



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Remarks on Some Texts from Akoris

Kruit, N.; Worp, K.A.

Citation

Kruit, N., & Worp, K. A. (2002). Remarks on Some Texts from Akoris. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik*, 140, 155-158. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10125>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10125>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

NOCHMALΣ ΔΦΕΪΛΩ + INFINITIV

N. Gonis hat in Tyche 13 (1998) 260, Korr. Tyche 252 anhand einer Korrektur von CPR X 62 auf diese in Papyri nicht ungeläufige, aber doch immer wieder mißverständene Wendung hingewiesen, die aus dem Partizip Präsens von ΔΦΕΪΛΩ und einem davon abhängigen Infinitiv nach dem Muster γνῶσις γαιδαρίων ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΩΝ ΔΟΘΗΝΑΙ (SPP VIII 1209,1; 8. Jh.) besteht¹. Vgl. weiters J. Diethart, Archiv 45 (1999) 58–60. Eine weitere Stelle, an der diese Wendung ebenfalls verkannt worden ist, läßt sich anfügen: In dem Zahlungsauftrag CPR X 2 = SPP VIII 1125 = SPP XX 150 (608 n.Chr., s. S. 26) ist demnach in Z. 3–7 statt der Lesung des Zweitherausgebers B. Palme παράσχου τὰ ... ΔΦ(ΕΙ)ΛΟ(ΜΕΝΑ) ΠΡΑΘ(ΗΝΑΙ) zu verstehen παράσχου τὰ ... ΔΦ(ΕΙ)ΛΟ(ΝΤΑ) ΠΡΑΘ(ΗΝΑΙ).

So weit die erste einsichtige Textverbesserung.

Die Papyri bringen an die fünfzig Belege aus dem 2.–8. Jh., und es gibt auch – warum nicht? – einige Stellen, wo ΔΦΕΪΛΩ mit mehr als einem Infinitiv verbunden ist, so z.B. P.Lond. IV 1375,12 (710 n.Chr.): ἀνθρώπων σου πιστῶν τῶν ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΩΝ ΚΑΤΑΒΑΛΕΣΘΑΙ ... ΚΑΙ ΚΟΜΙΣΑΣΘΑΙ ΤΗΝ ... ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΙΝ.

Nochmals: Das Sinngerüst unseres Dokuments lautet in der vorliegenden Fassung: παράσχου τὰ βληθ(έντα) εἰς τὸ ἀλιάδ(ιον) ... καὶ πεμ(φ)θ(έντα) ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοεῖτι (καὶ) ΔΦ(ΕΙ)ΛΟ(ΜΕΝΑ) ΠΡΑΘ(ΗΝΑΙ). Ich meine nun, daß – wie die vergleichbare Stelle auf dem Londoner Papyrus zeigt – auch βληθ() und πεμ(φ)θ() vielleicht als auf (das verbesserte) ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΑ bezogene Nennformen zu verstehen sind. Der Text dürfte dann wie folgt zu verstehen sein: παράσχου τὰ βληθ(ΗΝΑΙ) εἰς τὸ ἀλιάδ(ιον) ... καὶ πεμ(φ)θ(ΗΝΑΙ) ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοεῖτι (καὶ) ΔΦ(ΕΙ)ΛΟ(ΝΤΑ) ΠΡΑΘ(ΗΝΑΙ). Das besonders dann, wenn man für das einleitende παράσχου hier die sich wohl anbietende Übersetzung „gib zur Auslieferung frei“ wählt, denn alle Vorgänge erfolgten ja eigentlich erst nach dieser „Freigabe“: Die Frucht (132 Arten φακή) ist auf das Schiff zu bringen [βληθ(ΗΝΑΙ) εἰς τὸ ἀλιάδ(ιον)], in den Arsinoites zu verfrachten [πεμ(φ)θ(ΗΝΑΙ) ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοεῖτι] und schließlich zu verkaufen [(καὶ) ΔΦ(ΕΙ)ΛΟ(ΝΤΑ) ΠΡΑΘ(ΗΝΑΙ)]. Und καὶ verbindet ja gleichwertige Teile, eben βληθ(ΗΝΑΙ), πεμ(φ)θ(ΗΝΑΙ) und schließlich ΠΡΑΘ(ΗΝΑΙ), alle drei Nennformen abhängig von ΔΦ(ΕΙ)ΛΟ(ΝΤΑ) – bzw. von ΔΦ(ΕΙ)ΛΟ(ΥΣΑΣ), wie im folgenden zu zeigen sein wird.

Gegen diese Annahme spräche allerdings, wenn man ΔΦΕΪΛΩ jeweils nur vor der ersten Nennform fände. Ob die einzige Stelle, die ΔΦΕΪΛΩ nach der davon abhängigen Nennform bringt, nämlich P.Cairo Masp. II 67151,246 (570 n.Chr.): καὶ κατὰ παράκλησιν ἐμὴν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς κ[ατα]ιδεῖν ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΑΣ Τὸν θεο[φ]ι[λ]έ[σ]τα[τ]ον κουράτ[ο]ρα allerdings ausreicht, meine Überlegungen zu stützen?

B. Palme geht auch kurz auf den seiner Meinung nach möglicherweise vorliegenden Kongruenzfehler παράσχου τὰ ... φακ(ή)ς (ἀρτάβας) ein. Natürlich kann auch ein bloßer Schreibfehler τὰ statt τὰς angenommen werden, den Palme aber nicht in Betracht gezogen hat. Eine Lesung/Auflösung zu τὰ<ς> ... ΔΦ(ΕΙ)ΛΟ(ΥΣΑΣ) ΠΡΑΘ(ΗΝΑΙ) ... ἀρτάβας stellt nur einen kleinen Schritt dar, bringt aber die „grammatikalische Gerechtigkeit“ ohne großen Aufwand wieder ins Lot.

Infinitiv Präsens begegnet in den Wendungen mit ΔΦΕΪΛΩ ziemlich selten, und wenn, dann vor allem in Texten aus dem 2. Jh., z.B. in P.Oxy. XLII 3027 (166–169 n.Chr.): μηδενὸς ἀπεχομένου τῶν πράσσεσθαι ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΩΝ oder P.Petaus 49 (185 n.Chr.): εἰς ἐκβολὴν ἐργατῶν τῶν ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΩΝ ἀπεργάζεσθαι τὰ χωματικά ἔργα; aus dem 5. Jh. stammt P.Oxy. VI 904 (5. Jh.): καὶ ἄλλους τοὺς ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΑΣ τὴν παραφυλακὴν τῆς πόλεως ποιεῖσθαι.

Diese Wendung ist auch außerpapyrologisch nicht selten, z.B. bei Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos, De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae 652: διὰ τῶν βαβυλωνιακῶν τῶν ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΩΝ ταξιδεῦσαι εἰς τὸ πλόμιον oder 528: ὁ βασιλεὺς ... κελεύει τοῦ εἰσάξει τὸν ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΑ προβληθῆναι ραίκτηρα oder auch bei Aetios, Iatricorum liber XII 63, 122: κόψας τὰ ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΑ καπῆναι ἀδρομερῶς.

Wien

Johannes Diethart

¹ Haben wir es indes mit handelnden Subjekten zu tun, steht der aktive Infinitiv, wie z.B. in P.Wash. Univ. II 102,1 (5./6. Jh.): γνῶσις ἐργατῶν ΔΦΕΪΛΟΝΤΩΝ ἀπελθεῖν ...

REMARKS ON SOME TEXTS FROM AKORIS

In a remarkable volume '*Akoris: Report of the excavations at Akoris in Middle Egypt, 1981-1992*'¹ Jacques Jarry (hereafter: *J.J.*) published in Chapter V, pp. 330-371², approximately 90 papyri and 25 potsherds (ostraka) inscribed with texts in Greek and Coptic. To be sure, many of the texts published in this volume had appeared previously in a volume of the *Preliminary Reports* of the same excavation; some claimed scholarly attention already earlier (see below on some ostraka). Among these texts, the Coptic papyri outnumber the Greek papyri considerably; on the other hand, the number of Greek ostraka is more or less equal to that of the Coptic ostraka.

As the authors of the present note cannot claim any competence in Coptic, they must leave this class of documents out of consideration. Sometimes, however, they can hardly suppress the feeling (created by the translations which accompany the Coptic transcriptions) that *J.J.* presents unexpected novelties to his readers. E.g.: while years of the Era of the Martyrs are in general *not* expected already long before the first such year known to date, i.e. year 502 (= 785/6 C.E.),³ *J.J.* presents us with the novelty of a Martyrs era year 314 in Papyrus # 54 (p. 344 + pl. 138) without spending any comment on this remarkable phenomenon⁴; moreover, it appears that the year numeral '314' given in the translation can be found back in *J.J.*'s Coptic text only under the proviso that in Akoris the 'Syrian' way of noting down numerals in an inverted order of digits was practiced (on this see below, at ostrakon # 13) and that 'ΔΠ' is an error for 'ΔΙΤ'. Furthermore, though we lack competence in Coptic, a check of the plate makes us feel that in the Coptic papyrus # 7 (p. 331 + pl. 127) the end of line 2 of the transcript (actually, we think that one should count here line 4 on the papyrus) reads *χρεώσθαι* instead of *ΠΙΩΤ ΟΥΜΕΡΟC* = 'Father Homerus'. Likewise, a check of the plate of the Coptic papyrus # 19 (p. 333 + pl. 129) convinces us, that in l. 3 instead of *†ΕΟΡΤΗ ΝΧΟΙΔΚ* one should read the Greek phrase *† ἐγρά(φη) μη(ν) Κοιὰκ* [.

As far as papyri and potsherds carrying texts in Greek are concerned, we venture to give below a few transcripts of our own, based on the plates accompanying the report itself. We wish to stress, however, that we have not attempted to study each and every Greek fragment in the report in depth and to offer a complete re-edition of all Greek texts in the volume.

In text 9 (p. 331 + pl. 128) one finds according to *J.J.* an 81st Martyrs era year, 'απ Μ(απτόρων)'; inspection of the plate, however, shows that one should read here *απημ* [and that there is no Martyrs era year to reckon with (let alone such an unlikely early one, with a numeral given in the 'Syrian' [inverted] notation).

In text 12 (p. 332 + pl. 128) *J.J.* reads *Ακ]ορις ἐν κόρρα τῆς οἰκίας* ('..Akoris at the entrance of the house') followed in a second line by *ἂ]σφάλλοσε ὁ π[.....* ('insured'); we read on the plate line 1 as *] ὄρμου, βορρὰ τῆς οἰκίας* ('of the harbor (?)', to the north of the house' and line 2 as *δ]ιαφέρει σου τοῦ* [.

¹ Published under the auspices of the Egyptian Committee of the Paleological Association of Japan, Inc. (Kyoto 1995).

² On pp. 326-330 one finds some Greek inscriptions published by K. Mochikuzi and H. Takahashi; for these see *SEG* 45 (1995) 2069, 2070.

³ Cf. *Kush* 15 (1967/8) 133, pl. 25 (Old Dongola). On the era of the Martyrs see L.S.B. MacCoull and K.A. Worp in *Miscellanea Papyrologica* II (Firenze 1990) 375-408 and *Analecta Papyrologica* 7 (1995) 155-164.

⁴ For an even more remarkable 'attestation' of this era, cf. below at text 9.

In text 13 (p. 332 + pl. 128) we are convinced that instead of *J.J.*'s reading φόρος) ἐώνι(ος) one should read] ἀνδρεων] ; probably one may read here either 'Αλε]ξανδρέων] or some form of the noun ἀνδρεών.

To text 17 (p. 333 + pl. 128) *J.J.* adds the label 'Coptic'; he reads in l. 1 'ΡΟΜ]ΠΙ Ψ (ΜΑΡΤΥΡΩΝ) Η...', rendered as 'Year of the Martyrs ...8'. A check of the plate convinces us that the text is in fact Greek and that one can read in this line]. μεγαλοπρ[επ-, i.e. a form of the substantive μεγαλοπρέπεια or the superlative μεγαλοπρεπέστατος. The second line of this text does not contain a date [ΕΠΕ]Π ΚΘ Η ΙΝ[ΔΙΚΤΙΩΝΟΣ] (= Epeiph 29 of the 8th indiction), but may be read as]τοὺς ἐ[]. πιστ[έλλοντας or]τοὺς ἐ[]. πιστ[ολαφόρους, vel sim.

In text 18 (p. 333 + pl. 128) *J.J.* reads only Νίκα Χστ (Χρίστος) 'Christ triumphs'; on the plate we see remnants of two lines, the first of which is illegible, while the second may be read as] πεμεσι[.

In text 20 (p. 333 + pl. 129) *J.J.* reads ὁ ἅγιος Ὀννόφι[ος interpreted as 'Saint Onnophios (probably dialectal for Anouphios)'. On the plate we read without hesitation:] μακάριος Ὀννοφρ[; we cannot tell, however, whether the adjective μακάριος or the personal name Μακάριος is meant; likewise, one may restore a nominative Ὀννόφρ[ις or a genitive Ὀννόφρ[ιτος.

To text 31 (p. 335 + pl. 130) *J.J.* adds, again, the label 'Coptic'; he reads here 'ΘΥ ΔΓΕ[ΝΗC ?]', interpreted as 'Amen, Agenes?' (which tells us that ΔΓΕ[ΝΗC instead of ΔΓΕ[ΝΗC is meant); turning the plate by 180° enables the reader to verify our reading 'Σευήρο(ς) στοιχ(εῖ)'.
 Text 39 (p. 339 + pl. 135) is considered by *J.J.* as a sort of exercise in Greek, in which a monk repeated some liturgical sentences like homework in order to get used to them. The editor transcribes (we leave his accents unchanged):

ἀεὶ ἰχθϋς	Always Ikthys (Christian Symbol)
Σώ]τηρ Ἐνοχ	Enoch
Ἰ]άκωβ	Jacob
ἀεὶ νίκα Ἰησους	Jesus triumphs always
...α μου	a of me
τοῦ	
γ σου	yours

Again (cf. at text 31), turning the plate by 180° proves illuminating. This action enables the reader of the volume to see without a problem that the Greek text starts with:

1	] Ἐρμπολείτου[
2	]ἱρα []....
3	ἀπὸ τῆς αὐ]τῆς Αὐρηλι [
4	] χαίρει[v
5-6	Remains of two more lines

Clearly one is dealing in this fragment ('A') with the opening of a document. Another fragment ('B') in the same handwriting is stuck 'tête-bêche' to the top of the fragment transcribed above; it reads:

1	v]ομοῦ[
2	α]ὕτῃ[ς
3	]νου
4	].

Now, if one regards line 1 of fragment 'B' as the continuation of line 1 in fragment 'A' and then searches the DDBDP for the word combinations ἐρμπολιτου νομου / ἐρμπολειτου νομου, this yields the result that in the vast majority of matches such a combination is preceded by a phrasing like ἀπὸ κόμης / ἐποικίου + name, vel sim. To our own surprise, it turned out to be quite exceptional that an

indication of a title or an office preceded; therefore, we do not wish to reckon with precisely such a case in the document under review. In the final end we transcribe the preserved remains of the original document as follows:

- 1 N.N. ἀπὸ κώμης N.N. τοῦ Ἑρμοπολείτου [ν]ομοῦ (or perhaps even: νομοῦ ?)
 2 καὶ N.N.]ίρας ἀπὸ τῆς αἰὺτῆ[ς]
 3 καὶ N.N. ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς Αὐρηλίου [Πα / 'Α]νου-
 4] χαίρει[ν]
 5]ων μεθ' ὃ πεπ[...].
 6] Remains of a line
-

2. The 4 letters before ἀπὸ probably belong to the name of the 2nd sender himself or to that of his father (or perhaps even that of his mother?). At the end of this line, the same village must have been referred to as that in l. 1.

3. We do not reckon here with a title/office in -της, hence our present restoration. We read the letter following Αὐρηλί- as a (dotted) omega rather than as omikron, hence we take it that here stood the name of the addressee, rather than that of a sender of a document (who would then have written to 3 addressees). We are not able to decide whether in view of the available space in the lacuna we should reckon with a name 'Α]νου-|[βίωνι rather than with Πα]νοῦ-|[φι .

4-5. We take the trace at the end of line 4 as the top of a letter actually written in l. 5, e.g. as a kappa (e.g. πεπ[ρά]κ[α-]μεν) or a phi (e.g. πεπ[ομ]φ[α-]μεν, rather than as part of a very broad ny belonging to χαίρειν.

In the section dealing with ostraka (pp. 363ff.) J.J. reproduces among numbers 4-11 some texts published before already in the *Preliminary Report to the Sixth Season of the Excavations at Akoris*. As P. van Minnen & K.A. Worp considered this first edition unsatisfactory, they re-edited these texts in *Tyche* 5 (1990) 95-99 and from there the texts were reprinted in SB XX 14692 - 14698.⁵ It may be helpful to present the following concordance of these ostraka:

Akoris Ostrakon =	SB XX
4	14697
5	14695
6	14693
8	14696
9	14692
10	14694
11	14698

Ostrakon # 7 (p. 364 + pl. 149) poses a problem. Only so much is certain that most probably J.J.'s reading

- 1 † Νίκα Ἀμέ
 2 ριος Κόσμα φ(όρου)?
 3 ι κεράτια καὶ β νούμμοι Μαρτύρων Υ
 4 Ιωάννης στοιχεῖ

cannot stand. The photo, however, does not seem good enough for improving the reading of ll. 1 and 4 convincingly. For now we cannot do more than propose our reading of ll. 2-3, i.e.

εἰκοσι ἑπτὰ, γίνε(ται) κζ 'twenty seven, total 27.'

⁵ In the present volume one finds no word of that re-edition. Obviously, one is forced to draw the conclusion that J.J. considers the texts of the *Preliminary Report* as 'final'.

] κεράτια τέσσαρ(α) ἥμισυ, γί(νεται) (κερ.) δ (ἥμισυ). 'four and a half carat, total 4.5 car.'
In line 2 it is uncertain whether there is indeed an ink trace (a κεράτια symbol?) between γί(νεται) and κζ.

Ostrakon # 13 (p. 365 + pl. 150) is transcribed and interpreted by J.J. as:

ΒΚΤ μαρτύρων ε C	322 (of the martyrs = 606 of our era)	206
Γεωργιος γμ ε C	George 43	206
Φιλοθεος θω ε C	Philotheos 809	206

and by way of commentary he adds that it remains hard to understand why the same number appears at the end of each line and that the meaning of the numbers which follow the names of George and Philotheos remains obscure. He operates here, as elsewhere in chapter V, on the notion that in Akoris, like in inscriptions from Syria and Palestine, in Greek numerals the single units precede the tens and/or the hundreds. While disregarding the error 'ε = 6' there is, of course, no reason to believe that the practice in Akoris ran counter to the usual practice found elsewhere in Egypt, i.e. that units are preceded by tens which are in turn preceded by hundreds, etc.⁶

A check of the plate convinces us that one can read the text as:

δ(ιὰ) Βίκτ(ορος) Μη(νᾶ) νο(μισματίου) (ἔκτον)	'Through Biktor son of Mena 1/6th sol.'
]απίων Ἐνὸχ νο(μισματίου) (ἔκτον)	'Japion son of Enoch 1/6th sol.'
Ἀπο]λλῶς Κολλ(ού)θ(ου) νο(μισματίου) (ἔκτον)	'Apollon son of Kollouthos 1/6th sol.'

For a reedition of the Akoris ostraka nos. 19 and 20 see the publication by F. Morelli and G. Schmelz in ZPE 139 (2002) 127-137.

Leiden
Amsterdam

Nico Kruit
Klaas A. Worp

⁶ For numerals given in an inverted order see the remarks by B. Kramer in *Archiv* 43 (1997) 332, note to A. 2; while there are a few cases of this practice in documents from Egypt, in general it is unusual in this country.

GREEK TAX RECEIPTS FROM LATE-BYZANTINE AKORIS

Below we republish a small dossier of papyrus texts presented earlier by Jacques Jarry in *Akoris: Report of the excavations at Akoris in Middle-Egypt 1981-1992* (Kyoto 1995), Chapter V, pp. 330ff.; while we refrain from repeating the individual texts presented in the said chapter, we refer to them here as 'Akoris # ...'. Some other texts presented previously by Jarry have already been the subject of new editorial work, cf. N. Kruit - K.A. Worp in *ZPE* (forthcoming). To be sure, Akoris # 31 [ed.princ.: 'Coptic'; read, however, 'Συνήρος στοιχ(εῖ)', cf. Kruit - Worp, *loc.cit.*] might belong to the same dossier as the following texts. All of them seem to date from the late VIIth or early VIIIth century A.D. and apparently contain tax receipts, as administrative officials such as a διαστολεύς (cf. below, Akoris # 32, note to lines 1,2) sign the receipts which refer to various taxes like ἀνδρισμός, δαπάνη and προσθήκη and concern payments of:

1/6th sol.: Akoris # 32.2, 3, 42.4, 43'.2

1/3 sol.: Akoris ## 32.1, 37.1 (for δαπάνη?), 42.1,5, 43'.3, 43'.2,3, 44'.5 (for δαπάνη?), 44'.3 (for προσθήκη), 83a.2

2/3 sol.: Akoris ## 50, 87

1 sol.: Akoris # 44'.6,8 (for ἀνδρισμός)

2 sol.: Akoris # 83d.

Akoris # 32 (p. 335, pl. 131; the two fragments should be re-positioned in order to present a continuous text in l. 2):

-
- 1 ...]ελ() νομ(ισμα)τ(ίου) τρίτον, γί(ν.) νο(μ.) γ' μ(όνον). Κολ(λοῦ)θ(ος) δι(αστολεὺς)
στοιχ(εῖ). ὁμ(οίως) τ[ο(ῦ)]
- 2 [αὐτ(οῦ) ν]ομ(ισμα)τ(ίου) ἕκτον, γί(ν.) νο(μ.) ς' μ(όνον). Κολ(λοῦ)θ(ος) δι(αστολεὺς) στοιχ(εῖ).
ὁμ(οίως) το(ῦ) αὐτ(οῦ)
- 3 [νομ(ισμα)τ(ίου) ἕκ]τον, γί(ν.) νο(μ.) ς' μ(όνον).
- 4 [] vacat

- 1 ελ(): Presumably this is the same abbreviation as in Akoris ## 43'.2, 44'.2,6,8, and 83a.2, but we fail to understand what is meant precisely. 'ελ()' may stand for some form of ἔλ(αβον) [cf. P.Prag. II 140.6,7], but one would not expect to see this preceded by a single letter/numeral, cf. below at Akoris # 44', ll. 2 (θ ελ()) , 6 (α ελ()) , and 8 (ε ελ()) .
- 1.2 The same Κολλοῦθος διαστολεύς also occurs in Akoris ## 43'.2,3, 44'.6, and 44'.3; for chronological reasons this man can not be identified with his namesake in the same office, occurring in BGU XII 2143.10 (Vth). For the office of a διαστολεύς (also in Akoris # 42.1-5 ['Ἀγενη] and # 44'.7 ['Επίμαχος]), see J. Gascou in P.Sorb. II p. 61 n. 40. το(ῦ) αὐτ(οῦ): probably one should understand this as 'ὑπὲρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ', cf. the use of ὑπὲρ in Akoris ## 43'.1 and 44'.1; the preposition is also omitted in Akoris ## 43'.2, 44'.2, 44'.5,7 and 83a.1 (cf. also Akoris # 43'.3n.). What is meant by this remains unclear: does it refer to the tax payer, or to the tax? Compare Akoris # 44'.4-7, a receipt for a payment for ἀνδ(ρισμοῦ) by Elias son of Lionte, with Akoris 44'.7-9, a receipt for τοῦ αὐτοῦ. One may link 'τοῦ αὐτοῦ' with 'ἀνδ(ρισμοῦ)' in line 5 (by implication this entails that no tax payer is referred to other than the one already mentioned earlier in this text in ll. 1 and 4), or with the tax payer mentioned in line 4, 'Ἡλί(λ)ας Λιοντε (implying that the unspecified tax he pays for is again ἀνδρισμός).

Akoris # 37 (p. 339, pl. 134; *ed.princ.*: 'Coptic', reading 'ΟΝΟΜΑ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΟΝ' = 'the beginning of a chant'). After turning the plate around so that the bottom line becomes the top line one may read:

- 1 δα]π(άνης) νομ(ισμα)τ(ίου) τρίτον, γί(ν.) νο(μ.) γ' μ(όνον). [N.N. στοιχ(εῖ).
-