

JAMES M.S. COWEY & DEMOKRITOS KALTSAS

P.ELEPH. DAIK 1

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 123 (1998) 149–150

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

P.ELEPH. DAIK 1

Amongst the recently published papyri and ostraca from Elephantine¹ the very first papyrus (P.Eleph. DAIK 1) stands out as a particularly interesting document. It presents an extract from a judgement made by the chrematists, which deals with the usurpation of the guardianship of a certain Biote.

The text is dated to a seventh year, which the editor assigns to Ptolemy I Soter or Ptolemy II Philadelphus on the basis of the handwriting (note on line 2). Both these dates (299-298 B.C. or 279-278 B.C.) seem exceptionally early and would make our text one of the earliest Greek papyri from Egypt, from the time before the bulk of our documentation sets in (the Hibeh papyri and the papyri belonging to the Zenon archive). We may also add that our earliest instance of the institution of the chrematists in the Arsinoite nome is from 254 B.C. (P.Mich. I 39 and H. J. Wolff, *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer* (MB 44), München² 1970, p. 69).

In our opinion, the only argument the editor offers for his dating, the handwriting, is insufficient. There is no aspect of it that would prevent the papyrus from being dated to year 7 of Ptolemy III Euergetes (241-240 B.C.), see the photograph on Planche 1a. For example a royal decree from 237 B.C., P.Mich. I 70 (= C.Ord.Ptol. 27) with Plate IV after p. 148, is written in handwriting which is not far removed from the hand of P.Eleph. DAIK 1.

A prosopographical argument, based on a new reading, could lend support to this later dating. Lines 20-22 have been read by the editor as follows: ἀνάγειν δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν | βουλόμενον ἐπαινήσι | δῆμον. Αὐτόν refers to the condemned person, a certain Nikias, who had failed to appear for the trial (lines 9-10: ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμφανὲς (l. ἐμφανῆς) | ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος). Wagner reads ἐπαινῆσει instead of ἐπαινῆσι and translates “et de le (= Nikias) ramener de son plein gré, honorera le Peuple”. This construction is rather curious and presupposes an orthographical error in a text, in which the only other mistake is ἐμφανὲς instead of ἐμφανῆς in line 9. Retaining the reading but introducing a different word-division we can attain better sense: instead of ἐπαινῆσι | δῆμον we should read ἐπ’ Αἰνησίδημον. Further by putting a full stop after γαμεῖν in line 19 and taking ἀνάγειν in line 20 to be a jussive infinitive, we can interpret the three last lines of the text as an appeal for the apprehension of the missing man: ἀνάγειν δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν | βουλόμενον ἐπ’ Αἰνησίδημον, which we should translate “and let whoever wishes lead him before Ainesidemus”².

Ainesidemus is a rare name in the papyri. There are only three other instances, all dating from roughly the same period: P.Cair.Zen. III 59442.10 (= C.Ptol.Sklav. I 74, Alexandria?, mid 3rd century B.C.), P.Hib. I 71.5, 12 (= C.Ptol.Sklav. II 219, Heracleopolite?, 245 B.C.) and SB I 1685.5 (Alexandria, 239 B.C.). Ainesidemus in P.Hib. I 71 is involved with persons who have deserted quarry works (λατομίας): since Ainesidemus in P.Eleph. DAIK 1 is the official who is responsible for a man to be transported to the quarries (lines 5-6 and 7: ἀπαχθῆναι εἰς τὰ ἔργα³), we may well be dealing with the same man.

¹ G. Wagner, *Les Papyrus et les ostraca grecs d'Elephantine* (P. et O.Eleph. DAIK), Mainz am Rhein 1998, Grabung des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Schweizerischen Institut für Ägyptische Bauforschung und Altertumskunde Kairo, Elephantine XIII, Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 70.

² Such appeals to the general public often have τὸν βουλόμενον with the jussive infinitive, cf. μνηστέον τὸν βουλόμενον in C.Ord.Ptol. 21.29 (= SB V 8008), C.Ord.Ptol. 73.9 (= BGU VIII 1730 = Sel.Pap. II 209), C.Ord.Ptol. 82.17 (= BGU VI 1212). A parallel appeal to apprehend is UPZ I 121.12-13 (= C.Ptol.Sklav. I 81): τοῦτον ὃς ἂν ἀναγάγῃ, λήψεται χαλκοῦ (τάλαντα) κτλ. (τοῦτον refers to a runaway slave); cf. also Welles 73.8-9 with reference to a traitor and his sons (quoted by C. Römer in P.Köln VIII 348 introduction [p. 137, note 3]; the verb is ἄγειν) and P.Köln VIII 348 itself, a wanted notice for a female donkey, lines 3-6: ταύτην ὃς ἂν ἀνάγῃ | ἐπ’ Ἀλέξανδρον [τὸ]ν στρατοφύλακα --- λήψεται χαλκοῦ (δραχμᾶς) Ἄφ. The final part of the P.Eleph. DAIK 1 decision may well have led to the publication of a wanted notice with a reward.

³ For examples of τὰ ἔργα meaning mine works or quarry works see *LSJ* s.v. ἔργον I 3 c and although not in Preisigke, *WB*, passages such as P.Petr. II 4 (6) 1-2 καταβάντος | μου ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα could be interpreted in this sense. Cf. also Scholl,

It is further not inconceivable that the other two texts refer to the same man, if the rarity of the name and the coincidence of the dates contained in the texts can serve as a reliable argument. The text of SB I 1685, an inscription on a funerary urn from Alexandria, is as follows: Διὰ Φίλωνος. Ἰ Έτους ἦ Ξανδικουῦ κ̅ε̅. Ἰ Φιλώτου ἱπάρχου Ἰ τῶν δι' Ἀντάνδρου Ἰ τοῦ παρ' Αἰνησιδήμου τῶν Ἰ σ(ωματο)φυ(λάκων)⁴. Year 8 in this inscription has been assigned to Ptolemy III Euergetes and converted to 239 B.C.⁵ (a year later than P.Eleph. DAIK 1, if the new dating is correct). Ainesidemus (Pros. Ptol. II 4326 and Mooren⁶, No. 033) bears here the real court title σωματοφύλαξ, which indicates that he was a man of some importance at court. P.Cair.Zen. III 59442 is too fragmentary to add anything substantial to the picture; Ainesidemus is here mentioned in the same breath as a runaway slave, but it cannot be made out with certainty whether there is any connection between the two.

Finally we think that P.Eleph. DAIK 1 contains two more personal names. The editor prints lines 2-3 as follows: διὰ χρηματιστῶν πᾶσι στρατοῦ λοφίου, which he translates “par les Chrematistes pour tous ceux de l’armée du <Sommet de la colline>”. In his note on line 3 he rejects the possibility of reading two names in line 3 (i.e. Πασιστράτου Λοφίου), on the grounds that Pasistratos (contrary to Lophios) is not attested as a personal name. It is indeed not to be found in the standard onomastic works (Pape-Benseler⁷, Bechtel⁸, *LGPN* I-III A, Masson, *OGS*⁹); however, since there is nothing untoward about its form and since the editor’s understanding of his reading πᾶσι στρατοῦ λοφίου is not really very convincing, we think it better to suppose two proper names of the chrematists¹⁰. The absence of καί between the names is not unusual; cf. P.Tebt. III 2, 934.2 (c. 156 B.C.), P.Mert. II 59.5 (= C.Ptol. Sklav. I 59, 154-145 B.C.), UPZ I 118.4-5 (= Sel. Pap. II 264, 156-153 B.C.), BGU VIII 1827.15 (52-51 B.C.). Interestingly enough, an Alexandrian chrematist mentioned in P.Enteux. 8 from 221 B.C. (Pros. Ptol. III 8016) bore a name ending in -οφιος or -οφιας: χρηματιστῶν τῶν τὰ προσπίπτοντα κρινάντων ἐν τῷ Ἰ Ἀλφα Λεωνίδου, Ἰ Ἡγησιάνακτος [. . .] Ἰ οφίου (lines 6-7). There are not many names which come into consideration; the possibility of reading [καί] Λοφίου should at least be seriously considered, although we are unable to verify it on the photograph. It is not impossible that the same man continued to act as a chrematist some twenty years after the proposed date for P.Eleph. DAIK 1; of course he may well have spent an early part of his career in the chora.

With the new readings and the redating of this intriguing text we hope to have provided a firmer basis for work on the problems it still presents.

Heidelberg

James M.S. Cowey
Demokritos Kaltsas

C.Ptol. Sklav. II, p. 873 on P.Tebt. III 1, 703.215ff. P.Enteux. 61.6: ὁ {ο} Νικόδημος ἀφειθεὶς ἐκ τῶν ἔργων comes from the Heracleopolite nome and could, despite Guérauds’ interpretation *ad loc.* (“Il s’agit sans doute de corvées, comme celles par lesquelles on assurait l’entretien des digues”), be taken to refer to the same quarries as P.Hib. I 71. We might note that there seem to be no clear instances of heavy labour in quarries as a penal measure in Ptolemaic Egypt, cf. A. Helms, *Crime et châtement dans l’Égypte ptolémaïque. Recherches sur l’autonomie d’un modèle pénal*, Paris 1986 (thèse dact.), p. 196 with note 42 on p. 318. The text discussed here provides definite proof for condemnation to hard labour, be it to quarry or canal works.

⁴ For the corrections to the text see SB III, p. 396, SEG II 880 and Pros. Ptol. II 4326.

⁵ See BL III 167.

⁶ L. Mooren, *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt. Introduction and Prosopography* (*Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Klasse der letteren*. Jaargang XXXVII Nr. 78), Brussel 1975.

⁷ W. Pape - G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* I-II, Braunschweig³ 1911 (Reprint Graz 1959).

⁸ F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle 1917.

⁹ O. Masson, *Onomastica Graeca Selecta* (Introduction et index de C. Dobias et L. Dubois) I-II, Paris 1990.

¹⁰ One would have expected there to be three chrematists, as is the case already in the third century B.C., cf. Wolff, *op.cit.*, p. 68 with note 20; however a case is known from the second century B.C. where one of three chrematists was not able to attend because of illness (s. Wolff, *ibidem* with note 20a); this would not necessarily have had to be mentioned in an extract.