

Federico Morelli (Wien): P.Vindob. G 28018: un évráτων ... e un altro uguale: P.Vindob. G 759	219
Michael P e a c h i n (New York): Five Vindolanda Tablets, Soldiers, and the Law	223
Ivo P o l l (Amsterdam): Die διάργαρον-Steuer im späbyzantinischen und früharabischen Ägypten	237
Joshua D. S o s i n (Durham, North Carolina): Tyrian <i>stationarii</i> at Puteoli	275
Gerhard W i r t h (Bonn): Euxenippos — ein biederer athenischer Bürger	285
Klaas A. W o r p (Amsterdam): Coptic Tax Receipts: An Inventory	309
Bemerkungen zu Papyri XII (<Korr. Tyche> 313–340)	325
Corrigendum zu Korr. Tyche 262	334
Buchbesprechungen	335
Géza A l f ö l d y, <i>Die Baumschriften des Aquäduktes von Segovia und des Amphitheaters von Tarraco</i> , Berlin, New York 1997 (E. Weber: 335) — Roger S. B a g n a l l, Bruce W. F r i e r, <i>The Demography of Roman Egypt</i> , Cambridge 1994 (B. Palme: 335) — Rajko B r a t o ž (Hrsg.), <i>Westlyricum und Nordostitalien in der spätrömischen Zeit — Zahohoi litik in severovzhodna Italija v pozornosti dabi</i> , Ljubljana 1996 (E. Weber: 338) — Werner E c k, <i>Tra epigraphia, prosopografia e archaeologia. Scritti scelti, rielaborati ed aggiornati</i> , Rom 1996 (F. Beutler-Kränzl: 338) — Gawdat G a b r a, <i>Der Psalter im oxyrhynchitischen (mesokemischen / mittellägypsischen) Dialekt</i> , Heidelberg 1995 (H. Förster: 340) — Martin H o s e, <i>Erneuerung der Vergangenheit. Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio</i> , Stuttgart, Leipzig 1994 (G. Dobesch: 341) — Franziska K r ä n z l und Ekkehard W e b e r, <i>Die römertzeitlichen Inschriften aus Rom und Italien in Österreich</i> Wien 1997 (E. Kettenhohn: 344) — Guy L a b a r e, <i>Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale</i> , Lyon 1996 (L. Ruscus: 346) — Magdalena M á c z y Ń s k a, <i>Die Völkerwanderung. Geschichte einer ruhelosen Epoche im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert</i> , Zürich 1993 (G. Dobesch: 348) — Michael M a u s e, <i>Die Darstellung des Kaisers in der lateinischen Panegyrik</i> , Stuttgart 1994 (H. Hefner: 350) — Federico M o r e l l i, <i>Ollo e retribuzioni nell'Egitto tardo (V–VIII d. C.)</i> , Firenze 1996 (R. Mazza: 351) — Rolf S c h u r t c h t, <i>Cicero an Appian? Cic. fam. III.1. Umgangformen in einer politischen Freundschaft</i> , Trier 1994 (G. Dobesch: 353) — Jennifer A. S h e r i d a n, <i>Columbia Papyri IX: The Vestis Militaris Codex</i> , Atlanta 1998 (F. Mithof: 357) — Jörg S p i e l v o g e l, <i>Amicitia und res publica. Ciceros Maximae während der innenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen der Jahre 59–50 v. Chr.</i> Stuttgart 1993 (G. Dobesch: 362) — Volker Michael S t r o c k a (Hrsg.), <i>Die Regierungzeit des Kaisers Claudius (41–54 n. Chr.)</i> , <i>Umbbruch oder Episode</i> , Mainz 1994 (G. Dobesch: 364) — Timothy M. T e e t e r, <i>Columbia Papyri XI</i> , Atlanta 1998 (A. Paphthomas: 370) — Gabriele Z i e h e n, <i>Gesandte vor Kaiser und Senat. Studien zum römischen Gesandtschaftswesen zwischen 30 v. Chr. und 117 n. Chr.</i> St. Katharinen 1994 (G. Dobesch: 372)	
Indices (Betina Leiminger)	375
Tafeln 1–4	

Tyche 14 (1999)

J O S H U A D. S O S I N

Tyrian *stationarii* at Puteoli

Since its publication in 1850 the inscription containing the letter from the Tyrian *stationarii* of Puteoli has earned a degree of fame, figuring prominently in discussions of the Roman economy, voluntary associations, ethnic groups in antiquity etc. I argue here that scholars have misunderstood the politics and economics that underlie the letter and the debate at Tyre that it incited: the inscription shows that in A.D. 174 a divisive debate over political and fiscal policy came to a head between the Tyrian *stationarii* at Puteoli and certain factions in their mother-city, Tyre. Two problems have obscured the nature and stakes of this debate: the sum of the *misthos* owed by the Puteolan *statio* and the sequence of events reported in the *acta* of the *boulé* at Tyre.

Editions: T. Mommsen, *Epigraphische Analecten*, Berichte der k. S. Ges. d. W., phil.-hist. Classe (1850) 57–62, correcting many errors in the copy of Gruter; G. Franz, CIG III (1853) 5833; G. Kaibel, IG XIV (1890) 830; J. Belouh, *Campantien: Geschichte und Topographie des antiken Neapel und seiner Umgebung*, Breslau 1890, 164, p. 119–120; J.-P. Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, Louvain 1895–1900, II, 1899, p. 441–443; R. Cagnat, IGR I (1911) 421; V. Tran tam Tinh, *Le culte des divinités orientales en Campanie*, Leyden 1972, 153–156; W. Dittenberger, OGIS (1905) 595; Date: A.D. 174.

Commentary: Dittenberger: C. Dubois, *Pouzsoles antique: Histoire et topographie*, Paris 1907, 83–97; G. La Plana, *Foreign Groups at Rome*, HTR 20 (1927) 183–403, esp. 256–259; J. H. D. Arms, *Puteoli in the Second Century*, (n. 1) 105.

I am grateful to Mary Boatwright, John Oates and especially Kent Rigsby for their careful criticism and generous encouragement.

1 For a reading of the document in terms of the economic climate of Puteoli and Italy in the early Empire see J. H. D. Arms, *Puteoli in the Second Century of the Roman Empire: A Social and Economic Study*, JRS 64 (1974) 104–124, esp. 105; C. Dubois, on the religious tenor of the Tyrians' environment see the texts compiled by V. Tran tam Tinh, on larger issues of Mediterranean trade see T. Frank, ESAR V, Baltimore 1940, 242–244, 270–277; idem, *Economic History*, London 1927, 305–308, 411–412; M. I. Roslovitzeff, *SEFERE* 610 n. 25, on the *statio* as an ethnic community see La Plana, on the *statio* and voluntary associations see F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig 1909, 602 E 94b, 236, 270 n. ff. 334; Waltzing. A recent collection of essays on voluntary associations makes no mention of the document: J. S. Kloppenborg, S. G. Wilson, *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, London, New York 1996. It is unfortunate that the inscription falls outside the geographical scope of the important book by O. N. Van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*, Amsterdam 1997. On legislative procedure in cities of Graeco-Roman Phoenicia see J. Teixidor, *L'Assemblée législative en Phénicie d'après les inscriptions*, Syria 57 (1980) 453–464 with W. Ameling, Κοινων τῶν Σιδωνίων, ZPE 81 (1990) 189–199, esp. 193–194.

On the editions of the text from before the 19th century see Mommsen and Franz. Underlined readings are Gruter's (see Kaibel p. 220). The right edge had become illegible already by the time of Mommsen and Franz. The precise extent of the damage is best seen in Kaibel's diplomatic transcript. No photograph of stone or squeeze is in print. Now in the Capitoline museum in Rome.

- 1 Ἐπιστολὴ γρα[φεία τῆ] πόλει.
 2 Τυρίων τῆς ἱερῆς καὶ ἰσθμοῦ καὶ αὐτονομίου μητρο[πόλεως Φοινικίης] καὶ
 3 ὠν καὶ ναυαρχίδος ἀρχοῦσι βουλῆ δῆμῳ καὶ τῆς κ[υρίας πατριδός] οἱ ἐν
 4 Ποτιόλοις
 5 διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν αὐτοκράτορος τύχη[ν] εἰ καὶ τις
 6 ἄλλη στατί-
 7 ὠν ἐστὶν ἐν Ποτιόλοις (ὡ)ς οἱ πλείους ἡμῶν ἴσασι (ῆ) ἡμετέρα ἐστὶν καὶ
 8 κοσμῶ καὶ
 9 μεγαῖται τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρουσα. ταύτης πάλαι μὲν ἐ[πι]μελοῦντο οἱ ἐν
 10 Ποτιόλοις κα-
 11 τοικούντες Τύριοι (ΟΙ) πᾶλοι ὄντες καὶ πλούσιοι· νῦν δὲ εἰς ὀλίγους ἡμῶς
 12 ἀριθμῶν, καὶ ἀναλίσκοντες εἰς τε θυσίας καὶ θρησκείας τῶν πατριῶν ἡμῶν
 13 θεῶν ἐνθά-
 14 δε ἀφωσιωμένων ἐν ναοῖς οὐκ εὐτονοῦμεν τὸν μισθὸν τῆς στατίωνος
 15 παρέχειν κα-
 16 τ' ἔτος * ᾤΝ μάλιστα ἦ καὶ τὰ ἀναλώματα εἰς τὸν ἀρχῶνα τὸν ἐν Ποτιόλοις
 17 τῆς βουβουσίας
 18 ἦμειν προσετέθη. δεόμεθα οὖν προνοῆσαι ἡμᾶς τοῦ διαμένειν ἀεὶ τὴν
 19 εἰ δέ, ἐάν προνοίῃαν τῶν κατ' ἔτος διδομένων εἰς τὴν μίσθωσιν * ᾤΝ ποιη-
 20 σασθε. τὰ γὰρ ἔτε-
 21 ρα ἀναλώματα {καὶ τὰ} γεινόμενα εἰς ἐπισκευὴν τῆς στατίωνος εἰς τὸς
 22 ἱερὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ
 23 κυρίου αὐτοκράτορος συνεπέσου(α)ς ἑαυτοῖς ἐλογισάμεθα, ἵνα μὴ [τὴν]
 24 πόλιν βαρῶμεν.
 25 ὑπομιμησόμενοι δὲ ἡμᾶς ὅτι οὐδεμία πρόσδοδος γίνεταί οὔ[τε παρὰ
 26 ναυκλήριον
 27 οὔτε παρὰ ἐμπορίων τῆ ἐνθάδε στατίωνι ὡς ἐν τῆ] βασιδί] βασιλίδι Πώμη.
 28 παρρακαλοῦμεν
 29 οὖν καὶ δεόμεθα ὑμῶν τύχης φροντίσαστε τοῦ πρό[γματος]. ἐγράφη ἐν
 30 Π[οτι-
 31 ὄλοις πρὸ ἰ' καλανδῶν Ἀγούστου Γάλλῳ καὶ φλάκκῳ Κορνηλιανῶ
 32 ὑπάτοι.

- 20 Ἄπὸ ἄκρων βουλῆς ἀχθείσης κᾶ Δίου τοῦ ἔτους ἔ. ἐπιμερένυτος Γ[αίου]
 21 Ὀυάδερῖου
 22 Καλακράτου Πισουανίου προσέδρου·

- 22 ἀνεγνώσθη ἐπιστολὴ Τυρίων στατιωναρῶν, ἀναδεδεῖσθαι ὑπὸ Λάχης
 23 ἔνος αὐτῶν, ἐν ἧ ἤξιον προνοίαν ποιήσασθαι αὐτοῖς * ᾤΝ· (ἀναλίσκειν
 24 γὰρ) εἰς τε θυσίας

- 24 καὶ θρησκείας τῶν πατριῶν ἡμῶν θεῶν ἐκεῖ ἀφωσιωμένων ἐν ναοῖς
 25 καὶ μὴ εὐτονεῖν τὸν μισθὸν τῆς στατίωνος παρέχειν κατ' ἔτος * ᾤΝ
 26 καὶ τὰ ἀναλώματα εἰς τὸν ἀρχῶνα τὸν ἐν Ποτιόλοις τῆς βουβουσίας αὐ-
 27 τοῖς προστεθῆναι. τῶν γὰρ ἔτερον ἀναλωμάτων γεινομένων εἰς ἐπ[ι]-
 28 σκευὴν τῆς στατίωνος εἰς τὰς ἱερὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοκράτορος
 29 σ[ίν].

- 29 πέσου(α)ς αὐτοῖς ἐλογίσαντο, ἵνα μὴ τὴν πόλιν βαρῶσιν, καὶ ὑπεμίμη-
 30 σκον ὅτι οὐδεμία πρόσδοδος γίνεταί οὔτε παρὰ ναυκλήριον οὔτε

- 31 παρὰ ἐμπορίων ὡς ἐν τῆ βασιλίδι Πώμη, μεθ' ἧν ἀνεγνώσων Φιλοκλήης Διο-
 32 δώρου εἶπεν· Οἱ ἐν Πώμη στατιωνάριοι ἔθος εἶχον ἀεὶ ποτε ἐξ ὧν λαμ-
 33 βάνουσι παρέχειν τοῖς ἐν Ποτιόλοις * ᾤΝ· ἀξίωσι καὶ νῦν οἱ ἐν Πο-
 34 τιόλοις

- 34 στατιωνάριοι αὐτὰ ταῦτα αὐτοῖς τηρεῖσθαι, ἦ εἰ μὴ βούλονται οἱ ἐν Πώμη
 35 αὐ-
 36 τοῖς παρέχειν, αὐτοὶ ἀναδέχονται τὰς δύο στατίωνας ἐπὶ τῆ αἰρέσει,
 37 ἐπ-

- 36 ἐφώνησαν· Καλῶς εἶπεν Φιλοκλήης· Δίκαια ἀξίωσι οἱ ἐν Ποτιόλοις. Ἄει
 37 οὕτως εἵνετο καὶ νῦν οὕτως γεινέσθω. Τοῦτο τῆ πόλει συμφέρεῖ,
 38 Φυλάχθῃ.

- 38 τῷ ἡ συνήθεια· ἀνεγνώσθη πιττάκιον δοθὲν τότε ὑπὸ Λάχης, Πειριγογε-
 39 νείας καὶ Ἀγαθόποδος υἱοῦ, αὐτοῦ Τυρίων στατιωνάριων στατίωνος
 40 Τυριᾶ-

- 40 κῆς τῆς ἐν κολωνιά Σέβαστῆ Ποτιόλοις, ἐν ᾧ ἐδήλουν παρέχειν τὴν
 41 ἡμέτεραν
 41 πατριῶν στατίωνας δύο, τὴν μὲν ἐν τῆ βασιλίδι Πώμη, τὴν δὲ [---]

3. 1. καὶ δῆμῳ Kaibel 6. Mommsen Franz Kaibel Dittenberger: OC stone 8. del. Mommsen Kaibel Dittenberger: οἱ Franz 13. Mommsen Dittenberger: ποιτ(α)ῖ)θε. Franz Kaibel 14. del. Sosin 15. CYNΠΕCOYCNIC stone: CYNΠΕCOYCNIC stone: Franz: corr. Franz: συνεπεδύ(α)ς Mommsen Kaibel Dittenberger 18. Mommsen φροντίσασ(θαι) Dittenberger (= homophone φροντίσασ(α)ῖ) φροντίσασ(α) τε Franz: φροντίσασ(α) τε (4. καὶ) Kaibel 23. HEIONN stone: ἀναλίσκειν γὰρ add. Kaibel 26. Ποτι(ὄ)λοις Franz 27. ἀναλωμάτων (καὶ τῶν) γεινομένων Franz Kaibel Dittenberger 28–29. corr. Franz: συνεπέσουσιν stone 34. στατιωνάριοι stone Mommsen 38. Mommsen: δοθὲν (ὡ)πὸ Λάχης Franz: δοθὲν το Dittenberger: δοθὲν το / (τῷ) δοθὲν ? Kaibel

„Letter written to the city: to the archons, *boulé* and people of Tyre, sacred, inviolate and immune, metropolis of Phoiniké and other cities, and *nauarchis*, and supreme fatherland, the settlers in Puteoli send greeting.

[5] By the gods and the genius of our supreme emperor, if there is any other *statio* in Puteoli, as most of you know, ours surpasses in splendor and greatness the others. This long has been cared for by the Tyrian residents in Puteoli, who were many and wealthy, but now our number has dwindled to a few, and in paying for sacrifices and the rites of our paternal gods that are established for worship here in temples, we do not have the means to furnish the *misthos* on the *statio*, 250 *denarii* per year, especially since the payments for the bull sacrifice at the games at Puteoli are charged to us in addition. We entreat, therefore, that you provide for the lasting permanence of the *statio*. And it will last if you make provision for the 250 *denarii* given yearly as payment. For we have always reckoned to our own accounts the other payments incurred for the fitting out of the *statio* for the sacred days of the supreme emperor as they occur, lest we burden the [sc. mother-]city. And we remind you that no income accrues either from the *nauklêroi* or from the merchants, in the *statio* here, as in the *statio* in imperial Rome. We beseech, therefore, and entreat you by your fortune to take care of the matter. Written in Puteoli 23 July under the consulsip of Gallus and Flaccus Cornelians.

[20] From the *acta* of the *boulé* conducted on 11 Dios year 300, C. Valerius Kallikratês son of Pausanias presiding for the day as *proedros*.

[22] The letter of the Tyrian *stationarii* was read, having been brought forward by Lachês, one of them, in which they ask that Tyre make provision for them of the 250 *denarii*, [sc. explaining that] they pay for the sacrifices and the rites of our paternal gods that are established for worship there in temples, and do not have the means to furnish the *misthos* on the *statio*, 250 *denarii* per year, and that the payments for the bull sacrifice at the games at Puteoli are charged to them in addition. As for the other payments incurred for the fitting out of the *statio* on the sacred days of the supreme emperor as they occur, they have always reckoned them to their own accounts, lest they burden the [sc. mother-]city, and they remind us that they have no income, neither from the *nauklêroi* nor from the merchants, as they do in the *statio* in imperial Rome.

[31] After the reading of which, Philoklês son of Diodôros said, „The *stationarii* in Rome have always been accustomed, out of what they themselves take in, to furnish those in Puteoli with the 250 *denarii*, and now the *stationarii* in Puteoli ask that the same things be maintained for them; or if those in Rome are unwilling to furnish it to them, they themselves [sc. those at Rome] shall absorb the two *stationes* under the same governance“. They exclaimed, „Philoklês speaks well“. „Justly do those in Puteoli ask“. „It has always been so; now too let it be so“. „This is advantageous to the city“. „Let the custom be preserved“.

[38] A tablet was read, submitted at this point by Lachês son of Preimgeneia and Agathopous, himself one of the Tyrian *stationarii* of the Tyrian *statio* in Colonia Augusta Puteoli, in which he made clear that our fatherland provided the two *stationes*, the one in royal Rome and the other in Puteoli ...“.

First the *misthos*?². All editors agree on the reading of the stone, *CN Mommensen interpreted this as (*denarium*) (*centium milia*) (*nummum*) without comment, offering no parallel for the Latin abbreviations of Latin numbers in a text that is otherwise Greek.³ His interpretation has given rise to confusion. D'Arms accepts the figure, claiming the support of IG XIV 830, OGIS 595 and IGR I 421⁴, all of which print *ov (10–11, 13, 23, 25, 33). He notes „the sum of HS 400,000 ... is the single largest cost on record in Imperial Puteoli, and the largest rent recorded for any Italian city“⁵. This huge figure, which stems from Mommensen's unconventional interpretation, should have been suspect. Nevertheless, D'Arms defends it against Duncan-Jones, who „argues that the figure should read HS 100,000,“ (= 25,000 *denarii*)⁶. Duncan-Jones is alone in interpreting *CN as 25,000⁷. This figure can be reached only by assuming that the symbol for *denarii* (*) stands uniquely here for 100 *denarii*, or that the *denarius*-symbol is in error for HS in all of its five instances. Neither Mommensen nor Duncan-Jones offers parallels for either interpretation.

Dittenberger, Beloch and others, in disagreement with Mommensen, understood the abbreviation as 250 *denarii*⁸, which prompted Dubois to seek justification for

² Almost without exception, scholars have interpreted *misthos* as rent, in spite of the fact that this interpretation is required by neither evidence nor Greek. *Misthos* need imply nothing more than payment. L. Robert, *Hell.* VII 203–204, 204 n. 5, cautiously avoids the issue.

³ His only doubt was whether to expand (*centium*) or (*centium milia*): „CN kann 100 und 100000 Denare bezeichnen; doch ist die erstere Summe offenbar zu gering.“ (61 n.**)

⁴ D'Arms (n. 1) 105. Others have followed Mommensen's figure with little or no discussion: Walzing, I, 451 n. 5; La Plana 258 n. 21; R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*, Oxford 2/1977, 60; Teixidor, *L'Assemblée législative* (n. 1) 464.

⁵ D'Arms (n. 1) 105.

⁶ D'Arms (n. 1) 105 n. 10, referring to R. P. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 1974, 210, 236 (no. 1187) [same numbers in 2nd ed., Cambridge 1982]; here Duncan-Jones also purports to follow „Kaibel [IG XIV 830] and others“, when he prefers 25,000 *denarii* over „Mommensen's reading ... 100,000 *denarii*, which assumes the use of Latin numerals in a Greek text“. Reckoning the 250 directly as *sestertia* produces 250,000, not 25,000.

⁷ R. P. Duncan-Jones, *An Epigraphic Survey of Coins in Roman Italy*, BPRS n.s. 20 (1965) 189–306, 302 no. 1185a accepted Mommensen's interpretation, which he subsequently rejected in favor of the unsubstantiated figure, 25,000 *denarii*. He asserts also that Franz „likewise gives the figure as *CN [i.e. 100,000 *denarii*] in his replica, but he fatally misconstrues this in his transcription, rendering it throughout as *σν“. In his diplomatic transcription Franz transcribes X CN like every editor; his minuscule transcription shows that he interpreted the figure as 250 *denarii*. Duncan-Jones then condemns the texts of IG XIV 830 (which a decade later he would purport to follow), IGR I 421 and OGIS 595 because they „depart still further from the original“; the three texts, however, are in agreement with each other and with Franz's. He notes also that Dubois „does not appear to have been conscious of the discrepancies between the various published versions“ (302 no. 1185a); on the contrary, Dubois devotes five pages (89–93) to a discussion of Mommensen's interpretation, in open disagreement with Dittenberger (91).

⁸ Dittenberger (p. 292, n. 23) expands the abbreviation: *δηνάριον* *δικαεξοντῶν* *ρεπτήκορα*; Beloch (115) is equally unequivocal: „Der Rath von Tyros beschließt darauf, daß die Tyrische Station in Rom die 250 Denare zu zahlen habe“, so too Poland, *Veretinswezens* 498. „Auch die Station der Tyrer in Puteoli wird von der Stadtgemeinde durch eine jährliche Unterstützung von 250 Den. über Wasser gehalten“. C. Picard, *Observations sur la société des Possédonistes de Bérytos et sur son histoire*, BCH 44 (1920) 263–311, esp. 266 accepts 250 *denarii* as the rent

Mommsen's interpretation. Dubois (92–93) considers 250 *denarii* too small a sum to cause the *stationarii* consternation. More significantly, Dubois envisions the *statio* as a sprawling compound of large storage silos, trans-shipment depots, shops and lodgings, which he (92–93) likens optimistically to a medieval *fondaco*.⁹ On the other hand, 100,000 *denarii* seems to Dubois too high an amount for rent in second-century Puteoli, even for such a large complex, and so he argues (95–96) that the Tyrians in Puteoli received an annual sum of 100,000 *denarii* from which to pay their various expenses, rent included. This, however, contradicts the letter of the Puteolan *statio*. The *stationarii* state that their revenues are low because of diminished enrolment (8–9) and that the *statio* has been accustomed to meet other expenses out of pocket (15–16). They ask for assistance with the *misthos* alone (13). Furthermore, not only do we not know the dimensions or quality of the *statio*'s installation, but the number of known contemporary rents is too few, and their range of values too wide, to permit sound judgement on this score.¹⁰ Finally, Dubois' argument rests on a flaw in logic, on which 250 *denarii* cannot stand since it is too low a rent for a *fondaco*, which the *statio* must be because a rent of 100,000 is too high for anything else.¹¹

To summarize, there is complete agreement that the stone reads *CN̄. All modern editors correctly acknowledge the first character as the sign for *denarii*. All editors, with the exception of Mommsen, read the second character as a lunate *sigma* (all the other *sigmas* on the stone are lunate and identical in form), i.e. the number 200, and the third character as a Greek *nu*, i.e. the Greek number 50. Dubois alone acknowledges the „entrepôt ou comptoir“, N. Lewis, M. Rheinhold, *Roman Civilization*, New York 3 1990, II, 109–110, translate „250 *denarii*“.

⁹ Evidently following Mommsen's „Factorei“ (60–61). The same institutional parallel would later be suggested by L. Cantarelli, *Le Stazioni Manicipiorum*, Bull. Com. d'Archéologia (1900) 124–134; La Plana 259 n. 22, postulates the presence of baths (258 n. 21) in addition to the array of „sumptuous buildings“ (259); T. Frank, *An Economic History of Rome*, London 1927, 308; idem (n. 1) 274–275; M. Rosovtzeff, *SEHAW* II 791; A. H. M. Jones, *The Roman Economy: Studies in Ancient Economic and Administrative History*, ed. by P. A. Brunt, Oxford 1974, 145.

¹⁰ Duncan-Jones, *Economy* (n. 6) 210 nos. 1185–1189 lists five rents for Italy, ranging from HS 1,200 to HS 400,000 +, the highest being the rent on an estate of Pliny the Younger — hardly sufficient data to argue the *statio*'s *misthos* from cliometrics.

¹¹ Thus, Dubois' argument touches on the vexed question of the precise nature of the Tyrian *stationes*. Many scholars have attempted to equate them with the *stationes municipiorum* (Pliny, *NH* 16, 40), the *stationes* in the Piazza of the corporations at Ostia, other *stationes* of foreign merchants at Rome, or the Poseidonians of Berytos, the Herakleians of Tyre and other associations located on Delos; e. g. La Plana 258–265; Ameling (n. 1) 195–198; Picard (n. 8) 264–270. L. Robert, *Hell*, VII 197–205, esp. 202–205, however, has shown decisively that in Greek the word *statio* has a broader range of applications than most admit. On a roughly contemporary honorific inscription from Tarsus, in which it is mentioned that a board of secretaries has erected a *statio* for the sacred *synagion* (ὁ ἐὺνότος ὑπομνηστῆς τῆς στατίωνος ἐκ τῶν ἰδιῶν τῶ ἐλεῖν σὺνερῆται, 16–17), Robert observes that the *synagion* may be a professional association (202) and the *statio* need be no more than a small office („salon“ or „bureau“, 204) like those found at Ostia (204 n. 5). The Puteolan *statio* at Tyre could have been as small as the Tarsian or Ostan installations or as big as that belonging to the Berytian Poseidonians at Delos. The evidence does not permit certainty. If, however, we are correct that the *misthos* was 250, and not 100,000, *denarii*, and if the *misthos* represents rent on a building, then the small bureaus attested at Ostia and Tarsus may provide the better model.

ledges that the reason to reject the obvious interpretation (250 *denarii*) in favor of Mommsen's rendering is the notion that 250 *denarii* is too low a figure for the rent owed by a *statio*.

It is apparent from the second half of the text that much more is at stake for the Tyrian *stationarii* at Puteoli than the *misthos*, which is, as it turns out, only a foil for the more crucial issue of the survival of the Puteolan *statio*. This brings us to the second crux, the debate at Tyre. D'Arms summarizes:

Tyre must have considered it nationally important to maintain the station, for the payments were continued: the son of Diodorus, Philoklēs, pointed out to his fellow Tyrian senators ... that until then the rent for Puteoli's *statio* had always been paid by the Roman agency from its receipts, and the βουλή voted that the practice be continued: δίκαια ἀξιοῦσι οἱ ἐν Πουτρίῳις.¹²

The stone was erected in Puteoli, so we may be certain that the Tyrian *stationarii* at Puteoli were successful in their petition. Beyond this, the truth of D'Arms' assessment is not entirely clear. After the letter from the *stationarii* has been read¹³, Philoklēs introduces information not contained in the letter. He claims that in the past the Tyrian *stationarii* at Rome covered the expenses of the Tyrian *stationarii* at Puteoli (32–33). This is a direct refutation of the claim made by the Tyrian *stationarii* at Puteoli that they can no longer afford their *misthos* because their numbers have dwindled (8–9). The statement that they used to be wealthy but have now ceased to be so, since their ranks have diminished, implies direct correlation between membership and revenues. Yet according to Philoklēs their claim is a lie: they never paid the *misthos* in the first place.

The statements of Philoklēs that follow show his true colors even more clearly. He is not a champion of the Puteolan cause as D'Arms assumes. Again, Philoklēs produces information not contained in the Puteolians' letter (33–35): ἀξιοῦσι καὶ νῦν οἱ ἐν Πουτρίῳις στατίωνοῦντο αὐτὰ τὰ αὐτοῖς τηρεῖσθαι, ἢ εἰ μὴ βουλόμεθα οἱ ἐν Τύρῳι αὐτοῖς παρέχειν, αὐτοῖς ἀνοδέχονταί τὰς δύο στατίωνας ἐπὶ τῇ αὐτῇ ἀπορίᾳ. He claims that the Tyrian *stationarii* at Puteoli request first the preservation of the current arrangement. No such request appears in the Puteolians' letter. There they asked the city of Tyre to start paying the annual *misthos*, which in their terms represents a change from the current situation (We used to be wealthy, but now ...). The contingency that Philoklēs puts into the Puteolians' mouths is problematic. What is the meaning of ἀνοδέχονταί? Who are αὐτοῖς? What is the meaning of ἐπὶ τῇ αὐτῇ ἀπορίᾳ? If ἀνοδέχεσθαι denotes payment, as might be expected, then αὐτοῖς can hardly indicate the Tyrian *stationarii* at Puteoli since, on their own admission, they are unable to pay their own expenses, much less the expenses of both *stationes*. If αὐτοῖς indicates the Tyrian *stationarii* at Rome and ἀνοδέχεσθαι means „to pay“, then the resulting contingency plan of the Tyrians at Puteoli is otiose: if the *statio* at

¹² D'Arms (n. 1) 105.

¹³ Inasmuch as the report of the letter's contents conforms closely to its actual words Kabbel's shrewd restoration, or something very similar to it, in line 23 must hold. The *acta* of the *boule* first cites the Puteolians' request, subvention of the *misthos*, and then records their reasoning, example by example in identical order, with identical terms.

Rome is unwilling to pay, let them pay. Dittenberger (p. 292) saw that ἀναδέχεσθαι must mean something like „absorb into its own ranks”, and ἐν τῇ αὐτῆ ἀίψῃ must mean roughly „under the same governance/institutional oversight”. He attempted to solve the problem accordingly: „*Prisus Tyrii Romae consistentes suam ipsorum stationem condixerant et illius quae Puteolis erat mercedem collegio illic constituto numeraverant, iam eadem condicione utramque stationem in se recipere parati sunt qui Puteolis habitant*”¹⁴. Thus, on Dittenberger’s interpretation the Puteolan proposal, as voiced by Philoklēs, is: the *statio* at Rome should pay for its Puteolan counterpart, but if the Roman *statio* is unwilling, it shall be dissolved and merged with, and put under the governance of, the Puteolan *statio*.

Dittenberger’s solution and reconstruction of the background events, however, cannot be correct. The port at Puteoli was active long before the rise to prominence of Ostia, the port with which the Roman *statio* must have been associated. Other associations of easterners, probably businessmen, are attested at Puteoli from an early date¹⁵. It is more likely that the Puteolan *statio* preceded the Roman, but that, as is commonly accepted, its vigor declined as trade was increasingly routed through Ostia in the first and second centuries A.D.¹⁶ But the more compelling cause to reject Dittenberger’s proposal is the fact that αὐτοὶ by default should limit the nearer substantive, οἱ ἐν Πύρῃ, not, as Dittenberger assumes, the farther οἱ ἐν Πορτοῶνι.

We now see the full impact of Philoklēs’ remarks. The Puteolan *stationarii* ask for assistance on the grounds that they can no longer pay the 250-*denarii mishos*. Philoklēs moves to deny them assistance, claiming that they never did pay the *mishos*; the *stationarii* in Rome did (32–33). Philoklēs then says that the Puteolans actually want to preserve the *status quo*, or his version of it — subvention from Rome (33–34). Finally, Philoklēs makes his bid for the hostile take-over of the Puteolan *statio*, voicing an alternative proposal: if the more solvent Roman *stationarii* are unwilling to continue their (alleged) policy of subvention, then they should absorb and assume control of the bankrupt Puteolan *statio*. At 33 the disjunctive ἢ does not indicate two alternatives proposed by the Puteolans; it separates Philoklēs’ proposal from the Puteolans’. On the former interpretation Greek would require the infinitive ἀναδέχεσθαι at 35, to complement ἀξιοῦσιν (33) and to match τραπεῖσθαι (34). On the correct rendering and the text as it is, however, grammar requires that ἀναδέχοντα stand for subjunctive, ἀναδέχονται. The indicative -ονται could stand here as a simple orthographic variant for the subjunctive -ονται.¹⁷ Simply put, Philoklēs’ view is: either the *statio* at Rome pays, as (according to him) it always has, or the Puteolans relinquish their autonomy to their Roman counterparts.

¹⁴ So also the speculation of La Plana 259–260 n. 23.

¹⁵ For a brief conspectus of these see M. W. Frederiksen, *Campania*, London 1984, 330; Tran iam Tinh, *Waltzing*, III, 432–433.

¹⁶ D’Arms (n. 1); note, however, that the perceived poverty of Puteolan *statio* is one of the foundations of this argument.

¹⁷ Compare *I. Magnesia* 31, 24. At 6 the mason cut OC instead of QC and at 26 ΠΟΤΙΛΑΟΙΚ instead of ΠΟΤΙΛΑΟΙΚ. Whether this represents an orthographic variant or visual error (Mommсен read ΣΤΑΤΙΟΝΑΠΟΙΚ at 34) by the scribe it may be adduced in support of the -ονται/-ονται exchange.

Under this arrangement the Puteolan *statio* would presumably remain physically, but fall under the sway of its Roman counterpart. We may be certain that Philoklēs’ proposal that Tyre sanction the legal dissolution of the *statio* at Puteoli did not pass, since it is inconceivable that the poor Puteolans erected this costly monument in celebration of their own demise. In fact, the responses to Philoklēs’ advice are not spoken in consent, as D’Arms suggests. It has gone unnoticed that what ensues in the Tyrian assembly is not unanimous assent, but a spirited debate. The first acclamation is in support of Philoklēs’ proposal (36): „Καλῶς εἶπεν Φυλακῆς”. The second favors the request of the Puteolan *stationarii* (36): „Αἰκάρια ἀξιοῦσιν οἱ ἐν Πορτοῶνι”. The next three responses can be construed as supporting either side, depending on whether the speakers accept the Puteolans’ letter or Philoklēs’ interpretation of it (36–38): ¹ Ἀεὶ οὕτως ἐγείνετο καὶ νῦν οὕτως γεινέσθω, ² Τοῦτο τῇ πρόλει συμφέρει, ³ Φυλακῆς τῷ ἢ συμφέρει.

The debate is interrupted at this point by Lachēs, the delegate sent from Puteoli, who produces a second document in support of the Puteolan claim. Unfortunately the stone breaks at this point, but not before we learn that Lachēs adduces this second document as evidence that the mother-city Tyre founded two distinct *stationes*, one in the capital city of Rome and the other in Puteoli. Since Lachēs and the Puteolan *stationarii* were successful this second document must have attested in some way to the separateness of the two *stationes*. Perhaps the tablet contained the foundation charter — or mention of it — of one or both of the *stationes*; perhaps it only made mention of the two as independent bodies. Whatever the contents of this document, its validity as evidence for Lachēs’ claim was recognized and someone, probably Tyre herself, provided the Puteolans’ *mishos*. As D’Arms saw, the Tyrians who argued, „Αἰκάρια ἀξιοῦσιν οἱ ἐν Πορτοῶνι”, carried the vote, but they were not, as he assumed, supporting Philoklēs in his bid to lay the expense of the *mishos* on the shoulders of the Roman *statio*, or else dissolve the Puteolan *statio*.

In sum, the Greek number is to be read as a Greek number, * CN = 250 *denarii*. The figure 100,000 *denarii* was conjectured by Mommсен and defended by Dubois, without sufficient evidence, on grounds that a rent of 250 *denarii* seemed too low, given their anachronistic conception of the infrastructure of the *statio* and the apparent thrust of the Puteolans’ request. After all, the Puteolans’ petition does seem to revolve around the rent.

Lachēs’ mission, however, was to secure the continued survival and favored status of the Puteolan *statio*. He came armed with two arguments. The first was patriotic, religious and political: by the annual contribution of 250 *denarii* the city of Tyre could ensure the well-being of its most splendid and grand (6–7) *statio*, prevent the cult of its ancestral deities from falling into neglect (9–10), secure the good will of the god in whose honor the *bouthousia* was celebrated (11), and avoid insulting the imperial authorities by failing to celebrate the sacred days of the emperor (14–15)¹⁸.

¹⁸ Thus Franz’s corrections at 15 and 18–19 to the accusative, συντέρονον(α)ς, are perhaps more appropriate than the genitive συντερονονος, which, as Dittenberger explains, would have to modify στρατιωνος (14, 28) so that the passage (13–15 ≈ 27–29) be rendered „For we have always reckoned to our own accounts the other payments and those incurred for the fitting out of the *statio*, which is in a state of collapse, for the sacred days of the supreme emperor”

Lachês' second argument was on a point of law. He seems to have foreseen the objections raised by Philoklês, and in an act of diplomatic genius he produced the second document, which evidently he wielded as evidence for the independence of the two *statioes*, as soon as argument broke out on the floor of the Tyrian senate.¹⁹

The Puteolan *stationarii* did not spend the time and money involved in Lachês' mission simply to win a mere 250 *denarii*. The survival of their institution was at stake: people like Philoklês were plotting its downfall. There is no reason to doubt that the Puteolans did genuinely need the 250 *denarii*, but someone at Puteoli saw a means of capitalizing on their lack: the Puteolans need only convince Tyre that she might win great gains from the minimal contribution of 250 *denarii* per year. Thus Lachês exploited the low monetary value of the request to the Puteolans' advantage, never arguing explicitly from the modestness of the request. The Tyrian *statio* at Puteoli erected this inscription as a testimony to its independence and greatness, and in the process left an account of the battle over political and fiscal policy, which they fought and won to secure that status.

Joshua D. Sosin

Duke University
Department of Classical Studies
236 Allen Building, Box 90103
Durham, North Carolina
U.S.A.

¹⁹ This is not philologically impossible, though the phrase εἰς ἐπιτοκευὴν τῆς στατιῶνος εἰς τὰς ἐπαρὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ κρηπίου αὐτοκρατορῶνος (14–15 = 27–28) would be awkward in the attributive position. The introduction of news that the *statio* is falling apart seems intrusive in the light of the otherwise unified rhetorical front offered by the Puteolans. Contrary to Dittenberger, οὐρανῖτρον is used absolutely; see LSJ s. v. 2, but in support of Dittenberger's suggestion see *I. Stratonikeia* I 144, 2 (?); *Salamine de Chypre* XIII (Test. Sal. 2) 38, 4–5; *Isr. gr. d'Italia, Napoli* I 20, 6. For now the question must remain open.

¹⁹ If our reconstruction of events is correct then Ameling's argument against formal institutional ties between the *statio* and its mother city may be slightly overstated (n. 1) 193, 198. The fact that Philoklês could press for the dissolution of the *statio* and that Lachês could produce a document evidently effective at killing this proposal suggests that the mother city had competence in matters of a *statio*'s existence, if not over its routine administration.