THREE JOINS FROM THE ZENON ARCHIVE

I. FRAGMENT OF A LETTER

P. Brit. Libr. 2357C + P. Cairo ined.

7.9 x 8.8 cm

P. Lond. VII 2098 + Ms. Edgar, p. 12 no. 3

8 x 11 cm

date unknown

The text is written across the fibres in a small hand, which is comparable but not identical with that of Zenon himself.

Even after the joining of the two fragments too much is lost to obtain a comprehensible text. If the roll was about 30 cm in width, about a third must be missing. But perhaps the present publication will allow someone else to retrace one of the fragments missing to the left and to the right.

The traces at the bottom of the London fragment reflect in mirror writing the last line of the text (one recognizes the word μεταβαλου). Apparently the last words were not yet dry when the letter was folded.

The fragment to the right (photograph on p. 6) is now in the British Library. The left fragment is now in Cairo; I know it only through the transcript in a notebook of C.C. Edgar, which was put at my disposal by T.C. Skeat many years ago. Most of the texts in that notebook are gradually being published by prof. Zaki Aly.

- - - - -
- 1]....τηνυς ἐπιμε[
 - 2 ἀπομ]ετρῶ ἐμ Φιλαδελφείαι κρί(θης) Σμη καὶ Ταρυσίνοι
 - 3 τῶι ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρα[ς
 - 4] ἐὰν μὴ ἀναπληρῶ τὸ πλῆθος ἀλλὰ τις ἔγδεια γίνηται οὐκ
 - 5 ἐν[]πραχθήσομαι ἢ οὕτως οἶει με ἀτυχ[
 - 6 Ἑὰν δ' ἄ[ρα καὶ ἔγδεια τις γίνηται ὑπολαμβάνω ἡμᾶς
 - 7 δυνήσεσθαι ἀποτ[εῖσαι
 - 8]λει οἰκία σώματα κτήνη ὥστε τὰ διάφορα ἐκ τούτων εἶναι
 - 9 εἰ. [
 - 10].. εἰς ὑγιαίνειν τὰ κατὰ τὸν σῆτον ἀποστείλας τινὰ μετα-
 - 11 βαλοῦ καὶ [

so that I will] measure in Philadelphieia 248 (artabas of) barley and to Tarusinas, who is in charge of the Rock [.. artabas, total.. artabas of barley (?)]. If I cannot pay in full the amount, but some deficit occurs,

By permission of the British Library — Pap. 2357C

I will not [- -]. Payment will be exacted from me or do you think that I am so unfortunate [that - -]. If however some deficit occurs, I suppose that we will be able to pay [- -] - houses, slaves, cattle so that the cash may be derived from them. [- - if therefore you want to ascertain (?)] that the affairs concerning the grain are all right, send somebody and transfer (the grain) and [

2. The verb [ἀπομ]ετρῶ is probably a subjunctive form depending on a conjunction such as ἵνα or ὅπως.

2. Ταρυσίνας is a Thracian name; cf. D. DETSCHEW, *Die thrakischen Sprachreste*, 1957, p. 491; see also *SEG* XLII (1992), nos. 580-583 *passim*. A variant Ταρουθίνας is attested in *P. Cairo Zen.* IV 59656 ll. 9-10. This may be the same person, cf. *P.L. Bat.* XXI, p. 425. It is just possible that the name turns up again in a demotic text, *P. Lille dem.* III 99 verso col.5 l. 31. F. de Cenival reads here *Tryqynws* as the name of a slave in

a Greek cleruchic family. Several suggestions have been put forward for the underlying name: Drakon, Dorkinos, Dorigenes, Trichinos, none of them convincing. As often happens in demotic, the difference between *q* and *t* is very small and a reading *Trytynws* seems possible. A Thracian name for a slave would not surprise in the Hellenistic period. There is, however, a minor orthographical problem: instead of *Trytynws* one expects *Trwtynws*. Although in foreign names this kind of irregularity is rather frequent, I can offer this interpretation only as a suggestion.

Tarusinas' function in the present text is unclear. The «rock» may be the name of some kind of quarry, as the word is also used in the archive of the architekton Kleon, perhaps as a kind of toponym (*P. Petrie* III 43.2 col. 2 l. 13 [p. 119]).

3. For ἀναπληρώω τὸ πλῆθος «fulfill one's quota», compare *P.L. Bat.* XX 56A l. 8.

4. οὕτως οἶει με ἀτυχ[εῖν] rather than οὕτως οἶει με ἀτυχ[ῆς εἶναι] (thus indexed in *P.L. Bat.* XXI, p. 604). Neither the verb ἀτυχεῖν nor the adjective ἀτυχῆς occur elsewhere in the Zenon archive.

5. For the use of ἐὰν ἄρα, see E. MAYSER, *Grammatik* II 3, p. 120.

3-5. The combination of ἔγδεια with ἀναπληρώω and πράττομαι is echoed in *UPZ* I 112 l. 11, that of ἔγδεια with γίγνομαι and ἀποτίνω is found in *P. Rev. Laws* col. 45 l. 17 (ἀποτινέτω ὁ δεῖνα τὴν ἔγδειαν τὴν γενομένην) and col. 47 l. 9 (ἀποτινέτωσαν καὶ ἐὰν ἡ ὦνῃ ἔγδειαν ποιῇ). These parallels suggest that the present text has to do with tax farming.

6. οἰκίαί σώματα κτήνη: houses, slaves and cattle apparently function as mortgage for the payments the writer has taken upon him: if he cannot pay fully (ἀναπληρώω) the difference (τὰ διάφορα) will be made up from his possessions. The asyndetic juxtaposition of the three words gives the impression of a fixed formula, but the combination is hardly attested elsewhere. In Greek only two parallels can be given, both from early Roman Tebtynis: *P. Mich.* II 121 l. 4 (οἰκόπεδα καὶ κτήνη καὶ δουλικά σώματα καὶ ἐπίπλοα) and *P. Mich.* V 350 ll. 8 and 24 (ἀμπελώνων καὶ παραδείσων καὶ οἰκοπέδων καὶ δουλικῶν σωμάτων καὶ κτηνῶν παντοίων). For demotic parallels, which are much more common, a full survey is given by S.P. VLEEMING, *The Goose Herds of Hou* (*Studia Demotica*, 3), Leuven 1991, p. 173 note qq.

6. The word διαφορά is wrongly listed as ἡ διαφορά in the index of *P. Lond.* VII and *P.L. Bat.* XXI, p. 620. The new fragment clearly shows it is a plural of διάφορον.

7. Skeat read μεταβάλλωι, with a superfluous *iota*. The groups ου and ωι are very similar in this hand, as can be seen when τωι in l. 2 is compared with οὐκ in l. 3 and τούτων in l. 6. *Iota* is more straight, whereas the leg of *ypsilon* is curved. Our correction removes an orthographical problem: as I have shown elsewhere (*CE* 50, 1976, p. 150-166, where this passage is discussed on p. 165; *BO* 40, 1983, p. 81-86), irregularities in the use of *iota* adscript after *alpha* and *omega* are extremely rare before the end of the 3rd cent. BC. For the middle μεταβάλλομαι, compare *P. Hib.* I 42 ll. 3 and 8 and 45 l. 6.

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Willy CLARYSSE

II. UN UNICO CONTO DELL'ARCHIVIO DI ZENONE*

P. Cair. Zen. I 59112 + *PSI V* 545

Se si scorrono le pagine 4-71 del *Guide to the Zenon Archive*¹, in cui sono elencati i testi del *dossier* zenoniano, si trovano decine di papiri che sono stati ricomposti ricongiungendo due o più frammenti, talvolta conservati in collezioni diverse. La situazione non potrebbe essere differente, perché il materiale fu ritrovato da scavatori locali, i papiri rimasero sul mercato per parecchi anni e pezzi di vari reperti, già rotti al momento del recupero o frantumatisi successivamente a causa delle manipolazioni subite, furono frequentemente venduti ad acquirenti diversi². Quindi non

* Esprimo la mia gratitudine al dott. Mohamed Abdel Hamid el-Shimy, direttore del Museo Egizio del Cairo, e alla dott.ssa Franca Arduini, direttrice della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, che mi hanno autorizzato a pubblicare le immagini di *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59112 e di *PSI V* 545. Ringrazio, inoltre, il prof. Willy Clarysse, che mi ha fornito una riproduzione del reperto conservato al Cairo.

¹ P.W. PESTMAN *et al.*, *A Guide to the Zenon Archive* (= *P. L. Bat.* XXI), Leiden 1981 (d'ora in poi cit. *Guide*).

² Sul recupero dell'archivio e sul passaggio di esso attraverso il commercio antiquario cf. *P. Mich.* I, p. 1s.; E. BRECCIA, *Egitto greco e romano*, Pisa 1957³, p. 113ss.; Cl. ORRIEUX, *Zénon de Caunos, parépidèmos, et le destin grec*, Paris 1985, p. 41ss. Relativamente a *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59112 e *PSI V* 545, di cui si tratta in queste pagine, purtroppo non è possibile precisare quando siano entrati nelle collezioni del Cairo e di Firenze. Per il *P. Cair. Zen.* il *Journal d'Entrée* del Museo Egizio rivela soltanto che esso fu registrato il 15/X/1924, sotto il nr. 48560, insieme ad un gruppo di documenti zenoniani «acquired at various times from 1915 onwards, chiefly by purchase from M. Nahman» (cf. *Journal d'Entrée X*, ad 48448-48588). Del pezzo fiorentino, invece, si sa appena che esso fu comprato da Guido Gentili prima della sua scomparsa avvenuta nell'estate del 1916: cf. *PSI IV*, p. viis. e *PSI V*, p. vi.

[illegible]

ci si stupisce constatando che anche *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59112 e *PSI V* 545 altro non sono che due parti di un unico documento: il pezzo cairese contiene le righe iniziali del testo, quello fiorentino la sezione restante, senza che nessuna linea sia andata persa tra i due frammenti. L'ultima riga del *P. Cair. Zen.* e la prima del *PSI*, entrambe danneggiate, si completano a vicenda e si combinano in un'unica linea intatta, nella quale si legge ἄλλα ζ ἐξαπύχη (δρ.) β. La sillaba iniziale è conservata dal pezzo del Cairo, mentre i segni conclusivi sono rimasti su quello fiorentino; ma alcune lettere ed una cifra sono divise tra un papiro e l'altro: il secondo λ di ἄλλα, lo ζ successivo, l'ε e il π di ἐξαπύχη. Sicché non vi è incertezza alcuna sulla ricongiunzione dei frammenti.

Unificati i due pezzi, si ottiene un unico foglio di cm. 10 x 28,8, che porta un conto di 30 righe relativo ad un approvvigionamento di legname. All'inizio abbiamo la data, la menzione della persona che aveva effettuato gli acquisti, e la precisazione che il materiale veniva da Hypselé, cioè dal nomo Memphites (ll. 1-4). Alla l. 5 iniziano le registrazioni in dettaglio delle spese, con la segnalazione del numero dei pali comprati presso i vari fornitori e con l'indicazione del prezzo per essi pagato (ll. 5-17). Successivamente si annotano le spese relative al trasporto del legname, che prima fu trasferito per via di terra da Hypselé al Nilo (ll. 18-24), poi fu fatto risalire per via fluviale sino all'approdo di Kerké (ll. 25-29). Infine, nell'ultima riga, si segna l'importo complessivo dell'operazione (l. 30).

Siccome è datato al 2 Phaophi del XXIX anno del Filadelfo (26 novembre 257 a.C.), il conto deve essere inserito nel cosiddetto *dossier* di Panakestor, cioè in quel gruppo di testi dell'archivio, collocati fra il 257 e il 256 a.C., che riguardano la gestione della δωρεά nel periodo precedente alla nomina di Zenone come amministratore³. Fatta questa prima constatazione, si può anche notare che la destinazione finale del legno comprato a Hypselé sembra essere Kerké. Se, infatti, i pali avessero dovuto andare a Memphis o ad Alessandria, non sarebbero stati fatti risalire sul Nilo da Hypselé a Kerké per poi farli scendere di nuovo verso il Delta. Analogamente, se il materiale fosse stato destinato a Philadelphia, nel conto troveremmo registrate le spese relative al trasporto per via di terra da Kerké al villaggio. Poiché Kerké costituiva uno dei principali attracchi della flottiglia fluviale di Apollonio ed era la sede di

³ Cf. *Guide*, p. 175; Cl. ORRIEUX, *Zénon* (nt. 2), p. 44.

cantieri nautici⁴, non è arrischiato pensare che il legname là destinato dovesse servire alla costruzione o alla riparazione di battelli.

Del testo ottenuto ricongiungendo *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59112 e *PSI V* 545 si fornisce qui sotto una trascrizione integrale, anche se solo la metà iniziale di esso presenta cambiamenti rispetto alle precedenti edizioni. Così facendo si vuole agevolare il lettore nella comprensione del conto; nello stesso tempo si approfitta dell'occasione per chiarire qualche dettaglio del contenuto su cui non si erano soffermati i commenti annessi alle prime edizioni⁵.

- (ἔτους) κθ Φαῶφι β̄. λόγ[ος
 παρὰ Ἀμολῆτ[ος
 ξύλων ὧν ἠγόρακεν
 ἐκ τῆς Ὑψ[η]λῆς.
 5 παρὰ Εὐδῆμου ξύλα
 λγ ἐξαπήχη, ὥς τῶν
 δ (δρ.) ξύλ[α ια.] (γίν.) λγ (δρ.) ιβ,
 ἄλλα ς ἐξαπήχη (δρ.) β·
 παρὰ Μαρίου ξύλα ις
 10 ὀκταπήχη ἀνά[(γίν.) (δρ.) η·
 παρὰ Στρατίου ξύλα θ
 ἀν(ἀ) –c <(γίν.)> (δρ.) β –c·
 παρὰ Νουμενίου ξύλα
 β ἀν(ἀ) ρ (γίν.) (δρ.) α =·
 15 παρὰ Νικάνδρου ξύλ(α) δ
 ἀνὰ πήχεις η ἀν(ἀ) ρ (γίν.) (δρ.) η·
 · (γίν.) ξύλα ο, (δρ.) κς ρ c.
 καὶ ἀνηλώθη εἰς τὰ ξύ-
 λα ἐκ τῆς Ὑψηλῆς ἐπὶ τὸν
 20 ποταμόν, ὑποζυγίοις τοῖς
 καταγαγοῦσιν δ ἀν(ἀ) ρ
 (γίν.) (δρ.) β, καὶ ἐργάταις τοῖς με-
 τὰ τῶν ὑποζυγίων δ ἀν(ἀ) =c
 (γίν.) (δρ.) α ρ, ἡμερῶν β·

⁴ Cf. M. ROSTOVITZ, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.*, Madison 1922, p. 122ss.; Cl. PRÉAUX, *Les Grecs en Egypte d'après les archives de Zénon*, Bruxelles 1947, p. 29.

⁵ Dopo l'*ed. pr.* né il *P. Cair. Zen.* né il *PSI* hanno attratto molte attenzioni: il primo ha avuto una correzione in *CE* 43 (1968), p. 168 (= *BL* VI, p. 27), il secondo è stato rapidamente descritto e riprodotto in G. MESSERI SAVORELLI – R. PINTAUDI, *I papiri dell'archivio di Zenon a Firenze* (= *Pap. Flor.* XXIV), Firenze 1993, p. 57 e tav. XLIII.

- 25 ἐργάταις τοῖς ἐμβολομέ-
νοις εἰς τὸ πλοῖον τὰ ξύλα =
ἐργάταις δ τοῖς ὑλκύσα-
σιν τὸ πλοῖον εἰς Κερκὴν (δρ.) α·
ναῦλον πλοίου (δρ.) γ' .
30 (γίν.) <(δρ.)> η' . (γίν.) τὸ πᾶν (δρ.) λς c.

16 (δρ.) η *pro* (δρ.) β

27-28 l. ἐλκύσασιν

Anno XXIX, 2 di Phaophi. Conto presentato da Amoles per i pali che ha comprato a Hypselé.

Da Eudemos, 33 pali di sei cubiti al prezzo di 4 dracme per 11 pali, fanno pali 33, dr. 12.; altri 6 pali di sei cubiti, dr. 2;

da Marios, 16 pali di otto cubiti al prezzo di 3 oboli l'uno, fanno dr. 8;

da Stratios, 9 pali al prezzo di ob. 1 1/2 l'uno, fanno dr. 2 ob. 1 1/2;

da Numenios, 2 pali al prezzo di 4 ob. l'uno, fanno dr. 1 ob. 2;

da Nikandros, 4 pali della lunghezza di 8 cubiti al prezzo di 3 ob. l'uno, fanno dr. 8 (*sic*).

Fanno pali 70, dr. 27 ob. 3 1/2.

E per il trasporto dei pali da Hypselé al fiume si è speso:

per gli animali che li hanno portati giù, 4 al costo di 3 ob. l'uno, fanno dr. 2, e agli operai che hanno condotto gli animali, 4 al costo di ob.

2 1/2 l'uno, fanno dr. 1 ob. 4, per 2 giorni;

agli operai che hanno caricato i pali sul battello, ob. 2;

ai 4 operai che hanno trainato il battello a Kerké, dr. 1;

nolo del battello, dr. 3 ob. 3.

Fanno dr. 8 ob. 3. Fanno in totale dr. 36 ob. 1/2.

1. (ἔτους) κθ Φαῶφι β̄: 26 novembre 257 a.C. Attualmente su β non si scorge contrassegno alcuno; ma è assai probabile che in origine un'asta orizzontale fosse posta sopra il numero indicante il giorno, come era consueto. Essa poi andò perduta a causa dell'erosione che guastò il margine superiore del foglio e parte della riga iniziale.

2. Ἀμολῆτ[ος]: un onomastico Ἀμολῆς o Ἀμυλῆς compare in una decina di documenti dell'archivio: cf. *Guide*, p. 283. Ma, per quanto esso non sia troppo ricorrente, non è agevole stabilire se indichi sempre la stessa persona oppure designi individui diversi. L'unico personaggio con tale nome identificabile con sicurezza è un certo Amoles figlio di Herpekysis (o Herpechysis), citato con il suo patronimico in *P. Cair. Zen.* IV 59549, 2, 8 (257 a.C.), *PSI* VI 560, 6 (cf. *Guide*, p. 150; 257/6 a.C.) e *P. Col. Zen.* I 27, 2, 7 (cf. *ibid.*, p. 124; 256 a.C.) dove compare come destinatario di pagamenti fatti per la disinfestazione di terreni dalla macchia, e in *P. Cair. Zen.* II 59173, 40 (255/4 a.C.) dove figura come testimone. In *Guide*, p. 283, si definisce «farmer» questo Amoles di

Herpekysis e si segnala che egli probabilmente è menzionato pure in altri testi dell'archivio dove il patronimico non compare accanto al nome: i conti di *P. Cair. Zen.* II 59292 (ll. 373, 602; 250 a.C.), IV 59748 (l. 56) e *P. Mich.* I 119 (l. 39), in cui un Amoles è citato o come destinatario o come intermediario di pagamenti; la lista di persone di *P. Cair. Zen.* IV 59656 (l. 13); la lettera di *P. Cair. Zen.* III 59381; forse la ricevuta di *P. L. Bat.* XX 8 (cf. nt. d; 257 a.C.) e *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59112, cioè il testo qui riedito. L'ipotesi che tutti questi documenti possano essere assegnati allo stesso Amoles di Herpekysis è senza dubbio attraente; ma, prima di accettarla, è opportuna qualche cautela, almeno per quanto riguarda il conto qui trascritto. L'acquisto e il trasporto del legname, infatti, dovevano rientrare nelle competenze dei dipendenti della *δωρεά*, non in quelle dei contadini. Quindi non è molto verosimile che l'individuo nominato nella presente riga sia Amoles figlio di Herpekysis, perché nel 257/6 a.C. quest'ultimo non era un impiegato dell'azienda: egli curava la pulitura di terreni del latifondo, facendo lavorare altra gente con sé e incassando un compenso forfetario per ogni arura sistemata. Volendo, si potrebbe pensare che l'amministratore Panakestor, o qualche suo collaboratore, abbia incaricato l'Amoles figlio di Herpekysis di procurare dei pali, per quanto egli fosse al di fuori dell'azienda. Una simile eventualità non è del tutto esclusa; ma sembra poco probabile che la stessa persona potesse occuparsi contemporaneamente della disinfestazione dei terreni a Filadelfia (cf. *P. Cair. Zen.* IV 59549: anno XXIX, Phaophi 27) e dell'acquisto del legname nel nomo Memphites (cf. l. 1: anno XXIX, Phaophi 2). Davanti a queste difficoltà è meglio lasciare indeterminata l'identificazione del personaggio qui menzionato.

4. Ὑψ[η]λῆς: ὕλης *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59112. La traccia rimasta dopo υ nella parte più bassa del rigo e le dimensioni della lacuna, che separa lo stesso υ dal successivo λ, rendono sufficientemente sicura la trascrizione Ὑψ[η]λῆς suggerita da l. 19. Con la nuova lettura proposta si ottiene un'espressione ὅν ἡγόρακεν ἐκ τῆς Ὑψ[η]λῆς, che non manca di paralleli nei documenti dell'archivio: cf. *ex. gr.* *P. Cair. Zen.* IV 59595, 8 e *P. Mich.* I 28, 15.

5. Εὐδήμου: ἰδήμου *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59112, dove però si precisa in nota che Εὐδήμου «is just possible»; Ἀσιδήμου *CE* 43 (1968), p. 168 (= *BL* VI, p. 27). I resti della lettera iniziale ben si adattano ad un ε, mentre i segni successivi sono simili all'υ di καταγαγοῦσιν nella sottostante l. 21; sicché non è arrischiato leggere Εὐδήμου.

9. Μαρίου: non è il caso di ritenere che il nome Μάριος qui rappresenti l'equivalente greco del latino Marius, giacché è poco probabile che alla metà del III sec. a.C. vi fossero dei latini insediati nel nomo Memphites. Μάριος, piuttosto, deve essere considerato come la trascrizione greca dell'antroponimo aramaico ܡܪܝܐ, accogliendo le conclusioni tratte in *CPJ* I 47, 3 nt.

16. (γίν.) (δρ.) η: il costo complessivo dei 4 pali comprati presso Nikandros a 3 oboli l'uno era di 2 dracme, non di 8; pertanto qui dovrebbe comparire β al posto di η. L'anomalia, comunque, non deriva da un errore di calcolo, perché nel totale di l. 17 (dr. 27 ob. 3 1/2) i pali di Nikandros sono correttamente conteggiati per l'importo di 2 dracme. La sostituzione di β con η è piuttosto dovuta ad uno sbaglio di trascrizione, commesso quando il conto fu steso in forma definitiva, ricopiando i prezzi delle singole forniture forse già annotati altrove al momento dell'acquisto o del pagamento del materiale: la presenza della cifra η nell'indicazione della lunghezza dei pali, poco prima di (γίν.) (δρ.), può aver prodotto lo scambio fra η e β nella registrazione del costo complessivo.

17. Il grosso punto che precede i due totali deve essere inteso come un segno di controllo, che fu apposto quando la somma spesa venne scritta in un rendiconto generale, oppure quando fu fatta qualche verifica o sulla quantità del legname comprato o sull'importo per esso pagato.

ξύλα ο: il numero complessivo dei pali è esatto: 33 (l. 7) + 6 (l. 8) + 16 (l. 9) + 9 (l. 11) + 2 (ll. 13-14) + 4 (l. 15) = 70.

(δρ.) κζϚ c: ζ è stato tracciato su un simbolo Ϛ forse banalmente anticipato per un errore di trascrizione. Il totale delle somme pagate per le singole forniture è preciso ed include correttamente 2 dracme, anziché 8, per i pali acquistati presso Nikandros (cf. nt. *ad l.* 16): dr. 12 (l. 7) + dr. 2 (l. 8) + dr. 8 (l. 10) + dr. 2 ob. 1 1/2 (l. 12) + dr. 1 ob. 2 (l. 14) + dr. 2 (l. 16) = dr. 27 ob. 3 1/2.

30. (δρ.) >ηϚ rappresenta il totale dei costi sostenuti per il trasporto del legname, che sono annotati a ll. 18-29: dr. 2 (l. 22) + dr. 1 ob. 4 (l. 24) + ob. 2 (l. 26) + dr. 1 (l. 28) + dr. 3 ob. 3 (l. 29) = dr. 8 ob. 3.

Con (δρ.) λς c si indica l'ammontare complessivo delle spese registrate, che risulta dalla somma del prezzo pagato per il legname (l. 17: dr. 27 ob. 3 1/2) e del costo del trasporto (dr. 8 ob. 3).

III. UNITED AT LAST

P. Cair. Zen. I 59014 a and b

In his edition of the Zenon papyri, Edgar recognized that the previously published *PSI VII 867* belonged to a Cairo fragment. Thus he published both of them as *P. Cair. Zen. I 59014*; *PSI VII 867* became known as fragment (a), and the Cairo piece as (b). Edgar apparently never saw fragment (a), for he only reports corrections by Vitelli, unverified by himself, nor does he have any comments on the last three lines of the *PSI* part that were left unread in the *editio princeps*. As a result, Edgar was unable to establish the gap between both fragments, which led to their separate line numbering.

Some years ago, photographs of many Zenon papyri housed in Italian collections were published by R. Pintaudi in *P. Mostra Zenon*. One of the plates (Tav. CXCVIII) shows *PSI VII 867*, fragment (a) of *P. Cair. Zen. I 59014*. The picture shows that the last three lines, though not transcribed by either Vitelli or Edgar, are in fact partially legible. In all these lines we recognize remains of *φόρετρον* as well as some individual letters:

(a) 7	check-mark	κα	traces, number	φορετρ[
8			traces	δ φορετρ[
9		[]	υ κ	φορ[

The first lines of fragment (b) were transcribed as

(b) 1				=
2	[]	ων[	φόρετρον	φ
3	ταρείχ[ο]	υ	φ[όρετρο]	υ β

It immediately comes to mind that it is possible that both fragments are continuous and that no text is missing at all. Thanks to the cooperation of W. Clarysse, who provided me with a slide of the Cairo fragment, and R. Pintaudi, who checked the original in Florence, I was able to confirm this.

Although the connection of both parts is not new and although it could suffice to give the new reading of fr. a ll. 7-8 combined with fr. b. ll. 1-3, the fact that we now know the exact contents of the text justifies a new edition. For we are now also able to see how the calculation of obols was made. Furthermore, we can check the relevant entries in *P. Cair. Zen. I 59012*, which is closely related to this text and *P. Cair. Zen. I 59013*.

Nature of the text

P. Cair. Zen. I 59014 is a portage account of goods transported on the boat of Patron and destined for Apollonios the dioicetes. These goods were imports from abroad, arriving in Egypt through Pelousion. This is revealed by *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012, a long list concerning the taxation of these and other imported goods, which were transported on the vessels of Patron and Herakleides and meant not only for Apollonios, but for two other persons as well⁶. *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59013 is the portage account of the goods for Apollonios transported by Herakleides. It is written in the same hand as 59014⁷. Both texts enabled Edgar to reconstruct much of the lost part of *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012, col. I and II, which concern the same items as 59013 and 59014. Similar portage accounts must have been made for the two other beneficiaries of the imported products. Both 59013 and 59014 have check-marks, written somewhat lower than the entries to which they belong, and looking like a large *chi*. Some entries are deleted, sometimes corrections are added. Both texts have additions in the margin. In both texts we find items that are not listed in the taxation list *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012. Some of these items are pieces of furniture, others are imported food. Apparently they were not subject to taxation, presumably because they were meant for private use and consumption. *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59013 and 59014 were written in a skilled hand, but by someone who had some difficulties with orthography. The most remarkable mistakes the writer has made are the replacement of σ and ζ by ξ in οξουξ in 59013.11 and τραπεξης in 59014.15.

Text

- Ἐδόθη φορέτρων διὰ Πάτρωνος κυβερνήτῳ
 [X] Χεῖα ο ἡμιχῖα δ [Θ]άσια γ
 τουτῶν φόρετρον (δρ.) ζ = c
 X μέλιτος ἡμικάδια ζ ἐ[ρ]γά(ταις) † c

⁶ For *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012 see H. CHOULIARA-RAIOS, *L'abeille et le miel en Egypte d'après les papyrus grecs*, Iannina 1996, p. 74-75, and the literature cited there, n. 163. Cf. also A. ANDRÉADES, in *Mélanges Gustave Glotz* I, Paris 1932, p. 7-48. Reprints with translations and discussions of *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012-59014 have been recently published by X. DURAND, *Des Grecs en Palestine au III^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ*, Paris 1997, texts 12-14.

⁷ A plate of *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59013 is available in the *ed. pr.*, Pl. III, and in R. SEIDER, *Paläographie der griechischen Papyri* III.1, Stuttgart 1990, p. 177. Seider suggests (p. 176) that it was written by Herakleides himself. Since Patron's account is in the same hand, this does not seem likely.

5	X	ἄλλα', τριπόδια ε 'καὶ στάμνος'	φόρετρον	(δρ.) α f
		[[ἡμικάδια ιε μέλιτος 'καὶ στάμνου'	φόρετρον	f]]
	X	καπνάκ[ης]αι ε	φόρετρον	=
	X	ἑταρίχ[ου] βείκων δ	φόρετρον	f
	X	ταρείχ[ου] κε(ράμια) ι	φ[ό]ρετ[ρο]ν	(δρ.) β
10	X	κλυκέω[ς] κε(ράμια) ἥ' [[ια]]	φόρετρον	[[f c]] f
	X	Κορακη[σι]ωτικά δ	φόρετρον	f
	X	κλυκέως κε(ράμια) ε	φόρετρον	f
	κεραμι			
	X	λυχνίων γ	φόρετρον	=
	X	κλεινῶν β	φόρετρον	- c
15	X	τραπέξης καὶ κυλικείου		=
	X	[[μάκρας]] 'πυέλου'		=
	X	σαλωσίον		- c
		[[πέλτης καὶ θωρακείων καὶ κοντῶν		f c]]
	X	ἑταρίχου' βείκων ε	φόρετρον	f
20	X	συνύας ι		-
	X	γῆς φόρετρον ὑδριῶν β		- c
		[[τυροῦ στάμνων γ		c]]
	X	στασίνχαλκα καὶ ἔμπυρον		-
		(γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) ιη = c		
25				ις f c

2 Χεῖα: 1. Χῖα; 8 βείκων: 1. βίκων; 9 ταρείχου: 1. ταρίχου; 10, 12 κλυκέως: 1. γλυκέως; 14 κλεινῶν: 1. κλινῶν; 15 τραπέξης: 1. τραπέζης; 19 βείκων: 1. βίκων; 20 συνύας: 1. σιπύας

Translation

Has been given for portorage by Patron the shipper:	
70 Chian jars, 4 half-Chian jars, 3 Thasian jars,	
their portorage	6 dr. 2.5 ob.
7 half-jars of honey for the workmen	3.5 ob.
5 'others', tripods 'and a <i>stamnos</i> '	portorage 1 dr. 4 ob.
[[15 half-jars of honey 'and for a <i>stamnos</i> '	portorage 4 ob.]]
5 <i>kapsakai</i>	portorage 2 ob.
for 4 <i>bikia</i> of pickled fish	portorage 5 ob.
10 jars of pickled fish	portorage 2 dr.
8 [[11]] jars of sweet wine	portorage 3 [[5.5]]ob.
4 jars from Korakesios	portorage 4 ob.
5 jars of sweet wine	portorage 5 ob.
for 3 lamps	portorage 2 ob.
for 2 beds	portorage 1.5 ob.
for a table and and a sideboard	2 ob.
for a [[bathtub]] 'bathtub'	2 ob.
for <i>salousia</i>	1.5 ob.
[[for a shield and cuirasses and goads	4.5 ob.]]

for 5 <i>bikia</i> of pickled fish	portorage	3 ob.
10 meal tubs		1 ob.
for soil, portorage of 2 <i>hydria</i>		1.5 ob.
[[for 3 <i>stamnoi</i> of cheese		0.5 ob.]]
stands for a copper vessel and an incense burner		1 ob.
(total of all items: 9 dr. + 56 ob. = 18 dr. 2 ob.)		
total 18 dr. 2.5 ob.		
		16 dr. 5.5 ob.

Commentary

A final proof that the text is complete can be obtained from the total of drachmai and obols in ll. 24-25. The total in l. 24 is the total of all items in the list, including those that have been cancelled, and there is a miscalculation of only 1/2 ob.; the exact amount should be 18 dr. 2 ob. The total of l. 25 is the total of all entries with a check-mark, i.e. 18 dr., 2 1/2 ob. minus 9 ob., the portorage of the cancelled entries; the correction to the amount in l. 10 from 5 1/2 ob. to 3 ob. is overlooked. Thus, the text was written in different stages. First a list was made (based on *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012?) of several items and their portorage. The total was made up and registered at the bottom. Then, it was marked which of them was actually transported. They were counted and some items were deleted from the list or added to it. Check-marks were added in front of the entries and the new total of dues was written on the right in l. 25. It seems that the scribe who initially wrote the list also checked and altered it. The handwriting of the added items is similar to the original entries and the new total of l. 25 shows the same rectangular stigma that is also written in l. 3 and *P. Cair. Zen.* I. 59013.6⁸.

Virtually all entries concerning food and wine in *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59013 and 59014 correspond with the items listed in *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012 as belonging to Apollonios and transported on the boats of Herakleides and Patron. The following table will illustrate this for the wine, honey and fish of both cargoes and the other products of 59014, at the

⁸ For the epigraphical appearance of the numbers in these texts cf. below, comm. on l. 5. According to R. SEIDER, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 180, the second list in the margin of *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59013 was written by a second hand. It rather seems that the lack of space obliged the writer/controller of the list to use a different, smaller, type of writing than he used in the main text, cf. Edgar's qualification of the writing in the *ed.pr.*

same time showing their value, dues for *diapylon* (registered at the left of the entries in 59012) and mean portorage per unit⁹:

<i>P. Cair. Zen. I 59012</i>	<i>P. Cair. Zen. I 59013</i>	<i>P. Cair. Zen. I 59014</i>	portorage (average)	<i>diapylon</i>	value in <i>timesis</i>
wine:					
(22) Χῖ[α 61]	(2) Χεῖα 61		1/2 ob.	3 ob.	18 dr.
(17) Χῖ[α 70		(2) Χεῖα 70	1/2 ob.	3 ob.	18 dr.
(18) ἡμιχῖα [4		(2) ἡμιχῖα 4	1/4 ob.	1.5 ob.	[9 dr.]
(24) Θάσια [4]	(5) Θάσια [5] '4'		3/4 ob.	3 ob.	20 dr.
(19) Θάσια [3		(2) Θάσια 3	3/4 ob.	[3 ob.]	[20 dr.]
(10) ὄξο[ι]υς κεράμια 2]	(11) ὄξους κε(ράμια) [4] 2		1 ob.	3 ob.	3 dr.
(6) γλυ[κέως κεράμ]ια 5		(12) κλυκέως κε(ράμια) 5	1 ob.	3 ob.	12 dr.
(7) (γλυκέως) ἡμ[ικάδια 1]1.....		(10) κλυκέως κε(ράμια) [11] 8	[1/2] 3/8 ob.	[2 ob.]	4 dr.
(11) [γλυκέως ἡμ. 4]	(10) γλυκέως ἡμικάδια 4		1/2 ob.	[2 ob.]	4 dr.
honey:					
(30) Ἀττικοῦ στ[ά]μνος 1		(5) 'καὶ στάμνος'	?	2 ob.	20 dr.
(28) μέλιτος Θεαγγελικοῦ		(4) μέλιτος	1/2 ob.	2 ob.	12 dr.
ἡμ(ικάδια) 7		ἡμικάδια 7			
(33) Κορακησιωτικοῦ		(11) Κορακη- [σι]ωτικὰ 4	1 ob.	2 ob.	[12 dr.]
ἡμ(ικάδια) 4					
(34) Χαλυβονίου κα[ψάκ]αι 5.....		(7) καψάκ[ης]αι 5	2/5 ob.	1 ob.	?
(35) κεραμύλλια τριπόδια 5.....		(5) τριπόδια 5	?	no charge	?
fish:					
(38) ταρίχου [κερ.					
(39) ὥραίου [κερ.		(9) ταρεῖχ[ο]υ			
(40) ὑπ[ο]γαστρίων κερ.		κε(ράμια) 10	1 1/5 ob.	1 dr.?	?
(41) βίκια [4]		(8) ταρίχ[ου] βείκων 4	1 1/4 ob.	1 1/4 dr.	≥20 dr.
(42) κυβίων [3]		(19) ταρίχου	3/5 ob.	1 dr.	16 dr.
(43) σφηνέων [2]		βείκων 5			12 dr.
cheese, meat and Samian earth:					
(36) τυρ[.].οῦ Χίου		(22) [τυροῦ στάμνων 3]	1/6 ob.	no charge	5 dr.?, cf. 012.57
(37) ἄλλου τυρ[ου]					
(44) κρεῶν σ[υα]γρέων		(17) σαλωσίων	3/4 ob.	no charge	2 dr.
σαλού(σια) 2					
(45) γῆς Σαμίας στάμνοι 2		(21) γῆς ὕδριων 2	3/4 ob.	no charge	10 dr.

⁹ A similar comparison of all items listed in *P. Cair. Zen. I 59013* and their counterparts in 59012 can be found in N. KRUIT – K.A. WÖRPER, *APF* 46.1, §3.1 s.v. Κορακή-

The method of registering in *P. Cair. Zen. I 59012* can be seen in the nearly completely preserved ll. 81-86:

ταρίχου βικίον α	of pickled fish, one bikion
στάμνος α	one stamnos
μέλιτος ἡμ(ικάδια) γ	of honey, three hemikadia,
Θ]άσιον α	one Thasion
κα]ψάκαι β	two kapsakai
σ]τάμνος α	one stamnos

Thus, if only the kind of container changes, the product is not mentioned, if the product changes, the new product and the container holding it are mentioned. We also see that there is no firm relation between the portorage, *diapylon* and value of the imported goods. One would expect that if a *keramion* of sweet wine is valued at 12 dr., charged 3 ob. for *diapylon* and 1 ob. for portorage, a *hemikadion* would be valued at 6 dr., paying 1 1/2 ob. for *diapylon* and 1/2 ob. for portorage. However, only the last figure is correct: for *diapylon* 2 ob. are due, while its value is set at only 4 dr.¹⁰ Edgar already noted that the *keramion* and *hemikadion* seemed to have a fixed rate for the *diapylon*, regardless of the value of their contents. A *keramion* is charged at 3 ob., a *hemikadion* at 2 ob. He also noted that in some cases, the high value of the content of a small container, such as the *stamnos* of white oil, valued at 20 dr., could render the *stamnos* liable to the *diapylon* as well, whereas other *stamnoi* holding less valuable products (e.g. the *stamnoi* of Chian and other cheese) were exempted from the *diapylon*. In general, the amount of money paid for portorage is a fraction of the money paid for *diapylon*. However, the items which are exempted from the *diapylon* are not exempted from paying portorage, cf. again the *stamnoi* of cheese.

With this in mind, we can understand some entries better. Edgar could not fill all the lacunae in ll. 28-45 of *P. Cair. Zen. I 59012*, for he did not have the whole text of *P. Cair. Zen. I 59014*. He could not know of the 5 *kapsakai* of honey, the 10 *keramia* of pickled fish and the 4 *bikia* of the same product, all recorded in the previously unread lines of the Florentine fragment. It is evident that the 5 *kapsakai* are those of 59012.34,

σιον/Κορακησιωτικόν. Some of the correspondences presented in the chart below are based on new restorations/interpretations of *P. Cair. Zen. I 59012*, which will be accounted for below. For a discussion of the various kinds of honey that are listed in 59012 and 59014 see H. CHOULIARA-RAIOS, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 74-83.

¹⁰ Only in l. 92 is the *diapylon* for a *hemikadion* of sweet wine the expected 1 1/2 ob./*hemikadion*, but there it is also valued at 4 dr.

read as Χαλυβωνίου κ.[by Edgar, which can now be supplemented to Χαλυβωνίου κα[ψάκαι ε ἀν(ὰ) . (γίνονται) (δρ.) .]. The charge for *diapylon* recorded in front of this entry is 5 ob., thus 1 ob./kapsakes. In all likelihood, we therefore have to supplement [= κα]ψάκαι β in l. 85 and thus [f Θ]άσιον in l. 84 in order to reach the total of 3 dr. of *diapylon* for ll. 81-86 as recorded in l. 88¹¹. The *kapsakai* of l. 85 are valued at 8 dr. and this could also be the value of the Chalubonian honey. The entries for pickled fish are grouped in 59012.38-43. In l. 41, the kind of container changes into *bikia*, thereby suggesting that the containers of ll. 38-40 were the 10 *keramia*. Since the product does not change in l. 41, one probably has to understand (ὕπογαστρίων) βικία and in the following two lines κυβίων (βικία) and σφηνέων (βικία). The total of these lines must be 9 *bikia*. Edgar had supplemented l. 41 in his ed.pr., P. Edgar 73, as ε βικία [ε] ἀν(ὰ) κ[(γίνονται) (δρ.) ρ] on the basis of l. 81 which has α ταρίχου βικίων α (δρ.) κ. Naturally, he did not adapt his reconstruction of this line once he knew of *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59014, for the Cairo part in fact listed ταρίχου βικία ε. However, not ordinary pickled fish is meant here, but ὑπογάστρια, a superior quality¹². Furthermore, if 5 *bikia* worth 20 drachmai is charged for *diapylon* at 1 dr. each, how are we to understand ll. 42-43, where the remaining 4 *bikia* are valued at 16 and 12 dr., but nevertheless paying 5 dr. for *diapylon*. A more likely solution is to read the passage as follows:

ε βικία [δ] ἀν(ὰ) κ[. (γίνονται) (δρ.) .(.)]
 γ κυβίων [γ] ἀν(ὰ) ις [(γίνονται) (δρ.) μη]
 β σφηνέων[β] ἀν(ὰ) ιβ [(γίνονται) (δρ.) κδ]

If reconstructed like this, the higher value of the *bikia* in l. 41 is matched by the higher rate for *diapylon* and the higher amount of portorage (1 1/4 dr. and 1 1/4 ob. per *bikion*), whereas the cheaper qualities pay 1 dr. and a mean of 3/5 ob. per *bikion*¹³. We do not know the division of the 10 *keramia* of pickled fish in ll. 38-40. One could sup-

¹¹ The *stamnos* of l. 86, also preceded by a lacuna, was free of charge, cf. l. 82.

¹² Cf. the discussion of T. REEKMAN, *La consommation dans les archives de Zénon*, Bruxelles 1996, p. 26-27. Ὑπογάστριον is mistakenly understood as «Bauchfleisch» by H.-J. DREXHAGE, *Einige Bemerkungen zu Fleischverarbeitung und Fleischvertrieb nach den griechischen Papyri und Ostraka vom 3. Jh.v. bis zum 7. Jh.n.*, *MBAH* 16.2 (1997), p. 97-111.

¹³ Of course, a value of 1/5 ob. does not exist. The total of 3 ob. for portorage of 5 *bikia* is probably an upwardly rounded total of 3 *bikia* at x ob. and 2 *bikia* at y ob., cf. ll. 2-3 and the commentary on these lines below.

pose from the known payments of one and four oboloi for *diapylon* in ll. 38-39 that these lines conceal one *keramion* of pickled fish and four *keramia* of tuna fish¹⁴. This would mean that l. 40 would contain five *keramia* of fillet. This does not mean automatically that the amount for *diapylon* in that line should be five drachmai, for we have just seen that the *bikia* of fillet were probably paying a higher rate for *diapylon* than the cheaper qualities of pickled fish. Therefore, a higher amount than 5 dr. cannot be excluded for the supposed five *keramia* of fillet. In fact, this is the only missing entry for *diapylon* in col. II. In col. III, payments for *diapylon* could be missing in ll. 56-57, cf. Edgar's remark in the *editio princeps*. Fortunately, we know the total amount of *diapylon* for col. I-III, viz. 112 dr., 3 1/4 ob., 1 chalkos, cf. l. 75. The total of col. I is 84 dr., 1 ob. (l. 28). The total of col. II-III is 19 dr., 15 ob. = 21 dr., 3 ob. for ll. 28-39 + 3 1/4 ob., 1 chalkos for ll. 41-63. This means that in ll. 40 and 56-57 a sum is missing of 112 dr., 3 1/4 ob., 1 chalkos minus (84 dr. 1 ob. + 21 dr., 3 ob. + 3 1/4 ob. 1 chalkos) = 6 dr., 2 ob. In all likelihood, six dr. are to be restored in l. 40, leaving two ob. for ll. 56-57. In this way, the five *keramia* of fillet would pay nearly the same amount of *diapylon* as the four *bikia* of the same product (1 1/5 dr./*keramion* versus 1 1/4 dr./*bikion*).

The only entry that is difficult to reconcile with *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012 is the corrected l. 6, which must summarize 59012.29-32:

- (6) [ἡμικάδια ιε μέλιτος `καὶ στάμνου'] = (29) Ῥοδιακοῦ α
 (30) Ἀττικοῦ στ[ά]μνος α
 (31) Λυκιακοῦ ἡμ. α
 (32) ἐλάσσω [

The *stamnos* of Attic honey is the only item that corresponds exactly. After being added to this line, it was added again to the preceding line after which the whole of l. 6 was cancelled. The cancellation of the addition to l. 6 is marked by the fact that the bracket at the end of the line also extends above the supralinear written καὶ στάμνου. Apparently, the total amount of the Rhodian, Lycian and other honey in *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012. 29-32 was 15 *hemikadia*, but the amounts paid for *diapylon* listed opposite the entries seem to contradict this. The Rhodian honey

¹⁴ The rates of portorage for *keramia* and *bikia* are similar and therefore it seems reasonable to suspect that the *diapylon* rates were similar as well. As a result, a *keramion* of pickled fish would also be charged one dr. for *diapylon*, just like the *bikion* of l. 81.

pays the normal rate of a *hemikadion* viz. 2 obols for *diapylon* and valued 12 dr. The Lycian honey of l. 31 is also only one *hemikadion*. Thus, the entry of l. 32 would be 13 *hemikadia*, but the amount due for *diapylon* is only one drachme, or the levy for three *hemikadia*. Of course, the information of *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59014 can be mistaken and the figure '15' might be wrong. However, there seems to be good reason that although the whole line was cancelled, the items in it are still to be found in the list. As explained above, the *stamnos* of Attic honey was added to the 5 *tripodia* in the previous line, and it seems that the 15 *hemikadia* reappear as the supralinear written ἄλλα. This can be deducted from the rather high payment for portorage, 1 dr. 4 ob. For *diapylon*, the *stamnos* of Attic honey and the *hemikadia* of Rhodian and Lycian honey are paying 2 ob. each. The 5 *tripodia* are free of charge. Therefore, one would expect a charge for portorage of 1/2 ob./*hemikadion*, just as the *hemikadia* in l. 4 and probably even a lower figure for the *tripodia*. The amount due for the *stamnos* might be 3/4 ob., cf. the rate for the *Thasion* of wine, which is equal in value, or the *stamnos* of Samian earth. If l. 5 was to be understood as «other *tripodia*, 5, and a *stamnos*, portorage 1 dr. 4 ob.», both the element 'other' and the high figure of portorage are incomprehensible, since no tripods are preceding and the expected portorage would be only some 3 1/4 ob. or less. However, if the word ἄλλα is in fact a transposition of the cancelled 15 *hemikadia* of the line beneath, the whole phrase as well as the figure become understandable. Ἄλλα then should be understood as ἄλλα ἡμικάδια and the figure would also consist of 7 1/2 ob. (or 1 dr., 1 1/2 ob.) portorage for 15 *hemikadia*. The remaining 2 1/2 ob. could very well be the charge for the 5 *tripodia* and the *stamnos*. Thus, 15 *hemikadia* indeed may be the correct total of 59012.29, 31 and 32 with 13 *hemikadia* in that last line.

Yet another clue that this indeed might be the case can be gathered from the total value of all products liable to the 25% tax rate of col. II-III, viz. 859 dr., 4 1/2 ob. (cf. l. 70). If we add up all numbers that are securely read or reconstructed the total is only 228 dr. 4 1/2 ob., i.e. 631 dr. less. These 631 dr. are the total of ll. 31-43, but some of the amounts in these lines can be reconstructed with probability: the *hemikadia* of Lycian and Korakesiotic honey probably also valued 12 dr. each, the Chalubonian *kapsakai* could be 8 dr. each, the Chian and other cheeses valued each some 5 dr. and the 10 *keramia* and 4 *bikia* of pickled fish were valued at ± 20 dr. per unit. For the remaining 5 *bikia* I have

suggested a total value of 72 dr. The total value of the honey (without the honey of ll. 32 and 35) then would be 100 dr., that of cheese 15 dr. and that of pickled fish some 352-392 dr.¹⁵, or 467-507 dr. in all. We still would be missing 631 minus (507-467) = 124-164 dr. which must represent the value of the honey in ll. 32 and 35, thereby suggesting that in l. 32 indeed a substantial number of *hemikadia* is missing, not just 3 as suggested by the payment for *diapylon*.

1. φορέτρων: the word means «porterage», but the amounts registered in this list are not to be understood as the price for carrying the said number of individual jars. Carrying one Chian jar of wine would cost 1/2 ob., cf. the commentary on the next lines, but 1/2 -1 ob. is also the average wage of a workman per day, cf. K. MARESCH, *Bronze und Silber. Papyrologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Währung im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten bis zum 2. Jahrhundert n.Chr.* (*Papyrologica Coloniensia*, 25), Opladen 1996, p. 192.

2-3. *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59013.2 and 5 allow us to reconstruct the calculation that led to the total dues for porterage for Chia, half Chia and Thasia: the amounts for porterage are 1/2 ob./Chion, thus 1/4 ob./half Chion, and 3/4 ob./Thasion. The total therefore should be $(70 \times 1/2) + (4 \times 1/4) + (3 \times 3/4) = 38 \frac{1}{4}$ ob. = 6 dr. $2 \frac{1}{4}$ ob., rounded up to 6 dr. $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ob.

4. ἐ[ρ]γά(ταις): conjectured by Edgar (with a dotted γ) in his Introduction instead of Vitelli's ε.α. X. DURAND, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 126, doubted the correctness of Edgar's proposal. However, the plate of the Florentine part of the papyrus clearly shows ε[]γα and since *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59013.1 starts with ἀνήλωμα ἐργάταις, Edgar's solution is probably right.

5. τριπόδια ε: the reading of the numeral here and in l. 6 (ιε) was questioned by Vitelli because of the peculiar shape of the ε, looking like a large capital E. Therefore, they were dotted in *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59014 by Edgar, whereas he read the same numeral without hesitation in the Cairo fragment (b) 6 and 13. The writer of *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59013-59014 uses archaic, epigraphical types of letters for the numerals, which accounts for their peculiar shapes. See the discussion of A and E by R. SEIDER, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 177-178 and n. 96.

¹⁵ The total of 352 dr. is made up of 10 *keramia* and 4 *bikia* at 20 dr. + 72 dr. for the 5 *bikia* of ll. 42-43. An additional 40 dr. must be added if the 5 *keramia* and 5 *bikia* of fillet were valued higher (at 24 dr.), which one would expect from the payments for *diapylon* and porterage for these jars.

7. καψάκ[ης]αι ε: for καψάκης see Ph. MAYERSON, *Ka(μ)ψάκης in the Papyri, LXX and TLG, BASP* 36 (1999), p. 93-97¹⁶. Reporting the results of a search in the DDBDP, Mayerson (p. 95) lists the following papyrological attestations:

– Zenon texts

P. Cair. Zen. I 59007 Intr. (κάψ. honey); not in *DDBDP*, see Mayerson p. 96

P. Cair. Zen. I 59012.85, 107 (κάψ. oil)

P. Lond. VII 1930.152, 211 (κάψ. wine)

PSI IV 428.15, 64 (κάψ. honey)

– Other attestations

P.L. Bat. XVII 1.i.18 (AD 138-161: καμψάκιον)

BGU II 387.ii.19 (with *BL* I 43, AD 177-189: κα[μψά]κια χαλκ[ᾱ])

P. Oxy. XX 2273.6 (III AD: κάψ. oil)

P. Oxy. XXXVI 2784.25 (III AD: no product)

P. Ryl. IV 627.164 (IV AD: κάψ. oil)

To these may be added:

P. Cair. Zen. I 59012.34 (see the discussion above, κάψ. honey) and *P. Oxy.* XIV 1658.5 (IV AD), correcting the unexplained κατακην into κάψακην¹⁷. Lastly, the word occurs in l. 10 of the fourth (?) century AD Coptic papyrus *P. Mich.* Inv. 3552, published in *BASP* 19 (1982), p. 64-65, *kapsakes* of oil. Mayerson (p. 96) also mentions a graffito from Dura Europos, an inventory list of temple gifts, mentioning κα[ψ]άκια τρ[ί]α which was related by the editor to Hesychius' καψάκιον γλοσσόκομον («box, case»). Mayerson argues that this meaning «does not fit the context of the graffito. It appears more likely that a gift was made of three vessels, which may have been of a precious metal as other

¹⁶ The term κάψακης was discussed previously by H. CHOULIARA-RAIOS, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 124-125 with literature. The relation with Latin *capsa* has been doubted by D. HAGEDORN in *P. Heid.* V 333, comm. on l. 8. As further support of this rejection one may note that κάψακης is transliterated by late classic and medieval Latin authors as *capsaces* or *capsax*, cf. *ThLL* and DuCange, *s.v.* The Latin loan word κά(μ)ψα «case» and derivatives are attested in the papyri from AD 258 onwards, cf. D. HAGEDORN, *l.c.* Cf. also H. HARRAUER – B. ROM, *ZPE* 54 (1984), p. 98-99 on καψάριος and J. DIETHART, *ZPE* 64 (1986), p. 78, comm. on l. 4. For *P. Arméno-Grec*, cited by J. DIETHART, *l.c.*, see now J. CLACKSON, *ZPE* 129 (2000), p. 223-258.

¹⁷ There is no reason to read with the editor κενόν as καινόν «new»: κενόν «empty» is perfectly possible and καινόν is written correctly in the preceding line, thus arguing against an orthographical mistake in l. 5.

items of gold are mentioned». One may note, however, that *P.L. Bat.* XVII 1 and *BGU* II 387, cited above, are temple inventories as well and that *BGU* II 387.ii.13 also reports *θηκαι χαλκαϊ* «bronze cases». Therefore, the meaning given by Hesychius, who apparently regards the word as a diminutive of Latin *capsa*¹⁸, cannot be excluded *a priori*. If *κα(μ)ψάκιον* is to be regarded in these texts as a Latin based word, this would shift the *terminus a quo* one century back from 258 AD (cf. n. 16) to the middle of the second century AD. Of course, the meaning suggested by Mayerson is equally possible. For metal flasks belonging to a church, cf. e.g. *P.L. Bat.* XXV 13.12 with comm.

10. *κλυκέω[ς] κε(ράμια) ἡ' [ια] φόρετρον* [f c] : this entry must be the equivalent of *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012.7 which has *ἡμ[ικάδια ι]α*. The rate for portage (1/2 ob./ker.) shows that indeed *hemikadia* are intended, not *keramia* for which 1 ob./ker. should be paid, cf. the chart above and l. 12. A similar 'change' of jars has occurred in l. 21, where the Samian earth is now in *hydria*, whereas it was transported in *stamnoi* in *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012. Of course, one would expect that the corrected number of eight *keramia* = *hemikadia* would cost four obols for portage.

13-14. *κεραμι*: I fail to see the purpose of this not finished addition in the left margin.

16. *μάκρας*: Edgar printed *μακρᾶς* «large», but P. VAN MINNEN, *ZPE* 96 (1993), p. 118, suggested to read *μάκρας* «bath» instead, which was also the meaning listed by LSJ for this passage. It remains unknown why the scribe corrected a word meaning «bath» into another with the same meaning.

17. *σαλωσίων*: two *sal(u)sia* of meat of boars are meant, cf. *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012.44. For *σαλούσιον/-ώσιον/-ώτιον*, cf. *P. Oxy.* XLII 3060, comm. on l. 8.

21. *γῆς φόρετρον ὑδριῶν β*: *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59012.45 shows that Samian earth was transported. This was used for medical purposes, just like the Attic honey, cf. A. ANDRÉADES, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 15 n. 7.

Papyrologisch Instituut, Leiden

Nico KRUIT

¹⁸ So also L.R. PALMER, *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri*, London 1946, p. 14.