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The papyri that I would like to present in this paper carry the inventory numbers P. BM EA 10385 and 10393.¹ They were part of the collection of Egyptian antiquities assembled by Henry Salt and auctioned in 1835 at Sotheby’s, where they were acquired by the British Museum (Bierbrier 2012, 484–85). Neither papyrus has been published, but Revillout translated the Greek part of 10393 in 1880 (Revillout 1880, xx).² This was subsequently amended by Wilcken, who found it difficult to understand and suggested that it contained two registration statements (Wilcken 1927, 618 no. 129, cited as P. Forshall 41). His concerns are well-founded and he was correct in his assessment that there are two separate Greek texts. The reason for this is not because it was registered twice, but because the Greek belongs to two different, albeit related, papyri. The fragments must have been mixed together and because of the similarity in the hand of the demotic text (see below) they were assumed to all belong to the same papyrus. An attempt was made at some point, presumably on the basis of the colour, texture and fibres, to put them together. It was not just the fragments of these two related documents that were placed in the one frame, however, because there is also a small additional piece that belongs to an unrelated text. This is in a slightly different hand, but to the untrained eye this would not have been apparent. As this fragment has a right-hand margin it was assumed to be the beginning of the text and was mounted on the right-hand side of the frame accordingly. That it did not belong with the rest was pointed out by Herbert Thompson in his manuscript catalogue of the demotic papyri. Thompson drew attention to the fact that the hands were different and that it only contained the beginning of five lines of text, whereas there were six lines on one of the other fragments.³ Thompson also noted that the Greek subscriptions had to belong to two different texts and suggested that one of these could be P. BM EA 10385. The reason for this proposal, which is certainly correct, was that 10385 has the same date as the Greek subscriptions on 10393 and the demotic was written by the same scribe.

¹ I would like to thank Neal Spencer, Keeper of the Department of Ancient Egypt and Sudan of the British Museum, for permission to publish these papyri, and Ilona Regulski for her constant help and assistance on my visits to the Museum and for providing new digital images. Bridget herself and Helen Sharp examined the papyri in their frames and kindly discussed with me what could currently be gleaned from the state of the fibres. Thanks are also due to Francisca Hoogendijk (Leiden), who examined the Greek dockets and provided revised readings and apparatus criticus, and to Maren Goecke-Bauer (Munich) for the mark-up of the images. I am also most grateful to Brian Muhs (Chicago) for bringing to my attention and sending me photographs and bibliographic details of a hitherto rather neglected Memphite papyrus in Trinity College Dublin (IE TCD MS 1658).

² The papyrus is there referred to under its original inventory number of P. Forshall 41.

³ This is noted in the description of the papyrus in the British Museum on-line database.
THREE PAPYRI: TWO FRAMES

P. BM EA 10393: Physical Description (Figs. 1-2)

There are eight fragments in the frame (labelled A-H), the dimensions of which are: H. x W. 20.5 x 66cm. The fragments are glued onto board. Fragments A, B and D preserve their full bottom margin; fragment A also has its top and right-hand margins; fragment H has its left-hand margin. The writing is parallel to the fibres (↔).

The dimensions of each fragment are as follows:

- Fragment A: H. x W. c. 18 x 5.5cm; beginning of 5 lines of demotic; right-hand margin of c. 1cm, upper margin of c. 1.3cm, lower margin of c. 10cm.
- Fragment B: H. x W. c. 15.6 x 13cm; 4 lines of demotic, 2 lines of Greek; bottom margin of c. 10cm (below demotic text). There is one sheet join, right over left, just to the right of the centre (c. 4.5cm from right-hand edge).
- Fragment C: H. x W. c. 7 x 4cm; 5 lines of demotic; bottom margin of c. 3cm. This fragment has been mounted as though it is attached to fragment B.
- Fragment D: H. x W. c. 16 x 11cm; 6 lines of demotic, autograph confirmation, 2 lines of Greek; bottom margin of c. 9cm (below last line of main demotic text).
- Fragment E: H. x W. c. 8.5 x 7.5cm; 5 lines of demotic; bottom margin of 3cm.
- Fragment F: H. x W. c. 10.3 x 9.5cm; 6 lines of demotic; bottom margin of c. 3.5cm.
- Fragment G: H. x W. c. 2.5 x 2.8cm; 1 line of demotic; bottom margin of c. 2cm.
- Fragment H: H. x W. c. 12 x 18cm; 5 lines of demotic; bottom margin of c. 6.5cm and left-hand margin of c. 1.5cm. There is one sheet join, right over left, on the left-hand side (c. 3cm from the left-hand edge).

Fragments B-H are all written in the same hand but, as noted above, fragment A is by a different scribe. The identity of the two scribes is discussed in the Commentary below.

P. BM EA 10385: Physical Description (Figs. 3-5)

This frame contains on the Front the first complete line of a demotic papyrus, a slightly damaged second line, and a small part of lines 3 and 4. It is not, however, the only text in the frame, because placed next to it on the left-hand side is a separate witness-list and alongside this a small piece of papyrus that bears a black ink stamp. These have been positioned very neatly side-by-side and give the impression that they are all part of the same document. The demotic text: H. x W. 8.8 x 71.8cm; top and side margins are preserved. Upper margin: 1.5cm (from top horizontal stroke of $\text{ha}.t\cdot sp$); right-hand margin 2cm; left-hand margin 1.2cm. The writing is parallel to the fibres (↔). There are six sheet joins, all right over left. They occur at intervals of c. 14cm. The first is 1.5cm from the right-hand edge; the last is 1.2cm from the left-hand side. The witness list: H. x W. 9 x 4.8cm; it has an upper margin of 3.8cm. It is torn at the bottom. There are 6+x names. The writing is perpendicular to the fibres (↕). The black stamp is positioned just above the centre of a small piece of papyrus: H. x W. 10 x 3.5cm. The fibres run vertically (↕). There is a sheet-join running approximately through the middle. All three pieces are glued onto board.

There is a witness-list on the Back (↕), placed above and to the left of the word $dd$ on
the Front (it is visible as a window was cut in the backing board). This witness-list of 10+x names is identical to the one placed next to the main document on the Front, so the latter must belong to a text that was written at the same time. With the exception of fragment A of 10393 the other pieces of papyri in P. BM EA 10393 and 10385 are in the same hand. As the two Greek subscriptions have the same date as the demotic papyrus 10385, it seems certain that we have here two papyri that were drawn up to record the same transaction and that one of the Greek registration statements must belong with the latter text. Although certainty as to which fragments from 10393 belong with 10385 must await the removal of the backing board from the two texts, an analysis of their content does allow us to draw some preliminary conclusions on how the two papyri should be reconstructed.

**Commentary**

The fragments, with the exception of A of 10393, belong to two texts drawn up to record a sale or transfer of real estate: a document of transfer, sh-(r).db3-hd, and a document of no-rights, sh-n-wy. Under Egyptian law two documents were required to establish clear title. The first records the sale/transfer to the second party ('the buyer'); the second recognises that the first party ('the seller') has no rights over the object(s) in question (Zauzich 1968; Lippert 2008, 147–54; Depauw and Manning 2014, 285–87). The real estate in our texts is a house in the Anubieion, whose measurements are 18 x 6 divine cubits (= 9.45m x 3.15m).

The documents were written between the 2nd and 13th October 124 BC and registered in the Anubieion on the 13th. The parties involved are a merchant of Ptah called Harendotes, the son of Paesis and Tasis, and a lady possibly called Smithis (the reading is not certain and the names of her parents are in lacuna). The importance of merchants in the Memphite economy is well documented (Thompson 2012, 67–68), and they appear as participants in a number of texts from the Memphite Necropolis:

– P. BM EA 10393 and 10385 (124 BC);

---


5 This was not the only transaction for which two documents might be drawn up by/for the same party (e.g. certain types of matrimonial property arrangements required two texts), but the content of the document suggests that it is concerned with a sale or transfer.

6 Note fragment H line 5, ‘to complete two documents’.

7 This is reconstructed. The west to east dimension is in P. BM EA 10393; the south to north dimension is in P. BM EA 10385.

8 The year, month, season and first part of the day date are preserved in P. BM EA 10385. In P. BM EA 10393 fragment B line 5 the year, month and beginning of the season can be read. The month and day date are preserved in both Greek registration statements, but the only year in the text of fragment B.

9 In addition, the rights to the income from the work involved in the burial and mortuary-cult of a merchant and his family are the subject of a legal agreement among some funerary-workers in 78 BC, P. dem. Memphis 7 (Martin 2009). The tombs of merchants also appear in the long list of funerary properties in P. Louvre E 3266 (Cenival 1972). We have not included in the above list P. Bibl. Nat. 219 (where party A is a merchant). Although a Memphite origin has been suggested for this text, it could equally come from Athribis; cf. Reymond 1984, 19.
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– P. Cairo 30602 and 30603 (115 BC) (Spiegelberg 1906/8; Wilcken 1927, 618–19 nos 130–31);
– P. Brooklyn 37.1802, 37.1803, 37.1796 and P. Vatican 22 (109/8 BC) (Pierce 1972; Pestman 1977; Revillout 1885; 1886, 85; 1903, 2, 1301–3; Wilcken 1927, 619 nos 132–34);
– P. BM EA 10075 and Bodl. MS. Egypt. a. 41(P) (64 BC) (Cannata 2006).

The merchants involved in the above transactions belong to different organisations: the temple of Ptah, our documents, the domain of Osiris of Rutiset, Cairo 30602 and 30603, and the Anubieion, the Brooklyn papyri, P. Vatican 22, P. BM EA 10075 and P. Bodleian MS. Egypt. a. 41(P). As it happens however, the latter two papyri are concerned with the same property as the two texts edited here, despite the gap of sixty years between them. This property is the house in the Anubieion, whose dimensions and neighbours are identical. This cannot be a coincidence. The protagonists in all the texts are merchants and the papyri were acquired at more or less the same time. The three British Museum texts come from the Salt collection that was auctioned at Sotheby’s in 1835. The Bodleian text that belongs with P. BM EA 10075 originally formed part of the Curzon collection and appears to have been acquired in Egypt at some point in 1833. In addition, there is an unpublished fragmentary papyrus in Trinity College Dublin, IE TCD MS 1658, that entered the collection in this same period and whose contents are clearly related. The father of one of the parties involved in this transaction has the double name of Ares, the property lies on the southern side of the dromos of Anubis, the southern neighbour is the house of the lady Tabis, which was in the possession of Teos and is now with the children of his off-spring, and the traces of the northern neighbour mention Anubis. All of this is identical to the description of the property in P. BM EA 10075 and Bodl. MS. Egypt. a. 41(P), so it would appear that we have here a group of texts that belong to the same archive:

– P. BM EA 10393 and 10385;
– P. BM EA 10075 and Bodl. MS. Egypt. a. 41(P);
– IE TCD MS 1658.

Although the Trinity College text has been dated to the reign of Ptolemy III, this is erroneous. The text is certainly in the hand of the well-known Memphite scribe Pachrates son of Harsiesis, who wrote P. BM EA 10075 and Bodl. MS. Egypt. a. 41(P), and who is attested in texts dating from 78 to 64 BC (Martin 2009, 44 no. xvi). IE TCD MS 1658 is dated to month 3 or 4 of a year 23, which is likely to be that of Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos, 59/8 BC. The period covered by the archive therefore runs from 124 to 59/8 BC. In addition, fragment A of P. BM EA 10393 is written by this scribe (his handwriting is easily identifiable). As it

10 For the location of Rutiset, cf. Martin 2009, 48–49.
12 A catalogue of his collection was privately printed in 1849; it was presented to the Bodleian in 1922 by F. I. L. Griffith, who acquired it at Sotheby’s in the same year; cf. Cannata 2006, 185–86.
13 Abbott 1900, preface p. iv, gives the date of presentation of the papyri by Lord Kingsborough as 1838. The gift is mentioned in the Board Register in 1839. The papyrus is also listed in the catalogue of Hinks 1843, 7 no. 1. A publication of this Trinity College Dublin papyrus is being prepared by Brian Muhs and myself.
was mounted in the same frame, it must have been acquired at the same time and from the same source and may therefore belong to the archive. The identity of the scribe of the other fragments of P. BM EA 10393 and 10385 is less certain. The hand shows many similarities with that of the scribe of P. Pavia 1120, Chensthotes son of Harpbekis, which dates to 118 BC (Botti 1939; Martin 2009, 44 no. xii), but they are not a perfect match on all comparable signs. On balance, however, the similarities outweigh the slight differences and we would cautiously ascribe P. BM EA 10393 and 10385 to Chensthotes.

The order of the fragments

Because they both contain Greek registration statements, fragments B and D cannot belong to the same papyrus. The text on the last line of fragment D is also found in the last line of fragment H. As this is part of a standard formula and this particular phrase only occurs once in this clause, fragments D and H must be assigned to separate texts. The description of the neighbours of the house in P. BM EA 10075 and Bodl. MS. Egypt. a. 41(P) allows us to reconstruct the order of the other fragments with some certainty. The southern neighbour is mentioned in fragment F; the western in fragment E, which is continued in C; and the closing part of the description of the eastern neighbour appears in Fragment B. As it happens, line 4 of fragment B contains a date, which is continued, after a short lacuna, in H. The likely order of the fragments is, therefore, as follows: F, E, C, B, H. In fragment F there is a clear mnḫ.t, ‘beneficent,’ written in line 2 and a probable tḥ=f sn.t, ‘his sister,’ in line 1. Although mnḫ.t is in lacuna in line 2 of 10385, the shape of fragment F does not fit with the rest of that text and in addition tḥ=f sn.t, is preserved in line 1. Fragment F and, accordingly, fragments E, C, B and H cannot belong to 10385. Fragment D, on the other hand, which cannot be part of the same text as B or H, should therefore be assigned to 10385. The position of the tiny fragment G is uncertain. As fragment A is written by a different Memphite scribe, it belongs to a different papyrus of a later date. The witness-list to the side of P. BM EA 10385 must belong with 10393. Given that it would have been behind, or nearly behind, the dd on the Front, we should expect there to be text on its other side. To which papyrus the piece with the black stamp belongs is uncertain and can only be resolved when the backing has been removed. If it is part of 10393, there may be text on the other side.

In the translation that follows, the fragments of P. BM EA 10393 are arranged according to their probable order. The small fragment G is placed next, although its exact position is uncertain, followed by D, which belongs with P. BM EA 10385, and then fragment A.

14 iw=t mr hpr m-s=f, ‘If you wish to be behind’ (fragment D); iw t=t mr [hpr] m-s=f, ‘If you wish [to be] behind’ (fragment H).

15 See the remarks in the commentary above.
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**Text 1: P. BM EA 10393** (Figs. 1-2)

**Fragment F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>... tAy = f sn.t</td>
<td>... his sister ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>... mnh.t irm1 [t3 fy] t31-[nb m-b3h</td>
<td>... Beneficent, and [the Bearer-of-the-Golden]-basket [before ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>... nty 'kd' iw = f 'hbs' tw = f mH 'sb' [i 3] st</td>
<td>... which is built (and) roofed (and) provided with a door (and) window [ ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>... Ta]-b'ly 'nty hr1 Dd-1 hr3 [s3] 'Hr-p3-Rc nty hr n3 hrd.fw</td>
<td>... Tabis which was in the possession of Teos [son of] Harpres, which is (now) in the possession of the children [of his children ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>... md(t) nb (n) p3 t3 i.ir-n=t (n) rn= w' p3 nty iw = f iy</td>
<td>... any claim (on) earth against you (in) their name. The one who will come [ ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>... 'dd' i.iry 'md(t) nb nty hry1 'h3t' = y mtr n.im=w</td>
<td>... says: 'Carry out every word which is above. My heart is [satisfied with it ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Textual Notes**

- **Line 1**: For the writing of tAy = f sn.t, cf. P. BM EA 10385, line 1; P. Pavia 1120, line 1.

- **Line 2**: The difference in the writing of mnh.t between the example here and the more elaborate form in P. BM EA 10385 is quite normal in Memphite texts.\(^16\)

- **Line 4**: The reading of this very poorly preserved section is based on P. BM EA 10075 and Bodl. MS. Egypt. a. 41(P), where the property called the house of Tabis is the southern neighbour. Although the writing of Ta-by is damaged and the initial Ta- lost, the yod and the ly-group, which is occasionally used to write the ending of the name,\(^17\) are certain. In the BM and Bodleian papyri the scribe has the relative imperfect rwn-n3:w, ‘which was,’ which emphasises the distinction between the past and present occupants of the property, whereas our text just uses the relative converter nty.

- **rn=w**: ‘their name,’ or rn (n) p3 nty, ‘name (of) the one who’: how this clause should be continued is uncertain.

---

\(^{16}\) Cf. Martin 2009, 105 n. c.

Fragment E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'irm ti'[f]ly [...]</td>
<td>[...] and the Bearer-[of-the-Prize-of-Victory ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>'irv mntr 6 (n) 'p'ts mnt r pr isbtln' [...]</td>
<td>[...] measures 6 divine cubits from west to east, together with [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'p'ts wy (n) 'nh-Hp [...]</td>
<td>[...] the house (of) Achoapis [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ibd]-3/4 smw 'r,r=wa ... md(s) nb' [...]</td>
<td>3rd/4th [month of] smm, concerning them ... Everything on earth [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>htr iwty mn iw=w dd 'p'ts 2 [...]</td>
<td>[...] compulsorily, without delay. They say, the two people, [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual Notes

- **Line 3**: For the reading of the traces after 6, cf. line 2 of P. BM EA 10075 and Bodl. MS. Egypt. a. 41(P).

- **Line 4**: The house of Achoapis lies to the west of the house, so the mention of the northern neighbour that would have preceded it is in lacuna.

- **Line 5**: The traces at the beginning of the fragment could belong to either *ibd*-3 or *ibd*-4. The season *smw* is written *smm*, as also in P. Pavia 1120. The reading *r,r=wa*, ‘concerning them,’ is only a possibility, and it could be *r*, ‘to,’ followed by a verb, but in the broken context this section of the text is problematic. The possibility that it might be *ibd*, ‘month,’ is unlikely because of the clear writing in fragment C line 5.

Fragment C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>'r.' [...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'nty hrt hrid. tw' n 'n=ty=s' [...]</td>
<td>which is in the possession of the children of her [children ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>r't'hrt=ta n 'p'ts ibd mn=fa [...]</td>
<td>from you in the said month [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>sh-(r), db3-hd nty hry 'hn' p'ly=f' [...]</td>
<td>document-of-money which is above, together with its right(s) [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual Notes

– Line 4: The initial vertical stroke of *hrd.tw* is damaged, but the reading looks secure and the preceding traces are consistent with the expected *nty hr*, cf. the description of the western neighbour of the house in P. BM EA 10075, line 4, and Bodl. MS. Egypt. a. 41(P), lines 4–5. This clause is the latter part of the description of the western neighbour. On the basis of the BM and Bodleian papyri, the missing text may have read: *nty hr s.hm.t Ta-mr-wr ty=f šrt*, ‘which (was) in the possession of (the) lady Tamneoues, his sister’.19

– Line 5: The beginning of the clause can probably be restored as *[iw=y di.t wy=f r] hr=t n pš ibd rn=f*, ‘[I will cause him to be far] from you in the said month’.

Fragment B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>'...' [...]</td>
<td>[...] [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*iw pš hr 't'[wt=w ...</td>
<td>[...] the street being bet[ween them ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*hš.t]'-sp 47' tpy šh[.t ...</td>
<td>... regnal]-year 47, first month of the season of *aḥ[n ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*tw]'=t m-'[sš=n ...</td>
<td>[...] you are be[hind us ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek Registration

1 "Ετούς μὲ Ῥωθὸν καὶ ἀναγέγρα
(πται) ἐν τῶι [Ἀνουβιείωι δί]
Ἡρακλεῖδου
In the 47th year, on the 21st of Thoth, registered in the [Anubieion by Herakleides],

2 τοῦ παρὰ Τιμοθείου καὶ τῶν
μετ[όχων.]
the representative of Timotheios and his ass[ociates].

Textual Notes

Demotic

– Line 4: This clause appears at the end of the description of the eastern neighbour in the BM and Bodleian texts: *pš' wy n Pa-ḥt.m tny hr kt-h.t rmt*, ‘the house of Paihet, which is in the possession of other people’.

– Line 5: Although damaged, the reading is certain. Year 47 is also the date of the Greek registration and P. BM EA 10385. The text continued with the day date on which the documents

19 The BM and Bodleian texts write *rwn-nš.w*, but as our scribe had written *nty* instead of *rwn-nš.w* in fragment F he presumably did the same here.
were drawn up, and then \textit{nī3 Pr-\textsuperscript{r} Ptwm\textsuperscript{w}s-\textsuperscript{w}s}, ‘the Pharaoh\textsuperscript{l,p,h} Ptolemy\textsuperscript{l,p,h}’.

– \textbf{Line 6}: The reading is problematic, as elsewhere the scribe writes the second person singular feminine pronoun in a very elaborate way and here it would be just the simple letter \textit{t}. An alternative would be \textit{rnp.t}, ‘year,’ but this would be unexpected in the context. The clause may have continued: \textit{n.im=wn h\textsuperscript{w}s p\textsuperscript{w}s=wn hp}, ‘in respect of them, together with their right’. This would be an appropriate restoration for the length of the lacuna, which can be estimated with some certainty from the text of line 5.

\textbf{Greek}

– \textbf{Line 1}: The restoration of the end of the line is taken from the Greek registration statement on fragment D. Herakleides is attested in documents dated between 131 BC and 102 BC (Martin 2009, 142 n. xvi; Thompson 2012, 154 n. 40). In the earlier texts he acts as a subordinate, but later he appears as the official in charge.

– \textbf{Line 2}: \textit{kai} is corrected from \textit{ka}; \textit{tov} must have been meant (it is totally clear in B 2), but instead of the \textit{omega} there is only a semi curve connecting the \textit{tau} and the \textit{nu}.

– Timotheios and his associates may be the tax officials.\textsuperscript{20}

\textbf{Fragment H}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[...]\textsuperscript{=} \textit{f} [...]</td>
<td>[...] his [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[...]\textsuperscript{'} \textit{hm.t} [...] \textsuperscript{'} \textit{\ldots \ldots \ldots} \textsuperscript{'} \textit{\ldots \ldots \ldots} \textsuperscript{'} \textit{\ldots \ldots \ldots}</td>
<td>[...] wife [...] \ldots [...] \ldots [...] \ldots [...] \ldots him/his who is above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[...]\textsuperscript{'} \textit{w n\textsuperscript{w}s=h mn.w s\textsuperscript{w}s h\textsuperscript{r}y h\textsuperscript{w}s} \textsuperscript{'} \textit{\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots}</td>
<td>[...] whose/their neighbours are written above, together with.] [...] \ldots [...] \ldots [...] \ldots [...] \ldots [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[...]\textsuperscript{'} \textit{nty iw mn.d.f h\textsuperscript{w}s p\textsuperscript{w}s=f hp [r]} \textsuperscript{'} \textit{\ldots \ldots} \textsuperscript{'} \textit{\ldots \ldots}</td>
<td>[...] who lives forever, together with its right, [to] complete two documents. You are behind me] concerning them] [...] [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...]\textsuperscript{'} \textit{tw=t m-s\textsuperscript{3} p\textsuperscript{w}s=t mr [n.im=n\textsuperscript{3} p\textsuperscript{3} s 2 [r]} ir n\textsuperscript{=t p\textsuperscript{3} hp (n) p\textsuperscript{3} s h\textsuperscript{nty h\textsuperscript{r}y iw ir=t mr [hpr]} m-s\textsuperscript{3}=n p\textsuperscript{3} s 2 [r]}</td>
<td>[...] you are behind] the one among us you want, the two people, [to] carry out for you the right (of) the document which is above. If you want [to be] behind us, the two people,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Textual Notes}

– \textbf{Line 4}: \textit{n\textsuperscript{w}s=h hy}n.\textit{w}, ‘their neighbours,’ is offered with considerable caution. The writing of \textit{n\textsuperscript{w}s=h} is particularly problematic but, if \textit{hy}n.\textit{w} is correct, it is difficult to see how else

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Thompson 2012, 154 no. 37. A reference to the ‘associates’ of the official is only known from this papyrus.
this might be read. The vertical sign preceding it is presumably the plural .w or a divine
determinative. The possibility of reading the initial group as sh, ‘written,’ was rejected because
the form of this word is quite different to certain later writings. The traces further along the
line are too damaged to be read in the broken context.

– Line 5: The long horizontal stroke above the probable nty iw ḫnh d.t is disconcerting.
It looks like an elaborate letter t, which could then be the second person feminine suffix
pronoun and attached to the line above, but the space between the lines seems too large for
it to belong to line 4 and the meaning would be unclear. The reading of the badly rubbed nty
iw ḫnh d.t is based on the clear and very elaborate snake at the end of d.t, the tail of which
descends beyond the line below. It may be that the long horizontal stroke forms part of this
sign.

– Line 6: For the reading of this line, cf. the BM and Bodleian texts, lines 6–7, as well as
P. dem. Memphis 8a, lines 8–9 (Martin 2009).

Fragment G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'p₃ hrw ...'</td>
<td>today ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual Notes

– This small piece contains just a few signs from the last line of either text 1 or 2.

Fragment D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x+1</td>
<td>...] '...</td>
<td>...] · [...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x+2</td>
<td>...] šwty (n) 'Pth' [...]</td>
<td>...] merchant (of) Ptah [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x+3</td>
<td>...] '... nty 'hr-r[s]=f' nty ir n=f [...</td>
<td>...] which is before it (and) which makes for it [...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x+4</td>
<td>...] '... [s] 'Trt-r[=r]w=f nty hr n'y=f ḫrd.t.w [.] '...</td>
<td>...] · [son of] Inaros, which is in the possession of his children [.] .. [...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x+5</td>
<td>...] '... b.t nb³ lnc nb nty iw=y 'Sr[r].k n.im=w' [...]</td>
<td>...] every [title] deed, together with every document in respect of which I have title [...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x+6</td>
<td>...] '... iw=t' mr ḫpr m-s=f[n ...</td>
<td>...] · [.] If you wish to be behind [us ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autograph confirmation ... tp]=f n'y ... this himself.

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/publications/online_journals/bmsaes/issue_no/author.aspx
Greek Registration

1  [Ἐτους μιζ] Θωυθ κα
       ἀναγέγρα(πται) ἐν τῶι
       Ἀνουβιείωι δι᾽ Ἡρακ[λείδου]
       [In the 47th year], on the 21st of Thoth,
in the Anubieion registered by
Herak[leides],
2  [του παρα] Τιμοθείου καὶ τῶν
       μετόχων.
       [the representative of] Timotheios
       and (his) associates.

Textual Notes

– Line x+2: The reading is based on the occurrence of the title in P. BM EA 10385, but
what follows Swty is problematic. While the initial P and t fit the traces well, the letter ḫ is not
clear.

– Line x+3: Although damaged, the reading nty 'hr-r'=f is certain. The expression is very
common in texts from the Memphite Necropolis (Martin 2009, 86 n. vii). P. BM EA 10075
and Bodl. MS. Egypt. a. 41(P) have nty kd, 'which is built,' here rather than nty 'hr-r'=f’, but
the meaning is the same.

– Line x+4: A personal name suits the context and ṯ:r-r=r=w is a possible reading for the
traces (a name beginning with Pa- is also possible). The text diverges here from the BM and
Bodleian papyri.

– Line x+6: We would expect iw ṯ=t but what is written here does not resemble the clear
writing in line 6 of fragment 4. It looks more like a very elaborate writing of the second person
singular feminine suffix after the iw; cf. the writing, albeit smaller, in r.⌈Hr=t⌉ in fragment C
line 5. The traces before the small lacuna preceding it are probably the determinative of ḫp.

– Autograph subscription: For a similar writing cf. P. Pavia 1120.21

Fragment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ḫ':t-sp [...]</td>
<td>Year [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>mtry 'h'[t=τ ...</td>
<td>satisfied [my heart with ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>s.ḥm. ṯ Ta-ḥ[ ...</td>
<td>(the) lady Tab[is ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>šḥ ḫry r h ṯ=s=f [ ...</td>
<td>written above in accordance with its [...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'n.im=f ... '</td>
<td>in respect of it ... [...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual Notes

– Line 2: mtry may be part of the clause that introduces a document-of-sale, di=k/=t mtry

21 The formula would have read šḥ PN tp=fʾw; for other examples, cf. Depauw 2003, 81.
hit=y, 'you have caused my heart to be satisfied,'22 with the following traces belonging to hit, 'heart,' with the horizontal stroke beginning before the vertical.23

— **Line 3**: Only the first part of the name is preserved, but the lady Ta-by appears in P. BM EA 10075 and Bodleian MS. Egypt. a. 41(P) as the southern neighbour of the house (and also, albeit damaged, in fragment F line 4 of our text). The traces after the initial Ta- are consistent with a writing of the letter b.24

— **Line 5**: The tail of the =f is visible below the line.

### Text 2 - P. BM EA 10385 (Figs. 3-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hit-sp 47 ibd-1 'h.t sw .[&lt;a n&gt;] n3 Pr-aA a.w.s. Pt twlmw's&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;s&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt; irm Krbwptr3 t3=f sn t irm Kr&lt;sup&gt;v&lt;/sup&gt; 3w&lt;sup&gt;v&lt;/sup&gt; ptr3 t3=f hm t n3 ntr w mnht&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;(w) (n) p3 w&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (n) lgs&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;ntrw&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;s&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt; irm n3 ntr w nty lk hb irm n3 ntr w sn w irm n3 ntr w mnht&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;(w) irm n3 ntr w mr-it&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;=w irm n3 ntr w pr irm p3 ntr ntr w mnht&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;(w)</td>
<td>Year 47, first month of the season of abet, day [. under] the Pharaohs&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;sup&gt;ph&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;/sup&gt;. Ptolemy&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;sup&gt;ph&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;/sup&gt; and Cleopatra, his sister, and Cleo[patra, his] wife, the Beneficent Gods, (and under the) Priest (of) Alexander&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;sup&gt;ph&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;/sup&gt; and the Gods Who-Ward-Off-Misfortune and the Brother-and-Sister Gods and the Beneficent Gods and the Father-loving Gods and the Gods Who-are-Manifest and the God Exalting-his-Father and the Mother-loving God and the Beneficent Gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>irm 3ywrw&lt;sup&gt;p&lt;/sup&gt;p&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;[wl&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; (n)] Is t&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;.t in-Nw&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt; mw t&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;ntr&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; ir[m]&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; t&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; fy-sp-kny m-bih Brm&lt;sup&gt;y&lt;/sup&gt;yg&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt; t&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; [mnht&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt; irm t&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; fy] t&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;ntr&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; nb m-bih 3ryn&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; t&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; mr-t&lt;sup&gt;s&lt;/sup&gt;n&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; irm t&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; w[&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;h.t&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (n)] 3rsy[n]&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; t&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; mi&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;.t&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;=&lt;sup&gt;s&lt;/sup&gt; 'n3 nty smn&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (n) R&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;-&lt;sup&gt;kd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>and (the) Hieros P&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;olos&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; (of) Isis (the) Great, Nut, (the)] Divine [Mother], and the Bearer-of-the-Prize-of-Victory before Berenike, the [Beneficent, and the Bearer-of]-the-Golden-Basket before Arsinoe, the Brother-loving, and the Priest&lt;sup&gt;ess (of)] Arsinoe, the Father-loving, (and) those who are established (in) Alexandria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>dd šwy (n) Pθ Hr-n&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;nd&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt; =f &lt;sup&gt;s&lt;/sup&gt; t&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(The) merchant (of) Ptah Harendotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pt&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;Is&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;t mw&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;f T&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;-sy n s hm t&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; Šnty&lt;sup&gt;y&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;sup&gt;son of&gt; Paesis, his mother Tasis, said to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22Our scribe uses a similar writing of mntr in P. BM EA 10229, line 12 (Pestman 1963, pl. vi). Note how in that text the determinative in line 12 differs from that in line 3.

23For a similar writing of hit, cf. P. Innsbruck, line 1 (Spiegelberg 1903).

the) lady Smithis
daughter of [..., her mother ...]

[di=t mtr] 'h3t' [= y n p3 hâ n] t3=t
[dni t ...] p3`wy [... ... ...] 't [...]
"..." [muh] 'ntr 18 [... ... ...] 'p3`w y ...
['Pr'-hn-Inp
nty [... ... ...]'

[... ... ... ... ...] '18 . '[... ...
... ... ...] 't '[... ... ...] 't '[... ...
... ... ...] 't '[... ... ...] hyn.w 'nty
hry [...] 't [... ...]

Textual Notes

– Line 1: The day date begins with a damaged stroke that could be read 10 or 20. The single digit is in lacuna. As the Greek subscriptions state that the document was registered on the 21st of Thoth, the day date could be any number from sw 10 to sw 21. While registration on the same day as the document was often the case, there are examples of a delay.25

– That Krwpr3 be read with an r and ß rather than the letter l, cf. how l is written in Ptolemy and Alexander.

– The scribe writes it=w without the strong t. It is also omitted in the personal name Hr-nd-It=f in line 2, which for once is clearly written. In the rather ligatured examples of the name in the witness-list we have transliterated it with the f, as this is usually written.26

– Line 2: This writing of the title of hieros polos with initial hy is otherwise unattested.27

– The final vertical stroke of ntr is clear and the restoration certain.28

– Šmty is offered as no more than a possibility. The writing is less elaborate than in other texts from the Memphite Necropolis but comparable with some Upper Egyptian examples (Lüddeckens et al. 1980–2000, I. 3, 968 nos 4, 6, 7).

– Line 3: For the Memphite writings of s3.t, cf. the examples in Martin 2013, 47.

– p3y, written with the striking arm determinative, fits the traces nicely. Given the context of a property sale/transfer, this may be the noun ‘division,’ ‘half’ (Johnson 2001–14, Letter P, 165–66) or perhaps the latter part of dni.t-p3y, ‘half-share,’ with the preceding semi-circular
sign all that remains of dni.t. The horizontal fibres on the right have been stripped away.

- The Pr is rubbed, but the reading of the location is certain.
- Line 4: The number 8 is clear and the restoration of the first digit is based on the measurements in the preceding line.

**Witness-Lists**

**Witness-list on the Back of P. BM EA 10385**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hr-m-hb &lt;s&gt; Hr-5nh</td>
<td>Harmais &lt;son of&gt; Haunchis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hr-nd-it=f &lt;s&gt; Hr-5nh</td>
<td>Harmais &lt;son of&gt; Haunchis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hr-nd-it=f &lt;s&gt; Hr-5's-tIs.t</td>
<td>Harendotes &lt;son of&gt; Harsiesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wn-nfr &lt;s&gt; Hr-m-hb+b</td>
<td>Onnophris &lt;son of&gt; Harmais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hr-twbd &lt;s&gt; Hr-pa-Is.t</td>
<td>Haruotes &lt;son of&gt; Harpaesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'Mnt' [... &lt;s&gt; ...]</td>
<td>Mont-[... &lt;son of&gt; ...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'Wn-nfr' [... &lt;s&gt; ...]</td>
<td>Onnophris [&lt;son of&gt; ...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Traces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Traces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Traces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–16</td>
<td>In lacuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Witness-List at the side of P. BM EA 10385**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hr-m-hb &lt;s&gt; Hr-5nh</td>
<td>Harmais &lt;son of&gt; Haunchis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hr-nd-it=f &lt;s&gt; Hr-5nh</td>
<td>Harmais &lt;son of&gt; Haunchis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hr-nd-it=f &lt;s&gt; Hr-5's-tIs.t</td>
<td>Harendotes &lt;son of&gt; Harsiesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wn-nfr &lt;s&gt; Hr-m-hb+b</td>
<td>Onnophris &lt;son of&gt; Harmais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hr-twbd &lt;s&gt; Hr-pa-Is.t</td>
<td>Haruotes &lt;son of&gt; Harpaesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...] [... &lt;s&gt; ...]</td>
<td>[...] [... &lt;son of&gt; ...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–16</td>
<td>In lacuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Cf. the writing of dni.t from P. Ox. Griff. 74 line 10 (listed in Johnson 2001–14, Letter T, 238).
Textual Notes

- **Lines 2–3**: The two examples of the name $Hrnds$ differ noticeably from each other, but they are of course written by the witnesses themselves and the readings are certain.  

- **Line 3**: The writing of $Ts.j$ is reduced to little more than a blob of ink on the witness-list on the Back, but the writing on the side list is a little clearer.

- **Line 4**: The divine determinative of $Wn$ is written as an oblique rather than vertical stroke and there is a noticeable space between it and the rest of the word. The upper stroke of $Hr$ in $Hr$ is omitted, which is why there is some uncertainty over the reading.

- **Line 5**: The $wdj$ is written with only one vertical stroke and the reading is therefore uncertain.

- **Line 6**: The long horizontal stroke visible on the witness-list on the Back suggests $Mnt$, written with the strong $t$. On the witness-list on the side, the first part of the name is largely in lacuna, but what is visible looks like the letter $f$, a damaged sign which is possibly the divine determinative, and then the letter $m$, all suggesting that this might be $Mnt-mh3$. Against this possibility, however, is the fact that Montu names are unexpected at Memphis.

- **Line 7**: The vertical fibres after $Wn$ have been stripped away, which is why there is no trace of the father’s name.

- **Lines 8–16**: There are just a few traces of lines 7–10 of the witness-list on the Back. The assumption is that there would originally have been 16 names, which is the norm in Memphite Necropolis papyri.

Black Ink Stamp

It was originally Bridget who drew my attention to the existence of these stamps on demotic papyri when she removed the backing from P. BM EA 10384. Their presence had been noted by Vandorpe, but at the time her only examples on Ptolemaic demotic texts were from Hawara (Vandorpe 1995, 29–30, 61–64 [= Vandorpe 1996, 254–56, 282–84]; Vandorpe 2002, 38–39; Vandorpe 2014, 147–48). Unlike the stamp on our text, all the other examples noted by Vandorpe as well as that on P. BM EA 10384 were in red ink. The texts on which they are found carry a Greek registration statement on the Front. The stamps will have been connected with this registration process, presumably as an additional affirmation of the act and perhaps as a visual authentication for the illiterate (Muhs 2005, 96). To Bridget’s discovery of the two stamps on the back of 10384 can now be added that placed at the side of 10385. As they otherwise appear on the back of demotic papyri, this stamp is likely to belong to the fragments of the companion document under the 10393 number. Both 10384 and 10385 come from the Memphite Necropolis and are of similar date (132 and 124 BC). It would be interesting

30 The name can appear in some very idiosyncratic forms; cf. P. BM EA 10385, line 1 note.

to know if other contemporary papyri from here were also stamped, but unfortunately the rest of the Memphite texts of this period are mounted on board and the witness-lists are only visible as a result of a panel being cut in the back. It is no longer possible to identify what was written on our stamp but, based on other stamps and the traces of ink that are visible, it is likely that this was a rosette with the regnal year written in the centre.
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