

RTP 1087p

Edgar C.C.

Selected Papyri from  
the Archives of Zenon  
(Nos 55-64)

by C.C. Edgar

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



129937

SELECTED PAPYRI  
FROM  
THE ARCHIVES OF ZENON

(Nos. 55-64)

BY C. C. EDGAR.

---

VI

The following texts belong, with one exception, to the early years of Euergetes. The great event of this period was the victorious campaign in Syria, conducted by the king in person. It may be supposed that the outbreak of war created no little excitement throughout the country, filled as it was with garrisons and colonies of soldiers, and that the letters which the courier brought to the Fayoum did occasionally contain some political and military news from the capital. But, except for one or two faint allusions, our papyri cast no light on the history of the outer world.

One feature, however, of a certain political interest distinguishes the letters of this period from the earlier ones, and that is the absence of the name of Apollonios. It is true that we have not yet recovered all the correspondence; but in the Cairo and Florence collections he is only mentioned twice, and one of these two passages seems to indicate that he was either dead or disgraced. It is not unlikely that, as has already been suggested by the editors of *P. S. I.*, VI, p. 70, the new king soon changed his minister of finance and got rid of the old *dioiketes* whose name was associated with the policy of Ptolemy II, the rapprochement between Egypt and Syria, and the disastrous marriage of Berenike. But as to his actual fate there is no definite information in the papyri (see no. 61).

Whatever became of his patron, Zenon continued to live at Philadelphia and apparently to prosper. My impression is that during his residence

there he did not follow any definite career in the civil service, but was primarily a business man, and that in the later years he was entirely occupied with his own private affairs. Time will show whether this is a misconception.

Professor Grenfell has again been kind enough to revise my copies of nearly all the following texts and to discuss the doubtful readings.

No. 55. LETTER TO ZENON (?). — o m. 14 cent. × o m. 30 cent. — Year 1.

« Will you kindly write to Iason to let the *stathmos* of Theopompos be given to me to serve as a dwelling-place. For the one in which I am living used to belong to Phileas who was formerly scribe for the Arsinoite nome, and as he has recovered his property from the *dioiketes* they are ordering me to leave it. If it is not possible to obtain that of Theopompos, get a letter from Sostratos to his people requesting them to let his house be put at my disposal. »

The letter has no address on the back, but was probably intended for Zenon. Iason, Theopompos and Sostratos are familiar names in his circle. Phileas is otherwise unknown, unless indeed he can be identified with the Φ[ι]λέας of *P. S. I.*, 344, who was transmitting orders from the *dioiketes* to the nomarch in year 30, or with Φιλέου του ἐγλογιστοῦ mentioned in a papyrus of year 34. The restoration of line 4, and consequently the meaning, is uncertain.

This is the only Zenonian document as yet known that is dated by year 1 of Euergetes; nor is year 1 found on any of the Hibeh papyri or Petrie papyri. Yet we have plenty of dated documents from the preceding and following years<sup>(1)</sup>. This surely indicates that on whatever system the Greek<sup>(2)</sup> papyri of this period were generally dated year 1 was very short.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> It should be observed too that year 1 is seldom found on the dated coins from Phœnicia and Palestine, see the lists drawn up by Svoronos.

<sup>(2)</sup> One must distinguish between

Greek and demotic. In three bilinguals in our collection the demotic version, in contrast to the Greek, is clearly dated by the Egyptian year beginning in Thoth. So also *P. Hib.*, 80.

I fancy that the present letter was dated by the official Macedonian year, but that many other papyri follow the system of taking the 1<sup>st</sup> of Mecheir as the starting-point.

[ ] χαίρειν. καλῶς ποιήσεις γράψας Ἰάσονι προ-  
 [εθῆναι ἡμῖν τὸν Θεο]πρόμπου σλαθμόν, ὅπως ἔχωμεν ἐνοικεῖν·  
 ἦν γὰρ ὧι ἐνοικοῦμ[ε]ν Φιλέου τοῦ πρότερον γραμματεύσαντος  
 τὸν Ἀρσινοίτην, κε[κόμ]ισται γὰρ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα παρὰ τοῦ διοικητοῦ  
 5 καὶ κελεύουσιν ἡμ[ᾶς] παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκχωρεῖν. εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐν δυνατῶι  
 ἐσθῆν τοῦτον λαβ[εῖν, λ]αβὲ παρὰ Σωσίρατου ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς τοὺς  
 παρ' αὐτοῦ ὅπως [παρ]αδειχθῆι ἡμῖν ἢ οἴκησις αὐτοῦ.  
 ἔρρωσο. Λα, Μεχεῖρ ια.

2. Or προ[έσθαι]. — 4. κε[κόμ]ισται : uncertain, the letter after the lacuna might be either η or ι.

No. 56. DEPOSITION OF A WITNESS. — o m. 07 cent. × o m. 355 mill. — Year 2.

The following piece does not belong to our collection, but is, or formerly was, in private possession in Cairo. The owner kindly allowed me to see it, about two years ago, and to make a copy for publication. As it might otherwise remain unknown and as it is decidedly interesting, I have published it here along with a companion piece which was lately acquired by the Museum (no. 57).

These two papyri are the written depositions of Euphronios and Eudemos, witnesses for Antipatros in an action against Nikon. Euphronios states that while he and Nikon and some others were in a barber's shop Antipatros and Simon (Σῖμων) came and asked Nikon to give them back their son Theodosios, whereupon Nikon denied that he had taken the boy from them or that he was keeping him at all. The statement of the other witness, though it refers to a different occasion, is to nearly the same effect.

Both depositions are drawn up according to the same formula, and in both cases the personal description of the witness has been inserted afterwards. Both are citizens of Alexandria, and one of them at least is a man

of high position, a hipparch of the guard. The dates are given in Macedonian style, as was customary in legal documents; incidentally they show that the official year at this time began between Gorpianos and Panemos (= Phaophi to Mesore).

The depositions were presumably intended to be laid before the court which was to try the case. But I am unable to explain how they came to be preserved in Zenon's files, and I must leave it to others to comment on their significance from the legal point of view.

ὡς L λε, εὐμεγέθης, εὐρωστός, κλαστός, μελίχρους,  
μαρτυρεῖ Ἀντίπατρω Εὐφρόνιος Ἀπολλωνίδου, Ἀμμωνιεύς. οἰκῶ ἐμ Φιλα-  
δρόχωνος, οὐλή ὀφρύων δεξιᾶι  
δελφείαι τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου.

τοῦ δὲ βL, μηνὸς Πανήμου, ὄντος μου καὶ Νίκωνος καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἐν τῷ  
Εὐδόξου κουρείω, παραγενόμενος

Ἀντίπατρος καὶ Σῆμον, οἷς μαρτυρῶ, εἰς τὸ κουρεῖον τοῦτο ἤξιουν Νίκωνα  
ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῶν Θεο-

δόσιον· Νίκων δὲ ὁ κρινόμενος πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον οὐκ ἔφατο εἰληφέναι τὸ παι-  
δάριον παρ' αὐτῶν οὐδὲ ἔχειν αὐτὸ

5 παρευρέσει οὐδεμίαι.

Verso :

Lβ, Γορπιείου κς. φέρει

Εὐφρονίου.

Ἀντίπατρω πρὸς ἀντίδικον

Νίκωνα.

1. Ἀμμωνιεύς: for this deme-name see Breccia in the *Bull. Soc. arch. d'Alex.*, no. 10, p. 183. ὀρθόχωνος — δεξιᾶι: I have marked the reading as doubtful but have not had an opportunity of revising it on the original. — 6. φέρει: sc. μαρτυρίαν.

No. 57. DEPOSITION OF A WITNESS. — o m. 85 cent. × o m. 225 mill. —  
Year 2.

See the introduction to no. 56. The present deposition was taken down a month later.

The description of Eudemos contains one rather interesting detail, τοῦ αρ.[.].ου ἀγήματος ἱππάρχης. A passage of Polybius, V, 65, 2 and 5, is

thought by M. Lesquier<sup>(1)</sup> to prove that in the Ptolemaic army the term *ἀγῆμα* was reserved for the infantry of the guard and did not include the cavalry; but our text shows that it was not always used in this restricted sense. The preceding word I am tempted to read as *ἀρχ[α]ίου*, comparing the passage in which Polybius mentions the plan of sending *τοὺς ἀρχαίους καὶ προϋπάρχοντας ξένους ἐπὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν χώραν φρούρια καὶ τὰς κατοικίας*<sup>(2)</sup>.

[ὡς L]λε, μελάγχρους, ἀναφάλαντος

[μαρτυρεῖ Ἀντιπάτρῳ Εὐδήμ]ος Εὐθυγενοῦς, Νειλεύς, τοῦ αρ.[.].ου ἀγῆ-  
ματος ἰππάρχης.

[ Μέ]μφιν. τοῦ δὲ δευτέρου ἔτους, μηνὸς Λαίου,  
Ἀντιπάτρῳ, ὧι μαρτυρῶ,

[ Νί]κωνι καὶ Φαμένου τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (Θεοδόσιον)  
εἰργμένον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ συνέχεσθαι

[ ]νι ὠρίζετο Νίκων λέγων μήτε εἰληφέναι  
παρὰ μηδενὸς τὸ παιδάριον

5 [ ]μήτε εἶρξαι μήτε ἔχειν τὸ παι <sup>δά[ριον]</sup> π[αρ]εῦρέ-  
σει μηδεμίαι.

Verso :

Ἀν]τιπάτρῳ πρὸς Νι-

Ε]υδήμου (in larger hand)

L β ]Υπερβερε κ̄ε

1. Νειλεύς : a deme-name, see BRECCIA, *B. S. A.*, no. 10, p. 184. αρ.[.].ου : the letter after the lacuna resembles υ, but ι is also one of the possible letters. — 2. E.g. [οικῶ ἐμ Βουσίρει τῆι ὑπὲρ Μέ]μφιν, cf. *P. Hib.*, 101, 2-3, note. — 3. E.g. [ἐντυ-  
χόντος ἐναντίον μου Νί]κωνι. εἰργμένον : ει rewritten above the line. — 4. ὠρίζετο : the same word is used in more than one of our papyri with reference to statements made by litigants.

<sup>(1)</sup> *Institutions militaires*, pp. 21-25.

<sup>(2)</sup> POLYBIUS, XV, 25, 16-18, discussed by LESQUIER, *op. cit.*, p. 18. See also

the reference to *ἀρχαίων ἰππέων* in WILCKEN, *Griechische Ostraka*, I, p. 161, and II, no. 323.

No. 58. A PETITION TO THE KING FROM ZENON. — 0 m. 07 cent. × 0 m. 35 cent. — Year 4 (?).

«To king Ptolemy greeting from Zenon. I am being wronged by Herakleides. For in year 3 I gave him through Demeas 400 drachmæ in gold, requesting him to pay into the Treasury on my account 400 drachmæ in copper, on condition that on receiving from me the said amount in copper he should give me back the gold; and though I have been offering him the copper and demanding the gold from him, he has not given it back but has put me off up till now. I beg you therefore, if it seems good to you, to order Agenor the *strategos* to summon him and, if my story be found true, to force him to accept the 400 drachmæ of copper and give me back the four hundred drachmæ of gold, and so by your grace may I obtain justice.»

The petition is carefully written out, without corrections, and does not seem to be merely a draft. Nevertheless, as it was found among Zenon's papers and as it bears no date or annotation, it is doubtful whether it was really laid before Agenor in its present form; perhaps it is only a copy of the original. The writer uses the ordinary formulæ of petitions addressed to the king, though really intended for the local *strategos*<sup>(1)</sup>, but the diction is somewhat curt. He does not describe himself by his full name and title, nor does he give any details about his opponent Herakleides. The 400 drachmæ which Zenon owed to the Government were probably a tax of some sort. I do not yet venture to identify Herakleides with any of the persons of that name found in our papyri. Demeas is a less common name, and the Demeas of the petition may well be identical with the Demeas of our no. 61 (cf. *P. S. I.*, 391, 403). Agenor the *strategos* is a well-known personage often mentioned in documents of this period.

The most interesting point about the petition is the mention of gold. It is certain that a great deal of gold was in circulation in Egypt at this time, but we hear very little about it in the papyri<sup>(2)</sup>. Our no. 5 is an

<sup>(1)</sup> See LESQUIER, *Pap. de Magdola*, introd., p. 15.

<sup>(2)</sup> See the references to the currency

of gold in the interior collected by A. SEGRÈ, *Circolazione Tolemaica*, p. 45 (*Rivista ital. di Numismatica*, 1920).

invaluable document about the minting of gold in Egypt, or will become so when the text has been definitely established<sup>(1)</sup>. Of equal importance, though of less human interest, is no. 59 of the present instalment. From this we learn that a hundred drachmæ in gold had an exchange value of at least a hundred and four drachmæ in silver. And as 104 drachmæ in silver at the ordinary rate of exchange (26 1/2 obols to the stater)<sup>(2)</sup> were worth nearly 115 drachmæ in copper, Zenon's 400 drachmæ in gold were probably worth about 460 in copper. Of course this is only an approximate calculation; for we do not know what the actual rates of exchange were in the Fayoum at this particular time; nor do we know whether Zenon's gold included any coins of the old issue (see no. 59).

βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίω χαίρειν Ζήνων. ἀδικοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ἡρακλείδου· δόντος γάρ μου αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ γ L

διὰ Δημέου χρυσίου τ υ, ὅπως διαγράψῃ ὑπὲρ μου εἰς τὸ βασιλ[ι]κὸν χαλκοῦ τ υ, ἐφ' ᾧ κομισάμενος παρὰ μου ἀποδώσει μοι,

καὶ ἐμοῦ ἀποδιδόντος αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπαιτοῦντος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀποδέδωκεν, ἀλλὰ παρηλκυκέμ με ἕως τοῦ νῦν. δέομαι

οὖν σου, εἴ σοι δοκεῖ, προστάξαι Ἀγήνορι τῷ στρατηγῷ ἀνακαλέσαι αὐτὸν καί, ἐὰν ἦ ἀληθῆ, ἐπαναγκάσαι αὐτὸν

5 κομισάμενον τὰς υ τ τοῦ χαλκοῦ ἀποδοῦναί μοι τὰς υ τ τοῦ χρυσίου, καὶ ᾧ διὰ σὲ τοῦ δικαίου τετευχώς.

εὐτύχει.

5. καὶ ᾧ : one would have expected ἵνα ᾧ τετευχώς, cf. *P. Magd.*, 18, 6.

<sup>(1)</sup> In line 16 Grenfell reads *Φιάλας τουδε*, and *τουδε* seems fairly certain. The following letters are hardly legible, but the traces suggest *μεσο[...]*, so we may perhaps read *Φιάλας τουδε με ο[ύκ] ἐ[ἔ]ωντος δέχσθαι*. In line 21 Grenfell prefers to read *οὐ[τ]ε [τῶ]ν τραπεζῶν* instead of my *οὐ[τε] ἐπ[ι] τραπεζῶν*, and

I agree that this is rather more likely. Though there is only a fragment of the letter *s* in line 20, it does not seem possible to read *[ταῦ]τα* instead of *[ταῦ]τας*.

<sup>(2)</sup> *SEGRE*, *op. cit.*, p. 44 and *P. Petr.*, III, p. 86. The rate varied a good deal, but within narrow limits, and we seldom find it lower than 26 obols.

No. 59. A MONEY ACCOUNT. — 0 m. 405 mill.  $\times$  0 m. 18 cent. — Not dated.

This little document, which contains some new and curious information about the gold coinage of the Ptolemies, is unfortunately undated, and my only reason for publishing it here is that it deals with the question raised by no. 58, that is to say the exchange value of coined gold. Probably, however, it belongs to the reign of Philadelphos, and it may be as much as fifteen years earlier than the petition.

It is evident that the *μναιεῖα* of lines 1, 13 are the large gold coins which we call octadrachms and that the *πεντηκοντάδραχμα* are those which we call tetradrachms. The account shows that, though nominally equal to 100 and to 50 drachmæ in silver, they were in reality worth 104 and 52 drachmæ at the current rate of exchange in a Government bank. On the usual supposition that the nominal weight of the *μναιεῖον* was eight Ptolemaic drachmæ we find that the value of coined gold compared with that of coined silver stood nominally in the ratio of  $12 \frac{1}{2} : 1$ , as was demonstrated by Letronne<sup>(1)</sup>, but that in the money market the actual ratio was at this time  $13 : 1$ . If, however, we compare the real weights of the coins as ascertained from existing specimens<sup>(2)</sup>, we shall find that a *μναιεῖον* was worth, at the current rate of exchange, about  $13 \frac{1}{3}$  times its weight in coined silver. Practically therefore the ratio in Egypt about the middle of the III<sup>rd</sup> century B. C. was  $13 \frac{1}{3} : 1$ .

The account mentions still another class of gold coins, bearing the name of *τρίχρυσα*. These, I think, may be safely identified with the gold pentadrachms, as we now call them, which were issued under Soter and

---

<sup>(1)</sup> See the article by Hultsch appended to the German edition of Svoronos, *Münzen der Ptolemæer*, p. 16. A different theory is put forward by A. Segrè in the interesting article already cited. He holds that the new gold coinage of Ptolemy II was struck on a different standard from that of the silver coinage (p. 37); calculating therefore by the ac-

tual weights of the coins he concludes that the nominal ratio of gold to silver from B. C. 270 onwards was  $12 \frac{13}{16} : 1$ .

<sup>(2)</sup> HULTSCH, pp. 7, 8, 11, gives the weight of the gold octadrachms as 28.00-27.75 grammes and the weight of a silver drachma as 3.64-3.54 grammes. Segrè (pp. 36, 37) gives the normal weights as 27.843 and 3.571.

Philadelphos and were eventually superseded during the reign of the latter by the *μναιεῖα* and *πεντηκοντάδραχμα*. It appears from lines 6-8, 16, 17 that the nominal value of the *τρίχρυσον* was 60 silver drachmæ, but that its actual exchange value was  $66 \frac{2}{3}$ . The latter point is not indeed altogether clear; for while in line 8 the premium on a *τρίχρυσον* is said to be  $6 \frac{2}{3}$  drachmæ, the total in line 9 is calculated as if  $6 \frac{2}{3}$  drachmæ were the premium on each of the 51 minæ to which the 85 *τρίχρυσσα* were equivalent. But lines 8, 17 and 18 are so explicit that we may disregard the inconsistency in line 9 and take the exchange value of a *τρίχρυσον* to be  $66 \frac{2}{3}$  drachmæ, which is exactly  $\frac{2}{3}$  of a mina in silver. We have seen that the weight of a *μναιεῖον* was about 28 grammes and its exchange value 104 drachmæ. As the weight of the gold pentadrachm was in the time of Philadelphos 17.95 grammes<sup>(1)</sup>, its exchange value ought accordingly to be  $66 \frac{2}{3}$  drachmæ; and as the papyrus shows that this was the exchange value of the *τρίχρυσον*, there can be no doubt that the coins which the Alexandrians called *τρίχρυσσα* are those which we now call gold pentadrachms.

These figures show that the exchange value of the different denominations of gold coins was in exact proportion to their weight. But how is it that the *τρίχρυσσα*, though in fact exchangeable for a sum corresponding to their weight, had a nominal value of only 60 drachmæ with a premium of over 11 per cent, while the new coins had a higher nominal value with a lower premium of 4 per cent? It is perhaps better to leave such questions to the metrologists. I only venture to say, in concurrence with the views of A. Segrè<sup>(2)</sup>, that this valuation (1 *τρίχρυσον* = 60 drachmæ) is probably a survival from a time when the nominal ratio of

---

<sup>(1)</sup> HULTSCH, *op. cit.*, p. 8, states that Philadelphos continued to coin gold pentadrachms with a drachm-weight of 3.59-3.57 grammes. SEGRÈ, *art. cit.*, p. 35, gives the normal weight as 17.855. Taking Segrè's normal weights for both octadrachms and pentadrachms we arrive at the same result.

<sup>(2)</sup> *Art. cit.*, p. 35. The further theo-

ry, p. 45, that our no. 5 means that banks and private persons were obliged to sell their *τρίχρυσσα* to the Government at par, or for less than the new coins, needs to be argued more fully before one can form an opinion on it. In the present case the old coins appear to be exchangeable at their full weight value in a Government bank.

gold to silver was 12 : 1. In that case the *τρίχρυσον* would have been originally the equivalent in gold of the  $1/100^{\text{th}}$  part of a silver talent. As for the name, a *τρίχρυσον* must evidently mean a coin worth three *χρυσοῖ*, and in this particular case three *χρυσοῖ* of about 5.98 grammes<sup>(1)</sup>. But no gold coin approximating to this weight was current in Ptolemaic Egypt. At the time when the *τρίχρυσα* were being issued the term *χρυσοῦς*, if it was indeed used in Alexandria, can only have meant a sum of 20 silver drachmæ, not a special gold coin<sup>(2)</sup>.

ἔνεσσι μναιεῖα λζ,  
 καὶ τούτου ἀπαλλαγὴ τ ρμη,  
 πεντηκονταδράχμων μναῖ μς ἡμιμναῖον,  
 καὶ τούτου ἐπαλλαγὴ τ ρπς,  
 5 / ᾠ α τ  $\overset{\beta}{\text{Π}}$ χ[π.] πδ,  
 [κ]αὶ τρίχρυσα πε ᾠ μναῖ να,  
 καὶ τούτου ἐπαλλαγὴ  
 τοῦ τριχρύσου τ ςς- / τ φξςς- ,  
 εἰς δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ ᾠ β τ  $\overset{\beta}{\text{Π}}$ ρκδ.  
 10 ἀπὸ τούτου  
 [ ] .ιο. πόλει θεῖμα ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλικῆς  
 τραπέζης ἐφ' ἧς στρατοκλῆς ἀργυρ(ίου) ᾠ β.  
 τούτων μναιεῖ(α) ιε, καὶ τούτου ἐπαλλαγὴ τ ξ,  
 πεντηκονταδράχμων μν(αῖ) μς,  
 15 καὶ τούτου ἐπαλλαγὴ τ ρπδ,  
 τρίχρυ[σ]α [π]ε ᾠ μναῖ να,  
 [τ]ούτου ἐπαλ[λ]αγὴ τοῦ τριχρύσου τ ςς- / φξςς- ,  
 εἰς δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεται ᾠ β τ ις- .  
 τούτου  
 20 κεχ[ο]μίσμ[εθ]α τ ις- , λοιπὸν ἔχει ᾠ β.

<sup>(1)</sup> On the meaning of *τρίχρυσον*, see  
SEGRÈ, p. 25.

<sup>(2)</sup> Cf. SEGRÈ, *Circolazione Tolemaica*,  
p. 36, note 2.

Below, in a smaller hand :

]. ν†  $\bar{\lambda}$  α † Σμ καὶ τριχρύσων †  $\text{ΠΠ} \begin{matrix} \xi \\ \chi\zeta\eta \end{matrix}$  - καὶ προσσαριθμῆται † ργ =  
|  $\bar{\lambda}$  β.

Verso : ἐμβλημα ἐκ τοῦ κυνούχου

5. The symbol Π (= thousand) is found in a few early papyri and in some inscriptions of later date, see B. KEIL in *P. Eleph.*, p. 84. — 9. For the calculation of this total, see above. — 11. Possibly [ἐν] Διὸς πόλει. — 12. Stratokles is mentioned again in the following draft : Στρατοκλεῖ. καλῶς ἂν ποιήσῃς τὸν ὑπάρχοντα ἡμῖν λόγον ἐπ(ί) τῆς σῆς τρα(πέζης) καὶ ὃ ἂν καταλείπηται λοιπὸν ἐγ' λόγου δοῦς Ἰατροκλεῖ. As we hear of Iatrokles in connection with Mendes (*P. S. I.*, 333, 362), it may be conjectured that the bank of Stratokles was in the neighbouring city of Diospolis Inferior (v. STRABO, 802, πλησίον δὲ Μένδητος καὶ Διὸς πόλις). — 20. ἔχει, sc. ἡ τράπεζα. — 21. ]. ν† : read (μνασιών), (πεντηκονταδράχμων). — 22. ἐμβλημα : another papyrus in our collection, giving an account of money spent, is entitled ἐμβλήματα τῶν διὰ Λιμναίου ἀργυρίου † ἱ. Cf. also ἐμβεβλημέναι in *P. Hib.*, 63, 5. For κυνούχου, 'purse', cf. *P. Teb.*, 112, 31, 33, ἐκ τοῦ μαρσί(ππου).

No. 60. A LETTER TO ZENON AND A RECEIPT. — o m. 39 cent. × o m. 115 mill. — Year 5.

Some shepherds had apparently complained to Zenon that the writer had not given them sufficient land for pasturage (lines 1-4). The letter then continues : « [That they should tell you lies?] is not surprising, but it is surprising that they should have prevailed on you to write bidding me act fairly as Demetrios is according them justice. Yet I had given them not only the place which they leased, but an additional piece at the request of Ammonios, not allowing myself to accept a price from others. But so senseless are these people that they want me next to hand over to them the land which I have let to others by contract. The land I speak of is scattered through all the plains, for in each basin there are six or seven *arourai* of it, sometimes ten. Land of this sort I have not given up to anyone, but after you wrote I gave them the untilled land which lies in a single plain, comprising 200 *arourai*. I will inform you more fully when I am on the spot. — P. S. If any goads or spears are to be had cheap, buy me two for guarding the wild cattle and give them to Straton and Peromin (?). »





Verso :

Ζήνων Πύρρωι χαίρειν. ἀπέχομεν παρὰ σοῦ,  
 [κατὰ τὸν δια]λογ[ισ]μὸν ὃν ἐπ[οιη]σάμεθα πρὸς σέ,  
 [ἐπιβάλλοντά] σοι  
 τὸν [Φό]ρ[ον] τῶν ἱερείων ὃν ἐ[μι]σ[θ]ώσω μετὰ Πυθέου  
 [παρ' Ἐφ]αρμόσιου κα[τὰ] συγγραφήν τὴν παρ' Ἄρ-  
 και αὐτὰ τὰ ἱερεῖα ἰεC  
 [[τὰ θηλυκὰ ἱερεῖα]]

5 χαχάθωι, ἀργ ν [[καὶ τὰ ἰε]] τὰς τοκάδας [[ἰεC]].

Ζῆ[νων] Πύρρωι . [ἀ]πέχ[ομ]εν παρὰ σοῦ, κατὰ  
 [τὸν διαλο]γισμὸν ὃν ἐποιησάμεθα πρὸς σέ,  
 [τὸν ἐπι]βάλλοντά [σο]ι φόρον τῶν ἱερείων ὃν ἐμισ-  
 [θώσω μετὰ Π]υθέου παρ' Ἐφαρμόσιου  
 10 [κατὰ συγγρα]φήν τὴν παρ' Ἄρχαχάθωι,  
 [ἀργ ν καὶ α]ὐτὰ τὰ ἱερεῖα ἰεC.

[τ]ῆι προτέραι ἐπ(ιστολήι) οὐ χρήσει.

Recto. 4. Perhaps πο]λλά. — 7. ἀλλ' : doubtful. — 11-12. The reading is not certain. — 26. Perhaps οὐδέ. — 33. Θωύθι, sic. — 34. συβίνοι : see *Lexica* under σισύνη. — 35. Possibly ἰκανῶς. — 38. The reading is very doubtful.

Verso. 5. ἀργ ν, τὰ θηλυκὰ, τὰ ἰε : all doubtful. τὰς τοκάδας is also supposed to be deleted.

No. 61. CONCERNING MONEY OWED BY A SURETY. — O m. 175 mill. × O m. 108 mill. — Year 5 or 6.

Though this papyrus is incomplete and the information it yields is not so clear as one could desire, yet it has several points of interest and in particular it throws some light on the career of Apollonios the *dioiketes*.

A certain Demeas had made himself surety for the potter Horos, τὸν ἐγλαβόντα τὴν εἰς τὸ δ L κεραμεικὴν. It appears that Horos was bound by contract to furnish a certain amount of pottery to the local authorities at Philadelphia, that he had failed to do so, and that Demeas had been called upon to pay 270 drachmæ in copper. The present document, of which the beginning is lost, may be either a receipt saying that the amount due

has been paid on behalf of Demeas or a statement to some other effect concerning the debt. It should be compared with *P. P.*, III, 57 (b).

The natural meaning of the phrase τὸν ἐγλαβόντα τὴν κεραμεικὴν is that Horos was either farming a tax or monopoly or had contracted to supply the pottery needed for the year; and, to judge from the context, the latter explanation is the more probable. If my restoration of line 12 is right, Zenon was merely the guardian of the contract. The person with whom Horos made the agreement was Eukles. From the mutilated passage in which the position of Eukles is specified, lines 5-8, and from a comparison of this with lines 1, 2, 16-18, it seems probable that he was in charge of the district which had once formed the estate of Apollonios. But between the date of the contract and the date of our papyrus he had been succeeded by Bion (not, I suppose, the Φυλακίτης of *P. P.*, III, 128).

The last year in which we have as yet found mention of Apollonios acting as *dioiketes* is year 39, or possibly 38, of Philadelphos (see no. 54 and *P. S. I.*, 383). Between that date and year 4 of Euergetes his career seems to have ended. We may infer from the present text, adopting Grenfell's restoration of ἀναληφθείσης in lines 6, 7, that his estate had reverted to the Crown; at any rate it was no longer the δωρεά of Apollonios. Probably indeed he was dead; for if μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν is not the only possible restoration of line 7, it is on the whole the most probable.

The disappearance of Apollonios must no doubt have affected the position of Zenon at Philadelphia. Though it is doubtful whether Zenon was ever, strictly speaking, a Government official with a definite rank in the hierarchy, his connection with Apollonios constantly involved him in Government business, as we have seen from the correspondence. In private business it is not always easy to distinguish between his affairs and those of Apollonios, but there is reason to suppose that besides acting as an agent of Apollonios both in official and in private matters he was at the same time attending to his own interests and establishing an independent position for himself. So when Apollonios died or ceased to hold office and the δωρεά reverted to the Crown, Zenon continued to live at Philadelphia and occupy himself more than ever with his private affairs. It is significant that in a formal document of this period, *P. S. I.*, 389, he is no longer described as τῶν περὶ Ἀπολλώνιον but simply as *παρεπίδημος*.

The accounts on the *verso* have no connection with the *recto*.

κατὰ Φιλαδέλφειαν τῆς πρώτ[ε]-  
 ρου οὔσης Ἀπολλωνίου δ[ωρεᾶς]  
 ὑπὲρ Δημέου τοῦ Καλ. . . [ . . . πρὸς ]  
 ἐγγύ[η]ν ἣν ἐνεγυήσατο Δημέα[ς]  
 5 Εὐκλεῖ Διονυσίου ετ. . . . . [ ]  
 κατὰ Φιλαδέλφεια[ν ἀναληφθεί?]-  
 σης δωρεᾶς μετὰ τ[ὴν τελευτήν?]  
 Ἀπολλωνίου ὄρον [ . . . . . Ναυ]-  
 κρατίτην, κεραμέα, [τὸν ἐγλα]-  
 10 ἔοντα παρ' Εὐκλέους. . . . [ ]  
 τὴν εἰς τὸ δ L κεραμεικὴν [κατὰ]  
 συγγραφὴν, ἐφ' ἧς συγγραφ. . . [ ]  
 Ζήνων, τὸ ἐπιβάλλον Δημέαι  
 ἀφ' οὗ προσωφείλησεν ὄρος Εὐκλεῖ  
 15 κεράμου, οὗ ἀντιπαρε[.]. . . . .  
 Εὐκλῆς Βίωσι τῶι μεταλαβόντι  
 τὴν ἐπιστατείαν τῶν κα[τὰ] Φι-  
 λαδέλφειαν, τιμὴν κεραμίων  
 κενῶν Βψ ὡς τῶν ρ [χαλ + ι]  
 20 χαλκοῦ + Σο.

Verso :

Col. 1.

πρὸς τὸ ε L

<sup>υ</sup>  
 Ζήνων φ ἀμπέλου ἀργ μες

κεράμια κεκωνημένα χρζ

οἴνου καὶ ὄρους χα(λκοῦ) ᾠα υξςς = CTX

25 καὶ τῶν ἰχθυοβόλων ἀργ ρ

καὶ τοῦ δ L ες CT

Col. 2.

vestiges of 3 lines, then

πρὸς τὸ ζ Ζήνων ξ(αρούρου) γ'

τοῦ λ(αρούρου) δ'

3. Καλλι[ου? — 5. ἐπιστάτηι τῆς (or τῶν) would give good sense, but the traces of letters do not accord. — 6. ἀναληφθει[σης or τῆς. . . . . σης. — 7. μετὰ τ[ὴν : doubtful whether τ or στ, e. g. μεταστ[αθέντος]. — 10. Perhaps ἐν τῶ[ι γ Λ]. — 12. Perhaps συγγραφοφύλαξ, cf. no. 60, verso, 4, κατὰ συγγραφήν τὴν παρ' Ἀρχαγάθωι. — 15. ἀντιπαρέδειξεν? — 22. Read Φυ(λακτικῶ). ἀργ(υρίου) is doubtful. — 24. ΓΧ : read τέ(ταρτον), χ(αλλοῦς). — Col. 2. Ξ (αρούρου) : cf. P. S. I., 393, 20, 21, τοῦ Ζήνωνος καὶ Σωσιγράτου ἀμπελωνος (ἐξηκονταρούρου) τοῦ περὶ Φιλαδέλφειαν.

No. 62. DRAFTS OF TWO LETTERS FROM ZENON ABOUT THE ἀπόμοιρα. — 0 m. 30 cent. × 0 m. 225 mill. — Year 6.

The text fills one column of a papyrus which originally contained a number of drafts, not copies, of letters on various subjects, a sort of rough register of expedition. Part of a second column is preserved, but is too fragmentary to be published here.

The first letter, which is addressed to Sostratos, a partner or agent of Zenon, runs thus : «When Demetrios, who is engaged in farming the *apomoira*, was starting down the river to see Zenodoros about the farm and to ask that an order be sent to Hermaphilos and the accountants to make inquiry and, if it should appear that in year 5 not only the sums due for that year but also the arrears of year 4 are being paid up, to let the [ ] be returned to the sureties, I wrote to you also to attend to this question and ask Kraton the *praktor* to deal indulgently with Dionysodoros about the 3000 drachmæ for which he guaranteed the firm of Hippokrates and Demetrios. But I hear that Zenodoros has sailed up to Sebennytyos and I suspect that Demetrios has not found him in the capital. If then you have spoken to Kraton and he has agreed, it will be all right; but if not, do so even now without delay, for fear that while the deficit is being paid up the guarantee be exacted from Dionysodoros and we lose 3000 drachmæ, for you know well that it is not easy to recover money from the Treasury.»

The second letter is to Kraton the *praktor* : «Demetrios and Hippokrates, who have been engaged in farming the *apomoira* of Philadelphos for the Arsinoite nome, and for whom Dionysodoros is surety for year 4, having made up in year 5 the arrears of year 4 as well, have sailed down to see Zenodoros. . . .»

Various points in this interesting text are obscure to me and I can only offer a very imperfect explanation. We know that Hermaphilos was at this time *oikonomos* of the Arsinoite nome, and therefore the chief local authority in questions of taxation (see the *Revenue Laws*). Zenodoros was evidently his superior, and the references to him in the text suggest that he was no less a person than the great *dioiketes* in Alexandria. But there is a serious objection to this view<sup>(1)</sup>, and for the present we can only say that he was an official of very high rank. Kraton was the local *praktor* (cf. *P. S. I.*, 659). These together with the *logistai* were the Government's representatives. On the other side stand Demetrios and Hippokrates, *οἱ πρὸς τῆι ἔκτῃ*, their surety, Dionysodoros, and, associated with them by some bond, Zenon himself. Demetrios and Hippokrates are mentioned again in *P. S. I.*, 528 in connection with the *καρπὸς ξυλικός*; and Demetrios is evidently the author of *P. S. I.*, 439<sup>(2)</sup>, in which he speaks of sending Zenon the accounts of the various districts of the nome, no doubt the accounts of the *ὠνή*. In another very interesting papyrus, not yet published, Demetrios gives a report about the progress of business in year 5. But what was Zenon's connection with the farming of the tax? I can see no indication that he was acting as a Government official. One possible explanation is that though Dionysodoros was the nominal surety, Zenon stood

---

<sup>(1)</sup> From *P. Petr.*, II, 38 (*b*) and *P. Lille*, I, 3 it appears that a certain Theogenes was *dioiketes* in year 5 and the following years, and col. III, 60 of the latter text makes it seem probable that he was the great *dioiketes* in Alexandria. So if the editors are right in assigning these papyri to the reign of Euergetes, we must conclude that Zenodoros was a subordinate of Theogenes, perhaps a *hypodioiketes*. The editors of *P. S. I.*, vol. VI, p. 70, note 1, suggest that the Theogenes of *P. Lille*, 4 is the same person (cf. *P. Lille*, I, p. 44, note 5) and that this papyrus also, in spite of the evidence of the double date, may belong

to the reign of Euergetes rather than of Philopator. The identification seems to me to be possible enough, but I should draw a different inference from it: if the Theogenes of *P. Lille* 4 is the *dioiketes*, it is more probable that both papyri date from Philopator's reign. It is worth noting that the eponymous priestess for year 7 of Euergetes was the daughter of a Zenodoros, who might be the person mentioned in our text (see the art. *ἱερεῖς* by Plaumann in Pauly-Wissowa).

<sup>(2)</sup> In line 13 of this text I follow Vitelli's interpretation of *ἀντιγραφάμενος* (see Index XII), but lines 17-21 are difficult to understand or to emend.

behind him and was ultimately responsible for the money (cf. WILCKEN, *Ostr.*, I, p. 554). But I am more inclined to think that Zenon was in reality a partner in the farming of the *apomoira*. It is noticeable that in line 2 he had originally written ἀποστέλλοντες Δημήτριον, implying that he had some authority over the latter. It may be that Demetrios and Hippokrates, οἱ πρὸς τῆι ἔκτῃ, were the acting managers, in whose name the farm was leased (cf. ll. 11, 21, 22), but that they had some wealthy associates, such as Zenon, who took a less direct part in the work<sup>(1)</sup>.

As for the general meaning of the text I take it that the guarantee had not yet been definitely exacted from Dionysodoros and that if the order of the *dioiketes* arrived in time no farther steps would be taken about it, but that if it was exacted before the order arrived it would be difficult to obtain restitution from the Treasury. It may be that something has been omitted in line 19, for the order of the words is unusual, but taking the sentence as it stands I do not see how to explain it except by supposing that there is a break in the construction after Διονυσόδωρον and that the words ἡμᾶς τ ζημιωθῆναι go together. In that case the meaning may be that Zenon and his friends were likely to be the losers, perhaps in this way that they would have to recoup Dionysodoros out of the proceeds of the farm, but might be unable to recover from the Treasury the money which had been already exacted. But this explanation is of course very hypothetical; and unfortunately the difficulty of understanding the letter is increased by the fact that the reading which I have adopted in lines 10, 19 is disputed.

In the chapter which deals with the ἀπόμοιρα in the *Revenue Laws*, col. 34, it is stated that if there is a deficit on the year's accounts the farmers and the sureties are obliged to make it good in the first three months of the following year. Zenon's letter is dated year 6, Choiak 1, and it appears that even then the accounts for year 4 had not been finally settled. How to explain this discrepancy I do not know, except on the supposition that

---

<sup>(1)</sup> On the question of partnership and management, see STEINER, *Beitrag zur Interpretation des Steuergesetzes von Ptol.*

*Phil.*, pp. 7-28, and WILCKEN, *Ostraka*, I, chap. 6, also *Grundzüge*, pp. 183, 184.

the procedure laid down in the *Revenue Laws* was not very strictly observed in practice.

Λ ζ Χοίαχ α.

Σωσίρατωι. [[ἀποστέλλοντες Δημήτριον τὸν ε]]

καταπλέοντος Δημητρίου τοῦ πρὸς τῆι ζ' πρὸς  
Ζηνόδαρον περὶ τῆς ἀνῆς ὅπως γραφῆ

5 Ἐρμαφίλωι τε καὶ τοῖς λογισταῖς ἐπισκεψαμένους,

ἐν τῶι

ἐὰν φαίνεται [[τὸ]] ε Λ αὐτό τε ἀναπληρούμενον  
καὶ τὸ δ, ἀποδοθῆναι τοῖς ἐγγύοις τ[α[. . . . .]],  
ἐγράψαμεν καὶ σοι ὅπως περὶ τε τ[ῶν ἄλλων?]  
ἐπιμελήσης καὶ Κράτωνα τὸν πρ[άκτ[ορα]

Διονυσόδωρωι

10 ἀξιώστης [σ]υμπεριενεχθῆναι περὶ τῶν Ϛ τ

ῶν ἐνεγυήσατο τοὺς περὶ Ἴπποκράτην καὶ Δημήτριον.

πυθανόμεθα δὲ Ζηνόδαρον εἰς Σεβέννυτον

ἀναπεπλευκέναι καὶ σλοχαζόμεθα τὸν Δημήτριον

εἰληφέναι Ζηνόδαρον

μη κατ[ἀπεπλευκέναι] ἐμ πόλει. εἰ μὲν οὖν

15 διείλεξαι τῶι Κράτωνα καὶ ὑπακήκοε, καλῶς

ἂν ἔχοι· εἰ δὲ μή, ἔτι καὶ νῦν μὴ παρέργως αὐτὸ

ποιήσας, ὅπως μὴ συμβῆ ἀναπληρουμένης τῆς

ἀνῆς προεσπραχθέντα τὸν Διονυσόδωρον

θῆναι

Ϛ ἡμᾶς τ [ἐ]ζημιω[σασθαι]. οὐ γὰρ ἀγνοεῖς ὅτι

20 ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ οὐ ράιδιόν ἐστι κομίσασθαι.

οἱ

[[τούς]] πρὸς τῆι ζ' γενομένους

Κράτωνα. Δημήτριος καὶ Ἴπποκράτης, οὗς [[ἐγγυᾶται]]

τῆς Φιλαδέλφου

καὶ

τοῦ Ἀρσινοῖτου νομοῦ

Διονυσόδωρος [[τὸ δ]] ἐγγυᾶται τὸ δ Λ, ἀναπεπλευ-

ρακότες ἐν τῶι ε Λ καὶ τ[δ] δ Λ, καταπεπλευ-

κασι πρὸς Ζην[όδωρον. . . . .] αἱ ὅπως. .

25 τ.υ[.]ε. .[

6. αὐτό : υ corrected over ν. — 7. τ[α[. . . . .]] : the missing word does not appear to have contained more than seven letters and may have been shorter. τὰ σύμ-

εολα? — 8. Or simply τ[ούτων]. — 9. Or ἐπιμελήση[ι]ς. Zenon regularly omits ι adscript in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person. — 10. ἴ τ: Grenfell doubts this reading and prefers τ υ, suggesting also υ instead of τ in line 19. But ἴ τ seems to me possible and more intelligible. — 17. ποιήσον would be more grammatical. — 19. Zenon had apparently wavered between ζημιώσασθαι, ἐζημιῶσθαι and ζημιωθῆναι. — 21. -ος and -ης corrected from -ον and -ην. Read γενόμενοι. — 25. Below are faint vestiges of several more lines.

NO. 63. LETTER FROM SOSTRATOS TO ZENON AND XENOPHON. — O m. 325 mill. × O m. 265 mill. — Year 7.

Sostratos writes to say that he is sending, herewith subjoined, a copy of the letter which Sosibios has written to Zenodoros about the bee-hives and the other questions, and also a copy of the memorandum which he and Kleon had presented to Sosibios. If Ammonios still declines to give satisfaction, he asks his correspondents to send him the bee-keepers and Rodon with all the justificatory documents, in order that the case may be tried in his own district. He has written also to Zenodóros about these matters and about the house of Patis.

Below is the letter of Sosibios, which was merely a forwarding letter, accompanying a copy of the memorandum, with a request to Zenodoros to see that the petitioners obtain justice.

Next comes the memorandum, which I translate in full: «A memorandum to Sosibios from Kleon and Sostratos. We own one thousand bee-hives, which have belonged to us from the time of the king's father and which had been leased to Horos and sons by a contract passed in the office of Simaristos. Some of them were in the Herakleopolite nome, and for these Tou . . . . . has duly settled up to year 6. Others were in the Memphite nome under the management of Pames and Amenneus, and now we hear they have transferred them to the Herakleopolite nome without asking our leave, and Ammonios the *oikonomos* has sent them to prison and is ruining the hives by obstructing their work. Therefore, seeing that he was by force depriving the bee-keepers of a hundred hives, Sostratos who happened to be staying there, having gone up the river to see to the extraction of vegetable juice, spoke to Dionysios the agent of Zenodoros and explained the matter, and Ammonios getting alarmed released

the bee-keepers. The same individual, at the time when we were abroad with the king and had 150.000 sheaves (?) of hay lying at Bousiris in the Herakleopolite nome, sent Rodon the hay-guard to prison, bound him in fetters and kept him in custody for eight months, and in the meantime 120.000 sheaves disappeared, stolen by the natives. About this affair a preliminary inquiry has been made, and he more than once promised to exact the price and pay it back to us. Another result is that we have had a claim for freight presented against us for Kriton's boat, which was hired for carrying hay down to Alexandria for 1200 drachmæ. For when the boat arrived at the port, his people interfered and it went away empty. We beg you therefore, since it is not convenient either for us to leave home or for him to come here, to write to him to send the bee-keepers and a delegate to represent him at the trial, in order that we may not be overborne by him in his own district; and from the facts of our case you will learn how he treats the other people belonging to the nome. »

*P. S. I.*, 524 is another letter on the same subject, written a week later. It appears from this that the messenger had not delivered the letter of Sosibios to Zenodoros. Sostratos therefore asks Zenon and Xenophon, as soon as they get the letter, to send it back to him in order that it may be given to Zenodoros, who was apparently staying in his neighbourhood, and also to write to the bee-keepers to send a delegate with a statement of their grievances against Ammonios.

Of the persons whose names occur in the text the only one whose position is specified is Ammonios ὁ οἰκονόμος, mentioned again in no. 64<sup>(1)</sup>. In the present case his authority is exercised in the north of the Herakleopolite nome, but we do not know whether he was *oikonomos* of the whole nome or of a toparchy only<sup>(2)</sup>. Zenodoros is probably the high official to whom a question about the *apomoira* in the Arsinoite nome is referred in no. 62. The present text is not decisive as to his exact rank, though it is in favour of the view that if he was not the chief *dioiketes* he was at least a local *dioiketes* (see no. 37). Nor can we as yet define the official stand-

<sup>(1)</sup> An *oikonomos* of the same name is mentioned in *P. Hib.*, 61 and 168, but he appears to belong to the Oxyrhyn-

chite nome and to be a different person.

<sup>(2)</sup> Cf. *P. S. I.*, 510, Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ οἰκονομοῦντος τὴν κάτω τοπαρχίαν

ing of Sosibios, to whom the petition is addressed and who passes it on to Zenodoros with a request to take the necessary action. But clearly he was of superior rank to Ammonios (see l. 32), perhaps a *strategos* of a nome. The petitioners appear to have been sons of Iason; and as we know of an Iason who was a colleague and fellow-countryman of Zenon, it is probable that they belonged to the group of Carian friends by whom Zenon was surrounded (see no. 54). Sostratos cannot be identical with the Sostratos of *P. S. I.*, 500, whom we know from unpublished evidence to have been a son of Kleon; but he was probably a member of the same family. As regards the Kleon of the text, it is noteworthy that Zenon himself had a son of this name (*P. S. I.*, 528). *Ξενοφῶντι* in line 1 is restored from *P. S. I.*, 524, and the restoration seems certain; but I am unable to say who this Xenophon was.

It is not clear from what place Sostratos writes. He wishes the case to be examined in the district in which he resides and not in the Herakleopolite nome, where Ammonios was too powerful. Presumably then he was living somewhere farther north (v. l. 20).

There is a phrase of special interest in lines 23, 24, *καθ' ὃν χρόνον μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐξεδημοῦμεν*. This does not mean 'when we were in Alexandria with the king' (which would have been expressed by *παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ*), but 'when we accompanied the king abroad'. It must therefore be an allusion to the Syrian campaign of Euergetes, in which no doubt many of the Greek settlers in the interior of Egypt took part. Unfortunately the petitioners do not say definitely in what years they were absent.

Σώστρατος [Ζήνωνι Ξενοφῶντι χαίρειν. ἧς ἔγραψεν Σωσίβι]ος ἐπι-  
τολῆς Ζηνοδόρωι περὶ τῶν σμηνῶ[v. . . . . τὸ ἀντίγ]ραφον

φz

ὑπογέγρα ε. . . . . τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν ὑπό[μνημα. . . . . μ]ῆ ἔτι  
καὶ

νῦν ὁ Ἀμμώ[v]ιος ἐξευδοκῆι ὑμᾶς κ[α]ὶ π[. . . . .]. καὶ τ[ῶν σ]μην-  
ῶν, τρούς

5 τε μελισσοουργοὺς καὶ Ῥόδωνα πέμπετε πρὸς ἡμᾶς [[καὶ]] ἔχοντας πάντα τὰ  
δικαιώμαθ', ὅπως, καθέτι ἠξιώκαμεν, ἐνθὴδ' ἡμῖν κριθῶσιν. γεγράφαμεν δὲ  
[[καὶ]]

καὶ Ζηνοδώρῳ <sup>τε</sup> περὶ τούτων καὶ τῆς Πάτιτος οἰκίας.  
ἔρρωσθε. ΛΖ, Παῦνι ἦ.

Σωσίβιος Ζηνοδώρῳ χαίρειν. ἀπέσταλκά σοι τὸ ἀντίγραφον τοῦ δοθέν-  
τος ἡμῖν παρὰ Κλέωνος τοῦ Ἰά[σωνος καὶ Σωσίρ]άτου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ περὶ  
10 ὧν φασὶν ἀδικεῖσθαι ὑπ' Ἀμμωνίου [τοῦ] οἰκ[ον]όμου. σπούδασον οὖν ὅπως  
τὰ δίκαια αὐτοῖς γένηται κα<sup>θ</sup>ο<sup>α</sup>[[θάπερ ἀ]]ξιούσιν.

ὑπόμνημα Σωσίβιῳ παρὰ Κλέωνος καὶ Σωσί[ρ]άτου. ὑπῆρχεν ἡμῖν  
ἔτι ἐπὶ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως σμῆνη Α, ἃ ἐμεμίσθωτο κα(τά) συγγρα-  
φὴν τὴν γεγενημένην ἐν τοῖς [[.]] Σιμαρίστου Ὄρος καὶ υἱοί, ὧν τινὰ μὲν  
15 ἐν τῷ Ἡρακλεοπολίτῃ ἦν, ἃ Του.φ.βρμ. ηῦτάκτηκεν ἕως τοῦ ς L,  
τινὰ δὲ ἐν τῷ Μεμφίτῃ, ἃ εἶχεν Παμῆς καὶ Ἀμερνεύς, οὗ νῦν ἀκούομεν μετα-  
γηγοχέναι εἰς τὸν Ἡρακλεοπολίτην ἄνευ ἡμῶν, Ἀμμώνιος δ' ὁ οἰκονόμος  
ἀπαγήσχεν αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ σμῆνη καταφθεῖρει ἐγκόπλων αὐτοῖς.  
διὰ τό, ἀφαιρουμένου τῶν μελισσοουργῶν αὐτοῦ βίαι σμῆνη ρ,  
20 Σώσι[ρ]ατος παρεπιδημῶν, ὅτε ἐπὶ τὸν ὀπισμὸν ἀνέπλευσεν,  
ἐντυχῶν Διονυσίῳ τῷ παρὰ Ζη[ν]οδώρου ἐνεφάνισεν, κάκεινος φοβηθεὶς  
ἀφῆκε τοὺς μελισσοουργούς. ὁ δ' αὐτὸς οὗτος, καθ' ἐν χρόνον μετὰ τοῦ  
βασιλέως ἐξεδημοῦμεν, ὑπαρχόντων ἡμῖν ἐν Βουσίρει τοῦ Ἡρακλε-  
30 οπολίτου χόρτου M, ἀπήγαγεν τὸν χορτοφύλακα Ῥόδωνα εἰς τὸ  
δεσποτήριον, ἔδῃσε πένδαις καὶ εἶχεν ἐν φυλακῇ μῆνας ἦ, ἐν δὲ τού-  
ται διεφώνησαν ὑπὸ τῶν λαῶν M<sup>16</sup>· περὶ ὧν καὶ ἀνάκρισις ὑπάρχει,  
καὶ αἰεὶ ποτ' ἔφη πράξας ἀποδώσειν τὴν τιμὴν. συνέβη δὲ καὶ ναῦλον  
ἡμῖν προσάγεσθαι τοῦ Κρίτανος πλοίου, ὃ ἐμισθώθη ἵνα εἰς Ἀλεξάν-  
δρειαν καταχθῆι χόρτος τ ΑΣ· παραγενομένου γὰρ τοῦ πλ(οί)ου  
30 ἐπὶ τὸν ὄρμον καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ καλυσάντων κενὸν ἀπῆλθεν.  
ἀξιούμεν οὖν σε, ἐπειδὴ οὐθ' ἡμῖν ἐκπροεῖ ἀποδημεῖν  
οὐτ' ἐκείνῳ ἐνθάδε παραγενέσθαι, γράψαι αὐτῷ ἀποστῆλαι τοὺς  
μελισσοουργούς καὶ τὸν κριθησόμενον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, ὅπως  
μη' ἐκεῖ κατασλασισθῶμεν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐκ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς  
35 αἰσθήσει πῶς τοὺς λοιποὺς τοῦ(ς) ἐκ τοῦ νομοῦ διατίθῃσιν.

3. Possibly ἐν ἧ ἐνήν, but the letters are almost illegible. — ὑπό[μνημα πρὸς αὐτόν. ἐάν οὖν μὴ]? — 4. ἐξευδοκῆ: apparently in the sense of 'admit your claim'. — π[ερὶ τοῦ χόρτου]? — 6. δικαιώμαθ': it is interesting to compare the corresponding phrase in *P. S. I.*, 524, ὅπως ἂ ποτ' ἠδικῆσθαι φασιν ἀποστειλω(σί)ν τινα ἔχοντα. — Read ἐνθάδ'. — 14. Σιμαρίστου: see *Rev. Laws*, col. 24, 8, note. — 19. διὰ τό: for δι' ὅ. Or possibly a slip for διὰ το(ῦτο), as πλου for πλοίου in line 30. — 20. τὸν ὀπισμόν: I presume that this is not a slip of the scribe for τὸν ὀπλισμόν. — 24. The ordinary unit for measuring hay was the δέσμη διμναῖος, twenty of which made a φορτίον. The gender of ὑπαρχόντων suggests that φορτίων (δεκαπεντακισμυρίων) should be supplied here; nevertheless, as the unit is left unexpressed, I cannot but think that the word in the writer's mind was the usual δεσμῶν. — 26. ἀνάκρισις: see *P. S. I.*, 392, 2 and *Archiv*, VI, p. 392 (Wilcken). — 31. Read ἐπειδὴ.

NO. 64. LETTER FROM ARISTON TO ZENON. — o m. 185 mill. × o m. 85 cent. — Year 8.

«On the 8<sup>th</sup> of Mecheir Ammonios began to put the farms up to auction, and you must know that the baths are now being let without deduction of any sort. I thought it best therefore to make no bid until you came. Come and join me then, if it be convenient for you, in order that we may bid according to what you decide.»

Ariston, who writes as an agent of Zenon, is probably the person mentioned in no. 54 (b) as one of his intimates. Ammonios may be the *oikonomos* of no. 63. Ariston appears to have attended the auction in order to bid on Zenon's behalf. But finding that the baths were being let without the expected deductions (for upkeep etc.?) he does not know how much to offer and asks Zenon to come himself and make his calculations on the new basis.

The editors of *P. Hib.*, 108 and 116 distinguish between a general tax (*βαλανείων*) for the maintenance of Government baths and a special tax (*τρίτη βαλανείων*) on privately owned baths. In *P. S. I.*, 377 we find Zenon making money out of a bath and paying the *τρίτη*, while in *P. S. I.*, 584 he appears as the owner of a bath in Arsinoe (see Vitelli's commentary). In the present case the baths seem to be owned by Government and to be let out to the highest bidder. The whole subject of ownership and taxation is still rather obscure (cf. *P. Rylands*, 70, 11, note); but it

is evident that the exploitation of public baths was one of the many enterprises in which Zenon had an interest.

This is the latest of the dated letters in our collection (cf. *P. S. I.*, 552, introduction), or at least of those which certainly belong to Zenon's files.

Ἀρίστων Ζήνωνι  
χαίρειν. τῆι η τοῦ Μεχείρ  
ἤρξατο Ἀμμώνιος τὰς  
ὠνάς ἐπικηρύσσειν.

5 γίνωσκε δὲ καὶ τὰ βαλα-  
νεᾶ μισθούμενα ἀνυ-  
πόλογα παντὸς ὑπο-  
λόγου. ἔδοξεν οὖν μοι  
μηθὲν ὑποσῆναι

10 ἕως τοῦ σε παραγενέσ-  
θαι. εἰάν οὖν εὐκαιρὸν  
σοι ᾖ, παραγένου, ὅπως  
ὑποσῶμεν καθὰ ἂν  
συγκρίνηις.

15 ἔρρωσο. Λ η,  
Μεχείρ Ϝ.

Verso : Ζήνωνι.

5-6. Read βαλανεῖα. — 7. Cf. *P. Par.* 62, col. 1, 9, 10, [τὰς δ' ὠνάς ἀνα]πλη-  
ρώσειν οὐθένα ὑπόλογον [ποιούμενοι εἰς τὸ] βασιλικόν, and *P. Hib.*, 29, 26.

C. C. EDGAR.