

TWO NEW FRAGMENTS OF THE EDICT OF DIOCLETIAN ON MAXIMUM PRICES*

EVERY few years something is added to our knowledge of the Edict of Diocletian on Maximum Prices. In 1940, as an appendix to Volume V of Tenney Frank's *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, Elsa Graser published a text of the Edict based on the earlier text of Mommsen and Blümner, *Der Maximaltarif des Diocletian*,¹ incorporating the fragments discovered since its publication in 1893. Since the Graser edition of 1940 new fragments of the Edict have appeared in Italy, Aphrodisias in Caria, Ptolemais in Cyrenaica, Argos, Delphi, Aliveri and Aidepsos in Euboia, and Synnada in Phrygia. Inasmuch as most of the fragments add new material and the number of the fragments is large a list of them may be useful at this point.² The numbering of the sections is that of Mommsen-Blümner followed by Miss Graser.

1. Skolos(?) in Boiotia. Miss Graser failed to include two fragments from Skolos(?) published by A. D. Keramopoulos in *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1931, pp. 163–164.³ Now in the Thebes Museum. Fragment 1 includes section 20.13ff.; fragment 2 includes 19.58ff.
2. Synnada (Phrygia). I. W. Macpherson, "A Synnadic Copy of the Edict of Diocletian", *J.R.S.*, 42, 1952, pp. 72–75. A fragment of the Latin text in three columns including sections 16.5ff., 19.4ff., and 19.15–16.
3. Ptolemais (Cyrenaica). G. Caputo and R. Goodchild, "Diocletian's Price Edict at Ptolemais (Cyrenaica)", *J.R.S.*, 45, 1955, pp. 106–115. Fragments "large and small" of the Latin text covering sections 19–22 and the preamble.

* The author of this article, Professor E. J. Doyle of Stanford University, who died in 1965, made his manuscript available to me for my edition of the Edict of Diocletian (*Diokletians Preisedikt*, Berlin, 1971). I have used it, and I included the texts of the two fragments which had been found by Doyle on Euboia in my edition; I recorded certain changes from Doyle's readings after re-examining the stones, and I want to call attention to the fragment from Thelpusa in Arcadia, published by A. Petronotis in *Ἑλληνικά*, 26, 1973, pp. 255–270, which contains a parallel text to that from Aidepsos. The time has come to publish Doyle's complete text with his commentary. Permission for publication has been generously granted by the ephor Mr. E. Mastrokostas; I owe the knowledge of Doyle's manuscript to A. E. Raubitschek, Doyle's friend and colleague.—S. Lauffer, Munich University.

¹ T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore, 1933–40. H. Blümner, ed., *Der Maximaltarif des Diocletian*, Berlin, 1893.

² The most recent recapitulation of the fragments of the Edict is that of Chr. Habicht, *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- u. Wirtschaftsgesch.*, 47, 1960, pp. 376–379 in his review of the 1958 reprinting of the Mommsen-Blümner edition of 1893.

³ This omission was first brought to my attention by E. Vanderpool and was later noted by I. Macpherson in *J.R.S.*, 42, 1952, p. 72, note 1.

4. Pettorano (in the Abbruzzi). M. Guarducci, "Il primo frammento scoperto in Italia dell'Editto di Diocleziano", *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, 16, 1940, pp. 11–24, and "La pubblicazione in Italia del calmieri di Diocleziano", *Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, Serie VIII, Vol. XVIII, 1963, pp. 43–50. A fragment of the Greek text covering sections hitherto unknown on domestic animals, marbles, wild animals, paper, wax. This fragment was also published by Miss Graser in "The Significance of Two New Fragments of the Edict of Diocletian", *T.A.P.A.*, 71, 1940, pp. 157–174. Miss Guarducci considers the fragment Italian, i.e. a copy in Greek made on Carrara marble for the people in the Abbruzzi (the stone coming perhaps from Sulmo, 9 miles away). J. Bingen, (*B.C.H.*, 78, 1954, p. 349; note 2) takes strong exception to this view, pointing out among other considerations that there is no bilingual copy of the Edict; that in Achaia the Edict consisted of the Latin preamble followed by a Greek list, which fact, *prima facie*, renders a Greek text in the Abbruzzi suspect. He cites A. Degrassi (*Rivista di Filologia Classica*, N.S. 18, 1940, p. 143, note 1) who likewise does not believe that the inscription belongs to Italy and concludes that we must suppose that "il nuovo frammento abbia fatto un viaggio molto più lungo che da Sulmona a Pettorano." Bingen has also succeeded in identifying column 1 of Theban II (*C.I.L.*, III, Suppl., p. 1925 = Mommsen-Blümner 32.58–61) and Geronthrae V (*C.I.L.*, III, Suppl. = Mommsen-Blümner 32.1–8) as covering in part the same sections of the Edict as the Pettorano fragment.
5. Argos. J. Bingen, "Fragment Argien de l'Edit du Maximum", *B.C.H.*, 77, 1953, pp. 647–659. A fragment in Greek covering in part sections 4–6 and 7–8. The stone was found in 1953 at Dalamanara, halfway between Tiryns and Argos.
6. Delphi. J. Bingen, "Nouveaux Fragments Delphiques de l'Edit du Maximum", *B.C.H.*, 82, 1958, pp. 602–609. Bingen gives a useful recapitulation of the numerous fragments of the Latin preamble and the Greek tariff "publiés ou annoncés" from 1898–1958 (i.e. fragments numbered De 1–De 7) and publishes four new Delphic fragments of the Greek text (De 8–De 11). Those fragments published since Mommsen-Blümner and Graser include:
 - De 6. L. Robert, *R.E.G.*, 54, 1940, p. 237 announced a Delphic fragment (not yet published) of the Greek text dealing with section 29, corresponding to the Latin text from Halikarnassos (= Mommsen-Blümner 29.7–11).
 - De 7. J. Bingen, "Nouveaux Fragments Delphiques de l'Edit du Maximum", *B.C.H.*, 78, 1954, pp. 355–360 and fig. 2. A fragment of the Greek text covering section 19.29–37.
 - De 8. Section 26.77–87.
 - De 9. Section 28.13–23.

De 10. Section 32 (dealing with drugs).

De 11. Section dealing with freight charges (known from other fragments).

7. Aphrodisias (Caria). G. Jacopi, "Gli Scavi della Missione Archeologica Italiana ad Afrodisiade nel 1937", *Monumenti Antichi*, 38, 1939, cols. 202–225 and 231–232. Two large and five small fragments of the Latin tariff. The two largest deal, after a section on sponges, turpentine, resins, drugs, etc. (Mommsen-Blümner, section 32), with freight charges, *ex quibus locis ad quas provincias quantum nauli excedere minime sit licitum*. These fragments are reproduced from Jacopi's text, with added commentary, by Miss Graser in *T.A.P.A.*, 71, 1940, pp. 157–174. The other fragments from Aphrodisias include (in Jacopi's numbering):

No. 3. A small fragment on clothing from sections 26–28.

No. 4. A small fragment from section 29.13–15.

No. 5. An insignificant fragment not yet located.

Nos. 6 and 7 (listed under *Aggiunta*, cols. 231–232). Two small fragments dealing (no. 6) with sections 15 and 16 and (no. 7) section 29 (?).

8. Aliveri (ancient Tamynai in Euboia). See below.

9. Aidepsos (Euboia). See below.

NEW FRAGMENTS FROM EUBOIA

ALIVERI FRAGMENT

The first of the two new Euboian fragments of the Edict comes from Aliveri (ancient Tamynai) which lies one hour south of Eretria. It was probably transported there at some time from Eretria since it is unlikely that more than one copy of this lengthy document would have been set up in a single area, i.e. in the area controlled by Eretria which included Tamynai.⁴ Each major city appears to have had its copy of the Edict and of the four important cities of Euboia (Karystos, Eretria, Chalkis, and Histiaia) only Chalkis has thus far not produced any fragments. For Histiaia we now have the new fragment from Aidepsos, and two fragments from Karystos are known (*C.I.L.*, III, pp. 821–823), one of which was discovered over a century ago.

The Aliveri fragment came to light in the course of the excavations for the thermo-electric power plant built at Aliveri to tap for electric power the immense deposits of lignite which Euboia offers. The inscription was brought to the EBASCO engineering firm where Prof. Oscar Reinmuth of the University of Texas made a photograph and squeeze which he kindly made available to me. The stone is now in the museum at Eretria. It is of gray limestone. It measures in height 0.58 m.; width 0.45 m.; thickness 0.19 m.; letter height 0.012 m. (average). On the bottom and top the surface has been

⁴ See W. Wallace, "The Demes of Eretria", *Hesperia*, 16, 1947, pp. 115–146.

picked away. The stone was later re-used, the four sides having been cut away to form a pyramidal Byzantine capital.⁵ The letters are carefully cut and, except for one or two places, are legible. The use of the stone as a capital with the inscribed surface uppermost and perhaps flush with the ceiling doubtless helped to preserve it. Guidelines, vertical as well as horizontal, are lightly incised.

Column I includes sections 20.1a to 21.2 or twenty-three lines with fourteen items. Column II includes sections 24.13 to 25.2 (with thirteen new lines following on 24.16) or twenty-three lines with sixteen items. The part of the tariff which connected Column I with Column II, sections 21.3 to 24.12, included (approximately) forty-eight lines, though whether they continued below the preserved part or above it, it is impossible to say, and hence we can only guess at the height of the original stone. It seems safe to say, however, that the original was probably two to three times as large as the preserved portion. Most of the fragments of the Edict preserved in the Epigraphical Museum and those in other museums are of monumental proportions compared to earlier inscriptions. The thickness, for example, of almost all fragments of the Edict is particularly striking.⁶

Sections 20.1a–21.2 were otherwise known to us from the Greek fragments from (1) Karystos, covering sections 19.47–22.13; (2) Megalopolis, 19.35–22.1; (3) Thebes, 20.7–22.20; (4) Plataia, 20.4–24.3; (5) Skolos(?), 20.13–21.6; (6) in the Latin version from Ptolemais, 19.74–22.17. Sections 24.13–25.2 were known from the Greek fragments from (1) Karystos, covering 22.14–24.16; (2) Megalopolis, 25.1–26.33.

Column I

20	1			
	1a	πλουμαρίῳ εἰς συμψειρικὸν ὑ(πὲρ) ὀγ(κίας) α'	✕ σ'	1
	3	εἰς χλανίδαν Μοτυνησίαν ὑ(πὲρ) ὀγ(κίας) α'	✕ κε'	
	4	εἰς χλανίδα Λαδικηνήν Μοτυνησίαν ὑπὲρ ὀγ(κίας) α'	✕ κε'	
	5	βαρβαρικαρίῳ διὰ χρυσοῦ ἐργαζο(μένῳ) ὑπὲρ ὀγ(κίας) α' τοῦ πρωτίστου	✕ ,α	5
	6	ἔργου δευτερίου	✕ ψν'	
	2	εἰς στίχην ὀλοσειρικὸν ὑ(πὲρ) ὀγ(κίας) α'	✕ τ'	
	7	βαρβαρικαρίῳ εἰς ὀλοσερικὰ ὑ(πὲρ) ὀγ(κίας) α'	✕ φ'	
	8	ἔργου δευτερίου ὑ(πὲρ) ὀγ(κίας) α'	✕ υ'	10
	9	σειρικαρίῳ ἐργαζομένῳ εἰς συμψει- ρικὸν τρεφομένῳ ἡμερήσια	✕ κε'	

⁵ Similar capitals may be seen in the courtyards of the museums at Chalkis and Eretria.

⁶ EM 10061 (Megara) is 0.29 m. thick; EM 10028 (Megara) 0.30 m.; EM 10067 (Karystos) 0.29 m.; EM 10029, 10030, 10031 (Aigeira) 0.30 m.; EM 10063 (Megara) 0.18 m. The Aliveri fragment is 0.19 m. thick and the Aidepsos fragment 0.15 m.

10	εἰς ὀλοσερικὸν ἄσημον τρεφο- μένῳ ἡμερήσια	* κε'	
11	εἰς ὀλοσειρικὸν σκουλάτον	* ξ'	15
12	γερδία τρεφομένη ὑ(πέρ) εἰματίου πεξοῦ τῶν εἰς παράδοσιν ἡμερ(ήσια)	* ιβ'	
13	ἐν εἰματίοις Μοτυνησείοις ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς τρεφομένη ἡμερ(ήσια)	* ις'	
21	1a λαναρείῳ ἐργαζομένῳ Μοτυνήσια ἢ θαλάσσια τρεφομέ(νῳ) ὑ(πέρ) λ(ίτρας) α'	* μ'	20
	2 εἰς ἐρέαν Τερεντείνην ἢ Λαδι- κην[ήν] ἢ [Ἀλτεί]γην	* κε'	

Column II

24	13 μεταξαβλάττης ἥτοι ἐν χρώ- μασιν ἀγένητον λύουσιν λ(ίτρας) α'	* γ'	1
	14 πορφύραν εἰς ὀλοσειρικὸν νή- θουσιν ὑ(πέρ) ὀγ(κίας) α'	* ρις'	
	15 εἰς συμβειρικὰ νήθουσιν ὑπέρ ὀγ(κίας) α' {υσιν}	* ξ'	5
	16 πορφύραν εἰς πεξὰ πρωτ(είαν) νήθουσιν ὑ(πέρ) ὀγ(κίας) α'	* κδ'	
	17 πορφύραν εἰς πεξὰ δευτερ(είαν)	* ιβ'	
	18 πορφ(ύραν) νήθουσιν εἰς ὠθόνην ὑ(πέρ) ὀγ(κίας) α'	* μ'	10
	19 ὑποβλάττης ὀγ(κίας) α'	* λς'	
	20 μονοβάφου ἥτοι ὀξυτερίας ὑποβλάττης μονοβάφου ἥτοι ὀξυτερίας ὑπέρ ὀγ(κίας) α'	* κδ'	
	21 πορφύρας εἰς πείνης ὀγ(κίαν) α'	* ιβ'	15
25	1 περὶ ἐραίᾳς		
	1a ἐραίᾳς Μοτυνησείας ἐνχρυσι- [ξ]ούσης πεπλυμέ(νης) λ(ίτρα) α'	* τ'	
	2 Μοτυνησείας βαθυτέρας λ(ίτρα) α'	* σ'	
	3 ἐραίᾳς θαλασσίας λ(ίτρα) α'	* υ'	20
	4 ἐρέας Ἀλτεινησείας λ(ίτρα) α'	* σ'	
(1)	5 ἐραίᾳς Τερεντείνης πεπλυ(μένης) λ(ίτρα) α'	* ροε'	
(2)	6 ἐραίᾳς Λαδικηνῆς πεπλυ(μένης) λ(ίτρα) α'	* ρν'	

COMMENTARY

Column I:

Section 20 deals with the wages of embroiderers, silk-workers, brocade-makers, and wool-weavers, though the section title (not preserved in this fragment) includes only the first two: *περὶ μισθῶν τῶν πλουμαρίων καὶ τῶν σειρικαρίων*.

20.2. has been displaced by the stonecutter and appears out of order after 20.6.

20.3. Karystos reads *χλαμύδα*; Megalopolis *χλανίδα*.

20.5. Karystos and Megalopolis read *ἔργου πρωτίστου*, omitted here. In the next line *ἔργου* has been added in the margin. The stonecutter apparently intended to abbreviate *πρωτίστου* since there is an abbreviation mark after the first tau.

20.10. *ἄσημον*, i.e. 'plain', 'without design'. Cf. *holoserica pura* of the Ptolemais fragment.

20.11. *σκοῦ<τ>λᾶτον*. Latin *scutula*, 'lozenge'. Here the word apparently means a lozenge or diamond-shaped weave. See discussion in Mommsen-Blümner, *ad loc.* The price, 60 denarii (ξ'), is that given in Karystos and Plataia; Megalopolis and Thebes have 40 denarii (μ').

20.12. 'Wages for a woman weaver on "wool cloth with the nap still on it" (cf. *tunica pexa, indictionali* of Ptolemais) of those ready for sale.' *εἰς παράδοσιν* has been variously interpreted as 'for wholesale' (Loring), the simple 'for trade' (Mommsen), 'for delivery' (Graser). Blümner's 'zum Verkauf fertig' seems preferable. He contrasts the finished cloth in this line, ready for sale, with the raw wool, yet to be made into cloth, from Mutina and other places mentioned in the next line.

20.13. The price, 16 denarii per pound, is that given by Megalopolis, Thebes, and Ptolemais. Plataia gives 12 and Karystos 10.

21.1. The title of this chapter, *περὶ λαναρίων*, is omitted here as in all versions except Megalopolis.

21.2. Mommsen-Blümner followed by Graser read *ἰς ἐρέαν Τερεντείνην ἢ Λαδικηνήν ἢ ἀλειωνήν* (Loring read *ἀλειωνήν*). The correct reading is probably *Ἀλτεινήν*, referring neither to the sea (Loring) nor to "warm" clothing (so Mommsen-Blümner) but to wool from Altinum, a city in the area now occupied by Venice, which was famous for its wool in antiquity. The same triad of cities appears in section 25.4-6 where wools from Altinum, Tarentum, and Laodikeia, are mentioned. The correct reading is confirmed by the Ptolemais Latin fragment which has: *in lana Terentina uel Ladicena uel Altinata in po(ndus) unum × triginta*. In 25.4 the long form of the adjective, *Ἀλτεινησείας*, is used. In 21.2, however, there is not

enough space to accommodate more than four to five letters between the dotted eta and the dotted nu. A shorter adjective than Ἀλτεινησείαν must have been used. There is, moreover, a trace of a vertical line before the dotted nu. I have tentatively restored, therefore, [Ἀλτει]νην. Columella (VI, 24) gives the Latin form of the adjective as *Altinus*. The price of the wool as given in other copies of the Edict is thirty denarii whereas here it is twenty-five. The difference is not great but it should be pointed out that the reading in the Aliveri fragment is unmistakably κε'. For Altinum wool see Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, V, pp. 110–111. To the references cited there add Tertullian, *De Pallio*, 3.

Column II:

Section 24, περὶ πορφύρας, deals with the price of purple-dyed fabrics of varying hue and quality. At 24.13 there is a change from the materials to the wages of those working on the dyed cloth. The listing of the kinds of dyed cloth is resumed at 24.19.

24.13. μεταξαβλάττης should be μεταξαβλάττην. Karystos also has μεταξαβλάττης which was corrected by Mommsen. ἀγένητον is a curious error in translation of the Latin *infectum*, *infector* being the usual technical word in Latin for 'dyeing'. The translator obviously understood *in* to be the equivalent here of the Greek alpha privative.

The wage paid for unraveling the wool is set at three denarii per pound. Blümner points out that in 23.2 (by error he has 23.1a) the work of unraveling silk is paid for by the ounce and he has accordingly changed λ(ίτρας) here to ὀ(γκίας). This may be correct but it should be noted that in both the Aliveri fragments as well as the Karystian the reading for pound is not in doubt. Blümner also questions the wages paid, three denarii, as being too low and again contrasts this wage with that of the unraveler of silk in 23.2 who is paid 64 denarii per ounce (not, as Blümner has it, per pound). Moreover, the latter's wage includes maintenance (μετὰ τῆς τροφῆς) and the wage of the silk unraveler in 24.13 does not. However unskilled the labor involved in unraveling silk might be, a wage of three denarii per pound or per ounce seems ludicrously low.

24.14. The rho of the numeral forms a monogram with the star.

24.15. συμψειρικά, i.e. 'part silk' or 'with a silk warp in it.' Cf. R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, IV, p. 55. Forbes also discusses the different kinds of purple, *ibid.*, p. 115. The stonemason by error cut the last four letters of νήθουσιν twice.

24.16. πορφύραν εἰς πρῶτ(είαν) 'for soft-finished cloth (Graser) of the first quality'. Cf. 20.12. There is apparently no general price differential for first and

second quality. Here first quality is twice the cost of second. In 20.5–6 first quality is 1000, second 750.

24.18. *πορφ(ύραν)*. The abbreviation is written in the margin. *ῶθόνη*, ‘fine linen’. Here and in 26.64 it is *ῶθόνη* rather than the usual *ὀθόνη*.

24.20. The line as it stands does not make sense. *ὀξυτερίας* (and *ὀξυτυρίας*) should mean ‘sharp’ or ‘bright’ purple, and *ὑποβλάττης* a ‘light’ purple. The line perhaps ought to be read: *μονοβάφου ὀξυτερίας ἥτοι ὑποβλάττης μονοβάφου ὑπὲρ ὀγ(κίας)α΄×κδ΄*, i.e. “for single-dyed bright purple or single-dyed light purple, for one ounce, 24 denarii.”

One might assume that it was the amount of the purple dye used which determined the cost. Yet in 29.33–34 and 29.39–40, which are concerned with ‘light’ and ‘bright’ purple, in each case the light (*ὑπο*—) is more costly than the bright (*ὀξυ*—) purple cloth.

24.21. *πορφύρας εἰς πείνης*. Purple for ‘thread on the bobbin’. The genitive is strange here unless we understand *εἰς* as governing *ὀγ(κίαν)*. Cf. 30.3 *εἰς τὴν λ(ίτραν)* and 30.4 *εἰς λ(ίτραν)*. *εἰς κύπρου λι. α΄* in 7.25 is perhaps to be understood in the same way, viz. ‘per pound of copper’. *πήνη* occurs elsewhere in the Edict at 13.4: *κτένα . . . ἰς πήνην*, ‘a comb . . . for weaving’.

25.1. *περὶ ἐράϊας*. The title is preserved here. We now have the sections on purple and wool complete.

25.1a. I have restored *ἐνχρυσι[ζ]οῦσης*. There are sure traces of the omicron and upsilon. The verb *ἐνχρυσίζω* is not, to my knowledge, attested, but there is a like formation in the attested *ἐναργυρίζω*, ‘to be of silvery appearance’ (so L.S.J.,⁹ s.v.; the citation is from Hephaestio, a fourth century [after Christ] astronomer) and there is the verb *χρυσίζω* used by late Greek writers to mean ‘to be golden’ or ‘like gold’. If the restoration is correct the line means that Mutina wool of golden color or looking like gold, washed, cost 300 denarii per pound. It may be that the golden color of the natural wool gave an added value to it. We have seen the same principle applied to orichalc or brass which, because of its resemblance to gold, was highly valued. In any event, the Mutina wool has a value greater than that of any other wool except for the ‘sea-wool’ listed in 25.3 for which 400 denarii per pound is set as the maximum price.

25.2. The same wools mentioned in the section on purple are again listed here in the section on wool: wools from Mutina; from the sea (*θαλασσίας*; for a discussion of the term see Blümner, *ad loc.*); from Altinum; from Tarentum; and from Laodikeia. The wages for wool weavers are higher for those working on wool from the sea and on Mutina wool than for those working on wools from Tarentum, Altinum and Laodikeia (cf. 21.1a–2). In the list of the wools, however, the price

for Mutina and Altinum wool is the same. For Italian wools see Tenney Frank, *Survey*, V, and for wool production in general see Forbes, *Studies*, IV.

AIDEPSOS FRAGMENT

In the Spring of 1951 a large fragment of the Edict was discovered lying face up in the courtyard of a house in Aidepsos in northern Euboea. It had come to light in the course of digging foundations for a building some years before. The area in which it was found must have been the site of some ancient public building since, along with the fragment of the Edict, there are three monument bases, fragments of fluted and unfluted columns, and dedications to Septimius Severus and Caracalla. Walls of several structures, some apparently *in situ*, are visible.

The stone is a fine- to medium-grained crystalline, gray-white marble. It measures in height 1.40 m.; width 0.69 m.; thickness 0.15 m.; letter height 0.007 m. (average). It is broken at the top but the bottom and the sides are intact. The surface is much worn and there is a crack which runs down the right side of the front face. In general the letters are carelessly cut and unevenly spaced. This is markedly true of Column I in which the letters, of unequal sizes, are crowded together and the writing runs off in oblique lines. Incised guidelines are visible, particularly in Column I. As in the case of the letters the lines are cut obliquely to keep the stonecutter from impinging on the succeeding *στοίχοι*. The carelessness in the cutting of the letters and the sloppy appearance of the uneven *στοίχοι* in Column I probably indicate that the stonecutter began with Column III and worked from right to left. In any event the lettering in Column III is done with much more care, the lines are more evenly spaced, and the letters more nearly of uniform size.

The tariff is arranged in three parallel columns and covers (in the traditional numbering) in Column I, sections 10.1–11.8; Column II, sections 13.1–14.3; Column III, 15.31a–15.61, with seven new lines following on 15.61. These parts of the Edict are otherwise known from fragments of the Latin version from Aizanoi (Phrygia) covering sections 9.20–10.7 and 11.1–8; Mylasa (Caria) covering sections 10.16–19 and 11; and the Greek version from Geronthrai (Peloponnesos) covering sections 13.1–15.51 (15.23–30 missing), and Megalopolis covering sections 15.1–19.14.

Column I

10	1 [περ]ῖ λωραμένων	1
	1a ἀβέρτα	[✕ ,αφ']
	2 σκορδίσκον στρατιωτικόν	[✕ φ']

3	[----] μετὰ φλαγέλλου	✱ π'	5
4	[κάπ]ιστρον ἱππικόν [-----]	✱ οε'	
5	χαλινὸς [---] [σ]αλιβαρ [ίου---]	✱ ρ'	
6	χαλινὸς μου [λιωνι]κὸς [μετὰ καπισ]τέλλου	[✱ ρκ'] [✱ π']	10
7	κάπιστρον μουλιωνικόν		
8	[περὶ ζ]ωνῶν στρατιῶ [τικῶν]		
8a	[^{ca.3}]υ [---] Βαβυλωνικός	✱ ρ'	
9	[ζ]ώ [νη] Ἀλεξαν [δ]ρ [εῖη]	✱ σ']	15
10	ὑποπ[^{ca.4}] Βαβ[υλωνικ]ός	[✱ ρ']	
11	[ζ]ώνη [-----]	✱ ξ']	
12	ζώνη ἑξαδακ[τυλι]αῖος	[✱ οε']	
13	[περ]ὶ [ᾶ]σκῶν		
13a	ἄσκον πρώτης φώρ[μης]	✱ ρκ'	20
14	ἄσκον ἔλαιον πρώ[της φώρμης]	✱ ρ'	
15	ἄσκον μισθὸν [---]	✱ β'	
16	περὶ σκορτ[ιών]		
16a	σ[κ]ορτίων ἔχου [σ]α [ν] λ[ίτραν]	✱ κ']	
17	θήκη [ν] καν[νῶν]	✱ μ'	25
18	[φλ]αγέ[λλο]ν [μο]υλιωνικό	[✱ ις']	
19	κορριγί[αν] τεθριπ[^{ca.5}]αλον	[✱ β']	
1a	πίλων ᾶ[γενή]των	[✱ σ']	
2	[πί]λων [^{ca.3}]νη[----]		
	εἰς ζαβέρνας [ἦτοι σά]κκους	[✱ ι']	30
3	πίλων εἰς σχοῖνον ἐργασμένων λ[ίτρα] α'	✱ ι'	
4	[πε]ρὶ σαγμάτων		
4a	σάγμα βουδρῶνος	✱ [τ]ν'	
5	σάγμα ὄνου	✱ σν'	35
6	[σάγ]μα καμήλου	✱ τν'	
7	περὶ ζαβερνῶν		
7a	ζαβερν[ῶν ἦτοι] σάκκων λίτραν ἔχον ζευγὸς λ'	✱ ν'	
8	σακκοπάθνας μῆκ[ος] ὁπόσον πλάτους ἐνθεν τριπόδ[ων] [κ]αθ' ἑκαστον		40
		✱ ις'	

Column II

13	1	περὶ κερκίδων		1
	1a	κερκὶς πυξ[ίνη]	* [ι]δ'	
	2	κερκίδες β' ἐκ διαφ[όρων] ξύλων	* α'	
	3	κτένα πύξιον	* ιβ'	5
	4	κτένα ἐκ διαφόρ[ων] ξύλων	* η'	
	5	ἄτρακτος πύξιος μετὰ σφονδύλ[ου]	* ιβ'	
	6	ἄτρακτος μετὰ σφονδύλου ἐξ ἐτέρων ξύλων	* α'	10
	7	κτένιον γυναικεῖον πύξιον	* β'	
	8	κνήστρον ὀσταῖν[ον]	* -]	15
	9	κνήστρον σ[.ca.5.]	* δ'	
	10	κνηστρίον σούκιν[ον]	* [-]	
14	1	περὶ φορτίων ἥτοι πά[λ]ων		
	1a	πᾶλοι β'	* μ'	20
	2	κάλαμοι μεγάλ(οι) β'	* ν'	
	3	κάλαμοι μικρό(τεροι) β'	* κ'	

Column III

15	31a	ἔχον ἀπὸ [βίτου] [χωρὶς] σιδήρου	* [,ς]	1
	32	σαράγαρον ἀψιδωτ[οὺς] [ἔχον τοὺς τρ]οχοὺς χωρὶς [σιδήρ]ου	* ,γφ'	5
	33	ῥαῖδα ἀψιδωτοὺς ἔχουσα [τοὺς τροχ]οὺς χωρὶς σιδ(ήρου)	* ,γ	
	34	[δορμιτῶ]ριον ἔχον [τοὺς] τροχοὺς βιτω- [τ]οὺς χωρὶς σιδήρου	* ,ξφ'	10
	35	δο[ρμι]τῶριον ἔχον τοὺς τροχοὺς ἀψειδ- ωτοὺς χωρὶς σιδήρου	[* ,δ]	

36	σαράγαρα βιτατὰ καὶ ὀχήματα τὰ λοιπὰ [μ]ετὰ τῶν κανθῶν καὶ [τοῦ] σιδήρου λόγ[ου γενο]- μένου τοῦ σ[ιδή]ρ[ο]υ [πιπ]ράσκεσθαι ὀφείλου- σιν		15
37	καροῦχον βισατὸν χ[ωρίς] σ[ι]δήρου	[* ,ξ]	
38	περὶ [κάρρων]		20
39	κάρρον σεσιδηρ[ωμένον] ὑπὲρ τοῦ ξυλικοῦ καὶ τοῦ σιδήρου λόγου γε- νομένου οὗτ[ως] πιπρά- [σ]κεσθαι ὀφεί[λει]		25
40	ἄμαξα δίτροχος μετὰ ζυ- γοῦ χωρὶς σιδήρου	* ω'	30
41	τρίβολον ξύλιν[ον]	* σ'	
42	[ἄ]ροτρον μετὰ ζυγοῦ	* ρ'	
43	πάγλα ἦτοι λεύδια	* ρ'	
44	πτύον	* ιβ'	35
45	πάλα	* δ'	
46	τρικάνη	* η'	
47	τύρχη διόδους ξυλίν(η)	* δ'	
48	[σκά]φη πενταμοδιαία	* ρν'	
49	μόδιος ξύλινος	* ν'	40
50	μόδ(ιος) σιδηρένδετος	* οε'	
51	κάβαθαν ἦτοι κάμηλαν σημοδιαίαν τετορν(ευμένην)	* λ'	
52	περὶ μύλων		
52a	μύλος καβαλλαρ(ικὸς) λίθινος	* ,αφ'	45
53	μύλος ὀνικός	* ,ασν'	
54	μύλος ὑδραλετικός	* ,β	
55	χειρομύλων	* σν'	
56	περὶ κοσκίνων		
56a	κόσσκινον ἄλωνικὸν ἀπὸ βύρσ(ης)	* σν'	50
57	κόσσκινον ἀπὸ δέρμ(ατος) σιμιδαλ(ιακόν?)	* υ'	
58	κόσσκινον πλεκτὸν μέγα	* σ'	
59	κόσσκινον πλεκτὸν ἰδιω- τικὸν μέγ[α]	* ρ'	

60	κόσσκινον πλεκτὸν λεγου- μενᾶλε		✱ ν'	55
61	κόσσκινον πλεκτὸν πρὸς [.]λοριαν		✱ λε'	
62	κόσσκινον σουρελιανόν ἀπὸ βύρσης		✱ ξ'	60
63	περὶ χαλκοῦ			
63a	αὐροχαλκοῦ	λ(ίτρα) α'	✱ ρ'	
64	κυπρίου	λ(ίτρα) α'	✱ οε'	
65	ἐλατοῦ	λ(ίτρα) α'	✱ ξ'	
66	χαλκοῦ τοῦ κοινοῦ	λ(ίτρα) α'	✱ ν'	65

COMMENTARY

Column I, 10.1–11.8

Sections 10 and 11 which constitute Column I of the Aidedpsos fragment were hitherto known only from the Latin fragments from Mylasa, Aizanoi and Stratonikeia. The surface of the stone is much worn on the left-hand side and there are many uncertainties, but a goodly part of the Greek text can be recovered. The price in most cases has been restored from Graser's composite text.

10.1a. ἀβέρτα is all that can be read in this line. The Latin counterpart reads: *averta primae formae in carruca* ✱ *mille quingentis*, or 'a traveling-bag, first quality, for a wagon, 1500 denarii'. In *carruca*, which appears to imply a peculiar kind of bag used only on one kind of wagon, is probably no more limiting than our "airplane luggage" or "car-robe". It is the most expensive item in this section. For *carruca* see below, 15.37. According to Loring a *carruca* (Greek *καροῦχα* or *καροῦχον*) was "a high and pompous carriage of some kind." See *J.H.S.*, 11, 1890, pp. 311–312 and the late Latin passages cited from Du Cange.

10.2. The Latin version is *scordiscus militaris*, 'a military saddle, 500 denarii'. Blümner (*ad loc.*) derives the word from the Scordisci, a Pannonian tribe mentioned by Pliny (*H.N.*, III, 148). The saddle would then be a military saddle of a kind made famous internationally by the Scordisci.

10.3. Nothing can be read except *μετὰ φλαγέλλου* and the price, ✱ π'. The Latin text reads: *parammas mulares cum flagello* ✱ *octingentis*. *Parammas* (or *parhamas*, Aizanoi frag.) is an unknown word. It appears to be a kind of saddle. The Aidedpsos price π', given the price of the other saddle, is too low. The stonecutter may have confused in his list the Latin for 80 (*octaginta*) with the Latin for 800 (*octingentis*).

- 10.4. [κάπ]ιστρον ἱππικόν is all that can be read in this line. The Latin text has *capistrum equestre cum circulis et ducali* ✕ *septuaginta V*, or ‘a halter with rings and a leading-rein, 75 denarii.’
- On the whole, the stonecutter of the Aidepsos version when faced by an unknown or unfamiliar Latin term transcribes rather than translates from the Latin. Here, for example, instead of using the familiar Greek equivalent of *capistrum*, φορβειά, he has chosen to render the Latin word in Greek letters.
- 10.5. Better preserved in the Latin *frenum equestre cum salibario instructum*, or, ‘bridle complete with bit, for a horse, 100 denarii.’
- 10.6. *Frenum mulare cum capistello* ✕ *centum biginti*.
- 10.8. The Greek title for this section is preserved here.
- 10.8a. . . . ν — — — Βαβυλωνικός ✕ ρ’.
- 10.9. The Latin text has simple *item lata*. If the Aidepsos fragment is correct we have here a soldier’s belt of Alexandrian leather (or style?) as in the preceding line a Babylonian belt.
- 10.10. No restoration suggests itself for the Latin *subalare Babylonicum*. The word here seems to mean ‘a chest strap which goes under the armpits’ (Blümner calls it *Achselbänder*).
- 10.11. [ζ]ώνη is all that can be read here. The Latin version has *zona alba [dig]itorum quattuor* ✕ *sexaginta*.
- 10.12. The Latin version has: *item digi[torum se]x* ✕ *septuaginta V*.
- 10.13. The Latin title for this section is *De Utribus*, ‘for (leather) sacks’.
- 10.14. ἀσκόν ἐλαϊον correspond to the *utrem olearium* of the Latin version.
- 10.16. The Latin title is *De scortiis*, ‘for leather goods.’
- 10.16a. The Latin version reads: *scortia in sexstario uno* ✕ *biginti*. Waddington and Mommsen understood the Latin to mean ‘an oil-sack holding a sextarius’, i.e. a sixth part of a *congius* or about a pint. If the Aidepsos reading is correct it is a leather sack holding a pound.
- 10.18. The Latin reads: *flagellum mulionicum cum virga*.
- 10.19. The Latin version reads: *corrigiam aurigalem*, ‘leather driver’s-reins’.
- 11.1. The title is missing in the Aidepsos fragment. The Latin title is *De saetis caprinis sibe camellinis*, ‘for goat’s or camel’s hair’.
- 11.1a. Only πίλων ἀ[γενή]των can be read. They correspond to *pilorum infectorum* of the Latin.
- 11.2. [πί]λων[. . .]νη — — — — — εἰς ζαβέρνας [ἥτοι σά]κκους [✕ ι’]. There are approximately three letters before νη and an indefinite number of letters after.

- 11.3. *πίλων εἰς σχοῖνον ἐργασμένων* λ. α' ✕ ι' corresponds to the Latin *pilorum ad funem confectorum p.unum decem* or, 'hair made into rope, per pound, ten denarii'.
- 11.4. The Latin title for this section is *De sagmis*, 'for packsaddles'. For a discussion of σάγμα, see Blümner *ad loc.*
- 11.4a. Latin, *sagma burdonis*.
- 11.7. Latin title, *De zabernis*, 'for sacks'.
- 11.7a. 'For bags or sacks, a pair weighing thirty pounds'; appears where one might expect *λίτρας*. The price according to the Graser text is 400 denarii. According to the Aidepsos fragment it is 50 (?) denarii. In view of (a) the prices listed for packsaddles (350, 250 denarii) and (b) the fact that in 11.8 'bags three feet wide and of any length desired' are priced according to the weight per pound (viz. 16 denarii per pound) it is clear that the price in the Aidepsos fragment is too low.
- 11.8. *σακκοπάθνας μῆκ[ος] ὅπόσον πλάτους ἔνθεν τριπόδ[ων] [κ]αθ' ἕκαστον.*

Column II, 13.1–14.3

- 13.1. 'For shuttles'. The title, as often in the Edict, covers only one of the items listed. The section deals with shuttles, spindles, combs, and scrapers, all doubtless made traditionally in the same shop.
- 13.1a. 'One box-wood shuttle, 14 denarii.' The α', indicating the quantity, is missing in the Aidepsos fragment.
- 13.2. The price for two shuttles is α' in the Aidepsos fragment. λ' (30) of the Geronthrai fragment makes better sense.
- 13.4. Aidepsos price is η'; Geronthrai, ιδ'.
- 13.6. Again the Aidepsos price, α', makes no sense. Geronthrai, ιε'.
- 13.7. Aidepsos price β'; Geronthrai ιδ'.
- 13.8. The Aidepsos fragment reads *κνήστρον ὀστάϊν[ον]*, for *ὀστέϊνον*(?), 'a scraper made of bone' or 'with a bone handle'? The price cannot be read in the Aidepsos fragment. Geronthrai reads *κνησιοναιδοστι...υναικει...*, *κνησιον* being, as Blümner and Waddington surmised, a mistake for *κνήστρον*. The Aidepsos reading is an improvement over the text given by Mommsen-Blümner and Graser.
- 13.9. The price δ' is too low to be credible. Mommsen-Blümner reads *κνήστρον ἰχθύων*.
- 13.10. 'An amber scraper' or 'a scraper with amber handle'? The form *κνηστρίον* is also found in Geronthrai in both 13.9 and 13.10 and is otherwise attested alongside *κνήστρον*. The price of the scraper is not preserved.

14.2–3. Geronthrai (= *I.G.*, V, no. 1115 B, Col. I, 20) has *κάλαμοι μεικρότεροι* and all other editions (Blümner, Graser, *C.I.L.*, III, p. 834) have either *κάλαμοι μείζονες* or *μείζ[ο]νες* ✕ *ρ'*. The Aidepsos fragment has unmistakably *μεικρό-(τεροι)* and the price, less surely, *κ'*:

i.e. for two large stakes 50

for two smaller stakes 20 (?).

I have been unable to check the squeeze of Geronthrai at this point, but the Aidepsos text with *κ'* makes better sense for 'smaller stakes' than *ρ'*. Kolbe's reading *μεικρότεροι* is confirmed here as the correct reading.

Column III, 15.31a–16.66

15.31a. For *ἀπὸ βίτου* (= *βιτωτός* below in 15.34 and 15.36) see Loring, *J.H.S.*, 11, 1890, p. 310. Restorations in this and the following section are made from the Graser text.

15.37. Aidepsos *καροῦχον βισατόν*; Megalopolis *καροῦχον βιτωτόν*. The Megalopolis reading is obviously correct here. In 15.36 Aidepsos reads *σαράγαρα βιτατά* but in 15.34 *τροχοὺς βιτω[τ]οῦς*. *βίτος* (*vitus* in Latin) = *ἴτυς*, the 'felloe' or 'periphery' of a wheel.

15.38. Although the heading for this section is *περὶ κάρρων*, 'for wagons', it includes as well various farm implements (forks, plows, mattocks, tubs, yokes, etc.). The reason they are lumped together here is presumably that they are all made of wood or wood and iron and most likely made in the same kind of shop. A title, *περὶ σκευῶν*, may have been omitted here corresponding to *περὶ μύλων* below, which is preserved only in the Aidepsos fragment. The Aidepsos fragment agrees with the Megalopolis fragment (as against Geronthrai) in spelling *κάρρον* with double rho.

15.39. Both Aidepsos and Megalopolis have *ὑπὲρ τοῦ ξυλικοῦ*. Geronthrai, *[μ]ετ[ὰ] τοῦ ζυγοῦ ξυλικοῦ*. Aidepsos agrees with Geronthrai in the order *πιπράσκεσθαι ὀφείλει* as against Megalopolis, *ὀφείλει πιπράσκεσθαι*.

15.43–46. There are many differences among the three fragments in the text of these four lines.

<i>Megalopolis</i>	<i>Geronthrai</i>	<i>Aidepsos</i>
15.43. <i>παῦγλα ἦτοι γλεύδια</i> ✕ <i>ρ'</i>	15.43. <i>δίκελλαν τορονευτήν</i> ✕ <i>ιβ'</i>	15.43. <i>παῦγλα ἦτοι λεύδια</i> ✕ <i>ρ'</i>
15.44. <i>δηλάβρα ἦτοι πτοῖον</i> ✕ <i>ιβ'</i>	15.44. <i>σμ[ιν]ύην ἦτοι πτύον</i> ✕ <i>ιβ'</i>	15.44. <i>πτύον</i> ✕ <i>ιβ'</i>

<i>Megalopolis</i>	<i>Geronthrai</i>	<i>Aidepsos</i>
15.45.	15.45.	15.45.
παλα ✕ δ'	μάκ [ελλαν] ✕ δ'	παλα ✕ δ'
15.46.	15.46.	15.46.
θρεῖναξ ✕ η'	(lacking)	τρικάνη ✕ η'

15.43. *παῦλα*, Megalopolis *παῦλα*, has been plausibly explained by Loring as the Greek rendering of Latin *pavicula*, a 'tamp' or 'lump-breaker' for making a hard, smooth surface for a threshing-floor. *γλεύδια* (or Aidepsos *λεύδια*) is more difficult and Loring's ingenious explanation is not convincing. He connects *γλεύδια* with *gulbium*, a late Latin word for 'garden-tool'. *Gulbium* derives from *glubere* (cognate with *γλύφειν*) which would give the substantive *glubia* or *glubium* which in turn, by metathesis, would become *gulbium*. The Greek stonecutter then would through carelessness or lack of understanding have rendered the substantive *glubia* as *γλεύδια*.

More convincing is Blümner's explanation that *γλεύδια* is to be connected with *gleba*, a 'lump or clod of earth' and is an instrument similar in function to a *σφῦρα*, a wooden mallet used for breaking earth clods in the field, attested from Hesiod's time on. The Aidepsos fragment's *λεύδια* yields no meaning; the Geronthrai fragment reads *δίκελλαν τορονευτήν*, 'a two-pronged fork, turned', and the price 12 denarii. The surprising divergences in the three copies here and in the next two lines suggest that the stonecutter may have had to depend on his own ingenuity for finding Greek equivalents for unfamiliar Latin terms and that in his glossary he found several words defining the same or similar objects. On the other hand, the fact that both the object and the price are different suggests that for some reason our list is incomplete here.

15.44. Aidepsos has only *πτύον*, a 'winnowing-fan', whereas Megalopolis has *δήλαβρα ἥτοι πτύον* and Geronthrai *σμί[ν]ύην ἥτοι πτύον*. For *σμινύη* see *Hesperia*, 25, 1956, p. 302.

15.45. The Aidepsos fragment supports the reading *παλα* of Megalopolis. Geronthrai reads *μάκ[ελλαν]*.

15.46. *τρικάνη* in the Aidepsos fragment yields no meaning. Megalopolis reads *θρεῖναξ*, a 'three-pronged (winnowing) fork'. The word is missing in Geronthrai.

15.48. The *σκάφη* was used, according to Pollux (X, 102), by bakers. See *Hesperia*, 27, 1958, p. 231, and Blümner, *ad loc.*

15.50. Geronthrai, *σιδηρωτός*.

15.51. *κάβαθα ἥτοι κάμηλα σημοδιαία γεγεννημένη τετορνευμένη* (Megalopolis). *γάβαθαν ἥτοι κόνειλαν σημοδιάν γενομένην τορνευτήν* (Geronthrai). *κάβαθα* or *γάβαθα* is

identified by Blümner as the Latin (?) *gabata* which in Martial and Isidore means a deep bowl for table use. Here it seems to be a larger vessel (1/2 bushel) for grosser uses. It is equivalent here, apparently, to a *κάμηλα* (Latin *camella*). *γάβαθα* is also found in an inscription from Dura-Europos; cf. *Les Fouilles de Doura-Europos, 1922-23* (1926), p. 372.

15.52. The Aidepsos fragment preserves the title.

15.52a. Megalopolis describes the mill as *ἐν λίθοις* ('with stones', Graser) whereas the Aidepsos fragment has *λίθινος*. It is difficult to see why a millstone should be described as made of stone. What other kind was there? Blümner is doubtless right in assuming that the price encompasses only the stone itself and not the iron and wood handles or fastenings and that the same condition applies to the other mills listed. It is to be noted, however, that in the section above on wagons it is specifically stated when the price does not include the cost of the metal as well. Ambiguities of this kind are not common in the Edict.

15.55. Megalopolis, *χειρόμυλος*.

15.56. The section *περὶ κοσκίνων* is fully preserved in the Aidepsos fragment though there are differences between the items in it and in Megalopolis, the only other fragment (aside from three fragmentary lines in Mylasa V) which contains the section.

Megalopolis

56. *περὶ κοσκίνων*
 56a. *κόσκινον ἄλωνικόν*
*ἀπὸ βύρσης * σν'*
 57. *[κ]όσκινον ἀπὸ*
*δέρματος σιμιδάλια * υ'*
 58. *[κόσκ]ινον πλεκτόν*
*μέγα * σ'*
 59. *[κόσκι]νον πλεκτόν*
ἰδιωτικόν
 60. *ωριαν*
 61. *[κόσκινο]ν πλεκτόν*

Aidepsos

56. *περὶ κοσκίνων*
 56a. *κόσσκινον ἄλωνικόν*
*ἀπὸ βύρσ(ης) * σν'*
 57. *κόσσκινον ἀπὸ δέρμ(ατος)*
*σιμιδαλ(ιακόν?) * υ'*
 58. *κόσσκινον πλεκτόν*
*μέγα * σ'*
 59. *κόσσκινον πλεκτόν*
*ἰδιωτικόν μέγ[α] * ρ'*
 60. *κόσσκινον πλεκτόν*
*λεγουμενᾶλε * υ'*
 61. *κόσσκινον πλεκτόν*
*πρὸς [.]λοριαν * λέ'*
 62. *κόσσκινον*
σουρελιανὸν ἀπὸ
*βύρσης * ξ'*

The spelling *κόσσκινον* is consistent except in the title. In Megalopolis only *κόσκινον* occurs.

- 15.57. The adjective, whatever it is, is obviously from the noun *σεμίδαλις*, 'finest ground flour'. Blümner points out that only *σιμιδαλ* is clearly visible in Megalopolis. In the Aidepsos fragment *σιμιδαλ* is clearly an abbreviation. The Latin, as Blümner indicates, would doubtless be *cribrum pollinarium* or *cribrum pollinare*. I do not understand Blümner's (hence Graser's) *σιμιδάλια* here.
- 15.59. The Aidepsos fragment provides the price, 100 denarii, for this 'common' (Graser) or perhaps 'heavy-duty', 'coarse' (Blümner, 'ländliches', 'wohl grobes') sieve. The Aidepsos fragment has *μέγ[α]*, which does not occur in Megalopolis.
- 15.60. *κόσσκινον πλεκτόν λεγουμενᾶλε* corresponds to the ... [*c*]*ribrum leguminale t[extile]*... of the Latin text from Mylasa V. 'A sieve, woven, for beans' or simply 'common' (Graser). The line is missing from Megalopolis.
- 15.61. (= 15.60 of Megalopolis). Nothing suggests itself for a restoration here. There may be a letter before the dotted lambda; it is difficult to say since the alignment of words in successive lines is not consistent. Megalopolis, unfortunately impossible to read here, has only ... *ωριαν*...
- 15.62. *κόσσκινον σουρελιανόν*. It is not clear what the adjective means. *C.I.L.*, XI, 1147 (the famous bronze *tabula alimentaria* of Nerva-Trajan) mentions a *fundus syrellianus* in the Veleia area: *fund(um) ...syrellianum in Veleiate pag[o]* = obligatio 28, V. 24; cited in *RE*, s.v. Syrellianus. This inconspicuous place may have given its name to a particular kind of sieve, though we know nothing of it from any other source.

Metals and Metal Workers

L. West⁷ some years ago pointed out the lack in the present portions of the Edict of a section or sections on the common metals. Precious metals are dealt with separately in sections 30 and 31, though the lines on silver are too fragmentary to be of much use. The new fragment from Aidepsos supplies to some extent this lacuna on the common metals, copper, bronze, brass, etc. Presumably the section also included as well prices for iron, zinc, tin, and other metals, but this part has not yet come to light. The metals are listed in descending order of value:

περὶ χαλκοῦ	
αὐροχαλκοῦ	✕ ρ'
κυπρίου	✕ οε'
ἐλατοῦ	✕ ξ'
χαλκοῦ τοῦ κοινοῦ	✕ ν'

⁷ "Notes on Diocletian's Edict", *Class. Phil.*, 34, 1939, pp. 242-244.

15.63a. *αὐροχαλκοῦ*. Orichalc or brass. The original form *ὀρείχαλκος* was rendered in Latin by *orichalcum* but frequently (through a false etymology which saw a connection between brass and gold) the word was written *aurichalcum*. The original meaning of *ὀρείχαλκος* (mountain copper?) is obscure but by the first century B.C. it denotes brass.⁸ The cost of the metal is 100 denarii per pound, a reflection of the high value which the Romans put on it in relation to the other common metals. A coppersmith working on orichalc received 8 denarii per pound (section 7.24a) or 8 per cent of the value of the metal per pound. The same percentage can be seen in the case of the other metals. Copper is valued at 75 denarii per pound and a worker on copper receives 6 denarii per pound or 8 per cent of its value per pound (section 7.25). Likewise in the case of a worker on figurines or statues (section 7.27), if the metal used was *χαλκός ὁ κοινός* which is valued at 50 denarii per pound, the wage of 4 denarii per pound would reflect the same system of values. A similar relation of wage to value per pound of metal cannot be demonstrated for *χαλκός ἐλατός* since no worker dealing specifically with *ἐλατός* is listed in the section on wages. In the case of the precious metals the wage was perhaps 10 per cent of the value per pound. At any rate gold is listed (section 30) as 50,000 denarii per pound and the wage *τοῖς τεχνεῖταις τοῖς εἰς τὸ μέταλλον ἐργαζομένοις* is given as 5,000 denarii per pound or 10 per cent of its value. The fragmentary state of the section on silver leaves in doubt whether the same percentage was paid to workers in that metal.

15.64. *κυπρίου*. The Greek *χαλκός* and the Latin *aes* could both indicate bronze, copper, or even brass. When there was need for exactitude in referring to pure copper as distinct from its alloys a limiting adjective was added, e.g. *ἐρυθρός*, *rubrum*, *κύπριος*, *cyprium*, *cyprinum*, etc. So here we have *χαλκός κύπριος*, "Cyprian bronze" or copper in its refined state.⁹ In section 7.25 wages are listed for a worker *in cupri* (*εἰς κύπρου*). The cost per pound of copper is 75 denarii. Since *χαλκός ὁ κοινός* and *χαλκός ἐλατός* both appear to be kinds of bronze and sell for 60 and 50 denarii respectively it is difficult to see why copper should be more expensive than either. Making bronze involves the cost of tin and copper as well as the cost of labor in combining the two metals. The explanation may lie in the fact that pure copper does not often occur in ancient deposits unmixed with other metals. It was generally procured from the oxides, sulphides, and silicates in an expensive process.¹⁰

⁸ See R. J. Forbes, *Metallurgy in Antiquity*, Leiden, 1950, p. 286 and K. C. Bailey, *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects*, Part II, London, 1932, p. 162. Bailey quotes the opinion of Festus: *aurichalcum vel orichalcum, quidam putant compositum ex aere et auro; sive quod colorem habeat aureum orichalcum sane dicitur, quod in montuosis locis invenitur; mons etiam Graece ὄρος appellatur*. See also for an interesting discussion of orichalkos H. Michell in *Class. Rev.*, N.S. 5, 1955, pp. 21-22.

⁹ For a discussion of these terms see Forbes, *Metallurgy*, pp. 370ff.

¹⁰ For a discussion of these terms see Forbes, *Metallurgy*, pp. 350ff.

- 15.65. ἐλατοῦ. Ductile or beaten bronze; cf. Latin *ductilis*. There are many references to this malleable metal in antiquity; *inter alia*, Aristotle, *Meteorologica*, 378a, 27 and *passim*. Pollux (VII, 105) tells us that τροχίας was also called χαλκὸς ὁ χυτός and distinguishes it from χαλκὸς ἐλατός (also called τυπίας): τροχίαν μὲν χαλκὸν τὸν χυτὸν χρὴ καλεῖν τυπίαν δὲ ὃν οἱ νῦν εἴποιεν ἐλατόν. Pliny the Elder (34, 94f.) discusses the various forms and blends of copper and includes *regulare* (bar copper) or *ductile aes* which would be the Latin equivalents of χαλκὸς ἐλατός. He adds the observation that *aes regulare...ab aliis ductile appellatum* (i.e. malleable), *quale omne Cyprium est*. The price of the metal is here given as 60 denarii per pound. In A.D. 338 the cost had become over two and a half times as much. We learn from *Pap. Oxy.*, 85, a declaration of a guild of copper-smiths to the logistes, the value of the goods in stock at the end of the month. The declaration mentions 6 pounds of χαλκὸς ἐλατός worth 1,000 denarii and 4 pounds of χαλκὸς χυτός (i.e. cast bronze), the value of which is not given.
- 15.66. χαλκοῦ τοῦ κοινοῦ. Precisely what "common" bronze signifies is not clear. From its designation as "common" and the fact that it is cheaper than the other varieties we can perhaps assume that it was bronze used for everyday articles such as cookpots, thresholds, etc. rather than the more refined type required for coinage, decorative inlays, mirrors, sculptures, and the like. Perhaps it is similar to "pot-bronze" or "*ollarium*" (*vase nomen hoc dante*) which Pliny mentions (34, 98) as being composed of three or four pounds of silver lead to every hundred pounds of copper.

† E. J. DOYLE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY