

Gert Baetens

Demotic petitioning

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 44, 29-69

2014

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, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Gert Baetens

DEMOTIC PETITIONING*

1. INTRODUCTION

THIS ARTICLE PRESENTS THE FIRST RESULTS of a four-year project on petitioning practices in Ptolemaic Egypt, funded by the Research Foundation Flanders. Petitions are formal communications addressed to the authorities in order to obtain their support in a dispute or other extraordinary circumstances. The most conspicuous difference between what we would call petitions in antiquity and petitions today is that the latter mostly relate to general problems and are signed by a large group of unrelated people, while in antiquity petitions were written by individuals or small groups of interrelated individuals who were treated unjustly. Greek petitions have received ample attention in scholarly debate, but surprisingly not a single study on their Demotic counterparts has been

* My express gratitude goes out to Mark Depauw and Willy Clarysse for their valuable advice on various documents discussed in this paper, and to Yanne Broux for correcting my English. While writing this paper, I had access to photographs of several unpublished texts. For this opportunity I would like to thank Brigitte Bakech, Marie-Pierre Chaufray, Frédéric Colin, Christina di Cerbo, Claudio Gallazzi, Verena Lepper, Joachim Quack, Kim Ryholt, Marcela Trapani, Günter Vittmann, and Andreas Winkler. Trismegistos numbers are given for all cited papyri in this paper. They can be used on the Trismegistos website to retrieve additional information (<<http://www.trismegistos.org/>>).

written so far.¹ Moreover, many historians seem to be largely ignorant of the rich documentation they contain.² A foundation for further research on Demotic petitioning has been laid by Mark Depauw, who discusses petitions as a type of document related to letters in his monograph on the Demotic letter. Within the petitioning genre, he distinguishes memoranda (*mkmk*) from a second type of much longer and more rare petitions, and notes that *ḥn-smy* might possibly constitute a third category.³ It is beyond his scope to discuss Demotic petitions in detail, however; he only wishes to offer an overview of the existing evidence, mainly from epis-

¹ Old, but indispensable works on Greek petitions from the Ptolemaic period are: E. BICKERMANN, 'Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte. III. Ἐντευξις und ὑπόμνημα', *AfP* 9 (1930), pp. 155–182; P. COLLOMP, *Recherches sur la chancellerie et la diplomatie des Lagides* [= *Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg* 29], Paris 1926; O. GUÉRAUD, *Enteuxeis: requêtes et plaintes adressées au roi d'Égypte au III^e siècle avant J. C.* [= *Publications de la Société royale égyptienne de papyrologie, Textes et documents* 1], Cairo 1931. Anna Di Bitonto has written three articles about the formulas of Greek petitions: ANNA DI BITONTO, 'Le petizioni al re', *Aegyptus* 47 (1967), pp. 5–57; EADEM, 'Le petizioni ai funzionari nel periodo tolemaico', *Aegyptus* 48 (1968), pp. 53–107; EADEM, 'Frammenti di petizioni del periodo tolemaico', *Aegyptus* 56 (1976), pp. 109–143. More recent articles on Ptolemaic petitions are: J. HENGSTL, 'Petita in Petitionen gräko-ägyptischer Papyri', [in:] G. THÜR & Julie VÉLISSAROPOULOS-KARAKOSTAS (eds.), *Symposion 1995: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* [= *Akten der Gesellschaft für Griechische und Hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte* 11], Cologne 1997, pp. 265–289; Eftychia STAVRIANOPOULOU, 'Τοῦ δικαίου τυχεῖν, oder: Die Macht der Bitte', [in:] Christina KUHN (ed.), *Politische Kommunikation und öffentliche Meinung in der antiken Welt*, Stuttgart 2012, pp. 123–149. Finally, John Bauschatz has written a chapter on the subject in his recent monograph on the Ptolemaic police: J. BAUSCHATZ, *Law and Enforcement in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge 2013, pp. 160–217. For petitioning practice in Roman Egypt, see B. KELLY, *Petitions, Litigation, and Social Control in Roman Egypt*, Oxford 2011.

² HENGSTL, 'Petita in Petitionen' (cit. n. 1), p. 281, states that 'Griechisch ist die Sprache der Verwaltung und folglich auch der Eingaben'. Next, he gives examples of individuals that used Demotic documents for different purposes, but petitioned in Greek. BAUSCHATZ, *Law and Enforcement* (cit. n. 1), p. 188, is aware of their existence, but only one of his examples, *UPZ* I 6a (TM 3497), might be a petition. *P. Bürgsch.* 22 (TM 4452) and *P. Lille Dem.* I 4 (TM 2857) are contract sureties; *P. Bürgsch.* 16 (TM 43897) is a letter.

³ M. DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter: A Study of Epistolographic Scribal Traditions against Their Intra- and Intercultural Background* [= *Demotische Studien* 14], Sommerhausen 2006, pp. 323–332.

tolographic and formulaic point of view. This paper aims to develop a more comprehensive image of Demotic petitioning.

The focus of this article lies on the Ptolemaic period, in which an autonomous and delineated group of petitions originated in Demotic as well as Greek. A short examination of indigenous petitioning practices before the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great, however, will serve as starting point. Next an overview of Demotic petitions and related types of documents during the Ptolemaic period will be offered, and lastly, the socio-legal context of Demotic petitions will be discussed and their relation to Greek petitions in the same period. A list of Demotic petitions is added in the appendix.

2. PETITIONING BEFORE THE PTOLEMIES

It is no easy task to assess petitioning practices during the pre-Ptolemaic period. The lion's share of evidence for interpersonal disputes and their resolution during the New Kingdom originates from Deir el-Medina; evidence from other communities is rather scarce. Moreover, the interpretation of legal documents from the New Kingdom poses many difficulties. If a dispute could not be resolved in an informal way,⁴ people had the possibility to make a complaint to the authorities. Post factum records of disputes and proceedings of the court (*ḳnb.t*) often mention such complaints.⁵ Personal statements made in court have been preserved, written

⁴ Interestingly, several letters give witness to attempts to solve disputes in an informal way. Complaints are often addressed against the wrongdoer him-/herself, e.g. in O. Gardiner inv. 5 (TM 136014), where the letter writer reproaches the addressee for using other people's pots of fat. In O. Berlin inv. p. 12630 (TM 136331), a workman who did not receive his payment approaches the wife of the debtor for rectification.

⁵ Cf. Andrea G. McDOWELL, *Jurisdiction in the Workmen's Community of Deir el-Medina* [= *Egyptologische uitgaven* 5], Leiden 1990, pp. 13–14. Cf. S. ALLAM, *Das Verfahrensrecht in der altägyptischen Arbeitersiedlung von Deir el-Medineh* [= *Untersuchungen zum Rechtsleben im alten Ägypten* 1], Tübingen 1973, pp. 53–55; C. EYRE, *The Use of Documents in Pharaonic Egypt*, Oxford 2013, pp. 113–115. The verb *smi* is often encountered in this context: cf. section 3.5: 'Petitions and related genres'.

in the first person singular and recognizable by their typical introductory formulas.⁶ Long lists of charges offer an interesting insight into criminality during the New Kingdom, but their exact purpose in relation to the litigation process remains obscure.⁷ Alternatively, people could resort to oracular questions. In Deir el-Medina, several queries addressed to the deceased and divinized king Amenophis I have been found, but oracular questions from other localities are known as well.⁸ The god was consulted during processions and expressed his opinion by moving in a certain direction. Consultants could submit yes or no questions or questions with two possible answers from which the god could choose his answer. Alternative procedures existed for special cases: for instance, a list of names could be read out from which the god appointed the culprit.⁹ According to popular belief, the consulted god was capable of making correct judgments about legal affairs, and had the power to settle disputes. A clear delineation between civil jurisdiction and oracular jurisdiction probably did not exist.¹⁰

⁶ Cf. K. DONKER VAN HEEL & B. J. J. HARING, *Writing in a Workmen's Village: Scribal Practice in Ramesside Deir el-Medina* [= *Egyptologische uitgaven* 16], Leiden 2003, pp. 167–171. Cf. also A. H. GARDINER, 'The inscription of Mes. A contribution to the study of Egyptian legal procedure', *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens* 4/3 (1905), pp. 89–140.

⁷ The best-known example is P. Salt inv. 124 = P. BM inv. 10055 (TM 139327), a long list of charges against the chief-workman Paneb, probably for the attention of the vizier. Interestingly the text begins with an introduction written by the plaintiff in the first person. But often the context of such documents is more obscure, e.g. P. Turin inv. 1887 (TM 322159), a long list of charges against at least three persons, submitted by an unknown individual to an unknown authority or possibly drafted by the authorities themselves. Interestingly, separate entries in these lists are introduced through *sh3* ('memorandum'), which reminds of the *mkmk* / ὑπόμνημα format of Ptolemaic petitions (cf. section 3.1: 'mkmk').

⁸ Cf. Sandra LIPPERT, *Einführung in die altägyptische Rechtsgeschichte* [= *Einführungen und Quellentexte zur Ägyptologie* 5], Münster 2008, pp. 82–84; McDOWELL, *Jurisdiction* (cit. n. 5), pp. 107–141.

⁹ McDOWELL, *Jurisdiction* (cit. n. 5), p. 109.

¹⁰ D. KESSLER, 'Bemerkungen zur Tempel- und Gottesgerichtsbarkeit im Neuen Reich', [in:] Z. A. HAWASS, A. D. KHALED, & B. H. RAMADAN (eds.), *Scribe of Justice: Egyptological Studies in Honour of Shafik Allam*, Cairo 2011, pp. 249–263.

Still, none of the named documents give witness to petitioning *stricto sensu*. Letters seem to have served a similar function as petitions did in later periods. Nice examples can be found in the Late-Egyptian miscellanies.¹¹ They include letters in which people address complaints and requests concerning conscription, taxation, and other disputes to officials. It is not entirely clear if the documentary texts recorded in these miscellanies are authentic or fictitious, but at least they do reflect scribal practices during the New Kingdom.¹² Probably they served as model-letters, together with other examples in the miscellanies that do not contain a request.¹³ Letters with requests and complaints can be found outside the miscellanies corpus as well. In O. Chicago inv. 16991 (TM 138690), once more from Deir el-Medina, the scribe Neferhotep complains to the vizier about the failure to provide adequate income in rations for the workmen. In P. Valençay inv. 1 (TM 316913), the mayor of Elephantine writes to the chief tax-master to protest against tax claims raised by a scribe of the estate. All these documents show that there was no distinction between petitions and letters during the New Kingdom, or more accurately formulated: during the New Kingdom people could address their complaints to officials in letters.

Several Demotic letters from the Late Period include extant requests as well, but none of them seem to be of extraordinary nature; the requests they formulate are always ordinary and/or business-related. Persian rule also introduced Aramaic documentation in Egypt. The fifth-century BC archive of Jedaniah, the leader of the Jewish community of Elephantine, contains several letters and letter drafts that could be considered epistolary petitions, including the famous request to Bagavahya, governor of

¹¹ Transcriptions: A. H. GARDINER, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, Brussels 1937; translations: R. A. CAMINOS, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, London 1954. Some of them literally refer to themselves as *š^c.t*: P. Anastasi inv. 6 (TM 322162), l. 7; P. Bologna inv. 1094 (TM 322163), col. V, l. 1; P. Sallier inv. 1 (TM 322164), col. IX, l. 1. For *š^c.t* designating letters, see DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 257–258.

¹² Cf. GARDINER, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies* (cit. n. 11), p. ix; more recently F. HAGEN, 'Literature, transmission, and the Late-Egyptian miscellanies', [in:] R.J. DANN (ed.), *Current Research in Egyptology 2004. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Symposium*, Oxford 2006, pp. 84–99.

¹³ F. HAGEN, 'Literature' (cit. n. 12), p. 95.

Yehud, for a letter of recommendation to rebuild the temple in Elephantine.¹⁴

From the sixth century BC there is the famous *P. Ryl. Dem.* 9 (TM 47388) or ‘petition of Petiese’. Can this document be viewed as the first Demotic petition? The lengthy text of 25 columns can be divided into four parts.¹⁵ The first section is a report about events that took place in year 9 of Darius I and shortly thereafter; the second is an earlier report, addressed to the secretary of state (*snty*) and referred to in the first section; the third contains copies of two hieratic stelae; the fourth three hymns to Amun. Not a single part seems to be original, judging from the nature of the corrections that appear throughout the text. This curious ensemble of texts does not lend itself easily to interpretation.¹⁶ Günter Vittmann argues that the first two sections might constitute a petition which the priest Petiese wanted to submit or had submitted to a high official. The report of the second section had probably been sent to the secretary of the state earlier on, but was attached in copy to the later report copied in the first section.¹⁷ Erwin Seidl argues that this text cannot be a petition, because it contains no *petitum*.¹⁸ Vittmann, however, refers to a Greek *ἔντευξις* (UPZ I 20 = TM 3411) with two preceding drafts (UPZ I 18 and 19 = TM 3409 and 3410), of which only the second draft contains the actual *petitum*. In the final redaction (UPZ I 20) some irrelevant elements from both drafts are left out.¹⁹ According to

¹⁴ B. PORTEN & Ada YARDENI, *Textbook of Aramaic documents from Ancient Egypt I: Letters*, Jerusalem 1986, A 4.2 (TM 89406), A 4.5 (TM 89409), A 4.7 (TM 89411), A 4.8 (TM 89412).

¹⁵ G. VITTMANN, *Der demotische Papyrus Rylands 9 [= Ägypten und altes Testament 38]*, Wiesbaden 1998.

¹⁶ To some extent, the petition of Petiese might even be a fictional elaboration, rather than a real documentary text that was used as such: EYRE, *The Use of Documents* (cit. n. 5), p. 260; Jacqueline E. JAY, ‘The *Petition of Petiese* reconsidered’, [in:] F. HAIKAL (ed.), *Mélanges offerts à Ola el-Aguizy*, Cairo 2015, pp. 229–247; VITTMANN, *Der demotische Papyrus Rylands 9* (cit. n. 15), pp. ix–xiv.

¹⁷ VITTMANN, *Der demotische Papyrus Rylands 9* (cit. n. 15), pp. 678–686. Cf. EYRE, *The Use of Documents* (cit. n. 5), pp. 259–260.

¹⁸ E. SEIDL, *Ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte der Saiten- und Perserzeit [= Ägyptologische Forschungen 20]*, Glückstadt 1968 (2nd ed.), p. 8.

¹⁹ Cf. U. WILCKEN, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit I*, Berlin 1927, pp. 187–188.

Vittmann, *P. Ryl. Dem.* 9 might possibly be a similar preliminary petition draft, to which an explicit *petitum* was meant to be added in a later stage: implicitly, a clear request (for certain rights to offering endowments) emanates from the text, a claim that is moreover further supported by the copies of the two stelae in the third section.²⁰ Another possibility is that the first report was a copy of an earlier submitted report rather than a draft as well. In this case, *P. Ryl. Dem.* 9 might have been conceived as a family chronicle, or as a source collection, gathered with the intention of drafting a petition. In any case, the text does not conform in any way to the epistolary complaints of the earlier pharaonic period, nor to the petitions encountered under Ptolemaic rule.

3. PETITIONS AND RELATED DOCUMENTS DURING THE PTOLEMAIC PERIOD

1. *mḳmḳ*

The Ptolemies introduced new, autonomous types of Greek petitions in Egypt: ἐντεύξεις, ὑπομνήματα, and προσαγγέλματα (partly overlapping with the previous type). The majority of Greek petitions is written in the form of memoranda (ὑπομνήματα). It has long been recognized that the *mḳmḳ* (noun derived from the verb *mḳmḳ*, ‘to think, to consider’)²¹ is the Egyptian counterpart of the ὑπόμνημα.²² These Demotic memoranda are

²⁰ VITTMANN, *Der demotische Papyrus Rylands 9* (cit. n. 15), pp. 684–692. The hymns recorded in the last part of the papyrus, on the other hand, seem to have no judicial relevance at all. It must also be noted that even UPZ I 18 was conceived as a formalized petition from the start, whereas the first section of *P. Ryl. Dem.* 9 was not.

²¹ Where it is written with the *kʹ* sign, *mḳmḳ* has often been transliterated as *mkmk*. But Vittmann has shown that the *kʹ* sign should be transliterated as *ḳ* here: G. VITTMANN, ‘Zum Gebrauch des *kʹ*-Zeichens im Demotischen’, *Studi di Egittologia e di antichità puniche* 15 (1996), pp. 1–12.

²² The *mḳmḳ P. Bürgsch.* 13 (TM 5858) is a literal translation from the Greek ὑπόμνημα *P. Eleph.* 27 (TM 5858). The *mḳmḳ P. Bürgsch.* 13 bis A (TM 2789) is explicitly designated as

the ideal starting-point for an examination of Demotic petitioning practice during Ptolemaic rule.²³

The typical prescripts of these documents make them easy to recognize: most commonly $w^c m\dot{k}m\dot{k} n$ (addressee = A) $n-dr.\dot{t}$ (sender = s) or $w^c m\dot{k}m\dot{k} n-dr.\dot{t} s n A$. The first, inversed prescript with the name of the receiver preceding the name of the sender was adopted under influence of the Greek $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\nu\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$,²⁴ but in Demotic it was not used exclusively. Several less frequently attested variants of these formulas exist as well.²⁵

<i>Formula</i>	<i>Attestations</i>
$w^c m\dot{k}m\dot{k} n A n-dr.\dot{t} s$ (‘a memorandum to A from s’)	<i>O. Hor</i> 26 (TM 48993), 31 (TM 48438); <i>P. BM Siut</i> inv. 10591 v ^o , cols. I–II (TM 53821), 10599 (TM 48653), 10600 (TM 44188); <i>P. Fitzhugh Dem.</i> inv. 2 (TM 51409); <i>P. München BSB</i> inv. 5 (TM 45930); ²⁶ <i>P. Oxf. Griffith</i> 39 (TM 48545), 40 (TM 48880); <i>P. Syrac.</i> inv. 262 (TM 316183); ²⁷ <i>P. Tebt. Dem.</i> SCA inv. 5169.5, 8334, 8342, 8448 ²⁸

a $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\nu\eta\mu\alpha$ in its Greek subscription: cf. W. SPIEGELBERG, *Demotische Papyrus von der Insel Elephantine* [= *Demotische Studien* 2], Milan 1908, pp. 12, 15.

²³ Many short Demotic notes that evade strict classification are commonly called ‘memoranda’ as well, e.g. in G. R. HUGHES, B. P. MUHS, & S. VINSON, *Catalog of Demotic Texts in the Brooklyn Museum* [= *Oriental Institute Communications* 29], Chicago 2005, pp. 2–3. But in the present paper I use the word ‘memorandum’ in a more strict sense, namely to refer to a group of documents that literally refers to itself as such: the Demotic $m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$ and Greek $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\nu\eta\mu\alpha$. Because of this confusion WT. Brooklyn inv. 16.649 (= *P. Brookl. Dem.* 5 = TM 69352) is wrongly listed as a $m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$ in DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 325.

²⁴ For the inversed prescript of Greek $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\nu\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$, cf. DI BITONTO, ‘Le petizioni ai funzionari’ (cit. n. 1), p. 62. I know of only one Demotic letter with a similar inversed arrangement, in its exterior address: *P. Cair.* III 50069 (TM 46709).

²⁵ Reworked version of DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 326–327.

²⁶ To be published by the present author and Pierre-Luc Angles. The text was already described in N. REICH, ‘Aus der Sammlung der demotischen Papyri in der Kgl. Bayerischen Hof- und Staatsbibliothek zu München’, *WZKM* 25 (1911), p. 316, n. 5.

²⁷ Cf. G. BAETENS & M. DEPAUW, ‘A Demotic petition about the misconduct of an official in the Papyrus Museum in Syracuse (P. Syrac. 262)’, *ZPE* 197 (2016), pp. 191–194

²⁸ The unpublished memoranda P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 4579.12, 4679.11, 5169.5, 5930.3, 8334, 8342, and 8448 were found during the Italian-French excavations in Tebtynis, super-

<i>Formula</i>	<i>Attestations</i>
$w^c m\dot{k}m\dot{k} i.ir-hr \Lambda n-dr.t s$ (‘a memorandum to Λ from s ’)	<i>O. Hor</i> I (TM 48969), 2I (TM 48988)
$[w^c] b\dot{3}k m\dot{k}m\dot{k} r dy s n \Lambda n-dr.t s^{29}$ (‘a document of memorandum to give to Λ from s ’)	<i>P. Cair.</i> II 30976 r ^o (TM 567) ³⁰
$w^c m\dot{k}m\dot{k} n-dr.t s n \Lambda$ (‘a memorandum from s to Λ ’)	<i>P. Lille Dem.</i> II4 (TM 44438); <i>P. Loeb</i> 53 (TM 48851); <i>P. Oxf. Griffith</i> 37 (TM 46947), 38 (TM 48879), 4I (TM 48881), <i>P. Oxf. Griffith</i> [unregistered <i>tomos synkollesimos</i>], r ^o col. II; ³¹ most probably originally in <i>P. Loeb</i> 40 (TM 48850) and 66 (TM 48852) ³²
$w^c m\dot{k}m\dot{k} n-dr.t s i.ir-hr \Lambda$ (‘a memorandum from s to Λ ’)	<i>P. Cair.</i> II 3122I (TM 44349)

vised by Claudio Gallazzi. They will be published in the near future and will receive a Trismegistos number at that point of time. *P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv.* 4579.12, 4679.11, and 5930.3 probably contain the same prescript, but are very fragmentary: cf. Christina DI CERBO, ‘Neue demotische Texte aus Tebtynis. Überblick zu den demotischen Papyri der italienisch/französischen Ausgrabung in Tebtynis aus den Jahren 1997–2000’, [in:] F. HOFFMANN & H.-J. THISSEN (eds.), *Res Severa Verum Gaudium: Festschrift für Karl-Theodor Zauzich zum 65. Geburtstag am 8. Juni 2004* [= *Studia Demotica* 6], Leuven 2004, pp. 117–118.

²⁹ Wrongly read [...] $p^3 m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$ by the editor: W. SPIEGELBERG, *Die demotischen Denkmäler* II.2: *Die demotischen Papyrus. Text* [= *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire* 39], Strasbourg 1908, pp. 210–211.

³⁰ According to Ursula Kaplony-Heckel, this fragment belongs to the same papyrus as *P. Cair.* II 30975 and 30987 (cf. TM 567): Ursula KAPLONY-HECKEL, ‘Der demotische Papyrus Loeb 80 und ein Überblick über die demotischen Gebelein-Briefe und -Verwaltungsschreiben’, [in:] R. DE SMET, H. MELAERTS, & Cecilia SAERENS (eds.), *Papyri in Honorem Johannis Bingen Octogenarii (P. Bingen)* [= *Studia Varia Bruxellensia ad Orbem Graeco-latinum Pertinentia* 5], Leuven 2000, p. 192.

³¹ An unregistered *tomos synkollesimos* from the Soknopaiou Nesos archive, kept in the Ashmolean Museum. The second sheet of the preserved part of the *tomos* (identified as sheet 108 in the heading of the text) is an unpublished $m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$, which the priests of Soknopaiou Nesos addressed to NN son of Herieus, the *lesonis*. Carolin Arlt is currently examining these texts.

³² They seem to be copies of the same text as *P. Loeb* 53; cf. DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 326.

<i>Formula</i>	<i>Attestations</i>
$w^c b^3k m\dot{k}m\dot{k} n-dr.\dot{t} s n \Delta$ (‘a document of memorandum from s to A’)	<i>P. Bürgsch.</i> 13 bis A & bis B (TM 44604)
$w^c b^3k m\dot{k}m\dot{k} n-dr.\dot{t} s i.ir-hr \Delta$ (‘a document of memorandum from s to A’)	O. Strasbourg Dem. inv. 246 (TM 316909) ³³
$n \Delta w^c b^3k m\dot{k}m\dot{k} n-dr.\dot{t} s$ (‘to A a document of memorandum from s’)	<i>P. Bürgsch.</i> 13
$w^c m\dot{k}m\dot{k} n-dr.\dot{t} s r dy s n \Delta$ (‘a memorandum from s to give to A’)	P. Berlin inv. 15592, ll. 20–29; ³⁴ P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 1 (TM 51408); WT. Zürich inv. 1894 (TM 51507)
$p^3 b^3k m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$ ³⁵ (‘a document of memorandum’)	<i>P. Berl. Dem.</i> III 13567 (TM 48634)

Some texts with a different prescript or no prescript at all can yet be identified as $m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$. P. BM Siut inv. 10598 (TM 43409) is introduced by the epistolary prescript $s p^3 nty \underline{dd} n \Delta$ (‘s is the one who speaks to A’).³⁶ Apart from this, the text is a standard petition and is referred to as $m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$ (l. 16). O. Ifao Edfou Dem. inv. 632 (TM 128947) is a draft for a petition to the *strategos*. The expressions $gm^c m-\dot{s} n-dr.\dot{t}$ (‘harmed exceedingly by’, l. 3) and $iw=f hpr iw=s hs$ (‘if it happens that it pleases’, l. 6) clearly indicate that this is a draft for a $m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$ (cf. next paragraph). Curiously

³³ To be published by the Arpèges research group. The name of the addressee of this text (*3trstyks*) is puzzling, probably a faulty transcription of Aristodikos. His function is not known.

³⁴ To be published by the present author and Mark Depauw. The text is mentioned in Ursula KAPLONY-HECKEL, ‘Theben-Ost III. Die *r-rh=w*-Tempel-Quittungen und ähnliche Texte. Erster Teil: Allgemeiner Teil und Texte Nr. 18–25’, *ZÄS* 128 (2001), p. 30. Curiously, this $m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$ mentions two senders (husband and wife) and two addressees (brother and sister) in its prescript. The precise nature of the request of this $m\dot{k}m\dot{k}$ is unclear.

³⁵ No mention of sender or addressee, because this document is a draft with keywords only.

³⁶ Cf. DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 144–147, for this epistolary formula.

enough, however, the text is introduced by *n-dr.t s m-b:h* A ('from s before A').³⁷ This prescript never appears as such in other texts. On the other hand, the formula *n-dr.t s* ('from s'), without indication of the addressee, is used in some Demotic documents.³⁸ Lastly, *UPZ* I 6a (TM 3497) and *P. Freib.* IV 75 (TM 2515) can probably also be identified as *mkmk*, although their prescripts are lost. The first is a copy of a complaint that was kept by Ptolemaios, *katochos* in the Serapeion. Its tone and similarity to two Greek *ὑπομνήματα* from the same archive (*UPZ* I 5 and 6 = TM 3396 and 3397) suggest that this document is probably a memorandum, originally introduced by *w^c (b:k) mkmk* as well.³⁹ *P. Freib.* IV 75 is a text consisting of four fragments, in which the beer-seller Ameneus seeks redress for being thrown out of his brewery. The narrative of this text reminds strongly of memoranda and its lost prescript may very well have been a *mkmk*-formula. The only typical formula of the text that has been preserved, however, is *iw=s hs* ('if it pleases'), which appears in letters as well (cf. next paragraph). *P. Berlin* inv. 13608, col. b, a report about the murder of a soldier by Egyptian rebels, introduced by *n-dr.t s*, has been identified by Mark Depauw as a copy of a *mkmk*. But in fact it does not contain any request, nor any formal feature typical of memoranda,

³⁷ D. DEVAUCHELLE & Ghislaine WIDMER, 'Un brouillon au stratège (O. Ifao Edfou D 632)', [in:] Isabelle RÉGEN & F. SERVAJEAN (eds.), *Verba Manent. Recueil d'études dédiées à Dimitri Meeks [= Cahiers de l'ENIM (CENIM) 3]*, Montpellier 2009, pp. 83–96. Remains of an earlier draft (TM 128946) with only a few signs remaining are still visible beneath the current text.

³⁸ The formula *n-dr.t s* appears in two letters (*P. Bürgsch.* 17 [TM 43898]; *P. Claude* inv. 2 [TM 44928]), a tender for tax farming (*P. Oxf. Griffith* 53 [TM 45613]), a draft for a report giving advice concerning a petition (*P. BM Suit* inv. 10591 v^o, col. III [TM 53822]), a report about a murder (*P. Berlin* inv. 13608, col. b [TM 308]), and several notes on ostraka in the archive of Hor (*O. Hor* 2 [TM 48970], 12 [TM 48979], 16 [TM 48983], 17 [TM 48984], 19 [TM 48986], 22 [TM 48989], 23 [TM 48990], 24 [TM 48991], 25 [TM 48992], 28 [TM 48995], 29 [TM 48996], 30 [TM 48997], 48 [TM 49014]); cf. DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 154, 331.

³⁹ Most recent edition: W. CLARYSSE, '*UPZ* I 6a, a reconstruction by Revillout', *Enchoria* 14 (1986), pp. 43–49. Depauw puts *UPZ* I 6a in his list of Demotic memoranda as well: DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 325. Bauschatz views this text as a translation from Greek, but I cannot find any reason for this: BAUSCHATZ, *Law and Enforcement* (cit. n. 1), p. 188.

so it seems better to interpret it as an ordinary notification.⁴⁰ Depauw also identified *P. Cair.* II 30960 (TM 552) as a *mkmk*, but this document might be reinterpreted as a letter (cf. section 3.5: ‘Petitions and related genres’).

Complaints in Demotic memoranda can be introduced by a formula with the verb *gm^c* (‘to harm’),⁴¹ closely resembling narrations in Greek petitions introduced by ἀδικουμαι ὑπὸ τοῦ δέινος (‘I have been wronged by NN’).⁴² More often the exposition of Demotic memoranda is introduced through the date, *hpr* + date (‘it happened in [date] that ...’), or *n-dr.t hpr=f* (‘Since it happened that ...’).⁴³ The construction *hpr* + date was one of the most common ways to introduce the exposition in letters as well, especially business letters.⁴⁴ Several Demotic memoranda introduce their requests with the verb *tbh* (‘to beg’),⁴⁵ in most cases followed by the conditional formula *iw=f hpr iw=s hs* (‘if it happens that it pleases’) or just *iw=s hs*, (‘if it pleases’),⁴⁶ after which the specific request is stated. This reminds of standard Greek petitioning formulas like δέομαι οὖν σου, εἴ

⁴⁰ The other columns of this papyrus contain land records, accounts, etc. The whole has been interpreted as a ‘Tagebuch der staatlichen Verwaltung’ by Kaplony-Heckel: Ursula KAPLONY-HECKEL, ‘Demotische Verwaltungsakten aus Gebelein: Der große Berliner Papyrus 13608’, *ZÄS* 121 (1994), pp. 75–91. The notification of murder that is recorded in col. b must have been relevant for the book-keeper.

⁴¹ *tw=y gm^c n-dr.t x* (‘I am wronged by x’) in *P. BM Siut inv. 10598, 10599, 10600*; *x gm^c r-hr=y* (‘x is wronging me’) in *P. Syrac. 262*; *x gm^c hr=y m-š* (‘x is wronging me exceedingly’) in *P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 2*.

⁴² This Greek formula is typical for Greek ἐντεύξεις, but appears in many ὑπομνήματα as well: DI BITONTO, ‘Le petizioni ai funzionari’ (cit. n. 1), pp. 68–70.

⁴³ Cf. DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 328.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 277.

⁴⁵ There are several variants on the same formula: *tw=y/n tbh n-im=s* (‘I beg it’); *tw=y/n tbh n-im=s n-mtw=k/tn* (‘I/we beg it from you’); *iw=n tbh n.im=s* (‘while we beg it’). Demotic memoranda with this formula are *P. Berlin inv. 15592*, ll. 20–29; *P. BM Siut inv. 10591 v^o*, cols. I–II, 10598, 10599, 10600; *P. Bürgsch. 13*; *P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 2*; *P. Oxf. Griffith 40*; *P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 8448*.

⁴⁶ *iw=f hpr iw=f hs* in *O. Ifao Edfou Dem. inv. 632*; *P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 2*; *P. Lille Dem. 114*; *P. Oxf. Griffith 40*; *P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 8448*. *iw=s hs* in *P. BM Siut inv. 10591 v^o*, cols. I–II, and *P. Freib. IV 75*.

σοι δοκεῖ ('so I beg you, if it pleases you').⁴⁷ The request formula with *tbh* and attenuating formula with *hs* appear regularly in Demotic letters as well, but are never combined there.⁴⁸ In Demotic memoranda, on the other hand, they are almost consistently joined into a single formula, clearly influenced by Greek petitioning convention. Lastly, Demotic memoranda are closed with *sh* ('written'), often followed by the date and sometimes the name of the petitioner. They do not contain a final salutation like Greek petitions do (ἔρρωσο or εὐτύχει, 'farewell').⁴⁹

Structurally, the influence of Greek ὑπόμνημα petitions on their Demotic counterparts is manifest: they are compact messages, focusing on a specific grievance and composed with a prescript with the address (in several cases inversed like in Greek petitions),⁵⁰ a narration of events, and lastly a *petitum*, introduced by a similar set of polite formulas. They never contain an exterior address. Petitions of this kind are not known from the pre-Ptolemaic period. Most elementary formulas used in Demotic memoranda, however, appear in Demotic letters as well: the exposition through *hpr* + date, the request formulas using *tbh* and *hs* (separately) and the closing formulas with *sh*.⁵¹

⁴⁷ For variants of this formula, see DI BITONTO, 'Le petizioni ai funzionari' (cit. n. 1), pp. 71–74.

⁴⁸ *tbh* was already used in Demotic requests before the Ptolemaic period: DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 268. *hw=f hpr hw=s hs* superseded the earlier formula *hw=f hpr r mr=w s*: DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 265–267. A similar conditional formula appears in official Aramaic requests: P. E. DION, 'La lettre araméenne passe-partout et ses sous-espèces', *Revue biblique* 89 (1982), p. 50.

⁴⁹ In P. BM Siut inv. 10591 v^o, cols. I–II, a Greek salutation was translated in Demotic (cf. section 4: 'Socio-legal context'). In P. Bürgsch. 13 a list of autographs by the petitioners and family members standing surety is added; in P. Oxf. Griffith 38 a list of five people who have witnessed the violence.

⁵⁰ A notable structural difference between the Demotic and Greek petitioning prescript is that the word *mkmk* is included in the prescript during all centuries, while the word ὑπόμνημα has completely disappeared from it from the second half of the third century onwards.

⁵¹ Another example of epistolary influence on Demotic memoranda is the expression *p³ shn nfr st ir-rh s* ('the good decision, may it be known') in P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 2. For difficulties concerning the interpretation and translation of this formula, see DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 231–235.

Ordinary memoranda without petitioning function could also be called *ὑπομνήματα* (literally ‘reminders’) in Greek. Except for their pre-script, these documents have little in common with the petition – *ὑπόμνημα*.⁵² Similar ordinary memoranda can be found among the Demotic *mkmk*:

1. Neither the contents nor the used phrases of *O. Hor* 1 and 21 from the archive of the oneirocritic Hor allow identifying them as petitions. *O. Hor* 21 is a *mkmk* to the priests of the animal necropolis of North Saqqara about the role which the author had in the reforms that were proposed to put a stop to the abuses in the ibis sanctuary. *O. Hor* 1 is another memorandum to (presumably the same) priests in which the seer recounts a divine revelation of his concerning the royal dynasty and the war with Antiochos IV Epiphanes. Requests do not appear in these *mkmk* and they do not really make a complaint either. It is possible, however, that these documents were intended to collect material for the drafting of a petition in a later stage.

2. It is uncertain whether *O. Hor* 31 belongs to the same archive as the previous two documents, but it is clear that this *mkmk* did not serve a petitioning function either: the text does not contain a request and refers to the wife of the addressee.

3. *P. Loeb* 40, 53, and 66, three copies of one and the same text,⁵³ are applications for enrolment in the desert guard. They cannot be classified as petitions, because they cannot be linked to genuine grievances or other extraordinary circumstances.

4. The unpublished *mkmk* documents O. Strasbourg Dem. inv. 246 and P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 8334 seem to be business letters rather than petitions.

All above documents are listed separately in the appendix as ordinary ‘memoranda’ and are not examined any further in the following argumentation. In many cases, however, it is difficult to determine whether

⁵² BICKERMANN, ‘Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte III’ (cit. n. 1), pp. 165–166, 169–170. He gives several examples of *ὑπομνήματα* without petitioning function from the Zenon archive.

⁵³ DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 326.

a *mḳmḳ* should be viewed as a petition or as an ordinary memorandum. This is especially true for the more fragmentary texts, but also for a couple of completely preserved *mḳmḳ*. *P. Oxf. Griffith* 38, 39, and 41 are all complaints but do not make an explicit request. In the first document, the petitioner writes to the *lesonis* that he has received a beating from a colleague, and says that he submits this *mḳmḳ* ‘for the investigation of the named business’ (*r pʹ šn nʹ md.w rn=w*). The second document contains a complaint about the misconduct of the *lesonis* Tesenouphis, submitted to the prophet of Bastet in order to prevent anything in the world from being hidden to him (*r tm dy ḥp md (n) pʹ tʹ (n) pʹ ḥm-ntr B:st.t*). Lastly, the petitioners of *P. Oxf. Griffith* 41 state that they submit their *mḳmḳ* to prevent being accused themselves. Should such documents be considered petitions or not? Perhaps a detailed re-examination of the Greek material can shed more light on the classification of such documents.

2. Demotic petitions addressed to the king?

So there is ample evidence for Demotic counterparts of *ὑπομνήματα* – petitions. Beside these, some 250 *ἐντεύξεις* addressed to the king have been preserved in Greek.⁵⁴ This leads to the question if petitions to the king could be written in Demotic as well. If Plutarch’s statement that Cleopatra VII was the first Ptolemaic ruler who made the effort to learn the native language is to be believed,⁵⁵ Demotic petitions would have had a very small chance of success when read by the king. They might have been processed by his representatives (the *strategoī* and the *chrematistai*), like many Greek *ἐντεύξεις*, but these officials were traditionally recruited from the Greek population as well. Still, a small number of Demotic texts

⁵⁴ Estimate based on a search in the Trismegistos database. Many of these petitions were processed by the nome *strategoī* and *chrematistai* courts, who represented the royal jurisdiction. For the processing of *ἐντεύξεις*, see BICKERMANN, ‘Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte III’ (cit. n. 1), pp. 162–164; HENGSTL, ‘Petita in Petitionen’ (cit. n. 1), pp. 270–271; H. J. WOLFF, *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer* [= *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte* 44], Munich 1971 (2nd ed.), pp. 9–18.

⁵⁵ Plutarch, *Life of Antony* 27.

has been identified in the past as petitions to the sovereign. A closer examination of these documents is necessary.

Adel Farid argues that stela 1962-500 from the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford (TM 53705) records a Demotic petition to a Ptolemaic king or Roman emperor. According to him the priests of Damanhur initially submitted their petition to an official called Ammonios (possibly a *strategos* or prefect). Next, Ammonios added his personal commentary to the request of the priests and forwarded the entire matter to the king (or emperor) in a new petition.⁵⁶ But this interpretation has been criticized by other scholars. First, Mark Depauw has challenged Farid's view that the text might originate from the Roman period.⁵⁷ Second, Sven Vleeming has proposed several new readings that discredit Farid's interpretation of the text as a petition.⁵⁸ Even apart from these discussed readings it seems untenable to identify the text as a petition, let alone a petition to the king. When Ptolemaic officials passed on the decision concerning petitions to higher levels of the administration, i.e. the king himself according to Farid, they did not write a new, amended petition, but a letter to which they attached a copy of the original petition in question.⁵⁹ The text refers to itself as *hrw-bʿk* (l. 1). *bʿk* means 'of the servant' here and is added to *hrw* in order to be polite. *hrw* is often translated as 'plea' or 'request' because of its use in oracular questions and the report of the Siut trial (P. BM Siut inv. 10591 r^o [TM 43343]), where the word denotes the separate speeches delivered by the plaintiff and the defendant.⁶⁰ Conse-

⁵⁶ A. FARID, *Fünf demotische Stelen aus Berlin, Chicago, Durham, London und Oxford mit zwei demotischen Türinschriften aus Paris und einer Bibliographie der demotischen Inschriften*, Berlin 1995, pp. 77-134, especially 133-134.

⁵⁷ M. DEPAUW, review of A. Farid, *Fünf demotische Stelen* (cit. n. 56), *BiOr* 57 (2000), p. 280.

⁵⁸ S. P. VLEEMING, *Some Coins of Artaxerxes and Other Short Texts in the Demotic Script Found on Various Objects and Gathered from Many Publications [= Studia Demotica 5]*, Leuven 2001, pp. 101-108.

⁵⁹ BICKERMANN, 'Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte III' (cit. n. 1), pp. 174-176.

⁶⁰ See FARID, *Fünf demotische Stelen* (cit. n. 56), p. 84, for different translations offered by scholars for the word *hrw*. The pleas in the Siut trial were not pronounced by the litigants themselves, but by the scribe of the judges: P. BM Siut inv. 10591, col. VI, ll. 9-10. More-

quently, Farid translates *ḥrw-bʿk m-bʿḥ Pr-ʿ* as ‘Eingabe des Untertans vor dem Pharao’. But *ḥrw* must have had a much more general meaning, because it can denote ordinary letters as well. Mark Depauw and Karl-Theodor Zauzich have translated the term as ‘voice’ (most literally) or ‘communication’, and this seems more appropriate.⁶¹ The Ashmolean Museum stela must probably be interpreted as an ordinary report, which Ammonios (probably a high official such as a *strategos*) wrote to the king. In this report he informs the king about the arrangements he made following a petition by the priests of Damanhur. The priests engraved this communication on a stela to make the decisions which Ammonios took in their benefit public to all.

Farid refers to the archive of Hor for other Demotic petitions to the king.⁶² *O. Hor* 3 (TM 47824), 7 (TM 48974), 27 (TM 48994), 28, and 29 are reports addressed to Philometor about the abuses in the ibis sanctuary and the divine revelation of Hor about the royal dynasty and the war with Antiochos IV Epiphanes. None of them contain a request, however, nor any formal characteristics that would suggest that they are petitions. Moreover, it must have been absolutely unacceptable to send a potsherd to the king. These ostraka are most certainly drafts, and there is no conclusive evidence that their final purpose was the composition of a petition.

Lastly, Wilhelm Spiegelberg has identified *P. Cair.* II 31057 (TM 609 + 610) as a Demotic petition to the king, on the basis of his reconstruction of the first line of the recto: [*tʷ=y tḥḥ*] *n-im=s mʷ=k Pr-ʿ* (‘I beg it from you, Pharaoh’).⁶³ Unfortunately, the text is very fragmentary. Even if his emendation is correct, *tʷ=y tḥḥ* can also be part of a simple report or letter to the king. Moreover, it is not entirely certain whether the original

over, they cite each other literally and extensively. All this shows that the consecutive pleas before the *laokritai* must have been submitted in writing some time before the hearing.

⁶¹ DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 131, n. 268, p. 258; K.-T. ZAUZICH, *Papyri von der Insel Elephantine [= Demotische Papyri aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin 1]*, Berlin 1978: P. Berlin inv. 13544, 13547, and 15527. Depauw notes that in the body of a letter *ḥrw* normally refers to legally valid depositions.

⁶² FARID, *Fünf demotische Stelen* (cit. n. 56), pp. 123–124.

⁶³ Drawings and transliteration of *P. Cair.* II 31057 in SPIEGELBERG, *Die demotischen Denkmäler* (cit. n. 29), pp. 244–245.

version of the text was also Demotic. Ursula Kaplony-Heckel writes that *P. Cair.* II 31020 (TM 609 + 610) is a fragment of the same text.⁶⁴ The verso of this second fragment records an official Greek document, wrongly identified by Spiegelberg as a petition;⁶⁵ on the recto of this fragment, eight line endings of a Demotic text can be discerned. On the verso of *P. Cair.* II 31057, five line endings of Greek have been preserved, next to the Demotic text; perhaps they belong to the same Greek document as recorded on the verso of *P. Cair.* II 31020. The Greek writing at least shows that the papyrus must originate from a bilingual environment. Therefore, it is conceivable that the Demotic communication to the king recorded on the recto of *P. Cair.* II 31057 is a translation. In any case it has to be a copy or a draft, as is evident from the fact that the papyrus contains several other texts as well. Altogether, the identification of this text as a Demotic petition to the king seems implausible.

Other evidence pleads against the existence of an autonomous Demotic counterpart of the Greek *ἐντεῦξεις*. In the *mkmk* *P. Oxf. Griffith* 39, five royal farmers from Soknopaiou Nesos (who probably also had priestly functions) complain to an important prophet about the misconduct of the *lesonis* Tese-nouphis. Greek petitions concerning this dispute have been preserved too: *P. Amb.* II 33 (TM 8669; addressed to the king), 34 a+b (TM 8670; addressed to the *epimeletes* and the royal scribe), c (TM 8671; addressed to the king), and d (TM 8672; probably also addressed to the *epimeletes* and the royal scribe).⁶⁶ This collection suggests that it was acceptable to write a Demotic petition to an Egyptian priest, but not to the Ptolemaic king or Greek officials. In P. BM Siut inv. 10591 v^o, cols. I–II, a Demotic translation of a Greek *ὑπόμνημα* (cf. section 4: ‘Socio-legal context’) to the *strategos* Noumenios, the petitioners refer to previous memorandum – petitions that they have

⁶⁴ KAPLONY-HECKEL, ‘Der demotische Papyrus Loeb 80’ (cit. n. 30), p. 192.

⁶⁵ SPIEGELBERG, *Die demotischen Denkmäler* (cit. n. 29), p. 228. Part of an eponymous dating, which never appears in a petition, has been preserved in ll. 2 and 3.

⁶⁶ Cf. Marie-Pierre CHAUFRAY, ‘Des *lésônes* en action dans le temple de Soknopaios à Soknopaiou Nésos à l’époque ptolémaïque’, [in:] Patrizia PIACENTINI & C. ORSENIGO (eds.), *Egyptian Archives: Proceedings of the First Session of the International Congress Egyptian Archives / Egyptological Archives, Milano, September 9–10, 2008* [= *Quaderni di Acme* 111], Milan 2009, pp. 160–163, 167–168.

written to Noumenios and a petition to the king that he has delegated to the same *strategos* (col. I, ll. 12–13). While the first type of petitions (*ὑπομνήματα*) is referred to as *mkmk* in Demotic, the second (*ἐντετυξίς*) is literally transliterated as *ʾntks*: an autonomous Demotic term for petitions to the king did not exist.

3. *ʿn-smy*: Demotic counterpart of the Greek προσάγγελμα?

Next, the question arises if there was a Demotic equivalent for the Greek *προσάγγελμα*. The *προσαγγέλματα* form the third and smallest category of Greek petitions. Originally, they were short notifications to the police and other local officials, mostly concerning violations of and damages caused to personal property.⁶⁷ These early *προσαγγέλματα* do not contain an explicit request for action. From the second century onwards, *προσαγγέλματα* gradually take on the form of *ὑπομνήματα* – petitions, including an explicit *petitum*, which makes it increasingly difficult to distinguish between both types of texts.⁶⁸ Mark Depauw has suggested that the Demotic *ʿn-smy* might perhaps constitute a Demotic parallel to the Greek *προσάγγελμα*.⁶⁹ In most cases, *ʿn-smy* is used as verb, meaning ‘to report’,⁷⁰ ‘to summon (for payment)’,⁷¹ or ‘to announce (someone)’.⁷² In other documents *ʿn-smy* appears as

⁶⁷ For *proselmata*, see M. HOMBERT & Claire PRÉAUX, ‘Recherches sur le *proselma* à l’époque ptolémaïque’, *CdÉ* 17 (1942), pp. 259–286; Marilyn PARCA, ‘*Proselmata* ptolémaïques: une mise à jour’, *CdÉ* 60 (1985), pp. 240–247.

⁶⁸ DI BITONTO, ‘Le petizioni ai funzionari’ (cit. n. 1), pp. 53–56; HOMBERT & PRÉAUX, ‘Recherches sur le *proselma*’ (cit. n. 67), pp. 259–273; PARCA, ‘*Proselmata* ptolémaïques’ (cit. n. 67), pp. 240–241. One might even ask to what extent *προσαγγέλματα* were still conceived as a separate type of texts during this period, but this problem can not be expanded upon in this paper.

⁶⁹ DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 330.

⁷⁰ *O. Hor* 2 r^o, l. 7; P. Insinger (TM 55918), col. XI, ll. 1–2; *P. Oxf. Griffith* 30 (TM 46800), l. 7; *P. Oxf. Griffith* 41, l. 9.

⁷¹ *P. Prag. Satzung*. (TM 2928), col. A, l. 12; *P. Cair.* II 30619, l. 6.

⁷² P. Paris BnF inv. 149 (TM 48882), col. III, ll. 18, 19, 21, 23, 24.

a noun, used in first instance to designate a simple written report,⁷³ but also as the Demotic equivalent of the Greek *παράγγελμα* in the sense of ‘military summons’.⁷⁴

Three unpublished texts that are explicitly referred to as *‘n-smy* in their prescript seem to be of another nature than the *‘n-smy* listed above. The unpublished P. Köln Dem. inv. 10502 (TM 322160) starts with a date followed by *p³ ‘n-smy r.ir St³.t=ω-t³-wt³ m-b³h Wsir* (‘the *‘n-smy* that Stotoëtis made before Osiris’). As the text proceeds, Stotoëtis promises to make an offering of one deben of silver to Osiris if his child stays alive. Another date introduces a second section in the text, probably written by another party (the priests of Osiris?) because Stotoëtis has not kept his promise. This *‘n-smy* seems to be some sort of public declaration, made by Stotoëtis. The two other texts, however, show a closer resemblance to the Greek *προσαγγέλματα*. P. Sorbonne Dem. inv. 217 B (TM 372048) contains a report written by a royal farmer to the *komogrammateus* about something that was taken away from his land.⁷⁵ The third *‘n-smy*, P. BM Dem. inv. 10650 (TM 369018), is a complaint addressed to a police officer (*ts rsy*) named Bion concerning agricultural business.⁷⁶ The inversed prescripts of these texts (with the addressee preceding the petitioner), the introduction of the narrative by means of the date, as well as the addressees and sub-

⁷³ O. Hor 33 (TM 48999), l. 11; O. Manawir inv. 3414, l. 6; P. Count 5 (TM 8472), l. 2; P. Heidelberg Dem. inv. 811, ll. 2–3; P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 6481, l. 3. O. Manawir inv. 3414 is an unpublished ostrakon from the Persian period that contains a short internal report (*‘n-smy*); the text will be published together with other ostraka from Ayn Manawir by Michel Chauveau and Damien Agut-Labordère. P. Heidelberg Dem. inv. 811 is an unpublished communication with two *‘n-smy*, written by the *komogrammateus*, about the seeds of Greek estate managers. The unpublished P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 6481 is a letter with a report (*‘n-smy*) concerning ruined lands, introduced through date + x *p³ nty dd + tω=s p³ ‘n-smy*. This fragmentary text enumerates damaged properties of several owners, including large estates possessed by Greeks. Possibly it has to be interpreted as a state initiative, after the passing of a rebellion or another disastrous event. The same introduction (date + x *p³ nty dd + tω=s p³ ‘n-smy*) appears in P. Count 5, l. 2, a report concerning the levy of the salt-tax.

⁷⁴ P. Berlin inv. 13381 (TM 162) and P. Heidelberg Dem. inv. 781 b (TM 201). Cf. DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 330.

⁷⁵ To be published by Brigitte Bakech.

⁷⁶ To be published by Andreas Winkler.

jects of the texts, conform to the model of the Greek *προσαγγέλιματα*. The precise purpose of these texts, however, is unclear, so the identification of these *ᶜn-smy* with the Greek *προσαγγέλιματα* has to remain a working hypothesis. Both *ᶜn-smy* are closed by *sh* + date, which is also standard for Demotic *mḳmḳ*, but not for Greek petitions. This shows that P. Sorbonne Dem. inv. 217 B and P. BM Dem. inv. 10650 are most probably original Demotic texts and not translations (cf. section 3.1: *ᶜmḳmḳ*).

Interestingly, *ᶜn-smy* appears as a separate document type in the unpublished account P. Heidelberg Dem. inv. 695 (TM 454), directly after *mḳmḳ*.⁷⁷ This might possibly be another indication of the use of *ᶜn-smy* as a second petitioning type, besides *mḳmḳ*. The basic meaning of *ᶜn-smy* was '(to) report' or 'to declare/declaration'; in a more technical sense the term could refer to summons and could possibly be used as a Demotic counterpart of the *προσάγγελμα* as well.⁷⁸

4. Other Demotic petitions?

Mark Depauw cautiously distinguishes between *mḳmḳ*, *ᶜn-smy*, and a third category simply called 'petitions'. He justifies this distinction between memoranda and other petitions as follows: 'whereas a memorandum is a short recapitulation for mnemonic or administrative purposes of a complaint which was in most cases brought before the official orally, the 'petitions' I have brought together in this section are much longer and set out what has happened in great detail'. Final versions of these longer documents have not been preserved according to Depauw, only preliminary drafts.⁷⁹ Most of the texts to which he refers have already been interpreted differently above: P. Ryl. Dem. 9, the Ashmolean Museum stela

⁷⁷ KAPLONY-HECKEL, 'Der demotische Papyrus Loeb 80' (cit. n. 30), p. 193.

⁷⁸ P. Cair. II 30990 (TM 584) was also identified as an *ᶜn-smy* by Spiegelberg, because he thought he could read *ᶜn-smy* in the first line: SPIEGELBERG, *Die demotischen Denkmäler* (cit. n. 29), p. 217. But this reading has to be abandoned, on the basis of other, more certain attestations of the word that have been found in the meantime and do not resemble Spiegelberg's tentative reading of *ᶜn-smy* in P. Cair. II 30990 at all.

⁷⁹ DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 330–331.

1962-500, and *O. Hor* 3, 7, 27, 28, and 29. The other documents from the archive of Hor, which he identifies as drafts for longer petitions,⁸⁰ except for *O. Hor* 23 (see below), do not contain a request either; it seems better to identify them as ordinary notes, perhaps collected with the intention to draw up a real petition in the future.⁸¹ In any case preliminary reports written to gather information for a petition should not be confused with genuine petition drafts.

O. Hor 23 seems to be an exception. The beginning of this ostrakon describes the role of Hor in the reforms of the ibis sanctuary. At the end, two (unfortunately fragmentary) appeals concerning the enforcement of these reforms are recorded, introduced by the formula *tw=y tḥḥ n-ḥm=s* (l. 7) in the first case and *tw=y tḥḥ n-ḥm=s ḥw-ḥw=s ḥs* (l. 18) in the second. As we have argued (see section 3.1: 'mḥmḥ'), the combination of formulas used in the second appeal is only known from petitions. Yet apart from this, *O. Hor* 23 is a very problematic text: it is introduced by *n-dr.t s*, the addressees of the appeals are not known and the purpose of the composition is unclear. Possibly, the two appeals should be interpreted as supplications to the gods or rhetorical exclamations. Alternatively, they might be rough drafts for two petitions concerning the reforms in the ibis sanctuary. In this case, however, we have no idea of their final redaction, which might very well have been in the *mḥmḥ* format. *O. Hor* 23 cannot serve as evidence for a separate type of petitions, and certainly not for a traditional, more extant form of petitioning.

⁸⁰ *O. Hor* 2, 4 (TM 48971), 5 (TM 48972), 6 (TM 48973), 12, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24, 25, 30, and 48.

⁸¹ Cf. J. D. RAY, *The Archive of Hor [= The Egypt Exploration Society. Texts from Excavations 2]*, London 1976, pp. 121–123. Ray also suggests that these ostraka from the archive of Hor and *P. Ryl. Dem.* 9 might be exponents of an indigenous tradition of long and detailed petitions. He wonders whether the famous Turin Strike Papyrus (P. Turin inv. 1880 [TM 139434]) might be a pharaonic precedent for this sort of petitioning. But this document can hardly be viewed as such: the text describes the hearing of grievances of the workmen, but several other events as well. The Turin Strike Papyrus is an extensive personal record made *post factum*, albeit possibly with the intention to appeal to the authorities in the future: cf. EYRE, *The Use of Documents* (cit. n. 5), p. 250; P. J. FRANDSEN, 'Editing reality: The Turin Strike Papyrus', [in:] Sarah ISRAELIT-GROLL (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim I*, Jerusalem 1990, pp. 166–199.

5. *Petitions and related genres*

Other types of texts somehow seem related to the petitions discussed above, because they contain a complaint and/or request.⁸² Still, it would be unwise to group them together in one overarching category of petitions. There is a strong congruity between the petitioning *mkmk*, *ὑπομνήματα*, *ῥn-smy*, *προσαγγέλματα* and *ἐντεύξεις*. Together they constitute an autonomous group of petitions, perceived as such in the Ptolemaic period as well, as is evident from their shared set of formulas and scope. The documents that will be discussed in this paragraph originated from the same social need for external resolution of disputes and difficulties as the above-mentioned petitions *stricto sensu*, but are documents of a very different nature, nevertheless. It would be an anachronism to lump all of them together into one sociological concept.

The legal manual of Hermopolis, a Demotic law book from the third century BC that probably dates back to the Persian period, explains that the rights of a buyer can only be guaranteed if no one reports (*smy*) against him or issues a public protest (*ῥr*) against him for three years.⁸³ The verb *smy* (basically ‘to report’) regularly appears in legal documents from the New Kingdom onwards. In a technical sense, it can refer to the act of complaining and even petitioning.⁸⁴ More interesting are the public protests (*ῥr*), a type of document that is known from Egyptian law only and continued to exist during the Ptolemaic period.⁸⁵ Their function was very spe-

⁸² Because of this reason, many Demotic documents have been misidentified as petitions in the past: see a list of misidentifications in DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 325.

⁸³ *P. Mattha* (TM 48855), col. IX, l. 27. For general information on the manual, see Sandra LIPPERT, *Ein demotisches juristisches Lehrbuch: Untersuchungen zu Papyrus Berlin P 23757 rto* [= *Ägyptologische Abhandlungen* 66], Wiesbaden 2004, pp. 153–159; J. MÉLÈZE MODRZEJEWSKI, *Droit et justice dans le monde grec et hellénistique* [= *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology Supplement Series* 10], Warsaw 2011, pp. 150–157.

⁸⁴ See also LIPPERT, *Einführung* (cit. n. 8), p. 185.

⁸⁵ Cf. B. MUHS, ‘Clear title, public protests and P. Brux. Dem. 4’, [in:] K. RYHOLT (ed.), *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies: Copenhagen, 23–27 August 1999* [= *Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications* 27], Copenhagen 2002, pp. 259–272, for *status quaestionis* and bibliography.

cific in comparison to petitions: they could be made in property disputes by a buyer, if another claimant did not allow him to clear his ownership, or, conversely, by another claimant to prevent a certain piece of property from being clear for the buyer. In this way the protester could strengthen his own legal claim on a certain piece of property or discredit another's.⁸⁶

Next, there are dozens of Demotic oracle questions from the Ptolemaic period.⁸⁷ They give witness to the attempts of many people to resolve their disputes through divine intervention. But oracular justice was not integrated into the judicial system of Greco-Roman Egypt, like it had been during the New Kingdom. In the Ptolemaic and Roman period oracular questions had a religiously and psychologically inspired advisory function rather than actual legal significance, which distinguishes them clearly from petitions.⁸⁸ The same is true for letters to the dead or gods, in which individuals formulate complaints and ask for intervention.⁸⁹ One of these, P. Carlsberg inv. 67 (TM 48778), even refers to itself as a *mkmk*.⁹⁰ Still, these letters did not have any judicial significance.

A last topic that demands more attention here is the relation between petitions and letters. As discussed above, letters were used to petition officials before the Ptolemaic period. Under the Ptolemies, however, a new autonomous group of petitions came into existence. What became of the role of letters in terms of dispute resolution after this innovation? Extensive research of both Greek and Demotic letters from the Ptolemaic period is necessary to formulate an adequate answer to this question, but the following preliminary observations can already be made on the basis of the Demotic material.

⁸⁶ Possibly, three consecutive public protests automatically led to litigation, as suggested by Muhs, but there is no hard evidence for that.

⁸⁷ See survey and bibliography in DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 301–307.

⁸⁸ Barbara ANAGNOSTOU-CANAS, '«Justice» oraculaire dans l'Égypte hellénistique et romaine', *RHD* 76 (1998), pp. 1–16.

⁸⁹ DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 307–313; A. MIGAHD, *Demotische Briefe an Götter von der Spät- bis zur Römerzeit; ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des religiösen Brauchtums im alten Ägypten*, unpublished PhD dissertation, Würzburg 1986.

⁹⁰ J. D. RAY, 'Papyrus Carlsberg 67: A healing-prayer from the Fayûm', *JEA* 61 (1975), pp. 181–182.

Many Demotic letters from the Ptolemaic period contain requests.⁹¹ The request formulas that are used in Demotic petitions (*ṭw=y/n tbb*, *ṭw=f ḥpr ṭw=s ḥs*, and variants) appear in Demotic letters as well, but never combined (see section 3.1: ‘*mḳmḳ*’). Most requests, however, are of ordinary nature and concern familial or professional matters. In rare cases, letters do focus on a single conflict for which they seek redress. Mark Depauw gives an example of such letters in his survey of conflict solving strategies: *P. Berl. Dem.* I 13587 (TM 46489).⁹² The writer of this letter complains to the first prophet that he has not received payment from a third party that had promised the debtor of the first party to transfer the money, despite claims from the third party to the debtor that he had in fact done so. Another example is *P. Bürgsch.* 16, interpreted wrongly as a petition by John Bauschatz.⁹³ A man named Harendotef son of Hor addresses this letter to the *mr-mš*^c (‘general’)⁹⁴ because he wants to stand surety for an associate of his who has been imprisoned. A third example is *P. Louvre inv.* E 3334 (TM 46772), in which the priest Herieus complains to an unknown addressee about the malfunctioning of an ibis sanctuary and the violent treatment he received from a boy and his father when he was there. Curiously, he concludes the letter by saying that all is the fault of a woman and by warning the addressee not to side with her.

In none of these letters, official action is requested. Probably the writers of these documents attempted to deal with their problems on a more informal plane. Presumably, all involved parties in *P. Berl. Dem.* I 13587 are priests and the letter writer seeks redress by involving one of their superiors. In *P. Bürgsch.* 16, Harendotef inquires after the addressee’s well-being,

⁹¹ They can be easily found through the lists of letters that contain request formulas in DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 260–268.

⁹² M. DEPAUW, ‘Conflict solving strategies in late pharaonic and Ptolemaic Egypt: The Demotic evidence’, [in:] G. PFEIFER & N. GROTKAMP (eds.), *Außergerichtliche und gerichtliche Konfliktlösung in der Antike* [= *Global Perspectives on Legal History*], Frankfurt (forthcoming).

⁹³ BAUSCHATZ, *Law and Enforcement* (cit. n. 1), p. 188. The document is formatted as a standard letter though, including epistolary formulas and courtesies.

⁹⁴ For the uses of this title, see G. GORRE, *Les relations du clergé égyptien et des lagides d’après les sources privées* [= *Studia Hellenistica* 45], Leuven 2009, pp. 455–456.

a courtesy that does not appear in petitions, which are much more straightforward. John Ray, the editor of P. Louvre inv. E 3334, notes that the tone of his complaint is much more intimate and informal than in *mkmk* – petitions. Especially strange is the warning of Herieus that the addressee may not side with the woman who is responsible for the trouble, which has led Ray to assume that the dispute in question was an internal temple affair, with which Herieus wanted to deal internally. *P. Berl. Dem.* I 13619 (TM 46491), another letter which Depauw discusses in his survey of conflict solving strategies, shows how such internal resolutions could be effected.⁹⁵ In this letter, a man called *P³-wd²-mtw=s* (probably a priest) writes to a servant of Khnum that he has heard about the problems the servant experienced by the hands of Psentaes, presumably a servant of Min. The sender assures the servant that he has written about it to the prophet of Khnum, who in his turn addressed the prophet of Min. After this chain of letters, the prophet of Min approached the wrongdoer to put the dispute to an end. Dispute resolution is achieved here through an internal power game.

The procedure of addressing a letter was radically different from the procedure of submitting an official petition. Contrary to letters, *mkmk*, *ὑπομνήματα*, *ἡ-smy*, *προσαγγέλματα*, and *ἐντεύξεις* contain no exterior address; they must have been personally handed over to their addressee. Perhaps some petitioners also had the chance to argue their case in an audience: this would account for the fact that most petitions are formatted as relatively short memoranda. Only the main arguments had to be written down; more extant information concerning the dispute and the petitioner could be presented directly.⁹⁶ Letters, on the other hand, are less concise and formal.

It is striking that *mkmk* are mentioned on multiple occasions during the trials of Tefhape and Cratianch in the Siut archive.⁹⁷ The only letter that is referred to during the trials is a letter that was written in reaction

⁹⁵ DEPAUW, 'Conflict solving strategies' (cit. n. 92).

⁹⁶ BICKERMANN, 'Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte III' (cit. n. 1), pp. 170–172.

⁹⁷ P. BM Siut inv. 10591 r^o, col. II, l. 3 (= col. III, l. 20), col. III, l. 12 (= col. IV, l. 22), col. V, l. 7; v^o, col. IV, ll. 2, 3.

to a submitted petition.⁹⁸ A Greek petition to the king (*P. Amb.* II 33), in which the petitioner argues that his adversary is not allowed to seek the assistance of an advocate in a trial with implications for royal revenue, refers to the examination of ἐντεύξεις during proceedings before the chrematistai court:

δεόμεθ' ὑμῶν τῶν μεγίστων θεῶν εἰ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ
ἀποστεῖλαι ἡμῶν τὴν ἔντευξιν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρημα-
τιστὰς ὅπως ἐπὶ τῆς διαλογῆς τῶν ἐντ[εύ]ξεων συντά-
ξωσιν τῶι Τεσενούφει μὴ μετὰ συνηγόρου συνκαθίστασθαι.

We beg you, magnificent gods, if it seems good to you, to send our enteuxeis to the chrematistai in order that, during the examination of the enteuxeis, they will ordain Tesenouphis that he may not appear before court with the help of an advocate.

All this suggests that *mkmk*, ὑπομνήματα, and ἐντεύξεις, contrary to letters, could serve as valid legal evidence in hearings. The formula *p' mkmk n-mtω=k n/r mtr* ('the petition is with you for a witness'), found at the end of the preserved petitions of Tefhape,⁹⁹ might fit this hypothesis: Tefhape did not only submit these petitions in the hope that his requests would be fulfilled, but also to have legal evidence at his disposal in case of future litigation. Probably the same is true for ἱn-smy and προσαγγέματα, as they are closely affiliated to the *mkmk*, ὑπομνήματα, and ἐντεύξεις.

Several texts previously identified as petitions might be reinterpreted as letters. We have already mentioned *P. Bürgsch.* 16. An unpublished fragmentary ostrakon from the Egyptian Museum in Turin, suppl. 12723 (TM 92293), has been identified as a petition by Ursula Kaplony-Heckel. Apparently she understood the first signs as [*mk*]*mkmk*.¹⁰⁰ But normally *mkmk* is written differently. As no other elements confirm the identification of this text as a petition, it seems more plausible to read the first

⁹⁸ P. BM Siut inv. 10591 r^o, col. IV, ll. 14, 23, col. V, l. 3.

⁹⁹ P. BM Siut inv. 10598, 10599, 10600.

¹⁰⁰ KAPLONY-HECKEL, 'Der demotische Papyrus Loeb 80' (cit. n. 30), p. 191.

signs simply as *mtw=w*. The text on the recto of *P. Cair.* II 30960, a request to temple authorities for financial support for a funeral, has been interpreted as a *mḳmḳ* petition by Mark Depauw.¹⁰¹ Unfortunately, the prescript of the text, possibly including the word *mḳmḳ*, is lost. The only formal element that might confirm its identification as a petition is a request formula with *tbḥ*, appearing on line x+4, but this polite formula is common for ordinary Demotic letters as well. Moreover, there is no mention at all of a grievance of dispute in this text. The appearance of a request cannot on its own serve as a sufficient ground to classify a text as a petition rather than a letter with a request.

6. *The disappearance of Demotic petitioning*

Much has been written about the demise of Demotic documentation in Roman Egypt.¹⁰² This evolution has never been studied for petitions, however: do we have evidence for Demotic petitioning during the Roman period? It has already been argued above that stela 1962-500 from the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford is a Ptolemaic report rather than a Roman petition. More interesting is an ensemble of ostraka written by the priestly scribe Phatres, in the second half of the second century AD.¹⁰³ This scribe, active at the temple of Sobek and Renenutet in Narmouthis, wrote a series of 154 numbered ostraka that contain short notes about a dispute between himself and Pachrates. The large majority of them has been written in Demotic with some Greek additions (ODN 100–188).¹⁰⁴ Angiolo Menchetti suggests that these notes might have been used to draw up a petition to

¹⁰¹ DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 324.

¹⁰² See M. STADLER, 'On the demise of Egyptian writing: Working with a problematic source basis', [in:] J. BAINES, J. BENNET, & S. HOUSTON (eds.), *The Disappearance of Writing Systems: Perspectives on Literacy and Communication*, London 2008, pp. 157–181, for overview and bibliography.

¹⁰³ A. MENCHETTI & R. PINTAUDI, 'Ostraka greci e bilingui da Narmuthis (II)', *CdÉ* 84 (2009), pp. 201–238.

¹⁰⁴ A. MENCHETTI, *Ostraka demotici e bilingui da Narmuthis (ODN 100–188)* [= *Biblioteca di studi egittologici* 5], Pisa 2005.

the Roman authorities. Considering the dispute-related contents of the ostraka, this hypothesis is plausible. But it is barely conceivable that Phatres wrote this final petition in Demotic. Several words in the texts, especially legal or financial terminology and titles, are written in Greek, because Demotic alternatives did not exist or had been forgotten by this time: the ostraka are a first-rate witness of the growing disability of Roman scribes to use Demotic in official documents.¹⁰⁵ The possible use of Demotic notes for the compilation of a Greek petition, reminds of the archive of Hor.

It is certain that the term *mkmk* was still used as translation for *ὑπόμνημα* in the early Roman period: *P. Mich.* V 226 (TM 12067), a petition – *ὑπόμνημα* addressed to the strategos from AD 37, is called *mkmk* in its subscription. But not a single *mkmk* can be dated with certainty to the Roman period. *P. Cair.* II 3122I, a *mkmk* that has not been transliterated except for its first line, was dated to the Roman period by Wilhelm Spiegelberg.¹⁰⁶ Its dense handwriting does indeed suggest a late date of origin. Still, the late Ptolemaic period is possible on palaeographical grounds as well. The attestation of a *wy^c Pr-^c?* ('royal farmer') in line 3 favours such earlier dating. Considering the fact that there is no other evidence for Demotic petitioning during the Roman period, it seems more likely that this single document belongs to the Ptolemaic period as well.

3. SOCIO-LEGAL CONTEXT

In total thirty-six Demotic petitions from the Ptolemaic period have been preserved, doubtful cases included (see appendix: 33 *mkmk*, 2 *n-smy*, and *O. Hor* 23). This is a small number in comparison to the approximately 900 Greek petitions from the Ptolemaic period that are known.¹⁰⁷ What can be said concerning the identity of the individuals who wrote

¹⁰⁵ I. C. RUTHERFORD, 'Bilingualism in Roman Egypt? Exploring the archive of Phatres of Narmuthis', [in:] T. V. EVANS & D. D. OBBINK (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford 2010, pp. 198–207.

¹⁰⁶ SPIEGELBERG, *Die demotischen Denkmäler* (cit. n. 29), p. 309.

¹⁰⁷ Preliminary estimate, based on my survey of the Trismegistos database.

and received these Demotic petitions? In several cases, the name and/or function of the petitioner(s) and/or addressee(s) is lost. Even when they are preserved, it can be very difficult to determine to which ethno-cultural community individuals in Ptolemaic Egypt belonged, certainly on the basis of the onomastic criterion only and especially in the later stages of the Ptolemaic era.¹⁰⁸ Still, some clear trends can be observed concerning the identity of the involved parties in Demotic petitions.

With one exception, not a single petitioner bears a Greek name or exercises a profession in which Greeks are normally expected to be found. In at least seventeen cases, the petitioners belong to the Egyptian priesthood and its personnel. Among the remaining petitioners are one farmer, one royal farmer, one group of five royal farmers who probably had a priestly function as well (see section 3.2: ‘Demotic petitions addressed to the king?’), one beekeeper, and one beer seller, all typical professions for an Egyptian. The others are only known by name or not known at all. With one exception, all known accused bear an Egyptian name and several of them belong to the Egyptian priesthood as well.¹⁰⁹ Three petitioners (P. Berlin inv. 15592, ll. 20–29, *P. Oxf. Griffith* 40, P. Syrac. inv. 262) and one of the accused (O. Ifao Edfou Dem. inv. 632) are women.¹¹⁰

The only petitioner with a Greek name is Alexandros son of Eirenaios. The unpublished P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 8448 records his petition to Marres son of Marres, prophet of Bastet and royal controller (*epistates*) of temples in the Arsinoite. He complains that he was beaten on the street by Thortortaios, *pastophoros* of Soknebtynis, and asks Marres to write to another

¹⁰⁸ Cf. W. CLARYSSE, ‘Greeks and Egyptians in the Ptolemaic army and administration’, *Aegyptus* 65 (1985), pp. 57–66; K. GOUDRIAAN, *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt* [= *Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology* 5], Amsterdam 1988, pp. 60–87; KELLY, *Petitions, Litigation, and Social Control* (cit. n. 1), pp. 143–146.

¹⁰⁹ Hetia and Wergira, the accused in P. BM Siut inv. 10591 v^o, cols. I–II, are Nubian or Blemmyan: J. F. QUACK, ‘Das Diktum des Tutu über die Eingabe an Numenius’, [in:] Andrea JÖRDENS & J. F. QUACK (eds.), *Ägypten zwischen innerem Zwist und äusserem Druck: die Zeit Ptolemaios’ VI. bis VIII. Internationales Symposium Heidelberg 16.–19. 9. 2007* [= *Philippika* 45], Wiesbaden 2011, p. 271.

¹¹⁰ P. Berlin inv. 15592, ll. 20–29, mentions two senders in the prescript, apparently husband and wife.

Marres, *lesonis* of Soknebtynis and Thotortaios' superior, so that Thotortaios might be brought. Next the papyrus breaks off; probably Alexandros wanted Marres to interrogate Thotortaios. One cannot exclude that this Alexandros was in fact an Egyptian who used a Greek double name to identify himself. Yet here the petitioner addresses an important Egyptian priest in Demotic, so one would expect him to use his Egyptian name. The neat appearance and careful handwriting of the petition suggests that it was drafted by a professional scribe. Probably Alexandros was unable to write Demotic himself and hired the services of an Egyptian scribe in order to address Marres in a polite way. Marres was a priest of very high standing and had the right connections to bring an end to this dispute. In this way, P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 8448 might be a rare inversed parallel for those examples where Egyptians were required to write their petitions in Greek.¹¹¹

On a total of thirty-six Demotic petitions, at least eleven are addressed to an Egyptian priest.¹¹² All of these concern temple business or other disputes in which priests are involved. Interestingly, not a single Greek petition to a priest is known; Greek petitions were addressed to officials of the Ptolemaic administration, and exceptionally to estate managers and military officers. Individuals with various functions are approached in the other Demotic petitions:

1. *strategos*: P. BM Siut inv. 10591 v^o, cols. I–II; O. Ifao Edfou Dem. inv. 632;
2. royal scribe: P. Syrac. inv. 262;
3. *topogrammateus*: P. BM Siut inv. 10600;
4. *komogrammateus*: P. Oxf. Griffith 37; P. Sorbonne Dem. inv. 217 B;
5. village *epistates*: P. München BSB inv. 5;
6. *praktor* of the temples: P. Bürgsch. 13, 13 bis A, 13 bis B;
7. inspector (*p³ rmt³ šn*): P. Oxf. Griffith 40;
8. police officer: P. BM Dem. inv. 10650; P. Lille Dem. 114 (?);¹¹³

¹¹¹ See HENGSTL, 'Petita in Petitionen' (cit. n. 1), p. 281.

¹¹² P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 4579.12, 4679.11, 5930.3, and 8342 are probably also addressed to priests from Tebtynis.

¹¹³ In P. BM Dem. inv. 10650 the addressee bears the title *ts rsy*. Cf. P. BM Siut inv. 10591, col. II, l. 9, for *š n rsy* as *archiphylakites*. In P. Lille Dem. 114, the addressee is called *bry p³ mš^c*,

9. overseer of lands: P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 2;
10. royal farmer: P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 1;
11. private persons (?): P. Berlin inv. 15592, ll. 20–29.

Interestingly, eight addressees bear a Greek name, transcribed into Demotic:

1. O. Hor 26: Ariston (*ʒrstn*), function unknown;
2. O. Ifao Edfou Dem. inv. 632: Hierax (*Hyʒrgs*), *strategos*;
3. P. BM Siut inv. 10591: Noumenios (*Nwmmnys*), *strategos* and *archisomatophylax*;
4. P. Bürgsch. 13: Milon (*Mln*), *praktor* of the temples;
5. P. Bürgsch. 13 bis A: Milon (*Mln*), *praktor* of the temples;
6. P. Bürgsch. 13 bis B: Milon (*Mln*), *praktor* of the temples;
7. P. BM Dem. inv. 10650: Bion (*Byʒn*), police officer;
8. P. München BSB inv. 5: Horion (*Hwryn*), village epistates.

This raises the question if it was possible to submit a Demotic petition to a Greek official. Or were all Egyptian petitioners forced to make their complaint in Greek? The first two texts cannot really elucidate the question, because they are written on ostrakon, and most probably served as drafts. Ostraka made the perfect material for preliminary versions (see the archive of Hor and the archive of Phatres from Narmuthis), but – being second-rate writing material – they were probably never used for the final redaction of petitions. We cannot know, therefore, whether the final versions of these petitions were written in Greek or Demotic.

P. BM Siut inv. 10591 v^o, cols. I–II, records a petition by the priests of Syene to the *strategos* and *archisomatophylax* Noumenios. Unfortunately, we have to conclude that this important Greek official did not receive petitions in Demotic. Literal translations from Greek petitioning formulas

a title for a village police officer according to Françoise DE CENIVAL, ‘Fragments de lettres administratives du Fonds Jouguet’, [in:] H.-J. THISSEN & K.-T. ZAUZICH (eds.), *Grammata demotika. Festschrift für Erich Lüdtke zum 15. Juni 1983*, Würzburg 1984, p. 19. It cannot be excluded that *hry pʒ mš* is a military title, but there are certain arguments against such an interpretation: J. TAIT, ‘A Demotic list of temple and court occupations: P. Carlsberg 23’, [in:] THISSEN & ZAUZICH (eds.), *Grammata demotika*, p. 224. More research on the Demotic police titles is necessary. See W. CLARYSSE & Dorothy J. THOMPSON, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt*, II: *Historical Studies*, Cambridge 2006, pp. 166–168.

show that this text was most certainly translated from a Greek original, especially *hpr=f i. ir n3y hpr iw p3 hp ir. t n=n (n) rn=k iw-iw=k wd3* in lines 13–14 (‘so that this happens, while justice is done for us in your name, while you are doing fine’), from *τούτου δὲ γενομένου διὰ σὲ τευξόμεθα τοῦ δικαίου. εὐτύχει* (‘if this is done, we will obtain justice. Be prosperous’). The Greek memorandum was translated into Egyptian because Noumenios wanted the advice of the indigenous *laokritai* scribe Totoes, apparently a specialist in indigenous law. His advice has been preserved in col. III of the same papyrus.¹¹⁴

P. Bürgsch. 13, 13 bis A, and 13 bis B are addressed to Milon, *praktor* of the temples. The archive of Milon consists of ten Demotic and twenty-two Greek texts, of which most are addressed to Milon himself. Among these texts are four petitions (the three mentioned Demotic documents and one Greek), written by a prominent priestly family that experienced financial difficulties. *P. Bürgsch.* 13 and *P. Eleph.* 27 (TM 5858) record the same petition in respectively Demotic and Greek. Only the autographs of the petitioners in *P. Eleph.* 27 are Demotic. Wilhelm Spiegelberg notes that the Demotic text contains curious constructions: *n3-ε n=f r iw=k ir=f* in (l. 12: ‘it is good if you do it’) and especially *hpr=f r iw=f hpr* (l. 13: ‘so that it may happen’). The Greek text on the other hand confirms to the standard *ὑπόμνημα* model with its set formulas. Therefore, he identifies the Greek petition as the primary text, translated into Demotic afterwards.¹¹⁵ Kurt Sethe on the other hand argues that the Demotic text was primary and consequently translated into Greek. According to him, an Egyptian translation of a Greek petition to the *praktor* would have no function at all in the archive of the *praktor*.¹¹⁶ But one can equally pose the question what would have been the purpose of a Greek translation if the *praktor* understood Egyptian and received a Demotic petition in the first place.

¹¹⁴ Cf. G. BAETENS & M. DEPAUW, ‘The legal advice of Totoes in the Siut archive (P. BM Siut 10591, verso, col. I–III)’, *JEA* (forthcoming).

¹¹⁵ SPIEGELBERG, *Demotische Papyrus von der Insel Elephantine* (cit. n. 22), pp. 10–14.

¹¹⁶ K. SETHE, *Demotische Urkunden zum Ägyptischen Bürgschaftsrechte vorzüglich der Ptolemäerzeit* [= *Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Klasse der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 32], Leipzig 1920, pp. 287–288.

The formula $n^{\text{c}}-n=f r i w=k i r=f$ is paralleled in Greek by the expression $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\varsigma \pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ('you will do well'), but was fully integrated in Demotic epistolography.¹¹⁷ The formula $hpr=f r i w=f hpr$, however, does look like an awkward transposition of $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \delta\grave{\epsilon} \gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon$. In P. BM Siut inv. 10591 v^o, cols. I–II, this Greek formula is translated into Demotic as $hpr=f i . i r n^{\text{c}} y hpr$. The expression must have been quite a challenge for Egyptian translators. The Demotic autograph of *P. Eleph.* 27 also suggests that this document was the original. On the whole, Spiegelberg's hypothesis is the strongest.

One of the later petitions from the priests to Milon was most probably submitted in Demotic. *P. Bürgsch.* 13 bis A and 13 bis B are copies of one and the same Demotic petition. *P. Bürgsch.* 13 bis B is written on the verso of a fragmentary Greek letter (TM 5860), so it has to be a copy or draft. *P. Bürgsch.* 13 bis A was probably the originally submitted document, because it contains a Greek administrative docket, indicating that the subscribed text was the third memorandum that the priests addressed to Milon. The subscription shows that the Egyptian memorandum was read by Milon or someone of his personnel who mastered both Demotic and Greek. It does not surprise that the administration of Milon was able to cope with Demotic documents as well: as 'praktor of the temples' Milon probably had to deal with indigenous priests at multiple occasions.¹¹⁸

The $^{\text{c}}n$ -smy P. BM Dem. inv. 10650 is addressed to a police officer with a Greek name, Bion. He is not known from other documents, however, and it would be incorrect to identify him as a Greek on the basis of this onomastic criterion alone. The last Demotic petition addressed to an

¹¹⁷ DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 262–263. It appears in another Demotic petition as well: WT. Zürich 1894.

¹¹⁸ The precise duties of the *praktor* are unclear. Clarysse argues that the $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\omega\rho \iota\epsilon\rho\omega\acute{\nu}$ was a temporary state official, appointed when particular financial/fiscal problems arose in a temple: W. CLARYSSE, 'The archive of the *praktor* Milon', [in:] Katelijin VANDORPE & W. CLARYSSE (eds.), *Edfu, an Egyptian Provincial Capital in the Ptolemaic Period*, Brussels 2003, p. 22. Bussi thinks that it might have been a more permanent function, responsible for a larger area, e.g. a nome: Silvia BUSSI, 'Fiscalità e templi nell'Egitto tolemaico', [in:] EADEM (ed.), *Egitto dai Faraoni agli Arabi. Atti del Convegno 'Egitto: amministrazione, economia, società, cultura dai Faraoni agli Arabi' (Milano, 7–9 gennaio 2013)* [= *Studi ellenistici. Supplementi* 1], Pisa – Rome 2013, p. 123.

official with a Greek name is P. München BSB inv. 5, unfortunately incomplete. According to the description that Nathaniel Reich made of the text at the beginning of the previous century, the text originally consisted of two fragments.¹¹⁹ The lower part has gone missing since the 1980s, but used to contain some more lines of Demotic and a Greek subscription. Together with P. Bürgsch. 13 bis A, this would be the only Demotic petition that bore a Greek subscription. This might indicate that the village *epistates* Horion was versed in both Demotic and Greek as well.¹²⁰

The non-existence of Demotic petitions to the king has already been discussed (see section 3.2: ‘Demotic petitions addressed to the king?’). We have to conclude that other higher-ranking officials of the Ptolemaic kingdom were rarely approached with Demotic petitions either. Many Greek petitions are addressed to the *strategos*, whereas the first Demotic petition to this official (O. Ifao Edfou Dem. inv. 632) is possibly a draft for a Greek document and the second (P. BM Siut inv. 10591 v^o, cols. I–II) certainly a translation from Greek. The documents from the Soknopaiou Nesos archive show that Egyptian petitioners addressed priests and lower officials in Demotic and the king and higher officials in Greek at the same time (see section 3.2: ‘Demotic petitions addressed to the king?’). P. München BSB inv. 5, the petitions from the archive of Milon, and possibly P. BM Dem. inv. 10650, on the other hand, might indicate that certain Greek (or perhaps more fittingly ‘multiethnic’) officials were capable of working with both Demotic and Greek documents. But once more, it must be stressed that the question of ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt is a tricky one.

The accusations in Demotic petitions are similar to those in Greek petitions. Most disputes are in some way property-related. Theft is the best-represented category (P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 1; P. Oxf. Griffith 40; P. Sorbonne Dem. inv. 217 B; UPZ I 6a; WT. Zürich inv. 1894). Other property-related grievances concern inheritances, sales, debts, loans, and

¹¹⁹ REICH, ‘Aus der Sammlung der demotischen Papyri’ (cit. n. 26), p. 316, n. 5.

¹²⁰ Most village *epistatai* bear Greek names; see E. LAVIGNE, *De Epistates van het dorp in Ptolemaeïsch Egypte* [= *Studia Hellenistica* 3], Leuven 1945, pp. 26–28.

unjust claims by officials. *P. Oxf. Griffith* 39 and 41 are complaints about the misconduct of certain priests, *P. Syrac. inv.* 262 about the misconduct of a state official. *P. Oxf. Griffith* 38 and *P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv.* 8448 concern personal violence cases. Not all of these accusations are followed by explicit demands of redress: to the documents discussed at the end of the section 3.1: ‘*mkmk*’ (*P. Oxf. Griffith* 38, 39, and 41), the ‘*n-smy*’ *P. Sorbonne Dem. inv.* 217 can be added, submitted for the addressee’s information (*r dy.t rh=k s*: ‘to cause that you know it’). It is not entirely clear whether these texts without explicit request should be considered as petitions or not.

Often, the addressee is asked to conduct investigations in some way. The petitioners of *P. Lille Dem.* 114, *P. Oxf. Griffith* 37, and *P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv.* 8448 request to summon the accused; the petitioner of *P. Oxf. Griffith* 40 asks to summon and interrogate his adversary. In *P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv.* 2, the beekeeper Nektanebo writes to his superior, the overseer of lands Harmiysis, so that he might order his agent Dikaïos to bring the men who defrauded him. An order to comply (*my in=w n’ rmt.w rn=w (r)-hr=n*: ‘may they bring the named men to us’) is added at the bottom, probably written by the scribe of Harmiysis. But in all these cases it is unclear whether the requested investigations were only preliminary procedures or actually meant to put an end to the dispute right away.

Other requests are more specific:

1. *O. Ifao Edfou Dem. inv.* 632: to return the petitioner’s belongings;
2. *P. BM Siut inv.* 10591 v^o, cols. I–II: to order the *archiphylakite* and village *epistates* to temporarily block the wines of the petitioners’ property;
3. *P. BM Siut inv.* 10598, 10599, 10600: to summon the accused, to make him return the petitioner’s land and to prevent him from coming there anymore;
4. *P. Bürgsch.* 13: to release a mortgage;
5. *P. Bürgsch.* 13 bis A and B: to acknowledge a donation of land;¹²¹
6. *P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv.* 1: to forward a petition to the *komomisthotes*

¹²¹ The petitioners were unable to pay all instalments for their land, so they wanted the Greek Xenon to take over their property and pay the remaining instalments: CLARYSSE, ‘The archive of the *praktor* Milon’ (cit. n. 118), pp. 23–26.

and other (unspecified) individuals, so that they might prevent thieves from coming to the petitioners' fields;

7. *P. Freib.* IV 75: to write a letter to the *oikonomos* and the *topogrammateus* in order that they might hear the plea of the petitioner.

In other cases, the request is lost or unclear. As these petitions are only snapshots of more lengthy processes, it is often difficult to assess their precise place in dispute resolution and to evaluate the role which the addressed local officials and other high-standing members of society (like priests) played in this resolution. In order to investigate this, a further examination of the Greek petitioning corpus from the Ptolemaic period will be necessary.

APPENDIX 1 DEMOTIC PETITIONS¹²²

<i>Identification</i>	<i>TM no.</i> ¹²³	<i>Date</i>	<i>Nome</i> ¹²⁴	<i>Addressee</i>	<i>Archive</i>	<i>Type</i>
<i>O. Hor</i> 23	48990	167 BC	Memphites	?	Hor of Sebennytos	petition?
<i>O. Hor</i> 26	48993	mid-2nd c. BC	Memphites	Ariston (function?)	Hor of Sebennytos	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (petition?)
O. Ifao Edfou Dem. inv. 632	128947	75/74 or 46/45 BC	Apollonopolites	Hierax (<i>strategos</i>)	—	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (petition)

¹²² Another list of *mḳmḳ*'s has been published in DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), pp. 324–325, but this list has been updated on the basis of the discussions throughout this paper. There is one more unpublished candidate Demotic petition, of which I did not manage to obtain photographs: P. Ashmolean Museum Dem. inv. 74/1982.130, identified as a *mḳmḳ* in DEPAUW, *The Demotic Letter* (cit. n. 3), p. 325.

¹²³ Some of the unpublished texts have not received a TM number yet.

¹²⁴ In theory, a petition can have a different place of origin and submission. This is further complicated by the fact that petitioners often took recourse to professional scribes to draft their petition. In most cases, however, this entire itinerary took place in the same region. Therefore the nomes in which these petitioning processes took place, as far as known, are listed in this table.

<i>Identification</i>	<i>TM no.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Nome</i>	<i>Adressee</i>	<i>Archive</i>	<i>Type</i>
<i>P. Berl. Dem.</i> III 13567	48634	Ptolemaic	Ombites	?	—	<i>mkmk</i> (petition)
<i>P. Berlin inv.</i> 15592, ll. 20-29	91946	Ptolemaic	Panopolites	private persons?	—	<i>mkmk</i> (petition?)
<i>P. BM Dem. inv.</i> 10650	369018	Ptolemaic	Arsinoites	Bion (police officer)	—	<i>n-smy</i> (petition?)
<i>P. BM Siut inv.</i> 10591 v ^o cols. I-II	53821	170 BC	Ombites ¹²⁵	Noumenios (<i>strategos</i> and <i>archiso-</i> <i>matophylax</i>)	Siut	<i>mkmk</i> (petition: translation <i>ὑπόμνημα</i>)
<i>P. BM Siut inv.</i> 10598	43409	170 BC	Lykopolites	Spemminis (prophet and temple <i>epistates</i>) ¹²⁶	Siut	<i>mkmk</i> (petition)
<i>P. BM Siut inv.</i> 10599	48653	169 BC	Lykopolites	Spemminis (prophet and temple <i>epistates</i>)	Siut	<i>mkmk</i> (petition)
<i>P. BM Siut inv.</i> 10600	44188	169 BC	Lykopolites	Miysis (<i>topogrammateus</i>)	Siut	<i>mkmk</i> (petition)
<i>P. Bürgsch.</i> 13	5858	223 BC	Apollonopolites	Milon (<i>praktor</i> of the temples)	Milon <i>praktor</i>	<i>mkmk</i> (petition: translation <i>ὑπόμνημα</i>)
<i>P. Bürgsch.</i> 13 bis A	2789	223 BC	Apollonopolites	Milon (<i>praktor</i> of the temples)	Milon <i>praktor</i>	<i>mkmk</i> (petition)
<i>P. Bürgsch.</i> 13 bis B	44604	223 BC	Apollonopolites	Milon (<i>praktor</i> of the temples)	Milon <i>praktor</i>	<i>mkmk</i> (petition)
<i>P. Cair.</i> II 30976 r ^o	567	132/131 BC	Pathyrites	Nechoutes (function unknown)	—	<i>mkmk</i> (petition?)
<i>P. Cair.</i> II 31221	44349	late Ptolemaic?	Arsinoites	priests	—	<i>mkmk</i> (petition?)

¹²⁵ This petition, written by the priests of Syene, was sent to Noumenios, *strategos* of the entire Thebais. In this way it arrived in Siut (Lykopolites). Cf. BAETENS & DEPAUW, 'The legal advice of Totoes' (cit. n. 114).

¹²⁶ *shn Pr-5*: Cf. H. THOMPSON, *A Family Archive from Siut from Papyri in the British Museum Including an Account of a Trial before the Laocritae in the Year B.C. 170*, Oxford 1934, pp. 77-78.

<i>Identification</i>	<i>TM no.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Nome</i>	<i>Addressee</i>	<i>Archive</i>	<i>Type</i>
P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 1	51408	2nd/1st c. BC	Arsinoites	Ameneus (royal farmer)	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition)
P. Fitzhugh Dem. inv. 2	51409	3rd/2nd c. BC	Memphites?	Harmiysis (overseer of lands)	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition)
<i>P. Freib.</i> IV 75	2515	231/230 BC	Oxyrhynchites	?	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition?)
<i>P. Lille Dem.</i> 114	44438	3rd c. BC	Arsinoites	Tesenouphis (police officer?)	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition)
P. München BSB inv. 5	45930	135 BC	Arsinoites?	Horion (village <i>epistates</i>)	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition?)
<i>P. Oxf. Griffith</i> 37	46947	161 BC	Arsinoites	Pa-sobek-pi (<i>komogrammateus</i>)	temple Soknopaiou Nesos	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition)
<i>P. Oxf. Griffith</i> 38	48879	159 BC	Arsinoites	Tesenouphis (<i>Iesonis</i>)	temple Soknopaiou Nesos	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition?)
<i>P. Oxf. Griffith</i> 39	48545	156 BC	Arsinoites	Marres (prophet and royal controller of temples in Arsinoites)	temple Soknopaiou Nesos	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition?)
<i>P. Oxf. Griffith</i> 40	48880	147/136 BC	Arsinoites	Herieus (<i>Iesonis</i>), Pete- souchos (inspector), other priests	temple Soknopaiou Nesos	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition)
<i>P. Oxf. Griffith</i> 41	48881	131 BC	Arsinoites	Petesouchos (<i>Iesonis</i>), other priests	temple Soknopaiou Nesos	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition?)
<i>P. Oxf. Griffith</i> [unre- gistered <i>tomos synkol- lesimos</i>], r ^o , col. II	—	146/135 BC	Arsinoites	NN son of Herieus (?), <i>Iesonis</i>	temple Soknopaiou Nesos	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition?)
P. Sorbonne Dem. inv. 217 B	372048	195 BC	?	<i>komogrammateus</i> (name unknown)	—	<i>ꜥn-smy</i> (petition?)
P. Syrac. inv. 262	316183	Ptolemaic	Arsinoites	Horos (royal scribe)	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition)
P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 4579.12	—	mid-2nd c. BC?	Arsinoites	?	temple Tebtynis	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition?)
P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 4679.11	—	mid-2nd c. BC?	Arsinoites	?	temple Tebtynis	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (petition?)

<i>Identification</i>	<i>TM no.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Nome</i>	<i>Adressee</i>	<i>Archive</i>	<i>Type</i>
P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 5169.5	—	mid-2nd c. BC?	Arsinoites	Marres (<i>Iesonis</i>)	temple Tebtynis	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (petition?)
P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 5930.3	—	mid-2nd c. BC?	Arsinoites	?	temple Tebtynis	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (petition?)
P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 8342	—	mid-2nd c. BC?	Arsinoites	?	temple Tebtynis	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (petition)
P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 8448	—	148 BC	Arsinoites	Marres (prophet and royal controller of temples in Arsinoites)	temple Tebtynis	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (petition)
UPZ I 6a	3497	163 BC?	Memphites	?	<i>katochoi</i>	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (petition?)
WT. Zürich inv. 1894	51507	late 2nd c. BC	Pathyrites	Patseous (prophet and estate holder/manager) ¹²⁷	—	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (petition)

APPENDIX 2
OTHER *MḲMḲ* DOCUMENTS

<i>Identification</i>	<i>TM no.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Nome</i>	<i>Adressee</i>	<i>Archive</i>	<i>Type</i>
<i>O. Hor</i> 1	48969	159 BC	Memphites	'the priests'	Hor of Sebennytos	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (memorandum)
<i>O. Hor</i> 21	48988	mid-2nd c. BC	Memphites	the priests of Thot	Hor of Sebennytos	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (memorandum)
<i>O. Hor</i> 1	48969	159 BC	Memphites	'the priests'	Hor of Sebennytos	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (memorandum)
<i>O. Hor</i> 21	48988	mid-2nd c. BC	Memphites	the priests of Thot	Hor of Sebennytos	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (memorandum)
<i>O. Hor</i> 31	48438	mid-2nd c. BC	Memphites	Sarapion (prophet and eponymous priest)	Hor of Sebennytos?	<i>mḳmḳ</i> (memorandum)

¹²⁷ *c. n 1000*. For discussion of this title, cf. W. CLARYSSE, 'Egyptian estate holders in the Ptolemaic period', [in:] E. LIPIŃSKI (ed.), *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East* [= *OLA* 5–6], Leuven 1979, pp. 736–743.

<i>Identification</i>	<i>TM no.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Nome</i>	<i>Adressee</i>	<i>Archive</i>	<i>Type</i>
O. Strasbourg Dem. inv. 246	316909	early 1st c. BC ¹²⁸	Pathyrites?	Aristodikos? (function unknown)	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (memorandum)
<i>P. Loeb</i> 40	48850	middle Ptolemaic?	?	Petehyris (<i>komogrammateus</i>)	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (memorandum)
<i>P. Loeb</i> 53	48851	middle Ptolemaic?	?	Petehyris (<i>komogrammateus</i>)	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (memorandum)
<i>P. Loeb</i> 66	48852	middle Ptolemaic?	?	Petehyris (<i>komogrammateus</i>)	—	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (memorandum)
P. Tebt. Dem. SCA inv. 8334	— ¹²⁹	mid-2nd c. BC?	Arsinoites	Sokonopis (<i>Iesonis</i>)	temple Tebtynis	<i>mꜣmꜣ</i> (memorandum)

Gert Baetens

Department of Ancient History
 KU Leuven
 Blijde-Inkomststraat 21 – box 3307
 3000 Leuven
 BELGIUM
 e-mail: gert.baetens@kuleuven.be

¹²⁸ Judging from the writing, the text must have been written in the late Ptolemaic or Roman period. A dating in the early first century BC is most plausible though, because Psenanubis states that *ꜣtrstyꜣs* will go to Pathyris, a locality without much importance after its destruction in 88 BC.

¹²⁹ This petition will be published in the near future and will receive a TM number at that moment.