P.RYL. IV 709: A NOTE

According to the editors of P.Ryl. IV 709 this papyrus has to be dated to the early fourth century A.D. In a note to line 8 they state that "the regnal years should be those of Diocletian and Maximian, with their respective Caesars; if they are, the writer has miscalculated, or placed the years in the wrong order".

Line 8 reads:].c" wat is" wat ys" wat iBs" wat [

Now it is clear that the ς belongs to the numeral marking. We are thus dealing with a x^{th} year, a 10^{th} year, a 3^{rd} year and -surprisingly- a 12^{th} year. However, nothing prevents us from making a division somewhere in this sequence of years. Therefore, if we divide between the 3^{rd} and the 12^{th} regnal years and we restore at the beginning of this line LJa ς " we are dealing with years 11, 10 and 3 of Diocletian, Maximian and the Caesars (= 294/5 A.D.). Likewise, $\iota\beta\varsigma$ " nat [can be supplemented to $\iota\beta\varsigma$ " nat [$\iota\alpha\varsigma$ " nat $\delta\varsigma$ ", i.e. years 12, 11 and 4 (= 295/6 A.D.).

In line 2, the restoration $E\mathring{v}[c\epsilon\beta\tilde{\omega}v]$ is out of place after $K]a_{i}c\acute{a}\rho\omega v$. I think it more likely that after the mentioning of the rulers the name of the month should follow, i.e. ${}^{2}E\pi[\epsilon t\omega, of -less likely-{}^{2}E\pi[\alpha you \hat{\epsilon} v\omega v]$.

Bacifile address? Liablact At The Say world of Victory at the Title and the R

Action Light Court Inspect Agency Applied U.C., 1976, 240 221

University of Amsterdam

K.A. Word

¹⁾ See J.D. Thomas, CdE 46, 1971, 174ff.