Household Accounts: $SB$ I 5224 Revised

P.Hawara inv. 245\cite{P.Hawara245} = 10.6 cm x 44.6 cm

$SB$ I 5224\footnote{Provenance Unknown}

Below we publish a new, revised text of an account of expenses, long known and cited as P.Hawara inv. 245 = $SB$ 5224. The papyrus is now P.Yale inv. 19 (see $P.Yale$ II, p. xvi). Our revision of this text originated in an attempt to verify the supposed reading in the papyrus of the rare word $\pi\nu\omega\varsigma\iota\omicron\omicron\varsigma$, well known from the Lord's Prayer, but in documents supposedly attested only in this text. That check (with a negative result; see M. Nijman and K. A. Worp, "An Attestation of N.T. $\pi\nu\omega\varsigma\iota\omicron\omicron\varsigma$ in a Documentary Papyrus?" $Novum Testamentum$ 41 [1999] 231-4) was made on the basis of a xerox of the text provided by A. Crislip to K.A. Worp. At the same time it was noticed that the first edition was not up to modern standards and contained many mistakes and errors. We therefore undertook a complete re-edition of the text. This was based initially on several visits to New Haven by R.S. Bagnall; work on the text was completed together during a visit by Worp in July, 1999.

Instead of the separate line count in each column printed in the $ed.pr.$, we have used a continuous line count. We have also replaced the conventions of the first edition with standard Leiden Convention practice. (Most importantly, the original editor used square brackets where today we use round ones to mark abbreviations.) Finally, we note that after line 3 there is only one lost line, rather than the two indicated in the $ed.pr.$; consequently, lines 6 and following in the $ed.pr.$ are numbered below as lines 5 ff.

As was noted already in the article by Nijman and Worp referred to above, the first editor of the text, A.J. Sayce, wrote in 1889: "English housekeepers may be interested in knowing what was the daily expenditure of an Egyptian official some fourteen

\footnote{For an image see http://inky.library.yale.edu/papyrimg/74183627.jpg}
hundred years ago;" later scholars assumed, therefore, that the pa-
pyrus dates from the fifth century of our era. The text’s handwrit-
ing, however, is that of a documentary hand of the first to second
century. In fact, drachmas and obols do not occur as late as the fifth
century C.E.; cf. the observations made in ZPE 90 (1992) 234-5 and
in P.Kell. I Gr. 28.4n.

The text apparently is an account of daily expenses for various
commodities and other purposes. Unfortunately, however, the cor-
rect and full understanding of the opening lines of the text, esp.
lines 2-4, is anything but clear to us. On Mecheir 19 (cf. line 1), ap-
parently, after presenting some arithmetical calculations adding
and subtracting amounts of drachmas, a scribe wrote an itemized
account concerning expenses made previously for purchasing vari-
ous commodities in the period Mecheir 1-18. The part of the account
containing expenses made for Mecheir 9-12 is apparently lost in the
part of the papyrus which has broken off at the bottom of column 1.

The dimensions of the surviving sheet are 10.6 wide by 44.6 cm
high. It is made up of two pieces, the first 33.5 cm high, to the bot-
tom of which was attached a second piece 11.1 cm high. The first
column extends to both pieces, while the second ends at the border
between the first and the second pieces. The sheet was turned so
that the writing runs lengthwise across the fibers. The margin at
the left averages 1.3 cm (day numbers project to the left in the mar-
gin), that at the right 2.0 cm.

On the back of the account there are many offsets of letters;
these are the mirror images of letters belonging to another account
which is now lost. Taking these into account together with the ori-
entation of the writing, it seems to us most likely that the present
papyrus was fashioned by gluing together two pieces of unwritten
or almost unwritten papyrus from already-used rolls. Why the
writer chose to write across the fibers and with the long dimension
of the papyrus oriented vertically, we do not know.
HOUSEHOLD ACCOUNTS: SB I 5224 REVISED

Μεχείρ ἰθ
ἔς χες (δραχμάς) κ καὶ παραβε( ) (δρ.) μ καὶ παρ( ) (δρ.) 
κ.
ὁμ(οίως) κα... ( ) ... (δρ.) δ ... αι ὁμ(οίως) (δρ.) ιδ (δρ.) η
(γίν.) (δρ.) θβ (πεντώβ.)

4
... δρ... τος

περσέου (δρ.) α [διωβ.] (τετρώβ.) (ήμοβ.)
For persea fruit (?), 1 dr. 4.5 ob.

χαρταρίου (τετρώβ.)
For papyrus, 4 ob.

λ. αμι.
(τετρώβ.)
For --, 4 ob.

8

ηπατος (διωβ.)
For liver, 2 ob.

β
έρεβι(ν)θ(ων) (διωβ.)
On the 2nd, for chick-peas, 2 ob.

καλα(μ) (διωβ.)
For --, 2 ob.

ελαιον (τριωβ.)
For oil, 3 ob.

12

κυάμ(ου) (τριωβ.)
For beans, 3 ob.

καλα(μ) (όβ.) (ήμοβ.)
For --, 1.5 ob.

(γίν.) (δρ.) α (τετρώβ.) (ήμοβ.)
Total 1 dr. 4.5 ob.

γ

κρέος (δρ.) α (όβ.)
On the 3rd, for meat, 1 dr. 1 ob.

16
κεφαλ( ) (όβ.)
For head --, 1 ob.

σαμ( ) (όβ.)
For --, 1 ob.

άρτιδ(ιων) (όβ.)
For bread, 1 ob.

έρεβι(ν)θ(ων) (τετρώβ.)
For chick-peas, 4 ob.

20

καλα(μ) (διωβ.)
For --, 2 ob.

ελαιον (τριωβ.)
For oil, 3 ob.

(γίν.) (δρ.) β ἵ (όβ.)
Total 2 dr. 6 ob.

δ
κρέος (δρ.) α (όβ.)
On the 4th, for meat, 1 dr. 1 ob.

24
έρεβι(ν)θ(ων) (τετρώβ.)
For chick-peas, 4 ob.
καλα(μ) (διωβ.)
For --, 2 ob.
For bread, 1 ob.
For must (?), 0.5 ob.
For --, 0.5 ob.
For wood, 1 ob.
For a small jar, 0.5 ob.
For wheaten flour, 1 ob.
For oil, 4 ob.
[Total 3 dr.]
Total 3 dr. 2 ob.

On the 5th, for meat, 1 dr. 1 ob.

For sebakh transport, 3 ob.
For vegetables, 1 ob.
For --, 2 ob.
For an earthen pot, 1 ob.

For bread, 1.5 ob.
For chick-peas, 3 ob.
For oil, 3 ob.

Total 3 dr. 2 ob.

On the 6th, for fowl, 4 dr.
For meat, 1 dr. 1 ob.
For pickle, 4 ob.
For head --, 1 ob.
For arsenic, 4 ob.
For --, 2 ob.
For bread, 1 ob.
For eggs, 6 ob.
For chick-peas, 3 ob.
For oil, 3 ob.
For myself, 4 ob.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 56   | For --, 0.5 ob.  
   ζυτου | For beer, 0.5 ob.  
   (γιν.) (δρ.) | (διοβ.)(ήμοβ.) Total 9 dr. 2.5 ob. |
| 60   | On the 7th, for --, bread, 4 dr.  
   άρτων | For --, 4 dr.  
   καγι( ) | For --, 4 dr.  
   κομ( ) | For --, 4 dr.  
   κρέος | For meat, 1 dr. 1 ob.  
   οψωρίου | For fish, 1 dr. 1 ob.  
   κεφαλ( ) | For head --, 0.5 ob.  
   έρακου | For wild chickling, 2 ob.  
   λαχά(νων) | For vegetables, 1 ob.  
   οιάλου | For glass, 2 ob.  
   έλαιου | For oil, 3 ob.  
   (γιν.) (δρ.) | ιζ (τριωβ.) (ήμοβ.) Total 16 dr. 3.5 ob. |
| 72   | On the 8th, for meat, 1 dr. 1 ob.  
   κρέος | For fish, 1 dr. 1 ob.  
   οψωρίου | For asparagus, 2 ob.  
   άσπαρ(αγου) | For --, 2 ob.  
   καλαμ( ) | For beans, 0.5 ob.  
   κυάμο(υ) | For oil, 3 ob.  
   έλαιου | For chick-peas, 3 ob.  
   έρεβί(ν)θ(ων) |------------------------------------------|
| 76   | On the 13th, for --, 4 ob.  
   [ ... ] | For oil, 4 ob.  
   [έ]ξα[α]γου | For chick-peas, 2 ob.  
   καλ(αμ) | For --, 2 ob.  
   κεφ(αλ) | For head --, 1 ob.  
   (γιν.) (δρ.) | α, 5 (δβ.) Total 1 dr. 6 ob. |
84 ιδ ...[ ] (δρ.) α (ὁβ.) On the 14th for --, 1 dr. 1 ob.
oίνου (δρ.) α (ὁβ.) For wine, 1 dr. 1 ob.
ἐρεβί(ν)θ(ων) (διοβ.) For chick-peas, 2 ob.
kαλα(μ) (διοβ.) For --, 2 ob.
88 ἐλαιο(υ) (τριοβ.) For oil, 3 ob.
(γίν.) ..... Total (?) —

107 ἐλαιοῦ {ο}(μ) (πεντοβ.) (ὁβ.) 5 On the 15th for oil, 6 (<5) ob.
ἐρεβί(ν)θ(ων) (διοβ.) For chick-peas, 2 ob.
kαλα(μ) (διοβ.) For --, 2 ob.
ἀρτιδ(ιων) (ὁβ.) For bread, 1 ob.
(γίν.) (δρ.) α, (τετροβ.) Total 1 dr. 4 ob.

15 κρέος (δρ.) α (ὁβ.) On the 16th, for meat, 1 dr. 1 ob.
ἐρεβί(ν)θ(ων) (διοβ.) For chick-peas, 2 ob.
ἀρτιδ(ιων) (ὁβ.) For bread, 1 ob.
καλα(μ) (διοβ.) For --, 2 ob.
100 ἐλαιοῦ (πεντοβ.) For oil, 5 ob.
(γίν.) (δρ.) β, (τετροβ.) (ἡμοβ.) Total 2 dr. 4.5 ob.

15 κρέος (τετροβ.) On the 17th, for meat, 4 ob.
ὀψαρ(ιων) (τετροβ.) For fish, 4 ob.
104 ἐρεβί(ν)θ(ων) (διοβ.) For chick-peas, 2 ob.
ἀρτιδ(ιων) (ὁβ.) For bread, 1 ob.
kαλα(μ) (διοβ.) For --, 2 ob.
ἐλαιοῦ (τετροβ.) For oil, 4 ob.
108 στεφαν( ) (διοβ.) To Stephanos (or for a crown), 2 ob.
(γίν.) (δρ.) β (πεντοβ.) Total 2 dr. 5 ob.

17 καλα(μ) (διοβ.) On the 18th, for --, 2 ob.
ἐρεβί(ν)θ(ων) (διοβ.) For chick-peas, 2 ob.
112 ἀρτιδ(ιων) (ὁβ.) For bread, 1 ob.
We give below in alphabetical order a table of the objects of expenditure, indicating on which days they are found, followed by line references. Following that are notes on some of the items in this alphabetical list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Day(s) of recorded expenditure</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐλαίου</td>
<td>(τριώβ.)</td>
<td>For oil, 3 ob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(γίν.) (δρ.)</td>
<td>α (δβ.)</td>
<td>Total 1 dr. 1 ob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αγγελίδον</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλμυρίς</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>40, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμμηγία</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρακός</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρτιδιον</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 18</td>
<td>18, 26, 41, 51, 93, 97, 105, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρτος ...( )</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρσενικόν</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσπάραγος</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλυκ( )</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the expenses turn out to have been made for purchasing various kinds of foodstuff (on which, in general, cf. J. Wilkins et al. *Food in Antiquity* [Exeter 1995]), but there also expenses for buying commodities like glass, wood, buckets, papyrus, for paying services like the transport of sebakh (ἀμμηγία), and expenses of a more or less personal nature (cf. line 55, "to myself," cf. line 108, where one might translate "to Stephanos").
Various agricultural products mentioned in this list are well known; cf., e.g., M. Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten* (Munich 1925) 185 ff. (for ἀράκος = "wild chickling"), 189 (for ἐρέβινθος = "chick-pea"), 186 and 193 (for κόσμος = "bean"), 210 (for λάχανον = "vegetables"). Apparently, Schnebel does not discuss the term σέβτλον (τεύτλον) = "beet," though already in his time beets were mentioned in two published papyri (i.e. *BGU IV* 1120.12 and *P.Lond. III* 964.12 [pp. 211-2]). Later came *P.Mich. VIII* 496.16 and XI 619.2, 3, 25, 26; *P.Ross.Georg. III* 44.4; *P.Sarap. 66.19; SB XVI 12515.20*, O. Berenike I 87.7, and O.Claud. I 150.3; cf. also the diminutive form σεβτλιον in *P.Cair.Zen. IV* 59608.26 and 59702.26; *P.IFAO III* 37.32, and *P.Ryl. IV* 639.98).

Apparently there is no specific papyrological monograph on the production and consumption of proteins in the form of fish (ὀψάριον), meat (κρέας), fowl/poultry (δρυις) or eggs (φά). In general, see J. Wilkins, *op.cit.*, Part 2, 102-70; for the subject of fowl (δρυις), see Schnebel, *op.cit.*, 341. On the other hand, on various aspects of vine growing in the papyri there is a vast literature; for basic facts, see Schnebel, *op.cit.*, Sachregister s.v. "Weinbau" (p. 364). More recent literature can be found in E. Jakab, "Guarantee and Jars in Sales of Wine on Delivery," *JJP* 29 (1999) 22-44, and E. Kislinger, "Zum Weinhandel in frühbyzantinischer Zeit," *Tyche* 14 (1999) 141-56. For the terminology found in our text related to various types of wheat used for bread making and baking, see E. Battaglia, *Artos. Il lessico della panificazione nei papiiri greci* (Milano 1989), passim, and in particular pp. 73 s.v. ἀρτίδιον, 248 s.v. ἀρτος, 251 s.v. σεμίδαιλις. For ἕλαιον = "oil," see D. Brent Sandy, *The Production and Use of Vegetable Oils in Ptolemaic Egypt*. BASP Suppl. 6 (Atlanta 1989).

Often the same (or almost the same) amount of expenditure for a certain commodity is recorded throughout the account, e.g.:

ἀρτίδιον = "bread" usually costs 1 ob., except in l. 41 (day 5): 1.5 ob. At the same time note l. 60, 4 dr. for some type of ἀρτος.

ἕλαιον = "oil" usually costs 3 ob., except in lines 32, 79, and 107 (4 ob.), while 5 ob. are indicated in l. 100 and even 6 ob. (corrected from 5 [?] ob.) in l. 90.
"chick-peas" cost 2 ob. in ll. 9, 80, 86, 91, 96, 104, 111; 3 ob. in ll. 42, 53, 77; 4 ob. in ll. 19, 24.

"meat" usually costs 1 dr. 1 ob., but in l. 102 only 4 ob., i.e. half the regular price. Given the fact that payments of 1 dr. 1 ob. for meat are often recorded as the first entry for any specific day (cf. ll. 15, 23, 35, 71, 95, 102; only during days 6 and 7, ll. 46, 63, does meat not occur in the first place), one may perhaps restore some form of κρέας (abbreviated ?) in ll. 78 (expense of 4 ob.) and 84 (expense of 1 dr. 1 ob.); but these restorations are completely hypothetical.

"vegetables" costs, on the two occasions that the item occurs (ll. 37, 67), 1 ob.

"fish" yields prices at the same level as κρέας; ll. 64 and 72 record expenses at 1 dr. 1 ob., but l. 103 has a payment of 4 ob. (we have restored the abbreviated noun as plural here).

For the other expenses we have fewer steady price indications or the nature of the expenditure is uncertain. ἰλιμωρίς = "pickle" (in l. 40; cf. l. 57n.) costs 0.5 ob. in l. 40, 4 ob. in l. 47; we may be dealing with varying quantities costing varying amounts of money. Likewise, for κόσμωτα = "beans" there is no fixed amount per purchase; cf. ll. 12 (day 2): 3 ob, and 75 (day 8): 0.5 ob.

On the other hand, expenses made for καλαμάτα / καλάθι / καλάμι ( ) are quite frequent, in fact on almost a daily basis (for the moment the entries of days 9-12 are lost, and there is no entry for this purpose under day 7). Usually, the category costs 2 ob., except in ll. 13 (1.5 ob.) and 28 (0.5 ob.); in both cases an additional payment of 2 ob. is recorded for the same days (2 and 4). The question is how the abbreviation should be resolved. If one restores καλαμάτα = "reeds," one has to assume that for some unspecified use reeds were bought on a daily basis, but that does not seem likely. At any rate, the use of reeds for human consumption is apparently not recorded in Egypt (for India, however, see Aelian, Var.Hist. III 39). Likewise, a resolution of, e.g., καλαμάτα = "grasshopper" does not seem really attractive ("2 ob. per diem for breaded grasshoppers" ?). More likely
seems the assumption that in this case one is dealing with daily payments of wages to, e.g., a καλαμοτόμος (= "reed cutter") or a καλαμουργός (= "reed worker;" cf. καλαμουργία, καλαμουργέω). That, however, provokes the counter-argument that these substantives are not (or are scarcely) attested to date.

Likewise, the meaning of the category κεφαλ ( ) is not clear; Preisigke, WB I s.v. κεφαλή interprets that noun's occurrence in this list as "Tierkopf für Speise," but—depending upon one's talents for constructing an imaginative scenario (e.g.: κεφαλαλγίας = "for a headache"?)—any word beginning with κεφαλ- (cf. LSJ 944-6) can be considered. For this category we find expenses of 1 ob. three times (l. 16, 48, 82) versus 0.5 ob. only in l. 65.

For all these price indications in general, see H.J. Drexhage, Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne im Römischen Ägypten (St. Katharinen 1991) passim. The present papyrus is referred to there as "P.Hawara 245" (see the index of papyri used, p. 480; there is no reference to SB I 5224).

Notes on particular lines

2 After "you got 20 drachmas" the meaning is unclear. Nor is it evident who the "you" of ἑκεῖ is.

4 We have considered reading ἄνδροντος, but the first alpha would be really difficult and the other letters are not very convincing either. To be sure, a reading τοῦ δράκωντος seems equally problematic.

5 No indication of the first day (α) of the month of Mecheir is visible, but this is possibly due to seriously damaged ink.

As the omission of an intervocalic iota should not pose a real problem, our reading περικεῖον would seem compatible with the genitive of the noun περικεῖον = "fruit of the persea tree." It is, however, true that 1 dr. 4.5 ob. is a lot of money for purchasing fruit.

6 For all kinds of aspects of the papyrus plant and its various uses, particularly as writing material (χαρτάριον), the classic discussion remains that of N. Lewis, Papyrus in Classical Antiquity (Oxford 1974); for χαρτάριον, see esp. 77 ff. A supplement to this
appeared as *Pap.Brux.* 23 (Brussels 1989); for χαρτάριον, see esp. 34.

7 At first we thought about reading Κυαμίων, the genitive of the diminutive form of κύαμος (attested in Greek only rarely; cf. *LSJ* s.v.), but we are not comfortable with it. Likewise, comparing Lat. "salgamum" we considered reading ζαλγαμι- (‐λγ‐ being a slightly more attractive reading than the upsilon of κυαμι‐), but we are not satisfied with the reading of the first two letters as ζα‐. At the end of the word one may read –κ( ) practically as well as an open –ω.

8 There is no day total indicated after this line, as there is for the other days.

14 For accounting purposes (additions) throughout this text use is made of a "7-obol" drachma. This is a practice applied when it is necessary to convert bronze single drachmas of 6 obols into tetradrachms of "silver," which are generally calculated as having 28 or 29 obols, i.e. with an agio vs. the bronze currency unit. For this subject, see now K. Maresch, *Bronze und Silber.* *Pap.Col.* 25 (Opladen 1996) 112 ff.

17 We cannot say whether we are dealing with σάγμα (= "saddle") or one of its compounds. The word also occurs in l. 61. The very different amounts (1 ob. and 4 dr.) might not encourage the notion that we are dealing with commensurate goods, and it may be that one or both of these payments were made to saddlers, and that we should restore an occupational title (σαματάς, σαματολούς, σαματοράφος, all occur in Preisigke, *WB*). The one price for a saddle listed in Drexhage, *op.cit.*, 401, however, is for 2 dr. (*SB X* 10241 of 45 C.E.). As saddles probably varied considerably in character and quality, 4 dr. certainly seems like a reasonable saddle price here. The smaller figure, however, is difficult to interpret satisfactorily as a price for an object.

30 For the term ἀγαλίδων, see P. Radici Colace, *Lexicon Vasorum Graecorum I* (Pisa 1992) 57.

34 The result of the addition is 0.5 ob. too high.
39 For prices of χύτρωμα in the papyri, cf. H.J. Drexhage, *op.cit.*, 383. An obol for such an item is quite common during the first two centuries of Roman rule in Egypt.

40 According to *P.Oxy.* IV 736.73 ἀλμυρίς = "pickle;" it is translated as "Zalztunke" in Preisigke, *WB* s.v. and as "Brassica cretica" in *LSJ* s.v. Cf. above, p. 17.


56 Obviously, the reading and interpretation of the *ed.pr.* cannot stand, but we do not know what the word ζυμαίον (gen.) stands for: possibly, T. Renner suggests, an otherwise unattested adjective ζυμαῖος from ζύμη, leaven or yeast.

57 The reading and interpretation of the *ed.pr.* cannot stand, but we cannot arrive at a convincing reading. We have considered readings like ἐλκυ / ἐλβα / αλκυ / αλμυ (leading towards ἀλμυ(ρίδος ?); cf. note to 1. 40, where also a half-obol is paid), but we cannot convince ourselves that any of these is satisfactory.

60 Following ἄρτων there seems to be a qualifying adjective, but we have not succeeded in identifying it with the help of E. Battaglia, *op.cit.*

61 See note to 1. 17.

68 The subject of glass (ὑαλος) in the papyri known up to his time is discussed by Th. Reil, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Gewerbes im hellenistischen Ägypten* (Leipzig 1913) 47 ff. There is, of course, sufficient new material to warrant a new study, but this is not the place to undertake it. On glass in the Roman period, see now E.M. Stern's study in *AJA* 103 (1999) 441-84.

70 The result of the addition should be 15 dr. 3.5 ob., i.e. 1 dr. less.

73 The ρ has been corrected (into γ ?); we cannot tell exactly what the writer had in mind in correcting the letter, which has a small diagonal stroke. We know of no discussion of the growing of asparagus in Egypt, but there are some ten references to be found in the DDBDP.
We see nothing in the ink traces that correspond to the expected total amount of 3 dr. 2 ob.

It is difficult to tell what the function of the omicron after ἑλαίου was to be: did the scribe intend to start a word like ὀμοίως (but this is not used anywhere else in the text)? Vice versa, if we could read ἑλαίου οβ, one could see here the beginning of the word ὀβολός written out in full (rather than as a symbol) followed by a numeral.

The reading of the ed.pr., ὀρύζας is unlikely because there was no rice culture in Roman Egypt; cf. Schnebel, op.cit., 100 (ibid. he discusses also the date of this papyrus in a long note) and now R.T.J. Cappers, "A Botanical Contribution to the Analysis of Subsistence and Trade at Berenike (Red Sea Coast, Egypt)," in O.E. Kaper (ed.), Life on the Fringe. Living in the Southern Egyptian Deserts during the Roman and Early-Byzantine Periods. CNWS Publications 71 (Leiden 1998) 75-86, esp. at 86. Imports of rice into the heartland of Egypt do not seem likely.

We do not know whether we should regard ἄμεσα( ) as a common noun or as a personal name (i.e. read ἄμεσα(φ) = "to Stephanus").