

This seems to be the natural interpretation. Pollux makes the same statement about ἀργύρια also in 3.86 and 7.103, passages not adduced in *LSJ* or by Kaibel.

If, then, Pollux in these passages understood ἀργύρια to mean *money*, then the entry in *LSJ* should be corrected accordingly.

University of Western Ontario

I. AVOTINS

### PERIPLUS MARIS ERYTHRAEI 60

The *Periplus Maris Erythraei* is a handbook written by an anonymous author in the second half of the first century A.D., for the use of merchants from Roman Egypt who traded with east Africa, Arabia, and India.<sup>1</sup> In it the author devotes a good deal of space to the trade with India's west coast. He notes that there were two main commercial centres: one was Barygaza on the northwestern coast (44.15.4–7), and the other the twin ports of Muziris and Nelkynda on the southwestern (53.17.27–8), the area he calls Limyrikê, more or less the equivalent of the Malabar coast. He spells out in detail what Barygaza imported and exported (49.16.20–31) and then does the same for Limyrikê (56.18.16–28).

On the other hand, when he reaches the eastern coast, particularly the southeastern, he treats it almost perfunctorily. He merely lists the names of the principal harbours (60.20.6), notes that shipping between them and Limyrikê was handled by local small craft (60.20.6–8), and in one sentence summarizes their trade (60.20.10–13):

προχωρεῖ δὲ εἰς τοὺς τόπους τούτους πάντα τὰ εἰς τὴν Λιμυρικὴν ἐργαζόμενα, καὶ σχεδὸν εἰς αὐτοὺς καταντᾷ τό τε χρῆμα τὸ ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου φερόμενον τῷ παντὶ χρόνῳ κα<ι> τὰ πλείστα γένη πάντων τῶν ἀπὸ Λιμυρικῆς φερομένων....

The most widely used translation, that of W. Schoff,<sup>2</sup> renders the passage as follows:

There are imported into these places everything made in Damirica [Limyrikê], and the greatest part of what is brought at any time from Egypt comes here, together with most kinds of all the things that are brought from Damirica.

Schoff mistranslates χρῆμα – here, as elsewhere in the *Periplus*, it means ‘money’<sup>3</sup> – and gives a questionable rendition of τῷ παντὶ χρόνῳ. But over and above this, he creates an unreal distinction, between products ‘made in Limyrikê’<sup>4</sup> and products ‘brought from Limyrikê’. The only product that Limyrikê ‘made’ was pepper (cf. 56.18.22–3), and that certainly was among the products ‘brought’ from there, indeed the chief one.

Another version of most of the passage is offered by G. Giangrande:<sup>5</sup>

All that is produced in Limyrike is exported to these places, and almost all the currency which flows out of Egypt annually falls to their share.

Giangrande has not only corrected the translation of χρῆμα but also improved that of τῷ παντὶ χρόνῳ, for although, as will be shown in a moment, ‘annually’ mistranslates τῷ παντὶ χρόνῳ, he properly takes χρόνος here to mean ‘year’, a sense

<sup>1</sup> H. Frisk, *Le Périphe de la Mer Érythrée*, Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift 33 (Göteborg, 1927), offers the sole reliable text; it replaces C. Müller's in *Geographi Graeci Minores* 1 (Paris, 1855), pp. 257–305. I cite by chapter followed by Frisk's page and line number(s).

<sup>2</sup> *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (New York, 1912).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Frisk, p. 97.

<sup>4</sup> ‘Damirica’ is Schoff's misguided and unnecessary emendation.

<sup>5</sup> *JHS* 96 (1976), 156. G. Huntingford's translation (*The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, Hakluyt Society, New Series No. 151 [London, 1980]) follows Giangrande.

which is attested for the period of the *Periplus* and becomes increasingly common in later centuries.<sup>6</sup> But he retains Schoff's unreal distinction and, what is more serious, has the author make a statement that cannot be true. The *Periplus*' treatment of the east-coast ports makes it abundantly clear that, so far as trade with the west was concerned, they were of no great moment. It is inconceivable that 'almost all the currency which flows out of Egypt annually', i.e. was paid out each year by western merchants for Indian goods,<sup>7</sup> could 'fall to their share'. Almost all the currency fell rather to the share of Barygaza and the ports of Limyrikê.

One of the clues to a proper understanding of the passage is τὰ... ἐργαζόμενα, which both translators render 'what is made' or 'produced'.<sup>8</sup> The verb has the specialized sense of 'to trade' (*LSJ* s.v. II 6),<sup>9</sup> and we find οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι, with no further qualification, meaning 'traders'.<sup>10</sup> Thus the neuter form here can mean 'that which is traded', or, in the context, 'that which comes to Limyrikê through trade'.<sup>11</sup> If we make the very reasonable assumption that the author has in mind what comes there from the west, we have a real distinction: the east-coast ports took in two kinds of goods, the western products that were shipped out of Egypt, and the Indian that were shipped out of Limyrikê; they took in all of the first and most, but not all, of the second.

There is yet another distinction the author makes, one indicated by τῷ παντὶ χρόνῳ. Although Giangrande recognized that χρόνος here must mean 'year', his 'annually' does not properly translate the phrase, which, as he himself points out, means literally 'throughout the whole time', and has precisely that meaning elsewhere.<sup>12</sup> Conformably, it should mean here 'throughout the whole year'. In the light of certain factors that the author assuredly had in mind as he wrote, this makes excellent sense. Exports from Roman Egypt reached the east coast more or less at one particular time of year. This was because the arrival in India of vessels from the west was strictly determined by the monsoon winds that dominate the Arabian Sea: ships left their home ports on the Red Sea in July, docked at Limyrikê in September,<sup>13</sup> and then either went on to the east coast or forwarded in local bottoms what cargo was intended for the east coast. After September there were no new arrivals at Limyrikê until the following September. But vessels carrying exports from Limyrikê to the east coast,

<sup>6</sup> See *LSJ* s.v. 2c; *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. W. Arndt and F. Gingrich (Chicago, 1979), s.v. In Diosc. 1.19 χρόνον is a variant for ἔτος.

<sup>7</sup> At Limyrikê payment was principally in cash (56.18.17–18). The many hoards of Roman coins that have been found throughout southern India indicate that this was so elsewhere as well; see M. Wheeler, *Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers* (London, 1954), pp. 137–40.

<sup>8</sup> Müller had translated – correctly, as we shall see – 'quaecunq[ue] in Limyricen negotiandi causa mittuntur', which Frisk (73) branded a 'traduction un peu douteuse'. He preferred the rendition in B. Fabricius, *Der Periplus des Erythräischen Meeres von einem Unbekannten* (Leipzig, 1883), 'alles das, was in Limyrike producirt wird,' as being 'plus simple et plus naturel'. Schoff followed Fabricius, and Giangrande Frisk.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the *Periplus*' use of ἐργασία in the specific sense of 'trade' (17.6.17, 21.7.23, 30.10.10).

<sup>10</sup> Dem. 34.51, Paus. 3.23.3; cf. F. Dürbach, *BCH* 26 (1902), 491.

<sup>11</sup> As Müller had taken it; see note 8 above.

<sup>12</sup> The phrase preceded by ἐν occurs fairly frequently; see, e.g., Her. 9.27.1; Thuc. 1.33.2; Xen. *Vect.* 4.25; Dem. 19.312. The dative by itself, though rare, is attested; see Plut. *Pomp.* 32.2 and Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5.14.121.1 (Stählin), citing a line from Diphilus or Philemon (or a paraphrase of one; see J. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* III A [Leiden, 1961], p. 94, note 6).

<sup>13</sup> See L. Casson, 'Rome's Trade with the East: The Sea Voyage to Africa and India', *TAPA* 110 (1980), 21–36 at 31–5 (= *Ancient Trade and Society* [Detroit, 1984], pp. 190–2). No ships sailed directly to the east coast; they all made a landfall at Limyrikê (57.19.8–9 and cf. my comments in *CQ* 34 [1984], 476–9).

or vice versa, had no such limitation, particularly the small craft that the author notes were used on this run: the courses and wind patterns enabled them to leave by and large throughout the year. This important chronological difference clarifies the author's seemingly cryptic words. He is reporting that

There is imported<sup>14</sup> by these places all the [sc. western] trade goods imported by Limyrikê, and, generally speaking, there comes to them all year round [sc. and not just at a certain time, like the western goods] both the cash originating from Egypt [sc. paid by western merchants in exchange for east coast products] and most kinds of all the goods originating from Limyrikê.

New York University

LIONEL CASSON

<sup>14</sup> The author throughout uses *προχωρεῖ* to mean 'there is imported'; cf. Frisk, p. 101. This sense, occurring nowhere else in Greek literature, may well be businessman's jargon.

### PREVERBS AND DOWRIES\*

A fairly frequent syntactic phenomenon both of Greek and of Latin is, in the words of Calvert Watkins,<sup>1</sup> 'the iteration of a compound verb in a succeeding clause or sentence by the simple verb alone, but with the semantic force of the compound'. A straightforward example is provided by Ar. *Knights* 365–6:

Πα. ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἐξέλω σε τῆς πυγῆς θύραζε κύβδα.  
Δη. νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ κάμει γ' ἄρ', ἥνπερ γε τοῦτον ἔλκεης.

More complex is an inscription (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 43.35–44) cited by Watkins, in which not only are two compound verbs picked up by their respective simplexes, but one of the simplexes (τιθῆται) only becomes unambiguously intelligible when it is seen that it has to be taken in the sense properly belonging to the compound (ὑποθεμένῳ 'taking as security for a loan') that was used a line or two earlier:

ἀπὸ δὲ Ναυσινίκο ἀρχον[τ]ος μὴ ἐξεῖναι μήτε ἰδία μήτε δημοσ[ί]α Ἀθηναίων μηθενὶ ἐγκτήσασθαι ἐν τ[α]ίς τῶν συμμάχων χώραις μήτε οἰκίαν μήτε χωρίον μήτε πριαμένῳ μήτε ὑποθεμένῳ μήτε ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ μηθενί· ἐὰν δέ τις ὠνήται ἢ κτᾶται ἢ τιθῆται τρόπῳ ὁπωδὺν, ἐξεῖναι τῷ βολομένῳ τῶν συμμάχων φῆναι πρὸς τοὺς συνέδρους τῶν συμμάχων.<sup>2</sup>

The purpose of the present note is to draw attention to a group of passages which may be unnoticed instances of this idiom. All involve the verb ἐπιδιδόναι 'give in addition to (a woman being given in marriage), give as dowry' and its simplex δίδοναι. The first is an unproblematical example, notable only for the fact that having followed up the compound with the simplex, the speaker then returns to the compound:<sup>3</sup>

\* I am grateful to Professor Douglas MacDowell for his criticism and encouragement, and to an anonymous *CQ* referee for some constructive suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> *HSCP* 71 (1966), 115–19, at p. 115. Watkins gives references to earlier scholars who have collected instances of the idiom; further examples are adduced by R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), 77–85.

<sup>2</sup> The same verb ὑποτίθεσθαι, and its suppletive perfect passive ὑποκείσθαι, figure on two Attic *horoi* (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 2758/9) which neatly demonstrate that the omission of the preverb is entirely optional and has no effect on the sense. 2758 reads ὅρος χωρίου καὶ οἰκίας ὑποκειμένων ἹΗΗΗ δραχ(μῶν) ὥστε ἔχειν καὶ κρατεῖν [τὸν] θέμενον κατὰ συνθήκας τὰς κειμένας παρὰ Δεινίᾳ Εὐωνυμεί: in 2759 the mortgagee is given 'possession and control' by almost precisely the same formula – but he is called [τὸν] ὑποθέμενον.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Renehan (n. 1), 79, citing Pl. *Symp.* 211b–c and plausibly emending Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.54.