



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Six Notes on Byzantine Documents

Worp, K.A.; Bagnall, R.S.

Citation

Worp, K. A., & Bagnall, R. S. (1982). Six Notes on Byzantine Documents. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik*, 46, 239-247. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/11141>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/11141>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

SIX NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS

a) P.Ant.II 102: a Note on the Date

This fragmentary loan of money was dated to A.D.390 by the editor on the basis of a restoration of the consular date, which is given as follows:

[Ἰπατί]ας Οὐαλεντι[νιανοῦ Αὐγούστου τὸ δ̄ καὶ Φλ(αούλου) Νεω-]
[τερίου] τοῦ λαμπροτά[του]

The following is given as the justification for this restoration: "The only year known to us when Valentinian shared the consulship with a *clarissimus* is A.D.390. Cf. P.Lips.38.1: 'Fl. Valentiniano semper Augusto IIII et Fl. Neoterio viro clarissimo'.

The one item which might confirm or disprove this date is the indiction numeral, partly preserved in line 11 but represented in the edition only by a dot. Now the month is Pachon (line 10 must at its end be restored something like ἀπὸ ... τοῦ ὄντος μηνός Πα-
11 χῶν), and in Antinoopolis in Pachon, 390, the indiction should be the 4th. We therefore asked R.A.Coles to confirm that delta was possible. He replied, however, that there was unmistakably a vertical stroke, as in gamma, eta, or iota.

There is one year in which the consuls were an emperor Valentinianus with a private person *and* in which the indiction was 3, 8, or 10(+), namely 445, a 14th indiction. We propose, therefore, the restoration:

[Ἰπατί]ας Οὐαλεντι[νιανοῦ Αὐγούστου τὸ ς' καὶ Φλαούλου]
[Νόμου] τοῦ λαμπροτά[του, Παχῶν .. τῆς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης ἐνδικ-]
(τίνου)

(The degree of abbreviation can of course vary, but later lines suggest about 33-35 letters lost along a straight break.)

The p.c. of 444 was still in use on 28.iii.445 (see CSBE 118). The only papyrus published to date referring to Valentinianus VI and Nomus is from 446 and has a much more elaborate titulature

(BGU XII 2141), but Worp will publish elsewhere two papyri dated to the postconsulate of Valentinianus VI and Fl.Nomus, in which the latter is simply called ὁ λαμπρότατος. From a xerox provided by Dr.Coles, we see no objection on palaeographical grounds to dating this papyrus in the middle of the fifth century. For the omission of τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν before Valentinian's name cf. *BASP* 16 (1979) 241.

b) P.Mich.inv.1378

J.Ö. 46 . 12646

The late Herbert Youtie published in *ZPE* 38 (1980) 289-91 an interesting receipt of A.D.326 for vestis militaris from the Oxyrhynchite Nome. Below it stands a receipt for primipilon and epikhephalaion, of which only three lines remain before the break. The fiscal period in question in these payments is described, in the editor's text, as (line 12) ὑπ(ὲρ) νέας ιε' ἰνδικ(τιόνος). Youtie pointed out in his note that there were no other known examples of νέα applied to an indiction during the first fifteen-year indiction cycle (312-327), and he went on to observe acutely, "the credibility of the reading νέας is impaired by the fact that all other examples of this way of dating place the adjective after the number of the indiction" (he refers to our discussion of νέα ἰνδικτίων in *CSBE* 30-35).

The reading also seems to us not to impose itself palaeographically, to judge from the plate (XVIIIa), as Youtie's heavy dotting also suggests. We are grateful to Professor Ludwig Koenen for providing us with an excellent enlarged photograph and the benefit of his own examination of the papyrus in response to our suggestions. In the dubious spot in line 12, we have no difficulty in reading γενήματα instead of νέας. Youtie had in fact raised the possibility of this reading (line 3n.: "tempting") but dismissed it: "this is a most unlikely reading since the word has nowhere been brought into contact with vestis militaris, πριμίπιλον or ἐπικεφάλαιον." Nonetheless, the reading is clear in line 12 and in line 3, also, we should read γ[ε]νήματος instead of π[.]..ματος (pi looks different in this hand, as Koenen observes). The use of γένημα to

refer to a period or unit of tax liability in these particular taxes is indeed remarkable, but in the case of the vestis militaris and primipilon we are dealing with taxes based on landholdings, in connection with which reference to the crop is understandable, since it was on the basis of the crop that all agriculture-based taxes were collected. Cf. the reference to γένημα in connection with meat in e.g. P.Flor.I 31.5. At all events, the instance of νέα ἰνδικτιῶν in the first cycle and before the numeral is eliminated.

We take the opportunity to note a few minor readings from the enlargement and from Koenen's study of the original: 1, read παρέσχο(ν). 2, probably στιχαρο(λου). 6, ογ'δοον Pap. 7, τεσσαρακοστογ'δ[ο]ον Pap.

c) P.Mil.I 86 (S.B. ~~XVI~~ 12523

This papyrus, which has been re-edited recently with a full commentary by M. Manfredi¹⁾ is dated by Oxyrhynchite era years read as ο λη// (i.e. 70-38) in line 7. In his note ad loc. the new editor rightly remarks: "dovrebbe essere ο λθ", but with his following statement "ma le tracce non corrispondono" we cannot agree. Consultation of a good photo kindly provided by Prof. O. Montevocchi which reached us before we got Manfredi's new edition and a check of the original by Bagnall make us certain that the papyrus really has the expected ο λθ{//. The left-hand part of the theta which follows immediately after the lambda has partly disappeared, and Manfredi has taken the remaining right-hand part in combination with the following sinusoidal curve arriving at an eta. There is thus no reason to suppose a scribal error in the registration of these era years (for the few papyri showing scribal errors in Oxy. era years cf. GRBS 20 (1979) 387 n.34²⁾).

It may be useful to communicate here a few readings made by us independently from Manfredi: line 5, we prefer ὄν instead of τῶν;

1) *Scritti in onore di Orsolina Montevocchi* (Bologna 1981) 207-15; plate on p. 216.

2) It should be noted that era years 118-87 read by Manfredi (p. 214) in PSI III 165.5 refer to A.D. 441/2, not to 442/3.

We propose the following restoration:

- 1 [† Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοπάτορος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ] θεοῦ
καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν καὶ τῆ[ς θεοτοκίας ἡμῶν τῆς ἀγίας]
- 2 [θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, ἔτους]
Διοκλητιανοῦ τριακοσιοστοῦ ὀγδοη[κοστοῦ - - - Month, Day,
Indiction, ἐν - -]

This formula is our formula 4B. As the two lines have indicated restorations of about the same length, we do not think it likely that there was any abbreviation or use of abbreviated Nomina Sacra in the lacunas at all (note in this respect that the words θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος are written out in full).

The date of the document falls between 663-673 (cf. CSBE 48). In this respect we should like to draw the attention of our readers to another document with a date by the era of Diocletian, viz. SB I 4665. The era year is given in the ed. princeps as year 373, A.D. 656/7, the indiction as 6, A.D. 662/3. Apparently there is a gross conflict between date by the era year and date by the indiction. In order to solve this conflict we have asked our colleague Dr. J. Gascou (Paris) to inspect the papyrus kept in the Louvre, and with his customary kindness he has done so with the following result: "La partie litigieuse, entre Διοκλητ() et Με- χεῖρ a 2 cms de longueur, ce qui laissait la place à environ 6 lettres. Même en supposant que le quantième de l'ère de Dioclétien ait été écrit en lettres de gros calibre, cela ne suffirait pas à occuper toute la place disponible, or on voit des traces d'écriture sur toute la longueur des 2 cms. La première lettre-chiffre est assurément un tau, la 2me pourrait être un omicron, mais un qoppa serait plus difficile à justifier. La 3me, lue gamma par l'éd. pourrait à la rigueur être le reste de la barre horizontale d'un theta. On aurait donc le quantième τοθ. Entre ce que j'appellerais donc un theta et le M de Μεχεῖρ, il y a d'autres traces d'une ou deux lettres que je ne sais comment interpréter (à l'extrême rigueur εν)". This solves the apparent conflict between era date and indictional date. Diocl. year 379 = A.D. 662/63 and matches with a 6th indiction (A.D. 662/63). The date of the document is now firmly established on 9.ii.663, and the document is no longer our first testimony for the use of the era of Diocletian in a papyrus contract (cf. BGU I 312 from A.D. 656/7 or 657/8).

e) SB I 4858: a Re-edition

In the course of our study of invocations in documentary papyri our attention was drawn to SB I 4858. This papyrus (kept in the Louvre as E 4381 App.792) would be our earliest extant specimen of an invocatio written at the top of a document, dated to 2.vi.591 (Fayum), and it would present a slightly deviant formula of a Christ invocation, in that it would present line 1 as follows:

[† 'Εν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ]. In comparison with a normal Christ invocation ἡμῶν would be superfluous, and we expected here a mistaken reading of δεσπότης.

A check of a photostat kindly provided by Dr.H.Harrauer and Dr. J.M.Diethart (Vienna) revealed that a number of more serious errors were made by the first editor of this text, and that a new transcript of the papyrus was called for. We provide this herewith.

- 1 [† 'Εν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότης Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
- 2 [τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν, βασιλεῖ[ας τοῦ θεοῦ] ὁτ[ί]του)
- 3 [καὶ εὐσεβ[ε]σταίου ἡμῶν δεσπότης Φλ[αυίου] Μαυρικίου Τι[βε-
ρίου] τοῦ αἰωνίου)
- 4 [Αὐγ[ού]στου] Αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους] ιθ Πα[ύ]νι η τέλει [τῆς
τ]ρ[ί]της [ν]δικτιῶνος ἐν Ἀρ[σιν]ῳ).
- 5 [Φλ[αυίου] Στρατηγῶ] τῷ πανευφήμῳ ὑπ[ά]ρχῳ (καὶ) παγάρχῳ τῆς τε
- 6 [Ἀρ[σιν]οιτῶν] καὶ θεοδοσιουπολιτῶν Αὐρήλιοι[ς]
- 7 [Φοιβάμμ]ων υἱὸς Μακαρίου καὶ ἕτερος Φοιβάμμων
- 8 [ὁ καὶ Πεβᾶ]ς υἱὸς Σαμβᾶ μεθλιτῆ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως
- 9 [ἀπὸ ἀμφ]όδοιο ὁ μὲν προγεγραμμένος Φοιβάμμων
- 10 [.....]ς, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος Φοιβάμμων Γυναικίου χ[αί]ρειν).
- 11 [ὁμο]λογοῦμεν ἐκουσίῳ γνώμῃ ὥστε μὴ ἔξεῖναι ἡμᾶς
- 12 [μήτ' ἄλλ]ον τιν[ὲ]ς ἐκ [προ]σώπου ἡμῶν [

Verso

- 13 [. γενναί(εν) ὑπὸ Αὐρ[ηλίου] Φοιβάμμωνος καὶ]
- 14 [Φοιβάμμωνος] τοῦ (καὶ) Πεβᾶ μεθλιτῆ

Apparently we are dealing with some kind of contract between two *methlitai* and the pagarch Fl.Strategius, but the exact nature of

this contract escapes us, as the text breaks off after the declaration that the *methlitai* will not be allowed to ...

Notes:

1-2. The invocation runs now along normal patterns. Cf. in general our forthcoming article "Christian Invocations in the Papyri", *CdE* 56 (1981).

2-4. The exact date of the contract is now certain. Payni 8, regnal Mauricius 19, end of the 3rd indiction = 2.vi.600. The date of the text should be corrected accordingly in *RFBE* 62, form.8.

4. Of course, it is possible to restore only Ἀβγοῦστου written out in full. The first editor printed ἐπ' Ἀρ(σινουιτῶν πόλεως), but we prefer ἐν Ἀρ(σινόῃ). In fact, we have not seen any papyrus which unequivocally has ἐπ', and we think that all instances of printed ἐπ' rest on editorial error.

5. For the restoration of Strategius' name cf. *P.Lond.*I 113 5(c).6 + *BL* I 237. The London papyrus dates from 8.viii.600. It does not seem excluded that his name may be also restored in *SB* I 4721, though that papyrus apparently dates from A.D.589/590. It is clear that this Strategius cannot be identical with the Strategius II of the Apion family (cf. *P.Oxy.*XVI, p.6), and there is no chance that he may be identified with Strategius III (cf. *P.Oxy.*XVI, p.5, where the date of *P.Oxy.*XVI 1991 should be corrected to 601 according to information kindly provided by Dr.Zb.Borkowski), as this son of Apion III was ca. 6 years old at the time of the writing of this contract (information kindly provided by Dr.J.Gascou). For Strategius III cf. also *CdE* 41 (1966) 179.

6. We are surprised that Ἀρσινουιτῶν is abbreviated, Θεοδοσιουπολιτῶν written out in full.

8. For the restoration of the alias-name cf. the verso, line 14. The exact meaning of *methlitai* is unknown (cf. *LSJ*⁹, s.v. μεθελιτης). On the basis of our new reading the form μεθελιτῆριος disappears and should be deleted from all lexica. Is there a connection between this word and μέθυ?

10. At the start of this line a name of an amphodon is lost in the lacuna. For the amphodon Γυναίκιου cf. already C.Wessely, Die Stadt Arsinoe, 25. F.Preisigke (*Namenbuch*, s.v. Γυναίκιος) takes this as a personal name and omits it from his *WB* III, Abschn.22. We do not know of any other attestation of this amphodon which is not mentioned by A.Calderini-S.Daris, *Dizionario geografico*, vol.II.

14. We assume that here the same man is mentioned as in line 8.

f) PSI XIV 1423 = Naldini 45

This private letter, from Eulogius to his father Sakaon, is of interest for the price quoted in it for the solidus, 16 myriads of denarii, which indicates a price per pound for gold of 11,520,000 den. or 7,680 talents. No date is preserved, but the editor restored in line 15 a mention of a year 9; and the provenance is unknown. There is a further point of note, a calculation of the value of two vessels, the material of which is not stated.

To take the first of these points, a forthcoming study by Bagnall will argue that the gold price can be dated approximately to the later 330's. There is no year 9 which can be identified in this period; the 9th year of Constans fell in 341/2, but a reference to this year by year 9 alone, omitting year 18 of Constantius II, would be unthinkable; and in fact in this period regnal dating is virtually extinct save in the Oxyrhynchite, where Constantine's posthumous count was also still in use (year 36)³. There is thus reason to be suspicious of the text⁴. We find in fact the following: δέδημα δέ μετ' αὐτῶν τὸ θάλλιν [έτο]υς θ μου. It is apparent that the word order is also curious: a reference to a ninth year would normally put 'ninth' before 'year'. The reading, however, is sound, although three letters may be somewhat too much for the lacuna⁵. We have not been able to find a suitable restoration, but we do not think that [έτο]υς will do⁶.

The calculation about the cup and censer are as follows: καυκίν καὶ θύσκιν ἔχοντες λί(τραν) α (ούγκίας) θ γράμματα ιζ ὡς τῆς λί(τρας) α μωρ(ιάδες) πε καὶ τὸ ζυγο(στασι)ου (τάλαντα) β 'Δ, γ(ίνονται) μωρ(ιάδες) ρνδ x Βφ. PSI XIV, with the customary

3) Cf. our *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (Zutphen 1978) 74.

4) We can also exclude the idea that we are dealing with a ninth indiction (the nearest would be 335/6), since we do not find έτος instead of λνδικτιών for reference to indiction years.

5) The fibers have come loose and moved to the right. Bagnall has examined the original under a microscope. The upsilon, although damaged, seems unavoidable.

6) One might suggest [το]υ σ<τα>θμοϋ, but we are not sure what the point would be, and the assumption of scribal error in the immediate vicinity of a lacuna does not commend itself.

sobriety of that series, did not offer a translation, and the notes were brief. One reviewer was unable, without help, to follow the calculation: "Mit den Geldsummen Z.9-12 gestehe ich nicht zurecht zu kommen; sollen 2 Tal. 4000 Dr. = (154-85 =) 69 Myriaden sein?"⁷⁾ Evidently Zucker did not understand the use of $\delta\zeta$. In Naldini's edition, however, the passage is translated correctly: "... coppa e l'incensiere di una libbra (e) 9 once, grammi 17, al prezzo di 85 miriadi alla libbra, e il valore della pesa pubblica 2 talenti 4000 dracme, che fanno miriadi 154 denari 2500."⁸⁾ The general accuracy of the calculation may easily be verified:

288 gr. at 85 myriads per lb.	850,000 den.
233 gr. at 85 myriads per lb.	687,674 den.
weighing fee	4,000 den.
	<hr/>
	1,541,674 den.

Stated total in papyrus 1,542,500 den.

Since the amounts of the first pound and the weighing fee were easy to calculate, the error must lie in the second figure, which differs from the 688,500 presupposed in the total by 826, or .12%, a very small amount of error considering the methods of ancient arithmetic of fractions.

About the material, it is not hard to find the answer. There are not too many possibilities, after all, and since the ratio of the prices of gold and this material is 13.55:1, we may be sure that silver was the main ingredient: not pure silver, of course (which would be too soft for use in vessels in any case), but an alloy. Assuming a bullion ratio of 12:1 (which is the ratio always in use in the early fourth century) for gold and silver, we might suppose that the silver was about 88% fine. By comparison, modern sterling silver is 92.5% fine, about the maximum amount of silver at which the metal is still usable for implements and vessels⁹⁾.

New York
Amsterdam

Roger S. Bagnall
Klaas A. Worp

7) F. Zucker, *Archiv* 17 (1962) 112.

8) M. Naldini, *Il cristianesimo in Egitto* (Firenze 1968) 206-08, no. 45.

9) Cf. in general for silver and gold vessels, Th. Reil, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Gewerbes* (Borna-Leipzig 1913) 57.