

## FURTHER CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS

## 1. BGU III 900

This lease, drawn up and preserved in two copies written one below the other, was dated by the editor (Schubart) "aus byzantinischer Zeit". The remnants of the regnal formula indeed seem rather unpromising:

(lines 1-2) + βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου ...  
αἰωνίου αὐγούστου αὐτοκράτορος ...

(lines 14-15) + βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου ἡμῶν δευτέρου ...  
τοῦ αἰωνίου αὐγούστου αὐτοκρά(τορος) ἔτους τ[...]

The only other chronological information preserved is the indication in line 20 that the lease begins ἀπὸ καρπῶν τῆς σὺν θεῷ δευτέρας ἰνδικ[τίωνος ...

We are, therefore, currently in a first indiction. Since no instances of regnal dating are found in Egypt under Justinian without having also a consular dating, and this type of regnal formula does not antedate Justinian (see RFBE 45), we have the choice only of 567/8 and 582/3. For by 597/8, the next indiction 1, the use of an invocation had become essentially universal (see Cd'E 56, 1981, 115-17), and a photograph kindly provided by Dr.G.Poethke shows that the top is complete and that the invocation cannot be lost there.

Now the village of Ibion Sesymbothis (line 18) indicates a Hermopolite provenance: see Marie Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite* (Am.Stud.Pap.21, Missoula 1979) 127. For the reign of Justinus, only one regnal formula is known for that nome, namely RFBE 50, form.3 (i.e. CSBE version 2A), which uniformly begins βασιλείας καὶ ὑπατείας. It seems, then, that Justinus can be excluded.

We are left with 582/3, a year during which Mauricius came to the throne on 13.viii.582 at the death of Tiberius. If our document were dated by Tiberius (using RFBE 57, form.9), it could be referring to his year 4 (reckoned from 578, see CSBE 90 n.1 and BASP 17, 1980, 22), thus reading τ[ετάρτου] in line 15. This peculiarity of using 578/9 as regnal year 1 is Upper Egyptian, as Kramer and Hagedorn noticed (ZPE 42, 1981, 126), and thus poses no obstacle. Now documents are dated in Oxyrhynchos by Tiberius as late as 11.x.

\* Apart from the usual abbreviations, we refer to the following works of ours as indicated: CSBE = Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt (Stud. Amst.8, Zutphen 1978); RFBE = Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt (BASP Suppl. 2, Missoula 1979). We are grateful to various colleagues for their help; they are named throughout as appropriate.

582 (RFBE 56; but his death was known there by 23.xi., P.Oxy.XVI 1976) and a date between 1.v.582 and 11.x.582 (or a bit later) is therefore possible.

One could also, however, restore Mauricius (RFBE 61, form.7), year one, emending τ to π and restoring π[ρότου, or 582/3, with a date after 11.x.582. On the photograph, we can see no basis for preferring one letter or the other. A lease would most likely come from the fall of 582, which would allow either solution. A year other than 582/3, however, seems to us excluded<sup>1)</sup>.

### 2. P.Flor.I 3

Fourth-century consular dates in the papyri normally either give two names for each consul or one for each. We do not find writers mentioning, let us say, Septimius Acindynus and Proculus; either it is Septimius Acindynus and Populonium Proculus, or it is Acindynus and Proculus. If two names are given - as is usual in actual dates - Flavius may be one of them, but it is not used as a prefix to two names.

The published text of P.Flor.I 3 can be seen to offer an exception to this rule. There, in lines 23-24, we find

Υπατειας] Φλ(αυλου) Ποστουμίου Τιτι[ανου το β̄ και  
Ο[..... Νεπωτ]ιανου Μεσορη [.]

Ο[υριου, suggested in a note, is indeed to be restored in this date by the consuls of 301. But the appearance of Flavius in line 23 is disconcerting<sup>2)</sup>. On the plate (Tav.II), confirmed by a drawing of the ink traces kindly provided by Dr.R.Pintaudi, we see remains which we believe are incompatible with a reading Φλ. Rather, they seem to be the -ας at the end of ὑπατε[ι]ας. The text therefore conforms to the rule stated above.

### 3. P.Michael.28

This document contains, according to its first editor, D.S.Crawford, a "fragment of official letter". After a lengthy address, we find in lines 14-16 a phrase in which the duration of a certain obligation is stipulated:

14 ἐφ' ὅν χρόνον ἢ χρεῖα ἀπαίτεῖ ἀχρι ἀμ[ψ]ίως  
15 τ]ρίτης τοῦδε τοῦ μηνός c.16 ]ς η̄ς/ κ(α)τ̄ ε̄ς/

1) We take the opportunity to note a few minor corrections to the text: line 10, read Πιηούς; 17, read Πιηούτος Δολούτος; 28, read Πιηούς Δολούτος.

2) The second copy mentioned by the editor gives only [Τι]τιανου κ[αι ] ...[ ]ου, according to Dr.Pintaudi, and thus had only one name for each consul.

In a note added by E.G.Turner and H.I.Bell, it is remarked that years 8=6 might be interpreted, on the analogy of PSI VII 820.26,39, as regnal years of Maximinus and Constantine, A.D.311-12, and it is proposed to restore the lacuna in line 15 as

τοῦδε τοῦ μηνός X τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ης/ καὶ ς/

Unfortunately, the regnal years 8=6 were not indexed at the end of the volume (p.148, Index II: Imperial Titles and Datings), and they escaped, therefore, any subsequent attention by other scholars<sup>3)</sup>. As A.Chastagnol pointed out<sup>4)</sup>, documents referring to year 8=6 in fact refer not to 311-12 but to 313-14, and the document under discussion here should be added to the collection of regnal years in RFBE 38. The date of the document should be recorded as 313-14.

It may also be noted that this document is presumably not concerned with the exemption of the sender, a sailor, from service in the state transport service, or with guarantees for the provision of a substitute, as the first editor supposed. In our view, we are dealing with a document in which a sailor declares to the komarchs of seven Herakleopolite villages<sup>5)</sup> that he will undertake the post of a sailor which had to be supplied by these villages on their joint responsibility. For a similar transaction, compare P.Oxy.XIV 1626.

#### 4. P.Grenf.II 81a.13

The published text of this papyrus was used as the basis of the entry in CSBE s.a. 403: ὑπατείας τοῦ δεσπότη ἡμῶν Θεοδοσίου τοῦ γλεγγ[αλο]τάτου καὶ Ῥωμορρότου τ[οῦ] μεγαλοπρεπεστάτου. Subsequently, struck by the peculiarity of the appearance here of the adjective γενναϊότατος for the emperor Theodosius, we asked for a photograph, which was kindly provided by T.S.Pattie. On it we read instead ὑπατείας τοῦ δεσπότη ἡμῶν Θεοδοσίου<sup>14)</sup> τοῦ ἀλῶν[ου] Αὔγουστου καὶ Φλαύου Ῥ[ου]μορρίδου<sup>15)</sup> τοῦ λαμπροτάτου. *~B67*

3) Cf. the remarks in RFBE viii.

4) Cf. Aion (Caesarodunum X bis, Paris 1976) 235.

5) Most of these villages are represented by two komarchs, of whom only one is actually present at the drawing up of the document. In one instance a village is represented by three komarchs. For the number of komarchs in Egyptian villages (normally two in Roman and Byzantine papyri), see H.Missler, Der Komarch (Diss. Marburg/Lahn 1970) 33-34; he discusses the form of the address of this document but wrongly assumes that there are four komarchs mentioned in line 5: in fact one should of course read δ[ιὰ] τοῦ Βῆς instead of δ[ιὰ] τοῦ Βῆς.

## 5. P.Mich.XIV 682

This Oxyrhynchite receipt for iron is dated, by the local era years, to 22 May 496 (i.e. Pachon 27, era 172-141, indiction 4). The iron in question was needed ἐ[πι τῆ]ς δ[ὲ] ἑ[ξ]ῆς(τ)μ(τ)ῶνος κατασπορ(ᾶς) ἐ ἐπινημ(σεως), which the editor translates, "during the sowing of the 4th indiction, 5th epinemesis". About the passage he remarks, "the κατασπορά for which the shaduf was needed was to take place during the period of November-December. ... The sowing of the 4th indiction (Nov./Dec.) provided the taxes for the 5th epinemesis (starting in May). Most frequently the epinemesis was said to take place in the future; in the present case, the sowing itself was future and a special hint on the future character of the epinemesis was not needed. In any case, the epinemesis started earlier in the year than the indiction."

This curious mixture of fact and fiction will not do. First the sowing which took place during indiction 4 (495/6) happened in the fall of 495, not that of 496, and was thus long past in May of 496. Moreover, at the time the receipt was written, a harvest was either just finished or still underway; the crops of that harvest were those of the fifth "agricultural" indiction or epinemesis (fiscal 496/7). The papyrus therefore is not referring to anything happening in the future.

If κατασπορά were in fact to be rendered "sowing" here, we would be faced with a delivery of iron for work which was already past. We have discussed the uses of σπορά, σπόρος and their derivatives in such phrases elsewhere (Mnemosyne 4 ser.31, 1978, 289-90), showing that they may mean the "sowing of the crop" or simply "crop" by itself in such a context. The sense of "crop" here provides an appropriate sense: the iron was given during the 4th indiction (i.e. Oxyrhynchite, 'Thoth' indiction), but during the crop of the 5th epinemesis, i.e. the fiscal indiction imposed on the crop harvested in the spring of 496. A better translation, therefore, would be "during the 4th indiction, crop of the 5th epinemesis".

## 6. P.Oxy.XII 1551

This death notice begins with a consular formula transcribed as follows:

ἐπὶ ὑπάτων τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν  
 Αὐτοκρατόρων Διοκλη[τ]ιαν[οῦ]  
 τὸ ἕνατον καὶ Μαξι[μ]ιανοῦ τὸ η [Φαμ]εῦσθ

The normal formula for the year 304 (CSBE, Appendix D) ends with Σεβαστῶν after τὸ η. On a photograph kindly provided by Dr.R.A.Coles, we find only exiguous traces, compatible, we believe, with a reading [Σεβα]στ[ῶ]ν, though

it is difficult to assign the small traces to specific letters. The text (which is broken at the foot) presumably concluded, as is common at this period, with ὑπατείας τῆς προκειμένης plus the month (Phamenoth, cf. line 12) and day, which are not given in the heading.

Similarly, editors of a number of other texts have omitted from their restorations of imperial titulature the words Σεβαστῶν or Αὐγούστων, almost invariably without justification. We have noticed the following cases where these words must be restored:

P.Corn.20a.5, 21 (303p): restore Σεβαστῶν after τὸ ζ" in both lines.

Aegyptus 56 (1976) 57 = SB XIV 11614.1 (303p): restore Σεβαστῶν after τὸ ζ".

P.Coll.Youtie II 79.15 (311p): restore Σεβαστῶν at end.

P.Ant.I 32.5 (339p): restore Αὐγούστων at the end of the line after τὸ α'.

#### 7. P.Oxy.XX 2285

This order to pay wheat is dated (line 7) (ἔτους) β" θδθ ε̄, which the editors assigned to A.D.285, on the grounds that "the order was probably issued by Aurelius Philomousos, πραγματευτής of the most illustrious Ammonion, who occurs in 1544. Therefore the second year probably refers to Diocletian".

On turning to P.Oxy.XII 1544, we find a dating ἐπὶ ὑπ[ά]των Θεῶφι κγ, with the comment, "the dating by consuls (whose names are omitted) indicates a reign not earlier than Diocletian". This formula, however, has now been seen to belong to A.D.270, and P.Oxy.1544 is dated to that year in P.Oxy.XL, p.25 (missed by BL VI). Year 2 in P.Oxy.2285 is thus a date in all likelihood of Claudius (February-March, 270).

In Aegyptus 59 (1979) 89 appears a text which purports to contain both such a date ἐπὶ ὑπάτων (without names) and an indiction. On examination of the plate (Tav.III), however, we find that this impossible combination can be removed in favor of the following text:

-- -- -- -- -- (some traces visible)  
 τῷ ἀδελφῷ Ἀμμωνίῳ  
 τῷ καμηλ(ίτη) παρενεγκεῖν  
 μοι εἰς Π.δ.α σίτου  
 4 κα(θαροῦ?) ἑλλους εἰκοσι. ἑρῶ-  
 σαί σε εὐχομαι πάτερ  
 ζ̄ [νδικ(τίονος) Ἀθῶρ γ̄ καὶ πάντ(ας)].

*See remarks  
in SB. 16.  
(= S.B. 16.  
17232)*

We have not succeeded in identifying the place name in line 3, nor the measure in line 4 (editor's καγγέλλους is neither the right gender nor palaeographically possible). The last two words of line 6 were added as an

afterthought to the greeting in line 5. We date the papyrus to the 4th century A.D.

## 8. P.Oxy.XXXIV 2717

This papyrus contains two epiképhalaion receipts: lines 1-13, recording a payment of 1,200 dr. in accordance with the orders of the catholicus Memmius Rufus; and lines 14-18, with a further payment of 800 dr. by the same man. The signer in both parts is the systates Chosion. The first receipt is for, according to the editor, τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ια (ἔτους) καὶ [ι (ἔτους) καὶ γ (ἔτους)] of Diocletian and Maximian (294/5), the second for years 13-12-5 (296/7). The difference naturally arouses concern, but Thomas (BASP 15, 1978, 188 n.16), after checking the original, supported the editor's reading of alpha as the broken letter after iota.

Despite the weight of this autopsy, we are troubled by finding the same systates in office two years apart; nor is a receipt concerning more than one year found otherwise in the epiképhalaion texts (see the table, P.Oxy. XLII, p.101). And no other text, as Parsons points out there, records a payment covering a year earlier than 296/7. A slide provided by Dr.R.A.Coles and a print made from it, shows the numeral in question written as follows:

(no  
(voles)

1.3

We believe that ιγ is the best reading of the traces, and the date of the receipt thus 296/7 as a whole. In this event, Memmius Rufus' date must be pushed to 296/7, and the significance of his prohibition of renomination of dekaprotoi who served after 285/6 (P.Oxy.XII 1410, cf. BASP 15, 1978, 186-87) seems more likely to refer to the problems caused by renomination of those who served in either the first or the second epigraphic cycles (287/8-291/2 and 292/3-296/7) for service in the third cycle (297/8-301/2).

## 9. P.Princ.II 81 = III 181

In line 3 of this papyrus (published twice, the second editor not knowing of the first version), both editors restored [month and day] after the title comes following the name of the consul Sallustius. One would, however, expect normally to have τῶν λαμπροτάτων in this place. The month and day in documents of this period are often found at the end following the phrase ὑπατείας τῆς προκειμένης, and we believe that this must have stood in line 18.

## 10. P.Ross.Georg.III 50

This text, addressed to the stratelates and pagarch Fl. Theodorakios (Pros.Ars.I 5438) is dated to Epeiph 27 of indiction 2 in Arsinoe. The editor gives 613 and 628 as the two possibilities in this man's career. The papyrus is broken at top, and above the line with the month, day, indiction, and place only one line is preserved:

η[.....]ων τ[.....]

Zereteli suggested that since 613 and 628 both fell under Heraclius, "dessen Name also auch im Präscript gestanden hätte".

Now in this period all documents began with invocations, as well as regnal formulas. Furthermore, in one of the two suggested years (628), the Persian occupation of Egypt was still in course and no documents would have a regnal formula of Heraclius. Moreover, the succession of letters read by Zereteli, ]ων τ[, is not compatible with any sequence in known regnal titulature of Heraclius. If it is correct, therefore, we may well look for an invocation rather than a regnal formula.

Now Arsinoite documents of Heraclius' reign all have the Christ formula ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότης Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, which is not compatible with the reading of Zereteli (cf. Cd'E 56, 1981, 112-33 at 121). There is, however, a group of formulas in use after the Arab conquest (641) in the Arsinoite. We have pointed out (Cd'E op.cit., 128-29) that there are numerous papyri which have these formulas (our formulas 4A and 4B there) and which have no absolute dates. Gascou and Worp have now demonstrated (ZPE, forthcoming) that SB I 4483 is to be dated to 621 (though on very different grounds from those on which Chrysos advocated that date; cf. RFBE 82). There is thus one clear example of a Christ, Mary and Saints invocation before 641. It is therefore possible that this formula is to be restored also in P.Ross.Georg.III 50, and that it belongs in 628. In this event, one would restore formula 4A:

[ ... καὶ τῆς δεσποίνης ]  
ἡ[μῶν τῆς θεοτόκου καὶ πάντων]ων τ[ῶν ἀγίων]

There is, however, another possibility: P.Lond.I 113 (6.a) (p.212), dated to 2.iv in a 15th indiction, has a Holy Trinity, Mary and Saints invocation (formula 3C), with no regnal formula. We argued in Cd'E (p.121) that this formula, characteristic of Phocas' reign, should be dated to 612, at the very start of Heraclius' reign. It may be possible that the P.Ross.Georg.III 50 comes from 21.vii.613, some 15 months later, and also had this formula. The restoration of line 1 would be the same, however, as the formulas end with the same words. On the other hand, it is also possible that both texts

are to be dated to 643; P.Lond.I 113 (10) [p.222] = W.Chrest.8 mentioning the same Theodorakios dates from 639/640.

## 11. P.Wisc.II 61

This papyrus, containing an oath of a katasporeus, was written in Oxyrhynchus on 24.xii.303. The dating formula of the document, lines 24-28, is read by the editor of the papyrus as follows:

24 [(έτους) κ κατ (έτους)] ιθ τῶν [κυρ]ων ἡμῶν Διοκλητιανοῦ  
 25 [κα]τ Μαξιμ[ιαν]οῦ Σεβαστῶν κατ  
 26 [(έτους) ] ιβ τῶν κυ[ρ]ων ἡμῶν Κωνσταντινου  
 27 [κατ] Μαξιμ[ιαν]οῦ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων  
 28 [Κατ]σάρων Χο[ι]αχ κζ̄.

In his note ad loc. the editor rightly refers to J.D.Thomas' decisive demonstration (Cd'E 46, 1971, 173ff.) that the change from using three figures (20 Diocletian, 19 Maximian, 12 Caesars) in regnal year datings to the use of two figures (20 Diocletian and Maximian, 12 Caesars) fell at the very end of the year 303 or early in 304. The apparent use in the Wisconsin papyrus of a three-numeral regnal year formula would seem to show that news of the change had not reached Oxyrhynchus at this date late in 303. The latest examples of three figure-regnal year formulas in 303 are otherwise P.Oxy. XXXVI 2765 (20.xii.303) and Talanta 6 (1975) 41 = SB XIV 12047 (Oxy.?, 20. xii.303) (see RFBE 14, 26, year 20-19-12 and BASP 17, 1980, 115-16). The first use of 20-12 in the Oxyrhynchite otherwise comes in P.Oxy.XVIII 2187.4 (13.i.304); but in Karanis in the Arsinoite Nome, the new numbering was in use already on 16.xii (P.Mich.II 900.3). The distance is not large, and where a four-day lag may be tolerable, eight is uncomfortable.

It will be clear from the text of the dating formula as printed above that the readings of these lines, especially those of the numerals for the years in lines 24 and 26, are by no means beyond doubt. Furthermore, the supplement of line 24 (4 letters plus 2 symbols for year) seems rather large compared with the restorations at the start of line 25 (was this line somewhat indented?) and lines 26-28 (one may assume that the letters κατ in lines 27 and 28 were written very rapidly, and one does not need to assume that the lacuna was as large as that of three normally shaped letters). The left hand part of the papyrus has broken off in general rather raggedly, with as many as 13 letters (line 2) and as few as 1 (line 25) lost.

In order to check the possibility that a shorter restoration might be used in line 24, and to check the certainty of the reading of the numeral 19 in this line, we obtained an enlargement of these lines from the University of



Wisconsin Library. On the basis of this, we wish to note that (a) in lines 23-25, the break at left is vertically straight. Therefore, if one does not allow for indentation of line 25, one should supplement an approximately equal number of letters at the start of these lines; (b) the reading of the numeral  $\iota\vartheta$  is very uncertain. The traces at the start of line 24 are very faded, and we think that one might as well read  $\kappa\prime$ . In that event, we are dealing with a two-numeral year date, 20-12, and this papyrus is no longer the latest specimen of a three-numeral year date, but the earliest of a two-numeral date. In consequence, we can probably pinpoint the date of the arrival of the news in the Oxyrhynchite as being between the 20th and 24th of December, 303.

## 12. SB XIV 11472

This reedition of O.Stras.654 by H.C.Youtie in 1949 (TAPA 80, 224-29) was picked up by SB from *Scriptiunculae I* (Amsterdam 1973) 204-9. Line 3 reads

(ἔτους) ιγ' καὶ (ἔτους) ιβ[ ἀπό ἔως ]

Now the year in question (296/7) is normally given as 13-12-5 (year 5 of the Caesars being the third term): see RFBE 10-18. We know of no instance with only 13-12, and we therefore restore

(ἔτους) ιγ' καὶ (ἔτους) ιβ[ καὶ (ἔτους) ε ἀπό ἔως ]

Youtie (p.227 = 207) commented, "The length of the lacunae cannot be established with anything approaching certainty." There is thus no reason to prefer a shorter restoration for reasons of space.

## 13. Coptic ἀρχῆ Dates

In CSBE 54-60, we presented (as Appendix A-1) a list of Greek papyri in which ἀρχῆ is used in order to indicate starting dates for indictions within the Egyptian civil year. Now there is also Coptic documentation which shows similar use of this term, and we think it worth presenting what we have collected to allow comparison with the Greek evidence. The list below is based on a search through the major publications of Coptic documents listed in A.A.Schiller's Checklist in BASP 13 (1976) 99-123; we make no claims for completeness. The phrases containing ἀρχῆ in some of these texts are given by the editors in Greek type, and from the facsimiles we have been able to check, some of them seem in fact in a script distinguishable from the regular Coptic handwriting of their documents. We have not singled these out in the table. The texts are all papyri except for the ostraka cited from WS, CO, and KOW, and for the inscriptions from Aegyptus 11 (1930-31).

<u>Day</u>	<u>Ind.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Provenance</u>	<u>Document</u>
Pachon 6	14	VIII	Hermopolis?	Ryl 146
6	7	?	?	BKU III 400
10	3	VIII	Hermopolis?	Ryl 214
11	10 <sup>6)</sup>	VII-VIII	Hermopolis?	Ryl 194
11	lost	early VIII	Djeme	KOW 93
23 <sup>7)</sup>	6	early VIII	Djeme	CO 415 <sup>8)</sup>
28	1	VII-VIII	Hermopolis?	Ryl 319
28	10	VI	Aswan	Aeg.11, 274, no.25
--	6	?	?	Herm 74
Pauni 4	6	early VIII	Djeme	CO 414 <sup>9)</sup>
6	3	1.v.734	Djeme	KRU 106.246
10	11	?	Hermopolis?	BKU III 427 <sup>10)</sup>
10	7	5.v.723	Djeme	KRU 36 <sup>11)</sup>
Epeiph 17	6	VI	Aswan	Aeg.11, 269, no.13
--	6	VI	Aswan	Aeg.11, 269, no.14
Thoth 1	9	?	Coptos	VC 30
1	12(?)	?	Wadi Sarga	WS 173.7 <sup>12)</sup>
Phaophi 8	3	6.x.719	Djeme	KRU 35.80

As far as provenances are known, all of these texts come from Upper Egypt. The great majority (15 of 18) fall into the three summer months, with the number steadily diminishing as one leaves Pachon behind. This practice is in conformity with Upper Egyptian practice in the Greek papyri (cf. CSBE 20, 25-26). The numbers of the remaining cases are too small to allow any conclusion to be reached about them, but like similar cases in the Greek papyri, they are probably simply errors. At all events, the evidence does suggest that the Pachon beginning of the indictional year in Upper Egypt did not end with the Greek documents.

New York  
Amsterdam

Roger S.Bagnall  
Klaas A.Worp

6) The editor read 18, but on the basis of a photograph kindly provided by the John Rylands Library we think that the numeral of the indiction is just an iota followed by a numeral marking, not iota eta.

7) This seems the most likely reading (alternative: Pauni 3?); cf. Crum's remarks on the text and cf. n.8 below.

8) Same hand as CO 414.

9) Same hand as CO 415.

10) The reading of the name of the month is, however, insecure.

11) W.C.Till, *Datierung und Prosopographie der koptischen Urkunden aus Theben* (Wien 1962) 23, dates to 723. KRU 37, of the same year (ind.7), mentions  $\delta\phi\chi\eta$  in line 11 but lacks a month date with that reference. Another such monthless reference occurs in KRU 42.5 (725/6).

12) The interpretation of this document, i.e. Thoth 1 =  $\delta\phi\chi\eta$  12th indiction, is not certain.