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Below we publish for the first time the full text of papyrus inv. 2175 from the British Museum (now: British Library) papyrus collection. Parts of this papyrus were published already more than 70 years ago by Sir Harold Idriss Bell (cf. Archiv 7 [1924] 223-24), but the publication of a full text remained a desideratum to date. The writing of the papyrus (H. 26.3 x B. 11.3 cm.) runs along the fibres. The papyrus is cut off rather regularly at the top (margin: 5.1 cm.) and at the bottom (margin 8.5 cm.). Three vertical folds are still visible. The verso is blank.

P.Lond. inv. 2175
After 3.xii.217

175

Oxyrhynchite Nome

1 We are grateful to Dr. T.S. Pattie, Curator Papyrorum of the British Library, for his kind permission to publish this interesting papyrus.
“To (Aurelius Zenobios ?), strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome, from Titus Flavius Eudaimon and however he is styled, town councillor of the most illustrious city of the Alexandrines, through Aurelius Ammonios son of (?) -on and however he is styled, town councillor of the City of the Oxyrhynchites. Below follows a copy of the letter which I procured from Marcus Aurelius Menelaos, deputy-archidikastes, together with the petition pasted underneath it --- and I ask you to instruct the bibliophylakes enkteseon of the Oxyrhynchite nome to make an entry in order that no fraud takes place. ---

Marcus Aurelius Menelaos, town councillor and deputy-archidikastes, to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite (nome), greetings. Titus Flavius Eudaimon, town councillor of our most illustrious father town, appealed to us through a petition ---. Since he now says that regarding the --- he has petitioned the most illustrious prefect and obtained a subscriptio with the following contents: ‘-- I -- that she will sell the goods she possessed before -- during the period of her marriage’, take care that no measures will be taken concerning the possessions of Ptolemais until the decision [has been finally made?]. Farewell. Year 2 (?) of Imperator Caesar Marcus Opellius Severus Macrinus Pius Felix Augustus [Month, day].

To Marcus Aurelius Menelaos, deputy-archidikastes, from Titus Flavius Eudaimon and however he is styled. --- of Aurelia Ptolemais, the woman with whom I live together -- I appealed to the most illustrious prefect through a petition -- not only -- the value but also the part which falls to me -- and the prefect wrote underneath my petition: ‘Year 2, Choiak 7. If you have a legal ground -- I -- that she will sell the goods which she possessed before -- during the period of her marriage and regarding which no --.’ I, therefore, request that no fraud takes place (and that you write to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome?) in order that she (or: I ?) can obtain justice. Farewell. (M. 2) I, Titus Flavius Eudaimon, town councillor of the most illustrious city of the Alexandrines and however he is styled, have submitted (this document) through me, Aurelius Ammonios son of (?) -on, town councillor of the city of the Oxyrhynchites.”

In order to support a theory of Ulrich Wilcken regarding imperial rescripts Bell gave only excerpts of this composite document illustrating the practice of Ἱπόκόλλησις (l. 4). For understandable reasons these excerpts were never incorporated into the SB. A minor consequence thereof is the fact that Aurelius Ammonios, councillor of Oxyrhynchus (l. 2-3, 24), was not listed by A.K. Bowman in his list of town councillors of Oxyrhynchus in his “The Town Councils of Roman Egypt” (Toronto 1971) 138ff. Many more instances of Ἱπόκόλλησις have become known since; cf., e.g., P.Coll.Youtie I 65 = P.Oxy. XLVII 3365.5.

2 He may be identical with the Aurelius Ammonios who appears in P.Oxy. X 1278.4, 35; for Oxyrhynchite town councillors named Aurelius Ammonios in the early third century A.D., see Aegyptus 50 (1970) 37.4n.
For the structure of this papyrus, which evidently is an application to a strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome (from a man who first approached the praefectus Aegypti and a deputy-archidikastes) cf. P.Oxy. XII 1472 introd., category (1); cf. also L.C. Youtie in ZPE 46 (1982) 223ff. (= SB XVI 12698); P.Mich. XI 614; H. Kupiszewski in Symbolae Taubenschlag III (= Eos 48 [1956] 89ff. See in latest instance S.R. Llewelyn in New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity 7 (1994) 197ff. An analysis of the complex document yields the following sections:

Il. 1-6: Application to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome from Titus Flavius Eu-dainon, a town councillor of Alexandria, who is represented by Aurelius Ammonios, a town councillor of Oxyrhynchus, in which he refers (l. 3-4) to a copy of an earlier letter (epistole) from the deputy-archidikastes to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome and his previous petition to the deputy-archidikastes. Eudaimon now asks the strategus to give an order to the provincial bibliophylakes enkteseon to stop the procedure connected with the registration of some property (for παράθεσις having the meaning of ‘Sperrvermerk’ see H.-J. Wolff, Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens, II [München 1978] 235ff.; cf. also below, ll.5-6n.).

Il. 7-14: Copy of the referred-to letter from the deputy-archidikastes to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome referring to the subscriptio (ὑπογραφή) of the praefectus Aegypti given in answer to an earlier libellus from Eudaimon.

Il. 14-23: Copy of the referred-to previous libellus from Eudaimon to the deputy-archidikastes, enclosing (l. 19-20/21) a copy of the subscriptio (ὑπογραφή) of the praefectus Aegypti to an even earlier petition from Eudaimon. Evidently, the prefect instructed in his hypographe Eudaimon to bring his case to the attention of the (deputy-)archidikastes.

Διευθυντὴς (l. 23) may belong to either the petition of Eudaimon to the deputy-archidikastes (ll. 15-23), or (perhaps slightly more likely) to his petition to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome (ll. 1-6).

Il. 23-24: Eudaimon's subscription belonging to the application to the strategus, ll. 1-6.

Obviously Eudaimon himself had lodged an ἀντίρρησις with the archidikastes to prevent execution. The archidikastes was able to decide the matter (whether he was able to do so by delegation or competence of office remains unclear; cf. S.R. Llewelyn, op. cit., 212). At a κρίσις he decided between a creditor's right to proceed to execution and the validity of the ἀντίρρησις. Pending this κρίσις the archidikastes instructs in the present papyrus the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome to stop the procedure of execution in connection with some possessions of Eudaimon. Since the strategus is asked to instruct the bibliophylakes enkteseon in Oxyrhynchus (for these cf. P.J. Sijpesteijn - K.A. Worp in a forthcoming publication of P.Lond. inv. 1976 in Stud. Amst. XXXV) to effect a parathesis (cf. above ad ll. 1-6) concerning the conveyance of some property of Eudaimon the procedure of execution was already in an advanced stage. Before addressing himself to the archidikastes Eudaimon had petitioned the praefectus Aegypti and received from him an answer which in his eyes enabled him to lodge with succes an ἀντίρρησις.

For a penetrating study of how such petitions were dealt with administratively, see also R. Haensch in ZPE 100 (1994) 487ff.

The present text has attracted already some attention because of the anonymous strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome mentioned in l. 1.\(^3\) In l. 19 the papyrus presents a date to Choiak 7 of a second regnal year which in all likelihood is the 2nd year of the emperor Macrinus mentioned in l. 4.\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) It is unclear whether the prefect's subscription ends already in l. 20, or only in l. 21.

\(^4\) Cf. G. Bastianini - J.E.G. Whitehorne, Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt (Firenze 1987; = Pap. Flor. XV) 97.
ll. 13-14, i.e. December 3, A.D. 217. Supposing the question referred to in the text (vide infra) took place in or around Macrinus’ 2nd regnal year (A.D. 217/18) the anonymous strategus has to be placed between Aurelius Anoubion, still attested in August/September A.D. 216, and Aurelius Harpokration, attested for the first time in September/October, A.D. 218. In that case our strategus may be identical with Zenobius, attested in P.Alex.Giss. 62.7, which is dated to A.D. 218-222. In fact, [Αὐρηλίῳ Ζηνοβίῳ] (13 letters in restoration) would fill the lacuna at the start of l. 1 perfectly, as ± 14 letters are lost at the left-hand side of the papyrus (cf. l. 2). On the other hand, as many as ± 60 letters may be lost at the right-hand side (cf. the note to ll. 3-4). It is, therefore, not astonishing that the details of the question which formed the subject of Eudaimon’s petitions remain obscure; as usual in such lacunose texts we have supplied in our restorations only phrasings found elsewhere in this document or occurring in other similar texts, but we do not claim that no alternative restorations are conceivable. There is a question of a sale of (landed?) property (ll. 11 and 20) during the period of marriage (cf. ll. 12 and 21), but in possession before the marriage (cf. l. 11 and 20, προκρατεῖ). Bell supposed that the property in question belonged to Eudaimon’s wife, Aurelia Ptolemais, who may have attempted to sell this without Eudaimon’s permission. Unless, however, one assumes a scribal error in l. 22, Eudaimon petitions the officials on behalf of a third person who in all probability will have been his wife. It looks, therefore, as if Aurelia Ptolemais (and therefore indirectly her husband Titus Flavius Eudaimon) was hampered to do something with property she possessed already before her marriage to Eudaimon during this marriage. From the fact that Eudaimon sends this document eventually to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome one may deduce that the property involved was located in that nome. Furthermore, as he addresses the strategus through another person, it may be deduced that Eudaimon himself was not present in Oxyrhynchus. We may assume that he lived in Alexandria of which city he was a town councillor. We are, therefore, dealing with another instance of an absentee landlord. We must leave it to jurists to eventually discover what the affair was about exactly and to decide which could have been the answer of the prefect (probably Lucius Valerius Datus, cf. G. Bastianini in ZPE 17 [1975] 307 and 38 [1980] 86 n. 5: ANRW 10.1 513 [addenda till 1985]; to the attestations collected by Bastianini now add P.Oxy. XLVII 3347.4 and SB XVIII 14007.5).

Notes:
2. Bell (loc.cit. 223 fn. 2) rightly remarks that if Oxyrhynchus were named in the lacuna at the end of this line, one would expect τῆς σύντης πόλεως instead of τῆς Ὄξυρχησταν πόλεως
5 The latest Egyptian dating by Macrinus as sole ruler, before Diadumenianus was joined to the rule, is either May 27, A.D. 218, or May 26 - June 24, A.D. 217, cf. D.W. Rathbone, ZPE 62 (1986) 106. In general see also D. Kienast, Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie (Darmstadt 1990) 169ff. It is well-known (see ZPE 13 [1974] 219ff.) that after his death Macrinus suffered ‘damnatio memoriae’. In the present text, however, his name was not deleted (a phenomenon which occurs regularly enough).
6 In l. 6 of this papyrus [kept in the Musée gréco-romaine d’Alexandrie] there is a question of ὑδεῖν Σεοῦνθον καὶ Ἀντωνίνου, and in l 11 of Λούτοςκραδόρος Καῖσαρος Μάρκου Ἀντωνίνου [Εὐσεβίος Εὐσύνθος Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Αἰ.] Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Αἰλεαζώνδρου Καῖσαρος (Σεβαστῶν). It should be noted that in this papyrus from Alexandria Αὐρηλίου is left out between Μάρκου and Ἀντωνίνου (this could point to an early point in Elagabal’s reign).
7 Cf. the role of the βιβλιοφόρους ἐγκήπτησε (l. 5).
8 Read δύνηθο instead of δύνηθη; In l. 24 we read χρηματίζει, while χρηματίζω might be expected (the petition was submitted de facto by Eudaimon’s representative, Aurelius Ammonios).
in l. 3. From the wording in l. 8 taken in combination with that of l. 7 he assumed that Titus Flavius Eudaimon (a Roman citizen from before the Constitutio Antoniniana, whose forefathers had received the civitas Romana during the Flavian dynasty) was a councillor of Alexandria. This supposition is supported by our reading in l. 24. For a list of town councillors of Alexandria, see D. Delia, *Alexandrian Citizenship during the Roman Principate* (Amer. Class. Stud., 23).\(^9\)

2-3. The element -ιονος in the combination of names Αὐρηλίου Ἀμμωνίου, ιονος is either the end of the name of the father of Aurelius Ammonios or Ammonios’ alias name. An Oxyrhynchite town councillor Ammonios is also found in P.Oxy. XII 1562.4 (276-282), but this cannot be the same person. Cf. also P.Select. 5, Verso (III). For the specifically Oxyrhynchite use of the verb ἐπορίσα next to παρεκόμισα in the Arsinoite and Hermopolite nomes, cf. P.Heid. IV 325.4 n.

3-4. The restoration at the end of l. 3 is too long in comparison with other restorations at the right hand side of the papyrus, but words like ὧν ἦν πόλις or the first two names of the deputy-archidikastes, Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου (restored from l. 7, see note ad loc.), were possibly abbreviated or even just omitted.

4. Bell’s interest was in the words μετὰ καὶ τοῦ ψυχοκαλλιθέντος βιβλιοφύλου.

5-6. Since the deputy-archidikastes apparently instructs (l. 13) the strategus to do nothing until the κρίσις has come to an end, we assume that Eudaimon asks the strategus to inform the bibliophylakes enkteseon that they effect a parathesis concerning the conveyance of Eudaimon’s property. In most cases which attest execution the strategus is petitioned in order that he instructs the local bibliophylakes enkteseon to perform the conveyance of property, cf. P.Oxy. XXVII 2473 and P.Coll.Youtie II 65 (examples of such requests for parathesis); cf. also the introduction above with regard to ll. 1-6.

6 (and l. 22). For περιγραφὴ = ‘fraud’, cf. R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the papyri* (Warszawa\(^2\) 462; P.Oxy.XLVII 3350.20n.) 7. Unfortunately the name of the ἄνταρχιδικαστῆς = deputy-archidikastes (for occurrences of the title cf. P.Oxy. XLIII 3131.2n.; PSI X 1105.6, XII 1255.3; for the restoration of the title cf. our note to l. 15), who might be different from ὁ διεύθυν τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχιδικαστεῖαν, is not impeccably preserved. On the basis of some letters read with slightly greater confidence than others (our first reading was: ιος Α. η τος Μενέλαος ιος), and in view of the date of this text we think that we are dealing with a Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Μενέλαος (on Marci Aurelii in

---

\(^9\) In our opinion it cannot be excluded that the town councillor L. Septimius Hierax alias Philantinoos (SEG XII 557 = SB I 177; cf. Aegyptus 32 [1952] 402 and CdE 53 [1952] 316) also occurs in a papyrus from the Zereteli collection, P.Ross.Georg. II 40.4 (provenance unknown); as the papyrus contains a mutilated report of a town council’s proceedings he may have been even president of the council of Alexandria and the proceedings may give us a rare glimpse into the business of the council of that city (cf. P.Ross.Georg. II 40.12n.; for a list of town council proceedings cf. A.K. Bowman, *op.cit.*, 32-34; for P.Ross.Georg. II 40 esp., see also *ibidem* 113). In favour of this hypothesis it may be argued that in the Ross.Georg. papyrus, l. 17, an Aurelius Dionysios, γενόμενος —, occurs, while in another document from the same Zereteli collection, SB IV 7434.5, an Aurelius Dionysios, γενόμενος ὑπομνηματογράφος of Alexandria is mentioned. On palaeographical grounds the first editor of these texts dated them both to the 2nd century A.D., but the rather frequent mentioning of Aurelius in them makes us believe that such a date is not reliable and that a date after A.D. 212 is more likely. Furthermore, in SB VIII 9912.8 (A.D. 270) occurs an Aurelius Dionysios κοσμητέσσας βουλευτῆς of Alexandria. Are, after all, these Aurelii Dionysi all to be related to the same person or family? Unfortunately, other persons mentioned in P.Ross.Georg. II 40, viz. Antonius [ ] (l. 16), Statilius Serenus (l. 18) and Theophilos (l. 19) cannot be further traced down as being Alexandrians.
3rd-century Egypt cf. D. Hagedorn in BASP 16 [1979] 47-59), rather than that we fill the space available in the lacuna with a name consisting of the regular **tria nomina** of a Roman citizen (with a **cognomen** Δ. η 105, followed by a patronymic Μενελάος[υ]). Marcus Aurelius Menelaos must be placed between the **archidikastai** Aurelius Apollonios (A.D. 217) and Calpurnius Petronianus (ca. A.D. 225).

8. Cf. l. 15n.
11. The verb προκρατέω is attested also in P.Ross.Georg. II 28.8. The meaning of this rarely attested verb is ‘to posses before (a certain time)’. LSJ cites only one example of this verb, but with the meaning ‘to seize beforehand’. We exclude the possibility that one should separate πρόκρατει.
12-13. In l. 21 the scribe used the article τῆς before συμβιώσως, but here we cannot read the first letter after the lacuna as a sigma. For the reconstructed text: ιόν μηδέν ---]--- νεωτερίζηται ἀχρι χρήσεως cf. P.Giss. 34.7: μηδενός νεωτεριζομένου μέχρι τῆς --- κρήσεως. κρί(σεως seems to have been corrected by the scribe trying to change an original gamma into a kappa; apparently he did not succeed very well in his endeavour.
15. Already Bell assumed (rightly, we think) that an **archidikastes** was involved in the whole procedure reflected by our papyrus. At this point in the papyrus we expect the title to have been mentioned as part of an address in a petition from Eudaimon and directly preceding πάρα Τίτου Φλαβίου Ευδαίμονος κτλ.] (cf. Bell’s description of ‘c’10) and though a reading ἀρχιδ[ικαστ]ής may not look very convincing in itself, we see no alternative for it (the more so, as we must assume that we are dealing with an official capable of giving orders to a strategus, cf. our reconstruction of ll. 7-14 and of the character of the document in general). On the other hand, one might expect that an **archidikastes’** full title would contain many more elements (cf. for the full titulature the lists in P.Theon., Appendix B). This, however, is not the case with an ἀνταρχιδικαστής (for the three attestations thus far known cf. above, l. 7n.), and as it happens, we have the letters αν[ preserved after a name + βουλευ-τής in l. 7. As we fail to see what a βουλευτής of Ἀν[τινοῦ πόλις (or, for that matter, of any other metropolis beginning with Ἀν[) would be doing within the context of our document as far as preserved we think it best to combine the two elements ἀν[τ (l. 7) and ἀρχιδ[ικαστής, who resided, of course, in Alexandria. At the same time this restoration explains the phrasing in l. 8, βο[υλευτής τῆς λαμπροτήτης ἡμῶν πατ[ρίδος, said of Titus Flavius Eudaimon, who presumably was a town councillor of Alexandria (cf. l. 2n.); Marcus Aurelius Menelaos was a fellow-town councillor of Alexandria and used the plural ἡμῶν. An indication of the place, where Marcus Aurelius Menelaos was town councillor, was omitted in l. 7, because it would be quite clear from the following function indication ἀνταρχι-δικαστής that he officiated in Alexandria.
17. For the restoration, cf. BGU II 614.12.
18. Restore, perhaps, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ τιμῆματος (cf. P.Oxy. XII 1562.3)?
19. Maybe one should restore at the start of the prefect’s hypographe something like νοµ[ιµον εἰ- τι ἔχεις, or νοµ[ιµοι νοµιµοι, but other restorations seem also conceivable. For the form and contents of such hypographai in papyri from Roman Egypt cf. G. Foti Talamanca,

---

10 Apparently he found the word ἀρχιδικαστής preserved more or less completely somewhere in the text (cf. his use of [ ]-brackets in the second paragraph of his description of the text, loc.cit. p. 223).

20. Supplement, e.g., δικαίως ἐνοίχθην?
21. οὐκολ[; either οὐ κολ[ or οὐκ ὀλ[.
22. γ[νεσθήκα: the gamma starts with a superfluous oblique. In the following lacuna a restoration of a phrasing like, e.g., καὶ γράψαι τῷ τοῦ Ὀξυρυγχῖτον νομοῦ, is conceivable.
24. It should be noted that in l. 1 καὶ ὡς χρηστηκεῖ follows immediately after the petitioner’s name, while here it follows βουλευτής … Ἀλέξανδρεων. Its position in this line is the more usual one. Eudaimon mentions only his most important office, i.e. the membership of the council of Alexandria, and he does not bother to mention any other office(s) he had fulfilled or was still holding.

APPENDIX

A list of ἀρχιδικασταῖ which supplements the list of these officials in P.Theon., Appendix ‘B’ (numbers in our first column refer to the numbers given in that list):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>Ἣρακλείδης</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Köln V 227, B.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Ποτάμων, γενόμ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Oxy. XLIX 3463.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Πάλλας</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Oxy. XII 1471.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-96</td>
<td>Ἀντωνίνος</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Oxy. XLIX 3466.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Τίτος Φλαύιος Σιλαννὸς Σωτήριχος11</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Prag. I 11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 100</td>
<td>Καλλινίκος</td>
<td></td>
<td>BGU XV 2473.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/II</td>
<td>Σερήνου Ἡρακλείδου</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.XV Congr. 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 124</td>
<td>Ν.Ν.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Oxy.Hels. 18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125/26</td>
<td>Χρύσερμος</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Oxy. L 3557.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>(Ἰούλιος) Ὀθηστινιανὸς Ἀσκλη-πιώδης ὁ καὶ Λεωνίδης</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proc. XIX Congr. Papyrology I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127/8</td>
<td>Ν.Ν.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB XVI 12345.5 = P.Mil.Vogl.VI 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Μουντατιανὸς Μουντατιανοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Mil.Vogl. VI 266.2.3 (also to be restored in P. Mil. I 261-2, cf. P. Heid. IV p. 193 ad loc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Αἰλιάνὸς Εὐφράνορος</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.IFAO III 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141/2</td>
<td>Κλαύδιος Εἰρηναῖος</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB XVI 12520.25 = SB III 6951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Κλαύδιος Ἰέραξ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB XIV 12139 III 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158/9</td>
<td>Ν.Ν.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.IFAO III 11.9 (cf. BL VIII 153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159/60</td>
<td>Ἀχιλλεύς ὁ καὶ Ἡρωδιανὸς</td>
<td></td>
<td>BGU XV2472.8 (cf. III 881.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Or read Σωτηρίχου for Σωτηρίζο, taking Soterichus to be the father’s name with T. Fl. Silanus? The names ‘Titus Flavius’ point toward a Roman citizenship acquired under the emperor Vespasian or his sons.

Εἰρηναῖος Εἰρηναῖου 169/70 P.Oxy. XVII 2134.3,5
N.N. Aft. i. 175 P.Stras. 370.3,7
Διοδότος 176/77 BGU VII 1574.5
Πιτάμων ὁ καὶ Δίδυμος 182-186 SB XVI 12698.4,8
79 Διοδότος 189? SB XVI 12333.2,4
ˈἩρακλείδης Φιλοκράτου, διέπων Early II P.Mich. IX 528.3
N.N. II BGU XV 2492.10
N.N. (2 officials) II SB XIV 11607.3,4
N.N. II/III P.Diog. 17.21
N.N. ὁ καὶ Ἱππάρχος Aft.6.i.215 P.Heid. IV 325.5, cf. P.Turner 40.1 (III)
Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Μενέλαιος Aft. 3. xii. 217 P.Lond.inv. 2175
118 Σεπτήμιος Ἐρμίας ὁ καὶ Ἐρμαιίσκος 225-233 SB XVI 12837 = SPP XXII 70.1
Αὐρήλιος Βησαρίων 238 P.Oxy. XLVII 3365.30
108 Αὐρήλιος Μάξιμος ὁ καὶ Ἐρμαιίσκος 248 P.Rain.Cent. 69.1
110a N.N. Aft. 250 SB XVIII 13974.2
Αὐρήλιος Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ καὶ Διονύσιος Bef. 30. 8. 251 P.Oxy. LI 3610.4
Κλαύδιος Φιλώτας ὁ καὶ Ἰέραξ 289 P.Coll.Youtie II 73.12
N.N. ὁ καὶ Τούρβιον c. 298? P.Oxy. LXIX 3499.1
92 N.N. mid III SB XVIII 13302.3
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