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More Ostraca from the Fitzwilliam Museum

This article concludes my edition of Greek ostraca in the collection of the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge, cf. ZPE 80 (1990) 221-238 and 81 (1990) 267-269. Three of the texts, nos. 6, 10 and 11, probably come from the Oxyrhynchite nome, the others certainly or presumably from Thebes.

As before, I owe the opportunity to study these pieces and publish them here to the courtesy of Dr. David Gill.

1. Receipt for στέφανος

Inv. GR. P. 521 8 x 4 cm 2nd cent. BC (?)

The charges called στέφανος were in origin presumably free-will contributions to finance crowns presented to royalty and other high personnages on special occasions, but in Ptolemaic papyri they generally appear as taxes without any perceptibly voluntary aspects, and connection with a special occasion is rarely visible. The receipt published below presents a novel problem of interpretation in that the στέφανος is said to be τῆς χρέας τοῦ θ (ἔτους) (l. 5). Of itself this could mean 'to meet the needs of the 9th year,' but comparable texts have in the position of τῆς χρέας the name of some particular group which was subject to the tax: κάτοικοι (WO 330, 353, 701, 1311 = O.Leid. 20, 1512; O.Tait 113, P47; P.Vars. ostr. 50, SB XVI 12348; καληρούχοι (P.Teb. I 101, WO 1528), πη (O.Tait 112), γεωργοί (so named only in P.Teb. I 95.9, but payments by the tenants of Crown land are common). If χρέα here is parallel, it means 'office, branch of service' (WB s.v. 3) and the reference is to hunters (l. 3).

Payments of crown tax from catoec on the occasion of their entrance into that group are known; and a similar requirement from hunters, at least from those in the army, would not be very surprising. In view of the usual connection of στέφανος with land there could be an implication that the payer held a κληρον: apparently not otherwise attested of hunters, but again plausible enough.

Another possibility is raised by WO 1530. The occupation of the payer in that receipt is not stated, but the collector writes ἀπέχω παρὰ σοῦ τὸ γνώμονεν μοι ἀρχικυνηγήγα εἰς στεφάνιν ἄρ

---

1 WO I 295-299; Préaux, Economie royale 394-5. Rulers aside, crowns of honour were decreed by cities and other organizations to their benefactors (e.g., SB III 7246, V 8853-55, 8867, 8929; cf. in general Daremberg-Saglio III s.v. corona, esp. cols. 1532ff); but the only private person yet known for whom a στέφανος appears to have been collected in the manner of a tax is one Noumenios (O.Tait 201, 202, 256; WO 1360; P.Fay. 14). Noumenios, Pros.Ptol. IV 10092, is identified tentatively as the συγγενής καὶ ἐνστολαγράφος of I.Phila 19C; see Moor, Aulic Titulature 0269 for further bibliography.

2 P.Teb. I 61(b). 254 note; P.Berl.Lehig. I pp. 313ff. There was a στέφανος on animals in Syria and Phoenicia by 260 BC (COP 21.9 = Scholl, Corpus 3 I 9); it is attested as a land tax in Egypt by 243 (P.Teb. III (1) 746). P.Teb I, III, IV and BGU VIII contain many mentions of στέφανος in money and in kind; the amount due from royal tenants at Kerkeosiris was 1/2 artab of wheat per arura (P.Teb. III 1128 introd.). In 41 BC crown tax is spoken of as an irregular charge as opposed to the γνήσια βασιλεία in COP 76.26-28: τοῖς κατὰ κεφαλῶν ἔν τεν νομοὶ ἄρ στεφάνοις (sic). For the Roman aurum coronarium see A. K. Bowman in BASP 4 (1967) 59ff.

3 J. Lesquier, Institutions militaires de l’Égypte sous les Lagides (Paris, 1911) 223. The amount in kind may have been 2 artab of wheat per arura, P.Berl. Leihig. I p. 314.

τοῦ ν (ἐτούς) (2-5). Wilcken interpreted this as a gratification for the chief hunter himself; and if that is right, the payment here could be similar. I think, though, that the wording of WO 1530 is also compatible with the view that the ἄρχηκοντιγός was required to collect crown tax from the men in his charge and then turn it over to the government: the procedure would be comparable to that in WO 320, where payment for a royal crown is made to the representatives of a πρὸς τῇ συντάξει.

The text below is further unusual in that the formula used is not that of a bank or a granary, but indicates a collector of some other type; so also WO 320, 1530 and O.Tait 134. The formula is most commonly employed for money taxes (WO I p. 61), rarely for those in grain (ibid. p. 97). The ostracon breaks off before one can tell which is meant here.

1 Ἀμμώνιος Ἰππακλείδη
2 χαί (ρειν). ἕχω παρὰ σοῦ ύπέρ Πα-
3 μώνθου τοῦ θηρευτοῦ
4 εἰς τὸν λόγον τοῦ στεφάνου
5 τῆς χρέως τοῦ θ (ἐτούς)

breaks off

‘Ammonius to Heraclides, greeting. I have from you, on behalf of the hunter Pamonthes for the account of the crown of the trade for year ...

This appears to be the first occurrence of the form θηρευτῆς since SB I 4369(b). For words meaning ‘hunter’ in the papyri cf. Raïos-Chouliara p. 51 n. 17, and for other Ptolemaic hunters Pros.Ptol. 4419ff.

2. Botched Granary Receipt

Inv. GR. P. 488 9.5 x 5 cm 3 July, 112 BC

This text contains an error which hinders closer interpretation: after μεγάλη in l. 2 the scribe has omitted at least an abbreviation for θησαυρόν and the year for which the payment was made. If these items are all that are missing the receipt falls into Packman’s ‘Group One: Receipts with No Tax Phrase’. But it is possible that the omission was more extensive: θησαυρόν can also be followed by ύπερ τοῦ τόπου, εἰς τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν τοῦ ποστοῦ ἐτους ύπερ τοῦ τόπου, or εἰς τὸ fraction of an artab. Any one of these could have been meant here, and the oversight may have been so serious as to cause the scribe to break off the text before it was finished. The lack of a

5 WO I p. 295. Wilcken’s interpretation is based partly on the diminuitive στεφάνιον: Was der "Kranz" für den König ist ... das ist das "Kränzchen" für den gewöhnlichen Sterblichen. This distinction is probably too subtle: the crown for Noumenios (above, n.1) was also a στέφανος, as were the crowns awarded to public benefactors and to victorious athletes; on the other hand, the normal receipt WO 701 may well have στεφα[νίον] rather than στεφ[ανικόν], which does not seem to be attested unambiguously till the second century AD (Bowman, BASP 4 p. 60). Στεφάνιον as ‘reward’, though, as Wilcken points out, is clear in UPZ I 64.12.

6 Zola M. Packman, The Taxes in Grain in Ptolemaic Egypt (New Haven and Toronto 1968 = ASP IV) p. 16.
signature is no sign of this, as signatures are regularly omitted at this period;\(^7\) but the amount paid, here given only in words, was normally repeated in figures.

\[1\] ἔτοις Πισύνι ις με[μέτρηκεν] εἰς
\[2\] τὸν ἐν Διὸς πόλει τῇ μεγάλῃ
\[3\] ἰδοὺ(σαυρόν) Ἀντανδρός Ἄντανδρος Θεογέ(νους) πυροῦ
\[4\] πέντε

‘Year 5, Payni 17. Antandros, son of Theogenes, has paid five (artabs) of wheat at the granary in Diospolis Magna.’

\(^3\) For the rare name Ἀντανδρος cf. BGU IV 1134.6 and SB I 1686.4 (Pros.Ptol. 1839 = 4333).

\(^3-4\) πυροῦ πέντε: the omission of the word ὀρτόβας is normal; cf. ZPE 20 (1976) 127 n.6.

3. Bank Receipt

Inv. GR. P. 451 10 x 8.5 cm ca. 140-131 BC

It is unfortunate that this receipt should be damaged and hard to read, for it appears to deal with an interesting transaction, the sale of surplus material from the military camp at Thebes. No similar text is known to me,\(^8\) but the sale itself would presumably have been comparable to the auctions of royal property recorded for example in UPZ II 218-223.\(^9\)

The object of sale is lost at the beginning of line 3. Whatever it was, it had been used, or at any rate acquired, for the construction of ὄργανα | ἐλτικῶν (4-5). Ὄργανα καταπελτικά is a known collocation for ‘catapult’ (LSJ, s.v. καταπαλτικός): that would suit context and script.\(^10\) -αγγελτικῶν or a compound, however, would also do. Those would presumably be signalling devices.\(^11\) Κελτικῶν is palaeographically excluded.

An approximate date is given by the banker Herakleides, for whom the earliest attestation is Mecheir 140 (WO 1515) and the latest 15 November 126 (SB XVI 12349). The use of his name in

---

\(^7\) Packman p. 53. The date is determinable because receipts for payments εἰς τὸν ἐν Διὸς πόλει τῇ μεγάλῃ θηρσιωρὸν are found only from 164 to 88 BC, and in this time span the only regnal year 5 is that of Cleopatra III with Ptolemy IX, 113-112 BC. The date would not be affected by identifying the queen as Cleopatra II instead of Cleopatra III.

\(^8\) There are receipts for sales of land for the ἔδοις λόγος, BGU III 992 and P.Haun. I 11 (cf. P. R. Swarney, The Ptolemaic and-Roman Idios Logos, Toronto 1970, 7ff.), but these are far more complex than the ostracon.

\(^9\) The principal study is by M. Talamanca in Atti della Academia Nazionale dei Lincei Ser. 8, vol. VII.2 (1955) 38-104; see most recently P.KölN VI 268 with commentary. Cf. also land cessions such as P.Teb. IV 1101 and the references there.


\(^11\) The standard work is W. Riepl, Das Nachrichtenwesen des Altertums (Leipzig 1913, reprint Hildesheim - New York 1972); cf. Forbes, Studies in Ancient Technology VI 171ff. The watchtowers discussed and illustrated by R. S. Bagnall in CE 57 (1982) 125-8 (cf. also Clarysse and Sijpesteijn in AncSoc 19, 1988, 71-96; Zitterkopf and Sidebotham, JEA 75, 1989, 180-189) may be relevant, but ὄργανα should mean some type of equipment rather than the towers themselves.
line 2 shows that the text was written before 130, if the pattern observed in his other receipts held true here as well.\textsuperscript{12}

The ostracon contains the earliest specific reference to a χάραξις at Thebes (as opposed to a τεῖχος or φρούριον at the Memnonia), though of course military presence in the area is attested well before this.\textsuperscript{13} It is presumably this camp that gave its name to one of the quarters of the city under the Romans.

It is natural to ask oneself whether the ostracon should be directly connected with the dynastic struggles of this period and/or (the end of?) the revolt of Harsiesis,\textsuperscript{14} but the text provides no answer.

\textbf{4. Receipt for τέλος ταφής}

Inv. E. 284-1891

12 x 9 cm

12 May, AD 177

Burial tax at Thebes has been discussed in detail by Bénédicte Verbeeck and Guy Wagner in \textit{ZPE} 81 (1990) 290-295, to which the reader is referred for bibliography and parallel texts. Receipts for the tax are known from (probably) 108 to 192 AD and can be divided into two classes, those issued by agents of the clothiers’ tax and those from officials of the temple granary.\textsuperscript{15} These


\textsuperscript{13} J. K. Winnicki, Ptolemäerarmee in Thebais (Arch.Filol. 38, 1978) 51ff.

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. L. Koenen, "Θεούσιν ἐγερθώς: Ein einheimischer Gegenkönig in Ägypten (132/1 a)”, \textit{CE} 34 (1959) 103-112.

\textsuperscript{15} τελώναι and ἐπιτηρηται τέλους ἰματισμῶν versus τελώναι and ἐπιτηρηται θησαυροῦ ἱερῶν. From the list and analysis in \textit{ZPE} 81 (1990) 292-3 I deduct no. 3, O.Tait 1070, which there is no adequate reason to connect with τέλος ταφής.
two groups of receivers apparently functioned simultaneously, the first collecting two drachmas and the second only one. This suggests to my mind that there were two distinct taxes of the same name; but the lower rate has been attested only three times, so generalizations are risky. Verbeeck and Wagner, using the same evidence, concluded that only a single tax was involved.

The two-drachma charge is several times said to have been levied on ÙyÒnia, burial shrouds; whether it was collected from the merchants or the bereaved is still moot. If the tax collected by the Òσπεριον ετανων was in fact different, then the other principal known business of the Òσπεριον at this period, the collection of βαλανευτικόν, suggests a connection with water: cleansing the body or libations for the dead, perhaps. However this may be, the charges are so rarely met with as to suggest that there were forms of interment available on which τέλος ταφής was not due, and that these were the ones commonly used.

This text was mentioned by E. A. Wallis Budge in *A Catalogue of the Egyptian Collection in the Fitzwilliam Museum* (Cambridge 1893) p. 124, no. 425: "Red terra-cotta ostrakon, inscribed with seven lines of Greek. Karnak. 5 1/8 in."

---

16 Cf. for year 9 of Marcus Aurelius and Verus O.Tait 1073 and O.Cair. GPW 91 with WO 658; for year 12 of Antoninus Pius WO 1062 and 1585 plus Nachtrag with O.Tait A45.

17 Collection by τελανων ιματισμολον of οπισητηρ αι τελοι ιματισμολον certainly suggests that the tax payers should be ιματισμολοι, and the payer in the ostracon published by Verbeeck and Wagner is in fact described as such. On the other hand, the trade could have been stated there simply to distinguish the man from someone else of the same name. Against the idea of a trade tax stands WO 1463, in which a woman pays for her husband's burial. One can of course imagine that she too was in the cloth trade, but on the simplest view she paid as the person who ordered the mummy. Some receipts record payments for two or three burials at once. Wilcken felt that this too spoke for a trade tax (WO I 305-6), but multiple deaths in a single family were probably commoner in antiquity than today, see P.Lugd-Bat XIX p. 163.


Even if these speculations are along the right track, though, it remains obscure why officials of the Òσπεριοι should be the responsible parties. Archaeological remnants might theoretically have given a clue, but the temple granary at Karnak does not appear to have been identified yet. Structures like the 'storehouse' of Ψαμμυθις near the Sacred Lake seem at first sight tempting, but the latest study known to me denies that these were granaries (Claude Traunecker, "Les 'temples hauts' de Basse Époque," *Revue d’Égyptologie* 38, 1987, 147ff. at p. 157); and as he points out, they do not resemble the granary of Amon as discussed by Charles Van Siclen III in *Two Theban Monuments from the reign of Amenhotep II* (San Antonio 1982) 18ff.
'Psenemounis and associate tax farmers of the temple granary at Diospolis to Panas son of Psenmonthes. We have received the appropriate tax for one burial. Year 17 of the Imperatores Caesares Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus the lords Augusti, Pachon 23.'

1 Psenemounis was not known before, see the list in ZPE 76 (1989) 77ff. Add to the ἐπιτηρηται there 'Ἀπολλάνων καὶ μέτοχοι in year 7 of Vespasian, AD 74-75 (O.Str. 270 with BL II,1 p. 29); and add to the τελάναι, if the statement in BL II,1 p. 31 is correct, Ἕρωιφμόις καὶ μέτοχοι already in year 10 of Nero, AD 63-64 (O.Str. 477).

3 τὸ καθήκον τέλος: these receipts often omit the amount charged, presumably because it was standardized. In O.Leid. 144, though, τὸ καθήκον τέλος is followed by the sum collected.

5. Receipt for φόρος ἀπότακτος

Inv. GR.P.523 9 x 7 cm 2 June AD 252

The phrase φόρος ἀπότακτος is familiar from land leases, but in the following text it has every appearance of denoting a tax. The closest parallel is WO 1473 with BL II (1) p. 112; cf. also O.Mich. 752, a payment ὑπὲρ ἀποτάκτων (3rd cent. AD). Problematic is whether these charges are identical with the φόρος ἱερὸς ἀπότακτος or φόρος ἱεροῦ ἀποτάκτου which is so far attested only in a series of documents from the reign of Philip the Arabian, and also whether the latter is to be understood as a translation of sacra delegatio, from earlier periods is found in other connections: on bricks (P.Stras. I 66.8), boats (SPP XXII 183.35-7), priestly dues (P.Amh. II 119.8, P. Fay. 39.15), as a transport fee (P.Berl. Leihg. I 5.5 with introd.).

The receipt follows an unusual formula which R. Bogaert has shown to have been used by tax collectors of various types but not (as had previously been thought) by public banks. 

1 διεγραφέν Ποῦ(νι) ἡ τοῦ β (ἐκτους) τῶν κυρίων ἡ[μῶν] Tafel XXI
2 Γάλλων καὶ Οὐδολουσιανοῦ Σεβαστῶν Σοφεία Ἡ[μὸς]
3 ὁν(οι) τῆς Καμήτες Πεκύστος Ἀβῶτος(ς) ὑπ(ερ) φόρου ἀποτάκτ[ου]
4 τοῦ α(ὐτοῦ) β (ἐκτους) δραχ(μάς) δύο, (γίν.) (δρ.) β. Διογγήνης σεσήμεως.

'On Payni 8 of year 2 of our lords the Galli (sic) and Volusianus, Augusti, Sophia, daughter of NN, paid in the name of Kametis son of Pekysis, grandson of Abos, for the fixed tax for the same 2nd year, two drachmas, = 2 dr. Signed by me, Diogenes.'

1-2 The imperial formula with the plural Γάλλων is not precisely paralleled elsewhere in papyri. I presume it is simply an error for τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Γάλλων καὶ Οὐδολουσιανοῦ Σεβαστῶν (O.Tait 1635, O.Thebes 125, O.Mich. 156), possibly through the influence of the preceding plurals. There is also some slight chance that the scribe intended to refer to Gallus and Volusianus together as Galli, so P.KölN IV 196.12,19,27, and then changed his mind. A reference to Gallus and Hostilianus is not plausible, as the latter was neither a Gallus, nor living at the time of this text. For the fundamental dates see Rathbone, ZPE 62 (1986) 114-5.

20 ἀπότακτον = διατύπωσις = delegatio if this is not pressing an abbreviation in P.Cair. Isid. 42.6 too far.
3 There is a Καμήτις ὁμ(οίως) Πεκόσις Ἀβδοτος in O.Tait 1909.5, doubtfully dated to the 2nd century.

6. List of Grain

No inv. no. 8.5 x 7.5 cm 3rd cent. AD

Judging from the name Tampemou in l. 1 this is one of the few Greek ostraca yet published from the Oxyrhynchite nome. Others are SB I 1941, 1947-1960, 1962-1964, 1966-1983, 2251-2254, O.Ash.Shel. 50-51, 73-190, 197, and probably items 10 and 11 below.

1 Θ]άθ α'/ Ταμπεμού [8 or 9 Sept.
2 ] ρ Μακρο( ) (άρτ.) δ
3 ] ιν δ
4 ] ος δ
5 ] όλης Ἐλένου δ
6 ]Πολυδέυκης δ]
7 Ἠρακλείδης δ
8 ] γ Ὅμηρος δ
9 ] εφιαζ δ
10 ] γ breaks off

7. Delivery of Donkeys

Inv. GR. P. 499 8 x 7 cm 5 April, 3rd cent. AD

This note is complete in three lines. The closest parallels appear to be O.Tait P457, 458, 461, 475-6 and O.Mich. I 357-359, III 1054. The editors class the Michigan ostraca as 'delivery of donkeys by individuals', and such brief texts will hardly bear a more precise interpretation. A connection with the transport of grain from the repositories to a harbor, as in the slightly more elaborate receipts which have been discussed with bibliography in O.Oslo pp. 38-59, O.Br-Berl. pp. 161-163 and by H. C. Youtie, Scriptaunculae I 214-215, is on general grounds not unlikely but cannot be proved. O.Mich. 1053 is a comparable text concerning camels.

1 Ἡρακλάς
2 δονοι ζ
3 Φαρ(μοδθ)ι

'Heraklas, 6 donkeys, Pharmouthi 10.'

2 Dependant on the real purpose of this chit there is a chance that δονοι here is intended as a measure of grain (usually 3 artabs). The omission of πυροου, κριθης or the like does not speak against this possibility, as transportation receipts regularly fail to specify the type of grain meant, cf. e. g. O.Mich. 360-363, 365-414.
8. Money Account

Inv. GR. P. 536  
15 x 10 cm  
4th cent. AD

The term μυριάς in this text will refer to denarii (Bagnall, *Currency and Inflation* 12 n. 2). It indicates a date not earlier than the second half of the fourth century (*ibid.* 45).

1 [...]
2 ἐνος ἀγάθου μ(υριάδες) χ
3 ομπος μ(υριάδες) χ Διοσκόρου μ(υριάδες) μη
4 Διοσκόρου μ(υριάδες) φ
5 Διοκόρου μ(υριάδες) ρν

9. Three Occupations

Inv. GR. P. 531  
12 x 12 cm  
4th(?) cent. AD

The purpose of these three lines is obscure. The hand is large and clear, the use of abbreviations and the fluctuation between genitive and nominative do not speak for a school exercise.

1 καλκέως
2 ἐργάτης
3 βαλανέο(ς)

1 καλκέως 3 βαλανέως

10. Grain Receipt

Inv. GR. P. 537  
15 x 16 cm  
18 June, 6th cent. AD

This and the following text are written in the same hand on the same type of grayish, strongly ribbed pottery; the two sherds may well have come from a single vessel. The receipt was made out by one Phoibammon and records a payment of unsifted wheat for a 14th indiction. These features are reminiscent of SB I 1971 and 1972, which came from an Oxyrhynchite find part of which, according to the *Archaeological Report* for 1905/06 p. 15, was distributed to the Fitzwilliam Museum. There is consequently a good chance that these texts, like no. 6, come from the Oxyrhynchite nome.

1 π[...] 9 ἵδης πολ(πευόμενος) δι[...] 9
2 Πασίρου καὶ Φ[...], ον Πωκά ύπερ γε-
3 γήματος ἰδ ἰν(δικτίωνος) στ(του) ῥυπ(αροῦ) ἀρτ(άβας) τεσσεράκοντα
4 ἡμύνσυ φ(οίνικας) δ, γ(νονταί) στ(του) ῥυπ(αροῦ) (ἀρτ.?) μ (ἡμ.?) φ(οίν.) δ.
6 δι’ ἐμοὺ Φοιβάμμ[ωνος
7 Παξύνυκδ
5 ἤμου

... through NN son of Pasiros and NN son of Pokas, for the crop of the 14th indication, forty and one-half artabas and four choenices of unsifted wheat, makes 40 1/2 art. 4 ch., through me, Phoibammon. Payni 24.’

SB 1971 and 1972 both mention a boat belonging to the politeuÒmenow Dioscurides, so if this text indeed belongs to the same find the lacuna should perhaps be completed as εἰς] πλ[ε(οίων) Διοσκοῦρ]δης, nom. for gen. A ship owner with that name and title appears also in P.Heid. IV 313.14 and 16, but with all due allowance for the uncertainty of palaeographic dating the ostraca are probably too late to refer to the same man. According to the most recent study politeuÒmenoi, who were usually distinguished from βουλευταί, were members of the curial class (H. Geremek in Anagennesis 1 (1981) 231-247.

3 Πασίρου is apparently new, but the formation is regular.

11. Grain Receipt

Inv. GR. P. 512

See the introduction to no. 10.

1 ε...
2 ἐμετος[
3 iδ’ ἱνδικτ[ωνος
4 τρις τριτον
5 δι’ ἐμοὺ Φοιβάμμ[ωνος

1 Possibly ἐντῷηυν  4 τρεῖς

12-13. Jar Labels

When Wilcken published his study of ostraca he excluded all such writings as were applied to the jars before they had been broken and referred to the owners, content etc. of the vessels while they were still complete (WO I p. 4). Such notes have apparently still not been published in any great number: there is a survey by Claude Rapin, "Les Inscriptions économiques de la trésorerie hellénistique d’Aï Khanoum (Afghanistan)," BCH 107 (1983) 315ff. at 351-356; cf. now also O.Ash.Shel. 195 and 196. The fragments published below come from jars which had been used to hold pistachio nuts and dried fruits. David Gill has been kind enough to write a note on the type of pottery used, see p. 277.
12. Pistachios

Inv. GR. P. 532 17 x 12 cm 6th cent. AD

This is evidently the third reference to pistachios in a documentary text from Egypt: the others are P.Laur. IV 184.8 and P.Vindob. Worp 11.14 and 15. To the references given by the editors of those texts add now Suzanne Amigues' Budé edition of Theophrastus, Hist. plant. with her notes to III,15,3 and IV,4,6 (Les Belles Lettres, 1989). Pistachios were connected chiefly with Syria and Mesopotamia, but they are also said to have been grown near Alexandria.

1-2 \( \piστάκια\, [ \)  
2 \( πορφυρο(πόλου\, ?)\, κα\, [\)

1-2 \( \piορφυρο(πόλου)\) is the only attested expansion that seems likely to be right here. It would be the trade of the jar’s owner, whose name will then have been lost in l. 1. The traces after \( \piστάκια\) might be the first letter of this name, psi or xi; but it looks more like a talent sign, giving the weight of the pistachios in the jar. P.Laur. 184.4 reads \( \piστακιού \piορφ(υ)\rho(ο)\) but I see no grammatically plausible way of connecting the word in l. 2 with \( \piστάκια\).

13. Dried Fruits belonging to Menas

Inv. GR. P. 530 17 x 21 cm 6th cent. AD

1 \( Μην\, [\)  
2 \( τραγηματι[\)ων\)  
3 \( δευτερίων\, [\)

2-3 ‘second-class tidbits’. I presume the genitive depends on a now-lost statement of weight or measure.
Topfbeschriftungen, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge:
Nr. 5 (Inv. GR. P. 523), Nr. 12 (Inv. GR. P. 532), Nr. 13 (Inv. GR. P. 530)