Some Late Byzantine Papyri
from Hermopolis

I N this contribution I publish five papyri from the collection in the British Library (London) which drew my attention because of their dating formula ([1]).

1. P. Lond. III 867 descr. (cf. plate 81)

This Hermopolitan contract from A.D. 506 was only described in *P. Lond.* III, p. xli. A plate, however, was given in *P. Lond.* III, Plates ‡ 81. This plate shows that at the time of its printing the top fragment of the papyrus was mounted incorrectly. The papyrus is broken along various folds and when the fragments were put next to each other, a fragment was misplaced. The plate shows the fragments in the order (lines 1-7):

/   a   /   b   /   c   /

but one should read them in the order

/   b   /   a   /   c   /

We are dealing with some kind of contract between a woman and a soldier Fl. Danielius. The latter has occurred already before in *PSI* IV 292.2 (A.D. 520) and possibly also in *P. Lond.* III 994 (p. 259).15. He belonged to a well-known army unit, viz. the Mauri (for literature cf. *P. Charite* 7.3-5n.). The exact nature of the contract escapes us, as we have not found suitable parallels to restore lines 8-14. So much seems certain, that a sale of 2 arouras (cf. line 9), a worker in a vineyard (cf. line 10, *ἀμπ]ελουργόν*, line 11, *χωρίου ἀμπελικοῦ*) and the expression of a willingness to pay something mentioned earlier in the lost part of the contract (cf. line 13) according to the agreements (cf. line 14, *κατὰ] τὰ σύμφωνα*) were involved.

1 [Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλ(αονίων) Σαβινιανοῦ καὶ] Θεοδώρου τῶν
λαμπρο(τάτων) Φαμενὼθ κδ

2 [τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης   ἰν]δ(ικτίωνος)

3 ['Η δεῖνα θυγάτηρ τοῦ δεῖνος ἐκ μητρ]ὸς Μαρίας χωρὶς κυρίου
ἀνδρὸς

4 [χρηματίζουσα ὁρμωμένη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρμο]υπολιτῶν Φλανίῳ Δα-
νιηλίῳ

5 ['Ηρακλείδου τῷ καθοσιω(μένῳ) στρατιώτῃ ἀρι]θμοῦ τῶν γενναιο-
τάτων Μαύρων

6 [τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἑρμουπολιτῶν καθιδρυ]μένων χαίρειν. Ὁμολογῶ
διὰ ταύτης

7 [τῆς ἐγγράφου ὁμολογίας ἄνευ παντὸς δ]όλου καὶ φόβου καὶ βίας
καὶ ἀπάτης καὶ

8 [   ] ..αται παντὶ καιρῷ ἢ χρόνῳ

9 [   ] στιν τὴν πρᾶσιν τῶν δύο ἀρουρῶν

10 [ἀμπ]ελουργὸν νυνὶ ἀπὸ κώμης Σιγκερὴ

11 [   ]χωρίου ἀμπελικοῦ καὶ ἀμμάτων εἴκοσι ἓξ

12 [   ]το ὥστε ἐμέ, εἰ συμβαίη, παντὶ καιρῷ

13 [   ] ἑτο]ίμως ἔχειν εἰσενεγκεῖν τὰς αὐτὰς

   [κατὰ] τὰ σύμφωνα καὶ πρὸς σὴν ἀσφάλειαν

15 [πεποίημαι ταύτην τὴν ὁμολογίαν κυ]ρίαν οὖσαν καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ
ἐπερ(ωτηθεῖσα) ὡμολ(όγησα)

16 [(Μ. 2) 'Η δεῖνα   ]ἔθεμεν ταύτην τὴν ὁμολογίαν καὶ πίθω

17 [πᾶσι τοῖς προκ(ειμένοις).   Ὁ δεῖνα Ἀ]λεξάνδρου ἀπὸ Ἑρμοῦ
πόλεως) ἀξιωθεὶς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς

18 [ἀγραμμάτου οὔσης. (Μ.3) Ὁ δεῖνα Γεν]ναδίου ἀπὸ Ἑρ(μοῦ πόλεως)
μαρτυρῶ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ

19 [ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ θεμένου. (Μ.4) Αὐρή]λιος Φοιβάμμων Σαραπίω-
νος ἀπὸ Ἑρ(μοῦ πόλεως) μαρτυρῶ

20 [τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ θεμένου (Μ. 5) Αὐ]ρ(ήλιος) 'Ιωάν-
νης Μηνᾶ ἀπὸ Ἑρ(μοῦ πόλεως) μαρτυρῶ τῇ

14 πρός : π ex ε corr.   16 read ἐθέμην and πείθω   17 ὑπὲρ

21 [ὁμολογίᾳ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ θεμένου.]

22 [(M.6)   ]δι' ἐμοῦ Φ[οι]βάμμωνος ἐγράφη. Κ(ύρι)ε
                                      βοήθ(ει)   Tachygraphie

1. For the (post-)consulate of Sabinianus and Theodorus cf. R. S. BAGNALL - K. A. WORP, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, 121, years 505-506. The restoration of a post-consular formula is warranted in view of the length of the restorations (ca. 30 letters) elsewhere in this text.

2. Apparently, this line was indented, even with the restoration of the indiction numeral written out in full. An insertion of something like εὐτυχοῦς or παρούσης after τῆς would seem out of place in a dating formula at the start of a document.

3. For the women χωρὶς κυρίου χρηματίζουσαι cf. the list in *P. Mich.* XV, pp. 158-171, esp. ⧣ 102 where this papyrus is listed. The text does not mention a συνεστώς (the element ἀνδρός should be shifted from col. VII to col. V).

4. For the spelling Ἑρμουπολιτῶν cf. *P. Vindob. Worp* 8.22 n.

6. Ἑρμουπολιτῶν : or restore αὐτῆς πόλεως (cf. line 4)?

7. Cf. for this cluster of more or less synonymous concepts *Preis. WB*, s.v. βία, 7, and H. ZILLIACUS, *Zur Abundanz der spätgriechischen Gebrauchssprache*, 51.

10. For the village called Sinkere cf. M. DREW-BEAR, *Le Nome Hermopolite*, 254-56.

11. For the size of ammata (normally 1/64 of an arura) cf. *P. Bad.* IV 92.4 n.

14. Presumably the scribe started to write εἰς, then corrected this into πρός.

18. One might restore, perhaps, Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ταυρῖνος Γεν]ναδίου. This person occurs as a hypographeus in *P. L. Bat.* XIII 16.19 (for this papyrus see below, 22n.). On the other hand, however, one finds a Basilides, son of Gennadius, in *BGU* XII 2152.2, 14 (Vth century).

20. This witness also occurs in *PSI* IV 296.27, where one should presumably read ἀπό [Ἑρ(μου πόλεως)] rather than the editor's ὑπο [....] (*BL* I 394 suggests ὑπο[διάκ(ονος)]?).

22. This same notary occurs in *P.L.Bat* XIII 16.23 (cf. Taf. VII ; ed. VI-VII, but one should rather date this papyrus to V-VI). The notary Phoibammon out of *CPR* VII 40.32 (492 ; cf. Taf. 28) does not seem to be the same notary as his subscription is written differently. Other late V/early VI notaries called Phoibammon in Hermopolis are found in *BGU* XII 2149 (470), 2159 (485) and 2175 (V/VI).

For the element κ(ύρι)ε βοήθ(ει) cf. J. M. Diethart in *ZPE* 49 (1982) 79-82 where 5 instances of it given in papyri published to date are mentioned. To these may be added *P. Stras.* 247.25, where read δι' ἐμοῦ 'Απολλῶτος ἐγράφη κ(ύρι)ε βοήθ(ει), *P. Stras.* 696.26, where read δ[ι' ἐμο]ῦ Καλλινίκου κ(ύρι)ε βοήθ(ει)] and *P. Lond.* V 1795.20, where read δ[ι' ἐ]μοῦ --- [ἐγ]ράφ(η) κ(ύρι)ε βοήθ(ει)[the notary's name cannot be read].

2. P. Lond. III 1326a descr. (cf. plate 91)   ⁷ ⸢β⸣. ₁₆.₁₂₈₆₅

This start of a lease is dated by the regnal dating formula commonly
in use in Hermopolitan documents under the emperor Justinus II;
cf. R. S. Bagnall-K. A. Worp, *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt*,
50 form. 3. Given the fragmentary state of the papyrus we cannot es-
tablish the object of the lease.

HERMOPOLIS   25.ix.576

1   + [B]ασιλείας καὶ ὑπατείας τοῦ θειοτάτ(ου)
2   ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλαυίου Ἰουστίνου
3   τοῦ αἰων<ί>ου αὐγούστου αὐτοκράτορος
4   ἔτους ἑνδεκάτου Θὼθ κη ι'' ἰνδ(ικτίωνος)
5   + Φλαίῳ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ
6   κόμετι υἱῷ τοῦ τῆς λαμπρᾶς
7   μνήμης Γερμανοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρμ(οῦ πόλεως)
8   π(αρὰ) Αὐρηλίου Φοιβάμμωνος Γεωργίου
9   [ca. 4 ἑ]ξῆς ὑπογράφοντος γεωργοῦ ἀπὸ
10   [τῆς αὐτῆ]ς [πόλεως]. Ὁμολογῶ ἑκουσία
11   [καὶ αὐθαιρέτῳ γνώμῃ] μεμισθῶσθαι
12   [   ] Traces

2 φλαυῖου   5 φλαῖω = Φλαυίῳ   7 Γερμανοῦ : -ν ex -ς

NOTES:
5. I have not found other attestations of the comes Flavius Johannes
among papyri jrom Hermopolis. Cf. J. G. KEENAN in *ZPE* 11 (1973)
57 n. 106 for comites with the name Flavius.
9. It is unclear to me what could have stood in the lacuna at the start
of this line. There seems hardly space enough for μη(τρὸς) followed by
a name, but as we do have already the patronymic and the profession
of Aurelius Phoebammon, there are not many other alternatives for a
restoration of his mother's name. Dr. Daniel suggests to restore just
[τοῦ ἑ]ξῆς while admitting by himself that he does not know of any par-
allel for this.

3. P. Lond. III 1326b descr. (cf. plate 91)   *S.B. 16 12866*

For this start of a lease of a vine-yard cf. already the discussion of the dating formula in *BASP* 16 (1979) 244-245. The document does not present further novelties of its own, except for possibly a new geographical name in line 7 (see note).

HERMOPOLIS   26.iv.583

1 + Β[ασι]λεί[α]ς τοῦ θειοτάτ[ου] ἡμῶν δεσπό(του) Φλ(αονίου)
                                                        Μαυρικίου

2 νέου Τιβερίου τοῦ αἰωνί[ου] αὐγούστου αὐτοκρ(άτορος) ἔτους πρώ-
                                                        'του'

3 Παχὼν νευομηνίᾳ λ[ή]ξεως πρώτης ἰνδ(ικτίωνος).

4 † Αὐρηλίῳ Φοιβάμμωνι Γεωργίου τῷ θαυμασι-

5 ωτάτῳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρμουπολιτῶν πα(ρὰ) Αὐρηλίου

6 Παπνουθίου υἱοῦ Βίκτωρος μητρὸς Ῥαχῆλ ἀμ-

7 πελουργοῦ ἀπὸ ἐποικίου Διοσκορίδος

8 πεδίων κώμης Δημητρίου τοῦ Ἑρμου-

9 πολίτου νομοῦ. Ὁμολογῶ ἑκουσίως

10 καὶ αὐθαιρέτως μεμισθῶσθαι παρὰ σοῦ

11 ἐπὶ πενταετῆ χρόνον λογιζόμενον

12 ἀπὸ καρπῶν τῆς σὺν θ(εῷ) δευτέρας ἰνδ(ικτίων)ο(ς) τὸ δια-

13 φέρον σοι χωρίον ἀμπελικ[ὸν

14 ὅσο[ν ἐστὶν ἀρουρηδοῦ

_____

12 *ἰνδ*

NOTES :

5. *πα(ρά)* was abbreviated by a diagonal stroke written through a pi with an alpha on top of it.

7. An epoikion (?) Dioskorou is known from *P. Cair. Preis.* 30.19 ; maybe we are dealing with the same village under a slightly variant name.

8. For the village of Demetrius see M. DREW-BEAR, *Le nome Hermo-polite*, 90.

14. For this clause cf. H. JULY, *Die Klauseln hinter den Massangaben der Papyrusurkunden*, 42.

4. P. Lond. III 1315a descr.   *S.B. ·6. ·2867*

This badly mutilated papyrus contains a fragment of a lease. It is dated to the reign of the emperor Mauricius (A.D. 582-602), but the regnal year itself is lost. As the top of the papyrus is completely preserved (thus no invocation seems to have broken off), the date of the papyrus most likely falls before A.D. 591 (cf. *CdE* 56 [1981] 112 ff., esp. 117). Indiction 3 (line 3) = A.D. 584/5, then, and Mesore 20 = 13.viii. As the document comes from Hermopolis, this combination of dating elements leads to a date to 13.viii.584 in our calendar, but we cannot say whether the scribe dated his document to Mauricius' 2nd or to his 3rd regnal year, as 13.viii itself was the *dies imperii* of Mauricius (cf. R. S. Bagnall - K. A. Worp, *Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt*, 58) and as the scibe may have failed to advance the regnal numeral on this very day (cf. *BASP* 17 [1980] 62 ff.).

The precise object of the lease is not known. In line 11 we encounter a numeral 55 which might be taken as an indication of the number of arouras leased (restore σ[πορ]ίμης γῆς[after πεντήκοντα πέντε?). A plot of land of 55 arouras would be rather large, however. A consultation of the tables in D. Hennig, *Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht im ptolemäisch-römischen Ägypten* (Diss. München, 1967), yields the impression that in later Byzantine Egypte the number of arouras leased was mostly lower than 10 (the number of 200 ar. in *P. Ross. Georg.* III 32 [cf. A. Ch. Johnson - L. C. West, *Byzantine Egypt*, 84] is astonishingly high and may be the result of some mistaken reading).

HERMOPOLIS   13.viii.584

1 + Βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου ἡ[μῶν δε]σπότ[ου] Φ[λαουίου Μαυρικίου]
2 Τιβερίου Νέου τοῦ αἰωνίου α[ὐ]γ[ούστου αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους - -]
3 [ἰν]δ/ τρίτη Μεσορὴ εἰκάς +
4 + [[.]] Αὐρήλιος Πκῦλις [υἱὸς   μητρὸς]
5 Σοφίας γεωργὸς ἀπὸ κώμ[ης] Σ.[   ]
6 Αὐρηλίῳ Βίκτῶρος υἱῷ[τῷ   -]
7 τάτῳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρμουπ[ο]λιτῶ[ν]. Ὁμ[ολογῶ ἑκουσίως]
8 καὶ αὐθαιρέτως μεμισθῶσθαι [παρὰ σοῦ ἐφ' ὅσον βού-]

6 read Βίκτῶρι, υἱῳ   10 ἰνδ

9   λει χρόνον λογιζόμενον ἀπὸ κ[α]ορπῶ[ν τῆς ἐσομένης]
10 τετάρτης ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) καὶ αὐτῆ[ς   ]....[   ]
11 πεντήκοντα πέντε .[...]ιμησ...[ἐν κλήρῳ]
12 κ[α]λουμ[έν]ῳ 'Ιαεθρηδ[.....]μενον ..[   ]
13 κ[   ] . [   ]....θε..[   ]
14 [   ]..[   ]

NOTES :

1-3. The formula is *RFBE* 61, form. 7 ; this reference has to be added
there, of course. One may reckon with abbreviations like *Φλ(αονίου)*,
αὐγ(ούστου), *αὐτοκρ(άτορος)*. For the regnal year cf. *supra*, the introduction.

It is remarkable that the indiction precedes the month and that, moreover, this is in the dative, the day of the month in the nominative. Normally the month and day (in the dative) precede the indiction (in the
genitive). For another example of a day of the month in the nominative
cf. *P. Stras.* 190.5, *Μεσορὴ τριακάς..*

5. It is also possible that one should read *κώμ[η]ς* .[-.

6-7. For epithets which could suitably be restored cf. J. HERRMANN,
Studien zur Bodenpacht, 48-49.

7. It is also possible to read and restore *Ἑρμουπ[ο]λιτῶ[ν π]όλε[ως.*
Ὁμολογῶ ἑκουσίως], but]ολε[seems a slightly more difficult reading
than]ομ[. For the spelling of *Ἑρμουπολιτῶν* cf. *P. Vindob. Worp* 8.22 n.

7-10 For the phrasings used in this passage cf. J. HERRMANN, *op. cit.*,
50, 92-98. The coming 4th indiction was A.D. 585/6, the crops of which
were harvested in the summer of A.D. 585.

10-12. One expects here a description of the localization of the lease
object (cf. J. HERRMANN, *op. cit.*, 76-77). For the kind of lease object see
supra, the introduction. One might consider a reading *κ[α]λουμ[ένῳ]*
Πιαεθρηδ[as well.

5. P. Lond. III 1304a descr.   *5.B.,6.12 86P*

We are dealing, apparently, with a contract in which a person assumes
the obligation to perform work for a period of 1 year as a bath-man in
the service of a private owner of a bath. The terminology used in the
contract is slightly remarkable in that the kind of service is called on the
one hand a *paramone* (cf. line 7, *παραμεῖναι*), whereas on the other hand
the contract itself is called a *misthotike homologia* (line 6). It is, however,
well-known that in Byzantine papyri the original distinction between

142

paramone and *misthosis* is maintained no longer in a clear way (cf. B. Adams, *Paramone und Verwandte Texte*, 25). For baths in the Byzantine period cf. A. Berger, *Das Bad in der Byzantinischen Zeit*; (= *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia* 27, München, 1982), who does not discuss, however, the evidence concerning baths in Byzantine Egypt except for Alexandria. It should be noted that the restorations proposed for the lacunas in lines 6ff. are just *exempli gratia* and that they might be too short in fact. If so, one might pad them with the help of various periphrases like in lines 5-6 Ὁμολογῶ [διὰ ταύτης μου τῆς παρούσης ἐγγράφου μ]ισθωτικῆς ὁμολογίας. Likewise, one might insert in line 10 something like εὐτυχοῦς ἐσομένης after τῆς. On the other hand the dicolon ἑκὼν καὶ πεπεισμένος is of such a fixed nature (cf. H. Zilliacus, *Zur Abundanz der spätgriechischen Gebrauchssprache*, esp. 49), that one cannot insert something in between and that it is not easy to devise some other supplement which should follow after these words while suitably filling the remaining space (the phrasing in *P. Lond.* V 1724.12ff.: ἑκόντες καὶ πεπεισμένοι ἄνευ παντὸς δόλου καὶ φόβου καὶ ἀπάτης καὶ ἀνάγκης καὶ συναρπαγῆς καὶ οἱασδήποτε κακονοίας καὶ κακοηθείας καὶ παντὸς ἐλαττώματος καὶ φαύλου διαστήματος καὶ πάσης νομίμου περιγραφῆς exceeds the space available in the lacuna here). On the other hand the restoration found now at the start of lines 1-2 can be made shorter by assuming that there was an extensive use of abbreviations and nomina sacra in the parts lost. For the general contents of the contract, however, this is hardly of any importance.

HERMOPOLIS   13.viii.592-12.viii.593

1   [+ Ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ
              καὶ σ]ωτῆρος ἡμῶν, βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου

2   [ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλ(αουίου) Μαυρικίου Τιβερίου Νέου τοῦ αἰωνίου
              αὐ]γούστου αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους ἐνδεκάτου

3   [Μεσορὴ — τῆς ι. ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ἐν Ἑρ]μοῦ πόλει τῆς Θηβαίδος.

4   [Ὁ δεῖνα   υἱὸς   ]θειος βαλ[αν]έως ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρμοῦ

5   [πόλεως τῷ δεῖνι   ἀ]πὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως χαίρειν. Ὁμολογῶ

6   [διὰ ταύτης τῆς μ]ισθωτικῆς ὁμολογίας ἑκὼν

7   [καὶ πεπεισμένος π]αραμεῖναί σοι ἤτοι τῷ σῷ λουτρῷ

8   [ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰ]σιόντος μηνὸς Θὼθ τῆς

   3 θηβαῖδος   4 read βαλανεύς   7 λουτρῷ : -ῷ ex -ου corr.

9   [παρούσης ι. ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ἕω]ς τοῦ εἰσιόντος μηνὸς Θὼϑ
10 [τῆς ι. ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ἐκτελέσαι τὴν α]ὐϑεντικὴν ἐμὴν χρείαν
11 [   ]..[..]...[.]..[.].ελεω[.]γεναμ[   ]
12 [   ]θειων δεχ[ ] Traces
13 [   ].ουσο....... [   ]..[   ]ερα
14 [   ]Traces [   ] Traces

NOTES :
1. For the invocation see *CdE* 56 (1981) 112-33. For the regnal formula cf. *RFBE* 61, form. 7.

4. It seems likely that]θειος is the ending of a patronymic and that the writer erroneously wrote βαλανέως instead of βαλανεύς. In the context of the contract it is not so much important to indicate that the father of the contractor was a bath-man as it was to indicate that the contractor himself was. For the function of a βαλανεύς cf. A. BERGER, *op. cit.*, 122.

7. For λουτρόν cf. A. BERGER, *op. cit.*, 137 ; G. HUSSON, *OIKIA* (Paris, 1983) 157f.

8. One expects at the start of this line either an indication of the place where the bath was situated, or an indication of the period of time for which the contract would be valid (e.g. ἐπ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα? But this supplement would be rather long in view of the space available).

10. Instead of ἐκτελέσαι one could also restore e.g. ἀποπληρῶσαι 11-14. The remains of these lines are too scanty to be safely restored with the help of parallel documents.

The regnal year of this contract was already discussed in *BASP* 17 (1980) 109-10 where it was concluded that the document can have been written only during the reign of the emperor Mauricius. His 11th year ran from 13.viii.592 until 12.viii.593. Line 8 tells us that the contract would be effective per the coming month of Thoth, and it seems likely, therefore, that the contract was drawn up in the preceding month, i.e. in Mesore (or even slightly earlier, perhaps). There is, therefore, a problem as regards the numeral of the indiction to be restored in lines 3, 9 and 10. If the contract was drawn up between Mesore 20 (= 13.viii) and Mesore 30, we would be in the summer of A.D. 592 and the numeral of the indiction would be 11 in lines 3 and 9, but it would be 12 in line 10. But if the contract were drawn up on a date before Mesore 20, we would be in the summer of A.D. 593 and the numeral of the indiction would shift one notch.

Amsterdam   Klaas A. WORP