A receipt for gold bullion

P. Vindob. inv. G 27879
17.7 × 8.2 cm.

Hermopolis
29 September 329

IGHT-BROWN papyrus, writing on both sides parallel to the fibers. Margins 1.5 cm. at top, 5 cm. at right, 1.5 cm. below, 2.5 cm. at left. Join of κολλήματα at 5.5 cm. from right side (on front).

This papyrus appears to contain the receipts for a total of 55 grams (i.e., 2 oz. 7 gr.) of gold bullion delivered by the well-known Demetria also called Ammonia for the buying up of gold by the government in 329/330. The subject of these governmental purchases is discussed in the article of Roger Bagnall, pp. 322-326. The syntax of our text is very loose, consisting of a series of items of information given sequentially but with little syntactic connection. This sort of receipt recalls categories of texts like transportation chits, for which cf. L. Amundsen, O.Ost, p. 41. We have neither a verb referring to the collector (απέδοχον for instance) nor one referring to the person delivering (either in the second or the third person, e.g. παρήγγειλεν or παρέδωκεν) In this receipt we thus find a formula very different from its equivalent in Karanis (P. Mert. I 31). Since this is the first receipt of its kind to be published, coming from the Hermopolite Nome, we cannot say for certain whether this formula is a local variant or a collector’s peculiarity. But the approximately contemporary SPP XX 87, of which a revised text is given in the note to line 6, also Hermopolite and concerning the same taxpayer, presents a rather similar formula in a receipt for vestis ; we conclude, therefore, that the formula is likely to have been common in the Hermopolite at this period.

This may be a retrospective receipt, incorporating information from an earlier one as well as the actual payment on Phaophi 2. Even so, it is curious that no date is given for the first payment.

"Αποδέχωσίς χρυσοῦ συνομῆς είς
ητοι γ' "ηνεκτίτους. Δημητρία ή και
Αμονο[α] χρυσοῦ καθἀροῦ τριάκοντα πέντε.
η α[ντή...]. χρυσοῦ καθἀροῦ ἐπίκοιτο. Φαώψι β.
"Ελευ[ε]σίν ἄπο[δέκτης δι' ἐμ[οί] Σαμαίμανος
ἐσημίναιοςάμην).
FIG. 1. — A Receipt for gold bullion.


Verso (m.2)

Μέλανος ἀποδέκτης

1 ἀποδέκτης : ἕ x ex. corr. 3 Ἀρμονία ; traces above π of πέντε

4 καθαιρεῖ : first a corrected

"Receiver of gold for the buying up for the 17th-3rd indiction. Demetria also called Ammonia (delivered) thirty-five (grams) of pure gold. The same ... twenty (grams) of pure gold. Phaophi 2. I, Helenos, receiver, signed through me, Sarapammon.

Verso : Melanos, receiver."


1-2. ἦτοι γ᾽ ἡγεσίανος : See our forthcoming monograph on the institution of indications, where we discuss equations of this kind and
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argue that they can belong only to the years 327-342. The present date is to the indiction of 329/330.

2-3. Demetria also called Ammonia: This wealthy woman is found in several other papyri from fourth century Hermopolis; cf. P. Vindob. Bosw. 9. In a list, to which can be added SPP XX 87, and K.A. Worp, BASP 14 (1977) 95-97.

3. καθαρον: This word is generally written more fully, but the formula of the Karanis receipts demonstrates that this resolution is necessary. Given that gold is involved, only grams can be meant, although one would expect that γράμματα would have been written. More curious still is the apparent use of the figure of 35 gr. rather than 1 oz., 11 gr. But we see no alternative to our reading.

4. In the lacuna, possibly δομίων; there projects from the right side of the lacuna a horizontal bar which could be the habitual abbreviation stroke written in that word.

6. One finds the perfect more commonly, but ἐσθήμω[σάμην] is not unattested. It appears in SPP XX 87.6 (where Wessely read the perfect).

In this papyrus a number of changes in the published text are necessary; these show its formula to be nearer to that of the present papyrus than the first publication suggests. We therefore print a revised text based on Worp's examination of the original and our joint study of a photograph.

SPP XX 87

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{'Υποδέκτης ἐσθήτος} & \varepsilon \nu[\delta(\muηιίονος).] \\
\text{Ἀμμωνία} & \eta \ kαι \ 'Αμμωνια \\
\deltaια \ 'Ονοσάτων \ βοηθ[ου] \ παρέ[ῖ]σχες \\
\text{ἐπερ τῆς} & \alphaυτ[ῆς] \ ε\nu[δ(\muηιίονος) \ τα \ αίρε[ητα] \\
\text{καλκ[ικίον] \ ἐπερ} & \chiλαμ[ῶδων] \ δ'[\chi(νη[ονται] \ δ').] \\
\text{(m.2) Ομών} & \text{'Υποδέκτης} \ ε\nu[δ(\muηιίονος) \ τα \ [αίρε[υν] \\
\text{τοῦ καλκ[ικίον] \ ἐπερ} & \chiλαμ[ῶδων] \ δ'[} \\
\end{align*}
\]

7. We do not understand the relationship of the back to the front. It is just conceivable that Μέλανος is a genitive (from Μέλας) and that one should restore ἐποδέκτη[ου].
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