

NIKOLAOS GONIS

CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON III.-V. CENTURY DOCUMENTS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 123 (1998) 196–198

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON III.-V. CENTURY DOCUMENTS

P^Athen 56

The date of this third century document from the Arsinoite nome¹ is given in line 9, which was printed as follows:

⊥ α // Θὼθ ι . . [

‘This could possibly be a genuine dating by Macrianus and Quietus, but it is likely that the year number has been mis-read or was a scribal slip, probably for year 2’ (D. W. Rathbone, *ZPE* 62 (1986) 104 [similarly on p. 118] = BL VIII 390). Examination of the original² has shown that the papyrus has

⊥ α // Θὼθ ι . // [

The reading of the year figure is certain. As for the day number, this may well be ιγ. After ι there is a blank space of a few mm, and then what seems to be the right-hand tip of a high horizontal; the letter that would best fit space and trace is gamma (I rule out zeta). If the scribe is not in error, and my reading is correct, the date of this text is Thoth 13, i.e. 10 September, 260, making it the earliest Egyptian dating of Macrianus and Quietus;³ in fact they may have been recognised in the Fayum from as early as 2 September (Thoth 5), see Rathbone, loc. cit. 119.⁴ Their second earliest occurrence is 17 September (Thoth 10) (POxy XLIX 3476.12f.).⁵

P^Harr I 150

This document was assigned to the fifth century. Its dating clause, as published, reads as follows (line 8):

ιβ ἰνδ(ικτίονος), Ἀθὺρ κς, (ἔτους) [

There is mention of γενήματος τετάρτης ἰνδικτίονος in line 3. The editor noted: ‘Both τετάρτης (l. 3) and ιβ (l. 8) are certain; but a payment in the produce of eight years back appears remarkable’. Another unusual feature of the text is the succession of the elements of the dating clause: indiction, month, year. Inspection of the original at Birmingham has removed all singularity; the papyrus in fact bears a precise date, and that is by the Oxyrhynchite era:⁶

⊥ πβ| να|/ Ἀθὺρ κς|/ [

The date converts to 22 November 405; and Oxyrhynchite era year 82/51 actually coincides with a fourth indiction, see R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *The Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* 79, 97. The

¹ On this text see further D. Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-Century AD Egypt* 54, 69, 191, 416.

² I wish to thank Ms. I. Ninou, who is in charge of the archives of the Athens Archaeological Society, for providing access to the papyrus.

³ For further references on these usurpers see D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*² 225f.

⁴ POxy XIV 1698 is dated to Thoth 13, Year 1 of an unnamed emperor. According to Rathbone, loc. cit. 104 ‘a scribal slip must be assumed, probably for year 2’.

⁵ Another textual point may be discussed at this point. In the edition lines 5-8 run ἔχον παρὰ τοῦ τὰς ὄψε[ι]λλεσ τῆ εὐσχήμεν[ι] | πυροῦ ἀρτάβας δέκα [καὶ οἴνου] | μέτρα ὀκτώ / [. Rathbone, op. cit. 191 n. 17 suggested that lines 7-8 should be read πυροῦ ἀρτάβας δέκα | μέτρα ὀκτώ (γίνονται) [(ἀρτάβαι) ι μ(έτρα) η]. But what the first editor interpreted as a slanting stroke after ὀκτώ is a clear iota ligatured to omega (for the erroneous addition of ι to ω in final position see F. T. Gignac, *Grammar* i 185). Then at the end of line 7 there is a trace not reported in the edition; it can best be described as the lower part of a left-hand curve, or the base of a rounded letter. In the context, I suppose that this could be the base of kappa, and the papyrus had κ[αί]; for artabas καὶ μέτρα cf. PMich II 127.2.29 (45-46), CPR I 43.3 (iii), SB XVI 12943.3 (vi). I would thus propose that lines 7-8 be read as πυροῦ ἀρτάβας δέκα, κ[αί] | μέτρα ὀκτώ.

⁶ A very similar case of misunderstanding of an Oxyrhynchite era dating is discussed in R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 101 (1994) 97: in PYale inv. 499.4 the ἰδ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) of the ed. pr. turned out to be ⊥ οε μδ.

dating clause must be complete: at that time the indiction was not normally mentioned in dating formulas of Oxyrhynchite documents, cf. K. A. Worp, *APF* 33 (1987) 94.

PLond III 991 (p. 258)

The dating clause of this document, following the revision of R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *BASP* 17 (1980) 7-8 (= BL VIII 183), should read [μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ(αουίου) Βασι]λείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀποδιχθησομένου Παῦνι κη τῆ[ς ? ἰνδ(ικτίονος)]. The text ‘falling on Pauni 28 = 22 June, must ... belong to 481 and provide the earliest evidence so far attested of the knowledge of Basilius’ consulate in Egypt’ (loc. cit. 8). This is eminently possible, but the date clause of the Hermopolite CPR X 118, published six years after the *BASP* article, has shown that, at least in the Thebaid, the (second) postconsulate⁷ of Basilius, the consul of 480,⁸ was used as late as 13 (?) October 482: [μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν] Φλ(αουίου) Βασιλείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ δηλωθῆσομένου Φαῶφι ς ς ἰνδ(ικτίονος). In PLond III 991, which may well come from the Thebaid too, the indiction number is lost in lacuna. It seems, therefore, that we should also reckon with an alternative date for this text, i.e. 22 June 482. The indiction should be the fifth, if the date is 481, or the sixth, if the date is 482.⁹

POxy X 1334

This fragmentary order from ‘the mother of Eutropia’ presents a peculiar date: Thoθ (day number lost) of an Oxyrhynchite year given as 93/64, a false combination. Faced with this anomaly, the editors proposed that the scribe perhaps intended 94/63. This interpretation was challenged later, and 93 was thought to be correct, with 64 a mistake for 62, in which case the date of the text would be 416 (BL VIII 244). But it may be worth considering whether 64 is right and 93 an error for 95. We know of one more order to pay issued by the same woman, POxy XVI 1953, which is dated to 21 Mecheir of year 95/64, i.e. 15 February 419. The hand responsible for the two documents is identical.¹⁰ It thus seems worth envisaging the possibility that the two documents were written within the period of just a few months, and POxy X 1334 dates from the period 29 August - 27 September 418.¹¹

POxy LX 4074

This document is dated by the consuls of 307, Maximinus and Severus. The recent publication of POxy LXIII 4355, of 20 November 307, provides the earliest instance of the omission of the name of the deceased Severus from the consular formulas. Accordingly, 20 November 307 is a *terminus ante quem* for POxy LX 4074 (cf. POxy LXIII 4354.1-3 n.).

PSI Congr XX 17

The dating clause (line 5) of this document, as printed, runs (ἔτους) ρξ ρκθ Παῦνι ιγ/ [(7.vi.484). But at that time dating formulas normally mention the indiction. We should thus supplement ζ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) in the lacuna; cf., e. g., PLaur III 95.5, POxy XVI 1950.4, PWisc II 64.4.¹²

⁷ For a discussion of second postconsulates see Bagnall-Worp, *CSBE* 50-2.

⁸ For this consul and the occurrences of his consulate in Egypt see R. S. Bagnall et al., *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* 495, 497, 499.

⁹ In the case that PLond III 991 dates from 482, this might help explain the mistake in the consular formula of BGU XII 2155 (18.x.481), for which see Bagnall-Worp, *BASP* 17 (1980) 8.

¹⁰ I have inspected POxy X 1334 in the British Library, where it is now kept; for POxy XVI 1953, now lost, I rely on the reproduction in NPS 2. s., Pt. 10-11, Pl. 157d. I draw the opportunity to note that in POxy X 1334.1 the papyrus has ἡ μήτηρ Εὐτροπή[ς, as in POxy XVI 1953, and not Εὐτροπία[ς, as reported in POxy XVI 1953 introd. (= BL VII 137).

¹¹ Papyri with scribal errors in Oxyrhynchite year numbers are extremely few; see R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *GRBS* 20 (1979) 287 and n. 34; also *BASP* 17 (1980) 21.

¹² All these texts are of the same kind. I draw the opportunity to note that PLaur III 95 is by the same hand as PWisc II 64; the hand of PSI Congr XX 17 is similar, but probably not identical.

SB XVIII 13896

This text is an *Überstellungsbefehl* issued by the komarchs of Boubastos concerning a man who was accused by the dekaprotoi. It bears no date, but was placed to 242-54. The 242 terminus was suggested by the officials who occur in the text; for the first editor, the dekaprotoi made their first appearance between 242 and 246, while the komarchs were (re)introduced between 245 and 247.¹³ But in this reasoning, the upper terminus should be 245. As for the lower terminus, the editor assumed that since the back side contains a letter mentioning Pallas, whose activities as recorded in the Heroneinos archive span the period 254-64, the *Überstellungsbefehl* should not be later than 254. This is entirely possible. But the same archive has furnished examples of quick reuse of papyrus, cf. E. G. Turner, *BASP* 15 (1978) 163ff. To conclude, I suggest that the date range of this text should be 245-264.

Wolfson College, Oxford

Nikolaos Gonis

¹³ For N. Lewis, *The Compulsory Public Services of Roman Egypt*² s.v. the earliest occurrence for the liturgic office of the dekaproteia is PLeit 16 = PWisc II 86, of 245-7 (for the date see POxy LVIII 3925.8-9 n.; also F. Mitthof, *ZPE* 99 (1993) 99f., 107f.). 245 is the date of the latest occurrence of komogrammateis in papyri of the third century, while POxy XLIV 3178, of 28 August 248, provides the *terminus ante quem* for the introduction of the komarch; see J. D. Thomas, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 111-19, and Lewis, *op. cit.* s.vv.