

JAMES M.S. COWEY

REMARKS ON VARIOUS PAPYRI II (SB XIV)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 101 (1994) 79–82

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## REMARKS ON VARIOUS PAPYRI II (SB XIV)\*

## SB XIV 11288.

In lines 1-2 the editor prints the following text: [ . . . . . δε]κάτου Αὐ[ρ]ηλίου | [Ἄντωνίνου] Καίσαρῶ[ς] τοῦ κυρίου. The emperor, he argues, is Marcus Aurelius rather than Severus Alexander. He says that there is room for about ten letters before ]κάτου in line 1. It is obvious that we have to supplement Ἔτους, but it is not clear whether this accounts for all of the space before δε]κάτου, in other words, whether we should supplement δε]κάτου or, for example, δωδε]κάτου, which would fill the space better. It is, however, possible that Ἔτους was written with a very large epsilon and thus used up more space than would be usual. If this were the case then a date in AD 169 is possible, as year 10 of Marcus Aurelius was AD 169-170. The dating of 170-178, as given in *Aegyptus* 54, 1974, p.92, can be given slightly more accurately (SB XIV 11288 gives "170-177 n.Chr."). The accession of Commodus was 27 November, AD 176, which is fairly near the beginning of year 17 of Marcus Aurelius; although the news does not necessarily take very long to travel to Egypt, a date in AD 177 is still possible, because there are documents dated in AD 177, in which only Marcus Aurelius is mentioned: e.g. P.Customs 266 (6 January, AD 177) and P.Customs 268 (25 February, AD 177). Thus a dating between AD 169 (more accurately 29 August, AD 169) and AD 177 is a more accurate dating for the document.

## SB XIV 11307.

In lines 1-2 there is a date: year 14, Phaophi 30. If this is year 14 of Ptolemy III Euergetes then the corresponding date is 19 December, 234 BC, not 9 December 234 BC, as given in the ed.pr. and followed by SB XIV 11307. The alternative date has been correctly converted.

## SB XIV 11316.

In line 5 the date is year 32, Choiak 19. It is year 32 of Ptolemy IX Soter II (Lathyros) and can be converted to 31 December, 86 BC, not 31 December, 85 BC, as given in the ed.pr. and followed by SB XIV 11316.

## SB XIV 11371.

In line 20 the date is year 24, Choiak 15. In the first century BC there are two possibilities: year 24 of Ptolemy X Alexander I in which case the corresponding date is 28 December, 91 BC, or year 24 of Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos in which case the corresponding date is 20 December, 58 BC.

## SB XIV 11375.

In the first edition of this text in *Festschrift zum 150jährigen Bestehen des Berliner ägyptischen Museums*, Berlin 1974, pp.447-448, the editor states that a *terminus ante quem* for the text is the period between January/February, 211 BC and December, 211 BC/January, 210 BC. He favours reading the eleventh year rather than the twelfth, although the papyrus is difficult to be sure about at this point. There is a difference between when the Macedonian year begins and when the Egyptian one does, but it is minimal in this period. The eleventh year started in both cases in 212 BC and continued into 211 BC. On p.442 it is stated that the text was probably written in 212 BC. Somewhere along the line this was changed to 211-210 BC in the course of the text being reprinted in SB XIV 11375. The date should be given as 212-211 BC, as appears in BGU XIV 2399, a duplicate of this text.

---

\* This is a continuation of a series of articles concerning minor corrections to questions of dating, which have occurred during work on the making of a computer data-bank of all published documentary papyri. The first article appeared in ZPE 84, 1990, pp.75-78.

## SB XIV 11376.

This text has been dated one year later than is correct. The correct date is to be found in W. Clarysse and G. van der Veken with the assistance of S.P. Vleeming, *The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt* (P.L.Bat.24), *Chronological lists of the priests of Alexandria and Ptolemais with a study of the Demotic transcriptions of their names*, Leiden 1983, pp.10-11. Year 8 (in the Macedonian regnal calendar) of Ptolemy III Euergetes lasted from 18 June, 240 BC to 6 July, 239 BC. In this period the month of Peritios corresponded roughly with Mecheir, Phamenoth or Pharmouthi of the corresponding Egyptian year 8 (dependent upon whether the added month in that year was Hyperberetaios or Peritios), as can be seen from the tables provided by Pestman, *A Guide to the Zenon Archive* (P.L.Bat.21), Leiden 1981, p.253. We are, therefore, justified in dating this text to the year 239 BC.

## SB XIV 11405.

Year 16 is either that of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy IX Soter II (Lathyros), which lasted from 18 September, 102 BC to 16 September, 101 BC, or that of Ptolemy X Alexander I and Cleopatra Berenice, which lasted from 17 September, 99 BC to 16 September, 98 BC. Mesore 13 fell in both these years on 25 August. Thus the two possibilities are 25 August, 101 BC or 25 August, 98 BC.

## SB XIV 11406.

As mentioned by the editor this document may well have been written about the same time as SB XIV 11405 (*Demotic Papyri in the Ashmolean Museum I*, Oxford 1973, p.74). Thus the two possibilities for dating the papyrus are 25 August, 101 BC or 25 August, 98 BC.

## SB XIV 11408.

Year 10 is that of Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos (Auletes), which lasted from 10 September, 72 BC to 9 September, 71 BC. Mesore 29 fell in this year on 3 September. Thus the date can be converted to 3 September, 71 BC.

## SB XIV 11414.

Columns III, IV, V and VI (mostly unpublished) contain “the *κατὰ κόμην* account through Phaophi of the 20th year” (editor in *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists*, London 1975, p.154). This was presumably used to date the papyrus to “after October, 34 A.D.”. Year 20 of Tiberius started in AD 33 and lasted until AD 34. In this period Phaophi fell in AD 33. The date should be given as after October, AD 33.

## SB XIV 11423.

On the basis of the handwriting of the notary we are justified in stating that the provenience of this text is Hermopolites. He appears in J.M. Diethart - K.A. Worp, *Notarsunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten*, Wien 1986 (MPER N.S. XVI), p.67. Moreover lines 2 and 13 mention Hermopolis by name.

## SB XIV 11440.

In line 4 Mesore 9 corresponds to 2 August, not 30 July, as given in the edition. Thus the date is 2 August, AD 210 (?).

## SB XIV 11507.

A printing error landed this in the second century BC instead of the second century AD, as given in the original publication, O.Mich.IV 1120, in *ZPE* 18, 1975, p.271.

## SB XIV 11551.

In the original edition in *ZPE* 20, 1976, pp.161-162 the editors cited Hermopolites as the provenience for the papyrus. As this is clear from line 1 and because there seems no good reason for supposing otherwise, I assume that the provenience Heracleopolites in the SB was simply a slip.

## SB XIV 11560.

Although a full date is preserved on this ostrakon, it was dated to the late first century AD by the editor and reprinted as such in the SB. As a twelfth year appears, there is only really one possibility and that is the reign of Domitian, which would provide the corresponding date of 30 October, AD 92. Just possible is 30 October, AD 65, but the reign of Nero is probably too early to be qualified as the late first century AD.

## SB XIV 11564.

In lines 5 to 6 Pharmouthi 15 corresponds to 10 April, not 9 April. Thus the date is 10 April, AD 260, not 9 April, AD 260, as given in the edition.

## SB XIV 11634.

In line 1, year 9 of Domitian occurs; this corresponds to AD 89-90, not AD 88-89, as given in the edition.

## SB XIV 11649.

Year 8 of Ptolemy IV Philopator ran from 16 October, 215 BC to 15 October, 214 BC. Within this period Phamenoth 1 fell on 14 April. Thus the full date is 14 April, 214 BC. Both SB XIV 11649 and the original edition in *AncSoc.*7, 1976, p.204 have mistakes concerning the dating, each one slightly different from the other.

## SB XIV 11726.

In line 3 one should read  $\pi\rho\acute{o}(\beta\alpha\tau\alpha)$  ι, as in the ed.pr. and as is clearly verifiable on the plate.

## SB XIV 11852.

In lines 3 and 12 Payni 3 and Payni 4 appear respectively. They correspond to 28-29 May, not 29-30 May, as given in the edition. The date should be 28-29 May, AD 195.

## SB XIV 11859.

On this text CE 50, 1975, p.37 has “qui est sans doute romaine” instead of no date as in SB.

## SB XIV 11866 - 11868.

CE 51, 1976, pp.159-160 states that the second half of the second century BC is a more likely dating than the first half of the third century BC. SB XIV 11866 can therefore be dated to 8 January 147 BC or 5 January 136 BC.

SB XIV 11867 should be dated to the second half of the second century BC, not “2. Hälfte 1. Jahrh. v.Chr.” as stated in SB.

SB XIV 11868 mentions in line 3 a year 29. This can be taken as either year 29 of Ptolemaios VI Philometor, 153-152 BC, or that of Ptolemaios VIII Euergetes II, 142-141 BC.

## SB XIV 11887 - 11889.

Each of these documents is dated year 21 Mesore 4. Year 21 of Ptolemaios V Epiphanes lasted from 8 October, 185 BC to 7 October, 184 BC. In this period Mesore 4 corresponds to 6 September, 184 BC, not 6 September 185 BC, as given in SB on the basis of remarks in CE 56, 1981, p.349.

## SB XIV 11911.

Year 4 of Severus Alexander lasted from 29 August, AD 224 to 28 August, AD 225. Within this period Phaophi 13 fell on 10 October. Thus the date is 10 October, AD 224, not 10 October, AD 225, as given in the edition.

## SB XIV 11970.

In lines 13-14 what remains of the dating formula corresponds to 28 October to 26 November, AD 118, (for which one can compare G.Bastianini - J.E.Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt*, Firenze 1987, p.67) rather than AD 119, as given in the edition.

## SB XIV 11971.

In the ed.pr. in *Le monde grec. Hommages à Claire Préaux*, Bruxelles 1978, pp.611-621, the editor states on p.611 in the introduction to the text: "The payments . . . date from Choiak 6 of year 15 through Pharmouthi 30 of year 16 of the emperors Severus, Antoninus and Geta, that is, December 3, 207 A.D. to April 25, 209 A.D." The calculations are wrong. Year 15 of Septimius Severus was AD 206-207 and year 16 AD 207-208, in which allowance for a leap year has to be made. The corresponding Julian dates should have been calculated as 2 December, AD 206 to 25 April, AD 208. Thus the dating given in SB ("207-209 n.Chr.") should be changed to AD 206-208. As a result of identifying year 16 wrongly all the dates in lines 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 24 (p.613) are all a day out.

## SB XIV 11999.

On the basis of Bastianini's remarks (ZPE 47, 1982, p.218, n.42) and the appearance of ἀμοφοδογραμματα[εὑσι] Ἑρμο[υπ]όλεως in line 3 of the text, it is justifiable to state the provenience of the papyrus as Hermopolites (?). The date in SB XIV 11999, as well as in ZPE 18, 1975, p.226, n.6, is wrong. It was correctly converted to 24 February, AD 210 in ZPE 47, 1982, p.218.

## SB XIV 12104.

Year 4 of Tiberius lasted from AD 17-18. In this period Tybi 12 corresponds to 7 January, AD 18, not AD 17 as given in the edition.

## SB XIV 12117.

Instead of being dated 117-136 n.Chr. as stated in the SB, this text should be dated to 118-138 as can be found in G.Bastianini - J.E.Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt*, Firenze 1987, p.41. This dating accounts for the observation that such documents were usually submitted in the month of Mecheir (see P.Heid.IV 302, note on line 3, p.81). This makes a date in 117 AD very unlikely. There seems to be no reason for excluding the last two years of the reign of Hadrian.

## SB XIV 12180.

According to D.Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*, Darmstadt 1990, p.149, Commodus was honoured with the title Britannicus from the second half of the year AD 184 onwards. As Βρετα]γνικοῦ has been read in line 14 of this text it is possible to narrow the time span within which this document was written. This will have been on Hathyr 30 of the years AD 184-185 to AD 188-189 (the year has to be read as being in the twenties). The date can be given as 26 (or 27, where allowance for a leap year has to be made) November, AD 184-188.

## SB XIV 12210.

If the text is dateable to 322 AD (as stated in the SB), we can be sure that Tybi 20 corresponds to 15 January, AD 322, not "15./16. Januar", as given in the SB. It remains, however, quite possible that the account of the tenth indiction is being referred to in the eleventh indiction in which case a possible date is 15 January, AD 323.