



TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Härrauer
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 7, 1992





**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 7

1992



Verlag Adolf Holzhausens Nfg., Wien

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

In Zusammenarbeit mit:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Johannes Diethart, Wolfgang Hameter, Bernhard Palme
Georg Rehrenböck, Walter Scheidel, Hans Taeuber

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1,
A-1010 Wien. Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer
Sprache werden angenommen. Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgeschickt werden.
Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden besprochen.

Auslieferung:

Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in
Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 1992 by Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Wien

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien. Herausgeber:
Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien
Hersteller: Druckerei A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien.
Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

I N H A L T

Andrik A b r a m e n k o (Frankfurt/M.), Die Verschwörung des Alexander Lyncestes und die „μήτηρ τοῦ βασιλέως“. Zu Diodor XVII 32, 1	1
Roger S. B a g n a l l (New York), Count Ausonius (Tafel 1)	9
Roger S. B a g n a l l (New York), The Periodicity and Collection of the Chrysargyron	15
Marco B u o n o c o r e (Città del Vaticano), C. Herennius Lupercus patronus Larinatium (Tafel 2)	19
Angelos C h a n i o t i s (Heidelberg) und Giorgos Rethemiotakis (Herakleion), Neue Inschriften aus dem kaiserzeitlichen Lyttos, Kreta (Tafel 3–7)	27
Hermann Harrauer (Wien), ΣΟΥΒΡΟΜ, Abrasax, Jahwe u. a. aus Syrien. Mit einer Einleitung von Jawdat C h e h a d e (Damaskus) (Tafel 8, 9)	39
Edward D a b r o w a (Krakau), Könige Syriens in der Gefangenschaft der Parther. Zwei Episoden aus der Geschichte der Beziehungen der Seleukiden zu den Arsakiden	45
P. Th. J. d e W i t (Amsterdam) und Pieter J. Sijpesteijn (Amsterdam), Fragment einer spätbyzantinischen Emphyteusissurkunde (Tafel 10)	55
Johannes D i e t h a r t (Wien) und Ewald Kislinger (Wien), Σιγελλᾶτος — Μειζόκρουστος. Zu P.Vindob. G 16.846	61
Gerhard D o b e s c h (Wien), John Kevin Newman und „Catull der Römer“. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte der ausgehenden Republik	65
M. Serena F u n g h i (Pisa) e Gabriella Messeri Savorelli (Florenz), Note papirologiche e paleografiche (Tafel 11, 12)	75
Linda-Marie G ü n t h e r (München), <i>Gallicus sive Anticus</i> . Zu einem Triumphaltitel Justinians I.	89
Hermann H a r r a u e r (Wien), ΣΟΥΒΡΟΜ, Abrasax, Jahwe u. a. aus Syrien. Mit einer Einleitung von Jawdat Chehade (Damaskus) (Tafel 8, 9)	39
Peter H e r z (Frankfurt/M.), Asiarchen und Archiereiai. Zum Provinzialkult der Provinz Asia	93
Günther H ö l b l (Wien), Bemerkungen zur frühptolemäischen Chronologie	117
C. P. J o n e s (Cambridge, Mass.), Foreigners in a Hellenistic Inscription of Rhodes .	123
István K e r t é s z (Budapest), Zur Sozialpolitik der Attaliden	133
Ewald K i s l i n g e r (Wien) und Johannes Diethart (Wien), Σιγελλᾶτος — Μειζόκρουστος. Zu P.Vindob. G 16.846	61
Heikki K o s k e n n i e m i (Turku), Einige Papyri wirtschaftlichen Inhalts aus Turku (Tafel 13–18)	143
Johannes K r a m e r (Siegen), Schreiben der Prätorialpräfekten des Jahres 399 an den <i>praeses provinciae Arcadiae</i> in lateinischer und griechischer Version (Tafel 19, 20) ..	157
Wolfgang L u p e (Halle/Saale), Philoktets Aufenthalt unmittelbar nach seiner Verwundung. Euripides' Φιλοκτήτης (Hypothesis P.Oxy. 2455)	163
Gabriella M e s s e r i S a v o r e l l i (Florenz) e M. Serena Funghi (Pisa), Note papirologiche e paleografiche (Tafel 11, 12)	75

Victor P a r k e r (Heidelberg), The Dates of the Orthagorids of Sicyon	165
Heinz-Dietmar R i c h t e r (Bamberg), Verwaltungswiderstand gegen ein Prostagma Ptolemaios' II. Philadelphos? (P.Cairo Zen. 59021)	177
Giorgos R e t h e m i o t a k i s (Herakleion) und Angelos Chaniotis (Heidelberg), Neue Inschriften aus dem kaiserzeitlichen Lyttos, Kreta (Tafel 3–7)	27
Mustafa H. S a y a r (Wien), Der thrakische König Mostis (Tafel 21)	187
Ralf S c h a r f (Heidelberg), Germaniciani und Secundani — ein spätrömisches Trup- penpaar	197
Pieter J. S i j p e s t e i j n (Amsterdam), Byzantinischer Geschäftsbrief in Geldangele- genheiten (P.Lond. III 1019) (Tafel 22)	203
Pieter J. S i j p e s t e i j n (Amsterdam) und P. Th. J. de Wit (Amsterdam), Fragment einer spätbyzantinischen Emphyteusisurkunde (Tafel 10)	55
Holger S o n n a b e n d (Stuttgart), Polybios, die Attaliden und die Griechen	207
Michael P. S p e i d e l (Honolulu), Ala Celerum Philippiana (Tafel 23)	217
Bemerkungen zu Papyri V <Korr. Tyche 52–75> (Tafel 24)	221
Buchbesprechungen.....	231

Pontica I. Recherches sur l'histoire du Pont dans l'antiquité. Istanbul 1991 (231: Klaus Belke) — Gerhard RADKE, *Fasti Romani*. Betrachtungen zur Frühgeschichte des römischen Kalenders. Münster 1990 (232) — Marcus Tullius CICERO, *Brutus*. Lateinisch-deutsch ed. Bernhard Kytzler. München, Zürich 1990 (233) — Hermann STRASBURGER, *Studien zur Alten Geschichte*. Hrsg. v. Walter Schmitt-henner und Renate Zoepffel. Hildesheim, New York 1982–1990 (234) — Pedro DE PALOL, Gisela RIPOLL, *Die Goten. Geschichte und Kunst in Westeuropa*. Stuttgart, Zürich 1990 (239) — Marcus Tullius CICERO, *Über die Weissagung – De divinatione*. Lateinisch-deutsch. Hrsg., übers. u. erl. von Christoph Schäublin. München, Zürich 1991 (240) — Barthel HROUDA, *Der Alte Orient. Geschichte und Kultur des alten Vorderasien*. Mit Beiträgen von Jean Bottéro, Peter Calmeyer [u. a.]. München 1991 (241) — Dieter FLACH, *Römische Agrargeschichte*. München 1990 (242) — Erik HORNING, *The Tomb of Pharaoh Seti I / Das Grab Sethos' I*. Englisch und deutsch. Zürich, München 1991 (243: Gerhard Dobesch) — Donata BACCANI, *Oroscopi greci*. Messina 1992 (244) — John C. SHELTON, *Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca, and Wooden Tablets in the Collection of the Brooklyn Museum*. Firenze 1992 (244: Hermann Harrauer) — *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athen 25–31 May 1886*. Athen 1988 (245: Bernhard Palme) — Binyamin SHIMRON, *Politics and Belief in Herodotus*. Stuttgart 1989 (247: Robert Rollinger) — Gabriele WESCH-KLEIN, *Liberalitas in rem publicam. Private Aufwendungen zugunsten von Gemeinden im römischen Afrika bis 284 n. Chr.* Bonn 1990 (249: Walter Scheidel) — James H. OLIVER, *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri*. Philadelphia 1989 (251: Reinhard Selinger) — Hansjörg FROMMER, *Die Illyrer. Viertausend Jahre europäischer Geschichte ...* Karlsruhe 1988 (252) — Arne EGGBRECHT (Hrsg.), *Albanien. Schätze aus dem Land der Skipetaren. Katalog zur Ausstellung im Roemer- u. Pelizaeusmuseum Hildesheim*. Mainz 1988 (254: Peter Siewert) — *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque*. Actes du colloque intern. d'épigraphie ... Neuchâtel, Genève 1988 (255: Hans Taeuber) — Peter HERRMANN, *Hilferufe aus römischen Provinzen*. Hamburg 1990 (256) — Stefan LINK, *Konzepte der Privilegierung römischer Veteranen*. Stuttgart 1989 (257) — Heidrun SCHULZE-OBEN, *Freigelassene in den Städten des römischen Hispanien*. Bonn 1989 (258: Ekkehard Weber) — K. BURASELIS, *Θεία Δωρεά. Μελέτες πάνω στην πολιτική της δυναστείας τῶν Σεβήρων καὶ τὴν Constitutio Antoniniana*. Athen 1989 (259: Sophia Zoumbaki)

Indices (J. Diethart)	263
-----------------------------	-----

ROGER S. BAGNALL

The Periodicity and Collection of the Chrysargyron

As is the case with many institutions of late antique taxation, the tax on commercial activity — normally referred to as the χρυσάργυρον or πραγματευτικὸν χρυσάργυρον in Greek sources — is known to us from several different types of sources, the connection of which to each other poses many difficulties. Imperial constitutions preserved in the codes offer a variety of enactments regulating the tax; ancient authors refer to it in a variety of mainly tendentious contexts; and the papyri show the tax in everyday operation in the cities of Egypt. In an article of 1985, Roland Delmaire showed convincingly that the evidence usually cited in support of the view that the tax was collected every five years (Libanius) was compatible with a four-year cycle instead, and that other evidence made a four-year periodicity — pentetetic on inclusive reckoning — much more likely¹. In Delmaire's view, this cycle was based on 314 or 318 (and probably begun by Licinius) and can be traced at four-year intervals thereafter until 498, when the tax was abolished. Delmaire's arguments derived mainly from the literary sources, although he takes some of the papyrological evidence into account. His attempts to square the papyri with his four-year cycle, however, encounter difficulties. Since he wrote, moreover, a number of new documents have been published which complicate matters further, not all of them included in his subsequent book. Since neither Delmaire's discussion nor the comments of the editors of these recently published papyri reconcile the evidence satisfactorily, it seems worthwhile looking afresh at the old and new evidence in light of Delmaire's hypothesis.

We may begin with Delmaire's essentially sound observation, at the end of his article, that „il faut en conclure que la levée de l'impôt n'était pas encore commencée à cette date [May, 498], et sans doute que le chrysargyre est levé durant le courant de l'indiction qui commence en septembre: cette hypothèse est confirmée par le fait que la lettre du gouverneur d'Augustamnica à la fin de janvier 342 montre que la levée n'est pas encore commencée à cette date et par le papyrus de 391 qui affirme une levée pour l'indiction 10 et non pour une année civile“ (p. 129). The papyri in fact refer rather consistently to the *chrysargyron* as being of a particular indiction, as we shall see, and it would be remarkable if this tax alone were *not* collected on an indictional basis. (This indiction need not, of course, be calculated from

¹ *Remarques sur le chrysargyre et sa périodicité*, RevNum 6 ser. 27 (1985) 120–129. See 120 n. 1 for the various terms used to describe the tax. Delmaire demolishes the notion that the tax was connected to imperial anniversaries, although he is somewhat misleading in suggesting that this hypothesis has normally been a necessary accompaniment of the five-year cycle thesis. The gist of the article is repeated, only partially brought up to date, in Delmaire's *Largesses sacrées et res privata: L'aerarium impérial et son administration du IV^e au VI^e siècle*, Paris 1989, 354–374 (Coll. École Française de Rome 121).

September; that depended on the indiction start in use in the place where a particular document was drawn up².)

Now it might seem a simple matter to draw up a list of papyrological attestations and see if they in fact fit a quadrennial cycle beginning with 314/5 or 318/9, and Delmaire cites texts which he believes to fit with such a cycle. His conclusion is reaffirmed by Peter van Minnen in the introduction to *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* XXV 65: „It is to be noted that the fourth-century documents that bear an exact date conform to the four-year pattern established by Delmaire from A. D. 314 (or 318) onwards; *P.Oxy.* 3577 is for A. D. 342, PSI 884 is for A. D. 390.“ Unfortunately, this construction cannot stand. Van Minnen’s formulation speaks in terms of julian years, ignoring the indiction years which Delmaire rightly established as the basis of the collection of the tax. It also ignores *P.Mich.inv.* 3708, published in the same year as Delmaire’s article³. Here are the pertinent documents⁴:

<i>Text</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Ind.</i>	<i>Julian</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
<i>P.Oxy.</i> L 3577	28.i.342	15	341/2	<i>Praeses</i> instructs city
<i>P.Lips.inv.</i> 362 ⁵	369/70	?	?	Former collector apptd. to liturgy
<i>P.Lips.</i> 64	369/70	?	?	About past collections
<i>P.Oxy.</i> XLVIII 3415	?	5?	376/7?	Arrears for ind. 3–4, current tax
<i>P.Mich.inv.</i> 3708	26.vi.386	14	385/6	Guild collects via <i>kephalaïotai</i>
<i>PSI</i> VIII 884 ⁶	12.ix.390	4	390/1	Paid for a mill
<i>Pap.Lugd.Bat.</i> XXV 65	?	15	?	Account of collection
<i>P.Med.inv.</i> 71.66 ⁷	20.xii.421	5	421/2	Guild appts. collector
<i>PSI</i> XII 1265	27.xii.426	10	426/7	Guild appts. collector
<i>P.Rainer Cent.</i> 122	19.ix.429	13	429/30	Guild appts. collector

Delmaire had set aside the evidence of *PSI* XII 1265 on the grounds that it fell „à une époque où le paiement peut être mensualisé“ (128). As he remarks earlier (127), „En réalité, au V^e siècle, il était permis de payer le chrysargyre sous forme de versements échelonnés annuels ou même mensuels⁸.“ This practice is clearly attested in the other two texts from the 420s also. Delmaire cites *CTh* 13.1.20 for official sanction of this practice from 410 onwards. That constitution in fact makes such installment payments mandatory, but it gives no indication when the practice may have become normal. At all events, it may be agreed that the evidence of the 420s does not bear on the cycle of assessment (as opposed to collection).

But when did this practice begin? It is immediately apparent from the table above that *P.Mich.inv.* 3708 and *PSI* VIII 884 cannot support a four-year cycle, being payments for

² See R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, Zutphen 1978, 17–29 (Stud. Amst. 8).

³ P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 61 (1985) 73–75.

⁴ I omit those texts concerning the *chrysargyron* offering no information useful for present purposes.

⁵ *Archiv* 32 (1986) 39–46.

⁶ See *P.Rainer Cent.*, p. 424 n. 13. Not indiction 10 (Delmaire 129; correctly in *Largesses* 359). B. Kramer, *Archiv* 32 (1986) 41, repeats the editor’s errors of taking indiction 4 as 389/390 and the date as 391 (cf. *BL* 7.237); so too Delmaire, *Largesses* 369.

⁷ Published in *Aegyptus* 62 (1982) 65–68; see the restored text in *ZPE* 59 (1985) 67–70. Delmaire was unaware of this text and *P.Rainer Cent.* 122 when he published his article; they are cited in *Largesses*, but the Milan text only from the reprint of the ed. pr. as *SB* XVI 12260.

⁸ Cf. *Largesses* 359, where he sweeps aside all evidence dated after the end of the fourth century on these grounds.

indications five years apart. Either they support a five-year cycle or they represent already a collection in each indication year just like the documents from the 420s. A clear indication that the latter is the case may be derived from *P.Oxy.* 3415, in which Diogenes writes, „I have sent our assistant Eudaimon so that you can pay the twenty-four solidi, the twenty from the account of the chrysargyron and the four from the account of Constantinople; and in addition (pay) the arrears from the 3rd and 4th indications, both for the sitologoi and for the komarchs.“ As the editor remarks, the text implies that it was itself written in a 5th indication, which he shows is probably 376/7. That would not be compatible with a five-year cycle embracing the texts from 385/6 and 390/1. Neither, of course, is it compatible with a four-year cycle. The logical conclusion, then, is that the collection was carried out by indication at least as early as 376/7, and that no document concerning collection of that date or later is of any use for the establishment of a four-year cycle.

The two Leipzig papyri are not sufficiently explicit about the years for which the *chrysargyron* was collected to give precise information for our purposes, but the years in question must be earlier than the 13th indication (369/370), and the 11th and 12th seem most likely. Neither (367/8 and 368/9) will fit the supposed four-year cycle, thus providing some hint that already at this point annual collection was normal.

P.Oxy. 3577 is the earliest dated witness for our inquiry. As we have seen, Delmaire argues that it shows that in January, 342, the collection had not yet begun, and he connects this view with a cycle including 342/3 as an assessment year. But in fact the letter of the governor gives no indication that the collection is yet to start. It is, rather, an order not to collect the tax from those who are not subject to it; as the editor points out, „This sentence [lines 7–8] looks as if it was drafted to suit the case of a particular person and it may well be that an individual precedent formed the basis for a general ruling.“ The *praeses* goes on to say ἀποκαταστήσατε τὸ χρυσίον καὶ τὸν ἄργυρον, „give back the gold and silver“, presumably to the taxpayer(s) from whom it had been wrongly exacted. This shows that the collection was already well underway at this time. The collection must then be for 341/2, indication 15. This year does not fit into Delmaire’s cycle. If one shifts the cycle slightly, to make (e. g.) 317/8 the base year, this text can be made to fit. But that will not help the two Leipzig papyri, nor *P.Oxy.* 3415, nor yet *PSI* 884.

The evidence taken together, then, even with the exclusion of that from the 420s, cannot legitimately be made to fit any 4-year or 5-year cycle. The safest conclusion is that the papyrological references do not bear on the periodicity of assessment, and that it was *always* collected in Egypt in annual installments. The papyrological attestations must thus be left out of account in determining a multi-year assessment cycle. This is hardly surprising. They concern retail collection, and many of those subject to the tax would have had difficulty setting aside money to pay a large sum once every four years. The state was far more likely to collect the full amount due if it took it in over smaller intervals. Whether the same was not true also in other provinces, we lack the evidence to say, but it seems *a priori* likely; Egypt was certainly not among the poorer provinces.

None of that excludes assessment on a multi-year cycle, of course, although neither does it support it. The literary evidence is so explicit on this point that it would be foolish to reject the cycle on the basis of the collection practices in the papyri. Such a multi-year assessment remains remarkable all the same, and it is not obvious what its point was. Other taxes were assessed annually just as they were collected. A good explanation remains to be found.