CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS, II

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). 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.
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might come from the year mentioned: such, for example are \textit{P. Cair. Isid.} 40.3, \textit{ZPE} 23 (1976) 101, and \textit{O. Stras.} 468, 471 and 472 (cf. \textit{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): \textit{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 \textit{O. Mich.} III 1010 that the appearance of Venaphris son of Paesis makes a date in 302 probable: the same man appears in \textit{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. (\textit{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 (\textit{P. Col.} VII 124, \textit{P. Mich.} XII 626, \textit{P. Cair. Isid.} 6, \textit{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 (\textit{O. Mich.} I 503, 504, 509), but all of these appear in summary references (mostly dates \textit{\delta πο} a certain date \textit{\epsilonως} 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, \textit{O. Mich.} I 134.1 is alleged to have a date to \textit{ετους έκτου} 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, \textit{ετους ε’ καὶ 65’}. The ostrakon thus belongs to year 5–4 and is of normal form. Similarly \textit{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 \(\text{σ' \ θα' \ ξ'}\) 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 \(\text{παρθ' \ γκε'}\)) 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.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>O.Mich.</em> I</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369 = 58 VI 9031</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442 = SB VI 9037</td>
<td>7 or 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 γυί ηβζ και ησ δφι (μαρτος) 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 Yourie 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 \( \delta \nu \delta (\mu \alpha \tau \omicron \omicron \sigma) \) in line 2), and we therefore restore line 1 as \( \epsilon \varsigma \kappa \alpha i \iota \delta \varsigma \) \([\kappa \alpha i \iota S]\) and line 2 as \([\delta \nu \delta (\mu \alpha \tau \omicron \omicron \sigma)]\). In line 4, we consider \( (\epsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \upsilon \omicron \upsilon) \) \( \varsigma \kappa \alpha i i \varsigma \kappa \alpha i \theta \)’ 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: \( \epsilon \gamma \varsigma \kappa [\alpha i \iota \delta \varsigma \kappa \alpha i \epsilon \varsigma] \).

\( O. Mich. 1 \) 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 Papeis, is known over a fairly wide range of time, from \( O. Mich. 1 \) 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: \( O. Mich. 1 \) 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 \( O. Mich. 1 \) 447 would have to depend on which numeral is correct.

13. \( P. Ant. I \) 42

This papyrus, republished as \( CP Jud. III 508 \), contains a loan of money with repayment in wine.\(^5\) Its dating formula runs as follows (lines 1–3):

\[
\text{[B]} \alpha \sigma \lambda \iota \varepsilon [\alpha \varsigma \tau o \varsigma] \, \theta e i o t a \tau o u \, \hat{h} \mu \omicron \nu \delta \, d e s p \omicron \tau o u \, \Phi \lambda (a \nu i o u) \, \iota o u s t i n i a n o u \, \tau o u \, a i o n i o u \\
A u n \gamma o u \sigma \varsigma [o u \, k a i ] \, A u t o k r a t o r o s \, \epsilon \tau o u s \, e i k o o t o u \, t r i a k \varsigma \, \epsilon n \, \epsilon t i \, m e t a \, t \iota n \, \ups i a t e i [a n \, \Phi \lambda ] (a \nu i o u) \, B a s i l e i o u \, t o u \, \epsilon n d o z (o t a t o u) \, \Theta \omicron \theta \Sigma ' \, k \theta \, \epsilon k t h s \, i n d i k t i o n o s .
\]

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

\[
- - - - - t o \, k (a i) r \omega \, t o w \, t r u n g \omega \nu \, t o w \, M e s o r h \, m e n i \, t \iota s \, p a r o u s i s \, s w n \, t h e i o e i o u \omicron \upsilon \, k a p \iota \omicron \nu \, \epsilon b \delta \omicron \omicron \upsilon \omicron \upsilon \, i n d i k t i o n o s \, k (a i) \, t o w \, n a n . \, n e s \, e u r e t h \sigma s o m e n o n \, d \xi o n \, \eta \, a p o i \iota \gamma o s \, \hat{h} \, d \xi o m e n o s \epsilon k \, t o w \, a u t o w \, o i n o u \epsilon w s \, T \ups i b i \, k a i \, a u t o u \, m e n o s \, t \iota s \, a u t h s \, i n d i k t i o n o s \, - - - - -
\]

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

\(^5\) For a recent discussion of this type of document, see R. S. Bagnall, \( GRBS 18 \) (1977) 85–96; and cf. P. J. Sijpesteijn, \( ZPE 24 \) (1977) 105–06.
dating by the consulate of Basilius.)” He points out also that the expression ἐν ἑτεὶ (l. ἑτεὶ) 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 τριάκοσις 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 καπρῳτοῦν 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 \textit{P. Cairo. Masp. III 67302}, from A.D. 555; cf. \textit{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 τριακόσις ἐν, 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 εἰκοστὸν. 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 τριακόσις 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. \textit{CSBE} 87 n. 1 and \textit{CNBD} V 62.

\(^7\) The last document we know of where the indication of the year of the postconsular era is omitted is \textit{BGU} 1 305, A.D. 556. The first instance of the use of the numeral is \textit{P. Princ. III} 154, A.D. 545 or 546 (there is a conflict; we think 546 is probable; see \textit{CSBE} 65 and 124 a. 546).

\(^8\) It should be noted that ἑτεὶ 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. \textit{P. Stras.} 597.2, where the phrasing ἐν ἑτεὶ ἑτεὶς seems also an “unicum ergo dubium”; is ἑτεὶ (for ἑτεὶ) 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 Θαύ and followed by two strokes, as if
14. *BGU* I 317

The editor’s restoration of the regnal formula runs [Βασιλείας τοῦ δεσπότου] ἡμῶν Φλ. Τιβερίου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ αὐλώνιου Ἀγγυοῦστι ἔτους ὁ Μονατ ἱχθεὶς τεσσαρεκαδέκατη ἱερακτίονος. 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, [Μέτα τῆν ὑπατείαν τοῦ δεσπότου]; 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, 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 δεσποτάτου, 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.
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. Chastagnol10 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 ß’ was omitted at the end of the consular date, whereas 313 involves the supposition that 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).


11 *CSBE* 106 a.312 takes over Vitelli’s date.
The editor restores lines 1–3 as follows:

[Ba]σιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλαουή
[Τοῦ Ιούστίνου τοῦ αἰώνιου Αὐτοκράτορος έτους δωδεκάτου μα] ἵνα ἴνθ(ιόνος)

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 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.

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

At the end of line 2, the editor’s text is wrong: the papyrus reads δωδεκάτου (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:

\[ \text{[f BaoïAeiaç TOÎI dtior(OTOv) ij^cor otOTrorov }\]
\[ \text{[Nt'ou V.u>vOTaiirivov TOV }\]
\[ \text{[Month, day, indiction t'v TroKXû[vo<; ävta iróKti} \]

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 Σεβαστάτων after the Καίσαρων following the names of
Constantius and Galerius. While this error is not unknown, it is always
somewhat suspect; and the omission of Μεσορή before ἔπαγγελμαν 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

19. P.Lond. Ill 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:
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 υπατείας), 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 [ήμων δεσποτόν Φλασινίων Μαιρικίου Τιβερίου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγοῦστον αὐτοκράτορος]
ἐτους ἐπτακαιδεκάτου, [Μonth, day τῆς xx ἱδικτίωνos, 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 Ἐρμοῦ[πο]λῶν πόλεως χαίρειν· βούλομαι ἐκοινωνίας 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 (έτους) ιω (έτους) καὶ [. (έτους) 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 (έτους) ιω $ [α ι ε] S$.


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

\[ \text{[† έν ἀνόματι τοῦ κ(υρίων) καὶ] δεσπ(ότου) Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ καὶ σ(ωτῆς)ρ(ος) ἡμῶν,} \]
\[\text{[βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσέβ(εστάτου) καὶ φιλ(ανθρώπων) ἡμῶν δεσπ(ότου) καὶ μεγίστου εὐεργέτου} \]
\[\text{[Φλ(αυνίου) Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰώνιου Αὐγ(ύ)ούστου ἔτους] κ καὶ ὑπατίας τοῦ θεοστεφοῦς} \]
\[\text{[Φαρ]μοῦθι κθ[τ]ρίτης ἐν(δικτίονος) ἐν} \]
\[\text{'Αρ(ινών).} \]

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 Heracleus 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 θεοστεφῆς 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.


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 indication 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 εὐθείας τῶν τῶν, 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 Μα[στ]ήρια, 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] ΣF" κα" 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 θεωστάτου δεσπότηο[ν] ἦμων Φλ. Ίωναίτινον
tον οἰωνίων Ἁγ(ο)ντον αὐτοκρ(άτορος) ἐτοὺς ἐβδ]όμου Ἐπείφ
τετάρτη]

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 νεωμηνίας τοῦ ἔτης μηνὸς Θωᾶ[τής παρούσης][βα]ζ[ι]λείας τῆς τρισκαίδεκάτης [ἰνδικτίων 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 εἰσώντος] ἔτους ἡκα τ is possible.
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. 160 (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 θεοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου
[[μεγίστου]]
4 [[εὐεργέτου]] Φλ[αούιον] Μαυρ[ικίον] Τιβερίου καὶ Αἰλίας
Κοῦνταντίνας
5 τῶν αἰωνίων Αἰ[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

χιλγ ϒ[θ]
+ Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ [δεσπότου Θησού Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ
σωτήρος 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 μεγίστον εὐεργέτον 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(αουιψ)] Ἀπίων τῷ πανευφήμῳ καὶ ὑπερφυεστάτῳ ἄτω . . . ; 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 [Βασιλεῖας καὶ ὑπατείας τοῦ θεοτόκου καὶ εὐαγγελιστάτου 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]υ[ε]θ. ἴνδ(ὐτίνος) 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]χάρθ. ι[νδ]τ[υτίνος] ζ.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 ἴνδ(ὐτίνος) 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:

\[\pi\rho\sigma \tau\delta\varepsilon\rho\sigma\delta\kappa\beta\delta\varepsilon\kappa\alpha \varepsilon\tau\omega\nu\]

Concerning this phrase the editor expanded it to \(\nu\delta\kappa\alpha\tau\iota\nu\omega\nu\kappa\beta\varepsilon\varepsilon\sigma\tau\omega\nu\) 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 \(\tau\iota\nu\kappa\beta\delta\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\) 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, \(\iota\delta\kappa\beta\delta\varepsilon\delta[S']\). 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 (“\(\varepsilon\tau\omega\nu\) \(\iota\alpha\iota\nu\kappa\alpha\iota\gamma\tau\omega\nu\kappa\nu\iota\omega\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda\)). The abbreviation of \(\kappa\alpha\iota\gamma\), 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 \(\varepsilon\tau\omega\nu\kappa\alpha\iota\iota\tau\omega\nu\kappa\nu\iota\omega\nu\kappa\tau\alpha\lambda\). The actual date of the papyrus is therefore 28.VII.304 (ed. 295).

The editor of CPR VI 65 gives the following year date (line 3): \[\varepsilon\tau\omega\nu\iota\beta\iota\gamma\tau\iota\delta\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 \(\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\) \(\varepsilon\tau\omega\nu\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\), not \(\delta\lambda\lambda\omega\varepsilon\tau\omega\nu\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\).
insufficient for the restoration. We restore, therefore, [έτους ηθ] καὶ ηθ //


*O.Mich. I* 72.3–6 run as follows:

\[ \begin{align*}
\delta ν(\mu ατος) & \ Ωρου \\
καὶ Βαῦλος & \ δν(ος) \\
eίς. & \ ζ καὶ \ ζ (\ετους) \\
Χοῖακ & \ κγ.
\end{align*} \]

In the reedition of this text as *P.Sakaon* 78, the second editor read 'Ωριων
instead of "Ωρου and has added dots to read είς, but otherwise left the text
unchanged. In his apparatus he records, "Youtie and Koenen suggest
δν(ον) \(\epsilonυκα\)." An examination of the plate (*P.Sakaon*, pl. 14), however,
suggests that line 5 reads \(\epsilon\). \(\zeta\ καὶ \varsigma\), which requires the resolution δν(οι)
in line 4.

The month and day of *O.Mich. I* 73 were read by Amundsen as Θωθ \(\epsilon\). In
*P.Sakaon* 79, however, the editor reads the numeral as \(\varsigma\), 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 \(\epsilon\).
CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS, III.

32. The Indiction in the Herakleopolite Nome

In CSBE we took the documentation from the Herakleopolite Nome together with that from the Arsinoite in compiling our tables (p. 20) concerning the nature of the indiction-year, in particular the tables of occurrences of \( \alpha \rho \chi \bar{\eta} \) and \( \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \). In the ensuing discussion, however, we raised the possibility that this grouping might not be correct (p. 29). Our more recent work has persuaded us that in fact this grouping is unjustified. Three groups of Herakleopolite documentation are interesting in this regard: (a) examples of \( \alpha \rho \chi \bar{\eta} \) in Thoth; (b) examples of \( \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \) in Epeiph and Mesore; and (c) dates to the “old” indiction after 1 May without indication of this fact by means of \( \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \).

(a) We noted in CSBE that there were two examples of \( \alpha \rho \chi \bar{\eta} \) in Thoth from the Herakleopolite, viz. P. Erl. 67 (Thoth 19) and SB VI 9153 (Thoth 17/27; cf. RFBE 63) from A.D. 591 and 596 respectively. We believe that we can now establish a third example in P. Stras. 318. This lease of land is published with the following dating formula at the beginning:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[Metro } \tau \eta \nu] \upsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega [\delta] \varepsilon \sigma \pi [\alpha] \tau [\omega] \\
[\tau \eta \mu \omega \nu \chi \alpha \pi \varepsilon \kappa \iota \iota \eta \iota \upsilon] \pi \iota \beta \varepsilon \iota [\rho \iota] \\
[\tau \delta . . . . . . . . . \kappa \beta \alpha \rho \chi \bar{\eta} \tau \eta \nu \varepsilon \iota \tau \nu [\chi \alpha \chi [\omega] \varepsilon \\
[. . . . . . . . . \alpha \tau \eta \varsigma \iota \delta \iota (i) \kappa \tau \iota \alpha \nu \varsigma \varsigma] \eta \nu \iota \nu [\alpha \kappa \lambda (\varepsilon \omega \varsigma)] \tau \omicron \lambda (\epsilon).
\end{align*}
\]

1 For the previous installments of this series see BASP 15 (1978) 233-46 and 16 (1979) 221-37. We use the following abbreviations in addition to the usual ones: CSBE = Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt (Stud.Amst. 8, Zutphen 1978); RFBE = Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt (BASP Suppl. 2, Missoula 1979); CBND = “Chronological Notes on Byzantine Documents” (the present series). The present installment deals with questions of regionalism in dating practices.
The editor dates it to 590–596. There are only two other examples of this postconsular formula, namely the two documents mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph. Both of these texts are dated in Thoth, as we have noted, and both also contain ἀρχή.

The certain or nearly certain restorations of lines 1, 5, 6, 7, and 10–14 give a very strong indication of the length of the lacuna at the left side; the range is 6–9 letters (in line 5 the degree of abbreviation is uncertain), with 6–7 being fairly secure in the upper part of the papyrus. The possible restorations of lines 3–4 are thus very severely limited. In line 4, where the first two letters after the lacuna are not read, some 8–10 letters must precede αης. Indictions 9, 10, 11, and 12 may be excluded as too short, while 14 is certainly too long. Given the length of the lacuna, 13 is to be preferred to 15, which at 11 letters before αης seems excessive. We restore therefore [τρισκαλίδε]κάτης.

In line 3, we need after ἐτους (not το, cf. the other two examples) a two-digit number giving the postconsular reckoning of Mauricius, and perhaps a stroke after this. Three letters can follow in the lacuna. Of the months which can be found with ἀρχή, only Thoth will fit the space. Thoth 22 is thus 19.ix.594. The possible restorations of the postconsular number in line 3 are therefore 11 and 12, depending on whether the old or new style reckoning was used. In line 1, we expect (and have space for) a cross, while in line 2, we should restore Φλ(ασινίον) before Μαυρικίου.

In sum, we restore P.Stras. 318 as follows:

[ημῶν Φλ(ασινίον) Μα[υρικίου Τ[ιθε]ρίου]
[ἐτους ια, Θώθ] κβ ἀρχή τῆς εὐνχ[ο]ς
[τρισκαλίδε]κάτης ἰνδ(ικίονος) ἐν Ἑρ[ακλ[ειν]]̣ πόλι(ει).

It is probable that originally an invocation preceded this date. (We will deal with this question elsewhere.)

This third example seriously reduces the chances that we are dealing with a coincidence, for these three are the total of our instances of ἀρχή in the Herakleopolite. The pattern is thus very different from that in the Arsinoite, where examples fall mostly in Epeiph and Mesore.2

(b) The sole example of τέλεις cited from this nome was SB VIII 9876, dated to Epeiph 22 (16.vii) a.d. 534. This date, again, does not fit the pattern of the Arsinoite Nome, where examples fall in Pachon and Pauni (i.e. in the last two months of the indiction year reckoned by the delegatio, cf. CSBE 27). But we set aside from the discussion—wrongly, we now

2 See the chart in CSBE 55–60 and the tabulation on p. 20.
believe—*SPP* III 86 (cf. *CSBE* 62 n. 64), a text in which we have a reference to τέλεια in Mesore. On reconsideration, we do not see how the reference can be anything but a chronological one. This instance too coincides with the evidence cited above.

(c) We cited two documents from the Herakleopolite in which dates between Pachon 1 and Epeiph 1 (or 1 May and 1 July) occur which must be attributed to the indiction which began in the preceding Julian year, *BGU* I 314 (Pachon 28) and *SB* VI 9152 (Pauni 23). If these followed the Arsinoite pattern, they would need to have τέλεια, but it is lacking. Another probable indication of a Herakleopolite indiction running to Thoth 1 occurs in *P. Vindob. Sijp.* 7, a surety contract for a vineyard worker: the time period concerned is stated to run πρώτης ἴνδ(ι) 'κ(τίωνος) ξως Θω θ νεομηνίζοντι ήρισθης δευτέρας ἴνδικτιον. (For the reading see *ZPE* 29 [1978] 275.) The first indiction ended in 463, and the vintage of the second also took place in that year, at the start of the indiction. It seems indicated that the first indiction in this case ran until the first of Thoth. It seems likely to us, by the way, that the document actually dates to 463. The editor restored line 1 as [την υπατείαν] Φλ. Λέοντος κτλ., based on a lacuna of about 16 letters (cf. line 2). One might also restore [Μετά την υπατείαν], which comes to 15 letters. The omission of τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν before an emperor’s name is by no means unparalleled (cf. *CSBE* 112 a.363 for *P.Oxy.* VIII 1116; *CSBE* 113 a.364 and 115 a.390 for *P.Ant.* II 102). Two reasons specifically support this suggestion: (a) the abbreviation in this fashion of υπατείας and δεσπότου is unparalleled in any consular date heading a document before the time of Justinian (*SB* VI 9311 has a restoration with such abbreviations, but we are not at all persuaded that they are needed or correct there, either [cf. *CNBD* VII 71]), and they ought to be avoided if possible; (b) a surety-contract concerning the activities of a vine-grower in the harvest of 463 is more likely to have been made shortly before the actual pressing, not almost a year earlier.

A further item of evidence is provided by *P. Vindob. Inv.* G 25927, which will be published in *CPR* VIII. It is a lease dated by the postconsulate of Justinus II, year 10, Mesore 5 of the eighth indiction. Justinus’ tenth postconsular year may be 575 or 576 (depending on the reckoning method used), while indiction 8 is 574/5. It will be apparent that Mesore 5 (29.vii) with these criteria can only be 29.vii.575, indicating that the indiction was still going on at that date which had begun in the previous Julian year.

These four texts are the totality of the pertinent evidence of this type known to us. If they, and those cited above under a and b, were exceptions in a mass of evidence conforming to the Arsinoite pattern, they might be explained away. But they are in fact the totality of the relevant evidence for
the Herakleopolite Nome. We are therefore led to believe that the alternative suggestion which we advanced in *CSBE* is correct, namely that Herakleopolis observed an indiction year running from Thoth through Mesore. This characteristic immediately reminds us of the Oxyrhynchite practice (see *CSBE* 26), and it suggests that the Herakleopolite practices were linked to those of Oxyrhynchos. In this connection it is worth quoting the remarks of R. Rémondon on the relations of these two towns in the Byzantine period:

Interestingly enough, *SB* VI 9152 is one of the texts cited by Rémondon for this domination.

Despite this Oxyrhynchite domination, however, one should not leap to the conclusion that the Herakleopolite scribal habits were the same. This is not the case. Oxyrhynchite scribes never used τέλει; Herakleopolite ones did. Oxyrhynchite scribes used ἀρχή principally in the months Epeiph and Mesore, to distinguish the period between the start of the indiction (delegatio-reckoning) and the start of the civil year, used in Oxyrhynchos for indictional and era-year reckoning (cf. *CSBE* 26); Herakleopolite scribes used ἀρχή in Thoth, evidently simply to mean the start of the indiction year. In short, the meanings which Herakleopolite scribes attach to ἀρχή and τέλει are those in use in the neighboring Arsinoite; but the year to which they attach them is that found in Oxyrhynchos. Curious though the conclusion may seem, it appears necessary on our present evidence: another instance of the persistent localism of scribal habits and reckoning in Byzantine Egypt.

It should also be said that with the separation of the Herakleopolite into a separate category, much of the material which had to be viewed as breaking the rules for the Arsinoite is no longer a difficulty: thus two of the six late ἀρχή, one of four late τέλει, and two of three late dates without τέλει can be removed from the list of pattern-breakers. Additionally, some of the other recalcitrant Arsinoite evidence is not very firm. Of nine uses of ἀρχή after Thoth 1 now known, three are Herakleopolite and two are Oxyrhynchite (*P.Oxy. XIX* 2244.68 and *P.Oxy* VIII 1130). About the others, one may observe that *SPP* VIII 1320 and *SB* I 5279 may well refer to the same text, to judge from Wessely’s description, and that in
neither case is there any internal evidence allowing assignment to the Arsinoite Nome. It may be true that they were found there, but so were other papyri which were written elsewhere.\textsuperscript{4} SB I 4484, the sole Arsinoite example of $\dot{\alpha}p\chi\dot{\eta}$ in Phaophi, was published on several occasions by Wessely; his text in DenkschrWien 37 (1889) 167, App. 708, does not have $\dot{\alpha}p\chi\dot{\eta}$; thus the solidity of this witness does not seem beyond doubt. There remains only BGU 1 311, dated to Thoth 2. One could suppose that this scribe used 1 September rather than Thoth 1, or one might consider that the party issuing the document comes from Theogenis, near the border between the Arsinoite and Herakleopolite Nomes; at all events, the exception would not be very impressive evidence.

As to $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$ texts, of the four potentially problematic Arsinoite examples, two (SB I 4810 and P. Ross. Georg. III 57) are so far from any normal pattern (they fall in Choiak and Mecheir) as to be impossible to fit into any system. SPP XX 112 (reference to Thoth) seems to contain some error in any event (see CSBE62 n.63); and we have suggested an alternative reading of P. Ross. Georg. III 39 which would eliminate the problem there.

Finally, the only Arsinoite date after 1 May with no indication of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$, P. Haun. Inv. 318, is the work of a scribe not competent at dating clauses in any event.\textsuperscript{5}

To conclude, the establishment of a peculiar scribal pattern for the Herakleopolite Nome allows us to reduce significantly the problematic exceptions to the pattern established for the Arsinoite, while many of the remaining problem-texts are themselves able to be eliminated or discounted.

33. The Indiction in the Memphite Nome

We know of only one document which contributes to the question of how scribes reckoned the indiction in the Memphite. BGU 1 255 is a surety contract dated 15.v.599. The editor gives the Fayum as the provenance, and no doubt the papyrus may have been found there, but the papyrus states clearly that it was written $\dot{e}v$ M\textsuperscript{u}wφ(i). It is dated by regnal year 17 of Mauricius (13.viii.598–12.viii.599), by his consular year 16 (598 and 599 are possible), and by indiction 3 (599/600). Only the date given above, 15.v.599, will satisfy these criteria on a Pachon 20. From this

\textsuperscript{4} Aside from the Memphite piece discussed as no. 33 below, the following papyri published by Wessely as from the Fayum seem dubiously ascribed to the Arsinoite: SB14669 (really Hermopolite, cf. RFBE 70); SB 1 4676; SB 1 4683 (cf. CSBE5 n.21, observation [7]); SB I 4715 (cf. SB 1 4669); SB I 4796 (cf. RFBE 50). In addition, many “Fayum papyri” published by Wessely in CPR I actually come from Herakleopolis.

\textsuperscript{5} See ZPE 28 (1978) 226 for a correction of the date in this text.
reckoning, it can be seen that Pachon 20 in indiction 3 fell in the first Julian year of that indiction, and that the indiction therefore must have started before Pachon 20 in that place. Insofar as one may be permitted to generalize on the basis of this unique text, we consider it demonstrated that the Pachon indiction was in use in Memphis.

34. Λήγω, λήξις and the Start of the Indiction

A few texts exhibit uses of the verb λήγω or its noun λήξις which seem puzzling. As our remarks in CSBE 60 n.47 are inadequate on this point, we supplement and correct them now. First we consider P.Cair.Masp. III 67303, an Antinoopolite document to be dated to 27.iv.553. The dating clause concludes, Παχών δευτέρα ληγούσης πρώτης ἱνδικτίονος. The contract is for rental of a wagon for the harvest of the "present" second indiction. Given the normal usage in Upper Egypt at this time (cf. CSBE 25-26), an indiction beginning on 1 May must be in question.6 A similar usage of the noun may be observed in P.Lond. III 1326b descr., of which the plate (Atlas III, pl. 91) allows us to read the following dating formula:

1 † Β[ασί]ς τοῦ θειοτάτου ἕμιῶν δεσπό(του) Φλ(αούνο) Μαυρικίου
2 νέον Τιβερίου τοῦ αἰώνιον Αὐγούστου αὐτοκρ(άτορος) ἔτους πρῶτον
3 Παχών νεομνημία ληξέως πρώτης ἱνδ(ικτίονος).

This text, from the Hermopolite Nome, is thus dated to Mauricius’ year 1 (13.viii.582–12.viii.583) and to indiction 1, 582/3. Pachon 1 can only be 26.iv.583, and λήξις must mean the end of the May indictional year, as its verb did in P.Cair.Masp. III 67303.

A conclusion might seem in order, that λήγω and λήξις are used as non-technical terms for the end of the May indiction in Upper Egyptian documents (in contrast to the technical use of ἀρχή and τέλει in the Arsinoite Nome; it will be recalled that τέλει is never used in this region). But P.Lond. V 1794 comes to nullify this conclusion. It is a partnership contract from Hermopolis, dated to the postconsulate of Fl. Longinus. It reckons (10–12) ἀπο τῆς προγεγραμμένης σήμερον ἡμέρας ἡγίστα Ἡγήν Ἐβδομαδικάκις λήξεως τῆς παρούσης ἐνδεκάτης ἱνδ(ικτίονος).7

6 Our remarks on CSBE 60 n.47 are thus correct but need this further observation.
7 The verification of our suggested reading λήξεως in place of the editor’s δίξεως is owed to T. S. Pattie, who studied the original at our request. He writes, “I have looked at P.Lond. V 1794 (Pap. 1673) line 11 under ultra-violet and infra-red light and am convinced that λήξεως is correct.” Our remarks in CSBE 55 n.1 on this papyrus are naturally nullified by this new reading.
The end of indiction 11 fell in 488, and the date is therefore 21.vi.488 (to be corrected in CSBE, where editor’s date accepted and the text listed under 487).

A similar usage is found in an inscription from Ombos ascribed to the sixth or seventh century, SB IV 7475 (Lefebvre 562). The inscription (which concerns the restoration of a hostel) mentions the following date: ἴδιο ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ληγ(ούσης) Παῦλοι ιθ (line 32). This text and P. Lond. 1794, both coming from Paunci, seem scarcely ascribable to any indiction year except the reckoning of the delegatio from Epeiph 1 or 1 July. Such reckoning is not normally found in Upper Egypt. At all events, these four documents suggest that ληγω and ληξις do not have a specific and technical meaning to be compared with the τελεία/ἀρχή system in use in the Arsinoite, but are used to refer to the end of an indiction year, however reckoned.

35. Honorific Epithets of Fl. Basilius

In the listing of dates by the consulate and postconsular years of Fl. Basilius between 541 and 566 (CSBE 124–25), we found three honorific epithets attached to his name, λαμπρότατος, ἐνδοξότατος and πανεύφημος. Further tabulation of the material has shown that the use of these epithets is regionally defined, and we think it is worthwhile to set out the evidence and our summary conclusions.

In the Arsinoite, Herakleopolite and Oxyrhynchite Nomes, all preserved epithets are λαμπρότατος (as are the two documents from Constantinople). These are as follows:

Arsinoite: SPP XX 142; P. Lond. I 113 (5b); BGU III 736; P. Vindob. Sal. 10; BGU II 364; SB VI 9283; BGU I 305.

Herakleopolite: SB I 4676 (restored).

Oxyrhynchite: P. Oxy. XVI 1995; PSI VII 790; SB XII 11162; P. Oxy. XVI 1985; P. Princ. III 154; P. Bad. VI 172; SB VI 9239; P. Oxy. I 133; P. Oxy. I 140; PSI I 77; P. Oxy. XIX 2238, XXXVI 2780, XVI 1965, XVI 1895, XVI 1970, XVI 1980, I 125, XVI 1972; P. Wisc. I 8; P. Got. 9; PSI XIV 1427. Of these only P. Oxy. XVI 1895 is restored.

Constantinople: see RFBE 46.

It seems a fair conclusion that in Arcadia λαμπρότατος was used exclusively. One problematic case is discussed at the end of this note.

In Thebais, one finds no examples of λαμπρότατος; rather, ἐνδοξότατος is standard (with 54 examples), while πανεύφημος is found

8 The indiction number is erroneously given as α in CSBE 60 n.47.
occasionally (a total of 7 examples). The evidence by nomes is the following:

Hermopolite, ἐνδοξῶτατος: P.Stras. 597 (rest.); P.Stras. 487; P.Lond. III 1002, V 1872; P.Stras. 484, 338 (rest.), 247, 4; P.Herm. 65 (rest.); SB VI 9284; P.Stras. 398; SB VI 9292; P.Lond. III 1330b, 874; V 1765; III 1006; V 1766, 1767; P.Stras. 248; BGU XII 2200; P.Lond. III 1003; BGU XII 2202; SB VI 9085, inv. 16048. πανεύφημος: P.Stras. 482; P.Lond. III 1319; P.Stras. 485, 474.

Antinoopolite, ἐνδοξῶτατος: P.Cair.Masp. III 67302; P.Ant. 1 42(cf. CNBD II 13); P.Stras. 46–49 (mostly restored; cf. BASP 15[1978] 238–40).


Hermouthite, ἐνδοξῶτατος: P.Lond. V 1719, 1720.

In sum, one may normally in Thebais expect that ἐνδοξῶτατος will be the epithet used, but in the Hermopolite and Antaîopolite at least one also finds occasionally πανεύφημος, and it may be that in the other nomes only the paucity of evidence is responsible for the absence of such attestations.

One anomalous case needs discussion, P.Lond. V 1797. According to the editor, this text is dated to the postconsulate of Fl. Basilius (no year specified), Epeiph 18, 10th indiction, thus 12 July 546; he expresses some doubt. The text comes from Oxyrhynchos, but it shows the epithet ἐνδοξῶτατος. First, it may be remarked that as Oxyrhynchos used an indiction year beginning in Thoth, one would normally expect that this document fell to the second of the Julian years involved, i.e. 547 (so listed in CSBE 124). But the epithet is disturbing, a unique blemish on the uniform pattern described above. The absence of a year of Fl. Basilius leaves open the possibility that a different consulate is intended. The editor prints the name as Ἰάνου, and on a xerox copy kindly provided by T. S. Pattie we can see that the editor’s note to line 1 is very accurate; what survives allows any letter with a lower right-hand diagonal. The only real possibility seems to be that suggested by Bell, the reading of Ἐκβήμων, which would yield the postconsulate of Anthemiou in 515, hence 516. Bell rejected this date on the grounds that “if both consuls were named τῶν ἐνδοξῶτατῶν should have been written, and moreover there seems no room for both names. Hence
the date after the consulship of Basilius may be regarded as fairly probable; but of course it is possible that Anthemiou was named alone." The available evidence for the consulate of 515 (cited in CSBE 122) shows that in both documents known (SPP XX 126 and P. Cai. Masp. Ill 67306) Anthemiou does in fact appear alone. The only objection raised by Bell to a date in 516 is thus eliminated.

A possibly more serious one remains, that a date in 516 means that Epeiph stands in the first Julian year of the indiction of 516/7, contrary to normal Oxyrhynchite practice (but cf. CSBE 26 for the use of indictional years starting on Epeiph 1). The extremely bad condition of the document makes it impossible to tell what its contents were (a contract of some sort), but the parties are a singularis and a scholasticus, men of some station in life. It is conceivable that the singularis, who is on the staff of the praeses of Arcadia, is not a resident of Oxyrhynchus and is not following its practices, but the conflict is nonetheless disturbing. As we find it less improbable than the assignment of a document from Oxyrhynchus (or anywhere in Arcadia) with ἐνδοξοτατος to the period of Fl. Basilius, we prefer a date in 516.