cit.*, III, p. 182.

<sup>19</sup> W. HUSS, *Untersuchungen zur Außenpolitik Ptolemaios' IV. (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 69)*, München, 1976, p. 212, and L. ROBERT, *BCH*, 106 (1982), p. 328, accept that the city was Ptolemaic, but R.S. BAGNALL, *Ptolemaic Possessions*, p. 160 n. 6, seems to express some doubt.

<sup>20</sup> W. HUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-209, cites no evidence for a Ptolemaic influence on the east coast of the Hellespont during the reign of Philopator. Some of the places on the Chersonese mentioned by Livy XXXI 16.5 (Elaious, Alopekonnos, Kallipolis, Madytos) may have been Ptolemaic but they were only occupied by Philip V in 200. From OGIS I 88 no Ptolemaic influence in Sestos under Ptolemy IV may be inferred (*pace* W. HUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 211 with n. 242) as this inscription comes from Ilion (see now *Inscr. Ilion* 44).

<sup>21</sup> W. HUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 210, points to the fact that sometimes Thrace and the Hellespont, sometimes only Thrace is mentioned in our sources.

<sup>22</sup> ἐπαναπιπράσκω: UPZ I 112 col. III l. 11-14, VI l. 7-10; P. Lond. VII 2188 l. 277-281; UPZ II 218 col. I l. 24-25; 220 col. I l. 14-15; 221 col. I l. 19-20; ἀναμίσθωσις: BGU IV 1116 l. 33; 1119 l. 41; 1120 l. 46; 1121 l. 37; 1122 l. 32 (cf. P. Tebt. III 815 col. III l. 72; ἐπαναμισθῶ: SB VIII 9841 l. 8-9, 23-24; ἐπαναμίσθωσις: P. Köln III 147 l. 15 where without doubt ἐπαναμίσθωσιν is to be read instead of ἐξαναμίσθωσιν. We find the opposite situation in P. Petrie III 42 F c l. 11-14; 43 (2) recto col. I l. 19-27; III l. 2-7, IV l. 35-44; verso col. III l. 8-13, V l. 8-15: when public works have to be bid on for a second time (ἐπαναπιπράσκω, ἐπαναπωλέω) and the state has to pay a higher price, the first contractor has to compensate for the difference. For these penalty clauses see A. BERGER, *Die Strafklauseln in den Papyrusurkunden. Ein Beitrag zum gräko-ägyptischen Obligationenrecht*, Leipzig, 1911 (= Aalen, 1965), pp. 158-159, 166-167; cf. M. TALAMANCA, *BIDR*, Serie III, 2 (1960), pp. 253-255.

noted. The expression ἀφευρηκέναι τὴν ὠνήν, in contrast with ἐπιτετακέναι in l. 17, could mean that the auction of the tax yielded a lower price than in a previous year; but then why is the sale of the tax termed ὠνή and not διάπρασις as in l. 15? Another explanation could be that the tax-farming contract (ὠνή) was in deficit (ἀφευρίσκω), because the revenue of the tax was smaller than the price at which it was bought<sup>23</sup>; the expression ἀφευρίσκω τὴν ὠνήν was used then as a kind of counterpart to ἀναπληρώω τὴν ὠνήν<sup>24</sup>; probably to determine the cause of this deficit (or the lower bidding at the auction) the Ptolemaic financial administration asked for the accounts of the imported wine. Bagnall clearly underestimates the chronological value of the year 16 mentioned in this connection: "Both Euergetes and Philopator had sixteenth years, and the length over which cases could drag on in the bureaucracy should prevent us from assuming that a period of five years is preferable to one of fifteen (*sic*<sup>25</sup>) in a case of an important decrease in revenues"<sup>26</sup>. In my opinion it is far more probable that we are dealing here with a scrutiny of the accounts of five years, i.e. from the 16th year of Ptolemy IV<sup>27</sup> to the end of the 3rd year of Ptolemy V<sup>28</sup>, not only because the Ptolemies were not at all negligent when their revenues were at stake, but also because P. Tebt. I 8 itself attests to the fact that some taxes in the foreign possessions of the Ptolemies were farmed out for such five-year periods (l. 31: the purpur-tax in Lycia).

On the basis of the name Kallimedes and the appearance of a year 16, which in all likelihood refers to the reign of Philopator, it is preferable to return to a date under Ptolemy V Epiphanes for P. Tebt. I 8 col. I<sup>29</sup>. As the government apparently checked the wine-accounts till the end of the third year, and the taxes for the 4th year were already farmed out, the papyrus must date from the 4th year of Epiphanes (202-201).

Leuven

Eddy Lanciers

<sup>23</sup> This seems to be the interpretation of F. PREISIGKE, *Fachwörter des öffentlichen Verwaltungsdienstes Ägyptens in den griechischen Papyrusurkunden der ptolemäisch-römischen Zeit*, Göttingen, 1915 (= Hildesheim-New York, 1975), p. 37, s.v. ἀφευρίσκω: "was den Torzoll betrifft, so teilt er mit, daß er einen Minderertrag herausgefunden habe gegenüber dem (Inhalte des) Zoll-Pachtvertrages um x Talente". A deficit (ἀφεύρεμα) of tax-farmers is also mentioned in P. Coll. Youtie I 12 l. 3; P. Petrie III 93 col. III l. 3, 5; and P. Hels. I 21, where the expressions ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπογραφῆς τῶν ὠνῶν and ὁ πρὸς τῆι ὠνήι in my opinion do not mean "zuständiger Vorsteher der Steuerdeklarationen der Käufe" and "Steuerpächter der Verkehrssteuer", but are rather to be connected with tax-farmers and tax-farming contracts.

<sup>24</sup> For this expression see U. WILCKEN, *Griechische Ostraka aus Ägypten und Nubien*, I, München, 1899 (=Amsterdam, 1970), pp. 532-534.

<sup>25</sup> Between the 16th year of Euergetes (included) and the beginning of the 4th year of Philopator there are only 13 years.

<sup>26</sup> *JEA*, 61 (1975), p. 180 n. 45.

<sup>27</sup> In my opinion there is no relationship between this date and the 16th year used as a terminus ad quem in some documents: I hope to show elsewhere that this year is to be related to the reign of Epiphanes and not to that of Philopator as was assumed by T.C. SKEAT, *Notes on Ptolemaic Chronology. IV. The 16th Year of Ptolemy Philopator as a terminus ad quem*, in *JEA*, 59 (1973), pp. 169-174.

<sup>28</sup> E. VAN 'T DACK, *CdE*, 52 (1977), p. 373, already expressed some doubt about Bagnall's argumentation.

<sup>29</sup> I have used the papyrus as a document from the reign of Ptolemy V in my forthcoming study *Untersuchungen zur Regierungszeit Ptolemaios' V. Epiphanes (204-180 v.Chr.). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des hellenistischen Ägyptens* (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie der Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Letteren).