

## πεδά

By ERIC P. HAMP, Chicago

The Greek preposition *πεδά* constitutes an interesting correspondence between Greek and Armenian<sup>1)</sup> that lies on the border between lexicon and syntax. The equation *πεδά* ‘μετά’ = Arm. *yet* < *i het* must go back to an old neuter plural *\*pedǎ* < *\*ped( )H<sub>a</sub>* ‘traces’, derived by IE rule<sup>2)</sup> from *\*pod-* ‘foot’<sup>3)</sup>. For the semantics of ‘trace’ > ‘after’ cf. OIr. *tar éis*<sup>4)</sup>.

The Mycenaean *pe-da* supports the reconstruction of a neut. pl. *\*pedH<sub>a</sub>*, and not *-ḡ*. Per contra in *παρά* = Myc. *pa-ro* I think we must see *\*prH-m* [pṛHm̄], an ancient fossilized accusative.

Therefore, while from the point of view of IE this syntactic use of *\*pedǎ* may be an innovation, it is certainly no innovation among Greek dialects, but is a retention from common Helleno-Armenian patrimony.

IE age of this etymon is confirmed by Skt. *padá-* ‘(foot)step’, Av. *paða-* ‘foot (measure)’, OP *pati-padam* ‘in its own place’ < *\*padá-* (neut.) ‘(foot)step, trace, and its location or extent’.

## Greek and Roman Clothing: Some Technical Terms

By LIONEL CASSON, New York University

Greek and Roman technical terms present many problems. We have few ancient professional manuals at our disposal; we must depend upon casual appearances in literary works whose context is rarely illuminating, on explanations from scholiasts and grammarians that all too often smell of the study,<sup>1)</sup> on laconic mention

<sup>1)</sup> See A. Meillet, *BSL* 31, 1931, 42–4.

<sup>2)</sup> *IF* 82, 1977, 75.

<sup>3)</sup> See *ZCP* 34, 1975, 20–9.

<sup>4)</sup> See now *Ériu* 32, 1981, 159 on *és*.

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. H. Blümner’s remark apropos of one of Isidore of Seville’s explanations: ‘Grammatiker-Gelehrsamkeit, die nichts erweist’ (*Die römischen Privataltertümer*, Müllers Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 4. 2. 2<sup>3</sup> [Munich 1911] 247).

in papyri and inscriptions. I discuss below a number of such terms that occur in connection with clothing, treating the evidence used hitherto more rigorously than it has been and adducing some that has been overlooked.

ἀπλοῦς, διπλοῦς

From Homeric times to the end of antiquity, men and women wore outer garments that were characterized as 'single' (ἀπλοῦς) or 'double' (διπλοῦς).

When Iris visited Helen in her chambers, she found her busily weaving a δῖπλαξ (*Il.* 3.126; cf. 22.441); this presumably is simply another name for the χλαῖνα διπλή, a kind of mantle favored by the heroes (*Il.* 10.133–34, *Od.* 19.225–26). They used as well a 'single' χλαῖνα; Priam took along no less than a dozen as part of the ransom for Hector's body (*Il.* 24.230; cf. *Od.* 24.276). Both the 'single' and the 'double' lived on. Pollux reports (7.47) that the Athenians called the first a ἀπληγίς, the second a διπληγίς or δῖβολος. As time passed, still other types of outerwear came to be made in the two versions.<sup>2)</sup> Antisthenes the Cynic, we are told, in order to have a wrap warm enough to enable him to do away with wearing a tunic underneath, 'was the first to double' either the τρίβων, the type of mantle that became the Cynics' professional costume, or the himation, the well-known standard Greek mantle (Diogenes Laertius 6.1.13). Whether or not he originated the 'double' himation, it eventually became so common that Appian, in writing about Rome's campaigns in Spain, could describe the σάγος, a native Spanish cloak, as a 'thick double himation' (*Hisp.* 42).

The Romans, too, had outer garments characterized as 'double' (*duplex*), notably the *abolla* (Servius, *ad Aen.* 5.421) and the *laena* (Varro, *L.L.* 5.133), the first some kind of mantle that wrapped about the body, the second some kind of cloak that hung from the shoulders.<sup>3)</sup> Diocletian's edict on maximum prices, in the preserved portion of the section on clothing (19), lists at least three—*chlamys*, *fibulatorium*, *banata*—that came in both 'single' (*simplex*) and 'double' (*duplex*) versions, and no doubt there were others in the many entries that have been lost.<sup>4)</sup>

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (London 1891<sup>3</sup>) s.v. 'Pallium;' *DS* s.v. 'Pallium.'

<sup>3)</sup> Cf. L. Wilson, *The Clothing of the Ancient Romans* (Baltimore 1938) 84–86, 112–17.

<sup>4)</sup> References to the edict are to the edition of S. Lauffer, *Diokletians Preis-edikt* (Texte und Kommentare 5 [Berlin 1971]). *Chlamys*: 19, 21, 23, 26, 69,

What was the difference? Was the 'double,' as has long been, and still is, the prevailing opinion, a wrap or cloak so much more ample than the regular size, the 'single,' that it could be worn folded in two and thereby enable the wearer to enjoy the warmth of two thicknesses of cloth?<sup>5)</sup> Or, as has been argued, do the terms refer to the weight of the cloth rather than the size of the garment, and did the warmth come from the 'double' version being made of cloth twice as thick as the 'single'?<sup>6)</sup>

There are occurrences in which the traditional explanation, no question about it, must be right, in which 'double' can only refer to size and not weight of cloth or some other aspect. When Tertulian, in his defence of the wearing of the pallium, assures us that 'nothing is more easy to handle than a pallium, even if double, such as Crates used to wear' (pallio nihil expeditius, etiam si duplex, quod Cratetis more, *de Pallio* 5.3), he must have in mind the ample folds of a wrap twice normal size rather than a heavy version of the normal size. And it certainly is what Hesychius had in mind in defining a ἀπλοῦς as χλαῖνα ἢ μὴ δυναμένη διπλωθῆναι. Lastly, one of the scenes on Trajan's column shows a Roman soldier who is unmistakably wearing a long cloak folded in two.<sup>7)</sup>

There is yet another indisputable proof of the use of ἀπλοῦς (*simplex*) and διπλοῦς (*duplex*) to indicate size, one that has so far been overlooked. It is implicit in certain entries in Diocletian's edict on maximum prices. In the section devoted to clothing, the prices for both a 'double' and a 'single' Dardanic chlamys happen to be preserved (19.69–70), 12,500 denarii for the first and but little over half that, 7,000, for the second. Conformably, in the section de-

---

70; 22.16, 17. *Fibulatorium*: 19.24, 25. *Banata*: 19.55. The first two are types of cloak, the third is unknown; see Lauffer's notes to 19.24ff., 19.55–62.

<sup>5)</sup> J. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, zweite Auflage besorgt von A. Mau (Leipzig 1886) i 569–70; Smith (n. 2 above) ii 321; Blümner (n. 1 above) 217; *DS* s.v. 'Pallium' 290; Wilson (n. 3 above) 106.

<sup>6)</sup> This was first suggested by W. Helbig, 'Toga und Trabea,' *Hermes* 39 (1904) 161–81 at 165. Ever since, it has received respectful consideration. Blümner, though he opted for 'folded in two' in his text (n. 1 above, 217), cited Helbig's alternative without comment in a note. Almost three-quarters of a century later, L. Bonfante offers 'either "heavy" or "double weight;"' see her *Etruscan Dress* (Baltimore 1975) 127. Wilson (n. 3 above), though she explains some 'double' garments as big enough to be folded in two (106), elsewhere (86) emphasizes that 'the word *duplex* is ambiguous.'

<sup>7)</sup> C. Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Traianssäule* (Berlin 1896–1900) pl. xvi, no. 47. Cf. Wilson (n. 3 above) 106, where she identifies the garment portrayed as a *sagum*.

voted to fulling, i.e., the cleaning of textiles, the cleaning of a 'double' chlamys cost 500 denarii, of a 'single' exactly half that (22.16–17). In both instances, the very considerable difference cannot be accounted for by the weight of the fabric: it almost certainly did not require nearly twice as much materials and labor to fashion heavy garments as it did light, and it most certainly did not require twice as much labor to clean them. Indeed, the light, being more fragile, could well have demanded more care, and hence more expense, than the heavy. The logical conclusion is that here a 'double' chlamys must be one of ample measure, more or less twice the size of a 'single' and consequently that much more costly to buy or clean.<sup>8)</sup>

Yet, if the evidence reviewed thus far confirms what has been the general scholarly consensus, that a garment which is called *διπλοῦς* (*duplex*) is a double-sized version of the *ἀπλοῦς* (*simplex*), this does not solve the whole problem. For *ἀπλοῦς* (*simplex*), as it happens, appears in several contexts in which it cannot mean 'of normal size,' indeed cannot refer to size at all.<sup>9)</sup> The most patent case in point is the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*. This document, written in the latter half of the first century A. D.,<sup>10)</sup> by some merchant or ship

<sup>8)</sup> Lauffer (n. 4 above, note to 19.21ff.) failed to see this necessary inference; he renders *διπλοῦς* (*duplex*) and *ἀπλοῦς* (*simplex*) "wohl doppelt stark, doppelt gelegt" bzw. "einfach gelegt." J. Wild, 'Clothing in the North-West Provinces of the Roman Empire,' *Bonner Jahrbücher* 168 (1968) 166–240, in commenting on *banata* (228) writes that it is 'described as double-thickness'—which is no less ambiguous than the ancient term itself. Wilson (n. 3 above), in her discussion of the *laena*, suggested (113) that a double garment could have been of 'cloth woven so that the two surfaces were different,' in other words, what we today call 'reversible.' This, she claims, 'is a very reasonable interpretation of the definition given by Festus. He says that the *laena* "is a sort of garment, double in appearance."' Yet the very same passage (*Pauli Exc.* 84, Lindsay p. 104: *laena vestimenti genus habitu duplicis*) was cited by Blümner (n. 1 above, 217) for the interpretation 'double folded' and by Helbig (n. 6 above, 165) for the interpretation 'doubly thick!'

<sup>9)</sup> Over a century ago Mommsen recognized that *ἀπλοῦς* had to have multiple meanings, one referring to size, the other 'als technischer Ausdruck bei Wollstoffen;' see his 'Nachtrag zu dem Edict Diocletians de pretiis rerum venalium,' *Juristische Schriften* ii (= *Gesammelte Schriften* ii [Berlin 1905]) 312–22 at 317. Wilson (n. 3 above), though she does not say so expressly, agrees on multiple meanings: at one point (106) she offers the explanation of size, at another (113) still other explanations (see the previous note).

<sup>10)</sup> The date of the *Periplus*, after some misguided efforts to lower it to the third century A. D., is back to its previous favored place, the second half of the first A. D. For a judicious review of the problem, see W. Raunig, 'Die

captain in the plain unvarnished Greek familiar to us from that of the papyri found in Egypt, tells what objects of trade were to be bought or sold in the various East African, South Arabian, and Indian ports. The list includes certain forms of apparel—outerwear (ἀβόλλαι and γαννάκαι, *Per.* 6) and clothing (ἱματισμός, 24, 28, 39, 49, 56)—and blankets (λώδικες, 24), all of which are characterized as ἀπλοῦς. Now, the outerwear conceivably could be ‘single’ in size, that is, the opposite of a double-sized version, but hardly the clothing. No purpose could possibly be served by making a tunic or a sleeved garment (ἱματισμός χειριδωτός, *Per.* 24) twice as large as normal.

What, then, can ἀπλοῦς mean in this document? The term has so confounded commentators and translators that no two agree. The first and only one to deal in detail with the question was Mommsen, who turned to the *Periplus* for help with the several occurrences of ἀπλοῦς in Diocletian’s edict. Noting that the author frequently coupled it with such words as κοινός ‘common’ (24, 28), ἐντόπιος ‘local’ (24), and νόθος (28, 39, 49; literally ‘bastard,’ but see below), he concluded that it must represent a contrast to these and thus mean ‘of excellent quality.’<sup>11</sup>) But this cannot be right: in both the *Periplus* and the edict, quality is indicated by appropriate adjectives.<sup>12</sup>) Others have taken it to refer to color.<sup>13</sup>) This, too, cannot

---

Versuche einer Datierung des Periplus maris Erythraei,’ *Mitteilungen der anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 100 (1970) 231–42, esp. 240. The working out of a solid chronology for the kings of Nabataea establishes a terminus ante quem of 70 A. D.; see G. Bowersock, ‘A Report on Arabia Provincia,’ *JRS* 61 (1971) 219–42 at 223–25 and M. Rodinson in *Annuaire de l’École pratique des Hautes Études, IV<sup>e</sup> Section* 107 (1974–1975) 210–38, esp. 232–33.

<sup>11</sup>) Mommsen (n. 9 above) 316–17. Conformably, J. Pirenne, *Le Royaume Sud-Arabe de Qatabân et sa Datation* (Bibliothèque du Musée vol. 47 [Louvain 1961]), in rendering *Per.* 24 and 28 translates (169, 171) ‘abollai . . . couvertures . . . fines,’ ‘vêtements . . . fins.’

<sup>12</sup>) Thus in the *Periplus*, ἱματισμός ἀπλοῦς intended not for general sale but for sale to the local rulers is in one place described as διάφορος ‘of fine quality’ (28), in another as πολυτελής ‘expensive’ (49). In the edict, both the ‘single’ and the ‘double’ Dardanic chlamys mentioned above are specified as being ‘of top quality’ (καλλίστη).

<sup>13</sup>) *LSJ* Suppl. s. v. νόθος takes ἀπλοῦς to mean ‘undyed.’ J. McCrindle, *The Commerce and Navigation of the Erythraean Sea* (Calcutta 1879), translates all its occurrences as ‘plain,’ which is ambiguous, since ‘plain’ can refer either to color or to other adornment. W. Schoff, in *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (New York 1912), was unable to make up his mind: in *Per.* 24 he renders it ‘plain,’ in 39, 49, and 56 ‘thin,’ and in 28, where the word occurs

be right for, as we shall see in a moment, in an illuminating papyrus document *ἀπλοῦς* is used of a garment—immediately preceded by a word specifying the garment's color. The most recent translator of the *Periplus* avoids the difficulties of his predecessors by rendering *ἀπλοῦς* 'unlined.'<sup>14</sup>) However, there are no parallels which he can offer in support of this meaning. Moreover, for the passage in which *λώδικες ἀπλαῖ* are mentioned, since blankets can hardly have linings, he is forced into inconsistency: there he translates 'single.'<sup>15</sup>)

Let us turn to the papyrus just referred to, a piece, dated 138 A.D., that was found at Philadelphia in the Fayum (*BGU* 7.1564). Its contents are unusual, a listing in detail of certain textiles that were to be procured from the local weavers for forwarding to an army contingent stationed in Cappadocia. What interests us is an item intended for the unit's hospital (*ἐγίασθήριον*), namely 'one white "single" blanket (*λώδικος λευκῆς ἀπλῆς*), 6 cubits long, 4 cubits wide, 4 minae in weight, . . . of fine soft pure white wool' (lines 7–10). Here, as in the *Periplus*, *ἀπλοῦς* must refer to some aspect other than size, quality, or color. Size can be eliminated inasmuch as it is taken care of by the supplying of precise figures, 6×4 cubits. Quality is taken care of by the stipulation that the blanket be 'of fine soft pure white wool' (*ἐκ τε καλῆς καὶ μαλακῆς καὶ λευκοτάτης ἐρεᾶς*). Color is taken care of by the stipulation that it be white.

Could *ἀπλοῦς* here refer to weight? After all, as I pointed out at the very beginning, this has long been a favored candidate. But weight, too, must be eliminated, for, as in the case of size, it is taken care of by the supplying of a precise figure, 4 minae.

There is yet another proof, which can be inferred from the document, that *ἀπλοῦς* can refer to none of the above aspects, neither color nor size nor weight. As it happens, in addition to the blanket, the army unit had need of 'four white Syrian mantles (*συριῶν λευκῶν τεσσάρων*, line 6),<sup>16</sup> each 6 cubits long, 4 cubits wide,  $3\frac{3}{4}$  minae in weight'—in other words, the twin of the blanket in

---

twice, he divides his favors, rendering the first occurrence 'plain' and the second 'thin.'

<sup>14</sup>) G. Huntingford, *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (Hakluyt Society, Second Series, No. 151 [London 1980]).

<sup>15</sup>) Huntingford (n. 14 above) page 33.

<sup>16</sup>) The manufacture of *συρία*—a type of thick mantle (Hesychius, s. v.)—was carried on in Egypt from at least the middle of the third century B.C.; cf. *P. Hib.* 38.7, 51.3; *P. Sorb.* 21.9, 19, and n. to line 9.

color and size and practically its twin in weight. Yet, though the blanket was characterized as *ἀπλοῦς*, the mantles were not.

What, then, is left for *ἀπλοῦς* to refer to? From its root meaning of 'single,' the word acquired such derived senses as 'simple,' 'un-compounded,' 'unmixed,' i.e., composed of a single rather than a variety of elements (cf. *LSJ* s. v. III. 1). Obviously at some point it became a trade term among dealers in textiles. I suggest that they, by an easy transfer from its other senses, used it to mean 'un-adorned'—not with reference to color but to patterns or figures in the weave, embroidery, appliqué, fringe, and the like, elements that are commonly added to, compounded with, as it were, the simple fabric of a garment. Thus, when the author of the *Periplus* tells us (24) that at the port of Muza on the south shore of Arabia there is a market for sleeved Arabic clothing *ὃ τε ἀπλοῦς καὶ ὁ κοινὸς καὶ σκοτουλαῖτος καὶ διάχρυσος*, he means clothing 'either with no adornment or with the common adornment or with checks or interwoven with gold thread.' The mantles and blankets *ἀπλοῖ τε καὶ ἐντόπιοι* which also found a market there were types 'with no adornment as well as with the traditional local adornment.' And the blanket ordered by the army unit in Cappadocia was, as we might expect of a piece of hospital equipment, 'with no adornment.'

To sum up: *ἀπλοῦς* (*simplex*) and *διπλοῦς* (*duplex*), when used of mantles or cloaks, may refer to normal size and double size respectively, the latter enabling the wearer to fold the garment over in order to provide extra warmth. *ἀπλοῦς* (*simplex*) when used of any textile—clothing and blankets as well as outerwear—may also mean 'unadorned.'<sup>17</sup>)

#### *νόθος*

Another technical term used in connection with clothing is *νόθος* 'bastard.' It occurs four times in the *Periplus*, each time linked with *ἀπλοῦς*. In three passages the two are directly coupled: at the port of Kane on the southern coast of Arabia there was a market for 'Arabic clothing both *haplous* and *nothos*' (*ἱματισμὸς Ἀραβικὸς . . . ἀπλοῦς καὶ ὁ νόθος*, *Per.* 28); at Barbarikon in India near the mouth of the Indus, there was a fairly good market for clothing that was *haplous*, much less good for *nothos* (*ἱματισμὸς ἀπλοῦς ἱκανὸς καὶ νόθος οὐ πολὺς*, *Per.* 39); at Barygaza some 200 miles north of Bombay

<sup>17</sup>) Thus McCrindle came closest to the proper meaning (cf. n. 13 above), if we take his rendition 'plain' in the sense of 'without adornment.'

there was a market for all types of both (*ἱματισμὸς ἀπλοῦς καὶ νόθος παντοῖος*, *Per.* 49). In a fourth passage the two are indirectly coupled: at Adulis on the Ethiopian shore of the Red Sea, imports included dyed mantles that are *nothoi* (*ἀβόλλαι νόθοι χρωμάτινοι*, *Per.* 6) for general sale and mantles that are *ἀπλοῖ* for sale to the local ruler.

Originally *νόθος* meant an offspring who was not fully legitimate, not *γνήσιος* because of inequality on the mother's side.<sup>18</sup> In Homer, for example, the child of a union between a hero and his concubine, in Athens between a citizen and an alien woman, was a *νόθος*. By extension, animals that were the result of cross-breeding were called *νόθοι*; Columella, for example, uses the term (8.2.13) of chicks produced by mating native with alien fowl. It is conceivable that, by further extension, *νόθος* might have been applied to fabrics produced by weaving together different types of fibres, e.g., of linen and wool as referred to in the Old Testament (Lev. 19.19, Deut. 22.11) or of linen and cotton as described by Pollux (7.76). Yet to give it this sense in the *Periplus* would not explain why, in all its occurrences there, it is coupled with *ἀπλοῦς*. Since *ἀπλοῦς* means 'unadorned', it follows that *νόθος* should somehow refer to adornment.

*νόθος* was also used figuratively; by an easy transfer from its original sense, it came to mean 'supposititious,' 'counterfeit,' 'adulterated' (cf. *LSJ* s.v. II). Thus Philo (*de Somniis* 1.53 [628]) refers to the moon's light as *νόθον φέγγος*,<sup>19</sup> and Galen, discussing medical prescriptions, stigmatizes as *νόθοι* (12.216) ingredients of inferior quality that have been substituted for those a prescription calls for. All commentators and translators have assumed that the author of the *Periplus* uses *νόθος* in this sense, that he means by it garments inferior in quality<sup>20</sup> or 'made in imitation of a better

<sup>18</sup> M. Scheller, in *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung. Festschrift Albert Debrunner* (Bern 1954) 399.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Lucretius 5.575, Catullus 34.15-16.

<sup>20</sup> C. Müller, in *Geographi Graeci minores* i (Paris 1853), translates 'adulterinus'; B. Fabricius, in *Der Periplus des erythräischen Meeres* (Leipzig 1883), translates 'unechte'; McCrindle (n. 13 above) 'adulterated' (*Per.* 28) or 'mixed' (39, 49); Schoff (n. 13 above) 'of poor quality' (6), 'spurious' (28, 39), 'inferior sorts' (49); Huntingford (n. 14 above) 'spurious' with an explanatory note (page 60) 'made in imitation of a better quality.' Mommsen (n. 9 above, 317) took *νόθος* to signify inferiority to *ἀπλοῦς*. *LSJ* s.v. defines the word 'meretricious,' but in the Supplement shifts to 'dyed' as against *ἀπλοῦς* 'undyed' (cf. n. 13 above); this cannot be right since, in *Per.* 6, mention is made of 'dyed mantles that are *νόθοι*.'



quality.’<sup>21</sup>) We can now be more precise: the inferior quality, or the imitation of a better quality, must somehow be connected with adornment. Are there such garments?

Indeed there are—those made of fabrics that are adorned not in the age-old way with designs woven into them or embroidered on them, a procedure that requires time and care, but with designs simply dyed into them, printed fabrics, as they are generally called.<sup>22</sup>) We know that in the Middle Ages and later printed fabrics were turned out which copied the designs on expensive textiles with woven decoration<sup>23</sup>) and were sold as inexpensive substitutes.<sup>24</sup>) Why not in ancient times as well? *νόθος*, then, would be the trade term used by merchants for a printed garment—a most apt term, since such a garment was a cheap counterfeit of one with woven decoration. There is incontrovertible evidence that the ancients knew the technique of printing textiles by at least the first century A. D. and, what is more, that it was a specialty of Egypt, the very place from which the items listed in the *Periplus* were exported.<sup>25</sup>) The earliest example of printed fabric from the ancient Mediterranean world that we have dates probably to the fourth century A. D.; it

<sup>21</sup>) Huntingford, cited in nn. 14 and 20 above.

<sup>22</sup>) The term generally includes fabrics decorated with hand-painted designs as well as designs actually block-printed (G. *Zeugdruck*, Fr. *impression sur tissus*, It. *stampa dei tessuti*).

<sup>23</sup>) D. King, ‘Textiles and the Origins of Printing in Europe,’ *Pantheon* 20 (1962) 23–30 at 25, where he points out that the preserved examples, some forty in number, bear designs which ‘are very like those of contemporary silk textiles with woven patterns. At least three are copied from the designs of silk textiles which happen to have survived, and the rest follow exactly the same principles as the woven patterns of their period.’

<sup>24</sup>) R. Forrer, *Die Zeugdrucke der byzantinischen, romanischen, gothischen und spätern Kunstepochen* (Straßburg 1894) 16: ‘Die bedruckten Stoffe sollen die gemusterten Gewebe vertreten und sind minderwerthige Surrogate, deren Anziehungskraft in der grössern Billigkeit des Preises liegt;’ S. Robinson, *A History of Printed Textiles* (London 1969) 14: ‘[Prints] were first adopted as a cheap substitute for the costly woven silk brocades, damasks and velvets. The patterns used on these so-called “false tapestries” attempted to imitate the richness and opulence suggested by more exotic materials.’

<sup>25</sup>) Pliny 35.150. Cf. H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern* I (Leipzig and Berlin 1912<sup>2</sup>) 229–30. Forrer in his *Die Kunst des Zeugdrucks vom Mittelalter bis zur Empirezeit* (Straßburg 1898) 7–8 insists that Pliny is describing the technique of dyeing with wax, resist dyeing as it is called, but Blümner and most other commentators rightly explain that he is describing the technique of dyeing with mordants.

is a child's tunic found at Panopolis (Achim) in Upper Egypt which is decorated with a white design upon a solid blue background.<sup>26</sup>) The ἀβόλλαι characterized as νόθοι χρωμάτινοι (*Per.* 6) could well have been garments of this type, of a fabric dyed one color with designs in another color. The apparel characterized simply as νόθος (*Per.* 28, 39, 49) would have designs in color on an otherwise undyed fabric.

### μολόχια

μολόχια is the neuter plural, used as substantive, of the adjective from μολόχη 'mallow'.<sup>27</sup>) It is first attested in Latin dress, in yet another adjectival form used as substantive, *moloc(h)inarius*. Megadorus in Plautus' *Aulularia*, reviewing the disadvantages of marrying a rich woman, lists the various vendors of female garb and adornment who will besiege the doors of the man who makes such a mistake; among these he includes (514) *molocinarii*. Not much later μολόχια makes its debut, also in Latin dress, in a line cited by Nonius (548.16–20, Lindsay p. 879) from one of Caecilius' comedies:

carbasina, molochina, ampelina.

The feminine singular, somewhat disguised by a curious spelling, appears in a list of elegant apparel cited by Nonius (540.23) from one of Novius' farces:

mollicinam, crocotam, ceridotam, ricam, ricinium.

The instances from Plautus and Caecilius may well go back to the plays of Greek New Comedy which served as their models. Thus, possibly by the late fourth B.C. and certainly by the late third, μολόχια was in use as the name of some kind of garment worn by the well-to-do.

Its earliest appearance in Greek itself is in the *Periplus*: μολόχια figure among the items of clothing exported from India to the Greco-Roman world. Here too they are obviously of high quality, for they are coupled with silk (49) and with σινδόνες (6, 48, 51), which are

<sup>26</sup>) Forrer (n. 25 above) 8–11 and pl. i; the fourth century date is by no means sure, as Forrer's remarks (9–10) reveal. Much earlier examples have been found in China: Hsio-Yen Shih, 'Textile Finds in the People's Republic of China,' *Studies in Textile History in Memory of Harold B. Burnham*, ed. V. Gervers (Toronto 1977) 305–31, lists (307–11) seven that date from the Western Han period (206 B.C.–A.D. 8).

<sup>27</sup>) The alternate form μάλάχη produced no compounds.

fine textiles, usually of linen but, in the *Periplus*, since they originate in India, presumably of cotton.<sup>28)</sup>

The next attestation dates several centuries later, in a papyrus document of 481 A. D. A listing there of miscellaneous textiles includes *μαφόρια μολόχ(ινα) ἔν* (a *μαφόριον* was a sort of kerchief worn by women or priests).<sup>29)</sup>

The ancients themselves were not sure of the meaning of *μολόχινος* other than that it had to do with mallow. Nonius thought it referred to color, that the word meant 'mallow colored' (color flori similis malvae, 548.16) and *molochinarii* dealers in (sc. garments) of that color (institores molochini coloris, 548.19). Isidore of Seville, on the other hand, thought that *molochina* referred to clothes made from mallow fibres (quae malvarum stamine conficitur, *Etym.* 19.22.12). Among moderns, some follow Nonius, but the majority Isidore.<sup>30)</sup> Their preference is understandable: as was pointed out

<sup>28)</sup> B. Hemmerdinger, in *Glotta* 46 (1968) 242 (cf. 48 [1970] 55) derives the word from the Egyptian *šndw.t* 'pagne (en tissu fin).' It is often used of loose wraps such as winding sheets, or prayer shawls for priests or worshippers, which, in the nature of the case, would be of good quality; cf. R. Rémondon in *Chronique d'Égypte* 53 (1952) 200–202. For *σιδών* used of fine Indian cotton textiles, see Strabo 15.693.

<sup>29)</sup> *SB* 7033.39, a papyrus in the collection of Princeton University first published by H. Dewing in *TAPA* 53 (1922) 113–27. There may just possibly be another instance in *P. Cairo Masp.* 67006 v. 96 (6th A. D.): *νακιον μαλοχοον*. The word *νάκιον*, a *hapax legomenon* when this document was published, is now attested in *SB* 9594.3 (7th–8th A. D.) in a context that clearly shows it to be a garment of some sort. Just possibly *μαλοχοον* is a miswriting connected with *μολόχινον*.

<sup>30)</sup> Translators by and large have taken it to refer to color. E. g., P. Nixon in the Loeb edition of the *Aulularia* translates 'dealers in mallow dyes' and A. Ernout in the Budé 'les teinturiers en mauve,' while E. Warmington in *Remains of Old Latin* (Loeb Classical Library 1935) i 515 renders the line cited from Caecilius 'dresses of flax, mauve and vine-hued' (on this line see also n. 42 below). Warmington conformably takes *μολόχινια* in the *Periplus* as 'mallow-colored' cotton cloth (*The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India* [Cambridge 1928] 211; cf. n. 34 below). Dewing (n. 29 above) translates 'mallow-colored garment,' and W. Ensslin, in his extensive commentary on Dewing's rendition (*Rheinisches Museum* 75 [1926] 422–46), translates (438) 'das malvenfarbige Kopftuch.'

Specialists in the history of textiles are unanimous in taking *μολόχινια* to mean cloth woven of mallow fibre: J. Yates, *Textrinum Antiquorum: An Account of the Art of Weaving among the Ancients* (London 1843) 301–17; Blümner (n. 1 above) 247 and *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern* i (Leipzig and Berlin 1912<sup>2</sup>) 200; R. Pfister, *Textiles de Palmyre* (Paris 1934) 21; R. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*

almost a century and a half ago, 'mallow colored' is meaningless, inasmuch as the mallow's flower is 'an ordinary red colour, not differing in its hue from thousands of plants and other objects.'<sup>31</sup>)

If the majority of commentators saw the weakness in Nonius' view, not one saw the difficulties in Isidore's. Mallow grows as abundantly in Europe as anywhere else, certainly as abundantly as in India;<sup>32</sup>) then why is it that Europeans overlooked its usefulness for cloth and only the Indians took advantage of it? This very pertinent question has never been raised. Blümner, for example, blandly talks of 'die Fasern von Malven (*Malva silvestris* L.), die sogenannten *μολόχιννα*, die vermutlich nur am Indus gewebt wurden.'<sup>33</sup>) Nor has there been raised an even more critical point: mallow fibre is extremely coarse, and, although it has at times been used for cordage, there is no record of its ever having been used for clothing in any part of the world in any age.<sup>34</sup>) Even if it had, the

---

iv (Leiden 1964<sup>2</sup>) 63; J. Wild, *Textile Manufacture in the Northern Roman Provinces* (Cambridge 1970) 21. They have been followed by the lexicographers (cf. *LSJ* s.v. *μολόχιννος*; *TLL* and *OLD* s.vv. *molochinus*, *moloc(h)inarius*), although the etymological dictionaries prefer to straddle the fence (e.g., H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [Heidelberg 1973<sup>2</sup>] ii 166, 'aus Malvenfasern gemacht, malvenfarbig'; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* [Paris 1974] iii 662, "'fait de fibre de mauve" ou "couleur de mauve."')

<sup>31</sup>) Yates (n. 30 above) 303. The word *mauve*, derived from the Latin *malva* 'mallow,' in French initially denoted solely the plant. Only in the second half of the 19th century, in English as well as French, did it come to be used of a color, viz., the name of a new chemically produced dye. See *OED* s.v., where *mauve* is defined as 'a bright but delicate purple dye obtained from coal-tar aniline' and its first appearance dated 1859; cf. *Grand Larousse de la langue française* s.v. *mauve* adj. (first appearance dated 1875) and *mauve* n. m. (end of 19th century).

<sup>32</sup>) Yates (n. 30 above) 304–305, writing in 1843, was not even sure that the common mallow grew in India. It does; see G. Watt, *A Dictionary of the Economic Products of India* (Calcutta 1889–1893) v 142.

<sup>33</sup>) Blümner, *Technologie* (n. 25 above) 200.

<sup>34</sup>) Cf. Wild (n. 30 above) 21: 'there is no direct evidence that mallow cloth was woven in the north (sc. of Europe).' There is none for the south either, and, though a number of the Malvaceae of India have been used for cordage, not one has ever been used for cloth; see Watt (n. 32 above) i 15 (*Abutilon*), i 199–200 (*Althaea*), iv 228–48 (*Hibiscus*), vi. 2 681–86 (*Sida*), vi. 4 213 (*Urena*). Yates, even though he was aware of this fact, argued that *μολόχιννος* referred to cloth of hibiscus fibre, making some unconvincing attempts to get around the stumbling block (n. 30 above, 304–305). Pfister, who threw his net wide and suggested (n. 30 above, 21–22) cloth of any of the Malvaceae native to India (and of the jute plants to boot; cf. n. 35 below),

clothing would hardly be of the quality one would import from so great a distance to put on the backs of wealthy Greeks and Romans.

Almost a century ago, the distinguished specialist in the botany of the ancient Near East, I. Löw, stated that *μολόχινα* were garments not of mallow fibre but of jute. His evidence was the name the Arabs have used and still do for *Corchorus olitorius*, one of the plants from which the fibre known as jute comes: they call it *meluchīje*, a borrowed version of *μολόχινος*.<sup>35)</sup> Löw's claim did not gain any adherents, probably because he had no evidence of any kind to offer that the ancient world knew of jute.<sup>36)</sup> Now there is, thanks to a recent unexpected archaeological discovery. Since 1978 digging has been going on at Quseir al-Qadim, the site of the ancient Leukos Limen, a port on the Egyptian shore of the Red Sea midway between Myos Hormos and Berenice and, like them, serving ships on the Egypt-India run. There in Roman levels the excavators have unearthed pieces of coarse jute cloth.<sup>37)</sup>

Since other finds included peppercorns and pieces of teak, both of which could only have come from India, the presumption is that the cloth had been imported from there as well. Indeed, the plant that produces the best jute fibre, *Corchorus capsularis* L., is native to India. The merchants of Leukos Limen and elsewhere who dealt in the unusual cloth had to have a name for it, and Löw's view that this was *μολόχινος* may well be right.

---

was not even aware of it. Warmington (n. 30 above, 211) held that *μολόχινα* were so called because they were 'dyed, we must suppose, with a product of some Indian hibiscus.' But hibiscus was no more a source of dye than it was of clothing; cf. Watt 228-48.

<sup>35)</sup> *Die Flora der Juden* ii (Vienna 1924) 248, republication of a note that first appeared in 1899. The transliteration of the Arabic varies; Peter Forskal, whose *Flora Aegyptiaco-Arabica* (Copenhagen 1775) was a pioneering work, transliterated *melochia* (p. cxiv, no. 345). Pfister (unaware of Löw's work) also mentions jute but only as part of an all-embracing conjecture that takes in a whole range of fibrous plants; see n. 34 above.

<sup>36)</sup> Cf. C. Joret, *Les plantes dans l'antiquité et au Moyen Age* (Paris 1897-1904) ii 276: 'jute, si important aujourd'hui, ne remonte guère haut dans le passé, bien que ce textile ait été sans doute connu de temps presque immémorial;' 355: 'Les Hindous ont fait aussi très anciennement sans doute des étoffes avec le jute.' Watt (n. 32 above, ii 539, 543) is not nearly so sure of ancient use of the fibre.

<sup>37)</sup> D. Whitcomb and J. Johnson, 'Egypt and the Spice Trade,' *Archaeology* 34.6 (Nov.-Dec. 1981) 16-23 at 20.

Yet the problem raised a moment ago still remains unsolved: 'of jute fibre' does not satisfy the context in Plautus and the *Periplus* any more than 'of mallow fibre.' Though jute, unlike mallow, has a considerable history of being woven into cloth, the product is of a grade suitable only for sacking or the cheapest kind of apparel; in the last century, for example, India's poor was clad in homespun jute.<sup>38</sup>) If *μολόχινος* was the name given to garments of jute, it must have been given also to others of a much higher quality—an inference that is supported by what happened to the word in post-Classical times.

After Isidore, *molochinus* next appears, in the form *melocineus*, in a Latin epic about Charlemagne written in 799:

tecta melocineo fulgescit femina amictu.<sup>39</sup>)

Mediaevalists reveal that they are as divided as Classicists: some take the word to refer to color, others to material.<sup>40</sup>) However, in the derivatives from *melocineus* in Old French—*molequin*, *molequinerie*, *molequinier*<sup>41</sup>)—there ceases to be ambiguity: these all denote cloth—not of mallow fibre, as it happens, but of flax, to wit, fine linen.

The significant element is quality: *molequin* in Mediaeval times meant a kind of fine linen, just as *μολόχινα* in Classical times were garments fine enough to be imported for wear by the wealthy. Since *μολόχινα* came from India, they had to be of cotton,<sup>42</sup>) but they must have differed somehow from the fine cotton garments called *σινδόνες* which were exported along with them.<sup>43</sup>) For reasons

<sup>38</sup>) Watt (n. 32 above) ii 546.

<sup>39</sup>) *Karolus Magnus et Leo Papa: Ein Paderborner Epos vom Jahre 799* (Studien und Quellen zur westfälischen Geschichte Bd. 8, Paderborn 1966) 60–97 at 76 (line 231).

<sup>40</sup>) Thus F. Brunhölzl, translator of the epic, renders the line 'stattlich erscheint sie in ihrem malvenfarbenen Mantel,' whereas F. Blatt, ed., *Novum glossarium Mediae Latinitatis ab anno DCCC usque ad annum MCC* (Copenhagen 1969) s.v. *moloc(h)inus*, offers the definition 'vêtement tissé de fibres de mauve.' Du Cange, s.v. *melocineus*, leaves the matter open.

<sup>41</sup>) Cf. F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IX<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris 1888) s.vv.

<sup>42</sup>) Thus I would render the line from Caecilius (see n. 30 above) 'garments of linen, cotton, and vine leaves.'

<sup>43</sup>) C. Lassen over a century ago (*Indische Altertumskunde* iii [Bonn 1858] 24) stated that *μολόχινα* were garments of cotton, but, through a curious line of reasoning, concluded that they must have been of very cheap quality. His influence may lie behind Warmington's statement (n. 30 above, 211) that the word refers to 'coarse . . . cotton cloth.'

we can only guess at, dealers coined the trade term 'mallow (cottons)' to distinguish them.<sup>44</sup>) Eventually this came to embrace fine garments of linen as well,<sup>45</sup>) a meaning that, to judge from the descendants in Old French, survived the longest.

To sum up: *μολόχινος*, etymologically 'of mallow,' became a trade term for certain fine cotton garments imported from India from at least the third century B.C. on; in post-Classical times, perhaps even before that, it was extended to certain fine linen garments and eventually came to be limited to these. Possibly in the ports of the Red Sea and Arabian Gulf it was also a trade term for garments of jute, a usage that survives in the name Arabs have given to the plants in their country that produce jute fibre.

## Eine Spur des saturnischen Verses im Oskischen

Von PAOLO POCSETTI, Neapel

Unter den Nummern 124*a*, *b*, *c*, sind in Vettters *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*<sup>1)</sup> drei oskische Inschriften veröffentlicht, die auf Keramik aus den Nekropolen des alten *Teanum* und *Suessula* in Campanien eingeritzt sind. Die nach dem Brennen eingeritzten Buchstaben laufen auf der Innen- bzw. Außenseite drei verschiedenartiger Gefäße, die mit kunstvollen Ornamenten reich dekoriert sind. Die Texte lauten:

<sup>44</sup>) Warmington (n. 30 above, 211) raised the possibility that *μολόχινος* was simply a Greek corruption of some Indian word.

<sup>45</sup>) The word *κάρπασος* went through much the same development. It derives from the Sanskrit *karpāsah* 'cotton plant;' see M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen I* (Heidelberg 1956) 174. Although used to mean cotton (e.g., *Per.* 41), it relatively quickly shifted its meaning to include linen; cf. Warmington (n. 30 above) 210. *βύσσοσ*, which originally meant linen, came to be used not only of cotton but also of silk; see Frazer's note to Pausanias 5.5.2, Olck in *RE* s. v., and E. Masson, *Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts sémitiques en Grec* (Etudes et Commentaires 67 [Paris 1967]) 20–22.

<sup>1)</sup> E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg 1953, S. 96.