

## ON PROVENANCES : THE CASE OF P.KÖLN XI 448

Maria Rosaria Falivene

P.Köln XI 448 (published by Charikleia Armoni and Klaus Maresch in 2007) belongs to the cartonnage material acquired on the antiquities market in the 1970s and 1980s, extracted by Michael Fackelmann, then distributed among several papyrus collections around the world. Restoring and properly conserving, however, is not « extracting » : it requires that the whole restoring process be carefully recorded, by means of images and metadata, so as to report what was done, when, where, how, by whom, and why a certain procedure was preferred to another, available one – something we miss with respect to much of the cartonnage material I will be considering in this paper.

As was already noticed by Armoni and Maresch, P.Köln XI 448 shares some officials with P.Strasb. II 103 and 104, including the *epimeletes* Agathokles and the *oikonomos* Theon<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, these documents deal with the same kind of transaction (monthly payments to, respectively, infantry- and cavalrymen) in the same geographical area (the Herakleopolite nome) at the same time (a year 12). The procedure lying behind them ran along the same lines up to the point where it diverged towards, respectively, the *trapezites* and the *sitologos* : this was because P.Strasb. II 103 and 104 and P.Köln XI 448 dealt, respectively, with payments in money and in kind. Accordingly, P.Strasb. II 103 and 104 can be assigned to the « archives » of the *trapezites* Hermias, while P.Köln XI 448 pertains to the « archives » of the *archiphylakites* Theomnestos. Hermias and Theomnestos, however, were the final recipients of the two epistolary chains, not necessarily the final keepers of their (separate) « archives » : rather, we should think of these two sets of papers as « files » within the same comprehensive archives, possibly kept at the central office for the administration of the nome *metropolis*, where the *oikonomos* and the *basilikos grammateus* worked in close cooperation<sup>2</sup>.

On the basis of the combined information from both files, a common procedure behind these documents can be reconstructed as follows. A *grammateus* invoices the *epimeletes* for payment (either in kind or in money) due to the soldiers<sup>3</sup>. The *epimeletes* checks the *grammateus*' calculation, then forwards it (with corrections, if needed) to the *oikonomos*<sup>4</sup>. The *epimeletes* also writes to the *sitologos* (for payments in kind) or to the *trapezites* (for payments in money) : the copy he forwards to the *sitologos* (or *trapezites*) includes a copy of the *grammateus*' invoice, followed by the *epimeletes*' own order for payment, expressed in the first person<sup>5</sup>. Parallel, as it were, to the *epimeletes*, the *oikonomos* also sends the *sitologos* (or *trapezites*) an order for the same payment, with reference to the *epimeletes*'

<sup>1</sup> Note that P.Strasb. II 103 and 104 (Hathyr of year 12) actually name him as the assistant to the *epimeletes* Protarchos, whereas in P.Köln XI 448 (Phamenoth of year 12), Agathokles appears to be himself the *epimeletes*. It therefore appears that Agathokles was promoted to *epimeletes* within the approx. three-month period between Hathyr and Phamenoth of regnal year 12, *i.e.* – presumably – at the beginning of the new (13<sup>th</sup>) financial year in the month of Mecheir (or Tybi) of regnal year 12. On the regnal year in relation to financial year, see the helpful sketch provided by Clarysse (1976) 186 ; on the beginning of the financial year in Tybi or Mecheir, see P.Köln VI, p. 159–160 and P.Heid. VI, p. 129–130.

<sup>2</sup> See Falivene (2010) 210.

<sup>3</sup> P.Köln XI 448 : Archedemus, *grammateus* of the cavalrymen stationed in the Herakleopolite nome ; P.Strasb. II 103 and 104 : Dion, *grammateus* of the infantrymen stationed in the fort of Techthô. On Agathokles, *epimeletes*, see previous note.

<sup>4</sup> P.Strasb. II 104. The *oikonomos* possibly kept the original of the *grammateus*' invoice.

<sup>5</sup> Order for payment from the *epimeletes* to the *trapezites* : P.Strasb. II 103, 1–12 ; in attachment : copy of the *grammateus*' invoice (13–20), then the *epimeletes*' order in the first person (« I, Agathokles, etc. » : 21–23). And similarly in P.Köln XI 448 : order for payment from the *epimeletes* to the *sitologos* (12–16), followed by a copy of the *grammateus*' invoice (17–19) and the *epimeletes*' order in the first person (« I, Agathokles, etc. » : 20–23).

order, and undersigned by the *basilikos grammateus*<sup>6</sup>. At this point, the procedure for money payment reaches its end, as the *trapezites* could easily himself proceed with the payment in money. Payment in kind, on the other hand, required one more step : the *sitologos* writes to the *archiphylakites*, who is in charge of the actual delivery of (in the present case) wheat and barley<sup>7</sup>.

What I particularly wish to discuss is, first, the dating of these two files. Theomnestos' file has been dated by its editors on the basis of P.Köln XI 438 (dated to a year 9). In this case, the procedure concerns payment in kind (wine) for the *apomoira* to be destined to the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphos ; it is initiated by an order from the *dioiketes* Phoinix, whom we also know from two letters addressed by an official called Theodotos to the *dioiketes* Phoinix : these are now a Heidelberg papyrus (VBP II 13 = SB VIII 9800a), and its « twin » document in London (P.Hib. II 244)<sup>8</sup>. VBP II 13 is by far the better preserved of the two : Theodotos asks the *dioiketes* to write to the *epimeletes* of the Saite nome, who is to provide freighters for the transport of provisions (apparently including fodder : 8) to the Herakleopolite nome ; the last preserved line of its top fragment bears reference to a year 9<sup>9</sup>. The handwriting of P.Hib. II 244 (a very small piece from the top left corner of the original document) was judged by Turner to be « of the end of Philadelphus' reign or the early years of Euergetes », which would support the conclusion that « year 9 » in which Phoinix was *dioiketes* was in fact the ninth regnal year of Ptolemy III Euergetes (239/238 BC)<sup>10</sup>. As a matter of fact, a different *dioiketes* (Theogenes) is attested in year 9 of Philopator<sup>11</sup>. I also see no problem in the fact that year 9 was apparently Phoinix' last year in charge as *dioiketes*, another one (called Eutychos) being attested for year 10 of Euergetes (238/237)<sup>12</sup>. If P.Köln XI 438 is dated to 238 BC, the whole of Theomnestos' file must of course be dated around this time : P.Köln XI 448, for instance, should date from 235 BC.

The editors of the Theomnestos archive prefer a date under Philopator's reign and, in order to reconcile this with the fact that the *dioiketes* in year 9 of Philopator was Theogenes, they suggest that Phoinix may have been a *hypodioiketes*<sup>13</sup>. In VBP II 13, however, Phoinix is expected to act between, and above two different and distant districts (Saites and Herakleopolites), precisely as a *dioiketes* should do, and this must indeed have been his function – unless we somewhat uneconomically assume that there were two officials

<sup>6</sup> P.Strasb. II 104 : order for payment in the form of a letter from the *oikonomos* Theon to the *trapezites* Hermias (1–17), followed by Theon's order in the first person (« I, Theon, etc. » : 18–21) and undersigned (in demotic) by the *basilikos grammateus*, according to Clarysse (1989) 132, n. 48. Wilcken (1923) 91 understood P.Strasb. II 104 to have been « in attachment » to P.Strasb. II 103. P.Köln XI 448, 24–25 (a separate fragment, in a different hand) might be what is left of a similar document from Theomnestos' file : not part of P.Köln XI 448 itself, then, but attached to it ; if so, Theon's name (not Theophilos) should be supplied at the beginning of line 24. Note that Theon's capacity as *oikonomos* of the Herakleopolite nome is only apparent from P.Köln XI 448, where explicit mention of the *basilikos grammateus* (obviously the same who undersigned P.Strasb. II 104) is also found (3 : name lost).

<sup>7</sup> P.Köln XI 448, 1–11 : from the *sitologos* Theophilos to the *archiphylakites* Theomnestos, who is apparently to avail himself of attendants (4).

<sup>8</sup> Theodotos' precise function is not stated in what is left of the two documents.

<sup>9</sup> New reading by Armoni and Maresch (P.Köln XI, p. 82, n. 2), who add that a decimal number could precede here : this, however, is made less likely by the fact that we now have another document (P.Köln XI 438) certainly attesting a *dioiketes* named Phoinix in a year 9.

<sup>10</sup> Turner describes it as a « scrap from the right-hand corner » (P.Hib. II, p. 155), but this must be a slip of the pen on his part.

<sup>11</sup> After some controversy, consent was apparently reached on the dating of the *dioiketes* Theogenes under Philopator, rather than under Euergetes (palaeography of some of the relevant documents not allowing for a date later than Philopator's reign). See Clarysse / Hauben (1991) 53, n. 25. Further bibliography in P.Köln XI, p. 83–84, n. 7–8.

<sup>12</sup> The *dioiketes* Eutychos is attested in the correspondence of the architect Theodoros : see P.Petr. II 15 (2 a, 2 b ; = P.Petr. III 43 [7]) ; more precisely, P.Petr. II 15 (2 a) refers to instructions from the *dioiketes* Eutychos for a year 10.

<sup>13</sup> See P.Köln XI, p. 84.

called Phoinix : first a *dioiketes* under Euergetes and then, under Philopator, another Phoinix who, though called *dioiketes* in P.Köln XI 438, was actually a *hypodioiketes*.

Another argument adduced in favour of a date in Philopator's time for the Theomnestos papers is that no *epimeletes* is apparently attested before Philopator's reign<sup>14</sup>. But there is a risk of circular reasoning in arguing for the same point in opposite directions : either A (« no *dioiketes* Phoinix under Euergetes ») derives from B (« no *epimeletes* under Euergetes ») or, conversely, B derives from A. In other words : if we accept that VBP II 13 attests Phoinix as *dioiketes* in year 9 of Euergetes, by the same token the office of *epimeletes* comes to be attested under Euergetes ; it then follows that other documents mentioning a *dioiketes* Phoinix (P.Hib. II 244, but also P.Köln XI 438) will be datable to Euergetes' time, and the same will apply (if palaeography so allow) to documents mentioning an *epimeletes*, such as P.Grad. 7 (= SB III 6280), P.Strasb. II 104 and P.Köln XI 448. P.Grad. 7 is a receipt issued by a *grammateus* and nine illiterate men for payment of varying quantities of corn under the supervision of the assistants to, respectively, the *sitologos*, the *oikonomos* and the *epimeletes* ; P.Strasb. II 104 refers to the *epimeletes* Protarchos and his assistant Agathokles ; in P.Köln XI 448, Agathokles himself appears in the capacity of *epimeletes*<sup>15</sup>. The argument that a document mentioning the *dioiketes* Phoinix cannot be dated to year 9 of Euergetes because it mentions an *epimeletes* thereby dissolves.

Ultimately, the reason for the editors' reluctance towards dating the Theomnestos file under Euergetes must be its connection to the Hermias papers : these documents derive from the same cartonnage as the « Harmachis archive », published as a whole and assigned to Philopator's reign by Clarysse (1976)<sup>16</sup>. This dating is then taken for granted, and extended to the Hermias archive in a later study, dealing with the wider question of the adoption of the copper monetary standard in Ptolemaic Egypt<sup>17</sup>. It deserves, I think, to be reconsidered.

The Harmachis file (or « archive ») deals with the state transport of grain from the Herakleopolite nome to Alexandria in a year 8 which can be either 240/239 (year 8 of Euergetes) or 215/214 (year 8 of Philopator). In adopting a date in Philopator's reign Clarysse (1976) followed the *editor princeps* of P.Strasb. VI 562 and 563 (Schwartz [1973]), two of the Harmachis documents<sup>18</sup>. Clarysse, however, amended the date of P.Strasb. VI 562 : by reading « year 8 » instead of « 21 » (Schwartz's reading) in P.Strasb. VI 562, and pointing out that P.Strasb. VI 562 and 563 in fact deal with the same kind of transaction (transport of grain to Alexandria) to be performed by a captain bearing the same name (Herakleides) and by means of a freight belonging to the same person (« Agathokleia's boat »), Clarysse brought this document in line with the rest of the Harmachis file, and brilliantly streamlined its interpretation. In so doing, however, he also eliminated one of the two arguments put forth by Schwartz in favour of interpreting « year 8 » as « year 8 of Philopator ». Schwartz's argument ran as follows : as palaeography of both P.Strasb. VI 562 and 563 only allows for a date in the third century BC, « year 21 » must be assigned to Euergetes' reign ; « year 8 », on the other hand, must be more recent,

<sup>14</sup> See Clarysse / Hauben (1991). Most recent discussion : McGing (2002).

<sup>15</sup> McGing (2002) 52 already notes that, if VBP II 13, P.Hib. II 244 and P.Grad.7 have been correctly dated by their editors in the third century BC, they « would, of course, put the office back earlier than Clarysse and Hauben propose ». He also recalls that Seider (1938) 80 « proposed that Phoenix was the successor to the famous Apollonios and was in office before 242 BC ».

<sup>16</sup> The archaeological link between the Hermias and the Harmachis files (both were retrieved from the same cartonnage) is reinforced by internal data (reference to the same place, Techtho, as the location of, respectively, a *phourion* and a *thesauros*) : see Falivene (2010) 208–209.

<sup>17</sup> See Clarysse / Lanciers (1989) 127–132.

<sup>18</sup> P.Strasb. VI 562 and 563 are # 1 and 2 in Clarysse (1976) 185–189.

*i.e.* it must be Philopator's eighth year<sup>19</sup>. Schwartz supported his line of reasoning with a side argument: Agathokleia's ownership of one of the freights transporting grain to Alexandria would be « peu probable après les événements de 203 av. J.-C. », the year in which Agathokleia, the daughter of Oinathe of Samos and mistress of Ptolemy IV, was lynched by the mob in Alexandria<sup>20</sup>. Once « year 21 » is no longer read in P.Strasb. VI 562, there no longer is a *terminus post quem* for « year 8 », which eliminates Schwartz's first argument in favour of « year 8 » of Philopator as the date of P.Strasb. VI 563 and (after Clarysse's new reading) P.Strasb. VI 562.

Schwartz's side argument was more explicitly stated by Hauben (1975): after excluding all other possible identifications for the Agathokleia referred to (albeit incidentally) in P.Strasb. VI 562 and 563, Hauben drew the conclusion that « [P.Strasb.] 562 must perforce be dated, with Schwartz, to 227 », and that this « confirms the presumption that Oinathe was already living at court with her children under Euergetes I and that the family was already held in esteem at that time. »<sup>21</sup> This, the « Agathokleia argument », though originally aimed at excluding a date *later* than year 8 of Philopator, could also be used as evidence against « year 8 of Euergetes »: for, would Agathokleia not be too young a shipowner in 240/239? I think not, and more easily so, if she was older than both her lover the king, and her brother Agathokles (said in one source to be Philopator's *eromenos*, therefore possibly the youngest of the three). Agathokleia's (and her mother's) empowerment, following immediately upon Euergetes' death, does suggest that she was by then old enough to be in control of her lover, and of his kingdom<sup>22</sup>; a rather surprising turn of phrase in Strabo may even hint at an age difference nearer to that normally occurring between mother and son<sup>23</sup>. If so, and assuming that Philopator was born soon after his parents' marriage, she would definitely be old enough to be endowed with ships in the ninth year of the reign of Euergetes<sup>24</sup>.

The re-dating of the Harmachis file under Euergetes, if accepted, will reverberate on the dating of the Hermias file (whose documents were retrieved from the same cartonnage as the Harmachis papyri) and, in turn, on the dating of the Theomnestos file (which has two officials in common with the Hermias file, namely the *oikonomos* Theon and the *epimeletes* Agathokles). Thus, P.Köln XI 438 and P.Köln XI 448 (both from Theomnestos' file) should date from, respectively, years 9 and 12 of Euergetes, and P.Strasb. II 103 and 104 (from Hermias' file) should also be assigned to year 12 of Euergetes (approx. in the month of Hathyr, *i.e.* between December 20, 236 and January 18, 235 BC)<sup>25</sup>. If so, the *dioiketes* Phoinix (mentioned in P.Köln XI 438) held office in year 9 of Euergetes (239/238); thus

<sup>19</sup> Alternatively, a « year 21 » later than a « year 8 » could only belong to Ptolemy V Epiphanes (185/184): too late, on account of palaeography.

<sup>20</sup> See Schwartz (1973) 86. Our source on Agathokleia's fate is Polyb. 15, 24 a–33.

<sup>21</sup> Hauben (1975) 290, n. 10, with reference to Walbank (1967) 437–438: « Oinathe (...) was a Samian who came to Alexandria under Ptolemy III (Plut. *Mor.* 753d), whose mistress she probably became. »

<sup>22</sup> On Philopator's *eromenos*, see ΣAristoph. *Thesm.* 1062. There may have been some (intentional) confusion of roles by an unfavourable source now lost to us, *i.e.* Polybius himself, or rather Ptolemy of Megalopolis, on whom see Walbank (1967) 480. Athen. 6, 251e, on the other hand, attributes to Agathokles the quite adult role of *hetairoi*. On Agathokleia's empowerment, see Plut. *Cleom.* 33 and *De amore* 753d; Athen. 13, 577a; Iustin. 30, 1–2.

<sup>23</sup> See Strab. 17, 1, 11, which Jones (1932) in fact translated « Philopator *the son of* Agathokleia » (italics mine).

<sup>24</sup> I.Philae 4, 3 mentions « children » by the royal couple visiting the local temple soon after Euergetes' precipitous return from the Third Syrian war (end of 245, or 244 BC).

<sup>25</sup> More precisely: P.Köln XI 438 should date from November 12–13, 239 BC; P.Köln XI 448 from approx. between April 19 and May 18, 235 BC, *i.e.* in the month of Phamenoth of Euergetes' year 12. Note that in the Hermias file Agathokles appears as the *assistant* to the *epimeletes* Protarchos, whereas in the Theomnestos file he is himself the *epimeletes*: this may be explained by assuming his promotion at the beginning of the new financial year, which was usually in Mecheir (or Tybi), *i.e.* after Hathyr (Hermias file), but before Phamenoth (Theomnestos file). For the financial year in relation to the regnal year, see the very useful sketch in Clarysse (1976) 187.



there is no need to suppose that Phoinix was in fact a *hypodioiketes* (a title which in itself would require further investigation). Dating the Hermias file under Euergetes also makes it easy to explain why the silver currency is adopted in these documents, as this was in fact the only standard in use at this time : problems of timing which may derive from dating the Hermias papers under Philopator thus evaporate<sup>26</sup>.

Finally, dating the Harmachis, Hermias and Theomnestos files in the years 8, 12, and 9–12 of Euergetes' reign, respectively, may have interesting implications as regards reasons and circumstances for the movements of supplies between Alexandria and the Herakleopolite nome, and the payments to infantry- and cavalrymen that are attested in all of these documents. Extraordinary circumstances are suggested by the following documents :

- P.Strasb. II 93 (= SB XVI 12287 = Clarysse [1976] # 4) : requisitioning, in year 8, of all draught-animals ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸ τόποις, *i.e.* in the area pertaining to the *oikonomos* Horos or his agent Harmachis, in order to convey corn to several ports.
- P.Köln XI 441 : armed rebels robbing a presumably state-owned linen and clothes factory in year 11. And
- P.Strasb. II 111 (= Clarysse [1976] # 7) : strikers abandoning their workplace, but eventually resuming work in year 8: the exact hours of events are specified here.
- P.Strasb. II 95 (= Clarysse [1976] # 5) : apparently deals with distributions (παράδοσις, ἀνάδοσις) to soldiers in Alexandria in year 8<sup>27</sup>.

In my opinion, such circumstances may relate to the aftermath of the Third Syrian War, when Euergetes was compelled to hurry back to Egypt and take economic measures in order to sedate internal troubles.

Let us move on to the question of provenance. « Museum archaeology » in Strasbourg has ascertained that the files of Hermias and of Harmachis were retrieved from the same cartonnage, bought by Friedrich Zucker for the DPK in Gafadun (ancient Korphotoi, in the Agema toparchy of the Herakleopolites) and also containing the well-known Euripidean anthology P.Strasb. inv. WG 304–307. Provenance from el-Hibeh for these sets of papyri is possible, though not definitely proven<sup>28</sup>. On the other hand, Tebtynis demonstrably is the provenance of many cartonnage papyri acquired in the 1970s and 1980s, extracted by Michael Fackelmann and eventually distributed over different collections : this is shown by coincidences with Tebtynis papyri long ago extracted from cartonnage and published by Grenfell and Hunt (and Smyly)<sup>29</sup>. But do all « Fackelmann papyri » come from Tebtynis ? And is the Theomnestos file also « Fackelmann material » ? One thing is assured : the Theomnestos file, now in Köln, must have the same provenance as the Hermias and Harmachis files, in Strasbourg since 1909.

It is truly to be regretted that no information (equivalent to that available for the Hermias, Harmachis and Theodotos files) is available as regards the acquisition of the cartonnage made with the Theomnestos file. Were such information available, we might still

<sup>26</sup> Discussion in Clarysse / Lanciers (1989), who argue for the use of the silver standard, while trying to conciliate this with a dating under Philopator rather than under Epiphanes. This later dating was favoured by Reekmans (1948) 28 (assuming adoption of the copper standard) against Heichelheim (1930) 26, who assigned the Hermias documents to Euergetes' reign with no further argument (he may have seen no need for it because he assumed the use of the silver standard, which would necessitate this earlier dating).

<sup>27</sup> See Clarysse (1976) 198. Possible internal links between the Theomnestos and Harmachis archives are worth pointing out: reference to clothes (συνία) is found in P.Strasb. II 95 (= Clarysse [1976] # 5, as well as in P.Köln. XI 441. The wording (ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸ τόποις) as in P.Strasb. II 93 recurs in P.Köln XI 438 : could the sender of P.Köln XI 438 (Stratonikos, whose function we ignore) be the same as in P.Strasb. II 93 (whose name is lost) ? The expression ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸ τόποις also recurs in P.Petrie II 38 b : see Clarysse (1976) 191, n. 17.

<sup>28</sup> See Falivene (2010).

<sup>29</sup> See Clarysse (2008) ; Lippert (2008).

retrieve some important external (or material) evidence, which would be very relevant to the provenance of the Theomnestos papers, as well as of the Harmachis and Hermias files, and of the Euripidean anthology (P.Strasb. inv. WG 304 – 307) obtained from the same piece of cartonnage. As things presently stand, we are reduced to internal evidence. Thus, the (admittedly subjective) palaeographical observation that the Euripidean anthology was written by a hand similar to that of P.Hib. II 184 (doubtfully titled « Logical Exercise » by Turner) may further support its el-Hibeh provenance and, in consequence, that of the Hermias and Harmachis documents. The related Theomnestos documents, more recently acquired by the Köln collection, should then also come from el-Hibeh.

Consequently, reference to the *dioiketes* Phoinix in one of the Theomnestos documents (P.Köln XI 438) might be something more than a coincidence : as a matter of fact, P.Hib. II 184 was obtained from mummy 126, and so was P.Hib. II 245, an official letter addressed to the same Theodotus who addressed his letter (VBP II 13) to the same *dioiketes*. Provenance from Shêkh Hassan's el-Hibeh excavations of a good number of other Heidelberg papyri is in fact well ascertained<sup>30</sup> : they were acquired through the DPK before World War I, and VBP II 13 must have been one of these, as revealed by its « twin » document P.Hib. II 244, which was among those discovered in Shêkh Hassan's excavations but bought by Grenfell and Hunt in 1896. VBP II 13 and P.Hib. II 244, as well as P.Hib. II 245 and P.Hib. II 246 (also a letter to Theodotos, but from yet another mummy-case) must all have originally been in Theodotos' file of correspondence. P.Graf. 7 (referred to above as one of the papyri mentioning an *epimeletes*, and in fact dealing with a transaction altogether similar to those attested in the Harmachis, Hermias and Theomnestos files) was likely acquired through the same channel. In the case of the literary papyri, common provenance points to origin from one and the same book collection. Incidentally, the handwriting of the Köln Sappho papyrus (from an anthology : P.Köln XI 429 and 430) can be usefully compared to those of the Strasbourg Euripidean anthology, and of P.Hib. II 184<sup>31</sup>.

All things considered, it seems to me that there exists a good possibility that all of these papyri were recycled in Antiquity in order to produce one mummy-case (or possibly more than one, but in the same workshop and at the same time), and that their common provenance is el-Hibeh. Different pieces of the original mummy-case(s), however, appear to have been found at widely different times. How could this be ? Two possible answers occur to me : either new clandestine findings must have gone on, or else material from an old collection at some stage appeared on the antiquities market (such was apparently the case with the Artemidorus papyrus)<sup>32</sup>. Precious information from living testimonies might still be retrieved. In Egypt as in Italy, and elsewhere, « ask the locals » should be a golden rule – but we also urgently need some oral history within our own papyrological community.

## Bibliography

- Brodersen, K. / Elsner, J. (ed.) (2009), *Images and Texts on the « Artemidorus Papyrus »* (Stuttgart).  
 Clarysse, W. (1976), « Harmachis, Agent of the Oikonomos : An Archive from the Time of Philopator », *Ancient Society* 7, 185–207.  
 Clarysse, W. / Lanciers, E. (1989), « Currency and the Dating of Demotic and Greek Papyri from the Ptolemaic Period », *Ancient Society* 20, 117–132.  
 Clarysse, W. / Hauben, H. (1991), « Ten Ptolemaic Granary Receipts from Pyrrheia », *ZPE* 89, 47–68.

<sup>30</sup> See Falivene (2004).

<sup>31</sup> On the occasion of the Geneva Congress of Papyrology, Prof. Jürgen Hammerstaedt informed me that the Sappho papyrus and the Theomnestos documents came to the Köln collection via different channels. This may point to different provenances ; the dispersal of objects found at the same site, however, often starts precisely with their being sold through different dealers.

<sup>32</sup> For a provisional summary of this much discussed case, see Brodersen / Elsner (2009).

- Clarysse, W. (2008), « Graeco-Roman Oxyrhyncha, a Village in the Arsinoite nome », in Lippert / Schentuleit (2008) 55–73.
- Falivene, M.R. (2001), « Il censimento dei papiri provenienti da Al Hiba : principi metodologici, con qualche esempio », in *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Firenze 1998* (Firenze), 411–420.
- Falivene, M.R. (2010), « Greek Anthologies on Papyrus and their Readers in Early Ptolemaic Egypt », in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor 2007* (Ann Arbor), 207–216.
- Hauben, H. (1975), « Agathokleia and her Boats », *ZPE* 16, 289–291.
- Heichelheim, F. (1930), *Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen der Zeit von Alexander bis Augustus (Beiträge zur Erforschung der wirtschaftlichen Wechsellagen, Auschwung, Krise, Stockung* 3, Jena).
- Jones, H.L. (1932), *The Geography of Strabo VIII* (Cambridge Mass. / London).
- Lippert, S. / Schentuleit, M. (ed.) (2008), *Graeco-Roman Fayum. Texts and Archaeology. Proceedings of the Third International Fayum Symposium, Freudenstadt 2007* (Wiesbaden).
- Lippert, S. (2008), « Like Phoenix from the Mummies : Demotic Documents from Oxyrhyncha in Cartonnages from Tebtunis », in Lippert / Schentuleit (2008) 165–171.
- McGing, B.C. (2002), « Illegal Salt in the Lycopolite Nome. Appendix : The Ptolemaic Epimeletes », *APF* 48, 51–64.
- Reekmans, T. (1948), « Monetary History and the Dating of Ptolemaic Papyri », *Studia Hellenistica*, 15–43.
- Seider, R. (1938), *Beiträge zur ptolemäischen Verwaltungsgeschichte* (Heidelberg).
- Thomas, J.D. (1978), « Aspects of the Ptolemaic Civil Service : the Dioiketes and the Nomarch », in Maehler, H. / Strocka, V.M. (Hrsg.), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des Internationalen Symposiums, Berlin 1976* (Berlin), 187–194.
- Walbank, F.W. (1967), *Polybius II. A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford).
- Wilcken, U. (1923), « Referate. IX. P.Straßb. II », *APF* 7, 87–93.