

7

Grenfell's Gift to Lumbroso

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

In the year 1896 Bernard Grenfell presented to his friend Giacomo Lumbroso three small papyri, together with a sheet on which he had written out his own transcription of the texts. These were published from Grenfell's transcription in the following year by Lumbroso as an appendix to a review article of *P.Grenf.* II.¹ They were reprinted some two decades later by Preisigke in *Sammelbuch* I 5746–5748. In the years that followed, the three papyri disappeared from view, and they were only recently found again among papers given by Lumbroso to the Biblioteca della Società Economica di Chiavari. These texts have now been published a third time, again from Grenfell's transcription, but with consultation of the originals, by Amelotti and Migliardi, who have included them as Nos. 48–50 in their edition of papyri in the collection of the University of Genoa.² They have also rendered the great service of providing photographs of the papyri as well as a reproduction of Grenfell's autograph transcription.³

Of the three texts only No. 49 will retain our attention here.⁴ This papyrus preserves the first nine lines of a letter from a certain Diogenes to his father Stratippus. The new editors have improved Grenfell's transcription at a number of points, but in either version the text presents nothing of importance. The editors, perhaps for this very reason, have devoted the introduction to a statement of their position on a matter which has teased the minds of scholars for over sixty years.

Lines 4–6 of the letter have an example of the *proskynema* formula directed to Sarapis:

τὸ προσκύνημά σου ποιῶ παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ Σαράπιδι κατ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν.⁵

¹ *Rendiconti Accad. Lincei* 6, 1897, 77 f.

² For a brief but sensitive and moving account of the recent history of these papyri, see *PUG*, pp. 103 f. (cf. p. vi).

³ Plates 28–31.

⁴ My comment on No. 50 has appeared in *ZPE* 23, 1976, 109 ff.

⁵ Read καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν.

It is this clause which has induced the editors to provide a very brief but perspicuous summary of opinion on the point at issue, i.e., the localization of the *proskynema*. I repeat their comment: "Interessante, anche se trova riscontro in altri testi epistolari, è la menzione del *proskynema* a Sarapis e questo elemento potrebbe far pensare ad Alessandria quale luogo di provenienza della lettera: ma la tesi—formulata dal Wilcken ed anche accettata dallo Schubart—secondo la quale i papiri, ove si legge τὸ προσκύνημα τῷ Σαράπιδι proverrebbero necessariamente da Alessandria è oggi riveduta dalla critica più recente. Gli studiosi moderni—Koskeniemi, Zaki Aly, Geraci, ecc.—sostengono infatti che le lettere contenenti tale formula possono ben provenire da altre località dell' Egitto, in cui furono fondati dei Serapei, divenuti altrettanti famosi come quello alessandrino. E questo può essere il caso del papiro qui esaminato, in cui mancano elementi più precisi per l'identificazione del luogo di provenienza."

The final words of this summary—"mancano elementi più precisi per l'identificazione del luogo di provenienza"—are, as I shall show later, symptomatic of a basic weakness in the new theory regarding the diverse localities to which the epistolary *proskynema* to Sarapis may be assigned. For the moment, however, it seems desirable to review the history of scholarship on this question. As long ago as 1912 Wilcken posited a direct link between the epistolary *proskynema* to Sarapis and the city of Alexandria. He held that letters sent from Alexandria were for the most part identifiable because the writers employed the *proskynema* formula applied to Sarapis.⁶ In support of his contention he submitted a few examples for which he considered an Alexandrian origin to be explicitly attested, and a few for which he thought it probable.⁷ His view found favor with Schubart, who reported it approvingly in 1918, when he published his introduction to papyrology.⁸ Almost ten years later, however, he reprinted, with a short commentary,⁹ a letter originally published by Bell in 1919,¹⁰ and his interpretation of that text now induced him to restrict the application of Wilcken's doctrine. Admitting that the *proskynema* to Sarapis was especially fitting in Alexandria, where the god had his most famous temple and his most sacred image, he restates Wilcken's view that letters which contain the *proskynema* to Sarapis were written in Alexandria, and he grants that this principle of localization would apply for the most part, but he finds that it does not suit the letter with which he is immediately concerned.

⁶ Wilcken, *Grundzüge* 122 f.

⁷ *Op. cit.* 123, n. 1.

⁸ Schubart, *Einführung* 368.

⁹ *Idem*, *Griech. Pap.: Text*, No. 44, *Kommentar*, p. 54.

¹⁰ Bell, *Rev. Égypt* 1, 1919, 203-206; reprinted *Sammelbuch* III 6263.

This letter was written by Sempronius to his mother Saturnila. Lines 4-6 have the *proskynema* formula:

ἄμα δὲ τὸ προσκύ-

5 νημα ὑμῶν ποιῶμε¹¹ ἡμερησίως παρὰ τῷ κυρί-
ω Σεράπιδι.

After the usual complaint about his mother's failure to write (6-11) and a list of salutations (11-12) ending καὶ Ἑλένην καὶ τοὺς αὐτῆς, he writes the following sentence in lines 12-14:

μετάδος

12 αὐτῇ ὅτι ἔκομισάμην Σεμπρωνίου ἐπιστολήν¹²
ἀπὸ Καππαδοκίας,

literally, "tell her that I received a letter of Sempronius from Cappadocia." He then resumes the salutations and shortly concludes his letter.

The writer thus interrupted the series of salutations to introduce an instruction to his mother which is in effect a parenthesis. She is to convey to Helen a piece of information, which he must have supposed would be welcome news. Bell had understood this sentence in what might be thought to be the obvious way: "Tell her that I have had a letter from Sempronius from Cappadocia," i.e., "Tell her that I (the Sempronius who am writing this letter) have had a letter from the (other) Sempronius (writing) from Cappadocia." In another sentence the writer complains that he had written to his mother a number of times without receiving a single letter in reply, even though many travellers had come down the river: *τοσοῦτων καταπλευσάντων*. This Greek phrase elicited from Bell the following comment: "It appears from line 8 (*καταπλευσάντων*) that the writer was living lower down the river than his correspondents; and his mention of the arrival of a letter from Cappadocia makes it not improbable that he was at Alexandria."

Schubart was not satisfied with Bell's interpretation of the Greek, and he states categorically that the reference to "a letter from Sempronius from Cappadocia" makes sense only if it refers to this very letter from Sempronius to his mother Saturnila.¹³ In effect, then, Schubart sees the words "I have had a letter from Sempronius from Cappadocia" as a sentence to be spoken by Saturnila to Helen. What Schubart overlooked

¹¹ Read ποιῶμαι.

¹² Read ἔκομισάμην, ἐπιστολήν.

¹³ Schubart takes ὅτι as recitative and encloses the following clause in quotation marks, thus fixing it as direct discourse. The same interpretation underlies his remark made several years earlier (1923) in *Ein Jahrtausend am Nil*, p. 104: "Sempronius schreibt aus Kleinasien . . ."

in saying this, was the very great importance of epistolary salutations in the emotional life of ancient families.¹⁴ Since the letter holds a salutation for Helen, this would necessarily have been conveyed to her by Saturnila, and with it of course the news that Sempronius had written a letter including the salutation. The insertion of a special admonition that this news should be given to Helen, is indeed pointless.

At any rate, Schubart's revision of Bell's interpretation remained without consequence. Hunt and Edgar, who included this letter in the first volume of their *Select Papyri* in 1932, followed Bell, not Schubart,¹⁵ and Wilcken, writing in 1937, showed no awareness of Schubart's desire to modify his thesis regarding the *proskynema* to Sarapis. In a review devoted to a group of four letters in the collection of Columbia University published by C. W. Keyes,¹⁶ Wilcken declares with total confidence: "Von dem dritten Brief (Columb. Inv. Nr. 321) nehme ich wegen des προσκύνημα παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ Σαράπιδι an, dass er in Alexandrien geschrieben ist. Mir ist nicht bekannt, dass diese Schlussfolgerung, auf die ich in meinen Grundzügen S. 122 f. hinwies, widerlegt oder auch nur bestritten wäre. Mir ist sie inzwischen an der Hand neuer Beispiele immer sicherer geworden."¹⁷ Both Bell and Wilcken proceeded as if they had never seen Schubart's admittedly too brief exposition of another approach to the problem. The limit of irony, even though totally without conscious intention, is reached in Bell's contribution to a volume in honor of Schubart, published in 1950.¹⁸ Bell here republishes, as part of a family archive, the letter of Sempronius to his mother Saturnila. He gives not the least hint that he ever saw the pages on which Schubart assigned this letter to Cappadocia, and he repeats substantially the view that he had expressed in 1919: "Sempronius was evidently at Alexandria; this may be inferred both from his invocation of Serapis and from the fact that he mentions a letter he has had from a certain Sempronius in Cappadocia."

On this last point he is certainly right. As I have shown above, the Sempronius who wrote a letter to his mother, and the Sempronius who wrote from Cappadocia, are different persons. Bell may also be right when he suggests that the latter is the husband of Helen, now a long way from home and communicating with his family through his brother-in-law

¹⁴ Cf. the sentiment expressed in *P.Giss.* 78, 7 f.; *P.Grenf.* I 53 = Wilcken, *Chrest.* 131, 9-12.

¹⁵ Cf. *P.Mich.* VIII 476, 4-5 note.

¹⁶ *Class. Phil.* 30, 1935, 141 ff.; reprinted in *Sammelbuch V* 7659-7662.

¹⁷ *Archiv f. Papyrusforschung* 12, 1937, 83.

¹⁸ *Aus Antike u. Orient*, ed. S. Morenz, pp. 38-47. Cf. Bell, *Cults and Creeds* (Liverpool, 1953), pp. 20 f.

Sempronius, who happens to be at Alexandria.¹⁹ Whatever the personal relationship may be, it is at least clear that this letter was not written from Cappadocia, and even though it provides no sure ground for placing the writer at Alexandria, it also gives no help for placing him elsewhere. And Schubart went astray in attempting to use it as a means of restricting the application of Wilcken's thesis on the relation of Alexandria to the *proskynema* formula.

As it happens, Wilcken himself was, on one occasion at least, unmindful of his own theory. In his introduction to the Bremen papyri, published in 1936, he notes that several of the texts, among them No. 49, although found together with the archive of the strategos Apollonius at Hermopolis, were not written there. They were written elsewhere and sent to Hermopolis.²⁰ But in his discussion of No. 49, he makes a quite different approach. The text is a letter from a young man named Hermaeus to the gymnasiarch Aelius Apollonius. In lines 13–16 he writes a mysterious piece of Greek: τῶι θεῶι με ἐχαρίσω, παρ' ᾧ τὸ προσκύνημά σου ποιῶ μετὰ τῶν σῶν πάντων, "you made a gift of me to the god, before whom I make obeisance for you and all your people." In an attempt to explain what is meant here by making "a gift of me to the god," Wilcken has elaborated a complex background, in which "the god" becomes the great god Sarapis, who had a temple in the gymnasium of Hermopolis.²¹ In these conditions, the *proskynema* would be directed to Sarapis of Hermopolis, not to Sarapis of Alexandria. And if Wilcken were demonstrably right about this letter, we would be spared the need of further discussion, since he would have proved himself wrong about the exclusively Alexandrian connections of the *proskynema* to Sarapis. There is, however, no indication in the letter that it was written at Hermopolis, or that "the god" is Sarapis.²²

Of greater potential consequence for Wilcken's theory are *P.Sarapion* 89c and 90. The first of these is a letter sent by Heliodorus, one of the sons of Sarapion, to his mother Selene on May 2, presumably in A.D. 108.²³ In lines 3–5 Heliodorus gives a unique twist to the *proskynema* formula: τοῖς καλοῖς Σαραπείοις τὸ προσκύνημά σου καὶ τῶν τέκνων ποιήσαντες,

¹⁹ So also A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (1923), p. 160, n. 13.

²⁰ *P.Bremen*, pp. 9 f.: "Sind doch auch manche der Briefe, die nicht an Apollonius gerichtet sind, nach Hermopolis hin geschrieben (vgl. Nr. 48–53)."

²¹ *P.Bremen*, p. 117: "Wenn der Brief, wie mir aus allgemeinen Gründen wahrscheinlich ist, aus Hermopolis stammt, so war dieser Gott nach meinen obigen Ausführungen zu Nr. 46 (S. 110) 'der grosse Sarapis,' der ein Heiligtum im Gymnasium dieser Stadt hatte."

²² Geraci, *Aegyptus* 51, 1971, 196, wisely disregards Wilcken's discussion. His own statement is non-committal: the letter "dimostra inoppugnabilmente che con ὁ θεός si può intendere menzionare il dio del luogo."

²³ Cf. *P.Sarapion*, p. 243.

“having made obeisance for you and your children at the splendid festival of Sarapis.” It is not said specifically that the *proskynema* was directed to Sarapis, but that is an entirely reasonable, even necessary inference. Nor are we told where the letter was written. But its date, as well as the information provided in lines 7–8, where Heliodorus refers to the falling market value of gold,²⁴ link it to No. 90, a letter written by the same Heliodorus to his brother Eutychides two days later, on 4 May. Here there is lengthier and more explicit talk about gold prices and the intervention of the prefect.

Of considerable importance for our theme are the words that Heliodorus uses in No. 90 about the Prefect’s arrival on 20 April: *Σέρουιον Σουλπίκιον Σίμιλων τὸν ἀγαθώτατον ἡγεμόνα ἐπι[δ]εδη[μ]ηκέναι τῇ κ̄ε τοῦ Φαρμουθι*, “Servius Sulpicius Similis, the excellent Prefect, stopped here on the 25th of Pharmouthi.” Heliodorus is known to have resided for a long time in Memphis,²⁵ and if the reading of the verb were secure, we might very well share the editor’s conviction that the Prefect came to Memphis late in April,²⁶ very much later in fact than his normal annual schedule would suggest. The terms *ἐπιδημέω* and *ἐπιδημία* are regularly used of officials on tour and refer to the breaks in the journey on the way out or on the way back.²⁷ These words are not used to mark a prefect’s return to Alexandria. But the reading is something less than secure. Instructive is Bilabel’s comment in a note to the editio princeps: “*Ἐπι[δ]εδημηκέναι* scheint zu den dürftigen Spuren—es sind solche von den Spitzen der Buchstaben erhalten—am besten zu passen, ohne dass absolute Sicherheit zu erreichen ist.”²⁸ It is in consequence decidedly unsafe to use this reading of *P.Sarapion* 90 in order to place Heliodorus at Memphis when he wrote the letter to his mother from the same place. The latter would then be the only epistolary attestation of a *proskynema* to Sarapis at Memphis. We must go slowly here because other scholars have attributed *P.Sarapion* 90 to Alexandria,²⁹ or if not to Alexandria, in any case not to Memphis.³⁰ It is wise for the time being to suspend judgment about both letters and to hold that their place of origin is uncertain.

²⁴ Cf. *P.Sarapion*, p. 242.

²⁵ J. Schwartz, *Bull. Fac. Lettres Strasb.* 28, 1949–1950, 154; *Chr. d’Ég.* 68, 1959, 355.

²⁶ In spite of his note to *P.Sarapion* 90, 5: “La venue d’un préfet fin avril à Memphis a quelque chose d’anormal . . .”

²⁷ Cf. Wilcken, *Grundzüge* 33.

²⁸ *P.Baden* II 37, 5 note.

²⁹ A. C. Johnson, *Egypt and the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor, 1951), 20 f.

³⁰ G. F. Talamanca, *Ricerche sul processo nell’ Egitto greco-romano* (Milan, 1974),

Nevertheless, even if the doubtful reading in *P.Sarapion* 90 were taken to be correct and the papyrus assigned to Memphis, the unusual turn given to the *proskynema* formula may well have significance of its own. It departs radically from the customarily simple statement used elsewhere. The obeisance is said to have been performed at the time of the Sarapis festival. Since the occasion was exceptional, it may be precisely this which was thought to lend the *proskynema* a degree of persuasive power otherwise reserved for this act only when it took place in the Serapeum at Alexandria, the chief seat of Sarapis in this world. Comparable to the situation depicted in *P.Sarapion* 90 are the circumstances described in *P.Bremen* 15 as background for a *proskynema* directed to Isis. This letter was written in the Hermopolite nome, where the patron deity was Hermes, who is in fact mentioned in the *proskynemata* of four other letters on papyrus from the same nome.³¹ The writer states in lines 31–34 that he performed the obeisance *πρὸς ταῖς θυσίαις τῆς Ἰσιδος τῆι νυκτὶ γενεσι[ο]ς αὐτῆς*, “at the sacrifices made to Isis at night on her birthday.”³²

One other text deserves a moment’s attention. It is a letter dated to the third century. In lines 3–4 it has the familiar formula: *τὸ προσκύνημα ὑμῶν ποιῶ παρὰ τῷ μεγάλῳ Σαράπιδι*. And in lines 5–6 the writer communicates information which appears to have a certain importance for him: *ἡ μήτηρ μου οὐχ ἦκε*³³ *εἰς Σ]εναὸ οὐδ’ ἐλεύσεται*, “my mother has not come to Senao, nor will she come.” Senao is a village in the Oxyrhynchite nome, and if the text is correctly restored, the writer is living in Senao and has made the *proskynema* to Sarapis at an otherwise unknown temple in that village. But *εἰς Σ]εναὸ* is not obligatory, and *εἰκ Σ]εναὸ* is at least equally possible. The writer would then be saying: “my mother has not come from Senao, nor will she come.” And he would then not be writing from Senao, but from elsewhere, possibly even from Alexandria. This letter also we must put among those whose place of origin is unknown.

Although Schubart went wrong in trying to assign to Cappadocia the letter that Sempronius wrote to his mother Saturnila, he laid out a pattern of thought for letters containing the *proskynema* to Sarapis that recent writers on this subject have exploited much more fully. Outstanding among them are Koskenniemi, Zaki Aly, and Geraci.³⁴ Koskenniemi is

³¹ Geraci, *op. cit.* 188 f.

³² Geraci, *op. cit.* 183. The only other epistolary *proskynema* involving Isis associates her with Apollo (= Horus) and the *σύννοιοι θεοί* (*P. Ross. Georg.* III 4, 3–5). This letter was sent to Alexandria, but its place of origin is not disclosed.

³³ Read *ἦκει*.

³⁴ H. Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee u. Phraseologie des griech. Briefes* (Helsinki, 1956), 139–145; Zaki Aly, *Ét. de Pap.* 9, 1971, 173 f., 215 f.; G. Geraci, *Aegyptus* 51, 1971, 172–180, 203 f.

cited with approval by Geraci, who finds that a number of letters which certainly came from Alexandria mention a *proskynema* to Sarapis,³⁵ but he sees in this no proof that all the others in which the place of origin is not indicated, whether directly or indirectly, must also have been written in Alexandria. Some of them may come from other localities in Egypt where temples of Sarapis are known to have existed and prospered.³⁶

In putting the matter in this way, the newer scholars make substantially the same claim that motivated Schubart's remarks. They say in effect that Wilcken exceeded the possibilities of the evidence. Nevertheless, Wilcken has received strong support in our day from a notable historian. It has been demonstrated by Braunert that Alexandria for a variety of reasons—commercial, judicial, and religious, was the most frequent goal of travelers in Egypt, and nothing was more natural for such persons than to visit the great Serapeum, both to see the sights and to invoke the favor of Sarapis. In the course of his discussion Braunert has made a telling use of the private letters and their *proskynemata*.³⁷

And so it will do no harm to point up the fact that Schubart and his successors have also pushed their conclusion beyond the potentialities of the evidence. Starting with Geraci's useful list of *proskynemata* mentioned in papyri,³⁸ and adding a few more from recent publications, we obtain a total of 155 letters which have the *proskynema* formula. Of these 72 mention Sarapis,³⁹ and of this number 22, or almost one-third, either tell us directly that they were written at Alexandria or are so intimately connected with other letters known to have come from Alexandria, that an Alexandrian origin is in the highest degree probable. Of the other 50, not one reveals either directly or indirectly its place of origin. A similar result is obtained for *proskynemata* involving Apis, the bull god of Memphis, even though only two occurrences are known. For one of these we are told in the letter itself

³⁵ Geraci, *op. cit.* 12–26, argues strongly that *προσκύνημα*, a word restricted to Egyptian Greek, is not simply an equivalent of *προσκύνησις*, "obedience," but designates the graffiti inscribed on the walls and the stelae set up in the precincts of a temple to give permanence to the obedience. With this thesis it becomes necessary, in view of the various wording of the epistolary formula, to distinguish between *proskynemata* actually embodied in inscriptions and others inserted into private communications on papyrus as formal although valued compliments. This is too complex a subject for brief discussion, and I hope to return to it on another occasion.

³⁶ Geraci, *op. cit.* 173.

³⁷ H. Braunert, *Binnenwanderung* (Bonn, 1964), 146 f. Cf. *P. Tebt.* II 416 = Wilcken, *Chrest.* 98, 3–8; *P. Oxy.* VII 1070, 2–8; *P. Brem.* 48, 29–31.

³⁸ Geraci, *op. cit.* 203–208.

³⁹ To Geraci, *op. cit.* 203 f., add *P. Oxy.* XLIII 3094; *P. Soc. Ég. Pap. Inv.* 253 and 254 (*Ét. de Pap.* 9, 1971, 172 f., 166).

that the writer is at Memphis. For the other no such information is provided, and here again Geraci is tempted to extend the topographical scope of the text: "La lettera è stata redatta in un luogo in cui si trovava un sacello di Apis, forse a Memphis, come la precedente, forse in un' altra città, sede di un tempietto locale del dio . . ." ⁴⁰

It is significant that when we know where letters were written, the places indicated are such as might have been predicted for the deities who are mentioned. We have already seen that this is true for Sarapis and Apis. It is true also for Hermes. Four letters have the *proskynema* formula with Hermes as its object. These have come down to us as parts of the archive of the strategos Apollonius, and they were all written at Hermopolis. ⁴¹ One letter with a *proskynema* to Zeus Kasios was written at Pelusium, whose patron deity he was. ⁴² In another, which leaves no doubt that it comes from Coptus, the writer performs the *proskynema* *παρὰ τοῖς τριχώμασι ἐν Κοπτῶ*. The hair was the hair of Isis, which she had cut off in mourning when she heard at Coptus of the death of Osiris. It was exhibited there as a sacred relic of the great goddess, and it was the object of a cult. ⁴³

The evidence is accordingly of such a nature that it constrains us to caution in estimating the validity of the rival contentions regarding the epistolary *proskynema* to Sarapis. Wilcken may have overstepped the mark in extending the Alexandrian origin attested for approximately one-third of the letters which have the *proskynema* to Sarapis, also to others which yield no topographical clues. ⁴⁴ But it is at least equally excessive to broaden the possibilities the moment a text with no information on this topic is being considered. It will be time enough for that when at least one letter appears which on internal evidence can be assigned definitely to a place other than Alexandria. So far this has not happened. ⁴⁵ Until it does happen, we must grant that Wilcken's seemingly daring hypothesis has still a good chance of proving to be true, and Braunert's explanation of the

⁴⁰ Geraci, *op. cit.* 185 f.

⁴¹ Cf. Geraci, *op. cit.* 188 f. A group of inscriptions from Pselkis also have the *proskynema* to Hermes (*Sammelbuch* V 7911, 7921, 7926, 7932, 7934, 7942, 7944), and we must reckon with the possibility of different conventions governing epigraphic and epistolary *proskynemata*. This aspect of the problem needs further investigation.

⁴² Cf. Geraci, *op. cit.* 181 f.

⁴³ Cf. Geraci, *op. cit.* 182 f. See *P.Mich.* VIII 502, 5 note.

⁴⁴ A few of them refer to travel up and down the river in a manner suitable for someone writing at Alexandria, but this is not sufficient to prove an Alexandrian origin. See *Sammelbuch* III 6263, 7 f.; *P.Merton* I 22, 10 ff.; *P.Princeton* II 70, 5, 9, 11; *PSI* XIII 1331, 17 f., 21 f.; *BGU* I 333 = Wilcken, *Chrest.* 489, 3-5; *BGU* II 601, 16 f.

⁴⁵ Cf. E. G. Turner, *Rech. de Pap.* 2, 1962, 119, n. 2.

frequency of the formula may then be seen to be true also.⁴⁶ We must keep in mind that sixty-four years have passed since Wilcken first enunciated his doctrine, and although much new evidence has made its appearance over this span of more than half a century, not one piece of it has yet brought the proof that Schubart needed in 1927 to support his own contrary doctrine and his successors now need with equal urgency.

Ann Arbor

⁴⁶ See footnote 37. It is notable that Sarapis is rarely mentioned in epigraphic *proskynemata*. He is almost but not quite absent from the numerous pages (35-162) devoted to them by Geraci, *op. cit.* Cf. E. Bernand, *Inscr. gr. Philae* II, p. 109: "La mention de Sarapis à côté d'Isis est une rareté dans les inscriptions de Philae." See footnote 41.