

Herausgegeben von:

Thomas Corsten  
Fritz Mitthof  
Bernhard Palme  
Hans Taeuber

# TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte  
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

**HOLZHAUSEN**

Der Verlag

**Band 33, 2018**

# TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,  
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

**Band 33**

**2018**

**HOLZHAUSEN**  
— *Der Verlag* —

## Impressum

### Gegründet von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert, Ekkehard Weber

### Herausgegeben von

TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich

### Vertreten durch

Thomas Corsten, Fritz Mitthof, Bernhard Palme, Hans Taeuber

### Gemeinsam mit

Franziska Beutler und Wolfgang Hameter

### Wissenschaftlicher Beirat

Angelos Chaniotis, Denis Feissel, Jörg Fündling, Nikolaos Gonis,  
Klaus Hallof, Anne Kolb, Michael Peachin

### Redaktion

Chiara Cenati, Tina Hobel, Sandra Hodeček, Katharina Knäpper,  
Guus van Loon, Theresia Pantzer, Christoph Samitz

### Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und  
Epigraphik, Universität Wien, Universitätsring 1, 1010 Wien, Österreich.

E-Mail: [franziska.beutler@univie.ac.at](mailto:franziska.beutler@univie.ac.at)

Richtlinien unter <http://www.univie.ac.at/alte-geschichte>

Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

### Auslieferung

Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien

E-Mail: [office@verlagholzhausen.at](mailto:office@verlagholzhausen.at)

### Online Bestellungen Print & TYCHE–Open Access

<https://shop.verlagholzhausen.at/hhshop/buch.wissenschaft/Tyche/Jahresbaende.htm>

<http://tyche-journal.at>

Umschlag: Militärdiplom aus Carnuntum (ZPE 172, 2010, 271–276; Photo: P. Böttcher),  
Inscription aus Ephesos (ÖJh 55, 1984, 130 [Inv. Nr. 4297]; Photo: P. Sängler), P.Vindob. G 2097  
(= P.Charite 8).

**Bibliografische Informationen der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek und der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek**  
Die ÖNB und die DNB verzeichnen diese Publikation in den Nationalbibliografien; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind  
im Internet abrufbar. Für die Österreichische Bibliothek: <http://onb.ac.at>, für die Deutsche Bibliothek: <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

### Eigentümer und Verleger

Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien

### Herausgeber

TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich  
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik,  
Universität Wien, Universitätsring 1, A-1010 Wien.

E-Mail: [hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at](mailto:hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at) oder [bernhard.palme@univie.ac.at](mailto:bernhard.palme@univie.ac.at)

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Verlagsort: Wien — Herstellungsort: Wien — Printed in Austria

ISBN: 978-3-903207-31-8      ISSN: 1010-9161      eISSN: 2409-5540

Copyright © 2019 Verlag Holzhausen GmbH — Alle Rechte vorbehalten

**Stadt Wien**  
*Wien ist anders.*

Diese Publikation wurde durch die  
freundliche Unterstützung der  
Stadt Wien ermöglicht.

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

Bernhard W o y t e k: Theodore V. Buttrey † .....	1
Aitor B l a n c o - P é r e z: <i>EPINIKIA</i> : Celebrating Roman Victory in the Eastern Provinces of the Empire .....	9
Elena C h e p e l: P.Tbilisi inv. 344v: Extract from Memphite Land Register (Taf. 1–2).....	43
W. Graham C l a y t o r: Rent Receipts for Temple Land in Theadelphia (Taf. 3).....	49
Lucia C. C o l e l l a: Copia frammentaria di un protocollo di apertura di testamento in lingua latina (Taf. 4).....	55
Snežana F e r j a n č i ć – Nemanja V u j č i ć – Veselinka N i n k o v i ć: Fragments of Latin and Greek Inscriptions from the National Museum in Belgrade (Taf. 4–9) .....	61
Duccio G u a s t i: Il κόλλυβος è un sottomultiplo del χαλκοῦς? .....	75
Herbert H e f t n e r: Das Große Verfahrenstechnisch-Historische Scholion über den Ostrakismos [Philochoros FGrHist 328 F 30 / Theophrast fr. 640ab Fortenbaugh]. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion.....	79
Marek K r a m á r: Lysimachos, Byzantion und Athen.....	113
Eddy L a n c i e r s: The Career of Some Officials in the Arsinoite Nome in the Early Second Century BC.....	119
Dimitrios P a p a n i k o l a o u: On the Reluctant Orator of Ephesos.....	131
Federico R u s s o: La legislazione <i>de ambitu</i> a Roma e le norme contro la corruzione elettorale della <i>Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae</i> .....	145
Georg-Philipp S c h i e t i n g e r: Die <i>lex Papiria de tribunis reficiendis</i> . Anmerkungen zu einem Machtkampf zwischen Scipio Aemilianus und der gracchischen Ackerkommission.....	167
Peter S i e w e r t: Fragment einer hocharchaischen Bronzetafel aus Olympia mit Nennung der Eleer und des Mantis-Amtes (BrU 8) (Taf. 10).....	177
Ignazio S i m ó n C o r n a g o – Carlos J o r d á n C ó l e r a: The Celt- iberian S. A New Sign in (Paleo)Hispanic Epigraphy .....	183
Marja V i e r r o s: Copying practices in Ptolemaic Egypt. A discussion based on Greek agoranomic contracts from Pathyris (Taf. 11) .....	207
Bemerkungen zu Papyri XXXI (<Korr. Tyche> 855–885) .....	231
Adnotationes epigraphicae IX (<Adn. Tyche> 74–84) .....	249

## Inhaltsverzeichnis

Buchbesprechungen .....	265
-------------------------	-----

Guido B a s t i a n i n i, Simona R u s s o (Hrsg.), *Comunicazioni dell'Istituto papirologico «G. Vitelli» 12* (Edizioni dell'Istituto Papirologico «G. Vitelli» 5), Firenze 2015 (Á. T. Michálykó: 265) — Graeme B o u r k e, *Elis, Internal Politics and External Policy in Ancient Greece* (Cities of the Ancient World), London, New York 2018 (P. Siewert: 267) — Alberto D a l l a R o s a, Cura et tutela. *Le origini del potere imperiale sulle province proconsolari* (Historia Einzelschriften 272), Stuttgart 2014 (F. Hurlet: 270) — Jonas G r e t h l e i n, Antonios R e n g a k o s (Hrsg.), *Griechische Literaturgeschichte. Traditionen, Probleme und Konzepte*, Berlin, New York 2017 (J. W. G. Schropp: 272) — Josef W i e s e h ö f e r, Sabine M ü l l e r (Hrsg.), *Parthika. Greek and Roman Authors' Views of the Arsacid Empire / Griechisch-römische Bilder des Arsakidenreiches* (Classica et Orientalia 15), Wiesbaden 2017 (F. Alidoust: 276).

Indices .....	281
---------------	-----

Eingelangte Bücher .....	285
--------------------------	-----

### Tafeln 1–12

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*.

EDDY LANCIERS

## The Career of Some Officials in the Arsinoite Nome in the Early Second Century BC\*

### Introduction

Recently Willy Clarysse presented the archive of the *sitologos* Adamas and dated it to the first years of the second century BC (199–197 BC)<sup>1</sup>. Closer observation shows, however, that this date cannot be correct. Since prosopographical overlaps connect the archive with other documents, a situation which helps to elucidate the career of several officials in the Arsinoite nome, a more detailed study of the archive and its chronology seems worthwhile.

### Adamas (*sitologos*)<sup>2</sup>

Seven papyri can confidently be attributed to the archive of the *sitologos* Adamas (P.Tebt. III 750–754, 756, 941)<sup>3</sup>, one of which refers to persons under the protection (σκέπη) of a certain Hippalos (P.Tebt. III 750 l. 19). Although no title is given, Hippalos was clearly a person of considerable influence. Hence Clarysse identified him with Hippalos, son of Sosos, a leading official in Alexandria in the early second century BC, and attributed all the dates in the archive (years 7–9) to the reign of Ptolemy V. It seems more likely, however, that the archive belongs to the reign of Ptolemy VI. Although Hippalos may already have been an important person at the Alexandrian court in the

---

\* I would like to thank Willy Clarysse for his useful suggestions and comments.

<sup>1</sup> W. Clarysse, *Adamas, Director of the Granary (Sitologos)*, in: K. Vandorpe, W. Clarysse, H. Verreth (eds.), *Graeco-Roman Archives from the Fayum* (Collectanea Hellenistica – KVAB 6), Leuven, Paris, Bristol, CT 2015, 33 (also published online as TM ArchID 2).

<sup>2</sup> Pros.Ptol. I 1327.

<sup>3</sup> In the original edition following dates were attributed to these papyri: P.Tebt. III 750: “B.C. 187 (?)” (based on the erroneous reading of year 18 instead of year 8 in l. 24: see BL III 244); P.Tebt. III 751, 752, 754 and 941: “Early second century B.C.”; P.Tebt. III 753: “B.C. 197 or 173?”; P.Tebt. III 756: “About 174 B.C.?”. Three other papyri may also belong to the archive: P.Tebt. III 889 (undated): an account of expenses for travels outside the Arsinoite nome, mentioning a certain Adamas; P.Tebt. III 944 (undated) and P.Tebt. III 945 (29 Epeiph, year 6), fragmentary letters regarding the collection of grain and a granary. While the first text comes from mummy 50, which did not contain other Adamas papyri, P. Tebt. III 944 (mummy 53) and P.Tebt. III 945 (mummy 11) were discovered in the same mummies as documents which unquestionably belong to the archive.

190s BC — a daughter is attested as *athlophoros* in year 15 of Epiphanes (191/0 BC)<sup>4</sup> — his career clearly reached its zenith at a later date: he was an eponymous priest in Ptolemais from 186/5 BC until 170/69 BC<sup>5</sup> and is attested as *epistrategos* about 176/5 BC<sup>6</sup>. In a Theban ostrakon Hippalos appears in connection with a “17<sup>th</sup> year under the father of the king”, which might either relate to the reign of Ptolemy IV (206/5 BC) or Ptolemy V (189/8 BC), but this regnal year is used retrospectively and does not date the ostrakon itself<sup>7</sup>.

If we accept a suggestion of the editors of P.Tebt. III, there might be another connection between the Adamas archive and Hippalos. On the back of P.Tebt. III 895, originally edited as P.Tebt. III 778, the words ὄρος Ἄδα . [---] appear and a possible reading for the beginning of the name is Ἄδάμ[---] [why not: Ἄδαμιά; Genitive: Ἀδάμαντος?]<sup>8</sup>. Since the fragments of P.Tebt. III 895 come from the same mummies (nos. 11 and 48) as the correspondence of Adamas, it is not unlikely that Dionysios in P.Tebt. III 895 l. 7, who is probably a *sitologos*, is identical with the addressee of one of Adamas' letters (P.Tebt. III 750)<sup>9</sup>. The fact that P.Tebt. III 895 is dated to 176/5 BC<sup>10</sup> would then bring additional proof that the regnal years in the Adamas archive relate to Philometor.

Whatever the correct interpretation of P.Tebt. III 778 / 895, on the basis of P.Tebt. III 750 the dates in the Adamas archive can in my opinion confidently be attributed to the reign of Philometor. The following chronology can thus be established<sup>11</sup>:

- P.Tebt. III 756<sup>12</sup> l. 6: year 7 = 175/4 BC
- P.Tebt. III 750 l. 24: Epeiph, year 8 (see BL III 244) = 1 August–30 August 173 BC
- P.Tebt. III 753 l. 30: 12 Thoth, year 9 = 16 October 173 BC

<sup>4</sup> W. Clarysse, G. Van der Veken, *The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt* (P. L. Bat. 24), Leiden 1983, 20 no. 100.

<sup>5</sup> Clarysse, Van der Veken, *Eponymous Priests* (n. 4) 40–45 nos. 105 bis–121 bis.

<sup>6</sup> J. D. Thomas, *The epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. Part 1: The Ptolemaic epistrategos* (Papyrologica Coloniensia 6), Opladen 1975, 88 n. 8, accepts that Hippalos in the Adamas archive (P.Tebt. III 750) is identical with the *epistrategos* who appears in P.Tebt. III 895; he also (87–88) adduces convincing arguments to date the latter document, which mentions a 6<sup>th</sup> year, in the sole reign of Ptolemy VI (176/5 BC). This is consistent with the date of OGIS I 103 = I.Brooklyn 8, the only other source explicitly mentioning Hippalos as *epistrategos*: the inscription must have been erected between the death of Cleopatra I and Philometor's marriage with Cleopatra II, *i.e.* between April–May 176 BC and April 175 BC. For Hippalos, see also Pros.Ptol. I & VIII 193, II & VIII 1919, VIII 4303, III & IX 5155; 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 XXXVII no. 78), Brussels 1975, 85–86 no. 043.

<sup>7</sup> G. Gorre, *Une première mention d'Hippalos, stratège de la Thébaidé?*, CE 85 (2010) 230–239.

<sup>8</sup> P.Tebt. III 778, comm. ad ll. 14–15.

<sup>9</sup> P.Tebt. III 895, comm. ad l. 7.

<sup>10</sup> See above n. 6.

<sup>11</sup> If P.Tebt. III 945 really belongs to the archive (see n. 3) the date is 30 August 175 BC.

<sup>12</sup> Adamas' name does not appear in this fragment, but the text is written by the same hand as P.Tebt. III 750, a letter written by Adamas (see P.Tebt. III 756, introduction).

To determine whether the undated documents from the archive belong within the same timeframe we have to discuss the career of some other officials.

*Argeios (epimeletes)*<sup>13</sup>

P.Tebt. III 754, a letter written by Heliodoros<sup>14</sup> to his “brother” Adamas, mentions that another “brother” was detained in town, *i.e.* Krokodilon polis, but was apparently released after an investigation (ἐπίσκεψις) by a certain Argeios. Although a title is lacking, Argeios may no doubt be identified with an *epimeletes* of the Arsinoite nome known from other sources<sup>15</sup>. In P.Coll.Youtie I 12<sup>16</sup> he also appears in connection with the nome capital, here with the title *epimeletes*. The petitioner of this document declares that he was arrested by Argeios as a result of a false accusation and put in jail in Krokodilon polis in Mesore of year 25 of Ptolemy V (2 September–1 October 180 BC); the petition is written three years later, but this does not imply that Argeios was still in office in 177 BC<sup>17</sup>. In both documents Argeios’ intervention is probably related to his disciplinary powers over other officials in cases affecting royal income<sup>18</sup>.

On the basis of several other documents the chronological limits of Argeios’ tenure of office can be established as *c.* 185–179/8 BC:

- P.Tarich. 7 l. 26: undated, about 185 BC
- P.Tarich. 10 l. 1: undated, before 29 April 184 BC?
- P.Tarich. 11 ll. 6–7: undated, before 29 April 184 BC?
- P.Tarich. 12 l. 9: undated, after 29 April 184 BC?
- P.Tebt. III 793 col. 2 l. 32: about 18 February 183 BC
- P.Köln X 412 A II l. 10<sup>19</sup>: about 179/8 BC<sup>20</sup>
- SB XVI 12375 l. 20, l. 105 and perhaps l. 62<sup>21</sup>: undated.

<sup>13</sup> Pros.Ptol. I & VIII 936; Ch. Armoni, P.Tarich., p. 12.

<sup>14</sup> For a possible identification, see below n. 31.

<sup>15</sup> J. G. Keenan, P.Coll.Youtie I, p. 98, and Ch. Armoni, P.Tarich., p. 12, regard this identification as possible.

<sup>16</sup> For this text, see now E. Käppel, *Ein Asebieverfahren vor den Chrematisten? Eine Neuedition von P.Coll.Youtie I 12*, ZPE 203 (2017) 213–222.

<sup>17</sup> Käppel, *Asebieverfahren* (n. 16) 219, believes that he may have been dead in 177 BC.

<sup>18</sup> See E. Berneker, *Die Sondergerichtsbarkeit im griechischen Recht Ägyptens* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Rechtsgeschichte 22), Munich 1935, 91–3; B. C. McGing, *Illegal Salt in the Lycopolite Nome*, APF 48 (2002) 64.

<sup>19</sup> For the reading Ἀργεῖου instead of Ἀργαίου, see Ch. Armoni, P.Tarich., p. 12 with n. 22.

<sup>20</sup> This fragment mentions a year 2 (A I l. 1), which may be attributed to the reign of Philometor (see the discussion in P.Köln X, pp. 57–60). Due to the fragmentary state of the papyrus the possibility that the reference to Argeios is retrospective can, however, not be ruled out.

<sup>21</sup> P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Two Ptolemaic Accounts*, CE 54 (1979) 276, reads Ἀργεῖου τοῦ λα[οκ]ρίτου, but remarks “W. Clarysse considers the reading τοῦ ἐπιμελητοῦ probable” (281).



Ptolemaios (*epimeletes*)<sup>22</sup>

Adamas not only was a contemporary of the *epimeletes* Argeios but also of the *epimeletes* Ptolemaios. From P.Tebt. III 776 it appears that Ptolemaios' career preceded (part of) Adamas' correspondence. This papyrus contains a petition from the woman Senesis to the *oikonomos* Ptolemaios, in which the *epimeletes* Ptolemaios is mentioned (ll. 32–33). The verso of the papyrus, edited as P.Tebt. III 941, is a letter written to Adamas and must be later than the petition. The sender of the letter is a certain Ptolemaios, in all likelihood the *oikonomos*, who seems to have reused the petition to write his short note to Adamas.

Probably the *epimeletes* Ptolemaios was the direct successor of Argeios. He must followed him in office sometime between 179/8 BC — the latest attestation of Argeios if we accept the date proposed for P.Köln X 412 A — and 176/5 BC. The latter date can be deduced from the rather diffuse information about the career of the *epimeletes* Spartakos<sup>23</sup>. This official appears in the above discussed P.Tebt. III 895 (l. 122) from year 6 of Ptolemy VI (176/5 BC)<sup>24</sup>. We have, however, two data clusters for an *epimeletes* Spartakos, the first connecting him with the 190s BC, the second with the 170s BC. To make things even more complicated, he apparently not only had authority in the Arsinoites but also in the Herakleopolites. Matthias Stern recently studied the sources pertaining to Spartakos and concluded that we are probably dealing with one and the same official who had a split career<sup>25</sup>. Important for our present purpose are the dates of BGU XX 2480 (year 5, 21 Payni) and 2481 (year 6, 16 Thoth). While the editor does not decide between dates under Epiphanes (29 July 200 BC and 27 October 200 BC) or Philometor (23 July 176 BC and 21 October 176 BC)<sup>26</sup>, Stern prefers to date both papyri in 176 BC<sup>27</sup>. The latter proposal has the advantage to establish a direct chronological relationship with P.Tebt. III 895. The different sphere of influence — the Arsinoite nome in P.Tebt. III 895 and the Herakleopolite nome in BGU XX 2480–2481 — may appear surprising, but is perhaps not without parallel<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>22</sup> Pros.Ptol. I & VIII 952.

<sup>23</sup> Pros.Ptol. I 956.

<sup>24</sup> See n. 6.

<sup>25</sup> M. Stern, *Drei neue ptolemäische Papyri und das Amtarchiv des Demetrios*, BASP 53 (2016) 42–44. To the documents discussed by Stern may be added the unpublished Petrie fragment TCD cahier 3231.88 (TM 112690), which mentions Σπ[αρτάκου τοῦ ἐπιμ]ελιτοῦ (there is thus no need for a separate entry in Pros.Ptol. VIII 955b).

<sup>26</sup> See E. Salmenkivi, BGU XX, pp. 5, 7, 14. Dorotheos (Pros.Ptol. I & VIII 939) is attested as *epimeletes* in the Arsinoite nome between 27 August 202 BC and 22 September 197 BC: see G. Baetens, *A Petition to the Epimeletes Dorotheos in Trinity College Dublin*, *AncSoc* 44 (2014) 96. This is, however, not a conclusive argument against dating BGU XX 2480–2481 in 200 BC, because in these documents Spartakos operates in the Herakleopolites, whereas Dorotheos is linked with the Arsinoite nome.

<sup>27</sup> Stern, *Ptolemäische Papyri* (n. 25) 44.

<sup>28</sup> On the geographical area of operation of the *epimeletes*, see McGing, *Illegal Salt* (n. 18) 52–53.

Whatever the correct date of BGU XX 2480–2481, *c.* 176/5 BC must be regarded as a *terminus ante quem* for Ptolemaios' tenure. In fact this *terminus* must even be placed at an earlier date, since Ptolemaios was not the direct predecessor of Spartakos: P.Tebt. III 895 shows that a certain Ph[---]<sup>29</sup> preceded Spartakos (see ll. 9 and 76 combined: Φ[---] ὁ γενόμενος ἐπιμελητής); about the length of his tenure nothing can be said. We may tentatively date Ptolemaios about 179/8–177 BC<sup>30</sup> and Ph[---] about 177–176 BC. Three of the undated papyri from the Adamas archive can consequently be dated as follows:

- P.Tebt. III 754: about 185–179/8 BC<sup>31</sup> (contemporary with the *epimeletes* Argeios)
- P.Tebt. III 776: about 179/8–177 BC (contemporary with the *epimeletes* Ptolemaios)<sup>32</sup>
- P.Tebt. III 941: 179/8–177 BC or later (during or after Ptolemaios' tenure)

P.Tebt. III 751 and 752 are the only documents from the archive for which no date can be proposed, but they must also belong to the period between about 185 BC and 173 BC<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> Pros.Ptol. I 957.

<sup>30</sup> The period of Ptolemaios' tenure is an additional argument against identifying Spartakos in P.Freib. III 28 col. 1.2. 1 15 (179/8 BC, Arsinoites) with the homonymous *epimeletes*: cfr. Stern, *Ptolemäische Papyri* (n. 25) 42 n. 51.

<sup>31</sup> It is in my opinion likely that Heliodoros, the writer of this letter, is identical with the homonymous *sitologos* in Boubastos (together with Ammonios) in 189/8 BC: P.Tebt. III 774 (l. 22), and in Anoubias (together with Apollonios) in 184–182 BC: SB XIV 11887–11889 and SB XX 14988–14993 (see also TM ArchID 385). The word “brother” in P.Tebt. III 754 would then designate a colleague and not a real brother; for the use of “brother” to designate a colleague on the same hierarchic level, see A. M. F. W. Verhoogt, *Menches, Komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris. The Doings and Dealings of a Village Scribe in the Late Ptolemaic Period (120–110 BC)* (P.L.Bat. 29), Leiden, New York, Cologne 1998, 79–81. If the proposed identification is correct, it would confirm that P.Tebt. III 754 is one of the earliest texts in the Adamas archive.

<sup>32</sup> The lower part of P.Tebt. III 776 is written over an earlier text. The date (ἔτους) ε Παῦνι ιδ̄ proposed by the editors for this earlier text cannot be related to the reign of Philometor (16 July 176 BC), since this date falls after Ptolemaios' career as *epimeletes*. The obvious solution would be to accept the alternative reading of the editors (ἔτους) α Παῦνι ιδ̄ (17 July 180 BC), a date which precedes Ptolemaios' tenure, but this is in contradiction with the view that at least part of the month Mesore (2 September–1 October 180 BC) was still regarded as belonging to the 25<sup>th</sup> year of Epiphanes: see P.Coll.Youtie I 12 l. 7 (with the commentary on pp. 95–96). However, it is not excluded that the petitioner of P.Coll.Youtie I 12 retro-actively designated the whole period 5 November 181–6 October 180 BC (year 25 of Ptolemy V = year 1 of Ptolemy VI) as Epiphanes' 25<sup>th</sup> year: see P.Köln X, p. 60 n. 15 (K. Maresch) and Käppel, *Asebieverfahren* (n. 16) 219. Since we cannot determine with certainty whether the first text on P.Tebt. III 776 was written shortly before the second one or much earlier (for instance in the 1<sup>st</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> year of Epiphanes), the value of this papyrus to establish the date of Philometor's ascension remains rather doubtful.

<sup>33</sup> The same applies for the undated P.Tebt. III 889 and 944, if they indeed belong to the archive (see n. 3).

The *epimeletes* Ptolemaios also appears in P.Tebt. III 905 (l. 2), which therefore must be dated *c.* 179/8–177 BC. This document probably belongs to the archive of the *sitologoi* of the Herakleides *meris*<sup>34</sup>, which comprises documents dated between April–May 188 BC and July 170 BC<sup>35</sup>; P. Tebt. III 905 falls well within these chronological limits.

*Epimeletai* of the Arsinoite nome in the 180s and 170s BC

A combination of the data from the Adamas archive and the recently published archive of the *taricheutai* from Tanis<sup>36</sup> provides an uninterrupted sequence of *epimeletai* of the Arsinoite nome in the 180s–170s BC:

- Alexandros: before 3 September 189–187/6 BC<sup>37</sup>
- Hephaestion: 186/5–185/4 BC<sup>38</sup>
- Argeios: 185/4–179/8 BC
- Ptolemaios: about 179/8–177 BC
- Ph[---]: about 177–176 BC
- Spartakos: 176/5 BC – ?

The *oikonomoi* Ptolemaios, Leonides and Diophantos (?)

From P.Tebt. III 776 can be inferred that the *oikonomos* Ptolemaios<sup>39</sup> was in office at the same time as the *epimeletes* Ptolemaios, *i.e.* about 179/8–177 BC. We have an earlier attestation for this official in SB XVI 12375 (l. 16), a document which also mentions the *epimeletes* Argeios and therefore can be dated between *c.* 185/4 BC and 179/8 BC.

There are two other papyri which might contain references to the *oikonomos* Ptolemaios. The first is SB XXII 15767<sup>40</sup>, a draft of a letter to several officials, including Dexilaos, the *strategos* of the Memphite nome, and an *oikonomos* with the name Ptolemaios (ll. 6–7). Two problems arise here: the date of the document and the nome where the *oikonomos* held his post. The appearance of the *strategos* Dexilaos<sup>41</sup> does not help to date the document, since the only other papyrus mentioning this official (P.Tebt. III 911) can only be broadly dated to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC. More useful is the observation that

<sup>34</sup> The text is added to the archive by W. Clarysse, *Granary Directors (sitologoi) of the Herakleides meris*, in: Vanderpe, Clarysse, Verreth, *Graeco-Roman Archives* (n. 1) 152 (online: TM ArchID 539).

<sup>35</sup> See L. Fati, *Una sezione d'archivio concernente le attività di sitologoi della meris di Herakleides*, in: P. Schubert (ed.), *Actes du 26<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Papyrologie Genève, 16–21 août 2010* (Recherches et rencontres 30), Geneva 2012, 229–231. In view of these chronological limits the date 29 Phaophi, year 8 in P.Tebt. III 1038 should probably be attributed to Ptolemy VI (3 December 174 BC) and not to Ptolemy V (9 December 198 BC).

<sup>36</sup> P.Tarich. See also W. Clarysse, *Undertakers (taricheutai) of Tanis*, in: Vanderpe, Clarysse, Verreth, *Graeco-Roman Archives* (n. 1) 432 (online: TM ArchID 551).

<sup>37</sup> Ch. Armoni, P.Tarich., p. 12.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> Pros.Ptol. I & VIII 1082.

<sup>40</sup> The text is re-edited by W. Clarysse, *Three Ptolemaic Papyri on Prisoners*, APF 48 (2002) 101–102.

<sup>41</sup> Pros.Ptol. I 239.

SB XXII 15767 is written on the back of a circular letter (SB XXII 15766) from 11 Phaophi of year 25, a date which in all likelihood refers to the reign of Ptolemy V (16 November 181 BC)<sup>42</sup>. Assuming that the text on the back was written not too long after the text on the front side, the document would fall within the attested period of Ptolemaios' tenure, c. 185/4–177 BC. The second question is whether Ptolemaios in SB XXII 15767 really had authority in the Arsinoites. M. Müller, the first editor of the text, concludes from the appearance of the Memphite *strategos* that all other officials in the text were also active in that nome<sup>43</sup>. Willy Clarysse, who re-edited the document and observed that the text concerns the escape from prison of the tax farmers of the *apomoira* in the Arsinoite village Sebennytyos, accepts that Ptolemaios was an *oikonomos* of the Arsinoites, but he does not decide between the different homonymous *oikonomoi* who appear in that nome in the third and second centuries BC<sup>44</sup>. The fact that the *oikonomos* is informed about the escape of local tax farmers is not surprising in regard of his role in the collection of the *apomoira*<sup>45</sup>. If we accept the date proposed for SB XXII 15767, an identification of the official in that text with the *oikonomos* Ptolemaios in P.Tebt. III 776 and SB XVI 12375 is likely.

The observation that Ptolemaios was *oikonomos* about 180 BC may have some importance for the interpretation of a second document. P.Thomas 2 is a memorandum from a certain Ptolemaios to Nechoutes, ordering him to measure out *kleroi* of 80 *arourai* to three cavalry soldiers in the Arsinoite villages Eleusis and Tebetny. J. F. Oates, the editor of the papyrus, identifies Ptolemaios with the *strategos* of the Arsinoite nome under Ptolemy V and VI<sup>46</sup> and therefore dates the document under Philometor (29 Phaophi, year 2 = 4 December 180 BC); he regards Nechoutes as the *basilikos grammateus*. His view is challenged by Ch. Armoni, who doubts that the *strategos* was involved in the attribution of *kleroi*. She concludes: “Im Verfasser von P.Thomas 2, Ptolemaios, wird man vielmehr einen Funktionär der Finanzverwaltung sehen, vielleicht sogar den βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς<sup>47</sup>”; she suggests that Nechoutes was the assistant

<sup>42</sup> For the date, see Clarysse, *Papyri on Prisoners* (n. 40) 101: “... the palaeographical features point to the reign of Ptolemy V rather than Ptolemy III”.

<sup>43</sup> M. Müller, *A Circular Letter and a Memo* (P. Mich. Inv. 6980), ZPE 105 (1995) 239.

<sup>44</sup> Clarysse, *Papyri on Prisoners* (n. 40) 102. There are three other *oikonomoi* with the name Ptolemaios attested in the Arsinoites: Pros.Ptol. VIII 1080a (P.Petr. ined., 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC; attribution to the Arsinoites uncertain); Pros.Ptol. VIII 1081b (P.Yale inv. 2056 ined. [for the correct inventory number, see TM 44215]; attributed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC); Pros.Ptol. I 1084 (P.Tebt. III 789, about 140 BC). Since the first two texts are unedited, it is impossible to decide whether there might be a connection with our *oikonomos* Ptolemaios (it is in any case important to notice that other Yale texts, belonging to the archive of Leon, were originally also attributed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC, but in fact belong in the reign of Epiphanes: see TM ArchID 131). On palaeographical grounds an identification of the persons in SB XXII 15767 and P.Tebt. III 789 seems excluded.

<sup>45</sup> P.Rev.Laws col. 23–36. See P.Köln V, pp. 155–157 (W. Schäfer) and P.Hels. I 2 ll. 2–5.

<sup>46</sup> Pros.Ptol. I & VIII 312; Mooren, *Aulic Titulature* (n. 6) 98–99 no. 067.

<sup>47</sup> Ch. Armoni, *Studien zur Verwaltung des ptolemäischen Ägypten: Das Amt des Basilikos Grammateus* (Papyrologica Coloniensia 36), Paderborn, Munich, Vienna, Zurich 2012, 195–196 (quote on 196).

of the royal scribe Ptolemaios<sup>48</sup>. However, the unpublished P.Texas inv. 1 shows that — at least in case of a dispute — the *strategos* apparently had the power to order the royal scribe to (re-)measure *kleroi*<sup>49</sup>. If we follow Armoni in rejecting the identification with the *strategos*, it is conceivable that the financial official we are looking for is the *oikonomos* Ptolemaios and not an homonymous *basilikos grammateus*<sup>50</sup>. Several papyri indeed illustrate that the *oikonomos* was involved in the administration of *kleroi*, more particularly in their confiscation, and that in this role he worked closely together with the royal scribe<sup>51</sup>. The appearance of an *oikonomos* with a Greek name (Ptolemaios) alongside a royal scribe with an Egyptian name (Nechoutes<sup>52</sup>) corresponds well with the usual situation in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and early 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC<sup>53</sup>, though this is admittedly not a conclusive argument. At this moment it seems impossible to draw firm conclusions about the office of Ptolemaios in P.Thomas 2.

It is not clear whether we can further define the period of Ptolemaios' tenure as *oikonomos*. While the *epimeletai* always had authority over the whole Arsinoite nome, we have testimonies for *oikonomoi* of the nome and *oikonomoi* of each of its three divisions (*merides*)<sup>54</sup>. These are primarily attested in the reigns of Ptolemy III and IV, but they also appear in the first decades of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC and — less frequently — in later periods. Before we can decide whether other Arsinoite *oikonomoi* in the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC were predecessors, successors or contemporaries of Ptolemaios, it is essential to determine in which area he held office. The petitioner in P.Tebt. III 776 lives in Oxyrhyncha in the division of Polemon. If Ptolemaios in SB XXII 15767 is rightly identified with our *oikonomos*, he was involved in a case related to the village of Sebennytos in the division of Herakleides. The obvious conclusion that he was the *oikonomos* of the whole Arsinoite nome is strengthened by the fact that the other officials

---

<sup>48</sup> Armoni, *Basilikos Grammateus* (n. 47) 196 and 252 no. 32\*, proposes an identification with the royal scribe Ptolemaios in SB XX 14083. This document may indeed come from the Arsinoite nome, but the date remains uncertain: the 22<sup>nd</sup> year (l. 8) can in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC belong to the reign of either Epiphanes (184/3 BC) or Philometor (160/59 BC).

<sup>49</sup> This text will be published by David Martinez; I thank him for his permission to use this document.

<sup>50</sup> Some caution is needed because the date of the papyrus was based on the identification of Ptolemaios with the *strategos*. If this identification is rejected, a date in the joint reign of Ptolemy VI, Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II (1 December 169 BC) is also possible.

<sup>51</sup> See P.Köln VIII, pp. 107–108 (K. Maresch); Armoni, *Basilikos Grammateus* (n. 47) 201–204; Th. Christensen, D. J. Thompson, K. Vandorpe, *Land and Taxes in Ptolemaic Egypt. An Edition, Translation and Commentary for the Edfu Land Survey (P. Haun. IV 70)*, Cambridge 2017, 101. There might be a parallel between the role of the *oikonomos* in the attribution and confiscation of *kleroi* and his role in the attribution of *stathmoi*: P.Hal. I ll. 166–185 (= C.Ord.Ptol.<sup>2</sup> 24) with the commentary on p. 101.

<sup>52</sup> That Nechoutes was the royal scribe is accepted by Oates, P.Thomas, p. 78, but questioned by Armoni, *Basilikos Grammateus* (n. 47) 195 n. 76.

<sup>53</sup> See below for Leonides, another alleged royal scribe with a Greek name.

<sup>54</sup> See W. Huss, *Die Verwaltung des ptolemäischen Reichs* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 104), Munich 2011, 62–63 with n. 275 (with an overview of the earlier literature).

who appear with their title in SB XVI 12375 col. II are the *strategos* and the *epimeletes* of the nome.

An *oikonomos* who was in office at about the same time as Ptolemaios is Leonides, who appears in P.Köln X 411: Α]ξωνίδου τοῦ οἰκ[ονόμου (Fr. 15 l. 3; see also E col. 1 l. 4). Unfortunately, this fragmentary document is not precisely dated, but only contains retrospective dates between year 20 of Ptolemy V (186/5 BC) and Pachons of year 3 of Ptolemy VI (4 June–3 July 178 BC). In this context P.Genova III 97 seems also to be of interest. Since this document is attributed on palaeographical grounds to the early second century BC, its date — 21 Payni, year 21 — probably refers to the reign of Ptolemy V (25 July 184 BC). The papyrus contains a letter of Leonides<sup>55</sup> to Philon concerning the distribution by the assistants of the *sitologos* of 261 *artabai* of barley as horse fodder. Armoni suggests that Leonides may have been a *basilikos grammateus*<sup>56</sup>. Since we know from several other texts that the *oikonomos* could order the *sitologos* to provide grain to different groups of people<sup>57</sup>, I prefer to identify Leonides with the *oikonomos* in P.Köln X 411. In a third text, SB XVI 12375 (185/4–179/8 BC), assistants (*hyperetai*) of a certain Leonides are mentioned (l. 5, l. 92), which suggests that he was an official<sup>58</sup>. At first sight it seems logical to identify him with the homonymous *eisangeleus* in l. 13 and l. 100 of the same document, but since the *eisangeleus* normally was the subordinate of another official, it would be remarkable that he had his own assistants. The documents regarding Leonides can be explained in different ways. If Leonides in SB XVI 12375 is the *oikonomos*, he was a contemporary of Ptolemaios and probably the *oikonomos* of the division of Themistes: P. Köln X 411 concerns villages in this division and the village Arsinoe in P.Genova III 97 l. 14 would then be the village in the same *meris*. If we reject the identification of Leonides in SB XVI 12375 with the *oikonomos* but accept the identity of the persons in P.Köln X 411 and P.Genova III 97, Leonides may have been the predecessor of Ptolemaios as the *oikonomos* of the whole Arsinoites; it is then impossible to decide whether Arsinoe is the village in the division of Themistes or the homonymous locality in the division of Herakleides. If Leonides was the *oikonomos* of the Arsinoite nome, we must accept that he is mentioned retrospectively in P.Köln X 411 and conclude that Ptolemaios' tenure as *oikonomos* of the Arsinoites started after 25 July 184 BC, the date of Leonides' appearance in P.Genova III 97<sup>59</sup>.

<sup>55</sup> The reading Λεωνίδης of the editor must be corrected in Λεωνίδης; BL X 280.

<sup>56</sup> Armoni, *Basilikos Grammateus* (n. 47) 252 no. 31\*, and P.Tarich., pp. 12–13. Her proposal is only based on formal similarities between P.Genova III 97 and documents written by the Royal Scribe to his subalterns: Armoni, *Basilikos Grammateus* (n. 47) 27 with n. 72.

<sup>57</sup> See P.Heid. VII, pp. 6–7 (A. Paphomas); P.Kramer, pp. 14–15 (Ch. Armoni).

<sup>58</sup> See S. Strassi, *Le funzioni degli υπηρέται nell'Egitto greco e romano* (Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 3), Heidelberg 1997, 32–36.

<sup>59</sup> It is then impossible to decide whether the anonymous *oikonomos* mentioned alongside Argeios in P.Tebt. III 793 l. 32 of 183 BC is still Leonides or already Ptolemaios.

We probably have evidence for a third *oikonomos* in the same period. In SB XVI 12375 assistants (*hyperetai*) of a certain Diophantos are mentioned (ll. 27–28, l. 111). The impression that he is an official<sup>60</sup> is corroborated by col. II on the recto of this document, where Diophantos' assistants are mentioned in close connection with the *hyperetai* of the *oikonomos* Ptolemaios (l. 16), the *epimeletes* Argeios (ll. 20–21) and the *strategos* Ptolemaios (ll. 30–31). A person called Diophantos is also mentioned on the verso of P.Tebt. III 756, a document from the Adamas archive, but unfortunately in a very fragmentary context. It is attractive to recognize the same person in P.Mich. XVIII 780a, where Diophantos is the addressee of a letter regarding the non-payment of a substantial sum of money for the concession of the beer sales in Mouchis. The verso of this text contains the notice (ἔτους) α ὧν ἀφεῖκεν ὁ βασιλεύς. The editor suggests to relate this to the reign of Ptolemy V, because other documents from the same group (P.Mich. XVIII 776–778) contain references to years 11 and 13 of this ruler (195/4–193/2 BC). Since the time gap between these dates and the first year of Epiphanes (205/4 BC) or the beginning of Philometor's rule (181/0 BC) is nearly the same and we have evidence for amnesty measures of Cleopatra I and Ptolemy VI at the start of their reign<sup>61</sup>, a date in or after 180 BC cannot be ruled out<sup>62</sup>. This would bring P.Mich. XVIII 780a close to the dates of SB XVI 12375 (about 185/4–179/8 BC) and P.Tebt. III 756 (175/4 BC). The editors of P.Mich. XVIII 780a regard Diophantos as the *oikonomos* of the division of Polemon<sup>63</sup>. This would be consistent with his appearance in the Adamas archive, which concerns the same *meris*<sup>64</sup>.

<sup>60</sup> The suggestion of Sijpesteijn, *Two Ptolemaic Accounts* (n. 21) 280, that Diophantos may be identified with the *misthophoros* mentioned in P.Tebt. III 1044 (Pros.Ptol. II 3680), is extremely unlikely since this document mentions villages in the Herakleopolite nome.

<sup>61</sup> See P.Coll.Youtie I 12 ll. 13–16 and ll. 28–30, with the commentary of Käppel, *Asebieverfahren* (n. 16) 213–214, 219 comm. to l. 16. That the *philanthropa* decree P.Köln XV 606 belongs in the period 180–176 BC is uncertain.

<sup>62</sup> In P.Mich. XVIII, p. 165 comm. ad l. 18, the editors do not exclude the date to pertain to the reign of Philometor but regard it as less likely. B. Kramer, *Urkundenreferat 1997*, APF 11 (1998) 326, also suggests 180 BC as an alternative date.

<sup>63</sup> P.Mich. XVIII, pp. 163, 165.

<sup>64</sup> In P.Tebt. III 753 the villages Oxyryncha, Ibion (Eikosipentarouron), Kaminoi and Theogonis, all in the division of Polemon, are mentioned. It is furthermore noteworthy that in P.Tebt. III 755 Adamas swears by the god Soknebtynis, the principal deity of Tebtynis in the same division. The village Poan (TM Geo 1870) in P.Tebt. III 751, did apparently not belong to the same *meris*: in P.Petr.Kleon 88 l. 19 and 91 l. 212 it is located in the *nomarchia* of Aristarchos, which points to the southern part of the division of Herakleides: see P.Sorb. III, p. 54 (W. Clarysse) and P.Petr.Kleon, p. 162 (B. Van Beek).

### Conclusion

The documents from the archive of the *sitologos* Adamas were written between *c.* 185 BC and 173 BC. They help us to approximately determine the length of the tenure of some officials of the Arsinoite nome: the *epimeletai* Argeios (*c.* 185–179/8 BC) and Ptolemaios (*c.* 179/8–177 BC) and the *oikonomos* Ptolemaios (*c.* 184–179/8 BC). The functions of Leonides (*oikonomos* of the Arsinoite nome or of the *meris* of Themistes?) and Diophantos (*oikonomos* of the division of Polemon?) remain somewhat uncertain. Hopefully, the edition of new documents will shed further light on their careers.

KU Leuven  
Research Unit Ancient History  
Blijde Inkomststraat 21 – bus 3307  
3000 Leuven, Belgium  
eddy.lanciers@kuleuven.be

Eddy Lanciers