## XLI.  Critical Notes on Documentary Papyri

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

### 1. *PAberd.* 57

The text of this papyrus was written in the second century A.D. It is an application for a sublease of palm and olive trees growing on public land at Bubastus, which lay between Philadelphia in the east of the Fayûm and Socnopaei Nesus in the north.[1]   The applicant desires to hold his lease from the current tenth year until the expiration of the primary lease.   He undertakes to pay an annual rental of twenty drachmas and to deliver as *exaireta* one *mation* of Syrian dates.[2]   Of these obligations he states, according to the published text:

20          ὧν καὶ τὴν [ἀπό-]
            [δ]οσιν ποιήσομαι κα[τ']
            [ἔτ]ος μηνὶ Ἀθὺρ ειεινια.[.]
            [..]α

This clause follows a pattern common in papyri.[3]   Only the end of line 22 and the beginning of line 23 are unintelligible.   Of the

N.B.   I am deeply indebted to a number of my colleagues for their kindness in offering criticism, photographs, and assistance of other kinds: W. E. Blake and F. O. Copley (Michigan), B. Snell and Chr. Voigt (Hamburg), C. Del Grande (Bologna), N. Lewis (Brooklyn), E. G. Turner (London), P. J. Parsons (Oxford), and H. J. H. Drummond, Deputy Librarian of King's College (Aberdeen).   Their contributions are acknowledged in the course of the article at the appropriate places.   I wish also to express my appreciation of the generosity shown by my college in assigning me to off-campus duty for the months of April and May, 1961, and of a money grant provided by the Rackham School of Graduate Studies.   These evidences of concern for the promotion of ancient studies enabled me to complete this paper in profound quiet at a table reserved for papyrologists amid the books of the A. S. Hunt Collection in the Ashmolean Museum.

[1] *PTebt.* 2, page 373: "it probably lay between the southeast corner of Lake Moeris and Philadelphia."   In *PAberd.* 57 the applicant is a resident of Socnopaei Nesus (lines 3–4).

[2] The editor has printed μ[α|τί]ον and has said nothing of μ[έ|τρ]ον as a possible alternative.   The *mation* is $\frac{1}{12}$ art.; the *metron* $\frac{1}{10}$ (Wilcken, *Gr.Ostr.* 1, page 751).

[3] For examples see *TAPA* 91 (1960) 257.

letters as read, the editor notes that the first *iota* "might (very improbably) be *rho*." In so doing he takes account of a shallow loop at the top of the letter.[4]

There are a few texts of a similar kind in other collections which have the same clause in forms very suggestive for *PAberd*. 57. They use a word which compels us to reconsider the curious combination of letters in the Aberdeen papyrus. I have underlined the word in each citation.

> *PAmh.* 2.85.13 f.: τὸν δὲ φόρον ἀποδώσομεν ἐξενίαυτα ἐν μηνὶ Φαῶφι
>
> 86.11 f.: ἃς καὶ ἀπ[οδ]ώσω κατ᾽ ἔτος ἐξενίαυτα ἐν μηνὶ Φαῶφι
>
> *PStrasb.* 267.22 f.: καὶ [τ]ὸν κατ᾽ ἔτος φόρ[ον ἀ]πο[δώ]σομεν ἐξενίαυτα
>
> μηνὶ Τῦβι [5]

A photograph of the Aberdeen papyrus shows that we must read εξ there also in place of the editor's ει, and the full reading of the word is ἐξεινίαυ|[τ]α. This spelling finds its counterpart in the adjective ἐξεινιαύτους in *UPZ* 23.19.[6] When the editor of *PAberd*. 57 proposed *rho* as a possible but unlikely alternative for *iota*, he was in fact seeing the upper curve of a narrow *xi* of the kind mistaken also by other editors for *iota* or *rho*.[7]

The use of ἐξενίαυτα, which may be understood in this context as equivalent to ἔξω ἐνιαυτοῦ, *extra annum*, literally "outside the year," hence "beyond the year," specifically "in the following year," is peculiarly appropriate to leases of fruit trees. The editor of *PAberd*. 57 has observed that dates were harvested in Egypt in the fall of the year, through September and October, not long therefore after the beginning of the Egyptian year.[8] Accordingly, if a lease were negotiated in the tenth year, as in the Aberdeen papyrus (line 15), payment of the rental would be fixed for some

---

[4] I am indebted to the Deputy Librarian of King's College, Aberdeen, for a photograph of *PAberd*. 57. The papyrus has many tears and holes, which are reflected in the punctuation of the *ed. pr.*

[5] *Bull. Fac. Lettres Strasb.* 38 (1960) 210. I have omitted so much of the editorial punctuation as seems inessential for my purpose.

[6] Noted by E. Mayser, *Grammatik d. griech. Papyri aus d. Ptolemäerzeit* 1 (Leipzig 1906) 73.

[7] Youtie, *Textual Criticism of Documentary Papyri* (Institute of Classical Studies, London. Bull. Suppl. 6, 1958) 69. Once at least it has been mistaken for a mark of abbreviation (*TAPA* 91 [1960] 252).

[8] Cf. M. Schnebel, *Landwirtschaft im hellenist. Aegypten* (*Münch. Beitr. z. Papyrusf. u. Rechtsgesch.* 7, 1925) 297 f.

time during or after the harvest, i.e., in the eleventh year, and so properly ἐξενίαυτα.[9]

With this reading and interpretation of lines 22–23 before us, we may turn to lines 13–16, which date the inception of the lease to a tenth regnal year:

> ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσομένων
> καρπῶν τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος
> 15  ι (ἔτους) κα̣[ὶ] ἐκπειπτόντ[ων][10] ε̣ἰς ἐ-
> νιαυτά.

The editor has not missed the oddity presented by a neuter plural of ἐνιαυτός, and Karl Schmidt has urged that the phrase be corrected to εἰς ἐνιαυτόν.[11] But in neither form is it a satisfactory substitute for εἰς τὸ ἑξῆς ἔτος or εἰς τὰ ἑξῆς ἔτη, expressions characteristic of the parallel texts.[12] With the help, however, of the photograph we obtain a new reading which matches exactly the new reading of lines 22–23. There is no palaeographic obstacle to replacing ε̣ἰς ἐ|νιαυτά with ἐξε[ι]-νίαυτα.[13]

With the lines now restored to their original shape, they may be rendered as follows: "from the appearance of the fruit crop (on the trees) in the current 10th year and their harvesting in the following year." The future participle *esomenôn* shows that the lease has been arranged before the growth of the new fruit, i.e. in the winter months of the tenth year. This is replaced elsewhere by the present participle *epikeimenôn*,[14] which shows with equal clarity that the lease was made when the fruits were already

[9] On the distinction between the year of growth and the year of harvest, see Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.* 1, page 311. On the force of *exeniauta* see Wilcken, *UPZ* 21.12 note. Cf. the highly informative interpretations proffered by Preisigke-Kiessling, *Wörterbuch d. griech. Papyrusurk.*, s.v. ἐξενίαυτος. For a recent discussion see *PCol.* 5, pages 217 f. The adverb *exeniauta* has been inaccurately defined in *LSJ* as "yearly" on the basis of *PAmh.* 2.85 alone.

[10] Read ἐκπιπτόντων.

[11] *Philol. Wochenschr.* 61 (1941) 86.

[12] E.g. *CPR* 45 (= Mitteis, *Chrest.* 151 = *StudPal.* 20.21; cf. *Wörterbuch*, s.v. ἐκπίπτω) 9 f.: ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπικειμένων τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος . . . ἔτους [ἐ]κπειπτόντων εἰς τὸ ἑξῆς [ἔτος]; *BGU* 2.603.7–11: τοὺς ἐπ[ι]κειμένους τοῦ ἐνεστῶτο(ς) η (ἔτους) καὶ ἐκπίπτ[ον]τος (for -τας) εἰς τὸ θ (ἔτος) ἐλαϊκ[οῦ]ς καὶ φ[οι]νικικοὺς καρπούς; *PCol.* 5.5.4 f.: ἀπὸ καρπ(ῶν) ιδ (ἔτους) ἐκπ(ιπτόντων) εἰς τὰ ἑξῆς ἔτη.

[13] The scribe may have written ε in 15–16 and ει in 22–23, but I have allowed him to use the same spelling in both places because the papyrus is broken away at the end of 15.

[14] See footnote 12.

visible on the trees, i.e. in the spring or summer months of the same year.[15]    The adverb *exeiniauta*, written for *exeniauta*, points forward to the harvest, which would take place in the early months of the eleventh year.    The first year of the lease therefore runs from the tenth regnal year into the eleventh.[16]


## 2. *PBon.* 31

This papyrus has a short text of nine lines, of a type abundantly represented in papyri.    It is a receipt for work performed on the embankments of the desert canal of Polemon, in the vicinity of Tebtunis.[17]    The first three lines of the text date the receipt to the fifth year of Claudius, i.e. 44/45 A.D., but neither the month nor the day is indicated.

Lines 4–5 state that work has been done in the desert canal of Polemon, but the text is obviously defective.    The true text of these lines has recently been deduced by Naphtali Lewis from a formal analysis of similar receipts.[18]    His theoretical revision needs only a few adjustments of editorial punctuation to bring it into accord with the papyrus.[19]

---

[15] T. Fischer, *Die Dattelpalme* (Petermann's *Mittheilungen*, Ergänzungsheft 64, 1881) 21.

[16] Cf. *TAPA* 91 (1960) 257.    The reader may appreciate a few minor corrections and suggestions.    **Line 1.** [Διοσ]κόρῳ [: [. . . .]κ.οω[ ed.    The new reading has been obtained by comparing this line with the first line of the unpublished subscription. **Lines 5–6.**   παρὰ [σοῦ | το]ὺς ὄντας (approved by E. G. Turner): παρὰ | [σ]οῦ ὄντας ed.; παρὰ | [σ]οῦ ‹τὰ ἀκρόδρυ'› ὄντα K. Schmidt, *Philol. Wochenschr.* 61 (1941) 86. While Schmidt's suggestion is not valid for the papyrus, it shows that he also felt the lack of an article.    **Line 6.**  With [σπ]οραδίεις cf. *PCorn.* 10.8 σποράδεις; Hippocrates, *Acut.* 5 σποράδεες (Littré, with cod. M; reported by *LSJ*, s.v. σποράς). **Lines 7–8.**   The editor's φ[υ]|τὰ . . . is superior to Schmidt's φ[υ]|τε[υτά], of which the last four letters are plainly impossible.    Much less objectionable is φ[υ]|τὰ δύο, but even this proposal comes to grief on the extraordinary size of the supposed *omicron*, which is paralleled in this text only by *epsilon* and *theta*.    **Lines 21–22.**   κα[τ' ἔ|τ]ος: κα[τ' | ἔτ]ος ed.    This slight re-arrangement rests on the space available at the beginning of 22.    **Line 23.**  With παραδώσω understand μετὰ τὸν χρόνον.    The subscription, which the editor has left unpublished, consists of two very badly broken lines. It begins with [Δι]όσκορ[ος, but I cannot surely identify the few remaining letters of either line.    Peter Parsons has with good reason suggested ]νος for the end of the first line; this syllable would conclude the name of Dioscorus' father.

[17] On the relation of canal and village in the receipts see O. M. Pearl, *Aegyptus* 31 (1951) 223–30; M. Hombert, *ChronÉg.* 55 (1953) 167 f.

[18] *ChronÉg.* 68 (1959) 287.

[19] Carlo Del Grande has with characteristic generosity placed at my disposal an enlarged photograph of the papyrus.

Lines 6–8 are written by a second hand, which supplies the name of the village, i.e. Tebtunis, and the name of the person to whom the receipt was issued.   As for line 9, although it is printed entirely without dots, it cannot be resolved into readable Greek. It is here that the photograph has made a significant contribution. This line can now be recognized as a piece of Latin script, not Greek.

I present a new reading of the receipt with translation and brief comments.

$$\text{ἔτους πέμπτου Τιβερίου}$$
$$\text{Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ}$$
$$\text{Γερμανικοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος.}$$
$$\text{ἠργ(άσατο) ἐν τῇ ὀρινῇ Πολ(έμωνος) ἐφ' ἡμέρ(ας)}$$
5   $$\text{πέντ(ε) ὑπ(ὲρ) χ[ω]μ(ατικῶν) τοῦ [α]ὐτοῦ (ἔτους)}$$
  (2nd hd.) Τεβτύνεως
  Σοκεὺς Παπν[ε-]
  βτύνεως. (3rd hd.)  Ο..[
  rius · notavi[

## TRANSLATION

"The fifth year of Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus Imperator.   Has labored in the desert canal of Polemon for five days to the account of work on the embankments for the same year (2nd hd.) on behalf of Tebtunis: [20] Soceus, son of Papnebtunis. (3rd hd.) I, O——rius, have signed this receipt."

## COMMENTARY

4. ἐν: so also Lewis.   The omission of the preposition in the ed. pr. is obviously nothing more than a typographical error.

ὀρινῇ: sc. διώρυγι.   The spelling ὀρινός is common in papyri for ὀρεινός.

4–5. ἐφ' ἡμέρ(ας) πέντ(ε): ἐφ' ἡμέρ(ας) πέ(ντε) Lewis; κιη( ) μερ(ίδος) πέ(μπτου) (ἔτους) ed.   For the same phrase see e.g. PSI 9.1044, introd.; PStrasb. 16,160–63.[21]   The initial letter of the phrase is unlike any genuine kappa in the same hand; these are

[20] See footnote 17.
[21] PStrasb. 160 ff. have been reprinted in Publ. Fac. Lettres Strasb. 97 (1948) 40 ff. Indispensable to the discussion of the phrase is the article by Lewis cited in footnote 18, above.

always begun with a more or less vertical stroke, never with a line running obliquely downward from left to right.   A more fruitful comparison may be made with the *epsilon* of ἐν in the same line. In identifying the second letter of the phrase as *iota*, the editor has overlooked short oblique strokes on both sides of the long vertical. And the third letter, correctly read as *eta*, has no mark of abbreviation.

5. χ[ω]μ(ατικῶν): *sc.* ἔργων; χω(ματικῶν) ed.   The papyrus has *chi* written on the line followed by *mu* written above the line. It is hard to determine from the photograph whether any remnant of *omega* remains.

τοῦ [α]ὐτοῦ (ἔτους): [τοῦ αὐτοῦ] (ἔτους) Lewis; [τὴν πενθήμ]ε-ρ(ον) ed.   The dotted letters are almost but not entirely lost in a ragged horizontal tear of the papyrus.   For the same phrase in the same position see e.g. *PSI* 9.1044 introd., 1046, 1047; *PStrasb.* 16, 160–62, 167.

6–9. These lines appear to be much shorter than those which precede them, but this is merely an illusion imparted to the printed text by the character of the hands that wrote them.   They are both space-consuming.   The 2nd hand, which wrote a large but skilful Greek script,[22] I take to be that of a *katasporeus* or his assistant.   The 3rd hand, however, has written an awkward, sprawling Latin and is almost certainly to be assigned to a Roman soldier attached to the supervision of the *corvée*.[23]   On the "blank forms" that were prepared in advance for dike receipts and completed according to need by a work supervisor with such information as is here supplied by the 2nd hand, see the editor's note to line 6; Wilcken, *Archiv f. Papyrusf.* 1 (1901) 146; *PGot.* 1, introd.; *PSI* 9.1044, introd.; *CP* 39 (1944) 28 f.

6. Τεβτύνεως: Τεβτύνεως [ ed.   This line is as long as all those which precede it on the papyrus, and comparison with line 7 shows that only one letter could possibly be lost at the end of line 6. The text is wholly intelligible as it stands.

[22] The editor's judgment of this hand is somewhat different from mine: "Le rr. 6–8 sono di altra mano: lettere molto grandi e tondeggianti, *tratto grossolano*." (The italics are my own.)   It is not clear whether the editor also attributed line 9 to the same hand.   If lines 6–9 are all from one hand, they are the work of a soldier of eastern origin, probably a Greek, who wrote his own language more skilfully than he wrote Latin.   See the discussion to which I refer in the following footnote.

[23] Cf. *TAPA* 71 (1940) 626 f.

7. Παπν[ε-]: Π[απνε?] ed.   There are substantial remnants of
ink which are perfectly reconcilable with απν.

8–9. O . . [|rius: the dots after O represent two minute rem-
nants from the bottom of one or two letters.   If the end of line 7
has been correctly restored, and no alternative seems possible,
then another letter may have been lost at the end of line 8.   The
letters at the beginning of line 9 are badly abraded.   It is notice-
able that u has a very broad spread as compared with v in the
following word.   A less probable suggestion for r is x, but v (e.g.
Octavius) cannot be read.   Another but remote possibility is d,
but Ovidius is excluded by the remnant after O, minute as it is.
Latin names beginning with O, continuing with two or three
letters, and ending with rius, are not numerous.   I have seen
Orarius, Ostorius, and Otarius.   The best known of these is Ostorius.
(The reader may consult the index of names in W. Schulze, Zur
Geschichte latein. Eigennamen [Abh. Gesell. Wiss. Gött., Phil.-hist. Kl.,
N.F. Bd. 5, Nro. 5, 1933]).   Unfortunately, the remnants on the
papyrus are too meager to provide a basis for judgment.[24]

9. notavi[: I am inclined to suppose that nothing is lost at the
end of the line because all the corresponding Greek subscriptions
have σεσημείωμαι.   Nevertheless, the only other Latin subscrip-
tions to dike receipts, all on ostraca from Karanis (OMich. 1.287,
288; 2.825), have notavit, and that cannot be excluded here.   For
the texts of the ostraca and a brief discussion of their significance,
see TAPA 71 (1940)625–28.

### 3. PHamb. 1.88

This papyrus preserves the upper portion of a private letter
written in the second century A.D.   Antas writes to his brother
Capito, who is living in Philadelphia (Fayûm), about personal
and business affairs.   The text bristles with difficulties.[25]   Meyer's
notes are few and brief, and there is no translation.[26]   The
obstacles to a lucid interpretation begin with the first sentence
after the prescript.   It runs as follows in the edition:

---

[24] I am grateful to Frank O. Copley for his patience in considering this problem
with me.

[25] Meyer, PHamb. 1.88, introd.: "der recht dunkle und unverständliche Brief."

[26] PHamb. 1, pt. 3, which includes No. 88, was published without translations for
reasons of economy.   See Meyer's preface.

ἐχάρην λαβών σου τὸ ἐπιστόλιον
κạλῆς φάσεως ὅτι ἐγαίσησες [27]
5 καὶ ὅτι ἀσθενήσασ{α} ἐσώθη ⟨ς⟩.

Meyer's editorial punctuation and comments indicate sufficiently his view of this sentence, which we may embody in a translation: "I was very happy to have your letter with its good news that you have become a spearman and that you have recovered from your illness."

Meyer was well aware that γαισάω is a verb which occurs only here.   He derived it from γαῖσος, Lat. *gaesum*, a word of Celtic origin used for the "long heavy javelin of the Gauls." [28]   In the years that have intervened since Meyer published this text in 1924 we have learned how careful a transcriber must be about *unique* words like ἐγαίσησες.[29]   It is in this spirit that Kapsomenos, writing more recently on the same text, has suggested that Meyer's ἐγαίσησες is a misreading of ἐγένησες ( = ἐγέννησας).[30]   Thanks to the kindness of Bruno Snell and Chr. Voigt, I have had the opportunity of comparing Meyer's transcription with a photograph of the papyrus.   There can be no doubt about εγα and ησες, and a significant observation can be made about each of the two medial letters—*iota* and *sigma*.   If *sigma* were a true reading, its horizontal stroke would serve also as an integral part of the following *eta*.[31]   If *iota* were sound, its lower tip would be linked to the preceding *alpha* with a small downward loop.   This is not a normal ligature of *alpha* and *iota*, and in the Hamburg papyrus *alpha* is joined in this way to a following letter only in line 16, where the combination is αμ.   I conclude from this brief analysis that both *iota* and *sigma* are false.   If taken as the left and right sides of a single letter, they fit very well into the form of *mu* as

---

[27] For ἐγαίσησας (Meyer).

[28] Preisigke-Kiessling, *Wörterbuch*, lists only one example of γαῖσος in papyri (*PTebt.* 1.230; 2nd cent. B.C.) and none of γαισάω.   Wilcken's curious suggestion that the papyrus has "die barbarische Schreibung εγαις ησες" for ὑγιὴς ῟Ησες (῏Ησις) is recorded in *PHamb.* 1, page 269.   This proposal does excessive violence to the text, but as we shall see, Wilcken was entirely right in rejecting ἐγαίσησες in line 4 while accepting ἀσθενήσασα ἐσώθη in line 5.

[29] Cf. S. G. Kapsomenakis (Kapsomenos), *Voruntersuch. z. ein. Grammatik d. Papyri d. nachchr. Zeit* (*Münch. Beitr. z. Papyrusf. u. antiken Rechtsgesch.* 28, 1938) 8.

[30] S. G. Kapsomenos, *Ereunai eis tên glôssan tôn hellênikôn papurôn* (*Aristoteleion Panepistêmion Thessalonikês, Epistêmonikê Epetêris Philosophikês Scholês* 7, 1957) 360 f.

[31] In this hand the horizontal stroke of *eta* always runs for about the same distance to the right and to the left of the first vertical stroke.

illustrated elsewhere on the papyrus, and especially in line 8. The middle curve of the *mu* has been removed by abrasion, as have parts of many other letters over the whole sheet.    An ancient fold passed directly through the *mu*, and this is not a location conducive to survival.

The verb is accordingly ἐγάμησες,[32] which is pure *koinê*.[33]    In line 5 the papyrus has ἀσθενήσασα ἐσώθη, and I follow Wilcken[34] and Kapsomenos in accepting this as the true text.    The writer's failure to identify the woman more closely was simple negligence or indifference.    She had been named or otherwise described in Capito's letter to Antas, and there could be no misunderstanding. Kapsomenos is probably right in supposing that she was the wife of Capito.[35]    This is suggested also by the reading ἐγάμησες, as it was by his conjecture ἐγέν‹ν›ησες.

The most significant and also the most baffling passage in *PHamb.* 1.88 occupies lines 9–15.[36]    They have the following text in Kapsomenos' arrangement of Meyer's edition:[37]

> γράφεις μοι περὶ τῶν χρεωστῶν
> 10  τοῦ ταλαιπώρου Ἰου[λ]ιανοῦ ἀπο-
> χὰς προφέρειν τινὸς ἀστοῦ.  ἐὰν ἦν
> ἰδιόγραφα αὐτοῦ, θέλοντες καὶ μὴ
> θ[έ]λοντες δεῖ ἡμᾶς προσδέξεσθαι
> ταχέα, ἵνα μετὰ τὰς ἀποχὰς ἀπαι-
> 15  τείτωσαν.

It is not easy, even by combining all the indications given by Meyer and Kapsomenos, to make a coherent translation of this text which might at the same time faithfully reflect their points of view.    I italicize the interpretations that need discussion: "You write to me with reference to the *creditors* of wretched Julianus, that you could produce receipts (i.e. *acknowledgments made by him for loans received*) *from a certain citizen*.[38]    If these are documents in

---

[32] The same reading was made independently from the same photograph by E. G. Turner when he was in Ann Arbor in March, 1961.

[33] *LSJ*, s.v. *ad init.*; A. Debrunner, *Geschichte d. griech. Sprache* 2 (Sammlung Göschen 114) 112 f.

[34] See footnote 28, *ad fin.*

[35] See footnote 30.

[36] Meyer, note *ad loc.*: "Der Passus ist schwer verständlich."

[37] See footnote 30.

[38] Meyer, *PHamb.* 1.88, introd.: "Capito, der Adressat . . . hat dem Briefschreiber Antas 'betreffs der Schuldner des unglücklichen Iulianus' geschrieben, er möchte

his own hand, whether we wish to or not, we must consent without delay to their demanding payment *on the basis of the receipts.*" [39]

Meyer was troubled by χρεωστῶν (line 9) in the relatively uncommon sense of "creditors" instead of the usual "debtors" [40] and by ἀποχάς (lines 10 f., 14) as "acknowledgements or contracts of loan," a meaning it has nowhere else.[41] He thought of the ἀποχαί as receipts in form only, seemingly drawn with the intention of obscuring the real nature of the transactions between Julianus and "a certain citizen." They would serve to conceal Julianus' acknowledgment of loans made to him by this strangely anonymous person.[42] What drove Meyer to this dubious position and encouraged Kapsomenos to follow him appears to be their assumption that the collection mentioned in lines 14–15 was to be made on the basis of the ἀποχαί; [43] hence these could not be proper receipts, they must be acknowledgments of loans; the χρεῶσται could not then be debtors, they must be creditors.

A study of the photograph has yielded corrections of the text which permit us to redirect the interpretation. Although τινὸς ἀστοῦ is presented as certain in line 11, the *sigma* of ἀστοῦ is nevertheless unsatisfactory. Every other *sigma* on the papyrus has either a straight back or one that curves sharply down to the right. Only the *sigma* of ἀστοῦ would have a back inclining noticeably downward to the left, a feature more likely to be found

ἀποχὰς προφέρειν τινὸς ἀστοῦ." *Idem*, note to lines 9–15: "So wie die Worte dastehen, müssten wir fiktive Quittungen annehmen und τινὸς ἀστοῦ . . . als gen. obj. auffassen." See my next paragraph.

[39] Kapsomenos (above, footnote 30) has put lines 12–15 into mod. Greek: ἐὰν (αἱ ἀποχαί, τ.ἔ. αἱ ἀποδείξεις) εἶναι ἰδιόγραφα αὐτοῦ (τοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ), θέλοντες καὶ μὴ πρέπει νὰ δεχθῶμεν ἀμέσως ν' ἀπαιτήσουν μὲ τὰς ἀποδείξεις (ἐνν. τὴν πληρωμήν). K. also justifies μετά c. acc. = μετά c. gen. (page 361, note 3) as well as the imperative after ἵνα (page 361, note 2). [I am deeply indebted to Warren E. Blake for guiding my understanding of Kapsomenos' translation.]

[40] *LSJ* and Preisigke-Kiessling, *Wörterbuch*, record only the meaning "debtor." Meyer, in his note to lines 9–15, expressed astonishment that χρεωστῶν is used where a word for "creditors" is needed. Kapsomenos subsequently gathered the evidence for the meaning "creditors" in late Greek (*Voruntersuch.* [above, footnote 29] 103, note 1; *Ereunai* [above, footnote 30] 361, note 1).

[41] Meyer, *ibid.*: "In dieser Bedeutung wird aber das Wort niemals gebraucht." He refers to A. B. Schwarz, *Die öffentliche u. private Urkunde im röm. Ägypten (Abh. Sächs. Akad. Wiss.*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 31, No. 3) 145, note 4: ". . . werden Schuldscheine, die eine Empfangsbestätigung der Schuldvaluta enthalten, in den Papyri ebensowenig wie heute als Quittungen bezeichnet."

[42] See footnote 38.

[43] See footnote 39.

in the right half of an *upsilon*.    In fact, it needs only a glance at
αὐτοῦ in line 12 to see that this is also the word that was written
in line 11.    The left half of the *upsilon* was destroyed by abrasion.
The letter stands just to the right of the fold mentioned above in
connection with the abraded *mu* of ἐγάμησες.

In the same position to the left of the fold is the *omicron* of τινός.
It looks like a heavy dot with a relatively large watery blot below
it.    The dot might well be all that remains of *omicron*, but it would
also suit *alpha*.    With αὐτοῦ now substituted for ἀστοῦ the geni-
tive τινός no longer has any function in the sentence, but τινάς
will do admirably.    That half of *upsilon* and most of *alpha* have
vanished is not surprising.    Above them in line 10 are the meager
remains of two badly abraded letters, a third which has been
entirely rubbed away, and two more only half preserved: ᾽Ιου[λ]ι-
ανοῦ.

We may record also a new reading in line 14.    At the beginning
of the line Meyer's text has τὰ χ‹ρ›έα ἵνα.    Kapsomenos retains
ἵνα while changing τὰ χ‹ρ›έα to ταχέα.    There is no need to
discuss these readings at length because the photograph clearly
has τὰ δὲ λοιπά.[44]

By way of testing the validity of these corrections within the
scope of the entire context, I present a revised edition of lines 3–15
with translation and brief comments.

> ἐχάρην λαβών σου τὸ ἐπιστόλιον
> καλῆς φάσεως ὅτι ἐγάμησες
> 5 καὶ ὅτι ἀσθενήσασα ἐσώθη.
> λοιπόν, καθώς σοι πρέπι πάντοτε
> κα[τ]άγεις σεαυτὸν καὶ νῦν, ὡς ἄν-
> θρωπος τέλειος γενάμενος.
> γράφεις μοι περὶ τῶν χρεωστῶν
> 10 τοῦ ταλαιπώρου ᾽Ιου[λ]ιανοῦ ἀπο-
> χὰς προφέρειν τινὰς αὐτοῦ.  ἐὰν ἦν
> ἰδιόγραφα αὐτοῦ, θέλοντες καὶ μὴ
> θ[έ]λοντες δεῖ ἡμᾶς προσδέξεσθαι.
> τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ μετὰ τὰς ἀποχὰς ἀπαι-
> 15 τείτωσαν.

---

[44] Meyer fell into error because (1) the third letter is badly mutilated and might
be taken for either *chi* or *delta*, (2) the tongue of *epsilon* is joined to *lambda* in such man-
ner as to introduce a loop somewhat like that of *alpha*, and (3) he failed to see the small
circle of *omicron* which is attached to the end of *lambda*.  However, what he read as ινα
is indisputably ιπα.  It ought not to be possible to confuse *nu* and *pi* in this hand.

## TRANSLATION

"I was very happy to receive your letter with its good news that you have married and that she (i.e. your wife?) has recovered from her illness. For the rest, as befits you at all times, you so conduct yourself also now that you have become a full-grown man. You write to me with reference to the debtors of our wretched Julianus, that some are producing receipts from him. If these are documents in his own hand, whether we wish to or not, we must enter them as credit. But let them (i.e. our agents) collect what remains due beyond the amount of the receipts."

## COMMENTARY

4. φάσεως: φάσεως Meyer. ἐγάμησες: so also Turner; ἐγαισησες Meyer; εγαις ησες ( =ὑγιὴς ᾿Ησις) Wilcken; ἐγέν‹ν›ησες Kapsomenos. On the form of the verb see the references in footnote 33.

5. ἀσθενήσασα ἐσώθη: so also Wilcken and Kapsomenos; ἀσθενήσασ{α} ἐςώθη‹ς› Meyer. See page 558.

6–8. I follow Meyer's punctuation. Kapsomenos puts a full stop after σεαυτόν (line 7) and joins καὶ νῦν κτλ. to the following sentence.

6. πρέπι = πρέπει.

7. κα[τ]άγεις: so Meyer, although the meaning necessary in this context is extraordinary for κατάγω. The papyrus also permits κα[ὶ] ἄγεις, but what force καί would have at this point escapes me.

8. τέλειος: probably used here in its legal sense, as observed by Meyer.

11. τινὰς αὐτοῦ: τινὸς ἀστοῦ Meyer. See page 559.

11–12. I follow Kapsomenos' punctuation. Meyer put a comma after his ἀστοῦ in line 11 and a full stop after αὐτοῦ in line 12.

12, 13. -τες for -τας, as observed by Meyer. For τέσσαρες as the type of the new acc., cf. Debrunner (above, footnote 33) 61; J. H. Moulton, *GramNTGreek* 1³ (1908) 36.

13. -δέξεσθαι = -δέξασθαι, as observed by Meyer. For the meaning of the verb see Preisigke-Kiessling, *Wörterbuch*, s.v., 2: "eine Leistung jemandem anrechnen (gutschreiben oder zur Last schreiben)."

14. μετά: "above, beyond, in addition to." This sense of the preposition can be illustrated from accounts, e.g. *PFamTebt.* 8 in the text given by Youtie, *TAPA* 91 (1960) 262; *PGrenf.* 2.77.23.

14–15. ἀπαιτείτωσαν: the names of the collectors, doubtless agents of Antas and Capito, have been omitted as known to both. Nonius, who is so highly praised in lines 15–17, may be one of them. Cf. the omission of a woman's name or description in line 5, discussed on page 558. I have also considered the possibility that ξενικῶν πράκτορες ought to be supplied with the verb, since these officials were concerned with the collection of private debts. [On this type of omission cf. Mayser (above, footnote 6) 2.3.2 (1b); for the activity of the *xenikôn praktores*, S. Plodzien, *JJP* 5 (1951) 217–27; C. Préaux, *ChronÉg.* 59 (1955) 107–11.] As it happens, however, the verb used here is not characteristic of their function.

## 4. *PMerton* 2.70

The text of this papyrus is dated Oct. 29, 159 A.D.[45] It is presented by the editor as a report of charges collected on the transportation of natron by ἐπιτηρηταὶ ὠνῆς ναυνου γναφέων (lines 7–9), with ναυνου taken as a writing error for ναύλου. This title is given in translation as "inspectors of the boat-hire contract for the fullers." The word ὠνή designates a "contract for the farming of taxes," as this usage is defined in *LSJ*. It is the contract by which tax-farmers buy and the state sells the right to collect a tax or group of taxes. "Boat-hire" is of course an equivalent of ναύλον. The ἐπιτηρηταί, although called "inspectors, overseers, or superintendents," have in fact purchased the right to collect the taxes specified in their contract.[46]

There is nothing inherently improbable in this interpretation since the account of collections entered in lines 14–29 includes five

---

[45] Dated by the editor to Oct. 28. The Egyptian year 158/159 was a leap-year, hence all dates in 159/160 were advanced by 1 day up to March 1.

[46] Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.* 1.575, 599; cf. S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt (Princeton Univ. Studies in Papyrology* 2, 1938) 288.

examples of payments which are proportionate to the capacity of
the boat used for transporting the natron.[47]   Nevertheless, the
photograph published with the edition does not sustain the reading
ναυνου.   The last four letters are indeed correctly read as υνου,
the preceding letter could certainly pass for *alpha* if that were
the letter required.   The first letter, however, is not *nu*, it is *pi*.
The forms of *nu* and *pi* are consistently distinguished throughout
the text.   In these circumstances, the association of the word
with fullers points to πλύνου, and this is confirmed by the photo-
graph.

The title of the collectors is therefore ἐπιτηρηταὶ ὠνῆς πλύνου
γναφέων.   The word πλύνος is applied to the operations performed
by fullers in washing and cleaning newly woven cloth, chiefly wool
and linen, as well as cloth soiled by use.[48]   Since natron was, as
the editor of the Merton papyrus observes, "one of the principal
cleansing agents of the ancient world,"[49] it is easy to see why the
persons responsible for collecting charges on πλύνος γναφέων were
concerned with the procurement and sale of natron.   The use of
πλύνος as the name of a tax is found in *PHib.* 1.114, a report made
in the third century B.C. by collectors who have the title οἱ
ἐξειληφότες τὸν πλύνον καὶ στίβον.[50]   These are also tax-farmers,[51]
and their report covers the monthly returns for πλύνος and
στίβος over a period of nine months, from Mechir to Phaophi.
That the charge on πλύνος was in effect a levy on natron is sug-
gested by *BGU* 6.1364–74,[52] a series of Ptolemaic receipts in
which monthly payments are made, always by the same contri-
butor, for νιτρικὴ πλύνου, more often called simply νιτρική.[53]
Its connection with fullers is attested by No. 1374, where the pay-
ment is made διὰ τῶν γναφέων.[54]

[47] The charge for a boat of 50 art. is 25 dr.   Each additional 10 art. increases the
charge by 5 dr.

[48] Wilcken, *Gr.Ostr.* 1.226, 264; T. Reil, *Beitr. z. Kenntnis d. Gewerbes im hellenist.
Ägypten* (Leipzig 1913) 104.

[49] Cf. C. Préaux, *L'économie royale des Lagides* (Brussels 1939) 114 f.

[50] On *stibos* see Reil (above, footnote 48); cf. *LSJ*, s.v. στιβεύς (2).

[51] Wilcken, *Gr.Ostr.* 1.539 (note 1), 575.

[52] Cf. Meyer, *Gr. Texte*, pages 111 f.

[53] All the texts listed by Preisigke-Kiessling, *Wörterbuch* s.vv. νιτρική, πλύνος,
belong to the Ptolemaic period.   *PRyl.* 2.70.8 also has ν. π.; *Ostr.Tait* 1.37 and 39
ν. π.; 126 ν. τοῦ π.   Cf. Heichelheim in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE* 16 (1933), 173 f., s.v.
"Monopole."

[54] Pap. γναφείων.

The statement of monies received in the month of Phaophi occupies lines 14–29. It consists of five items, each of which begins with the name of the contributor, who may be a retail-dealer or even a fuller.[55]  The name is followed by the capacity of the boat used for transporting the natron and the amount paid for its use,[56] and these in turn by a recurring payment of 14 dr. 2 ob. for 100 slabs of natron.  In line 29 the total of the payments is drawn and stated as follows, in the edition:

$$(\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\alpha\grave{\iota}) \, [\sigma\kappa\varsigma] \quad \{(\dot{o}\beta o\lambda o\grave{\iota} \; \delta\acute{v}o)\} \quad (\dot{o}\beta o\lambda o\grave{\iota} \; \tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma)$$

i.e. 226 dr. 2 ob. corrected to 226 dr. 4 ob.[57]  In line 31 the monies received in Thoth are recorded as 239 dr. 4 ob.  These partial totals are then added to give the final total in line 33: 466 dr.

The difficulty raised by these numbers is easier to see if they are set one below another.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
(29) & 226 \text{ dr.} & 4 \text{ ob.} \\
(31) & 239 \text{ dr.} & 4 \text{ ob.} \\
\hline
(33) & 465 \text{ dr.} & 8 \text{ ob.} \; = \; 466 \text{ dr.}
\end{array}
$$

By using the traditional drachma of 6 ob. the editor finds that the "sum is too small by 2 obols."  He takes the view that the scribe erred in this way by neglecting his own correction of 2 ob. to 4 ob. in line 29, so that the addition was made as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
(29) & 226 \text{ dr.} & 2 \text{ ob.} \\
(31) & 239 \text{ dr.} & 4 \text{ ob.} \\
\hline
(33) & 465 \text{ dr.} & 6 \text{ ob.} \; = \; 466 \text{ dr.}
\end{array}
$$

If we now fix our attention on the corrected total in line 29, i.e. 226 dr. 4 ob., we find it to be accurate provided the items which precede it are also added on the basis of 6 ob. to the drachma.  But

[55] The editor seems to assign a different rôle from the one I suggest to the 5 persons named in the account: they "would be either the men who hired the boats or the boats' masters."  This statement is somewhat vague, but if by "the men who hired the boats" he means the retailers or fullers who paid to the *epitêrêtai* the sums collected for the use of the boats, we are in agreement.

[56] See footnote 47.  For the same arrangement in a list of arrears for *naulon* see *PMich.* Inv. 4607 (O. M. Pearl, *TAPA* 83 [1952] 78).

[57] Editor *ad loc.*; "The addition was corrected but the incorrect total not crossed out . . ."

the photograph does not support 226 dr. 4 ob. as a reading of the papyrus. The horizontal stroke which distinguishes 4 ob. from 3 ob. is simply not there.[58] What creates the illusion of such a stroke is a slightly darkened fiber which runs completely across the papyrus. Such fibers are numerous over the whole surface of the sheet. The total as written by the scribe is 226 dr. 3 ob., and this was obtained by using the tetradrachm of 28 ob., each drachma of the tetradrachm being equated with 7 ob.[59]

| (16) | 44 dr. | 2 ob. |
|------|--------|-------|
| (19) | 39 dr. | 2 ob. |
| (22) | 54 dr. | 2 ob. |
| (25) | 44 dr. | 2 ob. |
| (28) | 44 dr. | 2 ob. |

(29) 225 dr. 10 ob. = 226 dr. 3 ob

With a correct reading of line 29 and a drachma of 7 ob. as the basis of calculation, the final total is also vindicated, as shown in the following addition.

| (29) | 226 dr. | 3 ob. |
|------|---------|-------|
| (31) | 239 dr. | 4 ob. |

(33) 465 dr. 7 ob. = 466 dr.[60]

[58] For the symbols equated with 3 ob. and 4 ob. see *PLond.* 1, Index 6 (page 252.)

[59] L. C. Lewis and A. C. Johnson, *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (*Princeton Univ. Studies in Papyrology* 5, 1949) 9 ff., 46 ff.; cf. A. Swiderek, *La propriété foncière privée dans l'Égypte de Vespasien* (Acad. Scient. Pol., *Bibliotheca Antiqua* 1, 1960) 62, notes 165–69; 72,'notes 527–33.—I suspect that the strokes on the right edge of the lacuna, which the editor has transcribed as 2 ob., are the remains of *stigma*. I suggest the following as a closer reading of the papyrus: *(δραχμαὶ) [σκ]ς (τριώβολον)*.

[60] The reader may welcome a few further remarks of lesser significance. *Πάρθης* (line 20) is a misreading of *Πααβῆς*. The latter is listed in Preisigke, *Namenbuch*; the former is not. The editor observes that *Πιβήκιος* (line 14) is also not in the *Namenbuch*, but this is an obvious variant of *Πιβῆκις*, itself a variant of *Παβῆκις*, for which Preisigke lists 8 other spellings. Of the 5 names which stand at the head of the 5 items of the account, only *Κεντυρίων* is new. This in turn is only a Greek transcription of Lat. *centurio* used as a personal name. Cf. B. Meinersmann, *Lat. Wörter u. Namen in d. griech. Papyri* (Papyrusinstitut d. Universitätsbibliothek in Heidelberg. Bd. 1, Schrift 1, 1927) 24.—The transcription καὶ ὑπ(έρ) should be preferred to κ(αὶ) ὑ(πέρ) in lines 15, 18, 21, 24, 27. Cf. footnote 66, below.—The edition uses γί(γνονται) throughout although γί(νονται) is more suitable to a *koinê* text.—The reading and interpretation of lines 29 and 32 need more attention. I share the editor's doubt regarding ςἰς ἀ(ρίθμησιν?) and I am unable to see ἐὰν ἀπολ[ίπωντ]αι.

## 5. *PMerton* 2.74

The text of this papyrus is a barley account,[61] compiled in all probability in 304 A.D.[62]   It is described by the editor as "part of an account of rents in barley from holdings in two villages, Serenou and Talao, in the Oxyrhynchite nome."   He finds nothing in the document to establish the nature of "the estate of which the holdings form part."   In his note to line 5, which has the words μερίδων β̄ Σερήνου, he suggests that *meris* be taken as meaning "district," without excluding the possibility that it may designate a "portion of an estate."   In his note to line 13, he sees a contrast between μερίδων β̄ Σερήνου and κατὰ τό(πους) Ταλαώ: the one refers to "2 divisions of Serenou," the other to "all the subdivisions of Talao."

It can be shown, however, that the interpretation of the first phrase and the reading of the second are in need of revision.   Only one column of the account is preserved, and this is concerned entirely with Serenou and Talao.   Line 1 gives the total amount of seed barley due from both villages.   The total is then analyzed in lines 2 and 3 in order to clarify its distribution between Serenou and Talao.   I reproduce these lines with a slight rearrangement of the left margin which makes the scribe's intention completely obvious.[63]   I omit the amounts as indifferent to our present purpose.

$$\text{ὧν Σερήνου    (amount)}$$
$$\text{Ταλαώ    (amount)}$$

"Of these, (due from)Serenou   (amount)
                              Talao      (amount)"

---

[61] A photograph of the papyrus is reproduced on Plate 22, opp. page 80.   Line 4 has the symbol for πυρός, but the use of κριθή in lines 1 and 15 as well as the arithmetic of the account show the symbol to be an error on the part of the scribe.

[62] The editor takes a different view: "Though the hand in which this papyrus is written bears a superficial resemblance to the early Byzantine, closer examination shows it to be late second century . . . in some respects not unlike *Pap. Graec. Berol.* 32(b)."   Since line 11 refers to Thoth of the 21st yr., he equates this date with 21 Commodus = 180 A.D., or "conceivably" 21 Caracalla = 212 A.D.   The photograph published with the text leads me to prefer the editor's first impression that the script is early Byzantine.   Several of the plates at the back of *PCairIsidor.* seem to me more probative for the date of *PMerton* 74 than the one cited by the editor.

[63] This statement implies no disagreement between the editor and myself on the meaning of these lines.   I am simply using them to lay a foundation for remarks on lines 5–6.

There is no difficulty about the meaning of these lines, and lines 16–17 follow the same pattern. This is true also of lines 5–6. The pattern is not disturbed by the insertion of μερίδων β between ὧν and Σερήνου. If the same tabular arrangement is applied to these lines, it illuminates the relation of the phrase to the village names. After entering in line 4 the total amount of barley due for rent and seed, the scribe uses lines 5 and 6 to show its distribution between Serenou and Talao.

$$\text{ὧν μερίδων β Σερήνου} \quad \text{(amount)}$$
$$\text{Ταλαὼ} \quad \text{(amount)}$$

"Of these, (due from the) two divisions:  Serenou  (amount)
                                            Talao    (amount)"

For "divisions" we might substitute "districts."[64]  In any case, the reference is to the two villages, Serenou and Talao, taken as the two items to be accounted for in the analysis.

The account of collections in lines 8–14 is more complicated than those we have already inspected, but the same basic elements can be detached from it: 8. ἐξ ὧν (identical in meaning with ὧν), 9. μερίδων β Σερήνου, 13. Ταλαώ. The edition has κατὰ τό(πους) at the beginning of line 13 just before Ταλαώ, so that this combination of words appears to be contrasted with μερίδων β Σερήνου, which stands at the beginning of line 9.[65] The photograph, however, permits us to correct the reading in line 13 to κάτω τοπ(αρχίας)[66] Ταλαώ, i.e. "Talao in the lower toparchy," which in effect carries no more meaning than simple "Talao," as it is given in the other entries.[67] Consequently, the phrase μερίδων β again does nothing more than point to the two villages, Serenou and Talao.

A very close parallel to this use of *meris* is the use of *meros* in *PCairIsidor.* 13, a summary report made by the chaff collectors of Karanis to the *pertractator*, or inspector of accounts, of the Heptanomia in 314 A.D.  Lines 1–11 have the address to the *pertractator*, a statement of the origin and scope of the report, and an oath

---

[64] See the editor's note to line 5.
[65] See the editor's note to line 13.
[66] Following the same principle of abbreviation, we should prefer αἱ π(ροκεί-μεναι) to the editor's αἱ (προκείμεναι) in lines 7 and 18.  Cf. footnote 60, above.
[67] Talao is known from a number of Oxyrhynchus papyri to have been in the lower toparchy, e.g., *POxy.* 14.1659.100–105.

attesting the accuracy of the return.   Line 12 introduces a state-
ment of the areas subject to the delivery of chaff.   Lines 13–15
present the total areas of royal and private land in the village of
Karanis; lines 16–18, the total areas in the *horiodeiktia* of Karanis.
In line 19, the two totals given for royal land in the village and the
*horiodeiktia* are combined to yield the grand total for royal land in
the two districts (τῶν δύο μερῶν).   Line 20 does the same for
private land.   The two *merê* are the village of Karanis and its
*horiodeiktia*, as the two *merides* in the Merton papyrus are Serenou
and Talao.

The larger part of the Merton account as we now have it is
devoted to the quantities of barley due from these villages (1–7)
and to the quantities collected (8–14).   The editor takes the view,
but not with complete conviction, that lines 15–18 also record
collections.   This is in accord with his reading of the beginning
of line 15 as ὁμ(οίως) ἐνεχθ(εῖσαι), i.e., "likewise brought in,
likewise paid." [68]   The photograph, however, leads in another
direction.   The supposed ομ, which the critical apparatus repro-
duces from the papyrus as μο), consists of a large ornate arc with a
heavy dot in its center.   The arc is formed by distorting the two
halves of a *lambda*, but without fusing them; they are still easily
distinguished on the photograph.   The proper reading is there-
fore λο(ιπαὶ) ἐν ἐχθ(έσει),[69] which marks lines 15–18 as a state-
ment of arrears.[70]   The same phrase is used in *PCairIsidor.*
11.64–65; 16.45.

Seen in the light of this reading, *PMerton* 74 falls into three parts:
(1) lines 1–7 conclude an account of barley due as rent and seed
from the villages of Serenou and Talao; (2) lines 8–14 record the
portion of these dues that has been collected;[71] (3) lines 15–18

---

[68] See the editor's note to line 15.

[69] For *lambda* enclosing *omicron* as a writing of *loipai* see Bilabel in Pauly-Wissowa,
*RE*, 2te Reihe, 2 (1923) 2303, s.v. "Siglae"; H. I. Bell, *Abbreviations in Documentary Papyri*
(*Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson* 2, 1953) 428.   For the usual abbreviations of *homoiôs*
see Bilabel, *op. cit.* 2303; Bell, *op. cit.* 430.   The substitution of *chi* for *kappa* in *ekthesis* is
common, e.g. *PCairIsidor.* 11.49, 52; 17.1.

[70] Cf. the editor's note to line 15.

[71] The text and interpretation of these lines can be further improved.   The scribe
corrected the totals in lines 12 and 14 by adding to them an additional 13 art.   The
correction was explained in a marginal note of three short lines, now largely rubbed
away, opposite lines 10–11.   The editor refrains from giving a transcription of the
first two lines (see his note *ad loc.*), and his text of the third line is incomplete.   The
photograph permits something more: [ἀλλ]αι (ἀρτάβαι) ϛ | ]..ζ | (γίνονται) (ἀρτάβαι) ιγ.
In all strictness, the cancelled portion of line 14 should be punctuated as follows:

present the portion that remains to be collected. If the account was restricted to barley, another column preceding the one preserved and a third following it would be needed for a complete report. This would have begun with an address to the official to whom it was sent, followed by a statement of the scope of the report, and this in turn perhaps by an oath attesting its correctness. Then, after a list of the areas affected and the rates applied to them, would come the amount of the rents due on them. At this point the account would go over to a second column, which we have in *PMerton* 74. A third column would be required to balance the account by giving the complete total of collections and arrears. These do in fact equal exactly the amount of the dues as stated in line 4.[72] There would then be more than enough room for the date of the report and the signatures of the collectors.[73]

The text is in all respects a typical summary report of the kind submitted at the conclusion of a year's business by government agents entrusted with the collection of taxes and rents in kind. Since rents and seed are specified, it may very well be an account rendered by sitologi of the year 303/4.

## 6. *PMerton* 2.77

This text is a report made by the sitologi of Karanis to the strategus of the Heraclides division of the Arsinoite nome in 182 A.D.[74] They declare that they received at the granary of that village a certain quantity of wheat on November 3 of the same

{(ἀρτάβαι)} ⟦φκα (ἥμισυ) χ(οίνικες) η⟧. The editor's note is more nearly correct in this detail than his text.

In his note to line 9, the editor correctly identifies the *genikos logos* as an "account-in-kind," but then adds: "Here, as the payments are all in kind, the insertion of διὰ γενικοῦ λόγου is otiose." This is not correct. The phrase points to the daybook of payments in kind as the source from which the totals given here were compiled. On the force of διά see C. Rossberg, *De praepositionum graecarum . . . usu* (Diss. Iena, 1909) 39: *praepositio notionem "secundum" praebet.* Cf. *PIand.* 7.135.16, note.

[72] Also noted by the editor in his introduction.

[73] I have used *PCairIsidor.* 9, 11, and 13 as models for reconstructing the contents of *PMerton* 74.

[74] Of the 3 sitologi who are named Ptolemaeus son of Limnaeus and Castor son of Marres may be identical with persons of the same name known from Karanis tax rolls to have been active between 171 and 174 A.D. See *PMich.* 4, pt. 2, Index 3.

year.   The amount is recorded in lines 11–13 in the following
form, according to the edition:[75]

$$\pi\upsilon\rho[o\hat{\upsilon}] \; \dot{\alpha}\rho\tau\dot{\alpha}\beta\alpha\varsigma \; \delta[\iota]\alpha\text{-}$$
$$\kappa o\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \; \mu\acute{\iota}[\alpha]\nu \; \tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau o\nu \; \kappa[\alpha\grave{\iota}]$$
$$\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau o\nu, \; (\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu o\nu\tau\alpha\iota) \; (\pi\upsilon\rho o\hat{\upsilon} \; \dot{\alpha}\rho\tau\dot{\alpha}\beta\alpha\iota) \; \overline{\sigma\alpha\iota\gamma}$$

Editor's translation: "two hundred and one and one-thirteenth
artabas of wheat, total $201\frac{1}{13}$ artabas."

The appearance of $\frac{1}{13}$ as a fraction of an artaba is unexpected.
It has not occurred heretofore in any of the numerous measure-
ments of artabas in papyri.   Only three series of fractions have
been found with artabas: $\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{8}$; $\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{24}$, etc.; $\frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{10}$.[76]   Further-
more, even if $\frac{1}{13}$ were a permissible fraction in this connection, its
expression as $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau o\nu \; \kappa\alpha\grave{\iota} \; \delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau o\nu$ would be somewhat disconcert-
ing in a report submitted by sitologi in the second century A.D.,
or for that matter in any non-literary document after 300 B.C.
The treatment of the ordinal numeral, hence the fraction, as a
phrase consisting of three words is characteristic of Attic prose
and was superseded in *koiné* by the use of $\tau\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau o\nu$, which
like so much else in *koiné* illustrates the influence exerted by Ionic
on the formation of Hellenistic Greek.   This replacement was
effected in all the ordinal numerals, which of course supply the
fractions, from 13 to 19.[77]

Since $\frac{1}{3}$ and $\frac{1}{10}$ were both in use as fractions of the artaba, it
might be supposed that the text as given in the edition was not
meant for $\frac{1}{13}$, but rather for $\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{10}$, i.e. 13/30; but the linking of
fractions with a conjunction is not normal practice in the papyri.[78]
From no point of view, therefore, is $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau o\nu \; \kappa\alpha\grave{\iota} \; \delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau o\nu$ suitable
in the present context.   Since $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau o\nu$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau o\nu$ are correctly
read, the only alternative that satisfies at once the idiom of the
papyri and the requirement imposed by space is $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau o\nu \; \delta\omega\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau o\nu$.
And the photograph does in fact show an almost complete outline
of *delta* where the editor has read a doubtful *kappa*.[78a]   I accord-
ingly propose that lines 11–13 be read as follows:

[75] I have omitted all dots placed under letters which are broken but securely
identified.   A photograph of the papyrus is reproduced on Plate 25, opp. page 94.

[76] Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, page lxix; *PFay*. 101, introd.; Youtie and Pearl, *AJP* 62
(1941) 81.

[77] Kühner-Blass, *Ausführl. griech. Grammatik* 1, pt. 1 (1890) 626, note 3; Mayser
(above, footnote 6) 318; Moulton, *GramNTGreek* 1³ (1908) 96.

[78] Cf. Mayser (above, footnote 6) 319 f.

[78a] See now also C. Préaux, *ChronÉg*. 69–70 (1960) 292.

$$\pi\nu\rho[o\hat{v}] \ \dot{a}\rho\tau\dot{a}\beta\alpha\varsigma \ \delta[\iota]\alpha\text{-}$$
$$\kappa o\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \ \mu\acute{\iota}[\alpha]\nu \ \tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau o\nu \ \underline{\delta}[\omega\text{-}]$$
$$\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau o\nu, \ (\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu o\nu\tau\alpha\iota) \ (\pi\nu\rho o\hat{v} \ \dot{a}\rho\tau\dot{a}\beta\alpha\iota) \ \sigma\alpha \ \overline{\gamma\iota\beta} \ ^{79}$$

Translation: "two hundred one and five-twelfths artabas of wheat, equal $201\frac{5}{12}$ art. of wheat." [80]

[79] For the special character given to $\frac{1}{12}$ in cursive writing see Youtie (above, footnote 7) 55.

[80] I add three points of detail.  **Line 1.**  $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha(\tau\eta\gamma\hat{\omega})$: $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau(\eta\gamma\hat{\omega})$ ed., but perhaps only a typographical error.  The abbreviation used here is extremely common; cf. Bell (above, footnote 69) 429.  **Line 8.** $\bar{\zeta}$: $\zeta$ ed.  **Line 17.** $\sigma\nu\nu\mu\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau[\rho]\eta\mu\alpha\langle\iota\rangle$: $\text{-}\eta\mu\alpha(\iota)$ ed.