

A NEW PORTION OF THE EDICT OF DIOCLETIAN  
FROM MEGALOPOLIS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE inscription which follows came to light during the excavation undertaken this year, at Megalopolis, by the British School at Athens. It stood outside the house of a peasant, Βασίλειος Πετράκης, whose father had found it, many years previously, in a field upon the ancient site. The existence of the stone was reported first to the Ephor, Mr. Castroménos, who represented the Greek Government at our excavation. Mr. Castroménos courteously announced it to me, and both of us copied it. At that time we had no idea that it formed part of the 'Edict of Diocletian'; this was first suggested to me by Mr. Gardner, Director of the School, on my return to Cambridge. Mr. Castroménos' copy is to appear, as I understand, in the 'Δελτίου.' The text and edition which follow are from my own copy and squeeze.

The Edict of Diocletian and his colleagues, commonly spoken of either by Mommsen's title 'De Pretiis Rerum Venalium' or more briefly as the 'Edict of Diocletian,' is known to us already from a large number of fragments, Greek and Latin, found all (with one exception) in different parts of Greece or Asia Minor, and amounting together to many hundred lines. It is still however far from being complete.

Apart from earlier and necessarily less complete editions (for which v. *Corpus. Inscr. Lat.*, vol. iii. pt. 2, p. 801), all the fragments known up to date were collected, pieced together, and published

(1) by Mommsen in the *Berichte der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, vol. iii. 1851.

(2) by Waddington—first in the section 'Inscriptions Grecques et Latines' of Le Bas and Waddington's *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*—and secondly in separate form, under the title *Édit de Dioclétien, établissant le Maximum dans l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1864). The latter publication is a verbatim reprint of the former.

(3) by Mommsen again, in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. iii. pt. 2 (Berlin 1873).

Each of these editions is more complete than the one which preceded it, that in the *Corpus (C.I.L.)* being the most complete of all. Since its publi-

cation, however, a considerable number of fragments have appeared; for a complete list of which I must refer to an article by Mommsen in the first part of the *Hermes* for the current year (1890), p. 17 *sqq.* None of these fragments coincide with ours, with the exception of that numbered '7' in Mommsen's list,—an inscription from Megara, hitherto unpublished, but promised as No. 23 in Dittenberger's forthcoming *Inscriptiones Graeciae septentrionalis*. This fragment coincides, according to Mommsen, with a considerable part of Chap. XVI. in the arrangement adopted by himself and Waddington, but is in so imperfect a condition that it has been found impossible to equate it, line by line, with the version previously known (that from Carystus in Euboea). A portion of this fragment must correspond with our Col. III.; and, imperfect as it is said to be, we shall look forward to its publication with interest. Another fragment, not mentioned by Mommsen, some parts of which may possibly be found to coincide with that from Megalopolis, is one which was discovered this year (1890) by the American School in their excavations at Plataea. This fragment, like that from Megara, is at present unpublished.

Our own fragment is by far the most considerable which has appeared since the publication of the *Édict* by Mommsen in 1851, both from its extent (255 lines) and from the large proportion of it which is entirely new—how large a proportion, may be seen at a glance by a reference to my cursive edition, in which the parts known already are given in light, the new parts in heavy, type.

The inscription is engraved on a slab of white limestone,  $5\frac{1}{2}$ " thick, and (originally) 2' 11" square, exclusive of a small moulding which runs along the top. The top left-hand corner and the bottom right-hand corner of the slab are broken away.

The inscription is arranged in four columns, and the original number of lines was 85 to a column. In the present state of the stone no column is quite complete; of the second, which is the most nearly complete, 80 lines only are extant, and the first 10 and last 9 of them are very fragmentary. Were the slab complete, however, the inscription would still not be continuous: for both the moulding, which runs along the top of the slab and not along the bottom, and a comparison with other versions of the *Édict* prove that a lower slab (or slabs, but there is no need for more than one) is missing. Thus, for example, our Col. III. contains a portion of the *Édict* which is preserved, though very imperfectly, on a slab from Carystus, in Euboea, which it accompanies as far as Col. II. l. 46 (*C.I.L.*) of the Carystian stone. The remainder of the Carystian fragment appears neither on our Col. III. nor on our Col. IV. Unless therefore we suppose a sudden and unaccountable divergence of the two inscriptions at this point, we are led to the conclusion that this portion was engraved on a missing slab of the Megalopolitan version. Again a considerable part of the Carystian *precedes* our Col. III., and yet does not appear on our Col. II.; it must therefore have formed a portion of Col. II. which was engraved on a missing lower slab. In my edition of the text I

have indicated, by notes at the foot of each column, how much of the inscription is missing, and where (if anywhere) the missing portions may be found.

The letters on our slab vary from  $\frac{1}{4}$ " to  $\frac{3}{8}$ " in height. The engraving is careless, as the date of the Edict (A.D. 301) might lead us to expect,—and very shallow, but the lines are fairly horizontal and evenly distributed, the number in each column agreeing exactly. The first 25 lines of Col. I. being absent, the following equation will enable the exact position of any line of the inscription to be determined :

$$\text{Col. I. l. 1} = \text{Col. II., III., IV. l. 26.}$$

One peculiarity in the engraving deserves special notice. The stone, before it received the inscription, was extremely rough. In some places the surface was damaged, in others yellowish veins stuck up and marred its evenness ; and in many cases the irregularity was so great that it was impossible to engrave at all, and gaps have been left, often occurring in the middle of a word. This added considerably to the difficulty of deciphering the inscription, as it was not always easy to determine where letters were missing and where they were not, or how many letters were to be supplied. A good example of this is Col. II. ll. 56—58, where the gaps in the inscription, added to the indistinctness of the letters themselves, made the entry for a long time unintelligible.

For an introduction to the Edict itself, I must refer to the preliminary chapter in Waddington's edition ; but the following summary, which is based upon it, may be found useful :—

(1) The date of the Edict is fixed, by the number of consulships and tenures of the 'tribunicia potestas' assigned to its promulgators, to the last quarter (after Sept. 17) of the year 301 A.D.

(2) In form it is an 'Edictum ad Provinciales'—the provincials being addressed by the Emperors and Caesars *directly*, and not through the magistrates. Thus the preamble begins with the names and titles of the two Emperors, Diocletian and Maximian, and of the two 'Caesars,' Constantius Chlorus and Galerius—followed by the word 'dicunt' (the more usual form in edicts of this class is 'provincialibus salutem dicunt'). Thus also the words 'provinciales nostri' (voc.) occur in the course of the preamble.

(3) The Edict is for the *whole Empire*. The preamble says :—  
' . . . maxime cum ejusmodi statuto non civitatibus singulis ac populis adque provinciis, sed *universo orbi* provisum esse videatur.'

Both Mommsen and Waddington consider that it was practically operative only in the Greek and Oriental provinces which were under the immediate rule of Diocletian ; but I doubt whether there is sufficient ground for this opinion. It is true that a large number of the articles mentioned are Oriental, but a very large number also are from the West—*e.g.* nearly all the woollen garments, and the wool itself, of our Cols. III. and IV. It is true also that all the copies hitherto discovered have been discovered in the Eastern provinces ; but this only proves that excavation has been busier in the East than in the West.

(4) The sums named are not fixed prices, but *maximum* prices; *v.* preamble, ‘non *praetia* venalium rerum, sed *modum* statuendum [es]se censuimus.’

(5) Wilful disobedience of the Edict was punishable by death or deportation—‘placet, ut, siquis contra formam statuti hujus conixus fuerit audentia, capitali periculo subj[u]getur.’

(6) The *result* of the Edict is mentioned by the contemporary Lactantius, *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, chap. vii.—‘Tunc ob exigua et vilia multus sanguis effusus, nec venale quidquam metu apparebat et caritas multo deterius exarsit, donec lex necessitate ipsa post multorum exitium solveretur.’

(7) The prices are reckoned in ‘denarii,’ represented by the symbols ✕ (*e.g.* in *Car.* and *Meg.*), ✕ (in *Ger.*), and in Latin sometimes by Ø.

The ‘denarius’ in question is not the silver denarius with which we are familiar, but a copper coin of the later empire. Its value has, until quite recently, been matter of the greatest doubt. Both Mommsen and Waddington agreed in *provisionally* equating it, so far as its value relatively to the gold coin (‘aureus’ or ‘solidus’) is concerned, with the ‘follis’ of Constantine; but the value of the ‘follis’ itself was uncertain, Mommsen placing it at  $\frac{1}{14}$ , Waddington at  $\frac{1}{8}$  of the ‘solidus.’ With regard to the latter point it now appears that Waddington was right; but both he and Mommsen were wrong in their equation of the ‘denarius’ with the ‘follis.’ The ‘denarius’ of Diocletian was a very much smaller coin than either of them supposed.

The document which has finally settled this question is a fragment of the Edict discovered at Elatea (*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1885, p. 222 *sqq.*). Under the heading, Περὶ χρυσοῦ it contains the entry—

Χρυσοῦ βρύξης ἐν ῥή[γ]λοις ἢ ἐν ὀλοκοττίνοις λ.α’ ✕εμ<ύρια>

*i.e.* ‘1 lb. of fine gold, in bar or in specie, 50,000 denarii’: which, as Mommsen points out in the article above referred to (*Hermes*, 1890, p. 17 *sqq.*), implies that the value of the denarius was  $\frac{1}{50000}$  of the value of a Roman pound of gold. Then, reckoning the pound of gold at its present value—*viz.* 913·59 Marks—Mommsen obtains, as the equivalent of the ‘denarius,’ 1 $\frac{4}{5}$  Pf.—more exactly 1·827 Pf.—or about  $\frac{1}{5}$  of an English penny. This determination of Mommsen’s must, I suppose, be taken as final. Only it must be remembered, that to translate the ‘denarius’ into modern *copper* is somewhat misleading; for it obscures the point on which alone the prices quoted in the Edict can instruct us—*viz.* not the relative value of *copper* and of commodities (copper money being then, as now, mere token money), but the relative value of *gold* and of commodities. This relative value was, it now appears, extremely high,—*i.e.* either gold was dear or commodities were cheap. The prices for coats and cloaks indeed (Col. III.) are high enough; but 2 denarii a mile for portage (II. 17, 18), 4 denarii for a spade (I. 41) or fork (I. 43), and the prices assigned to fodder of various kinds (II. 29-31), are such ridiculously small sums that one feels inclined to decide for the former rather than the latter alternative, *i.e.* if commodities were cheap, it is at least equally

certain that gold was dear. The *absolute* value of (*i.e.* the difficulty of obtaining) commodities remains uncertain.

In these circumstances the interest of the inscription centres

(a) In the commodities themselves—their names, the materials of which they were made, and the knowledge to be obtained of them by a comparison with evidence from other sources.

(b) In the local epithets, which tell us of the countries from which these commodities were exported; and, in this connexion, the Βίρος Βρεταννικός of III. 2 has a special interest for English readers.

(c) In the *relative* prices of the objects specified.

(8) The only weights and measures which occur in our portion of the inscription are the *pound* [λείτρα (more commonly spelt λίτρα), = Lat. 'libra' symbol π,]—the *ounce* [ὀγκία or οὐγκία, = Lat. 'uncia': symbol Γο (*v. note* on III. 38)]—the '*modius*' [μόδιος]—and the *mile* [μείλιον].

The Roman pound = *c.* 0·72 of the English pound Avoirdupois; the ounce is  $\frac{1}{12}$  of the Roman pound, and is therefore almost exactly an English ounce; the '*modius*' is approximately an English peck; and the mile 1618 English yards.<sup>1</sup>

(9) Evidently there was no authorized Greek version of the Edict. This is proved by variations in the wording of different copies, by the insertion of headings in some which are absent in others, and by some curious mistranslations. Waddington's remarks on this subject are amply borne out by the Megalopolitan fragment. With regard to headings, note especially our heading Περὶ Λαυαρίων (III. 55), which occurs neither in the Carystian nor in the Theban version. An example of mistranslation occurs in I. 11 ἀπὸ βίτου (where see note): but the mistake is not peculiar to our stone. On the whole the author of the Megalopolitan version has avoided mistranslation by a free use of transcription. *Mistranscription* is very frequent: *e.g.* πωμέντου (II. 42) is a transcription of 'tomenti,' γλεύδια (I. 39) probably of 'glūbia,' δηλάβρα (I. 40) of 'dolabra.'

In editing the text of the new fragment, I have been careful to equate it with other versions (those from Geronthrae, Carystus, and Thebes) wherever these coincide with ours; giving them credit, by the adoption of a different kind of type, for every letter which they have correctly, and adding a complete collation in the notes. This was no easy matter where—as in the first 33 lines of Col. III.—a few letters only of the earlier versions were extant, and the number of lines (but not necessarily the number of entries) differed from the number on our stone; and where Lenormant's copy differed, even in number of lines, from Köhler's later and far better copy of the same stone. The collation possesses, however, very great interest, first because it proves the general agreement between the different versions of the Edict, and secondly because it brings out clearly the points in which our fragment supplements or corrects those previously known, or *vice versâ*. I am bound to add that in

<sup>1</sup> Gow: *Companion to School Classics*.

almost every case the Megalopolitan version has proved both completer and more correct than the rest.

In order to fit each column of our inscription into its proper place among the other fragments, I have placed in the margin of my *copy* indications of the stone or stones with which each portion coincides, and in the margin of my *edition* indications of those parts of Waddington's (Wadd.) and of Mommsen's (*C.I.L.*) editions of the entire Edict with which they are to be equated, or between which they are to be inserted. Lastly, in order to knit all together, I give here in tabular form a list of the different parts of Wadd., *C.I.L.* and *Meg.* (= Megalopolitan fragment), in the order in which they must be read so as to make this portion of the Edict as nearly continuous as possible:—

- (1) Wadd. or *C.I.L.* XV. 1—22 and *Meg.* I. 1—8.<sup>1</sup>
- (2) Wadd. or *C.I.L.* XV. 23—42 = *Meg.* I. 9—48.
- (3) *Meg.* I. 49—60.
- (4) Portion missing—lower slab of *Meg.*
- (5) *Meg.* II.
- (6) 5 lines and the lower slab missing. But the bottom part of this lower slab corresponded to
- (7) Wadd. XVI. 1—18 or *C.I.L.* XVI. 1—20.
- (8) Wadd. XVI. 19—66 or 67 } = *Meg.* III.  
or *C.I.L.* XVI. 21—56
- (9) Wadd. XVI. 67 or 68—101 or *C.I.L.* XVI. 57—100.
- (10) Portion missing.<sup>2</sup>
- (11) *Meg.* IV.
- (12) Small portion missing.
- (13) Wadd. or *C.I.L.* XVII.—end.<sup>3</sup>

In Chap. XV. (our Col. I.) the readings of Wadd. and of *C.I.L.* are practically identical; but for Chap. XVI. (our Col. III.) *C.I.L.*, rather than Wadd., should be used, Lenormant's copy, which Waddington followed, being wholly untrustworthy (cf. introductory note on Col. III.). Waddington's *notes*, however, should be consulted throughout.

In my commentary, the following are the works to which I am most indebted:—

<sup>1</sup> These must be added together; they cannot be equated; for the few letters which remain in *Meg.* do not correspond to the readings of the Geronthraean stone (Wadd. and *C.I.L.*), while they evidently form part of the same, or a similar, section. This implies either an omission on one of the two stones, or a slight difference of arrangement between them.

<sup>2</sup> The missing portion of Col. III. on the slab at Megalopolis is 21 lines; and the lower slab (entirely absent) perhaps contained, like the

upper, 85 lines.  $21 + 85 = 106$ . From this total subtract 60 lines of the Carystian stone [our portion (9)]. This leaves 46 lines as the probable amount missing both from the Carystian stone and from our own.

<sup>3</sup> This portion is far from being continuous. *C.I.L.* has more than Wadd.; and *C.I.L.* may be supplemented by various fragments more recently discovered, by far the most important of which is that from Elatea (*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1885, p. 222 sqq.).

(1) Waddington, *Édit de Dioclétien* (Paris, 1864). I have borrowed from, or referred to, his notes continually; in some cases I venture to hope that I have added something to them, where the new fragment throws light on words previously obscure. For my comment on the many new words which occur in our portion of the Edict I of course am solely responsible.

(2) Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*; and the corresponding Greek glossary. (Forcellinus has also proved useful, besides the ordinary books of reference which it is needless to enumerate.)

(3) Of ancient authors, Pliny the elder has been of the greatest assistance; our inscription is continually illustrated by passages in the *Historia Naturalis*; and I owe a special debt to the invaluable Index which fills the last two volumes of Sillig's edition of that work.

It remains only to add an explanation of the abbreviations, and other signs, which I have employed.

I. In the *copy*, shading // // // // // // represents breaks or irregularities in the stone—wherever either letters are lost or, owing to the irregularity, a gap was intentionally left.

Dotted letters (*e.g.* ε, Α) represent doubtful letters on the stone.

II. In the *edition* :—

Square brackets [ ] shew corrections or restorations.

Round brackets ( ) shew doubtful letters.

Angle brackets < > shew the completion of words abbreviated either intentionally or otherwise.

Heavy type indicates portions which are new (*i.e.* not already known from other sources).

Thin type, portions which are old.

In the case of words of which the component letters are partly old and partly new—where the *word* is new (*i.e.* neither an old word newly spelt, nor the completion of a word previously conjectured)—I have appended to it an asterisk (\*) in heavy type.

The marks §§, §, and the numbers (1), (2), (3), are introduced mainly to clear up the classification at the end of Col. IV.

At the end of each entry I have added the number of 'denarii' in Arabic numerals.

III. In the *commentary* :—

*Ger.* = stone from Geronthrae in Laconia ('Tabula Geronthraea Secunda,' *C.I.L.* Vol. III. Pt. 2, p. 817, or Le Bas and Waddington, '*Voyage Archéologique*, etc., section 'Inscriptions Grecques et Latines,' vol. II. p. 43).

*Car.* = stone from Carystus in Euboea ('Fragmentum Carystium Prius,' *C.I.L.* vol. III. pt. 2, p. 821, or Wadd. *Édit de Dioclétien*, pp. 43, 44).

*Theb.* = stone from Thebes ('Exemplum Thebanum,' *C.I.L.* vol. III. pt. 2, p. 823).

*Meg.* = our own stone at Megalopolis.

Wadd. = Waddington, *Édit de Dioclétien*, Paris, 1864.

*C.I.L.* = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. III. pt. 2, Berlin, 1873

## COL. I.

(The first 25 lines are missing. Thus l. 1 of Column I. corresponds, in position, to l. 26 of Columns II., III., and IV.)

New. (Cf.  
Ger. Col. I.  
37-61.)

N

M

\*K

\*O

5

\*YN

\*O

///ΖΟΥΔΟΧΗΜ\*Λ

///ΓΤΡΟΧΟΥΚΑΡΡΑΡΙΚΟΥ \*ΛΣ

///ΙΩΝ

-48 = Ger.  
Col. I. 62-II. 61.

10

///N///ΚΑΛΙΣΤΟΝΤΟΥΣΤΡΟ

//////////ΑΠΟΒΙΤΟΥΧΩΡΙΣΣΙΔΗ

///ΟΥ

\*,5

ΣΑΡΑΓΑΡΟΝΑΨΕΙΔΩΤΟΥΣΕΧΟΝΤΟΥΣ

ΤΡΟΧΟΥΣΧΩΡΙΣΣΙΔΗΡΟΥ \*ΓΦ

15

ΡΑΙΔΑΑΨΕΙΔΩΤΟΥΣΕΧΟΥΣΑΤΟΥΣ

ΤΡΟΧΟΥΣΧΩΡΙΣΣΙΔΗΡΟΥ \*Γ

ΔΟΡΜΕΙΤΩΡΙΟΝΕΧΟΝΤΟΥΣΤΡΟ

///ΟΥΣΒΙΤΩΤΟΥΣΧΩΡΙΣΣΙΔΗΡ \*ΖΦ

Δ//////////ΟΡΜΕΙΤΩΡΙΟΝΕΧΟΝΤΟΥΣ

20

ΤΡΟΧΟΥΣΑΨΕΙΔΩΤΟΥΣΧΩΡΙΣ

ΣΙΔΗ///ΡΟΥ \* Δ

ΣΑΡΑΓΑΡΑΒΙΤ///ΩΤΑΚΑΙΟΧΗΜΑΤΑ

ΤΑΛΟΙΠΑΜΕΤΑΤΩΝΚΑΝΘΩΝΚΑΙ

ΤΟΥΣΙΔΗΡΟΥΛΟΓΟΥΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥ

25

ΤΟΥΣΙΔΗΡΟΥΠΙΠΡΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙΟΦΕΙ

ΛΟΥΣΙΝ

ΚΑΡΟΥΧΟΝΒΙΤΩΤΟΝΧΩΡΙΣΣΙΔΗΡ \*Ζ

ΠΕΡΙΚΑΡΡΩΝ

ΚΑΡΡΟΝΤΕΤΡΑΤΡΟΧΟΝΜΕΤΑΖΥΓΟΥ

30

ΧΩΡΙΣΣΙΔΗΡΟΥ \*ΑΦ

ΚΑΡΡΟΣΕΣΙΔΗΡΩΜΕΝΟΣΥΠΕΡΤΟΥ

ΞΥΛΙΚΟΥΚΑΙΤΟΥΣΙΔΗΡΟΥΛΟΓΟΥ

ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥΟΥΤΩΣΟΦΕΙΛΕΙΠΙ

ΠΡΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ

35

ΑΜΑΞΑΔΙΤΡΟΧΟΣΜΕΤΑΖΥΓΟΥΧΩΡΙΣ

ΣΙΔΗΡΟΥ

\*Ω

	COL. I.	Denarii.	
	. . . . . [✱](ν)	50	1-8 New. (Cf. Wadd. and C.I.L. XV. 1-22.)
	. . . . . [✱](μ)	40	
	. . . . . ✱κ	20	
	. . . . . ✱ο	70	
5	. . . . . ✱ψν	750	
	. . . . . ✱ό	70	
	. . . . . ξου δ' ὀχήμ<ατος>? ✱λ	30	
	. . . . . (ν) τροχοῦ καβάραικοῦ ✱λς'	36	
	§§. Περὶ ὀχημά(τ)ων		9-48 = Wadd. and C.I.L. XV 23-42.
10	Σαράγαρο]ν κάλλιστον τοὺς τρο- [χοὺς ἔχον] ἀπὸ* βίτου* χωρὶς σιδή- [ρ]ου ✱,ς'	6,000	
	Σαράγαρον ἀψειδωτοὺς ἔχον τοὺς τροχοὺς χωρὶς σιδήρου ✱(,γ)φ'	3,500	
15	Ῥαῖδα ἀψειδωτοὺς ἔχουσα τοὺς τροχοὺς χωρὶς σιδήρου ✱,γ'	3,000	
	Δορμειτώριον ἔχον τοὺς τρο- [χ]οὺς βι(τ)ωτοὺς* χωρὶς σιδήρ<ου> ✱ζφ'	7,500	
	Δορμειτώριον ἔχον τοὺς τροχοὺς ἀψειδωτοὺς χωρὶς σιδήρου ✱,δ	4,000	
	Σαράγαρα βιτωτὰ* καὶ ὀχήματα τὰ λοιπὰ μετὰ τῶν καθῶν καὶ τοῦ σιδήρου, λόγου* γενομένου τοῦ σιδήρου πιπράσκεσθαι ὀφεί- λουσιν		
20	Καρούχον βιτωτὸν χωρὶς σιδήρ<ου> ✱,ξ'	7,000	
	§§. Περὶ κάρρων		
30	Κάρρον τετράτροχον μετὰ ζυγοῦ χωρὶς σιδήρου ✱,αφ'	1,500	
	Κάρρος σεσιδηρωμένος ὑπὲρ τοῦ* ξυλικοῦ* καὶ τοῦ σιδήρου λόγου* γενομένου οὕτως ὀφείλει πι- πράσκεσθαι		
35	Ἄμαξα δίτροχος μετὰ ζυγοῦ χωρὶς σιδήρου ✱ω	800	

	ΤΡΙΒΟΛΟΣΖΥΛΙΝΟΣ	*C
	ΑΡΟΤΡΟΝΜΕΤΑΖΥΓΟΥ	*P
	ΠΑΥΓΛΑΗΤΟΙΓΛΕΥΔΙΑ	*P
40	ΔΗΛΑΒΡΑΗΤΟΙΠΤΟΙΟΝ	*IB
	ΠΑΛΑ	*Δ
	ΘΡΕΙΝΑΞ	*H
	ΤΥΡΧΗΔΙΟΔΟΥΣΖΥΛΙΝΗ	*Δ
	ΣΚΑΦΗΠΕΝΤΑΜΟΔΙΑΙΑ	*PN
45	ΜΟΔΙΟΣΖΥΛΙΝΟΣ	*N
	ΜΟΔΙΟCCΙΔΗΡΕΝΔΕΤΟΣ	*OE
	ΚΑΒΑΘΑΗΤΟΙΚΑΜΗΛΑΧΜΟΔΙΑΙΑ	
	ΓΕΓΕΝΗΜΕΝΗΤΕΤΟΡΝΕΥΜΕΝΗ	*Λ
49-60 New.	ΜΥΛΟΣΚΑΒΑΛΛΑΡΙΚΟΣΕΝΛΙΘΟΙC	*ΑΦ
50	ΜΥΛΟΣΟΝΙΚΟΣ	*Α,ΑCΝ
	ΜΥΛΟΣΥΔΡΑΛΕΤΙΚΟΣ	*Β
	ΧΕΙΡΟΜΥΛΟΣ	*CΝ
	ΠΕΡΙΚΟCΚΙΝΩΝ	
	ΚΟCΚΙΝΟΝΑΛΩΝΙΚΟΝΑΠΟΒΥΡΧΗC	*CΝ
55	ΟCΚΙΝΟΝΑΠΟΔΕΡΜΑΤΟCΣΙΜΙΔΑΛΙΑ	
		*Υ
	ΙΝΟΝΠΛΕΚΤΟΝ////////ΜΕΓΑ	*C
	ΟΝΠΛΕΚΤΟΝΙΔΙΩΤΙΚΟΝ	
	ΩΨΙΑΝ	
60	Ν////////ΠΛΕΚΤΟΝ	

(The lower slab—perhaps 85 lines, like the upper—is missing.)

## COL. I.

Lines 1-8.—These lines, which are new, are too fragmentary for restoration. Apparently they belonged to a section dealing with the *parts* of carriages and carts. Such a section, in the Geronthraean fragment (*v.* Introduction), which contains our lines 9-48, occurs in precisely this position, *viz.* immediately before the section *Περὶ ὀχημάτων*. It is headed *Περὶ ξύλων τῶν ἐς τὰ ὀχήματα*, but no part of it agrees with ours. There must therefore have been either a difference of arrangement between the Geronthraean version and our own, or an omission in one or the other of them.

Lines 9-48.—This portion of our inscription coincides with part of the fragment referred to in the preceding note, from Geronthrae in Laconia. The fragment in question was copied by Le Bas, and edited (from Le Bas' copy, supplemented by squeezes) (*a*) by Waddington (*Édit de Dioclétien*, 1864); (*b*) by Mommsen (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. III. part 2, 1873). The two editions of the stone from Geronthrae agree perfectly (at any rate in the portions which concern us), except that in some places one editor deciphered a letter or two *more* than the other on his squeeze; in these cases I have given,

			Denarii.	
	Τρίβολος ξύλινος	✕σ'	200	
	Αροτρον μετὰ ζυγού*	✕ρ'	100	
	Παύλα ἤτοι γλεύδια	✕ρ'	100	
40	Δηλάβρα ἤτοι πτοῖον	✕ιβ'	12	
	Πάλα	✕δ'	4	
	Θρεῖναξ	✕η'	8	
	Τύρχη διόδου* ξυλλη*	✕δ'*	4	
	Σκάφη πενταμοδιαία*	✕ρν'*	150	
45	Μόδιος ξύλινος	✕ν'	50	
	Μόδιος σιδηρενδετός	✕οε'	75	
	Κάβαθα ἤτοι κάμηλα* σημοδιαία γεγεννημένη τετορνευμένη	✕λ'	30	
	Μύλος καβαλλαρικὸς ἐν λίθοις	✕αφ'	1,500	
50	Μύλος ὀνικὸς	✕,ασν'	1,250	
	Μύλος ὑδραλεκτικός	✕,β'	2,000	
	Χειρόμυλος	✕σν'	250	
	§§. Περὶ κοσκίων			
	Κόσκιον ἀλωνικὸν ἀπὸ βύρσης	✕σν'	250	
55	Κ]όσκιον ἀπὸ δέρματος σμιδα(λι)α . . . . .	✕ν'	400	
	Κόσκ]ιον πλεκτὸν μέγα	✕σ'	200	
	Κόσκιν]ον πλεκτὸν ἰδιωτικὸν . . . . . . . . . . ω(ρι)αν . . . . .			
60	Κόσκιν]ον πλεκτὸν . . . . .			

49-60 New.  
Comes between  
XV. and XVI.  
of Wadd. and  
C.I.L.

(The missing portion is supplied by no other fragment.)

in my collation, the *fuller* reading; occasionally I have given both, distinguishing them by the abbreviations (Wadd.) and (C.I.L.) respectively. From the proportion of heavy type to light in my transcript of lines 9-48, and from the notes, it will be seen that the Megalopolitan version (*Meg.*) is both completer and more correct than the Geronthraean (*Ger.*).

Line 9.—*Ger.* Περὶ [δ] χ[ημά]των,—thus supplementing ours. Under the heading *ὄχηματα* are included travelling and pleasure carriages, &c.; under the heading *κάρρα*, carts and waggons for agricultural purposes (Wadd.). This meaning of the word *κάρρον* corresponds roughly to that of *κάδοο* in modern Greek; but the modern *κάρρο* is a cart rather than a waggon.

Lines 10-12.—*Ger.* [Σαρ]ά[γ]α[ρ]ο[ν] τ[ρο]χού[ς] ἔχον ἀορβιτού[ς] χωρὶς σιδήρου ✕, γ—but the final *s* in the extraordinary word ΑΟΡΒΙΤΟΥΣ appears, from the diminutive size given to it in the *copies*, to have been doubtful. Thus, though the *reading* is completely altered, only two letters in *Ger.* (OP for ΠΟ) are different from those of *Meg.*

Σαράγαρον.—Wadd. says this word probably = Lat. 'sarracum'; but 'sarracum' is a heavy waggon of some sort (*v.*, *e.g.*, Juv. III. 254, 5 'Modo longa coruscat Sarraco veniente

abies' etc.), while *σαράγαρον*, from its position, must be some kind of pleasure conveyance. I suggest therefore that *σαράγαρον* is a corruption, not of 'sarracum,' a waggon, but of 'sarraclum,' a waggonette. This would at once account for the *ρ*, otherwise inexplicable, and give us the sort of meaning we require. The word 'sarraclum' occurs once (Ammianus xxxi. 2, 18, quoted in Forcellinus), but has been corrected to 'sarracum' for want of the confirmatory evidence which our inscription supplies. Wadd. says 'Il y avait des *σαράγαρα* à deux et à quatre roues'; but this remark is based on l. 22 *σαράγαρα βίρωτα* (bi-rotata), where however we dispute the reading *βίρωτα*, so that the evidence for the two-wheeled *σαράγαρον* falls through.

*ἀορβιτὸς* is explained by Wadd. (after Mommsen) as a hybrid word, formed from the Latin 'orbis' with the Greek negative prefix, and meaning 'non in orbem flexus,' so that the *τροχὸς ἀορβιτὸς* would be the mere pieces of wood destined to form a wheel. He restores the word also in l. 18, and is followed by Mommsen in the *Corpus* (C.I.L.), though from their copies it appears that the reading of the stone (if they read it correctly) was *βιρωτὸς*.

Now, even if the reading *ἀορβιτὸς* in ll. 11 and 18 were correct, the explanation given of the word would be open to two objections: (1) no instance of a hybrid word occurs in the inscription; Latin words are either translated into Greek, or transcribed in Greek characters and provided with Greek terminations; (2) the *δορμειάριον* with the *τροχὸς ἀορβιτὸς* costs more than that with the *τροχὸς ἀψειδωτὸς*—a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory that the former is incomplete, the latter complete. But as a matter of fact *ἀορβιτὸς*(s) in l. 11 must be an engraver's error for *ἀπὸ βίτρου*, which he did not understand, and in l. 18 it is a mere conjecture of the editors for *βιρωτὸς*, which they did not understand (the epithet 'bi-rotus' being obviously inapplicable to a wheel); the real reading in l. 18 was probably *βιρωτὸς*, as in *Meg.*

Now let us turn to our own readings, *ἀπὸ βίτρου* in l. 11, and *βιρωτὸς* in l. 18. In the first place they are equivalent, for both alike are opposed to *ἀψειδωτὸς* in the entries which follow them (ll. 13 and 20 respectively). Now *βίτρος* must be the Latin 'vitus,' an obscure word, for which however there is sufficient evidence (*v.* Forcellinus, *s.v.*). (1) It occurs in Probus, *Instituta Artium* (p. 116, 22, Keil), where it appears as a feminine word making abl. sing. 'vitu,' dat. and abl. plur. 'vitibus,' not 'vitubus,' but distinguished from abl. plur. of 'vitis' by a difference of accentuation. (2) It occurs in Marius Victorinus, *Ars Grammatica* (p. 56, 17, Keil), where 'vitus' ('viti in rotis') is given as a derivative from 'viere' (to bend, plait), whence 'vimen' &c. Here Keil suspects 'viti in rotis' and substitutes 'vietores'; but the MS. reading is borne out by our inscription, which makes 'vitus' a part of a wheel. (3) In the *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* (ed. Goetz), Vol. II. p. 334, are the entries '*ἴρως*, vitus' (al. virus) and '*καυθὸς τροχοῦ*, urus'—the latter of which, or else some similar gloss, was corrected by Scaliger (*Ep.* 333) to 'vitus' on the authority of Victorinus. Thus, apart from our inscription, the evidence for 'vitus,' as part of a wheel, rests only (1) on Victorinus, and (2) on the former of the above glosses; and in each case the reading has, for want of confirmatory evidence, been hitherto disputed. Scaliger follows Victorinus in deriving 'vitus' from 'viere'; but it is more probably identical with the Greek *ἴρως*, the *v* representing a lost digamma.

The conclusion, then, is that 'vitus' (*βίτρος* in our inscription) = *ἴρως*, the felloe, or periphery, of a wheel. But *ἀψίς* also commonly = the felloe of a wheel. How 'vitus' differed from 'apsis' (*ἀψίς*), and the *τροχὸς βιρωτὸς* from the *τροχὸς ἀψειδωτὸς*, is not clear. Possibly the *τροχὸς ἀψειδωτὸς* was a solid (spokeless) wheel; for such wheels were certainly used in ancient times, and *ἀψίς* (from *ἀπρω*) may, and often does, mean a disc as well as a circle or arc. *ἴρως*, on the other hand, means nothing but a rim, and implies a periphery, with spokes, as in modern wheels. This suggestion, which is little more than conjecture, at least accounts for the difference in price between the two.

Lastly, the question occurs, How did the reading *ἀπὸ βίτρου* in l. 11, as equivalent to *βιρωτὸς*, arise? Possibly some engraver with the Latin 'vitutus,' or some such word, before him, supposed the epithet to be one expressing material; and the mistake which thus arose has been perpetuated. By the time he reached l. 18 he had seen the word *ἀψειδωτὸς*, which opened his eyes, and prevented him from repeating the mistake.

Our price  $\chi, \varsigma$  is an improvement on *Ger.*'s  $\Psi, \gamma$ , which made the τροχὸς βιωτὸς in the case of the *σαράγαρον* less expensive than the τροχὸς ἀψειδωτὸς, while in the case of the *δορμειώριον* it is *more* expensive.

Lines 13, 14.—ἀψειδωτοῦς.—*Ger.* ἀψιδωτοῦς.  $\Gamma$  in *Meg.* is probably a mere slip of the chisel for  $\Gamma$ , which is the reading of *Ger.*

Lines 15, 16.—ἀψειδωτοῦς, τροχούς.—*Ger.* ἀψιδωτοῦς, τροχο[ύς]. 'Ραιδα = Lat. 'raeda' or 'reda,' a four-wheeled travelling-carriage. It must have been extremely light, if one may believe Suetonius' statement about Caesar—that he travelled, in a hired 'reda,' at the rate of a hundred (Roman) miles a day (*Suet. Caesar*, 57).

Lines 17, 18.—δορμειώριον, τροχ[χ]ούς, σιδήρ<ον>,  $\Psi \zeta \phi$ .—*Ger.* δορμειώριον, τροχούς, σιδήρον,  $\Psi, \beta \phi$ . βιωτοῦς.—*Ger.* [ἀσ]β[ι]τροῦς; but this is a conjectural restoration of the editors, very much farther from the truth than the reading of their stone, which, if they copied it correctly, was ΒΙΡΩΤΟΥΣ. The epithet βίρωτος ('bi-rotus') is of course inapplicable to a wheel; and βιωτοῦς, which is probably the true reading of *Ger.*, as of *Meg.*, was an unknown word and naturally did not occur to them.

Δορμειώριον ('dormitorium') is of course a sleeping-carriage—not a litter, however, for it had wheels. The following passage, which is quoted both by Forcellinus and Du Cange, includes several of the ὀχήματα ('vehicula') of our list. It is part of St. Jerome's commentary on Isaiah lxvi. 20; he enumerates the different vehicles, &c., in which it is said the people shall be brought to Jerusalem as an offering to the Lord, 'Equos et quadrigas, et rhedas et lecticas, sive basternas, et dormitoria, mulosque et mulas, et carrucas, et diversi generis vehicula.' The distinction here made between 'dormitoria' and 'lecticae sive basternae' seems at first sight to bear out the meaning ('carriage' not 'litter') in our inscription; but it must be admitted that later on St. Jerome appears to use 'basternae' and 'dormitoria' indifferently.

Lines 19–21.—*Ger.* Δορμειώριον ἔχον τ[οὺς τ]ροχούς ἀψιδω[τοῦς χω]ρίς σιδήρου  $\Psi, \beta$ .

Lines 22–26.—βιωτά.—*Ger.* βίρωτα.

καὶ τοῦ σιδήρου, λόγου γενομένου τοῦ σιδήρου.—*Ger.* καὶ τοῦ σιδήρου δὲ τοῦ γενομένου. But *Ger.*'s τοῦ σιδήρου τοῦ γενομένου is meaningless, and the καὶ . . . δὲ is rather absurd. Our reading λόγου for δὲ τοῦ, and the repetition of τοῦ σιδήρου, makes all clear. As to our reading βιωτά, the third letter is not absolutely clear; but it can hardly be anything but a T, and is certainly not a P. Moreover the reading T brings this line into accord with ll. 10–12, with which it corresponds. Five kinds of vehicles (*σαράγαρα* and *δορμειώρια*, with wheels βιωτοὶ and ἀψειδωτοί, and ραΐδαι of the latter kind) have been mentioned, and their prices, *without the iron*, have been given. The present entry provides for the case in which the *same* vehicles are sold *with* the iron. Instead of a repetition of the whole list, the *first* of the five (*σαράγαρα βιωτά*, a shortened form of *σαράγαρα βιωτοῦς ἔχοντα τοὺς τροχούς*) is repeated, with the addition καὶ ὀχήματα τὰ λοιπά, which exactly = 'κ.τ.λ.' or '&c.' The reading βίρωτα, given by Wadd. and *C.I.L.* as that of *Ger.* alters the whole drift of the passage, by introducing a *new kind* of vehicle, which is supposed to be sold *always with the iron*. Probably *Ger.*, like *Meg.*, really reads βιωτά, but the word, being unknown, was not recognized, and T is easily mistaken for P.

Note that the reading βιωτά destroys the evidence for the two-wheeled *σαράγαρον*; cf. note on *σαράγαρον*, l. 10.

καυθῶν, here 'tiers'—not the wooden periphery, which we have had already.

Line 27.—Καρούχον βιωτόν.—*Ger.* καρούχα; βιγάτα. The numeral ζ' is absent from *Ger.*

Καρούχα (= carruca) is of course more correct than καρούχον; but in this inscription genders are treated with great contempt. Thus, κάρρος and κάρρον are used indifferently (I. 29, 31), πλούμος (II. 32) = Lat. pluma, τρίβολος (I. 37) = Lat. tribulum. The last however is not peculiar to our inscription.

'Carruca' in Latin appears to have been a high and pompous carriage of some kind; this at least is the impression given by some of the passages quoted by Du Cange: 'Senatores prosequabantur carrucis nutantibus' (Paulinus, *Epist.* 10 *ad Severum*), and

'alii summum decus in carrucis solito altioribus ponentes' (*Cod. Theodor. et Justin.*). Note that the 'carruca' always has its wheels βιτωροί, and is, with one exception (the δορμειωρίων βιτωρόν), the most expensive vehicle in the list.

βιτωρόν.—Though our reading βιτωρόν is quite clear, it is conceivable that it is an error for βιγᾶτον, the engraver not understanding βιγᾶτον, and therefore substituting βιτωρόν, a word which he had had already. On the other hand 'bigatus' is an improbable word as an epithet of a carriage. No instance of such a use occurs. The proper epithet would be 'bijugus'; 'bigatus' having a totally different meaning, viz. 'with a biga on it,' e.g. 'bigatus nummus.' Note also that in Le Bas' copy all we have is ΠΙΙΤΤΑ, which is meaningless; and Wadd. can only say that ΒΙΓΑΤΑ on his squeeze is 'assez claire,' and that he is quite sure it is not ΒΙΡΩΤΑ. ΒΙΤΩΤΑ did not occur to him as a possible alternative. The conclusion of all this is that *Meg.*'s reading βιτωρόν is the right one, and that βιτωρά should take the place of βιγᾶρα in *Ger.*

Line 28.—Περὶ κάρρων.

κάρρων.—*Ger.* κάρων; but Le Bas' copy has ΚΑΡΙ////, which, combined with ΚΑΡΙΝ in l. 29, and ΚΑΡΙΟΝ in l. 31, looks as if the real reading of the stone were ΚΑΡΡΟΝ, double ρ, as in *Meg.*

κάρρων in this heading appears to be a generic term for agricultural carts, including the specific κάρρον and ἄμαξα, which are four-wheeled and two-wheeled respectively. There must have been some vagueness as to the specific meaning of these words since it was thought necessary to define them by the epithets τετράτροχον and δίτροχος. The word 'carrum' or 'carrus' occurs both in Caesar and Livy, but always designates a barbaric wagon of some kind. It was common in late Latin, apparently equivalent to the classical 'plaustrum' ('Plaustrum, quod vulgo carrum'; v. Du Cange), which was both four- and two-wheeled. In modern Greek while κάρρο is the common word for an agricultural cart (cf. note on l. 9), ἄμαξα is a four-wheeled pleasure or travelling conveyance, most commonly a 'fly.'

As Waddington has remarked, the use of headings in this edict is very uncertain and inconsistent. Thus, in the present case, no fresh heading occurs until l. 53, Περὶ Κοσκίνων, while the heading Περὶ Κάρρων is properly applicable to three entries only at most.

Lines 29, 30.—Κάρρον; ✕,αφ.—*Ger.* Kâron; ✕,σν. For kâron Le Bas' copy has ΚΑΡΙΝ; v. note on last line.

Lines 31-34.—Κ. σεσιδ.—*Ger.* Kâron σεσιδηρωμένον (neuter, as in preceding line). Le Bas has ΚΑΡΙΟΝ, and I suspect the real reading is ΚΑΡΡΟΝ, double ρ, as in our version; v. note on l. 28.

ἵππερ τοῦ ξυλικού.—*Ger.* (C.I.L.) [μ]ετ[ὰ] ζυγοῦ ξυλίνου, (Wadd.) [μ]ετ[ὰ] ζυγοῦ ξυλίνου. I greatly prefer our own reading; for *Ger.*'s reading, when λόγου is restored for δὲ τοῦ in l. 32, becomes untranslatable except by taking the words in a very unnatural order; and the restoration λόγου is certain. At the same time, τὸ ξυλικόν, absolutely, for 'woodwork, is peculiar.

λόγου.—*Ger.* δὲ τοῦ; v. note on ll. 22-26.

οὕτως.—Absent from *Ger.*

ὀφείλει πιπράσκεισθαι.—*Ger.* πιπράσκεισθαι ὀφείλει.

Lines 35, 36.—μετὰ ζυγοῦ.—*Ger.* μετ[ὰ] ζυγοῦ.

ἄμαξα, here two-wheeled. In one of the earliest places where the word occurs (*Od.* ix. 241) it is definitely stated to have four wheels, and such is the use of the word in modern Greek.

Line 37.—Τριβόλος.—Lat. 'tribulum' (from 'tero'). The short 'i' (v. *Anth. Pal.* vi. 104) arose from a confusion with τριβόλος, a 'caltrop.' 'Tribulum' is a threshing-sledge. Its use is best explained by Varro, *de R. R.* i. 52, 1—'Id fit e tabula lapidibus aut ferro asperata, quo [quæ?] imposito auriga aut pondere grandi trahitur jumentis junctis, ut discutiat e spica grana.' And Pliny (xviii. 30, 72) enumerates the different modes of

threshing, 'Messis ipsa alibi tribulis in area [the sledge], alibi equarum gressibus exteritur [treading], alibi perticis flagellatur [the flail], *v.* also Verg. *Georgics* I. 164.

Line 38.—*μετὰ ξυγοῦ*.—*Ger.* [μ]ετὰ ξύλων; but our *ξυγοῦ* is quite clear; and, the plough being almost (often quite) entirely of wood, *Ger.*'s ξύλων is meaningless. The cheapness of the plough (*Is.* 8*d.*; but *v.* Introduction) is interesting. Both the Hesiodic and the Vergilian plough were extremely simple structures; and the plough used in Arcadia at the present day is almost identical with the Hesiodic and hardly more elaborate; the only difference which one can discover being the addition of the Vergilian 'aures' or 'earth-boards.' I have seen such a plough in course of construction by a countryman, and he assured me he could complete it in a day.

Line 39.—*Παύλα ἤτοι γλεύδια ἄρ.*—*Ger.* δίκελλαν τορονευτήν Ψιβ. I can bring these two readings into no relation to each other; both must have been in the original, unless indeed 'pavicula,' which he did not understand, suggested δίκελλα to an imaginative engraver.

*Παύλα*.—No doubt the Latin 'pavicula,' a 'rammer' or 'beetle,' for beating down earth in making a floor or the like. Its use is explained by Cato, *de R. R.* 91 (to make an 'area' or threshing-floor), 'Comminuito glebas bene, deinde coequato, et paviculis verberato.' The word is derived from 'pavio' (cf. *παίω*), to 'beat,' 'pound,' whence 'pavimentum.'

*Γλεύδια*.—A clue to the meaning of *γλεύδια* may probably be obtained from the entry 'gulfium' in Du Cange. 'Gulfium' is there explained in the following terms: 'Instrumentum ad hortum excolendum, apud Adalardum in Statutis antiquis Monasterii Corbeiensis cap. 1, Scalprum, Gulfium, et falcilia, &c.' 'Instrumentum ad hortum excolendum' seems to me hardly a satisfactory explanation. From the position of the word, between 'scalprum' and 'falcilia' [?'falcula'], I should rather suppose it to be a cutting-instrument of some kind. In this connection, Mr. Hyslop, of King's, has called my attention to the word 'glubo' (*v.* Lewis and Short). 'Glubo' = γλύφω, and occurs in Cato (*de R. R.* 33, 5) and Varro (*de R. R.* i. 55, 2) in the sense of 'to bark' or 'to peel.' I am inclined to think that this verb is the origin both of 'gulfium' and *γλεύδια*. The derivative noun was probably 'glūbia' or 'glūbium.' This word has been corrupted, on the one hand, in the Statutes to 'gulfium' (transposition of u and l)—possibly this was even the form in use at that time—on the other, by the engraver of our inscription, who did not understand the Latin word, to 'glūdia,' *γλεύδια* (substitution of D for B). Both transitions are of the easiest; and for the discrepancy in gender, *v.* note on l. 27. *γλεύδια*, then, —properly *γλεύβια*, Lat. glūbia or glūbium—is an instrument for barking trees.

Line 40.—*Δηλάβρα; πτοῖον*.—*Ger.* Σμ[ι]νύνην; πτόον. *Δηλάβρα* should no doubt be *δολάβρα* = Lat. 'dolabra,' a 'pick.' Possibly it was wooden, like the *τύρχη* of l. 43, and (probably) the *θρέιναξ* of l. 42; *σμινύη* is the Greek translation of the same word.<sup>1</sup> Here, as in the succeeding line, the Geronthraean engraver translated, the Megalopolitan transcribed.

*πτοῖον, πτόον*.—The interchange of *οι* and *υ* shews how early the degeneration of Greek vowel-sounds set in. Probably by the end of the 3rd century A.D. *οι* and *υ* were pronounced alike, as they are at the present day. Similarly, *ι* and *υ* (*e.g.* *ισγινή* = *ύσγινή*); *ι, ει,* and *η* (*e.g.* *ίς* = *είς*; *όλοσηρικόν* (*Meg.*) = *όλοσηρικόν* (*Car.*), &c.).

The position of *πτοῖον*—among spades, forks, and picks—is noticeable. It is not a winnowing-fan, but a winnowing-shovel, with which the threshed corn was thrown up against the wind. Possibly even the notion of winnowing had disappeared, as in modern Greek the diminutive *φινάρι* is the ordinary word for a shovel.

Line 41.—*Πάλα*.—*Ger.* μάκ[ελλαν]. *Πάλα* = Lat. 'pala,' a spade; Rich adds 'with an iron blade,' apparently on the authority of Columella; but the price given here (less than *1*d.**; but *v.* Introduction) implies a wooden instrument of the simplest kind. *Ger.*'s

<sup>1</sup> *σμινύη* is not = 'bidens,' 'hoe,' as L. and S., but = 'dolabra,' 'pickaxe.' This is proved by Ar. *Nub.* 1486, as well as by our inscription.

translation *μάκελλα* suggests that the *μάκελλα* also was a spade; and there is nothing either in the word itself, or in the passages cited by the lexica, to conflict with this. The explanation of L. and S., 'pickaxe,' is disproved by one of the passages cited by themselves, *Luc. dial. cum Hes.* 7, a passage which decidedly favours the rendering 'spade.' Lastly, if *μάκελλα* in *Ger.* was not a spade, then the spade was altogether absent from the list.

Line 42.—*Θρεΐναξ*.—Absent from *Ger.* The price alone remains. *Θρεΐναξ, θρεΐναξ* = a three-pronged fork; cf. *Arist. Paz.* 567. It is so cheap, that it must, like the two-pronged fork which follows, have been wooden.

Lines 43, 44.—*Ger.* (Wadd.) . . . . . *μο . ουγ . . . ν . . . . .*  
*λ . . . . . αμου . . . . .*  
 . . . . . *¥ ρνδ.*

*C.I.L.* ditto. with slightly different intervals. Evidently in *Ger.* the numeral δ has got out of place, so that what were really two entries have, in the transcript, been combined into one. This gave *ρνδ* = 154, a ridiculous figure.

As to the letters, which evidently were not very clear, I suppose that what the transcribers have got as *MO . ΟΥΓ . . . N* was really *ΔΙΟ . ΟΥΓ . . . N*. (= *διόδους ξυλίνη*), and that . . . *ΑΜΟΥ . . .* should be . . . *ΑΜΟΔ . . .* (= *πενταμοδιαία*).

*τύρχη*.—Cf. Du Cange's *Greek* glossary, '*Τύρχη, Furca, in Gloss. Gr. Lat.*' He adds '*Puto legendum φύρκη;*' but our inscription confirms *τύρχη* as the correct reading. *Τύρχη* *διόδους*, then, = a 'two-pronged fork.'

*σκάφη πενταμοδιαία* = a 'five-modius tub.' The 'modius' was about a peck.

Line 45.—*Μόδιος ξύλινος*, a 'wooden modius-measure;' chiefly used for measuring corn; *v.* illustration in *Rich.* The 'modius' there figured seems to be *σιδηρηνδετός* ('strengthened with iron bands'), as in the next entry in our inscription.

Line 46.—*σιδηρηνδετός*.—*Ger.* *σιδηρωτός*, with same meaning.

Line 47.—*Κάβαθα; κάμηλα; σημοδιαία; γεγενημένη τεορνευμένη*.—*Ger.* *γάβαθαν; κόνειλαν; σημοδιαν; γενομένη[v] τορνευτήν*. (Wadd. notes that the *κο* of *κόνειλαν* is doubtful.) *Κάβαθα*, or *γάβαθα* (*Lat. gabata*) appears to be a hollow dish or bowl for food. That it is a bowl, and not a flat dish is proved: (*a*) by its epithet here, *σημοδιαία*, shewing that it held a fixed measure; (*b*) by the absurd etymology given by Isidorus and others [*v.* Du Cange], viz. from 'cavata' 'hollowed'; (*c*) from Hesychius' rendering of *γάβαθον*, '*τρούβλιον*,' a mistake which could not have arisen if it had been a flat dish. That it was a bowl for food, and not a drinking-bowl, appears (*a*) from *Martial* xi. 32, 18; where, describing the dinner given by *Caecilius*, where all the dishes are of 'cucurbita' or 'gourd,' he says of the steward, '*Sic implet gabatas paropsidasque, Et leves scutulas, cavaeque lances,*' all of which are dishes of various kinds—there is no reference at all to drinks; (*b*) from a Christian writer, *Fortunatus* (c. 600 A.D.), '*Carnea dona tumens argentea Gavata perfert,*' which shews that its meaning remained unchanged.

To the meaning of *κάμηλα* (*Ger.* *κόνειλα*) I have found no clue. It must have been a vessel of some kind, and probably received its name *κάμηλα* from its shape.

Lines 49—end.—The remainder of this column is new; I have nothing to collate with it. It is a continuation of Wadd.'s chap. xv., which breaks off abruptly at this point, the *Geronthraean* fragment here coming to an end.

Line 49.—*μύλος καθάλαρκός*, 'horse-mill'; *έν λίθους* apparently = *λιθους*.

Line 50.—*μύλος όνικός*, 'ass-mill.' Cf. *Mark* ix. 42, where *μύλος όνικός* is translated 'a great mill-stone' in the R.V., the horse, for such purposes, being unknown in Palestine. Here it is by no means the greatest. The order in price (as in size) is (1) water-mill (*μύλος ύδραλεκτός*); (2) horse-mill; (3) ass-mill; (4) hand-mill (*χειρόμυλος*). The prices must be for the stones only, the price for the water-mill especially being too small on any other supposition.

Line 53.—A new heading, 'Sieves.'

Line 54.—*Κόσκινον άλωνικόν*.—This was, I suppose, a *wimowing-sieve*. Two processes

had to be gone through, viz. (1) casting up the corn against the wind, so as to separate husk from grain ; (2) sifting the grain itself, so as to separate large from small. The modern 'winnowing' combines both functions.

Lines 55, 56.—Κ]όσκινον ἀπὸ δέρματος κ.τ.λ.—The difference between this and the Κόσκινον ἀπὸ βύρσης of l. 54 must be in the epithet, which I cannot wholly decipher.

Line 57.—Κόσκινον πλεκτόν.—The 'sieves' of ll. 54—56 were drums of hide, pierced. Those of ll. 57 *sqq.* are πλεκτά, *i.e.* a net-work like that of modern sieves. For the κόσκινον ἀπὸ βύρσης *v.* illustration in Rich *s.v.* 'Cribrum.'

Line 58.—ἰδιωτικόν, 'common,' 'ordinary.'—ιδιώτης came from meaning a 'lay' (as opposed to official), to meaning a 'common' (as opposed to superior) person. For ἰδιωτικός, = 'common,' *v.* Steph. *Thesaurus*, *s.v.* ; and for ιδιώτης, = a 'common person,' *v.* Col. IV. ll. 26, 27 of our inscription, 'λίθου τραχύτερου ἰς χρῆσιν ἰδιωτῶ[ν] τε καὶ φαμελιαρικῶν,' a coarser material for the use of common people and slaves.

## COL. II.

1-80 New

A \*H

M \*S

5 ΟΥ 7A \*M  
 ΧΡΩΜΑΤ 7A \*A  
 ΧΡΩΜ 7A \*K  
 ΗΚΑΙΧΕΛΩΝΙΝΩ  
 7A \*PN  
 ΙΝΔΙΚΟΥΝΩΤΙΑΙΟΥ 7A \*P  
 10 ω////  
 ΡΑΦΙΚΗΙΣΧΝΟΤΑΤΗ \*Δ  
 ΑΣΦΩΡΜΒΕΛΟΝΗ A \*B  
 ΝΗΣΑΡΚΟΡΑΦΗΗΤΟΙΣΑΓΜΑ  
 ΙΚΗ \*B  
 15 ΤΩΝΜΙΣΘΩΝΤΗΣΒΕΚΤΟΥ  
 ////HC  
 ΑΕΝΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΚΑΤΑΜΕΙΛΙΟΝ  
 \*B  
 ΗΣΜΙΣΘΟΣΚΑΤΑΜΕΙΛΙΝΑ \*IB  
 20 ////ΚΤΟΥΡΑΚΑΡΡΟΥΓΕΓΟΜΩΝΟΥ  
 ΙΣΛΕΙΤΡΑΣ ,ΑΣ ΚΑΘΕΚΑΣΤΟΝ  
 ΜΕΙΛΙΟΝ \*K  
 ΒΕΚΤΟΥΡΑΓΟΜΟΥΚΑΜΗΛΟΥΕΚ  
 ΛΕΙΤΡΩΝ Χ ΚΑΘΕΚΑΣΤΟΝΜΕΙ  
 25 ΛΙΟΝ \*H  
 ΒΕΚΤΟΥΡΑΟΝΟΥΓΕΓΟΜΩΜΕΝΟΥ  
 ΚΑΘΕΚΑΣΤΟΝΜΕΙΛΙΟΝ \*Δ  
 ΠΕΡΙΧΟΡΤΟΥ  
 ΧΟΡΤΟΥΒΙΚΙΑΣ 7B \*B  
 30 ΧΟΡΤΟΥΗΤΟΙΑΧΥΡΟΥ 7Δ \*B  
 ΠΑΒΟΥΛΟΥ 7S \*A  
 ΠΕΡΙΠΛΟΥΜΟΥ  
 ΠΛΟΥΜΟΥΧΗΝΕΙΟΥ 7A \*P  
 ΠΛΟΥΜΟΥΔΙΑΦΩΡΩΝΟΡΝΕΩΝ 7A \*N  
 35 ΠΤΕΡΑΛΕΠΤΑΠΟΙΚΙΛΩΝΟΡΝΕΩΝ  
 ΛΕΙΤΡΑ A \*B  
 ΕΠΕΑΣΗΤΟΙΠΛΟΥΜΟΥΑΠΟΕΛΙΚΗΣ  
 ΛΕΙΤΡΑΙ P \*A

	COL. II.	Denarii.	
	. . . . . α *η'	8	
	. . . . . μ *ς'	6	1-80 New. Comes between XV. and XVI. of Wadd. and C.I.L.
	. . . . . ου πα' *μ'	40	
5	. . . . . χρώματ<os> πα' *λ'	30	
	. . . . . χρώμ<ατος> πα' *κ	20	
	. . . . . (ν) καὶ χελωνίν[ου]		
	. . . . . πα *ρν'	150	
	. . . . . Ἴνδικοῦ νομισματικοῦ πα *ρ	100	
10	§§. ? Περὶ βελον(ῶ)[ν] ? ? Βελόνη . . .]ραφικὴ ἰσχυνοτάτη *δ'	4	
	Δευτέρ]ας φάρμ<ης> βελόνη α *β	2	
	Βελό]νη σα[κ]κοράφη ἦτοι σαγμα- [τ]ικὴ *β'	2	
15	§§. Περὶ] τῶν μισθῶν τῆς βεκτοῦ- [ρ]ης . . . αὖν ἀνθρώπῳ κατὰ μείλιον *β'	2	
	? Ἀμάξ]ης μισθὸς κατὰ μείλιν α' *ιβ'	12	
20	Βε]κτοῦρα κάρρου γεγομω<μέ>νου ἰς λείτρας ,αὐ' καθ' ἕκαστον μείλιον *κ'	20	
	Βεκτοῦρα γόμου καμήλου ἐκ λειτρῶν χ' καθ' ἕκαστον μεί- λιον *η	8	
25	Βεκτοῦρα ὄνου γεγομωμένου καθ' ἕκαστον μείλιον *δ'	4	
	§§. Περὶ χόρτου Χόρτου βικίας γβ' *β'	2	
30	Χόρτου ἦτοι ἀχύρου γδ' *β'	2	
	Παβούλου γς' *α'	1	
	§§. Περὶ πλούμου Πλούμου χηνείου πα' *ρ'	100	
	Πλούμου διαφόρων ὀρνέων πα' *ν'	50	
35	Πτερὰ λεπτὰ ποικίλων ὀρνέων λείτρα α' *β'	2	
	Ε[ρ]έας ἦτοι πλούμου ἀπὸ ἐλικῆς λείτραι ρ' *α'	1,000	

	ΛΥΧΝΕΙΔΟΣΚΕΝΤΗΝΑΡΙΝ	*A
40	ΚΑΝΘΗΛΗΣΤΟΙΚΑΛΑΜΑΝΘΗΛΗΣ ΚΕΝΤΗΝΑΡΙΝ	*P
	ΠΩΜΕΝΤΟΥΗΤΟΙΓΝΑΦΑΛΛΟΥ 7A	*H
	ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΥ 7A	*Δ
	ΠΤΕΡΟΝΠΑΘΝΙΟΝΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΟΝΑ	*B
45	ΠΤΕΡΑΓΥΠΙΝΑΚΕ	*5
	ΠΕΡΙΚΑΛΑΜΩΝΚΑΙΜΕΛΑΝΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΑΝΙΟΥ 7A	*IB
	ΚΑΛΑΜΟΙΠΑΦΙΚΟΙΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΝΟΙ ΜΟΝΟΓΟΝΑΤΟΙ	*Δ
50	ΚΑΛΑΜΟΙΔΕΥΤΦΩΡ Κ	*Δ
	ΠΕΡΙΕΣΘΗΤΟΣ ΧΛΑΜΥΣΣΤΡΑΤΙΩΤΙΚΗΝΔΙΚΤΙΩΝΑ ΛΙΑΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΗ	*Δ
	ΣΤΙΧ////ΗΝΔΙΚΤΙΩΝΑΛΙΑ	*B
55	ΑΣΗΜΟΣ	*ACN
	//ΕΝΔΡΟΜΙΣΙΣΠΑΠΥΛΙΩΝΑΜΙΑ ΕΧΟΥΣΑ////ΜΗΚΟΥΣΚ////////ΑΙΠΛΑ ΤΟΥΣΠΟ////ΔΑΣ Ι5 ΒΑΠΤΗ	*Bφ
	ΕΝΔΡΟΜΙΣΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΗΚΡΕΒΕΤΤΑΡΙΑ ΛΕΥΚΗΛΕΙΤΡΩΝ IB	*AX
60	ΕΝΔΡΟΜΙΣΑΡΑΒΙΚΗΗΤΟΙΔΑΜΑΣΚΗ ΝΗΗΕ////ΤΕΡΑCΟΠΟΙΑCΔΗΠΟΤΟΥΝ ΒΑΠΤΗΛΟΓΟΥΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥΤΟΥΛΕΙ ΤΡΙCΜΟΥΤΗΣΕΡΕΑΣΚΑΙΤΗΣΠΛΟΥΜΑ	
65	ΡΙCΕΩCΠΙΠΡΑΣΚΕCΘΑΙΟΦΕΙΛΕΙ ΕΝΔΡΟΜΙCΙΔΙΩΤΙΚΗ 7I	*φ
	ΔΕΛΜΑΤΙΚΟΜΑΦΕΡΤΙΟΝΓΥΝΑΙΚΕΙ ΟΝΕΞΕΡΙΩΝΤΡΑΧΥΤΕΡΩΝCΕCΗΜΙ ΜΕΝΟΝΠΟΡΦΥΡΑCΙCΓΙΝΗC	
70	ΔΕΛΜΑΤΙΚΗΑΝΔΡΕΙΑ//// ΚΟCΕΧΟΥCΑΥΠΟΒΛΑΤΤΗC//////// CΤΙΧCΥΝΨΕΙ////ΡΙΚ//////// ΥΠΟΒΛΑΤΤΗC Γ////////	

			Denarii.
	Λυχνείδος κεντήναριν	✱,α	1,000
40	Κανθήλης ἤτοι καλαμανθήλης κεντήναριν	✱,ρ'	100
	[Τ]ωμέντου ἤτοι γναφάλλου πα'	✱,ή'	8
	Δευτέρου πα'	✱,δ'	4
	Πτερὸν παόνιον κάλλιστον α'	✱,β'	2
15	Πτερὰ γύπινα κέ	✱,γ'	6
	§§. Περὶ καλάμων καὶ μελανίου		
	Μελανίου πα'	✱,β'	12
	Κάλαμοι Παφικοί Ἀλεξανδρείνοι μονογονατοί	✱,δ'	4
50	Κάλαμοι δευ<έρας> φώρ<μης> κ'	✱,δ	4
	§§. Περὶ ἐσθήτος		
	Χλαμὺς στρατιωτικὴ ἰνδικτιωνά- λια καλλίστη	✱,δ'	4,000
	Στίχη ἰνδικτιωνάλια	✱,β'	2,000
55	Ἄσημος	✱,ασν	1,250
	Ἐνδρομὶς ἰς παπυλιῶνα μία, ἔχουσα μήκους καὶ πλά- τους πόδας ἰς', βαπτή	✱,βφ'	2,500
60	Ἐνδρομὶς καλλίστη κρεβετάρια λευκὴ λειτρῶν ἰβ'	✱,αχ'	1,600
	Ἐνδρομὶς Ἀραβικὴ ἤτοι Δαμασκή- νῃ ἢ ἐτέρας ὁποιασδηποτοῦν, βαπτή, λόγου γενομένου τοῦ λει- τρισμοῦ τῆς ἐρέας καὶ τῆς πλουμα- ρίσεως πιπράσκεισθαι ὀφείλει		
65	Ἐνδρομὶς ἰδιωτικὴ δι'	✱,φ'	500
	Δελματικομαφέρτιον γυναικεί- ον ἐξ ἐρίων τραχυτέρων, σεσημι- μένον, πορφύρας ἰσγίνης		
70	Δελματικὴ ἀνδρεία [μῆ-] κος ἔχουσα ὑποβλάττης [. . . πόδας ?] Στίχη συνψευρικ[τῆ μήκος ἔχουσα] ὑποβλάττης γ' [πόδας ?]. . .		

CTIXHACH////MOCEΥ//////////

75 ΔΕΛΜΑΤΙΚΟΜ  
 CYNΨΕΙΡΙΚΟ  
 ΔΕΛΜΑΤΙΚΟΜ  
 ΤΟΥΝΗ////  
 ΕΧ////

80 ΔΕΛΜ

(5 lines, and the entire lower slab, are missing.)

### COL. II.

The second column is entirely new. It must come between Chaps. XV. and XVI. in the arrangements of Wadd. and of the *Corpus*, since our Col. I. tacks on to the end of their Chap. XV., and our Col. III. coincides with a part of their Chap. XVI. Col. II. did not immediately follow Col. I. (in its present form), the lower part of all four columns having been inscribed on a separate slab, which has not been discovered (*v.* Introduction). There is therefore a gap at this point, corresponding to all (perhaps eighty-five lines) which was engraved in this column on the lower slab.

Lines 1-10.—Of these ten lines we have fragments only. They refer to some article which was sold by weight (the pound), and which appears from l. 5 *χρώμα(τ)* . . . to have been of different colours.

Line 7.—*χελωνίν[ου]*,—‘of tortoise-shell’? or is it a colour?

Line 8.—*νωτιαίου*.—*v.* note on IV. 11.

Line 10.—[*Περὶ βέλων*] (*ῶ*)[*ν*].—The restoration is conjectural; but fairly probable, as headings are pretty abundant in this part of the inscr.

Line 12.—*δευτέρ[ας φάρμ<ης>]*,—‘second quality.’ In other parts of the edict, *e.g.* in our Col. IV., *πρώτ. φάρ.*, *δευτ. φάρ.*, etc.—or *φάρ. α’*, *φάρ. β’*, *φάρ. γ’*—are regular formulae. In other cases we have the full word *φάρμης*, or the same thing with a short *-ο-*. And in places where the original is extant, we have the Latin ‘forma,’ of which *φάρμη*, or *φόρμη*, is a transcript.

The transition to this sense of the word ‘forma’ (‘class’ or ‘quality’) appears in Cicero’s use of it for the *sub-divisions of a genus*, noted by Quintilian (V. 10, 62). Waddington remarks (introductory note on Chap. VIII.) that under the Empire ‘forma’ was a ‘grade’ in the imperial service, officials rising regularly from one ‘forma’ to another. Our word ‘form,’ equivalent to ‘class,’ in a school, is an extension of this.

Line 13.—*σα[κ]κοράφη*.—The stone reads clearly *σαρκοράφη*. That this is a mistake for *σακκοράφη* is clear from the following entry in the *Etymologicum Magnum*: ‘*Ἀκέστρα—ἢ βελόνη ἢ μείζων, ἣν νῦν σακκοράφτιον καλοῦσιν.*’ Since it was a large needle, and used for sacking, it was probably what we should call a ‘packing-needle.’

Line 14.—*σαγμα[τ]ική*.—Another large needle, perhaps a saddler’s needle, *σάγμα* being a ‘pack-saddle.’

Lines 15, 16.—A new section,—rates for carriage and portorage. *βεκτοῦρα* = ‘vectura.

Lines 17, 18.—. . . *αεν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ μέλιον*.—The reading is certain. *σάγμα* ἐν is a possible restoration, but I do not consider it satisfactory. In any case the wages are for portorage by hand. The price is very low. Possibly the missing word was some measure of weight—that of a small-sized package; so that the porter could earn twice or three times the amount in a single journey.

	Στήχη ἄσημος (εὐ) . . . . .
75	Δελματικὸ(μ) [αφέρτιον . . ?] συνψευρικὸ[ν . . . ?] Δελματικομ [αφέρτιον Μου-] τουνη[σιον θαλάσσιον μήκος ?] ἐχ[ον ὑποβλάττης . . . πόδας ?]
80	Δελμ . . . . .

(The lower portion of the missing slab corresponds to *Wadd. XVI. 1—18, C.I.L. XVI. 1—20.*)

Line 19.—ἀμάξ]ης.—The restoration is purely conjectural; but may well, I think, be correct. The word is of the right length to fit the line; it comes naturally alongside of *κάρρου* (l. 20); and the price is suitable—viz. rather more than half the hire of the *κάρρον*, which had four wheels, while the *ἄμαξα* had two.

μέλιω, for μέλιω. The termination -ω for -ιον is common in late inscriptions. We may compare *κενήγαριον* for *κενηγάριον* in ll. 39 and 41.

Lines 20–22.—Rate for carriage by waggon, 20 denarii a mile. For this rate the employer is entitled to a load *not exceeding* 1,200 Roman lbs. (*is λείτρας, ασ*).

λείτρας.—Λείτρα (or λίτρα)=Lat. 'libra,' 'a pound.' The Roman pound was equivalent to about 0.72 (=nearly  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) of an English pound. The symbol for it in the inscription is  $\pi$ , which perhaps =  $\lambda < \tau\rho\alpha >$ . Other symbols employed, in different versions of the Edict, are  $\Lambda$  (*Ger.*)  $\text{A}$  (*Car.*), and  $\lambda$  (*Megara*). In Latin fragments of the Edict the usual abbreviation is 'Ital. Po' (=Italicum Pondo).

γεγομω<μέ>νου,—two letters accidentally omitted. The verb *γομῶ*, from *γῶμος*, is not absolutely unknown; one instance is quoted from Babrius.

Lines 23–25.—Rate of carriage by camel.—Why is *λείτρας, ασ* in the preceding entry, *ἐκ λευτρῶν χ'* here? It is hardly likely that in one case the *maximum* load, in the other the *minimum*, for which the charge was made, is given; so we must suppose that the difference is merely in the point of view—one is 'up to,' the other 'down from,' the fixed amount.

Line 28.—A new heading,—'Fodder.'

Line 29.—βικλας.—Lat. *vicia*, 'vetch.' The meaning of 'vicia' is sufficiently established: (a) by the identity of name with our 'vetch,' (b) by its use as fodder, (c) by Pliny XVIII. 15, 37, where it is classed among leguminous plants, (d) by Varro, *de R. R.* I. 31, 5, where the word is derived from 'vincio' because of its *clinging tendrils*.

Why the price should be fixed for 2 lbs. is not clear. In the next entry the amount fixed is 4 lbs., and in the succeeding entry 6 lbs. Presumably these were ordinary 'feeds.' If the sale of larger quantities were contemplated, the rate would be either per lb. or (more probably) per cwt. (*κενήγαρις*; cf. l. 39).

Line 30.—χόρτον.—Here a *specific* kind of fodder, as opposed to the *generic* sense of the word in l. 28. Presumably 'hay,' the fodder *par excellence*. The word is frequently used as = Lat. *faenum*; e.g. in the proverb 'χόρτον ἔχει ἐπὶ τοῦ κέρατος' (*v. L. & S.*); and the modern *χόρτον* = 'grass' (plur. 'green vegetables'), 'hay.'

ἀχύρον.—ἄχυρον = Lat. *palea*, 'chaff.' The combination with *χόρτος*, 'hay,' is a natural one;—'palea plures gentes *pro faeno* utuntur' (Plin. XVIII. 30, 72).

Line 31.—παβούλου.—πάβουλον = Lat. *pabulum*.—Here a special kind of fodder, for whose nature there is no sufficient evidence. In any case the name 'pabulum' proves it to have been in very common use, and the price (1 denarius for 6 lbs.) is extremely low. In the absence of more certain information, I propose the following. There was a kind of fodder called 'ocinum,' much commended by Cato, Varro, Pliny, which grew quickly, was

cut (or better, *plucked*) green, and grew again. It is said to have been a kind of trefoil. Forcellinus gives this 'ocinum' as a special meaning of the word 'pabulum.' His authority for this specific use of the word absolutely (*i.e.* without further explanation) is insufficient; but undeniably that meaning would suit the present passage. There is a kind of trefoil in use at the present day—the 'sainfoin'—which corresponds very nearly with the ancient 'ocinum.' It is a good fodder, grows so quickly as to yield three crops a year, and is in consequence extremely cheap.

Line 32.—Περὶ Πλοῦμου.—Properly 'down,' as appears from the first two entries, in which πλοῦμος is markedly distinguished from the περὰ λεπτά of l. 35. But, as a heading, it is used loosely to include (a) down, (b) down-like substances, ll. 37–43, (c) feathers of various kinds, ll. 35, 6; 44, 5. Πλοῦμος (or perhaps πλοῦμων) is a transcription of Lat. 'pluma,' with a reckless disregard of gender (cf. note on l. 27).

Lines 33, 34.—'Goose-down'; 'mixed down';—no doubt for stuffing cushions, etc., like the πλοῦμος of l. 37 and the γνάφαλλον of l. 42.

Line 35.—'Small feathers of all sorts of birds,'—only  $\frac{1}{5}$  of the price of down. The feathers, like the down, are probably for stuffing. If for decoration, ποικίλων might be translated 'many-coloured'; but the price is, I think, too low. Besides, both the preceding and the succeeding entries refer to stuffing.

Line 37.—Ἐ[ρ]έας ἤτοι πλοῦμου ἀπὸ ἑλίκης.—The stone reads ἐπέας, which is meaningless. The ἑλίκη is a small variety of the willow (Theophrastus, *Hist. Plant.* III. 12; Pliny, XVI. 37, 69). It is worth noting that Theophrastus gives ἑλίκη as specially an Arcadian name, so that *possibly* the word is peculiar to our version of the Edict;—at the same time Pliny uses it as a matter of course.

What is meant by the 'wool' or 'down' of the willow? Presumably the 'catkins' or 'palms.' The following passage, to which the Master of Trinity Hall has drawn my attention, is very much to the point. It is from Evelyn's *Silva*, Bk. I., chap. 20, § 8. The writer is speaking of the 'Hopping Sallow,' which, like the ἑλίκη of our inscription, is a small variety of the willow.—'The Hopping Sallows open and yield their palms before other Sallows; and when they are blown . . . the palms . . . are four inches long, and full of a fine lanuginous cotton. Of this sort there is a *Salix* near Darking [= Dorking] in Surry, in which the *Julus* bears a thick cottonous substance: A poor body might in an hour's space gather a pound or two of it, which resembling the finest silk, might doubtless be converted to some profitable use by an ingenious housewife, if gathered in calm evenings, before the wind, rain, and dew impair them: I am of opinion, if it were dried with care, it might be fit for cushions, and pillows of chastity, for such of old was the reputation of the shade [?] of those trees.'

The reference at the end is no doubt to the 'lygus' or 'agnus castus,' whose *leaves*, according to Pliny (XXIV. 9, 38), were used for beds by the matrons at the Thesmophoria. If the 'agnus castus' was really a willow (Pliny only says it *resembled* a willow), it was probably not the leaves, but the 'palms,' which were used.

Line 39.—Λυχνεῖδος.—(For the substance of this note, and that on line 40 below, I have to thank Mr. W. R. Paton, who has corrected a former error of mine on the subject of these two lines.) The reference is, as Mr. Paton has pointed out to me, to the λυχνίς plant, mentioned by Pollux (X. 41) as used for stuffings. It was even, Pollux says, at one time known as ἀνθήλη, a word commonly employed in a more general sense for downy flowers of any kind (*v.* ἀνθήλη in the *Thes. Gr. Ling.*).

κεντήναριν,—for κεντηνάριον (cf. μείλων for μείλιον, l. 19) = Lat. 'centenarium,' 100 lbs. It is equivalent therefore to the λείτραι ρ' of the preceding line.

Line 40.—κανθήλης ἤτοι καλαμανθήλης.—καλαμανθήλη is the downy flower (ἀνθήλη) of the reed. κανθήλη must either be a slip for ἀνθήλη—due perhaps to the κ in καλαμανθήλη which follows—or (as Mr. Paton suggests) may stand for ἀκανθανθήλη, *i.e.* 'thistle-down,' the middle syllable being dropped for the sake of euphony, the initial α—either from careless pronunciation or by an engraver's error. A former suggestion of my own, that κανθήλη was some kind of *rush* (whence 'candela,' properly a *rush*-light, and κανθήλια,

properly *rush*-baskets), must be abandoned, unless it can be shown that any part of the rush was used for stuffing.

If *κανθήλη* is a mistake for *ἀνθήλη*, *ἀνθήλη* is here used in a specific, as opposed to its general, sense, designating some special kind of downy flower; just as 'tomentum' in l. 42 designates some special kind of stuffing.

Line 42.—[Τ]ωμέντου ἦτοι γραφάλλου.—The stone reads clearly Πωμέντου (πώμεντον = pulmentum)—a word more familiar to the engraver. Evidently it should be Τωμέντον = tomenti, 'stuffing,' 'cushioning.' The best commentary on γραφάλλου is Pliny XXVII. 10, 61—'Gnaphalium [*al.* gnaphallium] aliqui chamaezelon vocant; cujus foliis albis mollibusque pro tomento utuntur; sane et similia sunt' [*i.e.* the gnaphalium and the chamaezelon], *v.* also Pollux X. 41. The 'gnaphalium' in modern botany is the 'cudweed,' a genus which includes, among other varieties, the 'edelweiss.' The part used for stuffing would probably be the 'involucral bracts'; but the whole plant is of a somewhat woolly nature.

Line 43.—δευτέρου,—'second quality.'

Lines 44, 45.—Peacocks' feathers are sold singly, vultures' in bundles of twenty-five. These are of course not for stuffing but for ornament.

Line 46.—Περὶ καλάμων καὶ μελανίου.—'Pens (reed-pens) and ink.' The ink is sold by the pound. This tallies with what we know already of Greek and Roman ink;—it was solid, like our 'Indian ink,' and had to be mixed when required. Daremberg and Saglio (*s.v.* Atramentum librarium) appropriately quote Dem. *de Corona*, p. 313, where Aeschines, in his boyhood, is described as performing menial offices in his father's school,—among others 'τὸ μέλαν τρίβων.' It was made of the soot of resin compounded with gum (Vitr. VII. 10, 2). The inscription proves it to have been extremely cheap.

Lines 48, 49.—κάλामी Παφικοί Ἀλεξανδρείνοι.—On the analogy of other passages (*e.g.* III. 40, 41, where see note), this should mean 'Paphian made in imitation of Alexandrian,' or *vice versa*. 'Paphian or Alexandrian' would be Παφ. ἦτοι Ἀλεξανδρ.

Nothing is known of Paphian pens; Alexandrian, or at least Egyptian pens are mentioned with special approval by Pliny (XVI. 36, 64) and Martial (XIV. 38, 1). Pliny also mentions the pens of Cnidus, and those from the region around the Anaitic lake (in Armenia).

μονογονατοί,—*i.e.* made of a single joint of the reed. As this is a pen of best quality, one must suppose that a pen of which the whole length was cut out of a single joint was more pliant, more convenient to hold, and at the same time harder to get, than a pen made out of several. The 'second quality' pens of the next entry cost exactly  $\frac{2}{5}$  of the cost of the better kind. A reed-pen, cut ready for writing, has actually been found at Herculaneum; it is figured in Daremberg and Saglio, *s.v.* Calamus.

Line 50.—Δευτ<έρας> φάρ<μης>.—Cf. note on l. 12.

Line 51.—Περὶ ἐσθήτος.—'Clothing.'—This heading includes (1) all the rest of our Col. II., (2) probably also the entire *lost* part of this column (*i.e.* those portions which were inscribed on the lower slab, the latter part of which coincided with Wadd. Chap. XVI. 1-18, *C.I.L.* Chap. XVI. 1-20), (3) our Col. III. 1-33 (=Wadd. Chap. XVI. 19-45, *C.I.L.* Chap. XVI. 21-37).

Line 52.—χλαμύς,—a short cloak,—especially used for riding, and in the army. At Athens in classical times it was the characteristic dress of the 'ephebus': *v.* Dicts. *passim*.

ἰνδικτιωνάλια = Lat. 'indictionalis,' the adjective formed from 'indictio,' a 'tax' or 'impost.' Here the reference is to the system of the 'annona,' under which imperial officials were entitled, as part of their salary, to be provided with clothing at the expense of the provincials. Cf. *Vita Albini*, 10, 'Huic [*sc.* praefecto] salarium duplex decrevi, vestem militarem simplicem'; *Vita Claudii*, 15, 'tantum vestium quam proconsulatus Africano'; *Cod. Theod.* 7, 6, 'canonem vestium'; and, for the word 'indictio' in a similar sense, *ibid.* 6, 26, 15. I have to thank Professor Pelham for this note.

Line 54.—Στρίχη.—A translation of Lat. 'strictoria,' as appears from Chap. VII. 56 (Wadd.) of the Edict, where both Greek and Latin are extant. 'Strictoria,' being derived

from 'stringo,'—has been explained as a tight-fitting tunic of some kind. Both the above conclusions are confirmed from another source, viz. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* II. 189, 'Strictoria, στιχάριον'; *ibid.* II. 438, 'στιχάριον, tunica.' The form *στιχη* is peculiar to this Edict.

Line 55.—'Ασημος,—'plain.' Contrast with *σεσημμένον* in l. 68. In III. 49 it is contrasted with *σκουλατόν*, 'check.'

Line 56-58.—'Ενδρομίς.—The 'locus classicus' for the 'endromis' is Mart. IV. 19,—where it is described as a thick garment of Gallic wool ('Sequanicae pinguem textricis alumnā'), to be worn when taking (one would rather suppose *after* taking) exercise, and proof against wind and rain. Its warmth is further proved by Juv. III. 103,—where the 'Graeculus esuriens,' shamming cold to keep his patron company, 'accipit endromidem.' In shape and size it is supposed to have resembled a blanket. The meaning 'rug' or 'blanket' is confirmed by the inscription, but the use of the blanket is different. It is employed not as an over-garment (the original meaning of the word), but (a) as a tent or awning (*v. next note*), (b) as bed-covering.

*παπυλιώνα*.—*παπυλιών* = late Lat. papilio, a 'tent' or 'canopy,' from its resemblance, on a large scale, to a butterfly; hence Fr. 'pavillon' (same word as 'papillon'), Eng. 'pavilion.' How came a blanket (*ένδρομίς*) to be used as *παπυλιώνα*? I suppose that this, like the preceding entries, was *στρατιωτική*,—an army 'regulation' blanket, which could be used in various ways, among others as a sort of canopy against sun and rain. Its size, 16 feet each way, is sufficient to allow of this. *βαπή*, 'dyed'; as opposed to *λευκή* in the next entry.

Lines 59, 60.—'Ενδρομίς . . . κρεβετάρια,—a 'bed-blanket.' As there is no regulation quality for this, and its value depended as much on thickness as on size, it is sold by weight.

Line 61-65.—'Ενδρομίς 'Αραβική ήτοι Δαμασκήνη κ.τ.λ.—If this was a bed-covering, like the last, it was a *fancy* blanket or coverlet. If, on the other hand, it was to be used as an over-garment,—we may compare the Tyrian 'endromis' of Juvenal, VI. 246. Note the use of the wools of Damascus and Arabia, and the mention of *embroidery* (*πλουμαρίσως*). The 'endromis' was properly an athletic costume, and a *luxurious* endromis, worn by *women*, was regarded by Juvenal as a scandal,—almost as a contradiction in terms.

*έτέρας όποιασδηποσύν*,—*sc. έρέας*.

*λειτρισμού*,—'weight,' the *λείτρα* being the standard.

Line 66.—*ιδιωτική*.—*v. note* on I. 58.

Line 67-69.—*Δελματικομαφέρτιον*.—The word is new. Portions of it, more or less disguised, are extant on the 'Theban' and '1st Carystian' fragments. Thus we have . . . *αφέρτου*, . . . *ίέρτου*, and in one case (*C.I.L.* Chap. XVI. 17) *δελματικομάφερτ[ος]*, but without comment, as the word does not occur in Wadd.

*Δελματικομαφέρτιον* is compounded of two others, viz. (1) *Δελματική*,—for which *v. Wadd.*'s note on Chap. XVII. 11, and Du Cange, *s.v.* 'Dalmatica.' It was a tunic, for the shape of which at this period we have no evidence; but its shape in later times, when it was adopted as an ecclesiastical vestment, is pretty accurately described, for church writers attached allegoric meanings to all its details. It was cruciform, had large sleeves, was made of white wool, and was adorned with tassels ('fimbriae') at the left-hand side and with a purple stripe before and behind. Waddington is of opinion that at the time of this Edict, and for a long time after, it was identical with the *κολόβιον*, which was sleeveless; but the evidence for this theory is insufficient, while the evidence of the Edict itself is all against it, for we have several times repeated the entry *δελματικῶν . . . ήτοι καλοβίων*; and *ήτοι* in the Edict always distinguishes two different things, not two names of the same thing.

(2) *Μαφέρτιον* or *μαφόρτιον*.—The form *μαφόριον* is already known; in Lat. also 'mafors,' 'mafora,' 'maforteum,' etc. (*v. Du Cange*, both Greek and Latin). The commonest meaning seems to be a female *head-covering*; but the references to it are extremely inconsistent; it appears not only as a head-covering, but also as a *πέπλος*, *ιμάτιον*, etc., and in the only passage in which the form 'maforteum' occurs, it is evidently some kind of tunic. It is consistent however in designating always some article of *female* dress; and in the present passage the combination with *δελματική* makes it probable that it designates a

tunic. The word (in the form *μαφόριον*) occurs in one inscription besides our own, viz. *C.I.G.* 8695, no. 4.—(On a reliquary) ‘*Ἐξουσία.—Τὸ μαφόριον τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου.*’

What particular kind of tunic the combination of *δελματική* and *μαφόριον* was, it is obviously impossible to decide; but we cannot be wrong in describing it as a woman’s *δελματική*, in opposition to the *δελματική ἀνδρεία* of the succeeding entry.

*σεσημμένον*,—‘with a pattern,’—presumably the stripes of purple mentioned in my description of the *δελματική* above.

*προφύρας ἰσγίνης*,—more properly *ἰσγίνης*.—‘Hysginum’ was a kind of purple or scarlet made from a plant called *ὑσγη*, but the word was used loosely for any vegetable colour of the same hue. Thus Pliny (XXI. 26, 97) says that in Gaul the ‘hyacinthus’ was used as a dye for ‘hysginum’; and in a passage of this Edict (Wadd. XVI. 94), a *ἰσγίνη* made of sea-weed is mentioned. For a further discussion of the word I must refer to Wadd.’s note on the passage referred to (XVI. 94). He decides that the colour was intermediate between the scarlet ‘coccus’ [the kermes insect] and the deep Tyrian purple [murex].

Lines 70, 71.—*ὑποβλάττης*.—*βλάττη* = Lat. *blatta*, a ‘lump,’ ‘clot,’ especially of blood; thence purple, from its colour (!); not uncommon in late Latin. *ὑποβλάττη* is presumably a purple of lighter shade: *v.* Wadd.’s note on Chap. XVI. 87. He finds that *βλάττη* is the deepest (blackest) purple, and suggests that *ὑποβλάττη* is violet.

*μήκος ἔχουσα ὑποβλάττης*.—I suppose that a numeral followed, as in l. 73, and in both places I add *πόδας* conjecturally. The *δελματική* was white, with stripes of purple (*v.* note on ll. 67–69), and the price apparently varied with the length of purple stripes.

Lines 77–79.—My restoration is of course conjectural. *Μουτουνήσιον* is the only word we can regard as certainly correct.

## COL. III.

1-44 = Car.  
Col. I. 51-II. 25  
(C.I.L.); Col. A.  
45-B. 22  
(Wadd.).

	ΒΙΡΟΣΡΕΙΠΗΘΙΟΣ	*H
	ΒΙΡΟΣΒΡΕΤΑΝΝΙΚΟΣ	*S
	ΒΙΡΟΣΜΕΛΙΤΟΜΑΓΗΣΙΟΣ	*S
	ΒΙΡΟΣΚΑΝΥΣΕΙΝΟΣΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΟΣ	
5	ΧΗΜΙΩΤΟΣ	*Δ
	ΒΙΡΟΣΝΟΥΜΕΔΙΚΟΣ	*Γ
	ΒΙΡΟΣΑΡΓΟΛΙΚΟΣΠΡΩΤΟΣΤΕΚΑΛ ΛΙΣΤΟΣ	*S
	ΒΙΡΟΣΑΧΑΙΚΟΣΧΤΟΙΦΡΥΓΙΑΚΟΣ	
10	ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΟΣ	*B
	ΒΙΡΟΣΑΦΡΟΣ	*AΦ
	ΒΑΝΑΤΑΝΩΡΙΚΗΔΙΠΛΗΗΤΟΙΚΑ ΤΑΒΙΩΝ	*M <sup>B</sup>
	ΒΕΔΟΞΝΩΡΙΚΟΣΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΟΣΧΤΟΙ ΒΗΛΩΝ	*M <sup>A</sup>
15	ΒΑΝΑΤΑΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ	*M,ε
	ΒΕΔΟΞΓΑΛΛΙΚΟΣ	*H
	ΣΙΝΓΙΛΙΩΝΝΩΡΙΚΟΣ	*AΦ
	ΣΙΝΓΙΛΙΩΝΓΑΛΛΙΚΟΣ	*ACN
20	ΣΙΝΓΙΛΙΩΝΝΟΥΜΕΔΙΚΟΣ	*X
	ΣΙΝΓΙΛΙΩΝΦΡΥΓΙΑΚΟΣΧΤΟΙΒΕΣΣΟΣ	*X
	ΦΑΙΝΟΥΛΑΛΑΔΙΚΗΝΗΚΑΛΛΙ	*ε
	ΠΑΙΝΟΥΛΑΒΑΛΥΣΕΙΝΗ	*Δ
	ΦΙΒΛΑΤΩΡΙΟΝΡΑΙΔΙΚΑΝΟΝ	*M,βφ
25	ΦΙΒΛΑΤΩΡΙΟΝΤΡΕΒΕΡΙΚΟΝ	*H
	ΦΙΒΛΑΤΩΡΙΟΝΠΕΤΟΥΒΙΩΝΙΚΟΝ	*ε
	ΦΙΒΛΑΤΩΡΙΟΝΑΦΡΟΝ	*B
	ΧΛΑΜΥΣΔΑΡΔΑΝΙΚΗΔΙΠΛΗΚΑΛ	*M,βφ
	ΧΛΑΜΥΣΔΑΡΔΑΝΙΚΗΑΠΛΗΚΑΛ	*
30	ΜΑΝΤΟΣ	*A
	ΣΑΓΟΣΓΑΛΛΙΚΟΣΤΟΥΤΕΣΤΙΝΑΝΒΙΑ ΝΗΣΙΟΣΧΤΟΙΒΙΤΟΥΡΗΤΙΚΟΣ	*H
	ΣΑΓΟΣΑΦΡΟΣ	*φ
	ΠΕΡΙΜΙΣΘΩΝΤΩΝΠΛΟΥΜΑΡΙΩΝ	
35	ΚΑΙΣΕΡΙΚΑΡΙΩΝ	
	ΠΛΟΥΜΑΡΙΩΙΣΣΤΙΧΗΣΝΣΥΝΨΕΙΡΙ ΚΟΝ	////A *C
	ΙΣΣΤΙΧΗΝΟΛΟΣΕΙΡΙΚΟΝΓΟΑ	*T

	COL. III.	Denarii.	
	Βίρος 'Ρειπήσιος	✕,η'	8,000
	Βίρος Βρετανικός	✕,ς'	6,000
	Βίρος* Μελιτομαγήσιος*	✕ ς'	6,000
	Βίρος Κανυσεινός* κάλλιστος*		
5	σημιωτός	✕,δ'	4,000
	Βίρος Νουμεδικός*	✕,γ'	3,000
	Βίρος Αργολικός πρώτος τε κάλ- λιστος	✕,ς	6,000
	Βίρος 'Αχαικός ἤτοι Φρυγιακός		
10	κάλλιστος	✕,β'	2,000
	Βίρος "Αφρος	✕,αφ'	1,500
	Βάνατα* Νωρική διπλή ἤτοι κα- ταβίων	✕β'μ<ύρια>	20,000
	Βέδοξ* Νωρικός* κάλλιστος ἤτοι		
15	βήλ(ο)ν	✕ά'μ<ύρια>	10,000
	Βάνατα* Γαλλική	✕ά'μ<ύρια>,έ'	15,000
	Βέδοξ* Γαλλικός*	✕,η'	8,000
	Σινγιλίων* Νωρικός	✕,αφ'	1,500
	Σινγιλίων* Γαλλικός	✕,ασν'	1,250
20	Σινγιλίων Νουμεδικός	✕χ'	600
	Σινγιλίων Φρυγιακός ἤτοι Βέσσος	✕χ'	600
	Φαίνουλα Λαδικήνη καλλι<στη>	✕,έ'	5,000
	Παίνουλα Βαλυσείνη	✕,δ'	4,000
	Φιβλατώριον 'Ραιδικάνον	✕ά'μ<ύρια>,βφ'	12,500
25	Φιβλατώριον Τρεβερικόν*	✕,η'	8,000
	Φιβλατώριον Πετουβιωνικόν*	✕,έ'	5,000
	Φιβλατώριον "Αφρον	✕,β'	2,000
	Χλαμύς Δαρδανική διπλή καλ<λίστη>	✕ά'μ<ύριο>,βφ'	12,500
	Χλαμύς Δαρδανική άπλή καλ<λίστη>	✕[,ζ]	7,000
30	Μάντος	✕,(α')	1,000
	Σάγος Γαλλικός τουτέστι* 'Ανβια- νήσιος* ἤτοι Βιτουρητικές*	✕,η'	8,000
	Σάγος "Αφρος*	✕φ'	500
	§§. Περί μισθών* τών πλουμαρίων*		
35	καί σειρικαρίων*		
	Πλουμαρίω ίς στίχην συνψερι- κόν* [Γο]α'	✕σ'	200
	'Ις στίχην όλοσειρικόν Γο α'	✕τ'	300

1-65 = Wadd.  
XVI. 19-66 or  
67; C.I.L. XVI.  
21-56.

	ΙΧΧΑΝΙΔΑΜΟΥΤΟΥΝΗCΙΑΝΓΟΑ	*ΚΕ
40	ΙΧΧΑΝΙΔΑΛΑΔΙΚΗΝΗΝΜΟΥΤΟΥ ΝΗCΙΑΝ ΓΟΑ	*ΚΕ
	ΒΑΡΒΑΡΙΚΑΡΙΩΔΙΑΧΡΥCΟΥΕΡΓΑΖΟΜΕ ΝΩΕΡΓΟΥΠΡΩΤΙCΤΟΥΓΟΑ	*Α
	ΕΡΓΟΥΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΙΟΥ	*ΥΝ
45	ΒΑΡΒΑΡΙΚΑΡΙΩΙCΟΛΟCΕΙΡΙΚΟΝΓΟΑ	*Φ
	ΕΡΓΟΥΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΙΟΥ	*Υ
	CΕΙΡΙΚΑΡΙΩΕΡΓΑΖΟΜΕΝΩΙCCΥΝΨΕΙ ΡΙΚΑΤΡΕΦΟΜΕΝΩΗΜΕΡ	*ΚΕ
	ΙCΟΛΟCΕΙΡΙΚΟΝΑCΗΜΟΝΤΡΕΦΗΜΕ	*ΚΕ
50	ΙCΟΛΟCΕΙΡΙΚΟΝCΚΟΥΤΛΑΤΟΝ	*Μ
	ΓΕΡΔΙΑΤΡΕΦΟΜΕΝΗΕΙΜΑΤΙΟΥΠΕΞΟΥ ΤΩΝΙCΠΑΡΑΔΟCΙΝΗΜΕΡ	*ΙΒ
	ΕΝΕΙΜΑΤΙΟΙCΜΟΥΤΟΥΝΗCΙ////ΗΤΟΙC ΛΟΙΠΟΙC	*ΙΓ
55	ΠΕΡΙΛΑΝΑΡΙΩΝ ΛΑΝΑ////ΡΙΩΕΡΓΑΖΟΜ///////// ΝΗCΙΑΘΑΛΑCΙΑΤΡΕΦ///////// ΙCΕΡΕΑΝΤΕΡΕΝΤΕΙΝΗ///////// ΗΑΛΙΕΙΝΗΝ/////////	
60	ΥΠΕΡΕΡΕΑCΔΕ ΥΠΕΡΕΡΕΑCΤ ΛΙΝΥΦΩΤ ΤΕ ΙCΕ	
65	ΠΕΡΙ	

(20 lines, and the entire lower slab, are missing.)

### COL. III.

Of Col. II. five lines which were engraved on our slab are broken away, and the lower slab (or slabs) is lost. Some of the contents of the latter are however preserved, though in a very imperfect condition, on the 'first Carystian' fragment, and are edited as *C.I.L.* XVI. 1—20, Wadd. XVI. 1—18. Then comes our Col. III. which corresponds to *C.I.L.* XVI. 21—56, Wadd. XVI. 19—66 (or possibly 67; the imperfect state of the stone at this point makes it impossible to fix the limit with accuracy). Though I say that our Col. III. corresponds to a portion of *C.I.L.* and Wadd., it will be observed, from the quantity of thick type employed in my edition, that our lines 1—35 (or more than half of the column) are practically new. In this part *C.I.L.* and Wadd. have only a few letters here and there, which it has often been difficult to equate with ours; I have nevertheless thought it worth

		Denarii.
	Ἴς χλανίδα* Μουτουνησίαν Γο α' ✕κε'	25
40	Ἴς χλανίδα* Λαδικήνην Μουτου- νήσιαν Γο α' ✕κε'	25
	Βαρβαρικαρίφ διὰ χρυσοῦ ἐργαζομέ- νη ἔργου πρωτίστου Γο α' ✕,α'	1,000
	Ἔργου δευτερείου ✕ψν'	750
45	Βαρβαρικαρίφ ἰς ὄλοσειρικόν Γο α' ✕φ'	500
	Ἔργου δευτερείου ✕ν'	400
	Σειρικαρίφ ἐργαζομένη ἰς συνψει- ρικὰ τρεφομένη ἡμερ<ήσια> ✕κε'	25
	Ἴς ὄλοσειρικόν ἄσημον τρεφ<ομένη> ἡμε<ρήσια> ✕κε'	25
50	Ἴς ὄλοσειρικόν σκουτλάτου ✕μ'	40
	Γερδία τρεφομένη εἰματίου πέξου τῶν ἰς παράδοσιν ἡμερ<ήσια> ✕ιβ'	12
	Ἐν εἰματίοις Μουτουνησι[οις] ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς ✕(ις')	16
55	§§. Περὶ λαναρίων Λαναρίφ* ἐργαζομ[ένφ]* Μουτου- νήσια θαλάσσια τρεφ[ομένη] πα' ✕μ']	40
	Ἴς ἐρέαν Τερεντείνη[ν]* ἢ Λαδικήνην ? ἢ ὀλιεῖνη* [πα' ✕λ]	30
60	Ἐπὲρ ἐρέας δε[υτερερείας]* πα' ✕κ']	20
	Ἐπὲρ ἐρέας τ[ριτερείας]* πα' ✕ιε']	15
	Δινύφφ τ[ρεφομένη] ἰς ἔργον πρω- τε[ῖον] ἡμερήσια ✕μ']	40
	Ἴς (ε)ργον δευτερεῖον τρεφομένη. ✕κ']	20
65	§§. Περὶ . . . . .	

(The first part of the missing portion corresponds to Wadd. XVI. 67 (or 68)—  
101, C.I.L. XVI. 57—100.)

while to indicate them where they do occur, as they are sufficient to establish the general agreement which existed between the different versions of the Edict.

As to the sources of that part of chap. XVI. in Wadd. and C.I.L. which corresponds to our Col. III., they are the 'first Carystian' fragment (Wadd. and C.I.L.) and, for the last twenty lines, the 'Theban' (C.I.L. only). Wadd.'s edition of the Carystian fragment is based on a copy by Lenormant, the edition in C.I.L. on a later copy by Köhler. The two copies differ very considerably; a careful collation of both with the readings of our own stone has proved Lenormant's copy (Wadd.) to be almost worthless. I have determined therefore to omit the collation of it from my notes, except in a few cases in which it supplies a letter or two which are absent from Köhler's copy (C.I.L.). The abbreviation 'Car.' therefore, except where '(Wadd.)' is added, may be taken as representing 'Car. (C.I.L.);' i.e. the readings of the Carystian fragment as copied by Köhler and edited in the Latin *Corpus*.

Line 1.—*Car. (C.I.L.)* [Βίβ]ρος . . . ; (Wadd.) Βίβρος . . . The epithet and price are absent.

The form βίρος (one ρ) is peculiar to our version. On the other hand, in I. 29, &c., we have κάβρον (two ρ's) for κάρων.

**Βίρος.**—The 'birrus' was a woollen cloak of some kind with a hood. It was a common word under the later empire. Waddington quotes the Scholiast on Persius (i. 54), who explains 'trita lacerna' by 'birrus attritus,' and the Scholiast on Juvenal (viii. 145) who explains 'Santonicus cucullus' by 'birrus Gallicus.' Du Cange (*s.v.* birrus) should also be consulted. The 'birrus' of our inscription, if one may judge by the prices, must have been a more elaborate garment than the little cape figured in Rich, *s.v.* The word is said to be derived from an early Latin 'birrus' or 'burrus' = 'red' (cf. Greek πύρρος); but Wadd. is probably right in regarding it rather as of foreign origin.

**Ρειπήσιος**, Lat. 'Ripensis,' *i.e.* from the banks of the Danube. The part of Dacia, *e.g.*, which bordered on the Danube was called 'Dacia Ripensis' (Wadd.), and elsewhere the epithets 'Noricus Ripensis' occur in combination.

Line 2.—*Car. (C.I.L.)* absent entirely; (Wadd.) [Βίβ]ρος . . . From this point ten lines are omitted in Mommsen's edition (*C.I.L.*), with the note 'Sequuntur versus decem lectionis desperatae.' These 'versus decem' correspond to our ll. 2—15. But, though entirely absent from the *edition*, a few letters are extant in Köhler's *copy*, which Mommsen used (*C.I.L.* vol. iii. pt. 2, p. 821). These letters I have quoted wherever they were fairly certain, as evidence of agreement with Meg. Wadd. also has a few letters.

**Βρεταννικός.**—Unless this word = Bruttian (*v.* Guido, *Geographica*, § 67, *Totius Orbis Descr.* 556), we probably have here the earliest mention of an import of wool or woollen goods from Britain.

Line 3.—*Car. (C.I.L.)* ////OC/3:////ΜΑΓΗ/ϸ × Φ  
(Wadd.) . . . . . μαγη ×, a. This and the preceding entry are combined in Wadd.'s edition; wrongly.

**Μελιτομαγήσιος** (= Melitomagensis). An unknown word. I do not profess to have explained it; but Mago being one of the chief towns in the Balearic Islands, and Melita being the ancient name of Malta (as well as of another island), it is possible that we have here a wool produced at Malta in imitation of the Balearic (*v.* note on ll. 40, 41), or a wool produced indifferently in both these places.

Lines 4, 5.—*Car. (C.I.L.)* ////ΥΥϸΕ////ΜΝ

//////ΥΥϸΕ////ΜΝ  
(Wadd.) . . . . . υσε . . . . . αν

**Κανυστεινος.**—Canusium, in Apulia, was famous for its wool; a yellow wool ('fulvus') was its specialty (Plin. viii. 48, 73). Suetonius records of Nero, as one example of his extravagance, that his muleteers wore Canusian, 'soleis mularum argenteis, canusinatis mulsionibus' (*Nero*, 30). The following passage from Pliny (viii. 48, 73), containing a list of places famous for their wool, accords well with our inscription: 'Lana autem laudatissima Apula, et quae in Italia "Graeci pecoris" appellatur, alibi "Italica"' [I suppose these are the wools from Magna Graecia, *e.g.* the Tarentine]; 'tertium locum Milesiae oves optinent. Apulae breves villo nec nisi paenulis celebres. Circa Tarentum Canusiumque summam nobilitatem habent, in Asia vero eodem genere *Laodiceae*. Alba *Circumpadanis* [*e.g.* those of Mutina?] nulla praefertur,' &c.

**σημιωτός**, *i.e.* adorned with a stripe or pattern (like *σεσημμένον*, II. 68). Or does it mean 'marked,' *i.e.* with a trade-mark or the like, as proof of its being genuine Canusian?

Line 6.—*Car. (C.I.L.)* /// PO/NO//3:////×, Γ

(Wadd.) Βίβ[ρος] . . . . .

**Νουμειδικός**, 'Numidicus,' new as an epithet of woollen goods. In l. 11 we have an African birrus' which is only half as costly.

Lines 7-11.—At this point the collation becomes difficult, since our two copies of the Carystian fragment (those used in *C.I.L.* and by Wadd. respectively) diverge, not agreeing even in the number of lines. *C.I.L.* has three lines, corresponding to the number of *entries* on our stone; Wadd. has six, corresponding nearly with our number of lines. As it is impossible to equate them, line with line, I give both versions entire:—

(1) *C.I.L.* (Köhler)

//////////  
 //ΤΕ /////  
 ////////////

(2) Wadd. (Lenormant)

. . . ΟΣ . . . . .  
 . . ΓΟΝΠΑΝ . . . . .  
 . . . . . ΓΑΛΛ . . . . .  
 . . . . . ΤΙΚΗΓΥ . . . . .  
 . . . . .

Of all this, the only letters which can be equated with ours are Wadd.'s . . . ΟΣ, which form part of the 'Βίρος' of our l. 7. The remainder he himself equates (and it was inevitable) with a small fragment from Mylasa (*C.I.L.* vol. iii. pt. 2, p. 820), and would therefore restore as follows:—

Σά]γον Παν]νονικόν  
 Σά]γον Γαλ]λικόν  
 Δελμα]τική γυ]ναικεία.

This restoration, charming as it is, must be given up. The fault lies not in Waddington, but in Lenormant, who copied letters which were certainly not upon the stone. Köhler, with the same stone before him, failed altogether to see them; and so great a divergence from the Megalopolitan version at this point is out of the question, since, so soon as the inscription becomes clear—a few lines lower down—it agrees with ours.

After this point Wadd.'s readings almost entirely cease to be of service to us; I shall therefore give the readings of *C.I.L.* only, except in special cases, and 'Car.', unless otherwise stated, must be taken as = 'Car. (*C.I.L.*).' Both are from the same stone, and, where Wadd. (Lenormant) agrees with *C.I.L.* it is useless to quote them both; where they differ, *C.I.L.* is almost invariably the better copy of the two.

Lines 7, 8.—*πρῶτος κάλλιστος*.—I suppose a sort of superlative of *κάλλιστος*, 'first among the best,' 'A. 1'; perhaps a trade expression. Cf. *καλλίστης μέσης* in IV. 7.

Lines 12, 13.—*Car.* // ἤ ΑΤΑ // // Ν Δ /.

*Βάναρα*.—This, and the *βέδοξ* of the next entry (the two words are repeated in ll. 16 and 17), form one of the chief puzzles of the inscription. The probability is that both are barbarous words (perhaps Gallic or 'Noric') for over-garments of some kind. At the same time it is possible that they are Latin; and 'barbarous origin' is a refuge to be turned to only as a last resource. I therefore make the following conjecture, to be taken for what it is worth.

First, what we require are over-garments—coats, cloaks, or the like.

Second, though probably of wool, it is not necessary they should be of wool; transitions of this kind being common, e.g. IV. 12, from wools of various kinds to hare's fur. Over-garments were sometimes made of leather (*v. Mart.* xiv. 130).

Third, we have to account not only for the forms *Βάναρα* and *βέδοξ* of our own inscription, but for the forms *Αη[α]α* and *Εδοξ* of *Car.*

Now *β* in our inscription always represents either *b* or *v* in Latin, generally the latter.

The Latin forms therefore were probably 'vanata' and 'anata' (or 'hanata'), 'vedox' and 'edox' (or 'hedox'). It has occurred to me that the *original* forms may have been 'fanata' and 'fedox,' which would account for both the variants. The relation between *f* and *v* is obvious; the relation between *f* and *h* is well-known to philologists. Varro (*de Ling. Lat.* v. 19) gives an illustration which is very much in point. 'Edus' (more commonly spelt 'hedus' or 'haedus') is in Sabine 'fedus'; 'ircus' (= 'hircus') is in Sabine 'fircus.' It is quite *possible* therefore that the original form of our βέδοξ was 'fedox,' which has varied on the one hand to 'vedox' (βέδοξ), on the other to 'hedox' (έδοξ); and that it came from 'fedus' or 'hedus,' and meant 'a garment of *kid's skin*.'

Similarly the original form of βάναρα may have been 'fanata'; and since 'fannatio' (*v. Du Cange*) in late Latin meant 'fawning-time,' 'fanna,' or some such word, almost certainly = French 'faon,' our 'fawn.' If so, just as 'fedox' (hedox) may possibly come from 'fedus' and mean a 'kid-skin,' so 'fanata' (hanata) may come from 'fanna' and mean a 'fawn-skin.' I give this suggestion for what it is worth.

Νωρική, *i.e.* from the province of Noricum, south of the Danube, and partly coinciding with the modern Styria.

καταβίων.—Another new word. Is it a mistake for καταβρίων, *i.e.* 'mantellus catabriatus,' an expression which is found in mediaeval Latin? 'Catabriatus' appears to be rightly interpreted as '*striped*' (*v. Du Cange*).

Lines 14, 15.—*Car.* (C.I.L.) |ΔΕ|///|ΚΟC|/// \*|  
 (Wadd.) . as . . . κοs \*μύ<ρια>.

Βέδοξ.—*v.* note on ll. 12, 13.

βήλον.—Lat. 'velum,' generally = a 'curtain' or an 'awning,' here more probably a [large loose over-garment of some kind. Cicero, wishing to describe a loose, luxurious toga, compares it to a 'velum'—'velis amictos, non togis' (*Cat.* ii. 10, 22), so that the change of meaning is not difficult. Later, of course, velum = 'veil.'

Line 16.—*Car.* 'Αν . . . α Γαλλική \*μ<ύρια>.

Line 17.—*Car.* \*Εδοξ (?) κάλλιστος \*η, (The η is taken from the copy). This is the only line, in the portion 1—35, which *Car.* has complete; and even here κάλλιστος is almost certainly a mistake for Γαλλικός.

Lines 18—21.—These four lines, corresponding to three in *Car.*, are there almost entirely gone. Wadd. has

\* , δ  
 \* , αξ  
 . . . . . ον \* , αο

all of which is almost certainly wrong.

C.I.L. has the note 'Sequuntur versus tres qui legi non potuerunt'; but Köhler's copy, which he used, proves a general agreement with our version; for it reads—

///ΓΙΑΙΩΝ|///|  
 ///|:ΑΤ|///|  
 |///|

Line 18.—Σινγιλίων.—Lat. 'singilio,' a word which occurs in Treb. Claudius (*c.* 300 A.D.), in a letter of the emperor Gallienus, 'Singiliones Dalmatenses decem,' (*Du Cange*); where others read 'cingiliones' (*Forcel*). Elsewhere the form σινγιλίων (= sigillio) occurs, this form arising in a false etymology from 'sigillum' (*quasi vestes sigillatae*), as the form 'cingilio' arose in a false etymology from 'cingo.' 'Singilio' should probably be connected with 'singulus,' 'simplex,' &c., and denoted a simple, as opposed either to a double or to a made-up, garment. The prices, which are comparatively low, accord well with this. The epithet 'Dalmatenses' in the passage cited suggests a tunic; but the position requires an over-garment of some kind.

Line 21.—Φρυγιάκός.—The most celebrated Phrygian wools were those from Laodicea, for which *v.* note on next line.

**Βέσσος**, 'Bessian,' *i.e.* from the Bessi, a Thracian tribe? We should rather expect **Βεσσικός**; but cf. \***Ἄφρος**, l. 11 (and elsewhere).

Line 22.—*Car.* (price only) ✕, ε.

**Φαίνουλα**, should be **παίνουλα** (= *paenula*), as in next line. The form **φαίνουλα** is a compromise between the Lat. 'paenula' and the late Greek **φαινῶλης**, which bore the same meaning.

The 'paenula' was an over-garment of very thick woollen material, round in shape, and sleeveless; shorter than the toga, but long enough to cover the arms when hanging by the sides (*v.* Forcellinus, *s.v.*). Rich (*s.v.*) gives some useful references. It was used especially in wet weather; thus Galba, when asked for a 'paenula,' replied 'Non pluit, non opus est tibi; si pluit, ipse utar' (Quint. vi. 3, 66). Milo, at the time of the meeting with Clodius, is described as 'paenula irretitus' [the garment being sleeveless] (Cic. *pro Milone*, xx. 54).

**Λαδικήνη**, 'Laodicean.'—This is the Laodicea in *Phrygia*, famous for its wool (*v.* note on ll. 4, 5, quotation from Pliny); to be carefully distinguished from the *Syrian* Laodicea, which was celebrated for its linen (*v.* Wadd.'s note on chap. xvi. 11). The woollen materials of Laodicea were remarkable for their **χρῶα κοραξή** (= 'raven-black'—Strabo xii. 7, 16), and also for their softness (**μαλακότης**). Pliny (viii. 48, 73) places them at the head of Asiatic wools.

Line 23.—*Car.* (price only) ✕, δ.

**Βαλυσείνη**.—Possibly a lengthened form of **Βαλσεινή**, *i.e.* from Balsa (Plin. iv. 21, 35), a town of Lusitania in Spain. Spanish wool occurs elsewhere in our inscription (**ἐρέας Ἀστυρκησίας**, IV. 5). As an alternative Mr. Hicks suggests that 'Venusina' (Venusia in Apulia) is intended.

Line 24.—*Car.* (price only) ✕ α μ <ύρια>, βφ.

**Φιβλατόριον**, spelt in *Car.*, where it occurs in a later passage, **φιβουλατόριον**. 'Fibulatorium' is no doubt a cloak to fasten with a buckle or buckles. It occurs in Trebellius as an epithet of 'sagum.'

**Ραιδικάνον**, from the *Rhoeti*? (cf. Hor. *Od.* iv. 4, 17; iv. 14, 15, &c.). They occupied the modern Tyrol, and bordered on the Norici, whom we know already (*v.* ll. 12, 14, 18) to have exported wool.

Line 25.—*Car.* . . . . ον ✕, η . . .

**Τρεβερικόν**.—The Treveri, or Treviri, were a Gallic tribe, whose territory was situated between the Rhine and the Meuse. Their chief town, Augusta Trevirorum, is the modern Trier, or Trèves, on the Moselle.

Line 26.—*Car.* . . . . ικον ✕, ε.

**Πετροβλωνικόν**.—Petovio (modern Pettau) was a town in Pannonia. Possibly, however, the reference is not to Petovio, but to Patavium (modern Padova, near Venice), which sent woollen garments, &c., in great quantities to Rome. The names were easily confused; Petovio is even called by Ptolemy (II. 15, 4) **Παταύιον**. Strabo (v. 1, 7), commenting on the flourishing condition of Patavium in his time, remarks: 'Δηλοὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς πεμπομένης κατασκευῆς εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην κατ' ἐμπορίαν, τῶν τε ἄλλων καὶ ἐσθῆτος παντοδαπῆς, τὴν εὐανδρίαν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὴν εὐτυχίαν.' And (v. 1, 12) [Ἐρέαν δὲ τὴν μέσην—*i.e.* of medium roughness—**φέρουσι**] 'οἱ περὶ Παταύιον, ἐξ ἧς οἱ τάπητες οἱ πολυτελεῖς, καὶ γάυσασποι (a shaggy woollen material), καὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶδος πάν, ἀμφίμαλλον τε καὶ ἑτερόμαλλον' (*i.e.* with shaggy nap on both sides or only on one). He goes on to say that for a softer wool Mutina had a greater repute (*v.* note on l. 39.).

Line 27.—Entirely absent from *Car.*

Line 28.—*Car.* has a portion of the price only . . ρφ, an impossible combination. The φ alone is correct.

**Χλαμύς**, *v.* note on II. 52.

**Δαρδανική**.—Not from Dardanus in the Troad, but from the territory of the Dardani, a tribe which occupied a district to the south of the Danube, corresponding to the southern portion of the modern Servia.

Line 29.—*Car.* (the price only) ✕, ζ, an addition to our stone, on which the numeral is indistinct.

Line 30.—*Car.* (Wadd.) has the price only, ✕,δ, probably a mistake for our ✕,α; but our own numeral is not quite clear.

(*C.I.L.*) has the single letter . . α . . , the restoration of a doubtful stroke in the copy, which *may* have been the numeral. There is considerable confusion here in *C.I.L.*, this entry being in the cursive edition amalgamated with the next.

**Μάντρος**,—‘Mantum’ and ‘mantellum’ are common in mediaeval Latin; generally neuter, but the masculine forms also occur. Isidorus describes it as a *short* cloak, even deriving its name from its shortness, ‘quod manus tegat tantum’ (!). Its shortness perhaps accounts for its cheapness; but it cannot have been always short, for the word is sometimes used as = pallium.

Lines 31, 32.—*Car.* . . . . . να . . . α . . . . . του . . . γικος ✕,η  
which agrees almost perfectly with our stone.

**Σάγος**.—Lat. ‘sagus’ or more commonly ‘sagum.’ Both word and garment are of barbarian origin. The ‘sagum’ was a rectangular piece of ‘shaggy’ [same word] woollen cloth, thrown over one shoulder and buckled over the other. It was worn especially by officers, common soldiers, and slaves, in place of the ‘toga’ (*v. Rich, s.v., and Wadd.’s note on chap. XVI. 26.*)

**Ἀμβιανήσιος** = Lat. ‘Ambianensis.’—The chief town of the Ambiani—known by the name of the tribe—is the modern *Amiens*.

The present entry is probably identical with an entry in a small Latin fragment from Mylasa—the fragment which Wadd. wrongly identified with our III. 7 *sqq.* (*v. note on III. 7—11.*) The entry there reads ‘Sagum Gallicum hoc est . . . octo milibus.’ Wadd. suggested ‘Atrebatium’ (*i.e.* of *Arras*) to fill the gap, ‘Atrebatia saga’ being famous. Amiens belongs of course to the same region.

**Βιτουρητικός**.—I suppose ‘of the Bituriges.’ Their capital, Avaricum, is the modern Bourges.

Line 33.—*Car.* . . . α . . . . ✕φ .  
α . . . . = Ἀ[φρος].

**34, 35.**—A new heading.

*Car.* (Wadd.) ΠΕΡΙΤ . . . . . ΤΩΝΧΗΡ . . . . .

which Wadd. restored conjecturally Περὶ τῆς ἐργασίας τῶν σερ[ικῶν καὶ τῶν πέξων]. But Köhler’s reading (*C.I.L.*) of which the only letters given as certain are

Τ////Θ////////ΛΟΥ////  
ΤΩΝΧΗΡΙΚΑΡΙ////

proves the reading of *Car.* to have agreed in substance with our own. The first Τ should of course be Π.

**Πλουμαρίων**.—‘Plumarii’ = ‘embroiderers’; the word referred originally no doubt to some sort of ornamental feather-work, but afterwards to embroidery in general.

**Σειρικαρίων**.—*Car.* reads σερικαρί[ων]. ‘Sericarii’ are probably ‘silk-weavers,’ but *v. note on l. 47.*

Lines 36, 37.—*Car.* Πλουμαρίῳ ἰς στίχην σ . . . κο[ν ὀ <γκίας> α ✕]τ . . . Mommsen (*C.I.L.*) restored σ[ηρικόν].

The expression ἰς στίχην is perhaps elliptical for ἐργαζομένῳ ἰς στίχην, ‘working at (or “on”) a στίχην.’ It is used in connection with weaving (II. 47—50, and I. 58) as well as embroidery. The full form occurs in l. 47. Ἐν ἱματίοις κ.τ.λ. (I. 53) must have the same sense. When the material in which the embroidery is executed is mentioned, it is with the preposition διὰ (διὰ χρυσοῦ, I. 42, where *v. note.*)

στίχην, *v. note on II. 54.*

**συνσειρικόν**, Lat. ‘subsericum,’ ‘half-silk’; as opposed to ὀλοσειρικόν, ‘holosericum,’ ‘all silk.’ The insertion of the ν is due to false etymology, and is peculiar to our version. συνσειρικόν, the reading of *Theb.* in similar passages, is more correct. *Car.* has συψηρικόν.

[Γο] α'.—For the symbol ΓΟ *v.* note on next line. Embroidery is paid for by the ounce (ΓΟ = *ογκία* = 'uncia') of material used. The material (silk or wool) of the embroidery varied with the material on which it was worked. Thus the charge for embroidering a woollen garment (ll. 39–41) is very much less than for embroidering on silk.

Line 38.—*Car.* is *στίχην* [ὄλ]οσηρικόν[ν . . .] ὀ<γκίας> α ✕τ.  
ὄλοσηρικόν.—*v.* note on *συνψερικόν*, ll. 36, 37.

Γο.—The symbol used in our inscription for *ογκία* or *οὐγκία* = Lat. 'uncia,' an 'ounce,' the *twelfth* part of a Roman pound. The Roman pound being about three-quarters of the English, it follows that the Roman ounce was almost exactly equivalent to the English ounce.

The symbol used in *Car.* is Ὢ, which must represent Οὐ. Our engraver perhaps had a similar monogram of Ὅγ before him, and misread it Γο.

Line 39.—*Car.* is *χλαμύ*[δ]α *Μουτουνησιαν* ὀ<γκίας> α ✕κε.

Our reading *χλανίδα* is a distinct gain. We have done with *χλαμύδες* long ago (l. 29), and it is hardly likely we should return to them.

The *χλανίς* was a cloak of finer material than the *χλαμύς*, less generally military, and worn by women as well as by men. It accords well with this that we find it made of the wool of Mutina, which was famous for its softness; *v.* next note. In shape it is said to have resembled the *χλαίνα* rather than the *χλαμύς*, but *χλαίνα* itself is a somewhat vague term.

*Μουτουνησιαν*.—Rightly explained by Mommsen, followed by Wadd., as = 'Mutinensem.' '—ήσιος' in the inscription is the regular representative of Lat. '—ensis': *e.g.* 'Ρειπήσιος = Ripensis; 'Αμβιανήσιος = Ambianensis; 'Αστυρκήσιος = Astur(i)censis. Mutina was famous for a soft wool. Strabo (v. 1, 12) says: 'Ἐρέαν δὲ τὴν μὲν μαλακὴν οἱ περὶ Μουτίνην καὶ τὸν Σκουτάναν ποταμὸν φέρουσι πασῶν πολὺ καλλίστην.' Cf. note on l. 26.

Lines 40, 41.—*Car.* (C.I.L.) is *χλαμύδα* *Δαδικήην* [Μ]ουτουνησιαν ὀ<γκίας> α ✕κε.  
(Wadd.) *ibid.* but *Μοτουνησιαν* for [Μ]ουτουνησιαν.

*Δαδικήην Μουτουνησιαν*, 'faite à Laodicée en imitation de celles de Modène' is Wadd.'s explanation. He compares chap. XVI. 12, 'Βίβρος Δαδικηνός ἐν ὁμοίῳτι Νερβικοῦ.'

With *Δαδικήην Μουτουνησιαν* cf. *Ταρσικαλεξανδρείων* (IV. 36 *sqq.*), elsewhere written *Ταρσικῶν Ἀλεξανδρείων*,—*Παφικοὶ Ἀλεξανδρείνοι* (II. 48), &c. The only question is whether Wadd.'s arrangement should not be inverted, the *second* of the two names being that which denotes the actual place of origin. It would seem more natural that the epithet by which the thing was popularly known should come first, and in intimate connection with the substantive—afterwards the corrective local epithet. This arrangement, in the case of the epithets *Ταρσικοὶ Ἀλεξανδρείνοι*, would also remove the difficulty which Wadd. himself feels (note on chap. XVII. 5)—the absence of any mention of linens from Egypt.

Lines 42, 43.—*ἔργου πρωτίστου*, *Car.* *ὑπὲρ ἔργου πρωτείου*. Γο α', absent from *Car.* Wadd. rightly restores it.

*Βαρβαρικάριος* = Lat. 'barbaricarius,' an embroiderer in gold. This was especially an Oriental art. Another word for the same thing was 'Phrygio.' *διὰ χρυσοῦ*.—Apparently 'with (we should say rather "in") gold.' Perhaps it was from this that the expression *διάχρυσος* (in one word) arose; *e.g.* Polybius, vi. 53, 7, where Mr. Shuckburgh translates rightly 'embroidered with gold.'

Line 44.—*ἔργου δευτερίου*.—*Car.* *ἔργο[υ δ]ευτερείου*.

Lines 45–64.—From l. 45 to the end of the column, we have the assistance of a fragment from Thebes (*Rhein. Mus.* 1864, pp. 610–614; *C.I.L.* vol. iii. pt. 2. p. 823). The Theban fragment has the last halves of the lines only, but it is specially valuable from our l. 56 onwards, where both *Car.* and *Meg.* are defective. I give the readings of *Theb.* from the copy, *C.I.L.* p. 823.

Line 45.—*Car.* [Β]αρβαρικάρι[ος] *is* ὄλοσηρικόν ὀ<γκίας> α[✕]φ.

*Theb.* . . . . σερικόν [ὑ]πέ[ρ] (ὠν)α ✕ψ.

όλοσειρικόν, *v.* note on ll. 36, 37, *συνψειρικόν*.

Line 46.—*Car.* inserts δ<γκίας>α'

*Theb.* . . . . ὑπὲρ οὐ(π) α' ✕ υ'.

Line 47.—*Car.* Σηρικαρίῳ ἐργ[αζο]μένῳ εἰς συ[ψ]ηρικόν τρεφομ[ένῳ] ἡμερήσια]. . . .

*Theb.* . . . . σ[μ]ένῳ ἰς σουψειρικόν τρε . . . . ✕ κ ε

thus confirming our somewhat doubtful numeral.

Σειρικαρίῳ.—Σειρικάριος ('sericarius') is almost certainly a *weaver* in silk, not an embroiderer in silk :

(1) because the *πλουμάριος* of ll. 36—38 probably embroidered in silk, and it is unlikely that we should have him again under a different name.

(2) because it would be absurd to embroider upon a check background (l. 50).

(3) because if the *σειρικάριος* were an embroiderer, he would probably be paid, not by the day, but (like the *πλουμάριος* and *βαρβαρικάριος*) by the ounce of material employed.

ἡμερ<ήσια>, 'daily pay,' . . . . a day.'

τρεφομένῳ, 'in addition to his board.'

Line 49.—*Car.* εἰς for ἰς ; ὄλοσηρικόν for ὄλοσειρικόν ; τρεφομένῳ ἡμερήσια in full.

*Theb.* . . . . ἄσημον τ[ρεφο]μένῳ ἡμερ<ήσια> ✕ κέ.

ἄσημον, 'plain' ; as opp. to *σκουτλάτων* in next line.

Line 50.—*Car.* εἰς ὄλοσηρικόν σκουτλάτων ✕ ξ

*Theb.* . . . . κουτλά[τ]ων ✕ μ'

σκουτλάτων = Lat. 'scutulatum' or 'scutulatum,' a word which must indicate a pattern of some kind, presumably a *check*. Du Cange quotes Juv. ii. 97, 'Caerulea indutus scutulata ["a blue check"] aut galbana rasa' ; and, for the meaning, Pliny viii. 48, 74 'Scutulis *dividere* Gallia' instituit].

Lines 51, 52.—*Car.* ὑπὲρ εἰματίου for εἰματίου ; εἰς for ἰς ; ἡμερήσια for ἡμερ<ήσια>.

*Theb.* . . . . ἐρ εἰματίου πέ[ξ]ου τῶν εἰς πα . . . ✕ ιβ

Γερδιά, 'a female weaver.'—'Γέρδιος, ὑφάντης' (Suidas).

At this point we pass from silk to wool ; the new heading would come much better here than at l. 55.

πέξου.—πέξος = Lat. 'pexus,' which commonly = 'with the nap on,' as opp. to 'rasus,' 'thread-bare.' Here apparently a particular *kind* of material, presumably a material with long hairy nap.

τῶν ἰς παράδοσιν.—Cf. 'τῶ[v] εἰς παράστασιν καὶ [εἰ]ς παράδοσιν' in *Theb.* (C.I.L. chap. XVI. 58). Παράστασις = 'retail trade' (Arist. *Pol.* I. 11, 4 ; and *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* II. 396, where 'exhibitio' perhaps = 'exposition for sale'). Παράδοσις ('mancipatio, traditio,' *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* II. 394) may, when opposed to παράστασις, mean 'wholesale trade' ; but this requires confirmation.

Lines 53, 54.—*Car.* ἐν εἰματίοις Μουτουνησίοις ΗΤΟΙ/Ε//ΠΟΙΕ τρεφομένη ✕ ι

(Wadd. here has the correct price ✕ ἰς).

*Theb.* . . . . (γα)νησίοις ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς ✕ ἰς

There is no trace of a lost τρεφομένη on our stone.

ἐν εἰματίοις κ.τ.λ.—*v.* note on ἰς στίχην, l. 36.

Line 55.—Περὶ λαναρίων.—The heading occurs neither in *Car.* nor in *Theb.* It by no means adds to the clearness of the inscription, the real transition occurring not here, but at the female weaver (*γερδιά*) of l. 51.

Lines 56, 57.—*Car.* Δ . . . ἀρ . . . ζομένῳ Μουτουνη . . . . κα τρεφομένῳ λί<τρα>α' ✕ μ  
(Wadd.'s 'Λα<δικηνά>') arose from his mistaking Λ Α [= λίτρα α'] for the beginning of a word.)

*Theb.* . . . . νησία ἢ [θ]αλάσσια τρεφο . . . . ✕ μ'

thus filling a gap in *Car.*, confirming *Meg.* in the main, but distinguishing *Μουτουνησία* from *θαλάσσια* by interposing the conjunction ἢ.

θαλάσσια.—Were this the only place where the word occurred, I should suggest that it indicated *colour* [*θαλάσσιος* or *θαλάττιος* = *αλουργής* ; *v.* Sophocles' *Lexicon*]. But in

IV. 11, it appears to indicate a special *kind* of wool. May it have been a wool coming from some district over sea, and commonly known as 'lana Marina' or *ἐρέα Θαλάσσια*? Or, better still, from some district on the sea-shore? for Pliny (xxxii. 6. 33) tells us that sea-water was good for the fleeces of sheep, softening the wool.

If our reading (without the  $\eta$ ) is correct, *Μουτουνήσια θαλάσσια* = *θαλάσσια* made in imitation of *Μουτουνήσια*, or *vice versa* (v. note on ll. 40, 41).

Lines 58, 59.—*Car.* . . . . *τεινην* . . . *ικη* . . . . *ην* (× λ)

*Theb.* . . *ην ἡ Λαδικήνην ἰαρ* . . . . × λ'

The whole of my restoration therefore comes from *Car.* or *Theb.* *Meg.* adds the beginning and end of the line. The  $\eta$  . . .  $\eta$  thus arrived at is rather suspicious, and one is inclined to conjecture that *ἡ Λαδικήνην* may have been absent from *Meg.*; but (except by assuming an unusually large break in the stone) it is impossible to fill the necessary space without it. As an alternative it might be suggested that, though our *ἡ ἀλιείνην* is quite clear, the  $\eta$  is a mistake, and that the true reading is *ἡ Λαδικήνην ἀλιείνην*. Then, if *ἀλιείνην* = 'marinam,' the reference might be to the *Syrian* Laodicea, Laodicea 'ad Mare'; but the weak point in this is that we have no evidence for an export of woollen goods from the *Syrian* Laodicea.

*Τερεντέινην*.—For the wool of Tarentum v. note on ll. 4, 5 (quotation from Pliny).

Line 60.—From here to the end *Car.* is illegible. The copy used by Wadd. has indeed, in the next five lines, the letters—

. . Λ . . Δ . . . . &c.  
 . . HXH . . . . &c.  
 . . . . . &c.  
 . . . . . ΑΛ . . . &c.  
 . . . . . ΗCΟ . . . &c.

which, if correct, would argue a divergence from our stone. But, as before stated, this copy is utterly unreliable; so that these letters, and Wadd.'s attempted restoration, must be given up.

On the other hand *Theb.* and *Meg.* here supplement each other, the former supplying the second half, the latter the first half, of the lines. In the present line (60) *Theb.* reads—

. . . . . *δευ]ερείας ὑπὲρ λ. α' × κ'*

I have omitted *ὑπὲρ* in my restoration of *Meg.*, so as to make it accord with other lines.

Line 61.—*Theb.* . . . . *τρι]είας ὑπὲρ λ. α' × ιε'*

Lines 62, 63.—*Theb.* . . . . *ε]ἰς ἔργον πρωτείου ἡμερ × μ'*

The *λινώφος* is somewhat out of his place.

Line 64.—*Theb.* . . . *ον τρεφομένω × κ'*. Mommsen (*C.I.L.*) hit on the true restoration, now confirmed by *Meg.* In these 5 lines (60–64) the dove-tailing of *Meg.* and *Theb.* is almost perfect.

Line 65.—This line began a new section. The heading appears to have been peculiar to *Meg.*; for l. 19 in *Theb.*, which would otherwise correspond with our l. 65, reads . . . . . *νης × ν'*,—an entry and a price.

## COL. IV.

1-50 New.

ΕΡΕΑΣΤΕΡΕΝΤ////ΕΙΝΗΣΠΕΠΛΥ  
 ΜΕΝΗΣ 7A \*ΡΟΕ  
 ΕΡΕΑΣΛΑΔΙΚΗΝΗΣΠΕΠΛΥΜΕ  
 ΝΗΣ 7A \*ΡΝ  
 5 ΕΡΕΑΣΑΣΤΥΡ////ΚΗΣΙΑΣΠΕΠΛΥ  
 ΜΕΝΗΣ 7A \*Ρ  
 ΕΡΕΑΣΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΗΣΜΕΧΗΣΠΕΠΛΥ  
 ΜΕΝΗΣ 7A \*Ν  
 10 ΤΗΣΛΟΙΠΗΣΠΑΧΗΣΕΡΕΑ////ΣΠΕΠΛΥ  
 ΜΕΝΗΣ 7A \*ΚΕ  
 ΕΡΕΑΣΘΑΛΑΣΣΙΑΣΝΩΤΙ////ΑΙΑΣ 7A \*'  
 ΕΡΕΑΣΛΑΓΕΙΑΣΜΙΓΗΣ 7A \*Ρ  
 ΕΡΕΑΣΑΡΕΙΑΣ 7A \*ΡΝ  
 ΕΡΕΑΣΤΡΕΒΑΤΙΚΗΣ 7A \*C  
 15 ΠΕΡΙΛΙΝΟΥ  
 ΛΙΝΟΥΤΟΥΚΑΛΟΥΜΕΝΟΥΣΤΟΥΠΙΟΥ  
 ΠΡΩΤ ΦΩΡ 7A \*ΚΔ  
 ΦΩΡ ΔΕΥΤ 7A \*Κ  
 ΦΩΡ 7A \*ΙΣ  
 20 ΟΠΟΙΟΝΕΙΔΟΣΛΙΝΟΥΠΕCΗCΤΕΙΜΗΣ  
 ΟΥΚ ΥΠΕΡ/////////ΗΣΕΤΑΙΠΙΠΡΑΣΚΕΜΕΝΟΝ  
 ΤΗΝΩΡΙCΜΕΝΗΝΤΕΙΜΗΝΥΠΟ/////////  
 ΦΩΡ Α 7A \*,Δ//  
 ΦΩΡ Β 7A \*,ΓΞ  
 25 ΦΩΡ Γ 7A \*ΩΜ  
 ΛΙΝΟΥΤΡ////ΑΧΥΤΕΡΟΥΙCΧΡΗΣΙΝΙΔΙΩΤΩ//  
 ΤΕΚΑΙΦΑΜΕΛΙΑΡΙΚΩΝ  
 ΦΩΡ Α 7A ///////////  
 ΦΩΡ Β 7A \*/////  
 30 ΦΩΡ Γ 7A \*/////  
 CΤΙΧΩΝΑCΗΜΩΝCΚΥΤΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΑΝΩΝ  
 ΦΩΡ ΑΙCΤ Α \*,Ζ  
 ΤΑΡCΙΚΩΝΙCΤΟC Α \*/////  
 ΒΙΒΛΙΩΝ ΙCΤΟC Α \*,Ε  
 35 ΛΑΔΙΚΗΝΩΝΙCΤΟC Α \*,ΔΦ  
 ΤΑΡCΙΚΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΝΩΝΙCΤΟC Α\*,Δ  
 ΦΩΡΒCΚΥΤΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΑΝΩΝΙCΤΟC Α\*,Ε  
 ΤΑΡCΙΚΩΝ ΙCΤΟC Α \*/////

		COL. IV.	Denarii.		
		Ἐρέας Τερρευτίνης πεπλυ- μένης πα	✕ροε	175	1-50 New. Comes between XVI. and XVII. of Wadd. and C.I.L.
		Ἐρέας Λαδικήνης πεπλυμέ- νης πα	✕ρν	150	
5		Ἐρέας Ἀστυρκησίας πεπλυ- μένης πα	✕ρ	100	
		Ἐρέας καλλίστης μέσης πεπλυ- μένης πα'	✕ν	50	
10		Τῆς λοιπῆς πάσης ἐρέας πεπλυ- μένης πα	✕κε	25	
		Ἐρέας θαλασσίας νωτιαίας πα	✕.		
		Ἐρέας λαγείας μιγῆς πα	✕ρ	100	
		Ἐρέας Ἀρείας πα	✕ρν'	150	
		Ἐρέας Τρεβατικῆς πα'	✕σ'	200	
15	§§. Περὶ λίνου				
	§.	Λίνου τοῦ καλουμένου στουπίου			
	(1)	φώρ<μης> φώρ<μης> πα'	✕κδ'	24	
	(2)	φώρ<μης> δευτ<έρας> πα'	✕κ'	20	
	(3)	φώρ<μης> (γ')	πα' ✕ε,γ'	16	
20	§.	Ὅποῖον εἶδος λίνου π[ό]σης τεμῆς οὐκ ὑπερ[β]ήσεται πιπρασκ(όμ)εν(ον) τὴν ὠρισμένην τεμῆν (ἴ)πο . . . .			
	(1)	φώρ<μης> α'	πα' ✕,δ'	4,000	
	(2)	φώρ<μης> β'	πα' ✕,γξ'	3,060	
25	(3)	φώρ<μης> γ'	πα' ✕ωμ'	840	
	§.	Λίνου τραχυτέρου ἰς χρῆσιν ἰδιωτῶ[ν] τε καὶ φαμελιαρικῶν			
	(1)	φώρ<μης> α'	πα' [✕] .		
	(2)	φώρ<μης> β'	πα' ✕ .		
30	(3)	φώρ<μης> γ'	πα' ✕ .		
	§. (1)	Στιχῶν ἀσήμων Σκυτοπολειτάνων φώρ<μης> α' ἰστ<ὸς> α'	✕,ξ'	7,000	
		Ταρσικῶν ἰστὸς α'	✕ .		
		Βιβλίων ἰστὸς α'	✕,ε'	5,000	
35		Λαδικήνων ἰστὸς α'	✕,δφ'	4,500	
		Ταρσικαλεξανδρείνων ἰστὸς α'	✕,δ'	4,000	
	(2)	φώρ<μης> β' Σκυτοπολειτάνων ἰστος α'	✕,ς'	6,000	
		Ταρσικῶν ἰστὸς α'	✕ .		

	ΒΙΒΛΙΩΝ	ΙΣΤΟΣ	Α	※////
40	ΛΑΔΙΚΗΝΩΝ	ΙΣΤΟΣ	Α	※////
	ΤΑΡΣΙΚΑΛΕΞ////	ΑΝΔΡΕΙΝΩΝ	ΙΣΤΟΣ	Α ※////
	ΦΩΡΣΚΥΤΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΑΝΩΝ	ΓΙΣΤΟΣ	Α	////
	ΤΑΡΣΙΚΩΝ	ΙΣΤ////	ΟΣ	Α
	ΒΙΒΛΙΩΝ	ΙΣΤ////	ΟΣ	Α
45	ΛΑΔΙΚΗΝΩΝ	////	ΙΣΤ////	
	ΤΑΡΣΙΚΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΝΩΝ	ΙΣΤ	////	
	ΣΤΙΧΩΝ	ΣΤΡΑΤΙΩΤΙΚΩΝ	////	
	ΦΩΡ	Α		
	ΦΩΡ	Β		
50	ΦΩΡ	Γ		

(The remainder is missing.)

#### COL. IV.

Col. III. dealt with garments of various kinds, and with the wages paid for weaving and for embroidery. Twenty lines of that column, written on the upper slab, are lost, and the whole of the lower slab (or slabs); but a great part of the matter inscribed on the lower slab is preserved elsewhere, partly on the Carystian and partly on the Theban stone. The portion preserved contains two new headings, *Περὶ τεμῆς τῶν σθηρικῶν*, and *Περὶ Πορφύρας*, and forms Wadd's Chap. XVI. 67 (or 68) -101 (*C.I.L.* XVI. 57-100). Then comes our Col. IV., which is entirely new, and should be inserted before Chap. XVII. of Wadd. and *C.I.L.* which (with probably a small gap only) forms its continuation.

Col. IV. deals with raw materials (wool and flax), and manufactured materials (linen) not yet made up into garments. In l. 1 we find ourselves in the middle of a section *Περὶ Ἐρέας*, which must have begun somewhere near the end of the bottom slab of Col. III.

Line 1.—*Τερεντένης*.—*v.* note on III. 58, 59.

7.—*v.* note on II. 20-22.

Line 3.—*Λαδικήνης*.—The Laodicea in Phrygia;—*v.* note on III. 22.

Line 5.—*Ἀστυρκήσιος*.—*Ἀστυρκήσιος* = Asturicensis. Asturia was a province of Hispania Tarraconensis; Asturica, its capital. It was famous for its breed of horses ('Asturco' = an Asturian horse). So far as I am aware, this is the first mention of its wool.

Line 7.—*καλλίστης μέσης*,—'medium best,' A. 2'; cf. III. 7, 8, *πρῶτος κάλλιστος*, and note.

Line 11.—*θαλασσίας*.—*v.* note on III. 56, 57.

*νοτιαίας*.—A word of doubtful meaning. On the Latin fragment from Mylasa is the entry 'Strictoria leporina (d)urs . . .' Mommsen conjectured 'dorsualis'—a restoration which, in view of our *νοτιαίος*, may be regarded as certain. But Wadd's explanation 'to wear on the back' (I suppose that to be his meaning; note on Chap. XVI. 27) is impossible,—first, because it would be impossible to wear a 'strictoria' (a tight-fitting garment) on the back only; and secondly because, as now appears, the epithet was applicable to *materials* as well as to garments. This being so, the only possible explanation, though not altogether satisfactory, is 'from the back of the animal,'—*i.e.* the wool taken from the back and not from all parts indiscriminately.

Line 12.—*Ἐρέας λαγέας μιγῆς*,—'mixed hare's fur.' *Ἐρέα λάγεια* = 'lana leporina,' for which *v.* Lewis and Short, *s.v.* 'lana.'

The insertion of this entry in the midst of *wools* in the ordinary sense of the word is

		Βιβλίων ἰστός α'	✱ .
40		Λαδικήνων ἰστός α'	✱ .
		Ταρσικαλεξανδρείων ἰστός α'	✱ .
	(3)	Φώρ<μης> Σκυτοπολειτάνων γ' ἰστός α'	[✱ .]
		Ταρσικῶν ἰστός α'	[✱ .]
		Βιβλίων ἰστός α'	[✱ .]
45		Λαδικήνων ἰστ[ός α']	✱ .]
		Ταρσικαλεξανδρείων ἰστ[ός α']	✱ .]
	§.	Στιχῶν στρατιωτικῶν . . . . .	
	(1)	Φώρ<μης> α' [ἰστός α']	✱ .]
	(2)	Φώρ<μης> β' [ἰστός α']	✱ .]
50	(3)	Φώρ<μης> γ' [ἰστός α']	✱ .]

(After an interval, probably short, comes Chap. XVII. of Wadd. and C.I.L.)

curious. But cf. the transition, in the section Περὶ Πλούμου (Col. II.), from 'down' proper to 'willow-down' (πλούμος ἀπὸ ἐλίκης).

μιγῆς,—I suppose 'mixed,' *i.e.* not all of one colour. L. and S. give one example of μιγῆς (nom. sing.) for μικτός; but μιγός is, I think, without precedent.

Line 13.—'Αρείας.—This word is a puzzle. I suppose it should be written with a capital 'A. The province Aria, to the East of Parthia,—its capital Alexandria Ariana, the modern Herât,—is spelt in Greek both 'Αρία and 'Αρεία, and the people are called 'Αρειοί; but to connect this region with our 'Αρειος, in the absence of any evidence for an export of wools from this quarter, must be regarded as pure conjecture.

Line 14.—Τρεβατικῆς,—no doubt for 'Ατρεβατικῆς.—The Atrebatians were a Belgic tribe, their capital the modern Arras. Their woollen garments were famous;—'vestes Atrebatum,' 'χλαμύδες Ἀτραβαττικαί,' 'Atrebatia saga';—*v.* Wadd.'s note on Chap. XVI. 26.

Line 15.—Περὶ Λίνου.—A new section,—Flax and Linen. ll. 15–30 deal with the former (the raw material), l. 31–end with the latter. The former, like the raw wool, is sold by weight, the latter by measure.

Line 16.—Στουπίου,—'tow'; the fibres of the flax-stalk in their least prepared form. The common form of the word is στύπη, 'stuppa.'

Line 17.—πρώτ<ης> φώρ<μης>.—*v.* note on II. 12.

Line 19.—The form  $\text{Ϛ}$  may perhaps be a  $\Gamma$  (= τρίτης) combined with a break in the stone.

Lines 20–22.—The order of the words is rather involved—πιπρασκόμενον should follow τεμῆς. The meaning is 'What kind of flax, when sold at what price, will not exceed the price prescribed,'—a sort of preamble to the three lines which follow. The formula may be compared with one which occurs in Chap. XVII. of Wadd. and C.I.L., which forms a continuation of our Col. IV.—'ἄπερ ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς γ. φώρ<μης> τῆς προειρημένης ἐστὶν καταδεστέρα, ἐν πλείοσιν μέτρο[ι] κατασκευάζεται, τίνας τιμὰς ὑπερβυίνειν μηδενὶ ἐξὸν εἶναι,'—and then follow, as here, the three qualities, the quantity, and the price.

The last word in l. 22 is partly illegible. Mr. Gardner, who has independently examined it for me, sees traces of ὑπόλιον, and suggests that it may mean 'under the head of Flax'; but I am unable to satisfy myself of the reading.

Lines 24, 25.—Though the numerals on the stone are quite clear, I suspect an error on the part of the engraver, these two being the only *irregular* numbers in the inscription.

Lines **26, 27**.—*ἰδιωτῶν*,—‘common people’; *φαιμελιαρικῶν*, ‘slaves.’ *v.* Wadd.’s note on Chap. XVII. 29, and *cf.* *ἰδιωτικῶν*, ‘common,’ in I. 58, and my note there.

Line **31**.—*Στιχῶν ἀσήμων κ.τ.λ.*—At this point we pass from the raw to the manufactured material; not, as might appear at first sight, to the garments themselves,—this is proved by the measure of length (*ἰστός α'*) which forms part of each entry. The use of the name of the garment for the material is compared by Wadd. (introductory note on Chap. XVII.) to our English expression ‘shirtings.’

From this line, 31, to l. 46, the inscription deals with materials for a single garment, the *στίχη* (= ‘strictoria’), which was explained (II. 54, note) as a tight-fitting tunic. In III. 36–38 it was of silk, or half-silk; here, of linen. The linen is divided into three ‘classes’ or ‘qualities’ (*φῶρμαι*; *v.* note on II. 12), each quality again into five subdivisions, according to the locality from which the material came,—Scyt(h)opolis, Tarsus, Biblus, Laodicea (in Syria), Alexandria (in imitation of those of Tarsus; or *vice versa*,—*v.* note on III. 40, 41). The Biblus (Byblius) is certainly that in Syria, not in Egypt; and if, as Wadd. thinks, the *Ταρσικαλεξανδρείνοι* were made in *Tarsus*, not Alexandria, then *all* the kinds of linen mentioned are Syrian. Wadd. quotes appropriately from the ‘Totius Orbis descriptio’ (author unknown) the following list of Syrian towns which exported linen goods: ‘In linteamina sunt hae, Scitopolis, Ladicia, Biblus, Tirus, Beritus [= ‘Berytus,’ modern Beirut], quae linteamen omni orbi terrarum emittunt, et sunt habundantia.’

Lines **31, 32**.—The order of words in the first two lines is slightly irregular, thus obscuring the classification. The order should be

*Στιχῶν ἀσήμων φῶρμης α'*  
*Σκυτοπολειτῶν ἰστός α'*  
*Ταρσικῶν ἰστός α'*  
*κ.τ.λ.*

*ἰστός*,—properly a ‘loom,’ is here a measure of length. Probably it was the amount commonly worked on the loom in a single piece; *ἰστός α'* may therefore be translated ‘one piece’ or ‘one length.’ To judge from the prices, it was no small quantity.

Line **47**.—*Στιχῶν στρατιωτικῶν*.—These are of three qualities, but only one *kind* of linen; as the garment was part of the military outfit, probably the *kind* of material was prescribed.

After line **50** thirty-five lines of the slab are broken away, and the inscription comes to an end. The thread of it is taken up again, probably after no long interval, by a stone from Geronthrae, which is edited as Chap. XVII. of Wadd. and *C.I.L.* The Geronthraean inscription (‘Tabula Geronthraea Tertia’) opens with a classification of *δελματικά* (*v.* note on II. 67–69) similar to that of *στίχαι* in Col. IV. of *Meg.*

WILLIAM LORING.