

New York University



31142000075013



NYU


BOBST LIBRARY
OFFSITE



Elmer Holmes
Bobst Library

New York
University





AMERICAN STUDIES IN PAPHROLOGY
VOLUME ELEVEN

/THE TOWN COUNCILS
OF ROMAN EGYPT/

ALAN K. BOWMAN
••

A. M. HAKKERT LTD. TORONTO MCMLXXI

JS
7762
.A3
.B68
1971
c.1

NOV 29 2012

Set in Aldine Roman
Printed in the Netherlands


Published for
The American Society of Papyrologists
by
A. M. Hakkert Ltd.
554 Spadina Crescent
Toronto 179, Canada

Copyright © 1971 by A. M. Hakkert Ltd.

Standard Book Number
88866-011-1

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number
76-159259

To Jacqueline



Preface

During the third and fourth centuries of our era the Roman Empire underwent a succession of crises, political, social and economic, from which it was never able fully to recover. A period of two centuries which saw the first signs of a vulnerability later to be exploited by a long succession of barbarian invasions and a valiant attempt by the Emperor Diocletian to shore up the defences of the Empire offers the historian a broad field of research. Important results have accrued from studies of the various emperors and their policies, of the rise of Christianity, of the economic crises of the late third century and many other topics of importance and interest. Whilst the weighty themes of imperial history have, understandably, attracted much attention, evidence of the methods by which Rome attempted to control and make use of her vast Empire has been accruing. The details of the administrative bureaucracy which had been built up over a period of three centuries or more can be recovered and pieced together. It is to the dry climate of Upper Egypt that we owe the preservation of many thousands of papyrus documents; a large number of these belong to the third and fourth centuries A.D. The interpretation of this evidence is vital for the history of the Empire, for it provides a clear and comprehensible picture of the day-to-day operation of the imperial machine on its lower levels – a facet of the Empire which no Roman historian can afford to ignore. We cannot fully understand the motives, decisions and policies of rulers unless we first understand the conditions under which their subjects lived. Anyone who attempts, as I have done, to analyse and describe a single aspect of those conditions should not hope to reach a conclusion which will radically alter our view of the Roman world. If any such modification is to occur, it will be brought about by an accumulation of many such studies. This study of the *boulai* in the towns of Roman Egypt is intended as a contribution to the much larger study of conditions in the Mediterranean world.


This monograph, which is a revised version of my doctoral thesis, has been prepared over a period of three years. During that time I have had the fortune to receive generous financial assistance from the School of Graduate Studies of the University of Toronto, from the Committee of the Queen Elizabeth II (Ontario) Scholarships and from the Canada Council for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Professor E. G. Turner has been most helpful in placing unpublished documents from the Oxyrhynchus collection at my disposal. It is hoped that these documents will be published in due course, and I am grateful to

the Egypt Exploration Society for permission to refer to them in advance of publication.

For assistance and advice I am greatly indebted to D. I. Wardle; to C. P. Jones, P. R. Swarney and N. Lewis who examined my doctoral thesis and made many helpful suggestions for improvement; to F. G. B. Millar, P. J. Parsons and J. R. Rea who offered much useful comment and advice. The shortcomings which remain are attributable entirely to the author. My two greatest debts are to A. E. Samuel, the director of my doctoral thesis, to whom this study owes its genesis and whose advice could not have been more judicious or more generously tendered, and to my wife; the dedication is an inadequate repayment for her encouragement and support.

Contents

Preface	vii
Bibliography and Abbreviations	xi
Introduction	3
Chapter One: The Boule	7
Chapter Two: The Internal Operation of the Boule	21
Chapter Three: The Prytanis of the Boule	53
Chapter Four: The Business of the Boule	69
Chapter Five: Conclusions	121
Appendix One: The Prytaneis and Bouleutai of Oxyrhynchus	129
Appendix Two: The Oxyrhynchite Tribe Cycles and the Date of <i>P. Oxy.</i> 1413-4	149
Appendix Three: ΠΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΕΤΟΜΕΝΟΣ	155
Appendix Four: List of Documents	159
Indices	173
I. Index of Subjects	175
II. Index of Greek and Latin Titles and Technical Terms	178
III. Index of Names and Places	182
IV. Index of Sources	
A. Papyri and Inscriptions	184
B. Literary and Legal Texts	191



Bibliography and Abbreviations

The following list does not contain publications of papyri. Such volumes, for which there is no single standard method of abbreviation, are cited according to the abbreviations in one or other of the following lists: *LSJ*, 9th edition, pp. xliii-xlv; *BL* 4, pp. 124-30; E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri; an Introduction*, 1968, pp. 154-71. Other abbreviations used in this monograph are noted in parentheses after the main entry. Journals are cited, with a few self-explanatory exceptions, according to the abbreviations given in *L'année Philologique*.

- M. A. H. el-Abbadi, "The Gerousia in Roman Egypt," *JEA* 50, 1964, pp. 164-9.
F. F. Abbott, A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, Princeton, 1926, (= Abbott and Johnson).
G. E. Bean, T. B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia in 1962 and 1963*, Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften 85, Vienna, 1965.
H. I. Bell, "Antinoopolis: a Hadrianic Foundation in Egypt," *JRS* 30, 1940, pp. 133-47.
O. Benndorf *et al.*, *Forschungen in Ephesos*, Vienna, 1906-44.
E. Bickermann, "Testificatio Actorum," *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, pp. 333-55.
J. Bingen, Review of *Aegyptus* 31, 1951, *Chronique d'Égypte* 27, 1952, pp. 316-8.
R. Böhm, "Contribution à l'Étude de l'Administration Romaine en Égypte," *Aegyptus* 36, 1956, pp. 254-74.
Z. Borkowski, "Le Papyrus de Berlin Inv. 11314 et les Prytanes d'Oxyrhynchus de 277 à 282," *Chronique d'Égypte* 43, 1968, pp. 325-31.
G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford, 1965.
A. K. Bowman, "The Crown Tax in Roman Egypt," *BASP* 4, 1967, pp. 59-74.
A. K. Bowman, "Aurelius Mercurius – A 'Ghost' Prefect?" *BASP* 6, 1969, pp. 35-40.
A. K. Bowman, "A Letter of Avidius Cassius?" *JRS* 60, 1970, pp. 20-6.
A-J. Boyé, "P. Oxy. XVII 2130, *l'editio Opinionis* et l'appel en Matière de Charges Liturgiques," *Studi in Onore di Pietro Bonfante* IV, 1930, pp. 183-202.
H. Cadell, "P. Caire IFAO Inv. 45, P. Oxy. XIV 1719 et les Privilèges des Antinoïtes," *Chronique d'Égypte* 40, 1965, pp. 357-63.

- R. Calderini, "Ricerca sul Doppio Nome Personale nell' Egitto Greco-romano," *Aegyptus* 21, 1941, pp. 221-60; 22, 1942, pp. 3-45.
- R. Calderini, "Βουλευτικά," *Aegyptus* 31, 1951, pp. 3-41.
- R. A. Coles, *Reports of Proceedings in Papyri*, Papyrologica Bruxellensia 4, Brussels, 1966.
- W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, London, 1911.
- W. H. Fisher, "The Augustan *Vita Aureliani*," *JRS* 19, 1929, pp. 125-49.
- P. M. Fraser, "Inscriptions from Ptolemaic Egypt," *Berytus* 13, 1959-60, pp. 123-61.
- J. Gagé, *Les Classes Sociales dans l'Empire Romain*, Paris, 1964.
- R. Ganghoffer, *L'Evolution des Institutions en Occident et en Orient au Bas-Empire*, Paris, 1963.
- K. S. Gapp, "A Lease of a Pigeon-House with Brood," *TAPA* 64, 1933, pp. 89-97.
- P. D. A. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Second and Third Centuries of the Roman Empire with Special Reference to the Curial Class*, Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1967.
- D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*, *Hesperia* Supplement 12, 1967.
- F. M. Heichelheim, "An Alexandrian Decree of 175/4 B.C.," *JEA* 26, 1940, pp. 154-6.
- E. L. Hicks, *Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* III.2, Oxford, 1890.
- C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford, 1952.
- A. C. Johnson, H. B. Van Hoesen, "A Papyrus Dealing with Liturgies," *JEA* 12, 1926, pp. 116-9.
- A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*, Baltimore, 1936, Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* II, (= Johnson, *Roman Egypt*).
- A. C. Johnson, "Roman Egypt in the Third Century," *JJP* 4, 1950, pp. 151-8.
- A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford, 1937 (= Jones, *CERP*).
- A. H. M. Jones, "The Election of the Metropolitan Magistrates in Egypt," *JEA* 24, 1938, pp. 65-72.
- A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford, 1940 (= Jones, *GC*).
- A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284-602*, Oxford, 1964 (= Jones, *LRE*).
- C. P. Jones, "A New Commentary on the Letters of Pliny," *Phoenix* 22, 1968, pp. 111-42.
- P. Jouguet, "Documents Ptolémaïques," *BCH* 21, 1897, pp. 184-268.
- P. Jouguet, *La Vie Municipale dans l'Egypte Romaine*, Bibliotheque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 104, Paris, 1911 (= Jouguet, *VM*).
- P. Jouguet, "Sur les Métropoles Egyptiennes à la Fin du IIe Siècle après J-C,"

- REG 30, 1917, pp. 294-328.
- P. Jouguet, "Les βουλαί Egyptiennes à la Fin du IIIe Siècle après J-C d'après le Tome XII des 'Oxyrhynchus Papyri'," *Revue Egyptologique* N.S. 1, 1919, pp. 50-80 (= Jouguet, *Les Boulai*).
- F. Kenyon, "Phylae and Demes in Graeco-Roman Egypt," *Archiv* 2, 1903, pp. 70-8.
- E. Kiessling, "Οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων," *RE* III A², 1929, cols. 2331-2.
- Kübler, "Decurio," *RE* IV, 1901, cols. 2319-52.
- E. Kühn, *Antinoopolis; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hellenismus im Römischen Aegypten*, Göttingen, 1913 (= Kühn, *Antinoopolis*).
- J. Lallemand, *L'Administration Civile de l'Egypte de l'Avènement de Dioclétien à la Creation du Diocèse (284-382)*, Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques, Mémoires 57.2, Brussels, 1964 (= Lallemand, *L'administration*).
- L. Leschi, "L'Album Municipal de Timgad," *REA* 50, 1948, pp. 71-100.
- I. Lévy, "Etudes sur la Vie Municipale de l'Asie Mineure sous les Antonins," *REG* 8, 1895, pp. 203-50.
- I. Lévy, "Les ΠΑΤΡΟΒΟΥΛΟΙ dans l'Epigraphie Grecque et la Littérature Talmudique," *Revue de Philologie* 26, 1902, pp. 272-8.
- N. Lewis, "Miscellanea Papyrologica," *Chronique d'Egypte* 29, 1954, pp. 288-98.
- N. Lewis, "Exemption from Liturgy in Roman Egypt," *Actes du Xe Congrès International de Papyrologues*, Warsaw-Cracow, 1961, pp. 69-79.
- N. Lewis, "Exemption of Physicians from Liturgy," *BASP* 2, 1965, pp. 87-92.
- N. Lewis, "Exemption from Liturgy in Roman Egypt," *Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, Milan, 1966, pp. 508-41.
- N. Lewis, "Νοήματα Λέγοντος," *BASP* 4, 1967, pp. 27-36; 5, 1968, pp. 25-30; 6, 1969, pp. 20-6.
- N. Lewis, *Inventory of Compulsory Services in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*, American Studies in Papyrology 3, New Haven and Toronto, 1968 (= Lewis, *ICS*).
- J. B. Lidov, "Tribal Cycles in Oxyrhynchus," *TAPA* 99, 1968, pp. 259-63.
- H. MacLennan, *Oxyrhynchus, an Economic and Social Study*, Princeton, 1935.
- R. MacMullen, "The Anaboliae Species," *Aegyptus* 38, 1958, pp. 184-98.
- D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, Princeton, 1950.
- V. Martin, "Sur la Formule 'Archontes Conseil des Ptolémaïens Arsinoïtes,'" *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, pp. 294-8.
- V. Martin, "Relevé Topographique des Immeubles d'une Métropole," *Recherches de Papyrologie* 2, 1962, pp. 37-74.
- G. Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, Lausanne, 1918 (= Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*).
- P. Mertens, *Les Services de l'Etat Civil et le Contrôle de la Population à Oxyrhynchus au IIIe Siècle de notre Ere*, Académie Royale de Belgique,

- Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques, Mémoires 53.2, Brussels, 1958 (= Mertens, *Les Services*).
- P. Meyer, "Der Immobilierkauf Stud. Pal. XX n. 50," *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, pp. 323-6.
- J. G. Milne, "The Ruin of Egypt by Roman Mismanagement," *JRS* 17, 1927, pp. 1-13.
- A. Momigliano, Review of *CAH* X, *JRS* 34, 1944, pp. 109-16.
- H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*, Oxford, 1954.
- A. F. Norman, "Gradations in Later Municipal Society," *JRS* 48, 1958, pp. 79-85.
- . Oehler, "Βουλή," *RE* III, 1899, cols. 1020-37.
- F. Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, Leipzig, 1917, (= Oertel, *Die Liturgie*).
- J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerousia*, *Hesperia* Supplement 6, 1941.
- J. H. Oliver, "The Significance of the Municipal Album of Timgad," *RIDA* ser. 3.5, 1958, pp. 537-8.
- J. H. Oliver, "A New Letter of Antoninus Pius," *AJP* 79, 1958, pp. 52-60.
- P. J. Parsons, "A Proclamation of Vaballathus?" *Chronique d'Égypte* 42, 1967, pp. 397-401.
- P. J. Parsons, "Philippus Arabs and Egypt," *JRS* 57, 1967, pp. 134-41.
- O. M. Pearl, "Varia Papyrologica," *TAPA* 71, 1940, pp. 372-90.
- P. Petit, *Libanius et la Vie Municipale à Antioche au IVe Siècle après J-C*, Paris, 1955.
- P. V. Pistorius, *Indices Antinoopolitani*, Leiden, 1939.
- G. Plaumann, *Ptolemais in Oberägypten; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hellenismus in Aegypten*, Leipziger Historische Abhandlungen 18, Leipzig, 1910 (= Plaumann, *Ptolemais*).
- G. Plaumann, "Ein Ratsprotokoll von Ptolemais," *Klio* 13, 1913, pp. 308-13.
- H. J. Polotsky, "Greek Papyri from the Cave of Letters," *IEJ* 12, 1962, pp. 258-62.
- F. Preisigke, *Städtisches Beamtenwesen im Römischen Aegypten*, Halle, 1903.
- J. R. Rea, "Additions and Corrections to Documentary Papyri in Ox. Pap., vol. XXVII," *JEA* 49, 1963, pp. 180-1.
- J. R. Rea, "A Letter of Severus Alexander?" *Chronique d'Égypte* 42, 1967, pp. 391-6.
- J. R. Rea, "Two Notes," *BASP* 5, 1968, p. 40.
- J. R. Rea, "The Date of the Prefecture of Statilius Ammianus," *Chronique d'Égypte* 44, 1969, pp. 134-8.
- B. R. Rees, "The Defensor Civitatis in Egypt," *JJP* 6, 1952, pp. 73-102.
- B. R. Rees, "The Curator Civitatis in Egypt," *JJP* 7-8, 1953-4, pp. 83-105.
- O. W. Reinmuth, "A Working List of the Prefects of Egypt: 30 B.C. - 299 A.D.," *BASP* 4, 1967, pp. 75-128.
- M. Rostovtzeff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Römischen Kolonates*, *Archiv*, Beiheft 1, 1910.

- M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 2nd ed., 1957.
- G. Rouillard, *L'Administration Civile de l'Egypte Byzantine*, Paris, 1928.
- J. Scherer, "Le Papyrus Fouad Ier Inv. 211," *BIFAO* 41, 1942, pp. 43-73.
- W. Schubart, "Spicilegium Criticum," *Aegyptus* 31, 1951, pp. 148-57.
- A. Segrè, "Inflation and its Implication in Early Byzantine Times," *Byzantion* 15, 1940-1, pp. 249-79.
- A. Segrè, "Essays on Byzantine Economic History I, The *Annona Civica* and the *Annona Militaris*," *Byzantion* 16, 1942-3, pp. 393-444.
- T. C. Skeat, E. P. Wegener, "A Trial before the Prefect of Egypt Appius Sabinus, ca. 250 A.D.," *JEA* 21, 1935, pp. 224-47.
- A. Stein, "Zur Chronologie der Römischen Kaiser von Decius bis Diocletian," *Archiv* 7, 1924, pp. 30-51.
- A. Swiderek, "Professionis q.d. ΠΡΟΣΦΩΝΗΣΙΣ Fragmentum," *JJP* 2, 1948, pp. 111-4.
- J. D. Thomas, "The Office of Exactor in Egypt," *Chronique d'Egypte* 34, 1959, pp. 124-40.
- J. D. Thomas, "The Strategus in Fourth Century Egypt," *Chronique d'Egypte* 35, 1960, pp. 262-70.
- J. D. Thomas, Review of C. Vandersleyen *Chronologie des Préfets d'Egypte de 284 à 395*, *JHS* 84, 1964, p. 207.
- E. G. Turner, "Egypt and the Roman Empire: the δεκάπρωτοι," *JEA* 22, 1936, pp. 7-19.
- E. G. Turner, "The Gerousia of Oxyrhynchus," *Archiv* 12, 1937, pp. 179-86.
- C. Vandersleyen, *Chronologie des Préfets d'Egypte de 284 à 395*, Collection Latomus 55, Brussels, 1962.
- B. A. Van Groningen, *Le Gymnasiarque des Métropoles de l'Egypte Romaine*, Groningen, 1924.
- B. A. Van Groningen, "Pap. Oxy. 1416 and the History of the Gymnasiarchy," *Actes du Ve Congrès International de Papyrologie*, Brussels, 1938, pp. 508-11.
- C. E. Van Sickle, "Diocletian and the Decline of the Roman Municipalities," *JRS* 28, 1938, pp. 9-18.
- L. Vidman, "Ad Plinium Minorem Ep. X 113," *Listy Filologické* 92, 1969, pp. 236-8.
- P. Viereck, "Aktenstücke zum Griechisch-römischen Vereinswesen," *Klio* 8, 1908, pp. 413-26.
- S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, Princeton University Studies in Papyrology 2, Princeton, 1938.
- E. P. Wegener, "Some Oxford Papyri," *JEA* 23, 1937, pp. 204-25.
- E. P. Wegener, "Notes on the ΦΥΛΑΙ of the Metropoleis," *Actes du Ve Congrès International de Papyrologie*, Brussels, 1938, pp. 512-20 (= Wegener, *The Phylae*).

- E. P. Wegener, "The ΒΟΥΛΕΤΤΑΙ of the ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΕΙΣ," M. David, B. A. Van Groningen, E. M. Meijers, *Symbolae ad Ius et Historiam Antiquitatis Pertinentes Julio Christiano Van Oven Dedicatae*, Leiden, 1946, pp. 160-90 (= Wegener, *Symbolae*).
- E. P. Wegener, "The ΒΟΥΛΑΙ and the Nomination to the ΑΡΧΑΙ in the ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΕΙΣ of Roman Egypt," *Mnemosyne Series* 4.1, 1948, pp. 15-42, 115-32, 297-326 (= Wegener, *The Boule*).
- L. C. West, A. C. Johnson, *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt*, Princeton University Studies in Papyrology 5, Princeton, 1944.
- U. Wilcken, "Υπομνηματισμοί," *Philologus* 53, 1894, pp. 80-126.
- W. L. Westermann, A. A. Schiller, *Apokrimata, Decisions of Septimius Severus on Legal Matters*, New York, 1954.
- F. von Woess, "Ἀσυλία," *ZSS* 46, 1926, pp. 32-67.
- H. C. Youtie, "A Reconsideration of P. Oxy. I 40," *Festschrift Oertel*, Bonn, 1964, pp. 20-9.

THE TOWN COUNCILS
OF ROMAN EGYPT

THE TOWN COUNCIL
OF ROMAN EGYPT

Introduction

The city council, or *βουλή*, was a characteristic feature of many of the Greek cities of the Hellenistic period. Modelled more or less on the pattern of the Athenian *boule*, administratively the most important of the Athenian democratic institutions at the time of Aristotle, the *boulai* of the Hellenistic period were in a large degree responsible for the internal administration of the cities. Many of these cities eventually succumbed to Roman rule, but in most the *boule* was retained and remained an important institution in the Greek cities in the eastern Roman provinces.

The rule of the Ptolemaic dynasty in Egypt came to an end with the death of Cleopatra in 30 B.C. Egypt was added to the Roman Empire, but Augustus and his successors kept an especially close watch upon its administration.¹ During the Ptolemaic period only one city so far as we know, apart from Alexandria, possessed a *boule*. This was Ptolemais, founded by Ptolemy Soter after the pattern of a Greek city. Alexandria also may well have had a *boule* during some part of the Ptolemaic period, but it certainly did not possess one at the time of Augustus or Claudius, and requests from the Alexandrians to these Emperors for permission to set up a *boule* attest the importance of such an institution. In A.D. 130 the Emperor Hadrian founded a city in Egypt in memory of his favourite, Antinous, who was drowned in the Nile. The city was called Antinoopolis, and was modelled after the pattern of a Greek city, complete with a *boule*. Alexandria, meanwhile, did not achieve the object it had sought from Augustus and Claudius – permission to set up or reinstate its *boule* – until the reign of Septimius Severus.

The metropoleis in Egypt – that is, the chief towns in each nome – did not possess councils during the first and second centuries A.D., nor indeed during the Ptolemaic period. Until A.D. 200 their internal administration was dependent on a number of elected, co-opted or appointed magistrates who functioned in concert with the officials of the central government. Shortly after the visit of Septimius Severus to Egypt in 199-200, one of the results of which was the grant of a *boule* to Alexandria, evidence begins to appear for the existence of *boulai* in the metropoleis of Egypt; it is reasonable to suppose that these too owed their existence to Septimius Severus.

1. Velleius Paterculus 39.2; *Res Gestae*, 27; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.59.4, 12.60.3; *Hist.* 1.11.1.

Apart from the fact that the discovery of papyri in Egypt has produced for the historian an abundance of material relevant to the administration and the operation of the bureaucracy at all levels, coincidence has helped in making the boulai of the metropoleis a particularly fruitful object of study. For the third century A.D. provides a larger proportion of our surviving papyrus texts than any other single century.

Nevertheless, the boulai have not been the centre of a great deal of scholarly attention in the last fifty years or so. Three monographs on individual cities, Ptolemais, Antinoopolis and Hermopolis, have devoted some attention to the evidence for the individual boulai. But an indication of the comparative neglect which the total *corpus* of evidence for the boulai has suffered is the fact that the best and most comprehensive work on the subject is contained in the later chapters of a book written in 1911 by Pierre Jouguet (*La Vie Municipale dans l'Égypte Romaine*). The evidence upon which Jouguet was able to draw consisted largely of texts from Hermopolis, published without commentary by Wessely in the fifth volume of his *Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde (C. P. Herm.)* Shortly after the publication of Jouguet's book a number of important texts appeared in the twelfth volume of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, and Jouguet was able to supplement his earlier work with an article in the *Revue Egyptologique* in 1919. Jouguet's work represents the only real attempt to synthesise the evidence and produce a comprehensive picture of the boule as an administrative institution. Although much evidence has accrued since he wrote, his conclusions have stood the test of time remarkably well. More recent scholarship has produced work on the bouleutai of the metropoleis, and on the role of the boule in the appointment to ἀρχαί (by E. P. Wegener).


Although the publication of new texts will bring fresh evidence to corroborate or disprove any conclusions which may be made at the present, a complete synthesis of the available information for the boulai in Egypt seems desirable for several reasons. Whilst the *corpus* of published papyrus texts is growing ever greater, the historian, whose interest lies as much in using the information in the texts as in deciphering it, is perhaps unable to keep up with the new material at his command. The papyrologist who is intent on producing as accurate a text as he can with a maximum of helpful commentary has to peruse large numbers of volumes to find the information relevant to a new text. It may therefore be hoped that such a synthesis will bring the historian up to date on the available material and at the same time facilitate the task of the papyrologist in the publication of new material.

From a broader point of view, a study of the nature of the boulai in Egypt is of interest to the historian of the Roman Empire. Granted that Egypt stands somewhat apart from the other provinces of the Empire and that analogy is a tool to be used with caution, the fact remains that there is no evidence so abundant or so detailed for any other part of the Empire. The historian with an interest in the operation of local politics in the Empire will, it is hoped, find such a study of

some use. If there is an interest in the nature and history of such institutions as the boulai in the municipalities and cities of the provinces, such a study supplies at least part of that picture.

The growth of papyrology as a branch of classical studies, and the advance in epigraphical technique have done much to revolutionise classical scholarship in the last fifty years. Scholars of the twentieth century have been able to use more material, better presented than ever before. One of the results of this has been that they have been able to ask and answer questions which might have seemed unanswerable, if they were ever asked, to the pioneers of Roman history in the last century. The advances of the last fifty years have shown above all that the history of the Roman Empire is, in large part, the history of the people who lived in its provinces. On the broad view, the debt of such a study as this to the one man who, above all, recognised and grasped the importance of this kind of evidence for the history of the Roman Empire, is immense. I refer to Rostovtzeff. On a somewhat narrower view, anyone who works with papyrological material recognises his debt to the people who nurtured and advanced papyrological studies and who, having grown up with papyrology, had an unparalleled knowledge of the evidence it provided. Such a study as this is only made possible by the publication of texts in a concise and helpful fashion. Anyone who has had to work extensively with texts from Oxyrhynchus owes an enormous debt to the work of Grenfell and Hunt.

This monograph is, in essence, a study of the boulai of the metropoleis in Egypt: their nature as administrative institutions, the way in which they worked in internal government and in relation to the central administration in Egypt, the people who served in them. As the evidence stands at present, Oxyrhynchus provides more of the information for the boulai than any other single place. I have therefore attempted to centre the study on Oxyrhynchus, and to discern to what extent the material from other places corroborates or supplements what we know of the boule of Oxyrhynchus. So far as I am aware, every text of importance for the boule has been cited, if only to corroborate or supplement the evidence of other documents. In approaching the subject thus, I have had to avoid to some extent problems which are raised by evidence which is relevant only indirectly to the boule. Thus, an up-to-date monograph on the strategos might illuminate problems which I have been unable to tackle or solve. The extent to which I have been able to relate the evidence to the broader picture of the Empire is somewhat limited, largely because the material for other places has not been collected and digested. But I have not limited my study to the boulai of the metropoleis, although they do, in fact, provide most of the evidence. Such material as exists for the Greek cities in the Ptolemaic and Roman period has been adduced. It is hoped that the study will thus provide a comprehensive index to the documentary evidence for the history and nature of the boule in Egypt.



Chapter One

The Boule

The Boule in the Greek and Roman World

The archetype of the boule or city council is that which was so prominent a feature of the Athenian democratic constitution in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.¹ Several sections of the *Athenaion Politeia* are devoted to a description of the Athenian boule of the later fourth century B.C. It was a body of 500 elected by lot for a year and composed of fifty members from each of the ten tribes. The members from each tribe served in rotation for one tenth of the year as a standing committee of the boule (*φυλή πρυτανεύουσα*) in an order selected by lot. There were thus ten prytanies in the year, four of thirty-six days and six of thirty-five. The prytaneis convened meetings of the boule (which met on every day except holidays) and of the ekklesia or assembly (which met four times per prytany).

The prytaneis selected by lot from amongst themselves an *ἐπιστάτης* for each day of the prytany, whose task it was to preside over the prytaneis and to select nine *πρόεδροι* (one from each tribe except the prytanising tribe) each time the boule or ekklesia met, and from these an *ἐπιστάτης*. It was the responsibility of the *πρόεδροι* to preside at meetings and supervise elections and other business which was brought before the ekklesia after preliminary resolution by the boule.

The responsibility of the boule in supervising the general conduct of the magistrates was extensive, but its main importance was as a probouleutic body which prepared business for the ekklesia. It was the prytaneis who were responsible for giving notice of such business. In addition the boule held the *δοκιμασία* of the bouleutai for the following year and conducted trials of officials, though in the latter its verdict was not sovereign. In sum it was the primary executive body in Athens — *συνδωικεῖ δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρχαῖς τὰ πλεῖστα*.²

The evidence for the boule in the Greek cities of the Hellenistic period shows it in much the same role, as a probouleutic body, issuing decrees jointly with the demos and preparing business for the assembly.³ As at Athens, the boule played a large part in the general administration of the city, supervising the conduct of magistrates, controlling finances, granting honours, dealing with questions of

1. On the origin of the boule see *Ath. Pol.* 4; 8; 21; Plutarch, *Solon* 19; C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, 1952, pp. 92-6 (rejecting the existence of a boule before Cleisthenes).

2. *Ath. Pol.* 43-9; cf. Oehler, *RE* III, 1899,

1020-37.

3. In some cities the power and influence of the *gerousia* tended to dominate the other institutions; see Strabo 14.1.21; J. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerosia* (*Hesperia* Supp. 6, 1941), p. 19 and inscr. nos. 1-2.

citizenship, and presenting lists from which the assembly would elect magistrates.⁴ At Athens and elsewhere the responsibility for much of the routine business, such as the recording of business and resolutions, fell upon the *γραμματεὺς* of the boule. The system of prytaneis varied from place to place in the Hellenistic period. In some cities the boule was divided into sections which took responsibility in rotation for the performance of business, as at Athens. In others, the presidency of the boule and assembly was vested in a board of elected magistrates, called prytaneis. Rhodes provides the best known example of the latter. It had a board of five prytaneis, who served for a period of six months and appear to have held considerable power. A passage in Livy attests the importance of the prytanis: *qui cum in summo magistratu esset — prytanin ipsi vocant — multis orationibus pervicerat Rhodios, ut . . . Romanam societatem retinerent* (Livy, 42.45.4; cf. Polybius, 22.5.10; 27.7.2; 29.10.4). Normally the boule was selected on the basis of tribal representation for a year (though there are examples of six-month and two-year terms).⁵ In Athens, the boule was increased to 600 and the number of tribes and prytanies increased to 12 after 307 B.C.⁶

In the Roman period there were still boulai in the cities which had possessed them during the Hellenistic period, but Roman administration tended to assimilate them to the form of the Roman senate. Like the Greek city-states, the subject communities under Roman domination were often allowed to have a boule and an assembly. In the first century B.C. boulai were set up in the cities of Bithynia-Pontus under the terms of the *Lex Pompeia*. During the first three centuries A.D., the powers of the assemblies gradually diminished to the advantage of the boulai. The administration of the city came to be vested in the boule and in the magistrates who were either elected by it or elected automatically by the assembly on the nomination of the boule. The effect of this was that the boulai in the cities of the Empire became permanent, self-perpetuating bodies which directed the administration totally. This development exemplifies the Roman practice of vesting political power in the provinces in the local aristocracy.⁷

The system of presidency of the boule still varied from place to place — in some places the presidents were called *πρόβουλοι* with an *ἀρχιπρόβουλος*, in others *βούλαρχοι*.⁸ In Athens the old system of prytaneis, *πρόεδροι* and *ἐπιστάται* continued to function in the Roman period. As far as Athens is concerned, the

4. For a good exemplar of the boule in the Hellenistic period see the discussion of Ephesus by E. L. Hicks, *Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* III.2, 1890, pp. 71-4 with inscriptions 447-76, and *Forschungen in Ephesos* II, 1912, pp. 96-105.

5. For general discussion of the boule in the Hellenistic period see D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, 1950, pp. 58 ff., 133, 834-5, 840-1; Jones, *GC*, pp. 164 ff., 336-7, 340-1.

6. W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 1911, p.

96.

7. See Plutarch, *Præcepta Gerendae Reipublicae* 814C: the use of censors to enroll the boulai in Bithynia illustrates the trend (Pliny, *Ep.* 10.112).

8. On the general character of the boulai in the Roman period see D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, 1950, pp. 369, 640-5, 1504-8; Jones, *GC* pp. 176 ff.; I. Lévy, "Études sur la Vie Municipale dans l'Asie Mineure sous les Antonins," *REG* 8, 1895, pp. 219-31; Hicks, *loc. cit.* (above, note 4).

main difference in the Roman period is that the boule of the Areopagus regained the important position which it had lost in the fifth century B.C. The evidence shows that it was particularly important judicially, and it is often found acting in conjunction with the boule and the demos. The boule retained its complement of 600 until the time of Hadrian, when it was reduced to 500; in the third century it was increased to 750, but reduced again in the fourth to 300. The actual activity of the boule appears to have been restricted largely to matters relevant to the granting of honours, in which it is found acting alone and in conjunction with the demos.⁹ According to Hadrian's Oil Law it had a certain judicial competence. The prytaneis probably continued to function as an executive council preparing business for the boule and are attested into the third century; but the series of prytany decrees ceases between 222-3 and 234-5.¹⁰

The evidence of Pliny and Dio of Prusa shows that the boulai in the cities of Bithynia-Pontus were experiencing problems in the late first and early second centuries A.D. The system of boulai established under the *Lex Pompeia* had deteriorated to the extent that the minimum age for entry was being ignored and people were being given membership of the boule in more than one city.¹¹ The censors had found it necessary to enroll people under the minimum age who had not held magistracies, because it was preferable to enroll *honestorum hominum liberos* than to recruit senators *e plebe*. The boulai were enrolling supernumerary members, in some cases requesting permission from the Emperor, and it is probable that many of these new bouleutai were not altogether willing to be enrolled since they had to pay an entrance fee (which no doubt was one of the principal reasons for the efforts of the boulai to enroll them).¹² Although the evidence on the whole suggests that the state of the boulai was not as healthy as it might have been it is clear that decurial status did hold some attraction, perhaps more for the wealthy than for the moderately prosperous.¹³ There is ample evidence at this period for donations of money to the boulai, though the suspicion obtrudes that such gifts might

9. On the Athenian boule and the boule of the Areopagus see D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution After Sulla* (*Hesperia* Supp. 12, 1967), pp. 41-116. For the boulai in the Roman period de-creeing honours and related matters see e.g. Geagan, *op. cit.* Appendix I; *Forschungen in Ephesos* II, 1912, pp. 107-8 (celebration of the birthday of Antoninus Pius), pp. 173 ff.; III, 1923, pp. 118 ff.; Oliver, *op. cit.* (above, note 3), no. 5.

10. Geagan, *op. cit.* (above, note 9), pp. 92-103.

11. Dio, *Or.* 41.1-2; Pliny, *Ep.* 10.79-80; 114-5.

12. Pliny, *Ep.* 10.79-80; 112-3 (see C. P. Jones, *Phoenix* 22, 1968, pp. 138-9; L. Vidman, *Listy Filologické* 92, 1969, pp. 236-8); Dio, *Or.*

45.7; 40.14; 48.11; cf. *SEG* XIV 479 (Macedonia). On the entry fee see P. D. A. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Second and Third Centuries of the Roman Empire with Special Reference to the Curial Class* (unpubl. D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1967), pp. 401-39, taking the view that the entrance fee was only paid by those irregularly elected, i.e. *adlecti*, until the early second century. Note also the letter of Hadrian to the boule of Ephesus recommending L. Erastus for membership and offering τὸ ἀργύριον ὅσον δίδασσω οἱ βουλευόντες [δώσω τῆς ἀρχαι]ρσίας [ἐ]νεκα, (Abbott and Johnson, no. 85).

13. The evidence for the privileges of decurial status is collected by Garnsey, *op. cit.* (above, note 12), pp. 564 ff.

have been made by wealthy and patriotic citizens in order to attract their less prosperous compatriots to decurial responsibility.¹⁴ Apart from this, it is clear from what Pliny and Dio say that the actual operation of the *boulai* was subject to a good deal of influence and nepotism. Dio had to defend himself against the charge of having tried to force his way into the presidency, and mentions accusations that he had blocked a meeting and had exerted undue influence upon the *boule*, apparently when his son was president.¹⁵ Nonetheless, he is at some pains to stress the altruism of his motives in local politics and clearly exerted himself to a considerable extent to persuade the *boule* and the assembly to take measures to beautify the city. As a point of comparison, it may be noted that according to Pliny, the people of Claudiopolis built a bath with the money which was brought in by the enrollment, in some cases under compulsion, of supernumerary senators.¹⁶

The impoverishment of the local *boulai* throughout the Empire increased during the course of the third century and by the end of that century they were having difficulty in keeping up their numbers. There is abundant evidence for the catastrophic decline of the *boulai* and the curial class in the fourth century. Libanius adverts frequently to the desertion of the *curiae*¹⁷ and stresses that this is a universal phenomenon: *καὶ τοῦτο, ὡ βασιλεῦ, κοινὸν τὸ κακόν, ἐὰν τε Πάλτων εἴτης ἐὰν τε Ἀλεξάνδρειαν*. . . .¹⁸ The words of Julian to the Antiochenes also indicate the difficulty of maintaining the strength of the *curiae*: *ἔπειτα τοῦ βουλευτηρίου τὸν κατάλογον διακοσίοις βουλευταῖς ἀνεπλήρωσα φεισάμενος οὐδενός*.¹⁹ Membership of the council became a luxury barely to be afforded by the rich — for the poor it was enslavement.²⁰ The curial class thus became little more than the bearer of the burden of tax-collection for the central government and its members were, according to Libanius, put in the position of having to sell their estates in order to make up the deficits in their collection with consequent loss of decurial status.²¹ The plight of individuals was reflected in the position of the councils²² which gradually lost their administrative responsibilities and the right to elect important officials. The consequence was oppression at the hands of

14. See for example Oliver, *op. cit.* (above, note 3), nos. 3, 5, 6 (Ephesus); *CIG* 2782 (Aphrodisias); *BCH* 10, 1886, pp. 420-1 (Thyatira); *IG* XII 5.141 (Paros).

15. Dio, *Or.* 45.7; 50.7, 10.

16. Dio, *Or.* 45.9; 40.6; Pliny, *Ep.* 10.39.5.

17. Libanius, *Or.* 48.3: . . . ἦν, ὅτ' ἦν ἡμῶν ἡ βουλή πολλή τις, ἄνδρες ἑξακόσιοι ὥστε ἕκαστον ἔτος αἰεὶ τι τοῦ πληρώματος ἀφαιρούμενον διήρχετο, 48.6: . . . περὶ δὲ τοῦ κεκενῶσθαι μικροῦ τὸν βουλευτήριον . . . , 48.25: . . . τὸ βουλευτήριον δὲ τοῦτ' ὅτι ἡμᾶς ἄθλιον οἶκ ἀιδεῖσθε, ἐν ᾧ ποτε τὰς λειτουργίας ἤρπαζον οἱ ἑξακόσιοι.

18. Libanius, *Or.* 49.12; cf. *C. Theod.* 12.1.4, 10, 12, 13, 22, 24, 27.

19. Julian, *Misopogon*, (Hertlein) 475.

20. Libanius, *Ep.* 375.5: τὸ βουλευεῖν πλουσίῳ μὲν ἡγείται καλόν, πένητι δὲ δουλείαν, 374.5: . . . τὸν ἄνδρα πολὺν δὴ χρόνον φυγόντα τὴν οἰκίαν διὰ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι βουλήν καὶ πενίαν, cf. A. F. Norman, "Gradations in Later Municipal Society," *JRS* 48, 1958, pp. 79-85, esp. 83 ff.

21. Libanius, *De Patrociniiis* 9-10.

22. Libanius, *Or.* 2.35: καὶ μὴν αἶς μὲν τῶν βουλῶν ἢ γῆ πονηρά, τῷ μεγέθει τῶν φορτίων ἀπολώλασιν οὐδενός τῆς τοιαύτης ἐρώματος γῆς οὐδὲ ὠνομένου, παρ' οἷς δὲ βελτίων, ἀντὶ τῶν κεκληρονομηκότων ἔχουσι τοὺς πρίασθαι δυναμένους δεσπότης.

officials with direct responsibility to the central government.²³ The eventual result was only to be expected: in the east the city councils ceased to exist as administrative units and to hold formal sessions after the reign of Anastasius, although the curial class did survive for some time after this. Sessions of city councils in the west are recorded as late as the first quarter of the seventh century.²⁴

The Boule in Egypt before Septimius Severus

Of the Greek cities in Egypt only Ptolemais is known to have had a boule in the Ptolemaic period. The existence of a boule at Alexandria before A.D. 200 is still uncertain. A boule is attested for Naukratis in the first part of the fourth century A.D. (*P. Gen.* 10), but its antecedents are unknown.²⁵ No place in Egypt other than a Greek city possessed a boule before the third century A.D.

The constitution of Ptolemais is stated by Strabo (17.1.42) to have been of the Greek type, and evidence from inscriptions for the nature of the boule during the Ptolemaic period supports the relative accuracy of the statement.²⁶ There are five decrees of the boule of Ptolemais which survive in inscriptions, four from the third century B.C., and one dated only to the Ptolemaic period.²⁷ Two papyri from the third century may also be relevant; one contains a report of the proceedings, probably of the boule of Ptolemais (*SB* 7403),²⁸ and the other is a fragmentary document, referring to constitutional arrangements in a city argued by the editors to be either Ptolemais or Alexandria, which contains a probable reference to prytaneis ([] .ρυτα[]), (*P. Hib.* 28 = *WChr.* 25).

The evidence of the inscriptions shows the boule promulgating decrees in conjunction with the demos, and suggests that it played the same probouleutic role as in the other cities of the Hellenistic world. One of the decrees, issued by the boule and demos through the prytaneis states that because of *θόρυβος* in the ekklesia and boule, henceforth the *δικαστήρια* and the boule are to be chosen from *ἐπιλεκτοὶ ἄνδρες* (*OGIS* 48). It is thus clear that membership of the boule changed regularly. The decree names the prytaneis with the formula *πρυτάνεις οἱ σὺν . . .*, numbering six, each from a different deme. They are also referred to as

23. Libanius, *Or.* 43.13: *καὶ μηδὲ δὴ ἄρχοντε πίνοντε παραλίπης, οἷς ἄγροὶ τὰ ἐργαστήρια μικροῦ πάντα. ἂψ' ὧν γὰρ ἕκαστοι πωλοῦσι λαμβάνουσι τῶ λογιστῆ προσγωμένου τοῦ συνδίκου.*

24. For modern accounts of the councils and decurions see Jones, *GC*, pp. 208 ff.; *LRE*, pp. 757-63; R. Ganghoffer, *L'Evolution des Institutions Municipales en Occident et en Orient au Bas-Empire*, 1963, pp. 135-51; J. Gagé, *Les Classes Sociales dans l'Empire Romain*, 1964, pp. 161-9, 376-83; Garnsey, *op. cit.* (above, note 12), pp. 486-563. On the decline of the *curiae* see also

C. E. Van Sickle, "Diocletian and the Decline of the Roman Municipalities," *JRS* 28, 1938, pp. 9-18.

25. See *WGr.* pp. 12-3.

26. Cf. in general Plaumann, *Ptolemais*, pp. 4-20.

27. *OGIS* 47; 48; 49; 728; P. M. Fraser, *Berytus* 13, 1959-60, pp. 123 ff., no. 1. A convenient comparison may be made with the evidence from Ephesos (above, note 4).

28. Originally published with commentary by G. Plaumann, *Klio* 13, 1913, pp. 308-13.

administrators of the city: *καλῶς καὶ ἀξίως τῆς πόλεως προέστησαν*. Clearly, the prytaneis formed a college, six in number, based on tribal representation, as was the membership of the boule no doubt, and serving for a year (since they are named as the prytaneis of the eighth year), either as a college, or each taking the responsibility for two months. The principal, who is mentioned first, was evidently the chairman. The prytaneis were obviously responsible not only for the boule, but for the other administrative organs of the city as well, and will have performed the normal duties of ordering the agenda for meetings of the boule and the ekklesia. The constitution of Ptolemais is therefore comparable to that exemplified by Rhodes, rather than to the Athenian system.²⁹

In other decrees the title *πρύτανις διὰ βίου* occurs, which was perhaps an honorary title awarded to the president of the board of prytaneis after his term of office (OGIS 50; 51). Evidence for the *γραμματεὺς* of the boule in OGIS 49 shows him performing the duties associated with the office elsewhere in the Hellenistic world – he is responsible for the publication of the *ψήφισμα*; the fact that the *γραμματεὺς* in OGIS 728 is the same man as occurs in OGIS 51 with the title *πρύτανις διὰ βίου* suggests that the position was a fairly important one, which might be held by one of the members of the board of prytaneis.³⁰

The decree in OGIS 49 (in which the prescript is not preserved) shows the concern of the prytaneis with honours and citizenship; a man is to be honoured by the grant of a crown and maintenance in the prytaneion, and the prytaneis are to enroll him into a tribe and a deme. This evidence lends support to the assumption that the proceedings recorded in SB 7403 are those of the boule, since the matter under discussion is an *ἔντευξις* about citizenship.

Definitive evidence is still lacking on the question of whether or not Alexandria had a boule during the Ptolemaic period.³¹ An inscription whose provenance is Alexandria (SB 3996), records a decree containing formulae similar to those found in the decrees of the boule from Ptolemais, (*δημῶι πρυταν[; πρυταν]ῶν τῶν σὺν . . .*), but no place name is recorded. The letters *ῖρων*, however, could well be the end of *Ἀλεξανδ[ρ]ῶν*.³² Other evidence is purely circumstantial. Dio Cassius, describing the events of 30 B.C. says of Octavian *τοῖς δ' Ἀλεξανδρεῦσιν ἄνευ βουλευτῶν πολιτεύεσθαι ἐκέλευσε* (51.17.2), but this more naturally reads as a statement that he refused a request for permission to set up a boule than an assertion that he abolished the Alexandrian boule.

29. Cf. Plaumann, *Ptolemais* pp. 17-20; Jouguet, *BCH* 21, 1897, pp. 184-208.

30. Jouguet, *BCH* 21, 1897, p. 202, suggests that the *πρύτανις διὰ βίου* was probably always the president of the college, and compares the title *ἀρχιπρύτανις διὰ βίου* found in the Roman period (*BCH* 20, 1896, p. 246 = *Archiv* 2, 1902-3, p. 436, no. 32, of A.D. 80-81). On the *γραμματεὺς* cf. Plaumann, *Ptolemais*, pp. 18-9,

and compare *PSI* 199 (Antinoopolis, A.D. 203).

31. For bibliography and summary of scholarship see H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*, 1954, pp. 83-92; *CPJ* II, pp. 25-7.

32. For this restoration see G. Plaumann, *BPhW* 33, 1913, p. 639. The existence of a boule at Alexandria in 175-4 is assumed by F. M. Heichelheim in his re-edition of *P. Harr.* 61, *JEA* 26, 1940, pp. 154-6.

The only evidence which supports the view that Alexandria did not have a boule in the Ptolemaic period is a passage in the *Historia Augusta* which records the grant of a boule to Alexandria by Septimius Severus: *deinde Alexandrinis ius bouleutarum dedit, qui sine publico consilio ita ut sub regibus ante vivebant uno iudice contenti, {quem} Caesar dedisset (Sev. 17.2, Teubner text)*. With the evidence in this state, certainty is unattainable, but the view which has found most favour is that the Alexandrians did have a boule under the early Ptolemies (it may be regarded as improbable that Alexander would have founded a large Greek city *without* making provision for a boule), but lost it later in the Ptolemaic period; the troubles attested at Alexandria in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes Physcon might have been the cause of its removal (Strabo, 17.1.12: *καταστασιαζόμενος γὰρ ὁ Φύσκων πλεονάκις τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐφίει τὰ πλήθη καὶ διέφθειρε*).

Probably during the earlier part of the reign of Augustus, the Alexandrians sent a deputation to the Emperor to request permission to set up a boule, and part of the record of that embassy survives on papyrus. The Alexandrians asked for a boule of which the membership would change yearly (*κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν γίνε[σθα]ι*) and which would have a *γραμματεὺς* and some system of rendering accounts (*εὐθυναί*). The type of institution described is appropriate to a Greek city. In support of the case, arguments calculated to impress the Emperor are employed: a boule would prevent corruption of the ephobic body by people who were being illegally admitted — probably a veiled reference to the Jews — but more important, or more seductive, it will see that people who are liable to pay *λαογραφία* do not diminish the revenues by being listed in public records with the ephobes. The plea continues with further reference to the revenues: *εἰ δέ τις κατὰ {βαρ}βαροῖτο παρά λόγον πραττόμενος ἢ ὑπὸ Ἰδ[ο]ν Λόγου ἢ τως πράκτορος ἀνθρώπους διασεύοντος, συνερχομένη ἢ βουλή πρὸς τὸν σὸν ἐπίτροπον συνεπισχύη τοῖς ἀσθ[ε]ροῦσι καὶ μὴ δι' ἐρημίαν βοηθείας τὰ σοὶ τηρεῖσθαι δυνάμενα ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων ἀνθρώπων διαφορηθῆ*.³³ The Alexandrians were unable to obtain permission from Augustus, as the letter of Claudius shows (*P. Lond.* 1912.66-7): *περὶ δὲ τῆς βουλῆς ὅ τι μὲν ποτε σύνηθες ὑμεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων βασιλέων οὐκ ἔχωι λέγειν · ὅτι δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ Σεβαστῶν οὐκ εἶχεται σαφῶς οἴδατε*. Claudius promised that the matter would be investigated, but the request was evidently refused, since it was left to Septimius Severus to grant the Alexandrians the *ius bouleutarum* (*HA Sev.* 17.2, quoted above).

The reasons for the repeated pleas of the Alexandrians for a boule in the early Principate are not difficult to divine, especially if they had had one during some part of the Ptolemaic period. Alexandria was a Greek city, acutely conscious, as the record of the embassy to Augustus shows, of its Hellenic heritage. No doubt the Alexandrians considered the lack of a boule as an affront to the

33. *PSI* 1160, re-edited as *CPJ* 150 where a date of 20-19 B.C. is argued for. Other possible requests for a boule at Alexandria may be seen in

Dio Cassius 51.17.2 (quoted above, p. 12), and in *P. Oxy.* 2435.56 ff., probably of A.D. 13.

dignity and prestige of the city. But a more pressing motive may have been the trouble between the Greeks and Jews at Alexandria which is much in evidence during the early Principate. No doubt the grant of a boule would have given the Alexandrian Greeks enough autonomy (or so they must have hoped) to deal with the Jews in their own way, instead of having the problem subject to the directives of imperial policy.

That Ptolemais retained its boule throughout the Roman period is attested by an extensive document, illuminating one aspect of its functions (*SB* 9016). In 160 Ptolemais became involved in a dispute with Koptos over the right to appoint νεωκόροι for a temple of Ptolemy Soter in Koptos. The papyrus contains documents from the reigns of Claudius, Galba and Vespasian by which Ptolemais supports its claim to the right to appoint the νεωκόροι, and it is reiterated that the boule is involved in making the appointments. The main document contains a mention of an ἀρχιπρύτανις, and in the decision of the ἀνταρχιερεύς, which was communicated to the authorities of the Koptite Nome, the claims of Ptolemais were upheld and a letter from the prytaneis, boule and demos of Ptolemais is quoted. It thus appears that the boule maintained during the first two centuries of Roman rule the position which it had held during the Ptolemaic period, as a probouleutic body which acted in conjunction with the ekklesia and was headed by an executive board of prytaneis.³⁴ There is no later evidence for the boule of Ptolemais, but its existence in the third century is attested by προσκυνήματα of bouleutai.³⁵

The only other place in Egypt which had a boule before 200 was Antinoopolis, founded as a "Greek city" by Hadrian in 130. The boule was doubtless envisaged as part of its constitution from the foundation, for it is attested as early as 133 (*SB* 7603). The city was organised on a system of tribes and demes, and the composition of the boule was probably based thereon.³⁶ In *PSI* 199, of 203, we find the term πρυτανεύουσα φυλή occurring in connection with the boule. Ten tribes are attested for Antinoopolis and the system of prytanies was undoubtedly based upon them. Each tribe will either have held the prytany for one tenth of the year or will have served for one complete year in every ten. The official

34. *SB* 9016: *editio princeps* by J. Scherer, "Le Papyrus Fouad Ier Inv. 211," *BIFAO* 41, 1942, pp. 43-73 (with a commentary). The existence of the boule in the early Roman period had been conjectured by W. Schubart, *Archiv* 5, 1913, p. 76. note 3, on the basis of a restoration of *P. Fay.* 22 (= *MChr.* 291): ἐδοξε Πτολεμαίων τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τῶν δήμων. The document concerns the issuance of regulations about marriage, mainly technicalities such as registration and dowry, and might well have been within the competence of the boule, cf. *WChr.* 27. A document from the reign of Claudius (*SB* 8300) in which a boule and demos honour a certain L. Popilius Balbus probably has

its origin outside Egypt. References to ἀρχιπρυτάνεις in the Roman period are found in *Archiv* 2, 1902-3, p. 436, no. 32, and perhaps *SB* 2664 of the first century B.C. Cf. Plaumann, *Ptolemais*, pp. 70-81.

35. *SB* 8470; 8477; 8481; 8506. Bouleutai of Ptolemais are also found in *P. Oxy.* 43, of 295. The latest attestation of a bouleutes of Ptolemais is in *P. Lips.* 50, of 372.

36. See Kühn, *Antinoopolis*, pp. 90-137; H. I. Bell, "Antinoopolis: a Hadrianic Foundation in Egypt," *JRS* 30, 1940, pp. 133-47; F. Kenyon, "Phylae and Demes in Graeco-Roman Egypt," *Archiv* 2, 1902-3, pp. 70-8.

presiding at meetings of the boule is called ὁ πρυτανικός (*WChr.* 27), but it is impossible to be certain whether he is an official elected from the prytanising tribe and serving for part or the whole of the prytany, or whether he is a member of an executive board like that at Ptolemais. The term ἄρχων πρυτανικῶν occurs in *P. Fam. Teb.* 49-50, of 205, and is translated by the editors as "chairman of the *prytanikoi*," but it is uncertain whether the *prytanikoi* are to be regarded as the whole of the prytanising tribe or a board elected from it. The latter is perhaps marginally preferable unless the terms ὁ πρυτανικός and ἄρχων πρυτανικῶν are to be regarded as synonymous. We may then suppose that each tribe held the prytany for one year in every ten and that from that tribe there was elected a board of *prytanikoi* (of whom one was appointed the ἄρχων πρυτανικῶν) each of whom would take the presidency of the boule for part of the year in which his tribe served. In effect, therefore, the *prytanikoi* would constitute an executive board of the boule. The boule also had a γραμματεὺς (*SB* 7601); in *PSI* 199 he also has the title πρυτανικός, so he was sometimes, if not always, chosen from among the *prytanikoi*.³⁷

The second-century documents referring to the boule of Antinoopolis show it dealing largely with questions of citizenship and status. Documents from the middle of the second century which show the boule and prytaneis involved in the registration of citizens are explicable in terms of the recent foundation of the city and its Hellenic character (*SB* 7603-4). It was doubtless the latter which gave rise to the question of intermarriage of Antinoites with Egyptians, which is discussed in a meeting of the boule (*WChr.* 27, of the second century, after 161).

It is impossible to be sure whether Antinoopolis followed the Greek type of constitution in having a boule with a probouleutic role. A letter of Antoninus Pius, probably concerning privileges granted to Antinoopolis by Hadrian, contains an address to the magistrates, boule and demos, but does not supply any evidence of the comparative positions of the three bodies (*P. Strassb.* 130). It is noteworthy that in the dedication to Aelius Aristides the boule of Antinoopolis appears as a contributor without the demos.³⁸

The Metropoleis and the Foundation of the Boulai

In the first two centuries A.D. the administration of Alexandria and the metropoleis was headed by the ἄρχοντες, presided over by a board of prytaneis. The chairman of the prytaneis was the ἀρχιπρύτανις, who was often, if not always, an exegetes.³⁹ Several documents from Alexandria contain

37. Cf. Kühn, *Antinoopolis*, pp. 106 ff.; P. V. Pistorius, *Indices Antinoopolitani*, 1939, pp. 110-6, and below, p. 40.

38. *SB* 8276. In an inscription of the reign of Hadrian (*SB* 3998), [Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ] ὁ δῆμος of an unspecified place, presumably Ptolemais or

Antinoopolis, honour an imperial procurator.

39. See F. Preisigke, *Städtisches Beamtenwesen im römischen Aegypten*, 1903, pp. 7-15; A. H. M. Jones, "The Election of the Metropolitan Magistrates in Egypt," *JEA* 24, 1938, pp. 65-72; P. Jouguet, "Sur les Métropoles

applications for entry to the ephobic body addressed to an official who was evidently the chairman of the prytaneis, and to the *Caesarii* and the other prytaneis.⁴⁰ The *Caesarii* are usually assumed to be imperial nominees on the board of prytaneis. From these documents it is evident that the board of prytaneis at Alexandria performed the functions which were fulfilled at Ptolemais and Antinoopolis by the boule and the prytaneis. In *P. Oxy.* 592, of 122-3, there is a petition about financial matters addressed to a man with an impressive list of titles: γενομένῳ πρυτανικῶ ἄρχοντι(ι) ἱερεῖ καὶ ἀρχιδικαστῆ καὶ ἰπὸς τῆ ἐπιμε]λεία τῶν χρηματιστῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κριτηρίων. The offices here referred to must be Alexandrian ones,⁴¹ but the existence of the prytaneis in the metropoleis is attested for A.D. 198 by *P. Teb.* 397 (= *MChr.* 321), from Arsinoe, where a man bears the titles ἱερεὺς ἐξηγητῆς καὶ ἀρχιπρύτανις [κα]ὶ [ἐ]πὶ τῶν [μερι]σμῶν τῶν σπερμάτων καὶ τῆς εὐθηνίας.

Two examples demonstrate that the corporate body of ἄρχοντες in the second century operated in some of the same areas as did the boule in the third.⁴² *P. Ryl.* 77, of 192, contains a report of proceedings before a strategos about the nomination of a kosmetes, and a letter to the strategos from the ἄρχοντες of Hermopolis. Apparently the serving kosmetai had nominated a certain Achilleus as kosmetes, but he had refused on the grounds of insufficient means; when brought before the strategos, however, he had offered to take the higher-ranking, but less expensive, office of exegetes; after much wrangling he was eventually crowned as kosmetes. The document amply demonstrates the role of the ἄρχοντες in the election of magistrates in the metropoleis. In *P. Oxy.* 54 (= *WChr.* 34), of 201, there is a request addressed to a gymnasiarch and exegetes (who were perhaps prytaneis, though the title is not mentioned) by two epimeletai for the payment of expenses incurred in connection with public works; the epimeletai describe themselves as having been presented for the post by the γραμματεὺς τῆς πόλεως in accordance with the γνώμη of the κοινὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων. It will be amply demonstrated in Chapter IV that the boule had extensive responsibility in the third century for the management of public finance and for the election of magistrates and liturgists. The functions of the κοινὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων were taken over in the metropolis by the boule at the beginning of the third century. It is uncertain whether the κοινὸν survived or reappeared after 200.⁴³

Egyptiennes à la fin du IIe Siècle après J.-C.," *REG* 30, 1917, pp. 294-328 (cf. *VM*, pp. 303-14). As Jouguet pointed out, the evidence for the corporate activity of the κοινὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων comes from the very late second century, and may be the result of some reform. But the magistrates are attested individually long before this. Cf. *P. Oxford* 2.27 note.

40. *SB* 8010; *P. Oxy.* 477 (= *WChr.* 144); *PSI* 1225; cf. *BGU* 1084 = *WChr.* 146 (καθ' ὑπόμνημα πρυτανέων); *P. Berl. Leihgabe* 18 (τὸν τελειωθέντα

διὰ τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξ[ανδ]ρίᾳ πρυτανέων . . . ουστατικόν).

41. See Wilcken, *Archiv* 4, 1907-8, pp. 118-9.

42. Cf. Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 303-14. On financial administration by the ἄρχοντες see also *P. Oxford* 2.

43. In *P. Oxy.* 1025 (= *WChr.* 493) dated by the editors to the late third century, there is a letter from the officials of Euergetis (a gymnasiarch/prytanis, an exegetes, an archiereus and a kosmetes). The identification of Euergetis is

The character of the demos and its relation to the *κωών* in the metropoleis is difficult to define. It is doubtful, indeed, whether the demos existed at all as an administrative unit. There is one piece of evidence for the demos of Oxyrhynchus in the second century. *P. Oxy.* 473 (= *WChr.* 33) is a *ψήφισμα* of the boule and demos about an honour accorded to a gymnasiarch. The evidence of the third century shows the demos of Oxyrhynchus occurring only in the context of recognition of status and conferment of honours (*P. Oxy.* 1407; 41 = *WChr.* 45).⁴⁴ There is no evidence for the second century of the demos ever holding a meeting or taking an administrative decision, and it is tempting to conclude that its appearance in matters connected with conferment of honours is simply a matter of form. Nor is there any evidence as to what its composition might have been; did it consist only of the Greeks of the gymnasial class, or of all the residents of the metropolis? The fact that the tribal system was not instituted until the third century (see below, Appendix II) makes it extremely difficult to visualise how such a body could have been organised.⁴⁵ There is no evidence for it

difficult (for the suggestion that it was another name for Herakleopolis Magna see *P. Oxy.* 2582). The form of prescript looks more appropriate to a *κωών τῶν ἀρχόντων* than to a boule, and a *κωών* and prytaneis are attested in A.D. 47 for a place other than a metropolis or a Greek city (Krokodilopolis, *P. Lond.* 604, [III, p. 70]). In *P. Ryl.* 701, of 305, of unknown provenance, there is a report of proceedings rather different from those of the boule, mentioning τὸ κωών ἡμῶν . . . ἀρχόντων (see below, Chapter II, note 46). The only possible explanations seem to be either that it refers to a *κωών τῶν ἀρχόντων* in a place other than a metropolis, or that it refers to one of the individual *κωά* of magistrates (e.g. the gymnasiarchs), or that some metropoleis had at some period a *κωών τῶν ἀρχόντων* alongside the boule. Finally there is evidence from Karanis of an official who is styled *πρ[υ]τ(ανικῶ) καὶ ἐξη(γητικῶ) ὑπηρέ[τη]* in a document from 296 (*P. Cair. Is.* 99) — the title is attested in the second century, e.g. *P. Mil. Vogl.* 71.26 — and *πρυτανικός* or *πρυτάνεως ὑπηρέτης* in documents from the early fourth century (*P. Cair. Is.* 117; 118; 120, of 309, 310 and 311 respectively). The man in question is issuing receipts for rent in the area of Karanis, and the documents do not seem to be relevant to the official position. Since there is no evidence for prytaneis at Karanis, the documents seem to raise two insoluble problems: (a) is he, in all three, assistant to the prytanis at Arsinoe, the first title merely being an embroidered form of the shorter, more usual one, or does the earliest document reflect a post at some smaller place in the nome which had some kind of a *κωών*? (b) if

the latter, does the difference in title indicate that this institution disappeared during the first decade of the fourth century, or are we to suppose that there were places other than the metropolis which still had a prytanis as late as this? The safest conclusion in view of the lack of any certain evidence is probably that the titles signify the same office, which is to be referred to Arsinoe, but fresh evidence may disprove this. Nonetheless, it does seem likely that there were some places which had a *κωών* at some stage after 200 and the dates of *P. Ryl.* 701 and *P. Oxy.* 1025 suggest the possible explanation that the *κωών* was revived by the reforms of the early fourth century in order to alleviate some of the difficulties in administration. Such a revival will not have lasted very long. It should be noted in this connection that at Panopolis the title *ἀρχιπρυτανίς* is attested in the third century, while the president of the boule is called *πρόεδρος* before this became current practice in other places (see below, pp. 59-60).

44. See below, Chapter II, note 45.

45. The likelihood that there existed an official body called the *ἐκκλησία* is suggested by the occurrence of the word in *P. Strassb.* 254, of the early third century, but the document is so fragmentary as to yield no further information. It would be of particular interest to know whether it had any real administrative responsibility and what were the qualifications for inclusion. A first or second century inscription from Pisidia (Abbott and Johnson, no. 122) attests the division of a citizen body into *βουλευταί*, *ἐκκλησιασταί* and *πολιταί* but there is no evidence for *ἐκκλησιασταί* in Egypt. The occurrence of a *πολιτάρχης* in *P.*

having taken any part in the election of magistrates or liturgists. *P. Ryl.* 77 and *P. Oxy.* 54 suggest that the whole process was in the hands of the serving magistrates, and officials of the central government.⁴⁶

One of the results of the visit of Septimius Severus to Egypt in the winter of 199-200 was that Alexandria was given permission to have a boule (*HA Sev.* 17.2). Although the *HA* does not attest the fact, it is usually assumed that the boulai of the metropoleis were instituted at the same time. The boule of Alexandria came into existence between Pachon 200 and Payni 201. *SB* 7817 contains a complex of documents involving a magistrate of Alexandria who was a Roman citizen; in a document dated to Pachon 200 he is without the title of bouleutes which appears in the main enclosure, dated to Payni 201.⁴⁷

The evidence for the institution of boulai in the metropoleis is a little more difficult. The earliest relevant documents relate to Oxyrhynchus. An unpublished text records proceedings of the boule in the tenth year of Septimius Severus and Caracalla (201-2), but no month-name is preserved.⁴⁸ *P. Strassb.* 254 mentions βουλευτῶν τῆς Ὀξυ[ρύγχων πόλεως but the date is uncertain for several reasons. The document is badly damaged and clearly contains copies or quotations of previous rescripts and decrees. The crucial passage as presented by the editor reads:]. ων θ (ἔτους) ἀθῦρ γ̄ και ε[.]ρι τῶ̄ διέποντι τῆ[ν etc. The ninth year which is mentioned clearly refers to Septimius Severus (200-201) but it seems evident that this date should be connected with what precedes it rather than what follows. The subsequent words look like an address to an official, τῶ̄ διέποντι τῆ[ν e.g. στρατηγίαν, from bouleutai of Oxyrhynchus and the date will have come at the end of this letter. This document, therefore, does not help to determine the earliest date at which the boule of Oxyrhynchus is attested; the earliest date of which we may be certain is 201-2. The fact that *P. Oxy.* 54 (= *WChr.* 34) contains a request for money addressed by epimeletai to two individual magistrates suggests that the inception of the boule should be placed after

Oxy. 145, of the early first century, should be noted and it is clear that the status of πολίτης meant something – probably enrollment in an ἀμφοδοῦν (later a φυλή) was required – but unclear what, if any, political rights were involved.

46. There is no certain evidence for the demos having held meetings in the third century (see below, Chapter II, note 45). A. H. M. Jones, *JEA* 24, 1938, p. 66, thought that the demos elected the magistrates in the metropoleis in the second century but the evidence of *P. Ryl.* 77 suggests that this was in the hands of the serving magistrates. P. Jouguet, "Sur les Métropoles Egyptiennes à la fin du IIe Siècle après J-C," *REG* 30, 1917, pp. 294-328, discussed the position and composition of the demos (pp. 297-300), but could reach no satisfactory conclusion. He

concluded (p. 314) that οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως mentioned in *P. Ryl.* 77.33 were present as "the public," not an official body.

47. The title is not stated to refer to Oxyrhynchus and hence should be connected with Alexandria, especially since the κοινὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων is attested at Oxyrhynchus in Pharmouthi 201 (*P. Oxy.* 54 = *WChr.* 34, see below). On the date of the reforms see W. L. Westermann-A. A. Schiller, *Apokrimata*, 1954, pp. 30-1.


48. To be published by Dr. R. A. Coles in a forthcoming volume of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. The text does not state that it is the boule of Oxyrhynchus which is involved but its provenance, together with the fact that there is no good reason for assigning it elsewhere, is sufficient.

Pharmouthi 201. The boule of Arsinoe first appears in 202-3 (*P. Lond.* 348 [II, p. 215] = *MChr.* 197), that of Herakleopolis in 205 (*CPR* 228).⁴⁹ In sum, therefore, the evidence remains uncertain, but there is a strong probability that the institution of boulai in the metropoleis and at Alexandria were part of the same programme of reform. But there is no evidence to show whether or not the boule of Alexandria was in any way different from the boulai in the metropoleis.⁵⁰

49. The phrase $\text{[ει βουλήν ει τὸ ταμεῖον]}$ occurs in *P. Amh.* 79 (Hermopolis, dated by the editors to ca. 186). It is too mutilated to yield any plausible explanation, but *P. Ryl.* 77 makes it quite clear that there was no boule at Hermopolis in 192.

50. The following is a list of places for which boulai are attested during the Roman period. The century in which they are first attested follows in parentheses. References are provided only for those rarely mentioned. Ptolemais (I); Antinoopolis (II); Alexandria, Oxyrhynchus,

Arsinoe, Hermopolis, Panopolis, Herakleopolis, Athribis (*P. Oxy.* 1458), Koptos (*SB* 7473), Memphis ? (*SB* 8821; 9997), (all III); Naukratis (*P. Gen.* 10), Nikiotonpolis (*BGU* 939, identified with Naukratis by R. Calderini, *Aegyptus* 31, 1951, p. 15), Lykopolis (*P. Berl. Möller* 1), Leontopolis (*SB* 9192, but see below, Chapter II, note 4), Large Oasis (*P. Lips.* 36), Ibis (*MChr.* 78), Hermonthis (*P. Lips.* 9722), Thmuis (*P. Corn.* 20), (all IV).



Chapter Two

The Internal Operation of the Boule

Introduction

There is a lack of coherent evidence for the composition of the boule, for its operation as an administrative unit, and for the officials who worked in close conjunction with it.

There are two areas which are of particular interest. First, determination of the factors which controlled membership of the boule, and second, the relation of the members of the boule to the class of people who performed bouleutic liturgies. The evidence shows that in the third century a distinction must be made between on the one hand, the members of the boule (*βουλευται*), and on the other, people who performed bouleutic liturgies but were not members of the boule; apart from titles connected with the actual posts, the latter have no special designation — they are referred to in the papyri as *ιδιωται*. There is no indication that any connection with the boule or its members was required for eligibility for these posts, and several clear cases show that such status had no relevance. If we choose to refer to the bouleutai as the “bouleutic class,” we must make a clear distinction between it and the larger class of people who were liable to perform bouleutic liturgies. It is this distinction which marks the difference between the “curial” structure in Egypt and that in the *municipia* of the rest of the Empire. The situation in the fourth century is more difficult to determine. There is not enough evidence to permit a firm conclusion that the structure in Egypt changed and became more like that of the other provinces, but there are several indications that this may well have been the case.

Some of the major texts from Oxyrhynchus provide evidence about the protocol of the boule and the “mechanics” of its operation. The documents show that the boule probably met regularly on the thirtieth of the month (although this is subject to some qualification), and that there is no evidence for another regular meeting on a fixed date of the month.

There are a number of officials who appear in the documents relating to the boule. Some of them have functions which are internal to the boule; others are external, but work in close conjunction with it. The prytanis, who was the president of the boule, is the most important of the internal officials. The evidence for the prytanis, which is far more abundant than for any of the other officials connected with the boule, is presented in a separate chapter (III).

The Composition of the Boule and the "Bouleutic Class"

The size of the boulai, both of the metropoleis and the Greek poleis in Egypt, is unknown. Uniformity of size cannot necessarily be assumed since differences in population would prevent the towns from keeping the numbers of bouleutai at a uniform level, in practice if not in theory. It may reasonably be presumed that Alexandria possessed a boule which was larger than any metropolis could maintain. An estimate of 100 members for the boulai of the metropoleis conforms with our knowledge of the smaller *municipia* of the rest of the Empire, but allowance for variation must be made. A question from the prefect in SB 7696.71 about the numbers of certain people in Arsinoe elicits the reply that there are 300 and more; unfortunately, the reading of the word describing these people is totally uncertain — it might be ἐϋ[ποροι or πολ[λείται but since the question is clearly intended to discover the number of people who might be called upon to perform bouleutic liturgies, the suggestion that this fits an estimate of about 100 bouleutai is plausible but undemonstrable.¹

The existence of supernumerary bouleutai at Hermopolis is attested in P.

1. On the size of the senates in the *municipia* see Kfblcr, *RE* IV, 1901, 2323-4. For a boule of 80 members in Macedonia (the figure probably includes an enrollment of supernumerary bouleutai) see *SEG* XIV 479, new edition by J. H. Oliver, *AJP* 79, 1958, pp. 52-60. Note also the foundation of a *curia* at Tymandus in Pisidia, to have fifty decurions at first (Abbott and Johnson, no. 151). For the album of decurions of Canusium (223) and of Tingad (ca. 363) see *ILS* 6121-2 with L. Leschi, "L'Album Municipal de Tingad," *REA* 50, 1948, pp. 71-100; cf. J. H. Oliver, *RIDA* ser. 3.5, 1958, pp. 537-8. Wegener, *Symbolae*, pp. 166-7, 172, calculated that the boulai of the metropoleis had a membership of about 100. Using evidence from Oxyrhynchus, she calculated that each tribe (of which she supposed that there were five) supplied six members including a syndikos and supposed that these "tribal members" constituted the proportion of the bouleutai who were not ἄρχοντες. Since the proportion of bouleutai who were not ἄρχοντες was about one third, in the third century, (*Symbolae*, p. 164), the "tribal members" constituted about a third of the membership of the boule, which was therefore about 100. She further supposed (pp. 172-3) that new tribal members were appointed by *lectio* every *περίοδος* (which she thought was a five-year cycle). Several new pieces of evidence make this theory no longer tenable: (a) it is now known that in the first half of the third century there were six tribes at Oxyrhynchus, that the *περίοδος* was a six-year

cycle (though for a considerable period the tribes doubled up, giving a three-year cycle); see below, Appendix II; (b) the evidence of P. Oxy. 2407 shows clearly that each tribe did not have its own syndikos, see below, pp. 50-52; (c) even if the theory of one syndikos per tribe were abandoned, the evidence that there were five members of the third tribe present at the meeting in P. Oxy. 1413 is not secure. In line 12, the members from the third tribe make nominations; in line 15 somebody states that those who were nominated just now, were nominated by Pheleas and Heraklidion; in lines 16-7 three people are acclaimed. It is not necessarily the case that either the two nominators or the three nominees were present. The nominations could have been prepared beforehand and read from a *πιττάκιον* (cf. P. Oxy. 2130). On the contrary, it seems that the speaker of line 15 (ἴσος καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει), who names the nominators is the only member of the third tribe mentioned in this passage who is actually present. More probably, the members from the tribe were not a fixed number, and appear corporately in meetings only when the tribe has to act as an entity (see below, pp. 24-25); (d) on the argument for one third of the bouleutai not having been ἄρχοντες, see below, p. 29. On the tribes cf. Wegener, *The Phylai*, pp. 518-20. On the ἐϋποροι in SB 7696 (reference to the *editio princeps*, with commentary, in *JEA* 21, 1935, pp. 224-47 is implied in all references to this document), see Wegener, *Symbolae*, p. 172, note 60.

Lips. 18, of the late third or early fourth century, by the title *βουλευτής ὑπὲρ τὸ(ν) ἀριθμὸν [ἱερονίκης]*, but it is impossible to tell whether this was normally reserved as an honour for athletic victors and the like, or whether the boulai were in the habit of recruiting supernumerary members regularly and in considerable numbers.² *P. Lips.* 18 makes it clear that there was a fixed quota of bouleutai.

There is a similar lack of evidence for the methods by which the boulai recruited their ordinary members. In the first instance, no doubt, the composition of the boule was based to a large extent on the *κωὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων* which it replaced, either by direct co-optation or by imperial nomination. It is generally assumed that thereafter the membership was kept up by co-optation, although there is no direct evidence for this; election to the boule is mentioned in an ambiguous phrase in *P. Bas.* 16: *ἰγὰρ ὀνομάσθη εἰς τὴν βουλὴν*, which gives no evidence for the method of election.³ We know that in Oxyrhynchus a system of *περίοδοι* of tribes for liturgical service began to operate in 206-7 (see Appendix II), and the presence of *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης φυλῆς* at a meeting (*P. Oxy.* 1413.12) indicates that to some extent membership was based on tribal representation.⁴ There is no evidence for any formal *lectio* of the boule and it seems likely that vacancies were filled as they arose.⁵

There is one occurrence in the papyri of a *λεύκωμα βουλευτικόν* (*SB* 7261, assigned by Wilcken to the early fourth century⁶); presumably such an album

2. Cf. Dio of Prusa, *Or.* 45.7; Pliny, *Ep.* 10.39.5; 112-3; *SEG* XIV 479 (see above, note 1).

3. A. H. M. Jones, "The Election of the Metropolitan Magistrates in Egypt," *JEA* 24, 1938, pp. 65-72, thought that in *P. Oxy.* 1413.4 the meeting was asked to nominate people for membership of the boule. In fact it is asked to nominate bouleutai as exegetai, cf. Wegener, *Symbolae*, pp. 163-4; Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, pp. 66-7. For co-optation of the first boulai cf. *JEA* 12, 1926, p. 116. The assumption is that co-optation means that existing members of the boule nominate new members, but *contra* Garnsey, *op. cit.* (Chapter I, note 12), p. 422, who holds (without specific reference to Egypt) that bouleutai were normally enrolled by the magistrates, cf. the *Tabula Heracleensis* (Abbott and Johnson, no. 24) of 45 B.C. where there is provision for election of decurions by the magistrates and in the popular assembly (lines 83 ff., 132 ff.). In *BGU* 936 (= *WChr.* 123), of 426, an Oxyrhynchite is described as *ὑποβληθεὶς βουλευτής* but there is no indication of the method of election.

5. Wegener, *Symbolae*, pp. 172-4, thought that there was a *lectio* every five years for "tribal members" (see above, note 1), but that membership was probably hereditary for the sons

of bouleutai who were *ἄρχοντες*; that the Ion who is nominated as exegetes, probably as a minor, in *P. Oxy.* 1413.9 ff. was present as a member of this class, but without voting rights. However, there is no necessity to conclude that he was actually present at all. She applied the same reasoning to the sequence of events in 1413.12 ff.: *ὀνομάσατε δὲ καὶ βουλευτάς*, followed by a nomination and the statement *ἐπιτηρήσει Νεῖδος βουλευτής*, suggesting that it was unlikely that the instructions to nominate bouleutai were disregarded, and that the nominee must be both a minor and a bouleutes. However, it is more logical to suppose that the instructions were disregarded and that, as a compensation, a bouleutes was appointed as overseer (which explains the emphatic use of the title *βουλευτής*, not elsewhere used in this document). It should be noted that the album of Canisium (*ILS* 6121) contains the names of 25 *praetextati*, who are probably not members of the *curia* but only of the *ordo*.

6. Wilcken, *Archiv* 8, 1927, p. 314. A dating to the beginning of the third century was suggested in the *editio princeps* (*JEA* 12, 1926, pp. 116-9). Wilcken's suggestion is perhaps not to be regarded as certain. It was based on (a) the hand, (b) the fact that the distinction between *δημοικαὶ ὑπηρεσίαι* and *βουλευτικαὶ λειτουργίαι* does not

existed from the date of the inception of the boulai (cf. the *λεύκωμα ἀρχόντων* in *P. Oxy.* 2407.7, of the late third century).

There is no very clear indication in the documents that the body of bouleutai was divided into sections by status or seniority. In *SB* 7696.74 there is a reference to the younger bouleutai (*νεώτεροι*), but it is impossible to be certain that this represents a formal division of the bouletic body, since it could equally well be understood as a purely descriptive term. The titlature *βουλευτῆς πρεσβύτατος* of Alexandria (*P. Giss.* 34.2 = *MChr.* 75) looks like an official designation, but there is no attestation of the term for a bouletes of a metropolis. The position of the *δεκάπρωτοι* (*decemprimi*) as the ten leading members of the *curia* which appears to have obtained in other parts of the Empire cannot be posited for Egypt. The Egyptian *δεκάπρωτοι* shared with their counterparts a responsibility for the collection of taxes, but the evidence suggests that they were not even necessarily bouleutai.⁷ In the Theodosian Code the leading members of the municipal cadre are referred to as *principales* and this title is known to have existed at Alexandria. It cannot necessarily be assumed that the Alexandrian *principales* had counterparts in the *chora*, but it might be suggested that the term *πρεσβύτατος* expresses the same idea. Further, the title *πολιτευόμενος* which came into use in the metropoleis towards the end of the third century is probably not a synonym for *prytanis*, but rather another way of expressing the connotation of the word *principalis*.⁸

The position of the members from the tribes who are mentioned in the meetings of the boule reported in *P. Oxy.* 1413 and 1415 is not clearly defined. There are two possibilities; either there was a certain quota of places in the boule which were reserved for members especially chosen from the tribes, or the whole membership of the boule was dependent upon the tribal structure (see Appendix II), and elections to the boule would be influenced by this consideration. On the whole, the latter is favoured by the fact that the evidence does not show any clear difference between the members from the tribes and the other bouleutai. In the

appear until the fourth century (but *ἰππρέται* appear much earlier, of course, cf. below, p. 42 and *P. Vars.* 15) and (c) the opinion that an album of bouleutai fits the "municipal" structure after Diocletian better than the "griechische Ratsordnung" of Septimius Severus. This can hardly be regarded as conclusive and since evasion of liturgical responsibility is attested throughout the period, the document could equally well be referred to the late third century. Recruitment of new bouleutai will have been a constant process and we need not suppose that the document has to refer to one specific, large accretion of bouleutai.

7. For the functions of the *δεκάπρωτοι* see G. E. Bean, T. B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia in 1962 and 1963*, 1965, no. 29a (= *IGRR*

III 833a) where a man is described as *δεκαπρω]τεύσαντος πλειστά[κικς] ἐπὶ τῆ[ς εἰσαγωγῆς τῶν κυριακῶν φόρων πιστῶς*, cf. Jones, *LRE*, pp. 729-31; E. G. Turner, "Egypt and the Roman Empire: the *δεκάπρωτοι*," *JEA* 22, 1936, pp. 7-19.

8. See below, Appendix III. For the Alexandrian *principales* see *C. Theod.* 12.1.126 (392), 189 (436). The "quinque primates ordinis Alexandrini" of *C. Theod.* 12.1.190 (436) are presumably all or a portion of the *principales*. It is worth considering the possibility that they have their origin in the prytaneis who are attested in the second century (e.g. *P. Berl. Leihgabe* 18) and perhaps survived into the third century (*P. Vindob. Boswinkel* 7), see below, Chapter III, note 35.

debate in *P. Oxy.* 1415, when the members from the tribe which is responsible for the performance of liturgies are called upon to nominate someone for a post, they put forward one Ptolemaios, who is a member of that tribe and already holds the post of ἀρχιερεύς. If he is a bouleutes, as his presence at the meeting suggests, there is no ground for holding that the members from the tribes formed a minority in the boule and were distinguished from the majority by the fact that they had not been ἀρχοντες. The evidence most naturally leads to the conclusion that all tribes were represented in the boule by some method of weighting; this is given additional support by the fact that the members from a certain tribe only appear as a block in situations where the tribe is responsible for the performance of liturgies.⁹ In the same way the exegetai are called upon in *P. Oxy.* 1413 to make nominations for the ἐξηγητεία; the most natural supposition is not that they formed a special section of the boule, but that they were ordinary members who were exegetai and only acted as a corporate entity when the situation required. But we cannot discount the possibility that on the occasion of elections the whole κοινόν of exegetai (whether bouleutai or not) would be present.

This hypothesis is consonant with the fact that there is no evidence for *lectio* of the boule, and that the position of bouleutes, once attained, lasted until death. The term γενόμενος when attached to the title bouleutes seems to be applied only to people who are dead, and the attestations of people as bouleutai over a number of years, or as prytaneis twice or more in a period of a few years support this conclusion.¹⁰ It is probably to be assumed that there was a minimum age for entry to the boule, but there is no evidence as to what it was. It seems unlikely that a candidate for membership of the boule was required to have served in any post before he could become a member.¹¹

Apart from qualifications of status and wealth (which are discussed on pages 28 ff., below), there were probably certain requirements which a bouleutes had to fulfil. A residence in the metropolis was probably required, although there was clearly no objection to bouleutai owning property elsewhere as well. A person who was not a native of the metropolis could become a member of its boule (see, for example, an Antinoite who was a bouleutes of Oxyrhynchus in *SB* 7814), but

9. The status of Ptolemaios and his presence at the meeting are open to doubt since non-members did attend (see below, pp. 38-39). If he was a bouleutes we will have to suppose that his father, with whom he lived, was probably not a bouleutes (see below, note 60), but that is not particularly difficult. It is to be noted that even if he is not a bouleutes, there is no demonstration that the members "from the tribes" were not ἀρχοντες. οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς φυλῆς appear in *P. Oxy.* 1413; 1415, see above, note 1.

10. Aurelius Euporos — Agathodaimon (*BGU* 1073 = *MChr.* 198; 1074; *P. Oxy.* 1413), Aurelius Apollonios — Dionysios (*P. Oxy.* 55 =

WChr. 196; 59; *P. Flor.* 63; *PSI* 705), Aurelius Hierakion — Dionysios (*P. Corn.* 45; *P. Oxy.* 1104; 2665). On the term γενόμενος see below, Appendix I, note 32. In *PSI* 1160 (= *CPJ* 150), the Alexandrians appear to be asking for a boule of which the membership would change yearly.

11. Cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 10.79-80 for the establishment of a minimum age of 30 in Bithynia by the *lex Pompeia*. On bouleutai who had not held any office, see below, pp. 29-30. There seems to have been no maximum age, for there is a bouleutes of 61 mentioned in *P. Lond.* 348 (II, p. 215) = *MChr.* 197, of 202-3.

a residence qualification was probably necessary. In an imperial order for a levy on the nome (*P. Oxy.* 2106, of the early fourth century), it is stated that no burden is to be laid on strangers *εἰ μὴ ἄρα τὸ ἐφέστ[ιον] αὐτοὶ κατεστήσαντο καὶ μηδέπω ἐπολιτεύσαντο εὐποροὶ τε ὄντ[ε]ς τυγχάνουσιν* (i.e. unless they have a residence, have not yet been bouleutai and are rich),¹² suggesting a connection between residence and eligibility for election to the boule. Membership of the boule of a metropolis and of a Greek polis simultaneously is attested by many examples of people who were bouleutai of Alexandria and Oxyrhynchus, but there is no example of a person holding membership of two boulai of metropoleis at the same time.¹³ A restoration of a document, if correct, which describes a man as formerly bouleutes of Arsinoe, but now bouleutes of Leontopolis, would suggest that membership of a second boule was possible provided that the original membership were dropped.¹⁴

Other requirements are less easy to define. It seems that in the early fourth century, at least, it was possible to be a bouleutes without being literate.¹⁵ The evidence of an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus of 233 (*P. Oxy. Ined.* 12) shows that entrants to the boule were required to pay an entrance fee (*εἰσιτήριον*). The document contains a receipt from the *τάμιαις βουλευτικῶν χρημάτων* (see below, pages 41-42) addressed to the heirs of a deceased bouleutes who are paying interest at the rate of 100 drachmas per month on the *εἰσιτήριον*. If this is calculated at the normal rate of 12 per cent the principal will have been the very considerable sum of 10,000 drachmas. Each bouleutes would presumably pay this only once, but in cases like the present one where the man was unable or unwilling to pay the whole sum on entry the interest would provide the boule

12. That the bouleutai had residence in the metropolis is suggested by *SB* 7696.72-4. Segrè, *Byzantion* 15, 1940-1, p. 276, thought that *μηδέπω ἐπολιτεύσαντο* in *P. Oxy.* 2106 meant "had not been *curiales*" (as opposed to *decuriones*), but see below, pp. 27, 31, and cf. *P. Amh.* 82 where a man who describes himself as *οὐδὲ πολιτευσάμενόν ποτε* had served a bouleutic liturgy.

13. For examples of people who were bouleutai of Alexandria and Oxyrhynchus, see below, p. 58, and cf. Marcus Aurelius Asklepiades—Hermodoros of Hermopolis (on whom see Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 130 ff.).

14. *SB* 9192 (originally published in *JEA* 23, 1937, pp. 211 ff.). The restoration suggested is *τῶν βουλευσάντων [τῆς Ἀρσινουειῶν πόλεως νυν] βουλευτοῦ τῆς Λεοντοπολιτικῶν πόλεως*. The date is about 325. The editor, supported by Wilcken (*Archiv* 13, 1939, p. 231), suggested that the Leontopolis mentioned was not the metropolis, but a new foundation in the Arsinoite Nome which

drew its bouleutai from Arsinoe, thus explaining the word *βουλευσάντων*. This seems to be an uneconomical use of the evidence, and it would be strange to find a nome with two boulai, one of which was set up after Diocletian. It is hardly more difficult to suppose that a group of bouleutai had moved from one metropolis to another (if, indeed, the restoration is right). And the involvement of the logistes of the Arsinoite Nome is clearly dependent on some previous transaction about which the document is not explicit. For evidence of the transference of bouleutai from Nicaea to Basiliopolis by Julian see Jones, *CERP*, p. 426, note 35.

15. Two bouleutai who are illiterate appear in *P. Thead.* 32, of 307. No conclusion may be drawn from *PSI* 716, of 306 (?): *...βουλευένω ἀγράμματον*, cf. *C. Just.* 10.32.6 (293): "Expertes litterarum decurionis munera peragere non prohibent iura." For the supposed illiteracy of the prytanis Apollonios—Dionysios of *P. Flor.* 63 see *BL* 1, p. 144.

with a regular income.¹⁶

The evidence which is available for the definition of the "bouleutic class" in Egypt is extremely tenuous. In the *municipia* of the rest of the Empire, the curial class comprised the *decuriones* of the senates and their families. Membership in the curial class was hereditary in practice if not in theory also, since status and wealth would naturally be inherited (except that the qualifications were subject to periodic review, and promotions or demotions would presumably be made accordingly). In addition, the membership of the senates was augmented from time to time by the enrollment of supernumerary senators.¹⁷ It is difficult to define the precise difference between the titles *curialis* and *decurio*. In dealing with fourth-century Antioch, Petit came to the conclusion that there was, in fact, no difference between the terms *curialis*, *decurio*, *βουλευτής* and *πολιτευόμενος*; the leading members of the municipal administration were the *curiales* and they were all members of the senate (*decuriones*).¹⁸

The creation of the boule as an organ of municipal bureaucracy in the metropoleis of Egypt is an operation which is paralleled in the Romanisation of some of the eastern provinces, but it is unique in two respects. In no other place does the quantity and quality of the available evidence approach that of Egypt. And the creation of a municipal bureaucracy of this nature in a country which had been under Roman administration for over two centuries is without parallel.¹⁹ Before 200, the metropoleis did have a bureaucracy and an administrative elite in the *κοινὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων*, but they are not comparable to the boulai in terms of the extent of their powers and ramifications. It is therefore of some interest to discover, if possible, similarities and differences in the curial structure of Egypt as compared with the rest of the Empire.

The term *βουλευτικός* is frequently used in the papyri in connection with liturgical service (e.g. *βουλευτικαὶ λειτουργίαι*, *πόρος βουλευτικός*, SB 7261; *βουλευτικὸν φρόντισμα*, PSI 684), yet the evidence is not clear enough to enable us to define precisely what bouleutic status was. The liturgies with which the term

16. On the entrance fee see above, page 9. In certain cases it might be remitted, cf. *CIL* III 282 (Galatia, 145), mentioning a *προῖκα βουλευτής* and *ILS* 6296 (Italy, 193), "ob merito patris honorem decurionatus gratuitum." *P. Ryl.* 77.37 mentions an *εἰσιτήριον* for an *ἐξηγητεία*, which is presumably distinct from the crown-money which was also levied on such magistracies. In the third century the latter went to the *πολιτικὸς λόγος*, see below, pp. 43-4, 93. Analogy would suggest that in the second century the *εἰσιτήριον* was retained by the *κοινὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων* whilst the crown-money went to the city fund.

17. On the curial class in the empire see Jones, *GC*, pp. 179 ff.; *LRE* pp. 737-57; Kübler, *RE* IV, 1901, 2319 ff. (*decurio*), Garnsey, *op. cit.*

(Chapter I, note 12), pp. 486-563; R. Ganghoffer, *L'Evolution des Institutions Municipales en Occident et en Orient au Bas-Empire*, 1963, pp. 54-8, 135-51;

18. P. Petit, *Libanius et la Vie Municipale à Antioche au IVe Siècle après J-C*, 1955, p. 31. It should be emphasised that this is not the usual view. Garnsey and Ganghoffer, *loc. cit.* (above, note 17) see the structure as *decuriones* = bouleutai, *curiales* = bouleutai + their families. So in Canusium (*ILS* 6121) the 25 *praetextati* on the album will be *curiales* but not *decuriones*.

19. Isolated examples may be observed, e.g. the creation of a boule at Tymandus in Pisidia (Abbott and Johnson, no. 151).

βουλευτικός is connected existed before 200; some qualification was required, but we may presume that the term was not used, since, with the exception of Ptolemais and Antinoopolis, there were no boulai in Egypt.²⁰

We may therefore begin our inquiry about the nature of the "bouletic class" with the liturgies. In the period before 200 we know that there were required πόροι for the various liturgies. Oertel schematized the social structure of Egypt and showed the correspondence of his divisions to the qualification of personal wealth. The three top classes are: (a) *honestiores* of Alexandria, (b) *honestiores* in the metropoleis, i.e. "Greeks" in the gymnasial class, and (c) Greco-Egyptians from the towns and villages. These classes comprise the social and economic élite who are found performing the major liturgies. There is no information as to what the amount of required πόρος was for bouletic liturgies after 200, although we have a good idea of which liturgies were bouletic ones.²¹ It has been shown (above, page 22) that there were probably more than three hundred people in Arsinoe at a given time who had the qualifications to perform bouletic liturgies. In *P. Oxy.* 1415 a man who already holds a bouletic liturgy describes himself, in attempting to avoid nomination to another one, as a man of moderate means — μέτρώς εἰμι, παρὰ πατρὶ τρέφομα[ι] (line 22) — but this may safely be regarded as an understatement.

The gymnasiarchs were drawn exclusively from the class of οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γυμνασίου.²² The exact nature of the gymnasial class has not been determined, but the evidence seems to show that it was a privileged class of people of Greek extraction, of which the purity was preserved by an exacting ἐπίκρισις, in which a candidate for entry to the gymnasium had to prove that his ancestors had been through the same process. The relation of the gymnasial class to the μητροπολίται δωδεκάδραχμοι, another privileged class, is not entirely clear.²³ The evidence does not show to what extent, if at all, the other bouletic liturgies were restricted to members of the gymnasial class. In the case of the nomination of villagers as kosmetai in *SB* 7696 we have evidence that ιδιώται as well as bouleutai were called upon to perform the office. The nomination of villagers, who by definition could not be members of the metropolitan gymnasial class, was strictly illegal, but in practice the boule must have had some chance of getting away with such an infringement.²⁴ In such cases it would presumably nominate people who had

20. See above, pp. 11-15. No doubt the property qualification was the main requirement, cf. Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 361-2.

21. Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 361-2. For bouletic liturgies see the information under the various liturgies *ibid.* and in Lewis, *ICS*. Elsewhere the bouletic census was 100,000 or 120,000 HS; Garnsey, *op. cit.* (Chapter I, note 12), pp. 356 ff. opts for the higher figure. The relevant evidence is Pliny, *Ep.* 1.19.2; Dio 72.16.3; Suetonius, *Aug.* 41.1.

22. B. A. van Groningen, *Le Gymnasiarque*

des Métropoles de l'Égypte Romaine, 1924, pp. 38-41.

23. Mertens, *Les Services*, pp. 124-8. He thinks that the μητροπολίται δωδεκάδραχμοι were a privileged class lower than the gymnasial class. Hence one could belong to the former without belonging to the latter, whilst the reverse was not possible.

24. For difficulties in obtaining a legitimate release see *P. Amh.* 82 with N. Lewis, "Miscellanea Papyrologica," *Chronique d'Égypte* 29, 1954, pp. 288-98; *P. Oxy.* 2854.

sufficient *πόρος*.

A large proportion of the bouleutic liturgies was certainly performed by people who were not bouleutai. The calculations of Preisigke showed that of 127 such officials, only 45 were attested bouleutai; even with the allowance of a generous margin for possible omission of titles, the number who were bouleutai can hardly have been greater than half. Many of the bouleutic liturgies are known to have been open to women and minors.²⁵

Conversely, there were probably some bouleutai in the boule at any given time who had not held any of the major bouleutic liturgies. The proportion of such people in the boule has perhaps been overstated, since account has not generally been taken of the likelihood that the titles have simply been omitted.²⁶ In *SB* 7696.74 it is stated that all of the younger bouleutai have been either agoranomos or kosmetes, but since the statement is made precisely to give the impression that there were no bouleutai available for liturgies, it may well be, if not a positive untruth, at least an exaggeration of the normal situation. There is no evidence for any regulation that entrants to the boule had to have held posts before becoming bouleutai, and it is quite likely that there were some who did not hold posts in this category for some time after they had become bouleutai, though probably not so many as the statistics have suggested. This supposition lends sense to the expression which is found in addresses to and from the boule, *ἄρχοντες βουλή*, and to the phrase *τῶν ἐκ βουλῆς ἀρχόντων* (*P. Berl. Möller* 1.4). We must therefore regard the bouleutai and the *ἄρχοντες* as overlapping, but not identical groups.²⁷

Two groups must therefore be distinguished: (a) the bouleutai, including some people who had not served any of the major bouleutic liturgies, as well as many who had, and (b) those people who had served major bouleutic liturgies, of whom some, but by no means all, were bouleutai. It has been surmised that for the latter a minimum *πόρος* was required, and that, at least in the case of the gymnasiarchs, membership of the gymnasial class was necessary in addition. More caution is required in dealing with the first group. We may assume safely that the

25. F. Preisigke, *Städtisches Beamtenwesen im römischen Aegypten*, 1903, p. 47. For bouleutic liturgies open to women and minors see for example the entries in Lewis, *ICS*, s.v. *ἐπικρίτης, δεκάπρωτος*.

26. Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 358-63, commented on this modifying factor. Wegener, *Symbolae*, p. 164 calculated that in the third century one third of the bouleutai were not *ἄρχοντες*, and that in the Byzantine period only 40 of 140 were *ἄρχοντες*. The former is more credible — in the album of Canusium (*ILS* 6121) there are 32 *pedani* (people who have not held office, see Aulus Gellius 3.18), but the latter seems less likely and is probably due to an even greater laxity in titulature. That the

proportion of non-*ἄρχοντες* was considerably less than one third is suggested by the fact that in *P. Oxy. ined.* 1 only three out of the seventeen bouleutai whose names and titles can be read have no title apart from *bouleutes*.

27. Wegener, *Symbolae*, pp. 165-6 tried to show that after the last decades of the third century the title *ἄρχων* and *bouleutes* were synonymous, but this is not consistent with the available evidence, although the expressions *ἀπό βουλῆς* and *ἐξ ἀρχόντων* in *P. Oxy.* 2664.11,14 seem to be equivalent. Wegener has to regard the combination of titles *ἄρχας πολιτευόμενος*, common in the fourth century, as hyperbolic.

property qualification was essential, but it seems likely that there was some additional requirement for eligibility to be a member of the boule. There is no direct evidence as to what that requirement was, but it seems likely to have been membership of the gymnasial class.

These two groups together constitute what we normally call the bouletic class, but the documentary terminology provides no justification for this. The term *βουλευτικὸν τάγμα* does not occur in the papyri. The only distinction made is between bouleutai and *ιδιώται*, (*P. Oxy.* 2664; *SB* 7696.69 ff., where *ιδιώται* refers to those people who are not bouleutai but who possess sufficient *πόρος* for bouletic liturgies).²⁸

It remains to consider whether there is any evidence in Egypt for a hereditary structure in the bouletic class. So far as group (b) is concerned (excluding for the moment bouleutai and holders of offices like the gymnasium for which membership of the gymnasial class was essential), the answer ought to be simply that the crucial factor was possession of the *πόρος*, and that eligibility was not determined with reference to ancestry; since wealth was inherited, there would doubtless be a considerable number of people who would follow their fathers into this class. It would be hard to find direct evidence to support this supposition, but the fact that there is no case of disqualification from, or claim of ineligibility for, a bouletic liturgy on the ground of inadequate ancestry is perhaps a sufficient indication. If we are to regard this group as part of the bouletic class, there can be little doubt that membership was not, in the formal sense inherited.²⁹

As for the people who were bouleutai or were eligible for membership of the boule, there must have been a strong hereditary tendency since eligibility for the gymnasial class was inherited. In addition, the property qualification would have to be met and, as in the case of group (b), it would often be inherited. To this extent there is probably not much difference between group (a), i.e. bouleutai and people eligible to be bouleutai, and the curial class in the *municipia* of the rest of the Empire. But there is no evidence for *lectio* of the boule in Egypt, so promotion and demotion to and from this class might have been a continual process on the basis of class and property qualification.³⁰

In sum, the evidence or lack of it enjoins caution in dealing with the "bouletic class" of the third century. The class of people who were bouleutai, or eligible to be such, probably bore more resemblance to the curial class of the rest

28. For an occurrence of the term *βουλευτικὸν τάγμα* in Cilicia, see *IGRR* III 833b (probably late second century). The term is not attested at all in Egypt — the word *τάγμα* occurs in *SB* 7696.112 and *P. Oxy.* 891, but almost certainly refers to a *κοινὸν* of magistrates. In *SB* 7261 there occurs the phrase . . .]κηγ ἀξίαν, restored by the editors, certainly correctly, as *βουλευτικὴ*, meaning "bouletic rating," (see below, note 32).

29. The obvious hereditary tendency is exemplified in *P. Oxy.* 1413.9-10, where Ion is exhorted to take the office held by his grandfather.

30. Cf. notes 5, 23 above. Garnsey, *op. cit.* (Chapter I, note 12), pp. 486-563, concluded that while the curial class was never closed, membership naturally tended to be hereditary during prosperity and that this principle was enforced by the government in difficult times.

of the Empire than did the whole of the class which was liable for the performance of bouletic liturgies (i.e. groups (a) and (b) together).

There is even less evidence for the situation in the fourth century. The most notable phenomenon is the appearance towards the end of the third century of the term *πολιτευόμενος* as a synonym for bouletes, and its corollaries *προπολιτευόμενος* (on which see Appendix III), *οἱ πολιτευόμενοι* (*P. Lips.* 34), *τὸ κοινὸν τῶν πολιτευομένων* (*P. Mert.* 43). Is the lack of distinction between bouletes, *πολιτευόμενος*, *decurio* and *curialis*, which has been postulated on the basis of the evidence for Antioch (see above, page 27), demonstrable for Egypt? The most that can be said is that there is no person with the title *πολιτευόμενος* who is demonstrably *not* a bouletes, and that the occurrence of the term *πατρόβουλος* in a fourth-century document (*P. Lond.* 971 [III, p. 128] = *MChr.* 95) in connection with the performance of a liturgy suggests that the curial structure in Egypt was closer to that in the *municipia* of the rest of the Empire in the fourth century than in the third.³¹ There is a reference in an imperial law addressed to the prefect of Egypt in 380 to the *ordo curialis* (*C. Theod.* 12.1.80), but this does not imply that it was precisely the same as elsewhere.

The evidence of Libanius, and the many laws in *C. Theod.* 12.1 referring to attempts to avoid curial status and its consequent burdens, suggest strongly that the prestige of the curial class deteriorated severely in the fourth century. In Egypt, attempts to evade liturgy are a common feature in the third century as well as the fourth.³² One method by which liturgy could legally be avoided was the process of *cessio bonorum* (e.g. *CPR* 20 = *WChr.* 402), but even this did not always prove to be completely effective (see *SB* 7696.94-5, below, pages 111-112). In *P. Oxy.* 1415.5-6 there is a mention of a bouletes who was performing an *ἐπιμέλεια* but who had absconded. Less drastic methods of evasion are in evidence in *SB* 9597, of the late fourth century, in which a prytanis of Herakleopolis complains that bouleutai have left the city in order to avoid duties connected with the *annona militaris*.

It is perhaps worth asking why membership of the boule was valued at all, since it entailed an unwelcome expenditure of time and money. That it was valued is suggested by the fact that deprivation of *βουλεία* is a punishment *ἕαν* *βουλευτῆς τὸν [πρύτανω ἢ βουλευ]τὴν τύψη ἢ μέμψ[ητα]ι* (*P. Oxy.* 1406, of the

31. Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, p. 219, concluded from *P. Lips.* 57 (of 261), where a son of a bouletes appears to have no official status derived therefrom, that there was no "curial class" in the third century. The argument is weak but the lack of other evidence makes the conclusion impossible to refute. On the term *πατρόβουλος* see I. Lévy, "Les ΠΑΤΡΟΒΟΥΛΟΙ dans l'Épigraphie Grecque et la Littérature Talmudique," *Rev. de Phil.* 26, 1902, pp. 273 ff. The evidence of *P. Lond.* 971 shows that in the fourth century there were certain

liturgies which were performable only by bouleutai: ὁ γὰρ μὴ βουλευῶν τοιαύτην λειτουργίαν (i.e. ἐπιμέλεια κριθῆς) ἰφίστασθαι οὐ δύναται.

32. See above, pp. 10-11. In *SB* 7261 (see above, note 6), an unidentified official complains that people of bouletic status are using it to avoid *δημοτικαὶ ἰπηρεσίαι*, whilst avoiding bouletic liturgies by virtue of not yet having been enrolled on the album of bouleutai (see above, notes 6 and 28).

reign of Caracalla). Not that this was the case only in Egypt — in the late third or early fourth century a boule was set up at Tymandus in Pisidia in response to a request from the local citizens “pollicentibus quod apud se decurionum sufficiens futura sit copia” (Abbott and Johnson, no. 151). The grant of permission to set up a *curia* with fifty decurions and provision for a later increase perhaps indicates the suspicion that such zeal might be short-lived. Undoubtedly the privilege of better treatment at law was also a strong attraction.³³ It may be significant of the decline in value of bouleutic status that in *P. Oxy.* 1101, of 367-70, it is stated that a bouleutes who has recourse to the *praepositus* in a purely civil matter is subject not to deprivation of *βουλευία* but to confiscation of property. For the third century, the value placed upon bouleutic status was probably due partly to the legal privileges which it entailed and partly to the fact that avoidance of membership of the boule was not a guarantee of the possibility of avoiding liturgy, since a mere sufficiency of wealth would bring liability for liturgy. In fact, avoidance of these burdens might more easily be effected from within the boule than from without. This is suggested by the fact that in *P. Oxy.* 1413 the boule is asked to nominate bouleutai *as well* for the post of exegetes (meaning, presumably, as well as *ιδιώται*),³⁴ and by the suspicion which is apparent in *SB* 7696. 69 ff. that not all the bouleutai had served liturgies. The attraction of being a member of the administrative cadre, which must have been quite strong in the early third century, would not have diminished if avoidance of membership did not guarantee a reduction in the expenditure of time and money required from people who had the correct qualification.

The Meetings of the Boule

The meetings of the boule were held in the *βουλευτηρίων*.³⁵ The following is a list of recorded meetings or references to meetings of the boule.³⁶

WChr. 27, Antinoopolis; second century, no date.

Archiv 4, 1907-8, pp. 115-7, Antinoopolis; 258, after Mecheir 15 (the date of a letter read at the meeting).

SB 7696.40 ff., Arsinoe; probably 249; contains a reference to a meeting on Mesore 30.³⁷

33. See e.g. *C. Just.* 9.47.12; 10.32.4; cf. G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, 1965, pp. 148-9.

34. See above, note 3.

35. See *P. Oxy.* 1412; 2228.32 and note; for the word as a synonym of the boule, *P. Oxy.* 2110; *BGU* 1027 (= *WChr.* 424). Other terms used to denote the boule and its meetings are *συνέδριον* (*C. P. Herm.* 7 2, see below, p. 33); *σύνδοξος* (*P. Oxy.* 1412); *κοινὸν τῶν πολιτευομένων* (*P. Mert.* 43); *κοινότης τοῦ βουλευτηρίου* (*P. Mert.* 90); *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς βουλῆς* (*P. Oxy.* ined. 17).

36. For an example from the Ptolemaic period see *SB* 7403, of the reign of Philadelphus or Euergetes, from Ptolemais, see above, pp. 11, 12. Compare the extract ἀπὸ ἄκτων βουλῆς Πετραίων τῆς μητροπόλεως, of 124, quoted by H. J. Polotsky, “Greek Papyri from the Cave of Letters,” *IEJ* 12, 1962, p. 260 and *OGIS* 595.20 ff. (Tyre, 277), ἀπὸ ἄκτων βουλῆς ἀχθείσης followed by the reading of a letter and discussion.

37. The inference of a meeting on the 28th (*JEA* 21, pp. 242-3) seems to me to be incorrect. The sequence in lines 39 ff. should be the

BGU 144, Arsinoe; III, no date. Memorandum of a partial meeting.

BGU 925 (= *WChr.* 37), Herakleopolis; III, no date.

C. P. Herm. 1, Hermopolis; 266-8 (?).

SP XX 60, Hermopolis; 244-9.

C. P. Herm. 7 1, Hermopolis; probably early III, no date.³⁸

C. P. Herm. 7 2, Hermopolis; probably early III, no date. Reference to a partial meeting?³⁹

P. Univ. Gen. Inv. 1132, provenance unknown; III, no date.^{39a}

P. Harr. 129, provenance unknown; III, no date.

P. Ross.-Georg. II 40, provenance unknown; III, no date.

P. Princ. 71, provenance unknown; III, no date. Reference to an incident at a meeting?

From Oxyrhynchus:

P. Oxy. ined., synoptical minutes of meetings on the 16th and 30th of an unnamed month, 201-2.⁴⁰

P. Erl. 18, Phaophi 30, 248.⁴¹

P. Oxy. 2130, Mecheir 30, 267.

P. Oxy. 1413, not dated (probably between Thoth 4 and 11, reign of Aurelian, see Appendix II).

P. Oxy. 1414, not dated (probably shortly before Mecheir 30, reign of Aurelian, see Appendix II); also contains a reference (line 21) to a partial meeting, to be distinguished from the meeting of which 1414 is a report.⁴²

P. Oxy. 1412, ca. 284; a *πρόσκλητος βουλή* summoned on the 15th of a month, perhaps for the same day.⁴³

following: Apollonides did the sealing (on Mesore 28, cf. line 51), and the prytanis was not present — there is no reason to assume that this had to be done at a meeting of the boule; the prefect says, "But the prytanis was present when the boule made the nomination . . . ?" (i.e. on Mesore 30, at the meeting); answer, "[Yes but he went away] when the nomination began." The sealing is probably then a process done before the meeting, in this case by the prytanis-designate.

38. For a new edition see Jouguet, *VM*, p. 363. Dated to ca. 212 to 242-3 by Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 132-3, on the ground that it ought to be close in date to *C. P. Herm.* 7 2; the latter is dated by reference to Marcus Aurelius Asklepiades—Hermodoros, but he could very easily have acquired the Roman names before the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, being a distinguished athlete (compare his father, who also had them). Considering that he was one of Hermopolis' most distinguished sons, he is quite likely to have been one of the first, though not the first, prytanis of the boule, see *C. P. Herm.* 7 2.10.

39. See above, note 38.

39a. *Tetraonyma*, Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medioevale, Genoa, 1966, pp. 271-4. The text is not recognised by the editor as a report of proceedings of a boule. In line 9 read *πρύτανις εἴ(πεν)*, lines 10 and 15 *εἴ(πεν)*.

40. See above, p. 18.

41. For a new edition see Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 312-3.

42. Wegener, *Symbolae*, p. 184, thought that the reference to a *πρόσκλητος* boule in line 29 referred to the meeting mentioned in line 21, rather than to the meeting of which the document is a report; thus supposing that there were two meetings on the same day, a special, partial one, and a regular one. But if there were a regular meeting scheduled for the same day it seems unlikely that the prytanis would have gone to the trouble of holding a partial meeting to expedite a nomination, if the gain were only a few hours. It seems more likely that the *πρόσκλητος* meeting of line 29 is the meeting of which *P. Oxy.* 1414 is the report.

43. Ἐ[α οὖν π]άντες ἔκοντες [ὦσι?] βουλευταὶ τοῦτο γνῶντες ἐν τῇ σήμερο[ν] ἡ[τ]ίς ἐστ[ί]ν ιε [τὰ

P. Oxy. 2417, Hathyr, 286.

P. Oxy. 1415, late third century, no date.

P. Oxy. 1416, ca. 299, no date.⁴⁴

P. Oxy. ined. 7, early fourth century, no date.

P. Oxy. ined. 6, Epeiph 30, 300.

P. Oxy. 1103 (= *WChr.* 465), Mecheir 17, 360.

P. Oxy. 2110, Phaophi 9, 370.

Also to be noted are:

P. Oxy. 41 (= *WChr.* 45) late third or early fourth century, not dated. An account of a demonstration at a meeting, n.b. . .]αριας πανηγύρεως ούσης.⁴⁵

P. Oxy. 1305, late third century, not dated. Fragments of a report of a meeting apparently similar to that in *P. Oxy.* 41.

P. Oxy. 2407, a report of a meeting of liturgising tribes at the point of changeover in duty (see below, pages 50-52); late third century, probably the fifth epagomenal day of an unspecified year.

P. Ryl. 701, provenance unknown, Mesore 6, 305.⁴⁶

γρά]μμ[α]τα δημόσια προκείτ[α] could refer to the date of the meeting (which is the interpretation adopted by the editors), or to the date of the publication of the notice. In any case, the meeting must be envisioned in the near future (ὀξέως [συναχ]θῆναι), but the actual date may be prescribed in the lost portion of the document.

44. Dated by Vandersleyen, *Chronologie des Préfets d'Egypte de 284 à 395*, Collection Latomus 55, 1962, pp. 67-70, to 298 on the basis of his restoration of the last line, [π(ερὶ) τοῦ ἐπιδιμῖσαι τὸν Σεβαστὸν καὶ Πούπλιον ἡγεμόνα]. If this is correct it might explain the several references in this document to a πανήγυρις, which would be appropriate to a visit from the Emperor. One might also connect it with the visit of the Emperor to Panopolis (*P. Beatty Panop.* 1) for which preparations were being made in September of 298.

45. The nature of this meeting is not clear. There is no evidence for the existence of the demos as a corporate body making administrative decisions or elections, or being responsible for administrative ψηφίσματα. The presence of the prefect, and probably the καθολικός as well, suggests an extraordinary occasion. The mention of the word πανήγυρις suggests an outside chance that it may mean not "when the assembly had met," but "on the occasion of the festival," and might thus be connected with the festival and possible mention of a visit from the Emperor in *P.*

Oxy. 1416 (see above, note 44) or a similar occasion. That the Augusti are hailed in the plural in *P. Oxy.* 41 is not a serious objection. If the Emperor was not present the demonstration might have been occasioned by a visit from high state officials. The name of the prytanis in *P. Oxy.* 41 is Dioskoros but identification with the prytanis of 277-8 (see Z. Borkowski, "Le Papyrus de Berlin Inv. 11314 et les Prytanes d'Oxyrhynchus de 277 à 282," *Chronique d'Egypte* 43, 1968, pp. 325-31) or 306-7 (*P. Oxy.* ined. 13) is no more than possible in view of the commonness of the name. The demos is attested rarely in connection with the boule in the third century (*P. Oxy.* 1407; 2476; *C. P. Herm.* 112; 121), and then apparently only in connection with business involving the granting of honours or recognition of privilege (see below, pp. 83-84). This suggests observance of a formality, and there is no sign that the demos was a body with administrative competence.

46. *P. Ryl.* 701 was considered by the editors to be a report of a meeting, possibly of a boule, dealing with a division of house property. It concludes with a legal clause and the signature of an ἄρχα(ς) βουλ(ευτής), and is unlike other reports of meetings of the boule. The phrase τὸ κωὸν ἑμῶν εἶ[α] ἄρχόντων suggests that it refers either to a place other than a metropolis, or to one of the individual κωά of magistrates (e.g. the gymnasiarchs). See above, Chapter I, note 43.

This list shows two distinctions which may be emphasised at the outset. First, between extraordinary meetings (*πρόσκλητος*) and meetings which have no such designation, and second, between meetings attended only by part of the boule (e.g. *P. Oxy.* 1414.21; *BGU* 144; *C. P. Herm.* 7.2[?]), and the majority of instances where there is no reference to the composition of the meeting, most of which may be presumed to be plenary sessions.

It may easily be seen from the list that the thirtieth of the month is the most commonly attested date for the meetings of the boule, and is, in fact, the only date which appears more than once. Wegener proposed the theory that the boule met regularly twice a month, on the fifteenth and the thirtieth, but the only possible attestation of a meeting on the fifteenth of a month describes the meeting as *πρόσκλητος* (*P. Oxy.* 1412).⁴⁷ The evidence rather favours the supposition that there were regular meetings on the thirtieth of the month, extra ones being called when necessary; but certain difficulties must be observed:

1. In *P. Erl.* 18, which attests a meeting on the thirtieth of a month, the prytanis specifically states that he has summoned the meeting (. . . ἡμ[ῶν] δ[ε]δέημαι βουλῆ(ς) or βουλῆ) to deal with a particular problem, namely the food supply.⁴⁸ Similarly in *SB* 7696.47, if the passage is correctly restored, the prytanis is said to have convoked a meeting on Mesore 30. If there were provisions for regular meetings on the thirtieth of the month, it is surprising to find that the prytanis had to convoke the boule for meetings on this date.

2. In *P. Oxy.* 2407 there is a report of a meeting held probably on the fifth epagomenal day, which is not a meeting of the boule, but probably of the first and second tribes who were changing liturgy-duty at the end of the official year (see below, pages 50-52). The text refers to newly enrolled members as having to take part in meetings [ἀπὸ λ τοῦ Φαῶ]φι μηνός. The uncertainty of the text permits only a tentative hypothesis. Since it is stated in the document that the members in question should already be taking part in meetings (line 41), the meeting of Phaophi 30 (the date occurs, unrestored, in the same line) looks like the next meeting of this body. If this is correct it will have met regularly on the thirtieth of each alternate month. It is possible to suppose that the boule will have met, similarly once every two months, on the other alternate dates. But there is no evidence to suggest that the boule did not meet every month and it is unlikely that it could have functioned on the basis of only six "regular" meetings per year. There is no particular objection to the supposition that the boule will have met at least once a month on the thirtieth, and that the tribal body will have met each alternate month on the thirtieth, even though there were bound to be some people who were members of both bodies.⁴⁹

It seems clear that if there were regular meetings of the boule on the thirtieth of the month they had to be explicitly convoked by the prytanis. This in

47. Wegener, *Symbolae*, pp. 172-4. On *P. Oxy.* 1412 see above, note 43.

48. For a slightly different reading from the

original edition (but giving the same sense) see Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 312-3.

49. See above, note 1 and pp. 24-25.

turn suggests either (a) that there was no legal prescription as to when meetings were held, but the thirtieth was a favoured date, or (b) that, if there were some prescription for meetings on the thirtieth, the prytanis normally had to convoke the boule but could, in theory, omit to do so if there were no business to discuss. The various other dates attested for meetings suggest that the boule could be convoked whenever necessary. It would be natural to assume that all meetings other than regular ones would be termed *πρόσκλητος*, but the term only occurs in *P. Oxy.* 1412 and 1414.29. However, we should perhaps not expect that all reports will contain a reference to the technical status of the meeting; *P. Oxy.* 2110 contains a report of a meeting held on the ninth of a month which deals only with a complaint about an appointment to a liturgy and looks like a specially summoned meeting – but the term *πρόσκλητος* does not occur.

In sum, the evidence shows that the boule met more often on the thirtieth of the month than on any other single date, but that if this was the regular date for meetings, the prytanis still had to convoke them, and could omit to do so if a meeting were not needed. This conclusion is confirmed by *P. Oxy. ined.* 24 which attests a *νομίμη βουλή* on the 30th [of Hathyr]; but the document is too fragmentary to tell us whether there was another *νομίμη βουλή* during the month. Similarly, the prytanis could convoke the boule on any day, if there were pressing business to be discussed.

The terms *ὑπομνήματα* and *ὑπομνηματισμοί* are used to describe the reports of the meetings of the boule. The latter is used in the phrase *ἐξεδόμην τὰ ὑπομνήματα* appended by the secretary to the report in *P. Oxy.* 2110 and seems to be the equivalent of *commentarii*. Wilcken demonstrated an equivalence between the terms *ὑπομνηματισμοί* and *commentarii*; the attempt by Bickermann to show that *ὑπομνηματισμοί* are closer to *acta* is consonant with the use of the term in *P. Erl.* 18 and *P. Oxy. ined.* 7 where descriptions of discussions which were only part of the proceedings of a meeting are prefaced *ἐξ ὑπομνηματισμῶν*.⁵⁰ In the latter document the opening statement is preceded by the words *μετ' ἄλλα σκέμματα* and there is further evidence of *précis* in the phrase *μεθ' ἕτερα ὁ πρύτανις εἶπεν*.

The majority of the reports are written in *oratio recta* and contain vivid accounts of the proceedings, interspersed with acclamations and interjections.⁵¹ The proceedings seem to be reported fairly fully, and the debates normally have a logical coherence which suggests that little was omitted. The titles of the speakers are generally abbreviated, however, *βουλευτής* being rarely accorded to a participant (in the most extensive example, *P. Oxy.* 1413, it is not so used at all). Often some titles are given, followed by the formula *καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει*. The

50. U. Wilcken, "ὑπομνηματισμοί," *Philologus* 53, 1894, pp. 80-126; E. Bickermann, "Testificatio Actorum," *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, pp. 333-55 (esp. pp. 349-55); cf. R. A. Coles, *Reports of Proceedings in Papyri*, *Papyrologica Bruxellensia*

4, 1966, p. 24, "primarily the record of the official's activities and pronouncements." See also *C. P. Herm.* 1.

51. Cf. Coles, *op. cit.* (above, note 50), pp. 22 f.

reports of meetings of other bodies in *P. Oxy.* 41 (= *WChr.* 45) and 2407 have the same general characteristics and are particularly good examples of the vivid use of *oratio recta*. No doubt, several copies were made of the reports, of which at least one would presumably be filed in the archives of the town. If this was the original copy, then we have an example in *Archiv* 4, pages 115-7 in which the pages are numbered (see page 117, note 1). There is not much indication of the clerical practices employed. The *σκριβας* (see below, pages 39-41) was probably responsible for the making of the original and in general for the publication of the copies. That more than one person was employed in making copies is indicated by the fact that *P. Oxy.* 1414 is written in two different hands (see line 10); and in *P. Oxy.* 2110 the endorsement of the secretary is in a different hand from that of the rest of the document.

The type of full, verbatim report which is represented in most of our documents must be distinguished from the type represented by *P. Erl.* 18 and *P. Oxy. ined.* 7 in which one specific episode is reported. We have another example of the latter in *P. Oxy.* 1103 (= *WChr.* 465) which contains an account in *oratio recta* of a report made by an ex-logistes to a meeting of the boule.

Yet another type of report records briefly, in *oratio obliqua*, summaries of proceedings in the boule. There are two examples of such documents (*P. Oxy.* 1416; *BGU* 144), which may have served as notes from which the final minutes were drawn up by the secretary or (particularly in the case of *BGU* 144) a memorandum made by or for the prytanis. No technical term of description is attested for these documents.⁵²

Two other documents emanating from the boule may be briefly noted. *P. Oxy. ined.* 1, which belongs to the first half of the third century, contains a list of signatures of bouleutai, each written in a different hand and followed by the word *ἔδοξε*. Since the upper portion of the document is lost its purpose can only be inferred. The repetition of *ἔδοξε* suggests that it is to be connected with the process of passing a *ψήφισμα* in the boule. The signatories will then be those of the bouleutai who supported the resolution. The nature of the reports of proceedings in the boule do not favour the chance of discovering a counterpart to this document – a list of signatories followed by the words *οὐκ ἔδοξε* (see below, page 38). The second document (*P. Oxy. ined.* 4) dates to 302 and contains copies of correspondence of the boule arranged in two columns. This may be compared with the extensive collections of correspondence of a strategos in *P. Beatty Panop.* 1 and 2. The Oxyrhynchus text contains abbreviated copies of letters – précis is evident in the form of address *τῷ αὐτῷ ἢ βουλῇ* twice employed – sent out by the boule in *Thoth.* 302. We may therefore infer that the archives of the boule will have included records of incoming and outgoing correspondence.

The procedure of the meetings may be described briefly. They apparently

52. So, too, the reports in *P. Oxy. Ined.* (above, p. 18) are extremely abbreviated but in *oratio recta*.

opened with *εὐψημία* (*P. Oxy.* 2110.2).⁵³ The meetings were chaired by the prytanis, or in his absence by the designate-prytanis if there was one (*SB* 7696.40 ff.). The system of procedure in debate is rather obscure. The prytanis took a prominent role in opening discussions, introducing business and forcing decisions, aided in some cases by a syndikos. Apart from these more prominent officials, there does not seem to be any fixed order of speaking.⁵⁴ There is no evidence in any of the reports of an actual division being taken on any issue, and to judge from *P. Oxy.* 1415 any problem was simply discussed until a decision was reached (although it is impossible to tell whether the final statement represents a decision or not, since the document is broken); in several cases (see e.g. *P. Oxy.* 1413; 1416) discussions culminate in postponement until the next meeting.⁵⁵ *P. Oxy.* 2110 contains the closest thing we have to an actual vote; a complaint is made and the complainant is supported by statements from several bouleutai until the prytanis finally yields and upholds the complaint. The evidence of *BGU* 144 and *P. Oxy.* 1414.21 suggests that decisions of a partial meeting of the boule were as valid as those of a plenary session, although they may have required the formality of ratification by a full meeting; at least it is clear that action was taken upon decisions of a partial meeting.⁵⁶

The actual status of the people who attended the meetings is not easily determined. Obviously the majority would be bouleutai, but other officials were sometimes present as well. In *P. Oxy.* 2228 a strategos mentions that he was present at a meeting, and in *P. Oxy.* 1413 a γραμματεὺς πολιτικῶν, who may or may not be a bouleutes, attends.⁵⁷ In the same meeting the exegetai are called upon to make nominations; presumably not all of the exegetai were bouleutai, but it is impossible to tell whether the τάγμα of exegetai is present in full (which might be explained by the fact that nominations of new exegetai were on the agenda), or whether it is simply represented in the boule by those of its members who were bouleutai.⁵⁸

53. I.e. *acclamationes*, see *PSI* 1265.12 and note. The unpublished Oxyrhynchus text of 201-2 (see above, p. 18) perhaps contains an example of the acclamation of Emperors and other prominent persons at the beginning of the report.

54. Jones, *LRE*, pp. 729-31, supposed that the speakers in *P. Oxy.* 2110 in support of the complainant were the equivalent of the *decemprimi* (though he recognised that the title *δεκάπρωτος* had a different connotation, see E. G. Turner, "Egypt and the Roman Empire: the *δεκάπρωτοι*," *JEA* 22, 1936, pp. 7-19). There are, however, eleven speakers (one of the names is lost in a lacuna).

55. The only possible evidence for a division in voting is *P. Oxy.* ined. 1 (above, p. 37).

56. In *BGU* 144 (*ἐπεσάλῃ*) and in *P. Oxy.* 1414.21 ff. There would be little point in holding an *ad hoc* meeting to expedite a nomination if the

man could not get on with the job right away, see below, p. 102.

57. Lewis, *ICS* s.v. γραμματεὺς (*μητροπόλεως* suggests tentatively that the γραμματεὺς πολιτικῶν (*λόγων* rather than *χρημάτων*) may be the same official. *P. Oxy.* ined. 5 contains a third century letter of which the first line reads: π(αρά) τοῦ πρυτάνεως Σαραπάμμωνι γραμματεῖ πολιτικῶν *vacat* .[. There may be several letters following the break and the dotted letter could be λ or χ, hence λ[όγ(ων)] or χ[ρη(μάτων)]. But the *vacat* suggests a break from the preceding words and χ[αίρει] is more likely.

58. The latter is more probable; in that case the exegetai would only appear as a corporate entity in situations where they were required to take corporate action, like οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς . . . φυλῆς (see above, pp. 24-25).

It seems likely that there was an opportunity for some non-members to attend meetings and present business "from the floor" or on the agenda, though this might equally be done by previous arrangement with the prytanis.⁵⁹ In *P. Oxy.* 2110 the complainant, who is given the title *bouleutes*, is represented at the meeting by his son, who does not have the title. It might, of course, be the case that the title is omitted in the case of the son because he is present at the meeting (in accordance with the practice exemplified in *P. Oxy.* 1413) but in view of the lack of evidence for fathers and sons being *bouleutai* at the same time, it is probable that the son in *P. Oxy.* 2110 was not a *bouleutes*.⁶⁰ It is clear that there is no evidence for the meetings being open in the sense that there was a "public gallery," but non-*bouleutai* (notably officials) could and did attend.⁶¹

The Officials

Τη σκρεΐβας and γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς

The evidence for the official who performed the secretarial duties connected with the boule may conveniently be divided. In documents from Oxyrhynchus, this official is called the *σκρεΐβας*. In documents from other places, there is evidence for an official called the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*, but it does not permit a firm conclusion that there were two titles in current use for the same official, the one applying at Oxyrhynchus and the other elsewhere.

A report of a meeting of the boule from Oxyrhynchus (*P. Oxy.* 2110) bears the signature *Αὐρήλω[ς] Ἰσίδωρος σκρεΐβας ἐξεδόμην τὰ ὑπομνήματα*, in a different hand from that of the rest of the document. It was surmised (above, pages 36-37) that he was responsible generally for the publication of the reports, but not for making all the copies. No other document of this type from Oxyrhynchus is intact at the end, so it is impossible to say whether all such reports bore his signature. The earliest attestation of this official is in *P. Oxy.* 1191, of 280;⁶² the *strategos* is ordered *ὑπογραφῆν εὐ[δ]οκῆσεως τοῦ σκρεΐβου λαμβάνειν μὴ πα[ρ]αλίμπαναι* in all acts of the boule concerning the

59. In *P. Oxy.* 1416.1,4, there are two *εισηγηταί*. The first has the title *bouleutes*, the second does not. Since the title is used on the first occasion it seems safer to suppose that in the second case the man was not a *bouleutes*, rather than to suppose an error of omission. It is therefore likely that non-*bouleutai* were allowed to make proposals in meetings. In this case, the proposal concerns an advance from the bouletic fund (on which see below, pp. 41-42) for some posts (*χώραι*).

60. There are very few identifiable examples

of a father and son who were both *bouleutai*, and no certain cases of a father and son being both alive and members of the boule at the same time (see below, Appendix I, notes 32, 36).

61. Contrast *P. Ryl.* 77.33 where *οἱ ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως* are present at the proceedings (see above, Chapter I, note 46).

62. The restoration in *P. Oxy.* 1413.21-2 note, cannot be admitted as evidence. The editors presumably thought he might be called upon to clarify the question of the *ἐναλλαγὴ τῶν ἡμερῶν*.

election of ἐπιμεληταί, and he passes the instruction on to the σκρεΐβας. Presumably the role of the latter is simply to endorse the notice of appointment, rather than to signify active concurrence in it, since such an important role in bouletic business is not elsewhere attested for him. There is no example from Oxyrhynchus of such a notice emanating directly from the boule, and hence no means of checking whether this practice was followed, and if so, for how long.

A σκρεΐβας appears in *P. Oxy.* 1417, of the early fourth century, which contains a report of a trial before the strategos of a defaulting eutheniarch. The relevant passage (line 10) is badly mutilated, but the phrase ἐὰν ὁ σκρεΐβας φαίῃ suggests the possibility that he was present for the purpose of clarifying resolutions or instructions of the boule.⁶³ There is no evidence to suggest whether the σκρεΐβας of the boule was regularly a bouleutes, how he was appointed, or how long was the term of office.

The evidence for a γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς in the other boulai of the Roman period is not abundant.⁶⁴ In the Boule Papyrus (*PSI* 1160), which contains a request from the Alexandrians for permission to have a boule,⁶⁵ a γραμματεὺς is mentioned. An inscription of unknown provenance (*SB* 7905) refers to the ἑναρχος γραμματεὺς βουλῆς; since it dates to the second century, it must come from one of the two cities which are known to have had a boule before 200, namely Ptolemais and Antinoopolis.

The evidence from Antinoopolis shows a γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς who is also a πρυτανικός on a board of officials for the εἰσκρισις of παῖδες (*PSI* 199, of 203), and suggests a connection with status and privilege. In a document from the reign of Severus Alexander (*PSI* 1067), the writer asks the boule to instruct its γραμματεὺς to deal with the ἀπαρχή of a baby daughter. Other evidence for this official is totally uncertain.⁶⁶

The term σκρεΐβας was probably not introduced much before the end of the third century, and there is no information about an official with similar duties in the metropoleis for the earlier part of the third century. It is therefore impossible to say whether the office was an innovation at the end of

63. The evidence suggests that the term σκρεΐβας was not used only for the official connected with the boule. In *P. Oxy.* 59 there is a σκρεΐβας who was appointed by the boule to attend the court of the prefect, (the technical term for the duty is ἐξέτασις), and comparison with *P. Amh.* 82 suggests that the title may be a synonym for λογόγραφος. If so, there is no reason to regard him as the secretary of the boule. In *P. Oxy.* 2674 the title occurs but the document is too mutilated to be of any use. In *P. Lips.* 40, of the fourth or fifth century, there is a σκρεΐβας who is connected with a παράστασις τῶν ἰποβληθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν β[ο]υλευτῶν εἰς τὸν κεφαλαιωτήν, but the fact that

he is under the direct orders of the prefect of the Thebaid rather suggests that he is not the σκρεΐβας of the boule.

64. For the Ptolemaic period see above, p. 12.

65. Republished as *CPJ* 150. It is uncertain whether he is connected with the εἴθυνα since there is a lacuna of 17 letters.

66. A γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς is mentioned in the fragmentary *SB* 7601 (ἰπομνηματισμοί of an epistrategos), from Antinoopolis. The signatories to documents from Antinoopolis concerned with the registration of new citizens (*SB* 7603-4) may include the secretary of the boule, but there are no titles. On *P. Ryl.* 701 see above, note 46.

the third century, or whether the term *σκριβας* simply replaced *γραμματεὺς* as the designation of the secretary of the boule. It is to be noted, however, that the term *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* only occurs in connection with the Greek cities in Egypt which might be expected to be heavily influenced by Hellenistic terminology and practice, and that the office appears to be much closer in character to that of a Greek city of the Hellenistic or Roman world than to that of the boule of a metropolis in Egypt. If there was a *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* in the metropoleis in the early third century, he probably differed, as much as did the *σκριβας* later, from the official of the Greek cities.⁶⁷

The *ταμίας βουλευτικῶν χρημάτων*

The evidence hitherto available for this official has been limited to one document from Oxyrhynchus (*P. Oxy.* 1501) in which a man with the titles *ἐξη(γητεύσας) βουλευτῆς ταμίας βουλευτικῶν χρημάτων* acknowledges to another bouleutes the return of a loan [ἄς . . .] *ἔδα[ρεί]σῳ βουλευ[υτ] . . . δραχ[μ]άς . . .* The document is dated to the late third century by the editors, who comment that the loan is "probably from the city funds." The term *βουλευτικά* occurs in *P. Oxy.* 1416 as the source of an advance made for *χώραι* (translated by the editors as "posts"); the editors comment that "the *βουλευτικά*, which are not mentioned elsewhere, seem to be a private fund of the senate, distinct from the *πολιτικός λόγος* administered by them." Scanty though the evidence is, it may permit a few more comments.⁶⁸ The bouletic fund here attested is probably to be distinguished from *ὁ τῆς βουλῆς λόγος* at Arsinoe, which is mentioned in the third century and seems to have been the account into which were paid taxes collected by the boule for the state (see below, page 74). The suggestion that the *βουλευτικά χρήματα* were internal to the boule seems to have been correct and we may now add the evidence of *P. Oxy.* ined. 12, of 233, in which the *ταμίας βουλευτικῶν χρημάτων* of Oxyrhynchus, who is also a bouleutes, acknowledges to the heirs of a deceased bouleutes the payment of interest on the *εἰσιτήριον*. The interest amounts to 100 drachmas per month which, calculated at 12 per cent, gives a principal of 10,000 drachmas. This document suggests, therefore, that the bouletic fund had its source in entrance-fees paid by bouleutai and in interest owed by entrants who did not pay their *εἰσιτήριον* in a lump sum.⁶⁹ As regards the expenditure of this fund, the evidence does not

67. In general cf. Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 312-3; Lallemand, *L'administration*, p. 115. On the Greek character of Antinoopolis see H. I. Bell, "Antinoopolis; a Hadrianic Foundation in Egypt," *JRS* 30, 1940, pp. 133-47; Kühn, *Antinoopolis*, pp. 90-137.

68. It is to be noted that the restoration of *P. Oxy.* 1413.4 by Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, pp. 66-8, gives the sense that the payment of *σπεπτικόν* (on

which see below, pp. 43, 93 would come from the bouletic fund, if bouleutai were nominated for magistracies, but there is no parallel for this. He thought that such nominations would be *ἐπὶ ἰδίῳ πόρῳ καὶ τῆς βουλῆς*. But we know from *P. Oxy.* ined. 3 (see below, p. 43) that the *σπεπτικά* accrued to the *πολιτικός λόγος*.

69. See above, pp. 26-27, and Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, p. 58.

show whether it existed solely as a source of loans for bouleutai, though this was clearly one of its uses.⁷⁰ The ταμίας is evidently an official internal to the boule who administered this fund and it is logical to suppose that he would always be, as in *P. Oxy.* 1501 and *P. Oxy. ined.* 12, a bouleutes.

Minor Officials

The evidence for the assistant of the boule, βουλευτικός ὑπηρέτης, is extremely thin. There is only one piece of evidence from Oxyrhynchus attesting him (*P. Oxy.* 59), in which he is responsible for the delivery of a letter from the boule to the strategos.⁷¹ In a document from Hermopolis (*CPR* 20 1.12 = *WChr.* 402), he is found performing a similar task, delivering an ἐπίσταλμα from a deputy-prytanis to a petitioner. In addition to this, the petitioner mentions further on in the document that he has been put under surveillance (2.14-5): τὴν περὶ ἐμὲ φρούραν διὰ ὑπηρετοῦ βουλευτικοῦ καὶ φύλακος τῆς πρυτανείας. Clearly the attested βουλευτικοὶ ὑπηρεταί are somewhat menial servants of the boule, and the assumption must be that they were not bouleutai.

The relation of this official to the πρυτανικός (or πρυτάνεως) ὑπηρέτης who is attested in the Arsinoite Nome in the late third to early fourth century (*P. Cair. Is.* 99; 117; 118; 120, spanning the years from 296 to 311), is not clear. He is probably essentially the same official as the βουλευτικός ὑπηρέτης of Oxyrhynchus and Hermopolis, under a slightly different name, but the documents cast no light on his official duties. It seems improbable that in addition to the βουλευτικός ὑπηρέτης there was at Oxyrhynchus and Hermopolis an (unattested) πρυτανικός ὑπηρετής. The man at Arsinoe held the post for a period extending over fifteen years, though it is impossible to be sure that he did so continuously.⁷²

In the passage from *CPR* 20, quoted above, there is a mention of the φύλαξ τῆς πρυτανείας, whose duties, it may be supposed from the title and the circumstances described, were those of a beadle or sergeant-at-arms. He is also mentioned in *PSI* 199, from Antinoopolis, in close conjunction with the members of a board which sat for εἰσκρισις, more probably in the capacity of a sort of clerk or usher than as a member of the board.

The officials treated thus far operated within the boule; of the three officials for whom the evidence is considered below, two were external to the boule (οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων and the ταμίας πολιτικῶν χρημάτων), and one

70. Cf. *Forschungen in Ephesos* III, 1923, p. 142 (no. 57), of the third century: ἡ τεμὴ κατεσκευάσθη ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς βουλῆς χρημάτων ἐκ πύρων βουλαρχίας Πο. Κορ(νηλίου) Ἰταλοῦ.

71. For the corrections see *P. Oxy.* 1409.22 note; Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, p. 352. See also *P. Princ.*

30 (Hermopolis, ca. 264).

72. The title πρυτανικός καὶ ἐξηγητικός ὑπηρετής goes back to the second century, see *P. Mil. Vogl.* 71.26; *P. Teb.* 397.28 (= *MChr.* 321); *SP* XX 50.33 (cf. Meyer, *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, pp. 323 ff.). See above, Chapter I, note 43.

(the *σύνδικος*) operated both inside and outside the boule.

οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων

The assumption is generally made that the titles ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων and διέπων τὰ στέμματα refer to the same officials. The amount of available evidence is small and may be tested both for definition of function and demonstration of identity.

In the sole reference from Oxyrhynchus to this official, an application is made for enrollment in the *γερουσία*, or for the accordance of privileges in it,⁷³ to a person whose titles are ἐξηγήτευσας βουλ(ευτῆς) διέπων καὶ τὰ στέμματα (*P. Ryl* 599, of 226). The editor describes his duties as follows: "He was responsible for the *στέμματα*, that is the various divisions of the gymnasial class, and this, together with the implication of responsibility for enrollment in the *γερουσία* suggests that his duty was to maintain and revise the roll of citizens, in addition to which he supervises the list of magistrates and collects their fees."⁷⁴ The latter inference is drawn from the occurrence of the word *στεπτικόν* in *P. Oxy.* 1413.4, in a note to which the editors wrote: "The form *στεπτικόν* supports the view (which is not the usual one) that the officials called οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων were connected with the *στέφανοι* of magistrates." It is worth noting that to conflate these interpretations involves the assumption that the title is connected with *both* the *στέμματα* (as social divisions) and the *στέφανοι*. The new evidence of *P. Oxy.* ined. 3, however, shows that it was in fact the *ταμίας τῶν πολιτικῶν χρημάτων* who was responsible for the collection of crown-payments for magistracies (*στεπτικά*). With this evidence we may link the information in *P. Oxy.* 1413.7 where the *γραμματεὺς πολιτικῶν*, presumably a member of the same department, is called upon to confirm that a certain Ploution still owes *στεπτικόν* for an *ἐξηγητεία*. The inferred connection between *στέμματα* and *στέφανοι* is therefore probably best discarded.

The existence of this official in the metropoleis before the foundation of the boulai is attested by *P. Ryl.* 77, of 192, from Hermopolis, so there is no doubt that the office was not created in connection with the boulai. The document contains a record of proceedings held in connection with an appointment of a man as *kosmetes*. In lines 28-31 οἱ διέπον[τες τὴν τ]ῶν στεμμάτων [διώκῃσι]ν state that the candidate has made a pretence of *ἀπορία* in order to avoid nomination, and then offer to release bail and restore the keys of a house, which seems to have been sequestered. With this passage we may compare *P. Fay.* 87, of 155, in which the overseers of sequestered

73. See E. G. Turner, "The Gerousia of Oxyrhynchus," *Archiv* 12, 1937, pp. 179-86 (the original publication of *P. Ryl.* 599); M. A. H. el-Abbadi, "The Gerousia in Roman Egypt," *JEA* 50, 1964, pp. 164-9; and cf. Momigliano on the

gerousia of Alexandria in *JRS* 34, 1944, pp. 114-5.

74. Cf. Kiessling, *RE* III A², 1929, 2331; Kühn, Antinoopolis, pp. 114-5; F. Zucker, *GGA* yr. 211, 1957, p. 64.

property pay rent into a bank, and an equal amount τῷ ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων προκεχι(ρισμένῳ), though no magisterial delinquency is there stated; the official is from Alexandria. It seems likely, therefore, that the two slightly different formulae do refer to the same official, though an exact similarity is not demonstrable. The word διέπων, which occurs in *P. Ryl.* 77 and 599, usually has the force of "deputising" and there is no strong reason to suppose that this is not the case in these two documents.⁷⁵

The other references to the official are of little help. A first-century inscription from Alexandria refers to a μέγαν γυμνασίαρχον καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων (*SB* 592), and the title is attested twice at Antinoopolis in the third century (*P. Oxy.* 2130; *SB* 8312), and once in an obscure text of unknown provenance (*P. Lond.* 197 verso [II, p. 100] = *BL* 1, p. 251).

The evidence for these officials may be summarised as follows. One late second-century text (*P. Ryl.* 77) supports a connection between the officials in charge of the στέμματα and nomination to an ἀρχή (in this case the κοσμητεία). The evidence of third-century documents suggests (a) that these officials were connected with a social institution,⁷⁶ (b) that the στεπτικόν was managed by officials in charge of the πολιτικός λόγος, and (c) that the sequestration of property in connection with the default of a magistrate or liturgist was probably within the competence of the syndikos (see below, page 48). That the foundation of the boulai resulted in a change or diminution of responsibility for οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων is therefore a possible, although undemonstrable, conclusion. In all the relevant third-century texts these officials are bouleutai, but there is no evidence to show whether the position actually survived into the late third century.

ταμίας πολιτικῶν χρημάτων

This official, who was charged with the administration of the city fund, is another whose existence is attested before the foundation of the boulai (e.g. in *P. Ryl.* 86, of 195). After 200, when the boulai took over the financial administration of the metropoleis, he is found working in close conjunction with the boule.⁷⁷ The evidence for the administration of the πολιτικός λόγος is considered in detail below (pages 91-97); here only the evidence for the relation of its ταμίας to the boule is treated.

P. Oxy. 55 (= *WChr.* 196), of 283, contains a request for payment addressed to a pryтанis by two builders: καὶ ἀξιούμεν ἐπιστεῖλέσαι τῷ ταμίᾳ τῶν πολιτικῶν

75. For the view that it can apply to regularly appointed officials see *JEA* 21, 1935, pp. 239-40; the only "certain" case, however, has now been corrected by J. R. Rea, "The Date of the Prefecture of Statilius Ammianus," *Chronique*

d'Egypte 44, 1969, p. 135. See also below, page 59, on the title διέπων τὰ πολιτικά.

76. See Turner, *Archiv* 12, 1937, pp. 183-5.

77. For slight variations in the title see *P. Ryl.* 86.2 note.

χρημάτων τὸν ἐξοδισμὸν ἡμεῖν ποιήσασθαι κατὰ τὸ ἔθος. Two documents are to be contrasted with this. In *P. Oxy.* 54 (= *WChr.* 34), of 201, which relates to the period before the foundation of the boule at Oxyrhynchus, epimeletai appointed in accordance with the γνώμη of the κοινὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων ask the gymnasiarch and exegetes for an order for payment ἐκ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως λόγου. At the beginning of the fourth century the procedure is different again. In *P. Oxy.* 1104, of 306, a prytanis writes to a logistes asking for authorisation for a payment from the πολιτικός λόγος. The text as published reads: ἐπισταλῆναι τὸν τῶν πολετικῶν [ἐπί]τροπον ὅπως τὸν ἐξοδισμὸν μοι τούτων ποι[ήσῃ] and the document also contains an endorsement that the payment was made by a person with the title τ. . . (), for which the editors suggested a restoration of τ[αμ](ίας). The framework is clear enough: the logistes now controls the expenditure of the πολιτικός λόγος, subject to the approval of the prefect, and requests for payment have to go through him. It is less clear whether there were two officials engaged in the administration of the account itself. The suggestion that the ἐπίτροπος was an imperial procurator, in charge perhaps as a temporary expedient, does not seem convincing, since this is, in effect, the function of the logistes who was probably appointed at least with imperial sanction.⁷⁸ A solution is indicated by *P. Oxy. ined.* 9, of the early fourth century, in which there is a similar note to a logistes and an order from the logistes for payment to be made. The official addressed in the latter is the πολιτικῶν χρημάτων τραπεζίτης. A re-examination of *P. Oxy.* 1104, now in the Bodleian Library, convinces me that in lines 12-13 we should read τὸν τῶν πολετικῶν [χρημάτων] τραπεξίτην and in the endorsement (line 23) τρα(πεζίτης). The evidence shows, therefore, that the ταμίας at Oxyrhynchus was responsible for the management of the city funds, at first under the direction of the ἄρχοντες and later under that of the boule. When, in the early fourth century, the logistes became responsible for controlling the πολιτικός λόγος a change of official (or at least of title) is discernible. Payments are now made by a τραπεζίτης at the behest of the logistes.⁷⁹

The evidence from the other metropoleis confirms this picture in many respects. The essential points of the relation between the boule, the πολιτικός λόγος, and its ταμίας are illustrated by the many documents from Hermopolis which contain requests to the boule for payment from the city fund for pensions and for expenses incurred in jobs done under contract for the city, and offers to rent property from it. *C. P. Herm.* 94 (= *WChr.* 194) contains the texts of two documents – a letter from the boule to the ταμία πολιτικ(οῦ) λ[όγ(ου)] to pay an epimeletes and the letter of the epimeletes to the boule

78. On the logistes see B. R. Rees, "The Curator Civitatis in Egypt," *JJP* 7-8, 1953-4, pp. 83-105; Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 107-14. On the ἐπίτροπος see *P. Oxy.* 1419.2 note, Jones, *CERP*, p. 482, note 58.

79. On the title διέπων τὰ πολιτικά, sometimes borne by the prytanis and apparently connected with financial administration see below, page 59.

requesting the payment. *C. P. Herm.* 78 contains a request for a pension addressed to the same man (although the title is lost), and to the imperial procurator Aurelius Ploution. The same man (again without the title) is involved in proceedings before the procurator which seem to be concerned with a loan from the *πολιτικά χρήματα* (*C. P. Herm.* 22-3; 25-6).⁸⁰ All these Hermopolis texts date from the middle of the third century, and confirm and amplify the evidence from Oxyrhynchus. In *P. Beatty Panop.* 1.378 of 298, there is preserved a letter of a strategos addressed to a *χειριστῆς πολιτικῶν χρημάτων* of Panopolis about the one-third share of the price of hides payable by the city. It cannot be shown whether the title is simply a local variant for *ταμίας*, but since the payment clearly came out of the city fund it is at least possible.

The evidence shows that in the third century the *ταμίας* worked under the close direction of the boule. The Hermopolis texts show that the *ταμίας* was, at least sometimes, a bouleutes (*C. P. Herm.* 94, for example), but there is no evidence that he was always a bouleutes, or that he was appointed by the boule, though it is not unlikely.⁸¹ Evidence for the term of office is uncertain; in *C. P. Herm.* 98.4 there is a mention of the *ταμίας* (ἔτους), which suggests a term of a year, but the occurrence of a *ταμίας* τόκ(ου) and a *ταμίας* λήμ(ματος) or λημ(μάτων) in the same document suggests the possibility that there may have been more than one *ταμίας* connected with the financial administration.

It is appropriate to add that there is evidence from the same document showing that these *ταμίαι* were subject to the scrutiny of an *ἐξεταστής* chosen [*καταλεγόμενος*] probably by the boule. In *C. P. Herm.* 101 there is a report to the boule from a person chosen by it to make an *ἐξέτασις* of the levy of a 16-drachma tax. In *Archiv* 4, pp. 115-7, from Antinoopolis, it is stated that the accounts of an *ἐξοδισμός* for public works are to be subject to the scrutiny of an *ἐξεταστής*, (ἡ δέουσα ἐξέτασις). It is impossible to be sure whether this official was only appointed *ad hoc*, or whether he was always a bouleutes (as is the case in *C. P. Herm.* 101).

The σύνδικος

The evidence about this important official falls into two parts. In the third century he is attested in connection with the boule, playing an important role in its meetings, and representing it in dealings with officials of the state. In the fourth century the evidence shows that the title refers to an official closely akin in character to the *defensor civitatis* introduced by Valentinian I. Some new documentary evidence has recently come to light which may be brought to bear upon the role of this official, and particularly on his position vis-à-vis the boule.

80. *C. P. Herm.* 54-6; 66-7; 70; 72; 78; 81-96; 119; *CPR* 39. On *C. P. Herm.* 22-3; 25-6 see Jouguet, *VM*, p. 374, note 3. The occurrence of *βου[λ]ευτικ[ος]* in *C. P. Herm.* 22.4 is to be noted, but

owing to the fragmentary state of the text, cannot be explained.

81. See also *C. P. Herm.* 78.

The most recent detailed examination of the evidence about the syndikos is that of B. R. Rees ("The *Defensor Civitatis* in Egypt," *JJP* 6, 1952, pp. 73-102).⁸² Rees concludes that there was in the towns of Egypt, before the fourth century, an official known as the *σύνδικος* whose chief task was to represent the town, externally in its dealings with the imperial government, and internally in its dealings with private citizens. There is also an *ἔκδικος*, "who does not appear to be associated as commonly with the community as with individuals." Rees is sceptical about being able to define the exact difference between these officials and thinks that there is not enough evidence to base any assertion on the fact that the *ἔκδικος* is not associated with a community. But it is probably safe to remark the significance of the fact that the detailed evidence which is available for the boulaï in the last three decades of the third century nowhere mentions him. Rees further concludes that there was an official in the first half of the fourth century whose duties included the protection of individuals against fiscal extortion and the hearing of minor complaints and appeals, especially those which involved property. "This official, about whose correct designation there was some uncertainty, was a member of the municipal cadre, with administrative responsibilities . . ." He sees in him the connecting link between the older *σύνδικος* or *ἔκδικος* and the *defensor civitatis* of Valentinian I, assuming important responsibilities in the *municipia* in the early decades of the fourth century, "possibly as a direct result of the reorganisation initiated by Diocletian." A detailed treatment of the evidence for the connection of the syndikos with the boule is necessary in the light of new documents which were not available to Rees, and sheds light on the nature of the reforms in the structure of the metropoleis at the beginning of the fourth century. The evidence fits the framework of Rees' analysis, and shows the syndikos as an integral part of the structure of the boule in the third century; in the fourth century, the evidence shows a trend of development away from this close connection.

At Oxyrhynchus, the syndikos appears in connection with the boule in documents from the last three decades of the third century and the first decade of the fourth. Several references to the official in the plural make it plain that there was often more than one syndikos, at Oxyrhynchus and elsewhere.⁸³ There are several documents attesting two syndikoi (e.g. *P. Oxy.* 2665; 2673), but none which show more than two, and *P. Oxy.* 2407 now definitely disproves the hypothesis that each tribe had its own syndikos.⁸⁴ Several

82. For a survey of the earlier literature see Rees, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-7, and add Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 115 ff.

83. *P. Oxy.* 41 (= *WChr.* 45); 1417; 2665; 2673; *O. Meyer* 67 (originally dated to II-III A.D., but should perhaps be put rather later in the third century); *C. P. Herm.* 23 2. Rees, *op. cit.* p. 78, cf. p. 79, note 46, thinks it was an *ad hoc*

appointment, but the evidence suggests that in the third century he was a regular official of the boule. His predecessor may be the *πρόδικος* of *P. Ryl.* 77.33.

84. Wegener, *Symbolae*, p. 167, cf. *The Boule*, p. 299. It is not possible to tell from the available evidence whether there were ever more than two syndikoi at the same time.

examples show the syndikos as a bouleutes (e.g. *P. Oxy.* 2665; 2673; *MChr.* 196); in the reports of meetings of the boule of Oxyrhynchus, in which he appears (*P. Oxy.* 1413; 1414), the prominent role which he plays in bouleutic business makes it certain that he was a bouleutes, although, like the other speakers in these proceedings, he does not have the title. In *P. Oxy.* 2407.30, the office is described as a *λειτουργία*.

The syndikos is active in several spheres of bouleutic business. He is much concerned in the business of electing magistrates and in the proper execution of their duties. In *P. Oxy.* 1413.8-9 he makes a remark of which the end may be *Σερῆνός? ἢ ἔστω γυμνασιάρχος* which looks as if it is intended to disqualify a nominee,⁸⁵ and in line 14 he says that he has impounded property and will inform the boule of the amount. It is not stated why he has done this, but it seems likely that it had something to do with a defaulting magistrate (cf. *P. Ryl.* 77, and above, pages 43-44). In line 17 his broad concern with appointments to liturgies is demonstrated by the remark *ἵνα προτραπῶσω καὶ ἄρχωσω οἱ ὀνομαζόμενοι, τὸ πρωτενιαυτον τῆς λειτουργησίας*. Syndikoi are mentioned in *P. Oxy.* 1417, which contains the report of a trial before the strategos of a defaulting eutheniarch, and at least one is present. The crucial passage is so badly mutilated that little sense can be made of it (lines 13-4); one possible interpretation is that the syndikoi had certified the fact that the accused did default. The editors' comment that this was "an action before a strategos brought by the senate of Oxyrhynchus through their *σύνδικος*" is supported by texts from Hermopolis in which syndikoi appear in proceedings before an imperial procurator.⁸⁶

The concern of the syndikos with finances is demonstrated by *P. Oxy.* 1413.32-3, where he promises to bring it to the attention of the boule if any money is paid in advance to the artificers of the golden crown for Aurelian. An illustration of his role as an executive of the boule is provided by *P. Oxy.* 1414, where the imposition of *anabolicum* is discussed by the boule (see below, pages 70-74); the syndikos sums up the discussion with the statement that a sample of yarn will be supplied to the weavers (lines 9-11), presumably taking it upon himself to arrange this, although he uses the first person plural to signify the boule. The editors of these documents summarise his position by saying that he is prominent "especially in connexion with bringing matters to a decision or collecting information to be used at a later sitting, and he seems to have been a kind of legal adviser, as well as an advocate of the senate in courts

85. But his remark may be completely lost and this the end of the following remark. The gap will accommodate 66 letters (Jouquet, *Les Boulai*, p. 68).

86. *C. P. Herm.* 23 2, see below, p. 92. *C. P. Herm.* 53 was taken by Wilcken (*WChr.* 39, introd.) to be a letter from the boule to a syndikos concerning an action brought by the boule against

the gymnasiarchs. The date is Phaophi of 267. The man does not have a title, but it is to be noted that he turns up as an *ἐξεταστής* in *C. P. Herm.* 101, which dates to 266-7 or 267-8. It is possible that the latter was an appointment *ad hoc* and in addition to another position, but we cannot be sure that he was a syndikos.

of law" (*P. Oxy.* XII, p. 32). Although the majority of the information comes from Oxyrhynchus, the evidence from Hermopolis provides no basis for supposing that the syndikoi there were any different.

Other third-century texts from various places add no information. Two documents from the Fayum mention syndikoi who are also bouleutai, but there is no connection with a boule, and these seem to be documents of a private nature in which official titles are mentioned in the normal way (*CPR* 59, 135). *P. Beatty Panop.* 1.374-7 contains a letter from a strategos to an ex-syndikos who has been chosen to superintend the building of a bakery, but this casts no light on his position as syndikos.

A group of three documents from the first decade of the fourth century gives evidence for the syndikos. *MChr.* 196, of 309,⁸⁷ contains a notice sent by the βιβλιοφύλακες to two syndikoi, one of whom is also the prytanis-in-office, about the confiscation of the property of a man who is under sentence from the *dux*; the order for the investigation had come to the syndikoi from the *procurator rei privatae*, and had been passed by them to the βιβλιοφύλακες. The form of *P. Oxy.* 2665 is the same; the report is addressed to two syndikoi and the prytanis and contains a report of a similar investigation of the property of a certain Paul, under sentence from the *praeses* of the Thebaid. *P. Oxy.* 2673 contains a declaration addressed again to two syndikoi and the prytanis by a *lector* of a former church in the nome about property belonging to that church; the document dates to 304. Whatever the ultimate cause of these investigations (it seems likely that the last two, at least, are connected with the persecution of Christians), they register the fact that such tasks are delegated to the syndikoi and the prytanis by officials of the central government, and that the syndikoi are associated with the prytanis of the boule.

In later documents from the first half of the fourth century, the syndikos is not connected at all with the boule. *P. Freib.* 11, of 336, contains a petition to a syndikos complaining about illegal occupation of land and assault; the petitioner asks that the miscreants be driven out in order that she may pay her δημόσια τελέσματα. It is to be noted that there is no connection here between the syndikos and the boule, and that there is no evidence that the boule ever dealt with petitions of this nature (see below, pages 113-115). Two other documents may be adduced which show the syndikos acting in a judicial role, and without any connection with the boule. In *SB* 8246, of 340, a case of disputed ownership is heard before a syndikos; there is no mention of a boule. A document from Hermopolis (*P. Strassb.* 296, of 326), published after Rees' article, contains a complaint from a bouleutes about the ἀνδραποδισμός of a slave addressed to two officials styled ἀρχ(ασι) βουλ(ευταῖς) Ἐρμον[πόλεως] τῆς λαμπροτάτης συνδίκους πόλεως and relayed by them to the prefect of the Thebaid. Again there is no connection with the boule as an administrative unit.

87. For the date see Lallemand, *L'administration*, p. 261.

P. Oxy. 2407, placed by the editor in the late third century, has appeared since the major treatment of the syndikos. Since it contains important evidence for this official, it requires separate treatment. The document is a report of proceedings of a meeting, in which the syndikos plays the major role. The important points are the following:

1. He presents an account to the meeting, including an item "... from what was ordered by the most eminent prefect to be given from ..." Another account is to be referred to the prefect for his approval (lines 1-5). The relation of the syndikos to the prefect is to be noted.

2. He mentions the responsibilities involved in the office — "... I have continued to carry out all the orders of the prefect and of the other (authorities); and indeed the very administration of the city besides" (lines 6-7). It is to be noted that he does not mention the boule at all, and that he clearly regards himself as an official of some importance. The boule might be one of the "other (authorities)."

3. The distribution of magistrates and related matters (line 7-end).

(a) His distribution of the album of magistrates between the two tribes had been referred to the prefect (line 8).

(b) A certain Apollodoros states that "by order" (*δι' ἐπιστάλατος*) of the present syndikos his brother has already performed a liturgy (lines 12-14). (The suggestion that the syndikos could order someone to perform a liturgy is new — but *ἐπίσταλα* can perhaps mean simply "notice" or "communication," cf. *P. Oxy.* 1414.17,19).

(c) The enrollment into tribes (lines 14-37). Notable is the statement that "... the syndikos ... having spent the year ... has chosen to distribute the additional magistrates today" (lines 16-17). This suggests a tenure of one year, although a longer term is not absolutely excluded.⁸⁸

(d) The question of who ought to be taking part in the meetings (lines 37-48). (See below, page 51.)

(e) The syndikos demands a fine from someone who did not take part in a meeting and was posted up (lines 48-58). The syndikos is obviously responsible for the exaction of this fine, and when in difficulties, threatens with the authority of the prefect.

It is of some importance to discover the nature of this meeting. The editor thought that it was too large, and that the matters under discussion were too important, for it to be a meeting of the boule and suggested that it was perhaps a meeting of the boule and the demos. There is no evidence for the demos ever having held meetings of this nature.⁸⁹ The main objection of the editor to the supposition that this body is a lesser one than the boule is that

88. The fact that there is no other syndikos in evidence in *P. Oxy.* 2407 suggests the possibility that the present one was due to continue into the

next year.

89. See above, note 45.

the matters discussed are too important to be dealt with by anything but a plenary meeting. In fact the business includes only the role of two tribes in the performance of liturgies, and a financial statement. The sums of money involved in the latter are not very great in terms of the inflation at the end of the third century.⁹⁰ It is quite possible that these sums may only have application to these tribes – they could be, for instance, the expenses involved in the liturgies of the previous year, or the next one, or both. There is nothing here which could not conceivably be business preliminary to a meeting of the boule.

There are several facts which support the hypothesis that it is not a meeting of the boule. The absence of the personal designation of bouleutes is also characteristic of the reports of meetings of the boule, but the absence of the use of *bouleutai* collectively in *P. Oxy.* 2407 is striking. As the editor recognises, the meeting took place on the last day of the official year at the point of the changeover in liturgy-duty from the first to the second tribe, and only the members of these tribes are attested as being present at the meeting, apart from the *syndikos*. When the question of future meetings arises it appears that the people whose participation is under discussion are “those about to come of age, those who have already got (into the tribes) . . . , in general those from the album . . .” (lines 39, 41-2). This is clearly more appropriate to a meeting of a tribal body than to one of the boule or the boule and the *demos*. The meeting is more probably that of a tribal body (perhaps normally consisting only of the liturgising tribe, but on the occasion of the changeover of duty of the two tribes concerned), which met regularly on the thirtieth of every other month (see above, pages 35-36).

A final point worth consideration is the suggestion made by the editor that the text may have its origin in Ptolemais rather than Oxyrhynchus. If we are to consider the possibility of origin in a “Greek city,” it is as well to add that Antinoopolis cannot be excluded. There is nothing in the text to indicate the locality, nor does the subject-matter provide any ground for rejecting its attribution to Oxyrhynchus which, after all, is the provenance of the document. In any case, the information about the *syndikos* and the tribal structure is probably of equal value whether the document is to be referred to Oxyrhynchus or to a “Greek city”; for the evidence available for the third century does not suggest any great difference in the character of the local administration (see below, pages 116-117).

The importance of the text for the *syndikos* is clear. He has an important role in preparing the details of business which is preliminary to meetings of the

90. The largest sum mentioned in *P. Oxy.* 2407 is something over 39 talents. With this we may compare the 140 talents as the cost of 100 webs in *P. Oxy.* 1414 (reign of Aurelian, see Appendix II), and the 4 talents 4000 drachmas

demanded by builders for repairs on a street in *P. Oxy.* 55, of 283. 39 talents, plus the smaller sums, could easily be only part of the cost of a year's liturgy-duty.

boule, but acts in direct relation to the prefect, apparently without going through the boule. In terms of the tribal body, he plays as important a part as does the prytanis in relation to the boule. But the history of the syndikos shows that in the fourth century he assumed a different kind of responsibility, though maintaining a position as one of the leading members of the municipal cadre. The documents which show him in association with the prytanis investigating on the authority of officials of the central government in the first decade of the fourth century probably indicate the vestiges of the trend towards a broader and different responsibility, whilst *P. Oxy.* 2407 gives evidence for his position as an official concerned with the administration of the metropolis. This in turn may be seen as part of the history of the administration of the metropoleis; the boule which had been a relatively autonomous organ in the third century found in the fourth that its position was now subordinate to that of officials appointed by, or with the approval of, the central government (see below, pages 124-126).

Chapter Three

The Prytanis of the Boule

The Metropoleis

Before the foundation of the boulai of the metropoleis, the administration was in the hands of the *κοινὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων* headed by a number of prytaneis. There is not much evidence for activity of the prytaneis in the second century; most of the attestations pertain to Alexandria, and show that the prytaneis were active in matters concerned with *ἐπίκρισις*. The existence of a board of prytaneis, headed by an *ἀρχιπρύτανις*, in a metropolis is attested by *P. Teb.* 397 (= *MChr.* 321), but we are ill-informed about the nature and activity of this body.¹

The foundation of the boulai in the metropoleis at the beginning of the third century brought fundamental changes in the nature of the administrative executive. Each of the new boulai was now headed by a single prytanis who held the position of president of the boule. The prytanis presided at meetings of the boule, organised the business which it dealt with and represented it in its dealings with other officials and private individuals.

Definition and Duties

Most of the evidence for the nature of this official position dates to the third century and the spread of information over the various metropoleis indicates no great difference in the character of the prytanis between one place and another.

Texts from Oxyrhynchus and Arsinoe show that it was the duty of the prytanis to summon meetings of the boule. In *P. Oxy.* 1412 and *P. Erl.* 18 the prytanis convokes meetings to deal with election of epimeletai for the transport of *annona militaris* and difficulties which have arisen over the supply of food and performance of the eutheniarchy. If the boule met regularly on the thirtieth of the month, it nonetheless appears from *P. Erl.* 18 that these meetings were explicitly convened by the prytanis, and this is supported by a passage in *SB* 7696.30-2, from Arsinoe: *τίς συνάγει τὴν βουλὴν; συνάγει μὲν ὁ πρύτανις λόγῳ καὶ τῷ δοκεῖν, ὁ γὰρ συνά[γ]ων ὁ*

1. See above, pp. 15-16.

νόμος ἔστω ὁ νόμος διακόνῳ τῷ χρώμενος· πρύτανις [τις ἦν ὁ συναγαγὼν· τίς πρύτανις σ[υνη]γαγεν τὴν βουλήν; The result of this questioning is the emergence of the fact that Herapion was the prytanis who convened the boule.²

That the prytanis presided at meetings of the boule may seem to be self-evident in view of his position, but there is some evidence which adds detail on this function. In general, the prytanis introduced business to the boule in meetings and synthesised the purport of the debates. The prytanis was probably normally responsible for introducing each fresh topic of business in the boule, though there are exceptions to this, and very few instances survive in the reports of meetings.³ Occasionally the discussion of a topic is prefaced by the expression ἀναγνωσθέντος ἐπιστάλματος (from an official); it is not clear that the prytanis was actually responsible for the reading of the ἐπίσταλμα; if he was not, the secretary of the boule may have done this. The order of business was probably prepared beforehand by or for the prytanis in normal circumstances. *P. Oxy.* 1414.19-23 gives some indication of what was liable to happen under extraordinary circumstances. When an order came through the office of the strategos for the election of καταπομποὶ ζώων, [the prytanis] states that the business had been dealt with: συνάξας τινὰς τοὺς παρ[ό]ντας ἀπὸ τῆς βουλῆς ὠ[ν]ομάσαμεν ἓνα Σαραπ[ί]ωνα ἕνα μὴ (15 letters) γ[έ]νηται. His action is approved by the body of the boule.

In his capacity as president the prytanis was clearly able to play an active part in the business which was transacted in the boule. Once again, documents from various places present roughly the same picture. In *SB* 7696.44-5 the prytanis is mentioned: λ τὴν [βουλήν πο]ίησας οὐκέτι εὐρέθη κἀκεῖνος ὠνόμα[σεν; ἀπεκρ[ύ]νατο] ναί. It is not entirely clear whether this means that the prytanis actually made the nomination, or simply that he presided when the nomination was being made. The answers elicited by the prefect from the Arsinoites seem to be deliberately evasive and designed to throw as much responsibility as possible on to the ex-prytanis Herapion. In line 33 it is stated that the boule made the nomination in the usual manner: συναχθ[ε]ῖσ[α δὲ] ἡ βουλή ὀνομασίαν πεποιήται κατὰ τὸ ἔθος. It is clear, however, that in certain cases the prytanis did actually participate in the electoral procedure, for in *P. Oxy.* 1415, apart from making remarks about the status and willingness of the candidate, he appears to be responsible for “proposing” him to the meeting: ὁ πρύτανις ἐ[ί]π[εν]· προβάλλ[ομαι αὐτὸν ὑμῖν] (lines 29-30). In the same document the prytanis is asked to take the responsibility for nomination in another appointment, if the restoration ὁ πρύτανις] εἰσπορώτερον ὀνομαξέσθω (line 15) is correct. In *P. Oxy.* 1413, after nominations for the post of exegetes

2. *P. Erl.* 18.6-7: τοῦτου γὰρ [τοῦ πράγματος ἕνεκα] ταύτης ἡμ[ῶν] δε[ξι]εῖμαι βουλῆ(ς), cf. Wegener, *The Boule*, p. 312.

3. See for example *P. Oxy.* 1413-5; 2110; *P. Erl.* 18; *Archiv* 4, pp. 115-7.

have been made, the prytanis apparently chooses overseers for one of the nominees with the words *αἰροῦμαι εἰς ἐπιτήρησιν* . . . (lines 10-11, cf. line 13).⁴ In these documents the action of the prytanis is approved by the meeting of the boule. The extent to which the prytanis was able to act on his own initiative in the third century is not clear. In *BGU* 8 he is said to have chosen officials to collect the *νομαρχικά ἀσχολήματα*, but whether he did so on his own initiative, or in tandem with the boule, is a matter of conjecture.⁵

The prytanis was able, in the normal course of a meeting, to put business before the boule and to inform it of the circumstances governing its decision. The term *εἰσηγεῖσθαι* is used in the documents for people putting business to the boule, and seems to bear a meaning which might be expressed by the phrase "to introduce a motion." The evidence shows that people other than the prytanis were able to do this in meetings; the expression *γνώμη εἰσηγητῆς καὶ ἐπιψηφιστῆς*, of which the second term seems to mean the person who was responsible for getting a matter put to the vote, is applied to the prytanis in *BGU* 362 (= *WChr.* 96) in connection with loans to be made from temple funds. *SB* 7696 shows clearly that the prytanis was not the only person who could do this, and in *P. Oxy.* 1416 it is clear that an ordinary member could be an *εἰσηγητῆς*.⁶

In his position as president of the boule, the prytanis was probably more likely to be responsible for getting business introduced, discussed and voted upon. *P. Erl.* 18 makes it clear that the discussion of difficulties with regard to the food supply and the performance of the eutheniarchy at Oxyrhynchus was initiated by the prytanis. At the level of bureaucracy which the boule represented, the prytanis is clearly the person who is responsible for resolving difficulties connected with the smooth functioning of the metropolis. The documents from Oxyrhynchus illustrate the powers of the prytanis in this sphere. In *P. Oxy.* 1418 a petitioner to the boule mentions that a previous prytanis had made some adjustment in a term of gymnasiarchy and eutheniarchy. Similarly, in a hearing before a prefect, a person who requires *χειραγωγία* in the performance of a liturgy mentions the prytanis, apparently in connection with the alleviation of duties (*P. Oxy.* 2610). In *P. Fuad I* 52 there is an acknowledgment of a loan, perhaps made in connection with the performance of a liturgy; the document is addressed to the prytanis, and the loan is said to be *παρὰ σοῦ*. In *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 2 a prytanis describes the responsibilities of his position in a letter to a prefect; he mentions the expenses involved in the upkeep of the baths, the other *πολιτικά δαπανήματα* and *τὸ συνεχῶς τῇ βουλῇ περὶ τῆς τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀποδείξεως*. In documents connected with the boule, the term *ἀπόδειξις* is only used with reference to the

4. On the details of the electoral process see below, pp. 98-107.

5. See the passage quoted below, p. 75.

6. See *SB* 7696.3-4,34; *P. Oxy.* 1413.2;

1416.1,4; *SP* XX 60; *JEA* 21, 1935, p. 238; and below, pp. 104-105. In *P. Oxy.* 1416.4 it is not even certain that the *εἰσηγητῆς* was a bouleutes, see above, Chapter II, note 59.

designation of duties to officials after they have been elected.⁷ In the case in point, the prytanis has been forced by difficult circumstances to refer to the prefect, and the prescript of the letter indicates that it was from the prytanis, rather than from the boule through the prytanis. In cases of this sort, therefore, the prytanis might well have referred to a higher official on his own initiative and without the instruction or recommendation of the boule.

It is difficult to be sure of the extent to which the prytanis was able to do this in the normal course of business in the third century. In business which pertained solely to the metropolis, he frequently acted as the representative of the boule, through whom incoming and outgoing business was directed. As has been shown, he was also able on occasion to act independently of the boule, although in its interests. The impression that the prytanis was a powerful figure generally in the administration of the metropolis is reinforced by the terms in which he is adulated at the public gathering reported in *P. Oxy.* 41 (= *WChr.* 45): δόξα πόλεως, πρωτοπολιτά, κτιστὰ τῆς πόλεως.⁸

In business which was directly connected with the interests of the central government, the prytanis again appears in many documents simply as the representative and chief executive of the boule. In some cases, however, it is more difficult to see whether he was directly dependent on the boule for his instructions. In *P. Oxy.* 1662 a prytanis states that he is going away on a *πρεσβεία* to the court of the prefect to appeal the assessment of *ἀπότακτον* on the nome. In *P. Oxy.* 2341 a prytanis appears before the prefect to accuse a strategos of being responsible for the late delivery of taxes in kind. In both these cases the prytanis appears to be acting in the interests of the villages of the nome as well as the metropolis, but it is not clear that he is instructed by the boule, although the evidence shows that the boule bore a corporate responsibility for the payment of taxes due from the nome.⁹ The prytanis also pays taxes on behalf of the metropolis (*P. Oxy.* 1515), and bears the responsibility of managing the tax account for monies collected both in the nome and the metropolis (*P. Oxy.* 1419; 890 = *WChr.* 280). In a slightly different sphere, the prytanis appears with a deputy-strategos and a dekaprotos as the addressee in an application for the execution of an order of the *katholikos* and procurator for the purchase of land (*P. Lond.* 1157 verso [III, p. 109], from Hermopolis).

Although it is impossible to be quite specific in each case, it appears that the powers of the prytanis in the third century were not strictly limited to the

7. See below, pp. 107-110.

8. Cf. *P. Erl.* 18.13-5: ἐπεὶ γὰρ] πρύτανι
ἐχειροτονήσατε εἴνα ἐγκαταλίπητε [αὐτῶν τὰ
πράγματα καὶ] ἵνα σκέψηται περὶ τῶν κοινῶν καὶ
τὰ σύμφω[ρα ὑμῶν συμβουλευή], and the alternative
restorations proposed by Wegener, *The Boule*, p.
312. Many of the documents discussed in Chapter

IV provide examples of the prytanis acting as the
representative of the boule (e.g. *C. P. Herm.* 57-64;
P. Oxy. 59; *P. Oxy. ined.* 5; 15; 19; 21). In *P. Oxy.*
2130 a petition to the board of gymnasiarchs is
addressed through the deputy-prytanis.

9. See below, pp. 69-77.

implementation of decisions of the boule. The main function of the prytanis was to preside over the boule, to bring business to it and execute its decisions – a function which was to some extent shared with the syndikoi – but he was apparently also able to act on his own initiative in spheres of business in which the boule had a general interest. The precise difference in character between the position of the prytanis and that of syndikos might therefore be specified in terms of the limitation of power. In the third century the syndikos seems to have functioned as an official who was partly responsible for business enacted within the boule, and partly responsible for representing the boule in its dealings with officials of the central government and in the arrangements upon which depended the efficient functioning of the boule in the appointment of liturgists for the metropolis (see above, pages 46-52). His range of activity appears to be limited by the necessities or decisions imposed by the boule. Whereas the same is largely true of the prytanis, he was able to direct the activity of the boule to a much greater extent, and, if the occasion demanded, to resolve difficulties by going over the head of the boule.

The development of the office of syndikos into one which was independent of the boule in the fourth century has already been traced. The evidence shows that the prytanis is found more frequently acting on his own initiative. In documents from Oxyrhynchus and Hermopolis there is evidence that the prytanis appointed officials for duties connected with impositions by the state.¹⁰ In *P. Oxy.* 2110 it appears that the appointment made by the prytanis is referred to the boule only because the appointee had a justified claim for exemption from that office. Faced with difficulties in finding liturgists for the *annona militaris*, a prytanis of Herakleopolis reacted in the same way as did the prytanis of Oxyrhynchus in *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 2 – by writing to a higher official for assistance (*SB* 9597).

There are several documents from the fourth century in which the prytanis appears to conduct business independently of the boule. Investigations relevant to the confiscation of property by the central government are delegated to the prytanis and syndikoi of Oxyrhynchus, and by them to the bibliophylakes (*P. Oxy.* 2665; 2673; *MChr.* 196). There is no doubt that the prytanis, at least, is here acting as the representative of the boule, but he is not dependent on the boule for the task. *P. Wis.* 12 may be another illustration of this; a deed of surety for a vine-grower is addressed to the prytanis of Arsinoe. Similarly in *P. Oxy.* ined. 13 a prytanis is the recipient of a declaration about donkey-selling. This view of the prytanis as not merely the president of the boule, but as a member of the body of municipal officials which included the logistes, the syndikos and the strategos-exactor, is further illustrated by *BGU* 1027 (= *WChr.* 424) in which a *praeses* and *comes* writes to the *exactores* and *πρόεδροι* of Hermopolis, complaining of the failure to provide *annona militaris*.¹¹

10. *P. Oxy.* 2110; *P. Lond.* 971 (III, p. 128 = *MChr.* 95); cf *P. Giss.* 54 from the Thebaid (IV-V).

11. See below, p. 81.

Nevertheless, there is no firm evidence to suggest that the ex-prytaneis occupied any position of eminence in the metropoleis by virtue of having been president of the boule. In this respect the evidence for the third and fourth centuries is uniform. The most probable indication of some privileged position might be sought in reports of meetings, but the reports of meetings of the boule of Oxyrhynchus in *P. Oxy.* 1413 and 2110, which contain statements by ex-prytaneis, do not suggest that they occupied any privileged position in the order of speaking.

In the third and the fourth centuries it is quite common to find prytaneis occupying positions additional to the presidency of the boule. Tenure of municipal magistracies like the gymnasiarchy is frequently attested at Oxyrhynchus and elsewhere. In the early fourth century a prytanis of Oxyrhynchus bears the title of syndikos also.¹² There are several examples of prytaneis of Oxyrhynchus who also held posts at Alexandria. Quite frequently the tenure of these posts is anterior to the presidency of the boule of Oxyrhynchus, but in *P. Osl.* 85 there is a prytanis of Oxyrhynchus who is concurrently bouleutes, kosmetes and hypomnematographos of Alexandria (as well as being an ex-gymnasiarch). There is no evidence that membership of the boule of Alexandria was not held for life, and the prytanis will presumably have continued to hold this position after the presidency of the boule at Oxyrhynchus. The connection of such people with Alexandria is not entirely clear; they might have been natives of Oxyrhynchus with influential connections at Alexandria, or Alexandrians who owned property at Oxyrhynchus and were liable for service there. Whichever was the case, it was no doubt true that people of this type were among the wealthiest and most influential in the metropolis. In this connection it may be noted that the people who appear in connection with the boule of Oxyrhynchus and also held posts at Alexandria are mostly either prytaneis or ex-prytaneis at Oxyrhynchus.¹³ Such titles no doubt implied responsibilities, but they probably also carried considerable prestige. The same is probably true of the title *ἵππικὸς ἀπὸ στρατιῶν*, indicating equestrian military service, which is borne by a prytanis of Hermopolis, Aurelius Korellios Alexandros.¹⁴

The evidence shows clearly that the prytanis of the boule was the chief

12. *MChr.* 196, of 309 (see Lallemand, *L'administration*, p. 261). The statement in *P. Oxy.* 1413.17 note that it is addressed to a prytanis and two syndikoi needs correction. For examples of prytaneis holding municipal offices at Oxyrhynchus see Appendix I, Section A.

13. For other examples from Oxyrhynchus see *BGU* 1073 (= *MChr.* 198); 1074; *P. Oxy.* 55 (= *WChr.* 196); 59; *PSI* 705; 1330; *P. Fuad* 1 52; *P. Oxy.* 1412. Marcus Aurelius Asklepiades-Hermodoros, the prytanis of *C. P. Herm.* 7 2, was a

native Hermopolite who was a bouleutes of Alexandria and places outside Egypt (see Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 130 ff.).

14. For the titles of this man see e.g. *C. P. Herm.* 59 (= *WChr.* 151), *εὐθημιάρχῆσαντος γυμνασιάρχου βουλευτοῦ νεωκόρου τοῦ ἐνταῦθα μεγάλου Σαράπιδος ἵππικῶ ἀπὸ στρατιῶν καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει ἐνάρχου πρυτάνεως*. On his career and the documents pertaining to him see Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 375-8.

administrative figure in the metropolis in the third century. There are examples of three prytaneis of Oxyrhynchus who, in addition to normal titles, append to their titulature the term *διέπων καὶ τὰ πολιτικά*, the purport of which is not clear (*P. Oxy.* 55 = *WChr.* 196; *P. Oxy.* 2109; *PSI* 1070; *P. Oxy.* ined. 15; cf. *P. Harr.* 69 2). The editors of these documents understood the term as a title and translated it as "director also of municipal finance." If this is the meaning, it seems somewhat otiose, since the evidence adduced for the financial administration of the metropoleis shows quite clearly that the prytanis, in effect, normally occupied this position (see below, pages 91-97). It seems possible that this title was applied to the prytanis as a deputy administrator of the *πολιτικός λόγος* in the event of there being no *ταμίας*.¹⁵

There is a small amount of fourth-century evidence for prytaneis occupying other positions which were part of the municipal organisation, but bore direct responsibility to the central government. In *P. Cair. Is.* 70, of ca. 310, a prytanis of Arsinoe is found acting as strategos in the capacity of a deputy (*διάδοχος*). In *P. Abinn.* 58 a prytanis of Arsinoe requests an *epistula exactoriae* from Abinnaeus. Whether he wanted the actual position, or the benefits without the responsibilities, it is evident that he could have held the post, though this might have been abnormal.¹⁶

Terminology

As has been shown, the term *πρύτανις* (with its corollary *ἀρχιπρύτανις*) was probably applied in the second century to the officials who headed the *κοινὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων* in the metropoleis. After the foundation of the boulaï, the title is found applied to the president of the boule. This practice seems to have been common to all the metropoleis except one. A document from Panopolis dated by its editor to ca. 250 refers to different people with the titles *ἀρχιπρυτανεύσας* and *προεδρεύσας*.¹⁷ A possible explanation of this is that the document is to be dated to the early part of the third century; then the ex-archiprytanis will have been a relic of the second century, the ex-proedroi will have held the presidency of the boule. This does not explain why the term *πρόεδρος* should have been used at all, when the official was called the prytanis elsewhere. The explanation adopted by the editor, which is rather more coherent, is that the college of prytaneis headed by the

15. For the view that the use of the term *διέπων* sometimes indicates a deputy but does not always have this force see *JEA* 21, 1935, pp. 239-40; but there is no objection to the supposition that it can signify a deputy here, see above, Chapter II, note 75. It might conceivably mean that the prytanis was given somewhat wider responsibilities than was normal, although these would be difficult to specify. On the other hand, it

might be purely a descriptive flourish, although this would not explain why it is attached only to three prytaneis (and on two separate occasions for one of them). It would also be contrary to the normal practice of titulature.

16. See *P. Abinn.* 58 introd., Lallemand, *L'administration*, p. 123.

17. *SB* 9902 C16, 114, P8 (*editio princeps* in *Recherches de Papyrologie* 2, 1962, pp. 37-67).

archiprytanis, survived the foundation of the boule, presumably with severely limited or different responsibilities. This is supported by the fact that a document from the middle of the third century, very probably from Panopolis, attests that the president of the boule was called *πρόεδρος*.¹⁸ On the other hand, it might be a purely honorary title, but there is no indication, so far as our evidence goes, that this practice was in use in any of the other metropoleis at this period.

Apart from the occurrences of the term at Panopolis, the earliest dated example of the term *πρόεδρος* is in *P. Berl. Möller* 1, of 300, referring to Lykopolis. Thereafter the title is found quite frequently in the other metropoleis, and the equivalence of the title to that of prytanis is proved beyond all doubt by *P. Oxy.* 2110, in which the president of the boule is called *πρόεδρος* whilst his term is referred to as a *πρυτανία*.¹⁹ An ex-president of the boule bears the title *πρυτανεύσας, προεδρεύσας* or *ἀπὸ προέδρων*. The term normally used to describe the president elect in the third century is *ἀποδεδειγμένος πρύτανις* or *μελλοπρύτανις*; in the fourth century the same prefixes are used with the alternative title of *πρόεδρος*.²⁰ There are four examples, including one from the early fourth century, of deputy-prytaneis being appointed. These show that the normal expression for such an official was *ὁ διαδεχόμενος τὴν πρυτανείαν*.²¹ There does not seem to have been any particular difficulty about the appointment of deputies. In *P. Oxy.* 1662 a prytanis who has to go away requests the strategos to inform the man who is to be his deputy. It was probably convenient rather than mandatory to inform the strategos, for in *PSI* 804 a prytanis in a similar position writes directly to the deputy asking him to take over the presidency for a short time.

18. *P. Got.* 7, see *P. Beatty Panop.* introd., pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

19. The equivalence is also demonstrated by *P. Cair. Preis.* 13; 14; *SP XX* 99 which refer to the same man with the titles *ἀποδεδειγμένος πρύτανις* and *ἀποδεδειγμένος πρόεδρος*. The term *πρόεδρος* is used of the president of the boule in *P. Beatty Panop.* 1, of 298. For fourth-century examples see *P. Ross-Georg.* V 28 (*Oxyrhynchus*); *P. Abinn.* 18 (*Arsinoe*); *P. Flor.* 71.705; *P. Lond.* 971 (III), p. 128 = *MChr.* 95); *SB* 9558; *BGU* 1027 = *WChr.* 424 (all *Hermopolis*).

20. For examples see *P. Oxy.* 1414.24; *P. Cair. Preis.* 13; 14; *SP XX* 99; *P. Lugd.-Bat.* XIII 10; *P. Giss.* 54. In *P. Oxy.* ined. 2 a man is described as *πρύ(τανις) τῆς μελλούσης*, a phrase which presumably has the same connotation. It is remarkable that in *P. Cair. Preis.* 14 the man has the title of prytanis designate in Phaophi, and even more remarkable that in *P. Lugd.-Bat.* XIII 10 the

term *ἐναρχος μελλοπρόεδρος* is used. The simplest explanation of these phenomena is that the investiture of the president was for some reason delayed (cf. Lallemand, *L'administration*, p. 130). It is perhaps relevant that in *P. Oxy.* ined. 20 a prytanis sends an invitation to his *στέψις* which is to take place in Tybi. We would normally expect this to occur on Thoth 1, cf. *WChr.* 41 (the crowning of a gymnasiarch in 232). In this case the *στέψις* might have been delayed or the prytanis might have come into office late, for it is unlikely that this was normal, see below pp. 62-64. The term also occurs (by restoration) in *C. P. Herm.* 97 (rejected by Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, p. 168).

21. *CPR* 20 = *WChr.* 402 (*Hermopolis*, 250); *P. Oxy.* 2130 (267); 1662 (246); *PSI* 804 (provenance unknown, 301); *P. Oxy.* ined. 6 (early IV).

Election and Length of Tenure

Evidence for the term of office of the prytanis in the third century is found in documents from Oxyrhynchus, Hermopolis and Arsinoe.²² The arguments which follow are based on the supposition, which is supported by the evidence already adduced, that the system in the metropoleis was uniform; the evidence for the length of the term of presidency is consonant with this supposition.

There is no evidence from any of the metropoleis that the presidency of the boule was based on a college of prytaneis. There is no reference in the third-century evidence to show that there was ever more than one serving prytanis at one time, and the occurrence of the plural seems to refer generally to past or future presidents.²³ There is evidence from Oxyrhynchus to demonstrate that the prytanis was elected by the boule. In *P. Erl.* 18 the prytanis addresses the boule: ἐπεὶ γὰρ] πρύτανιω χειροτονήσατε . . . *P. Oxy.* 1414 demonstrates clearly not only that the boule elected the prytanis, but also that there was only one prytanis at a time — in a meeting of the boule the prytanis says: ὁ νόμος κ[ε]λεύει πρὸ ἑξαμήνου τὸν μελλοπρύτανιω ὀνομάζεσθαι. It is therefore odd to find that in *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 2 a prytanis writes to a prefect describing himself as ὑ[πο]γύω]ς χειροτονη[θείς διὰ] τῆς εὐτυχοῦς σοῦ δεξιᾶς εἰς τὴν . . . πρυτανείαν ἀ[σμένως?] παρελθῶν, but the editors were no doubt right in surmising that the election by the boule was probably confirmed by the prefect.²⁴

The assumption has normally been made that the prytanis of the boule was elected for a term of a year, and this may now be tested, for the third century at least, by an accumulation of evidence which serves to eliminate the other possibilities.²⁵

22. Examples of dated prytaneis in the third century are: *Arsinoe* — *BGU* 362 = *WChr.* 96 (one attested in office in Tybi, 214-5, a different one in Payni, 215); *SB* 7696 (Herapion in office until epagomenal day 5, 249, Apollonides in 249-50, from Thoth 1, 249); *Hermopolis* — *P. Lond.* 1157 verso (III, p. 109) (246); *CPR* 20 = *WChr.* 402 (250); *P. Oxy.* 2108 (259); *C. P. Herm.* 67; 83; 119 recto. 76-7 (266-8, see below, note 30); *Leontopolis* (?) — *P. Oxy.* 1503 (288-9, see below, Appendix I, note 10); *Panopolis* — *P. Beatty Panop.* 1 (298); *Unknown* — *PSI* 804 (301). Examples of undated prytaneis and ex-prytaneis are: *Arsinoe* — *BGU* 572-4 (III); *P. Fay.* 85 (247); *Herakleopolis* — *CPR* 228 (205); *SP* XX 60 (244-9); *CPR* 111; *BGU* 924; 925 = *WChr.* 37 (all III); *Hermopolis* — *C. P. Herm.* 7 1 (early III, a prytanis and an ex-prytanis); *C. P. Herm.* 7 2 (early III, a prytanis and an ex-prytanis); *C. P. Herm.* 14; 25-6; 94 = *WChr.* 194; 97; 112 (all III); *Panopolis*

— *P. Got.* 7 (mid III); *P. Got.* 15 ? (undated); *SB* 9902 (mid III); *P. Beatty Panop.* 1.272 (298); *Unknown* — *PSI* 794 (III ?); *P. Harr.* 129 (III).

23. E.g. *SB* 7696.76 f.: ὅτε ἦν ἐν εὐπορίᾳ τὰ πρά[γμα]τα ἐξέστη οὗτος ὁ πρύτανις καὶ ἄλλος] οὐδεὶς τῶν προ[υ]περῶν ἔμεινε [τ]ῶν ἑξῆς. The translation in the *editio princeps* took this to refer to the office: "when affairs were in a state of prosperity this prytanis resigned his property and not a single prytanis remained to succeed him." If this is the sense, it seems more likely to mean "...and not a single one of the succeeding prytaneis remained (in office)." More probably, however, ἐξέστη and ἔμεινε are to be taken as referring to the letter of the law (so Wegener, *The Boule*, p. 304).

24. χειροτονία to the presidency is attested at *Arsinoe* by *SB* 7696.49.

25. The term has generally been surmised to be one year, e.g. *JEA* 21, 1935, p. 243, where,

There is only one piece of evidence for the date at which the prytanis took up his duties. The natural supposition that it would be on Thoth 1 is confirmed by *SB* 7696.45-6 where the prytanis of Arsinoe says: ἔτου[ς] ς Μ[ε]σορή πρό τῷ ἡμ[ερ]ῶν π[ροῦ]βλήθη [γε] εἰς τὴν [πρυτανία]ν ταύτην, μέχρι δὲ πέμπτης τῶ[ν] ἐπαγομένων εἰ[ς] π[ρὸ] ἐμοῦ[ν] πρύτανις ἦν.²⁶ If this is the normal situation, as seems likely, the term of office of the prytanis must have been a dividend of twelve months, if it was shorter than a year. If it were shorter than a year but not a dividend of twelve months, the prytanis would only have come into office on Thoth 1 once every few years and this evidence would have to be regarded as coincidental. This must be regarded as highly unlikely.

There is only one example of two different, named prytaneis attested for the same metropolis in the same year, and there are several pieces of evidence which suggest very strongly that the term was not less than a year (and that this sole example must consequently be regarded as an abnormality).²⁷ Apollonides, the prytanis of Arsinoe in *SB* 7696, came into office on Thoth 1 of the seventh year of Philip (249-50). He was apparently still prytanis at the time of the trial before the prefect which is recorded in *SB* 7696 and which very probably occurred in the early spring of 250, some six to eight months after Apollonides came into office.²⁸ That he was still prytanis at this time is clear from lines 103-4 of the document: Σαβεῖω[ο]ς ἑπαρχος Αἰγύπτου σκεψάμενος μετὰ τῶν ἐν τῷ συμβουλείῳ Ἀπολλωνίδη πρυτάνι [εἰπ(εν)]... There still remains a faint possibility that the office may have lasted for six months, for the trial could conceivably have taken place in Tybi of the year in which Apollonides served. However *P. Oxy.* 1414.24 ff. seems to eliminate this possibility on various grounds. The prytanis informs the boule that the μελλοπρύτανις should by law be nominated six months in advance, and the meeting proceeds to renominate the present incumbent.²⁹ If the term were one of six months, this nomination would be for the next term but one, and this

however, some kind of a rotating arrangement is presumed. Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 375 ff. concluded that a one year term with re-election permitted was the most likely arrangement, though he also flirted with the idea of a rotation, perhaps every three or four months, on the basis of *BGU* 362 (= *WChr.* 96). The discussion which follows is based, for Oxyrhynchus, on the evidence set out in Appendix I, Section A.

26. The στέψις of a prytanis in Tybi (*P. Oxy.* ined. 20) can be interpreted so as not to conflict with the evidence of *SB* 7696, see above, note 20.

27. In *BGU* 362 5.14 (= *WChr.* 96) Aurelius Heracleides-Agathodaimon is attested as prytanis-in-office in Tybi, 214-5. In 15.6 Aurelius Harpokration is attested in office in a reference

which falls between sections dated to Payni 9 and 30, 215. In the reference to a prytanis in 12 and frag. 4 the name is lost.

28. For the date see *JEA* 21, 1935, pp. 227-8.

29. The election of the prytanis Apollonides at Arsinoe seems to have taken place shortly before Mesore 249, with the term beginning on Thoth 1, 249. The law mentioned in *P. Oxy.* 1414 would have been a curious one if it applied to Oxyrhynchus, but not to Arsinoe. The fact that a law existed did not mean that it was always observed, however. No doubt it was as easy for the boule of Arsinoe to elect the prytanis late, especially if it had difficulty in finding a willing candidate, as it was to impress villagers (illegally) into metropolitan liturgies.

makes nonsense of the language used here; *τὸν μελλοπρύτανω* must mean the prytanis who is to serve the next term. The exhortation addressed to the prytanis by the boule cannot comfortably be interpreted to mean anything other than that this prytanis is to remain in office: *ἐπι κάμε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, κάμε ἄξια τοῦ ἐπάρ[ω χρόνου]* . . . It seems clear, therefore, that the term of office was not normally less than a year. The example from Arsinoe of two different prytaneis in office in the same year could be explained in terms of the difficulties of getting people to serve which are evident in *P. Oxy.* 1414 and *SB* 7696. An alternative explanation is that one term may have been divided under pressure of special circumstances. In *P. Oxy.* 1414.28, directly after the attempts of the boule to renominate the prytanis, the phrase *οἱ ἡμι[σ]υ τούτ[ου] τοῦ μέρους [ὀ]φ[ε]λ[ί]λ[ου]τ[ες]* . . . occurs; apart from the doubtfulness of the reading, it is impossible to be sure whether this refers to election for the presidency or some other office. It is, however, admissible as possible evidence for the splitting of a term of presidency, and it is in any case quite likely that this will have happened on occasion.

The possibility remains that the term of presidency may have been longer than a year. In the face of the possibility that it may have been longer than twelve months but shorter than two years, the evidence for the term beginning on Thoth 1 may again be adduced. It is difficult to imagine that a term beginning on Thoth 1 could have been the exception rather than the rule, yet this would be implied by any postulation that the term was one of fifteen, sixteen or eighteen months, for example. It seems likely, therefore, that if the term was longer than a year, it was a multiple of a year. There are clear cases of the same people attested as prytanis-in-office in consecutive years. Aurelius Dioskourides-Sabinos was in office at Oxyrhynchus in 260-1 and 261-2. Aurelius Korellios Alexandros is attested in office at Hermopolis in 266-7 and 267-8.³⁰ It is, however, clear from the attempt of the boule to renominate the prytanis in *P. Oxy.* 1414 that re-election to the presidency was perfectly in order.

A recent accumulation of new evidence from Oxyrhynchus demonstrates beyond all reasonable doubt that the term cannot have been longer than one year. First, there is a three-year series of different prytaneis attested in 245-8. Aurelius Bion-Ammonios was prytanis in 245-6 (*P. Oxy.* 1662) – he appointed a deputy, but for the present purpose the two may be treated as one; in *P. Oxy.* 1418 there is an anonymous prytanis in office in 247-8 and a reference to an ex-prytanis named Asklepiades who was in office in 246-7 (see Appendix I). A similar series can perhaps be seen at Arsinoe in 247-50. *SB* 7696 attests the fact that Herapion was prytanis in 248-9 and was succeeded by Apollonides in

30. Korellios is attested in office in Hathyr and Choiak of 266 (266-7), and in Thoth and Choiak of 267 (267-8); also in Phamenoth of an unknown year, probably 268 (267-8), cf. Oertel,

Die Liturgie, pp. 347-8. In documents in which the year is restored as the fifteenth (267-8), he appears in Phaophi, Pachon and Payni. Cf. Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 376 ff.

249-50. A document of 247-8 (BGU 8) attests a prytanis-in-office named Agathodaimon but it is not certain that he was in office in that year. The text refers to the fact that he was responsible for the election of tax-collectors who were in office in 247-8 and might therefore have been elected in the previous year. In addition to these series a new document provides a list of prytaneis at Oxyrhynchus between the years 277 and 282.³¹ The text has entries in the form: δ (ἔτους) πρυτ(ανεύοντος) Εὐδαίμωνος. The provenance of the document is Hermopolis but the identifications of two of the prytaneis make it quite certain that the list refers to Oxyrhynchus. With this evidence of five different, named prytaneis in consecutive years, we can hardly doubt that the term of office was not longer than a year.

This conclusion is reinforced by a statistical examination of the data which was formulated before this new evidence became available and depends upon the assumption that the evidence constitutes a random sample. The test applied to the prytaneis hinges upon the observation of three pairs of different, named prytaneis in contiguous years. As may be seen from the list in Appendix I, we may use the following pairs: Aurelius Bion-Ammonios and Asklepiades (246-7 and 247-8), Aurelius Lypros (or Lysixos) and Euporos-Agathodaimon (272-3 and 273-4) and Aurelius Hierakion-Dionysios and Dioskōros-Helladios (305-6 and 306-7).^{31a}

With these three contiguous pairs as a basis, the following test may be applied. On the assumption that the presidency lasted for one year, and taking any given year in which the name of the prytanis is known, the chances of finding a *different* person in the following year are, obviously, 1.0 (100 per cent). On the assumption that the presidency was a two-year term, given the same knowledge, the chances of finding a different person in the following year are 0.5 (50 per cent). Ignoring for the moment the chances of re-election, the chances of observing three sets of different, named prytaneis in contiguous years, as we do, may be expressed as follows:

For a 1-year term: $(1)^3$, i.e. 1.0, 100 per cent.

For a 2-year term: $(1/2)^3$, i.e. 0.125, 12.5 per cent. Let the possibility of re-election be q , and let q be assigned arbitrary values of 0.2 (20 per cent) and 0.4 (40 per cent). Then the chances of observing three pairs of different, named prytaneis in contiguous years are:

For a 1-year term, where $q = 0.2$: $(1-q)^3$, approximately 51 per cent.

For a 1-year term, where $q = 0.4$: $(1-q)^3$, approximately 21 per cent.

For a 2-year term, where $q = 0.2$: $(1/2-q/2)^3$, approximately 6.4 per cent.

For a 2-year term, where $q = 0.4$: $(1/2-q/2)^3$, approximately 2.7 per cent.

31. Z. Borkowski, "Le Papyrus de Berlin Inv. 11314 et les Prytanes d'Oxyrhynchus de 277 à 282," *Chronique d'Égypte* 43, 1968, pp. 325-31.

31a. If Lypros is to be disqualified (see Ap-

pendix I, note 5) we can use Herapion and Apollonides of Arsinoe (SB 7696); if, as has been assumed, the system in the metropoleis did not differ, this does not affect the validity of the test."

The result may be stated as follows: Given the possibility of re-election in consecutive years, which we know to have existed:

1. It is more likely that the term was one year than that it was two years.

2. The chance of obtaining examples of contiguous pairs is in inverse proportion to the chance of re-election in consecutive years. The lower is the chance of re-election in consecutive years, the higher is the chance of obtaining examples of pairs of different prytaneis in contiguous years.

This result accords very well with the fact that there are comparatively few examples of the same prytanis attested in two consecutive years.³²

The evidence adduced in this inquiry all dates to the third or early fourth century. The comparative lack of evidence for the later fourth century makes it difficult either to affirm or deny this conclusion. The evidence from Oxyrhynchus for the first decade of the fourth century is reasonably abundant, but there is no example of two different prytaneis attested in the same year. Apart from the title of ἀπό προέδρων which is sometimes attached to an ex-president, there is only one document, from Hermopolis, which suggests that there was a plurality of presidents at any one time. A letter from a *praeses* and *comes* is addressed to the *exactores* and *πρόεδροι* of Hermopolis (BGU 1027 = *WChr.* 424). The document bears no indication of the year in which it was written. The financial and administrative difficulties which it attests in the provision of *annona militaris* make it perfectly possible to assume that Hermopolis might have changed to a collegiate system of presidents in order to spread the burden of office under difficult circumstances. But in view of the lack of supporting evidence, this example might with equal justification be regarded as a *lapsus calami*.³³

32. Definite cases will be Aurelius Korellios Alexandros at Hermopolis, Aurelii Dioskourides-Sabinos, Apollonios-Dionysios and Themistokles-Dioskourides at Oxyrhynchus. The list of prytaneis from Oxyrhynchus shows several examples of people who served more than one term in non-consecutive years. I am indebted to Dr. David Wardle, of McGill University, for help in the formulation of the test.

33. Examples of dated prytaneis in the fourth century are: *Arsinoe* — *P. Abinn.* 58 (345); *Hermonthis* — *P. Lips.* 97 22 (337-8); *Hermopolis* — *SP XX* 99; *P. Cair. Preis.* 13; 14 (all referring to the same person; the first document attests him as prytanis-designate in 320 (?), the others are

undated except that one contains the month Phaophi); *Lykopolis* — *P. Berl. Möller* 1 (300). Examples of undated and ex-prytaneis are: *Arsinoe* — *P. Amh.* 82 (III-IV); *P. Thead.* 33 (312, cf. *P. Wis.* 32); *P. Cair. Is.* 70 (ca. 310); *P. Abinn.* 18 (342-51); *Herakleopolis* — *SB* 9597 (IV); *Hermopolis* — *P. Lond.* 971 (III, p. 128 = *MChr.* 95) (III-IV); *P. Lond.* 1829 (IV); *BGU* 1027 = *WChr.* 424 (IV); *P. Flor.* 71.705 (IV); *P. Lugd.-Bat.* XIII 10 (IV); *SB* 9558 (325); *Lykopolis* — *PSI* 1264 (IV); *Thmuis* — *P. Corn.* 20 (302).

For the argument that *προπολιτευόμενοι* are not necessarily to be regarded as prytaneis see Appendix III.

The Greek Cities

The evidence for the system of prytaneis in the Greek cities in the second and early third centuries has already been discussed (above, pages 14-15), and a brief summary will suffice here. The later evidence is extremely sparse and adds little of value.³⁴

The evidence for the third and fourth centuries is almost totally confined to Antinoopolis.³⁵ That the organisation of its boule was somewhat different from those of the metropoleis is suggested by the occurrence of the term *πρυτανεύουσα φυλή* and the existence of *πρυτανικοί*, apparently with a chairman called the *ἀρχων πρυτανικῶν*. This suggests the possibility that the boule was organised with a ten-year cycle of prytanising tribes; the tribe responsible for the year would provide a board of *πρυτανικοί*, who would divide the responsibility for the year among themselves.³⁶

PSI 199 attests that in the early third century a *πρυτανικός* also held the post of *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*. Other duties are not well attested. In the meeting of the boule of Antinoopolis reported in *Archiv* 4, pp. 115-7, of 258, the presiding official is called ὁ *πρυτανικός*, just as in the second century (*WChr.* 27). His position here differs in no way from the presidents in the metropoleis. It is impossible to say how far the resemblance went. The prytaneis of Antinoopolis are attested in the third century in connection with matters pertaining to status and citizenship (*PSI* 199; *P. Fam. Teb.* 49-50; *PSI* 1067), just as they are in the second century, but the paucity of evidence does not permit a firm conclusion that this kind of business formed the greater proportion of their responsibilities.

Apart from the differences noted, the terminology applied to the prytaneis of Antinoopolis is similar to that of their counterparts in the metropoleis. An ex-prytanis in the third century used the title *πρυτανεύσας* (*P. Oxy.* 2130), and the term *πρύτανις* is also used with the same meaning as *πρυτανικός* (*SB* 8312). After the beginning of the fourth century, as in the metropoleis, the term

34. Dated prytaneis in the third century are: *Alexandria* – *SB* 4275 (216); *Antinoopolis* – *PSI* 199 (203); *P. Fam. Teb.* 49-50 (205); *P. Lond. Inv.* 2507 (209), cf. P. V. Pistorius, *Indices Antinoopolitani*, 1939, p. 114; *SB* 8312 (232); *Archiv* 4, pp. 115-7 (258).

Dated prytaneis in the fourth century: *Antinoopolis* – *PSI* 22 (376); *PSI* 24 (384).

Undated and ex-prytaneis: *Alexandria* – *BGU* 753 6 (III); *Antinoopolis* – *P. Oxy.* 2130 (267); *PSI* 22 (IV); *P. Ant.* 194 (V).

35. The occurrence of the phrase *καθ' ἵπομνήματος πρυτανέων* in *P. Vindob. Boswinkel* 7, of 225, almost certainly refers to Alexandria and suggests the possibility that the collegiate system

of prytaneis, attested at Alexandria in the second century, survived into the third.

36. See above, pp. 14-15. For *πρυτανικοί* in the early third century see *PSI* 199; *P. Fam. Teb.* 49-50. Wegener, *The Phylai*, pp. 515-6 pointed out that the Antinoites who appealed against nomination at Oxyrhynchus in 244-5 and reminded the authorities of the case in Mesore of 253 might have acted on the assumption that the system of liturgising tribes was the same at Oxyrhynchus as at Antinoopolis (*P. Oxy.* 1119). However, if they were nominated for 244-5 and expected to be nominated again for 253-4 (not 254-5, as Wegener assumes) the gap is only nine years, see below, Appendix II.

πρόεδρος is found (e.g. *PSI* 22; 24), although a reference to a *πρυτανεία* is found as late as the fifth century (*P. Ant.* 194). One striking difference between Antinoopolis and the metropoleis might be noted. The practice of using the prytanis as a kind of dating formula only occurs in the metropoleis in documents directly concerned with meetings of the boule (e.g. *P. Oxy.* 1103 = *WChr.* 465; 2110); at Antinoopolis this practice is found not only in documents where there is some connection with the boule, but also in texts completely unconnected with it.³⁷

As far as the evidence goes, the prytaneis at Antinoopolis may be said to have held other posts concurrently, like the prytaneis elsewhere. In *SB* 8312 there is a prytanis of Antinoopolis who was also a gymnasiarch and *ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων*.

The evidence for the second and early third centuries seems to indicate that the presidency of the boule at Antinoopolis differed from the system in the metropoleis. There is no evidence to indicate whether Antinoopolis ever became assimilated to the metropoleis in this respect. The presidents of the boule at Antinoopolis are so few and far between after the early third century that it is impossible to form any conclusion, independently of the earlier evidence, as to what the length of tenure may have been.

37. See *SB* 8312; *PSI* 22; *P. Ant.* 194.

100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

Chapter Four

The Business of the Boule

The evidence for the various kinds of business with which the boule dealt shows clearly that its administrative responsibilities fell into two main divisions. On the one hand it was responsible to the central government as a guarantor of the payment of taxes and the fulfilment of demands for *annona militaris* and on the other it looked after the internal administration of the metropolis, of which the major aspects were the supervision of finances and the appointment of liturgists. The first section of this chapter, therefore, deals with the evidence for the boule as a collector and guarantor of taxes and impositions for supplying the army. The second section examines its role in the administration of the metropolis. The third section deals with the evidence for the boulai in the Greek cities and the fourth considers the implications of the evidence for the position of the boule in relation to the other elements of the bureaucracy.

The Boule and the Central Government

Taxation

The financial administration of Egypt was ultimately the responsibility of the prefect. At the local level there functioned a large body of officials who were responsible for the collection and payment of taxes. The responsibility for the administration of taxes in the nome as a unit was in the hands of the strategos and the boule in the third century, and the evidence is sufficient to define the position of the boule in the tax-structure and its relation to the strategos.¹

Most of the evidence from the third century comes from Oxyrhynchus and shows clearly that the responsibility of the boule was not confined to the metropolis, but extended over the whole nome. The interest of the boule in the general question of tax-assessment is attested by *P. Oxy.* 1662, in which a prytanis writes that he is going away *ἐνεκεν πρεσβεΐ[[σ]]ας περι τῆς ἐπιβληθείσης ἐπιβολῆς τῶ ἡμετέρῳ νομῶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀποτάκτου*. The embassy

1. On the tax-structure see S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, 1938, pp. 292-6. On the role of the boule in the third century see Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 385-91;

Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 164-82; J. G. Milne, "The Ruin of Egypt by Roman Mismanagement," *JRS* 17, 1927, p. 8.

was to the prefect, and its purpose was presumably to appeal against the quota imposed upon the nome. The editors thought that *ἀπότακτον* was a general expression for imperial revenues, but in this case it is perhaps more likely to have been a special imposition.² The importance of this document is that it shows the prytanis assuming for the boule the responsibility of protesting the imposition on the whole nome, and further that the boule is acting in the interests of the tax-payers, rather than as an agent of the central government.

P. Oxy. 2341 throws into clearer relief the role of the boule in taxation. In a hearing before the prefect, the prytanis accuses the strategos of being responsible for the late delivery of taxes in kind, through failure to observe the traditional method of clearing the granaries. There is no doubt that the prytanis is here concerned with the details of collection in the nome, for he refers to *τῆς ἄνω (τοπαρχίας)* and *τὰς παραποταμίους κώμας* and hence, as the editors surmised, he is probably appearing on behalf of both the metropolis and the villages of the nome. This evidence therefore shows the direct responsibility of the boule for areas outside the metropolis. The very fact that the prytanis accuses the strategos before the prefect is also of some interest. The logical supposition is that the boule was likely to be held responsible for late delivery or arrears in tax and hence made an attempt (apparently successfully) to cover itself and shift the blame on to the strategos. Ultimately, no doubt, the boule would have to make good any arrears in the collection, and so in this case it is probably protecting itself and the tax-payers from a fine or an additional imposition. It appears that the strategos is responsible for the detailed procedure of collection and transportation. Whether or not the boule had any part in this, either directly or through officials whom it appointed, this responsibility is not in question in *P. Oxy.* 2341.³

P. Oxy. 1414 shows the boule occupying a somewhat different position in relation to the central government. The document contains a report of a meeting of the boule in which details of the manufacture of material are discussed. The editors thought that two subjects were dealt with in lines 1-11: (1) Clothes payable to the state as tax (lines 1-3); (2) Woven cloth which was required to be supplied by the municipality to a temple or temples (lines 4-11). In the following section the boule discussed a request from the city cloth-weavers for a rise in prices, but the editors disconnected this from the foregoing. They were almost certainly correct in this, since the city cloth-weavers have no part in lines 1-11, and neither the state nor the temples are mentioned in the following section.

2. See P. J. Parsons, "Philippus Arabs and Egypt," *JRS* 57, 1967, pp. 136-8, and compare *SB* 7696.102-3. Parsons (note 76) suggests the possibility of a similar imposition under Probus (*P. Oxy.* 1409; 1562). For Philip's imposition see also *BGU* 8 2.24.

3. For officials appointed by the boule in connection with taxes in kind see *P. Oxy.* 1031 = *WChr.* 343 (228); *P. Flor.* 21 (Arsinoe, 239, cf. Lewis, *ICS* s.v. *ἀνάδοσις σπερμάτων*); *P. Teb.* 403 (Arsinoe, 212-7).

Are the first eleven lines of this document really concerned with the two subjects outlined by the editors? A. H. M. Jones suggested corrections in these lines which are far-reaching in their effect, though he did not pursue them to their conclusion. In line 11 for τὴν ὀθόνην τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀνα he proposed to read τὴν ὀθόνην τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀναβ[ολικοῦ], and in the phrase τοῦ ἱεροῦ γραφ[ή]ν in line 4, he thought that ἀναβολικοῦ had dropped out between ἱεροῦ and γραφ[ή]ν. Palaeographically, the restoration in line 11 is extremely plausible. The restoration of line 4 is more difficult, since postulation of a scribal error is always uncomfortable. If, however, the grounds for accepting the restoration of line 11 are strong enough, some clarification of the phrase in line 4 is necessary.⁴

Several arguments may be advanced to support the restoration in line 11. There is no particular reason to expect that ἱεροῦ means "temple." There is no evidential support for the boule having dealings of this sort with temples, or for supplying vestments, though this is admittedly possible if the boule exercised some control over the city cloth-weavers as this document attests (lines 12-16). In *P. Oxy.* 1416 there is a mention of a petition of priests to the boule, but the subject is not preserved. Although the possibility that the boule is dealing with a temple cannot be definitively excluded, the document will make better sense if ἱεροῦ is understood as an adjective. The word is applied as an adjective to imperial revenues, and the only ones which could plausibly be restored in line 11 are ἀννῶνα, ἀπότακτον and ἀναβολικόν.⁵ Of these the first is excluded by its gender, and of the others the latter is clearly preferable, unless no reliance may be placed upon the reading of the first three letters by the editors as ἀνα. Two further facts support this preference. There is evidence that the *anabolicum* was paid in cloth; *P. Oxy.* 1136, of 420, contains a receipt for four στιχάρια (the same word occurs in *P. Oxy.* 1414.1), ὑπὲρ ἀναβολικοῦ.⁶ Second, *P. Oxy.* 1414 dates to the reign of Aurelian (see below, Appendix II), who is stated in the *Historia Augusta* to have been responsible for introducing changes in the imposition of the *anabolicum* in Egypt; further, linen was one of the products involved in this tax (*HA Aurelian* 45.1).⁷ It therefore makes sense to suppose that the boule might well be discussing the imposition of *anabolicum* in a document from the reign of Aurelian. Taken together, these arguments

4. Jones, GC, pp. 329-30, note 94.

5. For examples see *WO* 682; *P. Oxy.* 1662 (cf. Wilcken, *Archiv* 4, 1907-8, p. 185; Parsons, *loc. cit.* [above, note 2]); *P. Oxy.* 1135; *P. Thead.* 34.

6. In *P. Oxy.* ined. 4, of 302, the boule is apparently concerned with the transportation of στιχάρια to Alexandria.

7. There is no evidence for any connection of ἀπότακτον with linen or cloth goods; see the references given by Parsons *loc. cit.* (above, note

2). On the character of the *anabolicum* see S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, 1938, pp. 214-9. He believes that it was regularised by Aurelian as a tax in kind, and that previously it was a special levy made for the Roman armies engaged in actual warfare. R. MacMullen, "The *Anabolics* Species," *Aegyptus* 38, 1958, pp. 184-98, argued that there is good reason to reject the existence of *anabolicum* before the reign of Aurelian.

suggest very strongly that the restoration of ἀναβ[ολικοῦ] in line 11 is correct. In that case, even if Jones' suggestion that the word may have dropped out in line 4 be rejected, the sense must somehow be introduced or understood.

The effect of this restoration on the interpretation of *P. Oxy.* 1414 is radical. Instead of supposing that the boule discusses two subjects in lines 1-11 (i.e. the imposition of a tax in lines 1-3, and the supplying of clothes to a temple in lines 4-13), it may be suggested that the whole of this section is concerned with the imposition of the *anabolicum*. In lines 1-3 we have a discussion of the financial details, and in 4-11 a discussion of the details involved in producing the goods required.⁸ In that case, all reference to temples must be abandoned and the document must be interpreted anew. It supplies important information about the role of the boule in taxation from two points of view: (1) The position of the nome vis-à-vis the metropolis; (2) the position of the metropolis and the nome vis-à-vis the state.

The first three lines contain discussion about the amount of money which is owing, and the details of the distribution of the burden between the metropolis and the nome. This is perfectly consistent with the conclusion already drawn, that the boule was responsible for taxation in the nome. It is stated that 14 talents are owing and that the price of 100 στιχάρια is τάλαντα ἑκατὸν τεσσαρ[άκοντα].⁹ The prytanis says: ἀπέχω τὰ διαφέροντα τῷ νομῷ εἰς τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως ἕξ ἡμισοι, which the editors translate, "I have received the 6 1/2 belonging to the nome on account of the city's share." The next remark concerns compelling some group to pay money, and the editors restored 7 1/2 (talents), which, added to the 6 1/2, makes up the total of fourteen talents mentioned as owing. If the *anabolicum* was to be paid in kind, it seems unlikely that the 14 talents was owed by the boule to the state. It is probable in that case that the prytanis was referring to the quota of money which the boule had collected to finance the production of the material. Owing to the mutilated state of the text, it is not entirely clear how the burden was split between the city and the nome. The following seems to me to be the most plausible interpretation, though it is not the only one available. The phrase τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως refers to the total amount which had to be collected to finance the payment of *anabolicum* and it covers amounts due from both the

8. The editors restored an introduction by the prytanis as being appropriate to the introduction of a new subject in line 4. The idea of a new subject should be abandoned, but the prytanis might well have made the remark since the boule is addressed in the second person plural.

9. Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, p. 701, suggested a date of ca. 316 for *P. Oxy.* 1414. Apart from the attraction of the reference to *anabolicum* and the connection with Aurelian,

the suggestion is invalidated by the fact that the same syndikos is mentioned in 1414 and 1413 (the latter clearly dates to the reign of Aurelian, see line 25); the verso of 1414 contains an account, certainly written after the report on the recto, which dates to 279-80 (see Appendix I, note 9) and mentions a person who is also attested in *P. Oxy.* 1413 and *BGU* 1073 (= *MChr.* 198) and 1074, of 273-4. On the date of *P. Oxy.* 1413-4 see Appendix II.

metropolis and the nome. If the editors were correct in their translation of this passage – it is difficult to see what else it could mean – it is hard to explain τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως without the implication that it included amounts due from the nome. (τὰ διαφέροντα τῶ νομῶ). There is no evidence in the document to show who was responsible for the division between the metropolis and the nome. If the central government had any interest in the distribution being fair, it was probably prescribed rather than left to the boule to decide.

It is next stated that the boule had examined the γραφή and fixed a limit. If the word ἀναβολικοῦ cannot be inserted here, the sense must somehow be supplied. The resolution of the boule about that limit had been submitted to the strategos, but some group, whose title is lost in a lacuna, had objected that the limit was impossible. The original restoration of [οἱ ἱερεῖς μὴ . . . at the end of line 4 must now be rejected in favour of something like [οἱ λωέμποροι μὴ . . . So the boule had examined a γραφή, fixed a limit and submitted it to the strategos, but the [linen-merchants?] had claimed that the limit was beyond the capabilities of the weavers. If the document is correctly restored, it appears that the production of the material was aided by a subvention from the *fiscus* (ἀπὸ τοῦ τα[μ]ῆ[α]κοῦ λόγου), but the linen-merchants claimed that it was not enough. Their protests were ineffective however. The discussion ends with a statement by the syndikos of the boule to the effect that a sample will be supplied to the weavers.

The situation may be summed up. Oxyrhynchus is subject to an imposition of *anabolicum*. The prefect or one of his subordinate officials sends a γραφή stating the required amount of material. The boule of Oxyrhynchus examines the γραφή and fixes a limit on the amount it can provide (τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως), the burden being distributed between the metropolis and the nome. The check on the fact that the limit is a reasonable one is that the boule has to submit its resolution to the strategos.¹⁰ Perhaps aided by a subvention from the *fiscus*, the boule then requires the weavers, probably through the mediation of the linen-merchants, to provide the requisite material and supplies a sample. The money necessary for the operation, apart from any grant from the *fiscus*, was raised by a collection over the metropolis and the nome, administered by the boule. If this document is to be dated quite early in the reign of Aurelian (see Appendix II), the reason for the lengthy discussion may be surmised. Aurelian made some change in the imposition of *anabolicum*, and this might well be dated not too long after he had regained Egypt from the Palmyrenes.¹¹ If this *anabolicum* was a new imposition, or of a different

10. The appearance of the strategos in this context is more comfortable if the subject under discussion is a tax. If the subject were the production of vestments for a temple, it would be difficult to explain why the boule had to submit a resolution to him. This argument, however, is only circumstantial support for the

interpretation advanced here.

11. I.e. in the third or fourth year of Aurelian. On the chronology see P. J. Parsons, "A Proclamation of Vaballathus?" *Chronique d'Égypte* 42, 1967, p. 400; A. Stein, "Zur Chronologie der Römischen Kaiser von Decius bis Diocletian," *Archiv* 7, 1924, pp. 30-51.

character from an earlier *anabolicum*, it is easy to see why it occasioned detailed discussion in the boule.

The role of the boule in the collection of taxes may be further considered in the light of *P. Oxy.* 1419. In this document a prytanis orders an official called *πράκτωρ πολιτικῶν* to pay him from the *τελωνικά* 1500 drachmas credited by the *πράκτωρ* to an *ἀπαιτητῆς τιμῆς πυροῦ*, and another 300 drachmas for the *annona* of certain legionaries. It is relevant to ask whether state taxes are in question here, and if so, what the prytanis is doing with them. In a long and important note the editors concluded *inter alia*: (1) That there is no solid evidence for the metropoleis of Egypt having levied taxes which went into municipal funds, as distinct from state taxes; (2) That the taxes here referred to as *πολιτικά* are not "city taxes" as contrasted with "state taxes" (*δημόσια*), but rather state taxes pertaining to the city, as contrasted with those pertaining to the villages of the nome (*κωμητικά*). Hence the *πράκτωρ πολιτικῶν*, an official not elsewhere attested, is a collector of revenues due to the state.¹²

The purpose of the prytanis is not very clear. No doubt the boule was responsible for managing the account of monies due to the state. Evidence of this is provided for Oxyrhynchus by *P. Oxy.* 890 (= *WChr.* 280),¹³ in which a prytanis sends to the strategos a list of people who owe money to the city funds; these debts are to be collected and set against the debts of the city to the state. It is not certain that taxes due to the state are in question here, but it seems probable. Even if the prytanis is not paying actual taxes, the document shows how he managed the account of monies payable to the state.¹⁴ Further evidence is found in documents pertaining to Arsinoe, which mention an account called *ὁ τῆς βουλῆς λόγος*, to be distinguished from the *βουλευτικά χρήματα* attested at Oxyrhynchus (see above, pages 41-42). In these documents (*BGU* 771; *P. Strassb.* 58-64), amounts due in payment of state taxes are paid into the account, which was clearly managed by the boule.

It seems likely, therefore, that in *P. Oxy.* 1419 the *πράκτωρ πολιτικῶν* has credited money to another official concerned with state taxes (*ἀπαιτητῆς τιμῆς πυροῦ*) and that the prytanis is either attempting to straighten out the tax-account before presenting it to the higher authorities, or juggling it for some other purpose. The 300 drachmas which the prytanis requests for the

12. That he was a collector of state taxes is stated by S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, 1938, p. 314. Jones, *GC*, p. 330, note 95, describes him as a collector of civic revenues and suggests that the 1500 drachmas "which the latter has paid to a collector as the price of corn" might be "commuted *annona*."

13. The document may be dated by the strategos, who was in office between 229 and 237 (see

J. R. Rea, "A Letter of Severus Alexander?" *Chronique d'Egypte* 42, 1967, p. 392). It cannot, however, date to 234-5 as Rea suggests, if the prytanis served for one year, since *P. Osl.* 111 attests a different prytanis for this year (cf. Bowman, "A Letter of Avidius Cassius?" *JRS* 60, 1970, pp. 20-26).

14. Relevant to this role is the fact that in *P. Flor.* 63 and *P. Oxy. ined.* 2 taxes due to the state are paid through the prytanis.

annona of legionaries is also puzzling. It seems that the city was required to pay at least some part of the cost of providing *annona* (see below, pages 77-82). It is impossible to decide with any certainty between the various possible interpretations. (1) In addition to collecting state taxes the *πράκτωρ* has also been instructed to collect money to pay for the *annona*, which the metropolis itself would have to raise. (2) This payment for *annona* was to come from regular state taxes and the prytanis had specific instructions to use part of the collection of tax for it. (3) The *annona* was to be financed by the city, but the prytanis is borrowing money from state taxes in order to finance it. In this case the 300 drachmas would have to be repaid into the tax account.

The payment of taxes to the state is attested in *P. Oxy.* 1515, where a list of payments includes one made by the prytanis on behalf of Oxyrhynchus. Here the tax is not specified, and the payment is very small, so collection in the nome may not have been involved. Payment of tax might also be under discussion in *BGU* 925 (= *WChr.* 37), from Herakleopolis, where it is stated that *ἐλλεμά ἐστιν τοῦ* [ἡμε]τέρου ἀριθμοῦ, followed by a reference to the orders of the dioiketes and the phrase [ἐπι]σταλήτω ὁ στρατηγός.

The boule was also responsible for the appointment of some of the officials, at least, who were concerned in the collection of taxes. The boule of Oxyrhynchus appointed officials *ἐπὶ ἀναδόσεως σπερμάτων*, and similar examples may be adduced from other places.¹⁵ A document from Arsinoe provides some interesting information about appointments made by the boule and its responsibility (*BGU* 8 2): *ἐπειδὴ οὖν ἀπεφη[νάμη]ν τοῦ πρυτάνεως Ἀγαθοῦ Δαίμ[ο]ρος π[αρό]ντος αὐτῷ προσήκειν καὶ τοῖς προεστῶσι τῶ[ν] νομαρχικ[ῶν] ἀσχο[λημάτων] τὴν ἀπαί?]τησῶ μετὰ τῶν [ἐ]πιγενομένων καὶ ἐπιγενησομέ[ν]ων εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἀποδόσεως τόκων, φρόντισον κατασχεῖν [μὴ μόνον τῶ]ν νομαρχῶν καὶ τ[ῶ]ν λοιπῶν τῶν ἐνεχομένων καὶ τοῦ χ[ειροτονήσαντος αὐ]τῶν πρυ[τάνεως τὰ] ὑπάρχοντα. Unfortunately, the titles of neither the writer nor the addressee of this letter are preserved, but since the document preserves other correspondence between a procurator and a strategos, they are probably the officials involved here. From the tone of the letter and the fact that the addressee appears to be more closely connected with the collection and payment of the taxes, it seems likely that he is the strategos and the writer is the procurator. The document makes it clear that the prytanis had the responsibility of electing the officials, and that along with them, his *ὑπάρχοντα* were liable for seizure in default of payment. The boule is not actually mentioned in the document, but the prytanis is no doubt acting as its chief executive, as he does in many other documents.¹⁶*

15. See the documents cited in note 3, above, and perhaps *BGU* 1588 (Arsinoe, 222); *P. Strassb.* 58-64 (Arsinoe, 227-31).

16. *BGU* 8 2 also contains an account sent

by the strategos (?) to the procurator, giving the amounts collected by the boule through its delegates.

Additional evidence for the interest of the boule in the arrangements for tax-collection comes from *C. P. Herm.* 5-6. The prescript is lost, but plausibly restored as a letter to the Emperor from the boule of Hermopolis, sent through the procurator Aurelius Ploution. The letter seems to be a request for the institution of a *χορηγία πλουίων* in order to facilitate the transportation of taxes in kind (*ἐμβολή*) down the Nile and to minimise loss by damage. As has been stated, the strategos worked in this area (*P. Oxy.* 2341), but *C. P. Herm.* 5-6 provide specific evidence for the interest of the boule. A possible reason for the request is that the existing system is causing loss of taxes and the boule is being called upon to make good the deficit.

There is very little solid evidence for the role of the boule in taxation in the fourth century. In *P. Oxy.* 2106, to be dated shortly before August 304,¹⁷ there is an announcement addressed to the *ἄρχοντες* and the boule of Oxyrhynchus and the logistes of the nome. An imperial order has been made for the purchase of gold to be conveyed to Alexandria by the logistes and *ἐνός ἐξ ὑμῶν τοῦ τήν πρώτην τάξω ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ ἐπέχοντος*. The purchase price is stated, but the occurrence of the word *εἰσφορά* suggests something in the nature of a levy. Clearly, this is an extraordinary imposition, and the address of the document suggests that the responsibility for it lay with the logistes and the boule jointly.

During the fourth century, the position and nature of the office of strategos underwent changes. The strategos appears to have lost his position as the head of the local administration in the nome, which he had held in the third century, and the evidence shows that he was now mainly concerned with the imposition and collection of taxes. From the early fourth century onwards, the documents attest an official known as *στρατηγός ἦτοι ἐξάκτωρ* (though the title *στρατηγός* is still found on its own); the use of the title *ἐξάκτωρ* on its own appears to relate to the same official.¹⁸ *PSI* 684 shows that the *exactores* were appointed by the boule: *τοὺς ἐξάκτορας ἐξ ὀ[νο]μασίας τῆς βουλῆς δεῦν καταστ[αθῆναι]* (*BL* 3, p. 224). This document was dated to the late fourth or early fifth century by the editors, but is perhaps more safely to be put in the second half of the fourth century (bouleutai with the title of *ex-exactor* appear in the debate of the boule recorded in *P. Oxy.* 2110, of 370).

The evidence shows that the boule continued to supply officials for duties connected with taxation. In *P. Mert.* 90, to be dated to 311 or possibly 310,¹⁹

17. For the date see A. Segrè, "Inflation and its Implication in Early Byzantine Times," *Byzantion* 15, 1940-1, p. 249.

18. On the role of the boule in the fourth century see Jones, *GC*, p. 152. G. Rouillard, *L'administration Civile de l'Égypte Byzantine*, 1928, pp. 5-6; Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 126-31. On the strategos-exactor see Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 118-26; J. D. Thomas, "The Office of Exactor in Egypt" and "The Strategus

in Fourth Century Egypt," *Chronique d'Égypte* 34, 1959, pp. 124-40, and 35, 1960, pp. 262-70. Lallemand sees him as ranking after the logistes and *defensor* in the municipal hierarchy, and distinguishes from him the *exactor* who was a mere collector of taxes, working under the *ὑποδεκταί*.

19. On the date see now *P. Oxy.* XXXIII, p. 95.

it is attested that the boule elected officials in charge of the ἐμβολή. The corporate responsibility of the boule for the payment of taxes is perhaps illustrated in *P. Lips.* 34, of ca. 375, by the phrase οἱ πολιτευόμενοι . . . οἱ δεδωκ[ί]στες τὸ χρ[ύ]σιον Ἀμμωνᾶ.²⁰

There is also some evidence for a more general responsibility in matters connected with taxation. In a document from the very end of the third century (*P. Cair. Is.* 1, of 297) a letter of the prefect covering Diocletian's taxation edict states that it is to be publicised by the ἄρχοντες καὶ προπολιτευόμενοι ἐκάστης πόλεως εἰς ἐκάστην κώμην εἴτ' οὖν τόπον. The phrase ἄρχοντες καὶ προπολιτευόμενοι probably includes the boulai, or at least their leading members (see below, Appendix III). In *SB* 9253, of the early fourth century, there is an interesting but fragmentary letter from a prefect to a boule, passing on an imperial order setting a standard of eight Attic drachmas to the litre to be used in payments by the *fiscus*.²¹ It thus appears that the boule was also at least one of the media through which general regulations affecting taxation were transmitted.

The evidence demonstrates that the boule was an important part of the bureaucratic chain through which the taxation was managed, appointing officials and working generally in close conjunction with the strategos. But apart from being an essential cog in the imperial bureaucracy, it was also the link between that bureaucracy and the tax-payer in the metropolis and the nome, and hence sustained a dual role as an agent of the state and as the protector of the tax-payer against unfair treatment. In a sense therefore, the boule was in reality a more important element in the tax-structure than the strategos, and its position cannot be merely regarded as a subordinate one. Although most of the evidence comes from Oxyrhynchus, there is nothing in the other documents to suggest that the boulai of the other metropoleis differed from that of Oxyrhynchus in any major degree. As is to be expected, the system of taxation does not seem to have differed from nome to nome.

Impositions for Military Supplies

The role of the boule in the provision of *annona militaris* bears considerable resemblance to its position in the tax-structure. This is hardly surprising since demands for the *annona* made by the state were in fact

20. The gold in question was in payment of the χρυσός τιμώνων; this may be regarded as a military imposition, but is included here because it appears to have been a regular exaction, see Lallemand, *L'administration*, p. 205. Other documents perhaps relevant to the role of the boule in the fourth century are *P. Ross.-Georg.* V 28; 60²; *P. Lips.* 40 2.17; *P. Wis.* 32. The last dates to 305 and contains a petition sent by the komarchs of Phila-

delphia to a strategos asking him to instruct the boule to inspect the water-works at Tanis. The reference to the proper payment of taxes suggests that the boule is involved because of its responsibility for the payment of taxes.

21. On the possible connection of this document with *P. Oxy.* 2106 see Lallemand, *L'administration*, p. 204.

irregular taxes imposed when the need arose, and used in many cases for a specific allocation. In the case of Oxyrhynchus, the evidence falls mainly in the late third, and fourth century. In conjunction with the other evidence it suggests that the metropoleis had to shoulder an increasing burden in this sphere, proportional to the deterioration in the economic situation which rendered the government less able to support the expenses involved in the defence of the Empire and the upkeep of its armies.²²

The earliest piece of evidence from Oxyrhynchus for the supply of *annona militaris* is *P. Oxy.* 1419, of 265 (see above, pages 74-75). As has been stated, it is impossible to tell whether the 300 drachmas which were required for the *annona* of certain legionaries came out of regular state taxes, or whether this was merely a loan which would have to be repaid from city funds. It seems clear, at least, that the prytanis had orders to supply these specific legionaries *πεμφθ(έντων) από Ἡρακ[λ]άμ[μ]ωνος μετὰ Ἰσχυρίω(νος) διώκ(του) σίτ(ου)*, and that the financing of the operation, whether subsidised by the state or not, was supervised by the prytanis for the boule.

One of the principal ways in which the metropolis supported the expense of supplying *annona* was by the appointment of liturgists to deal with it. It was, of course, the liturgists themselves who bore the expense of the service. In *P. Oxy.* 1412 the necessity of appointing liturgists to deal with the transport of *annona* causes the summoning of a special meeting of the boule: *τὰ τῆς ἀνακ[ο]μιδῆς τῆς εὐθενείας τῶν [γ]εννησιότων στρα[τ]ιωτῶν οὐδὲ βραχεῖαν ἀνάθεσ[ι]ν ἐπιδέχεται*. The element of urgency seems to have been a fairly regular feature of the dealings of the boule with the *annona*, for the same emphasis occurs in *P. Oxy.* 1415 and perhaps 1414. The liturgies in question in *P. Oxy.* 1412 seem to have been connected with transport of the *annona*, for it is stated that the *πλοῖα* have already been prepared; the editors thought they were *δημόσια πλοῖα*, prepared in advance by the dioiketes. Somewhat similar to the case in point in *P. Oxy.* 1412 is the statement made by the prytanis in *P. Oxy.* 1414.19-23, to the effect that when the election of a *καταπομπὸς ζώων* was necessary, he had collected a few bouleutai to make a nomination. The conveying of supplies was a common duty, apparently, since it occurs again in *P. Oxy.* 1415; the prytanis requests at a meeting of the boule that conveyers be chosen to replace people who had absconded *ἵνα μὴ ἐμποδίζητε ἢ καταπομπή{ς} τῆς ἀνώνη(ς) τῶν γεννησιότων στρατιωτῶ[ν]*. Obviously, in duties of this sort the activities of the liturgists would spread beyond the metropolis, and if *P. Oxy.* 1415.6 is correctly restored, one of the officials was conveying collectors from "Arabia."²³

22. On the *annona militaris* and the role of the boule see Jones, *GC*, pp. 143-4; Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 186-8; Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 28, 128; A. Segrè, "Essays on Byzantine Economic History I, The *Annona Civilis*

and the *Annona Militaris*," *Byzantion* 16, 1942-3, pp. 393-444.

23. I.e. Arabia Felix, or the νομός Ἀραβία or the district between the Nile and the Red Sea (*P. Oxy.* 1415.6 note). See also *C. P. Herm.* 97,

The expense of personal service was not the only imposition by the government on the metropolis and its citizens. Important evidence from Panopolis is supplied by *P. Beatty Panop.* 1, of 298. This long document, containing copies of the correspondence of a strategos about preparations for the forthcoming visit of Diocletian and his military escorts is of exceptional value for determining the nature of the impositions, the role of the boule and its relation to the strategos.²⁴ There are several letters to the boule through its president, in many of which the strategos passes on orders from the imperial procurator and the *praeses* of the Thebaid. The main task which the boule had to do was to organise the collection of *annona* for the soldiers and appoint officials to deal with it: *τοὺς δὲ ἀποδέκτας ἤτοι διαδότας ἐκάστου εἴδους ὁμοῦ εἶναι τῆς πάσης ὑποστάσεως, τῆς τε πόλεως καὶ τοῦ ὄλου νομοῦ* (line 270). It appears that the task involved some difficulty, or was tackled with a marked lack of enthusiasm by the boule, for it had to be asked several times to get on with the job, and when it finally did so the strategos wrote to the procurator complaining that the collection had been organised wrongly. He also remonstrated with the boule for having disregarded orders and appointed collectors separately for each kind of provision, instead of by the toparchy. There is no suggestion that either the expenses of the liturgists or the cost of the supplies was supported by the state, and the assumption must be that the metropolis and the nome paid for the whole operation.

Apart from the actual collection of supplies, the boule was responsible for providing officials for other duties connected with the army. It has to supply an overseer for the repair of ships belonging to the Treasury. In another instance, the strategos passes on orders from the *praeses* of the Thebaid to send hides to a fort for the strengthening of the gates. This also probably required the appointment of an official, although we cannot be certain since the text breaks off in the middle. Another appointment is required in a letter from the strategos to the president, ordering the equipping of a bakery to maintain military supplies. In all these cases, the expense of service was undoubtedly borne by the metropolis and the officials, but the order for the supply of hides contains interesting information about the division of the cost of supplies. One third of the cost of the hides is to be paid by the metropolis and two thirds by the nome (lines 375-80, 388).²⁵

This document is important in several respects. It shows clearly that the

where the boule has received an order from a strategos *περὶ ἐπιμελητῶν καταφράκτων ἀποστελλομένων εἰς τὴν λαμπροτάτην Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἡλίου πόλιν*, (elected on their own κῶδιχος).

24. The relevant passages are lines 49-51, 167-79, 184-7, 241-3 (treasury ships); 53-9, 109-19, 221-4, 230-40, 244-51, 256-71, 276-337,

353-64, 374-7, 381-4 (supplies for troops); 342-7 (manufacture of armour); 378-80, 385-8, 405-6 (provision of hides).

25. This perhaps supports the suggestion made by Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 157-60 that *C. P. Herm.* 92-3 are concerned with *annona militaris*, but cf. Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 447-8, and below, note 64.

strategos was the liaison between the higher officials of the central government and the boule which was responsible for the execution of the necessary tasks. The main responsibility of the boule was to appoint the necessary officials and supervise the collection of supplies and other operations. In this, the responsibility of the boule extended over the whole nome. It is not clear whether the cost of all the supplies was divided in the same proportion as the cost of hides, one third to two thirds, but there can be no doubt that it was supported in its entirety by the metropolis and the nome.

Evidence of a similar operation at Oxyrhynchus is found in *P. Oxy.* 2228, which contains, among other correspondence, a letter from an official named Aurelius Mercurius to another official covering a copy of a letter from a strategos to the boule. The editors thought that Mercurius was the prefect and that the official to whom he wrote was the successor of the strategos whose letter to the boule is enclosed. The latter seems to be a logical supposition, but in the case of Mercurius fairly strong arguments may be adduced to show that he was an epistrategos.²⁶ The letter of the previous strategos to the boule refers to an order to the boule to supply mules, presumably for military purposes. The editors' interpretation is that the boule was ordered to supply the mules at a price of ten talents each, to be paid by the state. The strategos notes that this was agreed in the boule: ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν ἐξοδὸν μου ἐψηφίσασθαι ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ δεῦν τ[άλαντα δέ]κα ἐπτὰ δο[θῆναι]. This had apparently caused some delay, for the strategos orders the boule ἴσαι κατὰ τάχος ἐκάστου βουρδῶνος τάλαντα δέκα εἰς τε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸν νομόν (the editors restore the first word as [τελέ]σαι). The reason for Mercurius writing to the succeeding strategos is that the order still had not been filled. The assumption in this interpretation is that the state was paying for the mules and the boule was trying to wring as much money as possible from it by raising the price of mules. On the other hand, although there is possible evidence for such a state subvention for impositions of *anabolicum* (*P. Oxy.* 1414, see above, page 73), the text can be interpreted in such a way as to make the boule responsible for paying for the mules. It had been agreed that the boule should supply the mules and pay a price of ten talents each for them. But when the strategos departed the boule decided to cut the expense by voting to pay seventeen talents for two or three mules, for instance. The text does not specify that the vote of seventeen talents was *per mule* and a numeral could be restored after δο[θῆναι]. In that case the delay might have occurred because the boule was unable to buy the mules at this low price. This interpretation may be slightly favoured if the restoration of [τελέ]σαι is correct. The phrase εἰς τε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸν νομόν would then indicate that the expense was to be borne by

26. See *BASP* 6, 1969, pp. 35-40. The suggestion that he was a καθολικός (J. D. Thomas, *JHS* 84, 1964, p. 207) cannot be excluded, but the

concern of the epistrategos with *annona militaris* is better attested.

the metropolis and the nome. If, on the other hand, the boule is to spend ten talents (supplied by the state) per mule, the phrase is difficult to interpret.²⁷

The evidence from the fourth century indicates much the same organisation. In *P. Oxy.* 60 (= *WChr.* 43) a strategos writes to the boule of Oxyrhynchus through the prytanis to inform him that meat had been sent to Nikopolis for troops stationed there. The stated purpose of the letter is ὡ' οὖν εἶδέναι ἔχοιτε καὶ ἤδη τοῦτον ἐλόμενοι φαναιρόν μοι καταστήσεται. Since the understanding of this document is clearly dependent upon some previous transaction which is not mentioned, interpretation is precarious. The word τοῦτον might refer to a person delegated by the boule for some duty in connection with the *annona*. It is interesting to note that the prefect is the ultimate source of the orders which descend, as in many other documents connected with the *annona* and with taxation, to the boule through the strategos.

There is a good deal of evidence to show that the boule continued to appoint people to duties connected with the *annona* during the fourth century. In *P. Oxy.* 2114, of 316, a strategos mentions in a letter to a *praepositus pagi* that an epimeletes has been chosen ἀπὸ τῆς βουλῆς to supervise collectors of wine for the *annona*. The subject of an extensive debate in the boule in 370 was a man who had been appointed by the prytanis to an ἐπιμέλεια of soldiers' woollen clothing (*P. Oxy.* 2110, see below, page 106).

The burden of supplying *annona* continued to cause difficulty for the boulai both financially and in providing officials. In *SB* 9597, of the late fourth century, the prytanis of Herakleopolis writes to the *comes* and *dux* about the transport of *annona*; it is the responsibility of the bouleutai to perform these liturgies, but they are avoiding them by staying away from the metropolis; he therefore asks that a person in some capacity with a *vexillatio* be instructed (?) παραστήσαι ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως all the bouleutai in the nome in order to expedite the transport of the *annona*.

The boulai seem to have continued to support the expense of the *annona* and other military impositions. In *BGU* 1027 (= *WChr.* 424) a *comes* writes to the ἐξάκτορες and πρόεδροι of Hermopolis stating that Hermopolis has not contributed to the *annona* for three years and suggesting that the situation be remedied. It seems clear that the *comes* makes the point that the state has had to undertake the expense of this default, but there is no evidence that it had relieved the municipalities of this expense as a general practice.²⁸ There is evidence to suggest that the boule of Oxyrhynchus was paying the wages of

27. Compare the similar phrase in *P. Oxy.* 1414.2 (see above, pp. 72-73).

28. Segrè, *op. cit.* (above, note 22), pp. 443-4 drew on the evidence of *BGU* 1027 (= *WChr.* 424) and suggested the theory that the practice whereby the *annona* was paid for by the municipality broke

down at some time during the fourth century, and payment began to come from the government. *BGU* 1027 suggests no more than that the state had supported the expense created by the default of Hermopolis.

recruits in A.D. 360. In *P. Oxy.* 1103 (= *WChr.* 465) an ex-logistes makes a report in the boule with reference to a visit of the *dux*: ἀνεδιδάξαμεν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὡς τῶν νεολέκτων τῶν στρατευθέντων ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐκ παραλογοισμοῦ ἀνενεγκόντων ὡς μὴ πληρωθέντων τοῦ συμφώνου τοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς, and claims that the boule had paid them even more than τοῦ ὀρισθέντος ἀπὸ τοῦ ταμίου δοθῆναι. The editors interpreted this as meaning that the wages were paid by the city, taking the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ ταμίου with ὀρισθέντος as the amount decided by the treasury. Wilcken (*WChr.* 465) understood it as connecting with *δοθέντος*, raising the question of whether the *fiscus* or the city treasury is to be understood. If the *fiscus* were in question, it would necessitate the assumption that the money was supplied to the boule, and that the boule was fraudulently withholding some of it. It would seem curious that if the recruits were being paid from the *fiscus* the money went through the hands of the boule.²⁹

In *P. Oxy.* 1103 it is clear that the recruits were raised by the city and there is no evidence for this practice before the fourth century. In *P. Abinn.* 18, written between 342 and 351, there is evidence that forcible conscription was also practised. The president of the boule of Arsinoe writes to Abinnaeus protesting against press-ganging and misappropriation of property in one of the villages of the nome and threatens action unless something is done: πάντες οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου ἀνεπέγκωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν δεσπότην μου τὸν δοῦκα περὶ τούτου. As in taxation, the boule plays a dual role as agent of the government, and as the protector of its citizens against malpractice.³⁰

As in the case of taxation, the evidence is consistent with the supposition that the methods of imposing levies for *annona militaris* were standard throughout Egypt. Whilst the evidence from Oxyrhynchus is incomplete, particularly for the fourth century, it is supplemented by documents from other places which support this conclusion. Nor does there seem to be any ground for supposing that the methods of levying *annona* changed in the fourth century. These impositions continued to put a strain on the resources of the metropolis and the nome, in terms of personnel, goods and money. As in the case of taxation, the powers of the boule in this sphere extended over the nome in the third and the fourth centuries.

29. See *P. Oxy.* 1103 introd., and above, note 28.

30. See also *P. Ross.-Georg.* V 28, an account sent to the president of the boule of Oxyrhynchus by a *tabularius* containing one item of payment to an ἐπαρχικός (cf. *P. Oxy.* 1223.22 note). *P. Lugd.-Bat.* XIII 10 contains a letter sent by an ἐναρχος μελλοπρόεδρος of Hermopolis to the στρατηγοὶ ἦτοι ἐξάκτορες informing them that in

accordance with the order of the *comes* and *dux* to elect a *συναπαιτητῆς ἀχύρου* the boule has appointed a liturgist. It is impossible to tell whether the reference to the order is merely resumptive, or whether the boule was informed before the *strategoi-exactores*. If the latter, this will mark a change from the practice in the third century, or a deviation from the norm (cf. e.g. *P. Oxy.* 1412; *P. Beatty Panop.* 1).

Miscellaneous

There is some evidence that the boulai of the metropoleis were given the responsibility for various odd tasks by the central government from time to time. They were responsible for the election of *φροντισταί* for estates belonging to the *fiscus* in the third century (*P. Oxy.* 58 = *WChr.* 378; *P. Beatty Panop.* 1.365-73).³¹ The president of the boule of Panopolis was the joint recipient of an order from officials of the central government to provide personnel to assist in a search for *πασσαλιωτικοί* in connection with the interests of the *fiscus* (*P. Beatty Panop.* 1.192-201).³² In a document from Hermopolis (*P. Lond.* 955 [III, p. 127] = *WChr.* 425) the boule receives an application from two citizens of the metropolis for inclusion in a corn-dole granted by the emperors; if this interpretation of the somewhat mutilated document is correct, the boule was probably responsible for the local administration of the dole.

The only evidence of this kind of delegation in the fourth century is from Oxyrhynchus, in three documents from the first decade of that century in which the syndikoi and the prytanis are responsible for instituting inquiries about the property of people under sentence (*P. Oxy.* 2665; *MChr.* 196) and of a former church in the Oxyrhynchite Nome (*P. Oxy.* 2673). The orders were passed on by officials of the central government, but the responsibility of the boule is not clear. The boule itself is not mentioned in any of these documents, but it is very probable that the joint responsibility of the syndikoi and the prytanis indicates that they were acting as executives of the boule. Even if this is not the case, it is of interest that such tasks were delegated to officials of the boule, whose competence here extended into the nome.

The Boule and the Metropolis

Honours, Status

There is a little evidence that the boulai of the metropoleis were involved in the presentation of honours to officials of the metropolis, to private citizens and to the Emperor. All the examples of this kind of activity, however, appear to be somewhat special cases, and there is no evidence that the boulai of the metropoleis were in the habit of publishing honorary decrees in the same way as the boule of Athens, for example.³³

31. Cf. *P. Flor.* 6.14 ff. and the restoration in M. Rostovtzeff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Römischen Kolonates*, *Archiv*, Beiheft 1, 1910, p. 189, note 1: ἐπισκέπτῃς γ[ὰ]ρ ἐχειροτονήθην ἅμ' ἄλλοις (?) γῆς διαμισθο[υ]μένη]ς παρὰ [τῆς κ[ρα]τίστης] βουλ[ῆ]ς δι' ἄ[ου] τ[οῦ] νομοῦ δ[ιαφε]ρ[ο]ύσης τῶ ἱερωτάτῳ ταμίῳ.

32. The meaning of the word is still unclear, see *P. Beatty Panop.* 1.155 note. Similarly, *P. Oxy.* ined. 21 contains an order to arrest addressed to komarchs and other officials by a prytanis.

33. See D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution After Sulla* (*Hesperia Supplement* 12, 1967), pp. 62-91.

The boule of Oxyrhynchus discussed, in *P. Oxy.* 1413.25-33, the presentation of a golden crown to Aurelian. The crown-tax was normally levied in money, but on this occasion it is clear that the boule is concerned with commissioning the manufacture of a golden crown, raising the money to pay for it, generally supervising the financial details, and, presumably, for presenting it on behalf of the city.³⁴ This was undoubtedly an extraordinary situation and may be connected with Aurelian's recovery of Egypt from the Palmyrenes (see below, Appendix II).

The boule of Oxyrhynchus was also involved in the discussion of the presentation of a *ψήφισμα* to a prytanis (*P. Oxy.* 41 = *WChr.* 45, of the late third or early fourth century). A request is made, apparently by the demos to the prefect and katholikos, for permission to present a *ψήφισμα* to the prytanis. The precise nature of the *ψήφισμα* is not clear, but the prytanis is, or pretends to be, reluctant to accept it and a syndikos finally proposes that the request be referred to the boule: *τὴν ἀπ[αίτησιν ὑμῶν] παραθησόμεθα τῇ κρατίστ[τῇ] β[ο]ουλῇ*. It is thus clear that it was within the competence of the boule to discuss the presentation of a *ψήφισμα*, but unclear whether this competence included the power of ultimate decision.³⁵

Two similar cases from Hermopolis may be adduced. In a fragmentary document from the reign of Philip the Arab (*SP XX 60*) the boule is concerned with a bust (*προτομή*), apparently of Otacilia, but it is not clear whether this was intended for presentation or as an adornment for the city. In *C. P. Herm.* 121, from the reign of Gallienus, there is a letter from an official of Alexandria to the boule of Hermopolis about a Hermopolite victor in the trumpet competition at the games: *[ἴνα πνθόμενοι πάντα τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ Ὀλυμπιονικῇ νικῇ ὀφείλομενα ἀποπληρώσατε ἀγγέλλομεν ὑμῶν]*. The precise nature of the *ὀφειλόμενα* is not specified.³⁶

The evidence for the involvement of the boulai of the metropoleis in the census procedure is very difficult. There is one possible example from Oxyrhynchus in *P. Osl.* 111, of 235, which contains lists of free men and freedmen arranged according to houses and addressed to the prytanis. There are lists from three quarters of the city – the Goosekeepers', North Hermaion and West Hermaion – and it is reasonable to infer that the prytanis will have received lists from every quarter. The purpose for which the lists were made is not clear. The editors note that the returns expressly state whether a house is inhabited or not, and more particularly, where persons are *ἀναγραφόμενοι*. One

34. See A. K. Bowman, "The Crown Tax in Roman Egypt," *BASP* 4, 1967, pp. 59-74; for the presentation of crowns (or the equivalent in money) on accession cf. *P. Fay.* 20.7-8, 12.

35. For the restoration see *BL* 1. For the suggestion that the *ἡγέμων* is the *praeses* see *WChr.* 45 introd.; it is used of the prefect in *P.*

Oxy. 1416.29 (ca. 299). On the role of the demos and the circumstances of *P. Oxy.* 41 see above, Chapter II, note 45.

36. The same Hermopolite athlete appears in *P. Oxy.* 2476. The privileges may be some or all of those mentioned in *C. P. Herm.* 54-6; *BGU* 1073-4; *P. Oxy.* 2475-7 (cf. *JEA* 49, 1963, pp. 180-1).

possible explanation is that the lists were compiled in order to provide a record of the status and ownership of property, and might thus be connected with the fact that the boule was responsible for the administration of property belonging to the *πολιτικός λόγος*.³⁷ It is possible, therefore, that the boule conducted a census of a sort in the metropolis.

The evidence for the connection of the boule with the state census is very slight. In *P. Ryl.* 656 from Arsinoe (A.D. 300), a declaration of land for the census is made in the presence of *τριῶν βουλ[ε]υτῶν ἰουρατόρων* who append their signatures. The editors comment, "An important piece of new information is the explicit description . . . of the three *iuratores* who form part of the census party as *βουλευταί*; the new census procedure throws an important share of responsibility on the decentralized municipal senates." There is no evidence to suggest such a role either at Oxyrhynchus or anywhere else. The fact that the *iuratores* were bouleutai in this case could be a coincidence; but even if the boule did have the responsibility of selecting the *iuratores* from among its members, there is no evidence that this gave the boule direct responsibility for any part of the census procedure.

The boule did, however, deal with questions of individual status in a more restricted sense. A small group of documents directed to the boule of Oxyrhynchus concerns the status and privileges of athletes. *P. Oxy.* 2475-7, of 288, contain documents addressed to the boule in support of a claim for *ἀτέλεια* and *ἀλειουργία*. The first document perhaps contains the letter sent by the athlete to the boule covering the document supporting his claim to exemption and giving his credentials. This second document, containing the credentials, mentions a resolution of the society of athletes sent by the society *τῆ κ[ρ]ατίστη βουλῆ καὶ τῶ [λογίμ]ω δήμω* of Oxyrhynchus. It concludes with a covering letter sent by the society, supporting the claim to exemption. The third document contains a letter from a pancratiast to the boule making a request of which the precise nature is uncertain due to extensive lacunae.³⁹ *P. Oxy.* 2610 closely parallels certain parts of this group of documents, but does not add any information relevant to the boule; it contains a letter addressed to

37. In the commentary the editors suggested various possibilities for the purpose of the lists; the registration of people liable for liturgies, a connection with an imposition of tax, a means of keeping track of the ownership of property and the movement of population. Mertens, *Les Services*, pp. 84-98 concludes: "Sous la pression de circonstances extérieures et par suite de l'incurie de certains services administratifs, de grands relevés de la population furent être établis à la demande de la βουλή par des commissions spéciales qui avaient pour tâche primordiale de repérer les hommes (libres ou affranchis)." Alternatively *P. Osl.* 111 might be connected in purpose, though not in

form, with *P. Oxy.* 77, of 223, which contains a letter to a prytanis from a woman declaring on oath her ownership of a house.

38. The same bouleutai appear as *iuratores* in similar documents, *P. Cair. Is.* 3-5; cf. *P. Thead.* 54-5; *WChr.* 228-9; *P. Strassb.* 152; *P. New York* 1. These three are, in fact, the only *iuratores* who are attested as bouleutai.

39. The editor originally suggested that it might be a request for a pension, but later put forward a restoration suggested by Skeat that it was for a certificate of standing to enable the athlete to travel (*JEA* 49, 1963, pp. 180-1).

the boule mentioning a ψήφισμα of the society of athletes, probably adduced to support the claim to exemption. The address to the boule by the athlete covering documents supporting the claim is paralleled in BGU 1074.10-13, where the writer claims ἀτέλεια, ἀλειτουργία and ἀουλία.⁴⁰ BGU 1073 (= *M. Chr.* 198) connects with this document and shows how the boule dealt with such a request. It contains a letter from the boule to the βιβλιοφύλακες ἐγκτήσεων informing them that it has confirmed the privileges of Aurelius Apollodidymos who has been elected to the σύλλογος τῆς ἱερᾶς συνόδου, and requesting them to record the fact.

In all these cases it is clear that the claims to exemption rested on privileges granted to athletes by imperial edicts, which are quoted in the documents. It is therefore clear that the task of the boule was simply to confirm that the person claiming exemption fulfilled the required conditions, and to grant the exemption. There is no record of the boule having had the competence to decide whether privileges were to be conferred if there was no general regulation under which a particular case fitted. There is an indication in a document from Hermopolis (*C. P. Herm.* 119 verso 3 = *WChr.* 158)⁴¹ that in cases where there was no such regulation in existence the boule had to refer to higher officials. An orphan who was a descendent of famous athletes had apparently requested exemption of the same kind. The matter was discussed in the boule, but permission to grant the exemption was obtained from the Emperor. It seems clear, therefore, that the boule merely had the competence to confirm privileges claimed under a pre-existing regulation. The evidence also shows that the boule dealt with exemptions from liturgy and tax (with the exception of one example of ἀουλία, which, as *P. Oxy.* 1264 shows, did not on other occasions go to the boule – it may have done so in BGU 1074 because it was coupled with ἀτέλεια and ἀλειτουργία). It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that the boule had the competence to confer exemption from tax and liturgy because it was much involved in the administration of taxes and appointments to liturgies. There is, in fact, no example of a petition of this sort to the boule on any subject which was outside its normal competence (see below, pages 113-115). In those cases which were within its normal competence, it did not have the power to make grants *sui iuris*.⁴²

40. On BGU 1073-4 see P. Viereck, "Aktenstücke zum griechisch-römischen Vereinswesen," *Klio*, 8, 1908, pp. 413-26. On the nature of ἀουλία see F. von Woess, "Αουλία," *ZSS Rom. Abt.* 46, 1926, pp. 32-67, especially 34-8. On athletes' privileges see also the rescript of Diocletian and Maximian in *MChr.* 381.

41. Cf. W. Schubart, "Spicilegium Criticum," *Aegyptus* 31, 1951, pp. 155-6.

42. The grants to the athletes will be a case of δοκιμασία by the boule; this interpretation of its

role is supported by *P. Oxy.* 40, of 143 (cf. H. C. Youtie, "A Reconsideration of *P. Oxy.* I 40," *Festschrift Oertel*, 1964, pp. 20-9), where a physician demonstrates to a strategos that he is engaged in the practice of medicine. On this see N. Lewis, "Exemption of Physicians from Liturgy," *BASP* 2, 1965, pp. 87-92 and "Exemption from Liturgy in Roman Egypt," *Atti dell' XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, 1965, pp. 513-8. On the evidence for δοκιμασία by the boule see below, note 93.

The evidence adduced all dates to the third century, and it is impossible to say whether the competence of the boule underwent any increase or diminution in the fourth century, simply because there is no evidence. *P. Oxy.* 2110, of 370, shows that the prefect was responsible for making general regulations about liturgies (which in this case had been disregarded by the boule, see below, page 106), and it is not surprising that the boule had to recognise them. But this is different from the third century evidence, in which the boule has to make a specific grant of exemption under the provisions of an imperial regulation.

Public Works

It has long been recognised that the boule played an important part in the administration of public buildings and the upkeep of amenities in the metropolis, but this aspect of its functions has generally been discussed under the heading of financial administration.⁴³ Although there is a close connection between the administration of public works and of finances (see, below, pages 91-97), the evidence from Oxyrhynchus and elsewhere is sufficient to provide for a separate treatment.

In the third century the boule appears to have enjoyed a good deal of autonomy in this sphere. The evidence from Oxyrhynchus illustrates the way in which the boule dealt with matters of this sort. In *P. Oxy.* 55 (= *WChr.* 196) there is a letter from two joiners to a prytanis, containing a request for payment for work done on a street: τῆς κατασκευασθείσης ὑπὸ σοῦ πλατίου ἀπὸ ἠκουμένου πυλῶνος γυμνασίου ἐπὶ ν[ότ]ον μέχρι ῥύμης Ἰερακίου ἐκατέρωθεν τῶν μερῶν, τὰ συναγόμενα τῶν μισθῶν τοῦ ὄλου ἔργου [ἀ]κολού[θω]ς τοῖς ψυφισίῳ (l. ψηφισθείσι) ἐν τῇ γρατιστῇ (l. κρατίστῃ) βουλῇ. They ask the prytanis to order the ταμίας τῶν πολιτικῶν χρημάτων to make the payment. It is clear that the boule passed resolutions to authorise the work, and that it controlled the city fund from which the payment was made. The place of the prytanis in the procedure as the chief executive of the boule is quite clear; the phrase κατασκευασθείσης ὑπὸ σοῦ may be a suggestion that the prytanis was the prime mover behind the project, or simply a touch of flattery. The cost for this aspect of the project came from city funds, and it is impossible to tell whether any of the expense fell on private individuals or officials. In *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 2 the prytanis claims that his office entails certain expenses (ἔχων τὰ ἐπικείμενά μοι ἀν[αλώμα]τα εἰς τε τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν δημοσίων λουτρῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ λοιπὰ πολιτικὰ δαπανήματα) and it may be that in certain cases a proportion of the expenses involved in public works were borne by officials.⁴⁴

43. On the role of the boule in public works see H. MacLennan, *Oxyrhynchus, an Economic and Social Study*, 1935, p. 47; Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 438-54; Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp.

136-9, 152-6; Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 697-704; A. C. Johnson, "Roman Egypt in the Third Century," *JJP* 4, 1950, pp. 154-5.

44. *C. P. Herm.* 92-3 contain requests from

The evidence from the other boulai shows that the system of administration was essentially the same and provides a useful supplement to that from Oxyrhynchus. A large number of texts from Hermopolis contain requests to the boule from epimeletai, in charge of various aspects of public works, for payment from the πολιτικός λόγος. The epimeletai were chosen by the boule and concerned largely with work connected with the baths and the gymnasium.⁴⁵ Similarly, the boule of Antinoopolis discussed the arrangements for repairs to the baths, which were delegated to epimeletai, who were probably in charge of the contractors (μισθωταί) for the provision of water and chaff. It is uncertain whether the latter were paid officials or liturgists. The title implies that they had purchased a contract for the job, and hence their position was probably similar to that of the joiners in *P. Oxy.* 55 (= *WChr.* 196), who were paid for their work.⁴⁶ *P. Oxy.* 2569 contains a letter of resignation addressed to a prytanis by a μισθωτῆς ἀνιμήσεως ὑδάτων πολιτικῶν θερμῶν βαλανείων, who states that he had fulfilled his contract for ten months of the previous year, one month more than was necessary, on account of peculiar difficulties; he states that this had really been beyond his means, leaving no doubt that some of the expense at least had come from his own pocket. If the office was not a liturgy as the title suggests,⁴⁷ the explanation is probably that the man had bought the contract at a low price and had been forced to use his own means to fill it. He informs the prytanis that he must warn the exegetai of the difficulties connected with the water supply. Hence it appears that the exegetai were in charge of looking after the water supply in the city, and presumably of the contractor who was involved in it. There is evidence that this was one of the duties of the boule at Hermopolis also, where a document addressed to the boule contains the phrase ἀνανεώσεως τῶν σωλήνων οὔσης πρὸς τὸν πολιτικὸν λόγον (*C. P. Herm.* 95, cf. 96). At Oxyrhynchus, the exegetai appear to have sustained duties connected with the baths also. In *P. Oxy.* 891 the prytanis writes to an exegetes that since an exegetes is required εἰς τὰς θέρ[μ]α[s], he has been chosen to preside,

epimeletai for the one-third of expenses payable by the city treasury, but see below, note 64. *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 2 does not provide evidence that the expenses for public works were partly supplied by voluntary private donation, since the writer is the prytanis.

45. Examples of the various ἐπιμέλειαι at Hermopolis are: προκαύσεως Ἀδριανῶν θερμῶν βαλανείων (*C. P. Herm.* 66-7); γύψου καὶ [χ]άλκου τῶν ἐν τῷ ἐνταῦθα γυμνασίῳ τῆς αἰτῆς πόλεως Ἀδριανῶν θερμῶν βαλανείων τοῦ αὐτοῦ γυμνασίου (82); ξύλων [τεκτονικῶν] τῶν εἰς οἰκοδόμησιν δημοσίων . . . (83); τοῦ ἐκ καωῆς κατασκευαζομένου ἐν τῷ ἐνταῦθα γυμνασίῳ

πυλῶνος καὶ [. . . (83); συνωνήν ποιῆσαι λίθων κ[α]ὶ [ἀνακομιδῆν . . . (85); πλακ[ῶ]ν [3 letters]ριτικῶν (86 = *WChr.* 195); πλακώσεως στοῶν γυμνασίου) καὶ τμήτης λίθων (94).

46. Compare *P. Got.* 7, containing an agreement to work on public buildings at a specified salary addressed by three glassworkers to a prytanis (for the date and provenance see *P. Beatty Panop.* introd. pp. xxxii-xxxiii). Contractors were not paid a regular wage, but like paid workers (and unlike epimeletai or other liturgists) they received remuneration in some form.

47. The editor describes it as a liturgy, but it is not listed in Lewis, *ICS*.

the expenses being borne by the *τάγμα* (of *exegetai*).⁴⁸

It appears therefore that the same system applied generally in the metropoleis in the third century. The administration of public works was the responsibility of the boule, which delegated duties to liturgists in charge of paid workers. Apart from some expenses borne by individuals, the *πολιτικός λόγος*, controlled by the boule, paid for the work. Similarly, the boule was probably responsible for paying the wages of people who worked regularly in the public buildings. In *P. Oxy.* 1499, of 309, there is an order from a prytanis to a banker to pay wages to three *παραχύται δημοσίου βαλαρείου*; *P. Oxy.* 1500, of 229, contains a similar order, although the title of the person making the order is not stated. No doubt, the boule had this kind of responsibility from the beginning of its existence.⁴⁹

The evidence shows that the boulai in the third century enjoyed complete autonomy in directing business of this kind, taking decisions on what work was to be done and supervising the execution of the work and the financial details. It exercised a general supervision over the liturgists and paid workers who were involved. Thus in *PSI* 804, of 301, of unknown provenance,⁵⁰ a prytanis appoints a deputy, since he has to go away (?) *ἔνεκεν συλλογῆς* [. . .] *ἢ εἰς ὑπόκλιση τοῦ δημοσίου βαλ[ανίου]* (the supplement is probably *ἀχύρου*). It is possible that this was an extraordinary situation, perhaps caused by the failure of an epimeletes or a contractor to perform his duty.⁵¹

Texts from Hermopolis provide evidence of the supervisory duties of the boule over the normal operation of the gymnasium. In *C. P. Herm.* 57-64 there is a series of notices addressed to the boule by a certain Aurelius Tourbon-Ammonios, an *ἐλαιωχύτης*, who was appointed *δι' ὑπομνημάτων ὑπὸ τοῦ κρατίστου ἐπιστρατηγήσαντος* to inform the boule whenever *ἀναλειψία* occurred in the gymnasium, which it apparently did quite frequently. The fact that he was appointed not on the initiative of the boule, but on that of an official of the central government who was not normally involved in the internal administration of the metropolis suggests that an extraordinary situation may have obtained. The closest parallel from Oxyrhynchus shows the boule fixing the days on which the various gymnasiarchs were due to provide oil (*P. Oxy.* 1413; 1416, see below, page 110).⁵²

The evidence for the fourth century comes entirely from Oxyrhynchus. In

48. For the correction see *P. Oxy.* XXXI, p. 117, note 1.

49. See also *P. Oxy.* ined. 10 and 14, of the reign of Severus Alexander, containing requests for payment from *μισθωτὰ βαλαρείου* addressed to the prytanis.

49. The possibility that it is from Oxyrhynchus is suggested by the editor on the ground that other documents of this period from Oxyrhynchus show concern with the baths. This is

unconvincing, since there is no doubt that the baths were recurring objects of concern in all the metropoleis.

51. In *P. Oxy.* 1450, of 249-50, there is an estimate for repairing a public building, probably the baths. The address is lost, but, as the editors note, it was perhaps directed to representatives of the boule.

52. A similar regulation of days by the boule is attested in *P. Oxy.* ined. 17, of 257.

P. Oxy. 1104, of 306, a prytanis sends a request to a logistes: αἰτοῦμαι[α]ὶ καὶ νῦν ἐπιστάλ[η]ναι ἐξοδιασ[θῆναι] μοι [ἐκ τῶν] πολιτικῶν ἀπὸ τῶν διατυπωθέντων ἐξῆ[.....] προχωρῶν εἰς τὰ ἀναλώματα ἀκολ[ούθως] οἷς πρώην ἀναδέδωκά σοι γράμμασιν (of the prefect). The expenses incurred are in connection with τοῖς ἀνήκο[υσι] τῷ δημοσίῳ βαλανίῳ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἀνηκόντων τ[ῆ] αὐτῆ πρυτανείᾳ. *P. Oxy.* ined 9, of ca. 308-9, contains a similar request and authorization by the logistes. In *P. Oxy.* 892 (= *WChr.* 49), of 338, a logistes writes to inform a man of his appointment by the boule to duties in connection with the construction of the bath and the north gate (ἡρῆσθαι σε [εἰς.....] τῶν ἐνχρηζόντων ξύλων – the word to be supplied is probably ἐπιμέλειαν, ἀνακομιδὴν or συλλογὴν). It is at once apparent that the system of the third century has undergone radical change. The prytanis and the boule no longer exercise autonomous supervision of the administration of public works. Permission to undertake public works is, in some cases at least, obtained from the prefect or authorised by him, and the financial administration is in the hands of the logistes, whose appointment was probably at least vetted by the central government (see above, page 45).⁵³ The appointment of delegates by the boule is brought to the attention of the logistes, who seems to exercise a supervision over them. In two documents of 316, reports relevant to the repair of the baths are sent directly to the logistes and have no connection at all with the boule (*P. Oxy.* 53; 896 = *WChr.* 48). The distinction between the third and fourth century documents is therefore to be emphasised. In the third century, the boule directs the administration of public works, and the documents show a close correspondence in practice between Oxyrhynchus and Hermopolis. In the fourth century, the evidence of Oxyrhynchus shows that the administration is now in the hands of the logistes, and the power of decision has been removed entirely from the competence of the boule. There can be little doubt that this system was common to the other metropoleis as well, since the other evidence shows a move towards the centralisation of power in the hands of officials who were responsible to the state.

53. On the introduction and position of the logistes see Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 108-14; B. R. Rees, "The *Curator Civitatis* in Egypt," *JJP* 7-8, 1953-4, pp. 83-105, and below, pp. 124-125. Rees concluded that the logistes was probably nominated by the boule from its own membership, subject to the approval of the central government. He points out that by the date of *P. Oxy.* 2110 (370) the logistes was hardly distinguishable from the other bouleutai (*op. cit.* pp. 91 ff.). There is no actual evidence of a logistes appointed by the boule, but there are several known logistai who were bouleutai (see the list at the end of Rees' article, pp. 104-5, and add the evidence of *P. Oxy.* 2666-7). Lewis, *ICS*, s.v. λογιστής, wonders whether there is a λογιστεία in

the metropolis, to be distinguished from that in the nome, but does not indicate any firm conclusion. The available evidence certainly does not support a clear distinction. There is evidence for the logistes acting independently of the boule in public works. *P. Oxy.* 53 (a report on a tree) and 896 = *WChr.* 48 (an estimate for painting), both of 316, are addressed directly to the logistes. There is also evidence for the participation of the strategos independently of the boule in *P. Oxy.* 1430, dating to 324; it contains an acknowledgement to the strategos of the receipt of money, paid ἐξ ἐπιστάματός σο[υ] by the public banker, for the supply of charcoal for the baths. The editors assume that the baths were those of Oxyrhynchus, though this is not specified.

Finances

In the third century, the boule bore the main responsibility for the financial administration of the metropolis, and there is a good deal of evidence illustrating this role. A division may be made between the documents dealing with receipt of money and those dealing with expenditure.⁵⁴

1. Revenues

Evidence for revenue to the city from property owned by it is found in documents from Oxyrhynchus and Hermopolis. In *P. Oxy.* 2109 a prytanis displays a notice announcing that a site belonging to the city is for rent and giving details of an offer already made, in order to encourage higher bids. This offer specifies a rent of eight drachmas a month. In *PSI* 1070, addressed to the same prytanis, there is an application to lease land owned by the city, undertaking to pay all rents and taxes. In both these documents the prytanis is described as *διέπων καὶ τὰ πολιτικά*, understood by the editors as relating to financial administration and translated as "director also of municipal finance."⁵⁵ A large number of documents from Hermopolis contain similar offers to buy or lease land belonging to the city, the proceeds and rents accruing to the *πολιτικός λόγος* (*C. P. Herm.* 119 recto; *CPR* 39 = *MChr.* 275).⁵⁶ It is not clear whether the property thus acquired was subject to any tax levied by the city, as opposed to the regular state taxes. In *PSI* 1330, from Oxyrhynchus, the dues on property are described as *[ἀ]ν[υπερθέτους καὶ ἀκ]ιδύ[ρους] πάντος κιδύ[νου] τῶν τῆς γῆς δημοσίων [ἀ]ντων πρὸς τῆν πόλιν τὴν καὶ κυριευσούσαν τῶν καρπῶν ἕως ἂν τὰ [ὀ]φειλόμενα ἀπολάβῃ*. The city is clearly the landlord and is responsible for the payment of state taxes (*δημόσια*). The lessee has to pay rent and any agreed additional payments (*τὰ ὀφειλόμενα*), which will presumably cover taxes paid by the city to the state, but there is no evidence that the property was subject to taxes payable to the *πολιτικός λόγος*.⁵⁷ It must be emphasised that the property thus managed by the boule for the city included land and buildings not only within the metropolis but in the nome as well and that the boule here extends its sphere of competence in internal administration beyond the bounds of the metropolis. Apart from revenues from property owned by the city, there is also evidence at Hermopolis for profit accruing from the leasing of places (*μισθομ[ένων]*) in the *ἀγορά* (*C. P. Herm.* 102 = *WChr.* 296).

There is only one example of a direct tax levied by the city, and this appears to have been supervised by the boule. *C. P. Herm.* 101 contains an

54. On the role of the boule in financial administration see Jones, *CERP*, pp. 334-6; Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 140-64; Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 415-56.

55. See above, pp. 89-90.

56. See Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 144-50.

57. See Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 418, 420.

account rendered by an ἐξεταστής chosen by the boule for τοῦ γ[ε]ρομένου ἀ[ρ]γυρικοῦ ἐξηκονταδραχμοῦ μερισμοῦ εἰς τὸ κατ' οἰκίαν τῆς πόλεως. It is impossible to say whether this was ever done at Oxyrhynchus, but it seems clear that in this case the tax was levied by the house. There is no reason to assume that it applied only to property owned by the city, or that the proceeds of the tax were destined for an account other than the πολιτικός λόγος.⁵⁸

Several other possible sources of revenue for the city, which were supervised by the boule, are attested in the documents. One of these is confiscation of property, which might in some cases be connected with failure to perform a liturgy. In *P. Oxy.* 1416 confiscation is one of the subjects discussed in the boule: [π(ερί) τοῦ? . . . τῶν δη]μευθέντων καὶ τῆς πολετικῆς π[ροσόδου?]. Tentative though the restoration is, there is other evidence to suggest that the city was the beneficiary in cases of confiscation connected with liturgies in the metropolis. In *P. Oxy.* 1413.14 the syndikos mentions some property in Monimou which has been impounded, and promises to lay the amount before the boule when it is known. Since the remark occurs in the context of election of exegetai and determination of eligibility, the connection is likely to have been one of default. Since the amount is to be laid before the boule, it cannot be doubted that the financial interest related to either the πολιτικός λόγος, or possibly the βουλευτικά χρήματα (see above, pages 41-42).

There is some evidence for the city deriving profit in the form of interest on loans made by it. *P. Fuad I Univ.* 41 was interpreted by the editor as concerning possibly a "loan to municipal funds." Mutilated though the document is, it seems more probable to have been a loan made from municipal funds through the boule, in view of the occurrence of the words ἐδανίσαστο, συνθήκαι and τόκοι and the phrase . . . μὸν τελείσθαι, which could be restored as ἐξοδισμὸν τελείσθαι. Although this is the only mention of interest in connection with loans from the city fund, it cannot be doubted that such loans normally required repayment at interest.⁵⁹ There is evidence for loans from the city at Hermopolis in *C. P. Herm.* 22-3 and 25-6, which contain an account of proceedings before a procurator about money which was borrowed from the city fund. Apparently the debtor had died, and the city was forced to take action against his heirs for repayment. The document is not well preserved and contains many obscurities; it is to be noted that the procurator mentions the possibility of appeal to the prefect through the syndikoi, but it is not clear at what stage of the affair this might have taken place. In *P. Fuad I* 52, from Oxyrhynchus, there is a note to a prytanis from a man with the title

58. Grenfell and Hunt were perhaps unduly sceptical in *P. Oxy.* 1419.2 note. See Jouguet *VM*, pp. 428-32.

59. Cf. *BGU* 362 11.20-12.2, 15.2-9 (= *WChr.*

96), where loans at interest are made from the revenues of the temple of Zeus Capitolinus at Arsinoe, on the instructions of the boule.

προιστασάμενος ἀρτοκοπεῖον acknowledging the receipt of a loan (παρὰ σοῦ) and promising to repay it in monthly instalments. There is no mention of any interest here, and it is impossible to be sure whether the loan was a personal one from the prytanis, or whether it came from the πολιτικός λόγος or βουλευτικά χρήματα (see above, pages 41-42).

Although there is no clear evidence for municipal taxes as such, the evidence from Oxyrhynchus attests the system whereby magistrates had to pay for the privilege of wearing the crowns of office in the major magistracies (στέφανοι ἀρχόντων). *P. Oxy.* 1413.4 ff. contains discussion of this payment (στεπτικόν). According to the restorations proposed by Jouguet, the boule was asked to nominate bouleutai as exegetai in order that the payment for the crowns might be supplied from bouletic funds.⁶⁰ It is clear, however, from *P. Oxy.* ined. 3 that these payments normally went into the πολιτικός λόγος and were exacted by its ταμίας; when an attempt is made in *P. Oxy.* 1413 to invalidate a nomination on the ground that the nominee still owed the στεπτικόν for a previous office, the γραμματεὺς πολιτικῶν was called upon to confirm the debt.⁶¹ There is now evidence as to how these payments were exacted. In *P. Oxy.* ined. 3 the ταμίας πολιτικῶν χρημάτων receives notice of payment of στεπτικόν for an ἐξηγητεία. In practice this exaction could be described as a levy upon the holding of office.

Other evidence from Oxyrhynchus indicates revenues of an unknown nature accruing to the πολιτικός λόγος. In *P. Oxy.* 890 (= *WChr.* 280) a prytanis sends to a strategos a list of people who owe money to the city; it is apparently intended that the strategos should collect these debts and set them against the sums owed by the city to the state, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐμποδίσθῃ τῇ εἰσπραξῇ τοῦ ἱερωτάτου [ταμείου]. No doubt the prytanis is here neatly cutting a corner, and the sums owed by the city to the state were probably taxes. The nature of the sums owed to the city is not stated. Similarly, in *P. Oxy.* 1496 there is a list of contributions, including one from a prytanis, of fairly small amounts (all of one talent, except for one of two talents). Since some of the contributors were officials, the editors surmised that the payments might be, for example, contributions toward the expense of oil for the gymnasium.

There is little point in attempting to estimate the amount of revenue which went into the city funds over a given period. The evidence is not complete enough for any single place to make such an attempt feasible. There is every probability, for instance, that there was little difference between the revenue derived from property at Hermopolis and that so derived at Oxyrhynchus; no doubt it is due to accident that there is much more evidence for this type of revenue at Hermopolis than at Oxyrhynchus. It must also be noted that such a calculation would not supply a complete account of the

60. Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, pp. 67-8.

61. The restorations of Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, pp. 67-8 imply that the objection simply invali-

dated his right to have the στεπτικόν advanced from the bouletic fund (see below, p. 99).

incoming budget, since the city benefited enormously from "revenue" paid not in money but in personal service, by the magistrates and liturgists who were appointed to posts essential for the running of the city. The expenses of these posts were borne by the holders, relieving the city funds of the expenses necessary to provide personnel. The value of such service in terms of cash would be impossible to calculate, but there can be no doubt that it must have formed the equivalent of a large proportion of the city revenues.⁶²

2. Expenditure

The evidence for the expenditures from the *πολιτικός λόγος*, controlled by the boule in the third century, relates very largely to public works and has already been discussed in some detail (see above, pp. 87-90). A summary of the more important points is therefore sufficient.

Evidence for expenditure on public works shows that the boule was able to exercise a good deal of autonomy in the third century. In *P. Oxy.* 55 (= *WChr.* 196) there is a request for payment for work on a street addressed to the prytanis by two builders. The boule was responsible for voting the money necessary for the work, and the prytanis is now requested to order the *ταμίας τῶν πολιτικῶν χρημάτων* to make the payment.⁶³ Although a good proportion of the expenses involved in such work fell upon officials elected by the boule, in the form of personal service, the wages of paid employees came from the city treasury. The documents from Hermopolis make it clear that the materials for such work were purchased by the *πολιτικός λόγος*, and there is no certain evidence that expenses of this kind were ever borne by the epimeletes.⁶⁴ In the documents requesting payment for expenses in connection with public works the procedure attested is common to Oxyrhynchus and Hermopolis. The epimeletes sends a request to the boule requesting payment from the city treasury and undertaking to render account to it. The boule, normally through

62. Three minor pieces of evidence of uncertain significance remain. All relate to Oxyrhynchus. In *P. Harr.* 69 2 there are fragments of a letter addressed to the *ἄρχοντες* and boule including the word *διέπων* (see above, page 59). The subject of column 1 is a petition about the property of a deceased woman which has passed into the hands of the high priest of Alexandria, though it is mortgaged to the petitioners. In *P. Oxy.* 1413.35 the prytanis mentions a report made to the boule by the *kosmetai* which involves some financial transaction. In *P. Oxy.* 2276, of which the subject is unclear (it may involve a case brought by the boule against an epimeletes), a small sum of money is mentioned. Of these only *P. Oxy.* 1413.35 may safely be conjectured to have

any connection with city funds.

63. See also *P. Oxy. ined.* 5, where a prytanis sends an account of expenditures on the baths to a *γραμματεὺς πολιτικῶν* (see above, Chapter II, note 57).

64. See Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 157-60; Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 447-8 and above note 25. Méautis considered that the documents in which one third of the expense falls on the city are concerned with *annona militaris*. The other two thirds will then have fallen on the nome. Jouguet thought that two thirds of expenses in public works might be borne by the epimeletes. *P. Beatty Panop.* 1.375-80, 388, perhaps supports Méautis' view (see above, p. 79).

the prytanis, then sends an order to the *ταμίας* of the city fund to make the payment (e.g. *C. P. Herm.* 94 = *WChr.* 194).

In certain cases it appears that the boule sells contracts for public works, which are taken by *μισθωταί*. The procedure is attested for Oxyrhynchus in connection with the upkeep of the water-supply, the *μισθωτής* apparently working under the direction of the *exegetai* (*P. Oxy.* 2569), and at Antinoopolis for the provision of chaff and water for the baths under the direction of *epimeletai* chosen by the boule (*Archiv* 4, pp. 115-7). In the latter case, the expenditure was discussed at a meeting of the boule and provisions were made for an *ἐξέτασις* of the accounts. Although there is no evidence for this kind of audit at Oxyrhynchus, documents from Hermopolis contain reports of *ἐξετασταί* of municipal expenditure, who were chosen in all probability by the boule (*C. P. Herm.* 98-100).⁶⁵

It is difficult to say whether this was a regular procedure. In the case of Hermopolis, there is evidence that the finances were in a bad state at the end of the reign of Gallienus. The presence of Aurelius Ploution, a native Hermopolite, as an imperial procurator in these years with powers of intervention in the affairs of the metropolis indicates some difficulty. There is no evidence from elsewhere to suggest that this was a normal, or even common, situation. The direct interest of the procurator in financial affairs is attested by *C. P. Herm.* 22-3, 25-6 (see above, page 92), and 53, which contains a letter sent by the boule to an official notifying him of the fact that he is to be prepared for an investigation by the procurator of the *γυμνασιαρχικοῦ ἐγλόγ[ου]*.⁶⁶ Further intervention in the financial affairs of the metropolis is perhaps attested by *C. P. Herm.* 52 (= *WChr.* 38) in which the boule writes to the *strategos* to inform him that the prefect had granted a request, [ἀ]ξιῶντες παραδεχθῆναι ἡμῶν τὰ μ[ὴ] δεόντως ἀπητήμενα εἰς ἄλλα ἡμῶν ὀφλήματα. The nature of the debt is not clear, but it seems likely that the boule had been overtaxed and had requested a rebate from the prefect. If money exacted as tax was in question the boule would have had good reason to fear the intervention of the *strategos*; hence it wrote to warn him that the decision of the prefect was not to be trifled with.

Although it is not within the scope of this section to provide a complete description of expenditures incurred by the metropoleis in the third century, a few examples may be adduced by way of illustration. In some cases the documents bear no sign of the direct interest of the boule, but the evidence so far treated shows clearly that the boule had an important interest in financial administration.

65. It is difficult to estimate how great the expenditure at Hermopolis might have been over a year. See the calculations of Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 439 ff.: he calculates that *C. P. Herm.* 119 recto

contains a total expenditure of over 65 talents.

66. On the official addressed in this document see above, Chapter II, note 86.

Documents from Hermopolis show that the city funds were called upon to supply pensions for athletes, and requests for these were made through the boule (C. P. Herm. 54 = *WChr.* 157; 55-6). Although it is difficult to say what proportion of city funds were spent in this way, Méautis calculated from the extant examples a minimum expenditure of 7 talents and 2415 drachmas for athletes in 266-7.⁶⁷ Documents from Oxyrhynchus provide evidence for the supervision of festivals by the boule, and the expense for these was certainly borne by the city funds, apart from time and money spent by individuals (*P. Oxy.* 1416; *P. Osl.* 85). *P. Oxy.* 2127-8 provide some examples of expenditures, including a festival, a procession, the public baths, sacrifices in the theatre, and various public works including a sum paid to the commander of the night watchmen. The city fund probably also paid the wages of people who worked in public buildings (*P. Oxy.* 1499; 1500). In *P. Oxy.* 1414.12-16 the boule discussed a petition from the city cloth-weavers asking for an increase in prices paid to them; since the boule decided to grant the increase on its own initiative without reference to any state official, it seems likely that this was a purely municipal affair. No doubt, if the guild of weavers was under some kind of municipal control, the city fund will have received a return on the subsidies it made, perhaps by maintaining a monopoly on the finished products.⁶⁸

In dealing with expenditure, the same cautions as were applied to the calculation of revenues must be noted. There is no certainty as to what proportion of the evidence has survived, and again, it must be recognised that the expenses of the city were considerably reduced by the subsidies provided in the form of personal service. Nevertheless, the expenditure of a metropolis like Oxyrhynchus or Hermopolis must have been quite considerable, especially when demands by the central government for *annona militaris* are taken into account.

As far as municipal finance is concerned, there is evidence that the city received income from property which it owned outside the metropolis, but no indication that it ever spent its money on public works or anything else in the areas of the nome outside the metropolis.⁶⁹

The evidence shows that the boule was able to direct the financial affairs of the metropolis with very little interference, with the exception of a period of apparent crisis at Hermopolis. The evidence for the fourth century is not abundant, and is limited to Oxyrhynchus, but it shows quite clearly that the

67. Méautis, *Hermopolis-la Grande*, pp. 152-5.

68. Cf. Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, p. 702. Expenditures are also mentioned in the meeting reported in *P. Oxy.* 2407 (see above, pp. 50-52). There is a reference to an order of the prefect and to an account which is to be referred to him. Whether or not these sums are connected with the city fund is unclear. The document does not therefore provide firm evidence for prefectorial

control over city finances such as is attested by *P. Oxy.* 1104, for example. Considering the nature of the report in *P. Oxy.* 2407, the sums were probably somehow connected with the performance of liturgies. Even so, the supervision exercised by the prefect is of interest.

69. The concern of the boule of Arsinoe in the water-works at Tanis (*P. Wis.* 32) is probably to be connected with taxation (see above, note 20).

boule lost its position of predominance in favour of the logistes. In *P. Oxy.* 1104 the prytanis had to apply to the logistes for the authorisation of a payment from the city fund for expenses incurred in connection with public works. It is further stated that the work was undertaken with the written instruction or permission of the prefect. Two recently published documents reveal clearly the extent of the power of the logistes and the fact that he was responsible for his administration to the prefect. In *P. Oxy.* 2666 a logistes writes to an ex-logistes about a loan which had been made from city funds during the latter's term of office. The debt had not been repaid and the logistes had written to the prefect, who had ruled that the preceding logistes was partly responsible for the repayment. The same officials are involved in *P. Oxy.* 2667, where the present logistes writes to his predecessor that the prefect has instructed him to demand τῆς σῆς διοικήσεως τοὺς πολειτικούς λόγους. It is therefore clear that the logistes is the most powerful figure in the local financial administration, and that he is directly responsible to the prefect. His title is λογιστής Ὁξύρυγχίτου, and his competence extends, as the title implies, over the whole nome (see, for example, *P. Oxy.* 2673).⁷⁰

Apart from controlling the city funds, there is some evidence that the boule had other financial responsibility in the third century. A document from Hermopolis contains a report submitted by two men who were chosen by the boule καταπάτησω ποιήσασθαι χωρίων καὶ παραδείσων καὶ [ἀ]ναγραφῆν φυτῶν τῶν καταλαμβανομένων δη]λῶσαι ἡμεῖν καὶ διάθεσιν τῶν (πρότερον) [. . .]το[. . .]λομῆς νυνὶ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου Σαραπίου ἱερ[ε]ίων λόγου ὧν ἔστι μισθω[τῆς] It is further stated that in one of the villages of the nome the survey was carried out in the presence of the prytanis and a φροντιστῆς τῆς οὐσίας. The revenues involved here seem to go not into the city fund, but into the account of the priests of Serapis. There is also evidence from Arsinoe for the interest of the boule in temple revenues. *BGU* 362 (= *WChr.* 96) contains a long account of revenues and expenditures of a temple, presented by an epimeletes chosen by the boule to look after τῶν προσηκόντων τῷ πα[ρ] ἡμεῖν θ]εῷ Διεὶ Καπιτωλίωι. Included in the account are loans made at interest, at the instance of the prytanis.⁷¹ There is no indication in the document that the revenues of the temple accrued to the city funds, but it is clear that the boule was responsible for appointing the man who looked after the accounts and for supervising his activity.

This evidence reveals, therefore, that the activity of the boule in financial administration was not confined to the management of the πολιτικός λόγος. Evidence for the supervision of temple revenues comes only from Hermopolis and Arsinoe, and dates to the early part of the third century. The boule might,

70. On the logistes see above, note 53, and pp. 124-125.

71. *BGU* 362 11.20-12.2, 15.2-9 (= *WChr.* 96): ἀκολουθῶς τοῖς ἐπισταλεί μοι ὑπὸ τῆς

κρατίστης βουλῆς διὰ Αἰρηλίου Ἀρποκρατίωνος γυμ(νασιαρχήσαντος?) ἐνάρχ[ου] πρυτάνεως γ[ν]ώμη εἰσηγητοῦ καὶ ἐπιψηφιστοῦ. On the meaning of these terms see below, pp. 104-105.

therefore, have lost this responsibility during the course of the third century, but it is interesting to note that the evidence for its activities in this sphere shows it concerned with the areas of the nome outside the metropolis.⁷²

Appointment to Office

It is well known that this was one of the most important functions of the boulai of the metropoleis during the third and fourth centuries, and equally well known that the boulai faced ever-increasing difficulty in finding people willing to perform expensive and tiresome duties. The study of liturgical offices is a complete one in itself, and does not need full treatment here.⁷³ These offices are therefore considered only in those aspects in which they were a direct concern of the boule. The evidence which requires discussion is concerned with appointment to office and supervision of officials by the boule.⁷⁴

The evidence shows that the boule was responsible for making appointments to various posts, including the major metropolitan magistracies (gymnasiarchs, exegetai, etc.), and ἐπιμέλειαι both in connection with the administration of the metropolis and the fulfilment of impositions by the state. The connection of the so-called "bouleutic class" with these offices has already been discussed at some length (above, pages 28-32). No doubt the major offices, requiring the highest property qualification, were filled at the outset, in theory at least, by bouleutai, but in the course of the third century it became increasingly necessary to appoint *ιδιώται* to fill them. The same trend is illustrated by the fact that in the middle of the third century the situation in regard to state offices was regularised by an imperial πρόγραμμα issued through a *rationalis* and procurator reducing the numbers in some of the colleges of officials and the proportion of officials who had to be chosen from the bouleutai (*P. Oxy.* 2664).⁷⁵

1. Ὀνομασία and Προβολή

Much of the evidence for ὀνομασία in the boule in the third century comes from Oxyrhynchus. The earliest attestation of the process is in *P. Oxy.*

72. *BGU* 362 (= *WChr.* 96) dates to 215 (on the title used by the boule of Arsinoe see V. Martin, "Sur la Formule 'Archontes Conseil des Ptolémaïens Arsinoïtes'," *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, pp. 294-8). On the date of *C. P. Herm.* 7 1 see above, Chapter II, note 38. The early connection of the boule with temple finances might be explained by the fact that in the second century there is attested an official with the title ταμίας πολιτικῶν καὶ ἱερατικῶν χρημάτων (see *P. Ryl.*

86.2 note). On the bouleutic fund, also controlled by the boule, see above, pp. 41-42.

73. See Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, Lewis, *ICS*.

74. In general see Wegener, *The Boule; Symbolae*; Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 399-404; *Les Boulai; Méautis, Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 132-7; A. H. M. Jones, "The Election of the Metropolitan Magistrates in Egypt," *JEA* 24, 1938, pp. 65-72.

75. See P. J. Parsons, "Philippus Arabs and Egypt," *JRS* 57, 1967, pp. 134 ff.

1418, of 247, which mentions τὰ τῆς γενομένης ὀνομασίας, but it is too fragmentary to provide any valuable information. The earliest document which gives any detail about the process is *P. Oxy.* 2130, of 267, which contains a petition sent by an Antinoite to the board of gymnasiarchs of Oxyrhynchus through the deputy prytanis. He complains that he has been wrongfully nominated to some office connected with the gymnasiarchy: πρὸς ὁποιάν δὴ ποτε γενομένην ἔκ τως παρανομίας ἀναγνωσθέντος ἐν ὑμῖν ὡς ἔμαθον πιττακίου τῇ διελθ(ούση) λ βουλῆς οὔσης ὀνομασίαν ἐξ ἐπωνυμίας μου διαφερούσαν γυμνασιαρχίας ἀρχῆ. What had clearly happened was that the board of gymnasiarchs had prepared a list of nominees for various offices which needed to be filled and had presented them *en bloc* for ὀνομασία at a meeting of the boule. This document provides the ground for a preliminary definition. It is clear that ὀνομασία here means "nomination" to office and is to be contrasted with "election" to office. The possibility that the petitioner is using the term ὀνομασία to mean election, or to cover both the processes of nomination and election, is ruled out by the fact that his description of the office is imprecise. The letter is dated three weeks after the meeting of the boule which is mentioned, and it is hardly conceivable that he would be unaware of the nature of the office, if he had been elected three weeks before. In this case, therefore, the election of nominee did not take place at the same meeting as the nomination (ὀνομασία). The reason for this may well have been to provide an interval in which to ascertain the willingness of the nominee and to allow for an appeal.⁷⁶ Both these conclusions are supported by evidence from other documents.

In *P. Oxy.* 1413.1-17 the boule deals at some length with the appointment of exegetai, and several important points emerge. It was apparently established practice for the exegetai presently serving to nominate their successors.⁷⁷ After the exegetai had put forward candidates, the holders of other offices from the liturgising tribe were requested to make nominations (ὀνομασάτωσαν). Second, it may be noted that the meeting was requested specifically on two occasions to nominate bouleutai as well to these offices, on the first occasion perhaps with reference to an imperial order.⁷⁸ Third, there is a reference to the payment for crowns of office (στεπτικόν) in connection with the nomination of bouleutai; this payment may have been advanced from βουλευτικὰ χρήματα in order to assist bouleutai (see above, pages 41-42). In any case, it seems likely that election was assumed here, since the στεπτικόν can hardly have been required simply on nomination.

76. On the boule and ὀνομασία see Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 19-28; Jones, *CERP*, pp. 331 ff.; GC, pp. 181 ff.; Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, pp. 66 ff. On *P. Oxy.* 2130 see A.-J. Boyé, "P. Oxy. XVII 2130, l'Éditio Opinioni et l'Appel en Matière de Charges Liturgiques," *Studi in Onore di Pietro*

Bonfante IV, 1930, pp. 183-202, and below, p. 115.

77. Cf. *P. Ryl.* 77 (of the second century), and SB 7696.110-1.

78. See Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, pp. 66-8; Wegener, *Symbolae*, pp. 163-4.

The imperfect state of the text makes it difficult to see how many nominations were actually made. When the exegetai are called upon, they put forward three names, Ploution, Serenos (?) and Ion (lines 5-12). The holders of other offices nominate one man whose name is lost; the section ends with the acclamation of three men, Horion, Leonides and Besarion, who may also be nominees. In the case of Ploution it is remarked that he still owes crown-money for a previous office; Serenos (?) is stated to be a gymnasiarch. The nomination of Ion is followed by the proposal that he be subject to overseers. The prytanis then names two overseers who are acclaimed by the meeting. Following this is a statement that something is to be postponed until the next meeting. In this section the only nomination which clearly stands is that of Ion; the nominations of Ploution and Serenos (?) may have been invalidated, but it is impossible to be sure. The business which is postponed until the next meeting is uncertain due to a lacuna. The statement of it follows the acclamation of the overseers, but to judge from the fact that the appointment of an overseer in line 13 is expressed in precisely the same terms and no postponement is there mentioned, it seems likely that it is the election of the nominees which is postponed until the next meeting.⁷⁹ In this case, the nomination follows the same pattern as was observed in *P. Oxy.* 2130. The nomination of the people put forward by the holders of other offices from the third tribe also appears to follow the same pattern. In the final remark in this section (line 17), the syndikos says: ὅσα προτραπῶσω καὶ ἀρχῶσω οἱ ὀνομαζόμενοι, τὸ πρωενίαυτον τῆς λειτουργ[ησίου]ς The nominees here will presumably include those nominated by the holders of other offices, and conceivably those nominated by the exegetai also. The remark indicates that the process of appointment is not complete at this stage; the word προτρέπω is apparently used at various stages of electoral procedure (see line 5 where it is used with reference to ὀνομασία) and seems to mean "to press" or "to urge." In the remark in line 17 it probably refers to actual election, since ὀνομασία has already taken place.

It seems likely therefore that the same process of nomination is followed in *P. Oxy.* 2130 and 1413. In both cases it seems that the nominees were not elected at the meeting in which they were nominated, and it may very well be that elections were often held over to provide opportunity for appeal. It does not seem essential to suppose that either the nominees or the nominators from the third tribe were present. *P. Oxy.* 2130 provides an example of a man nominated in his absence; that the nomination was somehow arranged prior to the meeting of the boule is suggested by the fact that it was presented on a πιττάκιον (see above, Chapter II, note 1).

79. See the restoration proposed by Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, p. 68, accepted by Wegener, *The Boule*, p. 24. The point is not vital, since the nominees are clearly not elected at this meeting

anyway. Hence the interval between nomination and election may still apply here in the case of the exegetai even if the postponement does apply to the overseers.

In *P. Oxy.* 1415 there is a more detailed example of the electoral process. In lines 17-31 there is an attempt to nominate a man as a banker. The prytanis first demonstrates that it is possible for a man to hold two public offices at the same time, and then asks for a nomination. The members from the liturgising tribe propose a certain Ptolemaios who already holds the post of ἀρχιερεύς. Ptolemaios attempts to refuse the nomination and the prytanis asks the bouleutai to press him (προτρέπω). Finally, after much argument the prytanis says: προβάλλ[λομαι αὐτὸν ὑμῶν]. The bouleutai say οὐκ ἀντιλέξει τῇ φυλῇ, and this is followed by a remark from Ptolemaios' principal ally: πίστεως ἔνεκεν αὐτὸν εἶλασθε. There are several interesting points here. It is by no means certain that the conclusion of this discussion as we have it is the election of Ptolemaios, as the editors thought. The remark of the bouleutai may be simply a further encouragement, that of Ptolemaios' supporter a reference to the office which he already holds as ἀρχιερεύς. And since the document breaks off here, it is by no means certain that this is, in fact, the conclusion of the discussion. It appears however that Ptolemaios' attempt to refuse the nomination was overridden, and the remark of the prytanis seems to be in effect a "proposal" of the candidate. If this is the case, two elements of the electoral process may be distinguished in this document, namely ὀνομασία and προβολή.⁸⁰ In this case, the appeal against nomination in the form of Ptolemaios' attempt to refuse it follows directly upon the nomination. Any statutory interval was probably unnecessary since Ptolemaios was actually present at the meeting.

The process of ὀνομασία is also illustrated by an extensive document from Arsinoe, containing a report of a trial before the prefect about the nomination of villagers as kosmetai by the boule (*SB* 7696, of 250). Although the document is considered in greater detail in the following section, certain points may be emphasised here. As the document demonstrates, the reason for the trial was that the boule had nominated villagers to liturgies in the metropolis, which was illegal. The first column of the report is too mutilated to give any connected sense, but the phrase ὠνομασμένος δι' ὑπηρέτου δημ[οσίου] (line 25) is to be noted. There also occurs the expression προβολή πάντων (line 23), which probably signifies a proposal made by the boule collectively. The nominations were made at a meeting of the boule held on Mesore 30. The prytanis whose term of office had ended on that day had been responsible for convening the boule, which had then made the nomination in the accustomed manner (lines 32-3). It is stated that the prytanis made the nomination (ὠνόμα[σεν], lines 47-8), but this may simply be a curtailed way of expressing the fact that he convened the boule and introduced the business of nomination (unless it is a downright lie), for it seems that he disappeared after the meeting had begun (lines 41-2, 47). It seems that the normal practice at Arsinoe, as at

80. The term προβολή occurs in *P. Oxy.* ined. 8, but the context is uncertain.

Oxyrhynchus, was that the various boards of magistrates nominated their successors (lines 110-1). It is also to be noted that the candidates underwent a process of "sealing" (*σφραγίζεω*), which was carried out by the prytanis-designate on Mesore 28 (line 51) and that at the time when the nomination was made, the actual liturgies were not specified (lines 60-1). This evidence is particularly valuable, since it is obvious that it illustrates the standard procedure. This is proved by a remark made by the prefect in lines 54-5: τῆς παραγραφῆς ἀ[φ]η]ρημε.[] τὸ δοκεῖν [οὐ νομ]ίμως γερονέ[να]ι τὴν ὀνομασίαν ἐπειδὴ αὐ[τοὶ ἐντ]αῦθά εἰσω εἰπάτωσαν, which seems to mean that he is removing the accusation that the nomination was made illegally; that is, the procedure was perfectly legal, and the illegality lay in the fact that the villagers were actually nominated.

This evidence supports the supposition that the process of nomination to office did not vary much from place to place. There is no evidence from Oxyrhynchus for the process of "sealing" which took place before nomination, nor is the precise nature of this process clear (see above, Chapter II, note 37). It seems possible that it might have had something to do with the fact that in this case the candidates were villagers and hence, presumably, not enrolled in the tribes of the metropolis. The procedure of enrolling people into tribes as a preliminary to appointments made by the boule is perhaps attested by *P. Oxy.* 2407 (see above pages 50-51).

Further evidence for the use of the term *ὀνομασία* is available in documents from Oxyrhynchus. In *P. Oxy.* 1412 an extraordinary meeting of the boule is summoned in order to deal with the nomination (*ὀνομασία*) and election (*χειροτονία*) of epimeletai for service in connection with the transport of *annona militaris*.⁸¹ The same kind of appointment is mentioned in *P. Oxy.* 1414.19-23 where the prytanis reports that because of the urgent need for an epimeletes he had collected a few bouleutai and made a nomination (*ὠ[ν]ομάσαμεν*). In this case there is good reason to suppose that he refers not merely to nomination but to election as well. There is no sign in the document that the prytanis is presenting his nominee for election at the meeting. Since it is attested that nominees could be nominated and put forward for election at the same meeting (*P. Oxy.* 1412; 1415), it is likely that this had happened at the partial meeting arranged by the prytanis. If the business was pressing, as he implies, nothing would have been gained by making a nomination at a partial meeting which had to await ratification at the meeting of which *P. Oxy.* 1414 is a report, and the whole process could have been carried out in that meeting. The acclamations which follow the prytanis' report seem to be an endorsement of his action rather than the election of a nominee. Evidence from other documents supports the conclusion that the words *ὀνομασία* and *ὀνομάζεω* are sometimes used to refer generally to the whole process of election.

81. For the correction εἰς ἐπιμελητῶν ὀνομασίαν see *P. Oxy.* 2228.32 note.

P. Oxy. 1414 also contains a discussion of the nomination of a new prytanis (lines 24 ff.). It is stated that by law the nomination of a new prytanis must take place six months in advance, and the bouleutai are evidently eager to renominate the present incumbent. The remark *μετὰ σκέψεως ἢ ὀνομασία γείν[ε]ται* seems to be an actual statement of nomination. The prytanis protests the nomination on the ground of ill-health, but the poor state of the text obscures the conclusion of this debate. Nevertheless, it seems that *ὀνομασία* in this case refers simply to nomination.

The references to *ὀνομασία* in *P. Oxy.* 1416 seem to show the term in its more general sense. One of the subjects discussed is the appointment of an *ἀγωνοθέτης* from the *ὀνομασθ(έντων) εἰς ἀρχάς*. This suggests either that when nomination was made the exact office was not always specified (as in *SB* 7696), or that in this case one of the appointees was to be burdened with an additional post. Unless the actual election was not held until the post was specified (which did not happen in *SB* 7696), the people had probably been elected. In lines 11-2 the boule discussed a replacement: *ἀντί τ[ο]ῦ ὀνομασθ(έντος) καὶ μὴ συνλειτ[ο]υργήσαντο[ς] . . .*, which suggests default after election. The phrase in lines 15-6, which may refer to the same discussion, *τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ [εἰς τὸ . . .] αὐτοὺς τὴν πανήγυριω*, does not provide support either way.⁸²

The small amount of evidence available from the fourth century also suggests that the term *ὀνομασία* was used in a general sense. *PSI* 684 attests a regulation: *τοὺς ἐξάκτορας ἐξ ὀνομασίας τῆς βουλῆς δεῦν καταστ[αθῆναι]* and mentions two edicts: *ὦν τὸ μὲν προστάττει μηδένα βουλευτικὸν φρόντισμα[α] ὑπεισελ[θεῖν] ἄνευ ὀνομασίας τῆς βουλῆς*. Whether or not an appointment by the boule had to be ratified by higher officials is not specified in this document, but whatever the limitations on the competence of the boule were, it is clear that *ὀνομασία* here refers to the whole of the process for which the boule was responsible. Similarly in *P. Giss.* 54 there is a case of *ὀνομασία* of a *διαδότης* by a *μελλοπρόεδρος*.⁸³

82. The term *ὀνομασία* is also found in connection with the boule in *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 1 (289); 1416.20 (ca. 299); *P. Oxy.* ined. 7 (300, see below, p. 105); and in *P. Flor.* 88 (Arsinoe, 215?); *CPR* 20 = *WChr.* 402 (Hermopolis, 250); *P. Ross.-Georg.* II 40 (unknown provenance, third century). In *P. Oxy.* 2343, of 288, there is a case of nomination of a successor by a dekaprotos; there is no specific connection with the boule attested except that the nominee supports his protest by a letter, probably written by a prefect, to the strategos and *προπολιτευόμενοι* of

Oxyrhynchus (see below, Appendix III). But the fact that he was nominated on *Payni* 30 suggests that it was at a meeting of the boule (see above, pp. 35-36). It might be noted that in *C. P. Herm.* 7 1 a post is filled voluntarily by a man who already holds an office.

83. Cf. *P. Lond.* 971 (III, p. 128) = *MChr.* 95: *εἰς τί αὐτῷ ὁ πρόεδρος ἐπεβούλευσεν . . . ἠθέλησεν αὐτὸν ἐπιμελητὴν κριθῆς γίνεσθαι τὸν μὴ βουλευόντα*, and *P. Lips.* 40 2.17: *οἱ ὑποβληθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν β[ο]ουλευτῶν εἰς τὴν κεφαλαιωτήν*.

2. Election

The evidence has so far demonstrated that the first stage of procedure in the boule was nomination (*ὀνομασία*). There is evidence that in certain cases the nomination was followed by an interval in which appeal could be lodged. In other cases, notably when the candidate was present during the nomination, the procedure advanced at least as far as *προβολή*. In others still, the whole electoral process seems to be telescoped and described by the term *ὀνομασία* (this is particularly noticeable in documents later than the third century). Some of the evidence for "election" has therefore already been discussed.⁸⁴

The evidence adduced to show that there was often an interval between nomination and election to allow for the possibility of appeal has support in other texts. *P. Amh.* 82, from Arsinoe, contains an appeal to a prefect from a man who had been appointed (*χειροτονεῖν, αἰρεῖν*) by the boule as *λογόγραφος*. He petitions the prefect because he had failed to present an appeal to the boule in time, and it is evident that the election had been completed without his knowledge (*ἀνελθὼν ἐπὶ τῆς μητ[ρ]οπόλεως καὶ τοῦτο μαθὼν*). The possibility that appeal to the boule was allowed *after* election can almost definitely be excluded in this document, and conjunction with the other evidence suggests that the interval in which appeal was permitted followed the nomination (*ὀνομασία*).⁸⁵

In the light of this evidence the remainder of the procedure described in *SB* 7696 may now be elucidated. The candidates had been "sealed" on Mesore 28, and nominated at a meeting of the boule on Mesore 30. Thereafter: *τούτων εισηγηταὶ καὶ ἐπιψηφισταὶ ἐδόθησαν τοῦ εἰς τὰς [ἀ]ρχὰς τούτους πάντων κληθῆναι οὐκ ἀφίκασθω* (l. ? *ἐφήκασθω*) *πρὸς τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐπιστρατήγου γέγονεν διαδικ[α]σία*. The nomination was followed by the procedure involving *εισηγηταὶ καὶ ἐπιψηφισταὶ*. Some light is cast on this by *P. Oxy.* 1413.1-3, where there is an election of a man to a half-term (*ἡμιχώριον*) as exegetes. After the concession of a half-term, there occurs the phrase *ἴας δὲ εισηγοῦμαι*, which is followed by a final remark about the conditions and an acclamation. As other documents show, the acclamation seems to mark the fact that the man has actually been elected, and it follows that *εισηγηταὶ* is part of the electoral procedure. The term *εισηγηταὶ καὶ ἐπιψηφισταὶ* must therefore mean something like "introducers" or "adopters" and "seconders." It is therefore stated in *SB* 7696 that the candidates were nominated, adopted and seconded; no appeal was made and they were indicted before the epistrategos (lines 33-5).

84. On election see Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 30-5; Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 399-404; Jones, *JEA* 24, 1938, pp. 65-72; cf. Mertens, *Les Services*, pp. 16-30.

85. See *SB* 7696.26: *καὶ τότε ἐὰν γνῶ ἐκκαλεῖται. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*

ὁ νόμος, cf. Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 35-42 and below, pp. 114-115. *P. Flor.* 88 (Arsinoe, 215?) also contains an appeal against nomination involving the boule. On *P. Oxy.* 2343 see above, note 82.

It is impossible to tell whether the procedure of adoption and seconding is equivalent to *προβολή* or precedes it, but the fact that the latter is mentioned separately in line 25 suggests that it was distinct. The implication in lines 33-5 is that the election went ahead legally since no appeal was made when the adopters and seconders were named. It thus appears that appeal was possible either after nomination or upon the appointment of adopters and seconders.⁸⁶ Some new evidence is offered by unpublished reports of proceedings of the boule of Oxyrhynchus. It is clear from the phrase ... *ἐπιψηφίζομεθα πάντες εισηγούμεθα*, in *P. Oxy. ined. 6*, that the boule as a body could perform this function. From *P. Oxy. ined. 7*, of 300, it is clear that *εισηγηταί* και *ἐπιψηφισταί* were a necessary part of the process of *ὄνομασία*; in the debate there reported a prytanis states that during his prytany a problem caused by lack of *εισηγηταί* και *ἐπιψηφισταί* had been referred to a higher authority.

The evidence shows, therefore, several distinct stages in the process of appointment. First *ὄνομασία*, then *εισήγησις* και *ἐπιψηφισμός* probably followed by *προβολή*. If no appeal had been lodged and these stages had been completed, the candidate was apparently considered elected (*χειροτονία*). There is no example in the documents of a specific act of *χειροτονία*. No document attests in full detail an election containing *προβολή* and *εισήγησις* και *ἐπιψηφισμός*. There are two possible explanations for this; either the terms are simply different ways of describing the same process, or the reports of the procedure are slightly compressed. The procedure described in *SB 7696* does not include *προβολή*, whilst *P. Oxy. 1415*, which contains the fullest account thereof, is not complete. In view of the obvious compression in some of the other reports, the latter explanation is perhaps marginally preferable.

Several documents from Oxyrhynchus yield information about election in the third century. In *P. Oxy. 1191* there are two letters, one from an official whose rank is not stated to a strategos conveying an order of the prefect that in all acts emanating from the boule in connection with *χειροτονία ἐπιμελητῶν* the strategos should take the signature of the *σκριβάς* of the boule;⁸⁷ the other letter is from the strategos to the *σκριβάς* directing his attention to this regulation. In *P. Oxy. 1413.3* the acclamation of an exegetes who makes the final statement seems to signify completion of an election. The procedure regarding *ἐπιτηρηταί* in lines 10-11 and 13 is also of some interest. After the proposal that overseers be appointed, the prytanis says: *αἰροῦμαι εἰς ἐπιτή[ρησων Φιλέαν και] Πλουτέων ἵνα τὴν πίστην ἀποπληρώσωσιν τῆ βουλῆ*, and the bouleutai acclaim them. Similarly in line 13 the prytanis says:

86. An alternative supposition is that the reporting of the procedure is slightly distorted here by the speaker, or that the chronology of events is explained imprecisely. On the expression (*γνώμη*) *εισηγητής* και *ἐπιψηφιστής* (which occurs in other contexts, cf. *SP XX 60; BGU 362 = WChr. 96* [see above, note 71]; *P. Oxy. 1416.1,4*) see *JEA 21*,

1935, p. 238; Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 25-6; Jones, *GC*, pp. 340-1. On *προβολή* see also below, note 103.

87. The official who wrote to the strategos was probably the epistrategos, see *P. Oxy. 1412* introd.

ἐπιτηρήσει Νεῖλος βουλευτής, and the bouleutai acclaim him. It appears that in the election of overseers the process is not protracted. Acclamations of this type are not evident in all cases of election, and the evidence supports the view that if all stages of the procedure had been effected without obstruction, or if obstruction was removed, the candidate was in effect elected *nem. con.* There is no instance of the boule ever having taken a division in an election (cf. above, page 38).⁸⁸

There is only one document from the fourth century which supplies any information about election. In *P. Oxy.* 2110, of 370, a man makes a complaint before the boule that in spite of the fact that he was one of the 24 ordained by the prefect for *παγαρχίαι* and *κονδουκτορίαι*, he had been chosen by the president as an epimeletes for soldiers' woolen clothing. The interest in this document lies in the fact that the president had apparently made the appointment (*χειροτονεῖν*) without any recourse to election in the boule. Also, certain officials were chosen by the prefect, and a man who was in this category was exempted from serving in other posts. It is difficult to say to what extent the electoral process was fictional at this date. As has been shown, *PSI* 684 throws the responsibility for the appointment of *exactores* on to the boule, and there is evidence that the boule, or at least its president, appointed epimeletai (*P. Giss.* 54; *P. Lond.* 971 [III, p. 128] = *MChr.* 95). This may mean that in practice the responsibility for finding people to serve had fallen on the president of the boule, and that the boule as a body would not be involved at all, except in cases like *P. Oxy.* 2110.⁸⁹

The evidence from Oxyrhynchus (see Appendix IV, Section I) supports some conclusions which are consonant with the evidence from other places. As far as election is concerned, it is clear that the term most commonly used is *χειροτονεῖν*. The word *αἰρεῖν* is apparently not used to refer to anything but a completed appointment. The term *ὀνομάζω* normally signifies nomination, the first stage of the electoral process in the boule, but occasionally seems to refer to a completed election. *διδόναι* and *προτρέπω* are also used; the first seems to refer to appointment in general, the second is used at various stages of the electoral procedure (e.g. *P. Oxy.* 1413.5, 17; 1416.5; 1415.23).

In the documents which record actual elections there is a regrettable lack of uniformity in date, so far as the documents can be dated at all. It seems likely that from the middle of the third century, the situation had become so

88. For other appointments made by the boule in the third century see *C. P. Herm.* 7 1; 7 2; 66-7; 82-96; 97; 101 (Hermopolis); *BGU* 8; 144; 1588 (Arsinoe); *P. Flor.* 21; *P. Teb.* 403; *P. Strassb.* 58-64; *P. Amh.* 82; *BGU* 362 = *WChr.* 96; *P. Lugd.-Bat.* XVII 7 (all from Arsinoe); *Archiv* 4, pp. 115-7 (Antinoopolis); *CPR* 20 = *WChr.* 402 (Hermopolis); *P. Beatty Panop.* 1 (Panopolis); also perhaps *P. Mil. Vogl.* 254

(Arsinoe?, III, cf. *BASP* 6, 1969, p. 25); *P. Flor.* 6 (Hermopolis, 210, see above, note 31). For appointments made by the boule of Oxyrhynchus see below, Appendix IV, Section I, Table 2.

89. For appointments made by the boule in the fourth century see also the documents quoted above, note 83, and add *P. Lugd.-Bat.* XIII 10 (Hermopolis).

difficult that the need for liturgists was constantly recurring. Notable in this respect are posts connected with provision of *annona militaris*, which had to be filled as often as some new demand was made. The fact stands that there is little coherent evidence for electoral procedure, and this may be due to the fact that nearly all the evidence comes from the second half of the third century. Apart from the fact that the prytanis had to be nominated six months in advance, and that certain other nominations were made at meetings in the first and sixth months of the year, there is no evidence about the intervals between nomination, election and the taking of office, and the stages of the electoral process are not always distinguishable. The lack of coherent evidence suggests that any system which may have existed earlier in the third century had become corrupted by about 250.⁹⁰

The evidence also shows that to a large extent the boule was concerned with the election of metropolitan liturgists and those connected with the *annona*. It also, on occasion at least, elected regular collectors of state taxes and other officials connected with taxation (*P. Oxy.* 1031 = *WChr.* 343; cf. *BGU* 8; 1588; *P. Flor.* 21). In the appointment of officials in connection with impositions by the state, it is no surprise to find that the boule assumes an indirect competence outside the metropolis, being responsible for the proper performance of these duties. As far as the administration of metropolitan liturgies is concerned, a competence of the boule in the nome is not to be expected. But it may be noted that certain of the metropolitan liturgists did have competence in the nome. Apart from this, the obvious case of the boule stretching a tentacle outside the metropolis is *SB* 7696, where the boule of Arsinoe attempted (illegally) to appoint villagers to liturgies in the metropolis.⁹¹

3. Supervision and Responsibility

Apart from nomination and election, the boule was involved in the administrative details of public offices in a very real sense. It was ultimately responsible for the proper performance of duties and liturgies; it had to make sure that the elected officials filled the posts, and it often had to deal with difficulties arising from the duties. No doubt many of the details were dealt with internally by the *κοινόν* of magistrates concerned, but there are many examples of difficulties being dealt with by the boule.⁹²

90. The general difficulty with regard to the filling of offices is expounded in *SB* 7696.93-103.

91. For a liturgist appointed by the boule who had competence in the nome see Lewis, *ICS* s.v. *γυμνασίαρχος*. For other officials who were appointed by the boule to posts connected with taxation see *P. Teb.* 403; *P. Strassb.* 58-64. It is impossible to be sure what was the basis for the election of such officials by the boule, as opposed

to the amphodogrammateus (or later the phylarch); see *P. Oxy.* 1119 (= *WChr.* 397).

92. On the supervision of officials by the boule see Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 307-26. On the responsibility of the boule see N. Lewis, "Exemption from Liturgy in Roman Egypt," *Atti dell' XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, 1965, pp. 533-7.

There is very little evidence that the boule had much concern with arrangements preliminary to the election of officials. At Oxyrhynchus a system was introduced in 206-7 whereby the responsibility for the performance of liturgies rotated around the tribes in a six-year *περίοδος* (see below, Appendix II). There is an example in *P. Oxy.* 2407 of the kind of administration which such a system involved – the enrolling of people into tribes, the concern to distribute burdens fairly and to make sure that responsibilities were met. The meeting which deals with such business in *P. Oxy.* 2407 does not seem to be a meeting of the boule, but rather of the two tribes who were about to exchange the responsibility for liturgies. The concern of the boule is indirect; the meeting is presided over by a *syndikos*, who functioned both within and without the boule (see above, pages 46-52). The evidence that the boule had any direct concern in scrutinising the eligibility of candidates prior to nomination is extremely uncertain.⁹³

There is evidence from the third and fourth centuries that the boule was responsible for officials whom it elected to fulfil demands made by the state. In *P. Oxy.* 58 (= *WChr.* 378) there is a reference to an order that the boulai of the cities in the Heptanomia and the Arsinoite Nome are to elect, *κωδύνω* *ἐκάστης βουλῆς*, a *φροντιστής* for estates belonging to the *fiscus*. Similarly in *P. Oxy.* 2110 it is stated that people who are ordained by the prefect for *παγαρχίαι* and *κονδοκτορίαι* and are hence exempted from other liturgies, may serve in another position if they wish to, but not *κωδύνω* *τοῦ βουλευτηρίου*. It is not difficult to see the logic of this provision in regard to offices serving the interests of the state. If an elected official defaulted, the boule was responsible for supplying the deficiency (but cf. *C. P. Herm.* 97).

This is probably relevant to the proceedings in *P. Oxy.* 1415 where the boule had to elect replacements for officials connected with the transport of *annonna militaris* who had absconded. The bouleutai refuse to elect the officials and refer to the fact that the strategos is in possession of the sureties of the absconders. These sureties obviously provided an additional safeguard, and were perhaps deposited with the strategos by the boule on behalf of the officials. In that case the boule may be prepared to elect replacements provided that the sureties are returned, but may consider that if they are kept as compensation for the default it has fulfilled its responsibility.

In the case of municipal officials, the boule has to answer to itself for the conduct of its appointees. Hence, an oath of office, sworn by a man under-

93. For an apparent case of *δοκιμασία* by the boule see above, note 42. This, however, was a grant of exemption to privileged persons. There is no evidence that it was part of the normal duty of the boule to maintain records of the eligibility of people for office (cf. above, note 37). The term occurs in three documents connected with the boule (*P. Ross.-Georg.* II 40; *P. Oxy.* 2612; *P. Oxy.*

ined. 4), but in all cases the context is impossibly lacerated by lacunae. The evidence adduced by Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 29-31, is extremely uncertain. The nature of the business in the meeting recorded in *P. Oxy.* 2407 suggests the possibility that this responsibility may have lain with the tribes (see above, pp. 50-51).

taking to provide (χορηγεῖν) fish for the city, is addressed to the prytanis (P. Oxy. ined. 15, 228). In certain cases it is attested that a candidate is nominated on the security of his own πόρος (P. Oxy. 1413.8). No doubt this was in fact the normal procedure,⁹⁴ but there would presumably be no objection to another person providing the collateral for a candidate (which, in effect, was the case when minors or women were appointed). In case of default the property would then be impounded or confiscated by the boule.⁹⁵ The boule would then elect a replacement as it did in P. Oxy. 1416 in the case of a man who was ὀνομασθ(έντος) καὶ μὴ συνλειτ[ο]υργήσαντο[ς].

The boule appears to have dealt with the designation of duties among officials in cases of particular difficulty. In P. Erl. 18 a meeting of the boule discusses τὰς τροφὰς τῆ[ς πόλε]ως καὶ τὰ ἀλίμματα. It is stated that the gymnasiarchs sustain nine months per year of eutheniarchy and seven months and more of gymnasiarchy. In consequence of the food shortage the boule is asked by the prytanis to urge a man who was designated for some days of eutheniarchy to undertake these duties, and he was persuaded to undertake sixteen days of eutheniarchy. It is clear that in the months in which a person was in office he was only on active duty on certain days, and equally clear that this term of sixteen days is an emergency measure. The evidence of P. Oxy. 1252 verso 2 shows that such arrangements could be, and probably usually were, dealt with internally by the board of gymnasiarchs. A prytanis writes to the prefect stating that the board of gymnasiarchs has only designated (ἀπόδειξις) two of the three eutheniarchs required, who came forward at the urging of the boule, at first declined and then took the duty and partially supplied the needs. The prytanis urged another gymnasiarch-in-office of whose eutheniarchy a month more was due to discharge this ὑπὲρ τοῦ τούτους ἀνάκτησθ[ο]ν σ[τήσαντας] εὐμαρῶς καὶ τὸ ὑπόλοιπον τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀμέμπτως ἀποδοῦναι. However, the two originally designated had persisted in their refusal when called upon to supply food for the remainder of the office. The prytanis therefore asked the prefect to instruct the strategos to take action of some sort (the document breaks off here).⁹⁶ It is clear that designation was dealt with by

94. Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, p. 67, suggested that a person who had the money for the crown advanced from the bouletic fund was nominated ἐπὶ ἰδίῳ πόρῳ καὶ τῆς βουλῆς.

95. P. Oxy. 1413.14, cf. P. Ryl. 77, where property is impounded perhaps for failure to perform a liturgy. Such is presumably the purpose behind P. Oxy. ined. 16, of 300, where the prytanis instructs the bibliophylakes to record a κατοχὴ τοῦ ὀνόματος (cf. P. Ryl. 174.22-4 note) of a man elected to a liturgy. For the provision of collateral by a third person see Lewis, *op. cit.* (above, note 92), p. 537.

96. The date of P. Oxy. 1252 verso 2 is

probably 289-90. It is stated that the prefect reintroduced the ἀγορανομία and εἰθνημαρχία in the previous year, and the former was in operation in 288-9 (P. Oxy. 1642; that the nomination there attested was made in 288, as suggested by the editors, is not certain). P. Oxy. 1252 verso 2 cannot therefore be later than 289-90, and the supposition that it is to be placed in that year fits the chronological order of the documents on this papyrus (P. Oxy. 1252 verso 1 is dated in Thoth 289). P. Oxy. 2612 also mentions the εἰθνημαρχία and is dated to the prefecture of Valerius Pompeianus (287-90); it may more precisely be dated to 288-90, but it should be noted that after

the boule in cases of difficulty; when the boule proved unable to resolve the difficulty, it had recourse to officials of the central government.

In *P. Oxy.* 1413.19-24 the meeting of the boule discussed the designation of days to gymnasiarchs. It appears that the boule was asked to change the arrangements about the designation of days in order that a gymnasiarch, who had failed to supply oil when he should have done, could work off his debt. It is not stated here that the boule was responsible for the original designation, and this might well have been done internally by the board of gymnasiarchs. The boule is asked to make an *ἐναλλαγή τῶν ἡμερῶν* when some irregularity occurs, and the arrangements made in the boule are called *ψηφίσματα*. It was probably the same kind of difficulty which gave rise to the discussion in *P. Oxy.* 1416 about the urging (*προτραπήναι*) of people to serve (*γυμνασιαρχῆσαι*) on various days of Pharmouthi and Pachon (lines 6-9).⁹⁷

There is some fragmentary evidence of supervision of the gymnasiarchy and eutheniarchy in *P. Oxy.* 1417: *ἐν τῇ ἐξετάσει καὶ ἐπηκρήσεται τῶν λεξι ὁρίζεται τῶ τῆς βουλῆς ψηφίσματι.* [. The boule might here have been concerned with the designation of days, or with the shortening of a term of office. The latter is well attested in documents from Oxyrhynchus, with the prytanis playing a prominent role. *P. Oxy.* 1418 contains an application to the boule through the prytanis from a man who had held the gymnasiarchy and eutheniarchy and now wanted some relief in connection with the gymnasiarchy of his son. The mutilated state of the text precludes complete comprehension, but the writer begins by giving an account of his services and the difficulty of his financial position. He mentions a *ὄρου τοῦ δοθέντος* by the prefect, which could refer to a general regulation or a special dispensation in this case. He goes on to refer to the gymnasiarchy which he had held for five days a year, and offers to accept a four-month gymnasiarchy for his son. He then complains about an ex-prytanis named Asklepiades whose failure to fulfil his promises had forced the petitioner to undertake more than he had agreed. The promises of the prytanis probably related to shortening of the office, to judge by the references to *τρίτον* and *δίμοιρον*. This is supported by *P. Oxy.* 1413.1-3 where a person is apparently persuaded to undertake a half-term as exegetes. There can be no doubt that this kind of concession was often necessary in order to get people to serve. In *P. Oxy.* 1418 the prytanis himself might have undertaken some of the duty.⁹⁸

the last known date for Valerius Pompeianus there is no prefect attested until 292 (see O. W. Reinmuth, "A Working List of the Prefects of Egypt: 30 B.C. - 299 A.D.," *BASP* 4, 1967, p. 125).

97. For restorations see B. Van Groningen, "Pap. Oxy. 1416 and the History of the Gymnasiarchy," *Actes du Ve Congrès International de Papyrologie*, 1938, pp. 508-9. The concern of

the boule with the regulation of days for serving gymnasiarchs is also attested in *P. Oxy.* ined. 17, of 257; attention to the food supply is attested by an order from a prytanis for the delivery of bread (*P. Oxy.* ined. 19).

98. See lines 19-20. The word at the end of line 22 might be *ὑπέστη* . . . , or, as the editors suggest in their note, *ὑπέσχετο*

In *P. Oxy.* 2612 there is a report of proceedings before a prefect about a eutheniarchy.⁹⁹ The candidate appears to want assistance (*χειραγωγία*), but not in the form of a loan: *προχρεία[ς μ]ὲν οὐ δέομαι ἔθος δὲ ἔστω τὸν πρύταν[ω] . . .* The possibilities for restoration include something giving the sense that the prytanis divides or otherwise alleviates the duties. There is evidence elsewhere that the boule was in the habit of advancing loans to aid the performance of official duties (*P. Oxy.* 1416.3-4, cf. *P. Fuad I* 52).

Further evidence from Oxyrhynchus shows the boule exercising a general supervision over the performance of duties in connection with public works. In *P. Oxy.* 2569 a contractor for the water-supply to the baths sends a notice of resignation to the prytanis, informs him that there is some difficulty with regard to the water-supply and asks him to warn the exegetai of this fact.

There is not much evidence that the boule was involved in supervising the financial aspects of the offices which it filled, apart from the general direction of finance in the metropolis (see above, pages 91-97). In *P. Oxy.* 1413.31-2 there is mentioned a report submitted to the boule by the board of kosmetai involving some expenditure, and in *P. Oxy.* 891 the boule apparently decides that the expenses of a post to be filled by an exegetes are to be borne by the *τάγμα* of exegetai. In a document from Hermopolis the boule informs an official that the accounts of the gymnasiarchy are to be submitted to the imperial procurator Aurelius Ploution (*C. P. Herm.* 53 = *WChr.* 39, see above, page 95). The evidence discussed on pages 91-98 shows clearly that the boule maintained a general supervision over the expenditure of officials in these posts.¹⁰⁰

The evidence from Oxyrhynchus, with the exception of *P. Oxy.* 2110, all relates to the third century. The evidence from the other metropoleis fills in certain gaps but provides very little information for the fourth century. *SB* 7261, dated by Wilcken to the early fourth century (see above, Chapter II, note 6), contains evidence that people with bouletic rating were avoiding bouletic liturgies. There is no doubt, however, that evasion of liturgy was a common feature in the third century, as the evidence from Oxyrhynchus has shown.

A document from Hermopolis provides some detailed evidence on a method by which liturgy could legally be avoided — *cessio bonorum* (*CPR* 20 = *WChr.* 402, of 250).¹⁰¹ If a person was appointed to a liturgy which he was

99. See above, note 96 for the date. For the difficulties involved in performance of the eutheniarchy this document may be compared with *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 2, *P. Oxy.* 1417 and *P. Oxy.* 2854. In 1417 there is a report of a hearing before the strategos about a default in the performance of the eutheniarchy; the accused seems to be defending himself on the ground that it was not made clear that performance of the

gymnasiarchy also involved the eutheniarchy (lines 23-4); for the conjunction of offices see *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 2; *P. Erl.* 18; *P. Oxy.* 1418.

100. See also above, note 68.

101. On *CPR* 20 see Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 115-29; Méautis, *Hermoupolis-la-Grande*, pp. 178-9; Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 399-402; and the commentary of Mitteis, *ad loc.*

unable to fulfil, he could turn his property over to the person who proposed him for the post; the latter would then be liable for the performance of the liturgy. There is a small amount of evidence from Oxyrhynchus about the connection of the boule with the process of *cessio bonorum* and CPR 20 provides a useful supplement.¹⁰² In *P. Oxy.* 2854, of 248, a man who has been nominated to a eutheniarchy, in contravention of *ψηφίσματα* passed by the boule when he took a gymnasiarchy, offers, in spite of having an apparently solid excuse for refusal, to cede all his property to the prytanis in order to avoid the office; the latter then has to perform both offices as well as paying taxes on land owned and rented by the former. CPR 20 contains two letters from a man who wished to effect *cessio bonorum* in connection with the nomination of his son as kosmetes. Mitteis' interpretation of these complex documents is that the man had written to the prefect in order to obtain permission to effect *cessio*; the prefect had apparently granted this stating that: *τὸν κίνδυνον τῆς προβολῆς εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς ὀνομάσαντ[ας] . . . 1.8, cf. 17-18).*¹⁰³ The legal situation appears to have been that the man would cede all his property but for one third, which was not liable to execution: *εἰ δὲ οἶει, σὺ [αὐ]τὸς τὰ πάντα μου λαβῶ[ν] ἀντὶ τοῦ νενομισμένου τρίτου τὰ τῆ ἀρχῆ [δ]ιαφέροντα πάντα ἀποπληρώσεις καὶ [μ]ὴ ἐνεδρεύει μη[[δ]]τε τὴν πόλιν μηδὲ τὴν κρατίστην βουλήν . . .*¹⁰⁴ In spite of the permission of the prefect, the boule had set a watch upon the man, with the result that he wrote the two letters contained in CPR 20; one to the prytanis demanding his rights and offering to cede his property to the prytanis if the latter wished (see the passage quoted above), and one to the prefect informing him of the situation. The explanation of the fact that the boule set a watch on the man is probably to be explained in terms of the evidence of SB 7696.97 ff., where it is stated that a person who effected *cessio* sustained the office and by asking to wear the crown surrendered himself to the liturgy. This seems to mean that a person who ceded his property but wished to wear the crown of office was still under the physical obligation of filling the office, even though the expense would be borne by the person to whom the property had been ceded.¹⁰⁵ If the writer of CPR 20 had assumed himself to be freed of this obligation, but this had not been made clear to the boule, the fact that he was put under surveillance is explained.

102. The procedure is mentioned in a rescript of Severus Alexander, published in Alexandria (*P. Oxy.* 1405), cf. *MChr.* 375 (a rescript of Severus and Caracalla).

103. This passage seems to imply an equation between *προβολή* and *ὀνομασία*, but the distinction is clear in the process in *P. Oxy.* 1415, where the members of a tribe are called upon to make the nomination (*ὀνομασία*) and the proposal of the candidate (*προβολή*) is made by the prytanis. The simplest explanation would be that in this case the

"nominators" and the "proposers" were the same people (perhaps the whole boule [*προβολή πάντων*], cf. Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 127-8).

104. An alternative interpretation is that it is the normal procedure to cede one third of the property, but the man here offers to cede it all (cf. *WChr.* 402), but this seems inherently unlikely. But neither interpretation solves the problem raised by *τὸ νενομισμένον τρίτον* and the fact that all the property is ceded in *P. Oxy.* 2854.

105. Cf. Wegener, *The Boule*, p. 94.

If further evidence were needed to support the conclusion that the performance of liturgies was an expensive and unwelcome burden, it is provided by these documents. The pressure to find people to serve was so great that the prytanis of an unknown boule stated explicitly in a meeting that he did not intend to spare his friends (*P. Ross-Georg.* II 40).

On the whole, the evidence from the third century shows that the actual operation of liturgical posts provided the boule with a good deal of trouble. It seems to be the case that the boule would intervene in the performance of liturgy only when there was some irregularity or difficulty. The fact that there is a good deal of evidence for this may well be explicable by the fact that the operation of liturgical service in the late third century was subject to a great deal of irregularity and difficulty. No doubt the same was true of the fourth century, but there is no evidence to demonstrate it.¹⁰⁶

4. Petitions and Complaints

Many of the documents which provide evidence about petitions and complaints to the boule have been discussed in the previous section. The evidence provided by those documents and the ones discussed below shows that liturgies were the main subject of petitions to the boule. In fact, there are only two petitions addressed to a boule in which the subject is not a public office of some kind.¹⁰⁷ These petitions, in conjunction with those relating to public office, suggest that the boule dealt only with petitions of which the subject was within its general sphere of competence.

The evidence that the boule was called upon to confirm exemption from liturgy for privileged persons has already been discussed (above, pages 85-87). This evidence, mostly from Oxyrhynchus, dates to the third century and contains requests from athletes for recognition of privileged status. To this may be added a document from the first half of the fourth century containing a

106. The evidence for the fourth century relates to liturgies performed for the central government. A possible exception is *P. Mert.* 43 (for the date [ca. 386] see F. Zucker, *Archiv* 16, 1956, pp. 241-2), of which a possible interpretation is that it contains (recto) a petition to a *praeses* from the *πολιτευόμενοι* of some city — “perhaps Oxyrhynchus” — complaining that certain people are refusing to bear their proper share of burdens and are endangering the city. The whole context is, as the editors recognise by formulating two possible explanations, extremely uncertain. The ascription to Oxyrhynchus may be supported by the identification of Leukadios with the ex-prytanis of Oxyrhynchus, C. Julius Leukadios mentioned in *P. Mert.* 36 (see below,

Appendix I, p. 137). Another possible example of the involvement of the boule, through a prytanis, in a hearing connected with liability for liturgy is *P. Oxy.* 1503, of 288-9 (but see below, Appendix I, note 10).

107. *P. Oxy.* 14.4.12-6 (petition from weavers for higher prices); *P. Oxy.* 1416.10 (a petition from priests, of which the subject is lost). On petitions relating to liturgy see above, pp. 85-86; Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 30-5; Boyl. *op. cit.* (above, note 76); N. Lewis “Exemption from Liturgy in Roman Egypt,” *Actes du Xe Congrès International de Papyrologues*, 1961, pp. 69-79, and (same title) *Atti dell’XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, 1965, pp. 508-41.

petition addressed to the boule to which is appended a copy of an edict, probably of Diocletian and Maximian. The text is badly mutilated, but the mention of *γῆρας* and a reference to an age of 73 suggest that the petitioner is probably claiming exemption from liturgy on the ground of old age.¹⁰⁸ This again is consistent with the supposition that the boule was merely required to confirm the fact that the applicant conformed with the conditions laid down in the edict.

The evidence for the boule having been able to promulgate general regulations about liturgies is uncertain. A document of unknown provenance (*P. Leit.* 7, of ca. 219-24) contains a petition for relief from consecutive obligations of liturgy. The address of the petition is lost but it continues: *μηδέ|ν παρασελευθήσεσθα|ι τ|ῶν [τ|ῆς βουλῆς γραμμάτων οὐδὲ τοῦτο συγκεχωρημέ|νον] ἐκ τῶν θείων καὶ βασιλικῶν διατάξεων . . . δέον οὖν ἐν τῷ ἐνεστῶτι ἔχει μηδὲν ἐνοχλεῖσθαι με ἀκολούθως τῷ γεγενημένῳ ψήφισματι . . .* The *ψήφισμα* was probably put out by the boule (cf. *P. Oxy.* 1413.22), and may be the same as the *γράμματα* which are mentioned. It is doubtful, however, whether the boule had the power to issue a regulation about the interval between obligations except under the terms established by some imperial or prefectorial decree. Its *ψήφισμα* may therefore have been merely confirmatory of some higher regulation enjoining obedience to the instructions (*γράμματα*) of the boule.¹⁰⁹

Documents containing petitions from Antinoites against nomination to liturgies outside Antinoopolis throw a certain amount of light on the competence of the boule in questions of this sort. In *P. Oxy.* 1119 (= *WChr.* 397), of 253, there is a series of documents illustrating the case history of two Antinoites who were nominated in 244-5 by the *ἀμφοδογραμματεὺς* of Oxyrhynchus as *πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν*, in contravention of the privilege established by Hadrian that Antinoites should not be liable to serve liturgies outside their own city. They took the matter to the boule of Antinoopolis, which communicated it to the epistrategos. He in turn directed the strategos of the Oxyrhynchite Nome to order the offending *ἀμφοδογραμματεὺς* to rectify the mistake, which the latter did by undertaking the liturgy himself. They bring this case to the attention of the strategos nine years later in order that he may inform the phylarch and prevent a recurrence of the same error. A similar document exists in *BGU* 1022 (= *WChr.* 29), of 196, containing a letter to the boule from two Antinoites who have been appointed to a *καταγωγὴ σίτου* at Philadelphia and ask that the epistrategos be informed.¹¹⁰ It is to be noted that

108. Cf. *P. Flor.* 57; Lewis, *op. cit.* (above, note 107, XI Congr.), pp. 518-21.

109. Cf. Lewis, *op. cit.* (note 107, XI Congr.), p. 525. Lewis suggests (*P. Leit.* 7 introd.) that the boule might have been responsible for the decree whereby the liturgies were rotated round the

ἀμφοδα, but there is no direct evidential support for this.

110. See also *P. Osl.* 126, of the second century (shortly after 161). On the privileges of Antinoites see H. Cadell, "P. Caire IFAO Inv. 45, P. Oxy. XIV 1719 et les Privilèges des Antinoïtes," *Chronique*

in both these cases the boule of Antinoopolis is involved, whilst there is no reference in *P. Oxy.* 1119 to the boule of Oxyrhynchus (*BGU* 1022 predates the foundation of the metropolitan boulai). In *P. Oxy.* 2130 a different procedure is attested; an Antinoite who has been nominated to some office connected with the gymnasiarchy at Oxyrhynchus petitions the board of gymnasiarchs through the deputy-prytanis. The appeal was supposed to go to the epistrategos, but since it was not accepted he petitioned the prefect. Whether or not the ground for appeal was the same as in *P. Oxy.* 1119,¹¹¹ it seems to be significant that two appeals destined for the epistrategos went through different channels. Although the petition in *P. Oxy.* 2130 is not directed to the boule, the presence of the deputy-prytanis in the address, and the fact that the nomination was made at a meeting of the boule indicates the connection. It seems likely, therefore, that the authorities in the metropolis were involved because the office was connected with a liturgy in the metropolis. In *P. Oxy.* 1119 the boule was not involved because the office of *πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν* in the metropolis, for which the Antinoites were nominated by the *ἀμφοδογραμματεὺς*, involved the collection of taxes due to the state.

It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that although the boule of Antinoopolis had a particular interest in guarding the rights of its citizens, the boulai of the metropoleis were not generally involved in appeals unless they had a direct responsibility for the original error. A further refinement may be added on the basis of *P. Oxy.* 2130. Although the nomination was made in the boule, the petition was directed to the board of gymnasiarchs which was responsible for making the nomination in the boule. The evidence of other petitions supports the conclusion that the boule was the recipient of petitions only about business for which it was directly responsible.¹¹²

Miscellaneous

There is very little evidence which has not found a place in one of the previous sections. The main type of business dealt with by the boule for the metropolis is the organisation and supervision of festivals. This is only attested for Oxyrhynchus in the third century and is best illustrated by *P. Osl.* 85

d'Egypte 40, 1965, pp. 357-63; N. Lewis, *op. cit.* (note 107, X Congr.), pp. 73-5, and "Νοήματα Λέγοντος," *BASP* 6, 1969, pp. 20-1.

111. For the theory that the privileges disappeared ca. 254 see K. Gapp, *TAPA* 64, 1933, pp. 94-7, and cf. Cadell, *op. cit.* (note 110), p. 363. Lewis, *op. cit.* (note 107, X Congr.), pp. 74-5 envisaged the possibility that the immunity of Antinoites did not completely cover municipal *ἀρχαί*, and later suggested the possibility that the

Antinoite who was holding office at Oxyrhynchus in 256 (*SB* 7814) might have waived his right to exemption (*op. cit.* [note 107, XI Congr.], cf. *BASP* 6, 1969, pp. 20-1).

112. Other petitions connected with the boule are *P. Wis.* 2 (on the date see N. Lewis, "Νοήματα Λέγοντος," *BASP* 4, 1967, pp. 34 f.); *PSI* 1337, of the second half of the third century; and *PSI* 944 (of 364-6?). These documents are too fragmentary for coherent discussion, but all relate to liturgies.

which contains a letter to an *τριαστής ξυστοῦ* and a *ξυστάρχης* from the prytanis about the forthcoming *Agon Capitolinus*, to take place at Oxyrhynchus. He asks them to spare no effort to ensure that as many champions as possible take part in the games.¹¹³

The Greek Cities

The material adduced for the metropoleis may be compared briefly with the evidence for the boulai in the Greek cities in Egypt. Apart from possible involvement in dedicatory inscriptions (*SB* 3998; 8300), the only evidence for the boule of Ptolemais in the Roman period is a document concerning its right to appoint *νεωκόροι* for a temple of Ptolemy Soter in Koptos (*SB* 9016). The boule of Antinoopolis was much involved, in its early years, with business relating to the enrollment of citizens and the status and privileges of Antinoites inside and outside Antinoopolis.¹¹⁴

There is no evidence for the activity of the boule of Ptolemais in the third century, and very little for that of Antinoopolis. Two dedicatory inscriptions, one to Severus Alexander and Julia Mamaea, and one to a philosopher and bouleutes attest the involvement of the boule of Antinoopolis. It is also concerned with the maintenance of privileges bestowed upon the city by earlier Emperors. In a document of the later third century there is a quotation of a letter from Gordian III to the boule and demos of Antinoopolis; the subject of the letter is somewhat obscure, but it probably deals with religious privileges which seem to be at issue in the main document (*P. Ant.* 191).¹¹⁵ A document recently presented at the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology by Dr. E. Boswinkel contains a letter from Gordian III to the boule of Antinoopolis in which he confirms the validity of the privilege of exemption from tax.¹¹⁶

There is only one document from Antinoopolis which provides any detail about the actual operation of the boule. This is a record of proceedings which contains a discussion of repairs to be done on the baths in preparation for the visit of the *ἐπανορθωτής*, Claudius Theodorus (*Archiv* 4, 1907-8, pp. 115-7). This document shows that the boule of Antinoopolis dealt with matters pertaining to public works in much the same way as did the boule of Oxyrhynchus. It was responsible for authorising the work, for supervising the activity of epimeletai and *μισθωταί*, and for maintaining a general direction over the financial questions involved. It is stated in the report that the accounts are to be subject to audit by an *ἐξεταστής*.

113. For the connection of the boule with a *πανήγυρις* see *P. Oxy.* 1416.2, 11-7.

114. See above, pp. 15, 114-115; In *P. Mich.* 426 an Antinoite claims that the boule of Antinoopolis granted him the privilege of wearing the *χλαμῶς*; the nature of this grant is unclear, see O. M. Pearl, *TAPA* 71, 1940, pp. 383-90.

115. See also *P. Strassb.* 130, a letter of Antoninus Pius to the *ἄρχοντες*, boule and demos of Antinoopolis. Only the beginning is preserved, but it may well relate to privileges enjoyed by Antinoopolis.

116. For a summary see *BASP* 5, 1968, p. 48.

As far as the evidence goes, therefore, a certain similarity is demonstrated in the third century, but it is obvious that the boule of Antinoopolis continued to deal with questions which were created by its special status and therefore did not have application to the boulai of the metropoleis. The fact that the kind of activity attested for the boule of Antinoopolis in *Archiv* 4, pp. 115-7, is not paralleled for the second century may be merely due to accident. On the other hand, the evidence as it stands permits the tentative conclusion that the foundation of the boulai of the metropoleis had an effect on the boule of Antinoopolis; it may have assumed during the course of the third century some of the functions and characteristics of a boule whose purpose was purely administrative.

The Boule and the Bureaucracy

The evidence which has been adduced shows clearly that in the third and fourth centuries one of the major functions of the boule was to fill demands for taxes and *annona militaris* imposed by the central government, and in these areas we can see clearly that its role was designed to dovetail with the position of the other officials involved. Business of this sort was fed down through the upper levels of the bureaucracy to the boule, which had the responsibility for executing orders at the nome and city level. Thus, for example, the orders for the supply or transport of *annona militaris* might come to the boule from the dioiketes and the *ἐπιείκτης δημοσίου σίτου* (*P. Oxy.* 1412), or in the fourth century from the *comes* and *dux* (*P. Lugd.-Bat.* XIII 10). In fulfilment of such demands, the boule would have to work closely with the strategos – or in the fourth century with the *strategos-exactor* – in order to effect the collection and payment of the produce (see e.g. *P. Beatty Panop.* 1). Normally the boule would do this by appointing officials with responsibility for the collection, who would work under the direction of the strategos (*P. Beatty Panop.* 1). Similarly, in the area of regular taxation, orders might be passed down by the prefect to the boule, sometimes through the strategos, and the boule would be responsible for making sure that the orders were carried out in the metropolis and the nome. Thus the boule might be asked to organise the collection of a new imposition (*P. Oxy.* 1414) or to appoint officials to collect the regular taxes (*BGU* 8). In such cases it would be subject to the scrutiny of the strategos.

In the normal course of business of this sort, orders and instructions would be addressed to the boule through the higher levels of the bureaucracy. The boule would see to it that the demands were met and would be responsible to the officials of the central government for seeing that they were met. Instructions addressed to the boule would be delegated by it to officials in the metropolis and the nome, and would then be passed back through the boule to the upper echelons of the bureaucracy (e.g. *BGU* 8). Under difficult

circumstances the boule might have recourse to higher officials. Thus in *P. Oxy.* 1662 the prytanis goes to the prefect to appeal against the assessment of ἀπότακτον on the nome, and in *P. Oxy.* 1415 difficulties engendered by the appointment of epimeletai for *annona militaris* are referred back to the epistrategos (cf. *SB* 9597). With the exception of the disappearance of the strategos as the main functionary of the central government in the nome, in the area of tax collection the position of the boule in the fourth century is not appreciably different from its role in the third.

The evidence shows clearly that the boule enjoyed relative autonomy in business pertaining to the internal government of the metropolis in the third century. It was subject to general regulations issued by the higher authorities (e.g. *SB* 7696; *P. Oxy.* 2664), but it normally had a free hand in the administration of public works, the organisation of finances in the metropolis and the appointment of officials for duties in the metropolis. Thus it would not normally elect exegetai, for example, under the direct supervision of an official of the central government, but it would have to observe imperial regulations which prohibited the election of villagers to metropolitan liturgies (*SB* 7696) or prescribed the proportion of officials to be drawn from the bouleutai (*P. Oxy.* 2664). The boule was thus able to carry on the normal business of appointing ἄρχοντες, epimeletai and other officials for duties in the metropolis, delegating work to them and maintaining a general supervision over their activities, and controlling the financial account in the metropolis and the officials who operated it (see for example *P. Oxy.* 1413; 1416; 55 = *WChr.* 196; *C. P. Herm.* 66-8; 82-91). An exception to this appears to have occurred at Hermopolis in 266-8, when an imperial procurator named Aurelius Ploution is found exercising a competence in the administration of the metropolis, particularly the financial aspects (*C. P. Herm.* 22-3; 25-6; 53 = *WChr.* 39; 78). Further evidence of financial difficulties at Hermopolis (*C. P. Herm.* 52 = *WChr.* 38) corroborates the suspicion that an extraordinary situation obtained, and that Ploution had been entrusted with the task of setting things to rights.

In theory, therefore, the boulai were probably intended as relatively independent organs of administration in the metropoleis. In practice, there is a good deal of evidence for the involvement of officials of the central government in the internal affairs of the metropoleis in the late third century. Since most of the evidence for the third century dates to between 250 and 300 it is difficult to define the extent of such "interference" in the earlier period. The evidence suggests that officials of the central government would be consulted about the internal administration of the metropolis in extraordinary or difficult situations and this is consonant with the view taken of the activity of Ploution at Hermopolis. Thus there is a single example of a man being appointed by order of an ex-epistrategos to inform the boule of Hermopolis whenever a shortage of oil occurred in the gymnasium. The evidence from Oxyrhynchus is largely concerned with difficulties experienced by the boule in

the appointment of officials and the performance of duties in the metropolis. Thus in *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 2 the prytanis writes to the prefect about the difficulty of finding people to serve as eutheniarchs and asks him to intervene through the strategos. Investigations of irregularity in the performance of the eutheniarchy at Oxyrhynchus are conducted by the prefect (*P. Oxy.* 2612) and by the strategos (*P. Oxy.* 1417). When the villagers who were appointed as kosmetai at Arsinoe in 249 failed to serve the case was heard first by the epistrategos and then by the prefect.¹¹⁷ Similarly petitions from individuals against wrongful nomination to an office were directed to the epistrategos (*P. Oxy.* 1119 = *WChr.* 397; 2130), or, if a higher court of appeal were required, to the prefect (*P. Oxy.* 2130; *P. Amh.* 82). It appears that it was also up to the prefect to grant permission for *cessio bonorum* (*CPR* 20 = *WChr.* 402).

There is very little evidence from the fourth century for the internal administration of the metropoleis. The evidence from Oxyrhynchus shows that expenditure on public works at Oxyrhynchus was now subject to the control of the logistes who was directly responsible to the prefect (*P. Oxy.* 1104; 2666-7). The introduction of the logistes, and the change in the position of the strategos and the syndikos are seen as part of a reform which fundamentally altered the nature of the metropoleis. The introduction of a body of officials with competence in the metropolis and the nome was bound – and certainly intended – to have an effect on the position of the boule. The precise nature of this effect is considered in the following chapter.

117. On the competence of the strategos and the epistrategos see Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 129-32.

IN V. U. LIBRARY

Chapter Five

Conclusions

The synthesis of evidence about the boulai of the metropoleis provides some interesting conclusions. The contrast between the evidence for the boulai of the Greek cities in the first two centuries and that for the boulai of the metropoleis in the third and fourth is striking. The former bear a certain resemblance to the boulai of Greek cities in the Hellenistic or Roman period, and were probably modelled to a certain extent on boulai which existed elsewhere. Although the boulai in the Greek cities of the Roman provinces differed considerably from the Athenian boule of the fourth century B.C., the latter may still be seen as the archetype of the later boulai. However, the position and character of the boulai of the metropoleis appear to owe little to predecessors in Egypt or elsewhere, and there is no sign that they were modelled on the boulai of Ptolemais and Antinoopolis to any discernible extent. If anything, the evidence rather suggests the possibility that the boule of Antinoopolis may have gradually become assimilated to the boulai of the metropoleis.

The character of the boule of the metropolis as an administrative unit is quite clear.¹ It took over many of the functions of the *κοινὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων* in the metropolis, but it was invested with a much wider competence. Its most important tasks were the supervision of finance and public amenities and the election of the magistrates and liturgists who played an essential role in the administration of the metropolis. There is no sign that the boule of the metropolis ever resembled the boule of the Greek or Hellenistic world in being a probouleutic body linked to the demos in administration. The only occasions on which the demos of a metropolis is mentioned at all in the third century are those cases which involve the conferring of honours or recognition of status (e.g. *P. Oxy.* 41 = *WChr.* 45; 2476). In the latter case the mention of the demos may be simply a matter of form; in the former the demos does appear as a body, though its precise nature escapes definition. In neither case, however, is there any indication that the competence of the boule was limited, or subordinate to that of the demos.

The evidence shows quite clearly that in the third century the boule was the supreme administrative organ in the metropolis, exercising complete and autonomous control over financial administration and the appointment of officials, except in peculiarly difficult circumstances. It appears to have controlled property owned by the metropolis, directing the leasing and selling of such

1. Cf. Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 462-5.

property, although the boule seems to be a body whose competence in these spheres lay primarily within the metropolis. It was not responsible for the internal administration of the villages of the nome, but it is occasionally found acting outside the metropolis in connection, for example, with the administration of property and the appointment of officials.

The evidence shows beyond all doubt that the boule was far more than the prime administrative organ of the metropolis. It was responsible to the central government for the payment of taxes and for the implementation of demands for *annona militaris*. In these spheres it exercised a competence in the nome, but it was not merely an agent of the central government. It served to protect the inhabitants of the nome from extortion or unfair treatment. Apart from normal activities of this kind, the boule is found exercising competence in the nome in business especially delegated to it by the officials of the central government.

From its inception, therefore, the boule of the metropolis was invested with a dual role, as a relatively autonomous organ of government within the metropolis, and as a body responsible to the central government for the payment of taxes and the supply of armies. The reasons which lay behind the foundation of the boule are not difficult to conjecture, and do much to explain the novel character of the institution. The administration of the metropoleis before 200 had been vested in the *κοινὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων* but the operation of these bodies had been largely dependent upon co-operation with officials of the central government (observe for example the important role played by the strategos in the election of a kosmetes at Hermopolis in 192 [*P. Ryl.* 77]).² The creation of the boule in the metropolis will have relieved officials of the central government of some responsibility, and provided a more accessible focus around which the administration of the metropolis could revolve. The creation of an administrative unit in the metropolis involved the appearance of an organ of bureaucracy which was not only ultimately responsible to the central government for keeping its own house in order, but which had an obvious interest in doing so. The foundation of boulai in the metropoleis may therefore have been accepted with willingness by the inhabitants. Not only did it provide (in theory) an opportunity to avoid oppression by officials of the state, but it gave to the metropoleis the distinguishing characteristic of the autonomous Greek city; it was, after all, not until this very time that Alexandria itself was able to boast a boule.

In those spheres in which the boule was responsible to the central government, taxation and *annona militaris*, the system had an obvious double benefit. Insofar as the boule had to work closely with officials of the central government, particularly the strategos, each body was subject to the checking of the other, and in this way the interests of the *fiscus* were protected against evasion. But since the boule was ultimately responsible for the payment of taxes and *annona*, it had an interest in making sure that payments were made correctly,

2. See *P. Ryl.* 77 introd.; P. Jouguet, "Sur les Métropoles Egyptiennes à la fin du IIe Siècle après J-C," *REG* 30, 1917, pp. 294-328 and *VM*, pp. 303-14.

for it would have to make good any deficit and assume the responsibility for the officials whom it appointed *κωδύνω τῆς βουλῆς*. The argument employed in the Alexandrian embassy to Augustus may also appropriately be recalled – that a boule would be able to guard against oppression by state officials, support the weak and prevent the revenues from being plundered. The interests of the boule might lie rather in protecting the tax-payers than the *fiscus*, but it could no doubt be useful to the government in the latter (see above, page 13).

It may well be the case that the system established in 200 ran into serious difficulties from the very beginning. Certainly, after the middle of the third century the evidence shows that the boulai experienced ever-increasing difficulty in administration, particularly in finding people to fill posts (cf. *SB 7696; P. Oxy. 1413-5*). In Hermopolis the difficulties in administration apparently led to the appointment of an imperial procurator with general supervisory powers. The evidence as a whole suggests that the boulai may well have become increasingly dependent on the officials of the central government to extricate them from their difficulties.

The evidence adduced in the previous chapter demonstrated that the character and functions of the boulai of the metropoleis did not vary noticeably from place to place, except in a few minor details. The dual role of the boulai and their connections with other branches of the bureaucracy in the third century demonstrate the logical practicality of such an organisation. The boule was not only an organ of government within the metropolis, but also an important part of the bureaucratic chain of the central government, particularly in the areas of taxation and supply of *annona militaris*. The creation of boulai in the metropoleis in or about 200 suggests that these institutions will have been characterised by a uniformity which would not have existed if they had been allowed to develop piecemeal. The fact that the activities and competence of the boulai were required to dovetail with those of the officials of the central government will have demanded a certain basic uniformity.

The evidence for the fourth century is neither so detailed nor so abundant. It relates largely to the function of the boule as a collector of taxes payable to the state, and a provider of *annona militaris*. It is generally assumed that the reign of Diocletian saw the final breakdown of the system of autonomous government in the metropoleis and the reform which established the division of Egypt into city-territories with each metropolis controlling its nome. The evidence for the position of the boule is, of course, relevant to this question; on the view that the nome and the metropolis became an administrative unit, the effect of the "municipalisation" would be to give the boule a wider competence – in the nome as well as in the metropolis.

The evidence for the boule should enable us to define the nature of the changes which occurred. It is usually held that the so-called municipalisation of Egypt began in the late third or very early fourth century and was completed just before 310, with the creation of the *pagi* and their *praepositi*. Changes of this sort

– the introduction of the *praepositus pagi* and the *logistes* – are fairly well documented.³ If the municipalisation of Egypt involved wider competence for the boule this should be apparent in the documents which have been discussed. The extension of the power of the boule to the nome is documented – so it is held – by *P. Cair. Is.* 1, in which the ἀρχοντες and προπολιτευόμενοι of each city are instructed to publish copies of the taxation edict of Diocletian in the villages of the nome. This document dates to 297 – hence the view that the municipalisation of Egypt was being carried out in the last decade of the third century.⁴

It is unlikely that the προπολιτευόμενοι are the presidents of the boulai, but the view taken (in Appendix III, below) that they were in fact the *principales* of the boule does not affect this issue very much. The main point is the competence of the boule, or its leading members, in the nome. The evidence adduced for the role of the boule in taxation in the third century shows quite clearly that it had a competence in the nome (see above, pages 69-77), which is amply attested in the fourth century as well. It is therefore obvious that evidence for the competence of the boule in the nome in the sphere of taxation cannot be taken to indicate any kind of a change in the position of the boule. The same applies to all business, particularly the supply of *annona militaris*, in which the boule acted directly in the interests of the central government. It will have been noted that almost all the evidence for the boulai in the fourth century pertains to the collection of taxes and the supply of *annona militaris*.

A real change in the position of the boule in the nome might be discerned if there were any evidence that it became responsible for the internal administration of the towns and villages in the nome – the same kind of responsibility as is attested for it in the metropolis in the third century. There is, however, very little evidence available for the fourth century and what there is attests no such change. As may be seen from *P. Abinn.* 18 it was the *praepositus pagi* who was responsible for the well-being of the villages in his area. If he took a complaint to the boule about the fact that there had been looting by the soldiery it was probably because the boule was the link between the nome and the higher officials in matters pertaining to the army and its supply. There is no evidence that he would have recourse to the boule in a purely internal matter.⁵

The essence of the change is rather to be seen, as Rostovtzeff pointed out, in the introduction of new officials with powers over the metropolis and the nome, and responsibility to the central government.⁶ Hence, in the early fourth century we find the introduction of the *curator civitatis* (*logistes*); the development of the office of *syndikos*, which had been in the third century a position largely internal to the boule, towards that of *defensor civitatis*; the change in

3. See Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 107-31. The earliest attestation of the *logistes* is in 304 (cf. now also *P. Oxy.* 2673).

4. See Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 126-31; cf. Jones, *CERP*, p. 338.

5. On the administration of the villages see Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 131-7.

6. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, 2nd ed., 1957, pp. 512-4.

the position of the strategos from the main functionary of the central government in the nome to an official primarily responsible for the collection of state impositions (*strategos-exactor*).⁷ The evidence thus points towards the creation of a body of municipal officials who worked with the boule but were not answerable to it. Thus the logistes is an official of the nome who plays an important part in the direction of finance in the metropolis, in the administration of public works and the supervision of liturgists appointed by the boule (*P. Oxy.* 1104: 892 = *WChr.* 49). At the same time he stands alongside the boule in his responsibility for the fulfilment of demands by the state (*P. Oxy.* 1103 = *WChr.* 465; 2106). As far as the municipal administration is concerned, the logistes was responsible not to the boule, but to the prefect (*P. Oxy.* 2666-7). The evidence for the president of the boule in the fourth century fits this picture. In the third century we found occasional examples in which the prytanis seems to take action on his own initiative, particularly when problems of administration in the metropolis are not solved by reference to the boule (see above, pages 55-57). In the fourth century there are several examples of the prytanis making appointments without apparent reference to the boule (*P. Oxy.* 2110; *P. Giss.* 54; *P. Lond.* 971 [III, p. 128] = *MChr.* 95), although technically the boule did remain responsible for the appointment of officials (*PSI* 684) and a plea for release from an *ἐπιμέλεια* was made before the boule (*P. Oxy.* 2110). It therefore seems possible that the position of president of the boule will have been quite similar to that of the other officials who worked alongside the boule in the municipal administration.

This view is consonant with the hypothesis advanced in Appendix III that the term *προπολιτευόμενος* does not mean prytanis, but rather expresses the connotation of the word *principalis*. The leading members of the boule, including the president, will have filled positions with important administrative responsibility in the metropolis and in the nome. Their positions will thus have been linked to the boule, but they were answerable for their conduct to the central government. A new, or increased power in the nome for such officials as the logistes will not have implied an increase in power and competence for the boule as an administrative unit, even if the logistes was frequently or always a member of the boule.

The difference in the position of the boule in the metropolis and the nome in the fourth century is not to be seen, then, in any deliberate extension of the powers of the boule over the nome, but rather the reverse. Instead of giving the boule competence over the nome the central government had, in effect, created new officials with powers over the nome and the metropolis and its boule, and linked these officials to the boule. The reform cannot be discerned in any document prior to the earliest appearance of these officials,

7. On these officials see Lallemand, *L'administration*, pp. 107-26, and above, pp. 45, 46-52, 76.

who begin to be attested in the first decade of the fourth century; and it consists not in the creation of a wider sphere of competence for the boule, but in the exertion of a tighter control on the boule by the central government.

This may be explained logically in terms of the available evidence. In the late third century the boule experienced severe difficulties both in the internal administration of the metropolis and in fulfilling its responsibilities to the central government. The solution devised by the central government was the removal of effective power from the boule as a corporate body, and the centralisation of responsibility in the hands of a small number of officials who were directly answerable to the higher state officials. Viewed thus, the trend in the evidence is easily comprehensible. The boule lost a great deal of its power in the course of the fourth century, and this foreshadows the fact that by the fifth century it ceased to appear at all as an administrative unit.

It may therefore fairly be said that if the creation of the boulai in the metropoleis of Roman Egypt was intended to take some of the weight of administration from the officials of the central government and to vest a certain amount of power in the local propertied class the result was failure; and the institution of the logistes and other officials in the early fourth century was an admittance of that failure. The boulai were unable to fulfil their responsibilities and the result was that power was again centralised in the hands of a small number of officials with direct responsibility to the central government. Obvious reasons may be adduced to account for this failure – in particular the enormous difficulties caused by the economic crises of the late third century. But it is perhaps worth considering whether such explanations as this are sufficient to account for the kind of difficulties in administration which are, after all, apparent even in the middle of the third century. The creation of an extra level of bureaucracy which depends upon the participation of local personnel inevitably entails certain difficulties. The purpose of such a system is to relieve the burden of the professional administrator and place an increased responsibility in the hands of the amateur. Two factors in particular weigh against the efficacy of such a solution in Egypt. First, Egypt was regarded by its rulers, from the Pharaohs to the Romans, as an especially fruitful source of revenue, both in money and natural products. Second, the geographical features of Egypt – in particular the fact that the population was widely scattered over a huge area – created special problems in administration. These two considerations meant that uniformity in administration was at once both important and difficult to achieve. The Pharaohs had their Royal Scribes and subordinate officials, upon whom the efficiency of the administration depended. The Ptolemies relied upon the dioiketes, oikonomoi, nomarchs, toparchs, komarchs and grammateis and the Romans at first upon the prefect, epistrategoï and strategoi. The important fact here is that all these officials were appointed, professional administrators. The creation of the boulai in the metropoleis at the beginning of the third century is an attempt to shift some of the burden of administration on to elected amateurs.

The consequences are obvious. The appointed professional has an interest in doing his job efficiently and remaining in office, the more so because the consequences of inefficiency or misdemeanour may be savage. In a system which relied upon a mixture of professional administrators and elected officials inefficiency which falls short of illegality is more difficult to check and censure or responsibility can easily be shifted from one quarter to another. Nor can the elected official easily be persuaded in times of hardship that it is in his own interests to undertake administrative responsibility; reluctance to do so is often well-founded, for in third-century Egypt liturgical posts could bring financial ruin to their holders. In brief, whilst in the case of the professional administrator self-interest and the interests of the government are broadly coincident, the same is not true of the elected official or liturgist; the overall result of reliance upon the latter is loss of efficiency. If this weakness has become apparent but the bureaucratic machine is too unwieldy to be managed by a handful of professionals, as proved to be the case in third-century Egypt, a solution can be improvised. A small number of officials will bear, and will be seen to bear, the real responsibility for administration and will suffer the consequences of error or crime. A larger class of people will have duty without responsibility; they will collect taxes for the government and perform tasks necessary for the efficient functioning of their city but will have little or no power of decision. This is the essence of the reform effected in Egypt in the early fourth century; responsibility is put into the hands of the logistes and the other officials, whilst the boule and the bouleutic class is demeaned and oppressed. The success of such a solution is difficult to evaluate. In the short term it will have had a favourable effect upon the efficiency of the administration. But that cannot be the sole measure of its success or failure. As far as the local aristocracies were concerned, it must appear simply as an addition of insult to injury. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the policies of the central government in Egypt towards the local governing classes merely removed the facade of dignity from the hard fact of unremitting oppression.

NYU LIBRARY

Appendix One

The Prytaneis and Bouleutai of Oxyrhynchus

Appendix One
The System and Hierarchy of Oxidation

IN V. J. LIBRARY

A. The Prytanais of Oxyrhynchus

1. Dated Prytanais-in-Office

NAME	DATE*	TITLES**	DOCUMENT
Aelius Ammonios	207-8 (Phar. 208)	P	P. Oxy. 2341
Caius Calpurnius ¹	221-2 (Mesore 222)	Gymnasiarch, P	P. Oxy. Ined. 14
Aur. Ammonios	222-3 (Pach. 223)	Gymnasiarch, P	P. Oxy. 77
Aur. Theon-Maximus	228-9 (Choiak 228)	<i>Gymnasiarch</i> , P, <i>διέπων και τὰ πολιτικά</i>	P. Oxy. Ined. 15
Aur. Pkyllios-Theon	234-5 (Mech. 235)	Ex-gymnasiarch, P	P. Osl. 111
Aur. Bion-Ammonios	245-6 (Ep. 246)	Gymnasiarch, B, P	P. Oxy. 1662
Aur. Isidoros	245-6 (Ep. 246)	Ex-archiereus, B, eirenarch, deputy-P	P. Oxy. 1662
Aur. Asklepiades ²	246-7	Ex-gymnasiarch, P	P. Oxy. Ined.
Anonymous	247-8 (Thoth 247)	P	P. Oxy. 1418
Aur. Pasion-	248-9 (Phao. 248)	P, Ex-gymnasiarch, B	P. Erl. 18
Apollonios ³	248-9 (Hathyf, 248)	Ex-gymnasiarch, P, B	P. Oxy. 2854
Aur. Ptolemaios	256-7 (Epag. 257)	<i>Gymnasiarch</i> , P	P. Oxy. Ined. 17
Aur. Dioskourides-	260-1 (Tybi 261)	<i>Ex-gymnasiarch</i> , B, P, <i>διέπων και τὰ πολιτικά</i>	P. Oxy. 2109
Sabinos ⁴	261-2	<i>Ex-gymnasiarch</i> , B, P, <i>διέπων και τὰ πολιτικά</i>	PSI 1070
Anonymous	264-5 (Payni 265)	P	P. Oxy. 1419
Aur. Mounatios	265-6 (Thoth 265)	Ex-agoranomos, ex-exegetes, <i>gymnasiarch</i> , B, P	P. Oxy. 2569

* The date given first is the Alexandrian Year (Thoth 1 - Epagomenal Day 5) in which the attestation falls, converted to the corresponding Julian dates.

** The titles are given in the order in which they appear in the document. Abbreviations used are: P = Prytanis or Prytanis *ἐναρχος*, B = Bouleutes. Italicizing of a title indicates uncertainty as to whether the office is a current or a previous one.

1., The letter following Calpurnius looks very much like a *lambda*. If the name Lucius is to be supplied, economy of evidence suggests that he is identical with Lucius Calpurnius Caius of P. Oxy. 2723 (see Table 2) rather than an ancestor or descendant; the reversal of names is quite possible.

2. See below, note 18.

3. Wegener, *The Boule*, pp. 308-9 suggested that this man might be identical with Aurelius Apollonios—Claudianus attested as prytanis

between 238 and 244 (see Table 2). But the name can now be supplied from P. Oxy. 2854.

4. PSI 1070 is dated only to the second year of a reign, but is almost certainly to be put in 261-2. The writer undertakes to pay rent in Payni, and the document was probably written in the early part of the year. The prytanis may well be identical with the Sabinos mentioned in P. Oxy. 1413 as an ex-prytanis (see Table 2).

Aur. Sarapion-Philoxenos	266-7 (Pham. 267)	Ex-gymnasiarch, deputy-P	P. Oxy. 2130
Aur. Lypros (?) ⁵	272-3 (Pham. 273)	Ex-gymnasiarch, B, kosmetes, hypomnematographos of Alexandria, exegetes, B, P	P. Osl. 85
(or Lysixos?)			
Aur. Euporos-	273-4 (Tybi 273-4)	Ex-kosmetes, ex-exegetes, ex-hypomnematographos of Alexandria, ex-P, B, P	BGU 1073 (= MChr. 198)
Agathodaimon ⁶	273-4 (Mech. 274)	Ex-kosmetes, ex-exegetes, ex-eutheniarch, ex-hypomnematographos of Alexandria, ex-exegetes, ex-P, [B, P]	BGU 1074
Aur. Hermogenes-	275-6 (Payni 276)	Exegetes, B, [P]	P. Oxy. 907 (= MChr. 317)
Eudaimon ⁷			
Dioskoros	277-8	P	P. Berol. Inv. 11314 ⁸
Eudaimon	278-9	P	P. Berol. Inv. 11314
Catus Julius Diogenes	279-80	P	P. Berol. Inv. 11314

5. The name and date of this prytanis are not absolutely certain. The name was read by the editors as *Λυπρος* (for the suggestion of *Λικιτιος* see *BPhW* 58, 1938, p. 300, note 14), and the year as either the first or fourth of Aurelian. They settled on the fourth year (272-3) for the reason that the document is concerned with preparations for the *Agon Capitolinus* and the games seem to have been in progress in the fifth year of Aurelian (*BGU* 1073-4). If this is a satisfactory reason for rejecting a dating to the first year of Aurelian, it will also hold for rejection of the fifth year (the editors did not consider the possibility of reading the numeral as an *epsilon*). A letter about preparations for games written in Phamenoth would be inappropriate if the games were in progress in Tybi (the date of *BGU* 1073). The name *Λυπρος* is uncomfortable, but the possibility of identification with Euporos-Agathodaimon, who was prytanis in the fifth year of Aurelian, was

not considered by the editors. Dr. Rea kindly writes to me that he has seen a photograph of *P. Osl.* 85 and finds *Ευπρος* a good correction of *Λυπρος*; however (*ἔρως*) *δ* is very doubtful. It is probable, therefore, that Lypros is a "ghost" and possible, if dubious, that the first term of Euporos as president (see below, note 6) is to be put in 272-3.

6. For the date of *BGU* 1073-4 see P. Viereck, "Aktensücke zum griechisch-römischen Vereinswesen," *Klio* 8, 1908, pp. 413-26. The previous term as prytanis cannot certainly be dated, but it is possibly to be put in the previous year (see above, note 5). Euporos-Agathodaimon is also attested in *P. Oxy.* 1413, where he is clearly not prytanis-in-office (see below, Appendix II). His titles, if any, are not preserved there, and *πρυτανεύσας*, which is accorded to another speaker in line 3, could have been attached to Euporos. The identification of Euporos-Agathodaimon with

Aurelius Agathodaimon son of Potamon (see Section B) is assumed by the editors of *P. Mert.* 26, but it seems very dubious. The latter is attested as exegetes-in-office in Mecheir of 274, and the editors assume a short tenure of that office, since Euporos was prytanis in that year. The titles of Euporos, however, do not include that of exegetes-in-office, and it is precisely in Tybi and Mecheir of 274 that he is attested as prytanis.

7. The title of prytanis is restored from the survival of a dotted *rho* (cf. *BL* 1), but seems likely to be correct. If he was prytanis, he must have been succeeded by a deputy before the end of the year, since he was dead by Epeiph, when his will was opened.

8. Z. Borkowski, "Le Papyrus de Berlin Inv. 11314 et les Prytanies d'Oxyrhynchus de 277 a 282," *Chronique d'Égypte* 43, 1968, pp. 325-31.

Anonymous ⁹	279-80 (Tybi 279-80)	P	P. Oxy. 1496
Hierax s. of Hermeias	280-1	P	P. Berol. Inv. 11314
Apollonios-Dionysios	281-2	P	P. Berol. Inv. 11314
Aur. Apollonios-Dionysios	282-3 (Pach. 283)	Ex-hypomnematographos of Alexandria, ex-gymnasiarch, P, <i>δέπων</i> καὶ τὰ πολιτικά	P. Oxy. 55 (= <i>WChr.</i> 196)
Anonymous	286-7 (Hath. 286)	P	P. Oxy. 2417
Aur. Asklepiades s. of Achillon ¹⁰	288-9 (Pharm 289)	Hypomnematographos, gymnasiarch, B, P	P. Oxy. 2477
Aur. Apollonios-Dionysios	291-2 (Mech. 292)	Ex-hypomnematographos, B of Alexandria, ex-gymnasiarch, ex-P, B, P	P. Oxy. 59
Aur. Cornelianus	293-4 (Ep. or just before, 294) P	P. Oxy. 891
Aur. Ailourion-Hesychios	296-7 (297)	Ex-hypomnematographos, B (?) of Alexandria, ex-gymnasiarch, B, P	P. Oxy. Ined. 18
Aur. Themistokles-Dioskourides	299-300 (Ep. 300)	Ex-hypomnematographos, ex-gymnasiarch, B, P	P. Oxy. Ined. 7
Anonymous	300-1 (Thoth 300) P	P. Oxy. Ined. 16
Aur. Neilos-Ammonios	302-3 (Thoth 302)	P	P. Oxy. Ined. 4
Aur. Hiterakion-	303-4 (Mech. 304)	Gymnasiarch, B, P	P. Oxy. 2673
	305-6 (Payni 306)	Ex-gymnasiarch, ex-P, B, P	P. Oxy. 1104

9. The document is dated in the fifth year of an emperor, thought by the editors to be either Aurelian or Probus. The former is excluded since the document lists in succession payments by Euporos-Agathodaimon and the prytanis, made in Tybi of the fifth year. Since Euporos-Agathodaimon and "the prytanis" are clearly different people, the fifth year of Aurelian is excluded because Euporos-Agathodaimon was prytanis in Tybi of that year (*BGU* 1073 = *MChr.* 198, see above, note 6). P. Oxy. 1496 is therefore to be dated to the fifth year of Probus, in which case the unnamed prytanis is C. Julius Diogenes.

10. For the date of this document see J. R. Rea, *JEA* 49, 1963, pp. 180-1. There are two other prytaneis who might have been dated to the year 288-9: (1) Aurelius Apollonios-Dionysios, attested as prytanis in the fifth year of an unnamed emperor in *P. Flor.* 63, assigned by the editors to the fifth year of Probus (279-80), but the fifth year of Diocletian has been suggested. Neither dating is satisfactory, see below, note 24. (2) Gymnasios of P. Oxy. 1503. This document, dated to 288-9, contains a report of a hearing before a prefect in which the prefect and an official with the title *πρ()* are the chief speakers. The editors resolved the title as *πρ(ύτανις)*, but considered apart from the context, it could be resolved as

πρ(εβίτερος), for example. The document seems to be concerned with the status of Leontopolites and the inference made by the editors that the question is about the status of Leontopolites with regard to liturgies at Oxyrhynchus is only a reasonable guess based on the restoration *Λεοντοπολιτών*. The editors do not suggest that Gymnasios was prytanis at Oxyrhynchus, and in fact, since he appears to be asking for a release from [liturgies?], he is more likely, if he was prytanis at all, to have been the prytanis of Leontopolis.

On Asklepiades see also below, note 22.

Dionysios ¹¹	305-6	Gymnasiarch, B, . . . P	P. Oxy. 2665
Aur. Dioskoros-Helladios	306-7 (Pach. 307)	Gymnasiarch, B, P	P. Oxy. Ined. 13
Aur. . . . -Serenos ¹²	308-9 (Ep. 309)	P, syndikos, B	MChr. 196
Anonymous	308-9 (Payni 309)	P	P. Oxy. 1499
Eutropios	322-3 (Mes. 323)	P	P. Oxy. 60 (= WChr. 43)
Aur. Neptianos ¹³	337-8 (Tybi 338)	P	P. Oxy. 892 (= WChr. 49)
Aur. Achilleus s. of Asklepiades ¹⁴	344-5 (Payni 345)	P, ex-gymnasiarch, B	P. Wis. 12
Asklepiades s. of Achilleus	359-60 (Mech. 360)	P, ex-gymnasiarch, B	P. Oxy. 1103 (= WChr. 465)
Claudius Hermetios s. of Gelasios	370-1 (Phao. 370)	Ex-gymnasiarch, B, P	P. Oxy. 2110

11. This man also served a term as prytanis at some time before 298-9 (see Table 2), since he is attested as ex-prytanis in *P. Corn.* 45, of 299 (for the date see *BL* 3). For the correct reading of the name in *P. Oxy.* 1104 see *P. Corn.* 45, introd.

12. For the date of *MChr.* 196 see Lallemand, *L'administration*, p. 261. The same half-name occurs in *P. Mert.* 90, of 311 or 310, and the title of prytanis-in-office is there restored, with a good deal of probability. Since this document cannot be dated to 308-9 (see *P. Mert.* 90, introd., *P. Oxy.* XXXIII, p. 95), he will have served at least two terms of office as prytanis.

13. Aurelius Aëtios, attested as *προπολιτευόμενος* in 338 (*P. Oxy.* 67 = *MChr.* 56), would provide another prytanis for this year, on the conventional view that the title is a synonym for prytanis. The arguments against this view are

set out in Appendix III, below.

14. The titles were read originally by the editor as *πρω(τάξει) γου(βαιάρχω) βουλ(εῖρη)*, with a comment on the curious order. Normally, as he points out, previous offices precede current ones, in ascending order, in the titulature (for an exception, based on a somewhat uncertain reading, see *P. Oxy.* 2585, in Table 2). The reading in *P. Wis.* 12 was corrected by N. Lewis, "Νορήμαρα Λέγοντος," *BASP* 5, 1968, p. 25 to *πρω(τάξει) γου(βαιάρχω) βουλ(εῖρη)*, but the order is still curious. Lewis cites as a parallel *P. Oxy.* 1103 (= *WChr.* 465), but the formula there is slightly different, since the name of the prytanis comes directly after the title *πρω(τάξει)*, resolved as *πρω(ταξιάρχω) βουλ(εῖρη)* but more probably *πρω(ταξιάρχω) βουλ(εῖρη)* and is itself followed by *γου() βουλ()*. This formula only seems to occur in contexts where it is

necessary to throw emphasis on to the title of prytanis, e.g. "at a meeting of the boule in the presidency of . . ." (*P. Oxy.* 1103 is of this type; for other examples see *P. Ezl.* 18; *P. Oxy.* 2110), where the more usual order "ex-gymnasiarch, bouleutes, prytanis" would not give this emphasis. In *P. Wis.* 12 it seems likely that the man was prytanis in-office, since deeds of surety, of which this is an example, are normally addressed to officials (prytanis-designate in *P. Cair. Preis.* 13-4). In that case, the order of titles is still odd, and may be explained as either serving to throw emphasis on to the title of prytanis, or as a deviation due to ignorance or carelessness. There seems to be no certainty as to whether the second title is current or previous. This person was reasonably assumed by the editor to be the son of Asklepiades son of Achilleus, prytanis in 360 (*P. Oxy.* 1103).

2. Undated Prytaneis-in-Office and Ex-Prytaneis

NAME	DATE	TITLES	DOCUMENT
Anonymous	III	P	P. Oxy. Ined. 5
Aur. Achillion s. of Cornelianus	III	Ex-P	P. Oxy. 2474
Lucius Calpurnius Caius ¹⁵	III	Ex-eutheniarch, ex-kosmetes, B of Alexandria, gymnasiarch, P	P. Oxy. 2723
Aur. Diogenes s. of Harpokraton	III	B of Alexandria, P	PSI 1330
L. Septimius Aur. Sarapion-Apollinarius ¹⁶	Between 229 and 237	P	P. Oxy. 890 (= <i>WChr.</i> 280)
Aur. Apollonios- Claudianus ¹⁷	Between 238 and 244	P, ex-gymnasiarch, eirenarch	P. Oxy. 80 (= <i>WChr.</i> 473)
Anonymous Asklepiades ¹⁸	Mid-III In office before 247-8 (Thoth 247)	<i>Exegetes</i> of Alexandria, ex-gymnasiarch, B, P Reference to his <i>πρυτανεία</i> . See Table 1	P. <i>Fuad</i> I 52 P. Oxy. 1418
Septimius Serenus Hierax-Sarapion Sabino ¹⁹	Before Hathyr 248 Before Epeiph 265 Before ca. 272 (see Appendix II)	Ex-exegetes, ex-P Ex-gymnasiarch, ex-P, B Ex-P	P. Oxy. 2854 PSI 1249 P. Oxy. 1413
Anonymous	Reign of Aurelian (see Appendix II)	P	P. Oxy. 1413-4

15. See above, note 1.

16. That this man was prytanis in Pharamouthi of 235 was tentatively suggested by J. R. Rea, "A Letter of Severus Alexander?" *Chronique d'Égypte* 42, 1967, pp. 391-6. As the Table shows, there is a prytanis attested for 234-5 (Aurelius Pexylos-Theon of P. Oxl. 111). An alternative restoration is possible for the address in the document discussed by Rea; the address toApolinarios gives him the title of bouleutes and another title, *πρ.*, read in the *editio princeps* as *πρ[ε]σβ[υ]τ[α]ρ[χ]?* and by Rea as *πρ[ε]σβ[υ]τ[α]ρ[χ]*. An attractive identification is available with a man called Apollinarios, who occurs in P. Oxy. 933, with the titles β . . . *απρ* *πρ[ε]σβ[υ]τ[α]ρ[χ]*, see A. K. Bowman, "A Letter of Avidius Cassius," *JRS* 60, 1970, pp. 20-6.

17. See above, note 3.

18. Since the writer of the petition appears to be serving currently as a gymnasiarch, and the petition is dated to Thoth, 247, Asklepiades was probably prytanis in 246-7. This is now confirmed by an unedited Oxyrhynchus text, to be published by P. J. Parsons (see Table 1), to whom I am indebted for the information.

19. See above, note 4.

Aur. Euporos-	Before 273-4	See Table 1	BGU 1073 (= <i>MChr.</i> 198); 1074
Agathodaimon ²⁰			
Aur. Eudaimon-	Ca. 284	Ex-eutheniarch, ex-kosmetes, ex-exegetes, ex-hypommematographos, B of Alexandria, ex-gymnasiarch, B, P	P. Oxy. 1412
Helladios ²¹			
Anonymous	Ca. 290	P	P. Oxy. 1252 verso 2
Herakleos	Before Mesore 292	Ex-P	P. Oxy. Ined. 23
Aur. Asklepiades-	Before Hathyr 296	Ex-hypommematographos, ex-gymnasiarch, B, $\delta\iota\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\upsilon\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota\varsigma$, $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$ of lower toparchy	P. Oxy. Ined. 22
Achillion ²²			
Valerius Julianus-	Before Choiak 296	Ex-hypommematographos, ex-P, gymnasiarch, B, $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$ of southern toparchy	SB 9502
Dioskourides ²³			
Aur. Horion-Sarapion	Before 297-8	Ex-hypommematographos, ex-P	P. Oxy. Ined. 11
Aur. Hierakion-	Before Pachon 299	Ex-gymnasiarch, ex-P, B, see Table 1	P. <i>Corn.</i> 45
Dionysios			
Aur. . . . Ploutarchos	Before Epeiph 300	Ex-gymnasiarch, ex-P	P. Oxy. Ined. 7
Aur. Apollonios-	Late III (Pham. of the fifth year of an unnamed emperor)	Ex-gymnasiarch, B, P	P. <i>Flor.</i> 63
Dionysios ²⁴	Late III of Alexandria, gymnasiar ^{ch} , ex-P, B, see Table 1	PSI 705

20. See above notes 5 and 6.

21. He is identified by the editors of *P. Oxy.* 1412 with the man of the same name in *MChr.* 196, of 309, but the spread of 25 years or so, and the differences in titlature suggest the possibility that the two were father and son.

22. The prytanis in *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 2 is not named. *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 1 contains a reference to a letter of Asklepiades, who may be the same man as Asklepiades son of Achillion, attested as prytanis-in-office in 288-9 (*P. Oxy.* 2477, see Table 1) and titled $\delta\iota\varsigma \pi\rho\upsilon\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in *P. Oxy.* Ined. 22. Since *P. Oxy.* 1252 verso 1 is dated to Thoth of 289 it would not be surprising if it contained a reference to the prytanis of the previous year.

23. *Editio princeps* = *JJP* 2, 1948, pp. 111-4; for a re-edition see Böhm, *Aegyptus* 36, 1956, pp. 254-74.

24. *P. Flor.* 63 was tentatively dated to the fifth year of Probus. A dating to the fifth year of Diocletian (288-9) was suggested by L. C. West and A. C. Johnson, *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt*, 1944, p. 84, note 28, but may be rejected on the following grounds. (1) The dating formula contains only the fifth year; most commonly, documents of this year are dated by the fifth year of Diocletian and the fourth of Maximian (e.g. *P. Oxy.* 1503; 2477). (2) Asklepiades son of Achillion was prytanis in Pharmouthi of 288-9 (*P. Oxy.* 2477, cf. *JEA* 49, 1963, pp. 180-1). *P. Flor.* 63 is dated to Phamenoth of the fifth year, and apart

from the possibility that Apollonios-Dionysios was deputy-prytanis this could only be the fifth year of Diocletian if the prytaneis changed every month (provided it be accepted that the basic unit was the official Alexandrian year, beginning on Thoth 1). Since the prytanis of 279-80 was C. Julius Diogenes, neither dating is at present satisfactory; see Z. Borkowski, "Le Papyrus de Berlin Inv. 11314 et les Prytanes d'Oxyrhynchus de 277 à 282," *Chronique d'Égypte* 43, 1968, pp. 330-1. *PSI* 705 was dated by the editors to the early third century, but since the identity of Apollonios-Dionysios cannot be doubted, it should be assigned to the late third century.

Anonymous	Late III	P	P. Oxy. 1415
Aur. Anonymous	Late III	B, P	P. Oxy. 2610
Theoneinos-Sarapion	Late III	P	P. Oxy. 1515
Anonymous	Late III—early IV	P	P. Oxy. Ined. 19
Anonymous	Late III—early IV	P	P. Oxy. Ined. 20
Anonymous	Late III—early IV	P	P. Oxy. Ined. 21
Germanos	Late III—early IV	P-designate	P. Oxy. Ined. 2
Dioskoros	Late III—early IV	P	P. Oxy. Ined. 2
Aur. Themistokles-	Early IV	Ex-gymnasiarch, ex-P, deputy-P; see Table 1	P. Oxy. 41 (= <i>WChr.</i> 45)
Dioskourides ²⁵	Before Phao. 316	Gymnasiarch, ex-P, B	P. Oxy. Ined. 6
Anonymous	300-50 ?	P	P. Oxy. 103
Pinouthion	IV	P	P. Oxy. 889
Hermias	Ca. 308-9	P	<i>P. Ross.-Georg.</i> II 40
...-Serenos ²⁶	Payni 310 or 311	Ex-gymnasiarch, B, [P]	P. Oxy. Ined. 9
Aur. Dioskourides-	Before Hathyr 315	Gymnasiarch, ex-P, B	<i>P. Mert.</i> 90
Julianus ²⁷			P. Oxy. 2585
Aur. Herakleides	Before Mesore 353	Ex-gymnasiarch, ex-P, B	P. Oxy. 1632
s. of Herakleides	Before 360	Ex-P, gymnasiarch, B	<i>P. Mert.</i> 36
C. Julius Leukadios	Before 365	Ex-P, B	SB 6612
s. of ...malanos	Before 370	Ex-P	P. Oxy. 2110
Aur. Herakleides			
s. of Dioskourides			
Theon s. of Eusebios			

is preferable.

²⁵ For the date of *P. Oxy.* 103 see Wilcken, *Archiv* 3, 1903-6, p. 383. The reading of *πρωταεισάρχει* is unsatisfactory and *πρωταεισάρχει*

γυμνασιάρχου *πρωταεισάρχει* *βου* (*λευκή*), the order is unusual (see above, note 14).

²⁶ See above, note 12.

²⁷ If the titles are correctly read as

B. The Bouleutai of Oxyrhynchus

The Table which follows lists in alphabetical order people who are attested as bouleutai of Oxyrhynchus in the third, fourth and fifth centuries.²⁸ Its purpose is to provide a comprehensive index, so far as is possible, to people who are attested as bouleutai or *πολιτευόμενοι* of Oxyrhynchus, excluding the prytaneis, who are listed in the previous Section. It also includes some people who are not attested as bouleutai or *πολιτευόμενοι*, but who might reasonably be judged on other grounds to have been members of the boule.

The usefulness of such a list is subject to severe limitations in the present state of knowledge. Under the stricture of these limitations, the list has been left to stand with little comment. The significance of the social history of the bouleutai as a group in Roman Egypt is of great interest, but various factors make such a study difficult. The bouleutai would have to be identified in texts where they are attested without the titles which indicate their position; this can only be done on the basis of secure criteria for identification. The establishment of such criteria would have to depend on a comprehensive study of nomenclature in the papyri, conducted on a fairly large, random sample such as a complete corpus of papyri from Oxyrhynchus, given that it is likely to be representative of Egypt as a whole. Such a study might give some idea not only of the relative frequency of the occurrence of different names at different periods, but also of the use of patronymics, aliases and official titles. Such a study has never been attempted in a systematic fashion.²⁹ Since such an attempt lies beyond the scope of this study, I have not attempted to draw any conclusions on the basis of my list. Very few identifications, and then only very obvious ones, have been made. There is no attempt at systematic identification of the bouleutai with contemporaries of the same name who are attested elsewhere without the titles. The list might prove useful as a partial basis for a study of this kind, or, in conjunction with other lists of officials in Roman Egypt (e.g. epistrategoi, strategoi, gymnasiarchs), for a broader social study of bureaucratic personnel.

28. The bouleutai are listed according to Greek alphabetical order, without consideration of the Roman nomina (Aurelius, Septimius etc.). Generally the names have been simply transliterated, but in some cases the Roman form has been adopted (e.g. Claudianus, instead of Klaudianos), although Greek alphabetical order has still been observed. Bouleutai whose names are lost have been listed under the heading "Anonymous."

The list differs in several respects from that of R. Calderini, "Βουλευτικά," *Aegyptus* 31, 1951, pp. 3-41 (with corrections by J. Bingen, *Chronique d'Egypte* 27, 1952, pp. 316-8). Calderini listed people from all places who are attested with the title of bouleutes, but made no attempt to include *πολιτευόμενοι* (or even prytaneis who do not have

the title of bouleutes). Since her lists are incomplete in these respects and also contain mistaken attributions (e.g. the Antinoites of *PSI* 199 are assigned to Oxyrhynchus), it seems preferable to attempt a complete list for the metropolis with the largest number of attested bouleutai. The prytaneis are not included here (having been listed in Section A), and no attempt is made to deduce the function of bouleutes for people without the title, except in certain cases described in note 31, below.

29. See for example R. Calderini, "Ricerche sul doppio nome personale nell'Egitto greco-romano," *Aegyptus* 21, 1941, pp. 221-60; 22, 1942, pp. 3-45.

The orientation of previous work on the bouleutai has understandably been towards the official aspects of the bouleutic personnel.³⁰ But there can be no doubt that elucidation of the private aspects would be of great interest. Can we gauge the length of activity of an "average" member of the boule, or his personal wealth? In what sort of private activities are bouleutai involved? Is there a great variation in these spheres between one person and another? A prosopographical study based on the kind of criteria I have suggested might prove extremely enlightening.³¹

30. See for example F. Preisigke, *Städtisches Beamtenwesen im römischen Aegypten*, 1903, pp. 43-53; Wegener, *Symbolae*, pp. 160-90; Jouguet, *VM*, pp. 358-85.

31. The following abbreviations and symbols are used in the list:

B = Bouleutes

πολ. = πολιτευόμενος

προπολ. = προπολιτευόμενος.

Italicising of a title indicates that it is uncertain whether the office is a previous or current one.

+ This symbol denotes that the man appears as a participant in a meeting of the boule, but may have taken part as a non-member with some special interest in the agenda of the meeting. This category is limited to a few people adduced *exempli gratia*.

* This symbol denotes that the man does not have bouleutes or πολιτευόμενος in his titles, but is likely to have been a member of the boule. This category comprises: (1) "Internal" officials of the boule, the σκρέιβας, the syndikos (up to the first decade of the fourth century). With the exception of the syndikoi who appear in close connection with the boule in documents of the first decade of the fourth century, the municipal officials of the fourth century (logistes, syndikos-ekdikos, *exactor*) are not included unless they have the title of bouleutes. (2) People who make statements at meetings of the boule in the normal course of debate, without any obvious, particular interest in the business under discussion.

NAME	DATE	TITLES	DOCUMENT
Aur. Agathinos	305-6	Exegeset, B, bibliophylax	P. Oxy. 2665
Aur. Agathodaimon-Theon	III	B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Aur. Agathodaimon s. of Potamon	274	Hiereus, exegetes (of Small Oasis and Oxyrhynchus), B	P. Mert. 26
Aëtios	IV-V	πολ.	P. Oxy. 1048
Aur. Aëtios	338	ἄρξας, προπολ.	P. Oxy. 67 (= MChr. 56)
Athanasios	IV-V	πολ.	P. Oxy. 1048
Flavius Athanasios	449	πολ., riparius	SB 9515
Aur. Athenaios-Herakleides	235	B	P. Osl. 111.258-9 cf. 288-9
Aktasion	247	Kosmetes, B, ταμίας πολιτικών χρημάτων	P. Oxy. Ined. 3
Alexandros	Late III	[B?, convoyer] of collectors of wine	P. Oxy. 1415
Septimius Alexandros	Late III	B	P. Ryl. 691 verso
Ammon	220-2	B	P. Oxy. 1522
Ammonianos	III	B	P. Lugd.-Bat. XIII 5
Ammonetinos s. of Agatheinos	370	* Ex-exactor	P. Oxy. 2110
	309	Syndikos, B	MChr. 196
Aur. Ammonios	214	Gymnasiarch-designate, B	P. Oxy. 1278
Aur. Ammonios	249	B, bibliophylax	SB 7634; P. Oxy. 1268
Aur. Ammonios	276-82	B	P. Oxy. 1562
Aur. Ammonios	Late III	Ex-exegeset, B, ταμίας βουλευτικών χρημάτων	P. Oxy. 1501
Aur. Ammonios	300	ἄρξας, B	P. Oxy. Ined. 16
Aur. Amyntianos	259	B, bibliophylax	SB 9878
Anonymous	218	Archiereus, exegetes, B	BGU 1070 (= MChr. 323)
Anonymous	250	B, demosios trapezites	P. Oxy. 1284
Anonymous	271	+ γραμματεὺς πολιτικῶν	P. Oxy. 1413
Anonymous	280	* σκερβίβας	P. Oxy. 1191
Anonymous	291	Ex-exegeset, ex-B	P. Oxy. 1205
Anonymous	Second half of III	B	PSI 1337

Anonymous	III	B	SB 9854
Anonymous	Early IV	* Syndikos	P. Oxy. 1417
Anonymous	300	* Syndikos	P. Oxy. Ined. 7
Anonymous	Early IV	* <i>σικρεμβας</i>	P. Oxy. 1417
Anonymous	III-IV	* Syndikos	P. Oxy. 41 (= <i>WChr.</i> 45)
Anonymous	III-IV	Exeges of Oxyrhynchus and the Small Oasis, B	P. Oxy. 888 (= <i>MChr.</i> 329)
Anonymous	370	* Lost	P. Oxy. 2110
Anonymous	440-1	<i>πολ.</i>	SB 9503
Anonymous	488	<i>πολ.</i>	P. <i>Flor.</i> 325
Anonymous-Bakchios	Early IV	* <i>Gymnasiarch</i>	P. Oxy. Ined. 6
Aur.	260	<i>Ex-gymnasiarch</i> , B, <i>πρὸς τῇ ἐπικρίσει</i>	P. Oxy. 2186
. . . s. of Demetrios	Late III	Exeges, B	P. <i>Osl.</i> 158
Aur. mos	305-6	Gymnasiarch, [. ? B]	P. Oxy. 2665
. . . . phos	271	+	P. Oxy. 1413
Antonios Priskos	232-3	Ex-agoranomos, ex-B	P. Oxy. Ined. 12
Aur. Antonios-Phileas	300	+ Exeges of Alexandria, <i>gymnasiarch</i>	P. Oxy. Ined. 7
Aur. Apion-Ammonios	229	Kosmetes, B	P. Oxy. 2473
s. of Apion surnamed			
Pauseirion			
Aur. Apion s. of	III	<i>Gymnasiarch</i> , B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Diogenes			
Aur. Apion-Theonammon	275-6 (?)	<i>Gymnasiarch</i> , B, <i>πρὸς τῇ ἐπικρίσει</i>	PSI 457
Aur. Apion-Ptolion s. of	III	Kosmetes, B	P. Oxy. 1703
Ptolion			
Aur. Apollonios	III	<i>Agoranomos</i> , B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Apollonios	III (?)	Ex-exeges, B, bibliophylax	P. <i>Harr.</i> 75
Apollonios	III	<i>Exeges</i> , B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Apollonios	211	Hiereus, exeges, B	P. Oxy. 2584
Aur. Apollonios	250	Ex-gymnasiarch, B, demosios trapezites	P. Oxy. 1284
Aur. Apollonios	III	<i>Agoranomos</i> , B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Aur. Apollo	III	[. . .], B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Aur. Apollonios	III	Ex-agoranomos, B	PSI 74

M. Aur. Apollonios s. of Demetrios-Psamis ³²	237	Ex-gymnasiarch, ex-B	P. Oxy. 1114
Apollonios-Heraklas	Late III	Ex-gymnasiarch, ex-B	P. Oxy. 1693
Aphous	V	B	SB 1963
Areion	292	* σκευβας	P. Oxy. 59
Aristion	III-IV	* Syndikos	P. Oxy. 41 (= <i>WChr.</i> 45)
Aur. Aristion s. of Ptolemaios	341	ἄρξας, B	P. Oxy. 1559
Septimius Aristion	304	Exegetes, B	P. Oxy. 2187
Aur. Hatres	III	Ex-exegetes, pompagogos, προς τῆ ἐπικρίσει	SB 9161-2
Achilleus s. of Posi	370	* Riparius	P. Oxy. 2110
Berenikianos	304	Logothetes, ἄρξας, [B]	P. Oxy. 2187
Aur. Geminus-Silvanus s. of Demetrios	III	Agoranomos, B	P. Oxy. 1703
Aur. Germanos s. of ³³ Symmachos	252	B	PSI 1251
Gerontios	370	* Ex-exactor	P. Oxy. 2110
Danielios	442	[προπολιτευόμενος [B]	P. Oxy. 913
Aur. Demetrianos s. of Plout	276-82		P. Oxy. 1562
Aur. Demetrios-Alexandros	228	Ex-archiereus, B, ἐπι ἀναδόσεως περιμάτων	P. Oxy. 1031 (= <i>WChr.</i> 343)
Aur. Demetrios-Zoilos	233 or 265	Ex-archiereus, exegetes, B	P. Oxy. 911 (= <i>MChr.</i> 326a)
Aur. Didymos	III	Agoranomos, B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1

32. The application of the word *γεωμέτρος* which occurs in several cases with the meaning "late" causes some difficulty. It is normally assumed that the use of *γεωμέτρος* with the title of bouleutes alone signifies that the person is dead (since the position was one which was held for life), cf. Wegener, *The Boule*, p. 177; Jouguet, *VM*, p. 374; F. Preisigke, *Städtisches Beamtenwesen im*

römischen Ägypten, 1903. However, it is difficult to decide to which titles the term refers when it precedes a series (e.g. *BGU* 1073-4), of which bouleutes is the concluding title and the man is clearly alive. Preisigke, *op. cit.*, p. 41, considered that in a case of a series of titles (which did not include bouleutes), the term *γεωμέτρος* "bezieht sich gleichzeitig auf die folgenden Titel." In cases

of this sort where bouleutes is included and there is no sign that the man is dead, I have assumed that the term refers to all the title except that of bouleutes.

33. This man is identified in the document as an Antinoite.

Aur. Didymos s. of Didymos	265	B, <i>μαβωτῆς ἀμψίσεως ἰδάτων</i> for public baths	P. Oxy. 2569
Aur. Didymos-Dioskourides	226	Ex-exegetes, B, <i>διέπων καὶ τὰ στέμματα</i>	P. Ryl. 599
Aur. Didymos-Eudaimon		<i>Gymnasiarch</i> , B	P. Oxy. Ined. 11
Aur. Didymos s. of Theon	407	B	P. Oxy. 1122
Ti. Claudius Didymos-Herakleios	Late III	? , B	P. Oxy. 1501
Aur. Diogenes s. of Sarapammon	? 225	Ex-exegetes, B	P. Oxy. 2566
Aur. Diogenes s. of Stephanos	242	Ex-archiereus, B	P. Oxy. 1697
Ti. Claudius Diogenes	250	Ex-kosmetes, ex-agonothetes, B	P. Oxy. 1284
Septimius Diogenes-Agathodaimon	271-2	* Ex-hypomnematographos, syndikos	P. Oxy. 1413-4
Aur. Dionysios	III	B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Aur. Dionysios-Aphrodisios	252	Ex-gymnasiarch, B	P. Oxy. 977
Aur. Dioskoros s. of Apion	228 236	Agoranomos, B, ἐπι ἀναδόσεως σπερμάτων Ex-agoranomos, B	P. Oxy. 1031 (= <i>WChr.</i> 343) BGU 1062 (= <i>WChr.</i> 276)
Aur. Dioskoros s. of Silvanus	322 or 323 304	ἄρχας, B, <i>praepositus</i> of the <i>patrimonialia</i> of the tenth <i>pagus</i> , <i>προβληθείς</i> as <i>conductor</i> of the express-post	P. Oxy. 900 (= <i>WChr.</i> 437)
Dioskourides	? III	Logothetes, ἄρχας, [B]	P. Oxy. 2187
Aur. Dioskourides-Achillioniskos		Ex-exegetes, B, bibliophylax	P. <i>Harr.</i> 75
Aur. Dioskourides-Ptolemaios	241	B, bibliophylax	P. Oxy. 2231
Aur. Epimachos	257-9	Ex-eutheniarch, B	P. Oxy. 1637
Septimius Eudaimon	Mid-III	<i>Gymnasiarch</i> , B, demosios trapezites	P. Oxy. 2271
Eudaimon	Late III	* Exegetes	P. Oxy. 1415
Aur. Eudaimon-Helladios	309	Ex-gymnasiarch, B, bibliophylax	<i>MChr.</i> 196
Eulogios s. of Ptolemaios	370	* Ex-gymnasiarch	P. Oxy. 2110

Aur. Eutolmios	304	Deputy-logistes, exegetes, B	P. Oxy. 2187
Eutygios	360	+ Ex-logistes	P. Oxy. 1103 (= <i>WChr.</i> 465)
Zoilos s. of Dionysios	370	* Ex-gymnasiarch	P. Oxy. 2110
Aur. Zoilos s. of Zoilos	III	Ex-gymnasiarch, B	PSI 1330
Aur. Hera	III	B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Aur. Herakleianos-	303	Archiereus, B, demosios trapezites	P. Princ. 133
Morton			
Aur. n-Heraklios	305-6	Ex-archiereus, B, bibliophylax	P. Oxy. 2665
Aur. Herakleides	289	Exegetes, B, ex-epimeletes of a fort	P. Oxy. 1252 recto 2
Herakleides-Demetrios	242	B	P. Oxy. 1697
Aur. Herakleides-	248-9	B, dekaprotos of middle toparchy	P. Oxy. 1444
Dionysios			
Aur. Herakleides s. of	232-3	<i>Agoranomos</i> , B, <i>ραμίας βουλευτικῶν χρημάτων</i>	P. Oxy. Ined. 12
Dorion			
Aur. Herakles s. of	325	B, epimeletes	P. Oxy. 1261
Koiliakios			
Aur. Heras s. of Dionysios	316	<i>ἄρχας</i> , B, <i>praepositus</i> of the eighth <i>pagus</i>	P. Oxy. 2232
Aur. Herodes	216-7	Ex-gymnasiarch, B	PSI 79
Aur. Herodes s. of Apion	III	Ex-gymnasiarch, B	P. Oxy. 1374
Heron	306 (?)	Kosmetes, B	PSI 716
Aur. Heron-Agathodaimon	265	B	PSI 1249
Theon	Late III	B, [convoyer] of collectors of barley	P. Oxy. 1415
Theon (?)	V or VI	<i>πολ.</i>	P. Oxy. 2418
Aur. Theon	III	<i>Agoranomos</i> , B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Aur. Theon (?)	241	Ex-agoranomos, B, bibliophylax	P. Oxy. 2231
Aur. Theon	289	Archiereus, B, ex-epimeletes of a fort	P. Oxy. 1252 recto 2
Theon s. of Ammonios	370	B	P. Oxy. 2110
Theon-Ammonios	211	Ex-gymnasiarch, B	P. Oxy. 2584
Aur. Theon s. of Aristion	229	Gymnasiarch, B	P. Oxy. 2473
s. of Teiron			
Aur. Theon s. of Theon ³⁴	256	Kosmetes, B	SB 7814

34. This man is identified in the document as one of the petitioners of P. Oxy. 1119 (= *WChr.* 397), and is probably to be identified with 397), see below, p. 150.

Aur. Theon-Origenes	265	Gymnasiarch, B	PSI 1249
Theon-Origenes s. of ? Chairemon	271	*	P. Oxy. 1413
Aur. Thonios	289	Exegetes, B, ex-epimeletes of a fort	P. Oxy. 1252 recto 2
Aur. Thonios	300	ἄρχης, B	P. Oxy. Ined. 16
Thonis	Mid-III	Exegetes, B, demosios trapezites	P. Oxy. 2271
Hierax s. of Pesouris	323	ἄρχης, B	P. Osl. 138
Aur. Hierax s. of Pet. . . (probably Pesouris)	311-2	B, epimeletes	PSI 886
Julianus-Dioskourides	271	* Exegetes	P. Oxy. 1413
Aur. Isidoros	370	* σκρῆβιας	P. Oxy. 2110
Aur. Kronios	260	Ex-gymnasiarch, B, πρὸς τῇ ἐπικρίσει	P. Oxy. 2186
Kronios-Nepotianos	270	B	P. Oxy. 1200
M. Aur. Leonides-	III	Agoranomos, B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Nikoboulos			
Makrobios s. of Theon	370	+	P. Oxy. 2110
s. of Armonios			
Makrobios	370	* Riparius	P. Oxy. 2110
Maximus	211	Hiereus, exegetes, B	P. Oxy. 56 (= MChr. 320)
Maron	III	B	P. Lugd.-Bat. XIII 5
Aur. Matrimos	304	Gymnasiarch, B, syndikos	P. Oxy. 2673
Melas s. of Theon	275-6 (?)	Ex-egētes, kosmetes, B, πρὸς τῇ ἐπικρίσει	PSI 457
Menelaos	Late III	* Syndikos	P. Oxy. 2407
Aur. Neikias-Dionysios	III	Agoranomos, B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Neilos	271	B, appointed ἐπιτηρητής	P. Oxy. 1413
Valerius s. of Eudaimon	370	* Ex-gymnasiarch	P. Oxy. 2110
Valerius	IV-V	πολ.	P. Oxy. 1048
Pakios	IV-V	πολ.	P. Oxy. 1048
Aur. Pasion s. of Horion	338	[B], epimeletes	P. Oxy. 892 (= WChr. 49)
Aur. Pauleinos s. of	234	Exegetes, B	PSI 182
Neilammon			
Aur. Peteuris s. of	271	Gymnasiarch, B	PSI 1101
Kollouthos			

Aur. Ploutarchos	235	B	<i>Agoranomos</i> , B	<i>P. Osl.</i> 111.9, 11
Ploution	III		* Syndikos	<i>P. Oxy.</i> Ined. 1
Aur. Ploution-Origenes	Early IV			<i>P. Oxy.</i> 1417
Ptolemaios ³⁵	290		Exegetes, B, dekaprotos of the southern toparchy	<i>PSI</i> 461
Ptolemaios s. of Damarion	271		+ Gymnasiarch	<i>P. Oxy.</i> 1413
	Late III		* Archiereus	<i>P. Oxy.</i> 1415
Aur. Ptolemaios-Herakleides	212-3		Ex-agoranomos, B	<i>P. Oxy.</i> 70
Ptoleminos	III		<i>Agoranomos</i> , B	<i>P. Oxy.</i> Ined. 1
Flavius Ptoleminos ³⁶	370		* Ex-logistes	<i>P. Oxy.</i> 2110
s. of Eulogios	IV-V		πολ.	<i>P. Michael.</i> 33
Aur. Ptolion s. of Amois s. of Sarapion	229		Kosmetes, B	<i>P. Oxy.</i> 2473
Aur. Ptolmion	303		Exegetes, B, demosios trapezites	<i>P. Princ.</i> 133
M. Aur. Rodienos	III	B		<i>P. Oxy.</i> Ined. 1
Sarapion	237		Archiereus-designate, B	<i>P. Oxy.</i> 1114
Aur. Sarapion	III		<i>Agoranomos</i> , B	<i>P. Oxy.</i> Ined. 1
Aur. Sarapion	305-6		[. . . , B], syndikos	<i>P. Oxy.</i> 2665
Sarapion s. of Alexandros	222-3	B		<i>P. Oxy.</i> 1526
Aur. Sarapion-Apeis	252	B		<i>P. Oxy.</i> 977
Aur. Sarapion-Apollonios	226		Ex-gymnasiarch, B	<i>P. Oxy.</i> 2137
Aur. Sarapion-Apollonios	235		<i>Ex-gymnasiarch</i> , B	<i>SB</i> 5806

35. Ptolemaios was thought by B. Van Groningen, *Le Gymnasiarque des Métropoles de l'Égypte romaine*, 1924, p. 97 (followed by Wegener, *The Boule*, p. 318) to have been prytanis as well as gymnasiarch since he seems to have opened a subject for discussion in the boule. Since *P. Oxy.* 2110 has demonstrated that discussions

were not always opened by the prytanis, this conclusion is no longer necessary.

36. The two occurrences of the name in this document read Φλαύσιος Πτολεμαῖος Εἰδουργίου πολιτευομένου (line 1), and Φλαύσιος Πτολεμαῖος Εἰδουργίου πολιτευομενος (line 17). The editor was no doubt right to take the first case as a mistake

for the nominative, since the supposition that there is here an attested case of a father and son as members of the boule at the same time would involve the assumption that the scribe was guilty of two mistakes of omission.

Aur. Sarapion- Apollonios	265	Gymnasiarch, B	PSI 1249
Aur. Sarapion- Dionysiotheon	250	Ex-gymnasiarch, B	BASP 4, 1967, pp. 49 ff.
Aur. Sarapion s. of Eudaimon	342	B	P. Oxy. 87 (= WChr. 446)
M. Aur. Saras s. of M. Aur. Diogenes- Heliodoros	237	Ex-gymnasiarch, B	P. Oxy. 1114
Aur. Saras	222	B	P. Oxy. 1634
Saras	211	B, ἐροικ(ἀ)λογος	P. Oxy. 2240
Aur. Sarmates	304	Gymnasiarch, B, syndikos	P. Oxy. 2673
Sarmates	370	* Ex-logistes	P. Oxy. 2110
Secundus s. of Secundus	271	* Archiereus	P. Oxy. 1413
Aur. Serenos	III	Kosmetes, B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Serenos s. of Ammonios	271	+ Gymnasiarch	P. Oxy. 1413
Septimius Serenos- Ischyron	271	+ Exegetes	P. Oxy. 1413
Aur. Seuthes(-Horion)	286-93	Gymnasiarch, [B]	P. Osl. 135
Aur. Spartiates- Chairemon	244	Ex-gymnasiarch, B	P. Ryl. 683
Aur. Sokrates	III		
Aur. Sotas s. of Anouthios	426	Ex-gymnasiarch, B, πρὸς τῇ ἐπικρίσει	SB 9161-2 BGU 936 (= WChr. 123)
Flavius Tatianus	458	πολ., riparius	P. Gron. Amst. 1
Teiron-Apollonios	ca. 299	B	P. Oxy. 1416
Aur. Philippos	Mid-III	Ex-kosmetes, exegetes, [B]	P. Oxy. 2278
Ti. Claudius Flamma	266	Ex-B	PSI 940
Phoebammon	ca. 465	Ex-πολ.	P. Oxy. 902 (= MChr. 72)
Aur. Horion	III	B	P. Oxy. Ined. 1
Septimius Horion- Diogenes	ca. 299	+	P. Oxy. 1416

NY 11 LIBRARY

Appendix Two

The Oxyrhynchite Tribe Cycles and the Date of *P. Oxy.* 1413-4

It has long been known that after the foundation of the boulai of the metropoleis, a tribal system was organized which had particular reference to liturgical service. Recent evidence has shed a good deal of light upon the workings of this system at Oxyrhynchus in the earlier part of the third century. J. B. Lidov and Dr. John Rea have discovered certain pertinent facts from the examination of documents from Oxyrhynchus.¹ Lidov has been able to establish that there were six tribes at Oxyrhynchus and that they were responsible for the performance of liturgies, each for a year, on a rotational system. He shows that the first cycle (*περίοδος*) began with the first tribe in 206-7, and establishes the rotation up to the fifth year of the third cycle (222-3).

Rea has found evidence that the liturgical service in 232-3 was performed by an amalgamation of the fifth and sixth tribes, and concluded that the rotation by single tribes progressed as far as the end of the fourth *periodos* and was then replaced, probably due to difficulty in filling posts, by a system in which the cycle was reduced to three years and the tribes served in pairs instead of singly. It is therefore inferred that in the fifth cycle tribes 1 and 2 served in 230-1, tribes 3 and 4 in 231-2, and, as the new document shows, tribes 5 and 6 in 232-3.

Neither Lidov nor Rea were concerned with the evidence from the later part of the third century. There is a small amount of evidence to suggest that at some point there was a reversion to a single-tribe cycle. In *P. Oxy.* 1413 the third tribe's members make nominations at a meeting of the boule, and the editors reasonably inferred that this was the tribe responsible for liturgies. In *P. Oxy.* 2407 there is a report of a meeting which seems to take place at the point in changeover of duty from the first to the second tribe (see above, pp. 50-52). In *P. Oxy.* 1415 a single tribe again appears to be responsible for making a nomination in the boule.²

In arguing for a change from a single tribe cycle to a double one, Rea pointed out that the innovation could only be made at the end of a cycle if it were not to be unfair to some of the tribes. The same would of course be true in the case of a change back to the single tribe cycle. A hypothetical extension of the double tribe cycle would give the following table of dates:

1. J. B. Lidov, "Tribal Cycles in Oxyrhynchus," *TAPA* 1968, pp. 259-63. I am indebted to Dr. Rea for allowing me to refer to his

new text.

2. See also, for the fourth century, *P. Oxy.* 86; 1627; *P. Flor.* 39; *PSI* 1108.

Tribe 1+2	230-1	233-4	236-7	239-40	242-3	245-6
Tribe 3+4	231-2	234-5	237-8	240-1	243-4	246-7
Tribe 5+6	232-3	235-6	238-9	241-2	244-5	247-8

and so on.

There are several arguments which may be adduced to support the theory that the double tribe cycle ended in 244-5 and that a single cycle began again in 245-6.

1. It has been shown that the organisation of liturgical service in Egypt underwent an overhaul in the reign of Philip the Arab (244-9).³ If we suppose that the change back to a single tribe cycle occurred in this period, the new arrangement could have commenced either in 245-6 or in 248-9 (provided that it did so after the end of a double cycle).

2. One of the changes which took place in that period was replacement of the amphodogmateus by the phylarch. The former is last attested in 244-5 (*P. Oxy.* 1119). This document also shows that the phylarch was operating in 253, but an earlier reference to this official is now provided by *P. Oxy.* 2664, dated by the editor to ca. 245-8. Again, it seems probable that the change from amphodogmateus to phylarch and the change from double to single tribe cycle were part of the same administrative overhaul. But this does not predispose in favour of either 245-6 or 248-9 as the first year of the restored single tribe cycle.

3. *P. Oxy.* 1119 contains a petition from two Antinoites, one of whom is named Aurelius Theon, mentioning the fact that they had been nominated by the amphodogmateus as πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν at Oxyrhynchus in 244-5. They write in 253 to the strategos in order that the phylarch at Oxyrhynchus may be reminded of their right to exemption. According to the dates for the double cycle they will have been nominated in 244-5 with tribes 5 and 6. They state specifically that that nomination was made in the preceding cycle (*P. Oxy.* 1119.6: τῇ πρὸ ταύτης περιόδῳ).⁴ If this is correct, as we must assume, it follows that they would only be eligible for nomination again for 253-4 if (a) the reorganisation took effect from 245-6, and (b) it was based on a cycle of not less than nine tribes. It therefore seems reasonably certain that there was a reform in the tribal structure at the beginning of the reign of Philip the Arabian which included the replacement of the amphodogmateus by the phylarch, reversion to a single tribe cycle, and an increase in the number of tribes. Further hypothesis

3. See P. J. Parsons, "Philippus Arabs and Egypt," *JRS* 57, 1967, pp. 134-41.

4. The Aurelius Theon of *P. Oxy.* 1119 has been identified with another Antinoite named Aurelius Theon son of Theon who has the titles of kosmetes and bouleutes at Oxyrhynchus in Epeiph 255, see K. S. Gapp, "A Lease of a Pigeon-House with Brood," *TAPA* 64, 1933, pp. 83-97 (republished as *SB* 7814). The identification seems

secure but it is impossible to relate the holding of the kosmeteia to the tribal cycles if we assume that Aurelius Theon was correct in thinking that he was eligible for nomination for 253-4. It is quite likely that a proportion of the serving kosmetai could come from tribes other than the liturgising one and that Theon might have volunteered for the office, see N. Lewis "Νοήματα Λέγοντος," *BASP* 6, 1969, pp. 20-1.

is somewhat fragile since there is an almost total lack of evidence. New papyri from Oxyrhynchus, to be published by Rea, suggest the possibility that there were twelve tribes at Oxyrhynchus during the reign of Aurelian. It may therefore be suggested that the increase in the number of tribes in the reign of Philip was from 6 to 12 — in fact merely a division of each existing tribe into two. This hypothesis has the advantage of comparative simplicity; it is easier to create twelve tribes out of six than nine; nor do we have to postulate an increase to nine tribes under Philip and a further increase to twelve at some time before Aurelian.

On this basis the reform under Philip will have created (new) tribes 1 and 2 out of (old) tribe 1 and so on. It is then possible to suppose that Aurelius Theon was nominated in 244-5 with tribe 5 (+ 6) on the double cycle and expecting nomination for 253-4 with tribe 9, which will have been half of the old tribe 5. We may then construct the following hypothetical table for the tribe cycle beginning in 245:

Old Tribe	New Tribe	
1	{ 1	245-6
	{ 2	246-7
2	{ 3	247-8
	{ 4	248-9
3	{ 5	249-50
	{ 6	250-1
4	{ 7	251-2
	{ 8	252-3
5	{ 9	253-4
	{ 10	254-5
6	{ 11	255-6
	{ 12	256-7

This cannot be claimed as anything better than a tentative suggestion which remains to be proved or disproved by new evidence, but it does at least provide a possible explanation for the situation in *P. Oxy.* 1119. It is hardly possible to go beyond this, however, for the evidence from the reign of Aurelian is ambivalent.

In *P. Oxy.* 1413 the third tribe is the one responsible for liturgies. The papyrus is dated internally only by references to Aurelian. An extension of the scheme suggested above yields a date of 271-2 for the liturgy duty of the third tribe. The internal evidence of *P. Oxy.* 1413 suggests the suitability of a date close to the beginning of the reign of Aurelian alone, after the recovery of Egypt from the Palmyrenes. In lines 25-33 the boule discusses the presentation of a gold crown and Νύκη to Aurelian. The editors suggested that this would be appropriate after Aurelian had rid himself of Vaballathus or after the revolt of Firmus. Vaballathus is associated with Aurelian in the papyri in the first two years of Aurelian's reign.⁵ The presentation of a gold crown is a special performance,

5. See P. J. Parsons, "A Proclamation of Vaballathus?" *Chronique d'Égypte* 42, 1967, p. 400.

presumably prompted by a special occasion. The removal of Vaballathus is a suitable occasion and the third or fourth year of Aurelian is an appropriate time. This is consonant with the evidence from the *Historia Augusta* referring to the triumph of Aurelian: "praecesserunt inter hos etiam Palmyreni, qui superfuerant, principes civitatis et Aegyptii ob rebellionem" (*Aur.* 33.5), "praeferebantur coronae omnium civitatum aureae titulis eminentibus proditae" (*Aur.* 34.3). The traditional date for the triumph of Aurelian, for which there is no solid evidential support, is 274. But with this uncertainty, and on the assumption that the presentation of crowns was not unusual at the beginning of a reign or after some notable victory (cf. *P. Fay.* 20), there is no objection to supposing that the Oxyrhynchites were preparing to present Aurelian with a crown for a victory accomplished by the end of the summer of 271. On the other hand, the chronology of this period presents complex problems and there can be no certainty that Aurelian's victory had been achieved by the summer of 271.⁶ As for the date of *P. Oxy.* 1413, the fifth year of Aurelian's reign (273-4) can be excluded; Aurelius Euporos-Agathodaimon is known to have been prytanis in that year (*BGU* 1073-4) and the fact that he was not prytanis at the meeting in *P. Oxy.* 1413 is shown by lines 29-30 in which a remark made by him is immediately followed by a statement from the prytanis. On internal evidence, therefore, *P. Oxy.* 1413 seems likely to belong to 271-3 or 274-5, the earlier period being more appropriate to the presentation of a crown and Νίκη.⁷ Further, the year 274-5 can in fact be excluded definitively; for we know that the strategos in Phaophi of that year was Aurelius Herammon (*PSI* 1231), and *P. Oxy.* 1414.17, which probably belongs to the same year as 1413 (see below, p. 153), attests a strategos named Terentius Arios. We may take the hypothesis one tentative step further. If, as is at least possible, Euporos-Agathodaimon was prytanis in 272-3 as well as 273-4 (see Appendix I, notes 5, 6), that year also can be excluded as a possible date for *P. Oxy.* 1413-4; we would then be left with the year 271-2 as the only possibility.

It is also possible to be more precise about the time of year at which the

6. It appears from 1413.26 that the crown has been made, but the boule votes another 12 talents, perhaps for the Νίκη (cf. Jouguet, *Les Boulai*, pp. 77 ff.). The account of events in the *HA* is confusing. The revolt of Firmus is treated as an aftermath of the Palmyrene occupation and the triumph of Aurelian over Zenobia follows the supposed recovery of Egypt from Firmus (*HA Aur.* 32 ff., *Quad. Tyr.* 3 ff.). The actual authenticity of Firmus and his revolt is not beyond doubt, however, and the details of the triumph of Aurelian may well be fabricated (see W. H. Fisher, "The Augustan *Vita Aureliani*," *JRS* 19, 1929, pp. 125-49, esp. pp. 131-2, 143). The presentation and exhibition of crowns was probably a common feature of triumphs, however. The account in the sources implies at least one campaign by Aurelian

between the victory over Vaballathus and the revolt of Firmus. On the chronology see A. Stein, "Zur Chronologie der Römischen Kaiser von Decius bis Diocletian," *Archiv* 7, 1924, pp. 30-51.

7. The only other third century attestation of a particular tribe in a specific year is in *P. Oxy.* 1642.43 where the second tribe is mentioned. The date is 288 or 289. This does not fit the evidence adduced above, but (a) there is no statement that the second tribe was the liturgising tribe at this time, (b) the context is completely unintelligible due to extensive lacunae, and (c) it is quite likely that the tribal structure will have undergone some further change before this time, for the phylarch was replaced by the systates early in the reign of Diocletian (see Mertens, *Les Services*, pp. 30-47).

meetings recorded in *P. Oxy.* 1413-4 took place. The fact that the date of the meeting reported in *P. Oxy.* 1413 was some time in the month of Thoth is yielded by examination of lines 19-24. In this section the boule discusses the provision of oil for the gymnasium. The first remark is retrospective and refers to the provision of oil from Mesore 30 to Thoth 3; the latter is therefore the *terminus post*. The next remarks concern Thoth 11-13 and are followed by a reference to the interchange of days, which has to be engineered in such a way that a gymnasiarch may pay back a debt for a day on which he was required to provide oil but failed to do so. These references could conceivably be retrospective, but are more likely to be prospective. The latest date mentioned in this section is Thoth 28, and it ought to be prospective if the attempts to effect an interchange are to have any point. Thus the date of the meeting was certainly between Thoth 4 and 28, and probably between Thoth 4 and 11.

P. Oxy. 1414 probably belongs to the same year, since the syndikos of *P. Oxy.* 1413 also appears in 1414. The term of office of the syndikos was probably one year (see above, p. 50). And it has been shown that the subject-matter of *P. Oxy.* 1414 is also quite appropriate to the early part of the sole reign of Aurelian.⁸ The meeting may be placed in the middle months of the same year for the following reasons. It has been shown that the prytanis entered office at the beginning of Thoth (above, page 62), and in *P. Oxy.* 1414.24 the prytanis reminds the boule that the new prytanis must by law be nominated six months in advance. The boule then proceeds to renominate the present incumbent, and the passage breaks off in the middle of his protests. It is therefore likely that this meeting took place in Mecheir. The prytanis does mention in line 29 that the meeting is *πρόσκλητος* and it is possible that it took place some time before the end of Mecheir; in that case we may suppose that he is reminding the boule that a new prytanis will have to be nominated before the end of Mecheir, implying, or possibly stating, in the fragmentary remarks which follow that the boule must be prepared to nominate at the next meeting. The renomination of the present prytanis will then be understood as an excess of zeal on the part of the bouleutai.

8. See above, pages 71-72.

IN V.O. LIBRARY

Appendix Three

ΠΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΟΜΕΝΟΣ

The term *προπολιτευόμενος* is attested relatively infrequently in the papyri. It makes its first appearance in the late third century, and continues to occur sporadically in the fourth century. The earliest publication in which it was found was *CPR* 19 (= *MChr.* 69), and Mitteis argued in his commentary (*CPR*, pp. 61-2) that it was in fact a synonym for *πρύτανης* or *πρόεδρος* and that the man was therefore president of the boule. Since the term *πολιτευόμενος* occurs frequently in the fourth century as a synonym for *βουλευτής*, and since the prefix *προ-* can clearly refer to status, the interpretation is coherent and has never been seriously challenged. But since it carries important implications for the character of the presidency of the boule and for the position of the boule in the nome, it is appropriate to re-examine the evidence in detail.

The earliest papyrus text in which the term occurs is *P. Oxy.* 2343, dated to ca. 288, which contains a letter from a prefect of Egypt about the status of eirenarchs. The letter is addressed: Π]ερεγρήνος στρατηγῶ καὶ προπο[λιτευο]μένους Ὁξυρυγγίτου χαίρειω. The writer does not have a title, but since his letter is referred to as *ἐπιστολή ἡγεμονική* it is quite clear that he was a prefect, and his term is to be dated shortly before 287-8.¹

The next attestation is in *P. Cair. Is.* 1, of 297, in which the prefect announces arrangements for the publication of the taxation edict of Diocletian: προσετάχθησαν δὲ οἱ προπολιτευόμενοι ἐκά[σ]της πόλεως . . . εἰς ἐκάστην κώμην εἴτ' οὖν τόπον ἀποστεῖλαι.

In *CPR* 19 (= *MChr.* 69), of 330, there is a petition concerning a private sale of property addressed by a woman to a man with the title *προπολιτευόμενος Ἐρμουπόλεως καὶ νομοῦ*. Rejecting the possibility that the title applied to the *defensor* or the *logistes* because the *civitas* was not involved, Mitteis concluded that the *προπολιτευόμενος* was the president of the boule.

A similar situation is involved in *P. Oxy.* 67 (= *MChr.* 56), of 338, containing a letter about a dispute over property addressed to Aëtios ἄρξ(αντι)

1. See O. W. Reinmuth, "A Working List of the Prefects of Egypt: 30 B.C.—299 A.D.," *BASP* 4, 1967, pp. 123 ff. It is difficult to conjecture the date with any precision. Valerius Pompeianus is attested in office on October 25, 287. M. Aurelius Diogenes was in office at some time between

December 284 and May 286. If the notion that Aurelius Mercurius was a prefect be abandoned (see above, Chapter IV, note 26), Peregrinus could be placed between Diogenes and Pompeianus. But he might, of course, have preceded Diogenes.

προπολιτευομένω τῆς λαμ(πρᾶς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης) [Ἰ]ὸξυρυγίτων πό]λεως. The document also contains an application to the prefect from the person involved in the dispute that Aëtios be appointed to judge the issue, and the reply to this application from the prefect addressed to Aëtios προπολιτευομένω Ἰξυρ[υ]γγ[είτου].

In *P. Abinn.* 58, of 345, there is a request addressed to Abinnaeus for an *epistula exactoriae* (see above, page 59) from a man with the titles ἑναρχος πρύτανις προπολιτευόμενος τῆς Ἀρσωιτῶν πόλεως. A similar collocation of titles occurs in *SB* 9597, of the late fourth century, in which the [προπολι]τευόμενος ἑναρχος πρύτανις Ἡρακλέους [π]όλεως writes to the *comes* and *dux* about the difficulties of finding people to serve liturgies connected with the supply of *annona militaris*. *P. Lips.* 37, of 389, contains a petition about theft and assault addressed προπολιτε[υο]μέ[νω] Ἐρμοῦ πόλεως τῆς [λ]αμπρ[οτ]άτης ῥιπαρίω νομο[ῦ] Ἐρμοπολίτου, in which the petitioner asks that the miscreants be kept under custody pending the arrival of a higher official.

Finally there are four attestations which are of little assistance. The term occurs in an uncertain context in *P. Oxy.* ined. 4, of 302. In *PSI* 944, of 364-6 (?), there is a fragmentary petition to a prefect from the wife of a bouleutes; the subject is liturgy and the phrase προνοία Μακροβίου τοῦ προπολιτευομένου is used. In *BGU* 1024 6.3 ff. there is a reference to an Alexandrian with the title προλιτευόμενον, but since the passage is concerned with a love affair with a prostitute it does not help much for definition of the title.² In *P. Oxy.* 913, of 442, the term [προπολιτε]ύμενος occurs as part of a patronym.

The equation of the term with the title of prytanis produces several anomalies. The reference in *P. Oxy.* 2343 dates to the period before the reforms of Diocletian, which are generally placed in the last decade of the third century at the earliest. Clearly, the assumption that propoliteuomenos = prytanis would imply the supposition not only that there was more than one prytanis at Oxyrhynchus, but also that in some sense they were prytaneis "of the nome." As has been shown in Chapter III, there is no certain evidence that there was ever a plurality of prytaneis at any one time, and there is certainly no evidence for it in the third century. In *P. Cair. Is.* 1 the propoliteuomenoi are at least connected with the πόλις, but the phrasing again implies that there was more than one propoliteuomenos in each city.

We may now turn to those documents in which people carry both the title of prytanis-in-office and propoliteuomenos (*P. Abinn.* 58; *SB* 9597). In the former propoliteuomenos follows prytanis, in the latter it precedes. If the titles really are synonymous it seems very curious that they should both be employed in this way. In the obvious case where there are two titles signifying the same position, that of the strategos-exactor, the titles are joined by the conjunction ἦτοι (e.g. *P.*

2. The correction to προπολιτευόμενον was made by Wilcken, *Archiv* 3, 1903-6, p. 303. It is possible, no doubt, to read π(ρ)ολιτευόμενον.

Lugd.-Bat. XIII 10). In the case of the president of the boule, there are two titles which are synonymous in the fourth century, *πρύτανις* and *πρόεδρος*, and although the terms are used in close conjunction (e.g. in *P. Oxy.* 2110), there is no example of a president calling himself *πρύτανις πρόεδρος* or even *πρύτανις ἦτοι πρόεδρος*. This again leads to doubt as to whether the terms *prytanis* and *propoliteuomenos* really are synonymous.

The documents in which legal issues are at stake may now be considered. In his commentary to *CPR* 19 (= *MChr.* 69) Mitteis saw that the *propoliteuomenos* was invested with legal or judicial powers, and that he was *propoliteuomenos* of the city and the nome. He therefore applied the term to a member of the municipal cadre, and finding that the legal situation in the document was not appropriate to either the *defensor* (*syndikos*, *ekdikos*) or the *curator* (*logistes*), applied it to the president of the boule, noting the implication that he, and hence also the boule, was now invested with a competence which extended over the nome. This seemed to fit very well with the idea that the effect of the reforms of Diocletian was to weld the metropolis and the nome into an administrative unit. That the *propoliteuomenos* possessed some kind of legal competence in *CPR* 19 is beyond doubt but the assumption that this competence was *de iure* and connected with some municipal office is mistaken. This is shown quite clearly by *P. Oxy.* 67 (= *MChr.* 56), in which the *propoliteuomenos* is specifically given the competence, in a single definite case, by the authority of the prefect. The judicial competence which is supposed to have attached to the title is clearly not in evidence in *P. Lips.* 37. The petitioner asks the *propoliteuomenos*, who is also a *riparius*, to make sure that people under suspicion of assault and robbery are kept in custody pending the arrival of a higher official. There can be no possible doubt that the capacity in which the addressee is asked to do this is that of *riparius*. It therefore appears probable that the cases of *propoliteuomenoi* exercising a legal or judicial competence are due to specific grants of competence in specific cases, and that there is no reason why *de iure* judicial power should attach to the president of the boule or why anybody exercising judicial power which is not appropriate to the position of other municipal officials should be assumed to be the president of the boule.

The indications of locality attached to the term *propoliteuomenos* are also of some interest. In the two cases where the term is used in conjunction with the title of *prytanis* (*P. Abinn.* 58; *SB* 9597), the *πόλις* appears. In *P. Oxy.* 2343 the *propoliteuomenoi* are said to be of the nome, in *P. Cair. Is.* 1, "of each city." In *CPR* 19 both the city and the nome are attached to the title, whereas in *P. Oxy.* 67 the title is cited once with the city and once with the nome. A further variation is observed in *P. Lips.* 37 where the man is *propoliteuomenos* of the city and *riparius* of the nome. It is evident, therefore, that there is no consistency in the titlature, and doubtful whether there is any real differentiation to be made between a *propoliteuomenos* of the city and a *propoliteuomenos* of the nome. The same phenomenon may be observed in connection with the *logistes*; in *P.*

Oxy. 2667 there is a letter from a λογιστής Ὁξυρυγχίτου addressed λογιστεύσαντι τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως.

The evidence shows that there is no compelling reason to regard the term propoliteuomenos as a synonym for prytanis and several good reasons for not doing so. The equation would imply a plurality of prytaneis in the late third century which is not supported by any other evidence; it would be contrary to the normal practice of titlature in the fourth century; it would invest the prytanis with a "judicial" competence over the nome which is not elsewhere attested, although a prytanis might have such a competence on occasion.

If the term is not a synonym for prytanis, what is it? An alternative hypothesis is provided by a direct translation of the word: προ-, "leading" and πολιτευόμενος, bouleutes, decurion." In this sense, the activities of the propoliteuomenoi in the documents adduced are just as explicable as they are on the theory that the term means "prytanis." To be sure, the propoliteuomenoi might well hold other offices, either in the present or the past. The documents show clearly that a propoliteuomenos *could* be a prytanis, but on this interpretation he could also be a logistes or syndikos (see e.g. *P. Oxy.* 2110), or another of the leading municipal officials. The term could apply equally in the late third century to the bouleutai who occupied important posts in the metropolis. Nor is there any reason why an *ad hoc* grant of judicial competence should not be made to a logistes or an ex-logistes for example, just as easily as to a prytanis.

The theory has one more argument to recommend it. The temptation to look for parallels in sources outside the papyri is great and caution is to be applied in the equation of institutions and officials of Egypt with those found elsewhere. If we find a term in use in Egypt which apparently means "leading decurion," it is impossible not to think of the term which occurs in other sources, particularly the legal codes, with the same connotation; namely the word *principalis*. The *principales* as a group seem to have formed powerful nuclei in the senates of the provinces, and attempts to find their counterpart in Egypt have so far been unsuccessful.³ I would suggest that the word προπολιτευόμενος need not be a direct translation of the Latin word *principalis*, but that it very probably has the same connotation.⁴

3. See Jones, *LRE* p. 731 (cf. above, Chapter II, note 54). References to *principales* in *C. Theod.* 12 include one to the *Alexandrini principales* in 436 (12.1.189). This is, of course, no guarantee that their counterparts existed in the χώρα, but it

provides welcome corroboration.

4. *Corpus Gloss. Lat.* 3.182.44 has πολιτευόμενος as a gloss on *principalis*, but the *principales* are more than ordinary decurions, see Isidorus, *Orig.* 9.4.25.

Appendix Four

List of Documents

I. Nomination and Election

The Tables which follow are intended to summarise some of the evidence presented and discussed in Chapter IV.

Section A contains a summary of the documentary evidence upon which is based the discussion of nomination and election by the boule (above, pp. 98-107). For various reasons, these Tables contain only the evidence from Oxyrhynchus. Since the discussion in Chapter IV demonstrated, as far as possible, a basic similarity in procedure at the various places which provide evidence, it seems convenient to select as an example that place which provides the largest proportion of the evidence. Although the total amount of evidence from places other than Oxyrhynchus is quite large, there are very few documents which provide evidence as detailed as that in *P. Oxy.* 1413-8, for example.

Table 1 contains a list of references to *δνομασία* in connection with the boule of Oxyrhynchus, including those cases in which the term seems to be used to refer to the whole of the electoral process. The latter are also included in Table 2, which contains a list of appointments made by the boule. It is to be noted that both lists contain only those documents in which a specific connection with the boule is attested. No attempt has been made to discuss or tabulate any of the evidence relating to appointment to office in which the boule is not directly concerned. The evidence from places other than Oxyrhynchus may be found in the discussion in Chapter IV; documents which are not treated in the text are cited in notes 82, 83, 88, 89.

Appointment to Office by the Boule of Oxyrhynchus

1. Occurrences of *δημοασία* in connection with the Boule

DOCUMENT	DATE	DATE OF <i>δημοασία</i>	POST	REMARKS
P. Oxy. 1418	Thoth (Aug.-Sept.) 247	—	Gymnasiarchy and eutheniarchy	Seems to refer to a completed election. Petitioner had obtained some alleviation of duties. Protest from an Antinoite illegally nominated.
P. Oxy. 2130	Phamenoth 20 (Mar. 16) 267	Mechair 30 (Feb. 24) 267	A post connected with the gymnasiarchy	Not clear how many nominations are allowed to stand. Serving executives nominate first, then holders of other offices from third tribe.
P. Oxy. 1413	Thoth 4-11 (Sept. 1-8) reign of Aurelian	Thoth 4-11 (Sept. 1-8)	Several nominations for <i>ἐξγηγησία</i>	<i>δημοασία</i> by a few bouleutai hastily convened by the prytanis. Seems to refer to a completed election.
P. Oxy. 1414	Shortly before Mechair 30 (Feb. 25), reign of Aurelian	1. Shortly before the date of the document 2. The date of the document	1. <i>καταπομπὸς ζώων</i> 2. Prytanis	Renominated, but demurs.
P. Oxy. 1412	15th of a month, ca. 284	Same day or very shortly afterwards	Unspecified <i>ἐπιμέλεια</i> connected with <i>annonia militaris</i>	See P. Oxy. 2228.32 note.
P. Oxy. 1252 verso 1	Thoth 30 (Sept. 27)	—	Lost	Very mutilated. N.B. the expressions <i>χορηγῆν τῇ πόλει, δημοασία</i> .
P. Oxy. 1415	Late III	—	1. <i>δημόσιος γραφεύτης</i> 2. <i>δημόσιος γραφεύτης</i>	Request from a banker to appoint a substitute for someone. The bouleutai ask [the prytanis] to make the nomination <i>δημοασία</i> by the members of the liturgising tribe, <i>προβολή</i> by the prytanis.

DOCUMENT	DATE	DATE OF ELECTION	POST	REMARKS
P. Oxy. 1416	Ca. 299	—	1. Unspecified ἀρχαί	Appointment of an ἀγωνοθέτης from τῶν ὀνομασθ(έντων) εἰς ἀρχάς.
			2. Two posts, one or both connected with a festival	a. A man ὀνομασθ(έντος) καὶ μὴ συνλείτ[ο]βρηγήσαντος (for the festival?).
			3. Lost Dekaprotos	b. τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ ὀνομασθ(έντας) for (supervising?) the festival.
P. Oxy. 1204	299	Payni 30 (June 24)		ὀνομασθ(αι), (line 20). Not stated to be in the boule, but the date makes it likely. ὀνομασία and χειροτονία both used.
2. Appointments Made by the Boule				
P. Oxy. 1031 (= WChr. 343 P. Oxy. 1418	Choiak (Nov.-Dec.) 228 Thoth (Aug.-Sept.) 247	—	ἀνάδοις σπερμάτων Gymnasiarchy and eutheniarchy	αἰρεθεῖται ὑπὸ τῆς κρατίστης βουλῆς. See Table 1.
P. Erl. 18 P. Oxy. 1413	Phaophi 30, 248 Thoth 4-11 (Sept. 1-8), reign of Aurelian	—	Prytanis 1. Exegetes	χειροτονία. A ἡμιχώριον. Term used is εἰσηγησίμα.
P. Oxy. 1414	Shortly before Mecheir 30 (Feb. 25), reign of Aurelian	1. Same date as document 2. Shortly before date of document	2. Epiteretai for exegetai 1. ἐκ[α] 2. καταπομπὸς ζώων	Chosen by the prytanis (αἰρεῖσθαι). αἰρεθῆναι. Election postponed. See Table 1.
P. Oxy. 1191	Hathyr 11 (Nov. 7) 280	—	Epimeletai	Regulations about election (χειροτονία).

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

<p>P. Oxy. 1412</p> <p>P. Oxy. 2417</p> <p>P. Oxy. 58 (= <i>WChr.</i> 378)</p> <p>P. Oxy. 59</p> <p>P. Oxy. 1252 verso 2</p> <p>P. Oxy. 1415</p>	<p>15th of a month, ca. 284</p> <p>Hathyr (Nov.-Dec.) 286</p> <p>Thoth 16 (Sept. 13) 288</p> <p>Mecheir 16 (Feb. 11) 292</p> <p>Ca. 290</p> <p>Late III</p>	<p>Same day or very shortly afterwards</p> <p>Same date as the document</p> <p>—</p> <p>—</p> <p>—</p> <p>—</p>	<p>Unspecified ἐπιμένειαι con- nected with <i>amona militaris</i> Gymnasiarchy (?)</p> <p>φροντισταί for estates of the <i>fiscus</i> ἐξεταστής</p> <p>Prytanis</p> <p>1. Convoyers for καταπομοί of wine and barley 2. <i>συνλέκτης οἴνου</i></p> <p>3. δημόσιος τραπέζιτης</p> <p>1. Someone to invite the epi- strategos to the festival 2. ἀγωνοθέτης 3. Official(s) to supervise the festival 4. A kosmetes for some other post (?)</p> <p>Dekaprotai</p> <p>A representative of the boule? ἀρχιερεὺς</p>	<p>Payni 30 (June 24)</p> <p>—</p> <p>Thoth 13 (Sept. 10) 300</p>	<p>Ca. 299</p> <p>Late III-early IV</p> <p>Thoth 14 (Sept. 11) 300</p>	<p>χειρονομία. See also Table 1.</p> <p>Uncertain; the word <i>αἰρεθέντες</i> occurs.</p> <p>Order for election by the boule (<i>αἰρεθῆναι</i>).</p> <p>χειρονομία through (διὰ) the prefect.</p> <p>Election postponed (<i>δοθῆναι</i>).^a</p> <p>Replacement of someone released by the epistrategos. Election (<i>διδόναι</i>) postponed (?).</p> <p>Not clear whether he is elected, since part of the document is lost. See Table 1.</p> <p>ἡρησθαι.</p> <p>See Table 1.</p> <p>See Table 1.</p> <p>ἡρησθαι.</p> <p>Not stated to be in the boule but the date makes it likely. <i>ὀνομασία</i> and <i>χειρονομία</i> both used.</p> <p>τῷ ἐρχομιοθέντι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βουλῆς. Not stated to be in the boule, but <i>χειρονομία</i> by two bouleutai sug- gests as much.</p>
<p>P. Oxy. 1416</p>	<p>Ca. 299</p>	<p>—</p>	<p>3. δημόσιος τραπέζιτης</p>	<p>—</p>	<p>Ca. 299</p>	<p>Not stated to be in the boule but the date makes it likely. <i>ὀνομασία</i> and <i>χειρονομία</i> both used.</p> <p>τῷ ἐρχομιοθέντι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βουλῆς. Not stated to be in the boule, but <i>χειρονομία</i> by two bouleutai sug- gests as much.</p>
<p>P. Oxy. 1204</p>	<p>299</p>	<p>Payni 30 (June 24)</p>	<p>4. A kosmetes for some other post (?)</p>	<p>—</p>	<p>299</p>	<p>Not stated to be in the boule but the date makes it likely. <i>ὀνομασία</i> and <i>χειρονομία</i> both used.</p> <p>τῷ ἐρχομιοθέντι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βουλῆς. Not stated to be in the boule, but <i>χειρονομία</i> by two bouleutai sug- gests as much.</p>
<p>P. Oxy. 2276</p>	<p>Late III-early IV</p>	<p>—</p>	<p>A representative of the boule? ἀρχιερεὺς</p>	<p>—</p>	<p>Late III-early IV</p>	<p>Not stated to be in the boule but the date makes it likely. <i>ὀνομασία</i> and <i>χειρονομία</i> both used.</p> <p>τῷ ἐρχομιοθέντι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βουλῆς. Not stated to be in the boule, but <i>χειρονομία</i> by two bouleutai sug- gests as much.</p>
<p>P. Oxy. Ined. 16</p>	<p>Thoth 14 (Sept. 11) 300</p>	<p>Thoth 13 (Sept. 10) 300</p>	<p>—</p>	<p>—</p>	<p>Thoth 14 (Sept. 11) 300</p>	<p>Not stated to be in the boule but the date makes it likely. <i>ὀνομασία</i> and <i>χειρονομία</i> both used.</p> <p>τῷ ἐρχομιοθέντι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βουλῆς. Not stated to be in the boule, but <i>χειρονομία</i> by two bouleutai sug- gests as much.</p>

P. Mert. 90	311 or 310	—	αἰρέων.
P. Oxy. 2114	Mesore 17 (Aug. 10) 316	—	αἰρέων.
P. Oxy. 892 (= WChr. 49)	Tybi 18 (Jan. 13) 338	—	αἰρέων.
P. Oxy. 2110	Phaorhi 9 (Oct. 6) 370	—	χειρογονία by the πρόεδρος.

ἐμβολαρχία
ἐπιμέλεια of wine

ἐπιμέλεια of wood

ἐπιμέλεια τῆς στρατιωτικῆς
ἑρέως ἐσθήτος

II. Summary of Documents Discussed in Chapter IV¹

Published Documents

Archiv 4, pp. 115-7 (Antinoopolis, 258). Record of a discussion in the boule about repairs on public baths in preparation for the visit of Theodorus,² including quotation of a letter about the expenses involved.

BGU 8 (Arsinoe, 247-8). Includes a letter, probably from a procurator to a strategos, about the collection of *νομαρχικὰ ἀσχολήματα* by the officials chosen by the boule (2.1-11), and an account sent to the procurator, probably by the strategos, of the amounts collected by the boule through its delegates (2.12-25).

BGU 362 (= *WChr.* 96, Arsinoe, 215). Accounts of an epimeletes of the revenues of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, including the letter of the boule appointing him to that position (pag. V).³

BGU 771 (Arsinoe, III). Payment of tax into the account of the boule through a meridarch.

BGU 925 (= *WChr.* 37, Herakleopolis, III). Record of a meeting with a discussion apparently relating to arrears of tax owed by the boule.

BGU 1027 (= *WChr.* 424, Hermopolis, IV). Letter from an official titled *praeses*, *comes* and *flavialis*⁴ to the *exactores* and *πρόεδροι* about their failure to supply *annona militaris* over the previous three years.

BGU 1588 (Arsinoe, 222). Tax receipt issued by the boule through its delegates.

C. P. Herm. 5-6 (undated, probably 266-8). A letter from the boule to Gallienus through the procurator Aurelius Ploution about the conveying of wheat and other produce (*ἐμβολή*) down the Nile. The boule seems to be asking for the creation of a liturgical office to deal with this.

C. P. Herm. 7 1 (probably early III). Record of a discussion in the boule about an *ἐπιμέλεια*, of which the precise nature is unclear, for which a eutheniarch had volunteered himself.⁵

C. P. Herm. 7 2 (probably early III). Report submitted to the boule by people whom it had elected to make an inspection of land belonging to the account of the priests of Serapis.⁶

1. The list, which contains most, but not all, of the documents discussed in Chapter IV, is arranged in alphabetical order by the normal abbreviations. The provenance of the document is not given in cases where the title (e.g. *C. P. Herm.*, *P. Oxy.*) is sufficient indication.

2. For Claudius Theodorus, the *ἐπανορθωτής* see O. W. Reinmuth, "A Working List of the Prefects of Egypt: 30 B.C. - 299 A.D." *BASP* 4, 1967, p. 122.

3. See above, Chapter IV, notes 71-2. The

epimeletes is exhorted to pay attention to the instructions of τοῦ κρατίστ[ο]υ ἐπιτρόπου τῶν οὐσιακῶ[ν] διαδεχομ(ένου) [τῆ]ν ἀρχιερω[σ]τήνην. The concern of the epimeletes with temple revenues suggests that the official was here concerned in his capacity as ἀρχιερεὺς.

4. For this official see Lallemand, *L'administration*, p. 255.

5. For the date see above, Chapter II, note 38.

6. See above, Chapter II, note 38.

C. P. Herm. 22-3; 25-6 (probably 266-8). Report of proceedings before the procurator about a debt owed to the city treasury. It seems that the person who had borrowed the money had died, and repayment was being sought from his heirs. One possible interpretation of the references to the prefect is that the boule had applied to him originally and had been told to proceed before the procurator; the latter seems to suggest that the syndikoi will have to go before the prefect again.

C. P. Herm. 52 (= *WChr.* 38, 266-7). The boule writes to inform the strategos that it had asked and obtained the permission of the prefect to use τὰ μ[ή] δεόντως ἀπητήμενα εἰς ἄλλα ἡμῶν ὀφλήματα.

C. P. Herm. 53 (= *WChr.* 39, 267). Letter from the boule to an official telling him to be prepared for an investigation of the γυμνασιαρχικοῦ ἐγλόγ[ου . . .] by the procurator.⁷

C. P. Herm. 57-64 (59 = *WChr.* 151, 266-7). Reports sent to the boule by a man appointed by order of the ex-epistrategos to inform the boule whenever ἀναλειψία occurred in the gymnasium.

C. P. Herm. 66-8; 82-91 (86 = *WChr.* 195, 266-8). Requests to the boule from epimeletai for expenses in connection with public works.

C. P. Herm. 78 (267-8). Addressed to the ταμίας of the city treasury (cf. *C. P. Herm.* 94) and the procurator, concerning an athlete's pension. Probably sent by the boule.

C. P. Herm. 92-3 (266-8). Requests to the boule for payment from the city treasury, perhaps in connection with a military ἐπιμέλεια.⁸

C. P. Herm. 94 (= *WChr.* 194, 267). Order from the boule to the ταμίας of the city treasury to pay money to an epimeletes (lines 1-12), appending the request to the boule from the epimeletes.

C. P. Herm. 97 (reign of Gallienus).⁹ Letter from the boule to the strategos about the election of epimeletai for καταφράκτων ἀποστελλομένων εἰς τὴν λαμπροτάτην Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἡλίου πόλιν.

C. P. Herm. 101 (266-8?). Account of an ἐξεταστής addressed to the boule.

C. P. Herm. 102 (= *WChr.* 296, III). Letter from the boule to an agoranomos, mentioning the ἀγορά as a source of profit to the city.

C. P. Herm. 119 verso 3-4 (= *WChr.* 158, 266-7). Letters about a grant of privileges to an orphan who is a descendant of athletes. The sequence of the letters is not clear, and the following is merely a tentative reconstruction. The orphan may have written originally to the boule – it is not clear whether this is the subject of the letter in 4.17-26 – and the boule referred to the procurator. The latter applied to the emperor and the imperial decision was relayed through the procurator, epistrategos and strategos, and ultimately to the boule.

C. P. Herm. 121 (reign of Gallienus). Letter from an exegetes of Alexandria

7. On the official addressed here see above, Chapter II, note 86.

8. See above, Chapter IV, note 64.

9. See above, Chapter IV, note 23.

announcing the victory of a Hermopolite trumpeter in the games and requesting that he be paid due honour. The letter is addressed to the *ἄρχοντες*, boule and demos.

CPR 20 (= *WChr.* 402, Hermopolis, 250). Letter to the deputy-prytanis from a person, whose son had been elected kosmetes and who had offered *cessio bonorum*, protesting against the fact that the boule had ignored the decision of the prefect. A second letter to the prefect complaining that the boule had ignored the decision and put him under surveillance.

P. Abinn. 18 (Arsinoe, 342-51). A letter from the prytanis to Abinnaeus complaining about press-ganging and looting, and threatening to go to the *dux*.

P. Amh. 67 (Alexandria, ca. 232). A letter to the boule from a prefect about an *ἀρχή*.

P. Amh. 82 (Arsinoe, III-IV). A petition to the prefect from a man appointed by the boule to attend the prefect's tribunal as *λογόγραφος*.

P. Ant. 191 (Antinoopolis, reign of Gordian III).¹⁰ Letter to the boule from the Emperor about religious privileges quoted in a document from the later third century.

P. Beatty Panop. 1 (Panopolis, 298). Correspondence of the strategos, including many letters addressed to the boule passing on orders from higher officials about the appointment of epimeletai and other personnel in connection with the forthcoming visit of Diocletian.¹¹

P. Cair. Is. 1 (Arsinoe, 297). Circular from the prefect appending copies of the taxation edict of Diocletian for publication in the nome by the *προπολιτευόμενοι* and *ἄρχοντες*.

P. Flor. 21 (Arsinoe, 239). Request for grain-seed addressed to officials chosen by the boule.

P. Flor. 88 (Arsinoe, 215?). Fragment of a petition to a prefect about a liturgy from a doctor; the boule is mentioned.

P. Harr. 69 (Oxyrhynchus, III). Letter to the *ἄρχοντες* and boule about the property of a deceased person (col. 2). The position of the writer is unknown.

P. Lugd.-Bat. XIII 10 (Hermopolis, IV). The boule writes to the *strategoi-exactores* to inform them that in accordance with the orders of the *comes* and *dux* to appoint a *συναπαιτητής ἀχύρου* it has chosen a liturgist.

P. Lips. 34-5 (Hermopolis, ca. 375). Petition to the Emperors from an *officialis* against conviction by the *praeses* of Thebaid for misappropriation of *χρῦσος τρωῶνων*. The charge had been brought by the *πολιτευόμενοι* of Hermopolis, who had given the money to a certain Ammonas (titled *ἀπὸ διαψηφιστῶν*) to be passed to the *officialis* and thence to the *ὑποδέκτης χρυσοῦς τρωῶνων*.

10. To be compared with a new document to be published by Dr. E. Boswinkel, of which a summary may be found in *BASP* 5, 1968, p. 48.

11. For the relevant passages see above, Chapter IV, note 24, and p. 83.

P. Mert. 43 (Oxyrhynchus ? , ca. 384?). Possibly a petition to a *praeses* from the *πολιτευόμενοι* complaining that certain people are refusing to bear their share of burdens. Interpretation very uncertain.¹²

P. Mert. 90 (Oxyrhynchus, 311 or 310).¹³ Letter from the boule to the strategos about the election of embolarchs.

P. Osl. 85 (Oxyrhynchus, 273?). Letter from the prytanis to a *ξυστάρχης* and a *τριαστής ξυστοῦ* enlisting their efforts for the forthcoming *Agon Capitolinus*.

P. Oxy. 41 (= *WChr.* 45, III-IV). Demonstration by the demos before the prefect and *katholikos* asking for honours for the prytanis. The *syndikos* proposes reference to the boule.¹⁴

P. Oxy. 55 (= *WChr.* 196, 283). A claim for payment for work done on a street, addressed to the prytanis by two joiners.

P. Oxy. 58 (= *WChr.* 378, 288). Letter, perhaps from a *procurator rei privatae*, to the strategoi of the Heptanomis and the Arsinoite Nome ordering the election by each boule of *φροντισταί*.

P. Oxy. 59 (292). Letter from the boule to the strategos informing him that the man who had been appointed to go as *ἐξεταστής* to the prefect's court was exempt, and that a substitute had been appointed.

P. Oxy. 60 (= *WChr.* 43, 323). Letter to the boule from the strategos informing it that a supply of meat had been sent to Nikopolis for troops, in accordance with the orders of the prefect, and perhaps requesting that it choose and send a delegate to him.

P. Oxy. 889 (first half of IV). An edict of Diocletian is appended to a petition to the boule claiming exemption from liturgy on the ground of old age.

P. Oxy. 890 (= *WChr.* 280, 229-38).¹⁵ A letter from a prytanis to a strategos giving a list of people who owed sums to the city treasury, which were to be used to pay off the debts of the city to the *fiscus*.

P. Oxy. 891 (294). A prytanis writes to an exegetes to inform him that he has been appointed to a post in connection with the baths.¹⁶

P. Oxy. 892 (= *WChr.* 49, 338). Letter from a logistes to inform a man that he has been chosen by the boule for a post (probably an *ἐπιμέλεια*) connected with the construction of the bath and the North Gate.

P. Oxy. 1031 (= *WChr.* 343, 228). Application for seed addressed to officials appointed by the boule.

P. Oxy. 1103 (= *WChr.* 465, 360). An ex-logistes reports to the boule that complaints made to the *dux* by recruits were groundless.

P. Oxy. 1104 (306). A prytanis requests authorisation from a logistes for a

12. See above, Chapter IV, note 106.

13. For the date see the introduction to *P. Mert.* 90 and *P. Oxy.* XXXIII, p. 95.

14. See above, Chapter II, note 45.

15. For the date see J. R. Rea, "A Letter of Severus Alexander?" *Chronique d'Egypte* 42, 1967, p. 392, cf. above, Chapter IV, note 13.

16. See *P. Oxy.* XXXI, p. 117, note 1.

payment of 50 talents from the city treasury for expenditure on the public baths.¹⁷

P. Oxy. 1119 (= *WChr.* 397, 244-5, 253). Two Antinoites write to the strategos asking him to draw to the attention of the phylarch of Oxyrhynchus the fact that they were exempt from liturgy there. They append a series of documents pertaining to a previous case; they had been nominated by the amphodogrammateus as *πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν* and had appealed to the boule of Antinoopolis, which wrote to the epistrategos. The latter directed the strategos to inform the amphodogrammateus of his mistake; the latter admitted liability and performed the liturgy himself.

P. Oxy. 1191 (280). A letter from an epistrategos (?) to a strategos conveying an order of the prefect that the strategos should take the signature of the *σκριβας* of the boule in all appointments of epimeletai by the boule.

P. Oxy. 1252 verso 1 (289). Remains of a letter from a prefect (?) to the boule, perhaps concerning appointments.

P. Oxy. 1252 verso 2 (ca. 290).¹⁸ Letter from the prytanis to the prefect about the difficulties of getting eutheniarchs to serve, and asking him to give instructions to the strategos.

P. Oxy. 1407 (late III). Rescript of an Emperor (Claudius II?) to the boule and demos mentioning *παῖδες*.

P. Oxy. 1413 (Aurelian). Report of a meeting of the boule, including discussion of the election of exegetai, provision of oil for the gymnasium, and the preparation of a golden crown and *Νίκη* for Aurelian.

P. Oxy. 1414 (Aurelian). Report of a meeting of the boule including discussion of an imposition of *anabolicum* and the election of an epimeletes for the *annona militaris*.¹⁹

P. Oxy. 1415 (late III). Report of a meeting of the boule. Questions of the transport of *annona militaris* and the election of people to replace absconders and a person who has been released from duty are to be referred to the epistrategos. There is discussion of an election of a substitute for someone, requested by a public banker. There follows a report of an attempt to elect a banker (probably distinct from the preceding section).

P. Oxy. 1416 (ca. 299). Memoranda of proceedings in the boule, including the appointment of someone to invite the epistrategos to the festival, the election of people to supervise the festival, apportionment of days to gymnasiarchs.

P. Oxy. 1417 (III-IV). Report of a trial before a strategos about a failure to fill a eutheniarchy.

P. Oxy. 1418 (247). An application to the boule for relief in the performance of a gymnasiarchy, mentioning some regulation of a prefect.

P. Oxy. 1419 (265). An order from a prytanis to a *πράκτωρ πολιτικῶν* to pay over certain sums.

17. See above p. 45.

18. For the date see above, Chapter IV, note

96.

19. See above, pp. 70-74, 102.

P. Oxy. 1499 (309). Order from a prytanis to a banker to pay attendants of the public baths (cf. *P. Oxy.* 1500).

P. Oxy. 1662 (246). A prytanis, about to go away to appeal the assessment of ἀπότακτον, requests the strategos to inform a person who is to deputise.

P. Oxy. 2106 (304). Letter from a prefect to the boule and logistes announcing an imperial order for a collection of gold.²⁰

P. Oxy. 2108 (Hermopolis, 259). A letter from a strategos to the eirenarchs forwarding an announcement from the boule for publication.

P. Oxy. 2110 (370). Report of a meeting of the boule at which a man complains that he was appointed by the prytanis to an ἐπιμέλεια, although he was one of the 24 ordained by the prefect for παραρχίαι and κονδοκτορίαι and therefore exempt from other liturgies.

P. Oxy. 2114 (316). A strategos writes to a *praepositus pagi* that a collection of wine has been ordered by the procurator and an epimeletes has been chosen from the boule, and orders him to deliver the quota due from his *pagus*.

P. Oxy. 2130 (267). An Antinoite writes to the board of gymnasiarchs of Oxyrhynchus, protesting against a nomination in the boule. He had sent a petition to be forwarded to the epistrategos, and when it was refused, had petitioned the prefect. He now asks the reason for the refusal of the first petition.

P. Oxy. 2228 (283, or 285). A letter to a strategos, probably from an epistrategos, forwarding a letter to the boule from a previous strategos; the subject of the enclosure is a delay which had occurred in the purchase of mules by the boule, probably required by the state for military purposes.²¹

P. Oxy. 2341 (208). A hearing before the prefect at which the prytanis accuses the strategos of being responsible for the late delivery of taxes in kind.

P. Oxy. 2343 (288). A protest against nomination as a dekaprotos, appending an edict of a prefect about the status of eirenarchs addressed to the strategos and προπολιτευόμενοι of Oxyrhynchus.

P. Oxy. 2569 (265). Notice of resignation to the prytanis from a contractor for the drawing of water for the public baths.

P. Oxy. 2612 (ca. 290). Report of proceedings before a prefect about the difficulty of filling a eutheniarchy.

P. Oxy. 2664 (ca. 245-8). A *rationalis* and procurator announce an imperial decision to lighten the burden of liturgies by reducing them and spreading them beyond the bouleutai.

P. Oxy. 2665 (305-6). The bibliophylakes report to the prytanis and two syndikoi about the property of a man who is under sentence of the *praeses* of the Thebaid. The orders come from the *magister rei privatae* and the *procurator rei privatae*.

P. Oxy. 2673 (304). Report similar to 2665, from a *lector* of a former church in the Oxyrhynchite nome.

20. See above, Chapter IV, notes 17, 21.

21. See above, Chapter IV, note 26.

P. Ross.-Georg. V 28 (Oxyrhynchus, IV). Account sent by a *tabularius* to the president, including a payment to an *ἐπαρχικός*.

P. Ross.-Georg. V 60² (Hermopolis, 390-400). Petition to a *strategos-exactor*, containing an enclosure from the *boule* (not published in full).

PSI 1067 (Antinoopolis, 235-7). Request to the *boule* for the birth certificate of a daughter.

PSI 1337 (Unknown, second half of III). Petition to a prefect about liturgies.

P. Strassb. 58-64 (Arsinoe, 227-31). Series of payments of tax into the account of the *boule* through its delegates.

P. Teb. 403 (Arsinoe, 212-7). Accounts of a commission chosen by the *boule* for the *ὄξους ἀνωῶνα*.

P. Wis. 2 (Unknown, 270-5).²² A petition about liturgies, perhaps containing a reference to credentials for exemption deposited with the *bibliophylakes*.

P. Wis. 32 (Arsinoe 305). Petition to a *strategos* from the *komarchs* of Philadelphia asking him to instruct the *boule* to inspect the irrigation works in Tanis.

SB 7696 (Arsinoe, 250). A trial before the prefect about the nomination of villagers to metropolitan liturgies. The nominees had been summoned before the *epistrategos* when they failed to perform. The document also mentions an edict of Septimius Severus forbidding the election of villagers to metropolitan liturgies.

SB 9253 (Unknown, early IV). A prefect passes on to a *boule* an imperial edict setting a standard of 8 Attic drachmas to the litre for payments of remuneration by the *fiscus*.

SB 9597 (Herakleopolis, late IV). Letter from a *prytanis* to the *comes* and *dux* about people who are evading election to *ἐπιμέλεια* for the *annona militaris* by absenting themselves from the metropolis.

SP XX 60 (Herakleopolis, 243-9). Report of a meeting in the *boule* with discussion about a bust, apparently of Otacilia. Mentions the prefect.

Unpublished Documents²³

P. Oxy. ined. 1 (early III). A list of signatures of *bouleutai* each written in a different hand and followed by the word *ἔδοξε*; perhaps a subscription to a *ψήφισμα* of the *boule*.

P. Oxy. ined. 2 (III-IV). Receipt for *τέλος ἀθηροπωλῶν* paid through a designate-*prytanis*.

P. Oxy. ined. 3 (247). Notice of payment of *στεπτικόν* for an *exegeteia* addressed to the *ταμίας πολιτικῶν χρημάτων*.

22. For the date see N. Lewis, "Νοήματα Λέγοντος," *BASP* 4, 1967, p. 34; J. R. Rea, "Two Notes," *BASP* 5, 1968, p. 40.

23. These papyri will be published with full

commentary in a forthcoming volume of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. I am indebted to the Egypt Exploration Society for permission to refer to them in advance of publication.

P. Oxy. ined. 4 (302). Collection of correspondence of the boule, containing synopses of letters outgoing in the month of Thoth.

P. Oxy. ined. 5 (III). A letter from a prytanis to a *γραμματεὺς πολιτικῶν* about the expenditure for repairs to the baths.

P. Oxy. ined. 6 (early IV). Report of proceedings of the boule concerning elections.

P. Oxy. ined. 7 (300). Extract from proceedings of the boule concerning the necessity of *εἰσηγηταὶ καὶ ἐπιψηφισταί* for nomination (*ὄνομασία*).

P. Oxy. ined. 8 (III). Fragment of proceedings in Antinoopolis mentioning the titles of syndikos and designate-prytanis; the occurrence of terms connected with election to office is noteworthy (*προβολαί, ἐπιψηφισί*).

P. Oxy. ined. 9 (ca. 308-9). Request from a prytanis to a logistes requesting authorisation of a payment from the *πολιτικός λόγος* and a notice of authorisation sent by the logistes to the *τραπεζίτης πολιτικῶν χρημάτων*.

P. Oxy. ined. 10 (Severus Alexander). Request from two *μισθωταὶ βαλανείου* for payment of expenses incurred in connection with the baths. The address is lost but it will certainly have been directed to the prytanis (cf. P. Oxy. ined. 14).

P. Oxy. ined. 11 (297-8). Petition to the strategos Aurelius Zenagenes from five people including an ex-prytanis and a bouleutes.

P. Oxy. ined. 12 (233). Receipt for payment of interest on the *εἰσιτήριον* to the boule issued by the *ταμίας βουλευτικῶν χρημάτων*.

P. Oxy. ined. 13 (307). Sworn declaration addressed to a prytanis from a man who denies that he has engaged in the trade of donkey-selling.

P. Oxy. ined. 14 (222). Request to a prytanis from two *μισθωταὶ βαλανείου* for payment of expenses incurred in connection with the baths (cf. P. Oxy. ined. 10).

P. Oxy. ined. 15 (228). Oath of office addressed to the prytanis by a man undertaking to supply fish for the city.

P. Oxy. ined. 16 (300). Letter from a prytanis to the bibliophylakes instructing them to make a *κατοχή τοῦ ὀνόματος* of a man recently elected to office.

P. Oxy. ined. 17 (257). A letter about regulations made by the boule for the supply of oil to the gymnasium; the names of the sender and addressee are lost.

P. Oxy. ined. 18 (297). Report of a public physician made by order of a prytanis and addressed to him.

P. Oxy. ined. 19 (III-IV). An order from a prytanis to an *ἀρτοκόπος* to deliver bread.

P. Oxy. ined. 20 (III-IV). Invitation from a prytanis to his *στέψις* on a day in Tybi.

P. Oxy. ined. 21 (III-IV). An order to arrest from a prytanis to komarchs and other officials.

P. Oxy. ined. 22 (296). Nomination of village liturgists addressed to the *πρωτοστάτης* of the lower toparchy who is also an ex-prytanis.

P. Oxy. ined. 23 (292). Registration of children made through an ex-pyrtanis.

P. Oxy. ined. 24 (III). Fragment of a calendar of municipal events including an entry of a *νομίμη βουλή* on the 30th [of Hathyr].

INDICES

INDICES

NYPL LIBRARY

I. INDEX OF SUBJECTS

This index contains those titles and technical terms with their cognates, which occur most frequently (i.e. those commonly transliterated in the text). Others can be found in Index II.

- Acclamation (*acclamatio*): 38⁵³ 102, 104-6,
see *εὐφημία*
- Agoranomos* (*ἀγορανομία*): 29, 109⁹⁶, 131,
141-6, 165
- Album: 22¹, 23-4, 31³², 50-1, see *λευκῶμα*
- Annona militaris*: 31, 53, 57, 65, 69, 74-5,
77-82, 94⁶⁴, 96, 102, 107-8, 117-8, 122-4,
156, 160, 162, 164, 168, 170, see Military
Supply
- Appeal against appointment: 99-101, 104-5,
115
- Appointment to office: 8, 10, 16, 18, 22¹,
23-4, 28, 33³⁷, 34⁴⁵, 36, 38-41, 43-4, 46,
48, 53-4, 57, 62-3, 66³⁶, 69, 76-83,
89-90, 92, 94-5, 98-115, 117-9, 121, 125,
149-50, 153, 159-71, see Election, Liturgy,
Nomination, Proposal, *αἰρεῖν*, *διδόναι*,
ὀνομασία, *προβολή*, *χειροτονία*
- Archiereus* (*ἀρχιερωσύνη*): 16⁴³, 25, 94⁶²,
101, 131, 140, 142-4, 146-7, 162, 164³
- Areopagus, boule of: 9
- Assembly: 7-8, 34⁴⁵, see *Demos*, *Ekklesia*
- Athletes: 84-6, 96, 113, 165-6
- Baths: 87-90, 94⁶³, 95-6, 110-1, 164, 167-9,
171
- Boule*: *passim*, see *Curia*, Greek cities, Meet-
ings, Membership, Reforms, Reports of
Proceedings
- age for entry: 25
 - Alexandria: 11-14
 - Athens: 7-9, 121
 - decline: 10-11, 125-7
 - decrees: 11, see *ψήφισμα*
 - division in voting: 106
 - foundation in Egypt: 3, 12-14
 - foundation in metropoleis: 3, 18-19, 27,
44-5, 53, 59, 115, 117, 122
 - Hellenistic Cities: 7 ff.
 - Roman Provinces: 9-11
 - qualification for entry: 25-6, see *πόρος*
 - size: 22
 - uniformity in metropoleis: 61, 123
- Bouleutai*: 9-13, 17⁴⁵, 18, 21-2 *et passim*, see
curialis, *decurio*, *πολιτευόμενος*, *προπολι-
τευόμενος*
- list (*Oxyrhynchus*): 138-47
 - supernumerary: 9-10, 22-3, 27
 - transference: 26
- Bouleutic census: 111
- Bouleutic class: 21-32, 98, 127, see *Curial
class*, *Ordo curialis*
- Bouleutic fund: 39⁵⁹, 41-2, 92-3, 98⁷², 99,
109⁹⁴, 171
- Bouleutic liturgies: 27-31, 111
- Census: 28²¹, 84-5
- Central government: 69-83, 89-90, 110,
113¹⁰⁶, 117-9, 122-7, see *Epistrategos*,
Prefect, *Strategos* etc.
- Christians: 49
- Citizenship: 8, 12, 15, 40⁶⁶, 43, 66, 115-6
- City fund: 27, 41, 44-6, 59, 78, 82, 85,
87-9, 91-7, 98⁷², 165, 167, 170-1
- Confiscation: 43-4, 48, 57, 83, 92, 109
- Constitutio Antoniniana*: 33³⁸
- Corn-dole: 83
- Correspondence: 37, 79-80, 166, 171
- Crown: 151-2, 168
- of office: 12, 16, 27¹⁶, 43, 48, 60²⁰, 84,
93, 99-100, 109⁹⁴, 112, see *στεπτικόν*,
στέφανος, *στέψις*
- Curator civitatis*: 124, 157, see *Logistes*
- Curia*: 10, 11²⁴, 22¹, 23⁵, 24, 32
- Curiales*: 10, 26¹², 27, 31, see *Ordo curialis*,
Curial class
- Curial class*: 21, see *Bouleutic class*, *Curiales*,
Ordo curialis
- Decemprimus*: see *Dekaprotos*
- Dekaprotos* (*δεκαπρωτεύειω*, *decemprimus*):
24, 29²⁵, 38⁵⁴, 56, 103⁸², 144, 146,

- 161-2, 169
 Deme: 11 12, 14
Demos (δήμος): 9, 11-12, 14-15, 17, 34⁴⁵, 50, 84-5, 116, 121, 166-8, see Assembly, *Ekklesia*
Defensor civitatis: 46-7, 76¹⁸, 124, 155, 157, see *Ekdikos*, *Syndikos*
 Deputy: see διαδέχεσθαι, διάδοχος, διέπων
Dioiketes: 78, 117, 126
 Donations: 9
- Economic crisis: 51, 126
Eirenarch: 131, 135, 155, 169
Ekdikos: 47, 139³¹, 157, see *Defensor civitatis*, *Syndikos*
Ekklesia (ἐκκλησιαστής): 7-8, 11-12, 14, 17⁴⁵, see Assembly, *Demos*
 Election: 99-108, 160, 161-3, see αἰρεῖν, δίδοναι, χειροτονεῖν, χειροτονία
Embolarch (ἐμβολαρχία): 163, 167, see ἐμβολή
 Entrance-fee: 9, 26-7, 41, see εἰσιτήριον
Ephebe: 13, 16
Epimeletes (ἐπιμέλεια): 16, 18, 31, 40, 45, 53, 79²³, 81, 87⁴⁴, 88-90, 94-5, 98, 102, 103⁸³, 105-6, 116, 118, 125, 144-5, 160-6, 168-70
Epistrategos (ἐπιστρατηγεῖν): 40⁶⁶, 80, 89, 104, 105⁸⁷, 114-5, 118-9, 126, 138, 162, 165, 168-70
Epiteretes (ἐπιτηρέω, ἐπιτήρησις): 23⁵, 55, 105-6, 145, 161
 Equestrian military post: 58
Eutheniarch (εὐθηνιαρχεῖν, εὐθηνιαρχία): 40, 48, 53, 55, 58¹⁴, 109-12, 119, 132, 135-6, 143, 160-1, 164, 168-9
Exactor (*exactoria*): 57, 59, 65, 76, 81, 82³⁰, 103, 106, 117, 125, 139³¹, 140, 142, 156, 164, 166, 170
Exegetes (ἐξηγητεία, ἐξηγητεύειν, ἐξηγητικός): 5-16, 23, 25, 27¹⁶, 32, 38, 41, 42⁷², 43, 45, 54, 88-9, 92-3, 95, 98-100, 104-5, 110-1, 118, 131-2, 135-6, 140-7, 160-1, 165, 167-8, 170
 Exemption from liturgy: 57, 85-7, 106, 108, 113-5, 150, 167-70, see ἀλειτουργία
- from tax: 116, see ἀτέλεια
 Expenditure, metropoleis: 94-7, 168, 171
- Festivals: 34⁴⁵, 96, 115-6, 161-2, 168, see *agon*, πανήγυρις
 Financial administration: 44-6, 48, 50, 59, 69, 84, 87, 89-98, 111, 116, 118, 121, 125, 165, see City fund
Fiscus: 73, 77, 82, 83, 122-3, 162, 167, 170, see ταμείον, ταμιακός
 Food supply: 108-10, 171, see εὐθένεια
- Gerousia*: 7³, 43
 Greek cities in Egypt: 11-15, 26, 40-1, 51, 66-7, 69, 116-7, 121-2, see Alexandria, Antinoopolis, Naukratis, Ptolemais
 Gymnasial class: 28-30, 43
Gymnasiarch (γυμνασιαρχεῖν, γυμνασιαρχία, γυμνασιαρχικός): 16-17, 28-9, 34⁶, 44-5, 48, 55, 56⁸, 58, 60²⁰, 67, 89, 95, 97⁷¹, 98-100, 107⁹¹, 109-12, 115, 131-8, 140-7, 153, 160-2, 165, 168-9
 Gymnasium: 28, 87-9, 93, 118, 153, 165, 168, 171
- Hiereus*: 16, 73, 97, 140-1, 145
 Honours: 17, 83-7, 121, 165-7, see ψήφισμα
Hypomnematographos: 58, 132-3, 136, 143
- Imperial estates: 83, 108
- Jews: 13-14
- Katholikos*: 34⁴⁵, 56, 80²⁶, 84, 167, see *Rationalis*
 κοινόν τῶν ἀρχόντων: 16-17, 18⁴⁷, 23, 27¹⁶, 45, 53, 59-60, 121-2
Komarch: 77²⁰, 83³², 126, 170-1
Kosmetes (κοσμητεία): 16, 29, 43-4, 58, 94⁶², 101, 111-2, 119, 122, 132, 135-6, 140-1, 143-7, 150⁴, 162, 166
- Lex Pompeia*: 8-9
 List of documents: 164-72
 Liturgy: 18, 21-2, 24-32, 35-6, 48, 51, 55, 57, 62²⁹, 69, 78-9, 82³⁰, 85³⁷, 86-9, 94,

- 96⁶⁸, 98-115, 118, 121, 127, 149-51, 156, 164, 166-71, see *λειτουργία*, *λιτουρρησία*, *χορηγία*
- avoidance: 31-2, see Exemption, *Cessio bonorum*
 - default: 92, 103, 108-9, 111⁹⁹
 - designation of duties: 109-110, see *ἀποδείξεις*
 - responsibility: 107-13, see *κῶδυνος*
- Loans: 92-3, 97, 111
- Logistes* (*λογιστεύειν*): 11²³, 26¹⁴, 37, 45, 57, 76, 82, 90, 97, 119, 124-7, 139³¹, 144, 146-7, 155, 157-8, 167, 169, 171, see *Curator Civitatis*
- Meetings of the *boule*: 21-4, 32-9, 46, 50-1, 53-4, 68, 70, 78, 99-101, 103⁸², 104, 109, 134¹⁴, 139³¹, 153, 175, see Reports of proceedings
- attendance: 38-9
 - convocation: 33⁴³, 35-6, 53-4, 101
 - extraordinary: 35-6, 102, see *νόμμος*, *πρόκλητος*
 - partial: 33⁴², 35, 38, 102
 - procedure: 37-8
- Meetings of the *demos*: 7, 17, 18⁴⁶, 34⁴⁵, 50-1
- Meetings of the tribes: 34, 50-1
- Meridarch*: 164
- Membership of the *boule*: 21-32, 35, 58, see Bouletic class
- Metropoleis, administration: 15-18, 69, 83-116, 118, 123-7
- role in Military supply: 78-81
 - role in Taxation: 70-4
- Military supply: 69, 77-82, 108, 117, 122-4, 156, 164, 167-9, see *Annona militaris*
- Monopoly: 96
- Municipalisation: 123-7
- Nomarch* (*νομαρχικός*): 55, 75, 126, 164
- Nome*, role of the *boule* in: 69-77, 79-83, 90⁵³, 91, 94, 96-8, 107, 117-9, 122, 124-5, 155-8
- Nomination: 104-7, 109⁹⁶, 115, 159-61, 169, see *ὀνομάζω*, *ὀνομασία*
- Oikonomos*: 126
- Overseer: see *Epiteretes*
- Petitions: 71, 86, 94⁶², 99, 104, 110, 113-5, 119, 156, 166-7, 169-71, see *ἐντευξίς*
- Phylarch*: 114, 150, 152⁷, 168
- Politeuomenos*: 27, 29²⁷, 31, 32³⁵, 77, 113¹⁰⁶, 138, 139³¹, 140-1, 144-7, 155, 158, 166-7, see *Bouleutai*, *προπολιτευόμενος*
- Prefect: 31, 34⁴⁵, 40⁶³, 45, 50, 52, 54-6, 61, 69-70, 73, 77, 80-1, 84, 90, 92, 95-7, 101-6, 108-12, 115, 117-9, 125-6, 133¹⁰, 155, 157, 162, 165-70, see *ἐπαρχος*, *ἡγέμων*
- President: 7-8, 11-12, 14-16, 21, 106, 124-5, 155, 157, 170, see *Prytanis*, *ἀρχιπρόβουλος*, *ἀρχιπρύτανις*, *βούλαρχος*, *πρόβουλος*, *πρόεδρος*
- duties: 53-9, 66
 - election: 61, 103, 153
 - Greek cities in Egypt: 66-7
 - length of office: 61-5
 - metropoleis: 53-65
 - terminology: 59-60, 66-7
- Privileges: 32, 84³⁶, 86, 113-6, 165, see Exemption
- Procurator*: 45-6, 48-9, 56, 75-6, 79, 92, 95, 98, 111, 118, 123, 164-5, 169, see *Procurator rei privatae*, *ἐπίτροπος*
- Property of metropoleis: 91, 93, 96, 121-2
- Proposal: 39, 101, see *προβάλλειν*, *προβολή*
- Prytaneion*: 12
- Prytanis* (*πρυτανεία*, *πρυτανεύειν*, *πρυτανικός*): 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 17⁴³, 21, 24-5, 31, 33, 35-8, 40, 42, 44-5, 49, 53-67, 69-70, 72, 74-5, 78, 81, 83-5, 87-93, 95, 97, 101-3, 105-7, 109-13, 116, 118-9, 125, 131-8 (list), 146³⁵, 152-3, 155-8, 160-2, 166-72, see President
- deputy: 42, 99, 115, 131-2, 136²⁴, 137, 166, see *διαδέχεσθαι*
 - designate: 33³⁷, 38, 102, 134¹⁴, 137, 170-1, see *ἀποδεικνύσθαι*, *μελλοπρόεδρος*, *μελλοπρύτανις*
- Public works: 16, 44-6, 87-90, 94-7, 111, 116, 118-9, 121, 125, 164-5, 167-8

- Recruiting: 82
 Reforms of Diocletian: 47, 119, 123-7, 156-7
 – of Philippus Arabs: 150-1
 – of Septimius Severus: 3, 121-3
 Reports of proceedings: 32-4, 36, 39, 43, 46, 48, 50-1, 58, 92, 102, 105, 111, 133¹⁰, 149, 153, 164-5, 168-71, see Meetings, *Acta*, *ὑπόμνημα*, *ὑπομηματισμός*
 Revenues, imperial: 70-1, 74, 123, 126, see Taxation
 – of metropoleis: 91-4
 Revolt of Firmus: 151-2
- Sealing: 33³⁷, 102, 104, see *σφραγίζω*
 Secretary: 36-7, 39-41, 54, see *γραμματεὺς*, *λογόγραφος*, *σκριβας*
 Status: 83-7
Strategos: 5, 16, 37, 38-40, 42, 46, 48-9, 54, 56-7, 60, 69-70, 73-7, 79-82, 86⁴², 90⁵³, 93, 95, 103⁸², 105, 108-9, 111⁹⁹, 114, 117-9, 122, 125-6, 138, 150, 152, 155-6, 164-71
Syndikos: 11²³, 22¹, 38, 43-4, 46-52, 57-8, 72⁹, 73, 83-4, 92, 100, 108, 119, 124, 134, 139³¹, 140-3, 145-7, 153, 157-8, 165, 167, 169, 171, see *Defensor civitatis*
Systates: 152⁷
- Taxation: 24, 41, 46, 56, 64, 69-78, 81-2, 85³⁷, 86, 91-3, 95, 96⁶⁹, 107, 112, 115, 118, 122-4, 127, 164, 169-70
 – deficit: 70, 75-6, 123
 – edict of Diocletian: 77, 124, 155, 166
 Temples: 70-2, 73¹⁰
 – funds: 55, 92⁵⁹, 97, 98⁷², 164
 Tribes: 12, 14, 17, 22¹, 23-5, 35, 47, 50-1, 100, 102, 108, 112¹⁰³, 149-53, 160, see *περίοδος*, *φυλή*
 – liturgising: 34, 51, 99, 101, 149-53, 160
 – prytanising: 7, 14-15, 66
 Triumph of Aurelian: 152
- Visit of Diocletian: 79, 166
 – of Septimius Severus: 3, 18

II. INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN TITLES AND TECHNICAL TERMS

This index is intended to be used as a complement to Index I and therefore does not include those titles and terms listed in the Subject Index. For any particular reference both Indices should be used.

- ἄγιος*: 97
acta: 32³⁶, 36
ἀγορά: 91, 165
ἀγωνοθέτης: 103, 143, 161-2
adlectus: 9¹²
ἀθηροπώλης: 170
agorā Capitolinus: 116, 132⁵, 167
αἰρεῖν: 55, 90, 101, 104-7, 161-3
ἀλειτουργία: 65-6
ἀμφοδογραμματεὺς: 107⁹¹, 114-5, 150, 168
ἄμφοδον: 18⁴⁵, 114¹⁰⁹
anabolicum: 48, 71-4, 80, 168
ἀναγράφω: 84
ἀνάδοσις σπερμάτων: 70³, 75, 142-3, 161
ἀνακομιδή: 78, 90
- ἄνωνα*: 71, 170
ἀνταρχιερεὺς: 14
ἀξία: 30²⁸
ἀπαιτητής: 74
ἀπαρχή: 40
ἀποδεικνύσθαι: 60
ἀπόδειξις: 55-6, 109
ἀποδέκτης: 79
ἀπορία: 43
ἀπότακτον: 56, 69-71, 118, 169
ἀργυρικός: 114-5, 150, 168
ἀρτοκόπος: 171
ἀρχαιρεσία: 9¹²
ἄρχω: 29³⁷, 34⁴⁶, 48-9, 100, 140, 142-5, 155

- ἀρχή: 7, 44, 76, 99, 103-4, 109, 112, 115¹¹,
 161, 166
 ἀρχιδικαστής: 16
 ἀρχιπρόβουλος: 8
 ἀρχιπρυτανεύων: 59
 ἀρχιπρύτανις: 14-16, 17⁴³, 53, 59
 — διά βίου: 12³⁰
 ἀρχων: 15-16, 22¹, 23-5, 29, 45, 55, 66, 76,
 77, 93, 94⁶², 116¹¹⁵, 118, 124, 166
 ἀσυλία: 86
 ἀσχόλημα: 55, 75, 164
 ἀτέλεια: 85-6
- βασιλικός: 114
 βιβλιόφυλαξ: 49, 57, 86, 109⁹⁵, 140, 142-4,
 169-71
 βουλαρχία: 42⁷⁰
 βούλαρχος: 8
 βουλεία: 31-2
 βουλεύων: 9¹², 26¹⁴, 26¹⁵, 31³¹, 103⁸³
 βουλευτήριον: 10, 32, 80, 82, 108
 βουλευτικός: 23, 27-8, 30, 41-2, 74, 103
 — κά χρήματα: see Bouleutic fund
- γενόμενος: 16, 25, 142³²
 γραμματεὺς: 8, 12-13, 15, 39-41, 66, 126
 — μητροπόλεως: 38⁵⁷
 — πόλεως: 16
 — πολιτικῶν: 38, 43, 93, 94⁶³, 140, 171
 γραφή: 71, 73
- Caesarius*: 16
censor: 8⁷, 9
cessio bonorum: 31, 111-2, 119, 166
civitas: 152, 155
comes: 57, 65, 81, 82³⁰, 117, 156, 164, 166,
 170
commentarii: 36
conductor: 143
consilium: 13
- decurio*: 26¹², 26¹⁵, 27, 31-2
decurionatus: 27¹⁶
 δημεύων: 92
 δημόσιος: 34⁴³, 49, 74, 78, 87, 89, 91, 101,
 117, 140-1, 143-6, 160, 162
- δημοτικός: 23⁶, 31³²
 διαδέχεσθαι: 60, 164³
 διαδικασία: 104
 διαδότης: 79, 103
 διάδοχος: 59
 διάταξις: 114
 διαψηφιστός: 166
 διδόναι: 106, 162
 διέπων: 18, 43-4, 45⁷⁹, 59, 91, 94², 131,
 133, 143
 δικαστήριον: 11
 διώκτης: 78
 δοκεῖν: 37, 170
 δοκιμασία: 7, 86⁴², 108⁹³
dux: 49, 81-2, 117, 156, 166-7, 170
 δωδεκάδραχμος: 28
- εισηγεῖσθαι: 55, 104-5, 161
 εισήγησις: 104
 εισηγητής: 39⁵⁹, 55, 97⁷¹, 104-5, 171
 εισητήριον: 26-7, 41, 171
 εἰσκρισις: 40, 42
 εἰσφορά: 76
 ἔκλογος: 95, 165
 ἐμβολή: 76-7, 164
 ἐναρχος: 40, 58¹⁴, 60²⁰, 82³⁰, 97⁷¹, 131, 156
 ἐνοικιόλογος: 147
 ἐντευξις: 12
 ἐνχειρίζων: 162
 ἐξέτασις: 40⁶³, 46, 95, 110
 ἐξεταστής: 46, 48⁸⁶, 92, 116, 162, 165, 167
 ἐξοδιάζων: 90
 ἐξοδιασμός: 45-6, 92
 ἐπαγορθωτής: 116, 164²
 ἐπαρχικός: 82³⁰, 170
 ἐπαρχος: 62
 ἐπεϊκτής: 117
 ἐπιβολή: 69
 ἐπικρισις: 28, 53, 141-2, 145, 147
 ἐπικρίτης: 29²⁵
 ἐπίλεκτος: 11
 ἐπισκέπτης: 83³¹
 ἐπίσταλμα: 42, 50, 54, 90⁵³
 ἐπιστάτης: 7-8
 ἐπιστέλλων: 38⁵⁶, 44-5, 75, 90, 97⁷¹
 ἐπίτροπος: 13, 45, 164³

- ἐπιψηφίζεσθαι: 105
 ἐπιψηφισμός: 105
 ἐπιψηφιστής: 55, 97⁷¹, 104-5, 171
 εἰθένεια: 16, 78
 εἴθυνα: 13, 40⁶⁵
 εὐπορος: 22, 26, 54
 εὐφημία: 38

flavialis: 164

 ἡγεμονικός: 155
 ἡγέμων: 34⁴⁴, 84³⁵
 ἡμιχώριον: 104, 161

honestus: 9, 28

 ἴδιος λόγος: 13
 ἰδιώτης: 21, 28, 30, 32, 98
 ἱερατικός: 98⁷²
 ἱερός: 69, 71, 83³¹, 86, 93
 ἵππικός ἀπὸ στρατιῶν: 58
 ἰουράτωρ: 85

 καταγωγή: 114
 καταπομπή: 78
 καταπομπός: 54, 78, 160-2
 κατάφρακτος: 79²³, 165
 κατοχή τοῦ ὀνόματος: 109⁹⁵, 171
 κεφαλαιωτής: 40⁶³, 103⁸³
 κίνδυνος: 79²³, 91, 108, 112, 123
 κουνόν: 25, 31, 32³⁵, 107
 κουνότης: 32³⁵
 κονδοκτορία: 106, 108, 169
 κωμητικός: 74
 κυριακός: 24⁷

 λαογραφία: 13
lectio: 22¹, 23, 25, 30
lector: 49, 169
 λειτουργία: 10¹⁷, 23⁶, 27, 31³¹, 48, 133¹⁰
 λεύκωμα: 23-4
 λινέμπορος: 73
 λιτουργησία: 48, 100
 λογόγραφος: 40⁶³, 104, 166
 λογοθέτης: 142-3
λόγος: 41, 73-4, 97, see City fund

magister rei privatae: 169
 μέλλειν: 60²⁰
 μελλοπρόεδρος: 60²⁰, 82³⁰, 103
 μελλοπρύτανις: 60-3
 μερισμός: 16, 92
 μητροπολίτης: 28
 μισθωτής: 88-9, 95, 116, 143, 171
municipium: 21-2, 27, 30-1, 47
municipus: 26¹⁵

 νεόλεκτος: 82
 νεωκόρος: 14, 58¹⁴, 116
 νόμμος: 36, 172
 νομός: 69, 72-3, 78²³, 79-80, 83³¹, 155-6

 ξυστάρχης: 116, 167
 ξυστόν: 116, 167

officialis: 166
 ὀνομάξω: 23, 48, 54, 61, 106, 109, 112
 ὀνομασία: 54, 76, 98-104, 159-62, 171
ordo curialis: 23⁵, 24⁸, 31
 οὔσακός: 164³

 παγαρχία: 106, 108, 169
pagus: 123, 143, 169
 πανήγυρις: 34, 103, 116¹¹³
 παράστασις: 40⁶³
 παραχύτης: 89
 πασσαλιωτικός: 83
patrimonialia: 143
 πατρόβουλος: 31
pedanus: 29²⁶
 περίδος: 22¹, 23, 108, 149-50
 πιττάκιον: 22¹, 100
plebs: 9
 πολιτάρχης: 17⁴⁵
 πολιτεύεσθαι: 12, 26
 πολίτης: 17⁴⁵, 22
 πολιτικός: 42-3, 55, 59, 74, 88, 90-2, 97,
 131, 133, 168
 — λόγος, πολιτικά χρήματα: see City fund
 πομπαγωγός: 142
 πόρος: 27-30, 41⁶⁸, 42⁷⁰, 109
praepositus: 32, 143
praepositus pagi: 81, 123-4, 144, 169

- praeses*: 49, 57, 65, 79, 84³⁵, 113¹⁰⁶, 164, 166-7, 169
praetextatus: 23⁵, 27¹⁸
πράκτωρ: 13, 74, 114-5, 150, 168
πρεσβεία: 56, 69
πρεσβευτής: 135¹⁶
πρεσβύτατος: 24, 135¹⁶
πρεσβύτερος: 133¹⁰
primas: 24⁸
principalis: 24, 124-5, 158
προβάλλειν: 54, 62, 101
προβολή: 101, 104-5, 112, 160, 171
πρόβουλος: 8
procurator rei privatae: 167, 169
πρόδικος: 47⁸³
προεδρεύειν: 59-60
πρόεδρος: 7-8, 17⁴³, 57, 59-60, 65, 67, 81, 103⁸³, 155, 157, 163-4
προπολιτευόμενος: 24, 31, 65³³, 77, 103⁸², 124-5, 134, 139³¹, 140, 142, 155-8, 166, 169
πρόσκλητος: 33, 35-6, 153
προσκύνημα: 14
πρόσοδος: 92
προτρέπω: 48, 100-1, 106, 110
προχειρίζειν: 44
πρωτοπολίτης: 56
πρωτοστάτης: 136, 171

rationalis: 98, 169
riparius: 140, 142, 145, 147, 156-7

σκέμμα: 36
σκέψις: 103
σκρέιβας: 37, 39-41, 105, 139³¹, 140-2, 145, 168
στέμμα: 42-4, 67, 143
στεπτικόν: 41⁶⁸, 43-4, 93, 99, 170
στέφανος: 43, 93
στέψις: 60²⁰, 62²⁶, 171
στιχάριον: 71-2
στρατιώτης: 78
συλλογή: 89-90
σύλλογος: 86
συμβούλιον: 62

συναπαιτητής: 82³⁰, 166
συνέδριον: 32³⁵
συνλέκτης: 162
συνλιτουργεῖν: 103, 109, 161
σύνοδος: 32³⁵, 86
σφραγίζειν: 102

tabularius: 82³⁰ 170
τάγμα: 30, 38, 89, 111
ταμείων: 19⁴⁹, 82, 83³¹, 93
ταμιακός: 73
ταμίας: 59
 – *βουλευτικῶν χρημάτων*: 26, 41-2, 140, 144, 171
 – *πολιτικῶν χρημάτων*: 42-4, 87, 93-5, 98⁷², 140, 165, 170
τάξις: 76
τέλεσμα: 49
τέλος: 170
τελωνικός: 74
τόκος: 46, 75, 92
τοπαρχία: 70, 79, 126, 136, 171
τραπεζίτης: 45, 140-1, 143-6, 160, 162, 171
τριαστής: 116, 167

ὑποβάλλειν: 22³, 40⁶³, 103⁸³, 143
ὑποδέκτης: 76¹⁸, 166
ὑπόμνημα: 16⁴⁰, 36, 39, 66³⁵, 89
ὑπομνηματισμός: 36, 40⁶⁶
ὑπηρεσία: 23⁶, 31³²
ὑπηρετής: 17⁴³, 42, 101

vexillatio: 81

φόρος: 27⁷
φρόντισμα: 27, 103
φροντιστής: 83, 97, 108, 162, 167
φύλαξ: 42
φυλή: 18⁴⁵, 23, 25⁹, 35⁵⁸, 101

χειριστής: 46
χειροτονεῖν: 56⁸, 61, 75, 83³¹, 102, 104-7
χειροτονία: 102, 104-7, 161-3
χορηγεῖν: 109, 160
χορηγία: 76

χρήματα: see Bouleutic fund, City fund
 χρυσὸς τρωῶνων: 77²⁰, 166
 χώρα: 39⁵⁹, 41

ψηφίζεω: 80, 87
 ψήφισμα: 12, 17, 34⁴⁵, 37, 84, 86, 110, 112,
 114, 170

III. INDEX OF NAMES AND PLACES

Personal names included are those of officials of the central government and presidents of the boulai. Names of non-officials and bouleutai are not included (a list of the known bouleutai of Oxyrhynchus, in Greek alphabetical order, can be found on pp. 140-7).

- Abinnaeus (Flavius): 59, 82, 156, 166
 Achilles s. of Asklepiades (Aurelius): 134
 Achillion s. of Cornelianus (Aurelius): 135
 Aelius: see Ammonios, Aristides, Publius
 Agathodaimon: 64, 75
 Ailourion-Hesybios (Aurelius): 133
 Alexandria: 10-13, 15, 18, 22, 24, 26, 28,
 40, 43⁷³, 44, 53, 58, 66³⁴, 71⁶, 76, 79²³,
 84, 94⁶², 112¹⁰², 122-3, 132-2, 135-6,
 141, 156, 158³, 165-6
 Ammonios (Aelius): 131
 Ammonios (Aurelius): 131
 Anastasius: 11
 Antinoopolis: 3, 4, 14, 28, 32, 40, 42, 44,
 46, 51, 66-7, 88, 95, 99, 106⁸⁸, 114-7,
 121, 138²⁸, 142³³, 144³⁴, 150, 160, 164,
 166, 168-71
 Antinous: 3
 Antioch: 10, 31
 Antoninus Pius: 15, 116¹¹⁵
 Apollonides: 33³⁷, 61²², 62-3, 64^{31a}
 Apollonios-Claudianus (Aurelius): 131³, 135
 Apollonios-Dionysios (Aurelius): 25¹⁰, 26¹⁵,
 65³², 133, 136
 Appius: see Sabinos
 Arabia: 78
 Arion-Ploutarchos (Aurelius): 136
 Aristides (Aelius): 15
 Arios (Terentius): 152
 Arsinoe: 10, 16, 19, 22, 26, 28, 32-3, 41-2,
 53, 57, 59, 61-3, 64^{31a}, 65³³, 74-5, 82, 85,
 92, 96⁶⁹, 97, 104, 106⁸⁸, 107-8, 119, 156,
 164, 166-7, 170
 Asklepiades (Aurelius): 63, 64, 110, 131,
 135
 Asklepiades s. of Achilles: 134
 Asklepiades-Achillion (Aurelius): 136
 Asklepiades s. of Achillion (Aurelius): 133,
 136²², 136²⁴
 Asklepiades-Hermodoros (M. Aurelius):
 26¹³, 33³⁸, 58¹³
 Athens: 12, 83
 Athribis: 19⁵⁰
 Augustus: 3, 13, 123
 Aurelian: 48, 71, 73, 84, 151-3, 168
 Aurelius: see Achilles, Achillion, Ailourion,
 Ammonios, Apollonios, Arion, Asklepiades,
 Bion, Cornelianus, Diogenes, Dioskoros,
 Dioskourides, Eudaimon, Euporos, Harpokration,
 Herakleides, Herammon, Hermogenes,
 Hierakion, Horion, Isidoros, Korellios,
 Lypros, Mercurius, Mounatios, Neilos,
 Nepotianos, Pasion, Pekyllos, Ploution,
 Ptolemaios, Sarapion, Serenos, Themistokles,
 Theon, Zenagenes
 Balbus (L. Popilius): 14³⁴
 Basilinopolis: 26¹⁴
 Bion-Ammonios (Aurelius): 63-4, 131
 Bithynia: 8, 9, 25¹¹
 Calpurnius (Caius): 131
 Calpurnius (Lucius C. Caius) 131¹, 135
 Canusium: 22¹, 23, 27¹⁸, 29²⁶
 Caracalla: 18, 112¹⁰²
 Claudiopolis: 10
 Claudius: 3, 13, 14 (Emperor); see also
 Hermeios, Theodoros; 168 (II, Emperor)
 Cleisthenes: 7¹
 Cleopatra: 3

- Cornelianus (Aurelius): 133
 Cornelius: see Italus
- Diocletian: 24⁶, 47, 79, 86⁴⁰, 114, 123-4, 152⁷, 155-6, 166-7
 Diogenes (M. Aurelius): 155¹
 Diogenes (C. Julius): 132, 133⁹, 136²⁴
 Diogenes s. of Harpokration (Aurelius): 135
 Dioskoros: 34⁴⁵, 132, 137
 Dioskoros-Helladios (Aurelius): 64, 134
 Dioskourides-Julianus (Aurelius): 137
 Dioskourides-Sabinos (Aurelius): 63, 65³², 131
- Ephesus: 8⁴, 9¹²
 Erastus (L.): 9¹²
 Eudaimon: 64, 132
 Eudaimon-Helladios (Aurelius): 136
 Euergetis: 16⁴³
 Euporos-Agathodaimon (Aurelius): 25¹⁰, 64, 132, 133⁹, 136, 152
 Eutropios: 134
- Firmus: 151
 Flavius: see Abinnaeus
- Galba: 14
 Gallienus: 164
 Germanos: 137
 Goosekeeper's Quarter (Oxyrhynchus): 84
 Gordian III: 116
 Gymnasios: 133¹⁰
 Hadrian: 3, 9, 14, 15, 114
 Harpokration (Aurelius): 62²⁷, 97⁷¹
 Heliopolis: 79²³, 165
 Heptanomis: 108, 167
 Herakleides-Agathodaimon (Aurelius): 62²⁷
 Herakleides s. of Dioskourides (Aurelius): 137
 Herakleides s. of Herakleides (Aurelius): 137
 Herakleopolis: 17⁴³, 19, 31, 33, 57, 61²², 65³³, 75, 81, 156, 164, 170
 Herakleos: 136
 Herammon (Aurelius): 152
 Herapion: 54, 61²², 63, 64^{3:a}
 Hermaion (North and West, Oxyrhynchus): 84
- Hermeios s. of Gelasios (Claudius): 134
 Hermias: 137
 Hermogenes-Eudaimon (Aurelius): 132
 Hermonthis: 19⁵⁰, 65³³
 Hermopolis: 4, 16, 19⁴⁹, 22, 33, 42-3, 45-6, 48-9, 57-8, 61, 63-5, 76, 81, 83-4, 86, 88, 89-97, 106⁸⁹, 111, 118, 122-3, 155-6, 164, 166, 169-70
 Hierakion-Dionysios (Aurelius): 25¹⁰, 64, 133-4, 136
 Hierax s. of Hermeias: 133
 Hierax-Sarapion: 135
 Horion-Sarapion (Aurelius): 136
- Ibis: 19⁵⁰
 Isidoros (Aurelius): 39, 131
 Italus (P. Cornelius): 42⁷⁰
- Julia Mamaea: 116
 Julianus-Dioskourides (Valerius): 136
 Julius: see Diogenes, Leukadios
 Jupiter (Zeus) Capitolinus: 92, 97, 164
- Karanis: 17⁴³
 Koptos: 14, 19⁵⁰, 116
 Korellios Alexandros (Aurelius): 58, 63, 65³²
 Krokodilopolis: 17⁴³
- Large Oasis: 19⁵⁰
 Leontopolis: 19⁵⁰, 26, 61²², 133¹⁰
 Leukadios (C. Julius): 113¹⁰⁶, 137
 Lykopolis: 19⁵⁰, 60, 65³³
 Lypros (Aurelius): 64, 132
- Macedonia: 22¹
 Maximian: 86⁴⁰, 114
 Memphis: 19⁵⁰
 Mercurius (Aurelius): 80, 155¹
 Monimou: 92
 Mounatios (Aurelius): 131
- Naukratis: 11, 19⁵⁰
 Neilos-Ammonios (Aurelius): 133
 Nepotianos (Aurelius): 134

- Nicaea: 26¹⁴
 Nikopolis: 19⁵⁰(?), 81, 167
- Otacilia: 84
 Oxyrhynchus: 5, 18, 21, 33, 39, 41-3, 45-9,
 51, 53, 55, 57-9, 61-6, 69, 73-8, 80-4,
 87-99, 102-3, 105-6, 110-6, 118-9, 131,
 133¹⁰, 135¹⁸, 138, 149-52, 158-9, 166-70
- Palmyra: 73, 84, 151, 152
 Paltus: 10
 Panopolis: 19⁵⁰, 34, 46, 59-60, 61²², 79, 83,
 106⁸⁸, 166
 Pasion-Apollonios (Aurelius): 131
 Pekyllos-Theon (Aurelius): 131, 135¹⁶
 Peregrinos: 155
 Petra: 32³⁶
 Philadelphia: 77²⁰, 114, 170
 Philip the Arab: 150-1
 Pinouthion: 137
 Ploution (Aurelius) 46, 76, 95, 111, 118,
 164
 Pompeianus (Valerius): 109⁹⁶, 155¹
 Pontus: 8, 9
 Popilius: see Balbus
 Ptolemais: 3, 4, 11, 12, 28, 40, 51, 116, 121
-Ptolemaios (Aurelius): 131
 Ptolemy Euergetes Physcon: 13
 Ptolemy Soter: 3, 14, 116
 Publius (Aelius): 34⁴⁴
- Rhodes: 8, 12
- Sabinos: 131⁴, 135
 Sabinos (Appius): 62
 Sarapion-Philoxenos (Aurelius): 132
 Sarapion-Apollinarios (L. Septimius Aure-
 lius): 135
 Septimius: see Sarapion, Serenos
 Septimius Severus: 3, 13, 24⁶, 112¹⁰², 170
 Serapis: 58¹⁴, 97
-Serenos (Aurelius): 134, 137
 Serenos (Septimius): 135
 Severus Alexander: 112¹⁰², 116
- Tanis: 77²⁰, 96⁶⁹, 170
 Terentius: see Arios
 Thamugadi (Timgad): 22¹
 Thebaid: 40⁶³, 49, 79, 166, 169
 Themistokles-Dioskourides (Aurelius): 65³²,
 137
 Theodorus (Claudius): 116, 164
 Theon s. of Eusebios: 137
 Theon-Maximus (Aurelius): 131
 Theoneinos-Sarapion: 137
 Thmuis: 19⁵⁰, 65³³
 Tymandus: 22¹, 27¹⁹, 32
- Vaballathus: 151-2
 Valentinian I: 46
 Valerius: see Julianus, Pompeianus
 Vespasian: 14
- Zenagenes (Aurelius): 171
 Zenobia: 152⁶

IV. INDEX OF SOURCES

A. Papyri and Inscriptions

- | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|---|
| Abbott and Johnson,
no. 24: | 23 ³ | no. 122: | 17 ⁴⁵ |
| Abbott and Johnson,
no. 85: | 9 ¹² | Abbott and Johnson,
no. 151: | 22 ¹ , 27 ¹⁹ , 32 |
| Abbott and Johnson,
no. 90 (Hadrian's
Oil Law): | 9 | <i>Archiv</i> 2, 1902-3, p.
436 no. 32: | 12 ³⁰ , 14 ³⁴ |
| Abbott and Johnson, | | <i>Archiv</i> 4, 1907-8, pp.
115-7: | 32, 46, 54, 66, 95,
106 ⁸⁸ , 116-7, 164 |

- Aug., *Res Gestae*, 27: 3¹
 BASP 4, 1967, pp.
 49 ff.: 147
 BASP 5, 1968, p. 48
 (descr.): 116¹¹⁶, 166¹⁰
 BCH 10, 1886, pp.
 420-1: 10¹⁴
 Berytus 13, 1959-60,
 pp. 123 ff. no. 1: 11²⁷
 BGU 8:
 55, 64, 70², 75,
 106⁸⁸, 107, 117, 164
 144: 33, 35, 37, 38, 106⁸⁸
 362 = *WChr.* 96: 55, 61²², 62²⁵, 62²⁷,
 92, 97⁷¹, 98⁷²,
 105⁸⁶, 106⁸⁸, 164
 572: 61²²
 573: 61²²
 574: 61²²
 753: 66³⁴
 771: 74, 164
 924: 61²²
 925 = *WChr.* 37: 33, 61²², 75, 164
 936 = *WChr.* 123: 23³, 147
 939: 19⁵⁰
 1022 = *WChr.* 29: 114, 115
 1024: 156
 1027 = *WChr.* 424: 32³⁵, 57, 60¹⁹, 65,
 81, 164
 1062 = *WChr.* 276: 143
 1070 = *MChr.* 323: 140
 1073 = *MChr.* 198: 25¹⁰, 58¹³, 72⁹, 84³⁶,
 86, 132, 136, 142³²,
 152
 1074: 25¹⁰, 58¹³, 72⁹, 84³⁶,
 86, 132, 136, 142³²,
 152
 1084 = *WChr.* 146: 16⁴⁰
 1588: 75¹⁵, 106⁸⁸, 107,
 164
 CIG 2782: 10¹⁴
 CIL III 282: 27¹⁶
 C. P. Herm. 1:
 5-6: 76, 164
 7: 32³⁵, 33, 35, 58¹³,
 61³², 89, 98⁷²,
 103⁸², 164
 14: 61²²
 22: 46, 92, 95, 118, 165
 23: 46, 47⁸³, 48⁸⁶, 92,
 95, 118, 165
 25-26: 46, 61²², 92, 95,
 118, 165
 52 = *WChr.* 38: 95, 118, 165
 53 = *WChr.* 39: 48⁸⁶, 95, 111, 118,
 165
 54 = *WChr.* 157: 46⁸⁰, 84³⁶, 96
 55-6: 46⁸⁰, 84³⁶, 96
 57-8: 56⁸, 89, 165
 59 = *WChr.* 151: 56⁸, 58¹³, 89, 165
 60-4: 56⁸, 89, 165
 66: 46⁸⁰, 88⁴⁵, 106⁸⁸,
 118, 165
 67: 48⁸⁰, 61²², 88⁴⁵,
 106⁸⁸, 118, 165
 68: 118, 165
 70: 46⁸⁰
 72: 46⁸⁰
 78: 46, 118, 165
 81: 46⁸⁰
 82: 46⁸⁰, 88⁴⁵, 106⁸⁸,
 118, 165
 83: 46⁸⁰, 61²², 88⁴⁵,
 106⁸⁸, 118, 165
 84: 46⁸⁰, 106⁸⁸, 118,
 165
 85: 46⁸⁰, 88⁴⁵, 106⁸⁸,
 118, 165
 86 = *WChr.* 195: 46⁸⁰, 88⁴⁵, 106⁸⁸,
 118, 165
 87-91: 46⁸⁰, 106⁸⁸, 118,
 165
 92-3: 46⁸⁰, 79²⁵, 87⁴⁴,
 106⁸⁸, 165
 94 = *WChr.* 194: 45, 46, 61²², 88⁴⁵,
 95, 106⁸⁸, 165
 95-6: 46⁸⁰, 88, 106⁸⁸
 97: 60²⁰, 61²², 78²³,
 106⁸⁸, 108, 165
 98-100: 95
 101: 46, 48⁸⁶, 91, 106⁸⁸,
 165
 102 = *WChr.* 296: 91, 165

- 112: 34⁴⁵, 61²²
 119: 46⁸⁰, 61²², 86, 91, 95⁶⁵, 165
 121: 34⁴⁵, 84, 165
CPR 19 = *MChr.* 69: 155, 157
 20 = *WChr.* 402: 31, 42, 60²¹, 60²², 103⁸², 106⁸⁸, 111-2, 119, 166
 39 = *MChr.* 275: 46⁸⁰, 91
 59: 49
 111: 61²²
 135: 49
 228: 19, 61²²
Forschungen in Ephe-
sos II, pp. 96-105: 8⁴
 pp. 107-8: 9⁹
 pp. 173 ff. 9⁹
 III, no. 57: 42⁷⁰
 pp. 118 ff. 9⁹
IBM III.2, 447-76: 8⁴
IG XII 5.141: 10¹⁴
IGRR III 833a: 24⁷
 833b: 30²⁸
ILS 6121: 22¹, 23⁵, 27¹⁸, 29²⁶
 6122: 22¹
 6296: 27¹⁶
MChr. 196: 48, 49, 57, 58¹², 83, 134, 136²¹, 140, 143
 375: 112¹⁰²
 381: 86⁴⁰
OGIS 47: 11²⁷
 48: 11²⁷
 49: 11²⁷, 12
 50: 12
 51: 12
 595: 32³⁶
 728: 11²⁷, 12
 Oliver, *The Sacred*
Gerousia, no. 1: 7³
 no. 2: 7³
 no. 3: 10¹⁴
 no. 5: 9⁹, 10¹⁴
 no. 6: 10¹⁴
O. Meyer 67: 47⁸³
P. Abim. 18: 60¹⁹, 65³³, 82, 124, 166
 58: 59, 65³³, 156, 157
P. Amh. 67: 166
 79: 19⁴⁹
 82: 26¹², 28²⁴, 40⁶³, 65³³, 104, 106⁸⁸, 119, 166
P. Ant. 191: 116, 166
 194: 66³⁴, 67
P. Beatty Panop. 1: 34⁴⁴, 37, 46, 49, 60¹⁹, 60²², 79, 82³⁰, 83, 94⁶⁴, 106⁸⁸, 117, 166
 2: 37
P. Berol. inv. 11314: 34⁴⁵, 64³¹, 132, 133, 136²⁴
P. Berl. Leihgabe 18: 24⁸
P. Berl. Möller 1: 19⁵⁰, 60, 65³³
P. Cair. Is. 1: 77, 124, 155-7, 166
 3-5: 85³⁸
 70: 59, 65³³
 99: 17⁴³, 42
 117-8: 17⁴³, 42
 120: 17⁴³, 42
P. Cair. Preis. 13-14: 60¹⁹, 60²⁰, 65³³, 134¹⁴
P. Corn. 20: 19⁵⁰, 65³³
 45: 25¹⁰, 134¹¹, 136
P. Erl. 18: 33, 35-7, 53-6, 61, 109, 111⁹⁹, 131, 134¹⁴, 161
P. Fam. Teb. 49-50: 15, 66
P. Fay. 20: 84, 152
 22: = *MChr.* 291: 14³⁴
 85: 61²²
 87: 43
P. Flor. 6: 83³¹, 106⁸⁸
 21: 70³, 106⁸⁸, 107, 166
 39: 149²
 57: 114¹⁰⁸
 63: 25¹⁰, 26¹⁵, 74¹⁴, 133¹⁰, 136
 71: 60¹⁹, 65³³
 88: 103⁸², 104⁸⁵, 166
 325: 141
P. Freib. 11: 49
P. Fuad 1 52: 55, 58¹³, 92, 111,

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| | 135 | | 163, 167 |
| <i>P. Fuad I Univ.</i> 41: | 92 | <i>P. Mich.</i> 426: | 116 ¹¹⁴ |
| <i>P. Gen.</i> 10: | 19 ⁵⁰ | <i>P. Michael.</i> 33: | 146 |
| <i>P. Giss.</i> 34 = <i>MChr.</i> 75: | 24 | <i>P. Mil. Vogl.</i> 71: | 17 ⁴³ , 42 ⁷² |
| 54: | 57 ¹⁰ , 60 ²⁰ , 103, 106, | 254: | 106 ⁸⁸ |
| | 125 | <i>P. New York</i> 1: | 85 ³⁸ |
| <i>P. Got.</i> 7: | 60 ¹⁸ , 61 ²² , 88 ⁴⁶ | <i>P. Osl.</i> 85: | 58, 96, 115-6, 132, |
| 15: | 61 ²² | | 167 |
| <i>P. Gron. Amst.</i> 1: | 147 | 111: | 74 ¹³ , 84, 85 ³⁷ , 131, |
| <i>P. Harr.</i> 61: | 12 ³² | | 135 ¹⁶ , 140, 146 |
| 69: | 59, 94 ⁶² , 166 | 126: | 114 ¹¹⁰ |
| 75: | 141, 143 | 135: | 147 |
| 129: | 33, 61 ²² | 138: | 145 |
| <i>P. Hib.</i> 28 = <i>WChr.</i> 25: | 11 | 145: | 141 |
| <i>P. Leit.</i> 7: | 114 | <i>P. Oxford</i> 2: | 16 ³⁹ , 16 ⁴² |
| <i>P. Lips.</i> 18: | 23 | <i>P. Oxy.</i> 40: | 86 ⁴² |
| 34: | 77, 166 | 41 = <i>WChr.</i> 45: | 14 ³⁵ , 17, 34, 37, |
| 35: | 166 | | 47 ⁸³ , 56, 84, 121, |
| 36: | 19 ⁵⁰ | | 137, 141, 142, 167 |
| 37: | 156-7 | 53: | 90 |
| 40: | 40 ⁶³ , 77 ²⁰ , 103 ⁸³ | 54 = <i>WChr.</i> 34: | 16, 18, 45 |
| 50: | 14 ³⁵ | 55 = <i>WChr.</i> 196: | 25 ¹⁰ , 44, 51 ⁹⁰ , 58 ¹³ , |
| 57: | 31 ³¹ | | 59, 87, 88, 94, 118, |
| 97: | 19 ⁵⁰ , 65 ³³ | | 133, 167 |
| <i>P. Lond.</i> 197 (II, | | 56 = <i>MChr.</i> 320: | 145 |
| p. 100): | 44 | 58 = <i>WChr.</i> 378: | 83, 108, 162, 167 |
| 348 (II, p. 215) = | | 59: | 25 ¹⁰ , 40 ⁶³ , 42, 56 ⁸ , |
| <i>MChr.</i> 197: | 19, 25 ¹¹ | | 58 ¹³ , 133, 142, 162 |
| 604 (II, p. 70): | 17 ⁴³ | 60 = <i>WChr.</i> 43: | 81, 134, 167 |
| 955 (III, p. 127) = | | 67 = <i>MChr.</i> 56: | 134 ¹³ , 140, 155, 157 |
| <i>WChr.</i> 425: | 83 | 70: | 146 |
| 971 (III, p. 128) = | | 77: | 85 ³⁷ , 131 |
| <i>MChr.</i> 95: | 31, 57, 60 ¹⁹ , 65 ³³ , | 80 = <i>WChr.</i> 473: | 135 |
| | 103 ⁸⁸ , 106, 125 | 86: | 149 ² |
| 1157 (III, p. 109): | 56, 61 ²² | 87 = <i>WChr.</i> 446: | 147 |
| 1829: | 65 ³³ | 103: | 137 |
| 1912: | 13 | 145: | 18 ⁴⁵ |
| 2507: | 66 ³⁴ | 473 = <i>WChr.</i> 33: | 17 |
| <i>P. Lugd.-Bat.</i> XIII 5: | 140, 145 | 477 = <i>WChr.</i> 144: | 16 ⁴⁰ |
| XIII 10: | 60 ²⁰ , 65 ³³ , 82 ³⁰ , | 592: | 16 |
| | 106 ⁸⁹ , 117, 157, 166 | 888 = <i>MChr.</i> 329: | 141 |
| XVII 7: | 106 ⁸⁸ | 889: | 137, 167 |
| <i>P. Mert.</i> 26: | 132 ⁶ , 140 | 890 = <i>WChr.</i> 280: | 56, 74, 93, 135, 167 |
| 36: | 113 ¹⁰⁶ , 137 | 891: | 30 ²⁸ , 88, 111 |
| 43: | 32 ³⁵ , 113 ¹⁰⁶ , 167 | 892 = <i>WChr.</i> 49: | 90, 125, 134, 145, |
| 90: | 32 ³⁵ , 76, 134 ¹² , 137, | | 163, 167 |

1500:	89, 96	2276:	94 ⁶² , 162
1501:	41, 42, 140, 143	2278:	147
1503:	61 ²² , 113 ¹⁰⁶ , 133 ¹⁰ , 136 ²⁴	2341:	56, 70, 76, 131, 169
1515:	56, 75, 137	2343:	103 ⁸² , 104 ⁸⁵ , 155-7, 169
1522:	140	2407:	22 ¹ , 24, 34, 35, 37, 47, 48, 50-2, 96 ⁶⁸ , 102, 108, 145, 149, 169
1526:	146	2417:	34, 133, 162
1559:	142	2418:	144
1562:	70 ² , 140, 142	2435:	13 ³³
1627:	149 ²	2473:	141, 144, 146
1632:	137	2474:	135
1634:	147	2475:	84 ³⁶ , 85
1637:	143	2476:	34 ⁴⁵ , 84 ³⁶ , 85, 121
1642:	109 ⁹⁶ , 152 ⁶	2477:	84 ³⁶ , 85, 133, 136 ²² , 136 ²⁴
1662:	59, 60, 63, 69, 71 ⁵ , 118, 131, 169	2566:	143
1693:	142	2569:	88, 95, 111, 131, 143, 169
1697:	143-4	2582:	17 ⁴³
1703:	141-2	2584:	141, 144
2106:	26, 76, 77 ²¹ , 125, 169	2585:	134 ³⁴ , 137
2108:	61 ²² , 169	2610:	55, 85, 137
2109:	59, 91, 131	2612:	108, 109 ⁹⁶ , 111, 119, 169
2110:	32 ³⁵ , 34, 36-9, 57-8, 60, 67, 76, 81, 90 ⁵³ , 106, 108, 111, 125, 134, 137, 140-7, 157-8, 163, 169	2664:	29 ²⁷ , 30, 98, 118, 150, 169
2114:	81, 163, 169	2665:	25 ¹⁰ , 47-9, 57, 83, 134, 140, 141, 144, 146, 169
2127:	96	2666:	90 ⁵³ , 97, 119, 125
2128:	96	2667:	90 ⁵³ , 97, 119, 125, 158
2130:	22 ¹ , 33, 44, 56 ⁸ , 60 ²¹ , 66, 99, 100, 115, 119, 132, 160, 169	2673:	47-9, 57, 83, 97, 124, 133, 145, 147, 169
2137:	146	2674:	40 ⁶³
2231:	144	2723:	131 ¹ , 135
2271:	145	2854:	111 ⁹⁹ , 112, 131, 135
2186:	141, 145	P. Oxy. Ined. 1	29 ²⁶ , 37, 38 ⁵⁵ , 140-7, 170
2187:	142-4	2:	60 ²⁰ , 74 ¹⁴ , 137, 170
2228:	32 ³⁵ , 38, 80, 102 ⁸¹ , 160, 169	3:	43, 93, 140, 170
2231:	143	4:	37, 71 ⁶ , 108, 133,
2232:	144		
2240:	147		
2271:	143		


	156, 171	<i>PSI</i> 22:	66 ³⁴ , 67
5:	56 ⁸ , 94 ⁶³ , 135, 171	24:	66 ³⁴ , 67
6:	34, 60 ²¹ , 105, 137, 141, 171	74:	141
7:	34, 36, 37, 103 ⁸² , 105, 133, 136, 141, 171	79:	144
8:	101 ⁸⁰ , 171	182:	145
9:	45, 90, 137, 171	199:	12 ³⁰ , 14, 15, 40, 42, 66, 138 ²⁸
10:	89, 171	457:	141, 145
11:	136, 143, 171	461:	146
12:	26, 41, 42, 141, 144, 171	684:	27, 76, 103, 106, 125
13:	34 ⁴⁵ , 57, 134, 171	705:	25 ¹⁰ , 58 ¹³ , 136
14:	89, 131, 171	716:	26 ¹⁵ , 144
15:	56 ⁸ , 59, 109, 131	794:	61 ²²
16:	109 ⁹⁵ , 133, 140, 145, 162, 171	804:	60, 61 ²² , 89
17:	32 ³⁵ , 89 ⁵² , 110, 131, 171	886:	145
18:	133, 171	940:	147
19:	56 ⁸ , 110, 137, 171	944:	115 ¹¹² , 156
20:	60 ²⁰ , 137, 171	1067:	40, 66, 170
21:	56 ⁸ , 83 ³² , 137, 171	1070:	59, 91, 131
22:	136, 171	1101:	145
23:	136, 172	1108:	149 ²
24:	36, 172	1160 = <i>CPJ</i> 150:	13 ³³ , 25 ¹⁰ , 40
<i>P. Oxy. Ined.</i> :	18, 33, 38, 131, 135 ¹⁸	1225:	16 ⁴⁰
<i>P. Princ.</i> 30:	42 ⁷¹	1231:	152
71:	33	1249:	135, 144-5, 147
133:	144, 146	1251:	142
<i>P. Ross.-Georg.</i> II 40:	33, 103 ⁸² , 108, 113, 137	1264:	65 ³³
V 28:	60 ¹⁹ , 77 ²⁰ , 82 ³⁰ , 170	1265:	38 ⁵³
V 60 ² :	77 ²⁰ , 170	1330:	58 ¹³ , 91, 135, 144, 170
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 77:	16, 18, 19 ⁴⁹ , 27 ¹⁶ , 39 ⁶¹ , 43, 44, 47 ⁸³ , 48, 99 ⁷⁷ , 109 ⁹⁵ , 122	1337:	115 ¹¹² , 140
86:	44, 98 ⁷²	<i>P. Strassb.</i> 58-64:	74, 75 ¹⁵ , 106 ⁸⁸ , 107 ⁹¹ , 170
174:	109 ⁹⁵	130:	15, 116 ¹¹⁵
599:	43, 44, 143	152:	85 ³⁸
656:	85,	254:	17 ⁴⁵ , 18
683:	147	296:	49
691:	140	<i>P. Teb.</i> 397 = <i>MChr.</i>	
701:	17 ⁴³ , 34, 40 ⁶⁶	321:	16, 42 ⁷² , 53
		403:	70 ³ , 106 ⁸⁸ , 107 ⁹¹ , 170
		<i>P. Thead.</i> 32:	26 ¹⁵
		33:	65 ³³
		34:	71 ⁵
		54-5:	85 ³⁸

P. Univ. Gen. inv. 1132:33		8246:	49
P. Vars. 15:	24 ⁶	8276:	15 ³⁸
P. Vindob. Boswinkel 7:	24 ⁸ , 66 ³⁵	8300:	14 ³⁴ , 116
P. Wis. 2:	115 ¹¹² , 170	8312:	44, 66, 67
12:	57, 134	8470:	14 ³⁵
32:	65 ³³ , 77 ²⁰ , 96 ⁶⁹ , 170	8477:	14 ³⁵
SB 592:	44	8481:	14 ³⁵
1963:	142	8506:	14 ³⁵
2664:	14 ³⁴	8821:	19 ⁵⁰
3996:	12	9016:	14, 116
3998:	15 ³⁸ , 116	9161-2:	142, 147
4275:	66 ³⁴	9192:	19 ⁵⁰ , 26 ¹⁴
5806:	146	9253:	77, 170
6612:	137	9502:	136
7261:	23, 27, 30 ²⁸ , 31 ³² , 111	9503:	141
7403:	11, 12, 32 ³⁶	9515:	140
7434:	19 ⁵⁰	9558:	60 ¹⁹ , 65 ³³
7601:	15, 40 ⁶⁶	9597:	31, 57, 65 ³³ , 81, 118, 156, 157, 170
7603:	14, 15, 40 ⁶⁶	9854:	141
7604:	15, 40 ⁶⁶	9878:	140
7634:	140	9902:	59, 61 ²²
7696:	24, 26 ¹² , 28-32, 35, 38, 53-5, 61 ²² , 61 ²³ , 61 ²⁴ , 62-3, 64 ^{31a} , 70 ² , 99 ⁷⁷ , 101-5, 107, 112, 118, 123, 170	9997:	19 ⁵⁰
7814:	25, 115 ¹¹¹ , 144, 150 ⁴	SEG XIV 479:	9 ¹² , 22 ¹ , 22 ²
7817:	18	SP XX 50:	42 ⁷²
7905:	40	XX 60:	33, 55, 61 ²² , 84, 105 ⁸⁶ , 170
8010:	16 ⁴⁰	XX 99:	60 ¹⁹ , 60 ²⁰ , 65 ³³
		WChr. 27:	14 ³⁴ , 15, 32, 66
		41:	60 ²⁰
		288-9:	85 ³⁸
		WO 682:	71 ⁵

B. Literary and Legal Texts

[Aristotle], Ath. Pol.		10.32.6:	26 ¹⁵
4; 8; 21:	7 ¹	C. Theod. 12.1.4:	10 ¹⁸
53-9:	7 ²	12.1.10:	10 ¹⁸
Cassius Dio, 51.17.2:	12, 13 ³³	12.1.12:	10 ¹⁸
72.16.3:	28 ²¹	12.1.13:	10 ¹⁸
Corpus Gloss. Lat.,		12.1.22:	10 ¹⁸
3.182.44:	158 ⁴	12.1.24:	10 ¹⁸
C. Just. 9.47.12:	32 ³³	12.1.27:	10 ¹⁸
9.32.4:	32 ³³	12.1.80:	31

12.1.126:	24 ⁸	41.1-2:	9 ¹¹
12.1.189:	24 ⁸ , 158 ³	45.7:	9 ¹² , 10 ¹⁵ , 23 ²
12.1.190:	24 ⁸	45.9:	10 ¹⁶
Aulus Gellius, 3.18:	29 ²⁶	48.11:	9 ¹²
<i>Historia Augusta, Sev.</i>		50.7:	10 ¹⁵
17.2:	13, 18	50.10:	10 ¹⁵
<i>Historia Augusta, Aur.</i>		Pliny, <i>Ep.</i> 1.19:	28 ²¹
32 ff.:	152 ⁶	10.39:	10 ¹⁶ , 23 ²
33.5:	152	10.79:	9 ¹¹ , 9 ¹² , 25 ¹¹
34.3:	152	10.80:	9 ¹¹ , 9 ¹² , 25 ¹¹
45.1:	71	10.112:	8 ⁷ , 9 ¹² , 23 ²
<i>Historia Augusta, Quad.</i>		10.113:	9 ¹² , 23 ²
Tyr. 3 ff.:	152 ⁶	10.114:	9 ¹¹
Isidorus, <i>Origines</i>		10.115:	9 ¹¹
9.4.25:	158 ⁴	Plutarch, <i>Solon</i> 19:	7 ¹
Julian, <i>Misopogon</i>		Plutarch, <i>Moralia</i> 814C:	8 ⁷
(Hertlein) 475:	10 ¹⁹	Polybius, 22.5.10:	8
Libanius, <i>Or.</i> 2.35:	10 ²²	27.7.2:	8
43.13:	11 ²³	29.10.4:	8
48.3:	10 ¹⁷	Strabo, 14.1.21:	7 ³
48.6:	10 ¹⁷	17.1.12:	13
48.25:	10 ¹⁷	17.1.42:	11
49.12:	10 ¹⁸	Suetonius, <i>Aug.</i> 41:	28 ²¹
Libanius, <i>Ep.</i> 374-5:	10 ²⁰	Tacitus, <i>Ann.</i> 2.59.4:	3 ¹
Libanius, <i>De Patrociniiis</i>		12.60.3:	3 ¹
9-10:	10 ²¹	Tacitus, <i>Hist.</i> 1.11.1:	3 ¹
Livy, 42.45.4:	8	Velleius Paterculus,	
Dio of Prusa, <i>Or.</i> 40.6:	10 ¹⁶	39.2:	3 ¹
40.14:	9 ¹²		



IN V. D. LIBRARIIS



Elmer Holmes
Bobst Library

New York
University

