

CHRONOLOGICAL NOTES

(1) BGU II 586

In line 29 of this papyrus the date is given. Unluckily the beginning of this line is missing and only [ca.8]οις ὑπάτοις [τὸ τέ]ταρτον is preserved. In BL I p.54 the papyrus is dated to A.D.302 because G.Plaumann proposed to restore at the beginning of line 29 [Οὐαλερί]οις.¹⁾ He thought that we were dealing with the fourth consulate of C.Flavius Valerius Constantius Caesar and Galerius Valerius Maximianus Caesar. This form of the titles of Constantius Caesar and Maximianus Caesar as consuls would be unique. In the other years in which these Caesars function as consuls²⁾ their titles are as follows: οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίος καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς οἱ ἐπιφανέστατοι Καίσαρες.³⁾ It is a well-known fact there was a short-lived era τοῖς ἀποδειχθησομένοις / ἐσομένοις / μέλλουσιν ὑπάτοις starting in A.D.322 and ending in A.D.324.⁴⁾ The papyrus under review is another document from this era. At the beginning of line 29 one has to supplement [τοῖς ἐσομένοις] (the limited space available excludes a restoration [τοῖς ἀποδειχθησομένοις] which is also excluded because we are in the fourth year of this era [cf. ZPE 10, 1973, 124]). The papyrus dates, therefore, from A.D.324. At the beginning of line 30 the month and the day are irretrievably lost in the lacuna.

1) F.Preisigke, Wörterbuch III, Abschnitt 3 lists: [Οὐαλερί]ος τὸ δ'.

2) 1st consulship: A.D.294; 3rd consulship: A.D.300; 5th consulship: A.D.305 (till 1.5.305 as Caesares). Cf. A.Degrassi, I fasti consolari dell'impero romano, Roma, 1952, pp.76/7.

3) It is irrelevant that P.Panop.Beatty 2,59 and P.Cairo Isid. 41,20 have δεσπότηι instead of κύριοι. R.A.Coles was so kind to check the first line of P.Oxy.VI 891 and he confirmed our proposal that the first line reads: [ἐπὶ ὑ]πάτων τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν] (the same correction was independently made by J.R.Rea who will publish it in P.Oxy. XLVI 3297, 1 note [in the press]). P.Oxy.VI 889 has to be dated to A.D.324 (cf. J.D.Thomas, An Unrecognized Edict of Constantine [P.Oxy.889], Ancient Society 7, 1976, pp.301ff.). P.L.Bat.II 5 has to be dated to A.D.304 (cf. P.Theon., p.121. This papyrus, enlarged by a recently found piece, will be republished by E.Boswinkel).

4) Cf. L.C.Youtie - D.Hagedorn - H.C.Youtie, Urkunden aus Panopolis III, ZPE 10, 1973, pp.121ff. Another example of τῆ δευτέρᾳ ἀμοιβῇ is found in P.Vindob.Gr.Inv. No.15494A, published by us in Aegyptus LVI, 1976, p.44 and Inv.No.15014, to be published by K.A.Worp.

(2) P.Cairo Inv.No.10517

This papyrus was together with other ones published by us in ZPE 20, 1976, pp.160-161.⁵⁾ In lines 4-8, titles not formerly attested for Κωνσταντίνος and the two Caesars appeared: [ca.15 τῶν] | δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν <ἀ>νικητῶν Κωνσταντίνου κτλ. We changed the reading νικητ[to <ἀ>νικητ[because we were not aware of the occurrence in any papyrus published so far of νικητῆς as an imperial title⁶⁾ and because we were thinking of the well-attested formula οἱ τὰ πάντα νικῶντες / οἱ ἀνικητοὶ βασιλεῖς. In his aforementioned article (cf. note 3) J.D.Thomas connected νικητῆς which appears in P. Oxy.VI 889,2 with Constantine, exactly the emperor by whom in the papyrus under discussion the oath is sworn. He accepts the suggestion made by A.Chastagnol⁷⁾ that Constantine first took the title victor = νικητῆς after his final victory over Licinius on 24 September 324 A.D. If, as methodologically we should do, we take the reading of the papyrus at face value, we have to read τῶν] | δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν νικητῶν⁸⁾ Κωνσταντίνου κτλ. The very unusual order of νικητῶν could be explained by the influence of the formula οἱ δεσποταὶ ἡμῶν οἱ ἀνικητοὶ βασιλεῖς which appears in this position (cf. E. Seidl, *Der Eid im römisch-ägyptischen Provinzialrecht* II, München, 1935, p.6).⁹⁾

5) Read in note on line 4 of text no.1 ιβ̄ instead of ιθ̄; read in note on line 1 of text no.2 Σερῆν; add to note on line 8 of the same text a reference to CdE XXVII, 1952, p.167, note 2; text no.3 has to be dated to A.D.334/5.

6) LSJ⁹ cite only one inscription in which νικητῆς is used of the emperor Julian. Cf. P.Kneissl, *Die Siegestitulatur der römischen Kaiser*, Göttingen, 1969, p.174 for the use of Victor etc. in Latin versions of the titles of the emperors.

7) A.Chastagnol, *Un gouverneur Constantinien de Tripolitaine: Laenatius Romulus*, Praeses en 324-326, Latomus XXV, 1966, pp.539ff.

8) The reading νικητ[οῦ is not to be excluded. In our opinion the plural is to be preferred under influence of the formula οἱ τὰ πάντα νικῶντες (οἱ ἀνικητοὶ) βασιλεῖς. This would imply that the Caesars, too, got the epitheton automatically. Cf. also T.D. Barnes, *Three Imperial Edicts*, ZPE 21, 1976, 275ff., esp.pp.279ff.

9) J.D.Thomas (letter d.d.14.12.1976) thinks it almost certain that in line 6 part of the lacuna at the end of the line was filled by τῶν εὐδῶν αὐτοῦ (the same in line 7 of text no.4 in the lacuna at the beginning of the line). We agree with him and think that in view of the length of the lacuna it is probable that an adjective stood between τῶν and εὐδῶν (cf. E. de Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità Romana*, Roma, 1961, II 1, pp.655ff.).

(3) SPP VIII 854

This receipt is dated by its editor to Φαμ(ενώ)θ η θ λνδ(ικτίονος) ἀρ(χη) τ(ῆς) αὐ-
τ(ῆς) [λνδ(ικτίονος)]. Whether the "Constantinopolite" indiction (starting the 1st of
September) or (more probable) the Egyptian indiction (starting at the beginning of the
month Pachon)¹⁰ is involved, under no circumstance is it likely to speak in Phamenoth
(February - March) of the ἀρχή of an indiction. On a photograph kindly provided by
our colleagues from Vienna we clearly read at the end of line 3 Φαμ(ενώ)θ η θ λνδ(ικ-
τίονος) (ὕπερ) τ(ῆς) αὐτ(ῆς) [. A similar expression can be found in SPP III 294,3.

(4) P.L.Bat. XI 13

In lines 12-13 of this papyrus (a loan of wheat) the editor reads: τῆς εὐτυχούσης
ἐπ<ι>ουά(ης) ι S'' καὶ ς S'' β S'' νέας λνδικτίονος.¹¹ Naturally, the reading ἐπ<ι>-
ουά(ης) is very disturbing, and a check of the original revealed that the papyrus really
has: τῆς εὐτυχούσης ἔτους ι S'' καὶ ς S'' β S'' νέας λνδικτίωνος. We think that the
scribe mixed things up and wanted to date the repayment of the loan after both the
regnal years of the reigning emperors and after the indiction. This is a phenomenon
which occurs more often in IVth century documents.¹² The papyrus is dated by the
consulate of Domitius Modestus and Flavius Arintheus = A.D.372. The second indiction
mentioned in line 13 is the coming indiction which runs from A.D.373 till A.D.374.
A.D.372/3 is the 10th regnal year of the emperors Valentinianus I and Valens and the
6th¹³ year of Gratianus Augustus. What the scribe should have written is: τοῦ εἰσ-
ιόντος ἔτους ι S'' καὶ ς S'' τῆς εὐτυχούσης β S'' νέας λνδικτίωνος.

10) A full treatment of the indictions as used in Egypt can be expected in the near
future in a book by R.S.Bagnall and K.A.Worp.

11) Z.M.Packman, Aurelia Tetoueis Revisited, or the Meaning of Price in Contracts
of Sale on Delivery, CdE L, 1975, is, to say the least, very careless when she renders
(p.287) the reading of the papyrus as τοῦ εὐτυχῶς ἐπιόντος - ἔτους νέας λνδικτίωνος.

12) P.Oxy.VII 1041; PSI X 1108; SB IV 7445; BGU III 938. We will deal with these
texts in a forthcoming article.

13) Actually the 7th year. Gratianus becomes Augustus on 24.8.367 A.D. His first
year in Egypt should, therefore, run from 24.8. till 30.8.367 A.D. It seems, however,
that this short period was not calculated as a full year.

(5) PSI I 60 and P.Apoll.Ano 17

In line 5 of the PSI papyrus we read: ὑπατίας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβ(εαστάου) ἡμῶν δεσπ(οτοῦ) ἔτους ἰγ̄ Φαῶφι ἑ̄ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ἰδ̄". According to the editor the date of this papyrus is 10.10.595 A.D. The editor probably took the number of the year instead of the one of the day of the month. The exact date of this papyrus is 8.10.595 A.D. (A. D.595/6 being a leap year). A similar mistake is made by the editor of P.Apoll.Ano 17. In line 7 we read the date of this papyrus: Φαμ(ενῶ)θ̄ ἑ̄ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ε̄ which is 27.2.707 A.D. Taking the 9th of Phamenoth the editor arrives wrongly at 5.3.707 A.D.

(6) P.Oxy.XLIII 3127

In this papyrus published by J.R.Rea there appears (lines 10-11) ὁ διασημότατος καθολικῶς φλάουιος Νεμεσιανός. The papyrus, an undertaking on oath, is dated to A. D.332; in his introduction the editor remarks: "The nomen of the rationalis, Flavius Nemesianus, is new, and this is the first date known from his term of office, hitherto set simply 'before A.D.340'. On his career see PLRE i 621." The editors of PLRE¹⁴⁾ used for their reconstruction of the career of Nemesianus SB I 1005 = IGR I 1220. They overlooked, however, that this text has been republished with important new readings by J. Baillet, *Inscriptions grecques et latines des tombeaux des rois ou Syringes à Thèbes, Le Caire, 1926, no.1293*. Important for the point we want to make are the new readings in line 2: ἀπὸ καθολικῶν παλατίου and in lines 4-5: μάγιστρος καὶ καθολικῶς ὄν τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς¹⁵⁾ διοικήσεως. As there is a question in lines 4-5 of ἡ Αἰγυπτιακῆ διοικήσεως the inscription has to be dated after A.D.380-381.¹⁶⁾ After several other positions (some of them explicitly mentioned, others only generally referred to as ἕτεροι διάφοροι πράξεις [line 3]) Nemesianus becomes rationalis.¹⁷⁾ It is not probable that

14) Cf. for some addenda B.Baldwin, *Some Addenda to the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Historia XXV, 1976, pp.118ff.* and the literature cited in his footnotes 1 and 2.

15) On a photograph which M.L.Bierbrier of the British Museum very kindly took for us we were able to decipher Αἰγυπτιακῆς instead of Αἰγύπτου as Baillet reads.

16) Cf. J.Lallemand, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte de l'avènement de Dioclétien à la création du diocèse (284-382), Bruxelles, 1964, pp.55ff.*

17) Cf. J.Lallemand, *op.cit.*, pp.80ff.; N.Lewis, *A New Document on the Magister Rei Privatae, JJP XV, 1965, pp.157ff.*

the *rationalis* Flavius Nemesianus reached this position at an early age. Aside from any reasonable estimate of life expectancy¹⁸⁾ it is in our opinion excluded that 50 years later the same person is still *rationalis* and we must therefore conclude that the Flavius Nemesianus of the Oxyrhynchus text and the Nemesianus of the inscription cannot be one and the same person.

(7) P. Ant. II 103 and P. Genova 32

According to the editors P. Ant. II 103 starts with ἡμετέρας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβ(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπότης ἔτους β' ἐπαγομένων γ' ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ιδ. In their note on line 1 they state that the 14th indiction mentioned is the equivalent of the year A.D. 475. The εὐσεβέστατος δεσπότης is according to them the Emperor Zeno and they date the papyrus 26th Augustus A.D. 475. One wonders how the text can start with τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβ(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπότης although no emperor can have been mentioned before if the papyrus really starts with the first line of the editors. R.A. Coles checked at our request the papyrus and thinks it not improbable that the text is broken off at the top (letter d.d. 21.2.1977). We are reminded of dating formulae in which both the regnal year and the consulship of an emperor are used (e.g. P. Oxy. XVI 1892). Looking for a second consulship of an emperor which can under these conditions be matched with a 14th indiction we arrive at the year A.D. 580 as the only possibility. This is in accordance with the constatation that dating after both regnal year and the consulate of an emperor is thus far only known from the VIth century and later. We date this papyrus therefore to 26.8.580 A.D. If the formula usually used for dating after Flavius Tiberius Novus Constantinus was used in this papyrus too, about 6 lines will be lost at the top.

The same mistake is made in P. Genova 32 which, according to the editors, starts with ἡμετέρας τοῦ αὐτοῦ γαληνοτάτου | δεσπότης ἡμῶν ἔτους τρίτου] (lines 1-2). No δεσπότης has, however, been mentioned before. On the plate of the papyrus (tavola XX) one can easily see that the papyrus is broken off at the top (in the upper right-hand corner a trace of a letter of the previous line is still visible). As the text is dated by the editors to A.D. 584/5 (year 261 = 230 of the Oxyrhynchite era; line

18) On the Egyptian life expectancy cf. L.C. Youtie, P. London III 1170 and the Strategus Julius Isidorus, ZPE 13, 1974, p. 159, footnote 18; B. Boyaval, Remarques à propos des indications d'âges des étiquettes de momie, ZPE 18, 1975, pp. 49ff. Flavius Nemesianus, however, surely was not an Egyptian!

10) we can compare the beginning of P.Oxy.VI 996. If the same formula was used in P.Genova 32 at least 4 lines are missing at the top of the papyrus and the preserved part will have started with \dagger ἡμετέρας τοῦ αὐ[τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν] | δεσ[πότου (ἔτους) α/β, month, day, indiction].

(8) Leap years

X =
eruitgehaald

Not reckoning with a leap year or wrongly reckoning with a leap year is responsible for a wrong date in the following papyri, the right date of which is given below:

X a) P.ApolI.Ano 2	: 7.1.708 A.D.
X b) P.Cairo Masp.I 67087	: 28.12.543 A.D.
X c) P.Cairo Masp.I 67101	: 29.10.511 A.D.
X d) P.Cairo Masp.I 67106	: 10.10.539 A.D.
X e) P.Cairo Masp.III 67302	: 31.12.555 A.D.
X f) P.Cairo Masp.III 67306	: 11.10.515 A.D.
X g) P.Lond.III 775 (p.279)	: 12.9.567 A.D.
X h) P.Lond.III 1313 (p.256)	: 1.12.507 A.D.
X i) P.Lond.V 1687	: 16.12.523 A.D.
X j) P.Lond.V 1688	: 25.12.523 A.D.
X k) P.Lond.V 1690	: 30.8.527 A.D.
l) PSI VI 703	: 28.1.480 A.D.
X m) SB VI 9085 (inv.no.16050) ¹⁹⁾	: 8.9.579 A.D.
n) P.Thead.31 I 22-24	: 9./12.2.320 A.D.
X o) P.Oxy.XXXIV 2715	: 29.8.386 A.D.
X p) SB VI 9085 (inv.no.16166)	: 11.8.643 A.D.

(9) Various chronological mistakes

i) BGU II 690 A (= SPP VIII 1147; BGU II 690 B = SPP VIII 1148) reads in lines 1-2: --- τρισ(και)δεκάτης ἰ(ν)δ(ικτιώνος) Ἀράβων. In Index III of BGU II an ἰνδ(ικτιών) Ἀράβων is listed from this papyrus. This indiction does not exist. The village Ἀράβων is meant and the index of SPP VIII lists it properly.

ii) CPR V 8 is a lease of a canal bed πρὸς μόνον τὸ ἐνεστὸς ἔτος τέλει τῆς εὐ-

19) By a misprint ι was left out after Θδθ in line 3.

τυχοῦς θ̄̄ ἰνδικ(τίονος) (lines 10-12). In a note on line 11 the editor expresses his uneasiness at the reading τέλει. On the photograph one can see that γενή(ματος) instead of τέλει should be read (cf. e.g. P.Vindob.Salomons 8,3-4).²⁰⁾

iii) In line 11 of P.Harris 78 the date is to be found: (ἔτους) ρθ ρη Παχῶν λ. As the year 129 = 98 of the Oxyrhynchite era runs from the 1st of Thoth 452 up till the 1st of Thoth 453 A.D. this text can only be dated to 25.5.453 A.D. A similar miscalculation occurs in P.Harris 149: (ἔτους) ρκ πθ ιβ̄̄ ἰνδικ(τίονος) Παχῶν κς (line 5) can only be 21.5.444 A.D.

iv) An incorrect date, probably by misprint, occurs in the edition of P.Herm.Rees 69. The correct date of this papyrus is 5.5.410 A.D. The same must have happened in P.Michael.48, the correct date of which is 18.3.572 A.D. In P.Ross.Georg.III 52 a misprint is responsible for the fact that Phaophi 6 is rendered by October 9 instead of (correctly) October 3. A.D.399 in P.Herm.Rees 52 and 53 is a misprint for A.D. 398.²¹⁾

v) In P.Herm.Rees 72,5 Φαμενῶθ η̄̄ ιβ̄̄ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) should be read/restored instead of ἔσημεῖωθ η̄̄ ιβ̄̄ ἰνδ(ικτίονος).

vi) In P.Lond.III 994 (p.259),²²⁾ the editor reads at the end of the line: Μεχεῖρ ι τε̄ λ̄ ι ἰνδικ/. In a note on line 1² he comments on the appearance of τέλει with a month so early as Mecheir. A check of the plate (Greek Papyri in the British Museum, Facsimiles III, plate 83) and of the original in London by R.S.Bagnall convince us that the papyrus has in reality: Μεχεῖρ : λ̄̄ ι ἰνδικ(τίονος).

vii) The 11th regnal year of the emperor Maurice runs from 13.8.592 A.D. up till 13.8.593 A.D.²²⁾ P.Oxy.XVIII 2202 has, therefore, to be dated to 27.3.593 A.D. and the

20) In SB III 6249,8 the comma should be placed after and not before ἀρχῆ. The original publication has in line 2 rightly π(α)ῆρ and in line 7 Παχῶν κς. In SB X 10517 the date should be rendered as "zwischen 683/4 und 782/3". The original editor says so rightly (cf. BIFAO 64, 1966, p.89). Within this period the date should correspond with a 15th indiction.

21) The correct dates of SB I 5941 (= 21.9.510 A.D.); SPP I p.8 text no.3 (= 13.2.455 A.D.); SPP XX 140 (= 18.4.533 A.D.); SPP XX 102 (= 2.5.374 A.D.) and SPP XIV p.4 text no.XI (= CPL 199b and c = R.Seider, Paläographie der lateinischen Papyri I, Stuttgart, 1972, no.58) (= A.D.399) are given in F.Preisigke, Wörterbuch III Abschnitt 3. With the last text there is, however, a problem as there is mention made of the 14th indiction which runs from A.D.400-401.

22) Cf. N.Lewis, On the Chronology of the Emperor Mauricius, AJPh 60, 1939, pp.414ff.

21st of Tybi in the same regnal year in SB I 4496,5 must be 16.1.593 A.D. The first regnal year of the emperor Heraclius runs from 5.10.610 A.D. up till 5.10.611 A.D. Since in P.Oxy.XXIV 2420 the month Phamenoth is mentioned as part of the date, this papyrus should be dated between 25.2. and 26.3.611 A.D. The same reasoning can be applied to P.Ross.Georg.III 51 in which there is a question in the date of the month Phamenoth in the 20th regnal year (A.D.629/30) of the same emperor. This papyrus should, therefore, be dated between 25.2. and 26.3.630 A.D.

viii) In PSI III 191, 192, and 193 there is a question of the 242nd = 211th year of the Oxyrhynchite era which runs from the 1st of Thoth 565 up till the 1st of Thoth 566 A. D. The correct date of PSI III 191 is, therefore, 5.10.565 A.D.; of 192 it is 27.10.565 A.D. and of 193 it is 28.9.565 A.D. The correct date of PSI III 223 is 10.10.579 A.D. because the 256th = 225th year of the Oxyrhynchite era runs from Thoth 1 579 A.D. up till Thoth 1 580 A.D. and the year A.D.579/80 is a leap year. PSI VIII 884 is dated on the 15th of Thoth of the 67th = 36th year of the Oxyrhynchite era which corresponds with 12.9.390 A.D. Phaophi 18 corresponds with October 15 and the correct date of PSI IX 1074 is 15.10.400 A.D.²³⁾

ix) PSI X 1108 is dated to Thoth 5 in the consulship of Eucherius and Syagrius (A. D.381). The editor, however, dates the text to 29.8.381 A.D. on the supposition that the writer intended Θῶθ α (sic!) instead of Θῶθ ε as stands on the papyrus (PSI X, p. XV and BL VI p.184). The editor of P.Oxy.VIII 1116 was more cautious and refused to supplement the day-number in line 2 of the said Oxyrhynchus papyrus which is also a nomination to an office by the same person, albeit 18 years earlier. We see no reason why we should not take the PSI papyrus at face value and date the papyrus to 2.9.381 A.D. Although the nominee had to start his liturgy on the 1st of Thoth, his nomination was proposed only on the 5th of Thoth.

x) In P.Bad.VI 173 there is, according to the editor, a question of the 12th indiction in lines 2 and 7 but in line 4 we read τῆς (αὐτῆς) β̄̄ ἰνδ(ικτίονος). The problem can easily be solved by reading in line 2 ἐ̄̄ν μηνὶ Μεσορῆ τ̄²⁴⁾ β̄̄ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) and in line 7 Φαῶφι ι β̄̄ ἰνδ(ικτίονος).

23) In the text the date is given as 15.9.400 A.D. but in Index IV as 16.9.400 A.D.1

24) The editor (note on line 6) thought it improbable that we should read ἐ̄̄ν μηνὶ Μεσορῆ ι. Cf., however, e.g. SPP III 326,6.

xi) E.H.Kase, *A Papyrus Roll in the Princeton Collection*, Princeton 1933, has shown that the 6th consulate of Licinius and the 2nd consulate of Licinius Caesar fell in A.D.321. The correct date of SPP XX 79 is therefore A.D.321. The same applies to P.Got.6 and SB VI 9544.²⁵⁾ The correct date of these two papyri is respectively: 10.3.321 A.D. and 24.8.321 A.D.

xii) The consulate of Flavius Constantius²⁶⁾ and Constans in SPP XX 90 is that of the private persons who held that office in A.D.414, not of the emperors Constantinus (3rd time) and Constans (2nd time) in A.D.342, as the editor dates it. The date to A. D.414 is confirmed by the mention in lines 11/12 of μῆν Ἐπειφ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος for only the 14th indiction running from A.D.415 - A.D.416 corresponds with the year after a consulate of Constantius and Constans. The correct date of this papyrus is 15.6.415 A.D.

xiii) A check of the original convinced us that we should read in line 2 of SPP XX 121 Ἐπειφ ιβ instead of Ἐπειφ ιγ. The date of this papyrus is 6.7.439 A.D. The writer of this papyrus made a mistake when he wrote in line 2 ζ ἰνδικ(τίονος). He should have written η ἰνδικ(τίονος) (cf. lines 27, 28 and 45).

xiv) A more probable supplement in line 8 of SPP XX 126 is δεκάτης instead of ἐνάτης.

xv) The date of SPP XX 131 is corrected in P.Strassb.470, but because A.D.518/9 is no leap year the correct date of this papyrus is 3.2.518 A.D.

xvi) The correct date of SPP III 338 is 9.12.716 A.D.; of P.Strassb.484: 6.6.548 A.D. and of SB VI 9596: 29.7.579 A.D.²⁷⁾

xvii) Flavius Orestes and Flavius Lampadius were consuls in A.D.530. In SPP XX 139,1 is a question of Πασῖ[νι] κς τέλει θ ἰνδικτίονος). The 9th indiction in this case runs from A.D.530-531. As we are at the end of the indiction we must be in the year A.D.531. In line 1 we should, therefore, supplement [μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν κτλ.

25) For this text see P.J.Sijpesteijn - K.A.Worp, *Lesefrüchte*, ZPE 23, 1977, pp. 194f.

26) As our Vienna colleagues confirm the reading Κωνσταντίνου at the end of line 1 is correct. The absence of τῶν δεσποτῶν and the presence of τῶν λαμπροτάτων convince us, however, that the scribe intended to write Κωνσταντίου.

27) Some minor chronological mistakes (mostly misprints) in Vienna texts might be given here as well: read in SPP III 303,6 κη instead of κλ; in SB VI 9283,2 ις instead of ιτ (the correct date of this papyrus is 11.5.555 A.D.).

The same has to be done in SB X 10524 dated by its editor to 8.6.531 (?). In the lacuna at the beginning of line 2 he supplements, however, ὑπατείας Φλαουίων Ὀρέστου καὶ Λαμπαδίου who are consuls in A.D.530. The 10th indiction mentioned in line 3 runs from A.D.531-532. If we supplement in the lacuna at the beginning of line 2 μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν κτλ. we correctly arrive at 8.6.531 A.D.²⁸⁾

xviii) SB III 6632 has in last instance been published by E. Bernand, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine*, Paris 1969, no. 149; but the end of the inscription has been incorrectly rendered by Bernand. Previous editors gave the end of the inscription as ἔτους Διοκλητιανοῦ ὠθ̄ Με() ἰδ̄ ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ἰη.²⁹⁾ The 59th year of the Diocletian era (= A.D.342/3), however, does not correspond to a 18th indiction! On a photograph which M.L. Bierbrier of the British Museum very kindly took for us we read: Μεχ(εἰρ) ἰδ̄ | ΠΤῸβι ἦ. The 2nd date seems to be by another hand and probably was added at a later point by another visitor.

xix) The grave monument published as SB IV 7318 is dated ἔτους Διοκλητιανοῦ τῖδ̄ = A.D.597/8. In lines 8-9 we read: μηνὶ : Θῶθ | κα ἰνδ(ικτίονος). It is curious, though not unique, that no number of the indiction is given. A first indiction runs from A.D.597-598 and we propose to divide as follows: Θῶθ | κα ἰνδ(ικτίονος) = 17.9.597 A.D.³⁰⁾

xx) SB VIII 9754 is dated to 4.6.647 A.D. In line 4 we read: Παῦ[νι] δεκάτῃ δ' ἰν(δικτίονος). The 4th indiction in question runs from A.D.645 till A.D.646. The correct date of this papyrus is therefore 4.6.645 A.D. (reckoning with the Pachon indiction), one year later when a "Constantinopolite" indiction (cf. note 10) is used.

xxi) The Christian inscription published as SB VIII 9877 was dated by the first editor to 1.10.621 A.D. He arrived at this date by a very curious way of reasoning. Its second editor revised the date formula in lines 10-12 and reads: ἐν μηνὶ Φαῶφι τῆς δ' ἰν-δικτί(ονος). He rightly refrained from giving an exact date for this inscription. The

28) In P.Got. 5 and 39; P.Rein. II 92 and in P.Oslo II 35 there is a question of μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν κτλ. All four texts should be dated 1 year later. When one is willing to accept the reasoning in the introduction of P.Oxy. XVI 1984 one must either date to A.D.538 or change the name of the consul to Flavius (Anicius) Maximus.

29) This reading has already been challenged by S.P. Goodrich, *The Indiction Cycle*, unpublished Princeton dissertation, 1937, pp. 19f. Most of his arguments are, however, false and his proposed reading ENATH instead of ἰνδ() ἰη has to be rejected.

30) Another, less attractive possibility is to assume haplography and to write Θῶθ κα <α> ἰνδ(ικτίονος) = 18.9.597 A.D.

285 30
1978, p. 149

SB prints the correct, revised version of the text but took over the wrong date of the first editor.³¹⁾ We can go not further than dating this stone to the Byzantine period.

xxii) A check of the papyrus convinced us that it is possible to read in line 9 of SB X 10285 (= P.L.Bat.XVII 10) [τῆς παρ]ούσης πρώτης ἰνδ(ικτίονος).

xxiii) The editor of SB XII 10766 reads lines 2-4 as follows: ἐπλήρωσας τὸν φόρον τοῦ ὑπὸ σε ἀρτοκοπίου τῆς [ἐπινεμήσεως] ἀπὸ Ἐπειφ τρίτης τρεισκαίδεκάτης³²⁾ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) | ἕως Ἐπειφ δευτέρης τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης ἰνδ(ικτίονος) which she translates with: "Tu as payé entièrement le loyer de la boulangerie qui est dans la gestion, pour l'année qui va du 3 Epeiph de la treizième indiction au 2 Epeiph de la quatorzième indiction." She herewith introduces an unattested meaning "year" for the word ἐπινεμήσις which she supplements in the lacuna in line 3. ἐπινεμήσις is (in the papyri) well attested with the meaning "indiction". The person who gives the receipt is an ἐπίσκοπος. If we restore e.g. [ἐκκλησίας] instead of [ἐπινεμήσεως] there is no problem at all. Whatever one has to restore, it certainly is not [ἐπινεμήσεως].

xxiv) In the lacuna at the end of line 2 of BGU II 673 one can without hesitation supplement: τῆς δ ἰνδ(ικτίονος)].

xxv) In P.Erl.67 we read in line 3 as part of the date: Θᾶθ ἰθ ἀρχ(ῆ) τῆς εὐτυχ(οῦς) δεκάτης ἰνδ(ικτίονος). The 10th indiction in question runs from A.D.591 - A.D.592. The 19th of Thoth in this papyrus is the 17th of September (A.D.591/2 being a leap year) and the date of this papyrus is 17.9.591 A.D. The remarks of the editor in his note on lines 2ff. can be disregarded. In SB I 4484,3-5 we read: Φλ(αουίου) Μαυρικίου Τιβερίου τοῦ αἰων(ίου) | Αὐγούστ(ου) ἕτους ι Φαῶφι κζ [ἀ]ρχ(ῆ) | δεκάτης ἰνδ(ικτίονος). The 10th indiction is the same one as in the previous papyrus and the correct date of the SB text is 25.10.591 A.D.

xxvi) Thanks to photographs sent by our colleague R.Pintaudi we are able to date PSI III 201 and PSI VII 813 exactly. In line 4 of the latter papyrus we read (ἕτους)

31) Many are the mistakes made with the curve which in many cases follows a numeral (cf. H.C.Youtie, *The Textual Criticism of Documentary Papyri. Prolegomena*², BICS 33, 1974, note 20 on p.20). The editors of P.Warren 7 even go so far as to comment on δεκάτης, ι L, ἰνδικ(τίονος) (line 8). The papyrus has, however, nothing more than δεκάτης ι S ἰνδικ(τίονος) (cf. P.Mich.XII 649,2). In PSI X 1108,12 "il simbolo L (= ἕτους) é ripetuto solo dopo la prima cifra" according to the editor. We have, however, another case of a "curve" marking a numeral.

32) The papyrus has in reality τρεισκαίδεκάτης.

νς κε". We are dealing with the Oxyrhynchite era (the origin of this papyrus is therefore Oxyrhynchus). The exact date of this papyrus is 15.6.380 A.D.³³⁾ In PSI III 201,5 we read: (ἔτους) καστ' ια ζ' γ' σ'. These years refer to the regnal years of Constantine I Augustus, Constantine II Caesar and Constantius Caesar.³⁴⁾ The exact date of this papyrus is 7.3.327 A.D. In line 2 of the same papyrus we read: Ἐρμαίου ἀπο στρατηγῶ[ν].³⁵⁾ Are we dealing with the same person who in A.D.323 was strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome?³⁶⁾

xxvii) In P.Genova 30,2 one expects the month and the day before the mention of the indiction. On the photograph we read ἐπαγομῆ(ων) ς instead of δευτέρου ἔτους. The document has to be dated to 29.8.543 A.D. This implies that line 2 began further to the right than the other lines.³⁷⁾

xxviii) In P.Erlangen 78,1 one should restore ἑπατείας Φλ(αουίων) Κλημῆεντινου κτλ. and in SB I 4821,1 Φλ(αουίων) ῥουστικοῦ κτλ. In P.Grenf. I 57 there will be place enough in the lacuna at the beginning of line 1 to supplement also one of the usual epitheta (λαμπρότατος, ἐνδοξότατος, πανεύφημος) of Flavius Basilius. As Flavius Basilius mostly has only one epitheton it is better to leave λαμπρότατου καὶ out in SB VI 9292,1. The resulting supplement fits the space available in the lacuna better. The name of the first consul in P.Wisc. I 10 should be read as Πουσαίου.³⁸⁾

xxix) In SB VI 9592 the word-order in lines 2-3: (ἔτους) β' Παρ(μοῦθι) [μηνός . .] ἀρχῆ ἑ [ν(δικτιόνοος)] is surprising. On a photograph kindly provided by our Vienna

33) Above line 1 in the middle of the papyrus a cross is still visible.

34) Cf. A.Chastagnol, *La datation par années regnales égyptiennes à l'époque constantiniennne*, in: *Aiōn. Le temps chez les Romains*, Paris 1976, pp.221-238.

35) Cf. N.Lewis, *Two Terminological Novelties*, *AJPh* 81, 1960, pp.186f.

36) Cf. H.Henne, *Liste des stratèges des nomes égyptiennes*, Le Caire, 1935, p.34.

37) Some minor mistakes might be corrected at the same time: the seller must be mentioned already in line 3 because at the end of this line μητρὸς can be read; the most probable supplement in line 4 is: ἐξῆς / βραδέως ὑπογράφων (or the like). The note of the editors on this line can be disregarded; the reading of line 6 as it stands is wrong but we cannot offer a solution; in line 11 the papyrus has τεσέρων.

38) We correct at the same time some other mistakes in P.Wisc. I 10: the beginning of line 5 should be read Ματθ[αίου] μολνάζοντ[ι] (cf. ZPE 1, 1967, p.192); in line 6 the papyrus has νομοῦ instead of νομοῦ and in line 14 γιγνομένης instead of γιγνομένης; in line 10 read: ἕπερ ἀκίνδυνον ὄν κτλ.; in line 18: ἔσχον instead of ἔσχη(κα); in line 20: Ἀπφούτος ἀξιωθείς (cf. ZPE 1, 1967, 192 and BASP 13, 1976, p.82).

colleagues we supplement / read in lines 2-3 as follows: τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου (καὶ) Αὐτοκρ(άτορος) [ἔτους . month, day] ἀρχῆ ἢ ἐν ἰνδικτίονος) (cf. e.g. SPP XX 217, 1-2).

xxx) In P.Giss.121, the first line is entirely restored; according to the editor it contained ὑπ(ατείας) in this unexpectedly abbreviated form. The papyrus is dated to Φαμενώθ καὶ ἰνδικτίονος ἰγ (line 5). The 13th indiction in question runs from Pachon 534 A.D. till Pachon 535 A.D. and the 21st Phamenoth is March 17, 535 A.D. This implies that we are in the year after the 4th consulate of Justinian and that one line more has been lost at the top of the papyrus: [† μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν] | [τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν] κτλ. The remarks concerning this papyrus in the introduction to P.Strasb.472 can be disregarded.

xxxi) Of P.Strasb.247 only the right-hand part is preserved, and the dating formula had to be restored by the editor. According to him we are in the 25th regnal year of Justinian, in the 10th post-consulate of Basiliius, in the month Phamenoth and in the 15th indiction. If, however, we accept the restoration in line 2 of [πέμπτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ] then we cannot be in the 15th indiction but we have to restore in lines 3 and 9 τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος (cf. BL V, p.140). If the post-consulate of Basiliius was counted according to the so-called *modus victorianus*³⁹⁾ we should restore in the lacuna at the beginning of line 2 τετάρτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ and the indiction in lines 3 and 9 would be the 13th. In the last case the papyrus should be dated to March 550 A.D. In P.Lond.III 1006 (p.261) the counting of Basiliius' post-consulate must have been according to the *modus victorianus* as may be seen from the combination of a 4th indiction and the 15th post-consulate of Basiliius. The correct date of this papyrus is therefore 31.10.555 A.D. (cf. BL III, p.95). The same method of counting is to be found in P.Cairo Masp.I 67108; P.Strasb.484; P.Cairo Masp.I 67093 II; P.Cairo Masp.III 67332; P.Herm.Rees 65.

xxxii) The correct date of PSI VII 768 is July 23, 465 A.D. The date of PSI III 242 falls between September - November 574⁵ A.D. and that of P.Cairo Masp.I 67096 between May - November 573 A.D. (cf. BL IV, p.13). The correct date of P.Grenf.III 85 is June 23¹, 537⁶ A.D.

39) Cf. V.Grümel, *Traité d'Etudes Byzantines I: La Chronologie*, Paris, 1958, p. 354. E.Stein, *Post-Consulat et ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΙΑ*, *Mélanges Bidez II*, Bruxelles 1934, p.874.

28E 30,
1978, p.149
Chron. Syst.

xxxiii) In line 3 of P. Berlin Zilliacus 7 we read ὑπατίας τῆς αὐτῶν γαληνότητος τὸ η. In view of other documents from Oxyrhynchus which have the same formula (P. Oxy. I 134 [A.D. 569]; P. Varsov. 30 [A.D. 571]; cf. CdE 1973, pp. 140ff.; P. Oxy. I 126 [A.D. 572]; P. Oxy. XVI 1992 [A.D. 572]; P. Oxy. XVI 1894 [A.D. 573]) we expect τὸ η instead of τὸ η. The correct date of this papyrus is August 11, 574 A.D. (wrongly the editor in his note on line 3). The evidence of the papyri proves that E. Stein went astray in his note 4 on page 874 of his marvellous article "Post-consulat et ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΙΑ (Mél. Bidez II, Bruxelles 1934).

xxxiv) In line 2 of P. Princ. III 154 the editors read Θῶθ ι ἰνδ(ικτίονος). The introduction to the papyrus seems to indicate that the iota was taken both as month date and as indiction number. In reality the papyrus has Θῶθ ι ἰνδ(ικτίονος)⁴⁰ ι. The editors are right when they state that "either the post-consular date or the year of the indiction is wrong." We do not, however, subscribe to their conclusion "where there is a conflict between the two systems of dating, the indiction is usually wrong". It is our experience that in such cases on the contrary the indiction number is mostly right.

xxxv) In P. Genova 22,8 a date after only two emperors is given according to the editors. On tavola XIV one can see that the papyrus has in fact ἔτους μ δ κβ σ' ιγ'. The papyrus, therefore, also dates after A.D. 306/7 = the year in which Constantine I acceded to the throne.

xxxvi) In P. Abinn. 80 (= SB VI 9697) the editors read line 2 as follows: [χ]εἰρογράφων τῆ[ς] (αὐτῆς) νέας ἰνδ(ικτίονος). Cl. Wehrli has kindly examined the original for us and on the basis of his description of what is to be seen we consider the correct reading to be: τῆ[ς].S/ νέας ἰνδ(ικτίονος). The numeral is not readable, but what remains is certainly the sinusoidal curve plus stroke normally used to mark the numeral of an indiction.

xxxvii) BGU XII 2205 is dated in a month the name of which is lost, at the ἀρχῆ of the 9th indiction. The text was dated by a (now lost) regnal year of Mauricius, restored as ἐνάτου by the editor. Since the regnal years of Mauricius ran from 13 August to 12 August (8 = A.D. 589/90, 9 = A.D. 590/91), it is likely that in the period of Pachon to Mesore we are dealing with the eighth year of Mauricius, not the ninth, since most examples of ἀρχῆ come from the period before 12 August. The restoration ὀγδόου is

40) The printed edition omits the diaeresis over the iota of ἰνδ() in this line and in line 4: Ἡραΐδος. In line 7 ἐσχημέ[ναι] has been written above the line.

therefore more likely. Something in connection with the regnal years of Mauricius is also wrong in P.Strasb.190. If the reading Μεσορῆ [τ]ρι[ακ]ῆς in line 5 were right not the 10th but the 11th regnal year of Mauricius should have been mentioned in line 4. The papyrus is at the beginning of line 5 very abraded as we could establish on a photograph kindly provided by J.Schwartz. A reading [τ]ρι[τη] τῆς, however, does not seem excluded to us. In lines 13/14 we read: τῆς παρούσης ἑνδεκάτης ἰνδικτίωνος).⁴¹⁾

xxxviii) BGU XII 2148 is dated by the consuls of A.D.466, but the month is lost. The text is a lease which starts with the crops of the 5th new indiction (A.D.466/7). The editor takes νέας (line 9) to indicate that the indiction had started already and recently, and that the date is therefore early summer. But this is not possible, as the crop of the 5th indiction would then be already harvested or about to be harvested, whereas leases are concluded in sufficient time to allow sowing. Instead, we must assume a date very early in the year, when the crop might still be planted.

xxxix) BGU III 795 is quoted by Preisigke (WB III p.82) as evidence for an 18th indiction. This papyrus, however, contains a date to Pharmuthi 18 of the 5th indiction; no 18th indiction.

xl) In lines 17-18 of P.Flor.I 30 read: τῆς εὐτυχοῦς {ιν} ζ S ν[έ]ας ἰνδικτίωνος). The text of this papyrus needs correction elsewhere, as well, but that must wait for another occasion. We are indebted to Dr. R.Pintaudi for a photograph.

xli) From a photograph provided by Dr. R.Pintaudi we read lines 2-8 of P.Flor.I 103 as follows:

- [.] .. ἀπὸ κώμη[ς] - - - ἐφέσ-]
 τιον ἔχοντες ἐ[ν] - - -]
 4 βουλόμε<θα> ἐκουσ[ίως καὶ αὐθαιρέτως μισθώ-]
 σασθαι παρὰ σοῦ ἐ[ίς] - -ετῆ χρόνον ἀπὸ τοῦ]
 παρελθόντος μ[ην]ός - - - τῆς τετάρτης]
 ἦτοι ὀκτωκαιδεκάτης ἰνδικτίωνος τὰς]
 8 ὑπαρχούσας σοι ο. [

6 παρελθόντος: 2nd and / or 3rd letter corrected

In line 6, the equation has been made on the assumption that this text is to be connected with the change from the indiction cycle of A.D.312 - 327 to that of A.D.

41) It seems more probable to us that μαχαίρᾱ in line 9 is not the father of the mother of the lessee but that Aurelius Theodosius' occupation was that of a cutler.

327 - 342,⁴²⁾ when such equations are relatively common. If this assumption is incorrect, the number to be restored would be τρίτης. On the former assumption, the date would be A.D.330/1, on the latter, A.D.344/5.

xlii) In P. Ross. Georg. III 40,3 only Pachon or Pauni can come into consideration as months starting Πα[at the ἀρχῆ of the 7th indiction. The date will be in A.D.588 (indiction 7 = A.D.588/9), and the regnal year to be restored in line 2 is therefore 6.

xliii) SB V 8029 (S.G. Kapsomenos, ByzZ 37, 1937, 15ff.) is dated by the editor to 6.viii.538 A.D. In fact, this Antinoopolite text is dated by the post-consulate of Belisarius and by indiction 1. The post-consulate of Belisarius is still known in the east in April/May 538 A.D. (SB III 7201, 1; after that date we find dating to the consulate of Flavius Johannes); and indiction 1 (A.D.537/8), Mesore 13, would fall in A.D.537. The evidence thus coincides to demonstrate a date of 6.viii.537 A.D.

xliv) In SPP II, p.34, Wessely reads in lines 16-17 γενήματος ἰς ἦτοι β' νέας ἰνδικτι(ῶνος), which he used as evidence of a 14-year cycle still being used in A.D. 343, the date of the document. Worp has reread the original in Vienna, and the papyrus actually reads ἰς, 17th, rather than ἰς, 16th. Wessely apparently mistook the tail of the rho in ἡμέτερον in the preceding line 15 for the iota of the numeral.

xlvi) If the restoration concerning P. Vindob. Salomons 8 proposed on p.203 is correct, and the restoration of an indiction in the text is also correct, the number of this indiction should be restored as ια (A.D.322/3), since the month in which the payment falls, Παῦνι, 323 A.D., was certainly reckoned in the 11th, not the 12th, indiction, for the indiction did not at this time start until Thoth.⁴³⁾

xlvii) The repetition of [ἰδ] προσηροῦμεν in lines 17/18 of P. Oxy. I 52 by [προσηροῦμεν] ὡς πρόκ(ε)ιται is disturbing and the last two letters of this line (με[) are enigmatic. As other reports of public physicians tend to have a dating-formula at their end we propose to restore line 19 of P. Oxy. I 52 as follows: ἑξαετίας τῆς προκ(ε)ιμένης Με[σορῆ] . (.)] or Με[χεῖρ] . (.)].

xlviii) In line 8 of SB VI 9455 the editor reads on the papyrus: ἐν μηνὶ Φαρμουθι ἰνδικτιῶνος εὐτυχοῦς δεκάτης]. The position of εὐτυχοῦς between ἰνδικτιῶνος and

42) Cf. the forth-coming book by R.S. Bagnall and K.A. Worp on the chronological systems of the Byzantine papyri (cf. footnote 10).

43) Cf. E.H. Kase, A Papyrusroll in the Princeton Collection, Baltimore, 1933, pp. 25-31.

the indiction number is surprising. H.Harrauer who examined the original at our request confirms our idea that the papyrus in reality has ἰνδικτιόνης ἐνάτης.⁴⁴⁾

xlviii) P.Amh.II 138 is a declaration to the strategos by a pilot of a ship carrying charcoal to Alexandria. The date (lines 20-22) is given by the consuls of 326. The month and day are lost, but the editors restored them as Tybi 14. Their basis for this was the date added at the start of the papyrus by a second hand, "21st year, Tybi 14". Tybi 14 in the 21st year, however, fell in 9.1.327 A.D. Space does not permit the restoration of μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν in line 20. It is therefore more reasonable to suppose that the document was written late in 326, with the docket placed early in the next year, than to think that the scribe has by error written consulate for post-consulate. The date in line 22 may therefore be anything up to Tybi 5 (31.12.), and as probably no long time elapsed before the docket was added, the date falls probably in the last week or two of 326.

xlix) On the analogy of the usual formula we expect that the first line of SB I 4796 runs as follows: [† βασιλεί]ας καὶ [ῶ]πατείας.

l) P.Jand.Inv.Nr.290 published by us in *Aegyptus* 56, 1976, p.27 can be exactly dated to March 3, 489 A.D. because we have to supplement line 1 as follows: [μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ(αουίου) Λογγίνου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου κτλ. In the Vth century A.D. to which the handwriting points a 12th indiction can only correspond to the post-consulate of Flavius Longinus.⁴⁵⁾

li) According to the editors the scribe of P.Colt.Ness.15 made an error in the date.

44) Some minor corrections might be made at the same time: line 2]υ καὶ Ὀλυμπίου; line 3 τῶν γεννεωτάτων; Λεοντω[κλιβαναρίων; line 5 πρότης; line 6 B <το>; line 9 ἐρῶσθαι; line 10: there is no chrismon in front of Φλ(αουίος); line 11 δε]ιωθεῖς.

45) Most of the corrections proposed in section 9 of this article were made in the course of the work of preparing a book on the chronological systems of the Byzantine papyri, by R.S.Bagnall and K.A.Worp (cf. footnotes 10 and 42), which it is hoped will appear in 1978. A number of the corrections are therefore to be credited to Bagnall, who was unable because of the press of other work to take part in the composition of this article. We also wish to thank the following colleagues who were so kind as to check our proposals against the originals: R.A.Coles (Oxford); M.Fackelmann (Vienna), A.E.Hanson (Princeton), H.Harrauer (Vienna), R.Pintaudi (Florence), J.Schwartz (Strasbourg), J.D.Thomas (Durham), and Cl.Wehrli (Geneva). To some of them we are also indebted for photographs. U.Hagedorn (Cologne) made the "Verzeichnis der erwähnten Urkunden."

If, however, we supplement in the lacuna at the beginning of line 1 [μετὰ τὴν ὑπατεῖαν κτλ. there is no reason to blame the scribe because in that case he did not make an error in the date. The speculations of the editors (note on line 1) about the space taken by the initial upsilon enclosing a cross and by the abbreviation of Φλαουῶν can be disregarded.

ii) The correct date of P.Oxy.XLIV 3204 is 2.1.588 A.D.

iii) SB VI 8986 has to be dated after 26.1.641 A.D. If we could be certain that the ascension to the throne of Heraclius Novus Constantinus (on 11.2.641 A.D.) was known in Egypt the same day (a highly improbable supposition) the text could be dated somewhere between 26.1. and 10.2.641 A.D.

iv) The mention in line 23 of SB I 4504 of τῆς αὐν [θ(εῶ)] εἰσιούσης β' [ἐνδ(ικτίονος)] excludes the supplement ἐνδ(ικτίονος) δευτέρας] in line 6. We would expect ἐνδ(ικτίονος) πρώτης], but if this is what the papyrus had the date given by regnal year (18.11.613 A.D.) cannot be reconciled with that of the indiction (18.11.612 A.D.).

lv) CPL 230 (= P.Vindob.Lat.Inv.Nr.9) reads, according to the editor, as follows: Dom(inis) n(ostris) Arcadio III et Honorio III perp(etuis) Aug(ustis) cos(ulibus). According to the fasti, however, the 3rd consulate of Honorius corresponds to the 4th consulship of Arcadius. M.Fackelmann reexamined the papyrus at our request and after restoration one can now read on the papyrus the expected Arcadio IIII.

Amsterdam

P.J.Sijpesteijn - K.A.Worp

VERZEICHNIS DER IM VORSTEHENDEN AUFSATZ ERWÄHNTEN URKUNDEN

(Berichtigte Urkunden sind mit + markiert)

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--|------------------------------|-------------|--|
| + P. Abinn. 80 | (9) xxxvi | | + P. Got. 6 | (9) xi | |
| + P. Amh. II 138 | (9) xlviii | | + P. Got. 39 | n. 28 | |
| + P. Ant. II 103 | (7) | | + P. Grenf. I 57 | (9) xxxviii | |
| + P. Apoll. Ano 2 | (8) | | [+ P. Grenf. II 85 | (9) xxxii] | |
| + P. Apoll. Ano 17 | (5) | | | | |
| | | | + P. Harris 78 | (9) iii | |
| + P. Bad. VI 173 | (9) x | | + P. Harris 149 | (9) iii | |
| + Baillet, Inscriptions ---, 1293 | (6) | | + P. Herm. Rees 52 | (9) iv | |
| + P. Berl. Zill. 7 | (9) xxxiii | | + P. Herm. Rees 53 | (9) iv | |
| + BGU II 586 | (1) | | P. Herm. Rees 65 | (9) xxxi | |
| + BGU II 673 | (9) xxiv | | + P. Herm. Rees 69 | (9) iv | |
| BGU II 690 | (9) i | | + P. Herm. Rees 72 | (9) v | |
| BGU III 795 | (9) xxxix | | | | |
| BGU III 938 | n. 12 | | + P. land. Inv. Nr. 290 | (9) I | |
| + BGU XII 2148 | (9) xxxviii | | | | |
| + BGU XII 2205 | (9) xxxvii | | + P. Lond. III 1313 (p. 256) | (8) | |
| | | | + P. Lond. III 994 (p. 259) | (9) vi | |
| + P. Cairo Inv. No. 10517 | (2) | | + P. Lond. III 1006 (p. 261) | (9) xxxi | |
| P. Cairo Isid. 41 | n. 3 | | + P. Lond. III 775 (p. 279) | (8) | |
| + P. Cair. Masp. I 087 | (8) | | + P. Lond. V 1687 | (8) | |
| P. Cair. Masp. I 093 II | (9) xxxi | | + P. Lond. V 1688 | (8) | |
| + P. Cair. Masp. I 096 | (9) xxxii | | + P. Lond. V 1690 | (8) | |
| + P. Cair. Masp. I 101 | (8) | | P. Lugd. Bat. II 5 | n. 3 | |
| + P. Cair. Masp. I 106 | (8) | | + P. Lugd. Bat. XI 13 | (4) | |
| P. Cair. Masp. I 108 | (9) xxxi | | + P. Lugd. Bat. XVII 10 | (9) xxii | |
| + P. Cair. Masp. III 302 | (8) | | | | |
| + P. Cair. Masp. III 306 | (8) | | + P. Michael 48 | (9) iv | |
| P. Cair. Masp. III 332 | (9) xxxi | | P. Mich. XII 649 | n. 31 | |
| + P. Colt. Ness. 15 | (9) li | | | | |
| + CPL 199 b, c | n. 21 | | + P. Oslo II 35 | n. 28 | |
| + CPL 230 | (9) lv | | + P. Oxy. I 52 | (9) xlvi | |
| + CPR V 8 | (9) ii | | P. Oxy. I 126 | (9) xxxiii | |
| | | | P. Oxy. I 134 | (9) xxxiii | |
| + P. Erl. 67 | (9) xxv | | P. Oxy. VI 889 | n. 3 (2) | |
| + P. Erl. 78 | (9) xxviii | | + P. Oxy. VI 891 | n. 3 | |
| | | | P. Oxy. VI 996 | (7) | |
| + P. Flor. I 30 | (9) xl | | P. Oxy. VII 1041 | n. 12 | |
| + P. Flor. I 103 | (9) xli | | P. Oxy. XVI 1892 | (7) | |
| | | | P. Oxy. XVI 1894 | (9) xxxiii | |
| + P. Genova 22 | (9) xxxv | | + P. Oxy. XVI 1984 | n. 28 | |
| + P. Genova 30 | (9) xxvii | | P. Oxy. XVI 1992 | (9) xxxiii | |
| + P. Genova 32 | (7) | | + P. Oxy. XVIII 2202 | (9) vii | |
| + P. Giss. 121 | (9) xxx | | + P. Oxy. XXIV 2420 | (9) vii | |
| [+ P. Got. 5 | n. 28] | | + P. Oxy. XXXIV 2715 | (8) | |

- P. Oxy. XLIII 3127 (6)
 + P. Oxy. XLIV 3204 (9) lii
 P. Oxy. XLVI 3297 n.3
- P. Panop. Beatty 2 n.3
 + P. Princ. III 154 (9) xxxiv
- + P. Rein. II 92 n.28
 + P. Ross. Georg. III 40 (9) xlii
 + P. Ross. Georg. III 51 (9) vii
 + P. Ross. Georg. III 52 (9) iv
- + SB I 1005 (6)
 + SB I 4484 (9) xxxv
 + SB I 4496 (9) vii
 + SB I 4504 (9) liv
 + SB I 4796 (9) xlix
 + SB I 4821 (9) xxviii
 + SB I 5941 n.21
 + SB III 6249 n.20
 + SB III 6632 (9) xviii
 SB III 7201 (9) xliii
 + SB IV 7318 (9) xix
 SB IV 7445 n.12
 + SB V 8029 (9) xliiii
 + SB VI 8986 (9) liii
 + SB VI 9085 (8) m/p
 + SB VI 9283 n.27
 + SB VI 9292 (9) xxviii
 + SB VI 9455 (9) xlvii
 + SB VI 9544 (9) xi
 + SB VI 9592 (9) xxix
 + SB VI 9596 (9) xvi
 + SB VI 9697 (9) xxxvi
 + SB VIII 9754 (9) xx
 + SB VIII 9877 (9) xxi
 + SB X 10285 (9) xxii
 + SB X 10517 n.20
 + SB X 10524 (9) xvii
 + SB XII 10766 (9) xxiii
- + PSI I 60 (5)
 + PSI III 191 (9) viii
 + PSI III 192 (9) viii
- + PSI III 193 (9) viii
 + PSI III 201 (9) xxvi
 + PSI III 223 (9) viii
 + PSI III 242 (9) xxxii
 + PSI VI 703 (8)
 + PSI VII 768 (9) xxxii
 + PSI VII 813 (9) xxxi
 + PSI VIII 884 (9) viii
 + PSI IX 1074 (9) viii
 + PSI X 1108 (9) ix n.12 n.31
 + P. Strasb. 190 (9) xxxvii
 + P. Strasb. 247 (9) xxxi
 P. Strasb. 470 (9) xv
 P. Strasb. 472 (9) xxx
 + P. Strasb. 484 (9) xvi xxxi
 + SPP I p.8 text no.3 n.21
 + SPP II p.34 (9) xliv
 SPP III 294 (3)
 + SPP III 303 n.27
 SPP III 326 n.24
 + SPP III 338 (9) xvi
 + SPP VIII 854 (3)
 + SPP XIV p.4 text.no.xi n.21
 + SPP XX 79 (9) xi
 + SPP XX 90 (9) xii
 + SPP XX 102 n.21
 + SPP XX 121 (9) xiii
 + SPP XX 126 (9) xiv
 + SPP XX 131 (9) xv
 + SPP XX 139 (9) xvii
 + SPP XX 140 n.21
 + SPP XX 217 (9) xxix
- + P. Theod. 31 (8)
- + P. Varsov. 30 (9) xxxiii
 P. Vindob. gr. Inv. no. 15014 n.4
 P. Vindob. gr. Inv. no. 15494 A n.4
 + P. Vindob. Salom. 8 (9) ii xlv
- + P. Warren 7 n.31
 + P. Wisc. I 10 (9) xxviii