

# THE REGNAL YEARS OF PTOLEMY II PHILADELPHOS

R. A. HAZZARD

SOMETIME DURING the spring of 1902, B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt obtained a large and important group of papyri dating from the third century B.C. from the Ptolemaic necropolis of El-Hibeh (Grenfell and Hunt v). Those papyri included letters, receipts, and accounts dated by a series of Egyptian or Macedonian months and regnal years, so that the editors attempted the task, apparently mechanical, of placing the documents in chronological order (Grenfell and Hunt 332–367). In fact, neither Grenfell and Hunt nor any other scholars have completely sorted out the chronological problems raised by these documents in the last eighty-five years of study. We now know that Ptolemy II first reckoned his reign from Soter's death in 282 B.C. and that he later renumbered his regnal years from some point in 285, when, he alleged, he got the reins of power from his parent. This essay will review the divers kinds of evidence for regnal years and submit two dates for Ptolemy II's reform: 282 for the Macedonian calendar and 267 for the Egyptian calendar.

## INTRODUCTION

It will be helpful to begin the discussion with a few comments about the documentation of regnal years and about the respective value of each class of documents. *Official documents written in Greek* always use a Macedonian month under Ptolemy II, and, one presumes, a Macedonian regnal year as well. This class includes the king's letters, ordinances, and certain honorific inscriptions from Ptolemaic Lycia or the Egyptian *chora* (see below, note 14). Only the coins do not specify a month, but these dated issues come from the non-Egyptian cities of the kingdom—Alexandria, Tyre, Joppa, Sidon, Gaza, and Ake-Ptolemais—and doubtless refer to years on the Macedonian calendar. Of all our extant documents, the coinage is probably the best source of evidence for Macedonian years, since the king added both

The author is indebted to Roger S. Bagnall (Columbia University) and Chester G. Starr (University of Michigan) for their critical comments. The following are cited by author's name: W. Clarysse and G. Van Der Veken, "The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt," *PapLugdBat* 24 (1983); C. C. Edgar, *Zenon Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection* (Ann Arbor, Mich. 1934) 50–57; B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Hibeh Papyri* 1 (London 1906); E. Meyer, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der ersten Ptolemäer auf Grund der Papyri* (Leipzig 1925); P. W. Pestman, "La Chronologie égyptienne d'après les textes démotiques," *PapLugdBat* 15 (1967); A. E. Samuel, *Ptolemaic Chronology* (Munich 1962, Münchener Beiträge 43); J. N. Svoronos, *Die Münzen der Ptolemäer* (Athens 1904–1908); M. Wörle, "Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykien II," *Chiron* 8 (1978) 201–246.

dates and moneyers' marks to discourage tampering with the quality of production, and these security measures, in addition to the period between the cutting of the die and the striking of the planchet, would preclude any chance of chronological error.<sup>1</sup> Next, certain *Greek private documents*, by referring to eponymous priesthoods in Alexandria, indirectly attest to the king's recognition of the years entered in the dating formulae. Such documents prove helpful if we cannot find a Macedonian year in the official sources written in Greek. Then, the *Egyptian documents*, whether hieroglyphic inscriptions or demotic papyri and ostraka, usually name an Egyptian month, and thereby imply the use of an Egyptian regnal year as well. Since they never refer to Macedonian months, one can assume that any year appearing in these documents is Egyptian, even though it may not accompany an Egyptian month. Finally, Greek or demotic papyri will sometimes bear a *double date* equating the two calendars for a particular point in time. N. J. Reich discussed one of the clearest examples of this phenomenon in 1938, when he published the docket of an Egyptian marriage contract. The docket read:

ΛΚΒ ΜΗ(ΝΟΣ) Λωίου υθ  
Αἰγυπτίων ΛΚΑ ΜΗ(ΝΟΣ) Ἐπειφ υβ

P. W. Pestman lists many other examples, mostly from demotic contracts written between the twenty-first Macedonian year and the last or thirty-ninth year of Ptolemy II.<sup>2</sup> This same span of time also saw the equation in demotic papyri of certain Egyptian years with the eponymous priesthoods of Arsinoe, Alexander, and the Theoi Adelphoi. Since Ptolemy appointed these priests annually on the Macedonian calendar,<sup>3</sup> students of demotic

<sup>1</sup>Svoronos catalogued most of the dated coins. Because Ptolemy II had dated coins in his thirty-ninth (Macedonian) year, and because the Egyptian Canon of kings had dated his death in 247/6, nineteenth-century numismatists reckoned his first year as 285/4. Numismatists, unaware of the problem of retroactive dating, continued to use the same chronology into the twentieth century: E. T. Newell, "Standard Ptolemaic Silver," *The Coin Collector Series* 7 (1941) 3-5; The Burton Y. Berry Collection 2, Megaris to Egypt, *ANS Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* (New York 1962) nos. 1474, 1478, and 1480; A. Kromann and O. Mørkholm, *Egypt: The Ptolemies*, Danish National Museum *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* (Copenhagen 1977) nos. 509-516; and H. A. Troxell, "Arsinoe's Non-Era," *ANSMN* 28 (1983) 35-70, at 49.

<sup>2</sup>N. J. Reich, "The Greek Deposit-Notes by the Record-Office on Demotic Contracts," *Mizraim* 9 (1938) 19-32, at 10. Pestman's *termini* (22) are *OBrooklyn* 37.1821, where the Egyptian year 20 equals the Macedonian year 20, and *PDemLille* 1.4 where the Egyptian year 38 equals the Macedonian year 39.

<sup>3</sup>The priests' names appear in the Table (below, 156-158), and in much more detail in J. Ysewijn, *De sacerdotibus sacerdotisque Alexandri Magni et Lagidarum eponymis* (Brussels 1961) and in Clarysse and Van Der Veken. Although *PSI* 5.515 dates from year 35, but refers to the eponymous priesthoods of year 34, this anomaly has been dismissed as a scribal error by C. C. Edgar, *PCairZen* 2, p. 131, and H. Thompson, "Eponymous Priests under the Ptolemies," *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith* (London 1932) 23.

have equated the Egyptian year of the scribe with the Macedonian year of the priesthood to discover, as Reich had, that the Egyptian year is either equal to or one numeral less than the Macedonian year of the eponymous priesthood (Pestman *ibid.*). All these double dates behave in a way opposite to what one would normally expect: Egyptian and Macedonian years had about the same number of days most of the time, but as the Egyptian regnal year always ended on the same day of its calendar, so that a king's first year might last only a few days or months, while the Macedonian year started with the king's accession and lasted until his first anniversary, the Egyptian year was usually equal to or one numeral greater than the Macedonian year. The Egyptian and Macedonian dates behave in this fashion during the reigns of Ptolemy III, IV, and V. One can infer, therefore, that Ptolemy II changed his reckoning of regnal years at some point before his twenty-first Macedonian year or 265/4 and put the Egyptian year backwards one numeral against the Macedonian calendar.

Presuming the absence of a seventeenth and eighteenth year in any published text, A. E. Samuel suggested (66–67) that Ptolemy II had made his reform in 267, in effect, jumping from his sixteenth to his nineteenth Macedonian year. Pestman later found the seventeenth and eighteenth years missing from demotic texts.<sup>4</sup> But F. Uebel referred to two Sorbonne papyri dated to Ptolemy II's eighteenth Macedonian year, month of Artemisios (*PSorb* 9) and of Daisios (*PSorb* 10), and questioned Samuel's proposed point of retroactive dating in the light of these documents. Cadell also doubted Samuel's suggestion; Koenen proposed a *terminus ante quem* of 279/8; Wörrle suggested a date between 272 and 264; Clarysse and Van Der Veken preferred sometime before 274/3.<sup>5</sup> All presumed that Ptolemy II had changed his chronology at a single point in time, and that they had, in effect, examined all the evidence pertaining to the problem, even though they had ignored the dated coins of Ptolemy II. Let us include these coins with the other evidence to study the problem anew.

#### THE MACEDONIAN CALENDAR: LUNAR MONTHS, SOLAR YEARS

The Ptolemies used the Macedonian calendar for most official documents until the middle of the second century. The Macedonian calendar started the first regnal year with the king's accession, entered each subsequent year on

<sup>4</sup>Pestman 18 and 19. R. S. Bagnall, "Some notes on P. Hib. 198," *BASP* 6 (1969) 73–101, at 76, also supposed that Pestman's result had confirmed Samuel's proposed point of retroactive dating. In fact, an eighteenth Macedonian year had already appeared in *PRev* col. 37.

<sup>5</sup>F. Uebel, *BibO* 21 (1964) 311. H. Cadell, *Papyrus de la Sorbonne* (Paris 1966) 43 and 44; L. Koenen, "Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten . . .," *Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* 56 (1977) 43–45; Wörrle 212–215; Clarysse and Van Der Veken 5.

the king's anniversary, consisted of twelve lunar months never less than twenty-nine days nor more than thirty days, and added a thirteenth month every two years to bring the average of each year to about 369 days.<sup>6</sup> Like the Egyptian system, the Macedonian calendar saw a regular succession of months, but the king's accession, and therefore the new year's day, might fall at any time during the sequence of months.

The Macedonians also used an extremely precise and regular method of expressing the length of each reign; they reckoned the length in years, months, and sometimes days, and this system, had it survived intact, would have drawn a better picture of Ptolemaic chronology than the entries in the Canon, a priestly record of Egyptian kings.<sup>7</sup> But the Macedonian system did not survive in one piece: Greek authors sometimes gave the number of regnal years, though rarely the number of months or days of the last incomplete year. This practice is manifest from the dated papyri, where the last Macedonian year is one numeral greater than the length of the reign in Greek literature.<sup>8</sup> Ptolemy Soter dated documents in his forty-first Macedonian year, but received only forty years from Porphyry;<sup>9</sup> similarly, Ptolemy V dated documents in his twenty-fourth Macedonian year, but received only twenty-three years from the same polymath.<sup>10</sup> Hence, the total number of assigned years for a line of kings in Greek literature fell progressively short of the real length of time covered by their reigns. If we compare the Macedonian chronology of Porphyry to the Egyptian chronology of the Canon,

<sup>6</sup>Possibly too, the full and short months alternated with each other: in *PCairZen* 1.59008 we find that Gorpaios and Hyperberetaios had fifty-nine days together; and in *PCorn* 1 we find that Apellaos had thirty and Audnaos had twenty-nine days—cf. C. C. Edgar, *PMichZen* p. 51. Both documents were written in the reign of Ptolemy II: *PCairZen* 1.59008 was dated by Edgar to ca 259, whereas *PCorn* 1 is dated to the 28th Macedonian year.

<sup>7</sup>Greek historians regularly used the Macedonian chronology: App. *BCiv.* 1.102; Aristoboulos in Arr. 7.23.1; Diod. Sic. 17.117.5, 19.11.5, 20.29.1, and 22.4.1; Porphyry, *FGrHist* 260 FF 2 and 3; *POxy* 27.2222.

<sup>8</sup>According to *PdemBibNat* 218, Philip III lived into his eighth Egyptian year (see E. Luddeckens, *Ägyptische Eheverträge* [Wiesbaden 1960]); so he must have entered his seventh Macedonian year before his death. The fact that Diod. Sic. 19.11.5 states that Philip ruled only six years and four months does not really conflict with the papyrological evidence, because in Egypt, he was assigned seven full years on the Macedonian system in Porphyry, *FGrHist* 260 F 2 (1).

<sup>9</sup>*PEleph* 3 and 4 are dated in Soter's forty-first year. Porphyry gives forty years to Soter, then corrects that figure to thirty-eight in order to account for the two years later absorbed into the reign of Philadelphos.

<sup>10</sup>Svoronos 1348 and 1371; *SB* 1.4232 dated year 24, Dystros, a Macedonian month; and *FGrHist* F 260 F 2 (5) for Porphyry. O. Mørholm in I. Nikolaou and O. Mørholm, *Paphos I: A Ptolemaic Coin Hoard* (Nicosia 1976) 21 and 107, supposes that Ptolemy V issued coins in his twenty-fifth regnal year, but is unable to produce one. This supposition would only be true if the coinage were reckoned with Egyptian regnal years.

we find that the total number of regnal years in the Macedonian system falls two years short of the Egyptian total in the Canon.<sup>11</sup>

Kings:	Length of Reign:	
	Porphyry	The Canon
Philip Arrhidaios		7
Alexander IV		12
Ptolemy Soter	40, then 38	20
Ptolemy II Philadelphos	36, then 38	38
Ptolemy III	25	25
Ptolemy IV	17	17
Ptolemy V	23	24
Totals in years:	141	143

Once the Macedonian system is clear, one can sort out the chronologies of Ptolemies I and II. Soter dated his early papyri with his own satrapal years and with the regnal years of Alexander IV, so that when Soter ascended the throne in 305, he reckoned his regnal years, like the satrapal years, from the death of Alexander the Great in 323. This retroactive dating is visible from an inscription (*IG XIV 1184*) recording the death of the poet Menander and equating the Athenian archonship of Philip or 292/1 with the thirty-second Macedonian year of Ptolemy Soter. Since the thirty-second year equals 292/1,<sup>12</sup> then the first regnal year is 323/2, the year of Alexander's death.<sup>13</sup> Soter continued to date his reign retroactively until his death in his forty-first regnal year. After Ptolemy II succeeded to the throne, he dated his silver and gold coins with his first Macedonian year (Svoronos 558 and 559), but sometime before the twenty-first Macedonian year, when the Macedonian year was equal to or one numeral greater than the Egyptian year in double-dated documents, he reckoned his reign retroactively from the act of succession made by his father in 285. Porphyry even comments upon this dating in a fragment on chronology written in the third or fourth century after Christ.

While his father was still living, he (Philadelphos) completed two years of reign, and after his death, thirty-six more, so that for him, thirty-eight years are reckoned, the same as for his father. (*FGrHist* 260 F 2 [3])

<sup>11</sup>There can be little doubt that Porphyry has followed some official Macedonian chronology, rather than the native entries in the Canon, because we cannot explain from the Canon why his length of each reign for the first five Ptolemies is always one numeral smaller than the last Macedonian year for each king in the documents.

<sup>12</sup>B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year* (Berkeley 1961) 232; W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge, Mass. 1940) XVII; W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Mass. 1932) 22; and more recently A. E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology* (Munich 1972) 212.

<sup>13</sup>The reader will find a full discussion of Soter's Macedonian method of calculating his years in Samuel 13–19.

In this passage, Porphyry does not seem concerned about regnal years as chronological points, but as units of time; he has thus followed the convention of ignoring the last incomplete year on the Macedonian calendar. Bearing that convention in mind, we can calculate which years Ptolemy II decided to omit from his calendar, if we use the same approach as A. E. Samuel. Samuel reasoned that this retroactive dating should produce a numerical gap of two years in the documents before the twenty-first year; and we can see from the Table below that this couple of years could not have included years 1 and 4 to 21, which appear amongst the coins, inscriptions, and papyri. Most of the documentation in the Table comes from official sources: Ptolemy II issued all of the coins and decreed some of the ordinances in *PHibeh* 2.198, while local authorities commissioned *SEG* 15.652, 27.1114, 28.1224, 33.1183, *TAM* 2.158 and 159, *ILabraunda* 3.1.34, *PCairZen* 1.59075 and 59076.<sup>14</sup> By using official documentation, we can substantiate all of his dates except years 12 and 13, but the private papyri of those years provide the names of the eponymous priesthoods of Alexander, so that we can be reasonably sure that the king recognized years 12 and 13 as he filled the eponymous priesthoods for those years. Porphyry says that Ptolemy II lived thirty-six regnal years after his father's death, and indeed, if one totals all the extant years of Philadelphos, years 1 plus 4–38 inclusive, the sum would amount to thirty-six years. We can infer from this that we have included all the historical years of Ptolemy II and that he omitted the second and third years of his Macedonian calendar.<sup>15</sup>

That the king reformed his chronology at this early date would suggest that he reckoned all his subsequent years, beginning with his fourth, from the same new year's day of the Macedonian system. A letter dated in year 28 Dystros 23 and addressed to Zenon by a certain Artemidoros provides the *termini* for the new year's day, because the papyrus bears a docket of receipt dated year 29, Xandikos 2 (*PColZen* 8). C. C. Edgar inferred from these dates that during the nine days between Dystros 23 and Xandikos 2, Ptolemy II entered into his twenty-ninth Macedonian year (*PMichZen* pp.

<sup>14</sup>*PHibeh* 2.198 supplies Macedonian years 14 and 15 according to the original editors and also Bagnall (above, n. 4); inscriptions are published by L. Robert, *Documents de l'Asie mineure méridionale* (Geneva 1966) 54 and *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie* (Paris 1983) 124–127; J. Crampa, *Labraunda, Swedish Excavations and Researches* 3<sup>2</sup> (Stockholm 1972) inscription 43; L. Koenen (above, n. 5); and Wörrle.

Although there is no evidence showing the use of the Egyptian calendar outside Egypt during the reign of Ptolemy II, it came into use during late Hellenistic times: J. Pouilloux, *Praktika tou protou diethnous Kuprologikou Synedriou* 1 (Nicosia 1972) 141–155, has published an inscription, a Salaminian text of the first century B.C., which makes use of the Egyptian calendar. According to A. E. Samuel, (above, n. 12) 184–185, Salamis used in Roman times a calendar very similar to the Egyptian.

<sup>15</sup>A Greek papyrus, *PEleph* 5, is dated year 2, month of Tybi. The month is Egyptian and we can now see that the year is also Egyptian.

51 and 52). A. E. Samuel narrowed the *termini* still further, when he examined three letters of instruction written by Apollonios in the thirty-first Macedonian year, Dystros 23, then equated to Phanemoth 30 on the Egyptian system. On the following day, the letters were docketed with Pharmouthi 1, an Egyptian day, and with two different regnal years:

<i>PCairZen</i> 2.59202	year 31, Pharmouthi 1
<i>PCairZen</i> 2.59204	year 31, Pharmouthi 1
<i>PCairZen</i> 2.59203	year 32, Pharmouthi 1

Samuel pointed out that years 31 and 32 could not refer to the native calendar, because the Egyptian year only advanced on Thoth 1; he inferred from the dockets that sometime during the course of Pharmouthi 1, Ptolemy had entered into his thirty-second Macedonian year; the Macedonian new year then arrived on Dystros 24, one day after the composition of the letters.<sup>16</sup> In fact, one might even conjecture that Ptolemy used the same new year's day for all of his years on the Macedonian system—including his first—if we consider how much his first and fourth years seem to coincide. Samuel has put Soter's death between the 7th of January and the month of July in 282; Soter undoubtedly died in Dystros or Xandikos of his forty-first regnal year, or in January/February,<sup>17</sup> because his heir, Ptolemy II, later fixed the funeral games and sacrifices for his father, the Ptolemaieia, to the middle of winter.<sup>18</sup> Ptolemy II ascended the throne during the winter season and dated his gold and silver coins, and presumably other documents, with his first regnal year until in or before Dios, when he announced to the court that he had started his reign more than two years before his father's death and the beginning of his first regnal year. From *SEG* 28.1224, a Telmessian decree, written in the fourth year, month of Dios, we can see that Ptolemy had already entered the fourth year of his retroactive system by late summer or autumn of 282. Since the fourth year *theoretically* begins on Dystros 24 or in January/February, and since this date falls within the season of Soter's

<sup>16</sup>Samuel 62 and 63; but Samuel modified the remark (above, n. 12, 147–148), because the evidence seemed controverted by *PCairZen* 1.59139, dated in year 29, Dystros 26 = Phanemoth 26. By “established correspondences,” this papyrus had to fall at the end of the year, so that the new year would seem to fall after the 26th, unless the year was Egyptian or the date was a scribal blunder. He still thought the 24th of Dystros best suited most of the evidence.

<sup>17</sup>According to Samuel's tables, *PEleph* 3, dated in Soter's forty-first year, month of Artemisios, would be written after Soter's death, but Elephantine is located at the first Cataract, where word of Soter's death would arrive at least two or three months after the event in Alexandria. In addition, Samuel's tables do not always provide the precise Julian equivalents of Macedonian dates. Cf. the foreword to my Table, below.

<sup>18</sup>Ath. 196d. Both P. M. Fraser, “Two Hellenistic Inscriptions from Delphi,” *BCH* 78 (1954) 49–67, at 58, n. 3, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1 (Oxford 1972) 232, and E. E. Rice, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford 1983) 184 and 186, hold that the pageant was not a celebration of the Ptolemaieia. Their arguments have had little influence on other scholars; for example, H. Heine, *CAH* 7<sup>2</sup> (1984) 417.

death, one is tempted to think that Ptolemy did not recalculate the new year's day, even as he changed the numeral of his year. From our modern perspective, the first regnal year of Ptolemy II coincides with his fourth—he reckoned both from January/February of 282—and this coincidence explains why he dated gold and silver coins with his first year, though none with his fourth, and, conversely, why he dated bronzes with his fourth year, though none with his first.<sup>19</sup>

#### THE EGYPTIAN CIVIL CALENDAR

Unlike the Macedonian calendar, the Egyptian system started each year on the same day, Thoth 1.<sup>20</sup> The year consisted of twelve months of thirty days each, and added five supplementary days (ἐπαγόμενοι) at the end of these months in order to bring the total length to 365 days for each year. This length never varied, so that Thoth 1, if expressed in Julian terms, fell one day behind every four years throughout the Ptolemaic period.<sup>21</sup> When Ptolemy Soter arrived in Alexandria in 323, Thoth 1 was the twelfth of November, but when Octavian arrived some 294 years later, Thoth 1 had moved backwards to the thirtieth of August.<sup>22</sup>

The Egyptian priests exercised the same regularity in calculating the number of regnal years for each king. The priests counted the period of time from the accession to Thoth 1 as the first regnal year, reckoned each succeeding calendar year as an additional regnal year, but put any period from Thoth 1 to the king's death into the first regnal year of the succeeding king. This practice is particularly evident from dated private papyri, where the last regnal year of the king is one numeral greater than the length of his reign in the Canon. The Egyptians dated documents in the eighth year of Philip Arrhidaïos, but assigned him only seven years in the Canon;<sup>23</sup> similarly, they dated documents in the thirteenth year of Alexander IV, but gave him only twelve years in the list of kings.<sup>24</sup> By assigning the last portion of a regnal year to the successor, and by suppressing any short reign which did

<sup>19</sup>Svoronos 558, 559, and 563–565. Coins are almost indestructible documents issued in large quantities. The character of the document, along with the huge quantities of coins found for this period, invalidate the objection to constructing an argument from silence.

<sup>20</sup>When the king ascended the throne, the Egyptian year would immediately become year one of the new reign; this year would then be back dated to the previous Thoth, so that the year would still be counted as having 12 months and 5 supplementary days.

<sup>21</sup>In lines 40–46 of the Canopus decree, *OGIS* 1.56, we have preserved a royal directive to add a sixth epagomenal day to the Egyptian calendar every fourth year after 238 B.C. There is no evidence to show, however, that this day was ever added before the reforms of Augustus.

<sup>22</sup>W. F. Snyder, "When Was the Alexandrian Calendar Established?" *AJP* 64 (1943) 385–398.

<sup>23</sup>See above, note 8.

<sup>24</sup>*PdemLouvre* 2427 and 2440 are both dated in Alexander's thirteenth Egyptian year. Alexander had been dead since his eighth regnal year (310/9 B.C.), but Soter dated his documents with Alexander's years until 305.



not last beyond Thoth 1, the native priests could reconcile the number of years for each king with the total period of the dynasty. Thus, the period of time entered in the Canon for the first five Ptolemies is the correct number of completed years; the Macedonian total is deficient. P. W. Pestman compiled the Egyptian documents for the first twenty years of Ptolemy II and found a *lacuna* for years 17 and 18. Using Samuel's line of reasoning, he inferred (18–19) that Ptolemy II had omitted these years, and that upon the completion of his sixteenth year, he had entered the nineteenth year in his Egyptian reckoning.

#### THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE REFORMS

The retroactive dating of the Macedonian calendar and the revision of the Egyptian chronology in its nineteenth year are not acts one would expect from a tidy, administrative mind like Ptolemy Philadelphos'. The king may have had, or thought he had, good and persuasive reasons to interfere with the normal dating of his documents, and to undergo the inconveniences inherent in those reforms. His reasons were political.

The change in the Macedonian chronology in 282 resulted from the difficulties faced by Philadelphos when he ascended the throne after his father's death. Although Ptolemy Soter had raised Philadelphos over the claims of his elder half-brother, Ptolemy Keraunos, the issue of Soter and Eurydike, the old king had weighed his alternatives into his old age and caused much bitterness amongst the members of his own family. The bitterness had probably started by the end of the fourth century, as Ptolemy I had already appointed Magas, Berenike's son by a certain Philip, as *strategos* of Kyrene, once Magas had succeeded in subduing a rebellion in the city;<sup>25</sup> the king later arranged a marriage between Arsinoe, Berenike's daughter, and Lysimachos of Thrace, and another marriage about the same time between Lysandra, Eurydike's daughter, and Kassander's youngest son.<sup>26</sup> When Pyrrhos was staying in Egypt ca 298, he observed how Berenike had the greater influence (μέγιστον δυναμένην) of the king's two wives by her tact and understanding. Pyrrhos courted her for this very reason and married her daughter by Philip (Plut. *Pyrrhus* 4.4). Ptolemy's preference for Berenike about 298 would not imply, nonetheless, that the monarch had determined to elevate her offspring to the throne, especially since young Ptolemy was only about ten years old while Keraunos was over twenty. Even if they were the same age, Ptolemy's preference for Berenike would not imply a preference for her son, and indeed, the monarch continued the even-handed treatment of his offspring until at least 287. He contracted a marriage between the widowed Lysandra and Agathokles, son of Lysimachos, about 293 (above, note 26);

<sup>25</sup>Paus. 1.7.1 states that Magas got his commission through Berenike's influence.

<sup>26</sup>Paus. 1.9.6 and 10.6 and Plut. *Demetr.* 31.3.

and at some uncertain date, possibly 301, he signed an agreement of marriage between Ptolemais, another daughter of Eurydike, and Demetrios Poliorketes. Seleukos had allegedly proposed it in an effort to reconcile differences between Ptolemy and Demetrios.<sup>27</sup> Ptolemy seems to have viewed the matter with some indifference, and, according to Plutarch (*Demetr.* 46.3), the marriage only occurred in 287, when Eurydike delivered the bride at Miletos. If Ptolemy had already abandoned the Eurydikean side of the family and ordered Keraunos from the court, Keraunos should have made the point of meeting Demetrios and giving the bride away. Keraunos eagerly sought refuge with Seleukos and Lysimachos after the exile. Why not from Demetrios? The reason now seems apparent. Keraunos did not venture forth in 287 because he was still looking after his interests at Alexandria, where Demetrios of Phaleron and other members of the court were pressing the claims of the eldest son.<sup>28</sup> The rift between Ptolemy and Eurydike did not affect relations between monarch and heir apparent, at least not openly, and Keraunos did not lose the struggle with his half brother until late 285, when the old king settled the succession upon his youngest son and banished Keraunos from the court (*Nepos* 21.3.4). Even then, Demetrios of Phaleron prevailed upon the king not to relinquish his royal authority, for "if you give it to another, you will not have it yourself,"<sup>29</sup> and Ptolemy concurred by keeping all power until his death. The scribes kept dating their documents with the regnal years of Ptolemy Soter and declaring his name in the opening protocols.<sup>30</sup> Demetrios remained an honoured member of the court until Soter's death in 282; Argaïos, Eurydike's younger son, remained at large in the Ptolemaic realm until after the accession of Ptolemy II; still another son of hers remained in Cyprus; Keraunos himself, having fled abroad, plotted from the courts of Thrace and Syria. If the elevation of Demetrios Poliorketes in 306 and that of Antiochos I in 294 had brought them real power from their fathers, the future Ptolemy II had to wait until the old king's death in 282.

Then he struck! He threw Demetrios of Phaleron into prison,<sup>31</sup> brought charges of treason against Argaïos, and crossing over to Cyprus, killed an unnamed son of Eurydike for spreading unrest amongst the islanders;<sup>32</sup> the

<sup>27</sup>Plut. *Demetr.* 33.3 and 46.3.

<sup>28</sup>Diog. Laert. 5.78. Diogenes took his information from Hermippos, a friend of Kallimachos.

<sup>29</sup>Diog. Laert. 5.79: ἄν ἄλλω δῶς, σὺ οὐχ ἔξεις.

<sup>30</sup>*PEleph* 2, 3, 4 and *PHibeh* 1.84 a and b.

<sup>31</sup>Above, n. 28. Diogenes dates the imprisonment of Demetrios after the death of Ptolemy Soter. Ptolemy II would not likely take this measure after his reconciliation with Keraunos in 281 (*Justin* 17.2.9).

<sup>32</sup>Paus. 1.7.1. It does not seem plausible that Eurydike's unnamed son could have justified a disturbance before his father's death in 282, or after the renunciation of claims by Keraunos in 281. That the trouble occurred in 282 receives some support from the fact that Ptolemy II sailed

young king started dating his documents with his own regnal years and putting his name in the opening protocols. During the first year of rule or 282/1, he supported his claims with three important items of propaganda: firstly, he held funeral games and sacrifices in honour of his father in an effort to show some piety towards him and to win the respect of his friends and associates, men like Sostratos of Knidos and Philokles of Sidon; at this first Ptolemaieia, the young king promised the ropes for the Panathenaia scheduled at Athens for summer that year;<sup>33</sup> he also assured the Telmessians about the same time with promises of exempting their town from becoming a *dorea*;<sup>34</sup> next, Ptolemy brought his parents together as the Theoi Soteres in an effort to stress Berenike's marriage to the old king; no one could then say that young Ptolemy was an illegitimate son, even if Soter had not wedded Berenike in 308, the year of his son's birth; Ptolemy thus directed the cult of Theoi Soteres against the Eurydikean side of the family before the pact with Keraunos in 281 (Justin 17.2.9); and finally, the young king redated his reign from 285 in an effort to stress his nomination during that year by Ptolemy Soter; Kallimachos further justified this act of settlement when he referred to the succession of a virtuous Zeus over his elder siblings, Hades and Poseidon (*Iov.* 65–66), an apt analogy, since the king's apologists portrayed their monarch as virtuous, while they depicted Keraunos as rash and ill-tempered; but the king went even further, by declaring that Soter had actually bestowed all power upon him and had abandoned his royal office before his death. The tradition appears in Nepos, Pausanias, Porphyry, and Justin. According to Nepos,

Ptolemy himself while still alive handed over the kingdom to his son . . . .<sup>35</sup>

Pausanias adds to Nepos:

there to take care of some very serious business in his first year, when he met Kallias of Sphettos. In his commentary on *SEG* 29.102, T. L. Shear, *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286* (Princeton, N.J. 1978, *Hesperia* Supp. 17) 26, dates the visit to 282. Older scholars—Mahaffy, Bevan, Macurdy—have dated the events of Paus. 1.7.1 in chronological order, but Pausanias has mentioned Ptolemy's crimes in order of antipathy, just as Lucian would do, when he put the incestuous marriage before the lesser crimes of murder, adultery, and theft (*Icaromenippus* 15).

<sup>33</sup>*SEG* 29.102, lines 55–71. Shear (*op. cit.* 35–37) rejected this inference in his commentary, because he presumed that *SIG* 1.390, erroneously dated to ca 280, referred to the institution of the Ptolemaieia during that year. He persuaded both E. G. Turner and H. Heine; see *CAH* 7<sup>2</sup> (1984) 138 and 417 respectively.

<sup>34</sup>*SEG* 28.1224. The inscription refers to a gift of a golden crown to Ptolemy II. *SIG* 1.390 and *SEG* 1.366 suggest that this was the usual tribute to the king at the Ptolemaieia. Since the king held the festival before the Athenians held the Panathenaia in late summer, the Ptolemaieia was the likely occasion for the promise, since the Telmessians would have sailed to Alexandria at that time to express their loyalty to the new monarch.

<sup>35</sup>Nepos 21.3.4: *Ipse autem Ptolemaeus, cum vivus filio regnum tradidisset . . .*

And when his end grew near, he relinquished the kingdom of Egypt to Ptolemy . . . the son of Berenike, not the son of Antipater's daughter.<sup>36</sup>

Porphry elaborates with chronological details:

While he was still alive, he gave the rule to his son Ptolemy, who was called Philadelphos, and he lived two years under his son, who had assumed power. Thus, not forty, but thirty-eight years are reckoned for the first Ptolemy, whom they call Soter.  
(FGrHist 260 F 2 [2])

And Justin expands with rhetorical flourish:

After the war, Ptolemy died in the glory of his great achievements. Before falling ill, and against the tradition of his people, he had relinquished the kingdom to his youngest son, and had rendered an account of this deed to his people; his goodwill in accepting the throne was no less than his father's goodwill in giving it. This show of mutual affection between father and son had especially aroused the affection of the people towards the youth, because the father, by giving him the throne officially, had become a private citizen, an officer of the king's guards, and had said that it was more honourable to be father of a king (than to possess) an entire kingdom.<sup>37</sup>

The documents from the reigns of Ptolemies I and II do not bear out this version of the facts. Philadelphos had started with his *first* regnal year, and only afterwards had leaped into his fourth, although Porphry was pointing in the right direction when he associated the retroactive dating with the act of settlement in 285. By stating that Ptolemy had got all power at that time, Nepos, Pausanias, Porphry, and Justin have preserved an important article of propaganda from the early years of Ptolemy II. Ptolemy then spoke by changing his chronology and spreading the tale about his succession. And his message was appropriate for 282: although old King Ptolemy has passed away, I received the sovereignty from him during his own lifetime, and nothing has therefore changed.

The king hardly directed these apologetics to the native population of the *chora*; so we should not wonder that Ptolemy left unaltered the native system of dating in 282, and that the Egyptian regnal year fell some two or three numerals behind the corresponding year on the Macedonian calendar. Probably too, the young king was unfamiliar at first with the native system of reckoning, because he lived in Alexandria and dated with the Macedonian

<sup>36</sup>Paus. 1.6.8: καὶ ὡς ἦν πλησίον ἡ τελευταία, Πτολεμαῖον ἀπέλειπεν Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύειν . . . γεγόνοντα ἐκ Βερενίκης ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ τῆς Ἀντιπάτρος θυγατρὸς.

<sup>37</sup>Justin 16.2.7–9: *Finito bello, Ptolemaeus cum magna rerum gestarum gloria moritur. Is contra ius gentium minimo natu ex filiis ante infirmitatem regnum tradiderat eiusque rei populo rationem reddiderat, cuius non minor favor in accipiendo quam patris in tradendo regno fuerat. Inter cetera patris et filii mutuae pietatis exempla etiam ea res amorem populi iuveni conciliaverat, quod pater, regno publice ei tradito, privatus officium regi inter satellites fecerat omnique regno pulchrius regis esse patrem dixerat.*

system of years and months, although any lack of familiarity could not have lasted very long: Ptolemy visited the temple at Pithom in 278 and 272,<sup>38</sup> received numerous priestly messages dated on the native calendar, and doubtless heard about the growing volume of private papyri written in Greek, but dated with Egyptian months and years. This growing volume of private papyri—wills, accounts, and contracts—may have caused some real confusion or difficulty, if they ever appeared as evidence in a Greek court. Nevertheless, only in 267, when Ptolemy would raise a younger son over the claims of the future Euergetes<sup>39</sup>—a situation comparable to his own in 285—did the question of reforming the native calendar surface in the king's mind and finally influence the calculation of Egyptian years. By then, Ptolemy was no longer content merely to adjust the native chronology by some two years,<sup>40</sup> for he also wanted to relate the native calendar to the Macedonian method of dating and resolve any future ambiguity in favour of the Macedonian system. Beginning in the nineteenth Egyptian year, demotic scribes make references to the eponymous priesthoods of Arsinoe, Alexander, and the Theoi Adelphoi; by the twentieth Egyptian year, the scribes make equations between the native and Macedonian calendars. Both innovations would suggest administrative reasons for reforming the chronology; and no doubt these reasons weighed upon the king. But the coincidence of Ptolemy's changing his chronology and elevating his son at the same time was no accident: it illustrates how, even by 267, his own nomination in 285 would remain an important part of his Greek propaganda.

#### TABLE OF PTOLEMY II'S REGNAL YEARS

The Table (below, 156–158) indicates the chronology of regnal years under Ptolemy Philadelphos. The second and third Macedonian years and the seventeenth and eighteenth Egyptian years were never part of that chronology, because Ptolemy omitted them when he reckoned his dates from the settlement of 285. Most of the documents used to construct the Macedonian chronology are taken from official sources: coins, decrees, and honorific inscriptions. Because of the careful conditions of manufacture, the coins are the least likely of all official documents to show chronological error. The coins thus substantiate most of the Macedonian years in the Table. The

<sup>38</sup>*JCair* 22183, lines 7 and 15. Translation and commentary appear in E. Naville, "La Stèle de Pithom," *ZAeS* 40 (1902) 66–75.

<sup>39</sup>The elevation is suggested by a change in the opening protocols to include the son's name. *PdemLouvre* 2424, dated in Egyptian year 19, Hathyr, is the earliest document with the new preamble.

<sup>40</sup>The priests should have left the sixteenth year and entered the twentieth to put the Egyptian regnal year equal or one numeral ahead of the Macedonian year. The blunder resulted from Ptolemy's reforming the native calendar, but thinking in Macedonian terms.

documents showing the Egyptian years are taken from P. W. Pestman, "La chronologie égyptienne d'après les textes démotiques," *Pap. Lugd. Bat.* 15 (1967), while the eponymous priesthoods are mostly compiled from W. Clarysse and G. Van Der Veken, "The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt," *Pap. Lugd. Bat.* 24 (1983). The priests' names entered in Roman type are derived from demotic documents.

Although the proposed order of regnal years helps to sort out some of the problems raised by the documents, we are still so imperfectly informed about the Macedonian system in Egypt that we should not apply these results to Table C of A. E. Samuel's "Ptolemaic Chronology" (166, 167, and below) in an effort to reckon the period of each year, or even better, the Julian equivalent of a date on the Macedonian calendar. Samuel himself cautioned his readers about the mechanical use of his tables for dates before the twenty-second Macedonian year or 264/3 (161–163). We might pause to consider, therefore, the difficulties in his attempt at bringing some order out of a chaos of evidence. From R. A. Parker's study of *PdemCarlsberg* 9 and certain other documents, Samuel observed that the Egyptians had used a luni-solar cycle of twenty-five years for religious festivals from at least as early as 237 B.C. He then presented further evidence suggesting that the Ptolemies had used this cycle by 280/79 and possibly as early as 284/3, when they apparently adapted it to the Macedonian lunar calendar to begin each month on the evening of the first visibility of the crescent (54–61 and 63–73); by employing the cycle, they no longer needed to observe the phases of the moon. Samuel was then able to fit a large number of double-dated papyri from the Zenon archive into a coherent scheme of reckoning, but he also proposed two other systems of dating used side by side with the luni-solar cycle under Ptolemy II (33 and 34). In the first of these, the scribe equated the Macedonian month and day to an Egyptian month, whose day bore the same numeral as the Macedonian month's: thus, a certain Timandros equated Dystros 26 to Phamenoth 26 (*PHibeh* 1.146), and Artemidoros equated Peritos 6 to Phamenoth 6 (*PCairZen* 2.59251). In the second of these schemes, the scribe added ten to the number of days of the Egyptian month during its first twenty days, but subtracted twenty from the number of days of the Egyptian month during its last ten days to get the number of days for the corresponding month on the Macedonian system: Zenon equated Payni 1 to Daisios 11 (*PCairZen* 1.59145), but Apollonios equated Phaophi 23 to Dios 3 (*PCairZen* 1.59154). Even with *three* concurrent systems of dating, Samuel could not reconcile the double-dates in five papyri: *PSI* 5.502, *PMichZen* 1.48, *PHibeh* 1.77, *PCairZen* 2.59327 and 3.59562. "It is well to introduce one note of caution," he wrote in 1972. "If they are not to be taken as evidence of either another system, or, alternatively as suggesting that the system is not yet properly understood, they must be

explained as scribal errors."<sup>41</sup> Samuel's caution seems fully justified in the light of other documents. The scribe of *PHibeh* 1.92 equated year 22, Xandikos 14, to the Egyptian month of Mecheir; Mecheir securely dates from the 26th of March to the 25th of April, but Xandikos 14 falls on the 5th of May in Tables A to C (161–169); the amount of error is ten days; similarly, the scribe of *PdemZen* 3B equated the 34th Macedonian year to year 33, Mecheir 22, on the Egyptian calendar; the Egyptian date securely falls on the 14th of April in 252, but the 34th Macedonian year only begins on the 1st June in Table C; the amount of error here is more than forty-seven days; and finally, the scribe of *PdemLille* 1.4 equated the 39th Macedonian year to year 38, Tybi 20, on the native calendar; the Egyptian date securely falls on the 12th of March in 247, but the 39th Macedonian year only begins on the 6th of June in Table C; here the amount of error is greater than eighty-five days; although one could cite other documents for similar results, these three papyri are sufficient to show that the tables do not even produce a consistent amount of error.<sup>42</sup> Possibly we should associate this first problem—the failure of three systems to explain all the dates—with the second problem of Samuel's study, the internal inconsistency of his tables. One instance of this becomes apparent, if we examine the lengths of each year from Table C and calculate Dystros 24 of 282.

The length of each year in the Table is expressed in the number of days and in Julian dates. Because of the biennial intercalation, this length varied throughout the reign of Ptolemy II, so that odd years had about 384 days including a thirteenth month, while even years had about 354 days consisting of twelve months. Since year 1=4 had 354 days in theory, one can find Dystros 24 of 282 if one counts backwards 354 days from the 24th of January in 281: by this method, Dystros 24 would fall on the 4th of February. But we can calculate Dystros 24 of 282 by a second method, because the first day of each Macedonian year was also the last day of the previous year in Table C: the first day of the twenty-second year of Ptolemy II was thus the last day of his twenty-first year, the 14th of April in 264. If we wish to determine, therefore, the first day of the twenty-second year from Tables A to C in "Ptolemaic Chronology," we would follow Samuel's instructions and reckon Dystros 24 for year 21; similarly, if we wish to determine the (theoretical) first day of Ptolemy II's year 1=4, we would reckon Dystros 24 for the last or forty-first regnal year of Ptolemy Soter. By Tables A to C, that date would fall on the 7th of January in 282 or twenty-eight days ahead of the previous calculation of the 4th of February. Such internal error in the Tables, when combined with their failure to explain all the double-dates,

<sup>41</sup>A. E. Samuel (above, n. 12) 149, n. 1.

<sup>42</sup>Table A of "Ptolemaic Chronology" (163) contains five typographical errors under the heading "Philadelphus." They have not been employed in calculating the Macedonian dates in *PHibeh* 1.92, *PdemZen* 3B, and *PdemLille* 1.4.

TABLE C ADAPTED FROM "PTOLEMAIC CHRONOLOGY"<sup>43</sup>

year		no. of days:	year		no. of days:
1 = 4	-24 Jan. 281	354	22	14 Apr. 264-3 Apr. 263	354
5	24 Jan. 281-11 Feb. 280	383	23	3 Apr. 263-23 Apr. 262	385
6	11 Feb. 280-31 Jan. 279	354	24	23 Apr. 262-11 Apr. 261	354
7	31 Jan. 279-19 Feb. 278	384	25	11 Apr. 261-30 Apr. 260	384
8	19 Feb. 278-9 Feb. 277	356	26	30 Apr. 260-19 Apr. 259	355
9	9 Feb. 277-27 Feb. 276	383	27	19 Apr. 259-8 May 258	384
10	27 Feb. 276-16 Feb. 275	354	28	8 May 258-27 Apr. 257	355
11	16 Feb. 275-7 Mar. 274	383	29	27 Apr. 257-16 May 256	384
12	7 Mar. 274-24 Feb. 273	354	30	16 May 256-5 May 255	354
13	24 Feb. 273-15 Mar. 272	384	31	5 May 255-24 May 254	384
14	15 Mar. 272-4 Mar. 271	354	32	24 May 254-12 May 253	354
15	4 Mar. 271-22 Mar. 270	383	33	12 May 253-1 Jun. 252	385
16	22 Mar. 270-11 Mar. 269	355	34	1 Jun. 252-21 May 251	354
17	11 Mar. 269-29 Mar. 268	383	35	21 May 251-9 Jun. 250	384
18	29 Mar. 268-20 Mar. 267	356	36	9 Jun. 250-29 May 249	355
19	20 Mar. 267-7 Apr. 266	383	37	29 May 249-15 Jun. 248	382
20	7 Apr. 266-26 Mar. 265	354	38	15 Jun. 248-6 Jun. 247	356
21	26 Mar. 265-14 Apr. 264	384	39	6 Jun. 247-28 Jan. 246+	

suggests that we should cautiously refrain from applying the results of this essay to Tables A to C in an effort to get the Julian equivalent of a date on the Macedonian calendar.<sup>44</sup>

The Egyptian calendar, by contrast, is so thoroughly understood that one can apply Pestman's order of years to Skeat's tables, so that year 1 would be 283/2, year 2 would be 282/1, year 16 would be 268/7, but year 19 would be 267/6 etc. (see p. 152).

#### TORONTO

<sup>43</sup>The estimates of the number of days in each Macedonian year are my own based upon the assumption that the Julian dates in Table C are correct. I do not suggest that these figures and dates, submitted here for the purpose of discussion only, are accurate in any historical sense.

<sup>44</sup>Professor Samuel informs me that a computer programme used in preparing the tables was found to produce errors when he asked another computer centre to run it for him some years after the publication of his book.



Macedonian years and dates B.C.	Greek documents with Macedonian regnal years	The eponymous priesthoods of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi, and Arsinoe Philadelphos	Egyptian years and dates B.C.	Egyptian or Greek documents with Egyptian regnal years
1 = 282 4 = 282/1	Svoronos 558 & 559 <i>SEG</i> 28.1224		1 = 282	
5 = 281/0	Svoronos 556 & 557; L. Robert, <i>Doc. Asie Min. Mériid.</i> p. 53		2 = 282/81	<i>PEleph</i> 5; <i>PdemBM</i> 10530
6 = 280/79	Svoronos 634		3 = 281/0	<i>PdemPhil</i> 10
7 = 279/8	Svoronos 636 & 637; <i>PYale</i> 1.27 = <i>PHibeh</i> 1.97	Δ[ιμνάω]ϛ son of Ἀπ[ο]λλῶ	4 = 280/79	<i>PdemPhil</i> 11
8 = 278/7	Svoronos 659 & 570, <i>TAM</i> 2.158: <i>OGIS</i> 1.57		5 = 279/8	<i>PdemRyl</i> 12–14; <i>PdemBM</i> 10536
9 = 277/6	Svoronos 573–575, <i>SEG</i> 15.652		6 = 278/7	<i>ICair</i> 22183, line 7; <i>PdemBM</i> 10535
10 = 276/5	Svoronos 618; <i>PPetr</i> 3.20 <i>verso</i> , col. 2, lines 1–6		7 = 277/6	<i>PdemCair</i> 31013 A; <i>OBM</i> 5779
11 = 275/4	Svoronos 578 & 579; <i>TAM</i> 2.159, <i>PPetr</i> 3.20 <i>verso</i> , col. 3, lines 1–7		8 = 276/5	<i>PdemLouvre</i> 2428; <i>PdemPhil</i> 12
12 = 274/3	<i>PCairZen</i> 1.59001, line 2; <i>PHibeh</i> 1.110, line 40, <i>PSI</i> 4.321	Λεοντίσκος son of Καλλιμαῖδης	9 = 275/4	<i>PdemBM</i> 10529
13 = 273/2	<i>PCairZen</i> 1.59001, line 10; <i>PHibeh</i> 1.110, line 44	Νέο[ρχος] or Νεομ[η]ίδης son of [Νε]οκλῆς or [Φυλ]οκλῆς	10 = 274/3	<i>PdemLouvre</i> 2434 & 2437
14 = 272/1	<i>PHibeh</i> 2.198, line 147; <i>PHibeh</i> 2.199	Καλλικράτης son of Βοίσχος	11 = 273/2	
15 = 271/0	Svoronos 583–585, 639 & 640; <i>PHibeh</i> 1.99 & <i>PHibeh</i> 2.198, line 160	Πάτροκλος son of Πάτρων	12 = 272/1	<i>ICair</i> 22183, line 15; <i>PdemPhil</i> 13

Macedonian years and dates B.C.	Greek documents with Macedonian regnal years	The eponymous priesthoods of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi, and Arsinoe Philadelphos	Egyptian years and dates B.C.	Egyptian or Greek documents with Egyptian regnal years
16 = 270/69	Svoronos 589; <i>PPetr</i> 3.52b		13 = 271/0	<i>OBM</i> 5749; <i>IBuchem</i> 3
17 = 269/8	Svoronos 590–592		14 = 270/69	<i>OMaline</i> 10, 11, 14, 18, 26–30
18 = 268/7	<i>SEG</i> 27.1114, <i>PRev</i> col. 37, and <i>PSorb</i> 9 & 10		15 = 269/8	<i>ICair</i> 22181, line 13; <i>OMaline</i> 2
19 = 267/6	<i>ILabraunda</i> 3.1, p. 34	Aristomache daughter of Aristomachos	16 = 268/7	<i>PdemBM</i> 10077 A & B; <i>OLouvre</i> 7905
20 = 266/5	Svoronos 595–597, 645 & 844	Berenike daughter of Aristodikos	19 = 267/6	<i>PdemLouvre</i> 2424; <i>PdemCair</i> 50148
21 = 265/4	Svoronos 646 & 895 and <i>PRev</i> col. 37	Τιμαρχίδης son of Ἀσκληπιόδοτος Ξεινορόδη daughter of Agesipolis	20 = 266/5	<i>OBrooklyn</i> 37.1821; Cf. <i>ActaO</i> 25 (1960) 250
22 = 264/3	<i>PHibeh</i> 1.92 and Svoronos 647 & 896	Πέλοψ son of Ἀλέξανδρος Μνησιστράτη daughter of Τεΐσαρχος	21 = 265/4	<i>ICair</i> 22183, line 27; <i>PdemPhil</i> 14 & 510 b
23 = 263/2	Svoronos 648, 794 & 821; <i>PHibeh</i> 1.88 & 2.209	Κινέας son of Ἀλκέτας daughter of Πολεμοκράτης	22 = 264/3	<i>OBM</i> 5658
24 = 262/1	<i>PPetr</i> 3.20, verso, col. 3 lines 8–12; Svoronos 649	Ἀριστόνικος son of Περίλαος Χαρέα daughter of Ἄπιος	23 = 263/2	<i>PdemLille</i> 1.34
25 = 261/0	Svoronos 650, 722–724, 765 & 795; <i>PHibeh</i> 1.134, <i>POslo</i> 2.16	Πτολεμαῖος son of Ἀρατοκλῆς Φιλωτέρα daughter of Ἀ[ . . . ]	24 = 262/1	<i>PBerl</i> 13.637; <i>OBM</i> 5762, <i>OMaline</i> 6
26 = 260/59	<i>BGU</i> 6.1226; Svoronos 726	Ταυρίνος son of Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀρσυνή daughter of Ποσειδώνιος	25 = 261/0	
27 = 259/8	<i>BGU</i> 6.1227; Svoronos 651, 727, 728 & 796	Μήδειος son of Λάμπων or Λαάγων Μήταλα daughter of Ἀνδρωκάδης	26 = 260/59	<i>PdemPhil</i> 15

Macedonian years and dates B.C.	Greek documents with Macedonian regnal years	The eponymous priesthoods of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi, and Arsinoe Philadelphos	Egyptian years and dates B.C.	Egyptian or Greek documents with Egyptian regnal years
28 = 258/7	Svoronos 653, 729, 766 & 767; <i>BGU</i> 6.1228; <i>PHibeh</i> 1.94	Ἀντίφωλος son of Αὐκίνος Νύμφη daughter of Παίων	27 = 259/8	<i>PdemBruxelles</i> 4
29 = 257/6	Svoronos 656, 730, 731, 769, 823–825 <i>PCairZen</i> 1.59075, 59076, 59133; <i>PHibeh</i> 1.95	Ἀντίοχος son of Κεββας Δημόνικη daughter of Φίλων	28 = 258/7	<i>OBM</i> 5752
30 = 256/5	Svoronos 657–661, 732, 733, 770 & 798; <i>PSI</i> 9.1001, <i>PColZen</i> 1.54	Ἀλέξανδρος son of Λεωνίδης Πρέπουσα daughter of Δημήτριος	29 = 257/6	<i>PSI</i> 5.502; <i>PLeid</i> 379
31 = 255/4	Svoronos 622, 734–737, 771–774; <i>PCairZen</i> 2.59173 & 59182	Γλαύκων son of Ἐπεοκλῆς Βερενίκη daughter of Νικάνωρ	30 = 256/5	<i>PdemZen</i> 1
32 = 254/3	Svoronos 663–670, 738, 739, 775, 776, 803		31 = 255/4	<i>OBucheum</i> 54
33 = 253/2	Svoronos 671–679, 740–742, 777, 804–806 <i>PCairZen</i> 2.59248	Aetos son of Ἀπολλώνιος Demetria daughter of Διονύσιος	32 = 254/3	<i>OBerl</i> 6253 and 9479 <i>SB</i> 3.7263
34 = 252/1	Svoronos 680–684, 743, 744, 778, 807; <i>PHibeh</i> 1.98; <i>PSI</i> 5.515	Νεοπόλεμος son of Κρατίς Ἀρτυσιή daughter of Νικόλαος	33 = 253/2	<i>PdemLouvre</i> 2433
35 = 251/0	Svoronos 685–689, 745, 746, 779–781; <i>PCairZen</i> 2.59289	Πτολεμαῖος son of Ἀνδρόμαχος Βιαισιτύχη daughter of Φίλων	34 = 252/1	<i>PdemZen</i> 2
36 = 250/49	Svoronos 690–693, 749, 782, 811–813, 382; <i>PPetr</i> 3.145; <i>PCorn</i> 2	Ἐπαίνετος son of Ἐπαίνετος Ἐχειρίτη daughter of Μεννέας	35 = 251/0	<i>PdemZen</i> 4; <i>PMichZen</i> 1.48
37 = 249/8	Svoronos 694, 695, 750–753, 783, 814, 815		36 = 250/49	<i>PdemZen</i> 5; <i>OBM</i> 5676
38 = 248/7	Svoronos 696, 697, 754, 755, 784, 816; <i>PPetr</i> 3.54(a); <i>PSI</i> 5.521	Ἀντίοχος son of Κρατίδας Μενίστη daughter of Φίλων	37 = 249/8	<i>BGU</i> 6.1327; <i>PHibeh</i> 2.264
39 = 247/6	Svoronos 670, 699, 756, 817 <i>PCairZen</i> 3.59340	Τληπόλεμος son of Ἀρταπάτης daughter of Μενέμαχος	38 = 248/7	<i>PdemLille</i> 1.4
			39 = 247/6	<i>PSI</i> 6.583