

VII.—Critical Notes on Greek Papyri

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1. *PRyl.* 4.578

This papyrus bears a petition which was probably written in 59–58 B.C. A certain Judas, a Jewish cultivator of Philadelphia in the Arsinoite nome, complains that the village secretary has increased the annual charges on three arourae of “dry” land which he holds in lease. His statement of the customary rate begins naturally enough with a genitive, but the construction is soon broken by the intrusion of an accusative which is grammatically inexplicable. Since the statement is embedded in a series of absolute genitives and must be considered in relation to them if any clarification is to be obtained, it will be most useful to cite the pertinent lines of the text.

γεωργ-

οὐντός μου περὶ Φιλαδέλφειαν
 χέρσου (ἀρούρας) γ τῶν προυπαρχόντων
 5 ἐκφορίων καθ' ἔτος τὴν (ἀρουρῶν) ἐκλογὴν
 πυρῶν (ἀρτάβας) δ, ἣν καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς
 κακοπαθίας καὶ δαπάνης κατειργασμένου
 τὰ τε ἐκφόρια καθ' ἔτος ἀνεγκλήτως
 ἀπεντακτηκότος μέχρι τοῦ κγ (ἔτους)

In commenting on line 5, the editor recognizes that the syntax is confused, but he infers from *hên* in line 6 and *ta te ekphoria* in line 8 that two charges are involved — the basic rent, of which the amount is not given, and an exaction of four artabae called *eklogê*. This analysis of the text is further illustrated by the translation: “I am farmer of 3 arourae of dry ground near Philadelphia at the preexisting rental and an annual special fee of 4 artabae of wheat per aroura. This [i.e., the latter] I have effected with great dis-

N.B. In general, throughout these notes, I have omitted the dots which editors place under letters to indicate doubt of their identity, wherever I judge them to be unnecessary for critical purposes. In order not to introduce footnotes which have no value for the practiced reader of papyrus texts, I have also refrained from noting variants in spelling which are characteristic of papyri.

treass and expense, and [I] have completed the annual payments for rent satisfactorily up to the 23rd year." The petition thus gains an economic significance which is stressed in the introduction to the papyrus: "The petitioner, a Jew named Judas, is cultivator of 3 acres of dry ground near Philadelphia, for which he pays in addition to the ordinary rent a special fee (*eklogê*). . . . Judas does not here object in principle to the payment of this special fee, but he protests against the action of the village scribe in raising the amount of it."

This is, of course, a considerable structure for an admittedly incoherent text to support, and the translation is not proof against objection.¹ If *kateirgasmenou* (line 7) really means "having effected a payment," as it must in this interpretation, it goes beyond the normal usage of papyri and of Greek generally.² On the other hand, the verb is well known in the sense of bringing land under cultivation, and that is exactly what would have to be done with *chersos* (line 4). Land of this kind was dry and barren either because it had not for some time received the fertilizing water of the annual inundation and had consequently been abandoned as unprofitable, or because it had for one reason or another been left unsown even though it was within reach of the flood. Only constant irrigation could restore its productive capacity, and this would require a heavy and unremitting expenditure of labor and money.³ The relative pronoun, therefore, in line 6 might appropriately have *chersou* in line 4 as its antecedent. The editor's translation could then be readily adapted to the new syntax: "This land I have brought under cultivation with much toil and expense, and I have completed the annual payments for rent satisfactorily up to the 23rd year."

Regarded in this way, lines 6-9 no longer provide evidence of a double payment; they mention only rent. And again, in lines 11-13, which I have not reproduced above, the amount of the increase is stated, but rent alone is specified. We may adopt for these lines, with a slight modification, the translation given by the editor:

¹ I do not discuss the editor's suggestion that *eklogê* in *PTebt.* 1.5.166 is also a special fee, because this interpretation will be valid only if it can first be proved for the Rylands papyrus.

² See especially F. Preisigke and E. Kiessling, *Wörterbuch d. griech. Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin 1925-44) s.v.

³ W. L. Westermann, *The Dry Land in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt* (CP 17, 1922) 21-36; M. Schnebel, *Landwirtschaft im hellenist. Aegypten* (MBPR 7, 1925) 9-24.

"[he] has entered me, contrary to what is right, for the amount of $5\frac{2}{3}$ artabae of wheat per aroura over and above the amount of the rent."⁴ For the charge called *eklogê* we are thus thrown back on lines 4-6, which are unfortunately without a coherent syntax. The rest of the text contains no reference to it.

In a situation of this kind, there is frequently value in consulting similar expressions in other papyri. Statements of rents are sufficiently numerous so that one or another may be helpful. Without attempting to make an exhaustive collection, I have gathered enough examples to cover most of the possible variations in this formula. The majority of these can be disregarded for our purpose, since two of them are especially interesting for the lines in question.

PSI 4.385 (246-245 B.C.) 6: ἐκφορίου καθ' ἑκασ]τον ἔτος τὴν ἄρουραν
ἐκάστην πυρῶν ἀρτ[αβῶν⁵

PEnteux. 59 (222 B.C.) 3: ἐκφορίου τὴν (ἄρουραν) ἐκάστην (πυρῶν)
(ἀρταβῶν) γ

If the statement in the Rylands papyrus, which is later in date than the preceding but still of the Ptolemaic period, is put beside these, it is instantly clear that only *eklogên* breaks the pattern. With the substitution of *hekastên* and a few minor grammatical adjustments in the resolution of symbols, a close correspondence is obtained and the phrase becomes perfectly coherent: τῶν προυπαρχόντων ἐκφορίων καθ' ἔτος τὴν (ἄρουραν) ἐκάστην πυρῶν (ἀρταβῶν) δ.

When we ask how *eklogên* could have displaced *hekastên*, it is obvious that only three letters in each of the words enter the problem — ΛΟΓ and ΑΤ. The resemblances in these, letter for letter, are so close that a slight abrasion of the papyrus might well lead to reading one for the other.⁶ The combined evidence of parallel texts and palaeography is sufficiently strong to justify the assumption that the papyrus has *hekastên*.^{6a}

Judas, accordingly, asserts that he holds his land in lease "at the rent, as it has been heretofore, of 4 artabae of wheat annually

⁴ In line 13 I substitute a dative for the accusative used by the editor. The construction is illustrated by an almost exact parallel in *POxy.* 3.488.16 f.

⁵ The edition does not have *ekphoriou*, but this is an obvious supplement. The amount of the rent is lost in the lacuna at the end of the line.

⁶ The papyrus, of course, is not accurately represented by capitals, but these are well suited to show how easily the two groups of letters might be confused.

^{6a} This suggestion has recently been presented without discussion by T. Reekmans (*ChronEg.* 54 [1952] 412).

on each aroua." There is no mention of a special fee to be paid in addition to the rent, and his complaint is simply that the village secretary has raised his rent from 4 artabae to $9\frac{2}{3}$ artabae on the aroua. This is a stiff rise, and Judas is shocked into protest. Nevertheless, an increase in the rates on barren land once it had been cleared, cultivated for several years, and brought to something like normal productivity, was traditional administrative procedure. The edict issued by Euergetes II in 118 B.C., after a number of years in which the country was troubled by dynastic conflict, throws this practice into sharp relief. It is there decreed that "cultivators of vineland or orchards in the interior, if they plant them . . . in the land which has become flooded⁷ or dry, shall be left untaxed for five years from the time of planting them, and from the sixth year for three years more they shall be required to pay less than the regular amount, payment being made in the fourth year, but from the ninth year onwards they shall all pay the same taxes as the other owners of productive land; and that cultivators in the territory of Alexandria shall be allowed an extra three years' grace."⁸ A somewhat similar policy was adopted by Hadrian in 117–118 A.D. in view of the devastation caused by the Jewish War, which had been raging since 115.⁹

Judas, then, was caught in the consequences of his own industry. Having taken over three arouae of barren land, he expended much labor and money to raise its productive capacity and thus subjected it to administrative reconsideration for assignment at a higher rate.

2. *PRyl.* 4.604

This papyrus bears a letter dictated by a certain Ammonius¹⁰ to a scribe, perhaps his own secretary, at some time in the third century of the Christian era. The opening lines are either lost or badly mutilated, but from line 13 to the end of the letter in

⁷ That is, waterlogged.

⁸ *PTebt.* 1.5.93 ff., as translated by A. S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar, *Select Papyri* (Loeb Classical Library) 2.210. For discussion see Schnebel and Westermann (above, note 3; below, note 9).

⁹ W. L. Westermann, *Hadrian's Decree on Renting State Domain in Egypt* (*JEA* 11, 1925) 165–178. Cf. N. Lewis, *A Sidelight on Diocletian's Revival of Agriculture* (*JEA* 29, 1943) 73, n. 1: "The history of such inducements in the Roman Empire is almost as long as the history of the Empire itself."

¹⁰ The name is possible but not sure. As the editor remarks, "the writer was a person of some standing in a large circle of correspondents." He is given a title or rank in the address on the verso, but this is unfortunately incomplete.

line 36, the text is almost completely preserved and intelligible. Ammonius informs his correspondent, Andronicus, that he has written to Eutolmius concerning some matter which is now obscure because of the loss sustained by the papyrus. Then a second item of information is presented in the following words:

- 15 καὶ π[ερὶ] Ἡραίσ[κ]ου τοῦ ἀδελφ[οῦ]
 τῷ αὐτῷ Εὐτολμίῳ ἔγρ[α-]
 ψα συνιστῶν αὐτὸν οἷ[ς]
 μέλλεις ἐπιδοῦναι τὸ ἐπιστ[ό-]
 λειον. παρέστω ἅμα σοι Ἡρα-
 20 ἴσκος.

This reading of the Greek sets up a contradiction which is carried over into the translation: "and I have written about brother Heraiscus to the same Eutolmius, introducing him to those to whom you are to give the letter. Heraiscus should be present along with you." A few things are clear. Ammonius has written a letter to Eutolmius and has sent it to Andronicus, who will deliver it. It is disconcerting, however, that the letter written to Eutolmius is to be delivered to unidentified persons who are designated simply with a plural relative pronoun. Even more puzzling is the disposition made of Heraiscus. Ammonius has included in the letter to Eutolmius a recommendation for Heraiscus, but according to the Greek text, this is not aimed at Eutolmius. Heraiscus is being commended to the attention of the anonymous individuals into whose hands Andronicus will deliver the letter. We must suppose, then, that this nameless group is authorized to open a letter not addressed to them; and presumably, after satisfying themselves regarding its contents they will forward it to Eutolmius.

These vague intermediaries are intruded into Ammonius' letter at line 17 by a relative pronoun of which the second letter is doubtful and the third lost. One might guess that the text did not have this pronoun before the papyrus was damaged. Ammonius says clearly that he wrote a letter to Eutolmius, and we are entitled to assume it is to him that Andronicus is to deliver it, at the same time presenting Heraiscus. The clue to a correct understanding of the text is in this connection between the delivery of the letter and the presentation of Heraiscus. If we look for a word of temporal force to express the contemporaneity of the two services which Andronicus is instructed to perform, the elements for build-

ing it are seen to be already available in the relative pronoun. Its first letter is *O*; its second letter is a doubtful *I*, which has an obvious resemblance to *T*; its third letter is restored. If we replace the relative pronoun with the conjunction $\delta\tau[\epsilon]$, we have only to put a full stop before it and remove the period which now stands in line 19, in order to obtain a wholly consistent piece of Greek. The editor's translation may then be adapted to the new text with very little change: "and I have written about brother Heraiscus to the same Eutolmius, introducing him. When you plan to deliver the letter, Heraiscus should be present along with you."

In line 20, Ammonius continues with the usual admonitions: "Look after the children and the house, as I asked of you, and whatever you want here in Antinoupolis write to me about it, for I am glad to oblige you. Greet your children — may the evil eye not touch them — as well as your wife. Brother Apynchis salutes you." Where there are salutations, as here, a letter usually ends with them, but Ammonius thought of something else that he ought to say, and so the letter runs on:

τὸ συν-
δεδεμένον ἐπιστόλιον ἐσφρα-
30 γισμένον Λατκίῳ ¹¹ ἀπόστειλον
εἰς Ἀλεξανδρίαν τῷ ἀδελφῷ.
2nd hd. ἐρρῶσθαί σε εὖχομαι,
ἄδελφε.
1st hd. Θεοδοσίῳ δι' ἀσφαλοῦς φίλου
35 διὰ τάχους ἐπιδή ἀναγκαῖά
ἐστιν πρὸς τοὺς φίλους.

As the editor interprets the arrangement of this text, Ammonius concluded his dictation of the letter at line 31, added in his own hand the complimentary close in lines 32 and 33, then dictated the postscript which occupies lines 34–36. The Greek is translated accordingly:

[1st hd.] "Forward under seal to Alexandria to brother Latkios the letter enclosed with this."

[2nd hd.] "I pray for your health, brother."

[Postscript, 1st hd.] "To Theodosius by a safe friend because it is of great importance to our friends."

¹¹ Tau is written above the line.

In the introduction to the papyrus, lines 34–36 are described as “an interesting direction at its foot.” Theodosius is of course not the correspondent addressed in the letter, but he is, for the editor, an intermediary in its delivery. Since the letter is sent to Andronicus, this means that it will first come into the hands of Theodosius, who will forward it to the addressee. It is not easy to see, however, how this will be done when we consider the way in which letters were handled. A letter was regularly written on only one side of a papyrus, usually the recto. The sheet was then folded so that the text was entirely concealed, and no writing was visible except the address which was placed on the exposed surface of the verso. The address on the Rylands letter mentions only Andronicus. If it was entrusted to someone for delivery to Theodosius, the messenger had no way of refreshing his memory short of opening and reading the letter. This is hardly what a messenger is expected to do, and the direction written at the foot of the recto would serve no purpose. It is more likely that the letter was taken directly to Andronicus, whose name is on the verso. Since it was addressed to him, he naturally opened it and took account of the postscript.

There is still, however, another question. The postscript is constructed without verb or object. How could Andronicus know that it was this letter which he was supposed to send on to Theodosius? Now we mark an interesting coincidence. Lines 34–36, which follow the complimentary close in the manner of a postscript, have been taken to be an instruction to forward a letter to Theodosius, and lines 28–31, which immediately precede the complimentary close, clearly direct Andronicus to forward an enclosed letter to Alexandria. Furthermore, line 31 concludes with a dative and line 34 begins with a dative. Besides, as we observed above, lines 28–31 also have the air of being an afterthought because they follow the salutations, with which the body of a letter normally ends. In view of these considerations, one might try to read lines 28–31 and 34–36 as a single sentence, and this can be done if *Latkiô* in line 30 is provisionally omitted. A unified, coherent postscript is thus obtained which can be rendered as follows: “Forward the enclosed letter, which is sealed . . ., to Alexandria to brother Theodosius by a dependable friend, with haste, because our friends’ affairs are urgent.”

Postscripts are common enough in ancient letters, and they are usually found where one would expect to find them — in the

blank space below the complimentary close, in the left or right margin, or in all of these. Not so common is a postscript which, as here, is begun in the space between the body of the letter and the complimentary close and continued without a full stop in the space below. Another example may be cited from *PMich.* 8.496. In this case, the scribe wrote a letter consisting of thirteen lines and a single word in a fourteenth line. Then leaving a space of 3 cm. he added a very simple complimentary close followed by a date (line 20). The man who dictated the letter then filled out line 14 and part of another line with a more elaborate complimentary close of his own. To this he added, seemingly without pausing, five lines of a postscript in the space before line 20 and three more lines after it. A sentence begun in line 18 and interrupted by line 20 was completed in line 21. The parallel with the Rylands letter is not perfect in detail, but in both papyri a postscript is written around a complimentary close without injury to its syntactical structure.

One problem remains. What is to be done with *Latkiô*? It is not attested elsewhere either as a personal name or as a common noun, and its omission does not destroy the continuity of the sentence. Its position immediately after *esphragismenon* suggests that it was intended to modify or amplify the meaning of the participle in some way. The use of a dative with this verb is readily illustrated from papyri, and a few examples will suffice.

PFlor. 2.140 recto (3rd cent. A.D.) 4: [ἐσφρ]αγισμένον τῇ αὐτοῦ
σφραγίδι

BGU 3.896 (2nd cent. A.D.) 17: σφραγιῶ γλύμ<μ>ατι Ἀρποκρά-
το[us]¹²

PSI 4.333 (256 B.C.) 6 f.: ἐσφραγισμένοι τῶι ἐμῶι δακτυλίῳ¹³

These passages demonstrate the relation of *latkiô* to the participle and reveal the semantic class to which the word belongs. Although it is unintelligible and its spelling is barbarous, it has some chance of being genuine because the scribe deliberately corrected *lakiô* to *latkiô*.¹⁴ It has an obvious resemblance to *daktuliô*, but I hesitate to emend a text which the scribe has himself emended.¹⁵

¹² Cf. *Berichtigungsl.* 1.79.

¹³ Reprinted by Hunt and Edgar (above, note 8) 1.89.

¹⁴ See above, note 11.

¹⁵ Mr. C. H. Roberts has been kind enough to send me a photograph of the papyrus. The editor's reading is indisputable.

3. *PLugdBat.* 6.3

This text presents the terms of a sale of *ampelitis*¹⁶ which was drawn up in the eleventh year of Domitian (92 A.D.). Toward the end of the document the seller, a certain Arius, gives the buyer a full release from all taxes and other charges resting on the land "up to the present eleventh year and including the eleventh year itself . . .

διὰ τὸ τὰ ἐφέτια ἐκφόρια εἶναι το<ῦ> 'Αρείου."

The editor rightly equates *ephetia* with *epeteia*,¹⁷ and with considerable hesitancy he suggests that the Greek means "because the yearly rent belonged to Arius." Finding that "the sentence is obscure," he then puts the question to which an answer must be found: "Does the sentence mean that the *ekphoria* had been paid year after year to him [i.e., the seller] and nobody else, this being a proof that he and he alone was the owner?"¹⁸

If we turn to the few contracts which use similar language, we find much that is enlightening.¹⁹ *PSI* 8.897 is the remnant of a register devoted to cessions of catocic land. Each of the two surviving columns preserves a cession effected in 93 A.D., the one on January 16, the other two days later. Hence, both agreements were made in the winter, about the time when the fields should have been sown, but several months before the harvest season when

¹⁶ In the Roman period *ampelitis* is not "vineyard," as it is translated by the editor, but land formerly given to vines and now converted to grain. See below, sect. 6; *PRyl.* 2.202.1, note; *POslo.* 2.28.8, note; *PMerton* 16.7, note.

¹⁷ The spelling with *ph* is condemned in *EM* 354.59, where its departure from the Attic standard is clearly indicated. The same tendency produced *kath' elous*, which is very frequent in papyri for *kat' elous* (cf. *PRyl.* 4.578, quoted above, sect. 1).

¹⁸ He adds: "But I am not convinced that the interpretation is right." K. Kalbfleisch, who first edited this text in *Zeitschr. Sav.-Stift.* 65 (1947) 348 ff., encountered the same difficulty: "Was hier damit gemeint ist, kann ich nicht sagen."

¹⁹ No critical use can be made of *PSI* 4.320 (corrected in *PSI* 8.897.47, note), which is a cession of 6 ar. of catocic land *sun tois epetelois [o]utōn ekph[or]iois*. The document breaks off at line 14 and no other provisions of the agreement are preserved. *PRyl.* 2.293 mentions *ta epeteia ekphoria*, but the papyrus is too badly damaged to be available for a semantic investigation. In *PLond.* 3.1231 (p. 108) two persons holding land in sub-lease are giving up their lease at the end of the current year. They undertake to pay *ta epetia ekphoria* and whatever else they owe "at the proper time." There is no clue to the exact meaning of *epetia*. The interpretation to be placed on the word in these texts will depend on what can be made of it in others which lend themselves to analysis.

rents would be paid.²⁰ In Col. I, it is a woman who cedes five arouras for a consideration of 1200 drachmas, at the same time assuming responsibility for all taxes due up to and including the current year. In her subscription to the agreement, she acknowledges receipt of the price and reserves for herself the rents, which here also are described as *epetia* (line 47). The parallel with *PLugdBat.* 6.3 is thus complete. In the cession as in the sale, the party who agrees to pay the taxes through the current year also claims the right to collect the rents. Since rents would normally have been collected year by year, the position taken in these agreements must be that the seller is entitled to the rents of the *current* year even though the property changes hands as early as January, because he accepts responsibility for the taxes up to the end of the year.²¹ We may therefore understand *ta ep(h)etia ekphoria* to be "this year's rents."²²

This interpretation of the phrase is confirmed by other contracts in which it is the buyer to whom the rents are granted. In Col. II of *PSI* 8.897, a certain Sarapion cedes three arouras of catoecic land

σ[ὺν το]ῖς ἐπερίοις τούτων ἐκφορίοις (line 67).

The subject of the cession is clearly twofold: (1) the land, which has an area of three arouras, and (2) the rents thereon, which are again called *epetia*. Sarapion does not assume responsibility for the taxes of the current year, namely the twelfth year of Domitian (92–93 A.D.). He is careful to limit his obligation in this respect to the period "up to the past eleventh year and including the eleventh year itself." The implication is that the new owner is given the right to collect "this year's rents," i.e., the rents due in the twelfth year, and will consequently also pay the taxes for the twelfth year.

²⁰ Schnebel (above, note 3) 137 ff., 162 ff. For a brief summary of dates for sowing and harvest see *PMich.* 6.375, introd. (p. 41).

²¹ That is, the Egyptian year, which reached its close toward the end of August.

²² The word is defined by Hesychius as *epi tou nūn etous*, which is repeated in *EM*; cf. *LSJ* s.v. 3. The same meaning attaches to *ephetinos* (Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* [above, note 2] s.v. 2, and esp. S. G. Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuch. zu einer Grammatik d. Papyri d. nachchristl. Zeit* [*MBPR* 28, 1938] 65, note 1). References and bibliography for the corresponding adverb — *ephetous*, "this year" — are given in *PMich.* 8.473.10, note. It is this adverb which has occurred recently in *PPhilad.* 1.38, where its identity has escaped the editor: *ephetous prôtôs* is "this year for the first time." — It is significant in this connection that the Greek of the papyrus regularly uses *kat' etos* to designate rents as paid annually.

This implication is rendered explicit in *PRyl.* 2.164, a sale of land *σὺν τοῖς ἐ]πετέλοις ἐκφορίοις*. The deed was drawn up in Hathyr (October–November) of the twelfth year of Marcus Aurelius (171–172 A.D.). The seller takes responsibility for taxes “up to the past 11th year,” but not for the current year. It is the buyer who will pay the taxes “from the present 12th year.” The land, then, is transferred from seller to buyer early in the twelfth year, and the buyer both agrees to pay the taxes and receives the right to collect the rents beginning in that year.

If further proof were needed, *PMich.* 5.254–255 would be conclusive. This is a subscription to a sale of five arouras of temple land drawn up in the sixteenth year of Tiberius (30–31 A.D.). The seller guarantees to the buyer complete freedom from all debts, impositions, and other charges resting on the land “up to the past fifteenth year and including the fifteenth year.” There is no mention of the buyer’s responsibility for such payments in the sixteenth year, but the sale is guaranteed to be *σὺν τῷ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἐκκαδεκάτου ἔτους . . . ἐκφορίῳ*. Accordingly, the buyer is empowered to collect the rent due in the sixteenth year. The place occupied by *epeteia* in the contracts discussed above is here taken by “the present sixteenth year.” The reference in all of these agreements is to the current year.²³

To return now to *PLugdBat.* 6.3. That document is a sale drawn up in the eleventh year of Domitian. The seller undertakes to discharge all fiscal burdens on the land “up to the present eleventh year and including the eleventh year itself . . . because” he reserves to himself the right to collect “this year’s rents.” There is thus established a causal nexus between the payment of taxes and the collection of rents.^{23a} Although the land has passed

²³ A different but comparable arrangement is found in *PMich.* 5.252 (= *PSI* 8.905), a cession of 2 ar. of catocic land *σὺν τοῖς ἐφητέλοις κριθινῶν σπορῶν* (om. *ἐφητέλοις*, *PSI*). Both the land and “this year’s sowing of barley” are the object of the conveyance. This means that the cession was made after the sowing, probably at about the same time of year as the cessions preserved in *PSI* 8.897, and that the coming harvest will be the property of the new owner. Nothing is said of his corresponding obligation for taxes, but it is implied in his right to appropriate the harvest. Since the former owners assume all tax obligations through the 12th year of Tiberius (25–26 A.D.), the cession almost certainly took place in the 13th year.

^{23a} Note the parallel with leases, which frequently stipulate that the lessor, who receives the rent, shall pay the annual taxes (R. Taubenschlag, *Law of Greco-Roman Egypt* [New York 1944] 271 f.). Cf. *PCairoBoak* 14 (*Ét. Pap.* 3, 1936, 30): “The most noteworthy feature of the contract is that the lessees were exempt from paying any rental upon condition that they paid all the public taxes. . . .”

to a new owner, the former owner stipulates that his liability to taxes continues until the end of the year. In return, he retains for the year the landlord's share of the harvest.²⁴

4. *PLugdBat.* 6.12

This text consists of two tax receipts written in 112 A.D. on a single sheet of papyrus. The first receipt is concerned with catoecic dues and ends in line 11 with a date followed by 'Ελλήνων. The editor puts a full stop after the date and makes the following translation: "Epeiph 8. From the Greeks." This arrangement does not clarify the rôle of the Greeks in the text, and *Hellênôn* remains difficult, as the editor has seen, whether it is taken to be the conclusion of the first receipt or the beginning of the second. There is, however, a space "a trifle larger than elsewhere" between lines 11 and 12, and line 12 begins with *kai* followed by a date. Since *Hellênôn* is the last word of line 11, it is reasonable to suppose that it belongs to the first receipt.

The use of *Hellênôn* in this papyrus is not unique. Dates accompanied by ethnic appellatives are also found elsewhere, with expressive variations. A few examples will illustrate the syntactical tie which binds the ethnicon to the date.²⁵

PCairZen. 4.59690 (3rd cent. B.C.) 23 ff.: ἀπὸ Παύνη ἔως Ἀθύρ,
[Ἐ]λλήνων δὲ ἀπὸ Πανήμου [ἔως] Ἀπελλαίου²⁶

PEnteux. 22 (219–218 B.C.) 3 f.: μηνὸς Δαισίου, Αἴγυπτίων δὲ Ἀθύρ

PPar. 19 (2nd cent. A.D.) 8 ff.: μηνὸς Ἀδρια[νο]ῦ ἢ κατὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων
(sic), κατὰ δὲ τοὺς Αἴγυπτίους Τῦβι ἡ

²⁴ It may be useful to record here a minor but significant correction of the text. As is customary, the boundaries of the property are stated in terms of the adjoining parcels. The eastern boundary, in the text printed by Kalbfleisch (above, note 18) and adopted in *PLugdBat.* 6.3.16, is *tekna* [S]arapíōnis tou Achilleōs *kalamia* <ι>. The last word is taken as a dative, and so "the children of Sarapion, son of Achilleus, with their reed-bed" are on the eastern boundary. I find this arrangement of the text completely unacceptable as a specimen of Greek syntax. Kalbfleisch made the alternative suggestion that *tekna* be corrected to *teknôn* and *kalamia* be retained as a nominative. The boundary is then "the reed-bed which belongs to the children of Sarapion, son of Achilleus." This was rejected as implausible by the editor of the Leyden papyrus, but numerous statements of boundaries scattered through the papyri show that it is normal. For only one example out of a very large number, see *PMich.* 5.251.10–12, where three of the four statements which give the boundaries follow this pattern. — In *PLugdBat.* 6.3.7, *tês* is a misprint for *tou*, which is correctly given by Kalbfleisch (above, note 18).

²⁵ These are borrowed from the numerous examples given by Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* (above, note 2) 3.268 s.v. *Aiguplios*, 269 s.v. *Hellên*; Wilcken, *Ostr.* 1.792.

²⁶ Cf. Wilcken, *APF* 10 (1932) 239.

PPar. 19b (2nd cent. A.D.) 4 f. = *PLond.* 1.110 (p. 131) 3 f.:
 μηνὸς Ἀδριανοῦ ἡ, κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ἀρχαίω(ς) Τῦβι ἡ
PMich. 8.482 (133 A.D.) 20 f.: Μ[ε]σορή λ- Ἑλλήνων

These passages make it quite clear that the dates follow "Greek" and "Egyptian" calendars. In the Ptolemaic examples, the Greek dates conform to the lunar year introduced into Egypt by the Macedonians, the Egyptian dates to the solar year of native tradition. In the Roman period, the same terms distinguish the fixed year of the Julian calendar from the *annus vagus* of the Egyptians.²⁷

5. *PLugdBat.* 6.14

Before it was damaged at the bottom, this papyrus bore several copies or receipts which certified the payment in 114 A.D. of a fine imposed on a former keeper of public archives in the Heraclides division of the Arsinoite nome. The second of these receipts has the date Ἐπιφ μετ' ἄλ(λα) ῥ̄, which the editor understands to be "Epeiph, after other payments, on the 7th," although he remarks that a different word-order is expected, i.e. "Epeiph 7, after other payments." These expressions are not identical in meaning, and neither of them is likely to be correct. *Met' alla*, like its equivalent *meth' hetera*, is common enough in documents of other kinds; it is surprising in a tax receipt.

If we search through the great mass of receipts for something similar, we find the same formula with variations in a large number of papyri and ostraca.²⁸ Most illuminating for the Leyden text is another Fayum papyrus.

PFay. 54 (117–118 A.D.) 14 f.: Ἐπεῖφ μετὰ λόγον κζ̄

It is evident from this example alone that the date in the Leyden papyrus should read Ἐπιφ μετὰ λ(όγον) ῥ̄.

The exact bearing of *meta logon* is by no means clear. In many instances a slightly longer form is used to express the date. This may be illustrated from *PSI* 10.1133 (70–73 A.D.) 8: *Phaôphi* 30

²⁷ For bibliography see *PMich.* 8.482.20–21, note.

²⁸ A few examples are listed by Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* (above, note 2) s.v. *logos* (Col. 36). The material has been fully assembled and discussed at length by Westermann and Keyes in *PCol.* 2.2, introd. (pp. 42–56). To the examples of the double date collected there may be added *PMich.* 6.382, 383 (cf. introd., p. 68), *PMil.* 10, *PSAAthen.* 51 (cf. *AJP* 63 [1942] 307), *PSI* 10.1133, *Ostr.Str.* 60, *Ostr.Oslo.* 7, *Ostr.Tait* 26 (p. 67), *Ostr.Skeat* (*TAPA* 81 [1950] 109) 9 and 10.

meta log(on) 3. In many others *meta logon* is omitted while the double date is retained, e.g., *Ostr. Skeat* (TAPA 81 [1950] 109) 9.4: *Pauni* 30, 13. Wilcken explained these as equivalent in meaning to another phrase which is frequent in tax receipts.²⁹ For example, *PLugdBat.* 6.46.12 f. has *Pauni arith(mêseôs) Pachôn* as the date of a payment made in Pauni to the account of the preceding month Pachon. So Wilcken would interpret the double dates. The one quoted above from *PSI* 10.1133 would mark a payment made on Hathyr 3 into the account which closed on Phaophi 30.

PCol. 2.2 has thrown considerable doubt on this explanation without conclusively establishing any other. It has numerous examples of *meta logon* but these are found only in the last five months of the year, from Pharmuthi to Mesore. From Phaophi to Pharmuthi their place is taken by *ent*(), which the editors venture to expand to *ent(etagmenon)*.³⁰ Although both designations always stand between the month and the day, this position plays no part in the interpretation adopted by the editors. They are said to refer to a division of the year into two periods for the purpose of tax accounting. They are thus without relation to the dates between which they are invariably placed, except as they fix the months in one or the other part of the year. This information, however, is already supplied by the month-names, and it is only in Pharmuthi that *meta logon* and *ent*() are both used and hence strictly necessary. The double dates, in turn, are explained apart from these. The editors apply both numerals to the same month. In their view, the date in *PSI* 10.1133 marks a receipt issued on Phaophi 30 for a payment made on the third of the same month.³¹

6. *PMerton* 16

This is a short text of eight lines acknowledging a payment made on June 28, 149 A.D., of taxes in kind due on *ampelitis*, land formerly devoted to vines but now sown with wheat.³² The date

²⁹ Wilcken, *Ostr.* 1.815; cf. *Ostr.Oslo.*, p. 26, and *Ostr.Skeat* 9.4, note.

³⁰ One expects *ent(os logou)* or *en t(δ logô)* as a counterpart to *meta logon*. The editors may have avoided them because they are not attested, but it is equally true that *entetagmenon* is found nowhere as part of a date.

³¹ This explanation rests on certain cogent evidence, and a brief summary does not communicate adequately the complexity of the problem. Although the available material seems not to permit a single consistent solution, the full exposition made by Westermann and Keyes in their introduction to *PCol.* 2.2 is invaluable.

³² See above, note 16.

of the receipt occupies the first three lines and the beginning of the fourth. The acknowledgment begins in line 4 with "Ptollas, son of Heraclas, and the associate sitologi" and continues through four more lines:

- 5 Βακχι(άδος) δι' Ἀριστ() μεμετ(ρήμεθα) ἀπὸ γενη(μάτων) τοῦ
αὐτοῦ (ἔτους) ιβ μέτ(ρῳ) δη(μοσίῳ) ξυστ(ῶ) ἔπαιτο(ν) εἰς
Θέωνα Θέωνος κληροῦχ(ικῆς) ἀμπελ(ιτιδος)
(πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) τρεῖς ἥ(μισυ). Μ[ε]μ(ετρήμεθα) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) γ
ἥ(μισυ).

This is a piece of perfectly integrated Greek. At no point does its syntax break down, nor is its vocabulary in any way suspect. Nevertheless, a comparison with other sitologus-receipts, such as *PMich.* 6.391–398, raises doubts on several points.

The number of the year is written in full in line 1 and is repeated as a numeral in line 6. In the latter position the Michigan texts either have no numeral at all (391.7, 393.10, 395.7, 397.13), or if they have a numeral it precedes and does not follow *etous* (392.4, 394.5, 396.8, 398.11). They conform in this way to the rule, which of course is not free of exceptions, that the numeral follows *etous* only in a formal date. In a continuous text, on the other hand, there is a strong tendency to maintain a normal grammatical structure, and the numeral is then treated like any other adjective in the attributive position.³³ In the Michigan receipts, again, when the date of the crop is followed by a description of the measure used in the payment of the taxes, either nothing intervenes between *etous* and *metrô* or the latter is expanded to *purou metrô* (393.11, 394.5, 395.7, 396.9). For the Merton papyrus, this means that the numeral which now stands in the edition between *etous* and *metrô* may be a misreading of the symbol for *purou*, since they are somewhat alike in appearance.

In line 7 we are told that the taxes bear on *ampelitis*, grain-land which had formerly been a vineyard, but a very doubtful reading in the same line places the *ampelitis* in the class of cleruchic land. The editor has put dots under most of the letters of the word in question, and his caution is justified since *ampelitis* appears elsewhere to have constituted a distinct category analogous to cleruchic,

³³ E. Mayser, *Grammatik d. griech. Papyri aus d. Ptolemäerzeit* 2.2 (Berlin-Leipzig 1933) 32 f.

catoecic, and hieratic land.³⁴ The word stands immediately before *ampelitis* and after a prepositional phrase composed of *eis* and a personal name, which marks the account to which the delivery was credited. *POslo.* 2.28, another sitologus-receipt, has the same structure, with a village-name in the position here occupied by the designation "cleruchic." The close association of a village-name with the category to which the land belongs, is abundantly attested in tax receipts and registers, and the Michigan receipts do not fail to provide examples (391.15, 392.4 and 9, 393.12, 394.6, 395.9 and 15, 396.12, 397.14, 398.11). Hence we may justifiably look for a village-name in the Merton papyrus also.

Line 8 is devoted to a statement of the quantity of wheat turned over to the sitologi. What is surprising here is the failure to specify the extra charges, which for *ampelitis* are basically one-sixth of the principal amount.³⁵ The examples provided by *PRyl.* 2.202 are enough to make the point. Even if the amount of the extra charges were really not given, one would expect the Merton receipt to follow the style of *POslo.* 2.28 in recording the fact of their payment.

The editors of the Merton papyri have supplied an excellent reproduction of No. 16. The theoretical considerations exposed above have much facilitated the collation of the transcription with the facsimile. The hand of the receipt is a typical cursive of the second century, reasonably clear in general but not always easy to disentangle in detail. It presents the problem of all extreme cursives, which require for their decipherment constant consultation of parallel texts. I give below a revised text of lines 5–8 with the minimum commentary which appears necessary.

- 5 Βακχι(άδος) Ἡφαιστ(ιάδος) μεμετ(ρήμεθα) ἀπὸ γενη(μάτων) τοῦ αὐτοῦ (ἔτους) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβων) μέτ(ρω) δη(μοσίῳ) ξυστ(ῶ) ἔπαιτο(ν) εἰς Θέωνα Θέωνος Βακχ(ιάδος) ἀμπελ(ίτιδος) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) τρεῖς (δγδοον) πρ[ο(σμετρομένων) (ἡμισυ)] (τετρακαίκοστόν), (γίνονται) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) γ (δίμοιρον).

5. The administrative unity of Bacchias and Hephaestias is also attested elsewhere. *PMerton* 29 is an order to the Arab archers of Bacchias to arrest and produce the wife of the secretary of Hephaestias. The editor's note to line 1 of that text is very much to the point.

³⁴ *PRyl.* 2.202.1, note.

³⁵ *PBerlLeihg.*, p. 237.

6. The symbol for *purou artabôn* is identical with that used for *purou artabas* in line 8. The heavy dot, which makes *artabôn* a necessary part of the resolution, is probably a blunder. The Michigan receipts have only *purou* before *metrô*. See the discussion above.

7. The sitologi function, according to line 5, both for Bacchias and for Hephaestias, but the present payment is for land at Bacchias only.³⁶

8. The arithmetic is: $3 \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{24} = 3 \frac{2}{3}$. The extra charge reckoned at exactly $\frac{1}{6}$ of the main sum would be $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{48}$, i.e., $\frac{1}{48}$ less than the amount recorded on the papyrus. It was a common practice in public granaries to fix a minimum fraction for the calculation of tax payments.³⁷ This accounts for the displacement of $\frac{1}{48}$ by $\frac{1}{24}$ in the Merton papyrus. The fraction is only partly preserved, but the two long strokes that are clearly visible on the photograph above the line of writing are the characteristic mark of a fraction expressed, as $\frac{1}{24}$ would be, by a combination of two letters.

7. *PMerton 37* AND *POslo. 2.38*

PMerton 37 is a chirograph executed through a notary named Paulus on Thoth 6 (Sept. 3) 373 A.D. Aurelia Tetoueis, daughter of Hatres, there acknowledges to Aurelia Cottine, daughter of Ammon, that she has received from her a loan of twenty-seven artabae of wheat, which has been calculated to include a charge for interest of fifty percent.³⁸ She will repay the total amount of the loan in Pauni (May-June) 374 A.D.³⁹

The editor of *PMerton 37* remarks that the names of the parties to this agreement "seem to be new." They have, as a matter of fact, occurred once before. *POslo. 2.38* is a similar chirograph executed through the same notary in the last months of 374 A.D. or the early months of 375.⁴⁰ It is again Tetoueis, here called

³⁶ The reading of the village-name is due to O. M. Pearl.

³⁷ The fraction $\frac{1}{24}$ is a favorite minimum. Cf. Youtie and Pearl, *AJP* 62 (1941) 82; Rosenberger, *APF* 12 (1937) 72, sect. VII; *PMich.* 6.372.i.13, note; ii.9, note; 374.i.17, note.

³⁸ The docket on the verso has 26 artabae, which is doubtless an error. For the rate of interest on loans in kind see N. Lewis, *TAPA* 76 (1945) 126-139.

³⁹ When the editor remarks that repayment will take place "after next year's harvest," he has in mind the Roman year or, what comes to the same thing, the consular year. It is also the harvest of the next indiction (see line 9), since the indiction in Egypt began at a variable date in early or middle summer (May-July; cf. Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, introd. 60). So far as the Egyptian year is concerned, the date of the loan (Thoth) and the date of repayment (Pauni) fall within a single year, and from this point of view it is the harvest of the same year.

⁴⁰ The notary Paulus was also responsible for an unpublished Caranis papyrus in the Michigan collection (Inv. 3036), which records a sale of wheat in Febr. 377 with payment in advance of delivery. As usual, the delivery is to be made in Pauni (May-June). For bibliography on this type of transaction see the introduction to *PAnin.* 42.

Tetouein, who acknowledges receipt of another loan of wheat from Cottine, probably to be repaid as usual in May or June of 375. Unfortunately, the Oslo papyrus has lost a strip from the left side and some nine to thirteen letters are missing at the beginning of each line. Since the Merton papyrus is perfectly preserved, it may be used to effect a more complete reconstruction of the Oslo text than was heretofore possible. Nevertheless, the restoration of *POslo*. 2.38 in the original edition comes remarkably close to the wording of *PMerton* 37. Ten lines out of twenty require practically no alteration, and these I have taken into the new text, generally without special acknowledgment.

- [ὑπατ(είας) τοῦ δεσπ(ότου)] ἡμῶν Γρατια[ν]οῦ [τοῦ] αἰωνίου
 [Αὐγ(ούστου) τὸ γ καὶ Φ]λ(αοῦ) 'Εκυθίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου
 [month] κα.⁴¹
 [ὁμολογεῖ Αὐρ(ηλία) Τ]ετούειν 'Ατρῇ μητρὸς Ταπάει-
 5 [τος ἀπὸ κώμης Κ]αρανίδος Αὐρηλία Κοττίνῃ
 ["Αμμων(ος) ἀπ' ἀμφό]δου Φρεμ(εῖ) ἔχιν καὶ μεμετρήσ-
 [θαι παρ' αὐτῆς τ]ῇν ὁμολογοῦσαν Τετούειν
 [χρήσιν ἐν γένει σ]ίτου καθαροῦ σὺν ἡμολίᾳ
 [ἀρτάβας τεσσαρ]άκοντα ἡμισυ, ἅσπερ
 10 [ἐπάναγκον ἀπ]οδώσει τῇ Κοττίνῃ μὴνι
 [Παῦνι τῆς τε]τάρτης ἰνδικτίονος ἐπὶ τῆς
 [πόλεως μέτρ]ω τετραχονικῶ, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς
 [ἀπαιτήσεως γ]ίνεσθαι τῇ Κοττίνῃ τὴν πρᾶ-
 [ξιν ἐκ τε τῆς] ὁμολ[ο]γούσης Τετούεινος
 15 [καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπ]αρχόντων αὐτῇ πάντων
 [καθάπερ ἐκ δ]ίκης, καὶ ἐπερ(ωτηθεῖσα) ὥμολ(όγησεν). 2nd hd. Αὐρηλία
 [Τετούειν ἔσχ]ογ' ᾗς τοῦ σίτου καθαροῦ σὺν [ῆμ]ιο-
 [λίᾳ ἀρτάβ(ας) τεσ]σαράκοντα ἡμισοὶ καὶ ἀποδώσω τῇ προ-
 [θεσμίᾳ ὡς πρόκ(ιται)]. Αὐρήλιος 'Ασάμμων' Ἀρποκράμ(ωνος) ἔγραψα⁴²
 20 [ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἀγρα]μμάτων οὔσης.
 1st hd. δι' ἐμοῦ Παύλου.

8. PYALE INV. 349 = YCS 10 (1947) 250

This text is a petition addressed to the strategus of the Heracleides division of the Arsinoite nome, in 171 A.D., by the priests of

⁴¹ Lines 1-3 are taken without change from the edition. They suppose a date in 374, but as the editors observe, the loss of the month-name also makes possible a date in 375. The latter would require *meta tēn hypaleian* in line 1.

⁴² The father's name was written above the line.

Socnobraesis at Bacchias. They complain that they are being assigned, contrary to custom, to corvée duty in localities other than the Patsontis canal, which was in the neighborhood of Bacchias. They hope to enlist the sympathy of the strategus in his rôle of chief financial officer of the nome by stressing the significance of this canal for their village (lines 9–11):

ἀ[φ' ἧς] τὰ τε περὶ τῇ[ν] κώμην ἐδάφ[η] ὑδρ[ε]ύεται
καὶ ἰς [τ]ὰ ὑδροστάσια τὰ ὑ[π'] αὐ[τῇ] κατέρχεται.

It is noticeable that the verb at the end of the clause lacks a subject, and the editor very reasonably suggests, on the basis of *PFay.* 131, 9–12, that *hudôr* be supplied. The priests of Socnobraesis wish to retain their traditional privilege of performing the annual compulsory labor in the Patsontis canal, “from which both the fields round the village are irrigated and <water> comes down into the reservoirs below it.”

Nevertheless, since a word for “water” is needed in the second half of the clause, it is natural to look for it in the mutilated text which immediately precedes the verb. The two letters preserved after the lacuna — tau and eta — might well belong to a neuter plural noun of the type *genê*, and even if we have no word that can be supplied to give the required sense, the context urges us to accept *ta hu[. .]lê* as the subject of the verb.⁴³

This sequence of letters does indeed bring to mind *ta hudata*, which is relatively frequent in papyri for the waters brought down by the annual inundation of the Nile,⁴⁴ but *ta hudatê* is unexpected. There is, however, one example of this metaplastic plural.⁴⁵ *POxy.* 3.425, which is roughly contemporary with *PYale* 349, is a sailor’s song. Those who frequent the “briny waters” of the sea and those who keep to the “laughing waters” of the Nile are invited to compete in praise of their respective domains.⁴⁶ Both *hudatôn* and

⁴³ Professor C. B. Welles has sent me a handdrawing of the writing as he sees it on the papyrus. There are only slight remnants of epsilon, but from these the letter can be reconstructed. Welles, however, warns that it would not be typical in form and should not be regarded as certain. In his opinion, also, the lacuna is better suited to two letters than to three. The reading of tau and eta raises no question.

⁴⁴ Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* (above, note 2) s.v.

⁴⁵ Professors Paul Maas, Emil Kiessling, and L. R. Palmer have informed me that they have no other example in their collections of lexicographical and grammatical material.

⁴⁶ 2nd or 3rd cent. A.D. For text and bibliography see D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri* (Loeb Classical Library) 1.97 (p. 428).

hudatê occur, and the latter is guaranteed by the metrical scheme. It is placed at the end of a line, and every line ends with an iamb which is invariably paroxytone. We may therefore believe that this rare plural was used in the vulgar language of the time⁴⁷ and can safely be restored in the Yale text. If this is done, a perfect correspondence of syntax and meaning is recaptured. The priests of Socnobraesis then describe the Patsontis canal as the one "from which the fields round the village are irrigated and the waters of the flood come down into the reservoirs."

⁴⁷ Maas, *Philologus* 68 (1909) 445 f.; Mercati, *ChronEg.* 13 (1932) 201. The genitive singular in *-ous* is found in several papyri of the 1st and 2nd centuries (*PMich.* 5.322a.7, 24; 6.421.11; *PRyl.* 2.81.7, 10, 13, 21; *PLond.* 3.1177 [p. 182] 54), but this is not conclusive because it may be a graphic equivalent of *-os* and several of the same texts also have forms of the normal declension. On the other hand, a true parallel is provided by the vulgar use of metaplastic forms of *skôr* — nom. *skatos*, gen. *skatous*. See Lobeck's note in his edition of Phrynichus (293); cf. W. G. Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus* (London 1881) 354.