



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Chronological Notes on Byzantine Documents VIII

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

### Citation

Worp, K. A., & Bagnall, R. S. (1981). Chronological Notes on Byzantine Documents VIII. *Bulletin Of The American Society Of Papyrologists*, 18, 33-54.

Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/9213>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/9213>

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

## CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS VIII<sup>1</sup>

### 85. "New Style" Reckoning in the Later Sixth Century

In an important article<sup>2</sup> E. Stein identified a "style nouveau" employed under Justinus II, whereby in some contexts the actual year of the emperor's consulate is numbered as year 1 *μετὰ τὴν θῆσιν* or *post consulatum*, "after the consulate," whereas before this time (and still in many texts of this time), the year after the consulate was usually numbered "one," i.e. the first post-consular year. This "style nouveau" is found already under Justinian, in the count of the postconsular years of Fl. Basilius, but our inquiry in the present case is limited to Justinus II and later reigns.

To put things in tabular form, the difference between "old" and "new" styles is as follows:

<i>Orthodox count</i>	<i>"New Style" count</i>
566 cos. Justinus	p.c. Justinus, year 1
567 p.c. Justinus, year 1	p.c. Justinus, year 2
568 p.c. Justinus, year 2	p.c. Justinus, year 3

What is peculiar about "new style" is obviously that it combines reference to postconsulate with a numbering which takes its start not from the year after the consulate but from the year of the consulate itself. This type of numbering from the start of the consulate we will refer to as "consular." Stein cited (320-21, nn. 4 and 5) three examples from the papyri among his documentation, which also includes inscriptions, for the New Style: *BGU* III 838, *PSI* III 243, and *P.Oxy.* VII 1042. No more have been found from this reign since he wrote. "New Style" in these three cases, it should be emphasized, consists of the consular count coupled with the phrase

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this series and the abbreviations used, see *BASP* 15 (1978) 233.

<sup>2</sup> "Post-consulat et ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΙΑ," *Mélanges Bidez* (Bruxelles 1934) 869-912 = *Opera Minora Selecta* (Amsterdam 1968) 315-58. We cite according to the pages of the latter edition.

μετὰ τὴν ὀπατείαν.

Stein proceeds to treat the reign of Tiberius. There is only one secure instance of the phenomenon in this reign, viz. *P.Oxy.* I 144, where the consular number 2 is used in the year after the consulate. But Stein includes along with this document a group of papyri in which we find *not* μετὰ τὴν ὀπατείαν plus years by consular count (i.e. New Style), but rather ὀπατείας, "in the consulate" followed by these consular years (323 n.5). In *CSBE* 126-27 we largely followed Stein in designating these as New Style.<sup>3</sup> But this is incorrect, for in fact the phenomenon is different from that of New Style: instead of μετὰ τὴν ὀπατείαν plus consular numbering, we have ὀπατείας plus consular numbering.

Stein, having established the existence of New Style under Justinus II and Tiberius, concludes that consulate and postconsulate became interchangeable in the documentary parlance of this period. This conclusion is unwarranted and has had bad results, for it results in a muddling without distinction of two different systems. Once this lumping together is rejected, however, the problem of New Style under Mauricius needs reexamination in full.

One document under Tiberius seems to have the reverse of New Style: *PSI* VII 786 is dated to regnal year 6, ὀπατείας year 2, Tybi 7 of indiction 14. There is some error here (cf. *CSBE* 66 n.24), as the regnal year and indiction do not match. It seems likely that the date is 3.i.581 (the indiction is confirmed by lines 13-14) and that the scribes forgot to change the regnal year in December and the consulate early in 581. In this case the consular date gives in fact the number by postconsular reckoning, which is the reverse of New Style. (The postconsular numerals in *SPP* XX 217 and *SB* VI 9592 are lost, and the method of reckoning used there cannot be determined.)

A group of four documents early in Mauricius' reign refer to the postconsulate of the deceased emperor Tiberius. Three of them are examples of New Style reckoning: *P.Oxy.* I 136 and 137, and *P.Oxy.* XVI 1976. All refer to μετὰ τὴν ὀπατείαν but use consular count. In *P.Genova* I 31, the numeral for the postconsulate is lost.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Aegyptus* 56 (1976) 69 also belongs to this group, as does *P.Grenf.* I 60, cf. *CNED* II 17. So also does *P.Ant.* II 103. The reader is asked to delete N.S. in *CSBE* except for the examples justified in the discussion below.

The documentation referring to the consulate of Mauricius poses a more complicated problem. We list the texts first by categories (including a few texts where the restorations are probable).

A. ὀπατείας counted by consular reckoning, based on Mauricius' consulate in 583, i.e. with 583 = consular year 1.

1. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1988 (587), regnal 6, cos. 5
2. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1989 (590), regnal [9], cos. 8
3. *P.Erl.* 87 (592), regnal 10, cos. 10
4. *P.Amh.* II 150 (592), regnal 11, cos. 10
5. *P.Oxy.* I 201 descr. (593), regnal 12, cos. 11
6. *PSI* I 60 (595), regnal 14, cos. 13
7. *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2478 (595), regnal 14, cos. 13
8. *PSI* I 59 (596), regnal [15], cos. 14
9. *P.Wash.Univ.* 26 (596), regnal [15], cos. 14
10. *P.Oxy.* XIX 2239 (598), regnal [17], cos. 16
11. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1991 (601), cos. [1]9 (reading of John Rea, quoted by Z. Borkowski in *Inscriptions des factions à Alexandrie* [Warszawa 1980]; delete in *CSE* 128 s.a. 616 and add under year 601)

B. μετὰ τὴν ὀπατείαν counted by postconsular reckoning, based on Mauricius' consulate in 583, i.e. with 584 = p.c. year 1

1. *P.Erl.* 67 (591), p.c. 8
2. *P.Stras.* 318 (596), p.c. 13 (cf. *BASP* 16 [1979] 239 and "Christian Invocations in the Papyri," *CD'E* [in press])
3. *SB* VI 9153 (596), p.c. 13
4. *P.Köln* III 158 (599), p.c. 16

C. ὀπατείας counted by postconsular reckoning based on consulate in 583, i.e. counting 584 as consular year 1

1. *P.Oxy.* VI 996 (584), regnal 3, cos. 1
2. *P.Lond.* V 1731 (585), regnal 4, cos. 2
3. *P.Oxy.* XX 2283 (586), regnal 4, cos. 3
4. *P.Monac.* 11 (586), regnal 5, cos. 3
5. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1987 (587), regnal 5, cos. 4
6. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1993 (587), regnal 5, cos. 4
7. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1898 (587), regnal 4, cos. 4
8. *P.Oxy.* XLIV 3204 (588), regnal 6, cos. 5
9. *P.Köln* III 157 (589), regnal 7, cos. 6
10. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1990 (591), regnal 9, cos. 8

11. *P.Oxy.* XVIII 2202 (593), regnal 11, cos. 10
12. *P.Monac.* 14 (594), regnal 12, cos. 11
13. *P.Lond.* V 1733 (594), regnal 12, cos. 11
14. *PSI* III 244 (597), regnal 15, cos. 14
15. *P.Vatic.Aphrod.* 1 (598), regnal 16, cos. 15 (N.B.: indiction points to 599, probably in error)
16. *BGU* I 255 (599), regnal 17, cos. 16
17. *PSI* III 239 (601), cos. 18, ind. 4

D. μετὰ τὴν ὑπατεῖαν counted by consular reckoning from Mauricius' consulate in 583, i.e. with 584 = p.c. year 2

1. *P.Lond.* V 1897 (588), regnal 7, p.c. 6

(Several restored texts are left out of account, viz. *P.Cair.Masp.* I 67111, *P.Warren* 10, *P.Genova* I 32, *PSI* III 248, *SB* VI 9561.)

Several observations may be offered:

(1) Category A is only Oxyrhynchite, and Category B is only Herakleopolite. Category C, however, includes Oxyrhynchite, Memphite, Syenite, and Apollinopolite (Parva).

(2) There is only one true New Style date, i.e. using consular numbering with reference ostensibly to a postconsular date, viz. *P.Lond.* V 1897 (Category D). New Style ('N.S.') should be deleted in *CSBE* from all the other places where it occurs for this reign.

(3) Category C represents a reversal of the New Style situation: postconsular numbering is used to refer to a year ostensibly consular. This usage is paralleled hitherto only in *PSI* VII 786 under Tiberius (see above).

(4) If Categories A, B and D are taken as pointing to reckoning based on an understanding of Mauricius' consulate as having fallen in 583, and Group C as pointing to a 584 reckoning base, the two bases have an almost equal number of examples (16 and 17).<sup>4</sup>

(5) Since the Oxyrhynchite is represented in both what we may call the 583 group and in the 584 group, and since these groups are not chronologically disjunctive, we must reject a geographical or chronological explanation of the divergences.

(6) It seems unlikely that the government announced two dif-

---

<sup>4</sup> Stein, 355, is thus wrong to assert that "la très grande majorité" count 584 as first p.c. year of Mauricius. About half do now; slightly more than half did in Stein's time.

ferent years as being the base for computing consular dates, within a single nome. These differences must have an origin in scribal practices, and they are too numerous to be mere slips.

Now Mauricius entered his consulate on 25 December 583, just before the end of the Julian year (Stein, 333). The news must have reached Egypt only some weeks or months into 584 (we do not know when: at least after 11.i [*P.Oxy.* I 137 still uses Tiberius' post-consulate]; the first evidence of knowledge of it in Egypt is *PSI* III 248, in October-November, 584). We do not know in what form the proclamation was made, but it must have included the fact that 583 was the consular year, or we would not have some scribes dating by it.

The choices are essentially two: (1) some scribes may at the time of announcement have taken cognizance of the 583 start and therefore computed on its base, while others ignored 583 and started the count only with 584, the year in which they received the news; or (2) some scribes may have chosen (like the scribe of *PSI* 786) to use p.c. numbering even though they spoke of the ὑπατεύλας (Group C), while others distinguished accurately between consulate and post-consulate (Groups A and B) and counted accordingly, and still another used the New Style and said postconsulate but used consular counting (Group D).

*P.Monac.* 10 and 13, both dated in January, have consular dates which are lower by one than even the year calculated by Group C's method would be. These are evidently examples of Group C in which the scribe has failed to advance the consular year on l.i. It does not seem, though, that the Egyptian evidence provides decisive grounds for preferring one of the two explanations set out above.

Some Palestinian evidence, however, alters the balance. *P.Ness.* 29 and 30 provide a further group, in which the date is given by postconsulate. Their evidence is interesting:

*P.Ness.* 29: regnal 9, p.c. 6, year 485 of provincial era, ind. 9  
(23.xii.590)

*P.Ness.* 30: Regnal [1]5, p.c. 12, ind. 15 (13.ix.596)

These dates are both internally consistent *only* on the assumption that the calculation was based on a consular year of 584 and a correct use of the postconsulate (cos. = 584, p.c. 1 = 585, p.c. 6 = 590, p.c. 12 = 596). Scribal confusion of consulate and postcon-

sulate *cannot* be indicted here. There is in this province thus good evidence for a scribal belief that 584, when the announcement of the consulate arrived, was itself the consular year. This evidence seems to us to point to the correctness of view (1) above, that some scribes understood 583 as the consular year, others 584.

It thus appears that New Style is in fact limited to documents in which the phrase μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν appears, and that overall it can be found in only eight documents over these three reigns. A confusion of postconsulate and consulate otherwise appears only in PSI 786, which is an ill-drafted piece in any case. Otherwise, scribes appear to have distinguished accurately between consulate and post-consulate right through Mauricius' reign, but because of the peculiar circumstances surrounding his consulate, there was a divergence of views concerning which year was the consular year.<sup>5</sup>

#### 86. Officialdom in Prektis, 340-341

The documentation for the officials of the Hermopolite village of Prektis has recently been augmented by two new Vienna papyri published by J. Frösén as CPR VII 16 and 17. Their editor takes the occasion to offer a reconstruction of the chronology of those Prektis documents which lack absolute dates and to offer various comments on these liturgical offices (CPR VII, pp.79-82, Exkurs 2: "Zur Deutung der liturgischen Ämter des Dorfes Prektis 339-340 n.Chr."). As we find the method and conclusions of Frösén's discussion unacceptable, we will set out the evidence again in some detail in an effort to clarify matters.

The crucial documents number four, two with consular dates, two without (see the following chart for a schematic representation of the information):

---

<sup>5</sup> PSI III 179 contains a date only to ὑπατίας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβ(ευστάου) ἡμῶν δεσπότης ἔτους κ, Χοϊάκ κθ, Ινδ(ικτίονος) ζ, according to the editor, who dates "25 Dic. 602P?". R. Pintaudi has observed (P.Laur. III 91.1-7n.) that the letter cannot be stigma, but may be gamma or epsilon. Now 602 would be cos. 20 by the method of our Group A, but December 602 does not match with indiction 3 or 5.

Pintaudi suggests Heraclius, namely 25.xii.631. But cos. 20 of Heraclius is 630, which matches ind. 4; 631 is p.c. 20, and in this case the scribe has used the method of our Group C. We do not know what the solution is.

Ephor	P.Cair.Preis. 18=19 (Spring 340 ?)	BCU I 21 (13.viii.340)	P.Vindob.Sijp. 2 (Spring 341 ?)	P.Cair.Goodsp. 12 (15.viii.340)
Komarchs	Horos, s.of Ammonianus a) Horos, s.of Kastor b) Cornelius, s.of Paesis - - -	Horos, s.of Ammonianus Horos, s.of Kastor Cornelius, s.of Paesis Herakles, s.of Pagenes - - -	Kastor, s.of Teukes Sarmates, s.of Sil- vanus Ionis, s.of Ammo- nios - - -	Kastor, s.of Taukes Ionis, s.of Ammonios Sarmates, s.of Silvanus Cornelius, s.of Ammonas
Quadrarius	- - -	Herakles, s.of Pagenes	- - -	Cornelius, s.of Ammonas
Sitologi in function	Cornelius, s.of Kastor Poimen, s.of Pson- snaus Polys, s.of Karas Silvanus, s.of Pechon- sis (indiction 13)	- - -	Chous, s.of Hera- kles Phibis, s.of Hera- kles Ammonios, s.of Ionis Silvanus, s.of Pky- lis (indiction 13)	Chous, s.of Herakles Silvanus, s.of Pkylis Polys, s.of Silvanus (officials for the 14th (?) indiction)
Sitologi nominated	Silvanus, s.of Apollon Pekysis, s.of -- (indiction 14)	Ammonios, s.of Chous Herakles, s.of Phibis	Ammonios, s.of Chous Herakles, s.of Phibis	

*NB: Names in Italics are not styled as Sitologi in function; in fact no title is given!*

(1) *P.Cair.Preis.* 18 = 19 is a liturgical proposal made by the ephor, komarchs, and four *sitologoi* of Prektis for the thirteenth indiction, nominating the *sitologoi* for the next indiction. The names of those proposed are mostly lost but include a Silvanus son of Apollon and Pekysis (patronymic lost). There is no date preserved.<sup>6</sup> The names of the proposers are:

Cornelius son of Kastor	}	<i>sitologoi</i> of the 13th indiction <sup>7</sup>
Poimen son of Psonsnaus		
Polys son of Karas		
Silvanus son of Pechonsis		
Horos son of Ammonianos, ephor	}	komarchs
Horos son of Kastor		
Cornelius son of Paesis		

This group of functionaries, or a part thereof, we will refer to as Group A.<sup>8</sup> Those nominated we will call Group B, functionaries for the next year.

(2) *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 2 is a similar liturgical proposal, again with no preserved date, in which a well-preserved list of proposers again proposes a damaged list of liturgists (*sitologoi*). The proposers are:

Chous son of Herakles	}	<i>sitologoi</i> of the 13th indiction
Phibis son of Herakles		
Ammonios son of Ionis		
Silvanus son of Pkylis		
Kastor son of Teukes, ephor	}	komarchs
Sarmates son of Silvanus		
Ionis son of Ammonios		

The nominated men are:

<sup>6</sup> Frösén, 79, gives April-May 339 as the date; but this is only his own proposal advanced later and in our view wrong. Throughout he gives as if facts attested by the documents what is in fact mere hypothesis.

<sup>7</sup> Frösén writes (p. 79), "Das Zahlwort  $\omega$  in *P.Cair.Preis.* 18=19,5 dürfte für  $\omega\beta$  entweder falsch geschrieben oder falsch gelesen sein." On our photographs of *P.Cair.Preis.* 18 and 19 we consider the traces compatible only with  $\omega$ , and in 19 to be absolutely certainly this numeral.

<sup>8</sup> It is to be noted that only the *sitologoi* are designated by the indiction number. For some new readings in *P.Cair.Preis.* 18 see K.A. Worp, *Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar* [New York] 1 (1979) 102.

Ammonios son of Chous  
Herakles son of Phibis

It is immediately apparent that we have a second group identified as *sitologoi* of the 13th indiction and proposing their successors. Somewhere a scribe has evidently blundered.<sup>9</sup> We call the proposers Group C, the proposed Group D.

(3) The same *sitologoi* as in *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 2 also appear in *CPR VII 17*, which has no preserved date.<sup>10</sup> They here apparently act as sureties for a group whose names are only partly preserved and for whom no title is preserved. One is an Am.... (probably Ammonios), another Teukes, another Herakles. It is evident that Ammonios and Teukes would correspond to two of the men in Group D who are preserved in *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 2. It is possible that *CPR VII 17* has a connection with the same transaction.

Because of the fact that almost all of the names of Group B are lost, it is impossible to tell if we have four groups of *sitologoi* or only three, with B and C the same. Because of this fact, any attempt to see the correct order of the documents on this basis cannot stand.

(4) *BGU I 21*, dated by consuls to 13.viii.340, is a list of tax payments and expenditures submitted by the following:

Horos son of Ammonianos, ephor  
Horos son of Kastor } komarchs  
Cornelius son of Paesis }  
Herakles son of Pagenes, quadrarius

Except for the previously unattested quadrarius, these men are part of Group A. They collect taxes for the months Pachon through Mesore, 340, and report expenditures which include one payment for wine of the thirteenth indiction,<sup>11</sup> which unfortunately cannot be brought into connection with their term of office. They are reporting three and a half months after the end of indiction 13, but for some months included in indiction 14.

9 P.J. Sijpesteijn and K.A. Worp, *ZPE* 22 (1976) 106 n. 3, propose that the error is in *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 2; see below for further comment.

10 Editor: May-June, 340 (based on his reconstruction).

11 Frösén, 79; the correction made earlier (independently) in *CSBE* 10 n. 3.

(5) *P.Cair.Goodsp.* 12 is a list of payments of *merismos* for the fourteenth indiction, dated by the consuls to 15.viii.340. The submitting officials are:

Cornelius son of Ammonas, quadrarius	
Kastor son of Taukis, ephor	
Ionis son of Ammonios	} komarchs
Sarmates son of Silvanus	
Chous son of Herakles	} no title given
Silvanus son of Pkyllis	
Polys son of Silvanus	

The ephor and komarchs are recognizably officials of Group C, and Chous and Silvanus, though no title is given here, are *sitologoi* of that group. This group is collecting for indiction 14 and during indiction 14, as is the case with the officials in *BGU* 21. The difference, however, is that the *sitologoi* appear in *P.Cair.Goodsp.* 12 where they are absent in *BGU* 21.

To sum up our progress so far: on 13.viii.340, a group of four officials, three of whom were attested in an undated document acting with *sitologoi* of the 13th indiction, are collecting taxes apparently for the first four months of the fourteenth indiction (money taxes, that is). Two days later, on 15.viii.340, a group of seven officials, of whom three may be recognized as ephor and komarchs and two as *sitologoi* styling themselves as the *sitologoi* of the 13th indiction in another undated text, are collecting money taxes for the fourteenth indiction. What is the resolution of this seeming duplication of officials?

We may reject immediately any thought that there were two villages named Prektis in the same pagus as a counsel of desperation and inherently extremely unlikely (they use no phrase to distinguish themselves if so, and the nomenclature is strikingly similar). Nor does it seem plausible to suspect the consular date in either case, for errors in consular dates, aside from confusion of consulate and postconsulate at the very start of the year, are essentially unknown in the fourth century.

There are three more realistic possibilities:

(1) that the group acting on 13.viii.340 consists of officials of indiction 13, whose term of office had ended but whose liability for the taxes was not discharged until the full amount had been paid.

The principal objection to this hypothesis is simply that the taxes they are collecting seem to be those of the 14th indiction, not 13th;

(2) that the terms of the officials other than the *sitologoi* changed on 15 August (this is the hypothesis offered in ZPE 22 [1976] 106, rejected by Frösén, 81). The principal difficulty here is again that the officials seem to be collecting taxes both for indiction 14, and that the collections of the first group include Mesore with no indication that they had only half of that month under their jurisdiction. It should of course also be noted that there is no good evidence that other officials, let alone these, had terms ending in the middle of months; and the middle of a julian month seems an odd dividing point for Egyptian officials in the fourth century. Why not wait until the end of the civil year in two weeks?<sup>12</sup>

(3) It may be that the officials other than *sitologoi* continued in office until the end of Mesore, while the *sitologoi* came into office on 1 May or Pachon 1. In this case the absence of *sitologoi* from the group of officials on 13.viii would be explained by the assumption that the *sitologoi* in question had gone out of office some months before. What would be harder to explain is the activity of the officials other than *sitologoi* (i.e. komarchs etc.) in P.Cair. Goodsp. 12, some two weeks before one would suppose they took office. One could suppose that as they would be responsible for the collections for most of indiction 14, they were already assisting in apportioning the *merismoi* in advance of their actual term. But this explanation also is somewhat awkward.

The presence of the "*sitologoi*" in P.Cair. Goodsp. 12, at all events, seems to us decisive evidence that they are officials of indiction 14 and not 13, and that their selfstyling in P.Vindob. Sijp. 2 as of indiction 13 is wrong. In CRP VII 17, the editor has restored 13, but of course one cannot know whether the same error was in fact made there or 14 correctly written.

The group leaving office in 340 was thus responsible for P.Cair.

---

<sup>12</sup> P.Got. 6 (on which cf. ZPE 23 [1977] 186 and A.E.R. Boak in *Studies in Roman Social and Economic History in Honor of A.C. Johnson* [Princeton 1951] 331-32) poses a curious problem: dated to 10.iii.322, it contains the nomination of a tesserarius. There are difficulties in the reading. Cf. the nomination on 28. ii.350 in P.Amh. II 139. We simply do not know anything secure about the komarchs' term of office after 327.

Preis. 18 = 19, and that document must have been written in spring, 340; *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 2 would then have to fall one year later, in spring 341 (as also *CPR VII 17*, presumably).

A few further comments may be useful. Frösén comments (p. 80) that the occurrence of the names of the *sitologoi* of Group C among the taxpayers in *P.Cair.Goodsp.* 12 for indiction 14 shows that they cannot be functionaries for that indiction. This is not true: one still had to pay taxes while a liturgist. Compare, e.g., Aurelius Isidoros, *sitologos* in *P.Cair.Isid.* 9 and listed in line 154 of that text paying his taxes.

Secondly, Frösén compares the Polys son of Silvynus who appears in *P.Cair.Goodsp.* 12 as an untitled official of Group B to the Polis son of Silvanus of *SPP XX 95 ii*, who is there *gnoster* of a village "dessen Name verloren erwähnt," acting with *sitologoi* of the 14th and 15th indictions. We have argued (*CSBE 11*) that column i of this papyrus refers to 327/8 and 328/9, and it will be argued elsewhere that column ii refers to the indictions of 326/7 and 327/8 (in arrears). Worp has read the village (on the original papyrus) as Sinape, so the document has nothing to do with Prektis or the indiction cycle involved in its documents. Whether the man is the same, we cannot see any way to tell. For *SPP XX 95* see now *P.Charite 15*.

#### 87. *CPR VII 39*

The editor dates this loan to 406/7. His basis is apparently the repayment clause, which speaks of payment of interest after the expiration:

ἀπό τοῦ ἐσομένου Ἀθύρ μηνός τοῦ εἰσιόντος ἔτους πγ νβ.

Oxyrhynchite era year 83/52 is 406/7; but it is here explicitly called "approaching." We are therefore justified in putting the date of the document in the preceding year, 405/6.

#### 88. *P.Laur. III 75*

The editor gives the dating clause of this loan as follows:

+ [Βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβ(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπό(του) μεγ(ίστου)]  
 Εὐεργέτου Φλαουί[ου Μαυρικίου Τιβερίου]  
 τοῦ αἰωνίου Δύγο[ύστου καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος]

4 ἔτους ζ [ἡπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ]

γαληνότητος [ἔτους ζ . . . τῆς η̄ ἰνδ(ικτιονος).]

He gives the provenance as *Hermopolis*.

It is clear that we have here a formula with a regnal date followed by a consular one referring to the emperor. This combination is found in no Hermopolite documents of Mauricius' reign, and appears in fact only in the Oxyrhynchite and Memphite formula *RFBE* 58 formula 3. But here the consular phrase is not like this one. It reads ὑπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβεσιᾶτου ἡμῶν δεσπότη. So also consular dates under Phocas (*CSBE* 128).

The term γαληνότης in fact points unmistakably to Justinus II. It is found in *RFBE* 50 formula 4 and 51 formula 5 only. Of these, formula 5 is rare and refers to Justinus' second consulate of 568. Formula 4 is the standard Oxyrhynchite formula and is limited to that nome. It does, however, seem a bit long if only one line precedes the editor's line 2. At our request, Rosario Pintaudi examined the original and writes "tra la riga 1 e 2 è possibile un altro rigo." We propose to restore as follows:

- 1 + [Βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ]  
 1a [εὐσεβεσιᾶτου ἡμῶν δεσπότη μεγίστου]  
 2 Εὐεργέτου Φλαυίου [Ἰουστίνου]  
 3 τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγο[ύστου αὐτοκράτορος]  
 4 ἔτους θ̄ [ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν]  
 5 γαληνότητος [ἔτους θ̄ . . . τῆς η̄ ἰνδ(ικτιονος).]

The indiction number is given as eight in line 24, giving us a date of 574/5, or more precisely in the Oxyrhynchite Nome, 29.viii.574-28.viii.575. The regnal year can only be 9 or 10, and in fact one can see on the photograph a horizontal stroke in line 4 which can only belong to theta. The date is thus 29.viii-14.xi.574.

As the formula is Oxyrhynchite, it seems very likely that that city must be restored as the place mentioned in lines 9-10. In lines 13-14 the village Netneou is mentioned as the home of the acknowledging party. The editor restores 13-14 as follows:

Νετνη[οῦτος τοῦ Ἐρμου-]  
 πολίτου [ . ], χ[αίρειν.]

But a village of this name is known in the south of the Oxyrhynchite Nome, not in the Hermopolite (see editor's note ad loc.). The πολίτου of line 14, however, excludes restoring Ὁξυρυχίου.

J. Gascou has given us (by letter) the excellent suggestion that we have here an example of the appellation Νέα Ἰουσιῖνου πόλις for Oxyrhynchos (cf. R. Rémondon, *cd'E* 48 [1973] 140-44), found from 571 to the end of Justinus' reign. He restores lines 9-10 thus as ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς Νέας Ἰουσιῖνου πόλεως and 13-14 as Νετη-  
/4 [οὔτος τοῦ αὐτοῦ (?) Νέου Ἰουσιῖνου]-1<sup>1</sup> πολίτου νομοῦ. Gascou adds the remark that the subscription by the notary (*di' emu*) is in Latin, also excluding the Hermopolite.

## 89. P.Laur. III 77

This document opens with an invocation by Christ and a regnal formula which the editor restores as one of Heraclius. His date involves regnal year [ἐνά]του, Epeiph 12, indiction 7, in Hermopolis. From these he arrives at 6.vii.619 as a date. But in Hermopolis this date would have fallen already in indiction 8 (see *CSBE* 25-26), which began on 1 May. Epeiph 12 of indiction 7 would be 6.vii.618.

There is another possibility, 6.vii.603, one cycle earlier. Pintaudi rejected this cycle on the grounds of the "diversa finale" of δευτέρου, which he took to be the needed regnal year in 604. But since the indiction points to 603 rather than 604, one can restore [πρό]του with ease. Pintaudi's note in proof (p. 89, foot) referring to *BGV* XII, pp. 68-69, suggests that he had second thoughts, which we thus confirm. The consequences for the career of Pl. Magistor must be drawn in conjunction with a proper study of the other documents concerning him.

The use of a Christ invocation under Phocas is unusual, but not too surprising near the start of his reign; cf. our remarks in "Christian Invocations in the Papyri," to appear in *cd'E*.

SB 14 11539

## 90. P.Mil. inv. 224

This papyrus, published by Sergio Daris in *ZPE* 19 (1975) 291, opens with a date restored as follows:

[Βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτά]του δεσπότης ἡμῶν Φλαουίου

[Μαυρικίου Νέου Τιβερίου τοῦ αἰ]ωνίου Αὐγούστου .....

[ν]δ(ικτιονος) ιβ" ἔν Ὀξυρύνχ(ων) πόλει

The editor comments, "Non si può valutare con esattezza l'entità della parte mancante: l'integrazione data per le due righe ha solo

funzione indicativa."

Now it will be observed that the restorations of lines 1 and 2 are of rather unequal length (18 versus 26 letters); and the formula does not agree with the standard Oxyrhynchite formula for Mauricius (RFB 58-59, formula 3), where we get βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότης μεγίστου εὐεργέτης Φλαουλίου Μαυρικίου Νέου Τιβερίου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου αὐτοκράτορος (with some variation in the order of Mauricius' names possible). The reversed order of δεσπότης and ἡμῶν, the lack of μεγίστου εὐεργέτης, and the uneven restoration (33 versus 26 letters needed) all make one suspicious.

In fact, the absence of a consulate is further grounds for unease, and one is left with no reason to suppose that this formula concerns Mauricius at all. We see no indication that it is a *regnal* formula at all. If one restores [ὕπατείας (or μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν)] τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Φλαουλίου we have the start of numerous consular dates by the consulate of an emperor in the fifth and sixth centuries.

We therefore asked Professor O. Montevecchi for a photograph which she courteously and promptly supplied. It shows (a) that the left margin is almost straight, and (b) that the second line is to be read [ τοῦ αἰ]ωνίου Αὐγούστου τὸ γ' χορηγοῦν. This is therefore a reference to the third consulate of Justinian in 533; indiction 12 is thus 533/4. With a restoration of 17 letters in line 2, and the fact that the consulate is attested only in postconsular references, we can restore

[Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν] τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Φλαουλίου  
[Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ αἰ]ωνίου Αὐγούστου τὸ γ' χορηγοῦν  
[ἔτος month, day [γδ(ικτιονος) ιβ" ἐν Ὁξυρύχ(ων) πόλει.

The date is therefore sometime before 16.vii.534, when the consulate of 534 is known (SB VIII 9876).

[An unpublished papyrus described in a catalogue of the London dealer Charles Ede (*Writing & Lettering in Antiquity*) is dated to 20.x.533 by the third consulate of Justinian, the first example from that consular year. The space in the Milan papyrus, however, nonetheless favors 534, the p.c.]

91. P.Ness. 17

Most of what survives of this contract is the consular date at the start, which the editors restored as follows:

+ ὅπατέα τοῦ δεσ[πότης ἡμῶν Φλ(αοῦ)ου] Ἀναστασίου τοῦ αἰωνίου  
καί]

[τροπαιο]ύχου Αἰγούστου ἔτους τε[τρακοσιοστοῦ δωδεκάτου ἰνδ(ικτίω-  
νος) δεκάτης μηνός].

Π[ανέμου] ὀκτωκαιδε[κάτη]

The basis for the restoration was (a) the absence of any mention of a regnal year of an emperor as required by Justinian, *Novella* 47, hence giving a date before A.D. 537, and (b) the 400 + year of the era in line 2, giving 505/6 as a *terminus post quem*, plus (c) the evenness of the supposed length of the needed restorations in lines 1 and 2 with Anastasius, compared with an unevenness produced by restoring other emperors. The date assigned is thus 2.ii.517.

J. Frösén has recently called this date into question in the course of a discussion (*CPR* VII 40, Exkurs 1, pp. 153-54) of the use of αὐτοκράτωρ in imperial titulature of the fifth and sixth centuries. Calling attention to the use of ὅπατέα alone in *BGU* I 306 (566) and *SB* V 9596 (579), both written during the actual consular years of Justinus and Tiberius respectively, he rejects quite properly the editor's *terminus ante quem* and points out that the Fl. Anastasius who was consul in 517 was not the emperor in any case, so that 517 is impossible. Up to this point we find Frösén's argument persuasive.

He proceeds, however, to suggest "in P.Colt. 17, 2 sollte man vielleicht die Regierungsjahre und nicht die Ären lesen ... weil ὅπατέα offensichtlich in der Bedeutung 'βασιλείας' steht," comparing *BGU* 306 and *SB* 9596. He then suggests πέ[μπτου] as a restoration in line 2, referring to 578/9, Tiberius' fifth regnal year. The year 578 has some possibilities, but the method of reasoning is valueless. There is no example in the papyri of the use of ὅπατέα to mean βασιλείας. In *BGU* 306, ὅπατέα refers to the consulate, and no hypothesis of its 'meaning' βασιλείας is needed. In *SB* VI 9596, the case is clearer still; as in *BGU* 306, the date ends with ἔτους πρώτου, and the document comes from the actual consular year (cf. *RFBE* 55). ὅπατέα does not in any document mean βασιλείας or refer to regnal years (the unified count of years with the expression βασιλείας καί ὅπατέας is another phenomenon, for which see *CNBD* V 62). The parallels cited, at any rate, would point to the restoration πρώτου in line 2 of *P.Ness*. 17.

A check of the original, however (now located in the Pierpont

Morgan Library in New York), shows that the editor's reading τϛ[ is inescapable. Frösén's conclusion is thus excluded. What then are the possibilities? The *terminus post quem* is that established by the editor, 505/6. But there are five possibilities: Justinus I in 519; Justinian in 528 (his second consulate, but the papyri lack τὸ β'); Justinus II in 566; Tiberius, 578; Mauricius, 584 (but we have no instance of a date by Mauricius using only the consulate; the examples of postconsulates are limited to the Herakleopolite, cf. *RFBE* 63). Nessana is indeed otherwise (so far as our limited evidence shows) faithful to *Novella* 47, and the first two possibilities are to that extent more attractive. But we do not see any other ground for a decision.

## 92. P.Oslo III 120

This account of grain deliveries lists dates of

- (ἔτους) ιη} Μεσορῆ (line 8)  
 (ἔτους) ιη} Παῦσι (line 10)  
 (ἔτους) ιη} Ἐπελω (lines 12, 15, 18)

The editors assign a date of "A.D. 302, 310, or 324." (The papyrus is not listed in Index II and was thus not registered in *RFBE*.) It is nonetheless possible to date it, we think.

P.Oslo III 120 stands on the verso of III 83, official correspondence concerning Aegyptus Herculia. III 83 must on this basis be dated ca 315 or later (see J. Lallemand, *L'administration civile*, 49, 52 n.2), and III 120 must surely be later than III 83: we do not suppose that a register of high official correspondence was written later on the recto of a grain account written first on a verso. The only eighteenth year which can be considered is 323/4, year 18 of Constantine I; Pauni-Mesore would be May/June to July/August, 324. The use of only one numeral instead of the expected 18-16-8 is most closely paralleled by P.Amh. II 138, where year 21 is used in 327 (see *RFBE* 40), but is generally uncommon except in summary references to past years.

## 93. SB V 7667

This loan of money for repayment in cumin has a consular date by Constantine Augustus VI and Constantine Caesar I, Mecheir 22, or

17.ii.320. In lines 10-11, the current year is referred to as τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτος καὶ κβ (ἔτους) |<sup>11</sup> καὶ ζ'. Since 319/20 was in fact year 14-12-4, the editor's text would represent not only a mistaken year, but a rather astonishing scribal blunder of an otherwise unattested sort, putting a larger numeral second. At our request, P.J. Parsons has kindly checked the original and reports that the expected ἔτος καὶ ββ/ |<sup>11</sup> δδ/ is indeed readable. This text may be added to *RFBE* 40 under 319/20.

94. *SB* XII 11154

This lease, of which only the opening is preserved, is dated by the consuls to 321. The phrase for the term of the lease is transcribed as follows: ἐν χρόνον ἔτη [δύο (?) ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐ]ξῆς μηνὸς [ζ] |<sup>9</sup> ἔπειτα [τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος] ἔτος [ζ ἔτους - -]. The lease was therefore drawn up in Pauni (May-June) 321. It is a simple matter to determine the number of the regnal year currently in progress as 15-13-5, 320/1 (cf. *RFBE* 40) and to restore: [τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος] ἔτος [εζ/ ιζ/ εζ/]. *P.Wisc.* I 28 was the only previously published example of this regnal year.

95. *P.Vindob.* inv. 25838

This papyrus was first published by E. Boswinkel in the *Actes Xe Congrès International de Papyrologie* (Warsaw 1964) 118-20, and republished by the same editor as *P.Select.* (*Pap.Lugd.Bat.* XIII) 10. In the meantime, Roger Rémondon had written a note based on the first publication, which appeared in *Cd'E* 40 (1965) 180-97. It is Rémondon's remarks on p.183 about the date which concern us: "Il est très probable que cet ordre a été donné dans la seconde partie de l'année indictionnelle, c'est-à-dire dans le printemps ou aux approches de l'été d'une des années suivantes: 325, 340, 355, 370, 385, ou 400." The reasoning behind this statement is not explained, and it is not obvious to us. Officials in charge of collections in kind were generally appointed in the spring, it is true, but before the start of the indictional year for which they were responsible. If so, we should expect appointment in the year preceding that given by Rémondon in each instance. On his argumentation, the date would be in 384. (The choice of 325 would be unaltered, because the Pachon indiction was introduced after this year; but Rémondon has shown that

this year is in any case excluded.)

It is possible to argue that the date was not so early as spring. The appointee was a *synpaitetes* responsible for an amount of 400,000 pounds; one could suppose that he was a supplementary or substitute appointee. Even in this case, however, one would expect the appointment to come as early as possible in the indiction to allow collection of the dues as soon after the harvest as possible.

Rémondon drew important conclusions from what we think to be an incorrect date: "et le remplacement d'un officier germanique par un officier romain [i.e. Merobaudes by Eleutherios] ne serait peut-être pas dépourvu de signification: ce serait un élément supplémentaire à apporter au difficile problème de la 'politique gothique' de Théodose." If, however, our papyrus antedates 20.x.384, when we know that Merobaudes was in office, the order would be the reverse. A bit of caution would seem to be in order in attributing political significance to this papyrus.



96. *CPLat.* 199

This number covers several Vienna inventory numbers published as *SPP* XX 285-287, containing receipts for wine and meat. The editor of *CPLat.* gives 398 as the date, but it was observed already in *ZPE* 26 (1977) 273 n.21 that the consular date, p.c. Honorius IV and Eutychianus, in fact points to 399. This stands in apparent conflict, however with the indiction date read by the editors as XIV; indiction 14 in this cycle was 400/1. The repeated mention in the text of a supposed number *quantum decimo* was also puzzling.

At our request, J.-O. Tjäder kindly examined a photo of *CPLat.* 199a and the printed plates of *CPLat.* 199b/c, and has verified some suggestions of ours for improved readings, and he has communicated on the basis of these a new transcription of *CPLat.* 199a, as follows:

(1) est vino mille g. maced. sub c. Gaioli trib. d. an. octingentas triginta cinque ex d. quintum decimo Kal. April [i]n d. qu[art]um decimo Kall. easdd. duocene post conss. [dom. n.] H[on]orii p. Augg. qua[ter] (2) et Etychiani v.c. p. Sergio actuario ind. XII (?) (4) est carne mille g. maced. sub c. Gaioli trib. d. an. octingentas trigint[a] ci[n]qu[e] ex d. qu[int]um decimo K[al. April]l. in d. quart[u]m decimo Kall. easdd. [d]uocene pos[t] c[onss.] d[om]. n. Ho-

norī [ ]  
 (5) E[yt]ychiani v.c. p. Sergio a[ctuario ...

He comments, "There is thus no *quantum* at all: *quartum* in the second portion is perfectly clear. To me the only difficulty is the indiction number. At first, one is of course inclined to read XIV (especially on Seider's representation of [PERF] 520), but for [March] 399 XII is correct. Now one must take into consideration that at the end of the line, or at the end of a text, some letters could be extended to the right: I have found many instances of *m* and *n*, and *i* is also a short letter which ends in quite the same way as *m* and *n*. On Seider's reproduction, which is perfectly clear, the shape of the last sign is:  and this in fact is not even a *v* (*v*) but something of the symbol for *v* + *i* ()—which of course is quite out of place. And it would be somewhat surprising, if I am not mistaken, if 'fourteen' were expressed by means of subtraction: was not *xiiii* the normal way? At least it seems to have been so in the fifth century. To sum up, the indiction number in PERF 519 and in 520 can be interpreted as XII, with the last sign extended to the right."

The days in question may thus be seen to be 18-19.iii.399, with all chronological data in agreement. It remains only to add that in lines 3 and 6, the Greek reads (τάλαντα) ωλε.

We leave it to others to provide a commentary on this interesting but difficult text. For *Gaiolus*, cf. *CPLat.* 267; expand *sub c(ura)* (?). In the consular phrase, the *p.* is to be expanded to *p(erpetui)*. This is the proper equivalent of the Greek αἰώνιος, which is found routinely in formulas of this period; the editor's *p(ii)* has no Greek parallel.

97. ZPE 36 (1979) 84

*H. Med. J.* The date of *P. Inv.* 68.77, as given by its editor, is (ἔτους) πρ[ο]ς ρυγ[γ] Ἐπελφ[φ] ιζ' (ὡδ[δ] (ὡκτίσ[σ]ονος). About this the editor comments only "tra i due numeri non c'è traccia di alcuna congiunzione" (but this is not at all out of the ordinary). He seems not at all concerned about other elements of the dating formula.

It is very puzzling to think that the document would be lacking either an indiction number or a day number, or that an indiction number higher than 15 should occur here. A plate of the papyrus is

inexplicably printed in *Aegyptus* 59 (1979) Tav. 8, with no reference to the publication in *ZPE*. On it one can read easily (ἔτους) ριζ ρυς 'Ἐπειφ ιζ δ (νδ(κτ)λονος), providing as expected the correct date to 11 July 511.

98. *PSI* IV 316

This sublease of land was dated to the fourth century, with a mark of doubt, by its editors. They read a mention of the [current] year in line 4 as κγς" καὶ ..ς" καὶ ες" but could not identify it: "Nella datazione c'è, crediamo, piu di un errore." In *CSBE* 36 n.1 we suggested that the text must have a reference to regnal years 23-13-5 = 328/9, and we repeated this surmise in *RFBE* 40.

Lines 22 and 23, where one would expect a consular date in a document of this period (cf., e.g., *P.Oxy.* I 103), were described by the editors simply as "tracce." Thanks to a photograph supplied by Dr. R. Pintaudi and to his kindness in examining the original for us, we can now state that line 4 reads κγς" καὶ ιες" καὶ ες" as expected. Now an Oxyrhynchite lease in and for 328/9 was most likely concluded early in the civil year, i.e. in the last four months of 328. We read and restore the consular date in lines 22 and 23 as follows:

[ἡπατείας Φλ(αούλου) Ἰανου]α[ρίνου καὶ Ούεππίου Ἰούστ]ου τῶν  
[λαμπροτάτων, Φ]αῶφ[ι day ]

The date is thus ix-x.328.

## 99. Hall IX, 5 (No. 408)

One date by the Era of Diocletian poses a problem in an inscription published in H.R. Hall, *Coptic and Greek Texts of the Christian Period ... in the British Museum* (London 1905). Pl. IX, 5 (p.10, No. 408) is dated Phamenoth 5, indiction 2, Diocletian 482 (Ͻππβ). Hall, however, rendered the numerals as 472 and thus dated to 756. Diocletian 482 is 765/6, but indiction 2 is 763/4; one has thus a conflict between 1.iii.764 and 1.iii.766.

## 100. Addenda et Corrigenda

In the course of the composition of these notes and of our other work on chronological problems, we have accumulated a sub-

stantial mass of *addenda et corrigenda* to *CSBE* and *RFBE*, mostly coming from newly published texts or from corrections to texts made by us or by others. In addition, we have found a number of items of evidence overlooked by us. A comprehensive list of these corrections up to 30 June 1981 may be had by any interested scholar by writing to either of us: Bagnall at 606 Hamilton Hall, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, U.S.A.; Worp at Louise de Colignylaan 9, 2082 BM Santpoort-Zuid, Netherlands. With this installment we bring to an end the present series of notes.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

ROGER S. BAGNALL  
K.A. WORP