

### Notes on Egyptian Census Declarations, III

For the purpose and scope of these notes, see the first installment in *BASP* 27 (1990) 1-14.<sup>1</sup>

#### 22. P.Ashm.inv. 8, fragment

In *P.Oxf.* 8.7n., Wegener cites an unpublished fragment (now mounted with *P.Oxf.* 8) as being a declaration from the census of 103/4. An examination of the papyrus suggests that this is unlikely to be correct. It is true that it is written in a hand very similar to that of *P.Oxf.* 8, probably in the same hand, but that need mean only that it pertains to the affairs of the same family. It is addressed to one Protogenes, probably the *bibliophylax* of that name who served (with Isidoros) from year 4 of Vespasian until sometime before 114, and who was a central figure in the great furor over the state of the archives of Arsinoe documented in *P.Fam.Tebt.* 15 and 24.<sup>2</sup> He is not likely to have been the addressee of a census declaration, even if it would eventually wind up in his hands.

The thin strip contains 19 lines from the left edge of the document. It does (13) refer to the census of Domitian 9 (i.e., 89/90), but that could occur in declarations or petitions concerning status or property. Since there is an earlier reference to Domitian (line 7), to an emperor, perhaps the current one (8), and to Nero (12), it is clear that the writer is citing a variety of previous official acts. He is perhaps one of the 6475 Hellenes (2: ἀνδρῶν), which could furnish an explanation for the document.

Since the surviving document has none of the standard phraseology of census declarations, nor descriptions, nor ages, identifying it as a census declaration seems to have nothing in its favor.

<sup>1</sup>I am indebted to to Giovanni Geraci for a photograph of *P.Bon.* 18 and for generous labors in controlling readings on the original; to the John Rylands Library for a photograph of *P.Ryl.* II 111; to Thomas Pattie for his assistance with the London papyri (2-3 April 1991); to Revel Coles for making P.Ashm.inv. 8 fragment available for study (4 April 1991); and to Hermann Harrauer and his staff for every courtesy in my study of the *SPP* texts (22 April 1991).

<sup>2</sup>See Fabienne Burkhalter, "Archives locales et archives centrales en Egypte romaine," *Chiron* 20 (1990) 191-216 for this affair in a broader context.

23. *P.Bon.* 18

A tall piece from a τόμος συγκολλήσιμος, complete at top and bottom, preserves most of two declarations and part of a third, all from the village of Machor in the Herakleopolite Nome, from the census of 131/2. The editor dates them to 132, and the partly preserved dating clause in column ii was reconstructed by P.J. Sijpesteijn (cf. *BL* 7.30) as being of year 16 of Hadrian. The Herakleopolite, however, was among the nomes where declarations habitually were dated in the second half of the year *following* the year of the census (cf., e.g., *P.Bad.* IV 75b, *P.Oslo* III 98), and the date here must therefore be to year 17, specifically to March-April, 133.

Holes, abrasion, discoloration, and crumpling all contribute to make these declarations (copies, apparently; they have no address phrase) difficult to read. I therefore turned to Professor Giovanni Geraci for aid in checking the original where the photograph left me uncertain. Unfortunately, as he tells me, "[e]ffettivamente il papiro si presenta ora in uno stato di conservazione molto peggiore rispetto al passato," with the result that in many places it is still less helpful than the photograph. I offer a few suggestions for improvement, recording those in which Professor Geraci has been able to control the readings on the original.

Col. i declares two men, Piathres s. Petechon and Soeris, gs. Piathres,<sup>3</sup> a 27-year old farmer, and what (as the editor says) appears to be his father, whose name the editor reads as

Πετεχ[ι(ῶν) .....] μητρ(ρός) Τατ( )  
 χε..[ ] (έτῶν) ο

More is actually preserved in the first line than is shown, and a reading of Πετεχῶ(ν) Πιαθ(ρήους) seems perfectly possible. The mother's name does not begin in tau; there is only one tau, in fact, ending μητρ(ρός). I read (and Geraci confirms) 'Απυ|χε.., which one would most probably guess to be a genitive of 'Απύχις, a misspelling of 'Απύχις found in several texts.<sup>4</sup> Apynchis, to be sure, is a masculine name (although 'Απύχις τῆς Σεταβούς in *BGU* XI 2044.32 ['Απύνχις τῆς Σαταβού[ς] in line 9) seems to be an exception), and I have not been

<sup>3</sup>He is the declarant. In line 1, I read Πιαθρήους Πετε-

<sup>4</sup>E.g., *BGU* XI 2044.32, XIII 2336.8, *P.Petaus* 72.4, etc.

able to read the ending satisfactorily (-χεος is possible but uncertain). What follows, shown by the editor inside brackets, is preserved but blank, with the numeral pushed to the right (as is common). In line 21, οὐδεις ἄλ[λος] seems to be the correct reading ("molto verosimile," G.).

In column ii, there are numerous problems in the readings of the names. I propose the following:

17: for .. λ.γον( ) 'Ασ(ήμου?) read οὐλ(ή) γόν(ατι) ἀρ(ιστέρω). The last two words are confirmed by Geraci.

21: for ἀμφ(οτέρων) [..]. read simply ἀμφο(τέρων).

22: for Αχρ. ρη... [...]δ[...] ς read 'Αχωραῖς ἀδ(ελφή) ... (ἐτῶν) ς (confirmed by Geraci). The unread letters may be ἄση(μος), but I am not confident of that reading. The name (apparently unattested) might be derived from 'Αχωρις, an occasional variant of 'Ακωρις, the Hermopolite toponym and its eponym.

23: at the end, (ἐτῶν) γ.

24: at the end, (ἐτῶν) β.

In column iii, I think that the declarant's name begins Ερφ[ and is probably to be restored as 'Ερφ[αήσεως.

#### 24. *P.Lond.* II 452 (p.65)

The loss of the left part (a third?) of this text, coupled with substantial shredding in the left part of what remains, leaves its exact purpose in doubt. The editor described it as "either a census-return, or a copy of such a return" for the census of 215/6. But he noted that "the preliminary formula is different from that normally given," and inferred (wrongly) from ἀναγκάως ἐπιδί[[δωμι] in 2-3 that "it is a return made under protest." A dating by the previous reign at the end was interpreted as "a reference (as often in such returns) to the previous census."

This explanation is not satisfactory. Lines 7-8 contain a full date to year 25 of Caracalla, and such would have stood at the *end* of a declaration, and they are followed by a blank space equivalent to a line. In lines 12-13 clearly stood another such date, this time to Severus and Caracalla. The brevity of these texts and the disjuncture between the first and second parts point clearly to the presence of two extracts from declarations, one from each of two consecutive registrations. From the fact that priests are involved both in the heading and in line 9, one may



8 [ἀδελφ]ῆ Θάισαν (ἐτῶν) ιη· και ἐξ ἀμφο-  
[τέρων] υἱὸν Θεογεΐτουα μὴ ἀνα-  
[γεγραμ]μένον ἐν ἐ[πιγεγενημένοις]  
-----

5 αὐτοῦ: second u ex c 6 ὁμοπάτριον, ὁμομήτριον 7 ἀδελφὴν

26. *P.Lond.* III 843 (p.28)

"The conclusion of another return for the same census [i.e., 159/160], dated in Tubi [= January] of the following year, and addressed to the κωμογραμματεὺς and λαογράφοι of the village, the name of which is lost." So the editor described this text. The onomastic repertory (Thases, Pakysis, Orsenouphis, Stotoetis) as a whole points to Soknopaiou Nesos as the provenance.

In *BL* 1.274, a couple of additional readings by Bell are recorded, mainly [ἀπο]γράφο[μα]ι before ἐμαυτ[όν] in line 1. But ἀπογράφομαι is out of place in the enumeration of persons with age and marks, which is where the preserved text starts; it belongs earlier in the declaration. Here, instead, I read καὶ [εἰμι . . . . .]. . . . . (ἐτῶν) μα ᾄση[μο(ς)]. the declarant is thus 41, his wife<sup>6</sup> 35.

After the date,<sup>7</sup> comes an additional note of unclear relevance to the declaration, the first line of which was corrected to Θενοσίφριω (ἐτῶν) θ by Bell (*BL* 1.274). The second and third read ὑπάρχ(ει) τῆ Σ....( ) μέρος οἰκ(ίας) κ(αὶ) αὐλ(ῆς). The name seems not to be Stotoetis, but it is roughly written and I cannot make it out. It remains unclear what the connection of this note to the declaration is.

27. *P.Princ.* III 129

The editors published only the second column of this papyrus, which has portions of two columns of a *tomos synkollesimos*. Of the first, they said, "The ends of lines of the document preceding this are preserved, but very little is worth recording. The name of Tineius Demetrius is

<sup>6</sup>Read γυναῖκα in line 2.

<sup>7</sup>Read (though compressed) (ἐτοῦς) κδ̄ Ἀυτωνίου Καίσαρος κτλ.

preserved in part in l. 3, and possibly the name of his predecessor in l. 8 where Αύρηλιου is read." In the course of editing *P.Oxy.* XXXVI 2762, which is a return from the same census (187/8), John Rea examined the Princeton papyrus and gave a text for lines 3-10 of the first column. In fact, about as much survives of column i as of the published column ii, and a text is given below. The verso contains parts of twelve lines of a text of which I can make little.

The published text itself had many defects, some of which were corrected in a review by H.C. Youtie and in Hombert and Préaux's book on the census; these are recorded in *BL* 3.151-52. There is, however, a considerable amount more to be corrected, and some difficulties still remain. The text below incorporates Rea's readings in column i with a revised text of the whole.

The editors offered no provenance for the papyrus. Their erroneous restoration of *περὶ τὴν κώμην] Βουβαστ( )* in their line 9 (now 35) may have suggested the Arsinoite Nome and the well-known village of Boubastos in the Herakleides Division to them, but if so they did not so indicate. In Calderini-Daris, *Dizionario geografico* II 60, the declaration is indeed listed under the Arsinoite village.<sup>8</sup> In Nachtergaeel's list in *P.Brux.* I, p.57, however, it is classified (following Hombert and Préaux, *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* V, p.176) under a village of Boubastis in the Oxyrhynchite Nome; the basis of Hombert and Préaux's classification was the formula, which follows an Oxyrhynchite pattern (p.111). It remains true that the formula found here is attested only in the Oxyrhynchite. No such Oxyrhynchite village, however, is listed in Calderini-Daris nor in Pruneti, *I centri abitati*. A new reading of line 35 shows now that we are dealing instead with a *λαύρα*, a quarter of the metropolis, which must be Oxyrhynchos.

Column i

-----  
 [. . . . . ] traces  
 [θούτος μητ(ρός) Τ]απολ( )  
 [. . . . . : κατ]ὰ τὰ κελ(ευσθέντα)  
 4 [ὑπὸ Τιτη]ίου Δημητρί-  
 [ου τοῦ λα]μ(προτάτου) ἡγεμόνος  
 [καὶ Αύρηλί]ου Ούηριανού

<sup>8</sup>That provenance is also given in the Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri.

- 8 [τοῦ ἡγε]μονεύσαντος  
[ἀπογρα(φόμεθα)] πρὸς τὴν τοῦ  
[διελθ(όντος) κη (ἔτους)] Αὐρηλίου  
[Κομμό]δου Ἀντωνίνου  
[Καίσαρος] τοῦ κυρίου
- 12 [κατ' οἰκία]ν ἀπογρα(φῆν)  
[τὴν] ὑπάρχουσαν ἡμ(ῖν)  
[ἐπὶ Β]ουβα( ) οἰκ(ίαν) καὶ αὐλ(ῆν)  
[εἰς] ἦν ἀπογρα(φόμεθα) καὶ καταγιω(όμεθα)
- 16 [ἔσμε]ν ἡμεῖς αἱ προκ(είμεναι) Τετρυρί[ς]  
[... ]θουτο(ς) μητ(ρὸς) Τααπολ( )  
[... ] ἄση(μος) ὡς (ἐτῶν) κε,  
[... ] ἄλ(λη) ἀδελ(φή) μητ(ρὸς) ...
- 20 [.....] ὡς (ἐτῶν) κβ.  
[ὑπά]ρ[χ(ει) δὲ] ἡμ(ῖν) εἰσοδος  
[... ]πρ[... ] Πτολλα( ) ὁμο(ίως)  
[ὑπ]άρχ(ουσι) [ἡμ(ῖν)] οἰκ(ία) καὶ αὐλ(ῆ)  
24 [καὶ ὑ]πάρχ(ει) ἡμ(ῖν) ἐπὶ λα[ύ(ρας)]  
[.....] ψελ(ὸς) τόπ(ος)  
-----

## Column ii

- 
- [. .].[.].[.....].[. .].ιος  
28 Πανεμγέω[ς] μητρὸς Τα-  
ήσιος Ἀπολλῶς μετὰ  
κυρίου Πασῦ τοῦ Ἀρμιύ(σιος)  
ἀπο γρά(φομαι) κατὰ τὰ κελευσθ(έντα)  
[ὑ]πὸ Τινηίου Δημητρίου
- 32 τοῦ λαμπ(ροτάτου) ἡγεμόνος ἀπο[γρά(φομαι)]  
πρὸς τ(ὴν) τοῦ διελθ(όντος) κη (ἔτους)  
[κ]ατ' οἰκ(ίαν) ἀπογρ(αφῆν) τὰ ὑπάρχ(οντά)  
[μοι] ἐπὶ λαύρ(ας) Βουβαστ( )
- 36 ὄ[λην] οἰκ(ίαν) καὶ αὐλ(ῆν) ἰς ἦν  
[ἀπο]γρά(φομαι) σὺν ... ( ) αὐτὴ ἐγὼ  
[....]..... (ἐτῶν) λβ  
[... ]ναριστ( ) θυγ( ) .η( ) ἐξ ἐμοῦ
- 40 [....]..... [ἄσ]ημ(ος) (ἐτῶν) γ,

[. . .]ς αὐτ( ) θυγ( ) .. (ἐτῶν) ι  
 [ὑπάρ]χ(ει) δέ μοι ἐπὶ ... ( )  
 [. . . .]η( ) (πρότερον) Ταπουτῶτος  
 44 [Πα]ήσιος μέρο(ς) οἰκ(ίας) καὶ τόπ(ου)  
 [καὶ] ὁμνῶ τὴν Αὐρηλίου  
 [Κομ]μόδου Ἀντωνείνου  
 [Καί]σαρος τοῦ κυρίου  
 48 [τύχη]ν κτλ.  
 -----

3 Since the verb of declaring stood in the lacuna in line 8, it seems likely that the lacuna here contained the patronymic of the declarant's mother; but see line 30.

14 There is not room to restore λαύρας as in line 35, q.v. for the place name.

16 It is also possible to read Τεταῦρι[ς].

19 The traces at the end of the line are too exiguous to allow us to be certain whether the sister had the same mother, Ταπολλ( ).

21 I cannot read any term for property known to me. With this line begins the small contribution of a detached fragment that apparently joined here.

26 The scanty traces here may be the end of the declarant's name, but they could be her patronymic instead.

30 It is puzzling that the verb of declaring seems to appear both here and two lines later. Since it is written very small here and partly squeezed in above the line, it may have been an erroneous afterthought.

35 The most likely resolution is Βουβαστ(είου), as the editors of *BGU* I 53.13 (also a census declaration) resolved the same abbreviation with reference to an *amphodon* of that name in the Arsinoite metropolis, attested now also in *BGU* VII 1579.10 (written in full) and in *P. Corn.* 20.29 (also in full).<sup>9</sup> The λαύρα of Boubasteion is otherwise unattested, but the term normally means the same as *amphodon*. The term λαύρα, however, is rare in Arsinoe in the Roman period, being used in this way more commonly in Oxyrhynchos. And (cf. introduction) the formula of the document is unmistakably Oxyrhynchite. This must, therefore, be a district by that name in Oxyrhynchos.

<sup>9</sup>These three are shown as three different places in Calderini-Daris II 58 s.v. Βουβαστεῖον (ἄμφοδον), but the village provenances of the two Berlin papyri do not testify to *amphoda* in these villages.



37 A reading close to the editors', σὺν ἄλλ(οις), is possible, although the sense is unclear; much the same is true of σὺν ἀνδ(ρί), also a possible reading.

38-41 This key passage is very poorly preserved, and I have not been able to extract continuous sense from it. Many of the editors' readings seem impossible; where I have not been able to find a satisfactory reading to replace them, I have printed dots.

42 Perhaps another quarter name at the end of this line, followed by some type of real estate in the next.

48 A tiny trace is visible at the right edge of this line, which certainly continued the concluding formula of the declaration.

#### 28. *P.Ryl.* II 111

Only the lower right-hand part of this declaration survives. Almost the entirety of the opening phraseology is lost, picking up only at καὶ ἀπογρά(φομαι) εἰς τὴν κτλ., as Hombert and Préaux recognized (see *BL* 3.160). The amount missing at left is by no means obvious. The editors stated that "[t]he approximate length of the lines is given by ll. 2, 8, 10." Those lines, as they restored them, needed to about 28, 26, and 32 letters, respectively. The supposition of that length of restoration, however, leads to insoluble difficulties. Since the editors offered neither translation nor any reconstruction of the household declared here, we cannot know how they would have approached these difficulties. The first is that the restoration of line 2 rested on the inclusion of the year number written in words: εἰς τὴν τοῦ διεληλυθ[ότος τρίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους, κ]γ (ἔτους), θεοῦ κτλ. This is most unlikely. I do not know of a single other secure instance of writing the year number in words in this place in the declaration formula. The only published one I know of is *SB* XIV 11577, of year 7 of Trajan, where three letters of [ἐ]βδ[ό]μ[ου] are dotted and the rest restored.<sup>10</sup> It is thus very likely that only at most six letters can be restored here. For that matter, it is not impossible that another few letters of διεληλυθότος stood in line 1 at the right, perhaps with abbreviation. All we can be certain of is that the kappa of the year number must have stood in line 2. Since a 1-6 letter

<sup>10</sup>The original could not be located in November, 1990, nor could any photograph.

restoration is impossible in any other line, extreme indentation seems a necessary hypothesis.

The next few lines, with the family members, was restored as follows:

[έμαυτὸν . . . . . καὶ τὴν ὁμο]πάτριον καὶ ὁμομήτριόν  
 μου ἀδελ-  
 [φὴν . . . . .]μάριον (έτων) ἰάση(μον)  
 καὶ τὴν νυνεὶ γυναῖ-  
 [κά μου . . . . . μετὰ τῶν ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων  
 τέκνων Τρυφαίνης

Now in fact the formula here normally follows καὶ εἰμί with the name of the declarant in the nominative, then the names of other people in the accusative. We must allow about 27 letters' space for καὶ εἰμί . . . . . ὁ προκ(είμενος) (έτων) . . ἄσημ(ος), even if we permit that abbreviation and assume he was scarless. The editors assumed that the next person was his sister because of the termination -μάριον. The latter is virtually certain to be feminine, and in fact there are only two plausible names, Demarion and Didumarion. Actually, traces of an upsilon can be seen before mu, leading to Διδ]υμάριον. But what can have filled the intervening space? One must consider the phrase καὶ τὴν νυνεὶ γυναῖ|[κα], which surely suggests that a previous wife has been mentioned. Can she be the sister? But Didumarion is 10 years old, scarcely a plausible age for a former wife. Didumarion must rather be a daughter by a former wife, who must in turn be mentioned before her, either in line 3 or in line 4. One expects something like καὶ τὴν γενομένην γυναῖκα οὔσαν καὶ τὴν ὁμο]πάτριόν μου ἀδελ|[φὴν . . . . . (έτων) . . ἄσημ(ον) καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων θυγατέρα Διδ]υμάριον. Now that would give a total restoration in line 3 of some 63 letters, and 47 in line 4, which is rather unbalanced. It is possible to imagine abbreviation, but it is also possible that in 4 we should restore καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τέκνα . . . . . (έτων) . ἄσημ(ον) καὶ Διδ]υμάριον, which would bring it to about 61.

With his divorced wife still in the household, as his sister, and with their child or children, the declarant now proceeds to his current wife, all information about whom is missing (a name, patronymic, grandfather's name, metronymic, age, and description will bring the total restoration here to about 60 letters). They have at least two children, one named Truphaina; information about the other(s) is lost in line 6. It is puzzling to find in line 5 μετὰ τῶν ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τέκνων Τρυφαίνης, because

one does not expect the children to be declared in a prepositional phrase. It is possible that the case of τέκνων was simply attracted back into that of the preceding word, but with the lacuna of the size it appears to be, speculation may not be profitable.

If the argument is accepted that a restoration in the vicinity of 60 letters is needed to make sense of lines 3-5, the construction of the remainder of the text becomes still more obscure than it was with an implied restoration of less than half that size. In line 10, καὶ τὴν τούτου γυναῖκα signals a preceding free male. The wife's names (probably no grandfather), age and description can fit comfortably in the space (about 38 letters) in line 11 before the information about her registration in the previous census. Probably only one child's name and description are lost in line 12, but two are not impossible. Dioskoros in that line is thus one of two or three children. It seems impossible to reconstruct anything of the husband's entry, which the editors have occupying all of line 9 and almost all of line 10. With longer restorations, that is no longer possible. I can see no way, either, of recovering with certainty the status or relationships of Nikephoros alias Harpalos (line 6) or a person whose name is lost and Isiakos alias Amoules (line 7), or Eudaimonis (line 8), nor how many other persons may be lost in those lines. But, as I suggest below, their placement in the declaration suggests that these three are slaves of the declarant.

Lines 13 ff. present further problems. What survives of 13 begins Καλκοκάρου δούλος Ἡρωίδος τῆς Ἀρποκ(ρατίωνος). The editors comment that the nominative in δούλος "is probably a lapse," but they do not comment on the more puzzling genitive of Καλκοκάρου. It is perhaps in turn a lapse for nominative,<sup>11</sup> but it is impossible to be sure. By the end of line 14 we seem to have the end of the listing of a woman, followed by one or more children ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων, from which we may deduce that her husband preceded in the lacuna in line 14. The description ὁμοίως (ἑτῶν) δ in line 15 suggests that twins are declared, but another child of the couple might have preceded them. There then follows Heron s. of Heron (with another mistaken nominative) before a lacuna in line 16, which ends with the last three letters of a feminine name in the accusative and an age, and then Τασουχάριον ἄλλην, presumably ἄλλην θυγατέρα to be understood (line 17 may still be part

<sup>11</sup>Evidently so taken by I. Biezunska-Malowist, *L'esclavage dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine II* (Wrocław etc. 1977) 174, who includes this person in her list of slave names.

of her description). A 51-year old male occurs in line 18, and probably his wife in lines 19-20 (in 20, Dionysiou Topon may be the amphodon to which she has moved, rather than that in which she was registered 14 years earlier), then their daughters in 20-21.

Overall, then, there appear to be four households declared seriatim, with perhaps a fifth unrecoverable in lines 15-16. Too much is lost to reconstruct all of them with any confidence; one would particularly like to know if the heads of household were brothers. The structure does suggest that the persons in the accusative in lines 6-8 may well be slaves of the first household.

29. *SPP* XXII 32

Wessely's text of this declaration from Soknopaiou Nesos for the census of 103/4 gives a misleading impression of the physical shape of the papyrus, for he restores a lacuna of 6 letters in line 4, even though by comparison with more securely restorable lines it must have been about seven letters longer. This fact was pointed out by P.J. Sijpesteijn, *Mnemosyne* 4 ser. 36 (1983) 360-61, who corrected the restoration of the imperial titulature. But other parts as well need rectification, even if complete restoration is not possible. A new text will give a clearer sense of things.

-----  
 [ἀ]πογράφομαι εἰς τὴν τοῦ διεληλυθ(ότος)  
 ζ (ἔτους) Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Νέρουα  
 [Τ]ραιανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ  
 4 [Δακικοῦ κατ' οἰ]κίαν ἀπογραφὴν  
 [- 12 - ] ἀπογράφομαι. Πτολλοῦς  
 [NN (10) με]τὰ κυρίου τοῦ  
 [- 11 - 'Α]κουσλάου τοῦ  
 8 [- 12 - ] ἐπιδέδωκα  
 [τὴν προκ(ειμένην) ἀπογραφ]ὴν καθὼς  
 [πρόκειται. Ἔτους ὀ]γδόου  
 [Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρ]ος Νέρουα  
 12 [Τραιανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Γερ]μανικοῦ  
 [Δακικοῦ month, day ]  
 -----

It is clear that the name Ptollos in line 5 begins the subscription, not a listing of persons declared, and the repetition of ἀπογράφομαι, in the present, suggests that the correct restoration of the lacuna in line 5 must be ἐν ᾗ (οἷς, ᾧ) οὐδένα; this is property in which no one is registered. (A third person verb would be more common in such a place, but the reading is clear enough.) Line 7 will have had a term of relationship (like ἀνδρός or συγγενούς) plus a name.

30. *SPP XXII 34*

This declaration was retained in the list of census declarations given by G. Nachtergaele in *P.Brux.* I, p.52, but marked with an asterisk, which "indique un doute touchant la nature, la provenance ou la date du document" (p.51 n.1). That doubt is all too well founded, and this item should be deleted from our lists of census declarations. Addressed to the basilikos grammateus of the Themistos Division and to the komogrammateus of Apias by a resident of Soknopaiou Nesos, it is lost after the opening phrases. These, however, are decisive: ἀπογρ(άφομαι) κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα τὰς ὑπαρχούσας μοι περὶ τὴν προκειμέν[η]ν κώμην [<sup>12</sup> Dozens of texts with this formula are known, sometimes with the name or office (or both) of the person giving the orders, and the word modified by ὑπαρχούσας is ἀρούρας; these are declarations of land, of unflooded land, in fact. References to studies and lists of these can be found in the introduction to *P.Stras.* IX 834; cf. also now *P.Prag.* I 22 introd. *SPP XXII 34* can confidently be assigned to this category of text.

Columbia University

Roger S. Bagnall

<sup>12</sup>Wessely's text slightly emended from autopsy on 22 April 1991.