

Notes on Egyptian Census Declarations, II

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

14. *P.Amh.* II 74

This is a copy of a return addressed to the komogrammateus of Soknopaiou Nesos for the census of 145. The editors made no comment on the difficulties it raises, but Hombert and Préaux did in *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* V. They singled it out as one of three declarations with women purportedly giving birth before the age of 13, and concluded that "il s'agit sans doute d'erreurs dans la notation des âges" (p.161). In this case, the declarant was given as 40 and his mother as 51, a truly astonishing age at parturition of 11. It may have been reasonable, with Grenfell and Hunt the editors, to suspect scribal rather than editorial error. But examination of the original, now in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, shows that the mother's age is $\nu\epsilon$, 55, not $\nu\alpha$, 51. The son's age is very faint, but it appears to have one more hump than a mu should, depending on where the following omicron begins. Under a microscope, I think that $\lambda\beta$ is a better reading; the mother would then have been 23 at his birth. Even with his age at 40, however, the interval is acceptable.

There is another problem, however, which Hombert and Préaux did not raise, namely that in the declaration at the start the declarant, Panephremmis, describes his mother as "Stotoetis daughter of Horos," while in listing her in lines 16-17 he refers to her as "the mother of Panephremmis, Stotoetis daughter of Panephremmis, granddaughter of Paous." The explanation, I think, is that in copying the declaration the

¹I am indebted to Ludwig Koenen and Traianos Gagos for assistance during my visit to Ann Arbor and to the latter for a painstaking reading of my revised transcripts against the originals of the two Cornell papyri; and to Bruce Frier for hospitality on that occasion. My work on *P.Brux. inv. E7616 recto* has been greatly facilitated by an excellent set of photographs kindly provided by Georges Nachtergaele and by his inspection of the original, in company with Jean Bingen, to verify my suggestions. I am indebted to William Voelke and the staff of the reading room at the Morgan Library for their very helpful facilitation of my examination of *P.Amh.* II 74.

scribe's eye fell on Πανεφρέμμεως in the preceding line and reproduced it erroneously.

Another problem exercised Hombert and Préaux, the appearance at the end of the description of the mother of the word [κάτο]ικο[ν] (line 18). They pointed out (118 n.8) that this was an inappropriate term for a woman, and said that "nous croyons qu'il faut rejeter la restitution. . . Le mot κάτοικον serait, du reste, à une place anormale . . . on attend *καί* et la mention du lien de parenté que unit celle-ci au chef de la famille." That diagnosis was precisely correct. The space is ample for restoring [καί ἔνο]ικον, referring to Segathis, who is then listed.

Panephremmis, the declarant, is married to his sister Thases, who is in the editors' text age 17. Under magnification, however, it can be seen that the vertical taken as iota by Grenfell and Hunt is followed by part of a NE-SW diagonal, then by a space in which only two traces survive, both apparently (but not certainly) vertical, one at the upper left and one at the lower right. The space and traces dictate reading the first letter as a kappa. For the second, the most attractive guess would be eta, but the exiguous traces are simply not sufficient to justify reading more than κ., giving a possible range of 21-29.

One other point deserves mention. In line 21, Panephremmis is listing additional real property belonging to the household, part of which is a ἡ[μ]ισυ μέρος πα[τρ]ικ[ῆς] . αλ[.]δεως, according to the editors' reading. What can this be? Apart from names, the Duke Data Bank shows for this string of letters only the adverbs ἡδέως, ἀδεῶς, (ἀν-)ενδεῶς, σπουδέως (*sic*), and βραδέως, plus χαρύβδεως. I believe that one can read πα[τρ]ικ[ῆς] [οἰ]κ[ῆς] without any difficulty, but what follows is less clear. The letter after the lacuna is ill-made, with a blot under the NW-SE diagonal stroke. It is hard to avoid the restoration [ἐπαύ]λεως. There is room for that, and lambda seems acceptable, but I am not sure that there is room for *καί* before it, even in the short form used by this scribe. Perhaps just κ(αί) was written here. The phrase "house and *epaulis*" occurs in *P.Erl.* 60.5,7 and *P.Panop.* 10.17 (with an *aithrion* and *aule* also).

15. *P.Brux.* I 1-2

Unlike the other declarations forming part of the roll, these two come from Theresis. The first is poorly preserved--a strip missing at left and a badly-damaged middle--and has offered many difficulties to its editors. These have above all been in the names. The declarant was read in both editions as Σαραπίων Ἰαράσχιος. The uniqueness of the latter name led Jean Bingen (*Cd'E* 47 [1972] 233-34 n.2) to describe it as doubtful, a view echoed by Georges Nachtergaele in *P.Brux.* I. And while it is palaeographically not an unattractive reading in line 24,² it is not easy to reconcile with the traces in line 4. The iota at the beginning is particularly difficult onomastically. It survives only in line 24, where I suggest dividing instead [Σαραπ]ίωνι. The dative would be an error for nominative, but case errors do occur in the subscriptions to the declarations, as for example the genitive for nominative in *P.Brux.* 12 (Θεοσίου(ς)). For the remainder, Nachtergaele and Bingen suggest Ἀράγχιος, which I find persuasive. In line 4, then, read [Ἀρ]άγχιος.

A second onomastic peculiarity is the supposed grandfather's name of Ariston, son of Eros, who writes on behalf of the declarants in both of these texts. The signer was recognized as such and the name read by H.C. Youtie (*JEA* 40 [1954] 112-17 = *Scriptiunculae* II 994-99), who commented, "the photograph offers very little help with the series of letters after the name of Ariston's father Eros, and the edition shows that the papyrus cannot be much if at all superior to the photograph. . . Whatever the true reading may be, and it may not be 'Apotes' at all, its bearing is certain. It is either the name of the father of Eros and

²A few trivial remarks may be added here: *P.Brux.* 7.17, ζ of μζ is corrected from ς. The entirety of line 18 is a later insertion. Line 29, the ψ of Θαψίος is corrected. *P.Brux.* 9.2, read Εὐδαίμων. *P.Brux.* 13.3, read Θεσής. Line 4, read Θανιβήχις. Line 12, read Ἀρτίσις. The scribe appears to have failed to change nominatives to genitives in all of these cases (and perhaps others; it is often hard to tell). In line 14, the metronymic of Pantheus was read as Θεοντιθοίου by Hombert and Préaux, but corrected to Θεοντιθοίου by Bingen (*Cd'E* 47 [1972] 231-32). The third letter, however, seems clearly an omicron, giving Θεσον-. There is no objection to this interchange of omicron and epsilon in the vocalization of *T3-srt-n-*; cf. names in Τσον-. Line 18, Ἱερακίωνα is heavily corrected; I would prefer (with Hombert and Préaux) to take the iota following as part of that name rather than as the start of the following one, and thus to read Ἀρφήχιος rather than Ἱαρφήχιος. *P.Brux.* 15.2, the scribe seems actually to have written Θεμουθίου here, accidentally omitting the rho (which is included in line 17).

grandfather of Ariston or some word describing in some way either Ariston or his father Eros" (117 = 999). The reading is given by Nachtergaele in no.1 as 'Α]ποτῆς and in no.2 as 'Αποτήους. Now no such name is known, and the reader used to personal descriptions in the papyri might wonder if a different division of the letters would be more likely: ἀπό τῆς. Such a phrase invites αὐτῆς to follow, and in fact in no.2 I believe that αὐ(τῆς) does. An examination of no.1, however, persuades me that what stands is αὐτῆς, with ἀπό τῆς thus standing in the lacuna to the left. Now that the τοῦ before the grandfather's name is no longer required, of course, there is ample room.

Lines 13-17 of no.1 are so badly preserved that Hombert and Préaux printed nothing except dots, save only in line 16 where they print]η. Nachtergaele simply indicates "traces de 5 lignes." The reading of 16 by Hombert and Préaux seems to me correct and probably to give the age of the declarant. There are traces following which could be ἄση(μος), but that is hardly certain. Line 13, I think, should be read] ἐν ᾧ, referring to μέρος (restored in line 11). Line 14, of which hardly anything remains, will have given the declarant's name, continuing in line 15. Whether in 17, where abundant but muddled (erased?) traces survive, a second person was declared, I cannot say. In no.2, line 17, after the declarant's mother's patronymic, there surely stood (and perhaps still stands under the glued-on column iii) his age, although the editors do not indicate a lacuna. In fact, I think that the year sign can be made out rather faintly just before the join: read (ἔτους) [..].

16. *P.Brux.* I 10

The oldest of the four brothers who file this declaration for their large household is Pantbeus son of Petos, a 49-year old currently married to the 21-year old Theros, by whom he has three living children ages 2, 4, and 5. He also declares a son by a previous wife, Thapsathis, who is described as follows:

Πετώς Παντβ(εῦτος) μητ(ρός) Θαψᾶθις Πετώτο(ς) (ἐτῶν) ια
μονόφθ(αλμος).

"One-eyed" is a rare description in the papyri, and study of a photograph³ shows that just before οφθ there has been abbreviation. The two letters before the abbreviation marking seem to me to be clearly

³For which I am indebted to Georges Nachtergaele and Wilfried van Rengen.

ευ. Personal descriptions in the papyri offer two common characteristics including this diphthong, εὔσημος ὀφθαλμόν and λευκῶ ὀφθαλμῶ. Now the preceding letter, read as alpha and part of the age by editors, has no hint of closure of the loop and would most naturally be taken as lambda (and the boy would be 10, not 11). It seems most natural, then, to read λευ(κῶ) ὀφθ(αλμῶ). The one difficulty is that the abbreviation marking might be expected to look something like a kappa, which it does not; one would see a tau much more readily. Nonetheless, I do not see any alternative to the conclusion that the scribe simply used an abbreviation mark which did not resemble the next letter in the word.

17. *P.Brux. I 11*

The declarant here is a 15-year-old boy named Harendotes son of Pantbeus, grandson of Pnepheros. The property declared consists of a house, 300 cubits of vacant land in the village (with an oilworking establishment on it), Παντβεῦτος Πνεφερ(ῶτος) Ἀρενδῶτ(ου), "appartenant à Pantbeus, fils de Pnéphérôs, fils de Harendôtès," according to Nachtergaeel's translation. In the list of residents, remarkably, Harendotes comes in second place and is described with ὁ υἱός following the grandfather's name. Hombert and Préaux translated "son fils," with reference to the woman whose entry precedes, whose name they read as Ἐρωθις. She, or he, is described as son or daughter of Phimouis and Aphrodite, and 48 years old. Jean Bingen (*Cd'E* 47 [1972] 228) remarked, "le nom Ἐρωθις est suspect," pointing out that Vergote had been unable to provide any etymology for it. Bingen proceeded to offer an alternative:

"ils appellent le nom Σεμθεῦς qui s'impose aussitôt à la lecture, bien qu'on puisse hésiter entre -ευς et -υς pour la finale. Or, Σεμθεῦς est, à ma connaissance, un anthroponyme masculin. La ligne 16 peut-elle en contenir un, là où on voyait aussi aisément le nom de la mère d'Harendôtès? La chose est tout à fait possible, mais implique que ὁ υἱός indique dans ce cas la filiation non avec une Ἐρωθις, mais avec son père cité peu avant dans le texte. Σεμθεῦς, lui, peut être un vieux serviteur (d'ascendance servile par sa mère Aphroditè?) ou un colocataire."

This reading and interpretation is duly accepted by Nachtergaeel, who translates ὁ υἱός as "le fils (du propriétaire)." But this solution encounters problems of its own:

(1) Legal. It is impossible that Semtheus could be a "vieux serviteur." He has a patronymic, sufficient to exclude servile status in his generation, past or present. There is no such status as "d'ascendance servile." One is either freeborn, freed, or slave. This is, after all, a legal document, and people are careful in census declarations about how they describe themselves. This person is inescapably freeborn.

(2) Diplomatic. Declarations are generally divided into three categories: (a) those in which the declarant's family/household is listed; (b) those in which the renters of a house are listed; and (c) those in which no one is listed. The present declaration obviously belongs to category (a). Now of all published texts in this category, I know of only four others in which the declarant is not the first-named person. These are *P.Brux.* I 3 (a brother of the female declarants), *SB XIV* 11577 (three sons of the female declarant), and *SB I* 5661 and *P.Brux.* I 4, in both of which the declarant's mother is listed first. In all cases, the first-listed persons are family members. In three of four cases, they are older, and in the remaining one they are male. Given this evidence, and the plain fact that Harendotes is described as the son of the preceding person, it is incredible that the person in question should not be the parent of Harendotes, and since he or she is not his father, she *must* be his mother. A further difficulty is that the name attached to the property, even if not preceded by πρότερον (often abbreviated α/), is normally interpreted by Nachtergaeel as that of the *previous* owner and translated "ayant appartenu..." (*P.Brux.* 8 and 9 are examples where πρότερον does not appear.) There are good reasons for this interpretation, and every reason to suppose that one should in all consistency see Pantbeus (the father of the declarant) as the *former* owner of the property, which is (after all) described as τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μοι by Harendotes.

(3) Social. There is not a single instance in the published declarations of anyone listing non-kin before kin, and it is difficult to conceive of the situation in which that kind of deference would be given to a hired servant (assuming such a family had one--there is no other instance in the Brussels roll of any kind of free non-kin). Slaves and freedmen are *always* listed after family members in census declarations. Nor will a fellow tenant do; once again, he would have to stand at the end. The only situation entitling someone to stand ahead of the nominal

declarant is that described above, a family relationship giving pride of place to the other person.

There are thus serious problems created by the reading of Σεμθεύς, all of which would be obviated by the reading of a feminine name.⁴ They are, indeed, serious enough to make me conclude that the correct reading must be something else. I believe that the correct reading is to be found in the previous column, 10.29, Σεραθῆς. There is slight damage to the surface in 11.16, but the manner of writing the name seems almost identical. It is true that the rhos in this declaration mostly have full descenders, although that is not true in Μάρκου or Παρθικοῦ, where they are very short. More to the point, however, the scribe of the body of this declaration is the same as that in the preceding one, where by common agreement Σεραθῆς is written with precisely the kind of rho that we must see here to read that name. Moreover, the overall shape of the name is essentially identical to that in the preceding column. The declaration is thus that of Serathes, age 48, and her son Harendotes, 15. His father, Pantbeus, is no doubt dead, having left the property in question to his son.

18. *P.Corn.* 16

The four columns of this papyrus contain extracts from declarations from the censuses of 117/8, 131/2, and 145/6. The first edition omitted the remains of columns i and iv "as these offer nothing of value, other than that τοῦ ἀμφόδ(ου) Γυμνασίου appears in the top line of the first column, and τοῦ ἰδίο(υ) λό(γου) τῆς αὐ(τῆς) ημε() in the third line," as the editors put it. In fact, the *idios logos* does not appear; but the column does contain ten ages virtually intact, something of value for demographic study. Neither it nor the scanty remains of column iv allow us to determine exactly what the selection and organization of these returns rest on. There are clear family links among all of the declarations except those in column i, where too little remains of the names to give us any information. Given the many corrections necessary to columns ii and iii, a complete text of the entire papyrus seems worthwhile. An apparatus is provided for corrections published in *BL*

⁴I have seen no example of Semtheus as a female name; it refers to Horos as *sm3-t3-wj*, "unifier of the two lands," and occurs in compounds with Horos' name (e.g., Ἀρσεμθεύς, Πεταρσεμθεύς).

2.2.49, 3.46, 4.24, and 6.31, plus those of H.C. Youtie (in the margins of the volume in 807 Hatcher Library, University of Michigan) and of Traianos Gagos, and my own.⁵

Column I

	ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐ]τοῦ ἀμφόδ(ου) Γυμνασίου
] "Ἡρωνος ἐπὶ Μοήρεω(ς)
]δ() μη(τρός) Λεοντίου ἰδιώ(της)
	λαο(γραφοῦμενος) (ἐτῶν) μς,
	α (ἔτους) (ἐτῶν) με
4]c...() λαο(γραφοῦμενος) (ἐτῶν) [ι]ς, α (ἔτους)
	(ἐτῶν) ιε
	μη(τρός) τ]ῆς [α]ύ[τ]ῆς μὴ ἀναγεγρα(μμένος) ἐν
] ἐπιγεγενημ(ένους) (ἐτῶν) ι
8]υτο[. . .]. . .[.]. ἀτελ(ής) (ἐτῶν) γ
] καὶ ὁμομητρία ἀδελ(φή) οὔσα αὐτοῦ
] (ἐτῶν) μγ
] (ἐτῶν) κ
] (ἐτῶν) ιδ
12] (ἐτῶν) ζ
] (ἐτῶν) . β
	<i>vacat</i>
] . υ α . [. .] α
] ἀμφόδ(ου)
16] trace
	Ἡρακλ]εῖδ(ου) τοῦ Ἡρακλεῖδ(ου)
] μεθ' ἕτερα
]δ() τοῦ Λευκαροῦ
20	ἰ]διώ(της) λαογ(ραφοῦμενος) (ἐτῶν) κδ,
	ιε (ἔτους) (ἐτῶν) κγ

⁵Except for my own, I identify the proposer by initials: W-K = Westermann and Kraemer, ed.pr.; G = Traianos Gagos; H-P = M. Hombert-C. Préaux; Be. = H.I. Bell; Br. = H. Braunert; M = P.M. Meyer; V = G. Vitelli; W = U. Wilcken; Y = H.C. Youtie.

Column ii

- Εὐδήμῳ στρατηγῷ Ἄρσι(νοίτου) Ἡρακλείδου(υ) μερίδος καὶ
 Ἑρμαίῳ τῷ κ(αί) Δ[ρύ]τωνι
 βασιλ(ικῷ) γρα(μματεῖ) τῆς αὐτῆς μερίδος(ς) καὶ Ἡρακλείδῃ
 καὶ Εὐβούλῳ γραμματ(εῦσι) μητροπ(όλεως)
 καὶ Ἡρακλείδ(η) ἐξηγητ(ῆ) καὶ μετόχοις πράκτορσι
 ἀργυρικ(ῶν) μητροπ(όλεως) καὶ
 24 Ἡρώδῃ ἀμφοδάρχ(η) Ἱερᾶς Πύλης καὶ Μάρωνι λαογ(ράφῳ)
 τοῦ αὐ[το]ῦ ἀμφόδ(ου)
 παρὰ Φιλιππιαίνης τῆς Ζωίλου τοῦ Ἀπολλω(νίου) θυγατρὸς(ς)
 κατοίκ(ου) ἀπογεγραμ(μένης)
 δι' ἑτέρου ὑπομνήματο(ς) ἐπ' ἀμφόδ(ου) Μοήρεως μετὰ
 κυρίου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς
 Πλουτίω(νος) τοῦ Κόμωνος κατοίκ(ου) τῶν ἴσσοε. ὑπάρχει
 μοι ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ
 28 ἀμφόδο(υ) Μοήρεως ε' μέρος d' μέρους οἰκίας καὶ
 ἑτέρων [τό]π(ων) ἐν ᾧ
 ἀπογράφομ(αι) τοὺς ὑπογεγρα(μμένους) εἰς τὴν τοῦ
 διελη(λυθότος) β(έτους) Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος
 τοῦ κυρίου
 κατ' οἰκ(ίαν) ἀπογρα(φήν) ἐπ' ἀμφόδου Ἱερᾶς Πύλης
 ἐφ' οὗ καὶ τῆ τοῦ ζ(έτους) θεοῦ Τραϊανοῦ
 κατ' οἰκ(ίαν) ἀπογρα(φή) ἀπεγράφησαν. καὶ εἰσιν
 μεθ' ἑ[τ]τερα·
 32 Ζωὶς Ἡρακλείδ(ου) τοῦ Σωκράτους (ἐτῶν) νγ· καὶ ταύτης υἱὸν
 Σωκράτην Διοσκόρο(υ) ἐπικεκκριμ(ένον) (ἐτῶν) λβ ἄσημ(ου)·
 καὶ θυγατέραν Ἀφροδοῦν (ἐτῶν) λγ·
 καὶ ἑτέραν θυγατέραν Ἀφροδοῦν γαμουμένην τῷ ἀδελφῷ
 Σωκράτῃ τῷ προγεγρα(μμένῳ) (ἐτῶν) κη· καὶ τὴν τῶν
 προγεγρα(μμένων) περὶ Σωκράτην
 36 πρεσβυτ(έραν) κατὰ πατέραν τηθίδαν Ἰσαροῦν (ἐτῶν) ο.
 διὸ ἐπίδιδω(μι).
 κατακεχώρι(σται) στρ(ατηγῷ) καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι.
 (ἐτους) γ Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
 Φαμενώ(θ) κβ.
- Πρωτάρχῳ στρατηγῷ Ἄρσι(νοίτου) Ἡρακλεί(δου) μερίδος(ς)
 καὶ Ἑρμαίῳ βασιλ(ικῷ) γρ(αμματεῖ) τῆς

- 40 αὐτῆς μερίδο(ς) καὶ Μάρωνι γρ(αμματεῖ) μητρο(πόλεως)
καὶ Διδάτι πράκτορι Μοήρεως
καὶ Πτολεμ(αίω) ἀμφοδάρχ(η) καὶ Δεῖω λαογ(ράφω) καὶ
'Αυτωνεῖω τῶ καὶ 'Ερμαίω προκεχειρισμένω
παρὰ Πλουτίω(νος) τοῦ Κόμμωνος τοῦ 'Ηρωνος μη(τρὸς)
Πτολλαροῦτο(ς) τῆς κ(αὶ) Πτολέμας
τῆς 'Απολλω(νίου) κατοίκ(ου) τῶν 'ςυσε ἀναγραφομένου
ἐπ' ἀμφόδ(ου) Μοήρε(ως)

Column iii

- 44 [ἀ]πογ[εγραμ(μένου)] δι' ἐτ[έρου ὑπομνήματος]: ὑπάρχ[ει]
μοι ἐπ' ἀμφόδου]
'Απολλ[ω(νίου) Π]αρεμβολ(ῆς) [. . . μέρος οἰκίας ἐν] ῶ
ἀπο[γράφομαι]
τοὺς ὑπ[ο]γεγραμ(μένους) ἐνο[ί]κους εἰς τὴν το]ῦ
διεληλ(υθότος) ις (ἔτους) 'Αδριανοῦ]
Κα[ί]σαρ[ος] τοῦ κυρίου κα[τ' οἰκίαν ἀπογ]ραφήν
ἐπ' ἀμφόδ(ου) [- - - -]
- 48 [κα]ί ξείσιν· μ[εθ' ἕτερα]
Σωκράτης Διοσκό[ρου ἐπικεκρ]ιμ(ένος) (ἐτῶν) μς ἄσημος:]
καὶ τὴν τούτου γυναῖκα ν[ο]σ[α]ν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁμοπ(άτριον)
' ' κ[α]ί [ὁμομητρίαν]
ἀδελφὴν 'Αφροδοῦ[ν] (ἐτῶν) μβ,
52 ἀμφοτέρους ἀπογεγραμ(μένους) τ[ο]ῦ ῶ β (ἔτους) ἐπὶ
'Ιερᾶς Πύλ[ης:]
καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀλλήλω(ν) τέκνα Διόσκορον ἀναγεγ(ραμμένον)
ἐν ἐπιγεγ(ενημένοις) (ἐτῶν) ιβ·
καὶ 'Ονήσιμ(ον) ἀναγεγρ(αμμένον) ἐν ἐπιγεγενημ(ένοις)
(ἐτῶν) ι·
καὶ 'Ασκλᾶν ἀναγεγρ(αμμένον) ἐν [ἐ]πιγεγενημ(ένοις)
(ἐτῶν) η·
- 56 καὶ θυγατέραν Ζωιδοῦν (ἐτῶν) ς· καὶ 'Ηραΐδα (ἐτῶν) β.
διὸ ἐπ(ιδίδωμι).
κατακεχ(ῶριστα) στρα(τηγῶ) καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι
(ἔτους) ιζ 'Αδριανοῦ Καίσαρος
τοῦ κυρίου 'Επιφ κῆ.

Μαξίμω τῶι κ(αὶ) Νεάρχω στρατηγῶ καὶ 'Ηρακλείδῃ

- 60 βασιλ(ικῶ) γρ(αμματεῖ)
 'Αρσι(νοῖτου) 'Ηρακλείδο(υ) μερίδο(ς) καὶ Σαβεῖνω
 καὶ 'Αντωνεῖνω γραμματ(εῦσι)
 μητροπ(όλεως)
 παρὰ 'Ισιδώρας τῆς 'Ηρωνος τρίτου τοῦ 'Ηρωνος
 μητ(ρός) 'Ισιδώρας
 τῆς 'Ασκληπ(ιάδου) ἀναγραφομένης καὶ ἀπογεγραμ(μένης)
 δι' ἑτέρου ὑπομνήματο(ς)
- 64 ἐπ' ἀμφόδου 'Απολλω(νίου) 'Ιερακείου μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ
 ἀνδρό[ς 'Α]σκλ[ηπ(ιάδου)]
 τοῦ 'Ασκληπ(ιάδου)· ὑπάρχει μοι ἐπ' ἀμφόδ(ου) Μοήρω[ς]
 δ' μέρος οἰκ[ίας] καὶ αὐ[λῆς]
 ἐν ᾧ π[ρ]οσαπογράφομ(αι) ἐνοίκους εἰς τὴν τοῦ
 διελ[η]λυθό[τος] θ (ἔτους)
 'Α[ντ]ωνεῖνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κ[υρ]ίου κατ' οἰκ(ίαν)
 ἀπογρα(φήν) [ἐπ'] ἀμ[φ]ό(δου) . . .[.].-ς
- 68 [ἐφ' ο]ῦ καὶ τῆ τοῦ ις (ἔτους) 'Αδρια[νου] ἀπογρ(αφῆ)
 ἀ]πεγράψ[αν]το· κ[αί] εἰσιν·]

Column iv

- α[
 Ζωῖ[δοῦν
 μη(τρός) .[
 72 απ. .[
 τωπ.[ἐ-]
 φ' ἕτερ[
 ἐν ἐπιγ[εγ(ενημένοις)
 76 (ἐτῶν) ε· καὶ .[
 Διοδω[
 προσαπογρ[αφ-
 (ἔτους) ι ['Αντωνεῖνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου]
 80 'Επεὶφ κ[

25 Φιλιπιατότης W-K, Φιλιππιάτης (ex Φιλιππιατης), K
 θυγατρὸ(ς) κατ' οἰκ(ίαν) W-K, θυγατρὸ(ς) κατοίκ(ου) H-P
 26 δι' ἑαυτοῦ W-K, δι' ἑτέρου H-P 28 (τέταρτον) W-K

ἑτέρας [δύο μέρη?] W-K, ἕτερον [τό]π(ον) Y, ἑτέρων [τό]π(ων)
 G 30 θείου W-K, θεοῦ V 31 ἀπογρα(φήν) W-K, ἀπογρα(φή)
 Br. ἐ[τ]τέρας W-K, ἔ[τ]τερα G 33 Ἀφροδοῦν (ἑτῶν) ιγ W-K
 36-37 διὸ ἐπιδίδω(μι) | κατακεχωρι(σμένῳ) W-K,
 διὸ ἐπιδίδω(μι). κατακεχώρι(σται) W 42 καὶ W-K, κ(αὶ) G
 44 . .]οἱ[. .] W-K, ἀπογ[εγραμ(μένον)] Br. δι' ἑαυτοῦ W-K,
 δι' ἐτ[έρου] H-P 48 . . .]ιστου() . κ[αὶ εἰσω] W-K,
 Ἱερ[ᾶς Πύλ(ης)] Br. 50 γυναικῶν δ.υ.[.] αὐτοῦ
 λαογρ(αφουμένην) γυν(αῖκων) καὶ ὁμο[μητρίων] W-K, either
 ὁμο[π(άτριον) καὶ ὁμομ(ήτριον)] or γυν(αῖκων) <ὁμοπάτριον >
 καὶ Be., γυναικῶν οὐσ[α]ν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁμοπ(άτριον) Y
 52 τ[ου]οῦ W-K, τ[ου]ῶ G 56-57 διὸ ἐπιδίδω(μι) |
 κατακεχωρι(σμένῳ) W-K, διὸ ἐπιδίδω(μι). κατακεχώρι(σται) W
 63 δι' ἑαυτοῦ W-K, δι' ἑτέρου H-P 64 Ἱερακλείου W-K,
 Ἱερακείου W 66 ἐν ῶ . .οσι ἀπογράφομαι W-K, ἐν ῶ [οἱ]κῶ
 M, ἐν ῶ [πρ]οσ<ι> ἀπογράφομαι Br., ἐν ῶ π[ρ]οσαπογράφομαι
 Y 67 α.[W-K, ἐπ' [ἀμφό(δου) Ἱεράς Πύλ(ης)] Br. 75 ἐν
 ἐπιγ[εγ()] G 80 κ read by G.

The very damaged character of columns i and iv makes it difficult to determine the purpose of the papyrus as a whole. The entirety is written in a single hand, as far as I can see, and presumably at one time. The last declaration was for year 9 of Antoninus (145/6) and written in Epeiph of year 10, or June-July, 147. It is evidently impossible to exclude the possibility that additional columns included later declarations, but neither is there any positive evidence to that effect. The declarations are not reproduced in their entirety. The address is given in full in those which are completely preserved, as is the declaration formula and, apparently, the list of persons. Column i seems to have been an even more abbreviated extract than the rest. The concluding portions, however, are much abbreviated, with the oath formulas omitted, and the occurrence of μεθ' ἑτέρας or similar in lines 18, 31, and 48 shows that there were other omissions.

The curious phrase in line 3, "46 years old, in the 1st year 45 years old"⁶ indicates that the census was for the 2nd year, and that can only be

⁶I do not know what the significance of this information is, nor do I recall seeing a similar phrase in other census declarations. There are, however, instances in other extracts from census registers (and only there); see, e.g., *BGU* XIII 2226, where a man is stated to have been 58 but 57 in the 8th year, which was the year preceding the census, and XIII 2228.9-10n. with further references. The practice is described there as "undoubtedly a countercheck against error or fraud," but its relative rarity makes this an unlikely explanation for the handful of instances. Since we do not know the purpose of

117/8, i.e., the same year for which the declaration in lines 21-38 was filed. That is enough to show that we cannot simply be dealing with successive declarations concerning the same household; moreover, none of the people listed in lines 1-13 can be retraced later. The declaration-extract occupying lines 14-20, on the other hand, seems to belong to year 16, since its "24 years old, in the 15th year, 23 years old" phrase in line 20 points to the census 14 years after that in lines 1-13. It is therefore from the same year as lines 39-58. Now it is possible that there is a connection between the two declarations of column i, in that the 10-year old of line 6 could be the 24-year old of line 20. It is possible, of course, that he would resurface in column iv if that were better preserved. One might hypothesize that this last declaration contained a family different parts of which were being traced back in the others. The accumulation of the declarations over a period of 42 years, at all events, shows how seriously the census was taken and how available its documentation was for subsequent consultation and quoting.⁷

Lines 1-13 contain the roster of a family of nine: the father (46), mother (43),⁸ three sons (16, 10, and 3), and probably three daughters (20, 14, and 7), plus one other person with an age ending in 2, possibly a slave. The surviving children were thus born when their mother was 23, 27, 29, 33, 36, and 40. It is naturally possible that she had children before these who no longer live in the household, and there may well have been some who died young born during the longer gaps. If there is not still another column lost before this, the declaration is far more abbreviated than those in columns ii-iv. That in lines 14-20 seems to be still more abbreviated. It is possible that the young man declared was living by himself in rented accommodations before forming a household. Although damage prevents certainty, it is possible that the damaged

the Cornell compilation of declarations, it does not help resolve the question. Hombert and Préaux, *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* V, p.143, express uncertainty whether the information came from the declaration or another source, but such an indication has never appeared in a published declaration.

⁷H. Braunert, *JurPap* 9-10 (1955-56) 308-09, reached the conclusion "dass hier die Personen der deklarierten Mieter die gemeinsame Basis abgegeben haben, von diesen also die κατ' οίκων απογραφαι drei aufeinander folgender Zensusjahre--wohl als δικαιώματα--zusammengefügt wurden, was übrigens ja auch durch die Übereinstimmung dieser Personen in (1) und (2) bestätigt wird." Braunert did not, of course, have the outer columns available to him to develop this hypothesis with more specificity.

⁸His full sister.

names at the start of line 3 and at the start of line 19 were both 'Ἡρακλείδου), which would agree with line 17.⁹

Column iv shows that the declaration occupying lines 59-80 included Zoidous, the young daughter (age 6) included in the previous declaration. She would now be 20. There is at least one person listed before her, since column iv is incomplete at the top and there is one preserved line before Zoidous is listed. It is a reasonable guess that there are at least four and probably five persons listed after her before the concluding formulas. Perhaps her husband precedes her and some children follow, but that is not likely to be the whole story, since at age 20 she is not likely to have that many living children.

The amphoda mentioned in the various declarations have given rise to some discussion. A tabular display of the information may help clarify matters:

	21-38	39-58	59-80
Praktor	metropolis	Moeris	omitted
Amphodarch	Hiera Pyle	not said	omitted
Laographos	Hiera Pyle	not said	omitted
Decl. residence	Moeris	Moeris	Apoll.Hier.
Property located	Moeris	Apoll.Paremb.	Moeris
Registers renters	Hiera Pyle	lost	?
Previously reg. in	Hiera Pyle	Hiera Pyle	lost/not said

Column i mentions also Gymnasium and apparently Moeris in the first declaration, and an amphodon name which I have not managed to read in the second. Westermann and Kraemer argued that the declaration 59-80 (starting in line 39 in their numbering) registered the residents to the "bureaucrats of Moeris, not because the house was there, but because the residents were on the rolls there." In fact, however, Isidora files the declaration (as far as it is copied) only with the strategos, basilikos grammateus, and the grammateis of the metropolis; the amphodon officials are not even mentioned. Nor is it clear that she registers them as being in Moeris. Similarly, as Braunert pointed out, the notion that the renters were registered in Apolloniou Parembole in 39-58 rests on a

⁹In line 5, there may be abbreviation in [α]ϛ[τ]ης. In 15, possibly 'Αράβω(ν) at the end of the amphodon name, but that is very uncertain. Gagos suggests that the age in 13 may have been 42 (μβ), but the first digit is very uncertain.

misconstruction of the grammar.¹⁰ Braunert's attempt to find Hiera Pyle in line 48, however, cannot be supported; he faithfully reports Hombert's opinion (based on a photograph) that the reading is impossible, and Hombert was right.¹¹

On the other hand, there is no certainty either that Braunert's interpretation of the overall situation is correct. The declaration of 39-58 simply does not preserve for us the information of where the registration was carried out, and indeed line 52 (ἀμφοτέρους ἀπογεγραμ(μένους) τ[ου]ῶ β (ἔτους) ἐπὶ Ἱερῶς Πύλ[ης] might well lead one to suppose that it is put that way not (as Braunert thought) because *only* the parents were registered in the previous census (and not the children, not then living), but rather because they are *now* registered somewhere else. The final declaration is not likely to solve this problem, even if we could read line 67 with confidence, because the identity of the household with that in the previous declaration is unclear.

19. *P.Corn.* 17

This declaration, complete aside from small losses, mentions eleven persons, of whom three are women said to be registered by their husbands, i.e., in other households. The editors' text has been improved by various suggestions reported in *BL* 2.2.49 and 3.46, and subsequently by Dieter Hagedorn in *ZPE* 65 (1986) 86-87, but it is capable of a few further improvements, and the whole is by now sufficiently changed to deserve the printing of a text which incorporates them.¹²

παρὰ Σερῆ[μπ(ιος) Πατερ]μού[θ(ιος)] τ[ο]ῦ
 Σίριος μη(τρὸς) Θενη[. . .]ωνος τῶν
 ἀπὸ κώμ(ης) Ἀγκυρώ(νων). ἀπογρ(άφομαι) πρὸς τ[ὴν τοῦ]
 4 θ (ἔτους) Ἀντωνεῖνου Καίσαρος τοῦ
 κυρίου κατὰ τὰ κελ(ευσθέντα) ὑπὸ Οὐαλ(ερίου)
 Πρόκλου τοῦ ἡγεμ(όνος) εἰς τὸ ἐπιβάλ(λον)
 μοι μέρος οἰκί(ας)· εἶμι δέ·

¹⁰Braunert, *op.cit.*, 309.

¹¹Braunert, *op.cit.*, 309 with n.97.

¹²See above, on *P.Corn.* 16, for the abbreviations in the apparatus. H = D. Hagedorn.

- 8 ὁ Σερέμπις (έτων) ν οὐλ(ή) μήλ(ω)
ἀριστ(ερῶ)
γυνή μου Θενοσί(ρις) Ψενοσί(ριος) (έτων) νδ·
Πατερμουθ(ις) υἱός μου (έτων) κ[.]· καί
- 12 γυνή (αὐτοῦ) Θεναμο(ῦνις) Ψεναμο(ῦνιος) (έτων) ις·
Ταῶς θυγ(άτηρ) μου μη(τρὸς) Τετεμούθ(ιος)
ἀπογεγρ(αμμένη) ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδ(ρὸς) αὐτῆς·
Νοῦρις Πνεφο(ρῶτος) μη(τρὸς) Θεννούπ(ιος) υἱὸς
- 16 ἀδελ(φοῦ) μου τετελ(ευτηκότος) (έτων) λ οὐλ(ή)
βήμ(ατι) δεξιῶ·
Πατερμουθ(ις) ἀδελ(φὸς) τούτου (έτων) κς ἄση(μος)·
Πνεφο(ρῶς) Πνεφο(ρῶτος) μη(τρὸς) Θενοσίριος
- 20 υἱὸς τῆς προγεγρ(αμμένης) μου γυναικ(ὸς)
έτων κς ἄση(μος)·
γυνή (αὐτοῦ) Ταμουνις Ἀμενή(ως) (έτων) ιη·
Ταφορσίς ἀδελ(φή) τούτου ἀπογεγρ(αμμένη)
- 24 ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδ(ρὸς) αὐτῆς·
Ταῶς ἄλ(λη) ἀδελ(φή) τοῦ (αὐτοῦ) ὀμ(σίως) ἀπογεγρ(αμμένη)
ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀ[δ]νδ(ρὸς) αὐτῆς·
ὑπάρχ(ει) δέ μοι ἐν τῇ (αὐτῇ) κώμ(η) ἕτερ(α) οἰκοδ(ομήματα)
- 28 καὶ τῇ Θενοσί(ρει) γυναικ(ί) μου (πρότερον)
τῶν γονέων αὐτῆς, καὶ Νοῦρι
καὶ Πατερμουθ(ι) ὀμ(σίως) (πρότερον) τῶν γονέω(ν)
αὐτῶν, καὶ ὀμ(σίως) Πνεφο(ρῶτι) Πνεφο(ρῶτος) καὶ
- 32 [τ]αῖς τούτου ἀδελφαῖς (πρότερον) τοῦ π(ατρὸς)
[αὐ]τῶν ἐν τῇ (αὐτῇ) κώμ(η) ἕτερα
[οἰκ]οδ[ομ]ή(ματα). ὀμνύω τὴν
[Αὐτοκ]ράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτου
- 36 [Αἰλίου] Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνεῖνου
[Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσ]εβοῦς τύχην
[καὶ τὸν τοῦ νο]μ(οῦ) θεὸν Ἡρακ[λέ]α
[ἐξ ὑγιούς καὶ ἐ]π' ἄλ(ηθείας) ἐπίδ(εδωκέναι) τὴν
- 40 π(ρο)κ(ειμένην)
[γραφὴν κ]αὶ μηδ(έν) διεψεῦσθ(αι) ἢ ἔνοχ(ος)
[εἴ]ην [τ]ῶ ὄρκω.
(ἔτους) ι Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Τίτου Αἰλίου Ἀδριανοῦ
- 44 Ἀντωνεῖνου Σεβαστοῦ
Ε[ὐ]σεβ[ο]ῦς, Φαμενώθ ἰδ̄.

- (2 H.) 'Ωρείς διὰ 'Αφύγχ(ιος) φίλ(ου) σεση(μείωμαι).
 (3 H.) 'Αρψήμις καὶ Παχνοῦβις διὰ
 48 Σαραπίω[ν]ος φίλου σεσημειώ(μεθα).
 (4 H.) 'Ισιῖ[ω(ρος)] κωμ(ογραμματαεύς) δι(ὰ) Π[τ]ο[λ]λ(εμαίου)
 σεση(μείωμαι).

1 παρὰ ['Ο]σερέ[μπ(ιος)] W-K, παρὰ Σερέ[μπ(ιος)] H-P
 2 Ψενπ[W-K 3 'Αγκυρῶ(ν), πρὸς τ[ήν W-K, 'Αγκυρῶ(ων),
 πρὸς τ[ὸ] Bilabel 5 κειλ(ευσθέντα) W-K 8 'Οσερέμπις
 W-K, ὁ Σερέμπις H-P 11 κ (possibly with one lost letter
 following) G 16 τετελεσ(μένου) W-K, τετελευτ(ηκότος) V,
 τετελ(ευτηκότος) Y,H 16-17 οὐλ(ή) κ<ν>ημ(ῶ) δεξιῶ W-K,
 οὐλ(ή) βήμ(ατι) δεξιῶ Kapsomenakis 27 οἰκόπ(εδα) δ W-K,
 οἰκοδ(ομήματα) Bilabel, οἰκόπ(ε)δ(α) H 32 τού(των) W-K,
 τοῦ π(ατρὸς) H 33-34 ἕτερα. | καὶ ἐπερωτηθεῖς
 ὁμνύω W-K, ἕτερα | [οἰκοδομήματα] (καὶ) ὁμνύω H-P
 [οἰ]οδ[ομ]ή[ματα] G 35 Αὐτοκρά[τορ]ος W-K 36 Αἰλίου
 'Αδριαν[οῦ] W-K 37-38]μ() θεονηρακ[. .]α |
 . . .] πόλ(εως) W-K, [καὶ τὸν κύρ(ιον) ἡ]μ(ῶν) θεὸν 'Ηρακ[λε]α |
 [τῆς 'Ηρακλ(έους)] πόλ(εως) W, [καὶ τὸν τοῦ νο]μ(οῦ) θεὸν
 'Ηρακ[λε]α | [ἐξ ὑγι(οῦς) καὶ ἐ]π' ἄλ(ηθείας) Bilabel
 39 οἰκ(ίας) W-K, π(ρο)κ(ειμένην) H 40 ἔνοχος W-K
 ἔνοχ(ος) G, H 46 'Αρ[α]β[ῶ]ς W-K, Μαρ[ε]ῖ[ς] Bilabel,
 'Ωρείς H 49 'Ισιῖδωρο[ς] Ψ. . . . W-K, 'Ισιῖδω(ρος)
 κω(μογραμματαεύς) δι(ὰ) Πανᾶ(τος) Bilabel, 'Ισιῖ[ω(ρος)]
 κωμ(ογραμματαεύς), Π[τ]ο[λ]λ(εμαίου) H

Only a few comments are required. Hombert and Préaux suggested οἰκοδομήματα] (καὶ) in line 34, but the traces do not allow the conjunction. The editors' translation should be corrected where they did not recognize $\bar{\alpha}$ as meaning (πρότερον). Bilabel's restoration of the oath formula is correct except that space allows less abbreviation than he printed inside the brackets. On φίλου, see Hagedorn, 87.

20. P.Hamb. I 7

Our only declaration from the nome of Berenike, dated to 132, this text is just sufficiently damaged, by abrasion and loss of a strip in the left

middle, to pose problems. Five persons are registered: (1) the declarant, Niktathymis son of Papeiris and Apollonia, 71; (2) a 60-year-old woman whose names are damaged, clearly his wife because the third person is called ὁ υἱὸς ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων); (3) Niktathymis the son of these two, 40;¹³ (4) a further man, whose name is poorly preserved, and whose age is lost; (5) a 65-year-old woman, names damaged, his wife.

In the case of both women, their status is given in the edition (with corrections in *BL*) as ἡ γυνὴ Κλω() . . and ἡ γυν(τή) Κλωδ() . . On a photograph¹⁴ it is possible to see that the unread traces are in both cases ἄση(μον), as people are commonly described in these declarations. The supposed delta in the second instance is in fact the alpha of this word. But κλω() is correctly read, it seems. The editor speculated, "Ob wir es als Κλω(διανοῦ) γρ(αμματέως) (= Freigelassene des γρ. Κλ.?) lesen und auflösen können, scheint mir sehr unsicher." Since γρ is not the correct reading, this speculation may be discarded. What the meaning can be, however, is not obvious. Given the position of the word, one might think of an occupation, although this is rare with women. I can only wonder if a feminine equivalent of κλωστής, "spinner," might be meant. It would at least be an appropriate occupation for a woman. But I can offer no parallel.

The name of no.4 was read by Preisigke on the plate as Ἀμοῦνις Ἀρχιδήμου, but that leaves one with space for, and the end of, something else before it. Since the scribe seems to have managed cases otherwise, the apparent nominative in second place may be disquieting. A sigma precedes it, and before that apparently αἰ. The traces before alpha would be compatible with kappa, and it seems plausible to read [. . . ὁ] καὶ Σαμοῦνις; the nominative is thus acceptable. I have not found Samounis elsewhere, but note Σουσαμοῦνις in *P.Brux.* I 21.12, and the late undeclinable form Σαμοῦν, found in (for example) *CPR* X 8-10. As to the man's metronymic, read Τα[.]σε..., traces easily conforming to eta are present in the "lacuna", and that really leaves only Ταήσεως as a possibility; the last two letters seem to me an acceptable reading. After them appears a faint L-shaped year sign, with the age lost in the lacuna. It was probably at least 65 (his wife's age).

To return to the declarant: After his names, but before his physical description, comes a lacuna, followed by a string of letters read as

¹³A series of corrections, including this man's age, appears in *BL* 1.193.

¹⁴Kindly provided by Dr. Eva Horváth.

follows by the editor: *σειραδοχιμ()*. What can this be? The answer is *παραδόχιμ(ος)*, "hereditary," used of priests.¹⁵ And indeed, before it one can read [*ιερε*]ύς, with the right half of the upsilon very clear. Since his son is also designated a priest, one can hardly be surprised.

21. SB X 10759

This declaration, for the census of 33/4, is one of the earliest surviving.¹⁶ It includes a family of six, whose names are all preserved but whose ages are all lost with the right part of the text, where a lacuna amounting probably to half of the original has taken much of the information. There then follows a section (lines 16 ff.), for most of which still more is lost at right, in which an extended family of renters, *ἔνοικοι*, was enumerated. Indications of the size of the lacuna cease in the published text just at this point, so that it is difficult to judge how many such renters there were, and where the surviving information fits into their enumeration. The surviving traces suggest a minimum of nine renters, in my judgment, based on the following use of the space, which is obviously uncertain in detail.

- 16 καὶ ἔνοικος προφερόμενος Β[- 18 - 'Αφρο-]
 δισίου μη(τρός) Σαραπι[ι]ά[δος (έτων) .. ἄσημ(ος)· NN NN
 μη(τρός)]
 Θερμίου (έτων) κε [ἄσημ(ος)· NN NN μη(τρός) NN (έτων) ..
 ἄσημ(ος)·]
 Σαραπίων νεώ(τερος) 'Αφ[ροδισίου μη(τρός) τῆς α(ύτης)
 (έτων) .. ἄσημ(ος)· NN NN]
- 20 μη(τρός) τ(ῆς) α(ύτης) (έτων) ιη· 'Ηρακλ[- 29 -]
 καὶ τοῦ 'Αφροδ[ισίου γυνή (?) - 26 -]
 καὶ τοῦ Σαρα[πίωνος (πρ./νεω.) γυνή (?) - 23 -]
 καὶ ἕτερος ἔν[οικος - 27 -]

¹⁵A reading I would not have discovered without the Duke Data Base of Documentary Papyri, which gives *P.Aberd.* 16 and *SB VI 9066*; cf. *WB III 382* for additional references.

¹⁶Its date is presumably 35, rather than 33/34, since Arsinoite declarations were normally filed in the second half of the year following that of the census.

In line 16, an alias seems likely. The second son listed is evidently Aphrodisios' by a second marriage, as are those following. It seems to me probable that the lost name in 17 is Aphrodisios, who is referred to in line 21, which is otherwise inexplicable. Before Sarapion the younger may well stand in 18 Sarapion the elder, but that is not necessary, as the elder might have died or left. I suppose that the person in 19-20 is still a son, and Herakl[also is probably male. The persons listed in 21-22 could be something other than wives, but they seem the most likely restoration. In sum, it is probable that we have six children of Aphrodisios, one by his marriage to Sarapias and five by his marriage to Thermion. The "other renter" in line 23 may begin an entirely new family, but the papyrus breaks off at this point.

Columbia University

Roger S. Bagnall