

# ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR PAPYROLOGIE UND EPIGRAPHIK

*herausgegeben*

*von*

*Helmut Engelmann, Dieter Hagedorn, Rudolf Kassel  
Ludwig Koenen und Reinhold Merkelbach*



## TEN CONSULAR DATES

In the course of preparing a list of attestations of consulates in the papyri of the period 284-641, we have had occasion to examine a number of anomalies.<sup>1)</sup> In this article we discuss ten such difficulties of reading or dating and offer our resolution of each.

### 1. P. Athen. 34

The editor of this report of a physician did not give a transcription of, nor comment on, the last line of the text. Such reports universally have a date at the end,<sup>2)</sup> and at the date indicated by the hand (III-IVp, according to the editor), one would find either a date by regnal years or, in the fourth century, by a consulate. Examining the photograph (pl. XIII), we find that no regnal formula can be read. The writing of this line is smaller (though not by a different hand) than the rest of the document, and we calculate that about as much of this line is lost as is preserved, thus allowing us ca 20-25 letters. On the basis of the plate, we propose the following reading:

Ἰπάτειρας Οὐοληακίου Ῥου]φίνου (καὶ) Φλ(αίου) Εὐσεβίου κόμιτος

The consuls are those of 347. The titles diverge from those attested elsewhere in that Rufinus is not styled praefectus praetorio, and that neither man seems to be styled vir clarissimus, ὁ λαμπρότατος.<sup>3)</sup> But as there are in fact traces below this line, we may suppose that the date continued, giving at least the month and day, and in all likelihood preceding that, τῶν λαμπροτάτων. It is not uncommon for the papyri to alternate between giving λαμπρότατος with each consul and giving it in the plural after the pair.<sup>4)</sup> For the lack of an article before κόμιτος, cf. P.Princ.II 81.3 (A.D.344).

1) This list will appear in our Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt, forthcoming in *Studia Amstelodamensia*. For a further consular problem with significant implications for the *Fasti*, see our forthcoming article in *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978).

2) See for this class of documents the literature cited in P.Oxy.XLV 3245 introd.

3) For the consulate see P.Oxy.IX 1190.15; XLIII 3146.1; P.Ant.I 31.13; and P.Cair.Preis.39.22.

4) Compare, e.g. from A.D.372, P.Vindob.Sijp.13.1 and P.Lips.85.1.

## 2. P.Lond. III 1113 (p.lvii descr.)

Seventy years after its description, this text is still the only reference in the papyri to the consuls of 367. It therefore seemed to us worthwhile to check the exact reading. In a visit to London in May, 1977, Bagnall read the date as follows:<sup>5)</sup>

[μετὰ τ]ῆν ὑπατείαν Φλαουίου Λουπικίνου κόμ[ι]τος

ἰπικῆς τε καὶ πεδικῆς δυνάμεως καὶ Φλαουίου

[ ca 8: vacat? ] Ἰοβίνου τῶν λαμπροτάτων.

It is remarkable that the scribe gives Fl.Lupicinus the titles of comes equitum et peditem. He is otherwise recorded as having been magister equitum in the east from 364 - 367.<sup>6)</sup> His colleague, Fl.Iovinus, was magister equitum in the west. He apparently has no title in the consular formula here other than vir clarissimus.<sup>7)</sup> It is not certain if there was writing at the start of line 3, where any ink is now completely effaced. No other names are recorded for Iovinus which one could restore.

## 3. P.Lips.13

The loan of money recorded on this papyrus is to bear interest starting from the next month, Hathyr, of the current 8th indiction; the present month is therefore Phaophi, and line 21 indeed gives a date of Phaophi 25 = 22/23.x. The editors restore the consular date as follows: [Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατ]είαν Οὐ[αλεντινιανοῦ] Αὐγούστου καὶ Φ[λαυίου]

[Οὐάλεντος] Αὐγού[στου].

On the basis of this reading, they date the papyrus to A.D.366, for Valentinianus and Valens were consuls together in 365. The editors remark (lines 1-2 n.) on the anomaly of an 8th indiction's (364/5) being spoken of as still current in 366, but their confidence in the reading, particularly of the phi in line 1, leads them to reject the testimony of the indiction.<sup>8)</sup>

5) We wish to record our thanks to T.S.Pattie of the British Library for his cordial help on this visit.

6) A.H.M.Jones, J.R.Martindale, and J.Morris, *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire I* (Cambridge 1971) 520-521, Lupicinus 6.

7) *Ibid.*, 462-463, Iovinus 6.

8) The volume properly has only one editor, Mitteis, but it is clear that in P.Lips. 13 the final reading of these lines was that of Wilcken.

This restoration and dating arouse suspicion on several grounds. (1) It is very rare for the indiction to disagree with a consular date by more than one year, and most such instances in fact move in the other direction, i.e. the indiction is too high.

(2) The restoration supposes a much larger restoration at the left in these lines (11 letters in line 1, 9 in line 2) than in the other lines, where only 1-3 letters are lost. The editors were conscious of this difficulty and remarked, "Die beiden ersten Zeilen, bei denen etwas mehr fehlt als bei den übrigen, müssen weiter nach links ausgerückt gewesen sein, als die nachfolgenden." We have examined a good photograph of the papyrus,<sup>9)</sup> and the left margin is broken evenly all along the side, and the number of missing letters must have been the same (2 - 3) all the way along, except for lines 4 - 8, where a small strip of papyrus projects to the left with one or two letters on it.<sup>10)</sup> This means that one would have to assume a very large projection in line 1 to accommodate the editors' restoration. A restoration of 3 letters would be expected.

(3) The form of the imperial titles restored is very odd. The one secure example of a papyrus giving the titulature for the consuls of the year 365, SB III 6612.2 (22 October 365) reads: ὑπατείας τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Οὐάλεντινιανοῦ καὶ Οὐάλεντος αἰωνίων Αὐγούστων. The phrase τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν is almost never omitted from the consular titulature of living monarchs. Further, one does not expect to find Flavius with Valens alone; if it occurs at all (as in P.Lips.33 ii.1), it should come before both; and normally with emperors it is not found at all.

(4) The document was written by a scribe named Philsarapis. This scribe also occurs in other Leipzig papyri, namely P.Lips. 17 (377) and 28 (381), signing in a manner similar to that here. It is a priori probable that P.Lips. 13 also falls around the same time as his other two texts.<sup>11)</sup>

It seems to us reasonable, therefore, to seek a solution which takes all of these objections into account. This can only be the dating of the papyrus in October, 379, at which time an 8th indiction was current. The consuls of 379, D. Magnus Ausonius and Q. Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius, are manifestly not present in P.Lips. 13, for the

9) For this we thank R. Jäger of the University Library in Leipzig.

10) In line 8, print [ἀν]αγκαίαν.

11) This connection, we find, also struck J. Schwartz; Philsarapis also appears in P. Strasb. 246, a fragment now lacking any date, and Schwartz wondered "si le P. Lips. 13 pouvait être daté de 379 p.C."

reading of Augustus in line 1 is certain. Moreover, no texts have yet been published with these consuls. In fact, no texts from the year 379 with any consulate have been published. The consuls of 378, however, are attested, for example in BGU XIII 2339.1, where they have the form τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Οὐάλεντος τὸ ζ´ καὶ Οὐαλεντιανοῦ τὸ β´ τῶν αἰωνίων Αὐγούστων.

P.Lips. 13 does not at first sight accommodate quite this formula. Two remarks are in order before we go further. First, the papyrus is not complete at the top; no top edge is preserved, and it is quite possible that line 1 of the preserved section is not the original first line. Secondly, the photograph does not quite support the editors' text at all points. A diplomatic transcription of what we can read is as follows:

[...]ειανου[ ca 10 ]αυγουστουκα[ ca 7 ]  
 [...]αυ.ο.[ ca 11 ]

1. We see no trace of the supposedly certain phi here; Mitteis read only κα[ι in the "Erstdruck", no.6, but Wilcken thought he saw a phi.
2. The third letter is very probably tau, as it is formed in the same way as the tau of αὐτῆς in line 6. Mitteis read αὐτο in the "Erstdruck". The last letter before the lacuna is represented by scattered traces, and we are not absolutely certain what is ink. Arguments can be made for either epsilon or kappa. There may be some ink after the letter in question, depending on its identification.

On the basis of this transcription and the known phraseology of other documents of the period, we offer the following reconstruction:

[Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν]  
 [Οὐάλεντος Αὐγούστου τὸ ζ´ καὶ Οὐαλεν-]  
 [τιν]ειανοῦ [νέου αἰωνίου] Αὐγούστου καὶ [.....]  
 4 [...]αυ.ο.[ τὸ β´ ] vacat

This restoration provides a regular line length and relies, so far as it goes, on regular phraseology. But the titles of the junior Augustus are a problem; that he was called αἰώνιος and Valens not is a minor problem; if necessary, the word could be added to Valens' titles and those redistributed slightly over lines 1 - 2. That each emperor is separately called Augustus is also not a problem, though it is more common earlier in the fourth century, in the time of the sons of Constantine. But how are we to fill the remaining space? It is conceivable that the remainder of line 3 was blank, as also the

start of line 4, though it does not seem very probable. The contemporary documents provide no phrase beyond Augustus which could be restored here. We can suggest two possibilities, both of which would be unique for this period. (1) Read Αὐτοκ[ράτορος]. The difficulty here is twofold, that this title does not appear in titulature between the early fourth century and the reign of Anastasius,<sup>12)</sup> and that the traces before the lacuna, after what would be a kappa, are not likely to be compatible with rho.<sup>13)</sup> (2) Read [τοῦ ἀδελφι|δοῦ] αὐτοῦ. This restoration fills the space (as Αὐτοκράτορος does not), expresses correctly the relationship of Valentinianus II to Valens, and is not an anachronism. It encounters, however, two objections also: that the phrase is otherwise unattested (but cf. in ZPE 23 [1977] 218 the phrase Γρατιανοῦ τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου υἱοῦ τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ Αὐγούστου); and that if one reads αὐτοῦ one must dismiss several traces on the photograph as not being ink. From the photograph we cannot exclude either of these hypotheses and prefer in consequence to include neither in the text.

The exact date of P.Lips.13 is 23.x.379 (379/380 being a leap year).

#### 4. SPP XX 114

According to the editor, this text is dated to the consulate of Honorius VIII and Theodosius III, or 409. One is troubled, however, by the unexplained blank of the entire left half of line 2 and the apparent word ending which suggests a word between Αὐγ(ούστου) and τὸ γ'. Still worse, we find in Aegyptus 12 (1932) 375 that Zereteli, rereading the original papyrus, read the indiction number in line 2 as 15. But we have seen on a photograph that the iota is absent; hence it is 5. Neither 15 nor 5 suits the editor's consular date, for 409 is the end of indiction 7 and the start of 8. If we assume that we must be in a year which saw either the end or the start of a 5th indiction, that one of the consuls was a Theodosius and that the other was serving for the third time, we are forced to the consulate of 420, with Theodosius for the 9th time and Fl. Constantius for the 3rd. Now the year of the consulate is itself excluded, since it was divided between the 3rd and 4th indictions. And since the consuls of 421 appear

12) We find the term still in P.Lond.III 1291 (p.lxxi; cf. p.336), in 329 (cf. P.Oxy. X 1265.16; 336 A.D.), but it is exceptional even then. The first example of its reintroduction known to us is P.Lond.III 992, in 507.

13) We have considered possible restorations for consulates in the sixth century (cf. preceding note), but in our opinion the handwriting cannot belong to this period, and in any case we have found no suitable consular formula, and Philsarapis puts a later date out of court.

in a postconsular formula in August, 422 (SPP XX 118), and our text is dated to Mesore 1 (?), or 25 July, a date in 422 is unlikely. The year thus must be 421. The 5th indiction began in this year. We suggest that the text of lines 1-2 of this papyrus be read and restored as follows:

[Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Θεοδοσίου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγ(ούστου)  
[τὸ θ´ καὶ Φλ(αυίου) Κωνσταντίου τοῦ λαμπρ(οτάτου) πατρ(ικίου) τὸ γ´, Μεσορῆ α  
ἰνδ(ικτίονος) εἰς ἔν Ἀλεξ(ανδρείῃ)].

For the formula of this year cf. e.g. P.Oxy.VIII 1134 and Pap.Lugd.Bat.XIII 8 and 13.<sup>14)</sup>

#### 5. P. Haun. Inv. 318<sup>15)</sup>

The editors correctly dated this papyrus to 439, as it has a postconsular formula of Theodosius XVI and Fl. Faustus. But they were unable to make out the end of the first line, where the scribe has not written the date correctly. On the plate we read the consular date as follows:

Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Θεοδοσίου τὸ ις´ καὶ Φαύ(γου)σ-  
του <τοῦ> λαμπροτάτων (lege λαμπροτάτου)

In all likelihood, the scribe has washed out something after Theodosius' numeral, but the precise order in which he made the other corrections is not clear to us.

#### 6. P. Mil. I 64

According to the editor, this text is dated to the consulate of Fl. Anatolius, Choiak 10, and speaks of the current ninth indiction in line 9. On this basis, the date must be 6.xii.440, and it is to 440 that the editor dates it. But he remarks, "Non è da escludere la possibilità che la data fosse espressa con la formula postconsolare." When one considers that there are 10 letters restored in line 1 compared to 18 in 3, 19 in 4, and so forth, one suspects that a postconsular formula, which would occupy 17 letters, is indeed to be restored. Furthermore, one can see clearly on Tavola XXV that the reading

14) It is curious to note that Wessely apparently mentioned this text years before he published it, in MPER V, p.100 bottom, as PER No.4119, and there he dates it to 420, identifying the consuls as Theodosius (no numeral) and Constans (sic) III. For some reason this citation was not reprinted in SB I 5159ff. along with its neighbors.

15) Univ. of Copenhagen, Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin 6 (Copenhagen 1971), ed. Adam Bülow-Jacobsen and Sten Ebbesen.

ἐνάτης in line 9 is not possible. We read, in fact, δε[ε]κάτης on the photograph, and Professor Orsolina Montevicchi has been so kind as to confirm this reading on the original for us. The date is therefore a year later, 6.xii.441.

## 7. SB V 8264

The editors present the text of lines 1-2 of this papyrus as follows:

[† Ὑπατείας Φλαου[ίου Μ]αξιμου τοῦ  
 Λαμπροτάτου, Φαρ]μο[ῦθ]ι ι. ι., ἐν]δ(ικτί)ο(νος) β//

They dated it to 523. The difficulty arises, however, that Pharmouthi of indiction 2 fell in 524. Furthermore, the restoration of line 1 amounts to 8 letters, counting the cross, while that of line 2 comes to 14 letters, as do the restorations of succeeding lines, within a small margin of variance. It is therefore a priori likely that in fact we are dealing with a postconsular date, and that the papyrus is to be placed in 524. Professor Hombert kindly examined the papyrus for us, and Bagnall subsequently studied it with him. We think it safe to say that there is no objection to the restoration of a postconsulate, since the only letter in line 1 before the name of the consul can as well be a nu as a sigma in this hand, and the edge of the papyrus is straight. We read, therefore, [Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατεία]ν κτλ.<sup>16)</sup>

## 8. SB VIII 9773

According to its editor's text and restorations, this document is one of only two papyri with consular dates by the consuls of 405. His text reads as follows:

[ X X X βασιλείας τοῦ  
 ἡ[μῶ]ν δεσ[πότη]ου Φλα[ουίου] Ὀν[ω]ρίου  
 τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου [καὶ Α]ὔτοκράτορος]  
 4 ἔτου[ς] ι. α̅ ὑ[πατείας] Φ[λαουίου] Στιλ[ίχωνος]  
 τοῦ ἐν]δοξοτά[του] Φαῶφ[ι μηνός] ι τῆ[ς]  
 εὐτυχοῦς τετάρ[της] ἐν]δικ(τίωνος) κτλ.

This text must arouse suspicion, for it would offer an example of dating by regnal years under Honorius, when in fact no dates by regnal years are known after 385<sup>17)</sup> and

16) The only alternative means of avoiding the conflict is to read a different month in line 2; but Professor Hombert and Bagnall are agreed that this is not possible.

17) See the remarks of P.J.Sijpesteijn and K.A.Worp, p.239-243 on the few

before the publication of Justinian's Novella 47 in A.D.537. In addition, it suggests that Stilicho's colleague in 405, Fl. Anthemius, was ignored in the papyrus, whereas we know that he appears with Stilicho in SB VIII 9931.<sup>18)</sup> Finally, ἐνδοξότατος is not otherwise attested before 446 as an epithet for a consul,<sup>19)</sup> and one may observe also that the word μηνός is superfluous and in fact undesirable between the month name and the day.

On the other hand, after 566 the consular date is never again in the papyri given by the consulate of a commoner, who can be styled ἐνδοξότατος. As the earlier period is excluded by the fact that consular dates and regnal formulas are not blended in this way, we are limited to the period 537 - 566. Indiction 4 falls in this period in 540 (we are in Phaophi, thus in the first julian year of an indiction, e.g. of 540/1) and 555. The sequence of letters in line 3, λουστι, suggests that we have the consul of 540, Fl. Iustinus, and since the text evidently does not have a postconsular phrase or a numeral after the name of the consul, it is not likely that p.c. Basilii 14 (555) is the year in question.

On the basis of these deductions, we requested a photograph from Vienna; once again we have to thank H.Harrauer and M.Fackelmann for responding to our request. On this photograph we read the following:

† Β[ασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου]  
 ἡ[μῶ]ν δεσπότης Φλα[ουίου Ἰουστινι]ανου  
 τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος]  
 4 ἔτους ιδ' ὑ[πατείας] Φλαυίου Ἰουστίνου]  
 τοῦ ἐνδοξοτάτου Φαῶφι εἰκάδι τῆς .  
 εὐτυχοῦς τετάρτης ἰνδικτίονος ἐν Ἑρακ(λέους)<sup>20)</sup>

4 ὑ παρ.

The papyrus is thus datable to 540, in the 14th regnal year of Justinian (which be-  
 documents of the later fourth century where regnal years appear.

18) See ZPE 5 (1970) 86 for the correction of the consulate in this text.

19) BGU XII 2141 is the first example; and after that there is not another instance until 492, in SB VI 9152.

20) In line 8 also one must read Ἑρακ(λέους).

gan on 1.iv), in the 4th indiction, and in the consulate of Fl. Iustinus. The date is 17 October.

9. P.Vindob.Gr.Inv.25948<sup>21)</sup>

The editor presents as follows the text of lines 1-2 of this papyrus, which he dates to A.D.571:

[† Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φ]λαουίου Ἰουστίνου τοῦ ἐνδοξοτάτου ἕ[του]ς ἕκτου  
[ ἐβδόμη πέμπτης ἰνδικτίονος.

Line 8 provides the further information that indiction 6 is about to begin, presumably in the following year, for this document is a lease of land for the crops of that indiction. As an indiction 6 began in 572, the indiction accords properly with the editor's date. There is, however, the difficulty that the emperor Justin is never referred to in a consular dating as simply Fl. Iustinus; he consistently has a complicated and long formula of which the following is a simple version: βασιλείας καὶ ὑπατείας τοῦ δεσπότη ἡμῶν Φλ. Ἰουστίνου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου, ἔτους --. And the epithet ἐνδοξότατος is never used of a reigning emperor, only of a private person. We are thus prohibited from dating this papyrus to 571.

The only possible alternative is 541, which was indeed the year after the consulate of Fl. Iustinus (compare previous document).<sup>22)</sup> And the simple titulature of the Vienna papyrus coincides exactly with that used for Iustinus in 540. One may naturally object that the mention of a "sixth year" in the formula is an obstacle. But on the photograph printed as Plate III in the edition, we read the end of line 1 instead as Θωθ ε.[.]., providing the month and removing a sixth year. We cannot say with confidence what followed Thoth, but presumably there was a date written out.

10. CPLat.147

The consular date in line 2 of this fragment is printed as follows:

]um XXXIII post c(onsulatum) Basili bis anno XXI

21) TALLANTA 6 (1975) 52.

22) The one curious feature about a postconsular date in September, 541 by Fl. Iustinus is that the consulate of Fl. Basilius was evidently already known in Egypt in January, as we learn from P.Cair.Masp.II 67126.36 and P.Lond.V 1719.1 But SPP XX

To this text R. Cavenaile gives the date A.D.548, evidently on the basis of the assumption that the year 21 mentioned is the regnal year of Justinian, which ended in 548. This dating, however, ignores the figure XXXIII, leaving it without explanation, and does not indicate why we should find the word *bis* in the formula. On the plate published by C. Wessely in SPP XIV, Tafel XII, we read the following:

] an(no) XXXIII: pos(t) c(onsulatum) Basili ....( ) anno XXI.

The year 34 is to be taken as the regnal year of Justinian, running from 1.iv.560 to 31.iii.561; the 21st year of the postconsular era of Basilius can be 561 or 562, and is certainly 561 here.<sup>23)</sup> We may therefore date this document with confidence to the first three months of 561.<sup>24)</sup>

Columbia University  
University of Amsterdam

Roger S. Bagnall  
K. A. Worp

---

136.4, if correctly read, offers an example in February-March of a postconsular date by Fl. Iustinus.

23) During the period after 541, we find two ways of reckoning consular and post-consular years in the papyri. One of these treats the year after the consulate as p.c.1; the other calls it year 2 of the consulate. In practice, "consulate" and "after the consulate" are interchanged, and we thus find two numbers in use for a given year. For the workings of this system, see the remarks of E. Stein in *Mélanges Bidez* (Bruxelles 1934) 869-878 and 887-894. In Cd'E 28 (1953) 373, we find under L 3 the suggestion of 562 as a date for this text, evidently based on the consulate but not the regnal years.

24) We do not know what the few letters after Basilius' name are; there is an abbreviation stroke after them, so that *bis* is not possible. Possibly the letters after the first are *iu* plus abbreviation, i.e. *iu(nioris)*, as Basilius is styled in Latin formulas, cf. J.-O. Tjäder, *Die nichtliterarischen Lateinischen Papyri Italiens aus der Zeit 445-700* (Lund 1955) 521 s.v. *Konsuln*. The *u*, however, is rather dubious, and one is still left without an explanation of what precedes. It does not seem possible to read *v(iri) c(larissimi)* at any point.

P.ERL. 52 B Recto: A REEDITION

One of the more interesting, and neglected, texts for the history of the beginning of the fifteen-year indiction cycles is P.Erl.52, an account of various commodities disbursed for official purposes. The first edition presents numerous difficulties, and the preservation of parts of the text is poor. We have been led by our study of the indiction system<sup>1)</sup> to examine P.Erl.52 more closely on the basis of photographs kindly obtained by Professor J.Herrmann. From these we present a revised text and translation of the best-preserved part of the papyrus, B Recto, and a list of some corrections to the text of other parts of the papyrus.<sup>2)</sup>

Column I

-----	
23 κ[ρέ]ως [	] λί(τραι) / Βχνα
24 ούτως	
25 μη(νι) Μαίων [Κ]ορνηλίω Μώρου εις Τ[εντ]ύραν ἀπὸ κ <sup>ω</sup> ἰνδικ(τίονος) λί(τραι) ψ[ς]	
26 λοιπ(αὶ) εἰς τὴν πρὸ α <sup>ς</sup> Καλ(ανδῶν) Μαίων ὑπατείας Οὐβολουσιανοῦ καὶ Ἄννιανοῦ	
27 τῶν λαμπροτάτων	λί(τραι) / Αημε
28 ούτως	
29 κ <sup>ω</sup> ἰνδικ(τίονος) π(αρά) Κορνηλίω Μώρου	λί(τραι) υμη
30 λογοθεσίου ιη <sup>ω</sup> ἰνδικ(τίονος) π(αρά) Παῶτι Πχοταπῆτος καὶ κοι(ωνοῖς)	
31 ποιμέσι κώμης Πτύτewς	λί(τραι) υια ὄμ(οίως)
32 λογοθεσίου ιζ <sup>ω</sup> ἰνδικ(τίονος)	λί(τραι) / Απς
33 ούτως	
34 π(αρά) Ἰσχυρίωνι Κασιανοῦ	λί(τραι) υ
35 π(αρά) Νεφώτη Διοσκόρου καὶ κοι(ωνοῖς) μέναι)	λί(τραι) χπς γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκει-

1) The results of this study will be embodied in our forthcoming Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt, in *Studia Amstelodamensia*.

2) It should be pointed out that A and B join exactly.

- 36 κριθῆς (ἀρτάβαι) ψζ γ̄ ῑο  
 37 οὕτως  
 38 α' ἰνδικ(τίονος)  
 39 διαδότης ἐπὶ τόπων Οὐαλεντίνω καὶ Μάρκω (ἀρτάβαι) σλ β̄ η̄  
 40 οὕτως  
 41 κ'' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) ρψL ιζ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) μδ δ̄ κ̄ο  
 42 ὑποδέχεται τοῦ νομοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐπὶ τόπ(ων) χορηγίας (ἀρτ.) κζL  
 43 οὕτως  
 44 κ''' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) θ ζ'' ιζ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) ιη γ''  
 45 εἰς δὲ Τεντύραν ἀπὸ ιζ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτ.) ν γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκείμεναι)  
 46 γ(ίνονται) μεταβ... (ἀρτ.) τη δ̄ κ̄ο  
 47 λοιπ(αὶ) (ἀρτ.) τρ̄θ[η]'

## Column II

- 48 οὕτ[ως]  
 49 κ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτάβαι) [ ] λ̄ ζ̄  
 50 ιθ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτάβαι) ι γ''  
 51 ιη' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτάβαι) μη L δ''  
 52 ιζ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) (ἀρτάβαι) ρπθ κ̄ο  
 53 γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκείμεναι)  
 54 ἀχύρου λι(τρῶν) (μυριάδες) ια / Θ̄σ..  
 55 οὕτως  
 56 εἰς Μαξιμιανόπολ(ιν) λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) η / Θ̄..δ̄  
 57 οὕτως  
 58 Κτίστη Κοπρήτος γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκείμεναι)  
 59 Ἰανουαρίω ἀπὸ λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) θ̄ μετὰ  
 60 τὰς οὔσας α' ἰνδικ(τίονος) λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) β̄ / ΗΞ αἱ  
 61 λοιπ(αὶ) λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) ς / Ελμ  
 62 οὕτως  
 63 κ' ἰνδικ(τίονος) <λί(τραι)> / Δφ ιη'' ἰνδικ(τίονος)  
 64 λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) ε / Ζυμ  
 65 Πασμητ( ) ἀπὸ Ἐλεφαντίνης

- 66 ἀπὸ ιη´ ἰνδικ(τίονος) ἀπὸ λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) β´ μετὰ τὰς  
 67 οὔσας α´ ἰνδικ(τίονος) λ[ι](τρῶν) (μυρ.) α´ ωνς αἰ  
 68 λοιπ(αἰ) λί(τραι) / Θρμδ  
 69 Ψενπνῆχθι ναυκλήρω  
 70 ἀπὸ λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) β´ Ε μετὰ τὰς οὔσας  
 71 α´ ἰνδικ(τίονος) λί(τρας) / ςψ αἰ λοιπ(αἰ) λι(τρ.) (μυρ.) α´ Ηφ γ(ίνονται) αἰ  
 π(ροκεῖμεναι)  
 72 λοιπ(αἰ) λογοθ(εσίου) ιη´ ἰνδικ(τίονος) π(αρά) ὑποδέκταις  
 73 τοῦ νομοῦ λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) γ σ  
 35 Uncertain if papyrus has κοιν, κοι or κοιν[ω( )] 52 ρθ: ρ ex u

23. Possibly, as in 36, nothing was written in this line between κρέως and the amount.

25. The editor did not understand μη´ = μη(νί), and he therefore rejected his own correct suggestion of Μαίω(ν).

31. There is a line under the end of ποιμέσι and the start of κώμης.

35. For γ(ίνονται) αἰ π(ροκεῖμεναι) see H.C. Youtie, *Scriptunculae I* (Amsterdam 1973) 54 with other references. The editor (35n.) suggested this resolution but rejected it, evidently not understanding its use at the end of an account where the total is given at the top and then analyzed.

38. This line was apparently added between the lines as a supplement to διαδό-  
 ταις in the next line.

46. The editor's μεταβολεῖ has no sense in this place. We expect a form, probably passive, of μεταβάλλω, cf. line 7 of A Recto.

47. The editor places λοιπ(αἰ) in the preceding line, but this gives no sense, as the figure in 47 is in fact the balance, while 46 is the total of the figures above. The word is not really quite aligned with either line.

48. It is possible that the papyrus is virtually complete at top and that no text is lost (also in Column I). In this case it would be likely that lines 49ff. give a breakdown of line 47. But mutilation of the amounts makes it impossible to be certain.

54. The editor failed to recognize  $\wedge$  as the sign for myriads, but transcribed it as pi throughout, leading to grave problems in understanding the arithmetic.

58. There is a marginal stroke next to this line.

72. λογοθέσιον, absent from LSJ and WB, is cited by WB Supplement from this papyrus and from P.Oxy.XVIII 2187.9, where the editor translates it "audit of the accounts". Daris, Spoglio, adds PSI VII 767.49.

### Translation

#### Column I

Meat		2,651 lbs.
	As follows:	
In the month of May, to Cornelius son of Moros, to Tentyra, from the 20th indiction		7[06] lbs.
Balance on Ante I Kal. May in the consulate of Volusianus and Annianus the most illustrious		1,945 lbs.
	As follows:	
20th indiction, with Cornelius son of Moros		448 lbs.
From the audit of the 18th indiction, with Paos son of Pchotapes and associates, shepherds of the village of Ptytis		411 lbs.
Likewise, from the audit of the 17th indiction		1,086 lbs.
	As follows:	
With Ischyron son of Kasianos		400 lbs.
With Nephotes son of Dioskoros and associates		686 lbs.
The preceding sums agree.		
Barley		707 $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{12}$ art.
	As follows:	
To the local diadotai of the 1st indiction, Valentinus and Marcus		230 $\frac{2}{3}$ $\frac{1}{8}$ art.
	As follows:	
20th indiction		186 $\frac{1}{2}$ art.
17th indiction		44 $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{24}$ art.
To the hypodektai of the nome, for local provisions		27 $\frac{1}{2}$ art.
	As follows:	
20th indiction		9 $\frac{1}{6}$ art.
17th indiction		18 $\frac{1}{3}$ art.
To Tentyra from the 17th indiction		50 art.
The preceding sums agree.		
Total transferred (?)		308 $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{24}$ art.
Balance		399 [ $\frac{1}{8}$ ] art.

#### Column II

	As follows:	
20th indiction		[.]30 $\frac{1}{6}$ art.
19th indiction		10 $\frac{1}{3}$ art.
18th indiction		48 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ art.
17th indiction		189 $\frac{1}{24}$ art.
The preceding sums agree.		
Chaff		119,2[.] lbs.
	As follows:	

To Maximianopolis

89, [..]4 lbs.

As follows:

To Ktistes son of Kopres

The preceding sums agree.

To Ianuarius, from 90,000 lbs. after the sums from the 1st indiction, 28,060 lbs.,  
the balance 65,940 lbs. [sic]

As follows:

20th indiction

4,500 lbs.

18th indiction

57,440 lbs.

To Paset( ) from Elephantine, from the 18th indiction, from 20,000 lbs., after the  
amount from the 1st indiction, 10,856 lbs., balance 9,144 lbs.

To Psenpnechthis the naukleros, from 25,000 lbs., after the amount from the 1st in-  
diction, 6,500 lbs., balance 18,500 lbs. The preceding sums agree.

Balance from the audit of the 18th indiction with the hypodektai of the nome, 30,200 lbs.

A brief explanation of the addition may be useful in the case of doubtful points.

Lines 23-35, meat: the basic sum is line 25 + line 27 = line 23 (706 + 1945 =  
2,651). The figure of 1,945 is reckoned as follows: lines 34 + 35 = line 32 (400 +  
686 = 1,086); lines 32 + 29 + 31 = line 27 (1,086 + 448 + 411 = 1,945).

Lines 36-47, barley: the basic sum is 47 + 46 = 36 (399 1/8 + 308 1/4 1/24 =  
707 1/3 1/12). Line 46 is reached by adding lines 39, 42 and 45 (230 2/3 1/8 +  
27 1/2 + 50 = 308 1/4 1/24). Line 39 is the addition of two sums in line 41, and  
line 42 is the addition of two sums in line 44.

Lines 54-73, chaff: some figures are lost, making a complete reconciliation im-  
possible. Lines 60 + 61 must = 59, but the scribe incorrectly wrote an epsilon instead  
of alpha in the thousands' place in line 61; that alpha was right is shown by adding  
63 to 64 (4,500 + 57,440). Perhaps alpha was misread as epsilon from an account on  
which the figures originally stood. Line 66 less line 67 = line 68. Line 70 less line  
71 = line 71 (18,500). Lines 61, 68 and 71 add up to 89,584, evidently what should  
have stood in line 56 (we cannot say if it actually did). Line 54 minus line 56 =  
line 73, but uncertainty in the last digits in lines 54 and 56 makes the exact sum  
(and the accuracy of the reckoning) uncertain.

This account has numerous points of interest. Here we are concerned with only one,  
the mentions of indictions. There are mentions of the 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, and 1st  
indictions. The first four of these are certainly, since we have a clear date by consuls  
in line 4 of 30 April 314, the indictions of 308/9 through 311/2. The usage of such  
numbers was demonstrated by Kase,<sup>3)</sup> who remarked that these numbers equal the regnal

3) P.Princ.Roll, pp.26-27.

years of Galerius, the senior emperor at the time. We reserve a discussion of the problems concerning this style of reckoning to our forthcoming monograph.

The 1st indiction is the most recent, evidently (lines 38, 39, 60, 70, 71), and its harvest has already taken place. The entire account mentions only one expenditure after this date, in May (line 25), and we think it is a fair deduction from the fact that the last balance cited is that of 30 April that the account itself was drawn up in or shortly after May, 314. It is evident that indiction 1 in this context can be only the 1st indiction of the cycle of 312, i.e. 312/3. It is natural enough that indiction 2, 313/4, is not mentioned, for its harvest fell in 314 itself; the taxes would not begin to be paid, and the revenues thus be used for expenditures, until shortly after the time to which we assign this account, i.e. the harvest season of indiction 2 in 314. No mention of an indiction 2 is thus to be expected.<sup>4)</sup>

The broader significance of the evidence of P.Erl. 52 will be treated in our monograph on chronology. But it is important to point out that this is the only evidence known so far mentioning indiction 1 of the first cycle in a document. From P.Erl. 52 we can therefore deduce that by spring, 314, the authorities in Egypt were using the cycle of consecutively numbered indictions based on 312/3 = year 1, and that this system was used with reference not only to the current year but with regard to the past one. At all events, by May or June, 314, the cycle was in use with respect to the time since 312.

The other columns of this papyrus might also benefit from a reedition; and indeed P. Erl. 105 - 110, which clearly come from the same source and are closely related, could also use work. The photographs are not sufficiently clear to permit this at present, and recourse to the originals, not throughout well preserved, will be needed. For the present, we give a list of corrections to the remainder of P.Erl. 52 which can be made from the photographs. (X → Y means "for X read Y".)

P.Erl. 52 A Recto

Line 3:  $\text{Ιχτηφ γαϛ}$  →  $\text{Ι. Ηφ γ(ίνονται) αἱ προκειμένα}$

4: This line is heavily mutilated, but there seems space enough in the lacuna to restore the name at least of the second consul:  $[\text{καὶ Πρόβου}]$

4) Cl.Préaux, Cd'E 18 (1943) 169 pointed out that this papyrus contained a clear mention of the 1st indiction of 312/3, but her remarks have not been noticed by subsequent scholars, so far as we have seen.

- 5: λί(τραι) πγ σ → λι(τρῶν) (μυρ.) γ σ, cf. lines 54ff.  
 6: γαι' → γ(ίνονται) αἱ π(ροκείμεναι)  
 7: Ἀππωνίου → ἄννωνικοῦ  
 9: ]θασίου → λογο]θεσίου  
 10: ἰνδικ[τίονος] ..... χορη → ἰνδικ(τίονος) [εἰς τὰς] ἐπὶ τόπων χορη|-[γίας]  
 19: ].λογου → ]. λογοθ(εσίου)

P.Erl. 52 A Verso

Above the middle, one reads, in the same hand as B Verso, three lines:

Βορήσεως (cf. B Verso)

-----

Παχών

P.Erl. 52 B Verso

Line 78: Ψενεπ[ιμ]ιος → Ψενετύμιος

80: τοῦ θυ( ) → Τέχθ(ω)

ζ ρζL' → (τάλαντα) ιζS

82: (τάλαντον) αL επ → (τάλαντον) α (δραχμαὶ) Δπ

91: (τάλαντα) βξβ → (τάλαντα) β (δραχμαὶ) Β

93: Ἀ[σ]ιήτος → Ἀτρῆτος

The numerals in lines 80 and 81 refer, in our opinion, to pag̃i.

Columbia University  
 University of Amsterdam

Roger S. Bagnall  
 K.A. Worp