

AMERICAN STUDIES IN PAPYROLOGY

For
Prof. Naphtali Lewis

ἀγαθῶι ποιητῆι
ἰδιώτης αὐτοσχεδιάζων

AMERICAN STUDIES IN PAPYROLOGY
VOLUME EIGHTEEN

*IMPERIAL ESTATES
IN ROMAN EGYPT*

GEORGE M. PARASSOGLOU

ADOLF M. HAKKERT • AMSTERDAM • MCMLXXVIII

HD
130

.P37

1978 /4/

Set in Times Roman by Fotron S.A., Athens
Printed in Greece

Published for
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PAPYROLOGISTS
by
ADOLF M. HAKKERT
Calle Alfambra 26
Las Palmas G.C., Spain

Copyright 1978 A.M. Hakkert

I.S.B.N. 90 256 0744 6
I.S.B.N. 90 256 0754 3

Preface


I have but few points to clarify or emphasize in advance, for if this study does not succeed in justifying itself in the eyes of the reader, it is pointless that I undertake to do so here myself. My aim has not been to add another work to the roster of books and articles on the imperial estates throughout the empire. My purpose has been much more modest and limited: I deal only with Egypt, and only with the period during which the emperors were in fact personal owners of private property in that province. This is not the first time that such a study has been undertaken, nor will it be the last. In some areas I repeat or reinforce the opinions of my predecessors; in many others I offer a different approach and, hopefully, a more plausible interpretation. Throughout this work I have tried to guide myself by two strong beliefs: that certainties are luxuries a papyrologist ought to learn to live without; and that it is always more advantageous to the progress of knowledge to confess ignorance than to construct false edifices.

A slightly different version of this study was presented as a dissertation to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University in November 1972. To Professor Ramsay MacMullen, who supervised the writing of it, I am grateful for helping me glimpse something of Roman history, a history which as a Hellenist and a philologist I had always neglected; for trying to make my English readable; and for forcing me, time and again, to elucidate various points and to avoid lack of precision or of documentation. To Professor Naphtali Lewis, who suggested that I undertake this study, I am grateful for showing me my first papyrus and teaching me how to read it; for revealing to me a new and strange wonderland; and for offering me a large number of improved readings and of various suggestions, all of which I gratefully incorporated in my text. To both I tender my warmest thanks.

My thanks are also due to many other scholars whose assistance has proven invaluable. Some supplied me with offprints or copies of their work; others with photographs or transcripts of published as well as unpublished papyri; all took time to offer me help and advice. I am particularly grateful to Dr. R. A. Coles, Prof. J. F. Gilliam, Prof. H. G. Gundel, Mrs. S. Kambitsis, Prof. J. G. Keenan, Dr. H.-C. Kuhnke, Miss G. Matheson, Prof. W. Müller, Dr. G. Poethke, Prof. J. Scherer, Prof. J. Schwartz, Prof. R. Seider, Prof. E. Seidl, Mr. T. C. Skeat, Prof. A. Tomsin, Prof. E. G. Turner, Dr. C. Voigt, Prof. H. C. Youtie, and the Trustees of the British Museum, London.

Athens,
December 1972

G. M. P.



Contents

Preface	v
Abbreviations	viii
Chapter One: Origins and Terminology	3
Chapter Two: The Julio-Claudians in Egypt	15
Chapter Three: Location, Size and Type of Land	30
Chapter Four: Administration and Manpower	50
Appendix One: Non-Imperial Οὐοίατ	65
Appendix Two: Imperial Properties: The Evidence	69
Appendix Three: Note on the <i>Procurator Usiacus</i>	84
Bibliography	91
Addenda	100
Indexes	103

Abbreviations

For papyrological publications the standard abbreviations have been employed and should cause no difficulties. The non-expert may consult E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri. An Introduction*, 1968, pp. 154 ff., or M. David and B. A. van Groningen, *Papyrological Primer*, 1965, pp. 6* ff. As a rule all corrections recorded in *BL* (=F. Preisigke et al., *Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten*, 1922-69), are assumed as having been incorporated into the texts; later corrections, or ones that require comment, are given full documentation.


A number of unpublished papyri have been used for this dissertation, and are collected here for the reader's convenience. Prof. J. Scherer presented me with the late R. Rémondon's transcripts, and subsequently with photographs of P. Sorbonne inv. 2364, 2367 and 2370, also known as P. Weill inv. 104, 108 and 114. He was also kind enough to undertake a long and tedious, and unfortunately unproductive, search for the Louvre papyrus mentioned by Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 121. Prof. A. Tomsin kindly gave me information regarding P. Berl. inv. 11534, 11550 recto, 11550 verso, and 11561 recto, and allowed me to use the numbers assigned them by the late T. Kalén for their forthcoming publication, supervised by Prof. Tomsin, namely *P. Berl. Leihg.* 29, 31, 33 and 37. Dr. G. Poethke presented me with a full transcript of P. Berl. inv. 11529, a section of SB 10512 which he will soon publish in *APF*. Finally, Mrs. Kambitsis, who is preparing an edition of the carbonized papyri from Thmouis, was kind enough to send me long transcripts of P. Reinach inv. 2062, of two small scraps, frs. 14 and 36, of the collection of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Paris, and of P. Bibl. Nationale de Paris, Suppl. gr. 1374, frs. 44 and 48a-b. [See below, Addenda.]

With regards to non-papyrological publications, standard abbreviations have been also used. For the works of Greek and Latin classical authors see *LSJ* (=Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., 1940) and *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 1968-. For periodicals and serial publications the abbreviations in use in *L'année philologique* have been employed whenever possible; for these, as well as for references consisting of the author's last name plus a catchword from the title, see the Bibliography at the end of this work, where all abbreviations are expanded.

The following are additional cases:

<i>CIG</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum</i> . Berlin, 1828-77.
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i> . Berlin, 1863-.
<i>DEAR</i>	<i>Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane</i> .
<i>IGRR</i>	R. Cagnat et al., <i>Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes</i> . Paris, 1911-27.
<i>PIR¹, PIR²</i>	<i>Prosopographia imperii Romani saec. I, II, III</i> . 1st ed., E. Klebs, H. Dessau, P. de Rohden. Berlin, 1897-98. 2nd ed., E. Groag, A. Stein, L. Petersen. Berlin/Leipzig, 1933-.
<i>SDHI</i>	<i>Studia et documenta historiae et iuris</i> .
Dessau, <i>ILS</i>	H. Dessau, <i>Inscriptiones Latinae selectae</i> . Berlin, 1892-1916.

IMPERIAL ESTATES
IN ROMAN EGYPT



Chapter One

Origins and Terminology

Augustus' brilliant victory off Actium and his subsequent conquest of Egypt, accomplished with relative ease, made him undisputed ruler of the largest and richest grain-producing area in antiquity. From August of 30 B.C. to January of 27 B.C., when he relinquished his extraordinary war powers and at which time he probably surrendered as well his possession of Egypt to the *aerarium*, Augustus ruled Egypt as an absolute monarch.¹ Directly or indirectly (through his first two prefects, C. Cornelius Gallus and Aelius Gallus), he initiated a far-reaching reorganization of the administrative machinery and the economy — a reorganization which was still in progress as late as the prefecture of C. Petronius (24-1 B.C.).

Although thwarted in his attempt to display Cleopatra as the crowning touch of his triumph planned for 29 B.C., Augustus succeeded in securing her private fortune, a treasure by all accounts immense. Estimated at over one billion sesterces, accumulated over three centuries of Ptolemaic autocracy, and lately augmented by the confiscations carried out by Cleopatra after her defeat, its loss was a serious blow to the economy of Egypt, but its capture of paramount importance to Augustus. He was in great need of ready money and the treasure enabled him not only to repay the considerable loans advanced to him prior to and during his campaign against M. Antonius, but also to discharge other heavy obligations: large bounties to his generals and officers; land for his soldiers' colonization (none, it should be noted, within the borders of Egypt) and the promised bonuses; a donative of four hundred sesterces to each of approximately a quarter of a million members of the *plebs* of Rome; and probably the repairs of the temples undertaken in 28 as well as the cost of the games of the triumph of 29 B.C. Augustus' fear that Cleopatra might carry out her threat and burn this vast fortune together with herself in her mausoleum was indeed understandable.²

1. Immediately upon this surrender, of course, Egypt was returned to him as an imperial province, for him to govern and administer through an equestrian procurator as he saw fit. The idea, however, that Augustus considered Egypt as his private domain, and that subsequent emperors followed him in this, is quite wrong. This is not the meaning of the famous passage of the *Res gestae: Aegyptum imperio populi Romani adieci* (5.24), or of Velleius' well-known assertion that the annual revenues from Egypt in *aerarium redditus contulit* (2.39); cf. *CIL IV* 701, 702=Dessau, *ILS* 91, *Aegypto in potestatem populi Romani redacta*. See briefly Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 28 f. Hence, to consider the οὐσιακός λόγος (on which below, Chapter II) as "a curious sort of imperial patrimony within Egypt, which as a whole was regarded as a personal possession of the crown" (F.F.

Abbott and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, 1926, p. 34), is to introduce a dangerous differentiation between Egypt and the other provinces which did not exist. The current, and I believe correct, theory sees Roman rule in Egypt not as a simple continuation of the monarchic administration of the Ptolemies, but as an effort to incorporate this important province into the empire. See now N. Lewis, "Greco-Roman Egypt: Fact or Fiction?" *Amer. Stud. in Pap.* 7, 1970, pp. 3 ff.

2. I follow on the whole the persuasive arguments of T. Frank, "On Augustus and the Aerarium," *JRS* 23, 1933, pp. 143 ff., and *Rome and Italy of the Empire*, pp. 7 ff. On Cleopatra's threat see Dio Cass., 51.8.5.

As for the second, and more durable, part of the conquest, the very land of Egypt, Augustus introduced some important changes. Approximately 800,000 km² (or ca. 300,000,000 arourae) were added to the empire with the bite of an asp, of which only about 20,000 km² (or ca. 7,000,000 arourae) were cultivated or cultivable, the remainder being inhospitable desert. The tax revenue in grain from this land, however, was of great importance to Augustus and was sorely needed in Rome. Changes made by the Romans in the Ptolemaic administration of land were designed to curb the influence of the priesthood, to encourage the development of private ownership of land (at least to the extent that this was possible and practical, i.e. profitable, in Egypt), but above all to change the basic structure of the country from a Ptolemaic kingdom to a Roman province which, regardless of the peculiarities that persisted, was brought into line with the rest of the empire.³

The royal or domain land, the γῆ βασιλική which the Ptolemies had taken over from the pharaohs with little change, was now taken over by the Romans *en bloc*. It was transformed into *ager publicus*, as Roman law regarding the territories of conquered peoples dictated, and was placed under the control of the prefect and his immediate subordinate in charge of fiscal responsibilities, the *dioiketes*. Its administration was the primary function of the διοίκησις, the Egyptian *fiscus*. To this, by far the largest portion of cultivated and cultivable land, there was added the γῆ δημοσία, a category which still remains obscure.⁴ The administration of these two categories was identical, however, and any distinction between them, if indeed one was ever strongly felt, ceased to exist, and the terms βασιλική and δημοσία took on the same meaning of public or fiscal land.

In reality, of course, this was little more than an alteration in nomenclature. The lot of the local Egyptian tenant, the βασιλικός or δημόσιος γεωργός who leased and farmed the land, did not change with regard to his legal or economic status. The cultivation of the land and the exploitation of the fellahin remained basically unaltered, although the collection of rents and taxes was now more rigorously enforced than under the Ptolemies.

But the second category of Ptolemaic land, ἡ ἐν ἀφέσει γῆ, or "land released" by the king,⁵ underwent radical changes. That part of it which made up the temple land, the γῆ ἱερατική, was substantially reduced in size by the simple and drastic procedure of removing it from the control of the priests and assigning it to the administration of the *fiscus*.⁶ In a real as well as in a legal sense it became public land, and the power of the priesthood, which not even the strongest of the Ptolemies had succeeded in curbing effectively, was crushed once and for all.

The remaining released land comprised two similar categories, the δωρεά, or large areas of land granted by the kings either to members of the royal family or to trusted high as well as local government officials, and the κλῆροι, smaller allotments given to various classes of soldiers and local guards.⁷

3. I cannot enter here into any lengthy discussion of the classification of the land, and my presentation is of necessity sketchy. Valuable information and useful tables in O. Eger, *Zum ägyptischen Grundbuchwesen in römischer Zeit*, 1909, p. 31; Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 1 ff. (Ptolemaic), pp. 85 ff. (Roman period), still the standard work; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 287 ff.; Hohlwein, *L'Égypte romaine*, s.v. γῆ; Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 25 ff.; Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 1 ff.

4. See now A. Tomsin, "Βασιλική et δημοσία γῆ dans l'Égypte romaine," *Mélanges ... René Fohalle*, pp. 271 ff.

5. Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 4 ff.; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 270 ff.; J. Herrmann, "Zum Begriff γῆ ἐν ἀφέσει," *Chronique* 30, 1955, pp. 95 ff. (but cf. E. Seidl, *SDHI* 21, 1955,

p. 457); J. C. Shelton, "Ptolemaic Land ἐν ἀφέσει: an Observation on the Terminology," *Chronique* 46, 1971, pp. 113 ff.

6. The *locus classicus* is *P. Tebt. 302.6-7*, σιτικάς ἀρούρας φδ' τὸ πρότερον τῶν προκιμένων θεῶν, ἀναληφθείσας δὲ ὑπὸ Πετρωνίου] τοῦ ἡγεμονεύσαντος εἰς βασιλικὴν γῆν (the rest of the document makes the restoration certain). See F. Schubart, *GGA* 170, 1908, p. 194; Otto, *Priester und Tempel*, *passim*; Rostovtzeff, *GGA* 171, 1909, pp. 626 ff. and *Kolonat*, pp. 101, 164, 178; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 114, 300.

7. The classic discussion of δωρεά is still Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate in Egypt*; see also C. C. Edgar's introd. to *P. Mich. Zen.*, 1931, and E. Wipszycka, "The δωρεά of Apollonios the

At present we have no information regarding the number of the δωρεαί in existence just prior to the Roman conquest, let alone their size or location. It should be noted, however, that immediately after her defeat off Actium, Cleopatra punished her enemies, and especially those in high administrative positions, by death, confiscation, or both, and further augmented her treasury (perhaps with a view to renewed resistance to Augustus) by plundering various temples and shrines: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀσφαλεῖ ἐγένετο, πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν πρώτων, ἀτε καὶ ἀεὶ οἱ ἀχθομένων, καὶ τότε ἐπὶ τῇ συμφορᾷ αὐτῆς ἐπηρομένων, ἐφόνευσε, πολὺν δὲ καὶ πλοῦτον, ἐκ τε τῶν ἐκείνων κτημάτων καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ ὁσίων καὶ θείων, μηδενὸς τῶν πάνυ ἀβάτων ἱερῶν φειδομένη, ἥθροις (Dio Cass., 51.5.4-5). In this instance κτήματα can mean only landed estates and, given the land administration of Ptolemaic Egypt, are almost certainly δωρεαί.

The δωρεαί that survived the confiscations of Cleopatra certainly did not survive those of Augustus. This time it was the members of the royal family, the loyal supporters of the queen, her trusted officials, and those who had taken the field against the Romans who were the primary, though not the sole, victims: πολλὰ δὲ καὶ παρ' ἐκάστου τῶν αἰτιαθέντων τι ἥθροισθη. καὶ χωρὶς οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες, ὅσοι μηδὲν ἴδιον ἔγκλημα λαβεῖν ἐδύναντο, τὰ δύο μέρη τῶν οὐσιῶν ἥτηθησαν (Dio Cass., 51.17.7). Here, too, in both πολλά and οὐσίαι we should see landed properties as well as money and treasures.

In spite of constant assertions to the contrary, I am convinced that no new δωρεαί were created by Augustus or by any other emperor. In the first attempt at a systematic examination of the categories of land in Egypt, M. Rostovtzeff stated that “the οὐσίαι were the successors of the γῆ ἐν δωρεᾷ and, at least to some extent, privileged (as were also the δωρεαί) estates granted by the emperor.”⁸ A few years later, in his study of the Ptolemaic δωρεαί, the identification is presented in even stronger terms: “A temporary revival of the δωρεαί is to be found in the δωρεαί [sic] of Roman imperial times, grants which some leading persons in Rome received from the heirs of the Ptolemies, the Roman Emperors.”⁹ In this Rostovtzeff has been followed by almost all scholars, although the equation of οὐσίαι with δωρεαί has never been proven. So P. Collart defined οὐσίαι as “the large estates granted by the emperors, at the beginning of the Roman conquest, to members of their family, to favourites, to leading Roman, Greek and Egyptian persons. They are comparable, *mutatis mutandis*, to the δωρεαί of the Ptolemaic period, being closer to them than to the Byzantine *latifundia*.¹⁰ In the opening paragraph of his work on taxation, S. L. Wallace wrote that “to the members of the imperial family and to favourites ... were granted estates which comprised the most fruitful land in Egypt. ... These large private estates, like the δωρεαί of the Ptolemaic period, satisfied a temporary need and later reverted to the Roman emperors, either through inheritance or by confiscation, when they were no longer necessary to the most efficient exploitation of Egypt.”¹¹ In a lecture given in Alexandria, P. Jouquet said that “like the kings of the third century [B.C.], who had granted tenures of land, occasionally of considerable size, to their soldiers, and large estates to their favourites and to high officials ... Augustus too granted — and his successors imitated him — Egyptian land to princes of

Dioeketes in the Memphite Nome,” *Klio* 39, 1961, pp. 153 ff. There is a good list of Ptolemaic δωρεαί in W. Peremans and E. Van 't Dack, *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* IV (Studia Hellenistica 12, 1959), pp. 169 ff. For κλῆροι see esp. J. Lesquier, *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, 1911, pp. 202 ff.; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 303 ff.; Rostovtzeff, “The Foundation of Social and Economic Life in Hellenistic Times,” *JEA* 6, 1920, pp. 161 ff.; C. Préaux, *L'économie royale des Lagides*, 1939, pp. 463 ff.; F. Uebel, *Die*

Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern, 1968, with discussion and lists; lists also in *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* IV, pp. 57 ff.; F. Zucker, “Beobachtungen zu den permanenten Klerosnamen,” *Studien ... Friedrich Oertel*, 1964, pp. 101 ff.

8. *Kolonat*, p. 128.

9. *A Large Estate in Egypt*, p. 145.

10. *P. Bour.*, pp. 159 f.

11. *Taxation*, p. 1.

the imperial family and to great servants of the state.”¹²

It is one of the objects of this study to illustrate the insubstantiality of this view, while the evidence will, of necessity, be examined in various parts of this work as the occasion arises. But I should point out here that the very discontinuation of the term δωρεά in reference to allotments of land must be taken as an indication of the fact that, with the end of the Ptolemies, this institution also came to an end.¹³ It was a Hellenistic concept for which there was no room within the Roman system of government and provincial administration, nor indeed within the Roman law.

I have been able to find only one scholar, T. Frank, who does not share the commonly accepted theory regarding imperial estates in Egypt, and who expressed, in two generally ignored footnotes, my own way of thinking. “The assumption,” he wrote, “that Octavian gave Egyptian plots to members of his family ... seems to me impossible to believe. ... Even Julius Caesar did not do that kind of thing. The agents of relatives like Livia may have bought properties at the auctions of confiscated Egyptian land, and one may be offended at such participation, but at least the legal Roman forms were probably observed.”¹⁴ A few years later he stressed the point that “it would be unwise to suppose that when Octavian confiscated the estates of Cleopatra’s partisans in Egypt he distributed some of these directly to Livia and her sons, even though their names are later connected with such properties in the papyri. ... This assumption has been made by many, but it completely misrepresents the spirit of Augustus’ administration. Roman business agents would accompany an expedition like that of Octavian and bid in properties at the public auction. In some such way, I doubt not, the agents of members of the royal household secured their plots in Egypt.”¹⁵

The fate of military κλῆροι, in a sense small-scale δωρεά, was totally different. They, too, were a Hellenistic institution totally alien to Roman tradition and practice. Moreover, they were now obsolete and unnecessary, for the Roman army in Egypt would henceforth be an occupation force living in military camps, not scattered in the countryside, and certainly not cultivating fields. Augustus carried to its inevitable and logical conclusion the reluctantly conceded tendency (and it never was anything more than a tendency) of the last Ptolemies to treat these allotments as if they were private property. Those holders of γῆ κληρουχική (and in the Arsinoite, where there was a heavy concentration of Greco-Macedonian κάτοικοι, of more privileged γῆ κατοικική) who were alive at the time of the conquest and whose allotments were not confiscated were granted full rights of *possessio*.

Since ownership of γῆ κληρουχική or κατοικική entailed exemption from the capitation tax, as well as some other minor privileges, non-Hellenized Egyptians were barred from owning such land. They were, nevertheless, allowed, if not actively encouraged, to purchase unproductive or neglected land of other categories and cultivate it, and in such instances they, too, were granted all the rights of *possessio*.

This institution of private ownership of land is one of the most radical changes introduced in Egypt by the Romans, and the example most illustrative of the fundamental differences between Hellenistic and Roman tradition. The encouragement of such ownership was very active during the entire rule of the Julio-Claudians, and the sudden and abrupt introduction of such a novel

12. *La domination romaine*, pp. 14 f.; see also Kuhnke, Οὐδιακή Γῆ, p. 4, n. 1, and below, Appendix I.

13. In P. Ryl. 207a (II) the Κομανοῦ δωρεά is a Ptolemaic one; see the editor’s comments. The term continued, of course, to be commonly used for an emperor’s grants of privileges and *beneficia*; e.g., BGU 140 (Hadrian’s δωρεά by which the

illegitimate sons of soldiers and veterans were admitted to succession *ab intestato*), and BGU 655 (the *constitutio Antoniniana*); cf. also Dessau, ILS 8794 (Nero).

14. *JRS* 23, 1933, p. 146, n. 7.

15. *Rome and Italy of the Empire*, p. 26, n. 47.

concept in a country which had been for millennia totally unaware of it created a checker-board effect in all parts of Egypt. This is most notable in the Arsinoite, for which our information is more complete and where there was a greater concentration of privately owned land than in any other part of Egypt. Soon, perhaps already by the end of Augustus' reign, it became the rule rather than the exception that an individual's private holdings in land formed not a geographical unity but a scattering in various parts of a village, and often in many villages. The right, now introduced for the first time as a consequence of the introduction of private ownership, to divide up one's land among one's relatives in one's will contributed not a little to this. Other equally important factors were the constant buying and selling of portions of landed properties, confiscation for non-payment of taxes, reselling of such lands by the state, or the purchase of whatever pieces of land were offered by the department of the *idios logos*. This lack of topographical unity is more evident in larger holdings and even more so in imperial estates which, due to the constancy of nomenclature, can be traced over longer periods of time, and which, once they became part of the *patrimonium principis*, tended to fossilize, at least as far as their boundaries were concerned. But it is erroneous to assert that scattered parcels are characteristic of only one type of estate, the so-called *oὐοία*. It is the norm in Egypt, whether the land is an imperial estate of immense size or the humble property of a fellah consisting of a few arourae.¹⁶

Half a century, however, of weak and incompetent rule prior to the fall of Egypt, the civil wars that marred the early part of Cleopatra's reign, the queen's policies and preoccupations, and the disastrous defeat off Actium had left ineradicable scars upon the very land itself. Whatever the subsequent effects of the Roman administration and exploitation of Egypt (and there can be no doubt that in the long run they were calamitous), the early part of the Julio-Claudian regime saw the introduction of a new life to a sagging economy and the return to productivity of large areas of neglected land.¹⁷ In the Arsinoite, for example, which was and still is the pride and problem of Egypt, the irrigation system was in a deplorable state of neglect, and the desert had reclaimed much of the land that more energetic and thoughtful Ptolemies had wrested from it. Augustus did employ his legions in the task of cleaning and deepening the canals there and elsewhere in Egypt, but there remained the more arduous toil of reclaiming the land.¹⁸

This land was, of course, ownerless, and as such was classed as state or domain land, although the distinction between γῆ βασιλική and κλῆροι was maintained for reasons of taxation. It never was the practice, either of the Ptolemies or of the Romans, to bring such land back to

16. Cf. Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 124: "From the data available in the grain receipts [e.g., *P. Chic.*], it appears that at least some *oὐοία* were set out as parcels of land belonging to the areas of various villages. Geographical and topographical unity does not belong to the characteristics of an *oὐοία*. What gives the *oὐοία* its unity is the fact that the entire complex belongs to one and the same person. This complex was soon given the name *oὐοία*, property, and was called by the name of its owner." This basically correct observation, however, has often been misinterpreted to mean that lack of geographical or topographical unity is one of the major characteristics of a special kind of private property (e.g., Collart, *P. Bour.*, p. 160). We should also note the often ignored fact that, while the entire complex of various plots may be called *oὐοία*, so may also each individual component, e.g. the *oὐοία* of Seneca was made up of more than a dozen *oὐοία* in various localities. In *P. Wisc.* 19.2, 21.2 and *P. Mich. inv.* 366.2 (*ZPE* 1, 1967, p. 165), we even hear of a κάτω *oὐοία* (implying an ἄνω), which is but the Greek parallel to such Latin expressions as *fundus* or *ager superior* and *inferior*, or *major* and *minor*; see A. Schulten, "Fundus,"

DEAR III, 1906, esp. pp. 341 f. It would be pointless to list here all the known instances of privately held land which did not constitute a continuous whole. Wealthier persons purchased, and fellahin leased or subleased, whatever desirable piece of land was available.

17. In addition to general histories (e.g., Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 273 ff.) see esp. J.G. Milne, "The Ruin of Egypt by Roman Mismanagement," *JRS* 17, 1927, pp. 1 ff.; Rostovtzeff, "Roman Exploitation of Egypt in the First Century A. D.," *Journal of Econ. and Business Hist.* 1, 1928/9, pp. 337 ff.; H. I. Bell, "The Economic Crisis in Egypt under Nero," *JRS* 28, 1938, pp. 1 ff.; A. Piganiol, "Le statut augustéen de l'Égypte et sa déstruction," *MH* 10, 1953, pp. 193 ff.; Chalon, *L'édit*, pp. 53 ff.

18. Dio Cass., 51.18.1, τάς τε διώρυχας τάς μὲν ἔξεχάθησε τάς δὲ ἐκ καυνῆς διώρυξ. Cf. Suet., *Aug.* 18: *Aegyptum in provinciae formam redactam ut feracionem habilioremque annonae urbicae redderet, fossas omnis, in quas Nilus exaestuat, oblimatas longa vetustate militari opere detersit.*

cultivation through forced labor. Classed as "land in deduction," ὑπόλογος γῆ, it was considered ἄφορος, unproductive, and although βασιλικοί and δημόσιοι γεωργοί often leased it from the state, it was more desirable that an individual should purchase and bring it back to constant, if partial, productivity.¹⁹ Such land was rarely good for raising cereals, but under proper care it could be ideal for vineyards, olive groves or kitchen-gardens; at the very least it could be sown with grass and used for raising sheep and cattle. To encourage such purchases, three years of full exemption from taxation, ἀτέλεια, and in some instances five more years of partial exemption, κουφοτέλεια, were offered to the new owner.²⁰

It was under such circumstances, and possibly in some similar ways (although to a far greater extent, since wealthier and more powerful personalities were involved), that the genesis and blossoming of large estates suddenly took place in Egypt. Those that later became part of the *patrimonium principis* stand out not so much because of their size (some of them were indeed very large, but others were of average, if not small, size),²¹ but because the names of their original Roman owners were permanently affixed to them. Hence we can follow their history, and in some cases speculate about their origins, even though very often the earliest available documentary evidence comes from many years after the death of their owners. Of the other estates formed during the Julio-Claudian period we know little, since their appellation was not constant, and since many of them may have been broken up in wills or parcelled out in sales. We should not forget, too, the distressing fact that the first half of the first century A.D. is perhaps the least documented period of the Roman occupation of Egypt. But estates, owned by Romans, Alexandrian Greeks and Jews, as well as Greek metropolitans in various nomes, and totally unconnected with the imperial house, did exist, although their numbers declined seriously during the second half of the first and the first half of the second centuries.²²

The ways in which land could be acquired for the formation of an estate were diverse. It is very likely that the lands of the δωρεαί and those confiscated κλῆροι which at the time of the conquest were under cultivation were offered for sale at public auctions. Neglected and wasted land, from both γῆ βασιλική and κλῆροι, was offered either at the same public auctions or, as we have seen, at low and standard prices by the department of the *idios logos*. Private holdings, of course, of various sizes and value were available for sale whenever their owners felt the desire or the need to sell. Immediately after the conquest some parcels of land may have been given by Augustus to those members of his staff who welcomed part of their *manubiae* in landed property,

19. Definition in *P. Oxy.* 2847.12-15, [ὑπόλογος· ἀπάσης τῆς ἀφόροις ὁ[ύ]στης κ[υρι]ακῆ[ς] διὰ τοιετίας ἐπίσκεψις γείνεται· καλεῖται δὲ] ὑπόλογος ἐπειδὴ ὑπολογεῖται ἐκ τοῦ μέτρου τ[ῆς γῆς τοῦ κατὰ πεδίον ὡς ὑπολειφθῆναι τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμφορον. Discussion in Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 95 ff.; Hohlwein, *L'Égypte romaine*, pp. 160 ff.; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 360 ff.; Plaumann, *Der Idioslogos*, pp. 61 ff.; C. H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, "A Sale of ὑπόλογος at Tebtunis," *Aeg.* 13, 1933, pp. 455 ff.; M. Talamanca, "Contributi allo studio delle vendite all'asta nel mondo classico," *MAL Ser.* VIII 6:2, 1954, pp. 175 ff.; Skeat, *P. Beatty Panop.* 2.129 n.; Youtie et al., *P. Petaus* 17-23 introd.

20. Ownerless and confiscated κλῆροι, the land of which had become unproductive through inattention, were joined to neglected royal and public land, and both categories, sometimes collectively termed ὑπόλογος βασιλική γῆ, were under the administration of the *idios logos*. The *locus classicus* and one of the earliest surviving petitions for the purchase of such land is *P. Oxy.* 721 (13/14). Note that the petitioners are two Greeks (since the plots in question are confiscated κλῆροι) perhaps

forming a corporation; that a three-year ἀτέλεια is offered; that the petition is addressed to the *idios logos*. Similar documents from the Augustan period are *P. Oxy.* 635 (13) and *P. Soc.* 320 (18); see Tomsin, "Les continuités," p. 83. Worth noticing is the remarkably low price, 10 to 12 silver drachmae per aroura (the average for sales of land in private ownership during the first century was 185 silver drachmae per aroura; see Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, p. 147), which, coupled with the short-term remission of taxation, was designed to encourage buyers.

21. See below, Chapter III.

22. Examples of medium-sized and large estates (in addition to the non-imperial οὐοῖα listed below, Appendix I) from the early Julio-Claudian period: *P. Soc.* 1129 (24 B.C.) Tebtunis; *BGU* 1118 (22 B.C.) Alexandria; *P. Oxy.* 277 (19 B.C.) Oxyrhynchite; *P. Fay.* 101 (ca. 18 B.C.) Euhermeria; *BGU* 1129 (13 B.C.) Bousirite; *P. Lond.* 1171 (8 B.C.); *BGU* 1120 (5 B.C.) Alexandria; *BGU* 1123 (30 B.C. - A.D. 14) Menelaite, 1084 arourae of vineyard, corn-land and marshes; *P. Mich.* 232 (36) Arsinoite.

but this is very uncertain. If such were indeed the case, this could apply to two members of the imperial entourage who are known to have had estates in Egypt, Maecenas and Lurius.²³

In determining the exact legal status of a plot of land prior to its incorporation into an imperial estate we are faced with serious, and at times insurmountable, difficulties. Γῆ βασιλική, for example, upon private purchase became ἔωνημένη, and as such was classed or spoken of as ἴδιωτική or as ἴδιοκτητος, and there was no reason to refer to it by its former appellation. After the creation of the οὐσιακός λόγος, moreover, the land of the imperial *patrimonium* was termed οὐσιακή, and to call it βασιλική was a serious error (and one which no source seems to have committed), since the two categories were under different administrative departments.²⁴ Thus it is impossible to state with any degree of confidence to what extent royal land contributed to the formation of imperial estates in the Julio-Claudian period.

On the other hand we are on firmer ground when trying to detect the presence of γῆ κατοικική or κληρουχική in these estates. In some instances such an estate may be surrounded by olive groves or vineyards which are privately owned, or by land which is specifically termed κληρουχική; and this is a good indication that the estate too was made up of land of the same category.²⁵ Κλῆροι, moreover, tended to retain their names, and the evidence is certain when a parcel of an imperial property is called κλῆρος or ὁ τοῦ δεῖνα κλῆρος. This tendency survived well into the third century, since it was a convenient way of specifying a given section of a property. Thus κλῆροι are mentioned in the estates of Livia, Maecenas, Seneca, Messalina, Lurius and Doryphorus, as well as in other, unnamed, imperial properties, and are found in the Arsinoite, the Oxyrhynchite, the Herakleopolite, and the Hermopolite nomes.²⁶

The same phenomenon is also evident in the names of some of the former owners of various pieces of private properties which later became part of imperial estates. Although such names do not normally appear in long or complex official records such as cadastres and taxation lists, they are employed in documents such as petitions, lease applications, and accounts of estate supervisors. We have, therefore, a number of vineyards, olive groves, palm-tree plantations, farm houses, and localities which retained the name of their former owner, sometimes as late as the third century.²⁷

The estates that were created in this manner and which later contributed to the formation of the *patrimonium principis* were referred to in a variety of ways. The commonest of these, and the one that has caused considerable trouble, is οὐσία. From the Ptolemaic period down to Arabic times

23. See Frank, *Rome and Italy of the Empire*, p. 26, n. 47.

24. See below, Chapter II.

25. *P. Mich.* 274-5; *P. Aberd.* 96; cf. Tomsin, "Notes," p. 211.

26. *P. Ryl.* 166.8, 27, property of C. Iulius Alexandros, later of Livia (Euhemeria); *P. Mich.* 274-5.8, Maecenas (Ibion Eikosipentarouron); *P. Aberd.* 29.5, Maecenas (Arsinoite); *P. Oxy.* 2873.10-11, ἐκ τοῦ Διοτείμου κλήρου, Seneca (Oxy.); *SB* 10527.11-12, Lurius (Tebtunis); *CPR* 243.12, ἐκ τοῦ Μενελάου κλήρου, Messalina (Ankyron), cf. *P. Ryl.* 87; *P. Ryl.* 99.3, ἐκ τοῦ Δημητρίου κλήρου, Doryphorus and Seneca (Toou); *BGU* 1895.59, τινῶν οὐσιακῶν κλήρου κατοικικῶν (Theadelphia); *P. Ryl.* 168.4-5, οὐσιακῶν ἐκ τοῦ Απολλωνίου Ἀγαθείνου κλήρου (Hermopolite); *P. Sarap.* 34.6-7, ἀπὸ οὐσιακῆς γῆς ἐκ τοῦ θαίου κλήρου (Herm.); *P. Ryl.* 157.4, οὐσιακὸν ἀμπελικὸν κτήμα - - - ἐκ τοῦ Ξένωνος

κλήρου (Herm.); cf. also *P. Lond.* 195 (II, p. 127), Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 672 ff., n. 46.

27. *P. Princ.* 14.i.8-9, ἐποικίου Ἀντωνίας θυγατρὸς (πρότερον) Παμφίλου περὶ Βούβαστον; *P. Ryl.* 138.10-11 and 16-18, εἰς τῷ (= τὸ) τῆς οὐσίας ἐποίκιον Δρομήνως (= -έως) λεγομένου (= λεγόμενον), estate of Tiberius (or Claudius) and children of Livia Drusii; *SB* 7742.2-4, ἀμπελῶνος λεγομένου Συνεφήβον (Maecenas); *P. Osl.* 136.4-5, οὐσιακὸν ἔλαιωνος Ἐρυμάεως λεγομένου; *P. Würz.* 11.12, πρὸς τῷ Ἀδάμαντος (sc. τόπῳ ορ κλήρῳ ?) λεγομένῳ νομῶν (Dionysodorian); *P. Petrus* 75.9-10 (cf. 76, 77, 78), κτήματος Εύσεβοῦς λεγομένου (Lurius); *P. Strassb.* 321.6-7, μισθωτὸν τινῶν οὐσιῶν κτήματος Ἐπ.; *P. Oxford* 3.4-5, ἐν κτήματι τοῦ [λεγομένῳ]; *P. Ryl.* 427 fr. 22.6, Θονήσεως κτήμα (Latinus; see below, n. 42).

and the disappearance of the Greek language in Egypt, the term had one and only one primary meaning, "property," and it was so employed not only in Egypt but throughout the Greek-speaking part of the world, both in literature and in legal documents.²⁸ Its classic definition is given by Pollux in a series of aptly chosen synonyms (*Onom.* 6.196): οὐσία· κλῆρος, κτῆσις, περιουσία, πλοῦτος, βίος, χοήματα, εὐχρηματία, πολυχρηματία, εὐκτημοσύνη, πολυκτημοσύνη, κτήματα, ἐπικαρπία, τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, τὰ ὄντα.²⁹

Occurring rarely in Ptolemaic documents, the term οὐσία, when applied to landed property (in which case it means *fundus* or *praedium*), came into wide use in Egypt just after the Roman occupation, and this was by no means accidental: the beginning of its popularity coincided with the introduction of private ownership of land. It was a very convenient word, for it was more inclusive than such specific terms as ἀμπελών, δρυμός, ἔλαιών, νομή or φοινικών, which applied only to a certain type of landed property (and even such terms as παράδεισος, κτῆμα or κτῆσις had a strong tendency in Egypt to refer primarily to land planted with trees, vines and vegetables or flowers),³⁰ while the estates in question included a variety of types of land. All these terms, to be sure, are found in documents dealing with various properties, imperial or otherwise, but refer almost always to sections of them. When speaking about the entire property of an individual one tended to use the term οὐσία. Its chief attraction lay in the fact that it could be used with precisely the same flexibility as the English word "estate" and have as many connotations and shades of meaning.

Consequently, the properties of the Julio-Claudians in Egypt, like any other property, were normally referred to as οὐσίαι. This, indeed, became such a standard practice that, when they were combined and incorporated into a single administrative whole, what was known in the rest of the empire as *ratio patrimonii principis* was called in Egypt οὐσιακὸς λόγος, and its departmental head was known not as a *patrimonio* or as *procurator rationis patrimonii*, but as οὐσιακὸς ἐπίτροπος or as *procurator usiacus*. As for the properties or estates that made up the οὐσιακὸς

.28. Οὐσία was one of the standard words for "property" or "estate" in classical Athens; see the examples in *LSJ* s.v.; discussion and collection of evidence in J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, 600-300 B. C., 1971. The word was not particularly common in Ptolemaic Egypt: SB 8008.32 (262-60 B.C.); P. Tebt. 700 (131-25 B.C.); P. Col. 120.2, 6, 18 (229/8 B.C.); P. Tebt. 6.23 (140/39 B.C.); SB 7419.13 (50 B.C.); BGU 1730.13 (50/49 B.C.); BGU 1212.19 (late I B.C.). Very common in the Greek-speaking world throughout the Roman empire; see *LSJ* and W. Nawijn's index to Dio (Boissevain, V) s.v. οὐσία, a word of which Dio was very fond. For its use in non-Egyptian inscriptions of the Roman period see J. Zablocka, "Die Bedeutung von ἡ οὐσία in Inschriften aus der Kaiserzeit," *Klio* 49, 1967, pp. 265f. The landed properties of the Byzantine and Arabic periods called οὐσίαι in Egypt are too numerous to mention here; a good list may be found in Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* II, s.v.; discussion in E. R. Hardy, *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt*, 1931, and excellent bibliography on Byzantine estates, Egyptian and otherwise, in F. M. Heichelheim, "Domäne," in T. Klauser, ed., *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum* IV, 1959, cols. 88 ff.

.29. Cf. also *Onom.* 8.145, δημεῦσαι οὐσίαν· ἀποστῆσαι τῆς οὐσίας ... παραχρῆσαι τῶν χρημάτων, τῶν ὄντων, τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, τοῦ κλήρου, τῶν πατρών, τῆς κτήσεως, τῆς περιουσίας, τῶν περιόντων ἀπάντων; Hesychius, s.v. οὐσία· ἔξουσία, οὐσιότης, πλοῦτος, ὑπαρξία, εἶδος ὑφεστός, βίος, κτῆσις; cf. Harpokration, s.v. οὐσίας δικη (Dindorf, 229.6-16). In Dio Chrys., Or. 7.11 a δημευθεῖσα οὐσία includes πολλὰς

μὲν ἀγέλας καὶ ἵππων καὶ βιοῶν ... πολλὰς δὲ ποίμνας, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ καλοὺς ἄγρούς, πολλὰ δὲ ἄλλα χρήματα; cf. also *Or.* 31.58; cf. Philostr., *Vita Soph.* 2.19.4 (Kayser). In Suda, s.v. οὐσία (cf. Io. Damask. PG 94.564) we read ἡ δὲ τῶν πολλῶν συνήθεια κέχορται τῷ προσδήματι ἐπὶ τῶν σημανομένων κτήσεων, ὃν τις κέκτηται, οἶον οἰκημάτων, βοσκημάτων καὶ λοιπῶν ὑλῶν· ταῦτα γὰρ οὐσίαν καλοῦσι τοῦ κεκτημένου. Of particular interest is a parallel study of the Latin terms employed to express the idea of estate, and especially of a landed one (e.g., *fundus*, *saltus*, *ager*, *praedium*, *latifundium*, and even *possessio* which, like οὐσία, is at times used instead of the other terms). The standard work is still A. Schulten, *Die römischen Grundherrschaften. Eine agrarhistorische Untersuchung*, 1896, esp. Chapter I; see also his "Fundus," *DEAR* III, 1906, pp. 338 ff. On *latifundium*, a term greatly overworked by modern scholars in view of the fact that it is so rare in our sources, see now K. W. White, "Latifundia. A Critical Review of the Evidence on Large Estates in Italy and Sicily up to the End of the First Century A.D.," *BICS* 14, 1967, pp. 62 ff.

.30. Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 3, 14 ff., 126; W. H. Buckler and D. M. Robinson, "Greek Inscriptions from Sardis. I," *AJP* 16, 1912, pp. 11 ff., esp. pp. 78 f.; Schnebel, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 242; Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* ss. vv. Κτῆμα invariably refers to part of an οὐσία (cf. above, n. 27), but κτῆσις sometimes may mean the entire property; e.g., SB 6019, Μεσσαλίνης κτῆσις; P. Lond. 195 (II, p. 127).1, τελέσματα κτήσεως; P. Oxy. 62.1-2, ἐπὶ κτήσις(εων) [θεο(ῦ) Τήτου, but the restoration is very uncertain here.

λόγος, they continued to be called οὐσίαι and to carry the name of their original Roman owner.³¹

But while this new *ratio* was made out of οὐσίαι, not all οὐσίαι in Egypt belonged to or were administered by it. This is an extremely important point to bear in mind. For just as the Latin-speaking part of the world continued to employ the term *patrimonium* when referring to all kinds of property and did not apply it exclusively to imperial property, so in Egypt, both before and after the creation of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, the term οὐσία meant, and continued to mean, “property” and “estate,” not “imperial property” or “privileged estate.” It could be, for example, and was, applied to privately owned estates totally unconnected with the imperial *patrimonium*. Or it could be, and was, applied to properties which, for a variety of reasons, had been confiscated by the state (and not by the emperor) through the agency of the department of the *idios logos*. As such, these properties were exactly like so many other γενηματογραφούμενα or ἀναληφθέντα ὑπάρχοντα (ὑπάρχοντα being a term synonymous to οὐσία), and sometimes were incorporated into the so-called “revenue” land, the γῆ προσόδου.³² They plainly belonged not to the οὐσιακὸς λόγος but to the διοίκησις, which in fact administered them.³³ When the term ταμεῖον (or ταμιεῖον) replaced διοίκησις and became the predominant way of designating the *fiscus* confiscated properties were occasionally called ταμιακαὶ οὐσίαι; again, they were not the private property of the emperor but *praedia fiscalia*, i.e. part of the *ager publicus*.³⁴

Consequently, there are only two ways by which one can determine whether a property, be it known as οὐσία or by any other name, is in fact imperial: it must carry the name of an emperor or of a member of an imperial family; or it must be shown to be part of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος. And considering the fact that all the available evidence strongly suggests that after the formation of this *ratio* by the Flavians no more additions were made to it, it is highly likely that all the estates that make up the οὐσιακὸς λόγος in Egypt are Julio-Claudian creations.³⁵

As in most other parts of the empire, there is a marked tendency in Egypt for the imperial estates to retain the name of their former owner. There are two standard ways in which such a name was attached to a landed property:

Employment of the possessive genitive. This is, of course, the standard manner to designate the current owner of an estate, e.g., ἡ Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος οὐσία (P. Mich. 121 recto III.x; P. Mich. 244; P. Oxy. 2837); ἡ Γαῖου Καίσαρος Αὐτοκράτορος Σεβαστοῦ οὐσία (P. Ryl. 148); ἐδάφῃ Ἰουλίας Σεβαστῆς καὶ Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος (P. Lond. 445 [II, p. 166]); θησαυρὸς Ἰουλίας Σεβαστῆς καὶ τέκνων Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος (SB 10536); ἡ Λουκείου Ἀνναίου Σενέκα οὐσία (P. Oxy. 2873); ἐποίκιον Ποπλίου καὶ Γαῖου Πετρωνίων (P. Ryl. 127). But it is often employed to designate the former owner, in which case the term πρότερον (often abbreviated as ἄ or α') is usually, but not invariably, added, e.g., πρότερον Ἀντωνίας θυγατρὸς θεοῦ Κλαυδίου (P. Fay. 40); (πρότερον) Σενέκα (P. Ryl.

31. See below, Chapter II. The only instance where *patrimonialis* and οὐσιακός are used together is P. Ryl. 658.6-7 (early IV), where I would read τῆς πατρῷου[ναλίας ἦτοι (?) οὐ]σιακῆς (γῆς). This, of course, reflects the wider use of Latin terms in the early Byzantine era.

32. For the confiscation of land by the *idios logos* see Plaumann, *Der Idioslogos*; W. G. Uxkull-Gyllenband's commentary on the *gnomon* (BGU V:2) (1934); S. Riccobono Jr., *Il gnomon dell'idios logos*, 1950; J. Modrzejewski, “La dévolution au fisc des biens vacants d'après le *Gnomon de l'Idiologue* (BGU 1210, §4),” *Studi Edoardo Volterra* VI, 1969, pp. 91 ff. For γῆ προσόδου see Wilcken, *APF* 1, 1901, pp. 148 ff.; Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 135 ff.; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*,

pp. 297 f.; Collart, *P. Bour.*, pp. 156 ff.; Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 3 f.; Chalon, *L'édition*, pp. 148 ff.; cf. also below, Appendix I.

33. For a list of non-imperial οὐσίαι see below, Appendix I.

34. Ταμιακαὶ οὐσίαι in P. Oxy. 58 (288) and P. Beatty *Panop.* 1 (298); see now A. Masi, *Richerche sulla “res privata” del “princeps,”* 1971, pp. 75 ff., esp. 77, n. 100, with whom I am in full agreement. There is absolutely no connection between these οὐσίαι and the οὐσιακὸς λόγος. One may also mention here the πολιτικὴ οὐσία, i.e. “der ‘städtische’ Besitz an Gutsländern” (Preisigke), of P. *Strassb.* 25 (III).

35. See below, Chapter II.

99); ἡ πρότερον Ναρκίσσου οὐσία (WChr. 176); Κλαυδίας Ἀκτῆς (P. Ross.-Georg. II 42).³⁶

Creation of an adjectival form in -ανός or -ιανός. This is an obvious Latinism,³⁷ and is employed almost exclusively with the term οὐσία, which in these cases comes to mean *ager*, *fundus* or *praedium*; in a few instances, however, it is found with the term ἐδάφη, *agri*.³⁸ Since it invariably designates a former and not a current owner,³⁹ the earliest instance of its use may be safely considered a *terminus ante quem* the estate had become imperial property. The following forms in -(ι)ανή have been found thus far attached to various οὐσίαι of the imperial patrimony: Ἀγριππιανή, Ἀγριππινιανή, Ἀκτηιανή, Ἀλεξανδριανή, Ἀνθιανή, Γερμανικια-

36. A point of great importance, which has however escaped the notice of most commentators, is that the term πρότερον is also employed in order to refer not to a former owner, but to a former lessee of a property. Cf. P. Ryl. 99.1-4, where it is used for both cases, βούλομαι ἔκουσιώς μισθώσασθαι ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου εἰς ἔτη ε ἀπὸ οὐσιακοῦ λόγου --- τὰς δηλουμένας διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ (οὐ)σιακοῦ λόγου πρότερον μεμισθῶσθαι ὑπὸ Οὐαλερίου Βερενικιανοῦ καὶ υἱῶν Οὐαλερίου Διοδώρου, οὐσίας μὲν (πρότερον) Δορυφόρο[υ] ἀμέστου (ἀρούρας) ζ, (πρότερον) δὲ Σενέκα δ(μοίως) ἀρούρας β; cf. P. Athen. 19.8-10, τὰς πρότερον Ἀπί[ωνος] (scripsi), δεῖς ἀνακεχωρηκεν [ἐκ τῆς] [Λ]ογο[ι]ανῆς οὐσίας, [ἀρούρας]. Sometimes, too, a word which would normally signify possession actually indicates leasing, e.g., SB 9205.5, βούλομαι μισθώσασθαι παρὸ δοῦ ἦν προείχον (sc. ἀρούραν), and P. Oxy. 2410.12-14, ν[ομάς τ]ῶν ἐκ τῆς Νικανοριανῆς οὐσίας πρότερον δι' ἡμᾶ[ν οὖσας], ὑπερβάλλων ἔνοις [μισθοῖ]. So, too, in P. Oxy. 2873.8-10, ἀδυναμοῦμεν γεοργῆσαι δεῖς (sc. ἀρούρας) εἴχαμεν ἐπ' ὀνόματος ἡμῶν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς (sc. Σενεκανῆς) οὐσίας. These two practices, singly or jointly, have caused the names of five οὐσιακοὶ μισθωταὶ of the second century A. D. to be incorporated erroneously into the roster of former owners of Julio-Claudian properties, and this has resulted in some very imaginative theories about the formation of imperial estates (e.g., that the properties of Iulius Asklepiades and Ptolemaios, s. of Kronion, were confiscated by Augustus and divided up between Antonia Drusi and Lurius; see Tomsin, "Notes," p. 216; Youtie et al., P. Petaus 75-8 introd.).

Since this is, to the best of my knowledge, the first time that doubt has been cast on their status as former owners of Julio-Claudian estates, I give here a complete list of the instances where their names occur. (The similarity of phraseology necessitates a uniform way of expanding μισθ(), and the suggested solutions, μισθ(ωτῶν), μισθ(ουμένης) and μισθ(ωθείσης), either make no sense or are plainly ungrammatical.) In all the phrases quoted below πρότερον signifies not the former owner but the former μισθωτής (*Grosspächter*) of an οὐσία. —(1) Agathos Daimon (see Hohlwein, EPap 5, 1939, p. 65): SB 5670.5-7, δεῖς (sc. ἀρούρας) ἐπιτηρεῖτε --- τῆς Ἀντωνιανῆς οὐσίας μισθώσεως πρότερον Ἀγαθοῦ Δαι[μον]ο[ι]ς ... ίνου. —(2) Antonius, s. of Theon (see Browne, P. Mich. 599 introd.): P. Meyer 3.12-13, ἐπιτ(ηρητήν) μισθ(ώσεως) γινο(μένης) διὰ Ἀντωνίου Θέωνο(ς); P. Mich. 599.3-5, ἐπιτηρητής οὐσιακῶν μισθώσεω[ς]ς Ἀντωνίου Θέωνος. —(3) Apion, s. of Komanos (see Kortenbeutel, BGU 1893.441/2 n.; cf. below, Appendix I no. 22): P. Med. 65.5-9, μισθώσεως --- Ἀπίωνος Κομανοῦ; BGU 1893.441-2, περιγι(νομένων) οὐσι(ακῶν) μισθ(ώσεως) πρότερον Ἀπίωνος Κομανοῦ Χαρ(μανῆς) οὐσίας; cf. 481.2. —(4) Iulius Asklepiades (see Wilcken, APF 1, 1901, p. 552;

Rostovtzeff, Kolonat, p. 121, Preisigke, Girowesen, p. 172; Thunell, P. Sitol., p. 74, n. 1; Kalén, P. Berl. Leihg., p. 62; Jouguet, *La domination romaine*, p. 15; Wallace, *Taxation*, p. 360, n. 6; Rostovtzeff, SEHRE, pp. 293, 672, no. 32; Kortenbeutel, BGU 1893 introd. and 93/4 n.; Tomsin, "Notes," p. 216 and "Les continuités," p. 90; Kuhnke, Οὐσιακὴ Γῆ, p. 4. Obviously he is not identical with M. Iulius Asklepiades (PIR² I 178), and I see no reason to connect him with the philosopher C. Iulius Asklepiades who left his property to the city of Alexandria (P. Fay. 87; P. Hamb. 36; see Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 308); P. Fay. 82.14-16, τελωνικῆς ἀτελείας Λουσιανῆς (scripsi: Ἀδριανῆς) edd.; see Tomsin, "Notes," p. 216, n. 50) οὐσίας μισθ(ώσεως) πρότερον) Ιουλίου Ἀσκηπιαδού; BGU 1893.93-4, Ἀντωνίανης οὐσίας μισθ(ώσεως) πρότερον) Ιουλίου Ἀσκληπιαδού; cf. 485, μισθ(ώσεως) πρότερον) Ιουλίου Ἀσκληπιαδού) Ἀντωνίανης οὐσίας; cf. 625-6, 650; BGU 1893.260-1, Λουσιανῆς οὐσίας μισθ(ώσεως) πρότερον) Ιουλίου Ἀσκληπιαδού; cf. 309-10, περιγι(νομένων) οὐσι(ακῶν) Λουσιανῆς οὐσίας μισθ(ώσεως) πρότερον) Ιουλίου Ἀσκληπιαδού; cf. 548, 561, 658-9, 710-11. — (5) Ptolemaios, s. of Kronion (see Preisigke, Girowesen, p. 481; Rostovtzeff, Kolonat, p. 136; Lewis, P. Leit. 11.4 n.; Youtie et al., P. Petaus 75-8 introd.; Shelton, P. Mich. 599 introd.; Kuhnke, Οὐσιακὴ Γῆ, p. 4): P. Leit. 11.4, ἐπιτηρητής Πτολεμαίου Κρονίου; P. Med. 65.9-10, μισθώσεως πρότερον) Πτολεμαίου Κρονίου; P. Fay. 60.5-6, μισθ(ώσεως) Πτολεμαίου Κρονίου δω[δ]ε[κάτου] ἔτους Ἀντωνιανῆς οὐσίας; BGU 619.21-2, ἐπιτηρησιν ο[ν]ισιακῶν μισθώσεως Πτολεμαίου Κρονίου; P. Petaus 76.7-11 (cf. 75, 77, 78), ἐπιτηρητοῦ οὐσιακῶν κτημάτων μισθώσεως Πτολεμαίου Κρονίου κτήματος Εύσεβοῦ λεγομένου; P. Tebt. 609f, οὐσιακῶν δομοίων ὑπαρχόντων πρότερον) Πτολεμαίου [Κ]ρονίου [Κ]ρονίου [Κ]ρονίου (so A. Tomsin by letter). Very likely the same person is mentioned in P. Tebt. 343.19 and 28, ἐπικρατεῖ Πτολεμαίου Κρονίου. — Finally, in P. Oxy. 2185, F. Zucker (APF 16, 1958, p. 251) is indubitably right in seeing Antikrates and Sostratos as *Grosspächter*, as the other names in lines 20-23 also indicate; in line 19 for [οὐ]σίας we should perhaps read [οὐ]σι(ακῆς) sc. γῆς or προσόδου; cf. line 23.

37. See A. Schulten, "Fundus," DEAR III, 1906, esp. p. 340. See also the lists of *fundi*, *villae*, *praedia* and *saltus* in Dessau, ILS III, pp. 659 f., 664, and of *horti* in Platner-Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary*, s.v.

38. Μεσσαλινιανὰ ἐδάφη in P. Ryl. 87; P. Ryl. 684 (Μεσσαλειανῶν); P. Flor. 40. Δορυφοριανά in SB 9205 (cf. Youtie, TAPA 78, 1947, pp. 120 ff.).

39. Nevertheless, we come across such pleonasms as πρότερον Σενεκανῆς οὐσίας (P. Aberd. 152.7), τῶν πρότερον Δορυφοριανῶν (sc. ἐδαφῶν) (SB 9205.1-2), and πρότερον Ναρκισσιανῆς οὐσίας (P. Ryl. 171).

νή,⁴⁰ Διονυσοδωριανή,⁴¹ Δορυφοριανή, Καμηλιανή, Λατινιανή,⁴² Λουριανή, Μαικηνατιανή,⁴³ Μεσσαλινιανή, Μηνατιανή, Ούεσπασιανή, Παλλαντιανή,⁴⁴ Πετρωνιανή, Ρουτιλλιανή, Σενεκανή,⁴⁵ Σεουηριανή, Σωκρατιανή, Χαρμιανή.

In one form of referring to both the current and the former owner, the possessive genitive is employed twice, e.g., πρότερον Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Σαραπίωνος, νυνεὶ δὲ τοῦ κυρίου Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος (*P. Lond.* 280 [II, p. 193]); Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Πάλλαντος (πρότερον) Γαλλίας Πώλλης ((πρότερον)) δὲ Λουκίου Σεπτιμίου and (πρότερον) Ἐρωτος καὶ Χάρμου (*P. Lond.* 195 [II, p. 127]). Alternatively the possessive genitive is used for the current and the form in -(ι)ανή for the former owner, e.g., ἡ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ οὐσία Γερμανικιανή (*P. Ryl.* 134); ἡ ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοῖτη Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος Πετρωνιανή οὐσία (*BGU* 650); ἡ Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος Μαικηνατιανή οὐσία (*BGU* 181).

40. Γερμανικαινή in *P. Mich.* 224.5197; Γερμανικεανή in an unpublished Louvre papyrus (see Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 121).

41. Διονυσιοδωριανή in *P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.* 12.16.


42. Reading Λατινιανῆς for the editors' ἸΑΤΙΝΙΑΝῆς in *P. Ryl.* 427 (22).7.

43. This form has caused considerable difficulties to some scribes. So Μαικηνατιανή in *P. Ryl.* 171.14; *BGU* 181.7; *SB* 4414.13; *P. Berl.* inv. 11529+*SB* 10512 *passim*; Μαικηνατιανή in *P. Hamb.* 34.10-11; Μακηνιδανή in *P. Mich.* 274.5.8; Μακηνιανή in *P. Mich.* 224.3883, 4271a; *P. Ryl.* 207 (both in the unpublished col. i, and in ii.8, where the editors' Μαικηνατιανῆς is a subconscious correction); this should also be read in *P. Bour.* 42.82, 100 for Collart's Μακ() and K. F. W.

Schmidt's Μάκ(ρωνος) (*GGA* 190, 1928, p. 163), accepted by Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, no. 16. In *P. Phil.* 19.13, where Scherer read Μακ() οὐσ(ία), grammar and the published photograph (plate V) lead me to suggest Μαικ(ηνατιανῆς) οὐσ(ίας).

44. Apparently Παλατ(ιανή) in *P. Bour.* 42.103, not Παλατ(ιου) as K. F. W. Schmidt suggested (*GGA* 190, 1928, p. 163); cf. the distortion of the name in Πάλανδ(ος), *P. Mich.* 224.4233, 5195, 6188.

45. Σενεκανή in *P. Chic.* 18.5; Σενκανή in *P. Bour.* 42.136, 142; Σενοκ(ανή) or Σενόν(α) in *P. Lips.* 115.6. P.M. Meyer's observation (*P. Hamb.* 3.9 n.), although occasionally overlooked, still holds true: "Σενεκιανή οὐσία findet sich nicht." In *P. Oxy.* 3051.7 for Σενεκ[ι]ανῆς read Σενεκανῆς.



The Julio-Claudians

Chapter Two

The Julio-Claudians in Egypt

One of the questions that cannot be answered with any degree of certainty at this time is whether Augustus set aside any land in Egypt as his private domain, i.e. as his *patrimonium*.¹ It seems unlikely to me; but the evidence necessary to prove anything with regard to this is simply lacking. This being the case, we may consider 8 B.C. as the earliest definite date in which the emperor found himself in personal possession of land in Egypt. For in that year Gaius Maecenas, that most trusted of friends and associates (and, incidentally, the architect of the fierce anti-Egyptian propaganda during Augustus' struggle with Cleopatra and M. Antonius) died, bequeathing his entire property to the emperor. This was certainly large and included, in addition to the magnificent palace in Rome and the well known *horti* on the *collis Esquilinus* in the city,²

1. My analysis of the evidence pertaining to the Egyptian properties of the Julio-Claudians (collected below, Appendix II) differs considerably from the accepted theory, both in fundamental aspects as well as in the interpretation of isolated documents. Besides my belief that the emperors did not grant estates to various individuals in Egypt, I can find no evidence that estates that had passed to the emperor were subsequently given away to other holders; nor do I see any evidence for erratic and "spasmodic" confiscations. The traditional theory has been fully developed by Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 292 f. and 669 ff., N. Hohlwein, "Evhéméria du Fayoum," *JJP* 3, 1949, pp. 63 ff., and Tomsin, "Les continuités" and "Notes," esp. pp. 215 ff. In the following notes I have refrained from pointing out every single disagreement that I have with their position; but if I am correct in eliminating some persons from this discussion, either because I believe them to have been lessees, and not former owners, of imperial estates (see above, Chapter I, n. 36), or because they owned land which in no way seems to me to have been connected with imperial properties (see below, Appendix I), then the major arguments of their theory are seriously damaged. My attempts to cut down the number of imperial estates in Egypt are paralleled by what other scholars are doing with regard to Asia Minor and its provinces; see, e.g., T. R. S. Broughton, "Roman Landholding in Asia Minor," *TAPA* 65, 1934, pp. 207 ff., and B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 1967, App. VI, "Client Kings, Royal Domains, and Imperial Estates".

The properties of the imperial family, as well as large estates in general throughout the empire, have been discussed in a number of works, of which the following is a selected list: C. Lécrivain, *De agris publicis imperatoriisque ab Augusti aetate usque ad finem imperii Romani*, 1887; H. Pelham, *The Imperial*

Domains and the Colonate, 1890; R. His, *Die Domänen der römischen Kaiserzeit*, 1896; A. Schulten, *Die römischen Grundherrschaften. Eine agrarhistorische Untersuchung*, 1896; L. Homo, "Le domaine impérial à Rome," *MEFR* 19, 1899, pp. 101 ff.; E. Beaudouin, *Les grands domaines dans l'empire romain, d'après des travaux récents*, 1899; O. Hirschfeld, "Der Grundbesitz der römischen Kaiser in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten," *Klio* 2, 1902, pp. 45 ff. and 284 ff.; M. Rostovtzeff, *Geschichte der Staatspacht in der römischen Kaiserzeit bis Diokletian*, 1902; O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, 1905; A. Schulten, "Fundus," *DEAR* III, 1906, pp. 338 ff.; F. de Zulueta, *De patrocinis vicorum*, 1909; E. Kornemann, "Domänen," *RE* Suppl. IV, 1924, cols. 227 ff.; R. S. Rogers, "The Roman Emperors as Heirs and Legatees," *TAPA* 78, 1947, pp. 140 ff.; V. A. Sigaro, *L'Italia agraria sotto Traiano*, 1958; L. Lesuisse, "L'aspect héréditaire de la succession impériale sous les Julio-Claudiens," *LEC* 30, 1962, pp. 32 ff.; R. MacMullen, "Three Notes on Imperial Estates," *CQ* 56, 1962, pp. 277 ff.; J. Kolendo, "Sur la législation relative au grands domaines de l'Afrique romaine," *REA* 65, 1963, pp. 80 ff.; H. Nesselhauf, "Patrimonium und res privata des römischen Kaisers," *Historia-Augusta-Colloquium*, 1963, pp. 73 ff.; J. Béranger, "Fortune privée impériale et état," *Mélanges ... Georges Bonnard*, 1966, pp. 151 ff.; G. Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le haut-empire romaine. Rôle politique et administratif*, 1970; A. Masi, *Ricerche sulla "res privata" del "princeps"*, 1971; L. Flam-Zuckermann, "Un exemple de la genèse des domaines impériaux d'après deux inscriptions de Bithynie," *Historia* 21, 1972, pp. 114 ff.

2. See Dio Cass., 55.7.5; Suet., *Tib.* 15.1; Philo, *Leg.* 44; Tac., *Ann.* 15.39.1; Fronto, *Ep.* 1.8. For slaves see *CIL* VI

some very extensive estates in Egypt.

Augustus' treatment of the Egyptian properties of Maecenas set an example and a rule for subsequent emperors to follow. As he was fully entitled to do in accordance with the laws of inheritance and property, he did not turn them over to the prefect to be assimilated into the γῆ δῆμοσία, but treated them as what they were: his own private domain. Henceforth to be known by the name of their original owner as Μαικηνατιανὰ οὐσίαι, these estates — apparently unbroken and unparcelled — passed from emperor to emperor. There are many gaps in the early history of these as well as of similar properties, but this seems to me to be the import of the fact that in 46/7 we hear of them as belonging to Claudius, and in 57 as being part of the Neronian *patrimonium*.³

The fate of two other estates which, in all likelihood, were also formed during the reign of Augustus appears to have been identical. For the first of these, the Λουριανὴ οὐσία, the earliest evidence comes from 74, i.e. long after it had been incorporated into the οὐσιακὸς λόγος.⁴ The identity, moreover, of its original owner is by no means certain, the name Lurius being rather common to all social classes (and especially to the lower ones) during the first century. It has been argued, and not without some degree of plausibility, that the original owner was M. Lurius, ἄρχων in Sardinia in 40 B.C. and later commander of the right wing of the Augustan fleet during the battle off Actium.⁵ If this identification is right, Lurius (who was certainly not a senator, but most likely an *eques* or a freedman) could hardly have outlived Augustus, and it seems reasonable to assume that, like Maecenas, he bequeathed his estates to his commanding general and emperor.

There is even less certainty regarding the original owner of the second estate, the Πετρωνιανὴ οὐσία, which appears for the first time in 46/7 as belonging to Claudius, and which after another appearance in 50/1 vanishes from our records.⁶ Here, too, we are dealing with a name common to all strata of society — from senators to freedmen's slaves. I am not convinced that the Gaius and Poplius Petronii, owners of a farmstead in Euhemeria in 29, are in any way connected with Gaius Petronius, a personal friend of Augustus and prefect in 24-1 B.C.⁷ I suspect that the Petronii brothers are veterans who had settled in the Arsinoite after their discharge, as so many of their comrades did throughout the Roman occupation.⁸ The identification of the original owner of the Πετρωνιανὴ οὐσία with the prefect, on the other hand, cannot be proven, but is nonetheless very tempting. If this is indeed the case, Augustus may have inherited from a close associate.

When the first emperor died in 14, he left one third of his property to his wife, Livia Drusilla,

4016, 4032, 4095, 19926, 22970; cf. *AE* 1921, p. 22, no. 69 (where the Nero mentioned is most likely Tiberius). See also Platner-Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary*, p. 272. For this, as well as for other instances of legacies received by the emperors from friends and political allies, see R. S. Rogers, "The Roman Emperors as Heirs and Legatees," *TAPA* 78, 1947, pp. 140 ff., and J. Gaudemet, "Testamenta ingrata et pietas Augusti: contribution à l'étude du sentiment impérial," *Studi ... Arangio-Ruiz* 3, 1953, pp. 115 ff.

3. *P. Mich.* 274-5.7-8, τῆς Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτωρος Μαικηνιανῆς οὐσίας χρῆσιν (= κλήροι); *BGU* 181.5-7, τῆς Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος Μαικηνιανῆς οὐσίας.

4. *P. Hamb.* 3.10. For more documents see below, Appendix II.iii.16.

5. *PIR*² L 425. This identification was first made by K. F. W. Schmidt, *GGA* 190, 1928, p. 163, n. 5, and independently by Kalén, *P. Berl. Leihg.*, p. 83. It has received universal

acceptance.

6. *BGU* 650.1-3, τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἀρετοῦ Τίβεριος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος Πετρωνιανῆς οὐσίας (cf. lines 12-13); *SB* 9224.ii.24, τῆς Πετρωνιανῆς οὐσίας. In *P. Hamb.* 101.6 (III), ξε]χεν Λέων προνοητὴς Πετρωνίας, the expansion of the abbreviation is very uncertain (Πετρωνίας being more likely) and, in any case, I believe we are dealing with a privately owned property.

7. *P. Ryl.* 127.4-5, ἐποικίου Ποπλίου καὶ Γαῖον Πετρωνίων. On this see also below, Appendix I. For the prefect see *PIR*¹ P 196 with stemma (many Gaii, no Poplii); cf. *PIR*¹ P 198 (many Poplii, no Gaii); Stein, *Präfekten*, pp. 17 f.

8. For example, a tenant of M. Aponius Saturninus in Karanis knew, and borrowed money from, a Γάιος Πετρωνίος, στρατιώτης λογιώνος, *P. Osl.* 33 verso.6-7 (29). See also N. Lewis, "A Veteran in Quest of a Home," *TAPA* 90, 1959, pp. 139 ff., my remarks in *BASP* 7, 1970, pp. 87 ff., and J. F. Gilliam, "A Legionary Veteran and his Family," *BASP* 8, 1971, pp. 39 ff.

and two thirds to his adopted son and successor, Tiberius.⁹ The Egyptian portion of the property, i.e. the three estates mentioned above, passed on to the new ruler *in toto*. Livia, on the other hand, had already accumulated her own plots in the Arsinoite. The first reference to her estates dates to 5, when we hear of an οὐσία Λιβίας [καὶ] Γερμαν[ικοῦ Κα]ίσαρος, and this dual ownership, attested also in 14/15, continues even after Germanicus' death.¹⁰ From 19 to the death of Livia the joint ownership includes, in addition to the empress-mother, if not all the children of Germanicus certainly his three surviving sons, Nero Iulius, Drusus Iulius, and Gaius, the future emperor, all Caesares.¹¹ Livia appears to have been acquiring properties up to the very end, for she is the new owner of the lands formerly of C. Iulius Alexandros, a very enigmatic personality who died at some time between 26 and 28.¹² This was apparently a small plot, but whether the same person is the original owner of the Ἀλεξανδριανὴ οὐσία, an estate of slightly over 200 arourae in the Drymos Hieras Nesou, is a matter of speculation.¹³

References to Livia's estates cease after 29, the year of her death. Since her other son, Nero Claudius Drusus, had died in 9 B.C., and since in any event Tiberius annulled her will,¹⁴ it is certain that the emperor, and her only surviving son, inherited them. What happened to the estates of the children of Germanicus is not known, but it is very likely that the boys continued as owners, with Tiberius as their guardian.

The death of Germanicus himself, however, in 19 had already enriched Tiberius to a far greater extent. This "versatile and amiable mediocrity"¹⁵ had always been fascinated by Egypt, something he may have inherited from his mother, Antonia Drusi. We know, for example, that he visited Alexandria and the inner country as far as Elephantine and Syene, and that he paid a visit to the Arsinoite in order to view the "artificial" lake and the canal web; that he bestowed attention upon his estates there is a safe inference. His Hellenized apparel, his popularity among the Alexandrians, his prevention of a small-scale famine by the opening of the auxiliary granaries, and above all his very visit to a province barred to all members of the senatorial class without previous imperial authorization, drew sharp censure from Tiberius.¹⁶

In addition to Germanicus himself, his mother Antonia Drusi, her slave M. Antonius Pallas and Germanicus' own slave or freedman Anthos, all invested heavily in Egyptian land, and their estates grew to considerable size. The earliest reference to Germanicus' estates dates from 5, in a document (already referred to) in which he appears as co-owner with his grandmother, Livia.¹⁷

9. Suet., *Aug.* 101, *Tib.* 23; Tac., *Ann.* 1.8. Joint ownership by Tiberius and Livia is indicated in *CIL VI* 4358, 9066; X 7489. See Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten*, p. 28, n. 1.

10. SB 9150.4-5; P. *Lond.* 445 (II, p. 166).5-6, ἐδαφῶν Ἰουλίας Σεβαστῆς καὶ Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος.

11. SB 10536.14-15, θησαυροῦ Ἰουλίας Σεβαστῆς καὶ τέκνων Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος; P. *Med.* 6.1-3, ἐγλήμπτορι βίβλου Ἰουλίας Σεβαστῆς καὶ τέκνων(ν) Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος. In P. Sorbonne inv. 2364.5-7 (25/6) the certain reading is γεωργοῦ Ἰουλίας Σεβαστῆς καὶ τέκνων Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρον.

12. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 672, no. 44, suggested the identification of C. Iulius Alexandros with the son of Herodes and Mariamne the Hasmonean, and this suggestion was accepted by Hohlwein, *JJP* 3, 1949, pp. 81 f. Tomsin, "Les continuités," p. 90, n. 52, and independently A. Fuks, introd. to *CPJ* 420, rejected this theory on the very logical grounds that the son of Herodes had already been executed in 7 B.C. (cf. *PIR* I 498). Rostovtzeff also proposed βα]οι[λέω]ς for *P. Ryl.* 166.7, and this found its way to *PIR* I 137, but a photograph supplied me by the Rylands Library reveals that it is paleographically

impossible. Fuks proposed C. Iulius Alexandros the alabarch, brother of Philo and father of Ti. Iulius Alexandros, the prefect, an old friend of Claudius and procurator of Antonia Drusi (Jos., *Ant.* 19.276). But ἀλ]αβ[άρχο]ν is also impossible and this person was alive under Claudius. The name, we should bear in mind, was very common among Alexandrians, and particularly Jews, as well as slaves (e.g., *CIL VI* 5188, 8532, 8738, 11390); cf. J. Baumgart, *Die römischen Sklavennamen*, 1936, pp. 57 ff.

13. P. Bour. 42.108 (167).

14. Suet., *Tib.* 51.

15. M. P. Charlesworth, *CAH X*, p. 622.

16. For Germanicus' visit to Egypt see Tac., *Ann.* 2.59 ff.; discussion in Wilcken, *Hermes* 63, 1928, p. 48; Stein, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 80 ff., esp. p. 92; W. F. Akveld, *Germanicus*, 1961, pp. 94 ff.; and esp. D. G. Weingärtner, *Die Ägyptenreise des Germanicus*, 1969. The order forbidding senators to enter the province without authorization included illustrious equites as well: Tac., *Ann.* 2.59; *Hist.* 1.11; Dio Cass., 51.17.

17. SB 9150; see above, n. 10.

There can be no doubt that it was Tiberius who acquired the largest portion — if not indeed all — of Germanicus' estates upon the latter's death. From evidence pertaining to affairs in Rome we have a long list of *Germaniciani* among the imperial slaves and freedmen, but the exact time of their entrance into the imperial *clientela* is unknown; it may have been accomplished via Gaius or Agrippina.¹⁸ As far as Egypt is concerned, however, a document dated in 34 gives Tiberius as the new owner of the Germanician estates.¹⁹ (At this time, it should be remembered, Germanicus' wife, as well as their last four children, Gaius, Agrippina, Drusilla and Livilla, were still alive.) This Γερμανικιανή οὐσία appears to have been handed down thereafter from emperor to emperor, unbroken and undivided.

Some of the references to estates owned by Germanicus' sons have already been mentioned in connection with Livia.²⁰ An ἐποίκιον Λιβύλλα[ς] in Soknopaiou Nesos, where Germanicus, Anthos and Antonia Drusi had estates, very probably carried the name of Germanicus' daughter, Iulia Livilla.²¹ But this does not mean that she necessarily owned it (it could have been only named in her honour), and we know that another Livilla, Livia Drusi, also had properties in Egypt.

The Ἀγριππινιανή οὐσία is another estate closely connected with Germanicus.²² We are unable to determine whether the wife or the daughter is meant, or whether either of them created or inherited it. One thing is clear, however: whoever the original owner might have been, after her death the property passed to the emperor — Tiberius, if the elder Agrippina is meant (although her son Gaius may have been left part of it), Nero, if the younger. The Ρουτιλλιανή οὐσία which, for unknown reasons, is coupled with the Ἀγριππινιανή on a small bronze tablet which I would date to the first half of the first century, seems to have been formed at this time also.²³ The identity of its original owner is unknown, but the tablet states that it was imperial property by that time, although we cannot say who the first emperor was to obtain it.

Lastly there is a person whom the scribes of Karanis style "Ανθος Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος, but whether a *servus* or a *libertus* is meant is not clear.²⁴ His estate, the Ανθιανή οὐσία, became

18. *Germaniciani* among the slaves of Tiberius are attested in *CIL VI* 4336 (?), 4339, 4341, 4351, 4398, 4409, 5540. But they are also found in the household of Drusus Caesar (4337), Agrippina (4387), Iulius Nero Caesar (4344), and Gaius (4357, 33767). Discussion and bibliography in Chantraine, *Freigelassene*, pp. 315 f.

19. *P. Ryl.* 134.7-9, τῆ[ς] Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ οὐσία[ς] Γερμανικιανῆς.

20. See above, n. 11.

21. *BGU* 277.ii.15 (II); this is the reading of Dr. G. Poethke, who was kind enough to examine the papyrus at my request.

22. An Α[γ]ριππινιανή οὐσία is found in *BGU* 1047.14 (117-38), but I strongly suspect that we should read Α[γ]ριππινιανής or Α[γ]ριππινιανῆς (Prof. W. Müller informs me that the papyrus was lost during the war). *Contra Rostovtzeff*, *Kolonat*, p. 123, opting for Postumus, and *SEHRE*, pp. 292 and 670, no. 7; M. Reinhold, *Marcus Agrippa. A Biography*, 1933, p. 61, n. 54 and pp. 128 f., opts for the elder, on the analogy of the Maecenatian estates, and so also R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 1939, p. 380. If it were the estate of the elder, it is surprising that we do not find any other references to it; if of Postumus, it is surprising that we do, for names of minors of the imperial house disappear after the Flavian reorganization of the οὐσιακός λόγος. I should emphasize, however, that the possibility that an Agrippa had in fact estates in Egypt still exists.

23. *SB* 4226, Αγρειππινιανῆς καὶ Ρουτιλλιανῆς οὐσίας τοῦ κυρίου Αύτοκρατορος ἀτελῆν καὶ ἀνενγάρευτον. This was

undated when first published by A. Erman, *ZASA* 28, 1890, p. 59, but the fact that a living emperor is presented as the owner of the estate, as well as the mention of tax-exemption (on which below, Chapter IV), strongly suggest a Julio-Claudian date. Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 128, n. 1, tentatively assigned it to the second century, but offered no reasons; so also Wilcken, *Ostraka I*, p. 392. Hirschfeld, *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 293, in search of an illustrious owner of the second century, suggested M. Rutilius Rufus, the prefect of 113-17 (*PIR* R 173: Stein, *Präfekten*, pp. 55 ff.), and this was accepted by R. S. Rogers, *TAPA* 78, 1947, p. 152, who thought that Rufus left his estate to Hadrian or Antoninus. Both this and the Agrippinian estates are missing in Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 669, n. 45.

24. The formula occurs in *P. Mich.* 223.1289, 1875; 224.2275, 6024; 225.2655; 372.ii.23; elsewhere Ανθιανή οὐσία. The accepted theory explains the phrase "Ανθος Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος" as meaning "(estate) of Germanicus, (formerly) of Anthos" (contra N. Lewis, *AJP* 67, 1964, p. 370, reversing the order), which is by no means impossible. But this still leaves us with the question of the social status of Anthos. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 672, no. 31, saw in him a rich Alexandrian, and he has been followed by all subsequent commentators. His contention, however, that the name was a popular one among Alexandrians is unfounded; Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, lists only a Θέων ὁ καὶ "Ανθος" Αμμανιανός, *P. Soc.* 315 (137/8), and Foraboschi, *Onomasticon*, none besides the person under discussion. The phrase *N Germanici Caesaris* is the standard way to refer to Germanicus' slaves and

part of the *patrimonium principis*, but the exact manner in which this was accomplished is not known. It could have been via Germanicus, or because Anthos passed to the *clientela* of Tiberius or Gaius: all depends on the year of Anthos' death.

The property of Tiberius was further augmented by the death of his son Drusus Iulius Caesar in 23, and of the latter's wife, Claudia Livilla or Livia Drusi, in 31. Whether Drusus himself had estates in Egypt is a matter of speculation; we know that Livia Drusi did.²⁵ In 29 we hear of a Κλάδος Λιβίας Δρούσου Καίσαρος having financial dealings with an Egyptian farmer dwelling in the farmstead of the Petronii brothers.²⁶ In 34, i.e. three years after her death, we hear of a προεστώς τῶν Τιβ[ε]ρίου καὶ Λιβίας Δρούσου Καίσαρος τέκνων (s.c. οὐσιῶν). I see no reason to suppose the loss of a second τῶν before Τιβ[ε]ρίου and to regard this as a property belonging to the children of Ti. Claudius Drusus (the future emperor Claudius) and of his sister Livia Drusi.²⁷ The reference is, I believe, to the emperor Tiberius himself and to his two surviving grandchildren, Iulia and Ti. Iulius Caesar Gemellus, of whom he was the guardian. Finally, in 46 we hear of a Λιβιανὴ οὐσία, but whether its original owner was Livia Drusilla or Livia Drusi is unknown.²⁸ By that time the estates of both had become imperial property.

Yet another estate which, in all probability, was added to the *patrimonium principis* during the lifetime of Tiberius seems to have been originally unconnected with the imperial family. From 87/8 on we have frequent references to a Διονυσοδωριανὴ οὐσία as part of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος. Now a Dionysodoros is known to have owned property in the Arsinoite, where the Διονυσοδωριανὴ οὐσία was located. He was *strategos* of the nome for more than the entire reign of Tiberius, an inordinately long period of time for such an appointment.²⁹ Lastly, a palm-tree plantation in the Dionysodian estate near Epipolis was called Στρατηγοῦ in 207/8.³⁰ The identification, then, of this *strategos* with the original owner of the Dionysodian estate is very tempting. He was certainly not of high rank, for he is known only by his Greek name and the post of the *strategos* was rather low and one for which Roman citizenship was not required.³¹ Dionysodoros' relation to Tiberius or to the imperial family, however, is totally unknown, as are the reasons for his estate becoming imperial property, or the manner in which this was done.

When Tiberius died in 37, he bequeathed his entire property jointly to his grandson, Ti. Iulius Caesar Gemellus, and to his grandnephew and successor to the throne, Gaius. The Senate realized the impossibility of such an arrangement. The imperial wealth played too important a role and too vital a part in the finances of the state to be thus severed, and whatever Gaius' motives for his request might have been, the Senate agreed to annul Tiberius' will.³² The

freedmen; see Chantraine, *Freigelassene*, p. 37. Anthos itself is an exceedingly common servile name; I have encountered about 100 instances in the works listed below, n. 63. For imperial slaves and freedmen of that name see, e.g., *CIL VI* 4903, 5215, 15114, 15616; XII 257.

25. See, e.g., Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 292.

26. *P. Ryl.* 127.26-7. The editors suggest that Κλάδος is a corruption for Κλαύδιος, in which case he would be not a slave but a freedman. This is quite possible, but cf. *CIL VI* 29154, *M. Ulpius Aug. lib. Cladus Entellianus*, and 2260, *Perennis ... Cladianus*. A Κλάδος is also known in Ptolemaic Egypt (*BGU* 1943 [215/4 B.C.]).

27. *P. Ryl.* 138.3-5; see the editors' note *ad loc.*, an interpretation universally accepted (e.g., Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 292, 670, no. 11). Both Tiberius and Claudius (before and after he had become emperor) are called Tiberius in papyri; see P. Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales dans les papyrus, les ostraca et les inscriptions d'Égypte*, 1964, pp. 25 ff.

28. *P. Mich.* 560.

29. He is attested from before 12 to 45, although it appears that his occupation of the post was not continuous; documents in H. Henne, *Liste des stratégés des noms Égyptiens à l'époque gréco-romaine*, 1935, pp. 7, 12, 50, 65; and G. Mussies, *P. Lugd.-Bat.* 14, 1965, p. 21. There is no other example of a *strategos* who served for more than six years. For the nature of Dionysodoros' office see Preisigke, *P. Strassb.* 118 introd., and Eitrem and Amundsen, *P. Osl.* 123 nn.

30. *P. Gen.* 38.5-6, Διονυσοδωριανῆς οὐσίας φοινικῶν ἀρούρῶν σ. (ἡμίσους) Στρατηγοῦ λεγομένου.

31. For the office in general see N. Hohlwein, *Le stratège du nome*, 1969. A new study is now needed.

32. Suet., *Tib.* 76, *Gaius* 14.1; Dio Cass., 59.1.1; Jos., *Ant.* 18.205 ff. Even if it had not been annulled, Gaius would have inherited Gemellus' share after the latter's death according to the provisions of the will.

patrimonium was once more *principis*. Whatever estates Gemellus may still have had in Egypt and elsewhere, e.g., those he had previously inherited from his parents and which could not have been covered under Tiberius' will, also passed to the *patrimonium*. For Gaius, having adopted young Gemellus, forced him to commit suicide late in 37, after which he could claim ownership of the prince's property in his capacity of adoptive father.

How strongly the emperor still felt himself as the personal owner of the *patrimonium principis* is illustrated by the story that, when Gaius fell dangerously ill, he left his entire property, together with the empire, to his sister Iulia Drusilla.³³ Naturally, had he died at that time, neither the Senate nor, what is more realistic, the new emperor would have considered such a will in any seriousness, and the account itself may well be apocryphal. It illustrates, nevertheless, an actual state of affairs and, given Gaius' autocratic views on the empire, is in character. Yet even the most republican-minded of the senators should have agreed that, as far as the *patrimonium* was concerned, Gaius was within his legal rights in bequeathing it to whomever he pleased. But what the law stated and what the actual conditions dictated were two vastly different things. The finances, and with them the entire structure, of the empire would have collapsed had an emperor deprived the state of the immense resources of the *patrimonium principis*.

Gaius had properties in Egypt before his accession to the throne. He had inherited some from his father, for he is one of the sons of Germanicus mentioned in the papyri already referred to.³⁴ If the owner of the Ἀγριππινιανὴ οὐσία was his mother and not his sister, he may very well have received part or all of that property in 33, the year of her death, as he inherited the *horti Agrippiniani* in Rome.³⁵ All these properties were, of course, now joined to the *patrimonium principis* and to the estates acquired by Augustus and Tiberius, and they subsequently passed to Claudius.

Late in 37 another addition, and a major one, was made to the imperial estates in Egypt, for that year saw the passing of another *grande dame* of the Julio-Claudians. Antonia Drusi, the younger daughter of M. Antonius and Octavia, was survived by two male relatives, her son Claudius and her grandson Gaius. Indubitably they were the chief, if not the sole, beneficiaries under her will, and there is no doubt that Gaius must have received the lion's share. The first clear and indisputable evidence of an estate in Egypt owned by Claudius dates from 40, i.e. one year before his accession to the throne. We hear of a προεστὼς τῆς Γαῖου Καίσαρος Αὐτοκράτορος Σεβαστοῦ οὐσίας καὶ τῆς Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Γερμανικοῦ οὐσίας τῶν περὶ Εύημερίαν.³⁶ These are two distinct estates,³⁷ but the presence of the same *curator* in charge of both may point to joint management not only because of geographical proximity, but also because of joint ownership. It is quite possible that we have here estates left by Antonia Drusi jointly to her son and to her grandson. If this is so, we are dealing with a section of the well-attested Ἀντωνιανὴ οὐσία.

Unlike her elder sister of the same name, who was not interested in Egypt or in much else for that matter, Antonia Drusi was, and very much so. Her estates in the Arsinoite are referred to for the first time in a document of 22,³⁸ and we know that she owned land in various villages of that nome. There is a large number of papyri mentioning an Ἀντωνιανὴ οὐσία,³⁹ and although the possibility remains that the original owner of some of these estates may have been her granddaughter, Claudia Antonia, I should think it more likely that in the majority, if not in all, of

33. Suet., *Gaius* 24: *heredem quoque bonorum atque imperii aeger instituit.*

34. See above, n. 11. Tiberius had meanwhile seen to the death of the other two, Nero Iulius Caesar in 31, and Drusus Iulius Caesar in 33.

35. Sen., *Dial. 3 (de ira)* 18; Philo, *ad Gaium* 2.572; see Platner-Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary*, pp. 264 f.

36. *P. Ryl.* 148.4-9.

37. See Tomsin, "Notes," p. 218, n. 64, where he is certainly right in opposing Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 670, no. 9.

38. *P. Osl.* 123.4-6, τῆς ἐν τῷ [..]:χ[ο]ν ἐποικ[ι]ων οὐσίας] Ἀντωνίας Δρού[σου].

39. See below, Appendix II.i.4 bis.

these instances it is Antonia Drusi who is meant. In 23 we also hear of a *Cerinthus Antoniae Drusi servus*, most likely a *vilicus* or a *curator* of her estates.⁴⁰ The document that preserves his signature is a notification to the *strategos* of the Oxyrhynchite of Cerinthus' intention to transfer a considerable number of sheep and goats to the Kynopolite, the nome across the Nile. He states that the animals are his, but are they feeding on public land or on his mistress' pastures? We know that in 50 Claudius is listed as the owner of an estate in the Oxyrhynchite,⁴¹ and it is not impossible that we are dealing with an estate he had inherited from his mother.

It has often been asserted, on the other hand, that Antonia herself had inherited part or all of her Egyptian estates from her father, M. Antonius. Dio, it is true, states that, after the triumvir's death, Augustus presented his nieces with part of their father's wealth.⁴² But although the emperor may have allowed the two Antoniae to retain some of their father's estates, the common assumption that Antonius owned land in Egypt cannot be documented at present.⁴³ It seems to me more likely that Antonia acquired her Egyptian estates in much the same manner in which her aunt, Livia Drusilla, must have obtained hers, i.e. through purchase.

Gaius died in 41 without a will, and with him perished his wife and their infant daughter. Within hours Claudius was moved from behind a curtain to the throne of the empire, and he took into his capable hands the entire *patrimonium* of the Julio-Claudians. This, of course, included all the estates that Augustus, Tiberius and Gaius had accumulated in Egypt. It is also during his reign that we first hear, in 53, of the Καμηλιανὴ οὐσία as part of the *patrimonium principis*,⁴⁴ although the exact moment of its entrance into this roster is unknown. The identity of its original owner, Camelius, still remains a mystery, but the size of the estate was considerable. The name does not point to an illustrious personage,⁴⁵ and I would speculate that Camelius was a slave or a freedman whose estates passed to the emperor upon his death. Confirmation of this, however, must wait for further documentation.

Regarding the presence of slaves or freedmen among those whose properties further enriched the emperor during Claudius' reign our information is not as explicit as one would wish it to be. In a papyrus dated in the first year of Nero's rule, an Egyptian oil-maker informs his lessor that some of the machinery ἔλαιουργίου - - πρότερον Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Σαραπίωνος, νυνεὶ δὲ τοῦ κυρίου Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος] Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος had been repaired, if not purchased, at his own expense.⁴⁶ Ti. Claudius Sarapion, as his name reveals, was a freedman of Claudius. We cannot be sure, however, as to the exact date that this oil-press changed hands and became imperial property. The presence of the slave Epaphroditos, and his master Ti. Claudius Felix, another of Claudius' freedmen, in charge of the press may point to a pre-Neronian time.

40. *P. Oxy.* 244. See also Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 85 f.

41. *P. Oxy.* 2837.1-4, οὗσίας τοῦ κυρίου Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος] Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος. This is the latest reference to an estate owned by Claudius.

42. Dio Cass., 51.15.7, ταῖς τε ἀδελφιδαῖς, δις ἐκ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου ἡ Ὀκταυούια ἀνήρητο τε καὶ ἐτερόφει, χοήματα ἀπὸ τῶν πατρόφων ἀπένειμε.

43. Wilcken, *Ostraka I*, p. 393, saw M. Antonius as the original owner of the Ἀντωνιανὴ οὐσία; so also Hirschfeld, *Klio* 2, 1902, p. 293. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 670, no. 8, does not altogether dismiss the possibility, and at p. 671, no. 19, states that "it is probable that the estate [of Gallia Polla] was originally formed out of lands given by M. Antonius to one of his partisans". See also A. Piganiol, *MH* 10, 1953, p. 195. On a photograph of *P. Princ.* 11, I read Ἀντωνίας, not Ἀντωνίου, in

ii.6 (also Νέας at the end of the line). In *P. Princ.* 14.i.8, whether we read Ἀντωνίου or Ἀντωνίας θυγατρός, it is Antonia Drusi who must be meant, not her father. In *P. Strassb.* 267.6, where the editor read Ἀντωνίου Οὐεσπ[α-], Prof. J. Schwartz, who kindly examined the papyrus at my request, suggests a very tentative Ἀντωνίας Δρούσου Οὐε[στασ-].

44. *P. Mich.* 539.8; for more evidence see below, Appendix II.iii.4.

45. According to W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, 1933, p. 140, the name is connected with the *tribus* *Camilia* and is a variation of *Camil(l)ius*; cf. *Camellius* in *CIL VI* 1686; *Camelius* and *Camelia* in VI 6612; X 3699; XIV 3080-84. See also Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 123, but cf. *SEHRE*, p. 672.

46. *P. Lond.* 280 (II, p. 193).4-7.

The evidence surrounding the estate formerly of Narkissos is similarly equivocal. In 56/7 it is called [Τιβερίου] Κλαυδίου Δορυφόρου πρότερον Ναρκισσιανή ούσια.⁴⁷ There is little doubt but that the Doryphorus mentioned here is the well-known freedman of Claudius who later became a *libellis* to Nero. But who is Narkissos? The accepted theory is that we are dealing here with the famous *ab epistulis* to Claudius who, immediately upon that emperor's death, was arrested and driven to suicide. According to such an identification, Nero, who was Narkissos' new *patronus* whether the latter liked it or not, would have inherited Narkissos' estate and would have presented to one freedman what he had received from the other. But this identification, attractive though it is, cannot be considered absolutely certain. Aside from the fact that Narkissos is an exceedingly common servile name, we have the same Egyptian who complained about the oil-press of Sarapion now complaining about the τῆς πρότερον Ναρκίσσου ούσιας ἔλαιουρογύτον.⁴⁸ Here, too, parts of the machinery were defective and he had to purchase new ones with his own money. Are we dealing with the same oil-press, or are all presses in imperial estates in the same condition of deplorable neglect? Is there any connection between Sarapion and Narkissos, and if so, which of the two "former owners" came first? Lastly, was the press imperial property as early as 52/3, the year that the fellah's lease began, or did the oil-maker continue in his lease after the property had changed hands and entered the *patrimonium*? To these questions, unimportant, to be sure, but characteristic of the difficulties encountered in the present study, no definitive answer can be given at present.

We have better information, however, regarding the members of the immediate family of Claudius, for we know that both his third wife as well as his daughter by his second wife had properties in Egypt. A small leaden tessera found in Alexandria,⁴⁹ and which I think ought to be dated in Claudius' reign, is a mark of ownership and possibly the earliest evidence for the Messalinian estates. It bears the inscription Μεσσαλίνης κτῆσις upon it, and has as types "a standing figure of Messalina, copied with slight variations from the reserve of tetradrachms of her husband Claudius, and a cynocephalus baboon."⁵⁰ The empress does not seem to have purchased any land in the Arsinoite, or if she did the parcels were small and quickly engulfed by larger properties. She had estates, however, in the adjoining nomes, the Herakleopolite and the Hermopolite, where her name was attached to plots of land as late as the third century.⁵¹ What happened to these estates is not known. Claudius and their two children, Octavia and Britannicus, must have been the beneficiaries; if this is so, through marriage and assassination they passed to Nero.

Our information regarding the estates of Antonia, Claudius' daughter by Aelia Paetina, is scanty. All the certain evidence comes from the second century,⁵² but some of the references of the first century, as well as some of the instances where an Ἀντωνιανή ούσια is mentioned, may also point to her, rather than to Antonia Drusi. The standard way, however, of referring to Claudia Antonia's estates — estates apparently rather small — seems to have been (πρότερον) Ἀντωνίας θυγατρὸς θεοῦ Κλαυδίου, obviously in order to avoid exactly this kind of confusion.⁵³ Antonia survived her father, as well as all other members of the Julio-Claudian family with the exception of Nero, but in 66, a few months after the Pisonian conspiracy in which her complicity is doubtful, she was accused of attempted revolution and was executed. Her property had nowhere

47. P. Ryl. 171.1-2.

48. WChr. 176 (after 52/3, possibly Nero).

49. SB 6019. The inscription quoted is the entire text.

50. J. G. Milne, *JEA* 1, 1914, p. 94; see G. Dattari, *Monete imperiali greche. Numi Augg. Alexandrini, catalogo della collezione G. Dattari*, 1901, no. 6506, plate 37. Cf. Rostovtzeff, *Staatspacht*, p. 491, n. 359. What was seen as a

cynocephalus baboon is most likely a crude representation of Thoth, who was extensively worshiped in Hermopolis and the Delta.

51. See below, Appendix II.i.13.

52. P. Fay 40.7-8 (162/3); P. Bour. 42 *passim* (167).

53. See the previous note; for Ἀντωνιανή ούσια with no further qualifications see below, Appendix II.i.4 bis.

to go but to Nero.

Claudius was assassinated in 54, leaving behind him the last will ever to be written by a Roman emperor.⁵⁴ In it some reference must have been made to Britannicus, for it was too embarrassing to read in public. But whether Claudius was optimistic or foolish enough to have left part of the *patrimonium principis* to his son is uncertain. What is certain, however, is that Nero immediately set aside the old man's will and assumed power as sole ruler. With the assassinations that followed in rapid succession, of Britannicus in 55, of Agrippina in 59, of Octavia in 62, and of Claudia Antonia in 66, Nero remained the lone survivor of a once teeming Julio-Claudian house, a house that had found room under its roof for the greatest as well as the lowest forms of human being. The entire property of this family, the wealth accumulated since the days of Iulius Caesar and Gaius Octavius, the estates built up by a Maecenas, a Lurius, a Iulia Augusta, a Livia Drus, an Antonia Drus, a Germanicus in Egypt — all now lay in the hands of the young man. It was not enough.

The year 62 saw the death of two of the most powerful freedmen ever to cross the halls of the imperial palace and the further enrichment of the emperor. Ti. Claudius Doryphorus⁵⁵ was manumitted by Claudius and later became a *libellis* to Nero. There was a time when he was esteemed enough, and beloved enough, to merit a huge gift in money and a marriage ceremony with the emperor, but he made his fatal mistake in opposing Nero's marriage to Poppaea. From 62 onwards his estates are listed as part of the *patrimonium principis*. M. Antonius Pallas⁵⁶ was freed by Antonia Drus at some time between 31, when he is last attested as her slave, and 37, the year of her death. He passed to the *clientela* of her son Claudius, to whom he became a *rationibus*, and enjoyed unlimited power during the second half of Claudius' reign and the first years of Nero's. He died an old man, perhaps of natural causes, but rumor — whether true or Tacitean is unknown — insisted that the emperor, impatient to inherit the phenomenal wealth of his freedman, abetted nature with poison.⁵⁷

If a papyrus which gives details about the early stages of an estate of Pallas in the Arsinoite is in fact dated in the reign of Tiberius, Pallas must have begun accumulating property in Egypt while he was Antonia's slave or immediately upon his manumission.⁵⁸ This is by no means unlikely, for although he acquired the bulk of his wealth while a *rationibus*, he certainly was not a pauper before his elevation to that office. Is it too farfetched to speculate that he may have spent some time in Egypt in the decade of the twenties as the *procurator* of his mistress' estates?

The same papyrus mentions three individuals whose land was acquired by Pallas for the formation of this particular estate, Gallia Polla, most likely a local owner whose property was formerly owned by a L. Septimius,⁵⁹ and Eros and Kharmos, who were joint owners, and who

54. Suet., *Claud.* 44; Tac., *Ann.* 12.69; Dio Cass., 61.1.2, Νέρων οὖν τάς τε διαθήκας τοῦ Κλαυδίου ἡφάντισ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν πᾶσαν διεδέξατο. See P. A. Brunt, *JRS* 56, 1966, p. 78.

55. *PIR*² D 194. References to his Egyptian estates below, Appendix II.iii.7.

56. *PIR*¹ P 49. See also S. I. Oost, "The Career of M. Antonius Pallas," *AJP* 79, 1958, pp. 113 ff. The *horti Pallantiani* became imperial property as well; see Platner-Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary*, p. 270. *Pallantiani* among the imperial slaves in *CIL* VI 143, 8470. For references to his Egyptian estates see below, Appendix II.iii.21. It is very possible that Nero inherited (there is no reason to speak of confiscation) only part of Pallas' estates, since the latter was a *libertus*, not a slave. According to Oost, p. 138, "the rest went to Pallas' family, and provided the means whereby one of his descendants attained the consulship in 167" (*PIR*² A 859). A. M.

Antonius Pallas was living in the second century and owning land in Egypt; see below, Appendix I. Whether he is connected with the freedman, or whether he inherited (Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 123, n. 2) or created his estates there, is not known.

57. Tac., *Ann.* 14.65; cf. Dio Cass., 62.14.3; Suet., *Nero* 35.5.

58. On the basis of a photograph supplied me by the Trustees of the British Museum, *P. Lond.* 195 (II, p. 127).1-2 read τελέσματα κτήσεως λεγομένη(ς) [ca. 20 letters] Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ [ca. 25 letters]. It is most likely (but not certain) that line 2 is part of a date; see Foraboschi, *Chronique* 42, 1967, p. 172, n. 2, and cf. Tomsin, *Chronique* 46, 1971, pp. 352 ff.

59. L. Septimius has often been seen as an early member of the future imperial family of the Septimii Severi, or as a relative of Septimius Severus, the friend of Statius; so Rostovtzeff,

appear together in another document as well.⁶⁰ Other papyri show that the jointly owned lands of a Iucundus and a Khresimos,⁶¹ together with the property of an individual whose name is most likely to be restored as Numerius,⁶² contributed to the formation of the Παλλαντιανὰ οὐσία. All these persons are otherwise unknown, but it is curios to note that all the male names on the list are typically servile.⁶³ Did Pallas purchase land from some imperial slaves and freedmen, as well as from local landowners? Did he inherit from those of his own slave and manumitted *vilicii* in Egypt who had purchased land themselves as their *peculium*? (These parcels, we should observe, are of small to average size, none exceeding 50 *arourae*.) All this is, admittedly, pure speculation, but I find it easier to accept than to believe that an Eros, a Karmos, a Iucundus or a Khresimos were important Alexandrians; that an emperor granted land to them; and that the same or another emperor took it back and presented it to Pallas.⁶⁴

Another person to enrich the emperor with his estates was L. Annaeus Seneca the younger. His passion for acquiring riches was as deeply rooted and as insatiable as was his interest in agriculture, and he was successful in both pursuits. His estate near Nomentum is cited as an example of model management,⁶⁵ and Juvenal spoke of his gardens in Rome as *magnos Senecae praedivitis hortos* (10.15-16).⁶⁶ The size of his holdings in Egypt was not less immense. It appears that the Σενεκανὴ οὐσία was the single largest addition to the *patrimonium principis*, and the largest privately owned estate in Egypt at the time, second only to that of Nero.⁶⁷

SEHRE, p. 671, no. 24; see also Foraboschi, *Chronique* 42, 1967, pp. 172 f. But I find unacceptable this identification of L. Septimius with the former owner of the Σενεκανὴ οὐσία, which is never connected with the estates of Pallas.

60. *P. Berl. Leihg.* 29 (164), where Prof. A. Tomsin kindly informed me that we encounter a Παλλαντιανὴ οὐσία [(πρότερον) Ἔρωτος καὶ] Χάρου. His identification, however, of Eros with the person mentioned in Plut., *Apophth.* Aug. 4.207B, is questionable (see *PIR² E* 86; G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, 1965, p. 40; S. Tregiari, *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*, 1969, p. 191). Eros is the commonest servile name in any period. For imperial freedmen see *CIL VI* 8413, *Ti. Claudius Aug. I. Eros a rationibus*; 8607, *M. Upius Aug. lib. Eros ab epistulis*; 4124-5, 4245, 8753, 8901, 10395, 15035, 17274; X 6666. Erotes are also found in Egypt; from the reign of Augustus, *BGU* 1118, 1125, and 2047 (see *JJP* 16-17, 1971, p. 193).

61. See below, Appendix II.iii.10 and 13. The names appear always jointly. Χρησίμου is to be supplied in *P. Ryl.* 207.5 and 17; Χρησί(μου), not Χρυσί(ππον), is to be read in *BGU* 1894.94 (so Prof. W. Müller, who was kind enough to examine the papyrus at my request). I am not wholly convinced that the Ιουκούνδος Γρυπιανός or Γρυπιανοῦ of *P. Hamb.* 3.7 (74) is in any way connected with the Iucundus under discussion (so Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 671, no. 20; cf. *PIR² I* 73). Not all persons mentioned in lines 4 ff. need be former owners of imperial estates; the term οὐσία, applied to the lands of Maecenas, Seneca, Lurius and Germanicus, is missing after the two doubtful cases, of which the other is τὰς Ατίας or Ταπατίας (neither looks very satisfactory; see the published plate) Αμμωνίου, a person that I believe to be actually alive at the time, in view of the ἐπακολ(ουθοῦντος) etc.; cf. *P. Lond.* 1213-15 (III, p. 121) *passim*. Hence it is very likely that Aphrodisios, the undeciphered name and Iucundus stand in the same position, in which case we should read δι(έγραψαν) for δι(έγραψεν) in line 2. This is not definite, of course, but even if the mysterious name and Iucundus Grypianus are land-owners,

nothing compels us to regard them as former owners of imperial estates; *pace* Meyer, the γεωγοί mentioned in the document need not be exclusively οὐσιακοί.

62. *P. Bour.* 42.103 reads Παλατ() οὐσ(ίας) ἢ Ιουνερ(); the first doubtful word is almost certainly Παλατ(ιανῆς); for the second (which is paleographically certain) K. F. W. Schmidt, *GGA* 190, 1928, p. 163, n. 7, suggested Νούμερ(ίου); otherwise = Ιουκούνδου.

63. Throughout this chapter, in determining whether a name is common among slaves and freedmen I have relied on the index to *CIL VI* and on the following works: C. Huelsen, "Il sito e le iscrizioni della schola Xanthas sul foro Romano," *MDAI (R)* 3, 1888, pp. 208 ff.; A. Oxé, "Zur älteren Nomenklatur der römischen Sklaven," *RhM* 59, 1904, pp. 108 ff.; M. Lambertz, "Die griechischen Sklavennamen," *LVII. Jahresbericht über das k.k. Staatsgymnasium im VIII. Bezirke Wiens*, 1906/7, pp. 3 ff., and *LVIII. Jahresbericht*, 1908, pp. 3 ff.; J. Baumgart, *Die römischen Sklavennamen*, 1936; B. Doer, *Die römische Namengebung. Ein historischer Versuch*, 1937; H. Chantraine, *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser. Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur*, 1967; also W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, 1933, and P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris. A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves*, 1972.

64. So, e.g., Tomsin, "Notes," p. 221. The identification of these persons with rich Alexandrians was first made by Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 293 and 672, and has been universally accepted; see, e.g., Jouguet, *La domination romaine*, p. 15; N. Hohlwein, "Evhéméria du Fayoum," *JJP* 3, 1949, pp. 63 ff.; Tomsin, "Notes" and "Les continuités," *passim*.

65. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 580, n. 25.

66. See also Tac., *Ann.* 14.52 ff.; Platner-Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary*, p. 272.

67. The Senecan estates in Hiera Nesos, Drymos Hiera Nesou, Perkeesis and Ptolemais Nea (neighboring villages under a single administration) totalled slightly less than 2500 *arourae* (*P. Bour.* 42). See also Sen., *Dial.* 7 (de vita

The exact time at which Seneca started acquiring land in Egypt is unknown. In 31 or 32 he was visiting with his uncle Gaius Galerius, then prefect, in Alexandria,⁶⁸ but whether he began purchasing lands at that early stage is a matter of speculation. He could have done little, if indeed anything, between 41 and 49 while he was banished to Corsica and pleading with Polybios, but from 49 to 62 his life traced an ascending road to power and wealth. Burrus' death in 62, however, dealt a severe blow to Seneca's power, and the latter, now almost 70 years old, his relations with the emperor severely strained, attempted to retire from the political arena. *Iube*, he requested Nero, *rem per procuratores tuos administrari, in tuam fortunam recipi*, but the offer of his wealth was refused.⁶⁹ A document dated 25 October 62, and which is our earliest reference to his estates in Egypt, has been taken to mean that Nero had in fact confiscated them by that time.⁷⁰ The sole evidence for such a conclusion is that the subleasing of the Senecan estate in the Oxyrhynchite was handled by a Ti. Claudius Theon who is called μισθωτής. But this is no certain testimony, for even while in private possession of his properties, Seneca would have to engage the services of numerous *conductores*. The words of Seneca himself, probably written in 63 or 64, upon the arrival of an Alexandrian flotilla in Rome, are not ambiguous: *epistulas meorum accepturus non properavi scire, quis illic esset rerum mearum status, quid afferrent; olim iam nec perit quicquam mihi nec acquiritur* (Ep. 77.3). In spite of the fact that for a long time now he had had nothing to gain or to lose (which may simply mean that he was no longer engaged in business transactions), he still had *res suae* in Egypt of which news was forthcoming.

In addition to the estates mentioned up to this point, there are seven more which figure in the οὐσιακὸς λόγος. The identity of their original owners is a complete mystery — indeed the very name of one of them is lost in a lacuna. All the pertinent information comes from the second and third centuries, i.e. long after they had entered the *patrimonium principis*, but four of them (the οὐσία Χρήστου,⁷¹ the οὐσία Λατείνου or Λατινιανὴ οὐσία,⁷² the Σεουηριανὴ οὐσία and the Μηνατιανὴ οὐσία) are listed among the Vespasian portion of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, and it is certain, although only from circumstantial evidence, that the remaining three (the Σωκρατιανὴ οὐσία, and the οὐσία Ὄνησίμου and his unknown partner in a joint ownership) should be placed there as well.⁷³ These estates could have become part of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος at any time between Augustus and Vespasian, but not after the latter had organized the twofold division of this *ratio* between himself and Titus. Judging by their names only, Khrestos, Latinus and Onesimos were certainly slaves or freedmen; Sokrates and Severus possibly so.⁷⁴ As for the remaining owner, the current opinion is that his name was Menas, but Menatius is an equally logical possibility.⁷⁵

beata).17.2: *cur trans mare possides? cur plura quam nosti?* This, however, does not necessarily, or exclusively, mean Egypt; it is very likely that Sefeca had estates in Galatia as well; see W. M. Ramsay, *JRS* 16, 1926, p. 205.

68. Sen., *Dial.* 12 (*ad Helviam*).19.4; see Stein, *Untersuchungen*, p. 110, with nn. 1-2, and p. 259, with bibliography.

69. Tac., *Ann.* 14.54; Suet., *Nero* 35.

70. *P. Oxy.* 2873; see G. M. Browne, *BASP* 5, 1968, pp. 18 f.

71. Known only for the Mendesian nome and from unpublished documents; see below, Appendix II.iii.14.

72. In *P. Ryl.* 427 (22).7 we should read Λατινιανῆς οὐσίας (so also Mrs. S. Kambitsis by letter), and in (15).9 for the editors' ί.ζ οὐσίαν ἡ Λατείνου καὶ Ἡρᾶτ[ος] I would read, on the basis of a photograph supplied me by the Rylands Library, ίης (e.g., μισθωτῆς) οὐσίας ἡ Λατείνου καὶ Ἡρᾶς, or Ἡρᾶτ[ος]. In *P. Strassb.* 299 recto.17 we are also dealing with this estate; I read οὐσιαζῶν· Λατείνου. The property of Latinus figures

excessively in unpublished papyri from Thmouis, in the Mendesian nome, currently being studied by Mrs. S. Kambitsis, who was kind enough to send me long transcripts. The presence of the Latinian estate among the Vespasian ones excludes the possibility that we are dealing with the well-known *actor mimicus* ridiculed by Juvenal, and who later became informer to Domitianus (*PIR*² L 129).

73. The Sokratian estate is known only from *P. Berl. Leihg.* 1 verso.iv.7; the Onesimian only from *P. Ryl.* 207.23. There is no doubt that both were member-estates of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος.

74. See above, n. 63. Khrestos, Latinus and Onesimos are typical and frequent slave names. Sokrates and Severus, however, although found as servile names, are also encountered among wealthy Greek citizens and Roman *equites*. A Servianus Severus served as *idios logos* in 44/5-46 (*P. Tebt.* 298; *P. Vindob. Bosw.* 1).

75. Kalén, *P. Berl. Leihg.*, pp. 75 f., suggested Menas because of ἀπὸ ἀρουρῶν ἐπτὰ Μηνᾶ λεγο(μένων) in *P. Berl.*

Neither name points to an individual of high rank.

There are only two estates, both of which were created during Nero's reign, of which one certainly, the other possibly, entered the *patrimonium principis* after Nero's death. The first is the Ἀκτηιανὴ οὐσία, or Ἀκτῆς as it is more often called.⁷⁶ Its original owner was the well-known freedwoman of Claudius and Nero's mistress. Akte owned lands in Sardinia, Puteoli, Velitrae and Terranova (Olbia) as well, and we know that after her death these too became imperial property.⁷⁷ According to Suetonius, she survived her new *patronus*, whose body she helped lay to rest, but for how long is not certain.⁷⁸ The second estate is that of Calvia Crispinilla, another of Nero's mistresses. She was a γυνὴ ἐπιφανῆς who enriched herself during Nero's lifetime,⁷⁹ then went to Africa to assist Claudius Macro in his attempt at seizing the throne. If Tacitus is correct in stating that she lived unharmed, rich, powerful and childless during the reigns of Galba, Otho and Vitellius, then her estates must have entered the οὐσιακὸς λόγος during Vespasian's reign.⁸⁰ If they entered it at all, that is, for at present all the evidence we have about her properties in Egypt comes from a single scrap of papyrus, where her name is largely restored, and where it is not stated that her οὐσία became in fact part of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος.⁸¹

With the nocturnal flight and the subsequent tragicomic suicide of Nero on June 68, the Julio-Claudian dynasty came to an end. Up to that time the property of one emperor had descended to his successor — who was also his blood relative — in accordance with the ordinary laws of inheritance, even if a will were not available. But the break that took place in 68 was absolute: the familial connection was shattered. During the following year the army elevated to the throne three more emperors, only to break them with alarming dispatch: Galba in January, Otho in April, Vitellius in December of 69. There are few, and otherwise insignificant, pieces of evidence which indicate that the successors of the Julio-Claudians became also the possessors of their *patrimonium*. Thus Galba could form a commission to recall Nero's gifts;⁸² Otho took over Nero's slaves and freedmen, and held symposia (to use a mild term) in the *palatium*;⁸³ Vitellius complained (!) about the *domus aurea* where he was lodging, as badly built and wretchedly equipped, while his wife ridiculed the scantiness of decorations in the imperial halls: οὗτος αὐτὸν (sc. Vitellius) οὐδὲν τῶν ἔκείνου (sc. Nero) τι ἤρεσεν (Dio Cass., 64.4.1).

So, not because of any special legislation, but under the overwhelming influence of conditions and necessities none could ignore, the *patrimonium principis* had automatically

Leihg. 18.12 (163) in Lagis. This is extremely fragile: there is no evidence that the arourae were sold from the οὐσιακὸς λόγος; the Menatian estate is thus far known only from Theadelphia; Menas is a very common theophoric name in the East, and particularly in Egypt (see Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, and Foraboschi, *Onomasticon*). The identification of the original owner of the Menatian estate with Menas/Menodorus, the freedman of Pompeius who kept changing sides between Sextus and Augustus, is impossible: he died in a skirmish in Pannonia in 35 B.C. (Dio Cass., 49.37.6). See Kalén, *P. Berl. Leihg.*, p. 76, n. 1; M. Reinhold, *Marcus Agrippa. A Biography*, 1933, pp. 29, 33 n. 32, 38; S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*, 1969, pp. 188 f. On Menates/Menatius/Minatius, an Oscan-Etruscan name, see W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, 1933, pp. 185, 286, 361, 529; cf. the list of Minatii in Dessau, *ILS* III, p. 100.

76. Ἀκτηιανή in *SB* 10893.6; Ἀκτῆς regularly in the unpublished papyri from Thmouis; cf. also *P. Ross.-Georg. II*

42.4-5.

77. See *PIR*² C 1067. In the imperial household we find an Acteanus (*CIL* VI 15027) and an Acteniana (X 7980); cf. also VI 15357. Discussion and bibliography in Chantraine, *Freigelassene*, pp. 295 f.

78. Suet., *Nero* 50.

79. Dio Cass., 62.12.3-4; cf. *PIR*² C 363.

80. Tac., *Hist.* 1.73. Among the slaves of the Flavian household we find a Tychicus *Imp. Dom(itiani) ser. architectus Crispinil(lianus)*, *CIL* VI 8726, but it is not certain that Calvia is to be understood as his former mistress. Crispinilla is found among slaves, for example; cf. *CIL* VI 16586, and see Chantraine, *Freigelassene*, p. 309.

81. P. Aberd. 151 (I). Line 3 reads οὐσίας Καλβίας Κ[ρισπινί]λλης; is the restoration really "inescapable" (so E. G. Turner *ad loc.*)? K[is doubtful.

82. Tac., *Hist.* 1.20; Suet., *Galba* 15.

83. Dio Cass., 63.8.3 ff.; Tac., *Hist.* 1.80 ff.

become *Krongut*.⁸⁴ And more than that: the private property of an individual who ascended to the throne henceforth became, equally automatically, absorbed in the crown property and descended with it to all succeeding emperors. The emphasis, from now on, is not on *patrimonium* but on *principis*. We have already witnessed this development taking place under the Julio-Claudians, but in that era one could argue that the laws of inheritance had a large part to play. But when on 22 December 69 Vespasian was formally appointed emperor by the Senate, there passed into his hands not only the entire Julio-Claudian *patrimonium*, but also the properties of the three post-Neronian emperors. Thus we find *Galbiani* and *Othoniani* among the slaves and freedmen of the Flavian household, together with *Agrippiniani*, *Octaviani*, *Poppaeani* and the like.⁸⁵ This was repeated in 96, when a similar break took place and the Flavian dynasty came to an end: among Trajan's slaves we find an *Agrippinianus*.⁸⁶ And a century later, after an identical break had come with the end of the Antonines, Pertinax would refuse to have his name inscribed on imperial estates, since they belonged not to himself but to the office: τοῖς τε βασιλικοῖς κτήμασιν ἐκώλυσεν αὐτοῦ τούνομα ἐπιγράφεσθαι, εἰπὼν αὐτὰ οὐκ ἴδια τοῦ βασιλεύοντος εἶναι, ἀλλὰ κοινὰ καὶ δημόσια τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς (Herodian 11.4.7). The emperor may have not yet fully come to be the state, but the *patrimonium principis* was clearly a property belonging to the emperor *qua* emperor, and not *qua* private individual.

The evidence from Egypt is more explicit and complete. None of the few documents that come from 68 and 69 gives us any information about imperial estates, and of the considerable number of papyri from the Flavian period only a half dozen deal with them. But we have an abundance of material from the second and third centuries, and they all spell out a very clear picture: a definite and radical change has taken place.

Up to the Flavians there were three departments responsible for the administration of land in Egypt. The διοίκησις, or *fiscus*, administered all fiscal land, the γῆ δημοσία, βασιλική and προσόδου, and collected taxes from all private properties as well. The ἱερατικά was responsible for the hieratic revenues. The *idios logos*, ὃς τῶν ἀδεσπότων καὶ τῶν εἰς Καίσαρα πίπτειν ὀφειλόντων ἔξεταστής ἐστιν (Strabo 17.797), was the "special account" responsible for all sporadic and irregular sources of revenue, like fines, confiscations and acquisitions of *bona caduca* and *vacantia*. From the Flavians to Diocletian, however, we hear of a fourth department,

84. The *patrimonium principis* and its subsequent history are interconnected with the development of the imperial *fiscus*, the fate of the *aerarium*, and the emergence of the *res privata*, too complex and extensive subjects to be treated here. I append a selected bibliography for those who wish to pursue the matter, placing emphasis on recent works where references to, and criticisms of, previous studies may be found. (On the matter of the imperial *fiscus*, I find myself clearly on the side of H. Last and P. A. Brunt, as opposed to F. Millar, who seems to me to have misunderstood the material from Egypt; H. Nesselhauf's article and A. Masi's recent book are excellent studies on the *patrimonium* and the *res privata*.) O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, 1905, pp. 1 ff.; M. Rostovtzeff, "Fiscus," *DEAR* III, 1922, pp. 96 ff.; R. Syme, "The Imperial Finances under Domitian, Nerva and Trajan," *JRS* 20, 1930, pp. 55 ff.; T. Frank, "On Augustus and the *Aerarium*," *JRS* 23, 1933, pp. 143 ff.; S. von Bolla, *Die Entwicklung des Fiscus zum Privatrechtssubject mit Beiträgen zur Lehre von Aerarium*, 1938; G. Cardinali, "Amministrazione territoriale e finanziaria," *Augustus*, 1938, pp. 161 ff.; H. Last, "The Fiscus: A Note," *JRS* 34, 1944, pp. 51 ff.; C. H. V. Sutherland, "Aerarium and Fiscus during the Early Empire," *AJP* 66, 1945, pp. 151 ff.; R. S. Rogers, "The Roman Emperors

as Heirs and Legatees," *TAPA* 78, 1947, pp. 140 ff.; A. H. M. Jones, "The Aerarium and the Fiscus," *JRS* 40, 1950, pp. 22 ff.; H.-G. Pflaum, *Essai sur les procurateurs équestres sous le haut-empire*, 1950; A. Garzetti, "Aerarium e fiscus sotto Augusto. Storia di una questione in parte di nomi," *Athenaeum* 41, 1953, pp. 298 ff.; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romain*: I, 1960, II, 1961; F. Millar, "The Fiscus in the First Two Centuries," *JRS* 53, 1963, pp. 29 ff.; H. Nesselhauf, "Patrimonium und *res privata* des römischen Kaisers," *Historia-Augusta-Colloquium*, 1963, pp. 73 ff.; F. Millar, "The Aerarium and its Officials under the Empire," *JRS* 54, 1964, pp. 33 ff.; P. A. Brunt, "The 'Fiscus' and its Development," *JRS* 56, 1966, pp. 75 ff.; P. Baldacci, "Patrimonium e *ager publicus* al tempo di Flavi," *PP* 24, 1969, pp. 349 ff.; G. Boulvert, "Tacite et le fiscus," *RD* 48, 1970, pp. 430 ff.; A. Masi, "Ricerche sulla 'res privata' del 'princeps,'" 1971.

85. *Galbiani* in *CIL* VI 8819, 18048, 37759; *Othonianus* in XIV 2060; *Agrippinianus* in VI 15616; *Octavianus* (of Octavia, the daughter of Claudius) in VI 15551; *Poppaeanus* in VI 8954; see also F. Millar, *JRS* 53, 1963, p. 41, n. 176.

86. *CIL* VI 36911.

the οὐσιακά or οὐσιακὸς λόγος, the *ratio usiaca*, which is the Egyptian equivalent of *ratio patrimonii*. At its head is a *procurator*, the κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος οὐσιακῶν or κράτιστος οὐσιακὸς ἐπίτροπος.⁸⁷

Other evidence testifies to the magnitude of the change. Gone are the few forms of tax-exemption that we find in the Julio-Claudian properties; gone are the ἐπίτροποι, the οἰκονόμοι, the προεστῶτες, the slaves and the freedmen supervising or cultivating the land.⁸⁸ From now on we hear of a γῆ οὐσιακή, which like the δημοσία, βασιλική, ἵερά and προσόδου, is public land, and which is administered and exploited in a way that does not differ substantially or appreciably from that of the remaining public land.⁸⁹ From now on, too, the term οὐσιακὸς γεωργός totally replaces γεωργὸς οὐσίας, and this new farmer does not differ from the δημόσιος, βασιλικός, or προσοδικὸς γεωργός in any way; they are all public tenants of state land, δημόσιοι γεωργοί.

Exactly when was this οὐσιακὸς λόγος created, and exactly which properties did it include? These two questions are interdependent, and the answer to the first can be conjectured from the second. A number of papyri from the second and third centuries classify the οὐσίαι of this new οὐσιακὸς λόγος under two headings, those formerly of Vespasian, and those formerly of Titus.⁹⁰ Included in the οὐσίαι Οὐεσπασιανοῦ are the former estates of Antonia Drusi, Germanicus, Claudia Antonia, as well as those of Alexandros, Dionysodoros, Khrestos, Latinus, Lurius, Maecenas, Menas or Menatius, Pallas (including those formerly owned by Eros, Iucundus, Khresimos, Numerius and Polla) and Severus. On circumstantial evidence only, we may add those of Anthos, Camelius, Onesimos and Sokrates. The οὐσίαι Τίτου are fewer in number: those of Doryphoros (including those formerly of Narkissos and Sarapion) and Seneca; a scrap of papyrus suggests that those of Agrippina and Akte should be included in this list.⁹¹ The import of this is clear: the οὐσιακὸς λόγος comprised the estates of the Julio-Claudian emperors; apparently all of them, and apparently none other. At some time under the Flavians this *ratio patrimonii* became a closed and fossilized roster. There is good evidence that small parcels of it were later sold to individuals,⁹² as there is good evidence that the desert reclaimed part of the patrimonial land, as it did of other land as well, when the irrigation system steadily deteriorated.⁹³ But there is no

87. On the creation of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος see Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten*, pp. 355 ff.; Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 130 ff.; Hohlwein, *L'Égypte romaine*, pp. 163 ff.; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 298 ff.; Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate*, p. 12; Collart, *P. Bour.*, pp. 159 ff.; Kalén, *P. Berl. Leihg.*, p. 69; Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 292 ff.; Tomsin, "Notes," pp. 215 ff.; G. Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le haut-empire romain*, 1970, pp. 224 ff. On the *procurator usiacus* see below, Appendix III.

88. See below, Chapter IV.

89. The differences between the management and the exploitation of the οὐσιακή γῆ and the remaining state land seem to have been greatly exaggerated by Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 181 ff. It exists not so much between two categories of public land, as between garden- and grain-land, and it is primarily with respect to the former that the ἐπιτηρηταὶ οὐσιακῶν figure in the majority of the cases. See now the more restrained comments of Kuhnke, *Οὐσιακὴ Γῆ*, especially Chapters II and III, and his new discussion on the differences between οὐσιακὸς μισθωτής and οὐσιακὸς γεωργός, pp. 64 ff. The οὐσιακὴ γῆ is treated like the rest of the public land when it comes to *epibole* or *epimerismos* (see A. C. Johnson, *Aeg.* 32, 1952, pp. 61 ff. and G. Poethke, *Epimerismos*, 1969). I see no differences in the

leases and subleases involving οὐσιακὴ γῆ and those of other state land; see J. Herrmann, *Studien zur Bodenpacht im Recht der gräco-ägyptischen Papyri*, 1958, and D. Hennig, *Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht im ptolemäisch-römischen Ägypten*, Diss. München, 1967.

90. For the evidence see below, Appendix II. P. Soc. inv. 1345 recto (*SIFC* 43, 1971, pp. 144 ff.) refers to estates of Vespasian but it is not to be dated during his reign, as the editor suggested. The script (plate 2B) is extremely similar to, if not identical with, that of SB 10512 (*APF* 19, 1969, Taf. 4), which the missing portion recently discovered by Dr. G. Poethke reveals to be from 138/9.

91. SB 10893.

92. SB 10527 (152/3) Lurius; *P. Bour.* 42 (167) Claudia Antonia, Seneca; *BGU* 622 (182); *P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.* 52 (222/3) Seneca; *P. Cairo Preis.* 4 (320); *P. Oxy.* 1434 (see below, Appendix I).

93. *BGU* 889.21-4, *Ιυθίνων λ[εγομένη] (sc. διῶρνξ)* ἥπερ ἐγνώσθη ἐκ τῆς γενο(μένης) τῷ θ(έτει) (i.e. 144/5) τῶν οὐσι(ακῶν) κτ[ημάτων] δροθεσίας είναι τῆς [Μαι]κ(ηνατιανῆς) οὐσίας, ζημιμος [θ]α τοῦ πλείστου κατατεπ(τωκνία) (ἀρουρῶν) [...] --- ἥ καὶ μέχρι νῦν ἄφορος. In line 17 we should read τῆς γενο(μένης) δροθεσίας τοῦ θ(έτους) είναι τῆς

evidence that any additions were made to it, as there is no evidence that later emperors or relatives of theirs subsequently owned land in Egypt which, upon their mounting the throne, would become part of the *patrimonium principis*. Up to Vespasian, the patrimonial land was growing in size; from then on it was diminishing.

This twofold division of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος between emperor and heir gives us also an indication as to the time of its formation. The theory has been advanced that all the division implies is that some of these estates were directly confiscated by Vespasian, while the remaining were confiscated by Titus during his own reign.⁹⁴ I find it hard to believe that an imperial estate of the immense size of Seneca's would remain autonomous and ownerless until Titus decided to confiscate it.⁹⁵ Furthermore "confiscation" is not a very aptly chosen term, for the Flavians received the *patrimonium principis* simultaneously with the purple. And finally, the whole concept not only speaks ill of Vespasian's administrative capabilities, but also runs contrary to the evidence regarding the fate of the *patrimonium* in other parts of the empire.

Now, we know that, from as early as the first year of his father's reign, Titus was not only designated as the heir apparent, but was also assigned the position of virtual partnership in the administration, to the exclusion of Domitian. He was made *praefectus praetorio* without colleague, he was given *proconsulare imperium* and *tribunicia potestas*, he and Vespasian were censors in 73 and jointly held ordinary consulships every year except in 73 and 78.⁹⁶ I suggest that they were also joint owners of the *patrimonium principis* as well — certainly of the Egyptian portion, perhaps of all. When Titus became emperor, the entire *patrimonium* was of course his, but the division between οὐσίαι Οὐεσπασιανοῦ and οὐσίαι Τίτου is attested until the beginning of the third century.⁹⁷ This certainly was for purely administrative purposes, but its very survival points to the thoroughness of the organization of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, an organization that no subsequent prefect or *procurator usiacus* felt any necessity, or saw any reason, to disrupt or revise. As to the exact time during Vespasian's reign when such a division of the Egyptian *patrimonium principis* was made, we cannot be certain. It seems very likely, however, to have taken place early in 70, when both Vespasian and Titus were in Alexandria, and when a reorganization of the province, and especially of its system of taxation, was carried out.⁹⁸

Μαικ(ηνατιανῆς) οὐσ[ίας] (μασι.ους [...], Schubart). This condition was the result of the great Jewish war of 116-17, and nothing had been done in the intervening forty years to correct or improve it. See Wilcken, *Hermes* 54, 1919, pp. 111 f., and A. Swiderek, "Ιουδαικὸς Λόγος," *JJP* 16-17, 1971, pp. 45 ff. For the gradual decrease of the population of the Arsinoite, as well as the final abandonment of some villages by their inhabitants, due to the desert's taking over cultivable land, see A. E. R. Boak, "The Population of Roman and Byzantine Karanis," *Historia* 4, 1955, pp. 157 ff.

94. The hitherto classic view was formulated by Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 669 f., n. 45 (on *P. Berl. Leihg.* 1-4): "In some cases parts of the οὐσιακὴ γῆ of the 2nd cent. A.D. were still listed as having formerly been private property (οὐσίαι) of the Emperors Vespasian and Titus. This is a striking proof [?] of the correctness of my hypothesis that, after Nero, Vespasian and Titus were the only Roman Emperors who carried out vast confiscations of private οὐσίαι, and so laid the foundation of the department of the γῆ οὐσιακή, which was finally organized probably by Domitian." Cf. also p. 295.

Similar thoughts have been expressed by Hohlwein, *JJP* 3, 1949, p. 87, and Tomsin, "Notes," pp. 221 ff.

95. So, e.g., Tomsin, "Notes," p. 222, n. 106: "Seneca died in 65 (Tac., *Ann.* 15.65), Titus became emperor in 79; at least 14 years passed before the confiscation." But in 74 the Senecan estate is listed without special comment or terminology along with those of Maecenas, Germanicus and Lurius (*P. Hamb.* 3). See also Tomsin, p. 216, n. 40, where the same principle is applied to the Julio-Claudian period.

96. See *PIR*² F 398 (Vespasian) and 399 (Titus). Cf. E. Kornemann, *Doppelprinzipat und Reichsteilung im Imperium Romanum*, 1930, pp. 60 ff.

97. The last securely dated document that mentions the division is *P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.* 52 (222/3); *BGU* 1646 (mentioning Vespasian) and *P. Flor.* 337 (Titus) also come from the early third century. In *P. Oxy.* 62 (242) the restoration ἐπὶ κτήσι(εων) [θεο(ν) T]ίτου in line 1 is very uncertain.

98. Dio Cass., 65.8 ff.; see also Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 346 f.

Chapter Three

Location, Size and Type of Land

Extensive imperial estates are well attested in two of the three major administrative divisions of Egypt, the Delta or Κάτω Χώρα, and the Heptanomia plus the Arsinoite nome. The lack of evidence of estates in the Thebais may be due to the general scantiness of documents from the region, especially of the first century A.D. But it should be remembered that the only cultivable land in that area was the narrow strip along the banks (occasionally only one bank) of the Nile, and that this southern part of Egypt took longer to pacify and firmly subject to the Roman yoke.¹ It is only natural to assume that wealthy Romans and Alexandrians did not find it worth their money and effort to speculate so far inland, in an area where risks and uncertainties far outweighed all possible profits.

Little, too, is known about the Delta, and even less about the imperial estates there. A small number of published scraps and a long, carbonized roll discovered at Thmouis, the capital of the Mendesian nome, testify to the presence of οὐσιακὴ γῆ in at least one of its toparchies, the Psanitou. Of the estates that passed to Vespasian, we encounter those formerly of Latinus and Khrestos; of those assigned to Titus, the former properties of Claudia Akte, Seneca, and perhaps those of Agrippina and Doryphorus as well.²

Of the size of these estates and the type of land we have only a few glimpses. We know that in the Latinian estate there was a κτῆμα (most likely a vineyard) πρότερον Θοννήσεως measuring 163 arourae.³ At some time in the second century, a village near Thousis (*sic*) paid a grand total of 3931 drachmae 3 1/2 obols 3 khalkoi for taxes collected in money (Table 1).⁴ This is a moderate amount, and the village must have been quite small if the total represents the sum of an annual collection. 565 drachmae 1 1/2 obols went to the department of the οὐσιακά, the remaining being collected for the διοίκησις. Of these, 434 drachmae 3 1/2 obols were rental for a ψιλὸς τόπος⁵ in

1. The Thebais was restless during the Ptolemaic period as well; from 206 to 186 B.C. it was detached from the kingdom, and in 87-4 B.C. it revolted again, unsuccessfully. The remoteness and instability of the region prompted the Ptolemies to create the office of the ἐπιστράτηγος Θηβαΐδος. Under Augustus the prefect C. Cornelius Gallus (30-26 B.C.) crushed a bloody insurrection, caused partly by the more rigorous collection of taxes, and his vanity, attested by an inscription at Philai (Dessau, *ILS* 8995), cost him his post and his life. Under C. Petronius (prefect from 24 to 21 B.C.) the Romans advanced twice against the Ethiopians, and the Egyptian frontier was permanently fixed at Hiera Sykaminos (Maharraga). See the brief remarks of Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 303 and 679, nn. 56 and 57.

2. Lists below, Appendix II.

3. *P. Ryl.* 427 (22).

4. *P. Strassb.* 299 recto. Although the provenance of the papyrus is Oxyrhynchus, I do not doubt that the recto deals with villages in the Mendesian nome, whence it found its way to the Oxyrhynchite. The divisions and subdivisions of the headings and the presence of εὖδη are typical for the Delta; cf. *P. Ryl.* 213, the editors' excellent analysis, and the brief comments of Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 331 f.

5. On unoccupied lots see R. Rossi, "Ψιλὸὶ Τόποι," *Aeg.* 30, 1950, pp. 42 ff., and *P. Ryl.* 215, where various ψιλὸὶ τόποι, buildings and abandoned garden-lands in the estates of Titus and Vespasian, also in the Mendesian nome, are mentioned. Line 26 ought to read οὐσιακ]ῶν ὁμοίως· [θεοῦ Τί]του, and, on the basis of a photograph supplied me by the Rylands Library, line 30, οὐσιῶ]ν θεοῦ Οὐεσπασιαν[οῦ τῶν ἐ]ν κώμῃ etc.

the Latinian estate, the rest being for τελωνικὴ (?) ἀτέλεια.⁶ The size, however, of this unoccupied lot cannot be ascertained, for we do not know the rate at which this rental was fixed in the Delta.

Table 1

P. Strassb. 299 recto (A.D. II)

Taxes in money from a village near Thouis (in the Mendesian nome?). Amounts in drachmae, obols and khalkoi.

	Tax			6.25% Surcharge			Total		
Dioikesis	1420	1/2	3	88	4 1/2		1508	5	3
Hieratika	115			7	1	1	122	1	1
Eide	1633	1	3	102	1/2		1735	1 1/2	3
Subtotal	3168	2	2	198		1	3366	2	3
Ousiaka	532			33	1 1/2		565	1 1/2	
GRAND TOTAL	3700	2	2	231	1 1/2	1	3931	3 1/2	3

A carbonized roll from Thmouis, which is currently being prepared for publication, gives us also some limited information about the pastures of the estates of Khrestos and Latinus (a small number of sheep and goats is mentioned), and very valuable details regarding the grain-lands administered by the οὐσιακά.⁷ On the basis of the small number of papyri dealing with the Mendesian nome which have already been published,⁸ we should not expect any great amounts of cereals to be grown in the imperial estates there, and most of the sums mentioned in the Thmouis roll are also small (up to 1000 artabae). There are, nevertheless, some exceedingly large amounts (as high as 50,000, 60,000 and 70,000 artabae), as large, perhaps as the total annual revenue from the οὐσιακὴ γῆ in the Arsinoite may have been. It is hardly likely that these are annual sums, and the recurrent expression γίνονται πάντων τῶν ἐτῶν points to accumulated totals of entire reigns (Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius). If this be the case, the numbers shrink to insignificance.

In the northern-most nome of the Heptanomia, the Memphite, it is only the lands of Claudia Akte that are found, near the village Taie; nothing more is known about them.⁹ A little to the south, in the Herakleopolite nome, Messalina owned grain-land, especially in the neighborhood of Ankyronon Polis, and perhaps Seneca did as well.¹⁰ Bypassing for the moment the Arsinoite and turning southwest, we encounter the grain-lands of Claudius, Seneca and Anthos in various locations in the Oxyrhynchite nome. If the flock of *Cerinthus Antoniae Drusi servus* was pasturing on Antonia's estates, she must have had extensive grass-lands in the Oxyrhynchite and the Kynopolite, the nome to the east across the Nile.¹¹ Going farther up river, in the southern-most nome of the Heptanomia, we find the estates of Messalina, Doryphoros and Seneca, the last two near the village of Toou in the Hermopolite.¹² Οὐσιακὴ γῆ whose former owner is not known is also listed among the lands of such villages as Tarouthis, in the toparchy Peri

6. See below, Chapter IV, n. 48.

7. P. Rein. inv. 2062 and P. Acad. fr. 14.

8. BGU 976, 979, 980; P. Ryl. 215.

9. P. Ross.-Georg. II 42.

10. Messalina: CPR 243; P. Ryl. 87; Seneca: P. Hib. 279 ("Provenance almost certainly Heracleopolite nome, though

there is no internal evidence in confirmation," edd.).

11. Claudius: P. Oxy. 2837; Seneca: P. Oxy. 2873; P. Yale inv. 443; P. Lips. 115; Anthos: P. Oxy. 3170; Cerinthus: P. Oxy. 244.

12. Messalina: P. Flor. 40; Doryphoros: P. Ryl. 99; Seneca: P. Soc. 448; P. Ryl. 99.

Poleos Ano, as well as near the capital itself, Hermopolis Magna.¹³ Most of the οὐσιακὴ γῆ in the nome appears to have been grain-land, at least at the time for which the documents bear witness, i.e. the first three centuries A.D. We do not have any cadastres or extensive tax reports from any part of the Heptanomia that give us any indication as to the size or the productivity of any sizeable parcel of οὐσιακὴ γῆ in the area, but the relative rarity of references to imperial estates (especially in papyri from the Oxyrhynchite, a very well-documented nome) may indicate that the οὐσιακὴ γῆ was quite small in Middle Egypt — how small we cannot say.¹⁴

The picture is totally different in the Arsinoite nome, for here we encounter a very heavy concentration of imperial estates. The reasons for this are many and various. This was the place with the largest amount of privately owned γῆ κατοικική and κληρουχική, and also, if the second century B.C. is any guide, of δωρεά during the reign of Cleopatra; consequently, it was the place with the biggest volume of land available for purchase. It was here that the neglect of the irrigation system must have created the largest stretches of ὑπόλογος land, which was selling at low prices.¹⁵ Moreover, once a beginning was made in this region, it was only natural that later purchases, by the same persons or by their relatives or dependents, would tend to take place in the immediate neighborhood. The Arsinoite, we should remember, was one of Egypt's better known parts — to the Romans, at least — to some extent because of what was considered to have been the largest artificial lake in antiquity, a lake that Herodotus had numbered as one of the wonders of the world.¹⁶ Last but not least, this was ideal country for grapes and olives, crops which the Romans preferred to grain.¹⁷ The introduction of viticulture on a grand scale was primarily the doing of the Ptolemaic Greeks, who were missing their wine in this beer-drinking country, and the Arsinoite was the logical place for it, especially since part of the land could not be used for cereals.¹⁸ Similar conditions prevailed in parts of the Delta, where vineyards and tree-groves were also extensive. The initial expenditure for clearing the ground and planting it anew would be considerable, since for the first four or five years the land would produce nothing, and perhaps at this time it was only wealthy Romans and Alexandrians who could afford any such investment on a large scale. The subsequent profits, on the other hand, would be considerably higher than if the land had been sown with cereals. This does not mean, however, that wheat was not regularly raised on the better land — it was, and very extensively so, for Rome needed and demanded it in no uncertain terms. Immense tracts of imperial estates were devoted to the production of cereals from the earliest times, and to underestimate the size of this grain-land would be to distort the picture.

13. Tarouthis: *P. Cairo Preis*. 4; Peri Poleos Ano: *P. Amh.* 96; Hermopolis: *P. Strassb.* 5; cf. also *P. Sarap.* 34, and the οὐσιακὸν ἀμπελικὸν κτῆμα in *P. Ryl.* 157.4.

14. The phrase καθαρὸς ἀπὸ γεωγύιας βασιλικῆς γῆς καὶ οὐσιακῆς γῆς καὶ παντὸς εἶδους καὶ δφειλῆς καὶ κατοχῆς πάσης δημοσίας τε καὶ ἰδιωτικῆς, or similar expressions, occur in a number of documents from the Oxyrhynchite nome (e.g., *P. Oxy.* 506; 578; 633; 1200; 1208; 1270; 1276; 1634; 1696; 2134; 2722; 2723; *P. Osl.* 40; *P. Wisc.* 9; *SB* 8971), as well as in papyri from other nomes, but cannot be taken as evidence for the existence of οὐσιακὴ γῆ in any of these localities: it is a standard *Garantieklausel* which guards against all possibilities.


15. See above, Chapter I.

16. Hdt., 2.149 f., a much exaggerated account. His assertion that the lake χειροποίητός ἐστι καὶ δρυκτή is false.

17. See Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 5 ff. for ancient testimonies, and J. Lesquier, *L'armée romaine de l'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien*, 1918, pp. 328 ff., for the type of land owned by veterans (some of whom, however, despite their

Roman name, are of local origin). For Italy see Frank, *Rome and Italy of the Empire*, pp. 146 ff., 153 ff., and below, n. 57. On the cultivation of vines, olives and palm-trees in Egypt see esp. C. Ricci, *La coltura della vite e la fabbricazione del vino nell'Egitto greco-romano*, 1924; C. Dubois, "L'olivier et l'huile d'olive dans l'ancienne Égypte," *RPh* 1, 1927, pp. 7 ff.; N. Hohlwein, "Palmiers et palmeraies dans l'Égypte romaine," *EPap* 5, 1939, pp. 1 ff.

18. See Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate*, pp. 93 ff., esp. p. 94. "The wine market was made secure by the growing Greek population of Egypt and the State was glad to supply its wine drinking army with local wine instead of spending huge sums of money in buying wine abroad. The native Egyptians of course remained beer-drinkers as always." Herodotus, 2.77.4, however, is incorrect in asserting οὐ γάρ σφι εἰσὶ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ ἀμπελοί; there were vineyards, for example, in the neighborhood of Memphis and Thebes in pre-Ptolemaic times, although wine was, to be sure, comparatively scarce; see Wallace, *Taxation*, p. 51.



The Arsinoite Nome

With the exception of Messalina, Claudia Akte, Khrestos and Latinus, we find all the other original owners of imperial estates operating in more than 30 villages in the Arsinoite. On the northern shore of Lake Moëris, along the long irrigation canal, traces of which survive, and the northern desert road, there is a long string of small towns and villages whose land attracted members and friends of the imperial house as well as wealthy Alexandrians, metropolitans from Arsinoë and retired soldiers: Philadelphia, Dinnis, Boubastos, Patsontis, Bakkhias, Psenarpsenesis, Kerkessoukha, Karanis, Hiera Nesos, Drymos Hieras Nesou, Ptolemais Nea, Perkeesis, and further to the west the isolated Soknopaiou Nesos. Another line of towns and villages runs along the southern shore of the lake, those on the southwestern section of the line situated on the desert road to the Small Oasis: Dionysias, Philoteris, Euhemeria, Bernikis Aigiaiou, Theadelphia, Polydeukia, and further to the east Herakleia, Apias and then Psenyris. A third group is scattered in the crescent-shaped area between the lake and the southeastern tip of the nome near Herakleopolis, now plain desert but once fertile land criss-crossed by canals: Anoubias, Kanopias, Theoxenis, Lagis, Narmouthis, Ibion Eikosipentarouron, Talei and Tebtunis.

In a number of instances (e.g., Dionysias, Dinnis, Pelousion, Psya, Aphroditopolis, Metrodorou Epoikion, Skhedia, Iuliopolis) the former owners of οὐσιακὴ γῆ are not known.¹⁹

19. Dionysias: *P. Fay.* 251; *P. Soc.* 1243; Dinnis: *P. Phil.* 15; Pelousion: *P. Berl. Leihg.* 16C; *BGU* 84 (in this report of

A.D. 243, [5]517 57/64 arourae paid 29,299 15/16 artabae wheat, 302 5/8 artabae barley, and 1261 35/48 artabae beans.

For a precious few (Hiera Nesos, Drymos Hieras Nesou, Perkeesis, Ptolemais Nea, perhaps Lagis as well) we have all-inclusive lists preserved in a single document.²⁰ In the majority of the cases, however, the information for any given location is available in numerous, unrelated papyri, a jigsaw puzzle whose pieces are not all known, and whose assemblage is incomplete and conjectural at best. Even so, the roster that can now be drawn up of former owners of οὐσιακὴ γῆ arranged by village, although by no means exhaustive, is nonetheless impressive:²¹

Anoubias (Them.): Agrippina.

Bakkhias (Her.): Germanicus, Livia Drusilla; Maecenas.

Bernikis Aigialou (Them.): Antonia; Lurius, Pallas (Kharmos).

Boubastos (Her.): Antonia.

Boukolon (Pol.): Antonia.

Drymos Hieras Nesou (Her.): Claudia Antonia; Alexandros, Dionysodoros, Doryphoros, Maecenas, Pallas (Numerius), Seneca.

Epipolis (Her.): Dionysodoros, Pallas (Iucundus and Khresimos).

Euhemeria (Them.): Agrippina, Claudia Antonia, Antonia Drusi, Claudius, Gaius, Germanicus, Livia Drusilla, Claudia Livilla, Livilla's children, Tiberius; Alexandros, Dionysodoros, Lurius, Maecenas, Pallas (Kharmos, Polla), Petronius, Seneca, Sokrates.

Herakleia (Them.): Antonia Drusi, Nero; Doryphoros (Narkissos), Maecenas, Pallas (Iucundus and Khresimos), Sarapion.

Hiera Nesos (Her.): Claudia Antonia, Germanicus; Lurius, Maecenas, Seneca, Severus.

Ibion Eikosipentarouron (Pol.): Claudius; Maecenas.

Kanopias (Them.): Calvia Crispinilla.

Karanis (Her.): Antonia, Germanicus, Livia Drusilla, Claudia Livilla; Anthos, Camelius, Doryphoros, Lurius, Maecenas, Pallas (Iucundus and Khresimos, Kharmos, Polla), Seneca.

Kerkesoukha (Her.): Germanicus; Camelius, Lurius, Maecenas, Seneca, Severus.

Lagis (Them.): Germanicus, Lurius, Maecenas, Pallas (Eros and Kharmos).

Neiloupolis (Her.): Maecenas, Onesimos, Severus.

Patsontis (Her.): Anthos, Seneca.

Perkeesis (Her.): Claudia Antonia; Seneca.

Philadelphia (Her.): Antonia, Germanicus, Germanicus' children, Livia Drusilla; Camelius, Lurius, Maecenas, Pallas (Iucundus and Khresimos), Petronius, Seneca.

Philoteris (Them.): Antonia, Germanicus' children.

Polydeukia (Them.): Antonia; Lurius, Maecenas.

Psenarpsenesis (Her.): Camelius, Lurius, Maecenas, Pallas (Polla).

Psenyris (Her.): Antonia, Germanicus; Pallas (Iucundus and Khresimos), Seneca.

Ptolemais Nea (Her.): Claudia Antonia, Germanicus; Lurius, Seneca.

Pyrrheia Narmoutheos (Them.): Agrippina.

Sebennutos (Her.): Maecenas.

Seber[(Her.): Doryphoros.

Sen[: Maecenas.

Soknopaiou Nesos (Her.): Antonia, Germanicus, Germanicus' children, Livia Drusilla;

Of this area, 4437 57/64 arourae were unflooded, paying 22,565 13/48 artabae wheat, 296 5/8 artabae barley; the amount of beans is lost. These numbers represent a combined total, including *fiscus* and *patrimonium*); Psya, Aphroditopolis and Metrodorou Epoikion: *P. Tebt.* 503; Skhedia and

Iuliopolis: SB 9210.

20. *P. Bour.* 42; *P. Berl. Leihg.* 29 (Lagis).

21. The documents may be found listed below, Appendix II.

Anthos, Narkissos.

Tebtunis (Pol.): Antonia, Claudius, Germanicus' children, Livia Drusilla; Doryphoros, Lurius, Seneca, Severus.

Theadelphia (Them.): Agrippina, Antonia, Germanicus, Germanicus' children, Livia Drusilla; Dionysodoros, Doryphoros, Maecenas, Menas/Menatius, Pallas (Iucundus and Khresimos, Kharmos), Seneca, Severus.

Theoxenis (Them.): Claudia Antonia, Germanicus' children, Livia Drusilla.

[..].*kh[ou] Epoikion*: Antonia Drusi.²²

Although we know the size of some isolated imperial estates, there are no bases for estimating the total extent of the holdings of any given individual. Even more complicated is the task of calculating the entire amount of οὐσιακὴ γῆ in Egypt. In fact this can be attempted only for the Arsinoite, where our information is more abundant, and even there only to a limited extent. Of the cadastres that survive, only a few mention οὐσιακὴ γῆ, and all of them deal exclusively with grain-producing land. For other types of land we must depend primarily on records of taxation and private documents: they testify to the existence of vineyards and tree-groves, and they often give us their location, but very rarely their overall dimensions.

The most valuable, most complete and most detailed cadastre known to us deals with five neighboring villages on the northern shore of Lake Moëris forming a single κωμογραμματεία: Hiera Nesos, Drymos Hiera Nesou, Perkeesis, Ptolemais Nea and Kerkeesis.²³ The largest section of this document is a detailed list of all the land in the district paying taxes and rentals in wheat, i.e. all the royal, revenue and private land under the administration of the διοίκησις, and all the οὐσιακὴ γῆ. The grand total of the grain-producing fields of the κωμογραμματεία was 12,335 3/8 arourae, and the village scribe estimated that the tax and rentals for the year (167) ought to be 46,829 1/8 artabae of wheat — or an average of 3 3/4 artabae per aroura.²⁴ Nearly one third of the land, 4551 13/32 arourae, was οὐσιακὴ γῆ. This ranged from none in Kerkeesis to all the land of Perkeesis, which at one time was owned, almost in its entirety, by Seneca (Table 2). The rental of the οὐσιακὴ γῆ was 20,261 1/4 artabae of wheat, i.e. an average of slightly less than 4 1/2 artabae per aroura. This total is nearly half of the entire amount collected, but it should be noted that royal land paid at the same, and revenue land at an even higher rate. The amount of the διοίκησις is kept down because 3671 47/64 arourae of privately owned land administered by it paid tax at a flat rate of one artaba per aroura.

The list of the former owners of imperial estates in the κωμογραμματεία appears to be complete (Table 2a). The Vespasian section included the estates of Germanicus, Maecenas, Lurius, Severus, Alexandros, Dionysodoros, Pallas (Numerius), and an insignificant number of arourae formerly of Antonia, the daughter of Claudius, which had all been subsequently sold to various individuals. The grand total is 2044 1/32 arourae, assessed at 10,238 5/6 artabae of

22. *P. Osl.* 123. This is a case of the Antonian estate being situated near this village, and not of a farmstead by this name located within the estate (so Tomsin, "Notes," p. 212).

23. *P. Bour.* 42. See P. Collart's invaluable tables, and the English translation by Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, no. 16. In his Tables 2 and 13 Collart counts twice the 121 arourae of the Dionysodian estate in Drymos Hiera Nesou, which explains the discrepancy between his and Johnson's totals on the one hand and my Table 2 on the other. In his Table 21 he correctly counts the 121 arourae only once (cf. his note on line 101), but

gives 607 (the incorrect reading of the papyrus) instead of 577 arourae for Germanicus in Ptolemais Nea, and, by a misprint, 8 instead of 9 for Maecenas in Drymos Hiera Nesou (cf. his Tables 2, 4, 13 and 14, where the correct numerals appear); hence his total should be 2040 instead of 2069. In my totals I have included the small parcels of the Antonian and Senecan estates that had been sold in order to arrive at the original maximum size of the imperial estates.

24. Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, p. 49.

wheat. The portion of Titus was larger — and this is the only instance of such an occurrence. As was the standard in the nome, it comprised the estates of Doryphoros and Seneca; of the latter,

Table 2

P. Bour. 42 (A.D. 167)

Cadastral of five villages in the Herakleidou meris, Arsinoite. Total area of grain-land.

Village	Royal	Revenue	Ousiake	Private	Total
Hiera Nesos	2200 25/64	20	524 8/64	1317 13/64	4061 46/64
Drymos H. Nesou	91 54/64	—	919 16/64	622 16/64	1633 22/64
Perkeesis	—	—	2161 34/64	—	2161 34/64
Kerkeesis	289 30/64	—	—	267 16/64	556 46/64
Ptolemais Nea	847 34/64	664	947 32/64	1465 2/64	3924 4/64
TOTAL	3429 15/64	684	4551 26/64	3671 47/64	12335 24/64

the small amount of 8 45/64 arourae had been sold. The grand total is 2507 3/8 arourae, paying 10,022 5/12 artabae of wheat in rentals.

Table 2a

P. Bour. 42 (A.D. 167)

Cadastral of four villages in the Herakleidou meris, Arsinoite. Total area of ousiake grain-land.

Estate	Hiera Nesos	Dr. H. Nesou	Perkeesis	Ptolemais Nea	Total
Vespasian	Germanian	192 15/64	—	557 16/64	796 31/64
	Maecenatian	62 29/64	9 11/64	—	71 40/64
	Lurian	51 19/64	—	260 16/64	311 35/64
	Severan	118 8/64	—	—	118 8/64
	Alexandrian	—	205 9/64	—	205 9/64
	Dionysodorian	—	121 11/64	—	121 11/64
	Pallantian	—	443 56/64	—	443 56/64
	Antonian	1 8/64	1 48/64	12/64	3 4/64
TOTAL VESPASIAN					2044 2/64
Titus	Senecan	98 57/64	59 10/64	2161 22/64	110
	Doryphorian	—	77 63/64	—	77 63/64
TOTAL TITUS					2507 24/64
GRAND TOTAL					4551 26/64

A few miles to the east are the villages of Karanis, Psenarpsenesis and Patsontis. An assessment list for 179/80 or 211/12 treats them together, and it appears that they, too, formed a

single κωμογραμματεία.²⁵ Again, as is usual in such documents, the lands are divided between those administered by the διοίκησις and those under the jurisdiction of the ούσιακός λόγος. A large section of the papyrus is lost, but we know that the amount assessed under the head διοίκησις was 29,065 19/24 artabae of wheat, which is very close to that of Hiera Nesos and the adjoining villages. If this may be used as a guide, then the land of this κωμογραμματεία administered by the διοίκησις would be between 8000 and 9000 arourae, and if two of the preserved partial totals, 21,751 1/2 and 3895 5/8 artabae of wheat,²⁶ represent rentals from royal land and taxes on private fields, then the ratio between fiscal and private land would also be about the same. The section listing the ούσιακά is a little fuller, but also incomplete. The estates of Maecenas, Anthos, Pallas (Iucundus and Khresimos, Polla) and Camelius are mentioned (Table 3), comprising 1846 61/64 arourae expected to yield ca. 13,000 artabae of wheat in rentals. But we know that there were at least seven more imperial estates in the district — those formerly of Antonia (Drusi?), Germanicus, Doryphoros, Lurius, Seneca, Severus and Kharmos.²⁷ If these are added to those already included in the assessment list, the total of the ούσιακή γῆ may very well rise to ca. 4000 arourae, and the ratio between ούσιακά and διοίκησις around Karanis would then be about the same as that in the area surrounding Hiera Nesos, i.e. about 1 to 3.

Table 3

P. Mich. 372 (A.D. 179/80 or 211/12)

Cadastre (incomplete) of three villages in the Herakleidou meris, Arsinoite.

Estate	Karanis	Psenarpsenesis	Patsontis	Total
Maecenatian	518 7/64	274 28/64	—	792 35/64
Anthian	27 32/64	—	252 32/64	280
Iucundus & Khresimos +G. Polla =Pallantian	45 41/64 26 33/64	— 36 20/64	—	108 30/64
Camelian	75 29/64	590 31/64	—	665 60/64
TOTAL	703 14/64	891 15/64	252 32/64	1846 61/64

In addition to these two documents, there are approximately two hundred *Saatquittungen* from the northern shore of Lake Moëris, 58 of which mention ούσιακή γῆ (Table 4).²⁸ All these records of loans of seed to public farmers date from 158/9, and this is largely accidental; but the widespread distribution of seed for sowing both in this year and in 164 enables us to infer that the crop was a poor one at this time.²⁹ The estates of Antonia (Drusi?), Camelius, Germanicus, Lurius, Maecenas, Seneca and Severus are listed in five neighboring villages, Hiera Nesos, Karanis, Kerkesoukha, Patsontis, Psenarpsenesis and Ptolemais Nea. The grand total is a mere 295 27/32 arourae, but this number is to all intents and purposes useless: the amounts for Hiera Nesos and Ptolemais Nea are but sections of estates already listed in the sowing list of the area

25. P. Mich. 372. I find myself in agreement with the editors' understanding of this document. For a different interpretation see H. Geremek, *Karanis*, 1969, pp. 29 ff. (cf. Tomsin, *Chronique* 46, 1971, p. 390).

26. P. Mich. 372.ii.10-11, 13; see the editors' introduction.

27. They are mentioned in P. Mich. 223; 224; 225.

28. BGU 31; 104; 105; 160; 172; 202; 204; 206; 211; 280; 284; 438; 441; P. Cairo Goodspeed 18; 24; P. Chic. 5; 6; 7; 10; 16; 18; 19; 23; 26; 27; 28; 31; 32; 35; 36; 39; 41; 42; 43; 47; 48; 49; 50; 52; 53; 55; 57; 61; 62; 64; 65; 67; 68; 70; 71; 75; 76; 77; 78; 81; 82; 84; 87.

29. For 164 see P. Berl. Leihg. 1 verso and Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 500 f. Things deteriorated: in 165 the great

referred to above (Table 2a), and parts of those for Karanis and Patsontis were enumerated in the assessment list (Table 3).

We do not know the amount of the οὐσιακὴ γῆ of another large village in the division of Herakleides, Philadelphia, which must have had a total area of 7000 to 10,000 arourae, and where a number of imperial estates are attested.³⁰ Nor do we know the dimensions of the οὐσιακὴ γῆ of Bakkhias, a village only slightly smaller than Karanis and Philadelphia, and where at least Germanicus, Livia and Maecenas had estates.³¹

Table 4

A.D. 158/9

Summary table of the 58 grain receipts in *BGU I*, *P. Cairo Goodspeed* and *P. Chic. Ousiakē ge.*

Estate	Hiera Nesos	Karanis	Kerkesoukha	Patsontis	Psenarpsenosis	Ptolemais	Nea	Total
Antonian	—	13 24/64	—	—	—	—	—	13 24/64
Camelian	—	9 9/64	40/64	40/64	72 22/64	—	—	82 47/64
Germanician	—	—	14 6/64	—	—	21 2/64	35 8/64	
Lurian	—	14 40/64	—	—	66 61/64	—	—	81 37/64
Maecenatian	—	9	3 15/64	—	—	—	—	12 15/64
Severan	10	—	27 44/64	—	—	—	—	37 44/64
Senecan	—	30 15/64	2 56/64	—	—	—	—	33 7/64
TOTAL	10	76 24/64	48 33/64	40/64	139 19/64	21 2/64	295 54/64	

These are the documents that give us a comprehensive picture of the size of the grain-land administered by the οὐσιακὸς λόγος in some villages of the Herakleidou *meris*. As for the division of Themistos and Polemon, our documentation is less complete. A πορεία πρὸς ἐπίσκεψιν ἀβρόχου γῆς prepared by some officials of Tebtunis in 222/3 deals almost certainly with the land of Tebtunis itself, although the name of the village is lost in a lacuna.³² Of a grand total of 3588 17/64 arourae of grain-land declared as uninundated, a mere 132 25/32 arourae, or 1/27 of the total, is οὐσιακὴ γῆ (Table 5). This comprises the estates of Antonia (Drusi?), Doryphoros, Seneca, and a fourth individual whose name is lost: both Severus and Lurius are known from other sources to have had estates there. Even at such a late date, only 4 3/8 uninundated arourae from the Senecan estate had been sold. The amount of inundation that did or did not take place depended to such an extent upon the rise of the Nile, the time of the flooding and the conditions of the irrigation system, that we are unable to infer what the total amount of the land sown in cereals in Tebtunis was.³³

plague visited Egypt and raged for a period of 15 years.

30. This is estimated on the basis of the information presented by an unpublished Yale papyrus, which gives us a total of 2583 5/6 arourae of privately owned grain- and orchard-land; see J. F. Oates, "Philadelphia in the Fayum during the Roman Empire," *Atti dell'XI congresso internazionale di papirologia*, 1966, pp. 451 ff., and "Landholding in Philadelphia in the Fayum (A.D. 216)," *Amer. Stud. in Pap.* 7, 1970, pp. 385 ff.

31. According to P. Gron. 2 (not with the impossible numerals first read by A. G. Roos, but as republished by H. C. Youtie and O. M. Pearl, *AJP* 63, 1942, pp. 304 f.) Bakkhias declared in 219/20 a total of 2600 79/128 arourae of uninundated grain-land, of which 1464 1/64 arourae were

designated as royal land, the balance being hieratic and revenue (the Philodamian estate, on which below, Appendix I); for such a division of land cf. P. Bour. 42.6-7.

32. P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl. 52. Line 6 should read almost certainly Τεπτύλεως, and line 7 βασιλικῆς; in line 11 for the editor's Ιως I read on a photograph supplied me by the Giessen Library οὐσιακῶν, and in line 18 Δορυφόρος(ιανῆς) οὐσί(ας).

33. On the Nile and its irrigation see Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 7 ff.; D. Bonneau, *La crue du Nil, divinité égyptienne, à travers mille ans d'histoire*, 1964, and "Utilization des documents papyrologiques, numismatiques et épigraphiques pour la détermination de la qualité de la crue du Nil, chaque année de l'époque gréco-romaine," *Atti dell'XI congresso internazionale di papirologia*, 1966, pp. 379 ff.

The same difficulty holds true for another declaration of non-inundation, this time for Lagis in 164. The total amount of the uninundated οὐσιακὴ γῆ was 105 1/64 arourae, comprising the estates of Pallas (Eros and Kharmos; 50 27/32 arourae), Lurius (10 3/4 arourae), Maecenas (18 3/8 arourae) and Germanicus (25 3/64 arourae), all Vespasian estates.³⁴

Table 5

P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl. 52 (A.D. 222/3)

Cadastre of a village (Tebtunis?) in the Arsinoite. Total area of uninundated grain-land.

Antonian	62 22/64	
[]	30 44/64	
TOTAL VESPASIAN		93 2/64
Doryphorian	30 21/64	
Senecan	5 3/64	
Sold from Senecan	4 24/64	
TOTAL TITUS		39 48/64
Ousiake	132 50/64	
Royal (?)	355 6/64	
[]	3100 25/64	
TOTAL	3588 17/64	

A recently published document deals almost exclusively with the οὐσιακὴ γῆ of a village which the scribe has left unnamed, but which almost certainly was in the division of Themistos and Polemon.³⁵ The grand total was 1147 45/64 arourae of grain-producing land. It was made up of the Vespasian estates formerly of Maecenas, Pallas (Polla), Lurius and Severus, and of the Titan estates of Doryphoros and Seneca (Table 6). Of this land, the native villagers cultivated 694 31/64 arourae themselves; but none offered, or none remained, to till the outstanding 453 7/32 arourae, and the extremely bothersome but effective method of ἐπιμερισμός was employed.³⁶ An unknown number of farmers was transferred to the site from 11 other villages of the same *meris* to work on the land (Table 6a).

Purely by chance, a number of documents gives us a rather complete picture of Theadelphia, one of the larger villages in the nome.³⁷ A much mutilated papyrus, wherein, however, all the important numerals are preserved, gives us the total amount of the grain-producing land administered by the διοίκησις: 5283 49/64 arourae (Table 7).³⁸ Another document gives us what appear to be the total amounts of grain collected for taxes and rentals during the first ten months of 94/5 or 110/11 from the entire area of the village.³⁹ Of the grand total of 17,193 5/6 artabae of wheat, 3412 19/24 artabae, or 1/5 of the total, were collected for the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, the

34. *P. Berl. Leihg.* 29, according to information kindly advanced me before the publication of the papyrus by A. Tomsin.

35. SB 10512; see its original publication in *APF* 19, 1969, pp. 77 ff.; cf. Tomsin, *APF* 21, 1971, pp. 91 f. Dr. G. Poethke recently discovered that *P. Berl.* 11529 is the missing portion of this document, and presented me with a full transcript before its publication in a forthcoming issue of *APF*.

36. See now the detailed discussion of G. Poethke, *Epimerismos. Betrachtungen zur Zwangspacht in Ägypten während der Prinzipatszeit*, 1969.

37. See W. L. Westermann on *P. Col.* 1 recto 2, and A. E. R. Boak, *Historia* 4, 1955, p. 161.

38. *P. Berl. Leihg.* 5, with Kalén's notes.

39. *P. Lond.* 900 (III, p. 89); see the new edition and the discussion by Tomsin, "Un document de comptabilité fiscale, *P. Lond.*, III, 900, p. 89," *Académie royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques*, 5^e série, 40, 1954, pp. 91 ff. See also Kalén, *P. Berl. Leihg.*, p. 75, who first noted the similarities between this text and *P. Berl. Leihg.* 1 verso.ii.16 ff., and who first argued that the London text deals with Theadelphia.

Table 6

P. Berl. inv. 11529 + SB 10512 (A.D. 138/9)

Cadastre of an unknown village in the Themistou and Polemonos, Arsinoite. Total area of ousiakē ge.

(a) Area cultivated by the villagers:

Maecenatian	149 11/64
Pallantian (G. Polla)	32
Lurian	311 16/64
Severan	146 48/64
 TOTAL VESPASIAN	639 11/64
 Doryphorian	20 40/64
Senecan	34 44/64
 TOTAL TITUS	55 20/64
 TOTAL BY VILLAGERS	694 31/64

(b) Area cultivated by the inhabitants of 11 villages of the meris:

11 villages of the meris:	453 14/64
 GRAND TOTAL	1147 45/64

Table 6a

P. Berl. inv. 11529 + SB 10512 (A.D. 138/9)

Ousiakē ge of an unknown village in the Themistou and Polemonos, Arsinoite, subject to epimerismos to the inhabitants of 11 villages of the meris. Total area assigned.

Origin of farmers	Vespasian			Titus		Total
	Maecenatian	Lurian	Severan	Doryphorian	Senecan	
Themistou	31	133 18/64	[] 62/64	[] 40/64	—	173 56/64
	10 37/64	—	—	—	—	10 37/64
	—	14 36/64	—	32/64	9	24 4/64
	4 6/64	47 50/64	—	—	—	51 56/64
	2 16/64	—	32	—	—	34 16/64
	[]	[]	[]	[]	—	74 [?]
	Lagis	—	31 16/64	—	—	31 16/64
	Trikomia	—	31 48/64	—	—	31 48/64
Pol.	Sentrempaei	—	—	1 32/64	—	1 32/64
	 TOTAL THEMISTOU MERIS					433 9/64
	Narmouthis	—	—	—	[] [] []	
	Tebtunis	—	—	—	[] [] []	
	 TOTAL POLEMONOS MERIS					[20 5/64]
	 GRAND TOTAL					453 14/64

remaining going to the διοίκησις. The estates mentioned are those of Dionysodoros, Menas/Menatius, Seneca, and Severus, and the missing one — if only one is missing — is almost

Table 7

P. Berl. Leihg. 5 (A.D. 158/59)

Cadastral of Theadelphia. Total area of fiscal and private land.

Royal	2850	50/64
Hieratike	103	53/64
Revenue	168	
Fiscal	3122	39/64
Private	2161	10/64
TOTAL	5283	49/64

certainly that of Antonia (Drusi?). The scribe has given us a detailed account of the sums of wheat and barley collected from each estate, but did not bother, or forgot, to return and fill in the spaces he had left for the size of each in arourae. The total should have been between 700 and 800 arourae (Table 8).

Table 8

P. Lond. 900 (A.D. 94/5 or 110/11)

Grain collection, Theadelphia. Balance on Epiph 1 (25 June) (?)

Estate	Wheat	Barley	Lentils
[Antonian (?)	1078 1/24	658 15/24	—]
Dionysodian	48 15/24	797 3/24	—
Menatian	285 17/24	66 21/24	—
Severan	1135	42 18/24	—
Senecan	865	—	—
Ousiaka	3412 19/24	1565 4/24	—
Dioikesis	13781 1/24	[]	3277 8/24
TOTAL	17193 20/24		3277 8/24

Another papyrus, the beginning of which is missing, deals most likely with Theadelphia too, although, since it was discovered in Philadelphia, it is quite possible that the latter village is meant.⁴⁰ Of the list of former owners of imperial estates only the names of Dionysodoros and Kharmos survive. The entire amount, however, of the οὐσιακὴ γῆ paying rentals in grain is known: 713 25/32 arourae, expected to contribute 3708 1/48 artabae of wheat and 890 1/2 artabae of barley in 156/7. This tallies with the sums attested in the previous document, and if the village in this one is Philadelphia, then it must have had about the same number of arourae of

40. BGU 1636. Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, nos. 309 and 312, noted the similarities between this document and *P. Lond. 900* (III, p. 89), but was under the impression that both dealt with Philadelphia; see, however, the previous note.

οὐσιακὴ γῆ as Theadelphia, an only slightly smaller village. The rental in grain, it should be noted, must have been paid for the entire area, for it could not have possibly been levied only on the 270 arourae sown in wheat and the 38 arourae sown in barley (Table 9).

Table 9

BGU1636 (A.D. 156/7)

Total area of the ousiaka ge of a village (Theadelphia ?) in the Arsinoite, and total of the grain collected as tax for the year.

(a) Area by crop		(b) Area by former owner	
Wheat	270	[653 19/32]
Barley	38	Dionysodorian	12
Grass for cutting	38 6/32	Kharmian	48 6/32
Grass for grazing	228	TOTAL	713 25/32
Beans	30	(c) Tax in grain (in artabae)	
Vegetable seed	[38 26/32]	Wheat	3708 1/48
Lentils	70 25/32	Barley	890 1/2
TOTAL	713 25/32		

We have a good number of papyri giving us information about the monthly, and even the daily, revenues of the οὐσιακὴ γῆ of various localities in the Arsinoite, but it is impossible to estimate the dimensions of an area by means of its revenue in grain only, when neither the rate of the assessment is given, nor is the account full and annual. Our difficulties are fully illustrated by two summary reports of receipts in 164 and 165 (Tables 10 and 11), and a quarterly report for an unknown year of the second century (Table 12), all three dealing with Theadelphia.⁴¹ The chief

Table 10

P. Berl. Leihg. 4 recto (A.D. 165)

Grain collection, Theadelphia. Balance on Epiph 4 (28 June).

	Dioikesis			Ousiaka			Total		
	Wheat	Barley	Lentils	Barley*	Wheat	Barley	Lentils		
Balance	1884 12/24	617 3/24	1063 22/24	—	1884 12/24	617 3/24	1063 22/24		
Receipts	5518 12/24	239 23/24	1634 15/24	576 15/24	5518 12/24	816 14/24	1634 15/24		
Frumentum emptum					9 21/24				
				TOTAL	7412 21/24	1433 17/24	2698 13/24		
				Shipped to Alexandria	464 6/24	—	—		
				Balance	6948 15/24	1433 17/24	2698 13/24		

* All from the Dionysodorian estate, Vespasian.

41. P. Berl. Leihg. 1 recto and verso; P. Berl. Leihg. 4 recto; P. Strassb. 551. German translation of the Berlin papyri

in Thunell P. Sitol., pp. 42 ff. and 49 ff.; cf. also Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, no. 315. See in general Z. Aly, "Sitologia in

problem arises from the fact that, unlike the *καθήκοντα*, which did not vary from year to year, the rentals, or *ἐκφόρια*, paid by the cultivators of the royal, hieratic, revenue and *ούσιακὴ γῆ*, were determined according to the value of a particular plot of land, the time and the amount of the

Table 11

P. Berl. Leihg. 1 recto & verso (A.D. 164)

Grain collection, Theadelphia. Receipts of the fall quarter (29 August - 26 November).

	Dioikesis		Ousiaka		Total	
	Wheat	Barley	Wheat	Barley	Wheat	Barley
Balance	1910	6/24	28	9/24	49	22/24
Receipts					147	6/24
Thoth	341	15/24	8	4/24	—	—
Phaophi	129	12/24	—	—	30	8/24
Frumentum emptum						341 15/24
						129 12/24
						—
TOTAL	2381	9/24	36	13/24	49	22/24
Distributed	1560	19/24	80	8/24	439	5/24
Balance					177	14/24
					134	—
					2480	19/24
					2100	214 3/24
					380	19/24
						214 8/24!
						0

flooding of the Nile, and the demands of Rome. To this we should add the tendency of many a public farmer to pay at irregular intervals and often after a considerable time had elapsed since the harvest, and the fact that many "balances" are just that and not records of receipts: quantities of seed may have been distributed to farmers for sowing, and large amounts may have been shipped to Alexandria. In the particular case under discussion (and this, of course, finds parallels in other

Table 12

P. Strassb. 551 (A.D. 11)

Grain collection, Theadelphia. Receipts of the winter quarter (27 November - 24 February).

	Wheat	Barley	Lentils
Vespasian	312	8/24	185
Titus	132	—	—
Ousiaka	444	8/24	185
Dioikesis	3735	19/24	82
TOTAL	4180	3/24	268
			31 6/24

Roman Egypt," *JJP* 4, 1950, pp. 293 ff., and "Upon Sitologia in Roman Egypt and the Rôle of Sitologi in its Financial Administration," *Akten des VIII. intern. Kongresses für Papyrologie*, 1956, pp. 17 ff. On the *frumentum emptum* (*πυρὸς συναγοραστικός* in the Berlin papyri) see Thunell and

Kalén *ad loc.*; Grenfell and Hunt, *P. Tebt.* 369.6 n.; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 359 f.; Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 22 f.; cf. also *BGU* 2026; 2075; *P. Petaus* 44.58 with note; Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 620 f.; *P. Oxy.* 2958 introd.

localities as well), we should not ignore the fact that the public granaries of Theadelphia were regional ones, i.e. they received grain not only from the fields of the village itself, but also from those of neighboring communities, such as Euhemeria and Polydeukia. When compared with Table 8, Tables 10, 11 and 12 are shown to have given us some very misleading information.

These, then, are the documents that offer us an extensive and fairly comprehensive list of imperial estates in the Arsinoite. The total amount of grain-land that we can account for is about 8800 arourae. If we add to these papyri a miscellaneous collection of private documents (sales, leases, loans, memoranda, payments on credit) as well as public ones (petitions for redress, declarations of plots of uninundated land, notifications of death, official lists and accounts) that mention small additional parcels of οὐσιακὴ γῆ ranging from less than one to about 50 arourae, the grand total of the known grain-land in the Arsinoite belonging to the οὐσιακὸς λόγος comes to little less than 10,000 arourae.⁴² In a normal year this would be expected to yield between 40,000 and 60,000 artabae of wheat in rentals — a very rough estimate indeed. A question that must remain unanswered, at least for the present, is what part of the absolute total of the οὐσιακὴ γῆ in the nome are these 10,000 arourae we have accounted for. Considering that more than four fifths of the known sum are attested by only seven documents,⁴³ and bearing in mind that a single and otherwise unimportant small settlement on the lake shore like Perkeesis accounts for more than one fifth of the presently known total,⁴⁴ it would be wise not to venture any speculation. The evidence is simply not enough.

Of the three areas of cultivable land in Egypt, the Delta, the Nile valley and the Arsinoite, the last was also the smallest, comprising about one tenth of the total. In 1880 it was estimated that the Fayum, the present name of the Arsinoite district, had about 1230 km², or slightly less than 500,000 arourae, of cultivable land.⁴⁵ In the Ptolemaic and Roman times Lake Moëris must have covered about twice the amount of land it covers today. Long stretches of what is now plain desert were under cultivation at the time, as ruins of ancient villages and traces of canals testify. One may point out two large areas of this kind, the district from Soknopaiou Nesos to Philadelphia and farther to the east, and the portion of the division of Themistos and Polemon between Theadelphia and Magdola. The area, therefore, of the Arsinoite under cultivation by the Ptolemies and the Romans must have been larger than it is today, and its size was most likely between 1500 and 2000 km², or approximately between 600,000 and 700,000 arourae.

Clearly, the vast majority of this land was sown with cereals. Under the Romans, however, the Arsinoite continued to be a very important center for viticulture and gardening. Olives and palm-trees also prospered there, and pastures and marshes contributed not a little to the economic life of the area. The mildness of the climate and the productivity of the soil caused a variety of trees to prosper here, and this is evident even today. It is with full justification that a popular modern guide-book speaks of the district as *le verger de l'Égypte*.⁴⁶

Vineyards and garden-lands were the most prominent features of the cultivation of private land in the nome. We know, for example, of a private estate near Ibion Eikosipentarouron which had, among other types of land, the large amount of about 650 arourae of orchards.⁴⁷ Its accounts for 8 B.C. show a heavy deficit, possibly because of mismanagement, but possibly also because the

42. The documents are those assembled below, Appendix

II.

43. *P. Bour.* 42; *P. Mich.* 372; *P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.* 52; *P. Berl. inv.* 11529+SB 10512; *BGU* 1636; *P. Berl. Leihg.* 29.

44. *P. Bour.* 42 (cf. Table 2).

45. See Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, p. 7.

46. M. Baud, *Égypte* (Les Guides Bleus, 1950), p. 667.

47. *P. Lond.* 1171 (III, p. 179); cf. Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, no. 103.

estate was still in the process of development. Of more immediate import is a document from the last years of Tiberius: of the three estates described therein, one contained 65 1/4 arourae of ἀμπελῶν φόροιμος and 126 3/4 arourae of ἄφορος, perhaps non-taxable νεόφυτα. In the third estate there were 216 1/4 arourae of ἄφορος (208 3/4 of νεόφυτα) and 160 9/32 arourae of φόροιμος. The second estate, and the one that interests us most, belonged to Pallas. Out of a total of 63 arourae, 50 3/4 were ἀμπελῶν ἄφορος, i.e. νεόφυτα.⁴⁸ This is the largest vineyard we encounter among the imperial estates in the Arsinoite; we should recall here the κτῆμα Θοννήσεως of the Latinian estate in the Mendesian nome, which measured 163 arourae.⁴⁹ We also know of an ἀμπελῶν λεγόμενος Συνεφήβου in the Maecenatian estate near Ibion Eikosipentarouron, but its size is not stated.⁵⁰

From the second century we hear of a small olive grove in an estate of Severus (1 1/2 aroura), and an even smaller one in an estate of Maecenas (9/32 of an aroura), both in unknown locations in the Arsinoite.⁵¹ But in 34 the superintendent of the estate of Tiberius and the children of Livia Drusi in Euhemeria complained to the chief of the local police that two Egyptian shepherds had let their flocks into the νεόφυτα τῶν ἔλαιώνων, whereupon the sheep proceeded to graze down two hundred young olive plants in the land formerly of Falcidius.⁵² This must have been an extensive olive grove in the process of development. A century later we also hear of an οὐσιακὸς ἔλαιων Ἐρμάεως λεγόμενος near Euhemeria.⁵³ There was an oil-press in an estate of Doryphoros somewhere in the Herakleidou meris; we have already mentioned the troubles of a lessee of the ἔλαιουσογεῖον formerly of Ti. Claudius Sarapion in the Neronian estate near Herakleia.⁵⁴

These mentions of νεόφυτα — mentions which cease after the Julio-Claudian period — indicate a concentrated effort at this time on the part of the private owners of these estates to develop new vineyards and olive groves on what used to be neglected land.⁵⁵ The farther we move from the early first century, the more abundant become the documents mentioning vines, olives and palm-trees among the imperial estates, and this is only normal; but at the same time, the vineyards and garden-lands tend to become smaller and less prominent in the economic activities of the οὐσιακὴ γῆ. It appears that after these estates had become public land no significant effort was made to preserve, let alone expand, the vineyards and the olive groves, and that heavy emphasis was placed upon the production of cereals.⁵⁶ This does not mean that all ἀμπελῶνες and παράδεισοι were converted to grain-land. The administration, to be sure, was chiefly concerned with the grain shipped to Rome, but never neglected viticulture or the cultivation of fruit-bearing trees.⁵⁷ The revenues in money, moreover, from such enterprises, were considerable, and it would

48. *P. Lond.* 195 (II, p. 127); see the new edition and the discussion in *P. Ryl.* II, pp. 243 ff. and 254 ff.

49. *P. Ryl.* 427 (22).

50. SB 10947. Cf. also *P. Mil. Vogl.* 98.58 ff.

51. *P. Mil. Vogl.* 251; cf. Foraboschi, *Chronique* 42, 1967, pp. 175 f.; *P. Tebt.* 343.

52. *P. Ryl.* 138.

53. *P. Osl.* 136.

54. *P. Strassb.* 210; *P. Lond.* 280 (II, p. 193); *WChr.* 176. Cf. also the three arourae of olive groves near Euhemeria in *BGU* 599.

55. See above, Chapter I, and Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 675, "It must also be observed that the majority of the references to lands newly planted with vines and olives belong to the 1st cent. A.D., and refer to large estates. ... The Flavian age represented a reaction against rapid increase in private property in Egypt [cf. also below, n. 57], but, as I have shown, even under

the Flavians the formation of new private estates, small and large, did not cease. This is probably because ability and energy were needed to make the borderlands useful and fertile, and the royal peasants certainly were not conspicuous for either of these qualities." Cf. also p. 673, where his reference to *P. Ryl.* 171 is incorrect: the Doryphorian estate near Herakleia mentioned therein was not planted with vines and olives but was sown with cereals.

56. See, e.g., *P. Ryl.* 215.33, ψιλ(ὸς) τόπ(ος), καὶ παράδει[σος νυνὶ] ὃν ἔρημος in a Vespasian estate in the Mendesian nome; cf. Foraboschi, *Chronique* 42, 1967, p. 176, and above, n. 5.

57. During Domitian's reign a shortage of wheat and a superabundance of vineyards throughout the empire, and especially in Italy and the East, caused a very strong edict to be proclaimed: *ad summam quondam ubertatem vini, frumenti vero inopiam, existimans nimio vinearum studio neglegi arva,*

have been a fiscally irresponsible act to destroy productive vineyards growing on land unsuitable for cereals, or to cut down palm-trees and olives in areas where nothing else would grow.

During the second century, when the office of the ἐπιτηρητὴς οὐσιακῶν κτημάτων makes its brief appearance, we often hear of οὐσιακὰ κτήματα, but with no further qualification as to the type or the dimensions of the land in question. They are attested in Dionysias, Psenyris, Boubastos, Sebennutus, Theadelphia, Kerkesoukha and Epipolis. In the last village, the φόροι, or rentals, collected in money from the garden-land (?) of the district amounted to a little over 5500 drachmae per year.⁵⁸

On the other hand, a small and only partially published papyrus from Tebtunis presents us with some astonishing information.⁵⁹ During an unknown year of the second century, a total of 16 talents, 1268 drachmae, 5 1/2 obols and 2 khalkoi was derived from an area of 19,451 95/96 arourae in the division of Herakleides. This being clearly a tax of 5 drachmae per aroura, it is almost certain that this sum was collected for the ἀπόμοιος on garden-land in the district.⁶⁰ The size of the area is large enough to be the total garden-land of the entire *meris*; but under the head παραδείσων οὐσιακῶν[v there is a list of six villages, Psya, Psenyris Ano, Metrodorou Epoikion, Philadelphia, Boubastos and Aphroditopolis, and their combined total of garden-land amounts to a startling 6 3/4 arourae. Are we to suppose that this represents the sum of the οὐσιακοὶ παραδείσοι in the entire division of Herakleides? It is hardly possible, in view of the fact that we know of at least seven arourae of palm-tree groves in the estate of Antonia Drusi in Psenyris, and of garden-land in the neighborhood of Karanis and Patsontis. Nevertheless, there still exists this immense difference between 19,451 95/96 and 6 3/4 arourae, and although it is almost certain that these numerals refer only to a specific kind of παραδείσοι or only to a section of the *meris*, we are confronted with a ratio between διοίκησις and οὐσιακά about which no document offers any contra-indications.

Regarding vineyards and tree groves in Karanis, Psenarpsenenesis and Patsontis, our best sources of information are the three long tax rolls for 171/2 to 173/4.⁶¹ In them there are listed some 1000 persons paying land taxes or rentals in money, and although sections of the rolls are missing, this number must represent nearly all the persons who paid such taxes in Karanis, the Egyptian and Greco-Egyptian element of which has been estimated to have been at that time between 1800 and 2200 persons, including women, children and slaves.⁶² Of these 1000, only 60 are in any way connected with the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, and half of them may be eliminated from the present discussion: 27 paid only for δραγματηγία, or for transportation of sheaves, and therefore cultivated οὐσιακή grain-land, which, as we have seen, was of considerable size in the area; two were shepherds; one was a potter. The remaining 30 worked on garden-land and vineyards they had leased from the οὐσιακὸς λόγος. The only indication for παραδείσοι among this land comes from the very small payments (a total of 32 drachmae, contributed by 2 individuals) for φόρος

edixit, ne quis in Italia novellaret utque in provinciis vineta succiderentur, relicta ubi plurimum dimidia parte; nec exequi rem perseveravit (Suet., Dom. 7.2). Cf. also Dom. 14.2, and for the strong reaction in the East, Philostr., *Vita Apoll.* 6.42 and *Vita Soph.* 1.520. The edict was extremely unpopular and does not seem to have been enforced long, or to have had any effect in Egypt.

58. P. Strassb. 267; P. Leit. 11; P. Meyer 3; BGU 619; 2064; P. Mich. 599; P. Petaus 75; 76; 77; 78; SB 5670; P. Fay. 23. For Epipolis see P. Med. 65, where in line 4 read {Π}, in lines 9 and 14 τῶν Ἐπιπόλεως, and in line 10 Κρέοντος (see Youtie et al., P. Petaus, p. 274 with n. 8. The letters επι have been dropped by mistake in line 9; cf. the edition in Aeg. 22, 1942, p. 71 and SB 9014). Those who choose to see Ptolemaios,

s. of Kronion, and Apion, s. of Komanos, as former owners of imperial estates, and not as current lessees as I do (cf. above, Chapter I, n. 36), must include in their lists the other two names mentioned in lines 9 ff. as well: Ptolemaios, s. of Dioskoros, and Alexandros, s. of Simon, the latter obviously a Jew. All four act in precisely the same capacity, and it will not do to separate them into two groups.

59. P. Tebt. 503.

60. Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 71 and 516.

61. P. Mich. 223; 224; 225; 357 (a fragment of 224).

62. See A. E. R. Boak, "The Population of Roman and Byzantine Karanis," *Historia* 4, 1955, pp. 157 ff., where valuable information may be found regarding Philadelphia, Theadelphia and Bakkhias as well.

φοινίκων in the estates of Doryphoros and Maecenas,⁶³ and the even smaller payments (16 drachmae, paid by 4 persons) for φόρος ἔλαῖνων φυτῶν and for παραγωγὴ ἔλαιος in the estates of Lurius, Maecenas and Severus.⁶⁴ In addition, there are two categories of land, the ἀμπελος τρυγωμένη in the estates of Anthos and Maecenas,⁶⁵ and the apparently inferior αἰγιαλῖτις ἔμφορος, or productive shore-land, in the estates of Antonia (Drusi?), Doryphoros, Camelius, Lurius, Maecenas, Seneca and Severus.⁶⁶ Both types of land paid taxes at the same rate: ἐπαρούριον, 6 drachmae 4 obols per aroura per annum; ἀπόμοιρα, 10 drachmae per aroura per annum; γεωμετρία, 50 drachmae per aroura every fourth year. These are the standard rates in the Arsinoite for vineyards,⁶⁷ and it appears from the way the taxes were collected that the few olive trees already referred to were scattered among the vines of these estates. Now the 30 individuals who paid taxes on this οὐσιακὴ γῆ contributed for the ἀπόμοιρα a grand total of slightly less than 114 drachmae, which means that we are actually dealing with only 11 to 12 arourae of vine-land. The entire area of this type of οὐσιακὴ γῆ in the three villages could not have been much larger.

A similar picture emerges from Theadelphia across the lake, in a document entitled τοπαρχικός (sc. λόγος) λημμάτων κ (ἔτους) Ἀντωνίου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου (i.e. 157) Θεαδελφίας.⁶⁸ Vine-land is attested in all the estates of the village, i.e. those of Antonia (Drusi?), Dionysodoros, Maecenas, Menas/Menatius, Seneca and Severus. In the Dionysodian estate half an obol was collected for παραγωγὴ ἔλαιος, as opposed to 51 drachmae contributed to the διοίκησις, and these olive trees appear to have been scattered among the vines once more. There are detailed accounts of payments for ἀπόμοιρα (24 drachmae), ἐπαρούριον (16 drachmae) and γεωμετρία (117 drachmae), and how much each estate contributed, but the fact remains that all this adds up to a combined total of slightly more than two arourae.⁶⁹ The ἀμπελῶνες of the διοίκησις amounted to 320 arourae.

Some μυροβάλανοι (*Balanites aegyptiaca*) and 2 3/4 arourae of a palm-tree grove are mentioned in an estate of Severus,⁷⁰ and seven ἄκανθοι (*Acacia arabica*) and 18 palm-trees are found growing on the embankments and among the grain fields of an estate of Maecenas.⁷¹ We have already encountered the few palm-trees in the estates of Doryphoros and Maecenas near Karanis. In Epipolis there was a φοινικῶν Στρατηγοῦ λεγόμενος of 6 1/2 arourae in the Dionysodian estate.⁷² The Antonian estates in Boukolon, Philoteris and Psenyris had palm-tree groves; in the last-mentioned location there were at least 7 7/8 arourae of palm-trees in a κτῆμα ο παράδεισος (?) of at least 66 arourae.⁷³ Palm-tree groves administered by the οὐσιακός λόγος are also attested in Skhedia and Iuliopolis.⁷⁴

Λάχανον and λαχανόσπερεμον is a crop usually translated as “vegetable” and “vegetable seed”. It was good for both animal and human consumption, and it sometimes paid a tax in wheat, sometimes in kind. I append it here since it was generally included in the category of garden-land. It is attested in the estates of Livia in Karanis (1 5/8 aroura) and of Dionysodoros in Theadelphia (38 3/4 arourae).⁷⁵ In the neighboring Hermopolite nome it is found in the lands formerly of

63. Maecenas: *P. Mich.* 224.5509; Doryphoros: 224.6079.

unknown owner: 224.5436a; 357C.8.

67. Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 47 ff.

64. Maecenas: *P. Mich.* 224.3917, 5433; Lurius: 224.5570; Severus: 224.4009, 5910. See Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 61 f.

68. *BGU* 1894.

69. Compare the similar returns in *P. Col.* 1 verso 1 a col. 5; cf. col. 4 for the *fiscus*.

65. Anthos: *P. Mich.* 223.1289, 1873; 224.2275; 225.2655; Maecenas: 223.2695; 224.1913; 225.2892.

70. *P. Mil. Vogl.* 251.

66. Antonia: *P. Mich.* 224.3288, 6023 (this may be Anthos); Doryphoros: 224.4213, 5914; Camelius: 224.4249, 4941; 357B.3; Lurius: 224.5569, 5579; 357A.3; Maecenas: 224.3685, 5431, 6016, 6184, 6200; 357B.27; Seneca: 224.4111, 4200, 4223, 4228; Severus: 224.4008, 5909;

71. *P. Tebt.* 343.76 ff.; cf. Kalén, *P. Berl. Leihg.*, p. 184, for corrected readings and discussion.

72. *P. Gen.* 38.

73. *SB* 5670; *P. Fay.* 60; *P. Strassb.* 267.

74. *SB* 9210.

75. *P. Mich.* 560; *BGU* 1636.

Messalina.⁷⁶

There remain two other categories of land, the δοχμοί and the νομαί, in many respects similar, since agriculture, sheep-raising and hunting took place in both; in the marshes papyrus-growing and fishing as well.⁷⁷ The importance of marshes and pastures for the economic activity of a district should not be underestimated. The activities taking place therein yielded considerable revenue to the state, especially in money, and the administration, in its endless drive for more sources of income, made sure that all kinds of operators (the ἀλιεῖς ἀπὸ ποδός and the θρυοπῶλαι are good examples) paid taxes.⁷⁸ For the activities and the revenues consider, for example, a document of 87/8 in which a *Grosspächter* offered to lease νομὰς Θεαδελ(φείας) κώ[μης] ούσας ἐν τῷ δοχμῷ τῆς Θεαδ[ελ(φείας)], κ(αὶ) θήραν ἵκ[χ]θύας κ(αὶ) ὀγρίω[ν] (sc. δοχέων), κ(αὶ) ἀνθήλην κ(αὶ) φλόα κ(αὶ) κό[μην?]. The rental for one year was 10,000 drachmae, 8652 going to the διοίκησις and 1348 to the ούσιακά for the Dionysodorian estate.⁷⁹ We happen to know the size of the marsh and the pastures of Dionysodorus in Theadelphia: there were 255 arourae of marshes paying an annual φόρος νομῶν καὶ ἵχθύας of 3699 drachmae, or 14 drachmae 13 obols per aroura; and 42 arourae of χερσονομαί, or νομαὶ θεοῖναι καὶ χειμεριναί, paying 1000 drachmae, i.e. at a rate of 23 drachmae 5 obols per aroura.⁸⁰ A section of the long marsh between Theadelphia and Polydeukia was once owned by Iulia Augusta and the children of Germanicus, and we hear of papyrus-growing in the area,⁸¹ but it may have been of small size, for after this isolated reference of A.D. 26 it disappears from our sources. It is not impossible that it was incorporated in the Dionysodorian marsh.

Pastures which had once belonged to Anthos and to Antonia (Drusi?) are found in Soknopaiou Nesos, but their size is not known.⁸² We have, on the other hand, a large number of references to sheep and goats belonging to various estates and rented by individuals. That these animals grazed on pastures belonging to these estates does not necessarily follow: after a shepherd had rented sheep and goats from the state, he also had to lease a pasture in which to raise them. Apparently he was not obliged to use the pastures of the estate to which the animals belonged although it must often have been convenient to do so. In 208 an individual living in Soknopaiou Nesos paid 600 drachmae for the rental of a section of the pastures of the Antonian estate and 29 drachmae for the rental of an unknown number of sheep of the Germanician estate.⁸³

Goats and sheep and φόρος προβάτων καὶ αἰγῶν are attested for the estates of Pallas in Theadelphia, Karanis and Philadelphia; of Maecenas in Philadelphia and Euhemeria; of Lurius in Soknopaiou Nesos; of Germanicus in Philadelphia, Theadelphia, Karanis and Soknopaiou Nesos; of Camelius in Philadelphia; of Antonia (Drusi?) in Philadelphia, Karanis and Theadelphia; and of Claudius in Tebtunis.⁸⁴

76. CPR 243; of unknown owner in the same nome, *P. Ryl.* 168.

77. See N. Lewis, *L'industrie du papyrus dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine*, 1934, pp. 96 ff. (a new, expanded edition in English is now in the presses), and *P. Leit.* 14 introd.; *P. Tebt.* 308.4 n.; Calderini, *Aeg.* 1, 1920, pp. 56 ff.; M. C. Besta, 'Pesca e pescatori nell'Egitto greco-romano,' *Aeg.* 2, 1921, pp. 67 ff.

78. Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 72, 211, 220 f.

79. *P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.* 12, where we should read in lines 12-13 δι[ουκήσ]ως, not δι[αμισθώσ]ως as the editor suggested; lines 14-15 ought to read δραχμαὶ [H] ἔξακόσ(ιαι) ἐνενήκοντα (a mistake for πεντήκοντα?) [δύο, τῆς] δὲ Διονυσιδωριαν[ῆς ούσιας].

80. *BGU* 1894.102 ff.; see the editor's note on 102 and 105; see also *P. Col.* 1 verso 1a.46-7, where the amounts

mentioned are 3695 and 1000 drachmae; cf. *P. Würz.* 11.9, mentioning χειμεριναὶ νομαί. For the Theadelphian marsh and pastures see *P. Athen.* 14; *P. Ryl.* 98 (a); *P. Soc.* 458; *P. Osl.* 89; 90; and a group of related texts, *P. Soc.* 160; 735; *P. Osl.* 91; *P. Wisc.* 33; 34; 35; 37; *P. Mich.* 617.

81. *P. Med.* 6. See N. Lewis, *L'industrie du papyrus dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine*, 1934, pp. 112 ff.

82. Antonia: *BGU* 277; Anthos: *P. Strassb.* inv. 1108 (*APF* 4, 1908, pp. 142 f.); *BGU* 199 verso; 277; 810.

83. *BGU* 810.

84. Of Pallas in Theadelphia: *BGU* 1636; 1894; Karanis: *P. Mich.* 223; 225; Philadelphia: *P. Phil.* 19. Of Maecenas in Philadelphia: *P. Phil.* 19; Euhemeria: *P. Hamb.* 34; *SB* 8972. Of Lurius: *P. Trinity College* inv. 112 (*Chronique* 44, 1969, p. 317). Of Germanicus in Philadelphia: *P. Phil.* 19; Theadelphia:

We have sparse information about beasts of burden in the imperial estates, and none about cattle, although at least oxen must have been employed for the cultivation of the land and the threshing of the wheat. The estate of Livia and Germanicus had a sufficient number of donkeys in 5 to warrant the presence of an ἐπιστάτης (sc. δύναμον) κτηνῶν,⁸⁵ and the small bronze tablet inscribed Ἀγρειππινιανῆς καὶ Ῥουτιλλιανῆς οὐσίας τοῦ κυρίου Αὐτοκράτορος ἀτελῆν καὶ ἀνενγάρευτον must have been worn by a beast of burden immune from taxation and impressment for public service, most likely a donkey or a camel.⁸⁶

Another activity that took place in the communities around Lake Moëris was fishing. Of the imperial estates only the Antonian in the Soknopaiou Nesos is known to have possessed fishing-boats which were leased to individuals, for we have frequent references to φόρος πλοίων Ἀντωνιανῆς οὐσίας.⁸⁷ This tallies well with the large number of bronze fish-hooks and fragmentary cord fish-nets discovered during the excavations of the village. "This is not surprising," as one of the excavators put it, "in view of the proximity of Soknopaiou Nesos to lake Moeris, and we may well believe that in this outlying village, where there could be little commercial or industrial activity, a considerable portion of the population depended wholly or in part upon fishing to secure a livelihood."⁸⁸ The temple of Soknopaios was another large owner of fishing-boats in the village.⁸⁹

BGU 1894; Karanis: *P. Mich.* 223; Soknopaiou Nesos: BGU 810. Of Camelius: *P. Phil.* 19; cf. *P. Iand.* 26 (Theadelphia ?). Of Antonia in Philadelphia: *P. Phil.* 19; Karanis: *P. Mich.* 223; BGU 1894; cf. also *P. Oxy.* 224. Of Claudius: *P. Mich.* 121 recto II.x.1.

85. SB 9150.

86. SB 4226. In BGU 1047.ii.12 Lesquier tentatively suggested ἵππων, but could a stable be subject to διαμίσθωσις (line 16)?

87. *P. Aberd.* 24; BGU 199 verso; 212; 653. See Wallace, *Taxation*, p. 220; Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, p. 572.

88. A. E. R. Boak, *Soknopaiou Nesos. The University of Michigan Excavations at Dimê in 1931-32*, 1935, p. 19.

89. Cf. BGU 337; *P. Tebt.* 298.33 n.; see also Wallace, *Taxation*, pp. 219 f., C. Wessely, *Karanis und Soknopaiou Nesos. Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Bd. 47, Abh. 4*, 1902, p. 72.

Chapter Four

Administration and Manpower

Before their incorporation into the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, at which time they became in fact another category of public land and were exploited and administered as such, the estates of the members of the imperial family and their dependents were privately owned properties and were managed like similar landed estates in Egypt. A characteristic they shared with most of the lands owned by wealthy Alexandrians in the χώρα was the absentee owner. In the case of the Alexandrians, who may have owned land as far from the capital as the Arsinoite and the Oxyrhynchite nomes, the owner was at least living within Egypt; in the case of metropolitan land-owners, the master was, after all, living in the town of the same nome. For such an owner periodic visits to his land were always possible, and correspondence or the dispatch of trusted agents to his stewards and foremen made the task of overseeing his properties a simple one. Living on the estate, supervising activities and implementing the master's orders would be a hierarchy of officials known by such titles as προεστῶτες, προνοοῦντες, οἰκονόμοι, φροντισταί, προστάται, γραμματεῖς, πρεσβύτεροι, χειρισταί, πραγματευταί, and so on.¹ In short, such properties could be, and in fact were, managed in a manner similar to the one employed in the well-known δωρεά of Apollonips, the *dioiketes* of Ptolemaios Philadelphos residing in Alexandria; as far as administration and exploitation were concerned, it made no difference whether a piece of land was a temporary gift or an ownership in perpetuity.

The situation is somewhat different when we come to members of the imperial house and such magnates as Maecenas and Seneca. By far the majority of them never set foot in Egypt. The vast distances separating their abode from their Egyptian estates rendered continuous correspondence problematical, and although letters were exchanged between these owners and their agents,² such epistles must have dealt with general policies and objectives, for they could hardly have contained detailed instructions on such specific matters as the repairs of a faulty water-wheel or the treatment of a sickly foal. Most of the owners, we should remember, were persons who had neither time nor desire to deal with the close supervision of their estates, being preoccupied with running the empire, advising the emperor, or surviving palace intrigues. Some, to be sure, like Seneca, were deeply interested in agriculture and the management of estates, but the sheer size of their properties, as well as the distance, must have prevented them from exercising close scrutiny. Trimalchio's ignorance of the daily activities of his vast domain is not altogether a figment of Petronius' imagination; the author is caricaturing existing conditions. Others, on the other hand, like Claudia Livilla and Germanicus, not to mention their children who

1. For examples see Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, ss. vv.

2. See Sen., *Ep.* 77.3, on the arrival of ships from

Alexandria: *epistulas meorum accepturus*.

appear as owners before they had even reached majority, although interested in augmenting their possessions, were totally unqualified to express an opinion on viticulture, cereal sowing, or the temperamental flooding of the Nile.

I have already suggested in the first chapter that it was agents of members of the imperial household and of wealthy Romans who, in all likelihood, directed the purchase of land for their masters. If the rest of the empire may serve as an example (and there is no reason to believe that in this respect Egypt differed in any way), it would be freedmen and slaves who acted as *procuratores* in charge of the operations therein, who reported to the owner, and who forwarded the revenues.³ I find it hard to believe that the Greek and the Greco-Egyptian officials present in the estates were directly responsible to the owner in Rome. We know that Seneca had agents in Egypt,⁴ and it is only logical to posit the existence of *procuratores* of such individuals as Antonia Drusi, Iulia Augusta, Germanicus, Maecenas and Lurius. We should certainly assume the existence of imperial freedmen and slaves in charge of the overall management of the estates that had passed to the emperor. The number of such properties increased with each successive ruler, and it seems hardly likely that the προεστῶτες we shall presently investigate would communicate directly with Rome and the officials of the *patrimonium* there. There is, admittedly, no direct supporting evidence for my assumption, but I think that we should consider the possibility of the existence of a network of imperial freedmen and slaves in charge of the imperial οὐσίαι, and that this network was controlled by a bureau in Alexandria. We know, for example, that there were in Egypt, from the time of Augustus onwards, a number of *dispensatores Caesaris*, Strabo's ἀπελεύθεροι Καίσαρος καὶ οἰκονόμοι, μείζω καὶ ἐλάττω πεπιστευμένοι πράγματα (17.797), and it is natural to suppose that the function of at least some of these was the supervision of the *patrimonium principis*.⁵ The Alexandrian bureau and the entire administration may have already

3. The subject of the role of slaves and freedmen in the administration of the *patrimonium* is too large and too complex to treat here in any depth. The following is a selected bibliography of the most important works: O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, 1905; W. W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery. The Condition of the Slave in Private Law from Augustus to Justinian*, 1908; F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, 1926; A. M. Duff, *Freedmen of the Early Roman Empire*, 1928; J. N. Lambert, *Les operae liberti. Contribution à l'histoire de droits de patronat*, 1934; R. Besnier, *Les affranchis impériaux à Rome de 41 à 54 après J.-C.*, 1947, 1948; C. Cosentini, *Studi sui liberti*, 1948, 1950; G. Vitucci, "Libertus," *DEAR* IV, 1953, pp. 905 ff.; W. L. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 1955; J. Crook, *Consilium Principis. Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian*, 1955; J. Macqueron, *Le travail des hommes libres dans l'antiquité romaine*, 1958; P. R. C. Weaver, "The Status Nomenclature of the Imperial Freedmen," *CQ N.S.* 13, 1963, pp. 272 ff.; *id.*, "The Status Nomenclature of the Imperial Slaves," *CQ N.S.* 14, 1964, pp. 134 ff.; *id.*, "Vicarius and vicarius in the *familia Caesaris*," *JRS* 54, 1964, pp. 117 ff.; *id.*, "The Slave and Freedmen *cursus* in the Imperial Administration," *PCPhS* 1964, pp. 74 ff.; *id.*, "Freedmen Procurators in the Imperial Administration," *Historia* 14, 1965, pp. 460 ff.; *id.*, *Familia Caesaris. A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves*, 1972; M. Wolf, *Untersuchungen zur Stellung der kaiserlichen Freigelassenen und Sklaven in Italien und den Westprovinzen*, Diss., Münster, 1965; G. Boulvert, "Servi et liberti du prince," *Labeo* 12, 1966, pp. 94 ff.; R. Wachtel,

"Sklaven und Freigelassene in der staatlichen Finanzverwaltung des römischen Kaiserreiches," *AAntHung* 15, 1967, pp. 341 ff.; H. Chantraine, *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser. Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur*, 1967; S. Tregiari, *Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic*, 1966; G. Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le haut-empire romain. Rôle politique et administratif*, 1970.

4. See above, n. 2.

5. The evidence is collected and discussed by Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten*, pp. 367 f.; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 158 f. and *WChr.* 175 introd.; A. Bataille, "P. Clermont-Ganneau 3-5," *JJP* 6, 1952, pp. 185 ff.; A. Swiderek, "Les Καίσαρος οἰκονόμοι de l'Égypte romaine," *Chronique* 45, 1970, pp. 157 ff.; cf. also Chalon, *L'édit*, p. 127, n. 19. Well aware that I pursue a course detrimental to my theories, I cannot accept the view of Bataille and Wilcken that the οἰκονόμοι Καίσαρος that we know of (they appear in documents of the second and third centuries) are officials of the *patrimonium*. Wilcken, *WChr.* 175 introd., cannot really prove his theory by referring either to *P. Tebt.* 296 (*WChr.* 79) or to *P. Achmîm* 8 (*WChr.* 81). In the first document we are dealing with the *idios logos* (the name lurking behind line 5 being Marcus Moesianus; cf. *BLI*, p. 426), and in the second, regardless of whether Claudius Diogenes was a *procurator usiacus* or not, he is acting in his capacity of διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχερωσύνην; in both documents we are dealing with temple matters. In *BGU* 156 (*WChr.* 175) there is no reason why the Aurelius Felix should not have been *idios logos* or the *dioiketes* of A.D. 201; at any rate, we are dealing with the ιερώτατον ταμεῖον. In *BGU* 102 a Θεόφιλος Λουκιφέρος ο[ι]κον[ό]μ[ο]ις [ο]ὐικάροις (a similar official appears in *P. Oxy.* 735) collects φόρον προβάτων. Finally, if we

borne the name οὐσιακὸς λόγος, and it may have grown considerably during the reigns of the later Julio-Claudians, especially under Claudius and Nero. If this be the case, it could have been taken over and drastically reorganized by Vespasian, and out of it the new and familiar Flavian οὐσιακὸς λόγος may have been born.

We have some isolated references to slaves and freedmen operating on estates owned by the emperor or members of his family, and none of them appears to have been a general manager; the fact that they are found in Egypt, however, is telling. A Κήρινθος Ἀντωνίας Δρούσου δοῦλος is known from 23; he was either in charge of the sheep and goats of Antonia in the Oxyrhynchite or their actual owner. But whether he administered or owned property, his very presence is significant.⁶ In 29 a Κλάδος Λιβίας Δρούσου Καίσαρος is found in Euhemeria commissioning an Egyptian farmer to do some unspecified work for him; whether he was an administrator or a laborer is not known.⁷ In 55 an Ἐπαφρόδιτος, slave of the imperial freedman Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Φῆλιξ, served in an administrative capacity in an oil-press originally of Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Σαραπίων (obviously another imperial freedman) but at the time the property of Nero.⁸ We have already encountered a slave or a freedman of great wealth, ⁹ Ανθος Γεωμανικοῦ Καίσαρος,⁹ and I speculated in the second chapter that some of the other former owners of imperial estates who bear characteristically servile names, such as Eros, Iucundus, Numerius, Kharmos, Khresimos, Khrestos, Latinus, Onesimos and Sokrates, may have been *vilici, procuratores* or *conductores* who invested in land, and whose property passed to their master or to their *patronus*, all or in part, upon their death.

In addition to the freedmen and the slaves we have a group of officials who bear Greek names, persons obviously recruited from the local Greek and Greco-Egyptian element to serve as supervisors, foremen, stewards and managers. This was an eminently sound choice, for they were acquainted with local conditions. Thus we hear of a *dispensator* directing the leasing of plots of land to tenants, an Εύσχήμων, οἰκονόμος τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοίτη Τιβερίου Κλαύδιου Δορυφόρου πρότερον Ναρκισσιανῆς οὐσίας.¹⁰ It is impossible to know whether he was in charge of the entire Narkissian portion of the Doryphorian estate in the Arsinoite, or whether he was one of many οἰκονόμοι. The absence of the definite article from his title favors the latter view, and other private estates in Egypt appear to have had more than one such functionaries.¹¹

A document dated to 71 may very well preserve terminology employed already during the Julio-Claudian era. It is written by a Λιμναῖος τοῦ Λιμναίου, ἐπίτροπος Ἀφροδισίου Ἀφροδισίου, γραμματέως Δορυφοριανῆς οὐσίας.¹² Now Limnaios is not an οὐσιακὸς ἐπίτροπος as this office is known from the second and third centuries, and γραμματέυς occurs regularly as an official employed in private estates; it is most likely a post existing in the early stages of the transition from a Julio-Claudian to a Flavian οὐσιακὸς λόγος, and one that soon disappeared.

We also know of two persons bearing the title ἐκλήμπτωρ. Literally speaking, such a person

return to the first century, in line 22 of the edict of Ti. Iulius Alexandros the δστις{σ} ἀν ἐνθάδε ἐπίτροπος τοῦ κυρίου ἡ {ι} οἰκονόμος is concerned with *debitores fisci*, not with the *patrimonium principis* (the examples Chalon lists at *L'édit*, p. 127, n. 18, are misleading; better at p. 128, n. 21).

6. *P. Oxy.* 224.2, 15, 19.

7. *P. Ryl.* 127.26-7; on the name see above, chapter II, n. 26.

8. *P. Lond.* 280 (II, p. 193).2; cf. *WChr.* 312.2 n.

9. See above, Chapter II, n. 24. There was also a C. Iulius Amarantos in the estate of C. Iulius Alexandros, before it was acquired by Iulia Augusta, directing the leasing of land: *P. Ryl.*

166.1, 30.

10. Cf. *P. Lond.* 1223 (III, p. 139).14 (121), τοῖς τῆς οὐσίας οἰκονόμοις; *P. Hamb.* 8.1-2 (136), οἰκονόμοι Ιουλίας Βερνίκης; cf. P. M. Meyer's note.

11. *P. Osl.* 21.3-6. Ἐπίτροποι in private οὐσίαι: *P. Strassb.* 74 (*P. Sarap.* 2).11 (126); *P. Mich.* 620.4, 125, 206 (239-40); *P. Princ.* 50.10 (255). For γραμματέυς in charge (?) of an estate see *BGU* 1669.1-2 (Augustus) with editor's n. As administrative officials of the government γραμματεῖς appear only in the ταμιακαὶ οὐσίαι of the end of the third century: *P. Oxy.* 58.7-8 (288) and *P. Beatty Panop.* 1.207, 210 (298).

12. *P. Osl.* 21.

is simply a "collector" of revenues, an entrepreneur who exploits either all the operations inside a property, e.g., Ἡρακλείδης, ἐκλήμπτωρ οὐσίας τοῦ κυρίου Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος,¹³ or only a limited portion thereof, e.g., Ἀφροδίσιος Ζωύλου, ἐγλήμπτωρ βίβλου Ιουλίας Σεβαστῆς καὶ τέκνων Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος.¹⁴ His is a private position, and he works under contract to the owner or his representative; he may act as a bailiff of the estate, but since part at least of his function was the parcelling and the subleasing of his concessions, there is often little, if any, difference between him and a *Grosspächter* or *μισθωτής*.¹⁵

The same, to a large extent, may be said about the most numerous group of known officials, the *προεστῶτες*,¹⁶ persons who carry the favored term during the first century for "manager" or "superintendent." A document addressed τῷ προεστῷ τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοίτη Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος Πετρωνιανῆς οὐσίας implies that he was in charge of the entire Petronian estate in the Arsinoite, and it has been seen as an indication of the fact that all the parcels of an estate within the same nome were under the administration of a single *προεστώς*.¹⁷ This may very well have been the case, but I should like to emphasize that we know very little about this particular estate, and that it is by no means impossible that there existed only one parcel of it in the Arsinoite, namely the Philadelphian plot. Similarly, we do not know whether Σῶτος ὁ Μάρωνος, ὁ προεστώς τῶν Τιβερίου καὶ Λιβίας Δρούσου Καίσαρος τέκνων, was in charge of more than one parcel.¹⁸ In two instances the *προεστώς* is specifically stated to be supervising only a section of his master's domain, i.e. Χαιρήμων τοῦ Ἀκουσιλάου, ὁ προεστώς τῆς Γαῖαν Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ οὐσίας καὶ τῆς Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Γερμανικοῦ οὐσίας τῶν περὶ Εύημερίαν,¹⁹ and Διονύσιος, ὁ προεστώς τῆς ἐν τῷ [...] χ[ο]ι ἐποικίῳ οὐσίας Ἀντωνίας Δρούσου.²⁰ In all these instances the presence of the definite article suggests a single official in charge, but under him there were others bearing the same title; they are collectively referred to in οἱ προεστῶτες τῆς Πετρωνιανῆς οὐσίας and in οἱ προεστῶτες τῆς πρότερον Ναρκίσσου οὐσίας;²¹ and in one instance we encounter a specialized foreman in charge of the beasts of burden of an estate, one Καλλιστράτης τοῦ Καλλιστράτου, ὁ προεστώς κτηνῶν οὐσίας Λιβίας καὶ Γερμανικοῦ Καίσαρος, under whom works a hired ὀνηλάτης [καὶ προστάτης?] ὀνικῶν κτηνῶν.²²

These *προεστῶτες* were primarily responsible for the leasing of the land to various tenants, the collection of revenues, the overall administration of an owner's domains, and the supervision of needed agricultural activities, but they do not appear to have had any official or police powers outside their estate. When sheep enter the estates entrusted to them and graze down plants, when an employee defrauds them, or when thieves break into their buildings and steal their tools, they

13. P. Oxy. 2837.1-4 (50).

14. P. Med. 6.1-3 (26).

15. The Ἡρακλ[ε]ίδης, ἐγλήμπτ[ωρ] οὐσίας Τεβτύνεος καὶ Κερ[κεσό]ρεος of P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl. 13.1-2 (90) is a *Grosspächter*; more examples in Preisigke, *Wörterbuch III*, Abschnitt 8, s.v. Αν ἐκλήμπτος is also found in an estate jointly owned by M. Aponius Saturninus and Ti. Claudius Balbilus: P. Mich. 312.6-8, 50-1 (34). See further P. M. Meyer, P. Hamb. 9 introd.

16. *Προεστῶτες* in private estates: P. Ryl. 132 and 145. "The designation *προεστώς* is known to us," wrote Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 127; "this is the title born in Ptolemaic times by the foremen of a *δωρεά*" (cf. also *SEHRE*, p. 674, n. 46), and was echoed by Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 299. But this may not be used as evidence in support of the allegation that an *οὐσία*, like a *δωρεά*, was a grant, any more than the title of the *βασιλικός*

γραμματεύς qualifies as evidence for the existence of kings in Roman Egypt. The problem is similar to the one encountered in Asia Minor where, on the basis of the existence of ἐπίτροποι, *μισθωτά*, οἰκονόμοι and the like, many imperial estates were seen where there was no other supporting evidence; see T. R. S. Broughton, *TAPA* 65, 1934, p. 225, and more fully B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 1967, pp. 224 f.

17. BGU 650.1-3 (46/7); cf. WChr. 365 introd.; Tomsin, "Le recrutement," p. 82 with n. 10.

18. P. Ryl. 138.2-5 (34).

19. P. Ryl. 148.3-10 (40).

20. P. Osl. 123.3-6 (22).

21. BGU 650.12-13 (see above, n. 17); WChr. 176.7 (Nero).

22. SB 9150.2-5, 8-10 (5).

can only follow the example of their tenants and lamely complain to the local chief of police or to the *strategos*.²³

When a member of the imperial family or a wealthy Roman purchased land in Egypt, he acquired a plot which, at least to some extent, was already being cultivated by peasants. Part of it was certainly unproductive, and this could be brought back to cultivation either by direct management or by being leased to various individuals. The new plantations of olives in the estate of Tiberius and the children of Claudia Livilla in Euhemeria were almost certainly directly managed by the *προεστώς* of the *ούσια*, and the newly planted vines of Pallas in the Arsinoite must have been administered by a similar supervisor; in both instances free, hired labor must have performed most of the work.²⁴ As late as in 56/7, however, sections of the grain fields of the estate of Ti. Claudius Doryphorus in the Arsinoite had not been totally brought back to cultivation or had already reverted to unproductivity, and the *οἰκονόμος* of the estate is on record as agreeing to pay a certain sum to a tenant (he is living in the nearby farmstead of Antonia Drusi) for clearing the land and building embankments, *εἰς κατεργασίαν καὶ χωματισμοὺς τῶν ἐδαφῶν*.²⁵

Pastures, on the other hand, marshes, existing vineyards and gardens, and above all large tracts of productive grain fields must have been cultivated prior to their purchase by Ptolemaic crown peasants, *κληροῦχοι*, owners of *δωρεαί* and their tenants. The 2161 11/32 arourae owned by Seneca in the *ἐποίκιον* of Perkeesis could not all have been sun-scorched desert when he acquired them, and the very name of the settlement points to a possible pre-Senecan foundation.

There was no reason whatsoever for the new owner to turn out those peasants working on the productive plots of his land and to bring in hired labor or slaves. I doubt very much whether the emperor or the prefect would have allowed such a wholesale displacement, even if the owner could not realize that it was an economically suicidal move. The tenants would, in the long run, be cheaper than hired labor, and slave gangs were out of the question in Egypt — there were not enough of them to till all those thousands of arourae, and “the incredible cheapness of living in Egypt,” to use an apt phrase, made even hired hands cheaper.²⁶ In fact the situation was quite the reverse: not how to get rid of tenants, but how to attract more of them to work on the imperial estates, to expand the activities thereof and to bring back to cultivation neglected soil. As we shall soon see, both inducement and compulsion were employed to that end, especially during the last years of the Julio-Claudian reign when the economic condition of Egypt had deteriorated to an alarming extent.²⁷ Thus, first a private owner and then the emperor, also as a private owner, superimposed themselves over the real tillers of the earth, who remained tenants; and when the *ούσιακός λόγος* was created the *coloni Caesaris* changed masters once more; they joined the ranks of the *δημόσιοι γεωργοί* and became tenants who dealt directly with the administration and its representatives, leasing their land from *Grosspächter* or directly from such officials as the *strategos* and the royal scribe, paying rentals to the *ούσιακός λόγος* and, if private tenants, having their properties sequestered by the *idios logos* until all debts to the administration were satisfied.

The Greek term for a tenant (regardless of whether he was *ούσιακός* or not) was simply

23. *P. Osl.* 123; *P. Ryl.* 138; 148. Complaining tenants and farmers in *P. Lond.* 445 (II, p. 166); *P. Ryl.* 126; 134; 140; 141; *P. Strassb.* 118; *P. Sorbonne* inv. 2364; *P. Athen.* 32.

24. *P. Ryl.* 138 (34); *P. Lond.* 195 (II, p. 127) (Tiberius?). Compare the farm accounts collected by Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 174 ff., and cf. A. Swiderek, *La propriété foncière privée dans l'Égypte de Vespasien et sa technique agricole* d'après *P. Lond.* 131 recto, 1960.

25. *P. Ryl.* 171.15-16 (56/7).

26. Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, p. 301. See I. Biezunsko-Malowist, “Recherches sur l'esclavage dans l'Égypte romaine,” *CRAI* 1959, pp. 203 ff., and “Les affranchis dans les papyrus de l'époque ptolémaïque et romaine,” *Atti dell'XI congresso internazionale di papirologia*, 1966, pp. 433 ff.

27. For bibliography see above, Chapter I, n. 17.

γεωργός, farmer, but since his legal position was defined by a lease, he could also be called μισθωτής, lessee. In the papyri there exists a differentiation between these two terms only in so far as a γεωργός may be self-employed, i.e. he may cultivate his own land, or in so far as a μισθωτής may be a lessee of something other than land, e.g., of an oil-press, or of a piece of land which, properly speaking, could not be farmed or cultivated, e.g., a marsh or a pasture, in which case the term γεωργός would be inappropriate.²⁸ Offers for subleasing which include the formulaic expressions βούλομαι μισθώσασθαι ἀς ἀρουρας (or ἀφ' ὄντος ἀρουρῶν) καὶ σὺ γεωργεῖς (or ἔχεις ἐν μισθώσει), and entries into rolls of abstracts of contracts beginning with the formula ἐμίσθωσεν ὁ δεῖνα ἀς καὶ αὐτὸς γεωργεῖ τῆς τάδε οὐσίας ἀρουρας²⁹ illustrate the interchangeability of the terms and the fact that both γεωργός and μισθωτής may be used for the sublessor and the sublessee. The term ὑπομισθωτής, although a favorite of papyrologists, is in fact quite rare.³⁰

The economic and the administrative center of an estate was usually the ἐποίκιον or the συνοικία.³¹ These would vary greatly in size, from a simple farmhouse for the superintendent and a few adjoining rooms for the tenants, workers and animals of the estate, plus a number of storage areas for the produce and the tools, to a fairly large settlement like Perkeesis, which was surrounded by more than 2000 arourae of land. It follows, then, that the number of trades found in each center, trades which were supported either directly or indirectly by the imperial estates, would also vary considerably, while it is not unlikely that Perkeesis and similar hamlets may have reached the point of at least partial self-sufficiency. One should expect to find in these ἐποίκια all kinds of general and specialized farmers, such as vine dressers, harvesters, pruners and sebakh diggers, together with shepherds, oil-makers, wool carders, brewers, gardeners, donkey drivers, fishermen, basket weavers, goose tenders, millers, bakers, curers of fish and so on. The larger the settlement the more diversified the people it would attract for its needs, such as dyers, fullers, weavers, tailors, tavern keepers, cobblers, potters, brick makers, carpenters, lead workers and stonemasons, and of course the inevitable triad of scribes, prostitutes and embalmers.

Most, however, of the ἐποίκια in imperial estates known to us, and especially those carrying the name of a member of the imperial family, appear to have been farmsteads rather than hamlet-like settlements. In them one might be expected to find a number of special buildings, such as θησαυροί, granaries for the storage of wheat, barley and lentils, often equipped with a πύργος,³² these estates had their special measures, or μέτρα, as well, and these could be used by

28. See also the very good discussion by Kuhnke, Οὐσιακὴ Γῆ, pp. 64 ff., esp. p. 71, on the difference between οὐσιακὸς μισθωτής and οὐσιακὸς γεωργός.

29. *P. Mich.* 121 recto III.x.1 (42); cf. now *P. Mich.* 560.4-9 (46).

30. It does not occur in documents dealing with the imperial estates of the Julio-Claudian period. For the second century see *BGU* 1047.iv.5 (cf. Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 183 ff.); for the third, *CPR* 243.8-9, 20 (Messalinian estate).

31. See Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 673 f., n. 46. For συνοικία see *P. Tebt.* 401.35, reading ὁ(σ)τε (=ώτε) συνοικίᾳ Ἀντωνίας (not later than Tiberius), and *BGU* 1047.ii.3, [ἀ]πὸ συνοικιῶν ἐμπε[πο]λιμένων ἀς ἔδα[(=ξως ἔδαφονς?)] (117-38); cf. the συνοικία οὐσιακὴ of *P. Berl. Leihg.* 16B and 16C in Apias and Pelousion (161); cf. also *APF* 2, 1903, p. 562 = *AE* 1903, no. 226 = *SB* 4231. The ἐποίκια situated within the estates often carried the name of the owner, or the former owner, of the property: so ἐποίκιον Λιβύλλα[ς] as late as in the second century, near Soknopaiou Neson (*BGU* 277.ii.15; see above, Chapter II, n. 21. Antonia Drusi gave her

name to a number of such farmsteads: *P. Princ.* 11.i.1-2 and ii.6 (35) near Philadelphia and near Ptolemais Nea; *P. Princ.* 14.i.8-9 (23-40) near Boubastos; *P. Ryl.* 171.4 (56/7) near Herakleia. On the other hand, in the neighborhood of Euhemeria, situated within the estate of Tiberius and the children of Livia Drusi, and close to the lands of C. Iulius Alexandros acquired by Iulia Augusta, there was an ἐποίκιον Δρομέως: *P. Ryl.* 126.13-14 (28/9) and 138.11, 16-18 (34). For ἐποίκιον = κώμη see C. Wessely, *Topographie des Faijûm (Arsinoites Nomus) in griechischer Zeit*, 1904, pp. 5 f., and P. Jouguet, *La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine*, 1911, p. 207; cf. also Hohlwein, *L'Égypte romaine*, p. 251.

32. *P. Soc.* 1028.13 (15), Iulia Augusta; *SB* 10536.13-15 (25/6), Iulia Augusta and children of Germanicus; cf. *BGU* 1646 (III), a Vespasian estate near Philadelphia. For πύργος see *P. Ryl.* 138.20 (34), Tiberius and children of Livia Drusi; *P. Mil. Vogl.* 251 (II), Severus. Many such buildings are attested as being privately owned, and there is nothing strange in their presence amidst the imperial estates; see A. Calderini, Θησαυροί, 1924, pp. 41 ff.; E. M. Husselman, "The Granaries

people unconnected with the οὐσία as trustworthy to both sides of an agreement.³³ We also hear of μύλαια or μύλα for making flour, ἔλαιουργεῖα for making oil, ληνῶνες and various χοηστήρια for the treatment of grapes to make wine, vinegar or raisins.³⁴ These are but a few glimpses offered us by a small number of papyri, and instead of pointing to any differences between the imperial οὐσίαι and the estates owned by various inhabitants of Egypt, they emphasize the similarities between them: all these buildings, including complexes called ἐποίκια, are found in many a private property in the Arsinoite.³⁵

Not all the tenants or the workers of the estate lived in these ἐποίκια; they were not obliged to do so, and those who inhabited buildings owned by the landlord most probably had to pay a rent. A large number of the tenants lived in neighboring villages, or even in the ἐποίκια of a nearby estate.³⁶ Some of the farmers were δημόσιοι γεωργοί on the side,³⁷ while others owned properties of their own, at times located at a considerable distance from the estates where they worked. We hear of tenants owning houses with oil-presses and dovecotes, slaves, orchards varying from four to eleven arourae, and parcels of κλῆροι κατοικικοί from three to ten arourae in size.³⁸ Indeed some of them were wealthy enough to be impressed for liturgic offices.³⁹

The only lessee of an imperial property known to us who was not a farmer is one Herieus, son of Satabous, from Soknopaiou Nesos, whose tribulations, already referred to in the second chapter, tell us a lot about the actual condition of at least one small section of the imperial οὐσίαι.⁴⁰ In 52/3 he moved from Soknopaiou Nesos to Herakleia and leased an oil-press formerly of Ti. Claudius Sarapion in the Narkissian estate. It was, to say the least, in a rather sorry state. He requested the προεστῶτες of the estate to purchase a new machine, but they turned a deaf ear, and so in 54/5 he decided to buy it, together with the main beam and other wooden implements, at his own expense, at the same time informing the supervisor of the oil-press of his action so that, when his lease came to an end, he would be able to carry off the machine and its parts with him. Months passed and the situation did not improve; on the contrary, when the very building became dilapidated, Herieus was forced to purchase bearing beams and supports to prop up the tottering structure, until finally he decided he had had enough. He moved out and went home, paying the annual rent of 200 silver drachmae while receiving no income; whether he took the machine with him is unknown. Finally, two years after all this, the situation became too much for him. He wrote a letter to the strategos recounting the whole affair and requesting that, since he was no longer capable of withstanding such losses, the supervisors of the estate stop bothering him about the rent: ἐπαναγκάσαι τοὺς προεστῶτας ἀπαρενόχλητον με ποιῆσαι ὑπὲρ τῶν φόρων.⁴¹ We do not know whether the strategos paid any attention to this plea; a lease was a lease, and the lessor was acting for the emperor.

of Karanis," TAPA 83, 1952, pp. 56 ff.; and M. Nowicka, "A propos des tours-πύργοι dans les papyrus grecs," *Archeologia* 21, 1970, pp. 53 ff.

33. *P. Soc.* 1028 and *SB* 10536; see the previous note and D. Hennig, *Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht im ptolemäisch-römischen Ägypten*, 1967, pp. 14 ff.

34. *P. Mil. Vogl.* 251 (II), Severus; *P. Lond.* 195 (II, p. 127).18-19 (Tiberius?).

35. See above, n. 32. Further examples in Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* and E. Kiessling's supplements, ss. vv.; add the very important *P. Mich.* 620 (239-40). Often such ἐποίκια in private properties did not amount to much; cf. the one mentioned in *P. Oxy.* 486. 33 (131), which was totally destroyed during a heavy inundation of the Nile.

36. E.g., *P. Oxy.* 2837 (50); *P. Ryl.* 126 (28/9); 134 (34); 140 (36); 141 (37); 171 (56/7).

37. *P. Ryl.* 140.5-7 (36), δημοσίου γεωργ[οῦ], γεωργοῦντος δὲ μου καὶ οὐσίας Ἀντωνίας Δρούσου; *P. Ryl.* 141.5-8 (37), δημοσίου γεωργοῦ καὶ πράκτορος δημοσίων, γεωργοῦντος δὲ καὶ Ἀντωνίας Δρούσου.

38. *P. Mich.* 121 recto III.x.2 (42); *P. Mich.* 539 (53), where in line 12 Prof. H. C. Youtie informed me by letter that we should read καὶ δούλη Θεν.[for the impossible καὶ δολυθέργω; 540 (53); *P. Ross.-Georg.* II 12 (48), where the marginal notation οὐκία ἴδια or οὐκία ἴδια signifies that those farmers live in their own houses; *P. Ryl.* 126 (28/9); 148 (40); *BGU* 650 (46/7). Note that in *BGU* 181.4 (57) a tenant is described as τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως.

39. *P. Ryl.* 141.5-8, quoted above, n. 37; *SB* 9224, discussed below.

40. *P. Lond.* 280 (II, p. 193) (55); *WChr.* 176 (Nero).

41. *WChr.* 176.19-20.

The tenants who were farmers or operated in the marshes and the pastures dealt directly with the προεστῶτες and the ἐκλήμπτορες from whom they leased or subleased their land. Very few leases remain from the Julio-Claudian period, but there is no evidence that they differed in any way from other leases to farm private or public land.⁴² Some farmers felt the desire or the necessity to sublease part or all of their plot to other natives, but there was nothing strange in that either, nor does it appear as if this was done regularly or for great profit.⁴³ Of particular interest is an application to the ἐκλήμπτωρ βίβλου of the estate of Iulia Augusta and the children of Germanicus, especially since it has been taken by some as an indication of the existence of a monopoly in the production of papyrus.⁴⁴ But all the document states is that the sublessee (the ἐκλήμπτωρ was the main lessee) shall be able to gather papyrus and rushes from the marsh in the area extending from the boundaries of Theoxenis to those of Philoteris, to weave mats therefrom and to sell them in any village of the nome he may choose during the twelfth year of Tiberius (25/6); for this he shall pay 4 silver drachmae 15 obols, plus supplemental and receipt fees in three installments. The empress had a "monopoly" only in so far as she had absolute control over the products of her own estate.

In the treatment of his tenants the emperor was in a far more advantageous position than any other owner of land in Egypt. The power at his disposal enabled him to cajole, to persuade, to threaten or to compel as no one else could, and his wishes were the law.

There is some evidence that there existed an ἀτέλεια of sorts in the imperial estates, but we are very badly informed with regard to it. In the estate of Livia (it is not known whether Livia Drusii or Livia Drusilla is meant) near Karanis, and at the time the property of Claudius, there was a tenant cultivating οὐσίας Λιβιανῆς ἐν τῇ [ἀ]τελεῖ (sc. γῇ) ἀρουραν μ[ί]αν ἥμ[ισ]υ ὅγδοον, but exactly what τέλη were not paid or for what reasons we do not know.⁴⁵ Nor do we receive any additional assistance from the other two references to ἀτέλεια known to us, the first of which certainly, the second in all likelihood, date to the Julio-Claudian era. Also in the estate of Claudius, this time in the Oxyrhynchite, there was an Egyptian farmer whose widow described him as [τῶ]ν or [ῶ]ν ἐν τῇ ἀτελίᾳ τῆς π[ρ]ο[π]ειας οὐσίας,⁴⁶ while a small leaden tablet indicated that the beast of burden which wore it could not be taxed or impressed for public service with the words Ἀγροτικούς καὶ Ρουτιλιανῆς οὐσίας τοῦ κυρίου Αὐτοκράτορος ἀτελῆν καὶ ἀναγγάρευτον.⁴⁷ Since we know of a good number of lands, persons and animals that enjoyed

42. The following documents are of special interest: *P. Aberd.* 29 (48/9), a receipt of rentals issued by the secretary of the farmers; *BGU* 650 (46/7), the confiscation of the property of a tenant, and *P. Med.* 6 (26), an offer to lease concessions, both discussed below; *P. Oxy.* 2873 (62), a withdrawal from lease (see *BASP* 5, 1968, pp. 17 ff.); *P. Ryl.* 166 (26) and 171 (56/7), applications for lease of lands before they had become imperial estates (properties of Alexandros and Doryphoros); *SB* 7742 (57), withdrawal of a partner from a common lease (the two lessees are almost certainly brothers); *P. Mich.* 121 recto III.x (42), abstract of lease and sublease. On leases in general see J. Herrmann, *Studien zur Bodenpacht im Recht der gräco-ägyptischen Papyri*, 1958, and D. Hennig, *Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht im ptolemäisch-römischen Ägypten*, 1967.

43. Subleasing is indicated in the following documents: *P. Med.* 6 (26); *P. Mich.* 121 recto I.xii and III.x (42); 560 (46); *P. Oxy.* 2837 (50); 2873 (62).

44. *P. Med.* 6 (26). See Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 329

and 360, n. 198; Tomsin, "Les continuités," p. 90 and "Le recrutement," p. 78 with n. 47. Nowhere is it stated that the sublessee will be the only person to carry out these functions: the ἐκλήμπτωρ is not offering him exclusive rights. N. Lewis, *L'industrie du papyrus dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine*, 1934, pp. 101 ff., has demonstrated that the cultivation of papyrus was not a state monopoly; on this document see esp. pp. 112 ff.

45. *P. Mich.* 560.8-9 (46). Prof. H. C. Youtie informed me by letter that he reads τῇ (γῇ, ed.) in line 8, but the meaning of the passage does not change.

46. *P. Oxy.* 2837.9-10 (50).

47. *SB* 4226 (the quotation is the entire text); see above, Chapter II, n. 23. I should consider the mention of ἀναγγάρευτος as a good indication that this ought to be dated to a time when the estate was in fact a private property of an emperor, and not part of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, for ἀγγαρεία is a term applied to the impressment of private property for public service. The evidence for such requisitions during the Julio-Claudian period comes primarily in the form of edicts

a partial or a total ἀτέλεια or immunity from ὀγγαρεία while totally unconnected with the *patrimonium principis*, it is impossible at this stage of our knowledge to be sure whether these three instances refer to specific, exceptional grants or not.⁴⁸

Even if they do not, however, we know of other means by which the administration sought to attract a large number of cultivators to the imperial estates, to assure as uninterrupted a cultivation thereof as possible, and to guarantee a steady revenue to the *patrimonium*. One such means was compulsion. All the evidence currently available, and it is not much, comes from the reigns of Claudius and Nero, and this may not be coincidental. Egypt was experiencing an economic crisis in the fifties and sixties, a crisis which in part resulted in, and was further aggravated by, some fellahin's decision that it was better to abandon everything, "flee and live the life of wild beasts and robbers in the swamps of the Delta, and that was not an alluring prospect."⁴⁹ The fact that a number of them preferred such ἀναχωρήσεις to their daily life is significant. Furthermore, a prefect who received word from Rome that the grain supplies were not up to the imperial expectations, and one who was informed either directly or by a hint from a local agent that the palace was not totally satisfied with the revenues of the imperial estates, was apt to employ all means available to himself to rectify the situation, regardless of whether such means might be against tradition or the law, or might even prove to be counterproductive in the long run.

Consider, for example, the famous edict of 6 July 68, in which the prefect Ti. Iulius Alexandros almost simultaneously announced the accession of Galba and his own determination to correct a long series of abusive practices. Immediately after the florid preamble he addresses himself to what he calls "tax-farming and other leases of imperial estates": ἔγνων γὰρ πρὸ παντὸς εὐλογωτάτην οὖσαν τὴν ἔντευξιν ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μῆτρος ἀκοντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς τελωνείας ἥμερος ἀλλαζόμενος οὐσιακὰς παρὰ τὸ κοινὸν [ἔ]θος τῶν ἐπάρχων⁵⁰ πρὸς βίαν ἀγεσθαι, καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ὀλίγον ἔβλαψε τὰ πράγματα τὸ πολλοὺς ἀπείρους ὄντας τῆς τοιαύτης πραγματείας ἀχθῆναι μετ' ἀνάγκης, ἐπιβληθέντων αὐτοῖς τῶν τελῶν. διόπερ καὶ αὐτὸς οὔτε ἥγαγόν τινα εἰς τελωνείαν ἥμερος μίσθωσιν οὔτε ἄξωντας, εἰδὼς τοῦτο συμφέρειν καὶ ταῖς κυριακαῖς ψήφοις, τὸ μετὰ προθυμίας ἐκόντας πραγματεύεσθαι τοὺς δυνατούς· πέπεισμαι δὲ ὅτι οὐδὲ εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἀκοντάς τις ἄξει τελώνας ἥμερος μίσθωτάς, ἀλλὰ διαμισθώσει τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐκουσίως προσέρχεσθαι, μᾶλλον τὴν τῶν προτέρων ἐπάρχων αἰώνιον συνήθειαν φυλάσσων ἥμερος τὴν πρόσκαιρόν τινος ἀδικίαν μεταμηνοῦν.⁵¹

against the abuse of soldiers and officials: one by Germanicus Caesar himself, during his visit to Egypt in 29 (SB 3924); one by the prefect L. Aemilius Rectus in 42 (P. *Lond.* 1171 verso [III, p. 107]); one by Cn. Vergilius Capito in 48/9 (SB 8248 = *CIG* 4956 = *IGRR* 1262), in which mention is made of yet another edict by M. Magius Maximus (prefect in 10-12). For the second century we have the edict of M. Petronius Mamertinus of 133-37 (P. *Soc.* 446). See briefly Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 88 ff.; Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 347 ff.; Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 620 ff.

48. Examples in Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* and Kiessling's supplements, ss. vv. ἀτέλεια and ἀτελής. For the phraseology see esp. P. *Vars.* 11.2, P. *Ryl.* 216 and P. *Soc.* 1036.5; cf. also P. *Oxy.* 1434. The question of τελωνικὴ ἀτέλεια, which is often connected with the οὐσιακὴ γῆ and which appears to have been a special impost in recompense of unknown abatements, is imperfectly understood in spite of much discussion; see Grenfell and Hunt, P. *Fay.* 40 introd.; Wilcken, *APF* 1, 1901, p. 552; Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 121; Preisigke, *Girowesen*, pp. 171 f.; Thunell, P. *Sitol.*, pp. 69 f.; Kalén, P. *Berl. Leihg.* 1 recto ii.1 n., following Thunell; Kortenbeutel, *BGU* 1893 introd., p. 48 f.; Wallace, *Taxation*, p. 360 n. 6; Day and Keyes, P. *Col.* 1 verso

5.7 n. The term occurs in the following documents of the second half of the second century: P. *Fay.* 82.14 (145) (cf. above, Chapter I n. 36 no. 4); *BGU* 1893.190, 260, 500, 544, 547-8, 651, 658 (149); P. *Fay.* 40.3 (162/3); P. *Berl. Leihg.* 1 recto ii.1, iii.3 (164/5); P. *Mich.* 223.1698 (171/2); P. *Col.* 1 verso 5.7 (175/6 ?); *BGU* 199 verso (after 194). One may add here a mysterious payment which could be connected with the τελωνικὴ ἀτέλεια: P. *Strassb.* 229 recto.18 (II), money paid for Ιαίας τελεομάτων ἀτελῶν and collected by the οὐσιακὸς λόγος. Whether all these instances of abatements are in any way connected with those found in the Julio-Claudian imperial estates, or whether they reflect only a second century situation, is unknown.

49. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 298; cf. p. 677, n. 52.

50. So on the papyrus copy (*BGU* 1563.29-30); ἐπάρχειῶν on the two marble copies. See Chalon, *L'édit*, p. 103, n. 12, and p. 108, n. 33, and H.-D. Schmitz, *Tὸ ἔθος und verwandte Begriffe in den Papyri*, 1970, pp. 67 ff.

51. Lines 10-15; text as established by Chalon, *L'édit*, with the exception mentioned in the previous note and the deletion of superfluous letters.

Part of this I would consider unadulterated propaganda and rhetoric, e.g., the section "no little harm has been done by the compulsion of many persons inexperienced in such duties," and "I know that it is to the advantage of the imperial revenues to have men administer these leases willingly and zealously." To be sure, harm was being done, but this was not the point: more harm was being done, as far as the administration was concerned, when no persons appeared, willingly or unwillingly. The prefect is simply pacifying the local wealthy class, the δυνατοί,⁵² and this is perhaps why he singles out one of the forms of leases, the τελωνεία or tax-farming, a service that required capital in order to be performed. What is more important is that the prefect acknowledges practices like forced leasing to have taken place "contrary to the general practice of the prefects" and as the result of "someone's temporary wrongdoing." He may or he may not have meant only his immediate predecessor, C. Caecina Tuscus,⁵³ but since he himself had taken office four whole years before the publication of this edict, it is difficult to see why people were complaining if he had not ordered such leases. Could the "someone" be the recently murdered emperor? There is little doubt, however, that he wishes to portray such practices as irregular, illegal and sporadic, certainly not as traditional or systematic.

The little evidence that we have regarding this seems to bear him out, although we have to turn once more to the Arsinoite for our information.

Two documents that have been taken as indicative of forced leasing are the papyri dealing with Herieus, son of Satabous, the lessee of the oil-press that we have already encountered in the previous pages. The assumption is that no sane person would have leased such a wretched building to begin with had he not been forced to do so.⁵⁴ This is a very fragile argument, and I need only point out that many a destitute person had done worse things, and that many an Egyptian had found himself in even more ridiculous circumstances as a result of lack of foresight, judgment or plain chance. In the last analysis the question must be decided on the import of the phrase προσανγέλλω τοῦτο (i.e. the fact that he had purchased parts of the machinery at his own expense) καὶ μηνοίω, ἵνα, ἐὰν ἐγβαίνω καὶ ἀπολύωμαι τῆς μισθώσεως καθὼς [.....]εν, ἔχ[ω] αὐτῆς ἔξουσίαν ἀπεν[έγ]κεσθαι [τ]ὴν μηχ[ανὴν καὶ θ]υνίαν etc. One may very well see "eine liturgische Nuance" in ἐκβαίνω καὶ ἀπολύωμαι τῆς μισθώσεως,⁵⁵ but the fact remains that these verbs are found in leases of private land which have nothing compulsory about them.⁵⁶

The third document is more complicated and has been recently used as evidence of the fact that parcels of οὐσίαι were assigned to neighboring landowners for compulsory cultivation.⁵⁷ It is a petition addressed τῷ προε[στ]ῶτ[ι τ]ῆς ἐν τῷ Ἀ[ρ]σινοῖτη Τ[ι]β[ε]ρ[ι]ον Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αὐτοκρά(τορος) Πετωνιανῆς οὐσίας and is dated in 46/7. The letter is written by a Potamiae *alias* Taphiomis, acting through her husband and brother, Tesenouphis. I tentatively read the body of the petition as follows: ἐπεὶ προσῆλθον ὀγορασμῷ ή καὶ ὑποθήκῃ κλήρου κατοικικοῦ ἀρουρῶν ἐννέα ήμίσου[ς] τετάρτου, ἐν ᾧ ἐλαιῶν καὶ πύργος

52. I follow here Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, p. 706, who gives to τοὺς δυνατούς its full Attic force and translates "men of substance." N. Lewis and M. Reinhold, *Roman Civilization II, The Empire*, 1955, no. 98, translate "competent men," and Chalon, *L'édit*, p. 36, "ceux qui en sont capables."

53. So first Wilcken, *Ostraka I*, pp. 592 f.

54. *P. Lond.* 280 (II, p. 193) (55); *WChr.* 176 (Nero). See Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 195; Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 96 f. and 111 f.; Tomsin, "Le recrutement," p. 89 f. Cf., however, the terms mentioned in *P. Amh.* 63.19-21.

55. Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, p. 111.

56. Cf. *P. Hamb.* 8.19 and 23-4, ἀπέλυσα ίμᾶς τῆς μισθώσεως; *P. Tebt.* 309.23, θελήσητε ἀπ]ολῦσαι μοι. See esp.

for the Senecan estate a withdrawal from lease, *P. Oxy.* 2873.17-20 (62), διὸ ἀξειοῦμεν συνχωρῆσαι ίμῖν (= ίμῖν) τῆς ἐξτάσεως πρὸς τὸ ἀσυχοφαντήτους εἶναι αὐτοὺς (= ήμᾶς). Documents providing for a termination by agreement employ these and similar terms; see, e.g., *P. Tebt.* 310; *P. Osl.* 137; *SB* 7468; *P. Mil. Vogl.* 87; 88; 167; 196.

57. *BGU* 650 (46/7); quoted are lines 1-3 and 6-22. A large number of the restorations were proposed by Wilcken in his second edition of the text, *WChr.* 365. For the liturgy under discussion see A. C. Johnson, "The ἐπιβολή of Land in Roman Egypt," *Aeg.* 32, 1952, pp. 61 ff.; G. Poethke, *Epimerismos*, 1969, pp. 24 ff.

καὶ ἔτερα, περὶ Ἡ[ρ]ακλείαν τῆς Θεμίστου μερίδος, πρότερον Πε[τε]νούριος το[ῦ] Ὁρσενούφιο[ς], μισθωτοῦ τινων (sc. ἐδαφῶν) τῆς αὐτῆ[ς οὐσίας], ὑφορῶμαι δὲ μή τίς μοι ἔνκλησις γέν[η]ται] ὑπὸ τῶν προεστώτων τῆς δηλ[ο]υμ[ένης] Πετρωνιανῆς οὐσίας ἔνεκα [τοῦ χοὴ μὲν τὸ] ἀργύριον χωρεῖν ε[ἰς] δημ[ό]σιον, τῶν τοῦ αὐ[τοῦ] Πετενούριος ὑπαρχόν[των ἀνειλημμένων δι'] ἔγδειαν γεωργίας δημο[σία] or [σίω, αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν προεστώτων) δὲ] ἄπαντα συνεχῶς ἀπαιτούμενων, διὸ] ἀξιῶ, ἐὰν φαίνηται, ἐπι[σταλῆ]ναι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀ[ρ]χίων τεταγμένοις ε[γγράψαι] αὐτὰς (sc. τὰς ἀρούρας)] ἀνεμποδίστως, πρὸς τὸ [ἄσκυλτον καὶ ἀπαρε]νόχλητόν με εἶναι ὑ[πὲρ τοῦ περὶ τὴν] οὐσίαν λ[όγ]γ[ου].

Much of the reconstruction of the text is, of course, pure guesswork, but the situation, as I understand it, seems to have been the following: Petenouris leased a plot from the Petronian estate, but at the end of his lease there appeared a deficit in his accounts, an ἔκδεια γεωργίας. The supervisors of the estate requested the *fiscus* to confiscate the property which Petenouris had placed in collateral, and this was purchased by Potamiae who made a deposit during the auction. The money, she says, had to be paid to the *fiscus* which, after all, had directed the sale, but the supervisors kept insisting that she pay them also, in order to make up the deficit of Petenouris. She now suspects that they may bring legal action against her, and she therefore requests the general manager of the estate to instruct the proper officials to register her new property without further obstruction, so that, the estate having no more claims upon her or her property, the local supervisors will no longer harass her.

The text, as reconstructed, makes no allowances for ἐπιβολή.⁵⁸ Can it be taken, on the other hand, as evidence of the fact that Petenouris had undertaken the lease under compulsion, i.e. as a liturgy? I think not. The existence of fiscal responsibility on his part in no way should be considered as proof of the presence of a compulsory service. Consider, for example, the real possibility that the lease contained the following provisions — provisions not uncommon in private, freely undertaken leases, and provisions that could well explain the confiscation of Petenouris' property: “for each artaba that the lessee fails to deliver, he shall pay a fine to the amount of *x* drachmae; for abandoning his farming, the lessee shall pay a penalty to the amount of *y* drachmae plus an equal amount to the *fiscus*; the lessor shall have rights of execution against the lessee and all his property.”⁵⁹

The fourth document also introduces the last problem with which we shall deal in this work, and it is important enough to be quoted extensively. It is a γραφὴ ἀνδρῶν πτοοικ[...] κίας⁶⁰ from Philadelphia, dated in 50/1, and addressed to the *strategos* by the royal scribe of the village.⁶¹ Three individuals are mentioned, of whom the first is described as follows: Μάρων Πυλάδου, γεγον[ώς] πράκτωρ] λαογραφίας π[ρό]ποδε[ννέα (έτῶν) τῆς π[ροκ]ειμένης κώμης, [άνα]δ[ε]δ[ο]μ[έν]ος εἰς γεωργίαν τῆς [Μ]αικ[ην]ατιανῆς οὐσίας ἀ[πό] .. (έτους)] Τιβερίου [Κλαυδίου] Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ [Αὐτοκράτορος], μὴ ὅν ἐν λευ[κώμ]ατι εἰδ[ώς]

58. See Tomlin, “Le recrutement,” p. 89. He reads δι'] ἔγδειαν γεωργίας δημο[σίας in line 16, but unless he understands γῆς after it, Wilcken's objection, *WChr.* 365.16 n., still holds true: “Nicht δημοσίας. Dass müsste von γεωργίας stehen, passt auch sachlich nicht.”

59. Examples and discussion in A. Berger, *Die Strafklauseln in den Papyrusurkunden. Ein Beitrag zum gräco-ägyptischen Obligationenrecht*, 1911, pp. 4 ff. and 149 f. For the phrase καὶ εἰς τὸ δημόσιον τὰς ἴσας (sc. δραχμάς), see esp. P. Mich. inv. 1427.31 (4 B.C.) (*TAPA* 101, 1970, p. 491); *P. Soc.* 14.26 (22); *P. Oxy.* 1124.13-14 (26); *P. Oxy.* 729.19-20 (137).

60. Perhaps πρακτορικ[ῶν τοπαρ]κίας (= τοπαρχίας) as

E. P. Wegener suggested, *Eos* 48, 1956, pp. 345 f., but the letters before the break are very uncertain, and ἀνὴρ πρακτορικός is a novelty.

61. SB 9224. The lines quoted in this paragraph are 5 and 7-13; in the following paragraph, 14-30 (end). In line 8 I read π[ρό]ποδε[ννέα (έτῶν) for Martin's π[ρό]πατε[ννέα (έτη)], a phrase which in standard Greek means “every ninth year” (see *LSJ*s.v. πρόπατος, C.I.9). The πρακτορεία was more or less standardized early in the second century as a three-year liturgy, but we know of longer periods of service in the first century; see Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, p. 198. In line 17 I follow Browne, *P. Mich.* 582 introd., p. 15, and read γ[εωργὸ]ς for Martin's π[αντὸ]ς.

γράμματα. There is no way of arguing around the import of this: Maron has served a liturgy, is still serving one, and is eligible for those liturgies for which literacy is a requirement.⁶² He is not on the λεύκωμα, the *album* containing the list of persons exempt from compulsory service.⁶³ And although the expression ἀναδιδόνται εἰς γεωργίαν is still unparalleled, others that express the same import are known to us, and the verbs δίδωμι and ἀναδίδωμι are technical terms for nominations (in effect appointments) to a liturgy.⁶⁴ This, then, is our sole, indisputable documentary evidence that, for some individuals at least, the cultivation of the imperial οὐσίαι was a compulsory service. This, too, is precisely what Ti. Iulius Alexandros said in his edict, for γεωργία (except for farmers who own their land) is a μίσθωσις, but both his own words and the scarcity of examples of such practices point to an occasional occurrence — an occurrence, however, that in this particular instance we have no evidence for calling illegal.

The other two persons mentioned in the same γραφὴ ἀνδρῶν are more intriguing. One is Ὡρίων Πετοσίρε[ως], ἀπολύσιμος τῆς Μαικηνατιανῆς οὐσίας, γεγον[ώς] πράκτωρ λαογραφίας τῶι διελη[λυθότι] δεκάτῳ (ἔτει) καὶ ἀπολύσιμος γ[εωργὸς] γεγονώς τῶι ια (ἔτει) Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος, μὴ ὅν ἐν λευκώματι, ὃν ὑπ[ά]ρχει περὶ τ(ὴν) κώμην κλήρο(υ) κατοικ(ικοῦ) (ἄρουραι) ε ἄξι(α) (δραχμῶν) Αφ καὶ ἀμπέλου (ἄρουραι) ζ ἄξι(α) (δραχμῶν) Γ. The other is Δημήτριος Ισιδώρου, ἀπολύσιμος τῆς Πιετρωνιανῆς οὐσίας, γεγονώς πράκτωρ λαογραφίας τῶι διεληλυθ(ότι) δεκάτῳ (ἔτει), μισθωτής ζυτοπωλ(είου) ὑπὸ τὴν κώμην τοῦ ια (ἔτους) Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ [Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος], μὴ ὅν ἐν λευκώματι εἰδὼς γράμματα. On the face of it, one could argue that ἀπολύσιμος τῆς δεῖνα οὐσίας is an expression parallel to ἀναδεδομένος εἰς γεωργίαν, and that ἀπολύσιμος γεωργὸς γεγονώς is parallel to γεγονώς πράκτωρ λαογραφίας. In such a case the ἀπολύσιμοι γεωργοί are released from an οὐσία to serve a liturgy. But before we accept or reject such an interpretation, we must examine the other instances where the term occurs.⁶⁵

In all, we know the names of 35 ἀπολύσιμοι of 7 estates, including the 2 already mentioned. They are, one each in the οὐσία of Iulia Augusta and Germanicus in 14/5, of Maecenas in 50/1, of Petronius in the same year, of Camelius in 53; 2 in the estate of Antonia Drusi, and 5 in a neighboring one of Germanicus in 48; and an association of 24 τῶν ἀπὸ Τεβτύνεως ἀπολυσίμων οὐσίας Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αύτοκράτορος in 43.⁶⁶ In addition, we hear of a group of ἀπολύσιμοι καὶ προβατοκτηνοτρόφοι and a πλῆθος ἀπολυσίμων in a roll of abstracts dated to 46 and also dealing with inhabitants of Tebtunis, and these may have been connected or identical with the ἀπολύσιμοι of the estate of Claudius.⁶⁷ The phrases in which the term occurs are the following: ἀπολύσιμος οὐσίας τοῦ δεῖνα; ἀπολύσιμος γεωργός; ἀπολύσιμος καὶ προβατοκτηνοτρόφος (?); γεωργὸς καὶ ἀπολύσιμος τῆς δεῖνα (or τῆς τοῦ δεῖνα) οὐσίας; γεωργός τινων ἐδαφῶν τοῦ δεῖνα, ὃν δὲ καὶ ἀπολύσιμος τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας;⁶⁸ οὐσιακὸς γεωργὸς καὶ ἀπολύσιμος τῆς δεῖνα οὐσίας.⁶⁹

62. The πρακτορεία was such a liturgy; see SB 7375.

63. See G. Browne, *P. Mich.* 582 introd., p. 16. For persons qualified for exemption and for the circumstances under which this was possible see N. Lewis, "Exemption from Liturgy in Roman Egypt," part one in *Actes du X^e congrès international de papyrologues*, 1964, pp. 69 ff., part two in *Atti dell'XI congresso internazionale di papirologia*, 1965, pp. 508 ff.

64. See Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, p. 365; cf. N. Lewis, *TAPA* 100, 1969, p. 256, n. 3.

65. See esp. the discussion in Tomsin, "Le recrutement," pp. 85 ff.

66. Iulia Augusta-Germanicus: *P. Lond.* 445 (II, p. 166);

Maecenas, Petronius: SB 9224; Camelius: *P. Mich.* 539 (in lines 7-8 I read on the published photograph γεωργοῦ καὶ ἀπολυσίμου for γεωργοῦ τῆς [οὐσίας], and Prof. H. C. Youtie was kind enough to verify this on the original); Antonia Drusi, Germanicus: *P. Ross.-Georg.* II 12; Claudius: *P. Mich.* 244 (quoted in line 3).

67. *P. Mich.* 123 recto iii.40; viii.26; xxii.44.

68. *P. Lond.* 445 (II, p. 166).4-8 (14/5).

69. *P. Mich.* 539.7-8 (see above, n. 66). Here οὐσιακὸς γεωργός equals γεωργός οὐσίας and has nothing in common with the identically termed farmer of the post-Julio-Claudian period. This is made clear by a document of 25/6, where the

One should observe that not all tenants of imperial estates during the reign of the Julio-Claudians were ἀπολύτιμοι. One should also note that the ἀπολύτιμοι of originally non-imperial estates (Maecenas, Petronius, Camelius) appear only after these οὐσίαι had become imperial property. Is this simply due to accident, or are the ἀπολύτιμοι a privileged group found exclusively in estates owned by the emperor or members of his family (Iulia Augusta, Germanicus)? Also, is it just coincidental that they appear only during the Julio-Claudian era? Considering the relative scarcity of documents from the first half of the first century dealing with the *patrimonium principis* and the fact that about a third of them mention ἀπολύτιμοι, and considering that the term ἀπολύτιμος is never found among the far more numerous papyri which mention the οὐσιακὸς λόγος or the οὐσιακὴ γῆ of post-Julio-Claudian times, I think not. The ἀπολύτιμοι seem to have been a group that disappeared with the Flavians, when the οὐσιακὴ γῆ began being treated as part of the δημοσία γῆ, and when the οὐσιακοὶ γεωργοί had exactly the same obligations as the δημόσιοι γεωργοί.

By itself, the term ἀπολύτιμος indicates a person who is either discharged or exempt from a service or an obligation. Thus F. Preisigke, on the basis of ἀπολύτιμος στρατιώτης and ἀπολύτιμος ἀπὸ στρατείας, suggested that we are dealing with discharged veterans who had settled in the estates. This is ruled out by the fact that all but two of the 24 ἀπολύτιμοι in the estate of Claudius are under 40 (one is only 29 years old), and by the fact that, judging by their names, they all belong to the Egyptian, or at best the Greco-Egyptian, element of the population.⁷⁰

M. Rostovtzeff, seeing in the institution of the ἀπολύτιμοι a possible proof for his equation of the imperial οὐσίαι with the Ptolemaic δωρεά, and being under the impression that the inhabitants of villages situated near or within an estate were legally bound to it under a kind of bondage similar to the one which had existed in the δωρεά, saw the ἀπολύτιμοι as persons released from such an obligation, and in this he was followed by F. Oertel.⁷¹ Such an interpretation, however, will not do: there is no evidence whatsoever to support the assumption that the tenants of the imperial estates were operating under a strict sort of serfdom. Not only do we know that the inhabitants of villages situated near or within an estate, villages such as Bakkhias and Karanis and Perkeesis, were by no means obliged to work on the οὐσία, but we also know of a farmer from Herakleia who lived in the farmstead of Livia Drusi and who leased some land from the estate of Ti. Claudius Doryphorus, at the time privately owned and not part of the *patrimonium*; he is not called ἀπολύτιμος, there is nothing special about his case, and he may even not have been an actual tenant of Antonia Drusi on whose property he dwelled.⁷²

Rostovtzeff was under the impression that ἀπολύτιμος τῆς οὐσίας is grammatically parallel to such expressions as ἀπολύτιμος τῆς λαογραφίας or τῆς στρατείας, and so was U. Wilcken who, believing that the imperial estates were exploited through compulsory leasing, advanced the theory that the ἀπολύτιμοι were persons exempt from *Zwangsverpachtung*. The papyrus from Philadelphia with the γραφὴ ἀνδρῶν has been taken by its editor, V. Martin, and more recently by G. Chalon, as proof of the correctness of such an hypothesis.⁷³ But in a phrase like γεωργὸς καὶ ἀπολύτιμος τῆς δεῖνα οὐσίας, why should an individual who is already a tenant emphasize the fact that he does not have to be one? Too, why the stated restriction, exemption from compulsory tenancy regarding only one estate — the very one, we should note, of which he is after all a tenant?

phrase οὐσιακοῦ γεωργοῦ Ἰουλίας Σεβαστῆς καὶ τέκνων Γερμανικοῦ Καισάρων occurs: P. Sorbonne inv. 2364.5-7. These are the only known instances of the term οὐσιακὸς γεωργός being used before the Flavians.

70. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* s.v. (in the supplement γεωργὸς καὶ ἀπολύτιμος is translated as "Pächter und Steurbefreiter" by E. Kiessling). The objection was raised by

A.E.R. Boak, *P. Mich.* 244 introd., p. 101.

71. Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 128, n. 1, and p. 194 (but cf. *Staatspacht*, p. 491); Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, p. 95, n. 1.

72. *P. Ryl.* 171 (56/7).

73. Wilcken, *APF* 1, 1901, p. 154; Martin, *JJP* 4, 1950, p. 146 (cf. C. Préaux, *Chronique* 26, 1951, pp. 424 f.); Chalon, *L'édit*, pp. 106 f.

Both Martin and Chalon overlooked a very serious objection raised by O. Krüger. In the phrase *γεωργὸς καὶ ἀπολύσιμος οὐσίας*, he observed, the genitive *οὐσίας* may not have two different syntactical functions, being possessive when it comes to *γεωργός*, separative when it comes to *ἀπολύσιμος*. "The individuals are at the same time as much *γεωργοί* as they are *ἀπολύσιμοι* of the same *οὐσία*."⁷⁴ As a grammatically parallel expression Krüger suggested *ἴερὸν λόγιμον ἀπολύσιμον κώμης Τεπτύνεως*; G. Browne recently offered *ἴερεῖς ἀπολύσιμοι τοῦ ἐν κώμῃ Τεπτύνι λογίμου ἴεροῦ*.⁷⁵

But can we accept Krüger's own solution to the problem, namely that the *ἀπολύσιμοι* were, like some temples and some priests, exempt from taxation? If we turn once more to the ordinance of the association of the *ἀπολύσιμοι* of the estate of Claudius, we note that they belonged to a class subject to the poll-tax, perhaps the most important clause of the ordinance being that the money for the *λαογραφία* should be paid out of the common treasury of the association to the credit of its *ἡγούμενος* and *ἐπιμελητής*. These *ἀπολύσιμοι* cannot be regarded, therefore, as exempt from taxation — at least not wholly so. In dealing with the problem A. E. R. Boak summarized his own views as follows: "The word *ἀπολύσιμοι*, however, implies an exemption from some sort of obligation, and I can only suggest that, if we reject the solution proposed by Rostovtzeff and Oertel, it refers to exemption from personal service, such as canal and dyke work, transportation, liturgies and the like."⁷⁶

This is by far the most promising line of investigation and what must be further decided is whether it is an agreement between the lessee and his lessor only, or between the tenant and the official administration, that resulted in such an *ἀπόλυσις*. An example of the former kind is offered in a lease of a bath situated on a non-imperial *οὐσία* jointly owned by M. Aponius Saturninus and Ti. Claudius Balbillus near Theogonis. In 34 the *ἐκλήμπτωρ* of the estate leased (or subleased) the bath to two individuals, retaining for himself a prerogative stated in very interesting words: *ἔξει δὲ ὁ μεμισθωκὼς Ἡρακλείδης* (he is the revenue collector) *παρὰ τῶν μεμισθωμένων ἔξερέτους ἀπολυσίμους βαλανευτικοῦ τελέσματος ἀνδρες δέκα*.⁷⁷ Now the lessees had no right to grant exemption from a public tax, and it is almost certain that we are dealing with an immunity from a privately imposed bath fee. It is quite possible, therefore, that the *ἀπολύσιμοι* of the imperial estates were persons exempt from services for, or fees and payments to, the owners and the supervisors that other tenants had to contribute. Such a characterization of certain tenants, however, would hardly make sense when encountered in public documents, and is totally out of place in the *γραφὴ ἀνδρῶν* of 50/1, where what seem to be juxtaposed are the *ἀπολύσιμοι* on the one hand and liturgists on the other.

We are fortunate in possessing a recently published papyrus which deals with one of the *ἀπολύσιμοι* listed in the *γραφὴ ἀνδρῶν*. It is dated in exactly the previous year, during which Horion, son of Petosiris, was indeed serving as *πρόσκτωρ λαογραφίας*. His colleague in the office complained to a high functionary (his name and his title have been omitted), that Horion served as a collector for four *ἀριθμήσεις*, or payments, but then scorned his obligations and refused to undertake any more collections — *μήτε ὅν ἀπολύσιμος γεωργὸς μήτε ἐν λευκώματ(ι)*.⁷⁸ In other words, he acted as if he were an exempt farmer or a person whose name appeared on the *album*

74. O. Krüger, *P. Ross.-Georg. II* 12.i.1ff. n.

75. *P. Tebt.* 293.6; *P. Osl.* 115.7 (cf. *P. Soc.* 1147.13 and *P. Bad.* 169.4-5); Browne, *P. Mich.* 582 introd., p. 16, n. 11. See also the use of *ἀπολύσιμος* (not liable to *συντάξιμον*) in *P. Princ.* 9.ii.13, v.28, vii.3 (31), and the comments of Johnson and van Hoesen in the general introduction.

76. *P. Mich.* 244 introd., p. 101.

77. *P. Mich.* 312, with Boak's introd.; quoted are lines

27-30.

78. *P. Mich.* 582.ii.11-12, with Browne's introd. We know, in fact, of a farmer-tenant of an imperial estate who is not *ἀπολύσιμος* and who is serving a liturgy: *P. Ryl.* 141.5-8 (37), *πρόσκτορος δημοσίων, γεωργοῦντος δὲ καὶ Ἀντωνίας Δρούσου*. For the phraseology compare *BGU* 194.9-10 and 16, where *ἀπολύσιμος* equals *τῶν λειτουργῶν ἀφεθείς*.

listing individuals exempt from compulsory service. The inference seems to be clear: an exempt farmer did not serve in liturgies. The papyrus with the γραφὴ ἀνδρῶν of the following year tells us what happened to Horion: his devout wish had been granted, he had become an exempt tenant of the Maecenatian estate of Claudius (ἀπολύσιμος γ[εωργὸ]ς γεγονώς). His name, we should note, continued to be omitted from the *album*, and the royal scribe gives us the reason why this was so: he still possessed a property valued at 4500 drachmae, and therefore qualified eminently for a number of liturgies as soon as his status as ἀπολύσιμος γεωργός was revoked.

The γραφὴ ἀνδρῶν, then, is not a list of three new πράκτορες λαογραφίας, but a list of names which must temporarily be removed from the roster in the *strategos'* office. The royal scribe is notifying his superior officer that the first of the three πράκτορες should be removed for the time being because he was forced to accept a compulsory lease (ἀναδεδομένος εἰς γεωργίαν) and could therefore not legally undertake two liturgies at the same time (and it is interesting to note which of the two takes precedence), while the other two had been granted the status of ἀπολύσιμος, and were, for the duration, exempt. If this be the true import of the document, then we see two different ways of assuring uninterrupted cultivation of the imperial estates, both of them directed more or less at the wealthier classes of the population: a person could either be promised exemption from liturgies if he became a voluntary imperial tenant, or be forced to become an imperial tenant and thus serve a liturgy, the latter alternative being a last resort in difficult times and employed only during the last years of the Julio-Claudians. To the government there was nothing strange or inconsistent in such a state of affairs, as the *gnomon* of the *idios logos* attests; and when it came to taxes or compulsory services, we have yet to find the Egyptian who was a winner in the uneven battle of wits with the administration.

Appendix One

Non-Imperial οὐσίαι

The following is a revised list (cf. Hirschfeld, *Klio* 2, 1902, pp. 292 ff.; Grenfell and Hunt, *P. Tebt.* II, App. II; Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 120 ff. and *SEHRE*, pp. 669 ff., n. 45) of those properties of the first three centuries A.D. which are specifically called οὐσίαι at least once in the papyri, and which are unconnected either with the Julio-Claudian properties of 30 B.C.-A.D. 68 or with the οὐσιακὸς λόγος of the Flavian and the post-Flavian periods. Unless there is a notation to the contrary, the owners are alive and in full possession of their estates. None of these properties appears to have been privileged in any way, and they do not differ from any other estates which their owners or government officials did not choose to call οὐσίαι. The bibliographical notes are, of necessity, limited in number and scope (additional material in Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 669 ff., n. 45 and in the introductions and notes to the papyri), but I have endeavored to include all references to works that express an opinion at odds with my own.

1. M. Aponius Saturninus: *P. Osl.* 33 (29) Karanis; *SB* 10535 (ca.30) Theogonis; *P. Ryl.* 131 (31) Euhemeria; *P. Ryl.* 135 (34) Euhemeria; *P. Mich.* 312 (34) Theogonis (the last is a joint ownership with no. 2). See Eitrem and Holst, *Klio* 22, 1928, pp. 221 ff. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 671, no. 18, finds that there is "no doubt about the identity of this man with one of the members of the well-known family of the Aponii Saturnini."
2. Ti. Claudius Balbillus: *P. Mich.* 312 (34) Theogonis (joint ownership with no. 1). Almost certainly identical with the prefect of 55-59 (*PIR*² C 813)? See Stein, *Präfekten*, pp. 33 f. and *Aeg.* 13, 1933, pp. 123 ff.; Momigliano, *JRS* 30, 1940, p. 213; Schwartz, *BIAFO* 49, 1950, pp. 45 ff.; Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*, 1954, pp. 130 f.
3. Ti. Iulius Nikanor: *P. Sorbonne* inv. 2367 unpubl. (34/5) Philadelphia; cf. *P. Hamb.* 64 (104) Euhemeria. Is the Νικανοριανὴ οὐσία (a confiscated estate classed as βασιλικὴ γῆ) of *P. Oxy.* 2410 (120) his? See Tomsin, "Les continuités," p. 91, n. 53, who connects him with the Nikanor of Suet., *Aug.* 89.
4. Norbana Clara: *P. Lond.* 1213; 1214; 1215 (III, p. 121) (65-6) Hermopolis. See Preisigke, *Girowesen*, pp. 133 f.; Wilcken, *APF* 4, 1908, p. 543; Hohlwein, *L'Égypte romaine*, p. 165, n. 2; Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 671, no. 21. Uncertain whether confiscated or not.
5. M. Antonius Pallas: *P. Lond.* 1223 (III, p. 139) (121) Leukopyrgites Ano, Herm.; cf. ἐποίκιον Πάλλαντος in *BGU* 552; 2047; *P. Cairo Preisigke* 15; 30; τόπος Πάλλαντος in *BGU* 2178 (same location). Perhaps identical with the Pallas mentioned in *P. Flor.* 387, alive in 108 in Hermopolis Magna. Is he by any chance a descendant of the famous favorite? See above, Chapter II, n. 56. Another (?) M. Antonius Pallas was operating in Oxyrhynchus in 91 (*P. Oxy.* 2957).
6. Prophetae (Προφητιανὴ οὐσία): *P. Strassb.* 74 (*P. Sarap.* 2) (126) Pouantinouphis,

Herm.; *P. Strassb.* 78 (*P. Sarap.* 75) (127/8) Magdola Orou Samouou, Herm.; *CPR* 245 (date ?) Magdola. Uncertain whether the Claudia Athenais mentioned in these texts is the lessee or the owner of this estate; if the former, we are probably dealing with a confiscated property.

7. Iulia Polla (reading uncertain): *P. Lips.* 113 (127/8) Oxy. See Preisigke, *Giowesen*, p. 81. Her identification by Stein, *Untersuchungen*, p. 110, with the sister of the senator C. Antius Aelius Iulius Quadratus is groundless. Polla (if this is what the papyrus reads) was a common name; e.g., among Egyptian Jewesses.

8. Iulia Berenike: *P. Hamb.* 8 (136) Theadelphia. "Probably a descendant of the mistress of the emperor Titus," Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, p. 672, no. 45, but this is perhaps too fanciful; Berenike was, for obvious reasons, a name very common in Egypt.

9. Ti. Iulius Theon and his brother Ti. Iulius Theon/Tryphon (joint ownership): *P. Wisc.* 19; 20; 21; 22 (156-61); *P. Mich. inv.* 358-71; 374; 375 (partially published, Youtie, *ZPE* 1, 1967, pp. 163 ff.). List of Theones in Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*, 1954, pp. 103 f.; cf. Schwartz, *Chronique* 30, 1955, pp. 152 f.

10. Philodamos: *P. Lond.* 194 (II, p. 127) (I) Boubastos, cf. Thunell, *P. Sitol.*, p. 94, n. 1; *BGU* 512 (138-61) Boubastos; *P. Phil.* 9 (158) Philadelphia; *BGU* 210 (158/9) Psenarpsenesis; *BGU* 262 (158/9) Karanis; *P. Chic.* 13; 56; 60; 63 (158/9) Psenarpsenesis; *P. Bour.* 42 (167) Hiera Nesos; *SB* 10892 (ca. 188) Philopator, Herakleopolite; *P. Gron.* 2 (219/20) Bakkhias; cf. *AJP* 63, 1942, pp. 304 f. for improved readings. The example *par excellence* of an οὐσία confiscated by the *fiscus*. It became γῆ προσόδου, although it is at times called βασιλικὴ γῆ. See Collart, *P. Bour.* 42 introd.; Chalon, *L'édit*, pp. 148 ff., with full discussion and bibliography.

11. Kallimorphos (joint ownership; partner's name lost): *P. Princ.* 56 (153/4). Its exact status is unknown.

12. Iustus: *P. Sorbonne inv.* 2370 (185) Theadelphia.

13. Tonaitios (reading uncertain): *SB* 9387 (ca. 194) Hermopolis. Confiscated and administered by the *idios logos*.

14. Isis Taposeirias (temple of): *P. Soc.* 1036 (192) Hermopolite; cf. *P. Oxy.* 1434 (Oxy.). The only Roman example of the term οὐσία being applied to temple property; the sole Ptolemaic parallel usage is *P. Tebt.* 6.23. See Herrmann, *Bodenpacht*, p. 83.

15. Theoninos: *BGU* 63 (201) Soknopaiou Nesos; *BGU* 382 (206) Karanis. Confiscated by the *idios logos*, apparently for non-payment of taxes; in *BGU* 2102 (194) Theoninos appears as οὐσιακὸς μισθωτής.

16. Claudius Polybianos: *P. Bour.* 41 + *P. Achmîm* 6 (197). Confiscated property. Is he by any chance connected with Polybios, the famous freedman of Claudius (*PIR*¹ P 427)? A Ti. Claudius Polybianus (doubtless a different person) is known from *CIL* VI 12402.

17. Embres: *BGU* 106 (199) Arsinoite. Fiscal property (one of the μισθωταί is χρεώστης τοῦ ταμιείου, lines 4-5). See Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I, p. 64, n. 4; Preisigke, *Giowesen*, pp. 199 f.; Rostovtzeff, *Staatspacht*, p. 493; Meyer, "Διοίκησις," p. 146.

18. Aponia Berenike: *SB* 9562 (214) Philadelphia.

19. Claudia Isidora/Apia: *P. Oxy.* 919 (214 ?); *P. Yale* 69 (214); *P. Oxy.* 2997 (214); 1530 (215/6); 1046 (218/9); 1659 (218-21); 1578 (221); 1634 (222 ?); 1630 (223 ?); 2566 (255 ?); *P. Osl.* 111.i.126 and 130 (235); *BGU* 2126 (III). Land and houses in various parts of the Arsinoite, Oxyrhynchite and the Small Oasis; term οὐσία in *P. Oxy.* 2566.i.10 only. Confiscated by the *fiscus* (*P. Oxy.* 2566; *BGU* 2126). See Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 490, 674, n. 48, p. 747, n. 61; H. MacLennan, *Oxyrhynchus. An Economic and Social Study*, 1935, pp. 39 ff.

20. Apol- (reading abbreviated): *P. Strassb.* 67; 68; 69 (227-30) all Polydeukia. Very likely confiscated; see Preisigke, *Giowesen*, p. 199.

21. Titanianos: *P. Mich.* 620 (239-40) Dionysias, Alexandrou Nesos, Theadelphia (made up of at least the former properties of SpheX, Aristokles, Aeimnestos, Skyllax, Sotianos, Aulon and Longinos). The term οὐσία is used only in line 295, in a slightly ungrammatical passage. See Lewis, *Mnemosyne* Ser. IV 16, 1963, pp. 257 ff.; Gilliam, 17, 1964, pp. 293 ff.; Shelton, *P. Mich.* 620 introd.

22. Apion: *BGU* 8 (248) Arsinoite. Confiscated by the *idios logos*; not to be confused (so Kortenbeutel, *BGU* 1893.441/2 n.) with the οὐσιακὸς μισθωτής Apion, s. of Komanos.

23. Claudius Syrion: *P. Oxy.* 2854 (248) Oxy. Confiscated by the *fiscus*.

24. Ptolemais (?): *P. Princ.* 50 (255) Oxy.; but the meaning of line 9 is uncertain.

25. Flavius Athenodoros: *P. Strassb.* 10 (268) Hermoupolis.

26. Anoubas: *P. Lond.* 214 (II, p. 161) (ca. 270-5) Memphite. Confiscated by the *fiscus*.

27. Alypios: *P. Strassb.* 28 (*P. Chepteliers* 20, in *RecPap.* 3, 1964, p. 80) (Thraso). This is the only occurrence of the term οὐσία in the Heroninos archive.

The following persons have been seen by various scholars as owners of οὐσίαι, although their properties are never so termed, or as recipients of grants of land made by the emperor or the prefect, for which, with the possible exception of no. 11, there is no evidence. See, e.g., Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 293, 669 ff., nn. 45, 46; Jouguet, *La domination romaine*, pp. 14 f.; Hohlwein, *JJP* 3, 1949, pp. 81 ff.; Tomsin, "Notes" and "Les continuités." In the last article Tomsin argues for a differentiation between οὐσία and ἐδάφη (see also his "Le recrutement," p. 81, n. 1), which does not hold true. Indubitably the term ἐδάφη is used at times in order to refer to part of an οὐσία, but it can also mean the entire property; so in *P. Lond.* 1223 (III, p. 139) and *P. Oxy.* 1637 both terms are used in the same document to describe the same property. In an agricultural society "land" and "property" are often interchangeable terms. Moreover, Tomsin's theory that ἐδάφη ὑπάρχοντα τῷ δεῖνα or similar expressions refer to "biens-fonds concédés" (see "Les continuités," p. 92) by the emperor or the prefect is unfounded. Οὐσία and ὑπάρχοντα (be they ἐδάφη or not) are synonymous terms; they are so used not only in the two papyri mentioned above, but also in the *gnomon* of the *idios logos* (paragr. 1, 4, 22, 23, 29, 30, 36, 37, 50 and 105) and in the edict of Ti. Iulius Athenodoros (lines 16, 23 and 43; see the edition by Chalon, *L'édit*). I fail to see on what grounds a small group of "beneficiaries" has been segregated out of the hundreds of persons who refer to their properties as ὑπάρχοντα, the standard way of expressing ownership (e.g., in property declarations).

1. Theanous, d. of Alexandros: *P. Ryl.* 600 (8 B.C.).
2. Tigellius: *BGU* 1669 (Augustus).
3. Euandros, s. of Ptolemaios: *P. Ryl.* 166; 132; 133 (26-33).
- 4-5. Iulius Athenodoros and Ti. Calpurnius Tryphon (joint ownership): *P. Ryl.* 128 (ca. 30).
6. L. Terentius: *P. Mich.* 232 (36).
7. Theon, s. of Theon: *P. Ryl.* 145 (38).
8. Asklepiades, s. of Ptolemaios: *P. Ryl.* 167 (39).
9. Thermoutharion, d. of Lykarion: *P. Ryl.* 146 (39) and 152 (42). Hohlwein (*JJP* 3, 1949, p. 85) argued that this estate was formerly owned by the brothers Gaius and Popilius Petronii (on whom see above, Chapter II), by identifying the ἐποίκιον λεγόμενον "Αμμινον Θερμουθαρίου" (*P. Ryl.* 146.6-7) with the ἄμμινα ἐποίκιον Ποπλίου καὶ Γαῖον Πετρωνίων (*P. Ryl.* 127.4-5). Tomsin's objections as well as his proposed solutions ("Notes," pp. 123 f.) strike me as too elaborate and unnecessary. We are actually dealing with two different locations: a farmstead

called "Αμμινον (cf. *P. Fay.* 38), and the outcrops of sand (ἄμμινα) in another farmstead in the estate of the brothers Petronii (cf. *P. Ryl.* 561.6-11 [251 B.C.]).

10. Herakleides: *P. Lips.* 106 (98).
11. C. Iulius Theon, s. of C. Iulius Theon (*PIR² I* 598a, Add.): *P. Oxy.* 1434. I read, however, [ἀ]τελειῶν in line 7.
12. Theon/Anthos, s. of Ammonianos: *P. Soc.* 315 (137/8).
13. Moskhos or Moskhianos: *P. Mich.* 616 (ca. 182). This is a confiscated property administered by an ἐπιτηρητής γενηματογραφουμένων, not an ἐπιτηρητής ούσιακῶν as Shelton thought (see his introd. and nn.). The two *procuratores* mentioned in the text, Septimius Serenus and Claudius Calvinus, cannot be *dioiketai* for we know the holders of that office at that time, Fulvius F— and Vestidius Rufinus (*P. Soc.* 232 and 235; *P. Oxy.* 513). Nor can they be *procuratores usiaci*, for these did not have the power to order the sequestration of the property of *debitores fisci*, which is what Calvinus did. This leaves us with the only natural choice, the *idios logos*, and Serenus and Calvinus should be placed, in this order, between Calvisius Faustinianus of ca. 170 (*P. Soc.* 1105) and Modestus of 184 (*P. Soc.* 928; *SB* 9658).
14. Ti. Gemellus: *BGU* 156 (201). Certainly not identical with Ti. Iulius Caesar Nero, s. of Drusus Caesar and Livia, as L. Petersen suggested (*PIR² I* 226). Not only is the estate listed as belonging to the ταμιεῖον, but it was only recently confiscated; see line 6, [νῦν] δὲ τοῦ ἴερωτά[του ταμιείου]. Whether he is connected with the well-known L. Bellinus Gemellus (so J. Lindsay, *Daily Life in Roman Egypt*, 1963, pp. 264 f.) is very uncertain. The name Gemellus was very popular in Egypt during Roman times.

Appendix Two

Imperial Properties: The Evidence

The following is a revised list of the Julio-Claudian estates in Egypt, the references to their division between Vespasian and Titus, and the references to former owners of these properties. For the benefit of those who will disagree with some of my conclusions, I have included persons whom I do not believe to have owned properties in Egypt (I.1 and I.6), or regarding whose properties and their inclusion in the οὐσιακὸς λόγος there is some doubt (III.5).

A single question-mark preceding the reference to a papyrus indicates a paleographical difficulty or doubt regarding attribution in the case of similar names (e.g., Livia, Livilla). Two question-marks mean that I am convinced that the document does not belong in this list; others, however, hold a different opinion, and I have included such references bearing them in mind.

The second column gives the date of the document; the third the location of the property, not the provenance of the papyrus. Villages not followed by the name of a nome are in the Arsinoite. The fourth column presents the evidence for the type of property or the agricultural activities therein under the following code (lower-case letters indicate the presence of some doubt):

A: grain-land — production of wheat, barley, beans, lentils.

B: garden-land — vineyards and reed plantations for the vines; vegetables; tree-groves of all kinds.

C: pastures — cultivation of grass; raising of cattle, sheep and goats; beasts of burden.

D: marshes — fishing, hunting, growing of papyrus; fishing-boats (sailing Lake Moëris).

E: building sites — οἰκόπεδα and ψιλοὶ τόποι, oil-presses (BE), farmsteads, granaries (AE), wine-presses (BE).

I. THE JULIO-CLAUDIANS

1. M. VIPSANIUS AGRIPPA (POSTUMUS?)

? BGU 1047	117-38	Arsinoite	cE
------------	--------	-----------	----

2. VALERIA or IULIA AGRIPPINA

SB 4226	early I		
P. Vindob. Tandem 10	54	Euhemeria	A
? BGU 1047	117-38	Arsinoite	cE

P. Rein. inv. 2062	161-80	Mendesian	A
SB 10893	II		
? P. Thead. 53	IV	Pyrrheia Narmoutheos Anoubias Theadelphia Euhemeria	

3. CLAUDIA ANTONIA (CLAUDII FILIA)

?? P. Ryl. 138	34	Euhemeria	
P. Fay. 40	162/3	Theoxenis	
P. Bour. 42	167	Hiera Nesos Drymos H. Nesou Ptolemais Nea Perkeesis	A A A A

4. ANTONIA MINOR
(=ANTONIA DRUSI=ANTONIA AUGUSTA)

P. Osl. 123	22	Arsinoite	
P. Oxy. 244	23	Oxyrhynchite?	C
P. Ryl. 140	36	Euhemeria	
P. Ryl. 141	37	Euhemeria	
P. Ross.-Georg. II 12	48	Arsinoite	
P. Vindob. Tandem 10	54	Euhemeria	A
P. Ryl. 171	56/7	Herakleia	E
? P. Strassb. 267	126-8	Psenyris	B

4 bis. ANTONIA
(unknown which; probably DRUSI)

P. Princ. 11	35	Philadelphia	E
P. Tebt. 401	14-37	Ptolemais Nea	E
P. Princ. 14	23-40	Arsinoite	E
? P. Lond. 900 (III, p. 89)	94/5 or 110/11	Boubastos	E
P. Phil. 19	I/II	Theadelphia	A
? P. Mil. Vogl. 52	138	Philadelphia	C
P. Mil. Vogl. 75	144/5	Tebtunis	
P. Fay. 60	145	Tebtunis	A
BGU 1893	149	Philoteris	B
P. Berl. Leihg. 31	early II	Bernikis Aigialou	A
BGU 1894	157	Theadelphia	
BGU 212	158	Theadelphia	BC
BGU 280	158/9	Soknopaiou Nesos	D
P. Chic. 7	158/9	Karanis	A
		Karanis?	A

<i>P. Col.</i> 1 verso 1a	160	Theadelphia	b
<i>P. Col.</i> 1 verso 4	138-61?	Theadelphia	A
		Polydeukia	A
<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 1 verso	164/5	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Mich.</i> 224	172/3	Karanis	AC
? <i>BGU</i> 2064 [= <i>SB</i> 10761]	173	Theadelphia	
<i>P. Mich.</i> 225	173/4	Karanis?	A
<i>P. Aberd.</i> 24	194	Soknopaiou Nesos	D
<i>BGU</i> 277	II	Soknopaiou Nesos	C
<i>SB</i> 5670	II	Boukolon	b
<i>SB</i> 11011	II	Patsontis	A
<i>BGU</i> 199 verso	II/III	Soknopaiou Nesos	D
<i>BGU</i> 653	207	Soknopaiou Nesos	D
<i>P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.</i> 52	222/3	Tebtunis?	A

5. CLAUDIUS

?? <i>P. Ryl.</i> 138	34	Euhemeria	
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 148	40	Euhemeria	
<i>P. Mich.</i> 121 recto I.xii	42	Tebtunis	
<i>P. Mich.</i> 121 recto III.x	42	Tebtunis	C
<i>P. Mich.</i> 244	43	Tebtunis	a
<i>P. Mich.</i> 274-5	46/7	Ibion Eikosipentarouron	b
<i>BGU</i> 650	46/7	Arsinoite	
<i>P. Oxy.</i> 2837	50	Oxyrhynchite	
<i>P. Vindob. Tandem</i> 10	54	Euhemeria	A

6. CLAUDIUS' CHILDREN

?? <i>P. Ryl.</i> 138	34	Euhemeria
-----------------------	----	-----------

7. GAIUS

<i>P. Athen.</i> 32	39	Karanis
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 148	40	Euhemeria

8. GERMANICUS IULIUS CAESAR

<i>SB</i> 9150	5	Arsinoite	C
<i>P. Lond.</i> 445 (II, p.166)	14/5?	Bakkhias	
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 134	34	Euhemeria	
<i>P. Ross.-Georg.</i> II 12	48	Arsinoite	
<i>P. Mich.</i> 540	ca. 53	Karanis	
<i>P. Hamb.</i> 3	74	Philadelphia	
<i>P. Phil.</i> 19	I/II	Philadelphia	C
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 207	early II	Psenyris	A
<i>P. Mich.</i> 374	mid II	Ptolemais [Nea]	

<i>P. Mich. Diss. Michael.</i> 14	152	Karanis	B
<i>P. Coll. Youtie</i> 63	155/6?	Arsinoite	A
<i>BGU</i> 1894	157	Theadelphia	C
<i>BGU</i> 160	158/9	Ptolemais [Nea]	A
<i>BGU</i> 441	158/9	Ptolemais [Nea]	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 6	158/9	Ptolemais [Nea]	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 10	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 31	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 70	158/9	Ptolemais [Nea]	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 81	158/9	Ptolemais [Nea]	A
<i>P. Col.</i> 1 verso 1a	160	Theadelphia	
<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 29	164	Lagis	
<i>P. Bour.</i> 42	167	Hiera Nesos	A
<i>P. Mich.</i> 224	172/3	Ptolemais Nea	A
<i>P. Louvre</i> inv. ? [Kolonat, p. 121]	II	Karanis	C
<i>P. Yale</i> inv. 254	II	Arsinoite?	
<i>BGU</i> 810	208	Arsinoite	A
		Soknopaiou Nesos	C

9. GERMANICUS' CHILDREN

<i>SB</i> 10536	25/6	Tebtunis	AE
<i>P. Sorbonne</i> inv. 2364	25/6	Philadelphia	A
<i>P. Med.</i> 6	26	Theadelphia?	D
		Philoteris	D
		Theoxenis	D
? <i>BGU</i> 277	II	Soknopaiou Nesos	E

10. LIVIA DRUSILLA
(=LIVIA AUGUSTA=IULIA AUGUSTA)

<i>SB</i> 9150	5	Arsinoite	C
<i>P. Lond.</i> 445 (II, p. 166)	14/5?	Bakkhias	
<i>P. Soc.</i> 1028	15	Tebtunis	AE
<i>SB</i> 10536	25/6	Tebtunis	AE
<i>P. Sorbonne</i> inv. 2364	25/6	Philadelphia	A
<i>P. Med.</i> 6	26	Theadelphia?	D
		Theoxenis	D
		Philoteris	D
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 126	28/9	Euhemeria	
? <i>P. Mich.</i> 560	46	Karanis	B
<i>P. Vindob.</i> Tandem 10	54	Euhemeria	A

11. CLAUDIA LIVILLA (=LIVIA IULIA=LIVIA DRUSI)

II. THE FLAVIANS

1. VESPASIAN

<i>P. Strassb.</i> 267	126-8	Psenyris	B
<i>P. Berl.</i> inv. 11529			
+SB 10512	138/9	Arsinoite	A
<i>P. Med.</i> 65	139-49	Epipolis?	b
<i>P. Soc.</i> inv. 1345 recto	early II	Arsinoite	A
<i>BGU</i> 1636	155/6	Theadelphia?	ABC
<i>BGU</i> 1894	157	Theadelphia	
<i>P. Rein.</i> inv. 2062	161-80	Mendesian	AC
<i>P. Acad.</i> fr. 14	161-80	Mendesian	C
<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 1 recto	164/5	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 4 recto	165	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Bour.</i> 42	167	Hiera Nesos	A
		Drymos H. Nesou	A
		Ptolemais Nea	A
		Perkeesis	A
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 215	II	Mendesian	BE
<i>P. Strassb.</i> 551	II	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.</i> 52	222/3	Tebtunis?	A
<i>P. Oxy.</i> 3047	245	Oxyrhynchite	
<i>BGU</i> 1646	III	Philadelphia	AE

2. TITUS

<i>P. Berl.</i> inv. 11529			
+SB 10512	138/9	Arsinoite	A
<i>BGU</i> 1894	157	Theadelphia	
<i>BGU</i> 979	161	Mendesian	A
<i>BGU</i> 980	161	Mendesian	A
<i>P. Rein.</i> inv. 2062	161-80	Mendesian	A
<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 1 recto	164/5	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Bour.</i> 42	167	Hiera Nesos	A
		Drymos H. Nesou	A
		Ptolemais Nea	A
		Perkeesis	A
<i>SB</i> 10893	II	Mendesian?	
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 215	II	Mendesian	E
<i>P. Strassb.</i> 551	II	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.</i> 52	222/3	Tebtunis?	A
<i>P. Flor.</i> 337	early III	Arsinoite	
?? <i>P. Oxy.</i> 62	242	Oxyrhynchite	
<i>P. Oxy.</i> 3047	245	Oxyrhynchite	
<i>P. Athen.</i> 30 verso	III	Arsinoite	A

III. FORMER OWNERS OF JULIO-CLAUDIAN
AND FLAVIAN PROPERTIES

1. CLAUDIA AKTE

P. Rein. inv. 2062	161-80	Mendesian	A
SB 10893	II	Mendesian?	
P. Ross.-Georg. II 42	late II	Taie (Memphite)	

2. C. IULIUS ALEXANDROS

P. Ryl. 166	26	Euhemeria	
P. Ryl. 126	28/9	Euhemeria	
? P. Vindob. Tandem 10	54	Euhemeria	A

2 bis. ALEXANDROS (*idem?*)

P. Bour. 42	167	Drymos H. Nesou	A
-------------	-----	-----------------	---

3. ANTHOS

P. Mich. 555-6	107	Patsontis	A
P. Mich. 557	116	Patsontis	A
BGU 985	124/5	Karanis	a
P. Strassb. inv. 1108	ca. 138/9	Soknopaiou Nesos	C
SB 10566	199	Soknopaiou Nesos	C
P. Mich. 223	171/2	Patsontis	B
P. Mich. 224	172/3	Patsontis	B
P. Mich. 225	173/4	Patsontis	B
BGU 277	II	Soknopaiou Nesos	c
P. Mich. 372	179/80 or 211/12	Karanis Patsontis	A
BGU 199 verso	II/III	Soknopaiou Nesos	C
BGU 810	208	Soknopaiou Nesos	C
P. Oxy. 3170	III	Sinary (Oxy.)	A

4. CAMELIUS

P. Mich. 539	53	Karanis	a
P. Mich. 524	98	Karanis	a
P. Iand. 26	98	Arsinoite	C
P. Phil. 19	I/II	Philadelphia	C
SB 4414	143	Psenarpsenesis	
P. Coll. Youtie 63	155/6?	Arsinoite	A
BGU 104	158/9	Karanis	A
BGU 160	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
BGU 204	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A

BGU 206		158/9						A
BGU 211		158/9						A
BGU 438		158/9						A
P. Cairo Goodspeed 18		158/9						A
P. Cairo Goodspeed 24		158/9						A
P. Chic. 27		158/9				Karanis		A
P. Chic. 28		158/9				Psenarpsenesis		A
P. Chic. 57		158/9				Psenarpsenesis		A
P. Chic. 64		158/9				Psenarpsenesis		A
P. Chic. 68		158/9				Psenarpsenesis		A
P. Chic. 70		158/9				Psenarpsenesis		A
P. Chic. 75		158/9				Psenarpsenesis		A
P. Chic. 77		158/9				Psenarpsenesis		A
P. Chic. 82		158/9				Psenarpsenesis		A
P. Chic. 84		158/9				Psenarpsenesis		A
P. Osl. 26a		163/4				Psenarpsenesis		A
BGU 708		165				Psenarpsenesis		C
? BGU 1898		172				Arsinoite		
P. Mich. 224		173/4				Psenarpsenesis		B
P. Mich. 357B		173/4				Karanis?		B
P. Mich. 372		179/80				Karanis		A
A		or 211/12				Psenarpsenesis		A
BGU 2101		209				Kerkesoukha		A
B								
C								
C								
5. CALVIA CRISPINILLA								
? P. Aberd. 151								
P. Strassb. 118		22				Arsinoite		
P. Ryl. 129		30				Euhemeria?		
P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl. 12		87/8				Theadelphia		
P. Lond. 900 (III, p. 89)		94/5 or						
A		110/11				Theadelphia		
P. Würz. 11		99				Theadelphia		C
P. Bonn inv. 4						Arsinoite		A
P. Oxy. 986		ca. 130				Arsinoite		A
BGU 1636		155/6				Theadelphia?		AC
BGU 1894		157				Theadelphia		BCD
P. Col. 1 verso 1a		160				Theadelphia		BC
P. Col. 1 verso 4		138-61?				Theadelphia		AB
P. Berl. Leihg. 1 recto		164/5				Theadelphia		A
P. Berl. Leihg. 1 verso		164/5				Theadelphia		A
A						Euhemeria		A
P. Berl. Leihg. 4 recto		165				Theadelphia		A
P. Bour. 42		167				Drymos H. Nesou		A

P. Berl. Leihg. 13	II	(=NUMERUS (or 21))	Theadelphia	A
P. Strassb. 551	II		Theadelphia	A
P. Gen. 38	207/8		Epipolis	BE

7. TI. CLAUDIUS DORYPHOROS

P. Ryl. 171	56/7	Herakleia	A
P. Osl. 21	71	Karanis?	B
P. Strassb. 210	90-6	Seber[BE
P. Berl. inv. 11529			
+ SB 10512	138/9	Arsinoite	A
P. Mil. Vogl. 75	144/5	Tebtunis	A
P. Berl. Leihg. 37	late II		
P. Chic. 52	158/9	Karanis	A
P. Bour. 42	167	Drymos H. Nesou	A
P. Mich. 223	171/2	Karanis	A
P. Mich. 224	172/3	Karanis?	B
SB 10892	after 188	Arsinoite	a
SB 10893	II	Mendesian?	g
P. Ryl. 387	II		
SB 9205	II	Theadelphia	
SB 11011	II	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl. 52	222/3	Tebtunis?	A
P. Ryl. 99	III	Toou (Herm.)	W

8. EROS (cf. 12, 21)

P. Lond. 195 (II, p. 127)	early	KHR I	Arsinoite	B
P. Berl. Leihg. 29	164		Lagis	A

9. FALCIDIUS

P. Ryl. 138	34	10. IUCUNDUS (cf. 13, 21)	P. Ryl. 138
P. Phil. 19		I/II	Philadelphia
P. Med. 65		139-49	Epipolis?
P. Ryl. 207		early II	Psenyris
BGU 1894		157	Herakleia
P. Mich. 224		172/3	Theadelphia
P. Mich. 225		173/4	Karanis
P. Mich. 372		179/80 or 211/12	Karanis

11. IUMER- (=NUMERIUS?) (cf. 21)

<i>P. Bour.</i> 42	167	Drymos H. Nesou	A
--------------------	-----	-----------------	---

12. KHARMOS (cf. 8, 21)

<i>P. Lond.</i> 195 (II, p. 127)	early I	Arsinoite	B
<i>BGU</i> 1893	149	Bernikis Aigialou	A
<i>BGU</i> 1636	155/6	Theadelphia?	AC
<i>BGU</i> 1894	157	Theadelphia	C
<i>P. Col.</i> 1 verso 1a	160	Theadelphia	B
<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 29	164	Lagis	A
<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 1 verso	164/5	Euhemeria	A
<i>P. Mich.</i> 223	171/2	Karanis?	

13. KHRESIMOS (cf. 10, 21)

<i>P. Phil.</i> 19	I/II	Philadelphia	C
<i>P. Med.</i> 65	139-49	Epipolis?	b
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 207	early II	Psenyris	A
		Herakleia	A
<i>BGU</i> 1894	157	Theadelphia	C
<i>P. Mich.</i> 224	172/3	Karanis	C
<i>P. Mich.</i> 225	173/4	Karanis	C
<i>P. Mich.</i> 372	179/80 or 211/12	Karanis	A

14. KHRESTOS

<i>P. Rein.</i> inv. 2062	161-80	Mendesian	C
<i>P. Acad.</i> fr. 14	161-80	Mendesian	C

15. LATINUS

<i>P. Rein.</i> inv. 2062	161-80	Mendesian	A
<i>P. Acad.</i> fr. 14	161-80	Mendesian	C
<i>P. Strassb.</i> 299 recto	II	Mendesian?	E
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 427 fr. 15	II/III	Mendesian	
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 427 fr. 22	II/III	Mendesian	B

16. LURIUS

<i>P. Hamb.</i> 3	74	Philadelphia	
<i>P. Berl.</i> inv. 11529			
+ <i>SB</i> 10512	138/9	Arsinoite	A
? <i>P. Fay.</i> 82	145	Bernikis Aigialou	A
<i>BGU</i> 1893	149	Bernikis Aigialou	A

SB 10527	152/3	Tebtunis	
P. Athen. 19	154	Arsinoite	A
BGU 105	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
BGU 284	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Chic. 32	158/9	Karanis	A
P. Chic. 36	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Chic. 39	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Chic. 41	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Chic. 43	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Chic. 48	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Chic. 49	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Chic. 50	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Chic. 78	158/9	Karanis	A
P. Chic. 87	158/9	Psenarpsenesis	A
P. Berl. Leihg. 29	164	Lagis	A
P. Berl. Leihg. 1 verso	164/5	Euhemeria	A
P. Bour. 42	167	Hiera Nesos	A
		Ptolemais Nea	A
P. Mich. 224	173/4	Karanis?	AB
P. Mich. 357A+B	173/4	Karanis?	AB
P. Petaus 77	184	Kerkesoukha	
P. Petaus 78	184	Kerkesoukha	
P. Ross.-Georg. V 53	II	Polydeukia	A
P. Yale inv. 254	II	Arsinoite	A
SB 11011	II	Psenarpsenesis	A

17. GAIUS MAECENAS

P. Coll. Youtie 19	44	Arsinoite	
P. Mich. 274-5	46/7	Ibion Eikosipentarouron	b
P. Aberd. 29	48/9	Sen[A
SB 9224	50/1	Philadelphia	
P. Ryl. 171	56/7	Herakleia	a
BGU 181	57	Bakkhias?	
SB 7742 [=10947]	57	Ibion Eikosipentarouron	B
P. Hamb. 3	74	Philadelphia	
P. Phil. 19	I/II	Philadelphia	C
P. Ryl. 207	early II	Neiloupolis	A
P. Berl. inv. 11529			
+SB 10512	138/9	Arsinoite	A
SB 4414	143	Psenarpsenesis	a
BGU 889	151	Sebennutos	
SB 8972	156/7	Euhemeria	C
BGU 2286	156/7	Psenarpsenesis	A
BGU 1894	157	Theadelphia	B
?BGU 1895	157	Theadelphia	
P. Chic. 23	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A

P. Chic. 42	158/9	Karanis	A
P. Chic. 61	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
P. Chic. 65	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
P. Chic. 81	158/9	Karanis	A
P. Hamb. 34	159/60	Euhemeria	C
P. Col. 1 verso 1a	160	Theadelphia	B
P. Osl. 26a	163/4	Psenarpsenes	A
P. Berl. Leihg. 29	164	Lagis	A
P. Berl. Leihg. 1 verso	164/5	Polydeukia	A
		Euhemeria	A
P. Bour. 42	167	Hiera Nesos	A
		Drymos H. Nesou	A
P. Mich. 223	171/2	Karanis?	AB
P. Mich. 224	172/3	Karanis	AB
		Psenarpsenes	AB
P. Mich. 357A+B	173/4	Karanis	AB
		Psenarpsenes	AB
P. Mich. 225	173/4	Karanis?	B
P. Mich. 372	179/80	Karanis	A
	or 211/12	Psenarpsenes	A
P. Tebt. 343	II	Arsinoite	AB
P. Ryl. 383	II	Neilopolis	A
SB 11011	II	Karanis	A
P. Aberd. 50	ca. 202	Psenarpsenes	A

18. MENATIUS or MENAS

P. Lond. 900 (III, p. 89)	94/5 or 110/11	Theadelphia	A
P. Col. 1 verso 4	138-61?	Theadelphia	A
BGU 1894	157	Theadelphia	B
?BGU 1895	157	Theadelphia	
P. Col. 1 verso 1a	160	Theadelphia	B
P. Berl. Leihg. 1 verso	164/5	Theadelphia	A
P. Strassb. 551	II	Theadelphia	A

19. (TI. CLAUDIUS?) NARKISSOS (cf. 7)

P. Ryl. 171	56/7	Herakleia	A
WChr. 176	54-68?	Soknopaiou Nesos	BE

20. ONESIMOS

P. Ryl. 207	early II	Neilopolis	
-------------	----------	------------	--

21. M. ANTONIUS PALLAS

P. Lond. 195 (II, p. 127)	early I	Arsinoite	B
P. Ryl. 171	56/7	Herakleia	A
P. Phil. 19	I/II	Philadelphia	C
P. Ryl. 207	early II	Psenyris	A
		Herakleia	A
P. Berl. inv. 11529			
+SB 10512	138/9	Arsinoite	A
P. Med. 65	139-49	Epipolis?	b
BGU 1894	157	Theadelphia	C
BGU 438	158/9	Karanis	A
Berl. Leihg. 29	164	Lagis	A
P. Berl. Leihg. 1 verso	164/5	Euhemeria	A
P. Bour. 42	167	Drymos H. Nesou	A
P. Mich. 224	172/3	Karanis	AC
P. Mich. 225	173/4	Karanis	C
P. Mich. 372	179/80	Karanis	A
	or 211/12	Psenarpesensis	A

22. (GAIUS?) PETRONIUS

?? P. Ryl. 127	29	Euhemeria	E
BGU 650	46/7	Arsinoite	E
SB 9224	50/1	Philadelphia	E
?? P. Hamb. 101	III	Oxyrhynchite	E

23. GALLIA POLLA (cf. 21)

? P. Coll. Youtie 19	44	Arsinoite	
P. Lond. 195 (II, p. 127)	early I	Arsinoite	B
P. Berl. inv. 11529			
+SB 10512	138/9	Arsinoite	A
P. Berl. Leihg. 1 verso	164/5	Euhemeria	A
P. Mich. 224	173/4	Karanis?	A
P. Mich. 372	179/80	Karanis	A
	or 211/12	Psenarpesensis	A

24. RUTILLIUS

SB 4226	early I		

25. TI. CLAUDIO SARAPION

P. Lond. 280 (II, p. 193)	55	Herakleia	BE

26. L. ANNAEUS SENECA

<i>P. Oxy.</i> 2873	62	Oxyrhynchite	a
<i>P. Hamb.</i> 3	74	Philadelphia	
<i>P. Yale</i> inv. 443	83	Oxyrhynchite	a
<i>P. Oxy.</i> 3051	89	Oxyrhynchite	a
<i>P. Hib.</i> 279	late I	Herakleopolite?	A
?? <i>P. Soc.</i> 448	85/6 or 101/2	Hermopolite	
<i>P. Lond.</i> 900 (III, p. 89)	94/5 or 110/11	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 207	early II	Psenyris	A
? <i>P. Lips.</i> 115	133	Monimou Topoi (Oxy.)	A
<i>P. Berl.</i> inv. 11529 +SB 10512	138/9	Arsinoite	A
<i>BGU</i> 202	154/5	Karanis	A
<i>BGU</i> 1894	157	Theadelphia	B
<i>BGU</i> 104	158/9	Karanis	A
<i>BGU</i> 172	158/9	Karanis	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 5	158/9	Karanis	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 16	158/9	Karanis	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 18	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 26	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 35	158/9	Karanis?	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 53	158/9	Karanis	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 62	158/9	Karanis	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 65	158/9	Karanis	A
? <i>P. Chic.</i> 67	158/9	Karanis	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 71	158/9	Karanis	A
<i>P. Col.</i> 1 verso 1a	160	Theadelphia	B
<i>P. Rein.</i> inv. 2062	161-80	Mendesian	A
<i>P. Berl.</i> Leihg. 1 verso	164/5	Theadelphia	A
		Euhemeria	A
<i>P. Bour.</i> 42	167	Hiera Nesos	A
		Drymos H. Nesou	A
		Ptolemais Nea	A
		Perkeesis	AB
<i>P. Mich.</i> 223	171/2	Karanis?	A
<i>P. Mich.</i> 224	172/3	Karanis	AB
		Patsontis	AB
<i>P. Mich.</i> 225	173/4	Karanis?	AB
<i>P. Aberd.</i> 152	II	Arsinoite	A
<i>P. Aberd.</i> 50	ca. 202	Karanis	A
<i>P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.</i> 52	222/3	Tebtunis?	A
<i>P. Flor.</i> 337	early III	Arsinoite	
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 99	III	Toou (Herm.)	

27. SEVERUS

<i>P. Lond.</i> 900 (III, p. 89)	94/5 or 110/11 early II	Theadelphia Neilopolis	A A
<i>P. Ryl.</i> 207			
<i>P. Berl.</i> inv. 11529			
+SB 10512	138/9	Arsinoite	A
<i>BGU</i> 1894	157	Theadelphia	B
<i>BGU</i> 31	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 19	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 47	158/9	Hiera [Nesos]	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 55	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 67	158/9		
<i>P. Chic.</i> 76	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
<i>P. Chic.</i> 77	158/9	Kerkesoukha	A
<i>P. Col.</i> 1 verso 1a	160	Theadelphia	B
<i>P. Col.</i> 1 verso 4	138-61?	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 33	161-69	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 1 verso	164/5	Theadelphia	A
<i>P. Bour.</i> 42	167	Hiera Nesos	A
<i>P. Mich.</i> 224	173/4	Kerkesoukha	AB
<i>P. Mil. Vogl.</i> 251	II	Tebtunis	BE
<i>P. Strassb.</i> 551	II	Theadelphia	
<i>BGU</i> 835	217	Hiera [Nesos]	A

28. SOKRATES

<i>P. Berl. Leihg.</i> 1 verso	164/5	Euhemeria	A
--------------------------------	-------	-----------	---

Appendix Three

Note on the *Procurator Usiacus*

Unlike other high officials of Roman Egypt who have received, or are still receiving, close scrutiny and detailed examination, the *procurator usiacus* shares a common fate with his counterpart, the *dioiketes*: neither has been the subject of a systematic and exhaustive study. In recent years a number of valuable remarks regarding the administration of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος were made; but emphasis was placed upon the officials of the local level, the subject was not treated in full detail, and hardly anything was said about the *procurator usiacus*.¹

For the role and the competence of the *procurator usiacus*, as well as for his exact position within the hierarchy of the high functionaries in Egypt, we must still depend on what Wilcken wrote in 1912.² But even he was at times fallible, and more information is currently available to the scholar. As far as a working list of *procuratores usiaci* is concerned, Rostovtzeff's roster is hopelessly out of date, and in Pflaum's lists the freedmen *usiaci* are naturally excluded, while among the *equites* we encounter some otherwise unknown as well as some private (e.g., *BGU* 926) procurators, all grouped under an all-inclusive "Procurator in Aegypto."³

There is also a tendency of late to regard the office of the *procurator usiacus* as a catch-all, a title to be bestowed upon any procurator who is no more specifically defined than as ὁ κοάτιστος ἐπίτροπος, or ἐπίτροπος Σεβαστοῦ, or one who is otherwise unknown and whose functions are somewhat difficult to classify and attribute to other officials. We have thus reached the point where there are, in the literature on the subject, three persons competing for the office of the *procurator usiacus* in 201, namely Claudio Diogenes, Aurelius Felix and Publius Cerialis. It is possible that not one of them actually ever held that office. Such a state of affairs has naturally beclouded the entire matter and has further resulted in the creation of an official whose powers and competence extend far beyond the administration of the *patrimonium*.

There exists, then, a very real need for a detailed study of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος purely as a branch of the administration, and of the *procurator usiacus* as its head. This short note cannot, of course, claim to meet it: the entire matter is outside the scope and the chronological limits placed upon this study, since the creation of the *ratio usiaca* in Egypt heralded the end of estates privately owned by the emperors. I should like, nonetheless, to point out some flaws in the currently accepted theories; to present an updated list of the individuals who have valid claims to the title of the *procurator usiacus*; and to point out some troublesome areas that require further investigation.

1. See, e.g., Tomsin, "Le recrutement," *passim*, and Kuhnke, Οὐσιακὴ Γῆ, esp. pp. 74 ff.

2. Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 154 f., 158.

3. Rostovtzeff, *DEAR* III, 1922, p. 100; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romain* II, 1961, p. 1085.

Firstly, there is the question of the duration of the existence of the department. In Chapter II, I gave my reasons for arguing that the *ratio usiaca* was the creation of the Flavians, and more precisely of Vespasian. I also believe that there is every reason to posit that it was dissolved by Diocletian. This brings us to a very confused period, during which many imperfectly understood changes took place.⁴ With regard, however, to the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, the situation is as follows: (a) Fourth-century references to οὐσιακὴ γῆ are quite rare; I know only of *P. Flor.* 64 and 94, *P. Cairo Preis.* 4, and *CPR* 19. It is interesting to note that in the papyri of the Isidoros archive (*P. Cair. Isidor.*) the term does not occur even once, even though all 146 documents deal with Karanis, a village once surrounded by extensive tracts of patrimonial land. (b) During the fourth century we do not encounter οὐσιακοὶ γεωργοὶ any more than we do δημόσιοι, βασιλικοὶ or προσωδικοὶ; and while land is still referred to as being, or as having been, either royal or private, there can be little doubt that all rural areas, regardless of how they were styled, were in private possession by the end of the third century.⁵ It is very likely that the term "royal land" was a generic one at this time, comprising all categories of public land known during the Roman occupation. (c) Our latest reference to the *ratio usiaca* comes from 285 (*P. Oxy.* 2228).⁶ All available information, therefore, points to a discontinuation of the department with the Diocletianic reform.

Secondly, there is the question of the position of the department within the administration of Egypt and its connection, or lack thereof, with the *res privata*. Noticing that some οὐσίαι were administered by the ταμιεῖον after their confiscation, and that these ταμιακὰ οὐσίαι appear for the first time by the very end of the second century, Wilcken advanced the theory that the assignment of properties belonging to the emperor after their confiscation (οὐσίαι) to the *fiscus* (ταμιεῖον) came about as a result of the changes in the financial administration of Egypt that took place during the reign of Septimius Severus — the emperor, Wilcken believed, responsible for the creation of the *res privata*.⁷

Now, as I indicated in Chapter II, there is no evidence whatsoever that any additions were made to the οὐσιακὸς λόγος after its creation by Vespasian. But beyond that, we also know now that the emperor's *res privata* was not the creation of Septimius Severus: the celebrated phrase *tuncque primum privataram rerum procuratio constituta est*, of H. A. S., *Sept. Sev.* 12.4, is another of the groundless statements one is apt to encounter in that uneven work. The publication of an inscription that gives us the *cursus* of T. Aius Sanctus (*AE* 1961, no 280)⁸ reinstated *CIL VIII* 8810 as an indisputable witness and moved the date of the first evidence for the existence of the *res privata* to the reign of Antoninus Pius.⁹ Whether this emperor was the originator of the department I would deem totally immaterial for the present study.

We should also keep in mind that, whatever may have been happening in the rest of the empire, there exists for the moment no evidence for the presence of a *res privata* in Egypt before the Diocletianic reform; after which both the *magistri* and the *procuratores privatae* make their

4. This is not the place to enumerate or evaluate them. The reader is referred to J. Lallemand's excellent *L'administration civile de l'Égypte de l'avènement de Dioclétien à la création du diocèse. Contribution à l'étude des rapports entre l'Égypte et l'empire à la fin du III^e et au IV^e siècle*, 1964.

5. See H. C. Youtie and A. E. R. Boak, *P. Cair. Isidor.* 3 introd., with evidence and bibliography.

6. The Annus Diogenes of ca. 302 (*P. Soc.* 1125; *SB* 4421; *BGU* 620) is not a *procurator usiacus* as G. Vitelli (*P. Soc.* 1125 introd.) and E.P. Wegener (*P. Oxy.* 2228 introd.) thought.

His title is now given in *P. Oxy.* 3031.2 (302) as ἐπίτροπος Επτανομίας.

7. Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 154 f.

8. See the original publication, with discussion, in L. Moretti, "Due iscrizioni latine inedite di Roma," *RFIC* N.S. 38, 1960, pp. 68 ff.

9. See esp. H. Nesselhauf, "Patrimonium und res privata des römischen Kaisers," *Historia-Augusta-Colloquium*, 1963, pp. 73 ff. (reconstruction of *CIL* 8810 on p. 76, n. 9), and A. Masi, *Ricerche sulla "res privata" del "princeps"*, 1971, p. 12 ff.

appearance.¹⁰ Too, the equation οὐσία = *Partimonialgut* does not hold true unless the estate is part of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, as I attempt to demonstrate in Chapter I. Pace Rostovtzeff,¹¹ the phrase πρότερον τοῦ δεῖνα does not automatically indicate that the current owner of the land in question is the emperor, or that the estate belongs to the *res privata*.¹² The phrase πρότερον τοῦ δεῖνα νυνὶ δὲ τοῦ ἱερωτάτου ταμείου has nothing strange or extraordinary about it. It is paralleled by ἀρουραι ἀναληφθεῖσαι εἰς τὸ ταμεῖον (*BGU* 462.12), and this is in turn paralleled by ἀρουραι ἀναληφθεῖσαι εἰς βασιλικὴν γῆν (*P. Tebt.* 302.7) and by ἐδάφη ἀνειλημμένα εἰς τὸ δημόσιον (*BGU* 1200.6).¹³

Thirdly, the vexing question of the position of the *procurator usiacus* within the echelons of the Egyptian administration. This may be thought of as an unnecessary task, since it is now generally accepted that the *procurator usiacus* was the subordinate of the *idios logos*. No one, however, has endeavored to justify such a close association between two departments that dealt with fundamentally different matters, the *idios logos* being responsible for sporadic and irregular sources of revenue, the *procurator usiacus* dealing with the regular and stabilized revenues of the *patrimonium*. If, as is commonly and, I believe, correctly, agreed, the *fiscus* and the *patrimonium* were the two main branches of financial administration in Egypt, it is at best mildly surprising to find the *dioiketes* responsible to the prefect and the *procurator usiacus* accountable to the *idios logos*. The constant references to διοίκησις καὶ οὐσιακά in a great number of accounts of grain collection, for example, should rather indicate that both the *dioiketes* and the *usiacus* were independent heads subordinate only to the prefect, the official in charge of the entire financial administration of the province.

The suggestion that the *procurator usiacus* was the subordinate of the *idios logos* was made at a time when it was believed that the *idios logos* was the chief administrator of the imperial properties, while the then current controversy was whether he was in charge of the *patrimonium* or of the *res privata*.¹⁴ Under the circumstances, to place the *procurator usiacus* under the *idios logos* was a sound and logical idea, although solid documentation or proof was lacking.

We now know, of course, that the *idios logos* was neither the *patrimonium* nor the *res privata*; that it was a “special,” not a “private” account. Many still feel, however, that the reasons which compelled Wilcken and others to hold that the *usiacus* was the subordinate of the *idios logos* retain their validity.¹⁵ No new material directly pertaining to this question has come to light. In fact, the evidence that exists now as it existed then is to be found in a single piece of papyrus, and the argumentation travels a very circuitous route. In *BGU* 362.v.9-11 and vii.24-5 (215) we encounter an *Aurelius Italicus*, κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος τῶν οὐσιακῶν διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην. The other two documents offered as evidence by Wilcken cannot stand on their own but wholly depend on the interpretation we give to *BGU* 362. In *WChr.* 81.4-5 (197) we meet a *Claudius Diognetus*, ἐπίτροπος Σεβαστοῦ διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην; in *WChr.* 73.2-3 (247) a κράτιστος Μύρων διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην.

Now *BGU* 362 may be regarded as incontestable evidence of the fact that the *procurator*

10. See the brief remarks of N. Lewis, “A New Document on the Magister Rei Privatae,” *JJP* 15, 1965, pp. 157 ff., with documentation.

11. Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, pp. 120 ff.

12. Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 155, n. 5, had already called our attention to this.

13. Cf. also above, Appendix I.

14. As far as I can determine, this interpretation of the evidence pertaining to the offices of the *procurator usiacus* and the *idios logos* was first offered by Hirschfeld in his first edition

of *Verwaltungsbeamten*, 1876, p. 43, n.5; cf. the second edition, 1905, p. 357. It was accepted by the great scholars of the time: cf. Wilcken, *Hermes* 23, 1888, pp. 592 ff. and *Ostraka I*, p. 393; Meyer, “Διοίκησις,” pp. 156 ff.; L. Mitteis, *Römisches Privatrecht bis auf die Zeit Diokletians I*, 1908, p. 358.

15. The first, and still the fullest, discussion of the problem is to be found in Wilcken, “Kaiserliche Tempelverwaltung in Aegypten,” *Hermes* 23, 1888, pp. 592 ff.; Meyer, “Διοίκησις,” pp. 156 ff., simply repeats, and in his *Ostraka I*, p. 644, and *Grundzüge*, p. 127, Wilcken summarizes, the same evidence.

usiacus was the subordinate of the *idios logos* only if it can be proven that (a) it was invariably the subordinate of the ἀρχιερεύς who was called upon to become διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην, and (b) the *idios logos* and the ἀρχιερεύς were combined in one office. The answer to this is given by the recently published SB 9658 (193) wherein Modestus, known to have been *idios logos* in 184 (P. Soc. 928), is described as ὁ κράτιστος πρὸς τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ διαδεξάμενος καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην (i.23-25) and as ὁ γενόμενος πρὸς τῷ ἴδιῳ λόγῳ καὶ πρὸς τῇ ἀρχιερωσύνῃ (ii.18-20).¹⁶ This titulature, unparalleled thus far, shows beyond any reasonable doubt that (a) the *idios logos* and the ἀρχιερεύς were two distinct offices, and (b) the *idios logos*, just like the *procurator usiacus*, could be called upon to serve as temporary ἀρχιερεύς.

The case of Claudius Diognatos needs further investigation. Granted that he was *procurator usiacus* in 197 (WChr. 81), what evidence do we have that this was also his post in 202-4? His activities for that period are well documented: in P. Flor. 278 he is involved in matters of the army, specifically the impressment of animals; in P. Giss. 48 he is attested as having made an ὁρισμὸς γῆς; in P. Hamb. 11, P. Aberd. 50, P. Ryl. 596 and 682, P. Oxy. 1113, P. Brooklyn gr. 5 (Chronique 38, 1963, p. 117) and P. Variae Alex. Giss. 1 (SB 10617) he is the author of orders for general declarations of unwatered lands. In none of these documents is he called ἐπίτροπος οὐσιακῶν; his title is simply κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος τῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν. In none of these documents does he deal with the *ratio usiaca*. If we assume that the actions enumerated above are the functions of the *procurator usiacus*, then we should be willing to assume that the office had enlarged its power and sphere of administration to a considerable extent, and that it no longer dealt exclusively with the *patrimonium*.

In tracing the career of Diognatos, Pflaum¹⁷ already argued that, if he had ever been *procurator usiacus*, he was so only in ca. 197 (WChr. 81), and that his subsequent title, κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος τῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν, is precisely the one borne by Marcius Salutarius, a functionary invariably coupled with Claudius Marcellus, the *rationalis* of 245-8 (P. Lond. 1157 [III, p. 110]; P. Oxy. 78; 2123; 2664; P. Leit. 16). These two officials issue orders that encompass a variety of fields (notably enough, P. Oxy. 78 mentions orders for the registration of land) but never the *patrimonium*. Pflaum suggested that Salutarius served as *adiutor* to Marcellus, while in 202-4 the *adiutor* to the *rationalis* Claudius Iulianus (SB 4639; P. Giss. 48; also P. Erl. 78 [no. 20]?) was none other than Claudius Diognatos.

Now another person appears on the scene, Publius Cerialis (Celearis in the documents) whose office is recorded from 198 to 201, i.e. the period during which Diognatos was διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην and perhaps *usiacus* as well. His activities, however, are those of Diognatos when the latter was promoted to the office of the *adiutor rationalis*: he orders a general declaration of unwatered land (BGU 2023) and is engaged in an ἐπίσκεψις γῆς (P. Hamb. 12). There is obviously something fundamentally wrong when two persons appear having strong, indeed identical, claims to the title of the *usiacus* for the same period, when all the evidence indicates that there was only one such official at any given time.¹⁸

16. See the original publication of SB 9658 by H. Hunger, "Ein Wiener Papyrus zur Ernennung der Priester im römischen Ägypten," Acta Ant. Acad. Scient. Hung. 10, 1962, pp. 151 ff. and my restorations and discussion in "A Prefectural Edict Regulating Temple Activities," ZPE 13, 1973, pp. 21 ff. Cf. also P. Aberd. 51.11 (II), ἴδιον λόγων καὶ ἀρχιερέων κρίσις, and WChr. 72.6-7 (234), where ἡ τοῦ ἴδιολόγου καὶ ἀρχιερέως ἐπιτροπή should be understood now in the light of the new evidence as the simultaneous holding of two offices by the same person. For earlier discussion of this problem see H.S. Jones,

Fresh Light on Roman Bureaucracy, 1920, pp. 22 ff.; W.G. Uxkull-Gyllenband, *Der Gnomon des Idios Logos* (BGUV:2), 1934, pp. 5 f.; J. Scherer, "Le papyrus Fouad I^{er} inv. 211," BIFAO 41, 1942, pp. 43 ff.; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières*, no. 247; D. Hagedorn, "Bemerkungen zu Urkunden, II," ZPE 4, 1969, pp. 65 ff.; P.R. Swarney, *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos*, Amer. Stud. in Pap. 8, 1970, pp. 83 ff., 92 ff.

17. H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières*, no. 247.

18. Attention to the impossibility of having both Diognatos and Cerialis as *usiaci* has also been called by H.

Consider now that two declarations of unwatered land were made in 244/5 not in accordance with the orders of a *procurator usiacus*, but of an Aurelius Antoninus, who bears the title ὁ κράτιστος πρὸς τὰς ἐπισκέψειν (P. Oxy. 970 and 3046). On the other hand, a Claudius Alexandros, who bears the title borne by Diognetos and Cerialis, i.e. ὁ κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος τῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν, and who is expressly stated to have had the same office as the latter, made an ἐπίσκεψις γῆς in 206/7 and subsequent ones in 208/9 and in 209/10 (P. Hamb. 12). We also know of an Aurelius Maximus, ὁ κράτιστος πρὸς τὰς ἐπισκέψειν of ca. 223 (P. Soc. 1066; this name should be restored also in P. Erl. 24 verso [no. 19]). Finally, we come across a *Tib(erius) Cl(audius) Demetrius, dom(o) Nicomed(ia), v(ir) e(gregius), proc(urator) Augg(ustorum) n(ostrorum), item (ducenarius) episcepseos chorae inferioris* (CIL V 7870=Dessau, ILS 6762).¹⁹

An examination of this material leads me to suggest the following. Beginning with the reign of Septimius Severus, there appeared an official in Egypt one of whose primary functions was the annual examination of the land, both public and private, especially with regard to inundation or absence thereof. To this effect he issued annual proclamations for the registration of uninundated lands and conducted inspections, either in person or, one assumes, in most cases through such lower officials as ἐκλογισταί (P. Giss. 48) and γεωμέτραι (P. Soc. 1066). We should note that it is precisely at this time that the prefect stopped being the only official to issue orders for such annual declarations.²⁰ There is no evidence whatsoever that this official was the *procurator usiacus*: on the contrary, all available documents argue against such an identification. The official is a *vir egregius procurator Augusti* or *Augustorum*, as the case may be; his rank that of *ducenarius*. He is sometimes referred to as ὁ πρὸς τὰς ἐπισκέψειν or similar expressions, but whether this was his official, or indeed his sole, title is unknown. He serves in close association with the *rationalis*, who although a *ducenarius* too was however *vir perfectissimus* (P. Lond. 1157 [III, p. 110]; P. Oxy. 78; 2123; 2664; P. Leit. 16); but whether he was in fact his official *adiutor* or not is also unknown.

The following *procuratores Augusti*, therefore, were not *procuratores usiaci*:

1. Publius Cerialis, 198-201: P. Hamb. 12; BGU 2023.
2. Claudius Diognetos, 202-4: P. Flor. 278; P. Giss. 48; P. Hamb. 11; P. Aberd. 50; P. Ryl. 596; 682; P. Oxy. 1113; P. Brooklyn gr. 5 (Chronique 38, 1963, p. 117): P. Variae Alex. Giss. 1 (SB 10617).
3. Claudius Alexandros, 206-9: P. Hamb. 12.
4. Aurelius Maximus, 223: P. Soc. 1066; P. Erl. 24 verso [no. 19].
5. Aurelius Antoninus, 244/5: P. Oxy. 970; 3046.
6. Marcus Salutarius, 245-8: P. Lond. 1175 (III, p. 110); P. Oxy. 78; 2123; 2664; P. Leit. 16.
7. Ti. Claudius Demetrius, first half of III cent.: CIL V 7870=Dessau, ILS 6762.

These seven individuals, then, and the *perfectissimus* Annius Diogenes already mentioned,²¹ should be removed from the roster of the *procuratores usiaci* — at least for those years during which they were holding other offices.

I believe that there are more names that ought to be removed from the lists of *usiaci*:

The Ti. Claudius Blastos, γενόμενος ἐπίτροπος τοῦ κυρίου in CPR 1 (83/4), was almost certainly an *idios logos*. He directed the confiscation and sale of the property of a *debitor fisci*,²²

Maehler in his note to BGU 2023.7-8, but the problem was not solved.

19. See esp. A. Stein, *Chrestiera Alois Rzach*, p. 178; his reconstruction of WChr. 41.iii.14, however, is doubtful.

20. For this and lists see C. Préaux, "Declaration d'inondation déficitaire du Brooklyn Museum," *Chronique* 38,

1963, pp. 117 ff. with bibliography. To her lists add now BGU 2022; 2023; 2101; P.Oxy. 3046; 3047.

21. See above, n. 6.

22. It is not a case of sale of land of the *patrimonium*, as Preisigke, *Girowesen*, p. 501, thought.

and the fact that the former owner of the property was a μισθωτής τινων οὐσιῶν does not make Blastos an *usiacus*.²³

In *BGU* 156 (201) an Aurelius Felix, ὁ κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος, directs the sale of the land of another *debitor fisci* who was not even an οὐσιακὸς μισθωτής. The fact that a *dispensator Caesaris* is involved in the payment is totally irrelevant.²⁴ Rostovtzeff saw in Felix a *procurator usiacus*; Wilcken naturally objected, since he had already placed Claudius Diognetus in that time slot.²⁵ It is possible to consider Felix as an *idios logos* or a *dioiketes* (for the former cf. *CPR* 1, for the latter *BGU* 8 and 106).

In *P. Col.* 1 verso 5 notice is issued that various parcels of land are available for leasing according to the orders of Π...ίνου Σωκρό() τοῦ κρατίστου ἐπιτρόπου. Day and Keyes, in a lengthy introduction, offered a variety of reasons why this official should be an *usiacus*, none totally conclusive but somehow tempting. But they date the papyrus to 175/6, while the orders mentioned therein were issued in 174/5, the *usiacus* of that year being Ulpius Herakleides.

I have already given some reasons why the Septimius Serenus and the Claudius Calvinus of *P. Mich.* 616 should be considered as *idioi logoi*.²⁶

It is only the following, therefore, who are more or less certain cases of *procuratores usiaci*:

1. —NUS: *CIL* X 6000 (142), *Jnus lib(ertus) proc(urator) rationis usiaceae*. It is possible that *-nus* was incorrectly read for *-ctus* or *-ktus*, in which case this official is identical with the following.

2. AELIUS EKLEKTOS: *P. Oxford* 3 (142), Ἐγλεκτὸς ὁ κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος; *P. Wisc.* 34 and 35 (144), Αἴλιος Ἐγλεκτὸς ἐπίτροπος τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος; *BGU* 891 (144), Αἴλιος [Ἐγλεκτὸς] ὁ κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος (for the restoration at the end of line 15 see my remarks in *ZPE* 11, 1973, p. 23); *P. Mich.* 617 (145/6), ὁ κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος (but no name); *P. Oxy.* 3089 (146), Ἐγλεκτὸς ἐπίτροπος τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος.

3. EIRENAIOS: *P. Meyer* 3 (148), Εἰρηναῖος ὁ τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος ἐπίτροπος; *P. Wisc.* 31 (149), Εἰρηναῖος ἐπίτροπος τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος; *P. Bibl. Nat. Suppl. gr.* 1374 fr. 44 + *P. Rein. inv.* 2062 (no date), τῶν Εἰρηναίου καὶ Σωκρατικοῦ χρόνων.

4. AELIUS SOKRATIKOS: *SB* 10527 (152/3), [Αἴλιος] Σωκρατικὸς ὁ κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος; *APF* 2, 1903, p. 562 = *AE* 1903, no. 226 = *IGRR* I 1325 = *SB* 4231 (153), Αἴλιος Σωκρατικὸς ἐπίτροπος Σεβαστοῦ; *SB* 9210 (no date), Σωκρατικός (no title); *P. Bibl. Nat. Suppl. gr.* 1374 fr. 44 + *P. Rein. inv.* 2062 (no date).

5. P. AELIUS HILARUS: *CIL* XIV 2504 (between 161 and 169, or 176 and 180), *P. Aelius Hilarus Augg(ustorum) libertus qui proc(uravit) Alexandriae ad rat(iones) patrimonii*.

6. FELIX: *CIL* III 53 = *Dessau, ILS* 8759g (between 161 and 169, or 176 and 180?), *Felix Augg(ustorum) libertus procurator usiacus*.

7. ULPIUS HERAKLEIDES: *P. Tebt.* 317 (174/5), ὁ κράτιστος οὐσιακὸς ἐπίτροπος Οὐλπιος Ἡρακλείδης.

8. CLAUDIOUS DIOGNETOS (?): *WChr.* 81 (197), Κλαύδιος Διόγνητος ἐπίτροπος Σεβαστοῦ διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην.

9. AURELIUS ITALICUS: *BGU* 362 (214/5), Αὐρήλιος Ἰταλικὸς ὁ κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος τῶν οὐσιακῶν διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην.

10. AURELIUS TERPSILAOS: *P. Oxy.* 3092 (217), Αὐρήλιος Τερψίλαος ἐπίτροπος

23. Such was the opinion of Meyer, "Διοίκησις," p. 157, n. 1; Mitteis, *MChr.* 220 introd.; Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 142 and "Fiscus," *DEAR* III, 1922, p. 100.

24. Pace Wilcken, *WChr.* 175 introd. See above, Chapter

IV, n. 5.

25. Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 142 and "Fiscus," *DEAR* III, 1922, p. 100.

26. See above, Appendix I.

ούσιακῶν διαδεχόμενος καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν διοίκησιν; *P. Oxy.* 3103 (226), Αὐρήλιος Τερψίλαος ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίτροπος τῶν ούσιακῶν.

11. MYRON (?): *WChr.* 73 (247/8), ὁ κράτιστος Μύρων διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην.

Unnamed *procuratores usiaci* as well as the *ratio usiaca* are mentioned in the following documents: *BGU* 1047 (ca. 131), where the ἐπιτροπή of line ii.11 is the ούσιακή; *P. Amh.* 77 (139); *BGU* 599 (II), where in line 5 either ούσιακοῦ or ἐπιτρόπου may be supplied for the διοικητοῦ suggested by Wilcken, *WChr.* 363; *P. Giss.* 40 (213), where the *usiacus* may have been Aurelius Italicus; *P. Strassb.* 5 (262); *P. Oxy.* 1514 (274); 2228 (285); 1274 (III).

I should like to close this note with a list of the known lower, non-liturgic officials of the *patrimonium*:

1. Κέστος, γενόμενος βοηθὸς τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς (*BGU* 1047).
2. Ἡρακλᾶς, μαχαιροφόρος ούσιακός (*P. Amh.* 77).
3. Αἴλιος Φῆλιξ, ἐπιμελητὴς κυριακῶν (here = ούσιακῶν) κτημάτων (*P. Oxford* 3).
4. Αἴλιος Ἡράκλειτος, βοηθὸς Αἴλιου Ἐγλεκτοῦ ἐπιτρόπου τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος (*P. Wisc.* 34).
5. Ἐπιθυμητός, βοηθὸς Εἰρηναίου ἐπιτρόπου τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος (*P. Wisc.* 31).
6. Αἴλιος Εὐτυχῆς, βοηθός (sc. Αἴλιου Σωκρατικοῦ) (*APF* 2, 1903, p. 562 = *AE* 1903, no. 226 = *IGRR* I 1325 = *SB* 4231).
7. Φλάβιος Φῆλιξ, γενόμενος ἐπιμελητής τινων ούσιακῶν (*BGU* 1895).
- 8.-9. Εὐγράφιος and Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμων, ὀφφικιάλιοι τῆς ούσιακῆς ἐπιτροπῆς (*P. Oxy.* 2228).

Bibliography

This list contains only the books and articles which have been cited in the foregoing pages. The abbreviations employed in the notes are expanded here. Reviews of articles and books are not included. Also not included are editions of classical authors and collections of papyri and inscriptions, for which see above, Abbreviations. [See also below, Addenda.]

Abbott, F. F. and Johnson, A. C. *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*. Princeton, 1926.

Akveld, W. F. *Germanicus*. Historische Studien, 18. Diss., Utrecht, 1961.

Aly, Z. "Sitologia in Roman Egypt," *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 4, 1950, pp. 293 ff.

— "Upon Sitologia in Roman Egypt and the Rôle of Sitologi in its Financial Administration," *Akten des VIII. internationalen Kongresses für Papyrologie. Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, N.S. 5, Vienna, 1956, pp. 17 ff.

Baldacci, P. "Patrimonium e ager publicus al tempo dei Flavi," *La Parola del Passato* 24, 1969, pp. 349 ff.

Bataille, A. "P. Clermont-Ganneau 3-5," *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 6, 1952, pp. 185 ff.

Baud, M. *Égypte*. Les Guides Bleus. Paris, 1950.

Baumgart, J. *Die römischen Sklavennamen*. Diss., Breslau, 1936.

Beaudouin, E. *Les grands domaines dans l'empire romain, d'après des travaux récents*. Paris, 1899.

Bell, H. I. "An Epoch in the Agrarian History of Egypt," *Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiées à la mémoire de J.-Fr. Champollion*, Paris, 1922, pp. 261 ff.

— "The Economic Crisis in Egypt under Nero," *Journal of Roman Studies* 28, 1938, pp. 1 ff.

Béranger, J. "Fortune privée impérial et état," *Mélanges offerts à Monsieur Georges Bonnard à l'occasion de son quatrevingtième anniversaire*, Geneva, 1966, pp. 151 ff.

Berger, A. *Die Strafklauseln in den Papyrusurkunden. Ein Beitrag zum gräco-ägyptischen Obligationenrecht*. Leipzig/Berlin, 1911.

Besnier, R. *Les affranchis impériaux à Rome de 41 à 54 après J.-C.* Paris, 1947, 1948.

Besta, M. C. "Pesca e pescatori nell'Egitto greco-romano," *Aegyptus* 2, 1921, pp. 67 ff.

Biezunsko-Malowist, I. "Recherches sur l'esclavage dans l'Égypte romaine," *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1959, pp. 203 ff.

— "Les affranchis dans les papyrus de l'époque ptolémaïque et romaine," *Atti dell'XI congresso internazionale di papirologia*, Milan, 1966, pp. 433 ff.

Boak, A. E. R. *Soknopaiou Nesos. The University of Michigan Excavations at Dimê in 1931-32*. Ann Arbor, 1935.

— "The Population of Roman and Byzantine Karanis," *Historia* 4, 1955, pp. 157 ff.

Bolla, S. von. *Die Entwicklung des Fiscus zum Privatrechtssubjekt mit Beiträgen zur Lehre vom*

Aerarium. Prague, 1938.

Bonneau, D. *La crue du Nil, divinité égyptienne, à travers mille ans d'histoire*. Paris, 1964.

——— "Utilization des documents papyrologiques, numismatiques et épigraphiques pour la détermination de la qualité de la crue du Nil, chaque année de l'époque gréco-romaine," *Atti dell'XI congresso internazionale di papirologia*, Milan, 1966, pp. 379 ff.

Boulvert, G. "Servi et liberti du prince," *Labeo* 12, 1966, pp. 94 ff.

——— *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le haut-empire romain. Rôle politique et administratif*. Biblioteca di *Labeo*, 4. Naples, 1970.

——— "Tacite et le fiscus," *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 48, 1970, pp. 430 ff.

Bowersock, G. W. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford, 1965.

Broughton, T. R. S. "Roman Landholding in Asia Minor," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 65, 1934, pp. 207 ff.

Browne, G. "Withdrawal from Lease," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 5, 1968, pp. 17 ff.

——— "Two Land Leases from First Century Tebtunis," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 6, 1969, pp. 5 ff.

Brunt, P. A. "The 'Fiscus' and its Development," *Journal of Roman Studies* 56, 1966, pp. 75 ff.

Buckland, W. W. *The Roman Law of Slavery. The Condition of the Slave in Private Law from Augustus to Justinian*. Cambridge, 1908.

Buckler, W. H. and Robinson, D. M. "Greek Inscriptions from Sardis. I," *American Journal of Archaeology* 16, 1912, pp. 11 ff.

Bureth, P. *Les titulatures impériales dans les papyrus, les ostraca et les inscriptions d'Égypte (30 a.C.-284 p.C.)*. Papyrologica Bruxellensia, 2. Bruxelles, 1964.

Calderini, A. "Ricerche sul regime delle acque nell'Egitto greco-romano," *Aegyptus* 1, 1920, pp. 37 ff., 189 ff.

——— *Θησαυροί. Ricerche di topografia e di storia della pubblica amministrazione nell'Egitto greco-romano*. Studi della scuola papirologica, 4. Milan, 1924.

Cardinali, G. "Amministrazione territoriale e finanziaria," *Augustus. Studi in occasione del bimillenario Augusteo*, Rome, 1938, pp. 161 ff.

Chalon, G. *L'édit de Tiberius Julius Alexander. Étude historique et exégétique*. Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana, 5. Olten/Lausanne, 1964.

Chantraine, H. *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser. Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur*. Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei, 1. Wiesbaden, 1967.

Cosentini, C. *Studi sui liberti*. Catania, 1948, 1950.

Crook, J. *Consilium Principis. Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian*. Cambridge, 1955.

Dattari, G. *Monete imperiali greche. Numi Augg. Alexandrini, catalogo della collezione G. Dattari*. Cairo, 1901.

Davies, J. K. *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.* Oxford, 1971.

Doer, B. *Die römische Namengebung. Ein historischer Versuch*. Stuttgart, 1937.

Dubois, C. "L'olivier et l'huile d'olive dans l'ancienne Égypte," *Revue de Philologie* N.S. 1, 1927, pp. 7 ff.

Duff, A. M. *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*. Oxford, 1928.

Eger, O. *Zum ägyptischen Grundbuchwesen in römischer Zeit*. Leipzig, 1909.

Eitrem, S. and Holst, H. "Three Greek Papyri in Oslo," *Klio* 22, 1928, pp. 221 ff.

Erman, A. "Die Erwerbungen der ägyptischen Abtheilung der königl. Museen im Jahre 1889," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 28, 1890, pp. 54 ff.

Flam-Zuckermann, L. "Un example de la genèse des domaines impériaux d'après deux inscriptions de Bithynie," *Historia* 21, 1972, pp. 114 ff.

Foraboschi, D. "L'ousia Severiana: Una tenuta 'privata' romana in Egitto," *Chronique d'Égypte* 42, 1967, pp. 172 ff.

— *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum. Supplemento al Namenbuch di F. Preisigke. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità*, 16. Milan, 1968, 1970, 1971.

Frank, T. "On Augustus and the Aerarium," *Journal of Roman Studies* 23, 1933, pp. 143 ff.

— *Rome and Italy of the Empire. An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, 5. Baltimore, 1940.

Garzetti, A. "Aerarium e fiscus sotto Augusto. Storia di una questione in parte di nomi," *Athenaeum* 41, 1953, pp. 298 ff.

Gaudemet, J. "Testamenta ingrata et pietas Augusti": contribution à l'étude du sentiment impérial," *Studi in onore V. Arangio-Ruiz nel XLV anno del suo insegnamento*, Naples, 1953, 3, pp. 115 ff.

Geremek, H. *Karanis. Communauté rurale de l'Égypte romaine au II^e - III^e siècle de notre ère*. Academia Polona, Archivum Philologiczne, 17. Vratislav, 1969.

Gilliam, J. F. "Valerius Titanianus," *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser., 17, 1964, pp. 293 ff.

— "A Legionary Veteran and his Family," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 8, 1971, pp. 39 ff.

Hammond, M. *The Augustan Principate in Theory and Practice during the Julio-Claudian Period*. Cambridge, Mass., 1933.

Hardy, E. R., Jr. *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt*. Columbia Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, 354. New York, 1931.

Heichelheim, F. M. "Domäne," T. Klauser, ed., *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum* IV, 1959, cols. 88 ff.

Henne, H. *Liste des stratégies des noms égyptiens à l'époque gréco-romaine*. Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 56. Cairo, 1935.

Hennig, D. *Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht im ptolemäisch-römischen Ägypten*. Diss., Munich, 1967.

Herrmann, J. "Zum Begriff γῆ ἐν ἀρέσει." *Chronique d'Égypte* 30, 1955, pp. 95 ff.

— *Studien zur Bodenpacht im Recht der gräco-ägyptischen Papyri*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 41. Munich, 1958.

Hirschfeld, O. "Der Grundbesitz der römischen Kaiser in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten," *Klio* 2, 1902, pp. 45 ff., 284 ff.

— *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1905.

His, R. *Die Domänen der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Leipzig, 1896.

Hohlwein, N. *L'Égypte romaine. Recueil des termes techniques relatifs aux institutions politiques et administratives de l'Égypte romaine*. Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques, et classe des beaux-arts. Mémoires, 2nd ser., 8. Bruxelles/Paris, 1912.

— *Le stratège du nome*. *Papyrologica Bruxellensia*, 9. Bruxelles, 1969.

— "Le blé d'Égypte," *Études de Papyrologie* 4, 1938, pp. 33 ff.

— "Palmiers et palmeraies dans l'Égypte romaine," *Études de Papyrologie* 5, 1939, pp. 1 ff.

— "Evhéméria du Fayoum," *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 3, 1949, pp. 63 ff.

Homo, L. "Le domaine impérial à Rome," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome* 19, 1899, pp. 101 ff.

Huelsen, C. "Il sito e le iscrizioni della schola Xantha sul foro romano," *Mitteilungen des*

deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung, 3, 1888, pp. 208 ff.

Husselman, E. M. "The Granaries of Karanis," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 83, 1952, pp. 56 ff.

Johnson, A. C. *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian. An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, 2. Baltimore, 1936.

——— "The ἐπιβολή of Land in Roman Egypt," *Aegyptus* 32, 1952, pp. 61 ff.

Jones, A. H. M. "The Aerarium and the Fiscus," *Journal of Roman Studies* 40, 1950, pp. 22 ff.

Jones, H. S. *Fresh Light on Roman Bureaucracy*. Oxford, 1920.

Jouguet, P. *La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 104. Paris, 1911.

——— *La domination romaine en Égypte aux deux premiers siècles après Jésus-Christ*. Alexandria, 1947.

Kolendo, J. "Sur la législation relative au grands domaines de l'Afrique romaine," *Revue des études anciennes* 65, 1963, pp. 80 ff.

Kornemann, E. "Domänen," *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. IV, 1924, cols. 227 ff.

——— *Doppelprinzipat und Reichsteilung im Imperium Romanum*. Leipzig/Berlin, 1930.

Kuhnke, H.-C. Οὐσιακὴ Γῆ. *Domänenland in den Papyri der Prinzipatszeit*. Diss., Köln, 1971.

Lallemand, J. *L'administration civile de l'Égypte de l'avènement de Dioclétien à la création du diocèse (284-382). Contribution à l'étude des rapports entre l'Égypte et l'empire à la fin du III^e et au IV^e siècle*. Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques. Mémoires, 2nd ser., 57:2. Bruxelles, 1964.

Lambert, J. N. *Les operae liberti. Contribution à l'histoire des droits de patronat*. Paris, 1934.

Lambertz, M. "Die griechischen Sklavennamen," LVII. *Jahresbericht über das k. k. Staatsgymnasium im VIII. Bezirk Wiens für das Schuljahr 1906/07*, Vienna, 1907, pp. 3 ff.; LVIII. *Jahresbericht ... für das Schuljahr 1908*, pp. 3 ff.

Last, H. "The Fiscus: A Note," *Journal of Roman Studies* 34, 1944, pp. 51 ff.

Lécrivain, C. *De agris publicis imperatoriisque ab Augusti aetate usque ad finem imperii Romani*. Paris, 1887.

Lesquier, J. *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*. Paris, 1911.

——— *L'armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien*. Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 41. Cairo, 1918.

Lesuisse, L. "L'aspect héréditaire de la succession impériale sous les Julio-Claudiens," *Les études classiques* 30, 1962, pp. 32 ff.

Levick, B. *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*. Oxford, 1967.

Lewis, N. *L'industrie du papyrus dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine*. Paris, 1934.

——— "A Veteran in Quest of a Home," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 90, 1959, pp. 139 ff.

——— "The Non-scholar Members of the Alexandrian Museum," *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser., 16, 1963, pp. 257 ff.

——— "Exemption from Liturgy in Roman Egypt," *Actes du X^e congrès international de papyrologues*, Wroclaw/Warsaw/Krakow, 1964, pp. 69 ff., continued in *Atti dell'XI congresso internazionale di papirologia*, Milan, 1965, pp. 508 ff.

——— "A New Document on the Magister Rei Privatae," *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 15, 1965, pp. 157 ff.

——— *Inventory of Compulsory Services in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. American Studies in Papyrology*, 3. Toronto, 1968.

——— “On the Starting Date of Liturgies in Roman Egypt,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 100, 1969, pp. 255 ff.

——— “BGU XI, 2064,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 5, 1970, pp. 25 ff.

——— “The γραφὴ δημοσίων of Roman Egypt,” *Chronique d’Égypte* 45, 1970, pp. 161 ff.

——— “‘Greco-Roman Egypt’: Fact or Fiction?” *Proceedings of the XII International Congress of Papyrology*. American Studies in Papyrology 7, Toronto, 1970, pp. 3 ff.

——— and Reinhold, M. *Roman Civilization. II, The Empire*. New York, 1955.

Lindsay, J. *Daily Life in Roman Egypt*. London, 1963.

MacLennan, H. *Oxyrhynchus. An Economic and Social Study*. Diss., Princeton, 1935.

MacMullen, R. “Three Notes on Imperial Estates,” *Classical Quarterly* 56, 1962, pp. 277 ff.

Macqueron, J. *Le travail des hommes libres dans l’antiquité romaine*. 2nd ed. Aix-en-Provence, 1958.

Martin, V. “Une γραφὴ ἀνδρῶν du première siècle,” *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 4, 1950, pp. 143 ff.

Masi, A. *Ricerche sulla “res privata” del “princeps.”* Univ. di Cagliari, Pubblicazioni della facoltà di giurisprudenza, 11. Milan, 1971.

Meyer, P. M. “Διοίκησις und Ἰδιος Λόγος,” *Festschrift zu Otto Hirschfelds sechzigstem Geburtstage*, Berlin, 1903, pp. 131 ff.

Millar, F. “The Fiscus in the First Two Centuries,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 53, 1963, pp. 29 ff.

——— “The Aerarium and its Officials under the Empire,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 54, 1964, pp. 33 ff.

Milne, J. G. “Graeco-Roman Leaden Tesserae from Abydos,” *Journal of Egyptian Archeology* 1, 1914, pp. 93 ff.

——— “The Ruin of Egypt by Roman Mismanagement,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 17, 1927, pp. 1 ff.

Mitteis, L. *Römisches Privatrecht bis auf die Zeit Diokletians. I, Grundbegriffe und Lehre von den juristischen Personen*. Systematisches Handbuch der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft, 1:6:1. Leipzig, 1908.

Modrzejewski, J. “La dévolution au fisc des biens vacants d’après le Gnomon de l’Idiologue (BGU 1210, § 4),” *Studi in onore di Edoardo Volterra*, VI, Milan, 1969, pp. 91 ff.

Moretti, L. “Due iscrizioni latine inedite di Roma,” *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* N. S. 38, 1960, pp. 68 ff.

Mussies, G. “Supplément à la liste des stratèges des noms égyptiens de H. Henne,” *Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* 14, 1965, pp. 13 ff.

Musurillo, H. A. *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs. Acta Alexandrinorum*. Oxford, 1954.

Nesselhauf, H. “Patrimonium und res privata des römischen Kaisers,” *Historia-Augusta-Colloquium Bonn* 1963. *Antiquitas* 4, Bonn, 1964, pp. 73 ff.

Nowicka, M. “A propos des tours-πύργοι dans les papyrus grecs,” *Archeologia* 21, 1970, pp. 53 ff.

Oates, J. F. “Philadelphia in the Fayum during the Roman Empire,” *Atti dell’XI congresso internazionale di papirologia*, Milan, 1966, pp. 451 ff.

——— “Landholding in Philadelphia in the Fayum (A.D. 216),” *Proceedings of the XII International Congress of Papyrology*. American Studies in Papyrology 7, Toronto, 1970, pp. 385 ff.

Oertel, F. *Die Liturgie. Studien zur ptolemäisch und kaiserlichen Verwaltung Ägyptens*. Leipzig, 1917.

Oost, S. I. “The Career of M. Antonius Pallas,” *American Journal of Philology* 79, 1958, pp.

113 ff.

Otto, W. *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten*. Leipzig, 1905, 1908.

Oxé, A. "Zur älteren Nomenklatur der römischen Sklaven," *Rheinisches Museum* 59, 1904, pp. 108 ff.

Parassoglou, G. "Lurius, Aelius and Aelius. A Note on SB 10527," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 11, 1973, pp. 21 ff.

— "A Prefectural Edict Regulating Temple Activities," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 13, 1974, pp. 21 ff.

Pelham, H. *The Imperial Domains and the Colonate. An Inaugural Lecture*. London, 1890.

Peremans, W. and Van 't Dack, E. *Prosopographia Ptolemaica. IV, L'agriculture et l'élevage*. *Studia Hellenistica*, 12. Louvain, 1959.

Pflaum, H.-G. *Essai sur les procurateurs équestres sous le haut-empire*. Paris, 1950.

— *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romain*. Paris, 1960, 1961.

Piganiol, A. "Le statut augustéen de l'Égypte et sa destruction," *Septième congrès international de papyrologie. Museum Helveticum* 10, 1953, pp. 193 ff.

Platner, S. B. and Ashby, T. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Oxford, 1929.

Plaumann, G. *Der Idioslogos. Untersuchungen zur Finanzverwaltung Ägyptens in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*. Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philos.-hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1918, 17. Berlin, 1919.

Poethke, G. *Epimerismos. Betrachtung zur Zwangspacht in Ägypten während der Prinzipatszeit*. *Papyrologica Bruxellensia*, 8. Bruxelles, 1969.

— "Epimerismos von Bodenflächen verschiedener οὐσίαι der drei Bezirke des Arsinoites," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 19, 1969, pp. 77 ff.

— "Neues zu P. Berl. inv. 16015," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 21, 1971, pp. 91 ff.

Préaux, C. *L'économie royale des Lagides*. Bruxelles, 1939.

— "Déclaration d'inondation déficitaire du Brooklyn Museum (P. Brooklyn gr. 5)," *Chronique d'Égypte* 38, 1963, pp. 117 ff.

Preisigke, F. *Girowesen im griechischen Ägypten, enthaltend Korngiro, Geldgiro, Girobank-notariat mit Einschluss des Archivwesens*. Strasbourg, 1970.

— *Namenbuch, enthaltend alle griechischen, lateinischen, ägyptischen, hebräischen, arabischen und sonstigen semitischen und nichtsemitischen Menschennamen, soweit sie in griechischen Urkunden Ägyptens sich vorfinden*. Heidelberg, 1922.

Ramsay, W. M. "Studies in the Roman Province of Galatia," *Journal of Roman Studies* 16, 1926, pp. 201 ff.

Reinhold, M. *Marcus Agrippa. A Biography*. Geneva, N.Y., 1933.

Reinmuth, O. W. *The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*. *Klio, Beiheft* 34; N.S. Heft 21. Leipzig, 1935.

Ricci, C. *La coltura della vite e la fabbricazione del vino nell'Egitto greco-romano*. Studi della scuola di papirologia, 4:1. Milan, 1924.

Riccobono, S., Jr. *Il gnomon dell'idios logos*. Palermo, 1950.

Roberts, C. H. and Skeat, T. C. "A Sale of ὑπόλογος at Tebtunis," *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, pp. 455 ff.

Rogers, R. S. "The Roman Emperors as Heirs and Legatees," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 78, 1947, pp. 140 ff.

Rossi, R. "Ψὺλοὶ Τόποι," *Aegyptus* 30, 1950, pp. 42 ff.

Rostovtzeff, M. (also Rostowzew). *Geschichte der Staatspacht in der römischen Kaiserzeit bis Diokletian*. Leipzig, 1902. Also as *Philologus, Suppl.* 9, 1904, pp. 329 ff.

——— *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*. Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete, Beiheft 1. Leipzig/Berlin, 1910.

——— “The Foundation of Social and Economic Life in Hellenistic Times,” *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 6, 1920, pp. 161 ff.

——— “Fiscus,” De Ruggiero, ed., *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane* III, 1922, pp. 96 ff.

——— *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C. A Study in Economic History*. Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, 6. Madison, 1922.

——— “Roman Exploitation of Egypt in the First Century A.D.,” *Journal of Economic and Business History* 1, 1928/9, pp. 337 ff.

——— *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (=SEHRE)*. 2nd ed., rev. by P. M. Fraser. Oxford, 1957.

Schmitz, H.-D. Τὸ ἔθος und verwandte Begriffe in den Papyri. Diss., Köln, 1970.

Schnebel, M. *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 7. Munich, 1925.

Schulten, A. *Die römischen Grundherrschaften. Eine agrarhistorische Untersuchung*. Weimar, 1896.

——— “Fundus,” De Ruggiero, ed., *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane* III, 1906, 338 ff.

Schulze, W. *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*. Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philol.-hist. Klasse, N.S. 5:5. Berlin, 1933.

Schwartz, J. “Ti. Claudius Balbillus, préfet d’Égypte et conseiller de Neron,” *Bulletin de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale* 49, 1950, pp. 45 ff.

Shelton, J. C. “A Land Lease from the Age of Augustus,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 101, 1970, pp. 489 ff.

——— “Ptolemaic Land ἐν ἀρέσει: An Observation on the Terminology,” *Chronique d’Égypte* 46, 1971, 113 ff.

Sigaro, V. A. *L’Italia agraria sotto Traiano*. Univ. de Louvain, Recueil de travaux d’histoire et de philosophie, 4th ser., 16. Louvain, 1958.

Stein, A. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Verwaltung Ägyptens unter römischer Herrschaft*. Stuttgart, 1915.

——— “Ἐπίσκεψις,” Charisteria Alois Rzach zum achtzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht, Reichenberg, 1930, pp. 176 ff.

——— “Balbillus,” *Aegyptus* 13, 1933, pp. 123 ff.

——— *Die Präfekten von Ägypten in römischer Zeit*. Bern, 1950.

Sutherland, C. H. V. “The State of the Imperial Treasury at the Death of Domitian,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 25, 1935, pp. 150 ff.

——— “Aerarium and Fiscus during the Early Empire,” *American Journal of Philology* 66, 1945, pp. 151 ff.

Swarney, P. R. *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos*. American Studies in Papyrology, 8. Toronto, 1970.

Swiderek, A. *La propriété foncière privée dans l’Égypte de Vespasien et sa technique agricole d’après P. Lond. 131 recto*. Academia scientiarum Polona, Bibliotheca antiqua, 1. Vratislav, 1960.

——— “Les Καίσαρος Οἰκονόμοι de l’Égypte romaine,” *Chronique d’Égypte* 45, 1970, pp. 157 ff.

——— “Ιουδαικὸς Λόγος,” *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 16-17, 1971, pp. 45 ff.

Syme, R. “The Imperial Finances under Domitian, Nerva and Trajan,” *Journal of Roman Studies*

20, 1930, pp. 55 ff.

——— *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford, 1939.

Talamanca, M. "Contributi allo studio delle vendite all'asta nel mondo classico," *Memorie della classe di scienze morali e storiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei*, 8th ser., 6:2, 1954, pp. 175 ff.

Taubenschlag, R. *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri. 322 B.C.-640 A.D.* 2nd ed. Warsaw, 1955.

Tomsin, A. "Un document de comptabilité fiscale. P. Lond., III, 900, p. 98," *Académie royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques*, 5th ser., 40, 1954, pp. 91 ff.

——— "Notes sur les *ousiai* de l'époque romaine," *Studi in onore di Aristidi Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*, Milan, 1957, 2, pp. 211 ff.

——— "Les continuités historiques dans le cadre des mesures prises par les Romains en Égypte concernant la propriété de la terre," *Actes du X^e congrès international de papyrologues*, Wrocław/Warsaw/Krakow, 1964, pp. 81 ff.

——— "Le recrutement de la main d'œuvre dans les domaines privés de l'Égypte romaine," *Studien zur Papyrologie und antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte Friedrich Oertel zum achtzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet*, Bonn, 1964, pp. 81 ff.

——— "Βασιλική et δημοσία γῆ dans l'Égypte romaine," *Mélanges de linguistique, de philologie et de méthodologie de l'enseignement des langues anciennes offerts à M. René Fohalle*, Gembloux, 1969, pp. 271 ff.

——— "L'*ousia* de Pallas dans P. Lond. 195.15-19 (vol. II, p. 127)," *Chronique d'Égypte* 46, 1971, pp. 352 ff.

Treggiari, S. *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*. Oxford, 1969.

Uebel, F. *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*. Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur & Kunst, Jahrgang 1968, 3. Berlin, 1968.

Uxkull-Gyllenband, W. G. *Der Gnomon des Idios Logos. II, Kommentar. Ägyptische Urkunden aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, 5:2. Berlin, 1934.

Villers, R. "La dévolution du principat dans la famille d'Auguste," *Revue des études latines* 28, 1950, pp. 235 ff.

Vitucci, G. "Libertus," De Ruggiero, ed., *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane* IV, 1953, pp. 905 ff.

Wachtel, R. "Sklaven und Freigelassene in der staatlichen Finanzverwaltung des römischen Kaiserreiches," *Acta antiqua academiae scientiarum Hungaricae* 15, 1967, pp. 341 ff.

Wallace, S. L. *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*. Princeton Univ. Studies in Papyrology, 2. Princeton, 1938.

Weaver, P. R. C. "The Status Nomenclature of the Imperial Freedmen," *Classical Quarterly* 13, 1963, pp. 272 ff.

——— "The Status Nomenclature of the Imperial Slaves," *Classical Quarterly* 14, 1964, pp. 134 ff.

——— "The Slave and Freedmen cursus in the Imperial Administration," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* N.S. 10, 1964, pp. 74 ff.

——— "Vicarius and vicarianus in the *familia Caesaris*," *Journal of Roman Studies* 54, 1964, pp. 117 ff.

——— "Freedmen Procurators in the Imperial Administration," *Historia* 14, 1965, pp. 460 ff.

——— *Familia Caesaris. A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves*. Cambridge,

1972.

Weingärtner, D. G. *Die Ägyptenreise des Germanicus. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen*, 11. Bonn, 1969.

Wessely, C. *Karanis und Soknopaiou Nesos. Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philol.-hist. Klasse*, 47:4. Vienna, 1902.

— *Topographie des Faijûm (Arsinoites Nomus) in griechischer Zeit*. Vienna, 1904.

Westermann, W. L. "The 'Uninundated Lands' in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt," *Classical Philology* 15, 1920, pp. 120 ff.; 16, 1921, pp. 169 ff.

— *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 40. Philadelphia, 1955.

White, K. W. "Latifundia. A Critical Review of the Evidence on Large Estates in Italy and Sicily up to the End of the First Century A.D.," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London* 14, 1967, pp. 62 ff.

Wilcken, U. "Kaiserliche Tempelverwaltung in Aegypten," *Hermes* 23, 1888, pp. 592 ff.

— *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte*. Leipzig/Berlin, 1899.

— "Zu den jüdischen Aufständen in Aegypten," *Hermes* 54, 1919, pp. 111 ff.

— and Mitteis, L. *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*. I:1, *Historischer Teil, Grundzüge*, by U. Wilcken. Leipzig/Berlin, 1912.

Wipszycka, E. "The δωρεά of Apollonios the Dioeketes in the Memphite Nome," *Klio* 39, 1961, pp. 153 ff.

Wolf, M. *Untersuchungen zur Stellung der kaiserlichen Freigelassenen und Sklaven in Italien und den Westprovinzen*. Diss., Münster, 1965.

Youtie, H. C. "Parerga Papyrologica," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 78, 1947, pp. 105 ff.

— "Two Notes on Papyri," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 1, 1967, pp. 163 ff.

— and Pearl, O. M. "Notes on Papyri," *American Journal of Philology* 63, 1942, pp. 294 ff.

Zablocka, J. "Die Bedeutung von ἡ οὐσία in Inschriften aus der Kaiserzeit," *Klio* 49, 1967, pp. 165 f.

Zucker, F. "Beobachtungen zu den permanenten Klerosnamen," *Studien zur Papyrologie und antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte Friedrich Oertel zum achtzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet*, Bonn, 1964, pp. 101 ff.

Zulueta, F. de. *De patrociniiis vicorum. A Commentary on Cod. Theodos. 11, 24 and Cod. Justinian. 11, 54*. Oxford, 1909.

Addenda

Since the submission of the manuscript to the publisher early in 1973, two short but important works have appeared, and it is indeed a pity that I have not been able to make use of them: R. MacMullen, "Two Notes on Imperial Properties," *Athenaeum* 64, 1976, pp. 19-36, and D. J. Crawford, "Imperial Estates," in M. I. Finley, ed., *Studies in Roman Property*, Cambridge, 1976, pp. 35-70 and 173-207. Dr. Crawford and I do not always see eye to eye, but her collection of the pertinent evidence is exhaustive, her analysis of it sensitive and penetrating, and her conclusions thought-provoking. Some stimulating remarks on my work have already been made by Dr. A. Bowman in *JRS* 46, 1976, pp. 164-5 and 167.

A number of papyri pertinent to the subject of this book have been also published in the meantime. It has proven impossible to make any systematic use of them in the body of the work, but they have been incorporated in the collection of the evidence presented in Appendix II. They are: *BGU* 2286; *P. Bonn.* inv. 4 (*ZPE* 25, 1977, p. 164); *P. Coll. Youtie* 19 and 63; *P. Oxy.* 3089, 3092, 3103 and 3170; *SB* 11011; and *P. Vindob. Tandem* 10. The last is a particularly important text published with a rich commentary; mention is made of an estate τοῦ κυρίου Τίβεριου Κλαυδίου [Καίσαρος Αὐτοκράτορος πρότερον Ἀντωνίας Σεβαστῆς πρότερον Γαῖου Ἰουλίου Ἀλεξάνδρου?] (lines 7-10, cf. 64-7); of οὐσίας τῆς θεᾶς καὶ κυρίας Ἀγριππίνης Σεβαστῆς (lines 38-9); and of οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Τίβεριου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος πρότερον Ἀντωνίας Σεβαστῆς καὶ Ἰουλίας Σεβαστῆς (lines 40-4), all very likely in the Arsinoite.

Lastly, three of the papyri mentioned in the Abbreviations (p. viii) have since been published by myself: *P. Sorbonne* inv. 2364 (*P. Weill* inv. 104) and *P. Yale* inv. 443 in *BASP* 12, 1975, pp. 85-92; and *P. Sorbonne* inv. 2370 (*P. Weill* inv. 114) in *EEThess.* 15, 1976, pp. 247-51.

Page 7, note 16. On ἄνω and κάτω οὐσία see also A. E. Hanson in *Le monde grec. Homages à Claire Préaux*, Bruxelles, 1975, p. 610, and P. J. Sijpesteijn, *The Family of the Tiberii Iulii Theones* (*Studia Amstelodamensia*, V), Amsterdam, 1976, p. 10 with n. 6.

Page 13, note 45. My correction of *P. Oxy.* 3051.7 has been anticipated by J. C. Shelton; see *P. Oxy.* XLV, p. xviii.

Page 15. In *P. Soc.* 1150 (see the revised edition and notes of G. Messeri in M. Manfredi, ed., *Correzioni e riedizioni di papyri della Società Italiana*, Florence, 1977, pp. 40-9), dated 19 Nov. 27 B.C., occurs the phrase οἱ προεστῶ[τ]ε[σ] τῆς πρότερον Πετενεφιείους νυνεὶ δὲ Κα[ί]σαρος Αὐτοκράτορο[ς γῆς] (lines 5-6). Γῆς is indeed a logical and acceptable supplement, but so is οὐσίας—which would not only admirably explain the presence of προεστῶτες (see above, p. 53), but also present us with the earliest evidence of an estate owned by Augustus in Egypt.

Page 19, with note 29. On Dionysodoros see also G. Bastianini, *Gli strategi dell'Arsinoites in epoca romana* (*Papyrologica Bruxellensia*, 11), Bruxelles, 1972, pp. 8, 11-12.

Page 30. Dr. Crawford has drawn my attention to Strabo 17.818, where an island in the Thebais particularly productive of the best date is characterized as μεγίστην τελοῦσα πρόσοδον τοῖς ἡγεμόσι· βασιλικὴ γὰρ ἦν, ἴδιωτη δ' οὐ μετῆν, καὶ νῦν τῶν ἡγεμόνων ἔστι. By ἡγεμόνες the Roman emperors could, I suppose, be meant, but it is more natural to understand the word as referring to the prefects of Egypt.

Page 48, note 81 and page 57, with note 44. On *P. Med.* 6 see now N. Lewis, *BASP* 11, 1974, pp. 52-4, and *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity*, Oxford, 1974, pp. 106-8 and 114.

Page 57, with note 45. On the analogy of *P. Oxy.* 2837.9-10, I would now read *P. Mich.* 560. 8-9 ἐν τῇ ἀτελείᾳ(α) ἀρουραν etc.

Page 66, no. 9. See now Sijpesteijn's work mentioned above, addendum to page 7.

Page 66, no. 10. See further my remarks in *Studia Papyrologica* 14, 1975, pp. 85-102.

Page 66, no. 12. See my remarks in *EETHess.* 15, 1976, pp. 247-51.

Page 67, no. 21. See further J. F. Gilliam in *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne offerts à William Seston*, Paris, 1977, pp. 217-25.

Page 74. On *P. Athen.* 30 verso see my short correction in *Hellenica* 29, 1976, p. 51.

Pages 85-6, with note 10. The earliest references to a *magister rei privatae* are *P. Oxy.* 3247 and *P. Beatty Panop.* 1 of A.D. 298.

Page 87, with note 16. It is very gratifying to note that P. J. Parsons (*Chronique* 49, 1974, pp. 146-7) has independently reached the same conclusions from *SB* 9658 as I did. In my note 16 add now the important *P. Oxy.* 3263.9-10, ταῖς τοῦ ἴδιου λόγου καὶ ἀρχιερέως ἐπιτροπαῖς, and see J. Rea's comments ad loc.

Indexes

I. Sources

A. Ancient Authors

Augustus, *Res gestae* 5.24: 3
Dio Cassius 49.37.6: 26
 51.5.4-5: 5
 51.8.5: 3
 51.15.7: 21
 51.17: 17
 51.17.7: 5
 51.18.1: 7
 55.7.5: 15
 59.1.1: 19
 61.1.2: 23
 62.12.3-4: 26
 62.14.3: 23
 63.8.3 ff.: 26
 64.4.1: 26
 65.8 ff.: 29
Dio Chrys., *Or.* 7.11: 10
 31.58: 10
Fronto, *Ep.* 1.8: 15
Harpokration, s.v. οὐσίας δίκη: 10
H. A. S., *Sept. Sev.* 12.4: 85
Herodian 11.4.7: 27
Herodotus 2.77.4: 32
 2.149-50: 32
Hesychius, s.v. οὐσία: 10
Io. Damask., *PG* 94.564: 10
Josephus, *Ant.* 18.205 ff.: 19
 19.276: 17
Juvenal, *Sat.* 10.15-16: 24
Paterculus, *see* Velleius
Petronius, *Cena Trim.*: 50
Philo, *Leg.* 44: 15
 ad *Gaium* 2.572: 20
Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.* 6.42: 46
 Vita Soph. 1.21 (520): 46
 2.19 (600): 10
Plutarch, *Apophth. Aug.* 4.207B: 24
Pollux, *Onom.* 6.196: 10
 8.145: 10
Seneca, *Dial.* 3.18: 20
 7.17.2: 24-5
 12.19.4: 25
 Ep. 77.3: 25, 50
Strabo 17.1.12 (797): 27, 51
 17.1.51 (818): 101
Suda, s.v. οὐσία: 10
Suetonius, *Aug.* 18: 7
 89: 65
 101: 17
 Tib. 15.1: 15
 23: 17
 51: 17
 76: 19
 Gaius 14.1: 19
 24: 20
 Claudius 44: 23
 Nero 35: 25
 35.5: 23
 50: 26
 Galba 15: 26
 Dom. 7.2: 46
 14.2: 46
Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.8: 17
 2.59 ff.: 17
 12.69: 23
 14.52 ff.: 24
 14.54: 25
 14.65: 23
 15.39.1: 15
 15.65: 29
 Hist. 1.11: 17
 1.20: 26
 1.73: 26
 1.80 ff.: 26
Velleius Paterculus 2.39: 3

B. Inscriptions, Coins, Papyri and Tesserae

(Citations of a textual correction are distinguished by an asterisk)

AE 1903, no. 226: *see SB* 4231
 1921, no. 69: 16
 1961, no. 280: 85
APF 2, 1903, p. 562: *see SB* 4231
BGU 8: 67, 89
 31: 37, 83
 63: 66
 84: 33
 102: 51
 104: 37, 75, 82
 105 (*WChr.* 346): 37, 79
 106 (*WChr.* 174): 66, 89
 140 (*MChr.* 373, *Sel. Pap.* 213): 6
 156 (*WChr.* 175): 51, 68, 89
 160: 37, 72, 75
 172: 37, 82
 181: 13, 16, 56, 73, 79
 194 (*WChr.* 84) 63
 199 verso: 48-9, 58, 71, 75
 202: 37, 82
 204: 37, 75
 206: 37, 76
 210: 66
 211: 37, 76
 212: 49, 70
 262: 66
 277: 18 n. 21*, 48, 55, 71-3, 75
 280: 37, 70
 284: 37, 79
 337 (*WChr.* 92): 49
 362 (*WChr.* 96, *Sel. Pap.* 340, 404): 86, 89
 382: 66
 438: 37, 76, 81
 441: 37, 72
 462 (*WChr.* 376): 86
 512 (*WChr.* 362): 66
 552: 65
 559 (*WChr.* 363): 45, 90*
 619: 12, 46
 620 (*WChr.* 186): 85
 622: 28
 650 (*WChr.* 365): 13, 16, 53, 56-7, 59 n. 57*, 60 n.
 58*, 71, 81
 653: 49, 71
 655: 6
 708: 76
 810: 48-9, 72, 75
 835: 83
 889: 28 n. 93*, 79
 891: 89*
 926: 84
 976: 31
 979: 31, 74
 980: 31, 74
 985: 75
 1047: 18 n. 22*, 49 n. 86*, 55, 55 n. 31*, 69, 90
 1118: 8, 24
 1120: 8
 1123: 8
 1125: 24
 1129 (*MChr.* 254): 8
 1200: 86
 1210 (*Sel. Pap.* 206): *see Gnomon of the Idios Logos*
 1212: 10
 1563: 58
 1636: 41-2, 44, 47-8, 74, 76, 78
 1646: 29, 55, 74
 1669: 52, 67
 1730 (*Sel. Pap.* 209): 10
 1893: 12 n. 36*, 58, 67, 70, 78
 1894: 24 n. 61*, 47-9, 70, 72, 74, 76-83
 1895: 9, 79-80, 90
 1898: 76
 1943: 19
 2022: 88
 2023: 87-8
 2026: 43
 2047: 24, 65
 2064 (*SB* 10761): 46, 71
 2075: 43
 2101: 76, 88
 2102: 66
 2126: 66
 2178: 65
 2286: 79, 100
CIG III 4956: *see SB* 8248
 4957: *see Edict of Ti. Iulius Alexandros*
 5069: *see WChr.* 73
CIL III 53 (Dessau, *ILS* 8759g): 89
 IV 701, 702 (Dessau, *ILS* 91): 3
 V 7870 (Dessau, *ILS* 6762): 88
 VI 143: 23
 1686: 21
 2260: 19
 4016: 16
 4032: 16
 4095: 16
 4124: 24
 4125: 24
 4245: 24
 4336: 18
 4337: 18
 4339: 18
 4341: 18
 4344: 18
 4351: 18

4357: 18
 4358: 17
 4387: 18
 4398: 18
 4409: 18
 4903: 19
 5188: 17
 5215: 19
 5540: 18
 6612: 21
 8413: 24
 8470: 23
 8532: 17
 8607: 24
 8726: 26
 8738: 17
 8753: 24
 8819: 27
 8901: 24
 8954: 27
 9066: 17
 10395: 24
 11390: 17
 12402: 66
 15027: 26
 15035: 24
 15114: 19
 15357: 26
 15551: 27
 15616: 19, 27
 16586: 26
 17274: 24
 18048: 27
 19926: 16
 22970: 16
 29154: 19
 33767: 18
 36911: 27
 37759: 27
 VIII 8810: 85
 X 3699: 21
 6000: 89
 6666: 24
 7489: 17
 7980: 26
 XII 257: 19
 XIV 2060: 27
 2504: 89
 3080-4: 21
 CPJ 420: 17
 420a: *see P. Pyl.* 166
 462b: *see P. Strassb.* 299 recto
 CPR 1 (*MChr.* 220): 88-9
 19 (*MChr.* 69): 85
 243 (*WChr.* 367): 9, 31, 48, 55, 73
 245: 66
 Dattari, no. 6506: *see SB* 6019
 Dessau, *ILS* 91: *see CIL* IV 701, 702
 6762: *see CIL* V 7870
 8759g: *see CIL* III 53
 8794: 6
 8995: 30
 Edict of Ti. Iulius Alexandros (*CIG* III 4957, *IGRR* I
 1263, *OGIS* 669, *SB* 8444): 52, 58-9, 67
Gnomon of the Idios Logos: 64, 67
IGRR 1262: *see SB* 8248
 1263: *see Edict of Ti. Iulius Alexandros*
 1325: *see SB* 4231
MChr. 59: *see P. Oxy.* 486
 69: *see CPR* 19
 220: *see CPR* 1
 248: *see P. Oxy.* 506
 254: *see BGU* 1129
 348: *see P. Tebt.* 317
 373: *see BGU* 140
 376: *see P. Amh.* 63
 377-8: *see P. Giss.* 40
Monum. Ancyra: *see Index IA*, s.v. *Augustus, Res gestae*
MPER: *see P. Rainer*
OGIS 665: *see SB* 8248
 669: *see Edict of Ti. Iulius Alexandros*
P. Aberd. 24: 49, 71
 29: 9, 57, 79
 50: 80, 82, 87-8
 51: 87
 96: 9
 151: 26, 76
 152: 12, 82
P. Acad. fr. 14 (unpubl.): viii, 31, 74, 78
 fr. 36 (unpubl.): viii
P. Achmîm 6 + *P. Bour.* 41b: 66
 8: *see WChr.* 81
P. Amh. 63 (*MChr.* 376): 59
 77 (*WChr.* 277, *Sel. Pap.* 282): 90
 96: 32
Papyrologica Lugd.-Bat.: *see P. Oxford, P. Vindob.*
Bosw.
P. Athen. 14: 48
 19: 12 n. 36*, 79
 30 verso: 74, 101*
 32: 54, 71
P. Bad. 169: 63
P. Beatty Panop. 1: 11, 52, 101
 2: 8
P. Berl. inv. 11529 (unpubl.) + *SB* 10512: *see SB* 10512
 11534: *see P. Berl. Leihg.* 29
 11550 recto: *see P. Berl. Leihg.* 31
 11550 verso: *see P. Berl. Leihg.* 33
 11561 recto: *see P. Berl. Leihg.* 37
P. Berl. Leihg. 1 (*P. Sitol.* 1, *SB* 7193) recto: 42-3, 58,
 74, 76
 1 (*P. Sitol.* 1, *SB* 7193) verso: 25, 37, 39, 42-3, 71, 76,
 78-83
 4 (*P. Sitol.* 4, *SB* 7196) recto: 42, 74, 76

P. Berl. Leihg. (cont.)
 5: 39, 41
 13: 77
 16B: 55
 16C: 33, 55
 18: 25-6
 29 (unpubl.): viii, 24, 34, 39, 44, 72, 77-81
 31 (unpubl.): viii, 70
 33 (unpubl.): viii, 83
 37 (unpubl.): viii, 77

P. Bibl. Nat. Suppl. gr. 1374 fr. 44 + *P. Rein. inv. 2062*
 (unpubl.): viii, 89
 fr. 48a-b (unpubl.): viii

P. Bibl. Univ. Giss.: see *P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl.*

P. Bonn. inv. 4 (ZPE 25, 1977, p. 164): 76, 100

P. Bour. 41b: see *P. Achmîm 6*
 42: 13 nn. 43*, 44*, 45, 17, 22 n. 52*, 24, 28, 34-6,
 38, 44, 66, 70, 72, 74-83

P. Brooklyn gr. 5 (Chronique 38, 1963, p. 177): 87-8

P. Cair. Goodsp. 18: 37, 76
 24: 37, 76

P. Cair. Isidor. 3: 85

P. Cair. Preis. 4 (WChr. 379): 28, 32, 85
 15: 65
 30: 65

P. Chepteliers 20: see *P. Strassb. 28*

P. Chic. (SB, Beiheft 2A) 5: 37, 82
 6: 37, 72
 7: 37, 70
 10: 37, 72
 13: 66
 16: 37, 82
 18: 13, 37, 82
 19: 37, 83
 23: 37, 79
 26: 37, 82
 27: 37, 76
 28: 37, 76
 31: 37, 72
 32: 37, 79
 35: 37, 82
 36: 37, 79
 39: 37, 79
 41: 37, 79
 42: 37, 80
 43: 37, 79
 47: 37, 83
 48: 37, 79
 49: 37, 79
 50: 37, 79
 52: 37, 77
 53: 37, 82
 55: 37, 83
 56: 66
 57: 37, 76
 60: 66
 61: 37, 80

62: 37, 82
 63: 66
 64: 37, 76
 65: 37, 80, 82
 67: 37, 82-3
 68: 37, 76
 70: 37, 72, 76
 71: 37, 82
 75: 37, 76
 76: 37, 83
 77: 37, 76, 83
 78: 37, 79
 81: 37, 72, 80
 82: 37, 76
 84: 37, 76
 87: 37, 79

P. Col. 1 recto 2: 39
 1 verso 1a: 47-8, 71-2, 76, 78, 80, 82-3
 1 verso 4: 71, 76, 80, 83
 1 verso 5: 58, 89
 120: 10

P. Coll. Youtie 19: 79, 81, 100
 63: 72, 75, 100

P. Erl. 24 verso [no. 19]: 88*
 78 [no. 20]: 87

P. Fay. 23: 46
 38: 68
 40: 11, 22, 58, 70
 60: 12 n. 36*, 47, 70
 82: 12 n. 36*, 58, 78
 87 (Sel. Pap. 371): 12
 101: 8
 251: 33

P. Flor. 40: 12, 31, 73
 64: 85
 94: 85
 278: 87-8
 337: 29, 74, 82
 387: 65

P. Gen. 38 (WChr. 366): 19, 47, 77

P. Giss. 40 (MChr. 377, 378, Sel. Pap. 215): 90
 48: 87-8

P. Giss. Univ.-Bibl. 12: 13, 48 n. 79*, 76
 13: 53
 52: 28-9, 38 n. 32*, 39, 44, 71, 74, 77, 82

P. Gron. 2: 38, 66

P. Hamb. 3: 13, 16, 24 n. 61*, 29, 71, 78-9, 82
 8: 52, 59, 66
 9: 53
 11: 87-8
 12 (WChr. 235): 87-8
 34: 13, 48, 80
 36: 12
 64: 65
 101: 16 n. 6*, 81

P. Hib. 279: 31, 82

P. Iand. 26: 49, 75

P. Karanis: see *P. Chic.*

P. Leit. 11 (SB 10202): 12, 46
14 (SB 10205): 48
16 (SB 10207): 87-8

P. Lips. 106: 68
113: 66
115: 13, 31, 82

P. Lond. 194 [II, p. 127]: 66
195 [II, p. 127]: 9-10, 13, 23 n. 58*, 45, 54, 56, 77-8, 81
214 [II, p. 161] (*WChr.* 177): 67
280 [II, p. 193] (*WChr.* 312): 13, 21, 45, 52, 56, 59, 73, 81
445 [II, p. 166]: 11, 17, 54, 61, 71-2
900 [III, p. 89]: 39, 41, 70, 76, 80, 82-3
1157 [III, p. 110] (*WChr.* 375, *Sel. Pap.* 355): 87-8
1171 recto [III, p. 179]: 8, 44
1171 verso [III, p. 107]: 58
1213-15 [III, p. 121]: 24, 65
1223 [III, p. 139] (*WChr.* 370): 52, 65, 67

P. Louvre (Rostovtzeff, *Kolonat*, p. 121) (unpubl.): viii, 13, 72

P. Lugd.-Bat.: see *P. Oxford*, *P. Vindob. Bosw.*

P. Med. 6: 17, 48, 53, 57, 72, 101
65 (SB 9014): 12, 46 n. 58*, 74, 77-8, 81

P. Meyer 3: 12, 46, 89

P. Mich. 121 recto I.iii: 57, 71
121 recto III.x: 11, 49, 55, 56 n. 38*, 57, 71
123 recto: 61
223: 18, 37, 46-9, 58, 75, 77-8, 80, 82
224: 13, 18, 37, 46-7, 71-2, 75-83
225: 18, 37, 46-8, 71, 75, 77-8, 80-2
232: 8, 67
244: 11, 61-3, 71
274-5: 9, 13, 16, 71, 79
312: 53, 63, 65
357: 46-7, 76, 79-80
372: 18, 37, 44, 75-8, 80-1
374: 71
524: 75
539: 21, 61 nn. 66*, 69, 75
540: 56, 71
555-6: 75
557: 75
560: 19, 47, 55, 57, 57 n. 45*, 72-3, 101*
582: 60-1, 63
599: 12, 46
616: 68, 89
617: 48, 89
620: 52, 56, 67

P. Mich. inv. 358-71, 374-5 (*ZPE* 1, 1967, pp. 163 ff.):
66, *cf.* 100
366 (*ZPE* 1, 1967, p. 165): 7, *cf.* 100
1427 (*TAPA* 101, 1970, p. 491): 60

P. Mich. Diss. Michael 14: 72

P. Mil.: see *P. Med.*

P. Mil. Vogl. 52: 70

75: 70, 77
87: 59
88: 59
98: 45
167: 59
196: 59
251: 45, 47, 55-6, 83

P. Osl. 21: 52, 77
26a: 76, 80
33: 16, 65
40: 32
89: 48
90: 48
91: 48
111: 66
115: 63
123: 19-20, 35, 53-4, 70
136: 9, 45
137: 59

P. Oxford 3: 9, 89-90

P. Oxy. 58 (*WChr.* 378, *Sel. Pap.* 226): 11, 52
62 (*WChr.* 278): 10 n. 30*, 29 n. 97*, 74
78: 87-8
224: 49, 52
244: 21, 31, 70
277: 8
486 (*MChr.* 59): 56
506 (*MChr.* 248): 32
513 (*WChr.* 183, *Sel. Pap.* 77): 68
578: 32
633: 32
635: 8
721 (*WChr.* 369): 8
729: 60
735: 51
919: 66
970: 88
986: 76
1046: 66
1113: 87-8
1124: 60
1200: 32
1208: 32
1270: 32
1274: 90
1276: 32
1434: 28, 58, 66, 68*
1514: 90
1530: 66
1578: 66
1630: 66
1634: 32, 66
1637: 67
1659: 66
1696: 32
2123: 87-8
2134: 32

P. Oxy. (cont.)
 2185: 12 n. 36*
 2228: 85, 90
 2410: 12, 65
 2566: 66
 2664: 87-8
 2722: 32
 2723: 32
 2837: 11, 21, 31, 53, 56-7, 71, 101
 2847: 8
 2854: 67
 2873: 9, 11-12, 25, 31, 57, 59, 82
 2957: 65
 2958: 43
 2997: 66
 3031: 85
 3046: 88
 3047: 74, 88
 3051: 13 n. 45*, 82, 100*
 3089: 89, 100
 3092: 89, 100
 3103: 90, 100
 3170: 31, 75, 100
 3247: 101
 3263: 101

P. Panop.: see *P. Beatty Panop.*

P. Par. 69: see *WChr.* 41

P. Petaus 44: 43
 75: 9, 12, 46
 76: 9, 12, 46
 77: 9, 12, 46, 79
 78: 9, 12, 46, 79

P. Phil. 9: 66
 15: 33
 19: 13 n. 43*, 48-9, 70-1, 75, 77-9, 81

P. Princ. 9: 63
 11: 21 n. 43*, 55, 70
 14: 9, 21 n. 43*, 55, 70
 50: 52, 67
 56: 66

P. Rainer (Wessely, *Karanis*, p. 4) (unpubl.): 73

P. Rein. inv. 2062 (unpubl.): viii, 31, 70, 74-5, 78, 82, 89

P. Ross.-Georg. II 12: 56, 61, 63, 70-1
 II 42: 12, 26, 31, 75
 V 53: 79

P. Ryl. 87: 9, 12, 31, 73
 98(a) (*Sel. Pap.* 351): 48
 99: 9, 11-12, 31, 77, 82
 126: 54-6, 72, 75
 127: 11, 16, 19, 52, 67, 73, 81
 128: 67
 129: 76
 131: 65
 132: 53, 67
 133: 67
 134: 13, 18, 54, 56, 71, 73
 135: 65

138: 9, 18 n. 27*, 45, 53-5, 70-1, 73, 77
 140: 54, 56, 70
 141: 54, 56, 63, 70
 145: 53, 67
 146: 67
 148: 11, 20, 53-4, 56, 71
 152: 67
 157 (*Sel. Pap.* 52): 9, 32
 166 (*CPJ* 420a): 9, 17 n. 12*, 52, 57, 67, 75
 167: 67
 168: 9, 48
 171: 12-13, 22, 45, 54-7, 62, 70, 77, 79-81
 207: 13n. 43*, 24 n. 61*, 25, 71, 77-83
 207a: 6
 213: 30
 215: 30 n. 5*, 31, 45, 74
 216: 58
 383: 80
 387: 77
 427 (15): 78
 427 (22): 9, 13 n. 42*, 25 n. 72*, 30, 45, 78
 561: 68
 596: 87-8
 600: 67
 658: 11 n. 31*
 682: 87-8
 684: 12, 73

PSA, PSAA, PSA Athen.: see *P. Athen.*

P. Sarap. 2: see *P. Strassb.* 74
 34: 9, 32
 75: see *P. Strassb.* 78

PSI: see *P. Soc.*

P. Sitol. 1: see *P. Ber. Leihg.* 1
 4: see *P. Berl. Leigh.* 4

P. Soc. 14: 60
 160: 48
 232: 68
 235: 68
 315: 18, 68
 320: 8
 446 (*Sel. Pap.* 221): 58
 448: 31, 82
 458: 48
 735: 48
 928: 68, 87
 1028: 55-6, 72
 1036: 58, 66
 1066: 88
 1105: 68
 1125: 85
 1129: 8
 1147: 63
 1150: 100*
 1243: 33

P. Soc. inv. 1345 recto (*SIFC* 43, 1971, pp. 144 ff.): 28, 74

P. Sorbonne inv. 2364 (P. Weill inv. 104) (*BASP* 12,

1975, p. 87): viii, 17, 54, 62, 72, 100
 2367 (P. Weill inv. 108) (unpubl.): viii, 65
 2370 (P. Weill inv. 114) (*EETHess.* 15, 1976, pp. 247 f.): viii, 66, 100
P. Spec. Isag., pl. xi, no. 21: *see WChr.* 176
P. Strassb. 5: 32, 90
 10: 67
 25: 11
 28 (*P. Chepteliers* 20): 67
 67: 66
 68: 66
 69: 66
 74 (*P. Sarap.* 2): 52, 65
 78 (*P. Sarap.* 75): 66
 118: 19, 54, 76
 210: 45, 77
 267: 21 n. 43*, 46-7, 70, 74
 299 recto (*CPJ* 452b): 25 n. 72*, 30-1, 58, 78
 321: 9
 551: 42-3, 74, 77, 80, 83
P. Strassb. inv. 1108 (*APF* 4, 1908, pp. 142 f.): 48, 75
P. Tebt. 6 (*WChr.* 332): 10, 66
 293 (*WChr.* 75, *Sel. Pap.* 338): 63
 296 (*WChr.* 79): 51
 298 (*WChr.* 90): 25, 49
 302 (*WChr.* 368): 4, 86
 308 (*WChr.* 319): 48
 309: 59
 310: 59
 317 (*MChr.* 348): 89
 343: 12, 45, 47, 80
 369: 43
 401: 55, 70
 503: 34, 46
 609f: 12 n. 36*
 700: 10
P. Thead. 53: 70
P. Trin. Col. inv. 112: 48, *see also SB* 10566
P. Variae Alex. Giss. 1 (*SB* 10617): 87-8
P. Vars. 11: 58
P. Vindob. Bosw. 1: 25
P. Vindob. Tandem 10: 69-72, 75, 100
P. Weill inv. 104: *see P. Sorbonne* inv. 2364
 108: *see P. Sorbonne* inv. 2367
 114: *see P. Sorbonne* inv. 2370
P. Wisc. 9: 32
 19: 7, 66
 20: 66
 21: 7, 66
 22: 66
 31: 89-90
 33: 48
 34: 48, 89-90
 35: 48, 89
 37: 48
P. Würz. 11: 9, 48, 76
P. Yale 69: 66
P. Yale inv. 254 (unpubl.): 72, 79
 296 (unpubl.): 38
 443 (*BASP* 12, 1975, p. 91): 31, 82, 100
SB 3924: 58
 4226: 18, 49, 57, 69, 81
 4231 (*APF* 2, 1903, p. 562; *AE* 1903, no. 226; *IGRR* I 1325): 55, 89-90
 4414: 13, 75, 79
 4421: 85
 4639: 87
 5670: 12, 46-7, 71
 6019 (Dattari, no. 6506): 10, 22, 73
 7193: *see P. Berl. Leihg.* 1
 7196: *see P. Berl. Leihg.* 4
 7375: 61
 7419: 10
 7468: 59
 7742 (=10947): 9, 45, 57, 79
 8008: 10
 8248 (*CIG* III 4956, *OGIS* 665, *IGRR* I 1262): 58
 8444: *see Edict of Ti. Iulius Alexandros*
 8971: 32
 8972: 48, 79
 9014: *see P. Med.* 65
 9150: 17, 49, 53, 71-2
 9205: 12, 77
 9210: 34, 47, 89
 9224: 16, 56, 60 nn. 60*, 61*, 61, 79, 81
 9387: 66
 9562: 66
 9658: 68, 87, 101
 10202: *see P. Leit.* 11
 10205: *see P. Leit.* 14
 10207: *see P. Leit.* 16
 10512 + *P. Berl.* inv. 11529: viii, 13, 28, 39-40, 44, 74, 77-9, 81-3
 10527: 9, 28, 79, 89
 10535: 65
 10536: 11, 17, 55-6, 72
 10566: 75, *see also P. Trin. Col.* inv. 112
 10617: *see P. Variae Alex. Giss.* 1
 10761: *see BGU* 2064
 10892: 66, 77
 10893: 26, 28, 70, 74-5, 77
 10947: *see* 7742
 11011: 71, 77, 79-80, 100
SB, Beiheft 2A: *see P. Chic.*
Sel. Pap. 52: *see P. Ryl.* 157
 77: *see P. Oxy.* 513
 206: *see Gnomon of the Idios Logos*
 209: *see BGU* 1730
 213: *see BGU* 140
 215: *see P. Giss.* 40
 221: *see P. Soc.* 446
 226: *see P. Oxy.* 58
 242: *see WChr.* 41
 280: *see WChr.* 176

Sel. Pap. (cont.)

282: *see P. Amh.* 77
 338: *see P. Tebt.* 293
 340, 404: *see BGU* 362
 351: *see P. Ryl.* 98(a)
 355: *see P. Lond.* 1157
 371: *see P. Fay.* 87
 404, 340: *see BGU* 362
 425: *see WChr.* 81
VBP: see P. Bad.
WChr. 41 (*P. Par.* 69): 88
 72 (*P. Rainer*): 87
 73 (*CIG III* 5069): 86, 90
 75: *see P. Tebt.* 293
 79: *see P. Tebt.* 296
 81 (*P. Achmîm* 8, *Sel. Pap.* 425): 51, 86-7, 89
 84: *see BGU* 194
 90: *see P. Tebt.* 298
 92: *see BGU* 337
 96: *see BGU* 362
 170: *see BGU* 8
 174: *see BGU* 106
 175: *see BGU* 156

176 (*P. Spec. Isag.*, pl. xi, no. 21): 12, 22, 45, 53, 56, 59, 80
 177: *see P. Lond.* 214
 183: *see P. Oxy.* 513
 186: *see BGU* 620
 235: *see P. Hamb.* 12
 277: *see P. Amh.* 77
 278: *see P. Oxy.* 62
 312: *see P. Lond.* 280
 319: *see P. Tebt.* 308
 332: *see P. Tebt.* 6
 346: *see BGU* 105
 362: *see BGU* 512
 363: *see BGU* 599
 365: *see BGU* 650
 366: *see P. Gen.* 38
 367: *see CPR* 243
 368: *see P. Tebt.* 302
 369: *see P. Oxy.* 721
 370: *see P. Lond.* 1223
 375: *see P. Lond.* 1157
 376: *see BGU* 462
 378: *see P. Oxy.* 58
 379: *see P. Cair. Preis.* 4

II. Persons and Places

Adamas, τόπος or κλῆρος of, 9
Aeimnestos, land-owner, 67
Aelia, *see Paetina*
Aelius, *see Eklektos, Eutykhes, Felix, Gallus, Herakleitos, Hilarus, Sokratikos*
Aemilius, *see Rectus*
Agathinos, *see Apollonios*
Agathos Daimon, lessee, 12
Agathos Daimon, δρφφικιάλιος τῆς οὐσιακῆς ἐπιτροπῆς, 90
Agrippa, M. Vipsanius, estates of, 18
Agrippa, M. Vipsanius, Postumus, estates of, 12, 18, 69
Agrippina, Iulia, 18, 23; *see also* Germanicus' children
Agrippina, Valeria, *and* estates of, 18, 20, 100
Agrippina, Iulia or Valeria, estates of, 12, 18, 20, 28, 30, 34-5, 49, 57, 69-70
Aius, *see Sanctus*
Akousilaos, *see Khairemon*
Akte, Claudia, *and* estates of, 12, 26, 28, 30-1, 33, 75
Alexandria, 12, 17, 25, 29, 50-1
Alexandros, s. of king Herodes, 17
Alexandros, s. of Simon, lessee, 46
Alexandros, Claudius, proc. Augg., 88
Alexandros, C. Iulius, alabarch, 17
Alexandros, C. Iulius, *and* estates of, 9, 12, 17, 28, 34-6, 52, 55, 57, 75, 100
Alexandros, Ti. Iulius, prefect, 17, 52, 58-9, 61, 67
Alexandros, *see Theanous*

Alexandrou Nesos, 67
Alypios, land-owner, 67
Amarantos, C. Iulius, estate supervisor, 52
Amminon, epoikion, 67-8
Ammonianos, *see Theon/Anthos*
Ammonios, *see Atia*
Andromakhis, 40
Ankyronon Polis, 9, 31, 73
Annaeus, *see Seneca*
Annius, *see Diogenes*
Anoubas, land-owner, 67
Anoubias (village), 33-4, 70
Anthos and estates of, 12, 17-9, 28, 31, 34-5, 37, 47-8, 52, 75
Antikrates, lessee, 12
Antonia (major), 20-1
Antonia (minor) Drusi *and* estates of, 17-18, 20-3, 28, 31, 34-5, 37-9, 41, 47-9, 51-6, 61-3, 70, 100
Antonia, Claudia, *and* estates of, 11, 20, 22-3, 28, 34-6, 70; *see also* Claudioi children
Antonia Drusi or Claudia Antonia, estates of, 9, 12, 20-2, 34-5, 37-9, 41, 47-9, 55, 70-1
Antoninus, Aurelius, δρφφικιάλιος τῆς οὐσιακῆς ἐπιτροπῆς, 88
Antoninus Pius, emperor, 18, 85
Antonius, s. of Theon, lessee, 12
Antonius, Marcus, *triumvir*, 3, 15, 20-1
Antonius, *see Pallas*
Aphrodisios, 24

Aphrodisios, s. of Aphrodisios, γοαμματεὺς οὐσίας, 52
 Aphrodisios, s. of Zoilos, lessee, 53
 Aphroditopolis, 33-4, 46
 Apia, *see* Isidora/Apia
 Apias (village), 33, 55
 Apion, land-owner, 67
 Apion, s. of Komanos, lessee, 12, 46, 67
 Apol-, land-owner, 66
 Apollonios, *dioiketes*, 50
 Apollonios, s. of Agathinos, κλῆρος of, 9
 Aponia, *see* Berenike
 Aponius, *see* Saturninus
 Aristokles, land-owner, 67
 Arsinoite nome, 6-7, 9, 16-17, 19-20, 23, 29, 31-3, 35-7, 39-40, 42, 44-5, 47, 52-4, 56, 59, 66-7, 69-83
 Asia Minor, 15, 53
 Asklepiades, s. of Ptolemaios, land-owner, 67
 Asklepiades, Iulius, lessee, 12
 Asklepiades, C. Iulius, philosopher, 12
 Asklepiades, M. Iulius, 12
 Athenais, Claudia, land-owner, 66
 Athenodoros, Flavius, land-owner, 67
 Athenodoros, Iulius, land-owner, 67
 Atia (*or* Tapatia), d. of Ammonios, 24
 Augustus *andestates* of, 3-8, 15-16, 20-1, 23, 26, 100
 Aulon, land-owner, 67
 Aurelius, *see* Antoninus, Felix, Italicus, Maximus, Terpsilaos
 Bakkhias, 33-4, 38, 46, 62, 66, 71-2, 79
 Balbillus, Ti. Claudius, prefect, land-owner, 53, 63, 65
 Bellenus, *see* Gemellus
 Berenicianus, Valerius, lessee, 12
 Berenike, mistress of Titus, 66
 Berenike, Aponia, land-owner, 66
 Berenike, Iulia, land-owner, 52, 66
 Bernikis Aigialou, 33-4, 70, 78
 Blastos, Ti. Claudius, *idios logos* (?), 88-9
 Boubastos, 9, 33-4, 46, 55, 66, 70
 Boukolon (village), 34, 47, 71
 Bousirite nome, 8
 Britannicus, 22-3; *see also* Claudius' children
 Burrus, 25
 Caecina, *see* Tuscus
 Caligula, *see* Gaius
 Calpurnius, *see* Tryphon
 Calvia, *see* Crispinilla
 Calvinus, Claudius, *idios logos* (?), 68, 89
 Calvisius, *see* Faustinianus
 Camelius *andestates* of, 13, 21, 28, 34, 37-8, 47-9, 61-2, 75-6
 Capito, Cn. Vergilius, prefect, 58
 Cerialis, Publius, *adiutor rationalis* (?), 84, 87-8
 Cerinthus, Κήρινθος, slave, 21, 31, 52
 Cestus, βοηθός τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς, 90
 Cladianus, Perennius, 19
 Cladus, slave or freedman, 19, 52
 Cladus, M. Ulpius Entellianus, freedman, 19
 Cladus, *see also* Klados
 Clara, Norbana, land-owner, 65
 Claudia, *see* Akte, Athenais, Isidora, Livilla
 Claudius, emperor, *andestates* of, 9, 11, 16, 20-3, 26, 31, 34-5, 48-9, 52-3, 57, 59-64, 71, 100
 Claudius' children, 19, 71: *see also* Antonia (Claudia), Britannicus, Octavia
 Claudius, *see* Alexandros, Balbillus, Blastos, Calvinus, Demetrius, Diognetus, Doryphoros, Drusus, Eros, Felix, Iulianus, Macro, Marcellus, Narkissos, Polybianos, Sarapion, Syrion, Theon
 Cleopatra, 3, 5-7, 15, 32
 Cnaeus, *see* Capito
 Cornelius, *see* Gallus
 Corsica, 25
 Crispinilla, Calvia, *andestates* of, 26, 34, 76
 Crispinillianus, *see* Tychicus
 Delta (Nile), 22, 30-2, 44, 58
 Demetrios, κλῆρος of, 9
 Demetrios, s. of Isidoros, ἀπολύσιμος οὐσίας, 61
 Demetrios, Ti. Claudius, *proc. episcepseos*, 88
 Dinnis, 33
 Diocletian, emperor, 85
 Diodorus, Valerius, 12
 Diogenes, Annus, *proc. Heptanomiae*, 85, 88
 Diognetus, Claudius, *adiutor rationalis*, *proc. usiacus* (?), 51, 84, 86-9
 Dionysias, 33, 46, 67
 Dionysios, προεστώς οὐσίας, 53
 Dionysodoros, *strategos*, *andestates* of, 13, 19, 28, 34-6, 41-2, 47-8, 76-7, 100
 Dioskoros, *see* Ptolemaios
 Diotimos, κλῆρος of, 9
 Domitian, emperor, 25, 29, 45
 Doryphoros, Ti. Claudius, *andestates* of, 9, 12-13, 22-3, 28, 30-1, 34-40, 45, 47, 52, 54, 57, 62, 77
 Dromeos epoikion, 9, 55
 Drusilla, Iulia, 18, 20; *see also* Germanicus' children
 Drusilla, *see* Livia
 Drusus Iulius Caesar, 17, 20; *see also* Germanicus' children
 Drusus Iulius Caesar, s. of Tiberius, 18-19, 68
 Drusus, Nero Claudius, 17
 Drusus, Ti. Claudius, *see* Claudius, emperor
 Drymos Hiers Nesou, 17, 24, 33-6, 70, 74-8, 80-2
 Eirenaios, *proc. usiacus*, 89-90
 Eklektos, Aelius, *proc. usiacus*, 89-90
 Elephantine, 17
 Embres, land-owner, 66
 Entellianus, *see* Cladus
 Epaphroditos, slave, 21, 52
 Epipolis, 19, 34, 46-7, 74, 77-8, 81
 Epithymetos, βοηθός ἐπιτροπού, 90
 Eros, 24
 Eros *andestates* of, 13, 23-4, 28, 34, 39, 52, 77
 Eros, Ti. Claudius, *a rationibus*, 24
 Eros, M. Ulpius, *ab epistulis*, 24

Esquelinus, *collis*, 15
 Euandros, s. of Ptolemaios, land-owner, 67
 Euphratios, ὁφρικιάλιος τῆς οὐσιακῆς ἐπιτροπῆς, 90
 Euhemeria, 8-9, 16, 20, 33-4, 44-5, 48, 52-5, 65, 69-73, 75-6, 78-3
 Eusebes, κτῆμα Εύσεβοῦς, 9, 12
 Euskhemon, οἰκονόμος οὐσίας, 52
 Eutyches, βοηθός ἐπιτρόπου, 90
 F—, Fulvius, *dioiketes*, 68
 Falcidius, estate of, 45, 77
 Faustinianus, Calvisius, *idios logos*, 68
 Felix, *proc. usiacus*, 89
 Felix, Aelius, ἐπιμελητής κυριακῶν κτημάτων, 90
 Felix, Aurelius, *idios logos* or *dioiketes*(?), 51, 84, 89
 Felix, Ti. Claudius, freedman, 21, 52
 Felix, Flavius, ἐπιμελητής οὐσιακῶν, 90
 Flavius, see Athenodoros, Felix
 Fulvius, see F—
 Gaius (Caligula), emperor, *and* estates of, 11, 17-21, 34, 53, 71
 Gaius, see Alexandros, Amarantos, Asklepiades, Galerius, Gallus, Maecenas, Petronius, Theon, Tuscus
 Galatia, 25
 Galba, emperor, 26, 58
 Galerius, Gaius, prefect, 25
 Gallia, see Polla
 Gallus, Aelius, prefect, 3
 Gallus, C. Cornelius, prefect, 3, 30
 Gemellus, L. Bellenus, 68
 Gemellus, Tiberius, land-owner, 68
 Gemellus, see Tiberius Iulius Caesar
 Germanicus Iulius Caesar *and* estates of, 11-13, 17-19, 23-4, 28-9, 34-9, 48-53, 58, 61-2, 71-2
 Germanicus' children *and* estates of, 11, 17, 20, 34-5, 48, 50-1, 53, 55, 57, 62, 72; *see also* under individual names (cf. p. 14)
 Grypianus, see Iucundus
 Hadrian, emperor, 6, 18
 Heptanomia, 30-2
 Heraklas, μαχαιροφόρος οὐσιακός, 90
 Herakleia, 33-4, 45, 55-6, 60, 62, 70, 73, 77-81
 Herakleides, division of, 36-8, 45-6
 Herakleides, ἐκλήμπτωρ δρυμῶν, 53
 Herakleides, ἐκλήμπτωρ οὐσίας, 53
 Herakleides, ἐκλήμπτωρ οὐσίας, 63
 Herakleides, land-owner, 68
 Herakleides, Ulpianus, *proc. usiacus*, 89
 Herakleitos, Aelius, βοηθός ἐπιτρόπου, 90
 Herakleopolis, 33
 Herakleopolite nome, 9, 22, 31, 66, 73, 82
 Heras, 25
 Herieus, s. of Satabous, lessee, 56, 59
 Hermas, ἐλαῖων Ερμάεως, 9, 45
 Hermopolite nome, 9, 22, 47, 65-6, 73, 77, 82
 Hermopolis Magna, 22, 32, 65-7
 Hermopolis Parva, 40
 Herodes, king, 17
 Hiera Nesos, 24, 33-8, 66, 70, 72, 79-80, 82-3
 Hiera Sykaminos, 30
 Hilarus, P. Aelius, *proc. usiacus*, 89
 Horion, s. of Petosiris, ἀπολύσιμος οὐσίας, 61, 63-4
 Ibion Eikosipentarouron, 9, 33-4, 44-5, 71, 79
 Isidora/Apiia, Claudia, land-owner, 66
 Isidoros, see Demetrios
 Isis Taposirias, temple of, 66
 Italicus, Aurelius, *proc. usiacus*, 86, 89-90
 Iucundus *and* estates of, 24, 28, 34-5, 37, 52, 77
 Iucundus Grypianus, 24
 Iulia, 19; *see also* Livia Drusi's children
 Iulia, see Agrippina, Berenike, Drusilla, Livia, Livilla, Polla
 Julianus, Claudius, *rationalis*, 87
 Iuliopolis, 33-4, 47
 Iulius Caesar, 6, 23
 Iulius, see Alexandros, Amarantos, Asklepiades, Athenodoros, Drusus, Germanicus, Nicanor, Theon, Theon/Tryphon, Tiberius
 Iumer-, see Numerius
 Iustus, land-owner, 66
 Kallimorphos, land-owner, 66
 Kallistrates, s. of Kallistrates, προεστῶς κτηνῶν, 53
 Kanopias, 33-4, 76
 Karanis, 16, 18, 33-4, 36-8, 46-9, 57, 62, 65-6, 70-3, 75-82, 85
 Kerkeesis, 35-6
 Kerkeosiris, 53
 Kerkesouha, 33-4, 37-8, 46, 72, 76, 79-80, 82-3
 Khairemon, s. of Akousilaos, προεστῶς οὐσίας, 53
 Kharmos *and* estates of, 12-13, 23-4, 34-5, 37, 39, 41-2, 52, 78
 Khresimos *and* estates of, 24, 28, 34-5, 37, 52, 78
 Khrestos *and* estates of, 25, 28, 30-1, 33, 52, 78
 Klados, 19
 Klados, *see also* Cladus
 Komanos, δωρεά of, 6
 Komanos, see Apion
 Kronion, *see* Ptolemaios
 Kynopolite nome, 21, 31
 Lagis, 33-4, 39-40, 72, 77-81
 Latinus, *actor mimicus*, 25
 Latinus *and* estates of, 12-13, 25, 28, 30-1, 33, 45, 52, 78
 Leon, προνοητής, 16
 Leukopyrgites Ano, 65
 Limnaios, s. of Limnaios, ἐπίτροπος, 52
 Livia (= Livia Drusilla = Livia Augusta = Iulia Augusta) *and* estates of, 6, 9, 11, 16-17, 19, 21, 23, 33-5, 38, 47-51, 52-3, 55, 57, 61-2, 72, 100
 Livia Drusi (= Livia Iulia = Claudia Livilla) *and* estates of, 18-19, 23, 34, 45, 50, 52-5, 57, 62, 68, 73
 Livia Drusi's children, 9, 19, 34, 45, 50, 54, 73; *see also* Iulia and Tiberius Iulius Caesar Gemellus
 Livia Iulia, *see* Livia Drusilla
 Livilla, Claudia, *see* Livia Drusilla

Livilla, Iulia, 18; *see also* Germanicus' children
 Longinos, land-owner, 67
 Lucifer, οἰκονόμος, 51
 Lucius, *see* Gemellus, Rectus, Seneca, Septimius,
 Severus, Terentius
 Lurius *andestates* of, 9, 12-13, 16, 23-4, 28-9, 34-40,
 47-8, 51, 78-9
 Lurius, Marcus, 16
 Lycarion, *see* Thermoutharion
 Macro, Claudius, 26
 Maecenas, Gaius, *andestates* of, 9, 12-13, 15-16, 23-4,
 28-9, 34-40, 45, 47-8, 50-1, 60-2, 64, 79-80
 Magdola, 44
 Magdola Orou Samoou, 66
 Magius, *see* Maximus
 Maharraga, 30
 Mamertinus, M. Petronius, prefect, 58
 Marcellus, Claudius, *rationalis*, 87
 Marcius, *see* Moesianus, Salutarius
 Marcus, *see* Agrippa, Antonius, Asklepiades, Cladus,
 Eros, Lurius, Mamertinus, Maximus, Pallas,
 Rufus, Saturninus
 Mariamne, w. of Herodes, 17
 Maron, s. of Pylades, 60-1
 Maximus, Aurelius, ὁ πρὸς ταῖς ἐπισκέψεσιν, 88
 Maximus, M. Magius, prefect, 58
 Memphis, 32
 Memphite nome, 31, 67, 75
 Menas, 25
 Menas/Menatius *andestates* of, 13, 25-6, 28, 35, 41, 47,
 80
 Menas/Menodorus, 26
 Mendesian nome, 25, 30-1, 45, 70, 74-5, 77-8, 82
 Menelaite nome, 8
 Menelaos, χλῆρος of, 9
 Messalina, Valeria, *andestates* of, 9-10, 12-13, 22, 31,
 33, 48, 73
 Metrodorou epoikion, 33-4, 46
 Modestus, *idios logos*, 68, 87
 Moëris, Lake, 32-3, 35, 37, 44, 49
 Moesianus, Marcius, *idios logos*, 51
 Monimou Topoi, 82
 Moskhos/Moskhanos, land-owner, 68
 Myron, *proc. usiācus* (?), 86, 90
 Narkissos, Ti. Claudius, *andestates* of, 12, 22, 28, 34-5,
 52-3, 56, 80
 Narmouthis, 33, 40
 Neiloupolis, 34, 79-80, 83
 Nero, emperor, *andestates* of, 13, 16, 18, 23-6, 29, 34,
 45, 52, 73
 Nero Claudius Drusus, *see* Drusus
 Nero Iulius Caesar, 17-18; *see also* Germanicus'
 children
 Nikanor, Ti. Iulius, land-owner, 12, 65
 Nile, River and valley, 7, 21, 30, 38, 43-4, 51, 56
 Nomentum, 24
 Norbana, *see* Clara
 Numerius *andestate* of, 24, 28, 34-5, 52, 78
 Oasis, *see* Small Oasis
 Octavia, w. of M. Antonius, 20-1
 Octavia, 22-3; *see also* Claudius' children
 Octavian, *see* Augustus
 Olbia (Terranova), 26
 Onesimus *andestate* of, 25, 28, 34, 52, 80
 Otho, emperor, 26
 Oxyrhynchite nome, 8-9, 21, 25, 31-2, 52, 57, 66-7,
 70-1, 74-5, 81-2
 Oxyrhynchus, 65
 Paetina, Aelia, empress, 22
 Pallantos epoikion *ortopos*, 65
 Pallas, M. Antonius, *andestates* of, 13, 17, 23-4, 28,
 34-7, 39-40, 45, 48, 54, 81
 Pallas, M. Antonius, land-owner, 23, 65
 Pamphilou epoikion, 9
 Pannonia, 26
 Patsontis, 33-4, 36-8, 46, 71, 75, 82
 Pelousion (in the Arsinoite), 33, 55
 Perennis, *see* Cladianus
 Peri Poleos Ano (toparchy), 31-2
 Perkeesis, 24, 33-6, 44, 54-5, 62, 70, 74, 82
 Pertinax, emperor, 27
 Petenephies, 100
 Petenouris, s. of Orsenouphis, lessee, 60
 Petosiris, *see* Horion
 Petronii, Poplius *and* Gaius, epoikion of, 11, 16, 19, 67-8
 Petronius *andestate* of, 13, 16, 34, 53, 59-62, 81
 Petronius, land-owner, 16
 Petronius, Gaius, legionary, 16
 Petronius, Gaius, prefect, 3-4, 16, 30
 Petronius, *see* Mamertinus
 Philadelphia, 33-4, 38, 41, 44, 46, 48-9, 53, 55, 60, 62,
 65-6, 70-2, 74-5, 77-9, 81-2
 Philai, 30
 Philo (Judeus), 17
 Philodamos, estate of, 38, 66
 Philopator (village), 66
 Philoteris, 33-4, 40, 47, 57, 70, 72
 Polemon, division of, 38-40, 44
 Polla, Gallia, *andestates* of, 13, 21, 23, 28, 34, 37, 39-40,
 81
 Polla, Iulia, land-owner, 66
 Polybianos, Claudius, estate-owner, 66
 Polybios, 25, 66
 Polydeukia, 33-4, 44, 48, 66, 71, 79-80
 Pompeius, Sextus, 26
 Popilius, *see* Petronii
 Poppaea, empress, 23
 Postumus, *see* Agrippa
 Potamiae/Taphiomis, 59-60
 Pouantinouphis, 65
 Prophetes, land-owner, 65
 Psanitou (toparchy), 30
 Psenarpsenesis, 33-4, 36-8, 46, 66, 75-7, 79-81
 Psenyris, 33-4, 46-7, 70-1, 74, 77-8, 81-2

Psenyris Ano, 46
 Psy, 33-4, 46
 Ptolemaios Philadelphos, 50
 Ptolemaios, s. of Dioskoros, lessee, 46
 Ptolemaios, s. of Kronion, lessee, 12, 46
 Ptolemaios, see Asklepiades, Euandros
 Ptolemais, land-owner, 67
 Ptolemais Nea, 24, 33-8, 55, 70-2, 74, 79, 82
 Publius, see Hilarus, Rufus
 Puteoli, 26
 Pylades, see Maron
 Pyrrheia Narmoutheos, 34, 70
 Rectus, L. Aemilius, prefect, 58
 Rome, 3-4, 15, 18, 20, 24-5, 32, 43, 45, 51, 58
 Rufinus, Vestidius, *dioiketes*, 68
 Rufus, M. Rutilius, prefect, 18
 Rutilius, see Rufus
 Rutilius *andestate* of, 13, 18, 49, 57, 81
 Salutarius, Marcius, *adiutor rationalis*, 87-8
 Sanctus, T. Aius, 85
 Sarapion, Ti. Claudius, *andestates* of, 13, 21-2, 28, 34, 45, 52, 56, 81
 Sardinia, 16, 26
 Satabous, see Herieus
 Saturninus, M. Aponius, land-owner, 16, 53, 63, 65
 Sebennutus, 34, 46, 79
 Seber- (village), 34, 77
 Sen- (village), 34, 79
 Seneca, L. Annaeus, the younger, *andestates* of, 7, 9, 11-13, 24-5, 28-31, 34-41, 47, 50-1, 54, 59, 82
 Sentrempai, 40
 Septimius, Lucius, land-owner, 13, 23
 Septimius, see Serenus
 Serenus, Septimius, *idios logos* (?), 68, 89
 Servianus, see Severus
 Severus *andestates* of, 13, 23-5, 28, 34-41, 45, 47, 55-6, 83
 Severus, Septimius, emperor, 23, 85, 88
 Severus, Septimius, friend of Statius, 23-4
 Severus, L. Septimius, *andestate* of, 13, 23
 Severus, Servianus, *idios logos*, 25
 Sextus, see Pompeius
 Simon, see Alexandros
 Sinary, 75
 Skhedia, 33-4, 47
 Skyllax, land-owner, 67
 Small Oasis, 33, 66
 Soknopaios, temple of, 49
 Soknopaiou Nisos, 18, 33-4, 44, 48-9, 55-6, 66, 70-3, 75, 80
 Sokr-, *proc. usiacus* (?), 89
 Sokrates *andestates* of, 13, 25, 28, 34, 52, 83
 Sokratikos, Aelius, *proc. usiacus*, 89-90
 Sostratos, lessee, 12
 Sotianos, land-owner, 67
 Sotos, s. of Maron, προεστώς οὐσίας, 53
 Sphex, land-owner, 67
 Statius, 23
 Strategos, φοινικῶν Στρατηγοῦ, 19, 47
 Syene, 17
 Synephebos, ἀμπελῶν Συνεφέβου, 9, 45
 Syrion, Claudius, land-owner, 67
 Taie, 31, 75
 Talei, 33
 Tapatia, see Atia
 Taphiomis, see Potamiae
 Tarouthis, 31-2
 Tebtunis, 8-9, 33, 35, 38-40, 46, 48, 53, 61, 63, 70-2, 74, 77, 79, 82-3
 Terentius, Lucius, land-owner, 67
 Terpsilaos, Aurelius, *proc. usiacus*, 89-90
 Terranova (Olbia), 26
 Tesenouphis, 59
 Theadelphia, 9, 26, 33, 35, 40-4, 46-9, 66-7, 70-2, 74, 76-83
 Theanous, d. of Alexandros, land-owner, 67
 Thebais, 30, 101
 Thebes, 32
 Themistos, division of, 38-40, 44, 60
 Theognis, 63, 65
 Theon, s. of Theon, land-owner, 67
 Theon, Ti. Claudius, lessee, 25
 Theon, C. Iulius, s. of C. Iulius Theon, land-owner, 68
 Theon, Ti. Iulius, land-owner, 66, 100
 Theon/Anthos, s. of Ammonianos, land-owner, 68
 Theon/Tryphon, Ti. Iulius, land-owner, 66, 100
 Theon, see Antonius
 Theoninos, land-owner, 66
 Theophilos, *vicarius*, 51
 Theoxenis, 33, 35, 40, 57, 70, 72
 Thermoutharion, d. of Lykarion, land-owner, 67
 Thmouis, 25-6, 30-1
 Thonnessis, κτῆμα Θοννήσεως, 9, 30, 45
 Thoth (god), 22
 Thouis, 30-1
 Thraso, 67
 Tiberius, emperor, *andestates* of, 9, 13, 16-21, 34, 45, 53-5, 73
 Tiberius Iulius Caesar Gemellus, 19-20, 68; *see also* Livia Drusi's children
 Tiberius, see Alexandros, Balbillus, Blastos, Demetrius, Doryphoros, Eros, Felix, Gemellus, Narkissos, Nikanor, Sarapion, Theon, Theon/Tryphon, Tryphon
 Tigellius, land-owner, 67
 Titanianos, land-owner, 67; *cf. also* 101
 Titus, emperor, *andestates* of, 10, 25, 28-30, 36, 39-40, 43, 66, 74
 Titus, *see* Sanctus
 Tonaitios, land-owner, 66
 Toou, 9, 31, 77, 82
 Trikomia, 40
 Tryphon, Ti. Calpurnius, land-owner, 67
 Tychicus Crispinillianus, 26

Tuscas, C. Caecina, prefect, 59
 Ulpis, *see* Cladus, Eros, Herakleides
 Valeria, *see* Agrippina, Messalina
 Valerius, *see* Berenicianus, Diodorus
 Velitrae, 26
 Vergilius, *see* Capito

Vespasian, emperor, *and* *estates of*, 13, 21, 25, 27-30,
 35-6, 39-40, 42-3, 45, 52, 55, 74, 85
 Vestidius, *see* Rufinus
 Vispanius, *see* Agrippa
 Vitellius, emperor, 26
 Xenon, *χλῆρος of*, 9
 Zoilos, *see* Aphrodisios

III. Technical Terms and Selected Subjects

A. English and Latin

a patrimonio, 10
 absentee land-owner, 50-1
 acacia (ἀκανθός), 47
adiutor rationalis, 87-8
 administration, *see* estates, imperial, *and* *ούσιακή γῆ*
aerarium, 3, 27
 agents of imperial family abroad, 6, 51
ager, 7, 10, 12
publicus, 4, 11
 animals, 48-9, 53
 immune from impressment, *see* *ἀναγγάρευτος*
 immune from taxation, *see* *ἀτελής*
 artisans, 55
 association, of *ἀπολύτιμοι ούσιας*, 61, 63
 of farmers, 57
 barley, 41-3; *see also* cereals, grain-land
 baths, 63
 beans, 42
 beasts of burden, 49, 53
 cattle, 49
 cereals, 31-2, 35-9, 41-6; *see also* grain-land
 compulsory cultivation, 28, 39-40, 59-60; *see also*
 ἐπιβολή, ἐπιμερισμός
 leases of imperial estates, 58-64
 services, *see* liturgy, *ἀγγαρεία*
 confiscation of property, 4-6, 11, 15, 23-4, 27, 29, 60
 dates, 101; *see also* palm-trees
dioiketes, *see* *διοικητής*
dispensatores Caesaris, 51
 donkeys, 49, 53
 estates, imperial, formation, 6-9, 12
 lack of topographical unity, 6-7
 nomenclature, 7-8, 11-13
 status of land prior to formation, 9
 joint ownership, 17-20
 division between Vespasian and Titus, 28-9
 concentrated in the Arsinoite, 32-5
 size, *see* *ούσιακή γῆ*
 administration, 50-4
 farmers, 54-64
 see also *ούσια, ούσιακός λόγος*
 exemption, from compulsory service, 61; *see also*
 ἀναγγάρευτος, ἀπολύτιμος

from taxation, *see* *tax-exemption*
 farmers, exploitation, 4
 complaints, 54
 in imperial estates, 54-64
 classes, *see* *γεωργός*
 farmstead (ἐποίκιον, *συνοικία*), 9, 55-6
fiscus, imperial, 27
 Egyptian, 4, 11, 27, 60, 85-6; *see also* *διοίκησις, ταμ(ι)εῖον*
 fishing, 48-9
 fishing-boats, 49
 freedmen, imperial, former owners of imperial estates, 16-18, 21-6, 52
 administrators of imperial estates, 21, 28, 51-2
frumentum emptum (πυρὸς συναγοραστικός), 42-3
fundus, 7, 10, 12
 garden-land (παράδεισος), 10, 44-7
 goats, *see* sheep
 grain, *see* cereals, loan of seeds, *frumentum emptum*
 grain-land, 31-2, 35-44, 46
 granaries (θησαυροί), public, 44
 in imperial estates, 55
 grants of land, 4-6, 15, 21, 24, 67
 grass, 42; *see also* pastures
 hamlet, *see* farmstead
 hunting, 48
idios logos, 7-8, 27, 86-7; *see also* Index IB, s.v. *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*
 land, administration, 4-8
 private ownership, 4, 6, 7-10
 categories, *see* *γῆ*
 brought back to cultivation, 7-8, 45, 54
 reclaimed by the desert, 28-9
latifundium, 5, 10
 leases, of imperial estates, 52-64
 of ούσιακή γῆ, 12, 28
 lentils, 41-2
 lessees, 55; *see also* farmers, leases
 liturgy, 60-4; *see also* *ἀγγαρεία*
 exemption from, 61; *see also* *ἀναγγάρευτος, ἀπολύτιμος*
 loan of seed, 37-8
magister rei privatae, 85-6, 101

marshes (δρυμοί), 44, 48
 mat-weaving, 57
 measures (μέτρα) of imperial estates, 55-6
 monopoly, *see* papyrus
 oil-presses (έλαιουργεῖα), 21-2, 45, 56, 59
 olive trees, 9, 32, 44-7
 orchards, *see* garden-land
 oxen, 49
 palm-trees, 9, 19, 44-7, 101
 papyrus-growing, 48, 53, 57
 no monopoly, 57
 pastures (νοιμαί), 21, 31, 44, 48
patrimonialis, πατοιμουνάλιος, 11
patrimonium, 11
 principis, 7-8, 15-29, 51, 86
 a patrimonio, 10
 peasants, *see* farmers
possessio, 10
praedium, 10, 12
 praedia fiscalia, 11
procurator, of imperial estates, 17, 23, 25, 51
 episcepsos, 88
 rationis patrimonii, 10, 28
 rei privatae, 85-6
 usiacus, 10, 28, 68, 84-90
ratio patrimonii principis, 10, 28
usiaca, *see* οὐσιακὸς λόγος

rationalis, 87-8
 rentals (ἐκφόρια), 43
res privata, 27, 85-6
 procurator rei privatae, 85-6
saltus, 10
 secretaries, of farmers, 57
 of estates, 50, 52
 sheep and goats, 21, 31, 48
 shore-land, 47
 slaves, imperial, former owners of imperial estates, 17-19, 21, 23-5, 52
 administrators of imperial estates, 21, 28, 51-2
 taxes, *see* ἀπόμοιρα, δραγματηγία, ἐπαρούριον, παραγωγὴ ἐλαίας, φόρος
 tax-exemption, 63; *see also* ἀτέλεια, ἀτελής, κουφοτέλεια
 towers (πύργοι), 55-6
 trades, 55
 tree-groves, 32, 35, 44-7
 vegetable (λάχανον), 47
 vegetable seed (λαχανόσπερμον), 42, 47
vicarius, 51
 vineyards, 9, 30, 32, 44-7
 wheat, 35, 37, 41-3; *see also* cereals, grain-land
 wine, 32, 56; *see also* vineyards
 wine-vats, 56


B. Greek


ἀγγαρεία, 57-8; *see also* liturgy
 αἰγιαλῖτις ἔμφορος, 47
 ἀμπελος τρυγωμένη, 47
 ἀμπελών, 10
 ἄφορος, 45
 φόριμος, 45
 ἀναγγάρευτος, 18, 49, 57
 ἀναδίδωμι, 61
 ἀναλαμβάνω, 4, 11, 86; *see also* confiscation
 ἀναχώρησις, 58
 ἀπελεύθεροι Καίσαρος καὶ οἰκονόμοι, 51
 ἀπολύτιμος, 61-4
 ἀπολύτω, -ομαι, 59
 ἀπόμοιρα, 46-7
 ἀρχιερεύς, 87, 101
 ἀρχιερωσύνη, 86-7
 ἀτέλεια, 8, 57-8, 101
 τελωνική, 31, 58
 ἀτελής, 18, 49, 57-8
 βιοθῆδος τοῦ ἐπιτρόπου, τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς, 90
 γενηματογραφούμενα ὑπάρχοντα, 11; *see also* confiscation
 γεωμέτρης, 88
 γεωμετρία, 47
 γεωργία, 60-1


γεωργός, 54-5
 βασιλικός, 4, 8, 28
 δημόσιος, 4, 8, 28, 54
 οὐσιακός, 24, 28, 61-2, 85
 οὐσίας, 28, 61-2
 προσοδικός, 28
 γῆ, ἄβδοχος, 38
 αἰγιαλῖτις ἔμφορος, 47
 ἐν ἀφέσει, 4
 ἄφορος, 8
 βασιλική, 4, 7-9, 27-8, 85
 δημοσία, 4, 27-8
 ἐν δωρεᾷ, 5
 ἐωνημένη, 9
 ἰδιόκτητος, ἰδιωτική, 9
 ἰερά, ἱερατική, 4
 κατοικική, 6, 9, 32
 κληρουχική, 6, 9, 32; *see also* κλῆροι
 κυριακή, 8
 οὐσιακή, 9, 11, 28-9, 35, 85
 προσόδου, 11, 27-8
 ύπόλογος, 8, 32
 ύπόλογος βασιλική, 8
 γραμματεὺς οὐσίας, 50, 52
 δίδωμι, 61

διοίκησις, 4, 11, 27; *see also fiscus*, ταμ(ι)εῖον
 διοικητής, 4, 86
 δραγματηγία, 46
 δωρεά, 4-6, 8, 32, 50, 62
 ἐδάφη, 12, 67
 ἐκλήμπτωρ, 52-3, 57
 ἐκλογιστής, 88
 ἐκφόρια, 43
 ἐπαρούιον, 47
 ἐπιβολή, 28, 59-60
 ἐπιμελητής, of association of ἀπολύτιμοι, 63
 κυριακῶν κτημάτων, 90
 οὐσιακῶν, 90
 ἐπιμερισμός, 28, 39-40
 ἐπίσκεψις γῆς, 38, 87-8
 δι πρὸς ταῖς ἐπισκέψεσιν, 88
 ἐπιστάτης κτηνῶν, 49
 ἐπιτροπής οὐσιακῶν κτημάτων, 12, 28, 46, 68
 ἐπιτροπή, οὐσιακή, 90; *see* οὐσιακός λόγος
 ἐπιτροπος οὐσίας, 28, 52-3
 οὐσιακῶν, *see procurator usiacus*
 ἐποίκιον, *see farmstead*
 ἥγούμενος, of association of ἀπολύτιμοι, 63
 θησαυρός, *see granaries*
 ἴδιος λόγος, *see idios logos*
 ἴερατικά, department of, 27
 καθήκοντα, 43
 κλῆροι, 4-10; *see also γῆ κληρουχική*
 in imperial estates, 9
 κουφοτέλεια, 8
 κτῆμα, 5, 10, 46
 κτῆσις, 10
 λεύκωμα, *album*, 61, 63-4
 μαχαιροφόρος οὐσιακός, 90
 μίσθωσις, 12, 58, 61; *see also leases*
 μισθωτής, 12, 53, 55; *see also farmers, leases*
 μυροβάλανος, 47
 νεόφυτα, 45
 οίκονόμος, οὐσίας, 28, 50, 52-4
 ἀπελεύθεροι Καίσαρος καὶ οἱ., 51-2
 δηνηλάτης, 53
 δρισμός γῆς, 87
 οὐσία, meaning of the term, 5, 9-11
 lack of topographical unity, 6-7
 non-imperial, 65-7
 imperial, *see estates, imperial*
 ἄνω, κάτω, 7, 10, 100
 πολιτική, 11

ταμιακή, 11, 85
 οὐσιακός, τὰ οὐσιακά, department of, 28; *see* οὐσιακός λόγος
 γῆ, 30-49
 administration, 28
 size, 31-2, 35, 37-41, 46-7
 sales, 28, 35
 ἐπιτροπή, 90; *see* οὐσιακός λόγος
 ἐπιτροπος, *see procurator usiacus*
 κτῆμα, 46
 λόγος, 51-2, 84-6
 creation, 10-11, 28-9
 lower officials, 90
 μαχαιροφόρος, 90
 μισθωτής, 55
 παράδεισος, 46
 διφτικιάλιος τῆς οὐσιακῆς ἐπιτροπῆς, 90
 παραγωγὴ ἐλαίας, 47
 παράδεισος, 10, 44-7
 προεία πρὸς ἐπίσκεψιν ἀβρόχου γῆς, 38
 πραγματευτής, 50
 πράκτωρ λαογραφίας, 60-1, 63-4
 πρεσβύτεροι, 50
 προβατοκηνοτρόφος, 61
 προεστώς, κτηνῶν, 53
 οὐσίας, 20, 28, 50, 53-4, 56-7, 59-60, 100
 προνοητής, 16
 προνοῶν, 50
 δι πρὸς ταῖς ἐπισκέψεσιν, 88
 προστάτης, 50
 κτηνῶν, 53
 πρότερον, 11-12, 86
 πύργος, *see towers*
 πυρός συναγοραστικός, *see frumentum emptum*
 συνοικία, *see farmstead*
 ταμ(ι)εῖον, 11, 85; *see also fiscus*, διοίκησις
 ταμιακαὶ οὐσιαὶ, 11, 85
 τελωνεία, 58-9
 ὑπάρχοντα, 10-11, 67
 ὑπομισθωτής, 55
 φόρος, ἐλαΐνων φυτῶν, 47
 πλοίων, 49
 προβάτων καὶ αἰγῶν, 48
 φοινίκων, 46-7
 φροντιστής, 50
 χειριστής, 50
 χερσονομή, 48; *see also pastures*
 ψιλὸς τόπος, 30









New York University
Bobst Library
70 Washington Square South
New York, NY 10012-1091

DUE DATE	DUE DATE	DUE DATE
	SEP 22 2014 RETURNED	

LIBRARY USE

BOBST LIBRARY

FEES 17 2015

DUEDATE

BOBST LIBRARY



3 1142 01868 8591

