

JOSHUA D. SOSIN & JOHN F. OATES

P.DUK.INV. 314: AGATHIS, STRATEGOS AND HIPPARCHES OF THE ARSINOITE
NOME

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 118 (1997) 251–258

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

P.DUK.INV. 314: AGATHIS, STRATEGOS AND HIPPARCHES OF THE ARSINOITE NOME

We present here a papyrus from the holdings of the Special Collections Library at Duke University.¹ P.Duk.inv. 314 is a petition sent by Theambesis, a wine-seller from Oxyrhyncha, to a strategos and hipparches; the subscription is dated to a seventh regnal year. An unfortunate tear in the papyrus has removed the name of the addressee, but not his striking title. Only one “strategos and hipparches” is attested in Ptolemaic Egypt, in *P.Petr.* III 31.1, a petition dated to 199/198 and addressed to Agathis, the strategos and hipparches of the Arsinoite nome. The other texts recovered from the same cartonnage as P.Duk.inv. 314 date from the early second century, and come from the Arsinoite.² On the basis of the unique title and the consistent dates and provenience of the other Duke texts that were recovered with P.Duk.inv. 314, we suggest that Agathis should be restored as the addressee of P.Duk.inv. 314; the seventh regnal year of the subscription falls under Epiphanes (199/198). The last decade of the third century and the first decade of the second are only sparsely represented by strategoi in the Arsinoite. Agathis appears to have been the successor to another strategos attested in the Duke collection.³

The papyrus

This large, pale tan papyrus survives almost intact. A rectangular piece roughly 8 x 4 cm. has been torn from the upper left corner of the papyrus. The first half of the first line has been completely removed, and the name of the addressee with it. The first half of the second line has suffered as well, but the tear runs directly through the middle of the letters, leaving the lower halves easily visible. Two circular holes in the papyrus, roughly 3 cm. in diameter, have damaged parts of lines 21-25. The upper margin is slightly over 3.5 cm., the left just over 1.5 cm., and the bottom 2.5 cm. The right margin is fairly uniform and just short of flush with the edge of the papyrus.

Four different hands appear on the papyrus. The principal hand, responsible for the petition itself, occupies 39 lines of text. The second hand, Agathis’ own or that of a clerk in his office, is responsible for the dated subscription (40-43), with which Agathis forwards the text to Chairephanes, the epistates, summoning the parties involved. The third hand, from Agathis’ office, writes the forwarding address, “to Chairephanes” (verso 43). The fourth hand is a simple entry-docket that originates most likely from Agathis’ office (verso 44). The first hand flows in a swift, but very tidy, dark black ink along the fibres. The first three lines of the petition seem to have been written with exceptional care. Little remains of the first two, but the *theta* and *beta* of Θεαμβήσιος (2) are carefully rounded. The *nus* in Ὀνωφόριος

¹ All papyrological citations follow J. F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, in Duke University, Special Collections Library, “Duke Papyrus Archive” [hereafter *DPA*], <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>>, 1997 [in print see *idem*, *BASP* suppl. 7 (1992)]. All dates are BCE unless otherwise noted. We have benefited from discussions of this text in the past with Klaus Maresch, Dieter Hagedorn, Peter van Minnen and Zola Packman. We are grateful also to Kent Rigsby for comments and criticisms, and to Maxwell Watman and Rachael A. Thomas

² The papyrus was acquired in 1984, along with ten other pieces (P.Duk.inv. 313, 315-323). For acquisition information see *DPA*, <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/acquisitions.html>>. 1997. Digital scans and catalogue records may be found on the *DPA*, <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/>>, 1997. P.Duk.inv. 313 has been published by W. H. Willis, “Comoedia Dukiana,” *GRBS* 32 (1991) 331-353. Willis (333) dated the Comoedia Dukiana to the late third or early second century and rightly suspected that the other pieces were roughly contemporary; the date of P.Duk.inv. 314 is consistent with this date. To Willis’ comments on the group we can add that P.Duk.inv. 316, 317 (both in extremely poor shape) and perhaps 318 mention Ptolemaios, the strategos of the Arsinoite, who seems to have succeeded Agathis – earliest attestation is at *P.Athen.* 8 of 193/192 (*PP* I 312); for the date see L. Mooren, “Notes concernant quelques stratèges ptolémaïques,” *AncSoc* 1 (1970) 9-24, esp. 12. So three, possibly four, of the eleven texts may have come from the office of the strategos.

³ J. D. Sosin, “P.Duk.inv. 677: Aetos, from Arsinoite Strategos to Eponymous Priest,” *ZPE* 116 (1997) 141-146.

(2) and οἰνοκαπήλιος (2) touch the baseline with both vertical strokes. There is only a slight hint of the backward lean of the rearing *nu*, which is more characteristic of the other *nus* in the text. A broad and generous spacing also appears from the end of Ὀννώφριος (2) through the first half of οἰνοκαπήλιος (2).

Throughout the body of the text the scribe is somewhat more free, but no less careful. Connecting strokes are widely employed, so that the text appears to depend evenly from the headline (see especially Πολέμωνος 8; τοῦ δὲ 17; τοῦ αὐτοῦ 20). The initial letters of lines are written with great care: note the *deltas* in lines 9 (ἐπέδωκα), 10 (διακαφοῦσα), and 12 (δοῦναι), the *alphas* in lines 7 (αὐτήν) and 33 (ἄξιῶ). All *omegas* exhibit a single hoop. Connected *alphas* are open at the top and almost graceful. As a result when *alpha* and *iota* or *omega* and *iota* are joined by a connecting stroke, the two pairs look very similar. *Betas* and *thetas* are neatly rounded throughout (Θεαμβήσιος 2; Βρομίου 5; διεληλυθότος 17; φθείρεται 32; βοηθείας 38). The second hand, fast and “cursive,” is in a lighter, blackish ink. The third runs quickly in large letters; the ink is very faded. The fourth hand is written in a neat, blockish style.

In contrast to the great skill with which the script is executed, the prose contains several peculiarities in syntax and style. See the notes below on ἀδικουμένη (4), ὑπάρχοντός ... γνώσει (10-11), τοκιεῖ (15), αὐτόν (19), οὐκ ... πλήθους (22-24), ἐνεχυράσαντα (34-35).

The situation

Theambesis petitions Agathis, the strategos of the Arsinoite nome, for redress in the matter of a wrong done her by Heliodoros son of Bromios. Theambesis lent 1264 drachmas of bronze and 1 1/2 artabas of grain to Heliodoros on the condition that he pay back the loan with interest on the bronze at the end of three months. When the time was up Heliodoros did not return the money and grain, but offered a heavy coat as security instead, promising to return with the payment in one month. His failure to do so prompted Theambesis to ask the strategos to refer the matter to Chairephanes, the epistates. Chairephanes and Heliodoros paid Theambesis little attention, so she asks Agathis again to be more stern with Chairephanes and to resolve her problem once and for all.

The loan

The loan in this text was made in Tybi of the fifth year of Epiphanes (ii 9 - iii 8, 200) and lasted until Phamenoth 30 (v 9). The loan was extended for a month, to Pharmouthi 30 (vi 8). The loan anticipates the harvest. By Tybi (February) the nature of the harvest would be evident and by May the crop would have been harvested. Perhaps in this case another month was needed to have the wheat threshed or processed and thus the loan was extended against the security of Heliodoros' heavy cloak.

The amount of the loan is small; 1264 drachmas are probably the monetary equivalent four or five artabas of wheat. Prices are notoriously difficult to assess and not many survive from the early second century.⁴ The loan of wheat is also very small; the loan would have been of one artaba and the repayment of one and a half artabas of wheat.⁵ Heliodoros borrows the wheat when it would be most expensive on the market. Repayment seems to have been scheduled for after the harvest, when wheat

⁴ There is a list of prices in the appendices to K. Maresch, *Bronze und Silber: Papyrologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Währung im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten bis zum 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, *Pap.Colon.* XXV, 181ff. Only one price for wheat survives from the first decade of the second century: *P.Köln* V 217. Maresch gives value ratios for the monetary expressions on page 17; in “book” drachmas (Rechendr.) in this period 1200 drachmas equals 1 Alexandrian tetradrachm.

⁵ The interest on loans in kind is 50% in the Ptolemaic period, regardless of the amount or duration of the loan. See P. Pestman, “Loans Bearing No Interest?,” *JJP* 16-17 (1971) 7-29, esp. 9-14; N. Lewis, “The Meaning of σὺν ἡμιολίᾳ and Kindred Expressions in Loan Contracts,” *TAPA* 76 (1945) 126-139; see also *P.Dion.* p. 183.

prices would have fallen.⁶ Probably the loan is intended to provide for Heliodoros in the short period just before the harvest after which he should have been able to make repayment. The small loan, short duration, and mode of repayment already evident make it surprising that there was a default and that Theambesis petitions the strategos not once but twice in the matter.

The rational basis for the awkward sum of 1264 is not immediately evident. In the first place we do not know whether the loan is ἄτοκος, that is with the interest included in the capital sum, or whether the interest was to be paid in addition to the capital sum. In this period the interest rate was 24% per annum.⁷ We know neither the original sum of the loan nor the portion of the 1264 drachmas that stood as interest or penalty. We also cannot be certain that the loan was contracted on the first of Tybi. We can only guess at the evidently vague circumstances of this transaction, which would have made sense to all parties involved. It is important to note that in spite of the small size of the transaction, the document shows Theambesis' second and determined effort to recover her money and grain.

Agathis strategos and hipparches

The title “strategos and hipparches” is attested only in P.Duk.inv. 314 and *P.Petr.* III 31. Ptolemaic strategoi carry only a limited set of additional titles. The strategia is not associated with aulic titles in any formalized way until the second quarter of the second century.⁸ The only other title with which the post is regularly combined is also non-military: ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προκόδων. In the Arsinoite nome these are limited to a very few specific cases, the earliest of which appears more than fifty years after Agathis' tenure.⁹ The combination of the titles ἱπάρχης ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν and πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι, always in that order, has been noted previously.¹⁰ The instances of the combination of the two titles are confined to a single man, Ammonios, and to roughly the same period, ca. 118. If, in fact, the titles “strategos” and “πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι” are interchangeable in the Thinite, whence come all the examples of the combined titles, the posts certainly are not equivalent in the Arsinoite.¹¹ There are only perhaps three close parallels from the Arsinoite. *P.Tebt.* III.1 700.66-67 mentions a Εὐβίου τ[οῦ πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι] τεταγμένου. The text is dated to 125/124, the year for which Philinos is attested as strategos (*P.Tebt.* III.1 700.18-19, 97).¹² An Aristomachos is called τεταγμένος πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι in 225 (*P.Gurob* 2.7). In *P.Tebt.* III.1 815 Fr. 10.5-7 (223/222) a petitioner refers to a complaint that he has formally lodged with Ἀφθο[ν]ήτωι τῶι στρατηγῶι καὶ Ζήνωνι τῶι πρὸς τῶι [c]υβτάγματι τεταγμένωι. Perhaps the reading of Zenon's title should be corrected to τῶι πρὸς τῆι [c]τρατηγίαι τεταγμένωι. The

⁶ See Pestman (n. 5) 9, n. 9.

⁷ For ἄτοκος meaning that “interest is included in the capital sum,” see Pestman, (n. 5) 7-29. The basic work on loans is H.-A. Rupprecht, *Untersuchungen zum Darlehen im Recht der graeco-ägyptischen Papyri der Ptolemäerzeit*, (Munich 1967) [= *Münchener Beiträge* 51], 73-90, esp. 74 n. 7. See also idem, *Kleine Einführung in die Papyrskunde*, (Darmstadt 1994) 118-121. Compare also *CPR* XVIII 14, 16, and 24, on which see also the introduction 45-46.

⁸ L. Mooren, *La hiérarchie de cour ptolémaïque*, (Leuven 1977) 17-38; for an illustration of the phenomenon, the outdated H. Henne, “Sur la titulature aulique des stratèges de nomes à l'époque ptolémaïque,” *REA* 42 (1940) 172-186 is still useful; cf. L. Mooren, *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt: Introduction and Prosopography*, (Brussels 1975) 98-107 # 67-87 for the Arsinoite.

⁹ Sarapion (*PP* I 327); *P.Tebt.* III.2 924 (144); Phantias (*PP* I 340); *P.Tebt.* I 61b 363 (140/139); Phantias: *P.Tebt.* I 72d 359 (140/139); [Phantias]: *P.Tebt.* III.2 959 (140); Phantias: *P.Tebt.* III.1 785.1-2 (138); Phantias: *P.Tebt.* I 61b 46 (137/136); Apollonios (*PP* I 222 = I 937); *P.Tebt.* III.1 802.5-7 (135); Apollonios: *P.Amh.* II 35.1-2 (132); Lysanias (*PP* I 277); *I.Fay.* I 71 = *SB* V 8888 (95). See also Philinos (*PP* I 341); *P.Tebt.* III.1 700.18-19, 97 (125/124), strategos and grammateus of the [...]; Eirenaios (*PP* I 250); *P.Tebt.* III.1 791 (117/116) epistates and grammateus of the katoikoi hippeis and strategos; Ptolemaios (*PP* I 319); *I.Fay.* I 13.3-5 = *SB* V 7787 (42) strategos and exegetes of the Arsinoite.

¹⁰ L. Mooren, “On the Jurisdiction of the Nome Strategoi in Ptolemaic Egypt,” *Congr.* XVII 3.1217-1225, 1223.

¹¹ See *PSI* III 166-174 and *PP* I 210 as cited by Mooren (n. 10) 1223 n. 40. For a carrier of the title in Philae see *I.Philae* 320.13 (116); see also L. Mooren, “The Strategos Athenaios, his Subordinate Nestor, and the Administrative Organization of the Southern Thebaid,” *Cd'É* 55 (1980) 262-270.

¹² Mooren, (n. 10) 1222, does note that Eubios' post must be subordinate to the strategia.

titles of Eubios, Aristomachos and Zenon are otherwise anomalous.¹³ They permit us neither to equate the titles strategos and πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι nor to associate the combination of the titles ἱπάρχης ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν and πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι with the strategoi of the Arsinoite nome. Agathis' title hipparches, moreover, is not demonstrably equivalent to ἱπάρχης ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν, since the latter does not occur until the second half of the second century. The pair of titles strategos and hipparches, attested only in P.Duk.inv. 314 and *P.Petr.* III 31, is so unprecedented¹⁴ that we must identify the carrier of the titles in the Duke text with the Agathis of *P.Petr.* III 31; Agathis' name must stand in the lacuna in the first line of P.Duk.inv. 314.

The date

In *P.Petr.* III 31 Sentheus son of Sochotes,¹⁵ royal farmer and village-scribe of Lysimachis complains that an ox of his was killed on the royal road. W. Clarysse has read 4 1/2 lines that had not been transcribed in the initial publication. These lines reveal that Sentheus claimed that the ox was worth 8000 drachmas, an amount that could only have been measured in bronze; this means that the seventh year in which the events took place fell after ca. 210 and the change from a silver standard to a bronze standard. So the text, and with it Agathis' term as strategos of the Arsinoite, was re-dated to 199/198, the seventh year of Epiphanes' reign.¹⁶

Another, roughly contemporary Agathis is mentioned in *P.Frankf.* 6.2. F. Uebel argued that this Agathis, having charge of the Herakleopolite or Oxyrhynchite nomes, not the Arsinoite, is not the same as the Agathis as in *P.Petr.* III 31.¹⁷ W. Clarysse and E. Lanciers have followed Uebel.¹⁸ The following pieces of evidence may be added to their arguments. *P.Hib.* I 33 is an *apographê* of sheep from Rhoimeôtes, a Thracian in the troop of Aetos. The text is dated with reasonable certainty to the second year of Euergetes' reign, 245. It is probable that this Aetos is the same Aetos who commands a group of Thracians in *P.Frankf.* 5.2, 10, 18. *P.Frankf.* 5 is likewise an *apographê* of sheep, but it contains also a declaration εἰς τὰ ἀλικά. The mention of the salt-tax suggests that the seventh year, by which the document is dated, falls before the late 220s, after which attestations of the salt-tax are very rare.¹⁹

¹³ There may be two further instances in the Enteuxis papyri: in *P.Enteux.* 73.9-10 the petitioner asks the king to προστάξει Διοφάνει τῶι [στρατηγῶι γράψαι ca. ?] | τεταγμένοι ἐν τῆι Θεμίτου μερίδι; the entire right half of the papyrus is lost and its original dimensions cannot be deduced, but perhaps we should restore [στρατηγῶι γράψαι X τῶι πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι] | τεταγμένοι. This restoration may bear directly on *P.Enteux.* 63.10, [c ? τετα]γμένοι ὑπὸ Διοφάνου πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι. The editor notes "on peut hésiter entre τετα]γμένοι et λελε]μμένοι . . . mais, à vrai dire, la lettre mutilée ressemble un peu plus à un μ." U. Wilcken, *ArchPap* 10 (1932) 246, and C. C. Edgar, *JEA* 19 (1933) 108-109, 109, independently restored καταλελε]μμένοι. On the strength of the restoration in *P.Enteux.* 73.9-10 above we suggest that the reading of the *editio princeps* should be restored, but certainty is impossible. Equally unexplained are the two occurrences of the title διεξάγων τὰ κατὰ τὴν στρατηγίαν: *P.Tebt.* I 72b.25-26 (διεξάγων τὰ κατὰ τὴν στρατηγίαν καὶ τὰς προσόδους; 114/113), III.1 790.1 (II).

¹⁴ It is generally agreed that the military functions of the nome strategoi dissolved in the second and first centuries. There are, however, a few isolated cases in which the strategos seems to play a military role: Mooren (n. 10) 1222-1225. For the moment the most we can say about Agathis' unique title is that it may point to his inclusion among those few cases.

¹⁵ *PP* I 837 = VIII 837; see *P.Petr.* II 38a, III 34. For the later dating of these texts see M. Hombert and C. Préaux, "Recherches sur le *proselgelma* à l'époque ptolémaïque," *CdÉ* 17 (1942) 259-286, 264, 274; L. Criscuolo, "Ricerca sul komogrammateus," *Aegyptus* 58 (1978) 3-101, 82 n. 2; W. Clarysse and E. Lanciers, "Currency and the Dating of Demotic and Greek Papyri from the Ptolemaic Period," *AncSoc* 20 (1989) 117-132, 126 n. 31.

¹⁶ The worth of the ox leaves some doubt whether the seventh regnal year falls under Epiphanes (199/198) or Philometor (175/174) but the former date is secured on prosopographical grounds: Clarysse and Lanciers (n. 15) 125-127. On the change from a silver standard to bronze see Maresch (n. 4) 18-20, 21-51, 58-61.

¹⁷ F. Uebel, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*, (Berlin 1968) 138-139 n. 3; cf. G. Mussies, "Supplément à la liste des stratèges des nomes égyptiens de H. Henne," *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* XIV, 13-46, 16 #23.

¹⁸ Clarysse and Lanciers (n. 15) 125-127.

¹⁹ On the dates of the salt-tax see W. Clarysse and D. J. Thompson, "The Salt-Tax Rate Once Again," *CdÉ* 70 (1995) 223-229, *O.Vleem.* p. 35-36, *P.Brookl.* 32; *O.Ashm.Shelt.* 1, with bibliography since F. Uebel, "Die Frühptolemäische

Furthermore, the author of this declaration is Tarouthinas, a Thracian in Aetos' troop. The name is quite rare in the Ptolemaic period.²⁰ The only contemporary Tarouthinas is the recipient of *P.Frankf.* 6, a letter from an unknown Theophilos, who asks that Tarouthinas resolve a case between two men in accordance with Agathis' request. The letter is dated to the fourth year. There is no doubt that the two men named Tarouthinas (*P.Frankf.* 5, 6) are the same; there is little doubt that the two men named Aetos (*P.Hib.* I 33, *P.Frankf.* 5) are the same. The fourth regnal year by which *P.Frankf.* 6 is dated, therefore, should agree with the dates of *P.Hib.* I 33, and *P.Frankf.* 5, falling under Euergetes, 244/243. In the light of the prosopographical evidence and the mention of the salt-tax in *P.Frankf.* 5, we must, with Uebel, Clarysse and Lanciers, dissociate these two men named Agathis.

Given the solid identification of the Duke Agathis with the Agathis in *P.Petr.* III 31, and the dissociation of both from the Agathis in *P.Frankf.* 6, P.Duk.inv. 314 must be dated to the seventh year of Epiphanes' reign (199/198), during which we know that Agathis held the position of strategos of the Arsinoite (*P.Petr.* III 31).²¹ His predecessor Aetos occupied the post in the third year of Epiphanes' reign, 203/202.²² His successor Ptolemaios began his long tenure of the strategia by the thirteenth year of Epiphanes' reign, 193/192 (*P.Athen.* 8).²³ We do not know the precise limits of the three terms. But since Ptolemaios' tenure lasted at least through 170 (*BGU* III 1012) and perhaps as late as 168/167, after which Demonax held the strategia (*P.Erasm.* I 3), it may be wise not to extend Ptolemaios' career any earlier. It is possible, therefore, that Agathis held the post of strategos until 194/193. The evidence, however, does not provide proof of these dates, nor does it permit us to rule out the possibility of another, yet unattested, strategos for the years between Agathis and Ptolemaios.

P.Duk.inv. 314

31.7 x 13.5 cm.

xi 2, 199 BCE

Arsinoite

Tafel II

Special Collections Library at Duke University, "Duke Papyrus Archive," <[http:// scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/314.html](http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/314.html)>. 1997.

TEXT

[Ἄγαθίδι στρα]τηγῶι καὶ
 ἰππάρχῃ παρὰ Θεαμβήσιος
 τῆς Ὀννώφριος οἰνοκαπή-
 4 λιος. ἀδικουμένη ὑπὸ Ἡλι-
 οδώρου τοῦ Βρομίου τῶν
 κατοικούντων μοι τὴν
 αὐτὴν Ὀξύρυγχα τῆς
 8 Πολέμωνος μερίδος, ἐπέ-

Salzsteuer," *Congr.* XI 325-368. There are only two second-century attestations of the salt-tax: P. van Minnen, "Taking Stock," *BASP* 31 (1994) 89-99, 95 (151/150 or 140/139), with note on *P.Tebt.* III.2 880 (181/180 or 157/156). *P.dem. Berl. Eleph.* I 13537 (217) and *O.Vleem.* 25 (219) appear to be the latest third-century attestations. Argumentation on these grounds, however, ought to remain tentative until the appearance of W. Clarysse and D. J. Thompson's study of the Ptolemaic census, mentioned by van Minnen 89.

²⁰ *P.Cair.Zen.* IV 59656.10 (III), *P.Frankf.* 5.2, 10, 18, verso 1, *P.Frankf.* 6.1, verso 1, *PSI* I 64.1 (I?), Tarusinas *P.Lond.* VII 2098, 2 (III). On Thracian onomastics see V. I. Velkov and A. Fol, "Les Thraces en Égypte gréco-romaine," *Studia Thracica* 4 (Sofia 1977); J. Bingen, "Le Thraces en Égypte ptolémaïque," *Pulpudeva* 4 (1980) 72-79. The name does become common in the sixth century AD in the Oxyrhynchite.

²¹ See note on line 14 below.

²² Sosin, (n. 3) 142-143.

²³ L. Mooren, (n. 2) 9-12; Sosin (n. 3) 142-143.

- δωκά σοι ὑπόμνημα
 διασαφοῦσά σοι ὑπάρχον-
 τός μοι αὐτοῦ ἐν γνώσει
 12 δοῦναί με αὐτῶι διὰ χερσὸς
 χαλκοῦ (δραχμὰς) Ἀσξδ καὶ πυ-
 ρῶν (ἀρτάβας) α (ἥμισυ) τοῦ ε (ἔτους) Τῦβι
 ἐφ' ᾧ τοκιεῖ μοι τὸν χαλκὸν
 16 ἕως Φαμενώθ λ τοῦ αὐτοῦ (ἔτους),
 τοῦ δὲ χρόνου διεληλυθότος
 ἀπαιτούμενον ὑπό μου
 δοῦναί μοι αὐτὸν γαυνάκην
 20 τοῦ Φαρμοῦθι τοῦ αὐτοῦ (ἔτους)
 [ἐ]φ' ᾧ κομιεῖται [π]ρὸς τὴν λ̄
 [το]ῦ αὐτοῦ μη[νὸς, οὐ]κ ἀξίου
 [ᾔ]ντο]ς τοῦ προ[γεγρα]μμένου
 24 [πλή]θους. ἐπ[ειδὴ δὲ] σ]οῦ γράψαγ-
 [τος] Χαιρεφάνει[ι τ]ῶι ἐπιστά-
 τη ἀποστεῖλαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σὲ
 ὅπως ἐπαναγκασθῆι κομικά-
 28 μενος τὸν γαυνάκην ἀποδοῦ-
 ναί μοι τὰ προγεγραμμένα
 κάθοτι ἡξίου, οὐθένα μου
 λόγον ἐποιήσαντο ὅ τε γαυ-
 32 νάκης φθείρεται κείμενος,
 ἀξιώ σε γράψαι τῶι Χαιρεφάνει
 ἐπιστροφέστερον ἐνεχυρά-
 σαντα αὐτὸν ἀποστεῖλαι
 36 ἐπὶ σὲ ἵνα μὴ περὶ τῶν
 αὐτῶν σε παρενοχλῶ ἀλλὰ
 διὰ σὲ τύχῳ βοηθείας.
 εὐτύχει.
 40 (m2) Χαιρεφάνει.
 πέμψον πρὸς ἡμᾶς
 τοὺς [ἐ]γκαλ(ου)μένους (ἔτους) ζ Θῶτ κβ̄
 verso (m3) Χαιρεφάνει.
 44 (m4) εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν.

TRANSLATION

Recto:

To Agathis strategos and hipparches from Theambesis, daughter of Onnophris, wine-seller. Being wronged by Heliodoros son of Bromios, one of those who inhabit, as I do, Oxyrhyncha of the Polemon division, I submitted a memorandum to you in order to make clear to you that, since he was an acquaintance of mine, I gave him by hand 1264 drachmas of bronze and 1 1/2 artabas of wheat in the fifth year, in Tybi, on the condition that he pay me the interest on the bronze until Phamenoth 30 of the same year, but when the time had elapsed, when demanded back by me, he gave me a *gaunakes* in

Pharmouthi of the same year on the condition that he pick it up on the 30th of the same month, although it was not worth the aforewritten sum. But since when you wrote to Chairephanes the epistates to send him to you so that he might be compelled to pick up the *gaunakes* and give me the aforewritten amount, as I asked, they made no account of me and since the *gaunakes* is going to waste on deposit, I ask that you write more forcefully to Chairphanes, that he, seizing the security, send him [sc. Heliodoros] to you so that I not trouble you over these same matters, but so that I may get aid because of you. Farewell.

To Chairephanes. Send to us the accused. Year 7, Thoth 22.

Verso:

To Chairephanes. For reading.

NOTES

2. The form of the name Theambesis occurs elsewhere in the papyri only in another text from the Duke collection: P.Duk.inv. 316, a letter in extremely poor condition from the same Theambesis (there Thaembesis) to Arridaios the epistates of Oxyrhyncha; see *DPA* <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/314.html>>.1997. Thabesis is attested in *P.Oxy.* VI 918.12, 22, 24 (II AD). For Taambesis see *P.Mich.* II 123.12.30 (45-47 AD). For Ταμβήσ (genitive Ταμβέου) see *P.Hib.* I 106.6 (246/245), I 107.6 (244/243), *SB* XII 10783.7 (ca. 246); for genitive Ταμβείου see *P.Tebt.* III.2 834 fr. 3.68 (III/II); for dative Ταμβεῖτι see *CPR* I 181.3 (II AD). Ambesis occurs in *P.Tebt.* I 90.2.5 (I), *BGU* IV 1061.12 (14), and more commonly in the Roman period: *P.Congr.* XV 14.42 (41-48/9 AD), *P.Corn.* 21.99 (25 AD), *P.Corn.* 22.107 (I AD), 23 fr.A 2.34 (I AD), *P.Mil.Congr.* XVII p. 68/78 recto 2.8, verso 4.2 (30/31 AD), *P.Princ.* I 8.5.23 (27-32 AD), I 10.2.7 (34 AD) I 10.6.2, 4 (34 AD), I 13.17.14 (ca. 35 AD), *P.Turner* 32.14 (ca. 201-211 AD), *SB* I 5124.4.95 (193 AD).
- 3-4. The nominative in -tc for feminine occupational epithets is much more common with compounds of -πωλιc. Only one other (-καπηλιc is attested: *P.Fay.* 12.23 (ca. 103). On the genitive in -toc with -πωλιc see Sosin, (n. 3) 146 note to 6-7; H. -J. Drexhage, "Die Komposita mit -πώλης und -πράτης im hellenistischen Ägypten," *MBAH* 10 (1991) 1-17.
4. Note the departure from the more standard formula, "ἀδικοῦμαι" Theambesis begins with the participle ἀδικουμένη instead of the more usual finite verb. The introduction with a participle is uncommon in the Ptolemaic period and later, but not unparalleled: *P.Erasm.* 3.7 (166), *P.Mert.* I 5.3 (149-135), *P.Oxy.* XVII 2133.6 (III AD), *PSI* IV 399.2 (244/243) *P.Tebt.* III.2 952.4 (ca. 155), *P.Tor.Choach.* 4.3 (111), 5A 6 (110), 5B 7 (110), *SB* XVI 12305.6 (II), XVIII 13256.2 (268-246/230-221), *O.Bodl.* I 371.3 (?). On the formulaic ἀδικοῦμαι see A. Di Bitonto, "Frammenti di petizioni del periodo tolemaico," *Aegyptus* 56 (1976) 109-143, esp. 116.
- 4-16. The syntax is choppy. The genitive absolute ὑπάρχοντός μοι αὐτοῦ ἐν γνώσει (10-11) is awkward. ὑπάρχοντί . . . αὐτῷ would follow more smoothly, in agreement with αὐτῷ (12). The sense, however, is perfectly clear.
11. For the designation ἐν γνώσει, for someone who is an acquaintance, see *P.Col.* IV 74.9 (248): τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἐν γνώσει, *P.Col.* IV 115 h 2-3 (III?): [ὁ τ]ῆν ἐπιστολὴν παρ[ακομίζων σοὶ ἐστὶν ἡμῖν] [ἐ]ν γνώσει.
14. ε (ἔτους): the subscription is dated to Thoth 22 of the seventh year. Heliodoros failed to pay for the second time at the end of Pharmouthi, year 5, nearly eighteen months earlier. It is safe, therefore, to conjecture that Theambesis' first petition to Agathis was sent in the fifth year (201/200) or the sixth (200/199), and that Agathis' tenure of the strategia may have run for at least three years, through the fifth, sixth and seventh years of Epiphanes' reign, 201/200-199/198.
15. The verb τοκίζω does not occur without prefix elsewhere in the papyri. A prefixed form occurs only once: ἐξετόκιεν, *BGU* VI 1246.24 (III), governing no direct object. The noun τόκος gives rise only to the causal τοκίζω. The form here, τοκτεῖ, is the future indicative active of τοκίζω, but improperly used. Τοκίζω always means "to lend X at interest," not "to pay interest on X." The meaning here, however, is transparent: to pay back the capital and the accrued interest.
19. A *gaunakes* is a valuable, heavy and somewhat uncommon garment. The voiced and unvoiced initial letter is in free exchange. *Gaunakes*: *P.Cair.Zen.* IV 59539 B 4 (ca. 258), *P.Cair.Zen.* IV 59598.1 (III), *P.Lond.* VII 2141.3, 55 (III), *P.Zen.Pestm.* 51.28 (257); *kaunakes*: *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59048.3 (257?), *P.Hib.* I 121.11 (251-249), *PSI* VI 605.1 (III), *PSI* VI 678.10 (III), *P.Mich.* XVIII 778.24 (193/192-). The reiteration of the subject, αὐτόν, is awkward. The reading is somewhat difficult, but no other reading seems to satisfy the space and the visible traces of ink. Perhaps the redundancy is due in part to the clause's similarity in placement and form to that of line 12: δοῦναί με αὐτῷ.
- 22-24. As with the genitive absolute in 10-11, the genitive absolute, οὐκ ἄξιου [ὄντο]c τοῦ προ[γεγραμ]μένου [πλή]θους, is awkward. Grammar would prefer accusatives, in agreement with the elliptical direct object of κοιμῆται. In both cases the genitive absolute seems to be used paratactically as if to lend greater circumstantial emphasis to the clause.
31. With the shift to the plural, ἐποιήσαντο, Theambesis seems to imply collusion between Chairephanes and Heliodoros, as if the former tacitly disregarded the strategos' initial orders – of course it is also possible that Agathis never acted on Theambesis' first petition.

32. The *gaunakes* is not in a state of physical decay. The principal plus the interest accruing on the loan is exceeding the market value of the *gaunakes*; thus the garment is “going to waste” by remaining on deposit (κείμενος). We have some idea what the value of a *gaunakes* was in the mid-third century. *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59319 (249) is an account, one of whose entries reads (2, 7): κωνάκαι β πο(ρφοροῖ?) μν(αῖ) 30 (δραχμάς) 37 1/2. The garments apparently weigh an impressive 15 minas each, and are worth 18 3/4 drachmas of silver each. Another roughly contemporary *gaunakes* is registered in a private account, *P.Hib.* I 121.11 (251/250) as purchased for 4 drachmas of silver. The difference between the two prices is too wide to allow any calculation of the rate at which the interest is exceeding the worth of the *gaunakes*.²⁴ *P.Mich.* XVIII 778.24 (193/192) seems to give a contemporary reference to the approximate worth of a *kaunakes*, which would be very close to the amount of the loan: κα νακην (δραχμάς) ἄσ, 1200 drachmas (correct to κωνάκην). In addition to the reading, however, the context and significance of this line is not clear. Still, it seems safe to assume that the value of the *gaunakes*, if it ever equalled the amount of the loan, would quickly have failed to keep pace with the accruing interest.
34. The rhetoric of a second petition is closely paralleled in *BGU* VIII 1856 (I). There a landlord excuses his failure to remit taxes to the crown on the grounds that a delinquent tenant has not paid him. He notes that Artemidoros the *meridarches* has been asked to secure the payment from the tenant once already (11-14) and requests a second, more forceful, notification (16-19): ἀξιῶ ἐὰν φαίνεται γράψ[α]ι τ[ῶ]ι αὐτῶι Ἄρτεμιδώρῳ ἐπιστρεφέτερον τὴν [πράξιν] παρὰ τῆς προγεγραμμένης [sc. the tenant] συστήσασθαι εἰς τὰ ἐν ἐμοὶ βασιλικά (“I ask you please to write to the same Artemidoros more forcefully, that he remit the payment from the aforementioned to the crown on my behalf”). The adverb ἐπιστρεφέτερον is used elsewhere by petitioners who seek redress for the second time: *UPZ* I 24.24 (162), 51.21 (161). If an earlier petition lay behind the request to arraign two thugs in *P.Mil.Congr.* XIV pg. 34.15-16 (II) the text fails to mention it; the editors note “È invece insolito l’uso dell’avverbio ἐπιστρεφέτερον.”
- 34-35. The accusative ἐνεχυράσαντα refers to Chairephanes; the sense is “I ask that you write more forcefully to Chairephanes [sc. a letter, ordering], that he, seizing the security, send him [sc. Heliodoros] to you.” The implicit command in the letter governs the accusative ἐνεχυράσαντα and causes the shift from the dative (33). This use of the verb ἐνεχυράζω is not paralleled in the papyri, where the only subjects of the verb are those to whom the security is owed. So, for example, the subjects of ἐνεχυράζω in *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59077.2 (257), *P.Enteux.* 38.3-4 (221), 87.3, 6 (222), *P.Hib.* II 197.13, 15 (ca. 250). Here the verb is used simply to describe the act of seizure, which Chairephanes or anyone else can perform. The phrase is unusual, but clear.
42. The beginning τοὺς ἐ[γ]καλ- seems clear; the rest of the line is hastily scrawled and difficult to read. The plural seems to indicate that Agathis has summoned both Heliodoros and Chairephanes. See the note on ἐποιήσαντο (31) above. The year sign and the year date are ligatured so that it is difficult to tell where they divide; η (eighth year) is another possible reading, but two and one half years seems too long for Theambesis to have waited.
44. The phrase εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν occurs elsewhere only at *UPZ* I 14.125-126, 139 (158), where it is directed to the dioiketes. See also *P.Tebt.* I 61, B 4-5 of 118/117: παρ[επιγεγραμέν]αι Ἀρχίβιον τὸν διοικητὴν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναγνώ[σ]ε[ως] | τῆς κα[τ]ὰ [φύ]λλ[ον γε]μετρίας.

Duke University

Joshua D. Sosin
John F. Oates

²⁴ The significance of *P.Cair.Zen.* IV 59539b (ca. 258) is unclear in this regard.

