P. J. SIJPESTEIJN

P. KÖLN IV 196: A REMARK


© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn
P. Köln IV 196: A REMARK

In ZPE 54, 1984, 76f. I proposed to resolve the abbreviations ουαλ( ') / ουαλε ( ') in lines 16, 23, and 32 of P. Köln IV 196 as Οὐαλ(εριανόν) and Οὐαλε(ριανόν) respectively. I used the dating "Phoophi, year 1 of Valerianus" in lines 4 and 13 (?) to support the idea that Gallienus only became co-ruler after December 10, A.D. 253. D.W. Rathbone, ZPE 62, 1986, 117, note 1 pointed out that in line 31 of the Cologne papyrus there is a question of "Mesore, year 1 of Valerianus" and that in lines 4 and 13 of the said papyrus an abbreviated formula of no special significance was used. Rathbone concludes that in lines 16 and 23 the editor's expansion to Οὐαλεριανοῦ is as likely as my suggestion of Οὐαλεριανὸν. For my suggestion to resolve Οὐαλεριανὸν I pointed to P. Hamb. I 20, 20 but since then J.R. Rea (Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia III, Napoli 1984, 1133) has shown that the correct reading of lines 20-21 of P. Hamb. 120 is in all probability:

(ἐτούς) ἐ τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Οὐαλεριανὸν
[καὶ Γαλλιηνοῦ] Σεβαστῶν Μεσορή-λα-.\(^1\)

I still do not deny that Οὐαλεριανοῖ is a possible titulature for the Augusti Valerianus and Galienus\(^2\) but a new testimony proves that also in years later than year 1 only Οὐαλεριανοῦ could be used.

P. Lond. ined. 1157 recto and verso contains a miscellany of documents relating to Alabastrine in the Hermopolite nome.\(^3\) The main text of the recto is a long account of money = P. Lond. III 1157 (pp. 61ff.). P. J. Parsons (Proc. of the Twelfth Intern. Congr. of Papyrology, ASP 7, Toronto 1970, 390ff.) has dealt with the documentary text, a census-return, written at a later date in the space left free at the beginning of the roll. The editors of P. Lond. III 1157 refer to a third text on the recto.\(^4\) This 3rd text on the recto is heavily mutilated. We seem to be dealing with a λόγος(ος) ἐγκύβασις (? of a certain product\(^5\) which I

---

\(^1\) Rea's article (loc. cit., 1130ff.) shows that the plural Οὐαλεριανοῦ, albeit in combination with καὶ Γαλλιηνοῦ, is used for the Augustus Valerianus plus a Caesar.

\(^2\) I could refer also to SB III 6007 and CEML No. 563 where we read: (ἐτούς) γ Πυπτλίον meaning the Augusti Valerianus and Gallienus.


\(^4\) Note to line 209-210: " - - - , The rest of the present column is occupied by writing in a hand of the third century, dated in the 4th year of an unnamed emperor." The same hand wrote several lines underneath column 9.

\(^5\) The product is measured in (ἐρτάβατα).
am unable to decipher. In line 3 the grand total is given followed in line 4 by ὄν [ἐξωδεί[άςθη] ἀ]ναλόμωτος. This is followed by two mutilated columns of expenditure. Relevant for the present discussion is the fact that in lines 1-2 we can clearly read: - - - τοῦ ἐνεσιδῶτος (sic) δ (ἐτοὺς) Οὐαλεριανοῦ. In year 4, long after Gallienus' accession, mention of Gallienus could be omitted in the imperial titulature. We should not attach political consequence to this omission. It is, to cite Rathbone's words, "probably just an abbreviated formula of no special significance." Regarding P.Köl IV 196 I must say that D.Hagedorn's expansion to Οὐαλεριανοῦ is just as likely as my suggestion to resolve Οὐαλεριανόν.
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6 Since no month is mentioned, we cannot decide whether mention of Valerianus Caesar was also omitted (cf. J.R. Rea, loc. cit., 1125ff.).

7 One may point to a comparable phenomenon in the reign of Diocletian and his co-rulers. Cf. R.S. Bagnall - K.A. Worp, BASP 16, 1978, 221ff.