

*Hanan M. I. Ismail*

THE DATE OF *P. ALEX. INV. 622*, PAGE 28.  
A PAPYRUS FROM HERAKLEIDOU MERIS IN  
THE ARSINOITE NOME

Despite the gaps and missing lines that hinder a full reading and make the text too fragmentary to be translated, *P. Alex. inv. 622* preserves precious information, in particular a Roman *tria nomina* formula that was attested once in another papyrus (*P. Gen. II 97*). Moreover, it is possibly attested in the third one, which is a fiscal register, recently published in *P. Stras. X*; there the cognomen is abridged, which leaves room for discussion whether it is the same one or not. The same is true for the epitaph from Misenum, *CIL X 3385*, that does not contradict with their date. Thus, the paper makes a contribution to the prosopography of Roman Egypt.

It is of great importance that *P. Alex. inv. 622* preserves two geographical sites in the Arsinoite Nome. One of them, vaguely, was no longer mentioned in the sources since the second quarter of the third century AD. Additionally, the papyrus' handwriting was described by the editor as neat and cursive, and it was written down in a document classified as a small size official document 4 × 9.5 cm, in 8 lines. These palaeographical details must be considered to establish the date of the papyrus and to reedit it.<sup>1</sup>

*P. Alex. 622*, page 28 (I–IV AD, Arsin.):

[3 lines missing]

4 [ - ca.? - ] Μάρκου Ἀγτωνίου Ἀπολλινγαρίου ἀποκεχώρηκεν .  
[ - ca.? - ]

5 [ - ca.? - Ἡρακ]λείδου μερίδος τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου νομοῦ ἐν  
μεγτε[- ca.? -]

6 [ - ca.? - ] . . . ἀπὸ ἀρουρῶν τεσσάρων . . . ὑπὲρ ενε . . . [ - ca.? - ]

7 [ - ca.? - τέ]ταρτον καὶ ἐν πεδίῳ Ψεναρψεννήσεως ἐν το . [ - ca.? - ]

8 [1 line missing]

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexandria's Greco-Roman Museum was closed since 2005 till now (2022) for development. So, its holdings of papyrus were stored in Alexandria's National Museum. During this long period the museum's holdings of papyrus had been already subject to modern techniques of restoration to provide the papyrologists, after reopening, with better readable texts.

There is a discrepancy of dates in both of the published editions as well as in digital databases. According to *Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis*, the document dates back to the first four centuries AD, while according to *DDbDP* it is dated from 30 BC to AD 323, and according to *Trismegistos* – AD 1–299.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, Giuseppe Botti, in 1901, registered the fragment as a piece of the holdings of Alexandria's Greco-Roman Museum, which was preserved in Sale no. 6, in one of the furthest vitrines (F, G etc.). He classified it as “papyrus, dont le déchiffrement n'est pas définitif”,<sup>3</sup> and dated it to the Byzantine period.<sup>4</sup> In 1964 Anna Swiderek and Mariangela Vandoni published it as a document from the Arsinoite Nome. They classified it as a contract without giving a date.<sup>5</sup>

For adjusting the papyrus' date from a historical perspective, the following considerations are crucial:

**First**, line 4 preserves the *tria nomina* Marcus Antonius Apollinarius, in the genitive case, Μάρκου Ἀγτωνίου Ἀπολλιναρίου ἀποκεχώρηκεν. So, it is most likely to imply his son. The personal name of Marcus Antonius could be adopted in two ways: (1) since the second half of the first century BC, it was generally the result of recruiting in the east by Mark Antony during the second Triumvirate (43–33 BC),<sup>6</sup> as soldiers who received Roman citizenship adopted the praenomen and nomen of their general;<sup>7</sup> (2) it was also given to the freedmen of Antonia Minor (35 BC – AD 37), the daughter of Mark Antony and Octavia. Later she became the mother of Emperor Claudius.<sup>8</sup> In dating the papyrus back to 30 BC as *terminus post quem* the scholars from *DDbDP* presumably base on the first option. However, does it match with the other attestations of these *tria nomina*?

---

<sup>2</sup> See Papyri info: [https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.alex;;inv622?rows=3&start=213&fl=id,title&fq=collection:ddbdp&fq=\(ddbdp\\_series:p.alex+OR+hgv\\_series:p.alex+OR+dclp\\_series:p.alex\)&sort=series+asc,volume+asc,item+asc&p=214&t=227](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.alex;;inv622?rows=3&start=213&fl=id,title&fq=collection:ddbdp&fq=(ddbdp_series:p.alex+OR+hgv_series:p.alex+OR+dclp_series:p.alex)&sort=series+asc,volume+asc,item+asc&p=214&t=227).

<sup>3</sup> Botti 1901, 340.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 339.

<sup>5</sup> Swiderek 1964, 23 (B. Contrats).

<sup>6</sup> Groebe 1894, 2611 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Mclean 2002, 8; Zoumbaki 2008, 167.

<sup>8</sup> Oost 1958, 113–139; Zager 2014, 67–75.

The same personal name, Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιος Ἀπολινάρ[ιος, is attested in *P. Gen. II 97. 14* dating from the second half of the first century AD.<sup>9</sup> It is part of the tax register in alphabetical order (letter M).<sup>10</sup> The provenance of *P. Gen. II 97* is unknown.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, three Roman citizens' names are attested among the documents from Arsinoite in the papyrus from Geneva.

The son of Μᾶρκος Οὐαλέριος Βερνε[κιανός (*P. Gen. II 97. 18*)<sup>12</sup> and a son or grandson of Μᾶρκος Πετρώνιος Κέλερ (*P. Gen. II 97. 22*), bearing the *duo nomina*, are mentioned together in a document from the Arsinoite nome.<sup>13</sup> Additionally, [Οὐαλέριος] Λόγγος, most likely the son or grandson of Μᾶρκος Οὐαλέριος Λόγγος (*P. Gen. II 97. 3*), was attested in the Arsinoite nome.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, the second attestation of Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιος Ἀπολινάρ[ιος (*P. Gen. II 97. 14*) is *P. Alex. 622. 4*: Μάρκου Ἀγτωνίου Ἀπολλιναρίου, which evidently comes from the Arsinoite nome. So there is enough evidence that Arsinoite is the provenance of *P. Gen. II 97*. In the light of this evidence *P. Alex. inv. 622* also originates from Arsinoite.

Four more documents from Egypt mention Roman citizens with *nomen gentile* Marcus Antonius and a *cognomen* beginning with Apol( ):

*P. Gen. II 97. 14* (AD 50–99): the *tria nomina* Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιος Ἀπολινάρ[ιος.

*P. Stras. X 902, col. 8. 2* (AD 100–101, Herm.): the *tria nomina* Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιος(ς) Ἀπολ( ).

*O. Claud. II 390. 9* and *388. 6* (AD 100–150): the *duo nomina* Ἀντ(ώνιος) Ἀπολ(λινάριος).

<sup>9</sup> *P. Gen. II 97* (AD 50–99), l. 14–15: <sup>14</sup> Μᾶρκος Ἀντώνιος Ἀπολινάρ[ιος - ca.? -] <sup>15</sup> προσδιαγραφομένων (ἡμιωβέλιον) χ(αλκ) [ - ca.? - ].

<sup>10</sup> Martin 1932, 549–553.

<sup>11</sup> Martin 1932, 549: “Rien ne permet de déterminer à quelle region de l'Égypte appartiennent ces propriétaires”.

<sup>12</sup> *P. Diog. 7* (26 Mai – 3 August AD 142, Arsin.), l. 30: Οὐ[α]λέριον Βερνικιαγόν. Valerius Bernicianus is mentioned along with the son of Marcus Petronius Celer, l. 31: Πετρώνιον Κέλερα, in a cession of a katoikic land.

<sup>13</sup> *P. Diog. 6. 27–30* (26 Mai – 3 August AD 142, Arsin.): Οὐαλέριον Βερνικι/ανόν, together with Π[ε]τρ[ώ]νιον Κ[έ]λερα, in a cession of a katoikic land, cf. Schubert 2000, 182–184, no. 62.

<sup>14</sup> *BGU I 69. 1–2*: [Οὐαλέριος] Λόγγος [ἰ]π[πεύς] εἴλης Ἀπριανῆ[ς] τ[ί]ρ[μ]ης Τρανιανῆς (22 June AD 120, Arsin.).

This evidence shows that such a combination of names could appear since the mid-first till the mid-second centuries AD.

Nevertheless, one should not disregard that Roman families used to bequeath names over generations, and the same *tria nomina* could emerge in the third generation or after. For instance, veteran Marcus Valerius Turbo, belonging to the second century AD,<sup>15</sup> gave his *praenomen* and *nomen gentile* to his two sons, who were called Marcus Valerius Longinus and Marcus Valerius Montanus.<sup>16</sup> So we can argue that this veteran was the son of Marcus Valerius Turbo in *P. Gen.* 97,<sup>17</sup> as they bequeath the personal name Marcus Valerius over generations. Additionally, Marcus Antonius Longus was the father of Marcus Antonius Serinus.<sup>18</sup> Another Marcus Antonius set a gravestone up to his father, Marcus Antonius Valens.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, two siblings were named Marcus Antonius Heliiodorus and Marcus Antonius Aper.<sup>20</sup>

Accordingly, in view of the probability that the same *tria nomina* might appear in the third or fourth generation, the *terminus ante quem* for *P. Alex.* 622 should be prolonged to the end of the second century AD. This result matches well with the date of the epitaph, the second century AD,<sup>21</sup>

<sup>15</sup> *BGU VII* 1565 (28 Oct. AD 169, Philadelphia, Arsin.), cession of 6 arourai of katoikic land, ll. 4–5: παρὰ Μάρκου Ουαλερίου Τούρβωνος στρατιώτου περι Φιλαδέλφειαν σειτικὰς; 1574 (AD 176, Philadelphia), his will to his children, ll. 3–4: Μάρ[κω Ουαλερίω] Τούρβωνι ἐνωπίω, 10, 21; *BGU VII* 1662 (29 Sept. AD 182, Ptolemais Euergetis, Arsin.), ll. 2: ὁμολογεῖ Κυρίλλα θ]υ[γά]τηρ Μάρκου Ουαλερίου Τούρβ[ωνο]ς ἀστῆ, 6, 12.

<sup>16</sup> *BGU VII* 1662 (29 Sept. AD 182).

<sup>17</sup> *P. Gen.* II 97. 9–10: Μάρκος Ουαλέριος Τούρβω[v - ca.? -] ναυβίου (δραχμῆ) α προσδιαγ[ραφομένων].

<sup>18</sup> *P. Hamb.* I 97. 2 (29 Aug. AD 104 – 28 Aug. AD 105, Philadelphia, Arsin.), ll. 1–2: [ὁ δεῖνα] Μάρκω Ἀντωνίω [Σ]ερίνω ἀφήλεις[ι] [- ca.12 -][ διὰ τ]οῦ πατρὸς Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Λόγγου [. . . . .][ χάρειν.

<sup>19</sup> *CIL VIII* 3405 (not dated, Numidia): *D(is) M(anibus) / M(arcus) Antonius Valens vi/xit an(nos) XXIII / M(arcus) Antonius / f(ilius) pio fecit.*

<sup>20</sup> *PSI XIII* 1325 (AD 172–175), ll. 1–2: Νεμεσίωνι γυμ(νασιαρχήσαντι) βιβλ(ιοφύλακι) ἐνκτῆ(σεων) Ἡρακλεοπ(ολίτου) [παρὰ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Ἡλιοδώρου καὶ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Ἄπερος - ca.? - περι τῆς διαθήκης] λελυμ(ένης) ἐπὶ σφρ(αγιστῶν), τ[ῆ]ς μετ[ε]λλαχ(υίας) ἡμῶν μητρὸς Σαβ[ι]νίας Ἀπολλωναρίου.

<sup>21</sup> This is an approximate date (AD 150/250), offered by *EDR*, depending only on the text formula and palaeography.

to a gubernator called M(arcus) Antoni(us) Apol[ ], in the fleet of Misenum, which was rife with marines from Egypt.<sup>22</sup>

**Second**, another phrase that is important for determining the date of *P. Alex. 622* is ἐν πεδίῳ Ψεναρψεννήσεως in line 7. The plain of Psenarpsennesis<sup>23</sup> was not a village, but rather a region, which bordered the territory of Karanis and was cultivated with wheat, date palms and especially olive trees.<sup>24</sup> The late papyri that mention the plain and in the same time dated by the Egyptian regnal year of Emperors are undoubtedly the best to rely on. Thus, the latest two pieces of evidence are:

1) *P. Mich.* VI 372, an assessment list from Karanis, Arsinoite nome, dates back to 30 Aug. AD 179 – 28 Aug. AD 180 or 30 Aug. AD 211 – 28 Aug. AD 212, depending on col. ii. 3: ἐν κδ (ἔτει), which is followed by tax charges, evidently, pertaining to the 19<sup>th</sup> year of the Emperor's reign, col. ii. 6: ιθ (ἔτους). Accordingly, the papyrus was written in an Emperor's reign that lasted at least twenty-four years. Thus, the date at which this document was compiled is restricted to the reigns of Commodus (27 November AD 176 – 31 December AD 192) and Caracalla (28 January AD 198 – 8 April AD 217), because the reign of Emperor Commodus ran to thirty-three Egyptian regnal years,<sup>25</sup> and Emperor Caracalla to twenty-five Egyptian regnal years (Year 1 = AD 192/3); the latest dating by Caracalla from the Arsinoite, which is the second latest from Egypt, dated year 25, Epeiph 6 = June 30 AD 217.<sup>26</sup>

2) *P. Gen.* III 145, a receipt for the payment of τέλος καταλοχισμῶν from the Arsinoite nome, ll. 8–11: (ἔτους) ιδ Λουκίο[υ] Σεπτιμίου

---

<sup>22</sup> *CIL X 3385: D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Antoni Apol[ (?) ] / gubernato[r]is / centur(ia) Ar[ri] (? ) ---*; Hopkins 2014, 79 n. 332; Fiebiger 1894, 416 n. 161. He classified *Centuria Arrii* among the seven uncertain naval centuriae.

<sup>23</sup> The name appears chiefly in papyri in the form Ψεναρψεννήσις, more rarely as Ψεναρσεννήσις, Ψεναρψεννήσις, Ψιναρψεννήσις. There are also different ways of abbreviation of the name in the documents. Cf. Selim 2016, 1974.

<sup>24</sup> Selim 2016, 1973–1974.

<sup>25</sup> *BGU XIII 2289* (Aug. 29 AD 192 – Aug. 28 AD 193, Ptolemais Nea, Arsinoites), ll. 1–4: ἔτους λγ Λουκίο[υ Αἰλίου] Αὐρηλίου Κομ[μύδου] Καίσαρος τοῦ κυ[ρίου] - ca.? -] κδ.; *BGU I 270* (29 Dec. AD 192, Soknopaiu Nesos, Arsinoites), ll. 1–3: ἔτους λγ Λουκίου Αἰλίου Αὐρηλίου Κομύδου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Τυβί γ. *BGU II 651* (May 9 AD 192, Karanis, Arsinoites), ll. 12–14: (ἔτους) λβ Λουκίου Αἰλίου Αὐρηλίου Κομύδου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Παχῶν ιδ.

<sup>26</sup> *SB XII 10913. 6–8:* (ἔτους) κε Ἐπειφ ἕκτη ς; Rathbone 1986, 105.

Σεουήρου [Ε]ψεβοῦς Περτίνακος Ἀραβικοῦ Ἀδιαβητικοῦ Παρθικοῦ Μεγίστου καὶ Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου [Ἀν]τωνί[νου] Εὐ[σε]βοῦς Σεβαστῶν καὶ Πουβλίου Σεπτιμίου [Γέ]τα Καί[σα]ρος Σε[βαστο]ῦ Τ[ῶ]βι κε. Thus, the document was written down on the 25<sup>th</sup> of Tybi, the 14<sup>th</sup> year of Emperor Septimius Severus' reign, which corresponds to the 20<sup>th</sup> of January AD 206. Accordingly, one could conclude that the latest evidence for the Plain Psenarpsennesis is AD 212, and it does not appear in the documents from the second quarter of the third century AD. What could be the cause for this?

Huebner suggests that such cases of abandoning the areas that hitherto were prosperous with agriculture are due to climate change alongside irrigation problems that arose simultaneously in several villages at the outer edge of the Fayum depression, which led to the progressive desertification of land, as well as a series of below-average Nile floods in the 240s and 260s. Furthermore, climate proxies which record a general shift in African monsoon patterns at the source areas of the Nile and consecutively lower Nile flood levels from the middle of the third century on, corroborate this impression.<sup>27</sup> Huebner's view matches well with the low level of the Nile attested in AD 221.<sup>28</sup>

On the other hand, Lippert suggests that the initial element Pse-/Psi-corresponds to *P3-šy-* that in Demotic means “the lake”, which is plausible phonetically. She links the appearance of Pedion Psenarpsennesis with the body of water called μικρὰ λίμνη,<sup>29</sup> or “small lake”, that existed once in the Herakleidou meris. When the water level of the Fayum Lake fell after the New Kingdom (c. 1539–1075 BC), it was only attested in Greek texts of the third cent. BC and disappeared by the Roman period, when the water level in the “lake” fell by another 40 meters.<sup>30</sup> Thus, Lippert believes that the plain of Psenarpsennesis took its name from this former lake, “the lake of Harpsenesis” (*P3-šy-Hr-p3-šr-n-Īs.t*),<sup>31</sup> in the middle of which was a sanctuary of Harpsenesis, and which by slowly shrinking towards the south had left behind a fertile agricultural plain in the north; the “small lake” no longer existed in the Roman period, but there still was

<sup>27</sup> Huebner 2020, Abstract.

<sup>28</sup> Swiderek 1971, 31–44.

<sup>29</sup> Bonneau 1993, 53 n. 426, 54.

<sup>30</sup> Lippert 2020, 153–157.

<sup>31</sup> Selim 2016, 1974 n. 7: “The second part of the name which is *Hr-p3-šr-n-Īs.t* (Harpsenesis) means in Demotic ‘Horus son of Isis’”.

a canal. She concluded that this region was exposed to geomorphological changes over centuries.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, Fayum was not insulated from the variability of the Nile, and relied on flood-recession deposits of silt just as other arable areas did.<sup>33</sup>

On the other hand, *P. Alex. inv. 622* attests in line 7 the word τέ]ταρτον, which refers to a fraction of land area,<sup>34</sup> or even of a tax in kind.<sup>35</sup> Therefore, the plain of Psenarpsennesis was still in its thriving cultivated period, and under the concern of the Roman administration. So, the verb ἀποκεχώρηκεν (l. 4) should not be explained by fleeing from paying dues because of poverty. The holder of the *tria nomina* and his son were Roman citizens, not Egyptians who were forced to flee due to their inability to meet the exactions of the state.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, a Roman citizen was exempted from liturgies, which might be burdensome enough to push men to leave their property.<sup>37</sup> Motivation for abandoning this land could be the lack of security, as some complaints of robbery accidents in Pedion Psenarpsennesis are attested around the proposed date of the document under study.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Lippert 2020, 154–155.

<sup>33</sup> Adams 2019, 235.

<sup>34</sup> *P. Brook.* 8 (AD 177, Arsino.), ll. 25–26: ἐλαιῶνος ἀρούρης τέταρτον κα[ι] [ἄλλην περι κόμην Κ]ερεσοῦχα σιτικὴν ἄρουραν; *P. Cair. Mich.* III 8 (1) (AD 82–96, Karanis), l. 19: κόμης τε[τέταρτ]ον ἀρούρη[ς] κα[ι] τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν; *P. Lond.* II 141 (3 Jun. AD 88, Karanis), ll. 6–7: τ]ὸ νεόφυ[τον περι] δὲ Ψε[ν]αρψενήσιν τε[τέταρτ]ον ἀρούρων τριῶν Ἡρακοῦλις λεγομένων [τ]ῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀρούρων δεκαδύο ἡμίσεις τετάρτου ἢ ὄσων; *P. Mich.* IX 539 (23 June AD 53, Karanis), ll. 13–16: καὶ περὶ Ψεναρψενήσιν τε[τέταρτ]ον ἀρούρων 15 ἄρουραι τρεῖς ἡμισὺς τετάρτ[ον] δυτριάκος[τὸν]; *P. Mich.* IX 554 (before AD 93, Karanis), ll. 9–10: καὶ περὶ 10 [Καρανίδα κλήρου κατοικικοῦ ἄρου]ραι δύο τέταρτον; *SB IV 7379* (26 April AD 177, Ptolemais Eurgetis), l. 18: καὶ ἐν τόπω Κεντεκὲμ σιτικὰς ἀρούρας τέσσαρες τέταρτον.

<sup>35</sup> *P. Mich.* VI 395 (8 Jun. AD 183, Karanis), ll. 11–13: γίνονται (πυροῦ ἀρτάβα) θ β', ἐπιβῶλ( ) ὁ ἀ(ὐτὸς) δύο τέταρτον, (γίνονται) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβα) β δ'.

<sup>36</sup> Wallace 1938, 191, 460.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 115.

<sup>38</sup> A number of veterans held lands in Domitian's reign ἐν πεδίῳ Ψεναρψενήσεως, cf. *SB XX 15346* (AD 88–89). But complaints of robbery accidents, and need for urgent security, grew from the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> cent. to the 1<sup>st</sup> half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. and on, cf. *SB XIV 12022* (AD 100); *SB XX 15779* (AD 100); *SB XXII 15781* (AD 158/9); *SB XXIV 16252*; *P. Cair. Mich.* II 17 (AD 156/9, Karanis).

To sum up, the evidence presented in this paper indicate that *P. Alex.* inv. 622 dates back to the first two centuries AD. No evidence supports 30 BC to be the *terminus post quem*, or the third and fourth centuries AD to be the *terminus ante quem*. There is no bar against considering its *terminus post quem* to be AD 50, as it is the case for *P. Gen.* II 97. Accordingly, it can be argued that *P. Alex.* inv. 622, page 28 dates back to AD 50–200.

Hanan M. I. Ismail  
 Ain Shams University, Cairo  
 hanan.ismail@art.asu.edu.eg

### Bibliography

- C. Adams, “Stimuli for Irrigation, Agriculture and Quarrying”, in: K. Vandorpe (ed.), *A Companion to Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World (Medford 2019) 233–250.
- D. Bonneau, *Le régime administratif de l’eau du Nil dans l’Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine*, *Probleme der Ägyptologie* 8 (Leiden 1993).
- G. Botti, *Catalogue des Monuments exposés au Musée Gréco-Romain d’Alexandrie* (Alexandria 1901).
- O. Fiebiger, “De classium Italicarum historia et institutis”, in: O. Ribbeck et al. (eds.), *Leipziger Studien zur Classischen Philologie* 15: 2 (Leipzig 1894) 275–462.
- P. Groebe, “Antonius 30”, *RE* 1 (1894) 2595–2614.
- L. Hopkins, *Fleets and Manpower on Land and Sea: The Italian “classes” and the Roman Empire 31 B.C. – A.D. 193*, PhD Thesis (Oxford 2014).
- S. R. Huebner, “Did Shifts in the African Monsoon Lead to the Decline of the Roman Fayum from the Third Century CE?”, in: *Climate Change in the Breadbasket of the Roman Empire. Reconstructing Nile Floods for the Roman Period*, *Studies in Late Antiquity* 4/4 (Basel 2010) 486–518.
- S. L. Lippert, M. Schentuleit, “Agreements and Accounts. On-going Research on Economic Activities of the Temple of Soknopaiou Nesos according to the Demotic Texts”, in: A. Jördens, U. Yiftah-Firanko (eds.), *Accounts and Bookkeeping in the Ancient World: Question of Structure (Legal Documents in Ancient Societies. Conference VIII: Schwetzingen, 24–26.9.2016)*, *PHILIPPIKA: Altertumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen / Contributions to the Study of Ancient World Cultures* 55/ 2 (Wiesbaden 2020) 141–157.
- V. Martin, “Propriétaires romains en Égypte sous l’Empire”, in: *Mélanges Glotz* II (Paris 1932) 549–553.



- B. H. McLean, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Konya Archaeological Museum*, The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Monograph Series 29 (Ankara 2002).
- S. I. Oost, “The Career of M. Antonius Pallas”, *AJPh* 79: 2 (1958) 113–139.
- D. W. Rathbone, “The Dates of the Recognition in Egypt of the Emperors from Caracalla to Diocletianus”, *ZPE* 62 (1986) 101–131.
- P. Schubert, *Vivre en Egypte greco-romaine*, Éditions de l’Aire (Vevey 2000).
- E. A. Selim, “Where was Psenharsenes?” in: T. Derda, A. Łajtar, J. Urbanik (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Papyrology, Warsaw 29 July – 3 August 2013*, JJP suppl. 28, III (Warsaw 2016) 1973–1980.
- A. Swiderek, M. Vandoni, *Papyrus grecs du Musée gréco-romain d’Alexandrie (P. Alex.)*, Travaux du Centre d’Archéologie Méditerranéenne de l’Académie Polonaise des Sciences sous la direction de K. Michalowski 2 (Warsaw 1964).
- A. Swiderek, “The Land Register of the φερνουφίτου Toparchy in Mendesian nome”, *JJP* 16–17 (1971) 31–44.
- S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt*, Princeton University Studies in Papyrology 2 (Princeton 1938).
- I. Zager, *The Political Role of Women of the Roman Elite with Particular Attention to the Autonomy and Influence of The Julio-Claudian Women 44 B.C. – 68 A.D.*, PhD thesis, University of South Africa (Pretoria 2014).
- S. Zoumbaki, “The Colonists of the Roman East and their Leading Groups: Some Notes on their Entering the Equestrian and Senatorial Ranks in Comparison with the Native Elites”, *Tyche. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte, Papyrologie und Epigraphie* 23 (2008) 159–179.

This paper endeavors to determine the proper date of *P. Alex. inv. 622*, page 28, a papyrus from the holding of Alexandria’s Greco-Roman Museum. In “Catalogue des Monuments exposés au Musée Gréco-Romain d’Alexandrie” (1901) it was registered as a papyrus from the Byzantine period. In the publication of 1964 it was undated, and in online databases it is dated differently. As a result, this document has not properly been taken into account in scholarly research.

The study of the document from a historical perspective (onomastic and prosopographic analysis of the name Μάρκος Ἀγτώνιος Ἀπολλινάριος and considerations on the toponym πεδίων Ψεναρψεννήσεως) allows to date the papyrus from 50 to 200 AD and draw attention to its potential historic value.

В статье ставится задача уточнить датировку папируса *P. Alex.* инв. 622, с. 28 из собрания Греко-Римского музея Александрии. В каталоге 1901 г. он значился как папирус византийской эпохи, в публикации 1964 г. датировка не приводилась, а в электронных базах данных данные расходятся. Как следствие, документ практически не учитывался в научных исследованиях.

Изучение папируса в исторической перспективе (ономастический и просопографический анализ имени Μάρκος Αὐτόνιος Ἀπολλυῆαριος и соображения о топониме Псенарпсеннесида) позволяют датировать его между 50 и 200 г. н. э. и привлечь внимание исследователей к его потенциальной исторической ценности.

## CONSPECTUS

ELENA ERMOLAEVA	
Odysseus as a Target in the <i>Odyssey</i> and Aeschylus' Fr. 179, 180 Radt (On the History of Greek Parody) . . . . .	165
SALVATORE TUFANO	
With or without a <i>koinon</i> . The <i>Longue Durée</i> of Two Regional Festivals. I. The Pamboiotia and the Basileia from their Beginnings to the Fourth Century BC . . . . .	176
NICHOLAS LANE	
A Conjecture on Pindar, <i>Pythian</i> 2. 81–82 . . . . .	196
GAUTHIER LIBERMAN	
Petits riens sophocléens : Antigone II (V. 162–169, 189–190, 203–204, 207–208, 241–242, 253–254, 289–290, 320–321, 370–375, 389–390, 392–393, 413–414, 444–445, 497–501) . .	203
VSEVOLOD ZELTCHENKO	
What is Wrong with Nicostratus? (Ar. <i>Vesp.</i> 82–83) . . . . .	228
GLEB L. KRIVOLAPOV	
Dionysus or Heracles: Mark Antony's Religious Policy in 41 BCE in the Light of <i>Epistula Marci Antonii Ad Koinon Asiae</i> . . . . .	242
HEIKO ULLRICH	
Eine Konjektur zu Lukrez 3, 917 . . . . .	266
MIKHAIL SHUMILIN	
Unpublished Conjectures to the <i>Appendix Vergiliana</i> by F. Korsch, G. Saenger, and A. Sonny . . . . .	276
HANAN M. I. ISMAIL	
The Date of <i>P. Alex.</i> Inv. 622, Page 28. A Papyrus from Herakleidou Meris in the Arsinoite Nome . . . . .	289
GABRIEL ESTRADA SAN JUAN	
Pipa and Gallienus . . . . .	299
Keywords . . . . .	321