P.Giss. I 106 Revisited

P.Giss. I 106 (inv. 118; dated by the editor ‘VI’P) contains a receipt for payment of rent issued by the heirs of a woman named Secundilla living in Hermopolis to the heirs of another person (cf. ll. 1-2) living in the same city. The rent is stated to be 1 sol., 12 keratia (= 1.5 solidus), paid from the crops of the 15th indiction (cf. ll. 3-5). Incorporating some corrected readings in ll. 3, 4 and 5 recently proposed by N. Gonis in ZPE 143 (2003) 158-159 the Greek text now reads:

1 † π(αρά) τῶν καλησκηνῶν) Σεκουντίλλας ἀπὸ Ἐρμο(υπόλεως) τοῖς καλησκηνῶν(ις)
2 [ ], ρο[ ], μισουκας ἀπὸ τῆς α(υτῆς) μη(τροπόλεως). δεδωκατε καὶ ἐπλη([ρῶ(σατε)])
3 τὸ πάκτον τοῦ ἐμφυτεύμου(τος) καρπῶν [π]νεκτεαοιδέκατη[ς]
4 ἰνδ(ικτίδο)νος) χρυσοῦ νόμισμα ἐν εὐετ(α(θ)μον) καὶ κεράτιο διδέκα [ξ]λ[(ήρης),]
5 γ(υς) χρ(υσοῦ) ν(ομίσμα) α( ἐράτικι) ιβ πλ[(ήρης) τὰ καὶ λο[γ]η[(ε)θά(ντα) ἤμιν ἀπὸ ἐμβολῆς
6 πεντεκαὶ[δ]εκάτη[ς] ἰνδ(ικτίδο)νος) ἐν [τῷ τῆς] λαμπρ(οτάτης) ['Αν]τι[νόου (πόλεως)]
7 κοιν[φ] ι(ερότημα). καὶ πρὸς ὑμῶν ἀσφαλ(ειαν) π(ε)ποιήμεθα ὑμ[ή][ν]ια[
8 τὴν παροῦσαν πληρωτικὴν ἀπόδειξιν ὡς πρόκει(ται).

The body of the receipt is followed by two lines containing a subscription in Coptic

9 (m. 2) Λ.ΝΟΚ (m. 3) ΓΑΒΡΙΗΛΙΑ ΤΙΣ-
10 ΤΟΙΧΕΙ †

Dr. Gonis rightly remarks that the curious sequence in ll. 6-7 cannot be upheld. To his doubts may be added that l. 2, too, contains some unlikely elements: one would not expect a phrasing ἀπὸ τῆς 
α(υτῆς) 
μη(τροπόλεως), where normally a simple ἀπὸ τῆς 
α(υτῆς) 
πόλεως is found. As regards the reading of ll. 6-7, it is indeed unclear why according to l. 6 (mostly restored!) the rent would have been paid “in the κοινὸν (‘joint/common’) λογοστήριον (= accounting office) of Antinoopolis”.

A check of the photo of the papyrus available on the internet1 allows us to propose the following corrected readings:

2 [ ] ρο[ ] μισουκας ἀπὸ τῆς α(υτῆς) μη(τροπόλεως)
   → Ἀβρα[α(υ)]μιοῦ κας ( ) ἀπὸ Ταυαμήμι.

One could take the abbreviation κας( ) as part of a noun indicating a profession like κασσιτεραξ, 
κασσιτερουργός, κασσιτεροποιός, but an abbreviated father’s name in Κας- is not to be excluded. In favor of the latter solution it may be adduced that above the village name Ταυαμήμι there is also a marking stroke; for this village, see M. Drew-Bear, Le Nome Hermopolite, 264 (it is attested in the 7th and 8th cent.).

6-7 ἐν [τῷ τῆς] λαμπρ(οτάτης) ['Αν]τι[νόου (πόλεως)] κοιν[φ] 1) λογοστηρ(ιοφ)
   → δ[(ις) (τὸ) λαμπρ(οτάτου) [ ], ] βο[θ(οδ)] 1) λογοστηρ(ιοφ).
The lacuna before λαμπρ( ) offers space for only 3 rather than 5 letters, and the letters preceding the lacuna at the end of the line read much more easily as βο[θ] than as κοιν[φ], but there is also a marking stroke; for this village, see M. Drew-Bear, Le Nome Hermopolite, 264 (it is attested in the 7th and 8th cent.).

1) Via the address <http://bibd.uni-giessen.de/papryri/images/pgiss-inv.118recto.jpg>.
(first) letter, rising slightly above line level; the third letter could be taken as a iota; one might even argue that coming after the curved lower part of the iota there is an exiguous trace of yet another (4th) letter.

Before proceeding we observe that one finds a similar combination of the epithet λαμπρότατος with a βοηθός in P.Oxy. I 125.7 (560); even more illustrative is another papyrus from Hermopolis, P.Würzb. 19.3 (622, cf. BL 8.513) mentioning a certain Fl. Magister as λαμπρότατος βοηθός λογιστηρίου.²

The question, why in general a boethos logisteriou would appear as a third party in such a receipt (after all, the transaction is between a lessor and a lessee), can be answered simply by restoring δι[(ιω) τοῦ] in the lacuna before λαμπρ( ). The lessor acknowledges to the lessee the full payment of an amount of rent (1 sol., 12 ker.) which earlier on had been set to their account (= λα[γ]θ[εντα]) by an assistant of the public accounting office. For the background of the procedure concerning the collection of rent/tax, see J. Gascou, Les grands domaines, la cité et l'état en Égypte byzantine, T&M 9 (1985) 18ff. Finally, we observe (see our correction of ll. 6-7 above) that the papyrus should no longer be connected with Antinoopolis; the text comes from Hermopolis.

² For him see in particular P.J. Sijpesteijn in his first editions of SB XVI 12264 [628] and 12999 [626]. In our view there is not sufficient justification for reading in the Giessen papyrus the name as Μεγίστος in its full form, as the lacuna before the letters βοη may contain probably only 2 letters, hence one would have to accept an abbreviation Μεγίστος, or reckon with an undeclined form of the name. Such an approach, however, does not seem very comfortable and for that reason we would refrain from putting this name into the text of P.Giss. 106.6.