

## CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES ON BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS (VII)<sup>1</sup>

### 64. BGU II 370

The editor reads and restores the opening of this papyrus as follows:

- + ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου [καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ  
Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ [καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν,  
βασιλείας τῶν θει[οτάτων δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν]  
4 Φλ(αουίου) Ἡρακλείου [καὶ Φλ(αουίου) Ἡρακλείου Νέου  
Κωνσταντίνου]  
ἔτους κα Ἀθῶρ [ . . δ ἰν(δικτίμνος) ἐν Ἀρσ(ινόη)].

The date was hence given as x-xi.630. In *RFBE* 70 we noted that the supplements were too long but that Dr. Poethke had checked the editor's readings on a photograph and reported them correct.

The papyrus is now in Warsaw, and we owe to Dr. Z. Borkowski a good photograph, on which we observe that the right edge is relatively straight, so that the restoration in line 4 of 30 letters—compared to 17, 14 and 18 in lines 1-3—is clearly wrong. We must suppose that the scribe began to write a formula including Heraclius Jr. (as is common from 630 on), but abandoned this plan and included (by accident or design) only Heraclius

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this series of notes (to which we refer by the initials *CNBD*) see *BASP* 15 (1978) 233. We cite our *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt* (*Stud. Amst.* 8, Zutphen 1978) as *CSBE* and our *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* (*BASP Suppl.* 2, Missoula 1979) as *RFBE*.

himself. We restore this line [του αἰωνίου Αὔγουστου], 19 letters. The formula is *RFBE* 70, formula 6.

In line 5, we read the year number as κθ; this yields a date of x-xi.638, and one must restore the number of the indiction as ιβ.

#### 65. *BGU* XII 2181

The editor prints the dating formula of this Hermopolite lease as follows:

[Μετὰ] τὴν [ὑπ]ατείαν Φλα(νίου) [--- κ]αὶ Βεναντ[ί]ων  
τῶν λαμ-

[προτά]των [ ] Ἐπ[εί]φ ? . . δευτέρ]ας ἰνδ[ικτί]ωνος).

His comment on the problems posed by this date is acute and deserves quotation in full:

Da das Datum in den Monat Epeiph (Juni/Juli) eines 2. Indiktionsjahres fallen muss . . . kann es sich nur um das Jahr 508 bzw. die Konsuln des Jahres 507 handeln. Nach ihnen ist P.Oxy. XVI 1890 datiert: Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν τοῦ δεσπότης ἡμῶν Φλα(νίου) Ἀραστασίου τοῦ αἰ[ω]νίου Αὔγουστου τὸ γ' καὶ Βηναντίων τοῦ λαμπρο(τάτου), aber in 2181, 1 kann der erste Name kaum der des Kaisers gewesen sein, da ausser dem Ehrenprädikat τῶν λαμ[προτά]των alle Titel fehlen; auch wäre die Ergänzung [Ἀραστασίου κ]αὶ wohl etwas zu lang für die Lücke. Daher muss man die Möglichkeit in Betracht ziehen, dass der Schreiber hier die Konsuln des Jahres 508 eingesetzt hat, nämlich Celer und Venantius, obwohl er dann ὑπατεία hätte schreiben müssen.

It might be added that the indiction number is supported by the mention of the crop of indiction 3 (509/510: harvested in spring/summer, 509) in line 10 as the first crop to be covered by the lease.

There is one very grave difficulty opposing the editor's date of summer, 508, however: *P.Oxy.* XVI 1890, which he quotes. This text is dated to 27.xi.508 not merely by the postconsular dating but by the Oxyrhynchite era years and the indiction. If *BGU* 2181 belongs in vi-vii.508, we would have the astonishing spectacle of a consulate's being known in June-July but the postconsulate of the preceding year still in use (in a city nearer Alexandria) five months later. This, we have shown in *CNBD* VI 63, is not demonstrably attested in any instance and seems inherently unlikely.

A date in 509 thus has some attraction. Maehler (note to line 2) rejected the possibility of reading [Φαμ]εν[ώθ], and on a photograph which he kindly provided we can verify that there is no

space for such a restoration. In this regard, *SB* V 7519, a virtually identical lease for the same land on Pachon 19 (14.v) 510 is interesting, and the presence of ]ων ~~των~~ after a lacuna which should be only a few letters long is suggestive: we think restoring [Παχ]ών is very attractive. The ε. which follows (we see no reason to print [ ] to indicate a lacuna) can be εν as well as επ, and this suggests then the beginning of a day number. The 19 in *SB* 7519 would suggest ἐννεακαιδεκάτη, but that is perhaps rather long for the lacuna; in any case, ἐνάτη is possible.

We must then dispose of the [προτάτ]υν†, which is needed to complete the λαμ of line 1. There is no abbreviation mark after λαμ, but there is blank space, room for a few more letters which could have been used if the scribe had intended to write the word in full. We suppose therefore that abbreviation after mu was intended.

The text resulting from the considerations set out above is as follows:

[Μετὰ] τὴν [ὑπ]ατείαν Φλ(αυίων) [Κέλερος κ]αί  
 Βεναντ[ί]ου τῶν λαμ(προτάτων)  
 [Παχ]ῶν ἐν[άτ]η (?) τῆς δευτέ[ρας] ἡμέρας ἰνδ[ικτί]ου.

Celer was consul with Venantius in 508, and the length of the lacuna suits his name very well. The date would thus be 4.v.509. Fl. Opportunus was consul in 509, but the earliest Egyptian indication of the dissemination of knowledge of his consulate is *P. Vindob. Sal.* 9, of 25.ix.509. A puzzling p.c. Anastasius IV and Fl. Venantius appears in *CPR* VI 8 with no month and day; the editor dates to 509 without any apparent unease over the fact that a fourth consulate for Anastasius is not otherwise attested. This papyrus is, however, rather puzzling anyway, as only three words of the text of a *compromissum* were written and the rest of the papyrus is blank. Was this an exercise, the date of which is not to be taken seriously? (Cf. *SB* I 5941, where this aim may be the cause of the discrepancy between consular and indictional dates.)

It should in conclusion be said that we recognize fully the one serious objection to our proposed reconstruction, namely the incongruity of a date in 509 with the present second and coming third indiction. Our unease is increased by the rarity of such errors in indictional dates. Nonetheless, with present evidence (especially *P. Oxy.* 1890) we think a date in 509 is the most acceptable. After all, we are only just after the start of the indiction year in Upper Egypt.

66. *P.Got.* 60

This unprepossessing scrap was published as a theological fragment, but H. I. Bell (*CR* 43 [1929] 237: *BL* II.2, 70) recognized it as the beginning of a Byzantine document. It is in fact restorable rather fully (Schubart's partial restoration reported in *BL* II.2, 70 is not quite consonant with normal formulas):

[+ ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπ]ότου Ἰησοῦ Χρισ[τοῦ]  
 [τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, βασ]ιλείας τοῦ θειοτ[άτου]  
 [ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλ(αουίου) Μανρικίου] Τιβερίου τοῦ  
 αἰων[ίου]  
 [Αὐγούστου αὐτοκράτορος κτλ.

The formula is *RFBE* 61, formula 7. The date is 591–602. The absence of abbreviation in what remains makes it unlikely that *δεσπότου* was abbreviated in line 3; and hence *Νέου* was probably not written. The provenance is unknown; the absence of *Νέου* may point to the Arsinoite, but a few Hermopolite examples also omit this word. Cf. no.73.

67. *P.Grenf.* II 72

The date by the Roman calendar in this text is, in the editor's version, τῇ πρὸ εἰ Καλενδῶν Μαρτίων. In point of fact, ante 16 Kal. Mar. is preceded by the Ides of February, not ante 17 Kal. Mar. Though such an error would not be unparalleled (cf. P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 33 [1979] 240 n.49), we find on consultation of a photograph kindly provided by T. S. Pattie that the correct reading is τῇ πρὸ ιβ; the correct date is 18.ii.308.<sup>2</sup>

68. *P.Harr.* 91

The date of this short order is transcribed by the editor as (ἔτους) ρσα ρλ Χοΐακ ὀγ(δόης) ἰνδικ(τίονος). That ρσα is a typographical error for ρξα was noted already by V. B. Schuman (cf. *BL* III 80). It is also very odd that there is no day of the month. We are indebted to Dr. R. A. Coles for a photograph on which we read the date as follows: (ἔτους) ρξα ρλ Χοΐακ γ, η/Σ ἰνδικ(τίονος), or Choiak 3 of the 8th indiction, 29.xi.484.

<sup>2</sup> We take this opportunity to offer two new readings: line 4, read Πετενεφῶτου μητρὸς Ὀσερίνιος (this last name seems an *addendum onomasticis*); line 5, read ἐν νεκρῇ Πιτύτειος (for the village cf. *WB* Suppl.).

In line 3, we read the signature (in a second hand) as *ἐσημει-  
(ωσάμην) κρέως λίτρ(ας) τριάκοντα*. We are troubled by the  
internal abbreviation *σ(ίτ)ου*, and the papyrus seems to have  
*μοβ( )* instead of the editor's *μοδ( )*, but we have nothing to  
suggest as alternative readings or resolutions.

69. *P.Herm.* 30

This contract of hire is damaged at the top, and all that  
remains of the dating formula is published as follows:

*τοῖς τὸ ιε μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν  
ἰνδικτίονος ιγ'*

The date is given as "sixth century," but in a note the editor  
remarks, "There is not room for the *βασιλείας*-clause, if the  
reading suggested is correct . . . The first line, if correct, might  
point to A.D. 556 as a possible date."

It will be observed, however, that in 556 we would be in the  
fourth or fifth indiction, not thirteenth. To resolve this conflict we  
requested a photograph from the John Rylands Library, and  
thanks to their ready cooperation we can report that we consider it  
possible to read the number of the postconsular year as *ια*, and the  
indiction as *ιε*. The 11th postconsular year of Basilus was properly  
551, but by alternative reckoning 552 is also possible; and indiction  
15 is 551/2. This is therefore the correct date. It is possible—likely,  
in fact—that the regnal formula (*RFBE* 46, formula 2) was written  
beginning in the line before the first preserved one. The use of the  
*τοῖς τὸ* formula suggests the writer was in Oxyrhynchos (cf. *CSBE*  
124).

70. *P.Lond.* III 1304a descr. = SB 16, 12868 (complete)

This papyrus is described as dated "in the eleventh year of an  
emperor whose name is lost. 6th cent." In order to see if a more  
precise date could be found, we obtained through Mr. T. S.  
Pattie's good offices a photocopy of the papyrus. Line 1 contains  
the remains of an invocation formula, such as is found only from  
591 on (cf. *BASP* 15 [1978] 241). Only Mauricius, Phocas and  
Heraclius are thus possible. But Phocas is excluded—he had only  
eight regnal years—and in 620/1, Heraclius' eleventh year, Egypt  
was under Persian rule. The year is therefore that of Mauricius,  
592/3. The formula of this Hermopolitan piece is evidently *RFBE*  
61, formula 7. We read and restore lines 1–3 as follows:

[+ ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότην Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ  
 τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, βασιλείας τοῦ θεοτάτου  
 ἡμῶν δεσπότην Φλ(αοῦίου) Μαυρικίου Τιβερίου Νέου τοῦ  
 αἰωνίου Ἀγ(ούστου) αὐτοκράτορος, ἔτους ἐνδεκάτου,  
 [Month, day, indiction ἐν Ἐρ]μοῦ πόλει τῆς Θηβαίδος.

71. *P.Oslo* II 38 = *SB* VI 9311

This document belongs to the papers of Aurelia Tetoueis and is a loan of wheat to be repaid in Pauni of indiction 4, or May/June, 375. A consular date to 374 (Gratianus II and Equitius) is only partially preserved, as follows:

[ὑπατ(είας) τοῦ δεσπ(ότου)] ἡμῶν Γρατια[ν]οῦ [τοῦ]  
 αἰωνίου  
 [Ἀγ(ούστου) τὸ γ' καὶ Φ]λ(αοῦίου) Ἐκυθίου τοῦ λαμ-  
 προτάτου

As we have had occasion to observe before (*CNBD* III 32), such abbreviation of *ὑπατείας* and *δεσπότην*, while not uncommon in the sixth and seventh centuries, is quite unexampled in consular datings at the head of fourth and fifth century papyri. We must ask whether such abbreviation is really needed here.

Line 1 in full would be 18 letters restored, and line 2 would be 16. This is a bit longer than the 12 or so in most lines, but line 8 had 14 letters, and a bit of ecthesis in line 1 (a very common phenomenon) would, we think, be sufficient. We propose therefore to remove the signs of abbreviation.

72. *P.Oxy.* X 1334

This text bears an anomalous date to Oxyrhynchite era years 93–64: a difference of 29, where one normally finds 31. As the reading is correct (as T. S. Pattie has verified for us), one wonders what the true date is. The editors suggested that 94–63 was meant, and they assigned this to 416; but Thoth of that year in fact falls in 417. (Preisigke's 418 in *BL* I 335 is an error.) It seems to us quite possible, however, that this hypothesis of metathesis is wrong, and that we should simply take 93 as correct and 64 as a guess or blunder for 62; in that case the date *would* be 416.

## 73. SB I 5321 = SB 16. 12328

This small fragment was published by Magirus. It is easily restorable once it is recognized that the only emperor with a [Τι]βερίον in his nomenclature, under whose rule invocations appear, is Mauricius. We restore as follows:

+ ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπ(ότου) [Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ  
τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν,]  
βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου [ἡμῶν δεσπότηου Φλαουίου Μαν-  
ρικίου Τι-]  
βερίου τοῦ αἰων(ίου) Αὐγο[ύστου αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους . .]

The formula is *RFBE* 61, formula 7 and from the omission of Νέου the provenance seems most likely to be the Arsinoite Nome (cf. no.66 above)—as is indeed on general grounds easily to be supposed for Magirus' texts.

## 74. SB XII 10798

This damaged text begins with a trinitarian invocation characteristic of Phocas' reign, then contains a consular phrase without any regnal formula, of a type to be discussed fully in a forthcoming study of Z. Borkowski: ὕ]πατίας |<sup>4</sup> τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβ(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπ(ότου) .[. ] |<sup>5</sup> [. . . ] (ἔτους) ̅, Παῦνι ιζ̅, ινδ̅(κτιόνος) ιβ̅.

One wonders what can have stood between δεσπ(ότου) and the year date; and it is totally unheard-of in the seventh century to find ἔτους so abbreviated. Consultation of the plate in *Bull. John Rylands Library* 51 (1968) 150 shows that in line 4 one may read δεσπότη[ου]. In line 5, a sigma is visible before the numeral; before that it is blank. We restore [ἔτου]ς without hesitation.

Phocas' sixth consular year is 608; Pauni 17 of indiction 12 would then fall on 11.vi.608 (so *CSBE* 128). Borkowski, in the study cited above, suggests Oxyrhynchos as a provenance. If so, Pauni 17 of indiction 12 would fall in 609 and the date would be 11.vi.609, following normal Oxyrhynchite procedure (cf. *CSBE* 26). This conflict led us to request a photograph from the Rylands library, and on it we read clearly [ἔτου]ς ζ̅. The conflict is thus eliminated and the date is 609.

75. *PSI VII 790*

The dating clause at the end of this petition to the *ekdikos* is very badly preserved. It is read, very tentatively, by the editors as a regnal phrase of Justinian and consular date by Basilius. We believe that this is correct. They leave line 24, however, unread. From a photograph provided by Dr. R. Pintaudi, we propose the following reading of lines 23–25:

τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀύγου[ύ]στου [καὶ] ἀν[τοκράτορος]  
 24 ἔτους ι. ['], τοῖς τῷ ε με[τὰ τὴν ὑπατεῖαν Φλ(αουῖον)]  
 Βασιλίου τοῦ λαμπ(ροτάτου) [

P.c. Basilius 5 may be either 545 or 546. The regnal year of Justinian may be either *ιη* or *ιθ*, but we cannot distinguish the letter here.

For the formula see *CSBE* 124 a.542–566 and no. 69 *supra*. This is the earliest Oxyrhynchite papyrus so far published to give both regnal and consular date in this period (cf. *RFBE* 46) and, to our knowledge, the only regnal formula placed at the end of a document.

76. *P.Stras. VII 672*

The regnal dating formula of this document (lines 25–27) is preserved as follows: (ἔτους) ς" | [τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Διο]κλητιανοῦ [καὶ] εS" Μάρκ[ου Ἀύρηλιον Οὐ]αλερίου [Μαξι]μιανοῦ Εὐσεβ[ῶν Ε]ψτυχῶν | [Σεβαστῶν]. No precisely identical formula is found in *RFBE* 3–6, but formulas 3 and 5 are somewhat similar. They have in common that they have τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν in the singular before Diocletian's name; the giving of separate dates for the two (as opposed to the grouping of the numerals at the front) points to the use of the singular rather than the plural in any case. Restore [τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Διο]κλητιανῶ κτλ.

77. *P.Stras. VII 678*

The dating formula of this contract from Antinoopolis is published as follows:

+ Βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου ἡμ[ῶν] δεσπότου Φλαυῖου  
 τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀύγου [ύ]στου Ἀυτοκρ(άτορος) Ἔτους  
 "] δευτέρας ἰνδ(ικτίονος).

The editor dates it to the sixth century. He remarks, "En l'absence de toute mention consulaire (qui aurait dû venir après le nom de l'empereur) le nom de ce dernier reste incertain; la valeur de la lacune fait pencher pour Justin II (avec une 2<sup>e</sup> indiction en 518-9 p.C.) plutôt que pour Justinien (538-9 ou 553-4 p.C.)."

Now 518/9 is Justinus I, but this year is not a second indiction; Justinus I's only second indiction, 523/4, is excluded because no regnal reckoning was used in this reign (the editor's 518/9 may thus be only a slip or printing error for 568/9). Justinian is excluded because no papyri of his reign use only regnal dating without a separate mention of consulate (*RFBE* 45). Mauricius (583/4) is also impossible, for the formula (*RFBE* 61-62, formula 7) indicated would give a considerably excessive line length for the restoration of line 2. Given the absence of an invocation, a date after 591 is unlikely; and we thus find only 568/9, in Justinus II's reign, to be possible. We accordingly restore Ἰουστινόν in line 2; the regnal year may be 4 or 5. The formula is *RFBE* 50, formula 3, although the inclusion of καὶ ὑπατείας gives a slightly longer restoration than one might expect.

We should note that *P.Lond.* V 1707, which we classified in *RFBE* 49 as formula 2, should in fact be classified as formula 3, according to an examination of the original by T. S. Pattie at our request. Formula 2 is thus limited to the Strasbourg papyri of 566, which still use the postconsulate of Basilus, and it is extremely unlikely that we should find it in any subsequent year. The restoration of formula 3 in *P.Stras.* 678, despite its length, thus appears inevitable.

#### 78. *ChLA* III 210

This is a full edition of *P.Lond.* V 1875. In line 1 is given the consular date: [D(ominis) n(ostris) Fl(aui)o Iul(io) Constanti]io Aug(usto) V et Constant[io Gallo nob(ilissimo) Caes(are) Cos(ulibus)]. The year is 352, and this reference is to be added to *CSBE* 112 a.352. One may doubt, however, the soundness of the restorations. The Greek papyri dated by the joint consulates of Constantius and Gallus (*CSBE* 112 a.353, 354, 355) all give their names as Κωνσταντίος Αὐγουστος καὶ Κωνσταντίος ὁ ἐπιφανέστατος Καῖσαρ. There is no reason to restore Flavius Iulius nor Gallus. We would print [DD. NN. Constant]io Aug(usto) V et Constant[io nob(ilissimo) Caes(are) coss.].

79. *ChLA* III 217

The consular date in the first line of this text is only partly preserved: ]to v(iris) c[(arissimis) Cos(ulibus)]. The editor notes that the traces of the second consul's name make 401, 423, 437 and 483 possible; he considers all but 483 unlikely on the grounds that these dates are too early for the hand. We do not believe that such precision is possible in palaeographical judgments; and 483, for which the editor wishes to have [Agniatio et Faus]to, is dated in the papyri by the p.c. of Fl. Trocondus, cos. 482 (*CSBE* 120 a.483; our examples come from the summer, but as the p.c. was still in use in 484, it was evidently in use all through 483). We therefore think 437 would be better; an example of it has now turned up in *P. Wash. Univ.* I 37.1. But it is clear that this kind of restoration can arrive at no certainty, and it is better not to restore the consuls' names at all.

80. *ChLa* V 285

The consular date in line 13 is published as follows: ] d(ominis) n(ostris) Constantio Aug(usto) VIII et Cl. Iulian[o II; the date is 357. A check of *CSBE* 112 a.357, however, shows (as one would expect) that Julian is always given the title Caesar and usually the epithet *ἐπιφανέστατος* (*nobilissimus*). We think it likely that the correct restoration is Cl. Iulian[o nob(ilissimo) Caes(are) II.

81. *ChLa* XI 470

The consular date of this papyrus is given in the editors' text as 458: δρδρσσ FIFI M[aiol]rjanp [et Leone Augg Coss . . . This dating raises two major problems: (1) one does not expect Maiorianus to appear in papyri from Egypt, where he was never recognized (cf. *CSBE* 118 a.458; Seeck, *Regesten*, 407); (2) an attestation of a *praeses Thebaidos* at this date is unexpected. The *praeses* mentioned here, Fl. Ardaburis Fosforus Leontius v.c., is not elsewhere attested, and no *praeses* later than 391 appears in Lallemand, *L'administration civile*, 254; the other instances she gives (254-55; see *PLRE* 1098-99) without date are not likely to be much later than the last decade of the fourth century. The date must, on the other hand, be after 368, as the *praeses* is *clarissimus* (Lallemand, 61-62, 252).

Given the state of the papyrus, it is hard to attain certainty, but a year after 368 in which there are two emperors as consuls,



(ἔτους) κS" καὶ ιθ[S" καὶ ιβS" τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν]  
 [Δ]ιοκλητιανοῦ καὶ Μαξιμ[ιανοῦ Σεβαστῶν καὶ Κωνσταν-  
 τίου]  
 [κα]ὶ Μαξιμιανῶ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Καισαρίων]

giving restorations of 22, 27 and 20 letters. As some of line 2 was no doubt written in the usual slurred manner, these lengths cause no problem. It should be noted that the editor's δεσποτῶν in line 1 is never found in regnal (as opposed to consular) formulas of this period, in which κυρίων is always used. Cf. *ZPE* 39 (1978) 170 n. 18.

In line 1, the theta is palaeographically uncertain, and beta could also be read; but a sequence 20-12 would give too short a restoration and perhaps conflict with the fact that *P.Oxy.* XXXVI 2765.17, of the same date, already has 20-19-12 (cf. *RFBE* 14).

The verso (lines 8, 10) seems to mention a year 13. The editor suggests as the date of the verso 13.viii.305 (Mesore 20), thus taking the year to be 304/5. But we have no other example of 304/5 being designated simply by "year 13" during that year (cf. *RFBE* 30); this date therefore seems to us insecure. We have considered—without reaching any certainty—the possibility of interpreting the symbol L as (ῶν) rather than (ἔτους), and taking ιγS as meaning the 13th indiction (324/5). Just before the lacuna, we might well read κρ[ rather than κS, restoring e.g. κρ[θῆς]. The reference could be to payments made in Mesore for the 13th indiction.

#### 84. Miscellany

- a) *BGU* III 909: date is 24-29.viii.359, not 24-28.viii (ed.).
- b) *P.Harr.* 145: date is 363/4 (ed. 364).
- c) *P.Mert.* I 35: date is 29.i.348, not 28.i (ed.).
- d) *P.Oxy.* XII 1575: date is 26.v.338, not 339? (ed.).
- e) *P.Oxy.Hels.* 44: The editors read the consular date as τ[ο]ς ἐσομέ[νοι]ς ὑπάτ[ο]ι[s] τῶ .; in this phrase they recognize correctly the consular era used in 322-324. A glance at the chart on *CSBE* 108, however, shows that this formula was used only in 324. The numeral must therefore be δ and the date ii-iii.324.
- f) *SB* VI 9085, inv. 16050: the editor's text here, after the regnal date, reads Θῶθ ιγ ἰνδ(ικτίονος). In *ZPE* 26 (1977) 272 n.19 it was suggested that the omission of iota by haplography was responsible for the apparent lack of a day number and that the date was really 8.ix.579. The omission is, however, more serious:

we have now obtained from Dr. G. Poethke a tracing which enables us to see that the date is Thoth 18, thus 16.ix. The entire day number was apparently omitted by inadvertence in the first edition.

g) *Pap. Lugd. Bat.* XVII 10: date is 522/3 (ed. 523).

h) *ZPE* 30 (1978) 205: date is 27.ii, not 26.ii (ed.). = P. Oxy. 49.3572

*COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY*  
*UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM*

*ROGER S. BAGNALL*  
*K. A. WORP*