CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS, II[1]

12. Single Year Regnal Dating under Diocletian and his Successors

In the course of compiling a list of regnal dates in documents of the reigns of Diocletian and his colleagues and successors, we have encountered a number of texts dated by a single regnal year rather than the sequence expected with several rulers: thus, in year 9 of Diocletian one would normally find the date as year 9 (Diocletian), 8 (Maximianus), and 1 (the Caesars).[2] Any other form of dating would be in principle defective, incomplete. Nonetheless, editors have ascribed to this reign, or to one of those succeeding, a number of texts with single regnal year dates. We have examined these with care, and a number of conclusions have emerged which seem to us worth setting out here.

(1) There is under Diocletian and the first tetrarchy not a single certain instance of a regular, normal date by a single regnal year; that is, in no instance do we find as the date of a document, e.g. "year 12, month, day." The evidence on which this statement is based is set out in *RFBE*.

(2) In certain cases reference is made by a scribe to a year designated with a single numeral, i.e. "for the crop of the (e.g.) 12th year." In those cases where the exact date of the document itself is determined, it is in all cases later than the year which is referred to. There is, however, a certain body of material the exact date of which cannot be determined, and which

---

1   For the purpose of this series of notes (to which we refer as *CNBD*), see the first installment in *BASP* 15 (1978) 233–46. The present installment deals principally with problems which have arisen in the course of preparing our *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* (*BASP* Suppl. 2, Missoula 1979), which we cite as *RFBE*.
   2   Cf. S. A. Stephens, *ZPE* 31 (1978) 147–48.

might come from the year mentioned: such, for example are *P.Cair.Isid.* 40.3, *ZPE* 23 (1976) 101, and *O.Stras.*468, 471 and 472 (cf. *RFBE* 21-23, 25).

(3) In a considerable number of cases, it was not possible to be certain whether a document referring to a year belonged to the reign of Diocletian or that of Galerius; this was true in particular of a group of documents of year 19 (in all cases written later than that year and referring back to it): *O.Mich.* I 524, 525, 526, 527, 528; II 927; III 1010, 1079, 1080. The persons known in these ostraka appear, where they are elsewhere attested, in dates encompassing the entire range from Diocletian year 20 or even before, to Galerius' year 20 or even later. (For this reason we cannot agree with the editor of *O.Mich.* III 1010 that the appearance of Venaphris son of Paesis makes a date in 302 probable: the same man appears in *P.Cair.Isid.* 10.75, 12.42 and 20.26, in the following decade.)

(4) The use of single numerals in reference to years accompanied by actual formulas of imperial titulature is not known. The single-numeral references are all in phrases without titulature.

(5) The introduction even of retrospective reference by a single numeral does not come until the tetrarchy, when the use of three numerals did perhaps begin to be somewhat cumbersome. There is not a single example securely datable to the period of Diocletian and Maximianus' joint rule before the establishment of the tetrarchy. (*O.Mich.* I 414, which purports to date by year 5, is very dubiously read; cf. below.)

(6) Even under the tetrarchy, the introduction of such usage is not early. The only references to years 12, 13 and 14 come from land registers referring to the years in which plots became arable, and these registers (*P.Col.* VII 124, *P.Mich.* XII 626, *P.Cair.Isid.* 6, *P.Col.* VII 125) are not exactly datable but come from the period after 298. In years 15, 16, 17 and 18, there is no example of a text certainly datable to the year to which it refers by a single numeral, and references are from later or undatable texts. In year 19 there are finally instances of contemporaneous use of the single year (*O.Mich.* I 503, 504, 509), but all of these appear in summary references (mostly dates ἀπὸ a certain date ἕως another). The same is true in years 20 and 21.

We must now treat a number of documents which, as dated by their editors, may seem to contradict the general conclusions set out above.

First, *O.Mich.* I 134.1 is alleged to have a date to ἔτους ἕκτου S/, followed by a regnal formula of Diocletian and Maximianus, thus apparently contradicting conclusion 4 above. This unparalleled omission of Maximianus' numeral is suspect; on the plate (IV) we read instead, ἔτους ε′ καὶ δS′. The ostrakon thus belongs to year 5-4 and is of normal form. Similarly *O.Mich.* I 414 was published as having a date of year 5; but on a

photograph kindly lent by H. C. Youtie we observe that Lς´ καὶ ε´ would also be possible, and Professor Youtie considers that the editor's reading is so uncertain as to be eliminated from consideration.

O.Mich. I 195 is a receipt for chaff dated to a 15th year, which would seem to violate conclusion 6. The names of the taxpayer are not sufficiently well-preserved to allow us to know his identity. Since the formula (with παρήνεγκεν) is found later, and since "year" is represented only by the sinusoidal curve (S) which is also used to mark indictions,[3] it seems perfectly possible that the text dates to a 15th indiction later in the fourth century (326/7 or 341/2). *O.Mich.* I 532 presents an analogous case: a reference to the 11th (year or indiction) involves Heras son of Atisios, known from *P.Cair.Isid.* 10.2, 12.65, 14.135, 185, dating from the period approximately 311 to 314. The editor thought that the date might be 318, with year 11 referring to 11–9–1, or 316/7. It is equally possible that we have the 11th indiction, or 322/3, in this case.

One case in which we have not been able to reach certainty about the date is *O.Mich.* I 515, where a 15th year is referred to (crop). The taxpayer, Ptolemaios son of Ptolemaios, is probably the man known as early as A.D. 293 (*O.Mich.* II 894) and as late as 314 (*P.Cair.Isid.* 17). Obviously both Diocletian's and Galerius' 15th years are possible; it is not clear whether Gallienus' 15th year (267/8) is excluded, but probably it is. The 15th indiction (326/7) also does not seem very likely. Since there is no certain example of Galerius' 15th year being referred to only as such, Diocletian's year may seem marginally more suitable; but we cannot be certain.

O.Mich. II 903 and III 1098 both concern a veteran Ammonianos. They are dated to years 12 (no. 1098) and 13 (no. 903; reference to crop year 12). The editor allows 264 and 295 as the dates possible for 1098. We find Ammonianos also in *O.Mich.* II 989 of 277 (year 2 of Probus explicitly identified), I 384 (year 4), and 396 (year 6). There is absolutely no reason to assign any of the single-numeral years attested for this man to the reign of Diocletian. We consider that years 12 and 13 are those of Gallienus (264/5 and 265/6). Years 4 and 6 may be of Aurelian or Probus. In any event, there is no good reason to make of these texts exceptions to the prevailing pattern.

In *O.Mich.* I 468 we find a date to year 15, referring to the crop of year 14. The taxpayer, Horion son of Alexandros, appears also in *O.Mich.* II 908, dated to year 14 and referring to year 13's crop. J. D. Thomas[4] has rejected a date under Galerius because of the appearance of a *dekaprotos* (Kyrillos), and this is surely right. But that it follows that the date is to be

---

3 See *CSBE* 2.
4 *BASP* 11 (1974) 63–64.

assigned to Diocletian, we cannot agree. The man is attested in two other Michigan ostraka, *O.Mich.* II 873 and 887; the first of these is of year 2, referring to the crop of year 1; the second is of year 7, crop of year 6. It would be curious if all three documents of this man later than year 2 violated normal usage; but when one discovers that a *dekaprotos* Kyrillos appears in *O.Mich.* I 68, of A.D. 261, one may suspect that years 14 and 15 belong to Gallienus, and the others to one of the succeeding reigns. Here again there is absolutely no reason to place these documents under Diocletian.

In *O.Mich.* I 458, dated to year 14 and referring to crop of 13, we find one Manes son of Maron. This man is attested in only one securely dated text, namely *O.Mich.* I 159 (287/8), but he appears in a series of other ostraka:

O.Mich. I	160		year 1		
	363		1		
	365		2	crop of year	1
	369		2		
	379		3		2
	389		5		4
	399		6		5
	442	= *SB* VI 9037	7 or 8		7
	403		1		7

It is preposterous to suppose that Manes throughout his career encountered almost exclusively scribes who did not use the normal practice of giving full year dates. One must suppose that these dates belong to some reign or reigns prior to Diocletian. If the rather uncertain reading in *O.Mich.* 403 is correct, it should refer to year 7 of Probus and 1 of Carus and Carinus.

O.Mich. III 1060 mentions a donkey-driver named Didymos. The date is year 5, the crop year 4. A Didymos appears in *O.Mich.* I 428, II 893, 895 from 291, 292 and 295. It is perfectly possible prosopographically to assign *O.Mich.* 1060 to year 5 of Diocletian (288/9), but year 5 of Probus (279/80) does not seem excluded, and the single year number is in our opinion much more likely to belong to the earlier reign. The same is true of *O.Mich.* 1063, dated to a year 6 and referring to year 5; no useful prosopographical information is preserved, and we see no reason to assign this text to 289.

O.Mich. IV 1132.1–2 was published as having a date of year 13–12, but Professor Youtie tells us that the reading is too uncertain to serve as a foundation, and that ιγϛ καὶ ιβϛ καὶ εϛ ὀνό(ματος) is also possible; from a photograph we judge this likely. *O.Mich.* I 482, likewise, was published as dated to year 16–15, Phamenoth [.]8 and referring to the crop of the year

15–14. Professor Youtie kindly sent us a photograph of this very difficult ostrakon, which is faded in lines 4 and following. We think it is likely that it is broken at right (we note the absence of the expected ὀνό(ματος) in line 2), and we therefore restore line 1 as ιεS καὶ ιδS [καὶ ζS] and line 2 as [ὀνό(ματος)]. In line 4, we consider (ἔτους) ιζ καὶ ις καὶ θ'' to be possible; in this case the date is March, 301. Finally, in *P. Michael*. 23A, one should restore the full date in line 7: ιγS κ[αὶ ιβS καὶ εS].

O. Mich. I 447 raises some difficulty; its date was read as year 10, but the editor expressed doubt and thought year 2 also possible. The taxpayer, Ammonios son of Papeeis, is known over a fairly wide range of time, from *O. Mich*. I 408 and 409 (about 286) to *P. Cair. Isid*. 17.23 (314). In addition, other ostraka referring to him have single year dates which cannot be assigned with certainty: *O. Mich*. I 361 (year 1), 381 (year 2), 386 (year 4), 388 (year 5, crop of year 4). The first two of these might well belong to Diocletian, but we consider Probus a more likely slot for the texts of years 4 and 5. A date for *O. Mich*. 447 would have to depend on which numeral is correct.

13. *P. Ant*. I 42

This papyrus, republished as *CPJud*. III 508, contains a loan of money with repayment in wine.[5] Its dating formula runs as follows (lines 1–3):

[B]ασιλεί[ας το]ῦ θειοτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλ(ανίου) Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ αἰωνίου
Αὐγούστ[ου καὶ] Αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους εἰκοστοῦ τριακὰς ἐν ἔτι μετὰ τὴν ὑπατεί[αν Φλ](ανίου) Βασιλείου τοῦ ἐνδοξ(οτάτου) Θὼθ Σ`` κθ ἕκτης ἰνδικτίονος.

The delivery of the wine is prescribed in the following terms (lines 17–21):

– – – τῷ κ(αι)ρῷ τῶν τρυγῶν τῷ Μεσορὴ μηνὶ τῆς παρούσης σὺν θεῷ εἰσιούσης καρπῶν ἑβδόμης ἰνδικτίονος κ(αὶ) τὼν ναυ.ης εὑρεθησόμενον ὄξον ἢ ἀποίητος ἢ ὀξόμενος ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν οἴνου ἕως Τῦβι καὶ αὐτοῦ μενὸς τῆς αὐτῆς ἰνδ(ικτίονος) – – –

The editor of the papyrus, who dated it to 542, remarked that "there is a curious confusion in the date; εἰκοστοῦ should read πεντεκαιδεκάτου. (That the error is here and not in the indiction number is clear from the

dating by the consulate of Basilius.)" He points out also that the expression ἐν ἔτι (*l.* ἔτει) seems to be new.[6]

Indeed, the regnal year of Justinian (20 = 546/7) cannot be matched with an indiction 6, which could have fallen in 542/3 or 557/8. As to the year "after the consulate of Fl. Basilius," that can indeed be 542, but such dating was also used in later years, not always with an indication of a year number.[7]

The problems go deeper than this contradiction, however. The appearance of the word τριακάς is entirely unexpected. Of its meanings, the number 30 itself has no significance here, and the thirtieth day of the month is not to be expected here in Justinianian dating formulas. But our scribe is clearly something of a bungler anyway; the phrase about the repayment of the loan is ineptly drafted, with the seventh indiction described first as present, then as D.V. coming; and the word καρπῶν is inserted irrelevantly. It is the second term, coming, which is accurate here, and the scribe obviously corrected himself but did not bother to erase or cross out his erroneous first attempt.

This characteristic suggests another line of inquiry: indiction 6, combined with the reign of Justinian and a postconsular year of Basilius, can refer only to 542/3 or 557/8. Thoth 29 would in either case be 26.ix. (It should be noted that the first Antinoopolite attestation of a dating formula combining regnal year, consulate and indiction is *P. Cair. Masp.* III 67302, from A.D. 555; cf. *RFBE* 47). Now one is struck by the fact that 26.ix.557 would fall in the 31st regnal year of Justinian, and a reading of τριακὰς ἕν, intended to mean "thirty-first," suggests itself. The forms would of course be wrong (one wants an ordinal), but they would give the right year; and given the scribe's general incompetence at these dating phrases, there is nothing improbable in such a misdrafting nor, as we have seen, in his failure to delete the erroneous εἰκοστοῦ. We conclude that 557 is the only year which reconciles the available evidence; the exact date of the document is 26.ix.557.[8]

---

6   The editor remarks in respect of τριακάς that "Justin died on 1 August . . . so the thirtieth day of Justinian's reign would have fallen on Thoth 30, not 29." This is presumably a slip: Thoth 30 is 27 September, 57 days after the death of Justin. In any case, Justinian's regnal year is habitually calculated from 1 April in the papyri, cf. *CSBE* 87 n. 1 and *CNBD* V 62.

7   The last document we know of where the indication of the year of the postconsular era is omitted is *BGU* I 305, A.D. 556. The first instance of the use of the numeral is *P. Princ.* III 154, A.D. 545 or 546 (there is a conflict; we think 546 is probable; see *CSBE* 65 and 124 a. 546).

8   It should be noted that ἔτει still seems to be a new expression. It is possible that it is to be taken with the regnal year ("thirty-one year") and not with the consular formula: but cf. *P.Stras.* 597.2, where the phrasing ἐ[φ'] ὑ[π]ατείας seems also an "unicum ergo dubium"; is ἐ[τι] (for ἔτει) to be restored instead? The printed sigma after the month name is only a sinusoidal curve attached to the end of the final theta of Θωθ and followed by two strokes, as if

14. *BGU* I 317

The editor's restoration of the regnal formula runs [Βασιλείας τοῦ δεσπό(του)] ἡμῶν Φλ. Τιβερίου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστ[ου ἔτους γ̄ Monat]κθ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης ἰν(δικτίονος). This restoration fits with the *ca* 16 letters of the editor's other restorations, but it does not correspond to a normal formula for a regnal phrase of Tiberius II (i.e. *RFBE* 56–57, formula 7–9), and in fact we have no Arsinoite documents from this reign with regnal formulas. It is, however, perfectly reasonable to restore a consular or postconsular phrase (cf. *RFBE* 55, formulas 4 and 5), in which no epithets are normally found with δεσπότου and which is characteristic for the Arsinoite Nome in this reign. We restore, therefore, [Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τοῦ δεσπό(του)]; some abbreviation is possible. Indiction 14 is 580/1. For the years possibly to be restored for the postconsulate see *CSBE* 90. Possibly this papyrus is to be identified with *SB* I 5332 (communication of H. Maehler).

15. *BGU* II 408

This text is a receipt for 1 1/2 artabas of wheat as rent for 1/2 aroura of land at Philadelphia, issued to a resident of the Aphroditopolite Nome. It was originally drafted by a hand which is identified as that of *BGU* I 349 and II 409,[9] who wrote the date as being the consulate of Constantine and Licinius, Hathyr 26, a date rendered by the editor as 22.xi.307. A second hand, however, had specified the year for which the rent is paid as year 8–6

---

a number rather than a month name were being signalled. Not unique, but another indication of ineptness.

We take this opportunity to note that *SEG* VIII 355 (a revised version of *SB* III 6978) is restored as from the reign of Justinian in a very improbable fashion. (1) The inscription begins with an invocation, which would not be found in an Egyptian papyrus before 591, i.e. under Mauricius. (2) Buckler has restored for the emperor, whose name is lost, two epithets, εὐσεβ(εστάτου) and θειοτάτου, one abbreviated and the other not, a not very likely situation. (3) Justinian's titulature in Egypt used these epithets in reverse order where both appeared. In any event, any emperor from Justinian to Heraclius could have had these epithets. We see no reason for the assertion, "nullius imperatoris nomen aptius lacunam supplet."

9   The cross-references in *BGU* II are erroneously made on the basis of a mixup in numbering whereby it was thought that nos. 408 and 409 would be 400 and 399, respectively. *BGU* II, p. 356, corrected the numbers referred to in the headings of 408 and 409 to "wie No. 349 and 411," but this is not quite right either (*BL* I 44 records this information only for 408). The combined notation shows that 408 and 409 are in the same hand as 349. Nos. 349 and 409 record their scribe as being Aur. Ammonios. *BGU* 408 seems to have been written by one Aur. Sokras, but the apparatus tells us that this signature is also added after the text was written, presumably also by the second hand. *BGU* 411 is signed by Aur. Alypios, and the edition gives no indication that a different scribe wrote the body of the text, which dates to 27.v.314 and also comes from Philadelphia.

(line 14). Vitelli (see *BL* I 44) proposed a date of 22.xi.312 instead, supposing presumably that the year 8–6 was 311/2, the years being those of Maximinus and Constantine. At all events, 307 was the consulate of Severus and Maximinus, and the consular formula of 309, when Licinius and Constantine were consuls together for the first time, was quite different (cf. *CNBD* IV 46).

There is a difficulty with 312 also, however. Regnal dates of year 8–6, omitting the 4 for Licinius, are simply not found in Egyptian documents (see *RFBE* 36). It is thus virtually impossible to suppose that 311/2 is meant. In Egyptian documents, in fact, 8–6 always refers to 313/4, the years being those of Constantine and Licinius (cf. *RFBE* 37–38). The text is therefore registered by A. Chastagnol[10] as dating to 313, but he does not indicate that his dating differs from that normally accepted.[11] The date of 312 had involved the supposition that τὸ β′ was omitted at the end of the consular date, whereas 313 involves the supposition that τὸ γ′ is omitted there. Since *BGU* 349 is dated to 26.xi.313, and 409 to 25.xi.313, it seems in any case probable that 408 will come from 22.xi.313. The scribe has been very negligent, and a second hand has had to correct his errors repeatedly: the missing numeral is not added.

Some attention, however, ought to be given to the outside chance that the document dates from 315, when Constantine and Licinius were consuls together for the fourth time. The rent is paid, if the second hand is right, for year 8–6, i.e. 313/4, the harvest of which fell in 314. A date in 315 would have the merit of making the receipt fall after the harvest, rather than before, thus following normal patterns, and the disturbance in the consular formula would be no greater. To this date in 315, however, an objection can be raised: the cluster of three documents written in the same hand and dated within a four-day period is much more likely to come from the same year than not. The addition of year number 8–6 to the text by the second hand suggests that the first scribe did not know the number and left a blank; the second one then put in—incorrectly—the number of the current year, rather than the past one.

On balance, therefore, Chastagnol's date of 313 seems to be the correct one, and *BGU* 408 should be regarded as a clear example of the omission of the numeral from the consular formula (by a very negligent scribe, to be sure, not at all the kind of official who would have written *P. Ryl.* IV 616, on which see *CNBD* IV 46).

---

10 A. Chastagnol, "La datation par années régnales égyptiennes à l'époque Constantinienne," *Aiôn: Le temps chez les Romains*, ed. R. Chevallier (Caesarodunum 10 bis, Paris 1976) 221–38 at pp. 235–38. Chastagnol's incomplete list is now superseded by *RFBE*.
11 *CSBE* 106 a.312 takes over Vitelli's date.

16. *P.Bad.* II 30

The editor restores lines 1–3 as follows:

[Βασιλείας τοῦ θ]ειοτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλαουίου
[᾿Ιουστίνου ? τοῦ αἰωνίου Α] ὑγούστου Αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους δωδεκ-
άτου ια ἰνδ(ικτίονος)

A photograph kindly provided by R. Seider shows that the number of letters lost in these lines must be about equal, as the edge is sharply vertical. The restoration in 2 of Justinus is certainly right (the combination of year 12 with indiction 11 in the Hermopolite works only for Justinus and Heraclius, and the latter is excluded by palaeography[12] and the absence of an invocation), but line 1 needs a longer restoration. Starting in line 5, the restorations are about 8 letters, while a strip of papyrus lost higher up contains about 7. We would think that 15–20 was the right range for a restoration, with anything much longer being excluded. Line 2 has 20. Under the circumstances, *CSBE* formula 2A, *RFBE* formula 3 (p.50) (i.e. βασιλείας καὶ ὑπατείας τοῦ θειοτάτου κτλ.) seems the only possibility; at 24 letters, it is possible that it may have been written in ecthesis, and some letters may well have been ligatured. No other possibility is at all attractive: formula 6 (p.52) suits the length at 19 letters, but the use of epithets does not match.

Postconsular year 12 is 578; indiction 11 runs in Hermopolis from 1 Pachon 577 to 30 Pharmouthi 578; the document thus falls between 1.i.578 and 25.iv.578 and is the latest example of this formula.

At the end of line 2, the editor's text is wrong: the papyrus reads δωδεκ(άτου) (with abbreviation mark). The beginning of line 3 must have contained the month and day. In this case the ending –ατου must belong to the day, which should have had a feminine ending.

17. *P.Grenf.* I 60

This papyrus contains by restoration the name of an empress in the dating clause. Empresses in fact occur in no preserved dating formulas of Byzantine papyri, and it is a fair conclusion that we should not expect them to turn up. They do, on the other hand, appear in oath formulas (as in *P.Grenf.* I 60), a fact which misled some editors into restoring them in dating formulas also. Two other instances of such restorations are treated later in this article (*SB* VI 9547, no. 26; and *PSI* I 76, no. 28).

The papyrus preserves an oath formula mentioning Tiberius II and Anastasia, and the editor's restoration of the dating formula is based on the

---

12   See R. Seider, *Paläographie der griechischen Papyri* I, No. 52, Taf. 33.

oath. We may safely discard this restoration and seek one more in keeping
with normal formulas. The titulature of Tiberius is mostly lost, but there
are mentions of a 7th year and a 4th year. The indiction number is not
preserved. The first year, the 7th, must be Tiberius' regnal year, which ran
from 7.xii.580–6.xii.581. The second year ought to be his consular year.
This, however, should be 582 or 583. Such irreconcilable combinations of
dates are not uncommon; there is usually an explanation, and we have dealt
with the general problem in a forthcoming note (*CNBD* V 62). In the
present case, we think the most likely solution is that the scribe failed to
advance the regnal year to 8 in December, 581, and that we are in fact in
582. Since the month and day are lost, we cannot tell if the date is early in
582, when such an error would be most likely.

The text comes from the Apollinopolite Nome; we do not have other
formulas from this nome for Tiberius. The remains of line 3 suggest a
restoration of 32 letters to reach the normal formula with regnal plus
consular formulas which is known from the Oxyrhynchite (*RFBE* 56,
formula 8), and a restoration of lines 1 and 2 based on parallels from other
nomes yields the following probable restoration:

[† Βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτ(άτου) ἡμῶν δεσπότου ΦΛ. Τι]βερίου
[Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ αἰων(ίου) Αὐγ(ούστου) αὐτοκρ(άτορος) μεγ-
(ίστου) ε]ὐεργέτου ἔτους ἑβδόμου
[ὑπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν] δεσπότου ἔτους τετάρτου
[Month, day, indiction ἐν ’Α]πολλῶ[νο]ς ἄνω πόλει †

Obviously some variation in the degree of abbreviation is possible. The
date is probably in 582.

18. *P.Harr.* 130

The regnal dating formula at the end of this text, which belongs to year
14–13–6 of the first tetrarchy, has the peculiarity, according to the edition,
of adding Σεβ[αστῶν after the Καισάρων following the names of
Constantius and Galerius. While this error is not unknown, it is always
somewhat suspect; and the omission of Μεσορή before ἐπαγομένων in the
date, while also known, is unusual. On a photograph provided by R.A.
Coles we see that the exiguous traces are very amenable to a reading of
[Μ]εσ[ορὴ] at the end of the preserved portion of line 4.

19. *P.Lond.* III 1005 (p.260) = *SB* VIII 9932

This document, evidently the lease of a stable at Hermopolis, has a
dating formula presented by the editor as follows:

† Βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου [
ἔτους ἑπτακαιδεκάτου .[

He comments, "The document is dated in the seventeenth year of an emperor whose name is lost. Of the three emperors whose reigns were of sufficient length (Justinian, Maurice, and Heraclius), Maurice is perhaps the most probable on palaeographical grounds."

One can in fact be more certain. Heraclius' year 17 fell in 626/7, when the Persians were ruling Egypt; it is therefore impossible that the document belongs to that reign (as the absence of an invocation also shows). Justinian's year 17 fell in 543/4, at which time all documents include a consular date (regnal dating is sometimes present, sometimes not, but the consulate is in this period always mentioned). By the time the month and day, indiction and place are put in line 2, however, there is no room for a consular date. The document thus must belong to Mauricius, as the editor supposed.

We can go beyond this, however. Of the regnal formulas attested for Mauricius, only nos. 1, 7, and 8 (*RFBE* 58, 61–63) are found in Hermopolite documents. Of these 1 is excluded (it begins βασιλείας καὶ ὑπατείας), and 8 seems too long (as well as being found only once in the Hermopolite, compared to the regularity of formula 7, found in 13 other documents). We therefore restore lines 1–2 as follows:

† Βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου [ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλαουίου Μαυρικίου
Τιβερίου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου αὐτοκράτορος]
ἔτους ἑπτακαιδεκάτου, .[Month, day τῆς xx ἰνδικτίονος, place (?)]

It is possible that in line 1 some of the titles were abbreviated and/or that Νέου must be added to Mauricius' titulature, but as there is no line which can be restored with complete certainty (for example, in line 5 the editor's restorations could be expanded to ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρμου[πο]λ[ιτῶν πόλεως χαίρειν· βούλομαι ἑκουσίως καὶ αὐθαιρέτως μισθώσασθαι παρὰ], or 61 letters in the lacuna), the details cannot be recovered. Year 17 of Mauricius is 598/9.

20. *P.Lond.* III 1330a descr.

According to the editor, this text is dated to the 14th year of [Justinian], Pharmouthi, and the 2nd indiction. Such a date is surprising, since the 14th year in question ran from 540/1, while indiction 2 was 538/9. Furthermore, the document would violate the rule set out in *RFBE* 45–46, that in no case does the regnal date of Justinian appear by itself without the postconsular dating by Basilius. The reverse, consular dating without regnal date, however, is not rare; and one is led to suggest that indiction 2 is

instead 553/4, and the reference to a 14th year means the 14th postconsular year of Fl. Basilius, 554. As Pharmouthi of indiction 2 would have fallen in 554, the coincidence is exact.

21. *P.Oxy.* X 1318

As described, this loan contract was dated to (ἔτους) ια (ἔτους) καὶ [. (ἔτους) of Galerius and Maximinus. The editors remark on the difficulty presented by the fact that Galerius did not become senior emperor until the abdication of Diocletian in Galerius' thirteenth year, so that a date in which year 11 of Galerius comes first is most unlikely. Now in fact the dates involving only Galerius and Maximinus are known only from their years 16–4 (307/8) and 17–5 (308/9), and unless the scribe is guilty of gross incompetence, either 16 or 17 must be read. From a photograph provided by R. A. Coles we observe that the letter in question does not really resemble the alpha of this scribe, nor indeed any letter between alpha and theta. It does, however, look very much like a zeta whose upper horizontal stroke has disappeared completely, leaving only the diagonal and lower horizontal strokes. Given the known occurrence of formulas and dates of these emperors (see *RFBE* 31–33), we believe that zeta is a necessary interpretation of the remains. Whether the ink has been effaced or the scribe's pen for some reason did not write at this point, we do not know. We therefore read (ἔτους) ιζ S κ[αὶ εS].

22. *P.Ross.Georg.* III 55

The editor does not fully restore the lines containing the introductory formula. We propose the following:

[† Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κ(υρίο)υ καὶ] δεσπ(ότου) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ καὶ
σ(ωτῆ)ρ(ο)ς ἡμῶ(ν),
[βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβ(εστάτου) καὶ φιλ]ανθρώπου ἡμῶν δεσπ(ότου) καὶ
μεγίστου εὐεργέτου
[Φλ(αουίου) Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγ]ούστου ἔτου[ς] κ καὶ ὑπατίας
τοῦ θεοστεφοῦς
[Φαρ]μοῦθι κθ [τ]ρίτης ἰν(δικτίονος) ἐν
Ἀρ(σινόη).

The beginning of line 4 is problematic. Indiction 3 allows dates only of 24.iv.615 or 630, and this formula is not otherwise attested as early as 615. The date is therefore presumably 24.iv.630. At this date only Heraclius had been consul; Heraclius junior was consul only in 632. Heraclius therefore ought to be meant in the consular formula; but one would expect τοῦ αὐτοῦ in that case; and while θεοστεφής does occur in some formulas for

Heraclius (see *RFBE*, Index II), it does not so appear in the Arsinoite. We cannot say what the exact formula was for this line. We are indebted to Dr. I. F. Fikhman (Tiflis) and Dr. E. Metreveli (Tbilisi) for obtaining for us a photograph of this papyrus.

23. *P.Ross.Georg.* V 32

The editor does not restore the regnal formula of Justinus in this papyrus, and the breakage at both sides precludes a confident and exact restoration. But as the piece is dated to 569/570 on the basis of the 3rd indiction called "present" in line 11, formulas 1 and 2 of Justinus are excluded (i.e. *RFBE* 49). Formula 4 is excluded by provenance (the papyrus is Antinoopolite, and the formula is limited to the Oxyrhynchite). Formulas 5–7 (pp. 51–52) also seem impossible; hence only formula 3 is a plausible choice; the shorter form, without καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου, is the one found in nomes other than the Oxyrhynchite, and must have been the form here.

24. *SB* III 6003

The consular date in this text is, according to the editor, preceded (line 14) by Βα[σιλ]είας, followed by a formula for Constantinus I and Licinius (formula 2, p. 37 in *RFBE*). This word is unknown in papyrus documents of the fourth century in dating formulas (though it is, of course, well-known in the sixth century). On a photo kindly provided by R. A. Coles we read instead [L] ιS[″ καὶ] ηS″, i.e. the correct regnal date of years 10 and 8 (315/6), the current year at this time.[13]

25. *SB* VI 9293

The editor, H. Gerstinger, states that about 20 letters are lost in each line at the upper left; he nonetheless restores lines 1–2 as follows:

[Βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου δεσπό]το[υ] ἡμῶν Φλ. Ἰουστίνου
[τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγ(ούστου) αὐτοκρ(άτορος)˙ ἔτους ἐβδ]όμου Ἐπεὶφ
    τετάρτῃ

for restorations of 26 and 27 letters respectively. One will do better to restore

---

13 Βασιλείας is also to be expunged from *P.Oxy.* VII 1037.9, where the editors restore the term of a lease as being ἀπὸ νεομηνίας τοῦ ἑξῆς μηνὸς Θὼθ[τῆς παρούση]ς [βα]σ[ι]λείας τῆς τρισκαιδεκάτης [ἰνδικτίωνος κτλ. In an Oxyrhynchite lease we expect instead here the mention of the Oxyrhynchite eras, and T. S. Pattie, who kindly examined the original in the British Library at our request, confirms that [τοῦ εἰσιόντος] ἔ[του]ς ρκα ϙ is possible.

[Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τοῦ δεσπό]του ἡμῶν Φλ. Ἰουστίνου
[τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγ(ούστου) ἔτους ἑβδ]όμου Ἐπεὶφ τετάρτῃ

giving 23 letters (several in ligature) and 21 respectively; this restoration additionally eliminates the otherwise unattested use of regnal dating under Justinus II in the Arsinoite Nome and makes the document conform to a known pattern (*RFBE* 52, formula 6). The date of the document is 28.vi.573.

26. *SB* VI 9547

This text, like *P. Grenf.* I 60 (no. 17 above), was restored by its editor to include an empress in its dating formula. The *SB* does not precisely reproduce the state of things, and consultation of the original publication in the *Bulletin de la Société d'Études historiques et géographiques de l'Isthme de Suez* 2 (1948) 25 helps to understand the problem. In a copy of the article presented to the Papyrological Institute of the University of Leiden, J. Schwartz added the correct division of lines in this text. We quote Schwartz's description:

"Le second [papyrus] est le bas gauche d'un acte dont il ne reste plus que cinq lignes; il est terminé par une sorte d'apostille en une tres mauvaise cursive abrégée qui commence dans la marge gauche de la ligne 5 et se continue en une ligne 6. Les lignes 3 à 5 donnent:

3] βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου κα[ὶ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου
      [[μεγίστου]]
4 [[εὐεργέτου]] Φλ(αουίου) Μαυρ[ικίου Τιβερίου καὶ Αἰλίας
      Κωνσταντίνας]
5 τῶν αἰωνίων Αὐ[γούστων.

Il s'agit de l'empereur Maurice et d'Aelia Constantina, sa femme (582–602), mais aucun des types de titulature connus ne s'accorde exactement avec ce fragment ou le terme "[très grand] bienfaiteur" a été rayé (nous avons les bords gauches des lignes 4 et 5)."

A photograph kindly provided by the Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Cairo, has allowed us to inspect the readings. In lines 1–2 we read

χμγ q[θ
+ Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ [δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ
      σωτῆρος ἡμῶν]

The remains of line 2 are shredded, but we have not placed any dots as the overall reading is not doubtful. It should be noted that some abbreviation in the invocation is possible and indeed normal.

In lines 4 and 5, the text is indented at the left about nine letters compared to the margin in line 3. As the text contains an invocation, it comes from 591 or later (but not later than Mauricius' death in 602). The plural in τῶν αἰωνίων is read correctly, but it must be a scribal error, for it never occurs (or has any reason to occur) in Mauricius' known regnal formulas; there is no good reason to restore the name of Aelia Constantina in line 4. The scribe may, after deleting his first erroneous writing of μεγίστου εὐεργέτου in lines 3-4 (a line is drawn through) have rewritten the phrase in the now-lost part of line 4. On that hypothesis, line 4 would run to 30 letters, compared to 33 in line 3.

27. *PSI* I 58

The editor restored lines 1-3 of this text to give only a regnal date, presumably for reasons of space. But the restoration of line 3 includes two abbreviations: [Φλ(αουίῳ) Ἀπίωνι τῷ πανευφ(ήμῳ) καὶ ὑπερφυεστ]άτῳ . . . ; with these written out in full, there is a lacuna of 36 letters to be taken account of, and this will easily accommodate the expected [Βασιλείας καὶ ὑπατείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐ]σεβεστάτου κτλ. The formula is the Oxyrhynchite one listed as *CSBE* 2B, found only between 566 and 568, cf. *RFBE* 50, formula 3.

28. *PSI* I 76

This interesting and important papyrus has been reedited by James G. Keenan in *ZPE* 29 (1978) 191-209. Despite the generally excellent condition of the papyrus, however, the first line with the dating formula is mostly destroyed in both copies. Keenan prudently does not include in his text the editor's restoration of the empress in this formula (although he mentions it in his note as probable), and from what has been said above (nos. 17 and 26), it will be clear that such a restoration is without parallel in a preserved passage; we consider that it should be removed here also.

If the formula was written in Alexandria, it has no preserved parallels, and the exact wording may vary from what we have in documents from other parts of Egypt; no complete restoration therefore seems possible. At the end of line 1, where the indiction number must have stood, Keenan puts forth the following possible reading, which gives a tentative date of 574: Φ[α]μ[ε]νὼθ . ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ζ΄. Professor Keenan very kindly lent us his set of photographs of the papyrus, and on the first copy of the text we believe that we can read the indictional date as Π[α]χὼν ια [ἰνδι]κ(τίονος) ϛ.[14]

---

14 We are confident of the reading of the indiction number and of the month name; the day number is less certain. There are traces of ἰνδικ(τίονος) from the bottoms of letters, but we have not been able to assign them with any confidence.

Pachon 11 is 6 May; indiction 6 is 572/3. The question of the origin of the papyrus poses itself with peculiar force at this point, because if it is Oxyrhynchite we expect Pachon to fall in the last part of the year (see CSBE 26), and the date thus to be 6.v.573. In Alexandria, our exiguous evidence leads us to suggest (CSBE 46) that the Pachon indiction was in use, but the evidence is so thin as to preclude any certainty that the resultant date of 6.v.572 is the correct one. If the document comes from Oxyrhynchos, see RFBE 50–51, formula 4, for the expected wording.

29. PSI V 454

This application for circumcision is dated by the consuls to January–February, 320. In lines 15–16 the current year is described in the following terms, according to the editor's text:

$$[\pi]\rho\grave{o}\varsigma \; \tau\grave{o} \; \acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\grave{o}\varsigma$$
$$\iota\delta^\circ \; \kappa\beta S \; \delta[\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha \; (\acute{\epsilon}\tau\hat{\omega}\nu)$$

Concerning this phrase the editor expanded it to $\iota\nu\delta\iota\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}o\nu o\varsigma \; \kappa\beta \; (\acute{\epsilon}\tau o\upsilon\varsigma)$ and commented as follows: "Abbiamo così un nuovo esempio della incertezza di computo nei primi cicli d'indizione." He proceeds to explain that in 320 one would really be in indiction 23, not 22, reckoning from indiction 1 in 297.

Grenfell already read $\iota\delta S \; \iota\beta S$ in line 16 (BL I 399), but drew no conclusion from it. One should, however, clearly read a reference to the current regnal year, which was 14–12–4: read, accordingly, $\iota\delta' \; \iota\beta S' \; \delta[S'$. Professor R. Pintaudi has confirmed this reading for us on the original.

30. PSI VII 740 and CPR VI 65

The editor read the regnal year date (by the tetrarchs) in line 7 of PSI VII 740 as $(\text{"}E\tau o\upsilon\varsigma) \; \iota\alpha// \; \kappa\alpha\grave{\iota} \; \iota \; \kappa(\alpha\grave{\iota}) \; \chi \; \tau\hat{\omega}\nu \; \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \; \kappa\tau\lambda$. The abbreviation of $\kappa(\alpha\grave{\iota})$, coupled with the uncertainty of all three numbers, aroused our suspicion that a double rather than triple number might be involved, and at our request Professor Pintaudi examined the papyrus and sent us a xerox copy. From this it is possible to confirm that the correct reading is $(\acute{\epsilon}\tau o\upsilon\varsigma) \; \kappa'' \; \kappa\alpha\grave{\iota} \; \iota\beta'' \; \tau\hat{\omega}\nu \; \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \; \kappa\tau\lambda$. The actual date of the papyrus is therefore 28.vii.304 (ed. 295).[15]

The editor of CPR VI 65 gives the following year date (line 3): $[\; \acute{\epsilon}\tau o\upsilon\varsigma \; \iota\beta// \;] \; \iota\alpha// \; [\delta// \; \tau]\hat{\omega}\nu$ and a formula of the first tetrarchy. The space in the first lacuna, however, is much longer, and that in the second is

---

15 We take the opportunity to note that the beginning of line 1 actually reads $\kappa\alpha\lambda\hat{\omega}\varsigma \; \gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$, not $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\varsigma \; \gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}[[\mu]]\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$.

insufficient for the restoration. We restore, therefore, [ἔτους ιθ// καὶ ιη// καὶ] ια// [τ]ῶν κτλ.

31. *O.Mich.* I 72 and 73

O.Mich. I 72.3–6 run as follows:

> ὀνό(ματος) Ὡρου
> καὶ Βαῦλος ὄν(ος)
> εἷς. ζ καὶ ς (ἔτους)
> Χοίακ κγ.

In the reedition of this text as *P.Sakaon* 78, the second editor read Ὡρίων instead of Ὡρου and has added dots to read εἷς, but otherwise left the text unchanged. In his apparatus he records, "Youtie and Koenen suggest ὄν(ου) ἕνα." An examination of the plate (*P.Sakaon*, pl. 14), however, suggests that line 5 reads ε//. Lζ καὶ ςS, which requires the resolution ὄν(οι) in line 4.

The month and day of *O.Mich.* I 73 were read by Amundsen as Θὼθ ε⁻. In *P.Sakaon* 79, however, the editor reads the numeral as ς, crediting the reading to H. C. Youtie. A study of the plate persuades us that it is Amundsen's reading which is correct. The horizontal line at the top is completely separate from the numeral and was not written as part of it; it is, as Amundsen saw, a numeral marking. The scribe wrote ϛ̄ .

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY   *ROGER S. BAGNALL*
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM   *K. A. WORP*