

P. J. SIJPESTEIJN

SB I 993 *NOT* FROM THE REIGN OF CARACALLA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 78 (1989) 99–100

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

SB I 993 *not* from the Reign of Caracalla

E. Bernand republishes in his latest study (*Inscriptions grecques et latines d'Akôris, Le Caire* 1988) as no.13 an inscription published for the first time by G. Lefebvre and L. Barry in 1905 (*ASAE* 6, p.151, no.8) = SB I 993. The editors of *IGRR I* (1908) 1136 read and supplemented in lines 3-4 of the inscription under discussion: — — — [Μ]ά[ρ-][κ]ου Αὐρ[ηλ]ίου [Σεουήρου] instead of — — — Τ[ί-]τ[ου Αἰλίου Ἀδριανοῦ] of the original editors.¹ Bernand accepts the assignment of this inscription to the reign of Caracalla but dates it incorrectly to November 25, A.D. 217.² In line 11 we read ἔτους κε, Ἀθὺρ κθ̄ which, if this inscription had to be dated to the reign of Caracalla, would be November 25, A.D. 216.³ But has Bernand's no.13 to be assigned to the reign of Caracalla? For the imperial titulature Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Σεουήρος Ἀντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς Εὐσεβής in lines 3-6 Bernand refers his readers (note 3 on p.25) to P. Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales* (= *Papyrologica Bruxellensia* 2), Bruxelles 1964, 103. On p. 103 of his study Bureth lists indeed three examples of the titulature Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Σεουήρος Ἀντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς (with in two instances) Εὐσεβής for Caracalla. If we leave instance no.1, i.e. the inscription under discussion, for the moment aside the second instance which adds Εὐσεβής is WO 991.⁴ This ostrakon has in lines 1-3: — — — κε (ἔτους) Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Σεουήρου Ἀντωνίνου Εὐσεβοῦς Σεβαστοῦ and has to be dated to July 5, A.D. 217 (Ἐπεὶφ ιᾱ in line 3). As Wilcken remarks Caracalla was already three months dead when this ostrakon was written. Perhaps this ostrakon was issued later (during the reign of Elagabalus) and was the scribe confused.⁵ Be this as it may be, the titulature Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Σεουήρος Ἀντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς Εὐσεβής for Caracalla is to date not attested. On the other hand, the titulature Μάρκος

¹ Already in *Archiv* 4, 1908, 243 U. Wilcken had questioned the assignment of the inscription under review to the reign of Antoninus Pius.

² On November 25, A.D. 217 Caracalla who was murdered on April 8, A.D. 217 was already more than seven months dead. Cf. E. Hohl, *Das Ende Caracallas*, *Miscell.Acad.Berol.* 1950, 276ff.

³ Bernand has in his study cited in the text difficulties with the dates of the inscriptions he republishes. His no.8 has to be dated to November 21, A.D. 174; his no.11 to August 29, A.D. 201 [for the titulature Σεουήρος καὶ Ἀντωνίνος καὶ Γέτα οἱ κύριοι Σεβαστοί, cf. *BGU XI* 2091, 10-11]; his no.42 to A.D. 23/4 and his no.43 to November 20, A.D. 71. I would not even suggest the possibility that his no.10 has to be dated to a 9th year of Commodus, since Commodus never had a 9th year being associated to the throne by his father, Marcus Aurelius, only in the 17th year of Marcus Aurelius' reign. I suggest to take the curved line (sometimes followed by one or two small obliques) which appears in nos. 29,1; 30,1; 34,1; 35,1 as the symbol for (ἔτους). Cf. H. C. Youtie, *The Textual Criticism of Documentary Papyri. Prolegomena BICS Supplement* 33, London 1974, 20, note 20.

⁴ For the third example (without Εὐσεβής), cf. P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 50, 1982, 197ff.

⁵ Cf. P. Hamb. I 50. Cf. also P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 8, 1971, 186ff.

Αὐρήλιος Κόμμοδος Ἄντωνίνος Σεβαστὸς Εὐσεβής is well attested.⁶ For that reason I propose to read and supplement lines 3-6 of SB I 993 as follows:

— — — [Μ]ά[ρ-]
 [κ]ου Αὐρ[ηλ]ίου [Κομμόδου]
 Ἄντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ
 Εὐσεβοῦς — — —

The inscription has to be dated to November 25, A.D. 184.

Amsterdam

P.J.Sijpesteijn

⁶ Cf. P. Bureth, *op. cit.*, 90. Many more examples in, e.g., P.Petaus.