A Ptolemaic Lease Contract:
P.Monts. Roca inv. no. 381 + 569 + 578 + 649*  
S. Torallas Tovar and K.A. Worp

This collection of fragments belonging to a single Greek document measures together approximately 30 x 27.5 cm. After serving its original purpose as a so-called hexamartyros syggraphê the papyrus was apparently used for the production of mummy cartonnage. This observation is supported especially by the polychrome traces on the back of inv. 649, the fragment that is the largest and contains most of the left hand margin of the document. Written along the upper margin of the papyrus sheet in a very small and almost illegible script one finds a copy of the text of the document, the so-called scriptura interior, that was signed by the witnesses and then was rolled up. Below this comes the scriptura exterior that was to be left visible after the scriptura interior of the hexamartyros syggraphê had been rolled up.2

The document is dated to the 34th year of Ptolemy VI Philometor and Cleopatra II, Hathy 12. Using the conversion tables produced by T.C. Skeat, the precise date turns out to be 9.xii.148 BC.3 The priests mentioned are:4

Priest of Alexander and the deified Ptolemies: Kλυκλῆs (Kalliklēs), son of Tywkrōs (Diokratēs or Theokratēs)  
Athlophoros of Berenike Euergetis: τοφnύα (Ergonōē), daughter of Anaxandros  
Kanephoros of Arsinoe Philadelphos: ισχλψα (Asklepia), daughter of Ptolemaios  
Priestess of Arsinoe Philopator: Πανθήνα, daughter of Isokratēs  

Clarysse and van der Veken give as the sole attestation of this set of priests P.Cair. II 31179.5 This papyrus from Montserrat offers some important new data in addition to the information already given by Clarysse and van der Veken.6

---

* We want to express our sincere gratitude to the Benedictine community of the Abbey of Montserrat for allowing us to publish this piece here, especially to Father Pius Tragan, who always received us at the monastery with generosity. We also sincerely thank our colleague Brian P. Muhs for polishing our English text.


2 Both texts are virtually the same. In the transcript of the scriptura interior we include in parentheses the line number of the scriptura exterior corresponding to the text in the interior. In the notes to the text we use the same procedure.


Analysis of the scriptura exterior:

1–5: Dating formula of Ptolemy VI Philometor and Kleopatra II, indication of various priesthoods filled by various priests;

5–6: Indication of date [12 Artemisios = 12 Hathyr] and place [the village of Hephaistias in the Arsinoite nome];

6–7: Opening of the document (a lease of land) presenting a description of the two parties concerned: 1. Herakleides, son of Nikanor, for a certain Euboulos, member of the King’s inner circle and owner of a dorea near Hephaistias; 2. Petosouchos, son of Phramenis, inhabitant of Arsinoe;

8–11: Indication of the term of the contract (1 year) and of the amount of land involved: 15.25 arouras of wheat land, split up into 2 plots, (1) of 11 arouras at a rent of 4 art. / ar., and (2) of 4.25 arouras at a rent of 5.6666 art. / ar.;

11–13: Obligations in case of normal irrigation: Petosouchos takes care of sowing at his own expense; he will also pay the rent in full, even if he quits the lease early;

13–17: Warranty of the lessors (Herakleides, respectively the representatives of Euboulos) that in case of failure to meet with their obligations they will pay a penalty of 20 talents and the damages, while the lease will not be terminated;

18–19: Clauses concerning date of paying the rent, the place of delivery [Hephaistias], the quality of the wheat to be handed over and who is bearing the cost;

19–24: Provision for the case that Petosouchos does not provide any wheat for payment of rent: he shall pay a penalty of 1000 drachmas per artaba, or the highest market price at Hephaistias;


27–30: Listing of the six witnesses: 1. Pamênis, a priest; 2. N.N. and 3. Diodoros (both Persians) and 4. Kallias (a Thracian), all three members of the 2nd cavalry regiment under the command of Aratos and holders of a plot of 100 arouras; 5. Dorotheos; and 6. Ptolemaios, both members of a cavalry regiment and Macedonians; keeper of the contract is Pamênis;

31–32: Subscription by Ptolemaios;

33–34: Subscription by Petosouchos;

34: Subscription by Pamênis,

35: Resumé of most essential data of the document

---

5 _P.Cair.dem._ II 31179 = F. de Cenival, _Les associations religieuses en Égypte d'après les documents démotiques_ (Cairo 1972) 63; see now also _P.Köln_ IV 187, also featuring the patronymic as Anaxandros instead of Alexandros presented by our text.

6 For leases of land in general, cf. D. Hennig, _Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht im ptolmaisch-römischen Ägypten_ (Diss. Munich 1967). See in particular p. 27 for the rate of the rent; pp. 80–81, 92–93 for a list of penalties to be paid by whomsoever (lessor or lessee) breaks the contract; and pp. 185–190 for a list of 2nd century BC leases from the Fayum.
A Ptolemaic Lease Contract
Scriptura exterior

Εὐριπίδε[ν ἑ]τοὺς τετάρτου [καὶ] τρι[α-
κοστοῦ, ἐφ'] ἱερ[είας Καλλ[ικ]λε[ῖος τοῦ Διοκρ[ίτου του Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ] θεῶν Σ[ω]τήρ[ῶν καὶ θεῶν 
Αδε[λφῶν κ]αὶ θεῶν Εὐφρ[ίου τ]ῶν
2. καὶ θεῶν Φιλοπατ[όρ]ῶν καὶ θεῶν Εὐριπίδε[ν καὶ θεῶν Εὐστ[έρ]ᾶτόρος [καὶ] θ[εῶν 
Φιλομυστ[όρων, ἀθλομο[ι]φόρου Βερ[ε]νίκης
Πτολεμαίου
Ἀρτεμι[σίου δι[ο]δεκάτη
t]
νόρος τοῦ προετοιμα[στός τῆς] Ἐὐβοῦλο[ῦ τῶν <πρώτων> φιλο[ν διορ[ε]άσεις Πετοσού[χοι] 
τέταρτον κ[αὶ
t] τριακ[οιο-
7. τὸν ἔτος ἐκ[αυλίου τὴν ἄρωμαν ἐκάστη]
8. τοῦ παρ[χόν καθαρά'] ἕαν δὲ μὴ κατασε[παί] τῆς] 
9. φθοράς' βρεχε[ίσθη] δὲ τῆς γῆς ταύτης κατασπερά[τω] τ[ὴν γῆν Πετοσούχοι] 
10. τοῖς πατ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
11. τοῦ παρ[χόν καθαρά'] 
12. τοῖς κατασπαρεί[θ] 
13. τοῖς πατ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
14. τοῖς πα[τ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
15. τοῖς πα[τ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
16. τοῖς πα[τ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
17. τοῖς πα[τ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
18. τοῖς πα[τ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
19. τοῖς πα[τ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
20. τοῖς πα[τ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
21. τοῖς πα[τ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι] 
22. τοῖς πα[τ[όροι[ο]ς Πετ[οσούχοι]
And when the land has been sown, Herakleides and Euboulos’ representatives must guarantee to Petosouchos and his representatives the lease and the land [and the crops?] for the agreed period of time. (15) If he fails to guarantee the lease as written above, the above mentioned Herakleides or Euboulos’ representatives, being partners in the guarantee, shall pay a fine of twenty talents of bronze, and the
damages and this lease must be no less authoritative. And Petosouchos must be allowed to evict in return anyone who forces his way onto the land, without being liable to any penalty. If the lease is confirmed, Petosouchos shall deliver to Herakleides and the representatives of Euboulos the stipulated rent in the month (20) of Pachon of the same year and he must hand over the crop in the same village [---] Euboulos, wherever they order, in new, pure and unadulterated grain … (transported) to Hephaistias … at their own expense. And for each artaba which he does not deliver, Petosouchos shall pay immediately a fine of one thousand drachmas of bronze or the highest price that may be charged at the market of Hephaistias. (25) Let there be for Herakleides and Euboulos representatives the right of execution on the person of Petosouchos himself and on all his possessions, as according to the regulation and the laws. This contract is authoritative. Witnesses: Pamênis, priest; NN; Diodoros, both Persians; Kallias, Thracian, all three of them hekatontarouroi from the second hipparchy of Aratos; Dorotheos; Ptolemaios, both Macedonians of the Epigone. (30) Keeper of the contract, Pamênis, priest.

I, Herakleides, have leased out in accordance with what is written above and have deposited the contract with NN son of ---souchos
I, Petesouchos, have leased in accordance with what is written above and have signed the contract.
I, Pamênios, have received (the contract in deposit).

1 (1) For the regnal formula, see P.Köln IV 187.1 and SB III 7188.1. The formula never appears to have τῶν ἐκ Πτολεμαίων κτλ., which is sometimes restored by modern editors (cf., e.g., P.Gen. II 87.1, SB V 7632.1 and XVI 12373.1).

The priest of Alexander and the deified Ptolemies is attested in Demotic as Klyklês (Kalliklês), son of Tywkrts. Clarysse and van der Veken (op.cit. [n. 4]) transliterate this second name as "Diokratês or Theokratês." We venture to think that "-krits" may also stand for Greek names in "-kritos"; hence we should be dealing, then, with a Greek name Diokritos or Theokritos. Our papyrus in the scriptura exterior presents an incomplete and partly doubtful reading of which only the letters omikron, kappa, rho, and iota are more or less secure, while a more doubtful reading of delta + iota seems more attractive than theta + epsilon; hence we propose to read Διοκρήτου. This name does not appear in the usual papyrological onomastica nor in W. Pape and G.E. Benseler, Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen (Brunswick 1862–70), but it occurs in P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews, Lexicon of Greek Personal Names (Oxford 1987) I 135 (an attestation on Rhodes); the Epigraphical Database of the Packard Humanities Institute (see http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/) gives an extra attestation from another Greek island, i.e. I.Cret. I xxi 4A.7 (III BC).


3–4 (4–5) In P.Köln IV 187.7 (146 BC), the father of Ergonoê appears to be Αὐνάξανδρος. We have verified the reading and conclude that somewhere a misunderstanding must be at hand. The kanephoros Asklepias, daughter of Ptolemy appears in P.Cairo II 31179 (= F. de Cenival, Les associations religieuses en Égypte d’après les documents démotiques [Cairo 1972] 63). Asklepias was the athlophoros the
preceding year in *P.Meerman*. 3 + P.dem. Wien Kunsth. Mus. inv. 3874, ined. Apollonia daughter of Isokrates held the priesthood of Arsinoe Philopator a number of years (Clarysse and van der Veken, *op.cit.* [above, n. 4] nos. 142–145c) as attested by various demotic documents. She is attested in Greek also in *P.Köln* IV 187 (and restored in a lacuna in *SB* XXIV 16054 [145 BC]).

4 (5) In the lacuna at the end of the line in the *scriptura exterior* we restore the name of the Macedonian month corresponding to Hathyr 12 in l. 6 as Ἀρτεμίσιον δωδεκάμη. Cf. the *scriptura interior*, l. 4. Cf. in general A.E. Samuel, *Ptolemaic Chronology* (Munich 1962) 129–130, and the situation in *SB* XVI 12373.5 (158 BC): Audnaios 8 = Epeiph 8.

5 (7) The titulature τῶν πρῶτων φίλων appears in l. 5 of the *scriptura interior*. In the *scriptura exterior* there is a lacuna following τῶν φίλων, but one can hardly think of an inversion of the words into τῶν πρῶτων φίλων. To date, an Euboulos "of the first friends" is unknown. He does not appear in the *Pros.Ptol.* nor in L. Mooren, *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt. Introduction and Prosopography*. Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren XXXVII, Nr. 78 (Brussels 1975); id., *La hiérarchie de cour ptolémaïque. Contribution à l'étude des institutions et des classes dirigeantes à l'époque hellénistique*. Stud.Hell. 23 (Louvain 1977). For a later development concerning the title "of the first friends" see J.F. Oates, "Equal in Honor to the First Friends," *BASP* 32 (1995) 13–21.

6–7 (10) For the rent level, cf. Hennig, *op.cit.* (above, n. 6) 27.

9–10 (13–14) One would expect here a wording like βεβαιούτωσαν Ἡράκλειδη καὶ οἱ παρ’ Εὐβούλου Πετασόουχω καὶ τοὺς παρὰ Πετασούχω τὴν μύθωσαν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς καρπούς ἐπὶ τὸν συγγεγραμμένον χρόνον (cf. parallels such as *BGU* VI 1264.26–27; 1266.33–34; 1267.17; X 1943.16–17; 1949.5–6; XIV 2383.14; 2384.15; 2390.27; *P.Frankf.* 1, Int. 41–42, Ext. 45–46; 2, Int. 30–31, Ext. 36–37 and *P.Hib.* I 90.16–17; although these Ptolemaic texts are mostly from the Oxyrhynchite or the Herakleopolite nomes, rather than from the Arsinoite). The reading καὶ τὴν γῆν ἑαυτ[ ] on the *scriptura interior* seems clear enough, but as parallels are lacking we cannot find an explanation for this; maybe the solution should be found in cancelling the last letters, ἑαυτ, after which we may carry on with καὶ τοὺς καρπούς, etc.


12–14 (18–23) The corresponding passages in both texts are difficult to reconcile. The *scriptura interior* has:

```
```

A Ptolemaic Lease Contract
while the exterior has:

Βεβαιομένης δὲ τῆς μισθώσεως | π[α]ραδότων Πετ[ο]σούχ[ο]ς Ἡρακλείδη ὁ τοῖς [παρ’
Εὐβουλ[ο]ν τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα ἐκφόρια ἐν μηνι[ν]ιν Π[αχών] τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔτους καὶ
παρα[δότῳ τὰ γεν[ὴ]ματα ἐν τῇ [αὐτῆ κόμη [. . .] | [. . . . . . .]. οἱ γ[. . .]ργοι
τα ἐς Ἡ[φαίστ]ιαδ[α [. . .]ν απ[ε]γν [. . . .]ν τοῖς ἴδιοις | ἀνηλώμασιν

For the general wording of the text compare:

_P.Yale_ I 51.22–24 (cf. ll. 10–11):

ἀποδιδότωσαν δὲ [Ἀγαθοκλῆς καὶ [Ἡρακλῆς Πετεβεντήτει κατ’ έτος τὰ ἐκφόρια ἐπὶ
ἀδ[ο]λον μέτρωι δικαίωι μετρήσει δικαίωι καὶ καταστήσαντες τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀ[νη]λώμασιν εἰς
Κερκου[σχα] ὃν Πετεβεντήτης συντάσσοι καὶ ἐὰν μὴ ἀποδώσει τὸν πυρ[ὸν καθά]
προγέγραπται ἀποτεισάτωσαν [Ἀγαθοκλῆς καὶ [Ἡρακλῆς Πετεβεντήτει ἐκάστης

_P.Ambh._ II 44.29–34 (cf. ll. 9–11):

οὗ ἄν Πύρρος συντάσσοι c ? πυρὸν νέον ἀδ[ο]λον καθ[αρόν ἀπὸ [παντὸς c ?
| [c ?]ωι μετρήσει δικ[αία c ?
| [c ?] ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀποδώσει καθά γέγραπται ἀποτεισάτω] παραχρήμα e [, c ?
| [c ?] τὴν ἑσομε[ν] [πλειστὴν]
| [τὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγοραὶ τιμῆν c ἢ δὲ πράξεις ἕστω] Πύρρῳ τῷ [κατὰ τὴν]
| [συγγραφῆν πράσσοντι παρά τε c] καὶ ἕκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀυτῶ[ι] πάντων καθάπερ ἐκ
dικῆς

_PSIX 1098.20–26:

βεβαιομένης δὲ τῆς μισθώσεως μηθέν παρασυγγραφοῦντος ἀποδότωσαν αὐτοὶ οἱ
με[λ]ι[σ]θομένοι Ἀρίστων τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἐκφορίων ἐν μηνὶ Παύνι τοῦ δευ[τέρου] ἔτους
καταστήσαντες τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀνηλώμασιν εἰς τὴν π[ρ]ογέγραφ[αμ]ί] [κόμης Τεβτύνειν οὗ
tῆς κόμης τετραχοικῶι δ[ρ]ομ]ο] μετρήσει δικαία

_P.Tebt._ I 105.39–42:

tὸ δὲ διασεσαφήμενον ἐκφόριον κατ’ ἕτος ἀπ[ο]δότω Πτολεμαίος Ὁρίων ἡ τοῖς παρ’
a[υ]ς παύνι ἀποδιδότω πυρὸν νέον κ[αθ] ἀρόν ἀδ[ο]λον ἀπὸ πάντων μέτρωι
ἐξαχοικῶι δρόμῳ τοῦ ἐν τῇ προγέγραφ[αμ]ί] [κόμης Σουρχείου μετρήζει δικαία
καταστήσας εἰς τὴν αὐτήν πρός Ὁρίωνα οὗ ἄν συντάσσοι>e ν] τῇ αὐτῆν] κόμη το[ις]
ιδ[ιο]ς ἀνηλώμασιν.
P.Tebt. I 106.26–29:
καὶ τοῦ χρόνου διελθόντος παραδειξάτω ἃ καὶ παρείληφεν καθαρὰ [ἀπὸ θρύσου καλάμου]νάγρωστεως τῆς ἀλλης δείσης, τά τε κατ’ ἔτος ἕκφορια ἀποδότω [Πτολεμαίος Μάρωνι κ. 5 ἐν μηνὶ Π]αυνί ἐν τῇ σημαινομένῃ κώμῃ οὐ ἄν Μάρων [συντάσσῃ κ. 15]υποίσου καὶ λόχων μέτρωι τῶι πρός τό ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ [τοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ Σουχείου].

On the basis of these parallel texts one expects in our text a wording like οὐ ἄν συντάσσωσαι πυρὸν νέον καθαρὸν αἵολον μέτρω δικαίῳ μετρήσει δικαίαι καὶ καταστήσαντες εἰς Ἡφαιστίαδα τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνηλώμασιν.

13 (19–20) According to ll. 19–20 of the scriptura exterior, the scriptura interior should read ἀκροίρια ἐν μηνὶ Παχών τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔτους καὶ παραδότω τὰ γενήματά ἐν τῇ. But since there is a line written above the text, it may be assumed that the scribe first forgot and afterwards inserted part of this text.

In the scriptura exterior, l. 20, two different months could possibly be restored, Pachon or Pauni. Moreover the month should be the harvest month. For the wheat harvest in Roman Egypt (late Pharamouthi [= April] – early Pauni [= June]) see P.W. Pestman, *The New Papyrological Primer* (Leiden 1994) 316–317. Here, however, we are in Ptolemaic Egypt, and that at a moment when Hathyr 12 is December 9th, rather than November 8th or 9th (in a Roman leap year). Consequently, all Egyptian calendar data in this text fall approximately one month later in Roman Egypt. It follows that a supposed harvest date in P[auni] would fall effectively in Epeiph, i.e. during the rise of the Nile: not a particularly apt season for collecting harvests etc. Accordingly, the month name most likely to be restored in this Ptolemaic text is that of Π[αχών], which equals Pauni in Roman Egypt.

15 (25) There is a gap in the text of the scriptura exterior l. 25 of ca. 1 cm between the words καὶ and τοῖς.

17 (27) A Diodoros, Πέρσης, appears in *BGU* VI 1254.1, a complaint sent to the κομογραμματεύς of the village of Hephaistias in 154/3 or 143/2 BC. (cf. *Pros.Ptol.* II 2778, p. 106). He belonged to the second hipparchy (a cavalry unit) under the command of Ἀρω[...]κεφων. The reading of Ἀρω[...] should most probably be taken as a misreading for Ἀράττου, alpha and omega being often very similar in Ptolemaic hands.

No doubt, the first of these two commanders (cf. *Pros.Ptol.* II 1858, p. 8) must be identical with the Aratos mentioned in our text. There is an Aratos in the *Pros.Ptol.* II 1850 (p. 7), who seems to be an eponymous officer in *P.Tebt.* III.2 971.21 (150 BC).

On military personnel, see F. Übel, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemaeern*, (Berlin 1968), and for the foreign ethnicities (Thracians, Persians, Macedonians τῆς επιγονῆς) see C.A. La'da, "Foreign Ethnics in Hellenistic Egypt," in *Pros.Ptol.* X (2002) 87ff. (Thracians) 229ff. (Persians; our Diodorus is La'da's # E 1984 on p. 232), and 201ff. (Makedônes τῆς επιγονῆς).

Ext. 32, 34 One might expect συγγραφὴν κυρίαν, as in other examples of the formula found while searching the *DDBDP* for τεθείματα (cf. the 2nd century BC Fayumic texts *BGU* VI 1271.14; *P.Meyer* 2.5; *P.Oslo* III 140.5; *P.Tebt.* I 105.61; III.1 818.30; *P.Würzb.* 6 Ext. 39; *SB* VIII 9679.3; XVI 12372.22), but this does not seem to fit the traces.
One expects the name of the συγγραφούλαξ Pamēnis, but the traces seem to belong to a name starting with Φ-, perhaps followed by a mother's name Θευπετοσούχος.

Ext. 35 We think that in this line at least the elements ια, δ[ DEVICE], δδ and εβ refer to elements, in particular numerals, mentioned already earlier in the preceding contract. The numerals ια (= 11) and δδ (= 4.25) may be taken to refer to the number of arourae in each of the two plots of land referred to, while the first delta (= 4), must be, then, the rent paid for the first plot at four artabae per aroura, and the letters εβ (= 5 2/3) indicate the amount of rent for the second plot of land. The first numeral, however, δδ (= 4) must be, then, the rent paid for the first plot at four artabae per aroura, and the letters εβ (= 5 2/3) indicate the amount of rent for the second plot of land. The first numeral, however, 15 (= 16) is a mystery; as we do not see what this refers to (a σφραγίς numeral is not mentioned in the text itself) the function of the μ( ) is equally uncertain (it is unlikely to represent an abbreviation of μισθός) and the last word is not fully readable. While we cannot come further than reading μεμ . . . , we think that this must be a perfect form of the verb μισθώ. As we are at the end of the scriptura exterior, at this place the whole function of such summary of some important elements in the lease raises questions; such a summary, after all, may be expected rather on the verso of the text. Maybe these indications served as an aide-mémoire for the scribe who had to devise phrasings for the whole contract, i.e. the scriptura interior and, after that, the scriptura exterior?
Pl. I

Pl. II

Plates I–II
Plate III