

Evans, J. A. S. / Welles, C. Bradford

The archives of Leon

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 7-8, 29-70

1953-1954

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez **Muzeum Historii Polski** w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

THE ARCHIVES OF LEON

I.

The six papyri published here are part of a lot purchased by the late Professor Rostovtzeff in the summer of 1935 in Paris from the well-known Cairo dealer and connoisseur of antiquities, Maurice Nahman. They attracted our attention at once because of their early date, the general similarity of their hands, and the fact that all of them bear marks of colored plaster. They must have been together in antiquity, when they were employed for some purpose of cartonnage. They were promptly taken up in the papyrological seminar, and reading and interpretation were advanced by a number of students, notably Howard N. Porter, now my colleague at Yale, and Miss Elizabeth Holzworth, now the wife of Professor J. Frank Gilliam of the University of Iowa. Because of the difficulties of reading, particularly, P. Yale Inv. 1634, the advice of other scholars was sought and generously furnished: Sir Harold Bell, H. C. Youtie, and Mrs. Eleanor Husselman. During my stay in Egypt during the war. I had the privilege of discussing the whole collection with the present Secretary of the French Institute in Cairo, Octave Guéraud. Later the texts were again studied in the seminar with Bernard M. W. Knox, now my colleague. To all of these, I extend my sincere thanks and acknowledgments. Once more publication was postponed because of renewed military service. Now at length, thanks to the able assistance of my pupil J. A. S. Evans, it is possible to lay them before the scholarly world. It is hoped that they may be followed soon by a volume of Papyri Yalenses.

Not all of the difficulties of reading and interpreting these texts have been resolved, but their general nature is clear. Were P. Yale Inv. 1641 to have stood alone, one would have been inclined to regard it as a stray member of the Zenon Archive, dating about 240 B. C. The plaster traces tie it to the rest, however, four of which are letters to or from the toparch Leon, while P. Yale Inv. 1643 goes closely with them because the writer, Apollonius, is almost

certainly the epimelete of P. Yale Inv. 1647. They all date in the period around 230 B. C., and give an interesting glimpse of Philadelphia in the years following the period of the famous Zenon.

The description of the texts has been written by me, the account of the "Wine-Production and Trade in Ptolemaic Egypt" by Mr. Evans. We have, however, collaborated constantly throughout.

C. B. W.

1.

Letter to Hermias concerning Wine and Taxes
(PYale Inv. 1641)

11,2 × 23 cm.

ca. 240 — 220 B.C.

A sheet of rather coarse, brown papyrus, broken away at the top, and spotted with worm holes. A fold line runs from top to bottom down the middle of the sheet, causing occasional damage to the writing, and a more substantial fault, possibly also caused by a fold since it is quite straight, runs diagonally down from the upper left corner to the centre of the bottom. On the verso, the papyrus bears plentiful traces of colored plaster, pinkish brown and yellow, and the moisture from this source has caused the ink to run in places. The text occupies the whole of the recto, being written with the fibres in lines which extend to the very bottom. The last line is not completely used, though it cannot be the end of the letter. The message is continued on the verso in two lines written along the edge of the sheet, with the fibres. The end of the first of these is lost with the end of the papyrus. It is possible that the concluding greeting, ἔρωσο, was written at the missing right end of the second line of the verso, or on a missing strip of verso fibres immediately below it. This last was lost in ancient times, however, since the plaster covers the place where it had been.

The script is an uneven but fluent scrawl, not always easy to read with confidence. The pen was coarse and the ink inclined to run. The spelling ἐπίς (line 1, verso) is phonetic; ἀναφορόν (line 8) is probably a slip of writing. Letters average about 4 mm. in height, and are commonly widely spaced, though they may be crowded at the end of a line (the ὅπως of line 18 occupies less than half the space of the same word in line 17); the interval between lines is about 5 — 6 mm.

The writer cannot be identified, in the loss of the first line or lines. The addressee, Hermias, is called "the farmer of the 2% tax", but we have not identified him with any other known person. The subject of the letter is not very clear. It begins with a quotation from an unnamed person to the effect that he had received from another tax-farmer, "the collector of the 1% tax for the Philadelphia district", a sum of money to be applied to Hermias' own obligations. This might indicate that the speaker was a royal banker, and that the affair was that of a credit or loan between the two tax-farmers. But the speaker added that he had written to Diodorus (?) that he was holding the money for the appropriate payment in the same amount; the antecedent of *τούτῳι* in line 7 should be other than that of *αὐτῶι* in line 5, but we are not informed as to the account which would benefit from the *ἀναφορά*, whether that of Hermias or of the other. Furthermore, since all attempts to read a name in line 9 have been unsuccessful, and the subject of *ὀρίζετο* is, in consequence, to be the same as that of *ἔφη* above, the same speaker continues with some remarks about a vineyard. Either he or another has not issued and will not issue an *ἐντολή* until the author of the letter has come to him. We cannot be certain what purpose the *ἐντολή* was expected to serve. The word is used of all kinds of orders. In PCol. Zen 55, of 250 B.C., wine is released from a village repository on the *ἐντολή* of an oecónome.

Below, the letter concerns itself with the purchase of wine. Hermias was to arrange for the purchase of a small quantity of "old wine of Philadelphia" (or conceivably, perhaps, since the adjective occurs here for the first time, of wine from the *ἀπόμοιρα* of Arsinoe Philadelphia) for a certain Zenon. Probably the verb *συναγοράζειν* means here, in Edg ar's phrase (on PMich. Zen. 42, 3), "purchase from more than one source, but not compulsory purchase", though such purchase by government agents is known from Wilcken, *Chrest.* 410 (227 B.C.), and is forbidden in the royal edict PAmh. 29 (about 250 B.C.). This wine was to be like that sent to the writer (or does the *ἡμῖν* include others? Zenon?) the preceding year. It becomes a little obscure where the wine was to be bought, and who was to buy it. On the verso, at all events, it is Hermias who wants wine and the writer who will buy it, but this seems a different transaction; both price and amount are still to be indicated.

The bearing of all this on our knowledge of the production and marketing of wine in the Ptolemaic period is discussed below.

Recto

- [— — — — — ca. 19 — — — —] P[..]
 [— — — — — ca. 13 — —] ἔφη παραγε-
 [νόμενον] Δ[ιόδ]ωρον τὸν πρὸς τῆι (ἑκατοστῆι)
 [τῶν κ]ατὰ Φιλ[α]δελφείαν τόπων
 5 δοῦναι αὐτῶι εἰς τὴν (πεντηκοστὴν) ἦν σὺ
 ἐξειληφης χαλκοῦ (τάλαντον) α' καὶ
 [γρ]άψαι τούτῳ ἔχειν εἰς τὴν
 κ[α]θήκουσαν ἀναφορὸν τοῦ (ταλάντου),
 καὶ ὀργίλως ἀπὸ τοῦ κτήματος
 10 ὠρίζετο μὲν μήτ' ἐντολήν
 δεδωκέναι τοῖς περὶ τὸν
 Ἄπολλώνιον μήτε δώσειν ἕως
 τοῦ με παραγενέσθαι. σ' οὖν
 καλῶς ποιήσεις ἐκ παντὸς
 15 τρόπου, ἐὰν δύνη παρα-
 γενέσθαι, παραγενηθεῖς,
 ὅπως περὶ τούτων φροντίσω-
 μεν, σοῦ γ(ρ)άφοντος φροντιεῖν ὅπως
 συναγοράσωμεν Ζήνωνι οἴνου
 20 παλαιοῦ Φιλαδελφείου . . . ΟΥ κερ(άμια) θ'
 ὁμοίως οὐ ἀπέστειλας ἡμῖν
 πέρυσι FL .. eL vacat

Verso

διασάφησον δ' ἡμῖν τίνες αἱ τιμαὶ εἰσιν καὶ πόσα ἐτίς,
 καὶ μὴ βράδυνε — —
 ἡμᾶς κινεῖν ENTAY .. ἐπιμελοῦ δέ καὶ σαυτοῦ ἰν' ὑγιαίνης.

(Below, in reverse direction) Ἐρμῖαι.

8. Read ἀναφορὰν. 13. σε, which I had previously read, is less likely, as Guérard pointed out to me. 19. It is equally possible to read οἶνον. 20. Probably οἴγου, in spite of the repetition. 21. Possibly ὁμοιον. Verso, 1. Read αἰτεῖς. 2. It is almost possible to read ἐνταῦθα; ἐν ταῦτῳ is less likely.

--- he said that Diodorus (?), the collector of the 10% tax in the Philadelphia district, had given him one talent of bronze against the 2% tax which you have taken on contract, and that he had written him (Diodorus?) that he was holding it for the pending payment of

the talent, and he kept asserting angrily of the vineyard that he had not given an order to Apollonius and his group, nor would he give one until I came. You will please, therefore, come by all means, if you can come, so that we may consider these matters, for (?) you are writing that you will see to it that we buy up for Zenon nine keramia of old wine of Philadelphia, similarly as you sent us last year..... And make clear to us what the prices are and how much you want, and do not delay.... to stir us up (?). Take care of yourself also that you keep in good health.

To Hermias.

3. The name Δ[ιόδ]ωρον is restored *exempli gratia*, as seeming to fit the space little better than, say, Δ[ι]αίων. There is no reason to suppose an identity with the addressee of PYale Inv. 1643, although the other restoration is equally possible. The nature of the tax is unknown. A tax is mentioned with the identical expression in PCair. Zen. 59373 (239 B.C.): πρὸς . . . τῆι ἑκατοστῆι τῶν κατὰ Φιλαδέλφειαν τόπων, and is presumably the same. It is coupled with the import of wine: the farmer in question was "in charge of the import of wine and of the 1% tax in the Philadelphia district." This suggests that the tax was a toll on imported wine. With the mention of the 2% tax just below, one thinks of the 1% and 2% customs duty of Roman times, but there may be no connection. It may be questioned, also, that a 1% import toll would yield sufficient revenue to require a partial payment of a talent in bronze by the agent or agents here.

6. "In the second half of the reign of Philadelphus... heavy copper coins with heads of Egyptian gods were struck in Egypt, coins which were no longer tokens but regular, standard coins accepted at their metal value." (M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 1941, p. 400; cf. p. 1416, note 201).

8. The ἀναφορά or partial payment was due to be made by the tax-farmer to the banker; if the speaker is a banker in this instance, as seems likely, he stated that he had written to Diodorus (?) that he was holding the talent for credit to that ἀναφορά. Such installments were paid monthly against the beer tax in PGurob 24 b I (third century B.C.), and one of these came to more than two-thirds of a talent. The *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, col. 16, also

provides for monthly payments by the farmer for all taxes farmed, and the same is probably true here.

9. It is tempting to find a proper name here as the subject of ὠρίζετο, though the letter reads somewhat more normally with the same subject for both verbs. Since *omicron* and *omega* are often poorly differentiated in this script, we had thought of reading <Γ>οργίλος. A Gorgilus appears in PCair. Zen. 59661, where he is accused of falsifying amounts of wine removed from storage; he is mentioned again, *ibid.*, 59787, 51, where he is paid 120 drachmae for poppy seed, and he was apparently a planter or cultivator. If our papyrus dated from the period of the Zenon archive, the same man could be named here as an ἀπὸ τοῦ κτήματος, though we should expect the phrase to be preceded by the definite article. The word κτήματος itself makes a certain difficulty. The last four letters can be read, but they occur amidst traces of other writing. If this represents the correction of a mistake by the writer, it is not certain what was his final text.

10. The verb ὠρίζετο is hardly expected here, but has a counterpart in its use in PCair Zen. 59620 and 59621, where Edgard translates it "to declare". The noun ἐντολή is used very generally for orders of all sorts issued by various people. The closest parallel to this instance is PCol. Zen. 55,4, cited above.

12. There is no certainty as to the identity of this Apollonius; he would hardly have been the ἐπιμελητής of PYale Inv. 1647 and later texts of this group. It is interesting that the *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* of W. Peremans and E. Van't Dack (vol. I, 1950) lists as no. 1509 an Apollonius son of Demetrius; tax-farmer of the ἡμισεβ(μα)τα τῆς ἀμπέλου in the Herakleopolite division in the year 244/3 B.C. (SB III 7177; P. Collart, P. Jouguet, *Raccolta Lumbroso*, p. 123), but there is little reason to suppose an identity.

13. The reading σε makes easier sense, but is palaeographically difficult.

19. Συναγοράσομεν could be read also, but such ὅπως clauses take the subjunctive rather than the future indicative; cf. E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (1934), II, 3, pp. 49 f.

22. Interpretation of this line is difficult, nor is it clear why the writer left it half empty and then continued the message on the verso. The L symbol can be for ἡμισυ or for ἔτει. In between the two numerals it would be possible to read the drachma sign(†) and a numeral: "last year you sent us 6½ keremia at (e.g.,) 15½ drachmae", or possibly only 5½ drachmae (each). There is no insurmountable difficulty with the arithmetic, though it is curious that last year Hermias sent wine to his correspondent, but this year seems to ask his correspondent to buy wine. We should perhaps understand ἐπέστειλας¹; "just as you wrote us last year". And in any case, Guéraud, who had the kindness to examine the photograph, feels that it is possible to read ƆL ἦ εL: "last year, i.e. the sixth or fifth year". We lack a parallel for this vagueness. The hand of the papyrus belongs as well with the later texts from the Zenon archives, about 240 B. C., as it does with the remaining papyri published here, or with such texts later in the century as *Papyri Gr. Berolinenses*, Pl. 5, and Schubart, *Gr. Palaeographie*, p. 32, fig. 9. It could be dated in the seventh year of Euergetes or Philopator, though either dating would remove it further from the other papyri in this group than we should wish. We prefer to leave the question open.

2.

Letter of Apollonius to Leon, enclosing
a letter from Athenodorus the dioecetes,
concerning the Sowing Schedule

(P. Yale Inv. 1647)

27,5 × 18 cm.

Recd. 9 Mesore, yr. 15

23 September 232 B. C.

A sheet of coarse papyrus, complete except for a strip at the right. It was cut from a τόμος συγκολλήσιμος, and a κόλλημα runs across it, a little below the middle. The writing runs across the fibres. The verso bears traces of grey and yellow plaster. Originally the letter was folded over four times from the bottom to the top, and then doubled over to make a packet 17 × 4 cm, on which the address was written in a large, flourishing hand, and after delivery, the

¹ See further below on PYale Inv. 1634, line 12. A similar instance occurs in PCol. Zen. 51, 27, and the error may be common.

docket also. Here the writing was with the fibres. If this doubling was in the center of the original sheet, as seems likely, the missing portion at the right must have been about 7 cm. wide.

The writing is a good administrative hand of the period, with the lines of writing occupying about 5 mm., and the interval between lines the same or less. The margins are, top 1,3 cm., bottom 2,8 cm., left 2,2 cm. Occasionally the writing becomes very cursive, and letter forms are distorted in the interest of ease and speed of writing. The docket is written in a different, though similar hand, letters about 3 mm. high.

On the basis of other evidence for the *διαγραφὴ τοῦ σπόρου*, the writer should be the *ἐπιμελητής* of the nome, or of the Heraclid division. He writes to Leon, toparch of the *κατὰ Φιλαδέλφειαν τόποι*, instructing him to prepare the Schedule for his territory and to hold it until Apollonius should come for it. He appends a copy of the letter sent to him by the dioecetes, instructing him in the same sense. Leucippus, *ἀρχιφυλακίτης* of the nome or division, was charged with the return of the finished Schedule to Alexandria.

The letter has a number of points of interest, some of which are discussed separately below. It has been long known that the production of Egypt in the form of crops raised annually from seed was prescribed in a *διαγραφὴ τοῦ σπόρου*², but little has been known

² The testimonia to the *διαγραφὴ τοῦ σπόρου* are PTeb 703, PLille 26, and UPZ 110. In the first, a dioecetes instructs an oecome: "let your most vital concern be that the nome be sowed with the crops specified in the Sowing Schedule". In the second, Apollonius writes to his father, "I prepare the remaining land, unless you follow everything as it is in the Sowing Schedule for the 15th year, to lease it to the farmers". The third, which is too diffuse to quote, is further evidence of the central importance of this document in the agricultural economy of Egypt. PTeb. 61 b. is a detailed report of land usage submitted to the dioecetes. In it are memoranda of his own, lines 35/36: "if the farmers do not pay the revenues, let the land be released through Eubius the epimelete and the basilikogrammateus", and lines 40—43: "(remember) to ask the basilikogrammateus for the list by village and by individual of the lessees and the terms of lease and who are the lessors and let them insert the crop". Thus there has been no doubt that the Ptolemies closely controlled the sowing of the country after the inundation, and the matter has been much discussed, most fully by C. Pr é a u x, *L'Economie Royale des Lagides* (1939), especially pp. 117—119, and M. R o s t o v t z e f f, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (1941), pp. 279, 286, 302 f., 1382. Both of these authors assume that the list was made up in Alexandria and dictated to the nome officials. Pr é a u x imagines the requirements being distributed to the villages by the administration of the nome capitals. It is now clear

about its composition. It now appears that it was drawn up locally at the height of the inundation. That is to say, it took account of the water available for the year. It was prepared at least as far down as the toparchy, and probably in the village. As compiled for the nome or division, it consisted of three parts, a list of crops by cultivator, by village, and by summary for the nome or division. Over-all direction lay in the hands of the ἐπιμελητής, but he delegated his authority to the toparchs, and they, perhaps, to the komogrammateis or komarchs. This procedure was designed, obviously, to give the greatest possible realism to the Schedule. The local authorities who must deliver the crop at the end of the growing season were also the ones who planned the crop at the beginning. Presumably the central financial bureau in Alexandria, under the dioecetes, consolidated the entire program, and returned to each nome an approved διαγραφή which may not have corresponded in every respect to the Schedule which had been submitted earlier. The dioecetes certainly reserved the right to accept, reject, or modify the proposals of his subordinates. Nevertheless it is evident that the procedure was substantially decentralized, and left a large measure of discretion in the hands of local officials. If honestly administered, this διαγραφή should have operated to prevent undue hardship to the cultivators, who were unlikely to be subjected to impossible or ruinous requirements. The central government, on the other hand, was protected by the practice of previous years from collusion between officials and peasants to defraud the government. The records at Alexandria would give the production record of any district over many years, and when this was compared with the height of the inundation, it was easy to form an accurate estimate of the capabilities of the district in the coming year.

Since the sowing would start as the inundation receded, it was obviously vital that the διαγραφή be prepared, sent to Alexandria, and returned in the shortest possible time. It would be interesting to know the date of the letter of the dioecetes. The month is Epiph, but the day is missing. Apollonius' letter was written in Mesore,

that the Schedule originated in the field, and not vice versa. Unfortunately there is nothing to show here whether the Schedule applied to all the land of Egypt, including the military holdings, or only to the royal and sacred land. In view of the way in which it originated, however, I am inclined to suspect that it included all the land of Egypt, of whatever category, excluding perhaps orchards and vineyards and private gardens.

and received on the 9th of that month. The due date was in Mesore also, though that too is unfortunately lost with the end of line 11; this is apparently the date when the Schedule was due in Alexandria. Apollonius had only three weeks at most to get the Schedules from the toparchs, consolidate them, and get them to the capital, while it had taken two weeks or more for the dioecetes' message to get down to the "working level". This accounts for the prominence of the chief of police in the picture. Leucippus had received himself a personal letter from the dioecetes to "expedite" the report. He was to receive it from the epimeletes and forward it post haste to Alexandria. Doubtless he, as well as Leon and probably also Apollonius, was threatened with being "sent down" if there was any tardiness. This accounts also for the fact that Leucippus was to send along with the Schedule persons "to bring it back" (τοὺς ἀποκαταστήσοντας). That is to say, it was his duty to forward it down river with his messengers and guards — the report of the division would have been very bulky — and to have them wait in Alexandria until it was approved, and then escort it back.

It is to be hoped that Leon and his fellows had anticipated the dioecetes' wish and that the local schedules were ready even before they were called for. Otherwise it is hard to see how they can have accomplished their mission in time.

A special interest attaches to the name of Athenodorus, the dioecetes. He is hitherto unattested, and raises a question about another dioecetes of uncertain date and partly uncertain name, the Ζηνοδ[ώρου] of P Teb. 703. This papyrus is in the library of the University of California, where Professor Kendrick Pritchett was kind enough to examine it for me. He has sent me the tracing of the letters in question which I reproduce here (Ζηνοδ), and the following comment: "What I see on the papyrus is as follows: the first letter could be an *alpha* or a *zeta* in this script, for only the lower left corner of a triangular letter is preserved. The preserved portion of the second letter could be the base of a *theta*; but the difficulty with the reading ἸΑθηνο- is that there is really only space for one normal letter between the first letter and the perfectly preserved *nu*. The reading is made particularly difficult because the scotch tape which holds the papyrus to its isinglass case has been fastened at just this place". So it cannot be asserted that the dioecetes of P Teb. 703 was Athenodorus, and that that text belongs in the period about 230 B.C. But the possibility exists, and the probability of there having been

two holders of the office of dioecetes within thirty years whose names ended each in -ηνόδ[ωρος is certainly very slight. I suspect that the editors of P Teb. 703 would have read that name as Α[θ]η-νοδ[ώρου, had they known of that person's existence.

Recto

- Ἀπολλώνιος Λέοντι χαίρειν· τῆς παρ' Ἀθηνοδώρου τοῦ διοικη[τοῦ-]
 ὑπόκειται σοι τ' ἀντίγραφον. ἐπιτελέσας οὖν τὴν διαγραφ[ήν τοῦ]
 σπόρου μετὰ τῶν εἰθισμένων ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐπε[σταλμένοις]
 ἔχ' ἐν ἔτο[ί]μωι, ἵνα πρὸ τοῦ ὀρισμένου καιροῦ καὶ αὐτ[ο]ὶ ἡμεῖς]
 5 ἐπιδῶμεν Λευκίππωι τῶι ἀρχιφυλακίτηι, γινώσκων ὅ[τι ἐάν]
 ὑστέρημα γένηται καταποσταλήσει πρὸς τὸν διοικητ[ήν.]
 ἔρρ(ω)σ(ο). (ἔτους) ιε' Μ[εσορῆ .]
 Ἀθηνόδωρος Ἀπολλωνίωι χαίρειν· τὴν διαγραφὴν τῆς ἐ[νταῦθα ?]
 γῆς τοῦ εἰς τὸ ιε' (ἔτος) σπόρου συντελέσας μετὰ τοῦ [βασιλικοῦ]
 10 γραμματέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μεθ' ὧν καθήκει πέμψον τ[αύτην]
 μάλιστα μὲν συντομώτερον, τὸ δὲ μακρότατον ἔ[ως τῆς ..]
 τοῦ Μεσορῆ, κατ' ἄνδρα καὶ κατὰ κώμην καὶ ἐπὶ κεφα[λαίου]
 Λευκίππωι τῶι ἀρχιφυλακίτηι. γεγράφαμεν γὰρ αὐτ[ῶι ὅπως]
 ἔως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης ἀποδῶις τὰ γράμματα [ταῦτα κατ-]
 15 ἀποστεῖλαι εἰς τὴν πόλιν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, συμπέμψαντ[α καὶ τοὺς]
 ἀποκαταστήσοντας.

(ἔτους) ιε' Ἐπειφ [..]

Verso

(Second Hand)

(Ἐτους) ιε' Μεσορῆ θ'. Ἀπολλώνιος ἀντίγρ(αφον)
 τῆς παρ' Ἀθηνοδώρου
 τοῦ δι(οικητοῦ) ὑπὲρ τῆς
 διαγρ(αφῆς) τοῦ σπ(όρου) τῆς εἰς τὸ ιε' (ἔτος).
 Λέοντι. (In large letters)

The lacuna at the end of lines 1 and 2 should be about 9 letters, otherwise about 10. The restorations at the end of lines 3, and 9 alone seem of the proper length. Otherwise the restorations give a coherent sense to the text, and it seems pedantic to search for restorations of more nearly the expected length, especially since we have no assurance that the right margin was perfectly even.

1. There is no room for the expected ἐπιστολῆς, which is actually omitted on the verso in the same phrase. We may think of ἐντολῆς or something else.

7. The date must be between Mesore 1 and 9. 8. The last preserved letter is certainly E rather than Σ, so that such restorations as σ[ιτικῆς and σ[πορίμου

are ruled out. Perhaps ἐπί σου, or ἐν τῆι μερίδι. 9. τῆς could be read in stead of τοῦ, on the analogy of the phrase on the verso. 13. αὐτ[ῶι] was read by Guéraud. In place of ὅπως, perhaps better ἐάν, and yet one hesitates to make the dioecetes imply doubt that the schedule will be met. 14. κατ- is restored on the basis of the verb in line 6, and to give the line additional length; it violates the usual syllable division, and the practice of the scribe here of not dividing words between lines at all, and is rather suspect. Verso. The abbreviation of δι(οικητοῦ) is delta over an iota, of σπ(όρου) sigma surmounted by pi. 4. τῆς is written over something which has not been identified, possibly τοῦ.

Apollonius to Leon, greeting. The copy of the letter from Athenodorus the dioecetes is appended. Do you therefore complete the sowing schedule with the usual people in accordance with his instructions and hold it ready, so that we ourselves also may give it to Leucippus the archiphylacites before the appointed time, in the realization that if there is a delay, you will be sent down to the dioecetes.

Farewell. Year 15, Mesore?

Athenodorus to Apollonius, greeting. You will complete the schedule of the land in your district (?) for the sowing of the year 16 with the basiliko-grammateus and such other persons as is proper, and send this preferably sooner, but at the latest by the .. of Mesore, drawn up by cultivator, by village, and in summary, to Leucippus the archiphylacites. We have written him that by that date you will give him these documents to send down to the city to us, sending with them also persons to take them back.

Year 15, Epeiph?

(Verso) To Leon.

Year 15, Mesore 9. Apollonius; copy of the letter from Athenodorus the dioecetes concerning the sowing schedule for the 16th year.

1. For the possible identification of Athenodorus, see introduction, above. About Apollonius and Leon, little can be said with certainty. Apollonius was presumably an ἐπιμελητής, and can be the same as *Prosop. Ptol.* I, 933, possibly 932 also, although the name is too common to make for anything like certainty. Leon is hardly *Prosop. Ptol.* I, 1110, the only toparch of this name listed.

4. The phrase ἔχ' ἐν ἐτοιμίωι occurs in a papyrus of Roman date, and ἐν ἐτοιμίωι, "in readiness", is not uncommon in Roman times (Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, I, 606). Other similar adverbial phrases (ἐν κοινῶι, etc.) occur in the Ptolemaic papyri (Mayer, *Grammatik*,

II, 2, 398). αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς is a little unsatisfactory because of the καί; is the writer thinking that other ἐπιμεληταί will be giving reports to Leucippus?

6. The noun ὑστέρημα, "deficiency", occurs here for the first time in the papyri, according to Preisigke and Liddell & Scott. It is used in the LXX and the NT, and in the Hermetic writings.

13—16. This sentence combines two ideas: "We have written Leucippus to send down the documents", and "We have written L. that you would give him the documents".

3.

Acknowledgment by Leon of the Release of
Wine (?) to Military Leitourgoi for the
Macedonians in Philadelphia

(P. Yale Inv. 1622)

11 × 16 cm.

29 Mesore, yr. 16

13 October, 231 B.C.

A sheet of papyrus of rather good quality, incomplete below, and disfigured by a number of holes and by a fault vertically down the middle, where there had been a major fold of the papyrus. Perhaps it was originally folded as a letter, vertically from left to right three times. No trace of a medial fold in the transverse direction is preserved, which may mean that more than half of the original sheet is lost. The verso bears faint traces of yellow plaster, and what looks like the erasure of an address or docket.

The writing is very negligent, especially at the ends of lines and even more in the corrections. Frequently *alpha* becomes a mere hook, *nu* a simple vertical stroke, *theta* lacks its cross stroke, *rho* its curve, *tau* its right half. The writing of the first draft averaged about 5 mm. high, with an interlinear interval of 1 cm. Interlinear corrections were added freely after line 5, and offending portions of the text crossed out. Presumably a clean draft was prepared later, and this papyrus retained by Leon for record in his files. This may explain the erasure of the writing on the verso.

In a statement cast as an objective homology and headed by a date, the toparch Leon acknowledges to four persons called λειτουργοί the release of something—lost with the bottom of the sheet—

for the wine ἀγορά of the Macedonians (corrected from "soldiers") in Philadelphia. Presumably this means that the persons named, who may themselves also have been soldiers, having Greek names and patronymics, were responsible for the supply of wine to the soldiers of a military unit, either by way of sale or through issue against a credit account maintained in drachmae (PPetr. II 15, 2, as restored by Wilcken, *Arch. f. Papyr.* V, p. 224), and that what was released was wine from the government warehouse. The transaction is discussed further below.

Ἔτους ιϛ' Μεσορῆ κθ'.
 Ὅμολ[ο]γεῖ Λέων τ[οπά]ρχης
 παραδεδοσθαι δι' αὐτοῦ
 καὶ Νεχθοσίριος τοῦ τοπογρ(αμματέως)
 5 Σαραπίωνι [καὶ] Εὐβούλου
 Νικίαι Νικίου Σωστράτῳ Σωστράτῳ
 καὶ Μενάνδρῳ [καὶ τοῖς]
 Φιλίππου λειτουργοῖς
 [μεθ' αὐτῶν λειτουργοῖς]
 10 εἰς τὴν καθήκουσαν
 οἰνικὴν ἀγορὰν τοῦ ιϛ' (ἔτους)
 [Μ]ακεδόσιν
 [τοῖς ἐν Φιλαδ]ελφε[ῖαι] [σ]τρατιώταις]

Lines 6, 8, and 12 are written between the lines of the original text, which in lines 5—9 had run: Σαραπίωνι καὶ Εὐβούλῳ καὶ Μενάνδρῳ καὶ τοῖς μεθ' αὐτῶν λειτουργοῖς. Εὐβούλου was corrected merely by writing over the last two letters. The translation is that of the final text.

Year 16, Mesore 29. Leon the toparch acknowledges that there has been handed over through him and Nechthosiris the topogrammateus to Sarapion son of Euboulus, Nicias son of Nicias, Sostratus son of Sostratus, and Menander son of Philip, leitourgoi, for the appropriate agora of wine of the 16th year for the Macedonians in Philadelphia....

8. The best parallel for these λειτουργοί is furnished by PHib. 96 (259/9 B. C.), for which see below.

11. Since the papyrus dates at the very end of the 16th year, it seems more likely that this is the agora due the soldiers from the wine of that year, which would have been pressed in Pachous (see below) three months before, than that this is the installment on the

agora due the soldiers in the year 16. This would be the new sweet wine, in contrast with the "old" wine of P. Yale Inv. 1641, which may have been bought up cheaply at the end of the season because the government wished to liquidate its holdings in the anticipation of a new vintage.

12/13. Macedonians in Philadelphia in the third century are well known from the archives of Zenon, but they appear as individuals and as cleruchs, not as forming a group; the known instances are listed by M. L a u n e y, *Recherches sur les Armées Hellénistiques*, II (1950), pp. 1171 — 1188. Cf. *ibid.*, I (1949), pp. 309 — 312 and 332, and in general, *ibid.*, Chap. V: Vol. I, pp. 287 — 365. Typically, no doubt, a cleruch was paid by the produce of his cleruchy, and many of them possessed vineyards of their own and had no need of government wine. On the other hand, when they were on active service away from home they would receive issues of rations, as was done in the case of an agora of meat to cavalry on their way to a festival in Alexandria (PRyl. 562; 251 B. C.). These Macedonians may, then, be regarded as mobilized cleruchs or, possibly, as mercenaries on an active status. Cf. in general M. R o s t o v t z e f f, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (1941), pp. 284 — 287, 1339.

4.

Letter of Nechthosiris to Leon, requesting Supplies, and reporting on the Fortunes of himself and others in the Courts of the Dioecetes and the King.

(P. Yale Inv. 1634 & 1585)

14 × 41.5 cm.

25 Hathyr, yr. 18 (?)

12 January, 229 B. C. (?)

A sheet of coarse papyrus, with three transverse κολλήματα 17 cm. apart to show the nature of the roll from which it was cut. The writing is on the recto, but five lines of writing occur on the verso, at the top of the letter, which lost their left ends when the letter was written. Their interpretation is not clear, but they may have constituted a brief memorandum of some sort. Below these is the address running all the way across the sheet. As prepared for

transmittal as a letter, the papyrus must have been folded from bottom to top, but not folded over transversely; it would have made a rather thick packet, in any case, and not a very long one. Faults due to this folding occur, with the usual smaller holes; one of these faults caused the sheet to be broken in two. It was my colleague H. N. Porter, then a student in the seminar, who discovered that the two parts constituted one text. The writing on the recto goes to the very bottom of the sheet, but two small spaces are left without writing toward the end, and the lines are wider spaced. It looks almost as if the writer was trying to make the writing fit the sheet. Some traces of yellow plaster occur on the recto, at the top.

The writing averages about 5 mm. in height, with an interlinear interval of about the same amount, except toward the bottom, where it increases to 1 or 1,5 cm. The hand is very uneven, varying from the painfully exact to the very cursive and even careless. Combined with a very personal type of expression proper in a personal letter and some unexpected idioms and spellings, this has made the letter difficult to read, while line 9 has defied the talents of a number of the most skilled readers of third-century hands. Writing is on the recto, across the fibres.

The writer was fluent rather than schooled. He spells as he writes, for the most part, carefully, but twice indulges in assimilation before *μοι* (lines 6 and 21), confuses *iota* and *epsilon iota* both ways (*ἐπί* for *ἐπεί*, lines 11 and 17; *Λέονται*, line 1, but *Λέοντι* on the verso), is usually accurate with the long diphthongs, but for *eta iota* writes once *eta* (line 39), once *epsilon iota* (line 21), once *iota* (line 37). He has an even greater fondness for *ζως* than the writers of PYale Inv. 1641 and 1647, and is occasionally paratactical (lines 24, 35). He uses the epistolary perfect correctly, and has unusual or unique epistolary formulae of greeting and farewell. Occasionally he makes mistakes (lines 17, 37).

Nechthosiris, the topogrammateus, writes from Alexandria to his colleague Leon, the toparch, in Philadelphia. He enquires about an Apollonius who is specified once, perhaps twice, by an unexplained abbreviation (lines 3 and 32), and about an Epiodorus³.

³ An Epiodorus is known as a βασιλικὸς πράκτωρ from PSI 389, 5; cf. PCair. Zen. 59437. F. Zucker, *Studien zur Namenkunde vorhellenistischer und hellenistischer Zeit*, SB Deut. Ak. Berlin, Kl. f. Sprache, Lit., und Kunst, 1951, 1 (1952), pp. 12 f., regards it as theophoric, the "Merciful One" being Asclepius.

He has slaves with him, who are in need of food as he is himself of warm clothing to counteract the chill of the Alexandrine winter. Dionysius, ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν, has been negligent in sending these things, but Leon should see that they were brought when "they" came down on the 15th of Choiach, a month later. These "they" are unexplained; other, or the same, unspecified "they" occur below. Protolaus has brought word about Leon, so there was some traffic up and down the river.

Nechthosiris' own affairs were in good shape, but he was "detained" by the dioecetes. Others, unnamed, had been convicted by the circuit court of the chrematistae. That was why he was detained, as he explains, "lest being asked (or "asked for") he should reply(?) to the dioecetes that they could not be arrested, for the king himself would sit and judge the case." The outcome depends on the gods, but he adds that some connection of Leon's should come down, "for he will be acquitted as soon as we clear him in the suit against them." Does this mean that certain persons had charged this person with misconduct, had been themselves tried and convicted before the chrematistae, were threatened with arrest by the dioecetes, but were in stead to be tried by the king in person?

There is evidently much that we cannot understand. It is not difficult to imagine a situation where the officials of the toparchy and their friends were embroiled in a dispute with other persons, tax-farmers, for example. The genius of the Ptolemaic administration was to set group against group in rivalry, that the revenues might not slacken, for they depended for their greatest yield on the mutual suspicions and surveillance of the producers, the tax-farmers, and the officials. There must have been disputes. Complaints are common, and appeals for redress. Certainly there must have been many times when the dioecetes at Alexandria, with all his readiness to have people "sent down," must have been at his wits' end to see his way through people's quarrels, and to get them punished or reconciled and back at work. If we are really to imagine in the present case that the dioecetes and the king were working at cross purposes, that must be the explanation. It is hard to think of the dioecetes holding a witness who might testify, if asked, that the dioecetes was expecting to arrest persons whom the king wanted for trial. The king "reserved only a limited group of cases for his own personal judication... These comprised a series of so-called προσοδικὰ and βασιλικὰ ἐγκλήματα and delicts of lèse

majesté". The dioecetes was concerned with all connected with taxation. The chrematistae also handled προσοδικαὶ κρίσεις⁴. Thus it is not really surprising that a group of tax-farmers (for example) should be tried by the chrematistae, arrested by the dioecetes, and tried again by the king. Egypt had no law of double jeopardy. For that matter, if Nechthosiris and Leon's brother were merely witnesses, and not involved themselves in some failure to meet the government's production goals, it would not be strange that they should be held, at their own inconvenience if not risk. That is the interest of the present text. It gives a glimpse, although an obscure one, into the imbroglia of the Ptolemaic administrative machine.

Νεχθοσίρις Λέοντι τῷ

ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν ἔρρωσο καὶ

Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Δ' καὶ Ἡπίδωρος

καὶ οἱ παρὰ σοῦ πάντες. ἔρρωμαι δὲ καὶ

5 αὐτός. ἐμοῦ σοι γεγραφότος πλέονας
ἐπιστολὰς καὶ οὐθέμ μοι παρὰ σοῦ τί μοι
προσπεφώνηται· τὸ πλεόν ἀγωνιῶν
ἔνεκα τοῦ μηδ' ἕως τοῦ νῦν ἀκηχοέναι
τὰ κατὰ σε πρὸς τὸν ΘΕΩΣΗΝΕΧΡΟΙΜΑΙΟΛΛΗΙ

10 Πρωτολάου δὲ ἀπαγγείλαντος ἡμῖν τὰ
κατὰ σε, λίαν ἐχάρην.] ἐπὶ οὖν ἀπέσ-
ταλκα Διονυσίῳ τ[ῷ πα]ρ' ἡμῶν ἀποσ-
τῆλαι μοι ἱματίδιον καὶ χιτῶνα ἀπὸ Θωῶ[θ],
οὔτε ἀπέσταλκεν ἀλλὰ οὐδὲ τοῖς παι-

15 δαρίοις ἀπέσταλκεν σιτ[ά]ρ[ιον] ἕως ἡδῆ
εἰς τὴν διατροφὴν. διὸ ἀξιῶ σαυτὸν
παρενοχλήσαν, ἐπὶ παραγίνονται εἰς
τὴν πόλιν ἕως ἐ' τοῦ Χοῖαχ, καὶ σαυτὸν
ἐπιδοῦς ἕως τοῦ μοι ἀποσταλῆναι καὶ

20 τοῖς παιδίοις σιτάριον εἶναι. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ
δῶι, φράψομ μοι οἷ' ἂν σοι ἀπαντήσῃ
μηθὲν ὑποστειλάμενος. περὶ δὲ
τῶν κατ' ἐμέ, μὴ ἀγωνία πάντα λίαν
κατὰ λόγον γέγονεν. κατεγνωσμένοι

⁴ R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, I (1944), pp. 365-372.

25 εἰσὶν ὑπὸ τῶν χρηματιστῶν, καὶ
 τ[ού]των χάριν παρακατεσχέ-
 [μη]ν ὑπὸ τοῦ διοικητοῦ μῆ-
 ποτε ἀξιωθεις .[.].[.]..NIMHN τῶι
 διοικητῆι μὴ δύνασθαι ἀχθῆναι.

30 ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς αὐτὸς καθήμενος
 διακούει. τὸ δὲ πλεόν πάντων ἐπὶ
 τῶν θεῶν ἔστιν. περὶ δὲ τοῦ σοῦ Δ
 [κρ]ίνω αὐτὸν παραγενέσθαι εἰς
 [τῆν] πόλ[ι]ν [ἐπ]ὶ τῶν παρόντων.

vacat

35 [ἀ]πολυθῆσεται γὰρ ἅμα αὐτὸν
 καθαρὸν ποιοῦμεν ἐν τῆι πρὸς
 [τ]ούτους κρίσιν. εὐχαριστήσις
 οὖν μοι ἐπιμελούμενος τοῦ σώμα-
 τ[ό]ς [σ]οῦ [ἔ]να ὑγιαίνης.

40 ἔ[ρρ(ωσο)] (ἔτους) [ι]η' Ἀθυρ κε'

Verso (with the fibres)

τοπάρχηι

Λέοντι

(across the fibres)

ἸΑπολλωνίου ΔΕΗΣ

]HN καὶ τὸ (τάλαντον) (χίλιαι)

]. ΕΩΣ παραγενέσθ[αι]

]ΕΤΙ τοὺς παρά μου

5]ΑΝΤΩΝ τὰ ἀπόλυτα

9. It would be possible to read θεὸν or θεοῖσιν. It is also possible to read συνέχρησα πολλῶι or πολλοῖς, but since none of these readings yields sense, I have indicated the best reading of each letter, without regard to the formation of words. 17. Read παρενοχλήσαι. 20. εἶναι read by Youtie. 21. ἔι', read by Guéraud. Read ἀπαντήσηι. 23/24. πάντα μοι κατὰ λόγον γέγονεν, read by Guéraud and Mrs. Husselman; λίαν was suggested by Youtie. 27. μῆ- is indicated by the sense; the *mu* looks more like *lamda*, and there would be room for an additional letter in the lacuna. 28. Mrs. Husselman has suggested [ἀ]π[οκρ]ιν[α]ίμην; there is room for a letter between *nu* and *iota* but no trace of one exists, though the papyrus is well preserved at that point. It would be difficult, also, to read the two letters before *nu* as *rho* and *iota*. 30 — 39. The writer apparently spaced his words to avoid bad places on the papyrus. This desire may account for the wide space between lines 34 and 35.

37. Read κρῖσει, εὐχαριστησῆς. *Verso*. 2. The sign for talent is the same as in P. Yale Inv. 1641. I assume that the "1.000" refers to drachmae. 5. The word ἀπλότα does not occur in the papyri, according to Kiessling, *Wörterbuch*. IV, 1. The first letters suggest OMOA—, but it is difficult to read —OΓA at the end.

Nechthosiris to Leon, his brother, greeting. May you be well, and Apollonius the? and Epiodorus and all those who are with you. I am well myself also. Although I wrote you many letters, still no word has come to me from you; worrying the more because I had not heard until now how you were, by the god? — — —, but when Protolaus brought news of you, I was overjoyed. Since, therefore, I have sent to Dionysius, who is our agent, to send me a cloak and tunic ever since Thoth, neither has he sent them, but not even has he sent until now grain for the slaves for their sustenance. Therefore I ask you to go to some trouble, since they will come to the city by the 15th of Choiach, and apply yourself until these things are sent to me and the slaves have food. If he will not give you them, write to me what he answers you without concealing anything.

About me, do not worry: all of my affairs are very much in order. They have been convicted by the chrematistae, and for this reason I am detained by the dioecetes, lest being asked — — — — to the dioecetes that they may not be arrested; for the king himself will sit and hear the case. The further fortunes of all this are in the hands of the gods. About your?, I think that he should come to the city under the present circumstances. For he will be released as soon as we clear him in the suit against them.

You will favor me, accordingly, if you take care of your body that you be in good health.

Farewell. Year 18, Hathyr 25.

(Verso)

To the toparch Leon.

2. The use of ἔρωσο with a series of names in a health wish at the beginning of a letter is otherwise unknown to us. The usual formula is some variant on the expression: πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν, or εἰ ἔρωσαι εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· ὑγιαίνομεν δὲ καὶ αὐτοί; cf. F. X. E x l e r, *A Study in Greek Epistolography* (Diss. Catholic Univ., 1923), pp. 103 — 113.

3. Here and in line 32, occur abbreviations which are "mirror" forms of the same sign. The Δ̄ in the latter instance can be resolved as ἀδ(ελοφου), but this Δ̄ is puzzling. There is also a question whether

the writer, who is capricious enough in general, would have abbreviated ἀδελφός twice while he wrote it out once, in line 2. There are probably two persons named Apollonius in this collection, the ἐπιμελητής and the Apollonius of PYale Inv. 1641 who seemed to be interested in wine. Either one or both of these could be identical with this Apollonius, but the name is common. The same is true of the Apollonius whose name occurs in the memorandum on the verso.

6. The explanation of the last two words may be, that the indefinite τι was put in to reinforce the οὐθέν ("nothing at all"), and that μοι was then repeated in error.

9. The nearest approach to sense for this line was suggested by Mrs. H u s s e l m a n: "By the god, I consulted much" (or "many people"). The odd thing is that Nechthosiris, generally so painfully curate in his spelling, commonly avoiding ligatures and forming each letter in an ample space by itself, should here have written badly, just when his idiom became unusual. In general, he seems to have known Greek very well, although he uses it in an individual way.

10 — 12. There is no clue to the identity of Protolaus and Dionysius. The latter was in Philadelphia; the former had just come to Alexandria from the Fayum.

12. Here, as in PYale Inv. 1641, line 21, ἀποστέλλειν seems to be used for ἐπιστέλλειν. M a y s e r gives no basis to assume a phonetic confusion at this time. It is more likely that the writer in each case was confused by the similarity of the two verbs and used the wrong one.

13. For ἀπὸ Θῶθ, "from Thoth," cf. M a y s e r, *Grammatik*, II, 2, pp. 379 f. He had written for the supplies "in Thoth" and had received nothing "since Thoth".

14/15. παιδαρίοις is a certain reading here; below the writer uses παιδίοις. There is the usual uncertainty, to which W. L. W e s t e r m a n n has often pointed (cf. *RE*, *Suppl.* VI, 902), as to whether these persons were free servants or slaves, the latter being rather uncommon in Egypt.

15. ἕως ἤδη; we have found no other example of this phrase, which must be rare. Above, line 8, the writer used ἕως τοῦ νῦν. The

ζηδη is not absolutely certain, but with the initial *eta*, it is hard to see what else would fit.

16/18. The writer shows an individual fondness for using *σαντόν* for *σε*.

21. The subject of the verb *δῶι* is presumably Dionysius.

24. It is likely that the subject of the verbs *κατεγνωσμένοι εἰσίν* and *ἀχθῆναι* (line 29) is the same as the *τούτους* of line 37.

32. For the abbreviation at the end of the line, see on line 3.

35. *ἄμα* is used as a conjunction, in effect. Actually, the sense is rather paratactical: "For he will be freed; at the same time we make him clear". We have seen no parallel to this usage.

37—39. The closing formula is a blend of PEleph. 13 and PLond. 42, as quoted in Exler, *Greek Epistolography*, p. 113.

5.

Letter to Leon on Administrative Matters
(P. Yale Inv. 1635)

10 × 12 cm.

Undated

A sheet of good papyrus, with traces of yellow plaster on the recto. It is marred by several holes, a strip of fibres is missing, and the left half of the original letter is missing, with lines 5—8 preserved almost 4 cm. further than the rest. No fold marks are visible, and lacking the certain restoration of any line, it is impossible to estimate the amount which is lost on the left; if line 1 contained only one name before that of Leon, the loss should not be very great. There is a trace of ink on the verso, but nothing which can be read as letters.

The writing is small (ca. 3 mm.), careful, and regular, but shows the tendency usual in this group of papyri to become small, crowded, and cursive at the ends of lines. It is on the recto, and runs with the fibres. The interlinear interval is about 5 mm. The right margin is very irregular. Above is a margin of about 1 cm., below of 2,5 cm.

Beyond mention of the furnishing of donkeys, and of moving of grain "down", presumably toward Alexandria, the fragment gives

6.

Letter from Apollonius to Dicaeus,
requesting the Key to a Storehouse
(P. Yale Inv. 1643)

8,2 × 17,3 cm.

Undated

A sheet of rather poor quality papyrus, marred by some holes, and three faults resulting from the original folding of the letter up from the bottom. There was no transverse fold. A strip of the recto fibres is missing at the bottom, and most of the verso fibres are missing also. A strip in the center contains bits of colored plaster, grey and yellow and blue, and part of the address.

The writing is coarse but legible, with few ligatures. Letters average 4 mm., the interlinear interval the same. The right margin is uneven, the others: left, 1 cm., top, 2 cm., bottom, 4 cm.

Apollonius, who may well be the ἐπιμελητής, rather peremptorily scolds Dicaeus for not having sent him the key of a storehouse, possibly used for storing wine, and orders him to do so at once.

Recto

Ἀπολλώνιος Δικαίωι χαίρειν· ἀγνώμων γέγο- νας μὴ οὐκ ἀποστεί- 5 λας Σαραπίωνα τὸν παρὰ σοῦ κο- μίζοντα τὴν κλεῖ-	10	δα τοῦ Πετσαρμώ- τιος ταμείου, κα- θότι ἐτάξω. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐξαπόστειλον αὐτὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς. ἔρρωσο.
--	----	--

Verso

Δικαί[ωι

Apollonius to Dicaeus, greeting. You have been negligent in not sending Sarapion, your agent, with the key of the storehouse of Petarmotis, as you promised. Nevertheless even now send him to us. Farewell.

II

WINE-PRODUCTION AND TRADE IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT

The production and trade in wine are mentioned in three of our collection of papyri published here. In PYale Inv. 1622, Leon the toparch acknowledges that he has handed over wine¹ (?) to a number of λειτουργοί for the appropriate οἰνική ἀγορά of the sixteenth year for the Macedonians in Philadelphia. In PYale Inv. 1641, Diodorus refuses to give an ἐντολή to Apollonius and his group, and the writer and Hermias consider how to buy up (συναγοράζειν) old "Philadelphian" wine for Zenon. PYale Inv. 1643 contains an urgent request from Apollonius for the key to a ταμιεῖον. While the ταμιεῖον need not have contained wine, the term was regularly used for a storehouse for wine, and if the Apollonius of PYale Inv. 1643 can be identified with that of PYale Inv. 1641, the likelihood that it is a wine storehouse becomes stronger.

A concise account of wine-production and trade is found in Pr é a u x, *Économie Royale*², pp. 165—187, where most of the important evidence we have from Ptolemaic Egypt is reviewed. Earlier, but still valid for the most part, is R o s t o v t z e f f ' s account in *A Large Estate*³, which, together with his brief account in *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*⁴, pp. 353—355, and his evidence for the significance of the term κτήμα given in *Studien zur Geschichte der römischen Kolonates*⁵, pp. 14 f., 38, is the most useful body of literature on the subject. S c h n e b e l ' s account of viticulture in Egypt in *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Aegypten*⁶ only partially concerns us here.

¹ The papyrus is broken off, but we may suppose this with a fair degree of certainty. See below under "Supply of Wine to the Soldiers".

² C. Pr é a u x, *L'Économie Royale des Lagides*, Bruxelles, 1939.

³ Michael Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B. C.* University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History. Number 6. Madison, 1922.

⁴ M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 1941.

⁵ Michael Rostowzew, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*, Archiv für Papyrusforschung, Beiheft 1. Leipzig and Berlin, 1910.

⁶ Michael Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten*, München, 1925.

In his book on the Colonate⁷ Rostovtzeff notes that the word κτήμα which appears in PYale Inv. 1641, e.g., is used either directly with the meaning of "vineyard", or in the broader meaning of "garden-lands", and cites two instances in the Revenue Laws⁸ where κτήμα and κτάομαι are so used. This conclusion is generally accepted⁹. A papyrus¹⁰ from the Thebaid records a legacy of a vineyard with a well of burnt brick and all the appurtenances, and a deed¹¹ of cession records the sale of a vineyard. In PHib. 70 b (ca. 228 B.C.) we learn of the sale of 1¼ arouras of vine-land to a native soldier for forty drachmas.

There is, however, also ample evidence that vineyards existed on temple-land¹², and cleruchs¹³ also planted vineyards under a property title "neither irrevocable, nor automatically hereditary nor alienable"¹⁴. Gift estates (δωρεαί) appears down into the second century¹⁵. If PPetrie III, 29¹⁶ is restored correctly, we will have to accept the possibility of βασιλική γῆ being used for a vineyard, but this was no doubt a rare occurrence¹⁷.

The necessity of a stable land-tenure for vineyards, which require specialized cultivation and do not come into full production for five years¹⁸, makes attractive Rostovtzeff's theory¹⁹ that vineyards became the private property of their planters; but whether the plots of land became hereditary property of their owners automatically after they had been planted with vines, or only if a cer-

⁷ Studien, p. 14.

⁸ Col. 37, 10; col. 36, 11.

⁹ Cf. Rostovtzeff, *Large Estate*, p. 94. "The planting of a plot of land with vines, provided permission had been secured from the state, made the plot the hereditary property of the planter" (ἐμφυτευτής).

¹⁰ PGrenf. I, 21 (126 B. C.): the testament of a cleruch.

¹¹ PGrenf. II, 28 (103 B. C.).

¹² PTeb. 82 (115 B. C.).

¹³ PTeb. 83 (second century B. C.), lines 77—78; PRev. Laws, col. 24, 4 ff.; col. 36, 11 ff.

¹⁴ Préaux, *Economie Royale*, p. 166; cf. Rostowzew, *Studien*, p. 17: „... jeder Kleruch hat aber das Recht, seinen κλήρος zu bepflanzen; dadurch scheidet das bepflanzte Land aus dem κλήρος und wird zu Privatbesitz...." I doubt if we can make a generalization of this scope.

¹⁵ PMich. III, 200 (181/0 B. C. ?).

¹⁶ PPetrie III, 29 (e), p. 62.

¹⁷ Cf. Rostovtzeff, *Large Estate*, p. 94.

¹⁸ Cf. W. L. Westermann, *JEA* XII (1926), p. 43.

¹⁹ Cf. Rostovtzeff, *Large Estate*, p. 94.

tain payment was made to the government, is difficult to say. In the first year of Philopator we have a vineyard bought ἐγ βασιλικοῦ²⁰ and in the Revenue Laws we have the line:

[ὅσοι ἐ]χουσιν ἀμπελῶνας ἢ παραδείσους τρόπῳ ὡτ[ινοῦ]ν²¹,

where a certain diversity of land tenure is implied; likewise in Revenue Laws 36, 11—17 a distinction seems to exist between cleruchs possessing vineyards, and all others owning vineyards or holding them ἐν δωρεᾷ or cultivating them καθ' ὄντινοῦν τρόπον. Nevertheless a stable land-tenure was necessary to encourage the planting of vineyards, and the use of the word κτήμα to signify "vineyard" seems to show that such was the legal status of vineyards. Even in the use of PEleph. 14, which is a hereditary lease of a vineyard, the status of κτήμα is appropriate. In fact, we cannot know that the κτήμα did not merely signify a hereditary lease of this type, and if we accept Westermann's assertion that the τρίτη was rent, that interpretation would seem to follow²².

The Cultivation of Vineyards.

Most vineyards, and certainly all larger ones, were worked by a class of agriculturists called ἀμπελοργοί, who were assisted by common laborers. They were hired for a certain fixed wage per day, and a number of their "payrolls" survive²³. Rostovtzeff²⁴ suggests that the ἀμπελοργοί may also have shared the profits of the vineyard; this would depend upon the conditions under which they were hired, which seem to have varied. In PSI 414 Menon, the vine-dresser, writes to Zenon complaining that he is owed wages for a month; others, he says, have vegetables²⁵, but he is dependent entirely on his wages. Upon occasion vineyards could be leased to ἀμπελοργοί. This seems to be the case in PSI 393, where the men who have farmed the 60-aroura vineyard of Sostratos and Zenon complain to the archiphylakites that they have lost 30.000

²⁰ PEnteuxeis 65, 3.

²¹ PRev. Laws, col. 37, 10.

²² Westermann, *JEA* XII (1926).

²³ PMich. III, 200 (*verso*); PCair. Zen. 59752.

²⁴ *Large Estate*, p. 98.

²⁵ Vegetables were often grown in vineyards; cf. PCair. Zen. 59300, lines 2—3.

reeds²⁶. Certain small cultivators (οἱ γεωργοῦντες)²⁷ also farmed small vineyards.

In PSI 629 and 630 we have two documents dealing with the implements used in vineyards: ἀξίνας and πελέκεις (axes), δίκελλαι (mattocks), and σκαφεῖα (spades), from which it would appear that the ἀμπελοουργοί had their implements supplied them by their employers²⁸. In PTeb. 720 (before 238 B.C.) we have a receipt given to a royal banker for eighty drachmas which went to provide mattocks (δίκελλαι) for work in the vineyard of Berenice, the king's daughter²⁹. From PTeb. 878 (about 111 B.C.) it appears that the government would seize tools as security for payment due them from the vineyards³⁰.

The government itself may have loaned farm implements to some of the smaller cultivators from a government storehouse. In PCol. Zen. 90 we have such a ταμειῶν mentioned, where fifteen δίκελλαι are missing. There is no indication that these δίκελλαι were used for vineyards, but it is possible.

Viticulture was conducted in Egypt on scientific principles³¹, and the government, which derived an important revenue from this source, maintained a close supervision. Owners of ἰδιαίτη ληνοί³² had to register them before the tax-farmer³³; they were then sealed, and when the time came to make the wine, the seal was to be presented unbroken. Those who did not possess their own ληνοί were assigned to other ληνοί where they might have their wine pressed; this seems to be the case in PTeb. 1058³⁴, which contains a series of entries of the style: "so-and-so (whose vineyard is) in crown-land or temple-land (brings his produce) to the ληνός of so-and-so". There appears to have been an impost of some sort on ληνοί³⁵, some of which appear to have been built as private business ventures.

²⁶ I. e., for holding up the vines; Schnebel, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 255.

²⁷ PRev. Laws, col. 37, 14-15.

²⁸ Cf. Rostovtzeff, *Large Estate*, p. 97.

²⁹ Mattocks here cost three drachmas each.

³⁰ Cf. PCair. Zen. 59633, 15-20.

³¹ Cf. PSI 624, fragmentary instructions on viticulture.

³² For this phrase see PSI 860, 9; PTeb. 863, 15.

³³ PRev. Laws, col. 26, 1-10.

³⁴ Early second century B. C. For the meaning of ληνός see Schnebel, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 285. The hiring of a winepress is one of the expenses mentioned in PRylands 583, a lease of a vineyard (170 B. C.).

³⁵ PTeb. 863, line 4.

When the season came for harvesting the grapes³⁶, the cultivator summoned the tax-farmer and exhibited the vineyards to him. The tax-farmer then certified that he had inspected the crops, so that the cultivator might gather them without any intervention from the γενηματοφύλακες. We have a certificate from the second century which declares that Pnephoros may begin harvesting his vineyards in two villages subject to later payment of taxes³⁷.

The grapes were then taken to the ληνός and pressed under supervision of the tax-farmer, the oecosome, and the antigrapheus, or their agents³⁸. The wine was measured with the measures in use at each place, after they had been certified by the oecosome³⁹, and according to the result the ἀπόμοιρα was paid. If the cultivators disobeyed the law, they were pay twice the amount of the tax⁴⁰.

The Taxes on Vineyards.

(1) The ἀπόμοιρα. The nature of this tax, its size, and the way it was collected are described in the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, columns 1—37. About all the other taxes on vineyards there is a considerable element of doubt, especially over the question of who paid them, and how. But the apomoira was a tax of one-sixth⁴¹ of the produce from the vineyard, paid in kind. In certain tracts of land more unfavorable to viticulture, such as in the The-

³⁶ Cf. Schnebel, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 275.

³⁷ P^Teb. 719 (150 B. C.). The editors interpret this as a certificate of inspection. The text has the form of a letter, which states: παρλήφαμέν σε εἰς Κ[ε]ρκεοσίριν καὶ Ἄρεως κόμην τῆι κζ' ὅπως τρυγή[σηις] τοὺς σ[ο]ύς ἀμπελῶνας μέχρι τοῦ σταθῆναι τὰ πρὸς αὐτοῦς. The editors translate: "We have taken you to Kerkeosiris etc. pending the settlement in regard to them". The last phrase is at least obscure, but may refer to late payment of taxes. The first verb, however, seems to mean something like "clear": "We have cleared you as to Kerkeosiris, etc. to harvest your vineyards"; that is, "we have made the necessary investigation and authorize you to proceed".

³⁸ P^Rev. Laws, col. 25.

³⁹ P^SI 860 seems like an account of such a measurement.

⁴⁰ P^Rev. Laws, col. 25, 15. Some leeway was allowed, however; cf. col. 26.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, col. 24, lines 4 and 5.

baid, where special irrigation was required, and for certain other categories⁴², the levy was lowered to a tenth.

The apomoira was originally owed to the temples, but from the twenty-third year of Ptolemy Philadelphus on, those who used to pay this levy to the temples paid it to the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphus⁴³. From this it appears that the *ισρά γῆ* did not pay wine for the *ἀπόμοιρα*. The royal scribes are instructed to register the vineyards, separating the *ισρά γῆ* from the others: *Ἰνα [ῆ] λοιπή [. . .] η ἐξ ῆς δεῖ τὴν ἕκτην συνάγεσθαι κτλ*⁴⁴. But apart from this exception⁴⁵, both the provisions of the Revenue Laws and the amount of evidence that has survived concerning the *ἀπόμοιρα* support the conclusion that the *ἀπόμοιρα* was general throughout Egypt.

A part of the income from the *ἀπόμοιρα* actually went towards the expenses of the cult of Arsinoe, and Pr é a u x states that under Epi-phanes "le revenue en est partagé entre les cultes de la Philadelphie et des dieux Philopators"⁴⁶. B e v a n, writing before the publication of PCol. Zen. 55, says that there seems no reason to suppose that "the *ἀπόμοιρα* was not devoted in full to the maintenance of the cult of Arsinoe in the Egyptian temples"⁴⁷. Pr é a u x approves of B e v a n's account in the main, and refuses to accept PCol. Zen. 55 as a deciding factor in the dispute over whether the *ἀπόμοιρα* was partly used for secular purposes or not. But we now have two documents attesting the use of the *ἀπόμοιρα* for secular purposes. In PCol. Zen. 55, mentioned above, seventy-five metretae of wine are used for wages of the *φυλακῖται*, and in PCair. Zen. 59834 (241 B.C.) a

⁴² *Ibid.*, col. 24, lines 6–10.

[κα]ὶ τῶν στρατευομένων καὶ τοῦ[ς — —]
κλήρους πεφουτευκῶτων καὶ τῆ[ς ἐν τῆι — —]

Soldiers of some sort seem to be included; perhaps, from the tense of *στρατευομένων*, cleruchs who are on active military duty.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, col. 36.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 36, lines 3–10.

⁴⁵ Ostraca exist, however, where priests do pay the *ἀπόμοιρα*; e. g., OTait 70–72 (138 B. C.), on which see Pr é a u x, *Economie Royale*, p. 172. These vineyards may not be on *ισρά γῆ*, or possibly *ισρά γῆ* acquired after the twenty-second year of Ptolemy II did not enjoy the same immunity as the lands they possessed before the twenty-second year. In either case the evidence of these ostraca need not conflict with the Revenue Laws.

⁴⁶ Pr é a u x, *Economie Royale*, p. 180.

⁴⁷ E d w y n B e v a n, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, London, 1927, p. 134.

grammateus receives his salary from the ἀπόμοιρα. Hence it is possible that what Leon is handing over for the Macedonian soldiers in Philadelphia (PYale Inv. 1622) is wine from the ἀπόμοιρα.

As the grapes were ripening, the basilikogrammateus published a notice⁴⁸ announcing when the contract for the collection would be auctioned, and within ten days of this proclamation, he delivered a description of the vineyards in each nome to wouldbe tax-farmers, who had already registered themselves with him⁴⁹. In a papyrus of the Zenon correspondence⁵⁰, a basilikogrammateus writes that he has posted in the ἀγορά on the twelfth of Phamenoth a notice (ἔχθεμα) that the auction of the tax-farming contracts would be held on the thirtieth of that month.

On the appointed day the tax-farmers gathered and bid for the contract to collect the taxes. The assessment of the ἀπόμοιρα was concluded by a three-way agreement between the tax-farmer, the oecome, and the cultivator⁵¹. The tax-farmer and cultivator made two separate agreements; a sealed copy of the tax-farmer's went to the cultivator, with the oecome probably keeping the original, while the cultivator's went to the oecome. Thus the oecome had a record of both agreements. In PPetrie II, 27, p. 83, we seem to possess an example of such an agreement, where Dionysius acknowledges his assessment in kind (l. 5) and the price it will realize (l. 8) and swears to it by a royal oath (l. 11).

Thirty days⁵² after the tax-farmers had contracted for the ἀπόμοιρα, they were to appoint sureties greater by 1/20 than the price agreed upon for the tax, and became personally responsible for its collection. In PTeb. 772 (236 B.C.) we have a tax-farmer of the ἀπόμοιρα who has been arrested for failure to deliver the tax, and in a Petrie papyrus⁵³, a property of Theotimus has been sold to meet the lia-

⁴⁸ PRev. Laws, col. 33.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, col. 14, 2-5.

⁵⁰ PCol. Zen. 13. This refers to the ἀπόμοιρα on orchards, but the auction of the wine-tax was probably dealt with similarly.

⁵¹ PRev. Laws, col. 26, 18 — col. 28. Also in PCair. Zen. 59361 (July 25, 242 B. C.). Demetrios, a farmer of the ἀπόμοιρα, sends to Zenon a copy of the settlements he has made for various vineyards and orchards in accordance with the provisions of the Revenue Laws cited above.

⁵² PRev. Laws, col. 34; cf. PPetrie II, 46 (a); PGurob 7 (ca. 212 B. C.). In the last the tax-farmers have a double surety.

⁵³ PPetrie III, 57 b, p. 166.

bility of a tax-farmer he has gone surety for. The tax-farmer had to meet the deficit if the money realized from selling the ἀπόμοιρα did not meet the agreed assessment.

(2). The other taxes on vineyards. In PEleph. 14, 1. 3, the taxes on vineyards are divided into two categories, the ἀπόμοιρα and the καθήκοντες ἀργυρικοί φόροι. These last included a land-tax (the ἐπαρούριον)⁵⁴, a χωματικόν⁵⁵, and a φυλακιτικόν⁵⁶, all paid in money. But the really large levy on the vineyards consisted of a τρίτη⁵⁷ or a ἡμίσευμα⁵⁸ or even a τετάρτη⁵⁹. With the evidence available it is impossible to come to general conclusions concerning the levies; the τετάρτη is mentioned only once, and the phrase τρίτη ἀμπελῶνος does not occur. A papyrus⁶⁰ from the Herakleopolite nome (244/3 B.C.) furnishes our best evidence for the method by which the ἡμίσευμα was collected. The τελῶναι were employed in its collection, and they were to witness the vintage in much the same manner as the farmers of the ἀπόμοιρα. This document describes a situation where the grapes are ripe, and the τελῶναι are not present. In such a situation the Revenue Laws⁶¹ allowed the cultivator to proceed himself, with an agent of the oecome or antigrapheus only, and the cultivators seem to be on the point of doing the same thing here in the case of the ἡμίσευμα.

One document quoted below (PSI 508, 256/5 B.C.) appears to throw light on the problem of how this φόρος of one-third, one-half, or one-quarter was collected. It is addressed to Zenon, and runs as follows:

[...]ων. [...]σ[c. 10 11.]

ὑπογέγραφέ σοι τῶν

ἀμπελώνων, ὧν ἡγόρα-

κε Δᾶμις, τὸ καθ' ἐν καὶ

⁵⁴ PCair. Zen. 59337 (248 B. C.), and PTeb. 1062 (190 or 207 B. C.).

⁵⁵ "A dike-tax"; cf. OTait 31 (249 B. C.); PHibeh 112 (260 B. C.); PPetrie III, 108, 2. In this last the χωματικόν is sixty-one obols for sixty-one arouras, and in PHibeh 112 the χωματικόν is, with one exception, about one-eighth of the ἐπαρούριον, which would then average eight obols an aroura. However, the rates varied from year to year.

⁵⁶ PPetrie III, 108, 109.

⁵⁷ PPetrie III, 177(g), col. II, lines 2 and 37; and PCair. Zen. 59366 (ca. 241 B. C.), line 27; possibly also PTeb. 1064 (late third century B. C.), line 12.

⁵⁸ SB III, 7177, (244/3 B. C.), line 2; and PCair. Zen. 59604, line 4.

⁵⁹ PCair. Zen. 59366, line 28.

⁶⁰ SB III, 7177.

⁶¹ Col. 30.

- 5 πόσου ἕκαστόν ἐστιν.
 ἐπίστειλον οὖμ μοι ἐγδε-
 χόμενος [ὑπ]έρ αὐτοῦ καὶ π[ρο]σ-
 τάζει ὅπως ὁ οἶνος {σοι} ἀφειθῆι.
 ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
 εἰ δέ τινος ἰδίαι χρεῖαν ἔχεις, ἀπόστει-
 10 λόν τινα ὧι δώσομεν.
 Ἐρρωσο. L λ, Φαῶφι θ.
 ἐκ τοῦ Φανερίου ἀπὸ ἱ ρ π
 τὸ τρίτον μέρος ξ
 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀμφιστράτου ἀπὸ σι
 15 ὡσαύτως ο
 ἐκ τοῦ Ὀρου [...]αμῶτος ἀπὸ [ρμε]
 ὡσαύτως μη=
 ἐκ τ[ο]ῦ ἱεροῦ [ἀ]πὸ φν τὸ ἥμισυ σοε
 .[...]νγ[]
 20 τῶι κατα[...]χινη[.]·σεν[]
 ἀπὸ αμf=τὸ ἥμισυ φκγ-.

Rostovtzeff⁶² takes this to mean that Zenon was farming the taxes on wine, that Damis was Zenon's subcontractor, and that the vineyards which Damis had rented or farmed paid one-third or one-half of their produce in money as a tax. Westermann's⁶³ view is that Damis is a tax-farmer and Zenon an oecome at this time. He believes that Zenon's agent is reporting to Zenon that these amounts, the thirds or halves which constituted an ἐπιγραφή have been paid in, and asks Zenon to acknowledge their receipt; whereupon Damis will order (for Zenon) that the portion of the wine remaining to the producers be released for sale. He takes the reference in lines 9 — 10 to be to records which Zenon might need, not to wine or some other commodity which he wished. But this does not take account of the word ἰδίαι: this was for Zenon privately, not in an official capacity. My own inclination is to interpret lines 9 and 10 of this papyrus as meaning: "If you need from him (i.e., Damis) anything (of what he has bought, i.e. the produce of the vineyards) for private purposes, send someone to whom we shall give it." If this interpretation is acceptable,

⁶² *Large Estate*, pp. 100—103.

⁶³ *JEA* XII (1926), p. 50.

the writer would best be able to deduct wine for Zenon from the purchase if it belonged to him or, more probably, to Zenon himself, who would then have bought it through Damis. It must not be forgotten that Zenon went surety (ἐγδεχόμενος) for Damis; Damis was in his employ. Zenon was surety for "how much each is", i.e. the total or the fraction. However we are to understand the whole transaction, the prices followed by τὸ τρίτον μέρος or τὸ ἥμισυ would represent, on the one hand, the total price, and, on the other, the amount of the tax which must be paid to the state on behalf of the proprietors⁶⁴.

Thus it is very probable that the lists of vineyards and sums of money appended to this letter deal with the payment of the τρίτη or ἥμισυμα. The proportion charged is a third reckoned in money, except that "from the holdings of Hierus", and from another with its designation not preserved, the proportion is one-half.⁶⁵ Westermann objects that an addition of an ἕκτη to this 50% tax would bring the total impost to $66\frac{2}{3}\%$, which "would be plunder", and prefers to consider the ἥμισυμα and τρίτη as rents. Préaux, however, notes that taxes of these proportions were far from unknown in Egypt⁶⁶. The τρίτη and ἥμισυμα appear to have been called φόροι⁶⁷ and to have been collected by τελῶναι⁶⁸; yet the impost may have some of the attributes of a rental.

We may find the answer to this problem in P Rylands 583 (170 B. C.), a lease of a six-aroura vineyard to one Apollonius. The conditions are given in full: the rent was to consist of two-thirds of the fruits and produce grown in the vineyard, viz.: "when all the fruits have been turned into wine, and deductions made for the ἀπόμοιρα due to the Treasury, wages for the treaders, hire of the winepress and the contribution of a half kados to the agricultural guild, the must remaining shall be divided into three portions, of which Nicomachus shall take two and Apollonius one." From this it appears that the

⁶⁴ An implication to this theory, if it is acceptable, is that either there was no definite assessment for the τρίτη, in spite of PSI 632 (see n. 69 below), or that Damis bought the produce at the assessed value.

⁶⁵ But if ἐκ τοῦ ἸΕΡΟΥ is taken as ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, Westermann's objection would become invalid, since ἱερὰ γῆ did not pay ἀπόμοιρα.

⁶⁶ *Economie Royale*, p. 183, n. 2.

⁶⁷ PEleph. 14, line 2.

⁶⁸ SB III, 7177. This deals only with the ἥμισυμα, but it is likely that the τρίτη was treated similarly.

τρίτη, it collected in this case, was not deducted before the produce was divided between lessee and lessor; otherwise it is incomprehensible that it should not be mentioned when the ἀπόμοιρα is. But after the wine was divided, Apollonius could not pay the τρίτη. If it is to be paid at all, the lessor must do the paying.

If the proprietor of the vineyard was responsible for this tax, then it may be a kind of "tribute" stipulated when permission was given to plant a plot of land with vines. This "tribute" may even have been calculated after the ἀπόμοιρα was deducted, but in default of further evidence, we can only make speculations on this subject⁶⁹.

In PCair. Zen. 59604 a cleruch who has leased land to Zenon on which Zenon has planted vines writes that he has agreed to give

⁶⁹ Rostovtzeff (*Large Estate*, p. 100) refers to PCair. Zen. 59236 (254 or 253 B. C.), where Neoptolemos complains that his father Stratippus has been wronged by the oecome and basilikogrammateus. The complaint runs (lines 2—4): ἐπιγραφὴν γὰρ ποιούμενοι τοῖς ἀμπελώσι, ἐκ τριῶν ἐτῶν τὰ γενήματα λαμβάνοντες, τὸ τρίτον μέρος ἐπιγραφον, τῷ δὲ πατρὶ ἐκ δύο ἐτῶν τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν πεποιήνται, φάμενοι νεόφυτον εἶναι. According to Rostovtzeff, this means that the oecome and basilikogrammateus assessed the vineyard of Stratippus for one-half the produce, taking the average of the produce for the past two years, in stead of assessing it for one-third, taking the average of the last three years. However, this interpretation is not borne out by the text, and Edgar's suggestiou (PCair. Zen. 59236, note 4) seems more probable; i. e., that the oecome and basilikogrammateus took the average yield of the last three years as an assessment for future taxation. This text neither supports the assertion that the term ἐπιγραφὴ encountered in ostraca means the τρίτη in reference to vineyards, nor that the τρίτη was assessed in this manner.

The survey of the vineyards on which the oecome and basilikogrammateus based their ἐπιγραφὴ (assessment) is probably like that of PCair. Zen. 59828, which is called a γεωμετρία (line 1), and is compiled under the supervision of a basilikogrammateus, who, according to PCair. Zen. 59387, 12—14, in turn receives orders from an oecome. The γεωμετρία contained the necessary information for assessing the ἐπαρούριον (line 5) and the χωματικόν (line 6), and it probably also contained a record of harvest for a number of years, although the only evidence remaining are the vestiges of dates in line 8, col. I, and lines 3—4, col. II.

The oecome and basilikogrammateus could have drawn up an ἐπιγραφὴ for the τρίτη on the basis of such an assessment; in fact, Rostovtzeff is probably right in believing that PCair. Zen. 59236 refers to the τρίτη. But the word ἐπιγραφὴ probably meant no more than "assessment", and hence the term εἰς τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν found on numerous ostraca would mean only "to meet the assessment". Obviously, with this meaning, the ἐπιγραφὴ could refer to an assessment of the τρίτη, and this is perhaps the case in PSI 632 (cf. Rostovtzeff, *Large Estate*, p. 100; P. Cair. Zen. 59236, introd.). But we cannot be positive on the method of reckoning the τρίτη.

half the rental due him to his (?) sons, and asks Zenon to pay him their share directly after various taxes have been deducted. Among the taxes mentioned is a *τριηράρχημα*, a *λιτουργικόν*, and a *ἀλικῶν* κ. The *τριηράρχημα* is generally taken as a tax for the navy⁷⁰; the *λιτουργικόν*⁷¹ was probably a tax paid in lieu of liturgical duty. However, these taxes are not specifically charged on vineyards, and possibly the cleruch here is having them deducted from his rental for the sake of convenience only.

The state charged an export tax of $\frac{1}{24}$ on wine,⁷² and a *ἐκαστοστή*, which appears to be an *ad valorem* charge of 1%. In PCair. Zen. 59373 (239 B. C.) one Petesouchos writes that he has dispatched an official to Philadelphia to superintend the import of wine and exact the 1% duty for Philadelphia. From this it is likely that the ρ' mentioned in PYale Inv. 1641 was an import duty.

The οἴνου τέλος⁷³, which appears occasionally, is a name sufficiently vague to cover any tax or combination of taxes. It may perhaps represent a group of import or export taxes, in which the ρ' καὶ ν' could be included. The οἴνολογία appearing in certain ostraca⁷⁴ was explained by Wilcken⁷⁵ as a fee for the οἴνολόγοι, who collected the ἀπόμοιρα. Tait⁷⁶, pointing out that the large amount⁷⁷ paid for the οἴνολογία in OTait 144 is scarcely consistent with Wilcken's theory, suggests that it be related to the σπονδὴ Διονυσίου. It would be tempting to see in the οἴνολογία a σύνταξις, but the evidence is too vague to permit more than conjecture.

According to the Revenue Laws⁷⁸, the wine of the ἀπόμοιρα was to be placed in jars furnished by the cultivators, but paid for by the dioecetes at a fixed price, and conveyed by the cultivators to the royal ἀποδοχεῖα which the oecosome established in each village. In P Rylands 583 (170 B.C.), a lease of a vineyard, there is included

⁷⁰ PPetrie III, 100 (a), line 3; PCair. Zen. 59012 (259 B. C.) (introd.); cf. PEggar 73 (introd.).

⁷¹ PPetrie III, 100 (b), line 4.

⁷² PHibeh 80 (250 B. C.).

⁷³ Cf. PCair. Zen. 59553 (256 B. C.). In PCair. Zen. 59660, the οἴνου τέλος is three drachmas on four keramia. In both cases it appears to have been an export or import toll.

⁷⁴ OTait 144 (215 B. C. ?); Wilcken, *Ostraka* II, 711 (Ptolemaic).

⁷⁵ Wilcken, *Ostraka*, I, 270.

⁷⁶ OTait 144.

⁷⁷ I. e., five choes, three cotyles for ἀπόμοιρα ten choes for οἴνολογία.

⁷⁸ PRev. Laws, cols. 30—33.

a provision reading: "Each shall provide jars for himself, and as required for the ἀπόμοιρα according to the proportions of his lease, and each shall carry down the jars for himself to the wine-press, etc." Hence it appears that in the early half of the second century the cultivator still furnished the wine-jars for the ἀπόμοιρα, and if any change from the provisions of the Revenue Laws occurred, it was that the dioecetes may no longer have provided the price.

We must then account for the enormous number of jars which the state ordered. In PCair. Zen. 59366 (ca. 241. B.C.) a certain potter, Horus, has had a deficit of 2700 jars in his contract with the government, and his surety is now responsible to the ἐπιστάτης. In PCol. Zen. 88 (243 B.C.) Eucles, the ἐπιστάτης accuses Anosis, the village secretary, of irregularities in the accounts of wine-jars and in payments due to the potters. It was probably necessary for a central authority to see to it that there were sufficient containers on hand for the vintage, and this may be the meaning of such documents as PCair. Zen. 59741, 59742, and 59743 and PSI 859; but there was no government monopoly in wine-jars, as far as we know. Hence it is probable that the jars referred to in PCair. Zen. 59366 and PCol. Zen. 88 were to contain the wine of the τρίτη or ἡμίσειμα. This wine would also have been taken to the royal depositories, a contention supported by PCair. Zen. 59737, which records day by day the quantities of wine produced in the vineyards around Philadelphia. A certain proportion of the produce was handed over to the χειρισταί, whom Edgar suggests as the collectors of government dues. In line 20 the proportion is one-half; it is not preserved elsewhere.

The Revenue Laws provide for the sale of the ἀπόμοιρα in column 33⁷⁹. The oecosome examined the wine and sold it, taking with him the tax-farmer, the antigraphheus, and his agent. Hence in PSI 425, lines 25—30, the writer asks Zenon for a list of the sales of wine which Aristander and Hermolaus, the oecosomes⁸⁰, made. We know that more than the ἀπόμοιρα was sold in this fashion, for in PCol. Zen. 55 Etearchos, the nomarch, acknowledges that Anosis, the κωμογραμματεὺς, has turned over to him forty metretes of

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, col. 33, line 4.

⁸⁰ For Aristander, cf. PCol. Zen. 55 (250 B. C.); PLond. Inv. 2097 (247 B. C.; cf. *Prosop. Ptol.* I, no. 1021). For Hermolaus cf. PCair. Zen. 59236 (254 or 253 B.C.).

sweet wine for the retail dealers in accordance with an ἐντολή of the oecosome. The sweet wine is not ἀπόμωρα, which is mentioned later in the same document. It may belong to the τρίτη ἀμπελῶνος.

PSI 632, which is unfortunately fragmentary, offers similar evidence for the activities of the oecosomes in selling the wine taken as taxes. Stratippos, a cavalryman, complains that he is now in financial difficulties because the oecosomes have sold the wine taken as taxes at a price lower than he expected (?). R o s t o v t z e f f⁸¹ explains this text as a petition from Stratippos that he has had to pay his ἐπιγραφὴ, which he equates with the τρίτη, at a rate of three drachmas and some obols a metretes, but now he must pay much more because the oecosomes sell the wine at much less than three drachmas. There is as yet no definite proof that the ἐπιγραφὴ may be taken as the τρίτη, although R o s t o v t z e f f's theory does not seem unlikely. But the oecosomes here do appear to be selling all the taxable wine and not merely the ἀπόμωρα.

Even after the regular taxes were paid, a σύνταξις⁸² could be levied and an additional sale of wine made to meet it. This seems to be the case in PLille 4 (218/7 B.C.), where the writer (cf. 11. 14-15) speaks of τὴν προσεκκειμένην ἀγοράν⁸³ τοῦ οἴνου made διὰ τοῦ συ(μβόλου) τοῦ παρὰ Θεογένους for a royal σύνταξις. All this evidence seems to point to royal control over the selling of all the wine. If the government was to be able to sell an amount of wine which varied with the current price of the market⁸⁴, and even then have been able to apply an additional impost if necessary, it must have kept tight control of all the wine until the taxes were met.

Part of this control was no doubt exercised because the government took a certain proportion of the wine produced and put it in its own depositories. But it may even have gone further and sealed private ταμιεῖα, as they had sealed the ληνοί before the vintage. The particular situation recounted in PYale Inv. 1643 cannot be reconstructed with any certainty, but it is tempting to see in

⁸¹ *Large Estate*, p. 100.

⁸² "The word (σύνταξις) was generally used for religious purposes, but it is sometimes used for certain kinds of payments to the government" (PFayum Towns, 15).

⁸³ This is to accept the reading of W. Chrest. II, 336. For the significance of the term ἀγορά, see below.

⁸⁴ Cf. PEnt. 35, 7.

Dicaeus a government official who has locked a private ταμειῖον containing wine, and is in no hurry to release wine from it. The phrase τοῦ Πετσαρμῶτιος ταμειῖου need not imply ownership; it could mean that Petearmotis has leased a ταμειῖον, as is the case in PHib. 31 (270 B.C.), or that it is a royal ταμειῖον containing only Petearmotis' wine. This last seems to me the most unlikely. In PSI 620 (11. 16—19) τὸ ταμειῖον οὗ ἔκειτο ὁ Πατταικίωνος οἶνος is the phrase used in connection with wine-storage.

In PYale Inv. 1641 we encounter another refusal to release wine from a vineyard to Apollonius and his group. The same person who refuses to give an ἐντολή of the vineyard has also accepted a talent of bronze for the 2% tax which Hermias has contracted for, and is holding it for the payment of the one talent coming due. Hence he is a banker, or at least an official; we have seen that the oecnome gave ἐντολαί (cf. PCol. Zen. 55) and also supervised the balancing of the accounts (cf. PRev. Laws Col, 16).

But the toparch is also possible. In PYale Inv. 1622 Leon the toparch acknowledges that wine has been released through his agency. In PTeb. 703, 117—34, the toparchs are mentioned as responsible for the taxes⁸⁵; it was within their power to exact them⁸⁶, according to PGurob 20 (third century B.C.). It may be the toparch who is meant in our document also, but this cannot be asserted with any certainty.

The writer also wishes to consider the purchase of nine keramia of old wine of Philadelphia "similar to what you sent us last year". The phrase παλαιὸς οἶνος is found used again in PCair. Zen 59110, lines 28—29: οἴνου παλαιοῦ ἡδέος χῖα β. In PCair. Zen. 59349 the οἶνος παλαιός is set in opposition to the οἶνος νέος (lines 6—7: εἰ δὲ μὴ ὑπάρχει τοῦ παλαιοῦ, τοῦ νέου, εἰ ἔστιν ἤδη χρηστόν). The adjective παλαιός seems here to indicate wine of last year's vintage, or — less probably — of an even earlier one, but it was at least a year old. This is probably the meaning of παλαιὸς οἶνος in our text. It was not a fine old vintage; if anything, it was wine of an inferior quality.

⁸⁵ Cf. Rostovtzeff in PTeb. 703, p. 92, "The toparch, however, was the chief agent of the government in the collection of taxes".

⁸⁶ Hence the Leon in PCair. Zen. 59337 (248 B.C.), who is exacting arrears of the ἐπαρούριον is probably a toparch. But whether or not he is identical with the Leon in PYale Inv. 1622 is obviously doubtful.

Supply of Wine to the Soldiers.

In PYale Inv. 1622 Leon the toparch acknowledges a release of wine (?) for the Μακεδόνες in Philadelphia. Macedonians were regular soldiers of the Ptolemaic army, and comprised cavalry and footsoldiers. They also furnished the royal guard. The release has been made through Leon and the topogrammateus to a number of λειτουργοί for the appropriate δινική ἀγορά of the sixteenth year. There are some parallels for this transaction. PTeb. 724 (175 or 164 B.C. ?) has a notification to a certain Tephraeus from someone who writes that "the remainder of the cavalrymen who are pasturing their horses have come to me because wine is no longer supplied to them by the retailers who (?) on this account have taken refuge in the temples". The writer seems to have made inquiry and arranged that the retailers will get eighteen jars of wine, and is sending the letter to Tephraeus in order that as much as is approved . . . (here the papyrus breaks off, but one imagines that Tephraeus is to see that as much as is approved reaches the retailers). In PCol. Zen. 55 (250 B.C.) a nomarch acknowledges receipt of seventy-five metretae of wine for the φυλακῆται for their wages (lines 9—10). And PCol. Zen. 89 (243 B.C.) is the payment to the king by one Theodorus of a small sum "out of the wages paid him through the bank for transporting wine from Philadelphia to Alexandria for the distribution to the soldiers:" εἰς τὴν ἀνάδοσιν τῶν στρατιωτῶν. We encounter another ἀνάδοσις to the soldiers in PCair. Zen. 59441 (251 B.C.), but the papyrus is fragmentary and we cannot discover what the ἀνάδοσις to the soldiers consisted of: The latest treatment of this problem has been by Marcel Launey, *Recherches sur les Armées Hellenistiques*⁸⁷, vol. II, pp. 764—780. Griffith⁸⁸ and Lesquier⁸⁹ here also give accounts of the maintenance of Ptolemaic armies.

It was customary for a Hellenistic general in a foreign land to see to it that local traders provided an ἀγορά for his army, where his soldiers could buy food⁹⁰. For this purpose a special allowance

⁸⁷ Marcel Launey, *Recherches sur les Armées Hellenistiques*, Paris, 1949/50.

⁸⁸ G. I. Griffith, *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, Cambridge, 1935.

⁸⁹ Jean Lesquier, *Les Institutions Militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, Paris, 1911.

⁹⁰ Griffith, *Mercenaries*, p. 269.

(σιταρχία, or in Egypt σιτώνιον)⁹¹ was given to the soldiers, quite apart from their wages (μισθός or ὀψώνιον). The Ptolemies continued this practice in Egypt. In PRylands 562 (August 16, 251 B.C.) Bubalus, the writer, says (lines 2—10) ἔγραψας μοι ἀξιῶσαι Φανίαν τὸν γραμματέα τῶν ἰππέων παρασχεῖν ἀγορὰν ἐν Μεία[ι] τοῖς καταβαίνουσ[ιν] ἰππεῦσιν εἰς τὴν πενθετηρίδα. The papyrus adds that one Leon, no doubt a toparch⁹², has let the contracts to supply this market with meat and oil.

Both Launey⁹³ and Griffith⁹⁴ discuss three documents⁹⁵ of about 130 B.C. from the royal bank at Thebes which record the arrangement for a month's pay of mercenary cavalry stationed there. The payments are divided into three categories: ὀψώνια, σιτώνια, and ἰπποτροφικόν. The σιτώνιον was to be used for buying supplies from local traders, just as the cavalrymen bought their wine from the κάπηλοι in PTheb. 724, and according to this, a phrase like ἡ οἰνική ἀγορά in PYale Inv. 1622 would refer to a market where the Μακέδονες in Philadelphia could purchase their wine. But I believe that it possesses another meaning in this papyrus.

The term λειτουργοί used to describe the individuals in PYale Inv. 1622 to whom the wine was released, is commonly employed in the papyri to mean workmen; but at this period it can also denote military cleruchs. A papyrus contract from Hibeh⁹⁶ lists military λειτουργοί among the witnesses. The wine was not released to these λειτουργοί merely for transportation purposes, as might have been the case in the Roman period; rather, I am inclined to take them as the supply-commissariat of the Philadelphia Μακέδονες.

If this view is correct, what we have in PYale Inv. 1622 is a payment of rations in kind (σιτομετρία)⁹⁷. In BGU 1749 (64/3 B.C.) there is a request for such a payment in grain, addressed to a σιτολόγος and coupled with it a request for a payment of money addressed to a τραπεζίτης. A second century⁹⁸ petition from the

⁹¹ Launey, *Recherches*, p. 772; Griffith, *Mercenaries*, p. 278.

⁹² Such contracts were generally let by the toparchs; see PTheb. 48 (113 B. C.).

⁹³ *Recherches*, p. 772.

⁹⁴ *Mercenaries*, p. 278.

⁹⁵ PTheb. Bank. 5, 6, 7.

⁹⁶ PHibeh 96 (259 or 258 B. C.).

⁹⁷ Griffith, *Mercenaries*, p. 279.

⁹⁸ PGrenfell I, 42 = W. Chrest. I, 447.

Thebaid from cavalry mercenaries⁹⁹ reports how they had been receiving less remuneration than their comrades in the form of σιτώνια (line 9), ἀγοραί (ἐν δὲ [τοῖς] κατὰ τὰς ἀγοράς), and allowance for their horses (εἰς τὴν κράστιν τῶν [ἵππων], lines 11—12). The others have received their ἀγοραί by the month, but they have not, apparently through the negligence of a scribe (?). The term ἀγορά seems here to designate payment in kind, an interpretation which is further borne out by PSI 436 (248/7 B.C.), which speaks of τὰ ὀψώνια καὶ τὰς ἀγοράς (line 5): "wages and rations".

The word ἀγορά has this meaning as well as that of a market where supplies might be bought, as seems to be the case in PRylands 562. But soldiers generally received their wages by the month¹⁰⁰, while PYale Inv. 1622 speaks of the ἀγορά for the sixteenth year. The same use of the word (τὴν γινομένην ἀγορὰν εἰς το ἰ' [(ἔτος)]) reappears in PPetrie II, 15 (2), an order to give to an ἀρχιτέκτων an ἀγορά for the tenth year. In both these cases what is probably meant is a kind of drawing account, such as seems a necessary presupposition in interpreting PCol. Zen. 89. The soldiers could draw their rations of wine against such an account from the wine of such-and-such a year. If this was the case, we can interpret lines 9 and 10 of PYale Inv. 1622 as meaning: "to be charged against the suitable account of the sixteenth year", and it is legitimate to assume that the papyrus went on to specify a certain amount of wine released for the following month.

[Yale University]

J. A. S. Evans
C. Bradford Welles

⁹⁹ PSI 436, line 5.

¹⁰⁰ W. Chrest. I, 447, 17; *Recherches*, p. 779.