

WILLY CLARYSSE

TWO NEW ETHNICS IN PTOLEMAIC PAPYRI

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 92 (1992) 232–234

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

Two New Ethnics in Ptolemaic Papyri

1. VBP IV 47

The small town of Myndos, at the very end of the peninsula of Halikarnassos, was under Ptolemaic control during most of the third century B.C.¹ It is somewhat surprising therefore that Myndians in the Ptolemaic service are thus far only attested in the external possessions of the Ptolemies:

- Theokles son of Theogenes (PP VI 15147) and Herophantos son of Artemidoros (PP VI 15146) were sent as dikastai to Samos by Philokles, king of the Sidonians and "vice-roy of Ptolemaios I and II"² (PP VI 15085). Both were honoured and made proxenoi by the grateful Samians.
- A few years later Theokles' son Theogenes is honoured by the inhabitants of Argos (Mnemosyne 43, 1915, p. 366; M.LAUNEY, *Armées hellénistiques*, pp. 430 and 454)
- The origin of Hephaistios son of [- -]odoros, military officer in Thera (PP VI 15206), is far less certain, as his ethnic is partially supplemented: [Μύ]νδι[ος] and [Καλύ]νδι[ος] are both possible.

In Egypt itself no Myndians were attested thus far. Thanks to the excellent plate in the recent third volume of R.Seider's *Paläographie der griechischen Papyri III.1* (Stuttgart 1990), p. 326 we can now add a second century Myndian of a much lower social level to the people in the above list.

VBP IV 47 is an order to deliver (χρηματίσαι) 20 drachmae as opsonion to a certain Apollonios. Ll. 8-9 of the text were read as follows by the editor:

Ἄπολλωνίῳ Ἄ. [...]ίου Μεν<δ>αίῳ
τῷ α. [...]ρ[...]φ[ύ]λακι

The ethnic Μενδαίος is suspect because of the missing *delta*. The editor has envisaged "eine falsche Schreibung für Ἀθηναίος" *scil.* Ἀθηναίος, but he finally prefers the reading Μεν<δ>αίῳ³. In fact the papyrus clearly has Μύνδιῳ. The *delta* in the group δι is half open and less elaborate than in δια (l. 5) or in δι' οὐ and διωρθωσα (l. 11), where it constitutes the beginning of a word, but the group αι is written very differently in this hand (see χαίρειν l. 4, δηλοῦται l. 11, ἡγεμονίαι l. 14).

After name, patronymic and ethnic the editor reads a title, ending in -φύλαξ, "leider verstümmelt". A glance at the plate in Seider's book shows this reading to be quite impossible. The ending is]νῳι, with a rising *nu*, as in χαίρειν l. 4 and Πολιάνθης l. 7. The solution of the problem is given by ll. 11-12, where we find the participle διωρθωσάμενον applied to our man. Wilcken rightly suggested to the editor "daß sich Apollonios irgend eine Verfehlung zu schulden kommen lies und nach deren Gutmachung nun wieder zu seinem alten Truppenteil kommen soll". The "Gutmachung" is expressed by διορθωσάμενον, the "Verfehlung" by a similar participle in l. 9. I propose here δι[ω]ρ[θωμ]ένῳι, with the meaning "being punished, being fined". Of the dotted letters only the final *o-mega* is really doubtful.

¹ Cf. R.S.BAGNALL, *The administration of the Ptolemaic possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden 1976, pp. 97-98.

² Cf. H.HAUBEN, *Philokles king of the Sidonians and general of the Ptolemies*, in: *Phoenicia and the eastern Mediterranean in the first millenium B.C.*, Or. Lov. Anal. 22 (1987), pp. 413-427.

³ The passage is not listed in Calderini's *Dizionario* nor in any other reference work as far as I have

The text mentions a date, read by the editor as (ἔτους) μγ Ἐπειφ η in ll. 20, 22, 24, 26 and in the margin opposite l. 12. A second date occurs in l. 10, where Bilabel reads: κατὰ πρόσταγμα βασι(λέως) Παχῶν γ. This royal prostagma was incorporated by M.-Th. Lenger among the "allusions" in C.Ord. Ptol. pp. 252-253, n° 57. In fact the reading βασιλ(έως) is quite impossible; the papyrus clearly has (ἔτους) μγ Παχῶν γ *i.e.* 24 May 127 B.C. The prostagma is no doubt an administrative order, and the king has nothing to do with it⁴.

Since the letter is written in the same year as the ordinance and must of necessity be later than the latter, only the three months following Pachon enter into consideration for the date of the text: Pauni, Epeiph and Mesore. The name of the month is written very cursively each time it occurs. Bilabel has chosen Ἐπίφ, but in my opinion Παῶνι should be read (with the typical linking of rising *nu* with following *iota*). The reading is difficult because the middle part of the word is apparently written in "Verschleifung" in l. 20, 22 and 12: Π(αῶ)νι, whereas in l. 24 the writing is very faint [I propose Παυ(νι) η] and in l. 26 it is completely muddled. The present letter is then written on 28 June 127, one month after the prostagma.

The month is also mentioned in the cursive heading above the text, which clearly needs further revision. I cannot follow the editor's reading of ll. 2-3 εἰσγεν(ομένων) Ἐπειφ η [τ]ῷ ἄυτῷ ἔτει ἀργυ(ρίου) κ [/] ἀργυ(ρίου) δρα(χμαὶ) κ. Very tentatively I would suggest:

εἰστε.[. . .]. εφ ἦ
 ετει Παῶ(νι) ἦ ἀνεγρά(φη)

Since the text is clearly important for the study of the military administration, I venture here a first tentative translation of its central portion (ll. 4-22; the period is involved, the central idea being "Give order to deliver to Apollonios his pay"):

Amphikles greets Apollonios. Give order to deliver through Protarchos the secretary of the phalanx headed by Polianthes⁵ to Apollonios son of Dionusios (?)⁶, Myndian, the man who was fined, according to the ordinance of year 43, 3 Pachon, by which orders were given to pay (him) and to register him in the above mentioned company, in which he was also registered previously, the proper pay of the current "gift", (i.e.) twenty silver drachmae i.e. 20 silver.

Good health. Year 43, Pauni 8⁷.

2. PUG III 119

The text is a register of contracts, broken off on all sides, although the loss to the left and to the right does not seem to be very extensive.

The first contract preserved is a loan of money. One of the parties is a woman, and she is accompanied by her mother: συμπαρούσης καὶ συμπ[- -]. τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς Μαμάλα[ς - -] Ἐλυμαίας. The editor takes Ἐλυμαία as a personal name (see her note and the index), but

⁴ For prostagmata as administrative orders, see J.MODRZEJEWSKI, *The πρόσταγμα in the papyri*, JJP 5 (1951), pp. 187-206, esp. pp. 199-200.

⁵ In l. 7 φάλαγγας is apparently unavoidable, but this must be a scribal error for φάλαγγος (see also Wilcken in *Archiv* 8, 1927, p. 88). The relative pronoun after εφ has largely disappeared in a lacuna: Bilabel's reading ὧν, is not convincing, but ἧς is equally difficult.

⁶ Δι[ονυσ]ίου is just possible, but far from certain.

there can be no doubt that it is an ethnic, and that the personal description follows the regular pattern: name (Μαμαλά), patronymic (lost in the lacuna), ethnic (Ἐλυμαία), age, complexion.

Elumaïs or Elumaia (Elam) was a region in the area of Susa, between Babylonia and Persis. The Elumaeans were a warlike people and contributed excellent archers to the Seleucid armies⁸. This is their first appearance in Egypt. The name Mamala (the final *alpha*, not read by the editor, looks certain from the photograph), sounds exotic and may be Elamitic, although it could also be a variant of the Greek woman's name Μάμαλον, Μαμάλη, discussed by L. Robert in *Hellenica* 6 (1948), pp. 89-90⁹.

According to ll. 12-13 this contract is entrusted to a certain Sokrates, who acts as συγγραφοφύλαξ, "keeper of the contract". The editor reads the passage as follows:

σ]υγγραφ(οφύλαξ) μ(ισθώσεως) (δραχμαὶ) ξ Σωκράτης Κ[
]...αἰος κληροῦχος

The photograph (plate 28) clearly shows that the name Σωκράτης is not preceded by a series of abbreviations, but by the word συγγραφοφύλαξ written fully out (the *Haken-alpha* was read by the editor as a symbol for drachmae). Since Sokrates is a soldier (see the word κληροῦχος in l. 13) no patronymic is expected on the basis of the Nomenklaturregel¹⁰. The word following Sokrates is therefore an ethnic, e.g. Κυ[ρηναῖος]. In the lacuna after it the name of the eponymous officer is lost. The word preceding κληροῦχος should be part of his military title. Ll. 12-13 should therefore be read as follows:

σ]υγγραφοφύλαξ Σωκράτης Κ.[
[τῶν τοῦ δεῖνα - -]...αἰος κληροῦχος.

With l. 14 a new contract begins. Since the first party has no military title, Αἰακ[.]υς should be an ethnic or demotic, preceded by a patronymic in the genitive. I read:

[NN σ]τράτου Αἰακ[ιδε]ῦς ὡς (ἐτῶν) να.

For the Alexandrian demotic Aiakideus, see P.M.FRASER, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* I, p. 45; II, p. 122 n.58 and P.Petrie² I 1 l. 49 and 16 ll. 92-93.

The second party is a woman, a certain Musta, and she is accompanied by her kyrios Eupolemos. The presence of the patronymic¹¹ and the young age of Eupolemos suggest that he was a member of the epigone and that ll. 18-19 should be supplemented as follows:

Εὐπολέμου τοῦ Φιλ.[- - ethnic τῆς ἐπιγον]ῆς¹²

Leuven

Willy Clarysse

⁸ See M.LAUNEY, *Recherches sur les Armées hellénistiques*, Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 169 (1949), I, p. 583.

⁹ Robert's conclusion that the name is Greek is accepted by L. ZGUSTA, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, Prag 1964, p. 284.

¹⁰ For the Nomenklaturregel, see F.UEBEL, *Die Kleruchen Aegyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*, Abhandl. der deutschen Akad. der Wissensch., zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1968.3, pp. 11-13. Add now BGU XIV 2367.

¹¹ According to the Nomenklaturregel (see preceding note). A similar instance is found in PUG III 127, where I read [ὁ δεῖνα Ἀπ]ολλωνίου Σάμιος τῆς ἐπιγονῆς.