CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS, IV

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 βρ[η το]ν [l. βρήκαν]ν [δε θρήσκον]ν imposes itself in spite of BL 1 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.Amt. 8, Zupfen 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.
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Dr. G. Poethke, asked if the dating to the Arab period was palaeographically certain, replies "Hände zeigen Ähnlichkeiten, sind wohl nicht dieselben. Dattierung 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 Vè siècle," Hommages Serge Sauneron II: Égypte post-pharaonique (Bibl. d'Etude 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 βρής καὶ ν’(ον) τῷ άνδρα κυρίου (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 174 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: Ποικω και Ει..λείνω 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 Τοῦκω. 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 Τοῦκω και Ἀνουλλίνω υπάτοις.† At our request, Dr. G. Poethke has examined the papyrus, and on the basis of the information provided by him we propose the reading Τοῦ[α]κω και Ἀνουλλίνω υπάτο[ις].

38. P.Lips. 23

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

υπάτειας [τοῦ] δεσπότου η[μῶν Φλ. -]
ανοι τοῦ [αιωνίου Ανουστιον το .]
[και] ..... [... τοῦ λαμπ-]
ροτ[έτου κτ.]

† 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{υπατείας [τού]} & \text{ δεσπότου } η\underset{\mu\omegaν}{\text{ Φλ(αοιου)} } \text{ Γρατι-} \\
\text{αυ} & \text{ τού [αιωνίου Αυγούστου τό γ'] } \\
\text{[καὶ]} & \text{ Φλ(αοιου) 'Εκυ} \underset{\text{τίου τού λαμπ-}}{\text{τέρας}} \\
\text{ροτ[άτου κτλ.]} & \text{ .} 
\end{align*}
\]

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 ἀποστάρχου 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: Φλαοιου Τατιανοῦ τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἐπάρχου τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραιτωρίου και Φλαοιου Συμμάχου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἀποστάρχου (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: [υπατείας θείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου και τοῦ ἀποδείχθησιμένου Παύνη κη τῆς ἦν( ). The editor dates the papyrus simply “sixth century” without discussion. In the index, however, we find (p. 337), [ὑπατείας (?) Φλαοιου Βασιλείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου και τοῦ ἀποδείχθησιμένου (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 ἀποδειχθησιμένου 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 Hermontis. No document from any part of the Thebaïd (i.e. Hermopolis and all to the south) uses the epithet ἀλμπρότατος for Fl. Basilius cos. 541, who is uniformly called ἕνδοξότατος 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(ακουνιοὺ) Βασιλείου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀποδεκχθησομένου. 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 Ἀλδρήλιου 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 induction) 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:

[ὗπατείον Γρατία]νοῦ τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου νυσὶν τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμ[ῶν
Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ Ἀὐγούστου καὶ Δαυαλαίφου]
τοῦ λαμπροστάτου στρατηγάτου]

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 τὸς τελευταίας ἡμέρας τοῦ παρελθόντος μηνὸς Μεσορῆ τῆς φθαντούσης ἑβδόμης ἐν δικτύφωνοι, 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 φθαντούσα in combination with either ἑβδομήν or ἑπτάμηνος 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 ἑκτέρης ἑπτάμηνος. 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 φθαντούσης, which is attested as meaning “past” or “previous” (cf. LSJ s.v. φθαντός 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 induction 4 the following: ἐγραφὴ(η) Μεσορῆς ἐνδ(ικ.) γ 

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 Oxyrhynchus (cf. *CSBE* 21,26): Μεσορῆς ἐνδικτίων ο ἐθ(ης) τῆς τῇ Τεθρούς. The text thus belongs to that class dated first by the Thoth to Mesore indictional reckoning normal in Oxyrhynchus and secondly by the beginning of the July (delegatio) indiction.

45. *P.Oxy.* XLIV 3204

The consular date of this deed of surety of 2.1.588 (cf. *ZPE* 26 [1977] 284 and *CSBE* 127), following the regnal formula, differs from what is normal for Mauricius in Oxyrhynchus (for which see *RFBE* 58, formula 3) in (a) preceding ἐπαστείας with καί, and (b) omitting before ἡμῶν the adjective ἐσαέβστατον. 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 ἐσαέβστατον, and he reports that “the trace before ἡμῶν is very much like the zig-zag mark of abbreviation that is so often found in ἐσαέβσ. Before that the trace is very meagre, too slight to confirm beta, but ἐσαέβσ 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:

\[\upsilon \pi \sigma \tau(\epsilon)\lambda \alpha s \tau o u \alpha u t o u \epsilon \sigma a e] \beta(\epsilon \sigma a t o u) \eta \mu o n \kappa t l.\]

46. *P.Ryl.* IV 616

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:


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 ὑπ[ατον·λας]). The τ[ων] of the editor still leaves sufficient room for two more letters before α (ἐρος), which is actually ας.

Combining these circumstances, we consider a restoration in line 13 of ἔμ[ων] Ὑποστα[την και] Λεικενιν[ον] Ἡ[εθασ]τ[ων το] ας/ 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 το ας/ 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. 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:

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


6 See CSBE 108 s.a. 320 for the correct reading of the date (in P. Thead. 28).
NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS, IV


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 5, hence 1 May.7

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

This lease is dated to Tybi 19 in the consulate of Junius Bassus and Flavius Ablabius, and it is to run ἀπὸ τῆς ἕδη γενομένης ὕπ' ἐμοῦ σπορᾶς τού ἐνστάτου ἔτους πέμπτης ἱδικτίων. Preissigke took the view that the mention of a fifth indication pointed to a date in 332, while the consular date is 14.1.331. Of these Preissigke 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 indication should be followed; we thus dated the text to 15.1.332. The most recent editor, Parássoglou, dates to 331.

A reconsideration persuades us that the conflict is not real, and that the indication is compatible with a date in 331. We have argued elsewhere8 that σπορά and σπόρος commonly refer to the crop, and that the indication numbers attached to them refer to the indication of taxes declared for the crop in question, not the indication period during which the planting took place. The fifth indication 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 14.1.331 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 Ἡρωτικίου, the papyrus actually has Ἰστορίου, which we can only restore as Ν Ἰστορίου. Furthermore, after the month name there is no loss before the eta in line 3 which Wessely read, and one must read and restore Φαρμοῦθι ἦ τῆ ἰδικτίων. It remains virtually certain, however, that we are dealing with the consul of 464, as the Olybrii of 395 and 526 are put out of court by the third indication, which began in 464 but not in or near either of the other

---

7 We take the opportunity to point out that Parássoglou’s Ἀξίλου Σάκαώνος in line 11 should actually be read Πλουτάμμους.
two years. Phormouthi 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 τὲ [κίον N] 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
Φλαστινᾶς Ρου-]. The principal problem offered by our restoration is the
presence of a name of Rusticianus otherwise unknown to us, namely
Nestorius. But very little is known about Rusticianus in any case.

We take this opportunity of noting that in line 4 the space does not
permit Wessely’s restoration ἀπὸ [τῆς τῆς] Ἀρσανεστὼν 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[(αίου)] Ἐλεσιάριον τοῦ ?
[ἐκβολήσα] ἄτο[ν] Ἡσαχῶν ἤ τῆς δευτέρας
[ἐνδ[ικτίνος] κτ] Ἐρημίου ἐκ μητρὸς

The mention of the second indiction as present in line 27 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 vii–vii.554; it is a Hermopolite text,
and these follow the same formula as Antiopolite 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 BGU 1 305. 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, Ποτη[ρ]ης ἑταῖρας (tiovos) (= 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 (Τιος Τιονς, e.g.) of the acknowledging party.

52. SB VI 9359 = P.Lund VI 10

The editor gives the consular date of this text as ὑπὸ τοῦ Φλαβίου Στελίκλαβα καὶ Αὐρηλίανος τῶν Ἀμπροτατων, 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 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 Αὐρηλίανος, 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 328, 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 τὰ ν λαμπροτάτῳ at the end, is τὰ Ίαραι, which was attested in the consulate itself is otherwise unattested (cf. below). 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 Ίαραίος, which would allow us to restore the consuls of 328 in the proper order: Φλαβίου Ίανναρίνου καὶ Οὐσίου Ίουστου 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 παροίκης υἱός
This curious locution led E. P. Wegener (cf. BL III 220) to propose that φυλής was an error of the scribe or the editor for ῥάδυς(τίλλονος). 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 Συμίδας (cf. CdE 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

The editors of this papyrus proposed restoring the consular date in line 1 as follows: [Οὐκαλεῖται ζυγάτοις [τὸ τέ]ραπτον. 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 ἀποδείχθησι]σιν [ζυγάτοις [τὸ τε]ραπτον (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 ἐοιμέν]σιν ζυγάτοις [τὸ τε]ραπτον, as this passage should be restored. (Sijpsteijn 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 ἐρευνήσει [όσ ... ]? [.......]νε[... ἐτοίς]. In P.Stras. IV, p. 184, it is suggested that in line 6 one read ἐρευνήσει ἐτοῖς (?), and in line 7, τῆς ἴν]δικτύων. This does not quite give us correct sense, as the number of the indication is expected. The consular date in lines 19–21 shows that the date is 27.ix.325. The present indication at this point (during the first cycle) is 14. We restore, therefore, [ίδις ἴν]δικτύων in line 7.

57. P.Stras. 580

This text is dated by the editor "VfEs 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 σ’ Νωάνιας ἱστὸν [κ. ἵον]. As it stood, therefore, it was not clear whether June or July was in question. In fact, however, there was no ante 6 Non. Ian. (ante 4 being
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the first day after the Calends), while there was an ante 6 Non. Jul. We therefore regard it as clear that the restoration of ιος[λίων] 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 (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 Borely, 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 Αὐρήλιος Θεόδωρος Ἀυνιβίωνος ἔγραψα τῇ κυθῇ ἡμέρᾳ θλίου
2 ὑπατείας Φλαωείου Κωνσταντίου καὶ Οὐσὶ[ερίου Μαξιμιανοῦ]
   Καισάρων τῶν ἐπάρχων.

After the Agamemnon and Iphigeneia story one reads in line 7, μηνὸς
Φαρμοῦθ, ἡμέρᾳ θλίου. The second line printed above is also given by
Wessely, MPER II (1887) 29, who prints Κωνσταντίου. 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 (consulats 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 —— Οὐσι[ερίου Μαξιμοῦ τῶν λαμπρο]γάτων ἐπάρχων. Professor P. Mertens has very kindly verified this reading for us
on a photograph of the tablet obtained from the Château Borely. 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 σελήνη ιδ Χοί πτρ ανάπαυσθ, which is interpreted by L. Robert as σεληνή ιδ Χοί(α)κ π(ά)τρ(ε)ρ άνάπαυσθ(ο). One is struck by the absence of a day number with Choaik; and equally the method of abbreviating πάτρη seems different from that employed in μαρτίρων for μαρτίρων, for example. In fact, the formula does not require any vocative noun before άνάπαυσθον: 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. II, line 26. It seems, then, that one is justified in resolving π(ά)τρ(η), giving us the date (Choaik 1).

61. Lefebvre 663

This inscription from Nubia has a date Φαμενὰθ ας ήμέρας γ ἐπί τάς ζ ἡμερας κατά σελήνης κας ειν/ ενερηθης κθ. Lefebvre explains what follows the “selen” date: “Peu-ètre εἰν(α) 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 indication number, and one has only to divide ε ἦν and resolve ε ἦν(δίκτιον) 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 indication, and both may therefore be discarded.10
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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 “selen” 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 chretiennes 190–91 and JSOR 10 (1926) 295. The text is republished by M. Guarducci, Epigrafixa Greca 4 (Rome 1978) 459 (no improvement on the date).