

## Dog Bowls and Clean Socks: A Miscellaneous Ptolemaic Account\*

**Abstract:** Publication of a Ptolemaic papyrus fragment from the collection of the Bodleian Library, Oxford: Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 29 (P). The papyrus was excavated by Flinders Petrie at Gurob, Egypt. It is an account of daily expenses from around the middle of the third century BC, and is of interest for the rare items listed and for some unusual vocabulary. A small scrap from the same find, MS. Gr. class. f. 28 (P), is also published as an appendix.

Flinders Petrie's excavations at Gurob, in the Fayum, took place in 1889–1890.<sup>1</sup> According to the Bodleian Library's handlist of papyri, the present papyrus was discovered in 1890 in the course of these excavations, but the year is more likely to have been 1889, since Flinders Petrie finished work in January 1890. The papyrus was then presented to the Bodleian Library by Jesse Haworth, a patron of the excavations, in 1895.<sup>2</sup> It has been mounted in a glass frame with the back covered by a sheet. The top of this sheet, just to the right of the Bodleian Summary Catalogue number, is marked in pencil with the annotation 'cf A.3.4.', which probably refers to the mummy from which the fragment was recovered.<sup>3</sup>

The document is written across the fibres. The fragment comes from the top of a column, and the top margin is preserved to a depth of 0.9 cm; only a slither of the right and left margins is preserved on both sides, and the lower margin is lost. As the back of the papyrus has been covered by a sheet within the frame, it is presumably blank. The date of the document is best fixed by the circumstances of the find and the dates of the other papyri discovered at Gurob: as Archibald Henry Sayce remarked in his section on the Greek papyri from Gurob in Flinders Petrie's volume about the site, 'roughly speaking most of the documents belong to about 250 BC; none (so far as I know) are later than 225 BC'.<sup>4</sup> The subsequent publication of the papyri has revealed that there are in fact a few documents dating from as late as the second century,<sup>5</sup> but Sayce's statement holds true for

---

\* The images of the papyri edited in this article are published courtesy of the Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford. We are grateful to Dr Demokritos Kaltsas for comments.

<sup>1</sup> A. H. Sayce, 'The Greek Papyri', in W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Illahun, Kahun and Gurob* (London 1891) 34–47, at 34.

<sup>2</sup> For the distribution of the Gurob papyri to the British Library, the Bodleian Library, and the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, in 1895 through the intermediary of B. P. Grenfell, see F. G. Kenyon, 'Graeco-Roman Egypt', in *Archaeological Report (Egypt Exploration Fund)* (1894–1895) 50–56, at 55–56. On Haworth, see M. L. Bierbrier (ed.), *Who Was Who in Egyptology* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., London 2019) 210.

<sup>3</sup> See B. Van Beek, P.Petr.Kleon, p. 8. Most recorded mummy numbers follow the pattern of single letter or double letter + single number, not two separate numbers as here, e.g. AA22, B27, E67, ZZ1, but cf. P.Petr.Kleon 120 from a mummy labelled 'N' 1, 2'. The annotation must have been copied from the folder that originally contained the papyrus.

<sup>4</sup> Sayce, loc. cit. (n. 1) 34.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. W. Clarysse and E. Lanciers, 'Currency and the dating of Demotic and Greek papyri from the Ptolemaic period', *Ancient Society* 20 (1989) 117–132, at 125–127, and cf. P.Petr. II 32 (1) (197 BC), 38(a) (198 BC), 48 (187 BC).

the majority of the finds. A dating of the Bodleian papyrus in the middle of the third century is confirmed by the hand, which is closely comparable to some of the hands found in the Zenon archive: compare e.g. P.Cair.Zen. I 59010 (around 259), II 59176 (255), II 59232 (253), IV 59703 (mid third century).

The text is an account of expenses listing a curious mixture of everyday items and alimentary products. It betrays a varied diet based on proteins (fish, goose, meat), grains (wheat, barley), wine, dairy (milk), vegetables (λάχανα, as well as gourd), and condiments (vinegar, oil, salt). Other items of expenditure include payments to a bath-attendant and a tailor, as well as for τρύβλια. Some of the items of expenditure appear to have been extremely rare. Dog bowls (2 κρατήρια κυσί) have never been attested in the papyri before, nor, so far as we know, are dog bowls mentioned explicitly anywhere else in any surviving Graeco-Roman writings. The mention of payment to a fuller for the cleaning of socks (6 ποδέων γνάπτρα) is also unique. In addition, the papyrus has one of the oldest mentions of black writing ink (8 μέλαν). A number of terms are also of lexical interest: the words κρατήρια ‘small bowls’ (2), ὄξις ‘vinegar holder’ (8), and τρύβλια ‘dishes’ (9) are rarely found in the papyri. The account was probably organized by day of the month: see 5, 10 nn. For similar accounts of miscellaneous daily expenses, compare P.Cair.Zen. IV 59702–59706 and P.Petr. III 135, 137–140, 142, which include some of the same items as those listed in the present document.

The writer made several corrections. In 7 he inserted the symbol for τριώβολον without leaving the usual gap after the previous word, then deleted it, made allowance for the usual gap, and rewrote the symbol. In the interlinear space between lines 8 and 9 he inserted an extra entry that had been accidentally left out. The first total in 10 was accordingly deleted with two horizontal strokes and the new total squeezed in at the end of the line. In a few places there seem to be errors that were never corrected. In 2 the chalcous for the expense of the dog bowls was not subtracted from the total tally at the end of the line. And in lines 5 and 10 a quarter obol of milk is recorded, and it is unclear whether the repeated listing of the same amount of milk was mistaken.



...  $\frac{1}{2}$  ob., salt  $\frac{1}{2}$  ob., gourd 1 ch.,  
... oil  $\frac{1}{4}$  ob., for the tailor ...,  
...  $\frac{1}{4}$  ob., meat  $\frac{1}{2}$  ob., total  $4\frac{1}{2}$  ob. [1 ch.]  
... total 5 dr.  $\frac{1}{4}$  ob. 1 ch.

## Commentary

**2 κρατήρια κυσί.** This seems to be the unique surviving mention of dog bowls from Graeco-Roman antiquity. For expenses for dogs in early Ptolemaic accounts, most of them relating to food, cf. P.Cair.Zen. II 59292.270–273, P.Cair.Zen. IV 59569.14, 47, 119 (as corrected in P.Col. IV 77.28 n.),<sup>6</sup> P.Cair.Zen. IV 59710.66–67, 75, P.Cair.Zen. IV 59712, P.Col. IV 77.27, P.Iand.Zen. 27.10, 67 fr. a.5, PSI IV 368.11–12, PSI VII 861, UPZ II 158c.14, and possibly PSI IV 391.39. In P.Cair.Zen. IV 59782a.47–48 there is mention of a purchase of a chain for the hunter Attalos for the dogs (τοῖς κυσὶν ἀλύσιον). For further discussion of dogs in the Zenon archive, see P. Schmitz, P.Iand.Zen. 27.10 n.

For a ceramic dog bowl of the Roman period, discovered in a tomb for a dog in the vicinity of Cologne, see M. Grünewald, ‘Eine römische Hundebestattung mit zugehörigem Fressnapf aus Mayen’, *Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt* 39 (2009) 251–261. A colour illustration can be found in M. Hilke, ‘*Villaticus* – Der Wachhund in der römischen Antike’, in M. Reuter and R. Schiavone (edd.), *Gefährliches Pflaster: Kriminalität im Römischen Reich* (Mainz am Rhein 2011) 61–74, at 69, Abb. 11, and in H. Autengruber-Thüry, *Hunde in der römischen Antike: Rassen/Typen – Zucht – Haltung und Verwendung* (Oxford 2021) 237, Abb. 303, who also refers on p. 238 to a possible representation on a Roman tomb relief. The two literary sources cited by Grünewald, loc. cit. 254, however, do not refer to dog bowls as such: one is a funerary verse inscription for a dog, CIL X 659.11–12 (Salernum; second century AD) *lambere tu calicem lingua rapiente solebas | quem tibi saepe meae sustinuerunt manus*, ‘you used to lick with a greedy tongue the cup that my hands often held out for you’, which refers to the lapdog drinking from her master’s cup (cf. 9–10 *tu dulcis, Patrice, nostras attingere mensas | consueras*); the other is an epigram of Straton of Sardis (second century AD), *AP* 12.236.3 ὄντως ὡς ὁ κύων φάτνη, ‘truly like the (proverbial) dog in the manger’, which does not refer to a vessel.<sup>7</sup> Ps.-Plutarch, *De liberis educandis* 3B, mentions a dog eating from a λοπάς, a type of flat dish. Compare also Schol. Aristophanes, *Equites* 1034a Jones and Wilson οἱ κύνες εἰς τὰ μαγειρεῖα εἰσιόντες περιλείχουσι τὰς λοπάδας καὶ τὰς χύτρας, ‘the dogs going into the cooking stalls lick all around the plates and pots’.

---

<sup>6</sup> The editors of P.Col. IV also correct P.Cair.Zen. IV 59709.5 Κ[υ]νός and 15 Κυ[νός] to κυνός, but the reading is uncertain in both cases.

<sup>7</sup> As noted by Autengruber-Thüry, *Hunde in der römischen Antike* 237 n. 1036, but she continues to misinterpret the *calix* in CIL X 659 as a ‘Schüssel’. On Straton’s passage and the proverb behind it, see M. E. Giannuzzi, *Stratone di Sardi: Epigrammi* (Lecce 2007) 380, and L. Floridi, *Stratone di Sardi: Epigrammi* (Alessandria 2014) 355–356 ad loc.

The diminutive κρατήριον, ‘little bowl’, is rare: this is only its second certain instance in the papyri besides P.Cair.Zen. IV 59702.27, in which half an obol is paid for κρατήρια of unspecified use. Another payment for κρατήρες appears in P.Cair.Zen. IV 59767.2–3, where they serve as containers for red ochre. The only example of the word in the literary sources from near the period of our papyrus is found in *On the Nature of Women* in the Hippocratic Corpus, a treatise which probably dates from the middle of the fourth century BC: *Nat. Mul.* 34.24 = VII 374 Littré = X 262 Potter ἐλαίου τρία ἡμικοτύλια, ἀκτῆς φύλλα χεῖρα πλείην, ταῦτα ἔψειν· ἐγγέας ἐς κρατήριον θερμόν, πυριῆν ὀστράκοις θερμοῖς, ἐπὶ δίφρου καθίσας, περικαλύψας ἱματίοις, ‘boil a handful of elder leaves in three half-cotyles of olive oil, pour into a *kraterion* warmed over potsherds, and apply as a vapor bath, seating the patient on a stool and covering her with a blanket’ (tr. Potter, modified). There are also several examples in inscriptions from Delos.

The word possibly occurs in one or more other papyri of later date, but all of the supposed instances are uncertain. In P.Bodl. I 48.6 (second or third century AD), a list of objects, the editor suggests that κρητάρην could represent either κρητάριον ‘chalk’ or κρατήριον = κρατήριον, but see J. Kramer, ‘Bemerkungen zu einer Liste von Haushaltsgegenständen (P.Bodl. I 48)’, *APF* 44 (1998) 38–41, at 40, for a different interpretation. In P.Oxy. XVI 2049 (sixth century AD), an account of wine, κρατηρ( ) is resolved as κρατήρ(ια) or κρατήρ(ιον) throughout, presumably because the word is also abbreviated when the quantity is single (lines 8–9), but it is possible that the abbreviation marker was added mechanically to the latter instances and that κρατήρ/κρατήρες was meant. Another, perhaps less plausible resolution is fem. sg. κρατηρ(ία)/κρατηρ(ίαι), a noun found in some medical and alchemical texts of the Imperial and Late Antique periods. None of these words, κρατήρ included, is attested as a container for wine in papyri of this period, though cf. P.Wash.Univ. II 105.1 (late sixth or early seventh century AD) κρ( ) λς. Finally, in P.Vet.Aelii 18.30 (circa 222–255 AD) κρατηρ .[, the editor offers forms of both κρατήρ and κρατήριον as possible supplements, but without any indication of whether one is to be preferred over the other (the trace before the break is minimal).

**3 Φιλάμμωνος.** The name Philammon (TM Nam 3224) is well attested in the third century. Besides several references in dating clauses to Philammon the father of Menekrateia (TM Per 80040), a *kanephoros* of Arsinoe Philadelphos, the name appears in at least two other Ptolemaic documents from the Arsinoite nome: P.Rain.Cent. 49 (212), a letter from Philammon to Ptolemaios (re-ed. D. Kaltsas, *ZPE* 171 (2009) 190–192), and P.Cair.Zen. III 59374 = C.Ptol.Sklav. I 89 (207/206?), in which Philammon of Thessaly, a member of the troop of Nikophilos, is named as the owner of a Carian slave called Sappho. The present papyrus is probably too early to refer to either of these individuals.

-άμμων was originally a Greek hypocoristic suffix, but in the Libyan and Egyptian contexts it was reinterpreted to refer to the god Ammon; see W. Swinnen, ‘Philammon, chantre légendaire, et les noms gréco-égyptiens en -ammôn’, in *Antidorum W. Peremans sexagenario ab alumnis oblatum* (Louvain 1968) 237–262. The genitive ending is almost universally spelled -ovoc rather than -ovoc in this period, whereas the opposite situation prevails in the Roman period; see Mayser, *Gram. I.2<sup>2</sup>* (1938) 44, and Gignac, *Gram. I* 65–66.

**3–4 . . . . . Φιλάμμονος κρίνων ἕως | ια.** A puzzling sequence. The sum of 3 dr. 3 ½ ob. given in line 4 is an income rather than an expenditure, since it is added to the remainder of line 2 in the total given at the end of the line: 3 dr. 3 ½ ob. + 8 dr. 1 ¼ ob. = 11 dr. 4 ½ ¼ ob. This entry therefore must explain the source of that income.

The entry poses palaeographical and interpretative difficulties. The initial traces are slight: the first is an upright, the second and third probably belong to nu (with a high second upright curving backwards, as in 1 λοιπόν) or less probably alpha (like the second alpha in 11 ἄλλα), and the fourth is a descender. The final traces are more confused and are partly covered by a fold. So at the beginning of the line we could have a noun or name or a preposition such as παρά. Given the uncertainty of the traces and the obscurity of the rest of the entry, we are unable to offer a certain reconstruction.

If κρίνων is interpreted as a participle, the uncertain word at the beginning of the line is likely to be its object, either a name (N.N. son of Philammon) or a noun. For the expression as a whole, cf. LXX Judges 3:30 ἔκρινεν αὐτοὺς Αωδ ἕως οὗ ἀπέθανεν. The entry would seem to record the sum awarded to the writer for judging a case involving a certain (N.N. son of?) Philammon, presumably as compensation. He was possibly equivalent to one of the κριταί mentioned in PSI VI 551r.8 (Philadelphia; 258–256?), whom H. J. Wolff, *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer* (Munich 1970) 60, interprets to be ‘ein *ad hoc* eingesetztes privates Schiedsgericht’. On judges (δικασταί) in Ptolemaic δικαστήρια, who were chosen by lot, see N. Grotkamp, *Rechtsschutz im hellenistischen Ägypten* (Munich 2018) 26–29. To the best of our knowledge, the remuneration of judges, private or public, has not yet been documented in Ptolemaic Egypt; cf. differently UPZ II 172 (Thebes; 126/125), containing receipts for the payment of various court fees, and see N. Grotkamp, ‘The Ptolemaic *dikasterion*’, in M. Gagarin and A. Lanni (edd.), *Symposion 2013. Papers on Greek and Hellenistic Legal History* (Vienna 2014) 347–360, at 357 n. 66. For fees paid to judges in other parts of the Hellenistic world, see A. Cassayre, *La justice dans les cités grecques: De la formation des royaumes hellénistiques au legs d’Attale* (Rennes 2010) 278–281.

Alternatively, Φιλάμμονος could have been preceded by a short name in the nominative, ‘N.N. son of Philammon, acting as judge until the 11<sup>th</sup>’; for the absolute use of κρίνω, cf. LSJ s.v., II.3.b, and e.g. P.Petr. III 26.3–4 (circa 240; BL IV 68) εἰς δὲ τις παρὰ ταῦτα κρίνη ἢ κριθῆ, ἄκυρα ἔστω. But it would be difficult to explain why the author of the account recorded the fees accruing to someone else. A more remote possibility is that the writer judged a musical or athletic contest organised by Philammon rather than a legal dispute, but ἀγῶνα cannot be read at the beginning of line 3, and no suitable alternative presents itself.

Another, perhaps less plausible option is to interpret κρίνων as a genitive plural of κρίνον, ‘white lily’, preceded by e.g. παρὰ Φιλάμμονος. The syntax of κρίνων would be rather loose, and it would be difficult to explain lilies as a source of income. The only certain reference to lilies in the papyri is in PSI IV 297v.3–4 (Hermopolis; fifth century AD?) τὰ κρίνα βάλε εἰς τὸν οἶνον, on which see Kramer, loc. cit. (above, 2 n.) 39–40. Contrast the more plentiful evidence for the cultivation and uses of roses in the papyri, for which see M. C. D. Paganini, ‘Receipt of hay for the transport (?) of roses’, *ZPE* 193 (2015) 226–230, at 226–227. Finally, it may be worth considering whether κρίνων could be an abbreviation of Κρίνων(ος), specifying Philammon’s father. For the unmarked abbreviation, cf. 9 ὄλκ(ῆς) and 11 κολόκυν(τα). The name, however, has not been attested in Egypt (cf. *LGPN* I, IIIb, IV). A noun κρινωνεύς, gen. κρινωνέως, is unknown.

5 ] . The end of a horizontal at the level of the letter tops (e.g. γ, ς), written slightly to the left of the main column. In view of the total in the previous line, it is probably a day number marking the beginning of a new set of entries. A similar format is found, for example, in the long account of daily expenses preserved in P.Cair.Zen. II 59176 = C.Ptol.Sklav. II 212, where the numbers for dates running from the 7<sup>th</sup> to the 30<sup>th</sup> of Pachons (29 June–22 July 255) are added slightly in *ekthesis* at the start of each section where a new daily entry begins. On the back of P.Cair.Zen. II 59176, the contents of the papyrus are described as ἐφημερίδες, ‘daily accounts’. Compare also P.Corn. I = C.Ptol.Sklav. I 46 (257), an ἐφημερίς for the distribution of castor oil. See also below, 13 n.

**γάλα.** Milk is an item seldom listed in accounts of this period: compare P.Wisc. II 78.43, 45, 57, 59–67 (249), P.Cair.Zen. IV 59702.15 [1 ob.], P.Cair.Zen. IV 59703.7 [½ ob.], 11 [½ ob.], 14 [2 ch.], O.Bodl. I 307.13 (230/205; BL XII 320), and SB IV 7451.129 = C.Ptol.Sklav. II 129 (before 210). As noted in the introduction, this papyrus mentions a quarter obol of milk twice, both here and in line 10, and it is unclear whether or not this repetition of the same information is mistaken. Nowhere else in the papyrus does the writer record the same amount of the same item or even mention the same type of item more than once, and it would seem strange to give in the account

for one day a double mention of the same item. Both entries, however, seem to have been counted in the totals given in line 10 (see note ad loc.).

**6 ποδέων γνάπτρα (ὀβολός) (ἡμιωβέλιον).** This is the only mention of fuller's fees for the cleaning of socks in the Ptolemaic papyri. In other papyri there are payments to fullers for the cleaning of other items of dress: e.g. P.Cair.Zen. III 59398.7–8 = C.Ptol.Sklav. II 119 (257), where the payment of fees for the cleaning of slaves' himations (τῶν παιδαρίων γνάπτρα ἱματίων) and of chitons (χιτώνων γνάπτρα) is mentioned. Compare also P.Col. IV 63.29–30 (257) χλαμύδος γνάπτρα, BGU VII 1558.7 (late third or early second century) ἱματίου γνάπτρα, and SB V 7521.11 (178?) γνάπτρα ἱματίου. On fullers in early Ptolemaic Egypt, see W. Clarysse and D. J. Thompson, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt. Volume 2: Historical Studies* (Cambridge 2006) 164–165, N. Dogaer, 'The role of linen boilers in the Ptolemaic textile industry', *ZPE* 215 (2020) 195–200, at 199–200, and D. J. Thompson, *Memphis under the Ptolemies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Princeton 2012) 51: 'fullers provided a regular cleaning service, and accounts from both the Zenon and Sarapieion archives record payments made for the cleaning of individual items of clothing'. It is not certain how many socks would have been washed for one and a half obols. According to Thompson, costs for the cleaning service were not standardized in this period, 'though generally less than an obol an item'. Thompson points out, however, that in P.Cair.Zen. III 59398.7–8 'tunics were charged at 2 obols each and cloaks at 4'.

The evidence for the rare word ποδεῖον is collected and discussed in S. Russo, *Le calzature nei papiri di età greco-romana* (Florence 2004) 140–143, where she suggests that 'calzino' is the best translation (for discussion of the difficulties of identifying what sort of footwear this word refers to, consult Russo's full analysis). In Ptolemaic papyri, the spelling ποδεῖον occurs in P.Cair.Zen. I 59092.23, 24, P.Cair.Zen. III 59319.3, and P.Cair.Zen. III 59456.1, the spelling ποδέων in P.Cair.Zen. IV 59778.5 and PSI Com. 12.2, 3 = PSI VII 865 (mid third century). There seems to have been ancient disagreement over whether the accentuation ποδεῖον or πόδειον should be preferred: see the discussion in H. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, ed. C. B. Hase, G. Dindorf, and L. Dindorf (Paris 1847) VI.1275B–D. The writer of the account unusually does not specify whether this was a 'pair' (ζεῦγος) of socks or more than one pair, or some other number of individual socks. This is the only place in Ptolemaic accounts where ποδεῖα are mentioned unaccompanied by the word ζεῦγος, though this usage does appear in papyri that are not accounts: see P.Cair.Zen. III 59456.1 (letter from Kleon to Zenon).

The word γνάπτρα refers to the fees paid to a fuller in return for the cleaning of laundry items. It is one of a number of plural neuter forms with a suffix in -τρα that serve to indicate the

fees charged by certain workers: compare e.g. ἤπητρα ('tailor's fees') in P.Mich. I 1.8 (210). The evidence for this usage of these plural forms is collected in Maysers, *Gram.* I.3<sup>2</sup> (1938) 85–86.

**6–7 χηναλώπηξ.** A variety of geese (*Alopochen aegyptiaca*) rarely attested in papyrus documents, for which see D. W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London 1936) 330–331, and M. Cobiainchi, 'Ricerche di ornitologia nei papiri dell'Egitto greco-romano', *Aegyptus* 16 (1936) 91–147, at 121–126. The only other direct mention of the bird in the papyri is in SB VI 9091.3 (247), on which see M.-Th. Lenger, 'Quelques papyrus inédits de la Bibliothèque Bodléenne', *CE* 28 (1948) 109–121, at 121. The bird's eggs are mentioned in P.Cair.Zen. V 59821.8 (254), P.Cair.Zen. IV 59562.17–18 (253), and P.Lond. VII 1998.3 (250). A drawing of a χηναλώπηξ is found in P.Artemid. V 8, on which see R. Kinzelbach, *Tierbilder aus dem ersten Jahrhundert: Ein zoologischer Kommentar zum Artemidor-Papyrus* (Berlin–New York 2009) 30–31.

**7 πυρῶν χο(ίνικες) ι (διώβολον).** Assuming an artaba of 40 choenices, the price here would be equivalent to 1 dr. 2 ob. per artaba. In the mid third century, wheat commanded prices between 1 dr. 1 ob. and 3 dr. per artaba; see K. Maresch, *Bronze und Silber: Papyrologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Währung im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten bis zum 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Opladen 1996) 181, and S. von Reden, 'Money and prices in the papyri, Ptolemaic period', in *Oxford Handbook Topics in Classical Studies* (online edn, Oxford 2014) <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935390.013.71> (accessed 22 April 2024).

**8 μέλαν.** This is one of the oldest mentions of black writing ink. Among Ptolemaic papyri of the third century, one can compare only UPZ II 158a.30 μέλαν (ἡμωβέλιον) τέ(ταρτον); cf. also P.Cair.Zen. IV 59767.4 μέλανος [, in a list of painting materials. For discussion of the papyrological testimonia for black ink, see H. Harrauer, *Handbuch der griechischen Paläographie* (Stuttgart 2010) I 48–49. Earlier literary references to black ink can be found in the fourth century: see Plato, *Phaedrus* 276c, and Demosthenes 18.258.

**ὄξις.** A vinegar holder is a rarely mentioned item. In papyrus documents it is only elsewhere attested in P.Cair.Zen. IV 59613.3 = C.Ptol.Sklav. I 77 (mid third century) and P.Dryton 38.24 (mid second century). The word ὄξις is said by ancient lexicographers to be either an ἀγγεῖον ('vessel') or λαγόνιον ('flask'), and it is difficult to choose one translation over the other: 'vinegar holder' seems sufficient to indicate the function of the item.

**8a οίνου . . (τετρώβολον) (τέταρτον).** After οίνου one expects a measure and quantity of wine (cf. 7 πυρῶν χο(ίνικες) ι), but it has proved difficult to match the traces to any known measure or container. The first trace may be interpreted as an alpha or as the symbol for ἥμισυ in a slanted position (cf. P.Cair.Zen. IV 59742.32 with the note ad loc.). The second set of traces are less clear and are partly smudged, which perhaps indicates a correction; above them stands apparently a superscript omicron indicating an abbreviation. Although the word is not otherwise found abbreviated in this way, (ἡμί)χο(υv) may be entertained, assuming that the smudged ink to the left of the putative χο( ) is due to a correction. For a *keramion* of 6 *choes*, the implied price would be  $4 \frac{1}{4} \times 12 = 51$  ob. = 8 dr. 3 ob., which is in line with the prices of wine attested in the mid third century (see Maresch, *Bronze und Silber* 187). Compare P.Petr. III 135.4 (third century) οίνου ἡμίχουv (πεντώβολον). Chi, however, would be rather misshapen and is not easy to read. Kappa may also be considered. (We thank Prof. Willy Clarysse, Dr Kaltsas, and Dr Klaus Maresch for discussing this problem with us.)

**9 τρύβλια.** This word has not been attested so far in the papyri from Egypt. The only other example of the word found in a papyrus document is in P.Euphrates 12.19–20 (Beth Phuraia, Syria Coele; 244 AD). The term was used in four main ways in antiquity, firstly to refer to a type of wine drinking cup, secondly to refer to a type of vase used to store alimentary products, thirdly to refer to various items of tableware (e.g. bowls, cups, plates), and fourthly as a unit of measurement: see O. Bounegru, ‘Τρύβλιον (II): Aperçu épigraphique et archéologique : mise à jour’, in L. C. Ruscu (ed.), *Orbis antiquus: studia in honorem Ioannis Pisonis* (Cluj-Napoca 2004) 842–845, with discussion of earlier literature.

**τρύβλια γ ὀλκ(ῆς) ε (ἥμισυ).** For the indication of the weight of a vessel, compare e.g. P.Cair.Zen. I 59044.31–4 ψυκτηρίδιόν τε στατόν, μ[ικ]ρῶι πλέ[ο]ν [ἦ] χοῦν χωροῦν, οὐ ὀλκῆ ἐ[κ τ]ῆς παρ’ [ἡμ]ῶν γραφῆς . . . , ‘a little wine-cooler standing on its own base, holding rather more than a chous and weighing ... according to the list in our possession’ (tr. C. C. Edgar, *ASAE* 23 (1923) 195–196), P.Cair.Zen. III 59327.53 ἐπὶ τῶι σκόφει οὐ ὀλκῆ σξβ (sc. δραχμαί), 102 φιάλη οὐ ὀλκῆ σξ. 5  $\frac{1}{2}$  drachmas would be too light for three dishes, so that *mnai* must be meant here:  $5 \frac{1}{2}$  *mnai* = 550 drachmas = c. 1.95 kg. For the use of the symbol for the half obol to indicate half a *mna*, see P.Cair.Zen. V 59851a.21 n.

**κριθῆς.** The amount will have been specified at the start of the next line (cf. 7 πυρῶν χο(ίνικες) ι), but the writer left a large gap of free space in the rest of this line.

**10 γάλα.** See above on 5.

{(γίνονται)} [γ (τριώβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον)] (γίνονται) δ [(ὀβολός) (ἡμιωβέλιον) (τέταρτον)]. The first total includes the entries of lines 5–10 before the interlinear addition in 8a, which add up to 3 dr. 3 ½ ob. (assuming both entries for milk were included). The second total takes into account the addition of 4 ¼ ob. in 8a, resulting in a total of 4 dr. [1 ½ ¼ ob.]. The totals at the end of this line suggest that the next line records expenses for the following day, the indication of which in the left margin is now lost in the break (cf. 5 n.).

**11 κολόκυν(τα) χ(αλκοῦς).** The same also in P.Lille I 58.15 (third century) κολόκυν(τα) χ(αλκοῦς). For other mentions of gourds in papyri of the third century, compare PSI VI 553.14 (260), P.Cair.Zen. III 59300.3 (250), UPZ II 158a.15, 26, 61, 71 (243?). The spellings κολόκυντα and κολόκυνθα both appear in Ptolemaic papyri. For further information about gourds, see M. Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten* (Munich 1925) 202–203; M. Serpio and R. White, ‘Oil, fat and wax’, in P. T. Nicholson and I. Shaw (edd.), *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology* (Cambridge 2000) 403; H. Konen, ‘Die Kürbisgewächse (Cucurbitaceen) als Kulturpflanzen im römischen Ägypten (1.–3. Jh. n.Chr.)’, *MBAH* 14.1 (1995) 43–81.

**12 ἡπητῆ.** Tailors are not widely mentioned in documents of the third century: compare P.Genova IV 145.4 (middle of the third century), PSI IV 384.3 (248), and SB III 6313.2 (222); cf. also the mention of ἡπητρα, ‘tailor’s fees’, in O.Mich. I 1.8 (210; BL VII 287). On tailors in Ptolemaic Egypt, see further E. Skarsouli, P.Oxyrhyncha 30 verso ii.15 n.

**13 (γίνονται) (τετρώβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον) [χ(αλκοῦς)].** This is presumably the total of the entries in lines 11–13, which probably represent the expenditure of a particular day (see 10 n.). The preserved sums add up to 2 ob. 1 ch., which implies that the payment at the beginning of line 12 and the payment to the tailor together account for 2 ½ ob. The grand total in the next line suggests that the chalcous for the gourd (11) stood at the end of the total here.

**14 ] (γίνονται) ε (τέταρτον) χ(αλκοῦς).** This is the grand total of the corrected total in line 10 and the total in line 13: 4 dr. [1 ½ ¼ ob.] + 4 ½ ob. [1 ch.] = 5 dr. ¼ ob. 1 ch.

### Appendix: MS. Gr. class. f. 28 (P)

We take the opportunity to publish here a small scrap immediately preceding the above-edited account in the Bodleian catalogue. It shares the same provenance and acquisition history. These two texts are the last significant remaining unpublished papyrus fragments held in the Bodleian Library that have their provenance in Flinders Petrie's excavations at Gurob.<sup>8</sup>

Upper and left-hand margins are preserved, but the papyrus is regularly cut on the right and at the bottom. The back is covered by a sheet within the frame and is presumably blank. The type of document is uncertain, but it probably relates to tax-farming (see 4 n.). A village name is mentioned, followed by the names of at least three individuals in the nominative and the sum of 12 talents.

Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 28 (P)  
S.C. 31963

10 × 10.2 cm

Mid to late third century BC  
Arsinoite nome

Ἀπολλωνιάδος κερ .[  
Ἀρχίβιος Δημάρχου κ[αὶ Ν.Ν.]  
Νουμηνίου καὶ Διονυ[υσ - - - Ἡρα-]  
κλείδου (*vac.*) ἐφ' ᾧ διεγ[  
5 (ταλαντ ) ιβ̄ (*vac.*) [  
].[

-----

Apollonias ... Archibios son of Demarchos and N.N. son of Noumenios and Dionys— son of Herakleides, on condition that they will give surety (?) for 12 talents ...

**1 Ἀπολλωνιάδος.** On this well-known Arsinoite village, see TM Geo 253. It is mentioned in five other papyri excavated by Flinders Petrie in Gurob.

<sup>8</sup> For the recent edition of two other texts from this find (MS. Gr. class. d. 35 (P) a–b), see K. Panegyres, 'A letter and a petition: two Ptolemaic fragments', *APF* 69 (2023) 341–352.

κερ .[. Before the break a thick trace level with the letter tops. Dr Kaltsas wonders whether Κερκ[ could be read (assuming ink has been lost from κ's upright), which would indicate that the sphere of responsibility of the following individuals extended over two or more villages.

**2 Ἀρχίβιος Δημάρχου.** This individual is not attested elsewhere. In the third century, the name Δήμαρχος (TM Nam 2752) appears in only one other text from the Arsinoite nome, an additional fragment of P.Petr. III 54(b) (circa 244–242) published by D. G. Martinez, *BASP* 59 (2022) 41–59, at 48, which lists a λο(χαγός) Δήμαρχος Αἰτωλός in line 6. Compare also SB I 4307 = W.*Chr.* 241, of unknown provenance, mentioning a [Δ]ήμαρχος [Μ]ακεδὼν [τ]ῆς ἐπιγονῆς (1–3).

**3 Διογ[υσ - - -.** Since a whole name occupies the lacuna in line 2, Διογ[υσόδωρος is perhaps likelier than Διογ[ύσιος. A Dionysodorus son of Heracleides is known from P.Tebt. III 814.ii.51, 57 (227).

**4 διεγ[.** Dr Kaltsas attractively suggests restoring ἐφ' ὧι διεγ[γυήσουσι πρὸς] | (τάλαντα) ιβ or διεγ[γυήσουσι] | (ταλάντων ιβ). This would imply that the aforementioned individuals are prospective tax farmers who have been awarded a contract on condition that they give surety for 12 talents. Compare e.g. διεγγυήσω (in a fragmentary context) in BGU VI 1243.18 (third century), which is probably an application to farm a tax, and P.Hels. I 1.9–10 (194–180) [ο]ὐχ ὑπομένοντος διεγγυήσαι τοῦ ἐπιβ[άλλοντος αὐτῶι] μέρους τετάρτου, said of a tax-farmer. For an overview of tax-farming in Ptolemaic Egypt, see C. Préaux, *L'économie royale des Lagides* (Brussels 1939) 450–459.