

PAPYRI AND ROMAN IMPERIAL HISTORY, 1960-75*

By ALAN K. BOWMAN

'For those outside the circle of learned devotees important work by papyrologists too often remains unfamiliar' (J. J. Wilkes, *JRS* 65 (1975), 187). In the past few years the contribution of the papyri to the history of the Roman Empire has been very important, and it is the main purpose of the notes which follow to provide for the historian a convenient summary of recent documentary evidence which demands his attention. This survey encompasses work which has appeared in the last fifteen years (though with reference to documents published earlier which have recently received significant discussion) and covers the period of Roman imperial history from Augustus to Constantine.¹ The material is divided into three sections. In the first I collect items which provide new information on topics of general imperial history, mainly matters of chronology and prosopography relating to Emperors and the imperial house; to which I have added evidence for Emperors in direct contact with Egypt, relating largely to imperial visits and revolts. In the second part I discuss Egypt as a Roman province, its organization, officials, social and economic history; some of the fresh conclusions which have emerged naturally have a broader application, which I hope to have indicated in the course of my discussion. In the brief final section documents are collected which either have their provenance outside Egypt or specifically relate to places other than Egypt. It is hardly necessary to add that the overall selection of items is subjective and cannot hope to be comprehensive. It will be noticed that some important topics are intentionally excluded from systematic examination—in particular, Roman Law, Graeco-Roman religion and Christianity.²

I. ROMAN IMPERIAL HISTORY

1. *The Imperial Court.* Our knowledge of the reigns of individual Emperors and their friends and advisers has been enhanced by several items of importance. Foremost among these is a papyrus which preserves part of the funeral oration for Agrippa delivered by Augustus.³ Several points of interest emerge from this. First, the relationship between Agrippa and P. Quinctilius Varus, who is named, along with Tiberius, as Agrippa's

* For comment and advice on points of detail I am indebted to Dr. John Rea and Mr. H. W. Macadam. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to Dr. J. D. Thomas who painstakingly read the manuscript, pointed out omissions and rescued me from errors. For those which remain I alone am responsible.

¹ For the sake of brevity all references are put in a form as short as is conveniently possible. Abbreviations of papyrological volumes follow, in the main, E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri, an Introduction* (1968), 154-71. It is hoped that abbreviations of the titles of periodicals will be self-explanatory. The following abbreviations should be particularly noted:

ANRW II = H. Temporini (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, *Principat* (1974-); *Actes* x = *Actes du X^e Congrès Internationale de Papyrologues, Varsovie-Cracovie 1961* (1964);

Atti XI = *Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Milano 1964* (1966);

Proc. XII = *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor 1968 (American Studies in Papyrology VII, 1970)*;

Akten XIII = *Akten des XIII Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Marburg 1971 (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 66, 1973)*;

Proc. XIV = *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists, Oxford 1974 (Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 61, 1975)*.

During the fifteen years which I survey various bibliographies and surveys have appeared. Most comprehensive are those in the relevant issues of

Aegyptus; note also those by J. Modrzejewski in *RHD* and by R. Rémondon in *AEHE* sect. IV (from 1954/5-1971/2). The surveys by M. Hombert in *REG* 78-9 (1965-6) are complete only up to 1959; likewise that of H.-G. Pflaum in *Ann. Univ. Saraviensis, Philosophische Fakultät* 8 (1959), 105-15. A survey of Roman Egypt by H. Braunert is announced for *ANRW* II. 9. For the Byzantine period there is a survey up to 1959 by Rémondon in *Ann. Univ. Saraviensis, Phil. Fak.* 8 (1959), 87-103, and a supplementary one in *Akten* XIII, 367-72. Some other surveys are cited in the following note.

A number of the items to which I have referred in the footnotes are unavailable to me. It nevertheless seemed useful to note their existence. Such items are marked with an asterisk.

² Many of the issues discussed have a bearing upon Roman Law. Surveys with a juristic bias are to be found in the relevant issues of *RHD*, *Iura* and *SDHI*. See also E. Seidl, *Rechtsgeschichte Ägyptens als römische Provinz* (1974); J. Modrzejewski, *Proc.* XII, 317-77. For Christianity, see the surveys by K. Treu, *APF* 19 (1969), 169-206, 20 (1970), 217-83; also M. Naldini, *Il Cristianesimo in Egitto* (1968) and J. Van Haelst, *Proc.* XII, 497-503. Graeco-Roman religion is excluded principally because so much of the source material is epigraphical and could not receive fair treatment here. There are very useful bibliographical surveys by P. M. Fraser in *JEA*, the last of which appeared in vol. 48 (1962).

³ *P. Köln* inv. 4701, published by L. Koenen in *ZPE* 5 (1970), 217-83.

son-in-law. Koenen argued that the relationship cannot have been by virtue of Varus' marriage to Claudia Pulchra and must involve the marriage of Varus to an otherwise unknown issue of the marriage between Agrippa and Claudia Marcella *maior*, the daughter of Octavia and Claudius Marcellus and niece of Augustus. Reinhold pointed out that if this were the case, Varus must have made a yet earlier marriage, perhaps to a daughter of Agrippa and his first wife, Caecilia Attica.⁴ Second, the nature of Agrippa's *imperium*. In lines 7–11 of the papyrus we read: καὶ εἰς ἃς δῆποτέ σε ἐπαρχείας τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐφέλκοιτο μηθενὸς ἐν ἐκείναις ἐξουσίαν [μειζῶ] εἶναι τῆς σῆς ἐν νόμῳ ἔκυρώθη. Koenen's original hypothesis—that Agrippa received, in 23 B.C., when Augustus reviewed his own position, a grant of *imperium maius* which was thereafter made operative in particular areas by specific mandate—was criticised by Gray, who concluded that in 23 B.C. Agrippa was given *imperium aequum* for a *quinquennium* and that this was renewed in 18 B.C. and made *maius* in 13 B.C.⁵ It is also interesting to note Koenen's subsequent improvement of the text which suggests that Tacitus' characterization of the *tribunicia potestas* as 'summi fastigii vocabulum' may originate with Augustus himself.⁶

Several recently published texts increase our knowledge of the imperial *consilium*. We may begin with *P. Oxy.* 2435 verso, which lists the names of people who sat in *consilium* with Augustus, probably in the first half of A.D. 13, to hear Alexandrian ambassadors. The list is tantalizingly incomplete but it does seem to admit of one improvement in line 37.⁷ Following the name of Messalinus Corvinus in line 36 the text as published reads: [. . . .]ϋ καὶ τῖ. [. . .]ος. In fact, καὶ looks very odd here since it is hardly possible to fit into the available space 'Corvinus and N and Ti. . .'. Further, καὶ appears in the list only to link Tiberius and Drusus and to introduce (if it is correctly restored) the list of names which begins with that of Messalinus Corvinus; it does not appear between the names in that list. I suggest, therefore, that]ϋ should be read as a *nomen* and the following letters as a *cognomen*. A reinspection of the papyrus suggests the reading Κοπίτω[ν]ος, though with a somewhat broader *pi* than is usual in this hand. A suitable candidate for inclusion will be C. Ateius Capito (*cos. suff.* in A.D. 5) who died in 22 and whose legal expertise will have recommended him for a place in Augustus' *consilium*.⁸ The text is also interesting for the light it casts on the nature of the early *Acta Alexandrinorum*; taken in a group with *PSI* 1160 (which should now be regarded as most probably of Augustan date) and the recently published *P. Oxy.* 3020, recording the visit of an embassy to Augustus in Gaul, it suggests that the earliest *Acta* are strictly documentary, lacking the propagandist embellishments of later examples. In fact it is inaccurate to regard them as 'Pagan Martyr-Acts' at all.⁹

P. Oxy. 3019 records proceedings of the *consilium* of Septimius Severus in Egypt and the fact that the date is put in Roman form suggests that it may have been adapted from a Latin original.¹⁰ The editor plausibly saw the most likely source as the imperial *commentarii* themselves, and whilst this piece, like the group discussed above, does not belong with the Pagan Martyr-Acts, it is suggestive of the sources and methods which the compilers of the *Acta* may have used.

Another documentary text mentioning the *consilium* was published in 1972.¹¹ In this case the *consilium* is that of Antoninus Pius and among the interesting features of the text (which, again, appears to be a translation of a Latin original) is the fact that Marcus and Lucius are singled out for mention before the ordinary members (who are not named individually) from the senatorial and equestrian classes. The presence of Lucius Verus makes the likely date of the event after 154 and indicates his involvement in imperial decision-making processes.

⁴ *CP* 67 (1972), 119–21, cf. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 424, 434 and Table VII.

⁵ *ZPE* 6 (1970), 227–38, cf. Modrzejewski, *RHD* 1971, 166–7 and 1972, 166.

⁶ *ZPE* 6 (1970), 239–43. The phrase is δεξιῶθ[ε]ς πλεί[ου] ὕψους, which Koenen renders back into Latin as 'in summum rei publicae fastigium provectus.'

⁷ The notion that the name of Sejanus can be identified in the list (F. M. Heichelheim, *Festschrift Oertel* (1964), 19) seems to me fanciful.

⁸ Tacitus, *Ann.* 3, 70, *PIR*² A 1279. A possible

alternative might be Fonteius Capito (*cos. suff.* in A.D. 12), *PIR*² F 470; but Dio 56. 26. 1 suggests that he was a man of little account.

⁹ *PSI* 1160 is re-edited as *CPJ* II, 150 where a date of 20–19 B.C. is argued. H. A. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (1954), 83–92 argued for a Claudian dating but this is not likely, particularly since the publication of *P. Oxy.* 3020.

¹⁰ For comments on the Latin original of *P. Köln* inv. 4701 see Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970), 217–83.

¹¹ J. D. Thomas, *BICS* 19 (1972), 103–12.

Finally, some items of prosopographical interest. A handful of texts supply information relevant to the consular *fasti*. There is a reference to Nero's brief consulship in 55;¹² the consul suffect of 153 was perhaps C. Julius Gallus, who may be connected with the suffect of 124;¹³ the second consulship of Macrianus, probably with Quietus, was in 261, following a first consulship in 260 at the beginning of the reign;¹⁴ Caesonius Bassus is *consul ordinarius* in 317.¹⁵ The complexities of the dating by the consulships of the Licinii in 322-4 have been unravelled.¹⁶ References to the consulships of Proculus and Paulinus (325)¹⁷ and Papius Pacatianus (332)¹⁸ complete this short list.

Other persons of varying degrees of importance have appeared. First, an explicit reference to the estates of L. Annaeus Seneca in Egypt in a text dated 25 October A.D. 62.¹⁹ The original editor believed that the handling of this estate by a *μισθωτής* implied that the estate had already been confiscated by this date, but the conclusion is not inevitable and there is evidence of later interests in Egypt on Seneca's part.²⁰ Another item of Neronian prosopography emerges from a re-edition of *P. Ryl.* 608 which now appears to date to the latter half of the first century; the main point of interest is that the writer, Ulpian Celer, was an architect by profession and might therefore conceivably be the man who helped to design the *domus aurea*.²¹ Perhaps the most important item in this short list (still inexplicably ignored in some recent works) is *P. Oxy.* 2565, dated May-June 224, which gives a firm date for the prefecture of Epagathus and hence a *terminus ante* for the murder of Ulpian.²² A second-century text produces a *procurator usiacus* named Eclectus who has been thought to be identical with the murderer of Commodus, but the hypothesis is an unlikely one.²³ Finally, we may note that Gilliam has collected the papyrological evidence for Valerius Titianus, who was *ab epistulis Graecis* and *praefectus vigilum* in the early third century, and discussed the role of Egyptian *equites* in the administration of the Empire. He sees equestrian landowners like Titianus as precursors of the great landed magnates of the following century.²⁴

2. *Imperial chronology.* In a recent survey of imperial titulature in the papyri Van t'Dack has examined the different types of formulae which occur and has attempted to assess the historical significance of some of these phenomena.²⁵ The distinction between what he classifies as 'Roman' formulae on the one hand and 'local' ones on the other seems to me potentially misleading—it might be better to emphasize the greater or lesser degree of formality. However, the author's methodical survey of bibliography is useful and obviates the need for such an exercise here. In this section I have therefore collected a handful of items which reflect upon imperial chronology; it should be noted that many of the items discussed in the next section also inevitably involve matters of chronology.

Augustus: Bingen has shown,²⁶ following Wilcken, that the dating formula by the *κράττησις* was used from the beginning of the reign (i.e. 30 B.C.).

Nero: for the first consulship see above. There has been a discussion of the significance of the formula *ἔτους ἑβδόμου Ἰερού Νέρωνος*.²⁷

¹² A. Traversa, *Hommages Renard II* (Coll. Latomus 102, 1969), 718-25, republished in *SDHI* 36 (1970), 410-18 and as *SB* 10615; cf. J. Bingen, *CE* 44 (1969), 151-2.

¹³ J. F. Gilliam, *CP* 55 (1960), 177-8 on *P. Clermont-Ganneau* 16; the *praenomen* and *nomen* are new.

¹⁴ *P. Oxy.* 2710.

¹⁵ J. F. Gilliam, *Historia* 16 (1967), 252-4.

¹⁶ H. C. Youtie, D. Hagedorn, L. C. Youtie, *ZPE* 10 (1973), 122-4.

¹⁷ *P. Oxy.* 3125. Other evidence for the consulship leads the editor to suggest that Proculus was replaced by Julianus not earlier than 29 April.

¹⁸ *P. Oxy.* 3027-8.

¹⁹ G. M. Browne, *BASP* 5 (1968), 17-24 = *P. Oxy.* 2873.

²⁰ cf. G. M. Parássoglou, *Roman Imperial Estates in Egypt* (Diss. Yale, 1972), 32. This dissertation is due for publication in the series *American Studies in Papyrology*. For Egyptian property of Julia Augusta

(Livia) see now N. Lewis, *BASP* 11 (1974), 52-4.

²¹ *P. Ryl.* 608 = *Ch. Lat. Ant.* IV, pp. 42-4, no. 245; see J. R. Rea, *CE* 43 (1968), 373-4. For the *domus aurea* see Tacitus, *Ann.* 15. 42.

²² *P. Oxy.* 2565. For discussions of the broader political significance of this event see F. Grosso, *Rend. Accad. Lincei* ser. 8, 23 (1965), 205-20; J. Modrzejewski, *P. Lugd.-Bat.* xvii (= *Antidoron David*), 59-69; J. Modrzejewski and T. Zawadzki, *RHD* 1967, 565-611.

²³ *P. Wisc.* 1, p. 127, cf. *P. Oxy.* 3089, 6 note.

²⁴ *Mélanges Seston* (1974), 217-25, cf. M. A. H. el-Abjadi, *Proc.* xiv, 91-6.

²⁵ *ANRW* II. 1, 857-88, based on the useful, but even now inevitably out-of-date, collection of evidence by P. Bureth, *Les Titulatures impériales dans les papyrus . . .* (*Pap. Brux.* 2, 1964). See also the useful review of this by J. Modrzejewski, *RHD* 1965, 644-9.

²⁶ *CE* 39 (1964), 174-6.

²⁷ O. Montevecchi, *Aegyptus* 51 (1971), 212-20.

Otho: a recently published text provides the earliest attestation of this brief reign (10 February 69).²⁸

Vitellius: the earliest reference to his reign is provided by *P. Strasb.* 502 (25 May 69).

Pescennius Niger: the earliest known date for this Emperor is provided by a correction to *P. Gron.* 1 (30 May 193).²⁹

Caracalla: we now have an early attestation of him as *imperator designatus* in 197 (*P. IFAO* I, 12).

The year 238: the evidence has recently been reviewed by Rea and a new item has been added which provides the earliest attested date for the joint reign of Gordians I and II (16 June).³⁰ It is less certain whether, as Rea maintained, *P. Reinach* 91 is to be attributed to the first year of Maximinus and Maximus.³¹ In discussing generally the value of papyri for imperial chronology, Rea noted that 'their great value is that they supply absolutely incontrovertible *termini ante quos*. The writers of the documents could not date by an emperor who had not reached the throne'.

Claudius, Aurelian and Palmyra: Rea has also brilliantly elucidated the confused chronology of this period.³² He suggests that Aurelian modified his imperial titulature in two ways. First, in 271-2 he increased his own regnal year number by one in order to eclipse the reign of Quintillus and to carry his own *imperium* back beyond 29 August 270; and second, he received, in 274, an extra grant of *tribunicia potestas*. It may be noted that there are later parallels for these moves under Diocletian.³³ The date of *P. Oxy.* 1413 may also be relevant; ³⁴ the presentation of a crown to Aurelian in commemoration of a victory should mark a significant stage in his recapture of Egypt from the Palmyrenes.

Probus: a hitherto unattested year 8 of this Emperor has now appeared.³⁵ As regards his titulature, it is noteworthy that the *Persicus* element appears only in the papyri.³⁶

Diocletian: a new papyrus (*P. Oxy.* 3055) offers an early dating by his reign (7 March 285) and thus dispels any notion that his acceptance in Egypt was delayed. It also (uniquely for a documentary source) names the Emperor as Diocles rather than Diocletian. Further advance is marked by our recognition of the change in the method of calculating regnal years which occurred in 302-3 when the regnal years of Diocletian and Maximian were assimilated.³⁷

Constantine: a new text (*P. Oxy.* 3266) uniquely produces five regnal year numbers for 337, the last of which must refer to Dalmatius the younger, nephew of Constantine, and Caesar from 335 to 337.

Damnatio memoriae: a handful of examples have recently emerged and several scholars have discussed the chronological implications of the examples on papyri.³⁸ We may note specifically the edict of Baebius Iuncinus announcing the *damnatio* of Geta (*BGU* 2056) and two examples from the Oxyrhynchus papyri (2955 and 3244), the former reflecting the *damnatio* of Macrinus,³⁹ the latter providing the first instance on papyri of the removal of the 'Alexander' element from the titulature of Severus Alexander.

²⁸ G. Geraci, *Akten* XIII, 300-7.

²⁹ P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 11 (1973), 161-8.

³⁰ *ZPE* 9 (1972), 1-19. The text, which also contains the latest known dating by Maximinus and Maximus, is republished as *P. Oxy.* 3107. For the *dies imperii* of Gordian III see X. Lorient, *Mélanges Seston* (1974), 297-312.

³¹ X. Lorient, *ZPE* 11 (1973), 147-55 argues that the scribe mistakenly wrote α for β .

³² *P. Oxy.* XL, pp. 15-30.

³³ Rea's conclusion that the extra grant of *tribunicia potestas* came in 274 involves rejecting the (now unverifiable) evidence of some papyri. For Diocletian and Maximian see A. Chastagnol, *Rev. Num.* 9 (1967), 54-81, and R. E. Smith, *Latomus* 31 (1972), 1058-71; neither solution takes account of the difficulty presented by *CIL* VI, 1124 which suggests that Maximian's extra imperial acclamation came before 293.

³⁴ See A. K. Bowman, *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt* (*ASP* XI, 1971), Appendix ii. The results there obtained are summarized and improved by J. R. Rea,

P. Oxy. XLIII, pp. 23-4 where it is suggested that the actual date of *P. Oxy.* 1413 is early in the Egyptian year 272-3, with the recovery of Egypt coming at the end of 271-2. Cf. *P. Oxy.* 3115. For a reference to disturbance in Alexandria, but perhaps earlier in the third century, see *P. Oxy.* 3065.

³⁵ *P. Mich.* 610.

³⁶ E. Van t'Dack, *Zetesis* (= *Festschrift E. de Strijcker*, 1973), 566-79.

³⁷ Chastagnol, op. cit. (n. 33); J. D. Thomas, *CE* 46 (1971), 173-9.

³⁸ P. Mertens, *Hommages Herrmann* (*Coll. Latomus* 44, 1960), 541-52; R. O. Fink, *Syntelesia Arangio-Ruiz* (1964), 232 ff.; E. Van t'Dack, *ANRW* II, 1, 875-6.

³⁹ On *P. Oxy.* 2955 see P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 13 (1974), 219-27, against which Koenen, *ibid.* 228-39. See also G. Flore, *Syntelesia Arangio-Ruiz* (1964), 456-61, arguing that *P. Harr.* 75 reflects *damnatio* of the Philippi; alternatively, perhaps Severus Alexander.

3. *Emperors and Usurpers in Egypt*. A number of important texts have been published which deal either with visits to Egypt by Emperors or with revolts within the province, and in both areas our knowledge has advanced significantly.

Germanicus: neither an Emperor nor a usurper, but worthy of consideration because of the important record of his visit preserved in *P. Oxy.* 2435 recto which contains an account of his public reception in Alexandria, including the presentation of $\psi\eta\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ by the *exegetes*, the speech of Germanicus and the reaction of the crowd to it. The document has recently been re-examined in detail.⁴⁰ Two points are worth raising. Germanicus' reference to his commission implies no self-consciousness about breaking the rules applying to Egypt (Tacitus, *Ann.* 2. 59-60). Was the peculiar status of Egypt simply left out of account, did he omit to obtain permission in order to get there quickly to relieve a famine,⁴¹ or did he simply assume that he was exempt from the rules applied to senators?⁴² An argument I find more plausible is that Germanicus will have assumed that Egypt was included in his 'Ostkommando'.⁴³ Second, did the decrees emanate from the *gerousia* or the college of *archontes*?⁴⁴ These are not the only possibilities; Alexandria did lack a *boule* but it might well have had a tribal assembly of some kind which could pass honorary decrees.⁴⁵ That proceedings of this kind were called $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ is attested by *P. Oxy.* 2725 (see below, s.v. Titus).

Vespasian: problems have arisen over the interpretation of *SB* 9528, which the original editor supposed to record a speech of the Emperor Vespasian delivered during his visit to Alexandria in the later part of 69 or early in 70. Henrichs has re-examined all the evidence for Vespasian's visit and concluded that since the speech refers to the approval of the senate which came in December 69 or January 70 it must have been made on a different occasion, or should be referred to another Emperor.⁴⁶

Titus: a new papyrus supplies details for the date and time of his visit. He entered 'the city' (Alexandria, or perhaps Memphis) at about 7 a.m. on 25 April 71 (*P. Oxy.* 2725). The ceremonies marking his visit are called $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$, a phrase which can presumably also be referred to the reception of Germanicus and the Emperor concerned in *SB* 9528.⁴⁷

Hadrian: a calendar records the date on which Hadrian entered 'the city' in 130 (*P. Oxy.* 2553).⁴⁸ Which city? The date is between 30 November and 15 December and therefore presumably refers to Oxyrhynchus rather than Alexandria, since Hadrian is known to have been in Upper Egypt in October and November. Preparations for the visit may be reflected in an ostrakon recording a receipt for barley, but since the significant names are each restored from three damaged letters and since $\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\chi\eta$ of supplies is attested for visitors other than Emperors (e.g. *O. Bodl.* 1007) this cannot be regarded as more than a fragile hypothesis.⁴⁹

Avidius Cassius: the revolt against Marcus took place in the spring and early summer of 175. I have argued that a letter which has been variously assigned to Severus Alexander, Maximinus and Vaballathus in fact pertains to the proclamation of Avidius Cassius.⁵⁰ The letter states that the imperial nominee visited or was about to visit Alexandria, and promises appropriate benefactions to the city. Its tone should now be compared with the recently published letter of Trajan to Alexandria (*P. Oxy.* 3022), and that of Nero to the Arsinoites.⁵¹

⁴⁰ D. G. Weingärtner, *Die Ägyptenreise des Germanicus* (1969), 80 ff. For an improvement to *SB* 3924 (Edict of Germanicus) see J. H. Oliver, *Riv. Stor. Ant.* 1 (1971), 229-30.

⁴¹ Weingärtner, loc. cit. (n. 40); D. Fishwick, *JRS* 63 (1973), 255-6.

⁴² J. D. Thomas, *JEA* 57 (1971), 236-7. He also discusses the general notion of the *cura provinciae* as applied to Egypt, to which *P. Köln* inv. 4701 (Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970), 217-83) is perhaps also relevant; cf. H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (*ASP* XIII, 1974), 14, 138.

⁴³ D. Hennig, *Chiron* 2 (1972), 349-65.

⁴⁴ As suggested by E. G. Turner in the *editio princeps* of *P. Oxy.* 2435.

⁴⁵ Cf. *P. Oxy.* 3020, Jones, *CERP*², 474, n. 7 and compare *P. Oxy.* 41 and 2407 (with Bowman, *The Town Councils*, 50-2; N. Lewis, *APF* 21 (1971), 83 ff. suggests that 2407 may relate to Antinoopolis).

⁴⁶ *ZPE* 3 (1968), 51-80. See also C. P. Jones, *Historia* 22 (1973), 309.

⁴⁷ *P. Oxy.* XLII, p. 70, cf. C. Préaux, *CE* 44 (1969), 365.

⁴⁸ S. Follet, *Rev. de Phil.* 42 (1968), 54-77 suggests that Hadrian also made a visit in 134, but this is convincingly refuted by J. Schwartz, *CE* 44 (1969), 164-8.

⁴⁹ P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Historia* 18 (1969), 109-18 (= *O. Leid.* 123), cf. N. Lewis, *BASP* 8 (1971), 19-20.

⁵⁰ *JRS* 60 (1970), 20-6, where previous bibliography is cited. See also J. Schwartz, *Ancient Society* 4 (1973), 191-8.

⁵¹ O. Montevecchi, *Akten* XIII, 293-9; *Aegyptus* 50 (1970), 5-33. The letter is of a common type, refusing honours offered by the Arsinoites. On Nero and Egypt see now Montevecchi, *Parola del Passato* 30 (1975), 48-58.

The prefect of Egypt, Calvisius Statianus, is known to have supported Avidius, and further light is cast on his role by a new prefectural edict which refers to the κρόττησις of Avidius and is presumably part of the same body of Avidian propaganda as the letter.⁵²

Septimius Severus: one new detail in *P. Oxy.* 3019 which contains an extract from proceedings in the court-house at Alexandria before Septimius and his *consilium*. It is dated 9 March 200 and the Emperor hears embassies of Egyptians from the *chora* putting forward communal requests. Earlier evidence has shown him only issuing rescripts to individuals.

Palmyra, Aurelian and Firmus: it now looks as if the victory of Aurelian over the Palmyrenes in Egypt was all but won by the end of the summer of 272 (see above, p. 156). The *Historia Augusta* asserts that later a rich Alexandrian merchant named Firmus assumed the purple and was defeated by Aurelian. The authenticity of this revolt has not seriously been questioned even though the *HA*, in dealing with this period, is full of much obvious fiction.⁵³ There is no echo of this revolt in the papyri but Ammianus (22. 16. 15) and Zosimus (1. 61. 1) both record trouble in Alexandria at this time. What the papyri do attest in the reign of Aurelian is the presence of an ἐπανορθωτής named Claudius Firmus.⁵⁴ The presence of such an official by no means necessarily presupposes a revolt,⁵⁵ but there is one clear case in which an ἐπανορθωτής is connected with a revolt, that is, Achilleus in the revolt of L. Domitius Domitianus (see below, p. 159). It has been argued that the *HA* might have transposed elements of this revolt back to the reign of Aurelian; the coincidence of names between Firmus the usurper and Firmus the ἐπανορθωτής might seem to support this.⁵⁶

However, the confusion in the *HA* goes deeper than this. The author knows three Firmi (*Q.T.* 3. 1): a prefect of Egypt, a 'dux limitis Africani idemque pro consule' and the rebel, a friend and associate of Zenobia. It may be that the *HA*'s prefect of Egypt reflects Claudius Firmus the ἐπανορθωτής who probably also held the prefecture ten years earlier (the double office may be very significant for the inventiveness of the *HA*).⁵⁷ As for the other Firmi, the rebel is not otherwise attested, nor is the 'dux limitis Africani' whose title is certainly anachronistic (a *dux* would, in any case, not be a proconsul).⁵⁸ If these Firmi are suspect, it is tempting to speculate about their genesis. There was a very well-attested revolt by a man named Firmus in Africa whose genuineness is above suspicion. This revolt occurred during the reign of Valentinian (Amm. 29. 5 ff.) and in one interesting and possibly very significant detail Ammianus' account coincides with that of the *HA* on the Egyptian Firmus—both the rebels died by hanging (Amm. 29. 5. 54, *HA*, *Q.T.* 5. 2). It is at least possible that the author of the *HA* could have been familiar with this, either from Ammianus or a common source.⁵⁹ I am therefore tempted to hazard the suggestion that behind the three Firmi of the *HA* there lie two historical personages, a prefect of Egypt who was subsequently ἐπανορθωτής and an African prince who revolted under Valentinian. As for Egypt under Aurelian, one may believe the evidence of Ammianus and Zosimus for sedition in Alexandria, but in the absence of any reliable supporting evidence it is not safe to accord this the status of a full revolt or to accept that its leader was Firmus.

Diocletian: the evidence for this reign is difficult and confusing, but it is now possible to make considerable progress towards determining the nature and chronology of events in this period, thanks largely to the publication of the Chester Beatty Papyrus from Panopolis.⁶⁰

P. Oxy. 43 recto, dated early in 295, refers to certain soldiers as κόμιτες τοῦ κυρίου and πρῶδῆκτωρ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ. Although it is evident, in spite of the difficulties in determining

⁵² P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 8 (1971), 186–92.

⁵³ See e.g. W. H. Fisher, *JRS* 19 (1929), 125–49. On Firmus see J. Straub, *BHAC* 1971 (1974), 165–84.

⁵⁴ This is the Greek equivalent of the Latin title *corrector*.

⁵⁵ For other *correctores* in Egypt see *P. Mert.* II, Appendix; O. W. Reinmuth, *BASP* 4 (1967), 122; G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 (1975), 314, 317, 320.

⁵⁶ W. Seston, *Dioclétien et la Tétrarchie* (1946), 147 ff.; J. Schwartz, *Lucius Domitius Domitianus (Pap. Brux.* 12, 1975), 110–16 attempts to show that the *HA*'s account of Firmus uses elements from the

usurpation of Mussius Aemilianus as well as that of Achilleus.

⁵⁷ For the prefecture of C. Claudius Firmus see now *P. Oxy.* 3113; for the *correctura* see the works cited in note 55, above.

⁵⁸ See E. Birley, *Bonner HAC* 1968–9, 85, who sees this *dux* as a reflection of the African Firmus (cf. below), but does not refer to the Egyptian Firmus.

⁵⁹ A. Cameron, *JRS* 61 (1971), 259–62 against Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (1968), 23.

⁶⁰ T. C. Skeat, *Papyri from Panopolis in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin* (1964), no. 1.

the precise nature of the *comitatus* at this time, that detachments of troops did sometimes accompany the Emperor in person on specific occasions,⁶¹ it seems clear that Diocletian could not have been in Egypt in early 295. He is attested at Sirmium and Nicomedia in late 294, at Nicomedia in March 295 and at Damascus by 1 May.⁶² *P. Oxy* 43 recto can therefore hardly be taken to imply the presence of an Augustus.

Diocletian was, however, certainly in Alexandria when the *epistula* to the proconsul of Africa about the Manichees was issued on 31 March of an unspecified year. The hostile reference to the Persians in this document has suggested that its date must be close to the Persian War, that is *c.* 296–8; and Seston has argued that the addressee, Julianus the proconsul of Africa, probably held office in 296–7 and that the probable date of the *epistula* is therefore 30 March 297.⁶³ This is, however, far from certain and it may be possible to state a case for a later dating which would connect it more closely with the outbreak of the Great Persecution.

If it was issued in March 297, was this the occasion on which Diocletian was at Alexandria at the conclusion of the revolt of L. Domitius Domitianus? This is the most vexed chronological question of the period and has provoked an enormous literature which has not yet settled it. The evidence points to a revolt which lasted more than seven months, probably beginning in July of one Egyptian year and running at least into the spring of the next. Which years are involved? The only serious candidates appear to be 296–7 and 297–8.⁶⁴ It is not possible to discuss the problem in detail here. The literary and numismatic evidence is inconclusive, but I believe that the papyrological evidence points more strongly towards 297–8.⁶⁵ Skeat was inclined to favour it on the basis of the evidence of *P. Beatty Panop.* 1.⁶⁶ If this is correct, Diocletian will have been in Alexandria in the spring (or slightly later) of 298, in addition to a visit in March 297, if that is the correct date of the Manichaean letter. From *P. Beatty Panop.* 1 we know that Diocletian was due to visit Panopolis in the autumn of 298, presumably in the aftermath of the revolt. Skeat connected this with the known fact that Diocletian travelled up the Nile to the southern frontier after the revolt and arranged for its retrocession.⁶⁷ This timetable gives rather a tight schedule into which to fit the meeting between Diocletian and Galerius at Nisibis soon after its capture (if we accept Joshua Stylites' date of September 298 at the latest for the capture of Nisibis). If the meeting at Nisibis did take place after the revolt in Egypt and the visit to Panopolis, we can ease the chronology slightly by supposing that Diocletian's visit to Panopolis took place on his way *back* from the southern frontier to Alexandria (and thence to Syria). If this is the case, there is obviously the possibility that he had stopped there earlier on his way *to* the southern frontier. The reference in *P. Beatty Panop.* 1. 375 to the opening of bakeries to supply the troops 'just as last year' could imply a visit as little as a few weeks earlier (i.e. in the previous Egyptian year) or it could refer to the troops who regained the Thebaid for Diocletian, as Skeat suggests.

Given this timetable it is at least conceivable that Diocletian could have made his way to Nisibis by late 298 and back to Antioch, where he is attested on 5 February 299.⁶⁸ Needless to say, this is pure hypothesis. But if the revolt did take place in 297–8 we can then firmly place the taxation edict of Aristius Optatus before the revolt (*P. Cair. Isidor.* 1, 16 March 297). It will then be one of a number of administrative measures, which included the introduction of the πρωτοστάτης and possibly also the removal of the strategos,⁶⁹ whose

⁶¹ As attested in *P. Beatty Panop.* 1. For the Diocletianic *comitatus* see Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* 1, 49 ff.; W. Seston, *Historia* 4 (1955), 284–96.

⁶² Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften* II, 288.

⁶³ *Mélanges Ernout* (1940), 345–54. The uncertainty over the date of the *epistula* means that it cannot be used as an argument for or against any particular theory on the revolt of Domitianus (see below).

⁶⁴ For 296–7 most recently J. Schwartz, *CE* 38 (1963), 149–55 and *L. Domitius Domitianus (Pap. Brux.* 12, 1975). For 297–8, A. C. Johnson, *CP* 45 (1950), 13–21; Skeat, *P. Beatty Panop.*, pp. x–xv (tentatively); C. Vandersleyen, *Chronologie des préfets d'Égypte de 284 à 395 (Coll. Latomus* 55, 1962), 44–61; R. Rémondon, *CE* 41 (1966), 165–7.

⁶⁵ In an article forthcoming in *ZPE*, J. D. Thomas argues this point of view in detail.

⁶⁶ Skeat, *P. Beatty Panop.*, pp. x–xv.

⁶⁷ cf. J. Desanges, *CE* 44 (1969), 139–47.

⁶⁸ *CJ* 8. 53. 24.

⁶⁹ For the πρωτοστάτης see A. K. Bowman, *Akten* XIII, 43–51; *P. Oxy.* 3184; J. Schwartz, *ZPE* 16 (1975), 235–7, arguing that the evidence for this official does not especially favour a date of 297–8 for the revolt. For the non-appearance of the strategos in *P. Cair. Isidor.* 1 see J. D. Thomas, *JE* 60 (1974), 300; Jones, *CERP*², 489, n. 50 (for an improvement to this text see M. H. Crawford and J. M. Reynolds, *JRS* 65 (1975), 161–2). The earliest attestation of the πρωτοστάτης is in May 296.

completion was interrupted by the outbreak of the revolt. Finally, it is worth noting the evidence of *P. Oxy.* 1416, which suggests the possibility of a visit to Oxyrhynchus, probably after early May 298, by an Augustus and a prefect named Publius.⁷⁰ This may reflect a stop by Diocletian on the same journey which later entailed his visit or visits to Panopolis.

There may have been another visit to Egypt by Diocletian later in his reign. Amongst the confused compilation of evidence which goes under the name of the Barbarus Scaligeri is the statement that Diocletian was in Alexandria when Peter the Bishop was martyred.⁷¹ A recent republication of a papyrus may lend some support to this.⁷² The text was written during the governorship of Satrius Arrianus who was *praeses* of the Thebaid in 305-6 and 307,⁷³ though it must be noted that there are large gaps in the *fasti* on either side of him, so his term could well have commenced somewhat earlier. The subject of the text is an official of Hermopolis Magna⁷⁴ whose public conduct has been scrutinized in many cases, including one in the presence of the Emperor Diocletian. It is possible that this could refer to Diocletian's visit in 298, but it seems more plausible to suppose that the hearing will have been closer in time to the governorship of Arrianus, especially since it is unlikely that the official will have been in office for seven or eight years. This text therefore gives some ground for believing that Diocletian may have visited Egypt again towards the end of his reign, and should perhaps be linked with the evidence of the chronographer for a visit in 302 and with Procopius' statement that Diocletian organized a distribution of free corn in Alexandria.⁷⁵

II. EGYPT AS A ROMAN PROVINCE

1. *The status of Egypt.* Before moving on to consider in detail the advances made in the last fifteen years, it is appropriate to say something about the status of Egypt as a whole within the Roman Empire. Imperial historians, faced with a welter of papyrological evidence for the administration of Roman Egypt, sometimes show a tendency to opt out of considering the broader implications of this evidence for the Empire at large; to point to the 'Sonderstellung' of Egypt and to absolve themselves from the necessity of relating our knowledge of Egypt to our knowledge of other provinces. To treat Egypt as if it were not a province in the ordinary sense of the term is, for a variety of reasons, absurd.

Two distinct, but related, questions need to be asked. To what extent are the institutions of Roman Egypt merely a continuation of Ptolemaic practices? What is the evidence for Egypt's supposed special status? These questions have recently been considered by Lewis,⁷⁶ who has shown, convincingly in my view, that although the Romans retained much of the administrative terminology used by the Ptolemies (and, indeed, much of the Ptolemaic bureaucracy at the lower levels) the imposition of new institutions and the adaptation of old ones fundamentally changed the character of Egypt in many respects. He also sees similar important changes in the social structure of the populace, though the nature of the evidence makes this facet more difficult to demonstrate. On the same theme, Modrzejewski has made some penetrating observations about continuity and change in the application of law.⁷⁷ Whilst a considerable degree of continuity can be observed in private law, the changes in public law introduced by the Roman acquisition of Egypt were fundamental. All these conclusions are important and interesting and might—dare one suggest it?—be applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to other parts of the Hellenistic world if only we knew about them.

As for Egypt's special status, the ancient sources have been subjected to much misinterpretation. Augustus created for it an important equestrian prefecture and kept an

⁷⁰ For the date see B. A. Van Groningen, *Actes du V^e congrès international de papyrologie, Bruxelles, 1938*, 508-11. For the prefect Publius and the visit see C. Vandersleyen, *CE* 33 (1958), 113-34 and *Chronologie des préfets*, 67-9. Compare the recent evidence for a prefectural visit to the Arsinoite under Commodus (*P. Mich.* 536, *P. Petaus* 45-7).

⁷¹ Mommsen, *Chronica Minora* I, p. 354, cf. *Chron. Pasch.* (Dindorf), p. 514.

⁷² *P. Flor.* 33; J. R. Rea, *CE* 46 (1971), 142-5.

⁷³ *P. Oxy.* 2665; J. Lallemant, *L'administration*

civile, 250; J. R. Rea, loc. cit. (n. 72).

⁷⁴ Note the suggestion of T. C. Skeat (*P. Beatty Panop.*, pp. xix-xx) that at this time Hermopolis was the headquarters of the *praeses* of the Thebaid.

⁷⁵ Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* 26. 35. The evidence is discussed by C. Vandersleyen, *Chronologie des préfets*, 68-70, but he tries to discount the year 302 and link the distribution with the end of the revolt of Domitianus.

⁷⁶ *Proc.* XII, 3-14.

⁷⁷ J. Modrzejewski, *Proc.* XII, 322-6.

especially close eye on its revenues (he did not turn it into a private possession of the *princeps*, whatever that might mean), specifically forbidding senators and illustrious *equites* to enter it without permission.⁷⁸ Tacitus uses two phrases which are at least partly to blame for the belief in a special status: 'seposuit Aegyptum' and 'ita visum expedire provinciam . . . domi retinere',⁷⁹ giving the obvious reason that Egypt could be held militarily by a very small force. The rank of the prefect does not in itself create a special status—other provinces were governed by equestrian *praefecti*—and, indeed, Tacitus suggests precisely the reverse when he says 'decretaque eorum proinde habere iusserat ac si magistratus Romani constituissent'.⁸⁰ Brunt has recently noted⁸¹ that the uniqueness of Egypt's local government (some features of which were owed to Ptolemaic precedents) and its lack of a *κοινόν* does not justify our refusing to call it a 'province'. If its local government was unique this is no doubt due to some peculiar conditions, in particular the geographical features, the large amount of revenue and the organization of the rural economy. If Egypt is in some respects atypical we must not only remember that other provinces also had peculiar features (which might induce us to regard them as atypical, if we knew as much about them), but also ask ourselves what we might reasonably expect to be able to say about 'typicality' in the Empire. The important thing is to treat the evidence on its merits and to realize that, whilst the papyri may reveal details which are not literally applicable to provinces other than Egypt, they may, sanely applied, illuminate administrative, social and economic features of the Empire as a whole.

2. *The administrative divisions of Egypt.* It has been, until recently, accepted dogma that Egypt was, until the time of Diocletian, divided into three *epistrategiae*—the Delta, the Heptanomia with the Arsinoite, the Thebaid (the last of which is also to be found in papyri as a vague geographical description). However, evidence for the epistrategus of the whole Delta is still lacking and it has recently been suggested that circumstantial evidence points to the possible existence of four *epistrategiae*, with the Delta divided into east and west. A papyrus from Oxyrhynchus which lists the nome divisions of Egypt groups the nomes of the eastern and western Delta separately. It also curiously lists eleven nomes for the Heptanomia and Arsinoite, including apparently the Antinoite nomarchy.⁸²

It has long been known that under Diocletian the Thebaid became a separate unit governed by a *praeses*. New evidence shows us that at the same time the Antinoite and Cussite Nomes were created, and the Thebaid was extended northwards to include the Hermopolite. The Thebaid itself was divided into two parts—Upper and Lower—each with its own *procurator*.⁸³ Evidently the change was completed by 298; Skeat has in fact suggested that it can be taken back to at least 295 on the basis of an improved reading of *P. Oxy.* 43 recto, vi. 10–11, which has important consequences for our views of the chronology of the Diocletianic reforms in Egypt and elsewhere.⁸⁴ Skeat also suggested that Hermopolis might have been the headquarters of the *praeses*, which is interesting in view of the possible visit by Diocletian in 302 (pp. 159–60 above). It is open to question whether Egypt was similarly divided; a *procurator* of the Heptanomia turns up in *P. Oxy.* 3031 (c. 302), having presumably replaced the epistrategus (last attested in *P. Oxy.* 1416, probably of 298), but this does not settle the question.

In the second decade of the fourth century Lower Egypt was divided into Aegyptus Iovia and Herculia, the Heptanomia being a part of the latter.⁸⁵ It was until recently

⁷⁸ See Tacitus, *Ann.* 2. 59. 4; *Hist.* 1. 11. 1; *Res Gestae* 27; Velleius 1. 39. 2 and cf. *CIL* IV, 701. 2. The general issues are discussed on much the same lines by G. M. Parássoglou, op. cit. (n. 20).

⁷⁹ *Ann.* 2. 59. 4.

⁸⁰ *Ann.* 12. 60. 3.

⁸¹ *JRS* 65 (1975), 124. A question relevant to this issue in general, but not considered by Brunt, is that of the *edictum provinciale*; there is still no agreement as to whether there was an *edictum provinciale* for Egypt—for a range of views see H. Ankum, *Anamnesis, Gedenkboek E. A. Leemans* (1970), 63–9; R. Martini, *Ricerche in tema di editto provinciale*

(1969), 144–6; R. Katzoff, *Tijd. v. Rg.* 37 (1969), 415–37; J. Modrzejewski, *Proc.* XII, 341–4; A. Biscardi, *Studi G. Scherillo* (1972), 111–51.

⁸² J. D. Thomas, *Proc.* XII, 465–9; *Akten* XIII, 397–403, cf. Jones, *CERP*², 295–314.

⁸³ *P. Beatty Panop.*, pp. xv–xxi. For a procurator of the Heptanomia in c. 302 see below.

⁸⁴ loc. cit. (n. 83). The creation of the dioceses was probably under way before 295, cf. M. Hendy, *JRS* 62 (1972), 75–82. For the extended process of reform in local administration see A. K. Bowman, *Akten* XIII, 43–51.

⁸⁵ Jones, *CERP*², 489, n. 50.

accepted that the date of this change was 312.⁸⁶ It now appears, however, that the change cannot predate *P. Cair. Isidor.* 73 of late 314 or early 315, which shows the prefect exercising jurisdiction in both areas.⁸⁷ This has important implications for the dating of the *Laterculus Veronensis* and the question of its homogeneity.⁸⁸ Barnes now argues that the list ought not to be regarded as homogeneous, and that the evidence for dating the changes in each area needs to be tested independently.⁸⁹ The basis of his argument is that the Egyptian and Arabian items in the list are mutually exclusive, the former reflecting a situation after 314 and the latter one which obtained before 314. The general conclusion about the nature of the list seems to me certainly correct, even though it is impossible to be sure that the Arabian argument (based on a comparison of the list with a passage in Eusebius' *Martyrs of Palestine*) is watertight.⁹⁰ In fact, the evidence for the re-uniting of the Numidian provinces by 314 is sufficiently unambiguous to guarantee the conclusion,⁹¹ unless we strain credulity to its limits and suppose that the list was composed at some point in late 314 when Egypt had perhaps been divided but Numidia was not yet re-united.

3. *The Prefects of Egypt.* Recent compilations of prefectural *fasti* preclude the necessity for a long list of additions and corrections.⁹² A handful of brief notes will therefore suffice.

- (a) Aelius Gallus, rather than Cornelius Gallus, may be the subject of a recently published fragment of Egyptian history.⁹³
- (b) A prefect of the Flavian period, L. Peducaeus Colo (Colonus) has been identified in Dio of Prusa's *Alexandrian Oration* and helps to date it.⁹⁴
- (c) Aurelius Mercurius should probably be deleted from the prefect lists. I have argued elsewhere that he was an epistrategus; he might alternatively have been a *procurator usiacus*.⁹⁵
- (d) Aemilius Rusticianus is included in the latest list, but he was certainly a *vicarius praefectorum praetorio*.⁹⁶
- (e) Satrius Arrianus was *praeses* of the Thebaid in 305-7.⁹⁷
- (f) Victorinus was prefect in office in 308, succeeded before September by Aelius Hyginus (cf. Victorinianus below).⁹⁸
- (g) Sossianus Hierocles was certainly prefect in 310 rather than 307.⁹⁹
- (h) Victorinianus was *praeses* of the Thebaid, not prefect of Egypt. We have an early date for his tenure of office (29. 3. 322).¹⁰⁰
- (i) Flavius Gregorius, *praeses* of the Thebaid in 329.¹⁰¹
- (j) Flavius Quintilianus, *praeses* of the Thebaid in 332.¹⁰²
- (k) Aurelius Aeneas, *praeses* of the Thebaid in the early fourth century.¹⁰³
- (l) The name of the prefect of 328 is now established beyond doubt as Septimius Zenius.¹⁰⁴

⁸⁶ As argued by J. Lallemand, *Acad. Roy. de Belgique, Bull. de la classe des lettres*, 5. 36 (1950), 387-95.

⁸⁷ L. de Salvo, *Aegyptus* 44 (1964), 34-46, arguing that Licinius had reason to evoke the connection with the first tetrarchy.

⁸⁸ Principal treatments by J. B. Bury, *JRS* 13 (1923), 127 ff.; A. H. M. Jones, *JRS* 44 (1964), 21-9 (= *The Roman Economy* (1974), 263-9) arguing for a date between 312 and 314.

⁸⁹ *ZPE* 16 (1975), 275-7.

⁹⁰ As Barnes notes, it depends on the assumption that Eusebius was not guilty of anachronism; and the complex question of the date and stages of composition of the *Martyrs* makes it impossible to be quite certain that there was not some later revision in the relevant portion.

⁹¹ *AE* 1942-3, 84; 1955, 81; *CIL* VIII, 18905; cf. H.-G. Kolbe, *Die Statthalter Numidiens von Gallienus bis Konstantin* (Vestigia 4, 1962), 59-60, 69.

⁹² O. W. Reinmuth, *BASP* 4 (1967), 75-128; G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 (1975), 263-328. These lists both contain full annotation, unlike those compiled by P. A. Brunt, *JRS* 65 (1975), 142-7 and O. Montevecchi, *La Papirologia* (1973), 129-35. For the early fourth century see J. Lallemand, *L'ad-*

ministration civile de l'Egypte de l'avènement de Dioclétien à la création du diocèse (1964), 237 ff., C. Vandersleyen, *Chronologie des préfets d'Egypte de 284 à 395* (Coll. Latomus 55, 1962).

⁹³ *P. Oxy.* 2820, cf. N. Lewis, *GRBS* 16 (1975), 295-303, arguing that it may refer to the expedition to Arabia Felix.

⁹⁴ C. P. Jones, *Historia* 22 (1973), 306.

⁹⁵ *BASP* 6 (1969), 35-40; cf. J. D. Thomas, *JHS* 84 (1964), 207.

⁹⁶ C. Vandersleyen, op. cit. (n. 92), 62-3. Septimius Valentinus of *ILS* 619 is likely to be another early *vicarius*. Note also Julius Julianus, a known prefect and possibly grandfather of the Emperor Julian, attested holding a vicariate in about 315 (*P. Oxy.* 2952).

⁹⁷ Most recently J. R. Rea, *CE* 46 (1971), 145.

⁹⁸ *P. Oxy.* 2674.

⁹⁹ *P. Oxy.* 3120. 8-9 note.

¹⁰⁰ *P. Oxy.* 2674, 3123; *P. Panop.* 24, 27 (*ZPE* 10 (1973), 117, 126); D. Hagedorn, *Proc.* XII, 210; K. A. Worp, *Mnemosyne* 28 (1975), 119.

¹⁰¹ *P. Panop.* 28.

¹⁰² *P. Panop.* 29, 30.

¹⁰³ *P. Panop.* 25.

¹⁰⁴ *P. Oxy.* 3126.

As regards the position and functions of the prefect of Egypt, we have been fairly well served by recent work. Brunt has analysed the careers of the prefects between 30 B.C. and A.D. 235 in an attempt to determine whether or not their previous experience prepared them in any way for the rigours of the Egyptian job.¹⁰⁵ His conclusion that 'specialization' is an anachronistic concept will perhaps not occasion very great surprise, but the notion of amateurism which he imports strikes an odd note. One might legitimately suspect that the virtue of the Roman system was simply that the varied experience of administrators trained them to be at once flexible and sensitive to local detail.

Several pieces of work have been done on the judicial functions of the prefect.¹⁰⁶ Humbert discusses the status of the prefect as a lawgiver, the delegation of jurisdiction, the form of petitions to the prefect and of his replies and the organization of the *conventus*. His comparison, *en passant*, of the position of the prefect with that of the Ptolemaic monarch will hardly stand up to scrutiny. By far the most important of recent works on the prefect is that of Talamanca, discussing the *conventus*. The survey is exhaustive and some of the conclusions are far-reaching. It is not possible to do them justice here, but one might note in particular her assertion that there is no real distinction between the functions of δικαιοδοσία and δικάσιμος¹⁰⁷; that is, there is no such thing as an administrative *conventus* as distinct from a judicial one. This conclusion deserves to be widely noted because the supposed distinction between administrative competence and judicial competence is one which has bedevilled the study of Roman Egypt (and other areas) for many years. I suspect that it is a distinction which serves no useful purpose and one which no Roman administrator would have understood. Talamanca has also shown the fragility of Wilcken's dating of the Western Delta *conventus* and examined the gradual change in the system which resulted in the old *conventus* circuit becoming fragmented by the third century, a tour of each nome district by district.¹⁰⁸ She hints that this may be a feature of a more complete transformation of the administrative system than has hitherto been recognized and it seems natural to suppose that, if this is correct, the reign of Septimius Severus may be the crucial period.¹⁰⁹

As a rider to this discussion of the *conventus* may be added a note on a new prefectural edict which contains a list of the kind of cases which the prefect will personally hear and specification of conditions under which appeal (from Roman citizens only?) will be heard.¹¹⁰ Finally it may be useful to note recent compilations and discussions of *testimonia* relating to the prefect's administrative activity.¹¹¹

4. *The financial administration.* Here we enter an area plagued by the utmost doubt and uncertainty. Not that there is any lack of evidence in the papyri for the organization of the financial administration, but there has been no recent comprehensive attempt to synthesize it. Problems of definition still abound as regards the areas of competence of the main branches of the finance system: *idios logos*, *dioiketes*, *archiereus*, *epistrategus* and other *procuratores*. Work in this area remains an urgent *desideratum* and any summary is, at this stage, bound to consist of as many questions as answers.

The idios logos. In a recent monograph Swarney has attempted to trace the bureaucratic history and structure of the department and its functions as administrator, confiscator,

¹⁰⁵ *JRS* 65 (1975), 124-47.

¹⁰⁶ M. Humbert in *Aspects de l'empire romain* (1964), 95-147; G. F. Talamanca, *L'organizzazione del 'conventus' del 'Praefectus Aegypti'*, *Univ. di Roma, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano e dei Diritti dell'Oriente Mediterraneo* 48 (1974). Also worth noting are *E. Seidl, *Antologia Giuridica Romanistica* 1 (1968), 199-210; *V. Bartoletti, *ibid.* 259-67; A. Schiller, *The Classical Tradition: Essays in Honour of H. Caplan* (1966), 293-312; *R. Szymkiewicz, *Les gouverneurs de province à l'époque Augustéenne* (1974); R. Katzoff, *ZSS* 89 (1972), 256-92; and P. Petaus 9, providing the first mention in papyri of *damnatio ad bestias* (185).

¹⁰⁷ cf. J. D. Thomas, *The Ptolemaic Epistrategos (Pap. Colonensis 6, 1975)*, 67. For other recent work on the *conventus* see G. Zavattoni, *Studi G. Scherillo* 1 (1972), 153-64; J. Mathwich, *ZPE* 15 (1974), 61-78; N. Lewis, *BASP* 9 (1972), 23-36; 13 (1976), 5-14.

¹⁰⁸ Talamanca, *op. cit.* (n. 106), 96-7, 198-201.

¹⁰⁹ See also p. 168 below.

¹¹⁰ N. Lewis, *RHD* 1972, 5-12; 1973, 5-7; *Hommages à Claire Préaux* (1975), cf. E. Seidl, *SDHI* 38 (1972), 319-20.

¹¹¹ For collection of prefectural edicts see G. Chalon, *L'édit de Tiberius Julius Alexander* (1964), 251-6; P. Bureth, *RHD* 1968, 246-62 and *ANRW* II. 9 (announced); O. Montevecchi, *La Papirologia* (1973), 129-35. Recently published prefectural edicts: Lewis, *loc. cit.* (n. 110); *P. Oxy.* 2954, 3017, 3071; *P. Strasb.* 574; G. M. Parássoglou, *ZPE* 13 (1974), 21-37; *CE* 49 (1974), 332-5; *P. Mert.* 101; *BGU* 2056; *P. Mich.* 522. For a prefectural letter see A. Swiderek, **Festschrift 150 jähriges Bestehen des Berliner Ägypt. Museums* (1974), 425-9. On administration directly connected with the Nile see *D. Bonneau in *Etudes Macqueron* (1970).

investigator and judge. Questions remain to be answered about the periods during which its scope was augmented, particularly in view of the recent publication of a new fragment of the *Gnomon* (*P. Oxy.* 3014) which shows minor variations from the text in *BGU* 1210; the editor believed that this fragment might predate the *BGU* text (written not earlier than the Antonine period) by as much as a century, and if this is correct it will necessitate revision of Swarney's conclusions that the major stage in the development of the office occurred under Hadrian, and that the *Gnomon* was composed during the second century and designed for contemporary use to solve contemporary problems.¹¹²

The eventual fate of the *idios logos* is also of interest. The idea that during the second century it was combined with the post of *archiereus* of Alexandria is now discredited.¹¹³ Swarney argued that the post did not survive effectively beyond the reign of Septimius Severus, but this too can now be shown to be erroneous by reference to *P. Oxy.* 3133 where it is attested in 239; the editor hazarded the suggestion that it might finally have disappeared during the reorganization of Egypt in the reign of Philippus Arabs (see p. 168 below).

As for its relations with other officials, Swarney maintained that the relations between *idios logos* and prefect did not normally in the first century involve the former acting explicitly as the latter's delegate; and that, in the major areas of its competence, the *idios logos* was responsible not to the prefect but to Rome.¹¹⁴ As regards the latter, the prefect was probably involved in revision and publication of the *Gnomon*.¹¹⁵ In considering the former we must now look at a papyrus published in 1972,¹¹⁶ in which the prefect may be announcing a *δικολογισμός* to be conducted by the *idios logos*, Lysimachus, whom he calls *ὁ ἐμός*. This should probably not be taken to imply a regular *conventus* circuit for the *idios logos* distinct from that of the prefect.¹¹⁷ We should also welcome the recent view¹¹⁸ that it is mistaken to suppose that the office of *procurator usiacus* was a branch of the administration of the *idios logos*, which depended largely on the erroneous belief that during the second century the functions of *idios logos* and *archiereus* were merged.¹¹⁹

Ratio privata, patrimonium and the usiac account. The nature and development of the usiac account have recently been examined in some detail by Parássoglou in his Yale dissertation.¹²⁰ He concludes that it was created under the Flavian Emperors and comprised the estates acquired by the Julio-Claudians; but that thereafter the Emperors ceased to acquire land for private ownership and this account became a closed and fossilized roster. It is a fact that *patrimonium* and its cognates appear very rarely in the papyri. Are we therefore to assume that the term 'usiac' was applied to land in Egypt which elsewhere would have been described as 'patrimonial'? And further, that land which might have gone, in the first century, into the usiac category later accrued to the *ratio privata*? Difficulties arise if these are the implications of Parássoglou's hypothesis. The old idea of the Severan disappearance of the *idios logos* was convenient since it coincided with the supposed establishment of the *ratio privata*. But recent evidence shows that the *idios logos* continued to function after the Severan period; and the *ratio privata* is not attested in Egypt before the reign of Diocletian.¹²¹ If, therefore, the usiac account was frozen after the first century, into what category went lands acquired by gift, inheritance or confiscation? Possibly into the *idios logos*, but only until the middle of the third century at the latest. Whither, then, in the period between 250 (or thereabouts) and the reign of Diocletian? It seems difficult to assert that they did *not* go into the usiac account, which is attested as late as 284 (*P. Oxy.* 2228). Thus, in default of evidence for the *ratio privata* in Egypt between c. 250 and Diocletian we cannot assert continuity of function between the *idios logos* and the

¹¹² *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos* (*ASP* VI II, 1970), cf. H. J. Wolff, *Tijd. v. Rg.* 41 (1973), 372-7; J. D. Thomas, *JEA* 58 (1972), 329-30; A. K. Bowman, *Phoenix* 26 (1972), 415-6.

¹¹³ See P. R. Swarney, op. cit. (n. 112), 133-4; Bowman, *Phoenix* 26 (1972), 416; G. M. Parássoglou, *ZPE* 13 (1974), 21-37; P. J. Parsons, *CE* 49 (1974), 146-7.

¹¹⁴ *Proc.* XII, 455-60.

¹¹⁵ *ibid.* 458-9.

¹¹⁶ G. Geraci, *Akten* XI II, 300-7.

¹¹⁷ Swarney, op. cit. (n. 114), 458 believes that the *idios logos* might sit in the prefect's *consilium*. Geraci

(n. 116) has complex notes explaining why Tiberius Julius Alexander 'delegated' his jurisdiction; but it is worth adding the caution that the text is by no means securely established.

¹¹⁸ G. M. Parássoglou, op. cit. (n. 20), App. iii.

¹¹⁹ See n. 113.

¹²⁰ Cited n. 118.

¹²¹ For the *idios logos* see above, p. 163 f. On the *ratio privata*, F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (forthcoming), Appendix 3; *PLRE* 1, 1062 ff.; *A. Masi, *Ricerche sulla 'res privata' del 'Princeps'* (1971). The earliest attestation of the officials of the *privata* in Egypt is in *P. Beatty Panop.* 1 of 298.

ratio privata; what is clear is that there are some similarities between the function of the *idios logos* in Egypt and the *ratio privata* elsewhere (which is attested as early as the reign of Marcus). It may also be useful to point out here the existence of another special account in Egypt, namely the Jewish one, created to deal with the confiscations made after the rebellion of 115-17.¹²²

The changes which occurred under Diocletian present less confusion. The activities of the *magister privatae* and the *procuratores privatae* are amply attested in *P. Beatty Panop.* and we may presume that this department subsumed the earlier functions of the *idios logos* and the usiac account. The position of *rationalis* as overall head of finance in the whole of Egypt (even after it was split into Aegyptus and the Thebaid)¹²³ seems certainly to be a Diocletianic creation; the earliest definitely dated attestation is in 286 (*P. Oxy.* 1260), if we except the isolated case of Marcellus, a special appointment in the reign of Philip.¹²⁴ The disappearance of the *dioiketes* and the *archiereus* in favour of the *rationalis* indicates, as we would expect, a trend towards greater centralization.¹²⁵

Other procuratorial posts. Although most of the prosopographical information available up to 1961 has been collected by Pflaum,¹²⁶ there has been no comprehensive discussion of the functions of either the *dioiketes* or the *archiereus*, both of whom can be shown to have survived into the later part of the third century.¹²⁷ It is certainly more sensible to see the *procurator usiacus* as a fourth major branch of the financial administration in the pre-Diocletianic period, alongside, rather than subordinate to, the *idios logos*, the *dioiketes* and the *archiereus*.¹²⁸ There were of course other *procuratores* as well in this period and their functions need to be securely defined; one can point to, amongst others, the *procurator Alexandriae*, the *procurator ad Mercurium* and the *procurator Phari*.¹²⁹

The epistrategus. His was also, of course, a procuratorial position. Apart from prosopographical work,¹³⁰ he has not been the subject of a great deal of attention recently; in fact, the basic work on the character and function of the office remains that of Martin, now over sixty years old.¹³¹ However, we are now promised a new treatment by J. D. Thomas in succession to his volume on the Ptolemaic epistrategus.¹³² It would be unfair and unwise to attempt to anticipate his conclusions. I would merely draw attention to the remarks (p. 161 above) on the number of administrative divisions (were there, in fact, four *epistrategiae*?) and the question of the date of the disappearance of the epistrategus. Certainly, the epistrategus of the Thebaid will have disappeared when that province was separated, probably at the latest in 295. The others presumably survived until shortly after this date when they were replaced by *procuratores*.¹³³ In addition, one may cite a recent piece of work examining the evidence for the role of the epistrategus in liturgies.¹³⁴

5. *Local administration.* Here it is necessary to present a highly selective and condensed account, since there has been a great deal of new evidence and recent work in this area. The brief notes which follow are intended merely to sketch out some of the major advances of general interest. Some other remarks of relevance will be found below in the discussions of economic and social history.

The strategus. One of the most serious gaps in the history of the administration of

¹²² A. Swiderek, *JJP* 16-17 (1971), 45-6. For another text perhaps relevant to this revolt see *BGU* 2085. On the revolt in general, A. Fuks, *JRS* 51 (1961), 98-104; *CPJ* II, pp. 435-50.

¹²³ *P. Beatty Panop.* I, 64 note.

¹²⁴ P. J. Parsons, *JRS* 57 (1967), 138-9 disposes of other cases of early *rationales*.

¹²⁵ There is a *dioiketes* in *P. Mich.* 623, dated by its editor to (probably) 299; but see J. R. Rea, *JEA* 60 (1974), 296-7.

¹²⁶ *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres* III (1961), 1083-9.

¹²⁷ Pflaum, loc. cit. (n. 126); for the *archiereus* see the works cited n. 113 above.

¹²⁸ G. M. Parássoglou, op. cit. (n. 20), App. iii; note that in *P. Oxy.* 3092 a *procurator usiacus* acts temporarily as *dioiketes*.

¹²⁹ *P. Oxy.* 2567, 9 note; 3118 (where the *procurator*

Phari is responsible for enforcing restrictions on travel); 3046 (πρὸς ταῖς ἐπιστράγιαι); 3089, 6 note (on the title *egregius* used of freedmen in procuratorial posts); 3117. Note that the *oikonomos*, a Ptolemaic official of high rank, disappears from the upper reaches of the Roman bureaucracy (A. Świderek, *CE* 45 (1970), 150 ff.).

¹³⁰ Pflaum, op. cit. (n. 126), 1090-2; M. Vandoni, *Gli Epistrategi nell'Egitto Greco-romano* (1971); J. R. Rea, *ZPE* 11 (1973), 120.

¹³¹ *Les épistratèges* (1911).

¹³² Cited n. 107 above.

¹³³ *P. Oxy.* 1416 attests an epistrategos in (probably) 298; in *P. Oxy.* 3031 of c. 302 there is a *procurator Heptanomiae*.

¹³⁴ N. Lewis, *CE* 44 (1969), 339-44, stressing the limited nature of the role, but see now *P. Oxy.* 3025.

Roman Egypt is the lack of a comprehensive and up-to-date study of the strategi of the nomes, as is evident from the fact that Hohlwein's articles, now over fifty years old, have recently been reprinted.¹³⁵ The *fasti* are, in fact, reasonably up-to-date, but there has been no coherent attempt to show how this official is the key to our understanding of the way in which the central government secured or enforced the co-operation of local officials in the towns and villages of the nome in the first three centuries. The strategus lost his pre-eminent position in the nome as a result of the Diocletianic reforms and emerged at the end of the first decade of the fourth century as the strategus/*exactor*, one of a board of 'municipal' officials, who was responsible for supervising the collection of taxes.¹³⁶ Some light is cast on the change by two facts: first, the appearance of the πρωτοστάτης in 296-7,¹³⁷ and second, the remarkable non-appearance of the strategus in the Edict of Aristius Optatus (*P. Cair. Isidor.* 1).¹³⁸ This may suggest the beginning of reform, completion of which was delayed by the outbreak of the revolt of Domitianus.¹³⁹

The councils. These are treated at length in my monograph which covers material published prior to and including 1970.¹⁴⁰ Here I need merely reiterate the conclusion that an important change occurred during the first decade of the fourth century, as a result of which the councils lost much of their power; this was thereafter vested in a board of officials, the most important of whom was the *logistes*, drawn from the ranks of the council but with direct responsibility to the central government. In effect this was an admission of the failure of the Severan reform, which attempted to decentralize by creating the councils in order to relieve some of the government officials of the responsibility for local administration. Important new evidence which has appeared since 1970 shows that the council in Oxyrhynchus was responsible for the administration of the 'corn-dole'.¹⁴¹ There has also been a recent study of the social and economic position of the councillors of Oxyrhynchus.¹⁴² As a point of general interest, it is worth emphasizing that the so-called municipal structure in the pre-Diocletianic period seems to be basically Roman rather than Hellenistic, even in a 'Greek city' like Antinoopolis.¹⁴³

Liturgies. Our understanding of the liturgical system has been advanced considerably thanks to the work of Lewis, and we can now claim to know more about this than almost any other feature of Roman Egypt. In the third and fourth centuries the working of the liturgical system was closely tied in with the operation of the councils.¹⁴⁴ Apart from his *Inventory*, Lewis has published a large number of detailed suggestions on individual points.¹⁴⁵ We might also note recent work on the following topics: the creation and disappearance of the *dekaprotai*,¹⁴⁶ the role and function of the komarch,¹⁴⁷ the officials of Karanis¹⁴⁸ and the system of tribal cycles for liturgic appointments at Oxyrhynchus.¹⁴⁹ The latter is particularly important because it was instituted as a result of the creation of the councils, was part of a general overhaul of the liturgical system in the reign of Philippus Arabs and continued to function after the Diocletianic period.

6. *The Economy of Roman Egypt.* Here we must deal with two closely related topics: taxation and the land economy. A few remarks will be added on the papyrological evidence for inflation at the end of the third century.

¹³⁵ *Le stratège du nome* (*Pap. Brux.* 9, 1969).

¹³⁶ See G. Mussiesi, *P. Lugd.-Bat.* XIV (1965), 13-46; G. Bastianini, *Gli Strategi dell'Arsinoites* (*Pap. Brux.* 11, 1972); J. D. Thomas, *CE* 34 (1959), 124-40, 35 (1960), 262-70; J. Lallemand, *L'administration civile* (1964), 126-31; A. K. Bowman, *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt* (*ASP* XI, 1971), 76.

¹³⁷ See the items cited above, n. 69.

¹³⁸ J. D. Thomas, *YEA* 60 (1974), 300.

¹³⁹ Not the only possible conclusion, see J. Schwartz, *ZPE* 16 (1975), 235-7.

¹⁴⁰ Cited in n. 136 above, cf. J. D. Thomas, *YEA* 60 (1974), 298-301. The papyri described in Appendix iv are published in *P. Oxy.* XLIV and XLV.

¹⁴¹ *P. Oxy.* XL, see p. 170 below.

¹⁴² I. Fikhtman, *APF* 22-3 (1974), 47-87 (Russian).

¹⁴³ H. Braunert, *JfP* 14 (1962), 73-88; N. Lewis, *Proc.* XII, 3-14.

¹⁴⁴ Bowman, *The Town Councils*, Ch. iv.

¹⁴⁵ *Inventory of Compulsory Services in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt* (*ASP* III, 1968) with *BASP* 6 (1969), 13-16, 12 (1975), 9-12. Some of Lewis' numerous articles are cited in the bibliography of Bowman, *The Town Councils*; note particularly the series of notes published in *BASP* under the titles ΝΟΗΜΑΤΑ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΟΣ and *Notationes Legentis*.

¹⁴⁶ J. D. Thomas, *BASP* 11 (1974), 60-8 and *ZPE* 19 (1975), 111-19.

¹⁴⁷ H. E. L. Missler, *Der Komarch* (Diss. Marburg, 1970); cf. Thomas, *ZPE* 19 (1975), 111-19.

¹⁴⁸ M. E. Larson, *The Officials of Karanis* (27 B.C.-A.D. 337) (Diss. Michigan, 1971).

¹⁴⁹ *P. Oxy.* XLIII, pp. 21-4, improving upon Bowman, *The Town Councils*, App. ii; P. J. Parsons, *JRS* 57 (1967), 134-41.

The land. In recent years Tomsin has produced some fundamental work on the categorization and status of land in Roman Egypt.¹⁵⁰ He has shown clearly that the status of private land in Roman Egypt was quite different from that in the Ptolemaic period, and was based on the concept and categorization of *ager publicus*, but in a more complex system than has previously been recognized. Of particular interest are his remarks on the *ousiai*, which he sees as examples of *ager viritanus*; but the *ousia* was not simply a parcel of land, it was an 'organisme complexe dont le fonds n'est qu'un élément'.¹⁵¹ As is well known, the *ousiai* tended, in the first century, to gravitate towards the Emperor by gift or by confiscation. Parássoglou's dissertation examines in detail the evidence for Imperial estates in Egypt and reinterprets much of it.¹⁵² In spite of difficulties inherent in some of his arguments (see p. 164 above), a comprehensive work on such an ill-understood area of the land economy deserves to be widely known. Parássoglou has also drawn attention to the fact that in the middle of the second century land belonging to the usiac account could be classed as δημόσια γῆ, and parcels of it were sold to individuals.¹⁵³ Of great interest, but rather obscure, are the details of the process by which much of this land returned to private ownership, and formed the basis of the large estates which are in evidence in the fourth century. The social and economic aspects of this change have been discussed from the point of view of *P. Flor.* 50, a Hermopolite text of the mid-third century.¹⁵⁴ The papyrus not only illustrates the shift back to private ownership, but also shows that Alexandrians holding land elsewhere tended to relinquish their identification with Alexandria, since the *constitutio Antoniniana* deprived them of the benefits of Alexandrian status, and to identify with the area of their property. The actual size of estates in the Roman period and the social and economic importance of their owners is a subject which would repay more extensive study.¹⁵⁵ Two other important aspects of the land economy which have recently received detailed treatment are ἐπιμερισμός (compulsory leasing of uncultivated land) and the economic effects of the Nile upon agricultural conditions.¹⁵⁶

Taxation. This is a complex topic on which we are furnished with a wealth of detail, even to the extent that it is sometimes difficult to see the wood for the trees. Since Wallace's book nearly forty years ago,¹⁵⁷ nobody has tried to synthesize the evidence on a similar scale. Many new and valuable suggestions are to be found in the articles of Youtie, generally upon matters of detailed interpretation of particular texts.¹⁵⁸ Here I confine myself to some observations on what seem to be the most important topics to have evoked discussion in recent years.

Crisis and reform. It is appropriate to refer here to detailed work on the Edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander, even though our main text of it is inscriptional rather than papyrological. Chalon has provided a thorough commentary with citation of most of the relevant material.¹⁵⁹ It seems apparent that the edict was provoked by the need to tighten up the administration and minimize loss of revenue. In this connection one can hardly doubt that there was some sort of an economic crisis under Nero, though it has recently been suggested that some of the evidence cited to prove it will not easily bear the weight.¹⁶⁰ el-Abbadi has tried to show that the principal aim of the edict was to protect the landowners throughout the country.¹⁶¹

As regards general reform of the tax system, we can pick out several significant stages. Sijpesteijn has assembled the evidence for changes under Trajan, which include the

¹⁵⁰ *Studi Calderini-Paribeni* (1957), 211 ff.; *Actes* x, 81-95; *Festschrift Oertel* (1964), 81-100; **Mélanges Fohalle* (1969), 271 ff.; *CE* 46 (1971), 332-5.

¹⁵¹ *Actes* X, 81-95, cf. N. Lewis, *Proc.* XII, 3-14.
¹⁵² op. cit. (n. 20). See also *H. C. Kühnke, *Οὐσιακή γῆ, Domänenland in den Papyri der Prinzipatszeit* (Diss. Köln, 1971); D. Crawford, *Studies in Roman Property* (ed. M. I. Finley, 1976), 35-70.

¹⁵³ *ZPE* 11 (1973), 21-3, cf. *BGU* 2060.

¹⁵⁴ M. A. H. el-Abbadi, *Proc.* XIV, 91-6.

¹⁵⁵ See J. F. Oates, *Proc.* XII, 385-7; *H. Geremek, *Karanis, Communauté rurale de l'Égypte romaine au*

II-IIIe siècle de notre ère (*Archivum Filologiczne*, 1969).

¹⁵⁶ G. Poethke, *Epimerismos* (*Pap. Brux.* 8, 1969); D. Bonneau, *Le fisc et le Nil* (1971).

¹⁵⁷ *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (1938), now to be used with C. and K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 16 (1975), 83-120.

¹⁵⁸ *Scriptumculae* I-III (1973-5).

¹⁵⁹ *L'édit de Tiberius Julius Alexander* (1964).

¹⁶⁰ J. F. Oates, *Essays in Honour of C. B. Welles* (*ASP* 1, 1966), 87-95, cf. *P. Mich.* 594; E. G. Turner, *HSCP* 79 (1975), 14; D. Bonneau, *Le fisc et le Nil* (1971), 165-71; Chalon, op. cit. (n. 159), 53-68.

¹⁶¹ *BIFAO* 65 (1967), 215-26.

introduction of a *μερισμός* to cover default in tax-payments and the raising of the dyke-tax.¹⁶² In the reign of Septimius Severus we have the creation of the councils, which were given a corporate responsibility for the collection of taxes in the nome.¹⁶³ There is also a suggestion which is very significant, if correct, to the effect that during this reign the concept of *origo* underwent some modification;¹⁶⁴ this would certainly betoken an attempt to tighten up the census and, as a consequence, the tax administration. If, as is suggested, the concept of *origo* became nome-based rather than village-based, we can appreciate that the government now saw the nome as the basic geographical unit for taxation purposes and this neatly fits the role given to the newly created councils.

Further overhaul of the system took place under Philippus Arabs.¹⁶⁵ It may have been during this reign that the *dekaprotoi* were introduced¹⁶⁶ and there is at least circumstantial evidence to suggest that the whole system of collection and transport of taxes in kind underwent a reorganization at this time.¹⁶⁷ Other complementary changes in this period relate to liturgies in the metropoleis and to the land survey.¹⁶⁸

For the Diocletianic reform there is more explicit evidence which has not yet been fully synthesized. The main outlines can be reconstructed with some degree of probability. There was the introduction of a five-year cycle of *ἐπιγραφαί*, most probably in 287–8.¹⁶⁹ We might now also hypothesize the introduction of the *ἐπικεφάλαιον* by 296–7;¹⁷⁰ this perhaps represents (though the evidence is not really sufficient to prove it) a survival of money tax in a system which became predominantly based on taxes in kind. The equivalence of the *iugum* to the *caput* does not appear definitively until the Brigetio inscription of 311.¹⁷¹ The non-equivalence in the intervening years may have been a factor which, at least initially, encouraged further inflation of the currency and thus inevitably rendered Diocletian's Maximum Price Edict ineffective.¹⁷² Another significant change in the reign of Diocletian was the disappearance of the *dekaprotoi*.¹⁷³

Individual taxes:

Aurum coronarium. I have suggested that the Edict of Severus Alexander (*P. Fay.* 22) suspended extraordinary levies of crown-money, but allowed the regular collection of *στεφανικόν* to continue unabated.¹⁷⁴

Anabolicum. Following a suggestion of A. H. M. Jones, I proposed that *P. Oxy.* 1414 provides the earliest detailed evidence for imposition of this tax, a hypothesis which fits the evidence that it was organized for the first time under Aurelian.¹⁷⁵

Ἀπότακτον. The import of this term has recently been clarified by Parsons; it designates a quota of tax fixed by the imperial authority, local distribution of the burden being left to subordinate officials, and appears most strikingly in the reigns of Philippus Arabs and Probus.¹⁷⁶

Ἐπικεφάλαιον. This obscure tax, paid mostly in sums of 1,200 drachmas or multiples thereof, has so far appeared from 296–7 onwards. The quantity of evidence for it has recently been increased, but its nature still remains unclear (see above).¹⁷⁷

Annona militaris. I know of no new evidence on the origins of this tax to test the theory that it originated under Septimius Severus as a regular tax. It has been suggested that the

¹⁶² *P. Lugd.-Bat.* xiv (1965), 106–13; the publication of *P. Mich.* 582 (A.D. 49–50) has made it clear that the *πράκτορες ἀρχαϊκῶν* were in existence before the reign of Trajan.

¹⁶³ Bowman, *The Town Councils*, 69–77.

¹⁶⁴ J. D. Thomas, *JEA* 61 (1975), 201–21, esp. 217 ff., cf. H. Braunert, *JfP* 9–10 (1955–6), 211–328; D. Crawford and P. Easterling, *JEA* 55 (1969), 184–90.

¹⁶⁵ P. J. Parsons, *JRS* 57 (1967), 134–41; *P. Oxy.* 3046–50.

¹⁶⁶ J. D. Thomas, *ZPE* 19 (1975), 111–19.

¹⁶⁷ J. Schwartz, *BIFAO* 47 (1948), 179–200; P. J. Parsons, *JRS* 57 (1967), 136–7; *P. Oxy.* XLII, p. 126.

¹⁶⁸ P. J. Parsons, *JRS* 57 (1967), 134–41; *JEA* 57 (1971), 165–80; *P. Oxy.* 3046–50, 2664.

¹⁶⁹ J. Schwartz, *CE* 38 (1963), 149–55 and in *L. Domitius Domitianus* (Pap. Brux. 12, 1975) argued for a starting date of 286–7. J. D. Thomas, in a paper

presented at the xiv International Congress of Papyrologists, argued cogently that a starting date of 287–8 (as originally proposed by L. Amundsen, *O. Oslo*, pp. 65 ff.) produces a smaller number of anomalous pieces of evidence.

¹⁷⁰ *P. Oxy.* 2578–9, 2716–7, 3036–45, 3184 introd.; *PUG* 1, 19, cf. R. Rémondon, *Proc.* XII, 436. *P. Oxy.* 2717 perhaps records a payment for 294–5, but the reading of the date is not secure.

¹⁷¹ *AE* 1937, 232.

¹⁷² cf. Lactantius, *de mort. pers.* 7. 6–7.

¹⁷³ J. D. Thomas, *BASP* 11 (1974), 60–8.

¹⁷⁴ *BASP* 4 (1967), 59–74.

¹⁷⁵ *The Town Councils*, 70–4, cf. *HA, Aur.* 45. 1.

¹⁷⁶ P. J. Parsons, *JRS* 57 (1967), 137–8, to which should be added *P. Ryl.* 114. 23 (cf. J. R. Rea, *BASP* 5 (1968), 40).

¹⁷⁷ See n. 170 above.

evidence is too slender to carry this weight.¹⁷⁸ Clear and plentiful evidence for the *annona militaris* does not occur until the latter half of the third century. *P. Beatty Panop.* 1 now gives us detailed new evidence for the local organization of such collections, delegation to the council of collection and distribution on a nome-wide basis by *species* and toparchy.¹⁷⁹

Levies of bullion. The evidence for this practice in the early fourth century has recently been analysed by Rea.¹⁸⁰ He gives good reasons for believing that the government regularly made a profit from such levies even when it paid a fixed price for the metal collected. Equally interesting are the details of prices which can be gleaned from this evidence and, with the additional evidence of *P. Beatty Panop.* 2, it may now be possible to understand more fully the nature of inflation in this period and Diocletian's attempt to combat it.¹⁸¹ It seems likely that, with the figure of 60,000 *denarii* for a pound of gold in A.D. 300,¹⁸² the tariff of 72,000 *denarii* yielded by new fragments of the Maximum Price Edict from Aezani is more realistic than other estimates. This would give the reformed *aureus* a value of 1,200 *denarii*. As for the information yielded by the Currency Reform Edict, the evidence of the papyri suggests that the large laureate coin (the 'follis') was tarified at 12½ *denarii* before the reform and 25 *denarii* after it.¹⁸³

Industry and commerce. These, of course, play an important role in the economy of Roman Egypt, although the scale of their importance is not remotely comparable to that of agriculture. Some of the works cited above (p. 168) deal with the evidence for taxes on trade and industry, but little has been done to synthesize the evidence for commerce *per se*. There are, however, some useful studies of individual topics, notably the role of Alexandria as an entrepôt, the manufacture of papyrus, the textile industry and trade between Egypt and India.^{183a}

7. *Social History.* The most important single work to have appeared in this area, which deserves to be widely known by Roman historians, is Braunert's *Die Binnenwanderung* (1964), a masterly analysis of the evidence for population movement in Egypt. It is important not only because it reveals a greater degree of mobility than one might have expected, but also because it puts into perspective the role of Alexandria, of the nome metropoleis and of the villages in the context of the social history of the province. Other important advances have been made in our knowledge of social aspects of particular cities and particular institutions, some of which are reflected in the general treatment by MacMullen,¹⁸⁴ which naturally draws heavily on the evidence of Egypt.

For Alexandria we should note the relevance of Fraser's *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), particularly in relation to the composition of the citizen body (see p. 170 below); clearly, the Roman counterpart to this book is now needed. The only other 'Greek city' for which we have adequate information is Antinoopolis and here again we are indebted to Braunert for an important discussion of the evidence in which he shows that, although it is traditionally regarded as a 'Greek city', its institutions reflect the pattern of the Roman *municipium* rather than the Hellenistic *polis*.¹⁸⁵ This is important in relation to the development of the role of the metropoleis of the nomes, both in the Severan and the Diocletianic period.¹⁸⁶ The social history of the aristocracies in such towns still requires full treatment, but it is evident that during the third and fourth centuries they came gradually to conform to the pattern found elsewhere in the Empire.¹⁸⁷

Problems associated with citizenship, both Roman and local, have continued to provide food for discussion. The major difficulties associated with the *constitutio Antoniniana* have

¹⁷⁸ G. E. Rickman, *Roman Granaries and Store Buildings* (1971), 278-83.

¹⁷⁹ For an analysis of the data see *P. Beatty Panop.*, pp. 123-5.

¹⁸⁰ *CE* 49 (1974), 163-74.

¹⁸¹ The remarks which follow are intended merely to indicate points which a comprehensive investigation might elucidate.

¹⁸² *P. Beatty Panop.* 2. 215-18, cf. J. Bingen, *Atti* XI, 369-78, *CE* 40 (1965), 206-8, 431-4.

¹⁸³ R. and F. Naumann, *Der Rundbau in Aezani (Istanbuler Mitteilungen, Beiheft 10, 1973)*, 57, cf. M. H. Crawford, *CR* n.s. 25 (1975), 276 f. For the

value of the 'follis' see *P. Beatty Panop.* 2. ll. 299-308 (cf. A. Segrè, *CE* 40 (1965), 198-205 and Crawford loc. cit.).

^{183a} J. Schwartz, *ZPE* 1 (1967), 197-217; N. Lewis, *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity* (1974), 115-34; E. Wipszycka, *L'industrie textile dans l'Égypte romaine* (1965); M. Raschke, *Proc.* XIV, 241-6.

¹⁸⁴ *Roman Social Relations* (1974).

¹⁸⁵ *JJP* 14 (1962), 73-88.

¹⁸⁶ Bowman, *The Town Councils*, 121-7.

¹⁸⁷ Bowman, *The Town Councils*, 9-11, cf. P. D. A. Garnsey, *ANRW* II. 1, 229-51.

been eased somewhat with the publication of the *tabula Banasitana* and Sherwin-White's discussion of its implications.¹⁸⁸ In the present state of the evidence we should be prepared to accept that it conferred Roman citizenship on most groups within the Empire, but protected the rights and obligations of the citizen to his *patria*. The problem of the date of this measure has also continued to provoke controversy, but it now seems certain that it was known in Egypt by June 213.¹⁸⁹ The precise nature of Alexandrian citizenship also remains problematical. El-Abbadi has argued that there was no distinction between the designation of ἄσπιος and that of Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, but his argument has not found general acceptance.¹⁹⁰

Our knowledge of social institutions in the towns has been advanced by recent evidence, particularly from Oxyrhynchus. The social implications of the evidence for the councils and the bouletic and gymnasial classes can, in some degree, be measured against the evidence for the rest of the Empire.¹⁹¹ We now also have a significant amount of information about the *gerousia* of Oxyrhynchus¹⁹² which clearly shows that this was primarily a social institution rather than a political one. People of the gymnasial class who reached the qualifying age were entitled to be maintained at the public expense. This indication of the survival of aristocratic privilege again brings Egypt into line with what we know about the rest of the Empire.¹⁹³ As regards the status of individuals in Egypt, we have now a preliminary study of the evidence for the process by which people were admitted to privileged status (ἐπίκρισις).¹⁹⁴ Further work on Roman citizenship in Egypt would not come amiss; in particular, it would be useful to have further analysis of the numbers, status and landowning potential of citizens before the *constitutio Antoniniana* and the social changes which the *constitutio* brought about.¹⁹⁵ The demographic evidence for population structure and mortality rates might usefully be brought to bear on the question of social status and mobility;¹⁹⁶ the important role of guilds and cult-associations as catalysts of social mobility would also repay investigation.¹⁹⁷ Keenan has produced some important work on Roman *nomina* as status designations in the Byzantine period,¹⁹⁸ of which the first part is relevant to the end of the period here discussed.

Another aspect of privilege is revealed by the recent publication of a group of documents from Oxyrhynchus relating to the distribution of the *annona* in the reign of Aurelian (*P. Oxy.* XL), the inaptly named corn-dole. Apart from its value as evidence for the existence of such institutions in the smaller towns of the Empire, the archive does provide a useful basis for testing and enlarging our knowledge of the Roman 'dole'. Three features are particularly significant: the recipients are a *numerus clausus* (a total of 4,000); election to vacant places is by lot; there is a geographical basis for the admission of entrants. The regulation of the distribution by the council and the existence of distinctions within the local citizen body long after the *constitutio Antoniniana* are clearly attested, and the documents as a group strikingly confirm the conclusion reached for Rome by Van Berchem that the 'corn-dole' was not a subsidy for the poor but rather a perquisite of the already privileged middle classes.¹⁹⁹

For some individual points of detail in the social history of Egypt one should refer to the series of brilliantly illuminating articles by Youtie in which he discusses literacy and illiteracy on the basis of the evidence of the papyri.²⁰⁰ It is hardly necessary to point out the

¹⁸⁸ CRAI 1972, 468-90; A. N. Sherwin-White, *JRS* 63 (1973), 86-98.

¹⁸⁹ D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 1 (1967), 140-1. See also P. Herrmann, *Chiron* 2 (1973), 519-30, discussing earlier views and arguing that it was known in Lydia by early March 213, against which Z. Rubin, *Latomus* 34 (1975), 430-6.

¹⁹⁰ *JEA* 48 (1962), 106-23; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* II (1972), 130. See also *BGU* 2060 and E. G. Turner, *HSCP* 79 (1975), 10.

¹⁹¹ See the items cited n. 187 above, and I. Fikhman, *APF* 22-3 (1974), 47-87 (Russian).

¹⁹² *P. Oxy.* 3099-3102, cf. E. G. Turner, *APF* 12 (1937), 79-86; M. A. H. el-Abbadi, *JEA* 50 (1964), 164-9.

¹⁹³ cf. J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia (Hesperia)*, Suppl. VI, 1941.

¹⁹⁴ O. Montevocchi, *Proc.* XIV, 227-32; see also

C. A. Nelson, *Akten* XIII, 309-14.

¹⁹⁵ For particular aspects of this area see J. F. Oates, *Atti* XI, 351-74; H. Braunert, *P. Lugd.-Bat.* XVII, 11-21.

¹⁹⁶ See A. E. Samuel *et al.*, *Death and Taxes (ASP)* X, 1970; cf. P. S. & E. O. Derow, *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 80-8.

¹⁹⁷ Some recent items of evidence are collected by J. Herrmann in the reprint of M. San Nicolò, *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer* (1972).

¹⁹⁸ *ZPE* 11 (1973), 33-63.

¹⁹⁹ See also E. G. Turner, *HSCP* 79 (1975), 16-24; N. Lewis, *CE* 49 (1974), 158-62; J. M. Carter and K. M. Hopkins, *ZPE* 13 (1974), 195-6; D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 14 (1974), 300.

²⁰⁰ *Scriptiunculae* II, 611-28, 629-51; *ZPE* 17 (1975), 201-21.

relevance of this to much broader issues, such as the dissemination of information and propaganda in the Mediterranean world. Youtie has also given us an equally enlightening study of the social aspects of illegitimacy in Roman Egypt.²⁰¹

8. *The Roman Army*. Little has been done recently in this area by way of general survey, and the most complete synthesis remains that of Lesquier,²⁰² which is now badly out-of-date. Pflaum has brought together the evidence, mostly epigraphical, for auxiliary units, *cohortes*, *alae* and *classenses*, known to have served in Egypt until the reign of Diocletian.²⁰³ Undoubtedly the most useful work on military documentation is that by Fink.²⁰⁴ This is not confined to Egypt and includes only those documents which cast light on the internal administration of the army (unlike the collection by Daris²⁰⁵); but it represents a considerable advance in the interpretation of some of our more important papyrus texts. To take but one example: *P. Gen. Lat.* recto I has been much discussed—is it a pay record and, if so, does it refer to legionary or auxiliary troops? Since Fink produced a revised reading of 247½ drachmas for the *stipendium*, Speidel has stated anew and more strongly the case for supposing that it records the pay of the *auxilia*, which he calculates at ⅘ of legionary pay less 1 per cent.²⁰⁶ Speidel regards the case as unequivocal, and he has produced evidence to show that auxiliaries could have the *tria nomina*; but he has not satisfactorily disposed of the problem posed by the content of the recto of the papyrus as a whole. It can plausibly be argued, as it has been by Marichal,²⁰⁷ that the other three documents relate to a legionary unit, part of III *Cyrenaica*; at least two of the three seem certainly to relate to legionaries and the other cannot be shown to refer to auxiliaries. He who wishes to show that the remaining text is an auxiliary pay account must attempt to explain this anomaly.

Watson and Davies have provided useful syntheses of evidence for documentation in the army and for the daily life of the soldier, both relying heavily on the papyri.²⁰⁸ The prosopography of the Roman army in Egypt has benefited from recent work by Cavenaile and Devijver.²⁰⁹ Cavenaile's collection of data is marked by an unusually high proportion of error.²¹⁰ It is perhaps fair to say that the immediately apparent results of this prosopographical work do not add much to our understanding of the role of the army in Egypt, particularly since, in the case of the *militiae equestres*, the data are not really sufficient to test conclusions formulated on the basis of other material drawn from the Roman east. One fact which Devijver notes with regard to places of origin and military service is the frequency of interchange between Britain and Egypt; Schwartz has collected examples which connect Egypt and Gaul.²¹¹ Somewhat more fruitful, given the nature of the evidence, are attempts to synthesize and reinterpret information from papyri about individuals; Gilliam and Davies have discussed the cases of a legionary veteran, of Minicius Iustus and the enlistment of the well-known Terentianus.²¹² Gilliam has also made some penetrating general observations (based largely, however, on the Dura papyri) on the role of the army in the Romanization of the east.²¹³

New publications or reinterpretations of papyri are also fairly plentiful. By far the most important items are the Beatty Papyri from Panopolis; *P. Beatty Panop.* 1 gives us

²⁰¹ 'ΑΠΑΤΟΡΕΣ: Law vs. Custom in Roman Egypt'; given at the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists and published in *Le Monde grec . . . Hommages à Claire Préaux* (1975), 723.

²⁰² *L'armée romaine de l'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Mém. IFAO 41, 1918).

²⁰³ *Syria* 44 (1967), 339–62.

²⁰⁴ *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* (APA Philological Monographs 26, 1971).

²⁰⁵ *Documenti per la storia dell'esercito romano in Egitto* (1964).

²⁰⁶ *JRS* 63 (1973), 141–7.

²⁰⁷ *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'histoire Orientales et Slaves* 13 (1953) = *Mélanges I. Lévy*, 399–421.

²⁰⁸ *ANRW* II, 1, 493–507, 299–338. Also very useful are Davies' articles on the Roman military diet (*Britannia* 2 (1971), 122–41) and the police role

of the army in Egypt (*Ancient Society* 4 (1973), 199–212).

²⁰⁹ R. Cavenaile, *Aegyptus* 50 (1970), 213–320; H. Devijver, *ANRW* II, 1, 452–92; *De Aegyptio et exercitu Romano sive Prosopographia Militiarum Equestrium quae ab Augusto ad Gallienum seu statione seu origine ad Aegyptum pertinebant* (*Studia Hellenistica* 22, 1975). See also his article on the terminology of the equestrian *militiae* in *Zetesis = Festschrift E. de Strijcker* (1973), 549–65.

²¹⁰ See N. Criniti, *Aegyptus* 53 (1973), 93–158.

²¹¹ *Hommages Grenier* III (Coll. Latomus 58, 1962), 1397–1406.

²¹² *BASP* 8 (1971), 39–44; *Aegyptus* 53 (1973), 75–92; *BASP* 10 (1973), 21–6. On the language of the Terentianus archive, J. N. Adams, *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus* (Manchester U.P., forthcoming).

²¹³ *BASP* 2 (1965), 65–73.

evidence for the organization of the *annona militaris* in connection with the visit of Diocletian and his entourage to Panopolis in 298, and *P. Beatty Panop.* 2 attests a series of payments of money or provisions by a strategus to a number of military units in the Thebaid. There are good reasons for supposing that both operations were occasioned by extraordinary circumstances, but the papyri nevertheless give us more detail than we have hitherto had about the way in which the bureaucracy was affected by the presence of the army. From this point of view, if no other, it is absurd to draw an artificial line of division at the year 284. Skeat was also able to plot the locations and strengths of the various military units in the Thebaid, detachments of three legions and two auxiliary cohorts; it is clear from this, at least, that there was no attempt to separate legionary and auxiliary strength in the way envisaged by Van Berchem.²¹⁴ Among recently published texts with relevance to the army²¹⁵ two from Berlin are of particular interest. One of these attests a unit of *equites Marcomanni* at or near Hermopolis in 286,²¹⁶ and the other, from the mid-second century, relates to a soldier of III *Cyrenaica*, then stationed at Bostra, and provides the earliest papyrus attestation of the use of the word *matrix*.²¹⁷ A Columbia papyrus of 143 records the receipt from the *principia* of the property of a deceased auxiliary soldier.^{217a} It is also appropriate to draw attention to two collections of ostraka, as yet unpublished, which promise exceptional interest.²¹⁸ Finally, two noteworthy details concern deposits of money in the *sacellum*²¹⁹ and the legal status of military personnel.²²⁰

III. DOCUMENTS RELEVANT TO PLACES OTHER THAN EGYPT

Several of the documents which fall into this category relate to the Roman army. Fink has re-edited a considerable number of the Dura papyri with improvements.²²¹ These texts have continued to generate a lively interest; particularly noteworthy is the identification of M. Atho Marcellus who held an important position at the time of Gordian III's last campaign in the east.²²² Also a subject of continuing discussion is the well-known Moesian *pridianum* (Fink, *RMR* no. 63), of which even the date is still not fully agreed.²²³ Cavaenale has recently pointed out that there were two distinct Spanish auxiliary units—*Cohors I Hispanorum (equitata)* and *cohors I Hispanorum veterana*—the former of which had been transferred to Judaea by 105. So, if Syme's date is correct, the document must refer to the latter. It is still difficult to explain how this *pridianum* found its way to Egypt; Cavaenale's explanation is rather tortuous, though it is obviously plausible that it was brought back by a native Egyptian soldier.²²⁴ It is perhaps not inappropriate to refer here briefly to military documentation from Britain which, although not strictly papyrological, contains texts of much the same kind as those found on papyri from the east. The British documents date to the early second century and may yet tell us much about the Roman army in Britain at a period which is singularly badly documented.²²⁵

Among the major discoveries of recent decades have been the documents from the Dead Sea Caves. In 1961 a significant number of papyri were published which will by now

²¹⁴ *L'armée de Dioclétien et la réforme constantinienne* (1952), 59–71; he argued that the cavalry and legionary units constituted the army of occupation and defence, whilst the role of the *alae* and cohorts was to guard the *annona* depots and exercise constraint over the civil population.

²¹⁵ *P. Wisc.* 14, cf. J. F. Gilliam, *BASP* 5 (1968), 93–8; *P. Mich.* 592–3; *P. Oxy.* 2950–1, 2953; P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Talanta* 5 (1973), 72–84.

²¹⁶ *BGU* 2074, cf. M. Speidel, *ANRW* II. 3, 223–4.

²¹⁷ H. Maehler, *Akten* XIII, 241–50. See also p. 173 below.

^{217a} J. F. Gilliam, *BZ* 157 (1967), 233–43.

²¹⁸ A collection owned by Florida State University is to be published by R. S. Bagnall (see *Proc.* XIV, 10); for ostraka from Bu-Djem in Libya see R. Rebuffat and R. Marichal, *REL* 51 (1973), 281–6.

²¹⁹ R. W. Davies, *BZ* 168 (1968), 161–5.

²²⁰ *P. Oxy.* 3014 (*Gnomon of the Idios Logos*) has a clause not in *BGU* 1210 which shows (if it is correctly

dated to the first century A.D.) that the rule that children of soldiers born during service can inherit as long as they are *eiusdem generis* is earlier than Hadrian; if there are no heirs *eiusdem generis*, the property goes to the camp as a whole.

²²¹ In *RMR* (see n. 204).

²²² R. W. Davies, *JRS* 57 (1967), 20–3 argues that he was *procurator* of Syria Coele; R. O. Fink, *AJP* 88 (1967), 84–5, that he was commander of an auxiliary cohort or a high-ranking officer in the praetorian guard. For some other notes on Dura papyri see Davies, *BASP* 5 (1968), 31–4.

²²³ Syme, *JRS* 49 (1959), 26–33, arguing for A.D. 105–8; Fink, *RMR*, 219 ff., putting a (weaker) case for 100. On this papyrus see also Davies, *BASP* 5 (1968), 121–8.

²²⁴ *ZPE* 18 (1975), 179–91.

²²⁵ See now A. K. Bowman and J. D. Thomas, *Historia* 24 (1975), 463–78, with bibliography to date.

be familiar to most Roman historians.²²⁶ An important general feature of these documents is the way in which they illustrate the degree of Hellenization in the area and the extent to which Roman law had penetrated a province which was naturally supposed to have clung tenaciously to its religious and legal tradition; one can cite, for example, papyrus no. 115, a remarriage contract in Greek, which is in itself a document of a rare type. The second major discovery has still not been published in full: the finds in the Cave of Letters at Nahal Hever, including texts in Greek, Aramaic and Nabataean from the period prior to and during the revolt of Bar-Kokhba.²²⁷ The texts fall into two groups: documents and letters dealing with events relevant to the revolt, and the Archive of Babatha, with texts in Greek and Nabataean which, again, will offer a fascinating insight into the operation of the legal system in Judaea and Arabia. The documents and letters will not only fill out our knowledge of the revolt itself but also provide evidence for the gubernatorial *fasti* of Arabia and for the chronology of the provincial era.²²⁸ The question of the garrison of Arabia still remains unsettled, despite one additional piece of evidence from a Michigan papyrus.²²⁹

There are a few other items from Egypt which are relevant to other places. Documents relevant to Egyptian trade with India have recently been re-examined by Raschke who extracts from them a picture of Indo-Egyptian trade rather different from the traditional one.²³⁰ Individual points of Semitic interest are to be found in the Berlin military text (p. 172 above)²³¹ which yields geographical information for Peraia, and in a Latin slave-sale from Oxyrhynchus, of interest for the nomenclature of the individuals involved.²³² More striking are two other slave-sales from Oxyrhynchus, of which one²³³ appears to originate in Rhodes (a remarkable fact in itself) but unfortunately still presents difficulties of reading and interpretation.²³⁴ The other (*P. Oxy.* 3054) involves people from the city of Bostra and provides some new and interesting information about the tribal structure there; it was no doubt similar to that encouraged by the Roman government in other cities of the eastern provinces. The appellations are probably distinctive but, owing to the unfortunate condition of vital bits of the papyrus, not fully recoverable. Finally attention should be drawn to *P. Oxy.* 3106 which provides another partial text of the letter of Severus Alexander to the *kourov* of Bithynia, and slightly improves upon the version preserved in the *Digest*.

University of Manchester

²²⁶ P. Benoit, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux, *Les Grottes de Murabba'at (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert II, 1961)*; *P. Mur.* 115 = *SB* 10305.

²²⁷ Y. Yadin, *IEJ* 11 (1961), 36-52; 12 (1962), 227-57; B. Lifshitz, *IEJ* 11 (1961), 53-62; H. J. Polotsky, *IEJ* 12 (1962), 258-62; *Eretz Israel* 8 (1967), 47 ff. = *SB* 10288. For general and detailed comments on the documents see: Y. Yadin, *Bar-Kokhba* (1971), 124-39, 172-83, 222-53; B. Lifshitz, *Aegyptus* 42 (1962), 240-56; *Scriptorium* 19 (1965), 286-8; J. Bingen, *CE* 36 (1961), 413; *E. Volterra, *Iura* 14 (1963), 29-70; B. Kanael, *IEJ* 21 (1971), 39-46; *S. Goren, *Mahanaim* 59 (1961), 6-15 (Hebrew); M. Lemosse, *The Irish Jurist* 3 (1968), 363 ff.; A. Biscardi, *Studi G. Scherillo* 1 (1972), 111-5 (on the *ἑνωκρίται* see now *P. Oxy.* 3016); G.

Vermes, *JJS* 26 (1975), 1-14; E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ I* (revised by G. Vermes and F. Millar 1973), 118-22, 534-57.

²²⁸ See G. W. Bowersock, *JRS* 61 (1971), 219-42, esp. 228-36.

²²⁹ *P. Mich.* 562. The current state of the problem and earlier bibliography is summarized by Bowersock, *JRS* 65 (1975), 184.

²³⁰ *Proc.* xiv, 241-6.

²³¹ H. Maehler, *Akten* XIII, 241-50 (see p. 172 above).

²³² *P. Oxy.* 2951.

²³³ J. F. Oates, *JEA* 55 (1969), 191-210.

²³⁴ Summarized by J. Schwartz, *CE* 45 (1971), 173-5. For improvements of detail see H. C. Youtie, *ZPE* 7 (1971), 169; 15 (1974), 145-7.