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Preface

In the month of September in 1906, Emil Brugsch Pascha, Curator of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, was kind enough to send me photographs of a Demotic papyrus which he had seen in Cairo in the possession of Mr. Edward Drummond Libbey of Toledo, Ohio. Since it appeared from the photograph that this was a document of unusual importance I asked the owner of the original for a new reproduction, and he very kindly sent it to me with the permission to publish the papyrus. I wish to express here to Mr. Libbey my most sincere gratitude especially as the new text possesses a most extraordinary interest in several respects. I have, therefore, considered it my duty to make it accessible to scholars as soon as possible, and I am indebted to the "Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft in Straßburg" for having supported this the chief purpose of my publication.

For the sake of speedy publication the philological notes have been made as brief as possible; but I have tried, in my commentary to elucidate the significance of this new papyrus in its bearing upon history and upon the history of civilization. On the other hand, I have refrained from further juridical comments, since in that case it would have been necessary to enter into a new philological investigation of the now very numerous Demotic marriage-contracts, an investigation which lies beyond the scope of the present paper. He who wishes to inform himself about marriage in ancient Egypt according to the present stage of our knowledge may be referred to the literature quoted in the foot-note. The marriage-contract from the Strassburg Library dating from the time of the Ptolemies (Plate II) and in connection with it the ostrac from the same collection, which I have brought to bear upon the Papyrus Libbey, are intended to be a new contribution to the material thus far known.

1) The papyrus has since been donated by M. Libbey to the Museum of Art at Toledo, Ohio, where it is now to be found. It was purchased at Luxor, and it measures 0.605 x 0.16 m.
2) The reproductions on Plate I and III, I have been made from this excellent photograph.
In the year I, in (the month of) Athyr, of King Khâbâb shu, has said the lady Set-syer-bono, daughter of Peteharpokrates and of Semminis to the Pastophoros of Amon of Karnak in Western Thebes, Teos, son of low and of ens-gar_p e_khat:

Thou makest me (thy) wife, thou givest me 5/10 silver (-d'ben) = 21/2 staters - I repeat 5/10 silver (-d'ben) - which belongeth to these 5/10 silver (-d'ben) - which thou givest me (as) my dower.

If I discharge thee as (my) husband, hating thee and loving another more than thee, I shall give thee 21/2 tenths silver (-debën) = 11 1/4 staters - I repeat 21/2 tenths silver (-debën), which belongeth to these 5/10 silver (-d'ben) - I repeat 5/10 silver (-d'ben) - which thou givest me (as) my dower.

cede unto thee 10 lis of all and everything that I shall; 1

Translation.

5) = acqovn. C.L. Sethe: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens III, 94 sqq.
6) See Recueil de travaux XXIII, p. 99, ann. 2.
8) The scribe has erroneously anticipated the later following r Â for and forgotten to correct his mistake by cancelling the letters.
9) In the translations smaller type is used for uncertain words.
10) In hieroglyphic characters:

11) = about 1 dollar, i.e. half of the dower.

12) Literally: "I go away from thee (with)". This is a
acquire with thee as long as thou art married to me). Receive the copy of the above text in another papyrus. I have it drawn up. I affirm every word written above according to the present document. I shall complete it with 109 witnesses. I give it to thee — I shall not be able to fix another date for thee than the above — without negotiating with thee in any way in writing or easily.

"Written by Ptolemaeus, son of Ptolemaios".

Of the 16 names of witnesses which had signed according to 1.3, only the following 5 are preserved on the back (Plate III, 1); they are all autographs:

1. I. Peter (i) . . . son of Ptolemaios (1)
2. I. Satis, son of Wesperis (Apries)
3. . . . son of Thibis
4. I. Thoilea (i), son of Ptolemeios
5. I. the koi-sell priest (?) in Thebes, Amenemopis, son of Tese

II. 6 sqq. are desintegrated.

**COMMENTARY.**

The ruler from whose reign the Papyrus Libby is dated has heretofore been known from two contemporary monuments 1) only. Our papyri is the first Demotic document to bear his name. Except on the few contemporary monuments the name of King Hibis is met with also in an edict 2) of the year 312 B.C. issued by the satrap Polyene, later on King Polyene I Soter who gave back to the gods of Buto a temple-district which had belonged to the gods from the days of old, but had been confiscated during the time of the Persian rule, "the district of the goddess Buto". The edict tells about the earlier history of this temple-territory as follows:

1) When this great prince (i. e. the satrap Polyene) wished to be beneficial to the gods of Upper and Lower Egypt, his following and the great ones of the Delta told him:

The marsh-land called "the Land of Buto" was given (once) by the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Son-Tum-ap-n Pth 3), the son of Re, Hibis, living for ever, to the gods 4) of P. Dpr). After His Majesty (viz. Hibis) had marched to P. Dpr, when he visited the marsh-land all around on his journey in the Delta, when he inspected each branch of the Nile that flows into the Mediterranean Sea in order to keep away the Asiatic (i. e. Persian) fleet from Egypt.

Then said His Majesty (viz. Hibis) to his following: Inform me about this marsh-land! Now they related before His Majesty: The marsh-land called "the Land of Buto" belongs to the gods of P. Dpr of old, before the wicked Xerxes (Xerxes) 5) confiscated it. He offered no sacrifice in it (viz. the marsh-land) to the gods of P. Dpr.

The technical terms of the documents of tradition; see Spiegelberg, Die demotischen Papyrus der Staatbibliothek, p. 10, ann. 8.

1) Literally: "say thy time of being husband to me, which thou shalt make".

2) "he (i. e. to be husband, to be married)" is a technical term frequently used in the contracts of the Persian period (Pap. Berl. 3073, 3077, 3079, and elsewhere). Here, hi is to be supplied.

3) With regard to mi of Tho. papyri, 3, 10, 16 mi hi µj µj a µj a without "write it to me".

4) Also the Demotic Papyrus I of Strandberg of the time of Alexander the Great bears the autograph signatures of 16 witnesses. With regard to the word µj of Pap. Low. Sb 440.Verso (after Log. K in Revis. Egyptol. V, Plate 22) where at the end of the 16 names of the "list of names of witnesses that are written under this writ" there is written "in order to make full 16 men".


6) See: Uxurton I, 1 sqq.; for the first time recognized and translated by H. Brugsch (Ägypt. Zeit- schrift IX, 1 sqq.).

7) In Egyipt. Per-awet, in Coptic Wawetos, also in the name of the mother of god Phis. Cf. Brugsch: 1. c., p. H. and 36., and Giorgi: de l'Aig. Egypte, p. 387.

8) "likeness of the god Ptah (surname of the god Phis of Memphis) chosen by Phis".

9) These are the gods called elsewhere "the Souls of Buto", whose prototypes Seehe (i. c.) has recognized in the kings of the oldest dynasties before the union of the two empires.

10) The two quarters of Buto, the history of which is given by Sethes: Untersuchungen III, 12.

11) This is probably a confusion with Artaxes; cf. below, p. 9.

12) The same writing of µj is to be found in Erk. II, 48. 5. All the following are titles of the god Harendodes (i. 13) who is represented in the upper part of the stela.


14) Literally: "is known". This seems to indicate that even at the time of the satrap Polyene at the side of the cult-image of Neit of Saia there was an inscription in which the murder of Xerxes (Artaxerxes III) and of his eldest son was mentioned — perhaps called the vengeance of the goddess. This sentence would then be a parenthesis like the well-known phrase in the Old Testament which says that some town was called so and so "unto this day" (e. g. Dett, 3, 14). In Egyptian here we read for "to-day" literally "on this day", the same expression used in the I. 13 for the time of the satrap Polyene.

15) Saia is called Sia in Nej/j also in Paterne: Naukratis II, 28, 1c. I. e. the name of the goddess Neit.

16) Here also must refer to the god, viz. Harendodes; in the same way it is used in several other places, e. g. Nile. Naples 1, 12. Naukratis X No. 34, 35, 91, 111, 118 (ed. Chassinat). The meaning is probably: Lead me according to thy will that I live, and not die like the wicked Xerxes (Artaxerxes) 3).

17) rd; written erroneously in the same way as in I. 2.

18) Often not expressed in Egyptian, cf. Recueil XXIX, 57 ann. 1. Thus Canopus 6, rd rd; "given" corresponds to Greek euktiorein.

19) Following I. 20 Hibis had added a donation of his own in the restored old property.

20) The priests ask Polyene: "给你 is (i. e. Hibis) restoration repeated in thy name"?


22) This text itself is written by an official scribe.

23) Plate III, and Plate X (Verso) of the publication.

24) This proper name is probably contained also in 25) (correctly 25) in Marucchi Catal. Vatican. 181, 198, 239.
Since the name of the father occurs very seldom, it is very plausible to take both notaries to be the same person, all the more plausible as the script of both documents belongs to the same period, or at least furnishes no objection.

Thus the same *Pektahres*, son of *P* - *P* - *P* - *P*, was notary in the first year of the reign of King *Ibulb* and in the year before the death of Alexander the Great (324 B.C.). It is, therefore, impossible to date the first of the two rulers before Xerxes (486-465), since the same notary cannot have lived before 486 B.C. and after 324 B.C., and Prof. Wileken’s interpretation of the above text is brilliantly confirmed by the document under discussion.

Now, the king of *Ibulb* is not found among the rulers of the dynasties XXXIX—XXX covering the time from 398 until 342 B.C., and for this reason he must have reigned either before 398 or after 342. If we adopt the former date, the term of *Pektahres* would have lasted at least from 398—342, but probably very much longer, and this is very high impossible. Consequently *Ibulb* must needs be dated after 341, since only in this way a normal term of the office of the notary is gained. *Ibulb*, therefore, must have reigned between the years 342 and 332, i.e. in the decade before the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great, the last epoch of the Persian rule when Artaxeres III Ochus (342—339), Arsies (339—336) and Darius III (336—331 B.C) reigned shortly after each other. This last period of the foreign sway is shrouded in darkness. Taking account the internal weakness of the declining Persian empire, and especially the quarrels over the succession after the death of Ochus, we are led to believe that during this whole time the foreign rulers reigned over the subdued country only with the utmost difficulty, perhaps only nominally 5).

Under such political conditions it must have been easy for an enterprise prince to do away with the foreign dynasty which then was weak and which was bitterly hated since the last revolution had been cruelly suppressed by Ochus. *Ibulb* succeeded in this, at least during a period of two years 6), and during this time he reigned over the whole of Egypt down to the Mediterranean Sea.

For from the inscription of the satrap Polyomus (cf. above p. 2) we learn that he inspected the fortifications at the mouths of the Nile in order to be ready against an attack by the Persian fleet. His throne-name indicates a special connection between him and Memphis, and it would be natural to suggest that he had his residence there in the ancient capital.

So far we have no record of the way in which the new king succeeded in his daring enterprise, but perhaps the name of the king may give us a clue. It has been remarked several times 7) that *Ibulb* — vocalized perhaps *Kleb* - *Kleb* - *Kleb* — is not an Egyptian name. It seems to me that it bears so much resemblance to the known names of the Ethiopie Dynasty, to *Klebe*, *Klebe*, *Klebe*, *Klebe*, that in all likelihood the king may be taken to be an Ethiopian. If this suggestion should be confirmed, we might conclude that the Ethiopian king *Klebe* - *Klebe* making a wise use of the vacuities of the Persian rule kept the throne of the Pharaohs for a time — at least for two years — in the same way as more than 400 years before his time another Ethiopian king, *Psanubi*, under a similar combination of circumstances had conquered Egypt and ruled over it for a brief period 8).

1) No reference to this name is given in Liebel: *Dikt. de noms hiérog.*
2) Perhaps our notary occurs as contracting party in a papyrus of the Louvre (Corp. papyr. V, No. 4) dated in the 39th year of Alexander the Great.
3) It is characteristic of this period that none of the names of the three kings has so far been found in a contemporary inscription.
4) Äg. Zeitschrift IX, 13.
5) See the references in Maupier: *Histoire des peuples de l’Orient classique*, III, 714, foot-note.
6) Between the two forms there was a clearly pronounced vowel. A lengthened 5 (with *Dagsh forte*) would not have been indicated by a double 5; also in the Dacot is it written twice. The common form *Khab-keb*, is, therefore, wrong, I think.
7) Attention may be called to another fact which furnishes the opportunity of a new combination. The last native king Sennakösios (*Klebe-keb*) fled from the approaching Persian army with his treasure to Ethiopia (Diodor. XVII, 54). It is not impossible that he had a hand in the Ethiopian invasion.
8) It is certain, however, that this Ethiopian episode is not to be placed at the end of the Persian rule: for when Alexander the Great appeared in Egypt, a Persian satrap, named Mazarës, 9), handed the country over to him without fighting.

As is shown by the stеле of the satrap, the Ethiopian king followed the approved method of so many foreign rulers before and after his time: he revered the Egyptian gods, a very effective policy after the brutal persecution of the gods by Artaxeres III Ochus 10), to which, as I am led to believe, the above mentioned inscription refers. For I have found (— *Xerxes*) of the stèle of the satrap stands for Artaxeres, assuming that in this text written long after the Persian period the better known name of Xerxes has been substituted for the less known name in the same way as in some other cases 11).

The following considerations speak against the assumption that Xerxes is meant here. First, even if Xerxes, according to Herodotus (VII, 7) “made Egypt much more enslaved than it had been under Darius”, yet he respected the religious feelings of the Egyptians, whereas the inscription asserts the opposite. Moreover, on the one hand the name of the king is not surrounded by the royal cartouche, which is always put around the name of the true Xerxes in the contemporary inscriptions, but is followed by the determinative indicating bad people (ennemies, criminals). And it seems to me impossible that the Egyptians of a later period considered Xerxes to be a sacrilegist as is indicated by the inscription and the determinative of the name, for this reason: nowhere on the monuments there have there been discovered any traces that his name was intended to be scratched out or anything of that sort. On the other hand, the text as well as the passionate determinative of the name of the king are entirely in keeping with the feelings left by Artaxeres in the hearts of the Egyptians on account of his cruel policy. Secondly, it is utterly improbable and almost inconceivable that the temple-land confiscated by Xerxes should have been handed over to another after the very short reign. For the restoration of the secularized temple-property was always one of the first deeds by which, after the time of foreign sway, the new national era was inaugurated 12). But all the difficulties disappear if *Hérod* is taken to mean Artaxeres. He may be considered as having secularized the

The confusion between Artaxeres and Xerxes was very natural during the time of the rhetors; for the rhetors know only one Persian king except Cyrus and Dareios, i.e. *Xerxes*. The name of Artaxeres is not given by a single rhetor. It is significant that even Xenophon in the Hellenika gives his name only in the official document of the peace of Antakia (V, 31). Xerxes was known as an individual king by the year 480, but his successors were known to the Greeks only under the name of *Ańkoleb*, Ahut in the same sense as many parts of the Old Testament speak of Pharaoh. The official documents contained in the genuine Greek inscriptions give only *Ańkoleb*, never the proper name. Even in Aristophanes the word Artaxeres is never found, with *Paro* only in the doubtful *Alkibiades I*. It is therefore very easily understood that in tradition the less known name was corrupted to the well known name of Xerxes (cf. the instructive variant reading *dăpēs* for *āspēs*. Schol. Aristoph. Alk. 84). It is only a learned interpolation that in the extracts from Kleias the name of *Xerxes* was replaced by Artaxeres.

Papyrus Harris 75, 5 sqq. Cf. with this Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie égyptienne: XXXII, 37.
As important as the Papyrus Libbey is from a historical point of view, it is of equal value for the history of civilization. The wife has here such a precedent — one is tempted to say matricrural — position as is known to me only from the following Papyrus of the Berlin Museum).

TRANSLITERATION.

| §1. The wife shall be able to obtain it by force.
| §2. I give thee 2 silver (µδης) as a downer.
| §3. I give thee moreover every year a contribution towards thine alimony, in kind and in money.
| §4. If I discharge thee as (my) wife, hating thee and taking another one I shall give thee 10 silver (µδης).

(During the later Ptolemaic period: 1))

1. I make thee (my) wife.
2. I give thee 100 silver (µδης) and 10 artabas of wheat as a downer.
3. The oldest son is to be the heir of the entire common property, present and future.
4. The husband signs a receipt of the dowry which is specified in all details and estimated (δ) in its money-value,
5. and which remains at the free disposal of the wife.
6. At the time when I discharge thee as (my) wife, or when thou wilt in order to give thine own free will, I shall give back to thee thy dowry, as above, in kind or its value in money as written above.
7. The husband shall not be able to deny the receipt of the dowry under oath in court.
8. The wife shall be able to obtain it by force.

The latter scheme of which naturally many variant forms are extant in proportion as the conditions of life, the social position and the means vary, may be illustrated by a new document which a few years ago became part of the Strassburg collection of papyri.

1) I wish to sound a note of warning here regarding a combination which on the first moment seems plausible, viz. the identification of our ἤρωδ with Ἠρωδας (Arrian: Anab. II, 11, 8), among the Persian satraps the second from the last, who was killed at Issus. First, this is impossible for phonetic reasons, since ἤ cannot be rendered by ἤ. But above all the name of a Persian satrap surrounded by the royal cartouches is absolutely inconceivable. For even the satrap Ptolemy, the actual ruler of Egypt under Alexander IV., could not claim the royal cartouche, as is shown by the stile of the cartouche.


3) P. Pap. 3078 (Plate II of the Publication of the Berlin Demotic Papyri). — This papyrus is, by the way, the oldest marriage-contract known thus far. For the document herebefore claimed to be such (Corpus papyr. No. 7) is in reality a contract concerning the hiring of a slave-girl. If the text is corrected read and interpreted, it contains no reference to marriage.

4) The same group for σι "lord" is also found in Corpus papyr. 22, 1. It is furthermore contained in the royal name Μεο-ομ-Πθ (Seite 4; a) of a transliteration of this name, where σισσεται and vare, is furnished now by the papyri of the time of Ptolemaios Euergetes I. In one of the treasuries of Egypt, I found by O. Rubensohn at Elephantine. Probably the Demotic form is nothing but Μελο-ομ-Πθ, "beloved of Ptah". The reading proposed by G. (S. P. B. A. 1901, XXIII, p. 16) is therefore to be corrected.

5) Cf. A. Zeitschrift XXXVII, 32.

TRANSLATION.

1) The lady Ἰᾶα (τι), the daughter of the chieftain of the valley (i.e. necropolis) Khnophodres τος and of Ττο-ομ-νθ- τυα, to the chieftain of the valley Ττο-ομ-νθ-τυα, the son of Πο-ομ-πθ-τυα and of Πο-ομ-πθ-τυα:

Thou makest me (thy) wife to-day, thou givest me ½ a silver (µδης) from the treasury of Ptoh, cast, as my downer. If I discharge thee as (my) husband I hating thee and taking another one more than thee, I shall give thee ½ a silver (µδης) from the treasury of Ptoh, cast, as my downer. If of this ½ a silver (µδης) from the treasury of Ptoh, which thou hast given me as my above downer. I code unto thee, all and everything that I shall acquire with thee, without negotiating with thee in any way in writing.

"Written by Ἀρνησθάν, son of Νεριας Ἑρωδορίας."

On the back there are four autograph signatures of witnesses.

In order to appreciate the special character of these two marriage-contracts it is necessary to compare with it the scheme of the Ptolemaic age, in which the husband speaks to the wife about as follows: 2) (During the early Ptolemaic period:)

1. I make thee (my) wife.
2. I give thee 2 silver (µδης) as a downer.
3. I give thee moreover every year a contribution towards thine alimony, in kind and in money.
4. The oldest son is to be the heir of the entire common property, present and future.
5. If I discharge thee as (my) wife, hating thee and taking another one I shall give thee 10 silver (µδης).

(During the later Ptolemaic period: 1))

1. I make thee (my) wife.
2. I give thee 100 silver (µδης) and 10 artabas of wheat as a downer.
3. The oldest son is to be the heir of the entire common property, present and future.
4. The husband signs a receipt of the dowry which is specified in all details and estimated (δ) in its money-value,
5. and which remains at the free disposal of the wife.
6. At the time when I discharge thee as (my) wife, or when thou wilt in order to give thine own free will, I shall give back to thee thy dowry, as above, in kind or its value in money as written above.
7. The husband shall not be able to deny the receipt of the dowry under oath in court.
8. The wife shall be able to obtain it by force.

The latter scheme of which naturally many variant forms are extant in proportion as the conditions of life, the social position and the means vary, may be illustrated by a new document which a few years ago became part of the Strassburg collection of papyri.

1) Not Imros, of Recueil XXVIII, 201.
2) This passage proves clearly that Ἰᾶα is not, as suggested, a word for "betrothed", but, as is also indicated by the older literature, is a synonym for "wife".
3) r (? or n) µδης in the same meaning Corpus papyr. No. 15, 4.
4) After Papyr. Berlin 2469 (Plate VI).
5) About 400 dollars. — The woman in question is of very modest means.
7) About 600 dollars. — This represented a total value of 1480 silver (µδης) about 5920 dollars.
Demotic Papyrus Strassburg 56 (Plate II).

Light-brown. H. V. 0.26 from the right end a small strip is wanting x 0.25 m, with a joint in the middle.

Translation.
In the year 33 on the 20th [of the month of] Pharamuthi, of King Prolemy, the Beneficent God, the son of Prolemy, and of Queen Cleopatra, her sister, and of Queen Cleopatra, her wife, the Beneficent god, and of the priest of Alexander and of the gods that save her, and of the Fraternal Gods 5, the Beneficent Gods 6, the Father-loving Gods 6, the Illustrious Gods 6, the God whose father is noble 6, the Mother-loving Gods 6, the Father-loving God 7, the Beneficent Gods 6, and (under the priestess) who carries the victory 6, and (under the power) of Bereunike the benefactress 8, and (under the goddess) who carries the golden basket before Aminet who loves her brother 9, and (under) the priestess of Aminet who loves her father 10, as they 5 are nominated in R hồ and in Post in the name of Thebes.

Has said the scribes of Amom of Karnak in Western Thebes, I, [Scribe], daughter of Spotus and Themenos: I make thee (my) wife, I give thee 10 silver (+dress) = 50 [sisters], I repeat 10 silver (+dress) = 24 (copper) bonds (at the rate of) 1.00 (+dress) = 15 as thy dowry, which thou hast brought into my house —

One... (§staff)$^9$
One...
One...
One...
One...
One...
One...
One...
One...

— 24 copper bonds (at the rate of) 1.00 (+dress) (moreover)

One...
One...
One...

Rebuilt, thy dowry which thou hast brought into my house amounts to 1930 silver (+dress).

$^9$ = Oties Epytretyn.
$^9$ = Oties Epytretyn.
$^9$ = Oties Zyrhretyn.
$^9$ = Oties Ablaphos.
$^9$ = Oties Epemitw.
$^9$ = Oties Filakophoros.
$^9$ = Oties Phileakophoros.
$^9$ = Oties Aminet.
$^9$ = Oties Epytretyn.
$^9$ = Oties Filakophoros.
$^9$ = Oties Phileakophoros.
I have received them (i.e. these things) from thee, complete without remainder. My heart is content with it.

If thou wilt best to go of thine own free will as not to be a wife to me, I shall give thee the value of thy dowry described above, which amounts to 1930 silver children, whom thou hast borne unto me, and the children whom thou wilt bear unto me, are the owners of all (and) everything that belongs to me and that I acquire with thee, without negotiating with thee in any way in writing or orally.

Written by Onosepis, son of Kolophus, the substitute of Kolophus, son of Pahs, who writes in the name of the 5 classes of Amorrasonathus and of the gods that are united with him.

Below this

Amorrasonathu mu-t-(']ep(e) eic dwryw(e)Lyv wqmpwtk k').

On the back (Plate III, 1) there are the following 16 signatures of witnesses all written by the same notary:

1. Thothes, son of Khekeisk
2. Penukhis, son of Pohki these
3. ... ?... son of Anoumis
4. P'to-b(?) (t), son of PotFewhepes (t)
5. Pethos, son of Petahepes
6. [Pto']apathes, son of Ptohepes
7. Harpeta, son of Panses
8. Pthain, son of Anathus
9. Phorhokhthos (?), son of Ono........
10. ... ?... son of Sokh......
11. ... ?...
12. Onosepis, son of P's-W'er
13. ... ... son of Totes
14. Khekenik, son of Horeius
15. Penukhis, son of ?.......
16. ... ?.....

In connection with this papyrus the following ostracoon (D. 110) of the Strassburg collection may be published (Plate III, 2).

---

![Image of the page with text]

---

**TRANSLITERATION.**

1. tj-i-s p: wn n: nk-t
2. n': b[j][m-t n X-mht-s t' Wnsnfr mw-t-s
3. Swmt]t'-t
4. w' (?') mnw
5. ko (?') mnw
6. lunt(?) dbm(?)
7. 3 ste [n b]t 50 r p: the
8. w't nurb
9. w't knfue
10. k t kdwes
11. w' b? t
12. w' s'oe
13. w' b. 100
14. r bt 100
15. r bt 2080

---

**TRANSLATION.**

"List of the inventory of N-arkht, daughter of Onosepis and of Ser'nt(?)

1. 1 piece (?) of mace-stuff (?)
2. 1 other piece (?) of mace-stuff (?)
3. copper ... 
4. 3 (vessels) — each 50 silver (?-diben)
5. 1 mortar (?)
6. 1 other (vessels)
7. One knfue
8. Another knfue
9. One ... 
10. One brassier

Total 2080 silver (?-diben)"

This list of the dowry of a woman was probably afterwards incorporated in the marriage-contract.

---

Returning after this digression to the Papyrus Libby we notice at once the difference between its wording and that of the documents of the Ptolemaic period. The conditions have been wholly reversed. In one case the wife rules, in the other the husband, the formula are — mutatis mutandis — almost literally the same, except that in the first case the wife speaks, in the other the husband. But we must be careful not to draw from this single case general conclusions with regard to a change of the marriage practices in the different periods — conclusions that would imply that at the time of Alexander the Great when the Greek spirit entered Egypt, Greek law also entered and changed the position of woman which in Egypt always had been very free. For}

---

This group looks like "h'mu" or the like, or the like, but that gives no satisfactory sense.

The same expression is found in Demot. Pap. Strass. 43. 8. Literally: "I give it, (viz.) the list": the object is anticipated by the suffix, as is often done in older demotic documents (e. g. Corpus papi. No. 25). This is a peculiarity of the younger language. Cf. Junker: Grammatik der Demotatexte § 270.
it is certainly only accidental that thus far we have two contracts from the Persian period in which
the wife predominates. The bills of divorce issued by the husbands, which date from the same
period\(^1\), prove clearly that at that time also there were marriage-contracts drawn up in which the
husband appeared in the same role as in the Ptolemaic age. On the other hand, even in the Greco-
Roman period the older form of the marriage-contract did probably exist, although at present we
have no documentary evidence for it. This is plainly indicated by the well known passage from
Diodorus (I, 27)\(^2\) who gives the report — often questioned — that in Egypt among the middle-
classes the wife ruled over the husband and that this was expressed by the fact that in the marriage-
contract the husband promised implicit obedience to the wife. We learn now what the actual con-
ditions were upon which the report of Diodorus is based, i.e. such marriage-contracts as Pap. Berlin
3078 and Papyrus Libbey. Probably at all times these contracts were in use as well as those of
the other form which is considered — without evident reason — to be the specifically Ptolemaic
form. It is better not to venture any suggestion about the cases in which the two different forms
of the contract were chosen, because the material at hand is not sufficient to answer this question.
It may very well be accidental that in the two documents of the Persian period the contracting
persons are of very moderate means. We must, therefore, wait for new material, and for the present
be thankful for the light which the Papyrus Libbey has thrown on the problems connected with a
period of which hitherto very little has been known to us.

---

\(^1\) Cf. Pap. Berlin 3076, 3077, 3079; see the translation in the text, p. 5.

\(^2\) καὶ παρὰ τοῖς διαδόταις κειμένων τῆς γυναικείας κυριαρχίας.
1
Papyrus Libbey — Verso.

2
Demot. Pap. Strasbourg 56
Verso.