

Worp, Klaas A.

Regnal formulas of the emperor Heraclius

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 23, 217-232

1993

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Klaas A. Worp

REGNAL FORMULAS OF THE EMPEROR HERACLIUS

*To the memory of Zbigniew Borkowski
who took a special interest in the reign
of the emperor Heraclius*

This contribution¹ deals with imperial titulature under the emperor Heraclius (A.D. 610-641) as reflected in the papyri from Byzantine Egypt. In itself it cannot claim much originality as the subject was treated already 80 years ago by H. I. BELL, *A Dating Clause under Heraclius*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift" 22 (1913) 395-405. Moreover, a more recent survey of the dating formulas occurring in the papyri from the period under review was presented already in 1979 by Roger S. BAGNALL and myself in *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt* (hence *RFBE*; = *BASP* supplement 2), pp. 68-73.

Nevertheless it will appear, I hope, that despite these earlier studies the subject of Heraclius' dating clauses is not yet exhausted, if only because since 1979 a number of new documents providing us with new insights have been published. As a consequence, a re-study of some already well-known documents with fragmentarily preserved dating formulas has allowed me to come up with some suggestions for their restoration and, moreover, to date there has been no special discussion of a special class of documents showing a dating formula with (a) the regnal year of Heraclius, (b) the year of his consulate and then (c) the regnal year of his son, Heraclius Novus Constantinus. I shall begin with a full presentation of the evidence available to date. The various formulas are those already used in *RFBE* (texts with comments made in that study will be marked below with an *; for these the reader is referred to *RFBE*). The period of the occupation of Egypt by the Persians (A.D. 619-629) with its concomitant lack of regnal formulas by the Byzantine emperor(s) in these years is indicated by a series of dashes, '----'.

¹ I should like to thank my friend Roger S. BAGNALL for his kindly correcting my English.

The evidence:

(1) βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότης
 μεγίστου εὐεργέτου Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀυγούστου
 (καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους ...

- 610-611 P. Oxy. I 138 (5.x.610-29.viii.611)
 611 P. Oxy. LVIII 3954 (12.ii, om. μεγίστου εὐεργέτου); *PSI VII
 773 (5.vii); P. Oxy. LVIII 3955 (23.ix); LVIII 3956 (1.x)
 611/612 P. Oxy. LVIII 3957 (20.ii.611 or 21.ii.612, om. μεγίστου εὐεργέτου)
 612 *P. Princ. II 87 (21.i); *P. Oxy. XVI 1981 (25.x); *I 139 (26.x)
 613 PSI I 62 (27.ix)
 614 P. Oxy. XXIV 2420 (ii-iii; cf. BL VII 150 and P. Oxy. LVIII
 3954.3-7n.); LVIII 3958 (iv-v); *XVI 1979 (19.viii)
 618 P. Haun. III 60 (28.x)
 619 P. Jand. III 49 (5.vii)

Comment: All 15 documents come from Oxyrhynchus and are dated before the period of the Persian occupation of Egypt, A.D. 619-629. For other Oxyrhynchite texts from the reign of Heraclius see below, formula (12).

(2) βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότης Φλ. Ἡρακλείου
 τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀυγούστου (καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους ...

- 613 P. Heid. V 361 (8.vi)
 614/615 P. Prag. I 48 (24.ii.614 [R] or 615 (Ind.); om. epithet(s) for Heraclius, like below in BGU II 368; om. καὶ αὐτοκράτορος)
 615 *BGU II 368 (25.vi; lacks epithet(s)); *SB I 5271 (10.xii; om. καὶ αὐτοκράτορος)
 616 *BGU II 398 (14.viii; rest., om. καὶ αὐτοκράτορος); SB I 4497 (8.ix; restored)
 618 P. Alex. 35 (31.i); BGU II 401 (25.iii; om. (καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος); BGU III 725 (21.vii; cf. BL I 63)

 632 SB I 4662 (11.vii; adds ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους ..., regnal Heraclius Jr., cf. below, pp. 228-229)
 632 *SB VI 9461 (14.x)
 638 SB XVI 13016 (7.ix)

Comment: All 12 documents come from the Fayum. Given the fact, that BGU II 368 and P. Prag. I 48 share the same (remarkable) omission, the question might be raised whether both texts were written by the same scribe, but Dr Poethke tells me by letter (from 19.3.1992): “Der Gesamteindruck der Schrift beider Texte ist auf den ersten Blick sehr ähnlich. Im einzelnen ergeben sich doch Unterschiede. Der Gesamteindruck spiegelt eher den Zug der Zeit.”

It is also striking that a couple of texts omit from this formula the element *καὶ αὐτοκράτορος* which used to be a standard part of regnal titulature under earlier emperors (cf. for this omission also below, formulas (3), (4), (6)).

(3) βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλανθρώπου ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγούστου (καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους ...

610-641 CPR X 133 (incomplete and incorrectly drafted); P. Rain. Cent. 119 (n.d.; adds *ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους* ...)

611 CPR X 130 (6.x; adds *ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους* ...)

612 P. Rain. Cent. 120 (11.ix); P. Heid. V 350 (19.xii)

617/8 CPR X 132 (5.x-30.vi; adds *ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους* ...; om. *καὶ αὐτοκράτορος*)

618 SPP XX 220 = SB I 5269 (9.vi)

633 P. Lond. I 113.6.b (p. 214) (12.viii)

635 *SB I 4488 (19.iv)

636 P. Prag. I 64 (28.v); CPR VII 50 (22.viii)

636-641 SB I 4852 (vi-vii; much mutilated, cf. below; om. *καὶ αὐτοκράτορος*)

Comment: Probably all 12 documents are from the Fayum, though the provenance of SB I 4852 is not indicated.

NB: formula (3) = formula (2) adding *καὶ φιλανθρώπου* as Heraclius' epithet.

Lines 1-2 of SB I 4852 [given the collection's history probably from the Arsinoite nome; listed in *RFBE* sub formula (5)], can be restored as:

1 [Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν. [Βασιλείας τοῦ]

2 [εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλανθρώπου ἡμῶν] δεσπ(ότου) Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τ[οῦ αἰων(ίου) Ἀγ(ούστου)],

i.e. formula (3) implying restorations of 30 and 29 letters at the left. If, however, the words *κυρίου καὶ δεσπότης* in line 1 were written with extensive abbreviations, one should restore formula (2), i.e. omit *καὶ φιλανθρώπου* from the restoration in line 2.

(4) *βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλανθρώπου ἡμῶν δεσπότης καὶ μεγίστου εὐεργέτου Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου (καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους ...*

630 *P. Ross.Georg. III 51 (ii-iii); P. Ross.Georg. III 55 (24.iv; om. *(καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος*, adds *ὑπατείας τοῦ θεοστεφοῦς* []; cf. BASP 16 [1979] 232-233 and below)

631 CPR III 370 = MPER N.S. XV 108 (26.vii; adds *ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους ...* and regnal formula of Heraclius Novus Constantinus, cf. below, p. 228)

Comment: All 3 documents are, again, from the Fayum and this formula is formula (3) adding *καὶ μεγίστου εὐεργέτου* before Heraclius' name. The aberrant formula occurring in P. Ross. Georg. III 55 may be explained in terms of a scribal confusion; it is conceivable that one should continue after the regnal formula with *ὑπατείας (τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους — καὶ) τοῦ θεοστεφοῦς [αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ Ἡρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου, month, day]*, as in P. Prag. I 43 (Ars., 639); for the latter text cf. below, p. 230.

(5) formula uncertain

610-641 SB I 4746

Comment: This very fragmentarily preserved isolated document (probably from the Fayum) shows an irregular order of elements in the dating formula, i.e. *αὐτοκράτορος* before *Φλ. Ἡρακλείου*; one might wonder whether this is a dating by Heraclius at all.

(6) *βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότης Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου (καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους ...*

611/612 CPR X 131 (4/5.ii; om. *καὶ αὐτοκράτορος?*; adds *ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους ...*)

614 *BGU XII 2208 (8.x); *BGU XII 2209 (8.xi)

618 *P. Stras. V 328 (15-24.iv; adds second epithet?)

638 BGU II 370 (x-xi; cf. BASP 17 [1980] 105; starts with τῶν
θει[οτάτων, like formula (12) or (13); om. καὶ αὐτοκράτορος)

Comment: For this formula we now have 5 documents, 3 from Hermopolis (s.a. 614, 618) and 2 from the Fayum (others). As was remarked already in BASP, *loc. cit.*, the writer of BGU II 370 seems to have been confused. The 2 Fayumic texts are somewhat remarkable; one would, perhaps, expect the use of the epithet εὐσεβεστάτου rather than θειοτάτου in documents from the Fayum. (Is it a coincidence that in formula (12) θειοτάτου is a normal part of the formula, but that the only Fayumic text listed under that formula lacks this particular epithet?).

(7) βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ γαληνοτάτου καὶ θεοστεφοῦς
ἡμῶν δεσπότης Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου (καὶ)
αὐτοκράτορος καὶ μεγίστου εὐεργέτου ἔτους ...

610-641 P. Amh. II 151 (n.d.)

613 CPR IX 35 (21.v)

613/4 *SB I 4669 (ii-iii ?)

614 *P. Lond. III 1010 descr. (iv-v; om. καὶ μεγ. εὐεργ.)

617 BGU XII 2210 (15.vi)

618 *P. Edfou I 3 (13-23.vi; adds ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας (?)
ἔτους ..., cf. P. Rain. Cent. 119.4 Anm.)

Comment: This formula is shown by 6 documents from the Thebaid, i.e. 1 from the Upper Theodosiopolite (SB I 4669), 1 from the Upper Apollinopolite (P. Edfou I 3) and 4 from the Hermopolite (others).

(8) βασιλείας τοῦ γαληνοτάτου καὶ θεοστεφοῦς ἡμῶν δεσπότης
Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου (καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος
ἔτους ...

615/6 P. Lond. II 483 (p. 323) (5.viii.615 [Consulate] / 616 [Regnal
year, Indict.]; adds ὑπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν
δεσπότης ἔτους ...; cf. Cd'E 56 [1981] 362 n. 1 and BL I 270)

Comment: This formula occurs in only 1 papyrus from Apollinop. Heptakomias; formula (8) = formula (7) minus θειοτάτου καὶ and καὶ μεγίστου εὐεργέτου.

(9) βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ γαληνοτάτου καὶ θεοστεφοῦς ἡμῶν δεσπότην Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγούστου (καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους ...

611 P. Lond. V 1736 (25.ii)

613 P. Lond. V 1737 (9.ii; om. καὶ θεοστεφοῦς)

Comment: Both papyri come from Syene. Formula (9) = formula (8) adding *θειοτάτου καὶ*. At the same time it is formula (7) minus *καὶ μεγίστου εὐεργέτου*.

(10) βασιλείας τοῦ γαληνοτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότην Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγούστου (καὶ) αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους ...

613 *SB I 4504 (16.xi)

616 *P. Paris 21 (3.vi)

619/634 ST 436 (22/23.xii; *δεσπ. τῆς οἰκουμένης* rather than *ἡμῶν δεσπότην*; Greek date for Coptic doc.; cf. "Analecta Papyrologica" 2 [1990] 142)

Comment: For this formula we have 3 documents, 2 from the Thinite (the first 2 items) and 1 from an unknown provenance which probably was situated somewhere in Upper Egypt (ST 436, the epithet *γαληνοτάτου* is not found in documents from Lower Egypt dated by Heraclius); formula (10) = formula (8) minus *καὶ θεοστεφοῦς*.

(11) formula uncertain

612 SB XIV 11542 (1.v-5.x)

615/6 or 630/1 P. Lond. V 1875 (n.d.)

616/7 SB XIV 11543 (adds consulate; read/restore *ὑπατείας τῆς [αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ...]*?)

618 SB I 5112 (3.i; adds postconsulate, i.e. only *μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ*]/*γαληνοτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότην Φλ. Ἡρακλείου ἔτους* preserved; see notes at end of text)

618/9 or 633/4 *P. Lond. III 1011 (n.d.)

Comment: Into this category fall 5 documents, 1 from the Upper-Apollinopolite (SB I 5112), 2 from the Hermopolite (P. Lond. III 1011 and V 1875; restore in both [part of] formula (7)?) and 2 from unknown provenances (both SB XIV texts). One should probably restore in SB XIV 11543 the standard consular formula (for this cf. below, p. 225).

(12) βασιλείας τῶν θειοτάτων καὶ εὐσεβεστάτων ἡμῶν δεσπότην καὶ μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀυγούστων αὐτοκρατόρων Φλ. Ἡρακλείου καὶ Φλ. Ἡρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θεοστεφοῦς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ ἔτους ...

- 630 *BGU I 314 (23.v; partly restored; cf. ZPE 65 [1986] 165 for epithet of Heraclius jr.)
- 631/2 P. Oxy. LVIII 3961 (n.d.; om. καὶ μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀυγούστων αὐτοκρατόρων; adds ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους ... before regnal form Heraclius Novus Constantinus, cf. below, p. 228)
- 635 ZPE 65 (1986) 163 (22.i - 1.ix; like P. Oxy. LVIII 3961; Heraclius = τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀυγούστου αὐτοκράτορος, Heraclius Jr. = θεοφυλάκτου; cf. below, pp. 229–230)
- 639 P. Prag. I 43 (5.x? cf. ZPE 84 [1990] 76f.; om. θειοτάτων καὶ, καὶ μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν; adds ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους ... before regnal form. Heraclius jr., τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀυγούστων αὐτοκρατόρων at end, cf. below, p. 230)

Comment: This formula is shown by 4 documents from Lower Egypt, 1 from the Herakleopolite (BGU I 314), 1 from the Arsinoite (P. Prag. I 43) and 2 from the Oxyrhynchite (others). For the omission of the epithet *θειοτάτων* in the text from the Arsinoite cf. above at formula (6).

(13) βασιλείας τῶν θειοτάτων καὶ γαληνοτάτων καὶ θεοστεφῶν ἡμῶν δεσπότην Φλλ. Ἡρακλείου καὶ Ἡρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀυγούστων (καὶ) αὐτοκρατόρων καὶ μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν ἔτους ...

- 633 P. Lond. III 1012 (p. 265) (7.ix)
- 635 P. Flor. III 306 (x-xi; om. καὶ γαληνοτάτων καὶ θεοστεφῶν, καὶ μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν)
- 638 SB XVI 12492 (18.iii; om. καὶ γαληνοτάτων καὶ θεοστεφῶν, καὶ μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν)
- 641 SB VI 8986 (i-ii; adds postconsulate; cf. BL VII 200 and below, p. 231).
- 630-641 CPR IX 29 (om. καὶ γαληνοτάτων καὶ θεοστεφῶν, καὶ μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν).

Comment: We find formula (13) in 5 documents from Upper Egypt, 1 (SB VI 8986) from the Upper Apollinopolite, the four others from the Hermopolite. It is remarkable that three out of the four Hermopolitan representatives of this formula lack most of the imperial epithets.

(14) formula uncertain

- 634 SB I 4319 (Hermonthis, 4.xii; possibly formula (7) with consulate and regnal year Heraclius jr.; cf. below, p. 229)
- 639/640 P. Lond. I 113 [10] (p. 222) = W.Chrest. 8 (possibly some variant of formula (12) with consulate(?) and/or regnal year of Heraclius Jr.; Arsin.; cf. below, pp. 230–231)
- 630-641 SB I 5318 (Ars., n.d.; possibly formula (2) or (3) with postconsulate and regnal year of Heraclius' sons; cf. below, p. 227)
- 630-641 BGU I 319 (Ars., n.d.; possibly formula (3) with consulate and regnal year of Heraclius jr.; cf. below, pp. 226–227)
- 630-641 SB I 5114 (Apoll. Ano, n.d.; no part of dating formula preserved, but cf. the oath formula mentioning both Heraclius and Heraclius Novus Constantinus).

Comment: The precise form of the dating formula is uncertain in 5 documents, 1 from Hermonthis (SB I 4319), 1 from the Upper Apollinopolite (SB I 5114), and 3 from the Arsinoite (others). All documents are datable to the joint reign of Heraclius and Heraclius Novus Constantinus.

Analysis

It should be noted first that formulas (5), (11), (14) are all uncertain and incomplete; (5) and (11) differ, however, from (14) in that they seem to refer to Heraclius Sr. alone, while all documents under (14) (may) refer to the joint reign of Heraclius Sr. and Heraclius Jr.; they date or seem to date from a year after A.D. 629.

Bell listed in 1913 25 texts dated by Heraclius and/or his son Heraclius Novus Constantinus, though he could have referred to at least 8 more texts cited above from SB I, as their *edd. princ.* were already available, cf. SB I 4319; 4488; 4497; 4662; 4669; 4746; 4852, 5318 (cf. also SB 5114).

Be that as it may, in the period since 1913, i.e. in about 80 years, the number of dated papyri from Heraclius' reign has approximately trebled; now we have a total of almost 80 texts. This sizable growth of our evidence allows us to see that in principle Bell's method of attempting to apply a classification based upon regional variations has vindicated itself, while at the same time it allows us to see things with greater precision. Such regionalisms in the emperor's titulature are specifically reflected by the use of certain epithets. It seems worthwhile stressing the following points:

(a) There is (still) no secure attestation of a dating mentioning Heraclius Jr. earlier than A.D. 630, though this might be expected, at least theoretically.

Heraclius Jr. came to the throne, after all, as early as 22.i.613 and he is included in an oath formula as early as A.D. 618 (SB I 5112; cf. also SB I 5114). For now the question, why there is no such pre-630 dating formula referring to both Heraclii Augusti, must remain open. It may be just a matter of coincidence due to the haphazard character of the papyrus finds.

(b) On the other hand, after 630 A.D. a substantial number of texts still refer only to the father Heraclius, rather than to the father and to the son Heraclius Novus Constantinus. This phenomenon is especially visible in documents from the Fayum, cf. formulas (2)-(4) and (6) [but compare also the ambiguous date of some documents listed under formula (10) and (11)]. At present the number of 'post-630 documents from Egypt dated after Heraclius only' and that of 'post-630 documents from Egypt dated after Heraclius and Heraclius Jr.' is almost even.

(c) Consulates for Heraclius occur in both Lower and Upper Egypt, cf. formulas (2), (3), (4), (6), (12), (14) (all Fayum), (7), (11) and (13) (Apollinopolis Magna), (8) (Apollinopolis Heptakomias), (12) (Oxyrhynchite), Hermonthis (14); cf. also SB XIV 11543 (formula 11, prov. unknown). The most common formula is *ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους ...* (used about ten times in documents from both Lower and Upper Egypt), but there is a variant formula, viz. *ὑπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότης ἔτους ...* (occurring at least twice, in P. Lond. II 483 [formula (8)], and SB I 4319 [formula (7)?, cf. below, p. 229], both from Upper-Egypt; cf. also the Fayumic BGU I 319, discussed below, p. 226); only three postconsulates occur in:

— SB I 5112 (3.i.618, Apollinop. Magna): *μ[ετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ]/γαλην[οτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότης Φλ. Ἡρακλείου ἔτους ...* (but see notes at end of text), in

— SB VI 8986 (i-ii.641, Apollinop. Magna), after a regnal formula mentioning Heraclius and Heraclius Novus Constantinus: *μετὰ τῆν ὑπατείαν τῶν αὐτῶν [ἔτους --, and in*

— SB I 5318.3 (Fayum, 630-641), after a regnal formula mentioning Heraclius: *καὶ μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ὑπατείαν ἔτους [.*

The use of the (post-)consulate in dating formulas under Heraclius is not any longer common. It should be observed, however, that the whole process of the consulate's gradual disappearance from dating formulas (despite the prescriptions of Justinian's *Novella*, cf. *BASP* 22 [1985] 359) can be seen to emerge already much earlier, cf. in *RFBE* the regnal formulas used during the reigns of Mauricius and Phocas. This probably resulted from the factual identification of regnal years and consulate already under the emperor Justinus II (cf. in particular *RFBE*, formula 3; for the identification of regnal

years, consular years and indiction years under the emperor Mauricius cf. now J.R. REA in P. Oxy. LVIII, p. 51 ff.).

(d) *μέγιστος εὐεργέτης* (cf. BELL, *loc. cit.*, 403) occurs in formulas (1) (Oxy.), (4) (Ars.), (7) (Theodos., Apollinop., Hermop.), (12)-(14) (Hera- kleop., Hermop., Hermonthis). Evidently this epithet occurs in both Lower and Upper Egypt, but it remains hazardous to draw firm conclusions about whether it was a standard dating element in formulas used in a given nome, and from what moment it became so. It is, however, somewhat striking that it does not seem to occur yet in the Fayum before A.D. 630, while in the Hermopolite it occurs already in A.D. 613, being omitted in a document from 614 and being reintroduced in A.D. 617 (formula (7)). In such cases one may consider the omission of any such epithet to be almost a matter of idiosyn- crasy on the part of an individual scribe; formula (9) illustrates this situation.

Finally I wish to discuss those regnal formulas giving (a) the regnal year of Heraclius, (b) his consulate, and (c) a reference to a regnal year of Hera- clius Novus Constantinus. Apart from a lapidary remark made in *RFBE* 72, formula (14) concerning SB I 4319, where a numeral in a dating formula re- ferring to Heraclius Jr. was explained in terms of his regnal year, they have gone unnoticed as a separate category. I start by listing the pertinent texts:

(a) BGU I 319 (Ars., 630-641, with my own restorations; *ed. princ.*
line 1: τῶν θειοτάτων καὶ εὐσεβεστ(άτων) ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν Φλ.
Ἡρακλείου]; line 2: καὶ μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν αὐτοῦ ἔτους -]:

- 1 [† Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότη Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ
καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλανθρώ-
που]
- 2 [ἡμῶν δεσπότη Φλ. Ἡρακλείου] τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγούστου καὶ αὐ-
τοκράτορος ἔτους -, καὶ ὑπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν]
- 3 [δεσπότη ἔτους - καὶ Φλ. Ἡρακλίου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ
θεοστεφλοῦς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ ἔτους -, Month, day, ind., ἐν Ἀρ(σινῶ)]·

In itself, the restoration in this text (listed under formula (14) above) is that of regnal formula (3) of Heraclius Sr. (lines 1-2), followed by his consular year (lines 2-3) and a reference to his son's regnal year (line 3). The restora- tion of the invocation at the left of line 1 indicates the size of the lacuna at this part of the papyrus: a restoration of the expected words written out in full in- volves ca. 23 letters and the restoration at the start of line 2 involves the same

(c) MPER N.S. XV 108 = CPR III 370 (Ars., 26.vii.631; ed. in line 5:
τοῦ [αὐ]τοῦ εὐσεβεστ(άτου) δεσποτ]είας, Ἡρα]κλείου):

- 2 [† Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] τοῦ θεοῦ
καὶ σωτ[ή]ρος ἡ[μ]ῶν,
- 3 [βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλανθρώπου ἡμῶν] δεσπότου
μεγίστου εὐεργέτου
- 4 [Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου καὶ αὐτοκράτ]ορος ἔτους
εἰκοστοῦ πρώτου, καὶ ὑπατίας
- 5 τῆς [αὐ]τῶ[ν εὐσεβ]είας ἔτους εἰκοστοῦ, καὶ Φλ. Ἡρακλείου Νέου
Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ
- 6 θεοστ[ε]φ[ο]ῦς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ ἔτους ἐννέα καὶ δεκά[το]ν, κτλ.

The formula given here can be compared with that occurring in other texts from in the Arsinoite. For the first part of the formula cf. formula (4); the consular formula here restored also follows the example of normal formula, cf. above, p. 225; for the part of the dating formula referring to Heraclius Jr. cf. above, p. 226 at BGU I 319 and at the following texts.

(d) P. Oxy. LVIII 3961 (Oxyrhynchus, 631/2 [n.d.]):

- 2 βασιλείας τῶν θειοτάτων καὶ εὐσεβεστάτων ἡ[μ]ῶν δεσπότην
Φλαουίου Ἡρακλείου τοῦ]
- 3 [αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου καὶ αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους κ[-, καὶ ὑπατείας τῆς
αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους -, καὶ]
- 4 Φλαουίου Ἡρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θεοφυλάκτου
αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ ἔτους -, month, day].

The editor has modelled his restorations mostly after ZPE 65 (1986) 163ff. (cf. below, pp. 229-230, item 'g'). For unclear reasons both editors preferred to restore αὐτοῦ rather than the normal αὐτῶν in the consular part of the formula, line 3 (for the phrasing of this formula cf. above, p. 225).

(e) SB I 4662 (Ars., 11.vii.632; cf. BASP 17 [1980] 24 and 22 [1985] 361-3):

- 1 [† Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ
καὶ σωτῆ]ρος ἡμῶν, βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου
- 2 [ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλ. Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου αὐτο-
κράτορος ἔτου]ς εἰκοστοῦ δευτέρου, καὶ ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν

- 3 [εὐσεβείας ἔτους κβ, καὶ Φλ. Ἡρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ εὐσεβ]εστάτου ἔτους κ, κτλ.

Most of this formula, i.e. the regnal formula for Heraclius Sr., is sufficiently attested, cf. above, p. 218, formula (2); only the final part of the formula concerning Heraclius Jr. who is apparently provided here with the epithet εὐσεβ]εστάτου rather than with the usual element τοῦ θεοστεφούς is irregular, but I have checked the reading once again on the photograph and P.J. Sijpesteijn confirms the reading as presented already in BASP 22 (1985) 362.

- (f) SB I 4319 and p. 668 = KRU 77 (Hermonthis, 4.xii.634; cf. Byz. Zeitschr. 24 [1924] 81-83, *RFBE* 72-73, BASP 17 [1980] 24 and "Analecta Papyrologica" 2 [1990] 142):

[† Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ
[θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ]
[γαληνοτάτου καὶ θεοστεφούς ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλ. Ἡρακλείου]

- 1 [τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀυγούστου καὶ αὐτοκράτορος καὶ] μεγίστου
2 εὐεργέτου ἔτους εἰκοσ[τοῦ πέμπτου καὶ ὑπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ]
3 εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν [δεσπότου] ἔτους εἰκοστοῦ τετάρτου[υ],
4 καὶ Φλ. Ἡρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θεοστε[φούς]
5 [αὐ]τοῦ υἱοῦ ἔτους εἰκοστοῦ τρίτου, κτλ.

Obviously it is possible to restore an invocation and the beginning of Heraclius' regnal formula (7) at the start of this text and, given the remains of Heraclius' regnal formula as preserved (ending on *μεγίστου εὐεργέτου*) and the provenance of the text, there is hardly an alternative for the restoration of this formula.

- (g) ZPE 65 (1986) 163 (Oxy., 22.i - 1.ix.635; in 3, the *ed. princ.* omits Φλ., but cf. above P. Oxy. LVIII 3961):

- 1 † Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου κ[αὶ] δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ]
2 τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμ[ῶν, βασιλείας τῶν]
3 θειοτάτων καὶ εὐσεβεστ[άτων ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν Φλ.]
4 Ἡρακλείου τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀυγούστου αὐτοκράτορος]
5 ἔτους κε καὶ ὑπατείας τῆς [αὐτῶν (*ed.*: αὐτοῦ) εὐσεβείας ἔτους κε]
6 καὶ Φλ. Ἡρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ]

7 θεοφυλ(άκτου) αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ ἔτους κγ, κτλ.*

This formula differs slightly from other regnal formulae mentioning both emperors, especially from formula (12), in that it omits *καὶ μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν* and that it attributes the element *αἰώνιος ἀυγοῦστος αὐτοκράτωρ* only to the emperor Heraclius Sr., whereas it adds a consular year to his regnal formula. Moreover, Heraclius Jr. has here the epithet *θεοφυλάκτου* rather than the slightly more frequent *θεοστεφοῦς*.

(h) P. Prag. I 43 (Ars., 5.x.639, if my new readings in lines 4ff. are accepted; cf. also ZPE 84 [1990] 76f.):

1 † Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότης Ἰησοῦ
2 Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν,
3 βασιλείας τῶν εἰ[ὺ]σεβεστάτων ἡμῶν
4 δεσποτῶν Φλλ. Ἡρακλίου ἔτους κθ (*ed.*: κε) καὶ
5 ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας ἔτους κθ (*ed.*: κε) [καὶ τοῦ]
6 θεουστεφ[ο]ῦ[ς] αὐτοῦ υἱ[ι]οῦ Ἡ[ε]ρακλείου Ν[έ]ου]
7 Κωνσταντίνου τῶν αἰωνίω[ν] Ἀυγούστων]
8 καὶ αὐτοκ(ρατόρων) Φαῶφι ζ τρισκαιδε[κάτης ινδ.]·

Evidently the readings of the *ed. princ.* cannot all be accepted. The attempt in ZPE, *loc. cit.*, to restore a better known formula in lines 3-6 (cf. above, p. 223, formula (12)), but note the omission of an element *θεοτάτων καὶ* before *εὐσεβεστάτων*) marks an important step forward, but line 8 remained problematic. My new reading of this line entails a change of the year numeral in lines 4 and 5. The new readings aim at staying as close as possible to a well-known formula, but it should be noted that under the present circumstances an indication of the regnal year expected with Heraclius Jr. (after the reference to Heraclius Sr.'s consulate) is lacking. Moreover, one might have expected the element *τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀυγούστων καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων* to precede the name of Heraclius Sr. (cf. above formula (12)), rather than to follow that of Heraclius Novus Constantinus. Apparently the regnal years of Heraclius Sr. and of Heraclius Jr. have been equated (anachronistically), as is often the case in texts showing formulas (12) (cf. BGU I 314) and (13) (cf. P. Lond. III 1012, P. Flor. III 306, SB VI 8986 and XVI 12492).

(i) P. Lond. I 113 [10] (p. 222) = W. Chrest. 8 (Ars., 639-640):

1 Βασιλείας] τῶν θεοτάτων [καὶ εὐσεβεστάτων ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν
Φλλ. Ἡρακλείου ἔτους -, καὶ ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν εὐσεβείας

- 2 ἔτους - καὶ] τοῦ θεοστεφο[ύς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ Ἡρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀγγούστων αὐτοκρατόρων, *month, day, ιγ* ἰνδ.]

The restoration of this formula follows the model of P. Prag. I 43 (cf. above, sub 'h'), but the distribution of the restorations over lines 1-2 is all but certain and in fact an alternative restoration (modelled directly after formula (12)) is conceivable:

- 1 Βασιλείας] τῶν θειοτάτων [καὶ εὐσεβεστάτων ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν
μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν τῶν αἰωνίων Ἀγγούστων αὐτοκρατόρων Φλ.
Ἡρακλείου καὶ Φλ. Ἡρακλείου Νέου]
- 2 Κωνσταντίνου] τοῦ θεοστεφο[ύς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ ἔτους -, *month, day, ιγ* ἰνδ.]

In this case, too, one cannot be certain how the restorations in the lacuna between τῶν θειοτάτων and τοῦ θεοστεφο[ύς have to be distributed over the lines.

(j) SB VI 8986.4 (Apollinop. Magna, after 26.i.641, cf. BL VII 200):

- 1 [Βασιλείας τῶν θειοτάτων καὶ γαληνοτάτων καὶ θ]εοστεφῶν ἡμῶν
δεσποτῶν Φλαυίων
- 2 [Ἡρακλείου καὶ Ἡρακλείου Νέου Κωνσταντίνου τῶ]ν αἰωνίων
Ἀγγούστων αὐτοκρατόρων
- 3 [καὶ μεγίστων εὐεργετῶν ἔτους τριακοστοῦ πρώτου καὶ μετὰ τ]ῆν
ὑπατείαν τῶν αὐτῶν
- 4 [ἔτους τριακοστοῦ(?) καὶ τῶν θεοφυλάκτων αὐτοῦ τέκνων] Φλα-
υίου Ἡρακλείου καὶ Δανεῖδ
- 5 [± 40 θεο]φυλάκτου νοβελλησίμου
Μεχεῖρ
- 6 [τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος ἐν Ἀπόλλωνος
Ἄνω πόλει

In its given form this formula (discussed already by Bell, *loc. cit.*) is still unique, though a postconsular formula is encountered in SB I 5112 and in 5318 (cf. above, p. 225). Given the lack of parallel formulas it is not possible to propose a convincing restoration of the lacuna in line 5. At the start of line 6 one expects only a numeral for the day in Mecheir; this may have been written out in full, but it is also possible that this line indented.

It remains to tabulate the various regnal and consular years.

While we note that not all relevant data have been preserved completely, we see at a glance where the scribes, who had to observe 2 regnal and 1 consular year count(s), lost track of the correct year numerals (numerals printed in bold and underlined indicate an anachronistic situation; restored numerals are put between []):

Documents from A.D.	631	632	634	635	639	641
Heraclius Sr. yr	21	22	2[5]	25	29	31
His (post-)consular yr.	<u>20</u>	[22]	24	[25]	29	[30]
Heraclius Jr. yr	19	20	<u>23</u>	23	<u>29</u>	<u>31</u>
Indiction	5	6	8	8	13	14
Month, day	26.07	11.07	4/5.12	[]	5.10	01-02

According to the synoptic chronological table in R.S. BAGNALL & K.A. WORP, *The Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, the numeral for Heraclius' consular year in the papyrus from A.D. 631 should be 21, and the numeral for Heraclius jr.'s regnal year in the papyrus from A.D. 634 should be 22. The numeral for Heraclius jr.'s regnal year in the papyrus from A.D. 639 should have been 27, but evidently it was equated with the regnal year of his father. Similarly, the numeral for Heraclius jr.'s regnal year in the papyrus from A.D. 641 should have been 29, but it is equated with regnal year of his father. To be sure, in the other two anachronistic errors made by the individual scribes there is no particular system to be detected.

[Amsterdam]

Klaas A. WORP