Revisions for *P.Mich. X 578* (Census List)

Ann Ellis Hanson

The *editio princeps* makes clear that *P.Mich. X 578* (*P.Mich. inv. 616*) is from Philadelphia; that it belongs to the Julio-Claudian tax archive; and that its information ultimately derives from census submissions. The haphazard arrangement of the data is, as the first editor observes, most likely due to the fact that the ages given for these nine *aphelikes* were extracted from a register following the topographical arrangement of census takers and tax collectors, both of whom are known to have proceeded house-by-house at Philadelphia. He also dates the text to "probably 22/23 A.D.," with regnal year 6 belonging to the reign of Tiberius, CE 19/20, and argues that this text furnishes additional evidence for a census in that year (but see cautions in R.S. Bagnall and B.W. Frier, *The Demography of Roman Egypt* [Cambridge 1994] 3, n. 10). I shall here argue that "regnal year 8" in *P.Mich. 578.6, 7, 9, 10*, refers to the census year of CE 47/48 in the reign of Claudius, as I promised I would do some time ago. My evidence for the revised date of *P.Mich. 578* originally centered on my uneasiness over two aspects: first, the fact that documents in the Julio-Claudian tax archive dated to the reign of a named emperor only begin in the reign of Tiberius with regnal year 16, CE 29/30, and most texts in the archive with secure dates derive from reigns of Gaius, Claudius, and the first half of Nero. In this context references to regnal years 6, 7, and 8, seem out of place, if they be assigned to Tiberius (CE 19/20, 20/21, and 21/22). Second, and equally disturbing to me, is the editor's assumption about Stratippos, s. of Titan (l. 10): "The rarity of the name Titan makes it certain that the same Stratippos is referred to in all three papyri." The three papyri in question are: a declaration of death for Stratippos' son Nemesion, *SB XII* 11112.3–4, giving no age for Stratippos, s. of Titan, although the text itself is securely dated to CE 48; two papyri without precise dates which mention the age of a Stratippos, s. of Titan, *P.Mich. 578.10*, where he is 14 years old in year 8, and *P.Alex. 9.7–8 + BL VI, 2*, where he is 37 (ως ἐτῶν ζ). Thus the editor assigns a date of probably CE 22/23 to the Michigan papyrus on the assumption that the regnal year 6 in lines 2, 4, 5, refers to CE 19/20, and the date CE 44/45 to the Alexandrian papyrus, reflecting the 23 years he assumes separate Stratippos' age of 14 years in CE 21/22 and the year in which he would have been 37 years old.

Prosopographical evidence long ago suggested to me that the tax archive contains references to at least two men named Stratippos, s. of Titan – a grandfather and a grandson. And it is the grandson who is 14 years old in CE 47/48. But there is more from other texts from Philadelphia: not only is Stratippos, s. of Titan (l. 10), more comfortable as a 14 year old in CE 47/48, but both Kollouthos, s. of Ptollos (l. 3), and Kephalon, s. of Patouamtis (l. 7), are as well. Even Herakles, s. of Herakles (l. 6), with his very common name, is better placed as a 13 year old in CE 47/48. Data for the nine individuals listed in *P.Mich. 578* are surveyed below in the line-by-line commentary to the text, as are the minor adjustments made to the Greek text in lines 3, 4, 5, 7. In short, nearly half of these *aphelikes* obviously benefit from the revised dating, and no entry opposes the reassignment of the census year to that in the eighth year of Claudius' reign.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.Mich. inv. 616 (P.Mich. X 578)</th>
<th>10.2 x 17.5 cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortly after CE 47/48</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate: <a href="http://wwwapp.cc.columbia.edu/lpdp/app/apis/item?mode=item&amp;key=michigan.apis.2648">http://wwwapp.cc.columbia.edu/lpdp/app/apis/item?mode=item&amp;key=michigan.apis.2648</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In P.Siṣṣ. 26.96–97 Kollouthos, s. of Ptolli and Koleus, heads the list of minors, 14 years of age, who are present for regnal year 11 (CE 50/51) from the census descriptions: καὶ προσγίνουσαι εἰς τὸ ια (ʔetos) ἀφήλικες (τεσσαρεσκειδακαιετῖς) ἐξ εἰκονισμοῦ | Κολλούθος Πτόλλιδος μὴ(τρὸς) Κολεῦτος. In P.Mich. 578.3 both the regnal year and Kollouthos’ age are lost at right; while precise restoration of the two numerals is impossible, the local tax office considers Kollouthos liable for capitation taxes in the synopsis for regnal year 11 of Claudius, CE 50/51. Hence Kollouthos most likely attains 14 years of age in that year, or the year previous, having been first entered into census records as an 11 or 12 year old in CE 47/48 among those advancing toward age 14 years in regnal year 8: ἀφήλικες προσβαίνοντες εἰς (τεσσαρεσκειδακαιετῖς) (ἐτεί) ἡ. The numerals missing from the end of line 3 are likely to be (ἐτεί) ἡ ἐτῶν, 12 years old in year 8.

4 Μύσθας, instead of [   ] θας in P.Mich. 578.4. For the form of the name Μύσθας in the Philadelphia archive, see G.M. Browne, P.Mich. XII 638.17 and note ad loc.: "the nominative of this name in all the unabbreviated forms is regularly Μύσθας and the genitive is Μύσθου." The initial traces in this line seem those of μυ, but to date, no other Mysthas, s. of Harmiysis and Taesis, has appeared elsewhere in the prosopography of early-Roman Philadelphia. The Harmiysis, s. of Mysthas, who occurs in tax records for ca. CE 34 (SB XVI 12738 iii 12) and after ca. CE 46/47 (SB XX 14576.384), probably refers to the father of this ἀφήλιξ. Mysthas himself is perhaps 12 or 13 years old in regnal year 6, CE 45/46, and therefore already subsumed into the tax rolls prior to the synopsis for regnal year 11, CE 50/51 (P.Siṣṣ. 26).

5 Ἰσχίς Κάλλιτος, for Μάλλιτος in P.Mich. 578.5 (a name otherwise unattested in the papyri when the ed. prin. was published, see the note ad loc. p. 6, and one which remains so to the present day). To date, no other Ischis, s. of Kallis and Thenomounis, has appeared elsewhere in the prosopography of early-Roman Philadelphia. There is, however, some indication within the archive that both Ἰσχίς and Κάλλις may represent shortened forms of Ἰσχυρίων and Καλλίστρατος respectively, and that the choice of whether or not to use the longer form is made by the scribe, not the taxpayer. See e.g. the alphabetical year-register for payments of capitation taxes for the year CE 29/30, P.Princ. I 9 vi 26, where Ἰσχυρίων Καλλίστρατο(u) can be read at the beginning of the line: ed. prin., . . . . . p[i]ων Καλλίστρατο(u); or the two brothers both Ἰσχυρίων, s. of Κάλλις, one "elder" and the other "younger," in a daybook of payments made for the year CE 30/31, SB XVI 12737 v 7–8. But Κάλλις, s. of Ἱσχυρίων, appears even more frequently in the daybooks also dated to the last years of the reign of Tiberius (e.g. P.Corn. I 21 xiii 378). This evidence does no more than show that the names Ischis (Ischyrios?) and Kallis (Kallistratos?) alternate in a Philadelphian family of peasant tax payers in Julio-Claudian times.

6 The name Herakles, s. of Herakles, is omnipresent in the tax archive, yet at least eight of the men so named gain individuality through the different names provided for their mothers in some taxing documents: in addition to Herais here, there is also Glauke, Dionysia, Thanoubis, Sensouchis, Taksnephoros, Tanesneus, and Tapontos. In P.Siṣṣ. 26.92, the synopsis for CE 50/51, two men are said to enter military service in CE 49/50, ἐστρατευμέ(νοι) t (ἐτεί), and while one has the distinctive name Titan, s. of Nemieson (for whom, see below, note to l. 10), the other is Herakles, s. of Herakles, who may be the same young man of P.Mich. 578.6, then 13 years old in year 8, CE 47/48, for he would then be about 15 years
old at the time he enters military service. This is probable, but not certain, since the name Herakles, s. of Herakles, is encountered so frequently in the Philadelphia tax rolls.

7 Kephalon, s. of Patouamitis and Taoueis?: the ed. prin. does not take note of the fact that the omicron-upsilon in the mother’s name represents a supralinear correction to the genitive Ταωτος. While both Ταους and Ταως are attested names for women, P.Mich. 578.7 represents the only occurrence thus far of Ταουως, if, in fact that be the correction the scribe intends. The first editor suggests that this Kephalon is likely an ancestor of the latter-day inhabitant of Philadelphia mentioned in P.Lond. II 257.212 (CE 94/95), Kephalon, s. of Patouamitis and Taoueis, with his paternal and maternal grandfathers listed respectively as Ptolis and Kephalon. But, if the revised dating argued for here is accepted, it is more likely that the same Kephalon appears in both papyri, as is also the case with Theon, s. of Panomgeus and Tanetbeuis in lines 1–2 above. The two young men Theon and Kephalon are embarking on their liability for capitation taxes in P.Mich. 578 and then leaving the tax rolls in P.Lond. II 257 some forty-seven years later. A photograph of the London papyrus makes clear that the second pi in Πατουάμπτιος is an error of the transcript (p. 26; cf. also l. 209, where the transcript again gives the incorrect Πατουάμπτιος, and the father’s name in both lines 212 and 209 is writ as Πατουάμπτιος). Kephalon himself is said to be 5[?] years of age in this house-by-house register, and although only a few traces remain of the numeral after ν, a reading of φ seems more likely than the other possible numbers, with the exception of ω. If the 59 year old Kephalon of CE 94/95 is also the aphelix of the Michigan text, he would have been 12 years old in regnal year 8 of Claudius, CE 47/48, 47 years previous. (By contrast, a 55 year old Kephalon in CE 94/95 would be only a seven or eight year old in regnal year 8 of Claudius, CE 47/48, rendering the reading of ω for Kephalon’s age in the London text less attractive than φ.)

The name of Kephalon’s mother, however, remains a mystery (Ταουεις?, Ταους?, Ταως?), but both Kephalon, s. of Patouamitis, and his father, Patouamitis, s. of Ptolis, appear elsewhere in the Philadelphia tax archive, in which Patouamitis is a relatively rare name. Hence, it is attractive to consider the entry for Kephalon in P.Mich. 578.7 additional evidence that regnal year 8 belongs to Claudius, not Tiberius.

8 To date, no other Psosneus, s. of Hatres and Talous, has appeared elsewhere in the prosopography of early-Roman Philadelphia, despite the fact that the orthography for Psosneus varies in the archive, thus presenting more possibilities for identifications. (See especially P.Thomas 5.2–3, where the name Psosneus is written in two different ways in successive lines by two different hands).

9 To date, the name of Herakles, s. of Orsenouphis and Taesia, has not appeared elsewhere in the prosopography of early-Roman Philadelphia.

10 Titan, Stratippos’ father, has a rare name, attested in the Herakleopolite nome by P.Oxy. XIX 2230.5, 6, 11, and otherwise only at Philadelphia over the course of several centuries (in addition to the Julio-Claudian archive, see P.Yale III 76, CE 216/217, Diogenes, s. of Titan). In the mid-first century CE two distinct families of Philadelphia employ the name: Titan, s. of Apollonios and Tanomgeus, 49 years old in CE 46/47, sometimes mentioned together with his brother Sostratos (e.g. P.Princ. I 8 iv 5–7); and the family of this Stratippos, s. of Titan and Helenous, 14 years old in regnal year 8.

Of particular importance here is the still unpublished P.Brit.Mus. inv. 2248 (the front side of P.Lond. VI 1912, Claudius’ Letter to the Alexandrians), itself a year ledger of payments for regnal year 2 of Gaius,
CE 37/38; at iii 37–42 three men are listed, Stratippos, s. of Titan, and his sons Nemesion and Titan, and each of the three entries is marked in the margin by ἀπολύσιμος Καισάρων, priviledged farmer involved with the imperial estate of Gaius and Gemellus. Both Stratippos' sons, Nemesion and Titan, must be more than 14 years old in CE 37/38, because their names occur in a tax register among those liable to laographia, even though their payments are handled separately by the Philadelphia tax office (P.Sijp. 26.9, 95, 131 and the two notes with commentary to the subject matter of l. 9 – that is, the note to lines 9, 95, 131 and also the note to lines 9-15). Their father, Stratippos, s. of Titan, is probably the man mentioned as 37 years old in P.Alex. 9.7–8, if the paleographic arguments advanced by the first editor of P.Mich. 578 in behalf of an early date for P.Alex. 9 be valid (P.Mich. X, pp. 3–4 and n. 4). This Stratippos, s. of Titan, 37 years old when he signs the mutilated contract for Panemgeus, is likewise the father of two adult sons Nemesion and Titan in CE 37/38 (P.Brit.Mus. inv. 2248), and the one who submits the death notice for his son Nemesion in CE 48 (SB XII 11112.3). For father Stratippos also to be the 14 year old in regnal year 8 of Tiberius, CE 21/22, he must immediately after turning 14 years rapidly produce the two boys who will themselves both be 14 years or older by CE 37/38, for this scenario allows for only 16 years between the point at which father Stratippos himself turns 14 years of age and the time when both his sons must themselves be 14 or older. This is perhaps biologically possible, but uncommon in the culture.

Fortunately, there is a second Stratippos, s. of Titan, in the Julio-Claudian tax archive whose biography better meshes with a 14 year old in regnal year 8, provided that the year is CE 47/48. By the time father Stratippos announces the death of his son in CE 48, this Nemesion, s. of Stratippos, has himself fathered a son, Titan, s. of Nemesion, who enters military service in CE 49/50 (P.Sijp. 26.92). If the Herakles, s. of Herakles, who enters the military at the same time as this Titan, also has a mother named Herais, he would be about 15 years old in CE 49/50 (above, note to l. 6), and Titan, s. of Nemesion, one of the grandsons of Stratippos, s. of Titan, may be of similar age. Father Stratippos' other son Titan likewise produces sons whose names appear in Philadelphia tax records, yet his boys have different mothers and apparently are half-brothers: Nemesion, s. of Titan and Ta[pon]tos (SB XX 14526.22, after CE 56/57, a private document belonging to the tax collector Nemesion, s. of Zoilos) and this Stratippos, s. of Titan and Helenous of P.Mich. 578.10, 14 years old in regnal year 8 of Claudius, CE 47/48.
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