

A CASE OF PTOLEMAIC *QUID PRO QUO* FROM THE PHAIES ARCHIVE*

Abstract: Edition of a Ptolemaic *hypomnema* belonging to the Phaies archive (late III BC). The document comes from cartonnage W.M.F. Petrie unearthed at Gurob in 1889 and preserves a request that involves *quid pro quo*.

UC 31916, a *hypomnema* that is currently housed in the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, was excavated by W.M.F. Petrie in 1889 while working in the necropolis at Gurob.¹ Since it was recovered from mummy-cartonnage, traces of white and red gesso are still visible on the papyrus. While much of the cartonnage salvaged from this excavation was published not long after its discovery,² it was not until 1980 that the present papyrus was dismantled and separated from one of the mummies' breast plates from the 1889 find.³ Among the papyri initially retrieved and published from Gurob were two late third-century BC petitions addressed to a certain Phaies (Φαιῆς): *P. Petr.* II 10.1 (ca. 221–205 BC) and *P. Petr.* II 10.2 (ca. 221–205).⁴ Since UC 31916 is also written to a Phaies — a name which is seldom attested elsewhere (see n. 1 below) — it is likely the same person; in addition, all three petitions invoke Phaies' authority to grant requests of various kinds. Therefore, it seems that at one point these three documents belonged to an archive that was subsequently divided up and reused as cartonnage in the necropolis at Gurob.⁵

* We would like to thank Alice Stevenson, former Curator of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, for permission to edit and publish an edition of this papyrus and Tracey Golding, Visitor Services Officer, for permission to image the papyrus. We would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this article for their comments and suggestions that have greatly improved it.

¹ *P. Petr.* I, p. 9–13. The plate that encases the present papyrus has a note that reads “Petrie Cartonnage inv. 1B/G3” and “From Gurob”.

² Mostly in the *P. Petr.* I–III, *P. Petrie² I* and *P. Petrie Kleon*.

³ The inventory registrar for this piece reports that it came from the same cartonnage as UC 31907 (= *SB XVI* 12468), which was subsequently published by Turner & Cockle (1982) 272–276. In this article (p. 272) Turner and Cockle report that in 1980 a UC London team working under A.P. Mathias were able to demount a mummy breast-plate using proteolytic enzymes as solvent and were able to recover a number of pieces, Greek and Demotic, from this cartonnage.

⁴ For the dating of *P. Petr.* II 10.1 and *P. Petr.* II 10.2 see *Pros. Ptol.* I 268, 1091, and Uebel (1968) 249 n. 4.

⁵ There is a note with the papyrus that reads: “This is part of the same correspondence as *P. Petrie* II X, (1) and (2)”. With the addition of the present text, these three documents

The *hypomnema*, sent by a man named Dositheos, is intact in its entirety and is written in dark brown ink along the fibers.⁶ Although the first line is partially damaged, as deterioration has eroded the upper parts of certain letters, it is still legible and contains the opening address. Overall the text displays characteristics indicative of Ptolemaic scripts⁷ and is written in a semi-cursive style where letters are often connected without the lift of the pen.⁸ Orthographically the writer interchanges $\omicron > \upsilon$ in one instance (l. 6) and employs the iota adscript only in l. 3 after α ,⁹ morphologically there is one instance where the dative case is used where the accusative is expected (l. 3), and syntactically he employs a textbook example of a future more vivid conditional clause: $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ καταστήσης ... $\acute{\omega}$ φελήσω σε (ll. 2-5).¹⁰ However, in the apodosis there seems to be a curious grammatical structure as $\acute{\omega}$ φελέω is followed by a double accusative: (ll. 5-7) $\acute{\omega}$ φελήσω σε ... πλήθη ἱκανά. While the form σε is expected,¹¹ the following accusative πλήθη is difficult to classify. We are either dealing with an accusative of respect or with a missing complementary infinitive;¹² we are inclined toward the first option because it is more economical and it seems unlikely that the writer would accidentally omit the infinitive at such a crucial point in the text.

The document is concise and straightforward both in its form and content as its body consists of a single sentence — albeit a fairly lengthy one. The brevity of the document suggests a certain haste in delivering the message, and implies a degree of acquaintance between the sender

may now be properly called an archive (i.e. Archive of Phaias). This newly established archive was not included in Vandorpe e.a. (2015) because previously there were only two published documents addressing Phaias (see p. 16).

⁶ Average line height is 1.3 cm. The papyrus is mounted between two sheets of glass with graph paper on the back. While we were not able to examine the backside of the papyrus, it is doubtful that it contains any text.

⁷ I.e. lines are well spaced and letters are written with thick angular strokes, which are generally quite broad and give the appearance of being suspended from a uniform top line.

⁸ Notable letterforms include particularly small thetas and omicrons, large inclining epsilons, both triangular and rounded deltas. The descender of rho, phi, and upsilon contains serifs and raised nus appear at the end of certain words (l. 1, $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$; l. 7, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\varsigma$; l. 8, $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu$).

⁹ On the use of the iota adscript in third-century BC papyri see Clarysse (1976).

¹⁰ Smyth (1956) 523 (§ 2323).

¹¹ E.g. *P. Cair. Zen.* III 59520.6 (III BC): $\epsilon\acute{\xi}$ $\acute{\omega}\nu$ σε $\acute{\omega}$ φελήσω; *P. Mich.* VIII 498.6-7 (AD II): $\acute{\eta}$ σύστασις σου πολύ με $\acute{\omega}$ φέλησε. See also Smyth (1956) 339 (§1462). Although $\acute{\omega}$ φελέω can occasionally take the dative case of the person (§1591a), this emendation would not help clarify the following accusatives.

¹² If the complementary infinitive is missing one might expect a verb comparable to κερδαίνω: cf. Mark 8:36, τί γὰρ $\acute{\omega}$ φελεῖ ἄνθρωπον κερδῆσαι τὸν κόσμον ὄλον ...

and addressee, or at the very least a previous interaction regarding the matter. Dositheos writes to Phaies, whom we know to be an οἰκονόμος from the two other petitions addressed to him, something that almost seems to be a semi-formal request to join the ἐφοδεῖα.¹³ In exchange for this position, Phaies is promised goods; hence, we are dealing with an instance of *quid pro quo*.

If this *hypomnema* is indeed disclosing a case of *quid pro quo* — perhaps bordering on bribery — it is not unique.¹⁴ Already in the Pharaonic and Persian periods there are instances where promises of money were made in exchange for the appointment to certain offices.¹⁵ In fact, at approximately the same time that the present papyrus was written, *P. Berlin* 13543 (Demotic; possibly written 11 Aug. 219 BC) preserves a strikingly similar case of *quid pro quo*; in this letter a certain Eskhumpemet writes to the governor of Tshetres and asks him to intervene on behalf of his application for the office of *lesonis* in the Temple at Khum and pledges a sum of money in return.¹⁶ Likewise, as one moves into the Roman period similar examples can be found. In *P. Mich.* III 203 (early AD II) a soldier named Saturnilos intends to offer money to secure an assignment on the *cursus publicus*, but fears a “useless expense” (I. 12, κενὴν δαπάνην) if he pays the wrong officer.¹⁷ At roughly the same

¹³ Since the οἰκονόμος was the person to whom Dositheos appeals in order to be appointed to the ἐφοδεῖα, it is possible to infer that the ἐφοδεῖα was an office subordinate to and under the supervision of the οἰκονόμος. On the various responsibilities (administrative, judicial, financial) of the Ptolemaic οἰκονόμος see Berneker (1935) 94-102. For his judicial powers in particular see Bauschatz (2013) 128-129; cf. Samuel (1966) 444-450. For other examples of Ptolemaic *hypomnemata* and Demotic *mḳmq* in which a petition is being made for the police force see *PUG* III 101 (ca. 221 BC), *PUG* III 102 (ca. 221 BC), *SB* XIV 11860 (II/I BC), *P. Loeb* 40 = 53 = 66 (III-I BC).

¹⁴ Clarysse & Thompson (2006) 175 give a brief description of this unpublished text in which they hint at the fact that the office of *ephodos* was “worth having”, perhaps implying that there was some degree of bribery taking place to obtain it.

¹⁵ In Papyrus Salt 124, from the twentieth dynasty, it is alleged that a certain Penēb had bribed the vizier to become a “chief-workman”; see Černý (1929) 253. In Elephantine Papyrus B14 (late V BC) an allegation of bribery is also made; see discussion in Porten (2011) 128.

¹⁶ Zauzich (1978); cf. Porten (2011) 310-311 (C11). Similarly, during the Ptolemaic period (II BC) there are two documents wherein a certain Petehyris, most probably a prisoner, tries “by promises of Baksheesh”, as U. Wilcken appropriately remarks, to buy his freedom; Wilcken (1903) 579 [commenting on *P. Cair. Goodspeed.* 5 and *P. Grenf.* I 41]; “Unser Peteyris versuchte also durch Versprechung von Bakschisch die Freiheit zu gewinnen”. For other examples of Ptolemaic *quid pro quo* see Crawford (1974) 175 n. 27. Likewise, it is well known that Ptolemy XII “Auletes” (80-51 BC) resorted to bribery to secure Roman support.

¹⁷ On this interpretation see Youtie (1976) 291.

time, in *P. Mich.* VIII 468 (Latin; early AD II) another soldier named Terentianus informs his father via letter that, if he hopes to get transferred to a cohort, he will have to pay some money for the promotion.¹⁸ Whether or not the present text concerns what might rightly be classified as bribery (δωροκοπία), paying for offices in both the Ptolemaic and Roman periods was a matter of concern for higher officials who were constantly trying to curb the practice in order to limit corruption.¹⁹

Gurob 13.0 cm × 11.5 cm (H × W) Late III BC

Φαιῆι παρὰ Δωσιθέου.
 ἔάν με καταστή-
 σης πρὸς τῇ ἐφοδεΐαι
 δούς μοι μαχίμους
 5 ὠφελήσω σε ἐξ ἐμ-
 πυρίας σίτου πλήθη
 ἱκανὰ καὶ ἄλλων
 ἐπιτίμων ἅ σοι προς-
 ἦκει. (vac.) εὐτύχει.

3. l. τὴν ἐφοδεΐαν. 5–6. l. ἐμπορίας.

To Phaies from Dositheos. If you appoint me to the *ephodeia*, having supplied me with *machimoi*, I will provide you with a considerable amount of wheat from commerce and with other valuable goods that befit you. Farewell.

Notes

- 1 Φαιῆι. The same dative form of Φαιῆς appears in *P. Petr.* II 10.1.1 and *P. Petr.* II 10.2.1 that are a part of this archive, although, as noted above, in these two petitions he is addressed as Φαιῆι οἰκονόμοι. On the whole, this Egyptian name occurs only a handful of times, all of which appear in documents from the third or second century BC, and most of these are from the Arsinoite: *P. Gur.* 22.1.2

¹⁸ II. 35-41: *et si deus volueret spero me frugaliter [v]iciturum et in cohortem [tra]nsferri. hic a[ut]em sene aer[e] [ni]hil fiet neque epistulae commandaticiae nihil val(eb)unt nesi si qui sibi aiutaveret* (“And if god should be willing, I hope to live frugally and to be transferred to a cohort; but here nothing will be accomplished without money, and letters of recommendation will have no value unless a man help himself”). See also *P. Fay.* 117 (AD 109) where a gift of olives and fish was made to a local official to gain favorable decisions.

¹⁹ Monson (2012) 231-232.

(III BC); *P. Gur.* 24.1.2 (III BC); *SB XII* 10861 Fr. D2.51 and Fr. H.96 (mid III BC); *SB XII* 10862.10 (mid III BC); *P. Lille* I 5.16 (260/59 BC); cf. *P. Tebt.* I 72B.26 (114/13 BC): Φαιεῖ.

παρὰ Δωσιθέου. The name of the sender is partially illegible as it is written along the top margin of the papyrus that has been subject to damage. In the brief inventory for this text in the Petrie Museum it is titled “Letter of Doras to Phaies”, but the name Doras cannot be read. The first two letters δω are clear, and appear to be followed by a faint sigma and then a vertical hasta that resembles iota or possibly a descender of a rho; while there are parallels with certain rhos (ll. 3 and 6), it is also similar to the first iota earlier in this line. While the next two letters are difficult to securely identify, the first has a rounded oblong shape with a slight tilt to the right and appears to be a theta; the next letter is mostly lost in a break that comes down from the top of the papyrus, but it appears to have a lunate form and could be read as epsilon. Therefore, the most economical reading of the name is Δωσιθέου — a name well attested in the Arsinoite in the Ptolemaic period.

- 3 πρὸς τῇ ἐφοδεΐαι. The term ἐφοδεΐα is attested in Polybius 6.35.8 where it indicates the duty of “going the rounds” in a military context. When ἐφοδεΐα/ἐφοδεύω appear in *P. Tebt* III.1 703 (210 BC) they refer to the office of the inspectorate. In Ptolemaic Egypt the inspectorate was most likely under the jurisdiction of the “tax controller” (οἰκονόμος), the position which Phaies held (cf. *P. Petr.* II 10.1; *P. Petr.* II 10.2). In fact, as Monson (2012) 232 notes, one of the duties of the οἰκονόμος was “to travel frequently within his nome on rounds of inspections”. Cf. *BGU VIII* 1780.16 (ca. 57-50 BC); *BGU VIII* 1832.6 (51 BC); *P. Tebt.* I 96.3 (ca. 95-61 BC); *P. Tebt.* I 120.28 (ca. 97-64 BC); *P. Tebt.* I 257 (ca. 100-76 BC); *UPZ* II 204.1 (134 BC). The ἔφοδοι also performed some policing: Clarysse & Thompson (2006) 174-175; Bauschatz (2013) 148-149. See further Clarysse & Thompson, Fs. S.P. Vleeming (*Pap. Lugd. Bat.*, in press); here they publish a new fragment of *P. Count* 2, where in ll. 659-662 a total of 34 *ephodoi* (3*wphwtws*) is given for an administrative unit of 12,000 tax-payers, alongside more than 100 *kalasiries* and 370 *phylakitai* (n. to l. 659): “The word 3*wphwtws* is written as a Greek loan-word (with a person determinative) and in a very explicit way. *Ephodoi* are found in only three of the five districts. This identification is supported by the identical figure for *ephodoi* in

district B in the Greek part of the text (*P. Count* 3, l. 34). This Greek loanword is also found in an unpublished Demotic petition found in the Italian-French excavations at Tebtynis: inv. B 7409 (to be published by Kim Ryholt). For *ephodoi* we prefer the translation ‘policeman for the road’ to ‘itinerant inspector’; cf. *P. Count* 2, p. 168 (for both).”

- 4 μαχιμούς. The term μάχιμος is employed by Herodotus with the generic meaning of “fighting man” and in a few instances it is associated with Egypt (2.141, 164). In a later period, it evolved in meaning to indicate native Egyptian troops: *P. Yale* I p. 86-90; cf. Fischer-Bovet (2014) 162-166. Under Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 BC) the μάχιμοι became part of the territorial army and were granted cleruchic status by being allotted small plots of land (from 5 to 30 arouras). It is clear from *SB XVI* 12468 (III BC) that μάχιμοι performed police duties in the third century BC and it might be possible to assume that they were under the direction of the οἰκονόμος due to the fact that Dositheos, who was petitioning for the ἐφοδεία, requests them from Phaies.
- 5-6 ἐξ ἐμπυρίας. On the ο > υ interchange in unaccented syllables see Gignac (1976) 293. While ἐμπορία can have the meaning of “merchandise”, it typically refers more generally to “business”, “commerce”, or “trade” (s.v. LSJ). This usage is borne out in some papyri when the term does occur: e.g. *P. Giss.* I 9.2-3 (ca. AD 113-120): τοῦ ἀνδρός μου | [- ca.13 - Π]ετσησιπῶτο[ς] ἀποστάντ[ο]ς εἰς Ὀᾶσιν ἐνπορίας χάριν (“When my husband [NN son of] Peteesipos was away in the Oasis on account of business”). Most likely the ἐμπορία that is being referred to in the present document can be taken in the sense of “errand” or “journeying” as it pertains to business or commerce (s.v. LSJ). Thus, Dositheos appears to be promising Phaies that from his business on the ἐφοδεία — an office that is explicitly involved with inspection and making rounds — he will provide him with much wheat. Clarysse & Thompson (2006) 175 translate ἐμπορία as “market”, but we do not feel this is the best rendering; for “market” one would rather expect ἐμπόριον and not ἐμπορία.
- 6-7 σίτου πλήθη ἱκανά. Cf. *P. Lille* I 3.76 (216/15 BC): []ιτου ἱκανὰ πλήθη.
- 7-9 ἄλλων ἐπιτίμων ἅ σοι προσήκει. Variations of the phrase ἄλλων ἐπιτίμων typically occur in leases, contracts, or sales, and are almost always followed by a sum of money to denote a monetary fine or penalty: e.g. *BGU* IV 1058.40-41 (13 BC): καὶ τὰ βλάβη καὶ

δαπανήματα καὶ ἄλλο ἐπίτιμον ἀργυ(ρίου) (δραχμάς) φ (“... and damages and expenses and another fine of 500 drachmas, ...”). See Berger (1911) 4-14; Wolff (1941) 426-433. Here, however, the phrase departs from the customary usage and instead of denoting a penalty it is indicating something of value; on this meaning of the term ἐπίτιμος see Agath. 1.8.4. Here we take ἄλλων ἐπιτίμων as a partitive genitive.

Provo, Utah
Brigham Young University

Lincoln H. BLUMELL
lincoln_blumell@byu.edu

Chiara ALIBERTI
chiara@byu.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bauschatz (2013): John BAUSCHATZ, *Law and Enforcement in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge 2013.
- Berger (1911): Adolf B. BERGER, *Die Strafklauseln in den Papyrusurkunden: Ein Beitrag zum gräko-ägyptischen Obligationenrecht*, Leipzig 1911.
- Berneker (1935): Erich BERNEKER, *Zur Geschichte der Prozess-einleitung im ptolemäischen Recht*, Ansbach 1935.
- Černý (1929): Jaroslav ČERNÝ, ‘Papyrus Salt 124 (Brit. Mus. 10055)’, *JEA* 15 (1929), p. 243-258.
- Clarysse & Thompson (2006): Willy CLARYSSE & Dorothy J. THOMPSON, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt* (Cambridge Classical Studies), 2 vol., Cambridge 2006.
- Clarysse (1976): Willy CLARYSSE, ‘Notes on the Use of the Iota Adscript in the Third Century B.C.’, *CE* 51 (1976), p. 150-166.
- Crawford (1974): Dorothy J. CRAWFORD, ‘Skepe in Soknopaiou Nesos’, *JJP* 18 (1974), p. 169-175.
- Fischer-Bovet (2014): Christelle FISCHER-BOVET, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge 2014.
- Gignac (1976): Francis T. GIGNAC, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, I, *Phonology*, Milan 1976.
- Monson (2012): Andrew MONSON, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans: Political and Economic Change in Egypt*, Cambridge 2012.
- Porten (2011): Bezalel PORTEN (et al.), *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change* (2nd rev. ed.), Atlanta 2011.
- Samuel (1966): Alan E. SAMUEL, ‘The Judicial Competence of the *oikonomos* in the Third Century B.C.’, *Pap. Congr.* 11 (1966), p. 444-450.

- Smyth (1956): Herbert W. SMYTH, *Greek Grammar* (Rev. G.M. Messing), Cambridge (MA) 1956.
- Turner & Cockle (1982): Eric G. TURNER & Walter E.H. COCKLE, 'Complaint against a Policeman', *JEA* 68 (1982), p. 272-276.
- Uebel (1968): Fritz UEBEL, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*, Berlin 1968.
- Vandorpe e.a. (2015): Katelijn VANDORPE, Willy CLARYSSE & Herbert VERRETH, *Graeco-Roman Archives from the Fayum* (Collectanea Hellenistica – KVAB VI), Leuven 2015.
- Wilcken (1903): Ulrich WILCKEN, 'Miscelle. Ein Bestechungsversuch', *APF* 2 (1903), p. 578-579.
- Wolff (1941): Hans J. WOLFF, 'The *Praxis*-Provision in Papyrus Contracts', *TAPA* 72 (1941), p. 418-438.
- Youtie (1976): Herbert C. YOUTIE, 'P. Mich. III 203', *ZPE* 20 (1976), p. 288-292.
- Zauzich (1978): Karl-Th. ZAUZICH, *Demotische Papyri aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, I, Papyri von der Insel Elephantine*, Berlin 1978.

Plate

Fragment of ancient papyrus with handwritten text in a cursive script, likely Demotic or Hieroglyphic. The text is arranged in approximately 10 horizontal lines, though some characters are obscured by damage and the texture of the material. The script is dark and appears to be ink or a similar pigment applied to the natural fibers of the papyrus.