

### XVIII.—The Garden of Ptolemagrus at Panopolis

C. BRADFORD WELLES

YALE UNIVERSITY

Shortly before the War, in 1938, Habashi Effendi of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities discovered the fragment of a Greek inscription in a private house in Akhmim, the Hellenistic Panopolis, in Middle Egypt. When brought to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, the stone proved to be the lower portion of a square pillar acquired about the beginning of the century, and of unknown provenience although its label read "Alexandria."<sup>1</sup> In the following year, the complete monument was published by the Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Octave Guéraud, with a general discussion of the readings and the problems of the text.<sup>2</sup> Among other things, he pointed out the significance of the fact that a fragment of the same text had turned up in 1901, upon a pillar of somewhat different dimensions, and had been photographed in an antiquities shop in Abutig by the late Ludwig Borchardt.<sup>3</sup> It is the object of the present paper to review the text in the light of Guéraud's edition, and to attempt to come a little further toward an understanding of its significance for the social history of Egypt in the late second or third century of our era.

There is no need of repeating the exact and detailed description of Guéraud. As reconstructed, the monument is a pillar of modest height, nearly square in section, and as the inscription runs practically to the bottom of the four faces, it must originally have stood upon a base. Each of the four faces was similarly designed. At the top, in a recessed field, stands in low relief the bust of a Greek deity, identified by a verse of Homer on the border. Below, in the Egyptian style of outline relief, are three or, on the two wider sides, four Canopic jars, representing fourteen of the more notable Eryp-

<sup>1</sup> Published by J. G. Milne, "Greek Inscriptions from Egypt," *JHS* 21 (1901) 286–290, no. x (cf. Seymour de Ricci, *APF* 2 [1903] 568); *Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*, 23 (1905) 48, no. 9267, pl. vii.

<sup>2</sup> "Le Monument d'Agrios au Musée du Caire," *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 39 (1939) 279–303, pls. XL–XLIII.

<sup>3</sup> "Metrische Inschrift aus Ägypten," *APF* 2 (1903) 94 f., with added note by Ulrich Wilcken.

tian gods and goddesses. Below these, in turn, occur the Greek texts, filling the remaining available space. The cutting is careful but not skillful, and mistakes occur. The letters are a mixture of square and rounded characters which Ulrich Wilcken was inclined to date in the second or third century of our era. Guéraud follows him, and it is impossible to be more exact. There are indications that the stone-cutter worked from a copy.<sup>4</sup>

Face 1 is surmounted by the bust of Ares, identified by Homer, *Iliad* 5.31 (=455). The text is as follows:<sup>5</sup>

	ΕΙΜΙ ΜΕΝΕΞΙΕΡΗΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΙΗΣ	
	ΟΠΛΟΙΣ ΙΝΑ ΓΩΓΟΣ· ΚΑΙ ΣΑΡΟΣ	
	ΕΝ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΙΣ ΗΔΑΡΕΟΣ ΘΕ	
	ΡΑΠΩΝ· ΠΟΛΛΑ ΔΕ ΝΕΤΕΕ	
5	ΒΕΕΣΙ ΘΕΩΝ ΕΡΓΟΙΣ ΜΕΜΟΓΗΚΑ	
	ΣΩΜΑΤΙΚΑΙ ΘΥΜΩ ΓΗΡΑΟ[	]
	ΚΑΛΕΓΩΝ· ΟΤΝΕ ΚΕ ΠΑΙΝ[	]
	ΣΑΝΤΕΣ ΕΠΕΤΑΚΤΟ. .[	]
	[ ] ΝΤΕΣ ΑΟΦΡΟΣΤΝ.[	]
10	[	]
	.Ε.[	]
	ΦΟΝΕΝΕ.[	]
	ΓΡΙΟΝ ΩΔΕ.[	]
	ΦΩΠΑΙ ΔΕ ΔΥ[	]
15	ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΣ· ΕΥ[	]
	> —	
	ΤΑΥΤΑ ΔΙΕΤΣΕΒΙ ΗΝ ΠΙΤΟΔ[	]
	ΓΡΙΟΣ ΕΞΕΠΟΝΗΣΕΝ· ΤΕΤΕΔ[	]
	ΡΑΝΙΔΑΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΜΑΚΑΡΕΣ ΣΙΘΕ[	]
	ΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΟΔΕΞΙΟΦΙΝ <sup>6</sup>	
20	ΠΑΝΟΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ	
	ΠΑΡΑΣΗΚΟΝ· ΕΣΔΙ	
	ΜΝΑΣ ΦΟΙΒΟΤΜΕ	
	ΧΡΙΕ· ΑΣΑΦΙΚΗ·	

The first six lines of the elegiac were restored by Milne, the last four by Guéraud. How many verses, and of what sort, occurred in

<sup>4</sup> Guéraud, *op. cit.* (see note 2) 284; cf. especially the confusion of Ε and Γ.

<sup>5</sup> Here and below in the transcription of the text, a medial dot indicates the presence on the stone of the symbol > used to mark the ends of the lines of verse.

<sup>6</sup> The last five lines are shorter than the rest due to an original break in the surface of the stone.

the mutilated center remains obscure. There is space for about two couplets, but the verse endings indicated by the punctuation after ΓΠΙΟΝΩΔΕ and Καλλιμαχος, hexameter and pentameter respectively, come in the wrong places. It is unlikely that further revision of the stone would help, because Guéraud was fully aware of the difficulty, and the second punctuation mark, at all events, is reasonably clear from the photograph.

Εἰμὶ μὲν ἐξ ἱερῆς στρατιῆς ὅπλοισιν ἁ(ρ)ωγός,<sup>7</sup>  
 Καίσαρος ἐν πολέμοις ἡδ' Ἀρεος θεράπων·  
 πολλὰ δ' ἐν εὐ(σ)εβέεσσ<σ>ι θεῶν ἔργοις μεμόγηκα  
 σώματι καὶ θυμῷ γήραος[ς οὐ]κ ἀλέγων.  
 5 οὐνεκ' ἐπαιν[ή]σαντες ἐπ' εὐτάκτοιο [βίοιο]  
 [νοῦ]ν τε σαοφροσύνη[ν τ' ἄστοι ἐπεκλείσαν].  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 ταῦτα δι' εὐσεβίην Πτολ[εμά]γριος ἐξεπόνησεν  
 τεύξα[ς Οὐ]ρανίδαις καὶ μακάρεσσι θε[οῖς]  
 πάντ' ἀπὸ δεξιόφιν Πανὸς μεγάλου παρὰ σηκὸν  
 ἐς λίμνας Φοίβου μέχρ' ἱε[ρ]ᾶς ἀφίκη.<sup>8</sup>

Here and below, Guéraud has made the necessary observations in detail, and I do not differ from his conclusions. The writer, who speaks in the first person in a style suggestive of the oriental<sup>9</sup> at the beginning, then shifts, after the *paragraphus*, to the usual third person. Here, as on Face III, he calls himself Ptolemagrius, while on Face II he tells us that he is named both Ptolemaeus and Agrius. The name *Agrius* is known, but very rare;<sup>10</sup> *Ptolemagrius* is entirely unknown. It may be suggested tentatively that the second element was adopted as an epithet or cognomen, possibly in connection with

<sup>7</sup> Such reference to military service is especially common in the epitaphs, and must have been part of the stock in trade of the versifiers. Cf. the epitaph of Julius Terentius from Dura (*HThR* 34 [1941] 81), and *Gerasa* (C. H. Kraeling, *American Schools of Oriental Research*, New Haven, 1938) 452 f., nos. 219, 221.

<sup>8</sup> Guéraud, bothered by the elision (which is certainly awkward), merely suggests this reading in his commentary (295 f.).

<sup>9</sup> For a parallel cf. *The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Preliminary Report of the Seventh and Eighth Seasons of Work* (ed. M. I. Rostovtzeff and others, New Haven, 1939) 321, no. 918. Cf. from the Egyptian epitaphs, *SB* 7804, 8230, 8231. It is, of course, common for the *monument* to speak in the first person.

<sup>10</sup> I have not found an instance in Egypt, nor does it occur in the index of Dessau's *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* (Vol. III, pt. 1, Berlin, 1914). The latter omission marks it as, at all events, not a typical soldier's name. A *Lucius Agrius Pubelianus Bassus* appears in Elaea, the port of Pergamum (*IGRP* 4.271).

the transformation of Ptolemaeus from soldier to rustic, although the meaning of ἀγrios is rather "savage" than "rural." As a discharged veteran, at this time, he may be thought to have received Roman citizenship, but for metrical or other reasons he may have preferred not to use his Roman name. At all events, its absence here cannot be taken as indicating a date prior to the Antonine Constitution.<sup>11</sup>

It will be noted further that he refers to the existence of "two sons" (παῖδε δύο) in the mutilated part, one of whom may have been named Callimachus, and that the verses at the end refer to some sort of construction. By ταῦτα, as regularly in the building inscriptions, he means "this which you see," this house or monument.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, the verb ἐκπονεῖν has the technical implication of agriculture.<sup>13</sup> It is used of land rather than of masonry. While we should be a little cautious of interpreting the terms of these verse-makers too strictly, the expression fits perfectly well the operation of establishing a sort of garden or grove, which included at least two inscribed monuments. At all events, "this" was constructed out of piety, and as an offering to the gods, and had a certain extent, running "past the precinct of great Pan on the right (i.e., of the spectator as he faced this pillar) until you come to the sacred lake of Phoebus." While we seem to be very poorly informed concerning the topography and monuments of Panopolis, which was roughly used in the fierce conflicts of pagans and Christians, and which has never, so far as I can discover, been excavated, we are entitled to see in Pan's precinct the great and titular sanctuary of the metropolis.<sup>14</sup> Near by, we may suppose, was a temple of one of the

<sup>11</sup> Of the plentiful literature on the *Constitutio Antoniniana* and *P. Giss.* 40 it will be enough to refer to the most recent discussion and summary of H. I. Bell, *JEA* 28 (1942) 39-49.

<sup>12</sup> The briefest statement known to me is that of one of the ceiling tiles of the Dura Synagogue, *The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Preliminary Report of Sixth Season of Work* (New Haven, 1936) 388, no. 800: ἐκτίσεν ταῦτα οὕτως.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. for example the letter of Dareius in the inscription of the time of Hadrian from Magnesia on the Maeander, *SIG* 22.8-10: ὅτι μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐκπονέις γῆν.

<sup>14</sup> There is a brief but useful description in the 1928 edition of Baedeker. Cf. E. Amélineau, *La Géographie de l'Égypte à l'Époque Copte* (Paris, 1893) 18-22. Much the same picture comes from the early travelers' accounts, É. Quatremère, *Mémoires Géographiques et Historiques sur l'Égypte et sur quelques Contrées voisines* (Paris, 1811) 2.448-451; M. Champollion le Jeune, *L'Égypte sous les Pharaons* (Paris, 1814) 2.257-263. Strabo (17.1.42) dismisses it with the summary statement: Πανῶν πόλις, λινουργῶν καὶ λιθουργῶν κατοικία παλαιά. Herodotus (2.91), calling the city by the Egyptian name Chemmis = Akhmim (City or Sanctuary of Min), describes the rectangular

Egyptian gods whom the Greeks called Phoebus, most probably Horus.<sup>15</sup> The sacred lake was a regular feature of Egyptian temples, familiar to every visitor to Karnak or Thebes.

Face II is surmounted by the bust of Posidon, and explained by *Odyssey*, 9.528. The lines which follow are taken from the *Iliad* (15.187–193), and describe the division of the universe among the sons of Cronus. Restoration is facilitated here by the existence of the same lines in Borchardt's text.<sup>16</sup> There follow the pious line, perhaps original with Simonides<sup>17</sup> but become a commonplace of the epigram,

Μηδὲν ἀμαρτεῖν ἐστὶ θεῶν καὶ πάντα κατορθοῦν,

and four more lines of hexameter:

[Εἴ τις ἔρο]ιτο βρότων, τίς ἐν[έγλαψ]εν τάδε πέτρῃ.<sup>18</sup>  
 ἥδ[έ τις] ιδρώσας ἔργον τόσ[ον] ἐξεπώνη(σ)εν·  
 φράζ[ε] μάλ' ἀτρεκέως μιν, ἔν' ἄσβεστον κλέος εἴ[η].  
 εὔσεβέα Πτολεμαῖον ἰδ' Ἀγριον οὔνομά μ' ἄμφω.

The βρότων seems to have been thought of as a transition, in contrast with the θεῶν of the preceding line and the cosmology before that, and the ἄσβεστον κλέος is pure grandiloquence. Beyond explaining the name which the speaker has already used of himself, these verses contain only a renewed insistence on Ptolemaïus' personal and physical participation in the making of his garden and its monuments, even to the cutting of the inscriptions. To Guéraud's objection that the author of the verses would not have cut them so badly, one may reply that we need not actually suppose Ptolemaïus to have been the author. It is more likely that he turned for them to some dim forerunner of Nonnus in the town, a local verse-maker who wrote to order, perhaps from manuals.<sup>19</sup>

sanctuary with its enormous pylon, set in a grove of date palms, perhaps the ancestors of the palms of Ptolemaïus. He describes also the annual festival of the city's god, whom he calls Perseus, misled by a false etymology (cf. Amélineau, *loc. cit.*). This was an athletic contest with prizes.

<sup>15</sup> J. G. Milne, *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule* (3d ed., London, 1924 [Methuen's *History of Egypt*, Vol. v]) 196–199; cf. Adolf Erman, *A Handbook of Egyptian Religion* (London, 1907) 175.

<sup>16</sup> See above, note 3.

<sup>17</sup> Ascribed to Simonides' elegy on the dead at Marathon (fr. 63 Diehl = 82 Bergk). Guéraud refers also to the verses quoted by Demosthenes, 18.289.

<sup>18</sup> For the punctuation see above, note 5.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the bibliography on the Latin manuals cited *HTHR* 34 (1941) 81, note 10. So far as I know, the material has never been worked up from this point of view on the Greek side.

Face III bears the bust of Zeus, explained by *Iliad* 2.412, and appropriately the hexameters begin with the praise of monarchy of *Iliad* 2.204/5, converted into the Emperor's praise by the introductory words, Εἰς Καίσαρ, μέγας αὐτοκράτωρ.<sup>20</sup> Then follows in eight fragmentary lines what seems to be an enumeration of the Twelve Gods in the accusative case. The style is Homeric, or perhaps merely a cento of epic phrases taken from no one author. What may have been the meaning of this list is hard to see. The ninth line, which is better preserved, hardly explains the rest:

δῶ[δεκα θ'] οὓς σὺν Ζηνὶ θεοὺς μά[καρας] καλέονσιν.

Guéraud comments: "Sur la base d'un monument, on met volontiers à l'accusatif, sans verbe exprimé, le nom de la personne représentée. Mais, malgré la présence des divinités-canopes (d'ailleurs au nombre de quatorze), il ne semble pas que cette explication soit de mise ici." Possibly we may think of the representation of the deities elsewhere in the garden, though that will not explain the absence of a verb. To construe the whole list as depending on καλέονσιν, omitting the connective by reading τ]οὺς for θ'] οὓς, seems to me a counsel of despair.<sup>21</sup>

The last four lines on this face comprise a pair of elegiac couplets, though the language is not completely perspicuous and the two pentameters not devoid of difficulty. No transition of any sort is provided from the list of gods, nor is there a *paragraphus* as on Face I. It may be well to give the transcription first, and then the reading of Guéraud.

[ ]ENNIOΦΤΤΟΤΣΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΓΡΙ  
[ ]ΕΠΟΝΗΣΕΝ·ΠΕΡΣΕΙΑΣΠΑΣΑΣ  
[...].ΙΣΙΝΟΜΟΤ ΚΑΤΑΘΕΙΣ·ΤΑΣΔΕ  
[.]ΑΛΛΙΟΦΤΤΟΤΣΑΤΑΣΟΤΣΑΣΤΠΕ  
[.]ΗΜΩΝ·ΧΩΡΩΝΚΤΙΣΤΤΙΝΤΝ  
ΣΩΣΕΝΑΦΑΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ·

<sup>20</sup> This led Wilcken (see above, note 3) to think of Aurelian.

<sup>21</sup> This was one of many useful and penetrating suggestions of an unnamed reader, to whom the editor of the Association referred for comment the paper which I presented at Rochester. I am deeply indebted to him, even where, as here, I do not accept all of his proposals. My thanks will be obvious to him in the many ways in which the paper has been changed in the light of his criticism.

That is to say:

[Τὰς μ]ὲν ν<ε>ιοφύτους Πτολεμάργρι[ος ἐξ]επόνησεν.<sup>22</sup>  
 περσείας πάσας [π]αῖσιν ὁμοῦ<sup>23</sup> καταθείς·  
 τὰς δὲ [π]αλαιοφύτους αὔας οὔσας ὑπε[ρ]ήμων·  
 χωρῶν κτιστῦϊ νῦν σώσεν ἀφανόμενας.

Here the verb *ἐκπονεῖν* is used unmistakably of agricultural pursuits. Ptolemaïrius had prepared newly-planted *perseae*, setting them out with the help of his sons, and had rescued old ones by the re-establishment of arid land through irrigation. These trees are the *Mimusops Schimperi* Hochstett of the botanists, which bears in the summer a fruit similar to the mango. It was popular in ancient times in Egypt, but declined under the Empire and became almost extinct later. It has been revived in modern times.<sup>24</sup>

Thus far the monument of Ptolemaïrius presents no serious difficulties. We may be struck by the proximity of his garden to the temples of "Pan" and of "Phoebus," and by the repeated emphasis on the personal toil and labor of himself and his sons. The latter is really notable in Egypt, where physical labor has never been respectable and where the distinction between worker and effendi seems always to have been sharply drawn. Otherwise, however, we have the familiar picture in Imperial times of the discharged veteran who had received the *missio nummaria* and invested his bonus in land.<sup>25</sup>

At the top of Face IV, what may be thought to have been a bust of Hades, with the accompanying verse, has been largely broken away.<sup>26</sup> The text is transcribed as follows:

ΑΓΡΙΟΣΙΣΤΙΑΕΙΚΑΤΕΤΟΣ  
 ΔΙΣΔΗΜΟΝΑΠΑΝΤΑ·ΠΑ

<sup>22</sup> For the punctuation see above, note 5.

<sup>23</sup> This is the reading which Guéraud suggests in his commentary.

<sup>24</sup> So Steier, *RE* 37 (1937), 940-944. The same opinion is held by M. I. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 1941) 299, where he points out the value of these trees for lumber. Some have thought that some, at least, of these *περσείαι* or *περσάι* may have been peach trees; cf. M. Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 7, 1925) 312-314.

<sup>25</sup> The matter is well known. Cf. for example Rostovtzeff, *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft im römischen Kaiserreich* (Leipzig, 1931) 1.198 and 338; Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome (Roman Egypt)*, by A. C. Johnson; Baltimore, 1936) 2.680; 4.143-145 (*Roman Syria*, by F. M. Heichelheim, 1938).

<sup>26</sup> It may, however, be possible to detect Cerberus.

ΝΟΣΟΡΕΣΣΙΝΟΜΟΙΟΚΑΤΕΙ  
 ΛΑΠΙΝΑΣΦΟΙΒΟΙΟ·ΑΝΔΡΕ  
 5 ΔΤΑΡΧΟΝΤΑΣΚΑΛΕΩΝ  
 ΚΑΤΑΕΘΝΟΣΕΚΑΣΤΟΝ·  
 [     ]ΘΝΟΤΣΙΕΡΗΑΣΕΩ  
 [     ]ΧΩΝΤΕΣΤΝΕΡ  
 [     ]ΕΙΣΕΚΑΤΟΝΔΙΣΠΑΝ  
 10 [     ]ΣΑΤΚΑΒΑΝΤΟΣ  
 [     ]ΔΚΤΟΣΑΝΗ.[?]  
 [     ]Λ ΗΘΟΣΤΠΕΡΔΤΝΑΜΙΝ  
 ΦΙΛΟΤΙΜΟΣ·  
 >—  
 ΟΔΕΣΤΙΒΙΟΤΟΣΑΓΡΙΟΙΟΚΑΙ  
 15 ΤΡΚΗΩΝ·ΦΟΙΝΙΚΕΣΕΙΣΩ  
 ΚΕΙΝΟΔΟΙΣΙΠΕΡΣΕΙΑΙ·ΗΔ<sup>27</sup>  
 ΜΕΝΙΠΠΙΟΣΔΤΟΣΑΓΗΦΟΡΟΙ  
 ΔΟΤΝΟΙ·ΠΟΛΛΩΝΚΑΘΗ  
 ΓΗΤΗΡΕΣΕΤΣΕΒΩΝΕΡΓΩΝ  
 20 ΕΞΩΝΑΕΙΖΩΤΣΙΦΙΛΟΣΟ  
 ΦΩΣΔΙΗΝ·ΠΟΝΟΙΣΙΠΑΝ  
 ΤΟΙΟΙΣΙΔΕΙΤΑΠΡΗΣΣΟΝΤΕ[     ]  
 ΑΤΕΡΘΕΠΛΟΤΤΟΤΚΑΙΦΘΟ  
 ΝΟΤΚΑΚΟΖΗΑΟΤ·

The five hexameters are restored by Milne as follows, Guéraud proposing no restorations for lines 4 and 5:

"Αγριος ιστιάει κατ' ἔτος δις δῆμον ἅπαντα.<sup>28</sup>  
 Πανὸς ὀρεσσινόμοιο κατ' εἰλαπίνας Φοίβοιο·  
 ἄνδρε δὺ' ἄρχοντας καλέων κατὰ ἔθνος ἕκαστον·  
 [τοῦ τ' ἑ]θνους ἱερῆας ἑω[θε] χοῶν τέ συνερ[γούς]  
 5 εἰς ἑκατὸν δις παν[τὸς ὁμῶ]ς λυκάβαντος [ἀγῆλαι.]

One may translate as follows:

"Agrius feasts twice yearly the entire people of Pan the mountain-dwelling at the solemn banquets of Phoebus, calling two men, rulers, from each *ethnos*; and he is wont to glorify (?) priests of the *ethnos* and helpers for the libations to the number of a hundred, twice each year alike."<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> This is either a ligature of E and I, or Σ or E overcut H.

<sup>28</sup> For the punctuation see above, note 5.

<sup>29</sup> The verb ἀγῆλαι is not easy to translate, unless one takes it, after all, in the sense of ἀγέλαι. The Association's reader suggests ἐνείκαι. His interpretation is



I do not know that it is possible to know precisely what this means. The terms are those of Egyptian public life, but the picture is not clear. Without knowing the date of the inscription or the constitutional history of Panopolis, it is possible only to speculate. Nevertheless we know that the metropoleis of Egypt were characterized by the existence of *δήμος* and *ἄρχοντες*,<sup>30</sup> and presumably, after the visit of Septimius Severus in A.D. 202, Panopolis like the rest received a *βουλή*.<sup>31</sup> Whether the population was divided into tribes or demes which might be called *ἔθνη*, or not, or what meaning we are to ascribe to that word of wide use, I cannot say.<sup>32</sup> Possibly it may refer to "ethnic" groups, although that fits less well the civic type of picture which the scene calls up.<sup>33</sup> Is the *ἐθνοὺς* of the fourth hexameter the same as the *ἔθνος ἑκάστον* of the third? Are the *ἄρχοντας* the same as the *ιερείας* and the *χοῶν συνεργοὺς* (i.e., something like *κλίναρχοι*),<sup>34</sup> and does the total of one hundred lead us to think of fifty *ἔθνη* contributing assistants to Ptolemaïus at the rate of two each? In view of the technical significance of the word *ἄρχοντες* in Egypt at this time, I am not inclined to this last equation, and it is hardly likely that there were either fifty tribes or fifty ethnic groups in Panopolis. One remembers that *ἔθνος* could also be used of priestly groups,<sup>35</sup> but it is probably wiser to confess that we do not know what Ptolemaïus meant. How large were his feasts? He evidently means to let one suppose that they were large. We do not know the population of Panopolis nor how large a proportion of that population would have been included in the *δήμος*.<sup>36</sup> While this

otherwise somewhat different. He would read *συνεργός*, instead of *συνεργός*, and refer *εἰς ἑκατόν* to *χοῶν*, and translate: "and he is accustomed as a participant in the libations to offer as many as a hundred twice in every year without exception (reading ἀπλῶς for δμῶς)."'

<sup>30</sup> The standard work on the communities of Egypt remains that of Pierre Jouguet, *La Vie Municipale dans l'Égypte Romaine* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 104, 1911). See particularly pages 344 f. For more recent literature, one may consult the paper of Bell cited above, note 11.

<sup>31</sup> Apparently the earliest instances of *βουλευταί* at Panopolis are those cited by Jouguet from the Leipzig Papyri (*P. Lips.* 45, 46, 58, and 59, all of A.D. 371).

<sup>32</sup> Jouguet (309) believes that the *ἄμφοδα* in the metropoleis corresponded to the *φυλαί* of the cities, but the terminology does not seem entirely fixed and exact.

<sup>33</sup> This was suggested by the Association's reader, but I do not know any evidence that ethnic groups were kept distinct in the *δήμος* of a metropolis, although there were certain classes of citizens, as Bell (*loc. cit.*) emphasizes.

<sup>34</sup> So the Association's reader.

<sup>35</sup> As in the Rosetta Stone, *OGIS* 90.17.

<sup>36</sup> Baedeker gives the population of Akhmim in 1928 as something in excess of 28,000. While the ancient population of Egypt was certainly less than the modern, it

group was evidently not prosperous or politically important, it was jealously distinguished from the peasants. There was a wide gap between metropolitans and villagers.<sup>37</sup> At all events, the occasion of the feasts is clear, though we do not know in detail the cults of Panopolis. In Egypt as elsewhere in the ancient world, a festival meant, or included, a feast, and these were the occasions when public-spirited citizens came forward, by individual act, foundation, or bequest, to cover the costs.<sup>38</sup> But I do not know of any other recorded instance in Egypt of one's having done so. The κλῖναι of Sarapis were manifestly a much more modest affair.<sup>39</sup>

The last line before the *paragraphus* is not certainly read at the beginning. Possibly, if we had it, it might clear up some of the difficulties felt previously. We can see only that Ptolemaïrius claimed to be generous beyond his means, ὑπὲρ δυνάμιν φιλότιμος. As to that, we cannot judge, though for a veteran whose only declared property was a grove of fruit-trees maintained by the labor of himself and his sons, to entertain twice yearly guests whose numbers must have run into the thousands suggests a generosity only to be described as paradoxical.

But Ptolemaïrius still has something to say, and the concluding lines, which comprise seven iambic scazons, are clear and legible on the stone, even though not without mistakes of cutting and a certain obscurity of meaning.

“Ὅδ’ ἐστὶ βίωτος Ἀγρίοιο καὶ τ(ἐ)κ(ν)ων·<sup>40</sup>  
φοίνικες εἴσω κείν ὁδοῖσι περσεῖαι·

is also true that Panopolis was the metropolis and nome-capital, while Akhmim is now secondary to Sohag, just across the river on the west bank. We can hardly think of the δῆμος as less than several thousand.

<sup>37</sup> Jouguet, *op. cit.* (see note 30) 354; Bell, *op. cit.* (see note 11) 46.

<sup>38</sup> For Egyptian festivals cf. Erman, *op. cit.* (above, note 15) 213–216, 249–251; Franz Cumont, *Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain* (3d ed., Paris, 1929) 152. For Syria cf. *Dura Report VI* (see above, note 12) 157; H. Seyrig, *Antiquités Syriennes* 2 (Paris, 1938) 115. The bibliography on the Christian εὐωχία is collected by Stauffer in G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum neuen Testament* 1 (Stuttgart, 1933) 55. For pagan antiquity in general the standard handbooks are F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig, 1909), and B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1914). For this generosity cf. W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization* (2d ed., London, 1930) 100.

<sup>39</sup> U. Wilcken, *Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1912) p. 133, no. 99. The Association's reader reminds me also to refer to *P. Oslo* 3.157, and for the common meals of Egyptian guilds to A. D. Nock, *HThR* 29 (1936) 78, and to A. E. R. Boak, *TAPhA* 68 (1937) 216.

<sup>40</sup> For the punctuation see above, note 5.

ΗΔΗΜΕΝΙΠΠΙΟΣΔΤΟΣΑΓΗΦΟΡΟΙΔΟΤΝΟΙ·

πολλῶν καθηγητῆρες εὐσεβῶν ἔργων

5 ἐξ ὧν ἀεὶ ζῶουσι φιλοσοφῶς λίην·

πόνοισι παντοίοισι λειτὰ πρήσσοντε[s]

ἄτερθε πλούτου καὶ φθόνου κακοζήλου.

In sharp contrast to the munificence, not to say magnificence, of the earlier lines of Face IV, here is the pious, humble, and laborious Ptolemaïrius of Faces II and III. Possibly the *ὑπὲρ δύναμιν φιλότιμος* was intended to mark the transition. Certainly the speaker intended his *βίωτος*, his "living," to seem modest enough. It is the familiar grove of the Egyptian landscape, "date-palms within and mangoes by the paths,"<sup>41</sup> the latter desirable not only for their fruit but for their shade as well. We are not told the actual acreage of the garden, nor should we exaggerate the amount of land required to make one prosperous in Roman Egypt.<sup>42</sup> Nevertheless, a picture of modest circumstances fits the last three lines: "From which they live like true philosophers, faring humbly with multifarious toils, far from wealth and malicious envy."

To this picture of poverty, labor, philosophy, and good works, I know no parallel from pagan antiquity, for it can hardly be denied that the "leaders in many pious works" refer to Ptolemaïrius and his sons. Even if we are reduced to concluding that the speaker misstates or exaggerates, it is remarkable enough to have him publish such claims. We can hardly assume, as this monument was erected publicly, that Ptolemaïrius did not give the feasts and enjoy a reputation in other respects for an open-handed piety. That he was poor and laborious we may perhaps doubt in fact. Certainly he controlled substantial revenues from some source, whether or not he labored with his hands. Human labor has always been the cheapest and most plentiful of commodities in Egypt, and perhaps Ptolemaïrius was served by an army of fellahin, toiling himself only in

<sup>41</sup> The material on these mixed groves, under the partial shade of which gardens have always been cultivated, has been collected by N. Hohlwein, *Études de Papyrologie* 5 (1939) 42-66.

<sup>42</sup> See the material on acreage, prices, and rentals, assembled by Hohlwein, page 37, and by Johnson (*op. cit.*, see above, note 25), page 144. Instructive in this connection are the remarks of Jacques Pirenne, *Histoire des Institutions et du Droit Privé de l'ancienne Égypte* (Brussels, 1934) 2.324-327. He refers to the small amount of land involved in the royal and noble foundations under the Old Kingdom. On the wealth of the Hellenistic world in general cf. Tarn, *loc. cit.* (above, note 38), and Rostovtzeff *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* 1150-1154.

the somewhat theoretical fashion of Cyrus the Younger in his park at Sardes.<sup>43</sup> Praise of labor is an occasional theme in Greek literature,<sup>44</sup> although I know no instances of it from the Hellenistic states. But praise of poverty, if that is the meaning of the words *λειπὰ πρήσσοντες ἄτερθε πλούτου*, is something else. Greek philosophy, except for occasional Cynics, tended to regard wealth as something indifferent at the worst, and at the best a positive good.<sup>45</sup> Perhaps Ptolemaïrius did not mean that he was poor, but only that he had that modest competence which Greek thought of all periods liked to consider as the ideal state, neither poverty nor riches. But would a modest competence have made it possible for Ptolemaïrius to entertain the *demos* of Panopolis twice each year?

Further than this, perhaps, it is unwise to go, but inevitably one thinks of the combination of poverty, toil, piety, lavish hospitality, and escape from the world as they appear in Christian monasticism, and one remembers that it was in Egypt, and precisely in the region of Panopolis, that monasticism began.<sup>46</sup> Saints Anthony and Pachomius must have been born within no more than a hundred years or so of Ptolemaïrius' death, on any dating of the monument. If we were in a position to assume that Ptolemaïrius' garden was actually a religious foundation, occupied and administered by himself and his sons as a kind of trust in favor of the two great semi-annual festivals of the god whom he calls Phoebus, we should have an understanding of his meaning. The thing was possible in the

<sup>43</sup> Xen. *Oec.* 4.22.

<sup>44</sup> Xenophon favors it, if not overdone, but it is significant that Plato, in banning merely athletic exercise from his state, substitutes for it martial exercises, and not farm work (*Laws* 8.829A-834D).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Tarn, *op. cit.* 102; Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.* 1128-1130, 1602 f.

<sup>46</sup> E. Amélineau, *Monuments pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Égypte Chrétienne au IV<sup>e</sup> Siècle, Histoire de Saint Pakhôme et de ses Communautés* (Annales du Musée Guimet, 70, Paris, 1889); Otto Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchtum* (Frankfurt a.M., 1897); A. von Harnack, *Das Mönchtum, seine Ideale und seine Geschichte* (6th ed., Giessen, 1903); W. H. Mackean, *Christian Monasticism to the Close of the Fifth Century* (Studies in Church History, London Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, New York, 1920).

Monasticism in Egypt is properly a concern of the excellent Société d'Archéologie Copte of Cairo, and it has been the subject of two recent notes in the *Bulletin*. One (vol. 7 [1941] 77-79) reports a lecture at the American University given by H. Romilly Fedden, and the other, dealing more closely with the history of the institution (vol. 8 [1942] 210-212), a lecture before the Anglo-Egyptian Union by A. S. Atiya. Atiya Effendi would distinguish three phases of Egyptian monasticism, Antonian eremitism, collective eremitism, and the cenobitism of Pachomius. To the monastic ideals of devotion, chastity, and poverty, Pachomius added security and a home, and particularly labor in a vocation, especially in such activities of common benefit as gardening. He would see a continuation of this influence in all later monasticism.

Old Kingdom.<sup>47</sup> I do not know that it was impossible under the Roman Empire. Foundations for religious and other purposes are found in Roman Egypt, though more rarely than elsewhere.<sup>48</sup> They may have been discouraged in the land which the Emperors regarded mainly as a source of revenue. I do not know that Ptole-magrius would have escaped the burdens of taxation and liturgies, although as a veteran, if not as a philosopher, he may have enjoyed a partial immunity.<sup>49</sup> He was no anchorite, had made no ἀναχώρησις into the desert,<sup>50</sup> and his feasts, or if we wish, his foundation, did nothing to discourage his townsmen's famed religious fanaticism and inclination toward the flesh-pots.<sup>51</sup>

This is slippery ground. Pagan sources of monasticism have been more often denied than claimed, and it may be that the attempt of Weingarten, seventy years ago, to see a forerunner in the Serapea, or more specifically the Serapeum of Memphis, occupied by substantial numbers of recluses, has been discredited.<sup>52</sup> I certainly do not claim that the garden of Ptole-magrius was such a forerunner. But human institutions rarely are created out of whole cloth, without at least the minds of men being prepared for them. Ptole-magrius cultivated, or at least praised, a simple life of toil, meditation, and devotion. Whether or not his garden was dedicated and attached to the temple of "Phoebus," it was adjacent to it, and was consecrated to the Blessed Gods. In it, and with revenues derived from it, he entertained his townsmen in sacred feasts. For the

<sup>47</sup> Pirenne, *op. cit.* (see note 42) 324–366. Land in foundations for religious purposes was administered by persons who shared in the returns; they might be members of the family, or descendants, of the founder. The obvious Greek parallel is the will of Epicurus, who left his Garden in trust for his heirs in philosophy (Diogen. Laert. 10.16–21).

<sup>48</sup> Wilcken, *Chrest.* 153, 168, 407; Laum (see note 38) 2, pages 143–146; *OGIS* 177–179; *SB* 6048. Cf. the cautious statement of Walter Otto, *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1905) 1.392, note 2.

<sup>49</sup> Jouguet, *op. cit.* (see note 30) 104; Johnson, *op. cit.* (see note 25) 610.

<sup>50</sup> Rostovtzeff, *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft* 2.118, 334; *Hellenistic World* 291, 879, 1420 f., 1549; N. Lewis, *JEA* 23 (1937) 63–75; Bell, *JRS* 28 (1938) 1–8; W. L. Westermann, "On the Background of Coptism" (*Coptic Egypt*, publication of the Brooklyn Museum, n.d.) 12 f.

<sup>51</sup> Amélineau, *Géographie de l'Égypte* 18–22. To the Egyptian Department of Antiquities, Akhmim is famous as a center for the manufacture of forged antiquities.

<sup>52</sup> Hermann Weingarten, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums im nachconstantinischen Zeitalter* (Gotha, 1877). In view of Wilcken's determination that the recluses were "detained" by religious motives, Weingarten's thesis may remain still valid in a sense, though the Serapeum occupied for a time by Pachomius was no longer used for worship, and it may never have been used as a retreat. At all events, it was not directly converted into a monastery (Amélineau, *Monuments* 7 f.).

social history of Egypt under the Romans, in the last century before the triumph of Christianity, this is an interesting and novel situation. I hope that it will be duly noted by all who are concerned with these things.

I have left to the end, as not being immediately pertinent, the third line of the sczons. On any interpretation yet suggested, they have no great bearing on the meaning of the inscription as a whole.<sup>53</sup> The ΔΤΘ reminded Guéraud of Ptolemaḡrius' two sons, but there is no compelling connection. The adjective σαγηφόροι is elsewhere applied to persons wearing the *sagum*, the Roman military cloak, but it can come from σαγή equally well, and refer to anything or anyone "bearing fardels," a pannier donkey, for example, or a peasant carrying the universal wicker basket. The former suggested to Guéraud the possibility of taking ΟΤΝΟΙ as an analogical Ionicism for ὄνοι, which in turn suggests recognizing ἵππος earlier. He suggests as a desperate solution

ἡδὴ μὲν ἵππος δύο σαγηφόροι δ' οὖνοι.<sup>54</sup>

This would then be a part of Ptolemaḡrius' *βίωτος*, and the next logical step would be to reverse the order of lines 4 and 5, as has been suggested to me by Professor F. W. Householder.<sup>55</sup> Another suggestion is to read the beginning of the line as ἡδ' ἡμὲν.<sup>56</sup>

One's reaction to this will depend on his opinion of Ptolemaḡrius, and on his reconstruction of the scene as a whole. There is no doubt that the line is utterly banal, in this interpretation, and banality has not appeared as a characteristic of the person in question. He consistently avoids the practical if trivial details which would, in many cases, have let us understand him better. I have tried to persuade myself and others that ΜΕΝΙΠΠΙΟΣ is actually Μένιππος, the Cynic

<sup>53</sup> This was truly observed by the Association's reader.

<sup>54</sup> The late position of δέ is awkward, and was one of the reasons why I inclined to a different understanding of the passage. But δέ is postponed on occasion at all periods, and especially in verse. Cf. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1934) 187-189.

<sup>55</sup> Orally, at Rochester. The same solution is favored by the Association's reader. In view of the somewhat rambling style of the versifier, however, I should hardly think it necessary on any interpretation of the passage; he strings his thoughts along, line by line or couplet by couplet, without much idea of complete sentences. And on the other hand, there is present none of those indications which palaeographers use to fortify a theory of misplaced lines, similarity of the beginning and end, and so on.

<sup>56</sup> So my reader, remarking justly that this is an exceedingly bad style. He suggests as an alternative ἡδ' ἡ μὲν, converting Ptolemaḡrius' presumed horse into a mare.

philosopher whose fame was widespread under the Empire.<sup>57</sup> The historical Menippus, as the Menippus of Lucian, was a believer neither in gods nor in work, but not all of the later Cynics were irreligious,<sup>58</sup> and they were simple in life, dress, and manners, perhaps the best expression of the idea of a philosopher in Imperial times, with beard, staff, wallet, and exhortations to be good. If Ptolemagrius called himself Menippus, we see the force of the ἥδη, "at last" or "at length." He was now a very Menippus. But this sort of metaphor ("A Daniel come to judgment") is not common in the inscriptions, and there is no need of insisting upon it.<sup>59</sup> In that case, I should have had to understand ΔΟΤΝΟΙ as a mistake in cutting for ΔΟΤΛΟΙ, and would take the reference to the two sons, in dress and activity like δύο σαγηφόροι δοῦλοι.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Helm, *RE* 29 (1931) 888–893.

<sup>58</sup> Notably the egregious Peregrinus Proteus, that one-time Christian who successfully defied Rome, and ended by immolating himself in a great funeral pyre at the Olympic Games. He is known mainly through Lucian's satire. Cf. the recent discussion of Roger Pack, *AJPh* 67 (1946) 334–345.

<sup>59</sup> It is less common than I had supposed, perhaps because I had been considering the fragment of Dioscorus of Aphroditto in *P. Reinach* 2.82, where one may read:

σοφός παλαιὸς ὡ <ς> Μένανδρος τοῖς λόγοις,

and find in the next line an obscure mention of Isocrates (cf. *AJPh* 68 [1947] 97). This reference is a simile rather than a metaphor, but even that is uncommon. As parallels of sorts I find Lais referred to as τὴν θνητὴν Κυθέρειαν (*AP* 7.218), and in G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca ex Lapidibus Conlecta* (Berlin, 1878) 882:

εἰ κατὰ Πυθαγόραν ψυχὴ μεταβαίνει εἰς ἄλλον  
ἐν σοί, Λαίτε, Πλάτων ζῆ πάλι φαινόμενος.

If one collected all of the examples in Greek verse, I doubt if it would prove anything for this passage.

<sup>60</sup> The confusion of N for Δ in inscriptions is not uncommon, and the cutter in this case, Ptolemagrius or another, made mistakes enough. I still consider the interpretation as possible, for slavery was one of the forms of world-defiance assumed by the later Greek philosophic tradition. There was an honorable series of slave-philosophers, Aesop, Plato, Diogenes, Epictetus, and of course, Menippus himself. One may amuse himself with thinking that Ptolemagrius was distinguished from his sons by the same mark which distinguished Menippus from an actual slave, namely by a beard. But this is to withdraw into the world of fantasy.