

WILLY CLARYSSE & MARK DEPAUW

GREEK REGISTRATIONS IN HAWARA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 131 (2000) 125–128

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## 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:<sup>1</sup>

Ἀπολλώνιος καὶ Ποσειδώνιος ἀνέγρα(ψαν) (ἔτους) ιδ Μεσορῆ ἐπαγ(ομένων) β̄ τρο(φίτιν) ἀργυ(ρίου) χρυ(σῶν) κα, ἦν πο(ιεῖται) Πεμπῶς Ταμεστασύτμει. ἐπικελεύ(ει) ὁ πατήρ Κόλουλις, διὰ γρ(αμματέως) Ἰναρῶτος.

*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 Tamestasytmis. His father Koloulis agrees. Through the scribe Inaros.*

On the basis of the excellent plate, the reading ἀνεγρα should be corrected to ἀνενη, an abbreviation for ἀνενή(νεκται), passive perfect of the verb ἀναφέρω,<sup>2</sup> which is occasionally used in registrations.<sup>3</sup> 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 Ἀχ[ιλλ]εὺς ἀνεκή(ρυξαν) (ἔτους) β̄ Φαρμουῦθι γ̄ ἀποστ(άσιον) κατὰ νεκρ[ι].[...] Μαρρηῆ. ἐπικελεύει τ(ο)ύ(τοις) Θασῶς, διὰ Ἰναρῶτος.

*Dioscurides and Achilleus have proclaimed, in year 2, 3 Pharmuthi, a cession of mortuary property ... for Marres. Thasos concurs with this. Through Inaros.*<sup>4</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> For the reading of the ligature εν, 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.L.Bat. XXV 21, line 2, all from Hawara and from the same period.

<sup>3</sup> 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: ἀνενήνοχα τὴν συγγραφὴν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀ[ρχεῖον τῶν] δεδανημένων (P. Ryl. IV 588, line 39-41).

<sup>4</sup> E.A.E. Reymond, *Embalmer's Archives from Hawara* (*Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the Ashmolean Museum*, 1), Oxford 1973, p. 59, pl. 2 and 3.

<sup>5</sup> Reymond, *Embalmer's Archives*, p. 67 note 40.

<sup>6</sup> K. Vandorpe / W. Clarysse, *A Greek Winery for Sale in a Fayum Demotic Papyrus*, in: A.M.F.W. Verhoogt / S.P. Vleeming (ed.), *The Two Faces of Ancient Egypt. Greek and Demotic and Greek-Demotic Texts and Studies Presented to P.W. Pestman* (P.L. Bat., 30), Leiden 1998, p. 128 n. 7.

<sup>7</sup> As already noticed by the editor, the use of ἀνεκή(ρυξαν) 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.<sup>8</sup> It also solves the problematic reference to the clause of assent by the wife of the first party, Thasos: ἐπικελεύει τ(ο)ύ(τοις) Θασῶς. The awkward abbreviation in the middle of the word τ(ο)ύ(τοις) can be discarded in favour of the palaeographically and contextually more plausible ἡ γυ(νή). The addition of the article ἡ in a frontal apposition is paralleled in ὁ πατήρ of the above P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 12 or in ὁ πατήρ αὐτῆς of P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 13, but it is also found in several other misread subscriptions where reference is made to an approving relative (see below II).

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

P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 12	P. dem. Ashm. I 3
Ἄπολλώνιος καὶ Ποσειδώνιος. ἀνενή(νεκται) (ἔτους) ιδ Μεσορῆ ἐπαγομένων β̄ τρο(φίτις) ἀργυ(ρίου) χρυ(σῶν) κα, ἦν πο(ιεῖται) Πεμψᾶς Ταμεστασύτμει. ἐπικελεύ(ει) ὁ πατήρ Κόλουλις. διὰ γρ(αμματέως) Ἴναρῶτος. <sup>9</sup>	Διοσκουρίδης καὶ Ἀχιλλεύς. ἀνενή(νεκται) (ἔτους) β̄ Φαρμουθι ᾗ ἀποστ(άσιον) κ... νεκρ[ί]ων ταριχευτῶν, ὃ πο(ιεῖται) Σοκόνωπις] Μαρρεῖ. ἐπικελεύει ἡ γυ(νή) Θασῶς. διὰ Ἴναρῶτος. <sup>10</sup>
<i>Apollonios and Poseidonios. Has been registered, in year 4, the 2<sup>nd</sup> epagomene, an alimentary deed worth 21 gold pieces, made by Pempsas for Tamestasymtis. His father Koloulis agrees. Through the scribe Inaros.</i>	<i>Dioskourides and Akhilleus. Has been registered, in year 2, 3 Pharmuthi, a cession of ... (income of) embalmers' cemeteries [made by Sokonopis] for Marres. His wife Thasos agrees. Through Inaros.</i>

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 *Ἰρ.τ-Ἡρ-ρ-ρ=ω σζ Μζ'-Ρ' σζ Κιλ* 'Inaros son of Marres son of Koloulis'.<sup>11</sup> The editors of P. dem. Lüddeckens 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.<sup>12</sup> 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,<sup>13</sup> and by examples where the same rush was used for both Demotic contract and Greek subscription.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>8</sup> As already suggested in the review of the publication by R.H. Pierce, in: *BiOr* 32 (1975), col. 27a, who read ἀνενη(νό-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.

<sup>9</sup> With corrections of a full stop after the names of the registering officials (see U. Wilcken, *UPZ I* p. 609 and nos. 135-142), ἀνενή(νεκται) instead of ἀνέγρα(ψαν), and the nominative τρο(φίτις) instead of τρο(φίτιν).

<sup>10</sup> With corrections of ἀνενή(νεκται) instead of ἀνεκή(ρυξαν) and ἡ γυ(νή) instead of τ(ο)ύ(τοις). The text in the lacuna is suggested according to a combination of P. dem. Lüddeckens Hawara 17β and 19. The correct reading Μαρρεῖ rather than Μαρρηῖ was already suggested by J. Bingen in his review in *CdÉ* 51 (1976), p. 188.

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

<sup>12</sup> 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: *CdÉ* 68 (1993), pp. 186-201, esp. p. 193. Another clear example where Greek and Demotic were written with the same brush is P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 3 (233 BC).

<sup>13</sup> Add the new examples in P. dem. Lüddeckens Hawara 10, 13-15, 16α&β, 17α&β, 21a, 23 to the case mentioned in P.W. Pestman, *The Archive of the Theban Choachytes (Second Century B.C.). A Survey of the Demotic and Greek Papyri*

## II

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 ... ἦν πο(ιεῖται) Μαρεφauῆς Θασουχίω. ἐπικελεύ(ει) [ὁ] πα(τήρ) Νεκσοῦχis rather than ... ἦν πο(ιεῖται) Μαρεφauῆς Θασουχίω γυναικεί τῆ(ι) θυ(γατρὶ) Νεκσοῦχis. The scribe is thus cleared of the alleged ‘*gravierender Fehler*’ confusing the patronymics of the parties.<sup>15</sup>

Secondly there is the complex case of P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 16α and 17α, where the editors read the enigmatic ἐπικελεύ(ουσιν) οἱ γ, ἄλλ(οι) Ἀρμάις καὶ Ψύλλος and ἐπικελεύ(ουσι) οἱ γ· ἄλλ(οι) Ἀρμάιος καὶ Πετεσοῦχος, with the translation ‘*Ihre Zustimmung erteilen die Drei, die (beiden) anderen sind Harmais und Pysillos (resp. Harmaios und Petesuchos)*’. Here once again a kinship term solves the problem and instead of οἱ γ ἄλλ(οι) the correct reading is οἱ ἀδελ(φοί), 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 Pysillos, 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 Pysillos or Petesouchos respectively, hence the Greek registration’s misleading ‘*The brothers Harmais and Pysillos (resp. Petesouchos) agree*’. Or schematically:

- P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 16α original contract for Petesouchos, with clause of consent by Harmais in which he mentions Pysillos’ share; additional signature of Harmais
- P. dem. Lüdd. Hawara 17α original for Pysillos, 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 ἐπικελεύουσι οἱ τρεῖς Ἀρμάιος καὶ Πετεσοῦχος. This does not make sense as such, hence the editors’ emendation to ἐπικελεύουσι οἱ τρεῖς· <ἄλλ(οι)> Ἀρμάιος καὶ Πετεσοῦχος ‘*Ihre Zustimmung erteilen die Drei, <die (beiden) anderen sind> Harmaios und Petesouchos*’. 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 οἱ γ instead of οἱ ἀ, part of οἱ ἀδελ(φοί), 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 [ἐ]πικελεύ(ει) ὁ πρεσβύ(τερος) υἱὸς Ἀρμάις Ἀρμάιος μη(τρὸς) Ταμαρρῆς and ὁ υἱὸς ἐπικελεύ(ει) ὁ πρεσβύ(τερος) Ἀρμάις Ἀρμάιος μη(τρὸς) Ταμαρρῆς.

contained in the Archive (*Studia Demotica*, 2), Leuven 1993, pp. 338–339. For further connections between notaries and registrars, see *ibid.* p. 341.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. in P. dem. Lüdeckens Hawara 3. See also W. Clarysse, *op.cit.*

<sup>15</sup> Neksouchis the father of the declarant Marephaues does indeed give his consent in an elaborate clause at the end of the Demotic contract (ll. 3–6).

## III

The name of the official responsible for the registration in P. dem. Hawara Chicago 9 docket and P. dem. Hawara Lüdeckens 1 docket (9 and 10 March 239 BC respectively) is read as Ἐπιφανής by the editors.<sup>16</sup> Though Ἐπιφανής is well attested as a royal epithet, it is not common as a personal name.<sup>17</sup> In both passages the papyrus clearly reads διὰ Σωσιφάνους.

Leuven  
Oxford

Willy Clarysse  
Mark Depauw

---

<sup>16</sup> The inventory numbers are P. OI 25263 and P. Carlsberg 34.

<sup>17</sup> 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).