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The papyrus preserves the beginning of a receipt. ‘The unpracticed hand is difficult to date, but might be of the fourth century.’ Ed. pr. gives the following text and translation:

\[\text{parêșchn} \, \text{ómegac} \, \text{Afoi\v{G}} \, \text{úpér } \text{Anobɔ́} \, \text{koítis } \text{ζε-} \, \text{káptis } \text{e[} \, \tau_\ldots{]\ldots} \]

‘Aphoi the elder (?) has paid for Anobas, belonging to the 10th land lot ...’

The text is hardly intelligible: it is difficult to see how koêtis could fit into the run of the Greek. But study of the photograph (Pl. XXIb) results in a somewhat modified text, and reveals the nature of the document. I suggest that it is a receipt for anabolikon, a tax recently discussed by J. Sheridan, ZPE 124 (1999) 211-17, who describes it as ‘a late antique linen tax, sometimes paid in cash, and sometimes in kind, which supplied some branch of the government, probably the army’ (p. 216). The document was written by a scribe on the verges of literacy, or rather knowledge of Greek. The handwriting, of a type common in subscriptions and ‘school-texts’, betrays minimal practice, and provides a fitting companion to the level of the text’s Greek. A re-edition is presented below.

\[\text{parêșchn} \, \text{ómegac } \text{Afoi\v{G}} \, \text{úpér } \text{ánobolí}- \, \text{koÊ t∞! } \text{de-} \, \text{káptis } \text{iv-} \, \text{diktiá沃oc} \]

‘The great Aphis has supplied for the anabolikon of the tenth indiction ...’

1-6 The receipt P.Wisc. I 28 (321) offers a close parallel: παρέ\v{G}\v{e}\v{N} ό μέ\v{G}ας Αφο\v{G} ὑπέρ ἄνοβολος τῆς ἄνοβολος τῆς ἀνοβολού θε̥ (I 1-3; cf. BL VII 100); cf. also P.Mert. I 34.9 (346-7), P.Oxy. VIII 1136.3-4 (420). (P.Wisc. 28 is Oxyrhynchite; given the Oxyrhynchite provenance of the bulk of the collection, P.Wash. 93 may also come from this area.)

2 ω (l.  ó) μέ\v{G}ας ‘the great’, or ‘the old’; for the collocation cf. UPZ II 168.4 (121 BC), P.Tebt. I 61a.90 (118-7 BC), SB XII 11077.19 (IV/V), P.Palau Rib. 48.2 (VII), and the parallels cited in ed. pr.; for the sense see F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch II 28, cf. W. E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary 250 (s.v. ἀρόι). ‘Afoi\v{G} seems to be a new name in Greek papyri’ (ed. pr.), but the formation does not seem plausible, and έ is not assured. As Prof. Hagedorn suggests, the upper part of the putative έ might belong with the preceding letter, which would give the sequence ός, and the name Αφο\v{G} (‘Αφο\v{G}, i.e. ‘Αφοίς, is more difficult).

3-4 The interpretation of the sequence ονοβολοκου as an erratic form of ἄνοβολοκοῦ might seem far-fetched at first sight, but the postulated errors, metathesis and syllable loss, are by no means inconceivable, cf. F. T. Gignac, Grammar I 314-15 and 312-13 respectively. I cannot judge from the plate whether the few traces visible at the end of line 3 are significant, in which case we should read ἄνοβολοικοῦ, accidental, or illusory.

5-6 ε[iv]τε[ί]κτιωνος (l. 31\v{G}κτιωνος). Although the introduction of aberrant spellings iuxta lacunam might appear too bold, the phonetic interchanges involved are common, see Gignac, op. cit. 190-91 (ι > ει), 81 (νδ > ντ), and the spellings ηντικτι-, ενδικτι-, and ινδικτι- are recorded in the papyri. Cf. also 1-6 n.

The commentary tentatively suggests reading το\v{G}ίς, but the letter after τ is more likely to be ε or σ than ο.
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