This fragmentary receipt of the seventh century was read as † παρέσχεν ὁ κ [υ]+ τρίτης ἱν(δικτίωνος). 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 ἱν(δικτίωνος). At the end of the line, I would simply transcribe ὡν.

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 Μακάριος ὀνέλατης (l. ὀνη-)...

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

ἀρίθμιον νόμισμα τβ ἔχοντα...τέταρτον
ἀρίθμιον νόμισμα ἑν...τεσσάρακον τριά τέταρτον
ἀρίθμιον νόμισμα ἑν...εἴκοσι ὡκτώ (after BL VIII 447)

The image shows that in l. 3 the papyrus has αγ´, not ἑν´. If we reckon with a 21-carat solidus, as in l. 4, 1⅔ sol. = 28 car., so that we should restore (κερ). But the solidi in l. 2 have 21½⅛ carats each; 1⅔ solidus of this kind makes 28½⅓ carats, i.e., (κερ.) κη ἡ ἡμίσι τρίτον.

In l. 1 of this fragmentary receipt, Wessely read παρέσχεν ἡ 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 ἡ ἐργάται; cf. SPP VIII 840 (= XX 186), 841, 842, and 878.13

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

The date clause of this tax receipt was presented as a series of drawings, followed by ’ἰδινδικτιών’. On the image it is possible to read μτ κ ψ, i.e., Μ(ε)χ(ερ) κ λ (δικτίωνος) t. 

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

---

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

13 In these texts Wessely had understood the writing differently: η (I. 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: παράσχετε τοῖς δύο ὀνελάδοις παρά τρόπῳ φης γαςὶ διὰ τρίτης ἤπειῥ τοῖς δύο ἄρὡν. The abbreviations have given difficulty.14 The context suggests resolving the first of the two as μ(αν)δάκια ‘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 83.1–4.15 It is less clear what εν χερ( ) 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 Τυβίνεομνίας 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:

Σαβῖνος τὸ δημόσιον μεσιτὴς Ἠλίας ἀρτάβας ἡπ̔ ἐποικίου Θεοσκρίτους ἀρτάβας γὰρ Φουρτιᾶς... I do not see how to explain λογίζων in terms of sense and syntax; a verb corresponding to ἔχει would be preferable. I suggest reading λογίζων (ζετάω): Gerontios received 8 artabas and credited 3⅔ artabas to Kyrikos the deacon.

903. SPP VIII 1238

Wessely drew what was visible at the beginning of l. 1 and continued with τιμίας. The image allows reading φιλαρτίμιας.

904. SPP VIII 1286b

This short memorandum of the seventh/eighth century reads as follows (cf. BL XII 270): ἔχει Τυβίνεομνίας μεσιτῆς Ἰλίας ἀρτάβας ἡπ̔ ἐποικίου Θεοσκρίτους ἀρτάβας γὰρ Φουρτιᾶς... I do not see how to explain λογίζων (ζετάω): Gerontios received 8 artabas and credited 3⅔ artabas to Kyrikos the deacon.

14 The passage was transcribed in DDbDP as μ(ηνῶν) δὲ χερ/ δύο.
15 But not in P.Ross.Georg. III 57.16, where μ(αν)τ(άκω) should be read instead of μ(αν)δ(άκω).
905. SPP VIII 1301

The first line of the text as edited begins with a sign followed by ὀκτῶ 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 οκτῶ 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:

This is a receipt for 22½ carats paid for diagraphon; cf. SPP III 675. It is unclear why Wessely did not restore διαγράφου in l. 2 and [εἴκοσι δύο ήμισ]υ 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: οκθδἰνδ(ικτίωνος). The name of a month came before κθ, but the letter under the raised omicron is not identifiable. Θο(θ) (l. Θοθ) is hardly attractive, nor is Τβ(βί). Με[ρ(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 δι(α) η[η] is also dubious; what is the name beginning ητ-, 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 ήμιόν. There are very few examples of signatures introduced by δι ήμιόν in receipts, but they include P.Ross.Georg. V 46.2.4, SPP III 262.2, III 532.4, and 547.3, all from the Fayum. ήμιόν 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 δοθείσας τῷ [ , a word was omitted: τὰς καὶ δοθείσας 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(γνων) ]
[ τῶν ἀπὸ Κοβία (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 θεριζομεμε. Before τῶν in l. 4, F. Morelli observes that it is possible to read ο, with the end of a high horizontal to its left, such as of π. I propose to read l. 4 as follows:

[ὑ]πὸ τῶν ἀπὸ Κοβα (καὶ) θεριζομένων

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