

CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS, IV¹

36. BGU II 539 and 608

It was noted in *CSBE* 34 n.10 that almost all known examples of indictions numbered 16 belonged to the beginning either of the second (327-342) or third (342-357) cycles of indictions, being equivalent to the first indiction of the new cycle in the latter case (342/3), which accounted for most of the instances. Only *BGU* IV 1092 belongs to the cycle of 372. One exception to the pattern of fourth-century distribution was noted, *BGU* II 539, a list of payments and arrears of wheat taxes dated by the editor "aus arabischer Zeit." This remarkable exception to the normal pattern awakens suspicion of itself. The suspicion is increased when one notices that *BGU* II 608, also dated "aus arabischer Zeit," is stated by Krebs to be in the same hand as 539. *BGU* 608, however, is a list of men from the village of Karanis (in i.1, the restoration βρέ[υ]ων [*l. βρέουιον*] ἀνδρ(ων) imposes itself in spite of *BL* I 56), presumably detailed for some liturgical duty. Now it is well-known that the last century to produce any quantity of Karanidian documents is the fourth; and *P.Haun*.inv. 318, of A.D. 439, is the last known text from the village. A text from the Arab period from Karanis, therefore, is unlikely; and the names which one finds in the two *BGU* texts are strongly reminiscent of the nomenclature of the fourth-century papyri from Karanis. Scarcely any of them, in fact, can be found in papyri of the seventh and eighth centuries. We suggest, therefore, that both texts are to be dated to the fourth century, and in all probability to ca 342.

¹ For the purpose of this series, see *BASP* 15 (1978) 233. Besides standard abbreviations, we cite our own works by the following: *CSBE* = *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (Stud.Amst. 8, Zutphen 1978); *RFBE* = *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* (*BASP* Suppl. 2, Missoula 1979); *CNBD* = "Chronological Notes on Byzantine Documents" (the present series of notes), in *BASP* 15 (1978) and following.

Dr. G. Poethke, asked if the dating to the Arab period was palaeographically certain, replies "Hände zeigen Ähnlichkeiten, sind wohl nicht dieselben. Datierung schwierig, jedoch würde man die Texte auf den ersten Blick nicht der 'arabischer Zeit' zuweisen." [After this article was in press we saw D. Bonneau's article, "Un règlement de l'usage de l'eau au V^e siècle," *Hommages Serge Sauneron II: Egypte post-pharaonique* (Bibl. d'Étude 82, Cairo 1979). On p. 15 (and nn. 1-2) she deals with *BGU* 608, which she thinks is "bien plus tardive" than the fourth century, a view we cannot agree with. In n. 2 she restores line 1 as βρε[ο`ν'(ιον) τ]ῶν ἀνδρ(ων) (*sic*); the article is not necessary and the abbreviation seems also out of place.]

37. *BGU* III 858

This text is a receipt for a payment of five thousand drachmas, dated to years 12-11-4 of the first tetrarchy, Phaophi 13. This date was given by Krebs as 10.x.294, but rightly corrected by Preisigke in *BL* I 74 to 11.x.295. The first line of the papyrus, which has no apparent relationship to what follows, was transcribed by the editor as follows: Πουκω και Ει. . λεινω πα. ρ. [.]. In *BL* I 74, the correction printed on p. 7 of *BGU* III is recorded, that the beginning of the line should read Τρυκω. No suggestion about the sense of this peculiar line was made.

Documents after the creation of the tetrarchy commonly have consular dates at the beginning or the end, and in the first few decades of consular dating the combination of a consular date with a regnal one is not uncommon. We ought therefore to seek a consular date for the first line of *BGU* 858. The consuls of A.D. 295 were Nummius Tuscus and C. Annius Anullinus; one of the known forms of their dating clause is Τούσκα και 'Ανουλλίνω ὑπάτοις.² At our request, Dr. G. Poethke has examined the papyrus, and on the basis of the information provided by him we propose the reading Τρυ[σ]κω και 'Αν[ο]υλείνω ὑπάτοι[ς].

38. *P.Lips.* 23

The editors present the consular date at the beginning of this papyrus as follows:

ὑπατείας [τοῦ] δεσπότης ἡ[μῶν Φλ. -]
 ἀνοῦ τοῦ [αἰωνίου Ἀγγούστου τὸ .]
 [καὶ] [. . . τοῦ λαμπ-]
 ροτ[άτου κτλ.]

² See *CSBE* 104 a. 295; we are dealing of course with a transliteration of the names in the ablative in Latin rather than the normal translation into the genitive or dative; cf. S. F. Johanson, *Proc. XIV Int. Congr. Pap.* 183-88.

The papyrus belongs to the Fl. Isidoros group, which spreads over the years 368 (*P.Lips.* 33) to 389 (*P.Lips.* 37). It is dated (line 29) to Thoth 27 = 24 September, and it mentions a fourth new indiction, which could be 375/6 or 390/1, as being future (cf. *CSBE* 31). Now 374 was the consulate of Gratianus III and Fl. Equitius, while 390 was that of Valentinianus IV and Fl. Neoterius. These are the only consulates in proximity which can be considered. Of them, however, the consuls of 390 can be excluded, because at 24 September 390, the fourth new indiction would no longer be future but present. The consuls of 389, on the other hand, are not suitable (no emperor involved). We conclude, therefore, that one must restore as follows and date to 24.ix.374:

ὑπατείας [τοῦ] δεσπότου ἡμῶν Φλ(αοῦ) Γρατι-
 ανοῦ τοῦ [αἰωνίου Ἀγγούστου τὸ γ']
 [καὶ] Φλ(αοῦ) Ἐκν[τίου τοῦ λαμπ-]
 ροτ[άτου κτλ.]

The alternative date in *CSBE* 31 to A.D. 389 should thus be deleted.

39. *P.Lips.* 42

The presence in line 2 of this papyrus of the title ἀποεπάρχου with reference to the second consul makes it necessary to recognize there the consuls of A.D. 391, Fl. Tatianus and Fl. Symmachus, whose normal titulature in other papyri is as follows: Φλαοῦ Τατιανοῦ τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἐπάρχου τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραιτωρίου καὶ Φλαοῦ Συμμάχου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἀποεπάρχου (see *CSBE* 115 a.391). The remains of the two copies of *P.Lips.* 42 preserve virtually all of this except the consuls' names. The papyrus must be dated therefore to iii-iv.391 and becomes the earliest published example of the current consuls in that year.

40. *P.Lond.* III 991 (p. 258)

The consular formula of this text is presented as follows in the original publication: [ὑπατείας]λείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθησομένου Παύνη κη τῆ[ς] ἰνδ(). The editor dates the papyrus simply "sixth century" without discussion. In the index, however, we find (p. 337), [ὑπατείας (?) Φλαοῦ Βασι]λείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθησομένου (qu. A.D. 542?). The consulate of Fl. Basilius was 541; since the indiction number is lost in line 1, it is difficult to see why 542 is suggested. Neither 541 nor 542, however, is possible, for two reasons: (1) the phrase καὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθησομένου is never used with Fl. Basilius cos. 541, nor indeed with any consul after A.D. 500. It is strictly a fifth-century phenomenon.³ (2) The text seems to come from the Thebaid, as the editor

³ See *CNBD* VI 63 for a detailed discussion.

remarks on the basis of the fact that one of the parties comes from Hermonthis. No document from any part of the Thebaid (i.e. Hermonthis and all to the south) uses the epithet λαμπρότατος for Fl. Basilius cos. 541, who is uniformly called ἐνδοξότατος in this part of the country.⁴

There was, however, another Basilius who served as consul, namely Fl. Caecina Decimus Maximus Basilius, cos. 480. Like the other Basilius, he had no colleague, but it was evidently at one time expected that one would later be announced. There is, however, no mention of a colleague or the expectation of one in *BGU XII 2155.2*. This papyrus, the sole other attestation of this consulate, also gives Basilius the epithet λαμπρότατος.

P.Lond. III 991 therefore seems to refer to the consul of 480. But we know that as late as 27.iii.481 (*P.Princ.* II 82) Egyptian scribes were dating by the postconsulate of Zeno III, i.e. the consul of 479. *BGU XII 2155*, of 18 October, refers to Basilius as consul, but the editor has properly described this as an error for postconsulate, natural enough if his consulate *per se* had never been in use in the country. The scribe might be pardoned for believing that the newly-announced name meant the consul of the current year. *P.Lond.* III 991, falling on Pauni 28 = 22 June, must also belong to 481 and provide the earliest evidence so far attested of the knowledge of Basilius' consulate in Egypt. We therefore restore line 1 as follows: [μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ(αοῦ) Βασι]λείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθησομένου. The length obtained for the restoration is about 21 or 22 letters. In line 23, the only one certainly restorable, 21 letters are missing; in line 2, if Αὐρήλιοι were written out instead of abbreviated, one would have 22 letters.

41. *P.Lond.* V 1719

In the course of arguing that *P.Vindob.inv.G. 25948* was to be dated in September, 541, we cited two examples of the supposed knowledge of the consulate of Fl. Basilius in early 541 in Egypt (see *ZPE* 28 [1978] 229 n. 22). We later realized (as James G. Keenan has pointed out to us) that one of these (*P.Cair.Masp.* II 67126) is not Egyptian at all, but was written in Constantinople, while the other one is doubtfully dated, namely *P.Lond.* V 1719 from Thebes. The editor assigned the text to the consulate of Basilius (541), but expressed some doubt; he opted for 541 rather than 556 (which is also a fourth indiction) because he considered the room in line 1 insufficient for μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν. Keenan points out to us, however, that the papyrus is broken off at the top, and that nothing prevents the assumption that a postconsulate, perhaps preceded by a regnal date, stood on one or more

4 We treat this question in *CNBD* III 35.

now-lost lines. Given the difficulty of a consular date by Basilius in Egypt in January-February 541, 556 seems to us inevitable.

42. *P.Med.inv.* 27

This papyrus is published by S. Daris in *ZPE* 23 (1976) 217-18 for the sake of the consular formula, which is printed as follows:

5b14
12099

[ύπατείας Γρατια]γού τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου υἱοῦ τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμ[ῶν
Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ Ἀγούστου καὶ Δαγαλαίφου]
τοῦ λαμπροτάτου στρ[ατηλάτου]

The text mentions, however, the 11th indiction. This indiction is 367/8. It seems most likely that this forms part of the title of an official (if one considers the mention of Alexandria in line 5), and it does not seem very likely that the officials for 367/8 would already have been functioning in 366 (as the editor considered the most likely date to be). It therefore seems to us much more likely that we should restore the date as a postconsulate. As most of the piece is lost, no conclusion about the length of the lacuna is otherwise possible.

43. *P.Mich.* XIII 660

In *CSBE* 62 n. 65 we commented on the problem posed by lines 9-10 of this papyrus, in which the editor's text gives *εἰς τὰς τελευταίας ἡμέρας τοῦ παρελθόντος μηνὸς Μεσορῆ τῆς φ[θιν]ούσης ἐβδόμης ἰν[δι]κτ[ι]σ[το]νος*, which he translates, "in the last days of the passed month Mesore of the seventh indiction which is coming to its end." The usage of *φθίνουσα* in combination with either *ἰνδικτίων* or *ἐπινέμησις* is unparalleled, and it suggests that the indiction which was going on in Mesore was still going on in Thoth but about to come to an end; this is contrary to everything we know of the indiction system. Now in line 15 there is a reference to Phaophi 8 *τῆς παρελθούσης ἔ[κτ]ης ἐπινεμήσεως*. Indiction 6 thus at least is past. Since the reading of the phi in line 10 is certain (as we have verified from a photograph), a word with that beginning must be restored. It seems to us considerably more attractive to restore *φ[θαν]ούσης*, which is attested as meaning "past" or "previous" (cf. *LSJ* s.v. *φθάνω* II.1 and Julian, *Epist.* 73 Bidez).

This restoration, however, does not solve the problem posed by the seeming suggestion that the indiction which included Mesore immediately past was different from the indiction in which the document was drawn up, for in this part of Egypt one would expect an indictional reckoning beginning with Pachon or May. We cannot say whether Constantinopolitan usage affected this text in some way, or whether the implication that Mesore was the immediately preceding month is incorrect.

remarks on the basis of the fact that one of the parties comes from Hermonthis. No document from any part of the Thebaid (i.e. Hermopolis and all to the south) uses the epithet *λαμπρότατος* for Fl. Basilius cos. 541, who is uniformly called *ἐνδοξότατος* in this part of the country.⁴

There was, however, another Basilius who served as consul, namely Fl. Caecina Decimus Maximus Basilius, cos. 480. Like the other Basilius, he had no colleague, but it was evidently at one time expected that one would later be announced. There is, however, no mention of a colleague or the expectation of one in *BGU XII 2155.2*. This papyrus, the sole other attestation of this consulate, also gives Basilius the epithet *λαμπρότατος*.

P. Lond. III 991 therefore seems to refer to the consul of 480. But we know that as late as 27.iii.481 (*P. Princ.* II 82) Egyptian scribes were dating by the postconsulate of Zeno III, i.e. the consul of 479. *BGU XII 2155*, of 18 October, refers to Basilius as consul, but the editor has properly described this as an error for postconsulate, natural enough if his consulate *per se* had never been in use in the country. The scribe might be pardoned for believing that the newly-announced name meant the consul of the current year. *P. Lond.* III 991, falling on Pauni 28 = 22 June, must also belong to 481 and provide the earliest evidence so far attested of the knowledge of Basilius' consulate in Egypt. We therefore restore line 1 as follows: [μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ(αουίου) Βασι]λείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθησομένου. The length obtained for the restoration is about 21 or 22 letters. In line 23, the only one certainly restorable, 21 letters are missing; in line 2, if *Ἀυρήλιοι* were written out instead of abbreviated, one would have 22 letters.

41. *P. Lond.* V 1719

In the course of arguing that *P. Vindob. inv. G. 25948* was to be dated in September, 541, we cited two examples of the supposed knowledge of the consulate of Fl. Basilius in early 541 in Egypt (see *ZPE* 28 [1978] 229 n. 22). We later realized (as James G. Keenan has pointed out to us) that one of these (*P. Cair. Masp.* II 67126) is not Egyptian at all, but was written in Constantinople, while the other one is doubtfully dated, namely *P. Lond.* V 1719 from Thebes. The editor assigned the text to the consulate of Basilius (541), but expressed some doubt; he opted for 541 rather than 556 (which is also a fourth indiction) because he considered the room in line 1 insufficient for *μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν*. Keenan points out to us, however, that the papyrus is broken off at the top, and that nothing prevents the assumption that a postconsulate, perhaps preceded by a regnal date, stood on one or more

4 We treat this question in *CNBD* III 35.

now-lost lines. Given the difficulty of a consular date by Basilius in Egypt in January-February 541, 556 seems to us inevitable.

42. *P.Med.inv.* 27

This papyrus is published by S. Daris in *ZPE* 23 (1976) 217-18 for the sake of the consular formula, which is printed as follows:

[ύπατείας Γρατια]ροῦ τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου υἱοῦ τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμ[ῶν
 Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ Αὐγούστου καὶ Δαγαλαίφου]
 τοῦ λαμπροτάτου στρ[ατηλάτου]

5314
12099

The text mentions, however, the 11th indiction. This indiction is 367/8. It seems most likely that this forms part of the title of an official (if one considers the mention of Alexandria in line 5), and it does not seem very likely that the officials for 367/8 would already have been functioning in 366 (as the editor considered the most likely date to be). It therefore seems to us much more likely that we should restore the date as a postconsulate. As most of the piece is lost, no conclusion about the length of the lacuna is otherwise possible.

43. *P.Mich.* XIII 660

In *CSBE* 62 n. 65 we commented on the problem posed by lines 9-10 of this papyrus, in which the editor's text gives *εἰς τὰς τελευταίας ἡμέρας τοῦ παρελθόντος μηνὸς Μεσορῆ τῆς φ[θιν]οῦσης ἐβδόμης ἡ[δι]κτ[ῆ]τος*, which he translates, "in the last days of the passed month Mesore of the seventh indiction which is coming to its end." The usage of *φθίνουσα* in combination with either *ἡνδικτίων* or *ἐπιπέμης* is unparalleled, and it suggests that the indiction which was going on in Mesore was still going on in Thoth but about to come to an end; this is contrary to everything we know of the indiction system. Now in line 15 there is a reference to Phaophi 8 *τῆς παρελθούσης ἡ[δι]κτῆς ἐπιπέμης*. Indiction 6 thus at least is past. Since the reading of the phi in line 10 is certain (as we have verified from a photograph), a word with that beginning must be restored. It seems to us considerably more attractive to restore *φ[θαν]οῦσης*, which is attested as meaning "past" or "previous" (cf. *LSJ* s.v. *φθάνω* II.1 and Julian, *Epist.* 73 Bidez).

This restoration, however, does not solve the problem posed by the seeming suggestion that the indiction which included Mesore immediately past was different from the indiction in which the document was drawn up, for in this part of Egypt one would expect an indictional reckoning beginning with Pachon or May. We cannot say whether Constantinopolitan usage affected this text in some way, or whether the implication that Mesore was the immediately preceding month is incorrect.

44. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1997

The editors print as the date of this receipt for the taxes of indiction 4 the following: ἐγράφη(η) Μεσορή ζ̄ ἰνδ(ικ.) γ̄ ὕ[π]ἔρ [τῆς ? τ]ετάρτης (line 4). The mention of the indiction for which the taxes were paid has already been made in lines 2-3, and it is puzzling that it recurs in the dating formula. On the basis of a photograph kindly provided by Dr. D. Hagedorn, we believe that we can read a formula more normal for Oxyrhynchos (cf. *CSBE* 21,26): Μεσορή ζ̄ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) γ̄ ἄρ[χ(ῆ)] τῆς τ]ετάρτης. The text thus belongs to that class dated first by the Thoth to Mesore indictional reckoning normal in Oxyrhynchos and secondly by the beginning of the July (*delegatio*) indiction.

45. *P.Oxy.* XLIV 3204

The consular date of this deed of surety of 2.i.588 (cf. *ZPE* 26 [1977] 284 and *CSBE* 127), following the regnal formula, differs from what is normal for Mauricius in Oxyrhynchos (for which see *RFBE* 58, formula 3) in (a) preceding ὑπατείας with καί, and (b) omitting before ἡμῶν the adjective εὐσεβεστάτου. As the first of these rests on restoration, and the second is mostly restored, one may naturally question the appropriateness of printing a deviation from the standard phrase. We have asked Dr. John Rea to examine the original for the possibility of reading εὐσε]β(εστάτου), and he reports that "the trace before ἡμῶν is very much like the zig-zag mark of abbreviation that is so often found in εὐσε]βS. Before that the trace is very meagre, too slight to confirm beta, but εὐσε]βS seems to me very likely to be right." The restoration of the standard phrase is a bit longer than line 2, but, as Rea points out, the initial phi in line 2 may well have been large. We therefore restore line 3 as follows:

[ὑπατ(ε)ίας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσε]β(εστάτου) ἡμῶν κτλ.

46. *P.Ryl.* IV 616

BL 7 This taxation list of the province of Augusta Iovia is dated by the editor to ca A.D. 312. The basis on which this date was assigned is Column ii.12-13, where we find the following text:

Ἰνδικτίονος τοῦ ἐνεστ[ῶτος] κανόνος ὑπ[ατε]ίας τῶν δεσποτῶν
ἡμ[ῶν] Κωνστα[ντίνου καὶ] Λικιννίου[υ] Σ[εβασ]τ[ῶν] α (ἐτους).

About this, the editor comments, "the only year in which a consulate of Constantine and Licinius coincides with the first year of an indiction cycle is 312."

This dating raises a number of problems: (1) the indiction cycle was not, so far as our evidence goes, introduced into Egypt until late 313 or

early 314, after the death of Maximinus Daia, and year 1 was therefore never "present" (cf. *CSBE* 3-5). (2) The consulate of Constantine and Licinius in 312 was their second one; we would have to assume that the numeral was omitted, which is not unknown (cf. *CNBD* II 15), but which is uncommon and not to be expected with a scribe of high caliber and station. (3) The interpretation by which the numeral of the indiction is separated from that word by an entire consular phrase rests on no parallel; indictional dates after 312 are always closely accompanied by the number. (4) One would naturally take any numeral written immediately after a consulate to refer to the number of the consulate, as is universally the case elsewhere. (5) An excellent photograph kindly provided by the John Rylands Library shows that in line 13 the lacuna after the dotted tau has room for four letters (corresponding to part of pi and the four following letters in the preceding line in $\upsilon\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\alpha\varsigma$). The $\tau[\omega\nu]$ of the editor still leaves sufficient room for two more letters before α ($\epsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$), which is actually $\alpha S/$.

Combining these circumstances, we consider a restoration in line 13 of $\eta\mu[\omega\nu] \text{Κωνστα}[\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon \text{καὶ}] \text{Λικιννί}[\omega\nu] \text{Σ}[\epsilon\beta\alpha\sigma]\tau[\acute{\omega}\nu \tau\omicron] \alpha S/$ virtually inescapable. Now the first consulate of Constantine and Licinius fell in 309, during a period when there were both numbered indictions with the regnal year number and also phrases such as we find in *P. Ryl.* 616. We suppose that *P. Ryl.* 616 was written in or after 309; if, as J. D. Thomas has argued (*BASP* 15 [1978] 133-45) and we believe, the tax assessment was issued in May or June at this time, the assessment of the consulate would be "present" or current from May or June of that julian year until the same time the following year. It is possible, since the writer of our papyrus speaks of the canon and not the consulate as present, that we should draw the conclusion that the text is to be dated in the first five or six months of 310, but that cannot be regarded as certain.

A date of 309-310 for *P. Ryl.* 616 may encounter some questions, and it will be as well to face those which occur to us here. (1) Is it not peculiar to find $\tau\omicron \alpha S/$ with a first consulate, when there was at the time no certainty that a second one would follow? It is, indeed, not the rule at this period, but there is one clear example in 307, just two years earlier, namely *P. Thead.* 10 = *P. Sakaon* 64 (we have verified the reading on a photograph in Brussels). (2) The consular formula is not that normal for 309, if compared with other papyri of that year, since both wording and order are different, whereas they correspond well enough to the formula for 312. This is the most serious objection in our eyes; the standard formula speaks of Licinius Augustus and Constantinus filius Augustorum, in that order. Such a reversal of order is indeed surprising; we cannot cite another example. On the other hand, A. Chastagnol has chronicled the numerous vagaries in the Egyptian evidence produced by the shifting relationships of Constantine and Licinius to the eastern emperors in this period, and if the date is indeed

310 and not the year of the consulate, the reversal of order and change of titles may not be impossible.⁵ It is regrettable that no regnal titulature is attested in the papyri between September–October 309, when Constantine was still called a Caesar, and June, 314, by which time he was the senior Augustus (cf. *RFBE* 33–37). (3) What becomes of the role of *P. Ryl.* 616 in the evidence for the price of gold in this period if its date is shifted? If one considers the table in *P. Oxy.* XLIII, p. 81, one sees that there is no absolutely dated price between the 60,000 den. per pound in A.D. 300 (*P. Panop. Beatty* 2.216) and the 432,000 den. per pound paid on the open market in A.D. 316–318 (*P. Oxy.* XLIII 3121). The price of 100,000 in *P. Oxy.* XVII 2106.20 is only approximately and vaguely dated to *ca* A.D. 304–306. A date of 310 for *P. Ryl.* 616, with its figure of just under 110,000 for an official use, is in no way incompatible with the other evidence.

In sum, we consider that none of the objections to a date in 309 or early 310 is sufficient to overcome the weighty considerations in favor of such a date as set forth above.

47. Dates in *P. Sakaon*

G. M. Parássoglou's recent welcome reedition of the texts of the fourth-century Theadelphia archives contains a number of minor errors in the computation of dates, many of them no doubt typing errors, which we take this opportunity to correct:

<i>Text</i>	<i>Ed. date</i>	<i>Correct date</i>
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 15.29	25.ii.308	26.ii.308
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 16.3	19.iii.309	29.iii.309
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 18	29–30.iv.312	28–29.iv.312
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 21.10	29.xii.319	30.xii.319
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 7.15	26.viii.320	23.viii.320 ⁶
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 22	5–12.ix.324	5–8.ix.324
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 51	7.v.324	6.v.324
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 23	25.xii.324	24.xii.324
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 24	29.vi.325	28.vi.325
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 25.10	29.viii.327	30.viii.327
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 25.19,32	11.ix.327	12.ix.327
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 43	6.xi.327	7.xi.327
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 65	12.ix.328	11.ix.328
<i>P. Sakaon</i> 73	29.ix.328	28.ix.328

⁵ See A. Chastagnol, "La datation par années régnales égyptiennes à l'époque Constantinienne," *Aiôn: Le temps chez les Romains*, ed. R. Chevallier (Caesarodunum 10 bis, Paris 1976) 221–38 at pp. 224–25. A more complete table of regnal dates than Chastagnol's appears in *RFBE*.

⁶ See *CSBE* 108 s.a. 320 for the correct reading of the date (in *P. Thead.* 28).

48. *P.Sakaon* 19.41 = *P.Thead.* 29.39

The month date in Pachon in this line was read as theta by Jouguet, zeta by Parássoglou, and rendered therefore as 4 or 2 May. In fact we see on a photograph provided by J. Bingen that the numeral is clearly ς , hence 1 May.⁷

49. *P.Sakaon* 69 = *P.Stras.* 1 43

This lease is dated to Tybi 19 in the consulate of Junius Bassus and Flavius Ablabius, and it is to run *ἀπὸ τῆς ἡδὴ γενομένης ὑπ' ἐμοῦ σπορᾶς τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους πέμπτης ἰνδικτίονος*. Preisigke took the view that the mention of a fifth indiction pointed to a date in 332, while the consular date is to 14.i.331. Of these Preisigke preferred the consular date to 331. In *CSBE* 50, 110 a.332, we supposed that the consulate was an error for post-consulate and that the indiction should be followed; we thus dated the text to 15.i.332. The most recent editor, Parássoglou, dates to 331.

A reconsideration persuades us that the conflict is not real, and that the indiction is compatible with a date in 331. We have argued elsewhere⁸ that *σπορά* and *σπόρος* commonly refer to the crop, and that the indiction numbers attached to them refer to the indiction of taxes declared for the crop in question, not the indiction period during which the planting took place. The fifth indiction was 331/2, and its harvest took place in early summer, 331; the crop already growing in January 331 is the crop harvested in May and June 331. The correct date is therefore 14.i.331 and all indices agree with this date.

50. *SB* I 4821

This papyrus figures on *CSBE* 119 as the sole example of the consulate of 464 in that year (there is one example of the postconsulate cited, *PSI* VII 768). The text as printed is rather curious, however, and we have obtained a photograph from the Louvre (where it is inventory number 6546 b W App. 685) thanks to the kindness of M.-F. Aubert. On it we find that Wessely's reading is utterly wrong, for where he reads *Ῥου]στικίου*, the papyrus actually has *Ἰεστορίου*, which we can only restore as *N]εστορίου*. Furthermore, after the month name there is no loss before the eta in line 3 which Wessely read, and one must read and restore *Φαρμουθι³ η τ[ρ]ιτη]ς ἰν(δικτίονος)*. It remains virtually certain, however, that we are dealing with the consuls of 464, as the Olybrii of 395 and 526 are put out of court by the third indiction, which began in 464 but not in or near either of the other

⁷ We take the opportunity to point out that Parássoglou's *Ἀεῖλον Σακαῶνος* in line 11 should actually be read as *Πλοντάμμονος*.

⁸ See *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978) 287-93.

two years. Pharmouthi 8 of indiction 3 must be 3 April 465, in the post-consulate of these consuls.

Now the papyrus has virtually no margin at the top, and a photograph of the verso kindly provided by the Louvre shows that the papyrus was in fact broken off at top, so that there is every likelihood that some text has been lost. The first letter of the preserved line of the recto, read as upsilon by Wessely, can equally well be tau, and we think we see traces of an iota following it. Since about four letters seem lost in the lacuna before the nu, we consider τ[κίον Ν] a likely reading of the start of line 1. We would then restore the entirely lost first line of the original as [Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλαουίων Ξουσ-]. The principal problem offered by our restoration is the presence of a name of Rusticius otherwise unknown to us, namely Nestorius. But very little is known about Rusticius in any case.

We take this opportunity of noting that in line 4 the space does not permit Wessely's restoration ἀπὸ [τῆσδε τῆς] Ἀρσινοειτῶν πόλεως, but indicates rather the more normal [τῆς] only. (The restoration of this papyrus proposed in *ZPE* 26 [1977] 278 is now replaced by the present note.)

51. *SB* III 7201

This Ghent papyrus, published originally in *Revue Belge de Philologie* 4 (1925) 649 no. 7, has a dating formula given by the editor as follows:

Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ[(ανίου)] Β[ελισσαρίου τοῦ ?]
 [ἐνδοξοτ]άτο[υ] [Ἰαχῶν" .[" τῆς δευτέρας]
 [ἐνδ(ικτίονος)]τινος Ἱερημίου ἐκ μ[ητρὸς]]

The mention of the second indiction as present in line 17 secures the number of the indiction, and the manifestly sixth-century character of the writing led the editor to the restoration of Fl. Belisarius as the consul, inspired, as he put it, by the postconsulate of Belisarius in *SB* III 6266 = 6704.⁹

It is perfectly possible that this date is correct. But it seems to us equally possible that one could restore the consul's name as Basilius, so that the date would be 553, also a second indiction. It might seem strange that (a) the regnal year of Justinian is not given at this date, and (b) the year of the postconsular era of Basilius (12 by normal reckoning) was not given. To the first of these one may cite *P.Lond.* V 1765, dated by consular year and presumably indiction (lost in line 2) to vi-vii.554; it is a Hermopolite text, and these follow the same formula as Antaiopolite in this reign. There is no

⁹ The editor's date is 537, but 23.i in indiction 1 falls in 538, and the text is so listed in *CSBE*.

regnal date. As to the second problem, an instance of the absence of the numeral can be found as late as 556, in *BGUI* 305. Finally, a postconsulate by Belisarius on 2.vi.538 (cf. below) would fall later than the date (15.iv) on which the new consulate of 538 is already attested in *P. Oxy.* XVI 1887.1. Our discussion in *CNBD* VI 63 (see below) leads us to the conclusion that such an overlap is not demonstrably found in any other year. The case for 553 is accordingly strengthened, and we take that to be the date.

It remains to add that on the plate in the original publication we read in line 2, Π[αύ]ν[ι] η τ[ῆ]ς β[ι]νδικ[α] (τίονος) (= 2.vi.553). Line 3, where no more than about 8 letters were lost, can thus hold adequately the nomen (presumably Aurelius) and the beginning of the name (Ἰουστ[α]τίνο[ς], e.g.) of the acknowledging party.

52. *SB* VI 9359 = *P. Lund* VI 10

The editor gives the consular date of this text as ὑπατ[ε]ίας Στελίχ[ω]νος καὶ Ἀύρηλιαν[οῦ] τῶν λ[α]μπροτάτων, i.e. A.D. 400. This seems correct, but one wonders why Stilicho, who is styled Flavius in his consulate of 405 (*SB* VIII 9931, cf. *CSBE* 116 s.a.405) lacks this name here. Consultation of the plate (pl. 3) in *P. Lund* VI and a comparison of lacunas in the following lines suggest that there is no real objection to inserting Φλ. into the restoration. In line 1, it should be noted, the plate suggests reading Ἀύρηλιανοῦ, with a raised upsilon rather than a mark of abbreviation.

53. *SB* XII 11024

According to the editor's text (the papyrus was originally published in *Aegyptus* 50 [1970] 57) this fragment was dated by the consuls of 332, whose names, however, appear in an order reversed from what is normal (see *CSBE* 110 a.332 for the normal formula). All that is actually left on the papyrus, however, except for τ]ῶ[ν λ]α]μπροτάτων at the end, is]ο[υ]λαριαν[ο]ῦ. The reversal of order of names in a papyrus coming from the consulate itself is otherwise unattested (cf. no. 46 above for a rather different phenomenon), and one may well be suspicious. On the plate in the original edition, we consider it possible to read Ἰα]ν[ο]υαρι]α]νοῦ, which would allow us to restore the consuls of 328 in the proper order: Φλαουίου Ἰανουαρίνου καὶ Οὐεττίου Ἰούστου τῶν λαμπροτάτων. The superfluous alpha, converting an -inus name into -ianus, is paralleled by the conversion of Probinus into Probianus in *P. Flor.* I 17.19, of A.D. 341.

54. *PSI* I 86

In line 12 of this undertaking to be a surety for the performance of a liturgy, we find the basis of the liturgy defined as ὑπὲρ τῆς παρούσης ις"

φυλῆς. This curious locution led E. P. Wegener (cf. *BL* III 220) to propose that φυλῆς was an error of the scribe or the editor for ἰνδικ(τίονος). A photocopy kindly provided by R. Pintaudi shows that the editor's reading is correct (as Pintaudi has checked for us also on the original). From the name Σνεῦς (cf. *Cd'E* 49 [1974] 342 ff.) we suspect a Hermopolite provenance for the papyrus, and we do not know enough about the tribal system there to be certain if the phrase makes sense. If it does not, it is the scribe and not the editor who is at fault.

55. *PSI* IV 300

haben
Wefke et al

The editors of this papyrus proposed restoring the consular date in line 1 as follows: [Οὐαλερι]οῖς ὑπάτοις [τὸ τέ]ταρτον. They relied on *BGU* II 586, for which G. Plaumann had proposed a similar restoration. It was soon recognized that this restoration was incorrect, and that the consuls of A.D. 302 could not be referred to in this manner. Vitelli accordingly proposed [τοῖς ἀποδειχθησομέν]οις ὑπάτοις [τὸ τέ]ταρτον (*BL* I 395), with reference to the era of the Licinii. The date is correct, but in fact the formula used for the fourth year of this era in the Oxyrhynchite is in all cases [τοῖς ἑσομέν]οις ὑπάτοις [τὸ τέ]ταρτον, as this passage should be restored. (Sijpesteijn and Worp have already corrected *BGU* II 586 in *ZPE* 26 [1977] 267.) The correct date is thus 8.v.324.

56. *P. Stras.* 137

The period of this lease is defined as follows in the editor's text: πρὸς τὸ ἐνεστ[ῆ]τος ...]? [.....]νκ[... ἔτος]. In *P. Stras.* IV, p. 184, it is suggested that in line 6 one read ἐνεστὸς ἔ[τος]?, and in line 7, τῆς ἰνδικτίω[νος]. This does not quite give us correct sense, as the number of the indiction is expected. The consular date in lines 19–21 shows that the date is 27.ix.325. The present indiction at this point (during the first cycle) is 14. We restore, therefore, [ἑδς ἰν]δικτίω[νος] in line 7.

57. *P. Stras.* 580

This text is dated by the editor "VIe s. p.C." It does, however, have an exact date: p.c. Basilius year 12, Choiak 8, indiction 2. These indices give a date of 4.xii.553, and the papyrus is so listed in *CSBE* 124 a. 553.

58. *M. Chrest.* 196

This text is dated by the consuls of 309 (and is so entered in *CSBE*). The month and day were read by the editor as follows: πρὸς ἑ' Νωνῶν Ἰου[. ἰω]ν. As it stood, therefore, it was not clear whether June or July was in question. In fact, however, there was no ante 6 Non. Iun. (ante 4 being

the first day after the Calends), while there was an ante 6 Non. Iul. We therefore regard it as clear that the restoration of Ἰου[λίω]ϛ is to be preferred, and the date of the papyrus is 2.vii.309.

59. Pack² 2731

Under this number, R. A. Pack lists a set of six wooden tablets containing two iambic trimeters and the story of Agamemnon and Iphigeneia. The most recent edition is to be found in E. Ziebarth, *Aus der antiken Schule*² (Bonn 1913) under no. 17 (cf. G. Zalateo, "Papiri Scholastici," *Aegyptus* 41 [1961] 186, no. 189).

Undoubtedly the tablets (now kept in the Musée du Château Borelly, Marseille) came from Egypt (cf. the introduction to Ziebarth, no. 17a). The story of Agamemnon and Iphigeneia is preceded by a note which is printed by Ziebarth, no. 17b, as follows:

- 1 $\text{Αὐρήλιος Θεόδωρος Ἄνουβίανος ἔγραψα τῇ κθ' ἡμέρᾳ ἡλίου}$
- 2 $\text{ὑπατείας Φλαουείου Κωνσταντίου καὶ Οὐάλ[ερίου Μαξιμιανοῦ}$
 $\text{Καισάρω]ν τῶν ἐπάρχων.}$

After the Agamemnon and Iphigeneia story one reads in line 7, $\text{μηνὸς Φαρμουῦθι, ἡμέρᾳ ἡλίου}$. The second line printed above is also given by Wessely, *MPE* II (1887) 29, who prints *Κωνσταντίνου*. Wessely dates the text to 21.iv.294; Zalateo adopts a more cautious line and gives the date as 294-306.

Now it is striking that the formula as restored does not resemble any of the known formulas for the consuls of 294 (see *CSBE* 104 a.294). Also the formulas of 300, 302, 305 and 306 (consulates of Constantius and Maximianus jointly) are in no way comparable.

One should therefore look for an alternative, and this can easily be found in the year 327, the joint consulate of Flavius Constantius and Valerius Maximus (cf. *CSBE* 109 a.327). In the second line printed above one should restore --- $\text{Οὐάλ[ερίου Μαξίμου τῶν λαμπρο]ράτων ἐπάρχων}$. Professor P. Mertens has very kindly verified this reading for us on a photograph of the tablet obtained from the Château Borelly. If one compares lines 1 and 7, one gets the month and the day on which Aurelius Theodoros, son of Anoubion, made his school exercise, i.e. Pharmouthi 29, on a Sunday. Professor Mertens has verified the numeral.

Now Pharmouthi 29 = 24 April. With the help of the tables of V. Grumel, *La Chronologie* 316, one can see that 24 April 327 fell on a Monday; the pupil mistook either date or day of the week (unless Grumel's hypothetical tables do not correspond to the reckoning actually in use in Egypt in this period).

60. *Collection Froehner* 81

This inscription from Nubia is discussed in *CSBE* 49 n. 24; the numeral giving the number of hundreds in the date by the era of the martyrs is difficult to interpret. The month date which follows is also curious: it reads *σελλενι ιθ Χοί(α)κ π(ά)τ(ε)ρ ἀνάπανσο(ν)*, which is interpreted by L. Robert as *σελήνη ιθ Χοί(α)κ π(ά)τ(ε)ρ ἀνάπανσο(ν)*. One is struck by the absence of a day number with Choiak; and equally the method of abbreviating *πάτερ* seems different from that employed in *ματρ* for *μαρτ(ύρων)*, for example. In fact, the formula does not require any vocative noun before *ἀνάπανσο(ν)*: cf. e.g. J. Kubinska, *Faras* IV (Warsaw 1974) 42 no. 9, line 22; 44 no. 10, line 27; 48 no. 13, line 8; 52 no. 11, line 26. It seems, then, that one is justified in resolving *πρ(ώ)τ(η)*, giving us the date (Choiak 1).

61. *Lefebvre* 663

This inscription from Nubia has a date *Φαμενώθ ια ἡμέρα γ ἐπὶ τὰς ζ ἡμέρας κατὰ σελήνη κς ειν/ ενερηνη ρθ*. Lefebvre explains what follows the "selene" date: "Peut-être *εἰν(αι) ἐν εἰρήνη* (Millet)." V. Grumel (*Byzantion* 35 [1965] 83–85), in discussing this text and trying to elucidate its date, ignores these words. But it is clear that what is lacking here is the indiction number, and one has only to divide *ειν/* and resolve *εἰν(δικτίονος)* to supply that lack, make perfect sense of the text, and follow normal patterns. It may be noted that neither of the years (943 and 1122) suggested by Grumel for this inscription is compatible with a fifth indiction, and both may therefore be discarded.¹⁰

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

ROGER S. BAGNALL
K. A. WORP

10 Cf. Grumel, *La Chronologie* 229–30, for a different attempt on this text. There is nothing very astonishing about the failure of his method, for the dates were based on the "selene" dates; we cannot go into a full discussion here of the use of this type of dating, but we may note that of Grumel's attempts in the *Byzantion* article to use it to date otherwise undatable texts, three fail completely to provide any solution, and two others succeed only by circular reasoning or choosing a calendar to fit the answer. No more persuasive are the treatments by M. Chaine, *Chronologie des temps chrétiennes* 190–91 and *JSOR* 10 (1926) 295. The text is republished by M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca* 4 (Rome 1978) 459 (no improvement on the date).

CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS V¹

62. Irreconcilable Dates

In *CSBE* 64-66 we gave a list of "documents . . . in which the date given by regnal year, era of Oxyrhynchos, or consulate cannot be reconciled with that of the indiction on any theory of the indiction, as well as those in which an indiction agrees with one or more criteria but disagrees with a further one." It omitted dates by the Era of Diocletian (treated separately in *CSBE* 45) and conflicts involving consular dates before 542 where the indiction pointed to a later date than the consulate (treated separately in *CSBE* 52). In the present article, we take up the documents coming from the reign of Justinian and from those of his successors to the end of Byzantine rule in Egypt. A division of the problems by reigns and within these by type of problem seems to us to yield reasonably reliable criteria for deciding which date is correct in a conflict. (We include a few documents not in the list in *CSBE* 64-66 in our discussion here.)

Justinian

There are eight examples where the indiction and the consulate conflict and other criteria are lacking:

<i>P. Princ.</i> III 154	7.ix.545/546
<i>P. Cair. Masp.</i> I 67095	1.iv.547/548

¹ For the nature of this series, see *BASP* 15 (1978) 233. It is cited as *CNBD*, with installment and item numbers. We cite our works on Byzantine chronology as follows: *CSBE* = *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (Stud. Amst. 8, Zutphen 1978); *RFBE* = *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* (*BASP* Suppl. 2, Missoula [MT] 1979).

<i>P. Stras.</i> I 4	13.ii.550/551
<i>SB</i> VI 9292 = 55 14 . 12.131	11.ii.552/553
<i>P. Cair. Masp.</i> II 67130	25.ii.556/557
<i>P. Lond.</i> V 1766	14.i.558/559
<i>P. Stras.</i> 248	6.i.560/5.i.561
<i>PSI</i> XIV 1427	26.vi.564/565

An examination of these dates shows that two fall in January, three in February, one in each of April, June, and September. The concentration early in the year (which we saw [*CSBE* 53] was characteristic of earlier consulate/indiction conflicts as well) suggests strongly that the scribe has in these cases failed to advance the consulate. The error is the easier here in that every one of these is a case of the postconsular era of Fl. Basilius, when all that changed on 1 January was the numeral of the postconsular year. The fact that the error is in the same direction in each case, i.e. the second and higher number is that indicated by the indiction, points to a failure to advance the consular number. The reverse assumption, that in all cases the scribe had advanced the indiction number too soon, seems in itself unlikely and in any case disproved by the concentration early in the year.

The three cases in which the indiction agrees with the consular date but both disagree with the regnal date are also instructive:

<i>P. Cair. Masp.</i> III 67303	27.iv.552/553
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XVI 1970	8.vi.553/554
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XVI 1972	22.vii.559/560

In each case, the regnal year points to the lower year, the indiction and consular to the later. Now Justinian's *dies imperii*, from which his regnal years were reckoned, fell on 1 April. These documents fall in the first, third, and fourth months of the regnal year. Since this reckoning of the regnal year was connected to no calendar used in Egypt (or anywhere else), occasional scribal failure to remember the date when it changed is not surprising. We may legitimately follow the indiction plus consulate against the regnal year in these cases.²

In two cases, documents have four dating criteria, of which the indiction, Oxyrhynchite era years, and regnal year agree against the consulate:

<i>P. Oxy.</i> I 140	26.iv.549/550
<i>P. Oxy.</i> I 133	19.x.549/550

² The hypothesis (which we note in *CSBE* 87 n. 1) according to which these texts are based on a 1 August start of the regnal year (Justinian's accession to sole power) does not seem worth retaining.

In these cases the consulate points to 549, all other indicators to 550. The agreement of the three indicators must be given the greater weight here.

Somewhat less clear are the cases in which the indiction and regnal years agree against the consulate:

<i>P. Oxy.</i> XIX 2238	7.viii.550/551
<i>P. Lond.</i> V 1692a	3.v.554/555
<i>P. Lond.</i> V 1686	7.xi.564/565

In these cases again, the consular year is one behind the others. While the weight against the consular date is rather less heavy than in the examples where an era date was also present, we do not doubt that the regnal and indiction years are the correct ones in these cases.

A few miscellaneous items remain. In *P. Oxy.* XVI 1986, the indiction disagrees with the Oxyrhynchite era years. The indiction is given as 12, the era years as 226-195, giving us a choice of 29.x.548 or 29.x.549. Since the crop concerned in the contract is the fourteenth indiction's, and since the lower number is the more suspect in general, we have no doubt that the era year is correct in this instance. In *P. Oxy.* XXXVI 2780, according to the editor's text, the indiction (2) points to 16.vii.554, while the regnal and consular dates point to 16.vii.553. In reply to our inquiry, however, Dr. R. A. Coles has kindly examined the original papyrus and writes "your expectations of $\nu\delta(\)\alpha$ [are] quite correct." All indications therefore point to 16.vii.553, and there is no inconsistency with normal Oxyrhynchite practices (the uneasy hypothesis emitted in *CSBE* 27 n. 1 is thus no longer necessary).

Finally, in *P. Cair. Masp.* II 67170 and 67171 (16.iv.564 or 565) the indiction disagrees again with the regnal and consular dates. In this instance it seems possible that the indiction is again in error, but the source of the putative error is not obvious. On the other hand, the regnal year had changed only 15 days before, and it is conceivable that the indiction is right after all, and the others wrong.

To summarize: we find that in no instance is the Oxyrhynchite era year at all likely to be wrong, and in one or only a handful of cases is the indiction incorrect; those can be demonstrated only by the conflict of the indiction with the more accurate era year, or by a combination of other evidence against the indiction. Both regnal and consular dates, on the other hand, are comparatively frequently wrong, and the consular date is never right against other criteria except in a few instances where it supports the indiction against the regnal year.³

³ There are also papyri in which a date p.c. Basilus may seem to conflict with the indiction; but these result only from the failure to include a numeral for the year of Basilus, a rather common practice and—by the standards of the preceding century—a normal one. Cf. *CNBD* II 12, n. 7.

Justinus II

We find relatively few conflicting dates in this reign. One of them, *P.Stras.* I 40, finds the indiction pointing to 568 against 569 for both regnal and consular reckoning. The date, 27.ix, is not near the beginning either of the consular (julian) year or the regnal (15.xi) year; we therefore conclude that the indiction is wrong.

There are three other examples of conflicts. One of them, *PSIVI* 709, sets the indiction plus consulate against the regnal year; the other two (*P.Cair.Masp.* II 67159 and *P.Lond.* III 1327) set the indiction plus regnal year against the consulate. The conflict is only apparent, however. All of these documents are examples of formula 3 in *RFBE* for Justinus II, the formula beginning *βασιλείας καὶ ὑπατείας*. Texts with this formula always give only one number for both regnal and consular reckoning, and these did indeed coincide during the first ten and a half months of the year. Between 15.xi and 31.xii, however, the years were out of phase by one; and the three documents listed in fact belong to 19.xi, 16.xii and 19.xii, just this period. It is apparent therefore that in *PSIVI* 709 the regnal year has failed to be advanced, while in the other two the year has been advanced before the consulate changed.

In short, the consulate has ceased in such situations to have any independent value aside from the reckoning of regnal years.

Tiberius II

The reign of Tiberius II provides, for its short duration, a number of problems. Tiberius became Caesar on 7.xii.574 and always dated his regnal years from that date. But two documents seem to have a different reckoning, which H. I. Bell (*P.Lond.* V 1725.1n.) suggested was based on Tiberius' accession as sole ruler on 6.x.578 (we repeat this suggestion in *CSBE* 90 n. 1). One of these, *P.Lond.* V 1725 = *P.Monac.* 3, has a *βασιλείας καὶ ὑπατείας* formula of the kind which caused difficulty under Justinus; year 2 of this reckoning is an impossibility, strictly speaking. But if the reckoning is from the consulate, which was 579, then in 580 we find no problem. In other words, the person using this formula reckoned the joint regnal-consulate figure from the sole accession or consulate, rather than from the accession to Caesarship. The rather peculiar *SB VI* 9085 inv. 16050 has only regnal dating and indiction; the indiction is that of 579/80, and 8.ix in that indiction would be 579. The regnal year 1 which is mentioned would then refer to 579, assimilated to consular reckoning without mentioning the consulate.

Other problems occur with regnal dates in this reign. In *Aegyptus* 56 (1976) 69 (cf. *BASP* 15 [1978] 237) we find the indiction, era of Oxyrhynchos, and consulate taken together consistent against the regnal

date some seven months after the change of regnal year. In *PSI* VII 786 (cf. *CSBE* 66 n. 24), the regnal year again has failed to advance (this time only in January, however, from a 7.xii *dies imperii*), and disagrees with the indiction (cf. *CNBD* VIII 85 [forthcoming]). In *PSI* VIII 963, the regnal date disagrees again with indiction and consulate, and it has failed to advance on 21.x, almost eleven months after the proper date. In *P. Oxy.* I 135, the indiction points to 21.iii.579, the regnal date to 21.iii.578; it is evident that again the regnal reckoning has failed to change on time, four and a half months later.

The evidence from Tiberius' reign, then, indicates that there was considerable confusion in regnal calculations, principally stemming from a certain amount of ignorance of the need to calculate from the Caesarship of Tiberius, and partly from gross carelessness in keeping track of the proper date for advancing the regnal count.

Mauricius

A peculiar error showing the interconnectedness of regnal and consular reckoning occurs in *P. Oxy.* I 137, in which the indiction and consulate point to 11.i.584, while the regnal year points to a year later. It appears that the scribe has advanced the regnal count along with the consular one, ten days before.

A whole group of documents have conflicts of indictional dates versus regnal ones:

<i>P. Lond.</i> V 1728	8.iii.584/585
<i>PSI</i> XIII 1367	2.ix.584/585
<i>SB</i> VI 9085, inv. 16055	12.ix.588/589
<i>SB</i> VI 9456	20.ix.593/594
<i>P. Grenf.</i> II 86	15.xii.595/596
<i>BGU</i> II 395	7.ix.599/600

In every case except that of *P. Lond.* V 1728, the date indicated by the indiction is one year later than that by the regnal year. *Mauricius' dies imperii* was 13.viii, and it is striking that four of the documents fall in September and one in December. It seems highly likely that in all of these cases, there has been a failure to advance the regnal numeral at the proper time.

The situation is entirely different in *P. Lond.* V 1728, however. There the regnal year is later, and we are not near the change-date for regnal calculation. It seems to us rather more likely that the indiction is wrong here, but we do not see any secure basis for deciding.

Two final cases need to be treated, *P. Monac.* 10 and 13. These provide dates of 28.i and 18.i in their respective years. It is the indiction and regnal

year which point to the higher year, the consular to the lower; one is led to suppose that the consulate has simply not been advanced on *l.i* as it should be. (We will return on another occasion [CNBD VIII 85] to the general problem of "New Style" dating.)

Phocas

Two documents under Phocas contain striking disagreements of the indiction with the regnal year, in both cases a matter of *two* years' discrepancy: *SB* I 4503 and 4505. In such a difference, it does not seem possible to offer an explanation with the available evidence. Phocas' *dies imperii* was 27.xi, while the two documents date to 10.i and 11.x; no obvious solution presents itself.

Heraclius

Four clear examples of failure to advance the regnal count occur under Heraclius:

<i>P.Oxy.</i> XVI 1981	25.x.611/612
<i>BGU</i> XII 2208	8.x.613/614
<i>BGU</i> XII 2209	8.xi.613/614
<i>SB</i> VI 9461	15.x.631/14.x.632

Since Heraclius' *dies imperii* was 5.x, it is clear that these examples, all within the first month or so after that date, are cases of incorrect regnal dating.

There are two other problems: (1) *SB* I 4662 (cf. *RFBE* 69), in which indiction and regnal dates agree on 11.vii.632, while the consular year 20 can be only 630. It seems clear that the consulate (very rare in this reign) is in error. (2) *SB* I 4319, in which the regnal year of Heraclius Jr. is too high by one; see *RFBE* 72–73 for discussion.

Summary

The detailed discussions above have shown that the Oxyrhynchite era years are in no case convicted of inaccuracy; they coincided with the traditional civil year and were evidently prized by the Oxyrhynchites. The indiction, the principal means of chronological reference throughout Egypt, is almost as consistent in its accuracy; it is almost always evidently right against the consular or regnal reckoning. These latter two, although commonly used in the headings of documents, evidently did not have quite such widespread understanding and are comparatively frequently the source of errors. Sometimes one of them is right against the other, sometimes they are both wrong. It varies from reign to reign which seems more reliable; neither is in general terms the more dependable.

A few principles emerge as helpful in dealing with inconsistencies: (1) the later date is more likely to be the correct one, as the scribes had a natural tendency (like modern letter and check writers) to forget to change the numeral of a year which did not coincide with the one they used for most purposes; (2) these lapses of calculation occur most commonly in the few months after the date when the consular or regnal year changes, but they are found in small quantities throughout the year; (3) coping with three or four dating systems confused ancient scribes to a considerable degree, and while many errors in editions have turned out to be the work of the editors, a considerable number are attributable to the natural confusion of the scribes.

*COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM*

*ROGER S. BAGNALL
K. A. WORP*

CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS VI¹

63. Consulates and Postconsulates

The mass of evidence concerning the use of consular dating in Egypt assembled in *CSBE* Appendix D² has considerable interest for various questions. One of these is the problem of the dissemination of knowledge of who the consuls for a year were: how did the news, once announced in the capital (for our purposes, Constantinople), travel to the scribes in the metropoleis and villages who prepared the documents which have survived to the present? The question is a large one and in considerable part an unanswerable one, because most of the levels of administration through which such information must have passed are not represented in our documents. The problem deserves to be studied in its entirety, not only for Egypt but for the whole empire.

Our purpose here is more limited; we aim to set out some of the information derivable from the papyri pertinent to this question, in the hope that our remarks will lead a competent scholar to integrate this material into a broader synthesis which we cannot undertake here.

1 For the purpose and nature of these notes, see *BASP* 15 (1978) 233. We cite our own works as follows: *CSBE* = *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (Stud. Amst. 8, Zutphen 1978); *RFBE* = *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* (*BASP* Suppl. 2, Missoula [MT] 1979); *CNBD* = "Chronological Notes on Byzantine Documents," in *BASP* 15 (1978) 233-46 and following (i.e. the present series of notes).

2 Addenda and corrigenda in *RFBE* 75-79.

A. Overlap of Consulate and Postconsulate

In a certain number of cases, it appears that the last attestation of a postconsular date to the consuls of year x is later than the first attestation of the consulate of year $x + 1$. On examination, the situation turns out to be not so simple as it might appear.

A.D. 319	p.c. Licinius V and Crispus I	<i>P.Col.</i> VII 185.17 (21.i)
	cos. Constantinus V and	<i>P.Flor.</i> I 60.11 = <i>P.Sakaon</i>
	Licinius Caesar I	20 (19.i)

The Columbia papyrus comes from Karanis, the Florentine one from Theadelphia. But the Karanis text is a receipt issued by a resident of the metropolis to the tenant living in Karanis, and it is not clear where it was written. *P.Flor.* 60 is a tax receipt written by a *bouleutes* to a taxpayer in Theadelphia; the writer, as a metropolitan of a high class, should have had current information. At all events, minor local variations in transmission time or personal whereabouts can be responsible for this small overlap.

A.D. 346	p.c. Amantius and Albinus	<i>P.Lond.</i> III 1249.22 (p. 227)
	cos. Constantius IV and	(5.v)
	Constans III	<i>P.Abinn.</i> 47.20 (1.v)

The Abinnaeus text is Arsinoite, while the London papyrus is of Hermopolite origin. The small discrepancy can be explained on grounds of the distance between the nomes.

A.D. 396	p.c. Olybrius and Probinus	<i>P.Oxy.</i> VIII 1133.1 (24.iii)
	cos. Arcadius IV and	<i>SB</i> XII 10932.1 (6.iii)
	Honorius II	

SB 10932 is a scrap of which the provenance is unknown. The day numeral (Phamenoth 10) is dotted, but Dr. S. Daris assures us that it is certain and that another digit may have followed. It does not seem possible to draw any conclusions on grounds of provenance. It should, however, be noted that *ὑπατείας* is restored, and while the resultant 22-letter restoration corresponds well enough with the 24 letters in line 2, *μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν* would increase the count only to 28, which does not seem impossible. A papyrus in Vienna, in fact, *P.Vindob.* inv.G 22067 + 20784 ined. (which Worp will publish with the kind permission of the Austrian National Library), preserves a date to the postconsulate of Olybrius and Probinus, Mesore 1, i.e. attesting the p.c. still on 25.vii.396. The strong likelihood is thus that *SB* 10932 should be restored as p.c. and dated to 397. This year thus ceases to be an example of overlap.

= P. Reiner
Cent. 88,
= (P.R. 10.
107 α

- A.D. 434 p.c. Theodosius XIV and Fl. Maximus
P.Lond. V 1777.1 (7.ix)
 cos. Fl. Ariobindus and Asper *P.Stras.* I 1.1 (20.viii)

P.Lond. V 1777 is a receipt from the Oxyrhynchite; most of the phrase [μετὰ τὴν ὑπαρτ]ε[ί]α]ν is restored, but the length of the restoration in line 4 seems sufficient guarantee of its correctness. (In line 2, we prefer the editor's alternate restoration: [τὸ ἰδ' καὶ Φλ(αοῦ)ῖου] Μαξί[μ]ου.) *P.Stras.* I poses problems. Preisigke restored this Hermopolite text as follows (lines 1-2):

- 1 [Βασιλείας Φλα]ργίαν Ἀριοβίντ[ου] καὶ Ἄσπερος τῶν μεγ[ίστων]
 (έτους)
 Μεσορῆ κζ δ ἰν(δικτίονος).

He dated the text to A.D. 510. Wilcken (*Archiv* 5 [1913] 252) correctly restored ὑπατείας, which led him to a date of 506; but he pointed out that this date would not agree with the indiction. Hohmann suggested therefore μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν and referred the text to 435 (*Zur Chronologie der Papyrusurkunden*, 38; cf. *BL* I 403), but Preisigke objected that there was no room for this, and he concluded (*BL* I 403), "ich weiss keinen Ausweg."

Hohmann is certainly right in thinking that we have a reference to the consuls of 434; the indiction (confirmed by the very likely partial restoration of the next indiction as the fifth in line 9) points to a date in 435, as he said, and given the conflict which results if the papyrus is assigned to 434, we think a date in 435 is almost certain. Ὑπατείας is then an error for μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν (a very common error, cf. *CSBE* 52-54). *P.Oxy.* XVI 1879, which also attests the consuls of 434, has no absolute date and presumably comes from later than 7.ix.434, but before the end of the year.

- A.D. 441 p.c. Anatolius
 cos. Cyrus *P.Mil.* I 64.1 (6.xii)
BGU II 609.1 (12.xi)

BGU 609 is dated to the eleventh indiction, thus 442/3 (that is, 12.xi.442). As no papyri for 442 are yet published, it is not possible to say if the consuls of that year (known from a p.c. in *P.Oxy.* VI 913, cf. *Mnemosyne* 31 [1978] 289 n. 9) were announced locally during that year. *BGU* 609 is Arsinoite, while *P.Mil.* 64 is Oxyrhynchite. As no explanation on grounds of location is possible, it seems likely that the indiction is right in *BGU* 609 (our remarks on p. 54 of *CSBE* are to be cancelled). But in any case, this pair is not solid evidence for our question. (It should be pointed out that in *P.Mil.* 64 the p.c. is our restoration in *ZPE* 28 [1978] 226, but we consider it certain.)

- A.D. 462 p.c. Dagalaiphus and Severinus *PSI* III 175.1 (20.ix)
 cos. Leo II and Fl. [] *M.Chr.* 71.19 (14.vii)

The addition of a second consul in *M.Chr.* 71 is contrary to the phrase with Leo alone in *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 7.1 and the p.c. of Leo alone in *SPPXX* 127 (or both p.c., if, as we suggest in *CNBD* III 32, *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 7 belongs to the p.c. also). The time difference here is far too great to make a locational explanation plausible; but the second consul raises doubts which make us unsure of the nature of the problem here. [From a photograph of *M.Chr.* 71 kindly provided by R. Jäger (Leipzig), we observe that the numeral β (= II) for Leo's consulate is very dubious. A reading γ' (cos. Leo III = A.D. 466) does not seem excluded; if it is correct, the problem of overlap in A.D. 462 would disappear.]

- A.D. 472 p.c. Leo IV and Probinianus *P.Lond.* V 1793.2 (1.xii)
 cos. Marcianus and to be *BGU* XII 2150.1 (8.xi)
 announced

As both texts are Hermopolite, an argument by location is not possible. But the London text is dated to the tenth indiction (471/2), which would yield a date of I.xii.471, a year earlier than the consulate points to (cf. *CSBE* 65 n. 15). The only papyrus of 471 is *P.Bad.* IV 91 b.14 (24.iii), dated to the p.c. of Jordanes and Severus (i.e. of 470). One might surmise that *P.Lond.* 1793 was mistakenly dated p.c. rather than cos.; in a century when p.c. datings are the rule, the scribe might be pardoned for assuming that any new consuls were already out of office. This, however, is the reverse of the normal error,³ and we remain uncertain what has happened.

- A.D. 476 p.c. Leo Jr. I, deceased *BGU* XII 2151.2 (19.x)
 cos. Zenon and Armatus *SB* III 7167.2 (4.x)

Both texts are Hermopolite. *SB* 7167 is restored as p.c. by the editors (thus 477), as consulate by J. R. Rea, in his note on *CPR* V 15.1 (which is dated by p.c. Armatus in vi.477). Rea provides a clear discussion of the problems of consular dates in this turbulent period. The restoration of the consulate, however, seems uncertain, as Rea's restoration for line 2 requires 21 letters, vs. the 29 in the nearest securely restorable line (6). Restoring with the editors *μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν*, on the other hand, gives 28. Given the insecurity of the restoration and the paucity of our knowledge for these years, it seems best to renounce any use of this pair for our question. [P. Köln III 152 brings new evidence to bear on this problem and supports, we believe, our doubts about Rea's restoration. See the editors' introduction.]

3 See our remarks in *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978) 288.

A.D. 534 p.c. Justinianus III
cos. Justinianus IV

P. Stras. 472.2 (xi-xii)⁴
SB VIII 9876.1 (16.vii)

SB 9876 is Herakleopolite, *P. Stras.* 472 Hermopolite; obviously location will not account for the discrepancy. The postconsulate in the Strasbourg papyrus is based on restoration. As the editor remarks (note to line 2), "Cette ligne a dû commencer légèrement plus à gauche que les suivantes." Now the projecting to the left of the heading of a papyrus (address, dating formula) is a common phenomenon, but in this case it would remove the difficulty of the overlap of consulate and postconsulate if one restores instead the consulate of 533. The other documents dated to 533 do not form an obstacle to this hypothesis, as the latest document known from this year is *SBI* 4663 (8.x; dated by the postconsulate of the consuls of 530, cf. *CSBE* 51).

An obstacle is, however, presented by the mention in line 12 of the coming fourteenth indiction. As the editor aptly remarks in his introduction, "notre ligne 12 nous renvoie à la 13e indiction (534-535)." *P. Stras.* 472 contains a lease for two years from the crops of the coming fourteenth indiction; it is axiomatic that a lease will not begin at a set date without including the next crop to be harvested.⁵ As the lease concerns grain land, the crop of the coming fourteenth indiction should have been sown in the fall of 534. This would conflict with a hypothetical dating of the papyrus in 533.

We have a choice, then, between the restoration of a postconsulate which is a bit long and causes the above conflict with *SB* 9876; or the restoration of consulate, in which case this conflict is removed, but we are left with an indiction number which is, by normal practices, unexpected. In any case, the problem is such that this pair is also not very useful for the question.

Of the nine cases examined, three (A.D. 396, 476, 534) involve texts where *ὑπατείας* or *μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν* is restored and there may be doubt about the correctness of the restoration. In three cases (434, 441, 472), the indiction contradicts the consular date, leading to uncertainty about the true date of the document. In the case of A.D. 462, the consular formula is

4 The papyrus is dated to Choiak (xi-xii). The name of the month is followed by a diagonal stroke. A numeral of the day seems to have been omitted, but one wonders if one should not read *Χοία(κ) κ/*, i.e. 20 Choiak = 16/17.xii.

5 Cf. *CSBE* 9 n. 2; Comfort, *Aegyptus* 14 (1934) 432 foot; J. Herrmann, *Bodenpacht* 98. Seeming exceptions are documents in the form of a *μισθοποχή*, which appear to have been contracted usually after the point at which a field could be planted for the nearest harvest: *CPR* I 247 (7.iv.335, for ind. 10 = 336/7); *P. Gen.* 66 (2.v.374, for ind. 5 = 376/7), 67 (19.i.382 or 383 [cf. *CSBE* 52], for ind. 13 = 384/5), and 69 (386; crops of ind. 15 = 386/7); *P. Gron.* 9 (20.iv.392, for ind. 7 = 393/4).

aberrant and we cannot be sure what the situation actually is. In only two cases, then (319, 346) do we actually have a certainly observable overlap, by two and four days only, and in both cases the location of the scribe seems easily sufficient as an explanation. We conclude, therefore, that so far as present evidence shows, the dissemination of knowledge of consulates was as uniform throughout Egypt as its geography allows once the news reached the country. It appears, therefore, that the local bureaucracy is not at fault in the cases of tardiness of transmission of the news of the announcement of consuls.

B. The Date of the Announcement of Consulates in Egypt

Within reasonable limits, then, evidence from any part of Egypt can be used for the question of when consulates were announced in that province. The evidence is not so abundant as to allow the pinpointing of the announcement in most years; the most useful tool seems to be the date of the last attestation of the *previous* consulate for each year. These dates provide a rough *terminus post quem* for the announcement of the new consul; in any given case, new evidence may of course come to move the *terminus* later. The following tabulation includes years from 314 to 541; in cases where the exact day is not known but the range can be narrowed, the year is listed under the *earliest* month possible. [Years followed by *a* or *b* refer to years in which a p.c. of an earlier year was replaced by a p.c. of the immediately preceding year during the course of the year.]

- January: 315, 316, 319, 325, 328, 342, 355, 373, 374, 383?, 386, 392, 480, 496a, 500
 February: 314, 339, 340, 345, 350, 360, 377, 453, 463, 492 [*ZPE* 30 (1978) 205], 497, 517, 518, 534, 538, 539
 March: 336, 337, 393, 396, 409, 418, 427, 445, 455, 471, 481a, 498, 503, 535, 540
 April: 395, 428, 493, 524
 May: 346, 380, 387, 389, 403, 410, 432, 475, 484, 489, 509 (cf. *CNBD* VII 65 [forthcoming])
 June: 399, 400, 407, 417, 423, 448, 458, 477, 531
 July: 351, 382, 398, 419, 421, 439, 465, 501, 505, 516
 August: 402, 415, 422, 449, 454, 456, 483, 487, 506, 527
 September: 412, 434, 435, 461, 462, 470, 486, 488, 510, 526, 532, 541
 October: 364, 379, 426, 443, 444, 468, 476, 481b, 491, 504, 514, 533, 537
 November: 375, 385, 420, 430, 436, 446, 464, 495, 496b, 508
 December: 441, 472, 485, 494, 536

Although no exact reliance can be placed in statistics based on evidence of the sort we possess, the distribution seems sufficiently spread

out to make it clear that the news of the new consuls could arrive at any time of year. A breakdown by centuries, however, clarifies this conclusion:

	<i>IVp</i>	<i>Vp</i>	<i>VIp</i>	<i>Total</i>
January	12	3	0	15
February	7	4	5	16
March	4	8	3	15
April	1	2	1	4
May	4	6	1	11
June	2	6	1	9
July	3	4	3	10
August	0	8	2	10
September	0	8	4	12
October	2	7	4	13
November	2	7	1	10
December	0	4	1	5

It is obvious that in the fourth century more *termini* fall in January–February than in all other months together, and this picture is consistent with a situation in which the consuls were normally proclaimed near the end of the old Julian year or soon after the start of the new. In the fifth century, on the other hand, the median is between July and August, and in the sixth in July: there is no longer any preference for the early months of the year, quite the reverse in fact. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the news of the new consuls reached Egypt much later than in the fourth century (as the high number of fifth century postconsulates shows in itself) and that the amount of delay followed no observable pattern.

C. Consuls yet to be Announced

In seven years we find in a consular formula the name of a consul plus *καὶ τοῦ δηλωθησομένου/ἀποδειχθησομένου* or its Latin equivalent. These are the following:

- 453 p.c. *Sporacius καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας δηλωθησομένου* *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 11.1 (17.ii)
- 461 p.c. *Apollonii et qui nuntiatus fuerit* *P.Oxy.* XVI 1878.1 (1.ix)
- 464 p.c. *Vivianus καὶ τοῦ ἀποδ./δηλ.* *BGU XII* 2147.1 (7.x)
P.Oxy. VI 902.19 (20.xi) (cf. *CSBE* 52 n. 4)
- 472 cos. *Marcianus καὶ τοῦ ἀποδ.* *BGU XII* 2150.1 (8.xi)
- 481 p.c. *Basilius καὶ τοῦ ἀποδ.* *P.Lond.* III 991 (p. 258) (cf. *CNBD* IV 40)

- 483 p.c. Trocondus καὶ τοῦ δηλ. *P.Lond.* V 1896.1 (vi-vii)
BGU XII 2156.2 (27.viii)
- 501 p.c. Patricius (& Hypatius)
καὶ τοῦ δηλ. *P.Amst.* I 45.2 (7.vii)

Similar dates where the name of the first consul is lacking are *SPPXX* 146 and *SB* I 5264 (to be republished as *P.Amst.* I 45a).

In every case except that of 501 we are dealing with a year in which only one consul was proclaimed and recognized in Egypt; in some cases no second consul was proclaimed at all (481, 483). That the missing consul is normally the western one is made clear by *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 11 (despite the erroneous τῶν for τοῦ).⁶ In no case do we find later that the second person was proclaimed.

The text of 501, *P.Amst.* I 45, is a peculiar case. The scribe has written μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ. Πατρικίου τοῦ μαικαλοπρεπεστάτου (ἰ.μεγαλο-) καὶ ἐνδοξοτάτου στρατηκοῦ καὶ ὑπάτου καὶ τοῦ δηλωθησομαίνου. The scribe has transformed the name of the second consul Hypatius (already known in Egypt on 15.ix.500: *P.Oxy.* XVI 1962.1) into the title ὑπάτου, consul (nonsensically: who but a consul would be consul!); he has then felt the need of a second consul and added the "to be designated" phrase.

D. Constantinople vs. Egypt

If the dissemination of consular names within Egypt seems to have been rather uniform, as we have argued, where does the peculiarly even distribution of *termini post quem* over the julian year in the fifth and sixth centuries come from? One possible approach to the question is through the legal codes. The imperial enactments contained in the *Codex Justinianus* and *Codex Theodosianus* mostly have consular dates and month and day. Where these have not been tampered with by the editors of the codes, they provide evidence of at what dates the consulates were known in the imperial court, generally Constantinople in the eastern empire. A few other sources, like records of church councils, give evidence for consulates in some years.⁷

⁶ But see *P.Lond.* III 991 (cf. *CNBD* IV 40). For *P.Vindob.Sijp.* 11 cf. R. Pintaudi, *ZPE* 24 (1977) 222. For the subject treated here and below, Th. Mommsen, "Ostgothische Studien I: Die Consularatirung des getheilten Reiches," *Historische Schriften* III (Berlin 1910) 363-87, remains fundamental.

⁷ For difficulties in comparing this type of material to papyri and in using it generally, see O. Seeck's introduction to his *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476* (Stuttgart 1919) and our remarks in *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978) 287-93. We depend for this material on Seeck.

The list below includes each year in which the latest reference in the papyri to the postconsulate of the (a) preceding year is two months or more later than the earliest reference in legal sources and similar materials to the consulate of the current year; in this way, all chance that *only* the time involved in getting news to Egypt is responsible has been eliminated.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Latest reference to p.c.</i>	<i>Earliest reference to cos.</i>
346	<i>ZPE</i> 23 (1977) 139.1 (5.iii)	<i>CTh</i> 10.10.8 (5.v)
364	<i>PSI</i> I 90.1 (17.x)	<i>CTh</i> 13.3.6 (11.i)
375	<i>P.Lips.</i> 61.1 (11.xi)	<i>CTh</i> 12.6.16 (9.iv)
379	<i>P.Lips.</i> 13.1 (23.x)	<i>CTh</i> 6.30.1 (24.ii)
380	<i>CPR</i> VII 19.1 (6.v)	<i>CJ</i> 1.54.4 (6.i)
382	<i>SB</i> IV 7445.1 (12.vii)	<i>CTh</i> 14.10.1 (12.i)
385	<i>P.Lips.</i> 62 ii.17 (4.xi)	<i>CJ</i> 1.55.4 (1-5.i)
387	<i>Aegyptus</i> 54 (1974) 83.1 (28.v)	<i>CTh</i> 13.3.13 (22.i)
389	<i>P.Lips.</i> 37.1 (5.v)	<i>CTh</i> 15.14.8 (14.i)
395	<i>CPR</i> V 13.28 (17.iv)	<i>CTh</i> 2.1.8 (6.i)
396	<i>P.Oxy.</i> VIII 1133.1 (24.iii) (cf. <i>supra</i> , p.28)	<i>CTh</i> 15.13 (6.i)
398	<i>P.Herm.</i> 52.1, 53.1 (4.vii)	<i>CTh</i> 7.1.16 (28.i)
399	<i>P.Giss.</i> 104.1 (30.vi)	<i>CTh</i> 11.24.4 (10.iii)
402	<i>P.Grenf.</i> II 80.1 (4.viii)	<i>CTh</i> 16.5.30 (3.iii)
407	<i>P.Oxy.</i> VIII 1122.1 (9.vi)	<i>CTh</i> 6.26.13 (25.i)
410	<i>P.Herm.</i> 69.1 (5.v)	<i>CTh</i> 16.5.48 (21.ii)
412	<i>P.Mich.</i> XI 611.1 (27.ix)	<i>CTh</i> 7.17 (28.i)
415	<i>P.Mich.</i> XI 613.1 (19.viii)	<i>CTh</i> 3.1.9 (17.ii)
417	<i>P.Berl.Zill.</i> 5.1 (15.vi)	<i>CTh</i> 8.12.9 (14.iii)
418	<i>P.Köln</i> II 102.1 (30.iii or 9.iv)	<i>CTh</i> 16.2.43 (3.ii)
419	<i>PSI</i> XIII 1365.2 (6.vii)	<i>CTh</i> 11.30.66 (8.iii)
420	<i>PSI</i> XIII 1340.1 (18.xi)	<i>CJ</i> 8.10.10 (5.v)
422	<i>SPF</i> XX 118.3 (29.viii)	<i>CTh</i> 6.32.2 (12.i)
423	<i>PSI</i> I 87.1 (29.vi)	<i>CTh</i> 8.4.35 (14.ii)
426	<i>P.Oslo</i> II 35.1 (6.x)	<i>CTh</i> 9.41.1, 42.24 (23.i)
428	<i>P.Flor.</i> III 314.1 (27.iv)	<i>CTh</i> 6.2.26, 27.22 (31.i)
430	<i>BGU</i> XII 2138.1 (16.xi)	<i>CTh</i> 10.10.34 (22.ii)
434	<i>P.Lond.</i> V 1777.1 (7.ix)	<i>CTh</i> 5.12.3, 11.28.15 (18.vi)
435	<i>P.Flor.</i> III 315.1 (ix-x?)	<i>CTh</i> 6.28.8 (29.i)
436	<i>PSI</i> VI 708.1 (2.xi)	<i>CTh</i> 10.20.18 (8.iii)
439	<i>CPR</i> VI 6.1 (8.vii)	<i>Nov.Theod.</i> 7.1 (20.i)
441	<i>P.Mil.</i> I 64.1 (6.xii) (cf. <i>supra</i> , p. 29)	<i>Nov.Theod.</i> 7.4 (6.iii)
443	<i>P.Oxy.</i> VI 913.1 (16.x)	<i>CJ</i> 1.46.3 (28.i)

444	<i>P.Harr.</i> 86.15 (8.x)	<i>Nov.Theod.</i> 25 (16.i)
448	<i>P.Flor.</i> III 311.1 (24.vi)	Mansi VII 197 (25.ii; cf. Seeck 425.33)
449	<i>P.Flor.</i> III 313.1 (12.viii)	<i>CJ</i> 5.17.8 (9.i)
454	<i>SB X</i> 10523.1 (4.viii)	<i>Nov.Marc.</i> 4 (4.iv)
456	<i>P.Yale</i> I 71.1 (28.viii)	<i>CJ</i> 1.3.25, 1.4.13 (25.iii)
468	<i>P.Wisc.</i> I 10.1 (10.x)	<i>CJ</i> 1.14.10, 12.21.7 (8.ii)
470	<i>BGU XII</i> 2149.2 (19.ix)	<i>CJ</i> 5.27.4 (1.i)
472	<i>P.Lond.</i> V 1793.2 (1.xii) (cf. <i>supra</i> , p. 30)	<i>CJ</i> 8.37.10 (1.i)
486	<i>CPR V</i> 16.2 (16.ix)	<i>CJ</i> 4.20.14 (21.v)
505	<i>P.Stras.</i> 471 bis.1 (16.vii)	<i>CJ</i> 2.7.22 (1.i)
527	<i>P.Lond.</i> V 1690.1 (30.viii)	<i>CJ</i> 1.31.5 (22.iv)
533	<i>SB I</i> 4663.1 (8.x)	<i>CJ</i> 1.1.6 (15.iii)

In general, it does not seem possible to argue that all of the wide gaps found are due either to retroactive editorial insertion of consulates in the codes, or to the time required for transmission of news from Constantinople to Egypt and its local diffusion there. Nor does the season of the year (i.e. usable for sailing or not) seem an explanation. While all three of these may account for certain individual instances, the bulk is too large to admit such explanations. The conclusion that significant delays occurred in the bureaucracy appears necessary to us.⁸ It is our hope that a scholar competent in Byzantine history and institutions will try to set the information we have gathered and analyzed into its place in the historical record.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

ROGER S. BAGNALL
K. A. WORP

8 Cf. O. Seeck's remarks (*supra*, n. 7) 15 and his introduction generally. We see no basis for any suggestion that the scribes of individual papyri varied because of personal whim.