

JOHN SHELTON

TWO NOTES

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 82 (1990) 122

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## Two Notes

(1) SB XVI 12769 is a receipt for ἐπιγραφὴ τοῦ ζ (ἔτους) paid by two groups of men. According to the edition, one group pays κατὰ τὸ α(ὐτὸ) (ἔτος) (line 3), the other κατὰ τὸ α(ὐτὸ) ἔτος (4-5); the editors translate “pour la même année” and do not comment on the strange use of κατὰ.<sup>1</sup> On the plate at the end of the article I read κατὰ τὸ (ἥμισυ) and κατὰ τὸ ἥμισυ; i.e., each group paid half of the tax. For the expression cf. eg. P.Med. inv. 83.03 lines 6-7 (*Aegyptus* 68,1988,16 with ZPE 78,1989,300); *WB* I col. 741, foot.

In l. 4 of the same text the name of one of the parties is transcribed as Ὡρος ηοιος. It has been proposed to interpret the last letters as “brachylogic for ἡ οἶος ἂν καλῆται” (*Aegyptus* 65,1985,36). On the plate it looks like Φίβιος.

(2) SB XVI 12776 is a receipt issued by the tax farmer of the ἕκτη on fruit trees in the Apollonopolite, similar to O.Edfu 241 from the same man a few weeks earlier. According to the transcript the tax farmer stated the area but not the year for which he was responsible, although this is a standard part of such receipts and was not omitted from O.Edfu 241. I suggest following the pattern of the latter text and reading <sup>2</sup>τοῦ Ἀπ[ο(λλωνοπολίτου)] | <sup>3</sup>εἰς τὸ μς (ἔτος) instead of <sup>2</sup>τοῦ Ἀπ[ο(λλωνο)πολ(ίτου)]. The plate shows that the ink is faded, but there seems to be no serious objection to the expected text.

In line 4 the plate shows ἀδελ(φοί) rather than μέτ(οχοι), and as the text is drafted in epistolary style the verb in l. 5 should be resolved τετά(ξασθε) instead of τέτα(κται).<sup>2</sup>

Trier

John Shelton

<sup>1</sup> D.Devauchelle and Guy Wagner, “Ostraca ptolémaïques bilingues d’Edfou”, *ASAE* 68 (1982) 89-101, at p. 93. For the date (14 June 163 BC) see E. Lanciers in Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology (Athens 1988) II 408.

<sup>2</sup> Similarly read τέ]τα(ξαι) for τέ]τα(κται) in O.Edfu 241.4; the same verb form is required in O.Edfu 367.5, and replace αὐτῇ with σοι in the restoration in l. 6 there. One tax collector from Edfu does incorrectly use the 3rd person in this formula (WO I pp. 61-63) in BGU VI 1210, but there is no need to assume that this was the case in the other texts. Indeed, the σοι in O.Edfu 241.5 shows that the tax collector there, who issued SB 12776 as well, used the 2nd person.