140. τις 3' ἐν Βιλαμωνίτας, Kleine Schriften IV (Berlin 1962) 487, but Pap. now confirms R's text. This is the transitional use of ἐκι, proceeding to a new point, «then again», cf. Denniston, The Greek Particles (Oxford 1954) 263.

141. Pap. confirms the variant in Σ: R's τις 3' has intruded from the line above.

142. τό 3' Pap.: τὸ τόσον Suda λ 63: στός R. A vestige of τό lurks in R's « cavern », but the article here spoils the tragic rhythm.

150. ἕν Παπ. (εἰσεθυμεῖ,受贿) ἐν Βιλαμωνίτας, Kleine Schriften IV (Berlin 1962) 487, but Pap. now confirms R's text. This is the transitional use of Σ, proceeding to a new point, « again », cf. Denniston, The Greek Particles (Oxford 1954) 263.

141. Pap. confirms the variant in Σ: R's τις 3' has intruded from the line above. It has intruded from the line above.

142. τό Pap.: τὸ τόσον Suda λ 63: στός R. A vestige of τό lurks in R's « cavern », but the article here spoils the tragic rhythm.

150. ἕν Παπ. (εἰσεθυμεῖ,受贿) ἐν Βιλαμωνίτας, Kleine Schriften IV (Berlin 1962) 487, but Pap. now confirms R's text. This is the transitional use of Σ, proceeding to a new point, « again », cf. Denniston, The Greek Particles (Oxford 1954) 263.

141. Pap. confirms the variant in Σ: R's τις 3' has intruded from the line above. It has intruded from the line above.

142. τό Pap.: τὸ τόσον Suda λ 63: στός R. A vestige of τό lurks in R's « cavern », but the article here spoils the tragic rhythm.
PAPYRUS DOCUMENTATION IN EGYPT FROM CONSTANTINE TO JUSTINIAN

In a remarkable and penetrating paper at the Eleventh International Congress of Papyrology, Roger Rémondon described and analyzed the distribution of dated papyri from the fifth century and, for the sake of context, from the forty years on either side of it, thus 360-540 in all (1). From it he created graphs showing the distribution, and on the basis of these he formulated a theory explaining the enormous decline in the fifth century and significant revival in the sixth by means of the evolution of institutions: a reduction of administration and official activity to the profit of large private landowners.

It seems to us of interest to examine the problem once again to see if another decade and a half, in which notably considerable numbers of Byzantine papyri from Berlin, Strasbourg and Vienna have been published, have affected the picture. The lists compiled in our *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* and *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* provide, when combined, a list of all texts dated by regnal years, consulate, Oxyrhynchite era, or a combination of these, for the period 284-641. In the present article we take up the period treated by Rémondon—slightly enlarged by the period 337-360 (2).

The graph below presents our results, for the whole of Egypt and then for the Arsinote, Heracleopolite, Hermopolite and Oxyrhynchite nomes individually, in the way that Rémondon did. In each case we show the figures given by Rémondon by the broken line, our own with a solid one. The reader will notice at once [1] that the lines are very similar in shape, and [2] that Rémondon’s is sometimes higher than ours.

The first of these facts is not particularly a surprise for anyone who looks at Rémondon’s Graph 1, where the lines for 1965 and 1925 are given.

---


That for 1965 is almost a perfect duplicate of that for 1926, lifted several notches. The essential similarity of our graph to Rémondon's 1965 graph comes to confirm that the basic shape of the graph is a real and permanent fact of papyrological documentation, and not only an accident of discovery or publication. Such a conclusion fully supports the thesis presented by Rémondon concerning the meaning of the decline of numbers in the fifth century and recovery in the sixth.

The other fact, however, may astonish and disconcert: has the number of published documents for any decade declined in the last 15 years? It is of course a priori possible: a misdated document now relocated will leave a gap in the year to which it was wrongly assigned, and the critical work of the last few years has corrected a number of dates (3). But there is more involved than that. We must, therefore, examine how Rémondon's charts were constructed. Rémondon tells us (pp. 135-36) that he excluded texts not 'exactement datés' and that he excluded ostraka and inscriptions. Now the latter exclusions are insignificant: there are only two dated ostraka from this period to exclude, and scarcely any inscriptions. The question then is what is meant by 'exactement datés'. In our own lists we have taken it to mean dated to a particular year or to a meaningfully narrow range of years (e.g. P.Laur. II 27: between 487 and 491). That Rémondon meant something much less precise is indicated by his statement « Par exemple, nous n'avons aucun papyrus daté d'Antaioupolis entre 380 et le début du 6e siècle », glossed with the note « BGU 974, et les pièces les plus anciennes des archives de la famille de Dioscore d'Aphrodito (P. Maspero 67135, 67327; PSI 935; P.Lond. 1702; P.Flor. 281) ».

Now this choice is peculiar: P.Cair.Masp. I 67001, 67100 and 67101, P.Flor. III 279 and 280 would have been better choices than P.Flor. III 281, which is later than any of them. P.Cair.Masp. II 67135 has as dating criterion only the second indiction (coming); 67327 is dated to Mesore of a third indiction: PSI 935 is a receipt for the second indiction: P.Lond. 1702 refers to rent for the sixth indiction. None of these has a consular date. Any exact date depends on prosopographical and archival study. Now such investigation is valuable and the dates arrived at may be fairly secure: but the use of such texts for a list of this kind introduces an element of subjectivity and—what is worse—makes it impossible to verify the graph presented, for Rémondon gives no list of what documents he includes nor any references or argument for those the date of which rests on inference. We are thus unable to attempt any detailed reconciliation of our figures with Rémondon's.

---

(3) A bibliography of our efforts in the area of Byzantine chronology is given in GRBS 20 (1979) 279-95, especially 279 n. 1.
Another factor, regrettably, may be at work. Rémondon says (p. 136), « Antinoé n’a livré pour le 5e siècle que deux papyrus isolés, qui sont de 430 ». His references are to PSI 1239 and SB 7996. But these are the same papyrus in two publications (4). Again, the absence of any list makes further verification impossible. Rémondon cites also P.Sorbonne inv. 2253 (143 n. 5, 145 n. 3) of A.D. 502 and presumably included it in his figures, though it is still unpublished (5). We cannot say if there were other such inedita in the figures. It will by now be clear why we have regarded the inclusion of our own lists (Appendix) as anything but a waste of space.

An examination of the graphs by nomes shows that while some peaks and valleys have become flatter and others sharper and deeper, little has changed in the overall shape of the curves. There is one significant exception, the Hermopolite Nome between 460 and 520, where comparatively large archival masses in BGU and P.Stras. have come to augment the totals and provide a rarity in this period, archival material (6). Rémondon had commented (p. 144) on the virtual disappearance of archives in the fifth-century papyri. This absence is somewhat less striking now, but the situation is far from being like the 4th or 6th century. Whatever future finds may do to enlarge the documentation of the fifth century, they do not seem likely to lead it to overshadow the fourth and sixth centuries, for which recent publications are more numerous still.

(4) This oversight was already noticed, as we now see, by D. Bonneau in Hommages S. Sauneron (Cairo 1979) 4-5 n. 7.
(5) We will publish this papyrus elsewhere through the kind permission of Professor Jean Scherer.
(6) Cf. especially P.Stras. 470-480 (Church of the Resurrection) and BGU XII (archive of Taurinos); see esp. pp. XIX-XXIV.

APPENDIX

LIST OF DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN TABULATION

Introductory note: No system of counting documents is quite satisfactory, but we must state a few of our principles. Texts in which multiple documents are recorded are counted once for each year in which there is a date given in it. Thus a text with receipts in 316, two in 317, five in 318, ten in 319, and one in 320 is counted once for each year. Retrospective
references to years (« In the consulate of X and Y the defendant attacked my grandmother ») are not counted.

It is obvious that many documents dated inferentially have a strong probability or near-certainty for exact dating. These are, however, not included. Noteworthy are many tax receipts from Karanis and much of the Abinnæus archive. In all likelihood, the net result of any such documents if they were included would be to inflate the periods with an already high number of texts and thus exaggerate the curves. The reader should keep this in mind.

Finally, for provenance we have used the place where the document was written, so far as that can be determined. Many documents were found at locations different from that of writing, but we have not taken these as the provenance. This practice is again arguable, but a decision had to be made and we consider the ancient place of writing the more important.

References to CNBD refer to our « Chronological Notes on Byzantine Documents » in BASP 15 (1978) and following volumes.

An asterisk marking a reference indicates a papyrus not listed in CSBE, app. D.

Antiochopolis


Antinoopolis
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317. 531: SB X 10524. 537: SB V 8029.

Areinote

148, 149. 342: P.Sakam 46, P.Abinn. 44, P.Col.Youtie II 78, BGU IV 1049*. 343:
SB VI 9622. P.Abinn. 45, 46. 345: P.Abinn. 58, 59. 346: P.Abinn. 47, 48, 49,
50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 60, 61. 348: BGU II 405, 406, III 917. 349: P.Wirsb. 16. 360:
374: P.Gen. 66, BGU XII 2332, SB VI 9311 (or 375; cf. CNBD VII 71). 377: ZPE
I 66. 400: SB VI 9359 (cf. CNBD IV 92). 407: SB I 5109. 409/410: SPP
XX 115. 415. SPP XX 90. 417: P.Got. 39. 439: P.Haum. inv. 318. 441/
442: BGU II 609. 454: P.Wirsb. 17. 465: SB I 4821 (cf. CNBD IV 50). 488:
530: BGU II 369. 531: SPP XX 129. 533: SPP XX 140, SB I 4666. 536: P.
Grenf. II 85.

Heracleopolite

Hermopolis

337: SPP XX 88, Sorg 8. Bagnatt - Klaas A. Worp
340: P.Vindob.
341: P.Cair. Goodsp. 13, SPP XX 89, P.Vindob.Sijp. 5, CPR VII 16*.
343: P.Cair. Goodsp. 14, SPP XX 89.
348: SPP XX 88, SPP XX 89.
350: P.Vindob.Sijp. 6, P.Vindob.Sijp. 5.
352: SPP XX 89.
353: P.Vindob.Sijp. 5, P.Vindob.Sijp. 5.
355: P.Vindob.Sijp. 5, P.Vindob.Sijp. 5.
Papyrus documentation in Egypt...


Oxyrhynchite

20

Roeter S. Bagunall - Klas A. Worp


Other provenances
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Apollinopolite (Pana): 455: SPP I, p. 8 (iii).


Great Oasis: 376/378: P.Leips. 36.


Nilopolis: 343: P.Mil. 66.


Ptolemais: 372: P.Leips. 50.


Provenance unknown

TABLE 1: EGYPT AS A WHOLE

-- -- Rémondon (1965)
1979

---
### Table 2: Individual Nomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nome</th>
<th>Rémondon (1965)</th>
<th>1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxyrhynchite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermopolite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleopolite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsinoite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>