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:

['Ὑπατί]ας Οὐαλεντι[νιανοῦ Αὐγούστου τὸ δ̄ καὶ Φλ(αουίου) Νεω-]
[τερίου] τοῦ λαμπροτάτ[ου

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 μηνὸς Πα]-
[11]χὼν), 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:

['Ὑπατ]ίας Οὐαλεντι[νιανοῦ Αὐγούστου τὸ ς' καὶ Φλαουίου]
[Νόμου] τοῦ λαμπροτά[του, Παχὼν .. τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης ἰνδικ-
          (τίονος)]

(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 δεσπότου ἡμῶν before Valentinian's name cf. *BASP* 16 (1979) 241.

b) P.Mich.inv.1378

The late Herbert Youtie published in *ZPE* 38 (1980) 289-91 an
interesting receipt of A.D.326 for vestis militaris from the Oxy-
rhynchite Nome. Below it stands a receipt for primipilon and epi-
kephalaion, 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(τίονος). Youtie
pointed out in his note that there were no other known examples
of νέα applied to an indiction during the first fifteen-year in-
diction 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 ἰν-
δικτίων in *CSBE* 30-35).

The reading also seems to us not to impose itself palaeographi-
cally, to judge from the plate (XVIIIa), as Youtie's heavy dotting
also suggests. We are grateful to Professor Ludwig Koenen for pro-
viding 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
γενήμ(ατος) instead of νέας. Youtie had in fact raised the possi-
bility 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 ἐπικεφά-
λαιον." 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 milita-
ris 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 ἰνδικτίων in the first cycle and before the numeral is elimi-
nated.

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 στιχαρ(ίου).   6, ογ˙δοον Pap.   7, τεσ-
σαρακοστογ˙δ[ο]ον Pap.

c) P.Mil.I 86

This papyrus, which has been re-edited recently with a full com-
mentary by M.Manfredi[1] 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. Con-
sultation of a good photo kindly provided by Prof. O.Montevecchi
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.34)[2].

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

1) *Scritti in onore di Orsolina Montevecchi* (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.

the reading μέντοι σοῦ seems impossible to us (we have considered
μέχρι τοῦ ν[ῦν σ]οῦ, but we are not certain that this is the true
reading); in line 6, we think a reading ἐπιγενομένην possible; in
line 8, we read the numeral of the epagomenal day as γ∫// (= 26 viii).

d) SB I 4797: a Remark on the Invocatio

   The first three lines of *SB* I 4797 are printed as follows:
1 [†'Εν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου ἡμῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ]
2 [τοῦ] θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ τῆ[ς δεσπ(οίνης) ἡμῶ(ν) τῆς
                                        ἁγίας θεοτό(κου)]]
3 [ἔτους] Διοκλητιανοῦ τριακοσιοστοῦ ὀγδοη[κοστοῦ -------   ]

   The first editor thus assumed that the first line was com-
pletely lost, and that there was a small lacuna at the left of the
lines, a larger one at the right. The invocatio formula as restored by
him presents a slight anomaly, in that normally an invocation by
Jesus Christ *and* Mary ends by καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων (cf. R.S.
Bagnall - K.A.Worp, *Christian Invocations in the Papyri* CdE 56 [1981] forth-
coming). Between θεοτόκου and καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων one may find
καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας. In order to check the actual state of the
papyrus we asked Dr.H.Harrauer and Dr.J.M.Diethart (Vienna) for a
photostat of the text, and on the basis of this we note the
following:
a. There is no sign that the top of the papyrus has broken off,
and that consequently a line (or more)has been lost. This is the
more unlikely because one would, then, expect some descending
strokes from a lost preceding line to be visible on the photostat.
b. The piece has broken off sharply vertically at the left and the
right, presumably on folds.
The consequence of this is, that if there is no lost first line,
all of line "1" actually belongs to line "2", a loss of ca. 45
letters at most (one may reckon, however, with some abbreviation
in the use of Nomina Sacra in which case the number of lost letters
may be significantly lower). The lacuna in front of line "3" is
thus much larger than suggested in the ed.princeps, and would con-
tain sufficient space for a restoration of καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων.

We propose the following restoration:

1 [† Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ] θεοῦ
    καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ τῆ[ς δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἀγίας]

2 [θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀγίων, 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 σωτῆρος 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 kindliness he has done so with the following result: "La partie litigieuse, entre Διοκλη( ) et Με-χείρ 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 longeur 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 Μεχείρ, il y a d'autres traces d'une ou deux lettres que je ne sait 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 δεσπότου ἡμ]ῶν 'Ιησοῦ Χρι[στοῦ τοῦ].
In comparison with a normal Christ invocation ἡμ]ῶν would be su-
perfluous, and we expected here a mistaken reading of δεσπότ]ου.

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] κ[αὶ] δεσπότου 'Ιη[σοῦ Χρι]στοῦ
2  [τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡ]μ[ῶ]ν, Βασιλεί[ας τοῦ θει]οτάτ(ου)
3  [καὶ εὐσεβ(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπό]του Φλ(αουίου) Μαυρικίου Τι[βε-
        ρίου] τοῦ αἰων(ίου)
4  [Αὐγ(ούστου) Αὐτοκρ(άτορος) ἔτους] ιθ Πα'ῦ'νι η τέλει [τῆς
        τ]ρ[ί]της ἰν(δικτίωνος) ἐν 'Αρ(σινόῃ).
5  [Φλ(αουίῳ) Στρατηγίῳ] τῷ πανευφήμῳ ὑπ[άτῳ (καὶ)] παγάρχῳ τῆς τε
6  ['Αρσιν(οϊτῶν)] καὶ Θεοδοσιουπολιτῶν Αὐρήλιοι{ς}
7  [Φοιβάμμ]ων υἱὸς Μακαρίου καὶ ἕτερος Φοιβάμμων
8  [ὁ καὶ Πεβᾶ]ς υἱὸς Σαμβᾶ μεθλίται ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως
9  [ἀπὸ ἀμφ]όδου ὁ μὲν προγεγραμμένος Φοιβάμμων
10 [......]ς, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος Φοιβάμμων Γυναικίου χ(αίρειν).
11 ['Ομολο]γοῦμεν ἑκουσίᾳ γνώμῃ ὥστε μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἡμᾶς
12 [μήτ' ἄλλ]ον τιν[ὰ ἐ]κ [προ]σώπου ἡμῶν [
    - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
```

Verso
```
13 [            ]. γεναμ(εν ) ὑπὸ Αὐρ(ηλίων) [Φοιβάμμωνος   καὶ]
14 [Φοιβάμμωνος] τοῦ (καὶ) Πεβᾶ μεθλιτ[ῶν
```

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 de-
claration 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 Αὐγούστου written out in full.
The first editor printed ἐπ' Ἀρ(σινοιτῶν 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 Ἀρσιν(οιτῶν) 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. μεθελίτης). On the basis of our
new reading the form μεθλιτάριος disappears and should be deleted from all lexi-
ca. 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 Γυναικίου cf. already C.Wessely, Die Stadt Arsinoe, 25. F.Prei-
sigke (*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 am-
phodon 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 text[4]. We find in fact the following: δέδηκα δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν τὸ θάλλιν [ἔτο]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 lacuna[5]. We have not been able to find a suitable restoration, but we do not think that [ἔτο]υς will do[6].

The calculation about the cup and censer are as follows: καυκίν καὶ θύσκιν ἔχοντες λί(τραν) α (οὐγκίας) θ γράμματα ι̅ζ̅ ὡς τῆς λί(τρας) α μυρ(ιάδες) πε καὶ τὸ ζυγο(στασίο)υ (τάλαντα) β 'Δ, γίν(ονται) μυρ(ιάδες) ρνδ ✗ 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 ἔτος instead of ἰνδικτίων 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]ῦ σ<τα>θμοῦ, 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 ὡς. 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 ac-
curacy 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.
	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 vessels[9].

New York   Roger S.Bagnall

Amsterdam   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 Kennt-nis des Gewerbes* (Borna-Leipzig 1913) 57.