

Es handelt sich in unserem Text um einen Kompromiß. Für diese Art Texte vgl. in letzter Instanz ZPE 31 (1978) 127ff., P. Genov. I 23, und auch A. Steinwenter, *Das Recht der Koptischen Urkunden*, München 1955, 53ff. Wir haben es hier aber nicht mit einem vollständigen Kompromiß zu tun, sondern mit einem Auszug aus einem größeren Text, denn einige übliche Elemente fehlen, und zwar: Invokatio (vgl. R. S. Bagnall-K. A. Worp, *Christian Invocations in the Papyri*, CdE 56 [1981] 112-133) und Datierung, die Einleitungsformel Τόδε τὸ κομπρόμισσον ποιῶνται πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐκουσία γνώμη... (vgl. z. B. BGU I 315,1-6), und schließlich die persönlichen Unterschriften der an dem Kompromiß beteiligten Parteien.

Es mutet etwas merkwürdig an, daß die Arbitrer (συγκρίτης; dieses Wort begegnet auch – teilweise ergänzt – in BGU I 314, 9) nicht mit ihren Namen genannt, sondern mit „ein Priester, der Sohn des Apa Iulios, und der Sohn des Zacharias“ umschrieben werden.

2. πρεσβύτερον): Das *Pi* wurde aus *Tau* korrigiert. Hier wird wohl ein Geistlicher, nicht „der ältere Sohn“ gemeint (vgl. JJP 18 [1974] 220). Für die Tätigkeit der Geistlichkeit als Schieds- und Friedensrichter vgl. die Literaturangaben bei A. Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law*, s. v. episcopalis audientia; vgl. auch A. A. Schiller, *The Courts are no more*, Studi E. Volterra, I, Milano 1969, 469-502.

4. πραιτωρίω: vgl. Daris, *Il lessico latino* 94-95. Das Wort begegnet auch in ZPE 31 [1978] 127.22-23. Was hiermit gemeint wird, ist nicht ganz klar (vgl. PSI V 477, 3 Anm.), aber nach Steinwenter, SPP XIX 60, handelt es sich um eine Art Büro des Pagarchen oder Ähnliches (vgl. SB I 4707; vgl. auch die Bemerkung zu P. Ross. Georg. III 46, 1).

5. ὄβρου(ζιακά): vgl. West-Johnson, *Currency* 144-45.

Φ(αῶφι): An sich könnte man auch an Φ(αρμουῦθι) oder an Φ(αμενώθ) denken, und es ist überhaupt merkwürdig, daß man die Abkürzung des Monatsnamens so wenig differenziert hat, wo die Möglichkeit der Vertauschung gegeben war. Wenn man mit Pharmuthi 9 rechnet, so wird das Datum 4. IV. 720, mit Phamenoth 9 wird das Datum 5. III. 720.

ἔτου(ς): so auch geschrieben in SPP III 190, 338 und 448. Das Diokl. Jahr 436 = 719/720 n. Chr. (vgl. Bagnall-Worp, *CSBE* 49).

6. Der *Symbolaiographos* Paulos begegnet auch in SPP III 343, wo ein ähnliches „Siegel“ am Ende der Zeile gezeichnet ist. Beide Texte wurden wohl vom selben Schreiber unterschrieben. Das als SPP III 441 herausgegebene Fragment paßt aber nicht in die Lücke am Anfang dieser Zeile unseres Papyrus (Harrauer, brieflich am 11. I. 1980). Eine ähnliche Unterschrift findet sich auch in SPP III 46, 6, wo wohl in der Lücke zu ergänzen ist: -- Δι' ἐμοῦ Παύλου συμβολαιογράφου (es handelt sich also nicht um die Unterschrift eines Georgios -, *Symbolaiographos*!). In letzterem Papyrus ist Z. 4 in der Mitte wohl zu ergänzen: ἐκ προσώπου ἡμῶν σοι ἐγκαλεῖν] περι κτλ., vel similiter (vgl. für πρόσωπον Preisigke, *WB* II, s. v.; statt σοι ἐγκαλεῖν vielleicht auch ἐπελεύσασθαι πρὸς σε). Für Literaturangaben bez. Symbolaiographen vgl. SPP XVII, S. 1-8 und 1\*-12\*; SPP XIX S. 61ff.; vgl. auch Preisigke, *WB* III, Abschn. 8, s. v. συμβολαιογράφος, und SPP VIII, S. 222-224.

Die Interpretation des gezeichneten „Siegel“ bietet eigene Schwierigkeiten. Meiner Meinung nach handelt es sich nicht um ein griechisches Handzeichen in Siegel-Form, sondern um ein arabisches. Die Handzeichen in SPP III 343 und in unserem Text sind – wie auch die Schrift der beiden Texte – identisch, aber obwohl die Schrift des SPP III 46 wahrscheinlich auch vom selben Schreiber wie in den beiden anderen Texten herrührt, ist es jedoch nicht sicher, daß auch das „Siegel“ in diesem Papyrus ganz identisch ist mit dem in den beiden anderen Texten (vgl. die Abbildungen der Siegel, unten Tafel 94). Sachverständige Arabisten haben leider bis heute nicht den Text der arabischen Handzeichen in obenstehenden 3 Texten lesen können. Das Problem der Interpretation ist noch ungelöst. An sich ist es schon eigentümlich, daß wir hier gezeichneten Siegeln begegnen, wo normalerweise Siegel aus Ton die Papyri verschlossen (vgl. CPR III.1, S. 77f., wo gezeichnete „Siegel“ überhaupt nicht erwähnt werden). Leider erörtert V. Gardthausen, SPP XVII, S. 8\*, diese Art Siegel nur sehr beiläufig; in späterer Zeit scheint die Frage nicht weiter behandelt worden zu sein.

Klaas A. Worp

## 122. NOMINATION OF A GOLDSMITH TO COLLECT TAXES\*

The Yale papyrus published below is an agreement of A. D. 429 between the guild of goldsmiths of Oxyrhynchos and one of its members, named Chairemon, setting forth the latter's nomination to the responsibility for collecting from the members of the guild their contribution toward the *chrysargyron*, the tax on trades collected in the later empire from Constantine to Anastasius<sup>1</sup>. As such, it bears a marked resemblance to PSI XII 1265<sup>2</sup>. The two documents complement one another and are evidently closely related.

\* I am grateful to Susan A. Stephens for permitting me to work on and publish this papyrus.

<sup>1</sup> The standard treatments are by O. Seeck in *PW/RE* IV, 1 (1900) 370-76, and Karayannopoulos, *Finanzwesen* 129-37. Further literature will be cited below.

<sup>2</sup> First published by M. Norsa in *Dai Papiri della Società Italiana: Elezione del κεφαλαιωτής di una corporazione del V secolo d. C.*, Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa 2 ser. 6 (1937) 1-7, reviewed by U. Wilcken, *Archiv* 13 (1938) 148 and Cl. Præaux, *CdE* 13 (1938) 157f. Plates are provided in both publications, and there is a partial reproduction with trivial text improvements by Seider, *PGP* I, no. 50 (p. 95).

The date and provenance of PSI XII 1265 were both unknown in the editor's opinion, but she argued properly that the oath referring to Theodosius (II) and Valentinian (III), coupled with indiction 10 and Tybi 1, left only 27. XII. 426 or 441 as possibilities. That papyrus is like ours an agreement between a guild, whose name is lost in the lacuna in line 2, and one of its members, named Chairemon, setting out his *cheirotonia*, election, as *kephalaiotes* of the guild, with responsibility for collecting the *chrysargyron*. The similarities are striking, although much of the phraseology is different. It is hard to say if the distinction between the *ὄνομασία* of P. Yale inv. 1648 and the *χειροτονία* of PSI XII 1265 is one of technical usage, between nomination and election, or if the terms are used loosely.

As it happens, line 2 of PSI XII 1265 contains a lacuna for the name of the city which was accurately estimated by Medea Norsa at 11 letters – precisely the proper length for Ὀξυρυγγιτῶν. Given that only the Oxyrhynchite and the Hermopolite have produced more than a tiny handful of documents from the first half of the fifth century<sup>3</sup>, and that the Florentine collection is rich in Oxyrhynchite papyri<sup>4</sup>, we are justified in referring the similarities of the two papyri to a common origin and date. The date of 426 thus seems almost certain for PSI XII 1265<sup>5</sup>.

The two papyri, when taken together, are of considerable interest for the general question of the collection of the *chrysargyron* by the guilds. That the guilds (*ἐργασία* is the term used by both texts<sup>6</sup>) had a corporate responsibility for collecting the tax from and for their members in the fifth century has long been known from the codes, and CTh. 13.1.17 (399p) orders specifically that guilds were to select supervisors to collect the tax due on them and this was not to be any longer the responsibility of the city's *curiales*<sup>7</sup>.

So much is well-known<sup>8</sup>. The pattern of assessment and collection is less clear. The Latin name of the tax, *collatio lustralis*, and other evidence point to its original five-yearly recurrence, evidently a source of trouble because of the size of the payment due all at once<sup>9</sup>. CTh 13.1.20 (410p) orders that the tax was to be collected from now on in small installments (*parva ac minima contributione*), which the monthly payments of PSI XII 1265 confirmed, as Karayannopoulos recognized<sup>10</sup>. The latter nonetheless upheld the five-yearly character of the tax and rejected Seeck's notion that it was at shorter intervals, calling Zonaras' characterization of the tax as *ἐτήσιος*, 'yearly', an error.

To this question P. Yale inv. 1648 makes the important contribution of describing the tax explicitly as χρυσάργυρον τῆς τρισκαιδεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος. In PSI XII 1265, the period for which Chairemon was chosen *kephalaiotes* ran for a year from Tybi 1 of the 10th indiction, or 27. XII. 426. In all likelihood the guild intended the term to coincide in essence with the julian year<sup>11</sup>. In P. Yale inv. 1648, however, the nomination takes place in Thoth, the start of the year in Oxyrhynchus as it was normally reckoned<sup>12</sup>.

It seems, then, that to the monthly installments was joined an assessment each year for the indiction. It is of course possible that the rates were assessed every five years and then simply divided by five to give

<sup>3</sup> See R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, "Papyrus Documentation in Egypt from Constantine to Justinian", *Miscellanea Papyrologica*, ed. R. Pintaudi, Firenze 1980, 13–23, esp. 18–20 and graph, 23 (Pap. Flor. 7).

<sup>4</sup> For example, of 25 Oxyrhynchite documents in the quarter-century 418–433, 5 come from PSI, more than any other collection except P. Oxy. (with 10).

<sup>5</sup> To the above considerations may be added that a consular date by the consulate to be expected in December, 441, would extend to only 41 letters or so and would be entirely lost at the upper left, whereas there are surviving traces on the papyrus which the consular date for 426, at 83 letters, could easily provide. The physical resemblance of the two papyri should not be ignored; the Yale piece is about the same height (25 vs. 24 cm.) and only a bit less wide (originally ca. 53 vs. 62 cm.).

<sup>6</sup> For the term see Reil, *Gewerbe* 194, with references. As a term in the papyri it is limited to the Byzantine period and largely supersedes *κοινόν*, the usual fourth-century term. Cf. generally San Nicolò, *Vereinswesen* I, 83–84; Johnson–West, *Byz. Egypt* 154–55; A. E. R. Boak, *TAPA* 68 (1937) 212–20; R. A. Coles, *ZPE* 37 (1980) 229–39. More recent references to *ἐργασία* can be found in e. g. P. Stras. 287 (VI p), P. Mert. II 95, and P. Vindob. Tandem 19.

On the model of P. Yale inv. 1648, I would restore the second line of PSI XII 1265 as follows: [ἡ (e. g.) λαμπροτάτη ἐργασία τῶν χρυσοχόων τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης] τῆς Ὀξυρυγγιτῶν πόλεως [δι' ἡμῶν] τῶν ἐξῆς [ὁ] προγραφόντων κτλ. At the start of line 3, [τῆς αὐτῆς ἐργασίας χαίρειν· seems probable.

<sup>7</sup> *κεφαλαιωτής* is the normal term for this office in the papyri. P. Mert. II 95 is an example (see E. Wipszycka, *Byzantion* 39 [1969] 194–95 n. 1), with a *κεφαλαιωτής ἐργασίας λευκαντῶν*.

<sup>8</sup> See the discussion of Karayannopoulos, *Finanzwesen* 129–37.

<sup>9</sup> Karayannopoulos, *Finanzwesen* 135.

<sup>10</sup> Karayannopoulos knows only the ed. pr. in *Annali Pisa*, not the republication in PSI XII.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Bagnall–Worp, CSBE 16; 22 for this phenomenon.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Bagnall–Worp, CSBE 26–27.



a yearly assessment; we do not know. But by 426, at least, the *chrysargyron* had become in effect a monthly tax, like many taxes on trades earlier under the principate.

In a sense, however, we should have known this already. The fact that the *chrysargyron* was levied by the indiction is already attested (though not in so clear a fashion) in PSI VIII 884, that orthographical monstrosity, a receipt of 12 September 390 (cf. ZPE 26 [1977] 274) ὑπὲρ λόγου μυλέου ἀτοῦ λούγου χρυσαργύρου τετάρτης εἰδιξιόνος, i. e. "for his mill on account of *chrysargyron* of the fourth indiction." The supposition of the editor that a five-year cycle coincided with that indiction is vitiated by the other dates for such receipts known: indiction 12 or 13 (368/9 or 369/70) in P. Lips. 64; indiction 10 in PSI XII 1265 (426/7); and now indiction 13 (429/30) in P. Yale inv. 1648. There is no five-year cycle here<sup>13</sup>.

PSI XII 1265 gives an assessment of [ἀργ]υρίου μυριά[δ]ας διακοσίας, 200 myriads of denarii, i. e. 2,000,000 den. per month. We have no good way of estimating the purchasing power of this sum in 426, but a comparison to prices in the last quarter of the fourth century may shed some light, at least in the form of a maximum value, especially as I have the impression that things changed much less after about 390<sup>14</sup>. Two million denarii are 1,333 talents. The yearly amount would be 16,000 T. To this, compare 30,000 T. as the annual rent for a house in Oxyrhynchos in 382 (SB IV 7445, cf. ZPE 24 [1977] 119 n. 30), or 12,000 T. for six *angeia* of pitch in 390 (P. Oxy. XIV 1753). The amount is clearly not completely trivial, but neither is it a giant burden.

It is remarkable that P. Yale inv. 1648 gives us the first explicit attestation of a guild of goldsmiths in any Egyptian metropolis for the period after the early fourth century (P. Oxy. XLIII 3121, ca. 316–318, is the last previously known example). There is a great deal of evidence for goldsmiths and for metalworkers generally in the Byzantine period, however, and the deficiency of our evidence for the guild is probably just an accident<sup>15</sup>. Because of the involvement of Chairemon, I take it that the same guild is involved in PSI XII 1265. The supposed mention of *τραπεζίται* in line 2 is now eliminated<sup>16</sup>, but Norsa's *trapezites* among the signers in line 16 remains<sup>17</sup>. It is very unlikely that there was a guild of *trapezitai* in fifth-century Oxyrhynchos, but Norsa has argued that neither should we see in this man a guild functionary like a *tamias*. Are we then to suppose that a banker was a member of a goldsmiths' guild? Given the dominant role of gold coinage in this period, the possibility does not seem to me excluded; but it is only a speculation.

P. Yale inv. 1648  
Oxyrhynchos

39.4 × 25 cm

19. IX. 429 A. D.

Light-colored papyrus, complete except for minor tears at top, bottom, and right, and the loss of the left-hand third of the document. There is substantial damage just about half-way down in several middle areas. There are kolleseis at 18.4 and 36.4 cm from the left edge. On the verso are faint traces which may be imaging from the recto caused by folding.

- 1 [Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Φλαουίων Φή]λικος καὶ Ταύρου τῶν λαμπροτάτων Θῶθ κβ// *vacat*
- 2 [ἡ (e. g.) λαμπροτάτη ἐργασία τῶν χρυσο]οχῶν τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως δι' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐξῆς ὑπογραφ[όντ]ω[ν]
- 3 [Αὐρηλίω Χαιρήμονι ± 8]. ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως τῆς αὐτῆς ἐργασίας χαίρειν· τῆς ὀνομασίας χάριν τοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἡμ[ε-]
- 4 [τέρας ἐργασίας . . . . .] χρυσαργύρου τῆς τρισκαιδεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος σὲ τὸν Χαιρήμονα ἐπιλεξάμενοι μᾶλλον . η[
- 5 [± 25 ] . μεν καὶ κατεπιστεύσαμεν ποιῆσαι τὴν διοίκησιν ἡμῶν ἐπαγγελιαμένων πάντ[α]
- 6 [± 13 τὰ τῆς αὐτῆς δ]ιοικήσεως γιγνόμενα ἀναλώματα εἴτε ἐπὶ τόπων εἴτε ἐν τῇ τάξει εἴτε ἐκ ασματος
- 7 [± 25 ] ἐκδημίας προφάσι τῆς αὐτῆς διο[ι]κήσεως ἡμᾶς ἐπιγνώναι καὶ καταβαλεῖν εἰς

<sup>13</sup> I propose to read lines 5–6 of PSI VIII 884 as follows (from a photograph kindly provided by Jean Bingen): ὠνπερεπειτη[[σ]]-ναμαπασαστησεργασιασ | μετασου and to understand it as ὠνπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπάσης ἐργασίας μετὰ σοῦ, "the amount for the whole guild with you."

<sup>14</sup> For these price levels see ZPE 24 (1977) 111–24.

<sup>15</sup> San Nicolò, *Vereinswesen* 82–86 comments on the development of the guilds of metalworkers in Byzantine times, and on p. 83 about the absence of evidence for gold and silversmiths' associations, a gap that can now be filled.

<sup>16</sup> See my restorations of the line, supra n. 6, on the model of the Yale text.

<sup>17</sup> The papyrus actually seems to read *τραπεδιτης*, to judge from the plate.

- 8 [± 20            ὁμολογίαν ἐθέμεθα [σο]ι καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τοῖς π...οῖς ζητούμενοις εἰς τὴν ἡμῶ[ν]
- 9 [± 25            ]. ζημ[.....]παντα. [.....].....[.....]. νκυριο [.....]..... γρα[
- 10 [± 25            ].....[..... (M2) Αὐρ]ήλιος 'Ι.[.....].....[... συμφω]γῆ μοι π[ά]ν[α] ὡς πρόκ[ι]ται.
- 11 [(M3) Αὐρ]ήλιος ± 20 συμφωνῶ μοι ὡς π[ρό]κειται. [(M4) Αὐρ]ήλιος 'Αφ[.....]τεσίου σ[υμφωνῶ] μ[ο]ι ὡς πρόκειται.  
Α[ὐρ]ήλιος [Α]βράμιος ἔ[γ]ραψα καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γράματ[α] μὴ ἰδῶτος.
- 12 [(M5) Αὐρ]ήλιος ± 20 συμφωνῶ μοι ὡς π[ρό]κειται. [(M6) Αὐρ]ήλι[ος] Πτολεμαίου [± 10]. συμφωνῶ μοι ὡς  
πρόκειται. (M7) Αὐρ]ήλιος Μακάριος συμφωνῶ μ[ο]ι ὡς πρόκειται.  
[another signature lost?]  
Tachygraphic signature.

“[After the consulate of Flavii] Felix and Taurus the most illustrious, Thoth 22. [The (most illustrious?) guild of the] goldsmiths of the illustrious and most illustrious city of the Oxyrhynchites, through us who sign below, [to Aurelius Chairemon son of X], from the same city (and) from the same guild, greeting. Having chosen you, Chairemon, rather than [ ] for the nomination for the *chrysargyron* [collected?] from our [guild] for the thirteenth indiction, [we – – –] and entrusted you to manage (the collection), with us promising that we would accept responsibility for and pay for the expenses of [the same] management which occur either locally or in office or from (?), [ – – –] of travel on account of the same management... we have made the agreement, and we agree... the things sought (?)”... (enforcement, penalty, validity clauses; signatures of six members of the guild).

1. Felix and Taurus were consuls in 428, but no papyri of that year have yet been published in which their consulate is attested. The only dated papyrus of 428 (by the postconsulate of Hierius and Ardabur) is P. Flor. III 314.1, of 27 April. P. Yale inv. 1648, dated to 19 September, could therefore in principle be restored either ὑπατείας (thus 19. IX. 428) or μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν (19. IX. 429). The consulate of 428 was announced in Constantinople at least by 31 January 428 (cf. BASP 17 [1980] 35 = Bagnall–Worp, *CNBD* VI, 63). Now the only attestation of Felix and Taurus in the papyri heretofore is PSI III 245.1, 16 January. The papyrus says ὑπατείας, but given P. Flor. III 314, this must be an error for μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν and the date thus 429 which the indiction also supports, cf. Bagnall–Worp, *CSBE* 53. What is decisive for 429 in the Yale papyrus is the fact that the obligation involved is for the thirteenth indiction (line 4), which began in Oxyrhynchus on 29. VIII. 429. A document almost a year before this is not likely. For the Oxyrhynchite indiction see Bagnall–Worp, *CSBE* 26–27. The formula is restored here without abbreviations in light of the scribe’s general preference throughout for writing things out in full.

2. The restoration of ἐργασία is taken from line 3. There is still space for another ten letters or so, probably filled with an epithet, for which λαμπροτάτη would be exactly right (it is restored for a guild *epistates* in BGU II 370). Σεμνοτάτη would also be appropriate; cf. W. Judeich, “*Inschriften*” nos. 40, 42 in C. Humann et al., *Altortümer von Hierapolis*, Berlin 1898 (Jahrb. d. Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Ergänzungsheft 4).

3. The word following Chairemon’s name was probably a patronymic, as the traces resemble *upsilon* or *sigma* at its end rather than anything else and are unlikely to be the right-hand point of an *omega* (of χρυσογράφ). The lacuna in PSI XII 1265 after Chairemon’s name is about the same length as that indicated here.

Preisigke, *WB* II 188, defines ὀνομασία in the sense used here as “Ernennung oder Bestellung eines Beamten”, citing e. g. P. Oxy. XIV 1642.3 (289p). Bowman, *Town Councils* 98–104, 160–61 discusses the term, noting (p. 99) that it refers to nomination as distinct from election. Cf. supra, p. 423, for the contrast provided by PSI XII 1265.

4. It is likely that some participle like ἀπαιτούμενου (cf. PSI XII 1265.6), which at 12 letters would fill the lacuna exactly, stood in the text originally. It is also, however, possible to restore πραγματευτικοῦ, also suggested by PSI XII 1265.7; cf. Karayanopoulos, *Finanzwesen* 129. Indiction 13 = 429/30. The same use of ἐπιλέγω is no doubt found in P. Oxy. XXXI 2570.14, where the editor’s suggestion of expanding [ἐ]πιλ[ε] into [ἐ]πιλ[ε](χθείας) seems correct (despite contrary suggestions by Fikhman and Mandilaras recorded in BL VI 110).

5. LSJ s. v. cites Zosimus for this use of καταπιστεύω, though that passage lacks the ποιῆσαι found here. For the middle instead of active, cf. P. Vindob. Worp, p. 34. For διοικήσεις meaning the management of business see Kießling, *WB* IV, 600; the verb is better known in this sense. P. Vindob. Tandem 19.14 (V–VIp) has two men called διοικηταῖς ἐργασίας λινοπλυτ(ῶν); but Chairemon does not have this title here. It is in any case “ein ziemlich farbloser, vieldeutiger Ausdruck”, as A. Steinwenter put it (SPP XIX, p. 20, quoted in P. Vindob. Tandem 19.14n.).

6. The specification of the conditions under which Chairemon’s expenses will be covered poses some problems. ἐπὶ τόπων apparently means here in the diverse locales where goldsmiths may be located, as opposed to the τάξις, which is presumably the guild’s office. But to what does ἐκ ἀσώστου refer? I can find no suitable sense. The reading ἐκ ἀσώστου, meaning perhaps “unrecoverable debts”, of which I once thought, seems to me on examination of the original incompatible with the strokes.

7. The *omicron* originally written in ἐπιγῶναι is corrected to *omega*.

11. The scribe apparently left the second *alpha* out of γράματα and had to squeeze it in later.

14. The bottom part of this line is lost, and I have not succeeded in reading the notary’s name.

Roger S. BAGNALL