

JAMES M. S. COWEY

REMARKS ON VARIOUS PAPYRI I.

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 84 (1990) 75–78

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

Remarks on Various Papyri I.

The Institut für Papyrologie of Heidelberg University under the auspices of the Akademie der Wissenschaften of Heidelberg is currently involved in a project to construct a computer data-bank of all securely dated documentary papyri. To be included are all documentary papyri which have been published in the volumes listed in the Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraca (BASP 1985 Supplements, Number 4) as well as the editions published since then. It is intended that the end product be published as a reference volume with information on: dating, publication number, original title of the document, place of origin, locations of photographs of the document (as far as such are available and published). The team of researchers, of which I am a member, has started with the most recent publications and is working backwards to include the earlier publications.

During my work on the project, I have noted some minor inaccuracies in the editions of a number of documents. Most of these concern problems of dating. This article will be followed by others of a similar nature. The corrections made in these articles will be incorporated within the data-bank. In publishing them in this way our intention is to keep to a minimum the information about corrections in the data-bank itself; there, reference will simply be made to the corrections suggested in this series of articles.

P.Köln VI 258.

Year 8 of Ptolemy IV Philopator was 16 October, 215 BC -15 October, 214 BC. Pachon 16 fell in that period on 28 June, thus the date is 28 June, 214 BC, not 28 June, 215 BC, as given in the edition.

P.Customs 317.

Phaophi 7 year 33(?) of Commodus corresponds to 4 October, AD 192(?), not 7 August, AD 192(?), as given in the edition.

P.Customs 425.

To be consistent with the published text, 15-23 July, year 7 should be given, instead of 15-24 July, year 7, because 24 July would be Epeiph 30, which the reading indicates as not possible.

P.Freib.IV 53.

If the editor goes as far as to postulate April of 68 BC or April of 39 BC as the date of the papyrus on the basis of palaeographical comparisons, then it might as well be stated that two full dates are possible: either 25 April, 68 BC or 18 April, 39 BC

P.Freib.IV 60.

During year 22 of Commodus no allowance has to be made for a leap year and so Thoth 21 corresponds to 18 September, AD 181, not 19 September, AD 181, as stated in the introduction to the text.

BGU XV 2470.

In line 9 the editor prints with a typing mistake περιτμηθ]ήναι τήν παιδά μ[ου. When it is a matter of circumcision, the article should be masculine, cf.l. 15.

BGU XV 2472.

In line 8 the month Mesore has been read (corresponds to 25 July - 23 August, AD 160). As made clear by the editor, lines 1-2 record an action which took place after the action described in lines 3-8. As the year mentioned in line 2 is year 23 of Antoninus Pius (as it is in line 8), the document can be dated to AD 160 instead of AD 159-160 as in the edition. Indeed, it can be dated between 25 July - 28 August, AD 160, with the likelihood being that it was written in the latter weeks of August.

BGU XV 2509.

In the year AD 231-232 allowance has to be made for a leap year, which means that the month Mecheir should be converted to 27 January - 25 February instead of 26 January - 24 February, as printed in the note to line 4 in the edition.

BGU XV 2518.

In line 4 the editor reads ἔτ[ο]υς [δ] (?), that is year 4 of Hadrian. This reading indicates that allowance for a leap year has to be made and, instead of 9-13 October, AD 119 (?) as given in the edition, the date should be 10-14 October, AD 119 (?).

BGU XV 2534.

In line 2 the supplement [ἔτους (number) καιδεκ]άτου suggests that, for reasons of space, the year number was recorded using the ordinal adjective of the form *x καιδέκατος*. Thus the possibilities are years 13-19 of Trajan rather than 10-18, as assumed in the edition. The dating for the document should be given as AD 107-116.

BGU XV 2537.

In line 5 Tybi 23 corresponds to 18 January, not 19 January, as in the edition, because we are still in year 6 of Antoninus Pius, in which no allowance for a leap year has to be made.

BGU XV 2546.

Although neither line 2 nor line 8 can be read with complete certainty, it seems likely that the date mentioned was Epeiph 12 year 6 of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, which corresponds to 6 July, AD 198. It is better to use this date with a question mark rather than the July, AD 198, as given by the editor.

BGU XV 2555.

As published in *Hellenica* 32, 1980, p.351, the date was read as Phaophi 5 year 2 of Marcus Aurelius and Verus, which corresponds to 2 October, AD 161. This date was adopted in SB XVI 12423. When the text was re-published in BGU XV, the date was read as Phaophi 15 year 2, which corresponds to 12 October, AD 161, and can be verified by looking at the microfiche. The correction to the text of SB XVI 12423 should be noted, as the editor of BGU XV 2555 makes no reference to the change.

P.Prag. I 43.

The fragmentary nature and physical state of the papyrus and the cursive, rather messy script make this a very difficult text to handle. I would like to make some comments on a few points within the first eight lines, where I believe a little more can be said to clarify readings, and to draw attention to aspects of interest within the dating formula.

In the *ed.pr.* lines 3-6 present the following text:

βασιλείας τῶν ε[ὐ]σεβεστάτων ἡμῶν
 [δεσποτῶν] Φλ(αουίων) Ἑρακλίου ἔτους κε καὶ
 ὑπατίας τοῦ [αὐτοῦ εὐσεβ(οῦς) ἡμ(ῶν) δεσπ(ότου)] ἔτους κε [καὶ τοῦ]
 θεουστεφ[ο]ῦ[ς] Φλ(αουίου) [Ἑ]ρακλείου Ν[έου]

It should be noted that we have here the first instance of βασιλείας τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν as a regnal formula for Heraclius and his son. In line 4, Φλ(αουίων) is correctly read: a phi is followed by two lambdas and an abbreviation stroke, which one might represent as Φλλ/, then comes a small eta, which is joined closely to the following rho. Because Φλ(αουίων) is correctly read, then the Φλ(αουίου) in line 6 is unnecessary and should be left out.

In line 5 after ὑπατίας, there is a tau formed with an almost vertical and not particularly long stroke with a horizontal crossbar and thereafter a small eta very similar to that in line 4 from Ἑρακλίου. Then comes an ink stroke, which I would be prepared to read as the top of a sigma, followed by the foot of the phi from Φλ(αουίων) in the line above and then another ink mark, which could be part of almost any letter. On the basis of parallels, I find support for the reading of τῆς α[] instead of τοῦ. In the examples of documents dated to the reign of Heraclius, where a consular dating is also present there are five examples of the wording ὑπατείας (ὑπατεία) τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους (month)...: P.Rainer Cent.119.4 (AD 610-641(?)), CPR X 130.7-8 (6 October, AD 611), CPR X 131.2 (4 February, AD 611 or 5 February, AD 612), CPR X 132.6-7 (between 5 October, AD 617 and 30 June, AD 618), P.Edfu I 3.3 (13 or 23 June, AD 618).

In addition to these five examples, I propose a sixth by suggesting a correction of the reading in part of the text of MPER XV 108 (26 July, AD 631). For lines 4-5, the editor prints ὑπατίας | τοῦ [αὐ]τοῦ εὐσεβεστ(άτου) δεσποτ[ε]ίας ἔτους. On the basis of the amount of space at the beginning of the line τῆς [αὐ]τοῦ εὐσεβ[ε]ίας is a better reading and supplement.

The placing of [τοῦ] θεουστεφ[ο]ῦ[ς] (read τοῦ θεουστεφ[ο]ῦς) before the names of Heraclius' son is odd and there are no parallels for it. One would expect exactly the opposite, i.e. Ἑρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θεουστεφ[ο]ῦς (cf. RFBE Formula 12 p. 72 = BGU I 314 and RFBE Formula 14 p. 72 = SB I 4319). In both of these cases αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ follows θεουστεφ[ο]ῦς, and I would suggest θεουστεφ[ο]ῦ[ς] αὐ]τοῦ [υἱοῦ Ἑ]ρακλείου Ν[έου] as a better reading than Φλ(αουίου) for the space between θεουστεφ[ο]ῦ[ς] and Ἑρακλείου. It is not particularly compelling to suggest that the scribe had forgotten that he had not written Ἑρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου and carried on with the formula τοῦ θεουστεφ[ο]ῦς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ before realising his mistake and then adding the regnal names and finishing with τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου; but it is the best that I can offer.

In line 8 I find the reading νωτ κ ἰνδικ(τίνοος) very difficult to follow, but can offer no better. After the indiction some sort of geographical information is to be expected. I would print the following text for lines 3-6:

βασιλείας τῶν ε[ὐ]σεβεστάτων ἡμῶν
 [δεσποτῶν] Φλ(αουίων) Ἑρακλίου ἔτους κε καὶ
 ὑπατίας τῆς α[]τῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους κε [καὶ τοῦ]
 θεουστεφ[ο]ῦ[ς] αὐ]τοῦ [υἱοῦ Ἑ]ρακλείου Ν[έου]

P.Prag.I 71.

If Πέτρος . . . νοτάριος is correctly identified with Pros.Ars.I 4464 (cf.Byz.Not.16.9.2, p.47), then the date is likely to be 6 December, AD 620, although the two dates 6 December, AD 605 and 7 December, AD 635 cannot be firmly ruled out.

P.Prag.I 82.

In line 2 Epeiph 26 has been correctly read, but, when converted, it is 20 July, not 21 July, as stated in the edition.

CPR XIV 1.

Epeiph 14 corresponds to 8 July, not 9 July, as in the edition. The date should be 8 July, AD 651(?).

CPR XIV 16.

The third indiction which is mentioned in the introduction began in either AD 659 or AD 674 and thus Thoth 11 corresponds to 9 September, AD 659 or 8 September, AD 674. The date should be given as 8 September, AD 674(?).

CPR XIV 48.

In line 20 the dating is a post-consular dating, which means that Julian calendar years are referred to. Thus the dating should be given as AD 506, instead of AD 505-506, as in the edition. This concurs with the examples given in CLRE p.547, which indicate that it was only in AD 506 that this post-consular dating appears.