THEODORE F. BRUNNER

PAPYRUS-MAKERS

Papyrus-Makers

In *P.Teb*. I 112, Menches, the Komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris, records four payments for papyrus. In line 62, one of these payments appears to have been made to a "paper-maker," τῶι χαρτοπο(ιῶι).[1] F. Zucker agrees with this reading (*Philologus* 70 [1911] 90 n. 17).

U. Wilcken, however, disagrees on the grounds that the paper trade was a monopoly under the Ptolemies: "Der Kleinverkauf [of papyrus] erfolgte durch χαρτοπῶλαι, wie der des Öl*s* durch ἐλαιοπῶλαι." He considers it factually suspect ("sachlich bedenklich") that papyrus would have been purchased directly from the manufacturer, adding that "die Abkürzung χαρτοπο(ιῶι) ist auffällig: ich vermute, daß χαρτοπό(ληι) (= χαρτοπώληι) zu ergänzen ist (*Grundz*. 255).

T. Reil concurs with Wilcken: "in sämtlichen Papyri begegnet m.W. kein einziger χαρτοποιός."[2] This argument is far from iron-clad: we find no instance of χαρτοπώλης in the papyri either.[3] Nevertheless, P.J. Sijpesteijn follows Wilcken and Reil: in *P. Wisc*. I 29 verso 28, a third century account of corn, he resolves χαρτ[ο]ʹπʹ into χαρτ[ο]π[(ώλη)], this despite the fact that χαρτ[ο]π[(οιῷ)] is equally possible here. F. Heichelheim, in his discussion of ancient monopolies, mentions χαρτοπο(ιός) and χαρτοπό(λης) as possible alternatives in *Teb*. I 112, but does not commit himself to either (*RE* 16, col. 185).

N. Lewis discusses *Teb*. I 112 at some length, concluding that "since [an earlier passage] strongly suggests payment directly to the maker, since in this long account of 126 lines there is no instance of omicron written for omega or vice versa, and since we know from *P. Teb*. 709 ... that papyrus rolls could legally be purchased from other sources as well as from the royal 'monopoly', it follows that χαρτ[ο]πο(ιῶι) is the correct reading" after all.[4]

To a large extent, the post-Grenfell/Hunt discussions of the passage turn on contextual considerations. Clearly also, they are influenced by the notion that the word χαρτοποιός is unattested in Greek[5]—its occurrence elsewhere would surely have been noted by those addressing the issue.[6] The non-existence of the word would seem curious; even if we were to accept that the *sale* of papyrus was a monopoly in Ptolemaic Egypt, references to papyrus *manufacture* (and to those engaged in it) should be expected somewhere in Greek literary or

---

[1] As resolved by Grenfell and Hunt.

[2] Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Gewerbes im hellenistischen Ägypten (Borna-Leipzig 1913) 131 and n. 1.

[3] I am grateful to Professor William H. Willis and the Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri for helpful information.

[4] Papyrus in Classical Antiquity (Oxford 1974) 117-118 and n. 7. Lewis had previously dealt with the issue in L'Industrie du Papyrus dans l'Égypte Gréco-Romaine (Paris 1934) 127-8.

[5] χαρτοποιός is not carried in any of the ancient or modern lexica.

[6] J. Diethart, "Zur Bedeutung von ἀνθηλᾶς," ZPE 75 (1988) 156, mentions the χαρτοποιός controversy in passing, noting that "seit der Arbeit von Reil ist kein weiterer Beleg dazu gekommen."

documentary texts. After all, -ποι-compounds denoting manufacturers of virtually any sort are exceedingly frequent in Greek: a search through the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae data bank yields more than 7,000 forms deriving from some 350 separate such compounds. By contrast, -πωλ-compounds are far more scarce: the TLG data bank contains only slightly more than 150 forms from some 50 separate words .[7]

In fact, the word χαρτοποιός is attested. In Constantine Porphyrogenitus, we hear of the Peloponnesians opting to make monetary and in-kind contributions in lieu of military service during the reign of Romanus I. Various metropolitans, bishops, and monasteries provided horses; holders of imperial rank, however, along with sailors, purple-fishers, and papyrus-makers did not contribute: οἱ δὲ ἔχοντες βασιλικὰ ἀξιώματα, πλώϊμοι, κογχυλευταί, χαρτοποιοὶ ἱππάρια οὐ δεδώκασιν (*De Administrando Imperio* 52.10-11).

The texts ascribed to Constantine reflect thorough acquaintance with all aspects of records and archives,[8] and can be assumed to utilize accurate terminology. Admittedly, the *De Administrando Imperio* dates from the tenth century. The lateness of the work, however, does not imply that its language is so fundamentally different from that employed by a late 2nd century B.C. village clerk as to render a reference to χαρτοποιοί meaningless vis-à-vis *Teb.* I 112.62. Χαρτοποιός, like all the other -ποιος compounds known to us, is a perfectly natural word-formation, and its presence in the *De Administrando Imperio* does support the Grenfell-Hunt χαρτοπο(ιῶι) reading. Without the *De Administrando Imperio* passage, the editors' resolution of χαρτ[ο]πο() into χαρτοπο(ιῶι) would have constituted the creation of a *hapax legomenon;* with it, the reading acquires greater legitimacy.

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae
University of California, Irvine   Theodore F. Brunner

---

[7] That is, -πωλ-compounds related to the verb πωλεῖν. There are numerous additional words derived from πῶλος, "filly."

[8] There are fifteen occurrences of χάρτη or χαρτία in Constantine's works; χαρτουλάριος occurs no fewer than 124 times.