Notes on Egyptian Census Declarations, IV

For the purpose and scope of these notes, see the first installment in *BASP* 27 (1990) 1-14.¹

31. *BGU I 58*

Although corrections in *BL* 1.13 improved the text of this declaration from Karanis (census of 159/160), they made no dent in the problems of reconstructing its lost right half (about 15 letters in most cases, as Viereck already saw) in a coherent fashion. The text below incorporates these improvements along with further suggestions in an effort to recover as much of the family structure as possible from the surviving indications.

¹This installment is devoted entirely to papyri in Berlin. I am greatly indebted to William Brashar and Günter Poethke for their assistance and hospitality during my visit to Berlin (10-19 April 1991), during which these (and many other) papyri were studied. I have not specifically noted cases in which the bracketing practice of the early 20th century in Berlin (and elsewhere) has been tacitly corrected; much that today would be read dotted was bracketed then. But where I do not give a new text, I do not report such cases separately.
7-8 τόπον: BL 1.13. It is not a normal location, but I have not been able to find a better term to restore.

11 The restoration here is a bit too long, but there must be a first brother lost, perhaps with a very short name; some abbreviation is also possible.

13-14 Perhaps other brothers; in line 14, perhaps a γέρφαίον. It does not seem possible to reconstruct these lines.

15-16 It is not clear who Thermouthas is; perhaps the wife of one of the brothers.

17 τό is puzzling, and given γεγονόταν after it, it must be an error for τόν. Perhaps the writer had τέκνον in mind when he wrote, but that term is generally used only when multiple children of both sexes are to be listed.

21 NN here is one of the brothers mentioned earlier.

24 The reading at the start of the line is sound; perhaps this is the end of a name rather than its entirety.

30 See BL 1.13 for the correction addition of Καίσοφρος to the titulature; but that gives a total of 23 letters, which is too long. Given constraints of space, one must assume either that the scribe omitted a word or that he abbreviated both. I print the latter on principle, but without any confidence that this is what was actually written.
The overall shape of the household is thus clear. The declarant, Pasoxis, registers himself, probably at least three brothers, a woman who may be the wife of one of them, his son by his divorced wife, and a daughter of one of the brothers by his divorced wife. The mention of property belonging to the declarant’s mother in lines 26-27 suggests that she may have been mentioned somewhere in a lacuna, perhaps in lines 13-14.

32. BGU I 117

The enumeration of persons other than the declarant and his wife (lines 7-9) was not reconstructed by the editors of this declaration (census of 187/8) as far as is possible. The key is the mention of a wife of Satorneilos in line 14, even though no person of this name has been mentioned earlier in the preserved text. The two possibilities for restoring it are lines 10 and 11, but the name in 10 ends in -ων at the start of line 11. Satorneilos, then, must be restored in 11, and the text then falls into place:

καὶ τὰ ἔξ ἀμ-
10 φοτέρων τέκνα, υἱῶν Ὄριωνα γεωργῶν [(ἐτῶν) . . . καὶ . . .
. . .]
. . .ων ἄλλον υἱὸν γραμματέα (ἐτῶν) ἢ, καὶ [Σατορνεύλου ἄλλον]
12 υἱὸν μη(τός) Σαραπούτοσ τῆς Ὄριωνος γεωργῶν (ἐτῶν) . . , καὶ
[θυγα.-]
[τῇ]έρα Ἀρποκρατίανον μη(τός) θαυμαρίου τῆς
[προγεγραμμένης]
[(ἐτῶν) .] σύναν γυ[να]κα τοῦ Σατορνεύλου καὶ ὁμοπάτριου]
[ἀδε]λφῆν, καὶ ἐξ ἀμφότερων υἱὸν Σατ[ορνεύλου (ἐτῶν) . . καὶ]
16 [θυγα]τέρα Σατορνύλη (ἐτῶν) ἢ, καὶ Ἀρτεμιδώ[ρα τῆς καὶ]
Διοσκο-]
ροῦν ἄλλην θυγατ[έρα Διοσκόρου τοῦ [προγεγρ(αμμένου)]
[μη(τρός) θαυ-]
ρίου (ἐτῶν) κ, καὶ Τασσοχάριον ἄλλην θυ[γατέρα (ἐτῶν) . . , καὶ . .
. .]
[, . . θαυ[. . .] . . . [. . ἀπότομα (ἐτῶν) κ[θ]
20 Σαραπούνι ἀπότομα (ἐτῶν) η, διὸ ἐτιδῖδωμι.]
First Dioskoros the declarant records two sons by his current wife Thaisarian, who is probably a freedwoman. The younger of them is 17. Then comes a son Satorneilos by a previous wife Saraphous; then a daughter Harpokritaina by the current wife. This daughter is married to Satorneilos, her half-brother. The age of neither is preserved, but their son and daughter are listed, the latter being 14. We may thus expect Harpokritaina to be in her late 20s or older. Part of her age survives in line 14. The most attractive reading palaeographically is the right part of a kappa like that in line 18, but this is obviously impossible. Zeta seems next best, though uncertain. An age of 27 would be young but not impossible; 37 is probably more likely.

There follows a 20-year old daughter of the declarant, evidently again by the current wife, and then still another daughter, probably also by Thaisarian. The next two lines preserve two fragmentary entries for ἀπόστορος aged 29 and 8, whose connection to the rest must remain conjectural; they are too old to be children of Tasoucharion.

33. BGU I 118

Column I of this papyrus contains a strip from the right side of a declaration (census of 187/8), from which, Wilcken estimated, some 40-50 letters (two-thirds to three-quarters of the original) were lost at the left, making any comprehensive restoration impossible. Wilcken read the declarant’s signature in line 20 as Νεμεσίλλα ή καὶ Ἰσι-, but another phrase in line 17 suggests a different reading. There, Wilcken read Ἰλπη καὶ Κυρίλλα, for which he offered no restoration. A word division between ιη and τη, however, suggests instead Ἰη τη καὶ Κυρίλλα. The letter before the first lambda is in fact almost surely another one; and, on the other hand, what Wilcken read as ιαι in line 20 is actually κυ. The dative in 17 is, coming shortly before mention of some other properties but after the persons, suggestive of the normal formulation: ὑπάρχει δὲ τῇ Νεμεσίλλῃ τῇ καὶ Κυρίλλᾳ. In line 20, therefore, read Νεμεσίλλα ή καὶ Κυρίλλα. Given her signing, it is likely that she is in fact the first person named in line 4, where one will restore εἰμί δὲ Νεμεσίλλα ή καὶ Κυρίλλα ἡ προγεγραμμένη (ἐτῶν) ἔθνος.2

2The numeral in line 7 is also overlined (κη), not noted in the edition. Some other minor notes: line 10, restore γενομένης; line 21, καθόσερ > καθως; iii.18, δια Π.; > διὸ ἐπίδεικνυμι.
34. BGU I 119

This piece has only the lower right corner of a declaration from the census of 173/4, which the editor interpreted as being a report of renters, reading in line 4 κρατ᾽ οἶκ(ων) ὑπογραφ(αφὴν) ἐνοικ(ων). The standard formula, however, would be τοὺς ὑπογεγραμμένους ἐνοίκους (or singular, as appropriate). And the lacuna in line 5 before διό ἐπιθ(ἰδωμι) is not likely to have been larger than 8-12 letters, since διελημμεθ(ὸντος) was almost certainly abbreviated like nearly everything else in this text, perhaps even to διελ( ) or διελῆλ( ). That is hardly enough to give a proper listing even of one person.

The solution is simple: instead of ἐνοικ(ων), read ἐν οἶς, followed in the lacuna by [οὐδεὶς]. No one was registered in these properties. The plural points up the fact that multiple properties were declared, and in line 2 for ξυραι read ἱ ποι; the half-share is at least the second property mentioned, but there may have been more.

35. BGU I 122

This declaration, addressed to the basilikos grammatheus of the Herakleides Division, was dated by Wilcken simply to the second century. The name of the royal secretary was read [. . .] ἑλλη, which did not (and still does not) correspond to the name of any known holder of the office in a year when census declarations were filed. Bastianini and Whitehorne report G. Poethke’s view that the eta is not certainly raised above the line, and they thus suggest reading Ἡρακλης ἑλλη as an error for Ἡρακλης ἑλθη, the basilikos grammatheus in 147.

This was a very shrewd proposal. The similarity of lambda and delta in many hands, however, raises the suspicion that the fault may not be the misreading of an exemplar by an ancient scribe but of the papyrus by moderns. Under magnification, the right end of a horizontal bottom stroke is visible, perhaps all that was made. In the delta of Διος, line 7, only a bit of the left diagonal stroke was ever made. We are therefore justified in reading [Ἡρακλης ἑλθη] and accepting Bastianini-Whitehorne’s date of 147 (for the census of 145/6).

3The lacuna in lines 6-7 and 9 is 10-12 letters.
4Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt (Pap.Flir. 15, 1987) 121.
36. *BGU* I 131

Although Wilcken offered a couple of restorations for this desperate scrap, broken at top, left, right, and below, more can be recovered and restored in the opening lines:

\[\ldots\] έμαυτήν καὶ in line 6).

Wilcken restored [γραμμα]τεύσι and χωρίς κυρίου etc. In 1, the μυ[η]τροπόλεως has a descender through it which probably comes from a line above. What remains obscure is why the declarant does not register herself (for there is certainly no room to restore έμαυτήν καὶ in line 6).

37. *BGU* I 137: A Ghost Name?

The lower part of this declaration from 147 is preserved only in a narrow strip at left, and reconstruction is impossible. It appears that lines 14-17 included a list of the renters whom the declarant mentioned in line 8. Line 17 is presented by Wilcken as follows:

\[\chiαριδήμου\, \deltaω\]

This is, as far as I know, the only instance yet reported from Egypt of a supposed name \chiαριδήμου; whether it existed at all seems uncertain.\(^5\)

\(^5\)Nothing in *NB, Onomasticon*, Pape-Benseler, Solin, *Prox.Ptol.*, or the Duke Data Bank. Fraser and Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* I 481 cite one example from Eretria, a stela which has simply the name in the nominative.
NOTES ON CENSUS DECLARATIONS

The well attested name with this beginning is of course Χαρίδημος. It is obviously tempting to separate the letters differently here: Χαρίδημον ὄω, a reading which has the additional advantage that the name is then in the accusative, the expected case for declared persons. The reader of census declarations will see immediately that an element beginning ὄω- after a name is likely to be ὄωτης, perhaps abbreviated as in line 15, ὄωτης(ν). There the iota before omega is written cursively with it, in a manner identical to that here. I read, therefore, Χαρίδημον ὄωτης(ν).

It may be noted that in *P.Mich.* IV 224.5882 the editors refrained from expanding Χαρίδημος( ), perhaps holding open the possibility of Χαρίδημον, despite their reading of Χαρίδημος in a whole series of other places. That is all the more striking in that it is there the patronymic of a Tapeheus; Charidemos son of Leonides and Tapeheus is well attested in this roll. There seems no good reason, then, not to resolve Χαρίδημος(ν).

38. *BGU* I 182

This papyrus contains a declaration from the census of 145, followed by one from that of 131. Krebs gave a semi-restored edition, with drifting margins. The following text incorporates corrections in *BL* 1.24 and 7.10, along with some new readings.

[Μαξίμω τῷ καὶ Νεάρχῳ] στρ(ατηγῷ) καὶ Ἡρακλείδη βασιλείας ὄω(ματεί) Ἀρσε(νίτου)
[Ἦρακλ(είδου) καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσι μητροπόλεως καὶ | - - - - - - - - -]
[παρὰ - - - - - - ] τῆς Πτολεμαίου τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἀπογεγραμμένης]
4 [δι' ἔτερον ὑπομνήματος ἐπὶ ἀμφόδου Ὀρίωνος Ἰερακίου μετὰ κυρίου]
[toῦ (relation) Ὅριος ὑπάρχει μοι ἐπὶ ἀμφόδου (e.g.) οἰκία] ἀνθρώπημα] τοῦς ὑπὸ γεγραμμένους ἐνοικοὺς εἰς τὴν ζεύγυρες(ηλιοθότος) θ(έτους) Ἀντωνεἰου]
[Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου κατ' οἰκίαν ἀνθρώπημα ἀμφόδου ἐπὶ τοῦ προκειμένου ἀμφόδου | - - - - - - - - - -]
8 entirely lost
The restoration of 16 is as suggested by Bastianini-Whitehorn 25.

39. BGU II 302

This declaration from the census of 1736 was submitted by a woman named Methe daughter of Panameus and Thaumastes, who describes herself as 32 years old. The loss of something less than half of the declaration at right makes reconstruction of the household difficult. From the fact that she is the declarant it is probable that Methe has no husband resident. The difficulty of reconstructing the household centers around her mother Thaumastes, who was listed in lines 16-17, and who is 48 (the eta is dotted, but no other reading seems possible). Wilcken reconstructed matters on the basis of lines 17-18, which he read

(ἐτών) μη, καὶ τὸν τῆς Θαυμαστῆτος ἄδειλφον . . . . .

6The name of the basilikos grammateus has still not been read (it is badly preserved); cf. G. Poethke ad Bastianini-Whitehorn 131.
NOTES ON CENSUS DECLARATIONS

ϕιν Αὐρηλίου τοῦ Ὅρσεως μητὶ(ρός) Τεφορσάτως (ἐτῶς) . .

He further assumed—it is not actually stated—that Thaumastes and Panameus had been brother and sister, and he thus restored Aurelius as Methus' grandfather's name, i.e., Panameus' patronymic.

This construction might seem plausible, even if not demonstrable. But in fact in line 16 Thaumastes' patronymic can be read: Ὅρσεως. It is clear that Thaumastes and Ἰphasis cannot be brother and sister. Since ὄδελφ[ is clear in line 17, the obvious solution is to restore ὄδελφον Ἰphasis is a nephew. (He may also be kyrios of Methes, the person listed in line 5 as her συγγενῆς.) The rest of the family then falls into place. In lines 14-15 we find an ὄδελφος of Methe, aged 14. Before ὄδελφος I read ὅμοιός ὑπήρ, thus clarifying the fact that Thaumastes is called the mother of Methe καὶ τοῦ . ., where I read Ἡρ[. Her is the brother of Methe on her mother's side but not her father's.

Thaumastes thus bore Methe when she was 16, Her[ when she was 34. Methe herself has a daughter The[ who is now 3; her patronymic is lost in line 10. She also has a son Nouma by her husband Tithoes, who is her brother on her father's side and probably also on the mother's (the restoration so of line 12 seems virtually inescapable). Wilcken restored her description of Tithoes as reading τοῦ τετελευτηκὸς(ός) μου ἀνδρός, but that is not inevitable; one might restore γενομένου or even συνόντος, if Tithoes was for some reason registered in another house. Nouma's age was not read by Wilcken, who printed a dotted alpha after his name. I think that alpha is correct, but a trace of a vertical, which I take to be part of the year sign, precedes it. The family thus apparently must be diagrammed as follows (declared persons are given in italics), leaving aside only the speculative maternal descent of Tithoes:
A text embodying all of these conclusions is the following:

[.(.)]ρο[.].υω '.....' βησ[υυιω γραμματεί]  
'Αρσ[υνίτου] Πολ[έμων] μερίδ[ος]  

η[πα]ρά Μ[εθής] τίς Παναμ[έως τον ΝΝ]  

4 μητ[ρός θαυμαστήτως ἀπίδο κόμης ......]  
Αὐρη[λίου] υπάρχει τ[ο]냏 [μου Νουμάτι ἐν τῇ κώ-]  

8 ἐμοὶς εἰς τήν τοῦ διελ(ηλυθότος) ἡ (ἐτοὺς) Αὐρηλ[λίου  
'Αντωνίνου]  
Καπσάρος τοῦ κυρ[π]ίου κ[ατ'] ὀικ(ίων) ἀπογρ[α(φίων), και εἰμι]  
Μεθή η π[ρο]σῳγο(γραφμένη) (ἐτών) λή, καὶ τὴν θυγ(ατέρα) Θε[.  

.... ΝΝ]  
(ἐτῶν) γ', καὶ τοῦ γεν[όμε]νων μοι ἐκ τοῦ[.] ....]  

12 μου ἀνδρός ὄντος δὲ ὄμοπατρίου [καὶ ὄμομπατρίου (?)]  
ἀδελφοῦ Τιθός ὑπὸν Νουμάν (ἐτών) α [καὶ τοῦ τίς]  
Μεθή ή ὀμ[ο]μπατρίου ὁ [ἀδελφόν ὁ Ηρ- ΝΝ]  
(ἐτῶν) ὅ, καὶ τῇ[ν] Μ[εθής καὶ τοῦ ὁ Ηρ[. - μιμέρα]  

16 θαυμαστήν Ὄρσεως μητρί(πος) ........]  
(ἐτῶν) μη, καὶ τον τῆς θαυμαστήτος ἀδελφίδων ......]  
φιν Αὐρηλίου τοῦ Ὁρσεως μητρί(πος) Τεθοσα[τος (ἐτῶν) ........]  

υπάρ.]  

χεὶ δὲ [τῇ] Μεθή καὶ τῷ ὑπὸ Νουμάτι μέρη[η ......]  

20 καὶ τῷ [Νουμάτι πατρικά καὶ μητρικά οἰκόπ(εδα) (?), διό ἐπιδίωμι]
NOTES ON CENSUS DECLARATIONS

40. BGU II 447

The complex household recorded in this declaration from the census of 1737 includes twin women, aged 38, Soeris and Taos, daughters of Ptolemiaos, of whom Taos has an ἀπάτωρ daughter Xanaris. The context is probably that suggested by Youtie's analysis of 'illegitimacy,' since their brother Valerius Aphrodisios is an auxiliary cavalryman, whose 30-year-old freedwoman is part of the household.9 'Taos is thus likely to have had a soldier 'husband.' The declarant describes the twins as ὧδε ημῶν τιθενὴς ὁμοῖοι in the editor's text. In fact, one can read σω[γενείς μοι], a common term for relationships not conveniently expressed by some standard and simpler term, used on occasion in other cases where relationships not recognized by Roman law were at stake (cf. Youtie, ZPE 9 [1972] 133-37 = Scriptuunculae Postiores I 61-65).

The family also included slaves. The first was, in the editor's text, Κοπρ[ήν (ἐτῶν) μ]. But since there follows immediately καὶ Σαρσωτάκα ἔγγο(νον) αὐτῆς (ἐτῶν) κ, restoration of the name as the masculine Kopres cannot be right. One must presumably read Kopr[είων, for which the space is adequate. The restored age is immediately puzzling--where could it come from?--but it seems to reflect only the editorial conventions of another era, bracketing where we would dot. One can see (ἐτῶν) μ on the papyrus. Krepia also had a son Dioskoros, whose age in line 25 I read as (ἐτῶν) ς.

41. BGU II 524

In the editor's text of this declaration from the census of 159, the list of persons declared disintegrates after the names of the declarant, his wife, and their daughter, into a morass of brackets and dots. Patient examination yields more, and I present here a revised text for lines 13-20:

7See Bastianini-Whitehouse 31, recording G. Poethke's correct affirmation of the editor's reading of the year as 16, hence fall 175, or 4-6 months later than normal.
8Le monde grec: Hommages à Cl. Préaux (Brussels 1975) 723-40.
9No age was read by the editor, who printed a text indicating the total omission of age, but that is most unlikely. I read in line 13 Σαρσωτάκα (ἐτῶν) λ.
καὶ τὴν

gυναῖκαν μου Θερμούθιας τῆς
[Π]ασοκ[νοπα]ίου (ἑτῶν) ἐκ δαση(μου), καὶ τὴν
16 ἐξ ἀμφότ[έ]ρων θυγατέραν Θερ-μοῦθιαν (ἑτῶν) δασ[η(μου)] καὶ τοῦ ὀμοπάτριον καὶ
[ὁμομπάτριον μου] ὀξελ[ῆ]θην Βη-
σίν[η] (ἑτῶν) καὶ ἀστη(μου), καὶ ὀξελη[ή]ν Θεο[νήθιον]
20 (ἑτῶν) ὑ ἀστη(μου), καὶ τοῦ τοῦ κατὰ πατέρα μου
κτλ.

The wife’s age is probably 24, delta being the most likely reading of the second digit. The name Teonchonis is scratched in before the end of the line and rather abraded, and even under high magnification the strokes are not entirely clear. The start of it, however, seems fairly clear.

42. BGU III 971

Though much will no doubt always remain obscure about the collection of documents assembled on this sheet, it must have been compiled in or after 245 in connection with some procedure concerning status, most likely epikrisis. The earliest document, occupying lines 1-7 (and the lost part of line 8) is dated to 195/6 and appears to concern a request for epikrisis of twin boys who reached the age of 14 in that year. The second (lines 8-15) is a declaration from the census of 229/230 submitted by one of those boys, now presumably a man of 48 (one may restore (ἑτῶν) μη in line 12 with plausibility if not absolute certainty), declaring himself, his wife, and a daughter. The final document is a declaration from the next census, that of 243/4, by which time the man had died, leaving his widow and a minor son, i.e., one born after the census of 229/230. The daughter is not mentioned in the surviving portion, but she could have been listed later or, perhaps more likely, was now married.

Two points in this last declaration require clarification. First, in line 19 the editor’s text reads ἐπ’ ἀμφότερον Ἑρμοθασίας τῶν κ.[... It is hard to see what this could mean. In fact, however, the papyrus has (instead of τῶν κ.[.), ἐν ὧν κατοι(κῶ)] the normal phrase, which is then logically followed by the statement that she was also registered in that amphodoton in the previous census.
NOTES ON CENSUS DECLARATIONS

The enumeration of persons begins, naturally, with the declarant Thermoutharion. The editor prints:

καὶ εἰ[μι θερμουθάριον]
[ἡ προγεγρα[μένη] ὡς (ἐτῶν) . . . . . γυνὴ] Ἄμμωνίου τοῦ
Δωρ[ᾶ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος . . .

This is most unlikely. A widow is no longer the wife of the deceased. The mention of the deceased, rather, should be part of the description of the boy. I restore, therefore:

καὶ εἰ[μι θερμουθάριον]
[ἡ προγεγρα[μένη] (ἐτῶν) . . καὶ τὸν γενόμενον μοι ἐκ τοῦ
gενομένου μου ἄνδρα;] Ἄμμωνίου τοῦ Δωρ[ᾶ ὕδιον NN
κτλ.]

The precise wording may have varied somewhat, naturally. This of course points to a longer restoration at left than the editor supposed, but nothing elsewhere in the text provides any objection to such a length.

43. BGU XI 2018

A thorough discussion of this text by H.C. Youtie, ZPE 9 (1972) 133-37 (= Scriptiumculae posteriores I 61-65), produced a number of improvements, most notably the information that three women called apatōres were kin, συγγενεῖς, rather than "daughters," θυγατέρας, of the declarant (cf. above on BGU 447). Their distribution over a 21-year span (ages 25, 15, and 4) led to interesting speculations about their parents' union, which in turn helped inform Youtie's classic article on illegitimacy.10

The editor expressed surprise that the declarant, who identified himself as a laborer, ἐργάτης, "scheint aber ein ziemlich vermögender Mann gewesen zu sein, da er außer dem einen Haus in Karanis, in dem er wohnt und das er von seinem Vater geerbt hat, noch mehrere Häuser
und Anteile an Häusern besessen hat." Youtie (137 n.20) dismissed this

10 Above, n.8.
concern with the remark that other resolutions of ἐργα( ) were possible, giving ἐργα(σπωνάρχης) as an example.

A new examination of the papyrus shows that what the editor read as ἐρ is actually ς. The scribe may have intended ζ originally and erased a part of the curving vertical stroke, but the final result is zeta. The declarant's age is thus 57 rather than 50. That leaves the editor's γα. Unremarked, however, is an omega written above alpha, not easy to disentangle from the messy descenders from line 7, especially since καὶ was squeezed in right on the edge. Now γαω does not suggest much, but if the 'gamma' is taken instead as a rather vertical lambda, λω(γραφοῦμενος) may be read, with trivial interchange of omicron and omega. Arsinoite village declarations in fact do not usually give occupations, so the revised text is in better conformity with the standard formula.

44. BGU XI 2019

This difficult papyrus includes two Memphite declarations, the first (at least) of which comes from the village of Moithymis. They are both topped by the numerals assigned them in a tomos synkollesimos: τξε and τα[ς], as I read them instead of the editor's doubtful ης and ης. Both are addressed to Dionysios the strategos (στρατηγοῦ) can be securely read in column 1).

The freedwoman declarant registers her daughter from an unmarried union, whose name is given by the editor as Ξεναμοῦνι(ν) Αβί, which is translated simply as Senamounis Abi. The presence of a second name with no other indication (such as ἦ καὶ) is not common and arouses suspicion. In fact, the word is ὄργη(ν), 'idle' or 'unemployed.' It is precisely a characteristic of Memphite returns to use this term, cf., e.g. P.Vindob.Sijp. 24, where the declarant Tetanoupis describes herself as ὄργην.

At the end are four (or perhaps five) lines not transcribed because they were deemed 'unlesserlichen.' They are indeed faint and hard to read, but in line 41 I read Σιοῦς at the start, and in 43, ὅπ(ἐρ) αὖτις, suggesting that we have (unsurprisingly) the clause indicating that someone had signed, beginning in line 37, for the illiterate Herakleia. The hand is shaky, though not extremely slow.11

11Minor notes: In 5, for Μ(εμπιτου) read οὐ(τοῦ); probably also οὐ(τοῦ) at the start of line 8.
Column II has resisted my efforts at decipherment, though at first glance it does not seem impossible. The declarant’s identification (line 4) is παρὰ Μὰρωνος Μᾶρωνος; the lines down to 15 seem largely occupied with details of property holdings. If any information on individuals was included, it is lost in lines 16-22, after which the scanty traces of nine more lines yield nothing useful.

*Columbia University*

Roger S. Bagnall