

NEW FRAGMENTS OF THE AMNESTY DECREE OF OCTOBER 9, 186 BCE¹

Alba de Frutos García *Universidad Complutense de Madrid* and
Sofía Torallas Tovar *University of Chicago*

Abstract. — In this paper we present three fragments, at least one of which belongs to the copy of the amnesty decree of 186 BCE known as *P.Köln* 7.313. P.Monts.Roca inv. 908 fits the left hand side of col. 1 of the decree. For the other two fragments (P.Palau Rib. inv. 172 c-d) we tentatively suggest that they belong to the same document, mainly for paleographical reasons and because they belong to a collection where other fragments of the same document are found. Although this paper does not provide many new insights into the text of the decree, it confirms that the sources for the Cologne, Roca Puig, and Palau Ribes collections of papyri were the same.

Three fragments, one from the Roca Puig collection at the Abbey of Montserrat, and two more from the Palau Ribes collection, struck us as very similar in their handwriting to the copy of the royal decree issued by Ptolemy V Epiphanes on October 9, 186 BCE, known as *P.Köln* 7.313. This decree was issued following the defeat of a major revolt in southern Egypt (206-186 BCE),² which had remained independent from the

¹ We are very grateful to the Benedictine community at the Abbey of Montserrat, especially Father Pius Tragan, for allowing us to publish the Montserrat fragment here and providing a wonderful space for our research in their collection. We are also grateful to the Archive of the Jesuits in Barcelona, and the curator of the Palau Ribes collection, Alberto Nodar, for allowing us to publish the two other fragments. We want to acknowledge the comments and corrections of Willy Clarysse (Leuven), Charikleia Armoni (Cologne), Peter van Minnen (Cincinnati), and the two anonymous readers, which contributed much to improving our article. Charikleia Armoni has to be thanked too for providing us with excellent photographs of the Cologne fragments and granting permission to publish them here. Sergio Carro (Barcelona) has been so kind as to produce a photographic combination of these fragments and has taken the photos in the Roca Puig and Palau Ribes collections. This paper is part of the research project financed by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitivity (FFI2015-65511).

² For earlier bibliography, see *P.Köln* 7, p. 64, n. 3. The fullest account of the historical background of the Great Revolt is A.-E. Veïsse, *Les "révoltes égyptiennes": Recherches sur les troubles intérieurs en Égypte du règne de Ptolémée III à la conquête romaine* (Louvain 2004). On the revolt, see 11-26, on the decree, see 171-177, with bibliography. New editions of texts concerning the Great Revolt have come to light since the publication of Veïsse's work. See A. Farid, "Zwei Demotische Privatbriefe. University of

Ptolemaic kingdom after having established a theocratic monarchy with two successive Egyptian pharaohs, Hurgonaphor and Chaonnophris.³

The two fragments kept at Cologne were first edited by L. Koenen in 1957 as *P.Kroll*,⁴ later reedited as *SB* 6.9316 and *C.Ord.Ptol.* 34. In 1982, S. Daris published the two fragments kept at the Palau-Ribes collection (P.PalauRib. inv. 172 a-b).⁵ These fragments were found to match and were reedited by Maresch as *P.Köln* 7.313.

The three collections, Cologne, Roca Puig, and Palau Ribes, were created from the same sources in Cairo. The most remarkable piece, which clearly reveals these connections, is the Biblical codex Rahlfs 967, nowadays scattered in the collections of Chester Beatty (Dublin), Fundación Pastor (Madrid), Scheide (Princeton), Roca-Puig (now at Montserrat), and Köln Theol. (Cologne).⁶ According to Koenen,⁷ the fragments referred to

Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, Inv.-Nr. E-16336 und E-16743," *ZÄS* 132 (2005) 1-11; M. Eldamati, *Ein ptolemäisches Priesterdekret aus dem Jahr 186 v. Chr. Eine neue Version von Philensis II in Kairo*, (München 2005); M. Depauw, "Egyptianizing the Chancellery During the Great Theban Revolt (205-186 BC): A New Study of Limestone Tablet Cairo 38258," *SAK* 34 (2006) 97-105; A.-E. Veïsse, "Retour sur les révoltes égyptiennes," in G. Charpentier and V. Puech (eds.), *Villes et campagnes aux rives de la Méditerranée ancienne. Hommages à Georges Tate* (Lyon 2013) 507-514; C. Armoni, *Das Archiv der Taricheuten Amenneus und Onnophris aus Tanis (P.Tarich)* (Paderborn 2013) 23-27. The bibliography on the causes that might have led to the Egyptian revolts is immense. Besides Veïsse's study, see also J.G. Manning, *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Structure of Land Tenure* (Cambridge 2003) 164-170; B.C. McGing, "Revolt in Ptolemaic Egypt: Nationalism Revisited," in P. Schubert (ed.), *Actes du 26e Congrès international de papyrologie, Genève, 16-21 août 2010* (Genève 2012) 509-516; Ch. Fischer-Bovet, "Social Unrest and Ethnic Coexistence in Ptolemaic Egypt and the Seleucid Empire," *Past and Present* 229 (2015) 3-45; P. Johstono, "Insurgency in Ptolemaic Egypt," in T. Howe and L.L. Brice (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Insurgency and Terrorism in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Leiden 2016) 183-220; F. Ludlow and J.G. Manning, "Revolts under the Ptolemies: A Paleoclimatological Perspective," in J.J. Collins and J. G. Manning (eds.), *Revolt and Resistance in the Ancient Classical World and the Near East: In the Crucible of the Empire* (Leiden 2016) 154-175. In the same volume, B.C. McGing, "Revolting Subjects: Empires and Insurrection, Ancient and Modern," 139-153. For a survey of texts concerning amnesties in Ptolemaic Egypt see C.A. La'da, "Amnesty in Hellenistic Egypt: A Survey of the Sources," in K. Harter-Uibopuu and F. Mitthof (eds.), *Vergeben und Vergessen? Amnestie in der Antike* (Wien 2013) 163-209.

³ It has been suggested recently that Haronnophris and Chaonnophris were one and the same person. When the name was changed, the regnal years were numbered continuously. See A.-E. Veïsse, "Retour sur les révoltes égyptiennes," (n. 2) 513-514.

⁴ L. Koenen, *Eine Ptolemäische Königsurkunde (P.Kroll)* (Wiesbaden 1957).

⁵ S. Daris, "P.Palau Rib. 172 e 70." *Studia Papyrologica* 21 (1982) 73-82 = *SB* 16.12540, *SB* 16.12541. According to Daris (75), P.Palau Rib. inv. 172 b (fr. C of the decree) had a fragment of a second column attached to the lower right corner, giving an idea of the intercolumnial space. This fragment is today detached from the main fragment.

⁶ See *P.Monts.Roca* 4.46 with commentary.

⁷ Koenen (n. 4) 1.

as *P.Kroll* were acquired in 1957 by Harald Bocke on behalf of Prof. Joseph Kroll. Roca Puig and O'Callaghan might have acquired their fragments around that time, when they were both forming their collections.⁸ As far as we know, Roca Puig visited Cairo at several occasions during the 1950s. In 1955 he bought the Codex Miscellaneus.⁹ The rest of his purchases cannot be exactly traced, since we only have personal notes with sums of money paid for the papyri, but no detailed account of the transactions. We know with certainty that Roca Puig was in Cairo in 1957, but there is no way of knowing if he indeed bought this fragment in precisely that year.¹⁰ In any case, he bought it from the same dealer who sold the Cologne fragments.

1. *P.Monts.Roca inv. 908*

P.Monts.Roca inv. 908 would just be a small papyrus fragment of little interest if it did not match the left hand side of the first column of *P.Köln* 7.313, Fr. A (TM 2229), itself consisting of two fragments from Cologne (*P.Kroll* col. 1 = *P.Köln* inv. 184), and the Palau Ribes collection (*P.Palau Rib. inv. 172 a*). *P.Monts.Roca inv. 908* joins the Cologne fragment so perfectly that in certain areas one of them preserves the horizontal fibers, while the other preserves the vertical fibers. We offer both a

⁸ On the origin and acquisition of the Roca-Puig collection see S. Torallas Tovar and K.A. Worp, *To the Origins of Greek Stenography. P.Monts.Roca I* (Barcelona 2006) 15-16; J. Gil and S. Torallas Tovar, *Hadrianus. P.Monts.Roca III* (Barcelona 2010) 24-31. On the acquisition see M.T. Ortega Monasterio, "El Instituto Papiroológico Roca-Puig y el CSIC: ¿Proyecto o realidad?" in *Palabras bien dichas. Estudios filológicos dedicados al P. Pius-Ramon Tragan* (Montserrat 2011) 57-76. On the Palau-Ribes collection see J. O'Callaghan, "Las colecciones españolas de papiros," *Studia Papyrologica* 15 (1976) 80-93; J. O'Callaghan, "El fondo papiroológico Palau-Ribes (Sant Cugat del Vallès – Barcelona)," *Aula Orientalis* 2 (1984) 285-288; S. Torallas Tovar, "Papirología en España hoy," in M.A. Almela Lumbreras, J.F. González Castro, J. Siles Ruiz, J. de la Villa Polo, G. Hinojo Andrés, and P. Cañizares Ferriz (eds.), *Perfiles de Grecia y Roma: Actas del XII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos, Valencia, 22 al 26 de octubre de 2007* (Madrid 2009) 1.155-165 (161-162); M.J. Albarán Martínez, "The Coptic Ostraca of the Palau-Ribes Collection: New Perspectives and Edition," in P. Buzi, A. Camplani, and F. Contardi (eds.), *Coptic Society, Literature and Religion from Late Antiquity to Modern Times. Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Coptic Studies, Rome, September 17th-22nd, 2012, and Plenary Reports of the Ninth International Congress of Coptic Studies, Cairo, September 15th-19th, 2008* (Leuven 2016) 1301-1315 (1303-1305); A. de Frutos García, "A Note on the O.Gerundense, Its Whereabouts, and the Formation of the Palau-Ribes Collection," *ZPE* 199 (2016) 128-130.

⁹ See the letter and the receipt issued by father Chaleur in Gil-Torallas Tovar (n. 8) 24-31, plates IX-XI.

¹⁰ This is highly unlikely, since the set of papyri bought by Roca Puig in Cairo in 1957 were lost before reaching Spain. See Ortega Monasterio (n. 8) 70-71.

diplomatic and an interpretative transcription integrating the other fragments with the text preserved in the Montserrat fragment preceding l. This papyrus confirms and corrects some of the conjectures in the lacunae on the left hand side of the text. In the interpretative transcription we will respect the line numbers of the edition in *P.Köln* 7.313 and in the commentary we will discuss the reconstructions proposed by previous editors.

P.Monts.Roca inv. 908

H × W = 13.2 × 3.8 cm

After 186 BCE
Oxyrhynchos?

→

1]αρα [

2]ατωντω [

3]ενεχε [

4] [

5] ονο [

6] [

7] [

8] traces [

9]γκλημα[

10]τεταχε[

11]εικαλεξαν[

12]ξε traces [

13]νους αφη[


14]λουτουςγωρ[

15]ναυτοιπαν[

16]τηςβασιλικη[

17]πατρικονμ[

18]γλημψεωστ[

P.Monts.Roca inv. 908 + *P.Kroll* col. 1 + P.Palau Rib.inv. 172a (= *P.Köln* 7.313)¹¹

[]αραλξιοι . [. .] . [. . . .] . [. . .] . [.] . . . τη[]

[καὶ ἐπιστ]ατῶν τῶν φυ(λακιτῶν) καὶ τῶν ἀρχιφυ(λακιτῶν) κ[αὶ

τῶν ἄ]λλων διὰ τὸ

[. .] ἐνέχεσθαι λείαις ἢ ἄλλαις αἰτίαις κ[αταπο]ρεύεσθαι εἰς

[τὰς ἰδία]ς ἀπολελυμένους τῶν ἐγκλ[ημάτων πλ]ήν τῶν

¹¹ We integrate here the readings from the three fragments. We present only the lines that have been affected by the match. For the full text we refer to the previous editions.

- 5 [. . . φ]όγους ἐκούσιους καὶ τῶν ἐκ τ[ῶν ναῶν καὶ τ]ῶν ἄλλω[ν]
 [ἱερῶν καὶ ἱ]ερῶν ἀποδοχίων σεσυληκό[των. . . ἀπο]λύει δὲ καὶ
 [ca. 9]των τεταγμένους καὶ τοὺς ε[τρατευομένου]ς καὶ τοὺς
 [ἄλλους ἐν] Ἀλεξάνδρειαι κατοικοῦντα[ς καὶ τοὺς ἐ]ν τῇ χώραι
 [τῶν ἐ]γκλημάτων καὶ τῶν ἀγν[οημάτων τῶν ἔ]ως Μεσορῇ
 10 [τοῦ 19 (ἔτους). προσ]τέταχεν δὲ [ἀ]πολῦσαι καὶ τ[ῆς ἐπι]γραφῆς
 καὶ τῆς
 [. . .] εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τοὺς . [. . .] αὐτῶν τοὺς τε
 [. . .] αξιῶς γενομένους καὶ τοὺς τοῖς χ . [. . .] . ἰσιν ἅτοι/ ἀφεσίμοι
 ἐπὶ-
 [γεγραμμέ]νους. ἀφίησιν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους κ[αὶ] τοὺς μισθωτὰς
 [. . .]λου τοὺς γεωργοῦντας τὴν βασιλικ[ή]ν γῆν τῶν ὀφι-
 15 [λημάτων ἐ]ν αὐτοῖς πάντων πρὸς τὴν ciτική[ν μί]σθωσιν καὶ τὸ χω-
 [ματικὸν] τῆς βασιλικῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ 19 (ἔτους) χωρί[ς] τῶν μισθωτῶν
 [τῶν εἰς τὸ] πατρικὸν μεμισθωμένων. ἀφίησιν δὲ καὶ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα
 [ἀπὸ τῆς ἐ]γγλήμψεως τῶν π[ρο]σόδων ἕως τοῦ αὐτοῦ χρόνου χωρὶς
 τ[ῶν]

“[King Ptolemy proclaims an amnesty to all his subjects ... by the] *epistatai* (superintendents) of the policemen or the chief policemen or the other officials, because they have been found guilty of theft or have been subject to other accusations, they shall return to their own homes free from their charges, except those guilty of willful murder or those who have plundered in temples, in other sanctuaries, or in the storehouses of temples.

[... The King] also releases ... those appointed to official positions and soldiers and the inhabitants of Alexandria and the countryside from their charges and faults for the period up to the month of Mesore [of the 19th year].

He has ordered to release those ... from the harvest tax and the ... to Alexandria and those who have been subjected to (*praxis*?) as well as those assessed(?) in the category of those subject(?) to exemption.¹²

He also releases all the others and the lessees, as well as royal farmers from their debts in respect to the farming of the grain-tax and the dyke-tax assessed on royal land for the period up to the year 16th except for hereditary lessees.

¹² For the reconstruction of this line and the unclear meaning of ἀφέσιμος, see Maresch and Merkelbach in *P.Köln* 7.313, commentary to ll. 10-13, pp. 70-71. See below, commentary to l. 12.

He also remits debts from the farming of money taxes up to the present moment, apart from...”¹³

1 Since the horizontal fibers are missing this line is almost illegible. Only the reading of a ρ is clear. Combining the traces with those in *P.Köln*, we are able to reconstruct ἀραξιοι, with a doubtful first α. We wonder whether this would correspond to a form of ἄξιος or the verb ἀξιόω or some form of the verb ταραύω. Accordingly, some of the proposed reconstructions should be rejected: ἀταξίαι, κ]ατάξιοι, and ταξιάρ[χ by Maresch (69) are not viable. H. Braunert (review of *P.Kroll, Gnomon* 32 [1960] 531-533, esp. 531, n. 2) suggests αξιοι; we read a word ending in ρ right before it. Cf. the formula καθάπερ ἀξιοι, *C.Ord.Ptol.* 62.7 and *BGU* 10.1910, Fr. B.

2 The reading of ατων is clear. Some traces follow, which match the traces of τῶν also preserved in the Cologne text. The Montserrat fragment completes a few letters of the word ἐπιτ]ατῶν proposed by Merkelbach; see Maresch (69).

3 From this line through line 9, the Montserrat fragment only presents the vertical fibers, while the Cologne fragment has the horizontal fibers with the text written on them, which should be superposed. The upper part of the letters ενεχε is still visible in the Montserrat fragment, while the lower part is in the Cologne fragment.

4 Only a tiny trace of a character from the text of this line survives in the Montserrat fragment. It remains completely illegible.

5 The Montserrat fragment preserves traces of letters which can be read as φονο. Hence it confirms part of the proposed φόνους.

8 The Montserrat fragment preserves some tiny traces of characters which might correspond with the top part of the first letters of Ἀλεξάνδρεια.

9 This line presents the reading]γκλημα which we interpret as ἐ]γκλημάτων. Therefore the edited line (*P.Kroll*) [τῶν ἁμαρτημ]άτων καὶ τῶν ἀγν[οημάτων τῶν ἔ]ως Μεσορή, based on *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53.2, needs to be corrected to [τῶν ἐ]γκλημάτων καὶ τῶν ἀγν[οημάτων τῶν ἔ]ως Μεσορή, as it clearly appears in the Montserrat fragment. As already

¹³ Maresch provides a translation into German in *P.Köln* 7.313 (pp. 76-78). A. Jördens provides another one in F. Breyer and M. Lichtenstein (eds.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* 2 (Heidelberg 2005) 374.



suggested by Passoni dell'Acqua,¹⁴ the fullest enunciation of the formula in an amnesty decree is found in *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53bis.2-6 and *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53ter.2-5: (...) ἀφιαῖα τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν βασιλείαν πάντας ἀγνοημάτων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐγκλημάτων καταγνωσμάτων αἰτιῶν πασῶν (...) πλὴν τῶν φόνοις ἐκουσίοις καὶ ἱεροσυλίαις συνεχομένων: "(They) proclaim an amnesty to all their subjects for errors, crimes, accusations,

¹⁴ A. Passoni dell'Acqua, "La terminologia dei reati nei prostagma dei Tolomei e nella versione dei LXX," in B. Mandilaras (ed.), *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25-31 May 1986* (Athens 1988) 2.335-350.

condemnations, and charges of all kinds (...) except to persons guilty of willful murder or sacrilege.”¹⁵ In copies of other amnesty decrees, this formula may appear in a different order or in an abbreviated form, as in, e.g., *C.Ord.Ptol.* 54 (= *P.Tebt.* 1.124) col. 2.23-24, from a group of decrees issued by Euergetes II (118 BC) concerning cleruchs. One of these concerns an amnesty for some offenses: ἀπολύ(εσθαι) (...) ἐγκ[λημ]ά(των) ἀγνοημά(των) ἀγνοημά(των) (l. ἀμαρτη(μάτων)) καταγνω(σμάτων) αἰτιῶν παρῶν ἕως τοῦ νῦν (ἔτους). The reading of the Montserrat fragment does not speak against such an assumption: lines 6-9 of the copy discussed here may thus feature an abridged version of the formulary of the *Generalamnestie*.

10 The Montserrat fragment confirms the reading *προς]τέταχεν*, at least in its last part.

11 In this line, the fragment adds the preposition: *εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν*, confirming Maresch’ suggested reading *τῆς | [εἰς]φορᾶς | εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν*, based on *C.Ord.Ptol.* 54.13.

12 This line preserves the bottom part of the letters *ξε*. There are two further traces that cannot be aligned with the traces in the Cologne papyrus. Unfortunately this fragment does not confirm or solve any of the suggested supplements by Koenen or Maresch. Further to the right in the line, the reading of a *χ* in the Palau Ribes fragment makes the reconstruction [*τε Ἑλλ]ησιν* unlikely. We wonder if something like *τοῖς χ[ρησθε]ῖσιν* can be read.

13 As in the rest of the document, in the Palau Ribes and the Cologne fragments, this fragment features punctuation spacing between *]νους* and *ἀφίησιν*, marking the beginning of a new period. The reading *]νους* confirms partly the reconstruction *ἐπι[γεγραμμένους]* suggested by Maresch (71).

14 The reconstructed *καί* does not appear in the preserved text in the Montserrat fragment, but a word ending in *-λου* precedes *τοὺς γεωργοῦντας*. We wonder whether this should be understood as [*καὶ τοὺς ἄλ]λου<ς>*. Otherwise *ἄλλος* in the genitive is difficult to explain here.

15 This line had been reconstructed by Maresch as *ὀφί[λημάτων] [τῶν ὄ]ντων πρὸς τὴν σιτικὴν [ν μί]σθωσιν*, based on *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53.10-13,

¹⁵ Translation of *P.Tebt.* 1.5 (= *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53) by R.S. Bagnall and P. Derow, *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation* (Oxford 2004) 95-100.

but we read [ἐ]ν αὐτοῖς πάντων. However, this new reading hardly changes the meaning. For the construction, cf. *P.Gurob.* 20.3; *P.Tebt.* 3.1.746.9-10; *P.Tebt.* 1.5.66-67; *P.Zen.Pestman* Suppl. E = *SB* 3.7222.46; *SB* 22.15766.13.

16 The edition supplies καὶ τὸ χωλ[ματικὸν τῆς αὐτ]ῆς γῆς, but the Montserrat fragment has τῆς βασιλικῆς γῆς. This confirms the interpretation by Maresch that this refers to royal land, although he prefers to supplement [τῆς αὐτ]ῆς γῆς. On the dyke-tax, see Kaltsas, *P.Paramone* 8.16n. (with bibliography). This is virtually the only example for the dyke-tax assessed on royal land.

17 The Montserrat fragment confirms the reconstructed πατρικόν.

18 The surface of the last part of this line in the Montserrat fragment is very damaged and we cautiously read γλήμψεως. We reconstruct [ἀπὸ τῆς ἐ]γλήμψεως τῶν ...

Two Fragments from the Palau Ribes Collection

Two further fragments apparently of the same decree belong to the Palau Ribes collection. They bear the same inventory number (172) as the Palau Ribes fragments edited by Daris, although admittedly we do not know whether he was aware of their existence. A palaeographical comparison with the known fragments of the decree reveals that the fragments are clearly written in the same hand. Moreover, our reading of some key legal terms may be taken as an argument in favor of the adscription of these new fragments to the decree. Both fragments were covered with plaster, since they come from cartonnage, and the reading in most of the surface is difficult. We cannot place them in relation to other fragments, and thus the reconstruction of the text is hypothetical.


2. P.PalauRib. inv. 172 c

H × W = 4.7 × 7.6 cm; top margin 1.5 cm; right hand margin 0.2 cm

This fragment might belong to the top right hand corner of column 1. The end of line 2 seems to be the right hand margin, since it features a blank space after the text, but we are not entirely sure whether this fragment presents the margin. Although the text is not substantial, we interpret it as referring to the amnesty for fugitives, comparing the text to that of *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53.6-9. The beginning of column 1 is supposed to deal with

fugitives and the crimes committed by them. Maresch (68) suggests the following text for the lacuna: Βασιλεὺς προτέταχεν τοὺς ἀνακεχωρηκότας ... which, if we are right, would be found to the left of our fragment.

- 1] . νους ἀπὸ τῶν
- 2] εἰς τὰς ἰδίας ἐν
- 3 ἐ]γκλημάτων
- 4] εκ . [.]
- 5] . α τους[.]
- 6] . ος . . παρεληλυ[.]
- 7 ἐν Ἀλ]εξανδρείαι κα[.]
- 8] ραι θανάτῳ[ι]
- 9] traces _____



2 εἰς τὰς ἰδίας: If the text concerns fugitives, this may be compared to *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53.6-9: προτετά[χα]ι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀνακεχωρηκότας δ[ιὰ τὸ ἐνέχεσθαι] | [λ]ήαις καὶ ἐτέραις αἰτίαις καταπορευομένους εἰς [τὰς ἰδίας].

3 See above, 1.9n.

5 The last four letters τους may stand for ἔτους, τους, or even ους[ι]. The context does not help in taking a decision.

6 The last traces can be read as παρεληλυ[, making this a form of παρέρχομαι. If it refers to time passing (cf. *PSI* 6.551r.4, *P.Entreux*. 46.3-4), it is not clear, since there is no context.

7 Perhaps ἐν Ἀλ]εξανδρείαι κα[ι ἐπὶ χώραι (cf. *C.Ord.Ptol.* 47.15) or ἐν Ἀλ]εξανδρείαι κα[ι κατ'Αἴγυπτον (cf. *C.Ord.Ptol.* 28.2-3).

8 We read θανάτῳ[ι which may refer to the death penalty.¹⁶ On the basis of similar texts we suggest reading θανάτῳ[ι ζῆμιούσθαι] or θανάτῳ[ι ἔνοχον εἶναι]. Apparently, in the Ptolemaic royal decrees dated to the 3rd-2nd cent. BCE, only royal functionaries were subject to the death penalty.¹⁷

¹⁶ On the death penalty, see A.-E. Veïsse, “Surveiller ou punir? Le contrôle des fonctionnaires dans l’Égypte ptolémaïque,” in L. Feller (ed.), *Contrôler les Agents du Pouvoir* (Limoges 2004) 104-111; F. Bluche, “La peine de mort dans l’Égypte ptolémaïque,” *RIDA* 3^e série 22 (1975) 143-175.

¹⁷ See Veïsse (n. 16) 109-110. For other references to the death penalty in royal decrees, see *C.Ord.Ptol* 73.6-7 (49/48 BCE).

• *C.Ord.Ptol.* 13.19 (= *P.Hib.* 2.198v.7.150, 269-268 BCE) too fragmentary¹⁸: θανάτῳ ζημιώσ[

• *C.Ord.Ptol.* 41.14 (145/144 BCE, Cyprus), decree by Euergetes apparently addressed to the royal functionaries who were abusively bringing people to justice: εἰ δὲ μή, θανάτῳ ζημιούσθαι

• *C.Ord.Ptol.* 50.28 (124 BCE): decree by Euergetes II ordering the sale through auction of the properties belonging to associations. Although the copy is too mutilated, the functionaries who disobeyed this order might have been subject to the death penalty: τὸν δὲ μὴ οὕτω ποιήσαντα θανάτῳ ἔνοχον εἶναι.

• *BGU* 6.1250.13-14 (2nd cent. BCE) referring to a decree, which established the death penalty for those functionaries who helped taxpayers to change their status in order to evade taxes: εἰ δὲ [μή, τὸν ποιήσαντα θανάτῳ ζημιούσθαι

• *P.Gen.* 3.136Av.1.7 (too fragmentary): θανάτῳ ζημιωθήσεται

• *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53.85-92 (118 BCE): decree by Euergetes II establishing the death penalty for royal functionaries who used false bronze measures in estimating the dues to the Crown: τοὺς δὲ παρὰ ταῦτα ποιούντας θανάτῳ ζημιούσθαι

For this formula in the first century BCE royal decrees see *C.Ord.Ptol.* 73.9 (79 BCE). See also *CPR* 28.14 Frs. 4,5,6,12.3-4 (125-50 BCE).

9 At the end of the line a horizontal mark looks like a *paragraphos*, used to separate sections of the text. These kinds of lectional marks however usually appear to the left of the text and in *ekthesis* into the left hand margin. Cf. *P.Tebt.* 1.5 (= *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53).

3. *P.PalauRib. inv. 172 d*


H × W = 10.5 × 8.2 cm; bottom margin 1.3 cm

This fragment preserves the bottom margin, and is thus the end of a column, but it is not clear in which order these columns were. The surface was partially covered by plaster, which has been removed as far as the material and the ink could bear.

¹⁸ See, however, the discussion in M.-Th. Lenger, *Corpus des ordonnances des Ptolémées* (*C.Ord.Ptol.*), (Bruxelles 1964) 25.

→ -----
 1] . ηςτη[
 2] . ρ [. .] παραπεπρακό[τ
 3] πεποηκότας τὸς μὴ ἀπο[
 4] ηκοντα κτ[] η εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἐννο[μίου
 5 τοὺς γε] γεωργηκ[ότα]ς τὴν βα(σιλικήν) γῆν ἀπο . [
 6] των καὶ τῶν ἄλλων [
 7 το]υ ἔτους πρακ . . . [
 8 illegible traces

5 β^a pap.



2 Παραπράσσω means “to exact money/taxes illegally”; cf. in Ptolemaic times *SB* 16.12519.7-8 and *P.Giss.Bibl.* 1.2.24; later *P.Brem.* 2.6 and *SB* 16.12678.16. Our decree probably concerns illegal tax exaction. Cf. *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53.155-167. See above 2.8n. But this may also be interpreted as a form of παραπιπράσσω “to sell at a reduced price” or “to sell illegally.”¹⁹ The insufficient context does not allow a trustworthy interpretation.

¹⁹ Cf. *P.Giss.Univ.* 1.2.12 and 24; D. Bonneau, “Le sacrifice du porc et Liloïtion en Pachôn,” *Chr.d'Ég.* 66 (1991) 330-340.

4 We propose to read κτ[ήν]η, which combined with the possibility of reading ἐννο[μίου] at the end of the same line, suggests the taxes on pasturage and registration of herds. The text is too fragmentary to reconstruct. One would expect a noun like ἀναγραφὴν in the lacuna to the right following ἐννο[μίου], but as said, with great caution.²⁰

5 βα(κιλικήν) appears abbreviated with an alpha standing on top of a *beta*. Other references in the same papyrus (col. 1 ll. 14, 27) are written in full. This deviation however does not seem substantial enough to reject the identification of this fragment as belonging to the decree.

5-6 τοὺς γε]γεωργηκ[ότα]ς τὴν βα(κιλικήν) γῆν closes a section, and the following ἀπο[λύει] probably opens a new period: “The King release so and so from *x* dues.” The genitive in the following line refers to the tax.

7 το]υ ἔτους πρακ . . . [: It is unclear whether το]υ may be read as the article or as the ending of an adjective in the genitive, like δεκάτου. The traces following πρακ are not clear enough to decide if it stands as an abbreviation of some form of πράκτωρ.²¹ We wonder whether this refers to the πράκτωρ ξενικῶν in his role of vendor of slaves from the Revolt.²²

²⁰ On ἐννόμιον, pasturage tax, see C. Préaux, *L'économie royale des Lagides* (Bruxelles 1939) 223-229; A. Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation in Early Ptolemaic Egypt: Demotic Land Surveys and Accounts* (P. Agri). (Bonn 2012) 27; W. Clarysse and D.J. Thompson, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt* (Cambridge 2009) 2.207. On registration of animals in Syria and Phoenicia, see *C.Ord.Ptol.* 21-22 (260 BCE).

²¹ For this office acting in the Ptolemaic period as bailiffs, see W. Clarysse, “The Archive of the *praktor* Milon,” in K. Vandorpe and W. Clarysse (eds.), *Edfu, an Egyptian Provincial Capital in the Ptolemaic Period* (Bruxelles 2003) 17-27, esp. 22.

²² See *SB* 20.14659. 8-9; *C.Ptol.Sklav.* 5. 15-18. See Veisse, *Les “révoltes égyptiennes”* (n. 2) 166-170, esp. 168-169 n. 47, with further discussion and bibliography.