

# THE ADMINISTRATORS OF ROMAN EGYPT<sup>1</sup>

By P. A. BRUNT

Before A.D. 70 the prefecture of Egypt was the greatest prize in an equestrian career—four praetorian prefects were promoted to it<sup>2</sup>—and thereafter it ranked only just below the praetorian prefecture, to which no fewer than fourteen governors of Egypt were advanced between 70 and 235.<sup>3</sup> In the other great provinces of the empire *legati Augusti pro praetore* could leave finance to the procurators, while proconsuls perhaps soon came to retain little of their original responsibility for the collection of taxes,<sup>4</sup> and had no army to command. The prefect of Egypt combined fiscal with military and judicial functions. So did the presidial procurators of such areas as Mauretania or Noricum, but the importance of Egypt and the complexity of its administration set the prefect far above them. Egypt was probably the most populous province in the empire<sup>5</sup> and contributed more than any other to the revenues,<sup>6</sup> partly in grain that provided much of Rome's essential food,<sup>7</sup> and its exploitation was a vast public enterprise of which the prefect was the managing director. He also had to do justice not only under Roman law but under the traditional laws of the native Egyptians and of the Greek settlers, among subjects who were both litigious and turbulent. Only defence against external attack was a simpler problem than in other frontier regions.

## THE NEED FOR EXPERIENCE

It is evident that ideally the prefect's duties demanded honesty, ability and experience. How far were these demands met? So far as the first two qualities are concerned, perhaps no answers can be given. Only the names of most prefects are known to us, and the careers of some. But the most distinguished career tells us that a man enjoyed the favour of emperors, not that he deserved it.<sup>8</sup> No doubt all emperors, even those most ruthless in

<sup>1</sup> Beside usual abbreviations, I use the following in this article:

Chalon = G. Chalon, *L'édit de Ti. Iulius Alexander* (1964).

Humbert = M. Humbert, 'La Jurisdiction du Préfet d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien', *ap. F. Burdeau et al., Aspects de l'Empire Romain* (1964), 95–147.

Pflaum = H.-G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres* (1960).

Reinmuth = O. W. Reinmuth, *The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, *Klio*, Beiheft xxxiv (1935).

Stein, *Präefekten* = A. Stein, *Die Präefekten von Ägypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (1950).

Stein, *Unters.* = A. Stein, *Untersuchungen zur Gesch. u. Verwaltung Ägyptens* (1915).

Wallace = S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (1938).

Prefects are listed and numbered in the Appendix. All dates are A.D., unless otherwise indicated. I am indebted for additions and corrections to Fergus Millar, P. J. Parsons and J. R. Rea; the opinions and errors that remain are my own. I deliberately refer to Egypt as a province, in conformity with all ancient sources (quoted by Stein, *Unters.* 92 f.), against the opinion of Stein and many others, for which Stein gives two reasons: (i) Egypt had no *koinon* (as if that were not true of nearly all provinces in 30 B.C.); (ii) it lacked 'die Gliederung nach der Gemeindeorganisation': but even if Egyptian local government is unique, no presupposition about the nature of such government is implicit in 'provincia', for whose derivation and meaning cf. Mommsen, *St. R.* I<sup>3</sup>, 51. See further *JRS* lvi (1966), 90 f.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix nos. 7, 12, 22; cf. the appointment of Macro in 38.

<sup>3</sup> Nos. 26, 30, 33, 36, 41, 46, 53, 58, 64, 65, 75, 77, 83, 84. Cf. n. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Dio liii, 15, 3.

<sup>5</sup> Jos., *Bj* ii, 385 gives Egypt without Alexandria 7,500,000 inhabitants from the poll-tax returns; according to Diodorus i, 31 there were not less than 7,000,000 in Egypt in his day. On my estimate (*Italian Manpower*, ch. 10) Italy had not many more inhabitants under Augustus. We can only guess at the population of most other parts of the empire.

<sup>6</sup> Wallace, ch. 18. On a minimum estimate the revenue of Ptolemy Auletes (c. 55 B.C.) is given as 36 m. denarii, at a time when Roman provincial revenue amounted to 85 m., or on a more literal interpretation of Plut., *Pomp.* 45, 3, 135 m. But Ptolemy Philadelphus' revenue had been reckoned as equivalent to 88 m., and by more efficient administration (cf. H. I. Bell, *CAH* x, 292, 313) Augustus must have extracted more than Auletes.

<sup>7</sup> Wallace l.c. Jos. *Bj* ii, 383, 386, says that Africa supplied two thirds, Egypt one third of Rome's grain. In fact there were certainly imports from other sources (Pliny, *NH* xviii, 66), and the truth may be only that Africa and Egypt were the main sources at the ratio of 2:1. *Epit. de Caes.* 1, 6 may be wholly unreliable.

<sup>8</sup> Contrast Pflaum, 331 on T. Furius Victorinus (no. 54): 'administrateur financier habile, chef énergique et courageux' (though nothing whatever is known of him but the bare facts of his career), or Reinmuth, 4, cf. 128: 'the prefects of Egypt were, by and large, men of outstanding ability'. As if in proof of this assertion, he notes that several were, or affected to be, men of letters (nos. 1, 23, 40, 47, 60, 62; he might have added 2, 38, 48) or jurists (no. 54; add 68). (Literary gifts do not imply administrative competence, nor of course exclude it.) Balbillus (no. 23) perhaps owed his appointment mainly to Agrippina's influence (Tac., *Ann.* xiii, 21, 6–22).

exactions to replenish the treasury or to pay for personal extravagances, did not desire to appoint men who would fill their own pockets; indeed, however 'rapacious' they might be themselves, prudence might make them recognize that the subjects should be sheared, not shaved. So Tiberius informed the prefect, Aemilius Rectus, who did not remain long in post.<sup>9</sup> However, the level of integrity was not uniformly high in the Roman official class,<sup>10</sup> and the best of rulers might have no option but to select its least unprincipled members. He might also not be discerning in his choice. Marcus Aurelius is not likely to have been alone in finding it hard to choose the right agents and advisers.<sup>11</sup> Loyalty was an obvious *desideratum*, yet Augustus found it wanting in his very first prefect, Cornelius Gallus; Ti. Iulius Alexander not only rebelled against Vitellius but had almost certainly been ready to abandon Nero; <sup>12</sup> Mettius Rufus incurred the suspicion of Domitian, and Calvisius Statianus joined in revolt against Marcus Aurelius. It would be odd if disloyalty were the only offence of which prefects were guilty. True, we know of only two prefects down to 235 who were certainly or probably condemned for maladministration.<sup>13</sup> (The fall of Avillius Flaccus in 38 is not relevant here; whether or not he deserved Philo's biased censures, he perished from the malignity of Gaius and not on account of the complaints of the subjects.) But it was not easy for the subjects (especially in Egypt) to accuse a man in whom, as his very appointment showed, the Emperor had reposed great trust.<sup>14</sup>

Extortion and fraud were endemic in the administration of Egypt among soldiers and officials. We know of this partly from edicts that prefects issued to repress abuses.<sup>15</sup> In 69 Ti. Iulius Alexander covertly imputed certain malpractices to his immediate predecessor, C. Caecina Tuscus. In fact he himself had not dared to prohibit them until Nero was dead, and Caecina may have been no more than he to blame for exactions that were perhaps prompted from Rome.<sup>16</sup> Alexander, and the other governors who sought to impose restraint, deserve credit for good intentions. Many, or most, of the prefects may well have been honourable men.<sup>17</sup> Yet it would be strange if some were not contaminated by the climate of corruption, especially as no other officials can have had so good a chance of impunity.

But if the ability and integrity of the prefects must remain a subject of speculation, or faith, evidence is not lacking about their experience. Once an equestrian *cursus* had been developed, most or all of them had had long and varied official careers. Though the common assumption that continuous employment of Equites was the rule can hardly be proved, a prefect of Egypt could certainly have spent far more years in the active work of government than a consular legate of Britain or Syria, if only because the senate was still in theory the great council of state, and its leading members were therefore required at times to sit idly on its benches at Rome.

In discussing the careers of prefects, Stein thought it enough to point to the posts they had previously held, without asking himself how far the experience they had acquired was relevant to their new duties (*Präfekten*, 180 f.). Yet in Egypt the system of government was unique, and a long official career elsewhere would not necessarily prepare them adequately for novel tasks. Conceivably a man who had grown old in handling problems of

<sup>9</sup> See n. 64.

<sup>10</sup> Brunt, *Historia* x (1961), 189 f.

<sup>11</sup> Brunt, *JRS* lxiv (1974), 10 f.

<sup>12</sup> Chalon, 43 f., following Wilcken; cf. E. G. Turner, *JRS* xlv (1954), 60.

<sup>13</sup> C. Vibius Maximus (Stein, *Präfekten*, 52; Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny*, 210, 481 disposes of the doubts raised by Pflaum) and the unnamed Severan prefect who was convicted of falsifying his records (*Dig.* xlviii, 10, 1, 4). I overlooked Vibius in my article cited in n. 10.

<sup>14</sup> Naturally the emperors heard representations from Alexandria, and like Trajan, might show a 'generalized benevolence' (P. J. Parsons on *P. Oxy.* 3022); *P. Oxy.* 3020 also suggests the possibility of complaints against the administration of the Idios Logos, but it was another matter to bring formal charges or complaints against a prefect.

<sup>15</sup> See esp. the edict of Ti. Iulius Alexander, and Chalon *passim*, esp. 239 f.; cf. edicts of 42 (Smallwood, *Docs. illustr. Principates of Gaius* etc. 381), 49 (ib. 382; note reference to edict of Magius Maximus), 54 (ib. 383), 133-7 (Wilcken, *Chr.* 26 and *PSI* 446) and 206 (*P. Oxy.* 1100). The encomium on a Strategus for not taking bribes or resorting to illegal violence illustrates the lowness of prevalent standards during the long prefecture of Galerius, see *SEG* viii, 527 = Ehrenberg and Jones, *Documents*, no. 320(a).

<sup>16</sup> See Chalon, pp. 72, 103, 108, 145 and 154 on vv. 14 and 26-32. On Nero's exactions see Brunt, *Latomus* xviii (1959), 556 f.

<sup>17</sup> It was not my purpose in *Historia* x (1961) to deny this, nor to suggest that emperors did not normally prefer such men, when they could find them.

a quite different kind from those which now confronted him might have lacked the flexibility of mind he required. Vice-Chancellors of Oxford University, who are seldom or never quite unfamiliar with the business of their office at the time they take it up, have been known to confess that they were not masters of it in their first year. The prefect's responsibilities were immeasurably more complex and heavy. It is unlikely that he could assert his own control over the administration for some time, unless he possessed transcendent ability or already had some experience of the country.<sup>18</sup> We do not know how many, if any, of the prefects were men of outstanding talents, but (as will be shown) few had any previous acquaintance with the land they were to govern. No doubt their efficiency should have increased with length of tenure. How long were they normally left in office?

#### LENGTH OF TENURE

The Appendix gives a list of prefects (with what is known of their careers) from 30 B.C. to the eve of the 'military anarchy'; the last prefect named held office till 236, outlasting Severus Alexander. It shows only the dates at which a prefect is actually attested at his post. There are 89 names in all including Vernasius Facundus (no. 59), who is not a quite certain holder of the office, but excluding Macro, who was appointed in 38 but never took up the post, and Norbanus (36a), who may have had a very brief tenure under Domitian.

If the list were complete, the average tenure would be 3 years. In fact it is evident that names are missing, probably three or four under Augustus (if tenure in his time approximated to three years), and another under Severus Alexander. However, between A.D. 14 and 224 the intervals within which no prefect is attested never extend to three full years and are usually much shorter. It is undeniable that some transient figures, as yet unrecorded, may still be placed in these gaps; we happen to know of 10 men down to 180 who cannot have held the prefecture for two full years (nos. 11, 12, 14, 16, 27, 28, 53, 57, 58, 61), to whom Vernasius (no. 59) should probably be added, if not Norbanus (no. 36a). On the other hand, Reinmuth inferred from *P. Ryl.* 678 that the 6 prefects attested from 133 to 154 held office in succession (he did not know that no. 51 went on beyond 152), with an average tenure of 3.5 years. In many reigns much briefer tenures may be explained by sudden death or by the prefect's recall to meet some unexpected need for his services at Rome. Thus Tiberius, who kept C. Galerius at his post for 15 years<sup>19</sup> and Avillius Flaccus (32-8) for the last five of his reign, was plainly unlucky in earlier appointments; Aemilius Rectus (no. 11), who lasted no more than a year, had incurred his disapproval (n. 64), but the short tenure of Sejanus' father (no. 12) was surely, like that of Vitrasius Pollio (no. 14), prematurely ended by death. Of the 4 or 5 prefects who held office in the 9 years of Vespasian's principate one at least died in office, and another may have been recalled to fill the vacancy in the praetorian prefecture which Titus' accession created after perhaps only a few months' stay in Egypt (no. 31). In the same way Furius Victorinus (no. 53) was rapidly recalled to command the praetorians, like Bassaeus Rufus (no. 58), who had himself succeeded a man with a distinguished career, removed surely by death after less than a year (no. 57); it was a time of pestilence. Again, we may conjecture that Marcus Aurelius did not allow the great jurist, Volusius Maecianus (no. 54), a normal tenure of the prefecture, just because he set so high a value on his legal advice (cf. *Dig.* xxxvii 14, 17, *pr.*). Under Commodus indeed we have 11 prefects attested in 12 years (of whom M. Aurelius Papirius Dionysius perhaps held the office only for a month or two), and similarly we know of 7 in the 11 years from 212-22; the rapid turnover probably illustrates the distrust that the emperors concerned felt for virtually all members of the higher orders; Commodus was also notorious for his frequent removals of praetorian

<sup>18</sup> No doubt a man who had not been immersed in the routine of Egyptian administration might have examined it with a fresh and critical eye, and made improvements so far as he was permitted. But the edict of Ti. Iulius Alexander, vv. 3-10, indicates that the prefect had little discretion. He was appointed to

work the system, not to remodel it. Cf. Chalon 238. *P. Fay.* 21 (p. 138) illustrates the kind of limited administrative reform a prefect could initiate.

<sup>19</sup> Sen., *ad Helviam* 19, 6 (cf. Stein, *Präfekten*, 25), gives 16 years, presumably reckoning inclusively.

prefects.<sup>20</sup> It may also be significant that there were 3 or 4 prefects in the last 7 years of Domitian's rule. The average tenure for the whole period is no doubt much reduced by the fact that it is not more than 2 years between 180 and 236. During that time only two of the known prefects (7 per cent) are known to have been in post for 4 years or more (no. 78 under Septimius and no. 89 under Severus Alexander), whereas we have 14 (22·5 per cent) who are attested in office for almost that length of time, or longer, in the previous 210 years (nos. 6, 13, 15, 21, 23, 26, 37, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 60), to say nothing of several others who may have assumed, or demitted, office earlier, or later, than our extant records as yet prove, and may also have governed Egypt for over 3 years.

It seems to me probable that between 30 B.C. and A.D. 180 no more than half a dozen names of prefects need be lost and that the average tenure was about three years, with a fair proportion holding office longer. From the accession of Commodus the practice changed, and nearly all prefects had too little time in which to familiarize themselves with the special problems of Egypt, if they lacked previous experience there. Until 180, however, most prefects at least had some opportunity of learning their duties *ambulando*. It must remain doubtful whether this was in itself sufficient to ensure good administration, unless they had been prepared by their previous careers for the tasks that awaited them in the Nile valley.

#### THE CAREERS OF PREFECTS

We may now consider the prior experience prefects had secured. For this purpose I divide them (excluding forty-four of whose previous careers nothing whatever is known) into three classes:

(i) those whose careers up to the prefecture are wholly or almost wholly recorded—nos. 39, 44, 49, 50, 53, 54, 57, 58, 68;

(ii) those of whose previous careers much is known—nos. 23, 26, 45 (?), 48, 62, 79.

(iii) those who are recorded in some previous posts—nos. 1, 7, 10 (?), 12, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38 (?), 41, 42, 43, 47, 56 (?), 60, 63, 64, 71 (?), 76, 77, 78, 85 (?).

Naturally the distinction between some members of the last two classes is marginal, while numbers 23 and 48 are excluded from class (i) only because it is not certain what higher post or posts immediately preceded their prefectures; by contrast it is the early career of no. 62 that is hidden.

For the whole of the first century we have few 'cursus inscriptions'. The very first that fully records a prefect's career is that of C. Minicius Italus (no. 39); there are incomplete epigraphic records for only two of his predecessors (nos. 17 and 23), though we know much of the career of Ti. Iulius Alexander (66–70) because he happens to be often mentioned in literary sources. At least four men had been praetorian prefects (n. 1), but it is no less obscure by what path men were promoted to that command; the laconic inscription of Burrus (*ILS* 1321) does not reveal with what justification Tacitus described him as 'egregiae militaris famae' (*Ann.* xii, 42), and the first praetorian prefect whose career can be fully reconstructed from epigraphic and literary sources is Q. Marcus Turbo under Hadrian (Pflaum, no. 94). This dearth of evidence does not mean that there were few equestrian careers to be recorded: rather that Equites were slow to adopt the fashion of having their careers inscribed. That fashion began with senators, and quite late. There had been a senatorial *cursus* for centuries before Augustus' time, yet there are few Republican inscriptions to illustrate it. Even under Augustus and Tiberius senators were less apt to have their careers commemorated than later, if we take the selection made by Dessau as a fair sample not only of career inscriptions now extant but also of all that were ever set up: we find 34, including those which are fragmentary, in *ILS* 880–950 inclusive, which belong roughly to the years 44 B.C. to A.D. 37, as against 26 in *ILS* 954–86 from c. A.D. 37 to 69, and 37 in *ILS* 987–1040 from c. 69 to 117; the annual rate roughly doubles after

<sup>20</sup> Excluding Cleander, we know 11 praetorian prefects by name from his reign (Passerini, *Le Coorti pretorie*, 304 f.), but *HA, Comm.* 6, 6 alleges that he changed them 'per horas ac dies', and though among

those recorded only one ex-prefect of Egypt is found, probably others were promoted to the guard from Egypt; this may help to explain the rapid changes in the government of Egypt.

Tiberius. Equites learned gradually to emulate the higher class; freedmen followed the same example later still, and rather infrequently (cf. p. 140).

There were indeed markedly fewer posts available to an Eques under Augustus and Tiberius than a century later. Prefects of Egypt in their day could therefore not have acquired the variety of experience attested under the Antonines. However, they will hardly have chosen men untested by any offices higher than those of the *militiae equestres*, and we may naturally infer from the dedication made by the Tarraconenses to M. Magius Maximus (no. 10) at what was evidently his home town, Aeclanum, that he had previously been procurator of their province, a post that certainly existed in his time (Strabo iii, 4, 20).<sup>21</sup>

#### PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE IN EGYPT

If only because the prefect of Egypt was equestrian, no senator could be employed as a subordinate to him, and though some such posts later held by Equites may at first have been entrusted to freedmen or natives,<sup>22</sup> Equites are recorded under Augustus and Tiberius not only as commanders of the legions stationed there, but also as Iuridici, Idioi Logoi and Epistrategi.<sup>23</sup> In the very first decade or two of Augustus' reign it may not yet have been recognized that procuratorial posts in general were public offices that qualified their holders for further advancement, and previous experience in Egypt itself may have led on to the prefecture. The first prefect, C. Cornelius Gallus, had probably won Augustus' confidence partly by his success in invading Egypt from the west, especially as Upper Egypt still had to be pacified, and military talent must have seemed to be the primary qualification; like Gallus, the two next prefects both directed military operations,<sup>24</sup> and like Gallus, they may have acquired some familiarity with local conditions while employed in the country, perhaps as prefects of the legions quartered there. Of course this hypothesis cannot be proved, but it is no objection to it that, later on, commanders of these legions are seldom recorded to have advanced further; in fact, as late as Vespasian, C. Aeternius Fronto (no. 30), who had been *praefectus castrorum* of the Egyptian legionaries engaged in the siege of Jerusalem, did become prefect (cf. n. 23).

At least three of the five prefects Nero appointed had had previous experience in Egypt, Balbillus (no. 23) as head of the Museum and record office etc., Caecina Tuscus (no. 25) as Iuridicus and Ti. Julius Alexander (no. 26) as Epistrategus. This is the more remarkable, as few later prefects seem to have had any previous connection with Egypt. Classes (i) and (ii) include half the prefects who governed between 101 and 169, and of the ten men concerned only Valerius Eudaemon (no. 48) had certainly served in a civil post in Egypt before his prefecture, and only Valerius Proculus (no. 49) and perhaps Baienus (no. 58) are documented in a military or partly military post there. Of course we have a record of no more than one or two offices that most prefects had held. Still, some 80 Epistrategi<sup>25</sup> are known by name and about as many holders of other procuratorial posts in the country; yet apart from the prefects already named and Ti. Claudius Subatianus Aquila (no. 79), who had been *Epistrategus*, perhaps for hardly more than a year, thirty-seven years before his prefecture, and (if indeed he held the prefecture), Vernasius Facundus (no. 59),

<sup>21</sup> Despite doubts of Sherwin-White, *PBSR* xv (1939), 16, n. 34.

<sup>22</sup> The first known Epistrategus (Pflaum, p. 1091) is apparently peregrine. Freedmen: Plut., *Mor.* 207 B; Wilcken, *Chr.* 443 with his commentary; Dio lviii, 19, 6. Hiberus, acting prefect in A.D. 32, must have had a high post, though hardly that of Iuridicus, the substantive rank of acting prefects in 176, 219 (?) and 225 (Appendix).

<sup>23</sup> See Pflaum's lists of the civilian officials, pp. 1083-92; 1107 f. A prefect of XXII Deiotariana (*ILS* 2687) is probably Augustan or Tiberian. Ritterling, *RE* xii, 1490 f.; 1513 f.; 1795 f. lists commanders of legions of Egypt, who are sometimes styled 'praefecti castrorum' or 'pr. exercitus qui est in Aegypto' (cf. *RE* xxiv, 1287 f.). Pflaum, p. 76, says that this post customarily marked the end of a man's career. For this generalization he cites

('surtout') one instance (*ILS* 2696, Claudian); one might perhaps add the anonymous of *OGIS* 586 = *IGR* iii 1015 (Flavian), but he had not certainly ended his career. Contrast not only Aeternius Fronto (my no. 31) but Pflaum, nos. 109, 195 and probably 211; moreover, some equestrian prefects of legions raised by Severus go further. The fact is that there are few of these commanders whose careers are known fully or even in part. It may be significant that after c. 100 in the numerous *cursus* inscriptions of men who rose to high rank a legionary post in Egypt occurs only once (Pflaum no. 109—*pr. ann.*), but such an argument *e silentio* has no force for the Julio-Claudian period.

<sup>24</sup> Stein, *Präefekten* 14-17.

<sup>25</sup> M. Vandoni, *Gli epistrategi nell'Egitto greco-romano* (1971).

who had been Dioiketes and had held some earlier subordinate post in the country, none of these subordinate officials appears in the almost complete *Fasti* of the prefects. Thus after the Julio-Claudian period previous experience within the country was apparently no recommendation. Other facts may point to a contrast between Julio-Claudian and subsequent practice. Ti. Julius Alexander, and perhaps Balbillus, were the only known governors born in the province. The prefects also include three homonymous couples, who were probably each father and son (nos. 11 and 18, 14 and 17, 46 and 57), and one might conjecture that the son accompanied his father to the Nile, just as an *Idios Logos* under Marcus Aurelius probably held that office in the prefecture of his father (no. 60). But two of the couples are also of the Julio-Claudian era.

## SUBORDINATE EQUESTRIAN OFFICIALS

In commenting on the career of Ulpius Serenianus who was *Antarchiereus* in 160 and perhaps in 162, and *Archiereus* in 171-8 and (as we have since learned) in 193, Pflaum suggested that the government preferred to keep specialists, of Graeco-Oriental origin, for long periods in Egypt. When he wrote, he was not aware of another perhaps comparable case: Lysimachus, *Idios Logos* in 69, was probably in the same post in 88, though he had not held it continuously in the intervening years. Moreover, out of 11 *Iuridici* of whose careers we know something 6 had already served in Egypt in a civil or military capacity (Pflaum, nos. 25, 77, 114, 116, 121, 137), and only 2 had clearly not (nos. 81, 178); in three cases we lack information (nos. 4, 100, 267). Recently it has been shown that of 19 equestrian army officers in Egypt, whose subsequent careers are recorded at least in part, 5 or 6 held civil posts in the country, not counting two who became *praefecti montis Berenicidis*.<sup>26</sup> Perhaps then, the prefect usually had assistance from equestrian officials more familiar with Egypt than he generally was.

However, the samples of careers cited are very small, and much other evidence does not harmonize with this suggestion.

(1) Only 12 men are known to have held more than one civilian post in Egypt, excluding the prefecture (Pflaum nos. 25, 55, 56, 77, 88, 104 bis, 114, 116, 121, 137, 192 bis, 256); to these we may perhaps add a *Dioiketes* who had once been *Arabarch* (192).<sup>27</sup> Pflaum gives some details of the previous postings of 4 *Dioiketai* (ib. nos. 169, 190, 193, 232) and of 5 *Idioi Logoi* (ib. nos. 7, 146, 177 cf. p. 981, 262, 268), but the *ex-Arabarch* alone had any attested experience of the country; we may now add Vernasius Facundus (my no. 59). Besides Ulpius Serenianus, and Balbillus, whose responsibilities under Claudius at least overlapped with those of the later *Archiereis*, we know the career of one *Archiereus*, L. Iulius Vestinus (Pflaum, no. 105), who probably combined this post with that of head of the Museum; he had no other connection with the country, and went on to palatine duties.<sup>28</sup> Promotion outside Egypt seems to have been usual; of 7 *Iuridici*, whose subsequent employment is recorded, only Caecina was again in Egypt, as prefect; the other 6 (ib. nos. 25, 116, 121, 137, 178, 250) do not seem to have returned, any more than those *Dioiketai* whose later posts are known (nos. 169, 193). The prospects of *Epistrategi* do not seem to have been good, but, of the two who became prefects, Ti. Iulius Alexander is known, and Ti. Claudius Subatianus Aquila can be assumed,<sup>29</sup> to have had varied careers elsewhere. Of the 8 others of whose later postings something is recorded by Pflaum 6 were promoted outside Egypt (nos. 52, 87, 103, 123, 217, 222), and only 2 held higher offices there, the first almost certainly after service elsewhere in the interval (nos. 114, 256). The anonymous figure who had been active in Cappadocia, Pannonia,

<sup>26</sup> Pflaum on n. 192 bis; he did not know that the same man appears once more as *Archiereus* in Feb./March 193, P. J. Parsons, *Chron. d'Ég.* xlix (1974), 135. Lysimachus: P. R. Swarney, *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos* (1970), 84, cf. pp. 127 f. for up-to-date list of these officials. Military officers: H. Devijver, in H. Temporini (ed.), *Aufstieg u. Niedergang der röm. Welt*, ii, 1 (1974), 452 f., esp. 463 f.

<sup>27</sup> The *Arabarch* controlled the collection of tolls

on the route to the Red Sea (*OGIS* 674), but was not always an *Eques*, cf. Jos., *AJ* xviii, 159; 259; xix, 276; xx, 100, 147; Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüdischen Volkes*, iii<sup>4</sup>, 132.

<sup>28</sup> G. M. Parássoglou, *Zeitschr. f. Pap. u. Epigr.* xiii (1974), 32 f. lists the *Archiereis*. He believes the post to be Hadrianic, and therefore excludes Balbillus.

<sup>29</sup> He came from Cuicul in Numidia, cf. Pflaum, no. 242 for his brother.

Italy and Gaul before becoming 'procurator ad dioecisin Alexandriae', and who then acceded to palatine offices and the prefecture of the corn-supply (Pflaum, no. 271, cf. p. 994), may be as typical, save for his exceptional success, of administrators in Egypt as the Archiereus on whose career Pflaum founded his hypothesis.

(2) None of the equestrian posts, so far as we can tell, was normally held for a long period. Thus there were at least 11 Iuridici between c. 114 and 147 (Pflaum p. 1087 f.) with an average tenure of not over 3 years, and at least 41 Epistrategi of the Heptanomia c. 114-235 (n. 25), whose average tenure was still briefer, since there are obvious gaps in the Fasti. Similarly no fewer than 6 Dioiketai are recorded in c. 180-200 (Pflaum, p. 1084). The lists of these officials at other times and of other officials in all periods are manifestly defective, but there is no reason to suppose that the figures given are not typical.

(3) Even in the lowest grade of equestrian posts in Egypt, that of the Epistrategi, Graeco-Oriental *cognomina* hardly preponderate as late as the second half of the second century, when we still find men whose *nomina*, e.g. 'Vedius', 'Luceius', 'Vettius', 'Egnatuleius' (Pflaum, no. 217), suggest western origin; most Epistrategi have such uninformative names as 'Iulius Quintianus'. Moreover, easterners need not have been specialists in Egyptian administration. All or most may have been as much 'birds of passage' as Ti. Claudius Xenophon (Pflaum, no. 222), Epistrategus in 180, whose varied career was otherwise passed at Rome, in Dacia, Pannonia, Dalmatia, Lower Moesia, Asia and Africa.

(4) What we know of the Archidicasts may also have a bearing on this question. Their jurisdiction was important; whether or not delegated by the prefect or restricted to certain types of case, it extended to the whole country; they could give instructions to Strategei (*BGU* 136; *P. Giess.* 34; *P. Mil. Vogl.* 229). The office was held by Alexandrians of distinguished family, sometimes from one generation to another; some also acted as *hypomnematographoi* or held civic offices at Alexandria. In the second century most of them seem to be Roman citizens, and almost certainly they would then have possessed equestrian census; under Hadrian four of them commanded cohorts both within and beyond Egypt, one twice. Yet none is recorded to have been advanced to higher equestrian posts in their own country. Moreover, though one was in office from 15 to 5 B.C., they mostly seem to have had very brief tenures, some for only a year. Even at this level the government apparently set little value on local experience.<sup>30</sup>

It would then appear probable that most equestrian officials in Egypt had as little prior familiarity with the administration there as most prefects.

#### PREVIOUS GOVERNORSHIPS OF PREFECTS

As already pointed out, the combination in the prefect's hands of military, judicial and fiscal functions is found elsewhere only in the provinces governed by presidial procurators. If experience in Egypt itself was not deemed to be desirable for a prefect, might he not naturally have been tested out in one or more of these presidial posts? Yet in fact only 7 or 8 prefects are attested in these procuratorships, one in the Maritime Alps (no. 49), one in Judaea under Claudius (no. 26), one or two in Raetia (nos. 57 and 36a, if ever prefect), two in Noricum (nos. 56 and 58), two in Mauretania Tingitana (nos. 57 and 64) and one in Sardinia (no. 79); one of the men concerned (no. 57) had governed two of these provinces. Of the 9 prefects in class (i) only 3 had previously governed a province.

#### PREFECTURES AT ROME

At the end of his reign Augustus appointed a former prefect of Egypt, C. Turranius (no. 5), to be prefect of the *annona*, probably the first holder of the post, but this precedent

<sup>30</sup> On the office and its holders see I. Calabi, *Aegyptus* xxxii (1952), 406 f.; to her list add Ti. Cl. Serenus between 139 and 144 (*P. Mil. Vogl.* 229), Ti. Claudius Alexander, 2nd century (*BGU* 2062), and Calpurnius Petronianus in 225 (*P. Oxy.* 2705). In 120-39, 12 Archidicasts are attested, and in both 143-4 and 159-60, 3. Her doubts on the Roman

citizenship of some men who have Roman *nomina* do not seem justified in view of the undoubted equestrian status of the 4 *ex-praefecti cohortis* and the hereditary dignity of some families represented (see e.g. *P. Oxy.* 1434 with commentary). Cf. Devijver o.c. (n. 26), 483-90.

was not copied except in bizarre conditions under Commodus (Pflaum, no. 181). Instead, no fewer than fifteen men were advanced from the prefecture of the *annona* to that of Egypt (nos. 30, 32, 33, 35, 39, 41, 42, 49, 50, 53, 54, 57, 63, 68, 78), including 7 in class (i). It seems fair to infer that this was a normal sequence. Now at first sight, in view of the importance of Egyptian corn for the provisioning of Rome, it might seem that *praefecti annonae* as such would have acquired some insight into the administration of Egypt.<sup>31</sup> Yet doubts must supervene. The *praefectus annonae* surely needed to obtain from Alexandria advance notice of the tonnage that he could expect and of the probable dates of shipment, but he did not need detailed knowledge about the upkeep of the irrigation system, the mode of assessing probable yields, the collection of the tax-grain or its transportation to the docks at Alexandria. Nor did the prefect of Egypt need to have been in actual charge of the procurement of grain for Rome in order to be aware that it was one of his most essential duties to extract as much grain as possible from the cultivators. Probably it was just because the *praefectus annonae* stood next to the prefect of Egypt in the equestrian hierarchy that he had a claim to fill the first vacancy at Alexandria.<sup>32</sup> If for some reason he were not available, the official who stood next to him in rank, the *praefectus vigilum*, could be preferred; three holders of this office were directly promoted in this way (nos. 43, 44, 58), and one governor of Egypt at least had held both prefectures at Rome (no. 32). Yet there was no natural link between the duties of the *praefectus vigilum* and the administration of Egypt. Of course the tenure of any of these offices is proof that the emperor valued the competence of the holders; but it does not appear that specialized skill or experience was looked for.

#### MILITARY EXPERIENCE AND DUTIES

The prefect was commander of an army. No doubt most prefects had at least held two or three of the *militiae equestres*. This is true of 7 of the 9 men in class (i). Unfortunately we do not know for how long on average an Eques destined for higher employment retained a legionary tribunate or auxiliary prefecture, or therefore to what extent he may be regarded as a professional expert.<sup>33</sup> In any case, even if we could fix the average, any individual might have served for either longer or shorter terms. In fact some of our 7 men had probably or certainly more than average military experience. C. Minicius Italus (no. 39) had held five equestrian commissions. T. Furius Victorinus (no. 53), who held only three, rose to be prefect first of the Ravenna and then of the Misenum fleet, and was finally to be given command of the praetorians. Q. Baienus Blassianus (no. 57), again after the *tres militiae*, commanded the fleet in Britain, governed two *provinciae armatae* and was prefect of the Ravenna fleet. M. Bassaeus Rufus (no. 58) had governed Noricum and was to be praetorian prefect; moreover he had risen from the ranks of the praetorian guard,<sup>34</sup> through the urban tribunates and the iterated primipilate. At least two other prefects had been tribunes of the guard (nos. 29 and 73), and probably Ser. Sulpicius Similis (no. 41), an ex-centurion, had a similar career. We may also recall that Vespasian appointed a man who had been *praefectus castrorum* of the Egyptian legions (no. 30), and that Tiberius Iulius Alexander was chief of staff to Corbulo, and later to Titus, to say nothing of his procuratorship in Judaea; very probably he had gone through the *militiae equestres*.

None the less military qualifications were not essential to a prefect of Egypt. Balbillus (no. 23) had perhaps held only an honorary tribunate and certainly had no other experience in the army. Neither Heliodorus (no. 47) nor Eudaemon (no. 48), cultivated Greeks, are likely to have practised arms. The jurist Volusius Maecianus (no. 54) had only held one equestrian commission in the army, and M. Aurelius Papius Dionysius (no. 68) and L.

<sup>31</sup> cf. G. E. F. Chilver, *AJP* lxx (1949), 16 f.

<sup>32</sup> cf. the promotion of praetorian prefects to Egypt and vice versa, nn. 1 and 2.

<sup>33</sup> E. Birley, *Roman Britain and the Roman Army* (1953), 137 f. argues that 'a period of three or four

years' service in each post can have been by no means unusual', but the evidence he cited is clearly too scanty to justify fixing an average.

<sup>34</sup> Dio lxxi, 5, 2.



Baebius (no. 79) none at all; that can also be conjectured for Commodus' tutor, Sanctus (no. 62).

Augustus would hardly have contemplated appointing mere civilians to command the army in Egypt. The first three governors were all engaged in important military operations (n. 24). At the outset three legions were stationed in the country, together with 3 *alae* and 3 cohorts (Strabo xvii, 1, 12). But one legion had already been withdrawn before A.D. 23 (Tac., *Ann.* iv, 5) and a second left probably under Hadrian. It was some compensation that the number of cohorts was increased; eight are attested, as well as three *alae*, in a diploma of 83, and in Pius' reign there were twelve. We cannot be sure that we know just how many auxiliary regiments remained thereafter, since there may have been more than those which happen to be recorded. Lesquier, however, guessed that the total force in the country was reduced from 22,800 under Augustus to no more than 17-18,000, and perhaps to as few as 11,000 in the post-Hadrianic era; the last figure should perhaps be 13,000.<sup>35</sup> Moreover Egypt was in no danger of a serious foreign invasion; the primary purpose of the legions or legion at Nicopolis was to overawe the unruly population of Alexandria, and elsewhere soldiers were scattered through the *chora* on police duties; officers were often employed in the civil administration.<sup>36</sup> In normal circumstances the maintenance of internal order was within the capacity of a competent civilian, and it may have been his hardest task, as commander-in-chief, to keep the troops disciplined and repress their depredations on the subjects (cf. Philo, *Flacc.* 5). But major revolts or inroads necessitated the deployment of additional forces, and then the high command might be placed in hands other than the prefect's. Marcus Turbo (Pflaum, no. 94) was specially commissioned to subdue the Jews at the end of Trajan's reign. Under Marcus Aurelius the legate of Syria, Avidius Cassius, was called in to defeat the Bucoli, shepherds and brigands in the north-west of the Delta.<sup>37</sup> The then prefect, C. Calvisius Statianus, had been *ab epistulis Latinis*; most such secretaries were men with no military experience (cf. n. 43). His inability to suppress the Bucoli without aid was not held against him; he remained in office for the exceptionally long term of six years, till disgraced for his part in Avidius' rebellion. Under Severus Alexander, M. Aurelius Zeno Ianuarius (Pflaum, no. 315), a former governor of Mauretania Caesariensis, operated in Egypt as *dux*, and not (as once supposed) as prefect.<sup>38</sup>

No doubt it was simply impossible for emperors to find men equally qualified for the military and civil duties of a governor of Egypt, and reasonable, given the conditions that generally prevailed there, if they looked primarily for competence in judicial and fiscal business. Hence the choice of men like Bassaeus Rufus, whom Dio (n. 34), while conceding his merits, describes as uneducated, may well evoke surprise: they can hardly have known much law, and came relatively late to fiscal work. Yet in fact legal expertise was still rarer than military proficiency among the prefects.

#### LEGAL EXPERIENCE AND DUTIES

Like the presidial procurators, the governor of Egypt possessed supreme jurisdiction, both civil and criminal, subject to any rights of appeal to the emperor (*CPL* 237: *P. Oxy.* 2104). Indeed in the view of some scholars all other officials, except the Idios Logos for certain fiscal claims, could only administer justice as his delegates. Whether or not this be so, he obviously had no time to deal with all the cases that might have come before him, and he must have resorted to full delegation on a large scale (cf. nn. 51 f.); alternatively, he could appoint *iudices pedanei* to decide particular suits in accordance with his instructions. Petitioners would try to attract his personal attention by appeals to his pity or to the public interest; this shows that they did not expect him to decide their suits personally

<sup>35</sup> *L'Armée rom. d'Égypte* (1918), 102 f., brought up-to-date on the number of *auxilia* by H.-G. Pflaum, *Syria* xlv (1967), 339 f.

<sup>36</sup> For their role in jurisdiction cf. nn. 44, 47; in *epikrisis*, *P. Oxy.* xii, p. 149; in the census, Hunt-Edgar, *Select Papyri*, no. 220; police and related duties, see documents listed and transcribed in

S. Daris, *Documenti per la storia dell' esercito romano in Egitto* (1964), 153-69. Cf. Mitteis, *Grundz.*, 28-30; 33-6; Wilcken, *Grundz.* 396 f.

<sup>37</sup> Dio lxxi, 4. Bucoli: *RE* iii, 1013.

<sup>38</sup> Pflaum, no. 315; see now P. J. Parsons, *Proc. of XIIth Conference of Papyrology* (1970), 389 f.

as a matter of course. Still there was no type of case that he was not in principle competent to hear himself, and might not choose to hear at his own discretion.<sup>39</sup>

And yet only two prefects are known to have been experts in the civil law (nos. 54, 68). Such expertise in officials cannot be assumed in the absence of professional study. It was probably deficient even in most advocates, a class sharply distinguished at Rome from juriconsults, though no doubt they picked up more knowledge of the law in forensic practice than most gentlemen did in the mere management of their own property.<sup>40</sup> Stein once opined that at least after Hadrian juristic qualifications were required for all higher Roman officials. There is simply no evidence for this. Only a few are known to have studied the law. Most of the subordinate posts Equites filled would not have provided even empirical training. It is true that in the second century some began as legal *consilarii* of the emperor or as *advocati fisci*. Hirschfeld, to whom Stein referred, was impressed by this, but to say nothing of the facts that the *advocati* may have been orators rather than lawyers, and were concerned with a restricted range of cases, it was not common for men of this type to rise to any of the greatest offices; in Egypt only one prefect to our knowledge had been a *consiliarius* (no. 68), and none an *advocatus fisci*.<sup>41</sup>

Fiscal as well as presidial procurators might enjoy some jurisdiction, but it was normally restricted to fiscal matters;<sup>42</sup> and in general nothing had prepared them to exercise even this limited power. Still less were most Equites fitted by previous experience for the presidial posts which made them supreme judges of all civil and criminal cases; moreover (as we have seen) few of the prefects of Egypt are recorded to have served a sort of apprenticeship as governors of smaller provinces. As a *libellis* or *ab epistulis*, men were certainly concerned with the legal problems referred to the emperor by private petitioners or by officials such as Pliny. But only three of the prefects (nos. 44, 54 and 68) are known to have served as a *libellis*—perhaps it is significant that they included both the jurists—the first (no. 44) for hardly more than a year (p. 137). Only one is attested as formerly *ab epistulis Latinis* (no. 60), three as *ab epistulis Graecis* (nos. 47, 48, 62) and one as *ad legationes et responsa Graeca* (no. 23); three of these (nos. 47, 48 and perhaps 23) seem to have been men of letters and can hardly be credited with legal expertise, which was probably not of much relevance to an emperor's dealings with Greek cities.<sup>43</sup> Caecina (no. 26) had served as Iuridicus in Egypt itself; but that does not make him a professional lawyer;

<sup>39</sup> Mitteis, *Grundz.*, 24 ff.; Coroi, *Actes du V<sup>e</sup> Congrès Int. de Pap.* (1938), 615 f.; Humbert, esp. 100 f., who thinks that only the Idios Logos had jurisdiction independent of the prefect, but argues (109 f.) for permanent delegations to certain officials, cf. n. 52 below. H. Kupiszewski, *Journ. Jur. Pap.* vii/viii (1953/4), 191 f. maintains that the Iuridicus had jurisdiction committed to him by the emperor; Strabo xvii, 1, 2 and *ILS* 2691 strongly suggest this, and all other arguments on each side seem to me indecisive. But no doubt the prefect could overrule the Iuridicus; the Idios Logos too was subject to his authority, cf. edict of Ti. Iulius Alexander, vv. 37–45, and *Gnomon Idiologi*, proem. On the Archidicast cf. n. 30. On petitions, Humbert, 131 f. See, most recently, E. Seidl, *Rechtsgesch. Ägyptens als röm. Provinz* (1974), 93 f.

<sup>40</sup> F. Schulz, *Hist. of Rom. Legal Science*, 108 f. Quintilian argued that the ideal orator should be expert in law (xii, 3), but equally in moral philosophy (ib. 2) and history (4); his ideal had never been realized (x, 2, 9), and it is clear from much that he says that advocates of his day, often appearing before 'imperiti' (ii, 17, 27), relied like Cicero, still the best model for Quintilian, on appeals to plausibility or emotion rather than to juristic arguments. Cicero too had insisted on the necessity of the ideal orator knowing the law (*de orat.* i, 18, cf. 166–201; *Orator* 120; *Part. Or.* 98 f.); in fact it is clear that the views and practice ascribed to M. Antonius (*de orat.* i, 234 f. esp. 248–53, cf. 172) were more typical (cf. *Part. Or.*

100). The ῥήτορες or συνήγοροι of Egyptian trials can be distinguished from νομικοί (*SB* 7696, cf. Seidl o.c. (n. 39), 115 f.).

<sup>41</sup> Stein, *Unters.* 194, citing Hirschfeld, *Kaiserliche Verwaltungsbeamten*<sup>2</sup>, 428 f. But *pace* Hirschfeld, as Pflaum's lists of imperial *consilarii* and of *advocati fisci* in Rome and Italy (pp. 1024 f., 1033, 1104) show, very few of them are known to have been promoted except to specialized legal posts; the same is true of provincial *advocati fisci*, who are hardly attested before the third century. Stein also relied on Mitteis, *Reichsrecht u. Volksrecht*, 193 and *Dig.* i, 22, cf. p. 134 below.

<sup>42</sup> Brunt, *Latomus* xxv (1966), 461 f., where it is argued that in some reigns they perhaps did not even exercise fiscal jurisdiction.

<sup>43</sup> Of 9 a *libellis* before 235 known to Pflaum (pp. 1021, 1104, cf. 994) 3 were jurists. Yet the freedmen predecessors of these equestrian officials can hardly have been *iurisperiti*, and legal attainments may never have been indispensable. Of 14 attested *ab epistulis* or *ab epistulis Latinis* (pp. 1020 f., 1104) 3 again were jurists (Pflaum, nos. 142, 172, 287). Birley, o.c. (n. 33), 142 f., thinks they needed military experience, but on patently inadequate grounds. Of Equites entitled simply *ab ep.*, Pflaum, no. 156 had 'great military experience'; not so all the others whose careers are known, nos. 60, 96, 105, 142, 271 (cf. p. 994), 287. Once again, freedmen *ab epistulis* had been neither lawyers nor soldiers. On rhetors as *ab ep.* *Gr.* see Pflaum, p. 684.

no Iuridicus is recorded to have had legal qualifications, although the very title implies that he was primarily concerned with jurisdiction; two at least (Pflaum nos. 4 and 100) were essentially military men. The other officials to whom the prefects sent down cases for decision or investigation were equally amateurs; they even included equestrian army officers.<sup>44</sup>

Roman law applied at first to Roman citizens in the province, though some of its rules were gradually extended to the other inhabitants. For the rest of the population the government naturally had no alternative but to uphold in the main, subject to modifications made in the course of time, Egyptian or Greek laws, or the amalgam of the two that had developed under the Ptolemies, to which their subjects were accustomed.<sup>45</sup> Ideally, the prefect and his delegates needed to be familiar with both Roman and native legal institutions: seldom trained in Roman law and mostly total strangers to the country, few possessed either qualification.

There is some evidence that they could seek guidance from *nomikoi* versed in the local 'laws', but little to show that Roman juriconsults were available. Provincial governors might have expert *adssesores* at least in the Severan period, but not all *adssesores* were juriconsults.<sup>46</sup> The papyri show prefects under Vespasian and Trajan discussing their judgements with *nomikoi*, but in the earlier instances the lawyers are Greeks concerned with local laws—the prefects appear to be entirely dependent on them for knowledge of what these laws prescribe—and in the last the issue is elementary. Under Nero the prefect's legal *consilium* consisted of the Iuridicus, the Dioiketes, some army officers and persons who, to judge from their names, were Alexandrian notables; the case related to military privileges, but an army officer also advises on a purely civil issue, just as they could decide such cases as delegates or *iudices pedanei* appointed by the prefect (n. 44).<sup>47</sup> Mitteis suggested that in their *scribae* governors found a staff educated in the law (cf. n. 41): but *scribae* are not attested in Egypt, and there is no evidence that they ever had the qualifications he imputes to them.

It must then remain uncertain how far the prefects had the benefit of professional advice on Roman law. In default of it they could no doubt turn to their archives for texts of the praetorian edicts, and of prefects' edicts in Egypt, for Roman legislation applicable there, for royal ordinances still valid, and for decisions of their predecessors which might serve as precedents.<sup>48</sup> Moreover, some of the more elementary books on Roman law may well have been used by, perhaps devised for, officials (rather than law students), and not only in Egypt; in every province the law was, we may think, generally administered by amateurs. The so-called *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* provided guidance to that officer in

<sup>44</sup> Mitteis, *Chr.* 84 (Humbert, 110 argues that this *pr. coh.* had a permanent delegation); 90 (trib. as *iudex datus*); *P. Teb.* 488 (tribune); *P. Oxy.* 237, viii, 3 (ἐπάρχῳ στόλου καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κεκριμένων τῷ τεταμῶ —[τά]τω); 1637 (centurion as *iudex datus*). See Seidl o.c. (n. 39), 102 on *P. Mich.* iii, 159. Cf. n. 36.

<sup>45</sup> Taubenschlag, *Law of Graeco-Roman Egypt*<sup>2</sup> (1955), ch. i; Seidl o.c. (n. 39), esp. Part iv. J. Modrzejewski, *XIIth Int. Congress of Papyrology* (1970), 317 f. seems to hold that all pre-Roman laws had only the status of customs after the conquest which acquired full legal validity as *Provinzialrecht* only if confirmed by Roman edicts or *decreta*; hence we cannot speak of decisions in Roman courts which set aside such customs as violations of law (cf. n. 54). Yet in *P. Oxy.* 2757 a Flavian prefect consults Areius the 'nomikos' about what the (Egyptian) 'laws command'. Obviously both rulers and governed must have started from the presumption that the relevant local 'nomoi' would remain in force, unless and until modified for specific reasons. On Modrzejewski's own showing Roman courts very commonly upheld them (339 f.).

<sup>46</sup> W. Kunkel, *Herkunft u. soziale Stellung der röm. Juristen*<sup>2</sup>, 269 f.; 355 f. (add *P. Oxy.* 2757), on

jurists in Egypt; ib. 331 ff. on assessors. The *xenokritai* of *P. Oxy.* 3016, whatever they may be, can hardly be relevant.

<sup>47</sup> *Nomikoi*: *P. Oxy.* 2757; 3015 (also for *consilium*); Mitteis, *Chr.* 372, iii, 18. *Consilium* of Caecina Tuscus: *P. Fouad* 21, cf. E. Balogh and H.-G. Pflaum, *Rev. hist. de droit fr. et étr.* xxx (1952), 117 f. The putative Alexandrians might be the archidikast, *hypomnematographos* and *eisagogeus*, for whom see commentary on *P. Oxy.* 1434; the last sits on the *consilium* in *P. Strasb.* 179. A *pr. alae* as *consiliarius* in *BGU* 288. References to the prefect consulting with his *consilarii*, or employing his 'friends' in judicial functions (e.g. *P. Oxy.* 2754) do not then prove that he had expert jurists on his staff. Seidl o.c. (n. 39) produces no new testimony for his assumption (233) that the prefects had jurists from Rome at their side.

<sup>48</sup> Private collections of rulings on particular legal topics (e.g. Mitteis, *Chr.* 370, 372, 374, cf. also *P. Oxy.* 237, vi, 28; vii, 12 f., Humbert 118) may have been extracted from official archives. On the sources of law in Roman Egypt cf. esp. the proem to the *Gnomon*, and see Seidl o.c. (n. 39), Part I; on the supposed provincial edict, Modrzejewski o.c. (n. 45), 341 f.

imposing penalties for the infringement of administrative regulations.<sup>49</sup> For my present purpose it hardly matters if reliance was placed on lawyers professionally trained or on clerks who would find documents in the archives; in either case the governor and higher officials depended on assistance from below.

According to Philo the Alexandrian Lampon, when an official of the prefect's court, had accepted bribes in both civil and criminal cases, falsified the records and grown rich by encompassing the death or impoverishment of defendants or suitors. These activities clearly antedate the prefecture of Flaccus and must be placed in the long period (16-31) when C. Galerius was prefect (cf. n. 15). Whether or not Philo's charges against Lampon were true, it must at least have been credible that corruption could affect judicial proceedings even under a governor of long experience. Philo in fact explains Lampon's success by the consideration that 'it was impracticable for the governors administering so vast a country, when more and more new business, both public and private, was always flowing in, to remember everything, especially as they were not only administering justice, but were occupied with the accounts for the revenues and taxes, the examination of which took up most of the year'; Lampon could 'trade on the forgetfulness of the judges'.<sup>50</sup>

Officials of his stamp must have had a still better chance of success when a new prefect could not depend at all on his own recollections, but had to rely on such evidence from the files as the officials laid before him. It is significant that in the famous case of Dionysia v. Chaeremon the latter ventured to petition a new governor without reference to the adverse decisions his predecessor had arrived at, though without success; on this occasion the prefect exercised 'his divine memory and unerring judgement' (*P. Oxy.* 237, vi, 8 f.). The fact that so few prefects were initially familiar with the system must also have favoured malpractices; the anecdote in Philostratus' life of Apollonius (v, 36), however unhistorical, about the proconsul of Achaëa whose ignorance enabled his assessors and staff to traffic in justice, may yet have the more universal truth of fiction, describing οὐκ ἄν γένοιτο, what all his readers knew to be possible, if not common. The preoccupations of the governor of Egypt were certainly greater than those of the governor in Greece; we have to think not only of the complexity of the tax system but of the multitude of petitions on legal and administrative matters which reached him. In under three days a Severan prefect received 1804 in one assize at Arsinoë.<sup>51</sup> M. Petronius Mamertinus (no. 46) refused to hear in the first instance charges or suits brought apparently by Roman citizens, except in a few specified categories, or on appeal, unless the appellants deposited part of the sum at issue.<sup>52</sup> We may conjecture that simple falsification of the records was not the only device of corrupt officials. They might also turn up those documents in the archives which favoured the cause of a particular litigant. They might induce the prefect to decide himself (under their influence), and to give priority to, the claims of a litigant who had bought their support, reducing the often long delays of legal process in Egypt, or to select someone to decide the case, who could be counted on to favour that litigant.

The litigation between Dionysia and Chaeremon may reveal some of the defects in the administration of justice. Down to Commodus' reign many, if not all, prefects had repeatedly forbidden litigants to approach them by letter rather than petition. Yet repetition of this rule would hardly have been necessary unless some of them had been prepared to countenance its violation. In fact Longaeus Rufus (no. 65) originally acted in

<sup>49</sup> Legal textbooks: Schulz o.c. (n. 40), 154 f.; we need not assume that there were not other early works, of which we happen to know nothing. Seidl, *St. Paoli*, 659 f., suggests that some prefects' decisions, e.g. *P. Ryl.* 75 (A.D. 150-2), were founded on *regulae*. W. von Uskull-Gyllenband, *BGU* v, 2, pp. 1-11, points out that the *Gnomon* has nothing on the Idios Logos' administration of land, his chief business. (On this perhaps he needed less guidance than on legal problems.) Fragments of juristic writings on papyri are of late-third-century date, see Taubenschlag, o.c. (n. 45), 36 f.

<sup>50</sup> *Flacc.* 130-4. Lucian, *Apol.* 12 says that he had a high salary for the task of bringing cases to the court (τὰς δίκας εἰσάγειν) and placing them in the right order (τάξις αὐταῖς τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐπιτιθέναι) and keeping

accurate records, especially of the decisions (τὰς τοῦ ἀρχοντος γνώσεις). It is to be noted that Lucian was no lawyer. Whether he held the same post as Lampon—nothing shows that it was equestrian—and what it was called, we do not know. Cf. Stein, *Unters.* 187 f.

<sup>51</sup> J. F. Oates et. al., *Yale Pap. in the Beinecke Library* (1967), 61.

<sup>52</sup> N. Lewis, *Rev. hist. de droit fr. et étr.* (1972), 5 f.; Li (1973), 5 f. In *P. Ryl.* 74 (probably A.D. 133) the prefect announces that he has no time to hold a *conventus* for the Thebaid, and no need, since most cases have been settled by the local authorities. In one way or another much more judicial business was evidently decided by subordinates than some modern accounts suggest.

this particular case on a letter from Chaeremon, a man of some status and wealth, without waiting to hear what could be said in reply.<sup>53</sup> At a later stage, with a new prefect in office (above), Chaeremon was able to claim the right under Egyptian custom to separate his daughter, Dionysia, from her husband against her own will, although (as Dionysia was to show) Roman courts under Hadrian and perhaps under Domitian had decided that paramount consideration was due to the wishes of the wife, at least in conditions which appear to have been fulfilled in her case.<sup>54</sup> Where the law to be applied was not known or was not certain, there were obvious opportunities for officials to manipulate the decisions of the courts.

Again, in a careful review of the types of case the prefect decided personally or delegated to others for investigation or trial, Humbert is unable to detect any clear distinction between them; the prefect tends to take more important cases (cf. Philo, *Flacc.* 4), yet he delegates some of them to others, and deals with some trivia himself.<sup>55</sup> Of course his time was limited, but it may well have been his officials acting in their own interests who induced him to devote it to hearing some claims and not others. Their co-operation was also probably required for the malpractices of the *Eklogistai* forbidden by Tiberius Iulius Alexander (edict, vv. 35 f.): they had been bringing *res iudicatae* over and over again before the prefects, no doubt on various legal pretexts, in order to harass the taxpayers and extort ruinous sums from them. Here again it is evident that this vexatious renewal of fiscal claims was facilitated by changes in the prefecture.

In these circumstances it would be unwise to assume *a priori* that judgements by the prefects or their delegates reflect expertise in Roman law. J. Modrzejewski (o.c. in n. 45, p. 346) suggests that Romanization of Egyptian juridical life affected the law of family and succession more rapidly and completely than contractual relationships. Perhaps the former were institutions of the civil law of which every Roman gentleman had some personal experience, and which the amateur judges therefore understood best.

#### FISCAL EXPERIENCE AND DUTIES

No doubt justice to private individuals, especially when relatively few of them were Roman citizens, was less important to the government than the extraction of revenue. On Philo's testimony this was the principal care of the prefects (above) and the very name, *διαλογισμός*, used in Egypt for 'conventus', confirms this. We may therefore think that the emperors appointed so few governors with legal qualifications, because competence in the law was less essential than experience in fiscal administration. Indeed much of the prefect's jurisdiction directly or indirectly affected the revenue; many petitions, for instance, concerned liability to the liturgies through which the collection of the revenue was assured. And it may be thought that in fiscal matters the prefects were generally well prepared for their tasks. At least 22 prefects, including all but the two jurists in class (i), had held one or more provincial procuratorships; probably this was usual from the time of Claudius. A few are also known to have had a part in the central financial administration, as *a rationibus* (nos. 50, 53, 58, 62, perhaps 49), *procurator rationis privatae* (no. 62), *procurator patrimonii* (no. 45), *procurator hereditarium* (nos. 44, 79) or *procurator vicesimae hereditarium* (no. 50).

We cannot generally tell how long men retained any equestrian offices, civil or military.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>53</sup> *P. Oxy.* 237, vi, 6 f., on which see Mitteis, *Grundz.* 27; 38, n. 3.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* vi, 17 f., vii, 13—viii, 7. Cf. n. 45 on the 'violation' of Egyptian law.

<sup>55</sup> Humbert, ch. ii.

<sup>56</sup> It seems to me clearly impossible, from the evidence and arguments adduced by Birley o.c. (n. 33), 133 f. and by Pflaum, *Proc. Équ.*, 210 f., to determine even the average age at which men entered the equestrian service. No inference is valid from the senatorial offices to which some were advanced, since we cannot tell if they held such offices at the minimum age. Nor do we know whether men whose age at some point of their career is recorded or calculable were typical, nor whether they had been

continuously employed. No doubt ex-centurions had usually had considerable service before promotion to equestrian offices, but *ILS* 2641 does not imply that they could not become *primipili* before the age of 50: 'vix. ann. xlix sanctissime et prope diem consummationis primi pili sui debitum naturae persolvit'—this only shows (a) that the *primipilate* was the apex of a centurion's career; (b) that *this* individual was 49, when the commission had been issued but not yet taken up. Moreover, centurions 'ex eq. R.' were surely not alone in starting as officers; others of good family, but below equestrian status, may also have done so. Finally, no ruling could bind the emperor to abstain from authorizing exceptionally rapid promotions.

Occasionally it is clear that they were transferred so quickly that they may not have acquired more than a superficial knowledge of the duties attached to a given post. T. Haterius Nepos (no. 44), after passing through the *militiae equestres*, became procurator of Armenia Minor, not earlier than 114, when it was temporarily annexed by Trajan; yet five years later he was prefect of Egypt, after holding four other posts. Ser. Sulpicius Similis (no. 41) was still only a centurion, conceivably a *primus pilus*, in Trajan's reign, perhaps at its very outset in 98; he was prefect in 107; we do not know his intervening employments.<sup>57</sup> (Only Dio's testimony shows that he retired into private life on leaving Egypt and re-emerged as praetorian prefect under Hadrian.) Aeternius Fronto (no. 30) had but 7 years to acquire any experience of civil administration. Much earlier, C. Turranius (no. 7) cannot have had a long career when he became prefect under Augustus at about the age of 35, and Balbillus (no. 23) had had only a decade of service before his prefecture. By contrast the official careers of Ti. Iulius Alexander (no. 26), C. Minicius Italus (no. 39), M. Sempronius Liberalis (no. 52) and L. Volusius Maecianus (no. 54) probably or certainly extended for 25 years or more before their prefectures, and that of Subatianus Aquila (no. 78) for 37, though it would be a mere assumption that they were continuously employed by the government throughout. Data are lacking by which we could determine the average tenure of a procuratorship, and the Egyptian Fasti indicate that an individual could hold a post for a term significantly more or less than the average.<sup>58</sup> There is, however, no reason to doubt that nearly all prefects of Egypt were well acquainted from the start with the general fiscal arrangements of the empire. Unfortunately, the system in the Nile valley was unique.

The Romans never created a system of taxes uniform throughout the empire; but usually adopted that which they found in each land they annexed.<sup>59</sup> Naturally this did not preclude them from subsequent modifications, but even after Diocletian there were still important differences in the taxation of different provinces.<sup>60</sup> In Egypt they inherited the system the Ptolemies had developed in a land where continuous and centralized supervision of irrigation had always been a necessity and had favoured state control of the economy at every point. No other Hellenistic kingdom is known to have had so complex a system which could have been passed on to Rome. Still less could barbarian peoples have evolved such sophisticated practices. It is therefore not surprising that what evidence we have for imperial taxation outside Egypt mostly reveals points of difference rather than of likeness. It must be admitted that that evidence is remarkably meagre, and that we cannot be sure that we can draw up a complete list of imposts collected in, for instance, Asia and Africa; still it remains inconceivable that the diversification of taxes in Egypt was paralleled elsewhere. The early modifications made even in Egypt in the Principate probably tended to accentuate its peculiarities. Thus publicans had already been subjected to close control by the Ptolemies, which the Roman Republic had never attempted, and which the Caesars were only able to introduce gradually elsewhere; yet it was in Egypt that direct collection by state officials began to replace tax-farming long before it was tried out in any other province.

In all provinces the land was the chief source of wealth, and therefore of revenue; in some, taxes (or rents due from public and imperial domains) still took the form of quotas of the crops, or cash equivalents, varying with the quality of the soil and the nature of its products, while in others there was a levy on capital as assessed in periodic censuses, covering both immovable and movable property. But in Egypt there was a running survey of the land, which made it possible to fix rents or taxes due from individual cultivators,

<sup>57</sup> Similarly Marcius Turbo, still an ordinary centurion in 104/5 at earliest, and not *pp. bis* before 109/10, became praetorian prefect in 119 (Pflaum no. 94).

<sup>58</sup> Some parallels from Pflaum: no. 71 held 5 procuratorial posts, 103 to 117 at latest; no. 73, after *militiae equ.* 102-6, holds 3 other posts before the procuratorship of Mauretania Tingitana, attested in 114; no. 104 held 3 military and 4 procuratorial posts, 106-28; no. 106 bis held 8 civil posts in perhaps 22 years; no. 109 rose from a praetorian tribunate through 5 other posts to be *pr. ann.* in probably 18

years (129-47); no. 114 was Iuridicus 21 years after being Epistrategus; no. 116 was *pr. alae* at latest in 117 and held his third procuratorial post (Asia) in 131-2; no. 138 was praetorian prefect 13/4 years after a praetorian tribunate; no. 180 perhaps embarked on the *militiae eq. c.* 160 and became praetorian prefect in 189. I find it hard to generalize from such evidence.

<sup>59</sup> For a brief survey see A. H. M. Jones, *The Roman Economy* (1974), 161 f.; most of the relevant notes there are mine.

<sup>60</sup> Jones, *Later Roman Empire*, 62-4.

varying with the legal category and normal productivity of each particular holding; the farmer could claim a reduction, or exemption, in a year in which the Nile floods left land waterlogged, or dry, or sanded, and his claim would be approved or rejected after they had been checked by official inspections (*episkepseis*). Grain was collected in kind, and its storage and movement down to the sea for shipment to Italy was organized and controlled by the state. Payments in money were exacted for garden land and vineyards. Numerous additional levies from the farmers were made in cash or kind under a variety of heads.<sup>61</sup>

A house-to-house census was taken in Egypt every 14 years, and kept up to date in the intervals by declarations of births and deaths; these records enabled the government to collect a poll tax on males between the ages of 14 and perhaps 62, at rates which differed from nome to nome; some classes of the population were exempt, while others paid at reduced tariffs. This poll tax may have resembled those collected in other provinces, but there is no known parallel to the so-called *merismoï*, additional capitation taxes, of which Wallace lists twenty, for instance for the upkeep of dykes; if the peasants were too poor to meet their liabilities, or ran away to escape them (a common occurrence), the deficit was 'apportioned' among their fellow villagers. Craftsmen and traders had to pay special capitation fees, or a percentage on their sales. There were also taxes on domestic animals (of which returns had to be made), on transfers of real property, on market sales; state monopolies, for example of salt and oil, and a host of minor imposts; the state took its cut from every lucrative activity of the subjects. Nothing like this is known elsewhere. There were of course burdens that the subjects sustained in other provinces too: duties on goods entering or leaving the country and internal tolls; the requisitioning for public needs of goods and services; taxes that fell on Roman citizens wherever domiciled; or the fiscal claims to *bona vacantia* and *caduca*, which in Egypt engaged the attention of a special procurator, the *Idios Logos*.

Publicans were used less than in other provinces (where indeed their employment was gradually decreased without ever being wholly discontinued); most taxes were collected by paid or liturgical officials recruited within the country. For other provinces we must assume, if only because the Principate never created this kind of bureaucracy, that, where it did not rely on tax-farmers, it looked to the local authorities to collect the direct taxes; this was still the practice preferred after Diocletian had enormously increased the number of civil servants.<sup>62</sup> Thus it must have been the task of, say, the procurator of Syria to see to it that the magistrates and council of Antioch furnished the *tributum* due; Antioch would have entrusted the collection from individuals in its territory to its own *leitourgoi* or publicans. But in Egypt only two or three communities enjoyed the autonomy which Rome allowed not only to cities of the Graeco-Italian type but also to the less urbanized *civitates* in areas such as Gaul. Hence the prefect and his staff had to control for themselves the liturgical system. It was no doubt partly for this purpose that they ordered the registration of all property, together with a statement of any legal claims by which it was burdened, so that it might be known which persons, if nominated to liturgical duties, could give adequate security from their own property for the sums they were liable to pay over to the fisc.<sup>63</sup> Here we have one more illustration of the mass and diversity of records that administration in Egypt required. In 134 the prefect ordained that whenever cash, goods or services were furnished in discharge of obligations to the state, documents should be exchanged to record the transaction between the taxpayer and the functionary (*P. Fay.* 21). (This passion for paper obviously presupposes a degree of literacy among the subjects that must have been uncommon in the more barbarous north.)

All these elaborate arrangements were directed and supervised by the prefect. No doubt his discretion was limited. Aemilius Rectus was rebuked, and apparently recalled, by Tiberius when he dispatched to Rome excessive sums in money or grain contrary to

<sup>61</sup> The most lucid introduction to Ptolemaic and Roman taxation in Egypt remains that in Wilcken, *Gr. Ostraka* i, 130-663, cf. his *Grundz.* 169 ff. Wallace's account of the Roman system was exhaustive in its day.

<sup>62</sup> Jones o.c. (n. 60), 456-9; 727 f.; 749; 760 f.

<sup>63</sup> Reinmuth, 75-7, see esp. Hunt-Edgar, *Select Papyri*, no. 219.

orders.<sup>64</sup> By contrast, under Nero and Severus prefects authorized novel levies, perhaps on instructions from the emperor, perhaps in the belief that Rectus seems to have erroneously entertained, that an increase in revenue, however procured, would earn imperial favour. Once Nero had fallen, Ti. Iulius Alexander felt free to prohibit such levies for the future.<sup>65</sup> Bassaeus Rufus under Marcus could decrease the assessment of a nome, presumably for capitation taxes, to take account of depopulation or impoverishment.<sup>66</sup> The prefect, again, can hardly have enjoyed the right to grant total or partial exemption to whole categories of persons from taxes or liturgies; yet in practice he alone could interpret the extent and application of the immunities emperors had approved, and maintain them, or let them lapse, when the subordinates engaged in tax collection tried to set them aside, in order to line their own pockets or at least to minimize a liability to the fisc, which they might otherwise incur themselves. To order the annual *episkepseis*, or the house-to-house census, or the registration of property, was a routine operation, but the edict of Mettius Rufus in 89 shows that the instructions his predecessors had given for such registration had not been observed; and similar orders had to be made by many later prefects (n. 63).

Reinmuth somewhat depreciates the arduous nature of the prefect's task by asserting that 'administrative procedure within the country was highly organized, well regulated, and almost self-operating', that the prefect only had 'to exercise a supervisory control' and that 'all of Egypt was much like a modern, well-organized business corporation, the functions of whose executive head consist largely in receiving the well-digested reports prepared by his subordinates from innumerable memoranda, from which he can assure himself that all phases of the organization are functioning properly'. This picture leaves out the frequent occurrence of illegal violence, speculation and graft among those very subordinates at every level. Reinmuth himself remarks 'that this machine did not operate so successfully at times as it might have been if it were not the fault of the machine'.<sup>68</sup> The procedures for copious documentation and checking of accounts were of no avail, unless they were exactly followed and their working closely scrutinized. Constant vigilance was needed to keep the machine working smoothly, with at any rate no more exploitation of the subjects than the system in itself entailed. Efficient supervision meant attention to detail. Hence we find prefects giving orders for the building of a nome archive, making repeated inquiries about the taxable status of two small plots of land, demanding to receive a list of persons owing taxes in a particular village, ordering the formalities to be completed for registration of a new vineyard.<sup>69</sup> We cannot suppose that any prefect acquired exact information on all such matters, but then, as in a modern government department (*experto crede*), it was evidently considered an appropriate means of ensuring that all subordinates were performing their duties, if the man to whom all were responsible probed here and there, almost at random, into the working of the administration. Above all, the careful auditing of the accounts by the prefect in person was probably indispensable to the uncovering or discouraging of embezzlement. According to Philo it consumed most of his time (p. 135).

Yet almost every incoming prefect must have been handicapped by his unfamiliarity with the peculiar fiscal system of Egypt, with business that Philo described as so manifold

<sup>64</sup> Dio lvii, 10, 5: Αἰμιλίω γοῦν ῥήκτω χρήματά ποτε αὐτῷ πλείω παρά τὸ τεταγμένον ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἢς ἤρχε πέμπαντι ἀντεπέστειλεν ὅτι "κέειραί μοι τὰ πρόβατα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποξέρεσθαι βούλομαι." Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.* i, 497, and others, infer that the emperor 'fixed, apparently each year, the total sum to be produced from Egypt . . . which the prefect could not vary downwards, nor at least under good emperors as in this case upwards'. But though it would have been useful for the emperor to know a year in advance the yield of the Egyptian revenues, and though that of the land taxes and rents could have been roughly estimated on the basis of annual *episkepseis*, some revenues e.g. from customs and sales-taxes, would inevitably have varied; if they proved exceptionally buoyant, the prefect cannot have been forbidden to give the benefit to the Roman treasury, and would hardly have been instructed, in case of a short-fall, to make up τὸ τεταγμένον by additional levies. That phrase can mean 'what is prescribed' rather than

'what is assessed'. Probably Rectus did take credit for keeping up revenues, by unauthorized levies, in a year in which the harvest was poor and the people therefore less able to meet demands of all kinds, cf. n. 66.

<sup>65</sup> Edict of Ti. Iulius Alexander, vv. 4; 45-51; *P. Oxy.* 899; 916.

<sup>66</sup> *BGU* 903; the tax in grain would automatically have fallen, in proportion to the land found to be under water or dry, but in these circumstances difficulties would also have arisen in collection of capitation and other taxes from an impoverished peasantry, and Bassaeus no doubt intended to mitigate the normal effects of the μερισμοὶ ἀνοικεχωρηκότων ἢ ἀπόρων (Wallace, 137 ff.). The great plague may explain Bassaeus' measure.

<sup>67</sup> Reinmuth ch. iii, cf. 65 f.

<sup>68</sup> *ibid.* 127 f.

<sup>69</sup> *SB* 7378 (A.D. 103); *P. Amh.* 68 verso (Flavian); *P. Teb.* 336 (189-90); *P. Oxy.* 1032 (156).



and complex as scarcely to be mastered by men engaged in it from their earliest manhood (*Flacc.* 3). It is true that Philo also asserts that Flaccus very rapidly acquired such a complete understanding of the work that the 'grammateis', who had been his teachers, soon became his pupils (*ibid.*), and that he was able to make substantial and necessary improvements in the fiscal administration; only in his last year, in terror of Gaius' displeasure, did he cease to attend to his duties (16 f.) and fall under the dominance of Alexandrian notables (20). But Philo admits that he praises Flaccus' earlier conduct in order to make his later villainy more conspicuous (6 f.), and though Flaccus may have really possessed outstanding quickness and grasp, and have deserved Philo's eulogy, the implication of what Philo says is clear and credible: few prefects could be expected to understand the administration at first, and until they did, the real power rested with *grammateis*—not the other officials of high standing, who were mostly as amateurish as the governors.

Who were these *grammateis*, evidently men whose lives were spent in the fiscal administration of Egypt? We can hardly think of the native *basilikoi grammateis* in the nomes, and still less of the scribes of metropoleis and villages, for though largely occupied in the collection of the revenues as paid servants of the state, they were merely local officials, in no position to instruct a prefect. Philo is evidently alluding to members of the prefect's own staff, but not, as the term *grammateis* shows, either to the soldiers who belonged to his *officium* or to such personal *adiutores* as he might bring with him, men as strange to the province as he was himself.<sup>70</sup> He is surely using a non-technical expression—'clerks'—for the freedmen and slaves of Caesar, who staffed fiscal departments in every province.<sup>71</sup> Literary sources rarely mention such lowborn persons, and only a minute proportion of them, in Egypt or in any other province, have left any documentary records of their existence; in particular, we have only a score or two of inscriptions which reveal that they too had careers, rising by merit, favour and seniority in a graded succession of posts; it was also in Rome and Italy rather than in the provinces that members of the *familia Caesaris* were most apt to commemorate themselves.<sup>72</sup> These inscriptions show that in the higher grades freedmen might move from one area or department to another, but it is a reasonable assumption that at lower levels they remained long in the same place,<sup>73</sup> just as private soldiers, unlike some centurions, remained with the same unit. Hence imperial freedmen and slaves could acquire the expertise which came with permanence, and which most higher officials lacked.

Strabo (xvii, 1, 12) says that the prefects, *Iuridici* and *Idioi Logoi* were 'attended by freedmen of Caesar and by *Oikonomoi*, who were entrusted with affairs of more or less importance'. His *Oikonomoi* are clearly slaves,<sup>74</sup> and can be identified with the *dispensatores* found in every province, 'servi quibus permittitur administratio pecuniae' (*Gaius* i, 122); they were authorized to receive and pay out moneys on behalf of the state, and the trust reposed in them is indicated by the fact that *vicarii*, slaves who belonged to their *peculium*, had a strong claim to succeed them,<sup>75</sup> when they were manumitted and promoted; evidently they were thought the best persons to choose and train their own successors, for whose good conduct as their assistants they could themselves be held responsible. Above them stood the freedmen, procurators, *tabularii* (accountants), *a commentariis* (registrars) etc. Strabo's language shows that some of these men at least had major responsibilities, especially when we compare his rather slighting reference to the *Epistrategi*, *nomarchs* and *ethnarchs* 'who were thought worthy to superintend matters of no great importance' (xvii, 1, 13). In the time of Strabo or Flaccus, freedmen may have occupied posts later

<sup>70</sup> A. von Domaszewski—B. Dobson, *Rangordnung des röm. Heeres*, 28 f.; Lesquier o.c. (n. 35), 117. Pflaum n. 56 is isolated as *adiutor*.

<sup>71</sup> G. Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux* (1970), offers the best account of their functions, and P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris* (1972), Part iii, of their careers. Cf. now Boulvert, *Domestique et fonctionnaire sous le haut-empire rom.* (1974), 111–80. Philo was not thinking of officials like Lampon, who were not employed in the fiscal administration (n. 50).

<sup>72</sup> Weaver 8 f. Of 607 dated documents cited in his App. ii only 11 are papyri.

<sup>73</sup> Weaver pp. 244, 246, 249, 253, 276 f. cites in-

scriptions which mention more than one post. Of 23 *tabularii* (246 f.) only 1 is recorded to have acted as such in more than one province, of 7 *a commentariis* again only one (249); transfers seem to be fairly often attested in higher grades, and never in lower.

<sup>74</sup> A. Świderek, *Chron. d'Ég.* xlv (1970), 157 f.; *SB* 9248 is decisive. She lists nine known documentary references to *Oikonomoi*. The edict of Ti. Iulius Alexander, v. 22 illustrates their importance, as well as that of (probably freedmen) procurators.

<sup>75</sup> Weaver o.c. (n. 71), 200–23 (though he does not explain why *vicarii* were thus promoted).

reserved to Equites, but in all periods they, and even the imperial slaves, must have retained considerable power, if only because of their relative permanence. The freedmen may have included the *Eclogistai* who were responsible for assessing what was due from the tax-payers, comparing their actual payments with the assessments and bringing defaulters to court; at least in his edict of 48 (n. 15), the prefect Vergilius Capito directs the royal scribes and the scribes of villages and toparchies to furnish information on the illegal exactions made by soldiers to Basilides, an imperial freedman, who was  $\delta \acute{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \omicron \upsilon \lambda \omicron \gamma \iota \sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota \omicron \upsilon$ , and to the *Eclogistai*, over whom he presumably exercised control. Yet these very officials were guilty of malpractices which Ti. Iulius Alexander sought to repress; by various devices, the nature of which is not perfectly clear, they had over-assessed taxes for their own profit; probably they received some proportion of the revenue collected.<sup>76</sup> Of course it was not only in Egypt that imperial freedmen and slaves could enrich themselves at the expense of the subjects.<sup>77</sup> Ti. Iulius Alexander probably ordered that in future the Strategoi in the nomes were not to accept tax lists from them, unless he had certified them as correct (n. 76); in that case, since he could not have hoped personally to do all their work anew, it must have been his intention to examine specimen lists by a random check. As a native of Alexandria, who had at this time been four years in post, he was better placed than most governors to control his staff effectively. But we may doubt with Chalon (239 f.) if his measures had a lasting effect.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Before taking office most prefects were unfamiliar with government in Egypt. They were seldom men of long military experience, and still more rarely jurists. They had usually held many financial posts, but this would hardly have prepared them for the peculiar complexities of the assessment and collection of taxes, and the maintenance of the irrigation system, in the Nile valley. Most senior, equestrian, officials in the province were initially (so far as we can tell) no less inexpert in Egyptian administration. Until the prefects had spent some time at their post, they were therefore likely, unless men of exceptional ability, to be largely in the hands of underlings, whether they were administering justice or supervising the finances. But on average they did not hold office for over three full years, less after 180. It may well be that for one year or more in three it was not the prefects who were in real control of the country.

The equestrian officials in the Principate have sometimes been represented as an 'imperial civil service'. This description better fits the freedmen and slaves of Caesar, as most Equites served a military apprenticeship, and many alternated between posts that were civilian and others which were partly or entirely military. Moreover, even their civilian tasks embraced a diversity of judicial and fiscal responsibilities. They had little resemblance to modern civil servants, who are so often experts in the special problems of a single department in which they spend their whole working lives.

Such specialism was alien to Roman traditions. The Republic had evolved the Roman system of civil law and conquered the *orbis terrarum* with annual magistrates, who rarely governed a province for as much as three years; they had been accustomed to dispense justice and to command armies, though neither legal nor military talent usually explains their election. The emperors may be supposed to have paid more regard to proved capacity in choosing men for the highest positions, but jurists with little or no training as soldiers could still be appointed as consular legates on the frontiers,<sup>78</sup> and not many senators, however able, were allowed more than about six years in such commands. Prolonged tenures were probably uncongenial to senatorial opinion: they restricted the opportunities of all but the favoured few. Once the equestrian *cursus* had been established, it tended to follow

<sup>76</sup> Chalon on the edict of Ti. Iulius Alexander vv. 35-40, 51-9.

<sup>77</sup> It was obviously not by legitimate means that Musicus, 'dispensator ad fiscum Gallicum provinciae Lugdunensis' under Tiberius, acquired the wealth to buy plate for which he needed two *vicarii* as *ab argento* (for a parallel cf. Pliny, *NH* xxxiii 145), or that a

*vicarius vilici Aug.* could pay for a *teloneum* in Africa (*CIL* viii, 12314). Cf. Smallwood o.c. (n. 15), 408, and for the late Empire *RE* iii, 1295 f. (Seeck).

<sup>78</sup> C. Cassius Longinus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 501), Javolenus Priscus (ib. I, 14), L. Neratius Priscus, Kunkel, o.c. (n. 46), 144 f.; Salvius Iulianus (ibid. 157 f.).

the senatorial model: Equites who rose in the service must also have desired the best jobs to go round.

Perhaps this amateurism did not do so much harm in general as modern notions might make us too readily suppose. Caesar and Cromwell did not need to learn the general's art in a long, slow progress from lieutenant to field-marshal. Any shrewd, honest man might dispense justice well enough, especially if he had the advice of professional lawyers, which was, however, not demonstrably available to provincial governors.<sup>79</sup> In most provinces the fiscal system was relatively simple. But government in Egypt was a far more complex affair. For those who would like to think that specialization was increasingly favoured in Roman imperial administration Egypt is the test case. It appears to show that the conception is anachronistic.

#### APPENDIX: THE PREFECTS OF EGYPT 30 B.C.—A.D. 236

The list that follows is based on that in Stein, *Präefekten*, corrected from O. W. Reinmuth, *Bull. of Am. Soc. of Papyrologists* iv (1967), 75 f.; v (1968), 105 f. and from later works cited where relevant. Thus the dates, which refer to the times when the men concerned are actually attested as in office, are those documented by Stein and Reinmuth, except where we have later information, which is then given. Similarly, readers are in general referred to Stein, or to Pflaum in certain cases, for evidence on careers (which can also be found in relevant entries in *PIR* and *RE*), and documentation is offered only when there is something to be added. A list more recent than Reinmuth's is given by O. Montevecchi, *La Papirologia* (1973), 129 f., but her datings are less precise; I have also eliminated the following names that occur in her list:

Caunius Paulinus (cf. no. 28a)

Dinarchus under Pius (rejected by Reinmuth)

P. Maenius Flavianus under Commodus (he did not exist, cf. P. M. Fraser, *Berytus* xv (1964), 90 f.).

Alfenus Apollinaris in 199–200 (Pflaum, 218 bis, but see J. R. Rea, *Chron. d'Ég.* xliii (1968), 370 f.).

Magnius Felix (now dated not to c. 210–12 but to Valerian's reign, see *P. Oxy.* 3109).

She also hesitantly includes C. Vibius Maximus in 124–6 (cf. J. Schwartz, *Chron. d'Ég.* xxvii (1952), 254 f. but see Reinmuth, and Sir R. Syme, *Historia* vi (1957), 480, n. 30), and does not include my numbers 16, 59 and 68, nor 36a. The last man and known acting prefects (14a, 28a, 60a, 80a, 82a, 87a), like Macro (15a), do not appear in my total.

Compare now G. Bastianini, 'Lista dei preetti d'Egitto del 30<sup>a</sup> al 299<sup>p</sup>', *Zeitschr. f. Pap. u. Epig.* xvii (1975), 263–328, published too late for systematic use here.

B.C. 30–29 (15. iv)

1. C. Cornelius Gallus

He had commanded an army in Cyrenaica, and bore the title of *praefectus fabrum* of Octavian (*AE* 1964, 253, cf. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* ii (1972), 94).

26–5

25 or 24–2

2. Aelius Gallus } See S. Jameson, *JRS* lviii (1968), 71 f. on chronology;  
3. C. Petronius } she has not convinced me that Petronius was in office  
before 24

13/12

7 (8. iii)—4 (4. vi)

4. P. Rubrius Barbarus

5. C. Turranius

*Pr. ann.* A.D. 14–8, cf. *RE* vii A, 1441 f.

2/1—A.D. 3 (19.ii)

between A.D. 3 and 10/11

6. P. Octavius

7. D. Ostorius Scapula

*Pr. pr.* 2 B.C.

8. Pedo.

*PSI* 1149, 5 shows that he preceded Magius Maximus, not that he was his immediate predecessor, any more than v. 13 shows that Octavius(?) immediately preceded Aquila. Stein unduly crowded the Fasti from A.D. 10 to 14 by putting Pedo between Aquila and Maximus; he may even belong to 21–7 B.C.

<sup>79</sup> By such advice the praetors must have built up the *ius honorarium*.

- 10/11  
11/14 (after 29. viii)
- 14  
15
- 16—31  
32
- 32—Oct. 38  
(38)
- 38—9 (?)  
39—41
- 41 (10.xi)—42 (29.iv)  
between 42 and 45  
45 (8.viii)—47  
47—52 (24.iv)
- 54 (29.iii)
- 55—9 (11.x)
- 59—62 (23. vii)
- 63 (5.ix)—64 (17.vii),
- 66—70
- 70 (before 27. vii)  
71/72—72/3
- between 69 and 79,  
probably between 71/3  
and 79  
78—9
9. C. Iulius Aquila  
10. M. Magius Maximus  
Probably former proc. Tarraconensis, cf. n. 21. J. R. Rea, *Chron. d'Ég.* 1968, 365 ff. shows that the text of Philo, *Flacc.* 74, which appeared to show that he was prefect now for the second time, is uncertain. Date: G. Wagner, *Bull. Inst. fr. d'Arch. Orient.* lxx (1971), 21 f.
11. Aemilius Rectus  
12. L. Seius Strabo  
*Pr. pr.* A.D. 14; probably died in office.
13. C. Galerius  
14. Vitrasius Pollio (cf. no. 17)  
14a. The freedman, Hiberus, was acting governor on his death in office.  
15. A. Avillius Flaccus  
15a. Naevius Sutorius Macro, *pr. pr.*, appointed to succeed him, was put to death before taking office.)  
16. . . ivius  
17. C. Vitrasius Pollio  
Pflaum no. 5. *Tr. mil., pr. eq.*, proc. of Aquitania and Narbonensis under Tiberius. Less probably, this is the career of no. 14.
18. L. Aemilius Rectus  
19. M. Heius (*P. Oxy.* 3033)  
20. C. Iulius Postumus  
21. Cn. Vergilius Capito  
Proc. of Asia (Pflaum, 13 bis).  
22. L. Lusius Geta  
*Pr. pr.* A.D. 48.  
23. Ti. Claudius Balbillus  
Pflaum, no. 15, identifying him with the homonymous subject of *AE* 1924, 78 (from Ephesus); *pr. fabr.* of Claudius, tribune of leg. xx (perhaps honorary), *ad legationes et resp[onsa Graeca]* (under Claudius), *proc. aedium divi Aug. et . . . [e]t lucorum sacro[rum]que omnium qu[ae] sunt Alexan[dreae et in tota Aegypt]o et supra museum et ab Alexandria bibliotheca et archiereus et ad Hermen Alexandreon* for some years. His final post should probably be restored as *proc. Asiae*. P. rejects this on the ground that the inscription postdates Claudius' death, while in 54 P. Celer held that post (*Tac., Ann.* xiii, 1). But why not a dedication to Balbillus at Ephesus after he had vacated the Asian post?
24. L. Iulius Vestinus  
Appointed to rebuild the Capitol in 70. He had been an *amicus*, probably a procurator, of Claudius.  
25. C. Caecina Tuscus  
Pflaum, no. 16 bis. *Iuridicus*, 51—2.  
26. Ti. Iulius Alexander  
Pflaum, no. 17; his career is fairly fully, but incompletely, known. Epistrategus, 42. Governor of Judaea, 46—8. 'Minister bello (Corbuloni) datus' (*Tac., Ann.* xv, 28) in 63. *Pr. pr.* with army in Judaea in 70; cf. E. G. Turner, *JRS* xlv (1954), 54 f.
27. L. Peducaeus Colon  
28. Ti. Iulius Lupus (died in office)  
28a. Paulinus was governor 72/3 (*Jos., BJ* vii, 434), probably on his death. An Oxyrhynchus papyrus, to be published by J. R. Rea, will show that *P. Oxy.* 1266, 25, where Κουρτίου should be read, refers to a man who was tribune in A.D. 56—8, not to an acting prefect, named Caunius Paulinus. No. 28a may be identical with no. 29.  
29. Valerius Paulinus  
Pflaum, no. 40. Praetorian tribune . . . procurator of Narbonensis in 69. [Cf. now Bastianini o.c., 275, n.3.]  
30. C. Aeternius Fronto (*PIR* L 287 for his name)  
*Praef. castrorum* of Egyptian legions at siege of Jerusalem in 70.

- between 73 and 82,  
perhaps in 79
- 80/81—82 (12.ii)
- 82 (7.vii)—83 (9.vi)
- 85 (8.ii)—88 (26.ii)  
89 (spring?)—91/2  
(after 29.viii 91).  
92 (14. iii)—93 (7. iv.)
- 91-2 or 93-3
- 94 (1. vii)—98 (24.vi)  
98—100 (14.ii)
- 100/101—3 (19.v)
- 103 (30.viii)—107  
(26.iii)
- 107 (29.viii)—112  
(21.iii)
- 113 (28.i)—117 (5.i)
- 117 (Aug.)—119 (4.viii?)
31. L. Iulius Ursus  
Previously *pr. annonae*, and later (it would seem) *pr. pr.* perhaps on Titus' accession, and then *cos. suff.* 84. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 630 prefers to put all his prefectures under Domitian.
32. C. Tettius Africanus Cassianus Priscus  
Previously prefect of *vigiles* and *annona*.
33. L. Laberius Maximus  
Pflaum, no. 43. He had been (financial) procurator of Judaea in 71, was *praef. annonae* in 80, and became *pr. pr.* about 84.
34. C. Septimius Vegetus
35. M. Mettius Rufus  
Formerly *pr. ann.* (cf. Pflaum, pp. 119 f.). Date: *BGU* 2057.
36. T. Petronius Secundus  
*Pr. Pr.* in 96 as colleague of Norbanus (36a).
- 36a. Norbanus  
In *Akten des VI. Int. Kongresses für gr. und lat. Epigraphik* (*Vestigia* xvii), 495 f., G. Winkler correctly (in my view) identified the Norbanus of Martial ix, 84 as a procurator of Raetia and as the praetorian prefect of 96 who joined Petronius in conspiracy against Domitian. He also suggested that it was this man who 'confiscated the property of a freedwoman of an Alexandrian citizen who had born children to an Egyptian (sc. on her death), whereas Rufus gave it to the children' (*Gnomon* 50), and supposed Norbanus to have been prefect; Rufus would then naturally be no. 37; it would be plausible that a prefect under Nerva reversed a harsh rule for augmenting fiscal profits that had been introduced by one under Domitian. However, the proem of the *Gnomon* shows that it was based on rulings by Idioi Logoi as well as by prefects, and Pardalas, named in 23, was Idios Logos under Hadrian. Balogh and Pflaum (n. 47) had identified the Norbanus of the *Gnomon* with an Idios Logos so named under Nero, when severe fiscal exactions would also be expected. There is also little room for Norbanus as prefect after 89, only part of the year beginning Aug. 91, and part of 93/4. Yet cf. p. 127 on the possibility of a rapid turnover of prefects under Domitian. It might be supposed that Domitian was prompt to promote an officer who had displayed signal loyalty in 89, perhaps in succession to no. 35 who was removed as a political suspect, but then soon felt the need to place him in command of the praetorians. Cf. no. 58.
37. M. Iunius Rufus
38. C. Pompeius Planta  
Probably proc. of Lycia in 75 or 76 (Pflaum, no. 58).
39. Minicius Italus  
Pflaum, no. 59. Five equestrian military posts in Lower Germany, at least the last under Vespasian, proc. of the provincia Hellespontus, proc. of Asia where he acted as governor on the death of the pro-consul, probably in 88, proc. of Lugdunensis, Aquitania and Lactora, *pr. ann.*
40. C. Vibius Maximus  
Pflaum, no. 65, cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny*, 210. He had apparently been prefect of an *ala* in Syria and in 95 *proc. Dalmatiae*, thereafter, perhaps. *pr. vig.* and *annonae* (R. Syme, *Historia* vi (1957), 480 ff.). He appears to have been condemned for maladministration. Cf. n. 13.
41. Ser. Sulpicius Similis  
A centurion, perhaps *primipilus*, as late as Trajan's reign. He was *pr. ann.* before and *pr. pr.* after governing Egypt, retiring in 119.
42. M. Rutilius Lupus  
Attested as *pr. ann.* at a date between 103 and 111.
43. Q. Rammius Martialis  
*Pr. vig.* 111 and 113.

- 119 (19.x)—124 (13. iv) 44. T. Haterius Nepos  
Pflaum, no. 95. Prefect of cohort, tribune of soldiers, prefect of *ala* (all unspecified), *censitor* of British tribes, proc. of Armenia maior (not earlier than May 114 or later than spring 117, probably 114–5), *proc. ludi magni*, *proc. hered. et a censibus*, *a libellis*, prefect of the *vigiles*. Date: J. R. Rea, *Chron. d'Ég.* xliii (1968), 367 f.
- 126 (4.i) —133 (27.iii) 45. T. Flavius Titianus  
Pflaum, no. 99 identifies him with a man of the same name whose partially preserved career records procuratorship of Galatia-Pontus, the patrimonium and Lugdunensis and Aquitania and no. 57 with the homonymous procurator of Noricum; this is not certain.
- 133 (18.viii)—137 (26.v) 46. M. Petronius Mamertinus  
*Pr. pr.* at least in 139–43.
- 137 (before 8.ix)—142 (18.ii) 47. C. Avidius Heliodorus  
Pflaum, no. 106. Previously *ab ep. Gr.*
- 142 (18.vii)—143 (11.ii) 48. Valerius Eudaemon  
Pflaum, no. 110. Proc. *ad dioecisin Alexandriae*, librarian at Rome, *ab ep. Gr.*, proc. of Lycia etc., *proc. hered.*, and probably at the same time proc. of Asia, proc. of Syria. It is not known what posts he held between this and his prefecture.
- 144 (12.v)—147 (April) 49. L. Valerius Proculus  
Pflaum, no. 113. Prefect of a cohort in Syria and of a legion in Lower Moesia, prefect of the Alexandrian fleet and of the 'potamophylacia', proc. of the Maritime Alps, *dilectator*, proc. successively of Baetica, Cappadocia etc., Asia and of 'three provinces' (the names are lost), perhaps *a rationibus*, *pr. ann.* (attested in 144).
- 147 (29.viii)—148 (11.xi) 50. M. Petronius Honoratus  
Pflaum, no. 117. *Pr. coh.* and *tr. mil.* in Lower Germany, *pr. alae* in Mauretania Caesariensis, proc. successively of the mint, of the XX *hered.*, of Belgica and the two Germanies, *a rat.*, *pr. ann.*
- 150 (17.iv)—154 (28.ii) 51. L. Munatius Felix  
Date: *P. Oxy.* 2961.
- 154 (29.viii)—159 (Jan.) 52. M. Sempronius Liberalis  
Probably *pr. alae* in Mauretania Tingitana, between 129 and 132 (Pflaum, p. 251).
- 159 (10.vii)—160 (before 13.ii) 53. T. Furius Victorinus  
Pflaum no. 139. *Pr. coh.* in Britain, *tr. mil.* in Lower Pannonia, *pr. alae* in Dacia, proc. in Gaul and then in Spain (the details are doubtful), *proc. ludi magni*, prefect first of the Ravenna and then of the Misenum fleet, *a rat.*, *pr. ann.* He left Egypt to become *pr. pr.*
- 160 (13.ii)—161 (15.xi) 54. L. Volusius Maecianus  
Pflaum, no. 141, cf. W. Kunkel, *Herkunft u. soziale Stellung der röm. Juristen*<sup>2</sup>, 174 f. *Pr. fabr.*, *pr. coh.* in Britain, *adiutor operum publ.*, *a libellis* to Pius as Caesar (138), *pr. vehic.*, *a studiis* and librarian, *a libellis et censibus*, *pr. ann.* After leaving Egypt, he entered the senate and became *praef. aer. Sat.* and consul, cf. nos. 61, 62, 76, 85.
- 161 (10 Dec.)/162—164 (2.iii) 56. M. Annius Syriacus.  
Date: *BGU* 2058.
- 164 (Aug.)—167 (24.vi) 57. T. Flavius Titianus  
Pflaum, no. 154 identifies him with a governor of Noricum (before 161), see on no. 46.
- 168 (21.ii) 58. Q. Baienus Blassianus  
Pflaum, no. 126, cf. p. 974; F. Zevi, *Acts of Vth Epigraphic Congress* (1967), 193 f. He was prefect of the cohorts II Asturorum—one unit so named was in Egypt, another in Britain—tribune of a legion in Upper Moesia, *pr. alae* probably in Cappadocia, where he was then *proc. ad. census*. He then became successively prefect of the fleet in Britain, governor of Mauretania Tingitana and Raetia, prefect of the Ravenna fleet, *proc. Lugd. et Aquitan.*, *pr. ann.* No doubt he died in Egypt. Date: A. Świderek, *Proc. of XIIth Intern. Congress of Papyrol.* (1970), 461 f. [From July/Aug. 167, Bastianini o.c., 297.]

168 (between 10.iii and 29.viii)—(?169 (?before Jan./Feb.))

Under Marcus or Commodus?

170 (24.ii)—175 (March–June)

176

176 (between 1.iv and 29.viii)—177 (28.iii)  
178–80 (? between 28.iii 178 and 17.iii 180, to a date not later than 181)

180–1 (before 4.vii 181)

181 (4.vii)—183 (Ap.–Aug.)

183/4–185 (? Sept.)

185/6 (between 27.xii 185 and 25.i 186)—187 (Sept.)  
188 (9.i—12.viii)  
188

189 (23.viii)—190 (28.viii)

190 (25.ix)  
Under Commodus?

192/3 (before 8.iv 192)

59. M. Bassaeus Rufus

Pflaum, no. 162. A poor rustic (Dio lxxi, 5), who had presumably risen from the ranks of the army, to be *pp. bis*. After the urban tribunates he became proc. of Asturia and Gallaecia, of Noricum, of Belgica and the two Germanies, *a rat., pr. vig.* (an office he held still on 10 March 168) and left Egypt to be *pr. pr.* from 169 until at least 176.

59a. ? Vernasius Facundus

The name of this man occurs along with those of six prefects in an unpublished *epikrisis* papyrus, whence C. A. Nelson, *Bull. of Am. Soc. of Pap.* ix (1972), 49 f., infers that he too was prefect. He is attested as Dioiketes in June or July 161, which would be compatible with a prefecture 20 years or more afterwards (cf. perhaps Pflaum on no. 48). But his name also occurs in *BGU* 786, which mentions an Egyptian priest who is likely to be a man known to have flourished in 128. While it is no doubt improbable that this document can be dated to the time when he was Dioiketes (I would guess that he was Epistrategos), Nelson's assumption that it is close in date to 128 is unnecessary; it could easily be twenty years later. If Vernasius was prefect, his term might then be set much later than any of the periods Nelson suggested, some of which are now excluded by new dates for nos. 55 and 57. On any view his tenure was extremely brief, and given conditions under Commodus (p. 126) we cannot be sure that there is no room for him even in the already crowded *Fasti* of that reign.

60. C. Calvisius Statianus

Pflaum, no. 166. He had been *ab. ep. Lat.* within the years 161–9. His son was Idios Logos before 173 and presumably under him.

60a. On 1 April C. Caecilius Salvianus, Iuridicus, is acting governor. Calvisius had taken part in Avidius Cassius' revolt.

61. T. Pactumeius Magnus

Probably consul in 183, cf. no. 55.

62. T. Aius (?Taius) Sanctus

Pflaum, pp. 1002 ff.; on the *nomen*, see J. R. Rea, *P. Oxy.* xxxvi, p. 41. *Ab ep. Gr., proc. rat. priv., a rat.* After leaving Egypt, he entered the senate and became *praef. aer.* and consul, cf. no. 55.

63. T. Flavius Piso

W. Seston, *Chron. d'Ég.* xlvi (1973), 152 f. Present at Marcus' *consilium*, 177. *Pr. ann.* 179.

64. D. Veturius Macrinus

Pflaum, no. 179 bis. *Proc.* of Mauretania Tingitana on 13 Oct. 180. He was to become *pr. pr.* under Didius Iulianus. Date: *BGU* 847.

65. T. Longaeus Rufus

He became *pr. pr.* under Commodus. Date: *P. Petaus* 9.

66. Pomponius Faustianus

67. M. Aurelius Verianus, cf. note on 68.

68. M. Aurelius Papius Dionysius

Pflaum, no. 181. Legal *consiliarius* at 60,000, then at 100,000 HS under Marcus, *pr. vehic.* etc., probably 178–80, *a libellis et cognitionibus* of Commodus, *pr. ann.* Apparently recalled from Egypt to resume that post and was then put to death in 189. Attested as prefect in 188 (*P. Oxy.* 1110), but *P. Oxy.* 2762 (cf. J. R. Rea ad loc.) and 2800, which in themselves would suggest that no. 69 was the immediate successor of no. 67, indicate that his tenure was very brief.

69. Tineius Demetrius

Cf. note on no. 68. Date: *P. Oxy* 2968.

70. Claudius Lucilianus

71. Petronius Quadratus

Perhaps identical with Quadratus, *proc. Achaeae*, 179–80 (*Hesperia* ii, 167). [But see o.c., Bastianini, 284.]

72. Larcus Memor

- 193 (6.iii)—194 (21.iv) 73. L. Mantennius Sabinus  
An ex-tribune of the praetorians.
- 195 (11.iv)—196 (25.ii) 74. M. Ulpius Primianus
- 197 (22.v)—199 (2.iv) 75. Q. Aemilius Saturninus  
Later *pr. pr.*
- 200 (23.v)—203 (25.ii) 76. Q. Maecius Laetus  
Pflaum, no. 219. Formerly proc. of Arabia. *Pr. pr.* in 205. *Cos.* II and *pr. urbi* under Caracalla. Cf. no. 54.
- 204 (Nov.)—205/6 77. Claudius Iulianus  
*Pr. ann.* 201 (*IGR* i 380; *ILS* 1346). Date: *BGU* 2024.
- 206 (Oct./Nov.)—210 (23.vii) 78. Ti. Claudius Subatianus Aquila  
Epistrategus on 14 April 169, in the 9th year of an unnamed pair of emperors (*P. Oxy.* 2708). Pace M. Vandoni, *Rend. Ist. Lomb.* 1969, 678–80, they must be Marcus and Verus, not Severus and Caracalla, as he cannot have risen from this sexagenarian post in 200/1 to the prefecture in only 5 years. Vandoni thought that there was insufficient room for him as Epistrategus of Heptanomia in April 169, as Lucceius Ofellianus is attested (*Aug.*) 168–9, and Aquilius Capitolinus in Nov. 170. In fact Subatianus might still have held the post for 12 or even 18 months between these men, as long for instance as Aurelius Herapio in 212. Moreover, J. Quaegebeur, *Chron. d'Ég.* xlv (1969), 130 f., gave reasons, based on Egyptian nomenclature, whose plausibility I cannot assess, for thinking that Subatianus was Epistrategus of the Thebaid.
- 212—213 (29.i) 79. L. Baebius Aurelius Iuncinus  
Pflaum, no. 251. No military posts, but after subordinate offices at Rome, *pr. vehic.*, governor of Sardinia, probably before Caracalla became joint Augustus in Jan. 198, *proc. hered.* His later posts are not known. Date: *BGU* 2056.
- 215 (16.iii) 80. Aurelius Septimius Heraclitus  
Probably killed in office.
- 215/6 80a. Aurelius Antinous, probably Iuridicus, is acting prefect.
- 216 (5.vi)—217 (7.iii) 81. L. Valerius Datus  
Executed by Macrinus.
- 217 (April)—218 82. Iulius Basilianus
- 219? 82a. Callistianus, Iuridicus, is attested as acting prefect, *P. Oxy.* 3117.
- 219 (13.viii)—220 (4.iii) 83. Geminius Chrestus  
*Pr. pr.* in March 222.
- 222 (6.i) 84. L. Domitius Honoratus  
*Pr. pr.* in 223.
- 222 (3.xi)—223 (early) 85. M. Aedinius Iulianus  
Pflaum no. 297. By 223 he was a senator, later *pr. pr.* Pflaum's view that he was acting governor of Lugdunensis, when procurator there before 222, is disputable.
- 223/4 (?) 86. . . alerius
- 224 87. M. Aurelius Epagathus  
Cf. *P. Oxy.* 2565.
- 224 (soon after May/June)—225 (13.ii) 87a. Ti. Claudius Herennianus was Iuridicus and acting prefect.
- 229/30 88. Claudius Masculinus
- 231/2 (Dec./Jan.)— 89. Maevius Honoratianus  
Date: X. Lorient. *Zeitschr. f. Pap. u. Epigr.* xi (1973), 147 f.
- 236 (20.xi)