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. Anh. 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 ν β, 55, not ν θ, 51. The son's age is very faint, but it appears to have one more hump than a μ should, depending on where the following omicron begins. Under a microscope, I think that λ β 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

¹ I 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 Voelkle and the staff of the reading room at the Morgan Library for their very helpful facilitation of my examination of P. Anh. 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 [κάτοικον] (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 καὶ 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 [καὶ ἐνοικός], 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 ἔνωμα μέρος παρατίμη [καὶ δικαίωμα]. It is difficult to guess the editors' reading. What can this be? Apart from names, the Duke Data Bank shows for this string of letters only the adverbs ἔνωμος, ἀδείως, ἀναφέρως, σποτιδέως (sic), and βραβέως, plus χαράβδεως. I believe that one can read παρατίμη [καὶ δικαίωμα] 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 ἐπούλας. There is room for that, and lambda seems acceptable, but I am not sure that there is room for καὶ before it, even in the short form used by this scribe. Perhaps just καὶ (αἰ) was written here. The phrase "house and epaulis" occurs in P.Erl. 60.5,7 and P.Panop. 10.17 (with an aithron and aule also).
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15. P.Bruz. 1 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 all been in the names. The declarant was read in both editions as Ἀράντιος Ἰαφρόγχως. 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.Bruz. 1. 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 [Σαραφ][ιών]. 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.Bruz. 12 (Θεστήςου(ς)). For the remainder, Nachtergaele and Bingen suggest Ἀράγχως, which I find persuasive. In line 4, then, read [(Ἀ]ρ[ά]γχως.

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 = Scriptiounculae 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 'Apostes' 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.Bruz. 7.17, θ of μυ is corrected from ει. The entirety of line 18 is a later insertion. Line 29, the θ of θεούς is corrected. P.Bruz. 9.2, read Εὐθυμιόν. P.Bruz. 13.3, read Θεαρς. Line 4, read Θεαρς(ις). Line 12, read Ἀραχως. 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 Ἐφιστῆφιος by Hombert and Préaux, but corrected to Ἐστῆφιος by Bingen (Cd'E 47 [1972] 231-32). The third letter, however, seems clearly an omicron, giving θου-. There is no objection to this interchange of omicron and epsilon in the vocalization of T3-sth-n--; cf. names in θου-. Line 18, Ἐφιστῆφιος 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 Ἐφιστῆφιος(ς) rather than Ἐφιστῆφιος(ος). P.Bruz. 15.2, the scribe seems actually to have written Θεομουθου 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 'Αντωνίς and in no.2 as 'Αποστόλος. 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: ὁπό τής. Such a phrase invites αὐτής to follow, and in fact in no.2 I believe that αὐτής (τῆς) does. An examination of no.1, however, persuades me that what stands is αὐτής, with ὁπό τής 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 Ἰη. Nachtergaeel 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 ἀπη(μος), but that is hardly certain. Line 13, I think, should be read ἐν ὥν, 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 (ἐτῶς) [...].

16. P.Bru. I 10

The oldest of the four brothers who file this declaration for their large household is Pantheus 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:

Πετως Παντηθ(εύτος) μπτ(ρος) Θαπσαθης Πετωτο(ς) (ἐτων) μα μονοθ(οιμος).

"One-eyed" is a rare description in the papyri, and study of a photograph\(^3\) shows that just before οφθ there has been abbreviation. The two letters before the abbreviation marking seem to me to be clearly

\(^3\)For which I am indebted to Georges Nachtergaele and Wilfried van Rengen.
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ευ. Personal descriptions in the papyri offer two common characteristics including this diphthong, ευσθιος ὑφαλμόν and λευκῷ ὑφαλμῷ. 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 λευκῷ ὑφαλμῷ. 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.Bru. I 11

The declarant here is a 15-year-old boy named Harendotes son of Panteus, grandson of Pnepheus. The property described consists of a house, 300 cubits of vacant land in the village (with an oilworking establishment on it), Παντεύτος Πνεφερ(ῶτος) Ἱρενδωτ(ός), "appartenant à Panteus, fils de Pnérphéis, fils de Harendotès," according to Nachtergael's translation. In the list of residents, remarkably, Harendotes comes in second place and is described with ὅ ὅνος following the grandfather's name. Hombert and Préaux translated "son fils," with reference to the woman whose entry precedes, whose name they read as Ἰρωθτις. She, or he, is described as son or daughter of Phimous and Aphrodite, and 48 years old. Jean Bingen (Cd'E 47 [1972] 228) remarked, "le nom Ἰρωθτις 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 Σεμθεῖς qui s'impose aussitôt à la lecture, bien qu'on puisse hésiter entre -ευς et -υς pour la finale. Or, Σεμθεῖς 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'Harendotès? La chose est tout à fait possible, mais implique que ὅ ὅνος indique dans ce cas la filiation non avec une Ἰρωθτις, mais avec son père cité peu avant dans le texte. Σεμθεῖς, lui, peut être un vieux serviteur (d'ascendance servile par sa mère Aphrodite?) ou un colocataire."
This reading and interpretation is duly accepted by Nachtergael, who translates ὁ γιός 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 Nachtergael 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 ὑπάρχοντα 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 Σεμθεδς, all of which would be obviated by the reading of a feminine name. 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, Σεραθης. 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 Περθυκου, 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 Σεραθης 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.Com.* 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 το άμφοτερου Γυμναστου appears in the top line of the first column, and του ιδίου του λόγου της άρτης ημερολογίου 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., Αρσεμθεδς, Πεσορσεμθεδς).
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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 αὐτοῦ ἀμφόδ(ου) Γυμνοσίου
]
| "Ἡράως ἐπὶ Μούρεως(ς)
| δ( ) μη(τρός) Λεοντίου ἰδώ(της)
| λοα(γραφούμενος) (ἐτῶν) μυ,
| α (ἐτους) (ἐτῶν) με
|
| [.ς(... ) λαο(γραφούμενος) (ἐτῶν) [ις, α (ἐτους)
| (ἐτῶν) ει
| μη(τρός) τῇ(ς) [α]η(της) μη ἀναγεγρα(μμένος) έν
| έπιγεγρημ(ένους) (ἐτῶν) ι
| ἅτοι[...] [...]. ἀτελ(ής) (ἐτῶν) γ
| 8
| καὶ Ὀμομητριά ἀδελ(φή) οὐσα αὐτοῦ
| (ἐτῶν) μυ
| (ἐτῶν) κ
| (ἐτῶν) βο
| 12
| (ἐτῶν) ζ
| (ἐτῶν) β
| vacat
| [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [. [...
Ειδήσεις στρατηγών 'Αρσι(νοίτου) 'Ηρακλείδου(υ) μερίδος και 'Ερμαίῳ τά(ς) Δ[ρύτων]
βασιλ(ικής) γρα(ματεί) τῆς αύτής μερίδος(ς) και 'Ηρακλείδης και Ειβούλω γραμματ(ευς) μητροπ(ήλεως)
και 'Ηρακλείδης(τής) έξηγη(τής) και μετάχεως πράκτορος ἀργυρίῳ(ν) μητροπ(ήλεως) και
24 'Ηρώδη άμφοδάρχη(τής) Ἰεράς Πύλης και Μάρωνι λαιγ(ράφως) τοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου(υ)
παρά Φιλιππίκου τῆς Ζώλου τοῦ Ἁπολλων(ιοῦ) θυγατρό(ς)
kατοίκου(υ) ἀπογεγραμμένης
dι' ἐτέρου ὑπομνήματος(ός) ἐπ' ἀμφόδου(υ) Μοῦρεως μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἀνδρός
Πλουτίω(νος) τοῦ Κόμωνος κατοίκου(υ) τῶν 'χοιν. ὑπάρχει μοι ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ
28 ἀμφόδου(υ) Μοῦρεως εὕρεσις δ' μέρους σικέιας καὶ ἐτέρων (τάπος·) ἐν ᾁ ἄπογραφο(μα) τοὺς ὑπογεγραμμένους εἰς τὴν τοῦ διελθησθέντος β (ἐτοὺς) Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος
tοῦ κυρίου κατ' οἰκία(ας) ἀπογραφή(πῆς) ἐπ' ἀμφόδου 'Ιεράς Πύλης ἐφ' οὐ καὶ τῇ τοῦ ζ (ἔτους) Θεοῦ Τραίανου κατ' οἰκία(ας) ἀπογραφή(πῆς) ἀπεγράφησαν, καὶ εἰσιν ἐν μέθ' ἐξῆτερα.
32 Ζώλη 'Ηρακλείδου(υ) τοῦ Σωκράτους (ἐτῶν) νῦ· καὶ ταύτης υἱὸν Σωκράτην Διοκλέρου(υ) ἑπακριμένου (ἐτῶν) λή ἀσπίδων(υ)
καὶ θυγατέραν Ἀφροδίτου (ἐτῶν) λγ· καὶ ἐτέραν θυγατέραν (αυ) Ἀφροδίτην γαμουμένην ντό αδελφής Σωκράτη τῇ προγεγραμμένη (ἐτῶν) κη· καὶ τήν τῶν Προγεγραμμένων περὶ Σωκράτην
36 πρεσβυτ(ερούς) κατά πατέραν τηθείου 'Ισαροῦν (ἐτῶν) ο. διὸ ἐπιδίδωμ(ι).
κατακεχώριστος(τοι) στρατηγή(ως) καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πάσιν.
(ἔτους) γ' Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
Φαμενώθ(ῆς) κβ.
Πρωτάρχω στρατηγω 'Αρσι(νοίτου) 'Ηρακλείδου(υ) μερίδος(υ)
καὶ 'Ερμαίῳ βασιλ(ικῇ) γρ(αμματεί) τῆς
αὕτης μερίδος καὶ Μάρωνι γρ(αμματεί) ημηρο(πόλεως) καὶ Διδάκτει πράκτορι Μοῖρε(ως) καὶ Πτολεμαί(ω) ἄμφοδάρχη(τι) καὶ Δείῳ λασσε(ράφω) καὶ Ἀὐτώνευσιν τῷ καὶ Ἰρμιϊῳ προκεχρ(ισμένῳ) παρὰ Ποσοῦ(νος) τοῦ Κόμωνος τοῦ Ἡρώνου μη(τρός) Πτολεμαί(ω) τῆς κ(αι) Πτολέμας τῆς 'Απολλων(ίου) κατοίκ(οι) τῶν 'ἐτος ἄναγραφομένου ἐπ' ἀμφόδους Μοῖρε(ως)

Column iii

44 [ά]πογ(γραμ(μένου)] δι' ἐτεροῦ ὑπομνήματος· ὑπάρχ[ει μοι ἐπ' ἀμφόδου]
'Απολλων(ίου) Πτολεμαί(ω) [. . . μέρος οἰκίας ἐν] ἑ ἀπο(γράφομαι]
τοὺς ὑπό(γεγραμ(μένους) ἐνο[κος εἰς τὴν το[ῦ]
διελθ(υότος) ἑς (ἐτος) 'Αδριανοῦ]
Καὶ(ι)σαρ[ας τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τ' οἰκίαν ἀπογ(ραφή)]
ἐπ' ἀμφόδους [ - - - ]

48 [καὶ] ἔσων· μεθ' ἑτερα]
Σωκράτης Διοσκοροῦ ὑπεκκριμ(μένος) (ἐτών) μη ἀσήμος·
καὶ τὴν τοῦτο τοῦτο διαφοράν υπάρχ[ει] αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑμημ(ἄτριον)
'. . . . . . . . . . . [ομωμητίαν]
ἀδελφὴν 'Αφροδίτ[ή] (ἐτών) μη,

52 ἀμφιτέρους ἀπογ(γραμ(μένους) τ[ου] β (ἐτος) ἐπὶ 'Ιερὰς Πύλ[ῆς])
καὶ τὰ ε̃ ε̃ ἀλλήλων(υ) τέκνα Διοσκοροῦ ἀναγεγρ(αμμένου)
ἐν ἑπιγεγρημένω (ἐτῶν) ἑς διογς(ενημένωι)
καὶ 'Ουρησμοῦ(ν) ἀναγεγρ(αμμένου) ἐν ἑπιγεγρημένω (ἐνος)
(ἐτῶν) τῆς 'Ασκλήπιον ἀναγεγρ(αμμένου) ἐν ἑπιγεγρημένω (ἐνοι) (ἐτῶν) τῆς

56 καὶ θυγατέραν Ζωδοῦν (ἐτῶν) ε̃ καὶ 'Ηραίδα (ἐτῶν) β.
διο γίγνομαι(ν)
κατακε(χώρισι) στρα(τηγῇ) καὶ τοῖς ὅλους πάσι.
(ἐτος) δὲ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Ἐπείφ κπ.
Μαξίμω τοῦ και 'Νεάρχῳ στρατηγῷ καὶ 'Ηρακλείδη
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60 Ἀρσί(νοίτου) Ἡρακλείδο(υ) μερίδο(ς) καὶ Σαβείνω καὶ Ἀντωνείνω γραμματ(ε)ὶ

μπροσπ(όλεως)

παρὰ Ἰσιδώρας τῆς Ἡρωνος τρίτον τοῦ Ἡρωνος καὶ Ἰσιδώρας
tῆς Ἀσκληπ(ίου) ἀναγραφομένης καὶ ἀπογεγραμ(μένης)

δι' ἐτέρου ὑπομνήματο(ς)

64 ἐπ' ἀμφόδου Ἀπολλω(νίου) Ἡρακλείου μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἀνδρός Ἄνατηλ[ης(ίδου)]

tοῦ Ἀσκληπ(ίου) ὑπάρχει μια ἐπ' ἀμφόδου(ιου) Μοήρεω[ς]

ἀ' μέρος οίκ[ης] καὶ άυ[λης]

ἐν ὧ[ν] ποσοσαπογράφομαι(αί) ἔνοικος εἰς τὴν τοῦ
dιελ[η]μηθὼ[τος] τοῦ (ἐτους)

'Ἀ[ντωνείνου Καίσαρος τοῦ Κ[υρίου] κατ' οίκ[ης] ἀπογραφ(ης) [ἐπ'] ἀμφόδ(ου) . . . [.].-.ς

68 [ἐφ'] οἰκὶ καὶ τῇ τοῦ ὅς (ἐτους) 'Αδρια[νοῦ οἴκος(ας)]

ἀπογράφ[ης] τοῦ Κ[αίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου]

Column iv

- - - - - - -

α[.
Ζωι[δοῦν

μη[τρός].-

72 ἀπ.[.

το[π.][ἐ-]

φ' ἐτερ[.

ἐν ἐπιγ[ης(ευμένους)

76 (ἐτων) ἐ' καὶ[.

Διοδω[.

προσεπογραφ[αφ-]

(ἐτους) i ['Ἀντωνείνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου]

80 Ἐπειφ[ς[.

25 Φιλιππιατότης W-K, Φιλιππιαίνης (ex Φιλιππιαίνης), Κ

θυγατρό(ς) κατ' οίκ(ης) W-K, θυγατρό(ς) κατοίκ(ου) H-P

26 δι' ἐσποῦ W-K, δι' ἐτέρου H-P 28 (τέταρτου) W-K
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 μέθ’ 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" indicates that the census was for the 2nd year, and that can only be
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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.

\(^7\)H. Braunert, JIntersection 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 κτήτος οίκων κατ ἀντίγραφοι drei aufeinander folgender Zensusjahre--wohl als διάστασες--zusammengefaßt 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.

\(^8\)His full sister.
names at the start of line 3 and at the start of line 19 were both 'Ἡρωὲλθε(ντίνη), 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Praktor</th>
<th>21-38</th>
<th>39-58</th>
<th>59-80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metropolis</td>
<td>Moeris</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphodarch</td>
<td>Hiera Pyle</td>
<td>not said</td>
<td>omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laographos</td>
<td>Hiera Pyle</td>
<td>not said</td>
<td>omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decl. residence</td>
<td>Moeris</td>
<td>Moeris</td>
<td>Apoll.Hier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property located</td>
<td>Moeris</td>
<td>Apoll.Paremb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registers renters</td>
<td>Moeris</td>
<td>lost</td>
<td>Moeris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously reg. in</td>
<td>Hiera Pyle</td>
<td>Hiera Pyle</td>
<td>lost/not said</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column i mentions also Gymnasion 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 [η]|τ|γ. In 15, possibly 'Ἀράβας(διοτ) at the end of the amphodon name, but that is very uncertain. Gagos suggests that the age in 13 may have been 42 (μυ), 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 (Ἀμφωτέρους ἀπογεγραμμένους τῶν β (Ἔτους) ἤπι "Ἱερᾶς Πύλης 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 Σερέ[μη(ιος)] Πατερ[μοῦ(θ(ιος))] το[υ]
Σἱριος μη(τρός) Θεντ[. . .]μός τῶν
ἀπὸ κώμης Αγκυρώ[νων]. ἀπογράφομαι πρὸς τ[ὴν τοῦ]
4 θ (Ἑτος) Ἀρτωίενίου Καλλικρής τοῦ
κυρίου κατὰ τὰ κελ(ευσθέντα) ὑπὸ Οὐκλείριου
Πρόκλου τοῦ Ἱγεμ[όνως] εἰς τὸ ἐπιβάλ(λον)
μοι μέρος ὀικ[ός] ἐστὶν δὲ—

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 Σερέμπιους (ἐτών) ὑ αὐλ(η) μὴλ(φ)
κριστ(ερψ). θυσία μου Ἐνος(μας) Ἐνος(μας) (ἐτών) ὑδ.
Πατέρμουθ(ις) υὸς μου (ἐτών) κ. [.] καὶ
12 γυνὴ (ἀυτοῦ) Θεομοιοῦνις Θεομοιοῦνις (ἐτῶν) ὑς.
ταῖς δυν(ᾶτερ) μου μη(πρός) Τετεμοῦθ(ιος)
ἀπογεγρ(αμμένη) ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄνδρ(ος) αὐτῆς.
Νοῦρις Ἡπειρο(ρώτος) μη(πρός) Θεονοῦσι(ιος) υὸς
ἀδελ(φοῦ) μου τετελ(ευπηκότος) (ἐτῶν) ὑ αὐλ(η)
βῆμ(ατι) δεξίω.
Πατέρμουθ(ις) ἄδελ(φος) τοῦ τοῦ (ἐτῶν) καὶ ἄστ(ιος).
Πυγεύο(ρος) Πυγεύο(ρος) μη(πρός) Θεοσιφύος
20 υὸς τῆς προγεγρ(αμμένης) μου γυναικ(δς)
ἐτῶν καὶ ἄστιος.
γυνὴ (ἀυτοῦ) Σαμοῦνις Ἀμενή(ως) (ἐτῶν) ὑ.
Ταλασσαίον ἄδελ(φης) τοῦ τοῦ ἀπογεγρ(αμμένη)
ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄνδρ(ος) αὐτῆς.
24 ταῖς ἁλ(ης) ἄδελ(φης) τοῦ (ἀυτοῦ) ὑμ(οίως) ἀπογεγρ(αμμένη)
ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄνδρ(ος) αὐτῆς.
ὑπάρχει(ει) δὲ μοι ἐν τῇ (αὐτή) καμὴ(η) ἕτερ(α) ὁμο(μήματα)
καὶ τῇ Θεοσιφύ(ρει) γυναικ(ίτι) μου (πρότερον)
τῶν γυνῶν αὐτῆς, καὶ Νοῦρι
καὶ Πατέρμουθ(ις) ὑμ(οίως) (πρότερον) τῶν γυνῶν(ν)
αὐτῶν, καὶ ὑμ(οίως) Ἡπειρο(ράτι) Ἡπειρο(ράτος) καὶ
32 τῇ τοῦ τοῦ ἄδελφας (πρότερον) τοῦ π(ατρός)
[αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ (αὐτή) καμὴ(η) ἑτέρα
[ὁικ(οδ)ομ(η)κατα]. ὑμ. ἐν τῇ
[Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτος]
[Αἰλίου] Ἀδριανοῦ Ἁυτωνείου
[Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς τύχη]
[καὶ τοῦ τοῦ νομοῦ θεῶν Ἦρακλῆ][α]
[ἐξ υψιώσας καὶ στὴν ἄλ(ηθείας) ἐπιστ(εικάκεια) τὴν]
π(ρός)(κειμένη).
40 [γραφὴν καὶ μηδ(έν) διεσθεσθ(αί) ἐν υπο(κος)]
[ἐγείρει τῇ ὁρκῳ.
(ἐτούς) ΙΑὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Τίτος Αἰλίου Ἀδριανοῦ]
44 Ἁυτωνείου Σεβαστοῦ
Ε(ὐ)σεβοῦς, Φαμενωθ(ι).
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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 α as meaning (πρώτευον). 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. 17

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 ὅ ψιδο(ζ) ἐξ ἄμφοτ(έρων); (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 γυ(νῆ) Κλωδ( ). . . On a photograph it is possible to see that the unread traces are in both cases ὄπισ(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 α. The traces before alpha would be compatible with kappa, and it seems plausible to read [. . . ὅ] καὶ Σαμοῦνις; the nominative is thus acceptable. I have not found Samounis elsewhere, but note Σαμοῦνις in P.Bruz. I 21.12, and the late undecinable form Σαμοῦν, found in (for example) CPR X 8-10. As to the man's metronymic, read Τα[.]εγ... traces easily conforming to eta are present in the "lacuna", and that really leaves only Ταῦτες 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

13 A series of corrections, including this man's age, appears in BL 1.193.
14 Kindly provided by Dr. Eva Horváth.
follows by the editor: σεραδόχυμ( ). What can this be? The answer is παραδόχυμ(ος), "hereditary," used of priests. And indeed, before it one can read [λεπε]ίς, 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. 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 - Ἀφρο-) διόσιου μη(τρός) Σαραπ[ι], ἄστυμ(ος)· ΝΝ ΝΝ μη(τρός)

Θερμίου (ἐτών) κε [ἄστυμ(ος)· ΝΝ ΝΝ μη(τρός) ΝΝ (ἐτών) ..

ἄστυμ(ος)]

Σαραπίων νεώ(τερος) Ἀφ[ροδισίου μη(τρός) τής α(υτής)

(ἐτών) .. ἄστυμ(ος)· ΝΝ ΝΝ]

20 μη(τρός) τ(ής) α(υτής) (ἐτών) ις Ἡρακλ[ - 29 - ]

καὶ τοῦ Ἀφροδ[ισίου γυνή (?) - 26 - ]

καὶ τοῦ Σαραπίωνος (νρ./νακ.) γυνή (?) - 23 - ]

καὶ ἔτερος ἐν[οικος - 27 - ]

15 A 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.

16 Its 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 Thernion. 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