

Herausgegeben von:

Thomas Corsten

Fritz Mitthof

Bernhard Palme

Hans Taeuber

TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

HOLZHAUSEN
DER VERLAG

Band 31, 2016



Hermann Harrauer

zum 75. Geburtstag

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

| | |
|---|-----|
| Norman G. A s h t o n – Gregory H. R. H o r s l e y: A rediscovered <i>arkhisynagogos</i> inscription from Thessaloniki, and an intriguing Iulia Prokla (Taf. 1–6) | 1 |
| John B a u s c h a t z: Lochos and Ariston (Taf. 7–16) | 25 |
| Christer B r u n: A Dedication in 173 CE at Roman Ostia, carried out on the Emperor Antoninus Pius’ <i>dies natalis</i> (Taf. 17) | 47 |
| Emanuele C a s t e l l i: <i>Titulus</i> . Un contributo alla storia della parola nel mondo romano | 51 |
| Sara C h i a r i n i: Ἐγὼ εἶμι Ἑρμῆς. Eine dramaturgische Facette der antiken Zaubersprache | 75 |
| Maurizio C o l o m b o: La campagna estiva del 357 in <i>Germania I</i> , la spedizione del <i>magister peditum praesentalis</i> Barbatio contro gli Alamanni Iuthungi in <i>Raetia II</i> e le manipolazioni narrative di Ammiano Marcellino | 103 |
| Dan D a n a – Florian M a t e i - P o p e s c u: Quatre diplômes militaires fragmentaires (Taf. 18) | 127 |
| Michael F l e x s e n h a r I I I: Marcia, Commodus’ ‘Christian’ Concubine and CIL X 5918 (Taf. 19) | 135 |
| Regula F r e i - S t o l b a – Benjamin H a r t m a n n – Cédric R o m s: <i>Vadimonium Nertae</i> . Zum römischen Privatrecht in den gallischen Provinzen (Taf. 20) | 149 |
| Marco F r e s s u r a: Un frammento di “glossario virgiliano” in P.Vindob. L 102 f (Verg. <i>Aen.</i> I 707–708, 714–715, con traduzione greca) (Taf. 21) | 157 |
| Chrysi K o t s i f o u: Prayers and petitions for justice. Despair and the ‘crossing of boundaries’ between religion and law | 167 |
| Peter v a n M i n n e n: A Receipt for Tax Arrears from Hermopolis (Taf. 22) | 201 |
| Fritz M i t t h o f – Konrad S t a u n e r: Zwei Kassen in der römischen Armee und die Rolle der <i>signiferi</i> . Ein neues Papyruszeugnis: P.Hamb. inv. 445 (Taf. 23) | 205 |
| Bülent Ö z t ü r k: New Inscriptions from Karadeniz Ereğli Museum III (Herakleia Pontike and Tieion/Tios) (Taf. 24–27) | 227 |
| Amphilochios P a p a t h o m a s: Die Enttäuschung des belesenen Severus. Eine Anspielung auf Herodot I 44, 2 im Brief P.Oslo II 50 | 235 |
| Shane W a l l a c e: The Rescript of Philip III Arrhidaios and the Two Tyrannies at Eresos (Taf. 28) | 239 |
| Ekkehard W e b e r: Scaurianus (Taf. 29) | 259 |

Inhaltsverzeichnis

| | |
|--|-----|
| Bemerkungen zu Papyri XXIX (<Korr. Tyche> 820–831) | 269 |
| Adnotationes epigraphicae VII (<Adn. Tyche> 57–60) (Taf. 30–31) | 285 |
| Buchbesprechungen | 291 |
| <p>Charikleia A r m o n i, <i>Das Archiv der Taricheuten Amenneus und Onnophris aus Tanis (P.Tarich)</i>, Paderborn 2013 (A. Papatomas: 291) — Roger S. B a g n a l l, James G. K e e n a n, Leslie S. B. M a c C o u l l, <i>A Sixth-Century Tax Register from the Hermopolite Nome</i>, Durham 2011 (A. Papatomas: 293) — Peter F u n k e, Matthias H a a k e (Hrsg.), <i>Greek Federal States and Their Sanctuaries. Identity and Integration, Proceedings of an International Conference of the Cluster of Excellence “Religion and Politics” held in Münster, 17.06.–19.06.2010</i>, Stuttgart 2013 (J. Piccinini: 295) — Alisdair G. G. G i b s o n (Hrsg.), <i>The Julio-Claudian Succession. Reality and Perception of the ‘Augustan Model’</i>, Leiden 2013 (R. Wolters: 297) — Volker G r i e b, Clemens K o e h n (Hrsg.), <i>Polybios und seine Historien</i>, Stuttgart 2013 (É. Foulon: 299) — Felix K. M a i e r, “Überall mit dem Unerwarteten rechnen”: <i>Die Kontingenz historischer Prozesse bei Polybios</i>, München Beck 2012 (F. Russo: 301) — Mischa M e i e r, Steffen P a t z o l d (Hrsg.), <i>Chlodwigs Welt. Organisation von Herrschaft um 500</i>, Stuttgart 2014 (R. Whelan: 304) — Theresa N e s s e l r a t h, <i>Kaiser Julian und die Repaganisierung des Reiches. Konzept und Vorbilder</i>, Münster 2013 (H. Förster: 307) — Julietta S t e i n h a u e r, <i>Religious Associations in the Post-Classical Polis</i>, Stuttgart 2014 (I. N. Arnaoutoglou: 309) — Claudio V a c a n t i, <i>Guerra per la Sicilia e guerra della Sicilia. Il ruolo delle città siciliane nel primo conflitto romano-punico</i>, Napoli 2012 (L. Cappelletti: 317).</p> | |
| Indices | 321 |
| Eingelange Bücher | 327 |

Tafeln 1–31

Die *Annona Epigraphica Austriaca* erscheint auf der Homepage des Instituts für Alte Geschichte der Universität Wien (<http://altegeschichte.univie.ac.at/forschung/aea/>) und wie bisher auch in der Zeitschrift *Römisches Österreich*.

JOHN BAUSCHATZ

Lochos and Ariston*

Plates 7–16

I present here nine Ptolemaic documents from the Duke Papyrus Archive,¹ a small dossier which details some of the activities of two second-century B.C. government officials: Ariston, τῶν πρώτων φίλων, στρατηγός, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων and νομάρχης, and Lochos, τῶν πρώτων φίλων and perhaps also a στρατηγός.²

The Documents

The texts presented below derive from a cache of mummy cartonnage purchased by Duke University in 1974 which eventually yielded P.Duk.inv. numbers 324–434.³ To date, only one text from this extensive group has been published.⁴ The documents in the set appear to date to the second century B.C. and to derive from the Herakleopolite nome, though both determinations must be considered hypothetical until more texts are published.⁵ While many of the individual papyri in this large group are small scraps of an indeterminate nature, dozens of them are identifiable as official letters and memoranda, petitions, accounts, lists, tax registers, leases and receipts.⁶ The nine texts in the

* I would like to thank the anonymous readers at Tyche for their many helpful suggestions. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Joshua Sosin and Megan O'Connell at Duke University for their assistance in obtaining images of the papyri in this article.

¹ Duke Papyrus Archive: <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/>. Images of all the texts presented here were accessed via the Archive. I have not seen the papyri first-hand.

² Unless otherwise noted, all abbreviations for editions of papyri are those of the Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets (<http://papyri.info/docs/checklist>). All translations are my own.

³ Acquisition of the Duke papyri: <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/acquisitions.html>.

⁴ P.Duk.inv. 360 (<http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/records/360.html>) was published in J. Bauschatz, *Three Duke Petitions*, ZPE 152 (2005) 194–196.

⁵ On the dates and provenance of the documents in the dossier, see below.

⁶ With few exceptions, P.Duk.inv. numbers 376–434 are small fragments of documents, many of them with only slight traces of writing. Official letters/memoranda: 332r, 333, 334, 335, 337r (?), 340, 342v, 343, 344 (?), 345r (?), 346v (?), 348v (?), 365 (?), 367 (?), 368 (?), 369v (?), 370r, 371, 372 (?), 373r (?); petitions: 338, 339 (?), 357, 358 (?), 359, 360, 374 (?), 384 (?); accounts: 341v (?), 345v (?), 351 (?), 369r (?), 375r, 378v (?), 383 (?), 387v, 397 (?), 416 (?), 423 (?); lists: 341r, 342r, 347, 348r, 349, 350, 352–355, 356r(b), 410 (?), 425 (?); tax register: 356v (?); lease: 362 (?); receipt: 361.

subset presented here — P.Duk.invs. 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331 and 336 — are all official letters.

Officials

These nine texts are connected by the appearance in them of two officials: Ariston, who held the positions of στρατηγός, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων and νομάρχης, as well as the court rank of τῶν πρώτων φίλων, “of the first friends” (of the king), and Lochos, who also has the rank of τῶν πρώτων φίλων in one of the documents (P.Duk.inv. 336.4) and may in fact have held a number of administrative positions, among these στρατηγός. Ariston appears in P.Duk.invs. 324, 325, 327, 329, 330 and 331; Lochos appears in 336; both men turn up in 326 and 328.

In spite of the fact that he appears in only three of the texts under consideration, it is quite possible that we know more about Lochos than Ariston. Another man of the same name appears in eleven late second-century documents spanning the years 127–113 B.C. and from a variety of different places.⁷ The Lochos who appears in them was the son of Kallimedes, had the court rank of a συγγενής (“kinsman” of the king) and held a number of different posts throughout his career: he was an eponymous officer,⁸ a ὑπομνηματογράφος (chief secretary), and, most importantly, στρατηγός (governor) of the Thebaid, a nome-level official with a number of civil, military and economic duties.⁹ Among Ptolemaic στρατηγοί, the position of στρατηγός of the Thebaid was

⁷ Trismegistos number (TM nr.) 10061: I.Délos 1526.5–7 (Delos, 127–126 B.C.?); I.Prose 22A.7–8, B.13, C.33–34 (Philae, 124–116 B.C.); P.Adler 2.4 (Pathyris, 124 B.C.); P.Dion. 21.30 (Akoris, 113 B.C.), 34.2 (Hermopolite, 116 B.C.); P.Dryton 23.9 (Pathyris, 124–116 B.C.); P.Ehevertr. 39 + P.Ryl.Dem. 20.3 (Pathyris, 116 B.C.); P.Ryl.Dem. 17 + P.Ryl. II 249.2 (Pathyris, 118 B.C.); SB VIII 9972.1–3, 9973.1–4 (both Cyprus, both 127–124 B.C.); UPZ II 187.6–7 (Thebes, 127–126 B.C.). Lochos possibly appears in a literary source, as well. If we emend the text of Diodorus 34/35.20.1 from Ἡγέλοχος to ἦγε Λόχος, we see that Lochos, στρατηγός, was sent by Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II against Marsyas, στρατηγός of the Alexandrians. This campaign likely occurred in 127/126 B.C., which fits nicely within the window of Lochos’ other attested activities. On this emendation see I.Prose II p. 62. Aside from Lochos, son of Kallimedes, the name Lochos occurs only very rarely in the second century B.C.

⁸ That is, the men under his command referred to themselves as “under the command of Lochos”. On eponymous cavalry commanders in Ptolemaic Egypt, see S. Fischer-Bovet, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge 2014, 158–159.

⁹ On the career of Lochos, see above all W. Peremans, E. Van’t Dack, *Prosopographica*, Louvain 1953, 40–45; also J. D. Thomas, *The epistrategos in Ptolemaic Egypt. Part I: The Ptolemaic epistrategos*, Wiesbaden 1975, 115–116; P. M. Meyer, *Das Heerwesen der Ptolemäer und Römer in Ägypten*, Leipzig 1900, 80 and OGIS pp.135–139. Titles: eponymous cavalry commander: P.Adler 2.4, P.Dion. 21.30 and 34.2, P.Dryton 23.9, P.Ehevertr. 39 + P.Ryl.Dem. 20.3, P.Ryl.Dem. 17 + P.Ryl. II 249.2; ὑπομνηματογράφος: SB VIII 9972.2, 9973.3; στρατηγός: I.Prose 22A.7–8 and C.33–34 (he is specifically called στρατηγός of the Thebaid in the latter instance), SB VIII 9972.2–3 and 9973.3–4 (where he is called στρατηγός αυτοκράτορος of the Thebaid: see Thomas, *epistrategos* [above] 115–116); συγγενής (of the king): I.Délos 1526.5–6, I.Prose 22A.7 and C.33, SB VIII 9972.1, 9973.2, UPZ II 187.6–7. Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II also calls Lochos ἀδελφός (“brother”) in I.Prose 22B.13, and he is referred to as ὑπέρμαχος

especially important. The Thebaid suffered through a large-scale revolt between the late third century and early second century B.C., after which it was more heavily policed. The position of ἐπιστρατηγός of the Thebaid was subsequently created to provide more supervision of and support to the various στρατηγοί of the nomes of the Thebaid.¹⁰ The στρατηγός of the Thebaid was a civil and military official superior to virtually all other officials in the Thebaid.¹¹

We have less luck when hunting for Ariston. Though the name occurs throughout the time and space of the Ptolemaic empire, only a pair of men with the name may reasonably be considered possible matches for the official in our texts. In UPZ I pp. 596–597.6, 11 (Thebes, 145 B.C.; TM nr. 343479), an Ariston without title is said to have sent instructions regarding some Egyptian contracts. Forty-six years after this, another Ariston appears in UPZ I 108.33, 34 (Memphis, 99 B.C.), this time with the title of στρατηγός “of the same nome” (TM nr. 5880). In addition to holding the title of στρατηγός like Lochos, as well as the court title of τῶν πρώτων φίλων, the Duke documents reveal that Ariston also held the positions of ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων and νομάρχης.¹² As it happens, the combination of titles seen in the case of Ariston is not completely without parallel in the evidence. A number of men held the positions of

(“champion”) in SB VIII 9972.1 and 9973.2. On ὑπομηματογράφοι, see P.Tebt. III.1 703 introduction, pp. 68–70; on the title συγγενής and other court appellations, see L. Mooren, *Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt: Introduction and Prosopography*, Brussels 1975 and id., *La Hiérarchie de cour ptolémaïque : Contribution à l'étude des institutions et des classes dirigeantes à l'époque hellénistique*, Louvain 1977; on the στρατηγός, first and foremost H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit III*, München 1964–1967, and N. Hohlwein, *Le stratège du nome*, Bruxelles 1969; also E. Van't Dack, *Les stratèges dans les archives d'Assiout*, *Studia Hellenistica* 5 (1948) 45–55; and L. Mooren, *On the Jurisdiction of the Nome Strategoi in Ptolemaic Egypt*, *PapCongr XVII* (1984) 1217–1225.

¹⁰ On the ἐπιστρατηγός (literally “[man] in charge of the στρατηγός”) see Thomas, *epistrategos* (n. 9).

¹¹ Thomas, *epistrategos* (n. 9) 32.

¹² The appellation τῶν πρώτων φίλων was an important court title: Mooren, *Aulic Titulature* (n. 9); *Hiérarchie* (n. 9). The official with the title ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων was concerned with state income and payments to soldiers: E. Salmenkivi, *A Note on the Ptolemaic ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων*, *Arctos* 37 (2003) 123–132. The Ptolemaic νομάρχης was the highest-ranking agricultural official in a nome: R. Seider, *Beiträge zur ptolemäischen Verwaltungsgeschichte. Der Nomarches. Der Dioiketes Apollonios*, Heidelberg 1938, 11–42; A. E. Samuel, *The Internal Organization of the Nomarch's Bureau in the Third Century B.C.*, in: id. (ed.), *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles*, New Haven, Connecticut 1966, 213–229; J. D. Thomas, *Aspects of the Ptolemaic Civil Service: The Dioiketes and the Nomarch*, in: H. Maehler, V. M. Strocka (eds.), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 27.–29. September 1976 in Berlin*, Mainz 1978, 192–194; S. Héral, *Deux équivalents démotiques du titre de νομάρχης*, *CE* 65 (1990) 304–320; W. Clarysse, *Nomarchs and toparchs in the third century Fayum*, in: C. Basile (ed.), *Archeologia e papyri nel Fayyum. Storia della ricerca, problemi e prospettive. Atti del convegno internazionale. Siracusa, 24–25 maggio 1996*, Siracusa 1997, 69–75; D. J. Thompson, *Irrigation and Drainage in the Early Ptolemaic Fayyum*, in: A. K. Bowman, E. Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt: from Pharaonic to Modern Times*, New York 1999, 109–110.

στρατηγός and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων concurrently in the second century B.C. in the Arsinoite, Herakleopolite and Pathyrite (?) nomes, as well as in the Thebaid.¹³ Among these men, only three are also attested as having the title τῶν πρώτων φίλων at the same time: a certain Phantias in the Arsinoite (140–135 B.C.; TM nr. 14490); his successor, Apollonios (135–132 B.C.; TM nr. 5437); and Hermias, son of Platon, in the Thebaid (125–118 (?) B.C.; TM nr. 7867).¹⁴ Further, of these three, there is one who also was evidently νομάρχης at some point in his career: Phantias. Phantias first appears with a title in P.Tebt. III.1 959.1–2 (Oxyrhyncha, 140 B.C.), where he is identified as [τῶν πρώτων φίλων καὶ | [στρατηγῶι] καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων. He subsequently has the same titles in SB XXVI 16744.1–2 (Oxyrhyncha, ca 140–139 B.C.) and in P.Tebt. III.1 785.1–2 and 786.1–2 (Oxyrhyncha, ca 138 B.C.), while in P.Tebt. III.1 787.1 (Oxyrhyncha, ca 138 B.C.), a petition to Phantias, the title ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων appears to have been omitted by the petitioners.¹⁵ Phantias is mentioned in a pair of later texts, as well. In P.Tebt. I 61B.ii.46–7 (Kerkeosiris, 117 B.C.), it is noted that he was στρατηγός and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων in year 34 (of Euergetes II: 137–136 B.C.), while in 61B.xiii.362 he is referred to as τῶι γενομένῳ ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις φίλοις. Finally, in P.Tebt. IV 1113.xviii.359–360 (Kerkeosiris, 113 B.C.) there is a reference to him holding the titles of στρατηγός and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων, this time evidently in year 31 (of Euergetes II: 140–139 B.C.), while in P.Tebt. IV 1113.x.205, a Phantias is referred to as τοῦ νομαρχήσαντος ἐν τῶι λδ (ἔτει). If this Phantias and the man who held the posts of στρατηγός and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων under Euergetes II are to be understood as one and the same — and this appears to be the case¹⁶ — it is clear that he held the post of nomarch concurrently with that of στρατηγός.

When we turn to Ariston, we see that in the Duke documents he is always referred to as (at least) τῶν πρώτων φίλων and στρατηγός whenever his title is preserved. In addition, Ariston also occasionally has the titles ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων or νομάρχης, though never both in the same document; and whenever either of these two titles appears, it always appears in the third position:

- P.Duk.inv. 324.16–17: [---] τῶν πρ(ώτων) φί(λων) καὶ | [στρατηγῶι ---] traces
 P.Duk.inv. 325.1: τῶν πρώτων φίλων καὶ στρατηγῶι καὶ νομάρχῃ
 P.Duk.inv. 326.12–14: (πρώτων) φ(ίλων) | καὶ στρ(ατηγῶι) | καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν (προσόδων)
 P.Duk.inv. 327.1–2: τῶ[ν πρώτων] | φίλων καὶ [στ]ρατηγῶι
 P.Duk.inv. 328.7–8 (?): traces of two lines, perhaps containing Ariston's titles
 P.Duk.inv. 329.13–14: τῶν π(ρώτων) φ(ίλων) καὶ | στρατηγῶι

¹³ A Ptolemaios (?) did so in the Pathyrite; an Apollonios, an Eirenaios, a Phantias and a Sarapion (?) in the Arsinoite; a Ptolemarchos in the Herakleopolite; and Hermias, son of Platon in the Thebaid. See Salmenkivi, *A Note* (n. 12) 129–130 for more details.

¹⁴ Salmenkivi, *A Note* (n. 12) 130.

¹⁵ The editors of the text restore the first three lines of the papyrus as follows: [Φανίαι τῶν πρώτων φίλων] καὶ στρατηγῶι | [παρὰ τῶν ἐξ Ὀξυρύ]χων τῆς Πολέμωνος μερίδος | [βασιλικῶν γεωργῶν].

¹⁶ TM nr. 14490; Mooren, *Aulic Titulature* (n. 9) 100.

P.Duk.inv. 330.3: Ariston without title (as addressee)

P.Duk.inv. 331.1–2: τῶν πρώτ[ων φίλων καὶ] | [στρατηγ]ῶι καὶ νομάρ[χη]

P.Duk.inv. 336.1: addressor/addressee lost; written to/by Ariston?

At this point, it would be useful to attempt to construct a timeline of Ariston's career, to determine when he held each of the offices mentioned above and whether he potentially held the positions of nomarch and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων concurrently. We will therefore now turn to a consideration of the dates of the papyri discussed here.

Dates

With the exception of P.Duk.inv. 326, in the Duke Papyrus Archive catalogue entries for each of the texts in the collection presented here the documents are assigned to the second century B.C. with no further specification.¹⁷ The entry for 326 suggests that the document could date to either 150 or 139 B.C., based on a partially-preserved date at the end of the text: year [.]2, Hathyr 20 (line 10: [(ἔτους) .]β Ἄθῶρ κ). The author of the catalog entry evidently decided that the regnal year was 32 ([λ]β), and thus that the document dates to the 32nd year of either Ptolemy VI Philometor (150 B.C., specifically December 18) or Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (139 B.C., specifically December 15). Yet assuming that the general placement of the text in the second century is correct, the regnal year in our text ([.]β) could be 2, 12, 22, 32, 42 or even 52. Depending on how one counts, this gives as many as thirteen distinct possibilities for the year, ranging from 194/193 B.C. to 103/102 B.C.¹⁸ Fortunately, there is a bit of additional dating help elsewhere in the documents. A date is preserved in P.Duk.inv. 329: year 41, Epeiph 22 (line 1: (ἔτους) μᾶ Ἐπεῖφ κβ), or August 11, 129 B.C. In addition, in P.Duk.inv. 330 there is a third date (line 2: [(ἔτους) μᾶ Τῦβ]ι ---). In the 41st year of Euergetes II, the month of Tybi would have run from January 23 to February 21, 129 B.C., giving this document the earliest date in the dossier.

Given the evidence from P.Duk.invs. 329 and 330, it is very tempting to restore [(ἔτους) μ]β Ἄθῶρ κ at P.Duk.inv. 326.10, giving us a date of December 12, 129 B.C. (year 42, Hathyr 20) for that document. Unfortunately, the regnal years in all three of these texts are not secure, so any restoration of the date in P.Duk.inv. 326 based on the dates in P.Duk.invs. 329 and 330 must remain hypothetical. However, an examination

¹⁷ Catalogue records for each of the papyri presented here can be reached via the links given before each text (below).

¹⁸ Year 12 of Ptolemy V Epiphanes: 194/193 B.C.; year 22: 184/183 B.C.; year 2 of Ptolemy VI Philometor: 180/179 B.C.; year 12: 170/169 B.C.; year 2 of the joint rule of Philometor with Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II and Cleopatra II (= year 13 of Philometor): 169/168 B.C.; year 22 of Philometor and Cleopatra II (restored): 160/159 B.C.; year 32: 150/149 B.C.; year 32 of Euergetes II (restored): 139/138 B.C.; year 42: 129/128 B.C.; year 52: 119/118 B.C.; year 2 of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy IX Soter II: 116/115 B.C.; year 12 of Cleopatra III (= year 9 of Ptolemy X Alexander I): 106/105 B.C.; year 12 of Ptolemy Alexander I (= year 15 of Cleopatra III): 103/102 B.C.

of three other texts derived from the same cartonnage, all of which are at least semi-securely dated, makes all three of these dates seem more likely. P.Duk.inv. 347, a list of persons, is securely dated to a year 41, Thoth 20. P.Duk.inv. 358, a petition (?), is likewise dated to a year 41, Pachons 2 (?).¹⁹ P.Duk.inv. 374, another petition (?), is dated to a year 40. If we are correct that the texts in the cartonnage containing P.Duk.invs. 324–434 belong as a group to the second century, then all three of these texts were written in the 40th and 41st regnal years of Euergetes II and must have fixed dates. P.Duk.inv. 347 must therefore have the Julian date of October 14, 130 B.C.; P.Duk.inv. 358 a date of May 23, 129 B.C.; and P.Duk.inv. 374, the year 131/130 B.C.

It seems, then, more than likely that all the texts presented here date to within a year, or two, of 130 B.C. This opens the door much more broadly to the possibility that the famous Lochos, στρατηγός of the Thebaid active 127–113 B.C., is the same Lochos present in three of the Duke texts below. Indeed, the man who appears in the Duke texts has a number of impressive powers. In P.Duk.inv. 328, Lochos (without title) sends instructions to a man who was a στρατηγός in his own right: namely Ariston (also without title here). In P.Duk.inv. 326 (December 12, 129 B.C.), he sends his agents into another nome to prevent an official from completing his own business. Though he has no title in P.Duk.inv. 326, he is numbered among the first friends, and he is almost certainly also called στρατηγός in P.Duk.inv. 336, a text that appears to refer to the events of P.Duk.inv. 326, and thus likely dates to within a few days or weeks of that text (i.e., ca December 12, 129 B.C.). If Lochos was not στρατηγός of the Thebaid by the end of 129 B.C., he was certainly already acting like a στρατηγός. Already in 1953, Van't Dack suggested that Lochos may have assumed the title of στρατηγός as early as 130 B.C., and Thomas in 1975 as early as 128.²⁰ That same year, Mooren demonstrated that Lochos' immediate predecessor in the position of στρατηγός of the Thebaid, Paos, was last attested holding the position on July 28, 129 B.C.²¹ We can now say with some certainty that Lochos had obtained the position by the end of that same year.

Provenance

If the Duke documents provide some clarification on the timeline of Lochos' career, it seems reasonable to suggest that they should also reveal a great deal about the career of Ariston. Unfortunately, however, all that can be said with any certainty at this point is that he was active in the years ca 129 B.C. In the three dated documents in which Ariston appears — P.Duk.invs. 326, 329 and 330, all from 129 B.C. — he has the titles τῶν πρώτων φίλων and στρατηγός. In the (chronologically) last of these texts (326), he also has the title ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων, which makes it possible that he only assumed this post at the end of 129 B.C. (and by December 12, the date of this document, at the

¹⁹ The Duke Papyrus Archive record for this text (<http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/records/358.html>) lists the year as 51, not 41. Upon closer inspection of the image, however, the relevant section of the document (line 10) reads μα, not να.

²⁰ Van't Dack, *Prosopographica* (n. 9) 43; Thomas, *epistrategos* (n. 9) 116.

²¹ Mooren, *Aulic Titulature* (n. 9) 92.

latest). Yet there is no good reason to assume that the absence of ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων in the list of Ariston's titles in the two earlier texts from 129 B.C. implies that Ariston did not hold the position earlier in the year: the similar case of Phantias (above) makes it abundantly clear that an official need not have been addressed by every one of his titles in every piece of mail he received.

Armed with three chronological pinpoints for the career of Ariston, we will turn now to the question of where he held office, and, consequently, the provenance of our texts. The Duke Papyrus Archive tentatively assigns each of the documents in our subgroup to the Herakleopolite nome, based (it would seem) on the fact that other texts from the series P.Duk.invs. 324–434 can be placed there.²² To be fair, in one of the texts presented here there is a reference to the Herakleopolite village of Tamphnouthis (P.Duk.inv. 327.12). Aside from this, however, there is very little geographical information in these documents, and that information which can be extracted generally concerns other nomes. Further, none of the officials mentioned in the Duke texts presented here is given a clear provenance. Yet in spite of these limitations, the information the texts do provide makes the Herakleopolite nome their likely place of origin.

Aside from P.Duk.inv. 327, three of the documents presented below make specific reference to geographical locations. In P.Duk.inv. 329, a man named Herodes travels (line 6) εἰς Πτολεμαῖδ[α]. There are a number of possibilities for restoration here, as settlements in Egypt including the name Ptolemais were many. Since the papyrus only contains room for about 6 characters in the lacuna, the possibilities are reduced somewhat: we are likely looking at either a Πτολεμαῖς with no further distinction (and there appear to have been at least a few of these, all Arsinoite), Πτολεμαῖς Ἀραβῶν (Arsinoite, in the Herakleides meris near the labyrinth), Πτολεμαῖς Δρυμοῦ (Arsinoite, in the Themistes meris near Dionysias), Πτολεμαῖς Ἑρμείου (Thinite, the nome metropolis), Πτολεμαῖς Θηρῶν (on the African coast of the Red Sea), Πτολεμαῖς Καινή (Arsinoite, in the Themistes meris near Euhemeria), Πτολεμαῖς Νέα (Arsinoite, in the Herakleides meris near Karanis), Πτολεμαῖς Ὅρμου (Arsinoite, in the Herakleides meris) or Πτολεμαῖς Περσῶν (Arsinoite). As Ptolemais Hermeiou is located in the far-south Thinite nome, and Ptolemais Theron is on the Red Sea, neither is likely to be the location mentioned here. The options that remain are all to be found in the Arsinoite nome.

The Arsinoite crops up again in P.Duk.inv. 326, a letter in which an official named Konnos writes to Ariston to report on his visit to the Arsinoite in search of some wood. Konnos travelled to two different villages in the Polemon meris of the Arsinoite: first to the village of Kerkesephis, and then to the village of Samareia, where he ultimately found the wood he was looking for, but ended up being prevented from obtaining the

²² E.g.: P.Duk.inv. 342r, a second-century list of land, mentions a number of villages and toparchies of the Herakleopolite; P.Duk.inv. 344, a memorandum (?), mentions the Herakleopolite village Peenemou; P.Duk.inv. 361, a tax receipt, records a payment at a bank in Herakleopolis.

wood by the agents of Lochos. The same trip to the Arsinoite seems to be referenced in P.Duk.inv. 336: the writer of this letter notes that Lochos had confiscated “the other wood” (line 5: τὰ ἄλλα ξύλα) and later makes mention of the Arsinoite nome (line 7).²³ There is an additional geographical reference in P.Duk.inv. 326, as well. Shortly after his arrival in the Arsinoite, Konnos reports that he attempted to locate a certain man (line 2: [---]ηνις), but was unable to find him, as he was “in the lower districts” (line 3: ἐν τοῖς κάτω τόποις). There are at least two different ways to understand this phrase. On the one hand, Konnos might simply be referring to the northern part of the nome in question, as the phrase κάτω τόποι could simply indicate regions in just such an area.²⁴ On the other hand, the phrase is also used to refer to specific “lower districts” (κάτω τοπαρχίαι) in certain Egyptian nomes. There were no such districts in the Arsinoite (which itself had subdivisions known as merides), but there were lower (and upper) toparchies in a number of other nomes, including the Herakleopolite and Oxyrhynchite, both of which bordered the Arsinoite.²⁵ Given the proximity of these nomes, it is tempting to suggest that the missing man was in the κάτω τοπαρχία of one of them. Ultimately, though, it does not make much of a difference to our understanding of the events: whether [---]ηνις was in the Herakleopolite, Oxyrhynchite or the northern Arsinoite, the key fact is that he was not to be found in the southern Arsinoite where Konnos was looking for him.

Clearly, much of the activity recorded in these papyri took place in the Arsinoite nome. Was this the base of operations for Ariston, Konnos and many of the other men who appear in the Duke texts? It seems unlikely. To begin with, the texts referring to Konnos and his wood-finding mission (326 and 336) make it clear that he had to cross into the Arsinoite to find the wood, which suggests that this nome was not his normal sphere of operations. After all, if Konnos were an Arsinoite functionary, why would he have informed his boss, Ariston, the Arsinoite στρατηγός, that he had crossed into the Arsinoite before heading off in the direction of two villages, instead of simply letting him know that he had gone to the villages? It makes more sense to situate both of these men in a nome adjacent to the Arsinoite. Of such nomes, either the Herakleopolite or the Oxyrhynchite would have been their most likely base of operations, since the villages Konnos visited in the Arsinoite — Kerkesephis and Samareia — were located in the Polemon meris of the Arsinoite, which is in the southern section of the nome and thus closer to the Oxyrhynchite (to the southwest) and Herakleopolite (to the southeast) than any other nomes.²⁶ The mention of Tamphnouthis in P.Duk.inv. 327 perhaps

²³ Wood is also mentioned in P.Duk.inv. 327 (5: [τ(?)]ἄ ξύλα), though the events of this document cannot be securely connected with those of P.Duk.inv. 326, as the former is too fragmentary.

²⁴ See U. Wilcken, *Urkunden-Referat*, APF 11 (1935) 293.

²⁵ There were also κάτω τοπαρχίαι in the Apollonopolite, Diopolite, Hermonthite, Lato-polite and Pathyrite nomes.

²⁶ One might also suggest that Konnos had crossed from the Memphite or Aphroditopolite nomes, which bordered the Arsinoite to the north and east, respectively, as a trade route through

makes the Herakleopolite more likely than the Oxyrhynchite, but in the absence of further geographical information from the Duke texts, selection between the Oxyrhynchite and the Herakleopolite is still difficult. If another man could be confirmed as holding the position of στρατηγός in either the Herakleopolite or Oxyrhynchite nome in 129 B.C., the one somewhat firmly attested year in which Ariston was στρατηγός, the task of determining Ariston's provenance would be much simpler. Unfortunately, we do not know the identity of either the Herakleopolite or Oxyrhynchite στρατηγός in that year. Further, there is also a general dearth of papyri from the Oxyrhynchite nome in the second century B.C., which means that barring good evidence from the Herakleopolite, any determination of Ariston's provenance will be at least partially based on an argument from silence.²⁷

Yet there is perhaps some light at the end of the tunnel: we know that men in the Herakleopolite nome could hold the offices of στρατηγός and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων concurrently in the second half of the second century B.C. In P.Tebt. III.1 810, a declaration on oath from Herakleopolis dating to 134 B.C., a Polemarchos (TM nr. 12548) has the titles [± 18 κ]αὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων (lines 12–13).²⁸ Though it is certainly not the case that the assignment of Ariston and his subordinates to the Herakleopolite nome is clear-cut, the circumstantial evidence — the suspected provenance of the Duke cartonnage, the mention of Tamphnouthis in P.Duk.inv. 327, the proximity of the Herakleopolite to the Arsinoite, the reference to the κάτω τόποι, the parallel of Polemarchos and the lack of comparable evidence from the Oxyrhynchite — strongly suggests that Ariston was στρατηγός, νομάρχης and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων in the Herakleopolite nome, and perhaps the successor of Polemarchos in these offices.

1. Letter to Ariston

| | | |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| P.Duk.inv. 324 | 18.9 × 12.4 cm | ca 129 B.C. (?) |
| Herakleopolite (?) | | pl. 7 |

<http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/records/324.html>

The recto of this papyrus contains 15 lines of text written across the fibers, and 3 lines along the fibers on the verso in a second hand and in two columns. A large upper margin of 4 cm is preserved on the recto. The papyrus is broken on all three other sides. The name of the addressee, Ariston, is written in large letters on the verso (line 18).

Bousiris connected these three nomes with the Herakleopolite: see M. Falivene, *The Herakleopolite Nome: Internal and External Borders*, PapCongr XX (1994) 204. Unfortunately, as we do not know who held the position of στρατηγός in the Memphite or Aphroditopolite in the years ca 129 B.C., it is impossible to situate Ariston and his subordinates in either of these nomes.

²⁷ On the chronological distribution of papyrological evidence, see W. Habermann, *Zur chronologischen Verteilung der papyrologischen Zeugnisse*, ZPE 122 (1998) 144–160. According to his calculations, papyri from the Oxyrhynchite nome and dating to the second century B.C. are extremely rare: 148–150.

²⁸ Given the proximity of Polemarchos to Ariston, who likely held these same posts in 129 B.C., it may be reasonable to restore [τῶν πρώτων φύλων] in the lacuna. See Mooren, *Aulic Titulature* (n. 9) 108 for other possible restorations.

The document appears to be an official letter from [---]os, son of Philinos, to Ariston. Though much is obscured by lacuna, it is clear that the letter concerns at the very least an amount of grain connected in some way with reeds (*kalamoi*), as well as some wrongdoing.

↓ 1 [---]ος Φιλίνου Ἀρίστωνι χαί[ρειν . ---]
 [---] τειν μου . [---]
 [---] . γ Ἀρτεμι[ι]δῶρ[ω]ι τῶ[ι ---]
 4 [---] τῶν οὖν καλαμο . [.]ο [---]
 [---] προσδεομένων ἐπιστρεφέστερ[ον ---]
 [---] . προνοηθ[η] . . . ὁ]ς οἱ αἴτιοι ἀναζητούμε[νοι ---]
 [---] ἴσονται ἐφ' ἡμᾶς . πυροῦ καὶ τᾶλλα . [---]
 8 [---]τέσται ὅπως παραδοθῆι π[---]
 [---]σους . γ . σ [---]
 [---]
 [---] . . . ρ . . [---]
 12 [---] προσήκοντα [---]
 [---] ἡμᾶς [---]
 [---] Ἀρτεμιδῶ[ρ ---]
 [--- ε]λαμενο[---]

verso, column 1:

→16 2nd m. [---] τῶν πρ(ότων) φί(λων) καὶ
 [στρατηγῶι (?)] traces

verso, column 2:

Ἀρίστων[ι].

“ ...os (?), son of Philinos, to Ariston, greetings ... me (?) ... to Artemidoros, the ... therefore, the reed ... needing more attentively ... to see to it that those responsible, being sought out, provide (?) ... (x artabas?) of grain to us, and (see to it that?) the other ... will be ... so that ... may be given ... the appropriate ... us ... Artemidoros ... ”

verso: (in a second hand) “To Ariston, of the „first friends“ and στρατηγός ... ”

4. καλαμο . [.]ο.....[---]: Three possible restorations suggest themselves, though none of them is secure: *καλαμοκόπων*, “reed-cutters” (BGU VII 1529.2–3 [Philadelphia, 210–204 B.C.? 193–187 B.C.?]; P.Sijp. 53.13 [Arsinoite, I B.C.–I A.D.]); *καλαμοπωλῶν*, “reed-sellers” (P.Cair.Zen. III 59398.5 [Philadelphia, 258–257 B.C.]); and *καλαμουργόντων*, “the people setting poles” (from *καλαμουργέω*: e.g., P.Tebt. I 120.141 [Arsinoite, after 97 B.C. or after 64 B.C.]).

6. προνοηθ[η] . . .]: The verb, likely either an imperative (*προνοήθ[ητι]*) or infinitive (*προνοηθ[ῆναι]*), should be followed by either a purpose clause (*ἵνα/ὥς/ὅπως* + subjunctive) or

an object clause of effort (ὥς/ὅπως + future indicative). The latter construction is more likely here, as a future indicative seems to be present at the beginning of line 7 — perhaps [ἀπο]ίσονται or [κομ]ίσονται — as well as line 8 ([---]ιέσται, which could be restored as [e.g.,] [---]ι ἔσται, “will be”, or perhaps [περ]ιέσται, “will remain”).

7. ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς .. πύρου: The two illegible characters probably contain the abbreviation for (ἀρτάβας) and an amount.

12. προσήκοντα: Most likely in the phrase τὸν προσήκοντα λόγον, “the appropriate account”, which is usually construed with a form of the verb ποιέω, e.g.: P.Diosk. 6.46–47 (Herakleopolite, 146 B.C.): ὅπως καὶ ἀπ[ὸ] τούτου ὀρηθέν[τες] ποιησόμεθα τὸν προσήκοντα λόγον; P.Eras. I 1.22–23 (Oxyrhyncha, 148–147 B.C.): βουλομένου μου τὸν προσήκοντα λόγον πρὸς αὐτοὺς ποιήσασθαι.

15. [--- ε]ίλαμενο[---]: There are a number of possibilities here, though perhaps a form of δια- (e.g.: BGU VIII 1803.4 [Herakleopolite, 64–44 B.C.]) or ὑποστέλλω (e.g., P.Yale 1 42.22 [Alexandria, 187 B.C.]), ἐντέλλω (e.g.: P.Grenf. II 14C.6 [Arsinoite, ca 225 B.C.]) or ἐπαγγέλλω (e.g.: BGU VIII 1747.21 [Herakleopolite, 63 B.C.]) is most likely.

16–18. cf. P.Duk.inv. 329. It is possible that the lacuna and traces at the beginning of line 17 contain στρατηγῶι, perhaps followed by καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων or καὶ νομάρχῃ, with some or all of the words in abbreviation. On Ariston’s titles, see above.

2. Letter to Ariston from Horion

P.Duk.inv. 325

15.4 × 19.7 cm

ca 129 B.C. (?)

Herakleopolite (?)

pl. 8 + 9

<http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/records/325.html>

This papyrus contains 19 lines of text written along the fibers on the recto, and one line written across the fibers on the verso. Only the bottom of the recto appears to have been broken off, as margins of 2 cm (top), 3.5 cm (left) and 0.5 cm (right) are preserved. The papyrus is comprised of two joining fragments, both of which have been heavily abraded in places, leaving little writing in sections and making the text very difficult to read, aside from the name and title of the addressee and addressor.

→ 1 Ἀρίστωνι τῶν πρώτων φίλων καὶ στρατηγῶι καὶ νομάρχῃ
παρὰ Ὠρίωνος τοῦ παρὰ [± 6] Ἀγροίτου λαάρχου .ν. ειτης
κατω[.] .[± 7]... traces ουχωηωσαλ. τῆν σὴν
4 .[.] .ν. . traces σ .[. . .] . .ν. .
ποιη traces . γαν . traces τ . τ . . τ . .
εαν . traces . σ traces . . . σ . . . δος
... traces ιθ traces ωλ . traces
8 traces προσ traces
traces
traces π . τ . . σοι traces μμ . . τειναι σοι
εισαποπ traces στροσηπρο . κα . οντωι
12 traces οτροπροστ traces
επει traces α traces αλπου . τα traces
μεγθ . traces ξ . . και traces
τω . απ . πι[.] . υσου . χυ . traces

(evidently) being there. After he went there the agents of Lochos arrived. Konnos was unable to transport any of the wood until Lochos' agents left.

The text highlights the importance of timber to the Ptolemies.²⁹ It also provides a few tantalizing clues about the dates and provenance of the papyri in the Ariston/Lochos group (on which, see the introduction) and is the only text in which Ariston appears with the title ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων.

↓ 1 Κοινῶς Ἀρίστωνι χαίρειν. περὶ ὧν μοι [ἔγραψας περ]ῖ τῶν ξύ[λ]ων, ὠιχό-
 μνη εἰς τὸν Ἀρσινοίτην καὶ ἠρώτων πο[ῦ] ἐστι (?)]ηνης καὶ μ[ό]λις ἐσημάν-
 4 θη μοι εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς κάτω τόποις: [---] ,ρες εὔρον αὐτὸν καὶ
 ἐκοινολογήθη αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν ξύλ[ων] ?]ι διὰ πιττακίου ἐπὶ
 Κερκεσήφιν καὶ εὔρον [. .] . [. .] . . [--- ἐ]πέστρεψα εἰς Σαμάρειαν
 διὰ τὰ ξύλα . [.] . [.] . . μὴ ἀπεγνή[ε]χθαι (?) ---]ν καὶ εὔρον τὰ ξύλα
 8 ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ [Σ]αμαρείαι, δέ(σματος?) ιε τα[.]λ[---] ὠιχόμνη εἰς Σαμάρειαν,
 παρεγενήθησάν οἱ παρὰ Λόχου [--- Σαμ]αρείας ὥστ' ἂν μὴ
 δύνασθαι μεθίσταναι μηθε[ν] ? ἀπε]λθεῖν (?) τοὺς παρὰ
 Λόχο[υ]. διὸ γράφω σοι ὅπως εἰδῆς. [ἔβρωσο (?). --- (ἔτους) μ]β (?) Ἄθῦρ κ.

verso:

→ [Ἀρίσ]τωνι
 12 (πρώτων) φ(ίλων)
 καὶ στρατηγῶτι
 καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν (προσόδων)

“Konnos to Ariston, greetings. Concerning what you wrote to me about the wood, I went into the Arsinoite, and I asked where [---]enis was, and with difficulty it was made clear to me that he was in the lower regions. ... (I/they) found him and I spoke with him about the wood ... via a note to Kerkesephis and I/they found (the wood?) ... I turned to Samareia since the wood ... was not being carried off... and I found the wood in the same Samareia, 15 desmai (?). (But after?) I went into Samareia, those from Lochos arrived ... of Samareia, so as for me to not be able to remove any (of the wood until?) those from Lochos went away. For this reason I am writing to you so that you may know. Farewell. Year 42 (?), Hathyr 20.”

verso: “To Ariston, of the first friends and στρατηγός and man in charge of the revenues.”

2. [---]ηνης: Names with Nominatives ending in these four letters are common. As no similar names appear in the rest of the texts under consideration here, a secure restoration is impossible.

²⁹ Timber in antiquity: R. Meiggs, *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Oxford 1982; G. E. Rickman, *Trees* (review of Meiggs, *Trees and Timber* [above]), CR (n.s.) 34 (1984) 120–122; A. H. S. El-Mosallamy, *Trees in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, PapCongr XIX (1992) 513–542.

That said, in another Herakleopolite text from 130 B.C. (SB XIV 12089), an official named Horenis writes to another named Sosibios to report on some grain thefts in his vicinity.

3. τοῖς κάτω τόποις: On the meanings of the phrase κάτω τόποι, see the introduction. According to M. R. Falivene, *The Herakleopolite Nome: A Catalogue of the Toponyms with Introduction and Commentary* (Am. Stud. Pap. 37), Atlanta 1998, 37–39, the “lower districts” of the Herakleopolite corresponded to the katō region of the Agema toparchy. On the provenance of this text, as well as the rest of the dossier, see the introduction.

[---] ,ρες: A couple of possibilities suggest themselves here: [οἱ φ]ῶρες or [οἱ πράκτ]ορες. The first is perhaps more likely, as φῶρες, “thief-catchers”, seem to have occasionally been involved in procuring wood: see J. Bauschatz, *Law and Enforcement in Ptolemaic Egypt*, New York 2013, 152–153. The Ptolemaic πράκτωρ, a debt collector, would have been less likely to get involved in the business being described here. On πράκτορες, see DNP 11, 2007, 777–778.

5. Κερκεσήφιν, Σαμαρείαν: As noted in the introduction, both villages were located in the Polemon meris of the Arsinoite nome. They also were relatively close to each other, so much so that, by the late third century A.D. at the latest, they formed an administrative unit: see BGU I 94.4, 6, 24 (Ptolemais Euergetis, A.D. 289). The exact locations of the two villages are unknown, though a significant amount of information about each survives. Data on the population, administration and location of the two can be found at http://www.trismegistos.org/fayum/fayum2/1063.php?geo_id=1063 (Kerkesephis) and http://www.trismegistos.org/fayum/fayum2/2077.php?geo_id=2077 (Samareia).

[. .] . [. .] . . [---]: Perhaps τὰ ξύλα, among other things, has dropped out here.

6. ἀπενήγ[εχθαι (?): The restoration is very tentative, but it seems to fit the sense: Konnos went to Samareia because he learned that the wood had not been taken away.

7. δέ(σματος?) τε: The restoration is uncertain, but fits the context. Wood could be measured in desmai (or desmoi): O.Bodl. I 271.3 (Thebes?, 125–100 B.C.): ξύλων δεσμ(αί) φ; P.Vet.Aelii 16.27–29 (Ankyron polis, A.D. 225): ἀ[πὸ δὲ τῆς] | ξυλίας δώσομέν σοι ξύλ[ων] | δέσμας πενήκογ[τ]α; P.Oxy. XXIV 2424.16 (Oxyrhynchite?, A.D. II–III): [δ]εσμοὶ ξύλων.

τα[.]λ[---]: A temporal conjunction meaning “after” or “when” (ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, ὅτε) likely belongs in this section of the text.

9. μηθῆ[ν ? ἀπε]λθεῖν (?): Perhaps τῶν ξύλων plus a Greek word meaning “until” and taking an accusative/infinitive (such as πρὶν) should be placed in the lacuna: μηθῆ[ν τῶν ξύλων πρὶν ἀπε]λθεῖν.

10. [(ἔτους) μ]β (?) Ἄθῶρ κ: On the date, see the introduction.

4. Letter to Ariston

P.Duk.inv. 327

frg. 1: 8.1 × 8.3 cm

ca Dec. 12, 129 B.C. (?)

Herakleopolite (?)

frg. 2: 6.6. × 8.4 cm

pl. 11

<http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/records/327.html>

The recto of this papyrus contains 14 lines of text written along the fibers; the verso is blank. The document consists of two non-joining fragments. A large upper margin of 3 cm is preserved, as is a left margin of 1.5 cm and an occasional margin of 0.5 cm at right. The papyrus is broken at bottom.

Little of this papyrus is preserved aside from the title of the addressee, but it does provide a firm geographical link to the Herakleopolite nome via mention of the village Tamphnouthis (line 12). There is also a possible connection between the events described here and those of P.Duk.inv. 326, as both texts concern the procurement of

wood. If the same episode is alluded to in both texts, they were likely written around the same time.

→ 1 Ἀρίστωνι τῶ[ν πρώτων]
 φίλων καὶ [στ]ρατηγῶι
 παρὰ Πιολ . . . ρ . . ου
 4 . πι . . . σ . . [---]
 [τ(?)]ἄ ξύλα . . εστα[---]
 [---] . . . [---]
 [---] . [---]

 8 [.] [---]
 τοῦτους τοὺς το[---]
 . . ους ± 9 τούτου
 ὄντος περὶ κώμην
 12 Ταμφνοῦθιν ἐν τῶι
 αὐτῶι πτ . . καζῶι
 ε . υει . [---]

“To Ariston, of the first friends and στρατηγός, from Pol- ... the wood ... these ... this being around the village of Tamphnouthis in the same ... ”

5. [τ(?)]ἄ ξύλα: See also P.Duk.inv. 326 and 336.

12. Ταμφνοῦθιν: This village appears in only one other text: BGU VIII 1814.8 (Herakleopolite, 60–55 B.C.), a petition to the Herakleopolite στρατηγός Paniskos (TM nr. 11404). According to Falivene (*Herakleopolite Nome* [P.Duk.inv. 326, n.3] 209), Tamphnouthis was perhaps near Tebetny, which was located in the Peran toparchy of the Herakleopolite nome.

13. πτ . . καζῶι: It would seem at first glance that πτ . . καζῶι should be a Dative to accompany τῶι | αὐτῶι, but no clear possibilities suggest themselves.

5. Letter to Ariston from Lochos

P.Duk.inv. 328

13.6 × 18 cm

ca 129 B.C. (?)

Herakleopolite (?)

pl. 12

<http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/records/328.html>

P.Duk.inv. 328 contains 9 lines of text, six on the recto and the remainders of up to three on the verso, in two columns. The writing is across the fibers on the recto, but along the fibers on the verso. The papyrus has margins (on the recto) of 3.5 cm at top and bottom and 4 cm at left. The text is broken at right, and perhaps also at bottom.

This letter, from Lochos to Ariston, apparently concerns a delivery of grain, though much has been lost. This is a pity, as P.Duk.inv. 328 is the only text in the dossier explicitly written by Lochos and addressed to Ariston. Were it better preserved, it would tell us more about the relationship between the two men. We might also gain a

clearer picture of the document's origins. Though it is likely that it ended up in the Herakleopolite, along with the rest of the texts presented here, the fact that it was written by Lochos makes it possible that it originated in the Thebaid (provided that our Lochos is indeed the well-known στρατηγός of the Thebaid, of course), or perhaps the Arsinoite (as Lochos was clearly operating there: see P.Duk.inv. 326 and 336).

↓ 1 Λόχος Ἀρίστωνι χαίρε[ι]ν καὶ ἐρρ[ῶ]σθαι. ---]
 συντελείσθ' ἐν τοῖς τόποις ω . . [---]
 Φίλων χάριν τούτου ὑπο . . [---]
 4 ἐντετάλαμεθ' αὐτῶι προ[σ]θηῖνα[ι . .] . . [--- καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις (?)]
 φροντίσας ὡς οὐδε[ί]ς τῶν ἀνδρῶν [--- ἄνευ τῆς τοῦ δεινός]
 γνώμ[ης] (?) [.] καὶ . . [---]

verso, column 1:

→ traces [---]
 8 traces [---]

verso, column 2:

Ἀρίστωνι

“Lochos to Ariston, greetings and salutations ... contributed in the districts ... Philon for the sake of this ... we have authorized him to deliver ... Therefore, you will do well (?) to see to it that none of the men ... without the authorization of ... and ... ”

verso: “ ... To Ariston ... ”

3. Φίλων χάριν τούτου: It is quite possible that Φίλων (the Nominative singular of the name) should be restored as φίλων (the Genitive plural of the noun/adjective). In fact, context suggests that the latter restoration may be correct, as χάριν generally takes a preceding Genitive. Yet this is far from regular practice in papyri from the Ptolemaic period: one often finds the preposition taking a following Genitive, at least in the second and first centuries (e.g.: BGU VI 1256.13–16 [Philadelphia, 147 or 136 B.C.]; VIII 1825.13–14 [Herakleopolite, ca 61–60 or 53–52 B.C.?]). If the name is correct, Philon is likely the man referred to in line 4 (αὐτῶι).

4. καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις: The restoration is quite likely, as the phrase (or a variation on it) is regular before φροντίσας in the instruction section of official letters (e.g.: P.Cair.Zen. I 59053.5–8 [Alexandria, 257 B.C.]: καλῶς ἂν οὖν ποιήσας φροντίσας | ὅπως γέγονται ἡμῖν τὰ τε στεργάσματα τοῖς πλοίοις καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ χρηστά; P.Col. IV 98.2–4 [Philadelphia?, III B.C.]: καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις φροντίσας | ὅπως ἂν παραδοθῆι αὐτοῖς | τὰ ἱερεῖα; P.Horak 26.7–11 [?, 260 or 222 B.C.]: σὺ οὖν καλῶς ποιήσεις | φροντίσας ὅπως χρήσιμόν τε λάβῃ καὶ τῶι | μέτρῳ μὴ παρακρουσθῆι).

5–6. [--- ἄνευ τῆς τοῦ δεινός] | γνώμ[ης] (?)]: Phrases like this are also common at the end of official letters in cases where the permission of one official is required before another takes action, or when someone has acted improperly (e.g., P.Grenf. II 14a.19–20 [Arsinoite, 232 B.C.]:

ὁ δὲ παρὰ σοῦ οὐκ ἔφη δύνασθαι | ἄνευ τῆς σῆς γνώμης ἀποδοῦναι; P.Tebt. I 6.35–37 [Kerke-
osiris, 139 B.C.]: [ἐ]τέρους δὲ παραιρε[ῖν ἀ]πὸ τῶν τελουμένων καὶ | [λο]γευομένων κ[αὶ
καθι]στραμένους ἄνευ τῆς αὐτῶν | γ[νώμης] ἀφροδίσια).

7–9. If it is correct that the remainders of two lines of text can be found to the left of Ariston's name, it is virtually guaranteed that they contained abbreviations of his titles (on which, see the introduction; cf. e.g. P.Duk.inv. 329).

6. Letter to Ariston

P.Duk.inv. 329
Herakleopolite (?)

17.5 × 16.6 cm

Aug. 1, 129 B.C.
pl. 13 + 14

<http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/records/329.html>

The recto of this papyrus contains 12 lines of text written along the fibers, the first of which may be in a second hand. On the verso are preserved three lines written along the fibers in the primary hand of the recto, in two columns. Margins of 2 cm (top) and 3 cm (left) are preserved. There is also occasionally a small bit of space preserved at right, though the scribe often writes to the very end of the line. The papyrus is broken at bottom.

The papyrus contains a letter from two men to Ariston. They write to report that a third man, Herodes, had arrived at Ptolemais and been upset to discover that a delivery of grain had not occurred. Among other things, the letter preserves the second somewhat firm date for the date of the Lochos and Ariston papyri.

→ 1 2nd m. ἐλ(ήφθη) (ἔτους) μα Ἐπεῖφ κβ̄. . μαυ Χα[τ]ρ[ήμων (?) ---]
1st m. Χαιρήμων καὶ Πυ . . . [.]ρ[. . Ἄ]ρ[ί]στωνι χ[αί]ρειν.
εἰ [ἔ]ρρωσαι (?) καὶ τὰλλά [σοι κατὰ] λ[ό]γον ἐστίν,
4 εἴη ἄν ὡς βουλόμεθα καὶ αὐτοὶ δ' ὑγιαίνομεν.
Ἡρώδου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τ[οῦ] . . [.] . . . του παραγενο-
μένου εἰς Πτολεμαῖ[δ]α] καὶ οὐχ ὡς
ἔτυχεν ἀγανακτοῦντος ἐπὶ τῷ μηδὲ
8 μἔχρι τοῦ νῦν ἀποδεδωκέναι σε τὸν πυρὸν
καὶ βουλομένου ἐπιβῆναι εἰς τοὺς σοὺς τόπους
αὐτοῖς β (ἄρταβ-) ευε . χ α . επ[. .] . ε .
καὶ . υ . εαν . . αι . . ση traces? τ ἀδελφ[---]
12 ου . εαν . . ν . καὶ θ . . . ε[. . .] π . [---]

verso, column 1:

→ τῶν π(ρώτων) φ(ίλων) καὶ
στρατηγῶι

verso, column 2:

Ἀρίστωνι.

(In a second hand) “Received year 41, Epeiph 22 . . . Chairemon (?) . . .”

Though this letter contains no information about the addressor or addressee, the fact that it seems to concern the same series of events described in P.Duk.inv. 326 (and 327?) suggests that it was written to, or by, Ariston. The latter possibility is especially tantalizing. If correct, this document may contain Ariston's official response to the letter of Konnos in the form of instructions to another official. It also may contain confirmation that the Lochos of the Duke texts was one and the same with the late second-century στρατηγός of the Thebaid if the restoration of the title of στρατηγός in line 5 is correct.

fig. 1

→ 1 [N.N. to N.N. (?)]
 [χαίρει]ιν (?). εἰ ἔρρ[ωσαι (?)] ---]
 [---] . ἐστίν, εἴη {ι} ἄν ὡς βουλό[μεθα. ---]
 4 [---] ὑγιαίνομεν .ε. [---]
 [τοὺς παρ]ᾶ Λόχου τῶν πρώτων φίλ[ων]
 [καὶ στρατηγ]οῦ (?) συσχέι{ε}ν τὰ ἄλλα ζύλα
 [---] . [. . .] . νων[---]
 8 [---] Ἄρ[σιν]οῖτι νομῶι πρ[ὸς ---]
 [---] καλῶς οἰῶν πο(ι)ήσεις συντάξας
 [---] αἰ τοῖς ἀπηπομω . . . [---]
 [---] . ἐκπληρωθῆι ησ . . . ρ
 12 [---] ινα[---] . . . [---]
 [---] θηχο . [. . .] . [---]
 [---] . . . ο . [---]

fig. 2

 15 [---] . . υρα . [. . .] . [---]
 [---] [---]

verso:

↓(?) 17 traces

“N.N. to N.N., greetings (?). If you are well, ... is ..., it would be as we wish ... We are well ... those from Lochos, of the first friends and στρατηγός (?), detained the other wood ... in the Arsinoite nome ... Therefore, you will do well to please ... to the ... (so that) ... may be paid off/filled up ... ”

2.-3. εἰ ἔρρ[ωσαι (?)] ---] | [---] . ἐστίν: The general sense here is, “If you are well, and everything else is as you want it to be ... ” The papyri illustrate a number of different ways to express this wish (e.g.): Chrest.Wilck. 223.1 (Arsinoite, III B.C.): [εἰ ἔ]ρρ[ωσαι κ]αὶ τὰ λοιπά σοι κατὰ γνώμην ἐστίν; P.Cair.Zen. II 59263.1 (Alexandria, 251 B.C.): εἰ αὐτός [τρως] τε ἔρρωσαι

καὶ τᾶλλά σοί ἐστιν κατὰ νοῦν; P.Duk.inv. 329.3 (above): εἰ [ἔρρωσαι (?)] καὶ τᾶλλά [σοι κατὰ] λ[ό]γον ἐστίν.

4. [---] ὑγιαίνομεν .ε .[---]: Perhaps [---] ὑγιαίνομεν δὲ καὶ αὐτοί. ---] (cf. C.Jud.Syr.Eg. 1.5–6 [Pathyris, 103 B.C.]; P.Diosk. 13.2 [?, 152 B.C.?]; P.Heid. III 228.5–6 [?, 200–151 B.C.]) or [καὶ αὐτοὶ δ'] ὑγιαίνομεν .ε.[?] (cf. Chrest.Wilck. 11A.4 [Pathyris, 123 B.C.]; P.Cair.Goodsp. 4.4–5 [?, 152 or 141 B.C. (?)]; P.Tebt. III.2 895.121 [Berenikis Thesmophorou, 175 B.C.]).

5. [τοὺς παρ]ά: cf. P.Duk.inv. 326.9–10 for the restoration.

6. [καὶ στρατηγ]οῦ (?): The restoration must remain tentative, given the fact that Lochos is nowhere else called στρατηγός in any of these documents, but it seems more than likely. On the identification, see the introduction.

τὰ ἄλλα ἐύλα: See also P.Duk.invs. 326 and 327.

8. [---] Ἄρ[σιν]οῖτι γομῶι πρ[---]: cf. P.Duk.inv. 326.1–2.

The University of Arizona
Department of History
Social Sciences 215
1145 E. South Campus Drive
Tucson, AZ 85721, USA
jbausch1@email.arizona.edu

John Bauschatz



zu J. Bauschatz, S. 33, n. 1: P.Duk. inv. 324 recto and verso

Tafel 8



zu J. Bauschatz, S. 35, n. 2: P.Duk. inv. 325 recto



zu J. Bauschatz, S. 35, n. 2: P.Duk. inv. 325 verso



zu J. Bauschatz, S. 36, n. 3: : P.Duk. inv. 326 recto and verso



n. 4: P.Duk. inv. 327



n. 8: P.Duk. inv. 331

zu J. Bauschatz, S. 38, n. 4 und S. 43, n. 8



zu J. Bauschatz, S. 39, n. 5: P.Duk. inv. 328 recto and verso



zu J. Bauschatz, S. 41, n. 6: P.Duk. inv. 329 recto



zu J. Bauschatz, S. 41, n. 6: P.Duk. inv. 329 verso



zu J. Bauschatz, S. 42, n. 7: P.Duk. inv. 330 recto and verso



zu J. Bauschatz, S. 44, n. 9: P.Duk. inv. 336 recto and verso