

# STUDIES IN CLASSICS

DIRK OBBINK & ANDREW DYCK, General Editors

## SINGULAR DEDICATIONS

*Founders and Innovators of Private Cults in  
Classical Greece*

Andrea Purvis

## EMPEDOCLES

*An Interpretation*

Simon Trépanier

## FOR SALVATION'S SAKE

*Provincial Loyalty, Personal Religion, and  
Epigraphic Production in the Roman and Late  
Antique Near East*

Jason Moralee

## APHRODITE AND EROS

*The Development of Greek Erotic Mythology*

Barbara Breitenberger

## A LINGUISTIC COMMENTARY ON LIVIUS

ANDRONICUS

Ivy Livingsron

## RHETORIC IN CICERO'S PRO BALBO

Kimberly Anne Barber

## AMBITIOSA MORS

*Suicide and the Self in Roman Thought and  
Literature*

Timothy Hill

## ARISTOXENUS OF TARENTUM AND THE

BIRTH OF MUSICOLOGY

Sophie Gibson

## HYPERBOREANS

*Myth and History in Celtic-Hellenic Contacts*

Timothy P. Bridgman

## AUGUSTAN EGYPT

*The Creation of a Roman Province*

Livia Capponi

AUGUSTAN EGYPT  
THE CREATION OF A ROMAN PROVINCE

Livia Capponi

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2005 by Routledge

Published 2016 by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

Copyright © 2005 Taylor & Francis.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Credits and acknowledgments borrowed from other sources and reproduced, with permission, in this textbook appear on appropriate page within text.

ISBN: 9780415972178 (hbk)

---

Library of Congress Cataloging-In-Publication Data

---

Capponi, Livia, 1975-

Augustan Egypt : the creation of a Roman province / Livia Capponi.

p. cm. -- (Studies in classics ; v. 13)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-415-97217-8 (alk. paper)

1. Egypt--History--Greco-Roman period, 332 B.C.-640 A.D. 2. Augustus, Emperor of Rome, 63 B.C.-14 A.D. I. Title.

II. Series: Studies in classics (Routledge (Firm)) ; v. 13.

DT93.C36 2004

932'.022--dc22

2004019987

---

To my parents

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Contents

Abbreviations	ix
Foreword	xi
Acknowledgments	xiii
<i>Chapter One</i>	
Introduction	1
<i>Chapter Two</i>	
The Roman Conquest of Egypt: The Precedents and the Aftermath	5
<i>Chapter Three</i>	
Ptolemaic and Roman Soldiers in Egypt before and after 30 BC	13
<i>Chapter Four</i>	
The Institutions of Egypt: The Impact of Rome	25
<i>Chapter Five</i>	
The Roman Conquest, Law, and the Administration of Justice	51
<i>Chapter Six</i>	
The Administration of the Community: Municipalisation and Liturgies	65
<i>Chapter Seven</i>	
The Beginning of the Census	83
<i>Chapter Eight</i>	
The Reorganisation of Landholding	97
	vii

*Chapter Nine*

Milking the Cow: Taxes and Tax Collection in Augustan Egypt 123

*Chapter Ten*

The Coinage and the Monetary Circulation  
from Cleopatra to Tiberius 157

*Chapter Eleven*

Conclusion 169

*Appendix*

The Fasti of the Prefects of Egypt under Augustus and Tiberius 179

Notes 187

Bibliography 253

Index 283

Subject Index 287

Sources Index 291

# Abbreviations

For the citation of documents, I adhere to the conventions of J. F. Oates, R. S. Bagnall, S. J. Clackson, A. A. O' Brien, J. D. Sosin, T. G. Wilfong and K. A. Worp, *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, January 2002, available online at: <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>

For the citation of periodicals, series and other abbreviated titles, I adhere to the conventions of Sections V and VI of the aforementioned *Checklist*, and of *The American Journal of Archaeology*, which can be found in current form at [http://www.ajaonline.org/shared/s\\_info\\_contrib\\_7.html](http://www.ajaonline.org/shared/s_info_contrib_7.html), with the following exceptions:

<i>APF</i>	<i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung</i>
<i>BL</i>	<i>Berichtigungliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten</i> , 8 vols.
<i>CE</i>	<i>Chronique d'Égypte</i>
<i>DDBDP</i>	<i>Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri</i>
<i>FIRA</i> <sup>2</sup>	Riccobono S. (ed.), <i>Fontes iuris romani antejustiniani</i> (Firenze 1940/1)
<i>NB</i>	Preisigke, F. and Littmann, E., <i>Namenbuch: enthaltend alle griechischen, lateinischen, ägyptischen, hebräischen, arabischen und sonstigen semitischen und nichtsemitischen Menschennamen: soweit sie in griechischen Urkunden (Papyri, Ostraka, Inschriften, Mumienbildern usw.) Ägyptens sich vorfinden</i> , Selbstverlag des Herausgebers (Heidelberg 1922)
<i>PIR</i>	<i>Prosopographia Imperii Romani</i> ( <i>PIR</i> <sup>1</sup> = editio princeps, <i>PIR</i> <sup>2</sup> = editio altera)
<i>PP</i>	<i>Prosopographia Ptolemaica</i>



<i>RPC</i>	Burnett, A., Amandry, M., and Ripollès, P. P., <i>Roman Provincial Coinage I (44 BC–AD 69)</i> , (London - Paris: British Museum–Bibliothèque nationale 1992)
<i>SEHWW</i>	Rostovtzeff, M. I., <i>The social and economic history of the Hellenistic World</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1941)
<i>SEHRE<sup>2</sup></i>	Rostovtzeff, M. I., <i>The social and economic history of the Roman Empire</i> , (2 <sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1957)
<i>WB</i>	Preisigke, F., Kiessling, E. and Gradenwitz, O. (1925) <i>Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden: mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten</i> , Selbstverlag der Erben.

For the transcription of ancient Egyptian, Greek and Roman names into English, I have chosen to use the most commonly used spellings when dealing with familiar place- and proper names (e.g. Oxyrhynchus, Tebtunis, Julius, rather than Oxyrhynchos, Tebtynis, Iulius), whereas I tend to transcribe the original term in Greek when referring to less familiar names or whenever the transcription into the Latin script might be unclear. For the quotation of Greek texts, either literature or documents, I have adopted the most common way to write *sigma* (σ and Ϛ) even when the first edition of the text adopted the lunate *sigma* (Ϝ). Overall, I have tried to achieve internal consistency within the book, once a particular transcription has been chosen.

# Foreword

*Studies in Classics* aims to bring high-quality work by emerging scholars to the attention of a wider audience. Emphasizing the study of classical literature and history, these volumes contribute to the theoretical understanding of human culture and society over time. This series offers an array of approaches to the study of Greek and Latin (including medieval and Neolatin), authors and their reception, canons, transmission of texts, ideas, religion, history of scholarship, narrative, and the nature of evidence.

While the focus is on Mediterranean cultures of the Greco-Roman era, perspectives from other areas, cultural backgrounds, and eras included as important means to the reconstruction of fragmentary evidence and the exploration of models. The series reflects upon the role classical studies has played in humanistic endeavors from antiquity to the present, and explores select ways in which the discipline can bring both traditional scholarly tools and the experience of modernity to bear on questions and texts of enduring importance.

Dirk Obbink, Oxford University

—Andrew Dyck, The University of California, Los Angeles

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Acknowledgments

This study originates in a *D.Phil.* thesis submitted in the University of Oxford in July 2003. The dissertation was the outcome of three years of graduate work at Brasenose College under the supervision of Professor Alan K. Bowman. During the time spent at Oxford I have incurred numerous debts of gratitude: many scholars have helped me by letting me see their work or simply by being available for discussion: in particular Dr Thorolf Christensen, Dr Revel Coles, Dr Daniela Colomo, Prof. Maria Rosaria Falivene, Prof. Daniele Foraboschi, Prof. Giovanni Geraci, Prof. Luigi Lehnus, Prof. Andrew Lintott, Prof. Fergus Millar, Dr Dominic Rathbone, Dr Jane Rowlandson, Dr Michael Sharp, and Prof. Dorothy Thompson. Special thanks must go to Dr Nikolaos Gonis for his assistance in my training in papyrology, and to Prof. Alan Bowman, who has been an extremely supportive, helpful and encouraging supervisor at all stages of my work. I am also grateful to the examiners of my dissertation, Prof. Martin Goodman and Prof. J. David Thomas, for providing corrections, and above all to my editor, Dr Dirk Obbink, who has been kindly available for discussion during the preparation of the book. Last, but certainly not least, I wish to express a big thanks to all the friends who have helped me, and to Dario, for support and interest.

The reader must note that Th. Kruse, *Der königliche Schreiber und die Gauverwaltung. Untersuchungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte Ägyptens in der Zeit des Augustus bis Philippus Arabs (30 v. Chr.–245 n. Chr.)* (2002) was published after this manuscript was submitted, and therefore has not been fully incorporated into the text. Map of Roman Egypt, from *The Cambridge Ancient History, vol. X*, reprinted by permission of Cambridge University Press.



## Chapter One

# Introduction

“The Egyptian affairs . . . intricate and diversified as they are and hardly grasped even by those who have made a business of studying them from their earliest years . . .”

—Philo, *In Flaccum* 3 (Loeb ed.)

Egypt is by far the best-documented province of the Roman empire. The dryness of its climate made it possible for an enormous number of literary and documentary papyri to survive over the centuries, as they had been dumped as rubbish, or were glued together as *cartonnage* to form the wrapping or the stuffing of mummies. The Egyptian papyri are a unique, reliable and rhetorically unbiased source, which document the history of Egypt in more detail than any other Roman province. In spite of this, the papyri have always been approached as something different from the other documentary sources, and, as a result, Egypt has been regarded as a peculiar region, not comparable with the rest of the empire. Indeed, Egypt had different and peculiar physical and climatic characteristics, such as the paramount importance of the Nile as the centre of gravity for economy, society, and politics. However, the arguments that Egypt was radically different from other provinces and that it can be studied only in isolation may have outlived their validity. Every province had its own geographical, historical and cultural peculiarities, and if Egypt was ‘atypical,’ there is no reason to suppose that any other province was ‘typical.’

This work approaches the problem of the transition of Egypt from the status of a Hellenistic kingdom to that of province of the Roman empire. Specifically, it examines the impact of the Roman conquest on Egypt’s administrative and fiscal structure. The evidence from other parts of the Roman world, e.g. from the kingdom of Galatia, but also from Asia or Bithynia yields information about the process whereby a Hellenistic kingdom that was in Rome’s sphere of interest fell under the Roman *tutela* as an allied kingdom, and was subsequently annexed, often by bequest, as a Roman province.<sup>1</sup> The reduction of a

Hellenistic kingdom *in formam provinciae* was, as Mitchell put it, a ‘complex but increasingly familiar transaction’:<sup>2</sup> after a transitional period in which Rome combined some military intervention with colonial settlement, direct rule was imposed through the establishment of an agent of the emperor as provincial governor, the occupation by Roman legions, the control of the population through the census, the imposition of new taxes or the modification of the existing taxation system, the redistribution of the land, the immigration of Roman officials and Roman citizens, and consequently the spread of Roman law. These were, in essence, the premises for the provincialisation of a region, although the ‘directions for use’ may have changed in accordance to the specific needs of a determined geographical area. In sum, one cannot expect to find universal guiding principles in order to understand the Roman conquest of a region in general, above all in a formative stage such as the Augustan period, when the administrative structure at Rome and in the provinces was still fluid.

This work takes into consideration the evidence from Egypt, and does not attempt to compare systematically the Egyptian administrative and taxation systems with their counterparts in other Roman provinces. Although the present research is founded on the belief that the Egyptian evidence may illuminate aspects of the Roman empire at large, on many occasions it has been preferable merely to note parallels rather than to postulate derivations of Roman practices from Egypt or *vice versa*. In fact, the resemblances between Egypt and other Roman provinces, especially in the Near East, may have derived from pre-Roman factors, such as the common Hellenistic or Persian background.

The debate about Augustan Egypt began in a series of articles that appeared from 1970 onwards, in which Naphtali Lewis challenged the common opinion that Roman Egypt took over and continued the Ptolemaic administrative tradition without much change.<sup>3</sup> From a general survey of the evidence, he suggested that, after the Roman conquest in 30 BC, substantial changes in the economy, law and administration were brought in, in spite of the preservation of the existing bureaucratic framework. In the past three decades, scholars have gradually embraced the view that Roman Egypt was substantially different from Ptolemaic Egypt, that the emperor was not simply the successor of the Pharaohs and of the Ptolemies, that after the conquest Egypt did not become the personal possession of the emperor, but was organised as a proper Roman province, governed by Roman law and institutions, and that the Augustan period was particularly important because the status that Egypt was given under Augustus remained more or less the same for the following three hundred years. The novel point of this approach was that Roman Egypt could be studied not only in isolation, but also in order to gain a better understanding of the Roman provincial administration as a whole.<sup>4</sup>

In his study of the Roman conquest of Anatolia, Mitchell suggested that Roman rule brought immense changes to newly annexed areas, but the cause or the instrument of these changes were not so much the administrators, who were too few to be able to introduce all-embracing reforms, and governed the province in an *ad hoc* manner. According to Mitchell, there was no such thing as a 'Roman provincial policy,' but the imposition of a new administrative superstructure in a province was only the skeleton for less visible but more substantial changes, which were triggered by the new social, economic and political conditions created by the annexation to the Roman empire. These were, for instance, monetarised economy, the growth of urban settlements, and new forms of exploitation of the land.<sup>5</sup>

This work tries to drag all these hypotheses down to the micro-level of the evidence of the documents. It examines first the impact of Roman rule, by sudden imposition or gradual infiltration, on the official level of the administration, and secondly, it takes in some social and economic issues; the changes in life and religion are touched only incidentally, because there are already specific studies on them.<sup>6</sup> It is also necessary to have it specified that this work does not aim to explain Egypt according to a binary theory of 'continuity *versus* change,' and considers the view that after the Roman conquest everything 'became Roman' as misleading as the argument that nothing really changed.

As regards the sources, this research has drawn attention to the documents, that is, papyri, ostraka and inscriptions; nevertheless, some literary sources have also been taken into consideration, so far as they are relevant and helpful to the main argument, as is the case with Strabo, an important witness of the Augustan period, who had a personal acquaintance with Egypt as he was in the *entourage* of the prefect Aelius Gallus. As far as modern literature is concerned, I have heavily drawn upon the research of previous scholars, such as the collection of the Augustan documents made in 1976 by C. Balconi, which has been updated by using papyrological databases available online.<sup>7</sup>

Augustan Egypt is approached through two introductory chapters: Chapter 2 attempts to summarise the political relationships between Rome and Egypt from the first century BC to the fall of Alexandria in 30 BC, and addresses the question of the status of Egypt between the conquest in 30 BC and the reorganisation of the provinces which followed the so-called 'settlement of 27 BC.' Chapter 3 deals with the evidence for the Roman military presence in Egypt before 30 BC, and investigates the fortunes of the Ptolemaic army thereafter.

Chapters 4 to 6 focus on the institutional changes, with no intention, however, of offering an exhaustive treatment of all institutions and officials documented in Egypt in the Roman period. Chapter 4 deals with the administrative structure of Egypt as a Roman province, and surveys the bureaucracy



from the high officials in Alexandria down to the local clerks of the villages of the *chora*. Chapter 5 explores the changes in the administration of justice, and the impact the introduction of Roman law had on the existing Egyptian and Greek legal systems. Chapter 6 looks at the Augustan period as the turning point when the relationship between the central government of the province and the local civic communities began to change. It considers the emergence of municipal offices in the nome capitals, and the formation of a system of compulsory services known as liturgies, through which the local élites were involved in the government of their community on behalf of Rome.

Chapter 7 focuses on the changes in the control of the population and the classification of the people according to social status, through the census and the *epikrisis*. Chapter 8 analyses the relationship of such social status with the possession of land and Greek education, and examines the reorganisation of the existing land system and the possible formation of new categories of land in the aftermath of the conquest. Chapter 9 deals with the changes the Roman administration introduced in the collection of the grain and cash revenue from Egypt, including the appearance under Augustus of new types of tax collectors. In addition, it surveys the origin, characteristics and purpose of the most important taxes attested in the reign of Augustus, but it does not intend to encompass all the taxes that feature in the later documents from Roman Egypt. Chapter 10 examines the coinage produced under Augustus by the mint of Alexandria, compares this coinage with that of the Ptolemies, and looks at the main characteristics of the monetary circulation from the reign of Cleopatra to that of Tiberius.

# The Roman Conquest of Egypt: The Precedents and the Aftermath

## ROME AND EGYPT BEFORE THE FORMAL CONQUEST

Diplomatic activity between Rome and Egypt is assumed to have begun under Ptolemy II Philadelphos, in 273 BC, when a Roman delegation to Alexandria obtained a declaration of *amicitia* between Rome and Egypt during the war between Rome and Pyrrhus. The alliance was renewed at different points during the first two Punic wars. Polybius (IX 11a.1) and Livy (XXVII 4.10) report that around 215 and 210 BC, M. Atilius and M' Acilius were sent to Alexandria to renew the *amicitia* with Egypt. Egypt helped Rome in the war against Antiochos III at the beginning of the second century BC, and in the conflict with Perseus of Macedonia, until the so-called 'day of Eleusis' in 168 BC, when Popilius Laenas prevented Antiochos IV from establishing a protectorate over the Ptolemaic kingdom. It was in the first century BC, however, that Egypt became increasingly tied to Rome.<sup>1</sup> In 96 BC, king Ptolemy Apion bequeathed to Rome the possession of Cyrenaica, which only around 74 BC became formally recognised as a province; in 81/80 BC, king Ptolemy X Alexander I (or, less probably, his son Ptolemy Alexander II) published a will in which he designated Rome as the legitimate heir to both Egypt and Cyprus. By that time, the prospect that Egypt could become a Roman province was probably a matter of political debate, both at Rome and at Alexandria. However, the expected annexation of Egypt did not take place in the end, probably because of the internal struggle of the leading men at Rome about the possible candidate for the Egyptian command.<sup>2</sup>

It was under king Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos *alias* Auletes ('Flute-player') that Egypt became one of the most important headlines in the Roman political agenda, and lost its independence for good. In 67 BC, Ptolemy

Auletes had his accession to the throne ratified by the Roman senate. In 63 BC, Cicero sought to establish that Auletes should be left in power, by stating that ‘the Roman people ought not to seem eager to acquire every kingdom,’ and ‘that our population will settle over there because of the quality of the land and the general abundance there.’<sup>3</sup> In 59/58 BC, Cyprus became a Roman province. At this time, Ptolemy Auletes was expelled from Egypt and sought refuge in Rome, where he managed to be formally restored to the throne as a *rex socius et amicus populi Romani*; allegedly, this formal recognition was paid for by Auletes at the price of 6000 talents.<sup>4</sup> In 57 BC, a delegation of Alexandrians came to Rome to speak against the king, but the embassy ended up in disaster, with the death of its chief ambassador or ἀρχιπρεσβευτής, the Academic philosopher Dio.<sup>5</sup> In 55 BC, the proconsul of Syria Aulus Gabinius, his financial agent the *eques* C. Rabirius Postumus and Roman troops restored Auletes to the throne. Thereafter, Auletes appointed Rabirius Postumus as *dioiketes* or finance minister, perhaps in order to pay off his debts to the Roman senate.

The infiltration of a Roman citizen in the highest echelons of the central administration was an unparalleled event in the history of Egypt, and thus, in order to justify his presence, modern scholars have hypothesised that Postumus had some special financial powers.<sup>6</sup> Recently, however, it was argued that there is no need to do so, as it was entirely normal for the agent of a provincial governor to act not only in a province, but also in an allied kingdom.<sup>7</sup> A fragmentary papyrus from the Herakleopolite nome preserves a tirade of uncertain nature against a certain Postumus, who is accused of having replaced the old administrators with incompetent ones, and of having sold off the patrimony that had been treasured for generations; the anonymous writer effectively describes Postumus’ aims as ἀρπαγή, ‘robbery.’<sup>8</sup> In 54 BC, Postumus was arrested and imprisoned by Auletes, and was then tried for ‘*repetundae*’ at Rome, where Cicero defended him in the famous speech *Pro Rabirio Postumo*.<sup>9</sup> Thereafter, it is likely that the post of *dioiketes* reverted to Graeco-Egyptians, although unfortunately there is no information about this official until after the Roman conquest.

The extent to which the fate of Egypt was publicly controlled by Rome is clear from the fact that, in the 50s BC, a copy of Auletes’ will was sent to Rome to be deposited in the *aerarium*, although because of some intervening public matters it ended up in the hands of Pompey, who was acting as Auletes’ guardian.<sup>10</sup> On Auletes’ death in 51 BC, dynastic struggles arose between his children Cleopatra VII and Ptolemy XIII. In the meantime, in 48 BC, Caesar sailed to Egypt to fight the final phase of his war against Pompey, the so-called ‘Alexandrine war.’ So far as we know, however, during his one-year stay at

Alexandria, Caesar did not interfere directly in the administration of Egypt, except for settling three, then four legions of soldiers under the command of Ruphio, the son of one of his freedmen.<sup>11</sup> Josephus informs us that at this time Caesar was involved in regulations concerning the rights of the Jews of Alexandria. According to Josephus, such regulations were engraved on a bronze stele that was deposited in the Roman Capitol. It is evident that, if Caesar intervened in the Jewish question at Alexandria, his powers were well above those of the reigning couple.<sup>12</sup>

A passage in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* tells us that the citizens of Alexandria were fully aware of the risk that, with Caesar present, the entire kingdom would soon become a Roman province. 'In their councils and public meetings the arguments which their leaders kept driving home were as follows: 'the Roman people were gradually acquiring a habit of seizing that kingdom; a few years earlier Aulus Gabinius had been in Egypt with an army; Pompeius too had resorted thither in his flight; Caesar had now come with his forces, and the death of Pompeius had had no effect in dissuading Caesar from staying on among them. If they had failed to drive him out, their kingdom would become a Roman province.'<sup>13</sup> However, this transformation did not happen, allegedly because Caesar feared—thinking, perhaps, of the unsuccessful experiment of Rabirius Postumus—that an ambitious governor might cause rebellion in Alexandria.<sup>14</sup> Thus, in 47 BC Caesar sailed back to Rome, leaving Ruphio in charge of the legions in Alexandria, and Egypt reverted to the co-regency of the *reges socii et amici populi Romani* Cleopatra VII and her younger brother Ptolemy XIV.<sup>15</sup> In 47 BC, Cleopatra gave birth to a son, Ptolemaios Kaisar also known as Caesarion ('little Caesar'), whom she claimed to have been fathered by Julius Caesar himself.<sup>16</sup> In 46 BC, she moved to Rome, where she stayed until after Caesar's death. In the summer of 44 BC, Cleopatra returned to Egypt, where Ptolemy XIV died (or was killed), so that room was made for Caesarion as successor.<sup>17</sup>

In the years between 39 and 31 BC, Egypt became the battlefield for the civil war between Octavian and Antony. In 34 BC Antony assigned to Egypt further territories, namely Cilicia and Cyprus, promoted the economic and cultural reorganisation of the country, and eventually married Cleopatra. Some scholars believe that in the 40s BC Egypt went through an economic crisis, due to the combination of bad harvests, shortage of water and overseas debts; however, there is no secure evidence to support this, and others have argued that, on the contrary, under Cleopatra Egypt enjoyed a period of economic and cultural renaissance.<sup>18</sup> These two views need not be incompatible: it is plausible that, after the crisis under Auletes, Cleopatra promoted the revival of indigenous customs and religion, tried to improve the economy and

above all to acquire a role in the Roman political scene, as did, for example, her 'colleague' king Herod of Judaea.<sup>19</sup> The developments that led to the final defeat at Actium in 31 BC, and in succession to the fall of Alexandria in 30 BC, the suicide of Antony and Cleopatra, the subsequent killing of Caesarion, of Antony's son Antillus and of other Antonian supporters have received ample attention, and thus will not be reconsidered here.<sup>20</sup>

The documentary evidence for the Roman presence in Egypt in the 50s and 40s BC is meagre, as all we have are scattered occurrences of Roman names. It is well known that Roman or Greek names are not a reliable indicator of ethnic origin, as Greeks who acquired Roman citizenship were often called by their Greek name alone, and people bearing the Roman *tria nomina* might have been Graeco-Egyptians or foreigners who obtained Roman citizenship after military service. The majority of Roman names in pre-30 BC documents seem to belong to soldiers or veterans who had come to Egypt with Gabinus in 55 or Julius Caesar in 48 BC. There are for instance names such as Sbebis, which may be connected with the veteran troops of *Suebi* (a Germanic tribe) who might have fought in the auxiliary troops of Caesar in 48/47 BC or later. Besides, the existence of *kleros*-holders with Latin names suggests that Roman soldiers were settled in Egypt before the formal conquest.<sup>21</sup> A later papyrus mentioning a ἑκατονταρχία β Ραβιρίου, possibly indicating a 'centuria no. 2 of Rabirius' may have something to do with the troops who backed Rabirius Postumus.<sup>22</sup> Besides, the occurrences in Roman documents of people called Gabinus, Marcus Antonius or Ventidius may be connected with the freedmen or the soldiers of Gabinus, Mark Antony and their associates.<sup>23</sup>

Roman-named landowners, most probably veterans, may be found in Egypt well before the Roman conquest. *BGU* VIII 1828.7 (52/51 BC) mentions the estate 'formerly belonging' to a certain Apikkios, which may be the transcription of the Latin name Apicius. *P.Bingen* 45 preserves an edict of Cleopatra and Caesarion of 33 BC, which granted fiscal exemptions to the properties of a Roman citizen in the *chora*—his name, barely legible, was read as either P. Canidius or Q. Cascellius.<sup>24</sup> A document from the Herakleopolite, *BGU* XIV 2433.<sup>25</sup> mentions the collection of some money for the birthday of a certain Longinus (γενεσίοις Λουγείνου); an account of temple payments from the 50s BC, *BGU* XIV 2430.26, mentions a certain Λεπίνου Ρωμα(ίου), and elsewhere refers to an 'extortion' connected with the Romans (ἀρπαγῆς διὰ τοῖς Ρωμαίοις).<sup>26</sup> It is worth noting that also the papyrus referring to Postumus used the term ἀρπαγή to summarise the character of his administration.<sup>27</sup> One may interpret these documents as references to Roman soldiers who settled in Egypt before the conquest and acted as 'patrons' to Egyptian temples and local communities.

That there was an enclave of Roman veterans as early as the triumviral period is suggested by a papyrus preserving an edict of Octavian as *triumvir* on the privileges of the veterans (*veteranis . . . omnibus* l. 4), although it seems that Octavian addressed this edict to the veterans throughout the empire, not only to those settled in Egypt.<sup>28</sup> This text could be compared with a Greek inscription from Rhosos (a city on the boundary between Syria and Cilicia) in which Octavian as *triumvir* granted Roman citizenship and immunity (*aneisphora*) to the *nauarchas* of Rhosos, Seleucos the son of Theodotos, and to his wife and family, for his military exploits in the civil war.<sup>29</sup>

The history of the annexation of Mauretania shows in addition that Roman legionaries could be settled even in a foreign nation that was not formally annexed as a Roman province. Mauretania became a province in 33 BC, but was re-transferred to Juba II as a client kingdom in 25 BC; even then, the Roman legionaries were confirmed in their possession of land, and for jurisdiction they referred to the Roman law courts in the neighbouring province of Baetica. This suggests that it was definitely possible for Roman enclaves to survive in a foreign territory without being subject to their rulers, but being attached to another province for juridical, fiscal and military purposes.<sup>30</sup> The foundation of colonies and the settlement of Roman veterans for strategic reasons were the preliminaries of annexation of a foreign kingdom as a Roman province, and the strategic use of Roman colonisation in a royal territory may have applied also to Egypt before 30 BC. Egypt's land was already organised through an infrastructure of Ptolemaic military settlers, and thus it is possible that the Roman veterans simply inserted themselves in Egypt as foreign *κᾶτοικοι*.<sup>31</sup> This evidence strongly suggests that, under both Auletes and Cleopatra, Egypt was *de facto* under Rome's control.

Business and cultural exchange between Rome and Egypt existed since the beginning of the first century BC, but became more intense under Auletes and Cleopatra, when a number of Alexandrian intellectuals went to Rome to teach. Among these were, for instance, the historian Timagenes of Alexandria, who left Egypt in 55 BC and was first a supporter and then a critic of Augustus, and the philosopher Areios, the friend and teacher of the young Octavian.<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, the report that the chief manager of the Egyptian textile industry under Cleopatra was the Roman senator Ovinus strongly suggests that Roman businessmen were active in Egypt before 30 BC.<sup>33</sup> The literary sources report that in 29 BC Octavian forbade Roman senators and wealthy *equites* to enter Egypt without permission, and barred Egyptians from enrolment in the Roman senate.<sup>34</sup> It may be that, before the formal conquest, prominent Romans were increasingly involved with business in Egypt, and the local élites were becoming worryingly powerful, and that Octavian simply

wanted to exclude the senate and powerful knights from the profits from the wealthiest of the provinces. Naturally, however, behind this ban there may have been not only business interests but also political reasons, and anyway, it is unknown to what extent this ban was a hard-and-fast rule.

### 30–27 BC

After the fall of Alexandria Octavian remained in Egypt for some months, during which he briefly visited the χώρα, and laid down his administrative reforms.<sup>35</sup> It seemed odd, however, that Octavian decided everything in such a short space of time: if there was a reform of the Egyptian administrative and fiscal systems, it is overwhelmingly likely that it took at least a decade or two to get it started throughout Egypt. It may be interesting to note that, as Josephus reports, after the death of king Herod in 4 BC, two great council sessions of φίλοι of Augustus gathered in the temple of Apollo on the Palatine to decide about the future of Judaea.<sup>36</sup> It is possible that in 30 BC too Octavian took some major decisions concerning Egypt. Among his φίλοι there were people competent in Egyptian matters, such as the Alexandrian philosopher Areios, C. Proculius, Cornelius Gallus, imperial slaves and freedmen.<sup>37</sup> However, the most reasonable view is that in 30 BC there was no such a thing as ‘the settlement of Egypt.’

Another question is what status Egypt had between the conquest in 30 BC and the alleged reorganisation of the provinces by Augustus in 27 BC. The literary sources seem to support the view that Egypt officially became a province soon after the conquest.<sup>38</sup> Dio reports that the status given to Egypt in 30 BC was confirmed in 27 BC, when the province was assigned to Octavian, now *Augustus*, as ‘a province of the emperor.’<sup>39</sup> Nonetheless, it has been postulated that from the formal conquest up to 27 BC Octavian ruled Egypt as an absolute monarch.<sup>40</sup> This assumption was based on three main points. The first is that, between 30 and 27 BC, Octavian took over all the property of Cleopatra and assimilated it to the imperial *patrimonium*, as if it were his own possession.<sup>41</sup> The second is that in these years he held extraordinary military powers and stressed his being in Egypt as an αὐτοκράτωρ or *imperator*, that is, a military commander, and the *divi filius* or θεοῦ υἱός, that is, the son of a god.<sup>42</sup> The third point is that in 30 BC, Octavian chose one of his friends and military commanders, Cornelius Gallus, as prefect, without any authorisation from the Roman senate.<sup>43</sup>

These arguments are insufficient to prove that between 30 and 27 BC Egypt was something other than a Roman province. In fact, the triumph over Egypt that Octavian celebrated in Rome in 29 BC and the introduction of

festivals to commemorate the fall of Alexandria support the view that the landmark after which Egypt became a Roman province was indeed 30 BC.<sup>44</sup> Secondly, the arguments that Octavian possessed an imperial *patrimonium*, or that he took over some of the prerogatives of the Ptolemaic kings do not affect the formal status of Egypt, and cannot be taken as proof that Egypt was not a province; Augustus possessed patrimonial accounts in other provinces as well, and it is natural that in Egypt he presented himself as the legitimate successor of the Ptolemies.<sup>45</sup> But the crucial point that helps to judge the status of Egypt is the constitutional position of Egypt's first prefect, Cornelius Gallus. An obelisk erected by Cornelius Gallus in the *forum Iulium* of Alexandria carries an inscription which calls him *praefectus fabrum*, and for this reason it was believed that before 27 BC Gallus might have been only a military officer.<sup>46</sup> However, the inscription is undated, and the title of *praefectus fabrum* might refer to the official position of Gallus in the years of the civil wars, or in the first months of 30 BC. The most relevant piece of evidence is the trilingual inscription that Gallus set up in the temple of Philae in order to celebrate the defeat of the rebellion in the Thebaid. In the Greek version, Gallus is described as πρῶτος ὑπὸ Καίσαρος ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου κατασταθεῖς, while the Latin version calls Gallus *praefectus Alexandriae et Aegypti*. The inscription is dated 17 April 29 BC: this suggests that Egypt was legally a *provincia* under a Roman governor since 29 BC at the latest.<sup>47</sup> The powers of the prefect were probably defined around 30 BC, when a law conferred on the prefect an *imperium ad similitudinem proconsulis*, that is, an authority similar to that of any Roman governor.<sup>48</sup>

One may wonder whether the status of Egypt between the conquest and 27 BC was affected by the changes in the constitutional position of Octavian himself. Octavian's power in these years was essentially military and political (he was consul), but seems to have had no other legal basis.<sup>49</sup> According to Dio LIII 4.3, in 27 BC Octavian 'gave up' his powers, allegedly, 'the army, the laws, and the provinces, not only those which you committed to me, but also those which I myself later acquired for you.'<sup>50</sup> Although this passage may be described as 'historical fiction,' it may nonetheless suggest that in 27 BC Octavian regarded Egypt as one of the provinces that he had acquired for the benefit of the senate and the Roman people.

In conclusion, in the first years after the conquest, Egypt cannot be regarded as Octavian's personal possession only because he had chosen the prefect from his entourage, or because in these years he held extraordinary powers, or had patrimonial property. Indeed, one may find a contradiction in the fact that Octavian claimed that he had added Egypt to the *imperium* of the Roman people (*Res Gestae* 27), but introduced an era of the *dominium* (or



*imperium*) of Caesar *divi filius*,’ although, as Millar suggested, it is probably the kind of contradiction that should not be resolved.<sup>51</sup> The constitutional position that Octavian had between 30 and 27 BC must not be confused with the juridical status of Egypt. Octavian did not need to be an emperor to turn a client kingdom into a Roman province, as is shown by the fact that he annexed Mauretania as a province in 33 BC when he was only *triumvir*.<sup>52</sup> These points suggest that, even if Octavian’s powers in 30 BC are difficult to explain in constitutional terms, from this date one must nonetheless regard Egypt as a Roman province.<sup>53</sup>

## Chapter Three

# Ptolemaic and Roman Soldiers in Egypt before and after 30 BC

### INTRODUCTION

This chapter takes into consideration the documentation concerning the military forces active in Egypt before and after Actium, and tries to investigate to what extent the Ptolemaic army came into contact with Roman troops before the formal Roman conquest. After examining the structure of the Ptolemaic army in the reigns of Ptolemy Auletes and Cleopatra, it surveys the evidence for the Roman military forces in circulation at the time of the civil wars, and compares it with the evidence for Roman-style military forces in Egypt before 30 BC.

The second part of this chapter addresses the question of what happened to the Ptolemaic forces after the Roman conquest, when a standing army of two Roman legions, nine cohorts and other auxiliary forces were settled in Egypt. Both the literary sources and the documents will be surveyed in order to find out whether Cleopatra's soldiers were somehow 'reused' under Augustus. This chapter examines evidence of Ptolemaic soldiers employed in the public services, such as the new police system or the irrigation works, and surveys what we know about the local recruitment of Egyptian troops as the *auxilia* of the Roman army. It also takes into consideration cases of survival of Ptolemaic military titles in Roman documents, at a time when one would expect the demilitarisation of the former army of Cleopatra to have been completed.

Overall, this chapter surveys the documents in order to understand to what extent the allied kingdom of Egypt was militarily independent before the Roman conquest, and, secondly, in order to test the common assumption that after the Roman conquest the Ptolemaic soldiers were forced to retire from active service and to devote themselves to farming the land. In essence,

the two principal questions are the following: did Roman military forces infiltrate in Egypt before 30 BC? Did Rome disarm Egypt after 30 BC?

### ROMAN SOLDIERS IN EGYPT BEFORE 30 BC

The classic study of Lesquier supported the view that the organisation of the Ptolemaic army did not undergo substantial changes from the third to the first century BC. However, such an impression of continuity might be determined by the uneven survival of the documentation. In fact, it is likely that some changes took place under the last two Ptolemies.<sup>1</sup> The Ptolemaic army was composed essentially of regular troops of Macedonians, and indigenous μάχιμοι or λαοί. These soldiers were settled on the land, and were assigned plots according to their rank. The μάχιμοι were given holdings of thirty, seven or five arouras, hence the denomination τριακοντάρουροι, επτάρουροι or πεντάρουροι, and were grouped in λααρχίαι commanded by λάαρχοι. The Macedonian cavalry was organised in numbered ἵππαρχίαι of four to five hundred men commanded by ἵππαρχοι, who held plots of seventy, eighty or one hundred arouras, hence the attribute ἑβδομηκοντάρουροι, ὀγδοηκοντάρουροι and ἑκατοντάρουροι. Such hipparchies were further divided into ἴλαι, of about thirty men, under the command of ἱλάρχαι.<sup>2</sup>

There is not much more information about the rest of the infantry, except that there were χιλίαρχοι and ἑκατοντάρχοι, and that in the Roman period these terms translated the Latin *tribunus militum* and *centurio*. Not much is known as regards the fleet either, except that it played an important role and was recruited from among the lowest social classes.<sup>3</sup> At Alexandria there was a Macedonian royal guard of μαχαροφόροι, who were grouped in religious/social associations called σύνοδοι or ἑταιρίαι.<sup>4</sup>

All these soldiers were settled on the land as κάτοικοι, and therefore were also farmers. It is commonly assumed that the Graeco-Egyptian *katoikoi* were substantially different from the Roman veterans, because the *katoikoi* had to undertake some military training and could be mobilised in case of war. In this way they constituted a means of garrisoning and, in rotation, cultivating the land.<sup>5</sup> But the analogies and differences between the Graeco-Egyptian *katoikoi* and the Roman soldiers who were settled on the Egyptian territory are still unclear. In order to gain a deeper understanding, one has to investigate when Egyptian and Roman military institutions first came into contact.

An important landmark was the arrival in Egypt in 55 BC of the governor of Syria Aulus Gabinius and his cohorts of *Gabiniani*, who restored king Ptolemy Auletes to the throne.<sup>6</sup> Once their task was completed, the *Gabiniani* were not

withdrawn, but were left as a permanent garrison to protect the *status quo*. On the basis of a passage in Caesar saying that the *Gabiniani* were settled in Alexandria and mixed with the local population, it was believed that the *Gabiniani* were soon assimilated to the local population and became a part of the Ptolemaic army.<sup>7</sup> However, it is likely that the advent of Roman troops in 55 BC brought about some changes. Another turning point in the Roman military infiltration in Egypt was the arrival of Caesar in 48/47 BC to fight the Alexandrian war, and his settlement of three, then four Roman legions thereafter.<sup>8</sup>

In the late Roman Republican period, the non-legionary troops circulating in the Mediterranean were light-armed units of cavalry *alae* and infantry *cohortes* of about four hundred men each. They were highly flexible, not being linked to a place but only to their current commander, and were indicated either by the Greek terms *σπεῖρα* or *ἴλη*, or by the equivalent Latin terms *cohors* and *ala*, followed either by the commander's name in genitive (e.g. *cohors Nigri*) or, when referred to a past commander, by an adjective with the ending *-ana* (e.g. *ala Apriana*).<sup>9</sup> Their name and position changed with their commander, and thus it is difficult for us to identify and reconstruct their movements, especially when we rely on isolated attestations. As Speidel and Birley have pointed out, the infrastructure of *alae* and *cohortes* played an important role as a bridge between the late Republic and the early empire, as such units evolved into the *auxilia* of the imperial army. We do not know when during the empire these arrangements were made permanent. The *auxilia* were a fluid and all-embracing organism, which seems to have become fully institutionalised under Tiberius or Claudius.<sup>10</sup>

In a dossier of late Ptolemaic documents from the Herakleopolite nome (published as *BGU VIII*) we find the earliest occurrences in Egypt of the term *σπεῖρα*, which may have been a direct translation of the Latin *cohortes*.<sup>11</sup> *BGU VIII 1763* mentions a *σπεῖρ[α]* ἐκ τοῦ Σαδαλείου, that is, a contingent from a place connected with a military commander or a person of importance called Sadalas or Sadales; the document refers to the commander of this unit, Alexandros, by using the Ptolemaic title *laarches*. *BGU VIII 1876* mentions men from the *Sadaleion*.<sup>12</sup> The soldiers of this unit are described as *καθωπλισμένοι*, armed as *'hoplitai'*, a technical term which might have indicated either the armour of the Ptolemaic soldiers or, possibly, of the Roman auxiliaries.<sup>13</sup> One may connect the evidence of these documents with the information that in 42 BC the Thracian king Sadalas died bequeathing his kingdom to Rome. Some of Sadalas' Thracian soldiers may have been 'inherited' and employed by Rome as auxiliaries in Egypt, possibly on his death in 42 BC.<sup>14</sup> The reason for this is unknown, and to argue for a special diplomatic relationship between Thrace and Egypt may

be hazardous, and it is possible that exchanges of troops between allied kingdoms of Rome were common practice in this period. *BGU VIII 1806* of around 50 BC is a petition, probably addressed to a διοικητής, about the wages of the ὑπεῖς of the σπεῖρα of Diphilos. The fact that this *speira* was named after its commander recalls the custom of Roman Republican *alae* and cohorts; however, it is not guaranteed that the practice of naming a unit after its commander was exclusively Roman, and it could have been generally Hellenistic. Furthermore, the presence of a *laarches* suggests that these military bodies were of the Ptolemaic type.<sup>15</sup>

It is common knowledge that, at least from the mid-first century BC, Rome's allies tended to adopt or at least imitate Roman tactical principles. King Deiotarus of Galatia, for instance, had thirty cohorts armed in the Roman manner, which were turned into the *legio XXII Deiotariana* on his death. King Juba of Numidia had three Roman-style legions too.<sup>16</sup> Josephus describes the military forces of king Herod of Judaea in terms of τάγματα, σπεῖραι and στρατοπεδάρχαι, i.e., legions, cohorts and *praefecti castrorum*, and thus it was suggested that Herod too adopted the Roman model for the organisation of his army.<sup>17</sup>

Similarly, the terminology present in the Herakleopolite dossier may suggest that auxiliary units of the Roman type, that is, units structured as *alae* and *cohortes*, were already in existence in Egypt in the 50s BC. It is tempting to hypothesise that the infiltration of Roman units influenced the Ptolemaic army in terms of organisation, arms and training. Unfortunately there is not enough evidence to prove this. It is thus safer to assume that Roman units and the regular Ptolemaic army could coexist.

Van't Dack held the view that the Roman soldiers who were sent to Egypt before 30 BC were integrated in the Ptolemaic army.<sup>18</sup> This assumption was based on the consideration that the language of all military units in Egypt was Greek, and on two pieces of evidence: a Cretan inscription of around 55 BC, which describes a certain C. Lutatius Crispus as στρατιώτης Πτολεμαϊκός, and a Greek dedication to king Ptolemy Auletes by a cavalry commander called Gaios.<sup>19</sup> An additional piece of evidence is *O.Edfou 371*, of 49 or 27 BC, accounts in Greek for the wine supply of a group of soldiers with Roman, Greek, and Egyptian names.<sup>20</sup>

It is difficult to generalise from these documents, because they are isolated items with no parallels, and might have reflected exceptional arrangements. Furthermore, the fact that a soldier had a Greek or Roman name does not help to identify either his provenance or his first language (on the contrary, Egyptian names are usually reliable indicators of Egyptian origin). For these reasons, such documents may simply indicate that the Roman soldiers

operating in Ptolemaic Egypt were 'assimilated' to the other Ptolemaic forces, in the sense that they were able to communicate in Greek. This is not surprising, as in Egypt Greek continued to be the *lingua franca* also after the Roman conquest.

This picture is enriched by a dedication from the temple of Isis at Philae which records the presence in the Thebaid in 32 BC of an ἑπαρχος called C. Julius Papius and eight centurions with Greek and Latin names. These were probably Roman centurions and a *tribunus militum* or a *praefectus castrorum* who came to Egypt with Gabinius in the 50s, Caesar in the 40s, or Antony in the 30s BC—the name C. Julius suggests that they were Caesarian troops<sup>21</sup>—and the fact that their names are Greek and Latin shows that the soldiers of the Roman units sent to Egypt were recruited from the Greek-speaking provinces (if not from Egypt).

One of the most important and controversial items of evidence concerning the Roman legionary presence in Egypt before 30 BC is an edict in Latin of Octavian as *triumvir*, which granted privileges to the Roman veterans. At first sight, the fact that this is an official regulation suggests that a significant number of Roman veterans were settled in Egypt, possibly in the Arsinoite, as early as in the triumviral period. However, the lack of a date and of specific references to the Egyptian context and the existence of a similar edict inscribed on stone at Rhosos suggest that this edict may have been addressed not just to the veterans in Egypt, but to all Roman veterans, and that one of them, when assigned some land in Egypt, may have brought the document with him.<sup>22</sup>

Although it is difficult to extract coherent information from the isolated references to Roman soldiers before the Roman conquest, the period between 55 and 30 BC may be regarded as the progression of two different streams. After the initial infiltration of Roman elements with the settlement of the *Gabiniani*, Caesar's arrival in 48 BC marked a substantial change: his four legions were much more significant than the two cohorts of *Gabiniani*, and even more than the three legions that garrisoned Egypt under Augustus. Further Roman troops are likely to have come to Egypt in the late 40s and 30s BC to support Antony. But how did the situation change after the formal conquest in 30 BC?

## PTOLEMAIC SOLDIERS AFTER 30 BC

After the Roman conquest, the *legio II Traiana*, *III Cyrenaica* and *XXII Deiotariana* were left as a permanent garrison of the province, together with nine cohorts and additional auxiliary forces scattered in various places. Their

headquarters were in the newly founded camp of Nikopolis, near Alexandria.<sup>23</sup> According to Strabo, who was a contemporary witness, there were 'three legions of soldiers, one of which is stationed in the city and the others in the country; and apart from these there are nine cohorts, three in the city, three on the borders of Aithiopia in Syene, as a guard for that region, and three in the rest of the country. And there are also three bodies of cavalry, which likewise are assigned to the various critical points of the country.'<sup>24</sup> One might wonder whether the former soldiers of Cleopatra played any role in this context.

Our knowledge about the fortunes of the Ptolemaic soldiers after 30 BC is limited to two passages in Josephus, who reports that, some time after Actium, Augustus gave to Herod four hundred Galatians who had served as Cleopatra's bodyguards (Josephus uses the term *δορυφόροι*).<sup>25</sup> In another passage Josephus reports that, around 25 BC, Herod sent five hundred *σωματοφύλακες* to the prefect of Egypt Aelius Gallus in support of his Arabian campaign.<sup>26</sup> It is tempting to assume that these two contingents were one and the same, and that they were Cleopatra's bodyguard, sent out of Egypt during the first years after Actium, and ordered back later. Naturally, however, this remains hypothetical, as the episode might have been one of the routine exchanges of troops and goods between Roman provinces and kingdoms of *reges socii et amici populi Romani*.<sup>27</sup>

After the conquest, it is likely that at least some of the former soldiers of Cleopatra were recruited in the administration, in the police, or in the Roman army. Throughout the Augustan period, soldiers with Greek and Egyptian names escorted tax collectors, supervised the grain boats down the Nile, or the imperial quarries of the Eastern desert. In *P.Oslo* II 30 of 20 BC, a *ἑκατοντάρχης* called Anchorimphis controls a transaction in grain in the village of Sendrypaei; the term *ἑκατοντάρχης* was commonly used to indicate a Roman *centurio*, and thus Anchorimphis might have been an Egyptian recruited in the Roman army, perhaps one from the last generation of Ptolemaic soldiers.<sup>28</sup>

Suetonius reports that in the first years of the Roman occupation Augustus used the army in a massive effort to clean up the canals that had fallen into disuse, in order to increase the grain produce. A passage in Strabo sets such works 'in the times before Petronius,' that is, in the years roughly from 27 to 25 BC.<sup>29</sup> This detail seems to be supported by a contemporary document, a sworn declaration of workers at the canals.<sup>30</sup> The reorganisation of the irrigation system was one of Augustus' major concerns, and both military and civil manpower was used for these works. In *P.Ryl.* IV 603 of 7 BC, a Roman official called Bassus orders two officials called Herakleides and

Tryphon, possibly the *κωμογραμματεὺς* and *τοπογραμματεὺς* of Oxyrhynchus, to force Egyptian villagers to complete some works at the canals with a soldier (or taking a soldier with them).<sup>31</sup>

Some Ptolemaic soldiers were probably incorporated into the imperial army. The practice of lending troops or bequeathing entire armies to Rome was not new among the friends and allies of Rome, at least since the mid-first century BC: as we have seen, the army of king Deiotarus of Galatia, for instance, evolved into the *legio XXII Deiotariana*, and some Ptolemaic contingents may have been used in a similar manner.<sup>32</sup> An identical development may have affected the two auxiliary *cohortes Ituraeorum* that recur in Egyptian documents of the first century AD. According to Daris, these units were the evolution of an earlier cohort that is attested in Egypt under the names of three commanders, Florus, Facundus and Niger in succession. However, these units may have been connected also with the eight hundred Iturean mercenaries whom, as Josephus informs us, Herod recruited for his war against Antigonus in 38 BC.<sup>33</sup> By analogy, the first-century AD attestations of two auxiliary *cohortes Thebaeorum* may be connected with earlier contingents from Thebes in Upper Egypt.<sup>34</sup> Another example of local recruitment may be the *ala Xoitana*, a cavalry unit of the Roman *auxilia* that was probably recruited from around the city of Xoïs in the Delta.<sup>35</sup>

SB V 7600 of AD 16 is the proof that a Graeco-Egyptian could serve in the Roman army. This document is a private letter in which a certain Akamas writes that he has been promoted *curator* (l. 26 *κουράτωρ*) of 'the *turma* of Akamas,' probably the subdivision of a Roman *ala*, and mentions a Roman centurion called Secundus.<sup>36</sup> It is worth noting that the soldiers of this *turma* were called (possibly after him) *Ἀκαμείοι*, which would be a parallel to the standard practice in the late Republican and early imperial *alae* and *cohortes* that were named after their commanders. A well-known, later case of Egyptian who was recruited into the imperial army is that of Neilos *alias* L. Pompeius *L.f. tribu Pollia* Niger, a legionary soldier who took up a Roman name after enrolling in the Roman army.<sup>37</sup>

It is likely that Augustus reused the Ptolemaic fleet as well.<sup>38</sup> According to the literary sources, what remained of the sixty ships of Cleopatra present at Actium became the later *classis Alexandrina*.<sup>39</sup> A historical narrative that has partially come down to us in *P.Oxy.* XXXVII 2820 reports that after Cleopatra's death an official moved her fleet from Alexandria to the Red Sea in preparation for a military campaign. It is possible that this official was the prefect Aelius Gallus.<sup>40</sup> Egyptian rowers played an important role in the imperial fleet throughout the Roman period; it is likely that Egyptians, as other provincials, sought to become Roman soldiers in order to obtain Roman cit-



izenship after discharge. The limitations to the grant of Roman citizenship to Egyptians in article 55 of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* suggest that this phenomenon became increasingly worrying for the Roman authorities.<sup>41</sup>

The Ptolemaic soldiers might have been recycled also in the so-called *numeri* of the Roman army, irregular troops recruited from among the natives, which are documented from the second century AD onwards, but probably existed before as well.<sup>42</sup> Montevecchi and Canducci suggested that the term ἀριθμός, which occurs in connection with the evidence of a group of 6475 *katoikoi* of the Arsinoite, might translate the Latin technical term *numerus*.<sup>43</sup> However, the figure of 6475 seems too high to represent only a military body. Rather, the term *arithmos* may have indicated a *numerus clausus*, that is, a status circle of owners of katoikic land, military only in origin.

Some Augustan papyri and inscriptions preserve the mention of Ptolemaic military titles.<sup>44</sup> It has been thought that these titles were fictive, and had validity only in contracts, with no counterpart in real life.<sup>45</sup> This view, however, may be challenged.

Associations of συστρατιῶται or ‘fellow soldiers’ are mentioned in documents of the late Ptolemaic and early Roman periods. *P.Ryl.* IV 580 of 78, of 49 or 27 BC (it is dated to the third year of an unnamed ruler) preserves some corporation—proceedings for the burial benefit of Greek-named soldiers.<sup>46</sup> Two inscriptions from Leontopolis of around 21 BC show the dedication of an ὁμφαλός by an association of soldiers and by a certain Philoxenos son of Apolophanes called σημεαφόρος. This title may have been, rather than a Ptolemaic survival, the Greek translation of *signifer*, an official attested in the auxiliary *alae* and *cohortes*.<sup>47</sup>

In an inscription of 18 BC, probably from Alexandria, the president of an association dedicated a stele to Sosigenes ἰλάρχης of the ἵππεῖς ἐντόπιοι.<sup>48</sup> It has been suggested that the term ἐντόπιοι, as opposed to Ἀλεξανδρεῖς, indicated cavalrymen of a τόπος, who were forced to retire from active service after 30 BC, but continued to meet on a social basis, according to the old tradition.<sup>49</sup> However, it is unlikely that military officials would have been the dedicatees of inscriptions by civilians who met only on a social basis. In my view, it is plausible that the ἰλάρχης Sosigenes was a commander in active service, e.g. a *decurio* of an auxiliary *ala* or *turma*. The phrase ἵππεῖς ἐντόπιοι may have indicated indigenous cavalrymen as opposed to citizen legionaries, or, more probably, soldiers who were settled in the territory they were garrisoning, rather than resident in Alexandria or Nikopolis. It is possible, however, that this terminology was taken over from the Ptolemaic period.<sup>50</sup>

In *P.Oxy.* II 277 of 19 BC, a landlord, Dionysios son of Alexandros, and his tenant, Artemidoros son of Artemidoros, describe themselves as

Macedonians and ἰππάρχαι ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν. The exact significance of these 'cavalry-officials over men' is unknown. The first editors thought that this was an honorary title that descended from the Ptolemaic period, and that indicated officials no longer in service. However, this cannot be proved.<sup>51</sup>

In *P.Tebt.* II 382.31–37 (of uncertain date, but probably between 30 and 27 BC<sup>52</sup>), the Alexandrian Kastor son of Apollonios, ἰππάρχης ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν of the first ἰππαρχία of the ὀγδοηκοντάρουροι, cedes land to a certain Akousilaos son of Maron, a Macedonian (possibly belonging to a στρατόπεδον, if the reconstruction of l. 37 is correct). This document too suggests that cavalry contingents of Macedonians were still in active service under Augustus.<sup>53</sup>

Further references to the first and third hipparchies of the 80- and 100-arouras-men may be found in an Arsinoite land lease of AD 1–10, which involved two *katoikoi* from the third hipparchy, called C. Julius C. f. Classicus and Asiaticus of the *tribus* Fabia.<sup>54</sup> It is striking that the soldiers of such an old-fashioned division had Roman names. Probably they were not Romans who had acquired katoikic status at the moment of purchasing the land, but Graeco-Egyptians who received Roman names after a period of service in some contingents of the imperial army.<sup>55</sup> In fact, the *nomen* Julius indicates that these persons had obtained the Roman citizenship under Julius Caesar or Augustus. The *cognomen* Classicus may be connected with the fleet (*classis*), or with one *cohors Classica* for which we have evidence under Augustus and Tiberius. The *tribus Fabia* is of the fictitious type that was often assigned to foreigners in the Roman army.<sup>56</sup> This hypothesis clashes with the rule that Roman veterans could not acquire land in the province where they served.<sup>57</sup> However, it is possible that in Egypt this regulation was applied only to soldiers coming from abroad, whereas the last generation of Ptolemaic *katoikoi*, who owned land already, was allowed to keep it or buy it back.

The first and third hipparchies of katoikic soldiers recur also in *P.Köln* V 227, an Arsinoite register of katoikic land of around AD 12. This document also informs us that these hipparchies were in some way related to a τᾶγμα from Niloupolis.<sup>58</sup> A second *hipparchia* of *hekatontarouroi* is referred to in *P.Grenf.* II 42.3 from the Arsinoite, curiously, as late as AD 86. These documents indicate that in Egypt, at least in the Arsinoite, there were three numbered hipparchies, the first two (α and β) of *hekatontarouroi*, and the third (γ) of *ogdoekontarouroi*. Naturally, however, it is possible that other military bodies were settled elsewhere, for instance in Alexandria, Nikopolis and in the Delta, but that we do not know about them because of the scarce amount of documentation that was preserved in that area.

The documentary references to three *hipparchiai* may be connected with Strabo's remark that three *hipparchiai* garrisoned Egypt along with the Roman imperial army in the 20s BC. Eight hundred cavalrymen—the equivalent of two *hipparchiai*—are also mentioned by Strabo among the forces that Petronius employed in his war against the Ethiopians.<sup>59</sup> If this interpretation were correct, it would prove that three Ptolemaic hipparchies were still serving under Augustus as the *auxilia* of the imperial army. The discovery that Augustus took over three cavalry bodies of the former Ptolemaic army, far from surprising, would be perfectly in line with what we know about the Roman military policy in other provinces.

## CONCLUSION

The evidence examined in this chapter has supported the view that Roman soldiers and veterans were present in Egypt well before the Roman conquest. Under Auletes and Cleopatra a number of Roman *alae* and *cohortes* were already patrolling Egypt. The arrival of the *Gabiniani* in 55 BC, and above all the arrival and settlement by Caesar of three or four legions after the Alexandrian war of 48/47 BC resulted in a high number of veteran settlers. Further Roman forces may have come to Egypt to support Antony in the 30s BC. The Roman troops did not replace the Ptolemaic army, but coexisted with it. Most probably, the Roman soldiers sent to Egypt were auxiliaries coming from Greek-speaking areas of the Near East, who had no problem using Greek as the *lingua franca*. After Actium, these units were turned into the *auxilia* of the imperial army, as happened to other armies of Rome's former allies. The *cohortes Ituraeorum* and *Thebaeorum* and the Ptolemaic fleet may have followed a similar pattern.

In 30 BC the Roman army officially occupied the province, but this did not imply that the Ptolemaic army was demobilised. Possibly some units were sent abroad or exchanged with other nations, such as Herod's Judaea, in the first years after the conquest. By combining the information in Strabo with the evidence of three hipparchies in the Arsinoite land contracts, it seems clear that in 24 BC, and as late as AD 12, three hipparchies of Macedonian cavalrymen were stationed in different places as auxiliaries to the Roman army. In the light of this evidence, it is no longer necessary to find escape-arguments to justify the presence of Ptolemaic military titles under Augustus, as it seems clear that some Ptolemaic forces survived the Roman conquest.

The documents suggest that in Egypt, as well as in other provinces, local recruitment played a more significant role than has often been thought. The enrolment of provincials in the Roman army was probably encouraged

through the grant of some rights of citizenship after discharge. Possibly, at some point in the reign of Augustus this trend was accelerating too much, and stricter regulations were devised. The recruitment of Egyptians in the army, however, continued throughout the empire, as is witnessed by their consistent presence in the Roman fleet. The units recruited from locals may have been trained and armed in their traditional manner, and it is likely that also the Egyptian soldiers in the Roman *auxilia* preserved their Ptolemaic armament, at least under Augustus.<sup>60</sup>

In conclusion, Rome did not disarm Egypt after 30 BC. Philo reports that during the prefecture of Flaccus, around AD 32, a certain Bassus undertook a major confiscation of arms from Upper Egypt. Philo states that Flaccus's measure was caused by the suspicion that Upper Egypt would revolt, 'as they had done on many past occasions'; Flaccus thus instituted a triennial celebration for the requisition of arms, in order to prevent the Egyptians from replacing and accumulating them. He also ordered a centurion, Castus, to organise a major search for arms in the houses of all the Jews of Alexandria.<sup>61</sup> Until then, however, there is no evidence for any consistent policy concerning the disarmament of the provincials. Probably, disarmament was a temporary expedient, which was confined to a limited section of the population or to a specific area, and was employed *ad hoc* when expecting disturbances. Although the *Lex Iulia de vi* prohibited the accumulation of arms *praeter usum venationis vel itineris vel navigationis*, stores of arms under local control probably existed, in Egypt as well as in many other provinces, and throughout the Roman period.<sup>62</sup>

*This page intentionally left blank*

# The Institutions of Egypt: The Impact of Rome

## INTRODUCTION

The trend of the Roman provincial administration to tolerate and preserve local customs has led to the assumption that, after the fall of Alexandria, Augustus left the Ptolemaic administrative system unchanged, retained Egypt as his personal possession, and presented himself to the Egyptians as the successor of the Ptolemies and even of the Pharaohs. This assumption, together with the technical nature of the papyrological evidence, has led scholars to consider Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt as a *continuum* of 'Graeco-Roman' institutions, and to regard Egypt as an idiosyncratic province, not comparable with the rest of the empire.

In the past thirty years, the scholarly consensus has shifted to the view that the administrative change after the Roman conquest was substantial, and that after 30 BC Egypt effectively became a Roman province, with all the consequences that this entailed.<sup>1</sup> Rome imposed from the beginning an administrative superstructure similar to that of other provinces, which was made up of military officials and a relatively small number of Roman equestrian officials. Some of the former Ptolemaic officials were suppressed, while others were replaced by entirely new officials or were deprived of some of their powers. In the towns and the villages of the *chora*, however, Rome tended to preserve the existing administration.<sup>2</sup>

A substantial continuity was that the Greek language remained the official language of bureaucracy, so that often, official titles and bureaucratic terminology remained the same, but the related functions were altered. For this reason, any study of the transition between Ptolemaic and Roman rule must struggle with the fact that the continuity in the usage of a term in the Roman

period is not a guarantee of continuity in the institution thus designated, and that uniformity in terminology may be an illusion.<sup>3</sup> The aim of this chapter is not to solve the continuity-*versus*-change question in favour of either view. It examines the Augustan documentation concerning the most important officials in order to find out in what areas Augustus imposed changes and where he allowed existing institutions to survive.

Various features might characterise a province: an administrative structure, a military establishment, the existence of a *lex provinciae* that defined the basis of taxation, the governor's provincial edict, the creation of a *koinon* or federal representative assembly for the local communities. However, none of these features were universal. The superstructure imposed on a province did not invalidate pre-existing or developing institutions and relationships, and Rome generally sought to encourage or create self-sufficient communities structured as Graeco-Roman cities and governed by their own élites. Temple and city aristocracies collaborated with Rome by accepting to take the burden of civic administration, securing in exchange social advancement (often, the grant of citizenship) and protection. Rome also preserved local legal systems, practices and customs, although Roman law and the emperor were the overriding legal authorities. Naturally, Rome's protection and tolerance cost the provincials high taxes and a permanent military occupation.<sup>4</sup>

In Egypt, the administrative superstructure of the province consisted of a limited number of military and civil officials, who were recruited from among Roman citizens: these were the prefect,<sup>5</sup> the *iuridicus* or *dikaiodotes*, the *idios logos*, the *epistrategoï* and possibly the *archidikastes*. In the Greek cities, such as Alexandria, Naukratis and Ptolemais, there were Greek-style civic institutions, such as the *boule* (except in Alexandria) and the *demos*, which Augustus seems to have left in place. From the level of the *nome metropoleis* down to the villages of the *chora*, on the other hand, the administration was in the hands of a network of local officials and secretaries, which remained more or less unchanged.

Our most important literary source for the changes in Egypt after 30 BC is the historian and geographer Strabo of Amasia, who had direct knowledge of the events he described, as he had spent some time in Egypt in the 20s BC in the entourage of the prefect Aelius Gallus. In the seventeenth book of his *Geography* Strabo says that the status of Egypt changed radically after the Roman conquest: 'Egypt is now a province; and it not only pays considerable tribute, but also is governed by wise men, the prefects, who are sent there regularly. Now he who is sent takes the place of the kings.'<sup>6</sup> After 30 BC, the powers of the Ptolemaic kings were entrusted to a prefect, the ἑπαρχὸς Αἰγύπτου or ἡγεμῶν, a Roman *eques* chosen personally by the emperor from

among his friends, or even his freedmen.<sup>7</sup> According to Strabo, the highest official after the prefect was the δικαιοδότης (*iuridicus* in Latin), ὁ τῶν πολλῶν κρίσεων κύριος, ‘the one who presides over the major part of the law-suits.’ Then there was ὁ προσαγορευόμενος ἰδιόλογος, ὃς τῶν ἀδεσπότην καὶ τῶν εἰς Καίσαρα πίπτειν ὀφειλόντων ἐξεταστής ἐστὶ, ‘the so-called *idiologos*, who administers all the properties that are ownerless and ought to fall to Caesar.’ After mentioning ‘freedmen of Caesar and οἰκονόμοι, dealing with affairs of major or minor importance,’ Strabo turns to the ἐπιχώριοι ἄρχοντες κατὰ πόλιν, i.e., the civic officials of Alexandria, whom Augustus left in their positions.<sup>8</sup> These were the ἐξηγητής, πορφύραν ἀμπεχόμενος καὶ ἔχων πατρίους τιμὰς καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν τῇ πόλει χρησίμων, ‘the adviser, who wears purple and has hereditary honours and is responsible for the public services in the city,’ the ὑπομνηματογράφος or ‘public recorder,’ the ἀρχιδικαστής or ‘chief judge’ and the νυκτερινὸς στρατηγός or ‘night *strategos*.’<sup>9</sup>

Strabo’s list has received two main criticisms: first, that it is by no means exhaustive, as it fails to mention important civic functionaries documented in Augustan Alexandria, such as the gymnasiarch; second, that it puts on the same level city offices (e.g. the night *strategos*) and state offices (e.g. the *idios logos*). This confusion may be due to the fact that the distinction between Alexandrian magistracies, civic offices and royal offices was blurred: in fact, it seems that from the late Ptolemaic period Alexandrian citizens could take up both Alexandrian magistracies and state offices in the *chora*.<sup>10</sup>

Strabo reports that, after having reorganised the administration in Alexandria, the Romans appointed new officials throughout the *chora*: ἐπιστρατήγους τιμὰς καὶ νομάρχας καὶ ἐθνάρχας καλουμένους ἀποδείξαντες, πραγμάτων οὐ μεγάλων ἐπιστατεῖν ἡξιωμένους, ‘country officials called *epistratego*i and nomarchs and ethnarchs, who were thought worthy to superintend affairs of no great importance.’<sup>11</sup> It seems odd that Strabo described both the *epistratego*i and the nomarchs as worthy of dealing with matters of minor importance, when the *epistratego*i were quite important officials. Perhaps Strabo meant that the competence of these officials was local rather than ‘provincial.’

Strabo’s idea that the Roman conquest introduced an administrative superstructure made up of new high officials and a reorganisation of the existing city officials at Alexandria, while in the nomes Augustus sent some new officials, but left the structure of the local bureaucracy as it was, still holds. However the current consensus is that the boundary must be drawn between the offices entrusted to Roman, Latin-speaking *equites* sent from Rome, and those left to the Graeco-Egyptian population.<sup>12</sup>



## THE BEGINNING OF A NEW ERA

A decree of the Roman senate established that the date of the capture of Alexandria, 8 Mesore (= 1 August) 30 BC, was to be a festival celebrated annually throughout the Roman dominions. Actian eras were begun also in other Roman possessions in the East. In Egypt, Augustus introduced the new era of the *Καίσαρος κράτησις θεοῦ υἱοῦ*, that is, of the *dominium* or *potestas* of Caesar *divi filius*. This era occurred above all in the dating formula of legal documents, where it was accompanied by a reference to both the Egyptian and the Macedonian months.<sup>13</sup> The new dating formula proved too complicated however, as it clashed with the ancestral calendar used in Egypt, and eventually fell into disuse. After the reign of Augustus, the documents revert to the old Egyptian calendar based on the calculation of regnal years.<sup>14</sup> Continuity prevailed also in the Ptolemaic practice of dating a document according to regnal year, without specifying the name of the ruler, so that in some early Roman documents the expected genitive of the name of the emperor after the mention of the year is omitted.<sup>15</sup>

An Augustan innovation was the introduction of *dies augusti* or ἡμέραι σεβασταί. This was the system whereby imperial anniversaries or birthdays had to be marked monthly in the dating formulas of documents: thus Augustus' birthday on September 23rd was recorded on the 23rd of each month. The knowledge of these anniversaries seems to have been quite widespread throughout Egypt since the early years of the reign of Augustus; the 'Augustan days' were duly recorded in Demotic documents as well.

In Asia, *hemeraï Sebastai* seem to have been introduced by 9 BC.<sup>16</sup> The precise date of introduction of *hemeraï Sebastai* in Egypt is unknown. The earliest known reference to a *hemera Sebastai* is in *BGU XVI 2604.20* of 7 BC; however, it is conceivable that they were introduced after Octavian assumed the title 'Augustus,' in Greek *Sebastos*, in 27 BC.<sup>17</sup> Augustus also renamed the month of Thoth (August) *Sebastos*; the earliest known occurrence of the denomination *Sebastos* might be—if the reading is correct—in a tax receipt of 6 BC, *SB I 4327.3*.<sup>18</sup> However, it is possible that the change took place earlier, in connection with the reform of the Julian calendar whereby the month *Sextilis* was renamed *Augustus*, around 27 BC.<sup>19</sup>

The introduction of a new era raises the question whether the presence of the Roman emperor was clearly perceived in Egypt soon after 30 BC. That there had been a dramatic change of regime from a Ptolemaic queen to a Roman emperor was something that the majority of the people were probably well aware of. As Mitchell pointed out, 'the Roman power was acknowledged everywhere, on coins bearing the emperor's portrait, on building inscriptions which carried their names, by imperial statues in public places, by

sanctuaries of the imperial cult which existed in every city and important rural centre.<sup>20</sup> It may be significant, in this respect, that, when the Ethiopians attacked the Thebaid under the prefect Aelius Gallus, they took Syene, Elephantine and Philae, and ‘pulled down the statues of Caesar,’<sup>21</sup> i.e., the imperial portrait-statues that were put in strategic public places, where everyone could see them. That Egypt was under Roman rule was also clear from two other important factors: the immigration of Roman officials in Alexandria and in the *chora*, and the ubiquitous presence of Roman soldiers and veterans, who carried out both military and civil tasks throughout the province.

## THE HIGHER ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROVINCE

Before 29 BC, the prefect was legally invested with an *imperium ad similitudinem proconsulis*, that is, an authority similar to that of a Roman governor.<sup>22</sup> Even if it is misleading to characterize the prefect of Egypt as either a viceroy or the successor of the Ptolemaic kings, it is overwhelmingly likely that he took over many of the royal peculiarities, such as the prohibition against sailing the Nile during the flood.<sup>23</sup> The prefect exercised control over all the aspects of the administration of the province, combining fiscal with military and judicial functions, and was subject only to the emperor. The average length of the prefect’s term of office was three years, but under Augustus and Tiberius it seems to have been quite variable. A catalogue of the duties of the prefect may be found in Philo’s *In Flaccum*, which depicts the prefect handling the revenues, controlling political associations at Alexandria, presiding over important trials together with other equestrian officials, and leading the army and a flock of secretaries.<sup>24</sup>

The prefecture of Egypt was at the top of an equestrian career, below the praetorian prefecture only. Cases of promotion from Egypt to the praetorian prefecture are documented throughout the Roman period. One example is the career of Tiberius Julius Alexander, a member of one of the most illustrious Jewish-Alexandrian families, the son of Alexander the alabarch and a nephew of Philo, who had been *epistrategos* in Egypt around AD 42, *procurator* in Judaea around AD 46–48, prefect of Egypt from about AD 66 to 69, and, probably around AD 71, praetorian prefect in Rome.<sup>25</sup> A counter-example may be Seius Strabo, the father of Sejanus, who held the praetorian prefecture before becoming prefect of Egypt in AD 15. However, the contradiction may be only apparent, as in the early Roman period the hierarchy of the equestrian offices was probably not yet fixed.<sup>26</sup>

Often the prefects of the *annona* in Rome were recruited from the prefects of Egypt, and vice versa, perhaps because the administration of the corn supply was central in the duties of both; Gaius Turranius, for instance, was

prefect of Egypt in the years 7–4 BC and then prefect of the *annona* in AD 14.<sup>27</sup> In most cases, however, before arriving in Alexandria the prefect did not have a particular training or knowledge of Egypt, and only *in situ* was he instructed by secretaries and counsellors.<sup>28</sup>

The prefect had the *ius gladii*, that is, powers of criminal jurisdiction, which he exercised in his tribunal at Alexandria, and also in his βῆμα or tribunal in the circuit court called in Latin *conventus*, in Greek διαλογισμὸς καὶ δικαιοδοσία, ‘review of accounts and dispensation of justice,’ at which he held assizes every year and throughout the province. The *conventus* of the provincial governor was known in other Roman provinces too, while it had no precedent in Egypt, where it was initiated by Augustus and remained more or less the same for the first two hundred years of Roman rule.<sup>29</sup>

The outlines of the *conventus*, therefore, seem to have been essentially Roman.<sup>30</sup> However, the term *dialogismos* existed in the Ptolemaic period too, and designated the revision of the accounts of the nome officials on the part of their superiors, such as the *oikonomos* of the nome and his *antigraphus*. The survival of the term *dialogismos* under Augustus is significant, as it shows the deliberate choice to utilise the existing terminology. A Roman novelty was that in the *conventus* the prefect administered justice as well.<sup>31</sup> In Egypt, the *conventus* could be referred to as ἀποδημία, ἐπιδημία or παρουσία, although all these terms could be used in general to indicate a journey of any official or private individual.<sup>32</sup>

In her study of the *conventus*, Foti Talamanca substantially agreed with Wilcken’s earlier theory that every year an edict of the prefect established the dates and places of his assize: in January at Pelusium for the nomes of the Eastern Delta, from the end of January to mid-April at Memphis for the Thebaid and Middle Egypt, and in June–July at Alexandria for the nomes of the Western Delta. After that time, the Nile flood began, and the prefect was traditionally forbidden to sail the river.<sup>33</sup> Several officials participated in the *conventus* besides the prefect, such as the δικαιοδότης and the ἴδιος λόγος, and perhaps also the ἀρχιδικαστής and the διοικητής. A number of lawsuits could be settled by local officers as well, for instance by the ἐπιστράτηγοι and the στρατηγοί.

During the *conventus* the representatives of each nome brought to the prefect the finance records and the petitions submitted during the year. Subsequently, local people were summoned to the prefect’s court through a notification called παραγγελία.<sup>34</sup> This term was taken directly from the Ptolemaic period. It is generally assumed that the Roman summons in Egypt was in line with the procedure of the Roman-style process, the *cognitio extraordinaria*, but unfortunately the information we have on both the Roman and the Egyptian process for the early Roman period is too little to allow for a more accurate comparison.<sup>35</sup>

It seems that the earliest evidence for the *conventus* in Egypt comes from documents of the so-called 'archive of Satabous' from Soknopaiou Nesos, extending from around AD 11 to 15, in which the *basilikos grammateus* of the Arsinoite nome presents a report to the *idios logos* in the *dialogismos* at Alexandria. Foti Talamanca, however, expressed reservations that these documents referred to a *conventus* held in Alexandria, rather than to the permanent court of the prefect in Alexandria.<sup>36</sup>

The first certain indication that the term *dialogismos* indicated the *conventus* is *P.Oxy.* II 294 of AD 22, where an Alexandrian official called Sarapion writes to his subordinate Dorion that he might come to the *dialogismos* in the Oxyrhynchite.<sup>37</sup> An early reference to what is called ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ διαλογισμός occurs in *BGU VIII* 1781.9 of around 61/60 BC. Possibly, another reference to the *conventus* may be found in *P.Wash. Univ.* II 106 of 18 BC, in which the prefect Pedo is expected to sail up the Nile in order to judge a certain Dionysia, probably in the *conventus* for Middle and Upper Egypt.<sup>38</sup> According to Wilcken, another piece of evidence for the *conventus* may be an inscription dated 8 January 4 BC, in which Q. Corvius Flaccus, ἐπιστρατηγῆσας Θηβαΐδος (the former *epistrategos* of the Thebaid) and δικαιοδοτῶν Πηλουσίῳ (that is, holding the *conventus* at Pelusium?) dedicated a throne and an altar to the imperial family and to the prefect Turranius. This was rejected by Foti Talamanca with the argument that, if this official was involved in the *conventus*, one would find διαλογιζόμενος, not δικαιοδοτῶν. In my view, however, Wilcken's hypothesis cannot be completely rejected, as the term δικαιοδοσία could indicate the action of the prefect in the *conventus*.<sup>39</sup>

Further evidence on the *conventus* may be *P.Fay.* 22 verso, an official account of legal proceedings in a διαλογισμός in AD 16–18<sup>40</sup>, and *P.Haun.* II 30 of the first century AD, that refers to the *conventus* at Memphis. There are also other references to 'visits' of the prefect and other officials, which may or may not have taken place within the *conventus*. In *BGU XVI* 2623.3 of 10 BC<sup>41</sup>, an official called Lucius is expected to make an ἐπιδημία in the Herakleopolite. In *BGU XVI* 2631.5 local officials of the Herakleopolite expect the παρουσία of a certain Gallus in 9 BC. Besides, two Theban ostraka of AD 34 mention a previous visit of the prefect Flaccus to Upper Egypt.<sup>42</sup> All these visits, however, might have been made outside the *conventus*, for specific administrative, judicial or military purposes.<sup>43</sup>

## THE DIKAIODOTHES

The lack of evidence for the δικαιοδοτής before 30 BC suggests that it was Augustus who introduced this official shortly after the conquest.<sup>44</sup> The

*dikaiodotes* was a Roman equestrian nominated by the emperor and independent from the prefect. He could not be removed from office except by the emperor, and his competence was civil law, the *iurisdictio contentiosa* or *voluntaria* (e.g. loans, mortgages and dowries), while criminal law fell under the authority of the prefect. He had a permanent tribunal at Alexandria, but his jurisdiction extended to the whole province, as he probably followed the prefect in the *conventus*. Mommsen compared the *dikaiodotes* in Egypt with the *legatus iuridicus* in other provinces, while the current consensus is that the *dikaiodotes* is comparable with the *praefectus iure dicundo* or *praefectus iuridicus*, a judge of procuratorial rank. In fact, Mommsen's *legatus iuridicus* is documented only from the reign of Hadrian.<sup>45</sup>

The occurrences of the *dikaiodotes* in the papyri are scarce. This may to some extent be due to the paucity of evidence from Alexandria, the centre of the bureaucracy of the province. An inscription from Pelusium mentions Q. Corvius Flaccus, the former ἐπιστράτηγος of the Thebaid, as δικαιοδοτῶν in 4 BC, but this seems too little to be acceptable evidence that he was the *iuridicus*.<sup>46</sup> A Latin inscription records that a certain L. Volusenus Clemens was nominated *iuridicus* of Egypt around AD 14–16, but he never took up the post, as he died while supervising a census in Aquitania.<sup>47</sup> Around AD 55, there is evidence for a certain C. Julius Proculus, a *tribunus militum* who subsequently became *procurator* in Cappadocia and Cilicia.<sup>48</sup> These documents suggest that the post of *dikaiodotes* was filled by Roman citizens, and that it often represented a stepping stone to a higher office, such as the prefecture of Egypt or a procuratorship elsewhere.

## THE IDIOS LOGOS

Augustus took over and continued the institution of the ἴδιος λόγος, the head-officer of the 'special' or 'private' account of the Ptolemaic king. Under Augustus and Tiberius, the *idios logos* continued to be called in the Ptolemaic manner ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ.<sup>49</sup> The earliest evidence for an official called ἐπίτροπος τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου is in *P.Oxy.Hels.* I 11 of AD 41/42.<sup>50</sup> This document also mentions a βενεφικιάριος of the *idios logos*.<sup>51</sup> Another reference may be found in *P.Select.* I 21.8 of the first century AD, a letter addressed τῷ κραιτίστῳ πρὸς τῷ]ι ἰδίῳ λόγῳ, asking for 3500 drachmas in order to improve the irrigation system in some revenue land. The document mentions an application previously made to the *strategos* Julius, as well as to an official called πρὸς τῇ ἐπιτροπῇ—perhaps the *procurator* of the *idios logos*.<sup>52</sup>

Augustus did not simply continue the existing institution, but introduced significant changes. First, he put a Roman citizen at the head of the *idios logos*.

It is unclear when exactly this change took place; the first known Roman *idios logos* is Q. Attius Fronto, documented around AD 13.<sup>53</sup> The Roman *idios logos* had a wider sphere of competence than his Ptolemaic counterpart. As was the case with the *dikaiodotes*, the *idios logos* was independent from the prefect and could not be removed except by the emperor. He acted as the investigator and judge in cases involving irregular revenues, such as ownerless or confiscated land that was sold off at public auctions. In the early Roman period the *idios logos* may have administered temple affairs too, such as the hereditary transmission or the sale of temple offices, the payments for admission to priesthoods (ἑἴσκρισις) and the periodical censuses of priests.<sup>54</sup> Besides, he controlled everything that concerned the personal status of the people, such as the regulations on inheritance, marriage and manumission.

The most commonly used among these regulations were summarised in the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*, a handbook for the instruction of the *idiologoi* created under Augustus and surviving in later copies that encompassed corrections and additions by subsequent emperors and officials.<sup>55</sup> The major part of the *Gnomon* is a list of cases concerning the confiscation of ownerless property by the *idios logos* or the payment of fines to it, especially in relation to the social status of the individuals.<sup>56</sup>

Numerous articles of the *Gnomon* clearly show a Roman origin, and probably derive from Augustus' legislation. One such case are the laws promulgated by Augustus around and after 18 BC on matters of marriage, inheritance and manumission. Naturally, however, a substantial kernel of regulations of the *Gnomon* may have continued earlier Ptolemaic norms.<sup>57</sup> As we do not know of Ptolemaic precedents of the *Gnomon*, this code is generally compared with the imperial codes of instructions, called ἐντολαί in Greek, *mandata (principis)* in Latin, which Augustus sent to the administrators in the provinces as early as 27 BC.<sup>58</sup> It is also possible that, as Rostovtzeff suggested, both the *Gnomon* and the *mandata* derived from ὑπομνήματα, instructions that the Ptolemaic kings sent to the bureaucracy.<sup>59</sup>

The survival of the Ptolemaic *idios logos* shows particularly well the intertwining of continuity and change within the Roman administration of Egypt. By taking over the Ptolemaic *idios logos*, Octavian made the deliberate choice to continue some 'royal' financial rights, such as the claim to any property of questionable ownership, that is, what in Roman legal terms were *bona vacantia et caduca* and *bona damnatorum*. In turn, the Egyptian *idios logos* effectively became a Roman institution, similar to, or overlapping with, the imperial *patrimonium*. As a result, also the official in charge of the *idios logos* became something different from his Ptolemaic counterpart, and more similar to the financial officials

who administered the imperial patrimony elsewhere, such as the *procuratores* in other provinces.<sup>60</sup>

### THE ALEXANDRIAN ΔΙΟΙΚΗΤΗΣ AND THE ΔΙΟΙΚΗΤΑΙ OF THE NOMES

In the third century BC, the διοικητής, that is, the manager of the state treasury called διοίκησις, was the most powerful finance minister of the Ptolemaic king. In the 60s and 50s BC there still was a *dioiketes* of the Ptolemaic type, that is, a financial official who resided in Alexandria and supervised all Egypt.<sup>61</sup> In 55 BC the *dioiketes* of Egypt was C. Rabirius Postumus, a Roman *eques* whom the Roman senate and the proconsul of Syria Gabinius imposed after the restoration of Ptolemy Auletes; Postumus' rule was unpopular at Alexandria, and in 54 BC he was accused of *repetundae*, as we know from Cicero, who defended both him and Gabinius in two famous speeches.<sup>62</sup>

In the Roman period public land and revenues were still under a department called διοίκησις, but from the Augustan period the Roman prefect had supplanted the Ptolemaic *dioiketes* as the head of this department.<sup>63</sup> As early as under Augustus the term *dioiketes* occurs in documents with reference to a minor official in the nome administration; it is possible that the eclipse of the Alexandrian *dioiketes* and the appearance of minor *dioiketai* in the nomes took place in the late Ptolemaic period; when exactly is unknown. An exception to the rule that in the early Roman period the Alexandrian *dioiketes* was supplanted by local *dioiketai* is represented by a puzzling document, *P.Fouad* 21, which refers to the *dioiketes* as a high Alexandrian official in AD 63. In this document the *dioiketes* Claudius Herakleides appears as a member of the prefect's *consilium*, and is listed after the *tribuni militum*. On the basis of this document Pflaum suggested that under Roman rule the *dioiketes* maintained some of his former privileges, but also that he had much less power than in the Ptolemaic period;<sup>64</sup> however, this is a unique document and has no parallels that can either support or modify Pflaum's assumption.

Another doubtful item of evidence is a passage in Plutarch that refers to a certain Eros as ὁ τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διοικῶν under Augustus. It is unclear whether Eros was effectively the *dioiketes*, a high official, or simply a financial agent of the emperor, as the term *dioiketes* might indicate an administrator in general.<sup>65</sup> Many of the imperial freedmen with unofficial financial tasks in the provinces may have been as powerful and wealthy as the provincial governors themselves, and may have been called *dioiketes* at an unofficial level.

Let us now turn to the local *dioiketai*. Wilcken hypothesised that, either in the late Ptolemaic or in the Augustan period, the term *dioiketes* came to indicate

a minor official who resided in the *μητρόπολις* of the nome and was concerned with judicial matters. Local *dioiketai* are documented in the early Roman period, until imperial procurators replaced them before the second century AD.<sup>66</sup> Our knowledge of the duties of local *dioiketai* under Augustus and Tiberius depends essentially on two archives: that of Akousilaos from Tebtunis, from the period AD 3–23, and that of Athenodoros from Herakleopolis, from the years between 21 BC and AD 5.<sup>67</sup> Akousilaos is first attested as *dioiketes* of Tebtunis in AD 3, and became the toparch of the village by AD 17: from these documents it was inferred that the *dioiketes* was lower in rank than the toparch. In *P.Tebt.* II 289 of AD 23 the *strategos* demanded an updated report on tax payments from Akousilaos, and threatened to send him to the prefect for trial—one may deduce that the toparch was inferior to the *strategos*.

This picture may be set against the evidence from the archive of Athenodoros. In 14/13, 7 and 3/2 BC Athenodoros is attested as *epistates*, and in 10/9 and 7 BC he is attested as *dioiketes*. During his term of office he received petitions and letters of recommendation, he was requested to write guarantees to ensure people against penalties or exactions, and intervened in problems arising from tax collection along with his police officers.<sup>68</sup> In 7 BC Athenodoros was still *epistates* and *dioiketes*, but there is no evidence that he became a toparch thereafter.<sup>69</sup>

A *dioiketes* called Tyrannus is documented in *P.Oxy.* II 291 of 25/26 AD, where Chaereas, the *strategos* of the Oxyrhynchite, requests from him a list of payments in cash and kind, which were due to Severus, an unidentified higher official. In *P.Oxy.* II 292 of AD 25, Theon writes to Tyrannus a letter of recommendation.<sup>70</sup>

These documents seem to indicate that in the Augustan period the *dioiketes* was a subordinate to the toparch and the *strategos*, that he exercised control against local abuses, especially in connection with the collection of taxes, and that he took part in legal proceedings and issued letters of recommendation and guarantees.<sup>71</sup> It is unclear whether there was only one *dioiketes* per nome, or whether a number of *dioiketai* could be scattered in different villages. This may have varied according to area: while Athenodoros and Tyrannus seem to have resided in nome capitals, Akousilaos was based in the village of Tebtunis; naturally, it is also possible that the *dioiketes* travelled from village to village to perform his duties. The evidence also suggests that in the Augustan period there was no fixed order for offices: the officials could be moved from one post to another according to local need, could hold two or three posts at the same time and could remain in their office for decades, as was the case under the Ptolemies.



## THE ROYAL ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΟΣ AND THE ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΟΙ OF CAESAR

In the Ptolemaic period, the οἰκονόμος τοῦ βασιλέως was a prominent member of the court who was entrusted with financial tasks and supervised over the *idios logoi*. The Ptolemaic *oikonomos* audited the accounts in grain and money of the local tax collectors, had power over the officials of the nomes and reported to the *dioiketes*. In the second century BC, some of the functions of the *oikonomos* were taken over by the *strategos*.<sup>72</sup>

The term *oikonomos* recurs in some Augustan documents, although there is no evidence that the royal *oikonomos* still existed in the Augustan period. *BGU IV 1140.10*<sup>73</sup> mentions a δημόσιος οἰκονόμος at Alexandria in 4 BC, but this document is a unique, and, moreover, the reading is doubtful. In *BGU IV 1206.6* of 28 BC, the Herakleopolite businesswoman Isidora writes to her brother Asklepiades that she needs Philo the *oikonomos* in order to deal with some tax payments.<sup>74</sup> This was either an official of the nome or a private accountant, not the royal *oikonomos*.

A passage in Strabo tells us that in Augustan Egypt there were ἀπελεύθεροι Καίσαρος καὶ οἰκονόμοι, μείζω καὶ ἐλάττω πεπιστευμένοι πράγματα, ‘freedmen of Caesar and *oikonomoi*, dealing with affairs of major or minor importance.’<sup>75</sup> Swiderek suggested that the ‘freedmen and *oikonomoi*’ of Caesar may be identified with the *dispensatores* of the imperial procurators who are documented in other provinces. Another good parallel for the imperial *oikonomoi* may be the *vilici*, who managed imperial estates both in Italy and in the provinces.<sup>76</sup>

## THE EPISTRATEGOI

As Thomas has suggested, instead of the traditional division between officials in Alexandria (e.g. prefect and *iuridicus*) and local officials (e.g. ἐπιστράτηγος and στρατηγός), a more proper division could be drawn between Roman procurators on the one hand and native officials on the other. Thomas regarded the office of the ἐπιστράτηγος as something intermediate between the prefect and the local officials at the nome level. The current consensus is that the *epistrategos* existed from the Ptolemaic period, but underwent substantial changes under Augustus.<sup>77</sup> Unfortunately, the basics of the Augustan reform of the *epistrategia* remain unclear. It is likely that the *epistrategoi* were deprived of their military powers and were confined to civil administration. They played a role in the *conventus* of the prefect and in rounds of inspection, had judicial duties such as receiving petitions and judging trials, and supervised the appointment to liturgies and to magistracies in the Greek cities.<sup>78</sup> According to Thomas, the *epistrategos* had a wide-ranging competence, which resembled that of the prefect, not

of the *strategos*; this competence was limited to a group of specific nomes, and possibly to certain sections of the administration.<sup>79</sup> The Roman administration also seems to have instituted a tax for the funding of the office of the *epistrategos*, the so-called ὑποκείμενον ἐπιστρατήγου.<sup>80</sup>

The evidence for the Augustan *epistrategos* is meagre. The earliest known *epistrategos* might have been a certain Ptolemaios son of Herakleides, the *epistrategos* of the Thebaid in *I.Philae* 135 of around 20 BC. His name suggests that he was a native official, but Thomas thought it unlikely that he was in charge from the time of Cleopatra, especially because of the revolt in the Thebaid in the first years of Roman rule. In any case, this document is the earliest extant evidence for the *epistrategia* in the reign of Augustus.<sup>81</sup> In *BGU* IV 1138 (= *M. Chr.* 100) of 19/18 BC there is a mention of an *epistrategos*, perhaps called Lucius or Ischyriion,<sup>82</sup> but the earliest secure evidence for an *epistrategos* with a Roman name is an inscription of 4 BC, *SB* I 982, which mentions a certain Q. Corvius Flaccus as the former *epistrategos* of the Thebaid. There is an important piece of recent evidence, *BGU* XVI 2671.25, a Herakleopolite account of the Augustan period, which refers to an *epistrategos* called Τείρων, probably transliterating the Latin name Tiro; this may support the view that the *epistrategos* was a Roman citizen as early as under Augustus.<sup>83</sup> An inscription from the temple of Tentyra, *OGIS* II 659, refers to M. Claudius Postumus in AD 1, and a certain Barbarus is mentioned in a document of AD 14/15.<sup>84</sup> An *epistrategos* called Q. Fresidius Pedito appears in another inscription from Tentyra in AD 23.<sup>85</sup> *OGIS* II 661 tells us that A. Folmius (or Fulvius) Crispus was *epistrategos* in the years AD 33–38, when Flaccus was prefect.<sup>86</sup> A certain L. Antonius Proculus occurs in *SB* V 7788,<sup>87</sup> and the *epistrategos* Quintus Sanquinius . . . inius Maximus is petitioned in *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3273 about a mistake in the appointment to liturgy for *sitologia*, some time in the early first century AD.<sup>88</sup> The survey of the names of the *epistrategoi* may suggest that in the early reign of Augustus they might have been still Graeco-Egyptians, while by the time of Corvius Flaccus, 4 BC, the post was restricted to Roman citizens of equestrian status.<sup>89</sup> This, however, is speculative, as the dating of our first attestation of the *epistrategos* in the Augustan period (and before 4 BC) is uncertain.

The Augustan reform of the *epistrategia* may have been connected with other changes to the administrative divisions of Egypt. In fact it seems that in the Ptolemaic period there was only one, possibly two *epistrategoi*, while in the Roman period the number was raised to three or four. This change was determined by the new subdivision of the *chora*: while in the Pharaonic period Egypt was divided into two main regions, Lower and Upper Egypt from north to south, in Roman documents we begin to find a tripartite division

into Lower Egypt, the Thebaid and Heptanomia. The earliest evidence for this division may be *P.Tebt.* II 302.25 of AD 71/72; this document refers to a 'year 41,' which, if it refers to a regnal year of Augustus, would be AD 11/12.<sup>90</sup> It is however possible that Augustus reformed the office of *epistrategos* twice, once immediately after the conquest and once before 4 BC, the date of the evidence about Q. Corvius Flaccus.<sup>91</sup> But the problem of the number of the *epistrategoï* in Augustan Egypt remains open.

## THE ARCHIDIKASTES

The ἀρχιδικαστής, or chief judge, is very sparsely documented in the Ptolemaic period; he was certainly an important official, as his jurisdiction was not limited to Alexandria, but encompassed the province as a whole, as was the case also in the Roman period.<sup>92</sup> The official title of the *archidikastes* was, at least from the late Ptolemaic period, ἀρχιδικαστής καὶ πρὸς τῆ ἐπιμελείᾳ τῶν χρηματιστῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κριτηρίων, 'chief judge and responsible for the *chrematistai* and the other courts.'<sup>93</sup> This title remained identical throughout the Roman period.

There are not many mentions of chief judges in the Roman period. A certain Theon is referred to as ἱερεὺς καὶ ἀρχιδικαστής in *P.Ryl.* II 257 (descr.) of the end of the first century BC. Artemidoros was chief judge in the years 15 to 5 BC, as *BGU* IV 1111, 1155 (= *M.Chr.* 67, *CPJ* II 148) and 1108 indicate, and a certain Herakleides appears in *P.Köln* V 227 B 20 (AD 12/13), a contract concerning katoikic land that probably had been summarised and copied on the memoranda (*hypomnematismoi*) of the *archidikastes* in the *katalogeion* of Alexandria; an *archidikastes* Herakleides appears also in *P.Oxy.* II 281 of some time between AD 20 and 50.<sup>94</sup> The name Theon occurs in *P.Oxy.* II 268 of AD 57<sup>95</sup>, while a certain Komon ἱερεὺς καὶ ἀρχιδικαστής and Claudius Sarapion occur in two undated Roman documents.<sup>96</sup> Overall, the documents suggest that, without being a hereditary office, under Augustus the post was monopolised by powerful Alexandrian families such as, for instance, the Theones. This was probably common practice in the Ptolemaic period too.<sup>97</sup> Another Ptolemaic feature that continued under Augustus is the flexibility of the term of office, which could extend to a decade or longer, as in the case of Artemidoros.<sup>98</sup>

According to Calabi, under Augustus the *archidikastes* was nominated by the emperor, and acted as overseer of all Alexandrian officials; the office underwent little change until the third century AD.<sup>99</sup> The Roman documents show that the *archidikastes* was concerned with the publication of contracts and supervised over the Alexandrian tribunals. He had the specific task of overseeing judicial complaints and disputes that originated from contracts of συγχώρησις, i.e.

private contracts such as marriage contracts, loans, contracts for the employment of a wet-nurse, and some types of land cessions. In *P.Oxy.* II 281, in the years between AD 20 and 50, a woman, after her husband abandoned her and dissolved her dowry, asks the *archidikastes* to press him to return her dowry and pay an additional fine; a similar situation recurs in *BGU* III 1001 of the Augustan period.<sup>100</sup> The *archidikastes* also had the chief responsibility for the *katalogeion* of Alexandria, the archive where the *συγχωρήσεις* were deposited.<sup>101</sup> The land register *P.Köln* V 227 B 19f of AD 12/13 mentions the *υπομνηματισμοί* of the *archidikastes* Heracleides, journals that contained the abstracts of the private contracts deposited in the Alexandrian *katalogeion*.

One may wonder how the *katalogeion* and the other Alexandrian law courts worked. Some Augustan documents from Alexandria published in *BGU* IV refer to at least three tribunals that Augustus took over from the Ptolemaic period: besides the *katalogeion* there were the *κριτήριον* and the *κριτήριον ἐν τῇ ἀύλῃ*, that is, the tribunal ‘in the court.’ It is unclear whether or not this was the ‘royal’ court, and possibly it was a public space in the complex of the gymnasium. Fraser hypothesised that the action of these royal tribunals was confined to the field of private law within Alexandria, as in these courts were drawn the contracts of *synchoreisis*. Each of these courts might have served people of a determined neighbourhood, or of a determined social class.<sup>102</sup> Each tribunal had a supervisor, called as in the Ptolemaic period *ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ κριτηρίου*, whose precise jurisdiction remains unknown.<sup>103</sup>

In *BGU* IV we find *synchoreseis* addressed from 18 to 15 BC to Achaios at the *κριτήριον ἐν τῇ ἀύλῃ*, and between 14 and 5 BC to Protarchos, *ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ κριτηρίου*.<sup>104</sup> From around 18 BC, we find contracts addressed to the *καταλογεῖον* or to the *ἀρχιδικαστής* Artemidoros. It is possible that around 15 BC Augustus suppressed the Ptolemaic *kriteria* and entrusted all juridical powers to the *archidikastes*, making the *katalogeion* the only tribunal and the archive where all written deeds were deposited, not only for Alexandria but also for the rest of Egypt.<sup>105</sup> However, what the extant evidence indicates is that the Alexandrian tribunals were still functioning under Augustus, and that even Roman citizens and imperial freedmen and slaves could use them.

## THE ΕΞΗΓΗΤΗΣ

Two of the highest Ptolemaic officials in Alexandria, the *ἐξηγητής* and the *υπομνηματογράφος*, continued to exist in the Roman period. The functions of the Ptolemaic *exegetes* are far from clear, but it seems that he had religious duties.<sup>106</sup> Strabo’s emphasis on his ceremonial attire (e.g. his purple dress) and his position at the top of the list of the Alexandrian magistracies suggest that he was

still one of the most prominent officials in Roman Alexandria. The earliest Roman evidence for the *exegetes* indicates that he had a wide sphere of competence, which encompassed various financial and judicial responsibilities, among which that of *curator minorum*, that is, to appoint and supervise guardians for women and children, and control over the status examination of people in these categories.<sup>107</sup> He also dealt with the grain supply, and possibly supervised the municipal *annona* before this responsibility was assumed by the ἐθνητιάρχης.<sup>108</sup>

BGUIV 1143, a contract for supply of goods addressed to Achaios, the chief of the *kriterion* in the *aule* at Alexandria, reports that the *exegetes* at Alexandria in 19/18 BC was a certain Montanus son of Diogenes.<sup>109</sup> The name Montanus might have been a Roman *cognomen*, which would imply that the Alexandrian *exegetes* had Roman citizenship. A certain Tiberius Claudius Kronios occupied the post in the first century AD.<sup>110</sup>

The term *exegetes* also indicated a lesser local official with similar tasks to those in Alexandria. Greek-named *exegetai* are documented in the nome capitals and villages. Under both Ptolemaic and Roman rule, this post could be taken up by the *strategos*. P.Ryl. II 118 of 16/15 BC is a petition to the *exegetes* Asklepiades regarding some land belonging to minors in the Arsinoite. SB XX 14085 of 13/12 BC or AD 32, also from the Arsinoite, is a list of court-sentenced people, referring to an *exegetes* called Ammonius, and to a man of importance called Cornelius, perhaps a *strategos*.<sup>111</sup> Hagedorn thought that the *exegetai* of the early Roman period were state rather than municipal officials, because they were linked, rather than to a city, to the villages of the nome as a whole. In either case, it is worth noting that he maintained the same duties of assistance to widows and minors both before and after it became a municipal office.<sup>112</sup>

## THE HYPOMNEMATOGRAPHOS

In the Ptolemaic period, the ὑπομνηματογράφος, often attached to the *dioiketes*, compiled and kept up to date the instructions given to the higher officials, and was responsible for ὑπομνηματισμοί or registers of official business.<sup>113</sup> It is unclear whether the *hypomnematographos* changed or remained the same in the Roman period. It seems that this official still played an important role in the ἀνάκρισις or scrutiny of slaves and the ἐπίκρισις or scrutiny of people who applied for privileged status.<sup>114</sup> In the Roman period there seems to have been only one *hypomnematographos*, who was chosen from the most prominent families of Alexandria. The Augustan evidence is scanty; the word may be read in BGUIV 1182 R of 14/13 BC, and in P.Oxy. XII 1434, in which C. Julius Theon appears as the ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ

ὑπομνηματογράφος around 10 BC. Thereafter there is a gap until the reference to a certain Tiberius Claudius Potamon in *P.Oxy.* XLIX 3463 of AD 58. Later occurrences indicate that this post was often combined with other honorific offices such as the *archiereus*, and that both offices were monopolised by the great families of Alexandrian citizens who possessed Roman citizenship, such as the Julii Theones.<sup>115</sup>

## THE ARCHIEREUS

Some scholars believed that Hadrian introduced a Roman procurator in charge of the administration of religious life, the ἀρχιερεὺς or high priest 'of Alexandria and all Egypt,' whose competence extended over all types of temples including the traditional ones.<sup>116</sup> Before Hadrian, the evidence relating to the *archiereus* is exceptionally scarce, hence the assumption that his functions were merged into the office of the *idios logos*.<sup>117</sup> The case of Julius Theon, however, shows that the probably honorific office of *archiereus* existed as early as under Augustus. In addition, other early Roman documents refer to an *archiereus* in connection with the imperial cult.<sup>118</sup> Two documents show an organisation of the cult of Augustus in Alexandria: *BGU* IV 1137 and *SB* XXII 15460 of 6 and 5 BC record the proceedings of a σύνοδος Σεβαστῆ τοῦ θεοῦ Ἀυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος, in which we encounter the priests Primus and Iucundus, probably imperial freedmen, and a gymnasiarch, at an interval of one year.<sup>119</sup> According to Dunand, however, there was neither a centralised organisation nor an *archiereus* for the cult of the emperor, and the 'high priest of Alexandria and all Egypt' was a state official, with little to do with the imperial cult.<sup>120</sup>

Glare hypothesised that in Egypt the term *archiereus* might have designated different officials at different times. Specifically, one could find this term with reference to: 1) the *archiereus* of the imperial cult, a city official documented from the first century AD; 2) the honorific post of the *archiereus* of a city, present at least from the second or third century AD; 3) the *archiereus* of individual deities other than the emperor.<sup>121</sup> It is possible, in my view, that the *archiereus* described in points 1) and 2) was one and the same official. It is significant that, as early as under Augustus, the highest honour for a wealthy Alexandrian citizen at the top of the city administration was to become a priest of the imperial cult. This pattern may have applied to other provinces too, where Augustus introduced the imperial cult.<sup>122</sup>

Glare pointed out that, as the Romans neither wished nor were able to eradicate the local culture, under Roman rule the cities still had traditional temples that offered a range of cults, incorporating Egyptian, Greek and imperial

elements. However, the imperial cult was something substantially different from the dynastic cult of the Ptolemaic kings, because it had a different purpose: the imperial temples and clergy, the religious happenings such as festivals, processions and games in honour of the imperial family and the other manifestations of the imperial cult aimed to make the absent emperor a very tangible presence throughout the province.<sup>123</sup>

One may ask who stood as an intermediary between the traditional Egyptian temples and the Roman state under Augustus and Tiberius. Stead suggested that apart from the officials of the nome, such as the *strategos* and the *basilikos grammateus*, a role of mediation was played by a number of local ἀρχιπροφήται, bishop-like figures with administrative functions that affected the temples in their area. In Stead's view, local practices continued until the creation of a high priest under Hadrian, which marked a decisive step towards the subjection of all temples, including the Greek and traditional Egyptian ones, to the Roman administration.<sup>124</sup> Glare's dissertation has suggested that the internal administration of a temple was in the hands of ἡγούμενοι and πρεσβύτεροι, while all the temples in one nome were supervised by officials called ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν under the Ptolemies, ἐπιστάται τῶν ἱερέων since the Augustan period. According to Glare, however, the administrative and organisational structures of temples may have changed according to geographical area.<sup>125</sup>

It is worth noting that Augustus did not suppress religious minorities and their representatives, such as the ethnarch of the Jews, who resided in Alexandria and presided over Jewish law-courts.<sup>126</sup> The literary sources tell us, however, that in AD 11 the last ethnarch of the Jewish community of Alexandria died, and Augustus gave the powers of the ethnarch to the Jewish γερουσία. It is still open whether Augustus established a *gerousia* alongside the ethnarch, or whether the office disappeared because of the ethnarch's lack of heirs. Overall, Augustus seems to have essentially continued Julius Caesar's policy of tolerance in matters of local customs and religious traditions.<sup>127</sup>

## THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NOME

The Ptolemaic administrative machine had Pharaonic, Persian and Greek-Hellenistic antecedents, such as the organisation in τόποι, τοπαρχίαι, and κῶμαι. Under Ptolemaic rule, the administration of the nomes was divided into three branches: the offices of the νομάρχης, the οἰκονόμος and the βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς.<sup>128</sup> The nomarch with the toparch and komarch at local levels were in charge of agricultural production. The οἰκονόμος and his ἀντιγραφεὺς or checking-clerks supervised finances. The βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς and his

subordinate secretaries, the τοπογραμματεὺς and the κωμογραμματεὺς, kept the records of the population and the land.<sup>129</sup> The στρατηγός had essentially military functions, until the late Ptolemaic period, when his sphere of competence broadened to encompass fiscal and administrative duties.<sup>130</sup>

In the Ptolemaic period there may have been, at least theoretically, a hierarchy from nomarch to toparch to komarch, but nonetheless this was not rigid, and the actual administrative practice varied according to nome. Often the shortage of personnel resulted in the combination of different posts in one official or in the suppression of one official, for instance the nomarch, so that the toparch presided over all the administration.<sup>131</sup> It is likely that similar arrangements took place in the early Roman period too, before the system of liturgical appointments became fully organised.<sup>132</sup>

It is common knowledge that in the Roman period the essential structure of the nome administration remained the same as before; the *strategos* was however deprived of his military power and supervised only fiscal, administrative and judicial matters with the *basilikos grammateus*, taking over also some of the former functions of the Ptolemaic *oikonomos* or *dioiketes*.<sup>133</sup> The *strategos* received census, livestock, and land declarations, and directed the public record office, where these documents were kept. He also controlled the commissions of ἐπισκέπται (inspectors), κατασπορεῖς (supervisors of the corn issue) and χωματεπιμεληταί (overseers of works at the canals), and was active in the requisitions of commodities for the benefit of the army. The *strategos* and his staff summarised the results of their administration and carried them to the prefect's *conventus*.

In the late Ptolemaic period, the *strategos* was called συγγενής, 'kinsman of the king,' as the *strategia* was in the hands of a few families powerful at court. It is interesting that some Ptolemaic families of *strategoí* maintained their privileges even after the Roman conquest. Most examples come from Upper Egypt. Some Theban ostraka indicate that the *strategos* Kalasiris II from the house of Monkores maintained his position in the Pathyrite, in the Ombite and perhaps in the Letopolite nomes.<sup>134</sup> The *strategos* of the Tentyrite, Panas son of Psenobastis, retained his office from the reign of Cleopatra until 13 BC, when his son Ptolemaios took up the post, until at least 5 BC. It is remarkable that the *strategoí* of Panas' family retained their aulic and religious titles, including the title of συγγενής.<sup>135</sup> In the Thebaid, the office of the *strategos* was monopolised by the house of Kallimachos, who was *strategos* around 74/73 BC, and whose sons served under Cleopatra and Augustus until 29 BC. Perhaps, as Ricketts hypothesised, the removal of the family from *strategia* was caused by its leading role in the revolt of the Thebaid in 29 BC.<sup>136</sup> Another example of the retention of Ptolemaic titulature is



Apollonios, the son of Ptolemaios the alabarch, who was *strategos* of the Ombite, the area around Elephantine and Philae, and *παραλήμπτης* of the Erythrean Sea in a *proskynema* on stone of AD 2.<sup>137</sup> Besides, the Arsinoite *PSI* VIII 949 of uncertain date (but possibly Augustan) preserves a petition to Theris, *συγγενής* and *strategos*, about the property of the wife of a certain Tarullus.

The adjustments of the *strategia* in the Roman period may have had some repercussions on the administrative subdivisions of the nomes. The Arsinoite nome had a *strategos* for each of its three divisions as early as AD 11.<sup>138</sup> The Oxyrhynchite nome and the neighbouring Kynopolite seem to have had one and the same administration from the Ptolemaic period until the reign of Tiberius. The evidence for this is *P.Oxy.* IV 746 of AD 16, a letter of recommendation that was signed by the *basilikos grammateus* of the Oxyrhynchite and the Kynopolite. Unfortunately this document has no parallels.<sup>139</sup>

A Ptolemaic feature that continued into the Roman period was the combination of the *strategia* with other offices, such as that of *ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων*, 'in charge of the revenues.'<sup>140</sup> A certain Ptolemaios son of Achilleus is *στρατηγός, συγγενής* and *ἐξηγητής* of the Arsinoite nome some time in the first century BC.<sup>141</sup> In other early Roman documents the office is combined with the posts of *exegetes*, chief of the police or gymnasiarch.<sup>142</sup> The official term of office for *strategoí* in the Roman period was three years, but until the reign of Tiberius we find longer terms of office, as was the case under Ptolemaic rule. The *strategos* Chaireas governed the Oxyrhynchite from AD 23 to 28;<sup>143</sup> Dionysodoros the Arsinoite from AD 14 to 26.<sup>144</sup> It is thus possible that the fixed three-year term was applied systematically only under Tiberius or Claudius.<sup>145</sup>

As a preventive measure against corruption, article 70 of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* prescribed that a *strategos* should serve outside his *ἰδιῶτα*, that is, outside of his nome of origin, and should not own property or lend money in his area of appointment. However, in the early period the rule was either not in force, or not respected *de facto*: it seems that in the years AD 14 to 26 the *strategos* Dionysodoros owned land in the Arsinoite, which was also his nome of office. It is worth noting, however, that there is no guarantee that article 70 was written under Augustus; it may have been a later measure.

At a certain point in the Augustan period, the *strategoí* began to be chosen consistently from the Roman or Alexandrian élite. This probably took place at different stages in different nomes, as is suggested by a survey of the names of the Augustan *strategoí*. A certain Lupus is attested as *strategos* in the Herakleopolite around 14/13 BC in *BGU* XVI 2602.6 and 2670 II 1. In the subdivisions or *μερίδες* of the Arsinoite we find a certain Tiberius before AD

14 (*P.Tebt.* II 484 descr.); Oiax in AD 11 (*W.Chr.* 344<sup>146</sup>); Valerius Varus in AD 12 (*BGU* III 757.1 and *P.Vind.Tandem* 9.17); Tryphon or C. Julius Tryphon around AD 10 and C. Julius Gratus in AD 1–10.<sup>147</sup>

The immediate subordinate and main helper of the *strategos* was the βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς, who could also act as his deputy and take over his post.<sup>148</sup> Both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman periods this official was probably bilingual in Greek and Egyptian, and functioned as an interpreter between the Greek-speaking officials of the nome and the Egyptian villagers.<sup>149</sup> The *strategos* also had other helpers and secretaries, such as the ἡγούμενος and the ὑπηρέται, with various civil and police tasks.<sup>150</sup> The ὑπηρέται are attested in Egypt under both Ptolemaic and Roman rule.<sup>151</sup>

The *basilikos grammateus* superintended the τοπογραμματεῖς and κωμογραμματεῖς. The *topogrammateus* was originally the scribe of the toparchies into which the nomes were divided, while the *komogrammateus* was a village secretary.<sup>152</sup> In the Ptolemaic period the post of *komogrammateus* was annual, but could be renewed many times, as was the case with other offices. The duties of the *komogrammateus* included the administration of the property of land and animals (e.g. inspections, measurements, auctions of royal land, controls of rents, seed loans, and declarations of property). In the Roman period the *komogrammateus* maintained these functions and took up the control of the population as well, i.e., collection of declarations of birth, death, census and *epikrisis*.<sup>153</sup> Below the *komogrammateus* there were helpers called in the Ptolemaic and in the Augustan period ὁ παρὰ τοῦ κωμογραμματέως.<sup>154</sup>

In the villages the *komogrammateus* remained the key official for centuries, while in the nome capitals this office was often merged with that of his immediate superior, the *topogrammateus*, so that both titles were held simultaneously by each of the two officials, hence the denomination τοπογραμματεῖς καὶ κωμογραμματεῖς. This association is attested from the second century BC to the reign of Nero. Both in the Ptolemaic and in the early Roman period, these officials could remain in their post for decades.<sup>155</sup> At Oxyrhynchus, Eutyichides and Theon were the τοπογραμματεῖς καὶ κωμογραμματεῖς in AD 19/20, while in AD 64/65 and 72/73 the post was held by Apollophanes and Diogenes.<sup>156</sup> In the middle of the first century AD, the τοπογραμματεῖς καὶ κωμογραμματεῖς were renamed γραμματεῖς πόλεως in the *metropoleis*, and by this time the posts were a liturgy. Apollophanes and Diogenes are last attested as τοπογραμματεῖς καὶ κωμογραμματεῖς of Oxyrhynchus in AD 72/73, and first as γραμματεῖς πόλεως in AD 74.<sup>157</sup> It is however not guaranteed that the appearance of a new title in a document signals a contemporary change, or a change that took place simultaneously throughout Egypt.

## THE PRESBYTEROI

In the Ptolemaic period the most important intermediary institution between nome officials and villagers were the boards of 'elders,' the *πρεσβύτεροι*, who dealt with agricultural and irrigation matters, such as the works at the canals, the harvest and the storage of the crops, and the collection of rents from the public farmers. In the late Ptolemaic period the village elders seem to have gradually become the channels and the guarantors of the payments the state exacted from the community of the village. This continued in the Roman period, when, according to Tomsin's interpretation, from guarantors of the villagers the elders became agents of the fisc.<sup>158</sup> Tomsin also suggested that in the Roman period age ceased to be a necessary requirement for *presbyteroi*, who came to be selected from among the wealthiest villagers; but this may have been the case in the late Ptolemaic period too.<sup>159</sup> The *presbyteroi* seem to have had no fixed term of office and could serve from two to four years, until the office became annual and liturgical at some point in the first century AD.

According to Tomsin, in the Ptolemaic period the *presbyteroi* acted on a local basis, and had little contact with the government. After the second century BC their interaction with the authorities increased, also because of the introduction of the principle of collective responsibility of the community for fiscal deficits, and in the Roman period they became the official authorities of the village, with the twofold role of tax collectors and police.<sup>160</sup> Indeed, it is possible that in the Roman period the village elders were subject to a stricter control on the part of the state, but overall it is likely that this local institution remained relatively unchanged. Tomsin also assumed that all the occurrences of *presbyteroi* referred to village elders, including the *πρεσβύτεροι δημοσίων γεωργῶν*. However, the term *presbyteroi* may have simply indicated the representatives of any community, of farmers, villagers, or priests. Similarly, the *ἡγούμενοι*, supervisors of the *presbyteroi*, are documented in connection with farmers, priests, villagers, or other local communities, such as the Jewish communities.<sup>161</sup>

## THE POLICE SYSTEM

Although the majority of the documentary sources relating to the police system in the Roman period come from the second century AD, it has been suggested that it was Augustus who abolished the police force of the Ptolemies, the village *φυλακῖται*, and replaced them with a system of *stationes* garrisoned by Roman army units, under the command of centurions.<sup>162</sup> Under Augustus one may find soldiers and centurions escorting tax collectors, supervising the grain boats down the Nile (*ποταμοφύλακες*) or the imperial quarries in the Eastern desert.<sup>163</sup>

The chief of police in the Ptolemaic period was the ἐπιστάτης φυλακῶν, or the ἀρχιφυλακίτης, to whom people addressed petitions against robberies and violent assaults, requesting the intervention of policemen. Under Augustus, both titles continue to occur in documents.<sup>164</sup> In the Herakleopolite, Athenodoros seems to have been *epistates* at least from 15 to 3/2 BC.<sup>165</sup> It seems also that he was not the only *epistates* of the nome, but had colleagues, presumably in other villages.<sup>166</sup>

From a certain point in Augustus' reign we find ἐπιστάται φυλακῶν with Roman names, who were probably soldiers of the Roman army. The precise date of this change cannot be established. It is likely that it took place in different years for different nomes. In the Arsinoite, it must have taken place before 4 BC, when we find mentions of various Roman-named *epistatai* in different administrative divisions. In 4 BC Cordus and C. Julius [. . .] Jos replaced a certain Solon; in AD 13 we find a certain Quintus Pacillius Euxinus, and an Alkibiades occurs in the Arsinoite, in AD 5.<sup>167</sup>

The characteristics of the office of the *epistates* may be seen in more detail from the more abundant documentation of the reign of Tiberius, especially from a group of petitions from Euhemeria that were published in *P.Ryl.* II. In the years AD 28–30 the *epistates* of Euhemeria was Sarapion. In AD 31/32 the post was taken over by Athenodoros, who was succeeded in AD 34–36 by C. Errius or Arrius Priscus. Athenodoros was again *epistates* in AD 38, while in AD 39/40 we find C. Julius Pholos. In AD 42, a certain Tiberius Claudius Philoxenos was *strategos* and *epistates*.<sup>168</sup> These documents show that under Tiberius the *epistates* had (at least at Euhemeria, but probably also elsewhere) a fairly regular term of office of three years. It remains unclear whether there was only one *epistates* for the nome, or whether there could be several in different villages. This might have changed according to area.

Both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman periods, the *epistatai* had under their orders troops of policemen called ἔφοδοι, commanded by an ἀρχέφοδος, who carried out tasks, such as protecting goods and tax-grain convoys.<sup>169</sup> Other police tasks were performed by the paramilitary body of the μαχαιροφόροι or 'sword-bearers.' The *machairophoroi* are documented from the third century BC and throughout the Roman period. In the Augustan archive of Athenodoros, we find *machairophoroi* guarding the sowing and the transport of grain along the Nile, escorting officials, and carrying letters and dispatches from one official to another.<sup>170</sup> In the Ptolemaic period, the *machairophoroi* were associated in σύνοδοι (cf. *BGU* IV 1190<sup>171</sup>), while under Augustus it seems that these colleges were suppressed.<sup>172</sup>

In the early first century AD, the competence of the *epistates* came to overlap with that of the centurion, called in the papyri ἑκατοντάρχης or, less

often, with a transliteration from the Latin, *κεντουρίων*. From the Augustan period the centurion played a significant role in the security service during the *conventus* of the prefect, as is the case of the centurion Lucretius in the documents from the archive of Satabous.<sup>173</sup> From the reign of Tiberius onwards, one begins to find petitions addressed to the centurion rather than to the *epistates phylakiton*.<sup>174</sup> It is worth remembering that, from some time in the Augustan period, the *epistates phylakiton* was an officer of the Roman army, as was the centurion, and thus the difference between the two officials perhaps was not substantial: both were Roman army officers, except that the *epistates* continued to hold his Ptolemaic, old-fashioned title. After AD 42, however, evidence for the *epistates phylakiton* is lacking.

## CONCLUSION

The documents surveyed in this chapter support the general argument that in Egypt, as in any other imperial province, there was an administrative superstructure made up of a governor and military and civil officials imported from outside Egypt, and an infrastructure of town and village governments that Rome entrusted to officials from the Alexandrian or the local aristocracy. The financial administration in Egypt, as in other imperial provinces, was entrusted to an imperial legate and a network of equestrian procurators and freedmen. The imperial freedmen and slaves moved freely around the province and presumably to and from Italy, managing the emperor's public and private business.<sup>175</sup> The prefect of Egypt, like other provincial governors, exercised the full range of military, administrative and judicial administration, and was aided by a staff of civil and military legates, tribunes, centurions, and commanders of auxiliary units. After the prefect, the highest officials were the *dikaiodotes*, the *idios logos*, the *epistrategoï*, and probably the *dioiketes*, all Roman citizens of equestrian rank.<sup>176</sup> Augustus preserved some civic officials of Alexandria, such as the *archidikastes*, the *hypomnematographos*, and the *exegesetes*. From the late Ptolemaic period, these officials extended their sphere of competence beyond the boundaries of the city, so that the distinction between city and state officials became blurred; Augustus maintained this flexibility and perhaps increased it. It is also possible that he introduced in other provinces officials modelled on those that he found in Alexandria.

As was the case in other eastern provinces that had formerly been Hellenistic kingdoms, in Egypt too the Roman conquest preserved the old subdivisions of the territory, such as the organisation in epistrategies, nomes, toparchies, and villages.<sup>177</sup> It is remarkable that, after the conquest, Augustus did not remove the old generation of officials at various levels, but continued

to use them. It is possible, though unprovable, that the revolt of the Thebaid induced him to a more drastic break with the past.<sup>178</sup> But even if Augustus preserved the traditional forms of the nome administration, as it would have been counterproductive and ultimately impossible to do differently, he introduced a substantial change in that he filled the most important administrative and police positions with Alexandrian or Roman citizens.<sup>179</sup>

The documents strongly suggest that there was no complete uniformity throughout Egypt, but that there were variations according to geographical area. The commonly accepted view is that the transition to Roman rule brought a higher degree of uniformity, and this may indeed be true. However, this assumption should be taken with caution: where the evidence allows for a comparison, it seems that most regional variations continued at least until the reign of Tiberius.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# The Roman Conquest, Law and the Administration of Justice

## INTRODUCTION

Since the Roman Republican period local communities in the area subordinate to Rome, in Italy and in the provinces, had their own systems of jurisdiction and law. In Sicily (the first region to become a Roman province in 227 BC) the *lex Rupilia* of 132 BC created a clear system of demarcation between Sicilian and Roman legal competences and judges.<sup>1</sup> In many other provinces, on the contrary, the boundaries between Roman law and pre-existing local legal practices were blurred, and it may have been up to the provincial governor to refer a particular case either to local judicial authorities or to Roman courts. This is the case in an inscription from Spain, the *Tabula Contrebiensis*, which records a dispute over lands and water supply between different local peoples in 87 BC; this dispute was first dealt with by the Roman governor according to Roman law, but was then referred to the local senate of Contrebia for judicial decision.<sup>2</sup>

The problem of the overlapping of different legal systems became more significant with the acquisition of eastern provinces full of Greek cities that followed Hellenistic customs. In these cities Rome often recognised local jurisdiction in a more or less formal way, and allowed it to continue alongside forms of Roman law. Even in Italy, and even in the early imperial period, Latin *municipia* often continued to follow local rather than Roman legal practices; similarly, in peregrine communities in the provinces local systems of law were tolerated rather than suppressed by the advent of Roman law. Persistence of Greek law in Roman provinces before AD 200 is documented in Syria, Bithynia and other Greek provinces of Asia Minor, in Greece and even in Italy. A remarkable example of integration of different legal systems is the



archive of Babatha—a Jewish woman who fled to a cave by the Dead Sea during the Bar-Kochba revolt in AD 132–135—in which Roman legal procedures appear together with Hellenised-Nabataean and Jewish law. Forms of Jewish private law, such as marriage law, were tolerated as late as in the Byzantine period.<sup>3</sup>

The relationship between Roman and local laws and jurisdiction was probably one of compromise until AD 212, when Caracalla's *Constitutio Antoniniana* granted Roman citizenship to all the free population of the provinces, and thus made Roman law effectively the only legal system valid throughout the empire. However, to what extent Roman law influenced the life of provincials before AD 212 is still unclear. In any region, the Roman conquest must have carried some radical changes: in any Roman province the highest authority was the provincial governor, who had the *ius gladii*, i.e. the right of condemning one to death, and the supreme legal authority became the emperor, to whom everyone, at least in theory, could appeal for all matters.

The introduction of Roman law in a province may not have suppressed the existing legal practices, though in certain legal situations such as sales, leases or other private contracts, provincials may have found Roman legal practice more attractive than their local customs, and may have chosen to refer to Roman judges. In conclusion, in some contexts Roman law may have been adapted to specific local needs, while in others local practice may have been continued.<sup>4</sup>

In a recent study on the role of women and law in late antiquity, Arjava has suggested that the Roman administration in the provinces did not mind continuing local legal customs, especially when these customs were in line with the existing Roman laws. In fact it is possible that, in many areas of life, provincial customs and Roman law were so similar that they could be assimilated without great efforts on the part of the provincial administration and of the population. To what extent the common people were aware of the type of law they were using is unknown; Arjava suggested that, as is the case nowadays, the majority did not know the technicalities of either Roman law or their traditional legal customs, but were aware of what was needed for their everyday life.<sup>5</sup>

This chapter tries to discover whether all these theories may be valid for the province of Egypt. In spite of the abundance of documents, many aspects of the legal systems of Egypt are still obscure. How far did Roman law influence legal practice in Egypt, and how far did the existing Egyptian and Hellenistic legal customs influence in turn Roman law? Was the introduction of Roman law a gradual process, and, if so, were the first steps of this process visible as early as in the Augustan period?

The main obstacle to any research in this field is our very limited knowledge of the precise features of Roman law and Roman jurisdiction as such, both under Augustus and in the first century AD in general. What we know about Roman law comes mainly from late antique Roman legal sources such as the *Digest*, a selection of laws of the classical period compiled under Justinian, and purged of all the laws that were not in accordance with that emperor's policies. One may wonder whether it is legitimate to compare late-antique legal sources with documents written in Egypt in the early Roman period, and whether such a comparison may be used to form hypotheses about the law enforced in Egypt under Augustus. In my view, since we have to exploit all sources at our disposal, the comparative exercise is both necessary and useful; however, one should be cautious not to assume that all that we find in the *Digest* was applicable to all the provinces and throughout the Roman period.

This chapter begins by looking at the legal systems that coexisted in Egypt; it first examines the Ptolemaic and Egyptian legal customs that survived into the Roman period, and then looks at the evidence for Roman law in Egypt in the early imperial period. The second part of this chapter tries to identify and analyse the continuities with the Ptolemaic past and the changes that the Roman conquest brought in the area of the administration of justice.

### **THE INTRODUCTION OF ROMAN LAW IN EGYPT: THE *STATUS QUAESTIONIS***

It is probable that Roman law applied to the Roman citizens who moved to a province as immigrants, in the first place to Roman soldiers and veterans, or to Egyptians who acquired Roman citizenship, and that it may have been used in those cases where both Roman citizens and provincials were involved. In Egypt, Roman law should have made its appearance with the first settlements of Roman legions and veterans after the campaigns of Gabinius and Julius Caesar in the 50s and 40s BC, even before the formal annexation of 30 BC. Unfortunately, the dearth of documentary evidence from this period does not help to prove this hypothesis.

It is likely that Roman law followed the increasing number of Roman citizens who emigrated to Alexandria after the Roman conquest. However, to assume that Roman law was imposed *en bloc* in 30 BC is almost certainly misleading, as there is no evidence that any unitary Roman provincial legislation or any imperial scheme, called either *lex provinciae* or *edictum provinciale*, were uniformly applied to Egypt nor, probably, to other provinces. On the contrary, it seems that the prefects of Egypt promulgated different laws at different times, in order to respond to specific problems and needs.

The prefects' edicts concerned matters such as the periodical censuses and registrations of property. The main source for prefectural edicts were instructions (ἔντολάι or *mandata*) coming directly from the emperor; probably the edicts were issued first in Latin and then translated into Greek by the prefect's staff; publication took place through the nome *strategos* and his secretaries, who affixed the edicts in the most visible place in the nome capitals, where they remained for one to three months. It is worth noting that, in a manner similar to all other Roman laws, the edicts of a prefect did not lose their validity after the end of his term of office, but could be quoted by subsequent prefects as well.<sup>6</sup>

A major problem in any investigation of the legal system of Augustan Egypt is the fact that there is almost no evidence for official provincial regulations under Augustus. The only official source of law preserved from that period is the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* (BGUV 1210), a legal code of instructions that originated from Augustus, but has survived in later copies including additions and corrections by subsequent administrators and prefects. The prologue of the *Gnomon* (ll. 3f) explicitly quotes Roman *senatus consulta* as legal sources valid also in Egypt, and some articles, especially those on the rights of marriage, inheritance and manumission, seem to mirror specific Roman laws; the problem is that the traces of Roman law in the *Gnomon* may refer to post-Augustan legislation, and thus may not be used to investigate the legal system used in Egypt immediately after the formal annexation to Rome.<sup>7</sup>

The earlier generation of scholars (e.g. Taubenschlag and Wolff) believed that the influence of Roman law in Egypt was superficial, at least until the extension of citizen rights to provincials with Caracalla's *Constitutio Antoniniana* of AD 212, or even until the end of the Byzantine period. The common view was that in the first two centuries AD Roman law applied only to Roman citizens, and that Rome did not try to impose new laws on provincials, who continued to use their existing legal systems, although some degree of interplay between Roman law and local practice existed in the case of those people who were born *peregrini*, but became Roman citizens at a later stage in their life, such as locals recruited in the Roman army.<sup>8</sup> Modrzejewski suggested that the Roman influence on law and judicial business was a gradual process which spread over the first two centuries of Roman rule, that Roman law followed the Roman citizens and soldiers who settled in a province, and overlapped with previous legal practices without eradicating them; but nevertheless, he thought that the papyri begin to reflect Roman law closely only after the extension of Roman citizenship to all provincials with the *Constitutio Antoniniana* of AD 212.<sup>9</sup>

According to Amelotti there was a substantial continuation of earlier royal legal norms in Roman Egypt; he cited as evidence the references to Ptolemaic regulations in documents of the Roman period, and quoted as parallels the continuation of the *Lex Hieronica* in Sicily and the continuation of Hellenistic norms on customs dues in Asia documented by the *Monumentum Ephesenum*.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand Lewis and, later, Rathbone and Bowman embraced the view that the introduction of Roman law was one of the most important changes that occurred after the annexation of a region as a Roman province, and thought that this change applied to the province of Egypt as well: the introduction of Roman law was a gradual process that did not automatically obliterate the old legal traditions but overlapped with them, as Roman law may have applied first to those with privileged status.<sup>11</sup> In conclusion, there was a continuum of legal institutions, which were applied in different forms according to the people's different social and legal classification. I now turn to test these theories against the evidence of the papyri.

### **THE SURVIVAL OF EGYPTIAN AND PTOLEMAIC LEGAL PRACTICES IN ROMAN EGYPT**

The documents suggest that Egyptian legal procedures persisted even when they were different from those standard in Roman law, which indicates that the Roman conquest suppressed neither the Egyptian laws nor the Greek-Hellenistic laws that coexisted under Ptolemaic rule. Contracts were written according to a Greek-Egyptian form and followed the local tradition, especially in marriages, inheritances, and other matters of private law. A significant element of continuity was that legal suits continued to be, as in the Ptolemaic period, in the form of petitions to the authorities requesting the summons of the opponent. Rome also allowed the Egyptians to continue practices such as the marriage between brothers and sisters, which was alien to the Roman tradition and mentality.

Mélèze-Modrzejewski thought that the status of the Egyptian inhabitants of the *chora* was inferior even to that of provincials or *peregrini*, and that, for this reason, their legal practices, although tolerated, had no legal value before the Roman authorities. Thus, according to Modrzejewski, in Roman Egypt local rights survived as customs but were not recognised as law, and must be grouped under the heading *de facto* rather than *de iure*. He thought that Egyptian and Greek legal practices persisted above all in the field of private law, while in public law and in the administration of justice the break with the past was clear, and Roman law predominated.<sup>12</sup>

According to Modrzejewski, there are three areas where the survival of earlier legal practices in Roman Egypt may be seen: 1) the relics of Ptolemaic royal legislation; 2) the local legal practices of the Egyptian inhabitants of the *chora*; 3) the laws of the Greek cities of Egypt.

As regards the first point, a survey of the documents done recently by Amelotti and Migliardi has shown that Ptolemaic royal decrees continued to be evoked as valid sources of law as late as under Hadrian.<sup>13</sup> Article 37 of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* mentions explicitly the *προστάγματα βασιλέων* as a source of law that had the same validity as the edicts of the prefects. In his letter to the Alexandrians<sup>14</sup>, the emperor Claudius referred to regulations introduced by the Ptolemaic kings that were still valid in his day. The contract of loan *BGU IV 1118.21* cites Ptolemaic edicts, regulations and ancient customs (*προστάγματα, διαγράμματα* and *ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἔθισμοί*) as still valid in 22 BC. Royal ordinances were often evoked in cessions of katoikic land; this may be the case of the *παλαιὸν πρόσταγμα* concerning the forced lease of land, which was cited as late as under Hadrian.<sup>15</sup> Another example of the continuity of Ptolemaic (or even Pharaonic) regulations into the Roman period concerns Egyptian priests and temples. A *πρόσταγμα* of an unspecified king Ptolemy on the fiscal privileges of priests is cited as still valid in a document of AD 122/123.<sup>16</sup> A document of AD 160 preserves the proceedings of a hearing of the city council of Ptolemais, which had to appoint some priests at the Koptos temple. The city council cited previous decisions regarding this matter, among which there was the verdict of Julius Lysimachos, the *Idios Logos* in AD 69/70, which in turn recalled *προστάγματα* of the Ptolemaic kings and previous decisions of the prefects.<sup>17</sup> Interestingly, as late as in the third century AD somebody copied on the back of a petition about minors a letter of Ptolemy II Philadelphos to the military authorities and cavalrymen, *ἡγεμόνες* and *ἵππεῖς*, settled in Herakleopolis and in the villages of the Herakleopolite nome. It has been hypothesised that this document included regulations concerning katoikic land, but nobody has managed to explain the purpose of copying a 500-year old regulation.<sup>18</sup>

Some documents, which one could consider as early evidence of the application of Roman law in Egypt, might also be used conversely, to argue that Egyptian legal practices were assimilated to the Roman legal system. *P.Wash. Univ.* II 77 of 21 BC, for instance, is a petition to the *basilikos grammateus* from Phantias son of Sarapion, *katoikos* and public farmer, who complained that the (imperial?) slave Hilarion had ruined some crops by driving sheep on to the royal land. Phantias wanted Hilarion to compensate for the damage and pay the impost on land as well. It is worth noting that the legal action in this document resembles the *actio de pastu de pauperie et de arboribus*

*caesis* that is documented in late-antique legal sources.<sup>19</sup> Similarly, in *P.Köln* III 147, a *μισθοπρασία* (lease/sale) of a ship of the Augustan period, the norms for the restitution of money in case of shipwreck, damage, or violent assault to the ship are equivalent to the *vis tempestatis, incurtus hostium, naufragio aut per vim piratarum* referred to in the *Digest*.<sup>20</sup>

Only one Augustan document, *BGU* IV 1148.17, refers to the νόμοι τῆς χώρας, a general phrase which probably indicated the local legal practices of Egyptians in the *chora*. These practices seem to have been tolerated within the Roman legal system, and it is likely that the Egyptian legal customs were never suppressed by any official authority, but survived in a latent form until its revival in Coptic documents.<sup>21</sup> The survival of Egyptian legal culture may be connected with the survival of the Egyptian language. It was assumed that the prevalence of the Greek language as the language of Roman administration resulted in the gradual demise of the use of Demotic documents, and in the increasing demand for Greek translations for administrative and legal purposes. A survey of the evidence suggests that Greek translations from Demotic were required by the Roman administration, but nevertheless, the Egyptian language continued on an unofficial level throughout the Roman period.<sup>22</sup>

Under Augustus also the Greek cities of Egypt (Alexandria, Naukratis and Ptolemais) probably continued to use their own legal systems, as was the case with other cities in the Hellenistic Near East. The right of all these Greek cities may have been a combination of Hellenistic regulations and new regulations imposed by Rome. It is plausible that, as Modrzejewski suggested, during the reign of Augustus the Greek cities of Egypt may have ceased to produce new laws, and that civic legal bodies such as the Alexandrian tribunals were suppressed or gradually fell into disuse under Augustus or Tiberius.<sup>23</sup>

## EVIDENCE FOR THE APPLICATION OF ROMAN LAWS IN AUGUSTAN EGYPT

Some references to legal provisions by Augustus may be found in post-Augustan documents. The edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander of AD 68 cites a measure of Augustus that forbade imprisonment for private debts, and confined it to debtors to the state.<sup>24</sup> The edict (ll. 25f) also says that Augustus imported in Egypt the principle of the *πρωτοπραξία*, which secured the wife's dowry on the husbands' property against any fiscal claim. In these cases, it seems clear that Augustus did not continue earlier regulations, but introduced something new.<sup>25</sup>

At first sight, it seems that the legal practices concerning the guardianship of women continued from Ptolemaic to Roman Egypt in both form and

substance with no significant change. According to both Ptolemaic practice and Roman law, women required a guardian for private transactions such as transfers of landed property or wills; the influence of Roman law is clear in a document of the second century AD which specifies that a guardian has been appointed 'according to Roman law.'<sup>26</sup> At the same time Ptolemaic practice continued in some degree: in fact, the phrase 'acting without a guardian' recurs in transactions where Roman law would not have required this, and guardians continued to be recorded according to Ptolemaic practice also in petitions to official authorities.<sup>27</sup> These inconsistencies may be explained by hypothesising that the Roman *tutela muliebrum* and the Ptolemaic legislation concerning guardianship of women were similar to the point that they could be assimilated without dramatic changes.

This pattern of assimilation may have applied not only to *tutela*, but also to other sectors of law. There is evidence that the *ius trium liberorum*, the Augustan law that permitted women with three children to act without a guardian, was known in the provinces from at least the second century AD, and possibly also before. There were cases, however, in which Roman law and Egyptian legal practice differed, such as the norms concerning divorce and the remarriage of widows; Augustus' legislation favoured remarriage, while Egyptian census records (and also evidence from other provinces) show that most widows did not remarry, probably in order to keep all the property.<sup>28</sup>

It is unclear to what extent people were aware when they used Roman law or their inherited baggage of legal customs. It is possible that, on some occasions, people had to employ Roman legal terminology (either in Latin or translated into Greek), while in other cases they could use the terminology that derived from the Ptolemaic background.<sup>29</sup>

It is also notable that the evidence for legal practice in the papyri often disagrees with what we know about Roman law from the late antique legal sources. In *SB XIV 11624* (= *ChLA XXVII 840*) of AD 7, written in Greek and subscribed in Latin, Ruphio, the slave of a certain C. Vibidius, requests the Alexandrian Diogenides to invalidate any document in the hands of his *conservus* Haemon, and this seems to contradict the fact that in Roman law slaves had no juridical autonomy. However, we know that in the Roman practice of *institores* a slave could be given a temporary independence to carry out business on behalf of his master.<sup>30</sup> Although this is an isolated case, it may suggest that from the papyri one could get a representation of Roman legal practice in Egypt in the first century AD more accurate than the picture that we may reconstruct retroactively from the legal sources of the Justinianic period. Unfortunately, this task is made difficult by the scarcity of early Roman papyri dealing explicitly with law.

## THE ROMAN CONQUEST AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

From the Ptolemaic period, the administrators of the nome, e.g. the nomarch and the *strategos*, heard cases of complaints and received petitions, including those originally addressed to the higher authorities. It is probably misleading to say that these administrators had any 'judicial power' delegated by the king or by the Roman prefect: it is probable that the local bureaucracy simply applied administrative or legal decisions, as was required by specific cases. In both Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, therefore, justice was closely bound to the administration, so that it is often difficult to draw a line between the two.<sup>31</sup> In any case, people had the possibility of appealing to the higher, specifically judicial, authorities.

In the Ptolemaic period, the administration of justice was organised according to language and social status. Those with the status of 'Egyptian' operated under Egyptian law, in the Egyptian language and with native judges called λαοκρίται, while those with the status of 'Greek' were judged by Greek-style courts, the δικαστήρια and κριτήρια that operated in Alexandria, in the Greek cities or in the nome capitals. At Alexandria there were also the royal courts of χρηματισταί, each composed of three members and one εισαγωγεὺς. It is unknown what linked the royal courts of the *chrematistai* and the city courts in Alexandria and the other Greek cities; according to Fraser, the *chrematistai* were 'Greek colleges of magistrates holding delegated responsibility' and covering all legal actions that were out of the jurisdiction of the Alexandrian tribunals.<sup>32</sup> At the head of the judicial system of Alexandria and Egypt there was the ἀρχιδικαστής or chief judge, who resided in Alexandria and reported directly to the king. In general, it is plausible that the jurisdiction in the Greek cities of Egypt corresponded in general to its counterpart in the Greek cities outside Egypt.

In the past thirty years scholars have embraced the view that Roman rule brought to judicial practice substantial innovations.<sup>33</sup> The higher administration of justice was taken over by new officials, the prefect and the δικαιοδότης or *iuridicus*. The supreme judicial power was held by the prefect, who was subject to the possibility of appeal to the emperor only. The prefect administered justice together with other affairs in his itinerant court of assize, the *conventus*, which was called significantly διαλογισμὸς καὶ δικαιοδοσία, 'revision of the accounts and administration of justice,' during which he and his staff heard complaints and responded to petitions that were brought to them in separate groups by the officials of each nome. The institution of the *conventus* was clearly a Roman novelty, which had parallels in other provinces, and continued throughout the Roman period.<sup>34</sup>



Lewis believed that Augustus reformed the college of the *χρηματισταί* by reducing its members from three to two, although it is possible that this change took place in the late Ptolemaic period.<sup>35</sup> It seems also that the Roman administration suppressed the native courts of *laokritai* and instituted a unique judicial system in Greek; still, it is possible that the *laokritai* had already fallen into disuse in the late Ptolemaic period.<sup>36</sup> Evidence shows that the Alexandrian tribunals continued to function for a certain period of time in the reign of Augustus, and that Alexandrian citizens continued to have a privileged treatment in matters of justice, as was the case under the Ptolemies. Besides, all the judicial bodies and tribunals that were taken over from the Ptolemaic period were subject to the over-riding judicial powers of Roman courts, of the prefect, and ultimately of the emperor.<sup>37</sup>

Some administrative change seems to have affected the style of the record of legal proceedings, which from the first century AD were written in direct speech or *oratio recta*.<sup>38</sup> This change may have been connected with the development in Augustan Rome of a system of Latin shorthand writing, the *notae tironianae*, which were allegedly invented by Maecenas through his freedman Aquila and were perfected by another freedman, Tiro.<sup>39</sup> It is possible that this system derived from an earlier system of Greek shorthand, but even if it did not, it spread very soon to the Greek-speaking provinces.<sup>40</sup> The latest known occurrence of *oratio obliqua* seems to be *P.Ryl.* I 65 of 67 BC, and the earliest dated example of the protocol style in *oratio recta* may be *P.Oxy.* I 37 of AD 49, the proceedings of a trial involving the Oxyrhynchite weaver Tryphon and his wife Saraeus.<sup>41</sup> One may add to the evidence for *oratio recta* *P.Ryl.* II 270 (descr.), a fragment of a *τόμος συγκολλήσιμος* of uncertain date in the first century AD, in which Tyrannus and Pythoklides feature as speakers in legal proceedings. *P.Oxy.* XXV 2435 *recto*, of the early first century AD, contains instances of direct speech in proceedings as well; however the editors suggested that these may be fictitious proceedings belonging to the genre of the *Acta Alexandrinorum*, and thus a literary piece, not a 'document.'

It is more problematic to identify and describe the characteristics of the judicial system at lower levels, where there probably was a mixture of Egyptian and Greek legal practices, Roman criminal and private law, and where in addition the provenance and language of the officials were diverse. From the prefect down to the *epistrategos*, the administrators were Romans and were presumably skilled in Roman jurisdiction, while from the level of the nome downwards it is likely that the old Graeco-Egyptian legal practices prevailed.<sup>42</sup>

In Egypt it seems that the old system of petition and response continued to be the principal form by which people could seek the help of official authorities against violent attacks. In papyri of the Augustan period, people addressed

petitions to the *dioiketes* of the nome requesting that he send *machairophoroi*, as was the case in the Ptolemaic period. Both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman period petitions against violent attacks were often addressed to the *epistates phylakiton*, the chief of the police in the nome. A group of petitions from Euhemeria in the Arsinoite show that the *epistatai* begin having Roman names from the reign of Tiberius; in a document of either 13/12 BC or AD 31/32, a list of people condemned for murder and violent attack, a certain Cornelius features as an official of importance.<sup>43</sup> In Chapter 4 it was argued that, at the end of the reign of Augustus or at the beginning of that of Tiberius, the post of chief of the police was entrusted to officers of the Roman army. Naturally, it is not guaranteed that what was true of the Arsinoite nome was true of the whole province; however, it seems that a high number of Roman soldiers, centurions and other officers of the Roman army dealt with justice and punishments throughout Egypt from very early in the Roman period. It must be noted that often the officers we think of as 'Roman' were local people, native speakers of Greek and/or Egyptian, who took up a new Roman name and 'identity' once recruited into the imperial army. Obviously, these people's social, fiscal and legal status changed too.

To sum up, the documents seem to indicate that in Egypt the Roman administration brought substantial changes to the administration of justice. The supreme authority became the emperor in Rome, while at Alexandria the highest judicial authorities were the prefect, the *iuridicus* and their annual *conventus*. It is possible that, also at local level, the administration of justice became increasingly Roman: in Egypt as well as in other provinces the old institutions that administered justice first operated next to the imperial jurisdiction and, at a certain point, fell into disuse. If the petitions to the chief of police of Euhemeria are representative of a larger trend, one may hypothesise that a step towards the Romanization of the judicial system in the nome capitals and in the villages was taken at the end of the reign of Augustus or at the beginning of that of Tiberius. Naturally, however, this process may have had a different pace in different places, and may have affected some sectors of jurisdiction before others. The petitions from Euhemeria suggest that Roman officers were first introduced at local level in order to deal with the repression of violence and the policing of the nomes. This may support Galsterer's view that the change from local practices to a more uniform imperial jurisdiction may have taken place 'first in the provinces then in Italy and finally in Rome, first in criminal justice then in civil jurisdiction.'<sup>44</sup>

## CONCLUSION

At first sight the evidence for Egyptian and Hellenistic judicial practice and law in the documents from early Roman Egypt lends support to the old view

that Egypt was a peculiar country with millenary traditions and a three-centuries old Greek legal system, which Augustus neither could nor needed to suppress. However, to argue that the Roman conquest did not bring in any changes to law and justice would be profoundly misleading. In the first place, the fact that some local practices persist in the Roman period does not mean that all local practices were passively accepted by the Roman government: even when Ptolemaic regulations apparently continued, they may have been modified or may have served new purposes. Besides, the evidence for Roman law in Augustan Egypt may be scarce, but is present. The Roman conquest introduced changes in public and private law—criminal law is an area that awaits proper investigation for any province—and in the administration of justice, which was entrusted to new officials with Roman background, such as the prefect, the *iuridicus* and the other officials travelling around in their annual *conventus*.

It is difficult to identify and disentangle the concepts of Egyptian, Ptolemaic and Roman law, especially in the sphere of private law. The documents show that under Augustus private contracts continued to be styled in an Egyptian form, and that this form was not immutable, but had undergone several gradual changes during the Ptolemaic period, and continued to change under Roman rule.

The edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander and some Egyptian documents of the second century AD indicate that Augustus' legislation concerning inheritance, guardianship of women and dowry was applied to Egypt too, even before the *Constitutio Antoniniana* extended Roman citizenship to the majority of provincials in AD 212. This means that, even before Caracalla, Roman law was applied not only to Roman citizens but also to some provincials. The other side of the coin is that peregrine legal practices were not suppressed, but were continued, above all when they reinforced existing trends in Roman law. Thus, in the eyes of the modern scholars, Ptolemaic legal practice becomes 'Roman law' once Roman provincial governors took it over, modified it and recycled it in their own legislation; the papyri are an important source that can document this process, and only new evidence may help us to compare Roman law in the first century AD with Ptolemaic and Hellenistic law.

The evidence from Egypt gives us an idea of what the process of assimilation between Roman law and local legal customs may have been, but this obviously does not mean that in all provinces the imposition of Roman law required the same amount of effort and had identical effects. It is plausible that in areas where an efficient legal system already existed the imposition of Roman law took the form of a relatively slow process in which certain traditional norms were taken over and continued, while others gradually fell into

disuse. In the case of Egypt, it is difficult to establish exactly to what extent provincial customs 'vulgarised' Roman law, while it seems clear that, at least in certain cases, Roman law affected from the beginning the public and private life of all the population.<sup>45</sup>

Whether one can apply the conclusions drawn from the Egyptian evidence to all the provinces is a vexed question. It is likely that, in spite of its peculiar history and culture, Egypt was similar to other Roman provinces, such as Syria or the Greek provinces of Asia Minor, where Hellenistic-style legal systems survived besides Roman law, and where local authorities may have decided which legal system to use according to specific factors, such as the status of the people involved. However, one must be cautious when comparing evidence from different places in the Roman empire, as legal practices may have changed from one region to another even within one province, and the changes themselves may have had a different pace in different areas. Besides, it is possible that, even if laws were in force, people might not have complied with them.

It remains also open to what extent the common people had any knowledge of legal matters. In my view, we should not underestimate the ability of the Graeco-Egyptians to understand their own time. Although, naturally, people might have been ignorant of the technical details of the various legal systems that operated in Egypt, the average Graeco-Egyptian was probably perfectly aware that after (or even before) 30 BC the decisions in matters of law were no longer taken in Alexandria but that the centre of power was Rome. The presence of Roman soldiers, centurions, policemen, and the annual visits of the prefect and his *conventus* for the 'rendering of accounts and the administration of justice'<sup>46</sup>, an event for which all the local authorities were mobilised, must have made all the Graeco-Egyptian people, even the poorest and most illiterate in the villages, realise who the new rulers were.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# The Administration of the Community: Municipalisation and Liturgies

## INTRODUCTION

One of the most important changes that Roman rule imposed in the provinces, from Pompey to the Julio-Claudian emperors, was the promotion and increase of urbanisation. In his book on the Romanization of Anatolia, Mitchell has shown that Roman rule brought in a radical transformation of the political geography of Anatolia, by creating new cities organised according to the Greek model, so that a province became in essence a patchwork of cities and their neighbouring city territories. Behind the foundation of new cities lay the need of Rome to devolve much of the burden of provincial administration, and especially the collection of revenue and the provision of supplies and transport to armies and officials, to local communities; without the collaboration of local élites, in fact, it would have been impossible for the Roman personnel to meet all the demands of the provincial administration. According to Mitchell, among the Anatolian provinces only Cappadocia escaped the network of city territories that Rome imposed to its neighbours, and continued to be administered through estates and domains, as it did when it was a kingdom. Cappadocia was annexed directly into the possession of the Roman emperor or the Roman people, and was governed by an equestrian procurator, whose primary function was to collect and deliver revenues to Rome.<sup>1</sup>

Like Cappadocia, Egypt is commonly regarded as a province with little or no urbanization, because at the beginning of Roman rule it had only three Greek cities, Alexandria, Ptolemais Euergetis and the ancient Greek foundation of Naukratis. The Roman rule in Egypt did not take the form of new city foundations, but promoted the urbanisation of the already-existing nome

capitals or μητροπόλεις. Under Roman rule these μητροπόλεις gradually became Graeco-Roman πόλεις with Greek-style buildings and civic institutions, although they had no real political autonomy, as they were under imperial control. Scholars called this process ‘municipalisation,’ as it resembles the creation of Latin *municipia* in Italy and other provinces of the empire.

One aspect of this process was the creation of an organised system of compulsory or ‘liturgical’ services based on individual wealth, through which the wealthiest among the local élites were obliged to take up posts in the administration of their own communities. The liturgical system achieved its full development in the second century AD, while, in spite of the new evidence, the question when the first steps of this process took place has no straightforward answer. This is also the case with the origin of the process of municipalisation, which reached its climax in the third century AD.<sup>2</sup> As Mitchell pointed out, with reference to the search for the origins of Roman cities in Anatolia, ‘the origins of any phenomenon will be something less well developed and less immediately recognizable than its fully fledged successor.’<sup>3</sup> This chapter attempts to analyse the problem of the emergence of municipal and liturgical offices in the nome capitals of Egypt by re-examining the early Roman documents that may tell us something new on this matter.

## THE BEGINNING OF THE PROCESS OF MUNICIPALISATION

In the Ptolemaic period, the administration of Alexandria and the other Greek cities in Egypt was distinct from the institutions of the villages in the *chora*: the Greek cities had civic institutions such as the βουλή, the δῆμος, and the *gymnasium*, and magistrates such as the gymnasiarch, the *kosmetes* and the *exegetes*. On the other hand, the *chora* was administered through a chain of state institutions, from the *strategos* to the village secretaries and so forth, and the nome *metropoleis* were a superior kind of village with no autonomous political status. Naukratis and Ptolemais probably continued to have their own *boule* and other civic institutions throughout the Roman period.<sup>4</sup> Alexandria on the contrary did not have a *boule*, probably from the late Ptolemaic period. The so-called *Boule-Papyrus* informs us that an Alexandrian embassy asked Augustus to reintroduce the city council, claiming that it would prove useful to the Roman state, for instance by controlling access to the gymnasial class through the ἐφηβεία and preventing ‘uncultured people’ from infiltrating in tax-exempt categories. Augustus however denied the request, fearing perhaps that the *boule* would furnish the occasion for rebellions against Rome.<sup>5</sup> The literary sources also report that Augustus barred Egyptians from enrolment in the Roman senate and forbade Roman senators to visit Egypt without permission—probably to counteract the senatorial tendency

to buy estates in the provinces and to prevent them to acquire too much political power in an already turbulent province.<sup>6</sup>

The dichotomy between Greek cities and nome *metropoleis* came to an end around AD 200, when Septimius Severus introduced city councils throughout Egypt, and thus completed the process of transformation of the Egyptian *metropoleis* into Greek *poleis*.<sup>7</sup> Bowman and Rathbone suggested that the Severan reforms were only the apex of a gradual process, whose first steps were taken under Augustus. They believed that during his reign the gymnasia gradually disappeared from the villages and became exclusively civic institutions. In the Ptolemaic period the gymnasium was the principal place in the Greek cities where Greeks used to meet and hold games and festivals, but gymnasia and gymnasiarchs existed in the villages of the *chora* as well, for the needs of the local Greek élite. Under Roman rule, on the other hand, the gymnasiarchy became a city office that was concerned with administration.<sup>8</sup>

Hagedorn has examined the early Roman evidence for the gymnasiarch, the *kosmetes* and the *exegetes*, both in the *metropoleis* and in the villages, and argued that the gymnasiarch started to play a role as a municipal official only from around the middle of the first century AD, while in the Augustan period there still were γυμνασάρχαι κώμης, i.e., village gymnasiarchs with no real political role, as was the case under the Ptolemies. Some Augustan documents indeed present the gymnasiarch as a village official. In *BGU IV* 1188.2 of 15/14 BC, Kastor, the gymnasiarch of a village in the Herakleopolite, supports the public farmers against the *strategos* about the payment of taxes. In *BGU IV* 1189.2f of 1 BC to AD 1, Antaios, gymnasiarch of the village of Bousiris, petitions the *strategos* about some dike works. In *BGU IV* 1201.13 of AD 2, the priests of Bousiris report damages to the temple, and say that they were helped by the authorities of the village, i.e., the gymnasiarch and the village elders. *P.Lond.* II 354.18f<sup>9</sup> of 7–4 BC refers to a certain Diodoros as one from the group of the ἐν τῷ νομῷ γεγυμνασισαρχηκότεες. *SB VI* 9109.13 refers in AD 31 to some land formerly of a certain Sarapion which now belonged to a gymnasiarch named Tryphon; the document comes from Tebtunis, but this does not guarantee that the gymnasiarch referred to was the gymnasiarch of the village.<sup>10</sup>

However, one finds gymnasiarchs in the *metropoleis* as well. An Augustan tax list from the Herakleopolite, *BGU XVI* 2577.203, mentions a γυμνασάρχης μητροπόλεως. Often this post was held by the *strategos* himself. In the documents of the archive of Isidoros of Psophthis of around AD 6, the *strategos* Tryphon is also the gymnasiarch, and *P.Merton* II 62 of roughly the same date was addressed to Sarapion, *strategos* and gymnasiarch.<sup>11</sup> In Hagedorn's view, these documents indicate that *strategoí* could take up the



supervision of the local gymnasium as a collateral private matter. Thus, it would be wrong to interpret the presence of a gymnasiarch in the *metropolis* as a sign that it was becoming a city office. In fact, the office of gymnasiarch in the *metropolis* was a state office that encompassed the entire nome, but did not have a municipal, that is, a proper political role in the city. The change of the gymnasiarchy into a municipal office took place probably around the middle of the first century AD.<sup>12</sup>

Another gymnasial official was the *kosmetes*, who supervised various events in the gymnasium, was responsible for training *epheboi*, and acquired a role in the *epikrisis* under Roman rule. The *kosmetes* is found in Alexandria and in the other Greek cities of Egypt. In the 60s AD, for instance, Philoxenos *strategos* of the Arsinoite, and Papiskos *strategos* of the Oxyrhynchite are explicitly said to have been former *kosmetai* at Alexandria.<sup>13</sup> This office seems to have become a municipal office of the nome *metropoleis* towards the end of the first or the beginning of the second century AD.

The office of the *exegetes* is found from the late Ptolemaic period both in the Greek cities and in the *chora*. Both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman periods, the post was often combined with the *strategia*. In *SB V 7787* (= *I.Fay.* 13.35) of the first century BC, a certain Ptolemaios son of Achilleus is *syngenes*, *strategos* and *exegetes* of the Arsinoite nome, and in two documents of AD 39/40, the offices of *strategos* and *exegetes* in the Arsinoite seem to have been held simultaneously by C. Julius Asklas, a Roman citizen.<sup>14</sup>

Documents show that *exegetai* existed not only in the cities, but also in the *metropoleis* from which they presumably operated in the villages of the Egyptian *chora*.<sup>15</sup> According to Hagedorn, the early Roman *exegetes-strategos* residing in the *metropolis* controlled the nome not the city. Thus, it would be fundamentally misleading to think that the *exegetes* was a municipal office only because it is documented in *metropoleis*. The consensus is that this office became municipal around the 50s or the 60s AD.<sup>16</sup>

Further light may come from the analysis of the evolution of another municipal official, the ἀγορανόμος or supervisor of city markets. This official is documented in Alexandria and the other Greek cities of Egypt (and also in the cities of other Roman provinces) both in the Hellenistic and in the Roman periods. He controlled the prices, regulated weights and measures against cheating, and participated in the sale and emancipation of slaves. He presided over the ἀγορανομεῖον, an office in which a variety of contracts (e. g. sale and transfer of houses, manumissions, testamentary transactions) were drawn up and deposited.<sup>17</sup>

In his survey of the evidence, Raschke pointed out that under Roman rule the number of known *agoranomoi* increased, the office became collegial

and was spread to the nome *metropoleis*. However, neither the spread of the *agoranomoi* in the *metropoleis* nor their collegiality may be regarded as a Roman phenomenon. In fact, a survey of the documents shows that *agoranomoi* acting alone or in pairs in their offices may be found in *metropoleis* and villages from the Ptolemaic period.<sup>18</sup> Both the form of agoranomic contracts and the number and location of *agoranomoi* varied in different nomes. In the Oxyrhynchite, for instance, only the nome capital seems to have had an *agoranomeion* (as well as other notarial offices such as the *grapheion* and the *mnemoneion*), while in the Arsinoite and elsewhere we find *agoranomeia* in villages as well.<sup>19</sup>

To sum up, the documents surveyed show that, from the Ptolemaic period, the gymnasiarch, *kosmetes*, *exegetes* and *agoranomos* existed not only in Greek cities, but also in the nome capitals and in the villages. It is likely that some villages (especially in richer nomes such as the Arsinoite) were developed enough to have their own institutions, while in other nomes (e.g. the Oxyrhynchite) it was traditional that the officials resided only in the *metropolis*. It is also possible that these officials travelled from the *metropolis* to the villages.

It is likely that, as Hagedorn suggested, many offices became municipal between the 50s and the 70s of the first century AD.<sup>20</sup> However, it was Augustus who first promoted the development of the nome capitals into Greek cities, by favouring the concentration of the Hellenised classes there. The privileged class of the *μητροπολιται*, who paid a reduced rate of poll tax, and the inner élite linked with the gymnasium played a central role in the administration of the nome capitals from the Augustan period.<sup>21</sup> Certainly, some *metropoleis* may have been important economic social and cultural centres, and may have behaved like miniature *poleis* from the Ptolemaic period. But the substantial change that the advent of the Roman rule brought in was that the Egyptian *metropoleis* and their élites acquired a political role in the larger context of the empire.<sup>22</sup>

## LITURGIES

Compulsory services in the Greek cities and *corvées* in the Egyptian *chora* are documented from the Ptolemaic period.<sup>23</sup> These services did not disappear under Roman rule, but were taken over and expanded, so that, by the third century AD, the liturgical system embraced the entire province down to the smallest villages, and covered all areas of administration from record keeping to tax collection, police and so forth. Liturgies (that is, compulsory public offices) tended to be held for a limited length of time and probably on a limited number

of occasions, and involved a large number of people in the administration of their localities. The distinctive feature of liturgies was not so much that they were not remunerated (in fact, in some cases they might have been paid, often underpaid, jobs) but that they were compulsory, and were performed, rather than for a king or a city, for the local community, on behalf of the Roman state.<sup>24</sup>

Although compulsory services are documented in some form in the Ptolemaic period, it seems clear that nothing in the Ptolemaic evidence resembles the liturgical system that governed the Roman administration in Egypt in the second and third centuries AD. The date of the introduction of this system is controversial. The dearth of first-century documents has led to the tendency to rely on second or third century material, and to the view that liturgical administration was gradually introduced during the late first century AD, and was fully worked out in the second century.<sup>25</sup> However, scholars such as Wilcken and, later, Thomas, have taken into consideration the possibility that a system of proto-liturgic services may have existed as early as the reign of Tiberius, especially in the field of tax-collection.<sup>26</sup>

Thomas divided the evidence relating to compulsory services into three main categories. In the first category he grouped the administrative offices existing in the Greek cities from the Ptolemaic period, the so-called ἀρχαί or *honores*, such as the *gymnasiarchia*. In the second category he put the λειτουργίαι in the stricter sense, that is, the equivalent of the Latin *munera* (what Wilcken called *Amtsliturgie*). These were for instance the collection of direct taxes (πρακτορεία), and the distribution of state seed to public farmers (σιτολογία). In the third category he put the traditional corvées that were characteristic of Egypt from the Pharaonic period, such as the irrigation works (χωματικά ἔργα) and the cultivation of state land (γεωργία).<sup>27</sup> The term λειτουργία, however, may be extended to indicate all compulsory services, including the religious duties of Egyptian priests and the services connected with the army.<sup>28</sup>

According to Thomas, in the Ptolemaic period the term liturgy had no connotation of compulsion in itself.<sup>29</sup> Some Ptolemaic documents make the distinction between 'royal' and 'private' liturgies,<sup>30</sup> while others present *katoikoi* performing λειτουργίαι and χρεῖλαι, that is, services, both in the cities and in the *chora*.<sup>31</sup> In his legislation of 118/117 BC, Ptolemy Euergetes II ratified the right of the *strategos* to press the *katoikoi* into liturgies, and safeguarded this class from the obligation to perform liturgies other than theirs. Oertel thought that katoikic liturgies might have been exceptional, *ad hoc* tasks. However, this theory disagrees with the fact that they were so efficiently organised. It seems anyway that they were confined to corvée works such as

farming, or requisitions substantially different from the administrative liturgies of the Roman period.<sup>32</sup>

### CITY MAGISTRACIES

City magistracies called ἀρχαί existed in Ptolemaic Egypt as well as in the Hellenistic cities of the Near East. The most commonly accepted view is that in Egypt city magistracies were generally voluntary, and that the only compulsory services of the Ptolemaic kings were the transport, agricultural and irrigation works in the *chora*.<sup>33</sup> On this issue, however, opinions differ. Oertel thought that the compulsory *arche* (*Zwangsarche*) was unknown in the Ptolemaic period, but was introduced under Roman rule, perhaps under Tiberius. Thomas hypothesised that *archai* in the Greek cities of Egypt remained voluntary until the second or third centuries AD. According to Lewis, the earliest secure examples of liturgic *archai* in Egypt come from the Trajanic period.<sup>34</sup>

A passage in Philo suggests that some *archai* may have been compulsory as early as the reign of Tiberius. In the thirties AD, Lampon, the gymnasiarch of Alexandria, pleaded that 'He was the victim of an outrageous attack upon his property. For he was forced to act as gymnasiarch and protested that he had not sufficient means to meet the great expenses of the office . . . The excuse may be due to meanness and illiberality in spending his money, or it may be that he really had not the means, and though before the test (ἀπόπειραν) he had pretended to be quite rich he was shown under examination (ἐν τῇ δοκιμασίᾳ) to be not very wealthy, owning in fact hardly anything.'<sup>35</sup> This passage indicates not only that under Tiberius city officials could be pressed into service, but also that nominations to public offices were based on an official evaluation of the candidate's property.

The office of *strategios* has always occupied a middle position between a city magistracy and a compulsory service of the nome in the mind of scholars. Lewis excluded the *strategia* from his inventory of compulsory services, regarding it as a state not a civic office, although he considered the ὑποστράτηγος as a liturgy.<sup>36</sup> According to Hohlwein the *strategia* was an *arche* rather than a *leitourgia*, it was monopolised by the Alexandrian élite, and was surely obligatory in the Roman period. It is worth noting that from the late Ptolemaic period onwards the boundary between city magistracies and state offices was blurred, as Alexandrian officials often held state posts (e.g. the *strategia*) together with or subsequently to city offices. Indeed, it would be odd if these officials were subject to compulsion only in the capacity of 'state' rather than 'city' officials. It is thus likely that both city magistracies and state posts had a compulsory character even before they became part of an established liturgical system. In the case

of the *strategia*, this view receives further support from the fact that, in the Greek cities of other eastern Roman provinces, the office of *strategos* was a liturgy.<sup>37</sup>

The petition *BGU VIII 1846.14ff* of 50/49 BC reports the phrase *πρὸς ἀνάκτησιν χειροτονημένου*, probably with reference to the recipient of the petition, the *strategos* Soteles; the verb *χειροτονέω* is later documented as a technical term for liturgy,<sup>38</sup> although in *BGU VIII 1846* it could indicate that the *strategos* was simply elected not compelled to assume the position; it could also have been a rhetorical phrase.<sup>39</sup>

## LITURGIES IN THE NOME ADMINISTRATION

Thomas grouped in a second category the *λειτουργία* or *munera*, i.e., the compulsory services that were performed in the nome capitals or the villages of the *chora*. This category was approached in two different ways: on the one hand, Wilcken hypothesised that public services such as *πρακτορεία* and *σιτολογία* might already have been liturgic under Tiberius; on the other, Oertel, followed by Lewis, argued that there is no secure evidence of liturgies until the reign of Trajan.<sup>40</sup>

A step forward has been Chalon's commentary on a passage in the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander of AD 68, which concerned the immunity of Alexandrian citizens from *χωρικά* *λειτουργία*.<sup>41</sup> Chalon thought that these 'country liturgies' were tax-related duties such as *praktoreia* and *sitologia*, which were performed by Greeks, in opposition to *πολιτικά* *λειτουργία*, public city offices to which the Alexandrian citizens were liable. Chalon also suggested that, since Tiberius Julius Alexander did not regard these liturgies as a novelty, they were probably in existence from the reign of Tiberius or Claudius. To this theory one may object that the expression *χωρικά* *λειτουργία* may have indicated the *corvées* in the agriculture and the irrigation, which were not a Roman innovation.<sup>42</sup> Whatever it really meant, the term liturgy was not a novelty for Graeco-Egyptians under Roman rule, and thus needed no explanation.

Further problems arise from the reference to *munera publica* in a controversial edict in Latin that was issued by Octavian as *triumvir*.<sup>43</sup> This edict was probably promulgated in the years between 40 and 31 BC, and was copied on a papyrus some time in the first century AD, when a soldier recited it, probably in court.<sup>44</sup> The edict granted veterans immunity for all their property, citizenship for themselves and their families, exemption from military service and from performing *munera publica*, and the privilege of being neither *magistratus* (magistrate) nor *legatus* (legate) nor *procurator* (probably in the sense of guardian of minors or women) nor *emptor tributorum* (contractor for collecting taxes).<sup>45</sup>

Although the significance of the edict remains highly controversial, it may show that, from the triumviral period, liability or immunity from compulsory services was an issue for Roman citizens and veterans both in Italy and outside. This document may be compared with the so-called third Cyrene edict of 7/6 BC, in which Augustus, quoting earlier regulations by Julius Caesar and himself, declared that Roman citizens were liable to public services for their community.<sup>46</sup> This edict suggests that a Roman veteran may have been recruited as an official or a guardian, with reference to the liturgy of guardianship of minors or *tutela*.<sup>47</sup> That the office of *legatus* in an embassy was regarded as a compulsory public service is confirmed also by the so-called *Boule Papyrus*, in which the Alexandrians claim that 'if there should be need to send a mission to you (*sc.* Augustus), the council might elect those who are suitable, so that no one ignoble might make the journey and no one who is capable might avoid this service to his native city.'<sup>48</sup>

The reference to the *emptor tributorum*, that is the tax farmer, may suggest that this post was already a compulsory service before the Roman conquest. Chalon and Thomas hypothesised that some tax collectorships might have become liturgies under Tiberius.<sup>49</sup> This was also brought into relation with the reforms that moved the tax collection from the hands of tax farmers to state-appointed officials.<sup>50</sup> However, it could have been so even before. The letter *P.Oxy.* LV 3807 mentions a triennial tax-collectorship called *praktoreia* possibly in the context of the prefect's *conventus* at Alexandria around AD 26–28.<sup>51</sup> In this document, an official urges his subordinate: 'if you want to enter the *praktoreia* with Chaereas, you may. If not, you may take a toparchy and enter upon it when you have finished.'<sup>52</sup> According to Rea, the offices of tax collector or *πράκτωρ* and toparch were still voluntary in this document. It is however unclear what was the difference between being invited and being compelled to take up a post. The writer of this document was the responsible official for nominations to tax-collectorships for the Heptanomia or the Thebaid. It appears that he was a subordinate of the prefect and a superior of the *strategos*, and thus, he might have been the *epistrategos*, who was later known as the principal nominator to liturgies.<sup>53</sup> *P.Mich.* X 582 of AD 49/50 strongly suggests that the state office of *praktor* was compulsory. This text is a petition to a high official concerning the delinquency of the *praktor* Horion son of Petosiris (who recurs in *SB* VI 9224 as a 'released farmer' or *ἀπολύσιμος γεωργός*, who was eventually forced to take up the *praktoreia* by a centurion).<sup>54</sup>

Every year the state made grants of seed corn to the public farmers through *δημόσιοι σιτολόγοι* organised by toparchy and controlled by the *topogrammateus*.<sup>55</sup> *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3273 may suggest that by a certain point in

the first century the *sitologos* was a liturgy, and that the nominator to this post was the *epistrategos*; it is unfortunate that this text does not bear a date.<sup>56</sup> In this document, a tax collector petitioned the *epistrategos* against a mistake in the appointment to *sitologia* of a person who happened to have the same name as a wealthier candidate. Lewis however regarded this document as ‘proto-liturgic,’ because ‘its technical terminology and *modus operandi* are not yet fixed,’ and it does not fully conform to the stereotypes of liturgy in the following centuries.<sup>57</sup>

Some early documents relating to *sitologia* may be reminiscent of a liturgical context.<sup>58</sup> Among these, there is a lease of public land from Theadelphia, *P.Bad.* VI 170 of AD 54, where the ‘liturgic’ verb ἀποδείκνυμι, ‘to designate,’ is applied to a public *sitologos*.<sup>59</sup> *P.Strasb.* VII 962 preserves a list of the public *sitologoi* annually discharged in the *metropolis* of Oxyrhynchus (κατ’ ἔτος ἀπολυομένων σιτολόγων, ll. 2f), including the ones currently in office (νῦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, ll. 4f).<sup>60</sup> Unfortunately, this document is undated, but both the script and the presence of a φορολόγος—known so far only for the Augustan period—argue strongly for an early date.<sup>61</sup>

*P.Fouad* I 9, a fragment of a copy of an edict of the prefect C. Julius Postumus of AD 45–47, mentions public services and works (l. 5) which might have had something to do with compulsory services. *SB* XIV 11346, another fragmentary edict from the reign of Claudius, seems to hint to the exemption of soldiers from liturgies (ἀπολυομένων στρατιωτῶν ]ν λιτουρ[γίαν, U. 20f).

An Augustan papyrus, *BGU* IV 1159, indicates that as early as under Augustus some positions on the staff of the *strategos* may have been liturgical. This document is a private contract of συγχώρησις drawn up in Alexandria, apparently for the appointment of a clerk in the office of a *strategos*. In this text, a certain Zosimos, apparently a subordinate of an Alexandrian *strategos* called Ptolemaios, was elected as assistant *strategos* to carry out a specific task. The nomination for the post had the form of a private contract drawn up in an Alexandrian tribunal.<sup>62</sup> In this text, much of the terminology is reminiscent of a liturgical context. The term used to define Zosimos’ position is ἐξυπηρέτησιν (l. 7): the assistant of liturgists was often called ὑπηρέτης, βοηθός or γραμματεύς, and the term ὑπηρεσία was often used as a synonym of λειτουργία.<sup>63</sup> Zosimos is said to be working from the month of Thoth to the month of Choiak of the current year (l.12), and the first of Thoth normally marked the beginning of liturgies.<sup>64</sup> Moreover, the contract states explicitly that the office was ‘liturgic,’ by saying that Zosimos ὑπησχόληται ἢ λελιτούργηκεν ἐν τῇ στρατηγίᾳ (ll. 23f). The verb ὑπασχολέω occurs in an inscription from the reign of Ptolemy Alexander,

and indicates an official hired by another; the verb λειτουργέω may have already indicated compulsory service.<sup>65</sup> Last, the term ἐργατήαν (l. 21) may be compared to the known liturgy of ἐργασία, the performance of public works that usually lasted for two months.<sup>66</sup> To sum up, the document probably dealt with the post of *hyperetes* or assistant *strategos*, for which it may represent the earliest evidence in the Roman period. The terminology suggests that this post may have been already compulsory under Augustus, although a full system of liturgies was not yet in place.<sup>67</sup>

Thomas concluded that the beginning of the liturgical system went back to the Julio-Claudian period, and, as was first postulated by Wilcken, that the origin of liturgies was probably connected with the collection of revenues in cash and in grain.<sup>68</sup> This conclusion remains unchallenged. During his reign, Augustus seems to have employed his own network of freedmen and slaves in the collection of taxes and in other posts. Perhaps the fact that Augustus wanted to maintain a close control over the recruitment of public officials indicates that at this time different methods of recruitment of such officials were present in combination.<sup>69</sup>

## CORVÉES

The compulsory services of cultivation of public land (γεωργία) and work on the dikes (χωματικὰ ἔργα) existed in Egypt with no interruption from the Pharaonic to the Roman period. However, the Roman administration did not simply take over the existing procedures, but introduced substantial changes. The *georgia* under the Ptolemies had the character of a temporary, exceptional measure, while under Roman rule it was regularly and systematically applied.<sup>70</sup> Similarly, the principle of communal responsibility in the cultivation of vacant lots was already in force under Cleopatra; but it seems that only under Augustus did these compulsory assignments result in extra work or taxes, such as the ἐπιμερισμός, the ἐπιβολή and the ἐπίθεμα.<sup>71</sup>

Dike work was compulsory and salaried in the Ptolemaic period, and in the Roman period it became organised as a five-day corvée called πενθήμερος. Documents relating to the πενθήμερος appear quite suddenly in the early 40s AD.<sup>72</sup> This may be due to pure chance, but one cannot exclude the possibility that new regulations were introduced by Claudius after his accession in AD 41.

But how was dike work organised before then? Augustus introduced a capitation tax for the maintenance of the dikes, the so-called χωματικόν which was collected throughout Egypt at the rate of 6 drachmas 4 obols.<sup>73</sup> It was first believed that the *chomatikon* was the cash equivalent or the replacement of the *penthemeros*.<sup>74</sup> Foraboschi, on the other hand, suggested that it



was the *penthemeros* that was introduced as a substitute for the *chomatikon*, for the people who could not afford to pay the cash tax. He thought that the rate of tax was purposely set higher than the equivalent expenditure for five days of hired labour, as an incentive to perform the *corvée*, and an attempt to recruit manpower. The purpose was to fight the increasing ἀναχώρησις, whereby people abandoned the fields and the villages in order to avoid taxes and compulsory jobs. In sum, according to Foraboschi, the *chomatikon* was introduced soon after the Roman conquest, while the *penthemeros* was a later re-conversion of the tax into labour.<sup>75</sup>

The documents support the view that under Augustus dike work was compulsory and very tightly controlled, although it may have been organised differently in different areas. In a Herakleopolite papyrus of 25 BC, the elders of a village swear by the emperor to undertake the cleaning and repair of three canals, and acknowledge the receipt of state funding.<sup>76</sup> *BGU* XVI 2602 shows that in 14/13 BC dike work was not yet organised as a five-day *corvée*, as some public farmers complain to the *dioiketes* that they had been pressed into service for two days. In *P.Ryl.* IV 603 of 7 BC, a Roman official called Bassus wrote to two officials of Oxyrhynchus, Herakleides and Tryphon (most probably the *topogrammateus* and the *komogrammateus*) and urged them to have the work on the embankments finished.<sup>77</sup>

In addition to the known agricultural and irrigation *corvées*, there were other collateral compulsory services, such as, for instance, the surveillance (φυλακία) of the crops and the canals.<sup>78</sup> *P.Hib.* II 275 of the first century AD probably refers to guards of the threshing floor with the liturgic term 'designated' (ἀναδοθέντων), and *BGU* IV 1189.5f of ca. 1 BC<sup>79</sup> reports that the dike guards or δεκανοὶ χωμάτων of the village of Koma in the Herakleopolite risked the confiscation of their property for deserting their job. The compulsory services around the dikes may have followed a state development plan: an extract from a κόλλημα (perhaps a register of public services) of AD 30 preserves the sworn declaration of the farmer Harpaesis to plant mulberry trees on the dikes around 300 arouras of land near Tebtunis, and to water them five times a month, after receiving public funding from the imperial slave Phileros.<sup>80</sup> But a declaration on oath is no proof of liturgy in itself, and nothing excludes the possibility that this was a 'voluntary' job.

## POROS

In the Roman period the financial standing of an individual played a major role as the basis and the prerequisite for the appointment to compulsory services. The πόρος of a person was calculated on the basis of the property owned, equivalent

to the sum of the land and house property. The minimum wealth demanded for different offices probably changed from nome to nome, and was subject to variations according to the office in question.<sup>81</sup> The latest view is that the requirement of an established *poros* in order to serve in a liturgy was a Roman innovation.<sup>82</sup>

The mentions of *poros* in the late Ptolemaic period are scarce and doubtful,<sup>83</sup> and it seems likely that the *poros* started playing a role under Augustus. In *P.Ryl.* II 118 of 16/15 BC, an individual asks for permission to sell the land of some minors, claiming that he had no other *poros* to be confiscated, because his own land was already under custody.<sup>84</sup> In *BGU* IV 1189, of around 1 BC, Antaios the gymnasiarch of Bousiris wrote to the *strategos* of the Herakleopolite to complain that he was obliged to pay the public treasury on behalf of some dike guards who had deserted their job, while, as Antaios stressed, the expense could be paid from their *poros*, which consisted of houses, land, cattle and seed (ll. 11–13). In two declarations of *anachoresis* of AD 19/20, the relatives of the fugitive insisted on the fact that he possessed no *poros*.<sup>85</sup>

All that concerned the *poros* was under the control of the βιβλιοφύλακες of the βιβλιοθήκη ἐγκτήσεων, the registry of the property. The existence of this *bibliotheke* in towns and villages of the *chora* is documented from the Ptolemaic period, but it was in the Roman period that the registration and the control of the financial status became essential for the assignment of liturgies. It was probably under Augustus or Tiberius that these record-offices began to be moved from the villages to the nome capitals.<sup>86</sup>

In the Roman period, the persons liable to liturgies were called εὐποροί, εὐθετοί, ἐπιτήδειοι and εὐσχήμενες, all terms that in essence mean 'suitable' or 'honourable'.<sup>87</sup> It is possible that there existed lists of such people, drawn up locally, as is suggested by the reference to an error in the nomination to a liturgy, probably due to alphabetical listing, in *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3273 of the early Roman period. Similarly, in the late Ptolemaic or Augustan periods, the terms 'strong' and 'weak' acquired a financial connotation, so that ἀσθένεια came to signify 'financial exhaustion,' and κινδυνεύειν 'putting at risk one's fortune'.<sup>88</sup>

The people who had no *poros* were called ἄποροι. The earliest direct evidence for an official notification of ἄποροι appears in *P. Strasb.* VII 627 of AD 20 or 30.<sup>89</sup> A group of Oxyrhynchite notifications of *anachoresis* refer indirectly to an official registration of *aporoí* in AD 19/20.<sup>90</sup> In these documents, the family of the fugitive stated that he had no property liable to confiscation, and asked to be put in the official list of *aporoí*. According to Lewis, the *poros* of the fugitives was confiscated twenty days after their flight, otherwise all the damages had to be borne by the tax collectors. The deficits were also covered by a surtax that all had to pay and that was called μερισμὸς ἀπόρων.<sup>91</sup>

## TEMPLE LITURGIES

Some instances of the term *λειτουργία* occur in the context of the Egyptian temples, under both Ptolemaic and Roman rule, to indicate apparently annual services connected with the upkeep of the temples or with services to a deity.<sup>92</sup> An oath of temple-lamplighters of Oxyrhynchus, preserved in *P.Oxy.* XII 1453 of 29 BC, states explicitly something quite obvious, i.e. that there was no break in the annual temple services from Cleopatra to Augustus. Documents from the temple of Herakleopolis also show that from the point of view of the priests there was a substantial continuity in the sacrifices that they performed annually 'from the times of the queen' to the prefecture of Gaius Turranius in 7–4 BC.<sup>93</sup> *BGU* IV 1199 quotes an edict of Turranius of 4 BC, in which the prefect complained that too few of the priests (*τερεῖς*) who inherited temple services (*λειτουργῖαι*) each year, and too few of the *παστοφόροι* had been registered officially.<sup>94</sup>

Under Roman rule (and probably also before) priests were expected to take up services as much as everyone else: evidence shows that as early as under Augustus priests were not exempted from the *corvées*, such as the compulsory farming (see for instance the case of Harthothes son of Marres, priest and royal farmer in Augustan Theadelphia<sup>95</sup>), and may have become liable to other annual services as well, such as tax collection and *φυλακία*. This may have continued the existing tradition. *P.Mich.* V 233 of AD 25 was usually cited as the proof of the existence of compulsory service in the early Roman period. This document is the oath of four priests who served as sluice guards (*ἀφεσιφύλακες*) in the temple of Tebtunis. The oath, however, is no proof of liturgy in itself.<sup>96</sup>

In conclusion, it seems likely that under Roman rule priests were liable to compulsory services, possibly to a greater extent than before. However, as Glare suggested, liability to liturgies may have varied from temple to temple. Due to the lack of a uniform system, both poll tax and liturgies were probably directed at some priests as individual Roman subjects rather than at the temples themselves. The fact that there were no universal rules concerning the priestly privileges and exemptions might also explain the frequent complaints and problems over the matter between priests and local officials.<sup>97</sup>

## REQUISITIONS

In the Roman period there is evidence for many irregular *ad hoc* requisitions, which, according to Thomas, were no less compulsory than what we call liturgies.<sup>98</sup> A system of requisitioning transport called *ἀγγαρεία* was in use under the Persian empire, and survived in kingdoms that formerly belonged to it, such as the Seleucid kingdom and Ptolemaic Egypt.<sup>99</sup> The *angareia* was similar to a

liturgy in that it was compulsory and generally paid (often underpaid); its peculiarity was that it requisitioned goods in kind rather than the time or the private wealth of the person. From Ptolemaic to Roman Egypt these requisitions extended to the compulsory lease or sale of cattle and boats to the state, the maintenance of officials travelling in the country, and the sale of grain for military purposes at a price fixed by the state.<sup>100</sup>

According to Lewis, the earliest evidence of compulsory *angareia* occurs in AD 19, when Germanicus, during his visit to Egypt, issued an edict against the abusive requisitions in his honour.<sup>101</sup> A survey of the documents, however, shows that some forms of *angareia* continued from Ptolemaic to Roman period, while others were introduced under Augustus or Tiberius. The requisitions for Germanicus are reminiscent of the late Ptolemaic and Augustan references to contributions for the visit (παρουσία) of public officials, and the edict that Octavian issued as *triumvir* safeguarded Roman veterans against all kinds of forced hospitality, by stating that *neq(ue) [...] in domo eorum divertendi em[a]ndiq(ue) · causamque [ab] ea quem detuci place.*<sup>102</sup>

In the Ptolemaic period, the wages of the soldiers was paid from requisitions, generally in fodder or barley.<sup>103</sup> Requisitions of grain for the army continued and probably increased in the Roman period. In *BGU XVI 2644* of 4 BC someone writes to Athenodoros that all the ships were pressed into *angareia* by the legion, so that it was difficult to transport wheat, and that many people had somehow modified the price of wheat for the legion.<sup>104</sup> A receipt from the reign of Tiberius refers to a tax called μονοδεσμία, which literally meant 'one bundle.' This might possibly have been a precedent for the contribution in kind to the army that developed into the *annona militaris*.<sup>105</sup> The contributions for the food supply of the Roman army could also be converted to a quota in cash, as is shown by receipts for τιμή χόρτου (or πυροῦ, ἄράκου, χλωρῶν) that one finds in the Roman period.<sup>106</sup>

Among the requisitions an important role was played by the supply of clothes and above all cloaks (ἱματισμός), which was principally, but not exclusively, for the soldiers of the Roman army.<sup>107</sup> Roman documents also suggest that there were requisitions of weapons built by locals: according to Philo, the prefect Flaccus in AD 32 carried out requisitions of weapons every three years in the *chora*. It is plausible that the local production of weapons for official purposes began as early as under the Ptolemies.<sup>108</sup>

Augustus also continued the requisition of transport, such as ships, carts, donkeys or camels, which existed in Egypt as well as in other provinces from the Hellenistic period. The edict of Sotidius Strabo in Pisidia (Anatolia) shows that accurate regulations on prices for transport were issued by Augustus and perfected by Tiberius. In Egypt, the post of donkey-driver was

a compulsory service certainly by the reign of Tiberius, and probably under Augustus too.<sup>109</sup> Augustus (with some possible precedents under Julius Caesar) took the postal service from Egypt as a model and imported it in Italy, where there was no regular postal service before his reign. The process began with the requisition of public and imperial messengers, and of logistical support from private individuals and communities on a random basis, such as free lodging, *gratuita mansio* or *σταθμός*. Augustus and Tiberius systematised the requisition of transportation by fixing rates and prices. During the early Roman period, the establishment of a sophisticated network of roads, inns, relay stations and vehicles was the result of the joint effort of private entrepreneurs, public officials, imperial servants, and the army.<sup>110</sup>

The *angareia* was probably something intermediary between a liturgical service and a fiscal imposition. So far it has been assumed that it had an irregular, *ad hoc* character, not only under the Ptolemies but also under Roman rule. However, it is likely that, as early as the reign of Augustus, it followed an official schedule that established prices and dates for the requisitions. As was the case with other compulsory services, also the *angareia* was probably organised in a more efficient way after the Roman conquest.

## CONCLUSION

A major obstacle to an understanding of the beginning of the liturgical system is the lack of early references to compulsion in the public administration. Except for cases of complaint or request for exemption, the documents do not tell us whether an official had been pressed into service or only 'invited' to take up a post. The documents surveyed in this chapter have suggested that, although the liturgical principle existed from the Ptolemaic period in the administration of the Greek cities and in military settlements in the *chora*, under Roman rule liturgies underwent both a qualitative and a quantitative change. They gradually increased in number and applications, and assumed a new significance as the means by which Rome organised the administration of the new province.

The question when the compulsory services became a full, coherent liturgical system is still open. It seems clear that this system was the final result of a gradual process whose first step was taken in the Augustan period. **It is likely that under Augustus there was a shortage of personnel in the provincial administration, which caused a significant immigration of military and civil officials, imperial freedmen and slaves who were sent directly from Italy to take up different posts in Egypt. This shortage of administrators may have been the major stimulus for the creation of a system of liturgical services.**

Liturgies and poll tax were the most important features of the Roman rule, and were based on one and the same classification of the people according to social status. In other words, the social classes that were exempted from poll tax were also immune from *corvées*, and similarly immunity from *aggareia* went often together with fiscal privileges. In my view, it is likely that determined classes of the population had privileges as concerns both poll tax and *corvées* from the Ptolemaic period, and that the first Roman emperors confirmed and enhanced these divisions.<sup>111</sup> Naturally, under Roman rule the privileged classes became those from which the candidates for city magistracies (*archai/honores*) and liturgical posts (*leitourgiai/munera*) were recruited.

The evidence suggests that the regular registration of the individual *poroi* first acquired a decisive role under Augustus. Augustus probably encouraged the private ownership of goods because the development of liturgies required large numbers of eligible property-owners. In the early Roman period, private land seems to have been in the hands of Romans, Alexandrians, Greek *katoikoi*, *metropolitai*, and members of the gymnasial class. In return for fiscal privileges, these classes were expected to perform various local administrative duties, and the gymnasial class above all seems to have played an important political role. The spread of the liturgies runs parallel with the evolution of the Egyptian villages and *metropoleis* into *poleis* of the Greek type, through the so-called process of municipalisation. In fact, liturgical public offices in the nome capitals were modelled on their counterparts in the Greek cities, especially in Alexandria.<sup>112</sup>

It may be useful to set the Egyptian evidence for liturgies against the information from other provinces. According to Lewis, the liturgical system in Egypt 'was an integral element of the Roman provincial administration under the emperors, fairly representative of the general tenor of life in the provinces of the Roman empire.'<sup>113</sup> In turn, while in the Greek cities of the East liturgies existed in the reign of Augustus, it would be odd if in Egypt they were begun much later. The documents examined in this chapter support the view that in Egypt liturgies were reorganised and increasingly applied from the reign of Augustus onwards, first as *ad hoc* measures and only subsequently as an organic system. The use in Egypt of liturgical officials corresponded to practice elsewhere, especially after the Severan period, when the process of municipalisation achieved its fullest development.<sup>114</sup>

*This page intentionally left blank*

# The Beginning of the Census

## INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I address the questions when the Roman provincial census was first introduced, and to what extent it derived from forms of census that existed under the Ptolemies. I shall begin by comparing the purpose, organisation and technical terminology of the Ptolemaic and the Roman census, and then I shall examine the documentation that might be connected with the earliest known censuses under Augustus, including declarations of households, population lists and tax receipts. This investigation aims to answer the question whether Augustus introduced the census along with the poll tax soon after the annexation of Egypt, as he did in other provinces, or whether he preserved existing forms of census.

Our understanding of the Augustan census is hindered by the scarcity of documents. In this chapter I shall try to find possible reasons for this lack of documents. Up to a certain point in the reign of Augustus or Tiberius, for instance, the census may have been based on oral reports to officials rather than on written self-declarations; in addition, the survival of the documents may have suffered from the Ptolemaic and early Roman practice of using waste papyri to make mummy *cartonnage*.

The scarcity of the material may be also explained by thinking that, both in the Ptolemaic and in the Augustan census, only certain categories of the population had to submit written declarations in order to achieve specific privileges. In other words, the census may have been connected with the scrutiny for privileged status or *epikrisis*, an examination through which people obtained access to categories with fiscal, legal and social privileges. The comparison between early Roman census-declarations and contemporary *epikrisis*-declarations will suggest that, originally, the counting of



the population (the census) and its social classification (the *epikrisis*) were part of the same bureaucratic operation. This will raise two further questions: whether the social classification of the inhabitants of Egypt was first introduced under Ptolemaic or Roman rule, and when this classification was connected with the exemption from or the reduction on the payment of poll tax.

### PTOLEMAIC AND ROMAN CENSUS

For the Ptolemaic period, we do not have evidence for any operation of counting people, but the presence of tax receipts relating to capitation charges such as the salt tax (άλική), and of written declarations of households implies that some form of census took place.<sup>1</sup> It is believed that this started during the reign of Ptolemy I or II, though precedents for the Ptolemaic census, as for the administration in general, may be found in Persian, Macedonian and Athenian practices.<sup>2</sup> The latest view is that Augustus introduced the Roman provincial census in Egypt (as well as in other provinces) and that this census borrowed some of the existing Ptolemaic bureaucratic practices, although it also imported elements from the Roman Republican background.<sup>3</sup> In addition, both in Egypt and in other provinces, the provincial census and poll tax had an unpopular ideological connotation of subjection to the Roman emperor.<sup>4</sup>

The primary purpose of the Ptolemaic census was the levy of the salt tax, the άλική, levied from all the population. The Roman provincial census served to raise the provincial poll tax in cash called λαογραφία, that was introduced by Augustus soon after the conquest. The Ptolemaic *halike* and its collateral obol tax were low-rate taxes paid by both men and women, while the *laographia* was more substantial (12 drachmas per year minimum) and was confined to the male population aged 14 to 62 or 65.<sup>5</sup> The purpose of the census in Egypt, under both Ptolemaic and Roman rule, differed substantially from that of the Republican census in Italy, which served to recruit for the legions and to establish voting rights at the *comitia centuriata* through the assessment of the wealth of the citizens that determined the membership to a *classis*.<sup>6</sup>

The secondary purpose of both the Ptolemaic and the Roman census was to keep a record of the people liable to compulsory services such as the *corvée* works on the canals, and to extract other capitation taxes, for instance on trades. For this reason it was always essential to declare the occupation of the individual and his family.<sup>7</sup> The fact that under Roman rule the census registered males and females, children and slaves may suggest that, from the Augustan period at least, behind the census there was some form of demographic consciousness, beyond the purpose of raising taxes and *corvées*.<sup>8</sup>

An analysis of the terminology lends further support to the view that census and poll tax were two closely connected institutions. In the Ptolemaic period the census was designated by the term *laographia*, which meant literally ‘registration of people (λαοί),’ but also indicated the actual registers of taxpayers. Under Augustus, the term *laographia* came to designate also the poll tax itself. Possibly, people gradually came to call the poll tax ‘census.’ The official Latin term that designated the provincial poll tax was *tributum capitis*, ‘head tax,’ whose closest Greek parallel may be ἐπικεφάλαιον.<sup>9</sup>

From the organisational point of view, the census at Rome and the Egyptian census presented substantial differences. The Roman Republican census was based on oral *professiones* on oath that the *paterfamilias* took in the presence of municipal officials or of the *ensor* at Rome,<sup>10</sup> while in Egypt the census took the form of written declarations of households, population lists and tax registers, which were deposited in village and city offices.<sup>11</sup> Although Egypt distinguished itself with its tradition of writing, it is likely that written declarations were restricted to urban and priestly élites.<sup>12</sup> It is entirely possible that, both in the Ptolemaic period and at the beginning of the Roman rule, written declarations had not yet been widely brought in, because of the excessive expense that this would involve.<sup>13</sup>

An aspect of continuity was the language of the census declarations: Ptolemaic declarations were written either in Greek or in Demotic Egyptian,<sup>14</sup> and Greek continued to be the language of administration after the Roman conquest, while Latin seems to have been limited to a small number of declarations by Roman citizens.<sup>15</sup>

As regards the formal layout of the census declarations, the surviving Ptolemaic declarations do not show a consistent wording; under Roman rule too there seems to have been nothing fixed like the *forma censualis* reported by Ulpian with reference to other provinces. It is likely that fixed formulas were imposed from the beginning for the Latin declarations of Roman citizens, while the census returns of the Graeco-Egyptian population became more and more standardised after the Roman conquest, although there is evidence that local variations always existed, probably due to Ptolemaic bureaucratic traditions that the Roman administration did not eliminate.<sup>16</sup> Generally, however, the typical ἀπογραφή was written in the first person and began with the verb ἀπογράφομαι. It listed people by name, gender, status or profession, and age, and was concluded by an oath by the emperor, whose standard formula at Oxyrhynchus stated that ‘no outsider, Roman, Alexandrian, Egyptian, freedman or anyone else is in my house except those listed above.’<sup>17</sup> The imperial oath was an aspect of innovation that Augustus

imported, which had no parallels (so far as the extant evidence shows) in Ptolemaic declarations.

The local officials involved in the Egyptian census remained the same from Ptolemaic to Roman rule, while the top officials changed. The Ptolemaic census was ordered by an edict of the king, while under Roman rule this was done through an edict of the prefect, after which people had roughly two years at their disposition to present a declaration.<sup>18</sup> At local level, both in the Ptolemaic and in the early Roman periods the key official who carried out the census was the *komogrammateus*.<sup>19</sup> The declarations for census, ἐπίκρισις and ἀναχώρησις, as well as the notifications of birth and death could be addressed to the *komogrammateus* and the *topogrammateus* until the mid-first century AD, when they were addressed to the *strategos*, the *basilikos grammateus*, and the *laographos*, separately or as a group.<sup>20</sup>

The census returns were collected from the villages, then brought to the toparchy, and subsequently to the μερίς and the nome capital, where they were deposited in the public library. Then, the tax lists drawn up from the census records went to some office in Alexandria, perhaps the καταλογεῖου.<sup>21</sup> This procedure probably remained roughly the same from the Ptolemaic to the Roman period. As regards the method of collecting census declarations, the disproportion of the evidence in favour of the cities suggests that in the Ptolemaic period two methods existed, possibly in combination: while the cities had established offices, where the people could produce written declarations, in the *chora* travelling officials collected the demographic data through house-by-house inspections (κατ' οἰκίαν) during the tax round after the harvest.<sup>22</sup> This duality of methods probably continued into the Roman period, when similar inspections on the ground were the basis of the land survey and the registration of the cattle.<sup>23</sup>

In the Ptolemaic census some people were counted separately and were assigned fiscal privileges: the registers κατ' ἔθνος, for instance, listed separately soldiers, workers in the large estates of government officials, foreigners or ἀλλόφυλοι, and those categorised as 'away from home.' Furthermore, specific ἔθνη, such as public officials, teachers, athletes, artists and priests seem to have been partially or totally exempted from capitation taxes.<sup>24</sup> The *laographia* register *P.Oxy.* IX 1210<sup>25</sup>, of the first century BC or AD, refers explicitly to immunities from the poll tax granted to the heads of households who maintained the elderly members of their family, and to the officials who carried out the census (e.g., the *komogrammateus* and *topogrammateus*); in l.10 the adverb συνηθως, 'customarily,' suggests that this was a known practice.<sup>26</sup> According to Thompson, in the Ptolemaic period the term *ethnos* indicated the profession or status, and consequently until the Roman period there was

no connection between fiscal privilege and ethnic origin.<sup>27</sup> La'ada's analysis of the ethnic designations in Demotic documents from Ptolemaic Egypt has lent further support to the view that, by the 220s BC if not before, ethnics developed into occupational or status designations. In addition, he noticed that the occupations that were treated preferentially seem to have been closely connected with the military.<sup>28</sup> From the Ptolemaic period, therefore, ethnics concealed status distinctions, while the 'real' ethnicity of a person did not play any real role in determining his or her fiscal, legal and social status.

The citizens of Alexandria enjoyed fiscal privileges since under Ptolemaic rule. A decree of Cleopatra and Caesarion of 41 BC safeguarded the privileges of the farmers from the city. In his letter to the Alexandrians of AD 41, Claudius says openly that the Alexandrian privileges that had been established under the Ptolemies continued under the Roman emperors.<sup>29</sup> It is possible that Alexandrian citizens did not pay some capitation taxes in the Ptolemaic period, and that Augustus continued these privileges in order to gain the support of this élite. This evidence casts some doubt on Augustus' claim that he spared Alexandria because of his admiration for Alexander the Great, and to do a favour to his friend and teacher, the Alexandrian philosopher Areius.<sup>30</sup>

It is unclear whether the Roman census in Egypt registered everyone, men and women, Romans, Alexandrians and Egyptians, or only certain categories of people. According to Bagnall and Frier, the Roman census registered everyone; on the other hand, Rathbone thought that Alexandrian and Roman citizens underwent separate registrations. It is indeed possible that the city of Alexandria had an independent way of registering its citizens, and this may have been true of the other Greek cities of Egypt as well. However, the evidence is insufficient to reach any conclusion.<sup>31</sup> The census of Roman citizens in Egypt took place independently too, as seems to indicate the census declaration submitted in AD 47/8 by a legionary veteran of Egyptian origin, Lucius Pompeius Niger. This declaration was written in Latin in the style required by Roman law, and listed a number of items of Niger's property with their estimated value in Roman sesterces.<sup>32</sup> It remains open whether the census of Roman citizens took place totally independently from the census of the Egyptian population, or whether the two could somehow overlap. It may have been a coincidence that AD 47/48 was a Roman census-year and also an Egyptian census-year.

A fundamental difference between the Ptolemaic and the Roman census was the relationship between the census and the declaration for property. Under both the Republic and the empire, the census of Roman citizens was the declaration on oath and the monetary evaluation of the individual property of

Roman citizens in Italy and abroad, including movable and immovable goods, precious objects and slaves.<sup>33</sup> In Egypt, the census registered the people with their houses but not their land, which underwent separate registration.<sup>34</sup> It was hypothesised that the data from the census and from the land cadastres were aggregated at a later stage, to calculate the *πόρος* or financial standing of every individual, which was the basis for liability to compulsory services.<sup>35</sup> In my view, however, the census of the population, the census of property and the registration of privileged classes through the *epikrisis* were closely connected operations, at least in the first century AD. It may be significant that in the first century AD some censuses of property fell in the same year as the *epikrisis* of some privileged classes.<sup>36</sup> Census and property records were deposited together in the *δημοσία βιβλιοθήκη*, until the creation, possibly under the Flavians, of a separate registry for property, the *βιβλιοθήκη ἐγκτήσεων*.

It seems that for the first time under Roman rule the control of the population extended to the obligation to notify births and deaths. The earliest known notification of death is *P.Oxy.* IV 826 (descr.) of AD 2/3, and thus it is possible that Augustus introduced the obligation to notify deaths in order to inherit property.<sup>37</sup> In Italy Augustus introduced the registration of birth for the legitimate children of Roman citizens, and it is likely that he introduced notifications of births also in Egypt. It is important to remember that, both in Italy and in Egypt, registrations of birth were in practice applications for privileged status, in which upper-class parents requested similar status for their offspring.<sup>38</sup>

According to the most recent hypothesis, suggested by Bagnall and Frier<sup>39</sup>, the Ptolemaic population lists were updated regularly every year, while the Roman administration introduced periodicity, every seven years under Augustus, every fourteen years from AD 19/20 onwards. The figures of seven and fourteen do not seem to come from the Roman Republican background, where the temporal unit of the census was the *lustrum* of five years. The figure of fourteen for the census cycle has been explained<sup>40</sup> in connection with the minimum age of liability to poll tax, but this does not account for the origin of the seven-year interval.

In other provinces too, the levy of the poll tax probably required some regular check of the population, but no periodical pattern is apparent—except a fifteen-year interval between the first two provincial censuses in Gaul, in 27 and in 12 BC.<sup>41</sup> Scholars often attempted to find evidence of a ‘universal’ census throughout the empire, in order to explain the mention in Luke of a first registration under Augustus that involved *πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη*, but the evidence suggested that provincial censuses in different provinces were taken at different times.<sup>42</sup> An empire-wide census of Roman citizens was taken by Claudius in AD 47/48, although it may have had an antiquarian, propagandistic purpose.<sup>43</sup>

Even if unreliable, imprecise or completely fictional, however, Luke's statement would have been more justified if the practice of taking censuses had already been 'universal' in Augustus' time. It is not impossible that Augustus took a multi-provincial census at the beginning of his reign: after completing the census of Roman citizens in 28 BC, in the years 27 to 25 BC he held provincial censuses in Gaul, probably in Spain, and, as I shall argue, possibly also in Egypt.<sup>44</sup>

## THE BEGINNING OF THE CENSUS IN EGYPT

What is the evidence for the Ptolemaic census? Some passages in the third book of the Maccabees report that Ptolemy IV Philopator took a census or λαογραφία of the Jewish population of Egypt. The term *laographia* occurs also in some Ptolemaic papyri, such as *P.Ryl.* IV 667 fr. 2.4 of the second century BC, *P.Tebt.* I 103 (= *W.Chr.* 288) and 121, of either 94 or 61 BC, and *P.Tebt.* I 189 of the first century BC. Although in these texts, *laographia* seems to indicate only a registration of people, not the poll-tax—in *P.Ryl.* IV 667 fr. 2.4 the term is associated with a sum in bronze talents, which may have been the funds raised for taking the registration—Wallace concluded from this evidence that both the capitation tax and the 14-year census were not a Roman innovation, but were introduced by Ptolemy IV Philopator around 220 BC.<sup>45</sup>

According to Préaux some form of census existed even before Philopator. This hypothesis was based on a document of the third century BC, *W.Chr.* 66 = *P.Petrie* III 59b, which refers to a registration of σώματα ἐρσενικά and ἕρα ἔθνη. It is also worth noting that two royal edicts of Ptolemy II Philadelphos, *C.Ord.Ptol.* 21 and 22, ordered a census of livestock and of local people through sworn declarations of households in Syria and Phoenicia (then assimilated to the administration of Egypt) in 260 BC. This evidence suggests that censuses of property were held, perhaps irregularly, from the beginning of the Ptolemaic period.<sup>46</sup>

In the course of a recent survey of the Greek and Demotic evidence for the Ptolemaic census, Thompson found two declarations that were submitted from the same household for two subsequent censuses, at an interval of fourteen years. She also found that the technical terms ἀπογραφὴ (τῶν σωμάτων), ἀπογράφομαι and κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφὴ existed in Ptolemaic census records too. Nonetheless, Thompson regards this evidence as too little to allow for general conclusions, and prefers to think that the Ptolemaic census had an irregular character.<sup>47</sup>

Grenfell and Hunt approached the problem of the beginning of the Roman census when they noticed a fourteen-year periodicity in the pattern of

survival of the census returns; their conclusion was that a cycle of censuses took place every fourteen years starting from 10/9 BC.<sup>48</sup> Later, Wallace connected the census with the introduction of the poll tax, and from a reference in *P.Oxy.* IV 711 to persons registered before the sixth year of Augustus, together with the earliest evidence of poll-tax receipts, he was able to prove that the poll tax and a form of registration of people were in existence before 24/3 BC.<sup>49</sup>

Recently, Bagnall reassembled the two halves of a census declaration submitted in AD 12 by Harthotes son of Marres, royal farmer and priest at Theadelphia.<sup>50</sup> This discovery was significant because it proved that a registration was held in AD 12, and it also suggested that there was a deliberate choice of a seven-year interval between this census and the following one, probably in AD 19/20.<sup>51</sup> Another seven-year interval was found in a register of katoikic land that mentioned compilations of records in AD 4/5 and 12.<sup>52</sup> Bagnall found some evidence for registrations or census declarations in the census-years back to 10 BC, except for 4/3 BC, and thus, he suggested that under Augustus the fourteen-year cycle was preceded by a seven-year cycle dating back as far as 11/10 BC.<sup>53</sup> He concluded that the poll tax was introduced soon after the conquest, perhaps as early as 27 BC, but that the full seven-year census started around 11/10 BC. During the gap between these two dates, the Roman administration used the existing registers, updating them through annual declarations.<sup>54</sup>

However, some points remain unclear. In the first place, it seems odd that Augustus waited to take a general census until 11/10 BC, as in 27 BC he held censuses in provinces even less bureaucratised (at least, so we think!) than Egypt. In other regions, census and *tributum* seem to have been the first two measures that followed the annexation of an allied kingdom as a province.<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, if Augustus introduced a new poll tax, he presumably needed to record all the people liable to it, including, for instance, the 14-year old males who entered the registers for the first time. These considerations suggest that Augustus probably took some form of census soon after the conquest. Further problems are that a seven-year census of all the population of Egypt seems a very frequent census even for modern standards; moreover, it is unclear why Tiberius should have changed the seven-year pattern of censuses into a fourteen-year one—a revival of a Ptolemaic tradition?

A survey of the Augustan documents supports the view that some registration of people took place before 24 BC. *P.Oxy.* IV 711 of 15/14 BC refers to some mistake in the registration of people—through *laographia*—before the sixth year of Augustus, that is, before 24 BC. A recently-published papyrus from the Benaki Museum in Athens is a receipt for *υποκείμενον λοογραφίας*, probably a contribution for the funding of the operations of census,

that the public farmers of Bakchias paid to an official called ὁ πρὸς τῆι λαογραφίᾳ of the Arsinoite nome, in the fifth year of an unnamed ruler, either Augustus or Tiberius. This document may indicate that a census was carried out either in 25 BC or in AD 19.<sup>56</sup> Among the doubtful pieces of evidence that might have to do with the census there is an unpublished list of persons and sums of money from Hawara, dated in the fourth year of Augustus.<sup>57</sup>

A group of documents clusters around the years 19 to 17 BC. *P.Grenf.* I 45 and 46 (= *W.Chr.* 200 A and B) are two ἀπογραφαί issued in 19 and 18 BC by a royal farmer of the Arsinoite, which may have been either census or annual self-declarations of farmers that served to exact the land tax in kind.<sup>58</sup> To 18/17 BC are also dated the tax-lists *P.Fay.* 231–234.

Another group of documents dates from 12 to 10 BC. *BGU* IV 1196 and XVI 2672 are lists of priests of the temple of Bousiris in the Herakleopolite; *P.Oxy.* IV 815–817 are lists of names and sums of eight drachmas, perhaps instalments of *laographia*. From 4/3 BC comes the order from the prefect Turranius for a census of priests. In AD 12 was issued *SB* XVIII 13236 = *P.Haw.* 244R, a list of names and figures of eight to ten drachmas, perhaps instalments of *laographia*. Tax-lists however should be taken with caution, as they may or may not be connected with the poll tax.

The distribution of this material may suggest that some forms of listing of the population for taxation purposes took place shortly after the Roman conquest, around 26/25 BC, and that other forms of control followed around 19/18 BC and 12–10 BC. The interval between these registrations seems to have been seven years, and thus it is tempting to hypothesise that the seven-year cycle of censuses of the Egyptian population began around 26/25 BC. The clustering of the data over a two- or three-year period is explicable if we imagine a first stage in which the raw data were collected and a second when registers were compiled, so that the total time allowed for declarations from the date of the census edict extended to three years.<sup>59</sup> For the last four registrations of people in the reign of Augustus, from 11/10 up to AD 11/12 we have the evidence already collected by Bagnall.

The hypothesis that some form of census began soon after the conquest clashes with the dearth of declarations, which may be attributed to the general lack of Augustan material.<sup>60</sup> This lack of evidence, however, would be even more difficult to explain, if we assumed with Bagnall and Rathbone that before 11/10 BC the Roman administration kept the old public records, updating them annually through declarations. It is hard to think that, soon after the conquest, written declarations were submitted every year and by all: it would have been too expensive and time-consuming.<sup>61</sup>



One could hypothesise that the number of papyri found in the excavations may be less than expected because of the Ptolemaic practice of forming mummy *cartonnage* from waste paper. It is notable that in the Roman period, when this practice stopped, the written material increases. Under Augustus, however, this practice was probably still in existence, which is suggested by the numerous Augustan documents found in the *cartonnage* of animal and human mummies, especially in the Herakleopolite.<sup>62</sup>

However, there might have been other reasons for the lack of early census declarations. From the Ptolemaic period, a significant part of the census may have been conducted orally, through annual house-to-house inspections, or through the communal registration of large groups of people, by using, for instance, the lists of public farmers that were drawn for the annual loan of state seed corn.<sup>63</sup> It is also worth noting that most of the earliest declarations are connected with temples and priests, possibly because the practice of writing gravitated around the temples, which were centres of literacy and archives.<sup>64</sup>

Another possibility is that the evidence for the earliest censuses was not lost, but less widespread than assumed. The early census may have involved some specific categories of people at different steps, rather than everybody at the same time: perhaps, only certain categories of people could or had to submit written self-declarations, in order to gain some fiscal privileges. But which were these categories? In order to answer this question it is necessary to look at the relationship between the census and the scrutiny for privileged status or ἐπίκρισις.

## CENSUS AND EPIKRISIS

It is common knowledge that in the Roman period the census registered the liability to taxation and to liturgical service, while the *epikrasis* was an examination undergone by a limited section of the population who applied for privileged status. Augustus may have introduced a new classification of the population according to personal status, which was connected with a different legal and fiscal treatment. The population of Egypt was divided into three categories: Roman citizens (*cives Romani*), Alexandrian citizens (in Roman legal terms, *peregrini*) and Egyptians (in a condition somehow lower than *peregrini*). This broad distinction was refined by granting fiscal privileges to the local Hellenised classes, i.e., the κάτοικοι, the inhabitants of the μητροπόλεις, and the inner urban élite of the people who attended the gymnasium, the so-called οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γυμνασίου. The Egyptians, at the bottom, paid the full rate for poll tax, the μητροπολίται, the κάτοικοι and the gymnasial class paid about half the normal rate, while the Roman and Alexandrian citizens were totally exempted.<sup>65</sup>

As regards the *katoikoi*, it is proven that they enjoyed privileged status both under the Ptolemies and under Augustus, and that, for this reason, their number was kept under control.<sup>66</sup> Documents from the Arsinoite refer to a privileged class called ἀριθμός of 6475 *katoikoi* or *Hellenes*. Montevicchi and Canducci thought that this group might have been Cleopatra's royal guard, which was converted after Actium to a *numerus* (hence the name *arithmos*) of the Roman army, but it is more likely that it was a *numerus clausus* of owners of katoikic land. Lewis suggested that Augustus created the *arithmos* to keep control over the Arsinoite *katoikoi*, while Montevicchi thought that it was created under Tiberius or later. It is also possible that the figure of 6475 existed only on paper, rather than in real life, and originated from a post-Augustan registration to which later documents refer.<sup>67</sup> Numbered groups of soldiers existed in the Ptolemaic period: *BGU VIII* 1749.8, 12 and 1750.4, [5], for instance, mention a body of 408 μάχιμοι Θηβαῖοι πεντάρουροι who garrisoned the Herakleopolite in 64/63 BC. Continuity is evident also from the survival of the ethnic designation Μακεδών, probably connected with the ownership of katoikic land, in twenty-four Augustan documents.<sup>68</sup>

Another early piece of evidence for a class-distinction may be *BGUXVI* 2577, a tax-register assigned to the 20s BC, which listed *katoikoi* and Greeks separately from Egyptians.<sup>69</sup> *P.Oxy.* IV 711 mentions a group of people registered for *laographia* (λαογραφούμενοι) as something different from the youths entering the gymnasial class (ἐφηβευκότες) with reference to the time before 24 BC. It is likely that, since the gymnasium existed from the Ptolemaic period, the status distinction between Egyptian λαοί and Greek ἔφηβοι was also in existence in the Ptolemaic period.

A prerequisite for privileged status under Augustus was residence in a city. However, the distinction between citizens of Alexandria and Egyptians of the *chora* existed in the Ptolemaic period too, as is indicated by the reference to those ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως in an edict of Cleopatra and Caesarion (*C.Ord.Ptol.* 75/76) of 41 BC.<sup>70</sup> The population list *P.Wisc.* II 46.34 seems to refer to some πολ( in 22/21 BC.<sup>71</sup> It is commonly assumed that Augustus invented the privileged class of the *metropolitai*, and granted to such class a reduction on poll tax.<sup>72</sup> Montevicchi considered *OGIS* II 709 of AD 1 as the earliest attestation of an official distinction between Egyptians (ἀπὸ τοῦ νομοῦ) and Greeks (ἀπὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως).<sup>73</sup> In some nomes, the *metropolitai* were called ὀκτάδραχμοι (payers of 8 drachmas for *laographia*) in others δεκάδραχμοι or δωδεκάδραχμοι. In my view, these local variations could have hardly been introduced under Roman rule, and probably derived from the Ptolemaic period.<sup>74</sup>

Within the hereditary élite of *metropolitai* there was another hereditary élite of people called οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γυμνασίου, ‘gymnasial class’ in modern scholarship. The gymnasial class paid poll tax at the same reduced rate as the other Hellenised élites, but apparently had a more prominent political role, providing officials for the administration. It has been hypothesised that membership of the gymnasial class came to be registered in lists under Augustus, when the institution of the gymnasium began to be ‘transferred’ from the villages to the nome capitals.<sup>75</sup> Indeed, there is abundant evidence that a registration or γραφή of the gymnasial class was drawn at Oxyrhynchus in AD 4/5<sup>76</sup>, although the expression οἱ ἀπὸ or ἐκ τοῦ γυμνασίου occurs in some Ptolemaic documents as well. In conclusion, it is possible that the gymnasial class existed and had some privileges before Augustus, and that the Roman conquest increased them and made them regular through official registrations of this class.<sup>77</sup>

Some form of scrutiny for privileged status was in existence in the Ptolemaic period. An *epikrisis* of land and buildings and officials called ἐπικριταί are documented as early as 250 BC.<sup>78</sup> According to Montevicchi, the Ptolemaic *epikrisis* was a judicial proceeding concerning buildings and land, totally unconnected with fiscal status.<sup>79</sup> It must be noted that, in the Augustan period too, the *epikrisis* or scrutiny of status was often based on the assessment of the land owned by an individual.<sup>80</sup>

As some documents seem to witness, during the reign of Augustus one or more registrations of priests took place. *BGU* IV 1196 and *BGU* XVI 2672 of around 11 BC are two lists or two fragments of the same list of priests from the temple of Bousiris. In 4/3 BC, the prefect Gaius Turranius ordered an *epikrisis* of priests, which probably introduced some modifications in the organisation of, or the access to, the priestly categories.<sup>81</sup> In AD 12 there may have been another *epikrisis* of privileged categories, including priests. Possibly, the declaration of the priest and royal farmer Harthotes son of Marres of AD 12 belonged to a specific *epikrisis* rather to the general census of the Egyptian population.

It is striking that the earliest documents of the census and the *epikrisis* resemble each other to the point that they can be easily confused. According to Hombert and Préaux, in early Roman documents the term ἐπίκρισις did not yet refer specifically to the examination of status, but indicated the census, as did the term ἀπογραφή. The overlapping of the meaning of these two terms, though, is attested as late as the third century AD.<sup>82</sup> The form of the earliest census- and *epikrisis*- declarations is remarkably similar,<sup>83</sup> and the individuals who appear in the earliest census returns seem to have been all members of privileged categories, for instance priests or inhabitants of nome capitals, i.e., the categories that would submit *epikrisis* returns.<sup>84</sup>

It is possible that some documents that were originally interpreted as evidence for the provincial census referred to *epikriseis* of specific categories. *P.Oxy.* II 288.35 states specifically that an *epikrasis* took place at Oxyrhynchus in AD 11. This may have applied only to the people in this specific *metropolis*, rather than to all the Egyptian population. Augustus may have taken specific registrations for privileged categories at varying intervals of time, while the Egyptian population underwent a regular census every 14 years. It has been suggested that a stricter type of *epikrasis* was introduced by Nero, under whom the term acquired the technical significance of ‘examination of titles, entailing appearance before a committee of *epikritai* with three witnesses.’<sup>85</sup> It is possible that the *epikrasis* was reformed even later, for instance under Vespasian, when there seems to have been a redefinition of some privileged categories (e.g. the *katoikoi*) and of the access to privileged status.

## CONCLUSION

The evidence examined in this chapter suggests that the Roman administration took over or revived elements of the Ptolemaic census, including perhaps the periodicity every seven or fourteen years. This tendency to continue the existing structures is not surprising, as it was both advantageous and inevitable for Rome to utilise the bureaucratic traditions that existed in the provinces. Unfortunately, the dearth of published evidence for the census under Ptolemaic rule does not allow for more precise conclusions.

In the Augustan period there may have been different forms of registration of people, possibly used in combination. The documentary evidence for a type of census that registered the Egyptian population (*laographia*) is extremely scanty until AD 33. However, there are some fragmentary references to registrations of people that took place from the very beginning of the reign of Augustus. Whether or not such registrations involved the population of the entire province, and therefore whether or not they may be called ‘provincial census,’ remains open. Indeed, it is possible that for some time under Augustus the Egyptian people and farmers continued to be registered through the annual listings that were drawn for agricultural purposes, as in the Ptolemaic period, while other categories of people, such as the *katoikoi*, the inhabitants of the nome capitals and some priestly categories underwent separate registrations of status, which were held at different times in different areas. It is likely, in addition, that Roman and Alexandrian citizens were registered through separate censuses.

To what extent the census in Egypt was similar to what we find in other Roman provinces is hard to say, because every province had its own

peculiarities, and we know virtually nothing about the way the censuses were taken. In Egypt, the count of the population, the assessment of the individual property (that is, the land owned), and the *epikrisis* or examination for privileged status were all events closely connected to each other. The census and some forms of *epikrisis* existed from the Ptolemaic period, although under Augustus these institutions acquired a new purpose, that is, the exaction of the provincial poll tax. It is overwhelmingly likely that the Roman administration favoured the creation of a rigid status-system, but this system may have been established through different steps that were taken over a period of several years, and exploited status differentiations that existed from the Ptolemaic period.

Neither the census nor the *epikrisis* were ever popular in Egypt. The registrations that took place under Augustus provoked embassies to the emperor, petitions and revolts. The documented embassies of Alexandrians to Augustus might have been connected to census- and status-registrations. An embassy of Alexandrians requested Augustus to reintroduce the city council in the 20s BC; another reached Augustus in Gaul in 10/9 BC, to petition him on problems concerning Alexandria and all Egypt,<sup>86</sup> and the third and last-known embassy took place in AD 12, possibly a census year.<sup>87</sup> The *anachoresis* or flight of villagers who attempted to escape the registration for taxes and compulsory services might have increased in the years of the census.<sup>88</sup> It may not be a coincidence that the earliest evidence of *anachoresis* in the Roman period comes from the census year AD 19/20.<sup>89</sup> Conversely, papyri preserving invitations to the *epikrisis* of 14-year old boys indicate that its positive outcome was celebrated as a private festival.<sup>90</sup>

# The Reorganisation of Landholding

## INTRODUCTION

From the Pharaonic period until the present day, agriculture has been at the centre of Egypt's economy, society, and politics. For this reason, the changes in the distribution and exploitation of land are likely to reflect political and social changes. This chapter attempts to analyse neither the legal connotations of the ownership of land in Roman law, nor the applicability of the situation in Egypt to the rest of the empire, but seeks to investigate, on the basis of the documents, how the organisation and exploitation of the land may have changed in the transition from Ptolemaic to Roman rule.

Under the Ptolemies (and probably also before), the principal categories of land were royal land (γῆ βασιλική), sacred land (γῆ ἱερά), land detained in some form of private ownership (γῆ ἐν ἀφέσει, γῆ ἰδιωτική, or κτήματα), land of the military settlers (γῆ κληρουχική, γῆ κατοικική), and gift-estates assigned by the king to his associates (δωρεαί).<sup>1</sup> According to Rostovtzeff, when after the Roman conquest the land underwent major confiscations and an overall reclassification, the principal categories remained the same, except for a fundamental novelty: the introduction of Roman-style, full private ownership of land and its spread on a large scale. This category comprised the land acquired by private individuals from the confiscations and the auctions that took place after the conquest; katoikic land, that is the land of Greek military settlers, which was assimilated to private land; and the large estates (οὐσία) that were privately owned by the imperial family or by wealthy Alexandrians and Greeks. Rostovtzeff believed that, when Augustus promoted private investments in land, he aimed to create a new landowning élite, on which he could rely for the administration of the new province.<sup>2</sup>

This chapter tries to set these assumptions against the early Roman evidence of the most important categories of land: public and sacred land, *katōikic* land, land sold by the state to private citizens, and private estates. It also deals with the relationship between the estates of the Julio-Claudian period and their Ptolemaic precedents, by examining their internal organisation, fiscal status, and administration.

## PUBLIC AND SACRED LAND

The consensus is that, after 30 BC, most of the land that belonged to the old category of royal land or βασιλική γῆ was renamed as public land, δημοσία γῆ or δημόσια ἐδάφη, which mirrored the Latin terms *ager publicus* or *agri publici*.<sup>3</sup> Still, the terms βασιλική and δημοσία γῆ continued to be used side by side, with no apparent distinction. This may have been a characteristic of certain geographical areas, such as the Arsinoite nome. However, it is possible that not everything that was called βασιλικός became δημόσιος: the survival of institutions such as the βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς, for instance, clearly shows that the Romans were not interested in changing names. As Lo Cascio recently hypothesised, the denomination 'public land' might have been a general heading under which the Romans grouped *basilike ge* and possibly other land, for instance confiscated land.<sup>4</sup>

After the Roman conquest, state land continued to pay annually variable rents in kind according to the level of the Nile-flood, though the average charge tended to be about half of the yield, that is, up to five artabas per aroura.<sup>5</sup> As was the case in the Ptolemaic period, so under Roman rule state land was leased out to public farmers, the δημόσιοι γεωργοί, or, as some of them were still called under Augustus, the βασιλικοὶ γεωργοί. These farmers received from the state annual loans of seed, to be returned at the end of the harvest in the form of taxation. In the Ptolemaic period, the status of royal farmer carried certain privileges, so that it was eagerly sought after. It is generally believed that under Roman rule the privileges of royal farmers were suppressed. However, it is likely that public farmers continued to have a favoured fiscal status, such as a reduced poll tax (which may have been collected from the community of public farmers), and the exemption from some compulsory services.<sup>6</sup>

Since the Pharaonic period, traditional Egyptian temples were endowed at their foundation with landed property, called ἱερά γῆ, from which they derived income to support the cult. In addition, some temple land was held as private land, and it seems that the tenure of temple land gave a special status or protection from the government.<sup>7</sup> In Wilcken's view, a radical change took place in the reign of Augustus, who drastically reduced temple property, removed it

from the control of the priests and partly equated it to public land.<sup>8</sup> This view was based on *P.Tebt.* II 302 (= *W.Chr.* 368) and *BGU IV* 1200. The first document reports that, in the early reign of Augustus, the prefect Petronius confiscated temple land and returned it to the temples as a replacement for the *σύνταξις*, the annual subvention the state gave to temples. The second document is a petition of 2/1 BC, in which some priests declare that, before 20/19 BC, the land of the temple of Bousiris was confiscated by the public treasury (*δημόσιον*), but the priests continued to administer the land on behalf of the state, and received 200 artabas of wheat a year as a subsidy.<sup>9</sup>

But did Augustus really introduce reforms in order to reduce the power of the traditional Egyptian priests and temples? *BGU IV* 1198, a petition of the priests of Herakleopolis against the payment of *laographia*, cites an edict of Turranius ordering a stricter control and registration of the priestly categories. In my view, this edict may have been an administrative regulation modelled on Ptolemaic precedents, and is not sufficient to prove that Turranius drastically reduced the power of the priests. Indeed, soon after the Roman conquest in 30 BC there were general confiscations of land, among which there were probably also confiscations of sacred land. However, the theory that he set out to undermine the prosperity of the temples may be an oversimplification: as Rostovtzeff first argued and, later, Glare explained in detail, there was no real dichotomy between Roman state and Egyptian temples, which remained relatively privileged.<sup>10</sup> The tax rate on sacred land continued to be two artabas per aroura as under the Ptolemies, that is, halfway between the low rates on private and katoikic land (one artaba per aroura) and the high rates on public land (up to five artabas per aroura).<sup>11</sup>

## KATOIKIC LAND

In the Ptolemaic period, katoikic land was bestowed by royal grant on a class of military settlers called *κάτοικοι ὑπεῖς*. According to recent studies, the class of the *katoikoi* was formed in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes II, around 145 BC, to subsume various categories of kleruchs throughout Egypt.<sup>12</sup> The king was the real owner of the land, while the *katoikos* was only the temporary possessor: katoikic land could not be alienated, but reverted to the king on the death of the soldier. If the soldier was unable to pay taxes, he could transfer the land, but only to another *katoikos*, along with the obligation to pay taxes on it. In origin, this transfer (called *παραχώρησις* or *καταχώρησις*) was for one year, then it gradually extended until, under the later Ptolemies, it became *εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον*.<sup>13</sup>



In 60 BC, a royal ordinance granted the right of inheritance of katoikic land not only to the soldiers but also to their wives and children.<sup>14</sup> Legally, a katoikic plot (κλήρος) could never be sold, but only be transferred, and thus the Ptolemaic cessions of katoikic land never mention any price. However, a cession of katoikic land could conceal the repayment of a loan or the payment of back taxes. It is also possible that a form of price existed although it was hidden. For the cession of katoikic land the soldiers had to pay a transfer tax called στέφανος (crown tax). Katoikic land had to pay taxes at the standard rate of one artaba per aroura.<sup>15</sup> By the end of the Ptolemaic period katoikic land was alienable and inheritable, but was confined to the closed circle of the *katoikoi*, so that, as Bingen argued, it was only 'quasi-private'.<sup>16</sup>

It is common knowledge that in the Roman period katoikic land was formally and legally equated to private land.<sup>17</sup> In fact, under Roman rule the *stephanos* seems to disappear, while a recorded price begins to appear in sales of land. The earliest evidence of a recorded price in a sale of land is *BGU* II 543 of 27 BC, where a certain Akousilaos declares to the authorities of the Arsinoite nome that he sold his ten arouras for 800 drachmas. Oddly, however, the occurrences of the price of land (παραχωρητικόν and, more rarely, τιμή) remain scarce throughout the Roman period, perhaps a sign that to record the price of land was not a standard practice yet.<sup>18</sup>

In *SB* V 7537 of 6/5 BC, a petition to the prefect Turranius from the village of Koma in Herakleopolites, a farmer claims that in 36/5 BC he submitted an ἀναφορά (possibly a declaration of property) according to which the plot of katoikic land which he inherited from his father was valued at 40 drachmas per aroura, 400 drachmas in total. This document shows that a value-price in drachmas was calculated in the late Ptolemaic period even for katoikic land. In the division of property *P.Tebt.* II 382 (20/19 BC<sup>19</sup>) some *katoikoi* described their land as ὑπάρχοντας ἡμῶν πατρικῶς κλη(ρ)ους—however, this document is insufficient to prove that a new type of private ownership was introduced by the Romans, because the verb ὑπάρχω indicated either possession or ownership.<sup>20</sup>

In the Ptolemaic period, katoikic land was administered through an extensive bureaucracy, which included secretaries, overseers and an official called ὁ πρὸς τῇ συντάξει, whose precise functions are still unclear.<sup>21</sup> Its records were deposited in a separate registry called ἵππικὸν λογιστήριον or cavalry office, and καταλοχισμοί at Alexandria, under an official called ὁ πρὸς τοῖς καταλοχισμοῖς τῆς Αἰγύπτου. Under Roman rule, katoikic land seems to have retained its peculiarities, from the manner of acquisition through cession to the registration in the cavalry office and the *katalochismoi*. The surviving cessions of katoikic land have a distinctive form that changed

according to area and included an oath.<sup>22</sup> In the Roman period, the formal layout of these contracts does not present significant changes. The ancient names of the first holders of *kleroi* of the Ptolemaic period remained attached to the land for centuries,<sup>23</sup> and Roman documents continue to cite Ptolemaic ordinances (*prostagmata* and *diatagmata*) on katoikic land as valid legal authorities.<sup>24</sup> As far as our evidence goes, the officials in charge of the *katalochismoi* have Greek names, until a certain point in the first century AD, when we encounter a certain Tiberius Claudius.<sup>25</sup> The only visible change seems to have been the disappearance of the Ptolemaic official called ὁ πρὸς τῇ συντάξει. A substantial reorganisation of katoikic land may have taken place in the second half of the first century AD, possibly under the Flavians, when the katoikic contracts came to be deposited in the βιβλιοθήκη ἐγκτήσεων.<sup>26</sup>

Under Roman rule, katoikic land continued to pay public dues or καθήκοντα of one artaba per aroura.<sup>27</sup> A tax list of the reign of Tiberius shows that this was the rate of taxation for private land in general, including both katoikic land and land called ἰδιωτική.<sup>28</sup> In this document, the owners of private and katoikic land, all with Greek names, were split into two categories, namely, Alexandrians and ἐντόπιοι; this suggests that katoikic and private land were in the hands of either Alexandrian citizens and landowners who were present on the ground, in the *chora*.<sup>29</sup>

According to Rowlandson, the Roman administration may have created some new katoikic land in addition to that existing before the conquest. This assumption was based on some Roman documents that referred to land 'bought into the κατοικία.' Among these documents, *PS/IV* 320.10f of AD 18 refers to ὠνημένης γῆς δώδεκα δραχμῶν εἰς τὴν τῶν κατοίκων σύνταξιν, which was interpreted as 'land previously bought from the state at twelve drachmas per aroura and assigned to the *katoikia*.'<sup>30</sup> In my view, however, the phrase δώδεκα δραχμῶν does not indicate the price of the land, but may refer to a category of people called δωδεκάδραχμοι, who took their name from the fact that they paid poll tax at the reduced rate of 12 drachmas. Specifically, the phrase may be translated: 'bought land of (or from) those who pay twelve drachmas for the *syntaxis* of the *katoikoi*.' This document thus seems to indicate that the land in question belonged to a class of *katoikoi*, the δωδεκάδραχμοι, who paid a 12-drachmas poll tax called *syntaxis* of the *katoikoi*.<sup>31</sup> This text cannot be used as evidence that the Roman administration created new katoikic land, and the question remains open.

It is likely that confiscations of the land of Ptolemaic soldiers took place after the war. However, Augustus may have let some of them keep their *kleroi* as private property, possibly by buying them back. The occurrence of a purchase

price of land in a document of 27 BC may suggest that in the Roman period katoikic land was officially recognised as private land.<sup>32</sup> However, one may wonder whether this evidence is really enough to prove that katoikic land was regarded as 'freely' alienable property. Since all the buyers of katoikic *kleroi* attested in the early Roman period seem to belong to the Hellenised élites, it is possible that in the early Roman period katoikic land could not be sold and bought by just everybody, but was confined to the status circle of the *katoikoi*.

Recent studies have shown that the *katoikoi* and their land enjoyed a privileged status in the Ptolemaic period. It is likely that in the Roman period these privileges were continued. The existence in the Arsinoite of a closed group of *katoikoi* called the 6475 *Hellenes* may be a testimony to this continuity. The 6475 are first mentioned in a letter that the emperor Nero addressed to this group (*SB XII 11012*), in which he stated that the 6475 existed also under the earlier emperors, probably meaning all the emperors including Augustus. It is possible that this number of soldiers existed only 'on paper,' as a result from an early Roman registration, though it might have existed in the Ptolemaic period as well.<sup>33</sup>

## BOUGHT LAND

It was once believed that private ownership of land did not exist in the Ptolemaic period, except for a minor number of privately-owned vineyards and gardens (κτῆματα), and that the category of ἔωνημένη γῆ or bought land was introduced by the Roman administration.<sup>34</sup> Rowlandson thought that 'bought land' was created in the earliest years of Roman rule, when uncultivable land was set aside as almost unproductive of revenue (ὑπόλογος) and was then sold at a low price to private individuals, so that they would use their own capital to bring this land back into cultivation. Bought land was granted tax-free status (ἀτέλεια) for three years, after which it was taxed at the standard rate of one artaba per aroura.<sup>35</sup> According to Tomsin, the practice of selling state land from the ὑπόλογος through the prefect or the *idios logos* derived from the Roman *agri quaestorii*, public lands that the state sold to private citizens through the agency of the *quaestor* or the *praetor*.<sup>36</sup>

The earliest occurrence of ἔωνημένη γῆ in the Roman period is *P.Köln V 227 B5f* of AD 12/13. *P.Oxy.Hels.* 9.6, 9, 11 of AD 26 refers to land bought in the fifteenth, forty-first, and forty-third years of Augustus, i.e. 15 BC, AD 11 and AD 13. *P.Oxy.* IV 721 shows the standard procedure of purchasing land from the state: under Augustus some κληῖροι were confiscated, either because the land was ownerless (*bona caduca et vacantia*) or for political reasons (*bona damnatorum*), and were assigned to the public treasury. Subsequently,

if they became unproductive, they were assigned to the ὑπόλογος, and were put up for sale. The price was established by the *idios logos*, to whom the prospective buyer had to submit an application. Once purchased, the possession of private land meant not only liability to taxes, at the rate of one artaba per aroura, but also to a rent to be fixed on inspection.<sup>37</sup>

This procedure applied to other kinds of property too: in *P.Oxy.* IX 1188 of AD 13, for instance, the *idios logos* confiscated and sold some wood from a sacred property: the potential buyer submitted an application to the *idios logos* Q. Attius Fronto, who forwarded it to the *basilikos grammateus* of the nome, with instructions to verify details and value the wood. The correspondence then descended to the *topogrammateus* and the *komogrammateus*, who had to go to the premises and supply the information required, and to establish the price of the wood κατὰ τὸν γνώμονα, 'according to the *gnomon*.' From the same time and place, *P.Oxy.* XX 2277 is an offer to purchase vacant land belonging to the *idios logos*. The officials involved are the same, and the price of the land is again calculated on the basis of a *gnomon* (ll. 7, 12), probably a conventional list of prices, not an early attestation of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*.<sup>38</sup>

It is overwhelmingly likely that Augustus increased and promoted sales of land to private individuals. However, it seems that private land existed from the Ptolemaic period and even from the Pharaonic one. In fact there is Ptolemaic evidence for γῆ ἰδιωτικῆ and ἰδιόκτητος,<sup>39</sup> for land sold to private individuals from temple estates,<sup>40</sup> and for γῆ ἐωνημένη, land bought from the royal account or from the Ptolemaic department of the *idios logos*, which acted as the confiscator and seller of vacant land.<sup>41</sup> In addition, *P.Haun.inv.* 407 of 119/118 BC, a land-survey from the Apollonopolite nome shows that private ownership was not only in existence, but also the predominant form of land tenure in the Apollonopolite since the Pharaonic period.<sup>42</sup>

Also the practice of selling dry land from the state account to private individuals had close Ptolemaic precedents. The technicalities of the sale of land, including the grant of a three- or five-year long ἀτέλεια and subsequent κουφοτέλεια to those who bought unproductive land, derived from decrees by Euergetes II, from the 'Revenue Laws' of Ptolemy Philadelphos, and possibly even from pre-Ptolemaic regulations. One aspect of innovation was that in the Roman period the ἐμφύτευσις or hereditary lease, common in the Ptolemaic period, seems to have gradually been replaced by private ownership of land.<sup>43</sup> The rate of taxation on private land remained one artaba per aroura, as in the Ptolemaic period. In addition to taxes (καθήκοντα), it is likely that private land paid also rents (ἐκφόρια). Taxes may have been payable to the *dioikesis*, rents to the *idios logos*.<sup>44</sup>

The increase of sales of state land to private individuals in the Roman period might have generated an increase of money transactions: as the land was the underpinning of credit, sales of land often covered other monetary operations, such as loans. A group of papyri originating in Alexandria, and belonging to the period roughly extending from 25 to 5 BC, preserve information about imperial slaves lending money, and leasing and selling plots of land: in *BGUIV* 1118 of 25/24 BC, Aisopos slave of the imperial slave or freedman Eros, leases some land cultivated as garden on the Kanopos branch of the Nile to Tryphon and his wife Arsinoe, who receive from Eros (through the bank of Dionysos) a loan of 2500 drachmas to do the necessary works. In *BGUIV* 1129 of 13 BC, Tryphon, slave of the imperial slave or freedman Simon, buys from Protarchos and his wife, the Alexandrian citizen Opora, some plots of land amounting to 48 11/16 arouras in the Bousirite nome (i.e. the *chora* of Alexandria) for 1400 drachmas; another sum had been anticipated from Tryphon to Protarchos some months before the transaction.<sup>45</sup> This document suggests that sales like this originated from a loan: people in need of money sold their land to the state or to the imperial *patrimonium* through imperial freedmen, and some of them may have continued to farm and pay rent on the land even after they had sold it. In *BGUIV* 1130 of 4 BC, the Alexandrian citizen Sarapion son of Diodoros purchases two arouras in the Lykopolite nome in the Thebaid from Pylaimenes, slave of the imperial slave Akratos. The deed of sale was drawn up in Alexandria and its guarantors were Pylaimenes himself and a certain C. Julius Hermias, who is described as the κύριος and δεσπότης of Akratos and acts through Hermias the slave (rather than the son) of Priscus. Apparently, C. Julius Hermias was an imperial freedman who supervised the imperial slave Akratos, while Pylaimenes, who was the person responsible for the practicalities of the sale, was a *vicarius*.<sup>46</sup>

## ESTATES

The presence of imperial estates or οὐσίαι under the Julio-Claudians is regarded as one of the earliest examples of the spread of private ownership of land on a large scale. These estates were in essence the revenues from various types of property that the imperial family owned in Italy and in the provinces, including Egypt. Often an *ousia* consisted of parcels of land scattered in several locations, but could also be the revenues from livestock or from the management of proto-industrial activities such as the textile industry or the production of papyrus.<sup>47</sup> Apart from the imperial family, also prominent members of the Graeco-Egyptian élite owned estates, called conventionally 'non-imperial' estates.<sup>48</sup> The area with the greatest concentration of *ousiai* is

the Arsinoite, while they seem to have been entirely absent from Upper Egypt.<sup>49</sup> Naturally, however, our knowledge of the distribution of estates has been shaped by the pattern of finds of the papyri, and new evidence might change it.

The number of estates in Egypt increased progressively in the Julio-Claudian period, until Vespasian or Titus grouped them in a department called *ousiakos logos*, which was assimilated to public land. However, the precedents and the genesis of the *ousiai* are still problematic. The principal question has been whether the *ousiai* of the Roman period were the continuation of the earlier δωρεάι, estates temporarily granted by the Ptolemies to their associates, or, as Parássoglou first argued, were purchased on the market.<sup>50</sup> Crawford and, later, Rathbone doubted that an open market for land ever functioned in Egypt, a province closely guarded by the emperor, and reverted to the view that the *ousiai* were grace-and-favour estates consciously modelled on the Hellenistic *doreai*, and that they originated from the confiscations that took place after the Roman conquest. Some estates were created from the former *doreai* of the Ptolemaic court, others from ownerless, unproductive, katoikic, and sacred land.<sup>51</sup> It seems unlikely that members of the imperial household such as Maecenas, Livia or Antonia purchased their land from Augustus.

The obstacle to any investigation of the precedents of the *ousiai* is the scarcity of information about the number, size and location of the Ptolemaic *doreai* from the second century BC onwards.<sup>52</sup> We have little evidence for the term δωρεά in the late Ptolemaic period, and in the Roman period it occurs only sporadically.<sup>53</sup> The only element which helps to reconstruct the history of the *doreai* are their names, as they were designated over the centuries by the name of their first owner (e.g. δωρεά τοῦ δέϊνος).<sup>54</sup> This pattern applied to the Roman *ousiai* as well, which were indicated in the documents by the term *ousia* followed by the proper name of the owner in the genitive (e.g. οὐσία Μαϊκήνου) or, in the case of a former owner, by πρότερον followed by the genitive of the proper name, or by adding the suffix—ιανή, a transliteration of the Latin suffix—*ianus* or—*iana* (e.g. οὐσία Μαϊκηνατιανή). For this reason, place names may be useful when trying to establish the date of the creation of an estate: the presence in Roman *ousiai* of farmsteads (ἐποίκια), granaries (θησασυροί) and other buildings with Greek or Egyptian names may suggest that the land was exploited as an estate before the Roman occupation too.<sup>55</sup>

A survey of the late Ptolemaic and early Roman terminology shows that estates were also indicated by a number of terms other from *ousia*.<sup>56</sup> The term ἐδάφη, 'fields' (close to the Latin term *fundi*), indicated the property of a Roman citizen in the Alexandrian *chora* in a document of 33 BC.<sup>57</sup> Some

*edaphe* of Asklepiades in the Herakleopolite are mentioned in a petition to an *oikonomos* and a *strategos* of 13/12 BC.<sup>58</sup> *P.Wisc.* II 52.6 of AD 32 refers to the *edaphe* of a woman called Thermoutharion, who occurs as a landowner in other documents too.<sup>59</sup>

An estate could also be designated by the term *πρόσοδος*, 'revenue.' In the first century BC, there is evidence of a *κεχωρισμένη πρόσοδος*, a 'separate account' for recording the revenues in cash from either the produce or the sale of the land.<sup>60</sup> *BGU* VIII 1828.7f of the 50s BC refers to the former *prosodos* of Ἀπίκκιος, perhaps the transliteration of the Latin name Apicius. *P.Ryl.* II 73.12f of 33–30 BC refers to ἐδάφη προσοδικά. A *prosodos* of Harpaeis occurs in *BGU* IV 1197.5 of 5/4 BC; a *prosodos* of Tigellius in *BGU* VII 1669.2 assigned to the first centuries BC or AD; and a *prosodos* and *κτῆσις* of Theon son of Theon occurs in *P.Ryl.* II 145.3f of AD 38.<sup>61</sup> In *PSI Corr.* I 1150.31 of 27 BC and *SB* XVI 13017.21 of 24 BC the rents from imperial estates were measured by the 'measure of the *prosodos*.'<sup>62</sup> In other Roman documents the term *prosodos* clearly indicates imperial estates.<sup>63</sup> This evidence suggests that the late Ptolemaic attestations of *ktesis*, *ktema*, *prosodos* and *edaphe* may be the link between the Ptolemaic *doreai* and the Julio-Claudian *ousiai*.

## ACQUISITION AND CESSION

Augustus took over and retained the land that formerly belonged to Antony and Cleopatra, both in Egypt and outside.<sup>64</sup> The earliest evidence for imperial property in Egypt is a document from Tebtunis, *PSI Corr.* I 1150 of 27 BC, a lease of land whose first lines (4–6) run: ἐμισθωσαν [Φιλόξενος] καὶ Ποσειδώνιος ἀμφοτέρω Διογνήτου οἱ προεστῶ[τ]ε[ρ]ε[ς] τῆς πρότερον Πετενεφειίδου νυνὶ δὲ Κα[ί]σαρος αὐτοκράτορος [γῆς κτλ.<sup>65</sup> The property was probably sacred land that the emperor took over as a part of his private patrimony. It is worth noting that the existing managers (*προεστῶτες*) remained in place despite the change of owner. The earliest known example of an estate granted by the emperor to some associates of his occurs in *SB* XVI 13017 of 24 BC, which mentions some land πρότερον Εὐδαίμωνος νυνὶ δὲ Μα[γ]ήνου καὶ Πωλίωνος.<sup>66</sup> The two recur in *P.Coll.Youtie* I 19.12 of AD 44 as Μακκήνου καὶ Πωλλ[ί]ωνος], and may be identified with Maecenas and probably Vedius Pollio.<sup>67</sup>

Apart from the imperial family, the owners of *ousiai* included Roman and Alexandrian citizens.<sup>68</sup> The city of Alexandria also owned estates in Egypt, through the institution of the οἶκος, the patrimony of the city, which I shall discuss below in this chapter. It is possible that a part of the Ptolemaic

aristocracy was allowed to keep their properties or buy them back after the Roman conquest. This might be the case with the estate called Νικανωρικωνή, if it was the estate of Nikanor the son of the philosopher Areius of Alexandria, who may have been allowed to retain and bequeath his property because of his friendship with Augustus.<sup>69</sup> Other properties may have remained in the same hands during the civil wars. The estate of Falcidius, documented in the Roman period, may have belonged to a partisan of Antony's and the estate of Gallia Polla might have belonged to a family of Antonian supporters.<sup>70</sup>

Under Augustus and Tiberius some *ousiai* seem to have been shared by two co-owners. Some examples are the estates of Eros and Charmos, Iucundus and Chresimus, C. Julius Athenodoros and Ti. Calpurnius Tryphon, Ti. Claudius Balbillus and M. Aponius Saturninus, Agrippina and Rutillius.<sup>71</sup> These partners were not related, nor do they seem to have been close friends or associates. It is commonly believed that these partnerships originated from the division of the Ptolemaic *doreai* in smaller parcels after the Roman conquest, in order to satisfy more beneficiaries and to have more people investing their private money in the cost of the necessary works.<sup>72</sup> However, the assumption that these co-owners shared an *ousia* may be an illusion generated by our misinterpretation of the documents. A reference to a farmer 'of the estate of *x* and *y*' may simply indicate that a farmer was working on two adjacent or overlapping plots of land, that belonged to *x* and to *y* respectively.

We have no evidence for the concession of an *ousia*, except perhaps P.Oxy. XII 1434 of AD 107/108, a register of concessions of immunity from taxation on the estate of C. Julius Theon in the Oxyrhynchite. This document states that in 7/4 BC an edict of the prefect C. Turranius granted to C. Julius Theon 'the father' some pasture land 'from the account of Caesar' (λόγος Καίσαρος), and some dry land, on condition that he should pay the city (either Alexandria or Oxyrhynchus) about two talents for taxes and other charges. On the death of C. Julius Theon around AD 10, his son C. Julius Theon submitted an application (I. 13 ἀναφόριον) to the prefect Aquila in order to be granted his father's land, and the prefect assigned to him the estate through an edict. It may be significant that the family of the Julii Theones held city magistracies at Alexandria throughout the Roman period: under Augustus, C. Julius Theon was *hypomnematographos* and *archieus*, and another Theon was *archidikastes*.<sup>73</sup> It is possible that there was some connection between the tenure of city magistracies in Alexandria or elsewhere and the assignment of an *ousia* in the *chora*. Unfortunately, the evidence is too scanty to allow for further discussion.

In the Ptolemaic period, the land given as *doreai*, as well as the γῆ ἐν ἀφέσει, could at any time revert to the Ptolemaic king.<sup>74</sup> Similarly, in the



Roman period, the imperial estates ultimately belonged to the emperor's patrimony: the numerous changes of owners of the Julio-Claudian *ousiai* seem to support the view that estates often reverted to the emperor, who redistributed them to new beneficiaries.<sup>75</sup> The aforementioned estates of Maecenas and Pollio reverted to the imperial patrimony on the death of their owners. Both Maecenas and Pollio belonged to the circle of the emperor's *amici*, and thus, their estates may be considered as 'imperial.' As Dio reports, it was almost obligatory for *amici principis* to bequeath their property to the *princeps*.<sup>76</sup> The estates of the prefects of Egypt, e.g. that of Petronius, also reverted to the emperor.<sup>77</sup>

The position of non-imperial estates, that is, of estates apparently unconnected with the imperial household, is more problematic. It is unclear whether these estates eventually reverted to the imperial patrimony, or whether they could be legally sold or bequeathed to the beneficiary's heirs; in addition, it is often difficult to distinguish 'non-imperial estates' from ordinary 'private land.'<sup>78</sup> There are two or three examples of estates that were bequeathed from father to son. The occurrence of an olive grove 'of the children of Euandros' in *P.Coll. Youtie* I 19.13 suggests that Euandros, priest and freedman of Tiberius, probably bequeathed his estate to his children.<sup>79</sup> *P.Oxy.* XII 1434 (discussed above) refers to an estate of C. Julius Theon the elder that passed around AD 10 to his son, also called Theon; he may have been the Theon son of Theon who appears as estate-owner in *P.Ryl.* II 145 of AD 38. *P.Fay.* 87.1.5 of AD 155 reports that the philosopher Julius Asklepiades (who lived under Augustus) bequeathed his property to the city of Alexandria. In conclusion, it seems that estates could be either donated or bequeathed, but there is no evidence that they were sold on the market.

## MANAGEMENT

Normally the owners of the imperial and non-imperial *ousiai* lived far away from their possessions, and entrusted the management of their estate to local officials who forwarded them the revenues. It is likely that the *ousiai* were managed in a variety of ways, depending on their origin, as the land came into the hands of the owners with crops, farmers and managers already in place.<sup>80</sup> In the papyri these managers are called most frequently *προεστώτες*, but also *προνοοῦντες*, *οἰκονόμοι*, *φροντισταί*, *προστάται*, *γραμματεῖς*, *ἐκλήμπτορες*, *πρεσβύτεροι*, *χειρισταί* and *πραγματευταί*.<sup>81</sup> These were superintendents in charge of one or more parcels, responsible for the leasing of land to various tenants, the collection of revenues, and the overall administration, and often had specific tasks, such as the supervision of the beasts of burden or of the cattle. In case of need, the local farmers of an *ousia*

probably addressed the manager, not the absentee owner: this seems the case with *P.Ryl.* II 133, a petition to Euandros, the priest and freedman of Tiberius, dated AD 33, in which a villager reported damages to the irrigation system of some fields that Euandros was probably managing on behalf of the emperor.

The managers of the imperial estates were most commonly called *proestotes*.<sup>82</sup> They probably existed since the Ptolemaic period, when the *doreai* were administered through a network of managers who were recruited from the slaves and freedmen of the owner or from the local population of the nome.<sup>83</sup> The managers of the *ousiai* were often imperial slaves who reported to imperial freedmen and had their own slaves as *vicarii*.<sup>84</sup> In *P.Oxy.* II 244 of AD 23, Cerinthus, a slave of Antonia wife of Drusus, was in charge of her sheep and goats in the Oxyrhynchite.<sup>85</sup> In *P.Ryl.* II 166 of AD 26, a certain C. Julius Amarantos managed the estate of C. Julius Alexandros at Euhemeria.<sup>86</sup> In *P.Ryl.* II 127.26f of AD 29, Cladus, slave of Livia wife of Drusus Caesar, commissioned an Egyptian farmer to do some work for him in Euhemeria.<sup>87</sup> After the creation of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος by the Flavians, both the local προεστῶτες and the imperial slaves were replaced by imperial procurators who were subordinated to an ἐπίτροπος οὐσιακός at Alexandria.<sup>88</sup>

It may be difficult to distinguish owners from administrators, as the freedmen who managed imperial estates often acted as if they were the owners.<sup>89</sup> Parássoglou noticed that, in turn, some of the owners of imperial estates had typical slave names, such as Eros, Iucundus, Numerius, Charmos, Chresimos, Chrestos, Latinus, Onesimos, and Sokrates, and suggested that they may have been, rather than proper owners, slaves who were assigned an estate for their lifetime and then bequeathed it to the emperor—as happened to the *ousia* of Anthos, probably a slave of Germanicus, which on Anthos' death passed to the imperial *patrimonium*. Parássoglou however thought that the majority of these people may have been wealthy Alexandrians.<sup>90</sup>

A survey of the evidence indicates that some of these landowners were indeed imperial slaves. As regards Eros and Charmos, there are numerous occurrences of Eros in the papyri of the Augustan period, and a literary source informs us that under Augustus a certain C. Julius Eros was a prominent figure, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διοικῶν.<sup>91</sup> Some documents suggest that Charmos may have been another imperial freedman doing business in Egypt through his own slaves.<sup>92</sup> Evidence on Jucundus and Chresimos suggests that they were imperial slaves too<sup>93</sup>: *BGU* IV 1137 (= *W.Chr.* 112) of 6 BC and *SB* XXII 15460 of 5 BC record the proceedings of an association for the imperial cult in Alexandria, whose president is an imperial slave called Primus. Among the participants there were the priest Jucundus and the gymnasiarch

Alexander.<sup>94</sup> Chresimos is explicitly regarded as a slave of Caesar in *P.Vind. Tandem* 9.19 of AD 12, where his slave Siphilos<sup>95</sup> acts as tax collector. A certain Mamilius slave of Chresimos appears in *O.Bodl.* II 1968 of 18 BC from Koptos, a receipt issued by Ruphio, slave of Mamilius to a certain Asklas for the delivery of 22 tin vessels on the account of Mamilius, slave of Chresimos. The document suggests that Chresimos was an imperial freedman, Mamilius his slave, and Ruphio was Mamilius' *vicarius*.<sup>96</sup>

*BGUIV* 1118 of 22 BC may contain an early instance of an estate leased or managed by an imperial slave. In this document Aisopos, a slave of the imperial slave Eros, leases for the third year a plot of garden-land on the Kanopos branch of the Nile to a certain Tryphon and his wife Arsinoe. The lessees received in turn a loan of 2500 drachmas from the public bank of Dionysos to perform irrigation and restoration works on that allotment. The document indicates (ll. 8f) that the payment of the rent was to be made either to Aisopos or to Eros' agents. The land in question may have belonged to Eros, who acted through his own *vicarius*. Alternatively, Eros may have been managing or temporarily owning some land that belonged to the imperial *patrimonium*, and that was destined to revert to it. In these documents one finds a recurring pattern: a prominent imperial freedman controls over a subordinate imperial slave, who, in turn, directs different local *vicarii* in different regions. This pattern may also be observed in other documents relating to the collection of the revenues, and indeed, the distribution of the imperial household in the territory of the provinces deserves further investigation.

## FARMING AND TAXATION

The imperial estates were farmed by public farmers, the δημόσιοι, οὐσιακοί or προσοδικοὶ γεωργοί, who also cultivated public and royal land. The farming of the estates continued to be part of the compulsory service called γεωργία, which could involve forced assignments of land also to the neighbouring villages (the so-called ἐπιβολή and ἐπιμερισμός).<sup>97</sup> The workers were often accommodated in farmsteads (ἐποίκια), and received loans of state seed to be returned with the harvest in the form of rents.<sup>98</sup>

The farmers of *ousiai* are sometimes described as ἀπολύσιμοι τῆς ... οὐσίας, that is, 'released' from an estate. Parássoglou argued that these farmers were exempted from corvées such as the irrigation works in consideration of having already been pressed into the compulsory farming of an estate.<sup>99</sup> This view was based principally on the evidence of three individuals described as ἀπολύσιμοι and πράκτορες in *P.Gen.* II 91, a γραφή ἀνδρῶν from Philadelphia of AD 50/51.<sup>100</sup> In my view, this evidence may indicate that

*apolyssimoi* were public farmers temporarily released from the agricultural work in order to serve in other liturgies, e.g. as tax collectors. In *PRyl.* II 141.5–8 of AD 37, for instance, a public farmer is acting as tax collector in the estate of Antonia the wife of Drusus. The evidence for *apolyssimoi* seems to end in the Flavian period, when the imperial estates were absorbed into the *ousiakos logos*.

The position of public farmer remained unpopular both under the Ptolemies and under Augustus, as is shown for instance by the documents from the archive of Isidoros of Psophthis, a public farmer who tried to avoid being enrolled in the estate of Livia at Philadelphia.<sup>101</sup> The first measure in the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander of AD 68 dealt with the problem of the obligation to lease estate land (ὄνσιακὴ μίσθωσις). According to Chalon, the edict intended to safeguard not so much the public farmers, but rather the upper classes from Alexandria and the Greek cities, who were often forced to lease a plot of land and perform all the necessary work at their expense. Tiberius Julius Alexander claimed that the compulsory lease was against the custom established by the previous prefects. However, it is possible that the forced lease of land never disappeared.<sup>102</sup>

It is still unclear whether estates paid taxes, and, if they did, to what financial department. The Ptolemaic *doreai* were in principle tax-free. Similarly, the *ousiai* of a reigning emperor, and probably also the estates of the Alexandrian citizens, enjoyed fiscal privileges, although naturally these privileges may have varied according to the status of the beneficiary. Unfortunately, our understanding of the fiscal status of estates is hindered by the dearth of data concerning the taxation on *ousiai* before the creation of the *ousiakos logos* in the late first century AD.<sup>103</sup>

The expression ἀτελῆν καὶ ἀνεγγάρρευτον, that is, exempt from taxes and requisitions, was found on a bronze tablet with reference to the livestock of an imperial *ousia*.<sup>104</sup> It is worth noting that a similar terminology occurs in a royal ordinance of 33 BC, whereby Cleopatra (and her co-ruler Caesarion) granted exemption from taxes to a Roman landowner and to his heirs. The text runs: 'we have granted tax exemption on all the land he owns in the *chora*,' and 'we have also granted that the animals used for ploughing and sowing as well as the beasts of burden and the ships used for the transportation of the wheat are likewise exempt from personal liabilities and from taxes, and cannot be commandeered.'<sup>105</sup> This document shows that under Cleopatra the exemption from taxes and liturgies was granted on an *ad hoc* basis, while normally the taxes on land were levied by the *dioikesis* and the *idios logos* (Il. 7f). The Roman administration may have derived from the Ptolemaic administration some regulations concerning the fiscal privileges of estates.

There is evidence, though scarce and unclear, that at least some of the early imperial estates were subject to both taxes and rents: *P.Lond.* II 195 (pp. 127f) refers to taxes on a vineyard of the emperor Tiberius, which was managed through his slaves, and *P.Oxy.* XII 1434.16f alludes to taxes and other charges on the estate of Julius Theon. We do not know the rate of taxation on estates before the creation of the *ousiakos logos* in AD 70, but thereafter ousiac land was taxed at five or six artabas per aroura. Perhaps this rate applied to the estates of the Julio-Claudian period too. It is also possible that, soon after the Roman conquest, taxes and rents on estates were calculated *ad hoc*, according to the type of crops sown or the productivity of the land, which was often put back to cultivation after a long time.

### THE DEPARTMENT IN CHARGE OF THE OUSIAI

Under both Ptolemaic and Roman rule, the revenues of Egypt were dealt with by three financial departments: the *διοίκησις* or public treasury administered public land and exacted taxes from private properties; the *ιερατικά* or sacred account dealt with temple land; and the *ἴδιος λόγος* was responsible for sporadic and irregular sources of revenue, such as inheritances and confiscations.<sup>106</sup> The imperial properties were under the jurisdiction of the *patrimonium* of the emperor, in Egypt called *λόγος Καίσαρος* and *κυριακὸς λόγος*, until at a certain point in the first century AD, under Vespasian according to common opinion, the estates were grouped in a special department called *ουσιακὸς λόγος*, and were assimilated to public property.<sup>107</sup>

Before AD 70, the overall management of the imperial properties may have been in the hands of a network of local *proestotes* and imperial freedmen and slaves, who probably referred to a central office in Alexandria. The members of the imperial family probably administered their properties through their own *procurator*, as happened in the province of Africa.<sup>108</sup> The creation of the *ousiakos logos* may have been connected with the introduction of the *procurator usiacus*, first attested in the second century AD.<sup>109</sup> After the introduction of the *ousiakos logos* and of the *procurator usiacus*, a web of Roman procurators gradually replaced the local *proestotes* and *ekleptores* who had managed the estates since the Ptolemaic period.

According to Swarney, the *idios logos* of the Ptolemies was the 'private' account of the kings, while under Roman rule it changed substantially and became a 'special' account that had little to do with the imperial *patrimonium*.<sup>110</sup> However, the connection between *idios logos* and *patrimonium* may be closer than assumed: a passage in Strabo describes the *idios logos* as 'he who investigates ownerless property which ought to fall to Caesar.'<sup>111</sup> Besides, Millar, and, later,

Rathbone, pointed out that Augustus voluntarily took over the rights of the private account of the Ptolemaic kings, and that the Augustan *idios logos* acted as a confiscator of ownerless property, and as an administrator of the imperial *patrimonium*.<sup>112</sup>

The relationship that connected the *idios logos* and the imperial *fiscus*, which one expects to find in a Roman province, is more problematic. Millar found it odd that the private account of the emperor could legally act as the *fiscus* of a Roman province, selling properties and receiving taxes, while Brunt thought that, in an imperial province such as Egypt, the sphere of competence of the *idios logos* overlapped with the provincial *fiscus*, because the *idios logos* represented the emperor both as an administrator of public property and as a private owner. According to Brunt, in the imperial provinces the distinction between the *fiscus* or patrimonial treasury and the *aerarium* or public treasury was unimportant, because the emperor used the same personnel to control both the revenues from taxation and the revenues from his own *patrimonium*.<sup>113</sup> Modrzejewski went even further, hypothesising that: 1) the Roman *idios logos* had taken over the functions of the Ptolemaic *idios logos* as the confiscating agent of ownerless property; 2) the *idios logos* in Augustan Egypt comprised the private *patrimonium* of the emperor, and overlapped with the provincial *fiscus*; 3) from the reign of Tiberius, the provincial *fiscus* gradually took over responsibilities and income that were of the public treasury, that is, the *aerarium*.<sup>114</sup> It is difficult to test these views on the evidence, because there are almost no documentary references to *idios logos*, *patrimonium* and related officials under Augustus and Tiberius.

## THE OIKOS OF ALEXANDRIA

It is common knowledge that from its foundation Alexandria owned a specific territory in the Delta, the so-called 'Ἀλεξανδρέων χώρα or 'land of the Alexandrians,' which was used for gardens, fruit-trees or vineyards.<sup>115</sup> It is unclear whether this land was owned collectively by the Alexandrian citizens or, as seems more likely, it was a special, low-tax land which the Ptolemaic king leased or sold to Alexandrian citizens only. Documents show that from the early Ptolemaic period this land enjoyed fiscal privileges, which continued at least until AD 68, when the edict of the prefect Tiberius Julius Alexander confirmed that the ἀρχαία γῆ in the 'Ἀλεξανδρέων χώρα and the Menelaite nome should be excluded from the land survey and therefore from taxation.<sup>116</sup> The property of the Alexandrian citizens, however, was not confined to the topographical area of the 'Ἀλεξανδρέων χώρα, that is, to the Delta.<sup>117</sup> Evidence shows that Alexandrian citizens could own or lease land in

other regions as well. In particular, a group of documents, all coming from the Roman period, refer in retrospect to a period in Egypt under the Ptolemies when the city of Alexandria owned land in different nomes through an institution called the οἶκος πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων, meaning literally the ‘household of the city of the Alexandrians.’ But what was an *oikos*? And when was the *oikos* of Alexandria first created?

In the Ptolemaic period the term οἶκος indicated the household or the estate of a prominent individual. According to Rostovtzeff, the whole of Egypt was the property of the *oikos* of the Ptolemaic king, but there were also smaller *oikoi* of the king’s principal assistants and friends of which the land that every farmer leased was part.<sup>118</sup> Rostovtzeff thought that the Roman government inherited this structure and continued it without change. However, in the Roman period the term *oikos* recurs only in connection with the estates of either the imperial household or the city of Alexandria. All extant references to the *oikos* of Alexandria come from the Roman period, so that it was believed that it was created under Roman rule.<sup>119</sup>

The *oikos* of Alexandria was described as ‘the patrimony of a city, in which converged donations, concessions and property bequeathed to the city,’ and ‘a corporate financial entity with landed property in the nomes.’<sup>120</sup> The last known mention of the *oikos* of a private individual seems to be in a late-Ptolemaic receipt from the Herakleopolite nome, *BGU XIV 2368.14* of around 63 BC, which refers to people ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τῆς βῆσ( ), interpreted as the *oikos* of a woman, Βῆσα(ρίου). The tax-list *BGU IX 1897a.63* of AD 166 from Theadelphia refers to land οἴκου Πτολε( ) πατρὸς Βα[.]. It was thought that this land belonged to the *oikos* of a private individual called Ptolemaios—which would be the only extant evidence for a private *oikos* in the Roman period. However, as Kambitsis pointed out, this fragment may be restored to οἴκου Πτολε(μαίου) πατρὸς βα[σιλίσσης on the basis of a parallel document of AD 158/9 which presents this formula in full.<sup>121</sup> The Ptolemy who was known in the Roman period for being ‘the father of the queen’ can be only Cleopatra’s father Ptolemy XII Auletes, to whom this phrase must refer.

Other Roman documents indicate that in the Roman period the *oikos* of Alexandria owned and managed land that had been the property of Ptolemaic kings and queens. In *P.Mil. Vogl. VI 269.29f* of AD 124 the Alexandrian citizen Philotera daughter of Ptolemaios subleases some land near Tebtunis, which is described as land οἴκου τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων πρότερον Κλεοπάτρας βασιλίσσης ἀδελφῆς, that is, land formerly belonging to ‘Cleopatra, the queen sister,’ then passed to the *oikos* of Alexandria.<sup>122</sup> The ‘queen sister’ was identified with the sister of Ptolemy VI Philometor (c. 180–145 BC), or the sis-

ter of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, who reigned from 145 to 116 BC, although in my view she may have been Cleopatra V Tryphaena, the wife and sister of Auletes. However, the phrase πρότερον Κλεοπάτρας βασιλίσσης ἀδελφῆς could have meant ‘formerly of the sister of queen Cleopatra’—Cleopatra’s most famous sister was Arsinoe, whom Caesar brought to Rome in 46 BC and led in chains in his triumph after the Alexandrine war—or ‘formerly of Cleopatra the sister of the queen,’ which may have referred to the sister of an earlier queen called Cleopatra.<sup>123</sup>

In *P.Fay.* 88.5–7, a receipt for rent issued by a nomarch to a farmer in AD 204, some land near Theadelphia is described as οἴκου πόλεως βασιλίσσης Πτολεμαίου Νέου Διονύσου. The first editors assumed that the *polis* in question was the capital of the Arsinoite nome, although there is no positive evidence to support this; on the contrary the term *polis* with no further specification normally indicated Alexandria. The phrase in l. 7 makes no sense, unless we supplement <α>, for πρότερον, between πόλεως and βασιλίσσης: in this way, it becomes ‘land of the city, formerly belonging to the queen of Ptolemy Neos Dionysos.’ As Gallazzi suggested, the phrase βασιλίσσης Πτολεμαίου Νέου Διονύσου in *P.Fay.* 88 may have been an error for the regular title βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας τῆς καὶ Τρυφαίνης τῆς γυναικὸς τοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου Νέου Διονύσου, that is, Cleopatra Tryphaena, the wife of Ptolemy Neos Dionysos.<sup>124</sup>

In P.Nicole. inv. 54<sup>125</sup> of AD 142/143, a group of people lease a plot of one hundred arouras near Sebennytyos in the Arsinoite, and part of an aroura belonging to an unspecified *oikos*. The lessors are called μισθωταὶ οἴκου [πρότερον] βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου [γυνὴ δὲ τοῦ ἱερω]τά[του ταμιεῖ]ου; the land in question, thus, seems to have been the former property of the *oikos* of a king Ptolemy (possibly Ptolemy Auletes), which passed to the imperial *fiscus* or to some other treasury, either in Rome or in Alexandria.<sup>126</sup>

BGUIV 1182 of 14/13 BC is a petition to a high official with reference to a five-year lease of some land near Kerkesoucha in the Arsinoite. This land was the property of an *oikos* (ll. 4–5 mention οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου παρὰ τοῦ τοῦ οἴκου ὑπηρέ[του]), and there is also a reference to a Ptolemaic queen ([βα]σιλίσσης, l. 6). Another interesting piece of evidence is *P.Oxy.* IV 807, an official list of sheep and goats belonging to different people in a village; some sheep were called Ἀρσινὸς φορικὰ and were subject to a special *phoros* payable nominally to a certain Arsinoe, but in effect to the state. It is possible that this document referred to livestock belonging to the estate of queen Arsinoe the wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphos, as Grenfell and Hunt first suggested, although in my view this Arsinoe was not necessarily a queen (as the



document would have said it explicitly): she may have been a Ptolemaic princess, such as, for instance, Cleopatra's sister, or a private individual.<sup>127</sup>

In theory it is possible that these rulers donated or bequeathed their land to the *oikos* in their time, but this cannot be proved, because there is no direct evidence of the *oikos* of Alexandria in the Ptolemaic period. A temporary hypothesis may be that the *oikos* of Alexandria was created after the Roman conquest: Augustus may have confiscated old categories of royal land redistributing them partly to himself and his household, partly to the city of Alexandria.

Documents show that the *oikos* of Alexandria existed as early as under Augustus. *P.Fay.* 87 of AD 155 refers to some estates around Euhemeria that had belonged to the Alexandrian philosopher Julius Asklepiades, and were bequeathed by him to the οἶκος πόλεως under Augustus. The estates of Julius Asklepiades recur in *P.Hamb.* I 36 of the second century AD, in which Dioskoros, the *misthotes* or head-lessee, subleases the estate of Julius Asklepiades to a local farmer, and in *P.Fay.* 82.15 of AD 145, where the former land of Julius Asklepiades is leased to οὔσιακοὶ μισθωταί and enjoys τελωνικὴ ἀτέλεια (l. 14) or tax-free status.<sup>128</sup> The documents however do not tell us whether Julius Asklepiades bequeathed his estate to the *oikos* of the city spontaneously or whether he was obliged to do so. *P.Fay.* 82 also helps to gain a better understanding of the internal structure of the *oikos*: the rentals of the estates (in total 1 talent 4000 drachmas) had to be paid first into a local bank in the Arsinoite and subsequently to an Alexandrian official called ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων, who seems to have been on the staff of the gymnasiarch. It is thus possible that the *oikos* was administered by or connected with the Alexandrian gymnasium.<sup>129</sup>

Evidence shows that the land owned by the *oikos* of Alexandria was ouasiac land, and that it was leased to Alexandrian citizens called μισθωταὶ οἴκου. *P.Coll. Youtie* I 63 of around AD 155/6, a list of lessees and seed loans on land around Karanis in the Arsinoite, refers to the land of a πόλις (l. 120)—probably Alexandria—along with ouasiac land. *BGU XVI* 2663 of 9 BC is a letter concerning the payment of rents from the lease of some ἐδάφη τοῦ οἴκου. In the *editio princeps* this phrase was translated as 'the foundations of the house,' but it is more likely that it indicated the 'fields of the *oikos*'; this would be the only instance of the property of the *oikos* in the Herakleopolite. Another land-tax register from the first or second century AD, the Hermopolite *P.Strasb.* I 23.4.75, mentions an οὔσια οἴκου. The *editio princeps* translated this phrase as 'treasury of the *ousia*,' although in my view it probably indicated the 'estate of the *oikos*,' as is suggested by other occurrences of a similar phrase to indicate the estate of the emperor.<sup>130</sup>

The estates of the *oikos* were leased to *misthotai oikou*, head-lessees who may have been Alexandrian citizens themselves, and who in turn leased plots of land to local small-scale farmers. To these *misthotai* one may connect documents such as the Theban ostrakon WO II 1256, dated year 35 of an unknown ruler, a receipt that Apollonios, μεμισθώμενος οἴκου, issued to Herakleides for the rent of some land, and *P.Princ.* II 33 of AD 126, a loan of wheat for the farming of some land belonging to an unspecified *oikos* (ll. 5f) according to the instructions of a certain Kalokairos. In addition one could connect the *misthotai oikou* with the people whom in AD 68 the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander defended against forced μισθώσεις οὐσιακάι, i.e. the compulsory leases of estates. It is possible that, from the early Roman period, wealthy Alexandrian citizens were increasingly obliged by the Roman government to lease dry or abandoned land and put it to cultivation at their expense.<sup>131</sup>

It remains to be investigated whether there is evidence for other *oikoi* apart from that of Alexandria. Some documents show that some traditional Egyptian temples had their own *oikos* too. *P.Mil.Vogl.* VII 302 of AD 152–154 refers to an οἶκος Ἀθη( ), resolved as οἶκος Ἀθη(νῶς)· this was believed to be the property of the temple of Athena near Tebtunis, however there are no parallels for the *oikos* of Athena in Egypt. In *P.Mil.Vogl.* II 56 of AD 151 a certain Isidoros, *misthotes oikou* of the *neokoroi* of the great god Serapis, issued a receipt to Ptollarion, the former gymnasiarch, who leased land of an *oikos* near Tebtunis, for an annual rent of 60 artabas of wheat. The first editor considered the *oikos* in this document as the estate of the temple of Tebtunis, although it may have been that of Alexandria too. An isolated document shows that the city of Rhodes had an *oikos*: *P.Oxy.* L 3593.27–8 and 56–7 of AD 238–244 is a contract of sale of slaves through a Rhodian bank, which was subscribed by the *neokoros* of the οἶκος τῆς πόλεως. Another *oikos* is documented at Antinoe, which was founded under Hadrian and probably had the *oikos* of Alexandria as a model.<sup>132</sup>

In conclusion, the evidence examined shows that, at least in the Roman period, the city of Alexandria and its citizen community owned land not only in the surrounding Ἀλεξανδρέων χώρα, but also throughout Egypt. In addition there were estates and lands that Alexandria owned in Egypt through the *oikos*. It seems that all the land owned by or leased to Alexandrian citizens enjoyed partial or total exemption from taxes. Such fiscal privileges seem to have existed throughout the Roman period.<sup>133</sup> It remains open when the *oikos* of Alexandria was first created. From the lack of direct references from the Ptolemaic period, one might argue that the *oikos* was a Roman innovation. At first sight it seems possible that Augustus introduced the *oikos* in Alexandria in

the first years after the conquest, when he confiscated old categories of royal and private lands and gave them to new beneficiaries: he may have given new land to Alexandria in order to gain the city's political support in a crucial phase for the empire. Alexandrian citizens may have been more willing to collaborate with the new regime if it increased their landed property and privileges.

However, the group of documents mentioning the land of Ptolemaic kings and queens tell us that there was a major turning point when the *oikos* of Alexandria acquired the land of Ptolemy XII Auletes, and probably also of his wife Cleopatra Tryphaena and his daughter Arsinoe, Cleopatra VII's sister.<sup>134</sup> These documents suggest that there was a substantial transfer of land from the royal family to the *oikos* of Alexandria, which may have taken place either before or after the death of Ptolemy Auletes in 51 BC, that is, either in the late 50s BC or possibly in 48/47 BC, when Julius Caesar came to Alexandria to fight the last phase of the civil war. It is possible that this 'transfer of property' from the account of Ptolemy Auletes to that of Alexandria took place on the death of Auletes in 51 BC, when Julius Caesar publicly opened the will of the king, of which one copy was deposited in Rome.<sup>135</sup> The creation of the *oikos* may have served to reward the wealthiest Alexandrian families in exchange of other favours, to create a city treasury that could pay the salaries of the city administrators, or to make up for the absence of a city council at Alexandria, a problem that had existed since before the Roman conquest, and that is the subject of a famous delegation of Alexandrians to Augustus.<sup>136</sup> The possibility that the *oikos* was created by Octavian after 30 BC seems less likely because the documents describe the estates of the *oikos* as the former property of Ptolemy Auletes, which is a sign that Cleopatra had not yet entered the political stage. In fact, after her accession in 51 BC, all the royal properties must have become 'of queen Cleopatra,' and, by 30 BC, 'of the kings Cleopatra and Caesarion.'

## CONCLUSION

Egypt's geophysical characteristics, and especially the role of the Nile flood in agriculture, made the relationship between Egypt's land and its farmers one of deep continuity over the centuries. The Roman conquest, however, caused a general expansion of the cultivated soil and probably also an improvement of agricultural techniques. First of all, Augustus secured to himself the control over the hydraulic system by using his army to clear up the canals in the years after 30 BC.<sup>137</sup> Besides, evidence shows that in the Augustan period public officials inspected the quality of samples of seed (δείγματα) before selecting the best one for sowing.<sup>138</sup>

It is entirely possible that the spread of *ousiai* after the Roman conquest introduced some changes in the selection of crops. After all, this had happened three centuries earlier, when the Greek conquerors promoted the cultivation of Mediterranean crops such as olives, wheat and wine; similarly, after Sicily became a Roman province in 227 BC, its production of grain was devoted to export for consumption in Rome.<sup>139</sup> Rostovtzeff thought that the formation of *ousiai* brought in substantial changes in the method of exploitation of land. However, it has been argued that the *ousiai* were normally divided in small-scale plots farmed in the traditional manner, and that the Roman landowners in the *chora* did not really differ from their Greek or Egyptian predecessors. In a recent study, Kehoe hypothesised that, although when an *ousia* was created the range of crops sown was already determined, the spread of imperial estates may have determined gradual agricultural improvements and large investments in capital-intensive crops such as vines—it remains unclear who sponsored these investments, whether the imperial patrimony, the beneficiaries of the estates, or the small-scale farmers who subleased them.<sup>140</sup> The major change that the spread of imperial *ousiai* brought in was that the revenues from these estates did not remain within Egypt—as was the case with the Ptolemaic *doreai*—but flowed directly into the imperial *patrimonium*; the main purpose of creating imperial *ousiai* may thus have been to extract wealth from Egypt in the most direct way, and without too many intermediaries.

In the first two centuries AD, the majority of the land in Egypt continued to be the property of the state: as in the Ptolemaic period, the most fertile land was kept as state or patrimonial property, while the unproductive land was put up for sale.<sup>141</sup> The most important novelties of the Augustan period seem to have been the official recognition of katoikic land as private land and the increase of private land in general. However, surveys of the evidence for katoikic land suggest that the administration of this type of land changed little from the Ptolemaic to the Julio-Claudian period, and that the *katoikoi* continued to enjoy the privileges attached to their land, including a discount on their capitation tax. It seems that, at least under Augustus and Tiberius, land was not freely alienable to all, but only to a restricted section of the population, i.e. Roman and Alexandrian citizens, and persons with Greek status. It is likely that the Roman government took over and enhanced the existing status system that linked ownership of land to a privileged fiscal status and the notion of Greek culture.<sup>142</sup>

The documents regarding the *ousiai* suggest that, although the structure and administration of these estates owed much to their Ptolemaic precedents, they were probably the most innovative form of landownership brought in by

Rome. As Kehoe argued, the estates in Egypt fulfilled the same functions as the estates of Roman citizens in other parts of the empire, that is, to provide an absentee owner with an annual revenue on which his social position depended. The precise legal conditions under which estates were 'owned' remain however obscure. It is unclear whether it is legitimate to speak of private property rather than of usufruct, and whether the estates automatically reverted to the emperor on the death of their owners.<sup>143</sup> Probably, the estates of the imperial family generally reverted to the imperial *patrimonium*, while only on some occasions estates could be ceded as gifts or through inheritance.<sup>144</sup> The confiscation of the land of Ptolemy Auletes and his family and its redistribution to the *oikos* of Alexandria clearly shows that some important turning point in the reorganisation of land may have taken place even before the formal conquest in 30 BC. The Alexandrian citizens seem to have owned most of the 'non-imperial' estates. It seems also that, by acquiring land, they also acquired the obligation to sow it, so that to buy or to be assigned an estate often meant to take up an almost-compulsory task.<sup>145</sup> Augustus or even some other Roman authority in the 50s or in the 40s BC may have promoted the creation of estates mainly in order to increase the area of cultivated land by using the capitals of the local élites.

An aspect of innovation of the Augustan period was the concentration of power in the person of the emperor and in his household. Augustus took over the *idios logos* of the Ptolemaic kings, and the private account of the emperor became gradually more important than the public one. This concentration of power may be seen also from the sudden appearance in the Augustan period of imperial slaves and freedmen as business managers who performed wide-ranging transactions. These freedmen are the Egyptian counterpart of the *vilici*, *actores* and *institores* who are documented in Italy and outside from the late Republican period.<sup>146</sup> In Egypt, as in the other provinces, imperial slaves and freedmen not only administered the private patrimony of the emperor, but also supervised the collection of the public dues, so that the emperor *de facto* established a close control over all the revenues.<sup>147</sup>

Against Rostovtzeff's portrayal of the Ptolemaic state as a '*dirigiste*' state, the most recent studies on the Ptolemaic agricultural regime have suggested that under the Ptolemies Egypt was not so centrally or tightly managed, but that the Ptolemaic control was regionally variable and not uniform throughout Egypt.<sup>148</sup> For this reason it is incorrect to say that Augustus dismantled the centralised system of the Ptolemies; on the contrary, it seems that he preserved this system and made it even more centralised and controlled by his household. In conclusion, the old view that Augustus' creation of new private land went against the monolithic power of the Ptolemaic regime loses force: it seems clear

that the emperor took over lands, revenues and competences that were previously royal or temple-related, and concentrated in his person more powers than the Ptolemaic kings ever had.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Milking the Cow: Taxes and Tax Collection in Augustan Egypt

## INTRODUCTION

The principal source for the study of the history of taxation in Egypt is a very large, continually growing number of tax receipts and tax registers preserved on papyri and ostraka. Such a body of material has no parallel in other provinces, but in spite of its size, it still cannot answer all the questions relating to the fiscal system of Egypt, of which there is no up-to-date synthesis since Wilcken and Wallace published their works in 1912 and 1938 respectively. Thus many aspects of the taxation system that operated in Egypt remain obscure, especially with regard to the earlier period of Roman rule.

In this chapter I argue that the essential structure of the taxation system of Ptolemaic Egypt was taken over by Augustus, and that the technicalities of the annual assessment for taxes through a sophisticated system of records and accounting continued from the Ptolemaic into the Roman period without significant changes. Taxes were assessed in the office of the ἐκλογιστής in Alexandria and in boards of ἐκλογισταί in the nome capitals, who established the amount to be exacted from each nome. The estimate of the revenue available was deduced from the reports periodically submitted by the *strategos* and the secretaries of the nome. The substantial change that the Roman conquest brought in was that the total amount of taxes to be exacted from every province was determined every year by the emperor in Rome. The assessment was probably based on reports and a tax schedule or γνώμων supplied by the prefect. Besides, edicts of the prefect could furnish corrections or modifications to the assessment of the taxes, for instance by granting exemptions or reductions to defined groups of people or to specific geographical areas.<sup>1</sup>



The first part of this chapter investigates the methods and the personnel involved in the collection of taxes. It examines the terminology used to designate tax collectors, and looks at the provenance and social status of the officials involved. It addresses the questions whether the cities or other local communities had any degree of autonomy in the collection of taxes, as seems to have been the case in other provinces, and whether the advent of Roman rule introduced changes in the method of collecting taxes.

The second part of this chapter examines the most important taxes documented under Augustus; it does not aim to list all taxes known from the beginning of the reign of Augustus until the second century AD, but examines whether the Augustan documents can tell us whether the majority of the taxes were taken over from the Ptolemaic period or were introduced by Augustus. There are two major obstacles to such an analysis. First, the scarcity of late Ptolemaic evidence often does not allow for an adequate comparison between the Ptolemaic and the Roman periods. Besides, the irregular distribution of tax receipts, coming always from the same places within a few districts, makes it difficult, often impossible, to judge whether taxation was uniform throughout the province.

### **THE COLLECTION OF THE TAXES IN CASH: TELONAI AND PRAKTORES**

The literary sources inform us that in 47 BC Julius Caesar transferred the collection of the regular taxes in the cities of Asia from the companies of Roman *publicani* to the civic authorities, and reduced their burden by one third.<sup>2</sup> Thus, Caesar, and later Augustus, deprived the companies of Roman *publicani* of the political power that they had accumulated (and often abused) in the Republican period. The collection of direct taxes was taken out of the control of the *publicani* and was entrusted to officials appointed directly by the state, and only a minor number of *publicani* continued to be employed for the farming of indirect taxes, such as the 5% inheritance tax or the 2% sales tax. Furthermore, it seems that in the Augustan period the *publicani* who were left to farm the indirect taxes were controlled more closely, as imperial procurators were introduced to supervise the collection and prevent collusion between the tax farmers and the local administrators. In some provinces, such as Asia and Africa, the Greek cities could also gather in the taxes themselves, by selling the rights of collection to native tax farmers.<sup>3</sup>

On the basis of these assumptions one might hypothesise that in early imperial Egypt too the Ptolemaic tax farmers called *τελώναι* were replaced by *πράκτορες*, tax collectors appointed annually by the state. However, when

exactly this took place is unclear. Because of the scarcity of mentions of *praktōres* in Augustan documents, it was thought that state-appointed *praktōres* were brought in after the reign of Augustus, possibly during the latter half of the reign of Tiberius, although such an important change does not suit the stereotyped portrait of Tiberius as a mere conservator of Augustus's achievements.<sup>4</sup> Another problem in this theory is that, if a radical reform in the method of tax collection really took place under Augustus, this would have been mentioned by Tacitus, who on the contrary states that the collection of the grain and money revenues in the provinces was in the hands of companies of publicans as late as AD 23.<sup>5</sup>

The question remained open until 1970, when Lewis suggested that the Roman conquest brought about a substantial change to the taxation system of Egypt: under the Ptolemies the collection of taxes was performed by salaried functionaries, with tax farmers as mere guarantors of the collection, while under Roman rule tax collectorships became liturgies. Lewis thought that the turning point from a Ptolemaic to a Roman method of levying taxes was the reign of Augustus, and that the *telonai* who occur in Roman documents were in effect acting as Roman *publicani*.<sup>6</sup> Besides, Tacitus' remark about the presence of publicans in AD 23 may not have referred to the situation in Egypt, and thus one cannot use this passage to draw conclusions about Egypt. All these points of view will be tested against the documents.

In the Ptolemaic period, the collection of the taxes was carried out through partnerships that bought the right to levy the royal dues for a percentage of these revenues. Generally, there was a more prominent figure called ἀρχώνης, who directed the tax farmers and their partners (τελώναι and μέτοχοι), and there were state-appointed officials (πράκτορες), who collected fines and arrears.<sup>7</sup> The contract of a tax farmer normally lasted one year, but was renewable; the same contractor could farm several taxes and his sphere of influence could extend from a single village to the entire nome. Ptolemaic tax farmers contracted to pay lump sums, and were also entitled to an ὄψωνιον or salary in money, equivalent to 5–10% on their contract.<sup>8</sup> Every month, the tax farmer and the banker reported to the οἰκονόμος, and the copies of this monthly report were forwarded to the offices of the διοικητής and the ἐκλογιστής at Alexandria. If there was a deficit, tax farmers were liable for it with their own properties, which insured the state against fiscal risks. Tax farmers were often supervised by higher officials, called ἐπιτηρηταί or λογευταί, who could also participate directly in the collection. The Ptolemies had very precise laws in matters of fiscal right (νόμοι τελωνικοί), which also included instructions to tax collectors on matters of behaviour. The existence of—as Préaux has put it—a 'morale fermière,' that

is, a moral code for tax collectors, implies that the abuses in this sector were endemic.<sup>9</sup>

The general trend in the early empire was to use *publicani* only for the levy of indirect taxes. For this reason, Youtie thought that in Roman Egypt too the direct taxes came to be collected by state-appointed *praktōres*, while *telonai* were confined to the levy of indirect taxes, as happened to the *publicani* in other Roman provinces.<sup>10</sup> But is it legitimate to compare the Egyptian *telonai* to the Roman *publicani*? The answer is probably negative. In fact, the Egyptian *telonai* were men of influence and wealth in their own communities, but their sphere of activity was limited, as they normally bid for one or more taxes collected within the city or the village. For this reason, tax farmers in Egypt, as well as in Judaea and probably also in other Eastern provinces, were much less powerful than their Roman counterparts. The Egyptian evidence suggests that *telonai* could levy either direct or indirect taxes under both Ptolemaic and Roman rule, and, as Rostovtzeff first pointed out, that probably the large companies of Roman publicans never set foot in Egypt.<sup>11</sup> This was also due to a language problem: in order to collect taxes in Egypt one needed to know not only Greek, but also Egyptian.

In the documents of the Roman period one continues to find partnerships of tax farmers called *τελώναι* and *πραγματευταί*, either alone or aided by partners (*μέτοχοι*). Under Augustus one finds *telonai* collecting both direct and indirect taxes. In *SB I 4327* of 6 BC, for instance, a certain Asklas farms the tax on weavers; other documents show tax farmers collecting the bath tax, the pig tax, and the tax on sales.<sup>12</sup>

Other terms indicating tax farmers in the early Roman period are *πραγματευόμενος*, *δημοσιώνης*, and *ἀσχολούμενος*. In *P.Ryl. II 118.15*, 22 of 16/15 BC someone is described as the *πραγματευόμενος* of the tax on sales. It must be noted, however, that the term *πραγματευόμενος* is documented before the Roman conquest, especially in the expression *οἱ τὰ βασιλικὰ πραγματευόμενοι*, indicating the official authorities in general.<sup>13</sup>

Evidence for the tax farmer called *δημοσιώνης* (which is a close translation of the Latin *publicanus*) is first found in *P.Oxy. I 44* of AD 66<sup>14</sup>, and there seems to be no reference to any *ἀπαιτητής* as such in documents of the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, although *ἀπαιτησις* was the technical term indicating the collection of direct taxes both in the late Ptolemaic and in the early Roman period.<sup>15</sup> The term *ἀσχολούμενος* designated an official who took up the liturgy of running an office or levying a tax. The earliest occurrences of this term are *M.Chr. 183* of AD 46, with reference to the management of the *γραφεῖον* or record-office at Soknopaiou Nesos, and *BGU III 748.2.5f* of AD 62, where a certain Tiberius Claudius Eurhythmos has taken up the collection of the sales tax or *ἐγκύκλιον* for the entire Arsinoite nome.

In the Ptolemaic period, we meet the term *πράκτωρ* without any further specification, or with supplements such as *ξενικῶν*, *βασιλικῶν*, or *ἰδιωτικῶν*. In origin, this was an executive official of the court of justice of the *χρηματισταί*. After the Roman conquest, the ancient executive organs were not suppressed, and the *praktōres* continued to exist for some time in the reign of Augustus, although they had less power and were confined to minor juridical matters. It is worth noting, however, that the terms *πράκτωρ* and *πρακτορεία* could indicate tax collectors and tax collection in the late Ptolemaic period as well. In *BGU* VIII 1851.5 of the first century BC, a *πράκτωρ* called Zoilos levies τὸν τῆς συντάξεως στέφανον from a *katoikos*. In *BGU* VIII 1867.2, of the period 64–44 BC, the term *πρακτορεία* indicates the round of tax-collection of the *strategos* in the nome. *P.Tebt.* II 345, perhaps of 28 BC, lists payments for *πρακτορικά*, possibly the salary of *praktōres*.<sup>16</sup> In an Augustan document from Alexandria, a *πράκτωρ τῶν προσόδων* receives a payment for *ἀναφόριον* and *στέφανος* for a transfer of landed property, and in a private document of 13 BC unspecified *praktōres* received a payment of interest for a loan of money.<sup>17</sup> It seems that these were *praktōres* of the Ptolemaic type, who dealt with judicial executive tasks, and had little to do with the actual collection of direct taxes for the Roman state.<sup>18</sup>

The earliest document that mentions *πράκτορες* collecting *λαογραφία* seems to be *SB* VI 9545.1.5 of AD 12. A *πράκτωρ* of a tax *ὑπὲρ ἀπόρων* appears in *O.Bodl.* II 765.3 of 2 BC.<sup>19</sup> The evidence for *πράκτορες* collecting direct taxes becomes more significant from the reign of Tiberius onwards. In the first century AD the mention of a *πράκτωρ* was usually accompanied by an identification of the tax involved in the genitive case, e.g. *λαογραφίας*, *βαλλανευτικῶν*, *χωματικῶν*. From the reign of Augustus comes the earliest evidence for the phrase *πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν*, that is, collector of taxes in money—a counterpart to this figure may be the *πράκτωρ σιτικῶν* or collector of taxes in grain, attested from the reign of Trajan.<sup>20</sup> The earliest evidence of a *πράκτωρ δημοσίων* or exactor of public dues comes from the reign of Tiberius. This title derived probably from the Ptolemaic title *πράκτωρ τῶν βασιλικῶν*, which is documented from the third century BC onwards.<sup>21</sup>

Both in the Ptolemaic and in the Augustan period, tax collectors had assistants and helpers called *ὑπηρέται*, *χειρισταί* or *βοηθοί*.<sup>22</sup> From the third century BC there is evidence that subordinate local officials performed the actual collection on behalf of tax collectors, often called *λογευταί*; some documents from Philadelphia in the Arsinoite shows *λογευταί* levying the poll tax and other money taxes under Augustus and Tiberius.<sup>23</sup> Sharp thought that Rome might have introduced new officials, such as the *ἐπιτηρητής*, of which the earliest evidence seems to be *O.Elkab* 180.1 of AD

33/34. This was a liturgical official appointed at the level of the nome to supervise a variety of taxes, and occasionally engaged in the actual collection alongside tax farmers.<sup>24</sup>

The terminology indicating tax collectors also varied according to geographical area. In the Arsinoite, for instance, the most common types of tax collector were the *πράκτωρ* and his agents, the *χειρισταί*, but elsewhere tax collectors may have had different titles. In addition, in some areas, such as Upper Egypt, it was banks and bankers that did most of the work.<sup>25</sup>

The principle regulating the number of *praktōres* for each nome is unknown. Presumably it was established according to the number of taxpayers of the nome, on the basis of lists submitted by village officials to the *strategos* or the prefect. But when did tax collectorships become liturgical? Rostovtzeff thought that these offices may have been occasionally compulsory since the late Ptolemaic period, as there is evidence that people tended to avoid the offices of *telones* and *praktor* because they could not hope to make enough profit from that job, but often faced a deficit for which they were responsible with their own money. This may have been the origin of the Roman system of compulsory services, but there is no direct evidence to prove this.<sup>26</sup> The earliest secure evidence for liturgical *praktōres* is *P.Mich.* X 582 of AD 49/50, although, according to Thomas, some tax collectorships may have become compulsory services earlier in the Julio-Claudian period.<sup>27</sup> In addition, the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander of AD 68 reveals that, although the officials of the province had no legal right to compel contractors to submit bids, *τελώναι* were often obliged to accept contracts against their will.<sup>28</sup> In *P.Oxy.* I 44 of AD 66, a *strategos* writes to a *basilikos grammateus* complaining about the difficulty of finding contractors for the collection of the *ἐγκύκλιον* and for the management of the offices of the *ἀγορανομεῖον* and the *γραφεῖον* at Oxyrhynchus. He says that he had been in communication with the prefect about this problem, and that the prefect ‘replied requesting me to examine the terms under which the taxes had previously been farmed, and as far as possible to lighten the burden of the farmers, in order to prevent the disappearance of those who were being pressed to bid.’<sup>29</sup>

To sum up, the evidence for *praktōres* collecting direct taxes appears under Augustus and increases from the reign of Tiberius onwards. It is likely that Augustus introduced new *praktōres* for the collection of the most important direct taxes (e.g. the *laographia*), while Wilcken’s hypothesis that it was Tiberius who reformed the method of collecting taxes after AD 23 loses force.<sup>30</sup> But one should be wary of any dogmatic view. The process whereby *praktōres* partially replaced *telonai* probably took longer than is commonly assumed and was not

uniform throughout Egypt. In addition, *telonai* and *praktores* may have been used in combination.

### THE COLLECTION OF THE GRAIN REVENUE: PHOROLOGOI AND SITOLOGOI

A clear change after the Roman conquest emerges from the documents concerning the collection of the revenue in grain. A small group of Augustan papyri refers to an official called φορολόγος, which has been considered as the Greek translation of the Latin *publicanus*, *procurator* or (most appropriately in my view) *tributarius*.<sup>31</sup> This official supervised the collection of the grain tax and the distribution of seed corn from the local σιτολόγοι to the public farmers. It is worth noting that all surviving mentions of the *phorologoi* come from the Augustan period, and that, in all known cases, these officials appear to have been freedmen, slaves or *vicarii* from the household of Augustus.<sup>32</sup>

In BGU XVI 2605.6 of 7–5/4 BC, the imperial slave Athenion acts as *phorologos* of the graintax.<sup>33</sup> The same Athenion ‘slave of Caesar’ recurs in BGU XVI 2662.4, where he is accused of harassment. An Arsinoite document of AD 11–15 concerning the distribution of seed grain to public farmers mention a certain Faustus as the *vicarius* of the imperial slave Priscus, who acted as the *phorologos*. The actual payments were made to two officials called Dionysios and Philologos, who may have been the *sitologoi*. The document mentions also an imperial freedman, Lucius Marius, who may have presided over the whole operation.<sup>34</sup>

*P.Vind. Tandem* 9.19f of around AD 12 presents a certain Siphilos as a *vicarius* of Chresimos, a *phorologos* and a slave of Augustus,<sup>35</sup> while *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3273 (undated, but of the first century AD) shows a certain Eudaimon, slave of the *phorologos* M. Antonius Spondon, supervising the distributions of seed corn by liturgical *sitologoi*. The first two names of Spondon suggest that he may have been a freedman of Mark Antony’s daughter Antonia, or perhaps of Antonia Drusi, who is documented as an estate-owner in the Oxyrhynchite.<sup>36</sup> Another document, assigned to the first century BC, lists the public *sitologoi* of the *metropolis* of Oxyrhynchus along with an official called Olympos, slave of Hierax. Probably Olympos was the local *vicarius* of the imperial *phorologos*.<sup>37</sup>

The term *phorologos* and its cognate *phorologia* find further parallels in the documents and in the literary sources. In a document of the Augustan period, the annual corn revenue from public land is called φορολογία Καίσαρος Αυτοκράτορος Θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ,<sup>38</sup> and a passage in Philo accuses the tax collectors of committing every sort of abuse ‘for the sake of the revenue’ (φορολογίας ἔνεκα).<sup>39</sup> A passage in Strabo informs us that Rome’s

first move after the annexation of a region as a province was to send there ἡγεμόνας καὶ φορολόγους.<sup>40</sup> While the reference to ἡγεμόνας probably indicated provincial governors, Strabo's φορολόγοι, as well as their documentary counterparts, may have indicated the collectors of the *tributum soli*.

To sum up, from the very beginning of the Roman period, the collection of the grain revenue throughout Egypt was managed by imperial officials. The *phorolогоι* seem to have been imperial freedmen with their own staff of slaves as *vicarii*. The reason why the references to *phorolогоι* seem to disappear so suddenly after the reign of Augustus is unknown, but the silence of the sources seems to be too consistent to be a mere coincidence. It is possible that under Tiberius or Claudius imperial freedmen and slaves continued to be employed in the collection of taxes, but were called something different, or were replaced by other officials under the command of imperial *procuratores*.

From the Ptolemaic period, the σιτολόγοι were the main officials responsible for the collection of the grain tax, and for the annual distribution of seed grain to royal (or public) farmers.<sup>41</sup> Under both Ptolemaic and Roman rule, the responsibility of the *sitologoi* extended from the single granaries (θησσαυροί), to the villages and the toparchies of the nome, so that the *sitologos* of the nome had control over the *sitologos* of the toparchy and, ultimately, over that of the single village or granary. The *sitologoi* were helped by assistants and secretaries, and were often supervised by πράκτορες σιτικῶν or φορολόγοι.<sup>42</sup> The internal relationships within the hierarchy of *sitologoi* and between the *sitologoi* and the public farmers are still obscure, as the administrative boundaries of the granaries are unknown, and the procedure presented regional variations.

The earliest *sitologos*-orders for the Roman period are *BGU XVI 2560–2576*, dating from 8/7 to 3/2 BC; the last ones from the Ptolemaic period are *SB V 8755–8756* of either 78 or 49/48 BC<sup>43</sup>, all from the Herakleopolite. The comparison of these two groups of documents shows that the basic procedure of distribution of seed corn remained the same in the Ptolemaic and the Roman periods. In the Herakleopolite, the toparch and the κατασπορεύς issued the directives and the *sitologoi* took written oaths (καθηκούσας χειρογραφίας) from the farmers, while elsewhere it was the *strategos* who issued the directives, together with the *basilikos grammateus*.<sup>44</sup> In the Oxyrhynchite the σιτολόγοι resided κατὰ τόπων or in the μητρόπολις,<sup>45</sup> and were occasionally called σιτολογούντες, as was the case in the Ptolemaic period.<sup>46</sup> At Oxyrhynchus, the *komogrammateus* or the *topogrammateus* could confirm that the farmers receiving the seed were actually farming the land they had said they would.<sup>47</sup> It is possible that a Roman (Augustan or later) development was that the *sitologoi* became liturgic officials, nominated by the *komogrammateus*, and

worked in pairs for one to three years; however, many regional idiosyncrasies in the distribution of seed corn probably continued into the Roman period from earlier times.

It is also possible that in the Roman period the former royal granaries were renamed as public, and were increasingly privatised, in the sense that they could be leased to private citizens, who ran them under the close control of the state. This probably applied also to the granaries in imperial estates, such as those of Livia and Claudia Livilla in the Arsinoite.<sup>48</sup> However, this might have happened before the Roman conquest. It has been also noticed that, as early as under Augustus, some private banks acted as granaries and issued receipts for payments in grain; since a similar procedure is found in Republican Rome, scholars assumed that Augustus simply imported it in Egypt.<sup>49</sup> However, it is possible that mixed payments in cash and grain existed in banks as early as in the Ptolemaic (and possibly the pre-Ptolemaic) period.

Further light may come from the investigation of the names of the collectors of taxes. The proportion of Latin names may say something about the presence of Roman officials who were sent to Egypt from Italy in order to take part in the collection of the revenues, naturally, however, with the *caveat* that Greek or Latin personal names are not as reliable an indicator of anybody's ethnic origin as Egyptian names are.

The use of the Latin language in tax collection as early as under Augustus is witnessed by the Latin ostrakon *CPL* 282 of 18 BC, on which someone wrote *acc(epi) art[abas] frum[enti] . . .*, and by two ostraka from Edfu, *SB XVIII* 13574 and 13575, tax receipts written in Demotic and Latin for payments in wheat in AD 9.<sup>50</sup> In *SB I* 4960 of 29 BC taxes are collected by Eros the slave of Hilarion, probably an imperial slave. Some documents show Latin-named collectors of money taxes under Augustus. In *BGU XVI* 2652, from the period from 10/9 to 2 BC, a certain Antonius collects 2000 drachmas for ἀριθμητικὸν κατοίκων<sup>51</sup> for the Herakleopolite nome, although the actual collection is performed by Athenodoros and Eurylochos. In *BGU XVI* 2646 of 3 BC, an official called Afinius collects cash taxes on behalf of the prefect Turranius, and a certain Damas, apparently a man of importance, is involved too. In *BGU XVI* 2626.25,51 a certain Ruphio collects direct imposts. *BGU XVI* 2670 of 14/13 BC preserves an account for taxes in money for the entire Herakleopolite nome, to be collected according to toparchy before the visit of a certain Lupus, perhaps the *strategos*. *P.Oxy.* IV 817, a list of names and sums of money dated 10/9 BC, mentions an Anteros son of (or, more probably, slave of) Lucretius, possibly the tax collector. In *O.Fay.* 12.1 of 6 BC a λογευτής collected a tax of 4 drachmas at Theadelphia, but final payments converged eventually to a certain Polio, a



possible transliteration of the Latin name Pollio. In *BGU VII 1590a.2* of AD 6/7, the *συντάξιμον* at Philadelphia is collected by a *χειριστής* called Romulus. In *P.Mich. V 233.5* of AD 25, a certain C. Julius Philetus is the *katasporeu/j* or supervisor of the sowing of the Arsinoite nome. In addition, numerous ostraka from Berenike mention Roman-named tax collectors, mostly imperial freedmen and slaves, among whom a certain C. Julius Epaphroditus seems to be the most prominent figure.<sup>52</sup>

These documents clearly indicate that Augustus introduced a radical change in the collection of taxes, namely the introduction of imperial freedmen and slaves who often came from outside Egypt. It is possible that, as Brunt hypothesised, under Augustus the taxes once farmed for a lump sum came to be farmed on a percentage basis and that this required a closer supervision over the tax farmers. For this reason, procurators, imperial freedmen and slaves were introduced to direct or perform the collection of taxes.<sup>53</sup> The Egyptian evidence supports the view that the collection of taxes in the late Republican and early imperial period was organised according to the *vilicus* system, whereby tax farmers or imperial procurators could appoint fiscal *vilici* in charge of smaller administrative units.<sup>54</sup> To sum up, in Egypt Augustus left in place the local small-scale tax-farmers, such as the *telonai*, who could speak the Egyptian language, but established a closer control over them by introducing a hierarchy of imperial freedmen, who resided in Alexandria and supervised the collection through a system of subordinate slaves who travelled around the province acting as *vicarii*, *actores*, or *vilici*.<sup>55</sup>

## THE ROLE OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN THE COLLECTION OF TAXES

It seems that in Egypt Augustus made little use of civic communities in the collection of the taxes, while this practice was adopted in the rest of the empire. Sharp hypothesised that the councils of the Greek cities of Egypt played a role in the collection of taxes, but that this did not apply to nome capitals before the Severan reform of AD 200, when town councils (*βουλαί*) were introduced everywhere.<sup>56</sup> According to Sharp, however, the Roman administration in Egypt devolved the collection of taxes to local communities other than cities, which operated under the close control of state officials, while it avoided where possible the use of Roman staff.<sup>57</sup>

The reason why it is so difficult to establish to what extent cities may have played a role in the collection of taxes is simply that there are almost no documents coming from the Greek cities of Egypt. As concerns Alexandria, we know that the city had an *ὄϊκος*, that is, a corporate financial entity with

landed property in the nomes; but whether this institution played any role in the collection of Alexandrian taxes or in the handing in of the revenues to the Roman state is unknown.<sup>58</sup> As regards the nome capitals, although they did not have βουλαί before AD 200, they might nonetheless have had some autonomy in the collection of taxes, naturally under the close supervision of state officials.

Both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman periods, tax farmers could supervise the work of local intermediaries who gathered the taxes and made requisitions on their behalf.<sup>59</sup> The evidence of tax receipts addressed to ἡγούμενοι or πρεσβύτεροι of temples, guilds and villages shows that the presidents of different local communities acted as intermediaries between the local payers and the state.<sup>60</sup> In *BGU*XVI 2663 of 9 BC, an ἐκλήμπτωρ (tax farmer) coerced the president of the public farmers of Tilothis into collecting taxes on estate land, and in *BGUIV* 1197.8 of 6/5 BC two priests of the temple of Bousiris petitioned the *strategos* Asklepiades, complaining that the presidents of the public farmers had not paid the σύνταξις for five years.

Priests and temples were often involved in the collection of taxes, both in grain and in money. Priests could act as *sitologi*, and temples functioned as granaries, and often organised the collection of taxes for Rome within their neighbourhoods. In *P.Oxy.* XII 1480 of AD 32, for instance, a priest writes to a prophet about the delay in some payments, and appears to have been in contact with the *komogrammateus* and the *eklogistes* of the nome.<sup>61</sup> As Brunt pointed out, it was not only communities organized on the pattern of Greek and Italian cities that could be entrusted with the collection of taxes: in Judaea in AD 66, for instance, it was the priestly administration of Jerusalem who performed this task.<sup>62</sup> In Egypt too, temples often acted as banks in the Ptolemaic and probably also in the Roman period.

Banks played an essential role in the collection of taxes already in the Ptolemaic period. The bankers with their daybooks of collections assisted the *praktōres* in the preparation of monthly reports to the *strategos* or the prefect, and the revenues from taxation were transferred through bills of exchange from the accounts of tax collectors to the state treasury in Alexandria.<sup>63</sup> Bogaert's study of the family of the Theban banker Kephalos, in the period from the 20s BC to AD 1, has demonstrated that the Ptolemaic practice of leaving public bankers in their jobs for decades continued under Roman rule, and that in some places the office continued to be hereditary.<sup>64</sup> Probably most banks in the Julio-Claudian period continued to work in the traditional manner and continued to issue receipts in Demotic, as is the case with the banks at Thebes.<sup>65</sup>

Youtie found it surprising that ‘a great number of Egyptians were in the habit of taking a stroll down to the bank to discharge their legal obligations to a foreign power.’<sup>66</sup> In fact, it is plausible that most of the times it was the tax collector who took a stroll down the bank after his round of collections from different villages.<sup>67</sup> Under Roman rule it was normal for tax collectors to be escorted by soldiers and police guards, who often used violent means to extract revenues from recalcitrant taxpayers. Some form of police control over the collection of taxes probably existed in the Ptolemaic period, but under the Roman administration the military involvement in the collection of taxes may have been increased.<sup>68</sup> The Herakleopolite *BGU* IV 1188 shows that in 15/14 BC a soldier and two *telonai* broke into the house of a man whom they alleged not to have paid taxes. A *στᾶτωρ* (a transliteration of the Latin term *stator*) called Faustus appears in *BGU* XVI 2671.21 of the Augustan period, while in *BGU* XVI 2618.11f of 7 BC, the *statores* Sokrates and Elemmon<sup>69</sup> harass a certain Tryphas to extract some money from him. The *stator* was a Roman military officer who could act as escort, bodyguard and letter carrier on the staff of the prefect of Egypt, and seems to have played a role in the prefect’s *conventus*. These documents show that military officials of the Roman type were employed in the Herakleopolite nome as early as under Augustus. The involvement of the Roman army in the collection of taxes in Egypt is even more remarkable if we think that in this province there was a sophisticated bureaucracy that had performed this task for centuries. Thus the strong military presence in the collection of taxes goes against the supposition that Rome used its army to collect taxes only in the provinces that did not have an efficient administration.<sup>70</sup>

## THE QUESTION OF THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEFICITS

The problem of the use of violence and of the imprisonment for debts is linked to the problem of the responsibility for deficits. That people were responsible for debts with their private fortune, and that tax collectors guaranteed with their properties were accepted principles from the Ptolemaic period: as early as under Cleopatra, there is evidence that taxes could be gathered as collective taxes from the representatives of the village community, and that a village could be held responsible for the shortfalls of some of its members.<sup>71</sup> However, Lewis assumed that, in the Ptolemaic and early Roman periods, all the responsibility gravitated around the person of the tax collector, and that this responsibility was extended to the community of taxpayers from the reign of Trajan; this shift was believed to have taken place when Trajan introduced new tax collectors, the *πρόκτορες ἀργυρικῶν*, and surtaxes that the communities had to pay on

behalf of those who could not pay (μερισμοὶ ἀπόρων and ἀνακεχωρηκότων.<sup>72</sup> However, the tax could have been introduced earlier: *O.Bodl.* II 765, a Theban receipt for 5 drachmas paid ὑπὲρ ἀπόρων in 2 BC, indicates that a similar tax, if not one and the same surcharge, existed as early as under Augustus. Another Augustan document, *BGU XVI* 2593.1f, appears to attest a πράκτωρ ἀρ[-γυρικῶν], while another πράκτωρ ἀργ(υρικῶν) features in *O.Leid.* 48 of AD 29. Although this evidence is scanty, it may suggest that *praktōres* of this type existed well before the reign of Trajan. Probably, from the Augustan period both the collectors of taxes and the communities had some share of responsibility for shortfalls.

The so-called principle of collective responsibility for deficits was certainly operating under Roman rule. Some passages in Philo describe vividly the collection of taxes in the early Roman period, and say that tax collectors tortured and killed those who did not pay along with their relatives, their neighbours and their entire village.<sup>73</sup> Among the tortures inflicted by tax collectors, Philo refers specifically to στρέβλωσις, the rack, and it is worth noting that this term appears also in an Augustan document, in connection with the πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν,<sup>74</sup> which makes the testimony of Philo look more credible than it has been assumed. The account of Philo may have reflected the situation in Egypt during the reigns of Augustus or Tiberius, but he does not say explicitly that the abuses he was describing were a Roman innovation.<sup>75</sup> Similar tortures, as well as the principle that the relatives of a tax-evader were responsible for his shortfalls, may have existed in the Ptolemaic period.

The connection between *praktōres* and torture and imprisonment in the πρακτόρειον, the public prison, is documented already in the Ptolemaic period.<sup>76</sup> In AD 68, the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander records that a βούλησις of Augustus confined the use of the πρακτόρειον for debtors to the *idios logos* (ὀφείλοντες εἰς τὸν κυριακὸν λόγον).<sup>77</sup> Augustus claimed that people should pay their debts from their money, rather than their bodies, although this principle did not apply to private debtors, who continued to be put in prison.<sup>78</sup> To the existence of a prison for tax-evaders one may also connect the taxes called φύλακτρον ἀπόρων or μερισμὸς πρακτορίου, and possibly also the later evidence for a tax called πρακτορικόν, which was once interpreted as the charge for late payment or for the cost of collecting taxes.<sup>79</sup>

Youtie deplored the lack of documentary evidence for abuses on the part of tax collectors in the Roman period.<sup>80</sup> Recent publications make up for this. In *BGU XVI* 2640 of 10 BC, someone complains that a tax collector (*logentes*) has harassed a farmer to make him pay taxes. *BGU XVI* 2604 of 6 BC is a petition against a violent attack to a man and his cargo in Alexandria by two individuals (possibly slaves) called Chrysippos and Skaliphos. In *BGU XVI* 2643 of

9/8 BC somebody complains that a certain Skolops has not allowed the farmers to work, while in *BGUXVI* 2618.11 of 7 BC Tryphas writes to Athenodoros that two military officers are harassing him daily, and his slaves are dying in prison as a result of his debts. That the officials were considered responsible for the debts is clearly demonstrated by *BGUXVI* 2639 of 10/9 BC, where the *komogrammateus* who was in charge in the year of the deficit was imprisoned together with the tax-defaulters.<sup>81</sup> A passage in Philo also informs us that in case of tax-default, Egyptians could be beaten by whips, while Alexandrian citizens had the special privilege of being beaten by a flat implement. This recalls the Roman tendency to inflict different punishments according to status, but nonetheless it may have derived from an earlier Ptolemaic regulation.<sup>82</sup>

### THE METHOD OF THE COLLECTION OF TAXES

The evidence surveyed suggests that the method used for the collection of direct taxes under Roman rule underwent some changes under Augustus, although tax-farming continued to be employed for the collection of indirect and occasionally also direct taxes.<sup>83</sup> In Egypt, the collection was entrusted to small-scale tax-farmers, who were appointed by the *strategos* or other state officials. Unlike in other Roman provinces, in Egypt there is no evidence for corporate companies of publicans at any time. The earliest evidence of *praktoreis* taking over the collection of the direct taxes comes from the Augustan period. However, the process by which state-appointed *praktoreis* replaced tax farmers must have been a gradual one.<sup>84</sup> Tacitus' remark that in AD 23 some companies of Roman *equites* were farming the tributes does not indicate that all the tributes were farmed to publicans, but, rather, only that some were. In addition, as Brunt pointed out, we do not know whether Tacitus referred to Egypt, and to what extent he knew the arrangements that were enacted there.<sup>85</sup>

In Egypt, the difference between state-appointed tax collectors and tax farmers was less significant than in other provinces, as both *praktoreis* and *telonai* were under the close control of state officials, mainly the *strategos* and his staff.<sup>86</sup> For this reason it is probably correct to say that Egypt substantially differed from some provinces, although to consider 'the rest of the empire' as something homogeneous may be misleading, because we have no evidence that the collection of the revenues was performed in a single, uniform way in all the other provinces except Egypt; on the contrary, it seems that in Eastern provinces such as Judaea there were small-scale tax farmers very similar to the Egyptian *telonai*.<sup>87</sup>

The method of collecting taxes seems never to have been totally uniform throughout Egypt. It is possible that the nome-level officials were quite flexible

in their choice of the personnel to be employed in the collection of taxes.<sup>88</sup> The documents show that in Roman Egypt state officials and tax farmers coexisted, and that tax farmers could collect not only indirect but also direct taxes. It is also possible that some tax collectorships that were originally entrusted to *praktores* were subleased to local companies of *telonai*, as seems the case of *P.Fay.* 34 of AD 161, in which the βοηθοί γεωργῶν from a village near Theadelphia sublet the collection of direct taxes to a tax farmer.<sup>89</sup> Methods of collection and personnel may have also changed according to the type of taxes involved. It is possible that Augustus and Tiberius introduced new tax collectors to supervise new or revenue-raising taxes (such as the poll tax), and left the existing officials to collect taxes of minor importance.

The dearth of early evidence for city offices has led some to the conclusion that in Egypt, differently from other provinces, the collection of taxes was hardly ever devolved to the cities, but was carried out by either state-appointed officials or private contractors.<sup>90</sup> Probably, the responsibility for collection of taxes on land and people was delegated to the propertied élites within local communities, as it was indispensable to Rome to obtain the collaboration of local representatives, not least because they could speak the Egyptian language. It is however possible that the Greek cities and the nome capitals had some degree of autonomy in the collection of taxes, even before the introduction of city councils under Septimius Severus.<sup>91</sup>

The occurrences of Roman names in documents relating to tax collection reveals that the presence of Roman officials was significant from the early reign of Augustus.<sup>92</sup> In the years after the conquest, Augustus created a sort of civil service of imperial freedmen and slaves, who supervised and directed the collection and the delivery of the revenues in grain and cash. Such a network presented the clear advantage to the emperor of guaranteeing a close control over the revenues. The bank accounts of the imperial slaves covered the risk of deficits and probably facilitated the transfer of cash and grain revenues from local banks and granaries to the central administration.<sup>93</sup> Tax farmers and imperial officials could provide cash or convert payment in kind into cash, when not all the people may have had access to cash.<sup>94</sup>

It remains open whether the principle of collective responsibility for deficits was introduced by Rome. It seems that the principle according to which individual families had a degree of responsibility on behalf of their defaulting members was not entirely new, but existed from the Ptolemaic period and derived from Greek law.<sup>95</sup> Philo's description of the abuses that accompanied tax collection under the first emperors is probably less exaggerated than modern scholars assumed. However, Philo does not say that these abuses had begun under Roman rule; they could have existed for centuries.<sup>96</sup> The edict of Tiberius

Julius Alexander informs us that Augustus ordered that private debts should be paid out of the goods not executed upon the person, and a later source relates that the emperor Tiberius told his prefect Aemilius Rectus, 'I want my sheep shorn, not flayed,' when he sent to Rome more revenue than was due.<sup>97</sup> But not even Tiberius' 'philanthropic' words sound totally new: a similar philosophy of administration may be found in the codes of instructions that the Ptolemaic kings gave to their bureaucracy.<sup>98</sup>

## THE TAXATION SYSTEM OF EGYPT AS A ROMAN PROVINCE: THE POLL TAX

In Republican Rome, the fiscal value of a province was estimated on the basis of its annual revenue in cash. In essence this revenue derived from direct and indirect taxes. Direct taxes were levied on all the population, indirect taxes applied only to some goods or services. In the Republican period and under Augustus, all taxes could be called *vectigalia*, while the term *stipendium* designed the direct taxes levied in the provinces of the Roman people. During the early Roman period (perhaps as early as the Augustan period), the term *vectigal* came to indicate only indirect taxes, while direct taxes were called *tributum*, either *capitis* (capitation tax) or *solī* (land tax).<sup>99</sup>

One of the most important Roman innovations in Egypt was the introduction of *tributum capitis* in the form of an annual poll tax called λαογραφία, which was levied on adult males, including slaves, aged 14 to 62 or 65, except for Roman and Alexandrian citizens and their slaves, some holders of official posts, and some categories of Egyptian priests.<sup>100</sup> The provincial poll tax and its prerequisite, the provincial census, seem to have had no precedents under the Roman Republic, and it seems that Augustus first introduced them, both in Egypt and in the other provinces. Often, the census and poll tax were the first two measures that followed the Roman annexation of a foreign country, and thus carried a strong connotation of subjection to Rome.<sup>101</sup>

Under the Ptolemies (and probably from the Persian period<sup>102</sup>), the most important capitation tax was the salt tax or ἄλική, which was levied on men and women at the rate of about 1.5 silver drachmas for men, 1 drachma for women, plus a collateral obol tax levied on men only. Under Augustus the ἄλική was not suppressed, but was restricted to males and its rate was set at 4 obols per year.<sup>103</sup> *P. Tebt.* II 482 documents the payment for salt tax in 11 BC along with a tax levied on *katoikoi*, and *BGU XIII 2291* of c. 5 BC shows that the 4 obols for salt tax were paid along with the capitation tax called συντάξιμον. In sum, the *halike* seems to have continued as a minor tax into the Roman period.<sup>104</sup>

The earliest Roman receipts for poll tax come from soon after the conquest of 30 BC: some Greek and Demotic ostraka refer to the tax called *syntaxis* as early as the very first years of Augustus.<sup>105</sup> There are in addition some receipts for *laographia* on Demotic-Greek ostraka from Apollonopolis Magna (SB XVIII 13565–13573) dated to the first years of reign of an unnamed ruler, possibly Augustus.<sup>106</sup>

The receipts for poll tax show that both the method of collection and the rate of the poll tax varied from region to region. The basic rate of the *laographia* of the Egyptian people in Middle Egypt seems to have been 16 drachmas (24 drachmas in the Thebaid), and a lower rate, perhaps half the standard one, applied to the privileged classes, such as the *metropolitai* and the *katoikoi*.<sup>107</sup> An exceptionally high poll tax seems to have been levied in the Arsinoite, where the basic rate was 40 drachmas and the privileged rate 20. In this nome the poll tax was collected together with the salt tax and other dues and extras as a combined annual charge called *sunta/cimon*, normally totalling 44 drachmas and 6 *chalkoi* or 45 drachmas 2 obols per year.<sup>108</sup>

The reason for the presence of different rates of tax in different nomes is still unknown. Rathbone suggested that a higher poll tax was set on the Thebaid as a form of penalty for the revolt against Rome in 29 BC. However, a counter-argument may be that the Arsinoite, which did not rebel against Rome, paid a higher rate.<sup>109</sup> In my view, the variation in the rates of the Egyptian poll tax must have had a different origin. From the time of the Persian occupation, the assessment of the poll tax was determined by the agricultural productivity of the land in different areas of Egypt; thus it is possible that over the centuries the Arsinoite was taxed at a higher rate because it was the most productive region.<sup>110</sup> At first sight it seems implausible that Rome imposed the poll tax, the most universal of the taxes, at different rates in different areas within the same province, but it is indeed possible that Rome imposed taxes in accordance with the productivity of a region, as happened under the Ptolemies.

The interpretation of the documents may have been distorted also by the practice of combining different taxes in one payment, by lumping the poll tax with other capitation charges such as the salt tax, the dike tax or trade taxes. In fact, tax receipts often indicated only the total amount to be paid, without specifying each tax it consisted of.<sup>111</sup> Another misleading element may be the practice of splitting payments into monthly instalments. In the Oxyrhynchite, for instance, the 12 drachmas for *laographia* were paid in two instalments of 8 and 4 drachmas, while in the Arsinoite the annual levy of 44 drachmas could be paid through monthly instalments of at least 4 drachmas each, or, as in *P.Fay.* 45 of AD 9/10, in three instalments of 28, 12 and 4



drachmas plus additional *chalkoi* and obols. The figures in tax receipts are always multiples of four, because the means of payment was the silver tetradrachm. This may lead us to regard one instalment of a given tax as its entire amount.<sup>112</sup>

In the Roman period, regional variations also emerge from the evidence of privileged classes that paid the *laographia* at different rates in different nomes. At Hermopolis there was a class called *metropolitai oktadrachmoi*, who paid 8 drachmas; at Oxyrhynchus there were *metropolitai dodekadrachmoi*, who paid 12 drachmas, and there seem to have been different rates of poll tax in different neighbourhoods of the same city.<sup>113</sup> These varying privileges are difficult to understand, if we postulate that it was Rome that first introduced them: one would expect Roman provincial measures at least to be uniform throughout a province. Still, it is possible that Augustus imposed different levels of poll tax according to social status in different regions and cities. In *BGU* IV 1198.7–9 of 6/5 BC, a petition to the prefect against the payment of capitation taxes, the priests of Bousiris claim that they had enjoyed exemption from *laographia* with no interruption ‘from before and in the times of the queen as well’ until the twenty-fifth year of Augustus.

The term λαογραφία occurs in some documents of the Ptolemaic period as well. In these documents, however, λαογραφία indicated a registration of people rather than the poll tax paid by the Egyptians, as the term came to designate the poll tax only under Augustus.<sup>114</sup> A reference to revenues in cash ἐκ λαογραφίας may be found in *P.Ryl.* IV 667 fr. 4 of the second century BC. It is more difficult to establish what was the exact significance of the term in *P.Tebt.* I 103, 121 and 189, all belonging to the first century BC.<sup>115</sup> The question whether before the Roman conquest the term could indicate the poll tax as well, not only the census, remains open.

In the Arsinoite nome the poll tax was collected as a combined charge called συντάξιμον.<sup>116</sup> The earliest known instance of συντάξιμον is *BGU* VII 1590a of AD 6/7, where this tax is collected by a certain Romulus, and *BGU* XIII 2291 of around 5 BC. The poll tax could also be referred to as ἐπικεφάλιον, ‘head tax,’ or λαϊκή σύνταξις, assignment on the λαοί, i.e. the Egyptians as well. This terminology, of clear Ptolemaic origin, seems to have been peculiar to the Arsinoite, but one cannot exclude the possibility that it was used elsewhere too. The earliest known evidence for ἐπικεφάλιον seems to be *P.Tebt.* III/1 701.186 of 211/10 BC<sup>117</sup>, while the term σύνταξις, ‘assessment on the individual,’ originally indicated a registration of people, and subsequently acquired the sense of ‘capitation tax based on a registration of people.’<sup>118</sup>

The significance of the term σύνταξις is still unclear. The tax called σύνταξις may have been connected in some way to the Ptolemaic official

known as ὁ πρὸς τῇ συντάξει, whose precise functions are unknown, except that he collected taxes from the *katoikoi*.<sup>119</sup> The term σύνταξις also indicated the annual contribution that, both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman period, the state gave to Egyptian temples, and in some documents it had the general sense of salary or unspecified contribution. In *P.Grenf.* I 45 and 46 of 19 and 18 BC, a public farmer from the Arsinoite stated that he had paid the σύνταξις, which here may have been either the poll tax, or some other fixed charge levied on public farmers.<sup>120</sup> A late Ptolemaic document refers to ‘λαογραφία κατ’ ἄνδρα of those paying the σύνταξις’, which was interpreted as ‘the listing of taxpayers liable to the *syntaxis*.’<sup>121</sup> Payments for σύνταξις are also recorded on ostraka from Karanis which Youtie assigned to the very early years of the reign of Augustus.<sup>122</sup>

To sum up, Augustus may have taken over various capitation charges that existed in the Ptolemaic period, and perhaps introduced different rates according to wealth and social status. If Augustus had introduced *laographia*, *syntaxis* and *syntaximon*, he would probably have established a fairly uniform terminology and rate throughout the province. On the contrary, the existence of regional variations may indicate that traditional bureaucratic practices were continued from the Ptolemaic period. The most plausible view is that Augustus took over and unified different Ptolemaic capitation taxes, which now fulfilled the new function of Roman provincial poll tax.

## OTHER DIRECT TAXES

In this section I take into consideration the most important direct taxes documented in the reign of Augustus. The aim is not to list all taxes known in Roman Egypt, but to find out whether the late Ptolemaic and Augustan documents can tell us anything about when these taxes were first introduced. I shall begin by investigating the documents of the Augustan period that refer to the most important direct taxes besides the poll tax: the χωματικόν or dike tax, the μερισμὸς ἀπόρων or tax ‘on behalf of the poor,’ and the ἀριθμητικὸν κατοίκων or tax on the numbering or registration of the *katoikoi*.

After the poll tax, the most important of the direct taxes seems to have been the χωματικόν or dike tax, which was levied from the reign of Augustus on all Egyptian males including priests at the annual rate of 6 drachmas 4 obols,<sup>123</sup> and which seems to have played a central role in the Augustan reorganization of the irrigation system.<sup>124</sup> A survey of the receipts shows that it was often paid together with the *laographia*, the bath tax, and other capitation taxes, and that its rate remained 6 drachmas 4 obols throughout the Roman period. However, in special cases, such as works and repairs to the embankments, the

rate could be altered, even doubled, as seems the case of *SB XVI 12632* of AD 35 (*P.Princ.* I 11 + *P.Corn.* 21 V) from Philadelphia, although this document may deal with the combination of two payments.<sup>125</sup>

It was argued whether the *χωματικών* was the cash equivalent of the five-day corvée at the canals called *πενθήμερος*.<sup>126</sup> Foraboschi suggested that the *penthemeros* that was introduced later than the reign of Augustus as a replacement of the payment of *chomatikon*: the *penthemeros* may have been a way of extracting labour from those who could not afford to pay the tax in cash.<sup>127</sup> This hypothesis is supported by the fact that, while the *chomatikon* is documented from the Augustan period, the earliest evidence of *penthemeros* comes from the early 40s AD. It is possible that the five-day corvée was introduced in the very first years of the reign of Claudius.

The *μερισμός ἀπόρων* or impost 'on behalf of the poor' was a surtax levied on all the population to compensate for taxes not paid by those without a *poros*, that is, the poor. It was commonly assumed that this surtax was introduced during the reign of Trajan,<sup>128</sup> but the evidence of *O.Bodl.* II 765, a receipt issued by the bank of Kephalos at Thebes in 2 BC for a payment of 5 drachmas *ὑπὲρ ἀπόρων*, shows that some tax on behalf of the poor was already in place under Augustus. The rate attested in this document is consistent with the known rates of 4 to 7 drachmas that is found in later receipts. The dearth of attestations of this tax in the Augustan period has suggested that it may have tacitly been incorporated with the payment for poll tax. In addition, it is possible that the mentions of different capitation taxes or *μερισμοί* levied on behalf of the poor (*ἀπόρων*), the weak (*ἄσθενῶν*) and the fugitive (*ἀνακεχωρηκῶν*) were local variants that indicated in essence one and the same tax.<sup>129</sup>

According to the standard view, the introduction of these surtaxes went together with the introduction by Trajan of new tax collectors, the *πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν*; it was believed that, thereafter, the responsibility for deficits shifted from the person of the tax collector to the community of taxpayers.<sup>130</sup> However, the early evidence for these surtaxes (and also for *πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν*) suggests that, from the reign of Augustus, both tax collectors and communities were responsible for shortfalls: communities were liable to the surtax 'on behalf of the poor,' and tax collectors risked having their property confiscated.

The tax called *ἀριθμητικὸν κατοίκων* was collected *per capita* from the owners of katoikic land, probably to provide revenue for the maintenance of the katoikic records, and may have served as a tax on the ownership of katoikic land as well.<sup>131</sup> This tax is documented from the Augustan period until the end of the second century AD, but the rates that we can see in the receipts

vary. The two most commonly attested figures are 16 drachmas 11/2 obols and 28 drachmas 3 obols, but one may also find receipts for instalments of 16, 18 or 20 drachmas. Generally, when one encounters payments smaller than these, it is likely that arrears were involved, while larger sums may reflect payments for more than one person or holding. The largest payment made by a single person for *arithmetikon* is 44 drachmas 4 obols 4 *chalkoi* in *P.Col.* V 1 b 54. Daniel and Sijpesteijn interpreted this as a double payment—of 16 and 28 drachmas—for two holdings. This rate is strikingly similar to that of the *syntaximon* that was levied in the Arsinoite.<sup>132</sup>

The earliest published evidence for the *arithmetikon* may be *BGU XVI* 2613.5 of 15/14 BC, a letter in which the *dioiketes* Seleukos complains to Athenodoros about the rude ways of his agents in the levy of the *arithmetikon*. However, the term *arithmetikon* has no further specification and might indicate a tax on the official numbering of property items, such as sheep and goats.<sup>133</sup> In *BGU XVI* 2652 (probably dating from the period 10/9 to 2 BC), Athenodoros writes to Eurylochos asking him to give the tax collector Antonius the 2000 drachmas for the *arithmetikon katoikon* of the Herakleopolite nome.<sup>134</sup> The earliest instance of the tax, the Theban ostrakon *O.Ashm.* I 24 of 9 BC, records the payment for *arithmetikon katoikon* by the owner of a plot of katoikic land of 14 1/2 arouras. The fact that the measures of the land were recorded raises the question whether this tax was originally calculated on the area of the land and subsequently became a fixed charge, but at present the question remains open.

It seems clear that the *arithmetikon* had some connection with the numbering of the *katoikoi* and the possession of katoikic land. The possessors of katoikic land enjoyed privileged status in the Ptolemaic period, and continued to enjoy this status under Roman rule. There is evidence that a capitation tax on the *katoikoi* was levied in the Ptolemaic period: *P.Tebt.* I 119.31, for instance, records payments in kind for the ἐπικεφάλαιον of the *katoikoi* around 103 BC. It is thus possible that the tax ‘for the numbering of the *katoikoi*’ was a capitation tax. Augustus may have continued to levy this tax, which may have been reformed under Tiberius or Claudius, when the last generation of Ptolemaic soldiers disappeared, or when the ownership of katoikic land was dissociated from the status of *katoikos*.

## TAXES ON STATE MONOPOLIES: BATHS, OILS, BEER AND PAPYRUS

The Roman administration took over the monopolies once controlled by the Ptolemaic kings, such as the access to public baths and the production and

consumption of oils, beer and papyrus. These were partly leased out to private individuals, while taxes on the commodities most in demand were levied on individual consumers.<sup>135</sup>

According to Wallace, public baths were established in the Ptolemaic period for the Graeco-Macedonian élite in connection with the gymnasium, especially in Lower Egypt. There were also baths owned by or leased to private individuals, which paid to the Ptolemaic government a licence fee of one third, called βαλανεῖον, φόρος βαλανείου or τρίτη βαλανείου. The Roman administration kept up the existing public baths and also built new ones, and probably continued the Ptolemaic bath taxes. A survey of the earliest evidence shows that taxes on baths were levied from the very beginning of the Roman period. Wallace thought that from the Augustan period there were three different imposts on baths: a capitation tax imposed on all, whether they used a bath or not, an entrance fee to public baths, and the one-third rent for the lease of a bath by private individuals.<sup>136</sup> The earliest published bath-tax receipt is *O.Edfou* III 388 (AD 28), which refers to the payment of 1 drachma 1 obol for βαλα( ) at Apollonopolis Magna, in Augustus' first year.<sup>137</sup> Two interesting pieces of evidence are *O.Strasb.* 262 and 263 of AD 26–29, two receipts that carry the phrase ὑπὲρ βαλανε(του) σίτου Μακ(εδόνων)<sup>138</sup>; it is unclear whether these documents indicate that there was a bath called 'of the Macedonians,' or whether one person was paying the bath-tax (here in grain) on behalf of a community of Macedonian soldiers. In some Demotic ostraka from Denderah we find amounts of 40 drachmas, which may represent collective payments.<sup>139</sup>

There is no agreement as regards the rate of this tax. It seems that a first instalment of 1 drachma 1 obol was often paid together with poll tax, and a second instalment of 4½ drachmas was paid with the dike-tax; with additional charges the total amounted to about 7 drachmas 5 obols and 1 or 2 *chalkoi*. This rate seems to have been fairly stable throughout the Roman period. It is worth noting that on some occasions the bath tax was paid in kind, e.g. when paid to the granaries of a temple.<sup>140</sup>

This evidence suggests that in the Roman period the Ptolemaic taxes on baths were continued. Probably the lessees of state baths continued to pay rents for the management of these baths, this time to the Roman state rather than to the king. In addition to this, the individuals who attended the baths paid a fixed entrance fee. In my view, it is hard to prove that under Augustus the bath tax became a capitation tax. On the contrary, the fact that bath-tax receipts often refer to the geographical location of the bath (e.g. 'the bath of Euhemeria' in *O.Fay.* 2–4 of 23 BC, 3 BC and AD 24) suggests that this tax was connected with the entrance to a specific bath, or was levied on some categories of the population, and was not paid by all.

Another Ptolemaic monopoly was the right to brew beer, which was controlled by the state, but could be leased to private companies or temples. Beer brewers paid the state a licence fee or a tax on the concessions called φόρος ζυτοποιῶν or φόρος ζυτηρῶς, while the people who consumed beer paid ζυτηρά or τέλος ζυτηρῶς. The monopoly of brewing beer was taken over by the Roman administration, and the right to brew beer was leased to contractors by ἐπιτηρηταί, as was the case with other trades of the Roman period. Under Roman rule, there is evidence that a tax called ζυτηρά was levied per head (κατ' ἄνδρα), but the details of the assessment of this tax are unclear.<sup>141</sup> The amount of this tax cannot be determined with certainty; some third-century AD documents record payments of 4 and 8 drachmas.<sup>142</sup> Among the earliest Roman evidence there are some ostraka from Karanis that Youtie assigned to the Augustan period, such as *O.Mich.* I 362 = *SB XIV* 11445, a receipt dated to the first year of Augustus.<sup>143</sup>

In Wallace's view the ζυτηρά was not a consumer tax, but a capitation tax that was imposed under Roman rule, when the state monopoly of beer-brewing declined, in order to extract taxation from the private production of beer, without the need for assessing the single amounts produced or consumed in one family.<sup>144</sup> This theory is confuted by attestations of this tax in the second and first centuries BC. It is likely that the beer tax was a consumer tax levied on men, depending on the amount of beer one consumed, so that each consumer was responsible for paying the tax he owed; the tax may have been calculated on the basis of the brewer's or the seller's record with the names and the quantities sold.<sup>145</sup> According to Foraboschi, the beer tax was not a capitation tax, but a tax imposed on every beer-brewer or beer-seller and his staff, which normally consisted of members of his family; the expression *kat'andra* must be intended as *viritim*, that is, 'imposed on every beer-producer.'<sup>146</sup>

The most important of the Ptolemaic monopolies was the production and sale of various seed-oils that were used both as aliment and as combustible. Oddly, this seems to have been the only one to disappear in the transition to Roman rule, despite the fact that oil remained a very important commodity in the Roman period too. Both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman periods there are erratic occurrences of taxes of unclear nature called ἐλαική or εἶδη ἐλαικά.<sup>147</sup> A document from Soknopaiou Nesos of around AD 14 states that since the 43rd year of Augustus no tax had been paid on lamp oil. One might hypothesise that the oil tax was present during the reign of Augustus, and was suspended in his last year or at the beginning of the reign of Tiberius; but this remains just a guess.<sup>148</sup>

The exaction of taxes on oils was probably connected with the property and exploitation of oil presses (ἐλαιουργεῖα). One may suppose that, in the

Ptolemaic period, in every village there was a state-owned oil press, from which the state collected a rent. In the Roman period, these oil presses were probably taken over by the public treasury or by the imperial *patrimonium*, as there is evidence that oil presses were often within imperial estates. From *W.Chr.* 176 (= *Sel.Pap.* II 280) we know that the oil press in the former estate of Narcissus paid a rent of 200 drachmas (monthly or yearly, depending on the produce) plus a certain amount of oil, while in *P.Ryl.* II 128 of around AD 30, Hatres, the oil maker in the estate of Gaius Julius Athenodoros and Tiberius Calpurnius Tryphon at Euhemeria, reports to the chief of the police that a female worker had ran away, and had stolen, among other things, forty drachmas that he had put aside to pay the rent for the oil press.<sup>149</sup>

The importance of papyrus for official use throughout the empire made it one of the most important cash crops of Egypt. A passage in Strabo illuminates us on the organisation of the production of papyrus under Roman rule. He remarks that ‘they do not allow the byblus to grow in many places, and because of the scarcity they set a higher price on it and thus increase the revenues, though they injure the common use of the plant.’<sup>150</sup> It is unclear whom Strabo is referring to as ‘they’—the Egyptian administrators before the Roman conquest, the Roman administrators, or both.

A tax called χαρτηρά was farmed in the Ptolemaic period, and there is evidence of this tax as well as of payments for τιμή χάρτου or χαρτῶν under Roman rule too.<sup>151</sup> The term χαρτηρά seems to have designated a capitation tax on the use of papyrus, a licence to manufacture or sell papyrus, and also the revenues from the papyrus industry in general.<sup>152</sup> After the Roman conquest, this proto-industry was taken over by the state, and, as is the case with olive yards and oil presses, it seems that a great part of the papyrus marshes were in imperial estates that belonged to the imperial *patrimonium*. It seems also that in the second century AD the revenues from *chartera* did not go to the public treasury or διοίκησις, but to the patrimonial account or οὐσιακὸς λόγος. This supports the view that, before then, the profits from the papyrus industry were managed by the imperial patrimony.<sup>153</sup>

The imperial estates leased the rights of exploitation of their resources to local people for an annual rent. This is the case in *P.Mil.* I 6 of AD 26, a letter of Harthotes son of Marres to Aphrodisios son of Zoilos, ἐκλήμπτωρ or manager of the papyrus marsh in the estate of Livia and the children of Germanicus near Theadelphia in the Arsinoite. In this letter, Harthotes asks for the concession to gather papyrus and reeds, weave mats and sell them around the villages of the nome, and promises to pay the licence fee in three instalments during the summer of the following year. In a lease of a papyrus marsh of 14/13 BC, *BGU* IV 1180, the lessees acknowledge the receipt of a

loan of 200 drachmas, which they promise to return through instalments of 1 drachma a day and a portion of their daily harvest of papyrus stalks over a six-month period. These 200 drachmas may have been equal to the rent for one or more months, which the lessees may not have been able to pay.

BGUIV 1121<sup>154</sup> of 5 BC is a three-year lease of a papyrus marsh in the Arsinoite nome from an Alexandrian woman and her son to two people, Hierax and Papos, for a rent of 5000 drachmas a year. This rent is payable in monthly instalments of 250 drachmas over the six months from Thoth to Mecheir (September to February), and of 583 drachmas 2 obols over the richer period of the harvest, from Phamenoth to Mesore (March to August). The contract also obliged the lessees not to exceed the fixed wage used for hired workers. According to Lewis, this document proves that the owners of papyrus marshes formed a sort of cartel to protect their profits and to keep down labour costs; he suggested that Strabo referred to this kind of cartel when he mentioned the strategy of producing less papyrus in order to keep prices up.<sup>155</sup> Indeed, it seems that the price of papyrus and the wages of workers were not random, but derived from a precise policy that governed the whole industry. However, it was probably an official authority, rather than the owners of papyrus crops, who established these regulations.

## TRADE TAXES

In this section I look at trade taxes or *χειρωνάξια*, which were believed to be Roman in origin rather than Ptolemaic. It seems that, rather than taxes set at a percentage of the profits or of the gross income, they were capitation taxes levied on all persons engaged in industry. The levy of these taxes was made easier by the existence since the Ptolemaic period of trade guilds, which the Roman administration continued.<sup>156</sup> Under Augustus and Tiberius we find scattered allusions to taxes on various trades, e.g. builders, wool workers, barbers and others,<sup>157</sup> and it was even argued that Caligula's introduction of the tax on prostitutes in Italy around AD 40 was copied from an Egyptian counterpart.<sup>158</sup>

The best documented trade was that of weavers, as weaving was one of the most important industries and markets of the *chora*, and the Egyptian linen and cotton were exported to all the Mediterranean. The Egyptian textiles were important for the state as they provided, among other things, the supply of uniforms for the army.

Before the Roman conquest, Cleopatra's textile factories were managed by a Roman senator, Q. Ovinius.<sup>159</sup> There is evidence that in the Augustan period Roman-named and Latin-speaking people, possibly also slaves and freedmen from the entourage of the emperor, were involved in the textile industry. The



earliest known evidence for the tax on weavers (called χειρωνάξιον γερδίων, τέλος γερδίων or more commonly γερδιακόν) comes from the Augustan period; in addition, *ChLA* XLIII 1241 d 3 from Oxyrhynchus has an obscure reference to a στατήρ γερδίων in the years between 29 and 2 BC.<sup>160</sup> This document, in Greek with a Latin subscription, records the monthly accounts and expenses of a weaver called Gaius Valerius Niger; among these, 51/2 drachmas and 40 drachmas were paid for στατήρ γερδίων, and eventually the figures were converted into δηνάριοι χρυσοί, an expression that probably indicated the *aurei*. Another interesting text is *P.Oxy.* IV 737 of the Augustan period, an account of wages paid on different days to weavers (*textores*), hired labourers (*conducti*) and a *magister*. The document was written in Latin and, oddly, was dated according to the Roman calendar.<sup>161</sup> Some tax receipts from the archive of the Oxyrhynchite weaver Tryphon, extending from AD 8 to 66, show annual payments for γερδιακόν at 28 drachmas and three obols, which were split in four instalments and paid together with other capitation taxes (i.e., the poll tax, the pig tax and the dike tax).<sup>162</sup> It is worth noting that these taxes added together give a total of about 45 drachmas per year, which is equivalent to the combination of poll taxes known as *syntaximon* in the Arsinoite nome. As Brunt hypothesised, the *tributum capitis* may have embraced trade taxes as well.<sup>163</sup>

To sum up, under Augustus there was a reorganisation of the textile industry; trade taxes, which existed in the Ptolemaic and even the Persian periods, were probably taken over by Augustus. The extant evidence however does not say what was the annual rate of the tax on weavers, and whether it was uniform throughout Egypt. It is also unclear whether all persons engaged in the same trade paid the same rate of trade tax, or whether there were different rates within the same trade, according to the age or the gender of the workers.

## INDIRECT TAXES: THE SALES TAX

The most important of the indirect taxes was the sales tax or ἐγκύκλιον. In the Ptolemaic period the term ἐγκύκλιον indicated a tax of varying rate payable to the state as a percentage on contracts and market transactions. This tax was continued under Roman rule, when the ἐγκύκλιον was levied *ad valorem* on sales, manumissions of slaves, donations and mortgages and was collected at the rate of 5 or 10% on the price of the goods. However, the term *enkyklion* could also designate a tax between 1 1/2 obol and 2 drachmas, levied every year on small purchases, which could be paid together with the capitation taxes.<sup>164</sup>

In addition to this, the *enkyklion* may have encompassed all those receipts that do not specify the name of the tax for which they were issued, but present the term τέλος followed by the name of the commodity subject to taxation.

Normally there was no need to specify the amount of the tax, because it was implicit that it was a fixed percentage on the price paid.<sup>165</sup> The collection of the sales tax was farmed to publicans, who were probably working in close contact with the ἀγορανόμος.<sup>166</sup>

Both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman period, the sales tax was levied on the sale of land and house property,<sup>167</sup> and a τέλος εἰς τὰ ἀνδράποδα was levied on the sale of slaves, which took place before the *agoranomos* and the tax farmer.<sup>168</sup> The *enkyklion* was levied from sales of animals too.<sup>169</sup> One may also connect with the *enkyklion* some evidence for a 5% tax called εἰκοστή or τέλος εἰκοστών.<sup>170</sup>

Some receipts of the Roman period preserve the mention of a tax of one-quarter (25%), the τέλος τῆς τετάρτης, which may have continued an earlier Ptolemaic tax on trades or customs dues,<sup>171</sup> and of a 2% tax called πεντηκοστή, levied on purchases made on the public market, perhaps identical with the *enkyklion*.<sup>172</sup> In *O.Theb.* 91 of the first century AD, a tax farmer called Germanos and his colleagues receive the 2% tax on a donkey, probably an internal customs tax or duty that was collected at the boundaries of the nomes. It is possible that in the Augustan period, the toll of 1% and 2% (called ῥ καὶ ῥ) could be split in two separate payments, of which one was the sales tax. The earliest known attestation of the tax ῥ καὶ ῥ is in a custom-house register from Philadelphia, *P.Thomas* 3 of uncertain date, either in 132 BC or in AD 9. P. van Minnen has supplied the name of the tax ῥ καὶ ῥ in a document of AD 24/25. From this evidence one may deduce that the charges ῥ καὶ ῥ were aggregated by the time of Augustus. This may have an innovation of Augustus, although the tax may have been in place from before.<sup>173</sup>

## THE STEPHANOS

This section investigates whether the Roman conquest affected in any way the levy of a tax called στέφανος (possibly equivalent to στεφανικόν), that is, crown tax.<sup>174</sup> In Ptolemaic Egypt as well as in other Hellenistic kingdoms this was a cash offering for the donation of a golden crown to the ruler on his accession; this seems to have been commuted into a money payment under the later Ptolemies.<sup>175</sup> In the Ptolemaic period the *stephanos* was a tax levied on transfers and inheritances of katoikic land. In *BGU* IV 1123, for instance, three people pay 1000 drachmas for the *stephanos* levied on a plot of 1084 arouras which they inherited from their parents. In the Ptolemaic period the payment of a *stephanos* was obligatory for a holder of katoikic land at the moment he took possession of a plot, and also for the heritage of a lease of land; in the Roman period this tax may have become the τέλος

καταλοχισμῶν.<sup>176</sup> In a late Ptolemaic document, *BGU VIII 1851*, the *stephanos* was a tax on land collected by a *praktor*; this is the case in *BGU IV 1123* too, which is likely to be late Ptolemaic rather than Augustan, as was previously assumed.<sup>177</sup>

The earliest extant receipts for an annual crown-tax date from the reign of Claudius. The situation before then is unclear.<sup>178</sup> It seems that Augustus refused offerings and donations of crowns, and granted the provinces full or partial remission from the crown tax; Augustus claims in the *Res Gestae* that he refused a golden crown of 350,000 pounds offered to him by the 35 urban tribes for the triumph of 29 BC, and other sources report that he refused various offers of crowns, except some offerings from the Iberians.<sup>179</sup> A papyrus of the Augustan period, *P.Fouad I 46* of 23/22 BC, alludes to contributions for a donation of a real crown, as it records the payment of 900 drachmas to goldsmiths for a gold crown of ten *minae* (c. 240–270 g).<sup>180</sup> The evidence is insufficient to prove the existence of the *stephanos* tax under Augustus, although on special occasions (especially early after the conquest) he may have accepted some donations of real crowns. It seems likely that Augustus abolished the late Ptolemaic *stephanos* that was levied on transfers of katoikic land, probably because katoikic land was equated to private land and began to be sold for a price.<sup>181</sup>

## TAXES ON ANIMALS

This section takes into consideration the evidence concerning taxes on animals in order to verify the common view that, although a control over the ownership of animals existed from the Ptolemaic period, the control over all kinds of property was made stricter under Augustus.<sup>182</sup> In the Roman period, property returns of sheep and goats (ἀπογραφὰὶ προβάτων καὶ αἰγῶν) were submitted all over Egypt. Under Augustus, these declarations were submitted at the beginning of Mecheir (especially during the five days corresponding to January 26–30), while from the reign of Claudius onwards they were required twice a year. The purpose of these returns was to keep control over the number of privately owned animals in order to impose the tax called in the declarations the καθῆκον τέλος. This tax has been identified with the pasture tax or ἐννόμιον, which probably existed since the Ptolemaic period.<sup>183</sup> It has been discussed whether these taxes were rents, licence taxes or property taxes. It was commonly assumed that the ἐννόμιον was the equivalent of the Roman *scriptura*, the tax on sheep and goats pasturing on state land.<sup>184</sup> El Abbadi introduced a further distinction between the φόρος προβάτων, a rent on state-owned flocks, the φόρος νομῶν, a rent on pastures leased for the grazing of privately-owned

sheep, and the ἐννόμιον or τέλος ἐννομίου, a tax on the property of sheep and goats, which were normally pasturing on state land.<sup>185</sup>

Taxes on cattle called *ennomion* and *phoros probaton* existed as early as the third century BC.<sup>186</sup> The earliest Roman evidence for the *ennomion* comes from the declarations for sheep and goats edited as *BGU XVI 2578–2587*, from the years 14/13 BC (except for 2586, which is of 5 BC). In a farm account of 8 BC, 720 drachmas were paid for *ennomion* and 60 drachmas for *arithmetikon*, probably a surcharge for the official numbering of sheep and goats.<sup>187</sup> *P.Oxy. II 244* of AD 23<sup>188</sup> is a request made by Cerinthus, a slave of Antonia the wife of Drusus and a manager of her flocks, to transfer the sheep and goats from the Oxyrhynchite nome to the neighbouring Kynopolite. This document suggests that the authorities of the nome had to be informed of every movement of any flocks, even those belonging to an imperial estate; this was probably due to the existence of a tax on the transfer of cattle.<sup>189</sup>

Augustus seems to have introduced a tax on the ownership of donkeys. *P.Oxy. XII 1457* of 4/3 BC is a registration for donkeys addressed to the farmers of the ε(αδραξμια, the annual six-drachmas tax also known as τέλος ὄνων.<sup>190</sup> Evidence for this tax is also found in two ostraka from Apollonopolis Magna, *O.Edfou III 397* and *398* of AD 4. Later evidence suggests that the name of this tax remained *exadrachmia* and its rate 5 drachmas 1 obol throughout the Roman period.<sup>191</sup> However, donkeys owned as property were registered since the Ptolemaic period, and this registration was probably directed to levy some property tax at that time too.

In the Ptolemaic period, there is evidence that tax farmers collected the ὑκκή or tax on pigs, a property tax assessed on the basis of declarations for the ownership of pigs. Unfortunately there are no published receipts of this tax either in the late Ptolemaic or in the Augustan periods. According to Wallace, in the Roman period the pig tax was no longer a property tax based on the number of pigs which one owned, but became a μερισμός or capitation tax collected along with *laographia*.<sup>192</sup> Youtie doubted that the pig tax was paid by all in the Roman period, as it was not always levied on the whole population of a village,<sup>193</sup> while Bogaert reverted to the view that the pig tax under Augustus was, rather than a tax on pigs as in the Ptolemaic period, a μερισμός assessed on the entire population.<sup>194</sup>

The nature of the pig tax is still unclear. The earliest Roman attestation of ὑκκή is in an unpublished papyrus from Oxyrhynchus dated 20 BC, and its rate seems to have remained stable at 1 drachma 1 obol under Tiberius and until the second century AD.<sup>195</sup> It is attractive to hypothesise that both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman period, the *hyike* was a property tax that was assessed on the number of animals owned, as was the case with other taxes on animals. It is per-

haps not coincidental that the tax-register (of the second or third century AD<sup>196</sup>) *P.Oxy.* XXIV 2414.13–15 associates the pig tax with other licence or property taxes on animals, such as the tax on donkeys and the tax on sheep and goats, separately from the capitation taxes. The Ptolemaic and Roman evidence of property returns for pigs lends further support to the view that the pig tax was a tax on the property of the animals.<sup>197</sup>

In conclusion, it seems that Augustus took over and continued some taxes on animals such as those on sheep and goats or on pigs, while it is possible that he introduced radical changes concerning the tax on donkeys, possibly in connection with some reform of the transport system.

### TAXES ON PRIESTS AND TEMPLES

This section investigates the possible changes in the taxation involving priests and temples. It was once believed that Augustus introduced strong limitations on the privileges of the priests, while recently Glare argued that the stereotyped model of the antagonism between Roman state and Egyptian temples is outdated.<sup>198</sup> The Ptolemies had developed a system of *συντάξεις*, government subventions either in money or in kind, which were granted to the temples for the maintenance of the priests.<sup>199</sup> Under Roman rule these subventions were continued, although, in Wallace's view, they became an instrument of control, rather than support, over the temples and their property. Documents in which priests acknowledged or requested the *σύνταξις* may be found from around 13/12 BC, and throughout the Roman period.

Under Roman rule (as was probably the case before) the priestly *syntaxis* was mostly in kind. The grain used for these payments often came from the land of the temples themselves, or from neighbouring estates.<sup>200</sup> In *BGU* IV 1197 of 12/11 BC, the priests of Bousiris complain about the failure to receive the annual *syntaxis* of 150 artabas of wheat, which was normally made out of the revenue of a certain Harpaesis. In *BGU* IV 1200 from 2/1 BC, the temple *syntaxis* consisted of 100 artabas from the confiscated estate of the temple and 100 artabas from the estate of a man of importance called Asklepiades. It thus seems that on some occasions for a temple the grant of *syntaxis* was alternative to the possession of land, and that the *syntaxis* was drawn from private estates that were connected with a specific cult. Still, it is possible that there was no uniform rule valid for all temples in the province.<sup>201</sup>

In the Ptolemaic period, the priests paid a tax called *ἐπιστατικόν* to fund overseers of temples called *ἐπιστάται* ἱεροῦ or ἱερῶν. Wallace thought that after the Roman conquest the *epistatai* were abolished, but the *epistatikon*

continued to be collected.<sup>202</sup> Augustus did not suppress the main elements of the financial administration of Egyptian temples: the ἐπιστάται τῶν ἱερῶν are found often with the slightly different name of ἐπιστάται ἱερέων, superintendents of the priests, until 27 BC<sup>203</sup> and the ἐπιστατικόν continued to be paid either by the temple community or by individual priests.<sup>204</sup> In spite of the continuation of the tax called *epistatikon*, however, the evidence for *epistatai* of priests or temples ceases after 27 BC.

Another tax connected with priesthood was the εἰσκριτικόν, i.e. the fee for the assumption of a priestly rank, and the τελεστικόν for the advancement in the hierarchy.<sup>205</sup> The Roman administration may have limited the size of the Egyptian priesthoods through a stricter process of admission to priesthood, but the basic regulations probably derived from the Ptolemaic period. Other taxes on priests were the πεντεφυλία, apparently a tax on the five tribes of priests, and ἱερατικά, on which we do not know anything precise.<sup>206</sup>

To sum up, it seems that the Roman government tended to adopt the existing cult regulations and continued most of the taxes connected with priests of traditional Egyptian temples. An important piece of evidence in this respect is an official memorandum of the first century AD found in the precinct of the temple of Soknebtunis at Tebtunis, and which refers to a dispute between *pastophoroi* and *hiereis*. The dispute was resolved by decisions of the prefects Scapula, Aquila, Peto and Magius Maximus, who acted according to the 'sacred law Semnouthi,' a traditional Egyptian book of sacred laws. This clearly indicates that the Roman administration was not imposing alien religious prescriptions, but tended to enforce the existing ones.<sup>207</sup>

## LAND TAXES IN CASH

In the Ptolemaic period (but probably as early as the Persian period), taxes in money were assessed on land producing crops other than grain, such as vineyards, palm trees and market gardens.<sup>208</sup> In this section I take into consideration the hypothesis that in the Roman period these taxes changed, as they came to be calculated on the area rather than the produce of the land. Wallace thought that, while in the Ptolemaic period the term γεωμετρία designated a fixed charge of 1/2 artaba per aroura that covered the cost of surveying the land, under Augustus the *geometria* was a new tax on vineyards, palm groves and gardens, also calculated on the aroura. He suggested that the Roman *geometria* was not levied annually, but every five years, and that this was connected with the introduction of the *lustrum*, the five-year period at the end of which the administration took a general revision of the property and taxation. However, no positive evidence supports the view

that the *lustrum* was present in early Roman Egypt, and furthermore, it seems clear that the *geometria* continued to exist from the Ptolemaic to the Roman period with no break.<sup>209</sup> This may apply to taxes on palm trees or vineyards that are documented since the Augustan period.<sup>210</sup>

Another land tax was the ἀπόμωρα, which in the Ptolemaic period was the portion (normally of one-sixth) of the produce of vineyards and garden land which was annually dedicated to temples. This tax was present in Egypt as early as the Persian domination and possibly even earlier.<sup>211</sup> In the Roman period, it was a tax of 10 silver drachmas per aroura for vineyards and 5 drachmas per aroura for gardens, and was collected also on *ousiac* and revenue land. It was believed that in the Roman period the *apomoira* became a fixed charge calculated on the aroura, but this may have been an earlier Ptolemaic development.<sup>212</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The second part of this chapter has addressed the question whether the taxation system of the Ptolemies was taken over and continued by Augustus, or whether it underwent substantial changes. A survey of the tax receipts suggests that the basis of the taxation system did not undergo radical changes. Many taxes existing under Augustus may have been continuations of Ptolemaic taxes, and even what seems to be a Roman innovation often derived from the Ptolemaic or even the Persian taxation systems. It seems implausible that Augustus altered radically the fiscal system, as it seems unlikely that as early as 30 or 29 BC Augustus could introduce a wholesale reform of the taxation system and apply it at once throughout Egypt.

Some changes however did take place. As concerns the poll tax, it seems clear that Augustus took over different capitation taxes that were levied in the Ptolemaic period at different rates from different categories of people, and that were based on the enumeration of the people belonging to such categories (e.g. *katoikoi* and *laoi*). The substantial change was a change in scope, as under Roman rule the old capitation taxes became something new, that is, the provincial poll tax. The *chomatikon* and the *merismos aporon* seem to have been introduced under Roman rule, while the *arithmetikon katoikon* was taken over from the Ptolemaic period. The taxes on beer, baths, oils and papyrus derived from Ptolemaic precedents, although naturally these industries were now controlled by the Roman state. Augustus also continued trade taxes, while the textile industry seems to have been closely controlled by managers with Roman citizenship. The taxes on priests and temples present the highest degree of continuity.

The extant tax receipts attest a great stability in tax rates from Augustus to end of the second century AD. This stability, however, should not be taken

as the proof that all these rates were first established under Augustus. Often it is difficult to determine the amount due for one year of a tax, because the figures in the extant receipts vary, and payments were itemised or cumulated. The rate of the taxes varied according to geographical areas, probably according to the different productivity of different regions.<sup>213</sup> It is hard to establish whether it was Rome that influenced Egypt or vice versa, and the analogies between Egypt and other Eastern provinces may have derived from their common Hellenistic background.<sup>214</sup> In any case, a comparison with the taxation system of Persian Egypt shows that the essential structure of the taxation system as well as the system of weights and measures that were adopted under Roman rule were Persian in origin.<sup>215</sup>

It is likely that the imposition of new taxes by Augustus provoked the negative reaction of the people in Alexandria and discontent throughout Egypt. The evidence for this in the papyri is scarce. It seems that also under Augustus and Tiberius people often fled from their villages in order to avoid taxation and compulsory services, but this phenomenon had been a characteristic of Egypt at all times.

It has also been suggested that the revolt of the Thebaid in 29 BC broke out because of the new taxes imposed by Rome.<sup>216</sup> This assumption was based on the passage in Strabo (XVII 1.53 (819)) that reported that soon after the Roman conquest, a revolt broke out in Heroonpolis in the Delta and the Thebaid because of some φόροι, and was suppressed by the intervention of the legions commanded by the prefect Cornelius Gallus. The reliability of this passage has never been discussed. However, the fact that Strabo identifies the cause of the revolt in the φόροι does not prove in itself that such φόροι had been introduced for the first time by Octavian: they could be existing taxes that the Roman administration extended to a wider range of people. The causes of the rebellion of 29 BC, thus, may have been not only economical but also political.



*This page intentionally left blank*

# The Coinage and the Monetary Circulation from Cleopatra to Tiberius

## INTRODUCTION

To win the battle of Actium meant to Octavian to take over the richest of the allied kingdoms as a Roman province. Suetonius reports that, after 30 BC, the sudden surge of wealth brought from Egypt caused a great inflation of the prices in Rome. The revenue of Cleopatra's father Ptolemy Auletes amounted to 6000 talents according to Diodorus, 12500 talents according to Strabo, and the income of Augustus at the beginning of his reign was estimated at 75 million drachmas, but the real figure was likely to be even higher.<sup>1</sup>

Ptolemaic Egypt differed substantially from other allied kingdoms of Rome, because it had a closed system of currency, whereby coins from the rest of the empire did not normally circulate inside Egypt, and Alexandrian coins were not valid outside. This closed system was continued after Egypt became a province of the Roman empire: the mainstream imperial currency was not used in Egypt, while the silver and bronze coins minted in Alexandria did not circulate outside of the province. The exchange of persons and freight between Egypt and other parts of the empire was closely controlled too.<sup>2</sup>

Another characteristic of Egypt was the presence of different metal standards used as units of reckoning. These were the silver standard, represented by the silver tetradrachm, rare and overvalued, and the bronze standard, which was expressed in copper drachmas, and which was the money used in everyday life. In the late Ptolemaic period above all, the ratio between the silver and the bronze standards was not fixed, and this caused instability of prices and high inflation.

This chapter does not aim to analyse archaeological and metrological issues in detail, nor to give an exhaustive treatment of the problem of coin finds

in Egypt from the point of view of the numismatist, but attempts to compare the Egyptian coinage and currency under Augustus with the situation under the later Ptolemies, in order to find out what innovations Augustus brought in, and to what extent he continued earlier practices.<sup>3</sup> Since the principal use of cash was to pay taxes, an understanding of the way monetary transactions worked may throw light on the changes that the fiscal system underwent under Roman rule. The coinage was also the means through which a ruler propagated his official iconography and title, and thus a survey of the official series of Augustus may help to understand how the emperor related himself to Cleopatra and to the Ptolemaic dynasty in general.

### CLEOPATRA'S REFORM AND AUGUSTUS' SERIES

Under the later Ptolemies, and especially under Auletes, Egypt seems to have gone through economic difficulties. It suffered, for instance, a disastrous outflow of money as early as 55 BC, when Auletes bought his throne back from the Roman senate for ten thousand talents.<sup>4</sup> Towards the end of her reign, around 42 BC, Cleopatra attempted to give stability to prices and keep inflation under control through a monetary reform, which established a fixed ratio of 1:480 between the two standards that were used to reckon all monetary transactions.<sup>5</sup> These standards were the Ptolemaic silver tetradrachm, which was rare and overvalued, and the copper drachma that was used in everyday life.<sup>6</sup> The ratio was calculated not on the intrinsic value of the metals, but on the nominal exchange relationship between the two standards. Cleopatra's reform was essentially a political operation. Unfortunately, neither the historical sources nor the documents mention this reform explicitly. Simply, after 42 BC we begin to find bronze pieces bearing the mark of their value in copper drachmas: the bronzes marked with Π were worth 80 copper drachmas, and those bearing M, 40. Cleopatra also continued minting the traditional Ptolemaic silver tetradrachms.<sup>7</sup>

After the Roman conquest, the Alexandrian mint stopped producing silver coinage, perhaps because of the sudden outflow of wealth from Egypt that followed the war.<sup>8</sup> In the years between 30 and 27 BC, Octavian introduced a first series of bronzes that continued Cleopatra's coinage. On the obverse they had value marks Π and M, the bare head of Octavian styled as *Καίσαρος Αυτοκράτορος* and *Θεοῦ Ἰσιού*, and on the reverse the Ptolemaic eagle.<sup>9</sup> In his first series, therefore, Octavian explicitly inserted himself in the Ptolemaic tradition, and took over Cleopatra's monetary reform.<sup>10</sup> It is also worth noting that on the Egyptian coinage of the Augustan period there are no references either to Actium or to any important historical event, in contrast with what one finds on the contemporary coinages of other provinces.<sup>11</sup>

From the so-called 'second' series on, the emperor was styled Σεβαστός, the marks of value disappeared and the coinage no longer followed Cleopatra's model. The chronological boundaries of this series are however problematic, as the denominations were diverse, and no dating elements appear on the coins. According to Milne, it was struck after 19 BC, while *RPC* suggests the earlier date of 27 BC, when Octavian took the title *Augustus/Sebastos*. This series depicted the bare head of Augustus with the legend ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ on the obverse, and the legend ΚΑΙΣΑΡ on the reverse, where the Ptolemaic symbols were replaced by Roman-style sacrificial implements. Two varieties of a smaller denomination carried the symbol K, which may have been either a date or a mark of value in bronze drachmas.<sup>12</sup> There was also a palaeographical change, as the sigma took the lunate form 'c' that was used in the papyri.

*RPC* identified the third series of Augustus with a group of coins bearing the date 'year 28th' ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ, that is, 3/2 BC. The fourth series (belonging to the last years BC and the first years AD) was devoted to Gaius Caesar, the grandson of Augustus. The fifth series was marked with the legend ΠΑΤΗΡ ΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ, from the title of *pater patriae* that Augustus acquired in 2 BC; this series probably covered the period from 1 to 5 AD. The sixth series, the first systematically dated, extended to the years AD 9–12, and had as distinctive elements the inscription ΕΥΘΗΝΙΑ, 'abundance,' and symbols such as the oak wreath and the Victory. From AD 9/10 to 12, Augustus's coinage was minted jointly with that of Livia, while after 12 we have no more evidence of Augustan coins.

From the last decade BC, the documentary references to high figures in copper drachmas, which expressed the bronze standard, die out. Probably, after the Augustan period Ptolemaic copper drachmas fell out of circulation, although there is evidence that the practice of counting in copper drachmas was still present in the first century AD, especially in documents connected with old categories of land.<sup>13</sup>

Tiberius' earliest series extended from AD 14 to 20 and bore the inscription ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΥ accompanied by Egyptian symbols, such as the hippopotamus, the crocodile, the ear of corn and the eagle. A new era began in AD 19/20, when the mint of Alexandria started to strike a tetradrachm of real silver again. Its intrinsic value came close to that of the silver tetradrachm of Cleopatra (hence the hypothesis that it was over-struck on issues of Cleopatra's)<sup>14</sup>, and was also close to the intrinsic value of the Roman *denarius*.<sup>15</sup> This new series was engraved with the radiate head of Augustus and the inscription ΘΕΟΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ. Clearly, Tiberius wanted to show his devotion to his predecessor, in order to stress his own position as the *Neos Sebastos*.

The coinage of Cleopatra continued to circulate together with the imperial currency, until the reign of Nero, around AD 57/8, when it was taken out of circulation and replaced by a new currency. Thereafter, any trace of the coinage that was valid under Cleopatra, Augustus and Tiberius decreases dramatically from both the written documentation and the hoards.<sup>16</sup> This was about twenty-five years after the minting of a new tetradrachm under Tiberius, and more than eighty years after the formal conquest of Egypt.

### PTOLEMAIC AND AUGUSTAN SILVER

In order to refer to the official coinage, the Augustan papyri use the terms δραχμαί, ἀργυρίου δραχμαί or ἀργυρίου Πτολεμαϊκού νόμισμα. It seems odd that under Augustus the money was still called 'Ptolemaic,' since it would be more natural if it referred to the emperor. There are references to Ptolemaic silver before 30 BC as well. In the Ptolemaic period, ἀργυρίου ἐπισήμου or ἀργυρίου Πτολεμαϊκοῦ νόμισμα were fixed formulas indicating that the contract required the use of real silver coinage, because often the bronze standard was a notional standard that covered a transaction in kind.<sup>17</sup> In *SB XVIII* 13219 of AD 15, the banker C. Julius Zosimus issues a receipt for ten drachmas of Ptolemaic silver for the inheritance left by C. Maecenas Gratus to Quintus Zenas son of Quintus. Although the money is called 'Ptolemaic,' it seems likely that the inheritance in a Roman-style will was expressed in the coinage that circulated in the Roman period. This supports the view that Cleopatra's silver tetradrachm and Augustus' reformed silver tetradrachm were both known as 'Ptolemaic silver drachmas.' In other words, under Augustus people continued to designate his official currency in the same way as under Cleopatra, that is, Πτολεμαϊκοῦ ἀργυρίου δραχμαί.<sup>18</sup> According to Christiansen, the full denomination was probably ἀργυρίου παλαιοῦ Πτολεμαϊκοῦ νομίσματος.<sup>19</sup>

From the reign of Tiberius one begins to find the phrase ἀργυρίου Πτολεμαϊκοῦ καὶ Σεβαστοῦ, that is, 'Ptolemaic and Augustan silver.' One may wonder why Tiberius might have wanted to call his currency 'Augustan.' The full formula was ἀργυρίου Σεβαστοῦ νομίσματος, which Christiansen successfully translated as 'the emperor's silver coins.'<sup>20</sup> The most plausible explanation is that this currency corresponded to the new series of silver tetradrachms that Tiberius introduced in AD 19/20. The common designation of this coinage as 'Augustan' or 'imperial' money may have been due to the fact that the coins bore the inscription ΘΕΟΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ.<sup>21</sup> Under Tiberius 'Ptolemaic and Augustan silver' were used together in payments as interchangeable currencies. In *P.Oxy.* XLIX 3484.6 of AD 27–33 and in *P.Vindob.* L 135 of AD 27 (= *SB XVI* 12609) we find that *dracmas augustas et ptolemaicas* were added up together, as if they were one and the same currency.<sup>22</sup>

The documentary references to 'Ptolemaic silver,' that is, of the coinage of Cleopatra and Augustus, disappear after the reign of Claudius. It is likely that it was Nero who took the earlier, Ptolemaic silver coins out of circulation, when he initiated a new silver currency. However, isolated references to the 'old Ptolemaic silver' may be found as late as the third century AD.<sup>23</sup> It is possible that, in times of crisis or depreciation, coins of Ptolemaic times were requested.<sup>24</sup>

### **PROSDIAGRAFO/MENA AND PROSMETROU/MENA**

Under the Ptolemies, tax farmers and royal banks levied a range of surcharges (from 2 to 20%) to cover the costs of collection, transport expenses or the salary of the officials, and, if taxes were assessed in silver, for the conversion of copper into silver. The practice of levying surcharges on public and private cash payments to cover various costs continued in the Roman period, when all surcharges were grouped under the name of προσδιαγραφόμενα, *P3 wt* in Demotic Egyptian. These terms existed in the Ptolemaic period, but only under Roman rule did they acquire the technical significance of a fixed charge of one sixteenth (6.25%), equal to one and half obol per tetradrachm. The earliest evidence for this rate comes from the reign of Tiberius, but it was thought that it was first introduced under Augustus.<sup>25</sup>

The documentary references to *prosdigraphomena* show that they were an added charge in cash that was levied along with direct or indirect taxes in cash. They thus had a public, administrative usage, and do not seem to occur in private transactions such as loans.<sup>26</sup> What was the purpose of the *prosdigraphomena* has been a vexed question. One hypothesis was that the *prosdigraphomena* were a fee for the transport of the coinage;<sup>27</sup> however, this theory loses force if one considers that both in Ptolemaic and in Roman Egypt funds were transferred from an account to another through bills of exchange, rather than by transporting great amounts of coins. Another view was that, insofar as taxes were paid in silver tetradrachms, there was no obligation to pay *prosdigraphomena*, while when a taxpayer had accumulated bronze obols from his daily wages, he had to pay a supplement in order to convert them to the silver standard required for tax payments.<sup>28</sup> However, this view is contradicted by the documentary evidence that *prosdigraphomena* were levied not only on payments in bronze coins, but also on the silver tetradrachm.

According to Gara, the *prosdigraphomena* were a Roman invention that served to make up for the difference between the old Ptolemaic currency and the reformed tetradrachm of Augustus. In fact, under Augustus the silver tetradrachm was exchanged for 28 or 29 obols instead of the traditional 24. In addition, the introduction of a supplementary fee served to establish a fixed ratio between the Egyptian coinage and the imperial currency, because it

equated the Egyptian tetradrachm to the Roman *denarius*.<sup>29</sup> This was in order to improve trade and monetary circulation, and to facilitate the levy of the provincial poll tax, which, although paid in provincial currency, was assessed by the central administration in *denarii*. This theory is supported by some metrological data. The pieces of bronze struck in Egypt by Augustus, for instance, were similar in weight to the Roman official types: pieces worth 1 1/2 obols were equivalent to 1 Roman *as* (10 grams), a piece worth 3/4 obol was equivalent to 6 *chalkoi* or a *semis* (5 grams), and a 3 *chalkoi*-piece could be compared to the *quadrans*.<sup>30</sup>

In a recent study, Maresch suggested that the *prosdigraphomena* had no relationship to the exchange between the tetradrachm and the *denarius*, but served simply to relate different currencies within Egypt, by establishing a fixed ratio between the nominal and the real value of the silver tetradrachm. According to Maresch, the *prosdigraphomena* were analogous to the Ptolemaic ἀλλογή, a supplementary fee connected with the internal exchange between official silver standard and the bronze and copper coinage.<sup>31</sup> In introducing *prosdigraphomena*, Augustus was taking on Cleopatra's attempt to stabilise the relationship between different currencies under a unique standard, the silver tetradrachm.<sup>32</sup> Maresch thought it likely that a stable currency was reached only gradually, in the course of the first century AD (the official ratio became 1: 300 only in the second century AD), while under Augustus the tetradrachm fluctuated between 1: 450 and 1: 350 copper drachmas.<sup>33</sup>

According to both Gara and Maresch, the *prosdigraphomena* were introduced around 11/10 BC, which is also the date of their earliest attestation, in the receipt for *adaeratio* of corn *O.Strasb.* 48. However, Gara thought that the imposition of supplementary 'artificially created' exchange fees was not totally alien from the Ptolemaic background, because the introduction of an overvalued silver tetradrachm under Augustus resembled a similar operation effected by Ptolemy II Philadelphos.<sup>34</sup> A survey of the documents may modify this view. In a receipt of 25 BC we find the term *P3 wt*, that is, the Demotic name of *prosdigraphomena*.<sup>35</sup> In addition the term *prosdigraphomena* possibly occurs in a banker's receipt of 112 BC.<sup>36</sup> Augustus may have introduced this surcharge after 27 BC, but it is possible that he took over and reformed an older Ptolemaic practice.

The equivalent of *prosdigraphomena* in transactions in kind were the additional charges called προσμετρούμενα. It was long believed that they were introduced by Augustus, and that their earliest evidence was the aforementioned *O.Strasb.* 48 of 11/10 BC.<sup>37</sup> However, we find references to προσμετρούμενα in a document of 18 BC, and in Ptolemaic documents as well.<sup>38</sup> Novel aspects introduced under Roman rule may be that *prosmetroumena* and *prosdigraphom-*

*ena* came to unify a number of older Ptolemaic imposts, which were now calculated as a percentage on the total sum to be paid.

From the Ptolemaic period, the *prosmetroumena* were connected with the κάθαρσις of grain, that is, the process of sifting the grain from extra material that altered its weight. It was thus levied when payments required clean grain (πυρὸς καθαρὸς). In the Roman period too, the *prosmetroumena* were an added charge to payments in πυρὸς καθαρὸς, which was adopted as the unique standard for fiscal purposes.

Throughout the Roman period, both *prosdigraphomena* and *prosmetroumena* were connected with the terms ῥυπαρὸς and καθαρὸς, which respectively meant 'gross' or 'net,' that is, inclusive or exclusive of additional charges, and could refer to either grain or money. It was believed that the use of the terms ῥυπαρὸς and καθαρὸς in connection with grain existed since the Ptolemaic period, but that its application to money was an Augustan development.<sup>39</sup> This view, based on the fact that the earliest occurrences of ῥυπαρὸν and καθαρὸν ἀργύριον, ῥυπαραὶ and καθαραὶ δραχμαί, and of καθαροὶ ὀβολοί come from the Augustan period, still stands. There is also an occurrence of χαλκὸς ῥυπαρὸς in a text dated 'year 6,' which the first editors assigned to the years 60–30 BC.<sup>40</sup>

Gara thought that *prosdigraphomena* served to equate all internal currencies to the only official standard, and this to the Roman *denarius*.<sup>41</sup> The problem with this theory is that there is no positive proof that one Egyptian tetradrachm was equal to one *denarius* from the outset, as the earliest secure evidence of a formal exchange rate between the two currencies comes from the Flavian period.<sup>42</sup> Walker and the authors of *RPC* hypothesised that the official exchange rate between the Egyptian tetradrachm and the *denarius* was established at the beginning of the reign of Claudius.<sup>43</sup>

It is worth noting that some Egyptian documents from the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius preserve accounts in Roman money, e.g. in *aurei*, *denarii* and *asses*. *P.Oxy.* IV 737, of some time between 27 and 8 BC, preserves the accounts of another weaver, with payments in *asses*, which the editors regarded as the Latin expression of the obols.<sup>44</sup> It is true, however, that these accounts may have been drawn up in Italy and later brought to Egypt, as papyrus was used as a writing material throughout the empire.<sup>45</sup> In *SB* XVI 12609 of AD 27, the soldier L. Caecilius Secundus expects a salary of 200 drachmas, but reckons in *asses*, which probably expressed the obols.<sup>46</sup> The earliest known reference to the *aureus*, the gold coin that was equivalent to 25 silver *denarii* occurs in the Greek and Latin accounts of the weaver C. Valerius Niger, which refer to some δηναρίων χρυσῶν and to 100 ἀργυρίου δραχμαί.<sup>47</sup> These documents do not contradict the assumption that Egypt had a closed currency. On the con-



trary, they support the view that in Egypt the imperial currency was used as a unit of reckoning, not only for taxes, but also for the pay of the soldiers and for private or semi-private payments that involved Roman citizens.<sup>48</sup>

A Palmyrene tax-list of the Hadrianic period known as the 'Palmyrene Tariff' quotes a measure by Germanicus that established that most (if not all) taxes in the province had to be assessed in the Roman imperial currency. This document suggests that the exchange rate between provincial currencies and the *denarius* was fixed by the time of Germanicus' journey to the East in AD 17–19.<sup>49</sup> In Egypt, an informal agreement about the exchange rate between the tetradrachm and the *denarius* must have existed from the reign of Augustus. In fact, without a clear conversion rate between Egyptian and imperial currency, it would have been difficult to pay the Roman soldiers serving in Egypt and to assess taxes.<sup>50</sup> An interesting parallel is Sicily, a Roman province since 227 BC, where the assimilation to the Roman monetary system did not prevent bronzes of local character from continuing to be produced, so that the Sicilian system was simply made compatible with the Roman one.<sup>51</sup> A similar development probably took place in Egypt and in other provinces, where the local currencies, weights and measures were not replaced, but only adapted to the imperial system through the establishment of clear ratios.

### THE FORM OF PAYMENTS: CASH AND KIND

The scope of the monetary reforms of Cleopatra and Augustus may be better appreciated by looking at the way in which payments were actually made. The accepted consensus is that, under the later Ptolemies, the use of cash had decreased to the point that often financial transactions were paid in grain even when they were calculated on the bronze standard.<sup>52</sup> It was believed that this return to transactions in kind was due to the absence of small change, because during the sixty years before the reign of Cleopatra the Alexandrian mint had produced only silver coinage, which was too overvalued to be used in day-to-day payments. For these reasons, in 42 BC Cleopatra attempted to put cash back into circulation by establishing a fixed internal exchange rate between the silver standard, used for calculations, and the bronze standard, used for actual payments.

Augustus continued Cleopatra's efforts to foster the circulation of cash by introducing new tetradrachms of billon and smaller bronze pieces. Augustus' tetradrachm at 28/9 obols was used for the capitation taxes that were paid on a universal scale. The annual twelve drachmas for *laographia* were split into two instalments of eight and four drachmas, that is, two and

one tetradrachm.<sup>53</sup> In addition, it seems that Augustus coined bronze pieces *ad hoc* for the payment of specific taxes: he introduced, for instance, a bronze coin worth 1 1/2 obols, equivalent to the rate of *prosdigraphomena* that was levied on one silver tetradrachm.<sup>54</sup>

An important factor in the diffusion of cash was the so-called *adaeratio*, that is, the practice of converting payments that were originally in kind into cash. It was long believed that Augustus first applied the *adaeratio* to taxation in kind, as in the Roman period we begin to find receipts issued ὑπὲρ τιμῆς πυροῦ, 'for the price of wheat.' The general purpose of *adaeratio* seems to have been to speed up the payments in goods that were difficult to transport and collect. Probably, the conversion into cash resulted in a discount on the price, which made the *adaeratio* convenient to the payer.<sup>55</sup> Under Augustus, the *adaeratio* was applied not only to taxes and arrears, but also to the payments for compulsory services and corvées, such as the irrigation works, or the requisitions of goods for the maintenance of the army.<sup>56</sup>

The phrase τιμὴ πυροῦ occurs in Ptolemaic documents, but it is unclear whether it could have anything to do with *adaeratio*; there is however Ptolemaic evidence that arrears in kind could be repaid by converting each artaba into its cash equivalent; thus, the practice of *adaeratio* may have been in existence before the Roman conquest, and Augustus may have taken over and increased it.<sup>57</sup> The receipts for τιμῶν, however, must be taken with caution, as in some cases they may have represented simply contracts of credit, where the money was anticipated on the condition that it would be repaid in kind at the time of the harvest; in sum, it was a sort of loan on the future produce of the land.<sup>58</sup> In the Augustan period, however, there probably was great flexibility in the means of payment of taxes. It is likely that in some cases taxes assessed in cash were still paid in kind, especially when paid as a lump sum by the representatives of the communities of farmers or villagers.

It is possible that Augustus introduced some new regulations concerning the rate of interest in private contracts of loan. The fact that article 105 of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* prescribed that the customary rate of interest in the payment of debts had to be 12% was interpreted as the indication that Augustus reduced the rate of interest from 24% (cited in the documents as τόκων διδράχμων), to 12%, which remained the legal rate of interest throughout the Roman period.<sup>59</sup> This theory however presents some problems: in the first place, we cannot assume that everything that the *Gnomon* says refers to Augustus' initiative, and secondly, under Augustus the interest on loans in kind remained at 50% as in the Ptolemaic period, and an interest of 24% was still paid in some cases, e.g. on overdue debts.<sup>60</sup> Other deviations from the legal rate of interest as established by the *Gnomon* were the Ptolemaic practices of giving

mixed credit in kind and cash, or credit with no interest (ἄτοκος).<sup>61</sup> It seems thus that in the reign of Augustus Egyptian traditions and Roman norms coexisted, and that even later, despite the existence of precise Roman norms, some Egyptian traditions prevailed *de facto*.

Continuity seems to emerge from the evidence of a group of Alexandrian papyri of the Augustan period, which refer to an official διάγραμμα as the valid legal source for the rate of interest. The term διάγραμμα sounds Ptolemaic, and thus it was assumed that it was a Ptolemaic regulation that was still in use under Augustus. This, however, cannot be proved, and it could be an Augustan measure as well.<sup>62</sup>

Article 106 of the *Gnomon* safeguarded the fairness of the exchange rate between silver and bronze prescribing that ν[ό]μισμα πλέον οὐ[[κ]] ἴσχυει οὐκ ἔξδὸν κερματίζειν, that is: 'exchanging currency for bronze at more than the official rate is not allowed.' Although we do not know exactly when this regulation was made, it is possible that this was part of the measure that Augustus took when he established the price of the tetradrachm at 28/29 obols. However, one cannot exclude the possibility that there were earlier Ptolemaic regulations which defined the exchange rates from silver into bronze for internal circulation.<sup>63</sup>

## BANKS

It was believed that in the Ptolemaic period banking was a royal monopoly, and that the Roman conquest brought about the demise of Ptolemaic state banks and the rise of private banks.<sup>64</sup> This view is contradicted by the fact that private banks existed also under the Ptolemies, especially at local level.<sup>65</sup> In addition, from the Ptolemaic period both private and state banks could be called after the name of the banker, usually in the genitive.<sup>66</sup> Probably, the Roman state simply exercised a closer control over both public banks and banks leased by the government to private citizens.<sup>67</sup>

A development of the Augustan period was that the 'royal' banks were named 'public'; the earliest known public bank is that of Areios in the Herakleopolite in 25 BC.<sup>68</sup> It is also likely that, although some exchange banks or κολλυβιστικὰὶ τράπεζαι existed since the Ptolemaic period, under Augustus money changing became a necessity for all those paying taxes, as taxes were assessed and exacted in cash, and thus the number of κολλυβιστικὰὶ τράπεζαι increased.<sup>69</sup> Besides, evidence shows that in the Roman period, and probably also before, banks were entitled to perform operations in kind as well.<sup>70</sup> In conclusion, it is possible that new banks were created by the Roman administration in the Egyptian *chora* and in marginal areas, where cash was re-

quired for, and confined to, the payment of taxes;<sup>71</sup> however, it is inevitable that, since in Egypt banks had been playing a central role in the collection of taxes for centuries, the Roman conquest did not bring about sudden changes, but allowed the existing traditions to continue.

## CONCLUSION

The information gathered from the literary sources, the coins and the papyri suggests that under the later Ptolemies, and especially under Ptolemy Auletes, the currency in Egypt was too complex to meet the needs of real life, inflation was high, the prices unstable, and the economy in decline. For these reasons, around 42 BC Cleopatra attempted to change this state of affairs through a reform, of which we know nothing but for indirect references in the numismatic evidence.

After the Roman conquest, Egypt continued to have its own closed currency system.<sup>72</sup> Between 30 and 27 BC, Octavian took over Cleopatra's coinage and completed her reform by unifying the currencies under a new and unique official standard, the silver tetradrachm worth 29 obols; our ignorance of Cleopatra's reforms is however a major obstacle to understanding Augustus' reforms. By introducing a fixed exchange-fee for the conversion from the Ptolemaic currency into the reformed silver standard, Augustus managed to achieve the two main objectives of Cleopatra's reform, i.e., the stabilisation of the internal currency, and the increase of the amount of coinage used in daily transactions. The *prosdiagraphomena* also served to unify various small exchange fees that descended from the Ptolemaic period.

In the Augustan period, and until AD 19/20, the coinages of Cleopatra and Augustus were assimilated to one and the same currency, and were used interchangeably. The fact that the currency under Augustus was still called 'Ptolemaic' shows that Augustus was not interested in changing names. A substantial change took place in AD 19/20, when the mint of Alexandria reverted to the production of the tetradrachm of real silver, the so-called 'Augustan' silver, which circulated alongside the coinage of Cleopatra and Augustus. It is likely that, by this time, a fixed ratio between the *denarius* and the Egyptian tetradrachm was established.<sup>73</sup> This was exactly fifty years after the fall of the city in 30 BC.<sup>74</sup> Another change took place around AD 57/8, when Nero took out of circulation both the Ptolemaic and the Augustan coinage, and introduced a new currency.<sup>75</sup>

Coinage acquired a special power under Augustus, when it began to reach all the social classes, from the urban Hellenised élites down to the Egyptian farmers in the *chora*. Die counts seem to show that the output of

Alexandria made the Egyptian tetradrachm by far the largest provincial silver coinage. New bronze issues were also introduced, in order to supply small change for day-to-day transactions. The wide range of Augustan denominations and designs are unparalleled both in the Ptolemaic period and under Augustus' successors.<sup>76</sup>

It is likely that under Augustus the practice of the *adaeratio* and the use of money in general were increased by the exaction of capitation taxes in cash on a large scale.<sup>77</sup> Hopkins observed that under the Roman empire many provincial taxes and rents in kind were exacted or commuted into money, because taxation in kind was difficult to transfer, and most expenditure in Rome was in cash;<sup>78</sup> this may have applied to Egypt too.

Probably, the province of Egypt was vital to the rest of the empire not only for its grain, but also for its annual outflow of cash in the form of taxation.<sup>79</sup> One may wonder how funds were transferred from Egypt to Italy, since the Egyptian currency had no value outside the province, and therefore the outcome of taxation could not be sent to Italy as it was. According to Walker, the tetradrachms that were accumulated from tax collection were transported to Rome and then melted down to extract silver; alternatively, they could have been melted down in Alexandria and then refined in Rome.<sup>80</sup> This seems however too difficult and expensive to be feasible. If money was exported, it would have been impossible for the government to return several millions drachmas a year to the Egyptian taxpayers, so that they could continue to pay taxes.

It is possible that the revenues from Egypt were transferred through other channels. According to van Minnen, traders played a decisive role in carrying back Egyptian money from Italy to Egypt.<sup>81</sup> In my view, however, the conversion of the local currency to the imperial one took place within the boundaries of the province rather than through massive shipments of coins or gold. In fact, most tax transactions between Rome and the provinces were probably made through bills of exchange in banks. The guarantors of these transactions may have been the supervisors of the collection of the revenues, i.e., the governing bodies of Alexandria and the Greek cities, the equestrian procurators or the emperor's slaves and freedmen, who could rely on their huge bank accounts both in Rome and at Alexandria.<sup>82</sup>

## Conclusion

The present book aimed to examine and, where possible, challenge the old commonplace that Rome took over the existing administrative fiscal and economic structures in newly annexed provinces with no significant change. The purpose of the work was to survey the documents of the period from the 60s BC to the 40s AD in order to verify the hypothesis that after the fall of Alexandria in 30 BC not everything remained unchanged, but Egypt acquired all the characteristics of a full Roman province. The documents from Egypt are a unique source, which we lack in any other area of the Mediterranean; they help to gain a better understanding of the ways in which Rome created a province, and show where the local traditions were continued with no significant change, and in what areas the impact of Roman rule left a visible mark.

When approaching the documents of the Augustan period, the first impression is one of strong continuity with the past. At first sight, in fact, the documents seem to confirm the view that after a foreign kingdom was annexed as a province Rome did not modify its essential structure, but only imposed an administrative and legal organisation that facilitated control by the central government in Rome, and ultimately by the emperor himself. In this respect, Egypt was neither isolated nor substantially different from other regions; as Rostovtzeff saw, Egypt had land and taxation systems similar to those of other former Hellenistic kingdoms, which Rome tended to continue, after these kingdoms were turned into provinces.<sup>1</sup>

The documents suggest that Augustus continued not only Ptolemaic but also pre-Ptolemaic traditions. The later Roman evidence of Coptic and Demotic documents indicates that the Egyptian language, culture and religion continued on an unofficial level over centuries of foreign rule. Glare's study of the impact of the Roman conquest on the life of the traditional Egyptian temples has challenged the old view that there was a dichotomy between the Roman state and the Egyptian temples, and convincingly argued

that the Roman emperors and prefects allowed Egyptian priests and temples to retain their ancestral privileges, and used them as intermediaries not only in religious affairs, but also in the financial and fiscal administration of the province. Furthermore, it is striking that some institutions that were in use in Roman Egypt—such as, for instance, the system of weights and measures—had been first introduced during the Persian domination in the fifth century BC. Persian institutions survived also in other countries in Asia Minor that had been part of the old Persian empire, such as Armenia, Persia and Pisidia. It thus seems that Egypt was not as idiosyncratic as scholars used to believe, and that even Egypt's most original aspects may have good parallels in other regions of the Near East.

By looking at all these aspects of continuity, one might believe that the novelties that the Roman conquest brought to Egypt were as superficial as the earlier generation of scholars believed, and that Egypt's cultural and geographical peculiarities and, above all, its role as a major source of grain for Alexandria and Rome made the relationship between farmers, land and taxes immutable over the centuries.<sup>2</sup> The archaeological evidence of the early Roman period, such as the reliefs on the temple of Kalabsha (Talmis) showing Augustus and Tiberius in the Pharaonic attire, has lent further support to the view that the Roman emperors wanted to present themselves as the legitimate successors of the Ptolemies and even of the Pharaohs.<sup>3</sup> One should take into account, however, that these monuments represented the image that the emperors wanted to propagate on the official level, and therefore should not be taken literally.

The documents examined in this book profoundly contradict the stereotyped vision of Egypt as the country of the unchanging continuity, and suggest that the Augustan period was a decisive turning point in various respects. Chapter two has shown that the possibility of having Egypt incorporated into the Roman empire was a matter of public debate as early as in the 80s BC, when king Ptolemy Alexander designated Rome as the legitimate heir of Egypt and Cyprus, although Egypt was not annexed eventually. Twenty years later, under Ptolemy XII Auletes, Egypt lost its independence for good: Gabinius' military campaign in 55 BC and the appointment of Rabirius as the finance minister of Egypt clearly show that by the 50s BC Egypt was controlled by Rome from both the economic and the military points of view. Julius Caesar's military campaign of 48/47 BC and his liaison with Cleopatra further support the view that in the 40s and 30s BC Egypt was part of the Roman political agenda to a much larger extent than the definition of 'Roman protectorate' might suggest. The fact that Cleopatra called her son Ptolemy Kaisar is significant, and shows the extent to which Egypt depended on

Roman politics even before the official date for its formal annexation as a Roman province, the fall of Alexandria on 8 Mesore or 1 August 30 BC.

Chapter three has argued that after the conquest Egypt underwent a strong militarization, although a considerable number of soldiers and veterans had been settled on Egyptian land even earlier, by Gabinius in the 50s and by Julius Caesar in the 40s BC. The analysis of the documents has lent further support to the testimony of Strabo, who reports that in the 20s BC Egypt was garrisoned by three Roman legions, three cohorts and three bodies of Macedonian cavalrymen; in fact, the references to Macedonian cavalrymen in land contracts of the Augustan period suggest that they may have been Cleopatra's soldiers, who may have been still in active service under Augustus. It thus seems that in 30 BC Octavian neither disarmed nor expelled the Ptolemaic military bodies that had survived the war, but took them over as auxiliaries of the Roman army. The documents also show that Graeco-Egyptians were often recruited into the Roman army or into the fleet, and that a number of Graeco-Egyptians recruited as Roman soldiers were employed in police and civil tasks throughout Egypt from soon after the conquest. To provincials, a military career in the Roman army was attractive as it constituted a relatively easy way to obtain Roman citizenship, and, consequently, to achieve social, economic and legal privileges.

Chapter four has suggested that the Roman conquest brought to the administration of Egypt some fundamental changes. As was the case of other Near Eastern provinces, however, Rome did not modify significantly the territorial divisions of Egypt in nomes, *epistrategiai* and so forth, and, especially from the level of the nome downwards, Augustus retained the existing bureaucracy with no major changes. Greek continued to be the official language of administration, while the most commonly spoken language throughout the Roman period continued to be Demotic Egyptian, as one may deduce from the revival of the Egyptian language in the genesis of the Coptic language. A more radical change involved the higher administrative offices, which were taken up by Roman equestrian officials similar to those documented in other imperial provinces; such equestrian officials often came from outside Egypt and were chosen by the emperor in person. From very early after the conquest, in addition, a large number of freedmen and slaves, often imported from Italy or from the Greek-speaking provinces, were the ones actually in charge of the day-to-day financial running of the resources of the province; they appear in the documents in the capacity of, among other things, estate managers, tax collectors, bankers, and priests of the imperial cult.

Besides this administrative superstructure there was an infrastructure of town- and village- governments, which Rome entrusted to officials from the



Alexandrian or the local aristocracy. The Greek cities of Egypt, i.e., Alexandria, Naukratis and Ptolemais Euergetis, seem to have continued administering themselves through their own Greek-style institutions, such as the city council (*boule*) or the popular assembly (*demos*). Only Alexandria was deprived of its city council, probably at some stage in the late Ptolemaic period, and had to wait until AD 200 to have it back.

As regards the internal administration of the nomes, Augustus basically continued all the traditional offices, although these posts were often filled by Roman or Alexandrian officials chosen by the emperor in person or selected at local level among the wealthiest. Some of the *strategoï* who had been in power under Cleopatra continued to serve in their post under Augustus, and even bequeathed it to their sons, although from a certain point onwards (in the Augustan period) the post of *strategos* seems to have been monopolised by Alexandrian citizens only. Roman army officers also seem to have taken over posts in the local police-system from the reign of Tiberius at the latest. Overall, it is difficult to make generalisations that may be valid for the province of Egypt as a whole, as the basis for such statements is evidence that survived by chance in heterogeneous contexts. In fact it seems that, although Rome may have brought a higher degree of uniformity in institutions, different regions within Egypt maintained their own bureaucratic traditions under Roman rule as well.

Chapter five has shown that the Greek and Egyptian legal systems that co-existed in Ptolemaic Egypt survived under Roman rule. Most contracts were drawn in the Graeco-Egyptian way, and on some occasions the edicts of Ptolemaic kings were even cited as a valid legal authority as late as in the second century AD. In spite of this, there is evidence that Roman law was present in the public and private sphere from the Augustan period, and Roman law seems to have been used not only by the minority of Roman citizens who had settled in Egypt, but also by Greek-Egyptians, and well before AD 200, when Caracalla's *Constitutio Antoniniana* extended Roman citizenship to all the free population of the empire. It is inevitable that Roman law played an important role in the process of transformation of Egypt from a Hellenistic kingdom into a Roman province. Besides, the Roman conquest brought a clear change in the administration of justice, which was now entrusted to the prefect, the *iuridicus* and their annual court of assize, the *conventus*. The common form of litigation continued to be the petition to the official authorities requesting the summons of the opponent. The Greek-style law courts at Alexandria, and probably also in the other Greek cities, continued to function for some time under Augustus, until they fell into disuse at a certain point during his reign or in that of Tiberius.

Chapter six has suggested that the Augustan period marked the beginning of the process of municipalisation, whereby the Greek population of the *nomes* came to be concentrated in the nome *metropoleis*, which were gradually turned into Graeco-Roman *poleis* with buildings and institutions of the Graeco-Roman type. A corollary of this process was the emergence of compulsory public offices, the liturgies, through which the self-sponsored élites were entrusted the administration of the cities and of the surrounding *nomes*. Both municipalisation and liturgies were aspects of one and the same long-term process, whose roots went back to the liturgical magistracies in the Greek cities of Ptolemaic Egypt. The liturgical system began to expand under Augustus, when it was applied to tax collectorships, and became fully developed in the second or third centuries AD, when it became the method of recruitment of the bureaucracy on all levels of administration.

Chapter seven has tried to suggest that one of the most important changes that followed the annexation of a foreign kingdom as a province of the Roman empire was the introduction of the census of the population and of the *tributum*, a poll tax in cash levied on all; in Roman Egypt both institutions could be indicated by the term *laographia*. From Augustus onwards, the numbering of the population, the assessment of the individual property, the examination for privileged status (*epikrisis*) and the payment of different levels of poll tax according to one's personal status were events closely connected to each other. Although capitation taxes and forms of census and *epikrisis* existed from the Ptolemaic period, under Augustus these institutions acquired a new purpose, that is, the exaction of the provincial poll tax and the delivery of the provincial revenues to Rome. Augustus probably exploited the status-differentiations that he found in Ptolemaic Egypt in order to create an even more rigid social system in which privilege depended on the individual wealth and on the pretence of Greek cultural habits. This system aimed to promote the social advancement of the Hellenised class, that is, of the urban and privileged section of the population, while it exploited the native Egyptian population as low-cost agricultural manpower; in this respect it is interesting that in the examinations for status in the reign of Augustus, many people of Graeco-Egyptian origin were reclassified and may have been downgraded to the rank of Egyptians.

Chapter eight has shown that Rome promoted a major reorganisation of the land in Egypt, not only after the conquest, when Augustus confiscated the estates of the supporters of Cleopatra and created imperial *ousiai*, but even from the late 50s or the 40s BC, when much of the property of Ptolemy Auletes seems to have been transferred to the Alexandrian citizen community or the *oikos* of Alexandria. The imperial *ousiai* derived consciously from the gift-estates that the Ptolemies used to give to their associates (*doreai*); however, two substantial

differences were that most owners of the *ousiai* were members of the imperial household, and that the revenues from the *ousiai* did not remain in Egypt—as was the case with the Ptolemaic *doreai*—but flew directly into the *patrimonium* of the emperor at Rome. In Egypt Augustus' reorganisation of the land categories aimed also to widen the amount of cultivated land subject to taxes and rents, to the point that often the assignment of an estate carried the obligation to cultivate it, becoming thus a sort of compulsory service that the wealthiest had to take up. It is also possible that Augustus introduced technical improvements to agriculture, by making the irrigation system more efficient or by developing new cash-raising crops such as wine.

The evidence has contradicted the long-established view that Augustus introduced private ownership of land in Egypt *ex abrupto*, as there is evidence that private land existed from the Ptolemaic period; besides, it seems that in sales of land the Roman administration took over and continued the existing Ptolemaic practices with only slight modifications. The contracts and offices of katoikic land also present many aspects of continuity with the Ptolemaic period; besides, it seems that, for some time in the first century AD and possibly until the Flavian period, the ownership of katoikic land still required the possession of the status of *katoikos*. This means that under Augustus katoikic land did not become 'freely alienable' as was once believed, but continued to be held by a closed circle of people with Greek status. It thus seems that, in effect, under Augustus and Tiberius only a restricted section of the population, consisting of Romans, Alexandrians and Greeks, owned land as private property. A deeper reorganisation of the land may have been Vespasian's undertaking.

Chapter nine has shown that most Ptolemaic taxes were taken over and continued, although the methods of their levy changed. The majority of tax collectorships continued to be in the hands of tax farmers, but under Augustus one sees also new figures of state-appointed tax collectors, the *prakttores*, who were introduced to collect the *laographia* and other capitation taxes. However, the process by which state-appointed *prakttores* replaced tax farmers must have been a gradual one. It is possible that Augustus appointed new tax collectors to supervise either newly introduced or revenue-raising taxes such as the poll tax, while the existing officials were left to collect taxes of minor importance. A radical novelty was Augustus' use of his own freedmen and slaves to supervise both tax collection and grain distributions: some documents show imperial slaves in the function of supervisors of the grain tax or *phorologoi*, an office that, oddly, seems to disappear under Tiberius.

At local level tax collection was performed by the local representatives of the communities of taxpayers, e.g. villages, guilds of workers or temples; the help of such intermediaries was indispensable to Rome, not least because they

could speak the Egyptian language. It is also possible that the Greek cities and the *metropoleis* of the nomes were granted some degree of autonomy in the collection of taxes even before, around AD 200, Septimius Severus introduced city councils (*boulai*) in every nome capital. The documents also show that from very early after the conquest the collection of taxes was enforced by officers of the Roman army (e.g. soldiers, centurions, and *statores*) in a larger degree than one might expect in a province that had a sophisticated, centuries-old bureaucracy.

Under Roman rule the structure of the taxation system remained substantially the same as in the Ptolemaic period. Augustus however did introduce a number of new taxes: in the first place he reformed radically the most important capitation tax, the poll tax, he introduced the dike tax and surtaxes that would make up for tax-evaders. It also seems that Augustus incorporated in his patrimony all the revenues coming from the proto-industries of oil- and beer-making, access to baths and the manufacture of papyrus, which were once the monopoly of the kings. In this respect, it is striking that the centres of production of such proto-industries were often part of estates under the control of the imperial household. On the other hand, the taxes upon traditional Egyptian priests and temples seem to have been taken over from the Ptolemaic period with no apparent change. An interesting phenomenon is that, under Roman rule, the rate of the taxes was not uniform throughout Egypt, but varied according to geographical regions depending on their agricultural productivity. Although modern scholars may find this difficult to accept, in ancient times the level of taxation was often adjusted so that the richer areas paid higher taxes; in Egypt this was common practice from the Ptolemaic and even the Persian periods.

Chapter ten has argued that under Roman rule Egypt continued to have a closed system, in which the imperial currency (the *aureus*, the *denarius* and so forth) did not circulate; vice versa, the Egyptian silver tetradrachm could not circulate outside the province. Continuity also emerges from the fact that the currency of Egypt continued to be the silver tetradrachm of the Ptolemies; and that Octavian's first series of coins (of the years around 30–27 BC) closely imitated the coinage of Cleopatra both in iconography and in metrology. Even Augustus's attempts to unify the internal circulation of currency by connecting all the existing standards (i.e., bronze and copper) with the silver tetradrachm may be seen as the continuation of the reforms Cleopatra had begun in 42 BC. Such reforms aimed to unify the metal standards used to reckon with those used to pay, in order to stabilise the prices, and to increase the amount of coinage that was used in the everyday transactions of the majority. It was under either Augustus or Tiberius, probably, that an official exchange rate of 1:1 between the

Egyptian tetradrachm and the Roman *denarius* was established. The most striking aspect in the currency of Augustan Egypt is that the Ptolemaic currency continued to circulate alongside the currency minted by Augustus, and that until AD 20 Ptolemaic and Augustan coins were used interchangeably, and were both called 'Ptolemaic drachmas' or 'Ptolemaic silver.'

It seems clear, in sum, that the annexation of Egypt was of vital importance to the rest of the empire, not only because of the need for its rich harvests of grain, but also because of the huge revenues in cash that were raised from that province. It is unclear how the revenues from taxation in Egypt reached the imperial treasuries in Rome, since Egypt's currency was a closed system. It is likely that the cash revenue collected from taxpayers was transferred through bills of exchange from the banks of the local communities to Alexandrian and eventually to Roman banks. Such transfers of money were often supervised by imperial agents, freedmen or slaves, who could act as guarantors, as they had huge patrimonies in banks both in Italy and in the provinces.

The individual chapters of this book have suggested that Egypt was annexed as a full Roman province since the date of its formal conquest, 30 BC, and that Egypt was one of the most important provinces for several reasons, first of all its immense wealth and the presence of Alexandria, whose economic, political and strategic importance almost surpassed that of Rome. Even from an ideological perspective, in addition, the threat that the conquest of Egypt was indispensable for Rome's material and moral survival proved to be the most effective points of propaganda of Octavian, and the stimulus for his rise to power.

The Roman conquest should be regarded as a turning point in the history of Egypt: the Augustan period linked two different worlds, the world of Hellenistic kingdoms and the newly-born world of Roman provinces and emperors. The elements of the old Ptolemaic administration, which the Roman government continued, played a new role in the larger context of the empire: even if Egypt had been exploited for centuries through a system of leases and exactions in grain, and although the social discrimination between the Greek and Egyptian population had existed long before the Roman conquest, as long as Ptolemaic rule lasted this was confined to the boundaries of the country. In fact, the Ptolemaic king had no other resource than Egypt, and thus had some interest in guaranteeing the survival of its inhabitants, while under Roman rule Egypt was a province among others, a cow to be milked or a sheep to be shorn.

What the documentary sources do not tell us explicitly is how painful this process was for the majority of the population, and what the majority

thought about becoming part of the empire. Indeed, the Roman conquest brought development and wealth, but these advantages were accessible to a restricted section of the population. Cities became organised according to a Roman-imperial model, that is, with buildings and institutions of the Graeco-Roman type, and this was a stimulus for the creation of a new form of society, which was both imposed on and adopted by the native population. Indeed, Roman rule improved the life of the provincial élites, who were now able to join a broad cultural and political system covering the whole Mediterranean basin; but nevertheless, the majority of the Egyptian population remained excluded from all this.<sup>4</sup>

In conclusion, the documents examined in the course of this work suggest that we cannot describe Augustan Egypt through the stereotyped dichotomies of continuity *versus* change, centralisation *versus* local autonomy, Ptolemaic '*dirigisme*' *versus* Roman liberal policy. Such binary categories are oversimplifications of a more complex reality, as in Egypt contradictory aspects co-existed. Egypt was annexed as a province of the Roman people, but was also a province of the emperor with some sort of special status, as emerges from the fact that Roman citizens of high status were kept away from it. It was governed by a provincial administration and by an equestrian governor, but was in the hands of powerful freedmen and slaves from Augustus's household. It paid hundreds of millions of drachmas to Rome in money taxes, but had a closed currency that could not circulate in the rest of the empire. Even as concerned religion, in Egypt ancestral Egyptian gods, Greek deities and the deified Roman emperor were often worshipped in the same shrine. All these contradictions, some of which continued to exist over the Roman period and the following centuries, cannot, and probably should not, be resolved.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## The Fasti of the Prefects of Egypt under Augustus and Tiberius

After the fall of Alexandria in 30 BC, Octavian claimed in a speech in Greek that he had spared the city for his admiration for Alexander the Great, and for the sake of his teacher and friend, the Alexandrian philosopher Areius. According to the literary sources, Octavian was keen to make Areius the first prefect of Egypt, but the philosopher rejected the offer and eventually took up another post in Sicily.<sup>1</sup> The historical reliability of this anecdote is doubtful, as there are no parallel examples of people turning down a post offered by an emperor, least of all by Augustus. In my view, it is possible that this anecdote was created to justify Octavian's removal of Areius (who may have been popular at Alexandria) and the imposition as prefect of Cornelius Gallus, a Roman *eques* and a friend of Octavian's.

The *fasti* of the Augustan prefects still present many gaps. In the first place, the chronology of Cornelius Gallus, Aelius Gallus and Publius Petronius is controversial. Cornelius Gallus is believed to have taken the prefecture after fighting with Octavian at Alexandria in 30 BC, and to have held it until his suicide around 26 BC, Aelius Gallus from around 26 to 24 BC, P. Petronius from around 24 to around 22 BC. Cornelius Gallus (c. 69/68–26 BC) was a Gaul from Narbonensis, acquainted with Cicero and a friend of Asinius Pollio, with whom he probably acted as *triumvir agris dividendis* in Cisalpine Gaul during the confiscations after Philippi. He was honoured by Virgil in the tenth *Eclogue* (and, according to Servius, originally also in the fourth *Georgic*) and was himself an elegiac poet.<sup>2</sup> To Gallus most probably belong the verses that were found on the earliest known Latin papyrus from Egypt, *P.Qasr Ibrim*, found on the site of ancient Primis in Egyptian Nubia, on the frontier with Ethiopia, a site that was briefly occupied by a Roman garrison under the prefect Petronius.<sup>3</sup>



The years of the prefecture of Gallus were occupied by military actions. The first was the suppression of a revolt that broke out in the Thebaid in 29 BC. The deed was recorded in a trilingual inscription in Greek, Latin, and Hieroglyphic Egyptian from Philae, *OGIS* II 654 of 15 April 29 BC, according to which Gallus was able to quell the revolt in fifteen days and two battles, and conquer five cities. In another inscription on the base of an obelisk originally in the *forum* of Alexandria, Gallus appears as *praefectus fabrum*. This title is puzzling, and may be explained, rather than in the context of the prefecture of Egypt, as an older post that Gallus held before 30 BC. After his disgrace, exile and suicide around 26 BC, Gallus seems to have been condemned to *damnatio memoriae*. Possibly this was the reason why the stone with his inscription at Philae was broken in two pieces and the obelisk removed.<sup>4</sup>

Aelius Gallus took up the prefecture around 26 BC and held it for about two years, until 25/24 BC. He was a prominent *amicus principis*, perhaps one and the same as M. Gallus whom Galen and other medical authors refer to as Augustus's personal physician.<sup>5</sup> As Strabo records, his major exploit was his military campaign against Arabia in 25/24 BC, which ended up in disaster.<sup>6</sup> Strabo was himself a witness to the events he described, as he was on the staff of Aelius Gallus, with whom he sailed up the Nile to explore the territory of Upper Egypt before the campaign against Arabia.<sup>7</sup> *P.Oxy.* XXXVII 2820, an anonymous historical narrative of preparations for a military campaign after Cleopatra's death, might have referred to the preparations for this expedition; the question is still open.<sup>8</sup> We do not know anything about Aelius Gallus after the disaster of Arabia; it is likely that he was removed from his post and spent the rest of his life at Rome.<sup>9</sup>

Aelius Gallus' successor was Petronius, who was in office by 25/24 BC, when he sent shipments of grain to king Herod to aid Judaea during a famine.<sup>10</sup> To Petronius belongs the earliest known prefectural edict, a fragment dated 22 BC and dealing with farmers and their property.<sup>11</sup> Soon after Petronius took office an expedition to Ethiopia was led, allegedly to suppress an Ethiopian attack on the Thebaid. Petronius defeated the Ethiopians and sacked the capital Napata, leaving garrisons before withdrawing from there. Two years later, the Ethiopians attacked these garrisons, and Petronius returned, defeated the Ethiopian queen Candace, and ordered her to send ambassadors to Augustus at Samos.<sup>12</sup> *P.Tebt.* II 302 (= *W.Chr.* 368) of AD 71/72 informs us that Petronius introduced changes in the administration of sacred land. Strabo reports that during a public appearance in Alexandria the prefect was almost stoned by the mob.<sup>13</sup>

From Petronius, who is last attested in 21 BC, until P. Rubrius Barbarus, who is first documented in 15/14 BC, there is a gap, which some

recently published documents might help to fill. *P.Wash.Univ.* II 106 of 13 January 18 BC, a letter from a certain Dionysia to her brother Panechotes, mentions a high official called Pedo, who was about to sail up the Nile in order to judge Dionysia in court. This Pedo may possibly be identified with the Pedo who is later documented as prefect.<sup>14</sup> However, it is possible that the future prefect Pedo was at this time among the high officials who accompanied the prefect in the *conventus*. It is also possible, though less likely, that Pedo was connected with the poet Albinovanus Pedo who was on the staff of Germanicus in AD 15.<sup>15</sup>

*BGU* IV 1138 of 19/18 BC (= *M. Chr.* 100) is a petition from a certain Nikanor to an official possibly called Lucius and addressed as τὸν πάντων σωτῆρα καὶ ἀντιλήμπτορα (l. 19), the formula normally used for prefects. Nikanor complained for receiving unjust treatment from a judge, Kasios (that is, Cassius) whom Lucius had appointed.<sup>16</sup>

An enigmatic piece of evidence is *SB* XX 14085, an official list of court-sentenced people for murder in various villages of the Arsinoite. The second column of this document begins with the date (Year 18) and the phrase ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κορνη(λίου).<sup>17</sup> Cornelius might have been the *strategos* or some other official who dealt with justice; there is also a slight possibility that he may have been the prefect. The dating of this document is uncertain; the eighteenth year may have been in the reign of Augustus, that is 13/12 BC, or of Tiberius, that is AD 31/32.

The earliest known attestation for Rubrius Barbarus was thought to be in 13/12 BC.<sup>18</sup> He also appears as Βαρ]βάρου τοῦ ἡγεμόνος as early as 15/14 BC in *BGU* XVI 2595.2f, a circular letter from Dorion, a royal secretary, which announced to the τοπογραμματοεῖς of the nome an inspection of the accounts. Of Rubrius Barbarus we know that he was a native of Casinum, where he dedicated an inscription to the emperor in 23 BC.<sup>19</sup> He is mentioned in two other inscriptions, *OGIS* II 656, the base of an obelisk erected in Alexandria, and II 657, a dedicatory inscription to Augustus from the temple at Philae, and he might have been one and the same as the Rubrius mentioned in the *Acta Alexandrinorum*.<sup>20</sup> It is worth noting that an unnamed official is addressed as σωτῆρ καὶ ἀντιλήμπτωρ in a fragmentary petition of 14/13 BC, which was published (as a description) as *BGU* IV 1182.

*BGU* XVI 2558 of 12 BC may be an edict of a prefect, because it begins with the technical verb λέγει. The edict is concerned with agricultural matters and contains a threat to punish those who abandon their work in the fields. The name of the authority who issued the edict is lost, apart from the ending ]οκλος, which might have been Πρ]όκλος, that is, the transliteration of the Latin name Proculus.<sup>21</sup> The document refers to Barbarus too, as

the former prefect in 12 BC. In another document, *BGU XVI* 2631, an official named Gallus was expected to make a *παράστασις* at Memphis in 9 BC, and clothes were being requisitioned for him. Although the term *παράστασις* may have indicated an inspection by an official, it is conceivable that this Gallus was a prefect on his *conventus*, as the date in March falls in the time-span that was allotted for the *conventus* at Memphis every year.

The prefect C. (Julius?) Turranius was in office from about 7 to 4/3 BC, as is demonstrated by *BGU XVI* 2605.1 and 2646.32. Before then we know nothing about Turranius' career, except that he, as many Augustan prefects, was an *amicus Caesaris*.<sup>22</sup> Turranius recurs in two inscriptions, *IGRR* 1295, composed in elegiac couplets by a poet called Catilius, probably in 7 BC, and *IGRR* 1109, erected by the former *epistrategos* Q. Corvius Flaccus in 4 BC, each dedicated to the prefect and the emperor with other members of the imperial family.

Most references to Turranius in the papyri concern his reforms, which restricted the number of the privileged categories of priests and increased their liability to taxes and *corvées*. In *BGU IV* 1198, the priests of Isis at Bousiris in the Herakleopolite complained that they had to pay the *λαογραφία*, which they had never paid before, inclusive of four years of arrears. *P.Oxy.* XII 1434 mentions an edict of Turranius that conceded to C. Julius Theon<sup>23</sup> some land confiscated from the land sacred to Isis; *BGU IV* 1197 is another petition of priests to the prefect concerning the state subvention to temples called *σύνταξις*, and *BGU IV* 1199 is the copy of a letter of Turranius ordering an *ἐπίκρισις* of priests. After his prefecture in Egypt, Turranius was nominated *praefectus annonae* in AD 14, and maintained this position, possibly with some interruptions, until AD 48.<sup>24</sup>

After Turranius, and from *c.* 2/1 BC to *c.* AD 3, the prefect was a certain C. Octavius. We know nothing of his career before his prefecture. Octavius appears in three inscriptions dedicated to the emperor, *IGRR* 1117 (AD 3), 1163 (AD 1), and the undated 1322. He is also the addressee of *BGU IV* 1200 (2/1 BC), a petition from priests who asked to receive some arrears of state funding.<sup>25</sup>

After Octavius the list of the prefects becomes confused again. The most important piece of evidence for this period, *PSIX* 1149.13 = *SB XVI* 12531, mentions four prefects in a row, i.e. Scapula, Aquila, Pedo, and Magius Maximus, as those who gave authority to the *παστοφόροι* of a temple over some lesser priests. From this document it was deduced that Scapula, Aquila, Pedo and Maximus were prefects in succession.<sup>26</sup> However, it is also possible that the writer did not follow the chronological order, and that he selected the

prefects who had taken steps towards the problem in question, without mentioning other prefects who might have governed in the meantime.

P. Ostorius Scapula, prefect between AD 3 and 10, may have been related to the Q. Ostorius Scapula whom Dio reports as praetorian prefect in 2 BC. P. Ostorius Scapula is the recipient of petitions in the archive of Isidoros of Psophthis. He was from the family of the Ostorii Scapulae from Amiternum, had connections with the Sallustii Crispi and became very close to Augustus. Scapula is also mentioned in an undated inscription from Narmouthis, *SB V* 8083, which contains a dedication to the emperor.<sup>27</sup>

C. Julius Aquila is attested only in texts concerning his role as prefect in AD 10/11, e.g. *IGRR I* 1055 and 1056, two bilingual inscriptions that commemorate the building of a canal from Schedia to Alexandria under Augustus. *P.Oxy.* XII 1434.12 tells us that Aquila had granted to C. Julius Theon the permission to inherit the paternal *ousia* around AD 10/11. It is worth noting that Dio refers to a certain Aquila as a freedman used by Maecenas to train people in Latin (and possibly Greek) shorthand writing. It is not impossible that the prefect Aquila began his career as a freedman in Augustus' household.<sup>28</sup>

A passage in Philo (*Flacc.* 74) reports that Magius Maximus was prefect twice, the second time in AD 14/15.<sup>29</sup> According to Philo, soon after he became prefect, Magius Maximus published directives (*ἐντολαί*) to replace the ethnarch of the Jews, who had died under Aquila.<sup>30</sup> Maximus is also addressed in some petitions dated to AD 14/15. Magius Maximus is also quoted in the edict of Vergilius Capito about the restrictions to the requisitions for the travel of public officials in the *chora*.

An passage in Dio reports that, after the round of tax-collection of AD 15, Tiberius rebuked the prefect of Egypt Aemilius Rectus, saying that he wanted his sheep to be shorn, not skinned alive.<sup>31</sup> The dates of the prefecture of L. Aemilius Rectus are controversial, as he appears to have been prefect under Claudius, not under Tiberius. For this reason it was believed that there were two Aemilii Recti, father and son, who both attained the prefecture. However, the most plausible view is that Dio's reference to Aemilius Rectus and Tiberius was anachronistic.<sup>32</sup>

In another passage, Dio reports that a prefect called L. Seius Strabo was sent to Egypt in AD 15.<sup>33</sup> Seius Strabo was an Etruscan from Volsinii who ranked among the *amici* of both Augustus and Tiberius (Seius' mother was a sister of Maecenas' wife Terentia). Under Augustus, Seius Strabo had been prefect of the *praetorium*, first alone and then in association with his son Sejanus, who continued as the only praetorian prefect after AD 15. On Seius Strabo's death Tiberius inherited all or part of his property.<sup>34</sup>

C. Galerius, probably a native of Ariminum, seems to have been prefect for sixteen years, from AD 16 to AD 31. This view was based on a passage where Seneca said that he had spent some time in Egypt with his uncle, who had been prefect of Egypt for sixteen years and had died during a sea voyage. Seneca's uncle was identified with Galerius because of a passage in Dio (LVII 19.6) that said that Galerius had also died on a ship. However, as Rea first pointed out, this identification is likely to be a mistake. In fact, Galerius' 16-year-prefecture would be exceptional, given that the normal term of office was roughly three years, and furthermore, the only secure documentary evidence for Galerius as prefect comes from AD 22/23.<sup>35</sup> According to Rea the figure of sixteen years might have originated from a scribal error in the manuscript tradition of section 19.6 of Seneca's *Consolatio ad Helviam*, that misinterpreted the number VI or VII as XVI; Rea thought it more likely that after Magius Maximus, last documented in AD 14/15, L. Seius Strabo was prefect for six or seven years, and that he was the uncle of Seneca, while Galerius became prefect only later, around AD 22. Subsequently, Corbier challenged this view by arguing that the term *avunculus* that Seneca used may have indicated a male relative in general, not specifically his uncle.<sup>36</sup> On this basis, one could suggest that Seneca's *avunculus* was Junius Gallio, a friend of Tiberius and Ovid who adopted Novatus, the eldest son of Seneca the Elder,<sup>37</sup> although unfortunately there is no Egyptian evidence to confirm this.

In AD 19 Germanicus visited Egypt, but the details and the reason of this visit remain obscure. It is also unclear who the prefect was at that time. In his edict against honours and requisitions in his favour, Germanicus requested the population to abide by his schedule of prices for requisitions and urged the people to refer to a certain Baebius, whom he called 'his friend and secretary.'<sup>38</sup> A certain Baebius Juncinus is documented as *tribunus militum* in AD 63 in *P.Fouad* 21.7, while another Baebius Juncinus was prefect of Egypt in AD 212.<sup>39</sup> It is possible that the Baebius who accompanied Germanicus came from the same family as the later prefect Baebius Juncinus; Germanicus' friend may have been, if not the prefect, a person of authority around AD 19. Naturally, however, this remains in the realm of speculation.

*P.Oxy.* LV 3807 reports that the imperial freedman Hiberus was acting as prefect around AD 26–28. This document is important because it proves that even a freedman could achieve this post. Some connected Hiberus with the M. Antonius Hiberus who appears in several inscriptions, and in turn with the freedman of Antonia the wife of the elder Drusus; however Rea hypothesised that he was a P. Flavius.<sup>40</sup> The literary sources for this period are particularly obscure. Dio calls Hiberus *Kaisareios*, that is, an imperial freedman or slave, and states that he became prefect after Vitrasius Pollio, in AD

32. This information is contradictory, as Vitrasius Pollio is attested under Gaius.<sup>41</sup> Both Vitrasius Pollio and Hiberus died in office after a short prefecture, as Galerius did; it is thus possible that Dio confused the deaths of two prefects, Galerius and Hiberus, with the later prefecture of Vitrasius Pollio.

Between Galerius (prefect in AD 23) and Hiberus (prefect in AD 26–28) there might be room for another prefect. It is remarkable that in the manuscript tradition of Philo the name Hiberus was confused with that of Severus<sup>42</sup>; thus it is worth considering whether in Tiberius' reign there was any official of importance called Severus, who may justify the error, and who may have been prefect. A certain Severus appears in *P.Oxy.* II 291.6 of AD 25/26 as a superior of the *strategos* Chaereas, and a L. Septimius Severus occurs in some documents of the first century AD as the former owner of the οβσία Σεουηριανῆ in the Arsinoite. When this Severus acquired this *ousia* is unknown; however, the concession must have taken place some time before AD 37, when it had already passed through the hands of Gallia Polla and of M. Antonius Pallas in succession.<sup>43</sup> Although the evidence is scanty, it is possible to hypothesise that before Hiberus, around the years 25/26, the prefect was L. Septimius Severus, an ancestor of the emperor Septimius Severus. Philo or his sources may have confused the names of Severus and Hiberus because of their similar spellings (and, probably, also their pronunciation) in spoken Greek, and because one followed the other in the *fasti* of the prefects of Egypt.

Immediately after Hiberus, from AD 33 to AD 38, the prefect of Egypt was the infamous A. Avillius Flaccus, whose wrongdoings are vividly portrayed by Philo in his *In Flaccum*.<sup>44</sup> Flaccus was born and brought up in Rome, and was close to the imperial family from his childhood: he was a friend of Augustus' grandsons Gaius and Lucius, Agrippa Postumus, and Tiberius (*Flacc.* 2, 158). According to Philo, Flaccus was a man of extraordinary intelligence; when he was sent to Egypt, he learned so quickly the structure of the Egyptian administration that he instructed his advisors, rather than being taught by them (*Flacc.* 4). Philo portrays him leading the army and other military forces and going out every day with his entourage (*Flacc.* 163). After the accession of Gaius in AD 37, however, Flaccus' prefecture seems to have degenerated. In these years took place the prosecutions against the Alexandrian Jews, the riots at Alexandria, and the trial against the Alexandrian leader Lampon, who later became, with a certain Isidoros, Flaccus' main accuser.<sup>45</sup> Flaccus' career ended in disgrace: he was arrested, and died in exile (*Flacc.* 54–96).

The documents record various measures introduced by Flaccus. The edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander of AD 68 cites the suppression by Flaccus

of old fiscal privileges on certain categories of land.<sup>46</sup> The fragmentary edict *W.Chr.* 13 of AD 34/35 contains the prohibition by Flaccus to bear arms, with a circular letter that instructed each *strategos* to publish the text, while *W.Chr.* 414 commemorates a visit (or more probably an inspection) of Flaccus to Thebes on 9 August AD 34. Flaccus recurs in *OGIS* II 661, an honorary inscription to Tiberius, and in *IGRR* I 1290 C9, the inscription on the Nilometer at Elephantine, a column marked with the levels of the Nile in different seasons.

In conclusion, the *fasti* of the prefects of Egypt under Augustus and Tiberius may be summarised as follows:

Date <sup>47</sup>	Documented prefect	Possible prefect
30–27/26 BC	Caius Cornelius Gallus	
27/26–24 BC	Lucius? Aelius Gallus	
24–22 BC	Publius Petronius	
18 BC		Pedo? Lucius? Cornelius?
15/14–12 BC	Rubrius Barbarus	
12/11–8 BC?		Proculus? Gallus?
7–4/3 BC	Caius (Julius?) Turranius	
2/1 BC–AD 3	Publius Octavius	
AD 3–?	Publius Ostorius Scapula	
AD 10/11–?	Caius Julius Aquila	
		Pedo
AD 14/15–?	Magius Maximus	
AD 15–18?	Lucius Seius Strabo	
AD 19		Baebius ?
AD 22/23	Caius Galerius	
AD 25/26		(L. Septimius) Severus?
AD 26–28?	Hiberus	
AD 33–38	Aulus Avillius Flaccus	

# Notes

## NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. Cf. Mitchell 1993, 61f and n. 53.
2. Mitchell 1993, 62.
3. See Lewis 1970, 3–14 = 1995, 138–149.
4. See Geraci 1983, 1989, 1994; Lewis 1984 = 1995, 298–305; Bowman and Rathbone 1992; Rathbone 1993.
5. Mitchell 1993, 69.
6. See for instance Lewis 1983, on life in Egypt under Roman rule, and Glare's PhD thesis of 1993, on Egyptian temples and religion.
7. Balconi 1976, 208–296.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. For a full discussion of the relationships between Rome and the Ptolemaic kingdom before 168 BC, see Heinen 1972.
2. Cf. Harris 1979, 154–158.
3. Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II 41f; I report the translation by Harris 1979, 157f. See also Gabba 1973, 449–458; Geraci 1983, 13–16; Thompson 1994a, 318f.
4. On this figure, which of course must be taken with caution, see Suet. *Div. Jul.* 54.3, Harris 1979, 158. On *reges socii et amici populi Romani*, see Cimma 1976, Braund 1984. In 57 BC, the consul P. Lentulus Spinther was in charge of the restoration of Auletes. The name Spinther is documented in Augustan Alexandria, although naturally this may be a pure coincidence. An Alexandrian citizen, Spinther the son of Philammon, appears in *BGU* IV 1165 of 20/19 BC; another Spinther, the son of Harpaesis, appears in *BGU* IV 1139 of 5 BC; cf. Bowman 2001, nos. 55 and 61.
5. Cf. van't Dack 1983c, 401. To the political instability of these years one may perhaps connect the evidence of *BGU* VIII 1762 from the Herakleopolite nome, a report about sedition in the *chora* under the command of a certain Hermaiskos. It is worth noting that an Alexandrian citizen called Hermaiskos appears in the prologue of the letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians of AD 41; cf. *CPJ* II 153.19. The two Hermaiskoi might have been related—but naturally, this remains speculative.
6. On the legal position of Rabirius Postumus, see Brunt 1990, 55 n. 6; 63; Heinen 1966, 39, 48 n. 3; see also Thompson 1994a, 319f.



7. Bowman 2001, 13.
8. *SB* XXII 15203, published and discussed by Balconi 1993, 3–20 and 1994, 219–222. It is however not proven that the Postumus mentioned in this papyrus is Rabirius, as the papyrus is dated on palaeographical grounds. In fact, one cannot exclude the possibility that it refers to C. Julius Postumus, prefect in AD 45–48; cf. Bastianini 1975, 272. Another possibility is that he was the M. Claudius Postumus mentioned in an inscription from the temple of Tentyra (*OGIS* II 659) as the *epistrategos* in AD 1; cf. Chapter 4.
9. Cf. Cic. *Pro Rabirio* 22, 39f.
10. Cf. Caes. *BC* III 108; Braund 1984, 136f.
11. Cf. the pseudo-Caesarian *Bellum Alexandrinum*; Heinen 1966, 146f; see also van't Dak 1983a, 20f; 1983b, 77–82. A full discussion of the evidence and chronology of Caesar's visit to Egypt is given by Geraci 1983, 25–36.
12. Jos. *C. Ap.* II 37 and *AJ* XIV 188; *BJ* II 488 refers to *Kaisar ho protos*. Scholars have hypothesised that Josephus confused Caesar with Augustus; a summary of the debate may be found in Geraci 1983, 27f. Recently, Pucci Ben Zeev 1998, 6–9, 359–368 has reconsidered the authenticity of the documents quoted by Josephus and has suggested that Josephus referred to Julius Caesar. On Caesar's policy towards the Jews, see Pucci Ben Zeev 1998, 45–51, 415–419.
13. *Bell. Alex.* 3: *Atque haec principes in consiliis contionibusque agitabant: populum Romanum paulatim in consuetudinem eius regni occupandi venire. Paucis annis ante A. Gabinium cum exercitu fuisse in Aegypto; Pompeium se ex fuga eodem recepisse; Caesarem venisse cum copiis, neque morte Pompei quicquam profectum quominus apud se Caesar commoraretur. Quem si non expulissent, futuram ex regno provinciam.* Loeb transl.
14. Suet. *Div. Jul.* 35.1: *veritus provinciam facere, ne quandoque violentiorem praesidem nacta novarum rerum materia esset*; 'fearing that if he made a province of it, it might one day under a headstrong governor be a source of revolution' transl. Loeb. Geraci 1983, 25 suggested that this passage referred to the policy of Octavian, rather than the situation in 47 BC. However, it is possible that the allusion to a *praeses* referred to the disorders that took place in the 50s BC, when Rabirius Postumus was *dioiketes*, or in 47 BC, when Caesar's freedman Ruphio was left at Alexandria to supervise the legions that were left there.
15. Cf. Suet. *Div. Jul.* 76.3. On the Caesarian 'new order' of Egypt, see Heinen 1966, 142–146. Geraci 1983, 26f has pointed out the similarity to the practice, common under Augustus, of entrusting important offices to freedmen.
16. A Demotic stela from the Serapeum of Memphis indicates the exact date of birth of Caesarion to 23 Pauni of the fifth year of Cleopatra, that is, 23 June 47 BC; see Heinen 1969, 182–184 and Geraci 1983, 36f.
17. See Geraci 1983, 51–54.
18. According to Maehler 1983, 1–16, the reigns of Auletes and above all Cleopatra did not coincide with a phase of decline, but, on the contrary, the quality of artistic craftsmanship was particularly high, the society that commissioned such works was flourishing, and the high Egyptian classes embraced Greek culture. Thompson 1994a, 323 reverted to the view that under Cleopatra Egypt underwent a economic crisis.
19. On the meeting between Herod and Antony, the acquaintance between Cleopatra and Herod, and their meeting in 33 BC in Judaea, we have the colourful account by Josephus in *AJ* XV 74–79 and 96–100.

20. Cf. Geraci 1983, 83–119. According to Plut. *Ant.* 81.5, it was the philosopher Areius who advised Octavian to kill Caesarian; but this may have been Octavian's propaganda. According to the literary sources, Caesarian's teacher Rhodon and Antillus's teacher Theodoros betrayed and handed over their pupils to Octavian. On the death of Caesarian, cf. Plut. *Ant.* 81.1–4, 82.1, 87.1; Suet. *Aug.* 17.5. According to Orosius VI 19.20, Canidius was killed because of his loyalty to Antony, while Ovinius (*PPV* 12777) was accused of degrading the senatorial class because he was the manager of Cleopatra's textile industry.
21. A search for the occurrences of the name Sbebis in the *DDBDP* shows that they mostly come from the first century AD. On Latin-named *kleros*-holders, see Pruneti 1975 and Canducci 1990 and 1991. On Caesar's German troops, and on the role of *Suebi* as auxiliary forces, see Saddington 1982, 7, 41, 94, and 115. Cf. Chapter 3.
22. In *P.Oxy.* II 276.9f = *CPJ* II 422 of AD 77, as the name Brabirius is not attested anywhere else, the accepted reading ἑκατονταρχίας Βραβιρίου may be emended to ἑκατονταρχίας β' Ραβιρίου, which may have indicated the 'centuria no. 2 of Rabirius' and might be the earliest example of a numbered *centuria*. However, this reading must be taken with caution as there are no known parallels of numbered *centuriae* in the first century AD.
23. Cf. the occurrence of the name Gabinus in *BGU* IV 1103.33 (c. 13 BC, from Alexandria) and Ouentidis (the transliteration of Ventidius) in *P.Wash.* II 106.10 (18 BC). P. Ventidius, consul in 43 BC, was a general of Antony's, whom Augustus put to death in 28 BC; cf. Syme 1989, 3, 27 and 33 n. 6.
24. On this document see van Minnen 2000b, 2001, and Zimmermann 2002.
25. Cf. BL 8, 60.
26. = *C.Prol.Sklav.* 239. According to BL 8, 60 *Harpage* may have been a proper name. Cf. also BL 11, 33.
27. The verb ἀρπάζω occurs in *BGU* VIII 1800.2 dated to the second year (probably) of Cleopatra (51/50 BC). This is a fragment of an official document referring to an individual as ἀρπάσαντα ἀπὸ τῶν βασιλικῶν π... In ll. 5f there is a reference to τῶν λοιπῶν βασιλικῶν παράδοσιν, which might have indicated the royal revenues (rather than the patrimony of Auletes).
28. Octavian's edict: *BGU* II 628 verso II = *W.Chr.* 462 = *CPL* 103 = Daris 1964, no. 100 = *CIL* XVI *app.* no. 10 = *ChLAX* 416 with bibliography. On this document, see also Chapter 6. On Roman soldiers in Egypt before 30 BC, see Chapter 3.
29. On Octavian's grant of citizenship to Seleucos *nauarchas* of Rhosos, see *FIRA*<sup>2</sup> vol. I no. 55, pp. 310ff. In the first part of the edict Octavian says that he was *imperator* for the fourth time (l. 2); as this title was conferred on to him in 40 BC, the edict could be dated around 36 BC.
30. Mackie 1983, 336, 350–355.
31. Cf. Chapter 3.
32. For further details on the 'diaspora of Alexandrian scholars,' see Van't Dack 1983c, 401–405, who cited the historian Timagenes of Alexandria, and a certain Philoxenos from Alexandria, according to Fraser 1972, 690 n. 266, 'the earliest Alexandrian grammarian to have taught in Rome.'
33. Oros. VI 19.20; *PPV* 12777.
34. On the prohibition on senators and prominent *equites* from entering Egypt, see Tac. *Ann.* II 59 (see below for the full quotation) and Dio LI 17.2. See also Strabo II 3.5.

Some norms on the control of people and freights arriving and leaving from Alexandria are preserved in articles 64–69 of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*. See Riccobono 1950, 203–210. For further literature see Geraci 1983, 146 n. 710.

35. Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 93; Geraci 1983, 15f.
36. Jos. *BJ* II 25 and 81; *AJ* XVII 229 and 301.
37. On the counsellors of Augustus, see Geraci 1983, 111.
38. The testimony of Tacitus *Ann.* II 59 concerns mainly the prohibition on senators entering Egypt without permission and the ‘isolation’ of Egypt, but nonetheless refers to it as a province: *Nam Augustus, inter alia dominationis arcana, vetitis nisi permissu ingredi senatoribus aut equitibus Romanis inlustribus, seposuit Aegyptum, ne fame urgeret Italiam quisquis eam provinciam clausuraque terrae ac maris quamvis levi praesidio adversum ingentis exercitus insedisset;* Tac. *Hist.* I 11: *Aegyptum copiasque, quibus coereretur, iam inde a divo Augusto equites Romani obtinent loco regum: ita visum expedire, provinciam aditu difficilem, annonae fecundam, superstitione ac lascivia discordem et mobilem, insciam legum, ignara magistratum, domi retinere;* ‘Egypt, with the troops to keep it in order, has been managed from the time of the deified Augustus by Roman knights in place of their former kings. It had seemed wise to keep thus under the direct control of the imperial house a province which is difficult of access, productive of great harvests, but given to civil strife and sudden disturbances because of the fanaticism and superstition of its inhabitants, ignorant as they are of laws and unacquainted with civil magistrates’ transl. Loeb. For an analysis of this passage, see Geraci 1983, 20. Suet. *Aug.* 18.2 stated that *Aegyptum in provinciae formam redactam ut feraciorem habilioremque annonae urbanae redderet, fossas omnis, in quas Nilus exaestuatur, oblimatas longa vetustate militari opere detersit;* ‘he reduced Egypt to the form of a province, and then to make it more fruitful and better adapted to supply the city with grain, he set his soldiers at work cleaning out all the canals into which the Nile overflows, which in the course of many years had become choked with mud’ transl. Loeb. Strabo XVII 1.12 (797) stated that Egypt ἐπαρχία δὲ νῦν ἐστίν. This statement comes immediately after the narration of the destruction of Antony and Cleopatra in 30 BC. As I pointed out earlier, Strabo represents the most detailed source on Augustan Egypt, and is especially valuable as he had visited Egypt in the mid-20s BC as a part of the diplomatic/intellectual entourage of the prefect Aelius Gallus.
39. Dio LI 17 1–4, LIII 12.7 and 13.2, not contradicted by Strabo XVII 3.25.
40. Cf. (*contra*) Geraci 1983, 19 and 135.
41. Cf. Parássoglou 1978, 3.
42. On the introduction by Octavian of the era of the *Kaisaros kratesis*, see Chapter 4.
43. On the friendship between Cornelius Gallus and Octavian, see Geraci 1983, 166, 175.
44. Cf. the description of the honours given to Octavian after the capture of Egypt and his triumph in Dio LI 19–21.
45. On imperial estates and *patrimonium*, see Chapter 8.
46. The inscription on the obelisk of Cornelius Gallus (commonly referred to as the ‘Vatican obelisk,’ now in St. Peter’s square at Rome), *AE* 1964, 255 = *AE* 1968, 53, was dated to 30 BC (?) by Bastianini 1975, 267. Cf. Geraci 1985, 166f.

47. *CIL* III 14147–5 = *ILS* 8995 = *OGIS* II 654 = *SB* V 8894 = Ehrenberg and Jones 1955<sup>2</sup>, 21 = *I.Philae* 128. On the Egyptian text and the iconography of Cornelius Gallus in this stele, see Bresciani 1989.
48. See *Dig.* 1.17.1; 40.2.21; *Tac. Ann.* XII 60; Geraci 1983, 163; Bowman 1996, 681. De Martino 1974/1975, 850 thought that the law mentioned by Ulpian might have been, rather than a comital law, an imperial constitution, but left the question open.
49. Augustus' official propaganda used general terms to describe his power: *iuravit in mea verba tota Italia sponte sua . . . iuraverunt in eadem verba provinciae (Res Gestae 25.3f) and potitus rerum omnium (cf. Res Gestae 34.13ff).*
50. The passage runs: τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπασαν . . . τὰ ὄπλα τοὺς νόμους τὰ ἔθνη, οὐχ ὅπως ἐκεῖνα ὅσα μοι ὑμεῖς ἐπεστρέψατε, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσα αὐτὸς μετὰ ταῦθ' ὑμῖν προσεκτεσάμην. De Martino 1974/1975, 119–122 defended the reliability of this passage.
51. Millar 1984, 38.
52. When king Bocchus of Mauretania died in 33 BC, Octavian annexed Mauretania as a Roman province, although his position was far from secure; cf. Mackie 1983, 336, 350–355.
53. On the constitutional status of Egypt see the reflections by De Martino 1974/1975, 853–857.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1. See Bingen 1983, Tomsin 1964.
2. Cf. Lesquier 1911, 31–43. On the organisation of the Ptolemaic *katoikoi* in numbered hipparchies, see Armoni 2001.
3. On the evolution of the Ptolemaic fleet, see Van't Dack 1988, 3 n. 11, 22–32.
4. On the Ptolemaic royal bodyguard of *machairophoroi*, see Aubert 1987, 129 n. 11. The title 'Macedonians' applied to soldiers because of their fighting methods rather than their real ethnic origin; see Saddington 1982, 131f, 166.
5. Cf. Lesquier 1911, 22, 31–34, 78, 215. *P.Bad.* II 14 (first century BC) shows some *katoikoi* in active service.
6. Saddington 1982, 24 pointed out that 'the Romans felt it advisable on occasion to strengthen an allied king by stationing Roman forces, both legionary and auxiliary, under his control in his kingdom,' and quoted the examples of the Roman soldiers at Alexandria and in Mauretania and of the Antonian assistance to Herod. On the *Gabiniani* see also Heinen 1966, 48–52.
7. Cf. Caes. *BC* II 1–4; Fraser 1972, 130f and van't Dack 1983a, 19–30.
8. Cf. Heinen 1966, 146, Geraci 1983, 25–27.
9. The first known instance of an *ala* named after its commander is the *ala Patruii*, in an inscription of 44–30 BC from Apulia, cf. Speidel 1984, 111–113.
10. Speidel 1984, 101–108; Birley 1988, 368–384.
11. Cf. Mason 1974, 85.
12. See *BGU* VIII 1763.10, 1786.4, 1831.7, 1850.10, and the unpublished P.13730, quoted by Schubart in *BGU* VIII, p. 128 n. 4. Cf. Foraboschi 1971, 277, Preisigke *NB*, 356f. *Av* ἐποίκιον *Sadalou* is attested in the Oxyrhynchite in the third and fourth centuries AD: see Calderini and Daris 1988, 234 and Pruneti 1981, 160. Ricketts 1992, 278 n. 19

- wondered whether Latin names should be regarded as evidence of the Roman presence or only as an indication of status. On Antony's allies at Actium, see Saddington 1982, 21f.
13. Cf. Shatzman 1991, 209. On the meaning of the designation *ὀπλίται* and its possible identification with Roman auxiliaries, see Saddington 1982, 49f.
  14. On king Sadalas of Thrace, see Mitchell 1993, 62.
  15. On units named after their commanders, see Birley 1988.
  16. On Deiotarus, see Caes. *Bell.Alex.* 34.4, Cic. *Phil.* 11.33. On Juba, see Caes. *Bell.Afr.* 48.1, App. *BC* II 96, Caes *BC* II 40.1.
  17. Cf. Jos. *AJ* XIV 410. According to Plut. *Ant.* 71.1, in 30 BC, when Herod swore allegiance to Octavian he had *τάγματα* and *σπεῖραι*. In 4 BC, Archelaus suppressed the rioters after Herod's death sending a tribune and a cohort, cf. Shatzman 1991, 205–207. Indeed, it is possible that Josephus referred anachronistically to the terminology of his own day, although his source for books XV to XVII of the *Jewish Antiquities* was Nicolaus of Damascus, a contemporary of Herod, who was thus likely to have used technical terms of the Augustan period. Cf. also Saddington 1982, 48–50.
  18. Cf. Van't Dack 1983a, 27f; 1983b, 85f.
  19. Lutatius Crispus: *Inscr.Cret.* IV 215c. Gaius: *SB* VIII 9815 = *SEG* XXX 509 (55 BC).
  20. = *CPJ* I 140.
  21. *I.Philae* I 63. Centurions: Rufus, Demetrios, Niger, Valerius, Labeo, Terentius, Nikanor, Baronas. Ricketts 1980, 107 thought it likely that C. Julius Papius was a prefect in charge of a Roman garrison in the region.
  22. See *BGU* II 628 = *CPL* 103 = *ChLA* X 416 of unknown date, probably between 40 and 31 BC.
  23. A full list of the military contingents present in Roman Egypt may be found in Alston 1995, Appendix 1 pp. 163–191.
  24. See Strabo XVII 1.12 (797) (Loeb translation).
  25. Jos. *BJ* I 397; *AJ* XV 217. Galatians are mentioned again in *BJ* I 437.
  26. See Strabo XVI 4. 23 (780); Jos. *AJ* XV 317.
  27. Josephus *AJ* XV 307 reports, for instance, that in the 20s BC, the prefect Petronius assisted Herod with provisions of Egyptian grain. Cf. also *AJ* XX 51f, and Geraci 1994, 283f.
  28. Native Egyptians continued to be recruited into the Roman army after the last generation of Ptolemaic soldiers disappeared; see for instance the case of L. Pompeius Niger, a legionary soldier who was called Neilos before enlistment in the *legio XXII Deiotariana* under Tiberius; on Niger, see the recent discussion and survey of the earlier literature by Rathbone 2001. On the functions of district centurions, see Alston 1995, 86f. On centurions see also Bagnall 1977, 68; 1997, 506 and Chapter 4. On Roman soldiers in quarries see *OGIS* II 660, = *I.Koptos* 41 = *CIG* 4716 = *SB* V 8580.
  29. See Suet. *Aug.* 18.2 *militari opere detersit* and the chronological indication in Strabo XVII 1.3 (787) ἐπὶ γούν τῶν πρὸ Πετρωίνου χρόνων.
  30. *SB* XVI 12312 = *BGU* XVI 2590 is a sworn declaration of workers on the canals in 25 BC; *BGU* XVI 2602 of 14/13 BC is a petition to Athenodoros the *epistates* and *dioiketes* of the Herakleopolite, against a certain Eros, from the *entourage* of the strarregos Lupus, who is forcing people to work at the canals. On the use of soldiers and veterans in public works, see Bonneau 1993, 138f and Alston 1995, 79–81.

31. Cf. *CPJ* III 457a. On the κωμογραμματεὺς καὶ τοπογραμματεὺς see Chapter 4.
32. On the levy of Roman auxiliaries from the local armies of allied kingdoms or subdued tribes, see Saddington 1982, 140f.
33. On Itureans, see Daris 1988, 757; Jos. *BJ* I 327f and *AJ* XIV 447, 452f.
34. Cf. *BGU* VIII 1749.8, 12 = *Sel.Pap.* II 393; 1750.4, [5] mentions a body of 408 μάχιμοι Θηβαῖοι πεντάρουροι who garrisoned the Herakleopolite in 64/63 BC. *P.Oxy.* XXXVII 2820.19–22 informs us that some μαχιμώτατοι from Thebes were summoned on the death of Cleopatra for a military expedition.
35. See Daris 1988, 755.
36. Cf. *BL* 3, 190.
37. For a summary of the literature on Pompeius Niger, see Rathbone 2001.
38. See Tac. *Ann.* IV 5.6, van't Dack 1977, 100–103.
39. See Plut. *Ant.* 64.1 and Oros. VI 19.16.
40. *P.Oxy.* XXXVII 2820.3–5 reports that '(he) forged a more than adequate quantity of weapons'; 5–16 'he refitted Cleopatra's fleet, which had been neglected after her death, and (he) stationed garrisons at the entrances of the country and he prepared everything needed for war'; 18–27 'esteeming the Egyptians of the Thebaid to be better fighters than the others, he first encouraged them to volunteer for the expedition, but when they did not come forward (. . .)'. The identification of the protagonist of this passage is problematic; it was usually identified with a Roman prefect, either Cornelius Gallus or Aelius Gallus. See Treu 1973, 221–233; Lewis 1995, 183–195; Geraci 1983, 168 and 170f.
41. Cf. article 55 of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*, *BGU* V 1210.142–5, ἐὰν Αἰγύπτ[ι]ο[ς] λαθὼν στρατεύσηται εἴην λεγῶνι, ἀπολυθ[εῖς εἰ]ς τὸ Αἰγύπτ[ι]ο[ν] τάγμα ἀποκαθίσταται. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐκ [τοῦ] ἐρετικροῦ ἀπ[ο]λυθέντες ἀποκαθίστανται πλὴν μόνων τῶ[ν] ἐκ Μησιῶν [σ]τόλου. Some commentary may be found in Riccobono 1951, 190–194. Cf. also the so-called archive of Taesion/Thaesis, i.e. the correspondence of Apollinaris, enrolled in the fleet of Misenum, and his mother at Karanis, in *PMich.* VIII 490 and 491 of the late second century AD. These documents have been rediscussed by Rowlandson 1998, 133–138.
42. On the *numerus salaratorum peregrinorum*, see Daris 1988, 765 and Bagnall 1977, 72.
43. On the possible equivalence of the terms *arithmos* and *numerus (clausus)* of soldiers, see Montevecchi 1970, 21 (with reference to *SB* XII 11012); Canducci 1990, 226f and Montevecchi 1997, 724f. For further discussion on the origin of this *numerus*, see Chapter 7.
44. Some examples of Ptolemaic '100-arouras men' may be found in *PP* I 567 = IV 8774; IV 8712; '80-arouras men' in *PP* II 2218 VIII add., and '50-arouras men' in *PP* IV 9048, and *BGU* VIII 1749–1750.
45. See Van't Dack 1977, 89f n. 6; 1983b, 84.
46. According to the editors, 'we should not expect a club of fellow-soldiers (nor veterans) all bearing Greek names still in existence then.' See *BL* 4, 74 for the correction of the reading Ἰτυχίας to κλη[ρ]ουχίας in l. 3. 'Fellow-soldiers' occur in *BGU* VIII 1830.1 of 52/51 BC, *SBV* 7787 + *BL* 3, 194; 4, 82, 7, 197 (42 BC), and *I.Philae* 63 of 32 BC. Augustus probably continued the Ptolemaic guild-notms; see de Cenival 1972, 196 with reference to article 81 of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*. Philo, *Flacc.* 4 reports that, under the prefecture of Avillius Flaccus, *synodoi* and *hetairiai* were forbidden.

47. See *SEG* XLV 2095. On the Ptolemaic *semeiophoros* (or *semeophoros* or *semeaphoros*) see *PP* II pp. 64f and *PP* VIII p. 155. On the Roman *signifer*, see Speidel 1984, 112 and 329–332.
48. See *SEG* XLI 1669.
49. According to Lajtar 1992, 215, the term ἐντόπιοι simply indicated that cavalrymen were living in the same *topos* (either a village, a town or a toparchy). On *katoikoi* called *entopioi* as opposed to Alexandrians, see the commentary to *P.Lond.* II 192.95 (pp. 222–225) of the first century AD, perhaps from the reign of Tiberius.
50. Cf. Bernard 1991, 53–55. According to Mason 1974, 56, the Greek term *ilarchos* or *ilarches* may have corresponded to the Latin *sevir equitum*, *praefectus alae*, or *decurio*, and the Greek term ἄλη indicated the Roman *ala*, but also the *cohort* (*equitata*). Mason 1974, 57 pointed out that the denomination ἵππεῖς was used not only for auxiliary cavalry *alae*, but also for *equites* of the Roman army.
51. Nielsen and Worp 2001, 135ff no. 16 note 6 (with reference to *P.Tebt.* I 54.2f) read ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν which they translated as 'manly.' However, the reading ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν and the older theory that this phrase indicated a sphere of command 'over men' seem more plausible.
52. Dating: see BL 3, 242 and BL *Konkordanz* 260.
53. According to van't Dack 1983b, 84 these were fictive titles that survived 'une dizaine d'années ou plus' after the Roman conquest. In *P.Berl.Möller* 11 = *SB* IV 7348, a private letter of AD 33, we meet Greek-named soldiers in a military camp.
54. *SB* XVI 12751 (dated to the years AD 1–10), see BL 9, 291; Daris 1983, 134f; Montevicchi 1997, 724.
55. *Peregrini* who entered the Roman army took a Roman name (although they were granted Roman citizenship only after discharge, that is, after the *honesta missio*); see Clarysse 1985, 60 with reference to *BGU* II 423 = *W.Chr.* 480 of the second century AD, a letter from Apion, an Egyptian soldier who had taken the name Antonius Maximus on entering the Roman fleet of Misenum. The case of Pompeius Niger is an earlier example of a Roman legionary from an Egyptian family background; cf. Whitehorne 1988, 445–450; Rathbone 2001.
56. A certain Gaius Classicus son of Aristokles occurs in the Arsinoite nome in *PKöln* I 54 of 4 BC. On the *cohort II Classica* see Speidel 1984, 102f; Saddington 1982, 142. The *tribus Fabia* is attested also in *BGU* IV 1083.14 = *ChLA* X 426 (dated AD 32–38).
57. Cf. article 111 of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*, and exceptions in Lewis 1982, 143–148. On the Egyptian application of the law that forbade soldiers to own provincial land, see Lewis 1995, 306–314.
58. Cf. *PKöln* V 227.B2 and B5 n. Cf. *BL* 10, 89f.
59. Strabo XVII 1.12 (797) and XVII 1.54 (820).
60. See Speidel 1992, 134 'the horsemen in an Egyptian *ala* . . . pawned a silver-inlaid helmet and a silver and ivory dagger scabbard.' One may wonder whether these 'fancy' arms were bequeathed from one generation of *katoikoi* to another. On the local production of weapons for the Roman army, see Speidel 1984, 329–332, with reference to *Stud.Pal.* XXII 92 = *P.Freib.* IV 66 of the second or the third century AD, a receipt for palm-wood shafts by Flavius Silvanus, *semeaphoros* of the prefect's horseguards from the elders of the village of Soknopaios. Naturally one must be cautious in dealing with this document, as it is much later than the period examined.

61. See Philo *Flacc.* 86–96.
62. For the *lex Iulia*, see *Dig.* 48.6.1. For some examples from other provinces see Brunt 1990, 257–266.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. See Lewis 1995, 138–149 and 298–305; Bowman and Rathbone 1992.
2. See Bowman 1996, 351.
3. See for instance Lewis 1970 and 1984 (= 1995); Geraci 1983; Bowman and Rathbone 1992.
4. Modrzejewski 1982; Bowman 1996, 348f.
5. For some chronological problems relating to the fasti of the prefects of Egypt under Augustus and Tiberius, see Appendix 1.
6. Strabo XVII 1 12 (797f) ἐπαρχία δὲ νῦν ἐστὶ, φόρους μὲν τελοῦσα ἀξιολόγους, ὑπὸ σωφρόνων δὲ ἀνδρῶν διοικουμένη τῶν πεμπομένων ἐπαρχῶν ἀεί. Ὁ μὲν οὖν πεμφθεὶς τὴν τῶν βασιλέων ἔχει τάξιν.
7. See for instance the freedman Hiberus, who was prefect around AD 26–28. A parallel example from outside Egypt may be Felix, the son of a freedman, who was procurator of Judaea under Claudius. On the social status of the governors of provinces of the emperor or of the *populus Romanus*, see Bowman 1996, 369f Table 2.
8. Fraser 1972, 96–98.
9. I report the translation by Fraser 1972, 96. According to Fraser 1972, 97f, the prominence that Strabo assigned to the *nykterinos strategos* was perhaps due to ‘his acquaintance with the Roman *praefectus vigilum*, the commander of the *vigiles*, who was probably modelled on the Alexandrian institution.’
10. According to Fraser 1972, 97, this change was perhaps connected with the abolition of the Alexandrian *boule*, which possibly took place in the reign of Euergetes II. Fraser quoted two first century BC officials, Chrysermus ‘συγγενής, ἐξηγητής, in charge of the medical corps, and president of the Mouseion,’ mentioned in *I.Delos* 1525 = *OGIS* 104, and Lykarion, described in *SB* I 2100 as ‘honorary ἀρχιγέρων, *dioiketes*, *exegetes*, commander of the city, and gymnasiarch’ (cf. Fraser 1972, n. 16 p. 177).
11. Strabo XVII 1.13 (798).
12. See Geraci 1989, 189.
13. Geraci 1983, 162f suggested that the new dating system was probably obligatory in deeds deposited in public offices.
14. As *P.Oxy.* XII 1453 indicates, the era of the *Kaisaros kratesis* started on 1 August (or 8 Mesore) 30 BC, so that the end of the first year was due on 7 Mesore 29 BC, while the Egyptian year started traditionally on 1 Thoth (= 29 August). This discrepancy must have caused confusion, and the date soon reverted to 1 Thoth. This did not affect the date of the festival for the victory over Antony, which remained on 8 Mesore. The change in the dating system is recorded also by Dio LVII 19.6. Further discussion of the documents and bibliography may be found in Geraci 1983, 158–163, to which add Skeat 1993, 2000 and 2001 and Hagedorn 1994.
15. Some examples from the reign of Cleopatra are *BGUVIII* 1757.8 and *SBV* 7609.22; under Augustus, see for instance *BGUXVI* 2590 I 18, II 16 of 25 BC. A similar omission occurs in *P.Harrauer* 33, from the reign of Tiberius, Gaius, or Claudius.



16. In 9 BC, the proconsul of Asia imposed a new calendar beginning on Augustus' birthday. See Ehrenberg and Jones 1955<sup>2</sup> no. 98.
17. On the introduction of *hemeraï sebastai*, see Snyder 1938, 231f. Some bibliography may be found in Geraci 1983, 187 n. 904 to which add *P.Wisc.* I p. 92. A list of *hemeraï sebastai* may be found in *P.Col.* VIII p. 88, to which one may add the Augustan *POxy.* II 387 verso (desct.) and *ChLA* XLIII 1241d.2 = *P.Vindob.* L 1d, from some time between 29 and 2 BC.
18. Cf. BL 2.1, 21 on the possible reference to Tiberius rather than Augustus in this document.
19. On Augustus' reforms of the calendar in Egypt and Asia, see Scott 1931, 224–226. On the hypothesis that *Sextilis* was renamed *Augustus* around 27 BC, see Scott 1931, 226f; on the evidence for this change around 5–2 BC, see also Hagedorn 1994, 214 n. 12.
20. Cf. Mirchell 1993, 241.
21. Strabo XVII 1.54 (820) says that Candace, the queen of the Ethiopians, captured these statues and was negotiating their return, when Aelius Gallus attacked the Ethiopian capital Napata.
22. *Dig.* 1.17.1; 40.2.21; Tac. *Ann.* XII 60; see Chapter 1.
23. Some passages in the ancient sources were misleadingly interpreted as evidence that the prefect was a sort of viceroy (against these views see Geraci 1983, 19f, 134f); on the contrary the sources state only that the prefect occupied the place that was once of the king; see Tac. *Hist.* I 11 *Aegyptum copiasque, quibus coerceretur, iam inde a divo Augusto equites Romani obtinent loco regum*; Strabo XVII 1.12 (797) τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως ἔχει τόξιν; Amm. Marc. XXII 16.6 *Aegyptus ipsa, quae iam inde uti Romano imperio iuncta est, regio iure regitur a praefectis*. The Nile taboo is recorded by Pliny *NHV* 57: cum crescit, reges aut praefectos navigare eo nefas iudicatum est.
24. Philo, *Flacc.* 1–4. *Flacc.* 105 also reports that provincial governors had to render an account of their term of office directly to the emperor.
25. Cf. Bastianini 1974, 274 and 1980, 77; on Alexander's procuratorship in Judaea see Schürer 1973–87, I, 456–458.
26. According to Hanson 1982, 251, in the early Roman period the two highest posts of the equestrian career, the prefecture of the *praetorium* and the prefecture of Egypt, could be regarded as equivalent in rank, and it was towards the end of the first century AD that they became fixed—possibly it was the proximity to power and to the person of the emperor at Rome that eventually made the prefect of the *praetorium* the most important equestrian post.
27. Brunt 1990, 226f.
28. Brunt 1990, 222f; Montevicchi 1988a, 469; Philo *Flacc.* 3.
29. On the *conventus* see Fori Talamanca 1974. On the jurisdiction of the prefect see De Martino 1974–1975, 863 and Galsterer 1996, 411–413.
30. Bowman 1996, 691f.
31. Wilcken 1908, 369–371 pointed out that δικαιοδοσία was a general term that could refer to the action of 'Rechtgeben' either in the *conventus* or in local law courts. Similarly, the verb δικαιοδοτεῖν was not a technical term of the *conventus*, but could refer to the judicial power of other officials, such as the *διοικητες*, the *epistrategos*, or the *strategos*. Strabo III 3.4.20 (167) uses the verb with reference to the *conventus* of the governor of Spain.

32. In other Greek-speaking provinces, the *conventus* could be designated by the term ἀγορά, the Greek equivalent of *forum*. Wilcken 1908, 372 regarded the expression ἀγοραῖσι . . . καὶ ἀνθύπατοι in *Acts* 19.38 as a close parallel to διαλογισμοὶ καὶ ἡγεμόνες in *P.Flor.* I 61.47 = *M.Chr.* 80 of AD 85.
33. See Foti Talamanca 1974, 6–8; Lewis 1981, 120.
34. On the handling of petitions and the procedure of litigation in the *conventus*, see Lewis 1981, 122–126.
35. Foti Talamanca 1979, 21f noted the resemblance between the Ptolemaic summons διὰ προγράμματος, found for instance in SB V 7609 (48/47 BC) and 7610 (51 BC), and the *evocatio edictis* and *cognitio extra ordinem* of the Roman Republic. On the continuity of the Ptolemaic term παραγγελία, ‘notification’ or ‘communication,’ analogous to the *litis denuntiatio* or *evocatio* of the Roman process, see Foti Talamanca 1974, 88; 1979, 79–81; Galsterer 1996, 411–413. On the lack of evidence for the *cognitio extra ordinem* in the first century AD, see Frier 1996, 976.
36. Cf. Foti Talamanca 1974, 96. The documents from the archive of Sarabous were re-published and commented on by Messeri Savorelli in *CPR* XV, to which add *P.Lond.* II 276 pp. 148f (AD 15), SB I 5239.2–4 (AD 14), 5240.8 (AD 17), X 10308.2–4 (AD 11). A possible reference to the *conventus* may be found in *P.Tebt.* II 289 of 15 February AD 23, where the *strategos* of the Arsinoite nome writes to the toparch of Tebrunis ordering him to present a report of payments, and threatening to send him to the prefect for trial.
37. *P.Oxy.* II 294 = *P.Olsson* No. 17; for discussion see Foti Talamanca 1974, 126f.
38. Its dating to 13 January and the fact that the *conventus* is placed in the near future roughly corresponds to the date of the *conventus* for the Thebaid, from late January to mid-April; cf. Lewis 1981, 120.
39. *IGRR* I 1109 = *SB* I 982. See Foti Talamanca 1974, 101–105 with reference to Wilcken 1908, 384.
40. *P.Fay.* 22 verso is described very briefly in the introduction to *P.Fay.* 22.
41. Cf. BL 11, 35 on the dating.
42. *O.Bodl.* II 972, *WO* 1372; see Foti Talamanca 1974, 108f, 114f.
43. Cf. also the term ἀποδημία that in *P.Graux.* II 9.17f (AD 33) indicates a visit of an official called Dionysios with a centurion called Sextrillius.
44. In the Ptolemaic period, the term δικαιοδότες, ‘dispenser of justice,’ occurs only once as an epithet of the *strategos*, in the petition *BGU* VIII 1846.9 (51–49 BC). It is possible that the *dikaiodosia* was one of the competences of the Ptolemaic *strategos*, although presently this cannot be proved.
45. See Kupiszewski 1953/1954; De Martino 1974–1975, 817; Geraci 1989, 87. See also Elia 1990, 189 and Thomas 1981, 13.
46. On this inscription see Thomas 1981, 53; Foti Talamanca 1974, 101–105; Elia 1990, 189.
47. *CIL* XI 6011 = *ILS* 2691 *hic cum | mitteretur a Ti(berio) Caes(are) Aug(usto) | in Aegypt(um) ad iur(is)dict(ionem)* etc. Cf. Pflaum 1960 I 17 n. 4 and Elia 1990, 190f.
48. Cf. *AE* 1966 no. 472; *AE* 1914 no. 128.
49. According to Swarney 1970a, 67 and 121, the change in the titlature of the *idios logos* took place in the second century AD.
50. Cf. BL 8, 273.
51. The earliest known instance of a *beneficiarius* is *SB* XIV 11953.11 (first century BC) from Qast Ibrim; cf. Weinstein and Turner 1976, 125f. A *beneficiarius* was a soldier

- seconded from service to special duties on the staff of commanders, such as the *praefectus castrorum*, or the *praefectus Aegypti*. Cf. Lesquier 1911, 117 n. 4; Fink 1971 no. 9 2m n., and 51 II 18a n. Another *beneficiarius* may be read with some difficulty in a fragmentary line of *PSI XIII 1307 II 18.19* (= *CPL 108, ChLA XXV 786*; cf. *BL 8, 409*; 11, 251), of uncertain date, but possibly of AD 64. On the functions of *beneficiarii* see Dise 1995, 72–85.
52. I shall not go through the references to individuals ‘in charge of the ἐπιτροπή,’ as the term ἐπιτροπή may have been used in the general sense of ‘management,’ rather than in the specific one of ‘procuratorship.’
  53. Swarney 1970a, 127f listed the known *idiologoi* in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman periods: Kastor in *OGIS I 188* of 89 BC; Noumenios in *BGU VIII 1782* of 63/62 BC; Hephaestion in *BGU VIII 1772, 1756, 1757, SB V 7455* of 61/60 and 52/51 BC; Q. Attius Fronto in *P.Oxy. IX 1188* and *XX 2277* of AD 13; C. Seppius Rufus in AD 14–16, in *P.Oxy. IV 721* and in the archive of Satabous (cf. above); M. Verg. M.f. Gallus Lusius in *CIL X 4862* from the reign of Tiberius. An interesting case is Norbanus Ptolemaeus, a Roman citizen of Graeco-Egyptian origin, who acted as both iuridicus and idios logos in AD 63 (*PFouad I 21*).
  54. According to Swarney 1970a, 59, the *idios logos* may have acquired these areas of competence in the Flavian period; see also Stead 1981, 415. See further Chapter 8.
  55. See articles 1–121 of the *Gnomon* in *BGUV 1210*, dated to the second century AD; articles 35–41 in *P.Oxy. XLII 3014*, dated (on palaeographical basis) to the first century AD. Cf. Riccobono 1950; Swarney 1970a, 119–122; 1970b, 455–460; Thomas 1981, 13 and n. 17; Bowman 1976, 163f; Méléze-Modrzejewski 1970, 327.
  56. Articles 1–70 concern ownerless property and the rights of Alexandrian and Roman citizens; articles 71–97 deal with regulations on Egyptian priesthood; articles 98–135 are a miscellany of commercial and administrative regulations. This however was a selection, by no means exhaustive, from a larger body of regulations.
  57. As was suggested by Rathbone 1993, 100f.
  58. The preamble of the *Gnomon* says: ‘A summary of the *gnomon* which the deified Augustus delivered to the administration of the *idios logos* and of the additions made from time to time by emperors or senate or prefects or *idios logoi* of the time . . .’ Cf. Riccobono 1950, 77–95. Dio LIII 15.4 reports that Augustus began to issue instructions to his appointees and proconsuls in 27 BC. Evidence for Augustus’ legislation on individual status is preserved in the third Cyrene Edict, according to which gaining Roman citizenship would not in itself affect a man’s obligations to his home community, and in the bronze tablet from Banasa in Morocco, referring to the registration of the names of people granted Roman citizenship from Augustus onwards. These documents have been discussed by Millar 1984, 49f and 1992<sup>2</sup>, 642.
  59. In *P.Tebt. III/1 p. 72*, Rostovtzeff suggested that the original form of the *Gnomon* was similar to Ptolemaic *hypomnemata*, such as *P.Tebt. III/1 703* of the third century BC, an extract of the regulations that was sent probably by a *dioiketes* to an *oikonomos*, with advice on agriculture and irrigation, royal revenues and monopolies, official correspondence and instructions of general character. The tone of this document is colloquial and personal, the style and expressions very similar to those found in the *Gnomon*.
  60. Cf. Rathbone 1993, 99–110.

61. *BGU* VIII 1764, 1768 (64–44 BC) are official letters of a *strategos* to a *dioiketes*; in *BGU* VIII 1756 (59/8 BC), 1772 (57/6 BC) and 1757 (52/1 BC) a certain Hephastion was both *dioiketes* and *idios logos*.
62. On Rabirius Postumus, see Chapter 2. See also Cicero's *Pro Rabirio Postumo*, and Bowman 2001, 13.
63. Thomas 1981, 13 and n. 16; Lewis 1970, 6 = 1995, 141; on the Roman *dioiketes*, see Hagedorn 1985, 188.
64. The document was studied by Pflaum 1983, 123f. The reference to *tribuni militum* (Ι. 8 χιλιάρχων) is a restored reading; see Haensch 1997b, 223f. On this document see BL 3, 60; 5, 32.
65. *Apophthegm. Aug.* 4 (p. 207) PIR<sup>2</sup> E 86; Bowersock 1965, 40 hypothesised that Eros was the *idios logos*, not the *dioiketes*. Another C. Julius Eros is attested in Augustan Alexandria, see Bowman 2001, no. 8. In any case, Eros was one of the most common servile names, as Parássoglou 1978, 24 n. 60 pointed out. On the *dioiketes* as private manager, see Hagedorn 1985, 189f, while the *dioiketai* mentioned in Strabo XVII 3. 25 (840), ἐς τὰς Καίσαρος ἐπαρχίας ἡγεμόνας καὶ διοικητὰς Καίσαρ πέμπει, must have had the general meaning of 'financial administrators.'
66. *WO* I, pp. 492, 498. Hagedorn 1985, 188 n. 60.
67. Akousilaos appears in *P.Tebt.* II 462, 408, 409, 410 (= *P.Olsson* nos. 12–14), and 289 (= *W.Chr.* 266, *Sel.Pap.* II 419). The archive of Athenodoros includes roughly *BGU* XVI 2600–2668.
68. On the career of Athenodoros see *BGU* XVI, p. 81. In *BGU* XVI 2639 of 10/9 BC, two taxpayers in arrears and a *komogrammateus* were put in prison for tax default, and Athenodoros as *dioiketes* was requested to send his policemen to bring the miscreant to his court for trial. In 7 BC, Herakleides wrote to Athenodoros about problems with beer-brewers over the payment of some dues (2608). In 9 BC, Pappos wrote to Athenodoros about the requisitions to be made for the arrival (Ι. 5 παράστασις) at Memphis of a certain Gallus (2631). In 6 BC, Philotas wrote to the *dioiketes* Soterichos a letter of recommendation in favour of a farmer, asking him to collect the rental fees from some shepherds (2654). A letter of 3 BC requested the *dioiketes* Athenodoros to write to the prefect Turranius concerning payments and policemen (2646). Athenodoros might have been the epistates addressed in *BGU* XVI 2600 (although there is no direct reference to him in the text).
69. Cf. *BGU* XVI 2606, 2608, 2637, 2646, and 2654. In 2654 the address on the back is δίοκης Σωτηρίχων, in 2646 δίοκης Ἀθηνοδώρων. The disagreement between δίοκης and the proper name in the dative disappears if one considers the ζ in δίοκης as an abbreviation stroke that should be resolved as διο(ι)κη(τή). However, this remains hypothetical, as I have not been able to see the original papyri.
70. Another Tyrannus appears as an advocate in the fragmentary legal proceedings in *P.Ryl.* II 270 (descr.) of the first century AD.
71. Some literature on letters of recommendation may be found in *BGU* XVI pp. 81f. Greek and Latin letters of recommendation share identical modes of expression, formulas and set phrases, which may or may not have developed independently of each other; cf. Corton 1981, 4–6. Cf. *P.Col.* VIII 211 of AD 10, a letter of recommendation to the *dioiketes* Asklepiades asking that Isidoros be undisturbed. Another letter of recommendation in favour of Isidoros was published by Nielsen and Worp 2001. On the archive of Isidoros of Psophthis see Hanson 1997.

72. On the Ptolemaic *oikonomos*, see Rostovtzeff in the introduction to *P.Tebt.* III/1 703 and Préaux 1939, 71, 287.
73. = *W.Chr.* 58 = *CPJ* II 151.
74. = *P.Olsson* 4.
75. Strabo XVII 1.12 (797f) transl. Loeb.
76. See Swiderek 1970, 157–159. On *dispensatores*, see Boulvert 1970, 429f. The *oikonomos* is mentioned also in the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander, *OGIS* II 669.22. In his commentary to the edict, Chalon 1964, 127 n. 19 hypothesised that it was the direct continuation of the Ptolemaic *oikonomos*. On the possible equivalence of the terms *oikonomos* and *vilicus*, see Mason 1974, 71 and Chapter 8.
77. Thomas 1982, 12.
78. Thomas 1982, 102, 111f, 179–181 pointed out that most of the evidence comes from the period AD 110–210.
79. Thomas 1982, 141, 180–182. The prominent position of the *epistrategos* may be seen from the example of Tiberius Julius Alexander, who, before becoming prefect, had been *epistrategos* in AD 42 (*OGIS* II 663.4f).
80. On the ὑποκείμενον ἐπιστρατήγου, see Thomas 1982, Appendix I pp. 219–221, *P.Lund.* IV pp. 38–42, and Wallace 1938a, 333, 490 n. 302, who suggested that this and other *hypokeimena* were introduced under Roman rule.
81. The length of term of office is not exceptional, as the Ptolemaic tradition of long terms of office continued into the Augustan period; see Thomas 1982, 14 n. 23. *O.Strasb.* 776 from Elephantine preserves an oath by the fortune of Ptolemaios προεστῶτος ἡμῶν<sup>ο</sup> in the first century AD; *SB* V 7951 of AD 2 mentions Ptolemaios the ‘arabarch’; the Ptolemaios attested as the *epistrategos* of the Thebaid might have had the post of arabarch too; cf. Thomas 1982, 193.
82. Thomas 1982, 212 rejected the reading [Α]ευκ[ιτω] in *BGU* IV 1138.1; cf. BL 8, 41f. A certain Ischyriion is mentioned in the document, but none of these names is definitely connected with the *epistrategos*.
83. Unfortunately the dating of this document is unknown.
84. Cf. Thomas 1982, 193 no. 4.
85. *SB* III 7256.11–13. Cf. Thomas 1982, 185.
86. Cf. Thomas 1981, 193 no. 6.
87. Thomas 1982, 187 suggested the second century AD as a possible dating. Cf. *SEG* XXXIV 1582.
88. Cf. Thomas 1982, 82. In the introduction to *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3273, Rea suggested that Q. Sanquinius . . . inius Maximus may have been related to the senatorial family of the Sanquinius listed in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> S 133–136. A Quintus Sanquinius Maximus was consul suffectus and died before AD 47 as a legate of Lower Germany; the *epistrategos* might have been an adopted son of Q. Sanquinius Maximus, and the fragmentary name might have been his original nomen. On this document, see BL 7, 158.
89. Cf. Lewis 1995, 141; Thomas 1982, 13–15 and passim.
90. *P.Tebt.* II 302 = *W.Chr.* 368. The seven nomes that gave the name to the region were: Arsinoite, Kynopolite, Oxyrhynchite, Herakleopolite, Aphroditopolite, Memphite and perhaps Letopolite; see Thomas 1982, 15. On the history of the administrative divisions of Egypt, see *WO* I, pp. 423–427 and Thomas 1970, 465–469. Possible precedents for a tripartite division of Egypt may be *BGU* VIII 1730.1–5 of 50/49 BC, which refers to

- a division in the nomes around Memphis, the Thebaid and Alexandria; and Strabo XVII 1.24 (804) and 1.3 (787), who also seems to refer to a tripartite division.
91. Cf. Thomas 1982, 32f. It is worth noting that some papyri of the first and second centuries AD speak of Oxyrhynchus as 'a city of the Thebaid,' while by that time Oxyrhynchus was certainly part of the Heptanomia. Most probably this reflected an old geographical division between Lower Egypt and the Thebaid. See Thomas 1982, 17 n. 10.
  92. Calabi 1952, 406f. The *archidikastes* existed from the third century BC; see Fraser 1972, 113.
  93. This title seems to occur in *SB* XIV 11411.1f (= *P.Ashm.* I 23, possibly of 84 BC) and *BGU* III 1001.1, possibly of the Augustan period (where, however, most of the title is restored); see BL 1, 86f; 7, 17.
  94. = *M.Chr.* 66. An unnamed *archidikastes* is mentioned in *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2471 of around AD 50.
  95. = *M.Chr.* 299; see BL 1, 320; 2.2, 94; 7, 129 on dating.
  96. Respectively, in *BGU* II 455 and *P.Mert.* III 104. Cf. also a reference to Sarapion in *P.Oxy.* II 260 = *M.Chr.* 74.11–12.
  97. Calabi 1952, 409f.
  98. *BGU* IV 1111, 1155 and 1108.
  99. Calabi 1952, 418–424. However, the idea of an Augustan reform remains speculative, due to the lack of evidence for the Ptolemaic period. Cf. Fraser 1972, 113 and n. 173.
  100. Cf. BL 1, 86f; 7, 17.
  101. Calabi 1952, 422f. Taubenschlag 1955<sup>2</sup>, 489 n. 63; Foti Talamanca 1984, 129f, 132f, 157 n. 91. Fraser 1972, 113 hypothesised for Alexandria a 'skeleton of a jurisdiction by royal courts in the field of private law within the city.'
  102. Schubart 1913, 59 remarked that all the documents addressed to Protarchos come from two quarters of Alexandria, namely 'Beta' and 'Delta'; naturally, this could be a pure coincidence.
  103. The title ἐπι τοῦ κριτηρίου is found in the Ptolemaic period too, cf. *P.Tebt.* I 7 = *C.Ord.Ptol.* 61 of 114 BC. Schubart 1913, 40 thought it more likely that the term ἀύλή referred to the royal court rather than to a court in general. It is also possible that the ἀύλή in question was located in the complex of the gymnasium; on the gymnasium as administrative centre, see Burkhalter 1992.
  104. Protarchos might have been connected to the M. Sulpicius Protarchus son of Lysias who appears in *BGU* IV 1059 (Bowman 2001, no. 35) or to the Protarchos who was dioiketes of Egypt in 51/50 BC; cf. *BGU* VIII 1759, 1760, 1761, 1766.
  105. Schubart 1913, 57–60.
  106. Fraser 1972, 97 suggested that he might have been the priest of the civic cult of 'Alexander the Founder.'
  107. Fraser 1972, 97 suggested that the Roman institution of the *curator minorum* borrowed some features from the Egyptian *exegetes*.
  108. As he was a leading magistrate, the *exegetes* also participated in the embassies to the emperor, as in the embassy in *P.Oxy.* XXV 2435 verso. The second-century evidence for officials 'in charge of the *euthenia*' has been discussed by Sharp 1998.
  109. On the dating see BL 11, 25.

110. This individual appears in *SB* V 8010; cf. Delia 1991, 102f. On the *exegetes* see Kraut 1984; Alston 2002, 188; *P.Hamb.* IV nos. 268–283.
111. Possibly the prefect; see the Appendix. A certain Cornelius appears also in *BGU* IV 1158 = *M.Chr.* 234 of 9 BC from Alexandria.
112. Some occurrences of the *exegetes* in the early Roman period are: *PRyl.* II 118.2 (16/15 BC), *SB* XX 14085.4 (12 BC or AD 32); *BGU* XVI 2671 (21–5 BC); *POslo* II 26.15 (5/4 BC) and *PRyl.* II 94 (= *Sel.Pap.* II 255) from the reign of Tiberius, an application for bail for five weavers addressed to the assistant of the *exegetes*. *PMich.* V 232 (= *SB* V 7568, of AD 36) mentions the *exegetes* Chaeremon; *P.Hamb.* IV 272.6 (AD 41–68) mentions a *strategos* and *exegetes*. Cf. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 122.
113. On the *hypomnematographos* see Rostovtzeff's commentary to *P.Tebr.* III/1 703, pp. 69f; *POxy.* XII pp. 28–30; Braunert 1964, 349–352, Whitehorne 1987; Delia 1991, 80, 104–5 and 154–6.
114. At least by AD 58 (*POxy.* XLIX 3463).
115. For documentation on this family see *P.Theon.* pp. 1–16 and *POxy.* XLIV 3197 introduction, *POxy.* LXVI 4531 introd. Cf. Whitehorne 1987, 102–109, 124.
116. Parásoglou 1974a, 32–34; Stead 1981, 412. The original title was 'archiereus of the gods Augusti and of the great Serapeion and in charge of the temples of Alexandria and all Egypt'; cf. *SB* XII 11236.5f (AD 120).
117. Stead 1981, 411. Swarney 1970b, 456f rejected the view that the *idios logos* may have functioned as high priest in the first century AD or later, and thought that it was the prefect who controlled priestly and temple life in terms of cult and financial administration.
118. In *POxy.* XII 1434.9–11, C. Julius Theon is said to have been *archiereus* and *hypomnematographos* in Alexandria around 10 BC. *PMerr.* I 11 and *PRyl.* II 149, both of AD 39/40 and from the Arsinoite nome, refer to a C. Julius Asklas who was *strategos* and *archiereus* of the emperor Gaius, while an inscription of around AD 55 presents Ti. Claudius Balbillus as the 'archiereus of the temples of Augustus and his altars and sacred groves, all that are in Alexandria and all Egypt.' On this inscription, see Pflaum 1960 I 34; Smallwood 1967, 261a; Millar 1992<sup>2</sup>, 77, 86; and Rigsby 1985, 279.
119. *BGU* IV 1137 = *W.Chr.* 112. Cf. Brashear 1993, 13.
120. Dunand 1983, 50f.
121. Glare 1993.
122. On high priesthoods in other provinces of the East, see Rigsby 1985, 284 n. 20; on the difference between Ptolemaic ruler cult and imperial cult, see Dunand 1983.
123. Glare 1993.
124. Stead 1981, 416f.
125. Glare 1993.
126. Cf. the reference to an *archeion* or record-office of the Jews in *BGU* IV 1151 = *CPJ* II 143, a contract concerning an inheritance of 13 BC.
127. Cf. Philo *Flacc.* 74, Strabo ap. Jos. *AJ* XIV 117, *AJ* XIX 280–285. Cf. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 117f; *CPJ* II, pp. 4f. On the ethnarch of the Jewish community at Alexandria, see Ben Zeev 1998, 302f. On Augustus' policy as the continuation of Caesar's policy towards local legal and religious traditions, see Ben Zeev 1998, 116, 253.
128. On the nomarch in the Ptolemaic period, see Thomas 1978, 187–194.

129. See Bagnall 1976, 3–5 and Criscuolo 1978, 62 n. 4.
130. On the evolution of the office of the *strategos* in relation to military kleruchs, see Bengtson 1952, III 15ff, 24ff.
131. According to Samuel 1966, 222, nomarchs and toparchs may have fulfilled similar functions, so that sometimes both nomarch and toparch were present, sometimes neither. In addition, someone may have been called nomarch although his district may have had another designation, as the ‘nomarchies’ were not fixed administrative districts. The association of *oikonomos* and toparch is found as early as in the third century BC, see for instance *P.Hib.* II 240. According to Strabo XVII 1. 54 (820), the rebels in the Thebaid in 29 BC claimed that they had been ‘wronged by the nomarchs’; possibly in this case the term simply indicated the ‘authorities of the nome.’
132. On liturgies, see Chapter 6.
133. Hohlwein 1969, 92f, 103–126. On the judicial functions of the *strategos*, see Witt 1977.
134. *O.Medin.Habu Dem.* 125, of around 1 BC. Cf. Ricketts 1992, 280 nn. 28 and 29.
135. Cf. Mooren 1975, nos. 137 and 138 pp. 125–129; Basriani and Whitehorne 1987, 110.
136. *L.Philae* II 128, the trilingual stele commemorating Cornelius Gallus’ victory over the rebellion, recorded the capture of the chiefs of the rebel cities, the centres of the activity of Kallimachos. Cf. Strabo XVII 1.53 (819), Ricketts 1983, 100–102.
137. *SB V* 7951.
138. *P.Lond.* II 256e (p. 96) = *W.Chr.* 344.
139. = *P.Olsson* no. 15; White 1986, no. 78.
140. Bengtson 1952, 253; Oertel 1965, 385f; Hohlwein 1969, 135. The title of στρατηγός καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων may be found in the Augustan period in: *BGU* IV 1188; *BGU* IV 1189; I.Cairo dem. 31093, *BGU* XVI 2586, 2601, and 2662. There is only one post-Augustan reference, in *P.Oxy.* II 260 = *M.Chr.* 74 (AD 59).
141. *SB V* 7787 = *I.Fay.* I 13.35; cf. Ricketts 1983, 84. Alston 2002, 200f analysed the diachronic development of the official titulature in the inscriptions from the temple of Tentyra. Around AD 24, a *strategos* was still called by the Ptolemaic title of πρυτανιστάριος (*P.Lond.* III 604 B l. 240 p. 83). The general consensus is that this was a fossilised title, without any official validity.
142. Cf. *P.Ryl.* II 149, 152, and *P.Merton* II 62.
143. On Chaireas, see *P.Oxy.* II 244 (= *ChLA* III 206), 245 (= *Sel.Pap.* II 322), 291, 350, 351 (= *SB XII* 10795), 353 (= *CPJ* III 482).
144. On Dionysodoros, see Parássoglou 1978, 19 and n. 29.
145. The term of office of the Ptolemaic *strategos* could extend to twenty-five years; see Hohlwein 1969, 135. This is the case of the Ombite nome, where the same *strategos* is documented from 78 to 53 BC. The letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians in AD 41 and the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander of AD 68 refer to a three-year institutional term for *strategia*: see *P.Lond.* VI 1912.62ff (= *CPJ* II 153) and *OGIS* II 669.34ff. On the term of office of the *strategos*, see Chalon 1964, 181f and Whitehorne 1988b, 600f.
146. = *P.Lond.* II 256e p. 96.
147. Tryphon appears in *P.Col.* VIII 211.5. C. Julius Grarus occurs in the archive of Isidoros of Psophthis at Philadelphia, which was discussed by Hanson 1997. Cf. also Whitehorne 1981, 421–427; and Hohlwein 1969, 42f.



148. In BGU XIV 2369 of 57 BC, Paniskos is *strategos* and Heliodoros *basilikos grammateus*; in PP I 258 of 50/49 BC, Heliodoros has taken up the *strategia*.
149. Whitehorne 1988, 602. On the *basilikos grammateus* cf. Kruse 2002.
150. On the ἡγούμενος of the *strategos*, see P.Oxy. II 294.19f (AD 22); *P.Lond.* II 256 p. 96; Hohlwein 1969, 60f.
151. Cf. Strassi 1997, 20f n. 46, 40ff.
152. On τόποι and toparchies see *WO I*, pp. 428ff. The existence of ‘village’ secretaries in the nome μητροπόλεις is only an apparent contradiction, and derives from the Ptolemaic period, when outside the Greek cities there were nome capitals which must have been quite large, but did not have ‘city’ status; see Criscuolo 1978, 32 nn. 1–8.
153. See Criscuolo 1978, 51f. In the late Ptolemaic *BGU VIII* 1859, the *topogrammateus* and the *komogrammateus* inspect some land for building purposes; in *BGU VIII* 1805 (64–44 BC) the *topogrammateus* deals with the permission to build houses. In *BGU XVI* 2599 of the Augustan period, three farmers petition the *basilikos grammateus* Theon because of irregularities in the survey and evaluation of their property on the part of Zenon, possibly the *topogrammateus*, in collusion with another official, probably the *komogrammateus* (to be read in l. 14). In the seed corn documents published in *BGU XVI* (2560, 2561, 2563, 2565, 2570, 2572 of 8/7, 6/5 or 3/2 BC), the toparch and *katasporous* order the sitologoi to measure out to the public farmers the annual state loan of seed grain, according to the topographical indications of the plots given by the *komogrammateus* of each village. In *BGU XVI* 2596 of 13/12 BC, the *topogrammateis kai komogrammateis* draw up a summary seed report for the *basilikos grammateus*. *Topo-* and *komogrammateis* were also involved in the operations necessary to the sale of state land to private individuals through the agency of the *idios logos* (see for instance P.Oxy. IX 1188 and XX 2277 of AD 13). The *komogrammateus* could be held responsible for shortfalls, as is shown in *BGU XVI* 2639 of 10/9 BC, where he was imprisoned with two defaulting taxpayers. On the involvement of these officials in the handling of census returns, declarations of birth, death etc., see Chapter 7.
154. In the Augustan period we also find the expression ὁ παρὰ referred to other officials, such as the *strategos* or the *basilikos grammateus*, see Criscuolo 1978, 91f; Oates 1995a, 114f.
155. The association of the titles τοπογραμματεὺς καὶ κωμογραμματεὺς is documented as early as the second century BC: see for instance *P.Tebr.* I 26 (cf. *W.Chr.* 330), 27 (cf. *W.Chr.* 331), 72, III/2 902 and 903, *UPZ* I 110 (cf. *CPJ* I 132), *P.Tor.Choach.* 12.4, and *O.Joach.* 13.8 (= *SB* III 6924). For early attestations in the Roman period, see *P.Oxy.* II 251, 252 and 254 of AD 19/20. As concerns the duration of the term of office, Menches was the *komogrammateus* of Kerkeosiris for at least nine years from 120 to 111 BC, and Kallias served as *topogrammateus* and *komogrammateus* of Ombos for at least twenty years in the early first century BC. Cf. Criscuolo 1978, 26f.
156. See *P.Mich.* X 580.1–2 comm. (AD 19/20).
157. Cf. *PUG* I 12 (cf. BL 7, 24); *P.Oxy.* LXV 4478 and *P.Oxy.* XLIX 3510 = *C.P.Gr.* II 15; see BL 8, 271.
158. Tomsin 1952, 124f.
159. It appears that they were linked in some way to the group of the village εὐσχήμονες, but the documents are too scarce to establish a precise relationship between the two; cf. Tomsin 1952, 524; on εὐσχήμονες, see Lewis 1993.

160. Tomsin 1952, 99, 124f, 469f.
161. The earliest occurrences of *πρεσβύτεροι* come from the Ptolemaic period. *P.Zen.Pestman* 38.13 of 253 BC refers to the land of the *πρεσβύτεροι*. In *UPZ* II 157.2.21 (242/241 BC) we find *πρεσβύτεροι* guarding the canals; in *P.Tebt.* I 13 V.5 *πρεσβύτεροι* of the farmers (cf. *P.Tebt.* IV 1140 and BL 11, 284); in *P.Münch.* III 49.2 = *P.Polit.Iud.* 20.2, cf. also 6.12 and 19.1 (second century BC, Herakleopolis) *πρεσβύτεροι* of the Jews. Tomsin 1952, 126 thought that earliest occurrence of the designation *πρεσβύτεροι τῆς κώμης* was *BGU* VIII 1829.7 of the late Ptolemaic period. However, *P.Enteux.* 22.14 of 218 BC and *P.Amb.* II 30.23f (W.Chr. 9) of the second century BC mention *πρεσβύτεροι ἐκ τῆς κώμης*. On the relationship between *ἡγούμενοι* and *πρεσβύτεροι*, see Tomsin 1952, 516, 523–526.
162. Cf. Bagnall 1977, 68; Lewis 1995, 302.
163. Cf. the centurion in *P.Oslo* II 30.2 of 20 BC; see Bagnall 1997, 506 and Chapter 3. On imperial quarries, see Cockle 1996.
164. Cf. some Ptolemaic *ἐπιστάται φυλακῶν* in *P.Perr.* III 128.1,2 and 130 (third century BC); *BGU* VI 1252.33 (second century BC); an *ἐπιστάτης καὶ ἀρχιφυλακίτης* in *P.Mich.* XV 688.1 (second or first century BC), *BGU* VIII 1854.20 of 45/44 BC, and *SB* XVI 12524 of 17 BC. Cf. also the *ἀρχιφυλακίτης* in *P.Heid.* II 217 of 2 BC, and *SB* XIV 11264 of 6 BC, an order of transfer of two arrested people which was addressed from Artemidoros to the *ἀρχιφυλακίτης* of an Arsinoite village. Artemidoros might have been the same as the *ἀρχιδικαστής* who is documented in the years 15–5 BC.
165. Athenodoros appears as *epistates* in *BGU* XVI 2600.10, 2602.2, 2606.1, 2613.2f (15/14 BC), 2637.14 (3/2 BC), 2657.2, 25. From around 14/13 BC he was also *dioiketes* (*BGU* XVI 2602 *passim*), and he held this post until at least 3 BC (*BGU* XVI 2646.44).
166. A certain Heras appears in *BGU* XVI 2613.2f.
167. Cordus: *P.Lond.* II 354.9 pp. 163–5, *CPR* XV 15.11 of 4 BC (cf. BL 9, 130); C. Julius (Pholos?): *SB* XVIII 13087.1f of 4 BC (cf. BL 9, 297). Perhaps he was a relative to the C. Julius Pholos attested in AD 39/40 at Euhemeria. Q. Pacillius Euxinus: *P.Princ.* II 23.1. Alkibiades: cf. *SB* VI 9150, Nielsen and Worp 2000, 173–176; the date to the late fifth century AD is probably a misprint; in fact, the document explicitly refers to a date in AD 5 (ll. 12, 16).
168. Sarapion: *P.Ryl.* II 125, 127, 128, *P. Lond.* III 895 pp. 129f, *SB* XX 15182; cf. also *P.Tebt.* II 476 (descr.) of AD 30 from Tebtunis. Athenodoros: *P.Ryl.* II 130, 132. Errius Priscus: *P.Ryl.* II 134, 136, 137, 139, and 140. Athenodoros: *P.Ryl.* II 145. C. Julius Pholos: *P.Lond.* III 1218 pp. 130f, *P.Ryl.* II 148, 150, 151, and *SB* XIV 11275. Ti. Claudius Philoxenos: *P.Ryl.* II 152.
169. An *archephodos* called Theon features in *BGU* IV 1060.33 from Alexandria, in 14 BC; *ephodoi* are the addressees of the order to arrest *SB* XVIII 13854 of the first century BC (cf. BL 9, 306).
170. *BGU* XVI 2646.18f (3 BC) refers to the *machairophoroi* of the *dioiketes* and to soldiers of the prefect; *BGU* XVI 2671.25 refers to the *machairophoroi* of the *epistrategos* Teiron (i.e. Tiro?); *machairophoroi* were involved in the tax collection in *BGU* XVI 2603.12, 16; 2639.9f (10/9 BC), while in *BGU* XVI 2656.10f, a *machairophoros* carried an order concerning a delivery of oil. On the supervision of the transport of grain, a liturgy by the reign of Trajan, see Sijpesteijn 1993, 128.

171. Cf. BL 8, 43.
172. On *machairophoroi* see *P.Vind. Worp* 12.10 n., pp. 123f; a comparison with *lictiores* or *apparitores* was made by Aubert 1987, 127 n. 6, 129–131.
173. Cf. *CPR XV passim*; *SB X* 10308 (AD 11), *SB I* 5238, 5239, 5954 (AD 15).
174. The centurions Caius Passer (*P.Oxy.* XIX 2234, AD 31; see BL 10, 247), C. Trebrius Justus (*PRyl.* II 141, AD 37); and Q. Fabius Fabullus (*PSIXIII* 1356, of the first century AD) appear as the addressees of petitions.
175. Imperial freedmen and slaves were present not only in Egypt, but also in other imperial provinces. On the question whether freedmen might have had procuratorial jurisdiction, and on the interpretation of Tac. *Ann.* XII 60, see Millar 1964a, 180–187 and 1965, 362–367; Brunt 1990, 163–187; and Boulvert 1970, 374–419.
176. Bowman 1996, 351f.
177. Syria and Judaea had an administrative system based on toparchies, Thrace on strategies. This system continued in Judaea after the Roman annexation in AD 6, see Schürer 1973–87, II, 190–196; Criscuolo 1978, 62 n.4; Cotton 1999, 81–89.
178. According to Ricketts 1983, 99f, the declaration of fidelity to Octavian of the temple lamplighters of Oxyrhynchus (*P.Oxy.* XII 1453 of 30 BC) may be compared with other oaths Octavian also in Italy, to secure his power at different stages of his principate.
179. Oates 1995a, 115.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1. Lintott 1993, 56.
2. For a full discussion of this document, see Birks, Rodger and Richardson 1984.
3. Cf. Lintott 1993, 156–158.
4. Cf. Lintott 1993, 155–158.
5. Arjava 1996, 264f.
6. On the edicts of the provincial governors, see De Martino 1974/1975, 819–821; on the characteristic features of the edicts of the prefects of Egypt, see De Martino 1974/1975, 861–863 and Katzoff 1982. The most recent collection of edicts of the prefects of Egypt is Purpura 1992. On the official handling of petitions see Haensch 1994.
7. According to Méléze-Modrzejewski 1970, 338–340, 346, article 29 of the *Gnomon* indicates that the Roman laws on marriage and manumission were applied also in Egypt; on these laws see Riccobono 1950, 24f, 86–89. Articles 22, 23 and 24 of the *Gnomon* were regarded by Méléze-Modrzejewski 1970, 338 n. 135 as the application of Roman (post-Augustan) *senatus consulta*. On the contrary, Rathbone 1993, 101 thought that the majority of the norms in the *Gnomon* concerning marriage derived from the Ptolemaic period.
8. Cf. Taubenschlag 1955, 36–55. For the theory that Roman law was a superficial phenomenon until the end of the Byzantine period, see Wolff 1974, 104.
9. Cf. Méléze-Modrzejewski 1970, 344, 367.
10. For a discussion of these documents see Amelotti 2001; see also *C. Ord. Protol.* pp. 269–272.
11. Cf. Lewis 1970, 6 = 1995, 141; 1984, 1083 = 1995, 304; Bowman and Rathbone 1992. On the introduction of Roman law as a gradual process see Bowman 1996, 693.

12. See Méléze-Modrzejewski 1970, 326; on the inferior status of Egyptians, see Jos. C. *Ap.* II 4.41; Pliny *Ep.* X 6 [22]; Tac. *Hist.* I 11.
13. See Amelotti 2001 and Migliardi Zingale 2001.
14. *P.Lond.* VI 1912.58f = *CPJ* II 153.
15. Some references to royal ordinances in katoikic cessions of the Roman period are: *PSI* X 1118 (AD 25/26); *P.Ryl.* II 159 and *PSI* VIII 897; with reference to a forced lease of land in *P.Giss.* I 4.9f of AD 118 (= *W.Chr.* 351 + BL 6, 42).
16. *P.Mil.Vogl.* II 81.7, republished as *P.Kron.* 1.
17. Cf. *SB* VI 9016.14f.
18. Cf. *P.Vind.Tandem* 1; Migliardi Zingale 2001, 507 n. 44. Cf. also the ordinances of Ptolemy Philadelphos about military matters in *C.Ord.Ptol.* 5–10.
19. As pointed out in the first edition of part of this document in *P.Vind.Worp* 2. Further discussion and bibliography may be found in the introduction to *P.Wash.Univ.* II 77.
20. *Dig.* IV 9.3 and XIX 2.15.1. Similar formulas may be found in *BGU* IV 1050, 1059, 1098, and 1184 of the Augustan period. Cf. *P.Köln* III 147 introduction. On contracts of *misthopsia*, see Rathbone (forthcoming).
21. See Méléze-Modrzejewski 1970, 330f.
22. See, above all, the evidence of a ‘Demotic Legal Code’ in *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3285 of the second half of the second century AD. On the survival or the demise of Demotic documents see Lewis 1995, 351–356 and 2001, 179–181. A list of Greek subscriptions to Demotic contracts is given by Messeri and Pinaudi in *P.Harnauer* 32 (a contract for sale of a house at Soknopaiou Nesos of 8 BC). For some discussion of the evidence of Demotic tax-receipts under Augustus, see Tait 2001.
23. See Méléze-Modrzejewski 1970, 336.
24. *OGIS* II 669.15f.
25. Cf. Chalou 1964, 115–119 on the execution of debts, and 137–143 on *protopraxia*.
26. The technical phrase in Greek is *κατὰ τὰ Ρωμαίων ἔθη*, in *P.Freib.* II 8.4f = *SB* III 6291 (AD 143).
27. Cf. Arjava 1996, 118f.
28. Arjava 1996, 167.
29. Cf. Arjava 1996, 118–121, 184f.
30. A possible reconstruction of the events may be that Vibidius ordered his slave Ruphio to take all legal precautions in order to block Haemon, who had run away with some documents. On the juridical personality of slaves, see Aubert 1994, 43–45 and n. 21.
31. Bagnall 1976, 7; Bowman 1976, 163 and 1996, 693. On the judicial powers of the *strategos*, see Witt 1977.
32. See Fraser 1972, 113. On *laokritai* and *chrematistai* in the Ptolemaic period, see Méléze-Modrzejewski 1970; Aly 1995, 11ff, 30ff. On the Alexandrian tribunals see Chapter 4.
33. Cf. Lewis 1970, 6 = 1995, 141; 1984, 1083 = 1995, 304; Bowman 1996, 692f.
34. On the functioning and the evidence of the prefect’s *conventus* see Chapter 4.
35. Calabi 1952, 419.
36. Foti Talamanca 1979, 10f suggested that the *laokritai* may have disappeared in the late Ptolemaic period, as there is no direct evidence for them after the second century BC.
37. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 117 n. 58.
38. Coles 1966, 9.
39. Cf. Dio LV 7.6, Coles 1966, 10 n. 2.

40. However, according to Coles 1966, 13 and 19, there is no good evidence for Greek shorthand writing before the end of the first century AD. The papyrological references to *notarii*, shorthand writers, are post-Augustan only.
41. = *M.Chr.* 79 = *Sel.Pap.* II 257 = *C.P.Gr.* I 19.
42. Cf. Bowman 1996, 692f.
43. *SB* XX 14085. The document lists people condemned in different years ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κορνητη(λίου) (cf. II. I.8, II.1, 5, 7). On the possibility that Cornelius might have been the prefect, see Appendix 1.
44. See Galsterer 1996, 412f.
45. Cf. Arjava 1996, 191.
46. The technical phrase is *dialogismos kai dikaiodosia*, on which see Chapter 47.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX

1. See Mitchell 1993, 98.
2. On the origin of the process of municipalisation and its full development after the reforms by Diocletian see Jones 1983, 316, 327, 336f, 341f.
3. Mitchell 1993, 80.
4. Bagnall 1976, 7f, Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 119f.
5. *PSI* X 1160 = *CPJ* II 150 dating probably from the 20s BC, on which see Delia 1991, 115–124. On this problem see also Dio LI 17.12. The lack of *boule* is mentioned in Claudius' letter to the Alexandrians, *P.Lond.* VI 1912 = *CPJ* II 153 (AD 41). See Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 118f.
6. On the prohibition to senators and prominent equites from entering Egypt, see Tac. *Ann.* II 59; Dio LI 17.2. Delia 1991, 69 suggested that Augustus, rather than Nero, may have renamed some Alexandrian tribes and demes, although the Ptolemaic organization in tribes and demes was continued after 30 BC.
7. On the process of municipalisation in Italy, see De Martino 1974–1975, Chapter XXVII p. 703; for the provinces, see Ch. XXVIII p. 745.
8. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 121; on village gymnasia see Zucker 1930/31.
9. See *P.Lond.* II, pp. 163–165.
10. At Oxyrhynchus, the register of temple expenditures in *P.Oxy.* VIII 1143.3f mentions offerings to the prefect and to one or more gymnasiarchs in the Augustan period (cf. BL 9, 183). A gymnasiarch called Ptollas is mentioned in *P.Amst.* I 89.8 of AD 3 (+ BL 8, 8); another gymnasiarch occurs in *P.Oxy.* LXVII 4582, a petition of beekeepers of AD 16; but there is no reason to suppose that he was gymnasiarch in a village rather than in the *metropolis*, as gymnasiarchs could travel from the *metropolis* to the villages to perform various tasks.
11. On the archive of Isidoros, see Hanson 1984 and 1997, 417–421.
12. Hagedorn forthcoming.
13. Philoxenos: *W.Chr.* 176 (60–64 AD); Papiskos: *P.Oxy.* II 246 = *W.Chr.* 247 (AD 66); see Bastianini and Whitehorne 1987, 88. On the Alexandrian *kosmetes*, see Delia 1991, 101.
14. On Gaius Julius Asklas see *P.Ryl.* II 149.4 and *P.Mert.* I 11.2–4. Cf. Fraser 1972, 97 and nn. 31f. On the *exegetes* see also Chapter 4.
15. In *P.Ryl.* II 118.2 (16/15 BC), a certain Ischyriion writes a petition to the *exegetes* Asklepiades, with reference to some land near a village in the Arsinoite nome. In *SB*

- XX 14085 ii.4, of either 12 BC or AD 32, a certain Ammonios is defined as former *exegetes*, possibly of the Arsinoite nome; a certain Dionysios is *exegetes* at Oxyrhynchus in *P.Oslo* II 26.15f of 5/4 BC; in *P.Ryl.* II 94 of the reign of Tiberius, the president of the guild of the weavers of Euhemeria in the Arsinoite nome addresses a petition to Heron, the *cheiristes* of the *exegetes* Sotas. It is however not guaranteed that in this case (nor in the previous ones), the *exegetes* was in the village where the petition was written, and indeed, he might have travelled to the village although he resided at Ptolemais Euergetis.
16. *P.Rainer* SN 172; Hagedorn forthcoming. However, Alexandrian officials used to take up state offices in the *chora* from the Ptolemaic period. See Fraser 1972, 96f.
  17. On the *agoranomos* at Alexandria, Oxyrhynchus and in Greek cities outside Egypt, cf. Delia 1991, 100; Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 123; Alston 2002, 190f.
  18. See the results of a search for *agoranomos* in the *DDBDP*. A college of *agoranomoi* in Alexandria is mentioned in the sales of slaves *BGU* IV 1128 of 14 BC and *BGU* IV 1114 of 5/4 BC.
  19. The *ἀγορανόμος* is often called *μνήμων*, but it is unclear whether the *μνημωνεῖον* and the *ἀγορανομεῖον* were one and the same office. See Raschke 1974, 349–354; Alston 2002, 191.
  20. Cf. Hagedorn forthcoming.
  21. On the classification of the people according to social status see Chapter 7.
  22. Cotton 1999, 82–89 compared the Judaeen system, based on toparchies and capital villages called *μητροκωμίται*, with the Egyptian system of nomes and *metropoleis*. The capital villages of the Judaeen toparchy had an independent administration, complete with *komogrammateis*, *agoranomoi*, judicial courts, and Roman centurions, and behaved like the Greek *poleis* or the *metropoleis* of Egypt. It was only under Severus that the Judaeen *μητροκωμίται* (like the Egyptian *metropoleis*) were granted the official status of *poleis*.
  23. On the classical origin of liturgies and the facets of the term, see Lewis 1960 and 1965.
  24. See Oertel 19652, 2f; Bagnall 1971, 356–362; Lewis 1995, 143; Thomas 1983, 39.
  25. Cf. Lewis 1997.
  26. Thomas 1983, 39 with reference to Wilcken 1912, 340f.
  27. Thomas 1983, 35–41.
  28. Lewis 1960, 175–184; 1965, 227–230.
  29. Thomas 1983, 36.
  30. Cf. *P.Cair.Zenon* II 59042 introd. (257 BC), III 59323.16 (250/49 BC), and *P.Tebt.* I 5.178–181 (= *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53).
  31. Ptolemy III Euergetes' laws, *P.Tebt.* I 5.178ff (= *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53), defend the right of the *strategos* to press the *katoikoi* into 'private' liturgies, εἰς λειτουργίας ἰδίας. *C.Ord.Ptol.* 54.17f concerns the right of the *katoikoi* not to be pressed into liturgies other than the 'katoikic' ones: καὶ ἐπεὶ τινες ἔξη(σθηνησκότεες) μὴ μεταβεβη(κότας) εἰς τὴν κα(τοικίαν) μὴ περισπᾶσθαι εἰς ἑτέρας λειτουργίας πλὴν τῶν κα(τοικικῶν). For a survey of the Ptolemaic liturgies, see Taubenschlag 19552, 614–616. According to Oertel 19652, 58, these were exceptional measures.
  32. The late-Ptolemaic evidence for compulsory services is doubtful, and according to Oertel 19652, 58, these were exceptional measures, not permanent posts. *BGU* X

- 1932.3 of the late second century BC mentions *λειτουργοί* in Herakleopolis; here the term means probably 'workers.' *BGU* IV 1190.5–7 of the first century BC cites some people *τάς χρείας παρεχομένους ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείαι, σιταρχομένους δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλεοπολίτου*; the same expression is referred to soldiers in *BGU* VIII 1747.11. *CPR* VI 77 Fr. B26 mentions *πολιτικῶν λειτουργίων*. *BGU* VIII 1774.1 of the first century BC is addressed to *τοῖς ἐπὶ χρείων τεταγμένοις*, although this probably indicated 'the authorities' in general. *BGU* XIV 2421.3 and 2422.7 of the first century BC mention the term *χρεία* in a military context. *P.Oxy.* IV 792 (descr.) of the first century BC, and possibly of the Augustan period, mentions payments to *λειτουργοί*, which may have indicated workers in general.
33. Thomas 1982, 100 n. 40; 1983, 37. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 116f, however, pointed out that there is no evidence for popular election (i.e. election by the *demos*) of city magistrates in the Ptolemaic period, and that the long terms of office of the Ptolemaic officials tell against the theory of the popular election.
  34. Oertel 19652, 61; Thomas 1983, 37; Lewis 1972, 61f and 1982. According to Lewis, the earliest certain example of liturgic *arche* seems to be *P.Ryl.* II 77 of AD 192 (cf. *Sel.Pap.* II 241; BL 2.2, 113), a record of proceedings from Hermopolis; however, according to Jones 1983, 320f and n. 30 p. 482, at this date candidature for office was, at least in form, voluntary. The latter view seems unlikely to me; however, the question is still open. On *archai* see also Jones 1983, 317f.
  35. Philo *Flacc.* 131, transl. Loeb; cf. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 116.
  36. Lewis 1982, 51.
  37. See Hohlwein 1969, 12–19. According to Lewis 1982, 84, the *strategos* was a key figure in the control of liturgies in villages, *metropoleis* and nome. On the *strategia*, see also Whitehorne 1981, Bastianini 1972, Forzano 1997, and Chapter 4.
  38. Cf. Lewis 1982, 64.
  39. On this document see also BL 8, 49.
  40. See Thomas 1983, 38.
  41. *OGIS* II 669.34; see Chalon 1964, 165–170.
  42. See Thomas 1983, 38.
  43. *BGU* II 628 verso II = *W.Chr.* 462; *CPL* 103; Daris 1964, no. 100; *CIL* XVI app. no. 10 = *ChLA* X 416.
  44. The *incipit* of *ChLA* X 416 reads: [.] *cum Manius Valens ueteranus ex [.]ter recitasset partem edicti hoc quod infra scriptum est . . .* This document was discussed by Millar 1983, 85.
  45. Cf. *ChLA* X 416.10f *optimo iure optimaque legis civis romani sint immunes sunt liberi s[un]to mil[itari]e mun[er]ibusque publicis fu[ngend]i uocat[i]o (= uacatio); ll. 19–22 ne[que] magistr[at]us cet[er]os neque laegatum [ne]que procuratorem [ne]que emptorem t[ri]butorum esse place neq[ue] [.] in domo eorum diver[te]ndi em[an]diq[ue] causamq[ue] [ab] ea quem detuci place. See Millar 1992, 85; Lewis 1982, 91f. *BGU* I 180 (= *W.Chr.* 396, *Sel.Pap.* II 285; cf. BL 9, 17) of AD 172 is a petition of a veteran from Karanis mentioning a period of five years after discharge in which veterans were free from liturgy. The technical term used here is *ἀνάπαυσις*, the equivalent of the Latin *vacatio*. *SB* XIV 11346.20f is a fragmentary edict from the reign of Claudius that mentions *ἀπολυομένων στρατιωτῶν . . . ]ν λητουρ[γ]ίαν*. On the veterans' exemption from liturgies for five years, see Lesquier 1918, 338.*

46. According to Augustus' third Cyrene Edict: 'if any in the Cyrenaic province have been honoured with (Roman) citizenship, they by my order are none the less to perform public services as *Hellenes* with <their patrimonies> and their persons (λειτουργεῖν <χρήμασι καὶ> σώματι, ll. 57f), except those to whom by law or senatus consultum upon the decision of my father or upon my decision immunity has been granted along with citizenship. Even these to whom immunity has been granted are without obligation (to the cities) on that property which they rightfully held at that time; on subsequent acquisitions they are to pay the going rate'; translation by Oliver and Clinton 1989, no. 10 p. 47; for literature on the Cyrene Edicts of Augustus, see Oliver and Clinton 1989, 40f.
47. On the liturgy of guardianship, see Lewis 1982 s.v. ἐπίτροπος (ἀφελίκων).
48. *PSI* X 1160.11-14 = *CPJ* II 150 μήτε εὐθετός τις ὦν φεύγη τὴν πατρίδος ὑπηρεσίαν. The dating of this document is uncertain; it was assigned to the 20s BC because the emperor is called simply 'Caesar'. On this document see further bibliography and corrections in *BL Konkordanz* 235; *BL* 8, 408; 9, 320; 11, 250.
49. See Chalon 1964, 167 and Thomas 1983, 39.
50. See Chapter 9.
51. The term *praktoreia* is documented from the Ptolemaic period. The earliest evidence of this term in the Roman period seems to be *PIFAO* II 2.6 (a letter of Sarapion to Athenodoros of 14 BC; this document might possibly be connected with the archive of Athenodoros that was published in *BGUXVI*). The first indication of compulsory *praktoreia* is the petition to Ti. Claudius Balbillus from some πράκτορες λαογραφίας who claim to κινδυνεύειν, and δι'ἀσθένειαν προλιπεῖν τὴν πρακτορείαν. *SB* IV 7462.13, 15 (AD 55/56). According to Lewis, 1982, 44f, the first secure attestation of liturgical *praktoreia* is in *PSI* 56 of AD 106.
52. Cf. ll. 24–26 ἔάν σὺ θέλης εἰσιελθεῖν εἰς πρακτορ(εῖαν) σὺν Χαίρεα εἰσέλθης, εἰ δὲ μ[ὴ] γε, σὺ λάβης τοπαρχίαν καὶ τελέσας εἰσελθε. On this document, see further comments by Rathbone 1991b, 205; see *BL* 9, 205; 10, 155.
53. In l. 19 the writer orders to find a |απιανός, ἵνα μὴ ἄργῃ; the verb ἄργεῖν was the opposite of λειτουργεῖν. Cf. Rea's commentary to ll. 24f and ll. 37–42.
54. This document was discussed by Thomas 1983, 39; cf. *BL* 7, 114; 8, 216. On 'released farmers', see Chapter 8.
55. Cf. Chapter 7.
56. *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3273 of uncertain date (cf. pl. 2). Thomas 1980, 316f thought it likely that the *sitologia* was already a liturgy at this time. On the role of the *epistrategos* in the Augustan period, see Chapter 4.
57. The person liable to liturgy is described as εὐπορος καὶ εὐθετοῦντος εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν; the other as ἄθετος καὶ π[ε]νιχρός. See Lewis 1986, 125–127; cf. Thomas 1983, 39. The term ἄθετεῖν is used with general meaning in *SB* V 8974 Fr. 3 2.31 (first century BC); the status of ἀθέτησιν καὶ ἀκώρωσιν is mentioned in *PMil.* I 7.24 (AD 38) and *PErl.* 59.13 (first century BC).
58. See the expressions προσάγγελμα τῶν σιτολόγων and ἀναδέδεκται Ἀκουσίλας in *PSI* VIII 968.9f and 17f of the first century BC. An early list of *sitologoi* is preserved in *P.Oxy.* IV 833 (descr.) of around AD 1. From later evidence we know that the names of the liturgists and their financial standing were listed alphabetically in registers called διαστρώματα; see Wilcken 1912, 90–93, Hohlwein 1969, 137f.



59. Cf. ll. 24f: τῶ ἀποδειχθισομένωι τῆς κώμης δημοσίω σιτολόγῳ. The verb ἀποδείκνυμι belongs to the vocabulary of liturgy; see Lewis 1982, 59. On this document (to be republished in *SB XXIV*) see BL 3, 256; 5, 9; 6, 9; 11, 14.
60. *P.Strasb.*, VIII 762, and BL 8, 431.
61. On *sitologoi* and *phorologoi* see Chapter 9. See also the group of documents from the Arsinoite mentioning the public *sitologos* Akousilaos: *P.Lond.* II 256 D5 (pp. 97f) of AD 11/12, *P.Vind. Tandem* 9.2.12 (AD 11/12), *P.Wash. Univ.* I 50 2 20 (first century BC), *SB VI* 9223.6 (2 BC). In *SB VI* 9050 1.21 (first/second century AD) two brothers serving as *sitologoi* ask that one of them is exempted from this liturgy.
62. Neither Zosimos nor Ptolemaios are listed in Bastianini and Whitehorne 1987. The reading Μεν<ελ>αείτην in ll. 5f is uncertain, and could be turned into Μενφείτην or, perhaps, to a completely different word that defined the position of Ptolemaios. On assistants and substitutes to liturgists, see Lewis 1982, 109. See also *P.Oxy.* XXXVI 2769 (AD 242), an agreement concerning substitution in *sitologia*. On *interim strategoi* see Eliassen-De Kat 1979, 116–123, esp. 121, with reference to *SB I* 5238 of AD 12, where a certain Diophantos replaces Dionysodoros, *strategos* of the Arsinoite. This may be one of the earliest known pieces of evidence concerning the substitution of a *strategos*.
63. Lewis 1982, 109 n. 86. The ὑπηρεσία στρατηγική is cited by Lewis 1982, 50 as first arrested as a liturgy in AD 133/134. The verb indicating the action of taking up an office here is μεθίστημι, later καθίστημι (per se nor evidence of liturgy, according to Lewis 1982, 61). A full treatment of *hyperetai* may be found in Strassi 1996.
64. Lewis 1995, 114 pointed out that, naturally, there could have been exceptions to this rule.
65. *OGIS I* 179.9f (Arsinoite, 95/94 BC) mentioned τῶν ὑπασχολουμένων ἐν τῇ οἰκονομίαι.
66. See Lewis 1982, 32.
67. See Strassi 1996, 40–47 on the *hyperetai* of the *strategos*. The earliest secure items of evidence that the *hyperetes* of the *strategos* was liturgical are the oaths of incoming *hyperetai* in *P.Oxy.* I 82 and *P.Oxy.* XXXVI 2764 of the third century AD.
68. See Thomas 1983, 39 with reference to Wilcken 1912, 340f.
69. Cf. Chapter 9.
70. See Thomas 1983, 37 with reference to Wilcken 1912, 277f, and Poethke 1969, 30–34.
71. On the communal responsibility of the villagers, see *BGU VIII* 1779.17ff (51/50 BC; cf. BL 11, 28f); 1815.17ff (61/60 BC); on the village and guild solidarity in the Ptolemaic period, see Préaux 1939, 509–514 and Chapter 9. Wallace 1938a, 20–22 thought that *epibole* and *epimerismos* were all introduced under Roman rule, while Préaux 1939, 508 showed that the *epibole*, that is, the compulsory assignment of land to the villagers, existed from the Ptolemaic period (cf. *P.Tebt.* III 734 of 141 BC; cf. *P.Tebt.* III/2 1004). The *epithema*, an additional assignment of land to public farmers, occurs in *P.Tebt.* II 576 R of 14/13 BC (cf. Wallace 1938a, 26; BL 9, 357).
72. The earliest *penthemeros* certificate seems to be the Arsinoite *P.Bon.* 31 of AD 44/45. On these documents, see Sijpesteijn 1964; Foraboschi 1970, 123–130; Sijpesteijn 1986a and 1986b; Hagedorn 1988a, 201ff.; Abd-El Ghany 1990, 107f.

73. Wallace 1938a, 140f. See for instance *BGU* IV 1198.17–20 (5/4 BC), where the priests of Herakleopolis state to have paid the *laographia* and the *chomatikon*. See Chapter 9.
74. *WO* I pp. 336ff. However, Préaux 1939, 398 rejected the idea that *chomatikon* was a compensation for work, as it is impossible to prove it, and Wallace 1938a, 140–143 and 421 n. 38 remarked that this liturgy had different characteristics in different areas of Egypt. Furthermore, it is likely that, as Glare suggested in 1993, the payment of *chomatikon* instead of the actual dike work was confined to privileged categories of people.
75. Foraboschi 1970. See Chapter 9.
76. *SB* XVI 12312 = *BGU* XVI 2590.
77. = *CPJ* III 457a.
78. Cf. Lewis 1982, 133 B.
79. Cf. *BL* 8, 42.
80. *P.Mich.* V 349.
81. Lewis 1982, 74–76. Thomas 1983, 36.
82. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 110f.
83. *SB* V 7530.16f of either 38 or 16/15 BC (see *BL* 8, 328) preserves the earliest known occurrence of the term *aporoí*. The expression ἐν ἀπόροις ζητήσω πόρον could indicate that the writer was about to make a search in an official list, although Schubart considered it as a metaphor, in the sense of 'I shall find a way in a difficult situation'. Schubart convincingly interpreted the expression οὐκ ἔχων ἕτερον πόρον τῆς τούτων ἀπεργασίας] in *BGU* VIII 1856.8f of the first century BC in the same metaphorical way.
84. *PRyl.* II 118.10 κατὰ φυλακὴν οὐδένα ἄλλον πόρον ἔχομεν; in line 7 μὴ ἴσχύοντες is also similar to the technical term ἀσθηνεῖν, which is found later in liturgical contexts.
85. *P.Oxy.* II 252.10f (= *W.Chr.* 215); 253.19. Cf. also *P.Oxy.* II 251.22 of AD 44. Cf. *BL* 6, 96; 7, 129.
86. On official archives in Egypt see Cockle 1984, Burkhalter 1990. Rostovtzeff 19942, 133f, 192. *WO* I p. 507 connected the *poros* with the occurrences of the verb ὑπάρχειν, 'to belong'. However, this verb appears to have indicated private property of land and of immovable goods in the Ptolemaic period too. Cf. Chapter 7 on the census.
87. The earliest mention of εὐθετός occurs in the *Boule*-Papyrus *PSIX* 1160.13f (= *CPJ* II 153): μήτε εὐθετός τις ὦν φεύγη τὴν τῆς πατρίδος ὑπηρεσίαν. See also the expression εὐπόρου καὶ εὐθετοῦντος [εἰς τὴν] χρεῖαν in *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3273.6f of the early Roman period. The *Boule*-Papyrus also contains the expression προχειρίζεται τοὺς ἐπιτηδέτους, which was later technical terminology relating to liturgies. The term ἀνεπιτήδαιοι occurs in the Postumus-papyrus published by Balconi 1993 and 1994, which was assigned to the 50s BC. The designation εὐσχήμονες was an unofficial one, according to Lewis 1993, 106f.
88. *BGU* VIII 1773.13 (59/58 BC) refers to physical weakness, σωματικὴ ἀσθένεια, but in 1833.9 (51/50 BC) this term could mean 'financial exhaustion'; 1835.9f (after 51/50 BC) refers to financial ἀσθένεια; 1850.16 (48–46 BC) mentions the confiscation of a katoikic *kleros* because of ἀσθένεια, which probably means the inability to pay the taxes on the land. In *PSIX* 1160.6 one of the tasks of the Alexandrian *boule*

- should be *συνεπισχέειν τοῖς ἀσθενοῦσι*. *P.Graux*. I 2.11f of AD 55/56 (= *SBV* 7462 = *Sel.Pap.* II 281), a petition to the prefect Ti. Claudius Balbillus by six poll-tax collectors, reports that διὰ τοῦτο κινδυνεύειν ἡμᾶς δι' ἀσθενείαν προλιπεῖν τὴν πρακτορείαν 'for this reason there is a danger that we may abandon our duties as collectors because of impoverishment' (I report the translation by Hanson 1988, 275).
89. The second earliest instance is *P.Corn.* I 24 of AD 56, cited by Thomas 1983, 39 n.42.
  90. See *P.Oxy.* II 252 and 253 *passim*, and *P. Mich.* X 580.
  91. On this tax, see Chapter 9. Lewis reported the mention of *anachoresis* in the census declaration *BGU* II 447 of AD 175, although he did not make a connection between the *anachoresis* and the census.
  92. Thomas 1983, 36 n. 6 with reference to *P.Tebt.* II 302.13 (= *W.Chr.* 368) of the first century.
  93. See *BGU* IV 1198.8f τῶν τῆς βασιλίσσης χρόνων μέχρις κτλ. 12 ἀγνήας καὶ θυσίας, 1199.5 τὰς λειτουργίας παραδεχομένους, 1200.12f συντελουμένας λειτουργίας κατ' ἔτος, 1201.7f λειτουργείας καὶ θυσείας. On this document see *BL* 1, 444.
  94. A discussion of this document may be found in Glare 1993.
  95. On the archive of documents concerning Harthotes son of Marres, see Casanova 1975; see also Bagnall 1991.
  96. = *SB* III 7174. According to Lewis 1978, 140f, the presence of an oath is not by itself a sufficient indication of liturgy; on oaths, see also Lewis 1982, 86f n. 17.
  97. Glare 1993.
  98. Thomas 1983, 35 n. 3
  99. Mitchell 1976, 122; Lintott 1993, 94.
  100. See Taubenschlag 19552, 622f.
  101. *SB* I 3294 = *Sel.Pap.* II 211; Lewis 1982, 11.
  102. *BGU* II 628 v II = *W.Chr.* 462 = *CPL* 103 = *CIL* XVI app. no. 10, ll. 21f = *ChLA* X 416. Requisitions for παρουσία of officials are found both in Ptolemaic and in early Roman Egypt: in either 96–94 or 63–61 BC, *P.Tebt.* I 121.95 mentions the παρουσία of a certain Dionysodoros, and 253 (descr.) of military officials. *BGU* XVI 2631.5 (9 BC) cites the παράστασις of Gallus, possibly a prefect; *W.Chr.* 413.3 (AD 19) of Germanicus; *W.Chr.* 414.4 and *O.Bodl.* II 972.4 (both of AD 34) of the prefect Flaccus. *BGU* VIII 1747.19 and 1762.4f (64/63 BC and c. 58 BC) cite requisitions for the ἐπιδημία of a *strategos* and other officials from Alexandria. On requisitions for παρουσία in the Ptolemaic period, see Préaux 1939, 392 n. 2.
  103. *BGU* VIII 1747 and 1748 (64/63 BC) mention the delivery of barley to the horses of the cavalry; *BGU* VIII 1749 of the same date cites the salary and the corn supply to the πεντάρουροι.
  104. *BGU* XVI 2644.4f τὰ] πλοῖα ἅπαντα ἐνγεγάρευται ὑπὸ τῆς λεγεῶνος; 11 οἱ πλείονες πεδ. τα[ι] τὴν τιμὴν τῆι λεγεῶνι.
  105. The earliest receipt for μονοδεσμία is *P.Wisc.* I 26 of AD 19. See also *SB* I 1441.2 (of uncertain date). See Chapter 9.
  106. On *adaeratio*, cf. Chapter 10.
  107. A supply of cloaks is mentioned in *P.Oxy.* II 293 (AD 27) = *P.Olsson* 19; see also *P.Iand.* VI 104.4 (AD 15–36). In *SB* XII 10793 (AD 18) cloaks are sold by two individuals called οὔεστ(άριοι); *SB* XX 15189 (AD 24/25) is a list of payment for Arsinoite

- cloaks; *P.Oxy.* X 1281 (AD 21) = *CPJ* II 414 refers to the purchase of one hundred linen clothes; *BGU* XVI 2631.5 (9 BC) refers to a requisition of cloaks for the advent of Gallus. On Ptolemaic requisitions of clothes, and Ptolemaic estates as centres of production of textiles for official use, see Préaux 1939, 105 and 107.
108. Philo, *Flacc.* 92f. On the local supply of weapons to the Roman army, see Speidel 1981 and Chapter 3.
  109. The edict of Seius Strabo was issued under Tiberius but quoted *mandata* of Augustus; see Mitchell 1976. Cf. *P.Tebt.* II 564 (descr.), a list of donkey owners of AD 18/19, and *SB* I 3294 = *Sel.Pap.* II 211, the edict of Germanicus that ordered that transport animals should be requisitioned according to 'his schedule' (l. 20 διαγραφή). Requisitions of transport were characteristic of Egypt from the Ptolemaic period, and probably also before; see Préaux 1939, 144.
  110. Cf. Aubert 1994, 385.
  111. See Millar 1983, 84; cf. *SB* I 4226 and Parássoglou 1978, 57f, *P.Bingen* 45.13–15 and Chapter 8. On the social classification of the population in Roman Egypt, see Chapter 7.
  112. According to Bowman 2000, 184, the urbanisation of Egypt took Ptolemaic Alexandria as the model.
  113. See Lewis 1982, 188.
  114. See Brunt 1990, 328.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN

1. The earliest ἀλική receipt seems to be *O.Berol.* P6550 of 15 May 263 BC; the earliest date in census registers, 251/250 BC.
2. Thompson 1997b, 249.
3. The provincial poll tax has no precedents under the Republic, except for ad hoc capitation taxes occasionally sanctioned by the senate: see Rathbone 1993, 95 n. 43.
4. Cf. Bagnall and Frier 1994, 30.
5. On *halike*, see Thompson 1997b, 245–249; on *laographia*, see Bagnall and Frier 1994, 27; see also Rathbone 1993, 90–92, 96f.
6. Italy was exempted from *tributum* since 168 BC, see Rathbone 1993, 94. On the Republican census, see Nicolet 1980, 60–73.
7. The self-definition as ἀτεχνος, without craft, ἰδιώτης or ἀργός in census declarations may have indicated that the individual did not have a specific, tax-exempt occupation, or an occupation in general; Bagnall and Frier 1994, 24 suggested that these individuals may have been estate-owners.
8. Bagnall and Frier 1994, 29. On the Italian census figures under Augustus, see Brunt 1987, 113–120. In Josephus, *BJ* II 385, king Agrippa II of Judaea estimated the population of Egypt (excluding Alexandria) to 7.5 million people from the total amount of poll tax collected; on the reliability of this figure see Rathbone 1990, who regards the figure of 4–5 million as more likely.
9. The term κῆνσος is used to indicate the poll tax in the Gospels, see for instance Mark 12.14, Matthew 22.17, and Luke 20.22. See Tcherikover 1950, 200 n. 48.
10. For a discussion of the professions referred to in the *Tabula Heracleensis*, see Nicolet 1980, 61ff. These were initially believed to be census declarations, although it seems

- more likely that they were connected to corn-dole distributions; see Crawford and Cloud 1996, 358ff.
11. The data could be arranged either according to household (κατ' οἰκίαν), or to occupation (κατ' ἔθνος); the household listings grouped all the members of a family in the same fiscal category, while the occupational registers served to raise different trade taxes. Perhaps this double registration resulted in a stricter control through cross-checks. See Thompson 1997b, 251f.
  12. Thompson 1994b, 67–83.
  13. This was first suggested by Wallace 1938b, 430f, 441f. The Roman rule probably increased the practice of gluing together the declarations on registers called τόμοι συγκολλησιμοί, which were in turn used for the preparation of tax lists. See Bagnall, Frier and Rutherford 1997. On *tomoi* see Clarysse 2003.
  14. In the Ptolemaic period Demotic was the spoken language of the majority of the population, including local officials, in the villages of the *chora*. See Thompson 1994b, 73f.
  15. There are also declarations of Roman citizens written in Greek, see Kaimio 1979, 149f. The earliest known census declaration in Latin is the declaration of the legionary veteran Pompeius Niger in AD 47/48 *PSIXI* 1183 = *CPL* 170 = *ChLA* XXV 785; this document has been republished and extensively discussed by Rathbone 2001.
  16. On the form of the Roman returns see Hombert and Préaux 1952, 101f; Bagnall and Frier 1994, 20–26. Cf. Ulpian *De censibus*, *Dig.* 1.9.12, and Brunr 1990, 330f.
  17. The earliest attestation of this oath is *P.Oxy.Hels.* 10.19–24, which was submitted for the census of AD 33/34; on this document, see BL 8, 272; 10, 157; 11, 174.
  18. The census edict is first quoted in a declaration of AD 89; see Bagnall and Frier 1994, 11. It is possible that, besides the prefect, other high officials such as the *dikaiodotes* were involved in the organisation of the census. See Chapter 4. Tac. *Ann.* I 31.2 and 33.1 reports that Germanicus supervised a census in Germany in 14 AD; in AD 19 he visited Egypt, but the precise reason why he was there is still unknown. Cf. Montecocchi 1976, 73f.
  19. See Bagnall and Frier 1994, 19.
  20. Bagnall and Frier 1994, 19f. See Chapter 4.
  21. A καταλογεῖον ἀσπῶν, that is, a record-office with lists of the Alexandrian citizens, is documented in *P.Flor.* III 383.62 of AD 232; see Delia 1991, 18.
  22. The villages were grouped into districts (τόποι), which constituted a tax collector's round, and in turn the τόποι were grouped in toparchies; see Thompson 1997b, 253.
  23. This would explain the evidence of groups of declarations coming from villages and clustered around a very narrow scope of time (one or a few days); see Bagnall and Frier 1994, 17f. The practice of collecting returns κατ' ἄμφοδον may have influenced the *recensus populi* that Caesar took around 46 BC in Rome, and which, according to Suet. *Div.Jul.* 41.3, he conducted *nec more nec loco solito*, but *uicatum per dominos insularum*. The expression *uicatum* resembles the practice κατ' ἄμφοδον, which Caesar may have seen in Egypt in 48/47 BC. Caesar's *recensus* might indeed have been a corn-dole distribution rather than a proper census of people; however, this does not invalidate the comparison. Further discussion on the *recensus* may be found in Wiseman 1969, 62; Crawford and Cloud 1996, 360f; Lo Cascio 1997, 13, 53 n. 174.

24. For an example of separate listing of *hiera ethne*, men and women, see *P.Petr.* III 59 (a) 4 p. 174 (see BL 1, 383; 8, 280; 9, 210; 10, 161) of uncertain date, possibly of the second century BC.
25. Cf. BL 8, 242.
26. This may also explain why the census declarations did not fail to report the elders, and often exaggerated their age to 70. Cf. Bagnall and Frier 1994, 107f. On age-rounding and other evidence of bias in the Egyptian census returns, see Scheidel 1996b.
27. However, Rathbone 1993, 93 took into consideration the possibility that 'quasi-ethnic' distinctions existed from the late Ptolemaic period.
28. La'da 1994, 183–189.
29. *SB* IV 7337 = *C.Ord.Prol.* 75–76 (41 BC) from Herakleopolis. For discussion, see Bingen 1995 (see also *SEG* XL 2088). On this document see also Delia 1991, 30f. In the letter of the emperor Claudius to the Alexandrians of AD 41, *P.Lond.* VI 1912.57–59 (= *CPJ* II 153 = *Sel.Pap.* II 212), Claudius referred to earlier measures concerning the rights of the Alexandrians by Augustus and, before him, by the ἀρχαίοι βασιλείς, i.e. the Ptolemies. However, Rathbone 1993, 96 and n. 46 thought that this decision was not simply a continuation of Ptolemaic norms, but 'a Roman decision with Roman precedents.'
30. Cf. Dio LI, 16, 4, *Plur. Ant.* 80, 1–3, and see Geraci 1983, 127.
31. On Augustus and Alexandrian demes and tribes, see Delia 1991, 63–70 and 135–141 *passim*.
32. *PSI* XI 1183 = *CPL* 170 = *ChLA* XXV 785.
33. Cf. Nicolet 1980, 69–73. For some literary references to minute listings of the property of Roman citizens, see Brunt 1990, 328, 336. To the declaration for property may be connected some papyri preserving lists of precious objects, such as the inventory of vessels and clothes *BGU* XVI 2669, of the Augustan period, and *BGU* III 781, possibly of the first/second century AD; the document was republished and discussed by Oliver and Shelton 1979 (on the dating BL 8, 33f; 10, 16).
34. The reason for this, as is commonly believed, was that the Egyptian people normally leased the land but did not own it; see Rathbone 1993, 98.
35. The lists of people and their financial standing served for the extraction of compulsory services; see Rathbone 1993, 96; 2001 and Chapter 6 on liturgies.
36. Montevecchi 1975, 230 cited the *epikrisis* of the gymnasial class at Hermopolis and the *apographe* of property in AD 63; the *apographe* of property and the *epikrisis* of the group of the *metropolitai* of the Arsinoite nome ordered by the prefect Mettius Rufus in AD 89/90.
37. *P.Oxy.* IV 826 = *C.P.Gr.* II 1. Scheidel 1999, 67–70 rejected Wilcken's earlier hypothesis that half of the rate of *laographia* was levied on the persons who had died within the first six months of the year; Scheidel thought that there was no compulsion to notify deaths, but that to do so was in the interest of the people; see also Casarico 1985, 17–22. An updated review of the bibliography on this issue may be found in the introduction to *P.Oxy.* LXV 4478–4480.
38. The earliest Egyptian birth declaration seems to be *P.Tebt.* II 299 of AD 50 (on which cf. BL 11, 278) or, if the phrase ἀπογραφὴ κωμογραμματέων in l. 35 means 'notification of birth,' *P.Oxy.* II 288, dated AD 25, but referring to AD 11/12 (+ *SB* X 10220). On declarations of birth as declarations of status, see Lewis 1997, 23. In Italy

- the birth registration of Roman citizens was instituted by the *lex Aelia Sentia* in AD 4: see Brunr 19872, 114; Nicolet 1980, 65.
39. Bagnall 1991, and Bagnall and Frier 1994, 2–5.
  40. Bagnall and Frier 1994, 2–5.
  41. Brunt 1990, 330 and 345f. King Herod held censuses every seven years according to Schalit 1969, 273–77, on the basis of some passages in Josephus saying that Herod remitted one-third or one-fourth of the taxes, and that the Jewish people had to take an official oath declaring loyalty to Caesar and to the king; cf. Jos. *AJ* XV 365, *AJ* XVI 64, *AJ* XVII 42, but this remains hypothetical.
  42. *Luke* II 2–4; see also *Acts* V 37 and Jos. *AJ* XVII 355.
  43. Dio LIII 22.5. On the census of AD 47/48 see also Rathbone 2001. Another empire-wide census was taken by Vespasian in AD 73/74; see Brunt 1990, 330.
  44. See Brunt 1990, 330.
  45. Cf. *Macc.* III 2, 28–30; 4,14; 6,38; 7,22; Wallace 1938b. In the third book of the Maccabees, which is commonly assigned to the late Ptolemaic period, the term λαογραφία is associated to ἀπογραφὴ (32) and τοῖς κετικῆ διαθήσεις (27), which was translated to ‘servile status,’ by Passoni Dell’Acqua 1997, 790. In *WO* I pp. 245f, Wilcken hypothesised that these passages had nothing to do with the contemporary situation in Egypt. On the Ptolemaic evidence for *laographia*, see Chapter 9.
  46. See Préaux 1939, 380–387.
  47. The debate about the 14-year cycle is summarised by Bagnall and Frier 1994, 2, 27.
  48. See the introduction to *P.Oxy.* II 254.
  49. Some early *laographia* receipts are the Theban *O.Bodl.* II 407 (23 BC), *O.Strasb.* 38 (22/21 BC) and *O.Ashm.Shelton* 6 (21/20 BC). *P.Fay.* 43 is a receipt for a 12-drachmas tax dated Year 2 of an unnamed ruler, perhaps 28 BC. Cf. Rathbone 1993, 88 n. 20; Wallace 1938a, 97, 116.
  50. *P.Mil.* I 3 + *P.Col. inv.* 8, published by Bagnall 1991 = *SB* XX 14440 (+ *BL* 11, 230).
  51. The dating of *P.Oxy.* II 254 is however uncertain (cf. *BL* 6, 96; 10, 138; 11, 143). In the introduction to *P.Mich.* X 578, Browne assigned it to AD 19/20, because the officials addressed, Euthychides and Theon, are documented as τοπογραμματοεῖς καὶ κωμογραμματοεῖς in AD 19/20 by *P.Oxy.* II 252 (= *W.Chr.* 215), and because they generally remained in office for not more than five years. However, this last assumption is not proved, and on the contrary, there is evidence that these officials often served for decades, as was the case under Ptolemaic rule. Cf. Chapter 4.
  52. *PKöln* V 227.
  53. Cf. Bagnall 1991; Bagnall and Frier 1994, 2–5.
  54. Bagnall and Frier 1994, 2. One may also connect to the census *P.Grenf.* I 45 and 46 (= *W.Chr.* 200 A and B), two declarations issued in 19 and 18 BC by a royal farmer from the Arsinoire. The purpose of these texts is however uncertain, as they may be, rather than census declarations, the annual self-declarations of public farmers, similar to the subscriptio aratorum that was required in Republican Sicily to exact the land tax in kind; cf. Brunt 1990, 330.
  55. There were provincial censuses in Gaul and perhaps Spain in 27 BC: see Dio LIII 22.5 and Brunt 1990, 330. The annexations of Judaea by Augustus, of Cappadocia by Tiberius, and of Dacia by Trajan were followed by censuses. All these were imperial provinces. See Brunt 1990, 330.

56. *P.Ben.Mus.* 1; Papapolychroniou 2000 assigned the document to either 25 BC or AD 19. The dating has been corrected by Cowey 2001, 178 to 'year 5 Phamenoth 20.' The title of ὁ πρὸς τῆς λαογραφίᾳ is not paralleled elsewhere, although it sounds Ptolemaic, and resembles the Ptolemaic official called ὁ πρὸς τῆς συντάξεως. In the Roman period, there is also some evidence for an official called ὁ πρὸς τῆς ἐπικρίσεως, such as, for instance, *SB XIV* 11270 (AD 96–98), which was addressed 'to the one in charge of the *epikrisis* of some *amphoda* of the metropolis.'
57. *SB XVIII* 13219.15 footnote = *APF* 5 (1909), 380 n. 28.
58. On this type of declaration cf. Brunt 1990, 330.
59. Montevecchi 1976, 73f.
60. On this problem, see Bagnall and Frier 1994, 8 Table 1.2.
61. Wallace 1938a, 104 first drew attention to the high costs of the census operation, especially if returns were issued in multiple copies.
62. The journey of the documents (now published in *BGU IV*) from an office in Alexandria to a *cartonnage*-maker in Herakleopolis was described by Schubart 1913, 45f. On literacy and cartonnage-making see Thompson 1994, 71.
63. Continuity in the bureaucratic practice from the 'times of the queen' is explicitly mentioned in *BGU IV* 1198.7–9 (5/4 BC); see Rathbone 1993, 94 n. 41, 96. Even if we assume that Augustus imposed a model of census drawing from the Republican tradition, it would have also been based on personal attendance and on oral declarations.
64. Many documents connected either with the early census or with taxation come from the Serapeum of Oxyrhynchus: *P.Oxy.* II 254 (prob. AD 19/20); *P.Oxy.* IV 832 (descr.) of 16/15 BC, *P.Oxy.* LXIV 4440, and, probably, also other documents described in *P.Oxy.* IV; see Montserrat, Fantoni and Robinson 1994, 12. *P.Tebt.* II 554 of the end of the first century BC is a list of persons under the heading 'Street of the Shepherds: Those Paying the Collection' (οἱ τελοῦντες τὴν λογεῖαν); this document was connected with a temple, according to Wallace 1938a, 244.
65. It is unclear to what extent Greeks and Egyptians were two clearly identifiable ethnic groups, especially after three centuries of Ptolemaic rule and immigration. According to Montevecchi 1997, 720, in the Oxyrhynchite prevailed the Cyreneans, while in the Arsinoite and the Herakleopolite the land was mostly in the hands of Macedonian *katoikoi*. Cf. also Geraci 1983, 185f. On the legal status of Egyptians and of *peregrini* see also Chapter 5.
66. Cf. Chapter 8.
67. Cf. Canducci 1990 and 1991; Montevecchi 1997, 724f; Lewis 1999, 91; Montevecchi 1999, 92. Montevecchi's view was based on the lack of references to Augustus in Nero's letter to the 6475 (*SB XII* 11012), and on the lack of references to the 6475 in *P.Köln V* 227 of AD 12. Cf. Chapter 3. We also know of a tax called ἀριθμητικὸν κατοικῶν, 'for the numbering of the *katoikoi*'; cf. Chapter 9.
68. Makedones are documented in the Roman period in: *BGU IV* 1132 (= *CPJ* II 142) of 14 BC; *BGU IV* 1052.36 (= *Sel.Pap.* I 3) of 14/13 BC; a Macedonian woman called Laodike features in *BGU IV* 1059.3 of the Augustan period; hipparchoi in *P.Oxy.* II 277 of 19 BC; a Macedonian landowner of *katoikic* land in *SB XVI* 12524.2 of the first century BC; Akousilaos son of Maron in *P.Tebt* II 382.17, 36; Macedonian *katoikoi* in *SB XIV* 11274.4 of 4 BC and *CPRI* 224.3f (= *W.Chr.* 111) of AD 6; *katoikoi*



- in *P.Köln* V 227 B of AD 12/13; further references to Macedonians in *P.Mich.* V 259.3, 21 of AD 33, 267–268.1 of AD 41/42, 273.1 of AD 46, and 303.1 of the first century AD. See Montevecchi 1985, 339–353 and 1997, 724 n. 23.
69. On this document, see Brashear 1992.
  70. Cf. *SEG* XLV 2088.
  71. On this document see BL 8, 512.
  72. *OGIS* II 709 = *SB* V 8328; see Montevecchi 1975, 229 and 1985, 340.
  73. Montevecchi 1975.
  74. The *metropolitai* δωδεκάδραχμοι are documented above all in the Oxyrhynchite nome, while in the Hermopolite and in the Herakleopolite we find δεκάδραχμοι and δεκάδραχμοι. See Wallace 1938a, 110, 118, 403f n. 78; Brashear 1992, 42f.
  75. Cf. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 121.
  76. A list of members of the gymnasium in AD 4/5 is cited in *P.Oxy.* II 257.37f (= *W.Chr.* 147); *P.Oxy.* X 1266.10–12; XII 1452.54; XVII 2186.4; XLVI 3276.16 and 3283.14f; and *PSIV* 457.10. At Oxyrhynchus, another registration took place in AD 56–59, while at Hermopolis Magna and at Ptolemais Euergetis general registrations seem to have taken place in AD 53/54 and 63/64; cf. Montevecchi 1975, 229–231; Nelson 1979, 26–35.
  77. Cf. *BGU* VI 1256.27–29 = *Sel.Pap.* II 275 (second century BC) and *W.Chr.* I 3.22 (246 BC). On the reduction on or exemption from *laographia* for certain categories of priests, see Otto 1908 II, 247ff, who assumed that these exemptions began in the Roman period.
  78. *P.Hib.* II 197.22, 29, 44f.
  79. See Montevecchi 1975, 227–232.
  80. In *CPR* XV 6.3f of AD 14, for instance, in order to solve a controversy over some land, the *idios logos* Seppius Rufus decreed that the status of this land should be decided through an *epikrisis*. The document reports that the land in question was of an ἀρχαῖος λαάρχης. On the meaning of the term ἀρχαῖος with reference to Ptolemaic military officials, see Falivene forthcoming. On the land of military settlers that was confiscated by the Ptolemaic *idios logos*, see Vanderpe 2000, 175.
  81. Montevecchi 1997, 723; *BGU* IV 1199.1 ἀντίγραφον ἐπιστολῆς, i.e. copy of a circular letter. See Katzoff 1980, 810 n. 7. The first two columns of the papyrus are the petitions against the *laographia*, which were published as *BGU* IV 1197 and 1198; the copy of the edict was attached as the third column. Apart from this, there is no surviving prefectural edict, official order or correspondence concerning the census; see Bagnall and Frier 1994, 26. Its date in the month of Παῦνι (June), too, would agree with the period when the census edict was issued; see Montevecchi 1976, 73f.
  82. Hombert and Préaux 1952, 48f and Bussi 2003, 148.
  83. The consensus was that the expression κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφή first occurred in the reign of Nero: see Montevecchi 1976, 74 n. 8. It is possible, however, that it was used earlier too.
  84. Cf. Hombert and Préaux 1952, 124–127. Traditional Egyptian priests and temples feature in: *P.Oxy.* II 254 (AD 19), Duttenhöfer 1997, 55–60 no. 1 (Augustan?); *metropolitai* in *P.Oxy.* II 288 of AD 25 + II 314 of AD 11/12 (= *SB* X 10220); a priest and royal farmer in *SB* XX 14440 of AD 12 (+ BL 11, 230); fugitives in *P.Oxy.* II 252 (*W.Chr.* 215) and 253 of AD 19/20, and 251 of AD 44.

85. Montevocchi 1975, 228, 231; Oates 1975, 116f.
86. Cf. the *Boule*-Papyrus PSI X 1160 = *CPJ* 150 (of uncertain date, probably Augustan) and *P.Oxy.* XLII 3020, on which see Millar 1966, 163 and BL 7, 155; 9, 198f.
87. Philo, *Flacc.* 105. In *P.Oxy.* XXV 2435 V of AD 12/13, the speaker was a certain Alexander, perhaps C. Julius Alexander the brother of Philo. These delegations had representatives of both the Greek and the Jewish communities in Alexandria. On the delegations to Augustus, see Millar 1966, 163 and Méléze Modrzejewski 19952, 133.
88. In the census of Roman citizens of AD 4 Augustus did not compel the poorer citizens or those living abroad to enrol, δέισσας μὴ νεωτερίσωσι τι παραχθέντες; Dio LV 13.4, Wiseman 1969, 60.
89. *P.Oxy.* II 252 and 253, and *PMich.* X 580 (all of AD 19/20). However, the flight of people from their villages and work that is called anachoresis was a centuries-old phenomenon in Egypt. On the connection between the census, the *anachoresis*, the individual *poros* and the starring dare of liturgies, see Chapter 6.
90. See Perpillou-Thomas 1993, 27 with reference to *P.Oxy.* VI 926 (= *W.Chr.* 486) and *P.Oxy.* XXXVI 2792, both of the third century AD.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER EIGHT

1. Rostovtzeff 19942, 107f.
2. Rostovtzeff *SEHRE*<sup>2</sup>, 267–269.
3. See Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 111. According to Rowlandson 1996, 40, to designate some land as δημοσία rather than βασιλική was relatively arbitrary, while according to Rostovtzeff 1994<sup>2</sup>, 164f, the replacement of the term *basilikos* with the term *demosios* is a post-Augustan development.
4. Lo Cascio 2000, 124f.
5. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 112. This system of taxation was similar to the treatment of *agri publici* in Sicily, and of royal land in other former Hellenistic kingdoms. On tax rates, see Rowlandson 1987, 292; on the productivity of the land in the first two centuries AD, see Foraboschi 1972, 38–51.
6. On the fiscal advantages of royal farmers in the Ptolemaic period, see Rowlandson 1996, 96 n. 77 with reference to Rowlandson 1985; see also *P.Tebt.* IV 1103 introd. (p. 39).
7. Manning 1999, 91, 99–102.
8. On confiscations of sacred land in the late Ptolemaic and Roman periods, see Wilcken 1912, 300ff; Rowlandson 1996, 30; 61f. Dio LI 5.5 and 17.6, and Jos. *AJ* XV 90f refer to some confiscations of temple property by Cleopatra.
9. Cf. *P.Tebt.* II 302.5–7, 17f of AD 71/2 (cf. BL 8, 491); *BGU* IV 1200.5–10.
10. See a fuller discussion of this problem in Glare 1993.
11. On sacred land, see Rowlandson 1996, 61f; on tax-rates, see ead. 1987, 292; the average produce was between 10 and 12 artabs per aroura.
12. According to Oates 1995b, 155f, there is evidence for *katoikoi* in the Hermopolite, Herakleopolite, Arsinoite, Oxyrhynchite and Panopolite nomes and around Thebes, but nothing excludes their existence in other areas as well; according to Oates, the terms *katoikos* and *kleruch* by the late Ptolemaic period indicated one and the same class, while earlier, Rostovtzeff 19942, 108f thought that κατοικική and κληρουχική γῆ were two separate though very similar categories.

13. See for instance the late Ptolemaic cessions of katoikic land *BGU* VIII 1731–1735, 1739, 1740, and *P.Oxy.* XIV 1635. On the evolution of the katoikic right, see Préaux 1939, 472–477.
14. See *SB* VIII 9790 (first century BC), the petition of Rhodokleia, daughter of a *katoikos*, who claimed her right to inherit her father's land in the Herakleopolite.
15. On the *stephanos* tax, see Chapter 9. On the possible existence of hidden money transactions in cessions of *katoikic* land in the Ptolemaic period, see Oates 1995b, 155.
16. Bingen 1983, 4f; see also Oates 1995b, 155f. Some late-Ptolemaic cessions are: *BGU* VIII 1731 (68 BC), 1732–1734, *BGU* VIII 1850 of the first century BC, *P.Oxy.* LV 3777 (57 BC) and *P.Oxy.* XIV 1635, of the period 44–30 BC. *BGU* IV 1060.13f refers to privately owned katoikic land in 22 BC.
17. Cf. Rowlandson 1996, 43f.
18. *BGU* II 543.11–13 διὰ τὸ ἀπεσχηκέναι με τὴν τοῦ κλήρου τιμὴν ἀργυρίου δραχμᾶς ὀκτακοσίας. According to Oertel 19652, 6 the address τοῖς ἐν τῷ Ἄρσινοίτη ἐπὶ χρηῶν τεταγμένοις πᾶσι is a typically Ptolemaic formula that survives in some Augustan contracts, *pace* Tomsin 1964a, 82f. The term *parachoretikon* is first documented in the Oxyrhynchite nome in 4 BC (see P.Mich. XVIII 784 introduction and 3n.); the term possibly occurs also in the Alexandrian *BGU* IV 1127.6 (18 BC) and possibly in 1129.35 = *M. Chr.* 254 = *CPJ* II 145 (13 BC). On the recording of the price of katoikic land, see Rupprecht 1984, 370.
19. Cf. BL 5, 147.
20. According to Rupprecht 1984, 371 n. 50, the term ὑπάρχειν is 'ein indifferenter Begriff, der sowohl Besitz wie auch Eigentum bezeichnen kann.' Cf. *WB* s.v. On this document and on the problem of private ownership of katoikic land, see Rostovtzeff 1994<sup>2</sup>, 108f.
21. The meaning of the term *syntaxis* is unclear: Wilcken thought that this official was in charge of fiscal impositions on *katoikoi*, while Grenfell and Hunt thought that he superintended the assignment of land to the katoikoi; cf. Geraci 1981, 269.
22. On the form of katoikic contracts in the Ptolemaic period, see Oates 1995b.
23. On the names of *kleroi* in the Oxyrhynchite see Zucker 1964, 101–106; Uebel 1968; Pruneri 1975, 159–204.
24. Oates 1995b, 160. Some early Roman cessions are: *P.Oxy.* II 366 (descr.) = *P.Dubl.* 3 (AD 14/15), *PSI* IV 320 (AD 18) + *P.Mich.* XVIII 784; *PSIX* 1118 (AD 25/26). See also the formula ἀκολούθως τοῖς περὶ τούτων προστεταγμένοις καὶ ἐπεσταλμένοις in *PSIX* 1118.12f (AD 25–37), *PRyl.* II 159.16f (AD 31/32) and *PSI* VIII 897.71f (AD 93), which might have referred to ordinances of either the Ptolemies or Roman prefects; on the relics of Ptolemaic law in the Roman period see Chapter 5.
25. There are references to the cavalry office called *hippikon* in documents of both the Ptolemaic and the Roman periods: *BGU* VIII 1731–1740 (first century BC); *P.Dubl.* I 3 Fr. 1.2.5 (AD 14/15), *PSIX* 1118.3 (AD 25–37), *PRyl.* II 159.6 (AD 31/32), *P.Oxy.* XXXIV 2725.20f (AD 71); *PSI* VIII 897 *passim* (AD 93). We know the names of some officials in charge of the *katalochismoi*: the earliest attested is Eudaimon in 73 BC (*P.Oxy.* XLIX 3482.6); Heliodoros in 61/60 or 57/56 BC (*BGU* VIII 1772.8); Alexandros, of the 'first friends' of the king, in 44–30 BC (*P.Oxy.* XIV 1635.5); Perdikkas in Nielsen and Worp 2001, no. 16 pp. 134f ll. 7f (first century BC or AD);

- Heliodoros and Eirenaios in AD 14/15 (*PDubl.* 3 Fr. 1.2.8); Theon in AD 18 (*PSI* IV 320.8; cf. *PMich.* XVIII 784); Zenon in AD 25–37 (*PSI* X 1118.4); Tiberius Claudius ἀσχολουμένου τὸς καταλοχισμούς τῆς Αἰγύπτου in the late first century AD in *P.Oxy.* II 344 (descr.). The official in charge of the *katalochismois* seems to have supervised the entire province, see *P.Col.* VIII 223 introduction, and *PLaur.* IV 153 1n.
26. The most common view is that the βιβλιοθήκη ἐγκτήσεων was introduced in the mid-first century AD; see Ruppel 1984, 375; Rowlandson 1996, 47.
  27. See Rowlandson 1996, 41f, 53f; Wallace 1938a, 13f. Whether or not there was a tax called μοναρταβία that was levied on katoikic land since the Ptolemaic period is unknown, as the occurrences of the term μοναρταβία in *BGU* XIV 2441.124, 133 and 2446.56 from the first century BC, and in *BGU* XVI 2559.8 of AD 1–9, and the term μονάρταβος in *P.Oxy.Hels.* 9.12 of AD 26 (cf. BL 9, 205) are the result of modern resolutions of abbreviations and symbols, and must be taken with caution.
  28. Cf. *PLond.* II 192.83–85 (pp. 222f).
  29. The term *entopioi* may be equivalent to the Latin term *inquilini*; see some epigraphical evidence from Africa concerning *inquilini* in Crawford 1976, 48.
  30. See Rowlandson 1996, 46f. *PSI* IV 320 was republished along with the adjoining lower half of the papyrus as *PMich.* XVIII 784, which mentions a *parachoretikon* (l. 3) for the cession of the land in question. Later evidence of land ‘bought into the *katoikia*’ may be found in *PSI* XIII 1328 of AD 201, *P.Oxy.* II 270.24f, 346 and LII 3690.7.
  31. The definition δωδεκάδραχμοι is documented in the Oxyrhynchite nome with reference to *metropolitai*, not *katoikoi*; in the Hermopolite we find δεκάδραχμοι and δωδεκάδραχμοι; see Wallace 1938a, 110, 118, n. 78 p. 403f, and below, Chapter 7.
  32. *BGU* II 543.
  33. On katoikic land in the Ptolemaic period, see Oates 1995b. On the 6475 *Hellenes*, see Canducci 1990 and 1991, and Montevocchi 1997. Nero’s letter to the 6475 *Hellenes* of the Arsinoite referred to earlier regulations by the emperors before him (ὅτι πρὸ ἐμοῦ αὐτοκράτορες); Montevocchi 1970 and 1999 thought that the lack of reference to Augustus indicates that Nero referred to Tiberius and Claudius, while Lewis 1999 suggested that it was Augustus who first introduced the 6475. In my view, Nero referred to all past emperors including Augustus. On this document, see also Chapter 7.
  34. See Rowlandson 1996, 28f, 176f.
  35. See Rowlandson 1996, 48f.
  36. See Tomsin 1964a, 86.
  37. See Rowlandson 1996, 53.
  38. *BGU* IV 1118.45, a lease of a garden in Alexandria of 22 BC, refers to the price as τὴν πρὸς τὸν γνώμονα τιμῆν; Swarney 1970a, 51f connected this *gnomon* with the *Gnomon* of the *Idios Logos*.
  39. On the (unclear) difference between the two, see Rowlandson 1996, 41–43. Cf. the occurrence of γῆ ἰδιόκτητος in *BGU* XIV 2437 and 2440, land registers from the first-century-BC-Herakleopolite. Cf. also the ‘private fields’ of Harpokrates and Herieus in *O.Bodl.* II 1783 of the first century BC.

40. According to Manning 1999, 90 and 100f, within the temple estate, land was bought and sold by private individuals, men as well as women, with no restriction of time, and temples derived incomes from sales of plots.
41. *BGU* XIV 2441.30, 72, 259 (first century BC Herakleopolite) refers to land 'bought,' ἀπὸ ἐπικαταβαλλομένων (i.e. from confiscated land of debtors, see LSJ *s.v.*) and ὑπολόγου; *BGU* XIV 2449.43 (first century BC) refers to land bought from the royal account or βασιλικόν. *P.Köln* V 227 B 5 (AD 12/13) and *P.Mich.* V 259.25 (AD 33) mention land bought ἐξ ὑπολόγου. State auctions existed in the Ptolemaic period too, although it is often difficult to establish whether the land was sold or leased: often both lessors of royal land and owners of γῆ ἐν ἀφέσει were in effect lessors for a long time, who paid ἐκφόρτια, and whose land eventually went back to the king. In any case, Ptolemaic evidence of verbs such as κυριεῖν or δεσπάζειν indicate that a form of private ownership did exist. On the *idios logos* and the sale of vacant land, see Swarney 1970a, 49–57.
42. Cf. Christensen 2002.
43. See Tomsin 1964a, 87f. The *emphyteusis* is documented from the second century BC: cf. *P.Tebt.* I 5.12 (= *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53). Some mentions of *ateleia* (and cognate expressions) before the reign of Augustus are *BGU* IV 1185.23 of 61/60 BC (= *C.Ord.Ptol.* 71); *BGU* XIV 2433.108 (first century BC); and *P.Bingen* 45.5, 10, 14 (33 BC). Rostovtzeff 1994<sup>2</sup>, 160, 180, pointed out that the model of sale of land from the state treasury and the concession of a three-year *ateleia* had close Ptolemaic precedents.
44. See Rowlandson 1996, 53f.
45. = *M.Chr.* 254 = *CPJ* II 145.
46. Biezunska-Malowist 1984, 302 hypothesised that the buyer was about to move from Alexandria to the Lykopolite; however, it is more likely that he subleased the land and had the revenues sent to him in Alexandria.
47. The term *ousia* was known in the Ptolemaic period too, when it was used in the general sense of 'substance,' that is, property; see for instance *BGU* VIII 1730.13 of 50/49 BC.
48. According to Parássoglou 1978, 11, an estate was imperial if it carried the name of an emperor or of a member of the imperial family, or was later shown to be part of the *ousiakos logos*. Crawford 1976, 40 thought that the estates belonging to members of the imperial family should be excluded from the definition of 'imperial estates' proper, except when they became part of the emperor's patrimony by inheritance.
49. Possibly because in that region temple property was predominant, according to Crawford 1976, 37.
50. See Parássoglou 1978, 5–9; he admitted, however, that Augustus might have given some parcels of land to his associates as a reward for their support in the war.
51. See Crawford 1976, 40–43; Rathbone 1993, 102ff, 109f; Kehoe 1992, 16f. Dio LI 5.4f reports that Cleopatra punished her enemies in the administration by confiscating their possessions; cf. also Dio LI 17.6f on confiscations by Cleopatra before, and by Octavian after Actium.
52. Some bibliography on Ptolemaic *doreai* may be found in Parássoglou 1978, 4f n.7. The beneficiaries and farmers of the known Ptolemaic *doreai* are listed in PP IV, 169ff, and in Rostovtzeff 1994<sup>2</sup>, 67f, who recorded the *doreai* of: Kallixeinos, possibly the historian Kallixe(i)nos of Rhodes (cf. *SB* XX 15150 = *P.Lille* I 19.9 = *W.Chr.* 164), Chrysermos (*P.Magd.* II 28.185ff), and the *synoikia* of Artemidoros (*P.Petr.* III

- 73.5–7). See also the reference to a ‘former *dorea* of Artemidoros’ in *P.Oxy.* II 280.9f of AD 88/9. A *dorea* of Komianos with an *epoikion* of Kiton is mentioned in the second century AD, in the Hermopolite land survey *P.Ryl.* II 207 A 4.
53. See Lewis 1995, 303. From the second century AD, the term *dorea* seems to indicate prevalently an imperial donation in general: cf. *BGU* I 74.5 (AD 167), *P.Würzb.* 9.28 (AD 161–169), *M.Chr.* 373.28 (AD 119).
54. On the continuity in the names of *doreai*, see the occurrences of a *dorea* of a certain Agathokles (provided that they all referred to one and the same person) in *BGU* VI 1415.2 (206 BC), *O.Wilb.* 2.3f (206 BC) and possibly in *O.Strasb.* 294.4f (first century BC?).
55. Naturally, however, this criterion should not be taken as a rule, as it does not follow that the settlements in a Roman *ousia* should have a Roman rather than a Greek name.
56. See Parássoglou 1978, 10.
57. *P.Bingen* 45.6f; cf. The Roman citizen involved was Publius Canidius according to van Minnen 2000b, Quintus Cascellius according to Zimmermann 2002. There are two other possible readings of the nomen of this individual. The first is Κάρκι[ω]ν, that is Publius Carisius (PIR<sup>2</sup> C 422), the governor of Hispania Ulterior from 27 to 22 BC, whom Dio LIV 5.1 accused of cruelty and luxury; cf. Syme 1986, 43f. The second possible reading is Καμψ[ω]ν, that is L. Caninius Gallus, consul in 37 BC, a friend of Propertius and the husband of Antony’s cousin; cf. Syme 1986, 308 n. 69. It is entirely possible that, as a relative and ally of Antony, Caninius was granted an estate in Egypt in the 30s BC. The image of the papyrus may be seen at the following address:  
[http://millennium.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/lhpc/collections\\_images/045\\_Bingen.jpg](http://millennium.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/lhpc/collections_images/045_Bingen.jpg)
58. *BGUXVI* 2601. The property of a certain Asklepiades in the Herakleopolite recurs in the archive of Athenodoros published in *BGUXVI*. The name Asklepiades occurs in connection with other estates too. A man of importance called Asklepiades appears in *BGU* IV 1200. According to Parássoglou 1978, 12 n. 36, the Julius Asklepiades whose estate was given to Antonia the daughter of Claudius (*BGU* IX 1893.93f and Hagedorn 1999, 216) was different from the philosopher who left his property to the city of Alexandria in *P.Fay.* 87 and *P.Hamb.* I 36.
59. *P.Ryl.* II 146 of AD 39 and *P.Ryl.* II 132 of AD 47. In these documents Thermoutharion is described as Λυκκαρίωνος, which has been interpreted as ‘daughter of’ Lykarion’. In *BGU* IV 1053 = *M.Chr.* 105 (13 BC) C. Julius Philios lends money to Lykarion and his wife Θεωταρίου (ll. 8f). The name Theotarion is unparalleled, and may be a wrong reading of the name Θερμουθαρίου. This Thermoutharion might have been Lykarion’s wife, although it is possible that Lykarion had a wife and a daughter both called Thermoutharion.
60. *BGU* XIV 2438 and 2439 *passim*. Cf. *P.Tebt.* I p. 570. Rostovtzeff 1994<sup>2</sup>, 69f first suggested that *prosodos* land and the land set aside in the *κεχωρισμένη πρόσδοδος* were connected with *doreai*, or with *ousiai* in the Roman period. For a survey of the documents on *prosodos* land see Armoni 2000, 234–236.
61. Tigellius might have been connected with the soldier M. Tigellius Ialysos, who occurs in *BGU* IV 1168 of 14/13 BC; cf. Bowman 2001, no. 15. On the estate of the Theones see *P.Theon.* Appendix c.
62. It was a common feature of *ousiai* to use their special measures; see Parássoglou 1978, 55f.

63. See for instance the *prosodos* of Livia in *SB XVI* 12835.3 of AD 5/6. On Eros and Charmos, see *P.Lond.* II 195.17 (pp. 127f; cf. *P.Ryl.* II p. 255). The phrases ἐδάφη προσοδικά and προσοδικός γεωργός refer to an imperial estate in *P.Ryl.* II 142.4f, 14f of AD 37. In the *prosodos* of Livia at Philadelphia, the public farmer Isidoros of Psophthis was obliged by the *strategos* Tryphon to take up the compulsory service of γεωργία οὐσιακή καὶ προσοδική. It is worth noting that, while from the end of the second century BC the *strategos* was also ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων, i.e., in charge of the revenues, in the archive of Isidoros Tryphon is called ἐπὶ τῆς προσόδου, in charge of 'the revenue'. It is possible that here the *strategos* also acted as the manager of the estate of Livia; this would explain why he insisted personally on pressing Isidoros to farm that land. On Isidoros, see Hanson 1984 and 1997. On the title στρατηγός καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων, see Chapter 4.
64. Some balsam plantations near Jericho, described by Pliny as *agri regii*, were presented by Antony to Cleopatra, who leased them to Herod (Jos. *BJ* I 361). On Cleopatra's death they probably fell to Octavian as booty and were retained as his private property; perhaps they were returned to Herod in 30 BC; cf. Jos. *BJ* I 396 and *AJ XV* 217. Some copper mines at Cyprus, which had been restored to Cleopatra by Antony, became Augustus' private property when Cyprus became a province in 12 BC; Augustus gave a share of these to Herod; cf. Jos. *AJ XVI* 128. See Lo Cascio 2000, 112f n. 44.
65. *PSI Corr.* I 1150 = *SB XIV* 11933.4–6. Pereneiphis, a known landowner of sacred land, possibly a priest, is documented at Kerkeosiris during the period roughly from 120 to 110 BC; see Messeri in *PSI Corr.* I, pp. 40–49, and Parássoglou 1978, 100.
66. Cf. Sijpesteijn 1983, 135–139. No Eudaimon is known elsewhere, except for ὁ πρὸς τοῖς καταλοχισμοῖς in *P.Oxy.* XLIX 3482.5f (73 BC). Another Eudaimon had a ῥύμη named after him in Alexandria, see *BGU IV* 1117.8 (13 BC) = *M. Chr.* 107.
67. Cf. *P.Coll. Youtie* I pp. 176f. Asinius Pollio the elder, born in 76/75 BC, *cos.* 40 BC, died in AD 6, cf. *PIR<sup>2</sup>* A 1241; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 43.2. On Asinius Pollio the younger, born in 10 BC, *cos.* AD 23, cf. *PIR<sup>2</sup>* A 1242. See also Capponi 2002.
68. See Parássoglou 1978, 65–68.
69. Rowlandson 1996, 55 n. 87 identified the landowner called Nikanor with the Nikanor appearing in Suet. *Aug.* 89.1, who might have been the son of Areius; Parássoglou 1978, 65 regarded this estate as non-imperial.
70. On the estate of Falcidius, see *P.Ryl.* II 138 (AD 34), *SEHRE<sup>2</sup>*, 269 and Parássoglou 1978, 45, 77. On Anronia as heir of Antony's property, see Dio LI 15.7, *SEHRE<sup>2</sup>* 671 n.19 and Parássoglou 1978, 70f; on Gallia Polla, see Suet. *Tib.* 6.3, and Parássoglou 1978, 81.
71. See Parássoglou 1978, *s.v.*
72. Cf. Tomsin 1957, 213, 219f.
73. Cf. Sijpesteijn 1976 = *P.Theon.* Appendix C.
74. Rosovtzeff 1994<sup>2</sup>, 68f.
75. See Rowlandson 1996, 56f. Rosovtzeff 1994<sup>2</sup>, 209f thought that, as in the Ptolemaic period, the Roman state considered itself as the ultimate owner of all the land.
76. According to Dio LV 7.5, with few exceptions, Augustus inherited the property of his friends.
77. It is likely that the *ousia* of the prefect Perronius (or of the Perronii, soldiers) became eventually the property of the emperor. This *ousia* is documented by *BGU II* 650.1–3 (= *W.Chr.* 365) of AD 46/47 as the property of Claudius, and by *SB VI* 9224 (=

- P.Gen.* II 91.24) of AD 50/51. The Petronian *ousia* was inherited by Salvius Otho (probably the future emperor Otho); see Messeri and Pintaudi 2000, 199 n. 1.
78. Parássoglou 1978, 67 excluded from the list of owners of *ousiai* a number of landowners, which he considered owners of 'private land', including: Theanous daughter of Alexandros in *P.Ryl.* IV 600 (8 BC), Tigellius in *BGU* VII 1669; Euandros son of Ptolemaios in *P.Ryl.* II 132, 133, 166 (AD 26–33); Julius Athenodoros and Calpurnius Tryphon in *P.Ryl.* II 128 (c. 30), L. Terentius in *P.Mich.* V 232 (AD 36), perhaps connected with the imperial freedman mentioned in *BGU* IV 1141.27 of 13 BC, and in *ChLA* XLII 1239.4 (first century BC or AD), Theon son of Theon in *P.Ryl.* II 145 (AD 38) and Asklepiades son of Ptolemaios in *P.Ryl.* II 167 (AD 39). It is however hard to agree with this distinction, since there is no secure evidence that can prove once for all whether these properties were 'non-imperial estates' or 'private lands'.
79. Euandros son of Ptolemaios is cited as owner of an estate in the Arsinoite in *P.Ryl.* II 132 and 166 (AD 26–33); *P.Ryl.* II 133 is a petition from a farmer to Euandros in person. It is very likely, although not guaranteed, that the two Euandroi were one and the same person.
80. See Kehoe 1992, 37.
81. See Parássoglou 1978, 52f. Normally, the manager was a local, as in the cases of Aphrodisios son of Zoilos, *ekleptor* of the papyrus-marsh of Julia Sebaste and the children of Germanicus in *P.Mil.* I 6.1–3 of AD 26; or Herakleides son of Isidoros in the estate of Ti. Claudius Balbillus and M. Aponius Saturninus in *P.Mich.* V 312.5f, 50 of AD 34. In *BGU* VII 1669.1, 4 a certain Korkodeilos was the secretary to the *proestos* of the former estate of Tigellius, and reported to a certain Amyntas, possibly an imperial slave. This pattern is found also in other provinces of the Greek East. According to Crawford 1976, 51, the term ἐκλήμπτωρ was equivalent to *conductor*, *πραγματευτής* to *actor* and οἰκονόμος to *vilicus* in Asia but to *dispensator* in Egypt. This terminology more or less agrees with that of the imperial estates and their managers in Galatia; see Levick 1967, 224f. According to Aubert 1994, 32f, in the Greek-speaking part of the Roman empire the term *institor/praepositus* was equivalent to *προεστώς*, *vilicus* could be translated to διοικητής but was generally rendered by οἰκονόμος (which could also indicate a *dispensator*), *actor* was equal to *πραγματευτής*, and *procurator* and *tutor* to φροντιστής and ἐπίτροπος respectively. These business managers moved freely throughout the empire; for this reason, it is unlikely that the terms by which they were designated changed radically from one province to another.
82. In *P.Ryl.* II 138.2–5 (AD 34) Sotas son of Maron is the *proestos* of the estate of the children of Tiberius and Livia Drusi Caesaris; in *P.Oslo* III 123.3–6 (AD 22) a certain Dionysius is the *proestos* of an *epoikion* in the *ousia* of Antonia Drusi; in *SB* VI 9150.2–5 (AD 5) Kallistratos son of Kallistratos is the *proestos* of the beasts of burden of the *ousia* of Livia and the children of Germanicus. See further references in Parássoglou 1978, 53 n. 16.
83. The late Ptolemaic *BGU* VIII 1821.4f and VIII 1831.9f (cf. *PP* IV 10085) refer to the estate of Hierax, run by a *προεστηκώς*; in *BGU* 1831.10 [...]. τητου may be restored to [ἴδιο]κτήτου. *BGU* VIII 1833 (cf. *PP* IV 10096) is a petition to the *strategos* Seleukos from a widow asking for the remission of her husband's debts towards the *προστάτης* Bion, who was probably managing the patrimonial property of the



- strategos*. See also the Augustan *PSI Corr.* I 1150.4–6 = *SB XII* 11933.4–6, where two *proestotes* continued to manage the land of Petenephies when, after the Roman conquest, it became the estate of the emperor; cf. Capponi 2002, 184 n. 34.
84. According to Biezunska-Maowist 1984, 304, the *oikonomoi* were never manumitted because they had a prominent financial position and a high degree of responsibility in the administration, and could thus become dangerously powerful. On *oikonomoi*, see Chapter 4.
85. = *ChLA* III 206 = *CPL* 175.
86. = *CPJ* II 420 a.
87. Cf. *PIR<sup>2</sup>* C 744. The *ed. pr.* regarded Κλάδος as a variant of Κλαύδιος, although the name Cladus is attested.
88. Cf. Parássoglou 1978, 84f.
89. In *P.Oxy.* II 244 (= *ChLA* III 206 = *CPL* 175), Cerinthus, slave of Antonia, called her sheep and goats in the Oxyrhynchite ἃ ἔχω ἐν ἀπογρα(φῆ); this was translated by Grenfell and Hunt to ‘which I have in the register’. In *P.Ryl.* II 152.11 of AD 42, the manager of the estate of Thermoutharion says ἄς ἔχω νομάς ἐν ἐλαιῶνι Θερμουθαρίου κτλ. However, the verb ἔχειν does not necessarily imply private ownership.
90. Cf. Parássoglou 1978, 18f n. 24, 52.
91. On Eros see Plut. *Apophthegm. Aug.* 4.207 B; Bowersock 1965, 40, *PIR<sup>2</sup>* E 86, Treggiari 1969, 191; Bowman 2001, no. 8. In *SB I* 4960 (29 BC) we find Eros slave of Hilarion (possibly another imperial slave). An imperial slave called Eros appears in *BGU* IV 1118 *passim* (22 BC); C. Julius Eros in *BGU* IV 1125.17 (13 BC); cf. also *BGU* IV 1141 and *BGU* IV 1168 (11/10 BC). A freedman called Gaius Eros issues a receipt for repayment of 3000 drachmas in *BGU* XI 2047.7 (Ptolemais Euergetis, AD 8). This man may be attested also in *PUG* II 61.2, which refers to a bank of Πρω( ) (καὶ) Ερ( ) in the early first century AD in Ptolemaic Euergetis. In *BGU* IV 1184 (Alexandria 30 BC–AD 14), refers to Eros slave of Lucius Lucceius. Parássoglou 1978, 24 n. 60 cautioned that Eros was one of the commonest slave names.
92. A certain Pleinis son of, or, more probably, slave of Charmos occurs in *O.Camb.* 51.7 of AD 8 and *O.Cair.* 89.5 of AD 9. In *BGU* IV 1037.10 of AD 48, a certain Charmos features as the owner of a house in Karanis.
93. See Tomsin 1957, 221 and Parássoglou 1978, 24. On the estate of Iucundus and Chresimos, cf. *P.Ryl.* II 207.5, 17; *BGU* IX 1894.93ff.
94. Cf. Brashear 1993, 12f.
95. Possibly a wrong reading of the name Diphilos. Cf. Chapter 6.
96. In l. 4, the edition presents the reading Μάμιλ(του) χρησίμ(ους), which should be corrected, in my view, to Μάμιλ(του) Χρησίμ(ου). Chresimos is attested as an imperial slave in *P.Vind. Tandem* 9. The document is about a certain Mamilius Chresimus, where Chresimus is an abbreviated *cognomen*, according to De Romanis 1996, 257f.
97. On the forced lease of land to neighbouring villagers, see Johnson 1952, 61ff and Poethke 1969, 24ff.
98. See Parássoglou 1978, 54–56. See *P.Ryl.* II 140.5–7 (AD 36).
99. The earliest evidence of an *apolytimos* comes from the estate of Livia and Germanicus: cf. *P.Lond.* II 445.7 (pp. 166f) of AD 14/15. On *apolytimoi*, see Martin 1950, 146–149; Chalon 1964, 106ff; Parássoglou 1978, 57f, 60–63 esp. 62 n. 73. On the tax-free status of imperial *ousiai*, see Rostovtzeff 1994<sup>2</sup>, 142f n. 67.

100. = SB VI 9224. Maron the son of Pylades γεγο[νῶς] πράκ[τωρ] λαογραφίας (l. 7) and [ἀνα]δ[ε]δ[ο]μ[έν]ος εἰς γεωργίαν of the former estate of Maecenas; Horion son of Petosiris, ἀπολύσιμος of the former estate of Maecenas, πράκτωρ λαογραφίας in the tenth year of Claudius, and ἀπολύσιμος γεωργός; and Demetrios son of Isidoros, ἀπολύσιμος of the former estate of Petronius and πράκ[τωρ] λαογραφίας in the tenth year of Claudius. In *P.Mich.* X 582.11f, there is another reference to Horion, who one year later refused to undertake the tax collection although he was not an *apolytimos*, and that his name was not in the register of the exempt people (*leukoma*); cf. *P.Mich.* X p. 15.
101. There was no obligation to compulsory farming outside one's own nome of residence, as Isidoros claimed. Cf. Hanson 1997, 413, 421.
102. *OGIS* II 669.10–15 τῆν τῶν προτέρων ἐπάρχων αἰώνιον συνήθειαν. See Chalon 1964, 104–109.
103. See Parássoglou 1978, 57ff; Rowlandson 1996, 56f. Further evidence for *ateleia* in connection with imperial estates is found in *P.Mich.* IX 560.8–10 (AD 46), where Livia's estate at Karanis is said to have tax-free status, and *P.Oxy.* XXXVIII 2837.9f = *C.PGr.* II 7 (AD 50), the notification of death of a farmer ἐν τῇ ἀτελίᾳ (i.e. *apolytimos*?) of the estate of Tiberius. It is worth noting that this notification was addressed to Herakleides, the *eklempor* or manager of the estate.
104. *P.Gen.* II 91 (AD 50/51); cf. Parássoglou 1978, 57f.
105. *P.Bingen* 45.6f ἐπ[ικε]χωρήκαμεν δὲ καὶ ὧν ἔχει κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἐδαφῶν πάντων ἀτ[ε]λεῖα[ν] κτλ. and ll.14f ἀνέπαφα καὶ ἀτελεῖ καὶ ἀνευγάρευντα εἶναι κτλ. I have reported the translation by Van Minnen 2000b, 34.
106. See Parássoglou 1978, 27.
107. One of the reasons for the creation of the *ousiakos logos* may have been the increased number of estates and properties of the imperial *patrimonium* at the end of the Julio-Claudian dynasty. The presence of Vespasian and Tirus at Alexandria in AD 70 may have been the occasion for a reorganisation of the province of Egypt.
108. Livia, for instance, had her own *procurator*, a post held for some time by Sex. Afranius Burrus; cf. *ILS* 1321, *CIL* X 7489. See Crawford 1976, 39.
109. See Parássoglou 1978, 84f.
110. Swaney 1970a, 71–73.
111. Strabo XVII 1.12 (797) ὁ προσαγορευόμενος ἴδιος λόγος, ὃς τῶν ἀδеспότων καὶ τῶν εἰς Καίσαρα πίπτειν ὀφειλόντων ἐξεταστὴς ἐστί.
112. See Millar 1992<sup>2</sup>, 159; Rathbone 1993, 101, 105–110.
113. Brunt 1990, 148, 161f with reference to Millar 1963.
114. See Méléze-Modrzejewski 1990 IV, pp. 91–125, esp. 95f and 113.
115. Méléze-Modrzejewski 1979, 163–188; cf. Horden and Purcell 2000, 223. On the topographical location of the *Alexandreon chora* see Jones 1983, 304 and 475 n. 11.
116. The so-called 'Amnesty Decrees' of Ptolemy Evergetes II (*P.Tebt.* I 5.93–98 = *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53) granted tax exemption to this territory in 118 BC, and other royal decrees addressed Alexandrian citizens who resided in the *chora* as a privileged class: see SB VI 8993 II (175/4 BC) = *C.Prol.Sklav.* 8; see also *C.Ord.Ptol.* 76, the edict of Cleopatra VII and Caesarion that was addressed to 'those from the city who farm in the Prosopite and the Boubasirre' (cf. *BL* 10, 46); as concerns the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander see *OGIS* II 669.59–61, and Chalon 1964, 230–3.

117. Although according to Rowlandson 1996, 107 the majority of the lands of the Alexandrians were concentrated in that area.
118. Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, 269, 325, 1197, 1309. Some instances of the term *oikia* occur in *P.Tebt.* I 40 (117 BC) or *BGU* VIII 1833 (51/50 BC).
119. Cities began to acquire estates much later according to Rowlandson 1996, 68.
120. See Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 117.
121. P.Graux.inv. 2009, presented by Kambitsis 1988, p. 51.
122. This *oikos* is probably one and the same as the *oikos* mentioned in *P.Mil. Vogl.* VI 296, from the same time and place.
123. See Heinen 1966, 142 and Whitehorne 1994 Table 2 p. 213 for a stemma of the later Ptolemies.
124. *P.Mil. Vogl.* VI 269.30n.
125. Nicole 1906, 225f transcribed only a part of the document. Some suggestions for restoration may be found in *P.Mil. Vogl.* VI p. 26 n. 1.
126. In the papyri the phrase ἑρωτάτων ταμειῶν normally indicates the imperial  *fiscus*; cf. Millar 1963, 29.
127. *P.Oxy.* IV 807 = *SB* X 10534 on which see Swarney 1968. The *DDBDP* dates it to the period 30 BC – AD 68.
128. Some ἐπιτηρηταί (managers) of the possessions of an *oikos* are attested in *P.Mil. Vogl.* II 56.1–10. The philosopher Julius Asklepiades who left his property to Alexandria in *P.Fay.* 87 and *P.Hamb.* I 36 may have been one and the same as the Asklepiades of Mendes mentioned by Suet. *Aug.* 94.4; see *RE* II 1627 no. 26 and *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1199. A man of importance called Asklepiades occurs in *BGU* IV 1197.1, IV 1200.14 (where he is said to have gone to Italy), and XVI (*passim*), all of the Augustan period, and in the Herakleopolite archive so-called ‘of Isidora and Asklepiades’ in *BGU* IV 1203-9 (= Olsson nos. 1–7) from the early reign of Augustus. The *incipit* of the letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians *P.Lond.* VI 1912.17 = *CPJ* II 153 records Julius Asklepiades among the names of the Alexandrian *presbeis*; he may have been the son of the philosopher Asklepiades documented under Augustus. Julius Asklepiades ‘the younger’ may have been the owner of the estate that was given to Antonia the daughter of Claudius in *BGU* IX 1893; see Parássoglou 1978, 12 n. 36; on Antonia see Hagedorn 1999, 216.
129. *P.Fay.* 82 = *Sel. Pap.* II 269. The ἐπὶ τῶν στέμμάτων is documented in *CIG* 4705, ll. 4–6, in AD 232/3. The term στέμμα may have been equivalent to the Latin *ordo* or *familia*. On the role of the gymnasium in the administration of Egypt see Burkhalter 1992.
130. An οἰσία οἴκου Καίσαρος recurs in *PLips.* 96.1.3 of the second or third century AD, possibly from the Hermopolite, while *P.Oxy.* XLII 3047.5 of AD 245 refers to land of the *oikos* of Vespasian and Titus.
131. Cf. *OGIS* II 669.10–15. On *misthotai* as wealthy head-lessees, see Chalon 1964, 104f, and Rowlandson 1996, 81.
132. *PSI* V 449.6 refers to land in the Oxyrhynchite that belonged to an οἶκος τῶν Ἀντινοέων some time in the fourth century AD.
133. *PRyl.* II 216 (cf. col. VII) of the late second or early third century AD shows Alexandrian citizens paying lower tax rate on vineyards and gardens in the Mendesian nome than others. On Alexandrians as privileged landowners see Parássoglou 1978, 27–29; see Rowlandson 1996, 104–117, 182–3 266–7 and 269 n. 188 on Alexandrian and Antinoite citizens who owned estates in the Oxyrhynchite nome.

134. Cf. Whitehorne 1994, 182, 185.
135. See Caes. *BC* III 108, Dio XLII 44.2. See also Caes. *Bell. Alex.* 3. On Auleres' will and royal wills in general see Braund 1984, 136–7 and Chapter III.1. On the relationship between Auletes and Pompey, and on the role of Caesar in the recognition of Auletes as a king, see Heinen 1966, 9–10 and 144 n. 3.
136. See the so-called *Boule* Papyrus, *PSIX* 1160 (= *CPJ* II 150), on which see the editions by Norsa and Vitelli 1930 and 1932, and the discussion in Delia 1991, Chapter V.
137. Suet. *Aug.* 18; Strabo XVII 1.3 (787); see Garnsey 1999, 14.
138. See Casanova 1995.
139. On Sicily, see Andorlini and Marcone 1999, 330–335; on Egypt, see Rostovtzeff *SEHRE*<sup>2</sup>, 269f; on the balance of crops and their relationship with the payment of taxes and rents, see Rowlandson 1996, 236–239.
140. According to Kehoe 1992, 40–42, normally the owners of *ousiai* provided for just enough investment that their small-scale tenants could produce a sufficient harvest, so that owners could count on a secure income for each parcel of land; however, he hypothesised that some owners might have invested in viticulture in their estates. Sharp 1998 thought it unlikely that in the Augustan period the patterns of production and distribution of food changed dramatically.
141. According to Rowlandson 1996, 29f: 'the advantage to the state of retaining large quantities of land in public ownership lay not so much in the relative insecurity of tenure possessed by its tenants, but in the fact that the land produced a much higher revenue per aroura than was customarily charged on private land.'
142. Manning 1999, 101 talked in terms of 'effective private ownership of real property' in Ptolemaic Egypt. On the pretence of Greek education on the part of the Graeco-Egyptian privileged classes, see Turner 1984, 148.
143. As Kehoe 1992, 16 pointed out, when dealing with estates, the terms 'owner' and 'beneficiary' may be misleading.
144. Cf. Kehoe 1992, 36.
145. Rostovtzeff 1994<sup>2</sup>, 56f, 105, 120f, 132, 160.
146. Aubert suggested that the *vilicus* system originated in the context of the management of agricultural estates and was then applied to other areas of private and public administration. However, Aubert warned that the papyrological evidence shows no universal standardised patterns, and that it is hard to march them with the institutions of Roman private law. Cf. Aubert 1994, 35–38, 414f.
147. Often the imperial slaves were entrusted temporary offices in one province and then were transferred to another. It is difficult to collect the material on imperial slaves and freedmen, as the nomenclature is not always clear: in the papyri of the early imperial period (until the reign of Tiberius) slaves are designated as (slave) 'of Caesar' (proper name + *Kaisaros*); or from their function (e.g. *oikonomos*). Imperial freedmen may also lurk in the number of Roman citizens bearing an imperial *gentilicium* and a Greek *cognomen*, e.g. C. Julius Eros; in such cases it is impossible to establish whether we are dealing with Roman citizens, imperial freedmen, or provincials who obtained Roman citizenship. In addition, we do not know whether Graeco-Egyptians who obtained Alexandrian citizenship changed their name thereafter. See Biezunska-Malowist 1984, 297.
148. Manning 1999, 84, 101.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER NINE

1. Some items of evidence for the continuity of the office of the ἐκλογιστής in the Roman period are *P.Oxy.* XII 1480.12, 15 = *P.Olsson* 22 (AD 32); *P.Oxy.* XLII 3061.17, 19 (first century AD), *SB X* 10741.10 = *PUG* II 64 (second/third century AD). On the assessment of taxes, see Wallace 1938a, 294–296.
2. App. *BC V* 4; Dio XLII 6. Brunt 1990, 380 thought that ‘the change was easy, because *pactiones* (i.e. bargains whereby the cities collected the money on behalf of the publicans) already existed’; the publicans had become mere guarantors of the collection, and this made it easier for Caesar to suppress them.
3. See Brunt 1990, 380, 386.
4. See Wilcken 1912, 212f.
5. Tac. *Ann.* IV 6.3 *frumenta et pecuniae vectigales . . . societatibus equitum Romanorum agitabantur*.
6. See Lewis 1970, 7 = 1995, 142; Bagnall 1991a, 9.
7. Literally, however, a τελώνης was a ‘tax-buyer’ rather than a ‘tax-farmer,’ as his contract was a ὠνή not a μίσθωσις, that is, a sale not a lease; see Youtie 1973, 561. On tax farming in Egypt, see the summary by Brunt 1990, 422ff.
8. See Brunt 1990, 423.
9. See Préaux 1939, 457; on the surplus from tax farming, see Brunt 1990, 424.
10. Youtie 1973, 554–578.
11. See Youtie 1973, 560–573, with reference to Rostovtzeff 1902, 480–482.
12. On these taxes, see Chapter 9. Mason 1974, 92 translated τελώνης to *publicanus*. I report here some early Roman attestations of τελώναι: *SBI* I 4519.1 (AD 19) concerning the bath tax; *SB XIV* 11635.2 (AD 24) that refers to a τελωνεῖον; *SB XVI* 12495.1.6 (first century AD); *O.Bodl.* II 653 (AD 14) that mentions a τελώνης called Petemenophis son of Psenetymis; *O.Cair.* 84.1,3 (AD 6/7) that refers to Chesthotes, farmer of the tax on weavers. *O.Deiss.* 34.3 (AD 35) refers to colleagues or μέτοχοι τελώναι. *O.Deiss.* 74 (6 BC/AD 1) and *O.Leid.* 44.1 (AD 12/13) = *SB X* 10338 refer to a tax farmer called Ammonios, who in the second document levies the 2% tax. *O.Leid.* 45 = *SB X* 10423 (AD 15) refers to farmers of the bath tax. In *O.Petr.* 119.1 (AD 14) and in *WO* II 1551 (AD 34) a certain Asklas farms the weavers-tax at Thebes—perhaps he was one and the same as the Asklas who features in *SBI* I 4327 (cf. *SB* II, p. 462). In *O.Petr.* 213 (AD 18) there are μέτοχοι τελώναι. In *O.Theb.* 91.1 (= *O.Bodl.* I 170, first century AD), a certain Germanos and his colleagues farm the 2% tax.
13. See for instance *P.Tebr.* I 6.1.16 = *W.Chr.* 332 = *C.Ord.Ptol.* 57 (140/139 BC); *P.Tebr.* III/2 904 (115 BC); *SB XII* 11078 (100 BC); *UPZ* I 106.5 and 107.6 (99 BC), both = *C.Ord.Ptol.* 62.
14. = *W.Chr.* 275 = *Sel.Pap.* II 420.
15. Cf. *BGU* IV 1192.11 (c. 55 BC); *BGU* IV 1198.16f mentions the ἀπαίτησις of capitation taxes in 6/5 BC. In *P.Oxy.* II 291.7 of AD 25/26, a certain Severus supervises the ἀπαίτησις of taxes in corn and money (σιτικά καὶ ἀργυρικά). Some evidence for ἀπαίτηται in the second century and later is quoted by Wallace 1938a, 303f, 308, 316. The evidence for this official has been fully discussed by Palme 1989.
16. Cf. *BL* 8, 492; 10, 276.

17. Respectively, *BGU* IV 1123.5 and *BGU* IV 1132.8 (13 BC).
18. On the πράκτωρ ξενικῶν, see Préaux 1955. Cf. also *BGU* VIII 1826.47, 1827.24 of 52/51 BC, and SB III 6663.31 probably of 6/5 BC. According to Grenfell and Hunt (see *P.Oxy.* II 286.5 n.), both in the Ptolemaic and in the Roman period the πράκτωρ ξενικῶν was a collector of ξενικά, i.e., debts owed by persons who were living in another nome, and thus were under the jurisdiction of other officials. In origin the πράκτωρ was the officer in charge of the execution on the property of the defaulter, see Taubenschlag 19552, 509, 526f. *BGU* XIV 2420.11 (dated to the second year of an unnamed ruler, probably in the first century BC) mentions a πράκτωρ involved in the collection of taxes from a village.
19. Apollphanes is πράκτωρ of the tax on weavers in *P.Oxy.* II 285.6 (AD 50), and so are Melas and Theon in *P.Mich.* X 598 (AD 49). In *O.Bodl.* II 1103 (AD 33) Haryothes and Psais collect the pasture-tax. In *O.Bodl.* II 655 (AD 21) Asklas collects the bath tax at Thebes. In *O.Bodl.* II 1104 (AD 35) Petemenophis collects the bath tax, and in *O.Bodl.* II 660 (AD 36) he and Psenamounis collect the bath tax. A πράκτωρ λαογραφίας and χωματικού occurs in *O.Strasb.* 780 (AD 29). A certain Panechates is πράκτωρ of dike-tax in *O.Bodl.* II 561 (AD 34).
20. Cf. *BGU* XVI 2593.1 (Augustan). Cf. also Palechemis son of Psenhotos, who is πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν in *O.Leid.* 48 = *SB* X 10426 (AD 29). It was believed that this official was introduced by Trajan; see Wallace 1938a, 291; Sharp 1999, 227.
21. Some instances of the πράκτωρ τῶν βασιλικῶν are *P.Petr.* III 26.14 (240 BC), *UPZ* II 155.13 (254 BC) and *PSI* IV 389.5 (243/242 BC). A πράκτωρ δημοσίων is found in *P.Ryl.* II 141.6 (AD 37); another one, a certain Secundus, occurs in *P.Oxy.* X 1258.3 (AD 45). On the change in terminology from βασιλικός to δημόσιος, and on the co-existence of these two terms under Augustus, see Geraci 1983, 149.
22. Some Arsinoite documents show χειρισταί and βοηθοί acting as the agents of πράκτορες. Another χειριστής levies the σύνταξις at Soknopaiou Nesos in *BGU* XIII 2291.2–4 (6–4 BC). A χειριστής called Romulus levies the συντάξιμον in *BGU* VII 1590a.1–3 (AD 6). Akousilaos is βοηθός λαογραφίας in *P.Tebt.* II 348 of AD 23, and Mysthas has the same title in *P.Tebt.* II 349.2–5 (AD 28). In *P.Fay.* 45.1–6 (AD 9/10 and 10/11) from Theadelphia, a certain Heraklas, βοηθός of the συντάξιμον, is the helper (ὁ παρά) of a certain Tryphon, described as the gu. (.) (l. 3), perhaps the γυμνασάρχος. In *P.Mil.* I 9.1–5 (AD 13/14), also from Theadelphia, we find perhaps the same tax collector Heraklas, on the staff of C. Julius Alexander. *SB* XVI 13017.27 (24 BC) refers to a βοηθός at the record-office of Soknopaiou Nesos. *WO* II 290-of uncertain date-refers to a certain Marcus βοηθός λαογραφίας. In *WO* II 285–288, 292–294 (of uncertain date) we find πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν.
23. On Ptolemaic λογευταί and their ὑπηρεταί, see Préaux 1939, 456 n. 3. In *BGU* VII 1590b.5 (AD 6/7) Mysthas occurs as the λογευτής of poll tax. In *O.Fay.* 12 (Theadelphia, 6 BC) we encounter a λογευτής of a tax of 4 drachmas and a certain Pollio to whom the payment had to be made. In *P.Graux.* II 9 (AD 33) one encounters λογευταί of poll tax.
24. Sharp 1999, 218f.
25. See Wallace 1938a, 298f; in the Arsinoite, a πράκτωρ (probably of the Ptolemaic type) occurs in *SB* V 7376.20f of AD 3.

26. On the possible compulsion to farm out taxes in the Ptolemaic period, see Youtie 1973, 570; Hanson 1989, 432, however, suggested that the office of *praktor*, although compulsory, could be popular, because it was a source of money and social prestige. The fact that an office was liturgical does not imply that it was not paid, although the evidence for the salaries of tax collectors is meagre; see Wallace 1938a, 323f.
27. Thomas 1983, 39. On the dating of *P.Mich* X 582, cf. BL 7, 114.
28. See Chalon 1964, 54 with reference to *OGIS* II 669.10ff.
29. I quote from Grenfell and Hunt's translation of *P.Oxy.* I 44.11–16 = *W.Chr.* 275 = *Sel.Pap.* II 420. On the dating of this document, see Hagedorn 1988b, 153f.
30. Wilcken 1912, 212f; Brunt 1990, 392.
31. On the possible meanings *publicanus* and *procurator*, see Mason 1974, 92 s.v.; on *tributarius*, see *Corp.Gloss.Lat.* (Goetz Schoell) II 559.7, 4472.56.
32. There is no reference to the *phorologos* in Wallace 1938a; this official was first mentioned by Thomas 1983, 38. Cf. the reference in Diod. XIX 94.10 to φορολογούμενοι, 'populations who pay tribute' according to the *Loeb* translation; in my view this term could be translated as *tributarii*.
33. Ἀθηναίων Καίσαρος φορολόγω; his colleague's name, Φιλ[. . .]ρω could have been, for instance, Philetairos or Philargyros, and possibly Phileros; cf. Foraboschi 1967, 330f. A certain Philargyros is mentioned in *BGU* IV 1116 and 1167 of 13/12 BC; in 1167 he is attested as the slave of Antonia.
34. Cf. *P.Lond.* II 256 (pp. 95–99).
35. See BL 7, 279 and 8, 505. In *P.Vind.* Tandem 9.19, the reading of the name Σίφιλος may be changed to Δίφιλος, as Siphilos is not attested otherwise.
36. See Straus 1978, 261, and cf. Cerinthus, slave of Antonia the wife of Drusus in *P.Oxy.* II 244 = *CPL* 175 of AD 23.
37. *P.Strasb.* VIII 762.1f reads π[α]ρὰ Ὀλύμπου [τέ]ρακος κα[ί] . . . ρολόγου, which could be resolved to π[α]ρὰ Ὀλύμπου Ἰέρακος Καίσαρος φορολόγου. The abbreviation Καίσαρος is widely found in documents of the Augustan period; see for instance *BGU* IV 1116.6 (13 BC), 1151.11 (13 BC), 1158.5 (9 BC), *BGU* VII 1598.ii.1 (16 BC), *PSI Corr.* 1150.1 (27 BC). Probably, Hierax was a *phorologos* and imperial slave, and Olympos his *vicarius*. This was the standard pattern according to Straus 1978. There seem to be no other instances of an imperial slave or freedman called Hierax. According to Plut. *Ant.* 82.2, Cleopatra's doctor was called Olympos. Another Olympos is mentioned by Josephus as a friend of king Herod of Judaea; see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> O 99, *AJ* XVI 332, 354, and *BJ* I 535.
38. *CPR* XV 15.4, a copy of *P.Lond.* II 354 p. 163 (7–4 BC). Messeri Savorelli translated this phrase to 'exaction of the taxes of Caesar Imperator.'
39. Philo *De Spec. Leg.* III 163 (*Loeb* translation).
40. Strabo XVII 3.24 (839) καὶ πέμπουσι ἡγεμόνας καὶ φορολόγους. The *Loeb* edition reads: 'and send to them (i.e. to the provinces) praefects and collectors of tribute'; according to Mason 1974, 97, the φορολόγοι in this passage were Roman procurators. This passage however must be taken with caution as Strabo may have generalised or oversimplified a more complex situation.
41. The documentation relating to the state distribution of seed corn has been discussed in *P.Oxy.* LVII 3902–3909.
42. See Wallace 1938a, 36.

43. On the dating of these documents see BL 9, 251.
44. The *katasporous* was the inspector of the sowing; apparently, this official superintended to the entire nome. C. Julius Philetus (possibly an imperial freedman) is *κατασπορεύς* of the Arsinoite in *PMich.* V 233.5 (AD 24). On this official, see Oertel 1965, 188f, *PPetaus* 52 introduction; *PMünch.* III pp. 126f.
45. In *SB* VI 9223.6 (7 BC) Leonidas and Apollonios are the *sitologoi* of the Eastern part of the lower toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite. *PSI* VIII 968.9 (first century BC) refers to a *προσάγγελμα* (report) of the *sitologoi*. *P.Oxy.* IV 833 (Augustan) mentions *σιτολόγοι κατὰ τόπων*; cf. also *P.Oxy.* XXXVIII 2842.5 (15 BC or AD 29) and *P.Prag.* I 54.1 (AD 19/20). The reference to *σιτολόγοι τόπων* is common in the Oxyrhynchite, but rare in the Arsinoite.
46. Cf. the expression *σιτολογου[ν]τες* in *P.Oxy.* II 287.3 (AD 23; *σιτολ[ογού]των τὰς δημ[ο]σίαις ἐμβ[ο]λάς* (i.e. public shipments of corn) in *P.Strasb.* VIII 762.5f, possibly Augustan.
47. In *P.Oxy.* XVIII 2185.15–17 (AD 92) and *P.Köln* III 137 (AD 88) respectively.
48. On the granary of Livia see *O.Fay.* 15 (first century AD); on the estate of Claudia Livilla at Euhemeria see Parássoglou 1978, 73 and *P.Ryl.* II 127 and 138. On imperial estates, see Chapter 8.
49. See Bogaert 1994, 405f and Chapter 10.
50. On the dating cf. BL 9, 303.
51. On this tax, see below in this Chapter.
52. Cf. Bagnall, Helms and Verhoogt 2000. Further examples of Roman tax collectors are: C. Julius tax collector of 8 artabas of barley at Berenice in 6 BC, in *O. Tait* I 220; P. Mamilius Ambrosius at Myos Hormos in AD 6, in *O. Tait* I 223; Gabinius Agathopous in AD 19, in *O. Tait* I 225; Euandros son of (or slave of) Cornelius in *O. Tait* I 227 of AD 26 (but see a different hypothesis on the dating of these two documents in BL 3, 268); Anicetus slave of Tiberius at Berenice in AD 33–35, in *O. Tait.* I 237, 238, and 239 (cf. BL 8, 535); accounts of Gaius Norbanus at Myos Hormos are also mentioned in *O. Tait* I 244 of AD 36.
53. Brunt 1990, 386–414.
54. Aubert 1994, 329, 346f.
55. On the structure of the system of freedmen procurators, *vilici*, *vicarii*, *actores* and so forth, see Brunt 1990, 385. I do not discuss here the Egyptian evidence for *οἰκονόμοι*, on whom see Chapter 4.
56. The common view is summarised by Sharp 1999, 215–217.
57. A full survey of the operations of the administration, from the prefect to the *strategos*, in the collection of taxes is given by Sharp 1999, 234–236.
58. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 117. On the *oikos* of Alexandria see above, Chapter 8.
59. Sharp 1999, 224. On the appointment of tax collectors and their supervisors, see Youtie 1973, 568. A possible piece of evidence on a *ἐπιτηρητής* supervising taxes is *P.Oxy.* II 370 (descr.), dated to the second year of an unnamed emperor, but probably in the first century AD); cf. BL 1, 321.
60. On temple granaries and tax receipts issued by temples see Calderini 1924, nn. 5–11. Sharp 1999, 222 warned that we should not overestimate the degree of autonomy enjoyed by the village elders and other representatives of local communities.
61. = *P.Olsson* 22.
62. Brunt 1990, 390, with reference to Jos. *BJ* II, 405–407.



63. See Wallace 1938a, 334f.
64. Bogaert 1994, 159f compared the evidence on the Theban banker Kephalos in the Augustan period with that on his ancestor Kephalos, who was royal banker from 112 to 84 BC.
65. See Bogaert 1991, 262. See further discussion on banks in Chapter 10.
66. See Youtie 1973, 754.
67. In the commentary to the poll-tax list *P.Harrauer* 33.110, Messeri suggested that in the villages the poll tax was exacted around the same days of every month, a procedure that probably derived from the Ptolemaic period.
68. Sharp 1999, 236f.
69. In this document the *statores* have Greek names; they could have been recruited locally into the Roman army; cf. Chapter 3.
70. The office of the *στάτωρ* was discussed by Rea in *P.Oxy.* LVIII 3917.1n.
71. See Préaux 1939, 511f. Taubenschlag 19552, 688–691. See for instance *BGU* VIII 1779.17ff (51/50 BC), where three inhabitants of the village of Tesenephis are requested to pay the rents on behalf of the entire village.
72. Cf. Lewis 1995, 8f and n. 7.
73. Philo *De Spec. Leg.* III 159–163.
74. *BGU* XVI 2593.1 mentions torture (*στρεβλωτῶν*) for tax defaulters. The people mentioned are the villagers *τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς κώμης* and the ones *ἐν ξένοις* (ll. 5f). There is evidence for the use of *στρέβλη* in the Ptolemaic period as well: see *P.Tebt.* III 789.15 (c. 140 BC); another term used in general for torture was the euphemistic *πειθανάγκη*; see Préaux 1939, 499 n. 2.
75. In AD 39 Philo described himself as an old man, and thus what he reported as his memories about tax collection may have reflected the situation under Augustus and Tiberius. Cf. Philo *Leg.* 1, 182 (ed. Smallwood 1961). On the reliability of Philo, see Youtie 1973, 578.
76. See *BGU* VIII 1847.16 (50 BC). Ambaglio 1987, 157 pointed out that the detention of insolvent debtors and their starvation in prison is documented both in the Hellenistic and in the Roman periods.
77. *OGIS* II 669.18; see Chalon 1964, 113f. Wallace 1938a, 166 regarded the *πρακτόρετον* as the ‘office’ of the *πράκτωρ*. Youtie 1973, 555 cited as a parallel Luke 3.12, which tells us that Matthew was in the *τελωνεῖον*, the office where he carried out the business of the tax collector, when Jesus summoned him.
78. In order to explain the evidence for imprisonment for private debts under Augustus (e.g. *BGU* IV 1138, 19/18 BC) and Tiberius (e.g. *P.Oxy.* II 259 of AD 23, on which cf. *M. Chr.* 101), Chalon 1964, 115–117 suggested that Augustus did not abolish the imprisonment for debts, but only created a way out with the payment of a fine. On *praktōres* and imprisonment, see also the passage in *Luke* 12.58 *καὶ ὁ κριτὴς σε παραδώσει τῷ πράκτορι, καὶ ὁ πρᾶκτωρ σε βαλεῖ εἰς φυλακὴν*. According to Youtie 1973, 560f, although this refers to the collection of taxes in Judaea, it is likely that it applied to Egypt as well: ‘there are clear indications in the Gospels that the system of tax-collection in Palestine resembled that of Egypt in important essentials.’
79. See Wallace 1938a, 324 and Youtie 1973, 753.
80. Youtie 1973, 571.
81. In *BGU* XVI 2629 of 4 BC, Eurylochos writes to Athenodoros about the falsification of a letter which needed to be written to the prefect; the scribe protested his innocence,

- but eventually Eurylochos found the way to 'make him speak' (ll. 17f): a euphemism that hinted to the use of torture?
82. Philo *Flacc.* 78; Alexandrians could be beaten *σπάθαις*; cf. the Latin term *spatula*. This passage was analysed by Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 115.
  83. Brunt 1990, 378.
  84. Brunt 1990, 383 suggested that tax-farming was never completely abandoned, as 'publicans always had an incentive to maximize profits, and when they did so under the percentage system, the *fiscus* too directly benefited,' while 'salaried officials had no like incentive and they could hardly have provided sureties for their operations.'
  85. Brunt 1990, 393.
  86. Cf. Sharp 1999, 241.
  87. Youtie 1973, 560f drew a parallel between tax collectors in Egypt and Judaea, while according to Brunt 1990, 396 there is no warrant that the Egyptian system had parallels in other provinces.
  88. Cf. Sharp 1999, 237f.
  89. This document was discussed by Wallace 1938a, 289f.
  90. See Sharp 1999, 217ff.
  91. Brunt 1990, 381.
  92. For some bibliography on slaves and freedmen in the administration of the *patrimonium principis*, see Parásoglou 1978, 51 n. 3.
  93. However, Brunt 1990, 380 thought that the equestrian officials and the imperial freedmen and slaves employed in the province had no liability for deficits, while the liturgical tax-collectors were compulsory officials chosen from men of substance, and that their own property guaranteed the revenues. In the last resort, communities were collectively liable for deficits too.
  94. Brunt 1990, 379. See Chapter 10.
  95. See Rostovtzeff 1995, 209 and n. 35, who argued that collective responsibility appeared in Egypt in full bloom under Tiberius, but had precedents in fifth century BC Athens, where members of a family shared the responsibility of the head of the family if he did not fulfil his obligations towards the state.
  96. Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* III 159–163.
  97. Dio LVII 10.5; Suet. *Tib.* 32.2. Naturally, this anecdote may have been invented. On this prefect, cf. Appendix 1.
  98. On the Hellenistic 'philosophy of government,' see Rostovtzeff in *P.Tebt.* III 703, p.71. See also Préaux 1939, 431, 457, 518.
  99. Rathbone 1996, 312f.
  100. According to Wilcken, half the rate had to be paid if one died before the sixth month of the year; this view was rejected by Scheidel 1999, 67, who thought that the full rate was exacted even in the year when people died; see Chapter 7.
  101. Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 112f.
  102. Rostovtzeff *SEHWW*, 470 pointed out that the salt tax was present and organised along the same lines in Egypt, Judaea and Babylonia.
  103. Rathbone 1993, 90f.
  104. On the *halike* in the Roman period, see Wallace 1938a, 183f and 432 n. 11, *WO I* pp. 141ff, *P.Petaus* 42 introd.; on poll taxes, see *P.Köln* II 95 introd.; *BGU XV* 2533–2540 introd.; *P.Brook.* 32 introd., and Rathbone 1993, 91 n. 30.

105. Cf. Tcherikover 1950, 188f; Rathbone 1993, 88. *O.Mich.* 709–714 and 736 range from the years 4 to 29 of an unnamed reign, probably of Augustus; *O.Mich.* 704 is dated Year 2 of an unnamed ruler.
106. These ostraka were generally assigned to the period 50 BC–AD 50 by the first editor Zauzich 1984, 67ff.
107. See Wallace 1938a, 121; Bowman and Rathbone 1992, 112.
108. On the composition of this sum, see Wallace 1938a, 123, who summarised earlier hypotheses by Keyes and Tait.
109. Rathbone 1993, 97.
110. Briant 1996, 405.
111. Rostovtzeff *SEHRE*<sup>2</sup>, 1741f and Rathbone 1993, 97 pointed out that the lumping in of different capitation taxes with the poll tax proper was common practice in Egypt and in other former Hellenistic kingdoms of the Near East.
112. On the lumping in of the poll tax with other charges, see Shelton 1977, 20–22.
113. On the *metropolitai* see above Chapter 7. According to Wallace 1938a, 128 ‘the rate of assessment varied among the different towns in Upper Egypt, and, surprisingly, among the various subdivisions of Thebes’; according to Rathbone 1993, 87, ‘in some quarters of Thebes the rate was 10 drachmas, in others 24 drachmas, possibly because only the former quarters counted as metropolitae.’
114. See Brunt 1990, 327; Préaux 1939, 384–386; Rathbone 1993, 92, 96.
115. *P.Tebt.* I 103.1.1 (= *W.Chr.* 288) records the λαογραφία κατ’ ἄνδρα of those ‘paying the σύνταξις’ (in either 94 or 61 BC). *P.Tebt.* I 121.60f records the revenue of 4000 drachmas χάριν λαογραφίας (again, in either 94 or 61 BC). *P.Tebt.* I 189.1 records the λαογραφία of those ‘who have paid for σύνταξις and ἐπιστατικόν’ (this papyrus was assigned to the first century BC). See Chapter 7.
116. Wallace 1938a, 123 thought that the term συντάξιμον meant ‘payment for the σύνταξις,’ while Rathbone 1993, 88 preferred ‘combined charge.’ On these taxes, see *O.Tebt.Pad.* pp. 4–17, and the introduction to *BGU XV* 2533–2540; *PMich.* XII 638–642 introduction, *SB XVI* 12739, 12740, *P.Coll.Youtie* I 20; Bogaert 2000, 163f. For a list of payments for συντάξιμον in the Arsinoite see also Hobson 1984, with bibliography. On the Ptolemaic σύνταξις, see Evans 1957; Uebel 1966, 363.
117. On the dating cf. *BL* 7, 272.
118. Other early instances of συντάξιμον are *PMil.* I 9 (AD 13/14) and *P.Tebt.* II 349.3 (AD 27/28). On λαϊκή σύνταξις see *PMich.* V 241.35 (cf. *CPJ* II 413) and 346 B.5 (AD 16/17). The συντάξιμον is documented as late as AD 87–102/3 in *PMich.* VI 382.
119. The common consensus is that in the Ptolemaic period ὁ πρὸς τῇ συντάξει supervised the arrangement of—or the assignment of land to—the *katoikoi*; see Geraci 1981 and Chapter 8.
120. = *W.Chr.* 200 A; see Rathbone 1993, 90.
121. *P.Tebt.* I 103 = *W.Chr.* 288 (94 or 61 BC) and 189 descr. (first century BC); see Rathbone 1993, 92. See also Préaux 1939, 380–387 and Chapter 7.
122. *O.Mich.* I 121–125 = *SB XIV* 11446–11450, and another group of Michigan ostraka published by Youtie 1973, 82–85. To this evidence one may add *O.Bakchias* G 9, of the first century BC or AD, a receipt for *syntaxis* (4 drachmas) paid by the priest Apollonios son of Kratos; see Cuvigny 1999.

123. Wallace 1938a, 140f. See for instance *BGU* IV 1198.19 (5/4 BC), where the priests of Herakleopolis claim that they had paid (among other taxes) the *chomatikon*.
124. See Wallace 1938a, 140–143 with a list of receipts on p. 421, n. 38; a summary of the literature on *chomatikon* and places of publication of receipts may be found in Poethke and Sijpesteijn 1979, 135, to which add the Greek and Demotic receipts listed by Bogaert 2000, 148f, and *O.Leid.Dem.* I p. 17.
125. Wallace 1938a, 141.
126. Préaux 1939, 398f rejected the theory that *chomatikon* was a compensation for work, while Wallace 1938a, 141f left the question open.
127. Foraboschi 1970.
128. Cf. Wallace 1938a, 291f.
129. On *merismos anakechorekoton*, see Lewis 1995, 1–13, 1980, 63f. Cf. also Wallace 1938a, 137–140, and Bogaert 2000, 145 n. 38. Wallace 1938a, 135, 168f thought that the Roman administration had a predilection for distributed taxes or *merismoï* that were equally assessed on entire communities. Still, some of these taxes may have existed in the Ptolemaic period.
130. Cf. Wallace 1938a, 291f; Sharp 1999, 227, 240.
131. Daniel and Sijpesteijn 1985, 47ff. Cf. also Wallace 1938a, 49f, 176–180 and Youtie 1973, 753; Parsons in *P.Oxy.* XLII 3030.3 argued that the *arithmetikon* was collected every five years in the second century AD, but the evidence is too little to tell us whether or not this began in the first century. Cf. also *BGU* XV 2525 introd., and *P.Hamb.* III 209 introd. .
132. According to Daniel and Sijpesteijn 1985, 49 n. 10, ‘it does not seem fortuitous that the two amounts most commonly encountered, namely 16 drachmas 1 obol 4 *chalkoi*, and 28 drachmas 3 obols, add up to the 44 drachmas 4 obols 4 *chalkoi* of the passage in question.’
133. Cf. *P.Lond.* III 1171.16f (p. 177) of 8 BC, where the payment for pasture-tax is associated and lumped in with a small charge for *arithmetikon*.
134. Cf. *P.Oxy.* XXIV 2414.3.2 (second/third century AD), which recorded the amount of taxes paid for one or more nomos: the total amount for *arithmetikon katoikon* was 5 talents and 4000 drachmas.
135. On monopolies, see Wallace 1938a, 181ff. On the origin of the Ptolemaic monopolies, see Préaux 1954.
136. Wallace 1938a, 155f, 223. On the Ptolemaic bath-tax, the τρίτη βαλανείου, see Préaux 1939, 338–343. On this tax in the Roman period see also *P.Köln* IX 376 introd., and Bogaert 1998/1999, 58f.
137. The dating is by Bogaert 2000, 138f. *O.Fay.* 2 of 23 BC records the payment of 14 obols for τέλος βαλαν(είου) Εἵημερί(ας). Another τέλος features in *O.Mey.* 13 and 14 of 6 and 5 BC, while *O.Leid.Dem.* 19 of c. 4/3 BC is a receipt for 4000 drachmas, probably the annual rent for the leasing of a public bath. *WO* II 1368 records the payment of 4 drachmas for φόρος βαλανείου to a tax collector at Thebes in AD 6/7. *SB* XX 14384 is a receipt for βαλανευτικόν φόρον issued in AD 7 in the Thebaid.
138. + BL 2.2, 150. The readings slightly differ in the two documents.
139. Cf. some Demotic receipts in *O.Mattha* pp. 138–144; cf also *O.Bodl.* II 645.4f (ca. 22 BC); *O.Zür.Wangstedt* 7 (Memnonia 19 BC); *O.Leid.* 43.3 + BL 9, 386 (Hermonthis AD 12), the payment of 2 drachmas for *balaneutikon* along with the 16 drachmas for the poll tax on *metropolitai*.

140. Cf. Wallace 1938a, 157f.
141. See Mosallamy 1981, 218f.
142. Such variations are outlined in *O.Tebt.Pad.* pp. 56f. For full discussion on the beer tax, see Gallazzi in *O.Tebt.Pad.* pp. 47–57. See an updated list of documents and literature in Bogaert 2000, 156f.
143. See Youtie 1973, 79. *BGU XVI* 2588 is a receipt for *zytera* with payments of 15 obols, 4 drachmas and 12 obols in 10/9 BC. *P.Aberd.* 75 a and b of the first century AD mention payments of 5000 drachmas for φόρος ζυτηρῶς in the Arsinoite, that is, either the amount for the tax collected from the entire nome or the licence-fee of a brewery. Among other documents, *SB XIV* 12170.17 records the liability of persons to beer-tax in AD 31/32, and *O.Mich.* III 987.1 and 988.2 from Karanis are two receipts for ζυτηρῶ (the second specifies κατ' ἄνδρα) from the first century AD.
144. Wallace 1938a, 187f thought that the Roman *zytera* levied *per capita* served 'to recover revenue which might otherwise have been lost through the growth of that home industry (of beer)'; cf. Amundsen in *O.Oslo*, pp. 31f and Gallazzi in *O.Tebt.Pad.* I, pp. 47ff.
145. Nelson 1976, 127–129.
146. Foraboschi 2003, 255f.
147. See Préaux 1939, 65ff, 91f and Bogaert 2000, 156. A mention of εἶδη ἐλαϊκῶς is found in *P.Fay.* 64.4 of the second century AD.
148. *SB I* 5233.30 (AD 14). Cf. BL 2.2, 118.
149. Cf. also *P.Lond.* II 361.17 (pp. 169f), a petition concerning the lease of an oil-press in the first century AD (not an olive-yard, as the *ed. pr.* reported).
150. Strabo XVII 1.15 (800).
151. An early Roman example is *BGU IV* 1163.5 of 16–13 BC.
152. Préaux 1939, 192.
153. Cf. Lewis 1974, 105, 138f.
154. = *Sel.Pap.* I 41.
155. Lewis 1974, 113.
156. According to Wallace 1938a, 191, 213, Augustus introduced trade taxes to replace the revenues that the Ptolemies gathered from the monopoly of the industries. Wipszycka 1971, 129 rejected Wallace's idea that there were *ad valorem*, i.e., percentage taxes on industry.
157. For a list of documents see Wallace 1938a, 193–207, Bogaert 2000, 174 and *O.Strasb.* 54.3f (Thebes, AD 15); *O.Medin.Habu Dem.* 57.3 and 58 (first century BC) from Memnonia.
158. There is no secure evidence to prove this. On Caligula's measure, see Suet. *Gaius* 40. McGing 1989 cited as evidence of prostitute tax in Egypt the Theban ostrakon *WO* II 1030 of AD 31, in which a certain Cornelius son of Cornelius acknowledges that he had received the *telos* from a woman. However, this document may have referred to any tax on trades employing women. On this tax see Bagnall 1991a, 5 and Nelson 1995, 24.
159. On Ovinius, see *Oros.* VI 19.20; Bowman 1996, 679 and Chapter 2.
160. = *P.Vindob.* L 1. The earliest published receipts for *telos gerdion* are: *O.Bodl.* II 1012 (17 BC), *O.Zür.Wangstedt* 8 (16 BC), *O.Leid.Dem.* 603 (10 BC), *O.Mattha* 182 (5

- BC?); 183 (5 BC), *O.Medin.Habu Dem* 54, 55 (AD 12), *O.Petr.* 213 (AD 16), *O.Medin.Habu Dem.* 56.2 (AD 14–37). I report this list from Bogaert 2000, 174f.
161. *P.Oxy.* IV 737 = *ChLA* V 308 = *CPL* 311 (31–8 BC).
162. *P.Oxy.* IV 309 (AD 18/19) = *SB X* 10221; *P.Oxy.* II 311 (AD 22/23) = *SB X* 10223; cf. Biscottini 1966, 67, 82.
163. See Brunt 1990, 335.
164. On the sales tax cf. *WO* I pp. 182f, *P.Tebt.* II 350 introduction; Wallace 1938a, 227–230; Gallazzi in *O.Cair.GPW* 51–58 introduction; Bogaert 2000, 140f, 172.
165. Cf. *SB* IV 7385, a receipt of 1 drachma 1 obol for *enkyklion* on an unknown good in AD 25. On the evidence for an unspecified *telos*, see Bogaert 2000, 175 + list of some early receipts of this type: *O.Mattha Dem.* 193 (8 BC); 194 (AD 10) and 195 (AD 12); *O.Suec.* 18 (1969) p. 18 n. 11 (AD 31). In *O.Mattha* p. 65 unspecified taxes are interpreted as trade-taxes.
166. On the farming of the *enkyklion*, see Martin and Straus 1989, 251–255.
167. A τέλος ψιλοῦ τόπου occurs in *P.Tebt.* II 280.6 of 126 BC and in *P.Mich.* V 236.2 from the reign of Augustus or Tiberius. *P.Ashm.* I 24 = *SB* XIV 11412 (dated to the first century BC) mentions a τέλος οἰκίας for a house bought by Harthotes son of Marres at Hawara, in the sixth year of an unnamed ruler. This Harthotes may have been related to the well-known Harthotes son of Marres (cf. Casanova 1975); if they were one and the same person, this papyrus could be assigned to the sixth year of Tiberius, AD 20. *P.Tebt.* II 587 (descr.), of either 6 BC or AD 5, is a receipt for sales tax at 2% paid on the sale of a house in Tebtunis. In *P.Ryl.* II 118, someone sought permission to sell or purchase the land of minors; the addressees of the petition were the farmer of the ἐγκύκλιον, the ἀγορανόμος and μνημῶν of the Arsinoite nome, and ultimately the ἐξηγητής in Alexandria.
168. Cf. *BGU* IV 1059.9, a contract for the sale of slaves from the Augustan period. See also *WO* II 1066 (AD 154) and 1454 (AD 179), *O.Bodl.* II 1097 (AD 131) and 1098 (second century AD Thebes). In *P.Hib.* I 29 (= *W.Chr.* 259; *C.Ptol.Sklav.* 6) of 265 BC, the tax on the purchase of slaves is equivalent to one-third of the price of the slave, while in *P.Col.* I inv. 480.6 (198/7 BC) it is called *hekatoste* (1%). On the farming of the sales tax see Martin and Straus 1989, 255.
169. A Theban ostrakon, *O.Bodl.* II 1096, is the receipt for the tax on the purchase of a white bull, while *O.Bodl.* II 2206 of AD 33 records in Greek and Demotic the payment of a tax probably on the purchase of pigs.
170. Cf. the Demotic receipt *O.Mattha.* 119.3 of 2 BC, and *BGU* IV 1207.19f of 28 BC (= *P.Olsson* 5). There probably was no relationship between this tax and the *vicesima hereditarium* or *libertatis*, the tax on inheritances and on manumissions that was paid by Roman citizens.
171. Cf. *WO* II 1363.3 of 27/26 BC; *O.Cair.* 92.5 of AD 18; *P.Ryl.* II 167.22 of AD 39. Cf. Wallace 1938a, 219, 223, and 446 n. 40.
172. Wallace 1938a, 225–227. *O.Bodl.* II 1086 of the first century AD is the receipt for a 2% tax on donkeys carrying cargoes. The Theban ostrakon *O.Leid.* I 44 (= *SB X* 10338) of AD 12/13 records a custom duty paid in to the tax farmer of the *pentekoste*.
173. Cf. *P.Thomas* 3 introd and *SB* XX 15189, an account for sale of Arsinoite tunics of AD 24/25. On customs duties cf. Strabo XVII 1.13 (798), probably referring to the Augustan period, and Wallace 1938a, 268–270.

174. Wallace 1938a, 281–284, however, thought that the tax called *stephanos* was different from the *stephanikon*.
175. Cf. *BGU* VIII 1731.8; 1732.[9], 19; 1733.10, 14; 1734.9; 1739.13,[17]; 1740.11, 1813.[11]; 1850.23; 1851.3 of the 50s BC. In *P.Coll. Youtie* I 17, Diogenes writes to Dionysios to urge him to write to a third party to facilitate the delivery of the payment (probably in kind) of the *stephanos*. This papyrus is dated to the fifteenth year of an unnamed ruler, presumably either Cleopatra or Augustus. The first editor (Hanson) dated it to 37 BC, but year 15 of Augustus seems likelier.
176. On taxes on katoikic land, see further the introduction to *P.Köln* V 227 (AD 12/13).
177. *BGU* IV 1123 was assigned by Schubart to the Augustan period, but lacks any reference to dates: on the dating of this document, see Montevecchi 1970, 16 n. 1 (cf. BL 7, 18). *BGU* VIII 1851.3 documents the existence of ὁ τῆς συντάξεως στέφανος, a tax on the transfer of katoikic land in the late Ptolemaic period; see Geraci 1981, 269. Further discussion on the *stephanos* in the Ptolemaic period may be found in Shelton 1991, 267f.
178. A discussion on the *stephanos* in the Roman period and a list of the published evidence may be found in Bowman 1967; cf. also Youtie 1973, 754 and *BGU* XV 2503 introd.
179. Cf. Augustus' *Res Gestae* XI 21; Dio XLVIII 42.4, LI 21. Montevecchi 1970, 16–18 assumed that Augustus had remitted the payment of *stephanos* throughout the empire.
180. Bogaert 2000, 233.
181. On katoikic land see Chapter 8.
182. Wallace 1938a, 77f.
183. On declarations of sheep and goats see Avogadro 1935, 131ff and 1934, 293–297; Balconi 1984, 35ff; 1990, 113ff; *P.Köln* II 86 introd.; *P.Oxy.* LV 3778–9 introd.; *BGU* XVI 2578–87; *P.Mich.* XVIII 782; El Abbadi 1992.
184. Avogadro 1934, 293. On *scriptura*, see Lintott 1993, 83.
185. El Abbadi 1992, 211.
186. Early references to *phoros probaton* may be found in *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59433.23f, from Philadelphia in the third century BC; to *ennomion* in *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59206.30, 46, 69 (254 BC) and IV 59634.7 (third century BC).
187. *P.Lond.* III 1171.14–17 (p. 177).
188. = *ChLA* III 206 = *CPL* 175.
189. On Roman taxation on the transfer of cattle, see Lintott 1993, 83 and n. 79 p. 209.
190. Wallace 1938a, 90f.
191. *P.Gen.* II 95.1 (AD 65), *P.Oxy.* XII 1438.19 (second century AD), *P.Mich.* XV 709.2 (second or third century AD), *P.Oxy.* XXIV 2414.2,15 (second or third century AD).
192. On the pig tax see Wallace 1938a, 94, 143–145;
193. Youtie 1973, 752f.
194. Bogaert 2000, 165.
195. *WO* II 1031 of AD 31 is a receipt issued by a τελώνης ὑκτῆς for τέλος δελφακίδος μιᾶς, i.e., the tax for one piglet. *O.Bodl.* II 1094.2 preserves the mention of a tax on a pig in AD 21, but probably referred to the sales tax.
196. On the daring cf. BL 8, 257.

197. Cf. *BGU* I 92 = *W.Chr.* 427 (AD 170), II 649 = *W.Chr.* 428 (AD 130), III 730 (AD 187) from the Pharbaithite nome.
198. The old view is summarised in Wallace 1938a, 238ff.
199. Préaux 1939, 384, 489f.
200. On the priestly *syntaxis* see the classical work by Otto 1905, I 366ff; see also Wallace 1938a, 239–241. A reference to *syntaxeis* of uncertain nature occurs in *P.Oxy.* LXVII 4624.11 of the first century AD. See also *P.Tebt.* II 302.5 = *W.Chr.* 368 (AD 71/2), *BGU* III 707.9f + *P.Bodl.* I 61 (a) V (AD 179–182). The priestly *syntaxis* was paid in *P.Oxy.* VII 1046.5 as late as AD 218/9.
201. Glare 1993, Ch. 3. The connection between estate land and land funding the cult of a specific god is also evident in *P.Oxy.* XII 1434.11f (with reference to the Augustan period), where the estate of C. Julius Theon may have belonged once to Isis Taposiris.
202. Wallace 1938a, 250–252.
203. The Herakleopolite *BGU* IV 1194.3–5 mentions a Horos prophet and ἐπιστάτης ἱερῶν in 27 BC, while in *P.Oxy.* XII 1453.13f of 30/29 BC, Heliodoros the son of Heliodoros and Heliodoros the son of Ptolemaios are ‘those in charge of the temples of the Oxyrhynchite and the Kynopolite.’ This title occurs in an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus of around 26 BC, of which I am preparing an edition.
204. Cf. *P.Tebt.* I 189.1 of the first century BC. Cf. *O.Mich.* IV 1114 of 20 BC and *O.Mich.* IV 1115 = *SB* XIV 11501–2; *O.Mich.* III 986 of AD 10. *O.Mich.* I 116 = *SB* XIV 11451 and *O.Fay.* 1 are receipts for the payment of 4 drachmas for an unnamed tax, possibly the ἐπιστατικόν; Youtie assigned them to the first and the fifth years of Augustus, that is, 29 and 25 BC. Cf. also *O.Mich.* II 737–744 and 984–985, monthly instalments for *epistatikon* amounting to 2, 4 or 8 drachmas, from the years 1 to 23 of an unnamed emperor (probably either Augustus or Tiberius), and *P.Bakchias* 24 = *SB* V 8070, attesting a collective payment for ἐπιστατικόν ἱερέων and other taxes around 7 BC. *SB* VI 9030 is a receipt λόγῳ ἐπιστατικοῦ dated to the thirteenth year of an unknown ruler, and *SB* XIV 11448 and 11450 are receipts dated to the seventeenth and twentieth years of an unnamed ruler. Cf. Youtie 1973, 85 and 1981, 238 and Glare 1993 Chapter 3.
205. This tax has been fully studied by Glare 1993. The Theban ostrakon *O.Bodl.* II 1123 is a receipt on the εἰσκρισις of παστοφόροι for 4 drachmas, with additional charges of 1 drachma 1 obol in AD 16, which was issued on behalf of the *idios logos*; this documents the involvement of the *idios logos* in temple affairs in the early Roman period. Cf. *P.Lund* IV, pp. 94–107, Bogaert 2000, 141.
206. See Bogaert 2000, 142, 146.
207. *PSIX* 1149 = *SB* XVI 12531, especially ll. 10f. Cf. Glare 1993. Cf. also Appendix 1.
208. On the land tax in grain see Chapter 8. On the importance of the cash revenues from crops such as wine, see Kehoe 1992, 41f.
209. Cf. Wallace 1938a, 50–52; 374f n. 14. Reinmuth 1934, 256ff regarded the reference to the taxation of the previous five-year period in the edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander (πενταετία, *OGIS* II 669.49) as evidence that the edict of the prefect was published at the beginning of every *lustrum*. Chalon 1964, 71f rejected this view, on the grounds that there is no positive evidence of such prefectural edicts in Egypt.



210. Cf. *O.Bodl.* II 951 of 21 BC, receipt ὑπὲρ φοινικῶνων at the rate of 20 drachmas per aroura and *WO* II 1543 of 8/7 BC ὑπὲρ ἀμπέλων or ἀμπελώνων at the rate of 40 drachmas per aroura. See a list of documents in Bogaert 2000, 138, 140, 148.
211. Briant 1996, 411.
212. See Wallace 1938a, 55f, Bogaert 2000, 138.
213. Briant 1996, 405 showed that taxation in the Persian empire was assessed at different levels according to the economic productivity of different regions.
214. Cf. Brunt 1990, 328.
215. An analysis of the Persian system of taxation, especially after the reforms of Darius, may be found in Briant 1996, Chapter X.
216. Cf. Rathbone 1993, 88 and Appendix 1.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER TEN

1. Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 41; Diod. XVII 52; Strabo XVII 1.13 (798).
2. See Rathbone 1997, 187.
3. The most important historical studies on the subject are those by Gara 1976, King and Walker 1976a, to which Maresch 1996 has added a summary of the history of the bronze and silver coinage in Egypt from the Ptolemaic to the Roman period. Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès' *Roman Provincial Coinage* (1992, cited from now on as *RPC*) offer a new interpretation and a different chronological arrangement of Augustus's numismatic series. For a picture of the distribution of hoards, see further West and Johnson 1967, 74ff.
4. On the monetary policies of the later Ptolemies, see Walker 1976 I, 139, 150 and Gara 1976 Appendix I; Gara thought that the evidence is too meagre to allow for a precise judgement on the causes of the alleged economic crisis under Ptolemy Auletes.
5. See *RPC*, 688.
6. According to Crawford 1970, 41, the coinage had to be 'suitable for day-to-day transactions,' because 'monetary transactions at a very humble level were central to the well-being of society.'
7. Cleopatra was said to have written a treatise on weights and measures, possibly as an appendix to her treatise on *Kosmetika*. See Gara 1987, 154.
8. See *RPC*, 688.
9. See Gara 1988, 929.
10. See *RPC*, 693; Gara 1976, 155.
11. We find references to Actium and to the peace after 30 BC in the coinage at Nicomedia, Cos, Pella, and in other Achaean cities; see *RPC*, 45. On the coinage of Antony, see Geraci 1983, 79f.
12. *RPC*, 691 supported the second hypothesis, as the absence of the year-symbol 'L' makes it unlikely that it was a date.
13. Accounts in copper drachmas may be found in: *BGU* IV 1194.16f (27 BC) and 1209.12 = *P.Olson* 7 (23 BC), *O.Bodl.* II 951 (21 BC), *O.Camb.* 29 (20 BC), *P.Fay.* 101 V 6f (18 BC), *P.Fay.* 44.10ff + BL 1, 454 (6 BC), *PSIX* 1099.13f (6/5 BC; cf. BL 11, 249), *O.Mich.* I 17.3f (4 BC). See Gara 1976, 17 n. 54; see also Shelton 1977, 29.

14. Gara 1976, 188f suggested that, under Tiberius, the Alexandrian mint recycled Roman denarii to coin new silver tetradrachms; King and Walker 1976, 265 rejected this theory. Nonetheless, it is possible that some quantities of Roman denarii were kept in Alexandria for the Roman citizens there.
15. See *RPC*, 696.
16. See Gara 1984a, 1013f.
17. See for instance the references to Ptolemaic silver in *BGV* VIII 1732.15 and 1733.21 of the first century BC; *P.Ryl.* IV 585 fr. 1 4f of the second century BC; *P.Strasb.* II 115.10 (possibly of the second century BC). See Gara 1984a, 1013. Gara 1988, 932 also offered the explanation that the clause ἀργυρίου Πτολεμαϊκοῦ νόμισμα guaranteed the creditor against payments in the reformed tetradrachm of Augustus. This explanation, in my view, is not entirely convincing, as it was based on the evidence of some wet-nurse contracts, a category of documents that has not yet shown to be in use in the Ptolemaic period, and where it is more likely that the reformed currency was used from the outset; see Hengstl 1972, 61f.
18. It is worth noting that, in the most important bronze hoard of the Augustan period, probably from Abydos, coins from the reign of Cleopatra down to the end of the Augustan period were stored together; see *RPC*, 689.
19. Christiansen 1984, 297.
20. Christiansen 1984, 286–7.
21. See Foraboschi 1983, 101; Gara 1987, 162 n. 26.
22. See Walker 1976, 139.
23. See for instance *P.Lond.* III 1243.9 (pp. 176f) of AD 281, *P.Ryl.* II 165.18 (AD 266), *P.Strasb.* VI 539.5 (AD 290/1), *Stud.Pal.* XX 71.11 (AD 268–270) = *SB I* 5151.
24. Christiansen 1984, 298.
25. The earliest secure evidence for the rate of *prosdia-graphomena* at 1/16 of a tetradrachm is *O.Wilb.* 14 of AD 33. A full bibliography on *prosdia-graphomena* may be found in Gara 1976, 22 n. 4, to which one may add Bogaert 2000, 151.
26. See Gara 1976, 28.
27. See Schuman 1979.
28. See West and Johnson 1967, 11.
29. See Gara 1976, 98, n. 3.
30. See Gara 1976, 99f.
31. Gara thought that the *prosdia-graphomena* included a number of surcharges that existed in the Ptolemaic period, such as the κόλλυβος, a contribution towards the salary of the official who exchanged the money on behalf of the state, or the ἀλλαγή, the fee for the conversion from the silver standard into bronze coins. The reference to both these fees disappears in the reign of Augustus and during the first century AD. On *kollybos* see Gara 1976, Appendix III esp. 182f; on *allage* see the Appendix II in the same book.
32. Maresch 1996, 127 defined *prosdia-graphomena* as ‘Differenzbetrag zwischen theoretischen und tatsächlichen Wert der Tetrachme.’
33. See Maresch 1996, 116–118.
34. See Gara 1976, 21ff; Maresch 1996, 123. To the known occurrences of *prosdia-graphomena* one may add *BGU* XVI 2559.14 and 2603.7 of the Augustan period.
35. *O.Leid.Dem.* 53.3, on which see Bogaert 2000, 155.
36. *P.Amb.* II 31 2.21 = *W.Chr.* 161.

37. See Gara 1976, 26ff.
38. The term *prosmetroumena* is found in *WO* II 716.2 (18 BC), but also in *BGU* IV 1192.18 (first century BC), *BGU* XIV 2375.19 (62–50 BC) and 2435 *passim* (first century BC). *P.Tebt.* I 92.10 (second century BC) mentions *προσμετρούμενα εἰς τὰς καθάρσεις*. The occurrence of this term in *P.Tebt.* I 124.42 (118 BC) is uncertain; cf. *C.Ord.Prol.* 54.
39. See Gara 1976, 42f. To the *καθαρός*-standard was also connected the formula *ἀλλ' κ(αθαροῖ)*, that converted the sum of a payment to the net equivalent. Cf. Gara 1976, 45–49.
40. *BGU* VI 1235.4 records the payment of 10 talents of *χαλκὸς ῥυπαρὸς*. Cf. *ῥυπαρὸν ἄργυριον* in *P.Tebt.* II 519 (AD 11). The earliest evidence for silver *καθαρός* occurs in a lease of land from Tebtunis of around 27 BC, *SB* XIV 11933 = *PSI Corr.* 1150.17, 25. On the usage of the terms *καθαρός* and *ῥυπαρὸς*, see Gara 1976, 37–39.
41. A list of the evidence for *προσδιαγραφόμενα* and the occurrences of the verb *διαγράφω* in the Ptolemaic period may be found in Gara 1976, 28 n. 24.
42. See *O.Edfou* I 40, 41, 120, and 124 of AD 72; Walker 1976, 155.
43. Cf. Walker 1976, 155; *RPC*, 29, 688f.
44. = *ChLA* V 308 = *CPL* 311. The payments were 3 1/2 asses for a *textor* (weaver), 4 for a conductor (hired man), and 6 for the magister.
45. This was hypothesised by Christiansen 1984, 285.
46. = *ChLA* XLV 1340. If the tetradrachm were worth one denarius, two hundred drachmas would be 50 *denarii*, which is a credible figure, given that the average pay of a soldier was 75 *denarii* before tax; see Gilliam 1981, 279. On the Roman as as an expression of the obol, see Harrauer and Seider 1979, 114 n. 7.
47. *ChLA* XLIII 1241.7ff = *CPL* 247, of some date between 29 and 2 BC.
48. On the use of *denarii* and *asses* in Egyptian documents connected with Roman citizens, see Gara 1976, 85. For the use of *denarii* as a pure reckoning unit for the soldiers pay cf. Christiansen 1984, 279–80.
49. *OGIS* II 629 of AD 136/137. Cf. Gara 1976, 103f.
50. Gara 1976, 105, 113.
51. Crawford 1985, 114f noticed that, while Cicero in his *Verrines* calculates Sicilian money in *sestertii*, the contemporary (and even later) Sicilian inscriptions continue to reckon in talents, *tetralitra* and *litrai*.
52. See Gara 1984, 1010f. An example of grain used to pay an account in the bronze standard is *P.Tebt.* I 131 = *SB* XVI 12675 (c. 100 BC), on which see Keenan and Toumazou 1981.
53. See Shelton 1977, 17ff. Cf. Chapter 9.
54. See Gara 1984a, 1013 n. 31.
55. See Wallace 1938a, 74. It could also happen that taxes that were assessed in cash were paid in kind; cf. *SB* XVIII 13087.9 of 4 BC, which mentions a payment in wheat for the bath tax. See Wallace 1938a, 157f.
56. See Gara 1988, 927; some applications of *adaeratio* may be found in Wallace 1938a, 54f, 57, 74, 141–143, 280f. The *adaeratio* of contributions of wine and oil to the army was also known from the Ptolemaic period. *P.Wisc.* I 26 proves that by AD 29 there existed a contribution called *μονοδεσμία χόρτου*, i.e., the deduction of some money from the military pay for the purchase of hay for the army, comparable with

- the Roman *faenarium*. In general, the receipts 'for the price of hay' (ὕπερ τιμῆς χόρτου) probably belong to the context of the payments for the provisions for the army. See Chapter 6.
57. According to a search in the *DDBDP* the phrase τιμὴ πυροῦ occurs in a number of Ptolemaic documents, such as *O. Mich.* IV 1128 = SB XIV 11515 of the second or first century BC; cf. also *P.Oxy.* IV 784 (descr.) of the first century BC. The formula τιμὴ πυροῦ is also found in *P.Gen.* II 89.6 (Theadelphia 5 BC) and *PSIX* 1099.5 (Oxyrhynchus 6/5 BC) on which see Bogaert 1994, 190 n. 337. It is however unknown whether such a formula had anything to do with *adaeratio*. On the *adaeratio* of arrears in the Ptolemaic period, see *O. Mattha* p. 49, *O. Bodl.* II 1779 (AD 11), *O. Mattha* 248, Wallace 1938a, 45, 57, and Gara 1984, 1012f. Cf. also the expression τιμὴν ἐκάστης ἄρτάβης in *BGU* IV 1142.15f (25/24 BC).
  58. See Foraboschi and Gara 1982, 79.
  59. See Foraboschi and Gara 1981, 336ff. It is worth noting that at Rome the rate of interest was fixed at 12% as early as 51 BC; see Cic. *Ad Att.* V 21.13.
  60. Foraboschi and Gara explained the high rate of interest for the credit in kind by arguing that the price of wheat was more subject to fluctuations than cash, and that a high rate of interest was necessary to ensure against the risk of the seasonal change in prices. See Foraboschi and Gara 1981, 335–343.
  61. Foraboschi and Gara 1981, 342; Gara 1988, 944.
  62. The evidence in *BGU* relating to a rate of interest of 24% either normal or overdue is: IV 1052.43 (13 BC), 1053.19, 25 (13 BC), 1056.9f (13 BC), 1057.24 (13 BC), 1104 (8 BC), 1118 (22 BC), 1120 (5 BC), 1122 and 1126 (9 BC), 1127 (18 BC), 1134.17 (10 BC), 1136 (11/10 BC), 1146 (19 BC) 1147.19–20 (13 BC) 1150.21 (13 BC), 1151.15 (13 BC), 1156.21 (15 BC), 1161 (24/23 BC), 1162.2, 9f (17/16 BC), 1166.9 (13 BC), 1167.8 (12 BC), VIII 1882 (first century BC, reading uncertain). Some of these documents refer to a *diagramma*: cf. *BGU* IV 1053, 1054, 1055, 1115, 1150, 1151 (all from 13 BC); 1118 (22 BC), 1145 (5 BC), 1156 (15 BC), 1161 (24/23 BC?), 1162 (17/16), 1167 (12 BC), 1170 (10 BC), 1172 (9 BC), *BGU* VIII 1792 (first century BC) to *prostagmata* and *diagrammata*; *BGU* XIV 2376 (36/35 BC) and 2377 (26/25 BC) to a *diagramma*.
  63. The question was left open by West and Johnson 1967, 89.
  64. See Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* 1287f.
  65. According to Préaux 1939, 283f, in the Ptolemaic period banks were operating according to a hierarchy from a central royal bank in Alexandria to minor banks in the nomes, *merides* or *topoi* of the *chora*.
  66. See Bogaert 1994, 158f.
  67. See Gara 1976, 119. On government leasing of banks in Roman Egypt, see also Johnson 1926, 446–449.
  68. Cf. *BGU* XVI 2590 II.7f.
  69. See Gara 1976, 182f. On the terms τροπεζίτης (more common) and κολλυβιστής, see Parássoglou 1971, 13.
  70. Cf. a bank dealing with grain in *O. Bodl.* II 2499 and 2500 of AD 16; cf. Bogaert 2000, 190f. According to Bogaert 1996, 405f, this practice derived from the Roman *argentarii*, who were bankers and at the same time superintendents of the granaries. An ἀργεντάριος occurs in *BGU* III 781 of the first century AD; this document was republished by Oliver and Shelton 1979.

71. Normally, people made their payments through cheques made out to the tax collector who visited them once a year or more often; otherwise, taxpayers went directly to the bank, paid into the account of the tax collector, and were issued a receipt by the banker; see the wording  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu(\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma)$  or  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu$ , followed by the proper name of the tax collector in the genitive.
72. *RPC* 29, 688: in Asia, the monopoly of the *cistophorus* was ended by the advent of the Roman empire, but in Egypt the local system remained dominant.
73. See King and Walker 1976, 265. *RPC* 688–690 translated the term *Sebastos* as ‘imperial.’
74. One may hypothesise that the changes to the monetary system were connected with some celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the conquest. This in turn may have been connected with Germanicus’ visit to Egypt, on which see Weingärtner 1969.
75. See *RPC* 688–690.
76. *RPC* 13, 24f, 53f; Bland 1996, 116.
77. Gara’s hypothesis that, in the first years after the Roman conquest, the request for payments in cash to the state was exclusively confined to the levy of the poll tax is attractive, although impossible to prove; see Gara 1988, 937.
78. Hopkins 2000, 256f.
79. See Gara 1976, 98f; Millar 1967a, 184.
80. See Walker 1976, 257.
81. See van Minnen 2000a, 209; a similar theory was proposed by West and Johnson 1967, 89.
82. Gara 1976, 105.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER ELEVEN

1. *SEHWW* 1310.
2. See, for instance, Préaux 1983.
3. For a description and comments on the relieves of the temple of Kalabsha see Winter 1968.
4. Mitchell 1993, 241.

## NOTES TO THE APPENDIX

1. Plut. *Ant.* 81.5. Cf. Geraci 1983, 119, 127 nn. 617–620, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1035. On the refusal of the prefecture of Egypt cf. Julian *Epist. ad Themist.* 265 C; 265 D–266 A. According to Bowersock 1965, 40f Areius had the post of *idios logos* and was succeeded by Theon. Subsequently Areius was sent to Sicily as an imperial procurator; cf. Plut. *Apophtheg.* 207 B. Bowersock thought it likely that Areius, like other Greeks in the imperial court, was granted Roman citizenship.
2. Strabo XVII 1. 53 (819); Dio LI 17; Orosius VI 19, 13–15; on his office see Dio LIII 23.5–7, 24.1; Jerome *Chron.* 188. See also Ammianus XVII 4.5, Suet. *Gramm.* 16. The documentation concerning Gallus was listed by Bastianini 1975, 267.
3. See the first edition by Anderson, Parsons and Nisbet 1979 and bibliography in Geraci 1983, 95f.
4. Gallus was the object of accusations from his old associate Valerius Largus and various members of the senate. According to Dio LIII 23.5–7, the cause of Gallus’s disgrace was that he failed to show proper respect to Octavian and set up images of himself all over Egypt, even inscribing his name upon the pyramids. According to Suet. *Gramm.* 16, on the other hand, the problem was Gallus’ friendship with the

- poet Q. Caecilius Epirota, a lover of Caecilia Attica the daughter of Atticus and wife of Agrippa, of whom the emperor disapproved. As suggested by Bennett 1971, 13 n. 20, the inscription on the walls of Pompeii *Aegyptus Gallo suo salutem* (CIL IV 2107) may have referred to Cornelius Gallus.
5. Cf. Bennett 1971, 17 n. 10.
  6. Cf. Dio LIII 29.3–5; Jos. *AJ* XV 317, and Strabo II 5.12 (118). Strabo XVII 1.54 (819) makes the dubious point that Aelius Gallus would have conquered Arabia if the Arab diplomat Syllaeus had not betrayed him. Jameson 1968, 77 believed that the campaign took place in autumn 25 BC. She allocated the succession from Cornelius to Aelius Gallus in 27 BC, which would fit the theory of a three-year term of office for the prefecture of Egypt.
  7. Cf. Dio LIV 5.4–6; Bennett 1971, 15; the *Res Gestae* 26 mention two campaigns, which were led roughly at the same time against Ethiopia and Arabia.
  8. Cf. Lewis 1995, 183–191; Geraci 1983, 170 n. 829 with bibliography.
  9. Tac. *Ann.* V 8 mentions an Aelius Gallus who was an associate of Sejanus. Bowersock 1965, 128 hypothesised that Aelius Gallus, Sejanus' father L. Seius Strabo, and the geographer Strabo were related by ties of kin, but this cannot be proved.
  10. Jos. *AJ* XV 299, 306f.
  11. Bagnall 1985a deduced the date of this document, 22 BC, from the reference in this edict to Augustus' birthday on 25 Thoth (23 September) of a leap year. Two Petronii, C. and P., occur as estate owners in the Arsinoite nome, in *P.Ryl.* II 127.4f of AD 29. Parássoglou 1978, 16 n. 20 suggested that they might have been soldiers. This is supported by the reference to a veteran called C. Petronius in AD 34 in *P.Oslo* II 33 V; see also P.Berol. 11649 = *CPL* 257, a Latin letter of recommendation assigned to the first century AD, which was addressed from a soldier, Priscus, to his father Petronius in favour of a third person; this document was discussed by Cotton 1981, 8–14.
  12. The discrepancy between Dio LIV 5.4–6, who dates the war to 22 BC, and Strabo XVII 1.54 (820), who puts it in 24 BC, may be resolved by hypothesising a two-year conflict, as did Jameson 1968, 72–75. On Candace, see possible evidence for a dedication to this queen in *CIG* III 5080 = *W.Chr.* 4 of 13 BC from Pselkis Dakke in Nubia. In my view, however, the mention of a *κυρία βασιλίσσα* might have been an anachronistic reference to Cleopatra.
  13. Strabo XVII 1.53 (819).
  14. On Pedo as prefect cf. *SB* XVI 12531.5 = *PSIX* 1149 and the inscription *SB* V 8797, of AD 3–11.
  15. Bennett 1971, 37f.
  16. However, the reading of the name Lucius has been rejected by Thomas; cf. BL 8, 41f.
  17. This phrase recurs (in the same document) at I.8, II.5 and 7.
  18. Bastianini 1975, 268.
  19. *CIL* X 5169.
  20. *P.Bouriant* 7.4 = Musurillo 1954, no. 16 p. 75.
  21. A Greek inscription at Side records C. Julius Proculus as the *iuridicus Alexandriae et Aegypti* in AD 55; cf. *AE* 1966 no. 472.
  22. Crook noticed that Turranius and Cornelius Gallus were the first two prefects of Egypt to have come from the circle of the emperor's friends. On imperial *amici* as provincial governors, see Crook 1955, 21–30, 186.

23. Possibly Theon was one and the same as the Stoic philosopher of Alexandria; see Bowersock 1965, 37.
24. On Turranius see *PIR<sup>1</sup>* T 296 and 297; Crook 1955, 186; Bastianini 1975, 268.
25. Bennert 1971, 35f.
26. Bastianini 1975, 269 n.1.
27. On Q. Ostorius Scapula prefect of the *praetorium* in 2 BC, see Dio LV 10.10. More information on the family of the Ostorii Scapulae may be found in Hanson 1982, 243–253.
28. Dio LV 7.6. Cf. Aquila in *PIR<sup>2</sup>* A 979, 980, and C. Julius Aquila in *PIR<sup>2</sup>* C 165.
29. The archive of Sarabous was republished and discussed by Messeri Savorelli in *CPR* XV; on the obelisk see Pliny *NH* XXXVI 69; on the edict of Capito, *OGIS* II 665.28. On Maximus, see also Rea 1968, 365–367.
30. Philo *Flacc.* 10.74. Here we find the term ‘genarch,’ which probably indicated the ethnarch of the Jews. On Philo’s passage see the corrections by Rea 1968, 365–367.
31. Dio LVII 10.5; cf. Suer. *Tib.* 32.2.
32. Bennert 1971, 49f.
33. Dio LVIII 19.6; the only other reference to his prefecture is Pliny *NH* VI 160.
34. See Crook 1955, 183 and Bastianini 1975, 270.
35. Galerius is cited in two inscriptions on behalf of Tiberius, *IGRR* I 1150 and *SB* V 7256, and in an honorary decree set up by the citizens of Bousiris for their *strategos*, *SB* V 7738. However, it seems that Tiberius used to keep his functionaries in office for a long time; cf. Jos. *AJ* XVIII 170, 172–176; Tac. *Ann.* I 80; Suer. *Tib.* 41; and see Balconi 1984b, 1100 n. 8.
36. On Seneca’s *avunculus* see Rea in *P.Oxy.* LV p. 183 and Corbier 1991.
37. On Gallio see Syme 1989, 354, *PIR<sup>2</sup>* I 756. He was consul in AD 32 and a *satelles Seiani* according to Tac. *Ann.* VI 3.
38. *SB* I 3924.14 = *Sel.Pap.* II 211.14; cf. Oliver and Clinron 1989, nos. 16–17.
39. In *P.Fouad* 21.7, the word [χιλιάρ]ρχων is restored; see Haensch 1997, 223f. On L. Baebius Aurelius Iuninus, prefect in AD 212/3, see Bastianini 1975, 306 + 1980, 86. The passage from the post of *tribunus militum* (χιλιάρχος) to that of provincial procurator is documented; see the example of C. Julius Proculus in AD 55 in Chapter 4.
40. Cf. *PIR<sup>2</sup>* H 168, Bastianini 1975, 270. Rea (*P.Oxy.* LV 3807 pp. 182f) hypothesised that Hiberus was not M. Anronius but P. Flavius, and connected him with an inscription from the Small Oasis, *BIFAO* 73 (1973), 183 of 29 August AD 28, a dedication on behalf of Tiberius, Livia and their domus to Herakles Kallinikos and Ammon. On *P.Oxy.* 3807 see BL 9, 205 and 10, 155.
41. Dio LVII 19.6. See also Philo *Flacc.* 2. The hypothesis that the literary sources got the succession wrong was first held by Milne 1924<sup>3</sup>, 280f.
42. See Philo *Flacc.* 2 ed. Cohn VI p. 120.12 ὁ Φλάκκος οὖν οὐτός . . . μετὰ τὴν Ἰβήρου (Ἰβήρου S. Reiter βήρου Γ σεβήρου ceteri).
43. Cf. Foraboschi 1967, 172–176. A Lucius Septimius owner of a vineyard occurs in *P.Lond.* II 195.16 pp. 127f = *P.Ryl.* II p. 255 (AD 37); some οὐσιακὰ ἐδάφη of Severus occur in *P.Mil.Vogl.* I 4 from Tebrunis; a ‘Severian’ bath in the Arsinoire occurs in *P.Lond.* III 1177.30 p. 182 of AD 113. Among the Severi who are documented in this period there are a friend of Horace, eques Romanus, referred to in a letter of Augustus to Horace (*PIR<sup>1</sup>* S 306); an intellectual mentioned by Quintilian

- (PIR<sup>1</sup> S 309); and the ancestor of the future emperor L. Septimius Severus (PIR<sup>1</sup> S 342).
44. Philo's *In Flaccum* was dismissed by modern scholarship as rhetorical exaggeration. The sources on Flaccus are listed in Bastianini 1975, 271 and 1980, 75f.
  45. Flaccus is also mentioned in Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium* 20.132 as the ἐπίτροπος τῆς χώρας, while in Philo's *De Somniis* there is a speech that was dubiously assigned to Flaccus. *P.Oxy.* VIII 1089 = Musurillo 1954, 93–104 describes the night-meeting of Flaccus with Dionysius (probably the C. Julius Dionysius in the *legatio* of AD 41 to Claudius) Isidorus and Aphrodisia at the Serapeum of Alexandria; according to Musurillo, the document may represent the illegal negotiations of the prefect with the Alexandrian faction in AD 37/38. Cf. Musurillo 1954, 102–104 on the family connection between Dionysius and Theon. On the Isidoros who was gymnasiarch of Alexandria under Flaccus, see Lukaszewicz's commentary to *P.Thomas* 10.
  46. Cf. Chalon 1964, 144f.
  47. Dates are approximate.



*This page intentionally left blank*

# Bibliography

- ABBOTT, F. F. and JOHNSON, A. C. (1926), *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- ABD-EL GHANY, M. (1990), 'Notes on the penthemeral reports of revenue accounts in Roman Egypt,' *ZPE* 82: 107–113.
- ALSTON, R. (1994), 'Roman Military Pay from Caesar to Diocletian,' *JRS* 84: 113–123.
- (1995), *Soldier and Society in Roman Egypt: a Social History* (London: Routledge).
- (2000), *The City in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (London: Routledge).
- ALY, Z. (1995), 'The Judicial System at Work in Ptolemaic Egyptian Law Courts,' *Essays and papers: a miscellaneous output of Greek papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Athens: Greek Papyrological Society): 9–34.
- AMBAGLIO, D. (1987), 'Tensioni etniche e sociali nella *chora* tolemaica,' in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi Ellenistici II* (Pisa: Giardini): 129–162.
- AMELOTTI, M. (1966), *Il testamento romano attraverso la prassi documentale* (Firenze: Le Monnier).
- (1989), 'L'Egitto augusteo tra novità e continuità: una lettura della più recente bibliografia,' in L. Criscuolo and G. Geraci (eds.), *Egitto e storia antica dall'Ellenismo all'età araba. Bilancio di un confronto, Atti del Colloquio internazionale. Bologna, 31 agosto–2 settembre 1987*: 243–250.
- (1990), 'L'Egitto augusteo tra novità e continuità,' *JJP* 20: 19–24.
- (2001), 'Leggi greche in diritto romano,' *Minima Epigraphica et Papyrologica* 4: 11–24.
- ANDERSON, R. D., PARSONS, P. J. and NISBET, R. G. M. (1979), 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrim,' *JRS* 69: 125–155.
- ANDORLINI, I. and MARCONI, A. (1999), 'L'orzo nell'Egitto greco-romano,' in D. Vera (ed.), *Demografia, sistemi agrari, regimi alimentari nel mondo antico. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Parma 17–19 ottobre 1997)* (Bari: Edipuglia): 325–344.
- ANDREAU, J. (1999), *Banking and Business in the Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- ARJAVA, A. (1996), *Women and Law in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- ARMONI, Ch. (2000), 'Drei prolemäische Papyri der Heidelberger Sammlung,' *ZPE* 132: 225–239.
- (2001), 'Hebdomekontarouroi in nummerierten Hipparchien: SB XXII 15213,' *ZPE* 137: 237–239.
- ATKINSON, K. M. T. (1966), 'The third Cyrene Edict of Augustus,' in *Ancient society and institutions: studies presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his 75<sup>th</sup> birthday* (Oxford: Blackwell): 21–36.

- AUBERT, J. -J. (1987), 'Transfer of Money-Tax from the Village of Theadelphia to the Village of Apias. P.Col.inv. 192,' *BASP* 24: 127-131.
- (1994), *Business Managers in Ancient Rome. A Social and Economic Study of Institores, 200 B.C.—A.D. 250* (Leiden: Brill).
- AVOGADRO, S. (1934), 'Alcune osservazioni sulle tasse del bestiame nell'Egitto greco-romano,' *Aegyptus* 14: 293-297.
- (1935), 'Le ἀπογραφὰὶ di proprietà nell'Egitto greco-romano,' *Aegyptus* 15: 131-206.
- BAGNALL, R. S. (1971), 'The Ptolemaic Trierarchs,' *CE* 46: 356-362.
- (1976), *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt* (Leiden: Brill).
- (1977), 'Army and Police in Roman Upper Egypt,' *JARCE* 14: 67-86.
- (1982), 'Papyrology and Ptolemaic History,' *Classical World* 76: 13-22.
- (1985a), 'Publius Petronius Augustan Prefect of Egypt,' *YCS* 28: 85-94.
- (1985b), 'Agricultural Productivity and Taxation in Later Roman Egypt,' *TAPA* 115: 289-308.
- (1991a), 'A trick a day to keep the tax man at bay? The prostitution-tax in Roman Egypt,' *BASP* 28: 5-12.
- (1991b), 'The Beginnings of the Roman Census in Egypt,' *GRBS* 32: 255-265.
- (1993), 'Managing Estates in Roman Egypt—a review article,' *BASP* 30: 127-135.
- (1995), *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History* (London: Routledge).
- (1997), 'A kindler, gentler army?,' *JRA* 10: 504-512.
- BAGNALL, R. S. and FRIER, B. W. (1994), *The Demography of Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- BAGNALL, R. S., FRIER, B., and RUTHERFORD, I. C. (1997), *The Census Register P.Oxy. 984: The Reverse of Pindar's Paean, Pap.Brux. 29* (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique Reine Elisabeth).
- BAGNALL, R. S., HELMS, C. H., and VERHOOGT, A. M. F. W. (2000), *Documents from Berenike I: Greek Ostraka from the 1996-1998 Seasons, Pap. Brux. 31* (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique Reine Elisabeth).
- BAILEY, D. M. (1991), *Excavations at el-Ashmunein IV. Hermopolis Magna: Buildings of the Roman period* (London: British Museum).
- (1996), *Archaeological Research in Roman Egypt: the Proceedings of the Seventeenth Classical Colloquium of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum held on 1-4 December, 1993, JRA Suppl. 19*.
- BALCONI, C. (1976), 'Documenti greci e latini d'Egitto di età augustea,' *Aegyptus* 66: 208-286.
- (1984a), 'Απογραφὰὶ προβάτων καὶ οἰγῶν dell'età di Tiberio e Caligola,' *Aegyptus* 64: 35-60.
- (1984b), 'La prefettura d'Egitto di C. Galerius,' *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983*: 1099-1105.
- (1985), 'Alessandria nell'età augustea: aspetti di vita,' *Egitto e società antica, Atti del Convegno Torino 8/9 VI-23/24 XI 1984*: 181-196.
- (1990), 'Le dichiarazioni di bestiame ed il controllo del patrimonio zootecnico nell'Egitto romano,' *Aegyptus* 70: 113-122.
- (1993), 'Rabirio Postumo in P.Med. inv. 68.53?,' *Aegyptus* 73: 3-20.
- (1994), 'Rabirio Postumo *dioiketes* d'Egitto: prima testimonianza papiracea,' *Proceedings of the 20<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Papyrologists, Copenhagen 23-29 August, 1992*: 219-222.

- BARI, S. A. (1992), 'Economic interests of Augustan Rome in Egypt,' in *Roma e l'Egitto nell'Antichità classica, Atti del I Congresso Internazionale Italo-Egiziano, Cairo, 6-9 Febbraio 1989*: 69-76.
- BASTIANINI, G. (1972), *Gli strateghi dell'Arsinoites in epoca romana (Pap.Brux. 11)* (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique reine Elisabeth).
- (1975), 'Lista dei prefetti d'Egitto dal 30<sup>a</sup> al 299<sup>p</sup>,' *ZPE* 17: 263-328.
- (1978), 'Successioni nella prefettura d'Egitto,' *Aegyptus* 58: 168-171.
- (1980a), 'Aggiunte e correzioni,' *ZPE* 38: 75-89.
- (1980b), 'Frammento di petizione a uno stratego dell'Heracleopolites,' *ZPE* 39: 148-154.
- (1982), 'Lista degli strateghi dell'Hermopolites in epoca romana,' *ZPE* 47: 211-227.
- (1984), 'La titolatura del prefetto d'Egitto nella documentazione greca: precisazioni di tipologia formulare,' *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983*: 1335-1340.
- (1985), 'Le istituzioni pubbliche dell'Egitto romano,' in *Egitto e società antica, Atti del Convegno Torino 8/9 VI-23/24 XI 1984*: 197-209.
- (1988), 'Il prefetto d'Egitto (30 a. C. - 297 d. C.): Addenda (1973-1985),' *ANRW* II 10.1: 503-517.
- BASTIANINI, G. and WHITEHORNE, J. E. G. (1987), *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt: Chronological List and Index, Pap.Flor.15*, Firenze: Gonnelli.
- BELL, H. I. (1934), 'Egypt under the Early Principate,' *The Cambridge Ancient History* X: 284-315.
- (1938), 'Roman Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian,' *CE* 13: 347-363.
- (1948), *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest: a Study in the Diffusion and Decay of Hellenism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- BEN ZEEV PUCCI, M. (1998), *Jewish Rights in the Roman World. The Greek and Roman Documents quoted by Josephus, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* 74 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- BENGTSON, H. (1937), *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit: ein Betrag zum antiken Staatsrecht* (München: Beck).
- BENNETT, R. E. (1971), *The Prefects of Roman Egypt: 30 B.C.-69 A.D.* (Diss. Ann Arbor).
- BÉRANGER, J. (1966), 'Fortune privée impériale et état,' *Mélanges offerts à M. Georges Bonnard à l'occasion de son quatrevingtième anniversaire* (Genève: Drotz): 151-160.
- BERNARD, A. (1992), *La prose sur pierre dans l'Égypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: ed. du Centre national de la recherche scientifique).
- BERNARD, E. (1991), 'Dedicace d'un ilarque (18 av. J.-C.),' *ZPE* 87: 53-55.
- BICKERMAN, E. J. (1980), *Chronology of the Ancient World* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (New York: Cornell University Press).
- BIEZUNSKA-MALOWIST, I. (1966), 'Les affranchis dans les papyrus de l'époque ptolémaïque et romaine,' *Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Milano 2-8 Settembre 1965*: 433-443.
- (1973), 'La propriété foncière dans l'Égypte romaine et le rôle de l'élément romain,' in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne* (Paris: Mouton): 253-265.
- (1975), 'Les Citoyens romains à Oxyrhynchus aux deux premiers siècles de l'Empire,' *Le Monde Grec. Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université): 741-747.
- (1984), *La schiavitù nell'Egitto Greco-Romano* (Roma: Edirori Riuniti. Original title: *L'esclavage dans l'Égypte gréco-romain*, I-II, Warsaw 1974-1977).

- BINGEN, J. (1983), 'Les cavaliers catœques de l'Héracléopolite au I<sup>er</sup> siècle,' *Egypt and the Hellenistic World, Studia Hellenistica* 27 (Leuven): 1–12.
- (1995), 'Les ordonnances royales C.Ord.Procl. 75/76 (Héracléopolis, 41 avant J.-C.),' *CE* 70: 206–222.
- (1996), 'Le P.Prag. II 204 et la comptabilité des *phrontides* de type héroninien,' *CE* 71: 122–128.
- BIRKS, P., RODGER, A., and RICHARDSON, J. S. (1984), 'Further Aspects of the *Tabula Contrebiensis*,' *JRS* 74: 45–73.
- BIRLEY, E. (1978), 'Units named after their commanders,' *Ancient Society* 9: 257–273 = *The Roman Army: Papers, 1929–86* (Amsterdam: Gieben): 268–284.
- BISCOTTINI, M. V. (1966), 'L'archivio di Tryphon, tessitore di Ossirinco,' *Aegyptus* 46: 60–90 and 186–292.
- BLAND, R. (1996), 'The Roman coinage of Alexandria 30 BC–AD 296: Interplay between Roman and local designs,' in D. M. Bailey (ed.), *Archaeological Research in Roman Egypt, JRA Suppl.* 19: 113–127.
- BÖHN, R. (1953), 'Contribution a l'étude de l'administration romaine en Égypte,' *Hermes* 81: 465–480.
- (1956), 'Contribution a l'étude de l'administration romaine en Égypte,' *Aegyptus* 36: 254–274.
- BOGAERT, R. (1980), 'Reçus d'impôts thébains,' *CE* 55: 290–291.
- (1991), 'La banque de Memnonia: une mise au point,' *ZPE* 86: 259–263.
- (1994), 'Banques et banquiers à Thèbes à l'époque romaine,' *ZPE* 57 (1984) 241–296 = *Trapezitica Aegyptiaca, Pap. Flor.* 25 (Firenze: Gonnelli): 153–204.
- (1988), 'Les opérations en nature des banques en Égypte gréco-romaine,' *Ancient Society* 19 (1988), 213–224 = *Trapezitica Aegyptiaca, Pap. Flor.* 25 (Firenze: Gonnelli): 397–406.
- (1994), 'Les banques affermées de l'Égypte romaine,' *Trapezitica Aegyptiaca, Pap. Flor.* 25 (Firenze: Gonnelli): 77–94.
- (1983), 'Les κολλυβιστικὰί τράπεζαι dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine,' *Anagennesis* 3 (1983), 21–64 = *Trapezitica Aegyptiaca, Pap. Flor.* 25 (Firenze: Gonnelli): 95–121.
- (1989), 'Listes de taxes et banques dans l'Égypte romaine,' *ZPE* 79 (1989), 207–226 = *Trapezitica Aegyptiaca, Pap. Flor.* 25 (Firenze: Gonnelli): 363–386.
- (1987), 'Recherches sur la banque en Égypte greco-romaine,' in T. Hackens and P. Marchetti (eds.), *Histoire économique de l'antiquité, Séminaire de Numismatique Marcel Hoc*, Louvain-la-Neuve (1987), 49–77 = *Trapezitica Aegyptiaca, Pap. Flor.* 25 (Firenze: Gonnelli): 1–24.
- (1998/99), 'Les opérations des banques de l'Égypte ptolémaïque,' *Ancient Society* 29: 49–145.
- (2000), 'Les opérations des banques de l'Égypte romaine,' *Ancient Society* 30: 135–270.
- BONNEAU, D. (1971), *Le fisc et le Nil: incidences des irrégularités de la crue du Nil sur la fiscalité foncière dans l'Égypte grecque et romaine* (Paris: Cujas).
- (1983), 'Recherches sur le *kyriakos logos*. Commentaire de P.Oxy. 2847,' *JJP* 19: 131–153.
- (1993), *Le régime administratif de l'eau du Nil dans l'Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine* (Leiden: Brill).
- BOTTI, G. (1957), 'Papiri demotici dell'epoca imperiale da Tebtunis,' *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni* II (Milano: Ceschina): 75–86.
- BOULVERT, G. (1970), *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le haut-empire romain. Rôle politique et administratif, Biblioteca di Labeo* 4 (Napoli: Jovene).

- BOWERSOCK, G. W. (1965), *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).  
 —(1983), *Roman Arabia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- BOWMAN, A. K. (1967), 'The Crown-Tax in Roman Egypt,' *BASP* 4: 59–74.  
 —(1971), *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt*, ASP 11 (Toronto: Hakkert).  
 —(1976), 'Papyri and Roman Imperial History, 1960–75,' *JRS* 66: 153–173.  
 —(1980), 'The Economy of Egypt in the Earlier Fourth Century,' in C. E. King (ed.), *Imperial Revenue, Expenditure and Monetary Policy in the Fourth Century AD. The Fifth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History*, (Oxford: BAR Intern. Series 76): 23–40.  
 —(1992), 'Public Buildings in Roman Egypt,' *JRA* 5: 495–503.  
 —(1996) 'Egypt,' in A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin, and A. W. Lintott (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) X: 676–702.  
 —(1996) 'Provincial Administration and Taxation,' in A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin, and A. W. Lintott (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) X: Chapter X.  
 —(1996b), *Egypt after the Pharaohs: 332 BC–AD 642: from Alexander to the Arab Conquest* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (London: British Museum Press).  
 —(2000), 'Urbanization in Roman Egypt,' in E. Fentress (ed.), *Romanization and the City. Creation, transformations, and failures. Proceedings of the conference held at the American Academy at Rome to celebrate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the excavations at Cosa*, *JRA Suppl.* 38: 173–188.  
 —(2001), 'Some Romans in Augustan Alexandria,' *Alexandrian Studies in Honour of Mostafa El Abbadi* (Alexandria): 13–24.
- BOWMAN, A. K. and RATHBONE, D. (1992), 'Cities and Administration in Roman Egypt,' *JRS* 82: 107–127.
- BOWMAN, A. K. and ROGAN, E. L. (eds.) (1999), *Agriculture in Egypt: from Pharaonic to Modern Times, Proceedings of the British Academy* 96 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- BRASHEAR, W. (1977), 'P.Sorb. inv. 23558 and the New Statistics on Death Certifications,' *BASP* 14: 1–10.  
 —(1979), 'Before the penthemeros,' *BASP* 16.1–2: 25–29.  
 —(1992), 'Egyptians and Greeks in an early *laographia* account (P.Berol. 25161),' in J. H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a multi-cultural society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and beyond* (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago): 41–43.  
 —(1993), *Vereine im griechisch-römischen Ägypten*, *Xenia* 34 (Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz).
- BRASHEAR, W. and HOOGENDIJK, F. A. (1990), 'Corpus tabularum lignearum cerararumque Aegyptiarum,' *Enchoria* 17: 21–54.
- BRAUND, D. (1984), *Rome and the Friendly King: the character of the client kingship* (London and New York: Croom Helm, St. Martin's Press).
- BRAUNERT, H. (1955–56), 'ΔΙΑ: Studien zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte des ptolemäischen Ägypten,' *JJP* 9/10: 211–328.  
 —(1957), 'Zur Terminologie der Volkszählung im frühen römischen Ägypten,' in I. Biezunska-Malowist (ed.), *Symbolae Raphaeli Taubenschlag dedicatae* III (Bratislava: Ossolineum): 53–66.  
 —(1964), *Die Binnenwanderung. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte Ägyptens in der Ptolemäer- und Kaiserzeit* (Bonn: Röhrscheid).

- BRESCIANI, E. (1989), 'La stele trilingue di Cornelio Gallo: una rilettura egittologica,' *EVO* 12: 93–97.
- BRESCIANI, E., BETRÒ, M. C. and PERNIGOTTI, S. (1980), 'Osiraka demotici da Ossirinco,' *EVO* 3: 147–165.
- BRIANT, P. (1996), *Histoire de l'Empire Perse de Cyrus à Alexandre* (Paris: Fayard).
- BRUNT, P. A. (1990), 'Charges of Provincial Maladministration under the Early Principate,' *Historia* 10 (1961): 189–227 = *Roman Imperial Themes*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 53–95.
- (1990), 'Procuratorial jurisdiction,' *Latomus* 25 (1966), 461–487 = *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 163–187.
- (1990), 'The 'Fiscus' and its Development,' *JRS* 56 (1966), 75–91 = *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 134–162.
- (1990), 'Did Imperial Rome disarm her subjects?,' *Phoenix* 29 (1975), 260–270 = *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 255–266.
- (1990), 'The Administrators of Roman Egypt,' *JRS* 65 (1975), 124–147 = *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 215–254.
- (1990), 'The Romanization of the Local Ruling Classes in the Roman Empire,' in *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien* (1976), 161–173 = *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 267–281.
- (1990), 'The Revenues of Rome,' *JRS* 71 (1981), 161–172 = *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 324–346.
- (1990), 'Remarks on the Imperial Fiscus,' *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 9.1 (1984), 2–4 = *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 347–353.
- (1987), *Italian Manpower, 225 B.C.- A.D. 14* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- (1990), 'Publicans in the Principate,' *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 354–432.
- BRUNT, P. A. and MOORE, J. M. (1967), *Res gestae divi Augusti: the achievements of the divine Augustus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- BURKHALTER, F. (1990), 'Archives locales et archives centrales en Égypte romaine,' *Chiron* 20: 191
- (1992), 'Le Gymnase d'Alexandrie: centre administratif de la province romaine d'Égypte,' *BCH* 116: 345–373.
- BURETH, P. (1988), 'Le préfet d'Égypte (30 av. J.-C.–297 ap. J.-C.)—État présent de la documentation en 1973,' *ANRW* II 10.1: 472–502.
- BURETH, P. (1964), *Les titulatures impériales dans les papyrus, les ostraca et les inscriptions d'Égypte: (30 a.C.-284 p.C.)* (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique reine Elisabeth).
- BURNETT, A. (1991), 'The Coinage of Egypt in the Roman World,' *NNF-NYTT* 2: 25–33.
- (1993), 'Roman Provincial Coins of the Julio-Claudians,' in R. Bland, A. Burner, and M. Price (eds.), *Essays in honour of Robert Carson and Kenneth Jenkins*, London: Spink: 145–154.
- BURNETT, A., AMANDRY, M., and RIPOLLÈS, P. P. (1992), *Roman Provincial Coinage I (44 BC–AD 69)* (London–Paris: British Museum–Bibliothèque nationale).
- BUSSI, S. (2003), 'Selezione di élites nell'Egitto romano. 'Epi/krisij ed eia'ksrisij tra I e III secolo d.C.,' *Laverna* 14: 146–166.
- CALABI, A. (1952), 'Ἰσχυρὸν καὶ κράτος nei primi tre secoli di dominazione romana,' *Aegyptus* 32: 408–424.

- CALDERINI, A. and DARIS, S. (1988), *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto greco-romano* (Milano: Cisalpino-Goliardica).
- CALDERINI, A. (1924), *ΘΗΣΑΥΡΟΙ. Ricerche di topografia e di storia della pubblica amministrazione nell'Egitto greco-romano, Studi della Scuola Papirologica 4.3*, (Milano).
- CALDERINI, S. (1946), 'Ricerche sull'industria e il commercio dei tessuti in Egitto,' *Aegyptus* 26: 13–83.
- CANDUCCI, D. (1990), 'I 6475 cateci greci dell'Arsinoite,' *Aegyptus* 70: 211–255. — (1991), 'I 6475 careci greci dell'Arsinoite,' *Aegyptus* 71: 121–126.
- CAPOGROSSI COLOGNESI, L. (1990), *Max Weber e le società antiche*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Roma: La Sapienza Editrice).
- CAPPONI, L. (2002), 'Maecenas and Pollio,' *ZPE* 140: 181–184.
- CARRIÉ, J.-M. (1977), 'Le rôle économique de l'armée dans l'Égypte romaine,' in *Armées et fiscalité dans le monde antique* (Paris): 373–391.
- CASANOVA, G. (1975), 'Theadelphia e l'archivio di Harthores,' *Aegyptus* 55: 70–158.
- (1995), "'Deigma." Tesrimonianze del vocabolo, con un papiro inedito,' *Aegyptus* 75: 25–36.
- CASARICO, L. (1985), *Il controllo della popolazione nell'Egitto romano, 1. Le denunce di morte*, Azzate: Tibiletti.
- CAUDERLIER, P. (1992), 'Les tablettes grecques d'Égypte: inventaire' in É. Lalou (ed.), *Les tablettes à écrire de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne*, *Bibliologia* 12: 63–96.
- CAVENAILE, R. (1970), 'Prosopographie de l'armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Diocletien,' *Aegyptus* 50: 213–320.
- CAZZANIGA, L. (1992), 'Osservazioni sulla successione dei prefetti d'Egitto all'epoca di Tiberio,' *Analecta Papyrologica* 4: 5–20.
- CENIVAL, F. de (1972), *Les associations religieuses en Égypte d'après les documents démotiques* (Cairo: IFAO).
- CHALON, G. (1964), *L'édit de Tiberius Julius Alexander: étude historique et exégétique*, *Biblioth. Helv. Romana* 5 (Olten: Urs Graf-Verlag).
- CHRISTENSEN, T. (2002), *The Edfu Nome surveyed: P.Haun. inv. 407 (119–118 BC)* (Cambridge PhD Thesis).
- CHRISTIANSEN, E. (1984), 'On Denarii and Other Coin-Terms in the Papyri,' *ZPE* 54: 271–299.
- (1985), 'The Roman Coins of Alexandria 30 BC to AD 296: An Inventory of Hoards,' *Coin Hoards* 7: 77–140.
- (1988), *The Roman Coins of Alexandria. Quantitative Studies* (Aarhus).
- CIMMA, M. R. (1976), *Reges socii et amici populi romani* (Milano: Giuffrè).
- CLARYSSE, W. (1985), 'Greeks and Egyptians in the Ptolemaic Army,' *Aegyptus* 65: 57–66.
- (2003), 'Tomoi synkollesimoi,' in M. Brosius (ed.) *Ancient archives and archival traditions: concepts of record-keeping in the ancient world* (Oxford: CSAD): 344–359.
- COCKLE, W. E. H. (1984), 'State Archives in Graeco-Roman Egypt from 30 BC to the Reign of Septimius Severus,' *JEA* 70: 106–122.
- (1996), 'An inscribed architectural block concerning imperial quarries' in D. M. Bailey (ed.), *Archaeological Research in Roman Egypt: the Proceedings of the Seventeenth Classical Colloquium of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum held on 1–4 December, 1993*: 23–28.



- COHEN, N. (1996), 'A Notice of Birth of a Girl,' in R. Katzoff, Y. Petroff, and D. Schaps (eds.), *Classical Studies in Honor of David Sohlberg* (Ramar Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press): 385–398.
- COLES, R.A. (1966), *Reports of Proceedings in the Papyri, Pap.Brux.* 4 (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique Reine Elisabeth).
- CORBIER, M. (1991), 'Du nouveau sur l'*avunculus* de Seneque?,' *Mélanges Étienne Bernand, Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon* (Paris): 165–191.
- COSENTINI, C. (1948–50), *Studi sui liberti* (Catania).
- COTTON, H. (1981), *Documentary Letters of Recommendation in Latin from the Roman Empire, Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* 132 (Königsten: Hain).
- (1999), 'Aspects of the Roman Administration of Judaea/Syria-Palaestina,' in W. Eck and E. Müller-Luckner (eds.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert*, (München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag): 75–92.
- COWEY, J. M. S. (2001), 'A Nore on P.Ben.Mus. 1,' *ZPE* 135: 178.
- CRAWFORD, D. J. (1973), 'Garlic-growing and Agricultural Specialization in Graeco-Roman Egypt,' *CE* 48: 350–363.
- (1976) 'Imperial Estates,' in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Roman Property* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 35–70.
- CRAWFORD, M. H. (1970), 'Money and exchange in the Roman world,' *JRS* 60: 40–48.
- (1985), *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic: Italy and the Mediterranean Economy* (London: Methuen).
- CRAWFORD, M. H. and CLOUD, J. D. (eds.) (1996), *Roman Statutes, BICS Suppl.* 64 (London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London).
- CRINITI, N. (1973), 'Supplemento alla prosopografia dell'esercito romano d'Egitto da Augusto a Diocleziano,' *Aegyptus* 53: 93–158.
- (1979), 'Sulle forze armate romane d'Egitto: Osservazioni e nuove aggiunte prosopografiche,' *Aegyptus* 59: 190–261.
- CRISCUOLO, L. (1978), 'Ricerche sul *komogrammateus* nell'Egitto tolemaico,' *Aegyptus* 58: 3–101.
- CROOK, J. (1955), *Consilium Principis. Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (1976), 'Classical Roman Law and the Sale of Land,' in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Roman Property* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 71–83.
- CUGUSI, P. (1991), 'Papiri latini e critica del testo,' *Analecta Papyrologica* 3: 39–41.
- CUVIGNY, H. (1999), 'Ostraka grecs de Bakchias (OBakchias G 8–13),' in S. Pernigotti, M. Capasso, and P. Davoli, *Bakchias VI. Rapporto preliminare della campagna di scavo del 1998* (Pisa-Roma: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali): 135–143.
- DACK, VAN'T, E. (1977), 'Sur l'évolution des institutions militaires lagides,' *Armées et fiscalité dans le monde antique: actes du colloque national, Paris 14–16 octobre 1976*: 77–105.
- (1983a), 'L'armée romaine d'Égypte de 55 à 30 av. J.-C.,' *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions 26.–30. September 1978 in Trier*: 19–30.
- (1983b), 'L'armée lagide de 55 à 30 av. J.-C.,' *JJP* 19: 77–86.
- (1983c), 'Les relations entre l'Égypte ptolémaïque et l'Italie. Un aperçu des personnages revenant ou venant d'Alexandrie ou d'Égypte en Italie,' *Egypt and the Hellenistic World = Studia Hellenistica* 27 (Leuven: Orientalisre): 383–406.

- (1988), *Prolemaica selecta: études sur l'armée et l'administration lagides* (Leuven: Orientaliste).
- (1992), 'L'armée de terre lagide: Réflet d'un monde multiculturel?', in J. H. Johnson (ed.) *Life in a multi-cultural society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and beyond* (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago): 327–342.
- DANIEL, R. W. and SIJPESTEIJN, P. J. (1985), 'Some notes on the ἀριθμητικὸν κατοίκων', *ZPE* 59: 47–59.
- DANIEL, R. W. (1979), 'Notes on the Guilds and the Army in Roman Egypt,' *BASP* 16: 37–46.
- DARIS, S. (1956), 'Note per la storia dell'esercito romano in Egitto' *Aegyptus* 36: 235–246.
- (1960), 'Note per la storia dell'esercito romano in Egitto' *Aegyptus* 40: 67–72.
- (1964), *Documenti per la storia dell'esercito romano in Egitto* (Milano: Vita e pensiero).
- (1976), 'Ricerche di papirologia documentaria,' *Aegyptus* 56: 47–95.
- (1983), 'Ricerche di papirologia documentaria,' *Aegyptus* 63: 134–135.
- (1986), 'Spigolature documentarie,' *ZPE* 62: 93–99.
- (1988), 'Le truppe romane ausiliarie in Egitto,' *ANRW* II 10.1: 743–766.
- (1991), *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto* (Barcelona: Institut de Teologia Fundamental, Seminari de Papirologia).
- DE MARTINO, F. (1974–75), *Storia della Costituzione Romana* IV (Napoli: Jovene).
- DELIA, D. (1991), *Alexandrian Citizenship during the Roman Principate* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- DE ROMANIS, F. (1996), *Cassia, Cinnamomo, Ossidiana. Uomini e merci tra Oceano Indiano e Mediterraneo* (Roma: L' "Erma" di Bretschneider).
- DEVAUCHELLE, D. (1983), *Ostraca démotiques du Musée du Louvre* (Cairo: IFAO).
- DI BITONTO, A. (1968), 'Le petizioni ai funzionari nel periodo tolemaico,' *Aegyptus* 48: 53–107.
- (1976), 'Le petizioni ai funzionari nel periodo tolemaico,' *Aegyptus* 56: 109–143.
- DISE, R. L. (1995), 'A reassessment of the functions of *beneficiarii consularis*,' *The Ancient History Bulletin* 9.2: 72–85.
- DREXHAGE, H. -J. (1991), *Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne im römischen Ägypten bis zum Regierungsantritt Diokletians* (St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae).
- DUECK, D. (2000), *Strabo of Amasia. A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome* (London: Routledge).
- DUFF, A. M. (1958), *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Heffer).
- DUNAND, F. (1983), 'Culte royal et culte impérial en Égypte. Continuités et ruptures,' *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposiums 26.–30. September 1978 in Trier*: 47–56.
- DUNCAN-JONES, R. (1976), 'The Price of Wheat in Roman Egypt under the Principate,' *Chiron* 6: 241–262.
- (1982), *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (1990), *Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- DUTTENHÖFER, R. (1989), 'Drei Todesanzeigen,' *ZPE* 79: 227–234.
- EHRENBERG, V. and JONES, A. H. M. (eds.) (1955), *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

- EL ABBADI, M. (1992), 'Φόρος προβάτων' tax or rent,' *Proceedings of the XIX International Congress of Papyrology, Cairo, 2–9 September 1989* II: 205–211.
- ELIA, F. (1990), 'I iuridici Alexandriae,' *Quaderni Catanesi* 2: 185–216.
- ELIASSEN-DE KAT, M. H. (1979), 'Substitution of strategus and royal scribe in the Roman period,' *Actes du XV<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Papyrologie, Pap. Brux. 19*: 116–123.
- ELTON, H. (1996), *Frontiers of the Roman Empire* (London: Batsford).
- EVANS, J. A. S. (1957), 'The Poll-Tax in Egypt,' *Aegyptus* 37: 259–265.
- FALIVENE, M. R. (1998), *The Herakleopolite Nome: a Catalogue of the Toponyms, ASP 37* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 'Patterns of the Greek Settlement in Egypt during the Ptolemaic Period. "Old Settlers" in the Herakleopolite Nome,' forthcoming in *Akten des 23. Internationaler Kongresses für Papyrologie, Wien, 22.–28. Juli 2001*.
- FINK, R. O. (1971), *Roman Military Records on Papyrus, Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association* 26 (Princeton).
- FINLEY, M. I. (1985), *The Ancient Economy* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (London: Hogarth).
- FLORE, G. (1962), 'Sul Gnomon § 37,' *Studi in onore di Emilio Betti IV* (Milano: Giuffrè): 543–550.
- FORABOSCHI, D. (1967), 'L'Ousia Severiana: Una Tenuta "Privata" Romana in Egitto,' *CE* 42: 172–176.
- (1970), 'Adaeratio della corvée alle dighe, nell'Egitto romano?,' *Acme* 23: 123–130.
- (1971), *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum. Supplemento al Namenbuch di Preisigke* (Milano: Istituto editoriale Cisalpino "La Goliardica").
- (1972), 'Remunerazione e produttività del lavoro nel P.Mil.Vogl. 153 (169/170 d. C.),' *SCO* 21: 38–51.
- (1983), 'Minima papyrologica,' *PRain.Cent.* (Wien): 101.
- (1986), 'L'Egitto,' in M. H. Crawford (ed.), *L'Impero Romano e le Strutture Economiche e Sociali delle Province* (Como: New Press): 109–125.
- (2003), 'Egitto romano: birra, tasse e inflazione,' *Rivista italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini* 104: 255–259.
- FORABOSCHI, D. and GARA, A. (1976), 'Il rapporto dracma-argento nell'Egitto romano,' *CE* 101: 169–177.
- (1981), 'Sulla differenza dei tassi d'interesse in natura e in moneta nell'Egitto greco-romano,' *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology: New York, 24–31 July 1980*: 335–343.
- (1982), 'L'economia dei crediti in natura,' *Athenaeum* 60: 69–83.
- (2003), 'Egitto romano: birra, tasse e inflazione,' *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini* 104: 255–260.
- FORZANO, V. (1997), 'L'ufficio dello στρατηγός dell'Oxyrhynchites nel I e II secolo d. C.,' *Aegyptus* 77: 85–101.
- FOTI TALAMANCA, G. (1974), *Ricerche sul processo nell'Egitto greco-romano I. L'organizzazione del "conventus" del "praefectus Aegypti"* (Milano: Giuffrè).
- (1979), *Ricerche sul processo nell'Egitto greco-romano II.1. L'introduzione del giudizio* (Milano: Giuffrè).
- FRANK, T. (1933), 'On Augustus and the Aerarium,' *JRS* 23: 143–148.
- FRASER, P. M. (1984), *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- GABBA E. (1973), 'Note sulla "rogatio agraria" di P. Servilio Rullo,' in *Esercito e società nella tarda repubblica romana* (Firenze: La Nuova Italia): 449–458.

- GALSTERER, H. (1996), 'The Administration of Justice,' in A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin, and A. W. Lintott (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) X: Chapter XII.
- GARA, A. (1976), *Prosdia graphomena e circolazione monetaria: aspetti dell'organizzazione fiscale in rapporto alla politica monetaria dell'Egitto romano* (Milano: Cisalpino-Goliardica).
- (1977), 'Supplementi fiscali e circolazione monetaria nell'Egitto romano,' in G. Giangrande (ed.), *Museum Philologum Londiniense* II (Uithoorn: Gieben).
- (1979), 'Tre papiri della collezione Michigan,' *ZPE* 35: 120–122.
- (1984a), 'Continuità e trasformazione nella politica monetaria di Augusto,' *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983*: 1007–1014.
- (1984b), 'Limiti strutturali dell'economia monetaria nell'Egitto tardo tolemaico,' *Studi Ellenistici* I (Pisa: Giardini): 107–134.
- (1987), 'Egitto,' in A. M. Burnett and M. H. Crawford (eds.), *The Coinage of the Roman World in the Late Republic. Proceedings of the colloquium held at the British Museum in September 1985, BAR International Series* 326 (Oxford): 153–163.
- (1988), 'Aspetti di economia monetaria nell'Egitto romano,' *ANRW* II 10.1: 912–951.
- GARNSEY, P. A. (1970), *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- (1988), *Famine and Food Supply in the Greco-Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (1999), 'Malnutrizione e produttività agricola nel mediterraneo antico,' in D. Vera (ed.), *Demografia, sistemi agrari, regimi alimentari nel mondo antico. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Parma 17–19 ottobre 1997)* (Bari: Edipuglia): 11–25.
- GARZETTI, A. (1953), 'Aerarium e fiscus sotto Augusto. Storia di una questione in parte di nomi,' *Athenaeum* 31: 298–328.
- GERACI, G. (1977), 'Un biglietto del preferto Ti. Giulio Alessandro relativo al *conventus* del Menfire,' *Aegyptus* 57: 145–150.
- (1981), 'Ἐὶς τὸ πρὸς τῆς συντάξεως. Note sull'amministrazione militare nell'Egitto tolemaico,' *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology: New York, 24–31 July 1980*: 267–276.
- (1983), *Genesi della provincia romana d'Egitto* (Bologna: Clueb).
- (1985), 'La formazione della provincia romana d'Egitto,' *Egitto e società antica, Atti del Convegno Torino 8/9 VI–23/24 XI 1984*: 163–180.
- (1986), 'Publio Petronio, il genetliaco di Augusto e il 'faraone Cesare',' *ZPE* 65: 195–196.
- (1988), 'Ἐπαρχία δὲ νῦν ἔστι. La concezione augustea del governo d'Egitto,' *ANRW* II 10.1: 383–411.
- (1989), 'L'Egitto romano nella storiografia moderna,' in L. Criscuolo and G. Geraci (eds.), *Egitto e storia antica dall'Ellenismo all'età araba. Bilancio di un confronto, Atti del Colloquio internazionale. Bologna, 31 agosto–2 settembre 1987*: 55–88.
- (1994), 'L'Egitto provincia frumentaria,' *Le ravitaillement en blé de Rome et des centres urbains, Actes du Colloque international de Naples 1991*: 279–294.
- GILLIAM, J. F. (1978), 'Some Roman Elements in Roman Egypt,' *ICS* 3: 115–131.
- (1981), 'Notes on a new Latin Text: P.Vindob. L 135,' *ZPE* 41: 277–280.
- GLARE, P. (1993), *The Temples of Egypt: the Impact of Rome* (Cambridge PhD Thesis).
- GRENIER, J. C. (1986), 'Le prophète et l'autokratôr' *Revue d'Égypte* 37: 81–89.
- HAENSCH, R. (1994), 'Die Bearbeitungsweisen von Petitionen in der Provinz Aegyptus,' *ZPE* 100: 487–546.

- (1997a), 'Zur Konventsordnung in Aegyptus und den übrigen Provinzen des römischen Reiches,' *Akten XXI Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995*: 320–391.
- (1997b), *Capita provinciarum—Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit, Kölner Forschungen 7* (Mainz: Ph. von Zabern).
- HAGEDORN, D. (1985), 'Zur Amt des διοικητής im römischen Ägypten,' *YCS* 28: 167–210.
- (1988a), 'Keine Befreiung von der Penthemeros. Eine Bemerkung zu SB VI 9626 = SB XVI 12989,' *ZPE* 73: 201–203.
- (1988b), 'Paniskos und Papiskos, Strategen des Oxyrhynchites?,' *ZPE* 75: 153–154.
- (1994), 'Zum Ägyptischer Kalender unter Augustus,' *ZPE* 100: 211–222.
- (1999), 'Bemerkungen zu Urkunden,' *ZPE* 125: 215–217.
- (2004), 'Municipal Offices in Oxyrhynchus,' in *Oxyrhynchus. A City and its Texts* (Oxford—forthcoming).
- HANSON, A. E. (1980), 'P.Princeton I 11 and P.Cornell 21v,' *ZPE* 37: 242–248.
- (1982), 'Two Copies of a Petition to a Prefect,' *ZPE* 47: 233–243.
- (1982), 'P. Ostorius Scapula, Augustan Prefect of Egypt,' *ZPE* 47: 243–253.
- (1984), 'The Archive of Isidoros of Psophthis and P. Ostorius Scapula, *Praefectus Aegypti*,' *BASP* 21: 77–87.
- (1987), 'Fragment of a letter from the reign of Augustus,' *BASP* 24: 97–102.
- (1988), 'The Keeping of Records at Philadelphia in the Julio-Claudian Period and the "Economic Crisis under Nero",' *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25–31 May 1986*: 261–278.
- (1989), 'Village Officials at Philadelphia. A Model of Romanisation in the Julio-Claudian Period,' in L. Crisuolo and G. Geraci (eds.), *Egitto e storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba: bilancio di un confronto: atti del colloquio internazionale, Bologna, 31 agosto - 2 settembre 1987*: 429–440.
- (1992), 'Egyptians, Greeks, Arabes, and Ioudaioi, in the First Century A.D. Tax Archive from Philadelphia: P.Mich.inv. 880 recto and P.Princ. III 152 revised,' in J. H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a multi-cultural society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and beyond* (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago): 133–146.
- (1997), 'Isidoros of Psophthis, Augustan Cultivator: An Update,' *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995*: 413–429.
- (2001), 'Sworn Declaration to Agents from the Centurion Cattius Catullus: P.Col.inv. 90,' in R. S. Bagnall and T. Gagos (eds.), *Essays and Texts in Honor of J. David Thomas, ASP* 42: 91–98.
- HARMON, A. M. (1934), 'Egypt. Property returns,' *YCS* 4: 135–230.
- HARRAUER, H. and SEIDER, S. (1979), 'Ein neuer lateinischer Schuld-schein = P.Vindob. L 135,' *ZPE* 36: 109–120.
- HARRIS, W. V. (1979), *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- (2000), 'A Julio-Claudian business family?' *ZPE* 130: 263–264.
- HAUBEN, H. (1984), 'Gallus Apostata. Encore le P.Oxy. 2820,' *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983*: 1085–1097.
- HEINEN, H. (1966), *Rom und Ägypten von 51 bis 47 v.C. Untersuchungen zur Regierungszeit der 7. Kleopatra und des 13. Ptolemäers* (Diss. Tübingen).
- (1969), 'Cäsar und Kaisarion,' *Historia* 18: 181–203.
- (1972), 'Die politische Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Ptolemäerreich von ihren Anfängen bis zum Tag von Eleusis (273–168 v. Chr.),' *ANRW* I 1: 633–659.

- HENGSTL, J. (1972), *Private Arbeitsverhältnisse freier Personen in dem hellenistischen Papyri bis Diokletian* (Bonn: Habelt).
- HOBSON, D. W. (1984), 'P.Vindob.Gr. 24951 + 24556: New Evidence for Tax Exempt Status in Roman Egypt,' *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983*: 847–864.
- HOHLWEIN, N. (1949), 'Evhemeria du Fayoum,' *JJP* 3: 63–99.
- (1969), *Le stratège du nome, Pap.Brux.* 9 (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique reine Elisabeth).
- HOLDER, P. A. (1980), *Studies in the Auxilia of the Roman Army from Augustus to Trajan, BAR Int. Ser.* 70 (Oxford).
- HOMBERT, M. and PRÉAUX, C. (1952), *Recherches sur le recensement dans l'Égypte romaine (P. Bruxelles Inv. E. 7616)* (Leiden: Brill).
- HOPKINS, K. (1980), 'Taxes and trade in the Roman Empire (200 BC–AD 400),' *JRS* 70: 101–125.
- (2000), 'Rents, taxes, trade and the city of Rome,' in E. Lo Cascio (ed.), *Mercati permanenti e mercati periodici nel mondo romano. Atti degli incontri capresi di storia dell'economia antica (Capri 13–15 ottobre 1997)* (Bari: Edipuglia): 253–268.
- HORDEN, P. and PURCELL, N. (2000), *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- HOWGEGO, C. J. (1995), *Ancient History From Coins* (London: Routledge).
- HÜBNER, R. (1977), 'Oath of a Dike Overseer,' *ZPE* 24: 44–47.
- (1978), 'Four Oxyrhynchus Papyri,' *ZPE* 30: 199–200.
- HUMBERT, M. (1964), 'La juridiction du préfet d'Égypte d'Auguste à Diocletien,' in F. Burdeau (ed.), *Aspects de l'Empire romain* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France): 95–147.
- HUSSON, G. and VALBELLE, D. (1992), *L'État et les Institutions en Égypte des premiers pharaons aux empereurs romains* (Paris: Colin).
- JAMESON, S. (1968), 'Chronology of the Campaigns of Aelius Gallus and C. Petronius,' *JRS* 58: 71–84.
- JOHNSON, A. C. (1952), 'The ἐπιβολή of Land in Roman Egypt,' *Aegyptus* 32: 61–72.
- JONES, A. H. M. (1938), 'The Election of the Metropolitan Magistrates in Egypt,' *JEA* 24: 65–72.
- (1983) *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (Amsterdam: Hakkert).
- JÖRDENS, A. (1999), 'Das Verhältnis der römischen Amtsträger in Ägypten zu den Städten in der Provinz,' in W. Eck and E. Müller-Luckner (eds.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert* (München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag): 141–180.
- JOUGUET, P. (1947), *La domination romaine en Égypte aux deux premiers siècles après Jésus-Christ* (Alexandria: Publications de la Société royale d'archéologie).
- KAIMIO, M. (1979), *The Romans and the Greek language* (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica).
- (1981), 'On the Sureties of Tax Contractors in Ptolemaic Egypt,' *Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Papyrology*: 281–287.
- KAMBITISIS, S. (1988), 'Présentation de quelques papyrus inédits,' *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25–31 May 1986*: 49–54.
- KASHER, A. (1985), *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: the struggle for equal rights* (Tübingen: Mohr).

- KATZOFF, R. (1980), 'Sources of Law in Roman Egypt: The Role of the Prefect,' *ANRW* II 13: 807–844.
- (1982), 'Prefecural edicts and letters,' *ZPE* 48: 203–217.
- KAYSER, F. (1994), *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines (non funéraires) d'Alexandrie impériale (Ier-IIIe s. apr. J.-C.)* (Cairo: IFAO).
- KEENAN, J. G. (1982), 'Papyrology and Roman History: 1956–1980,' *Classical World* 76: 23–32.
- KEENAN, J. G. and TOUMAZOU M. (1981), 'Ptolemaic account (P.Teb. 131),' *ZPE* 41: 263–269.
- KEHOE, D. P. (1992), *Management and Investment on Estates in Roman Egypt during the Early Empire* (Bonn: Habelt).
- (1997), 'Investimento e sicurezza del possesso nell'affitto agrario romano,' in E. Lo Cascio (ed.), *Terre, proprietari e contadini dell'impero romano. Dall'affitto agrario al colonato tardoantico* (Roma: La Nuova Italia Scientifica): 61–74.
- KEYES, C. W. (1931), 'Syntaximon and Laographia in the Arsinoite Nome,' *AJP* 52: 263–269.
- KING, C. E. and WALKER, D. W. (1976a), 'Ptolemaic and Augustan Silver,' in D. Walker (ed.), *Papers in Ancient and Medieval Metrology, BAR Suppl.* (London).
- (1976b), 'The Earliest Tiberian Tetradrachms and Roman Monetary Policy towards Egypt,' *ZPE* 21: 265–269.
- KRAMER, J. (1991), 'Die Verwendung des Apex und P.Vindob. L 1c,' *ZPE* 88: 141–150.
- KRÄNZLEIN, A. (1952), 'P.Yad. inv. 25824 a/, b/ U.Amh. 65,' *JJP* 6: 195–238.
- KRAUT, B. (1984), 'Seven Heidelberg Papyri concerning the office of Exegetes,' *ZPE* 55: 167–190.
- KRÜGER, J. (1990), *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit: Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption* (Frankfurt am Main and New York: Lang).
- KRUSE, Th. (1999), 'KATAKPIMA: Strafzahlung oder Steuer? Überlegungen zur Steuererhebung im römischen Ägypten in iulisch-claudischer Zeit anhand von P.Oxy. XLI 2971, SB XIV 11381, SPP IV pp. 70–71, BGU VIII 1613 und OGIS II 669,' *ZPE* 124: 157–190.
- (2002) *Der Königliche Schreiber und die Gauverwaltung. Untersuchungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte Ägyptens in der Zeit des Augustus bis Philippus Arabs (30 v. Chr.–245 n. Chr.)* (Munich and Leipzig: Archiv Beheften).
- KÜHNKE, H. -C. (1971), *Οὐσιακῆ γῆ. Domänenland in den Papyri der Prinzipatszeit*, (Diss. Köln).
- KUPISZEWSKI, H. (1953–54), 'The iuridicus Alexandriae,' *JJP* 7/8: 187–204.
- KUPISZEWSKI, H. and MODRZEJEWSKI, J. (1957–58), 'Hypereraï—Étude sur les fonctions et le rôle des hyperètes dans l'administration civile et judiciaire de l'Égypte gréco-romaine,' *JJP* 11–12: 141–166.
- LA'DA, C. A. (1994), 'Ethnicity, occupation and tax-status in Ptolemaic Egypt,' *Acta Demotica. Acts of the Fifth International Conference for Demotists. Pisa, 4<sup>th</sup>–8<sup>th</sup> September 1993*: 183–191.
- LAJTAR, A. (1992), 'Ptolemaic soldiers under the Romans. A note on the dedication of an ilarches (*ZPE* 87, 1991, 53–55),' *ZPE* 94: 213–216.
- LAST, H. (1944), 'The Fiscus: A Note,' *JRS* 34: 51–59.

- LENGER, M. -T. (1949), 'Les vestiges de la législation des Ptolémées en Égypte à l'époque romaine,' *RIDA* 3 = *Mélanges Fernand De Visscher* II (Bruxelles: Office international de librairie): 69–81.
- (1980), *Corpus des ordonnances des Ptolémées: (C. Ord. Ptol)* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (Bruxelles: Palais des académies).
- (1990), *Corpus des ordonnances des Ptolémées (C. Ord. Ptol. \*): bilan des additions et corrections (1964–1988), compléments à la bibliographie* (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique reine Elisabeth).
- LESQUIER, J. (1911), *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides* (Paris: Leroux).
- (1918), *L'armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien, (Mem. IFAO 41)*, (Cairo: IFAO).
- LEVICK, B. (1967), *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- LEWIS, N. (1960), 'Leitourgia and Related Terms,' *GRBS* 3: 175–184;
- (1962), 'First Century Dike-corbée Certificates: A Postscript,' *CE* 37: 153–154.
- (1965), 'Leitourgia and Related Terms,' *GRBS* 6: 227–230.
- (1968), 'ΝΟΗΜΑΤΑ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΟΣ,' *BASP* 5: 25–30
- (1972), 'ΝΟΗΜΑΤΑ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΟΣ,' *BASP* 9: 61–69.
- (1974), *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- (1978), 'An Early Liturgist?,' *ZPE* 31: 141–142.
- (1980), 'Notationes legentis,' *BASP* 17: 61–65.
- (1981), 'The Prefect's *Conventus*: Proceedings and Procedures,' *BASP* 18: 119–130.
- (1982), *The Compulsory Public Services of Roman Egypt* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) *Pap. Flor.* 28 (Firenze: Gonnelli).
- (1982), 'Soldiers Permitted to Own Provincial Land,' *BASP* 19: 143–148.
- (1983), *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- (1984), 'More on those fugitives from Philadelphia (P.Oslo inv. 1026 = SB XIV 12015),' *Μνήμη George A. Petropoulos* II (Athens: Sakkoula): 71–75.
- (1986), 'Notationes Legentis,' *BASP* 23: 125–130.
- (1993), 'Ἐὐσχήμονες in Roman Egypt,' *BASP* 30: 105–113.
- (1994), 'Olyra = Triticum,' *CE* 69: 138–139.
- (1995), 'Μερισμὸς ἀνακεχωρηκῶτων: an aspect of the Roman oppression in Egypt,' *JEA* 23 (1937), 63–75 = *On government and law in Roman Egypt: collected papers of Naphtali Lewis, ASP* 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 1–13.
- (1995) 'The Limited Role of the Epistrategos in Liturgical Appointments,' *CE* 44 (1969), 339–344 = *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt: Collected Papers of Naphtali Lewis, ASP* 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 108–113.
- (1995) 'On the Starting Date of Liturgies in Roman Egypt,' *TAPA* 100 (1969), 255–260 = *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt: Collected Papers of Naphtali Lewis, ASP* 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 114–119.
- (1995) 'Greco-Roman Egypt: Fact or Fiction?,' *Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Papyrology*, Toronto (1970), 3–14 = *On government and law in Roman Egypt: collected papers of Naphtali Lewis, ASP* 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 138–149.
- (1995) 'P.Oxy. 2820: Whose Preparations?,' *GRBS* 16 (1975), 295–303 = *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt: Collected Papers of Naphtali Lewis, ASP* 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 183–191.
- (1995) 'P.Oxy. 2820: Gallus . . . Vous direz Gallus?,' *CE* 62 (1987), 219–222 = *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt: Collected Papers of Naphtali Lewis, ASP* 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 192–195.



- (1995) 'The Romanity of Roman Egypt: a Growing Consensus,' *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983* [1984], 1077–1084 = *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt: Collected Papers of Naphthali Lewis, ASP 33* (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 298–305.
- (1995) 'A Roman Law of Hellenistic Origin?', *Symposion 1982*: 281–289 = *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt: Collected Papers of Naphthali Lewis, ASP 33* (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 306–314.
- (1995) 'The Demise of the Demotic Document: When and Why' *JEA 79* (1993), 276–281 = *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt: Collected Papers of Naphthali Lewis, ASP 33* (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 351–356.
- (1996), 'Notationes Legentis,' *BASP 33*: 61–66.
- (1997), 'Notationes Legentis,' *BASP 34*: 21–33.
- (1999), 'Οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀυτοκράτορες,' *Aegyptus 79*: 89–91.
- (2000), 'Judiciary Routines in Roman Egypt,' *BASP 37*: 83–93.
- (2001), 'The Demise of the Aramaic Document in the Dead Sea Region,' *SCI 20*: 179–181.
- LEWUILLON-BLUME M. (1979), 'Problèmes de la terre au I<sup>e</sup> siècle apres J.-C.,' *Actes du X<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Papyrologie, Bruxelles-Louvain 29 août-3 septembre 1977*: 177–185.
- LINK, S. (1993), 'Anachoresis. Steuerflucht in Ägypten der frühen Kaiserzeit,' *Klio 75*: 306–320.
- LINTOTT, A. W. (1993), *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration* (London: Routledge).
- LITINAS, N. (1999), 'Official Deadlines in the Documentary Papyri of Roman Egypt,' *APF 45*: 69–76.
- LLEWELYN, S. R. (1994), 'The Development of the System of Liturgies,' *New documents illustrating early Christianity 7*: 93–111.
- LO CASCIO, E. (1997), 'Le procedure del recensus,' *La Rome impériale. Démographie et logistique. Actes de la table ronde (Rome 25 mars 1994), Collection de l'École française de Rome 230* (Roma): 3–76.
- (2000), *Il princeps e il suo impero. Studi di storia amministrativa e finanziaria*, (Bari: Edipuglia).
- LUZZATTO, L. (1974), 'Sul regime del suolo nelle province romane,' *Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema: I diritti locali nelle province romane con particolare riguardo alle condizioni giuridiche del suolo (Roma, 26–28 ottobre 1971)* (Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei): 9–54.
- MACKIE, N. K. (1983), 'Augustan Colonies in Mauretania,' *Historia 32*: 332–358.
- MACMULLEN, R. (1958), 'The *Anabolicae Species*,' *Aegyptus 38*: 184–198.
- (1962), 'Three Notes on Imperial Estates,' *CQ 12*: 277–282.
- (1974), *Roman Social Relations, 50 BC to AD 284* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press).
- (1976), 'Two Notes on Imperial Properties,' *Athenaeum 54*: 19–36.
- (1984), 'Notes on Romanization,' *BASP 21*: 161–177.
- MAEHLER, H. G. T. (1983), 'Egypt under the Last Ptolemies,' *BICS 30*: 1–16.
- MANCA MASCIADRI, M. and MONTEVECCHI (1984), O., *I contratti di baliatico (C.P.Gr. 1)* (Milano).

- MANNI, E. (1949), 'L'Egitto Tolemaico nei suoi rapporti politici con Roma,' *RFIC* 27: 79–106.
- (1950), 'L'Egitto Tolemaico nei suoi rapporti politici con Roma,' *RFIC* 28: 229–262.
- MANNING, J. G. (1999), 'The Land-Tenure Regime in Ptolemaic Upper Egypt,' in A. K. Bowman and E. Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times*, *PBA* 96: 83–106.
- MARCONE, A. (1987), 'La Sicilia tra Ellenismo e romanizzazione (III-I sec. a. C.),' in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi ellenistici II* (Pisa: Giardini): 163–179.
- MARESCHE, K. (1989), 'Zession von Katökenland. Eine Neuedition von P.Erlangen 59,' *ZPE* 76: 115–120.
- (1996), *Bronze und Silber. Papyrologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Währung im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten bis zum 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, *Pap. Col.* 25 (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag).
- MARICHAL, R. (1957), 'Le Papyrus Latin 4 de Genève,' *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni II* (Milano: Ceschina): 229–241.
- MARTIN, A. (1981), 'P.Oxy. II 331 (83), contrat de vente d'une mètrikè oikia,' *CE* 56: 299–303.
- MARTIN, A. and STRAUS, J. A. (1989), 'Le P.Oxy. I 185 et la taxe sur la vente des esclaves,' *CE* 64: 250–259.
- MARTIN, V. (1950), 'Une *graphe andron* du premier siècle,' *JJP* 4: 143–149.
- MASI, A. (1971), *Ricerche sulla "Res Privata" del "Princeps"* (Milano: Giuffrè).
- MASON, H. J. (1974), *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: a Lexicon and Analysis* (Toronto: Hakkert).
- MATTHA, G. (1954), 'The Laographia: its Form and History in Demotic Documents,' *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Cairo University* 16: 51–53.
- MAZZARINO, S. (1973), *L'Impero Romano* (Roma-Bari: Laterza).
- McGING, B. (1989), 'The Taxation of Roman Prostitutes,' *Helios* 16: 79–110.
- McKENZIE, J. (1996), 'Architectural Style of Roman and Byzantine Alexandria and Egypt' in D. Bailey (ed.), *Archaeological Research in Roman Egypt, JRS Suppl.* 19: 128–142.
- MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI, J. (1970), 'La règle de droit dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque. État des questions et perspectives de recherches,' *Proceedings of the 12th International Congress of Papyrology*: 317–377.
- (1979), 'Régime foncier et statut sociale dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque,' in *Terre et paysans dépendants dans les sociétés antiques: colloque international tenu à Besançon les 2 et 3 mai 1974*: 163–188.
- (1983), 'Le statut des Hellènes dans l'Égypte lagide,' *RÉG* 96: 241–268.
- (1990), 'Entre la cité et le fisc: le statut grec dans l'Égypte romaine,' in F. J. Nieto (ed.), *Symposion 1982. Actas de la sociedad de historia del derecho griego y helenístico* (1985), 241–280 = *Droit impérial et traditions locales dans l'Égypte romaine, Collected Studies* 321 (Aldershot: Variorum): Chapter I.
- (1990), 'A propos de la ruelle dative des femmes dans l'Égypte romaine,' *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Marburg-Lahn 2–6. August 1971* [1974]: 263–292 = *Droit impérial et traditions locales dans l'Égypte romaine, Collected Studies* 321 (Aldershot: Variorum): Chapter III.
- (1990), 'La dévolution au fisc des biens vacants d'après le Gnomon de l'Idiologue (*BGU* 1210 § 4),' in Talamanca M. (ed.), *Studi in onore di Edoardo Volterra* (Milano 1971)

- 91–125 = *Droit impérial et traditions locales dans l'Égypte romaine*, *Collected Studies* 321 (Aldershot: Variorum): Chapter IV.
- (1993), 'Diritto romano e diritti locali,' *Storia di Roma* III/2 (Torino: Einaudi): 985–1009.
- (1995), *The Jews of Egypt: from Ramses II to Emperor Hadrian*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (Edinburgh: Clark).
- (1998), 'L'Égypte,' in C. Lepelley (ed.), *Rome et l'intégration de l'Empire 44 av. J.-C.–260 apr. J.-C.*, *Tome 2. Approches régionales du Haut-Empire romain*, (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France): Chapter X.
- MERTENS, P. (1958), *Les services de l'état civil et le contrôle de la population à Oxyrhynchus au III<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère* (Bruxelles: Palais des académies).
- MESSERI SAVORELLI, G. (1998–99), 'Papiri documentari viennesi,' *Analecta Papyrologica* 10–11: 36–38.
- (2000) 'Bilancio in uscita del tempio di Soknebtynis: edizione di PSI X 1151 e 1152,' *Analecta Papyrologica* 12: 163–177.
- MESSERI, G. and PINTAUDI, R. (2000), 'Proprietà imperiali e tasse in un papiro della Collezione Schøyen,' *ZPE* 130: 197–200.
- METZGER, H. (1945), 'Zur Stellung der liturgischen Beamten Ägyptens in frühromischen Zeit,' *Museum Helveticum* 2: 54–62.
- MIGLIARDI ZINGALE, L. (1994), *Introduzione allo studio della papirologia giuridica* (Torino: Giappichelli).
- (2001), 'Ancora sui *προστάγματα βασιλέων* nella provincia romana d'Egitto,' *Minima Epigraphica et Papyrologica* 4: 495–508.
- MILLAR, F. (1963), 'The Fiscus in the first Two Centuries,' *JRS* 53: 29–42.
- (1964a), 'Some evidence on the meaning of Tacitus *Annals* XII.60,' *Historia* 13: 180–187.
- (1964b), 'The Aerarium and its Officials under the Empire,' *JRS* 54: 33–40.
- (1965), 'The Development of Jurisdiction by Imperial Procurators,' *Historia* 14: 362–367.
- (1966), 'The Emperor, the Senate and the Provinces,' *JRS* 56: 156–166.
- (1967), 'Emperors at work,' *JRS* 57: 9–19.
- (1973), 'Triumvirate and Principate,' *JRS* 63: 50–67.
- (1981), *The Roman Empire and its Neighbours* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (London: Duckworth).
- (1981) review of Neesen (1980), *Latomus* 40: 674–675.
- (1983), 'Empire and city, Augustus to Julian: obligations, excuses and status,' *JRS* 73: 76–96.
- (1984), 'State and subject: the impact of monarchy,' in F. Millar and E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 37–60.
- (1992), *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.–A.D. 337)* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (London: Duckworth).
- (1993), 'Ovid and the *Domus Augusta*: Rome seen from Tomoi,' *JRS* 83: 1–17.
- MILNE, J. G. (1924), *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (London).
- (1927), 'The Alexandrian Coinage of Augustus,' *JEA* 13: 135–140.
- MINNEN, VAN, P. (1992), 'P.Hawara 208 Revised,' *ZPE* 93: 205–208.
- (2000a) 'Agriculture and the "Taxes-and-Trade" model in Roman Egypt,' *ZPE* 133: 203–220.
- (2000b), 'An Official Act of Cleopatra (with a Subscription in her Own Hand),' *Ancient Society* 30: 29–34.
- (2001), 'Further thoughts on the Cleopatra papyrus,' *APF* 47: 74–80.
- (2002), 'ΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΟΥ: 'Greek' Women and the Greek 'Elite' in the Metropoleis of Roman Egypt,' in H. Melaerts and L. Moeren (eds.), *Le rôle et le statut*

- de la femme en Égypte Hellénistique, Romaine et Byzantine, Actes du colloque international, Bruxelles–Leuven 27–29 Novembre 1997*, *Studia Hellenistica* 37, Leuven: Peeters: 337–355.
- MITCHELL, S. (1976), 'Requisitioned transport in the Roman Empire. A new inscription from Pisidia,' *JRS* 66: 106–131.
- (1993), *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- MITTHOF, F. (2001), *Annona Militaris: Die Heeresversorgung im spätantiken Ägypten*, *Pap.Flor.* 32 (Firenze: Gonnelli).
- MONTEVECCHI, O. (1946), 'Ricerche di sociologia dei documenti dell'Egitto greco-romano, V: Le denunce di morte,' *Aegyptus* 26: 111–129.
- (1947), 'Ricerche di sociologia dell'Egitto greco-romano VI: Denunce di nascita di greco-egizi,' *Aegyptus* 27: 3–24.
- (1970), 'Nerone a una polis e ai 6475,' *Aegyptus* 50: 5–33 = *Scripta Selecta* (Milano 1998): 83–112.
- (1975), 'L'epikrisis dei Greco-Egizi,' *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Papyrology*, Oxford, 24–31 July 1974: 227–232 = *Scripta Selecta* (Milano 1998): 215–222.
- (1976), 'Il censimento romano d'Egitto. Precisazioni,' *Aevum* 50: 72–84 = *Scripta Selecta* (Milano 1998): 223–238.
- (1985), 'Problemi di datazione: Tiberio,' *YCS* 28 (1985) 267–272 = *Scripta Selecta* (Milano 1998): 77–82.
- (1985a), 'Aigyptios-Hellen in età romana,' *Studi in onore di Edda Bresciani* (Pisa: Giardini): 339–353 = *Scripta Selecta* (Milano 1998): 329–344.
- (1985b), 'Egiziani e Greci: la coesistenza delle due culture nell'Egitto romano,' *Egitto e società antica, Atti del Convegno Torino 8/9 VI–23/24 XI 1984*: 233–245.
- (1988a), 'L'amministrazione dell'Egitto sotto i Giulio-Claudii,' *ANRW* II 10.1: 412–471.
- (1988b), *La papirologia* (Milano: Vita e pensiero).
- (1997), 'Problemi di un'epoca di transizione. La grecità d'Egitto tra il I<sup>a</sup> e il II<sup>a</sup>,' *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995*: 719–726 = *Scripta Selecta* (Milano 1998): 391–400.
- (1999), 'Ringrazio e rispondo,' *Aegyptus* 79: 92.
- MONTSERRAT, D., FANTONI, G., and ROBINSON, P. (1994), 'Varia Descripta Oxyrhynchita,' *BASP* 31: 11–80.
- MOOREN, L. (1975), *The aulic titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt. Introduction and prosopography* (Bruxelles: Palais des Academies).
- (1977), *La hiérarchie de cour ptolémaïque: contribution à l'étude des institutions et des classes dirigeantes à l'époque hellénistique* (Leuven).
- MORRIS, R. L. B. (1975), *A study in the social and economic history of Oxyrhynchus for the first two centuries of Roman rule* (Diss. Duke).
- MOSALLAMY EL-, A. H. S. (1981), 'Public Notices Concerning Epiteresis of the one yteras,' *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology: New York, 24–31 July 1980*: 215–229.
- MUSURILLO, H. A. (1954), *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs. Acta Alexandrinorum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- NACHTERGAEL, G. and PINTAUDI, R. (1998–99), 'Timbres amphoriques d'Égypte (Collection Donato Morelli),' *Analecta Papyrologica* 10/11: 183–187.

- NEESEN, L. (1980), *Untersuchungen zu den direkten Staatsabgaben der römischen Kaiserzeit: (27 v. Chr.–284 n. Chr.)* (Bonn: Habelt).
- (1981), 'Die Entwicklungen der Leistungen und Ämter (*munera* und *honores*) im römischen Kaiserreich des 2 bis 4 Jahrhunderts,' *Historia* 30: 204–235.
- NELSON, C. A. (1976), 'A Receipt for Beer Tax,' *CE* 51: 121–129.
- (1977), 'Receipt for tax on Fulling,' in G. Giangrande (ed.), *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 2: 244–250.
- (1979), *Status Declarations in Roman Egypt*, *ASP* 19 (Amsterdam: Hakkert).
- (1995), 'Receipt for tax on prostitutes,' *BASP* 32: 23–33.
- NICOLE, J. (1906), 'Le domaine du roi Ptolémée' *APF* 3: 225–226.
- NICOLET, C. and LECLERC, H. (1991), *Space, geography, and politics in the early Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).
- NICOLET, C. (1980), *Tributum. Recherches sur la fiscalité directe sous la république romaine*, Bonn: Habelt 1976, transl. in Nicolet, C., Falla, P. S., *The world of the citizen in Republican Rome* (London: Batsford).
- (2000), *Censeurs et publicains. Économie et fiscalité dans la Rome antique* (Paris: Fayard).
- NIELSEN, B. E. (2000), 'A Catalog of duplicate Papyri,' *ZPE* 129: 187–214.
- NIELSEN, B. and WOPR, K. A. (2000), 'New Papyri from the New York University Collection: I,' *ZPE* 133: 173–176.
- (2001) 'New Papyri from the New York University Collection: II,' *ZPE* 136: 125–144.
- NORSA, M. and VITELLI, G. (1930), 'Resoconto di una presbeia di Alessandrini ad Augusto,' *BSAA* 25 *Supp.*: 3–8.
- NORSA, M. (1932), 'Sul papiro della Boule di Alessandria,' *BSAA* 27: 1–16.
- OATES, J. F. (1975), 'Ptolemais Euergetis and the City of the Arsinoites,' *BASP* 12: 113–120.
- (1992), 'The *basilikos grammateus*,' in J. H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a multi-cultural society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and beyond* (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago): 255–258.
- (1995a), *The Ptolemaic Basilikos Grammateus*, *BASP Suppl.* 8 (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- (1995b), 'Cessions of Katoikic Land in the Late Ptolemaic Period,' *JJP* 25: 153–161.
- O'BRIEN, A. A. (1999), *Private tradition, public state: Women in Demotic business and administrative texts from Ptolemaic and Roman Thebes* (Diss. Chicago).
- OERTEL, F. (1965), *Die Liturgie. Studien zur ptolemäischen und Kaiserlichen Verwaltung Ägyptens* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (Leipzig: Teubner).
- OLIVER, A. J. and SHELTON, J. (1979), 'Silver on Papyrus. A translation of a Roman Silver tableware inventory,' *Archaeology* 32: 21–28.
- OLIVER, J. H. and CLINTON, K. (1989), *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society).
- OOST, S. I. (1985), 'The Career of M. Antonius Pallas,' *AJP* 79: 113–139.
- OTTO, W. G. A. (1905–8), *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten: ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- PALME, B. (1989), *Das Amt des ἀπαιτητής in Ägypten* (Wien: Hollinek).
- PAPAPOLYCHRONIOU, E. (2000) (ed.), *Greek Papyri in the Benaki Museum* (Athens).
- PARÁSSOGLU, G. M. (1971), 'A Canceled Order on a Bank,' *BASP* 8: 11–14.
- (1973), 'Lurius, Aelius and Aelius. A Note on SB 10527,' *ZPE* 11: 21–23.
- (1974a), 'A Prefectural Edict Regulating Temple Activities,' *ZPE* 13: 21–37.
- (1974b), 'Four Official Documents from Roman Egypt,' *CE* 49 (1974), 332–334.
- (1975), 'New Documents on the Imperial Estates in Egypt,' *BASP* 12: 85–92.

- (1978), *Imperial Estates in Roman Egypt*, ASP 18 (Amsterdam: Hakkert).
- PARSONS, P. J. (1967), 'Philippus Arabs and Egypt,' *JRS* 57: 134–141.
- PASSONI DELL'ACQUA, A. (1997), 'Il III libro dei Maccabei e l'amministrazione romana,' *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995*: 786–794.
- PEREMANS, W. (1972), 'Égyptiens et étrangers dans l'armée de terre et dans la police de l'Égypte ptolémaïque,' *Ancient Society* 3: 67–76.
- (1975), 'Égyptiens et étrangers dans le commerce et l'industrie, le transport sur terre et la florre, la domesticité,' *Ancient Society* 6: 61–69.
- (1978), 'Les indigènes égyptiens dans l'armée de terre des Lagides. Recherches anthropologiques,' *Ancient Society* 9: 83–100.
- PEREMANS, W. and VAN'T DACK, E. (1948), 'La Toparchie dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque,' *CE* 23: 147–161.
- (1972), 'Sur les rapports de Rome avec les Lagides,' *ANRW I* 1: 660–667.
- PERPILLOU-THOMAS, F. (1993), *Fêtes d'Égypte ptolémaïque et romaine d'après la documentation papyrologique grecque*, *Studia Hellenistica* 31 (Leuven: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique).
- PESTMAN, P. W. (1971), 'Loans bearing no interest?,' *JJP* 16–17: 7–29.
- PFLAUM, H. -G. (1960–61), *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* (Paris: Geuthner).
- (1982), *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain: Supplément* (Paris: Geuthner).
- (1983), 'Le *consilium* du préfet d'Égypte. Sa composition,' *RD* 30 (1952), 117–124 = *Scripta Varia* II (Paris: Harmattan): 250–257.
- PLAUMANN, G. (1919), *Der Idioslogos: Untersuchungen zur Finanzverwaltung Ägyptens in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, *Abh. Ak. Berlin* 17 (Berlin).
- PLODZIEN, S. (1951), 'The origin and competence of the *πράκτωρ ξενικῶν*,' *JJP* 5: 217–227.
- POETHKE, G. (1969), *Epimerismos. Betrachtungen zur Zwangspacht in Ägypten während der Prinzipatszeit*, *Pap.Brux.* 8 (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique reine Elisabeth).
- POMEROY, S. B. (1990), *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: from Alexander to Cleopatra* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press).
- PRÉAUX, C. (1939), *L'économie royale des Lagides* (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique reine Elisabeth).
- (1954), 'Sur les origines des monopoles Lagides,' *CE* 29: 312–327.
- (1955), 'Sur les fonctions du *πράκτωρ ξενικῶν*,' *CE* 30: 107–111.
- (1983), 'L'attache à la terre: continuités de l'Égypte ptolémaïque à l'Égypte romaine,' in *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions 26.–30. September 1978 in Trier* (Mainz am Rhein: Ph. von Zabern): 1–6.
- PRINGSHEIM, F. (1950), *The Greek Law of Sale* (Weimar: Böhlau Nachfolger).
- PRONTERA, F. and MADDOLI, F. (eds.) (1984–86), *Strabone. Contribuiti allo studio della personalità e dell'opera* (Perugia).
- PRUNETI, P. (1975), 'I *κλήροι* del nomo Ossirinchte,' *Aegyptus* 55: 159–204.
- (1981), *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchte: repertorio toponomastico* (Firenze: Gonnelli).
- PURPURA, G. (1992), 'Gli edirri dei preferri d'Egitto, I sec. a. C.–I sec. d. C.,' *Annali del Seminario giuridico della R. Università di Palermo* 42: 487–671.
- QUIRKE, S. (1997), *The temple in Ancient Egypt: New Discoveries and Recent Research* (London: British Museum Press).

- RASCHKE, M. G. (1974), 'The office of *agoranomos* in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt,' *Akten des XIII Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, München 1971*: 349–356.
- (1976), 'An official letter to an agoranomos: *P.Oxy.* I 170,' *BASP* 13: 17–27.
- RATHBONE, D. W. (1983), 'The grain trade and grain shortages in the Hellenistic East,' in P. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker (eds.), *Trade and Famine in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society): 45–55.
- (1989), 'The Ancient Economy and Graeco-Roman Egypt,' in L. Criscuolo and G. Geraci (eds.), *Egitto e storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba. Bilancio di un confronto* (Bologna): 159–176 = W. Scheidel and S. von Reden (2002), *The Ancient Economy* (Edinburgh: University Press): 155–172.
- (1990), 'Villages, land and population in Graeco-Roman Egypt,' *PCPS* 216 NS 36: 103–143.
- (1991a), *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-century A.D. Egypt*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (1991b), review to J. R. Rea (ed.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, LV, *CR* 41: 203–205.
- (1993), 'Egypt, Augustus and Roman taxation,' *CCGG* 4: 81–112.
- (1995), 'Ptolemaic to Roman Egypt: the death of the *dirigiste* state?,' in P. Subacchi (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Economic History Congress, Milan September 1994*: 29–40.
- (1996), 'The imperial finances,' in A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin, and A. W. Lintott (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup> X: Chapter VIII.
- (1997), 'Price and price formation in Roman Egypt,' in J. Andraeu, P. Briant, and R. Descat, *Économie antique. Prix et formation des prix dans les économies antiques, Entretiens d'archéologie et d'histoire* (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges: Musée archéologique départemental): 183–244.
- (2001), 'PSI XI 1183: Record of a Roman Census Declaration of A.D. 47/48,' in T. Gagos and R.S. Bagnall (eds.), *Essays and Texts in Honor of J. David Thomas, ASP* 42: 99–114.
- 'Misthoproasia. The lease/sale of ships,' forthcoming in *Akten des 23. Internationalen Kongresses für Papyrologie, Wien, 22.–28. Juli 2001*.
- REA, J. R. (1968), 'Five Papyrological Notes on Imperial Prosopography,' *CE* 43: 365–374.
- (1982), 'Lease of a Red Cow called Thayris,' *JEA* 68: 277–282.
- REINMUTH, O. W. R. (1934), 'The edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander,' *TAPA* 65: 248–259.
- (1935), *The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian, Klio Beheft* 34, Leipzig.
- RÉMONDON, R. (1951), 'Ἀπορικόν et μερισμός ἀπώρων,' *ASAE* 51: 221–245.
- RICCOBONO, S. (1950), *Il Gnomon dell' idios logos* (Palermo: Palumbo).
- RICKETTS, L. M. (1980), *The administration of Ptolemaic Egypt under Cleopatra VII* (Diss. Minneapolis Univ.).
- (1992), 'The administration of late Ptolemaic Egypt,' in J. H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a multi-cultural society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and beyond*, (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago): 275–281.
- RIGSBY, K. (1985), 'On the High Priest of Egypt,' *BASP* 22: 279–289.
- (1996), *Asylia: territorial inviolability in the Hellenistic world* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press).
- RINK, H. (1924), *Strassen- und Viertelnamen von Oxyrhynchus* (Giessen).
- ROSSI, R. (1950), 'ΨΙΛΟΙ ΤΟΠΟΙ,' *Aegyptus* 30: 42–56.
- ROSTOVTZEFE, M. I. (1902), *Geschichte der Staatspacht* (Leipzig).
- (1941), *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

- (1957), *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- (1994), *Per la storia del colonato romano* (Brescia: Paideia. Translation by A. Marcone of *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*, Leipzig: Teubner 1910).
- (1995), 'The Foundations of Social and Economic Life in Egypt in Hellenistic Times,' *JEA* 6 (1920), 161–178 = A. Marcone (ed.), *Scripta varia: ellenismo e impero romano* (Bari: Edipuglia): 77–99.
- (1995), 'Roman Exploitation of Egypt in the First Century A.D.,' *Journal of Economic and Business History* 1 (1929), 337–364 = A. Marcone (ed.), *Scripta varia: ellenismo e impero romano* (Bari: Edipuglia): 195–214.
- ROWLANDSON, J. (1984), 'Where were the δημόσιοι γεωργοί?,' *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983*: 1063.
- (1985), 'Freedom and Subordination in Ancient Agriculture: The Case of the βασιλικὸί γεωργοί of Ptolemaic Egypt,' in P. A. Cartledge and F. D. Hervey (eds.), *CRUX: Essays Presented to G.E.M. de Ste. Croix on his 75<sup>th</sup> birthday* (Exeter: Imprint Academic): 327–347.
- (1987), 'P.Oxy. XLII 3047, VII 1044, and the Land Tax in Kind,' *ZPE* 67: 283–292.
- (1996), *Landowners and tenants in Roman Egypt: the social relations of agriculture in the Oxyrhynchite Nome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- (1998), *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- RUBENSOHN, O. (1905), 'Ausgrabungen in Abusir-el-Mäläq,' *BSAAC*: 20–24.
- RUPPRECHT, H. A. (1984), 'Rechtsübertragung in den Papyri. Zur Entwicklung von Parachoresis und Ekchoresis,' in D. Nörr and D. Simon (eds.), *Gedächtnisschrift für Wolfgang Kunkel* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann): 365–390.
- (1999), *Kleine Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (Torino: Giappichelli. Italian revised edition by L. Migliardi Zingale).
- SADDINGTON, D. B. (1982), *The development of the Roman auxiliary forces from Caesar to Vespasian: 49 B.C.–A.D. 79* (Harare: University of Zimbabwe).
- SAFRAI, Z. (1994), *The Economy of Roman Palestine* (London: Routledge).
- SALLER, R. P. (1994), *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- SAMUEL, A. E. (1966), 'The internal Organization of the Nomarch's Bureau in the Third Century B.C.,' in *Essays in honor of C. Bradford Welles*, *ASP* 1 (New Haven): 213–229.
- SAMUEL, D. H. (1977a), 'New Editions of two Vienna Papyri,' *BASP* 14: 129–134.
- (1977b), 'Taxation at Socnopaiou Nesos in the Early Third Century,' *BASP* 14: 161–207.
- SAN NICOLÒ, M. (1972), *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*, (München: Beck).
- SCHALIT, A. (1969), *König Herodes: der Mann und sein Werk* (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- SHATZMAN, I. (1971), 'The Egyptian question in Roman politics 59–54 BC,' *Latomus* 30: 363–9.
- (1991), *The armies of the Hasmonaeans and Herod: from Hellenistic to Roman frameworks* (Tübingen: Mohr).
- SCHEIDEL, W. (1996a), *Measuring sex, age and death in the Roman Empire: explorations in ancient demography* (Ann Arbor).
- (1996b), 'What's in an age? A comparative view of bias in the census returns of the Roman Empire,' *BASP* 33: 25–59.



- (1997), 'Twins in Roman Egypt: Postscript to *BASP* 33 (1996),' *BASP* 34: 35–37.
- (1999), 'The dearh declarations of Roman Egypt: a re-appraisal,' *BASP* 36: 53–70.
- (2001) (ed.), *Debating Roman Demography, Mnemosyne Suppl.* 211 (Leiden: Brill).
- SCHNEBEL, M. (1925), *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten, Münch.Beitr.* 7 (München).
- SCHUBART, W. (1913), 'Alexandrinische Urkunden aus der Zeit des Augustus,' *APF* 5: 35–131.
- (1927), 'Die Bibliophylakes und ihr Grammateus,' *APF* 8: 14–24.
- SCHUMAN, V. B. (1957), 'Taxes in kind,' in *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni II* (Milano: Ceschina): 301–306.
- (1979), 'The "Rate" of the *Prosdigraphomena*,' *BASP* 16: 125–130.
- SCHÜRER, E. (1973–87), *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, revised by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black and M. Goodman (Edinburgh: Clark).
- SCHWARTZ, J. (1966), 'Réflexions sur les tétradrachmes d'Alexandrie au premier siècle p. C.,' *CE* 82: 371–379.
- (1976), 'Préfecture d'Égypte et intérim,' *ZPE* 20: 101–107.
- (1982), 'Préfets d'Égypte sous Tibère et Caligula,' *ZPE* 48: 189–192.
- SCOTT, K. (1931), 'Greek and Roman Honorific Months,' *YCS* 2: 199–278.
- SHARP, M. (1998), *The Food Supply of Roman Egypt* (Oxford DPhil Thesis).
- (1999), 'Shearing Sheep. Rome and the Collection of Taxes in Egypt 30 BC–AD 200,' in W. Eck and E. Müller-Luckner (eds.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert* (München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag): 213–242.
- SHATZMAN, I. (1971), 'The Egyptian question in Roman politics 59–54 BC,' *Latomus* 30: 363–369.
- (1991), *The armies of the Hasmonaeans and Herod: from Hellenistic to Roman frameworks* (Tübingen: Mohr).
- SHELTON, J. C. (1976), 'The extra charges on poll tax in Roman Egypt,' *CE* 51: 178–184.
- (1975–77), *A tax-list from Karanis (P.Cair.Mich. 359)* (Bonn: Habelt).
- (1988), 'Notes on the Ptolemaic salt-tax under Ptolemy III,' *ZPE* 71: 133–136.
- (1991), 'More ostraca from the Fitzwilliam Museum,' *ZPE* 86: 267–276.
- SHERIDAN, J. A. (1999), 'The *Anabolikon*,' *ZPE* 124: 211–217.
- SHERWIN-WHITE, A. N. (1973), *The Roman Citizenship* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- (1984), *Roman Foreign Policy in the East, 168 B.C. to A.D. 1* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press).
- SIANI-DAVIES M. (1997), 'Ptolemy XII Auletes and the Romans,' *Historia* 46: 306–340.
- (2001), *Pro Rabirio Postumo/Marcus Tullius Cicero. Translated with introduction and commentary by M. Siani-Davies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- SIDEBOTHAM, S. E. (1986), *Roman Economic Policy in the Erythra Thalassa 30 BC–AD 217* (Leiden: Brill).
- SIJPESTEIJN, P. J. (1964), *Penthemeros certificates in Graeco-roman Egypt (P.Lugd.Bat. 12)* (Leiden: Brill). Reviewed by C. Préaux, *CE* 39 (1964), 220–224.
- (1976), *The Family of the Tiberii Iulii Theones, Studia Amstelodamensia V* (Amsterdam: Hakker).  
 —(1983), 'Eine frühe Landpacht aus Soknopaiou Nesos,' *ZPE* 50: 135–139.

- (1986a), 'Five early pthenmeros certificates,' *CE* 61: 287–293.
- (1986b), 'Some remarks on the ΠΕΝΘΗΜΕΡΟΣ-corvée,' *ZPE* 64: 125–129.
- (1986c), 'ZPE 60, 1985, 279–281: An Addendum,' *ZPE* 63: 295–302.
- (1993), 'Two London Papyri,' *ZPE* 95: 127–130.
- SIRAGO, V. A. (1978), *Principato di Augusto. Concentrazione di proprietà e di poteri nelle mani dell'imperatore* (Bari: Laterza).
- SKEAT, T. C. (1953), 'The Last Days of Cleopatra,' *JRS* 43: 98–100.
- (1993), *The Reign of Augustus in Egypt: Conversion Tables for the Egyptian and Julian Calendars 30 B.C.–14 A.D.* (München).
- (2000), 'A Forgotten Factor in the Debate on the Calendar in Augustan Egypt,' *ZPE* 132: 240.
- (2001), 'The Egyptian Calendar under Augustus,' *ZPE* 135: 153–156.
- SMALLWOOD, E. M. (1961), *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium* (Leiden: Brill).
- (1967), *Documents illustrating the principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero* (Bristol: Classical Press).
- SNYDER, W. F. (1938), 'Ἡμέραι σεβασταί,' *Aegyptus* 18: 197–233.
- (1964), 'Ἡμέραι σεβασταί,' *Aegyptus* 44: 145–169.
- SPEIDEL, M. (1984), 'The pay of the *auxilia*,' *JRS* 63 (1973), 141–147 = *Roman Army Studies* I (Amsterdam: Gieben): 83–90.
- (1984), 'Auxiliary units named after their commanders. Four new cases from Egypt,' *Aegyptus* 62 (1982), 165–172 = *Roman Army Studies* I (Amsterdam: Gieben): 101–108.
- (1984), 'A Spanish cavalry decurion in the time of Caesar and Augustus,' *Roman Army Studies* I (Amsterdam: Gieben): 111–113.
- (1984), 'The Prefect's Horse-Guards and the Supply of Weapons to the Roman Army,' *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology: New York, 24–31 July 1980* [1981], 405–409 = *Roman Army Studies* I (Amsterdam: Gieben): 329–333.
- (1992), 'The Weapons Keeper, the *fisci curator* and the ownership of weapons in the Roman army,' *Roman Army Studies* II (Stuttgart): 131–139.
- STEAD, M. (1981), 'The High Priest of Alexandria and all Egypt,' *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology: New York, 24–31 July 1980*: 411–418.
- STEIN, A. (1950), *Die Präfecten von Ägypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Bern: Francke).
- STOLLWERCK, A. (1971), *Untersuchungen zum Privatland im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten* (Diss. Köln).
- STRASSI, S. (1991), 'SB XII 10788 B: una nora,' *ZPE* 88: 118–119.
- (1997), *Le funzioni degli hyperetai nell'Egitto greco-romano* (Heidelberg: Winter).
- STRAUS, J. A. (1978), 'Notes sur quelques papyrus concernant l'esclavage dans l'Égypte romaine,' *ZPE* 32: 259–262.
- SWARNEY, P. R. (1968), 'Two Papyri in the Library of the McCormick Theological Seminary,' *BASP* 5: 107–114.
- (1970a), *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos*, *ASP* 8 (Toronto: Hakkert).
- (1970b), 'Prefect and Idios Logos,' *Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Papyrology*, *ASP* 7: 455–463.
- SWIDEREK, A. (1970), 'Les Καίσαρος οἰκονόμοι dans l'Égypte romaine,' *CE* 45: 157–160.
- SYME, R. (1989), *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

- TAIT, W. J. (2001), 'Exuberance and Accessibility: Notes on Written Demotic and the Egyptian Scribal Tradition,' in T. Gagos and R.S. Bagnall (eds.), *Essays and Texts in Honor of J. David Thomas*, ASP 42: 31–39.
- TAUBENSCHLAG, R. (1936), 'Die Geschichte der Rezeption des römischen Rechts in Ägypten,' *Studi Bonfante* (Milano).
- (1955) *The law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the light of the papyri: 332 B.C.–640 A.D.* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe).
- TCHERIKOVER, V. (1950), 'Syntaxis and laographia,' *JJP* 4: 179–208.
- THOMAS, J. D. (1970), 'The administrative divisions of Egypt,' *Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Papyrology*, ASP 7: 465–469.
- (1975), *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*. I *The Ptolemaic Epistrategos* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag).
- (1978), 'Aspects of the Ptolemaic Civil Service: the Dioiketes and the Nomarch,' *Das ptolemäischen Ägypten*, 187–194.
- (1980), review to J. R. Rea (ed.), *The Oxhyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. XLVI (1978), *CR* 30: 316–317.
- (1982), *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*. II *The Roman Epistrategos* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag).
- (1983), 'Compulsory public service in Roman Egypt,' *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions 26.–30. September 1978 in Trier*: 35–40.
- THOMPSON, D. J. (1984), 'Agriculture,' *The Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup> IX: 363–370.
- (1994a), 'Egypt 146–31 B.C.,' *The Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup> IX: 310–326.
- (1994b), 'Literacy and Power in Ancient Egypt,' in A. K. Bowman and G. Woolf (eds.), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 67–83.
- (1997a), 'Policing the countryside,' *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995*: 961–968.
- (1997b), 'The infrastructure of splendour,' in P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey, and E. Gruen (eds.), *Hellenistic Constructs* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press).
- THORNTON, M. K. (1975), 'The Augustan tradition and Neronian economics,' *ANRW* II 2: 150–153.
- TOEPEL, L. R. (1973), *Studies in the Administrative and Economic History of Tebtunis in the First Century AD* (Duke PhD Thesis).
- TOMSIN, A. (1952), *Étude sur les presbyteroi des villages de la xw/ra égyptienne*, *Bull. Acad. Belg.* 38 (Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique reine Elisabeth).
- (1957), 'Notes sur les *ousiai* de l'époque romaine,' *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni* II (Milano: Ceschina): 211–224.
- (1964a), 'Les continuités historiques dans le cadre de mesures prises par le Romains en Égypte concernant la propriété de la terre' *Actes du X<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Papyrologues, Varsovie–Cracovie 3–9 Septembre 1961*: 81–95.
- (1964b), 'Le recrutement de la main d'oeuvre dans les domaines privés de l'Égypte romaine,' in H. Braunert (ed.), *Studien zur Papyrologie und antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte Friedrich Oertel zum achtzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet*, (Bonn: Habelt): 81–100.
- (1971), 'L'ousia de Pallas dans *P.Lond.* 195.15–19 (vol. II, p. 127),' *CE* 46: 352–355.
- TREGGIARI, S. (2000), *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- TREU, M. (1973), 'Nach Kleopatras Tod (*P.Oxy.* 2820),' *Chiron* 3: 221–233.

- TURNER, E. G. (1975), 'Oxyrhynchus and Rome,' *HSCP* 79: 1–24.
- (1984), 'Ptolemaic Egypt,' *The Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup> VII: 118–174.
- UEBEL, F. (1966), 'Die Frühptolemäische Salzsteuer,' *Atti dell' XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Milano, 2–8 settembre 1965*: 363–368.
- (1968), *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäer* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
- VANDORPE, K. (2000), 'The Ptolemaic epigraphic or harvest tax (*shemu*),' *APF* 46.2: 169–232.
- VERRETH, H. (1998), 'A Tax-List from the Mendesios of the Time of Augustus,' in W. Clarysse, A. Schoors and H. Willems (eds.), *Egyptian Religion. The last Thousand Years. Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 48 (Leuven): 455–476.
- VILLERS, R. (1950), 'La dévolution du principat dans la famille d'Auguste,' *Revue des études latines* 28: 235–251.
- VON REDEN, S. (1997), 'Money and Coinage in Ptolemaic Egypt,' in *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995*: 1003–1008.
- WALKER, D. R. and KING, C. E. (1976), 'Ptolemaic and Augustan Silver: the evolution of the tetradrachm of Roman Egypt,' in D. R. Walker (ed.), *The metrology of the Roman Silver Coinage I. From Augustus to Domitian, BAR Supplementary Series* 5: 139–159.
- WALLACE, S. L. (1938a), *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (Princeton: University Press).
- (1938b), 'Census and Poll-Tax under the Ptolemies,' *AJPh* 59: 418–432.
- WÄNGSTEDT, S. V. (1954), *Ausgewählte demotische Ostraka aus der Sammlung des Victoria Museums zu Uppsala und der Staatlichen Papyrussammlung zu Berlin* (Uppsala): 25–29.
- (1978), 'Demotische Ostraka. Varia I,' *Orientalia Suecana* 25–26: 3–41.
- (1983), 'Demotische Ostraka. Varia II,' *Orientalia Suecana* 30: 5–36.
- (1983), 'Demotische Ostraka. Varia III,' *Orientalia Suecana* 31–32: 5–32.
- WEAVER, P. R. C. (1963), 'The Status Nomenclature of the Imperial Freedmen,' *CQ* 13: 272–278.
- (1964), 'The Status Nomenclature of the Imperial slaves,' *CQ* 14: 134–139.
- (1964), 'Vicarius and vicarianus in the familia Caesaris,' *JRS* 54: 117–128.
- (1965), 'Freedmen Procurators in the Imperial Administration,' *Historia* 14: 460–469.
- (1972), *Familia Caesaris: a social study of the Emperor's freedmen and slaves* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- WEINGÄRTNER, D. G. (1969), *Die Ägyptenreise des Germanicus* (Bonn: Habelt).
- WEINSTEIN, M. E. and TURNER, E. G. (1976), 'Greek and Latin Papyri from Qasr Ibrim,' *JEA* 62: 115–130.
- WEST, L. C. and JOHNSON, A. C. (1967), *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (Amsterdam: Hakkert).
- WHITE, J. L. (1986), *Light from Ancient Letters* (Philadelphia: Forress Press).
- WHITE, K. D. (1967), 'Latifundia. A critical review of the evidence on large estates in Italy and Sicily up to the end of the first century A.D.,' *BICS* 14: 62–78.
- WHITEHORNE, J. E. G. (1978), 'A Checklist of Oxyrhynchite Strategi,' *ZPE* 29: 167–189.
- (1981), 'The Role of *Strategia* in the Administrative Continuity in Roman Egypt,' *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papirology: New York, 24–31 July 1980*: 419–428.
- (1987), 'The *Hypomnematographos* in the Roman Period,' *Aegyptus* 67: 101–125.

- (1988a), 'More about L. Pompeius Niger, legionary veteran,' *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25–31 May 1986*: 445–450.
- (1988b), 'Recent Research on Strategi of Roman Egypt (to 1985),' *ANRW II* 10.1: 598–617.
- (1992), 'Augustus as 'Theos' in Contemporary Papyri,' *Proceedings of the XIXth International Congress of Papyrology, Cairo 1989*: 421–434.
- (1994), *Cleopatras* (London: Routledge).
- WILCKEN, U. (1885), *Observationes ad historiam Aegypti provinciae Romanae spectantes* (Diss. Berlin).
- (1908), 'Der ägyptische Konvent,' *APF* 4: 385–416.
- (1937), 'Octavian after the fall of Alexandria,' *JRS* 27: 139–144.
- WILCKEN, U. and MITTEIS, L. (1912), *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- WINTER, E. (1968), *Untersuchungen zu den ägyptischen Tempelreliefs der griechisch-römischen Zeit* (Wien: Böhlau).
- WIPSZYCKA, E. (1965), *L'industrie textile dans l'Égypte romaine* (Warszawa).
- (1971), 'Les impôts professionnels et la structure de l'industrie dans l'Égypte romaine. A propos de la κοπή τριχός,' *JJP* 16/17: 117–130.
- WISEMAN, T. P. (1969), 'The Census in the First Century B.C.,' *JRS* 59: 59–75.
- WITT, P. D. (1977), *The Judicial Function of the Strategos in the Roman Period* (PhD Duke University).
- WOLF, M. (1965), *Untersuchungen zur Stellung der kaiserlichen Freigelassenen und Sklaven in Italien und den Westprovinzen* (Diss. Münster).
- WOLFE, E. R. (1952), 'Transportation in Augustan Egypt,' *TAPA* 83: 81–99.
- WOLFE, H. J. (1974), 'Das Vulgarrechtsproblem und die Papyri,' *ZSS Rom. Abt.* 91: 60.
- (1978), *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemäer und des Prinzipats* (München: Beck).
- WORP, C. and WORP, K. A. (1975), 'Index Locorum to S.L. Wallace, "Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian," Princeton 1938,' *ZPE* 16: 81–120.
- YOUTIE, H. C. (1933), 'Family ΣΥΝΤΑΞΙΜΟΝ Records from Karanis,' *Aegyptus* 13: 367–379.
- (1970), 'Callimachus in the Tax Rolls,' *Proceedings of the 12th Congress of Papyrology, Toronto*: 545–551.
- (1973), 'Notes on *O.Mich.* I,' *Scriptiunculae* I (Amsterdam: Hakkert): 63–104.
- (1973), 'Review to S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*,' *Scriptiunculae* I (Amsterdam: Hakkert): 749–757.
- (1973), 'Critical Notes on Greco-Roman Ostraca,' *TAPA* 76 (1945), 140–169 = *Scriptiunculae* I (Amsterdam: Hakkert): 153–179; 170–171.
- (1973), 'Publicans and Sinners,' *ZPE* 1 (1967), 1–20 = *Scriptiunculae* I, (Amsterdam: Hakkert): 554–578.
- (1981), 'PUG 12: τοπογραμματαίς καὶ κομογραμματαίς,' *ZPE* 24 (1977), 138–139 = *Scriptiunculae Posteriores* (Bonn: Habelt): 400–401.
- (1981), 'Ostraca from Karanis (*O.Mich.* IV),' *ZPE* 18 (1975) = *Scriptiunculae Posteriores* I (Bonn: Habelt): 237–252.
- YOYOTTE, J., CHARVET, P. and GOMPERTZ, S. (1997), *Le voyage en Égypte: un regard romain* (Paris: Nil).

- ZAUZICH, K. T. (1983), 'Demotische Texte römischer Zeit,' *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions 26.–30. September 1978 in Trier*: 77–80.
- (1984), 'Zwischenbilanz zu den demorischen Ostraka aus Edfu,' *Enchoria* 12: 67–90.
- ZIMMERMANN, K. (2002), 'P.Bingen 45: Eine Steuerbefreiung für Q. Cascellius, adressiert an Kaisarion,' *ZPE* 138: 133–139.
- ZUCKER, F. (1930–31), 'Γυμναστίαρχος κώμης,' *Aegyptus* 11: 485–496.
- (1964), 'Beobachtungen zu den permanenten Klerosnamen,' in H. Braunert (ed.), *Studien zur Papyrologie und Antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte: Friederich Oertel zum achtzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet* (Bonn: Habelt): 101–106.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Index

## A

- Acilius M.' 5  
Actium 8, 13, 18f, 22, 93, 157f, 192, 224, 244  
Africa 112, 124, 223  
Agrippina 107  
Akousilaos, *dioiketes* of Tebtunis 35, 199  
Alexander, C. Julius 29, 221, 233  
Alexander, Ti. Julius 29, 57, 62, 72, 111, 113, 117, 128, 135, 138, 185, 196, 200, 203, 243  
Alexander the Great 179  
Anthos 109  
Antigonos 19  
Antillus 8, 189  
Antiochos III, king of Syria 5  
Antiochos IV, king of Syria 5  
Antonia, daughter of Antony 129, 226  
Antonia daughter of Claudius and wife of Drusus 109, 111, 151, 184, 225, 227, 230, 234  
Anrony, Mark 7f, 17, 22, 106, 188f, 192, 195, 225f, 244  
Aquila, C. Julius 107, 153, 182f, 186, 250  
Aquila freedman of Cicero 60  
Arabia 18, 180, 249  
Areius 87, 107, 179, 189, 226, 248,  
Arremidoros, *archidikastes* 38f, 205  
Asklepiades 40, 106, 108, 116, 136, 152, 199, 208, 225, 230  
Athenodoros 35, 47, 79, 107, 131, 136, 146, 192, 199, 205, 211, 225, 227, 237  
Atilius, M. 5

Augustus, month (*Sebastos*) 28

## B

- Babatha 52  
Baebius 184, 186, 250  
Baetica 9  
Balbillus, Ti. Claudius 107, 202, 211, 214, 227  
Barbarus, Rubrius 37, 180f, 186,  
Bassus 18, 23, 76,  
Bithynia 1, 51

## C

- Caesar, C. Julius 6–8, 15, 17, 21f, 42, 53, 73, 80, 115, 118, 124, 170f, 188f, 202, 216, 231  
Caesarion 7f, 87, 93, 118, 188f, 230  
Candace, queen of Ethiopia, 180, 196, 249  
Canidius, P. 8, 189, 225,  
Capitol 7  
Capito, Vergilius 183, 250  
Cappadocia 65, 218  
Caracalla 52, 54, 62, 172  
Cascellius, Q. 8, 225  
Cerinthus 109, 151, 228, 234  
Charmos 107, 109, 226, 228  
Chresimos 107, 109f, 129, 228  
Cicero, Marcus Tullius 6, 34, 179, 199, 246  
Cladus 109, 228  
Claudius, emperor 15, 56, 75, 87, 142f, 150, 161, 163, 187, 195, 203, 208f, 217, 230, 251  
Clemens, L. Volusenus 32  
Cleopatra VII 6–12, 18, 22, 75, 87, 93, 106, 114f, 118, 147, 157–161,



Cleopatra VII (*continued*), 167, 170–173,  
180, 188–190, 193, 221, 224,  
226, 230, 234, 242, 244f, 249  
Contrebia 51  
Cornelius 40, 61, 181, 186, 202, 208, 235,  
240  
Crispus, A. Folmius (Fulvius?) 37, 192  
Cyprus 5–7, 170, 226  
Cyrene 73, 198, 211, 219,

**D**

Dacia 219  
Deiotarus, king of Galatia 16, 19, 192  
Dio, Academic philosopher 6  
Diocletian 208

**E**

Elephantine 29, 44, 186, 200  
Eros 34, 104, 107, 109f, 192, 199, 226,  
228, 231  
Ethiopia 22, 29, 179f, 196, 249  
Euandros 108f, 227, 235

**F**

Facundus 19  
Falcidius 107, 226  
Flaccus, A. Avillius 23, 31, 37, 79, 185f,  
193, 214, 251  
Flaccus, Q. Corvius 31f, 37, 182  
Florus 19  
Fronto, Q. Artius 33, 103, 198

**G**

Gabinius, Aulus 6–8, 14, 19, 34, 53, 170f,  
189,  
Gaius Caesar 159, 185,  
Gaius, emperor (Caligula) 147, 185, 201, 240  
Galerius, C. 184–186, 250  
Gallio, Junius 184, 250  
Gallus 31, 182, 198, 214, 225  
Gallus, Aelius 3, 18, 26, 29, 31, 179, 186,  
190, 193, 196, 249f  
Gallus, C. Cornelius 10f, 155, 179f, 186,  
190f, 193, 203, 248–250  
Germanicus 79, 109, 146, 164, 181, 184,  
214–216, 248

**H**

Hadrian 31, 41f, 56, 117  
Harthotes, son of Marres 90, 94, 146, 214, 241  
Heptanomia 38, 73, 201  
Herakleides archidikastes 38f,  
Herakleides, Claudius 34  
Herod, king of Judaea 8, 10, 16, 18f, 22,  
180, 188, 191f, 218, 226, 234  
Hiberus 184–186, 195, 250

**I**

Isidorus, Alexandrian 185, 251  
Isidoros of Psophrthis 67, 111, 117, 183,  
199, 203, 208, 226, 229

**J**

Juba, king of Numidia 9, 16, 192  
Jucundus 109f  
Judaea 10, 12, 22, 29, 126, 133, 136, 180,  
188, 195f, 206, 209, 215, 218,  
234, 236–238

**K**

Kalabsha (Talmis) 170, 248  
Kronios, Ti. Claudius 40

**L**

Lampon 71, 185  
Livia 105, 109, 111, 131, 146, 159, 226f,  
229, 235, 250  
Livilla, Claudia 131, 235  
Lucius 31, 37, 186, 249  
Lucius Caesar 185  
Lupus 44, 131, 192  
Lutatius Crispus, C. 16, 192

**M**

Maecenas 60, 105f, 108, 183, 229  
Maurerania 9, 12, 191  
Maximus, Magius 153, 182–4, 186, 194, 250  
Memphis 30f, 182, 199f  
Montanus, son of Diogenes, *exegetes* 40

**N**

Napata 180, 196

Narcissus 146  
 Naukratis 26, 57, 65f, 172  
 Nikanor, son of Areius of Alexandria 107,  
 181, 226  
 Nikopolis 17, 20, 21,  
 Niger 19, 192,  
 Niger, L. Pompeius 19, 87, 192–194, 216  
 Novatus, Annaeus 184, 282  
 Nubia 179, 249

**O**

Octavius, C. 182  
 Ostorius Scapula, P. 183, 186  
 Ostorius Scapula, Q. 183, 250  
 Ovid 184  
 Ovinius, Q. 9, 147, 189, 241

**P**

Pallas, M. Antonius 185  
 Pedit, prefect 31, 153, 181f, 186, 249  
 Pedit, Q. Fresidius, *epistrategos* 37  
 Pelusium 30–32,  
 Perseus, king of Macedonia 5  
 Persia 42, 78, 84, 138, 148, 153–155, 170,  
 175, 244  
 Petronius, P. 18, 22, 99, 108, 179f, 186,  
 192, 227, 249  
 Polla, Gallia 107, 185, 226  
 Pollio, Asinius 179, 226  
 Pollio, Vedius 106, 108  
 Pollio, Vitrasius 184f  
 Pompey 6, 65, 231  
 Popilius Laenas 5,  
 Postumus, Agrippa 185  
 Postumus, C. Julius 74, 188  
 Postumus, C. Rabirius 6–8, 34, 187f, 199  
 Postumus, M. Claudius 37, 188  
 Potamon, Ti. Claudius 41  
 Primis 179  
 Proculeius, C. 10  
 Pr(oculus) 151, 186  
 Proculus, Julius 32, 249  
 Proculus, L. Antonius 37  
 Protarchos 39, 104, 201,  
 Ptolemais Euergetis 26, 56f, 65f, 172, 209,  
 220

Ptolemy Apion 5  
 Ptolemy II Philadelphos 5, 56, 89, 103, 116,  
 162, 207  
 Ptolemy III Euergetes 209  
 Ptolemy IV Philopator  
 Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II 70, 99, 103, 115,  
 195, 229  
 Ptolemy X Alexander I 5  
 Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos *alias* Auletes  
 5–7, 9, 13f, 16, 22, 34, 114f,  
 118, 120, 157f, 167, 170, 173,  
 187–9, 231, 244,  
 Ptolemy XIII 6  
 Ptolemy XIV 7  
 Ptolemy XV Kaisar, see Caesarion  
 Pyrrhus 5

**R**

Rectus, L. Aemilius 138, 183  
 Rhodes 117, 224  
 Ruphio 7f, 188  
 Rutillius 107

**S**

Sadala, king of Thrace 15, 192  
 Sanquinius, Q. . . . Maximus 37, 200  
 Satabous 31, 48, 197f, 250  
 Saturninus, M. Aponius 107, 227  
 Sejanus 183  
 Seneca, L. Anneus 184, 250  
 Severus 35, 185f, 232, 250  
 Severus, L. Septimius, emperor 67, 167,  
 175, 185f, 209, 251  
 Sicily 51, 55, 119, 164, 179, 218, 221, 231,  
 248  
 Spain 89, 196, 218  
 Spendon, M. Antonius 129  
 Strabo, L. Seius 183f, 186, 215, 249  
 Strabo, Sotidius 79  
 Syria 6, 34, 51, 63, 89, 206

**T**

Thebaid 11, 17, 29–32, 37f, 43, 49, 73,  
 139, 155, 180, 193, 197, 200f  
 Theon 35, 38, 45, 106, 223, 225, 227, 248,  
 250, 251

Theon, C. Julius 40f, 107f, 112, 183, 202,  
225, 243  
Timagenes, historian of Alexandria 9, 189  
Tiro 37, 60, 205  
Titus, emperor 105, 229f  
Tryphon, Ti. Calpurnius 107, 146, 227  
Turranius, C. 29, 31, 78, 91, 94, 99, 101,  
107, 131, 182, 186, 199, 250  
Tyrannus 35, 60, 199

**V**

Vespasian, emperor 95, 105, 112, 174, 218,  
229f

**X**

Xois 19

# Subject Index

- Acta Alexandrinorum* 60, 181, 188  
*adaeratio* 162, 165, 168, 214, 246f  
*aerarium* 6, 113  
*ager publicus* 98  
*agoranomos* 68f, 149, 209  
*ala* 15f, 19f, 22, 191, 194  
*alabarch* 29, 44  
Alexandrians 6, 56, 73, 81, 87, 96f, 101,  
109, 113f, 118, 174, 187, 194,  
203, 208, 217, 230f, 237  
*allage* 245  
*allophyloi* 86  
*amici principis* 108, 180, 182, 250  
*amicitia* 5  
*anachoresis* 76f, 96, 214, 221  
*angareia* 78–80,  
*annona* 29f, 40, 79, 182, 190  
*antigraphis* 30  
*apographe* 85, 89, 91, 217  
*apolyssimoi* 73f  
*apomoirai* 154  
*archai, honores* 71, 81, 210  
*archidikastes* 26, 38f, 48f, 107, 201  
*archones* 125  
*arithmetikon katoikon* 142f, 152, 154, 239  
*ateleia* 111, 224, 229  
*aureus* 148, 163, 175  
*auxilia* 8, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22f, 171, 189,  
191f,  
banks 104, 110, 116f, 128, 131, 133f, 137,  
142, 160f, 166–168, 171, 176,  
228, 236, 247f  
*basilikos grammateus* 31, 42–5, 56, 86, 103,  
130, 204  
bath-tax (*balaneutikon*) 126, 141, 143f, 154,  
232f, 239  
beer-tax (*zytera*) 143–145, cf. 175, 199, 240  
*beneficiarius* 197  
*bibliotheke*  
birth and death declarations 45, 86, 88, 204,  
217f  
bodyguard (*doryphoroi, somatophylakes*), 18,  
134, 191  
*bona caduca, vacantia, damnatorum* 33, 102  
*boule* 26, 66, 73, 172, 195, 208, 213f, 221,  
231, 272  
bronze 89, 111, 157–162, 164–166, 168,  
172, 244–246  
calendar 28, 196  
*cartonnage* for mummies 1, 83, 92, 219  
cavalry office 100, 222  
centurion 17, 19, 23, 46–48, 61, 63, 73,  
175, 192, 197, 205f  
cession 56, 100, 207, 222–224  
*chartera* 146, 154  
*cheironaxia* 147f  
*chomatikon* 75f, 142, 154, 213, 239  
*chrematistai* 38, 59, 207  
citizenship, Alexandrian 232; Roman 8f, 19,  
22, 26, 40f, 52–54, 62, 154,  
171, 179, 189, 194, 198, 211,  
231, 248  
*classis* (fleet) 19, 21  
*cognitio extra ordinaria* 30, 197  
*cohors* 15–22, 171, 191f, 194,  
*comitia centuriata* 84  
compulsory services, see liturgy  
confiscation 23, 33, 76f, 101, 120, 179,  
221, 224  
*Constitutio Antoniniana* 52, 54, 62, 172  
*conventus* 30–32, 36, 43, 48, 59, 61–63, 73,  
134, 172, 181f, 196–198, 206f

- copper 157–159, 161f, 175, 244  
 Copric 57, 169, 171  
 corvée 69f, 72, 75f, 78, 81, 84, 110, 142, 165, 182  
 crown-tax (*stephanos*) 100, 149f  
 cult, imperial 29, 41f, 171, 202  
*curator minorum* 40, 201  
*decurio* 20, 194  
*demos* 26, 172, 210,  
*demosia* 88  
*demosiones*  
*demosios* 88, 98f, 221  
 Demotic 28, 57, 85, 87, 89, 121, 133, 144, 161, 169, 171, 207, 216, 240f  
*denarius* 159, 162–164, 167, 175f, 245f  
*diagramma* 247  
*dialogismos*, see *conventus*  
*Digest* 53, 57  
*dikaiodotes*, see *iridicus*  
*dioikesis, dioiketes* 61, 76, 103, 111, 143, 188, 192, 196, 198f, 201, 205  
 dirigism 177  
 disarmament 23  
*dispensator* 36, 200, 227  
 donkey-tax (*exadrachmia*) 149, 151f, 215, 241  
*dorea* 105–109, 111, 119, 173f, 224f  
*eikosta* 149  
*eiskrisis, eiskritikon* 153  
*emphyteusis* 103, 224  
*enkteseon* 77, 88  
*ennomion* 151, 242  
*entopioi* 20, 101, 194, 223  
*ephebeia* 68  
*epikephalaion* 140, 143  
*epikrisis* 4, 45, 68, 83f, 88, 92, 94–96, 173, 217, 219f  
*epimerismos* 75, 212  
*epistates* 35, 47f, 61, 153, 192, 199, 205, 243  
*epistatikon* 153, 243  
*epistrategos* 26f, 36–38, 48, 73f, 182, 196, 200, 205, 211  
*epitropos ousiakos, procurator usiacus* 109  
*epoikion* 105, 225, 227  
 erhnarch 27, 42, 183, 202, 250  
*euthenia* 159, 201  
*exegetes* 39f, 44, 66–69, 195, 201f, 208f  
 freedmen, imperial 34, 39, 41, 48, 80, 104, 109, 112, 130, 132, 137, 206, 231, 237,  
*fundis* 105  
*Gabiniani* 14–17, 20, 22, 191  
 Galatians 18, 192  
*geometria* 153f  
*georgia* 75  
*gerousia*, Jewish 42  
*gnomon* 103, 223  
*Gnomon of the Idios Logos* 44, 54, 56, 103, 165f, 190, 193f, 206, 223  
*grammateis poleos* 45  
 granaries (*thesouroi*) 105, 130f, 133, 137, 144, 235f, 247  
 guardianship (*tutela*) 6, 40, 57f, 62, 72f, 211  
 gymnasial class 66, 81, 93f, 144, 217, 220  
 gymnasiarch 27, 41, 66–71, 81, 110, 116f, 195, 208, 251  
 gymnasium 67f, 93, 201, 208, 230  
*Hellenes*, 6475 93, 102, 223  
*hemeraí sebastai*, see *calendar*  
*himatismos* 79  
*hipparchia* 14, 21f, 191, 219  
*hyperetes* 75, 212  
*hypokeimenon* 37, 200  
*hypologos* 102  
*hypommematographos* 40, 48, 202  
*idios logos* 26f, 31–33, 36, 41, 54, 56, 102f, 111–113, 120, 135, 197–199, 202, 204, 220, 224, 243, 248  
 inheritance 33, 54f, 100, 112, 120, 124,, 149, 160, 202, 224, 241,  
*institores* 58, 120  
 interest 127, 165–167, 247  
 Itureans 19, 193  
*iridicus* 26f, 32, 36, 59, 61f, 172, 198, 249  
*ius iudicium contentiosa* 32  
*ius gladii* 30, 52  
*ius trium liberorum* 58  
 Jews 7, 23, 29, 42, 46, 52, 54, 89, 183, 185, 188, 202, 205, 218, 221, 250  
 justice 30, 51–55, 57–63, 127, 172, 181, 197  
*Kaisaros kratēsis* 28, 190, 195  
*katalochismoi* 100, 222f

- katalogeion* 38f  
*katoikia* 101  
 katoikic land 20f, 38, 56, 90, 93, 97,  
     99–101, 105, 119, 142f, 149f,  
     174, 207, 209, 213, 219, 222f,  
     242  
*kollybos, kollybistes* 166, 245  
*komogrammateus* 45, 76, 86, 103, 130, 133,  
     199, 204, 209  
*kosmetes* 66–69, 208  
*kriteria*, see tribunals  
*ktema* 106  
*ktesis* 106  
*laokritai* 59f, 207  
 legion 7, 15–20, 22, 53, 79, 84, 87, 155,  
     171, 188, 191, 194  
*Lex Hieronica* 55  
*lex provinciae* 26, 53  
*logeutai* 125, 127, 233  
 liturgy, *munus* 37, 45, 70–79, 126205,  
     210–214,  
*lustrum* 88, 153f, 244  
 Macedonians 14, 20–22, 28, 144, 171, 191,  
     219, 220  
*machairophoroi* 47, 61, 191, 205f  
 managers 106, 108f, 120, 154, 171, 227,  
     230  
*mandata principis* 33, 54, 215  
 manumission 33, 54, 68, 148, 206, 241  
 marriage 33, 39, 52, 54f, 58, 206  
*merismos, aporon, anakechorekoton, praktoriou* 77, 135, 141f, 151, 154,  
     239  
*metropoleis, metropolitai* 26, 45, 66–69, 74,  
     81, 93f, 129, 139f, 173, 175,  
     208–210, 217, 219f, 223, 238,  
     240  
 mint 158–160, 164, 167, 176, 245  
*Monumentum Ephesenum* 55  
 mortgage 32, 148  
 municipalisation 66, 81, 173, 208,  
*municipium* 51, 66  
 nomarch 27, 42f, 59, 115, 202f  
*notae tironianae* 60  
*numerus* 20, 93, 193  
*oikonomos* 30, 36, 39, 43, 106, 198, 200,  
     203, 228, 231  
*oikos* 113–120, 173, 230, 235  
 oil-tax (*elaike*)  
*ousia* 104–112, 116, 119f, 154, 173f, 183,  
     185, 224–227, 229, 231  
 Palmyrene Tariff 164  
*parachoresis*, cf. cession  
*parachoretikon*, cf. price  
*parangelia* 30, 197  
*patrimonium*  
*pentekoste* 149, 241f  
*penthemeros* 75f, 142, 212  
*peregrini* 54f, 92, 194, 219  
 petitions 16, 30, 35f, 40, 44, 47f, 55f,  
     58–61, 67, 72–74, 96, 99, 100,  
     106, 109, 115, 133, 140,  
     181–183, 192, 197, 204, 206,  
     208–211, 214, 220, 222, 227f,  
     240f  
 philosophy of administration 138, 237  
*phorologos* 129f, 174, 212, 234  
*phoros* 115, 155  
*phylake* 213, 236  
*phylakitai* 46–48, 205  
 pig-tax (*hyike*) 126, 148, 151f, 241–243  
 police 13, 18, 35, 44–47, 49, 61, 63, 69,  
     134, 146, 171f, 199  
 poll tax (*laographia*) 84, 89, 93, 127,  
     138–141, 182, 219, 229, 233,  
     238  
*poros* 76f, 81, 142, 213, 221  
*praefectus Aegypti, eparchos* 11, 196, 198, 234  
*praefectus annonae* 182  
*praefectus praetorii* 29, 183, 196, 250  
*pragmateuomenos* 126  
*pragmateutes* 108, 126, 227  
*praktores* 70, 72f, 124–129, 133, 135–137,  
     150, 174, 211, 214, 234, 236  
*presbyteroi* 46, 205  
 price (*time, parachoretikon*) 68f, 80,  
     100–103, 146–150, 157,  
     165–167, 184, 222f, 241, 247  
 priests 33, 41f, 46, 56, 67, 78, 85, 90–95,  
     99, 108–110, 133, 138, 140f,  
     152–154, 170f, 175, 182, 198,  
     201f, 213, 220, 226, 239, 243  
 private ownership 81, 97, 100–104, 174,  
     222, 224, 228, 231

- procurator (epitropos)* 32–36, 41, 48, 65, 72, 109, 112, 129, 132, 168, 195f, 198, 206, 210, 227, 229, 234f, 248, 250
- professio* 85f, 215
- property declarations 45, 54, 87–89, 100, 217
- prosiagraphomena* 161–167, 245
- prosmetroumena* 161–163, 246
- prostagnata*, Ptolemaic or Roman 56, 101, 222, 247
- prostitute tax 147, 240
- protopraxia* 57, 207
- Ptolemaic silver 160f, 176, 245
- publicani* 124–126, 129, 136, 149, 232, 234, 237
- public farmers 46, 56, 67, 73, 91f, 98, 110f, 129f, 133, 141, 204, 218, 226
- reges socii et amici populi Romani* 6f, 18, 187
- requisitions 23, 43, 71, 78–80, 111, 165, 182–184, 199, 214f
- revenue land (*prosodos*) 32, 34, 44, 104, 106, 120
- sales tax (*enkyklion*) 148f, 241
- salt tax (*halike*) 84, 138, 215, 238
- scriptura* 150, 242
- senate 6, 9–11, 28, 34, 51, 54, 66, 147, 158, 189f, 198, 200, 206, 208, 211, 215, 248
- sitologia, sitologoi* 37, 70, 72, 74, 129f, 133, 204, 211f, 235
- stator* 134, 175, 236
- statues, imperial 28f, 196
- stipendium* 138
- strategos 27, 32, 35–45, 54, 59, 66–75, 86, 106, 123, 127f, 133, 136, 172, 181, 185f, 196f, 199f, 202–214, 226, 228, 235, 250
- strategos nykterinos* 27, 195
- Suebi* 8, 189
- syntaxis, syntaximon* 101, 139, 140–143, 148, 152, 222, 239, 243
- Tabula Contrebiensis* 51
- tax rates 99, 155, 221, 230
- telonai* 124–126, 128–137, 236
- temples 8, 10, 11, 17, 33, 37, 42, 56, 78, 91f, 94, 98f, 103, 112, 117, 121, 133, 141, 144f, 152–154, 169f, 174, 182, 187f, 202f, 208, 219–221, 224, 236, 243, 248
- tetarte* 149
- textile industry 9, 104, 147f, 154, 189, 215
- Theban soldiers 19, 22, 193
- toparch, toparchy 35, 42–45, 48, 73, 86, 130f, 194, 197, 203f, 206, 209, 216, 235
- topogrammateus* 18, 43, 45, 73, 76, 86, 103, 130, 181, 193, 204, 218
- torture 135, 236f
- transport 47, 65, 71, 78–80, 111, 152, 161, 168, 205, 215
- tribes 150, 208, 217
- tribunals 30, 32, 38f, 57, 59f, 74, 207
- tribunus militum* 14, 17, 32, 34, 184, 199, 250
- tributarius* 129, 234
- tributum* 85, 90, 130, 138, 148, 173, 215
- triumvir* 9, 12, 17, 72f, 79, 179
- vectigal* 138, 232
- veterans 8f, 14, 17, 21f, 29, 53, 72f, 79, 87, 151, 192f, 210, 216, 249
- vicarius* 104, 109f, 129–132, 234f
- vicesima hereditatum, libertatis* 241
- vilicus* 36, 120, 132, 200, 227, 231, 235
- weavers-tax (*gerdiakon*) 126, 147f, 232f
- will, of Ptolemy Auletes 5f, 8, 118, 231

# Sources Index

## A. INSCRIPTIONS, PAPYRI AND OSTRACA

AE	1914 no. 128	197	1083	194
	1964, 255 =		1098	207
	1968, 53	190	1103	189
	1966 no. 472	197	1104	247
BGU			1108	38, 201
I	74	225	1111	38, 201
	92	243	1114	209
	180	210	1115	247
II	423	194	1116	234
	455	201	1117	226
	543	100, 222f	1118	56, 104, 110, 207, 223, 228, 247
	628	189, 192, 210, 214	1120	247
	649	243	1121	147
	650	227	1122	247
III	707	243	1123	149f, 233, 242f
	730	243	1125	228
	748	126	1126	247
	757	45	1127	222, 247
	781	217, 247	1128	209
	1001	39, 201	1129	104, 222
IV	1037	228	1130	104
	1050	207	1132	219, 233
	1052	219, 247	1134	247
	1053	225, 247	1136	247
	1054	247	1137	41, 109, 202
	1055	247	1138	37, 181, 200, 236
	1056	247	1139	187
	1057	247	1140	36
	1059	201, 207, 219, 241	1141	227f
	1060	205, 222	1142	247
			1143	40
			1145	247
			1146	247



	1147	247	VIII	1730	200, 224
	1148	57		1731	222, 242
	1150	247		1732	222, 242, 245
	1151	202, 234, 247		1733	222, 242, 245
	1155	38, 201		1734	222, 242
	1156	247		1735	222
	1158	202, 234		1739	222, 242
	1159	74		1740	222, 242
	1161	247		1747	210, 214
	1162	247		1748	214
	1163	182		1749	93, 193, 214
	1165	187		1750	93, 193
	1166	247		1756	198
	1167	234, 247		1757	198f
	1168	225, 228		1759	201
	1170	247		1760	201
	1172	247		1761	201
	1180	147		1762	187, 214
	1182	40, 115, 181		1763	15, 191
	1184	207, 228		1764	199
	1185	224		1766	201
	1188	67, 103, 134		1768	199
	1189	67, 76f, 203		1772	199, 222
	1190	47, 210		1773	213
	1192	232, 246		1774	210
	1194	243		1779	212, 236
	1196	91, 94		1781	31
	1197	106, 133, 152, 182, 220		1782	198
	1198	99, 140, 182, 213f, 219f, 232, 239		1786	191
	1199	78, 182, 214, 220		1792	247
	1200	99, 152, 182, 214, 221, 225, 230		1800	189
	1201	67		1805	204
	1203	230		1806	16
	1206	36		1813	242
	1207	241		1815	212
	1209	244		1821	227
V	1210	54, 193, 198		1826	233
VI	1235	246		1827	233
	1252	205		1828	8, 106
	1256	220		1829	205
	1415	225		1830	193
VII	1590a	132, 140, 233		1831	227
	1590b	233		1833	213, 228, 230
	1598	234		1835	213
	1669	106, 227		1846	72, 197
				1847	236
				1850	191, 213, 222, 242

	1851	127, 150, 242	2586	151, 203
	1854	205	2588	240
	1856	213	2590	192, 195, 213, 247
	1859	204	2593	135
	1867	127	2595	181
	1876	15	2596	204
	1882	247	2599	204
IX	1893	225, 230	2600	199, 205
	1894	228	2601	203, 225
	1897	114	2602	44, 76, 192, 205
X	1932	210	2603	205, 245
XI	2047	228	2604	28, 135
XIII	2291	138, 140, 233	2605	129, 182
XIV	2368	114	2606	199, 205
	2369	204	2608	199
	2375	246	2613	143, 205
	2376	247	2618	134, 136
	2377	247	2623	31
	2420	233	2626	131
	2421	210	2629	237
	2422	210	2631	31, 182, 199, 214f
	2430	8	2637	199, 205
	2433	8, 224	2639	136, 199, 204f
	2435	246	2640	135
	2437	223	2643	135
	2438	225	2644	79, 214
	2439	225	2646	131, 182, 199, 205
	2440	223	2652	131, 143
	2441	223	2654	199
	2446	223	2656	205
	2449	224	2657	205
XV	2525	239	2662	129, 203
XVI	2533-		2663	116, 133
	2540	238	2669	217
	2558	181	2670	44, 131
	2559	223, 245	2671	134, 202, 205
	2560	204	2672	91, 94
	2561	204		
	2563	204	BIFAO	
	2565	204		73 (1973),
	2570	204		183 250n40
	2572	204		
	2560-		C.Ord.Ptol.	
	2576	130		5-10 207
	2577	67, 93		21 89
	2578-			22 89
	87	151, 242		53 209, 224, 229

	54	209, 246	IV	2107	249
	57	232	X	4862	198
	61	201		5169	249
	62	232		7489	229
	71	224	XI	6011	197
	75-76	93, 217, 229	XVI	<i>app.</i> 10	189, 210, 214
<b>C.P.Gr.</b>			<b>CPL</b>		
I	19	208		103	189, 192, 210,214
II	1	217		108	198
	7	229		170	216-7
	15	204		175	228, 234, 242
				247	246
<b>CPJ</b>				257	249
I	132	204		282	131
	140	192		311	241, 246
	142	219			
II	143	202	<b>CPR</b>		
	145	222, 224	I	224	220
	148	38	VI	77	210
	150	208, 211, 221, 231	XV	6	220
	151	200		15	205, 234
	153	187, 203, 207, 213, 217, 230	<b>C.Ptol.Skav.</b>		
	413	238		6	241
	414	215		8	229
	420 a	228		239	189
<b>ChLA</b>			<b>I.Cairo dem.</b>		
III	206	203		31093	203
V	308	241			
X	416	189, 192, 210, 214	<b>I.Delos</b>		
	426	194		1525	195
XXV	785	216f	<b>I.Fay.</b>		
	786	198	I	13	68, 203
XXVII	840	58	<b>IGRR</b>		
XLII	1239	227	I	1055	183
XLIII	1241	148, 196, 246		1056	183
XLV	1340	246		1109	182, 197
				1117	182
<b>CIG</b>				1150	250
II	4705	230		1163	182
	4716	192		1290	186
III	5080	249		1295	182
<b>CIL</b>				1322	182
III	14147-5	191			

<b>I.Koptos</b>			561	233
	41	192	645	240
			653	232
<b>ILS</b>			655	233
	1321	229	660	233
	2691	197	765	127, 135, 142
	8995	191	951	244
			972	197, 214
<b>Inscr.Cret.</b>			1012	241
<b>IV</b>	215c	192	1086	241
			1094	243
<b>I.Philae</b>			1096	241
<b>I</b>	63	192–3	1097	241
<b>II</b>	128	191, 203	1098	241
	135	37	1103	233
			1104	233
<b>M.Chr.</b>			1123	243
	66	201	1779	247
	67	38	1783	223
	74	201, 203	1968	110
	79	208	2206	241
	80	197	2499	247
	100	37, 181	2500	247
	101	236		
	105	225	<b>O.Cair.</b>	
	107	226	84	232
	183	126	89	228
	234	202	92	241
	254	222, 224	<b>O.Cair.GPW</b>	
	299	201	51–58	241
	373	225		
<b>O.Ashm.</b>			<b>O.Camb.</b>	
<b>I</b>	24	143	29	244
			51	228
<b>O.Ashm.Shelton</b>			<b>O.Deiss.</b>	
	6	218	34	232
			74	232
<b>O.Bakchias</b>			<b>O.Leid.Dem.</b>	
<b>G 9</b>		239	19	239
			53	245
<b>O.Berol.</b>			603	241
	P6550	215	<b>O.Edfou</b>	
<b>O.Bodl.</b>			<b>I</b>	
<b>I</b>	170	232	40	246
<b>II</b>	407	218		

	41	246		182	241
	120	246		183	241
	124	246		193	241
III	371	16		194	241
	388	144		195	241
	397	151		248	247
	398	151			
			O.Medin.Habu Dem.		
O.Elkab				54	241
	180	127		55	241
				56	241
O.Fay.				57	240
	1	243		58	240
	2	239		125	203
	2-4	144			
	12	131, 233	O.Mey.		
	15	235		13	239
				14	239
OGIS					
I	104	195	O.Mich.		
	179	212	I	17	244
	188	198		116	243
II	629	246		121-	
	654	180, 191		125	239
	656	181		362	145
	657	181		704-	
	659	188		714	238
	660	192		736	238
	661	186		737-	
	663	200		744	243
	665	250	III	984-	
	669	200, 203, 207, 210, 229-30, 234, 236, 243		985	243
				986	243
				987	240
	709	220		988	240
			IV	1114	243
O.Joach.				1115	243
	13	204		1128	247
O.Leid.			O.Petr.		
	43	240		119	232
	44	232, 241		213	241
	45	232			
	48	135, 233	O.Strasb.		
				38	218
O.Mattha.Dem.				48	142-3
	119	241		54	240

	262	144		
	263	144		
	294	225		
	776	200		
	780	233		
O.Suec.				
	18	241		
O.Tait				
I	220	235		
	223	235		
	225	223		
	227	223		
	237	223		
	238	223		
	239	223		
	244	223		
O.Theb.				
	91	149, 232		
O.Wilb.				
	2	225		
	14	245		
O.Zür.Wangstedt				
	7	240		
	8	241		
P.Aberd.				
	75	240		
P.Amh.				
II	30	205		
	31	245		
P.Amst.				
I	89	208		
P.Ashm.				
I	23	201		
	24	241		
P.Bakchias				
	24	243		
P.Bad.				
II	14	191		
VI	170	74		
P.Ben.Mus.				
	1	219		
P.Berl.Möller				
	11	194		
P.Berol.				
	11649	249		
P.Bingen				
	45	8, 215, 224–5, 229		
P.Bodl.				
I	61	243		
P.Bon.				
	31	212		
P.Bouriant				
	7	249		
P.Brook.				
	32	238		
P.Cair.Zenon				
II	59042	209		
III	59206	242		
	59323	209		
	59433	242		
IV	59634	242		
P.Col.				
I	inv. 8	218		
	inv. 480	241		
V	1	143		
VIII	211	199, 203		
	223	223		
P.Coll.Youtie				
I	17	242		
	19	106, 108		
	20	238		
	63	116		

<b>P.Corn.</b>			<b>P.Graux.</b>		
	21 <i>v</i>	142	I	2	214
	24	214	II	9	233
<b>P.Dubl.</b>				inv.	
	3	222–3		2009	230
<b>P.Enteux.</b>			<b>P.Grenf.</b>		
	22	205	I	45	218
<b>P.Erl.</b>				46	218
	59	211	II	42	21
<b>P.Fay.</b>			<b>P.Hamb.</b>		
	22 <i>v</i>	197	I	36	116, 225, 230
	34	137	III	209	239
	43	218	IV	272	202
	44	244		268–283	202
	45	233	<b>P.Harrauer</b>		
	64	240		32	207
	82	230		33	195, 236
	87	108, 116	<b>P.Haun. II</b>		
	88	115		30	31
	101	244		inv. 407	103
	231–		<b>P.Haw.</b>		
	234	91		244R	91
<b>P.Flor.</b>			<b>P.Heid.</b>		
I	61	197	II	217	205
III	383	216	<b>P.Hib.</b>		
<b>P.Fouad</b>			I	29	241
I	9	74	II	197	220
	21	34, 184, 198, 250		240	203
	46	150	<b>P.Iand.</b>		
<b>P.Freib.</b>			VI	104	214
II	8	207	<b>P.IFAO</b>		
IV	66	194	II	2	211
<b>P.Gen.</b>			<b>P.Köln</b>		
II	89	247	I	54	194
	91	227, 229		86	242
	95	242		95	238
<b>P.Giss.</b>					
I	4	207			

III	137	235	VI	1912	203, 207–8, 217, 230
	147	57, 207	P.Magd.		
V	227	21, 38–9, 102, 218–220, 224, 242	II	28	225
IX	376	239	P.Mert.		
P.Kron.			I	11	202, 208
	1	207	II	62	67, 203
P.Laur.			III	104	201
IV	153	223	P.Mich.		
P.Lille			V	232	202, 227
I	19	224		233	78, 132, 235
P.Lips.				236	241
	96	230		241	238
P.Lond.				259	220, 224
II				267–	
	192			268	220
	(p. 222)	194, 223		273	220
	195			303	220
	(p. 127)	112, 226, 250		312	227
	256			346B	238
	(p. 96)	203–4, 212, 234	VI	349	213
	276		VIII	382	238
	(p. 148)	197		490	193
	354			491	193
	(p. 163)	67, 205, 234	IX	560	229
	361		X	578	218
	(p. 169)	240		580	204, 214, 221
	445			582	73, 128, 229, 234
	(p. 166)	229		598	233
III	604 B		XII	638–	
	(p. 83)	203		642	238
	895		XV	688	205
	(p. 129)	205		709	242
	1171		XVIII	782	242
	(p. 177)	239, 242		784	222–3
	1177		P.Mil.		
	(p. 182)	251	I	3	218
	1218			6	146, 227
	(p. 130)	205		7	211
	1243			9	233, 238
	(p. 176)	245	P.Mil.Vogl.		
			I	4	250
			II	56	117, 230
				81	207
			VI	269	114, 230



	296	230		346	223
VII	302	117		350	203
				351	203
P.Münch.				353	203
III	49	205		366	222
				370	235
P.Nicole.				387 <i>v</i>	196
	inv.54	115	IV	711	90
				721	198
P.Oslo				737	163, 241
II	26	202, 209		746	44
	30	18, 205		784	247
	33 <i>v</i>	249		792	210
III	123	227		807	115
				815–817	91
P.Oxy.				817	131
I	37	60		826	217
	44	234		832	219
	82	212		833	211, 235
II	244	203, 234	VI	926	221
	245	203	VII	1046	243
	246	208	VIII	1089	251
	251	204, 213, 220f		1143	208
	252	204, 218, 220	IX	1188	198, 204
	253	220f		1210	86
	254	204, 218–220	X	1258	233
	257	220		1266	220
	259	236		1281	215
	260	201, 203	XII	1434	202, 243
	268	38		1438	242
	270	223		1452	220
	276	189		1453	195, 206, 243
	277	219f		1457	151
	280	225		1480	232
	281	38f	XIV	1635	222
	285	233	XVII	2186	220
	286	233	XVIII	2185	235
	287	235	XIX	2234	206
	288	217, 220	XX	2277	198, 204
	291	35, 203, 232	XXIV	2414	239, 242
	292	35	XXV	2435 <i>v</i>	201, 221
	293	214	XXVII	2471	201
	294	197, 204	XXXIV	2725	222
	309	241	XXXVI	2764	212
	311	241		2769	212
	314	220		2792	221
	344	223	XXXVII	2820	19, 180, 193, 229

XXXVIII	2837	229		130	205
	2842	235			
XLII	3014	198		P.Polit.Iud.	
	3020	221		6	205
	3030	239		19	205
	3047	230		20	205
	3061	232			
XLIV	3197	202		P.Prag.	
XLVI	3273	200, 211, 213		154	235
	3276	220			
	3283	220		P.Princ.	
	3285	207		I	11 142
XLIX	3463	202		II	23 205
	3482	222			33 117
	3484	160			
L	3510	204		P.Rainer SN	
	3593	117		172	209
LII	3690	223			
LV	3777	222		P.Ryl.	
	3778-9	242		I	65 60
	3807	250		II	73 106
LVII	3902-				77 210
	3909	235			94 202, 209
LVIII	3917	236			118 40, 77, 126, 202, 208,
LXIV	4440	219			213, 241
LXV	4478	204			125 205
	4478-				127 109, 205, 235, 249
	4480	217			128 146, 205, 227
LXVI	4531	202			130 205
LXVII	4582	208			132 205, 225, 227
	4624	243			133 109, 227
					134 205
					136 205
P.Oxy.Hels.					137 205
I	9	102, 223			138 226f, 235
	10	216			139 205
	11	32			140 205, 228
P.Petaus					141 111, 206, 233
	42	238			142 226
	52	235			145 106, 108, 205, 227
					146 225
P.Petr.					148 205
III	26	233			149 202f, 208
	59 (a)	217			150 205
	59 (b)	89			151 203, 205
	73	225			152 205, 228
	128	205			159 207, 222

	165	245			
	166	109, 227		I	5
	167	227, 241			6
	207	225, 228			7
	216	230			13
	257	38			26
	270	60, 199			27
IV	580	20			40
	585	245			54
	600	227			72
	603	18, 76			92
	667	89, 140			103
P.Select.					119
I	21	32			121
					124
PSI					131
I	56	211			189
IV	320	101, 222f		II	280
	389	233			289
V	449	230			299
	457	220			302
VIII	897	207, 222			345
	949	44			348
	968	211, 235			349
X	1099	244, 247			350
	1118	207, 222f			382
	1149	182, 243, 249			408
	1160	208, 211, 213, 221, 231			409
XI	1183	216f			410
XIII	1307	198			462
	1328	223			476
	1356	206			482
					484
					519
PSI Corr.					554
I	1150	106, 226, 228, 234, 236			564
					576
P.Strasb.					587
I	23	116		III/1	701
II	115	245			703
VI	539	245			734
VII	627	77			789
	962	74		III/2	902
VIII	762	212, 234f			903
					904
					1004
P.Tebt.				IV	1103
					229
					232
					201
					205
					204
					204
					246
					89, 140, 238f
					143
					89, 140, 214, 238
					246
					246
					89, 140, 238, 243
					241
					35, 197, 199
					217
					38, 99, 180, 200, 214, 221, 243
					127
					233
					233, 238
					241
					21, 100, 219
					199
					199
					199
					205
					138
					45
					246
					219
					215
					212
					241
					140
					198, 200, 202, 237
					212
					236
					204
					204
					232
					212
					221

	1140	205		4226	215
P.Thomas				4327	28, 126, 232
	3	149, 242		4519	232
	10	251		4960	131, 228
P.Tor.Choach.				5151	245
	12	204		5233	240
PUG				5238	206, 212
I	12	204		5239	197, 206
II	61	228	III	5240	197
	64	232		5954	206
P.Vindob.				6291	207
L	1d	196, 241		6663	223
	135	160	IV	6924	204
P.Vind.Tandem				7174	214
	1	207		7256	200, 250
	9	45, 110, 129, 212, 228, 234	V	7337	217
P.Vind.Worp				7348	194
	2	207		7385	241
	12	206		7376	234
P.Wash. Univ.				7455	198
I	50	212		7462	211, 214
II	77	207		7530	213
	106	31		7537	100
P.Wisc.				7568	202
I	26	214, 246		7600	19
II	46	93		7609	195, 197
	52	106		7610	197
P.Würzb.				7738	250
	9	225		7787	68, 193, 203
P.Zen.Pestman				7788	37
	38	205		7951	200, 203
SB				8010	202
I	982	37, 197		8070	243
	1441	214		8083	183
	2100	195		8328	220
	3294	214f, 250		8580	192
				8755	130
				8756	130
				8797	249
				8894	191
				8974	211
			VI	8993	229
				9016	207
				9030	243
				9050	212
				9109	67
				9150	205, 227

	9223	211, 235		12609	163
	9224	73, 227, 229		12632	142
	9545	127		12675	243
VIII	9790	222		12739	238
	9815	192		12740	238
X	10220	217, 220		12751	194
	10221	241		12835	226
	10223	241		13017	106, 233, 243
	10308	197, 206	XVIII	13087	205
	10338	232, 241f		13219	160, 219
	10423	232		13236	91
	10426	233		13565-	
	10534	230		13573	139
	10741	232		13574	131
XII	10793	214		13575	131
	10795	203		13236	91
	11012	102, 193, 219		13854	205
	11078	232	XX	14085	40, 181, 202, 208
	11236	202		14384	240
XIV	11264	205		14440	218, 220
	11270	219		15150	224
	11274	219n68		15182	205
	11275	205		15189	215, 242
	11412	241	XXII	15203	188
	11624	58		15460	41, 109
	11635	232			
	11933	226, 246	SEG		
	11275	205	XXX	509	192
	11346	74, 210	XXXIV	1582	200
	11411	201	XL	2088	217, 220
	11445	145	XLI	1669	194
	11446-		XLV	2088	220n70
	11450	240		2095	194
	11448	243			
	11450	243	Sel.Pap.		
	11451	243	I	3	219
	11501-2	243		41	240, 250
	11515	247	II	211	214-5
	11624	58		212	217
	11933	226, 228, 246		241	210
	11953	197		255	202
	12170	240		257	208
XVI	12312	192, 213		269	230
	12495	232		275	220
	12524	205, 219		280	146
	12531	182, 243, 249		281	214





XIX	280–285	202			
XX	51–2	192			
<i>BJ</i>					
I	327–8	193			
	361	226			
	396	226			
	397	192			
	437	192			
	535	234			
II	25	190			
	81	190			
	385	215			
	405–				
	407	236			
	488	188			
<i>C.Ap.</i>					
II	4.41	207			
	37	188			
<i>Julian</i>					
<i>Epist. ad Themist</i>					
	265–				
	266	248			
<i>Livy</i>					
XXVII	4.10	5			
<i>Maccabees</i>					
III	2. 28–				
	30	218			
	4.14	218			
	6.38	218			
	7.22	218			
<i>New Testament</i>					
<i>Acts</i>					
	5.37	218			
	19.38	197			
<i>Luke</i>					
	2.2–4	218			
	3.12	236			
	12.58	236			
	20.22	215			
<i>Mark</i>					
	12.14	215			
<i>Matthew</i>					
				22.17	215
<i>Orosius</i>					
VI 19.13–					
			16		193, 248
VI 19.20 189, 241					
<i>Philo</i>					
<i>De Spec. Leg.</i>					
III 159 236f					
			163		234, 236f
<i>Flacc.</i>					
	1–4	196			
	2	185, 250			
	3	196			
	4	185, 193			
	10	250			
	54–96	185			
	74	183, 202			
	78	237			
	86–96	195			
	92–3	215			
	105	196, 221			
	131	210			
	158	185			
	163	185			
<i>Leg.</i>					
	1	236			
	20	251			
	182	236			
	132	251			
<i>Pliny the Elder</i>					
<i>NH</i>					
V 57 196					
VI 160 250					
XXXVI 69 250					
<i>Pliny the Younger</i>					
<i>Ep.</i>					
X 6 [22] 207					
<i>Plutarch</i>					
<i>Ant.</i>					
	64.1	193			
	71.1	192			
	80.1–3	217			
	81.1–4	189			



- |                         |          |                              |  |                  |                  |
|-------------------------|----------|------------------------------|--|------------------|------------------|
|                         | 81.5     | 189, 248                     |  | 3.25             |                  |
|                         | 82.1     | 189                          |  | (840)            | 190, 199         |
|                         | 82.2     | 189, 234                     |  |                  |                  |
|                         | 87.1     | 189                          |  |                  |                  |
| <i>Apophthegm. Aug.</i> |          |                              |  | <b>Suetonius</b> |                  |
| 4.207B                  | 228, 248 |                              |  | <i>Gramm.</i>    |                  |
|                         |          |                              |  | 16               | 248f             |
|                         |          |                              |  | <i>Div. Jul.</i> |                  |
| <b>Polybius</b>         |          |                              |  | 35.1             | 188              |
| IX                      | 11a.1    | 5                            |  | 41.3             | 216              |
|                         |          |                              |  | 54.3             | 187              |
|                         |          |                              |  | 76.3             | 188              |
| <b>Seneca</b>           |          |                              |  | <i>Aug.</i>      |                  |
| <i>Cons. ad Helviam</i> |          |                              |  | 17.5             | 189              |
| 19.6                    | 184      |                              |  | 18               | 190, 192, 231    |
|                         |          |                              |  | 41               | 244              |
| <b>Strabo</b>           |          |                              |  | 43.2             | 226              |
| II                      | 3.5      | 189                          |  | 89.1             | 226              |
|                         | 5.12     |                              |  | 93               | 190              |
|                         | (118)    | 249                          |  | 94.4             | 230              |
| III                     | 3.4.20   |                              |  | <i>Tib.</i>      |                  |
|                         | (167)    | 196                          |  | 6.3              | 226              |
| XVI                     | 4.23     |                              |  | 32.2             | 237, 250         |
|                         | (780)    | 192                          |  | 41               | 250              |
| XVII                    | 1.3      |                              |  | <i>Gaius</i>     |                  |
|                         | (787)    | 192, 201, 231                |  | 40               | 240              |
|                         | 1.12     |                              |  |                  |                  |
|                         | (797)    | 190, 192, 194–6, 200,<br>203 |  | <b>Tacitus</b>   |                  |
|                         | 1.13     |                              |  | <i>Hist.</i>     |                  |
|                         | (798)    | 195, 242, 244                |  | I                | 11 190, 196, 207 |
|                         | 1.15     |                              |  | <i>Ann.</i>      |                  |
|                         | (800)    | 240                          |  | I                | 31.2 216         |
|                         | 1.24     |                              |  | I                | 80 250           |
|                         | (804)    | 201                          |  | II               | 59 189f, 208     |
|                         | 1.53     |                              |  | IV               | 5.6 193          |
|                         | (819)    | 155, 203, 248f               |  | IV               | 6.3 232, 250     |
|                         | 1.54     |                              |  | V                | 8 249            |
|                         | (820)    | 194, 196, 203, 249           |  | VI               | 3 250            |
|                         | 3.24     |                              |  | XII              | 60 191, 196, 206 |
|                         | (839)    | 234                          |  |                  |                  |