Gonis, Nikolaos

Three fragmentary Byzantine documents from the Duke Collection

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 29, 7-12

1999

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

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.



The Journal of Juristic Papyrology Vol. XXIX, 1999, pp. 7-12

Nikolaos Gonis

THREE FRAGMENTARY BYZANTINE DOCUMENTS FROM THE DUKE COLLECTION*

1. ORDER TO SUPPLY OIL TO WORKER(S)

What little survives of this document suffices to identify it as an order to supply oil to one or more workers; compare the phrasing of such orders in the sixth-century Arsinoite archive of the ἐλαιουργός Sambas, assembled by F. Mitthof, A. Papathomas, ZPE 103 (1994) 53-84. These texts also give us an idea of what is missing from this papyrus, which is not little: we do not know the names and capacities of the person who issues the order and of the recipient, the exact purpose of the payment, and the amount of oil to be disbursed. (The script of this text cannot be identified with any of those in evidence in the Sambas archive.) For a discussion of workers' allowances paid in oil and other related issues, see F. Morelli, Olio e retribuzioni nell'Egitto tardo, Firenze 1996, 1-7, 127-38.

The writing is along the fibres and the back is blank. The papyrus came to Duke by purchase in 1970.

P. Duk. inv. 69 3 cm x 5.3 cm Fifth/sixth century Provenance unknown

| ἐργαζομ(ένοις) εἰς [
| ἐλαίου ξέςτ[ας (m. 2)] ἐλαίου ξ(έςτ-) [

^{*} The papyri published here are housed in the Special Collections Library of Duke University, with whose permission their photographs are reproduced. They have been studied on the basis of the catalogue records (by P. VAN MINNEN) and digitised images offered at the website of the Duke Papyrus Archive. (On acquisition information see http://odyssey.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/acquisitions.html) I am indebted to Professor John F. OATES for his encouragement and practical help.

8 N. GONIS

- The trace on the edge would admit sigma, so that we may read -1]c ἐργαζομ(ένοιc); otherwise, resolve ἐργαζομ(ένφ). For the construction, cf. SPP VIII 890,2-3 (Arch. Sambas 3) εξ ξέcτας ἐλαί[ο]υ π[α]ράςχ(ου) πρίςταις ξ(ύλου?) καὶ Ι Cαμβᾳ τέκτ(ονι) [ὀ]ψωνιαςτ(ῆ) ἐργαζ(ομένοις) εἰς οἰκοδομ(ὴν) περεςτερεῶνος (the text after Morelli, op. cit., 16 n. 14 the edition has [ὀ]ψώνια ἀπεργαζ(ομένοις); accordingly, in Arch. Sambas 5,3 change ἀπ]εργαζ(ομένοις)(?) to ἐργαζ(ομένοις)). Cf. also SPP 902,2; 908,2 and 926,1 (all from the archive of Kyrikos, VII/VIII cent.).
- ἐλαίου. This must have been oil made from 'vegetable seed' (λαχανόςπερμον), on which see the literature assembled in *P. Hamb*. IV, p. 142 n. 1.
 ξέςτ[ας. On the sextarius see most recently N. Kruit & K. A. Worp, APF 45.1 (1999) 111-17, 119-20.
- 3. The trace on the edge suggests the upper part of an ascending oblique. I cannot match it with any letter. It could be part of an oblique stroke marking an abbreviation: at this point the texts of the Sambas archive usually have ἐcημει(ωcάμην) (εcημει/ pap.) ἐλαίου ξέcται number. Alternatively, the trace could be the top of an oblique of the type commonly preceding totals, i.e. (γίνονται) ἐλαίου ξ(έcται), but I think this less likely.

2. LEASE OF LAND*

The papyrus preserves the lower left-hand part of a land lease of the type known as *Teilpacht*, in which the lessee agrees to share the crops with the lessor as payment for the rent (sharecropping). For a list and discussion, see A. Jördens, *Vertragliche Regelungen von Arbeiten im späten griechischsprachigen Ägypten* [= P. Heid. V], Heidelberg 1990, 233-59. Issues relative to sharecrop leases are also addressed by J. Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt*, Oxford 1996, *passim*. For some interesting parallels with modern India, see J. Banaji, *Journal of Historical Sociology* 5 (1992) 379 ff., esp. 385-86.

The formulaic parts of the document strongly suggest an Antaeopolite provenance; cf. *P. Heid.* V 351 (534/5), 353 (VI); *P. Lond.* V 1694 (VI), 1841 (536), *PSI* VIII 934 (VI), and especially *SB* XIV 11855 = *P. Berl. Brash.* 17 (c. 546). Most of these texts are connected with the archive of Dioscorus.

The terms of the lease are largely lost. The clause about the provision of seed-corn (line 3) suggests that the crop envisaged would have been some sort of cereal. Most of the lacunas may be supplemented on the basis of other texts — the length of the break to the left may be estimated by lines 7-8, securely restored on the basis of parallels. There appears to be a novel formulation, not securely restored, in line 6.

The script is an unprepossessing large cursive, typical of the sixth century. The hand of the subscriber is that of a 'slow writer'. The writing is along the

^{*} I am grateful to Dr Andrea JÖRDENS for comments on an earlier draft.

PLATE I



P. Duk. inv. 69 (reduced by 90%) (http://odyssey.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/69.html)



P. Duk. inv. 500 (reduced by 90%) (http://odyssey.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/500.html)

P. Duk. inv. 497 (original size) (http://odyssey.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/497.html)

fibres. The back is blank. The papyrus was purchased from the University of Mississippi in 1988 (formerly P. Miss. 66).

P. Duk. inv. 500 Plate I 6.5 cm x 12.1 cm

Sixth century Antaeopolite

- 4 καὶ τυνκλίτω [τοῦ παντὸς (?) c. 11-16]
 εὶ δὲ μέρος κα[ταφρονήςω τῆς γεωργίας]
 τὸ ἴτον ἀπ[οτίτω (?). τοῦ δὲ καιροῦ γενομένου]
 τὸ περιγιγν[όμενον παντοίων γενημάτων καὶ]
- 8 ἀχύρων ἕξομ[εν κατὰ τὸ ήμιου. κυρία (?) ἡ μίοθωσιο]
 διοςὴν ὁμότ[υπον καὶ ἐπερ(ωτηθεὶς) ὡμολ(όγησα). (m. 2) † Αὐρήλιος]
 Χρήστη[ο ὁ προκείμενος μεμίο] θωμαι κ(αὶ) [c. 15]

12 ὡς πρόκ(ειται). [

4. l. cυγκλείcω 4. ιcov: ι ex corr. 9. l. διες ἡ ὁμότυπος 11. κ/ 12. προκ/

'... the seed-corn being provided by me (?) ... and I shall complete the work fully (?) ... And if I neglect part of the cultivation, I shall pay (?) an equal amount (to the damage). And when the time comes, we shall have one half of the resulting produce of the various crops and of the chaff. The lease is binding, (written) in two identical copies, and in reply to the formal question I assented. (2nd hand) Aurelius Chrestes, the aforesaid person, have leased and ... as aforesaid. (Notarial subscription)'

- 2. ζ[φ]ων καὶ [. For the clauses referring to the use of animals, see *P. Heid*. V, p. 254 with n. 20. SB XIV 11855,20-23 may give us an idea of what is missing from our text: ἐφ' ῷ με (l. ἡμᾶc) ταύτας γεωργ(εῖν) | ἐκ τῶν ἡμῶν ζφων | καὶ ποτίςαι ἀπὸ τοῦ | ἡμῶν λάκκου; cf. also *P. Ross. Georg.* III 44,3-4 (VI) - καὶ ποτίςαι | καλοφρονήτως. (The traces after καί, although minimal, exclude reading ἀ[ναλωμάτων, found at this point in several such texts from Aphrodito.)
- 3. For the clauses on the provision of seed-corn, see *P. Heid*. V, p. 255 with n. 26. παρ' ἐμοῦ (?). παρὰ cοῦ and ἐξ ἴcoυ are other alternatives.
- 4. cυνκλίcω [τοῦ παντὸς (?). For the sense, see *P. Michael.*, p. 93 n. 1. The earliest occurrence of the verb in a similar context is in *BGU* XIII 2333.16 (143/44). But I cannot tell what followed in the lacuna.
- 5-8. For the formulas, see *P. Heid*. V 351.11 ff. n., 12 ff. n.
 - 5. The restoration is after *P. Michael.* 46,20, which, however, continues with a rather garbled phrase: ἐφ' ὧ δὲ ὑμᾶς λαβεῖν τὸ μέρος Ι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πεφιλοκαλημένου.

10 N. GONIS

- 6. τὸ ἴcον ἀπ[οτίcω (?). I have found nothing similar in any other sharecrop lease. ἀπ[οτίcω is tentative; the collocation may be parallelled only by three texts, all much earlier: P. Wisc. I 4,30 (53); P. Oxy. Hels. 29,40-41 (54); P. Lond. II 154,17 (68). We might also consider restoring ἀπ[οδώcω. In any case, this is a penalty clause, on which see P. Heid. V, p. 257 with nn. 32-35.
- 6-8. The supplements are after SB XIV 11855,27-31.
- 7-8. On the clause see P. Heid. V, p. 245 with n. 44.
 - 8. There is no proof that κυρία stood in the original document, and we should also consider the possibility that the word was omitted (spacing is inconclusive). The elliptic *kyria*-clause is well paralleled among documents from Aphrodito, cf. e.g. *P. Cair. Masp.* I 67105,24-25 (532); *P. Lond.* V 1695,20 (531?); *P. Flor.* III 286,27-28; *SB* XIV 11855,31. In *P. Heid.* V 351,25 [- κυρ(ία) ἡ μίcθ(ωςις)], we may also consider restoring [- ἡ μίcθωςις], with κυρία omitted.
 - 9. διεςὴν ὁμότ[υπον. The ungrammatical collocation also occurs in P. Lond. V 1695,20, after which it has been restored in P. Cair. Masp. I 67105,24-25 (BL I 446); both texts ommit the kyria-clause (a check of the microfilm shows that the London papyrus is not by the same hand). Cf. also ChLA V 282.,3-4 κυρία ἡ ὁμολογεία διεςὴν Ι γραφῖcαν; P. Vat. Aphrod. 7,frA.23 (VI) διεςὴν γ[ραφ(εῖcα)].
- 10. Χρήςτη[c. (I owe the reading to Dr A. Jördens.) The name (a variant of the more common Χρῆςτος?) is a rare one, hitherto confined to sixth-century texts from Aphrodito: P. Cair. Masp. III 67283,3,19 (546/7) Χρύςτης κτήτωρ; 67353r,3 [ed. L. S. B. MacCoull, Dioscorus of Aphrodito. His Work and His World, Berkeley, New York, London 1988, 41-43] (c. 569/70) χρηςτης πωηρε νηλολω, P. Freer 1+2,155 (VI) μοναςτ(ήριον) "Απα Cουροῦτος ὑπὸ Χρήςτην Ἰωάννου καὶ Μουςῆν; possibly also in a Coptic letter published by MacCoull, Le Muséon 106 (1993) 39 (no. 13). It is unclear whether Chrestes' patronymic followed in the break.
- It is uncertain how this line will have continued. One possibility is καὶ [στοιχεῖ μοι πάντα], cf. P. Cair. Masp. III 67303,23 (553); another is καὶ [συμφωνεῖ μοι], cf SB XIV 11855.37-38.
- 12. Probably nothing was written after πρόκ(ειται).
- 13. The form of the *chrismon* here is similar to that found in several notarial subscriptions from Aphrodito; see J. M. Diethart & K. A. Worp, *Notarsunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten*, Wien 1986, Taff. 2-4.

3. LETTER OF VICTOR, CYMMAXOC

This papyrus too was formerly the property of the University of Mississippi (P. Miss. 63). No provenance is recorded. The writing is across the fibres, i.e. *transversa charta*; for this format, see *P. Oxy*. LIX 4005 introd. The back contains the end of the address, written along the fibres upwards in relation to the text on the front. The pattern of the folds as well as the address suggest that the papyrus was folded in two vertically first, and then was rolled up from the foot and pressed flat, with the top edge tucked inside. The address was written

along the panel next to the last fold. Traces of other vertical folds may suggest that at a later stage, probably after the letter was opened, the papyrus was rolled up (or folded) along the vertical axis.

The hand responsible for the main text is a large sloping professional cursive assignable to the first decades of the seventh century. The script of the address is different: it is an early example of the minuscule that we find in taxation and other official documents and accounts of the seventh and early eighth centuries, see H. I. Bell, *JEA* 12 (1926) 265-66, cf. G. Cavallo & H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period (BICS* 47: 1987) 94. The same scribe may have written both the letter and address; the variation of styles between front and back is common in letters of this period, and the most economical hypothesis would be to attribute the two styles to the same person.

The addressee of the letter is styled ἡ ὑμετέρα ὁςία δεςποτεία. This suggests a high ranking ecclesiastic, perhaps the provost of the monastery mentioned in line 3 (see below 2 n.). A great deal of the text is missing, and little of its import can be gleaned from what has survived; it reads much like a report, which seems to have concerned, at least in part, agricultural work in the holdings of the monastery. The sender of the letter, the cύμμαχος Victor, may have been in the service of the same monastery.

Even if a very small sample of the diction of the writer of the letter survives, this person seems to have had a good command of Greek. The use of blank spaces for punctuation is also worthy of note (on the practice see E. G. Turner & P. J. Parsons, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* [BICS 46: 1987] 8). All this suggest good education; in the context of a pre-modern society, it is hard to identify the scribe with an armed messenger.

P. Duk. inv. 497 Plate II 16.7 cm x 7.7 cm

Seventh century Provenance unknown

τῆο	c ὑμετ]έρας ὀςίας δεςποτείας ἐδεξάμην. ἀποδέδωκα δὲ καὶ τῷ α[] []ε εἰς τὰ κτήματα τοῦ εὐαγοῦς μοναςτηρίου. (vac.) [
4]του. (<i>vac.</i>) πλὴν εἰ καὶ οὐκ ἵσταται σήμερον κ[
] οντας αὐτῷ ἵνα ὑπουργήςως ν αὐ[τῷ
] τὴν cήμερον τουτέςτιν τῆ η Ἐπ[εἰφ
]τη ε την
8	

Back:

 $---\pi(\alpha\rho\dot{\alpha})]$ B[ί]κτορο(c) $cv\mu(\mu\dot{\alpha})\chi(ov)\dagger$

^{4.} ϊσταται 5. ϋπουργησωσιν 8. συμλ

12 N. GONIS

1. For the crosses here and in line 2, see *P. Oxy.* LVI 3871,1-2 n. They usually mark the central position; in this place we also find the mysterious $\pi()$, or, especially in earlier times, the Christian symbol $\chi\mu\gamma$. Letters headed by simple crosses are generally not earlier than the sixth century.

2. For the lost beginning of the line, compare P. Ant. II 94,1 (VI) τὰ γράμματα τῆς ὑμετέρας περιβλέπτου δεςποτείας ἐδεξάμην; P. Berl. Zill. 14.1 (VI) ἐδεξάμ[ην] νῦν τὸ τίμιον γράμμα τῆς ὑμετέρας πατρικῆς καὶ ὁςίας δεςποτίας; P. Oxy. XVI 1940,1 (VI/VII) τὴν γραφὴν παρὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας περιβλέπτου δεςποτείας ἐδεξάμην; P. Lond. III 1075,1f. (VII) τὰ γραφέντα παρὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας μεγαλοπρεπο[ῦ]ς καὶ Ι θεοφυλάκτου πατρικῆς δεςποτείας ἐδεξάμην.

τῆς ὑμετ]έρας ὁςίας δεςποτείας. The collocation also occurs in *P. Berl. Zill.* 14,1 (quoted above). The plural is most probably *pluralis maiestatis*. It is interesting that in most cases where ὅςιος is found with δεςπότης (*vel sim.*), the person thus qualified is a bishop: cf. *P. Grenf.* I 63,6f.; 66,4?; II 91,9; *SB* VI 9287,1f. (VII); XVI 12869,1 (VI/VII). This allows the assumption that the addressee of the letter was a person of authority, perhaps the superior of the monastery mentioned in line 3, or even a bishop.

έδεξάμην. ἀποδέδωκα δὲ κτλ. The construction recalls the reported speech of another εύμμαχος in SB XVIII 13762,5f. (VI/VII) εἶπεν ὅτι γράμματα ἐδεξάμην - - τὰ δὲ γράμματά coυ ἀποδέδωκα. (I should note that SB 13762 is not by the same hand as our text, and the general context is different.)

κτήματα τοῦ εὐαγοῦς μοναςτηρίου. For the expression, cf. e.g. P. Hamb. I 68,10; P. Mich. XIII 667,4 (VI); P. Stras. VII 697,14 (VI).

It may be worth noting that this letter belongs to a group (ex-Mississippi papyri) which includes texts associated with the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit/Tit-kooh (I discuss this point in an article forthcoming in *ZPE*). One may thus entertain the suspicion that the monastery mentioned here is that of Apa Apollos, although all the certain Bawit texts in the Duke collection are later in date than P. Duk. inv. 497.

- 6. Perhaps κατὰ] τὴν cήμερον.
- B[i]κτορο(c) cυμ(μά)χ(ου). On the omission of final sigma see F. T. Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, i.124-25. On the abbreviation see P. Lond. IV, p. 608 (index).

A cύμμαχος named Victor seems not to have been recorded elsewhere. He may have been in the service of the monastery of line 3, although this is not certain. Another text referring to a cύμμαχος and the possessions of a church is *P. Rain. Cent.* 126 (VI). On cύμμαχοι in general, see A. Jördens, *ZPE* 66 (1986) 105-18; *P. Heid.* V, pp. 55-58; *ZPE* 92 (1992) 219-31; cf. also P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 100 (1994) 257-60.

Nikolaos Gonis

Wolfson College Oxford OX2 6UD UNITED KINGDOM

e-mail: gonis@ermine.ox.ac.uk