

# Dorothy J. Thompson

---

## A historian among the papyri

---

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 43, 17-31

---

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Dorothy J. Thompson

### **A HISTORIAN AMONG THE PAPYRI**

I SHOULD LIKE AT THE VERY START TODAY to dedicate the reflections that follow to the memory of Jean Bingen, who was the first to initiate me in the ways of papyrology and whose historical writings continue to challenge and stimulate.<sup>1</sup> We miss him.

My brief for this contribution was, as a historian, to speak about recent developments in the field of Ptolemaic Egypt, but it is easier to say what I am not going to do than it has been to choose which subjects to treat. What I shall *not* be doing here is a literature review. In papyrology we are fortunate in the regular coverage of articles and other studies that we enjoy. The invaluable *Bibliographie Papyrologique* is now available also on-line and there are surveys of new Greek texts in our various journals, the 'Urkundenreferat' of *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, the 'Testi recentemente publicati' of *Aegyptus*, or the 'Demotische Literaturübersicht' of *Enchoria* for demotic studies, together with reviews in various journals that allow us an overview of recent work (admittedly at some short delay). The incorporation of texts scattered in periodicals and elsewhere in the *SB* provides an invaluable resource (though again we have to wait a little). Our papy.list regularly records the publication of new studies. We are fortunate then that we belong to such a well-organised and well-served field of study. And now too, in this age of composite

<sup>1</sup> See most recently, Jean BINGEN, *Hellenistic Egypt*, Edinburgh 2007.

Histories, Companions and Handbooks, we have the new *Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*.<sup>2</sup>

So, if not a survey of work recently published or underway, then what was I to cover? And how recent, I wondered, is ‘recent’? In the end, I decided that since ‘recent’ is a relative term it might cover not just work since the last congress or work of the twenty first century, but recent also in relation to papyrology as a discipline, starting that is in the late eighteenth century with the publication of the *Charta Borgiana*.<sup>3</sup> Here, therefore, I shall be concerned – at least in part – with developments in the study of Ptolemaic Egypt since I myself entered the field as a graduate student something over fifty years ago. Of course this gives me a ‘longue durée’ to consider, but for a historian that is desirable, and at the same time I shall try to illustrate my findings with more recent examples. And when one looks back over this period, this *pentakontaetia*, it is interesting to note how, while some subjects of interest remain constant – the ruling house, for instance, the administration, relations between different sectors of the population, the Ptolemaic royal economy, irrigation and agriculture – and some are more recent, at least in their terminology – literacy, ethnicity, self-presentation, for example – there are also areas of historical interest that go in and out of fashion over the generations – slavery, for instance, or military history. I shall try to present a few examples from some of these categories both over the longer term and more recently, most of which I suspect are already familiar. This is inevitably a selective coverage, which often reflects my personal concerns, and I am aware that gaps remain.

First, however, leaving aside the wealth of material added to our collections of published texts, I must highlight the most important change of the last thirty or so years. That of course is the digital revolution with all the exciting possibilities this has brought. In papyrology, I think, three elements were important to how early on and how successfully new possibilities were developed: first was the suitability of our material for this form of exploitation, secondly the vision and initiative of those involved,

<sup>2</sup> R. S. BAGNALL (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, Oxford 2009.

<sup>3</sup> N. I. SCHOW, *Charta papyracea Graece scripta musei Borgiani Velitris*, Rome 1788.

and thirdly the continuation of a tradition of collaboration set up in the early years of the discipline.<sup>4</sup> Compared with other disciplines, we were early in seizing the possibilities of this revolution. Yet earlier still, the founding fathers of papyrology had the foresight to realize the importance of providing multiple indices to their editions of texts, so facilitating searches of various kinds. But what in the past took days of work in a well-stocked library can now be accessed on-line in no time at all. Of course the added human input is still needed. The reconstitution of archives, which lie at the base of much of our work, still needs the experienced eye of the papyrologist, who reads the script, and the historian too, who recognizes a name, a hand, or even a date of acquisition by the museum where now a papyrus is housed.<sup>5</sup> But once this initial work is done the text itself is far more widely available than ever before. It can be accessed in various forms through the Papyrological Navigator at papyri.info, which currently allows us to search through the Duke Databank (DDbDP), HGV, APIS or Trismegistos.<sup>6</sup> Through the Links portal of the AIP website we have easy access to a range of further information. Of course there remain *desiderata* – the absence from ‘Duke’ of what are termed sub-literary papyri is a constant frustration – but overall we papyrologists are well-served, a model even for other branches of scholarship. This situation is, of course, well known to all papyrologists. These are now our tools in daily use. It is, however, sometimes salutary to remember that these developments, which have revolutionized the way we work, only go back some thirty years.<sup>7</sup>

A second more recent development is the result of changes in research funding, at least in most of Europe, where (on the scientific model) larger

<sup>4</sup> See J. G. KEENAN, ‘The history of the discipline’, [in:] R. S. BAGNALL (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, Oxford 2009, pp. 59–78; cf. P. VAN MINNEN, ‘The future of papyrology’, *ibidem*, pp. 644–659.

<sup>5</sup> On ‘museum archaeology’ see, for instance, K. VANDORPE, ‘Archives and dossiers’, [in:] *Handbook of Papyrology* (cit. n. 2), pp. 228–229.

<sup>6</sup> An on-line version of the *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* remains a desideratum.

<sup>7</sup> See R. S. BAGNALL (ed.), *Research Tools for the Classics* (= *APA Pamphlet* 6), Chico, CA 1980; the call for databases made here was picked up in DDbDP under the guidance of John F. OATES. The Ibycus system, developed by David W. PACKARD, was initially used for processing Greek texts.

projects involving teams of researchers tend now to dominate the university scene. Under such an umbrella, individual projects still remain possible but much of the work that is currently produced, whether in print or web-based format, has its origin in collaborative projects.<sup>8</sup> And the combination of digitization with such project work is resulting in many new types of study – too numerous to detail – often involving quantification, modeling or the application of new forms of analysis. Graphs are no longer so strange to find in a papyrological article as once they were.

The third development I would identify is the growing number of meetings, which often result in the publication of a group of papers on (more or less) related topics. And at these gatherings it is clear that papyrologists are working closely with those in related disciplines, with archaeologists, numismatists and others. Such cross-fertilisation is essential to our work. The stimulating series of Fayyum congresses<sup>9</sup> or the lively Ptolemies' meetings<sup>10</sup> may be named in this context, but there are many other examples. In addition, we have our triennial professional meetings, like that in Warsaw this year; demoticists too now have their

<sup>8</sup> Besides the major projects of digitisation already mentioned, see (for example) the results of projects via the Trismegistos website (Archives; Places, etc.; LDAB is a single author project); CEDOPAL Mertens-Pack<sup>3</sup>, etc.

<sup>9</sup> (1) Würzburg 2003: S. LIPPERT & M. SCHENTULEIT (eds), *Tebtynis und Soknopaiu Nesos. Leben im römerzeitlichen Fayum*. Wiesbaden 2005. (2) Lecce 2005: M. CAPASSO & P. DAVOLI (eds), *New Archaeological and Papyrological Researches on the Fayyum* (= *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 14), Lecce 2007. (3) Freudenstadt 2007: S. LIPPERT & M. SCHENTULEIT (eds), *Graeco-Roman Fayum – Texts and Archaeology*, Wiesbaden 2008. (4) Kloster Bronnbach 2011: C. ARLT & M. STADLER (eds), *Das Fayyûm in Hellenismus und Kaiserzeit. Fallstudien zu multi-kulturellem Leben in der Antike*, Wiesbaden 2013. (5) Leipzig 2013: 'Von der Pharaonenzeit bis zur Spätantike – Kulturelle Vielfalt im Fayum'. 5. Internationale Fayum-Konferenz, 29. Mai – 01. Juni 2013, Leipzig. Volume forthcoming.

<sup>10</sup> (1) Ptolemy II (Auckland, NZ, 2005): P. MCKECHNIE & P. GUILLAUME (eds), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and His World*, Leiden and Boston 2008. (2) Ptolemies VI and VIII (Heidelberg, 2007): A. JÖRDENS & J. F. QUACK (eds), *Ägypten zwischen inneren Zwist und äusserem Druck. Die Zeit Ptolemaios' VI. bis VIII.*, Wiesbaden 2011. (3) Ptolemaic Waterways and Power (Peiraeus/Athens, 2009): K. BURASELIS, M. STEFANOÛ, & D. J. THOMPSON (eds), *The Ptolemies, the Sea and the Nile*, Cambridge 2013. (4) Ptolemy I Soter and the Transformation of Egypt 404–282 BC (Macquarie, NSW, 2011): volume forthcoming.

own congresses, as do the Arabic papyrologists.<sup>11</sup> Little time then remains for those more substantial works of individual scholarship, which require time and intellectual space. And yet, these do continue to be written, importantly so.

So much for the changing framework within which our work goes on. What of actual developments in the field of Ptolemaic *history*? To start at the centre with the rulers themselves, important recent additions to our understanding come not just from papyri but more particularly from the field of epigraphy, both Greek and Egyptian. And in this epigraphical focus, I introduce one of my main themes, which is to stress the benefit that comes from the broader view, from taking account of other specialists' work – the work of Egyptologists, demotic papyrologists, archaeologists and numismatists,<sup>12</sup> as well of course as epigraphists.

First, Egyptian inscriptions. Some recent publications of Egyptian inscriptions – texts that are often bilingual or trilingual – allow us easier access to this material with the challenges of interpretation it presents. Relations of the rulers with the temples and their priests come under the spotlight here. Some of these were already known from much earlier editions but some are excitingly new. Starting with Alexander of Macedon, a dedication from the Bahariya oasis records this new pharaoh's full titulary with his five Egyptian names. Then, carved in Greek on the side of the same stone, king Alexander (*basileus Alexandros*) makes a dedication to Ammon his father.<sup>13</sup> A date from the time of Alexander's actual visit on his journey back to Memphis from Siwah is not impossible.

Next, from 311 BC when Ptolemy son of Lagos was acting as regent, comes a new edition of the so-called Satrap stele recording a royal dona-

<sup>11</sup> The addition of the database of Arabic papyri (APD) to PN is to be welcomed.

<sup>12</sup> See, especially, C. LORBER, 'The coinage of the Ptolemies', [in:] W. E. METCALF (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, Oxford 2012, pp. 211–234, with further references; O. PICARD, C. BRESCH, T. FAUCHER *et al.*, *Les monnaies des fouilles du Centre d'Études Alexandrines: les monnayages de bronze à Alexandrie de la conquête d'Alexandre à l'Égypte moderne* (= *Études Alexandrines* 25), Alexandrie 2012.

<sup>13</sup> F. BOSCH-PUCHE, 'L"autel" du temple d'Alexandre le Grand à Bahariya retrouvé', *BIFAO* 108 (2008), pp. 29–44; 'The Egyptian royal titulary of Alexander the Great, I: Horus, Two Ladies, Golden Horus, and Throne names', *JEA* 99 (2013), pp. 131–154.

tion to the gods of Pe and Dep at the city of Buto in the Delta; from under Ptolemy II are new studies too of the Pithom and the Mendes stelae.<sup>14</sup> For Ptolemy III, besides a fresh study of the Canopus decree<sup>15</sup> we have the recent publication of a new priestly decree from just a few years earlier, from 243 BC.<sup>16</sup> The hieroglyphic and demotic versions record details of the festivals set up for the birthdays of the king and the queen and the day of celebration for the king's accession. It further illustrates the *euergesia* of Euergetes from early in his reign. This is an exciting addition to the record of priestly decrees and the study of Ptolemaic relations with the temples.<sup>17</sup>

From the reign of Ptolemy IV, a recent study of the hieroglyphic versions of the Raphia decree suggests that not just Arsinoe III but also Antiochus' queen, Laodike III, was present with her husband at that battle.<sup>18</sup> And a later queen, Kleopatra VII, is now recorded as absent 'in the land of Syria', when meeting with Antony at Tarsus, on a late demotic stele from the Mother of Apis catacombs at North Saqqara dated 15 August 41 BC.<sup>19</sup>

From the reign of Ptolemy V, the Cairo copy of the priestly decree that goes under the name of Philensis II has now received a proper edition,<sup>20</sup> and there is a new priestly stele from the reign of Ptolemy VIII

<sup>14</sup> D. SCHÄFER, *Makedonische Pharaonen und hieroglyphischen Stelen* (= *Studia Hellenistica* 50), Leuven 2011.

<sup>15</sup> S. PFEIFFER, *Das Dekret von Kanopos (238 v. Chr.). Kommentar und historische Auswertung eines dreisprachigen Synodaldekretes der ägyptischen Priester zu Ehren Ptolemaios' III. und seiner Familie* (= *APF Beiheft* 18), Leipzig 2004.

<sup>16</sup> YAHIA EL-MASRY, H. ALTENMÜLLER & H.-J. THISSEN (eds), *Das Synodaldekret von Alexandria aus dem Jahre 243 v. Chr.* (= *SAK Beiheft* 11), Hamburg 2012.

<sup>17</sup> For a recent listing, see W. CLARYSSE, 'Ptolémées et temples', [in:] D. VALBELLE & J. LECLANT (eds), *Le décret de Memphis. Colloque de la Fondation Singer-Polignac à l'occasion de la célébration du bicentenaire de la découverte de la Pierre de Rosette*, Paris 2000, pp. 42–43.

<sup>18</sup> D. KLOTZ, 'Who was with Antiochus III at Raphia? Revisiting the hieroglyphic versions of the Raphia decree (CG 31008 and 50048)', *CE* 88 (2013), pp. 45–59.

<sup>19</sup> *MoA* 46.1–2 (41 BC), ed. H. S. SMITH, C. A. R. ANDREWES & S. DAVIES, *The Sacred Animal Necropolis at North Saqqara. The Mother of Apis Inscriptions*, 2 vols, London 2011.

<sup>20</sup> MAMDOUH ELDMATY, *Ein ptolemäisches Priesterdekret aus dem Jahr 186 v. Chr. Ein neue Version von Philensis II in Kairo* (= *APF Beiheft* 20), München und Leipzig 2005.

retrieved from under the water at Heracleion.<sup>21</sup> Would that this were more legible. A collection of private priestly stelae facilitates further study of royal relations with the priests.<sup>22</sup> The Egyptian side of Ptolemaic history is filling out; the role of the priests grows clearer. And finally, on the subject of rulers, dated to year 26 = 29 of the ‘pharaoh outside Egypt’ (Ptolemy IX Soter II on Cyprus) a text long known from Saqqara has at last been published.<sup>23</sup>

The importance of publishing together Greek and Egyptian texts from the same archive was long ago recognised and practised by Professor P. W. Pestman.<sup>24</sup> The increasing frequency with which with which this is now the case is striking,<sup>25</sup> and more of the new generation of scholars have facility in both languages. We need to take account of all relevant material. Without wanting here to intrude on Sandra Lippert’s territory I should like to end this section of my survey with a trailer. An important demotic text she has identified adds to the growing evidence for Antiochus IV as ruler in Egypt after his successful invasion.<sup>26</sup> Some

<sup>21</sup> C. THIERS, *La stèle de Ptolémée VIII Évergète II à Héracléion* (= *Oxford Centre for Maritime Archaeology Monograph* 4), Oxford 2009.

<sup>22</sup> G. GORRE, *Les relations du clergé égyptien et des Lagides après les sources privées* (= *Studia Hellenistica* 45), Leuven 2009.

<sup>23</sup> J. D. RAY, *Texts from the Baboon and Falcon Galleries*, London 2011, G1.6–7 (24 Nov. 89 BC).

<sup>24</sup> E.g. *P. Recueil* (1977); *P. Batav.* (1978); *P. Zen. Pestm.* (1980); *P. Tor. Amen.* (1981); *P. Dion.* (1982); *P. Tor. Choach.* (1992); *P. Choach. Survey* (1993).

<sup>25</sup> E.g. *P. Dryton* (2002); *P. Count* (2006); *P. Sorb.* III 75–102 (2011); *P. Erbstreit* (forthcoming), all with Greek and demotic; R. MAIRS & C. J. MARTIN, ‘A bilingual “sale” of liturgies from the archive of the Theban choachytes: P. Berlin 5507, P. Berlin 3098 and P. Leiden 413’, *Enchoria* 31 (2008/9 [2010]), pp. 22–67. For mummy labels, cf. S. P. VLEEMING, *Demotic and Greek-Demotic Mummy Labels and other Short Texts (Short Texts II 278–1200)* (= *Studia Demotica* 9), 2 vols, Leuven 2011; C. ARLT, ‘Deine Seele möge leben für immer und ewig’ *Die Mumienbilder im British Museum* (= *Studia Demotica* 10), Leuven 2011. See further W. CLARYSSE, ‘Bilingual papyrological archives’, [in:] A. PAPACONSTANTINO (ed.), *The Multi-lingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the Abbasids*, Farnham and Burlington, VT, pp. 47–72.

<sup>26</sup> S. LIPPERT, ‘Like phoenix from the mummies’, [in:] LIPPERT & SCHENTULEIT (eds), *Graeco-Roman Fayum* (cit. n. 9), p. 168.



Egyptians had much to fear at this time, while others supported the Seleucid king.<sup>27</sup>

The second area I want to mention where epigraphic work is changing, or at least modifying, the historical scene is the Ptolemaic overseas empire of the third and early second centuries BC. In this context new inscriptions together with the republication of some older ones serve to modify the picture. A dedication from Methana to Arsinoe II Philadelphos now shows her as a goddess during her lifetime playing a key imperial role.<sup>28</sup> The League of Islanders has recently been presented as the work of Ptolemy II rather than of the Antigonids; the post of Pamphylarch has been delivered a deathblow, and there is more to follow.<sup>29</sup>

There is development too in our understanding of the administration and how that functioned both in theory and on the ground. New texts and studies are forever adding to our knowledge. *P. Sorbonne* III, for instance, now provides a fuller picture of the administrative units in the early exploitation of the Fayum.<sup>30</sup> Nomarchies, staffed by nomarchs and *myriarouroi*, were the units employed for the initial reclamation and irrigation of this province, an area of importance to the early Ptolemies for settling soldiers and increasing their revenues. In another recent study, the post of the royal scribe has at last received the attention it deserved.<sup>31</sup> These are just a few examples; there are many, many more.

A subject that has returned into focus in Ptolemaic studies, as indeed in studies elsewhere, is the army. Why military history should again be high on the agenda is an interesting question which I do not have time to

<sup>27</sup> See D. J. THOMPSON, 'The sons of Ptolemy V in a post-secession world', [in:] JÖRDENS & QUACK (eds), *Ägypten* (cit. n. 10), p. 11 n. 6.

<sup>28</sup> J. WALLENSTEN & J. PAKKANEN, 'A new inscribed statue base from the sanctuary of Poseidon at Kalareia', *Opuscula* 2 (2009), pp. 155–165; cf. A. MEADOWS, 'The Ptolemaic League of Islanders', [in:] BURASELIS *et al.* (eds), *The Ptolemies* (cit. n. 10), pp. 29–31.

<sup>29</sup> MEADOWS, 'The Ptolemaic League' (cit. n. 27), pp. 19–38; A. MEADOWS & P. THONEMANN, 'The Ptolemaic administration of Pamphylia', *ZPE* 186 (2013), pp. 223–226.

<sup>30</sup> W. CLARYSSE in *P. Sorb.* III, pp. 51–55.

<sup>31</sup> Ch. ARMONI, *Studien zur Verwaltung des ptolemäischen Ägypten: Das Amt des Basilikos Grammateus* (= *Pap. Colon.* 36), Paderborn 2012.

explore. For many years Lesquier's 1911 study of *Les institutions militaires* remained the standard point of reference, while for cleruchs we relied, as in some respects we still do, on the careful work of Uebel.<sup>32</sup> In recent years, however, a series of important publications has begun to modify and fill out the picture; and there are more on the way. In 1995 in a short study of the Ptolemaic army, the author pointed to the reign of Ptolemy VI as important for military change, as indeed it was in so many other respects.<sup>33</sup> Since then, we have seen the publication of some interesting texts<sup>34</sup> and discussions.<sup>35</sup> The *katoikoi hippeis*, for instance, form the subject of an important recent study.<sup>36</sup> And now at last we can recognise for what they were those problematic Persians and Persians of the *epigone* known from the second century BC on in Upper Egypt. Persians there, we learn, were military men attached to camps, while Persians of the *epigone* were military reservists not *yet* under arms or not under arms *at the time*. Furthermore, an individual's designation might change from year to year.<sup>37</sup> It is good to be able to report on at least one part of a mystery solved.

<sup>32</sup> J. LESQUIER, *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*. Paris 1911. F. UEBEL, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin (= *Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst* 3), Berlin 1968.

<sup>33</sup> N. SEKUNDA, *Seleucid and Ptolemaic Reformed Armies 168–145 BC*, vol. 2, *The Ptolemaic Army*, Stockport 1995; cf. C. FISCHER-BOVET & W. CLARYSSE, 'A military reform before the battle of Raphia?', *APF* 58 (2012), pp. 26–35. For related changes, see D. J. THOMPSON, 'Ethnic minorities in Hellenistic Egypt', [in:] O. M. VAN NIJF & R. ALSTON (eds), *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, Leuven 2011, pp. 101–117 at 109–111.

<sup>34</sup> *P. Polit. Jud.* and *P. Pbrur. Diosk.* are particularly relevant editions; cf. also, *P. Lips.* II 124 (137 BC); *P. Paramone* 10 (2nd cent. BC); S. SCHEUBLE-REITER, 'Drei Trierer Papyri zum ptolemäischen Militär', *APF* 58 (2012), pp. 246–268.

<sup>35</sup> Ch. ARMONI, 'Zum amtlichen Procedure bei der Auszahlung von Soldatenlöhnen im hellenistischer Ägypten', *P. Kramer*, pp. 12–21; S. SCHEUBLE, 'Bemerkungen zu den *μισθοφόροι* und *τακτόμισθοι* im ptolemäischen Ägypten', *P. Kramer*, pp. 213–222; K.-Th. ZAUZICH, 'Gegen die Soldaten *ἐξω τάξεων*', *Enchoria* 32 (2010/1), pp. 139–141; C. FISCHER-BOVET, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge 2014.

<sup>36</sup> S. SCHEUBLE-REITER, *Die Katökenreiter im ptolemäischen Ägypten* (= *Vestigia* 64), München 2012.

<sup>37</sup> K. VANDORPE, 'Persian soldiers and Persians of the *epigone*. Social mobility of soldiers-herdsmen in Upper Egypt', *APF* 54 (2008), pp. 87–108; 'A successful, but fragile biculturalism. The Hellenization process in the Upper Egyptian town of Pathyris under Ptolemy VI and VIII', [in:] JÖRDENS & QUACK (eds), *Ägypten* (cit. n. 10), pp. 292–308 at 305–306.

I turn now to the economic history of Hellenistic Egypt.<sup>38</sup> There are two areas here where I would identify developments – in our knowledge of taxation, together – closely related – with money<sup>39</sup> and banking, and in what I term ‘the numbers game’. Let us start with the latter, and with a question. Are we, I wonder, any closer to knowing how many people there were in Ptolemaic Egypt? Well if we are not – and I fear this may be the case – that is not for want of trying. Based on some reasonable figures for the Fayum in the later third century BC, in vol. 2 of *Counting the People* Clarysse and I came up with a plausible figure of 85–95,000 for the total population of the Arsinoite nome. We then tried to go further, ending up with the lowish figure of just 1,500,000 for the total population of Egypt in the mid third century BC.<sup>40</sup> As was to be expected, this figure has not gone unchallenged. The debate of course continues, with its implications for the strength and success of the Ptolemaic state.<sup>41</sup>

In taxation and banking matters are more secure. Préaux (1939) remains the basic study, which we still all use.<sup>42</sup> At the same time, however, new texts combined with the study of those long known is bringing greater clarity to the nature of individual taxes and to how – and when

<sup>38</sup> See J. G. MANNING, ‘The Ptolemaic economy’, [in:] W. SCHEIDEL *et al.* (eds), *The Cambridge Economic History of the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 434–459; *The Last Pharaohs. Egypt under the Ptolemies, 305–30 BC*, Princeton 2010, pp. 117–164.

<sup>39</sup> See S. VON REDEN, *Money in Ptolemaic Egypt. From the Macedonian Conquest to the End of the Third Century BC*. Cambridge 2007.

<sup>40</sup> W. CLARYSSE & D. J. THOMPSON, *Counting the People in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge 2006, vol. 2, pp. 100–103.

<sup>41</sup> See now C. FISCHER-BOVET, ‘Counting the Greeks in Egypt. Immigration in the first century of Ptolemaic rule’, [in:] C. HOLLERAN & A. PUDSEY (eds), *Demography and the Graeco-Roman World. New Insights and Approaches*, Cambridge 2011, pp. 135–154. For further discussion and bibliography, see K. MUELLER, ‘Past and present population trends in the Fayyum region’, [in:] E. SUBÍAS, P. AZARA *et al.* (eds), *The Space of the City in Graeco-Roman Egypt. Image and Reality* (= *Documenta* 22), Tarragona 2011, pp. 129–143. A. MONSON, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans. Political and Economic Change in Egypt*, Cambridge 2012, pp. 33–69, relying in part on more recent census material (on which see Mueller above) stresses the abnormally low population of the Arsinoite. W. SCHEIDEL, *Death on the Nile. Disease and the Demography of Roman Egypt*, Leiden – Boston – Köln 2001, pp. 181–250, remains a stimulating discussion.

<sup>42</sup> Cl. PRÉAUX, *L'économie royale des Lagides*, Bruxelles 1939.

– these were charged. Particularly interesting here have been studies of ostraka recording receipts for the harvest tax and other taxes from different collection points in the south. These allow us to chart in detail both changes in control of the area, especially interesting during the troubles of the second century BC, and at the same time the success (or otherwise) of the state in collecting in its dues.<sup>43</sup> There is more work still to do here but this is another area where the combination of Greek and demotic texts is crucial to the emerging picture.

An important figure for the study of banking was Professor Raymond Bogaert from Ghent.<sup>44</sup> In many aspects of the subject his was the groundwork, which lay at the base of most later work.<sup>45</sup> He would, I suspect, have been delighted at the number of relevant texts published recently. Bank texts from the Herakleopolite nome with fragments of daily registers illustrate well the complexity and bureaucratic thoroughness of a royal bank in the second century BC.<sup>46</sup> It is to be regretted that part of a composite Arsinoite register from the mid third century BC Fayum published in 2009 needed revision a couple of years later.<sup>47</sup> In that text the most interesting figure is preserved on the verso: 79 talents, 3838 drachmas, 2 obols and 1 chalkous (almost 80 talents, that is) registered as ἐκ

<sup>43</sup> K. VANDORPE, 'Paying taxes to the *thesouroi* of the Pathyrites in a century of rebellion (186–88 BC)', [in:] L. MOOREN (ed.), *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World* (= *Studia Hellenistica* 36), Leuven 2000, pp. 405–436; 'The Ptolemaic epigraphé or harvest tax (*shemu*)', *APF* 46 (2000), pp. 169–232; 'The epigraphé or harvest tax in the Apollonopolite nome', [in:] K. VANDORPE & W. CLARYSSE (eds), *Edfu, an Egyptian Provincial Capital in the Ptolemaic Period*, Brussels 2003, pp. 107–122; B. MUHS, *Receipts, Scribes, and Collectors in Early Ptolemaic Thebes (O. Taxes 2)* (= *Studia Demotica* 8), Leuven 2011.

<sup>44</sup> K. VERBOVEN, K. VANDORPE & V. CHANKOWSKI (eds), *Pistoi dia tèn technèn. Bankers, Loans and Archives in the Ancient World. Studies in Honour of Raymond Bogaert* (= *Studia Hellenistica* 44), Leuven 2008.

<sup>45</sup> See, above all, R. BOGAERT, *Trapezitica Aegyptiaca. Recueil de recherches sur la banque en Égypte gréco-romaine* (= *Papyrologica Florentina* 25), Firenze 1994.

<sup>46</sup> *P. Köln XII 480–484* (131 BC), also interesting for the dating of the civil war under Ptolemy VIII; *P. Herakl. Bank*.

<sup>47</sup> *P. Poethke 8 verso 1* (235/4 BC); cf. W. CLARYSSE, D. J. THOMPSON & L. CAPRON, 'An early Ptolemaic bank register from the Arsinoite nome revised', *APF* 57 (2011), pp. 35–54.

πάντων, 'from all sources'. Could this be the annual tax income for the Arsinoite nome? And so the questions continue ...

Finally, I reach what, in my view, has been the most significant of recent developments in historical work – a change in geographical focus. The Ptolemaic empire has already been mentioned; the posthumous publication (in English) of the broad-ranging study of our learned colleague Jan Krzysztof Winnicki on Egypt and her neighbours treats immigrants from a far wider area.<sup>48</sup> Within Egypt itself, based on the documentary record, earlier ('earlier', that is, in the longer term) we tended to generalise from the area providing most of our texts to the whole of the country – from the Fayum, that is, to Egypt as a whole. Increasingly, however, the unusual situation of the Arsinoite is being recognized,<sup>49</sup> as more texts are published from elsewhere. Recent studies have done much to promote the south in particular as an important and sometimes different area of interest and importance for the Ptolemies. Local differences are coming more to the fore and the picture is fragmenting into regional histories. Not just the south but other areas too were subject to different experiences.

I should like to illustrate this claim. From the Arsinoite nome, of course, the Zenon archive with its wealth of detailed information on so many areas of daily life has been responsible for much of what we know of early Ptolemaic Egypt. That wonderful resource is not yet *quite* exhausted.<sup>50</sup> A few more texts have been published and the numbers of documents has at the same time *decreased* as existing texts have been joined.<sup>51</sup> The publication in 2007 of eighty two Zenon texts in the Giessen collection is important for anyone sharing my interest in garlic

<sup>48</sup> J. K. WINNICKI, *Late Egypt and her Neighbours. Foreign Population in Egypt in the First Millennium BC* (= *JurP Supplements* 12), Warsaw 2009.

<sup>49</sup> D. J. THOMPSON, 'The exceptionality of the early Ptolemaic Fayum', [in:] M. CAPASSO & P. DAVOLI (eds), *New Archaeological and Papyrological Researches on the Fayyum*, Lecce 2007, pp. 303–310.

<sup>50</sup> P. IAND. ZEN. M. CAPASSO & N. PELLÉ, 'Un nuovo papiro dell'archivio di Zenone', *SEP* 6 (2009), pp. 25–27.

<sup>51</sup> See, for example, *SB* xxvi 16503–16505 (third cent BC), where texts from two or three different collections are joined.

or poppies; among other scraps of information we learn that wool could be classified as either white or self-coloured, *autochroos*.<sup>52</sup> Such subjects of course are not suited to all tastes – different items will always appeal to different readers. The Zenon archive, however, retains its fascination and, given its scale, is suitable for many different forms of analysis, as recently for instance in the study of language usage.<sup>53</sup>

Let us move out from the Fayum. The Nile valley of Middle Egypt is now opening up, especially the Herakleopolite nome. Of course this nome was already well documented, particularly through the *BGU* texts,<sup>54</sup> but the recent editions of *P.Polit.Jud.*, *P.Phrur.Diosk.* and *P.Herakl.Bank.* shed further light on the city itself, with its harbour and forts, the mixed communities of the area and its importance as a military base from the mid second century BC. The role of the Nile fleet too is becoming clearer,<sup>55</sup> and the military reinforcement of Upper Egypt. There were similar developments in the Pathyrite nome, from where important archives survive, including that of Dryton and his family now illuminatingly reunited in a recent bilingual edition (*P.Dryton*). Pathyris (or Gebelein), one day's sail south of Thebes, was also strengthened with a military settlement sometime in the period 170–165 BC.<sup>56</sup> The picture of life there and of relations between the various elements of the population that emerges from the texts differs to some degree from the situation closer to the capital.

Other nomes too have been receiving attention – texts from the Lykopolite have important things to tell us,<sup>57</sup> a bank record comes from the Antaiopolite illustrating *syntaxis* payments to the temple there,<sup>58</sup> and there are others too. The Ptolemaic Delta on the whole remains a blank,

<sup>52</sup> *P. Iand. Zen.* 70.

<sup>53</sup> T. V. EVANS & D. D. OBBINK (eds), *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford 2010.

<sup>54</sup> See M. R. FALIVENE, *The Herakleopolite Nome. A Catalogue of the Toponyms, with Introduction and Commentary* (= *ASP* 37), Atlanta, Georgia, 1998.

<sup>55</sup> *P. Phrur. Diosk.* 4 (153 BC), *dioikêtês* in charge of the Nile fleet; cf. Th. KRUSE, 'The Nile police in the Ptolemaic period', [in:] BURASELIS *et al.*, *Ptolemies* (cit. n. 10), pp. 172–184.

<sup>56</sup> K. VANDORPE & S. WAEBENS, *Reconstructing Pathyris' Archives. A Multicultural Community in Hellenistic Egypt* (= *Collectanea Hellenistica* 3), Brussels 2009, p. 20.

<sup>57</sup> E.g. *SB* XXIV 15972 (190 BC); *P. Count* 53 and 54 (second cent. BC).

<sup>58</sup> *P. Paramone* 7 (second cent. BC?).

though the tax concession on the export of grain together with the protection of his farmers allowed by Kleopatra VII to a Roman estate-holder may refer to land in the neighbourhood of Alexandria.<sup>59</sup> Large estates are recorded elsewhere in this general area.<sup>60</sup>

There are many ways in which historically the south differed from further north. The strength of the temples, continually under central pressure in this period, remained a significant feature,<sup>61</sup> and the system of land tenure and taxation was not the same as further north. Settlers were somewhat fewer. Differences have been emphasized in recent work.<sup>62</sup> I continue to be impressed, however, by how successfully the central power continued a comparable levy of taxes in all areas of the country from what would appear administratively to have been very different categories of land. (Periods of revolt of course were different.) Harvest tax (*epigraphê*), for instance, was charged on 'private land' (*gê idioktêtos*) in the Apollonopolite nome at much the same rate as was 'rent' (*ekphorion*) coming from 'crown land' (*gê basilikê*) in the Arsinoite.<sup>63</sup> Other differences in the south include materials used for writing, with ostraka<sup>64</sup>

<sup>59</sup> *P. Bingen* 45.1–7 (33 BC). Beyond the phrase *κατὰ τὴν χώραν* (ll. 6–7), the location of the estate is unstated; an Alexandrian origin for the text remains uncertain. The name of the main recipient of privileges was read as *Π...ῶι Κασσιῶ[τη]ι* in the *ed. princ.*; cf. P. VAN MINNEN, 'An official act of Cleopatra (with a subscription in her own hand)', *AncSoc* 30 (2000), pp. 29–34, suggesting Publius Canidius; K. ZIMMERMANN, '*P. Bingen* 45: Eine Steuerbefreiung für Q. Cascellius, adressiert an Kaisarion', *ZPE* 138 (2002), pp. 133–139, prefers Quintus Cascellius.

<sup>60</sup> For 'farmers' (clearly influential landholders) of the Prosopite and Boubastite nomes, see the re-edition by J. BINGEN (*CE* 70 [1995], pp. 206–214) of *C. Ord. Ptol.* 76 (41 BC).

<sup>61</sup> Memphite temples, however, were equally important, cf. D. J. THOMPSON, *Memphis under the Ptolemies*, 2nd ed., Princeton 2012, pp. 99–143.

<sup>62</sup> J. G. MANNING, *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt. The Structure of Land Tenure*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 65–125; MONSON, *Ptolemies to the Romans* (cit. n. 40), pp. 73–93; ARMONI, *Studien zur Verwaltung* (cit. n. 30), p. 243, notes that in the second cent. BC more than one nome in the south might come under the same royal scribe.

<sup>63</sup> See Th. CHRISTENSEN, 'The Edfu nome surveyed: P. Haun. inv. 407 (119–118 BC)', PhD thesis, University of Cambridge 2002. An edition of this text is almost ready for publication by Christensen together with Thompson and Vandorpe.

<sup>64</sup> See R. S. BAGNALL, *Everyday Writing in the Graeco-Roman East*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 2011, pp. 117–137.

or (at least in Pathyris)<sup>65</sup> wood employed when further north papyrus was the norm.

So Ptolemaic Egypt, it seems to me, is in the process of fragmenting. It may take some time before it all comes together again but when it does I think that our picture will to some degree be modified. At the same time, I believe, Ptolemaic history will be better incorporated into that of the wider Hellenistic world or even, I would dare to predict, into a more global historical framework.<sup>66</sup>

Dorothy J. Thompson

Girton College  
Cambridge CB3 0JG  
GREAT BRITAIN

e-mail: [djt17@cam.ac.uk](mailto:djt17@cam.ac.uk)

<sup>65</sup> E.g. *SB* xxvi 16712 (103 BC); 16713–16714 (98–88 BC); *P. Worp* 12 (99 BC); K. VANDORPE and K. A. WÖRP, 'Paying *prostimon* for new vineyard land (T. BM inv. no. EA 56920). A bilingual set of wooden tablets from the archive of Horus son of Nechouthes', *CE* 88 (2013), 105–115.

<sup>66</sup> As so often this contribution has benefitted from the helpful critique and input of Willy CLARYSSE, for which I offer my thanks.