

JOSHUA D. SOSIN

ABDUCTION AT THE THRESHING FLOOR: P.DUK.INV. 714–716

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 127 (1999) 131–140

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

ABDUCTION AT THE THRESHING FLOOR: P.DUK.INV. 714–716

The papyri

Together P.Duk.inv. 714–716 comprise a group of petitions by the same individual. The three papyri were acquired by the Duke University Special Collections Library in 1979 fused in a chunk of cartonnage with inv. 711–713 and 717.¹ The three papyri, measuring 9.0 x 15.0 cm., 9.8 x 15.3 cm., and 10.1 x 9.5 cm. respectively, appear to have been cut from the same roll of papyrus. Margins at the top (2.5 cm.), left (2 cm.) and right are preserved in 714, at the left (2.5 cm.) in 715, and at the top (2.5 cm.) and left (1.5 cm.) in 716. 714 and 715 appear to be duplicates of the same petition, perhaps sent to different officials; 714 contains the first half and 715 the second. Roughly seven lines overlap in the middle. Thus, we can estimate the full length of each document to have been roughly 25–30 cm. 715 was less carefully written than 714 and may in fact have been a draft. 716 appears to be another version of the same complaint.

All three are written on papyrus of the same light tan hue, with the fibers, in skilled hands, with skinny, stick-like strokes. 714 and 715 were almost certainly written by the same scribe. The latter was penned with greater speed and less care, but its execution and stick-like components identify it as having been written by the same scribe as 714. At first glance the general look of the hand of 716 appears to differ from that of 714 and 715. I suggest that the same scribe penned all three but that greater care was devoted to 716, perhaps because it was intended for the strategos, whereas the others were destined for lesser officials. Several noteworthy similarities between the letter forms in 714 and 716 outweigh the differences in ethos and execution. Both exhibit open, angular *betas* (714: ἱερακοβοσκοῦ 3; βασιλεῖ, βασιλίσση 10; ἐπιβαλόντος 15; ἐπιλαβόμενοι 19; 716: [i]ερακοβοσκοῦ 4). In both texts the *kappas* tend to be markedly open, e.g. Κ (714: ἱερακοβοσκοῦ 3; ἱερακείου 5; ἱεράκων 13; 716: [i]ερακοβοσκοῦ 4). The most striking palaeographical characteristic shared by 714 and 716, however, is the distinctive shape of the two-looped *omegas* (714 has one-looped specimens as well: e.g. τῶν 12; τῶι 13). In both texts the *omegas* have a deep, wide and well-rounded left loop and a shallower, narrower and awkwardly formed right loop (714: Σαραπίωνι, ἀρχισωματοφύ- 1; Ὀξυρύγχωι 4; ψώμισμα 12; ἱεράκων, Ἀπολλωνίωι 13; 716: πρώτων φίλων 1; προσόδων 2; τῶν 4; Ὀξυρύγχων, Πολέμωνος 5. Both, moreover, exhibit an almost identical break at the bottom of the right loop of the *omega* (714: Πολέμωνος 4; 716: προσόδων 2; Πολέμωνος 5). The similarly awkward *omegas* support attribution of both texts to the same scribe, but the identical pen breaks in the same word remove any doubt.

All three petitions were sent or intended to be sent by Petosiris, a hawk-feeder at the hawk shrine in Oxyrhyncha (although in the case of 715 we cannot know the sender for certain), to Sarapiōn the *archisōmatophylax* (714), an official whose name is not preserved (715), and Phantias the strategos

¹ See Duke University Special Collections Library, *Duke Papyrus Archive [DPA]*, <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/acquisitions.html>> 1999. Some or all of these may have been penned by the same scribe, as examination of the scans reveals: *DPA*, <.../papyrus/records/711r.html>, <.../papyrus/records/712.html>, <.../papyrus/records/713.html>, <.../papyrus/records/717.html> 1999. 711 is a fragment containing pieces of two epigrams; 712 appears to be a fragment of an unidentified literary work in prose; 713 is an extremely tattered set of fragments from a single petition to Phantias that is almost certainly unrelated to 714–716; 717 is a fragment of a lease, with full regal prescript. 713 and 717 are almost certainly written by the same scribe; it is uncertain whether the same scribe also penned 714–716. 716 was deciphered with the generous assistance of Richard Weinberg and Paul Johnson (see p.127-130 in this volume). I am grateful to John Oates and Kent Rigsby for thoughtful and kind criticism.

(716).² It is reported that Apollonios, ὁ πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι, invaded the sacred precinct in search of something, presumably grain. When he and his henchmen found nothing they abducted Pais, the nephew of Petosiris, at the threshing floor (ἐπὶ τῆς ἄλω). In his petition Petosiris asks for the release of his nephew so that the two may return to their ritual duties.

Phanias and the circumstances of the petitions

In the 31st year of Euergetes II' reign (140/39) Phanias³ was occupied in part with a series of problems arising from poor harvests in the Polemôn division of the Arsinoite nome. From *P.Tebt.* I 61b.351–378 (≈*P.Tebt.* I 72.349–380) we learn that a portion of Kerkeosiris suffered inadequate harvests in 140/39. In the 30th year (141/0) rents on a certain plot of land had been increased (352–5), which led to the dismay and departure of some of the farmers (356–8). Ptolemaios the *epimeletês* hastily had replaced them with new farmers (359–61), but despite his efforts, the seeds were sown too late. The problem was compounded by a dispute between the farmers and their neighbors from Berenikis Thesmophorou over water-access (364–6). The quarrel may have arisen from a general lack of water in the vicinity, perhaps from insufficient flooding. At any rate, the returns were not promising and the farmers sought help from Phanias. Upon visiting the fields Phanias saw the poor state of the crop and ordered the immediate harvest and delivery of the crops ἐπὶ τὰς ἄλω⁴ (369–73). The returns came up short. Thus, Phanias called in sureties that appear to have been owed to him personally in order to cover the deficit; still, if the editor's restoration is correct ([μόλι]ς), he just barely made it (373–8).

Kerkeosiris was not the only village in the Polemôn division to suffer low returns on crops in Euergetes II' 30th and/or 31st year(s). Oxyrhyncha seems to have sustained similar losses. In Pauni (24 June–23 July) of 140 two *basilikoi geôrgoi* petitioned (*P.Tebt.* III.2 959) Phanias⁵ complaining that Adamas son of Leônidês and his two sons Petôs and Petesouchos (7–9) forced their way into their grain pit: εἰσβιασθέντες εἰς τὸν ὑπάρχοντα ἡμῖν σειρόν (10–11). Presumably, they made off with some or all of the grain stored therein. It is possible that the theft was motivated by a general lack of grain in the vicinity. Another petition to Phanias, *P.Tebt.* III.1 786, records similar incursions. Here the *basilikoi geôrgoi* of Oxyrhyncha accused certain (unnamed) rapacious officials of extorting grain from them (14) and disregarding official *prostagmata* concerning proper procedure with regard to the farmers (16–19). The *basilikoi geôrgoi*, therefore, sought protection against extortion and forced entry on their threshing floors: μηθενὶ καθ' ὄντινοῦ[ν] τρό[π]ον ἔπιτρέπειν παραλογεύειν ἡμᾶς μηδ' [ε]ἰσιβιάζεσθαι εἰς τὰς ἄλω^ς (26–28). The editors of the text dated it to ca. 138, apparently on the strength of the hand's similarity to that of *P.Tebt.* III.1 785. In the latter the petitioner's brother is said to have died in Epeiph of the 32nd year, so the document may safely be dated after 24 July–22 Aug., 138. There is no independent evidence, however, to support the date assigned by the editors to *P.Tebt.* III.1 786, ca. 138. In the light of the fact that *P.Tebt.* III.1 786 reports a situation that may have arisen from the same circumstances that led to the infraction reported in *P.Tebt.* III.2 959, it is worth speculating that the two documents are contemporary.

Moreover, the editors of *P.Tebt.* III.1 787 restore Phanias as the recipient of the petition in line 1 and suggest that the document should be dated earlier than ca. 138—the date that they assign to *P.Tebt.* III.1 785 and 786. This date, if it is correct, supports the picture of a poor harvest and a dearth of water. Like *P.Tebt.* III.1 786, 787 is a petition from the *basilikoi geôrgoi* of Oxyrhyncha—the restorations in 2 and 3 are virtually certain. Like the petitioners of *P.Tebt.* III.1 786, those of *P.Tebt.* III.1 787 reported

² The fact that all three were recovered from the same batch of cartonnage may suggest that they were never sent or that they were copies retained by Petosiris.

³ *PP* I 340.

⁴ Emend to ἄλω^ς?

⁵ The restoration of Phanias as the addressee in line 1 is likely on the strength of the year-date in 6, uncertain as the reading there may be.

that they suffered from a lack of water.⁶ The flood did not favor their land, compelling them to irrigate from their cisterns, not from the network of irrigation canals (6–10, 26–28). The farmers charge that an official named Apollonios (21) pressured them into cultivating the land in spite of its insufficiently watered state (22–32). The farmers then, from fear of the implacable⁷ Apollonios, sought refuge in a nearby precinct of Zeus (34–35); evidently they feared lest Apollonios arrest them, or worse. The fragmentary papyrus does not preserve Apollonios' title (22). The extortion alleged to have been committed against the petitioners of *P.Tebt.* III.1 786 was committed by officials,⁸ not petty thieves.⁹ Could this same Apollonios have been involved there as well? We can only speculate.

In the case of P.Duk.inv. 714, however, we may be on firmer ground. The title belonging to the Apollonios of P.Duk.inv. 714.14 (ὁ πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι) is not common in the Arsinoite nome. The actions of Apollonios, his homonym in *P.Tebt.* III.1 787, and the unnamed officials in *P.Tebt.* III.1 786, are nearly the same in all three cases: they all attempted to strong-arm local farmers into providing grain that they evidently did not have. This is of course insufficient grounds for equating the two Apollonioi or concluding that one of the officials accused of extortion in *P.Tebt.* III.1 786 was this same Apollonios. There may be another basis for identifying the two homonyms as one person. At *P.Tebt.* III.1 787.21–22 the editors print Apollonios' name and title as Ἀπολλών[ιο]ς | [ὁ 14 l.]. ος. There is not the room to restore [ὁ πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι τεταγμέ]γος.¹⁰ In a petition almost certainly addressed to the king, one petitioner refers to a deputy strategos as τετα]γμένωι ὑπὸ Διοφάνου πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι (*P.Enteux.* 63.10). A restoration, [ὁ ὑπὸ Φανία τεταγμέ]γος, would be only one letter over the 14 conjectured by the editors of *P.Tebt.* III.1 787, but may be discounted since the petition was addressed to Phantias in the first place.¹¹ Thirteen letters are given by the restoration, Ἀπολλών[ιο]ς | [ὁ ὑφ' ὑμῶν τεταγμέ]γος or [ὁ ὑπὸ σοῦ τεταγμέ]γος¹² I propose that *P.Tebt.* III.1 787.21–22 be restored accordingly (*vel sim.*) and that the Apollonios there mentioned be identified with the Apollonios of P.Duk.inv. 714.13.

The circumstances of P.Duk.inv. 714–716 fill out the picture sketched already by *P.Tebt.* I 61b.351–378 (≈*P.Tebt.* I 72.349–380), III.1 786 and 787 and III.2 959. Portions of the Polemôn division of the Arsinoite nome suffered from inadequate water-supply and a poor harvest in 140/39. This seems to have led to robbery in the case of *P.Tebt.* III.2 959 and extortion and forced entry at a threshing floor by officials in *P.Tebt.* III.1 786. In *P.Tebt.* III.1 787 it resulted in the application of excessive pressure to cultivate by Apollonios, probably the deputy-strategos, and the subsequent application for asylum by the farmers, afraid of arrest. In the case of P.Duk.inv. 714–716 it resulted in similar pressure exerted by Apollonios, the deputy strategos, and, when Petosiris resisted, the arrest of his nephew.

⁶ *P.Tebt.* III.1 787 as evidence for insufficient flooding: D. Bonneau, *Le fisc et le Nil: Incidences des irrégularités de la crue du Nil sur la fiscalité foncière dans l'Égypte grecque et romaine* (Paris 1971) 227.

⁷ The editors' restoration at 34, [φύβωι τοῦ ἀπαραι]τήτου, is colorful if not correct; in any case the sense is surely right.

⁸ As is evident from the charge that they violated the standing *prostagmata* (*P.Tebt.* III.1 786.16–19).

⁹ As was the case in *P.Tebt.* III.2 959.

¹⁰ [ὁ πρὸς τῆι στρ(ατηγίαι) τεταγμέ]γος fits the space more closely, but is improbable in the absence of abbreviation elsewhere in the—admittedly fragmentary—text.

¹¹ *P.Enteux.* 63.10 mentions Diophanes, its recipient, but the petition itself must have been addressed to the king, like the other petitions received by Diophanes in *P.Enteux.*

¹² There was nothing inherently improbable or abrasive in addressing the strategos directly in the second person, even in addition to normal use in formulaic phrases such as ἐάν σοι φαίνηται or ἀξιῶ σε. See for example J. D. Sosin and J. F. Oates, "P.Duk.inv. 314: Agathis, Strategos and Hippiarches of the Arsinoite Nome," *ZPE* 118 (1997) 251–258, 255–6: ἐπέιδωκά σοι ὑπόμνημα | διασαφοῦσά σοι... (8–10), ἐπ[ειδὴ δὲ σ]ὺ γράψαν[ι] [το]ς (24–5).

Apollonios ὁ πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι (τεταγμένος)

A handful of close parallels to Apollonios' title are known from the Arsinoite. An Aristomachos is called τεταγμένος πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι, *P.Gurob* 2.7 (225). It has been suggested elsewhere that *P.Tebt.* III.1 815 Fr. 10.6–7 (223/2) should be read, Ζήνωνι τῶι πρὸς τῆι | [σ]τρατηγίαι τεταγμένωι and that *P.Enteux.* 73.9–10 (222) be restored προστάξει Διοφάνει τῶι [στρατηγῶι γράψαι X τῶι πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι] | τεταγμένωι ἐν τῆι Θεμίστου μερίδι and that at *P.Enteux.* 63.10 (224–218) the reading of the *editio princeps*, [c ? τετα]γμένωι ὑπὸ Διοφάνους πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι, should be retained.¹³ A Eubios τ[οῦ πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι] τεταγμένου is attested at *P.Tebt.* III.1 700.66–67 (125/4). Ἀπολλών[ιο]ς | [ὁ ὑφ' ὑμῶν / ὑπὸ σοῦ τεταγμέ]νος in *P.Tebt.* III.1 787.21–22 may perhaps be added to this short list of deputy-strategoi; the Apollonios in *P.Duk.inv.* 714.13 certainly may.

Phanias' immediate successor to the *stratêgia* was Apollonios member of the first friends, strategos and in charge of revenues.¹⁴ He is first attested as strategos in 135, 26 Oct. / 24 Nov. (*P.Tebt.* III.1 802.5–7). The date is solid.¹⁵ *PSI XIII 1030* (Tebtynis) is a cover letter from a certain Phanias—no title is given—to an agent of the *agoranomos* with an appended copy of judgments passed by the *chrêmatistai*. The rarity of the name Phanias, the provenience of the document, and the fact that the strategos is the logical official to be appending a copy of judgments by the *chrêmatistai*, suggest strongly that this is the strategos Phanias. The cover letter is dated to a 36th regnal year (5; day and month are in lacuna), which, if the identification of Phanias is correct, can only be 135/4. No regnal year is preserved in the judgments (6, 17). Thus, *P.Tebt.* III.1 802 and *PSI XIII 1030* pose a problem: Apollonios and Phanias cannot both have been strategos of the Arsinoite in the same regnal year.¹⁶ No simple solution suggests itself. Perhaps Phanias was tying up loose ends in the days immediately following the close of his term as strategos and sent *PSI XIII 1030* one month after the start of the 36th regnal year. Otherwise we must assume that the Phanias mentioned in *PSI XIII 1030* was not Phanias the strategos.

However this chronological problem is to be resolved, Phanias' successor Apollonios is attested as strategos as late as 12 Aug. 132 (*P.Amh.* 2.35.1–2). It is tempting to speculate that Apollonios the deputy strategos attested in *P.Duk.inv.* 714 and possibly in *P.Tebt.* III.1 787.21–22 distinguished himself in Phanias' service and found his diligence rewarded with an appointment to the post of strategos.¹⁷ This of course cannot be proven, but personal connections did matter and there is evidence for unconventional appointments to the Arsinoite *stratêgia*. For example, it has been suggested¹⁸ that

¹³ Sosin and Oates (n. 12) 253, 254 n. 13.

¹⁴ *PP* I 222, V 14056a; L. Mooren, *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt: Introduction and Prosopography* (Brussels 1975) no. 072.

¹⁵ The next earlier 36th regnal year (146/5; Philometor) is unacceptable as Apollonios ranks among the first friends (6) by aulic and the administrative post of strategos was tied to the aulic *archisômatophylax* before the re-accession of Euergetes II. The next later date (82/1; Soter II) is also unacceptable; the aulic associated with the *stratêgia* in 82/1 was kinsman.

¹⁶ Nor can Apollonios be re-assigned to the Herakleopolite nome, the next most logical candidate—though an admittedly improbable one—since Polemarchos (*PP* I 307; Mooren [n. 14] no. 098) was strategos of the Herakleopolite in Philometor's 36th year: *P.Tebt.* III.1 810.12–13. Mooren (n. 14) no. 072 and *La hiérarchie de cour Ptolémaïque* (Leuven 1977) does not acknowledge the conflicting dates.

¹⁷ In the end Apollonios' alleged (in *P.Duk.inv.* 714 and *P.Tebt.* III.1 787) bullying tactics may have proven to be of greater benefit to Phanias than hassle.

¹⁸ *P.Tebt.* IV 1098 p. 27 n. on 13–14.

Ptolemaios son of Philinos, who is attested as strategos ca. 114 (*P.Tebt.* IV 1098.13–14),¹⁹ was the son of Philinos the strategos attested in 125/4 (*P.Tebt.* III.1 700.18–19, 97).²⁰

Sarapiôn archisômatophylax

A Sarapiôn, *archisômatophylax* and strategos, is attested in a report by a *kômogrammateus* (*P.Tebt.* III.1 743.2–3) from the mid 2nd century.²¹ The date can be refined. Sarapiôn's tenure of the post must fall after that of Melagkomas (153/2–152/1)²² and before that of Phantias' immediate predecessor, Ptolemaios son of Pyrrhos (143/2[?]-141/0[?]).²³ Moreover, it is a well-known fact that the system of aulic titles was overhauled upon the re-accession of Euergetes II in August of 145.²⁴ Thus, *P.Tebt.* III.1 743 must belong to the period before Euergetes II's re-accession, that is between 151/0 and Philometor's final year. *P.Tebt.* III.2 924 (*descriptum*) is dated to 20 June 144, but is addressed [Σ]αραπίωνι στρα(τηγῶν) καὶ ἐπὶ [τῶν] πρ[οσόδων. G. Mussies erroneously designates Sarapiôn as *archisômatophylax* in this text, in spite of the fact that no aulic appears.²⁵ So too L. Mooren: "Sarapion (n° 069) est archisomatophylaque en 144."²⁶ Sarapiôn's lack of an aulic seems to derive from a simple problem: what did one call a strategos whose tenure straddled Philometor's last year and Euergetes II's 25th? Sarapiôn was strategos and *archisômatophylax* at some point after 151/0 but before the re-accession of Euergetes II. After the re-accession of Euergetes II, however, either he no longer held the title or could be thought by his contemporaries (e.g. the author of *P.Tebt.* III.2 924) no longer to hold the title.²⁷

In contrast to the variation in aulic, Sarapiôn's administrative title, strategos, remains constant. Designation of a strategos by aulic alone, without the administrative title, is almost unparalleled. I know but one instance in which a specific, known strategos is addressed as *archisômatophylax* alone, without the administrative title (*SB* VI 9108; Thebaid; 173–169).²⁸ The extreme rarity of addressing a

¹⁹ See *P.Tebt.* IV 1098 p. 27 n. on 13–14 for identification of Ptolemaios son of Philinos the strategos with the Ptolemaios strategos and kinsman, attested in *P.Tebt.* I 13.2 (?; 114), 15.15 (114), 28.1 (?; ca. 114), 42.1 (ca. 114); *PP* I 318; Mooren (n. 14) no. 080.

²⁰ *PP* I 341, II 2485; Mooren (n. 14) 074. For a comparable instance of a father and son holding similar posts see W. Peremans and E. Van. 't Dack, "Notes concernant PSI VIII 969," *Eos* 48.2 [= *Symbolae Rapahaeli Taubenschlag dedicatae*] (1956) 121–132, at 125, and n. 17 on Philinos. For another Arsinoite strategos from a family of distinguished *strategoi* see J. D. Sosin, "P.Duk.inv. 677: Aetos, from Arsinoite Strategos to Eponymous Priest," *ZPE* 116 (1997) 141–146.

²¹ On the date: H. Henne, "Sur la titulature aulique des stratèges de nomes à l'époque Ptolémaïque," *REA* 42 (1940) 172–186, 173, 179 [= *BL* III 244]. Another Sarapiôn in the same text (*P.Tebt.* III.1 743.5) has been emended out of existence (δ ς → Δι ωι [τῶ]ι ἀρχισωματοφυλ[άκι] by W. Clarysse in Mooren (n. 16) 216–217 [= *BL* VII 272].

²² *P.Köln* III 144.7, 25 (152); *P.Erasm.* I 2 (152); *P.Tebt.* III.1 771 (ca. 152?); *SB* XVI 12305 (152).

²³ *P.Tebt.* III.1 736—questionable without patronym (143); *BGU* VI 1250 (ca. 143–141?); *P.Tebt.* III.1 788 (143); *P.Mil.Congr.* XVIII p. 10 (ca. 143–141); *P.Grenf.* I 13 (?); see Mooren (n. 12) no. 070.

²⁴ See Mooren (n. 16) 61–73. Evidence for a top-down initiative is of course lacking, but it is hard to conceive of any other impetus for the all-pervasive change in the system. J. F. Oates, "Equal in Honor to the First Friends," *BASP* 32 (1995) 13–21 has shown that, in another piece of evidence for the complete restructuring of the aulic hierarchy, the title ἰσότημος (τῶν ἰσότημων) τοῖς πρώτοις φίλοις did not exist before the re-accession of Euergetes II.

²⁵ G. Mussies, "Supplément à la liste des stratèges des nomes égyptiens de H. Henne," *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* XIV, 13–46 at 16 no. 34.

²⁶ Mooren (n. 16) 68.

²⁷ For a contemporary change in nomenclature that reflected the changing political scene, compare *I.Eg.Syene* 302 and 303, where it cannot be coincidence that before the re-accession of Euergetes II Hêrôdês called himself Pergamene (*I.Eg.Syene* 302.14), but that after Euergetes' return from Cyrene in 145, Hêrôdês' ethnic became *Bereniceus* (*I.Eg.Syene* 303.4), indicating origin in the western city of the Cyrenean pentapolis. The logical implication is that Hêrôdês had previously supported (at least ostensibly) Philometor, but that his new ethnic signaled his loyalty to the restored Euergetes II.

²⁸ This is the famous Noumenios: *PP* I 196; II 1966; III 5213; VI 14617; VIII 196; Mooren (n. 14) no. 049; for discussion and bibliography: idem, "The Governors General of the Thebaid in the Second Century B.C.," *AS* 4 (1973) 115–132, at 121–122.

strategos by aulic alone argues against identifying the Sarapiôn *archisômatophylax* in P.Duk.inv. 714 with the Sarapiôn in *P.Tebt.* III.1 743 and *P.Tebt.* III.2 924. Moreover, with the change in structure of the aulic hierarchy in 145 BC several lesser administrative titles started to appear in conjunction with the title *archisômatophylax*, especially those associated with the katoikic administration—and especially in the Arsinoite. The well-known Pankratês was *archisômatophylax* and ὁ πρὸς τῆι συντάξει.²⁹ The title is also associated with Dionysios, the well-known *archisômatophylax* and scribe of the *katoikoi hippeis*.³⁰ Dionysios, moreover, is called simply τῶν ἀρχισωματοφυλάκων without any other title in one text (*P.Tebt.* I 79.52; ca. 148), just as Sarapiôn is addressed simply by aulic (P.Duk.inv. 714.1). Both Pankratês and Dionysios received petitions,³¹ just as Sarapiôn does in P.Duk.inv. 714. I suggest that Sarapiôn was a local official, perhaps associated with the administrative apparatus of the *katoikoi hippeis*, but not to be identified with the man of the same name who is attested as strategos between 151/0 and the re-accession of Euergetes II.

. . .

P.Duk.inv. 714

9 x 15 cm.

140/39–137/6; ca. 140/39

<<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/714.html>>

Arsinoite

P.Duk.inv. 714 is addressed to Sarapiôn the *archisômatophylax*. The hand is fine and regular. The strokes are skinny and have a notably stick-like quality. Ligatures are evenly written as if by a slowly moving and upright pen.

The tone of the petition is noteworthy. The formal introduction fills the first 12 1/2 lines; the body of the letter does not begin until line 13. The prayer for “good favor with the king and queen” is formulaic, but not well attested in the second century (see notes below). The phrase carries a lofty air of deliberate archaism. So too the phrase ἄμα τε καὶ (11) is common in the third century, but otherwise unattested in the second. In spite of the elevated tone of the petition, the grammar falls flat at the start of the text’s body. Apollonios (13) appears in the dative, where a genitive termination is required by the genitive absolute construction. More jarring is the lack of a connective particle after Ἀπολλωνίωι (13). The petition’s lofty introduction carries a veiled threat. The second half of the petition shows that Petosiris’ request is simple. He asks for the return of his nephew so that they may properly continue their ritual duties (715.12–17). One of the duties to which Petosiris referred was, of course, praying for the good health of Sarapiôn (714.5–10). Without Petosiris’ nephew, the priest implies, prayers for Sarapiôn’s good health and good favor with the king and queen would not continue. The long introduction and dramatic tone underscore this subtle threat.³²

Text

Σαραπίωνι ἀρχισωματοφύ-
 [λακ]ι παρὰ Πετοσίριος τοῦ[σ]
 Πετοσίριος ἱερακοβοσκοῦ τοῦ ἐν
 4 Ὀξύρυγγωι τῆς Πολέμωνος
 μερίδος ἱερακείου. (οὐ) παραλεί-

²⁹ *P.Mil.Congr.* XVII p. 5–6.1 (Arsinoite; 142), p. 22. col. ii.4 (Arsinoite; after 142/1), XVIII p. 6.6 (Arsinoite; ca. 143/2), p. 24 .1 (Arsinoite; ca. 142/1), p. 30.1 (Arsinoite; ca. 142/1), p. 33.4–5 (Arsinoite; after 140/39); for the Pankratês archive see pp. 3–38. See also *SB* XIV 12162–3 (Magdola?; 2nd c.).

³⁰ Dionysios *archisômatophylax* and scribe of the *katoikoi hippeis*: *P.Meyer* 18–19 (Arsinoite; 144); *P.Mil.Congr.* XVII p. 6.30–31; *P.Tebt.* I 79.52 (τῶν ἀρχισωματοφυλάκων; ca. 148); see also P.Duk.inv. 707 (Arsinoite; 144–141), *DPA*, <.../papyrus/records/707.html> 1999 and forthcoming, J. F. Oates, “Petition to the Grammateus of the Katoikoi Hippeis,” *Bingen Festschrift*.

³¹ Pankratês: e.g. *P.Mil.Congr.* XVIII 24 (Arsinoite; ca. 142/1). Dionysios: P.Duk.inv. 707 mentioned above n. 30.

³² For a contemporary and comparable instance of leverage applied by priests see *P.Amh.* 2.35.44–55.

- πομεν καθ' ἡμέραν εὐχ[ό]-
 μενοι τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπὲρ σοῦ
 8 ὅπως ὑγιαίνης καὶ εὐημερῆς
 τὸν πάντα χρόνον παρὰ
 τῶι βασιλεῖ καὶ τῆι βασιλίσσηι·
 ἅμα τε καὶ ἐπιτελοῦμεν
 12 τὰ ψώμισμα καὶ τὰς ταφὰς
 τῶν ἱεράκων. Ἀπολλωνίωι
 τῶι πρὸς τῆι στρατηγ[ί]α[ι]
 ἐπιβαλόντος ἐπὶ το[ύς]
 16 τόπους καὶ εἰσελθόντος εἰς
 τὸ προειρημένον ἱερακεῖον
 καὶ οὐθέν εὐρόντος καὶ οἱ περ[ὶ]
 αὐτὸν ἐπιλαβόμενοι Παιν
 20 τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου
 μου ἀδελφοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς ἄλλω

4. read Ὁξυρύγχωι 12. read τὸ or delete τὰ? 13-14 read Ἀπολλωνίου | τοῦ

Translation

To Sarapiôn *archisômatophylax* from Petosiris son of Petosiris, hawk-feeder from the hawk shrine in Oxyrhyncha of the Polemôn division. We have <not> ceased to pray daily to the gods on your behalf that you may be healthy and in good standing with the king and queen for all time. Also at the same time we are tending to the feeding and the tombs of the hawks. Apollonios, who is on the staff of the *stratêgia*, having burst into the place and invaded the aforementioned hawk shrine and found nothing, and then the men in his company, after seizing Pais the son of my older brother, while he was at the threshing floor ...

Notes

1. A clear trace of ink arcs downward and to the left from the *upsilon*. Perhaps the scribe wrote ο begant to write the *lambda*, but erased it, or at least part of it, upon realizing that space at the end of line 1 was tight. Thus, perhaps we should read ἀρχισωματοφύ[λ]-. For a different error (*homoioleuton*) in the same position see τοῦ[σ] (2).
4. The appearance of Ὁξυρύγχωι for -οις is unparalleled. P.Duk.inv. 716.5 reads ἐξ Ὁξυρύγχων. Perhaps the scribe accidentally conflated the two roughly equal phrases and produced the incorrect dative singular.
5. The οὐ was probably omitted under influence of the -οι preceding it.
- 8-10. The phrase εὐημερεῖν παρὰ τῶι βασιλεῖ καὶ τῆι βασιλίσσηι is found in the third century, but only on one other occasion in the second: UPZ I 24.29 (162), P.Cair.Zen. I 59034.20 (257), I 59044.12 (257), IV 59571.14 (242). Petosiris' tone is elevated and emphatic.
11. ἅμα τε καὶ is rarely found in the papyri: P.Cair.Zen. III 59824.5 (252), PSI VI 584.8 (3^d c.). Again, Petosiris is dramatic.
12. τὰ ψώμισμα: scantily attested in the papyri. See C.Pap.Gr. I 4.15 (13), referring to some type of pabulum; P.Oxy. VIII 1088.39, 40-43 (1st c.), describing a "pill" used to treat fever. Cf. 715.14-18: ὅπως ... ψώμισμα καὶ τὰ [νομι]ζόμενα του . . . ἰα ἐπιτ[ε]λῶ]μεν.
- 13-14. The erroneous dative is unexplained. Note that the body of the petition begins with a genitive absolute. The body of 716.7-8 also begins with a genitive absolute (see notes below).
- 15-16. τοὺς τόπους is not generalizing; it indicates specifically the sacred precinct: see P.Lond. VII 2193.6-7, with A. D. Nock, C. Roberts, T. C. Skeat, "The Guild of Zeus Hypsistos," HTR 29 (1936) 39-88, at 78 [= SB V 7835] for further instances in Greek; see also A. Bernand, *La prose sur pierre* (Paris 1992) 40.13-14 [= E. Breccia, "Note Epigrafiche," BSA Alex. 24 (1929) 60-73 with plate = SB IV 7457]; for identical usage in demotic, *p* *m*, see P.dem.Berl. 3115 A ¶1.4; P.dem.Assoc. p. 108, 114, 178, n. 2.
18. It is unclear what they expect to find, but see the introductory notes above.

. . .

P.Duk.inv. 715

9.8 x 15.3 cm.

140/39–137/6; ca. 140/39

<<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/715.html>>

Arsinoite

The recipient of 715 is unknown. If we rule out the *archisômatophylax* and the strategos, the recipients of the other two texts, then not many candidates remain. The *epistatês* of the village is a possible recipient, but we cannot be certain. Moreover, the hand is generally swifter and less meticulous than that of 714, which may suggest that 715 was a draft, not a copy. The papyrus is in much worse condition than 714. Much of the right side no longer remains. A mass of strips and fibers are fused to the verso and could not be removed without causing damage to the papyrus. Lines 17–18 are almost illegible. The bottom margin is not preserved but the closing εὐτύχει is, so we do have the second half of the petition's body in its entirety. The date is not preserved. Ligatures are widespread. A single-stroke, convex *mu* appears in ψώμισμα (16). Ἄξιω (12) is written in huge “capitals.”

Text

[Ἄπολλωνίου]
 [τοῦ πρὸς τῆι στρατηγίαι]
 -- -- -- -- --
 1 [ἐπιβ] ἀλ[όντος ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους]
 [κα] ἰ εἰσελ[θόντος] εἰ[ς τὸ προει]-
 ρημένον [ἱερακ] εἰ[ὸν καὶ οὐθὲν]
 4 εὐρόντ[ο]ς καὶ οἱ πε[ρὶ αὐτὸν]
 ἐπιλαβόμενοι Παιν [τὸν]
 υἱὸν τοῦ πρεσβυ[τέρου μου]
 ἀδελφοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς [ἄλω ἀπή]-
 8 γαγον ἐνταῦθα [ἐν τῆι φυ]-
 [λα] κῆι ἐν τῶι α . [^{ca. 5}]
 τοῖς ἀν[.]σοι αὐ[τοῖς ? ^{ca. 2?}]
 οἱ τ' ἐπιβαλ[. . . ? δ] εἶσθαι
 12 ἀξιῶ [δεόμε] γος ἕάν σοι
 φαίνητα[ι συν] ἐπιλάβεσθαι
 ὅπως τοῦ Παιτος ἀπολυ[θέ]ντος
 [γ]ινώμεθα πρὸς τὰς τ[αφὰς]
 16 καὶ ψώμισμα καὶ τὰ [νομι]-
 ζόμενα του . . ια ἐπιτ[ελῶ]-
 μεν [ὑπὲρ ? σο] ὦ . λυετε μ . [. .]
 [^{ca. ?}] traces ? [^{ca. ?}]
 20 εὐτύχ[ει]

Translation

[... Apollonios, who is on the staff of the *stratêgia*], having burst into the place and invaded the aforementioned hawk shrine and found nothing, and then the men in his company, after seizing Pais the son of my older brother, while he was at the threshing floor, led him away from there and [threw him ?] into the ... with (?) the ... and they attempted to tie (?) him up. I ask you, therefore, if you see fit, to intercede on his behalf so that with the release of Pais, we may return to the tombs and perform the feeding and things customarily performed ... on your behalf ... Farewell.

Notes

- 8-9. The lacuna seems to have mentioned the place where Pais was detained. [ἐν τῇ φυλάκῃ] seems to fit the space and the traces of ink; εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον, the more common phrase, does not appear to fit either.
9. The line is virtually illegible; for ἐν τῷ . α . , we might also read: εἰς τὸν α . .
10. Perhaps ἀπ[]; the reading and syntax of the line are very uncertain.
11. οἱ τ' demands a finite verb whose subject is οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν [sc. Apollonios]. This leaves space for only one letter to complete εἰσθαι. The most logical reading would be δεῖσθαι. The idea of binding someone is not unsuited to the scenario of abduction, but there is no comfortable way to construe the infinitive. It is possible that ἐπιβαλ- is an error for ἐπιλαβ-, in which case δεῖσθαι would simply be complementary: “they undertook to tie [sc. him ?] up.”
12. Ἀξιῶ [δεόμε]νος: cf. *UPZ* I 106.16 (99) ἀξιῶ δεό[με]νος ἐὰν [δοκ]ῆι, 107.19, 108.14; *P.Petr.* II 12.8 (ca. 241), ἀξιῶ σε δεομένη; evidently a variation of the more common ἀξιῶ οὖν σε δεόμενος (for example *BGU* III 1006.3–4 [3rd c.]; *P.Heid.* II 210.8–9 [3rd c.]; *P.Mich.* I 104.5 [3rd c.]).
13. συνεπιλάβεσθαι can introduce consecutive or final clauses, indicating intercession on someone's behalf: *P.Cair.Zen.* IV 59553.9 (256) with ἵνα followed by the subjunctive; *P.Mich.* I 23.7 (257) with a substantive infinitive in the genitive case—expressing purpose—followed by and parallel to ἵνα plus the subjunctive. This is a relatively rare usage, one not found in the later Ptolemaic period. Again, Petosiris uses a deliberately emphatic tone.
- 16–18. For the phrase τὰ νομιζόμενα συν- / ἐπιτελεῖν cf. *P.Hib.* I 77.3–4 (3rd c.); *P.Fouad* 16.10 (2nd c.); *UPZ* I 42.49 (162), 41.24 (161/0); *P.Tebt.* I 6.48 (140/39).
17. The sense of τοῦ . . ἰα ought to be τοῖς θεοῖς *vel sim.*; cf. *P.Hib.* I 77.3 (249/8); *UPZ* I 42.49 (162), 41.24 (161/0); *P.Amh.* II 35.53' (132).
18. We expect [ὑπὲρ ? σο]ῦ to refer to the king; the formula tends to be ὑπὲρ σοῦ / ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν / ὑμετέρων τέκνων; cf. *UPZ* I 42.50–51 (162), 41.24–25 (161/0); *P.Tebt.* I 6.49 (140/39); *P.Amh.* 2.35.53–55 (132); *BGU* IV 1197.21–22 (5/4). Perhaps its use here—if the restoration is correct—is intended to refer back to the lost portion of the text that corresponded to P.Duk.inv. 714.5–10: (οὐ) παραλείπομεν καθ' ἡμέραν εὐχ[ό]μενοι τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπὲρ σοῦ ἢ ὅπως ὑγαίνης καὶ εὐημερήῃς ἢ τὸν πάντα χρόνον παρὰ ἢ τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τῇ βασιλίσσηι. The traces at the end of the line are virtually illegible.
- 18–19. We expect a formulaic closing phrase here. None of those collected by A. di Bitonto, “Frammenti di petizioni del periodo tolemaico: Studio sul formulario,” *Aegyptus* 56 (1976) 109–143 at 137–140 seems to fit.
19. It is not certain whether the faint smudges on the line are anything more than just that.

. . .

P.Duk.inv. 716

10.1 x 9.5 cm.

140/39–137/6; ca. 140/39

<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/716.html>

Arsinoite

J. Oates, R. Weinberg, J. D. Sosin, P. Johnson, “Reading Invisible Ink: Digital Imaging of P.Duk.inv. 716,” see above, p.127-130 (lines 1-6).

The papyrus is badly damaged. The ink is faint and flakes easily. Much gesso remains on the recto as it could not be removed without taking the ink with it. The text has been published already as a case-study in the benefits of digital photography.³³ It is reproduced here for the sake of completeness. Petosiris addresses Phantias and then immediately begins with the body of the text. The long and subtly threatening prelude does not appear in the text as it stands. Perhaps Petosiris was less willing to push the strategos as he was the *archisōmatophylax*.

Text

Φανίαι τῶ[ν π]ρώτων φίλων καὶ
στρατηγῶ[ι κα]ὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων
παρὰ Πετ[οσί]ριος τοῦ {Πετο}
4 Πετοσίριος [ἰ]ερακοβοσκοῦ τῶν
ἐξ Ὀξυρύγχων τῆς Πολέμωνος
μερίδος. τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος

³³ See the publication for a description of the techniques applied in the decipherment of the first four badly abraded lines.

8 ἡμῖν ἱερακείου τ[. . .]ίου
 τετολύμ[ηκ — — ca. ? —]
 . [— — — — ca. ? — — —]

Translation

To Phantias, member of the first friends and strategos and the one who is in charge of revenues, from Petosiris son of Petosiris hawk-feeder among those from Oxyrhyncha of the Polemôn division. Since the hawk shrine ... that belongs to us has been ... X dared to ...

Notes

- 3–4. Petosiris the hawk-feeder is unknown. For other Ptolemaic *hierakoboskoi*: *P.Petr.* III 99.5 (Gurob; ca. 249/8); *P.Tebt.* III.2 1016.20 (2nd c.); *BGU* VIII 1754.14 (Herakleopolite; 1st c.). For Ptolemaic *ibioboskoi* see *CPR* XIII 26.1.7 (Arsinoite; 3rd c.); *P.Petr.* III 58.E.2.23 (Gurob; 3rd c.); *SB* XII 10860.Fragm.30.317 (Ghoran; 3rd c.); *SB* XVIII 13254.1 (Tholthis; 3rd c.); *P.Mich.*, I 31.1.Fragm. 1.8 (Philadelphia; 256–5?); *UPZ* II 154.6 (Thebaid; 254); *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59270.7 (Philadelphia; 251); *P.Petr.* III 99.5 (Gurob; ca. 249/8); *P.Petr.* III 82.3 (Gurob; 243/2); *UPZ* II 153.5 (Thebaid 225); *P.Enteux.* 50.1 (Magdola; 221); *P.Lond.* II 219.A.3 (Thebaid; 2nd c.); *P.Tebt.* III.2 1016.2.20 (2nd c.); *P.Aust.Herring* 5.1; B.7 (Arsinoite; 159); *UPZ* I 119.17 (Memphis; 156); *O.Bodl.* I 124.6 (Thebaid; 149/138BC); *P.Tebt.* I 61.B.15.401 (118–117); *P.Lond.* VII 2191.23 (Philadelphia; 116); *P.Tebt.* I 72.D.20.410 (114–113), 113.11 (114–113BC), *P.Batav.* 6.3, 22 (Pathyris; 109), *P.Lond.* III 882.14 (DspMn; 101BC). For an *ailouroboskos* see *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59451.2 (Philadelphia; 3rd c.); for *kynoboskoi* (evidently *hapax*) see *I.Fayoum* I 98 (mid 3rd c.).
- 6–7. No other *hierakeion* is attested at Oxyrhyncha.³⁴ On private ownership of shrines see *P.Petr.* II² 1.42–3, with discussion on p. 69.
7. τ[. . .]ίου: faint traces suggest that a diagonal stroke, descending from the upper left, may touch the bottom of what I have tentatively transcribed as an *iota*. Thus, perhaps we should read τ[. . .]ίου. On this reading the missing word ought to be a passive participle, completing the genitive absolute construction—τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος is attributive. This would be consistent with another petition that begins similarly with a genitive absolute (*P.Tebt.* III.1 816.24–26 [192]): τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἡμῖν οἰκίας ἐν Ἡρακλέους | [π]όλει τῆι ὑπὲρ Μέμφιν πίστει κυρωθε[ί]σ]ης ὑμῖν | [π]ωλεῖν ὡς ἂν βούλησθε ... (since the house that belongs to us in Herakleopolis has been securely placed in trust by us for you to sell as you please...). This *hierakeion* is not attested elsewhere; nor is another attested in the Arsinoite nome. For a first-century *hierakeion* in the Herakleopolite see *BGU* VIII 1754.2.14.
- 8–9. Restore τετόλύμ[ηκε Ἀπολλώνιος] followed by a complementary infinitive?

³⁴ W. Rübsam, *Götter und Kulte in Faijum während der griechisch-römisch-byzantinischen Zeit* (Bonn 1974).