

de, und zwar in VDI 1952 Nr.2, 201-215. Leider ist dieser Aufsatz im Westen unbeachtet geblieben, und auch der Hinweis hierauf von I.F.Fikhman (Archiv 20, 1970, 136 Anm.3) hat für die Berichtigungsliste und das Sammelbuch keine Folgen gehabt. Weil die russische Zeitschrift im Westen leider des öfteren schwer zu finden und obiger Text völlig unabhängig zustande gekommen ist, halte ich es für angebracht, diese (Wieder-)Entdeckung hier zu veröffentlichen.

publ. Bl. 7
in SB 18

Amsterdam

Klaas A.Worp

REMARKS ON THE DATES OF SOME DOCUMENTS FROM EARLY BYZANTINE EGYPT

In a review of a collection of imperial titulature in dating formulas in Byzantine Egypt J.R.Rea¹⁾ has contributed a number of valuable observations on documents written under Diocletian which deserve a follow-up. I should like to add to this a few observations of my own on other documents as well.

a. *The dating formula in PSI III 162:*

Rea supposes that the editorial reading in line 27 of this papyrus is wrong in that Maximian's name should wrongly lack Valerius in the dating formula. A xerox of the papyrus, kindly provided by Dr.R.Pintaudi (Firenze), shows that the editorial reading is correct. The end of line 27 surely reads:

- - - Μάρκου Αύρηλλίου Μαξιμι[ανοῦ]

and there is no space for inserting Ούαλερίου after Αύρηλλίου. At the same time it should be observed that the element "Valerius" does occur in Maximian's name in the oath formula in line 8, so we must regard the omission as a scribal oversight. The presentation of the papyrus in RFBE 3, formula B.1, is thus correct.

b. *P.Lond.III 958 descr. (p.χλιπ, cf. p.333):*

Rea rightly supposes that the presentation of the regnal formula occurring in this papyrus is not correct. I have now seen a microfilm of the papyrus, and the remains of the dating formula are to be read as follows:

∟ ιγ'' Αὐτοκράτορος [
 Αύρηλλίου Ούαλερίου Μαξιμι[ανοῦ]
 Κωνσταντίου καὶ Γαλερί[ου]

These remains allow for 2 alternative restorations,

1°: ∟ ιγ'' Αὐτοκράτορος [Καίσαρος Γαίου Αύρηλλίου Ούαλερίου Διοκλήτιανου] καὶ
 ∟ ιβ'' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου]
 Αύρηλλίου Ούαλερίου Μαξιμι[ανοῦ] Εὐσεβῶν Εὐτυχῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ ∟ ε'' τῶν
 κυρ[ῶν] ἡμῶν Φλαυτίου Ούαλερίου]
 [Κωνσταντίου] καὶ [Γαλερί[ου] Ούαλερίου Μαξιμιανοῦ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Καισά-
 ρων]

but also of

1) Cf. JEA 70 (1984) 189-190. The review concerns R.S.Bagnall-K.A.Worp, Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt, Missoula 1979 (= BASP Suppl.2). Rea does not pay attention to the fact that the editors of RFBE, 5, form.5, misrepresent the formula of BGU I 13.18-20, in that Αὐτοκράτορος is omitted incorrectly before Διοκλήτιανου.

2°: / ιγ'' Αὐτοκράτορος [Καίσαρος Γαίου Αὐρηλίου Οὐαλερίου (Διοκλητιανού) καὶ
 / ιβ'' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου]
 Αὐρηλίου Οὐαλερίου (Μαξιμι[ανού] Γερμανικῶν μεγίστων Σαρματικῶν μεγίστων
 καὶ / ε'' Φλαουίου Οὐαλερίου]
 (Κωνσταντίου) καὶ (Γαλερί[ου] Οὐαλερίου Μαξιμιανοῦ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Καισάρων
 Ἐύσεβῶν Εὐτυχῶν Σεβαστῶν]

The first alternative may be compared with the dating formula in P.Wisc. II 58.1 and 59.1 (for these texts see below), the second alternative may be compared with those found in P.Lips.4.2, 5.10 and P.IFAO I 9.18 (all from year 10-9-2 = A.D. 293/4; P.Lips.4 and 5 are from Hermopolis, P.IFAO I 9 has no known provenance). As P.Lond.III 958 may come from Hermopolis, too, and as the lacuna in the 3rd line of the dating formula is better filled with the formula found in the 2 other Hermopolitan texts than with the formula found in P.Wisc.II 58-59, it is slightly preferable to choose the 2nd alternative restoration. So much is certain, however, that formula 2 in RFBE 10 is no longer existing.

c. P.Wisc.II 58 and 59:

Rea rightly remarks that Valerius is wrongly omitted from Diocletian's name in formula 3 in RFBE 10; but there is more to be said. The first editor of these texts (Arsinoe, year 14-13-6 = A.D. 297/8) has introduced a novelty in normal dating formulas mentioning the Augustus Maximian by restoring in P.Wisc.II 58.2 Γαίου Οὐαλερίου Μαξιμιανοῦ in the lacuna at the right of the line and by reading/restoring Γαί]ου Οὐαλερίου Μαξιμιαν[οῦ in P.Wisc.II 59.3. A comparison of the dating formulas mentioning the full names of Maximian shows that his first name, if mentioned, always was Galerius rather than Gaius. Therefore, this principle should be adhered to in both Wisconsin papyri as well; in P.Wisc.II 58.2 restore Γαλερίου Οὐαλερίου Μαξιμιανοῦ and in 59.3 read/restore: - - - Γαλερί]ου Οὐαλερίου Μαξιμιαν[οῦ - - -.

Of course, the standard formula in RFBE 10, form.3, should be adapted.

d. The names Aurelius Valerius used for both Diocletian and Maximian.

Rea correctly points out that Diocletian's name originally was Gaius Valerius Diocletianus, and that all papyri dating from his sole reign giving his full name follow this principle. Rea adds: "It seems reasonably evident that at some point Maximian and Diocletian each added the other's nomen to his own and so both became Aurelius Valerius." The question is: when did this event take place? The latest papyrus giving the name Gaius Aurelius Diocletianus is SB IV 7443.23 (Oxy., 30.xii.285), the earliest document mentioning both Diocletian and Maximian styled "Aurelius Valerius" is BGU IV 1090.34 (Hermop., 31.iii.286). The latter document was evidently written shortly

after Maximian became a co-emperor on 1.iii.286²⁾ and it seems only natural to suppose that this elevation of rank offered a suitable opportunity for each emperor to accommodate his own name to that of the partner. A similar occasion, the vicennalia of their joint rule in A.D.303, occasioned the assimilation of their regnal year count from "Year 20 Diocletian, 19 Maximian, 12 Caesars" to "Year 20 Diocletian and Maximian, 12 Caesars"; cf. A.Chastagnol in *Rev.Num.*9 (1967) 54-81 and J.D.Thomas in *CdE* 46 (1971) 173-179.

e. *The consular dating formula in PSI XIII 1338.*

The consular dating formula occurring in PSI XIII 1338.1 is listed in CSBE 104, year 299 with the remark that the editors' date should be changed from 10.x. to 11.x. The document stands out from the other texts dating from year 299 in that only in this text the iteration numerals for Diocletian and Maximian would be lacking, whereas these numerals are normally given. When one consults the edition, one sees that the name of the 2nd consul, Maximian, has been fully restored, and it may well be asked whether the lacuna offers enough space for a restoration of his name and the iteration numerals which should follow each consul. Upon my request Dr.R.Pintaudi has kindly checked the original of the papyrus and sent me a xerox of it. This enabled me to confirm Pintaudi's opinion that the lacuna is indeed spacious enough to have originally contained [τὸ ζ καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τὸ ς] σξβ[αστῶν]. PSI XIII 1338, therefore, should no longer be regarded as an exception to normal practice as regards consular datings from A.D.299.

f. *The date of WO II 1306.*

This ostrakon was discussed in latest instance by H.C.Youtie, *TAPA* 89 (1958) 380-83 = *Scriptiunculae* I 290-93; before that, P.Viereck (*Archiv* 1, 1901, 467) and L.Amundsen (*O.Oslo* 17-21, commentary, p.40 n.1) had already tried to improve upon Wilcken's text which is recorded below with subsequent proposals for improved readings:

1 θη(σαυρῶ) κώμηϛ	Youtie: θη(σαυροῦ)
2 Ἰερᾶϛ Νεικολᾶου	
3 /S ιη S .. S ς ὀνόμα-	Viereck: /S ιηS κηS ς;
4 τοϛ Κάσιος κατ' Ἰσίδω-	Amundsen: γ(εν)ή(ματος) ιηS ιςS ιS (301/302) or ιηS ιςS ηS (323/324)

2) For the date on which Maximian became a co-emperor cf. *Regnal Formulas* (supra, n.1), p.xi (taken over from *PLRE* I 574). There is, I think, no reason at all to assume that BGU IV 1090.iv.34-39 (a receipt dated by the Augusti Diocletian and Maximian on 31.iii.286) was not written on that day, cf. T.D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, 4 n.6 (who refers to C.Vandersleyen, *Chronologie des Préfets d'Egypte*, 36, for this papyrus and follows the authority of *Chron.Min.*I 229; I would rather think that in the latter source "Kal.Apr." should be regarded as a mistake for "Kal.Mar.").

5 ρος δι (δ) Ἀσῆπ (?) ὀνηλάτο[υ]

6 σακ../ ε/ Χοιάκ κ[.].

Viereck: σακκοφ(όρου), Χοιάκ κ;
Youtie: σάκκοι ε/

2 Νικολάου 4-5 Κασίου καὶ Ἰσιδώρου

As regards Viereck's proposal Youtie commented: "If this is what the ostrakon really has, it is as meaningless as Wilcken's partial reading." On the other hand, Youtie was convinced that Amundsen was right in recognizing in line 3 a series of regnal years which would advance the date of the ostrakon to the first quarter of the fourth century. However, a reading of either years $\eta\varsigma \iota\zeta \iota\varsigma$ or $\eta\varsigma \iota\zeta \eta\varsigma$ would not square sufficiently with the indications given by Wilcken and Viereck, and Youtie's final verdict as regards the date of the ostrakon, based upon a comparison of prosopographical data of this ostrakon with persons occurring in P.Cair.Isid., was: "between 298 and 314, and probably closer to 314 than to 324". [Presumably, the first "314" is a misprint for "324", KAW.] There is, I think, a reading of the litigious line possible which does square with the indications given by Wilcken, Viereck, Amundsen and Youtie. There are, after all, 3 strings of regnal years which start with a year "18" and which all occur in the first quarter of the fourth century. Two of them have been recognized by Amundsen, the third became known for the first time only 2 years after Amundsen published his O.Oslo. This third alternative is: $\gamma(\epsilon\nu)\acute{\eta}(\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma) \eta\varsigma$ καὶ $\zeta\varsigma$, i.e. year 18 of Galerius and year 6 of Maximinus in A.D. 309/310; it was found for the first time in some O.Mich.I (published in 1935). Remarkably enough, it occurs also a number of times in P.Cair.Isid., i.e. the collection of documents used by Youtie for establishing an approximate date of this ostrakon (cf. R.S.Bagnall - K.A.Worp, Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt, 33-34, for a list of attestations).

I cannot find any real obstacle against a reading and date as suggested above³⁾, and the only problem remaining is to explain what went wrong with Viereck's suggestion for what followed $\eta\varsigma$. I can think of 2 possibilities, a. Viereck was really reading the word καὶ as $\kappa\eta\varsigma$ (and then he apparently looked for a year-number; for the confusion of η/α , cf. H.C.Youtie, The Textual criticism of Documentary Papyri. Prolegomena, London 1974², 68 [= BICS Suppl.33]), or b. his correct reading was botched up in Archiv 1 (1901) 467 (the printer may have misread Viereck's manuscript and Viereck did not correct the printer's mistake).

Amsterdam

K.A.Worp

3) My suggestion implies a reading of $\zeta\varsigma$ for Wilcken's $\varsigma\varsigma$. This is, after all, the expected order of signs, and it may be that either Wilcken's text rests upon a mistaken reading (sti and double curve may look rather similar) or upon a misprint. It is even conceivable that the ς forms part of the end of καὶ and that no double curve followed the sti (as it followed the first year-numeral $\eta\varsigma$).

SUPPLICA AD ATENA SU UN OSTRAKON DA ESNA *)

Esna (Latopolis)

cm.9.8 x 9

I/II sec. d.C.

Taf. IV a

O.Cair.J.E.38622. Un ostrakon, allorché non presenta una ricevuta o una lista, un ordine o un appunto, un messaggio banale o un conto, in genere attrae facilmente l'attenzione dell'uno o dell'altro studioso e viene edito con celerità. Simile sorte non è però toccata all'O.Cairo.J.E.38622, il cui contenuto si sottrae pur esso alla scoraggiante ripetitività dei testi su cocchio. Trovato da J.Garstang a Esna, entro la necropoli dei pesci lates, durante gli scavi condotti tra il 1905 e il 1906¹⁾, il reperto fu trasferito senza indugi al Museo Egizio del Cairo, come si apprende da una nota del Journal d'Entrée. Giunto al Museo, venne esposto, non troppi anni dopo, in una vetrina centrale della Salle des Papyrus, ma là è rimasto impubblicato per innumerevoli decenni, sebbene porti un'allettante e inconsueta supplica ad Atena.

Il testo è stilato in una grafia d'ufficio, che dapprima scorre ampia e quasi senza legamenti (ll.1-7), poi si fa più veloce e più fitta (ll.8-9), e nelle righe conclusive, di cui l'ultima è tracciata entro il margine sinistro, assume un andamento prettamente corsivo (ll.10-12). Là dove è più accurata e lenta (ll.1-9), scrittura siffatta si palesa affine a quelle che mostrano P. Berol.inv.6854 (cfr. Schubart, Paläographie, Abb.34), P.Amh.II 64 (Pl.XIV) e PGB 22 b, tutti collocati sotto i regni di Traiano e di Adriano. Sicché, in

*) Prima di proporre l'edizione del testo esprimo la mia gratitudine al dott.Mohamed Saleh, direttore del Museo Egizio del Cairo, che mi ha prontamente concessa l'autorizzazione a pubblicare il reperto, e a Mr.Mohamed Gomah, ispettore nello stesso museo, che mi ha agevolato il lavoro iniziale sull'ostrakon. Rivolgo, inoltre, un riconoscente pensiero al dott.Jan Quaegebeur per i proficui suggerimenti che mi ha offerti; e in particolar modo ringrazio il dott.Willy Clarysse, che, avendo saputo del mio lavoro sull'O. Cair., non solo ha rinunciato a proseguire i suoi studi su una fotografia del reperto da lui trovata all'Università di Liverpool, negli archivi di J. Garstang, ma mi ha altresì fornito spontaneamente il suo aiuto per interpretare i passi meno agevoli del testo.

1) Una relazione sulla campagna archeologica, stilata dallo stesso Garstang, è apparsa in ASAE 8, 1907, 132-48 (in partic. pg.141sgg.). Ivi non si fa menzione alcuna al ritrovamento di ostraka greci; tuttavia, l'esatta provenienza di O.Cair.J.E.38622 è assicurata sia da un'annotazione inserita nel Journal d'Entrée, sia da un appunto annesso alla fotografia del cocchio inclusa nell'archivio di Garstang, sul quale mi ha gentilmente informato l'amico Willy Clarysse.