T. GAGOS

THREE SHORT BYZANTINE PAPYRI FROM THE MICHIGAN COLLECTION

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 79 (1989) 271–280

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

Three Short Byzantine Papyri From the Michigan Collection¹

The papyri published here all date from the later part of the Byzantine period. No. 1 is the only complete text, whereas nos. 2 and 3 are badly mutilated or incomplete; reconstruction is successfully effected where the text is of formulaic nature. None of the papyri bears an exact date and their assignment is decided on palaeographical grounds in conjunction with the internal evidence. The first two, which I date to the Vth century A.D., could be of particular interest, since they both belong to a period which is poorly documented (cf. R.S. Bagnall-K.A. Worp, *Miscellanea Papyrologica*, 13ff.).

1. Order to Pay

P. Mich.inv. 1962

25.5 x 4.6 cm.

V cent.A.D.

Provenance unknown

The text is written on a long rectangular piece of good quality papyrus. The margins, both at the top and the bottom, are very small; the left margin measures ca. 2.5 cm. The bottom edge is markedly irregular, whereas on the right there is no actual margin, as the writing runs to the very edge on line 2. There are at least ten vertical creases. The space between the succeeding creases becomes gradually wider from the left to the right, corresponding to the way the papyrus was once rolled and consequently flattened. The document has been written by two hands. The first hand writing the main text is rapid and practised and produces a semi-cursive, but legible, script; the second script is very similar to the first. There is intentional word-division in the first line in order to fill in the blank space after the address and for the same purpose the scribe uses the horizontal upper stroke of the sigma in $\Theta e \delta \omega \rho o c$ as filler stroke. The last line is slightly indented. The writing runs across the fibres and the back is blank.

The structure and the contents of the order are very basic. Theodorus addresses Philoxenus, a retail dealer, and asks him to pay the amount of one thousand eight hundred myriads of denarii (cf. note to line 2) to a hitherto unknown *scholasticus* called Apollonius. What the connection and economic relationship between these individuals is, cannot be established with certainty; none of them is, to my knowledge, identifiable in other papyri of the same period. There are two features of interest in our document: (1) the new *scholasticus* is given the honorific title $\theta \alpha \nu \mu \alpha c i \omega \tau \alpha \sigma$ and this, with the possible exception of one lacunose text, is unattested elsewhere in the papyri (cf. note to line 2); and (2) it records a $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta \rho \lambda \sigma c$; this profession is not frequently recorded in documents of a late date (see note to line 1).

The papyrus contains an indiction and month date, but, unfortunately, it does not record a regnal year. Given that the currency is counted in myriads, it should date from after the middle of the fourth century A.D. (cf. note on line 2, $\mu\nu\rho\mu\dot{\alpha}\delta\alpha c$). On palaeographical grounds, the

 $^{^{1}}$ I wish to thank G.M. Soter for checking my English and L. Koenen for his assistance in the preparation of this paper; I have used the CD Rom # 2 of the Duke Data Bank.

papyrus can be compared with scripts of the fifth century A.D., such as *P. Prag.* I 34 (pls. 35-36) of IV/V A.D., 51 (pl. 56) of 406 A.D., P. Med. inv. 69.07 (Montevecchi, *La Papirologia* 94) of 424-25 A.D.; *BGU* II 609 (Seider, *Paläographie* III, pl. 33, # 51) of 441 A.D., etc. This date is also supported by the occurrence of the honorific title θαυμαcιώτατος for the *scholasticus*; in the literary sources this title is encountered in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. (see the relevant note on line 2, τῷ θαυμαcιωτάτῳ cχολ. 'A.).

κυρίφ μου ἀδελφῷ Φιλοξένῷ μεταβόλ(ῷ) Θεόδωρος.
παράςχου τῷ θαυμαςιωτάτῷ cχολαςτικ(ῷ) ᾿Απολλωνίῷ ἀργυρίου μυριάδας
χιλίας ῷ.
(m₂) Ἐπεὶφ δ, ē ἰνδικτ(ίωνος). cεςημ(είωμαι) (δηναρίων μυριάδας) / αῷ.^{''}.

1. μεταβολ 2. εχολαετικ 3. ινδικ εεεημε 🗶

"To my lord brother Philoxenus, retail dealer, Theodorus. Give to the most excellent *scholasticus* Apollonius one thousand and eight hundred myriads of silver. (2nd hand) Epeiph 4th, 5th indiction. I, ..., have signed for 1800 myriads of denarii."

1. μεταβόλ(φ): this word for "retail dealer" (in *P. Rev.* mentioned along with κάπηλοι, 47.12; 48.3.7), due to its use as adjective in the name of a tax paid by the fishmongers, the μεταβόλων άλιέων τέλος (Wilcken, *Ostraka* I, 136), occurs frequently in Ptolemaic papyri. It is rarer in the Roman times (*P. Oxy.* XLV 3244 of 228 A.D.; *P. Princ.* II 135.v.17, where μετάβολος denotes the profession and, pace the editor, is not a proper name), but became part of the new formation ἰχθυομετάβολος (*P. Ryl.* II 196.7, IInd cent.; *P. Genova* I 2.13, IVth cent.), which is a synonym for the kindred (yet in literal meaning different) ἰχθύβολος, -λεύς, and ἰχθυόβολος. For the Byzantine times I am aware of only three secure examples (*P. Rain. Cent.* 109.6 of 490 A.D.; *SB* I 5246 = *P. Amst.* I 45, Anhang 2 of ca. 453-483; and *SB* XVI 12851 of the Vth cent. A.D.); uncertain is *P. Erl.* 53.46 of 314 A.D., where the editor's μεταβολεξί (i.e. dat. sing. of μεταβολεύς) may rather hide μεταβόλοι(c); the plural is more appropriate to the context, but the matter is complicated by the fact that, just before the word, the scribe has omitted a numeral.

2. τῷ θαυμαcιωτάτῷ cχολαcτικ(ῷ) 'Απολλωνίῷ: no scholasticus of such name is recorded in Claus, O ΣΧΟΛΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ, 20-42 or in the supplementary list published by Sijpesteijn, ZPE 70 (1987) 144-46. Now, one should also add the instances recorded in P. Freer inv. 08.45 (P. Freer 1 and 2), namely Θεοδόcιοc (I 35; III.78, 82, 91; VI 196; VII 217, 225; VIII 279 and IX 284), Yίνίαc (III 97), and Κωνcτάντιοc (VI 210), all of the early VI cent. A.D. These references are taken from the republication of the two first Freer papyri by J. Gascou and L. MacCoul, Travaux et Mémoires 10 (1987) 103 ff. (with a new edition of P. Cairo Masp. III 67140 in Appendix I, pp. 146-148, which also records a scholasticus). Further instances of scholastici are in SB XVI 12944 (name Κολλοῦθοc, title coφώτατοc) of VII cent. A.D. and 13015 of VI cent. A.D.; P. Oxy. LV 3797 of 624 A.D.; and P. Stras. IX 877 of IV A.D., where the word is partly restored.

This is the first instance of the honorific title $\theta \alpha \upsilon \mu \alpha \iota \omega \tau \alpha \tau \sigma \sigma$ used for the *scholasticus* in papyri. In *P. Masp.* II 67202.1, the editor restores this title (in abbreviation) for the *scholasticus*, but gives no discussion to either the title or the restoration. Compared to other honorific ti-

272

tles of the *scholasticus*, the present one is also rare in the literary sources; see Claus (*op.cit.*, 87, 137), whose examples are from the late 4th and 5th cent.

μυριάδας: After 360 A.D. when the term μυριάς is used by itself, that is without specification of coins, it does not refer to anything else, but denarii (so R.S. Bagnall, *Currency and Inflation*, 12 with note 2). For similar instances see, e.g., *P. Oxy.* XLIV 3203.19 (400 A.D.), *P. Yale* I 71.12 (456 A.D.) and *P. Köln* III 151.23; hence, P. Mich. inv. no. 307 [H.C. Youtie, *ZPE* 37 (1980) 225, note to line 5; repr. *Scriptiunculae Posteriores* II 589] could be after 360 A.D. This should then also be the *terminus post* for our papyrus, but cf. note on line 3, (δηναρίων μυριάδας).

 χ ιλίας $\overline{\omega}$: the reading of the omega is uncertain, but it is very unlikely that the scribe wrote οκτακοςίας, first of all due to the lack of space and second because the surviving traces support the reading of omega rather than of omicron; also at the top there appears to be a horizontal, which must be the number sign. The edge of the papyrus is quite regular and there is no indication of mutilation.

3: For the formula "month x, y indiction" see, *e.g.*, *CPR* X 17.2 (V A.D.), *P. Herm.* 71.5 (V A.D.), 76.5 (V A.D); and *P. Harris* I 92.5-6 (V/VI A.D.); cf. also *P. Herm.* 39.3 (V A.D), where the indiction number is written in full.

cecημ(είωμαι): Before this verb a name is expected. The first trace is very faint, and unless it is an off-set, it would rather be a cross; this is unlikely since there appears no other cross in this papyrus, neither at the very end nor at the beginning. The next letter is either a very large *omikron* (indicating perhaps the beginning of a new word) or a *theta*; then either a very cursive *omega* or perhaps a very fast *upsilon* and sigma follow. We may suspect that the scribe wrote a name like $\Theta\hat{\omega}(v\iota c)$ or $O\dot{v}c()$; see the examples listed in *Namenbuch* and *Onomasticon*).

(δηναρίων μυριάδαc): for the symbol (*), see *RE* III A, 2306 (line 13) and compare, *e.g.*, *P. Batav*. I 19.2 (V/VI A.D.), with note and the symbol in plate XI, and *P. Oxy.* XLIV 3203.20 (400 A.D.; in line 19 the text reads μυριάδαc and in line 20 the editor expands a symbol to δηναρίων μυριάδαc without indicating its shape); the form of the siglum indicates that it stands for δηναρίων μυριάδαc although after 360 μυριάδαc alone would have been sufficient (see above, n. on line 2, μυριάδαc).

2. Fragment of a Short Letter and a Drawing²

P. Mich.inv. 4290	20.00 x 9.5 cm.	V/VI cent. A.D.
Provenance unknown		Plate VII b

This light yellow scrap of papyrus contains the second half of two lines of text. The margin at the top, including the cross sign, measures just over 5.00 cm; at the bottom, below line 2, which does not run to the end of the papyrus, the blank is ca. 2.00 cm; on the right, line 1 runs right to the edge. The hand seems to be skilled and produces an attractive semi-cursive which is easy to read.

Because of the fragmentary condition of the papyrus, very little can be said about the content, except that it was a brief letter addressed to a middle or high rank official (see note on line 1, $\dot{\alpha}v\delta\rho\epsilon(\alpha)$ inviting him to visit the place of the sender. The wording of the document

² I would like to thank Th. Thomas for her useful comments on the drawing.

appears to imply an urgent situation, as the official is asked to move quickly (but, cf. note to line 1, first part). Expressions and structure can be compared with texts such as *P. Oxy. XVI* 1844-61.

The most interesting feature of this papyrus is the sketchy drawing on the back, which is located at the right hand side of the scrap, and perpendicular to the text on the front. It consists of three items: a male figure on the left, the head of a larger person on the right, and an elephant between the two human figures facing to the left. The elephant occupies the most prominent position in the drawing. The figure on the left has long and straight hair and feet markedly long in proportion to the rest of his body. The figure apparently holds a stick in his right hand which touches the elephant on the trunk. The head on the right side has short hair — silently arguing, perhaps, his young age — big bulging eyes as they are normal in Byzantine art, and a round face similar to that of the figure on the left. Each human figure bears two long curving horns on the head.

In drawing the elephant the amateur artist has tried to create a three-dimensional image, by depicting all four legs of the beast and both ears, the right one rising up in the background. The tail has been drawn in a single stroke and there is an effort to denote its swirling movement. The trunk is quite long and two curving strokes right at the root of the trunk and very close to the mouth seem to represent the tusks. The wrinkles on both the legs and the trunk are indicated with short parallel strokes.

There is good reason to argue that the drawing, even if taken as a simple doodle,³ bears signs of incompleteness. A close inspection of the human head on the right can confirm this suspicion, as there is clearly ink on the lower right side of the head, which seems to indicate that the activity was suddenly interrupted. There are also scanty traces further down the same part of the drawing, at the same level with the right side of the elephant, which if not taken as ink off-sets could mean that the right part of the drawing might have been once complete, but for some reason was perhaps intentionally or unintentially washed away. In this case the figure on the right must have been quite large, but I find this explanation less plausible.

The colour of the ink and the nib of the pen appear to be the same on both sides, but this is hardly sufficient proof for an identification of the hands. Also it is not clear whether the drawing is connected in some way or another with the message on the front or if it is merely the product of an idle moment.

The prominent position of the elephant in the drawing and the fact that the two human figures bear horns on their heads look like the most promising keys for the decipherment of the drawing.⁴ But, in the end, such hope is disappointed. The presence of the horns could point to a religious or, perhaps, magic environment. Similar horns on human figures occur in

³ It is by no means certain that the use of this term does justice to the drawing; essentially we do not know whether the drawing had any purpose or not.

⁴ On the elephant in general, see H.H. Scullard, *The elephant in the Greek and Roman World* (London 1974); the papyrological evidence has been collected and discussed by H.Raios-Chouliara, *Anagennesis* 1, 1981, 69-81 (with a list in pp. 74-75). In Egypt, the elephant could point, or allude, to Elephantine, "the land of the elephants", but there would be nothing to substantiate such a guess.

PGM II IX verso, Taf. I, Abb 7, which comes from more or less the same period (IV/V cent. A.D.). However, the elephant is not known to have been a sacred animal in Egypt or to have played a role in the Egyptian religion.⁵ The same applies to the magical side: as a matter of fact, ivory is mentioned in *PGM* XXIIa⁶ but there $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon$]φαντα occurs in the quotation of the verse Δ 141 which is used as spell for healing elephantiasis.⁷

+

κατ' αὐτὴ]ỵ τὴν ὥραν καταλάβῃ ἡ ὑμῶν ἀνδρεία τὰ ἐνταῦθα]ειcω ἀναγκαίως +

pap. υ, μων

1: It is impossible to establish exactly how much is missing on the left. This would depend on (1) whether there was a main verb (cf. note on καταλάβη), and (2) the exact form of the expression of time recorded here. *P. Oxy.* XVI 1871.2 records the basic form κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ὥραν (see the following note), whereas in P. Oxy XVI 1844.1 and *Stud. Pal.* XX 254.2 the expression is encountered in the expanded form εὐθέως καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ὥραν and πάραυτα καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ὥραν respectively. The phrase, a product of the late Byzantine period, always accompanies an urgent request for immediate action, although, because of the conventionality of the expression, the words need not be taken in their literal sense (cf. e.g. *P. Oxy.* XVI 1844, note to line 1).

καταλάβη: here, the verb means simply "to encounter somebody, to arrive at a place", cf. Preisigke, *WB s.v*. 3. The combination with τὰ ἐνταῦθα is found also in *P. Oxy.* XVI 1856.5; LI 3637.2 (see note); and also, perhaps, in XVI 1829.18-19. Most likely the subjunctive expresses a request or command (see the preceding note), either in the form of, *e.g.*, παρακαλῶ ὅπως κατ' αὐτὴ]ν τὴν ὅραν καταλάβῃ ἡ ὑμῶν ἀνδρεία τὰ ἐνταῦθα or shorter, with a jussive subjunctive in an independent clause, κατ' αὐτὴ]ν τὴν ὅραν καταλάβῃ ἡ ὑμῶν ἀνδρεία ... (cf. Mandilaras, *The Verb*, §§ 554 ff.). The former restoration suits better the use of the respectful address, ἡ ὑμῶν ἀνδρεία (cf. *P.Oxy.* 1871.2, in normalized spelling, παρακαλῶ τὸν ἀγήρων ἡμῶν] πατέρα καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ὅραν πέμψον μοι τὸ πλοῖον ...), but the growing conventionality of the honorific title (see the following note) may have devaluated its meaning to the point that it fits together with a jussive subjunctive, particularly if the sender is an official of a higher rank.

ή ὑμῶν ἀνδρεία: the person addressed must have been an official who belonged to the high, or more likely at this late period, to the upper middle ranks of the official dom. Initially, the title was

⁵ On coins struck by Ptolemaios Soter, Alexander's head is covered with the skin of an elephant's head; on other coins issued by Soter, Alexander's carriage is pulled by four elephants; also on statuettes of Ptolemaios Philadelphos, the king's head is covered with the trunk and skin of an elephant (H. Kyrieleis, *Bildnisse der Ptolemäer*, Archäologische Forschungen II, DAI [Berlin 1975] pll. 8.5 and 6; 9.1 and 2; 10.1-3; cf. catalogue B 1 and 2). These symbols have been connected with Dionysos (*e.g.* G. Grimm, *Das ptolemäische Ägypten*, Akten des Internationalen Symposions, September 1975 in Berlin, DAI [Mainz 1978] 108 with n. 605). But there is nothing to connect these representations with the present doodle.

⁶ The Greek Magical Texts, ed. H.D. Betz (Chicago-London 1986), 260 (in J. Scarborough's translation).

⁷ Outside Egypt, the elephant seems to have "gained an aura of sanctity, or at least of religiosity" and they were believed favourites of the sun-god (Scullard, *op.cit.* [see n. 4] 255). This could provide an explanation to the presence of the curving horns on the heads of the two human figures, but the existing evidence from Egypt offers no ground to speculate the connection of the elephant with either the sun or the moon deities.

used for the prefect of Egypt and his deputy; later, it passed to the praesides. However, already from the third decade of the fourth century the use of the title is not absolutely exclusive to those officials and in the fifth century its employment becomes more diffused and it is used also for officials of the middle ranks; cf. *CPR* V 7.9, note. I append below new additional examples which are consonant with the general pattern outlined in Rea's note; the last two entries, both from the fifth century, are, in my opinion, indicative of the indiscriminate use of $dv\delta\rho\epsilon i\alpha$ in the late period, as part of a more general diffusion of the honorific titles that occurs from the fifth century onwards:

1) P. Oxy. XLVI 3304.19 (A.D. 301: Prefect of Egypt)

2) P. Coll. Youtie II 79.12 (A.D. 311: Prefect of Egypt)

3) P. Oxy. XLIII 3123.r.4 (A.D. 322: Praeses of the Thebaid)

4) P. Oxy. XLIII 3125.r.7 (A.D. 325: Magister rei privatae)

5) P. Oxy. LIV 3757.9 (A.D. 325: Prefect of Egypt)

6) P. Oxy. LIV 3758.r.10,85 (A.D. 325: Prefect of Egypt)

7) SB XIV 11975.8 (ca A.D.325: Praeses of the Thebaid)

8) P. Abinn. 50.5 (A.D. 346: Praepositus; the text is damaged)

9) P. Abinn. 54.30 (A.D. 346: Dux of the Thebaid; the text is damaged)

10) P. Rain. Cent. 91.8,11 (A.D. 419: Tribunus; no more information can be derived)

11) BGU XII 2150.13 (A.D. 472: ακρινιάριος τῆς ατρατιωτικῆς τάξεως Θηβαίδος).

3. Loan of Money Involving Labour Duties

P. Mich.inv. 50231 x 29 cm.VI/VII century A.D.Hermopolis.Plate VIII

The papyrus in its spresent condition survives in two large, detached, fragments which join exactly in line 9 of the printed text. It has suffered severe mutilation at the top and the text before the formula acknowledging receipt of the loan is almost completely missing. The right segment has also suffered serious damage, whereas the left side is preserved in a good condition and bears a margin which measures approximately 1.2 cm. At the bottom, the space between the signature of the last witness and the lower edge of the papyrus measures ca 9.5 cm., and it contains a florishing and fluent notarial counter-signature (see note to line 15). As is to be expected in this late period, the papyrus is written on *charta transversa* in which writing and *kolleseis* run in the same direction (see E.G. Turner, *Recto and Verso*, 47 ff.). Three *kolleseis* are extant, the first along line 2 of the papyrus. Each *kollema* measures ca 14.00 cm. The damage of the papyrus at the top must have been caused by the separation of the upper *kollema(ta)* from its original location along the joint. The number of the *kollemata* lost at the top cannot be established.

best parallel is *SB* VI 9284 (553 A.D.).⁸ *P. Grenf.* II 87 (602 A.D.), is cited by Gerstinger as a parallel, but the wording and the situation are quite different. Both in the *SB* and the new Michigan text the borrower carries out irrigation duties on a piece of land which belongs to the lender. There is no information about the salary of the lender, nor do we hear anything about interest added to the capital. We may, therefore, assume that the borrower, instead of paying interest, undertook the labour obligation. The capital would be repaid at the time the borrower gives up his irrigation duties. This term is not mentioned anywhere, and could have been regulated in a separate contract of labour.

Aurelius Iordanes (line 12) who signs on behalf of the borrower, is the scribe of the main text. His is a practised hand which writes a semi-cursive and legible script with a tendency to slope to the right, and consists mainly of large letters, some with long up- and down-strokes, such as *rho*, *phi*, *chi*, and *tau*. Diaeresis is regularly employed over upsilon at the beginning of words.⁹ Apart from the signature of the public notary in line 15, two more hands are easy to distinguish at the end of the document (lines 12-14), those of the witnesses.

Since the imperial titulature is missing, there is no exact date for the document. Internal evidence strongly points to a date at the end of the sixth-beginning of the seventh centuries A.D. (see notes to lines 4, 8, and 15)

1	[ca 12] [χαί[ρ]ειν. ὁμολογῶ ἐcχ[ηκέναι c. 35 11.]						
	ύπ' ἐμὲ ἐοῦ κτήματος καλ[ουμένου] [] [] απ[κεφαλαίου]						
4	χυςοῦ νομιςμάτια πέντε παρὰ κεράτια Ἐξ ἕκαςτον δημ[οςίῷ ζυγῷ]						
	τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως, γί (νονται) χρ(υcoῦ) νο(μιςμάτια) ε π(αρά) κερ(άτια) ς, άπερ παρέξω						
coì ἡνίκ[α ?(?)]							
ἀποςταίην τῆς ἀρδείας τοῦ αὐτο`ῦ΄ χωρίου ἀμπελικοῦ ἐν χρυςῷ χαρά[γματι]							
ώς παρέλαβον, χωρίς τινος ὑπερθέςεως καὶ ἀντιλογίας καὶ κρίςεως							
8	8 καὶ δίκης ὑποκειμένων coι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ χρέος πάντων μοι τῶν ὑπαρχ[όντων]						
κ[αὶ] ὑπαρξ[ό]ντων πραγμάτων καθάπερ [ἐ]κ δίκης. τὸ γραμμα[τεῖον τοῦτο]							
	κύριον καὶ βέβαιον καὶ ἐπερ(ωτηθεὶς) ὡμολ(όγηςα). + Αὐρ(ήλιος) κ [] [ὁ						
	προκ(είμενος)]						
	έθέμην τοῦτο τὸ γραμματεῖον ὡς πρόκ(ειται). Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἰορδάνης []						
12	ἀπὸ Ἐρ(μουπόλεως) ἀξιωθεὶς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γράμματα μὴ εἰδότος. (m2)						
	⁺ Αὐρ(ήλιοc)						
13	Φοιβάμμων ἀπὸ Ἐρ(μουπόλεως) μαρτυρῶ τὸ γραμματεῖον ἀκούςας παρὰ τοῦ						

13 Φοιβάμμων ἀπὸ Ἐρ(μουπόλεως) μαρτυρῶ τὸ γραμματεῖον ἀκούςας παρὰ τοῦ θεμένου. +

⁸ Originally published by Gerstinger, *Symbolae R.Taubenschlag*, Eos 48.1 (1956) 206-208; also compare the very fragmentary *P. Grenf.* I 59 (VI A.D).

⁹ Cf. E.G. Turner, *Greek Mansucripts of the Ancient World*, ed. P. J. Parsons, BICS Suppl. 46 (1987) 10-11; L. Koenen-C.Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex, Abbildungen und diplomatischer Text*, PTA 35 (Bonn 1985) XX.

(m	n ₃) [#] Αὐρήλιο	ος Γεώργις Ά	αχιλλέως άπό	Έρμου(πόλεως)	μαρτυρῶ τῷ γραμ-		
ματείφ ἀκούςας παρὰ τοῦ θειμένου. +							
+							
$(m_4) \stackrel{\text{p}}{=} \delta_1$ έμοῦ Βίκτορος cùν $\theta'(εφ)$ cυμβολαιογράφου (sigla tachygraphica) $\stackrel{\text{p}}{=}$							
3 ϋπ	4 read χρυςοῦ	5 γιχ ρ ν	εψκεμς	7 ϋπερθεςεως	8 ϋποκειμενων		
9 ϋπαρ ξ [ο]ντων 1	Ο επερεωμολ	aup	11 προκγαυμ	12 and 13 gp		
12 aup	13 ϋπερ	14 ερμη	read τό γρα	μματείον rea	d θεμένου		

"[From X to Y] greeting. I acknowledge that I have received [...] five gold *solidi* less six carats on the public standard of the said city, total 5 gold *sol*. less 6 car., which I will provide to you whenever I give up the irrigation of the said vineyard in stamped money as I received, without any delay or dispute or lawsuit or legal process, all my possession present and future being mortgaged to you as though by decree of court. The document (is) enforceable and guaranteed and, having been questioned, I have given my consent. I, Aurelius ..., the aforementioned, have drawn up this contract as written above. I, Aurelius Iordanes, son of ..., from Hermopolis, having been requested, have signed on his behalf because he does not know letters. (2nd hand) I, Aurelius Phoibammon, from Hermopolis, witness the document having had it read to me from the person who has drawn it up. (3rd Hand) I, Aurelius Georgius, son of Achilleus, from Hermopolis witness the document having it read to me from the person who has drawn it up. (4th Hand) Through Victor, by the Grace of God, public notary."

1: The trace just above gamma of ὑμολογῶ in line 2 could be tau or even chi.

2-3: The parallel SB 9284,6-9 ὁμολογῶ ἐcχηκέναι καὶ ἀποδεχθῆναι παρὰ τῆc αὐτῆc ἐκκληcίαc $\delta(ιὰ)$ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου Βαcιλείδου οἰκονόμου λόγῷ προχρείας τῆc [ἀ]ρδείας τοῦ κτή[μα]τος καλου[μένου] τοῦ Βάνου κεφαλαίου, κ.τ.λ. (the formula in P. Grnef. II 87.12-15 is shorter and slightly different) suggests a tentative restoration: ὁμολογῶ ἐcχ[ηκέναι παρὰ coῦ λόγῷ προχρείας τῆc ἀρδείας τοῦ] ὑπ' ἐμὲ coῦ κτήματος καλ[ουμένου], followed by the name and/or the location of the κτῆμα. Whatever else survives in this line is illegible.

4 χυcou: There is certainly ink at the left top and the left bottom of the chi, which to me appear to be parts of the upper and lower strokes of chi itself, not another letter. For the omission of rho in general, cf. Gignac, *Grammar* I, 107-108. In *P. Herm. Landl.* XXX, 656 (*P. Flor.* I 71) the scribe initially wrote χυcoχόου and consequently corrected it himself to χρυcoχόου.

The subtraction of six carats per *solidus*, as the case is here, in the public standard of Hermopolis is first encountered in *P. Lond.* II 1319 (p. 261) of the year 545 A.D. and is attested as late as 602 A.D. (*P. Ross. Georg.* V 42); further on this see *CPR* VII 40, Exkurs 3, esp. pp. 157-59, where the main focus is on Hermopolis; cf. also West-Johnson, *Currency*, 140-156, and Segré, *Metrologia e circolazione monetaria*, 467 ff. This feature obviously supports the dating of this papyrus after the middle of the sixth century (cf. introduction).

5-6 ἄπερ παρέξω coì ἡνίκ[α (?)] ἀποcταίην τῆc ἀρδείαc: the amount is to be returned upon the termination of the labour duties. Similar is the stipulation in SB VI 9284.11-12: [ἅπ]ερ c[o1] ἀποδώcω, ἐπὰν ἀναχωρήcω τῆc ἀρδείαc τ[o]ῦ α[ὑτ]o[ῦ] κτήματος.

The irrigation process which involves mechanical means is normally indicated with the verb $\dot{\alpha}v\tau\lambda\hat{\omega}$ and its derivatives, whereas $\dot{\alpha}\rho\delta\epsilon\hat{\omega}\omega$ and its derivatives appear to be used—not very frequently in the papyri—for the "natural" irrigation caused by the inundation of the Nile, cf. D. Bonneau, *Crue du Nil*, 114 note 1. However, in *SB* VI 9459.1,6 (VII A.D.) the terms $\dot{\alpha}v\tau\lambda\epsilon\hat{\alpha}$ and $\dot{\alpha}\rho\delta\epsilon\hat{\alpha}$ are equated.

The optative $\dot{\alpha}\pi oct\alpha(\eta v)$ may have been preceded either by $\dot{\eta}v(\kappa[\alpha \text{ or rather }\dot{\eta}v(\kappa[\alpha \dot{\alpha}v)]$. In *koine*, the potential protasis came to be construed with $\ddot{\alpha}v$, in temporal as well as in conditional and relative sentences. Moreover, from the 4th cent. on, in a reversal of the preceding disappearance of the optative, the latter mood is more frequently used in temporal clauses than the subjunctive (G.Anlauf, *Standard Late Greek oder Attizismus* (Diss. Köln, 1960) pass., especially 90ff., 96ff., 116f., 144ff.; R.Ch. Horn, *The Use of the Subjunctive and Optative Moods in the non-Literary Papyri* (Philadelphia 1926), 143ff., esp. 145; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf, *Gramm des Neutest. Griech.* §386). Hence, $\dot{\alpha}\pi \dot{\alpha}v$ and occasionally $\dot{\alpha}\pi\eta v(\kappa\alpha \ddot{\alpha}v)$ with the optative replace the attic construction of $\ddot{\alpha}\pi \sigma \tau e(etc.)$ with the subjunctive, expressing a future potentiality (R. Ch. Horn, *op. cit.* 145-147). The same applies here to $\dot{\eta}v(\kappa[\alpha, \dot{\alpha}v \circ r \dot{\alpha}v v)$ thus found no other examples for the use of this conjunction with the optative (for $\dot{\eta}v(\kappa\alpha \ddot{\alpha}v \circ r \dot{\alpha}v)$ with subjunctive see, e.g., *P. Oxy.*I 104.26 (96 A.D.), *P. Fouad* 38.11 (I A.D.), *P. Rein.* II 94.21 (193/198 A.D.), *P. Nag. Hamm.* 66.18 (IV A.D.), and *SB* VI 9146.13 (VI-VII A.D.) and XVI 12481.21 (668 A.D.).

6 τοῦ αὐτο ῦ' χωρίου ἀμπελικοῦ: the same wording in e.g. *BGU* XII 2185.13-14, *P. Laur.* I 7.9, *P. Stras.* V 486.9, etc. The pronoun αὐτοῦ alludes to a previous reference to this particular vineyard, its exact location and description, which was, no doubt, cited in line 2 of the printed text (cf. note *ad loc*). Xωρίον ἀμπελικόν here means simply "vineyard"; for the wide range of meanings that χωρίον can take, see M.Drew-Bear, *Le Nome Hermopolite*, 42 and Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft* 242.

8ff. ὑποκειμένων coi κ.τ.λ.: The earliest Hermoupolite document to record this form of the liability formula is *CPR* VII 40 of 492 A.D.; see also the discussion in Exkurs 6 there.

9-10: On the legal meaning of κύριον in this clause see M. Hässler, *Die Bedeutung der Kyria-Klausel* (Berlin 1960) 19ff., who rejects the translation "valid." Also see H.J. Wolff, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens*, Hb d. Altertumsw. X 5.2 (München 1978), 145-146.

10: After $\beta \epsilon \beta \alpha \omega v$ the line is badly damaged along the original *kollesis* joint, which has caused the papyrus to break. Traces of the letters survive partly on the upper and partly on the lower fragment. The writing, however, can be recovered with certainty up to the *gentilicium* of the borrower, due to the formulaic nature of the text at this very part. The first three letters of $A\dot{\nu}\rho\dot{\eta}\lambda\omega c$ are there; the scribe seems to be consistent and, as in the next line, he must have abbreviated this word in the same way. After the rho there are vague traces of the letters which are followed by kappa and very poor traces of one more letter, perhaps omega. These traces belong to the beginning of the borrower's proper name; $I\dot{\alpha}\kappa\omega[\beta\alpha c \text{ could be a reasonable conjecture. Then, the line concluded with a patronymic, most likely followed by <math>\dot{\delta}\pi\rho\alpha(\epsilon(\mu\epsilonvoc))$ vel.sim.

11 ff.: None of the individuals mentioned here can be confirmed for sure in other papyri.

11: The ink has faded at the end of the line. The scanty traces, however, can be identified with some confidence due to the formulaic nature of the text. At the end of the line after 'Iop $\delta \alpha v \eta c$ the papyrus breaks. The expected patronymic must have been a very short one, such as 'Ic $\alpha \kappa$ vel.sim.

14: The ink used by this hand is much lighter and the nib different. A close examination of this line shows that the scribe used brown ink, a fairly common material from the IV century A.D. onwards (E.G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, ed.P.J. Parsons, p. 19 with note 107). The most interesting feature palaeographically is the employment of an angular *omega*. After the first *lambda* of 'Axt $\lambda\lambda$ kéwc the ink is smudged, but I cannot confirm whether the scribe made or intended to make a correction

15: The notarial signature, as normally in the late period, is elaborate with free and, occasionally, extravagant strokes. So far, the name $B(\kappa\tau\omega\rho)$ for a public notary is attested for at least three different individuals in the Hermopolite nome; the present one, however, is to be identified with the notary in *P*. *Stras.* 600, 39 (VII A.D.), cf. Diethart-Worp, *Notarsunterschriften*, p. 61 ($B(\kappa\tau\omega\rho)$, 2.6.1.) and the relevant table. Despite the small damage of the signature in the Stras. papyrus, the similarities with the present hand are very obvious; there also the signature ends with a long series of tachygraphic symbols and signs.

Ann Arbor

T.Gagos



Brief mit Zeichnung (P.Mich. inv.4290)

à 3