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A Gymnasial Epicrisis Declaration from Oxyrhynchos

This papyrus is held in the Special Collections Library of Duke University. It was acquired by William H. Willis from David M. Robinson in 1968 or later.²

The papyrus is written on both sides. On the front, along the fibres, it contains the middle part of an epicrisis declaration. The top and bottom of the document are broken off. On the left, the first five lines are missing c. 10 letters from their beginnings, while at the beginning of the last six to seven lines there is a c. 2 cm left margin. On the right, some lines reach the end of the papyrus, while others are irregularly broken. On the back, across the fibres and written by a different hand, the papyrus contains remains of an account, as a list of amounts in money suggests.

This epicrisis declaration comes from Oxyrhynchos, as is clear from references to amphoda in this city (see 6n., 10n.). The preserved part of the declaration contains the details of the epicrisis registrations of three ancestors of the candidate, which were necessary proofs of hereditary eligibility to the status applied for by the candidate. The status, now lost in the missing upper part of the declaration, would have been entry to the class of the gymnasials, since there are references to more than one paternal ancestor. This was the only type of epicrisis declaration which required evidence that the maternal and paternal ancestors of the candidate had been of this status at least as far back as the general epicrisis of the fifth year of Vespasian (72/3). The type of epicrisis declaration for entry to the metropolitans’ lower tax-rate class required reference to the status of the father and of the maternal grandfather only³.

Both statuses, metropolitan and gymnasial, often appear in the sources to have been assumed by the same person e.g. P.Oxy. XLIII 3096.13 (223/4) (διδακτάρχης ἀπὸ γυμνασίου, XLIII 3137.12–13 (295) (διδακτάρχης ἀπὸ γυμνασίου, or XII 1452 (127/8), containing two epicrisis declarations submitted for the same person, the first for entry to the metropolitans and the other to the gymnasials. The majority of or all the gymnasial members may have enjoyed metropolitan status as well. However, since each status has separate attestations in the sources, and the persons who had both statuses mentioned them both, it is conceivable that one status could not imply the other and they were distinct. Their difference appears to be qualitative. The metropolitan status was related to tax privileges, e.g. in tax-lists classification is made by reference to metropolitan and/or tax-rate status, never by reference to gymnasial status⁵. The gymnasial status had socio-cultural connotations, e.g. in two gymnasial epicrisis declarations there is reference to the cultural activities of the candidate members, presumably in support of their candidacy: P.Oxy. XXII 2345.2 (224) (with BL VII 148) μανθανόν γράμμα, XVIII 2186.3 (260) (with BL VII 145) μανθάνων. Con-

---

¹ I am very thankful to Dr R. Ast, Dr N. Gonis and Prof. A. Jördens for their helpful comments.
² Information according to <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/acquisitions.html>. An image is available online at <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/records/776r.html>. The present study has been based on a digital image kindly sent to me by Prof. J. Sosin, whom I thank for the permission to edit this papyrus.
⁴ The provenance of all the papyri mentioned herein, unless otherwise indicated, is the Oxyrhynchite nome. Oxyrhynchite epicrisis declarations for entry to the gymnasion have been preserved from about the last decades of the first century until about the end of the third century; the earliest certainly dated document of this type is of 98 (P.Oxy. X 1066) the latest is of 274/5 or 280/81 (P.Turner 38). All the dates are according to HGV, except for PSI VII 731 + P.Col. inv. 134 for which see below.
trary to what has been argued before\(^6\), the restrictions for entry to the gymnasial class must not have been applied by the state in order to restrict the multiplication of its lower tax-rate paying subjects. This was accomplished by the restrictions for entry to the metropolitan class, which must have been a larger group, since slaves and freedmen could be included into it by reference to their master’s status, while the gymnasial status could be given only to children.

The characteristic differential detail of gymnasial epicrisis declarations is the emphasis on origin. This is observed both in the phrasing of the status with the prepositions ἐκ/ἀπὸ τοῦ γυμνασίου or τάγματος ἀπὸ γυμνασίου, and in the long report of ancestors’ registrations. The declarants reported their ancestors’ details keenly, reaching not only up to the necessary referential point, AD 72/3, but in some cases even up to AD 4/5\(^7\). These were their official verifications that they descended from members of the gymnasium from the early Roman times, connecting themselves to the Greek immigrants of the Hellenistic times. The recognition of Greek identity, combined with Greek ποιδεία, was an important qualification for a career in the Roman Empire.\(^8\)

In other parts of Egypt\(^9\), Greek status was recognised for the descendants of Greeks, through corresponding epicrisis examinations and declarations with proofs of ancestry. Like in Oxyrhynchos, in Hermopolis too, there was a class of the gymnasials and respectively a class of the metropolitans (octadrachms).\(^10\)

In the Arsinoite nome, where during the Ptolemaic period there had been a larger concentration of Greek immigrant cleruchs\(^11\), the respective status was recognised to the descendants of “the 6475 κόσμοι” – a list that had been constructed before the reign of Nero.\(^12\) It is probable that a status of κόσμοι was in effect also for the Greeks of Herakleopolis (P.Oslo III 98.15–16 τῶν ἅπερ Ἡρακλέους)\(^13\). In the Arsinoite, lower tax-rating payers were classified as ἐπισκεφτικοί, which corresponded to the status of the metropolitans.\(^14\)

The missing top part of our papyrus could be restored on the basis of similar documents. Oxyrhynchite epicrisis declarations usually began with an address to the officials who were responsible for the judgement. Until about the first decades of the second century the officials addressed were the στρατηγοί, the βασιλικῶν γραμματεύς, or the βιβλιοφύλακες.\(^15\) From about the 130s until the beginning of the third

---

\(^6\) G. Ruffini, Genealogy and the Gymnasium, BASP 43 (2006) 75: “Keeping in mind the gymnasials in other [than Oxyrhynchos] Egyptian metropoleis, [the Roman state] losing tens of thousands of drachma from the poll-tax revenue may well have led Roman officials to take a closer look at membership requirements for the gymnasial class” and P. van Minnen, Αἱ ἀπὸ γυμνασίου. ‘Greek’ Women and the Greek ‘Elite’ in the Metropolis of Roman Egypt, in H. Meiers and L. Mooren (eds.), Le rôle et le statut de la femme en Égypte hellénistique, romaine et byzantine (Leuven 2002) 340: “Since this [14] is the age at which males started to pay the poll tax, one might be tempted to regard the metropolites and the gymnasial order as merely fiscal groups.” But cf. S. Bussi, Le élites locali nella provincia d’Egitto di prima età imperiale (Milano 2008) 8 with n. 5.

\(^7\) E.g. P.Oxy. XLVI 3283.14–15 (148/9); XVIII 2186.4 (260).


\(^9\) This did not apply to the residents of the Greek cities Alexandria, Naukratis, Ptolemais and later also Antinoopolis, whose Greek origin was not questionable, and who were recognised civic status, which was superior to that of the descendants of Greek settlers in the Egyptian χώρα.

\(^10\) For gymniasal and metropolitan declarations from Hermopolis see Nelson, Status Declarations … 20–21 and 30–33.

\(^11\) A. Monson, From the Ptolemites to the Romans (Cambridge 2012) 264.


\(^14\) See Wallace, Taxation … 116–19; Bussi, Le élites locali … 17.

\(^15\) Not all of them were always mentioned, and perhaps other officials may have been referred to with a general phrase καὶ ἄλλωσι καθήκοντι, e.g. P.Oxy. XII 1452.1–2 and 28–9 (127/8), PSI VII 731 + PCol. inv. 134.4–5 (95/6 or later). See T. Kruse, Der königliche Schreiber und die Gauverwaltung (Leipzig 2002) 254–8.
century the address to the officials was omitted, e.g. P.Oxy. XLVI 3276–83 (148/9), LXVII 4585 (189). In the third century addressing officials in the beginning was resumed, now to two βουλευταί – often with their other titles added, such as (ex-) gymnasiarch, ἐξηγητής, κοσμητής, e.g. SB VI 9162.1–3 (212–69), P.Oxy. XVIII 2186.1 (260), PSI V 457.1–2 (269) – who assumed the responsibility for the epicrisis16. The present document, whose date may be placed around 200 (see below), would be expected either to begin without an address to any official or to address two βουλευταί. There would follow the identification of the declarant17. Customarily the declarant was the father18 of an adolescent19 candidate, as is the case in the present document too. After that, there would be the standard statements of declaration20 and the report of the gymnastic epicriseis of all or almost all the paternal and maternal male ancestors.

In all epicrisis declarations the series of ancestors begins with the paternal and continues with the maternal. The first of the three ancestors preserved in this fragment is referred to as πατέρας μου (3); he was the father of the declarant, i.e. the paternal grandfather of the candidate; he had been registered in the amphodon Temenouthis probably during the reign of Hadrian (see 4n.). Next, there is reference to the registration of the applicant himself, i.e. the father of the candidate, restored ἐμέ (6); he had been registered at the amphodh Rhymes Onnophrions in the fourth or seventh year of the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (see 7–8n.). After this, there is reference to the candidate’s mother’s grandfather, οὖν τοῖς ἑν τούτου μητρὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ μου πατέρων Σαραπίωνα (10–11). Between the registration of the father of the declarant (117–38) and the general registration of 72/3, i.e. a span of 44–66 years, there would fit one to two generations21. Comparable cases are e.g. P.Oxy. XII 1452.44–9 (127/8), XLVI 3276.10–14 (148/9) and XLVI 3278.13–15 (148/9) in which the registrant of 72/3 was the father of the declarant and grandfather of the candidate; P.Oxy. XLVI 3283.10–12 (148/9) in which the registrant of 72/3 was the grandfather of the declarant and great-grandfather of the candidate22; P.Minnesota inv. 16 (published in BASP 44 (2007) 57–62; dated to 191) in which the ancestor who had been registered in 72/3 was the great-grandfather of the candidate (l. 13). The same would be

17 Identification required the names of the father, of the father’s side grandfather, of the mother, sometimes also of the mother’s side grandfather, and provenance, e.g. PSI VII 731 + P.Col. inv. 134.6–9 (95/6 or later), P.Oxy. XII 1452.3–5, 30–32 (127/8), XLVI 3283.2–3 (148/9).
18 The declarant is the father of the candidate in P.Oxy. II 257 (94/5), X 1266 (98), XLVI 3276 (148/9), XLVI 3277 (148/9), XLVI 3278 (148/9), XLVI 3279 (148/9), XLVI 3283 (148/9), XXII 2345 (224), XVIII 2186 (260). For the cases where the father of the candidate was absent or dead see U. Yiftach-Firanko, A Gymnasial Registration Report from Oxyrhynchus, A Gymnasial Registration Report from Oxyrhynchus, BASP 47 (2010) 54 with n. 19.
19 The common age of candidates for the epicrisis was twelve/thirteen or thirteen/fourteen years old, see e.g. a τρεισκαιδεκαετεῖς candidate in P.Oxy. XLVI 3276.7 (148/9) and a τεσσαρακαιδεκαετεῖς in P.Mich. XIV 676.3 (with n.) (272). For the way age was counted in Greco-Roman Egypt see N. Kruit, Age Reckoning in Hellenistic Egypt. The Evidence of Declarations of Birth, Excerpts from the Ephebe Registers, and Census Returns, in A. M. F. W. Verhoogt – S. P. Vleeming (eds.), The Two Faces of Graeco-Roman Egypt. Greek and Demotic and Greek-Demotic Studies Presented to P. W. Pestman, Papp.Lugd.Bat. XXX (Leiden 1998) 37–58.
20 Standard in Oxyrhynchite gymnasial epicrisis declarations was the statement that the declaration was made in accordance with the orders κατά τὰ κελευθέντα περὶ ἐπικρίσεως τῶν προσβαινόντων (or περὶ τοῦ ἐπικριθῆναι τῶν προσβαινόντων) εἰς τοὺς ἓκ (or ὀπλὸ) τοῦ γυμνασίου (or εἰς τρεισκαιδεκαετεῖς) εἰς τοὺς τῶν γένους τοῦτον (or εἰς ἕκ ἀμφότερον γονέων εἰς τόμιοι ἀπὸ γυμνασίου) e.g. P.Oxy. II 257.4–6 (94/5), PSI VII 731 + P.Col. inv. 134.9–15 (95/6 or later), P.Oxy. XLVI 3276.4–6 (148/9), XLVI 3275.7–5 (148/9), XLVI 3282.5–8 (148/9), XVIII 2186.2 (260), PSI V 457.4–5 (269) (for this phrase see Nelson, Status Declarations … 14), followed by a statement of the type ἐτέχει (ἐπὶ ἀμφόδου Placename) ὁ νῦν μου Name φίλότοτας τῆς τρεισκαιδεκαετεῖς (or γονοῦς τρεισκαιδεκαετεῖς) τῷ υἱῷ (ἐπὶ), e.g. P.Oxy. XLVI 3276.6–8 (148/9), XLVI 3283.6–8 (148/9), and then ἴθων παρεχθέντων πρὸς τὴν τούτον ἐπίκρισιν δήλω, e.g. P.Oxy. II 257.11–12 (94/5), XII 1452.16–17, 42–3 (127/8), XLVI 3283.8–9 (148/9), XVIII 2186.3 (260).
21 In documents of this type, the usual age difference between father and son is about 30–40 years (O. Montevecchi, commentary to P.Turner 38, p. 163). Similarly Rufini, BASP 43 (2006) 92–3, following R. S. Bagnall – B. W. Frier, The Demography of Roman Egypt (Cambridge 1994) 145–6, reckoned the average generation rate at 35.4 years.
22 A factor that may be taken into account in counting the generations is the age that the ancestor who was registered in 72/3 had, because that registration was common for all regardless of age, cf. e.g. P.Oxy. XVIII 2186.7–8 (260), in which one ancestor was registered in 72/3 and the next (his son) in 79/80.
likely for our papyrus too, and indeed is supported by the fact that the maternal ancestor mentioned first was the grandfather of the mother i.e. great-grandfather of the candidate. After the reference to the paternal ancestor’s registration in 72/3, reference to earlier ancestors’ registrations may have been added, such as the registrations of 56/7 and 57/8, e.g. P.Oxy. XLVI 3279.19–20, or the graphe of AD 4/5, e.g. P.Oxy. XLVI 3283.13–15; in our papyrus, reference to an ancestor’s epicrisis in the reign of Nero seems to be most likely (see 2–3n.).

In the missing bottom part of the document, after the hereditary proofs on the mother’s side, we would expect the oath of the declarant verifying all of his statements – that his son is his own and his mother’s natural son, neither adopted nor illegitimate, and that he has not employed someone else’s credentials or a namesake. Reference to witnesses would not be expected; among the published Oxyrhynchite gymnasial epicrisis declarations with their end preserved, those of the first and second centuries end with the oath of the declarant without reference to witnesses. The earliest known document of this type in which there is reference to witnesses (without their signatures) is P.Oxy. XXII 2345 (224) and later documents refer to witnesses too.

The registration of the father of the candidate some time in the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (161–9) suggests that a likely date for this papyrus would be around 200.

2–3 ἐπικεκριμένων πρὸς τὸ χήμα (ἐτὸς) [Θεοῦ] [Νέρωνος. On the model of other comparable epicrisis declarations, ἐπικεκριμένων may be part of a phrase that refers to credentials earlier than the registration of 72/3, e.g. P.Oxy. XLVI 3279.19–21 (148/9) ἐν Σαραπίων ἐν χιλιάρχῳ 20 (ἐπίκερσες) | P.Oxy. X 1266 (97) | P.Oxy. XII 11271 (117). The traces that follow ἐπικεκριμένων are a looped foot followed by two feet and further to the right a low-descending

23 P.Oxy. II 257 (94/5), P.Oxy. X 1266 (98), SB XIV 11271 (117).
24 P.Oxy. XVIII 2186 (260), PSI V 457 (269) and P.Mich. XIV 676.19–34 (272), the two latter contain the witnesses’ signatures after that of the declarant.
upright stroke. They can match προς το [ἐτος] (ἐτος), which is attested in similar context in P.Lond. II 259 ii 55 (p. 36–42) τῶν ἐπικεκριμένων προς τῷ ἔτος. Following, in lacuna, there should be θεοῦ and in the next line the emperor’s name. The available space matches the name of Nero, in whose reign there had been organised general gymnasial epicriseis. According to P.Oxy. XLVI 3279.19 and P.Mich. XIV 676.13, in Oxyrhynchus there were epicriseis in the third, fourth and fifth year of Nero. In all probability, in our papyrus there was reference to one of those years.

3 προσβάντα. This word is written out in full here as well as in P.Oxy. XLVI 3279.21–2 (148/9) and 3283.15–16, 17 (148/9). It is abbreviated in PSI V 457.15, 16 (269), where it was resolved as προσβ(εβηκότα); in P.Mich. XIV 676.7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18 (272), where it was resolved as προσβ(αίνοντα); in P.Oxy. XVIII 2186.5, 6, 7, 8, 9 (260), where it had been resolved as προσβ(αίνοντα) in the ed. pr. and subsequently was corrected to προσβ(αίνοντα) by V. P. McCarron, P.Mich. XIV 676.7n. (= BL VIII 254); in P.Oxy. XXII 2345.4, 6 (224), where it was resolved as προσβ(αίνοντα). In view of the non-abbreviated instances of προσβάντα, the resolutions προσβ(αίνοντα) or προσβ(εβηκότα) referring to ancestors’ registrations may be reconsidered and resolved as προσβ(άντα), which is grammatically preferable, because it refers to a past and completed action.

4 [τῷ x (ἐτευ) θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ]. Between προσβάντα and ἐπικεκρίσθαι there should be the year of the epicrisis registration of the father of the declarant with a phrase like προσβάντα τῷ x (ἐτευ) ἐπικεκρίσθαι, e.g. P.Mich. XIV 676.7. The registration should have taken place in a year of the reign of Hadrian (117–38). The space and the traces are compatible with a phrase like τῷ x (ἐτευ) θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ.

ἐπικεκρίσθαι in this context is an object of the verb that introduced the report of the ancestors’ registrations – usually δηλῳ (see fn. 20). There is nowhere a phrase written out in full as *προσβάντα ἐπικρίσει, so the editorial additions and resolutions in P.Oxy. XVIII 2186.5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 may be reconsidered: ἐπικ( ) should be resolved as ἐπικ(εκρίσθαι) without adding an extra (ἐπικ(εκρίσθαι)) or (ἐπικ(ρίσει)). The same applies to P.Oxy. XXII 2345.6, where ἐπικ( ) should be resolved ἐπικ(εκρίσθαι). προσβάντα refers to attaining the required year of age (see fn. 19), while ἐπικεκρίσθαι refers to the procedure of the scrutiny (epicrisis). The regnal year is that of the epicrisis of each ancestor; this is confirmed by the fact that while προσβάντα may sometimes be omitted, e.g. P.Oxy. XXII 2345.7 (224), PSI V 457.13, 14 (269), ἐπικ(εκρίσθαι) and the regnal year are never omitted from the report of an ancestor’s registration. In most cases, however, the candidate “in accordance with the orders” (see fn. 20) proceeded to gymnasial registra-
tion once he reached the age of thirteen in the same or in the next regnal year, so effectively the regnal year refers to both ηρεσαντον and ἐπικεκρίσθα. There were exceptions, such as P.Oxy. XLVI 3282 (148/9), in which the gymnasia candidate proceeded to epicrisis at the age of thirty-four declaring that he had entered the age of thirteen in the twelfth year of Hadrian, and one may also consider P.Oxy. II 257.23–4 (94/5), in which a man had not proceeded to epicrisis because he resided away: ἐμὲ δὲ ἔνθεος τετάχθη τῷ μὴ ἐνδήμ[ει]. In PSI VII 731 + P.Col. inv. 134, some peculiarities induced the editor to suppose that the epicrisis, albeit initiated in 95/6 AD, might have been completed only several years later. This may be possible, but there is no clear evidence of this. Thus, instead of dating it from “978 CE onwards” (BASP 47 (2010) 63) it should be rather dated to 95/6 AD or later.

4–5 η[-]. In 3–6 the details of the epicrisis of the applicant’s father are provided. The main information that should be given is the year of registration, followed by the reference to the district (ὁμορφοῦ) where the registration had been made. Another detail which may be added is the name of the official who was responsible for the epicrisis, and here η—perhaps introduced such a phrase (with ὑπὸ + name/function). Reference to officials was not necessary and is often skipped. Mostly attested are the strategus Sutorius Sosibius and the βασιλικὸς γραμματεύς Nicander, who were in office at the time of the general epicrisis of Vespasian in 72/3, e.g. PSI VII 731+ P.Col. inv. 134.23–25 (95/6), P.Oxy. II 257.13–15 (94/5), X 1266.26–8 (98), XII 1452.43–5 (127/8), XLVI 3282.15–16 (148/9), XLVI 3283.10–11 (148/9). With the passing of the generations, reference to the officials of 72/3 is gradually skipped – in the above examples the ancestor who was registered in 72/3 was either father or grandfather of the declarant or of his wife. In P.Oxy. XII 1452.58 (127/8) there is reference to the strategus Dios, ὑπὸ Διονυσίου στρατηγού τοῦ τάξεως τιτάρασιντος who was in office when the father of the declarant was registered, in 99/100. In our papyrus there could be reference to a στρατηγὸς of the reign of Hadrian; for possible candidates see J. Whitehorne, Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt (Str.R.Scr.2). Revised edition of G. Bastianini – J. Whitehorne, Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt. Chronological List and Index, Pap.Flor. XXXVII (Firenze 2006) 95–6.


ἐμέ]. The supplement ἐμέ (or e.g. καίμε) is unavoidable, in view of the space and the order of the ancestors. Cf. P.Oxy. XXII 3245.4 (224) καίμε (with BL VII 148).

7–8 τῷ [ ], [ἐπεκρίτης] Θεοῦ | Αὐρηλίων Ἀντωνίου καὶ Οὐήρου. A horizontal at baseline after τῷ may be the base of the year number, probably Z but Δ not excluded, rather than of the year symbol (L) – cf. the rest of the year symbol in I. 2. The fourth of the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus was 164/5 and the seventh 167/8.

10 ἁμοῦ (ὁ ἁμοῦ) ῶμῆς Ὀννόφριος. A district of Oxyrhynchus. See Calderini – Daris, Dizionario ... III 389; Supplemento 1° 214; Supplemento 3° 102 and 133.

12 In II. 11–13 there is reference to the registration of the maternal grandfather, which must have been in the general gymnasia registration of 72/3 (see the introduction above). τῇ αὐτῆτι may refer to τῇ αὐτῆτι (ἐπικρίσθα), cf. P.Oxy. XLVI 3282.13–14 (148/9) ἐπικεκρίσθα [τῇ γε]νομένῃ τῷ ε (ἐπεκρίτης) τοῦ Θεοῦ Οὐήρου [νοῦ] (i.e. ἐπικρίσθα), in place of the more common construction with prepositional phrase, e.g. P.Oxy. XLVI 3283.10–11 (148/9) κατὰ τῇ γε νομένῃ τῷ ε (ἐπεκρίτης) Θεοῦ Ὀννόφριου ... (i.e. ἐπικρίσθα). Another possibility would be τῇ αὐτῆτι to refer to τῇ τοῦ, but in that case εῦ would have been expected before τῇ αὐτῆτι, cf. P.Oxy. X 1266.24 (98); PSI VII 731 + P.Col. inv. 134.29 (95/6). The possibility that τῇ αὐτῆτι refers to the street mentioned above (ῥύμη Ὀννόφριος), in place of the more common ὁμοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, is unlikely, because τῇ αὐτῆτι would have been preceded by a preposition.

25 In X 1266.2 (98) the βασιλικὸς γραμματεύς Pamphilus is also mentioned for the same epicrisis in 72/3 (BL IV 61).

26 BL IV 62 Διον needs to be corrected into the genitive case; in the papyrus the last letter is an η written above the ο in the form of shallow bowl.
13 [αὐτῶν] ε ἔτους θεοῦ Οὐεσπασίανος. The traces at the end of the line are too small to allow certainty, but reference to the registration of Vespasians’ fifth regnal year would be expected in this position (see the introduction above). αὐτῶν seems to be likely in view of the available space and τῇ αὐτῇ τοῦ in the previous line. The whole phrase τῇ αὐτῇ τοῦ αὐτῶν would have been used in this position, because the general epicrisis of 72/3 should have been mentioned already for a paternal ancestor. Cf. e.g. P.Oxy. II 257.33 (with BL IV 58) (94/5) ἐπικεκρίθαι ὁμοίως τῷ αὐτῷ ἔτει (ἔτει); XVIII 2186.7 (260) τῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ ε ἔτους θεοῦ Οὐεσπασίανος ἐπικρίσεως.
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