

## 21. Acknowledgment of receipt

Richard Burchfield (Sydney)

P.Heid. Inv. Kopt. 110  
7<sup>th</sup> century (?)

34,5 x 17,0 cm

Ashmunein  
plate XXIV

The document is an agreement (χομολογια) in which a man from Tmounahi in the district of Ashmunein writes to a superior through a third party, George the μειζότερος. The writer says he received a λορχος in Babylon and is ready to give it to his superior – “our lord, the illustrious” – or to otherwise pay a penalty of six gold holokottinoi. The son of Elias subscribes (στοιχει), and a certain Pkol, who is likely the scribe of the rest of the document, writes for him. Two further signatures are present as well as traces of an eleventh line whose exact purpose is not clear.

Along with P.Heid. Inv. Kopt. 25 and 85, the agreement fits into a small dossier of texts from the Heidelberg collection relating to the μειζότερος George, which all mention men from the village Hake (see the commentary to line 9), and of which one (P.Heid. Inv. Kopt. 25) also involves Babylon. A further Greek text (SB 3 7036) dated to the 7th/8th centuries and of unknown provenance is likewise addressed to a Γεωργίος μειζότερος, although it is not sure that this is the same individual. The μειζότερος should not be considered a village official, but rather the major domo of a private estate (as argued in the doctoral thesis of Lajos Berkes). Based on this, it is possible that the matter recorded in P.Heid. Inv. Kopt. 110 concerns the internal workings of the estate in which George was employed, and that the owner is the second party – perhaps also the illustrious (see commentary to line 4). The exact purpose of the document, however, depends on the interpretation of λορχος, for which an exact Greek or Coptic equivalent has not been found (see commentary to line 3).

The text was certainly written in the region of Ashmunein, as a man from that district is the first party, and the text contains common linguistic features of the region. Four linguistic features are suggestive of the Ashmunein region. First, the use of the verb κωρω, “ask, request”, is very common in texts from Ashmunein (see T.S. Richter, *Rechtsemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, Wiesbaden 2002, 211 – in other regions αιτέω is more common). The spelling πρωμ- for the construct form of ρωμε is also typical in texts from Ashmunein, and especially frequent before ωμογν, whereas it is rare in other regions (see the discussion and references in P.Bal. I pp. 181–183). Finally, the interchanging of ϣ and β in νορχ (for νορβ l. 5) and νβνοι (for νρνοι l. 9) is a feature of this region (P.Bal. I pp. 93–94, 136–138), as is the writing νμοϛ for νμοϛ, as in νμοϣ (ll. 3, 4) and νμοϊ (l. 4) (P.Bal. I 99–100).

Based on its connection to P.Heid. Inv. Kopt. 25, which can reasonably be dated to the middle of the 7th century, and its palaeography, it is reasonable to think that this text too should be dated to the mid-seventh century – soon after the Arab conquest.

The text is written in clear, black-grey ink on a damaged papyrus. The papyrus darkens and the ink becomes faded below line 7 – as though from exposure. The top left-hand corner is lost, taking with it the beginnings of the first two lines and obscuring the beginning of the third. Further damage from beetles or some other insect has left lacunae of various sizes on nearly every line. Despite this, the script is quite legible and most of the damaged sections can

be understood from the surviving traces or reconstructed if none remain. Traces of one line, probably an address, are visible on the back before the lacuna obscuring lines one and two.

The hand is a neat semi-cursive, with regular ligatures between ε and ι or τ, as well as occasional ligatures of στ and λτ. Several letters, in particular ω, ς, and Ϸ, have distinct features which enable them to be distinguished from others when only traces survive. The ω is written like a sloping square, open at the top and with a straight, downward stroke forming its tail. The Ϸ has a long tail which extends down and under the line to as many as two letters to the right, and the ς has an extra stroke which ascends diagonally to the right from the top of the letter. The hand becomes hurried in the subscriptions, with line 8 sloping slightly downward, yet the characteristics of the letters as described above are maintained. It is therefore likely that the entire document was written in the same hand – probably that of Pkol.

### Front (↑)

1 [ c. 22 ]τϷ πρωμ τμογναρι Ϸμ πτωω ωμογν τπολις ετςζαί νπα-  
 [ c. 22 ]... Ϸιτοοτκ ντοκ \πκγρις/ γεοργε πμιζοτερας Ϸε τιζομολογι  
 Ϸε εις ογλογχοϷ . . . ει ετροοτ Ϸν βαβιλων ττενογ ογν τιο νξετοιμοϷ ταανατιτογ νμοϷ  
 ντοοτϷ νπενϷοειϷ πιλογστριοϷ εωωοναωπε νμοϊ τατεμανατιτογ νμοϷ ντοοτϷ  
 5 τιο νξετοιμοϷ τατισογ νρολοκοττ(ινοϷ) ννογϷ Ϸα πιλογχοϷ νατϷαπ νατνομοϷ  
 νατλααγ νρωϷ ναμφιβολεια [ειω]ρκ πνογτε παντωκρατωρ Ϸννειωω παραβα  
 ντιζομολογια προς τεϷσομ εγρ\α(φν) φαωφϊ κ . . . Ϸγμιον . . . Ϸιστωρ .  
 +++  
 + ανοκ . ωρεωρ πωε νηλιαϷ τιϷτοιϷ(ει) ετιζομολογια νθε ετςηϷ νμοϷ τ [ c.? ]  
 + ανοκ πσωλ πωε νλεμνηωε πρωμ νραβε ακκορωτ Ϸιςζαι ϷαροϷ Ϸε νβνοι νςζαι αν  
 Ϸγφ τιο νμηντρε  
 10 Ϸγμιον π . . . ογ Ϸγμιον μηνα  
 + + + +++  
 traces +

The back (→) shows traces of one line, probably an address.

1 πόλις 2 κύριος μειζότερος όμολογέω 3 οὖν έτοιμός αναδίδωμι 4 ιλλούστριοϷ εωωοναωπε read  
 εσααναωπε αναδίδωμι 5 έτοιμός παρ Ϸολοκοττ όλοκόττινοϷ νόμοϷ 6 άμφιβολία παντοκράτωρ παραβαίνω  
 7 όμολογία προς παρ εγρ\α/ έγρ\αφη σημειον 8 παρ τιϷτοιϷ/ στοιχέω όμολογία 9 νοέω The ντρε of τιο νμηντρε  
 is written below the end of line 9 10 σημειον

... the man of Tmounahi, in the district of Shmoun, the city, who writes to ... through you, you  
 the kuris George the meizoteros that I agree that a louchos came to me in Babylon, so now I  
 am ready to hand it over to him, our lord the illoustrios. If it happens to me that I do not hand  
 it to him, I am ready to pay six gold holokottinoi for the louchos without judgement, without  
 (recourse to) law, without any kind of dispute. I swear to God the Almighty that I shall not  
 transgress this agreement, according to its validity. Written Phaophi 2 . . . Signature of ...

+ I .. the son of Elias, I assent to this agreement in the manner in which it is written (?) ...

+ I Pkol the son of NN, the man of Hake, he asked me and I wrote for him as he does not know how to write, and I bear witness.

Signature of NN +++

Signature of Mena +++

Traces

1 We would expect the first party to be the same individual as the son of Elias who writes the assent clause in line 8. If this is the case, however, something else (perhaps a title?) has to stand between the personal name and the indication of place (πρωμ), as the traces of τϣ, after the lacuna, are not part of the name ρηλιας.

The village τμογναρι is otherwise only attested in P.Lond.Copt. I 1171.2 (τμογναρι), a letter from a superior to a certain Georgios, and in O.CrumVC 110.3–4, an order for jars of pickled food from a man of this village. A Greek equivalent can perhaps be found in an account on the back of P.Ryl.Copt. 338 – χω(ρίον) μουναιεί (see M. Drew-Bear, *Le Nome Hermopolite* (APS 21), Missoula 1979, 303).

2 While λογχοc seems to be a Greek noun, its meaning is unclear. It is clearly something physical that can be given and received. Possible equivalents are: λύχνοc, ‘lamp’; όλοκόττινοc (for which λογκωci is an attested variant – see Förster, *Wörterbuch* p. 569); or even λόγοc (in this context perhaps an account or document). Ultimately, none of these options is satisfactory, and the context does not point to one particular option.

3 A reading of λφει ετοοτ would make sense, however the traces do not support this. λβει is another possibility.

4 The term ιλλούστριοc is frequently used for the pagarch of a nome in both Greek and Coptic texts (see for example P.Lond. IV 1542.6; P.Lond. IV 1573.2; CPR 22 2.6; P.Koeln 7 319.5; P.Stras. 7 699.26). However, it need not refer only to the pagarch and it is possible in this context that it is just an honourific for a land owner or other important individual. Of course, there is no reason to suppose that the pagarch could not also be a land owner.

εωωων: ο for λ is well attested in the Ashmunein region (see P.Bal. I p. 81); ω for c less so (only three examples exist from Ashmunein – P.Ryl.Copt. 193; MIFAO 59 149, 150. See the discussion in P.Bal. I p. 127). The traces that remain, however, are strongly reminiscent of the strong angular features of ω in this text and so εωωων seems a stronger reading than the alternative εφωων.

7 Assuming the reading of φλωφι is correct, ερα(φη) best fits the surviving traces and context. Likewise, an abbreviated form of ινδικτίωνοc, such as ιηΔ or ιΔ, with a following numeral is expected before κυμιοη, however this cannot be read in the visible traces.

8 Above the η and θ of ηε, where the line dips suddenly, are traces of ink which look like a small ο with a ρ below and to the right of it. However, it is unclear how they relate to the text, if at all.

9 ρασε should be equated with the Greek Ἄκιc, which is known to have stood in the district of Ashmunein (see M. Drew-Bear, *Le Nome Hermopolite* pp. 55–56 for further attestations, and S. Timm, *Das Christlich-koptische Ägypten*, vol. III, Wiesbaden 1985, s.v. ‘Hagje’ pp. 1069–1071 for potential locations). In addition, this toponym may occur in P.Heid. Inv. Kopt. 125.5, but the reading is dubious.

...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ

Nr. 21 Recto

...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ  
 ...τοῦ ἐπιπέδου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ

Nr. 22 Recto