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GREEK REGISTRATIONS IN HAWARA

I

A newly published Demotic papyrus contract from Hawara (P. dem. Lüddeckens Hawara 12; 100 BC) bears a Greek note of registration which was read as follows by the editors:1

'Ἀπολλόνιος καὶ Ποσειδόνιος ἀνέγραψαν (ἐτοὺς) ἵνα Μεσορή ἔπαιρεν (ομένων) Β ὀργυρίου χρυσῆς καὶ Ἰννομίας Ταμεστασύμπει. ἐπικελεύει (ἐν) ὅ πατὴρ Κόλουλις, διὰ γραμματέως Ἰναρότας.

Apollonios and Poseidonios have registered, in year 4, the second day of the epagomenai, an alimentary deed worth 21 gold pieces, made by Pempsas for Tamestasytmeis. His father Koloulis agrees. Through the scribe Inaros.

On the basis of the excellent plate, the reading ονεγρα should be corrected to ονενη, an abbreviation for ονενη(νεκται), passive perfect of the verb ονεσαρφω,2 which is occasionally used in registrations.3 The same expression also went unrecognized in a very similar Greek subscription underneath a Demotic cession of mortuary liturgies, P. dem. Ashm. I 3 (= SB XIV 11404; Hawara, 115 BC), which was read as follows:

Διοσκουρίδης καὶ Ἀχίλλεις ἀνέκατος (πεταν) ἐν ἑπιστάσαται κατὰ νεκρῆ [...]. Μαρρης ἐπικελεύει τοῖς (τοῖς) θεσσας, διὰ Ἰναρότας.

Dioskourides and Achilleus have proclaimed, in year 2, 3 Pharmuthi, a cession of mortuary property ... for Marres. Thasos concurs with this. Through Inaros.4

The editor suggested that Dioskourides and Achilleus, whose names are not mentioned in the Demotic text, ‘acted as the ῥδω ‘officials’, representatives of the contracting parties’.5 The Greek text was subsequently interpreted as a subscription by the representatives of the consenting spouse of the declarant.6 Apart from other objections against these interpretations,7 the parallelism with the new text clearly shows that ονενη for ονενη(νεκται) should be read, that Dioskourides and Achilleus are the officials responsible for the registration, and that διὰ Ἰναρότας at the end provides the name of the

1 Inventory number P. BM 10603, published in E. Lüddeckens / R. Wassermann et al., Demotische Urkunden aus Hawara, (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 28), Stuttgart 1998.
2 For the reading of the ligature ev, see the very similar writing in P. dem. Ashm. I 25 (inv. Gr. 46), line 5; I 24 (inv. Gr. 47), line 2 (both plate XVI); and P.I.Bat. XXV 21, line 2, all from Hawara and from the same period.
3 The examples mentioned in Preisigke, Wörterbuch, col. 110-111, all date to the second and third century AD. Compare, however, the similar use in a Greek subscription by an Egyptian declarant in first century BC Fayum: ἀνεκατοκα τὴν συγγραφὴν ἐπὶ τὸ οὐρξον τῶν διδασκαλίαν (P. Ryl. IV 588, line 39-41).
5 Reymond, Embalmers’ Archives, p. 67 note 40.
7 As already noticed by the editor, the use of ἀνεκατοκα(πεταν) is unfamiliar in this context; contracting parties or their relatives only rarely express their consent in Greek under a Demotic contract, and two men with typically Greek names are not the most likely representatives for a consenting spouse with an Egyptian name; the other names mentioned are left unaccounted for. For autograph subscriptions under Demotic contracts before the Roman period, see now M. Depauw, Autograph Confirmation in Demotic Private Contracts, 1. Early Demotic and Ptolemaic Subscriptions, in: Chronique d’Égypte 75 (2000), forthcoming.
scribe of the Demotic notary contract. It also solves the problematic reference to the clause of assent by the wife of the first party, Thasos: 

\[ \text{Inaros. His father Koloulis agrees.} \]

We therefore propose the following new readings and translations for these registrations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Απολλώνιος καὶ Ποσειδώνιος. ἁνενή(νεκται) (ἐτούς) ἱδ Μεσορή ἐπαγο(μένω) ἔ μ(φίτις) ἄργω(ρίου) χρυ(σόν) κα, ἢ πο(τεταί) Πεμψάς Ταμεσσασύμηει. ἐπικελεύ(ει) ὁ πατήρ Κόλουλης, διά γρ(αμματέως) Ἰναρώτος.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Apollonios and Poseidonios. Has been registered, in year 4, the 2nd epagomene, an alimentary deed worth 21 gold pieces, made by Pempsas for Tamestatymis. His father Koloulis agrees.} \]

\[ \text{Through the scribe Inaros.} \]

\[ \text{Through the scribe Inaros.} \]

Although the signature at the end of the Demotic contract of P. dem. Ashmolean I 3 is lost, the Greek docket, the identical provenance, the date, and the palaeographical similarities show that in both cases the scribe of the Demotic was 'Ir. t-Hr-r-r=r=t w 3: M. p. 237 R' s: Kii ‘Inaros son of Marres son of Koloulis’. The editors of P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 12 have suggested that Inaros first wrote the Demotic text of the contract, and then, after having changed his Egyptian rush for the sharp Greek reed pen, also the Greek subscription. The similarity in formulation between the two registrations, despite the fifteen-year gap dividing them, seems to confirm this. The handwritings of the two subscriptions, however, are not at all similar and apparently contradict the idea. That Egyptian notaries were at least involved in registering the deed is proven by the fact that they are mentioned at the end of the subscription, and by examples where the same rush was used for both Demotic contract and Greek subscription.14

---

8 As already suggested in the review of the publication by R.H. Pierce, in: BiOr 32 (1975), col. 27a, who read ἁνενή(νο-χασιν): in view of parallels it seems better to solve the abbreviation as a passive (see below n. 9). Pierce’s suggestions have not found their way into the Greek Berichtigungsliste.

9 With corrections of a full stop after the names of the registering officials (see U. Wilcken, UPZ I p. 609 and nos. 135-142), ἁνενή(νεκται) instead of ἁνενή(νο-χασιν), and the nominative τρο(φίτις) instead of τρο(φίτιν).

10 With corrections of ἁνενή(νεκται) instead of ἁνενή(ροξαν) and ἡ γο(νή) instead of τ(ο)ι(τοι). The text in the lacuna is suggested according to a combination of P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 17β and 19. The correct reading Μαρρῆ has already suggested by J. Bingen in his review in CdE 51 (1976), p. 188.

11 See e.g. his writing of ny hry at the end of both contracts. Inaros probably wrote P. BM 10603 for his brother. See furthermore P. dem. Ashmolean 16 & 17.

12 For the different writing tools, see W.J. Tait, Rush and Reed: the Pens of Egyptian and Greek Scribes, in: B.G. Mandilaras et al. (eds.), Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25–31 May 1986, Athens 1988, vol. 2, pp. 477–481. After about 230 BC Egyptians seem to have abandoned the use of the brush for Greek, although for some Greek subscriptions the scribes apparently did not bother to change writing tool. See W. Clarysse, Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek, in: CdE 68 (1993), pp. 186–201, esp. p. 193. Another clear example where Greek and Demotic were written with the same brush is P. dem. Lüd. Hawara 3 (233 BC).

Amongst the registrations of the newly published Hawara papyri there are two further instances where the precise genealogical relationship between the declarant and the consenting relative has gone unrecognised.

First there is P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 15, which reads ... Ἰεν ... Ἰασοὐχίς rather than ... Ἰεν ... Ἰασοὐχίς. The scribe is thus cleared of the alleged 'gravierender Fehler' confusing the patronymics of the parties.15

Secondly there is the complex case of P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 16α and 17α, where the editors read the enigmatic ἐπικελεύσαι of γ ... Ἀρμαίος καὶ Πετεσοῦχος, with the translation 'Ihre Zustimmung erteilen die Drei, die (beiden) anderen sind Harmaios und Psyllos (resp. Harmaios und Petesouchos)'. Here once again a kinship term solves the problem and instead of γ ἄλλοι the correct reading is γ ἄδελ(φοι), which is confirmed by the text of the Demotic contracts. P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 16 and 17 refer to the same transaction, in which the father divides his property among his children from two marriages. The originals 16α and 17α have been issued for the younger siblings Petesouchos and Psyllos, with a clause of consent and a signature of their older halfbrother Harmais. In the clause of consent, however, the latter also refers to the portion assigned to the third brother Psyllos or Petesouchos respectively, hence the Greek registration’s misleading 'The brothers Harmaios and Psyllos (resp. Petesouchos) agree'. Or schematically:

P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 16α original contract for Petesouchos, with clause of consent by Harmais in which he mentions Psyllos’ share; additional signature of Harmais

P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 17α original for Psyllos, with clause of consent by Harmais in which he mentions Petesouchos’ share; additional signature of Harmais

P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 16β and 17β are copies of these originals with almost identical Demotic texts, written by the same notary. Again both contracts have been registered, but clearly in a hand different from that of the Greek subscriptions on the originals. The registration of 16β does not refer to the clause of consent, but that of 17β, continued on the verso, has a clear ἐπικελεύσαι τρεῖς Ἀρμαίος καὶ Πετεσοῦχος. This does not make sense as such, hence the editors’ emendation to ἐπικελεύσαι τρεῖς ἄλλοι Ἰασοῦχων. In our opinion it is more likely that the scribe who added the note of registration on the copies briefly glanced at the registration on the original, erroneously read γ instead of ἓ, part of γ ἄδελ(φοι), and made abstraction of the strokes that followed. Only the Greek summaries of the contracts on the verso of the originals 16α and 17α, in yet another hand, have the more precise ἐπικελεύσαι ὁ πρεσβύ(τερος) ὦ Ἰασοῦχων Ἀρμαίος μη(τρός) Ταμαρρής and ὦ Ἰασοῦχων ὁ πρεσβύ(τερος) Ἀρμαίος μη(τρός) Ταμαρρής.
III

The name of the official responsible for the registration in P. dem. Hawara Chicago 9 docket and P. dem. Hawara Lüddeckens 1 docket (9 and 10 March 239 BC respectively) is read as Ἐπιφανής by the editors. Though Ἐπιφανής is well attested as a royal epithet, it is not common as a personal name. In both passages the papyrus clearly reads δἰά Σωσιφάνους.

---

16 The inventory numbers are P. OI 25263 and P. Carlsberg 34.
17 In the fragmentary P. Tebt. III 811 l. 23 it is probably a proper name, although a royal name can perhaps not be excluded. In P. Ryl. IV 580 l. 7 (Pros Ptol I 3908) an interpretation as a personal name is certain. See also SB XVIII 13221 (Roman period).