

## 895.–908. Nikolaos GONIS

SPP VIII mimima<sup>12</sup>

## 895. SPP VIII 708

This fragmentary receipt of the seventh century was read as † παρησχ[ε]ν ὁ κ[υ]ρ[ι]ς [ ] | καρπῶν τρίτης ἰν(δικτίωνος) [ ] | τὰ δὲ ἄλλ(α) (κεράτια) ἰα κ[ ] | τῆς αὐτῆς ἰν(δικτίωνος) ὄγ[δ]ός (ll. 2–4). The reference to ‘the same eighth indiction’ in l. 4 after one to the third in l. 2 makes one pause. A check of the online image shows that the third indiction was meant also in l. 4, but the number was omitted from the published text: the papyrus has τῆς αὐτῆς γ ἰν(δικτίωνος). At the end of the line, I would simply transcribe ο. [.

## 896. SPP VIII 752

This receipt for *diagraphon* appears not to refer to any taxpayer, but on closer inspection this turns out to be due to the modern rather than the ancient scribe. The edition omits l. 4, which reads Μακάρ(ιος) ὀνελάτ(ης) (l. ὀνη-).

## 897. SPP VIII 821

There are three references to money in this seventh/eighth-century text (ll. 2–4):

ἀρ(ίθμια) νο(μίσματα) β ἔχο(ντα) (κεράτια) μγ δ’ τεσσαράκ[οντα] τρία τέταρτον  
 ἀρ(ίθμιον) νό(μισμα) ἔν - ἔχο(ν) (κεράτια) κ[ ]  
 ἀρ(ίθ(μιον) νό(μισμα) α ἔχο(ν) (κεράτια) κα εἴκ[οσι] ἔν (after BL VIII 447)

The image shows that in l. 3 the papyrus has α γ’, not ἔν -. If we reckon with a 21-carat solidus, as in l. 4, 1½ sol. = 28 car., so that we should restore (κερ.) κ[η] εἴκοσι ὀκτώ. But the solidi in l. 2 have 21½⁄₈ carats each; 1½ solidus of this kind makes 28½⁄₈ carats, i.e., (κερ.) κ[η] γ’ εἴκοσι ὀκτὼ ἥμισυ τρίτον.

## 898. SPP VIII 826

In l. 1 of this fragmentary receipt, Wessely read παρέσχ(ε) ἦ and then drew the top of a letter before indicating the lacuna. It is curious that he did not recognize ε, since parallels were not lacking. Read ἦ ἐ[ργ](ασία); cf. SPP VIII 840 (= XX 186), 841, 842, and 878.<sup>13</sup>

A bigger slip affected l. 4, which was omitted from the edition; read ἥμισυ τέταρτον [ .

## 899. SPP VIII 830

The date clause of this tax receipt was presented as a series of drawings, followed by ‘ἰδ(νδικτ.)’. On the image it is possible to read μ<sup>λ</sup> κ ἰ<sup>δ</sup> ι, i.e., Μ(ε)χ(εἰρ) κ ἰ(ν)δ(ικτίωνος) ι.

## 900. SPP VIII 842

The last line (4) of this receipt was omitted from the edition; read + δ(τ’) ἐμοῦ . . [ .

<sup>12</sup> I am grateful to Federico Morelli for checking originals in Vienna and commenting on a draft of these notes.

<sup>13</sup> In these texts Wessely had understood the writing differently: η (l. οἱ) ἐργ(άται). This was corrected in BL I 417.

## 901. SPP VIII 1077

This is an order to supply fodder for donkeys to two donkey drivers: παράσχε]τε τοῖς δύο ὄνελ(ά)τ(α)ς [ὑπὲρ τρο]φῆς γαιδ(αρίων) αὐτ(ῶν) ἀπὸ Τ[ῦβι νεομηνί]ας τρίτης ἰνδ(ι)κ(τίωνος) [ (ll. 2–5). Details on the fodder are given in l. 6, but the passage is problematic. This is Wessely's text, a good reproduction of what is written on the parchment, now in a bad state of preservation:

μῖ ἐν χ̅ δύο ἀπ̅ [

The abbreviations have given difficulty.<sup>14</sup> The context suggests resolving the first of the two as μ(αν)δ(άκια) ‘bundles’, apparently of hay (χόρτ(ου) would have stood at the end of the previous line); the plural form is suggested by δύο. The same abbreviation occurs in SPP X 83.1–4.<sup>15</sup> It is less clear what ἐν χε( ) represents. P.Amh. II 94 = W.Chr. 347.6 χορτενχέρσου (Herm.; 208) might be relevant.

Another problem is the transition from l. 4 to l. 5. The phrase ἀπὸ Τ[ῦβι νεομηνί]ας is not expected in a text of this kind. The parchment has ἀπὸ τοῦ . [ , but I cannot reconstruct what follows.

The text was assigned to the seventh/eighth century, but is slightly earlier. The hand and the structure of the text are comparable to the group of orders issued by Fl. Petterios, especially SPP VIII 1079, which date from the 660s–670s.

## 902. SPP VIII 1236

The first two lines of this fragmentary receipt of the seventh century (‘VI’ *ed. pr.*) were read thus:

] Σαβίνος τὸ δημό(σιον)  
]ρμε(νων) παρ' αὐτ(οῦ) ἀρουρῶ(ν) ἐπὶ κώμ(ης)

The image shows that l. 2 begins ]ρμε), to be restored as σπειρ]ομέ(νων). Sabinos has paid the tax on a number of aruras that he sows. A parallel is offered by SPP VIII 1346 (below, no. 908).

Two other points of detail. In l. 1, there are traces in the papyrus before Σαβίνος, not reported in *ed. pr.*: ]ε . . . In l. 3, for ] . σιδ( ) read ]ης ἰ(ν)δ(ικτίωνος) (i<sup>δ</sup> pap.).

## 903. SPP VIII 1238

Wessely drew what was visible at the beginning of l. 1 and continued with τιμας. The image allows reading φ]ιλῶτιμας.

## 904. SPP VIII 1286b

This short memorandum of the seventh/eighth century reads as follows (cf. BL XII 270): † ἔχει Γερ(όντιος) μεσίτ(ης) | (ὑπὲρ) τ(ῶν) μωαγαρ(ι)τ(ῶν) ἐποικίου Ἥλια (ἀρτάβας) η | (καί) λογι(σμοῦ) Κυρικῶ διακ(όνω) (ὑπὲρ) Φουρτιν (ἀρτάβας) γ ω. I do not see how to explain λογι(σμοῦ) in terms of sense and syntax; a verb corresponding to ἔχει would be preferable. I suggest reading λογί(ζεται): Gerontios received 8 artabas and credited 3½ artabas to Kyrikos the deacon.

<sup>14</sup> The passage was transcribed in DDbDP as μ(ηνῶν) δ \ε/ δύο.

<sup>15</sup> But not in P.Ross.Georg. III 57.16, where μ(αν)τ(άκια) should be read instead of μ(αν)δ(άκια).

## 905. SPP VIII 1301

The first line of the text as edited begins with a sign followed by ὀκτώ μ(όνα); the next and last line contains a kind of signature ending η μ(όνα). I reproduce what appears in the edition, juxtaposed with clippings from the online image:



In l. 1 the drawing is not entirely accurate and the top of the upright that follows was ignored. The enigmatic sign is that of ξ(έστης), and we should read ] ξ(έσται) η ὀκτώ μ(όνοι). The same sign was written before η in l. 2; read ξ(έσται) η μ(όνοι).

## 906. SPP VIII 1310

Of this fragmentary parchment document from the Fayum of the seventh/eight century, lines 2–4 call for comment. The edition has:

2 } ραφῶν κεράτια  
3 ἡμισυ γ κβζ Ἀλεξ<sup>αν</sup>(δρείας)  
4 ] γ( ) κθ δσ( ) ε δ(ιὰ) Ἰη[  
5 ] Χριστοφόρου

This is a receipt for 22½ carats paid for *diagraphon*; cf. SPP III 675. It is unclear why Wessely did not restore διαγ]ράφου in l. 2 and [εἴκοσι δύο ἡμισυ] in l. 3 (in the latter case, the space available on the page may have dictated choices, but not in the former). Line 4 is more difficult; here is a clipping of the image:



We have a date: ο κθ δ ιγδ(ικτίωνος). The name of a month came before κθ, but the letter under the raised omicron is not identifiable. Θο(θ) (l. Θωθ) is hardly attractive, nor is Τυ(βι). Με]σο(ρη) should be excluded, since there is a blank area before the unread letter.

At the end of the same line, F. Morelli points out that δ(ιὰ) Ἰη[ is also dubious; what is the name beginning Ἰη-, and how does it relate to Χριστοφόρου in the line below? There is no abbreviation stroke after δ, and this allows a different division of the letters and reading: δι' ἡ[μῶν. There are very few examples of signatures introduced by δι' ἡμῶν in receipts, but they include P.Ross.Georg. V 46.2.4, SPP III 262.2, III<sup>2</sup>.5 532.4, and 547.3, all from the Fayum. ἡμῶν would have been followed by a name, now lost; Χριστοφόρου indicates the second signatory.

There are faded traces above l. 1, but these are not the remains of another line.

## 907. SPP VIII 1327

In l. 2, τὰς δοθ(είσας) τῷ [ , a word was omitted: τὰς καὶ δοθ(είσας) τῷ [ .

## 908. SPP VIII 1346

This is a Heracleopolite account assigned to the sixth/seventh century. Lines 3–4 were read thus:

] τῶν ἀρουρ(ῶν) τῶν σπειρομέ(νων)  
] τῶν ἀπὸ Κοβα (καὶ) Δεριζομεμε( )

The last word was taken as a personal name (indexed as such on p. 290), but it is not one, and delta was misread: the papyrus has  $\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon$ . Before  $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$  in l. 4, F. Morelli observes that it is possible to read  $\omicron$ , with the end of a high horizontal to its left, such as of  $\pi$ . I propose to read l. 4 as follows:

[ὄ]πὸ τῶν ἀπὸ Κοβα (καὶ) θεριζομέ(νων)

The reference is to aruras harvested and sown by the people from the village of Koba.