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IN 1951, in the Preface to the fourth volume of the Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, C. H. Roberts wrote: "This volume includes all the Greek and Latin papyri at present in the possession of the Library which have not previously been published in the catalogue and thus concludes the undertaking begun by A. S. Hunt in 1911." A little over a decade later it became evident that these words were not accurate, through no fault of Roberts, who had apparently been given this information by a previous Keeper. In fact, in 1962 a complete reorganization of the whole Manuscript Department was undertaken by Dr. F. Taylor and Miss G. A. Matheson, the then Keeper and Assistant Keeper, in the course of which every single manuscript and manuscript fragment in the fifty-four language groups represented in the Department was checked against all known catalogues and lists, printed and unprinted. As a result, all language groups were "cleaned" and systematically re-arranged, and a shelf-list was compiled indicating the exact content and extent of each. It became evident from this that the Greek papyri, which had been received piecemeal from Oxford over many years and hitherto stored in several different places by preceding Keepers, contained material additional to that catalogued in the four volumes already published. Mr. Roberts was informed and made an examination of the additional material, confirming that it contained items of value. The attention of other scholars was also drawn to this material, including P. J. Parsons (whose notes have been of great value to the present writers in making their inventory), Dr. E. A. E. Reymond, and Dr. Robert Kraft. Dr. Kraft and Antonia
SOME ADDITIONAL GREEK PAPYRI

Tripolitis published eight of these additional papyri in 1968. It is evident from the account which Kraft gives of his first knowledge of the collection and his interest in it that he had not made a complete inventory of the whole.

Dr. Bowman was invited to catalogue the additional papyri when he took up a position in the Department of History at Manchester University shortly after the Rylands Library merged with the Library of the University of Manchester to create the John Rylands University Library. Preliminary work was begun in 1972, but the pressure of other commitments hampered progress. Since the present authors were then sharing some of those other commitments, it seemed sensible that Dr. Thomas should also take a share in editing the Rylands papyri and collaboration began in 1975. We had formed no definite plan for publication but had assumed that we should eventually be able to muster enough texts of interest to form volume V of the Catalogue. We would like to emphasize that this is still our intention, since there is no doubt that the collection contains sufficient items of interest to justify publication of such a volume. We intend to present, in addition to new texts, a fuller treatment of selected items from the descripta of volume II; papyrologists will readily realize that many of these have gained significantly by the publication of comparable or complementary texts over the last six decades. Since Dr. Bowman’s departure from Manchester it has been necessary to work to some extent from photographs of various texts and we are most grateful to the British Academy and to the U.G.C. for a grant from the latter’s funds which should provide sufficient resources to enable such photographs to be prepared. Work can therefore proceed in spite of the fact that it is not possible for the papyri to be removed from the Library.

The present article has a threefold purpose. First, to announce our intention to pursue our commitment to complete the publication of this important collection. Second, to give some general notion of the content of the unpublished texts, and third, to offer some samples from the collection.

As regards the first point, there is little more to say except that we hope eventually to produce a fifth volume of the catalogue which will contain:

1. Expanded editions of some of the descripta from volume II.
2. Republication, with proper serial numbers, of all Rylands papyri published since 1952.
3. Full editions of all significant papyrus texts from the additional boxes.
4. Brief descriptions of several hundred insignificant scraps or fragments which do not merit full publication.

We hope that it will then be possible to state that the project begun by Hunt in 1911 has been concluded, although we naturally hope that this will not necessarily deter this great Library from purchasing more papyri, should they become available again.

The additional Greek papyri are stored in boxes numbered I–VII, XI and XII; there is no indication of the reason for the omission of numbers VIII, IX and X. Within the boxes are folders, arranged in groups, each folder containing one or more pieces of papyrus. We have no reason to suppose that these papyri were not part of the original acquisition which Hunt purchased in Egypt and described in the preface to the first volume of the Catalogue of Greek Papyri. As with the bulk of the published texts, there is little external indication of the provenance and we are therefore compelled to rely on the evidence of the documents themselves. As with the papyri published in volumes I–IV, there are indications in the documents of connections with towns in the Fayum, with Oxyrhynchus, the Hermopolite Nome, with the Eastern Delta and perhaps with Alexandria. But in all cases we must be careful not to assume that the mention of a particular place in a text is a sufficiently clear guide to the place of origin of the particular piece of papyrus: a letter written in Alexandria will certainly have been found elsewhere, for example; a papyrus referring to a land survey made in the Mendesian Nome in the Eastern Delta is

1 In Box I we found a slip marked "Fayum Coll. I" and "Fayum Coll. II".
unlikely to have been found in the Delta. There is one other external indication of origin, but it is not likely to be of much value; in Box V there is a folder labelled "15 Luxor" but this may only indicate acquisition at Luxor, which was one of the principal centres of the trade in antiquities in the early part of this century. The papyri are clearly as mixed a bunch as the main bulk of the Rylands collection.

Kraft estimated that the collection contains well over one thousand pieces exclusive of mere scraps and pointed out that the eight papyri which he and Tripolitis published were by no means necessarily the most important or best-preserved texts. We would agree with the latter statement—there are clearly many texts of at least equal interest—but we find the former rather misleading (perhaps based on an impressionistic assessment of the collection as a whole). Our own assessment is based on a reasonably thorough bipartite examination of all the papyri; the first stage of the examination was made by Bowman alone, the second by both the present writers together. Our estimate is that there are perhaps 200 papyri which merit publication in a fairly full form, that is to say with extended notes and commentary as opposed to brief description. Of these 200, perhaps just under one third have substantial remains of writing on both sides of the papyrus, the rest on one side only. We might, therefore, hope that the eventual outcome of work on the additional papyri will be an edition of between 200 and 250 new Greek texts. Kraft also wrote that "the bulk of the collection consists of non-literary, mostly Byzantine, materials (letters, lists, deeds, contracts, petitions, etc.)." It is perhaps true to say that of the total number of pieces of papyrus with identifiable writing the majority are Byzantine documents; but, as our analysis will show, the preponderance of Byzantine papyri (i.e. post-Diocletianic) is not quite so marked as Kraft suggests if we confine our attention to those texts which we have earmarked as publishable. In fact, we find that in this group the texts of

\[^1\] Box I, 116+144; 69+70: for a problem relating to provenance see below, no. 1.

\[^2\] E. G. Turner, Greek Papyri: an Introduction (1968), 51.

the Roman period outnumber those of the Byzantine era by approximately three to two. Outside this group, there are quite a lot of fair-sized fragments which contain, however, no text of appreciable value.

The batch of papyri as a whole may be divided into six main categories (with the proviso that our assignation of some dubious cases to particular categories can only be regarded as tentative): literary fragments, theological texts, Greek documents from the Ptolemaic period, the Roman period and the Byzantine era and, finally, texts in Latin. Before saying something about the papyri in each of these categories, we should make a few observations about some odd items in the collection as a whole. As with most groups of papyri, there are signs of the influence of market forces at work. We had regrettfully to discard one very large piece (with several associated scraps), which was covered with long lines of writing in a small, rather cramped hand, as being a forgery (I, 85–89). We also found several pieces of stiff cardboard on which had been "mounted" a great mass of tiny fragments stuck together in a sort of papier mâché; it is conceivable that there might be something of value here, for traces of writing can be seen, but it is now certainly irrecoverable. Finally, there were other signs of the dealer's hand at work in the association of fragments written in similar hands; some were stuck together to produce what seemed to be a larger document but were in fact unconnected.

A few items deserve a special note, falling outside the six categories we have mentioned and being each an oddity in some respect. There is one piece of vellum (Box I, in a folder marked '3') which contains a complete, but rather faded Byzantine documentary text. Another non-papyrus text (in Box XI) is a thick wooden writing tablet (or slab), lacking a substantial portion, which contains what is perhaps a multiplication table of late date. There is another multiplication table on the back of a document of the Roman period (Box I, 71). There are three small scraps of what was once a drawing in black ink (II, 5.J). One Byzantine document perhaps has a Coptic text on its back (I, 9). Another curiosity which we have not yet been able to explain satisfactorily is a text which bears the appearance of a Latin hand and seems to
be written in Latin characters; but such words as we can read are Greek (III, 2.E). Finally, we have naturally been on the lookout for fragments of codices but have been able to identify only one small scrap which seems certainly to belong to a codex (III, N); this is presumably the one which Kraft also noticed, although he gives no inventory number.¹

The harvest of literary and sub-literary texts from this collection is extremely meagre. In fact we have not been able to identify any piece as certainly and genuinely literary. There is one Byzantine fragment which may have a literary character and two pieces which appear to be written in literary hands of the Roman period (I, 60; II, 6.F and G). There are two small pieces which might belong to magical texts (V, 14.7 and VI, 4) and one which is probably a horoscope or other text of an astrological character (V, 14.16). Similarly, there is little of directly theological interest remaining after Kraft’s publication. He noted only one genuine biblical piece²; four other scraps (one of which might be a prayer amulet) might have theological or other Christian interest (I, 2 and 7, IV, 13.19, V, 14.9).

Amongst the documentary texts the Ptolemaic period is the least well represented. In fact there is only one clearly Ptolemaic text of first-rate quality, a second-century tax receipt from Philadelphia (I, 20). Two other pieces, one merely a list of names, may well be Ptolemaic (I, 27 and 90). Finally, in Box V there is a folder marked “Luxor 7” containing two pieces, of which one is Ptolemaic and has a seal on the back.

The texts of the Roman period present a much more varied and potentially rewarding prospect. The total number we have earmarked for publication is approximately 80. In about half of these we have discerned, in our preliminary examination, some indication of date (though we have no doubt that the remainder will yield some dating criteria on closer scrutiny). Amongst the datable texts are four of the first century A.D., about 17 of the second and about 15 of the third. The texts fall naturally into two groups—official documents and private material. In the former category there are considerable numbers of routine texts,

¹ Loc. cit.
particularly tax receipts. Apart from the example published below, we find, not unexpectedly, several examples of receipts for work on the dykes (I, 97 ff.). There are also a few petitions including one to a strategos (I, 140). As we would expect, this official is represented in other examples of correspondence of various kinds; there are letters addressed to strategoi of Oxyrhynchus and of the Arsinoite. Other notable items amongst the Roman documents are a large census registration from the Antonine period (II, 148), a report of proceedings of a metropolitan council (III, 1.Q, third century), and, finally, a report on a land survey made in the Mendesian Nome by three people from the Busirite who were appointed by an epistrategos (I, 69-70, Antonine period). There is a substantial number of well-preserved private documents from the Roman period. Two of the private letters are published below but there are several other extensive texts in this category. The most noteworthy is one which describes the attempts of the writer to obtain a hearing before a prefect of Egypt; this is particularly interesting because the writer mentions that he appeared before the prefect's tribunal in a building called the Lageion—it is possible, though by no means certain, that he was writing from Alexandria (I, 116+144). Other types of private document include, for example, accounts (III, 1.X), contracts of sale (a donkey in V, 5), of loan (I, 115) and of sale or lease of land (V, 14.2).

As for the documents of the Byzantine period, they, again, can be divided into official and private materials. In the former category we note several receipts (two clearly dating to the period of the first tetarchy, IV, 13.17 and 21), orders for payment (e.g. II, 5.L) and name lists which may be official in nature (e.g. I, 68, V, 15.15-16). There is also a large piece of a protocol (II, 5.Y i) and two interesting examples of official correspondence from the fourth century, one addressed by two irenarchs to a kepitalaiotes (IV, 11.M) and the other addressed to a man titled prostates poleos (IV, 11.N). Amongst the private documents there are again many private letters and contracts as well as accounts and lists of various kinds. Among the latter are two pieces which may belong to the archive of Theophanes, though we are not sufficiently confident of this attribution to state it
with certainty (V, 14.14 and VI, 6). Our general impression of the publishable Byzantine material is that most of it dates to either the fourth or the sixth century, with a few pieces from the seventh, perhaps even the eighth century.

These cursory remarks, based as they are on a fairly rapid survey of the material, are intended only as a general guide to what the collection contains. It is certain that we have not fully grasped even a small proportion of the amount of information which these texts will yield, but it is hoped that we have given a fairly accurate impression of the type of papyri with which we are dealing. It is clear that much will emerge which is of more than routine interest, as we hope may be indicated by the examples we print below.

I. PRIVATE LETTER

P. Rylands inv. Greek Add. I, 97

Provenance unknown  11.8 × 16.8 cm.  Late second/early third century A.D.

This light-coloured papyrus is complete at all margins and contains a private letter written by a son to his father. The hand is a fairly bold business hand of no great refinement but with the letters clearly made and well separated. It is difficult to date with any certainty since we have been unable to find a dated parallel which is at all close, though the hand does have several features in common with P. Lond. II, 198 (Atlas II 70), of A.D. 169–77. P. Oxy. XLI, 2954 (E. G. Turner, Greek Papyri, an Introduction, (1968), P1. VIII) is comparable and is placed by its editor and by Turner in the second century A.D. We are confident that our text predates 250 and would like to place it in the latter half of the second century; but we cannot exclude an early third-century date. There is no indication, apart from the content of the text, for its provenance. The phonology of the Greek is rather wild but the confusions are paralleled in texts of this type and date. The grammar and syntax, whilst not too wild, leave something to be desired, but the meaning of the text seems clear apart from the reading of two dubious words in
This is perhaps noteworthy in view of the preponderance of Roman names in the letter which might perhaps point to an origin in the family of a Roman veteran (see below).

Lucretianus informs his father Lucretius that he is remaining at the place from which he writes because the business for which he had made the visit had not been transacted on the twentieth of the month; he blames the delay on the official called the nomarch. He then goes on to refer to the procuring by or for himself of several mundane objects of food and clothing as well as a small amount of money and concludes with a typical greeting to the members of the household.

In spite of the obscurity of the events described in the text, as is common in letters of this kind, there are several points of considerable interest. The most immediately striking fact is that of the six people who are named in this letter all but one have Roman names. These are not of the type most commonly encountered after the Constitutio Antoniniana took its full effect, which usually consist simply of a Greco-Egyptian name prefixed by the nomen Aurelius. But Lucretius, Lucretianus, Valerius, Valerianus and Vettia strike quite a different note. It looks as if we might be dealing with a family which acquired its citizenship, perhaps through military service, before the Constitutio (although we cannot be certain that the text does predate that measure). It should be further noted that, although the name of the father, Lucretius, occurs quite commonly in the papyri, the name of the son, Lucretianus, is much less common than one might expect (see line 1 note).

Our Lucretianus should probably be distinguished from Lucius Valerius Lucretianus of BGU, IV. 1022 and M. Chr. 327, an Antinoite who owned property in the Fayum. But an Antinoite connection for our writer is not out of the question and might be thought appropriate to the preponderance of Roman names which are in general more common at Antinoopolis than elsewhere in the late second century. The possible connection needs to be considered in the light of the interpretation of lines 2–6 which contain the only indication of where Lucretianus was when he wrote the letter.

He says, first, that he has made a προσκύνημα to Sarapis on
behalf of his father and, second, that he is waiting for the occurrence of an ἀναγοραία which has been delayed by the nomarch. Where might this have happened? The mention of the προσκύνημα to Sarapis raises a point of considerable importance. Wilcken long ago propounded the theory (Grundzüge, 122 f.) that this formula occurred only in letters sent from Alexandria and Youtie has recently pointed out (Illinois Classical Studies, iii (1977), 98) that Wilcken’s hypothesis still has a good chance of proving to be true until we can produce a letter whose origin can definitively be shown to be a place other than Alexandria. We cannot make so conclusive a claim for our letter but we believe that the reference to the nomarch is the strongest indication of non-Alexandrian origin which has yet occurred in a letter with the Sarapis formula. The relevant facts are set out in the notes to lines 4-6. Suffice it to say here that we believe: 1. That it is most unlikely that there was an Alexandrian official called a nomarch. 2. That the official here referred to is most likely to be the nomarch of Antinoopolis. 3. That, whatever the nature of the business he is conducting, it is most natural to suppose that he is conducting it at his home base rather than Alexandria.

Δουκρητιανός Δουκρητίω τῷ [[πα]]
πατρὶ ἁκρεῖν, τὸ προσκύνημά σου
ποιώ παρὰ τῷ Σαράπιτι, μένω ὡς γένη
te ἁναγοραία ἐπὶ οὗ γέγονε τῇ εἰ-
καδέλ. ἐφ’ ὦ νομάρχης ἔξοδοι καὶ οὗ-
πο τὸ ἥργον οὐ μην γέγοναι αὐτὸν ἁκρεῖν,
μενον ὡς γένηται τάχα τῇ ἢ ἀνα-
χαριάν. κόμησεν παρὰ Πλούσιου
τῆν δι... κιν Οὐαλερίων καὶ κέμπατα
πέντε. κοικώμησμε παρὰ Οὐαλερίο
(δραχμᾶς) ζ καὶ δερματικῆ καὶ μαφότην
καὶ σφυρίδου ἄρτον καὶ φυνίκια
καὶ κορμύδιον ἀπασε Οὐετίαν
καὶ Οὐαλεριανόν καὶ τοὺς ἐνοίκους
πάντες-. ἐξερχόμεθα σοι πάντες.

Back

Δὸς Δουκρητίω ἀπ(ο) Δουκρητιανοῦ νίκο
"Lucretianus to Lucretius, his father, greetings. I make supplication on your behalf to Sarapis. I am waiting until the announcement is made since it did not take place on the twentieth. Since the nomarch will publish it and my business has not yet been done because of him, I am waiting on the chance that the announcement may be made quickly. Get from Plousios the... of Valerius and five coins. I have got from Valerius 7 drachmas and a dalmatic cloak and a veil and a basket of bread and figs and onion. Greet Vettia and all the household. May you and all enjoy good health. (Back) Deliver to Lucretius from Lucretianus his son."

1. The name Lucretius is quite common in Greco-Roman Egypt, the name Lucretianus very much less so. In fact, Preisigke, Namenbuch and Foraboschi, Onomasticon Papyrologicum Altem, between them record only two people with this name. One is an Antinoite, Lucius Valerius Lucretianus, in BGU, IV, 1022 and M. Chr. 327 (see introd. above) and the other is a Lucretianus son of Lucretius in P. Ross.-Georg. V. 58. II. 35. The latter text was dated by its editors on palaeographical grounds to the 4th century A.D. but reservation about this dating was expressed by A. Delage, La Capitation du Bas-empire (1945), 65; but since it seems unlikely to be as early as the late 2nd or early 3rd century, we hesitate to suggest an identification with our writer. The names of father and son no doubt reflect a form of the practice of formation of cognomina ending in -anus from the gentilicum of the parent (see I. Kajanto, The Latin Cognomina (1965), 33, 109-10). It is not clear whether the Valerius of l. 9 and the Valerianus of l. 10 are also father and son.

2-3. On προσκυνήματα see G. Geraci, "Ricerche sul Proslynema ", Aegyptus, li (1971), 3-211, and on Sarapis especially pp. 172 ff. He is sceptical of the notion that the Sarapis formula appears only in texts originating in Alexandria, but as has been pointed out by E. G. Turner, "My Lord Apis", Recherches de Papyrologie, ii (1962), 117-21, and by H. C. Youtie, "Grenfell's Gift to Lumbroso ", Illinois Classical Studies, iii (1977), 90-99, it has not yet been possible to find an example in a text whose origin can be fixed elsewhere. We consider that this letter has something to offer in this respect on the ground that the mention of the nomarch (see l. 5 n.) points to a non-Alexandrian origin. The omission of κυρίω in this formula is unusual. Geraci (op. cit. p. 178) states "il suo nome [i.e. Sarapis] è sempre preceduto da κύριος, tranne in tre lettere in cui è preceduto da μέγας, in una in cui è preceduto da κύριος θεός, in una in cui è solo." The last is SB, VI 9017, no. 24.4-5, where the editor restores: τὸ προσκυνήμα [σου ποιω παρά τω] Σεράπιδι. If this is correct it will be the only parallel to our text.
To the first category of exceptions noted by Ceraci we can now add *P. Oxy.* XLIII 3094.5–6 (and cf. note ad loc.).

3–4. ὃς is here (and in l. 7) used in the sense of ἐως, for which see *LSJ,* ὃς Ad. 2 (p. 2038). According to B. G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri* (1973), §598 we should expect it to be accompanied by ἂν, but he points out that ἐως without ἂν is very common in papyri. On ὃς for ἐως see F. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods,* i (1976), 305. ἔνυτρε: for the interchange of vowels see Gignac, op. cit. 192. ἄναυφωπία: until recently this word had appeared only rarely in papyri, see *P. Fay.* 66.4, *SB* 111 6951.25, *P. Fam. Teb.* 24.40 (where the editorial “correction” should be ignored). It appears frequently, however, in the Oxyrhynchite corn-dole archive, see *P. Oxy.* XL p. 117 (cf. *P. Mich.* XII 629) and also in *P. Berol.* 21652 (*Akten des XIII internationalen Papyrologenkongresses,* Marburg, 1971 (1974), 241–50, cf. J. Rea, *ZPE,* xxvi (1977), 220), where it means a “roll-call” or “muster”. Since the context of our letter is so vague it is difficult to say whether this precise meaning is intended and it is perhaps safer to take it in the general sense of “announcement”.

5. The verb is written as ἔξοπες and we owe the suggestion of ἔξοπες to Professor H. C. Youtie; the disappearance of iota may be a phonological rather than a scribal omission (see Gignac, op. cit. 199). The reference to the nomarch is tantalizing but might give a clue to the place and circumstances of Lucretianus’ visit, since this official is less commonly attested in the Roman period than might be supposed. The evidence may be summarized as follows. 1. Nomarch(s) of the Arsinoite. A nomarch whose area of activity is a nome rather than a town has appeared so far only in the Arsinoite. Possible exceptions to this are *P. Osl.* II 62 (τοῦ νομοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος) and *P. Flor.* 174, from the Hermopolite, referring to a nomarchy; but the former is based on an insecure restoration and the latter, as the editor remarked, may simply be an error for νομοῦ. F. Oertel, *Die Liturgie* (1917), 165 noted that the nomarch appears only in the Arsinoite where he is basically concerned with the collection of taxes (there may be a plurality of nomarchs, see *P. Osl.* III 124). The distinction made by N. Lewis, *Inventory of Compulsory Services in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt* (1968), s.v. between the nome officials and the “municipal” nomarchs of *BGU* I 8 seems misleading and the other evidence he adduces for the latter actually refers to the nomarch of Antinoopolis. We prefer to suggest that these nomarchs are attested so far as functioning only in the Arsinoite and having responsibility for the collection of certain taxes; by the middle of the 3rd century A.D. (if not earlier) the office had become a compulsory service appointed in the metropolis. 2. The nomarch of Naukratis. There is only one reference, *P. Osl.* III 92 (A.D. 130), where he receives a report from an official who was perhaps in charge of fines imposed for the illegal occupation of vacant land. On the dubious existence of a Naukratite nome see H. Gauthier, *Les Nomes d’Égypte* (1935), 146–8, but there might have been a Naukratite nomarchy like that of Antinoopolis. 3. The nomarch of Antinoopolis. For this official and for the nomarchy of Antinoopolis see Wilcken *ad P. Würzb.* 8; A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1971), p. 311, 477 n. 17; P. V. Pistorius, *Indices Antinoopolitani* (1939), 116–22; J. D. Thomas, *Akten des XIII internationalen Papyrologenkongresses,* Marburg, 1971 (1974), 400–1. He was responsible in Antinoopolis for duties performed elsewhere by
the strategos but also had a particular role in affairs concerning the registration and status of Antinoite citizens (see especially P. Fam. Teb., passim and H. I. Bell, "Diplomata Antinoitica", Aegyptus, xiii (1933), 514–28). Which is the nomarch referred to by Lucretianus? The balance of probability seems to point to the nomarch of Antinopolis as being the official most likely to make public announcements of the kind indicated in the letter. This, in turn, would imply a non-Alexandrian origin for the letter. The only circumstances in which an Alexandrian origin could be postulated involve either the assumption of an Alexandrian nomarch, which we think very unlikely, or the supposition that the Antinoite nomarch was doing business at Alexandria, perhaps delegated to him by the prefect (but such delegates normally function in their own place of activity, not at Alexandria).

6. ἀργονος: for the omission of final μω see Cignac, op. cit. 112. γεγοναί: for the interchange of vowels see notes to ll. 3–4 and cf. κακώμημε in l. 10.

7–8. The syntax is difficult here. μενος may be taken as μενον but is perhaps more likely to be μενος (present or future), as in l. 3; see Mayser–Schmoll, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, I. 1 (1971), §41, for intrusive final μω. τάξις: LSJ curiously states that this word does not mean "quickly" in LXX and papyri but quotes as an exception one 2nd-century papyrus (SB IV 7556.25). That meaning seems clearly more suitable here than "perhaps" since Lucretianus has already stated definitely that the nomarch is going to make the announcement.

8. κόμηςει: we take this to be κόμησα. For the interchange of vowels see Gignac, op. cit. 192 and for intrusive final μω p. 113 and Mayser–Schmoll, loc. cit. (in previous note).

9. We cannot read the first noun. The third letter is probably α but we cannot make out the two (?) following letters. The second word can hardly be anything but κέματα; the third letter lacks the definite loop of ρ but the word κεμα does not exist.

11. The sum of 7 drachmas suggests a date earlier than the latter part of the 3rd century when such an amount would have been totally insignificant. For δεματωτηρ see Gignac, op. cit. 106; R. Murri, "Ricerche sugli abiti menzionati nei papiri greco-egizi", Aegyptus, xxiii (1943), 121–7.

12. φωνίκια: for the interchange of vowels see Gignac, op. cit. 197.

13. κρομμίδων: LSJ has two citations. Professor Youtie pointed out to us that the singular is probably intended as a collective noun here.

15. We take it that the writer intended αυ πάντες for αυ καί πάντες.

2. Sitologos Receipt

P. Rylands inv. Greek Add. I, 113
Fayum 7.5 × 15.5 cm. May 29–30, A.D. 195

The papyrus is complete at all margins and contains a text of a very common type which presents little difficulty in reading or interpretation. Satyros and his partners, sitologoi of Philadelphia, acknowledge two payments of dues made for public land
by a man named Julius who is apator. The land is attached to the village of Tanis which is often associated with Philadelphia in documents of this kind (see l. 10 n.). The text is written in a business hand which is fairly typical of the period and alternates between frequent use of ligature (most noticeable in the formulae) and clear separation of the letters. The back of the papyrus is blank.

In spite of the comparative wealth of documentation relating to sitologia in its various aspects, it must be said that there has not yet been a clear and complete synthesis of the information now available to us. Discussions of the formulae employed in sitologos receipts can be found in the introductions to P. Ryl. II 202, P. Fay. 80–85, by H. C. Youtie in TAPA, Ixxxiii (1952), 113–6 = Scriptiunculae, I (1973), 247–50. Sitologia is discussed more generally by S. L. Wallace, Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian (1938), 35, by Zaki Aly in Akten VIII int. Papyrologenkongr. (1955), 17–22, JJP, iv (1949), 289–307, Aegyptus, 1 (1970), 74–87, and by V. B. Schuman, Chronique d'Égypte, 1 (1975), 278–84.

Other sitologos receipts from the Rylands collection are nos. 200–2, but the documents which most closely parallel the present text in form are P. Lond. 315 (II, p. 90), 346 (II, p. 92) and BGU III 716. All of the commonly found formulaic elements appear here: the measure used, the name of the taxpayer, the crop from which the payment is made, the place, the category of land and the amount. But a random check of other sitologos receipts suggests that there is no fixed order in which these elements normally appear.

"Ετοὺς ὦ Δουκίου Σεπτυμίου
Σεούρηου Περτίνακος
Σεβαστοῦ Πάυν ἃ.
Σάτυρος Ἡρωνος καὶ οἶ
μέτοχο(λ) σιτολ(όγοι) κἀ(μὴς) Φιλαδελ(φίας)
μεμετρή(μεθα) μετρό(δη) μοσιῶ
ξοισ(ῶ) ἐπαυτοὺ εἰς Ἰούλιον
ἀπάτορα δι(δ) Ὁρίεως
ἀπὸ γεν(ήματος) τοῦ ἐνεστὼ(τοῦ) γ (ἐτοὺς)
10 Τάνεως δη(μοσίων) πυροῦ (ἀρτάβας)
Year 3 of Lucius Septimius Severus Pertinax Augustus, Payni 3. We, Satyros son of Heron and his partners, sitologoi of the village of Philadelphia, have measured by flat public measure to the name of Julius who is without a legal father, through Herieus, from the produce of the current third year for Tanis for public land artabs of wheat, forty three and 3/4, total artabs of wheat 43 3/4, and on the 4th of the same month likewise for Tanis for public land artabs of wheat eighteen and 1/2, total artabs of wheat 18 1/2, total artabs of wheat 62 1/4.’’

1-3. This form of the titulature of Septimius Severus appears in the second and third years of his reign according to P. Bureth, Les titulatures impériales dans les papyrus... (1964), p. 93.

4. We have not been able to find any other reference to a sitologos by this name at the right period, but both elements of the name are, of course, extremely common.

7. ἕπαυτον: this word has appeared frequently in texts relating to sitologia and has proved exceedingly difficult to explain satisfactorily. For the form of the word here cf. αἰσταυτον in BGU VII 1609 and P. Strasb. 372. Citation of occurrences, with references to earlier discussions, may be found at P. Strasb. 369 (appendix). Since that note was written a new discussion has appeared by V. B. Schuman, “The Meaning of ἕπαυτον and the Measurement of Grain”, Chronique d'Égypte, 1 (1975), 278–84. Schuman connects the word etymologically with ἐπαυτέω = “to ask for more”, i.e. lacking a little and therefore, in relation to measurement, “scant”; he refers to BGU IX 1893. 456–66 where the payments made are not in the amounts demanded. There seem to us to be several difficulties which this theory still leaves unexplained. If the word indicates some shortfall in payment one would expect evidence that the deficit had to be made up, yet such is not the case in texts where the word appears. Furthermore it does appear in P. Mil. Vogl. III 182, where payment of προσμετροῦμεα is recorded; this would seem to render it otiose on Schuman’s explanation. Since the metrological system allows for quite small fractions of an artab to be recorded, it does not seem likely that the sitologos was unable accurately to record the amount paid. If the word is applied generally as a qualification to measurements one would
SOME ADDITIONAL GREEK PAPYRI

expect it to appear much more widely in papyri of all sorts; yet with the exception of P. Ryl. II 166 and P. Amh. II 88 it appears only in connection with sitologia. εἰς Ἑωθᾶν: for a possible explanation of the significance of εἰς before the name of the taxpayer see P. Ryl. II, p. 274, P. Oxy. XLII 3047.5 n. In view of the occurrence of the Roman name at a date before the Constitutio Antoniniana and the fact that the man is ἀνάτομος (see l. 8, n.) we wonder whether he might not be the son of a Roman soldier.

8. On ἄνατομος see H. C. Youtie, Le monde grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux (1975), 723 sqq. He points out that they are people without legal fathers, many probably being the sons of serving soldiers (see l. 7, n.). If εἰς is used of the landowner (see l. 7, n.) διὰ will then refer to the tenant.

10. For the association of Tanis with Philadelphia see P. Teb. II, p. 403.

11. The amounts paid, both here and in l. 14, are much larger than is usual in receipts of this kind, but we can think of no obvious explanation save that the tax was being paid for a large area of land. Other examples of a receipt recording more than one payment are P. Mil. Vogl. III 176, BGU I 188, III 716, P. Teb. II 367.

13. The month is Payni (see l. 3). Receipts of this type are most commonly issued in Pachon, Payni and Epeiph, just after the harvest.

3. LETTER FROM PROCLUS TO SARAPION

P. Rylands inv. Greek Add. I, 28

Provenance unknown 17.7 × 7.8 cm. Third/fourth century A.D.

The text is written on a rectangular piece of papyrus with a small margin at the top and a broader margin of some two cm. at the left. The gap below the last surviving line is wide enough to make it rather improbable that any complete line or lines of writing have been lost here (see the note to line 13); thus the text has probably been preserved complete, except for a slight loss here and there at the right hand edge.

On the verso is a single line address written in the same hand as the recto. This address is written with the fibres, whereas the recto, somewhat surprisingly, is written against the fibres. The hand is large, untidy, and sprawling, with the letters for the most part made separately and little use of ligature. It is not an easy hand to date. Some resemblance to E. Boswinkel, P. J. Sijpesteijn, Greek Papyri (1968), pl. 23, of A.D. 179, is undeniable, but in general there is a much stronger resemblance to texts noticeably later than this, e.g. P. Lond. 981 (Atlas III 74; A. Bataille, Traité des études byzantines II: Les Papyrus, pl. VI),
undated but from the content certainly not earlier than the 4th century to which the editors assign it. *P. Merton I* 38, assigned to “middle of fourth century”; *ibid.* 29, assigned to the 3rd or 4th century. The letter forms in our text are mostly consistent with a 4th-century date, but beta resting on a broad base, e.g. in *laβόντες* line 12, might be thought to point somewhat earlier. The content is of little help for dating purposes; *οἰκονομία* may suggest a date before A.D. 300 (see 1. 7 n.), whereas *σίτος* may point to a later date (see 1. 3 n.); cf. also n. to *νομικός* (l. 8). The names might be held to be more characteristic of the 3rd than the 4th century. In all we would suggest as most probable a date in the later part of the 3rd century.

The papyrus contains a letter from Proclus to Sarapion, which, as often in papyrus letters, mixes in a random fashion business matters with more personal details. The sentence in ll. 8–10, which relates to the concern felt by Sarapion’s daughter for his well-being, might suggest that the letter comes from his son-in-law. But this is hardly compatible with the general tone of much of the letter, which reads like that of a landowner to his steward. Perhaps we should suppose that Sarapion’s daughter is, like her father, in Proclus’ employ and is serving her master in his place of residence (e.g. Alexandria) rather than on his estates. The contents offer no real clue to the provenance of the text. *Α Σεβαστὴ ἀγορά* (l. 8) is likely to have existed in more than one place in the chora (cf. the note ad loc.). For what it is worth, it may be pointed out that *κοῦλας* (l. 6) seems never to have occurred in a papyrus from the Oxyrhynchite nome. Noteworthy is the occurrence of no less than three Roman names: Proclus, Terentius, Longus.

---

Πρόκλος Σαραπίωνι τῷ φιλήτατῳ πλείστα χαίρειν. Ἐς ποιήσεις ἀποκτεντήσας Τερεντίῳ τᾶς δύο ἀρτάβας τοῦ σείτου ὅσον κατέλειψα παρὰ Πάσειτι γεωργίῳ καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν πραγμάτων ἵμαρ καὶ θησάμων τῇς κοῖλας τὰς σοὶ καὶ γραμματείας ἑαυτῷ ἀμέρμονος ὅμαι. περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐργατῶν τῆς κοῖλας προσέχόντως ἐπιστα[λ]εῖτο Ἰωάννη. μελησάτων σοι περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς κατέλειψα τῷ [κλέεισ]τῃ ἵππῳ [τῷ] παρὰ τῷ
Proclus to Sarapion his dearest friend very many greetings. Will you please pay back to Terentius the two artabas of grain which I left with Pasis the farmer; and take good care of all our affairs. Write to me also about your health, so that I don’t worry. Concerning the workmen in the hollow, let careful instructions be sent to Chaunes. Take good care of the document which I deposited with the clerk in the Imperial market-place. Your daughter reproaches you very much because up to today you have not written to us about your health. If the time comes round for the rent ..., do you and Alas the doctor and Eupator [?] his brother get it from the farmer and give it to Longus, getting a written receipt from him. If he does not want the samples [?] of the ... Pais the farmer has them [?] ... (Verso) To Sarapion from Proclus.”

1. Πρόκλος: a common syncopated form of Latin Proculus, on which see J. F. Gilliam, BASP, xiii (1976), 60.

Σαραπίων: the initial sigma, which is enlarged, is made in two halves and closely resembles a Latin crested c.

3. σείτου: the earlier meaning of the word embracing various types of grain was later superseded by the specific meaning “wheat” and the word came to replace πυρός in the papyri. H. Cadell, Akten XIII. Internat. Papyrologen-kongresses, Marburg, 1971, (1974), 64, and Chronique d’Égypte, xlviii (1973), 329-38, dates this change in meaning to the first half of the 4th century, implying that σείτος is not attested with the meaning “wheat” before 301. If in our text
the word means "wheat", as seems probable, this would suggest a date after A.D. 300 for the letter; but P. Oxy. XLII 3048.2 seems to have an occurrence of σῖνος in the meaning "wheat" as early as A.D. 246, cf. l. 8, n.

κατέδειξα: the second stroke of the lambda is made in a peculiar fashion, but the reading is not in doubt. The word presumably contains the idea of leaving something behind (intentionally) when one departs; cf. its probable occurrence in l. 7. This form of the aorist is attested in papyri as early as the 1st century B.C. and almost entirely replaces έλεγον in the Roman and Byzantine periods; see B. G. Mandilaras, The verb in the Greek non-literary papyri (1973), §306 (13).

γεωργία: the use of iota adscript within the body of a letter is remarkable if the text is really no earlier than the later third century.

5. ῥύμα: for this form of the subjunctive of εἰμί see Mandilaras, op. cit. §§114 and 116.

περὶ δὲ τῶν: reading doubtful: there is a gap between pi and epsilon, where the top fibres are stripped, and at least one letter should have been lost; the traces after iota are extremely uncertain.

6. κολάδος: according to P. W. Pestman, JEA, lv (1969), 135 n. 4, this is "a watercourse which dries out during part of the year". The word is used several times in documents from Pathyris and various parts of the Fayum, and once from Hermopolis, P. Lond. I 131 recto. In ll. 309–10 there we find, as here, workmen active in a κολάδα: βωλοκοπ(όσιον) ἐν τοῖς ταπεινοῖς τόποις... ἀμα δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς κολάδαις ἐργ(άται) β. A. Swiderek, in her edition of this long roll of agricultural accounts (La propriété foncière... 1960), points out (n. to ll. 300–1, p. 65) that the word should perhaps be understood as a proper noun. This is a possibility also in our text.

προσεχόντας: quoted by LSJ only from Menander and medical writers. προσεχέστερον occurs in a parallel context in P. Mich. VIII 486.13: έμι οὐκέν αὐτοῦ προσεχέστερον ἐπέζησα, but the form προσεχόντας is new to the papyri. It is sufficient by itself to suggest that the writer of our letter was a man of some education, but it nevertheless strikes a discordant note when compared with the ordinary language of the rest of the letter.

Χαννῆ: the name is unknown. Αβνής is, of course, a common name, but there is no real justification for taking the initial chi as a false stroke subsequently crossed out; it is made exactly like chi elsewhere in the text.

7. οἰκονομίας: if we leave aside the general use of this term to mean "arrangement, etc." and the specialized sense of "office of an οἰκονόμος", we find two uses in legal contexts, which are essentially distinct though sometimes shading into one another (see Wörterbuch and Fachwörter, s.v. (1) and (2)): (a) in a concrete sense of a "written instrument", "document", e.g. in notifications from the office of archidikastes, where we regularly read a phrase like γραμματεύως καταλογείαν τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἑγαρμα (cf. P. Oxy. XII 1474.7); it is an extension of this meaning when the word appears in the plural in connection with sales, etc., of land, meaning something like our "title deeds", e.g. in the expression γείτονες διὰ τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν προκήρυξιν οἰκονομίαι δηλώνει (cf. P. Oxy. III 504.12 f.). (b) in a more abstract sense of "(legal) transaction", as in requests from women for guardians πρὸς μάνης τατήν τὴν οἰκονομίαν (cf. P. Ryl. II 120.15). In our papyrus the meaning is clearly (a). A cursory check suggests that the usage, extremely common in the first three centuries A.D., is not found
thereafter, which would support the dating of our letter to the period prior to A.D. 300.

κατε[λει]ψα: κατεγραψα is equally possible as a reading, but it is regularly the νομικός, not the person making the contract, who actually writes the relevant document (cf. esp. BGU I 361 III. 2 (184) ὁ νομικός ὁ τῆς ὀλκονομίαν γράφας). For this reason we have preferred κατελειψα, used in the same sense as in l. 3.

8. νομικός: Wörterbuch misleadingly groups together all uses of this word (there is a similar confusion in Tomlin's introduction to the recently published P. Berl. Leihg. II 27). We need to distinguish sharply two categories (as was already done in Fachwörter): (a) experts in the law who, inter alia, gave advice to the prefect and others; see R. Taubenschlag, Law of Greco-Roman Egypt (1955), 518; W. Kunkel, Herkunft u. soziale Stellung d. röm. Juristen (1967), 354 f. (b) Scribes who drew up legal contracts, the equivalent of the Latin tabelliones. Our man is clearly of this second, much less exalted, category. There is no wholly satisfactory English translation; “notary” is obsolete and “lawyer” rather too grand for a man who no doubt performed functions nowadays performed by a solicitor’s clerk; perhaps “clerk” is the least misleading equivalent. In documents of the 5th century onwards we regularly find the statement ἐτελειώθη διὰ τοῦ δείνος νομικοῦ; on this type of nomikos see A. Steinwenter, SPP, XIX, pp. 61–67, and Taubenschlag, Opera Minora, ii. 164–5. Examples of this formula are found before the 5th century; the earliest we have noted is SB VI 9219.25 of A.D. 319. The contracts published as PSI X 1126 and 1127 are dated to the 3rd century by the editor; at the foot they are annotated διὰ τοῦ δείνος νου(. ), which he expands νου(ικοῦ). It is not certain, however, that the expansion νου(ιγράφου) can be rejected, especially as the νομικόι may have replaced the earlier νομογράφοι, who are not attested after the 3rd century (see P. Cair. Isidor. 88.17 n.). Mitteis doubts this equation (Grundzüge, 56 n. 7 ad fin.); he suggests, following Koschaker, that the nomikoi of the first three centuries A.D. were responsible for “der Abfassung der Rechtsurkunden der römischen Bürger”. But while this might suit the νομικός Ὀμαικός of BGU I 326 = M. Chr. 316. II. 22 (189/194) and SB VI 9298 (249), and possibly the νομικοὶ of P. Oxy. I 34 III = M. Chr. 188 (127) and the 2nd-century BGU II 388 = M. Chr. 91 I 26 (unless with Taubenschlag, OM, ii. 161–4, we consider these all as examples of type (a)), there is no reason to suppose those in BGU I 361 (referred to above) and P. Berl. Leihg. II 27.24 (167) are anything other than ordinary legal clerks; cf. also P. Oxy. XLI 2983. Note, too, that these texts antedate the Constitutio Antoniniana. Other 2nd- and 3rd-century uses are obscure, most of all that in P. Beatty Panopt. 1.194–5 (298), where τὸν ἐξ ἰδιωτῶν ἐυρέθειτα νομικῶν seems to relate to the appointment of a liturgical official (Skeat’s tentative suggestion, note ad loc., that he may have been a police officer seems to us improbable, but we endorse his remark that the functions of νομικοὶ are uncertain). What is quite certain is that the word occurs often enough before A.D. 300 for its use in our letter to be no help towards fixing a date when the letter was written.

εν τῇ Σεβαστῇ ἀγορῇ: an Imperial market-place is known at Arsinoeitou polis, cf. P. Petaus 33.21 and n., and at Alexandria, cf. P. Oxy. XLI. III 3093.6–7 and n. The market-place would be a normal location for such a legal office, cf. the νομογράφος ἀγορᾶς of BGU I 388.4, and the νομικὸς ἀγορᾶς Βασιλείων of P. Lond. IV 1550.15.
10. μής τωνος: this or μής τωνος appears to be the reading; no solution suggests itself.

σαν' ο[θ]ήν': it seems that the writer has added ο over σαν, perhaps merely to correct the orthography, but more probably, since ου is not deleted, because he felt that both words were needed, σαν going with the preceding clause and ου beginning the main clause.

11. Ἀληθός: this would seem to be the reading, but the name is unknown in this form; Ἀληθός is rare but attested. Ἀληθός cannot be read.

Ε[...] Π': Ε[...] Π' ἄτωρ would just fit the exiguous traces, but the name is very rare.

ἀδελφός: lambda is made with its cross-stroke horizontal, thus looking more like ταυ, and phi is formed very strangely, in a single movement of the pen.

ἀυτόκυρ: the correction, making this refer to φόρος, seems inescapable.

12. λαβόντες: after this, if παρ' is right, a space sufficient to accommodate two letters was left blank for no apparent reason.

12/13. Of the reading between μῆς and ξεις only the first seven letters of l. 13 are beyond doubt. τῆς after θελή is particularly difficult and there seems barely room for two letters lost after the delta following (lambda is also possible). If this clause is right, it perhaps suggests that Longus was a government official, since these were the people who would normally be interested in samples. But no word to follow τῶν with a genitive plural ending seems short enough to fit the lacuna before traces of writing are again visible and these traces do not allow of ου. After this all is obscure until ξεις; ἄε following is doubtful, but ὁ γεωργὸς is reasonably plain, as is Πάος following. This is certainly to be taken as a proper name, and there is insufficient reason to suppose him the same man as Πάσειν γεωργῶι in l. 3. The following traces give no secure basis for a reading. α'τῆ might just be read, which might then mark the end of the sentence and possibly of the whole letter. If so, what follows should be part of the closing greeting; ε[...] ἔτωι[τα] might be divined (which would imply σε εὐχομαι lost in a line underneath), but we could not claim to be able to read this in any meaningful sense.

14. There is a noticeable gap between Ζηπλαρριων and ΒΛ, presumably at the place where the binding string would have passed.

4. List of Names

P. Rylands inv. Greek Add. I, 68
Provenance unknown 8 × 16.9 cm. Late fifth/sixth century A.D.

There are small margins at top and sides, and the bottom 5 cm. of the sheet are blank; the text is complete. The hand in which it is written (with the fibres) is characteristic of the later Byzantine period. Many comparable examples are known from the 6th century, e.g. P. Lond. 994 (Atlas III 83) of A.D. 517. But
these characteristics (open-topped alpha, d-shaped delta, n-shaped nu, split tau etc.) are all already to be found in texts from the second half of the 5th century, e.g. O. Montevcechi, La Papirologia (1973), pl. 97, of a.d. 498.

The text gives the names of five persons, to which is prefixed the heading Βρέονον όνομάτων ὀφειλομένων παραβληθήναι ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγαλοπρεποστάτου κόμετος (on the readings see the notes ad loc.). It is tempting to regard the document as a police report containing a list of persons who are to be produced at the court of the comes, perhaps to answer charges there. The main point of interest is the description of two of these persons as φαρανίτης.

Βρ(έονον) όνομ(άτων) ὀφιλ(ομένων)
παραβληθ(ήναι)
ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγαλοπρ(εποστάτου) κόμ(ετος).

Δανιήλιον  Μεμφ(ίτην)
Ἰωάννην  Μεμφ(ίτην)
Θέωνα  Μεμφ(ίτην)
Φιλόξενον  Φαραν(ίτην)
Ἰούστον  Φαραν(ίτην).

Abbreviations are indicated by use of the spiral sign S, with the following exceptions:

1. οφιλ' (l. ὀφειλ(ομένων))
2. μεμφ'

“List of persons who have to be produced in the presence of his highness the comes:

Danielios  Memphite
Iohannes  Memphite
Theon  Memphite
Philoxenos  Pharanite
Ioustos  Pharanite.”

1. οφιλ': there is an oblique mark like a grave accent over the letter read as iota; it serves no apparent purpose. The reading is hardly in doubt; for expansion of the abbreviation see the next note.

2. παραβληθ(ήναι): theta is a rather difficult reading, since we must suppose the oval made in two curves written more or less on top of one another, so that the result looks rather like a plus sign. Lambda is made with the second leg sloping upwards, rather than obliquely downwards as would be normal; but
exactly the same form is used in Δανείλων (l. 4), where it is in ligature with iota. The reading as a whole is very probable; the meaning less so. παραβάλλω in the papyri is usually used transitively in the active with the meaning “go” or “come”; cf. P. Oxy. VI 934.12 and n. It is found transitively of producing food for pigeons in SB V 7814.10 (cf. LSJ s.v. I 1), and twice with personal objects where its meaning is obscure: SB I 5557.16 παραβάλλω Συριανόν . . . εἰς χρω(οὖ) λί(τρας) πέντη and P. Michael. 37.8. δέν δε τις ἡμῶν[ν] παραβάλη πούς διαφεροντάς σοι (where the editors translate, doubtfully, “sue”). More relevant perhaps is P. Cair. Masp. I 6705.21, where a petitioner complains that she has been arrested and tortured by a certain Senouthios, who then παρεβαλέν με τῷ προρηθέντι κα[λεῖ]οβώ[λω, Π]εριμία; here the translation “handed over” would seem to be required. We should no doubt understand the use of the word in our text similarly: the persons in question are to be “handed over” or “produced” before the comes. If this is right, we must presumably expand ὁμένων in the preceding line.

3. ἐπί: for its use with the genitive to mean “before” with respect to an appearance before a court cf. Wörterbuch, IV s.v., A 2, col. 855.

κόμι(τος): the office being filled by this official is quite uncertain. comes was regularly used at this period as an honorary description for a variety of officials, some of whom are noted by J. G. Keenan, ZPE, xi (1973), 57 and n. 106.

7. Φαραν(ίτης): Wörterbuch quotes this word only in III Abschn. 10 (Militär) from P. Flor. III 297, where at ll. 192, 219 and 302 we read ἄνω εἰς τῶν Φαρανίτων β' ἀλ[ης]. The word has subsequently been recognized in two other papyri, again in a military context: P. Lond. V 1735.24 (see Berichtigungsliste, V) and P. Cair. Masp. I 67054 11 8 (see Berichtigungsliste, IV). All the texts are 6th century and may all refer to the same unit; see R. Rémondon, Recherches de Papyrologie, i (1961), 75 n. 5. For Rémondon (p. 85) the pharanitae are “cavaliers armés de l’arc et montés sur des chevaux arabes”. He gives no reason for this statement and one wonders whether it is based on associating the word with φαρέτρα (LSJ recognizes φαρετρίτης as an equivalent of τοξοτής). Such an etymology is certainly false and the pharanitae must be associated in some way with Pharan (on which see below). Nevertheless, Rémondon’s suggestion does suit exactly the type of meaning we require in these contexts for Φαρανίτης, as Bell pointed out in his note to P. Lond. 1735.24: “we should expect here not a name . . . but a military title”. The most likely explanation is that the word refers to a type of soldier who was particularly associated with Pharan. Since this town is situated in the desert, an expert in desert warfare would seem a reasonable deduction and would be very suitable for these three references to pharanitae, all of which come from Upper Egypt. In these contexts the word would no longer have any real geographical sense, any more than, e.g., the Scyths of contemporary date were troops made up of Scythians; cf. J. Maspero, L’organisation militaire de l’Egypte byzantine (1911), 50-52, who describes such titles of units as “noms de fantaisie”.

Pharan was a town in the southern part of the Sinai peninsula. See A. H. M. Jones, Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces (1971), 293, and map facing p. 226; G. Hölscher, PWRE, s.v. (2), cols. 1811-12. It was important enough by the time of our papyrus to be the seat of a bishop; cf., e.g. Apopth. Patrum, Migne, PG, lxv, 156c.
There is no reason to suppose a military context in our papyrus. On the contrary, \textit{Φαρανίτης} must presumably be taken as parallel to \textit{Μεμφίτης}, and the latter can hardly be expanded differently or mean anything other than "inhabitant of Memphis". It would seem, therefore, that in our text \textit{Pharanites} means simply "inhabitant of Pharan". The names of the two \textit{Pharanitae} are commonplace in Egypt at this date, but they are no doubt equally commonplace throughout the Empire.