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**Ars polymita, ars plumaria: The Weaving Terminology of Taqueté and Tapestry**

John Peter Wild and Kerstin Droß-Krüpe

In Roman Egypt papyrologists and archaeologists sometimes seem to inhabit two different, if parallel, worlds, each apparently unaware of the treasures to be found in the other.¹ This paper, however, is a co-operative venture between an ancient historian with papyrological interests – Kerstin Droß-Krüpe – and an archaeologist – John Peter Wild. In the research field of textiles we overlap, and we want to offer you insights from each of our worlds.

At some point in the later 2nd century AD an unnamed magnate in the territory of the Lingones in central Gaul dictated a will in which he stipulated that a number of his prized possessions should be cremated with him on his funeral pyre.² Among those listed are *vestes polymitae* et *plumariae*.³ What do these two textile terms mean? And what did the textiles themselves look like? The images in Figures 1 and 2 are our provisional suggestions. The two items shown here are of wool – they are actually from Roman Egypt – and at first glance they look in decorative terms rather similar to one another;⁴ but the textile in Figure 1 is in *taqueté* – *vestis polymita*, we argue – mechanically woven – while the piece in Figure 2 is in tapestry weave, *vestis plumaria*, and hand-woven.

The structures of the two weaves can be characterised as follows:

Tapestry weave, made famous by the Gobelin workshops in Paris, is essentially a mosaic in coloured wool yarns, constructed free-hand, and concealing the underlying warp.⁵ The weaver has available on individual spools a selection of dyed yarns which he or she interlaces with the warp threads according to the requirements of the pattern. A distinctive feature of tapestry is the oblique lines or even vertical slits where weft yarns in different colours meet one another and turn back (Fig. 3). Across an area, an accomplished weaver can achieve the subtle, gradual, changes in colour visible in the highest-quality floor and wall-mosaics and in wall painting.

---

1. For a welcome recent exception see Palme & Zdiarsky 2012.
2. *CIL* XIII, 5708; Le Bohec 1991, 46 for dating; Le Bohec 2003. The inscription is only recorded in a 10th-century manuscript now in Basel.
3. The relevant part of the text as established by P. Sage *ap. Le Bohec* 2003, 354 reads: *volo autem omne instrumentum ... mecum cremari ... et vestis polymita et plumaria? ... quidquid reliquero.*
4. Fig.0.1: Wild & Wild 1998, 223, Fig. 10-1; Fig.0.2: Schrenk 2004, 447; compare Trilling 1982, 98 no. 108, Pl. 8 (*taqueté*) with *ibid.* 31 no.1, Pl. 1 (tapestry).
Fig. 1. Detail of a Late Roman wool textile in *taqueté* from the Roman port of Berenike on the Red Sea coast of Egypt (BE96 0227). On-site photo: J.P. Wild.

Fig. 2. Detail of a wool textile in tapestry weave from Egypt, now in the collection of the Abegg-Stiftung, Bern, showing a bunch of lotus flowers (Inv. Nr. 5345). Photo by courtesy of the Abegg-Stiftung, CH-3132 Riggisberg.
20. *Ars polymita, ars plumaria*: Weaving Terminology of *Taqueté* and Tapestry

*Taqueté*, also known as ‘weft-faced compound tabby’ and in German *Leinwandschusskompositbildung*, aims for a similar decorative effect, but rarely in more than two colours. It is created mechanically by means of a complex planned sequence of different sheds on the loom, which the weaver remembers. The overall decorative scheme is constructed by repeating a single pattern unit, sometime in mirror image. The weave structure can be recognised by the fact that a weft thread in one colour disappears to the reverse side of the cloth behind an adjacent thread in a different colour as the pattern changes, only to re-appear on the obverse again later when it is required (Fig. 4).

A variety of ancient sources can be deployed to inform discussion and argument about textile structure and terminology.

Roman inscriptions and papyri in Greek and Latin are crucial documents, but tend to be laconic: both the writer and the reader knew exactly what was meant by a given technical expression, but we are left in the dark. Authors of classical literature write at greater length, and at first sight more helpfully; but their reliability is variable and often difficult to check. Poets, for example, treat of technical matters with artistic licence, especially when the vocabulary does not fit the metre. Scholars who consult another much-quoted source, the late Roman and early medieval encyclopaedists and glossators like Hesychius and Isidore, are well advised to exercise caution: for such compilers may simply be guessing.

Ancient art, particularly funerary art, is a rich source of textile images, but, taken alone, the latter usually lack the necessary detail for precise technical identification. Surviving archaeological textiles are a relatively new and growing resource, and one might expect to find examples of *vestis polymita* and *plumaria* somewhere in the extant textile corpus. Both techniques are described explicitly as woven-in, and not decoration added afterwards, so that narrows the range of possibilities.

*Vestis polymita*

I (JPW) need to start by revisiting, and recanting, what I wrote in 1967 about the *ars polymita*. I argued then that it meant ‘tapestry weaving’; but I now accept that it refers to weaving *taqueté*, weft-faced compound tabby, as Grace Crowfoot, Donald King and others suggested long ago.

Commentators often begin with the passage in Pliny’s *Natural History* where he claims that Alexandria invented the weaving of *polymita*, with *plurima licia*, ‘multiple threads’. The Greek *mitos* and the

Fig. 3. Diagram of the meeting and reversal of weft yarns in tapestry weave. After Seagroatt (1979), 14.

Fig. 4. Diagram of the structure of *taqueté*. Drawing by courtesy of D. De Jonghe.

---

9. Crowfoot & Griffiths 1939, 47; King 1981.
10. *Naturalis Historia* VIII, 196 (c. AD 77-79).
Latin *licium*, however, are *generic* terms, and their specific sense depends on the context in which they are used. They could refer to warp or weft threads, for instance, or to the heddle cords for opening sheds on the loom.\(^{11}\)

In 1967 I was misled, I now think, by a key passage in a letter (of about AD 395-397) from Jerome to Fabiola in which he is describing the sash of the High Priest in Jewish ceremonial.\(^ {12}\) He says that it was woven in the form of a tube, 4 digits (c. 7.4 cm) wide, like a cast-off snake-skin. It had scarlet, purple and blue weft, but linen (or at any rate plant-fibre) warp, with flowers and gem motifs ‘woven in the *ars polymita* that you would think were not woven by a craftsman’s hand but added’, *i.e.* embroidered. Linen warp with polychrome patterned weft in a tubular format sounded to me in 1967 much more likely to be tapestry weave than mechanically woven *taqueté*, and I opted for tapestry, noting some flat-woven tapestry sashes in the archaeological record.\(^ {13}\)

So far, however, no direct archaeological evidence has been found for either *taqueté* or tapestry in tubular form; but Dominique Cardon has published from Maximianon and Krokodilō in the Eastern Desert of Egypt a group of early Roman tubular textiles in 2/1 herringbone twill weave with multi-coloured plied warp.\(^ {14}\) The existence of a tubular form of *taqueté* therefore cannot be ruled out. On the other hand Jerome’s phraseology echoes the Latin of his translation of the Hebrew text of the Book of Exodus; he may have been unaware (or chose to ignore) that *taqueté* was not known in Old Testament times. It would probably be unwise to place too much weight on his words.\(^ {15}\)

Petronius,\(^ {16}\) Pliny\(^ {17}\) and Martial\(^ {18}\) mention *polymita* in the 1st century AD. A dearth of archaeological finds of *taquetés* at that early date, which seemed to me an obstacle in the 1960s, has recently been alleviated by finds of early Roman *taquetés* at Berenike (Fig. 5),\(^ {19}\) Mons Claudianus,\(^ {20}\) Maximianon and Krokodilō\(^ {21}\) and Masada.\(^ {22}\) There are today several hundred Late Roman wool *taquetés* from Egypt.\(^ {23}\)

*Polymita* was used for covering beds, couches and pillows according to both Martial and documentary papyri.\(^ {24}\) In Roman Egypt there are several finds of feathers still adhering to *taqueté* upholstery covers,\(^ {25}\) and we have noted at Berenike that wool textiles in *taqueté* have had only one side exposed to strong daylight.

Another recent development is the recognition and recording of the *zilu* loom still in use today in parts of Iran for weaving *taqueté*.\(^ {26}\) It is vertical and
very large, and features two types of shed: the one is opened in plain tabby weave with heddle rods, the other type, the pattern-making sheds, is opened by draw-cords in various hierarchies – pulled out horizontally. These cords are good candidates to be the mitoi of polymita. Pliny could well be right about invention in Alexandria: the shedding mechanism of the ancient ancestor of the zilu loom could, like the water mill, be another brainwave emanating from the circle attached to the Museum in Ptolemaic Alexandria. 27

So, if vestis polymita is taqueté, what is vestis plumaria?

Vestis plumaria

The lexica are almost unanimous in translating vestis plumaria as ‘embroidered textile’ and they have been followed faithfully by most editors of papyri. 28 Indeed, at first reading, ‘embroidery’ seems to fit in all 95 instances of the use in Latin and Greek of terms based on the root plum-. But on closer inspection there are some broader issues.

Kerstin Droß-Krüpe has pointed out elsewhere that most classical references relating unambiguously to embroidery and using phrases like acu pingere, ‘decorate with a needle’, refer to foreign exotica

rather than Mediterranean fashion. But there was a Mediterranean tradition of embroidery of considerable sophistication, exemplified by a well-known panel from Achmīm where chain stitch and couched wool thread has been deployed to represent the personification of Autumn (Fig. 6), one of an original quartet. Nonetheless the corpus of surviving embroideries from the Roman world discussed recently by Annette Schieck is relatively small and – one has to admit – not very inspiring.

I argued very briefly in 1999 that the *ars plumaria* was not embroidery, but tapestry weaving, and Kerstin Droß-Krüpe came to the same conclusion in her study just mentioned. What is the evidence?

In AD 301 the Emperor Diocletian made a forlorn attempt to control rising prices for consumer goods and services by promulgating an Edict on Maximum Prices, intended to be applied across the Empire, and probably respected particularly in the eastern provinces which he ruled directly. The archetype was in Latin, but Greek translations were posted in the East. The compilers took an empire-wide view of the most significant merchandise to be included, along with its prices in notional *denarii*. There has been argument about the artificiality of the pricing structure, but for us it is the relative costs that reveal the relative qualities of the goods that matter most.

In Edict Chapter XX on pay in the textile industry the *plumarius* is paid per ounce of yarn for working on long-sleeved silk tunics (*strictoriae*), half-silk tunics and two of the most expensive half-moon cloaks (*chlamydes*) in wool (Table 1).

### Table 1. The Latin text of Chapter XX of the Edict of Diocletian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XX 1</th>
<th>[De mercedibus plumariorum et sericariorum]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td><em>plumarius</em> in <em>strictoria</em> subserica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>strictoria</em> holoserica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>chlamyde</em> Mutinensi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>chlamyde</em> Ladicena ut s(upra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>barbaricario ex a[u]ro facient&lt;i&gt; operis primi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>operis secundi in uncia una x septingentos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>barbaricario i[n] holoserica in uncia una x quingentos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>operis secundi in uncia una x quadr ingentos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>sericario in subserica pasto diurnos x viginti quinque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>holoserica</em> pura pasto diurnos x viginti quinque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>holoserica</em> scutlata x quadraginta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>gerdiae pastae in <em>tunica</em> pexa indictionali x duodecim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>in tunicis Mutinensibus vel ceteris pastae x sedecim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Pritchard 2006, 30-31, Fig.3.3.
Fig. 6. Late Roman embroidered panel in wool on a linen ground from Egypt, now in the Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester (inv. no.T.1968.252). It shows the personification of a season, probably Autumn. Photo by courtesy of the Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester.
pay, 25 *denarii* per ounce, is twice what a specialist (female) wool weaver could earn for a day’s work.\(^{36}\)

In Chapter XIX on wool textiles reference is constantly made to the value of the purple wool embodied in the decorative features. In the entries for two sorts of expensive bed covering (*rachana* and *stragula*),\(^{37}\) for high-quality long-sleeved tunics in wool (*strictoriae*)\(^{38}\) and probably for the higher class of *chlamys* on which the *plumarius* worked,\(^{39}\) it is prescribed that the textiles should be sold according to the weight of *plumatura* (πλουμάρισις in the Greek texts); but no upper price limit is set. For the less valuable and elaborate items, the jargon used in Chapter XIX is ‘*clavans purpurae libras*’*, with clavus bands containing x pounds of purple yarn*.\(^{40}\)

The compilers had no need to clarify their terminology. A glance through the catalogues of some of the principal collections of so-called ‘Coptic’ textiles in European museums – effectively the clothing of the well-to-do of Late Roman Egypt, often salvaged from their burial grounds with minimal or no archaeological record – leaves no doubt that tapestry weave is the dominant, almost exclusive, mode of Roman textile decoration.\(^{41}\) Egypt, thanks to local climatic conditions ideal for the preservation of organic materials, offers a snapshot of a phenomenon which is reflected in contemporary iconography across the whole Roman Empire,\(^{42}\) and among its neighbours, such as the Palmyrenes and Sasani-ans, further East.\(^{43}\)

If the dominant decorative form according to the Edict is *plumatura*, and the dominant technique in the archaeological record is tapestry weave, it is hard not to identify the one with the other. This is juxtaposition of evidence, however, not proof. But at present it has to be the basis of our hypothesis.

Some supporting amplification is to be found in comparing the range of textile goods for which the use of tapestry weave for decoration is archaeologically attested with the textile spectrum of which the written sources give us a glimpse.

Only a handful of types of textile were created entirely in tapestry weave, notably couch furnishings, curtains and wall-hangings.\(^{44}\) More commonly, individual tapestry-woven inserts are found in garments of wool, linen and silk which are otherwise undecorated. On (long-sleeved) tunics (Fig. 7) the technique was employed for weaving figured and plain bands (*clavi*) down front and back, roundels and panels at the shoulder, pairs of short bands at the wrist, and sometimes halters at the neck and horizontal bands at knee level.\(^{45}\) Cloaks are embellished with roundels and panels and other simpler motifs, placed in the corners, depending on garment shape.\(^{46}\) Furnishing fabrics also feature corner decoration, and bands marking the start and finish of the web.\(^{47}\)

---


37. EdD XIX, 6; XX, 36.

38. EdD XIX, 20: this is a lacunose entry and there is some doubt about the items listed.


41. For example Trilling 1982; Lorquin 1992; Schrenk 2004; Pritchard 2006.

42. For example in the mosaics of the Late Roman villa near Piazza Armerina in Sicily (Carandini *et al.*. 1982, *passim*; Wilson 1983) and mosaics in the North African provinces (Dunbabin 1978). The Late Roman mosaics at Noheda (Spain) depict a riot of exuberantly decorated costumes, many theatrical, but others more everyday (Tévar 2013).


44. Trilling 1982, Pls. 1, 2; Schrenk 2004, 26-45; Willers & Niekamp 2015; von Falke & Lichtwark 1996, 344-345 Nr. 394. Theocritus (*Epigrammata* XV, 78-83) refers to large (tapestry-woven?) hangings in Ptolemaic Alexandria (3rd century BC) and an epigram in the *Anthologia Graeca* (IX, 778) was originally attached to a tapestry map of the world.


46. Maciej Szymbasz is currently preparing a corpus of all Roman-period textiles, mostly cloaks, carrying decoration of tapestry-woven gamma-motifs.

47. Cushions: Paetz gen. Schieck 2009; curtain: Gervers 1977; spreads with loops: von Falck & Lichtwark 1996, 301-302 Nr. 341a-b; Verhecken-Lammens 2009, 132 Fig. 6; *sabana* (?): Carroll 1988, 94 no. 9.
References to long-sleeved shirts (strictoriae, στιχάρια) with plumatura abound in the papyri,⁴⁸ and Diocletian’s Edict adds the wide-fitting dalmaticae to the list, together with half-moon cloaks (chlamydes) and rectangular cloaks (fibulatoria).⁴⁹ Papyri mention veils and head-coverings with tapestry decoration (described as πλουμαρικὰ).⁵⁰ Household furnishings had more modest tapestry decoration. Under this heading we find a (wool) blanket,⁵¹ ‘spread’ (rachana, stragula),⁵² and cushion cover.⁵³ Most items, however, were anonymous linen sheets and towels with a touch of colour:⁵⁴ Late Roman church inventories mention altar cloths and curtains.⁵⁵

---

Fig. 7. Long-sleeved tunic in linen from Panopolis (Achmim), Egypt, now in the Museum Kunstpalast, Düsseldorf (Inv. Nr. 12746). Photo by courtesy of the Stiftung Museum Kunstpalast, Düsseldorf (Artothek).
The craft of the plumarius

Some 40 plumarii (and two plumariae) are known to us from a span of seven centuries (see Appendix 1). Vitruvius in Augustus’ reign and the compilers of Diocletian’s Edict 300 years later both make special provision for the work of the plumarius. A late Roman contract of apprenticeship provides for a girl, Evangeleia, to be trained as a πλουμαρίσσα by ‘experienced πλουμαρίοι’. But what did plumarii actually do?

Garments of wool and most linen textiles in antiquity were woven to shape on the loom as a single web of cloth (Fig. 8): they required little subsequent tailoring. Tapestry-woven decoration in panels, roundels and clavus-bands was integrated into the weaving on the loom as the appropriate stages were reached, and this is when the plumarius would be called upon to exercise his skills. But it was no simple matter.

To intensify the effect of the areas of dyed weft, the warp within the chosen ornament – band, panel or roundel – was often grouped and crossed (so-called croisage) (Figs. 9, 10), so that the weft yarn could be beaten up tighter. The precise configuration of the warp crossing varied greatly. Common to all, however, was that the warp re-arrangement started and ended within the flanking ground weave, a diagnostic feature most clearly seen along the edges of tapestry-woven bands. This means that the weaver, before and after inserting the coloured weft yarn, passed a few

Fig. 8. Outline drawing of a sleeved tunic as woven in one piece on the loom. After Carroll (1988), 38.
Fig. 9. Drawing showing the grouping of warp yarns on the loom for croisé (warp crossing). Drawing by courtesy of D. De Jonghe.

Fig. 10. Diagram of a typical example of the structure of croisé. After Schrenk (2004), 489, with permission.
yarns of ground weft through the new shed, and thus created a shadow effect (Fig. 11). In some cases – perhaps on particular loom types – some of the warp was eliminated from the weaving by being pushed to the back and ultimately cut or worn off. In some textiles, warp crossing and elimination appear in combination. In some independent tapestry motifs the ground weft also floated on the back. It is noteworthy in some cases that in successive bands on a single textile the same warp threads were grouped or eliminated, so some sort of mechanical device was used to store and repeat the shed.

Another enhancement, easily mistaken for embroidery, is the so-called ‘flying thread’ technique (Fig. 12). On an otherwise plain tapestry background white linen thread carried on spools is wrapped around warp threads and passed obliquely over the weft to create a network pattern in silhouette, all carefully counted out.

Finds of inked and/or painted cartoons on papyrus (ἐντύπα, χαρτάρια) (Fig. 13) indicate that the plumarius might have a repertoire of design motifs from which a customer could choose, as has been argued for mosaics and wall paintings. The cartoons may have served as a general guide rather than being copied at 1:1 as is modern practice.

Diocletian’s Edict hints that the plumarius may have chosen and provided his own dyed yarn, an expensive business. The complexity of Roman dyers’ practices being revealed by modern dyestuff analysis may reflect the pressure which the plumarius exerted on dyers to achieve a particular fashionable colour nuance.

The ταβλία πλοημαρικά, tapestry-woven panels, on tunics, cloaks and bedspreads in late antiquity were sophisticated works of art in their own right. Even more elaborate textile decoration was being demanded at every level in society as time went on. The huge ‘Dionysus Hanging’ in the Abegg-Stiftung, Bern, recently published, is a monument to the skills and dexterity of late Roman tapestry-weavers. The plumarius must have had a pivotal rather than an ancillary role in the weaving profession. Wealthy patrons might employ him on piecework in their domestic workshops; but the plumarius in

Fig. 11. The shadow effect of croisage on the ground weave adjacent to a tapestry-woven band on an Early Roman wool textile from Mons Claudianus in the Eastern Desert of Egypt. Photo: J.P. Wild.

64. Bogensperger 2012, 93 Abb. 34; Pritchard & Verhecken-Lammens 2001, 23-24 Fig. 3.2.
65. De Jonghe & Tavernier 1983, 182 Fig. 3, 174-175; Ciszuk & Hammarlund 2008, 127-129.
66. Verhecken-Lammens 2013. ‘Flying thread’ might be implied in SB XX, 14214, 10 which lists a garment ‘decorated with tapestry and by needle and ‘point’ (?).’
68. For a corpus of tapestry weavers’ cartoons on papyrus see Stauffer 2008; for wall painters’ copy-books see Ling 1991, 217-220.
72. Willers & Niekamp 2015. Around the time of the Arab conquest of Egypt and thereafter tapestry-woven ornament seems to have been woven separately from the garments to which it was later sewn: Pritchard 2006, 83.
turn probably employed humbler weavers to do the basic ground-weaving.

**The etymology of plumarius and its congers**

There is a final intriguing question to ask: what was the connection (if any) between *plumarius*, ‘tapestry weaver’, and *pluma*, ‘feather’? Kerstin Dross-Krüpe has already considered this problem, but the sources shed little direct light on it. Petronius alludes to the variegated shimmer of a peacock’s plumage in textile-metaphorical language (‘aureo Babylonico’) and two hundred years earlier Plautus includes ‘plumatile’ in a catalogue of new-fangled clothing designations. Some sort of visual likeness between a bright multi-coloured feather and tapestry weaving might have been in their minds and given rise to the neologism *plumarium*.

Be that as it may, the profession of *plumarius* was established in Italy at least by the close of the Republican period. It occurs for the first time in Greek as a loanword in a papyrus dated no earlier than the late 3rd century AD. Tapestry weaving, however, was already known in Classical and Hellenistic Greece;
but the practitioner was known simply by the portmanteau term ποικίλτης, ‘decorator’.79 One might suggest that as the craft of tapestry weaving became ever more demanding and sophisticated, a new term was coined to give the operative a more distinctive title.80 As a loanword plumarius (presumably through Greek) is found in Coptic writings,81 as one might expect, and once in Syriac.82 But, more surprisingly, pflūmāri occurs in Old High German, borrowed (before the second lautverschiebung of c. AD 400) from the Latin vocabulary of the northern Roman frontier provinces.83

Concluding comments

Already at the beginning of this paper we revealed the conclusion we had reached: vestis polymita is taqueté, vestis plumaria is tapestry. Such a premature revelation may seem unvissenschaftlich. But we would plead that trying to match textile with text is like playing a game of football on shifting sands. The players move, the ball moves, and so do the goalposts. Scoring a goal is more a matter of luck than fine judgement. But it is fun to try.

Appendix 1: Sources for textile terms based on the root -plum/-πλουμ-

1. Papyri and Ostraka

Note: Abbreviations for papyrological publications used below are cited according to the standard set out in J. F. Oates et al. (2001) Checklist of editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic papyri, ostraca and tablets (fifth edition), Oxford, and in later editions online at www.scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html.

3rd century AD: P.Oslo III, 161, 14-15 [late C3 or very early C4 (Pruneti 1998-1999, 152)]; 4th century: P.Oxy XXIV, 2421, ii, 32 [AD 312 - 323]; PDub. I, 20, 3 [AD 329]; PSI IX, 1082,14-15: P.Oxy LXI, 4001,19-20 [late C4]; P.Oxy XIV, 1741,16; PSI VIII, 959, 33 [end C4]; 4th/5th century: P. et O. El-eph. DAIK 324, 2-4; P.Aberd I, 59, i, 6-7; iii, 2 [C5/6 Turner]; SB XXIV, 16204 = P.Ant. I, 44, 9, 13 (cf. Rea 1996); SB XII, 11077, 26; 5th century: SB XVI, 12838 [ostrakon] [mid C5]; SB XVI, 12839 [ostrakon] [mid C5]; SB XVI, 12840 [ostrakon] [mid C5]; SB XII, 11075,11 [c. AD 400-450]; SB III, 7033, 39, 45 [AD 481]; P.Foud 74, 6 [end C5 Diethart]; 5th/6th century: P.Berol. 25405, 8; 6th century: P.Cair.Masp. II, 67163, 7, 12 [AD 569]; SB XVI, 12940,12 [= P.Vindob. G.23204]; SPP XX, 245.6, 8, 13, 14; P.Mich. XIV, 684, 12; SB XII, 10935, 21; SPP XX, 275, 1, 3-4; P.Cair.Masp. I, 6 v 85, 88; 6th/7th century: SPP III, 83, 4; P.Vindob. G.25737 (Diethart 1986, 75-77, 12-13); SB XX, 14214, 10 (P.Vindob. G.10740: Diethart 1990, 108, doc.1, 12, 10); SB XX, 14105, 5; P.Vindob. G.25737, 13 (Diethart 1986, 75-77); 7th century: SB XIV, 11543, 6 [AD 616/617]; P.Oxy XVI, 2054, 8; SB XX, 14202, 5, 6 (P.Vindob. G.4993 + 23239: Diethart 1990, 82 doc.1, 5-6); P.Prag. II, 153, 1; Diethart 1983, 13, doc 3.10; P.Heid. IV, 95, iv, 64; P.Heid. IV, 97, 26; 7th/8th century: P.Lat. 25, 13, 20, 27-31; 8th century: P.Lond. IV, 1433, 247 [AD 706-707]; P.Apoll. I, 75, 3 [AD 703-715]; P.Apoll. I, 38, 6-7 [c. AD 708-709]; P.Apoll. I, 65, 9 [AD 710-711]; P.Apoll. I, 83 [AD 712-713]; P.Apoll. I, 49, 5; Coptic: P.Ryl. Copt. 238, 15 [= *ἐμπλουμαριος].

2. Inscriptions

CIL VI, 7411 (Vicari 2001, no. 50) (Rome) [Augustan]; CIL VI, 9814 (Rome ‘outside gate of St John’)

79. Droß-Krüpe & Paetz gen. Schieck 2014, 213. In P.Cair.Masp. II, 67163, 7, 12 the same craftsman describes himself as both ποικίλτης (1.7) and πλούμαριος (1.12).
80. For a discussion of the implications of loanwords for archaeology see Wild 1976.
81. P.Ryl.Copt. 238, 15. We are grateful to C. MacMahon for the information that the term is also used by Shenute in his (Coptic) writings.
82. As plumia: Ioannes Ephesius, Historia Ecclesiastica II, 6 (Scriptores Syri (Paris 1935), Vol. III, iii, 105-106). We are grateful to Sebastian Brock for advice on this term.
83. We owe this reference to Roland Schumacher (see his article in this volume).
Appendix 2: Word forms built on the root \(-\text{plum}/-\text{πλουμ}\)

* not attested in Greek

Latin:
plumarius
plumare (?) [SHA, Carus XX, 5]
plumatius [Lucan, de Bello Civili X, 122; Caesar-
ius Arelatensis, Regula ad Virgines XLII]
plumatura [Edict of Diocletian passim]

Greek:
πλουμάριος
φλουμάρης [P.Oxy. XXIV, 2421, ii, 32; SB XII,
10935]
πλουμαρία [P.Oxy. LIX, 400, 19-20]
πλουμαρίςσα [P.Aberd. I, 59]
*πλουμαρίζω [restored from Coptic: Riedel &
Crum (1904), 55]
πλουμαρικός [P.Dub. I, 20; PSI VIII, 959, 33]
πλουμαρίςσας [Edict of Diocletian passim]
πλουμίον [Procopius, de Aedificiis III, 247]
πλουμ(ία) [SPP XX, 245, 6]
πλουμαρία [= πλουμία] [P.Oxy. XVI, 2054]
πλουμαρίσμος [= πλουμαρί<ο>ςήμος] [P.Ant. I,
15, 44]

Adjectival forms:
ἐμπλουμάριος [P.Fouad. 74, 6; SB XX, 245, 13]
eὐπλουμός [P.Ant. I, 44, 13]
ὀρθόπλουμος [SB III, 7033, 39; P.Apol. I, 49, 5]
οθονεμλ(ουμάριος ?) [SB XII, 11077, 26]
*ἐμπλουμάριος ? [P.Ryl.Copt. 238, 15]

Adjectival forms:

The decoration of the textiles associated with the Jewish Tabernacle is repeatedly mentioned in the Vul-
gate text of Exodus, chapters 26-39, where a variety of terms are employed, presumably on the authority of Jerome (Epistulae 29, 4). This terminology, and the corresponding Greek of the Septuagint, is discussed by Mossakowska-Gaubert (2000), 305.
20. **Ars polymita, ars plumaria: Weaving Terminology of Taqueté and Tapestry**

### Abbreviations


**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>T. Mommsen <em>et al.</em> (1862-) <em>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</em>. Berlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMA</td>
<td>W. M. Calder <em>et al.</em> (1928-) <em>Monumenta Asiæ Minoris Antiqua</em>. Manchester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG</td>
<td><em>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</em> (1923-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPE</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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