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When Grenfell, Hunt, and Smly published the first volume of The Tebtunis Papyri in 1902, perhaps the most remarkable document in that rich volume was P. Tebt. 8, 'a series of drafts of letters written to different officials and containing directions concerning the collection of the foreign revenues of Egypt', as the editors put it. It had no parallel then, and it has not found one in the seventy years since; what connections the Zenon papyri offer with the non-Egyptian possessions of the Ptolemies are of a very much more informal sort. The papyrus has naturally attracted some attention from historians, but there has been no critical text of it since Wilcken's Chrestomathie in 1912, and no discussion of its problems since D. Cohen's dissertation on the administration of the Ptolemaic empire in the same year. Furthermore, the second column of the papyrus, partly pictured on the plate published by the editors but not included in their transcription, has never been edited, although it has, despite its fragmentary condition, some significant information bearing on the dating of the text. These gaps I hope to fill here, but my discussion of the first column leads in many places to the conclusion that we know much less about the text and meaning of the papyrus than previous editors and historians have thought, and it can hardly be claimed yet that all of the major problems are solved.

1. The Text

Column I

[...\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron[...]] e\i\nu\eta\mu[...] y.[...]

\nu[...]\rhoo\nu\gamma\omicron[\omicron(\omicron)] \epsilon\i\pi\delta\epsilon[\delta\omicron\omicron]\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron

---

1 I am indebted to the Rare Books Collection of the Bancroft Library at the University of California at Berkeley for the photograph printed here (pl. 24) and to the Director for permission to publish it and the text of Column II. Much of the preparation of this article was made possible by the generous support of the Canada Council Doctoral Fellowship that I held in 1969–72. James G. Keenan has throughout my work on the papyrus given generously of his time and thought in alleviating the problem of my not being able to see the original papyrus, by repeatedly looking at it in Berkeley for me and in discussing many of the issues that I treat below. E. G. Turner, A. E. Samuel, and J. C. Shelton have also read drafts of the article and contributed suggestions, some of which are mentioned individually below. William H. Willis also discussed many of the problems in the papyrus with me and helped to clarify several points. To all of these I offer my thanks.

2 In the discussion below I refer to three works by the names of their authors: Ulrich Wilcken, Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde (1912), 1, 2, no. 2; D. Cohen, De Magistratibus Aegyptiis externas Ligerianum regni provincias administratibus (Diss. Leiden, 1912), 53–63; and W. Cröner's discussion of P. Tebt. 8 in Wochenschrift klass. Phil. (1903), 455. I may point out that Cohen's many restorations have never been registered in the BL.
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φειδ[... ] Ἐψίβ (τριφόλον) εἶσα[... ]
(δραχμάς) Ἀπο[... δ] τῶν καὶ τὰ λο[...] [.] [ ]

[... ] ἐς
Ἄφροδιτων χρημάτων καὶ σίτου
καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φο(ρων) τῶν ὑπαρξάντων
ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Δέσβου καὶ Θράκην
τῶν διασεφή(σα) εἰ μετεληφθέν
καὶ τοῦ Ἰππαλέττου καὶ τῶν γρα( )
ἀποσ(τιλαι) ὅπως διεξακθῇ.

12
Καλλυμῆδεν τ(ῶ) ἄν(τιγραφον) καὶ συναποσ(τειλαι) τοὺς ἀπὸ κα( ).

καθ
Νικοστράτων ἵππα(φαμεν) τὴν εἰς τὸ δ (ἐτος) διάπρα(σω)
16
tῶν κατὰ Λυκίαν ἄργου(μεν) προσόδουν
ἐπιπετακέναι (τάλαντα) s Ατίβ (τετράβολον)
ἐπηγεκάναι καὶ εἰς τ(ό) λοιπον.

[... ] διαπυλιον οδ γεγρ(άφαμεν) ἀφευρηκέναι
20
tὴν ὁνὴν (τάλαντα) β Ατίς γραφὴν
[ἀ]πὸ τοῦ ἢς (ἐτος) τοῦ εἰσγημέ(νου)
[δι] τῶν χ[αλ]τῶν οἴνου κατ᾽ ἐναυτόν
[ὡς ἀπτεθής] πρὸς τὸ ἀφεύρεμα.

24 [. . . . . . ]ου γεγρ( ) ἵππηετρα(χέναι)
[. . . . . . . ]ων ἢ διασπεφωρηκέναι
[. . . . . . . ]οι τῆς ἑθυκῆς καὶ
[tῆς . . . . ]ης φό(ρος) ὅπως μη καταλυθῆ ἡ
28 [. . . . . . ]ων κατὰ Ζήθου καὶ [...]. . ἦν
[tοὺς ἑλαβότης τὴν κατὰ Λυκίαν]
[πο]ρφυρήν εἰς (ἐτής) ε ὅς ἐγράφη

32 [πρ]έξαι τῶν φόρου κατ’ ἐναυτόν
[ἄργα]σου (τάλαντον) κ Αἰοι καὶ τὸν τοῦ δ (ἐτος)

Column II
Traces of 13 lines adjacent to upper part of Column I:

39 β[ 44 δόρ[ 46 λ[ 47 Ίππομέ[δοντ
τε.η.[
πεμ[... ]α( )[
Βα ... μι απ[ 48 ξα[
52 Θεογένους φ[ 53 . . α[}
2. Notes on the Text

Column I

This text is printed here with few of the restorations that have been proposed; these restorations and resolutions are discussed in detail below. The reason for this procedure is the lack of useful material similar to P. Tebt. 8: these letters are so compressed and allusive that only a significant body of comparable documents could allow us to provide valid supplements rather than arbitrary ones. In few cases can the meaning of a difficult passage be established so that only the wording is in question, and it is only when this is the case that we are justified in restoration. Some of the simpler resolutions proposed by the editors have been retained in cases where there seems little doubt of the correct forms. Wilcken's resolution of most of the abbreviated verb forms into infinitives has been adopted in preference to the editors' imperatives and Cohen's third-person imperatives.  

The form of the texts would seem to be abstracts of letters written and sent by either the dioiketes or someone high in his office; they give the contents but not the final form of the original letters.  

The papyrus as a whole was thus a log of correspondence, a summary of the business carried out by letter by the office. All of the letters in Column I seem to be letters sent by the office in question, but the same would appear not to be true of all of the letters in the second column (see below); this fact suggests that the correspondence was not in this digest separated into rolls of letters sent and of letters received.

1-4. This letter, the least-well-preserved in Column I, offers many difficulties. In line 1, the editors read nothing after ειλημ[, but in fact traces of three letters are visible, the middle one of which is evidently an υσιλον. 

Cohen's attempt to restore ειλημ[μεθα περι] κτλ is therefore excluded. In line 2, the editors read an alpha at the start of the

3 Wilcken explains his reasons for the choice of the infinitive on W. Chr., p. 8. The rejection of the editors' second-person imperatives rests largely on the conclusion that these texts are abstracts of contents rather than the original words of the letters, which might have been couched in the imperative or in some circumlocution. Cohen's third-person imperatives are more suitable to the sense, but the simplicity of the infinitives is preferable in these abstracts, short as they are; Cohen's forms would imply a modicum of literary style remaining in the abstracts, which seems unlikely.

4 Wilcken (p. 7): 'Formell sind es Auszüge aus Briefen, die eine und dieselbe Person an verschiedene andere geschrieben hat (vgl. etwa P. Ashmolean Verso), also aus dem liber litterarum missarum.' While apparently true for Column I, this conclusion needs to be modified in light of Column II, as I suggest below.

5 The letter seems to be clearer on the photograph than on the original (Keenan's observation).
line, but there is no more than a trace of it (it was dotted in the first edition), and it may well belong to the marginal scribblings of the left side of the papyrus. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that the alignment of line 4 and the paragraphos below it (not noted by the editors) indicate a margin which would run to the right of the supposed letter; the same is true of the supposed omicron in line 3, which is only a trace projecting from the margin. In line 3, also, the alpha at the end of the line, not read by the editors, is clear; following traces are not readable. In line 4, λο(υπά), dotted by the editors, is clear. The third letter of what follows might be either a tau or an epsilon.

A number of restorations and interpretations have been proposed for this passage. Crönert restored the beginning of line 2 as Ἀγεμ[Ω]ρου γρα(ματέως), but the gamma and μυ of his name are impossible, and the difficulty of the opening letter has already been discussed. Cohen more ambitiously restored almost all of the paragraph:

\[ \ldots \chi\omega[ι] γραφήν \varepsilonιλημ[περί] \]
\[ δλει[φα]ρ τοῦ γρα(ματέως) ἐπιδε[δώ]κότος \]
\[ οφειλ[εν] Ἔψιμος (ἱρῶβολον) εἰς \[το \gamma \varepsilonισ\] \]
\[ (δραχμάς) Βω[ες δραχμᾶς καὶ τὰ λο[υπά] [οῦτο] \]

This restoration encounters a number of problems. The upsilon of line 1 mentioned above excludes Cohen’s restoration there. Line 2 is yet more difficult, since the initial alpha is, as we have seen, very dubious. The sense of δλειφαρ, a rare word cited by LSJ mostly from poetical contexts, is not very suitable, unless the use of the word by Theocritus (7. 147) for resin for sealing wine jars is meant; this is not impossible, but the use of the word in a documentary context would be at least remarkable. In line 3, there is the opening-letter problem again, and in addition the fact that the alpha at the end of the line again excludes Cohen’s restoration. Neither Cohen’s restoration of the end of line 4 nor Crönert’s [διεξ(αχθο)] is palaeographically excluded.

Cohen thought that the paragraph, as he restored it, meant that the writer had received the account of unguent, 2,856 drachmas, and that later the secretary had reported that the inhabitants owed 5,712 drachmas for the third year. This view seems to distort sentence order beyond reason, and the lack of coherence of the contents more likely belongs to this restoration than to the original text.

Under the circumstances it is dubious if any attempt to restore this paragraph can be essayed with a chance of demonstrable success. One can create various conjectural restorations, but there is no way of telling which, if any, is correct. Line 1 might well have contained [τῶν] ειλημ[περιων], ‘the receipts’—but it might not have. We do not know how to resolve γρα( ) in line 2, because we do not know whether the subject of ἐπιδε[δώ]κότος is to be sought in line 2 or line 3. The end of line 3 might have been εισάγεω, ‘pay in’, but the conjecture cannot be verified.

5. There is no reason to think that any letters are lost in the bracketed space in this line; cf. line 14. Following the numeral are traces of letters ignored by the editors as falling into the category of marginal scribblings (discussed by them on pp. 67–8),

\[ ^{6} \textit{WB.} \text{gives } '\text{Geld vereinnahmen, Steuern erheben'} \text{as a possible meaning of λαμβάνω.} \]
unrelated to the text. Cohen, however, presented the following text of these letters:

\[
\tau\rho(l)\tau\eta \quad \iota \varepsilon \quad \mu(\alpha)\rho\alpha
\]

For this text he provided a detailed explanation. But the writing is upside down, a fact Cohen did not notice. The first line in fact reads \(\Sigma\pi\nu\omega\), the second apparently \(\lambda\beta\alpha\nu\).

6–11. The text of this letter abstract is perhaps the clearest of the papyrus. Aside from expansions of verb forms (see above), the only problems of restoration are the resolution (line 7) of \(\psi\omega(\phantom{l})\) (as in line 27) and of \(\gamma\rho\alpha(\phantom{l})\) in line 10. The editors read for the first \(\phi(\rho\omega\nu)\), while M. Rostovtzeff\(^8\) suggested \(\phi(\rho\tau\iota\omega\nu)\). The following points may be added in favour of the editors’ suggestion: (1) \(\phi\rho\alpha\) is used unabbreviated in line 32 in a context like those of lines 7 and 27; (2) \(\phi\rho\alpha\) is a far more common word than \(\phi\rho\tau\iota\omega\nu\), and is therefore more likely to have been written in abbreviated form; (3) \(\phi\rho\alpha\) in fact makes good sense here; the mentions of \(\chi\rho\mu\alpha\tau\omega\nu\) and \(\alpha\sigma\tau\nu\) refer to the media in which the revenues were received rather than to the names of taxes. I would translate the first part of the paragraph, ‘To Aphrodisios: about the money and grain and other revenues in the places in Lesbos and Thrace, to let us know if he has received part of them.’\(^9\)

The last two lines are more difficult: ‘About Herakleitos and the ?, send so that it may be carried out.’ The editors resolved \(\gamma\rho\alpha(\mu\mu\tau\epsilon\tau\omega\nu)\), but Keenan points out that \(\gamma\rho\alpha(\phi\omega\nu)\) is also possible, and perhaps more likely. One might envisage a problem about Herakleitos and his accounts more readily than about Herakleitos and the secretaries.

12–13. These lines are the most cryptic of the text, and their interpretation is difficult. The editors restored the end of line 13 as \(\sigma\nu\sigma\alpha\psi\dot{o}(\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu) \tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\rho\delta\ \kappa\alpha(\rho\lambda\alpha\varsigma?)\). For the beginning, Crönert suggested \(\tau(\dot{a})\ \alpha\nu(\dot{f}k\omega\nu\tau\alpha)\), but this does not yield a useful sense. Cohen, on the other hand, proposed \(\tau(\dot{a})\ \alpha\nu(\dot{a}\lambda\nu\gamma\alpha)\) και \(\sigma\nu\sigma\alpha\psi\dot{o}(\tau\epsilon\lambda\alpha\tau\omega) \tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\rho\delta\) ( ). He interpreted the first two words as meaning that the secretary was writing the same things to Kallimedes as to Aphrodisios, plus what followed. Wilcken adopted Cohen’s reading at the start, but retained the word-division in line 13. The sense of Cohen’s supplement is suitable and attractive, but he cited no evidence to support such a usage of \(\tau\alpha\ \alpha\nu\lambda\nu\gamma\alpha\), and I find no attestations of this word in the neuter plural to mean ‘the analogous things’. John C. Shelton suggests to me the words \(\tau(\dot{a})\ \alpha\nu(\tau\gamma\nu\rho\alpha\phi\dot{\nu})\),

\(^7\) Changed from \(\Sigma\pi\nu\omega\) (Keenan observes that the change seems certain to have gone in that direction rather than the reverse, despite logic). H. I. Bell, \(Ct.\ Rev. 28\) (1914), 199, pointed out Cohen’s mistake here.

\(^8\) \textit{Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World,} 335.

\(^9\) This translation is supported by Mayer, who, in citing the passage (lines 6 ff.) as a possible instance of a partitive genitive with \(\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\mu\beta\lambda\nu\) (‘teilnehmen’) in \textit{Grammatik}, \textit{n. 2} (1933), 197, remarks in n. 2 that it is doubtful that this classification is correct: ‘Es ist sehr fraglich, ob die Genitive \(\chi\rho\mu\alpha\tau\omega\nu\) και \(\alpha\sigma\tau\nu\) usw. hier direkt von \(\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\mu\beta\lambda\nu\) in Abhängigkeit zu bringen sind. Dem saphoristischen Charakter des Briefauszugs entspricht eher die S. 134, 21 gegebene Auffassung, wonach es sich wie in der angeschlossenen Wendung και \(\tau\nu\ \Pi\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu\tau\nu\ kai \tau\nu\ \gamma\rho\alpha(\mu\mu\tau\epsilon\tau\omega\nu) \alpha\rho\sigma\sigma(\tau\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu)\) απ\(\delta\) δι\(\epsilon\iota\alpha\kappa\beta\iota\nu\) um selbständige Genitive des Sachbetriffs handelt.’ On p. 134, in fact, Mayer classifies these lines 6–9 as a ‘Genitiv des Personen- und Sachbetriffs’.
which seem to me to be almost certainly correct: a copy of the letter to Aphrodisios is to be sent to Kallimedes with the additional instruction to send the (revenues?) from Ka—(whether the editors' restoration of this as Caria is correct defies demonstration at present). The procedure of sending a copy of a letter to someone other than the addressee, coupled with a covering letter and some further instructions, is so common in the Ptolemaic bureaucracy as to need no elaborate justification. The connection of this letter with the preceding one is perhaps strengthened by the fact that although a paragraphos (not noted by the editors) stands above line 12, the first word of that line begins only just to the left of the regular margin, rather than being aligned with the opening words of the other letters (as it is printed by the editors).

14. Cohen claimed that a delta was to be seen under the κα in this line. This is not the case; the strokes that Cohen saw are part of the abbreviation of γεφρ( ) in the next line.

15-18. Two problems exist in these lines. In line 15, the editors resolved γέφρο(φε) (they do not indicate that the word is written above the line); in the commentary they state that Nikostratos 'is told that information has been received to the effect that the sale of the money-taxes in Lycia for the 4th year had yielded an increase of 6 talents 1312 drachmas 4 obols'. On their interpretation, evidently, γέφρο(φε) is left without a subject. But one may ask who the subject could be, who would notify the dioiketes about the sale of a tax-farming contract; one would expect, rather, that the contract would have been let in an auction in Alexandria under the direct supervision of the dioiketes. It is possible, then, (as Keenan suggests) that γέφρο(πταί) is meant—"To Nikostratos: it has been written that the sale of the contract for the money taxes in Lycia for the 4th year, etc.' The solution of this problem, however, depends on the understanding we attach to line 18.

The verb ἐπισκέψαναι in that line has created problems. The editors took it to be (it seems most natural to suppose) the perfect infinitive of ἐπαινεῖμαι, a rare form; the advantage of this supposition and their interpretation of the meaning as 'to decline' is that the verb can then, correctly, depend on γεφρα( ) in line 15 (like ἐπισκέψαναι, which is seemingly parallel). They remark, however, that the use of καὶ instead of δὲ after the infinitive is strange on this view, and Cohen pursued this opinion to the conclusion that the verb is a perfect infinitive of ἐπαινῶ, a solution rejected by the editors on the grounds that no sense was possible.

Wilcken also accepted ἐπισκέψαναι (printing it with an iota subscript, unlike the editors), but did not discuss the problem. Mayser,11 LSJ,12 and WB.13 have also

---

10 Cf. the story of Joseph in Josephus, A.J. 12. 154 ff., where the subject goes to Alexandria just before the great auction in which the taxes for Syria and Palestine were to be sold.
11 Grammatische 1 (1923), 372.
12 LSJ's treatment of the word is curious. S.v. ἐπαινεῖμαι (1. 4) it states 'agree to or undertake to do, ἀνθυπνοε' ἐπαινεῖμαι λογίζειν E. Andr. 534; ἐ. ἐν τοί τοι λοιπυ E. Tebt. 8. 18 (iii n.c.).' When one turns to the work cited by the dictionary, the form in question is not to be found, for the editors of P. Tebt. 8 do not print the iota subscript that would justify this reference; it is to W. Chr. 2 that the editors of LSJ should have referred. Their interpretation is thus passed off as if it belonged to Grenfell, Hunt, and Smyly when in fact it does not. The reference to the Andromache of Euripides is no sounder: cf. the edition of P. T. Stevens (Oxford, 1971), who observes (p. 163), after discussing the many proposed emendations for this line, 'if the text is right, the verb is

[Notes 18 and 15 continued on page 174]
followed this interpretation. None of these has indicated any reluctance to accept that line 18 is an integral part of the sentence of lines 15–17; but if it is, the infinitive must depend on διάπρασμα(ου) as a subject, and must consequently have a perfect meaning. But it is quite impossible that if ἐπηρεκέκαναι from ἐπαινεῖ is the verb, the subject of that verb should be διάπρασμα(ου), for no sense emerges. The avoidance of any translation of the complete phrase by Wilcken, LSJ, and WB, prevents us from knowing how any of these understood the passage and what they took to be the subject of the second infinitive.

Two other possible solutions should be considered. The first (suggested to me by Shelton and Turner) is that we are to understand here ὑπηρετεύκερεν, a falsely formed infinitive (aorist stem, perfect ending) from ἐπιφέρω. The sound changes required (ε to η, dropping of γ) are not impossible for this time (late third century), although the combination might give pause, but other considerations seem to me to weigh heavily against it: (1) the scribe was secretary, it appears, to the highest official in the land; he writes carefully in this document and uses perfect infinitives correctly and frequently. The likelihood that he would make a type of mistake extremely rare in this period appears to me small. (2) There is no obviously suitable meaning of ἐπιφέρω to be understood here, for most technical use of the word in the Ptolemaic period has to do with producing contracts.

The other possibility (and perhaps it is what some earlier scholars supposed without so indicating) is that we are to understand a new subject for ἐπηρεκέκαναι, in which case ἐπαινεῖ becomes a plausible source for the form. One must in this instance consider used like παραπολέω in the sense “advise, recommend.” And L. Méridier, in the Budé Euripides 11 (1927), gives to this line the translation ‘Je m’exhorte à recouvrir la vigueur de mes jeunes ans.’ This meaning of ἐπαινεῖ should therefore be deleted from LSJ in its entirety.

13 WB. interprets P. Tebt. 8 (which, like LSJ, it cites for the form ἐπηρεκέκαναι when W. Chr. would be the correct reference) as an only example of a meaning ‘versprechen, in Aussicht stellen’.

14 For γ in place of ε, see Mayer, Grammatik (rev. H. Schmoll, 1970) 1. 1, 39–40, with numerous examples especially from the Hibeh and Zenon papyri; for disappearance of the nasal, p. 164, citing precisely several compounds of φέρω in the third and second centuries.

15 Mayer, Grammatik (Schmoll) 1. 2, 162–4, discusses these forms, remarking, ‘Das Gebiet unorganischer Zwitterformen mit Kreuzungen der Tempusstimme und Endungen ist in der ptolemäischen Papyri in Verhältnis zur Masse des überlieferten Materials klein, weitaus kleiner als in der späteren καινοῦ die römischen Kaiserzeit.’ The only third-century example cited, in fact, is ἀσευκόν in BGU 1010. 5 (dated by the editor to 219 B.C., but the year 29 mentioned is surely 257/256), where Mayer concedes that the word is at least as likely to be the dative plural of the participle (the fragmentary condition of the papyrus prevents argument from context). Cf. B. G. Mandilaras, Studies in the Greek Language (Athens, 1972), 12: ‘When a certain writer produces a hybrid verbal form it means that he confuses the tenses involved in it.’ Mandilaras also notes, pp. 18–19, that the perfect is well known and accurately used, especially in official contexts, in the Ptolemaic period. For late Roman documents, cf. S. Kaspomenakis, Voruntersuchungen, 90–1, esp. p. 91 n. 2, who notes the growing commonness of such forms in later papyri.

16 WB. 1 cites meanings of bringing up water, making a complaint, and (frequently) producing a contract; WB. Suppl. 1 cites for the same meaning inter alia P. Sorb. 15 (where the editor, p. 63, refers to M. Haessler’s discussion of validity clauses).

17 The omission of iota adscript in papyri of this period, particularly in the initial position as here, is not common, but it is attested: cf. Mayer, Grammatik (Schmoll) 103–4, citing P. Athen. 8. 7 (iii–ii). The scribe is usually careful with such things (cf. line 8, Ἐρωτάρχη), but it is a less remarkable occurrence than those supposed in a form of ἐπιφέρω.
that line 18 begins a new clause; although there is no physical evidence that this is so, the absence of a conjunction (as we have seen, the position of καὶ essentially excludes its having this function) lends support. If the verb γεγρα( ) is resolved, as Turner suggests, as γεγρα(ἀφαμεν), a common enough idiom of official correspondence, one may then suppose that with a certain amount of liberty in the use of parallel infinitives with different subjects the author of the letter is the subject of ἐπανεκένων. The whole passage would then be translated, ‘We have written that the sale of the contract for the money revenues for Lycia for the fourth year has increased to 6 talents, 1312 drachmas, 4 ob.; and that we have given approval also for the future.’ The intransitive use of ἐπανέω, while far less common than the transitive with a direct object of person or thing commended, is not unknown.

19–23. It is probable, in line 19, that the restoration adopted for the previous letter is to be understood here also; that is, one should resolve γεγρ(ἀφαμεν) (again, on the assumption that tax contracts would be let in Alexandria and not by the provincial correspondent). The last three lines of the letter then represent the current instructions in response to the situation outlined in 19–20. I translate, ‘another (letter:) about the gate toll, about which we have written that the sale was short 2 talents 1366 drachmas, to send the account of the wine imported by the merchants yearly from the 16th year, so that it may be balanced against the shortage.’ It is probable that the reference here is to a scrutiny of the accounts rather than to a payment of money in compensation. In line 20, τ[已经有]οedd.; but part of the ταυ is visible (and confirmed by Keenan on the papyrus).

24–28. The problems of this letter make a connected translation impossible. In 24, the editors read as follows: [. . . . . . . σε] τοῦ γέγρ(αφε) μὴ πεπρα(χέναι). As to the first word, the ταυ is not certain; it resembles the final upsilon of διαπυλικ[ο]υν in line 19, and the same type of construction, with ὅ γεγρ(ἀφαμεν), may well have stood here originally. (The editors do not indicate that μὴ is written above the line). The alpha of the next line, the first letter read in the editors’ text, is far from certain, and their restoration και χρηματικον is thus highly uncertain. In line 26, the editors restored [τοῦτοι καὶ], but Wilcken omits this, properly, for it is neither certain nor useful. In line 27, the editors read φό(ρος), but the case and number do not seem to me certain, inasmuch as the word would appear to go with the two preceding tax names. Unless the grammatical structure of the entire letter can be clearly discerned, it is hard to see why one case should be preferred.

And the structure of the letter is highly uncertain. Cohen, restoring [ἐλλῆνε φόρος] ( )

18 The photograph shows what looks like a paragraphos after line 17, but Keenan tells me that this is a ‘mirage—a hairline crack in the papyrus which is shaded on the photo, and so looks like ink.’

19 The verb ἐπαινέω, while better attested than ἐπανέμου, is not common in the papyri (cf. W.B. 1 etc.).

20 LSJ cites an absolute sense of ἐπανεκένω meaning consent or agree from Aristoph. A.C. 1616 and Thuc. 4. 65 (ἐπαινοεκένων ὑποτάκτων); similar is the passage of P. Eleph. 13. 4 (223/222 B.C.) cited by W.B., ὅ ἐπανέκένων μόνον, ἐπηρεάξει ροξ ὑποτάκτων. (The citation of this verb by W.B. Suppl. 1 from P. Col. Zen. 118a. 5 is in error; this Ptolemaic text reads ἐπανεκένω.)
...|νον γέγραπτ(αφε) μη πεπράθωσθα, followed much of the editors' indicated structure. But if the reservations indicated above are correct, the first part of the letter may have said something quite different. The adoption of a first-person-plural verb in line 24 would indicate that the first part of the letter summarizes information previously sent by the *dioikhetes* to the official, as was the case in lines 19–20 in the previous abstract. Lines 25–26 are extremely difficult; perhaps ἣ in 25 co-ordinates with a second perfect infinitive in 26 ending -κέναι. Or, perhaps more likely, the -ai ended an aorist infinitive giving (in the manner we have supposed earlier) the instructions of the present letter. But the impossibility of demonstrating the correctness of a full restoration here makes it unfruitful to offer one.\textsuperscript{21} It may be, actually, that ὕφο( ) in 27 is the subject of the second perfect infinitive, and that a partial stop should be placed after it. Some alteration would then be necessary in 28. I am far from suggesting that the difficulties of this passage are solved, but these suggestions may indicate the direction in which a solution might be found. That one is possible in the state of the papyrus and our lack of parallels is by no means certain.

29–33. In 29, Cohen, Crönert, and Wilcken all restored [Νικοστρᾶτος] τοῦ. The reason for the restoration (not made by the editors) is that the letter should be addressed to him because it concerns Lycia. But there can have been many officials in the area; and there is no evidence that Nikostatos did not have a supervisory position over a larger area than Lycia. Since the restoration gives us no additional knowledge, and since the evidence is not strong that it is correct, it seems best to omit it. I translate the text as follows: 'Concerning Zethos and ——es, who took the purple contract in Lycia for five years, and about whom it was written that they had collected the revenue of 1 talent 1800 drachmas per year and the (revenue) for the 4th year...'

Column II

50. I have not succeeded in restoring this name, evidently (as Turner remarks) originally ending in -ιας, for the alphabet after the iota evidently begins a new word.

56. If the sigma is read correctly, only this genitive can be restored.

Column III

I do not print a photograph of this column, which preserves the left margin of another series of abstracts, with two or three paragraph beginnings apparently starting with Απ[...]. To the left is more of the small cursive scribbling found to the left of Column I, but it is not upside down here. Little of this column seems readable.

\textsuperscript{21} On the meaning of διαφωνώση, uncritical use of *LS* by the editors resulted in the following remark (p. 67): 'διαφωνεῖν (l. 25) is used by Polybius of accounts which do not balance, but it seems better in this place to interpret the word in the sense in which it is used by Diodorus, xvi. 3 χρήσας βιβλία ἐκτὸς πρὸς τοὺς περίποθους, ἐξ ὧν πέρι διαφωνωθάν. The attestations are both taken from *LS* (1867, unchanged from 7th edn. of 1882), which reads 'α... διαφωνεῖ τῶν χρήματων the accounts disagree, are not balanced, Polyb. 22. 26. 23. *LS* cites the same passage, saying 'generally, disagree,... διαφωνεῖ τῶν χρήματων there is a discrepancy in the accounts', Plb. 21. 43. 23.' L. and J. Robert have pointed out in *La Carie*, ii, 310, n. 10, that the passage means 'disappear, be missing', and thus belongs in section 3 of *LS*'s article. As Thomas Drew-Bear points out in *Glotta* 50 (1972), 67, the *Supplement* (1968) to *LS* does not register this change.
3. The Date of the Papyrus

The editors assigned *P. Tebt. 8* to the last part of the third century B.C. on the basis of the palaeography. The date was further narrowed by the mention of a year 4 (lines 15 and 33) which is evidently imminent or present; the choices available are the reigns of Philopator (219/218) or of Epiphanes (202/201). The editors chose the latter on the basis of the correspondence that they saw in the contents of the papyrus with the historical situation about 202. The instructions issued, they argued, showed a state of crisis readily explicable in the face of Philip's moves in Thrace and elsewhere in 202. But what these abstracts really show is relentless activity on the part of the dioiketes to attend to the size and security of the revenues from every area of the empire and every possible source. There is nothing startling in this picture, which reminds us of the activity of Apollonios in the middle of the century. If we had comparative material from the files of an earlier year, it might be possible to assert that the differences here, if any, showed a state of crisis. In the absence of such material, a claim that the instructions of this papyrus reveal an emergency is unjustified. One might as well suppose that the government was in preparation for the campaign of Raphia and gathering its resources. Nothing here, then, points to one date or the other with certainty.22

More recently, P. M. Fraser has sought to provide further support for a date of 202 through the use of prosopography. The figure in question is Kallimedes, the addressee of the abstract beginning in line 12. Fraser pointed out that Livy records that Ainos was surrendered to Philip V in 200 by its commandant, one Kallimedes.23 The preceding letter to that addressed to Kallimedes here is concerned with affairs in Lesbos and Thrace, and if the interpretation τ(δ) δι(τιγραφον) is correct, Kallimedes would seem to be localized in this region in the papyrus.24 Fraser reasoned from this possible identification that a date close to the surrender in 200 would be preferable to an earlier one for this appearance of Kallimedes.

Fraser expressed some diffidence about the identification, however, asserting that 'it should be noted that the name Kallimedes is frequent in Ptolemaic Egypt'. This is not the case. Aside from the reference in *P. Tebt. 8*, only seven references to men of this name are registered in the Namenbuch and the Onomasticon, and Professor Peremans tells me he has no others listed in his files. Of these, four are private citizens in the second half of the second century, two of whom are alleged to be perpetrators of injustices suffered by petitioners.25 Of the remaining three, two belong to papyri mentioning an eponymous priest (of year 12 of Philadelphos) named Leonistos son of Kallimedes.26

22 No more can one accept the argument of K. J. Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* 2 iv. 2, 345 n. 1 (followed by D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, 936–7) that Philip had already taken these Ptolemaic possessions by 202, and that the letters must be earlier than that date; cf. the rebuttal of this position by P. M. Fraser, *JEA* 39 (1953), 91–2 n. 5.

23 Livy 31. 16. 4, cited by Fraser (n. 22, above). Ainos is otherwise known as a Ptolemaic possession through *Asyliearkunden aus Kos*, no. 8 (Abh. Berl., 1952, nr. 1).

24 The editors' resolution Kal(pha) would thus be definitely excluded.

25 *P. Grenf.* 1. 17; *UPZ* 180a Col. 19; 21; *SB* 428 and 4538.

26 *P. Hib.* 110. 41, and *P. Cair. Zen.* 59001 (the latter a double of *PSI* 331).
The last is also a patronymic, the father of the eminent official and companion of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, Lochos.\textsuperscript{27} The sum total, then, is two fathers of important sons and four private citizens of the late second century. For more than a century the name is not attested; and it is in the middle of this century that our Kallimedes falls. It would seem, therefore, that some of Fraser’s diffidence over the identification is unwarranted.

The father of the eponymous priest is part of a cluster of figures in third-century Ptolemaic history who seem to form a family group. The first Kallimedes, father of the priest, must have been born in the mid fourth century, his son a generation later.\textsuperscript{28} It is likely that the Perigenes son of Leontiskos who was an Olympic victor in 272 and appears on Siphnos in the 270s (providing entertainment for the Siphnians on the occasion of the announcement of the well-being of the king and his army)\textsuperscript{29} was a son of the eponymous priest, an active young man when his father was middle-aged. Another Perigenes appears as the Ptolemaic admiral of the campaign of Raphia; it was probably his daughter Iamneia who served as athlophore in 211/210 and as canephore in 210/209. It is not unreasonable to suppose that he was a son, or at least a relative of the other Perigenes.

It would also not be unreasonable to suppose that the commandant of Ainos, Kallimedes, came from this family. There is no evidence to provide him with a stemma, but if he belonged to the generation of the children of the second Perigenes, his period of activity might have spanned the period c. 220–180. If the Kallimedes of 200 was a middle-career officer well up in the military hierarchy, he might well have been a lower officer a decade or two earlier. While the identification by Fraser has much verisimilitude, then, and although it points to a later date for the papyrus, it is by no means conclusive evidence for the late date.\textsuperscript{30} While Kallimedes may thus be said to contribute to the solution of the problem, his place is not entirely clear.

Column II, fragmentary though it is, contributes two new names for consideration. We may take Theagenes first. There are only four Ptolemaic occurrences of this name, two of them from Tebtunis texts of the late second century that cannot concern the man of this papyrus.\textsuperscript{31} The third is a somewhat dubious patronymic in a third-century Petrie papyrus.\textsuperscript{32} The fourth, however, is of some interest. He dedicated a statue of his father, ——n son of Apollodoros, in Alexandria.\textsuperscript{33} The father, an Alexandrian, with the

\textsuperscript{27} For Lochos, see the study of W. Peremans and E. Van’t Dack, Proseopographica, 49–51.

\textsuperscript{28} The evidence for the members of this supposed family is gathered by J. Janssens, De Sacerdotibus, 63, no. 12, who makes these connections as far as the second Perigenes.

\textsuperscript{29} This text is best consulted as IG xi Suppl., p. 111, from G. Klaatsch’s revision on the stone, but the essential discussions are those of M. Holleaux, BCH 29 (1905), 319 ff., and L. Robert, BCH 60 (1936), 184–9; cf. his notes to M. Holleaux, Études vi, 25–6 n. 74; also the remarks of J. and L. Robert, Bull. épigr. 1965, 6, p. 75, on M. Vandoni’s recent reprints of the text.

\textsuperscript{30} It is possible that our Kallimedes was the father of the Kallimedes who was the father of Lochos; the sequence of generations would fit reasonably well.

\textsuperscript{31} P. Tebt. 94, 25 and 116. 19.

\textsuperscript{32} P. Petr. i, 59. 25 and ii 18, Περεογιν Θαγόν, in a list of names all of which are Egyptian; I owe the reference to Professor Peremans.

\textsuperscript{33} The inscription, then, in the Lyceum Hosianum of Braunsberg (now perhaps in Warsaw) was published by W. Schubart in Klio 12 (1912), 365–73, with a thorough commentary; the text is reprinted as SB 5021.
PTOLEMAIC CORRESPONDENCE IN P. TEBT. 8

Demotic Athenaeius, had these titles: τὸν [γε]νόμενον ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοις φίλους καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ λογιστηρίου τῶν νομαρχιῶν καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστατεία τοῦ ἐξουσιωμένου ἐμποδίου. He had evidently retired from the very top level of the Ptolemaic bureaucracy, as head of accounting for Nome accounts and chief of the customs service and export supervision in Alexandria—one of the highest subordinates of the dioiketes. His court rank was in keeping with these dignities. At the time of the dedication, he must have been well past the age of active service. His son, now τῶν πρῶτοιν φίλων himself, is τῶν ἐφημερεύοντων τοῖς βασιλείσσου εἰσαγγέλεων. Theagenes must be a courtier of middle age himself, and with a comfortable court position is perhaps past his own most active days; perhaps he lacked his father's distinction as an administrator and was kept on, for the sake of his father's feelings, as a minor court official.34

The date of the inscription cannot be established with certainty. Schubart suggested the second century on the basis of the hand.35 The presence of court rank suggests only that the text dates after the early part of Epiphanes' reign. If we identify this Theagenes with the official in P. Tebt. 8, we arrive at little more certainty about the date of the latter than was the case with Kallimedes. The earliest date at which the son of a man who was retired and aged, like Theagenes' father, could have been active—if we assume the earliest possible date for the inscription, in the 190s—would have been c. 225–220. We thus have, as before, a terminus post quem of the papyrus of about 220, a date that accommodates either of the possible dates of composition.

The last name is the most significant: Hippomedon. Aside from some legendary figures,36 scarcely any bearers of this name are known, none of them in Ptolemaic Egypt except Euergetes' governor of Thrace and the Hellespont.37 With a name of this rarity, and with at least a rough coincidence of dates and of spheres of activity, there can be no doubt that the Hippomedon of the papyrus is the same as the already known strategos. In order to extract the import of his appearance here for the chronology of P. Tebt. 8, it is necessary to examine in some detail the evidence for his life.

(1) Hippomedon, Polybius tells us, was alive in 219 and at that time had a daughter with two living sons.38 Hippomedon was the son of the Spartan Agesilaos, the advisor of Agis in the late 240s, and we know that his daughter married king Archidamos. Archidamos was dead by 227 or shortly thereafter, so that his wife's child-bearing must have begun c. 230, if not earlier.39 Plutarch tells us that Spartan women married late.40

34 Schubart shows that Theagenes' title of usher at court was a real position, and not purely honorary, but it is not exceptionally prominent.
35 He remarks (p. 365), 'Die Schrift, vom Steinmetzen vorgedruckt, gibt sich auf den ersten Blick als ptolomäisch zu erkennen, ist aber nicht besonders charakteristisch.'
36 See the list by H. Zwicker in PW 8. 2 (1913) s.v. Hippomedon. The Hippomedon whose name appears in Un Lévre d'écouter line 102 is, from the proximity in this list of polyphonic names to Polyeides and Eteokles, probably the member of the Seven against Thebes. (D. Foraboschi informs me that the reference to P. Cair. Zen. v in the Onomastikon s.v. Hippomedon is an error for this occurrence.)
37 Several are listed by Zwicker (n. 36), and to his list may be added SEG xxii 508, a dubious restoration by W. G. Forrest of the name in a Chian inscription; and the epitaph at Odessus of Artemidorus son of Hippomedon and his wife, SEG xxiv 990.
38 Polyb. 4. 35. 13.
39 Cf. Walbank's comments in the Commentary to Polybius, 1, 568 ff.
40 Lycurgus 15. 10.
and even if Hippomedon was married before the age of thirty, it is very unlikely that he had a married daughter before he was about forty-five. We may therefore conclude that Hippomedon was born c. 275 or even earlier.

(2) During the period c. 245–241, in the turmoil of the reign of Agis, Hippomedon was already εὐθύκειος ἐν πολλοῖς πολέμοις ἀνήρ καὶ μέγα δὲ εὖλοιν τῶν νέων δυνάμειος. From Plutarch also we learn that Spartan men did not take a part in the agora until they were thirty. If Hippomedon had served in many wars, was no longer one of the young men himself, and could take a part in public life, seconding his father and cousin in the years after 245, the date 275 once again seems a reasonable terminus ante quem for his birth.

(3) Of Hippomedon’s later career we also know something. Teles relates that he fled his native country and, like Glaukon and Chremoines of Athens, became counsellor to a Ptolemy. The date of this will certainly have been in 241, with the collapse of Agis’ government and his death. Hippomedon was at that time, according to Teles, made governor of Thrace: ὁ γὰρ ἐπὶ Θρᾴκης καθεσταμένος ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου—a post for which we have also epigraphical testimony of an uncertain date.

Hippomedon the governor of Thrace would have been in his middle to late fifties in 219, when Polybius tells us that he was still alive. By 202 he would have been well over seventy. It is not impossible that Hippomedon stayed in office to a very old age, escaping the shuffling of ambassadors and governors carried out by Agathokles after the death of Philopator. But it is surely more reasonable to suppose that Hippomedon would no longer have been in an active post abroad—if indeed he was still alive—in 202.

There is no certain date yet to be had about the date of P. Tebt. 8. The discussions of Theagenes and Kallimedes do not furnish decisive evidence for either a date under Philopator or one under Epiphanes. Hippomedon, however, seems to me to tip the balance in favour of the earlier date. Perhaps new evidence will one day allow the verification of this conclusion.

---

41 Plut., Agis 6. 3.
42 On the date of entrance to the agora, Plut. Lycurgus 25. W. Otto concluded in PW 8. 2 (1913), 1884–7 that Hippomedon must have been born before 270. His thorough survey of the ancient sources is still useful.
43 See the references in ProG Ptol. 14605, especially Teles, De Fuga (ed. Hense2), 23 and, on the terminology, C. Habicht, Gottmenschentum u. griech. Städte, 32 n. 20.
44 IG xi 8. 156, and Syll. 502; most recently, in Samothrace: Inscriptions, 39–40, with P. M. Fraser’s detailed commentary on the present state of the stone. The more useful earlier bibliography and readings are best discussed by L. Robert, BCH 59 (1935), 425–7 (now Op. Min. Sel. 1, 185–7).
45 A year 16 is mentioned in line 21, where the writer requests that the accounts from that year on be sent. Both Euergetes and Philopator had sixteen years, and the length over which cases could drag on in the bureaucracy should prevent us from assuming that a period of five years is preferable to one of fifteen in a case of an important decrease in revenues.