

Notes on Egyptian Census Declarations, I

In order to provide a more reliable basis for the study of the demography of Roman Egypt, and that of the Roman world in general, Bruce W. Frier and I have undertaken a study of the Egyptian census returns from the Roman period. These have of course been the subject of considerable study over the years, but there exists no complete list collecting and extracting all of the pertinent data from the declarations, nor any statistical analysis based on such a list. To improve the quality of data, I am reexamining each published text of this kind, on the original where possible, particularly to check ages and relationships of persons declared. For the most part, naturally, this control merely verifies the editors' readings, but in some places my readings differ from theirs. This article is the first in a series recording the findings of this systematic investigation.

1. *P.Alex.Giss.* 19 = *P.Brem.* 33

This declaration belongs to the dossier of the Apollonopolite strategos Apollonios. The name of the declarant, who is 59, is lost; but it is taken to be Miusis from the fact that the 53-year-old Senpachompsais is described as "wife of Miusis." In the edition, Miusis' statement of his own age is followed by the listing of two males named Pachoumis, who are given as follows:

Παχοῦμιω [πρ]εσβ(ύτερον) μητρὸς Σευ-
παχομψ(αίτος) Πανεχάτου
γεω(ργόν) ἄση(μον) (ἔτων) κθ
Παχοῦμιω νεώ(τερον) υἱὸν μη(τρὸς)
Θατρῆτος Ἐρμαίου (ἔτους) α

Now a normal reading of this passage would suggest that it lists two sons of Miusis, both named Pachoumis, but separated in age by 28 years and born to different mothers. It is all the more surprising to find that Senpachompsais and Thatres are both listed in the declaration (Thatres is 18 years old), but that Senpachompsais is listed as the wife of Miusis and Thatres as that of Pachoumis.

Apart from the lurid character of the scenario which seems to unfold, the attentive reader may be unnerved by the lack of the word

υίόν to indicate the relationship of Pachoumis the elder to the declarant. On a photograph kindly supplied by Dr. Armin Hetzer of the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Bremen, it is possible to see that the space where [πρ]εσβ() is supposed to stand simply is not wide enough for five substantial letters. Though the traces are anything but clear, it appears that they are compatible with a nu, and the space is in fact precisely that occupied by υίόν three lines later. I conclude, therefore, that one should read [υιό]ν. Pachoumis is the son of Miusis, and Pachoumis the younger is the son of Pachoumis. Order, not to speak of decency, is restored.

2. *P.Bad.* IV 75a and 75b¹

This pair of declarations concern the same family. In 75a, submitted in 133, we find Petesouchos, the declarant, his wife Tausiris, their 3-year old son Pnephoros, and Tausiris' mother Thenphrokos.² The age of the last is given in the edition as ν, 50. In fact, however, the papyrus breaks off toward the right side of the numeral, and a second digit could have stood there, yielding a possible range of ages from 50 to 59. After the faint traces of Pnephoros' age (fairly certain because his age is given as 17 in 75b, 14 years later), I see on the photograph the traces of ἄ[σ]η(μος). In lines 14-15, Petesouchos declares that his mother-in-law possesses ἄλλα μεσι(τευθέντα) οἰκο(δομήματα), as the editor reads it. Now the word οἰκοδόμημα is not the word used in census declarations to refer to house property. Instead, one consistently finds οἰκόπεδον. Here there stands in fact after omicron the open curve (here looking like a right-hand round bracket) commonly used to abbreviate at pi: hence, οἰκόπ(εδα). But the preceding word must also evoke suspicion, as it is never found in census declarations and its sense here is hardly obvious. In fact, it reads μέρη: ἄλλα μέρη οἰκοπ(έδων). Noting that the writer says ἄλλα, we turn back to line 7,³ and where the editor read (ἥμισυ) μέρος οἰκί(ας), we find that in fact the scribe wrote (ἥμισυ) μέρος οἰκοπ(έ)δ(ων).

¹See D. Hagedorn's corrections in *P.Heid.* IV, p.291 for 75b, in addition to (and correction of) various points in the *BL*. I am indebted to Professor Hagedorn for providing excellent photographs of both papyri.

²I am not persuaded by the reading but have not found a satisfactory one.

³To be fair, though, in 75b the writer says ἕτερα even though the term it refers to does not appear earlier in the text.

Fourteen years later he did describe the property as a house, rather than house-lots. The same description of his mother-in-law's property, however, may be found in 75b, lines 20 and 21, where οικόπ(ε)δ(α) is both times clearly visible, as Eric Turner pointed out (*Gnomon* 41 [1969] 506, noted in *BL* 6.8).

How Bilabel could describe 75a as being "in derselben Schrift wie 75b geschrieben" I cannot see; the hands are clearly different.

The small fragment (Bilabel's inv. 68a, now inv. G 668a), which Bilabel took to belong to another declaration and described in the commentary, seems (as Dieter Hagedorn points out to me) in fact to be in the same hand.

3. *P.Flor.* I 4⁴

This declaration of A.D. 245 is submitted by two brothers, aged 27 and 26; they list themselves and six other persons. Five of these are clearly slaves of one of the brothers (the younger one), but the sixth was read with some difficulty. I propose for line 23 the following reading: Μάρκου [νεώ]τερον δοῦλ(ον) ἡμῶν δηλ(ωθέντα) ἐκλελ(ύσθαι) καὶ ἤλευθ(ερώσθαι). The description of "the younger" distinguishes this person from the preceding one, simply named Marcus, a recently born slave. Were they perhaps twins? The reading is not without difficulty, as the editor's note testifies. I cannot read what stands at the start of line 24, but I am certain it is not the editor's εἴπω γ, an age for Marcus the younger. Clearly one might resolve the abbreviations in 23 differently and obtain a somewhat different syntax, but I take it that in any event the purpose is to declare that this slave was manumitted (and is thus not declared any longer as a member of the household?).

In line 18, at the start of the line, there appears to be a rho surmounted by the kind of curve generally representing pi, perhaps abbreviating πρ(οσαπεγράφη) or some other term from that root, followed by πρῶτως (as the editor suggested in the note).

⁴My work on this and other Florentine papyri was made possible through the generous assistance of Manfredo Manfredi and Rosario Pintaudi.

4. *P.Flor.* I 5

This declaration, from 244/5, was submitted by a woman of twenty-seven, Thermoutharion, registering herself and her children. It has suffered damage at left and particularly at the bottom, and the hand is often difficult to read. The end of the declarant's self-identification, just after the mother's name, in lines 3-4 was read by the editor as κατοικ[κου αναγρα(φομένης) επ αμφ]οδου Ταμειων. Hombert and Préaux, *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* V, p.106 n.3 (registered in *BL* 3.55), asked "Mais la lecture est-elle sûre? Si oui, κάτοικος n'est-il pas l'abrégé de θυγάτηρ κατοίκου?" The reading is certain; conceivably one should restore κατοικ[[κούσα], simply a statement about residence.⁵

The more substantial difficulty, however, arises from what Thermoutharion says after declaring herself:

καὶ τὰ τέκνα μου Κόπρει-
[ου].ωνος (ἐτῶν) ς καὶσπουρίου ς μὴ ανα-

The editor indicates that fragments of four further lines follow. A. Calderini, *Aegyptus* 33 (1953) 369 (*BL* 3.55) suggested reading κάκ Δείου σπουρίου ς and proposed completing ανα as ἀναγεγραμμένους. The former suggestion was in turn rejected by H.C. Youtie, *Hommages Cl. Préaux* 726 n.1 (*BL* 7.49), on the grounds that "the natural father of an ἀπάτωρ is never specified in the documents . . . Since the children are *spurii*, they have no legal father, and their natural father would not be named." One may well be troubled also by that genitive ending before the indication of age: what could it be? The reading is in fact open to question; ωνα seems to me a better reading.⁶ That would suggest, however, that Kopreios's age was given in the lacuna, followed by καὶ and the name of a second child ending in ωνα in the accusative and his age. It is possible to read, as Calderini proposed, ἀνα[[γεγραμμ]ένους ς in 16-17. The traces of 17-19 are practically impossible to make out, but

⁵Unparalleled in this form, though frequently one finds ἐν ᾧ κατοικῶ. For the record, at the end of line 4 the editor shows Μοη[[ρεως], where the papyrus actually has Μοήρε[[ως].

⁶I have not been able to read the rest of this name; it looks to me like]δι.ωνα, but the delta could be alpha and the iota could be rho; the natural guess, Εύ]δαίμωνα, is not easy to read.

in line 20 there is a γί(νονται), indicating that probably another two or three persons were listed in the intervening lines before the end of the listing. As to the controverted word(s) in line 16, I can only say that σπουρίους is a persuasive reading; κάκ Δείου is not an impossible reading, but it hardly imposes itself, and crasis seems out of place in this sort of document anyway. The word should be readable, but so far I have not succeeded in reading it.

5. *P.Harr. I 70*

This copy of a declaration has undergone correction at many hands, beginning with a reedition by Hombert and Préaux in *Cd'É* 23 (1948) 122-26 (cf. *BL* 3.78), which greatly improved the text; other corrections are signalled in *BL* 4.38 and 6.49; and see the remarks of P.J. Sijpesteijn and K.A. Worp in *Archiv* 27 (1980) 52-53. Some further progress is nonetheless possible thanks to a good photograph kindly provided by R. A. Coles (substantially clearer than the plate in *Cd'É*). The list of names of the tenants declared by the owner of the house in question begins in line 13 with a lacuna which may be estimated at 9 letters (neither Powell nor Hombert and Préaux gave any indication). Since at the end of that lacuna is the end of the patronymic, the names must be short. A clue comes in line 18, where there is a reference to γυνή τοῦ Ἑρμα[(H.-P.). Powell had in fact read a tau just before the lacuna: Ἑρματ[. Only the left part of the horizontal stroke survives, but it is sufficient to justify Powell's Ἑρματ[ος. But where was Hermas referred to above? The remaining male names refer to boys 16 or younger. Since the grandfather of the first person mentioned was named Ἑρμα[(line 13), it seems very likely that we should restore [Ἑρμαῶς . . .]εως τοῦ Ἑρμα[το]ς for this person, the first-named male.⁷

Despite the blank space after Ἡροῦς τῆς, the patronymic of Hermas' mother Hero must have stood in the ca 15-letter lacuna to the right. The next line then probably began (in a lacuna again of about 10 letters) with the name of the next-named person, Hermas' oldest son, perhaps preceded by (καὶ) υἱοῦς or some variant thereof. Following that Hombert and Préaux read]. . . . Ἡρακλ[() ἰδι]ώτ(ην). If Herakl[is

⁷The sigma after the lacuna is visible on the photograph.

the name of the son, however, one misses the mother's name. In fact, the traces can be read instead as] μητρὸς) Ἡρακλ[ο]ῦτο(ς). His age, given by Powell as 17 and by Hombert and Préaux as 16, is in fact 17 (ιζ).

The enumeration continues with Hera[, presumably a second son, the remainder of whose name stood in the lacuna at right (followed perhaps by a blank). The next line then probably began with [μητρὸς) τῆς αὐτ(ῆς)] before (Sijpesteijn and Worp's reading) [μῆ] ἀναγε[γ]ρα(μμένου) ἐν ἐπιγεγεννη(μένοις). His age was read by all editors as 2, but since an 11-year-old (a son also, evidently, since he is listed before Hermas' wife) follows, that is odd. On the photograph I think one can in fact read ιε, 15. The next line (16), a mass of dots in the editions, I have not managed to read; nor can I read lines 19-21, parts of which are preserved before the papyrus breaks off.

As far as can be reconstructed, then, the family included a father and mother, with sons 17, 15, and 11. Line 16 may have contained another son, and daughters may well have followed the mother in the listing.

6. *P.Lond. II 182b* (p.62)

This papyrus preserves in part an extract (written before 175) from a declaration from the census of 159/160. The persons listed are

- 1) Petheus s. Isidoros (s. Petheus) and Taimouthes, 73 years old
- 2) Isidoros, his son by Dideis the sister of Petheus, 40 years old
- 3) Ninnaros alias Ptolemaios s. Isidoros and Taonnophris, the sister of his father, 2 years old
- 4) Thailera⁸ Dideis, sister of Petheus, age lost⁹
- 5) Name lost, [θ]υγ() ἀμφοτ(έρων).

The papyrus is broken at the bottom, and there are traces left unread in the line before the break.

A moment's reflection shows that the "daughter of both" one expects to find here is the sister and wife of Isidoros, Taonnophris ("both" in this context obviously does not refer to the two immediately preceding persons). The editor's text gives in line 16 [. . .]αθ[.]θ]υγ ἀμφοτ, and an examination of the microfilm shows that the supposed first theta

⁸So editor; the theta is not absolutely certain, but I have not been able to read anything persuasive (such as Οὐαλερία, say).

⁹Actually, part of the second digit is visible on the microfilm; line 15 should be read ως [(ἐτῶν) .]. ἄσημος.

can in fact be omicron with the ligature headed into a nu; the traces and space fit perfectly with a reading of [Τ]αο[υυωφρις θ]υγ(άτηρ) άμφοτ(έρων). Her age was probably somewhere in the next line, not apparently in the surviving part. It is conceivable that one or more daughters, sisters of Ninnaros, stood in the part of the papyrus now lost.

7. *P.Mil.Vogl.* III 194¹⁰

This papyrus contains two declarations pertinent to the census of 145/6. As Herbert Youtie observed, it and *P.Mil.Vogl.* III 193, which was published with it, are parts of the same roll, all four declarations emanating from currently unmarried female heads of household.¹¹ The right-hand declaration, (a), was submitted by Herais, daughter of Protas, granddaughter of Orseus, whose name is given by the editor as 'Ηραείδος τῆς Πρωτάτος Ὀρσέως. In fact, instead of Πρωτάτος one should read Πρωτᾶ τοῦ, providing a short genitive and the normal article before the grandfather's name.

In a.16 Herais declares a five-year-old slave belonging to her, which the editor transcribes as δοῦλ(ον) Λάμπρον (ὡς ἐτώων) ε. The name Λάμπρος is not at all common, though it is attested. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* I 282 lists one instance from Chios. The one instance in the *Namenbuch*, however, is probably to be expunged. It is *P.Flor.* III 297, where in lines 33, 134, 271, and 370 the heirs of a Βίκτωρ Λαμπρ/ appears. The editor took this as a patronymic, but it seems to me far more likely that it is λαμπρ(οτάτου), the designation for someone holding the rank of *vir clarissimus*.¹² The heirs in question pays twice

¹⁰I am much indebted to Guido Bastianini for the facilities to study this and other Milan papyri and to Alessandra Gara and Daniele Foraboschi for discussion of some of the problems I encountered.

¹¹Cf. Youtie, *ZPE* 14 (1974) 261-62 = *Scriptiunculae Posteriores* I 115-16. A few minor corrections to *P.Mil.Vogl.* III 193: a.1, read Τεπτύνεως, not Τεβτύνεως (also to be so restored in line 1). At the start of line 4, what may be the patronymic of the declarant's mother may as well begin with tau as gamma. In line 11, the form Κρονιαυης seems to me less likely to be a misspelling of Κρονιαυίς (as the editor thinks) than a faulty genitive for nominative, reproducing in effect the genitive from line 2. Case errors are extremely frequent in census declarations.

¹²Normally with an article, whether following or preceding the person's name (and office). Some examples of λαμπρότατος following the name without an article appear in *WB* III 195; add, e.g., *CPR* V 18.23, *SB* VIII 9751.2. Like *P.Flor.* 297, these examples are Byzantine.

through an oilmaker and twice through their *pronoetes*. In fact, the Milan papyrus reads Λαμπραν,¹³ so we have a female slave (as is more common in the declarations). There is no apparent pattern to the editor's resolution of the symbol L as (έτων) or (ώς έτων), and I cannot see any reason for reading the latter in the case of this slave and two other persons in the declaration.¹⁴ The phrase should therefore be read δούλ(ην) Λαμπράν (έτων) ε.

Youtie has already dealt with 194b, but some further remarks are needed. In lines 6-9, Herakleia declares her property:

ὑπάρ-
χει μου] τῆ 'Ηρακλεία εν τῆ κώμη 'I-
βίωνι αἴθ]ριον καὶ αὐλή καὶ μητρικὸν
μέρος οἰκίας] καὶ αὐλῆς

Now the declaration is addressed to the laographoi of Tebtunis, and Herakleia describes herself as (lines 4-5) ἀπὸ [τῆς αὐτῆς] κώμης. Why would her property, at which she registers herself, be in Ibion? Moreover, if it were, why would the definite article stand in line 7 before κώμη?¹⁵ It is more likely that the word beginning with iota (which is correctly read) distinguishes this property in some way from that which follows (maternal share), and I suggest ἴδιον as a suitable descriptor.¹⁶

In lines 13-20 Herakleia tells us about the registration elsewhere of her children by her divorced husband Herakles.¹⁷

τὰ] δὲ γεγυότα μοι ἐκ τοῦ
ἀποπεπλεγμ]ένου 'μου' ἀνδρὸς 'Ηρακλήου
.....]ς τοῦ καὶ 'Αρεώτου τέκνα
.....] 'Ηρακλῆν ἀπεγρα.
.....] αὶ δὲ θυγατέρας μου 'Ηρά-

¹³Lampra appears in Solin's *Die griechischen Personennamen aus Rom* II 687 from *CIL* VI 19488 (Hilara Lamprae 1). Λαμπρή appears in *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* I with two citations (Chios, Arkades in Crete).

¹⁴It is not evidently a distinction between a straight and a peaked horizontal stroke, which in any case seems to have no significance. The other two instances of the latter are in line 11.

¹⁵And why would the Ibion not be further identified, since there were several? Such instances do occur, but there are not many.

¹⁶The reading of τῆ in line 7 before Herakleia's name also seems to me incorrect; perhaps δέ, which she uses in line 13.

¹⁷I have incorporated a correction of J. Bingen (*BL* 5.73) and a few minor changes of my own.

κλεια καὶ Τα]πετεσοῦχος ἐκάστη σὺν
τῷ ἐαυτῆς] ἀνδρὶ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης

Of line 16, the editor says, "le tracce visibili delle cinque lettere dopo ἀπεγρα permettono di supporre ἀπεγράφησιν, ἀπεγράφη ἐπὶ ὁ ἀπεγράψαμεν." Of these three, the second is certainly excluded, and I believe that the mu required in the third simply cannot be read. That leaves the first, which, though the traces are faint in places, appears to conform to them. We should suppose, therefore, that line 16 contained the name of another son followed by καὶ, and the start of line 17 must have contained something like σὺν τῷ πατρὶ or a word or phrase meaning "separately."

8. *P.Oslo* III 99¹⁸ = P.Mich.inv. 158A-B

In *SymbOsl* 65 (1990) 139-45, John Whitehorne has published two Michigan papyri containing better-preserved copies of the declaration first published as *P.Oslo* III 99. With the welcome new evidence, much is clarified, particularly about the names and relationships of the persons declared. Two points, however, remain troublesome. The first is the identity of the declarant, whose name is given as Παῖσιος Νεβτείχως τῆς Παχώμιος (in varying states of preservation) in all copies. Whitehorne translates, "Paesis son of Nebteichis whose mother is Pachomis" (p.144). That is impossible; grammatically τῆς refers to Nebteichis and cannot be a substitute here for μητρός, and Pachomis is a masculine name. And, in fact, there is evidence that Nebteichis is a feminine name, in *P.Bour.* 26.12, where we encounter Aurelia Nebtichis.¹⁹ Nebteichis was, therefore, the daughter of Pachomis.

Paesis describes himself as coming from Alabanthis, without specifying the nome (which would have appeared in the address to an official, to be written later). The editors assumed that this must be the well-known village in the Arsinoite Nome, but Hombert and Préaux²⁰ pointed to the presence of an oath formula, which is not a normal

¹⁸I am grateful to Inger Louise Forselv for providing me with a photograph.

¹⁹In Foraboschi, *Onomasticon*, 69, she is mistakenly listed as Aurelios Nebtichis, perhaps because the index to the publication said simply Αὐρ. and used "f.", which could refer either to "fils" or "fille."

²⁰*Recherches sur le recensement dans l'Égypte romaine* (Pap.Lugd.Bat. 5) 124 n.4.

feature of Arsinoite census declarations. They suggested that either the ὁμύω formula had been misread or that the provenance should be elsewhere. The new copies show that the reading is correct, and Whitehorne points out that the inclusion of the "greatest god Osirantinoos" in P.Mich.inv. 158B is specifically Antinoite. Whitehorne declines to assign a provenance, offering hypotheses to explain the presence of such an oath in the Arsinoite.

This caution, however understandable, seems to me unnecessary. A village Alabantis is known in the Hermopolite Nome, adjacent to the Antinoite, from *P.Oslo* III 134, presumably acquired at the same time as this declaration. There are many villages which belonged at times to the Hermopolite, at times to the Antinoite, and in 161 Alabant(h)is could well have been Antinoite. Tereus, the name of the declarant's daughter, though found in several areas, is predominantly Oxyrhynchite and Hermopolite, and Pachomis is, as far as I know, only Upper Egyptian. Furthermore, the formula used here, with ἐμαυτόν as object to ἀπογράφομαι coming only after the verb and at the start of the list of persons, is not found in the Arsinoite. There seems no reason to ignore the clearly regional character of the oath formula, then; Alabantis seems very likely to be the Hermopolite village of that name, which might have been part of the Antinoite at this date.

9. *P.Stras.* IV 268²¹

This declaration concerns only property, which is presented as follows by Lucius Poplius Isidoros, the declarant (lines 4-7):

ὑπάρ-
χει τῆ φροντισ[α]μένη ὑπ' ἐμοῦ Μαι-
...].μ..ρους ἐν κώμη Φιλαδελ(φία)
οἰκία κ]αὶ ἀύλη

"Malgré l'absence de l'expression κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφή, acte qui ne semble pas avoir concerné (sous cette forme) les citoyens romains d'Égypte avant 212 p.C. (cf. Hombert et Préaux, *o.c.*, p.56), il ne peut s'agir d'autre chose. Un citoyen romain L. Popillius (?) Isidoros fait une

²¹My work on the Strasbourg census declarations was made possible by the kind assistance of Jean Gascou.

déclaration pour sa pupille Maecia (?)." So the editor describes the contents. In fact, however, there are other examples of the κατ' οἰκίας ἀπογραφή submitted by a Roman citizen; these may declare only unoccupied property (for example, *SB* XII 10788B or *BGU* I 53), but there is no reason why one could not also have declared property occupied by renters. Mention may also be made of the problematic *SB* X 10219, in which the declarant is a legionary veteran with the *tria nomina*--presumably a citizen--who seems to declare himself as well as family members. There is certainly no difficulty in accepting the Strasbourg text as a typical declaration of unoccupied property.

At the end of line 5, it would also be possible to read μη, thus opening the possibility that one might read μη|τρί. In addition, ρους might instead be ρουτ[ι], yielding a dative ending. But this is no more than speculation. Cf. Taubenschlag, *Law*, 170-72 for the possibility that this terminology might fit a situation of son as guardian for his mother. Though the traces are exiguous, I think that in line 5 one must read φρουτιζ[ο]μένη, as James Keenan suggests; the aorist middle would not be appropriate.

10. *P.Stras.* V 313

This partially preserved declaration is submitted by a woman named Tasoucharion; damage to lines 5-9 makes it difficult to tell exactly how it was submitted, but apparently a second person is involved, about whom in lines 7-8 we are told

μη(τρός) Πτολεμαίδος ἀπ[ὸ] τῆς μη-
τροπόλεως διὰ φρουτιζ[ιστου] (*sic*)

In fact, however, the beginning of line 8 reads πολλεως, and it is evident that we must read and restore ἀπ[ὸ] τῆς μητρο[πο]λλεως (read -πόλεως). (The alternative, ἀπ[ὸ] τῆς Ἀρσινουιτῶν] | πόλλεως, is not found until the fourth century.²² The mother's name has no tau and is Πολεμαίς--perhaps just a slip, though Πολεμαίος is known.

In the lacuna in line 10, a place name and the word οἰκία are to be restored.

²²Cf. John F. Oates, *BASP* 12 (1975) 115-16.

11. PSI I 53

This very mutilated papyrus contains parts of twelve declarations. In column vii there is the lower part (missing the parts before the enumeration of people) of a declaration. The editor's text of the portion declaring males is as follows:

αὐτῷ [
 ὁ προγ(εγραμμένος) Γερ[μανός
 Σαραπίων υἱὸς μητρὸς]
 110 Διδύμης .[
 γερδ(ιος) ἄσημ(ος) [
 'Αφῦγχις ἀδελ(φός) [τέχνης ?]
 τῆς αὐτῆς) ἄσημ(ος) [
 (γίνονται) ἄνδ(ρες) .

The declarant's name is preserved in the concluding oath (line 130) as 'Αμόις Σαραπίων (sic), which shows that the restoration of Γερ[μανός in line 108 cannot be correct, because this phrase (ὁ προγεγραμμένος) always refers to the declarant. The answer, of course, is found in 111, where the weaver's trade is mentioned. In line 112, τέχνης was corrected to μητρὸς by the editors (p.xiii). In line 114, the number of men can be read as γ (3), as indeed one would expect, since no names would have figured before that of the declarant. A corrected text of the passage reads as follows:

αὐτῷ. [καὶ εἰμι 'Αμόις]
 108 ὁ προγ(εγραμμένος) γέρ[διος ἄσημ(ος) (ἐτῶν) ..]
 Σαραπίων υἱὸς μητρὸς]
 Διδύμης .[patronymic]
 γέρδ(ιος) ἄσημ(ος) [(ἐτῶν) ..]
 112 'Αφῦγχις ἀδελ(φός) [μητρὸς]
 τῆς αὐτῆς) ἄσημ(ος) [(ἐτῶν) ..]
 (γίνονται) ἄνδ(ρες) γ

12. *P.Prag. I 17 + P.Flor. I 102*

For the combination of these two pieces, already noted by G. Nachtergaele in *P.Brux. I* p.54 n.1 from a communication of J. Schwartz, see now L. Vidman, *ZPE* 77 (1989) 225-26 (with Pl. VIII). To Vidman's considerably improved text, I would add a few comments. In line 14 the age of the declarant's wife, Taoues daughter of Stotoetis the elder²³ and of Herieus, is read by the editor as λγ, a reading taken over from the first edition by Wessely (reprinted as *SB III* 6696). A study of the plate (the pertinent part is on the Prague half, which can be seen also in pl. XXIII in *P.Prag. I*), however, seems to me to indicate that in fact the correct reading is μγ. There has certainly been correction, in the second digit, perhaps from alpha to gamma, but possibly from gamma to alpha. But the mu seems to me secure. Reading a lambda leaves considerable space, with unexplainable traces, before the second digit. The wife is thus the same age as or two years younger than her husband rather than a decade younger.

Vidman correctly recognized that the united text indicates three children, not two. From autopsy of the Florentine half, I would read line 15 as

φρέμεως (έτων) [.] και Θ. . . [(έτων) .] κ[α].

In lines 17-18, the declaration refers to μέρη πατρικ(ά) και μητρικόν οικ.; Vidman comments, "non siamo sicuri sulla lettura delle ultime due lettere dopo οικ." On the plates they seem to me to be certainly an omicron followed by a raised semicircular curve of the sort which commonly marks pi in abbreviation, thus confirming οίκοπ(έδου) (or plural).

13. *SB I 5661*

P.Eitrem 1 was first published by its owner in *Philologus* 71 (1912) 24-27. Some improvements were offered by Leiv Amundsen in *Cd'É* 7 (1932) 328 n.3 and printed in *BL* 2.2.119-20. It is now inv. 421 in the Oslo collection.²⁴ The name of the declarant's son is given twice, described as follows in the edition (as corrected by Amundsen):

²³Vidman's resolution of πρεσβυτ() as πρεσβυτ(έρον) is presumably a slip. It is to Stotoetis, her father, that the adjective applies; read πρεσβυτ(έρου).

²⁴I am again indebted to Inger Louise Forselv for a photograph.

τὸν υἱὸν μου Πανέτβε υἱὲν Κεφάλωνος
ὁ προγεγραμμένος μου υἱὸς {π} Πανέτβε υἱεὶς Κεφάλωνος

It is hard not to be struck by two oddities: first, the juxtaposition of second- and third-declension forms of υἱός in both cases;²⁵ and the occurrence here in the early first century of the undeclinable Πάνετβε, of which there is no other secure example.²⁶ Both problems are resolved by reading Πανετβευειν and Πανετβευεις, respectively, yielding one of the normal forms of this name (with ει for the normal spelling with ι).

In line 24, Amundsen corrected Eitrem's κατὰ κ' ἔτ(ος) to κατακ(εχώρικα). (ἔτους) β κτλ. In fact, the form is always the middle-passive form, κατακεχώρισται,²⁷ and that is how the abbreviation should be resolved here.

Columbia University

Roger S. Bagnall

²⁵For that matter, Gignac, *Grammar* II 101 points out that "third declension forms are extremely rare."

²⁶*Onomasticon* lists *P.Bour.* 34, but that is a resolution of an abbreviation and cannot be given any value. The Eitrem text is the only instance in *Namenbuch*, and the Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri shows no instance.

²⁷The aorist passive καταχωρίσθη also occurs occasionally.