

THE
GREEK CITY
FROM ALEXANDER
TO JUSTINIAN

BY
A. H. M. JONES, LL.D., D.D.

CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD

1940

PREFACE

IT has been no easy task to find a title for this book which should at the same time convey to prospective readers some idea of its contents, and not be the despair of librarians and bibliographers. For the benefit of the latter class I have chosen one which is relatively brief. In justice to the former I must in this introduction define my subject more accurately than is possible on the title-page. My theme is there defined as 'The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian'. By the 'Greek City' I mean not only cities Greek by origin and blood, but any community organized on the Greek model and using Greek for its official language. On the other hand, the limitation 'from Alexander to Justinian' is not one of time only. In the first place it defines the geographical scope of my work: the cities with which I deal are those of the near eastern lands ruled both by Alexander and by Justinian. Secondly, it is meant to suggest a restriction of the topics treated. My theme is the development of the Greek city under the rule of kings and emperors; and I therefore do not touch some of the most striking achievements of the independent cities of the Hellenistic age, notably their creation of leagues.

I have divided my matter in the first place according to topics, and secondarily by periods. This scheme has involved some rather arbitrary lines of division. It is difficult, for instance, to say whether the decline of the decurionate more properly belongs to the mutual relations of the central government and the cities or, where I have put it, to the internal political development of the cities, for by the Byzantine period the two were closely intertwined. On balance, however, it has appeared to me that an arrangement by topics gives a clearer picture of the general trends of development than a purely chronological treatment.

Part I deals with the diffusion of civic institutions on the Greek model over the barbarian lands of the near east. Here I devote most space to the Hellenistic age, which is the formative period. On the one hand I trace the activity of the kings, imposing their ideas from above, and on the other the spontaneous urge from below of the educated classes, fast assimilating Hellenism, for the civic institutions of Greece, and I endeavour to assess the relative importance of these two forces. In this field the Roman

and Byzantine periods saw but little progress. There remained only a few backward areas which needed to be educated up to civic life; in other districts, which were already hellenized, the growth of self-government had been checked in the interests of administrative, and particularly fiscal, efficiency by the kings, and here the Roman government usually found it more convenient to establish local autonomy.

Part II treats the relations of the central government to the cities under two main headings, the methods whereby it established control over them, and the tasks which it imposed on them. Here the policy of the kings was tentative and hesitant. They failed to find any satisfactory technique of control, and they were therefore chary of using the cities. The Roman republic evolved that system of indirect control which the emperors perpetuated and on which they later, when the spirit of independence had been crushed, superimposed direct supervision. The Roman government was thus able to make full use of the civic authorities, to which it delegated a vast mass of administrative duties, duties which they continued to fulfil in the Byzantine age so long as they retained the necessary minimum of vitality.

In Part III, the internal political development of the cities, I pass lightly over the Hellenistic age, since the influence upon it of the royal governments was slight. The Roman period, in which the political structure of the cities was moulded by the central government, and the final struggle in the Byzantine age between the will of the emperors and the internal forces of decay are treated in more detail.

In Part IV the services rendered by the civic governments to their citizens are described. Here the interest shifts once again to the Hellenistic age, when the cities undertook many fresh responsibilities, such as education and the control of the food supply. In the Roman period, despite its ostentation, civic enterprise stagnated: in the Byzantine it was impoverished and sank into decay.

In the final Part I discuss the contribution of the cities to ancient civilization, and I argue that, great as their achievement was, it was based on too narrow a class foundation to be lasting. On the economic side the life of the cities involved an unhealthy concentration of wealth in the hands of the urban aristocracy at the expense of the proletariat and the peasants. Their political life was gradually narrowed till it was confined to a small clique

of well-to-do families, who finally lost interest in it. The culture which the cities fostered, though geographically spread over a wide area, was limited to the urban upper class. The great mass of the population, the proletariat of the towns, and still more the peasants of the country, remained barbarians.

In my notes my general policy has been to cite the original authorities. To this rule there is one exception. Since Part I is almost entirely based on the material collected in my previous work, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, I have in this part referred the reader to that book. Elsewhere, though I have cited modern works which I found especially useful on particular topics, I have as a rule given the original authorities as well. The references are in many cases not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to give typical illustrations, and, where inscriptions are concerned, are taken as far as possible from the more accessible *corpora*. The reader will thus in most cases, I hope, be able to satisfy himself of the truth of a statement by direct reference to the original documents on which it is based instead of having to consult one or more modern works before getting back to the source of the argument. The method has the further advantage that it makes plain how slender is the evidence for many modern theories, which often pass untested on the authority of a great name.

My debt to other scholars, both contemporary and of past generations, is large, and, owing to the system of reference that I have adopted, is very imperfectly acknowledged in my notes: for on many topics lack of space has forbidden me to cite modern discussions as well as the original documents. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to a number of scholars who have aided me personally; to Mr. R. Meiggs and Mr. R. Syme, who both read the book in manuscript and offered many useful criticisms and suggestions, to Mr. C. H. Roberts, who often advised me on papyrological matters, and gave me an advance view of several important papyri, and to Mr. M. Grant, who placed at my disposal his numismatic discoveries, on the basis of which he has rewritten the story of early Roman colonization in the East. Above all, I must thank Professor Last, who from the first inception of this book to its final redaction, has helped me with encouragement, advice, and constructive criticism, both on larger issues and on the minutest points of detail.

To the Warden and Fellows of All Souls College I owe a debt of gratitude for the research fellowship which enabled me to

pursue my studies. Nor must I omit from the list of my benefactors the Clarendon Press, which not only undertook without demur the heavy burden of publishing this book, but, despite the outbreak of war, has continued the task of printing it with unruffled calm and undiminished efficiency.

A. H. M. J.

6 December 1939.

CONTENTS

PART I

THE DIFFUSION OF THE CITY

I. THE WORK OF THE KINGS	I
II. HELLENIZATION	27
III. THE ROMAN REPUBLIC	51
IV. THE PRINCIPATE	59
V. THE BYZANTINE AGE	85

PART II

RELATIONS WITH THE SUZERAIN

VI. THE KINGS	95
VII. THE ROMAN REPUBLIC	113
VIII. THE ROMAN EMPIRE	129
IX. THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE	147

PART III

INTERNAL POLITICS

X. THE HELLENISTIC AGE	157
XI. THE ROMAN AGE	170
XII. THE BYZANTINE AGE	192

PART IV

CIVIC SERVICES

XIII. MATERIAL NEEDS	211
XIV. EDUCATION	220
XV. RELIGION AND GAMES	227
XVI. PUBLIC WORKS AND RECORDS	236
XVII. FINANCE	241
XVIII. THE BYZANTINE AGE	251

PART V

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE CITIES

XIX. ECONOMIC	259
XX. POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE	270
XXI. CULTURAL	277
NOTES	305
LIST OF BOOKS AND ARTICLES	368
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	371
GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX	374
INDEX OF SOVEREIGNS	383
SUBJECT INDEX	386
INDEX OF GREEK WORDS	392

PART I

THE DIFFUSION OF THE CITY

CHAPTER I

THE WORK OF THE KINGS

IN the diffusion of the Greek city over the lands of the East the reign of Alexander the Great marks the beginning of a new epoch. There had, it is true, in times past been extensive movements of colonization. A wave of Greek settlers had in the period of the great migrations occupied the western coast of Asia Minor, the Pamphylian and Cilician plains, and the island of Cyprus, and had sown them thickly with Greek cities. A later movement of expansion had planted Greek colonies around the northern coast of the Aegean, and flowing through the Hellespont and the Bosphorus had spread northwards and eastwards along the shores of the Black Sea. This same movement had also planted a few more cities along the inhospitable stretches of the south coast of Asia Minor which had been hitherto neglected, had established a permanent trading station in Egypt, and had intensively settled the promontory of Africa which juts out between the Syrtes and *Catabathmus*. But the movement of colonization had stopped for centuries when Alexander revived it and gave to it a far vaster scope by throwing open not only the eastern shore of the Mediterranean but all the interior of Asia.

The diffusion of Greek culture was, on the other hand, still proceeding in Alexander's day, though gradually. All along the western and southern coasts of Asia Minor Greek civilization was spreading inwards from the thin ring of Greek cities on the seaboard, more especially under the active encouragement of the philhellene Hecatomnid dynasts in Caria and Lycia; and the indigenous communities were developing an ordered civic life on the Greek model. In Syria too, though there were no Greek colonies, the intercourse of commerce was introducing Greek art and Greek social customs to the Phoenician cities, and even in conservative Egypt traders and mercenaries had familiarized the natives with the Greek way of life. But Alexander transformed what had been a gentle infiltration into a flood. His spectacular overthrow of the Persian empire incalculably enhanced the

prestige of Hellenism, whose professed champion he was, and made the Greeks the ruling race of the East. This could not but have an immense effect in hastening the hellenization of the oriental peoples and stimulating their ambition to become, like the Greeks, citizens of self-governing communities.

In these two ways, by initiating a new movement of colonization and by giving a new impetus to the spread of Greek culture, Alexander promoted the growth of Greek cities in the East. In another way he indirectly retarded it. The lax, decentralized régime of the Persian empire had given free play to local initiative; the local communities, provided that they paid their tribute and in times of need contributed their contingents to the royal army and navy, had been left to govern themselves very much as they wished. Alexander by the steps he took to improve the efficiency of the royal administration began a movement towards centralized bureaucratic government, which was, under some of the dynasties which succeeded him, to do much to eliminate local self-government and to nip in the bud the growth of civic autonomy from more primitive tribal institutions.

Alexander was not actually the originator of Hellenistic colonization. In this sphere of his activities, as in many others, he owed to his father a debt which is often overlooked. Philip followed up his conquest of Thrace by planting the country with colonies. Few of these colonies survived the period of anarchy which resulted from the Gallic invasion of 279 B.C. Philippi and Heraclea Sintica lay in a district of Thrace which was immediately adjacent to Macedonia and became an integral part of the kingdom. The survival of Philippopolis is more remarkable, since it was for centuries an island of civilization in a surrounding sea of barbarism. Little is known of this premature attempt to hellenize the Thracians, but it would appear that in his choice of settlers Philip anticipated the policy of the Tsars in Siberia: the colonies served the double purpose of penal settlements and outposts of the Macedonian kingdom.¹

Alexander was a colonizer on a grand scale. The majority of his colonies, it is true—all in fact save Alexandria of Egypt—lay in the eastern satrapies and therefore do not directly concern this book. But the influence of Alexander's example was so strong on the dynasties which succeeded him in the western satrapies that it is necessary to investigate his technique of colonization and if possible to deduce its guiding principles. Our information is unfortunately meagre, but certain facts can be established. We

know something of Alexandria of Egypt in the century succeeding its foundation, when it still probably remained much as Alexander had left it, and this information may justifiably be applied to the other foundations. There can in the first place be no doubt that Alexandria was a true city in the fullest sense of the word. The documents show that it had its own code of laws, modelled substantially on those of Athens, and an elaborate system of law courts, again modelled on the Athenian jury system. Its people was, like that of Athens, organized in demes, and, we may presume, tribes. It had its magistrates, and, though this is not directly attested, there can be no doubt that it had its council and popular assembly. Moreover it ruled a territory; for the district known as the Territory of the Alexandrians, though later one of the nomes of Egypt, can hardly have acquired this name unless it had originally been what the name signifies. Alexandria was a true city, an autonomous community centred in a town but ruling a rural district.²

We know less of the composition of the population. Polybius tells us that the citizens were Greeks of mixed descent; we know also that many Egyptians lived in the city, and that these included not only the inhabitants of Rhacotis, the village that had previously occupied the site, but many others who had been transplanted thither from the adjacent country-side and from neighbouring towns. On the question of population the evidence on the far eastern colonies is more explicit and of better quality. It appears from several passages in Arrian that the regular procedure in founding a city was to settle on the site selected a body of European colonists, drawn in the main from the Greek mercenaries but sometimes including time-expired or disabled Macedonians, and in the second place to concentrate in the town a generally far larger number of the natives of the surrounding district.³

Many motives have been suggested for Alexander's policy of colonization. It may have in part been inspired by Isocrates' scheme for thus relieving the over-population of Greece and dis-embarrassing it of the hordes of homeless adventurers who were ready to place their swords at the disposal of any one who would pay them; Alexander did in this way dispose of many thousands of landless and homeless Greeks. Military motives have been suggested; the colonies would serve as fortresses to hold down rebellious districts. There is no doubt some truth in this suggestion; for many of the cities were planted in the unruly districts of

eastern Iran. Commercial motives no doubt also entered into Alexander's schemes. He was, as we know from other phases of his activity, keenly interested in the development of trade, and the cities, particularly those planted in backward regions whose population was nomadic and predatory, would serve as stations on the trade routes, where caravans might assemble in security and exchange their goods. Alexandria of Egypt, too, was clearly designed to be a great port.

But the peculiar character of the foundations seems to point to yet another motive of a more idealistic character. It is significant that the foundations were cities. Military requirements would have been as well fulfilled by fortresses occupied by mercenary garrisons, or, if these were too expensive, by military settlements of the type later favoured by some of the Successors, in which the men received allotments of land but continued to be organized on a military basis. Trade routes could also have been secured by the establishment of fortified stations; the Ptolemies were later to open up the Red Sea by means of trading stations which were not cities. In the second place the participation of barbarians in the new foundations is important, all the more so since it was an *innovation*. If Alexander's object had been merely to provide for the surplus population of Greece, this feature of his colonial policy would be unintelligible. Nor was it conducive to military security to settle within the city wall a large body, generally outnumbering the European colonists, of the barbarians whom these latter were to overawe.

Alexander's colonies must be taken in conjunction with his social and cultural policy. His purposes in this sphere are difficult to trace through the haze of legend which has surrounded them, but it is tolerably clear that Alexander moved steadily away from the standpoint of the average contemporary Greek—and of his master Aristotle—that the barbarians were inferior by nature to the Greeks and fit only to be treated as slaves. Towards the end of his reign two leading ideas seem to have dominated his mind. He felt himself the apostle of Hellenism: it was his mission to carry Greek culture over the barbarian world. The instrument which he chiefly used to promote this policy was the celebration of musical and gymnastic games; by these games, which he held in every country through which he passed, he hoped to popularize Greek literature, music, and drama on the one hand and the Greek cult of athletics on the other. His second ambition was to obliterate the line which separated Greek and barbarian. The most

obvious way in which he promoted this object was by intermarriage. *He himself married a Persian princess, and at the great marriage feast of Susa he allotted wives drawn from the Persian nobility to eighty of his Companions.* The Macedonian and Persian aristocracies were thus to be blended, and the common soldiers were encouraged by the example of their betters and by treasury grants to marry Asiatic wives of lower degree.⁴

Both these policies found expression in the colonies. The essence of Greek civilization was civilization in its literal sense, life in a city community. The new cities were to provide models for the barbarians to imitate, and to be centres from which Greek culture was to penetrate the surrounding country. And from the first some barbarians were to be brought into intimate contact with the life of the city by actually living in the town. It would be interesting to know what Alexander intended the relations of the Greek and barbarian settlers to be. At Alexandria of Egypt the citizen body was in Roman times exclusively—except for illegal leakages—Greek, and the Egyptians had no political rights. This rule may well date from the foundation, but it is less certain that Alexander intended such a state of affairs to be permanent. He may well have considered that in the first generation the barbarians would be unfitted for citizenship; they needed to be trained for their responsibilities. But it seems improbable, in view of what we know of his general policy, that he intended the barbarians to be permanently excluded. Still less is it likely that he intended the Greeks to remain racially segregated from their fellow townsmen, as they later were by strict laws prohibiting that intermarriage which Alexander did his best to encourage. But his colonies were still in an experimental stage when he died, and when his guiding hand was removed the normal Greek attitude of exclusiveness prevailed.

If Alexander is a shadowy figure to us, the Successors are dimmer still. Their record is largely that of their mutual struggles either to master the whole empire or to establish their independence in their own satrapies. But they found time to establish a very large number of cities: nearly every prominent figure of the generation which followed Alexander's death is commemorated by at least one city, and often by a whole cluster, bearing his name or those of his family. This fact at least proves that the Successors were so far dominated by Alexander's ideas that they felt it to be an integral part of their royal prerogative to found cities. It became henceforth in the ideal theory of monarchy a

primary duty of a king to advance the civilization of his kingdom, or in other words to promote civic life within its boundaries: and since the creation of new cities was the most obvious and the most spectacular way of fulfilling this duty, it was the ambition of every king who wished his memory to remain green in future ages to leave in a city which bore his name a perpetual memorial of his enlightened rule. The foundation of a city became almost a hallmark of royalty. As Alexander's empire fell to pieces the emergence of the satraps as independent kings is marked by successive foundations of cities bearing their names, and the native dynasts who soon after asserted their independence similarly celebrated their emancipation by founding cities.

But if the notion that it was at once the duty and the glory of kings to found cities became firmly established, a critical analysis of their foundations makes it very doubtful whether the Successors really grasped the ideals underlying Alexander's colonial policy, or, if they grasped them, whether they approved them. The Successors were men of smaller calibre than Alexander, more subject to the prejudices of their race and age. It is very probable that most of them shared the normal contempt of the Macedonians for barbarians; and, whatever their personal feelings, political necessity compelled them to be more respectful of the prejudices of their followers than Alexander had been. They lacked Alexander's legitimate title to the loyalty of the Macedonian people and his vast prestige. He had made himself very unpopular with the Macedonians by his policy of putting barbarians on an equal footing with them, but he could afford to be unpopular. The Successors had to win the allegiance of their followers in competition with many other claimants, and they therefore had to conform to the ideas of those whom they led. Hence they tended to relegate the barbarians once more to the position of an inferior race.

It may also be questioned whether most of them had any very genuine enthusiasm for the political side of Greek culture. Some proclaimed themselves champions of the autonomy of the Hellenes, but even if this policy was sincere and not merely a bid for the support of the Greek cities against rivals who used more direct methods to control them, it does not imply any desire to enlarge the field of autonomy. The Successors, knowing by bitter experience how troublesome the old Greek cities could be, may well have been reluctant to create new centres of unrest in the barbarian parts of their dominions.

Some of the cities founded by the Successors nevertheless followed Alexander's model fairly closely. Antigonos, who till 301 ruled the greater part of Asia Minor and Syria and aspired to become Alexander's successor, seems to have maintained his master's policy most faithfully. Two of his foundations, Antigoneia of Bithynia, after his fall renamed Nicaea by Lysimachus, and Antigoneia of Syria, moved to a new site by Seleucus Nicator and called Antioch, were new Greek cities on barbarian soil. On the provenance of their settlers we have evidence which, though late, is probably reliable. The colonists of the Syrian city are said to have been Athenians with some Macedonians; there is no reason to doubt this statement, for Antigonos was in a position to demand a draft of settlers from Athens. The colonists of the Bithynian city are less precisely specified as 'Macedonians and the first of the Hellenes'; Dio Chrysostom who makes this statement emphasizes that they were not a mixed riff-raff and this may mean that they were not mercenaries but drafts from Greek cities under Antigonos' control. It is virtually certain, though definite evidence is lacking, that these foundations were true cities. Ptolemais of the Thebaid, the sole foundation of Ptolemy of Egypt, is proved to have been an autonomous city by inscriptions of the third century B.C., which record decrees of its council and assembly and mention its magistrates and its jury courts. Nothing is known of its settlers save that in the first century A.D. their descendants still bore distinctively Greek and particularly Macedonian names.⁵

Seleucus Nicator, who, at first satrap of Babylonia, conquered the far eastern satrapies and then in 301 pushed forward his western frontier to the Cilician Gates, has achieved the reputation of having been a colonizer on a grand scale: sixteen Antiochs, nine Seleucias, six Laodiceas, three Apameas and a Stratonicea, in addition to other cities named after Alexander or his own victories are attributed to him, and of these a large proportion seem to have lain in Mesopotamia, northern Syria, and Cilicia, which he regarded as the nucleus of his kingdom from 301. From lack of evidence it is very difficult to assess this vast colonial activity at its true value. It may be assumed that these foundations were true cities; a papyrus of the third century B.C. records the magistrates of both Seleucia in Pieria and Antioch by Daphne. A fair proportion of them must have been colonies of immigrants. Antioch by Daphne was so—though Seleucus in this case merely reused the human material supplied by Antigonos: Apamea on the Orontes was peopled with Macedonians: and the presumption is that new

cities in the interior, such as Seleucia and Apamea on the Bridge, *Seleucia by the Belus, Nicopolis, and Nicephorium*, were colonies of European settlers. Some of Seleucus' foundations were, it may be noted, superimposed on old native towns—Laodicea under Libanus on Kadesh, Antioch on the Callirhoe and Antioch in Mygdonia on Orrhoe and Nisibis respectively. Here again it is probable that the citizen body were European colonists; Macedonians were certainly settled at Orrhoe.⁶

Another series of settlements attributed to Seleucus Nicator seems to have been primarily inspired by a motive which can never have entered Alexander's mind. Alexander had never experienced a lack of man-power. As king of Macedon he could draw as he wished on the resources of Macedonia to fill the gaps in his army caused by casualties or old age; as general of the league of Corinth he could—though he does not seem to have made much use of his powers—levy contingents from the Greek cities; he could recruit Greek mercenaries without stint. He was, moreover, in his last years making various experiments in the use of Persian and other oriental troops. The Successors were in a very different position. They were dependent on the goodwill of the *regent of Macedonia for fresh drafts to reinforce the Macedonian regiments which they retained to garrison their satrapies; and seeing that they were either actual or potential rivals, Cassander was not likely to gratify them, particularly as the population of Macedonia was already heavily depleted. Their power to raise Greek mercenaries depended on control of the communications to the Aegean, and this for Ptolemy and Seleucus at any rate meant control of the sea, which was always precarious. Finally, they could not afford to experiment with Oriental troops. Subsequent experience proved that Orientals, even the despised Egyptians, could be made into excellent soldiers. But at the moment their inferiority seemed to have been proved by the collapse of the Persian armies before Alexander. Engaged as they were in a life and death struggle with one another, the Successors would only use troops of tried quality, that is to say, Greeks, some of the fighting races of the west, such as Thracians and Mysians, and above all Macedonians.*

Such troops were none too easy to obtain and must be kept at all costs, but to keep them all under arms was impossibly expensive. The solution which the Successors uniformly adopted was to settle a large number on the land. This policy was not only economical but had the additional advantage of attaching the

troops to their leader by a more solid link than mere pay. In the early struggles after Alexander's death the loyalty of the troops to the several leaders had—not unnaturally, since there was little to choose between them—been of the most precarious, and mass desertions had been common. Attached to the soil they might come to regard the kingdom in which they had settled as their home.

The policy of settling soldiers on the land had no necessary connexion with the creation of cities. The early Ptolemies settled *many thousands of Macedonians and Greeks in Egypt*, but the lots of land which they granted to them were scattered all over the country, and even where, as on the newly reclaimed land of the Lake nome, the settlement was densest and whole new villages of colonists were created, the kings granted to them no communal organization. The men were registered under their military units: for civil purposes they were governed by the same bureaucratic machine which regulated the life of the Egyptians. In western Asia Minor also military settlements of Macedonians were made, probably by Lysimachus, who ruled it from 301–280 B.C. But these again lacked any autonomy. Units were settled round the more important towns, but they took no part in the life of the town, nor had they any communal life of their own, remaining under military discipline. They were eventually received into the citizen bodies of the towns around which they lived, but this was a much later development.⁷

Seleucus' scheme of military colonization was conceived on more imaginative, it may be even said romantic, lines. It seems to have been his object to make the lands of northern Syria and Mesopotamia a second Macedonia, in which his expatriated countrymen should feel at home. It was no doubt as part of this policy that he renamed even the physical features of the country, calling the Orontes the Axius, the mountainous coast-line Pieria, and the plains around Nisibis Mygdonia. On a similar principle he named his settlements after towns of the old country—Pella, Aegae, Edessa, Cyrrhus, Beroea, Arethusa, Anthemus, Ichnae, Europus, Amphipolis, Chalcis (probably so called after Chalcidice and not after the Euboean city) and Larissa. The great majority of these colonies had been native towns, but there is ample evidence that they were planted with settlers, and there is some evidence for what is *a priori* probable, that the settlers came from the city which gave the colony its name; the inhabitants of Larissa are known to have been Thessalians.

These settlements were at a later date cities: Aegae issued coins under Antiochus IV and Cyrrhus under Alexander Balas, and many others under Roman rule. But it is questionable whether they were cities in the full sense from the first. It may be significant that some of these settlements were granted dynastic names not long after their creation, Pella on the Orontes for instance becoming Apamea and Edessa Antioch on the Callirhoe; it may be suggested that the dynastic name marks the grant of a charter of autonomy. Larissa was not a city in the second century B.C. but a town in the territory of Apamea. The land law of Europus in Parapotamia may also be a relic of the original status of the settlements. The land was not true freehold, as in the territory of a city, but escheated to the crown on the failure of heirs within a prescribed degree. This may mean that Europus was once merely a group of settlers, holding hereditary leases of crown land, like the Egyptian military colonies of the later Ptolemaic régime. As early as the beginning of the second century B.C. the men of Europus style themselves on official documents 'Europaeans', that is members of the community of Europus, in contrast to the military colonists of Asia Minor, whose official style is 'Macedonians about Thyateira'. Whether this means that Europus had in the course of the third century acquired city status, land tenure remaining however unchanged, or that Seleucus' military settlements from the first enjoyed some degree of autonomy without full city status, cannot be determined.⁸

The rulers of Macedonia and Greece had little scope for founding colonies of Alexander's type. Cassander indeed founded one city, named Antipatreia after his father, in the Illyrian country on the western frontier of Macedonia, which seems to have conformed to Alexander's pattern; it was primarily a fortress, but was autonomous and was no doubt peopled with Macedonians. But Cassander's more famous foundations were synoecisms of the traditional Greek type, though on a more grandiose scale. Cassandreia, which replaced Potidaea, destroyed by Philip, was formed by the amalgamation of Chalcidian cities, including the remnant of the Olynthians. In Thessalonica were concentrated twenty-six small cities around the Thermaic gulf. In Greece Cassander pursued the same policy, amalgamating two cities with Phthiotic Thebes, and persuading his allies the Acarnanians to concentrate in three cities. Demetrius Poliorcetes, who succeeded Cassander on the throne of Macedonia for a brief space, celebrated his reign by founding Demetrias; the city was formed by the

union of a number of cities in southern Magnesia—the names of twelve are recorded.⁹

Lysimachus seems to have made no attempt to carry forward Philip's programme of colonization in the interior of Thrace. His only foundation in Europe was Lysimacheia, which was merely a synoecism of a number of small Greek cities in the Chersonese. Nor, when in 301 he acquired Asia Minor, did he attempt to colonize the barbarous interior. His policy was again to amalgamate the Greek cities of the coast; a grandiose scheme to merge Teos and Lebedus in Ephesus under the title of Arsinoeia is all that is recorded. The city founded by his wife Amastris and called by her name was likewise a synoecism of four Greek colonies on the coast of the Euxine. Antigonos, who ruled Asia Minor before him, also founded some cities of this type. He tried to amalgamate Teos and Lebedus, and succeeded in reconstituting Smyrna, which had since the days of the Lydian kings been broken up into a number of villages, and in amalgamating upwards of six of the little Aeolian cities of the southern Troad in a new city, Antigoneia, renamed by Lysimachus Alexandria. Some too of Seleucus' foundations would seem to have been synoecisms; in Cilicia he had available the raw material in the Greek or long Hellenized cities of the coast. Seleucia on the Calycadnus is said to have been peopled with the inhabitants of the little city of Holmi near by, and it is probable that those of Aphrodisias swelled the new foundation; at any rate it disappears henceforth as a city. Issus and Myriandus similarly disappear with the foundation of Alexandria by Issus. Posideium on the Syrian coast had sunk by the third century to a mere fortress; its population may well have been moved into its new neighbour, Seleucia in Pieria.¹⁰

In the military colonies and in the synoecisms Alexander's original conception of colonization was falling into the background. Neither were new centres of Greek political life in barbarian lands. The former were settlements of Greeks (Macedonians being included in that term) in hitherto undeveloped regions, but lacked political organization. The latter were new cities, but were created in areas where city life already flourished, and at the expense of existing cities. Both movements were nevertheless real contributions to civilization. The military colonies, even if they did not later achieve a corporate life, hastened the general spread of Hellenism. The synoecisms on the whole raised the political life of their districts to a higher level. A city must, as Aristotle observed, be of a certain size adequately to

fulfil its function, and the majority of the cities destroyed by the Successors to provide the material for their new foundations probably did not reach the optimum size, and would never have achieved a very brilliant civic life. Some of the Successors on the other hand erred in the other direction; it is difficult to see what was the advantage of merging in Ephesus, already large enough, the two modest but respectable cities of Teos and Lebedus, and here Lysimachus stands convicted of the megalomania which was the vice of his age.

The Successors were not content to achieve immortality by giving their names to cities which they had created. Some even in the first generation after Alexander took the easier course of simply renaming existing cities. Pleistarchus called the capital of his short-lived kingdom Pleistarcheia; but he seems to have done no more than refortify the ancient hellenized Carian city of Heraclea by Latmus. Some of the many Antiochs and Seleucias of Seleucus Nicator probably belong to the same class; the long-hellenized Cilician city of Tarsus was Antioch on the Cydnus before the middle of the third century B.C. and may well have owed this name to Seleucus Nicator.¹¹

After the turmoil which filled the first generation following Alexander's death the kingdoms formed by his successors settled down into an uneasy equilibrium. Three of the dynasties founded by Alexander's marshals had weathered the storm. In Macedonia the descendants of Antigonus ruled until 168 B.C.; they retained Thessaly also and some control over Greece till Flamininus proclaimed the freedom of their Greek subjects in 196 B.C. They still held under their sway the Paeonian and Illyrian tribes which Philip had subdued, but his other conquest, Thrace, had relapsed after the Gallic invasion of 279 B.C. into an anarchy of warring tribes. In Egypt the family of Ptolemy reigned till 30 B.C.; this dynasty also held Cyprus (till 58 B.C.) and Cyrenaica (till 96 B.C.), and during the third century ruled the southern half of Syria and a number of scattered possessions along the south coast of Asia Minor and around the shores of the Aegean.

The third kingdom, that founded by Seleucus Nicator, was at first the largest by far. Its nucleus was Cilicia Pedias, northern Syria, and Mesopotamia, but its sway extended over the eastern satrapies and westwards to the coast of the Aegean. In Asia Minor its rule was never secure. Native dynasties had already established themselves in Bithynia and Pontic Cappadocia before Asia Minor became Seleucid in 280 B.C. and behind the screen of

the Gauls, whom they planted in the heart of Asia Minor, they consolidated themselves firmly; eventually the Bithynian kingdom was bequeathed to Rome in 74 B.C. and the Pontic annexed a few years later by Pompey. In southern Cappadocia also an oriental dynasty built up during the reigns of Seleucus' two successors a kingdom which was to endure till A.D. 17. Seleucid rule was thus almost from the first limited to the south-eastern part of Asia Minor, and even here the Ptolemies held portions of the south coast, while the highlands of the Milyas, Pisidia, Isauria, and Lycaonia were never effectually subdued. The Seleucid dominions were thus in effect an isolated block, comprising the Troad, Mysia, Phrygia, Lydia, and Caria, joined to the rest of the kingdom only by a tenuous route between the Gauls and the tribes of the southern highlands. Seleucid control of this detached province was inevitably weak and permitted the growth of several minor dynasties in the area, one of which, that of the Greek lords of Pergamum, for a time beat the Seleucids out of Asia Minor.

Antiochus the Great consolidated his control of Asia Minor, expelling the Ptolemies, but was ejected in his turn by the Romans, who allotted the greater part of the Seleucid sphere in Asia Minor, all except Lycia and Caria, to the kings of Pergamum; this kingdom lasted a little over half a century, being bequeathed to Rome in 133 B.C. Antiochus the Great also rounded off his dominions in Syria by the conquest of the Ptolemaic sphere in the south (201 B.C.), but in the latter part of his reign the Parthian power began to be menacing in the eastern satrapies. The Seleucid dynasty was gradually confined to Cilicia and Syria, and in this narrow area wasted its strength on interminable internecine wars, in the course of which a number of native kingdoms, Commagene, the Ituraeans, the Jews, and the Nabataeans, established their independence. The Seleucid power had long been a shadow when Pompey annexed Cilicia and Syria in 65-63 B.C.

The record of the Antigonids is modest—they had indeed little scope for activity—but on the whole useful. Antigonus Gonatas founded two cities on the barbarian fringe of his kingdom, Antigoneia in Chaonia and Antigoneia in Paeonia; both were no doubt primarily fortresses. His other foundations, another Antigoneia on the west and a Stratonice on the east coast of Chalcidice, and Phila, built by his son Demetrius II at the mouth of the Peneus, were likewise in all probability designed to hold the southern frontier of the kingdom and to overawe the Greek cities of the

coast, which—including the royal foundation of *Cassandraia*—tended to be restive. All were, however, true cities; they were probably peopled with Macedonians. Philip V continued the work of hellenizing Paconia, building a city named *Perseis* after his son; his other foundations, two *Philippopoleis* and an *Olympias* in Thessaly, were merely new names given to old cities; in one case the new name celebrated the massacre of the native population and the substitution for it of Macedonians.¹²

The Ptolemies made a very grand display of activity; their empire was littered with cities named *Ptolemais*, *Berenice*, and above all *Arsinoe*. But on analysis their real contribution comes down to almost nothing. In the Aegean all the three *Arsinoes* were old Greek cities, and *Ptolemais* was *Lebedus*. The Lycian *Arsinoe* was the long hellenized city of *Patara*, and the Pamphylian *Ptolemais* and *Arsinoe* and the Cilician *Arsinoe* were probably also old Greek or hellenized cities. *Arsinoe* in Cyprus was *Marium*, rebuilt by Ptolemy II after its destruction by his father. *Arsinoe*, *Berenice*, and *Ptolemais* in Cyrenaica were merely new names for *Taucheira*, *Euesperides*, and *Barca*; only in the last case was the change of name justified by any change in substance—the population was moved down from the old city inland to the port. On the Syrian coast the name of *Ptolemais* given to *Ace* seems to have signified nothing; the Phoenician towns were all by this date autonomous, and *Ptolemais* remained despite its Greek name purely Phoenician.¹³

These 'foundations' were nothing more than new names for old cities. Others of the Ptolemaic dynastic names mark the creation of new towns indeed, but towns which had no civic organization; the trading stations on the Red Sea coast and the military settlements in the Lake nome—itsself given a dynastic name, the *Arsinoite*, by Ptolemy II—were grandiosely labelled *Berenice*, *Arsinoe*, *Philadelphia*, *Philoteris*, and so forth. The Ptolemies cheapened dynastic names yet farther by bestowing them on native towns without raising their status. *Crocodilopolis*, the metropolis of the *Arsinoite* nome, was renamed, probably by *Euergetes II*, *Ptolemais Euergetis*; but it remained an Egyptian town without a vestige of civic organization. One may suspect that the Ptolemaic 'foundations' in the interior of Syria were of a similar type. There is no reason to believe that *Philadelphia* was more than a new name for *Rabbatamana*, the administrative capital of the hyparchy of *Ammanitis*, or that *Aela* when it was called *Berenice* ceased to be a mere trading station; the other

'foundations', Berenice (Pella), Arsinoe in the Aulon (perhaps Damascus), and Philoteria, were probably equally spurious.¹⁴

The Seleucids were the most active of the three Macedonian dynasties. The immediate successors of Seleucus Nicator seem to have been chiefly interested in Asia Minor, which he had conquered but had not lived to govern. Their first anxiety was no doubt to secure the road which led to their western province, and on it four cities were founded. Antioch by Pisidia was a colony in the old style, peopled by a draft of settlers from Magnesia on the Maeander. Apollonia by Pisidia may have been colonized with Thracian and Lycian troops, but the evidence for this is far from conclusive. Both these colonies were superimposed on old Phrygian towns. Of the other two cities, Laodicea the Burnt and Seleucia the Iron, we know only the sites.¹⁵

Farther west Antiochus I rebuilt Celaenae, the ancient capital of Great Phrygia, and renamed it Apamea. Apamea had by the beginning of the second century B.C. a Greek constitution, but no settlers are recorded, and it is perhaps significant that its people was in later times not divided in the Greek manner in tribes but organized by streets or trades. It may be that in Apamea we have the first instance of a new type of foundation, the reorganization of a native town as an autonomous community. Of Laodicea on the Lycus, founded by Antiochus II, we know even less; it was apparently an old town—its native name Rhoas is recorded by Pliny—but, as its people were divided into tribes, some of which bear Seleucid names, it may have been colonized. Antiochus I was probably the founder of two cities named Stratonicea, one in Mysia, the other in Caria: the latter at any rate was a colony of Macedonians. The other Seleucid foundations in Caria seem for the most part to have been synoecisms of the already strongly hellenized Carian communities. Nysa was certainly of this type, and probably Antioch on the Maeander; the later name of Apollonia on the Maeander, Tripolis, shows that this city on the Caro-Lyidian border was formed by the union of three communities. Seleucia and Antioch of the Chrysaoreis were merely new names bestowed by Antiochus III on the ancient hellenized Carian cities of Tralles and Alabanda.¹⁶

In Cilicia and Syria little progress can be traced from the days of Seleucus Nicator—to whom perhaps some of the work of his successors has been attributed—till those of Antiochus Epiphanes. Arad is said at one time—probably between 259 and 239 B.C.—to have been called Antioch in Pieria, and Berytus was renamed,

probably by Seleucus IV, Laodicea in Phoenice. The grant of dynastic names to these already autonomous Phoenician cities meant nothing; it is a curious and significant fact that Berytus actually translated its Greek title into Phoenician on the coins which it issued under Epiphanes.¹⁷

Antiochus Epiphanes showered dynastic names over his kingdom. His foundations were certainly not colonies. The age of immigration was by now long past—the last batch of Greeks who are recorded to have been transplanted into Syria were Euboeans and Aetolians whom Antiochus the Great incorporated in Antioch, and these were probably his political supporters who preferred exile in Syria to the vengeance of the Romans. After Magnesia the Seleucids had no Greek cities under their sway on whom they could draw for colonists, and in any case the population of Greece was by now on the decline. Nor were Antiochus Epiphanes' foundations synoecisms: they seem uniformly to have been existing native towns. Many of them are *no doubt to be discounted* as mere honorific titles granted to existing cities; 'the Antiochenes in Ptolemais' are a fairly obvious example. But a large number of them marked a genuine change, the grant of civic autonomy to a hitherto unorganized native town.

Antiochus was a curious and unbalanced character, and his motives are difficult to analyse. He was on the one hand a man of sudden and often rather superficial enthusiasms. At one period he was deeply impressed by Roman institutions, and robed in a toga administered justice in Antioch like a Roman magistrate. But his real passion was Hellenism; he seems to have felt a genuine mission to disseminate Greek culture throughout his dominions. On the other hand he was a hard-headed politician, and his hellenizing policy was a sound financial proposition. His educated native subjects were ambitious to become Hellenes, and when Antiochus showed that he viewed their ambition with favour they responded eagerly to his lead. But they found they had to pay, and pay heavily, for the royal authorization requisite for establishing Hellenic institutions in their towns. Antiochus did not boggle at the political implications of his hellenizing policy. He was prepared, as the great outburst of civic coinage in his reign shows, to allow to his cities—at a price no doubt—a greater measure of self-government than most Hellenistic kings liked to give. And furthermore he was prepared to give charters of autonomy to towns which had no civic organization; in such a case a substantial fee was demanded, as we know from the book of Maccabees.

Antiochus thus at the same time fulfilled his hellenizing mission and replenished his treasury. We have positive evidence for one only of his foundations, and that one proved abortive. But as the people of Jerusalem, or rather the hellenized notables of the town, obtained a licence to open a gymnasium, institute ephebic training, and be registered as 'the Antiochenes in Jerusalem', so no doubt did Oeniandus in Cilicia and Hamath on the Orontes become Epiphaneia, and Gerasa, Abila, Hippos, and Gadara in Coele Syria become Antiochs and Seleucias.¹⁸

Of the minor dynasties the Attalids and the Bithynian kings have the largest number of foundations to their credit. The Attalids founded three cities while they were still only dynasts of a small area round Pergamum, Philetaeria in the Troad, and Attaleia and Apollonis in northern Lydia: all were primarily military settlements, but Attaleia was at any rate later a city, and Apollonis is so called in an inscription which records its foundation; the city was formed by a synoecism, probably of the earlier Macedonian military settlements which were thick in the neighbourhood. After 189 B.C. were built Philadelphia of Lydia, Dionysopolis and Eumeneia of Phrygia, and Attaleia of Pamphylia. The first was almost certainly a native Lydian town reorganized; it still retained in later times the indigenous grouping by trades instead of the tribal system. The two last claim on their coins to be Achaean and Athenian respectively, and may be colonies. Two other Eumeneias are also recorded which later ceased to bear this name, one in Caria and one in 'Hyrcanis': the latter perhaps marked the concentration in a town of the tribal community of the Hyrcaneis on the Hermus.¹⁹

The Bithynian dynasty made a fine display, but there was not much substance behind the façade of dynastic names. The capital Nicomedia was apparently a synoecism of two Greek cities, Olbia and Astacus. Apamea and Prusias on Sea were restorations of Myrleia and Cius, two cities recently destroyed by Philip V of Macedon. Prusias by the Hypius was a new name for the old Greek colony of Cierus. Prusa would seem to have been a new foundation, and Bithynium was a military settlement of Bithynians in the Paphlagonian territory conquered by Nicomedes I; the Paphlagonian town of Creteia would also seem to have been colonized with Bithynians.²⁰

Of the other dynasties there is even less to record. The one foundation of the kings of Pontus, Pharnaceia, was a synoecism of two Greek colonies. The kings of Cappadocia had no Greek

subjects, and the native Cappadocians were a backward people, slow to adopt Greek culture. But the dynasty did its best to hellenize the few towns. Ariarathea, probably the work of the founder of the kingdom, seems by the first century B.C. at any rate to have been a true city. Mazaca and Tyana were granted autonomy, under the styles of Eusebeia under the Argaeus and Eusebeia in Taurus respectively, by Ariarathes V Eusebes, who was personally a keen student of Greek literature, philosophy and, it would seem, constitutional antiquities; we are told that the Mazacenes were granted the laws of Charondas. This Ariarathes seems to have granted Greek constitutions to other towns which perished in the decadence of the kingdom after his death: an inscription of his time or shortly after reveals that at that period Anisa, a town of which there is no trace later, was an autonomous community.²¹

The lesser Macedonian dynasts who established themselves in the third century B.C. in Seleucid Asia Minor founded several cities named after themselves, Docimium, Themisonium, and Philomelium and Lysias. Even the native dynasties which rose on the ruins of the Seleucid kingdom in Syria followed the universal fashion. King Samos of Commagene built Samosata, and one of the Nabataean kings named Obodas was revered as the founder of Eboda; these seem both to have been genuine cities. Mennaëus, tetrarch of the Ituraeans, gave to his capital Gerra the Greek name of Chalcis, but not, it would appear, a Greek constitution; Chalcis remained a native town. Only the Hasmonæan dynasty left no memorial of themselves; the kings of the Jews preferred to be remembered as destroyers rather than as founders of cities.²²

There was another aspect of royal policy which was not so favourable to the development of city government—the system of centralized administration which was evolved by many hellenistic monarchies. The system was indigenous in Egypt, and it was here that under the Ptolemies it reached its most extreme form. In Egypt too, owing to the survival of innumerable administrative documents written on papyrus, its working is best known to us: elsewhere we can in general only infer its existence from fragmentary allusions to it, or from the titles of officials or territorial divisions.

Egypt was divided into about forty circumscriptions called nomes, each governed by an official called a *strategus*, assisted by a royal scribe, who provided him with the statistical data required by the administration, and by various other officials responsible

for special departments, such as police, royal monopolies, land revenue, and so forth. Each nome was subdivided into two or more toparchies, with a smaller staff of officials, the chief of whom were the governor (toparch) and the scribe (*topogrammateus*). The toparchies were again subdivided into villages, which were the ultimate unit of government; each village had its headman (comarch) and its scribe (*comogrammateus*). All these officials, even the humble village clerk, were appointed by the crown, and all authority radiated from the centre outward: orders were circulated by the central ministries to the relevant nome officials, and by them to those of the toparchies and by them again to the village officials; local difficulties were reported by the village officials to their superiors, and these reports were sifted and if necessary sent a stage higher, and eventually the accumulated dossier came down again by the same route to the village officials with a decision.

Such a system was expensive and needed careful supervision, but if it was efficiently run it had the great advantage that it made possible the most minute and elaborate economic exploitation of the country in the interest of the government. In Egypt this exploitation went to extraordinary lengths. The land, which was regarded as crown property, was, with the exception of limited areas granted on more favourable terms to privileged classes, such as military colonists, rack rented in small lots to the natives, the 'royal cultivators'. By giving the tenants no definite leases and by encouraging competitive bids the government secured the maximum rent possible: it further specified the nature of the crop in accordance with its own requirements. The irrigation works were maintained by an elaborate system of forced labour. The quality of the crop was improved by loaning seed corn to the tenants—they apparently had no corn left after paying their rent, which was in kind, feeding themselves and selling a minute surplus for their cash requirements. Furthermore almost every necessity of daily life—salt, oil, beer, and cloth, to name some prominent examples—was monopolized by the government. The operation of these monopolies was it is true entrusted to concessionaires, but the government regulated the price of the raw materials, the wages of the operatives, and the price of the finished product, and so minutely supervised all their activities through its officials that they can have made little profit on their contracts. Finally an infinite variety of complicated taxes were levied: these too were usually farmed, but the farmers were so elaborately

supervised that they had little opportunity of pocketing any more than the legal percentage of the revenue which passed through their hands.

The system embraced the entire country. The temples, which had been powerful corporations owning their own sources of revenue, were brought under its net. They were not, it is true, deprived of their property, but their land was administered on their behalf by the crown, which paid a salary to each priest, and the taxes that they had previously collected themselves were collected by the crown and the proceeds remitted to them. The few cities which existed were deprived of territorial jurisdiction. The "Territory of the Alexandrians" became a nome, administered from Hermopolis Minor; Ptolemais was the metropolis of the Thinite nome; and the tiny territory of Naucratis was brought under royal administration, eventually to become the Naucratic nome.²³

A similar system was applied by the Ptolemies to southern Syria, or at any rate the inland part of it. From a recently-published papyrus of the reign of Ptolemy II we know that the country was then divided into hyparchies; these were probably the areas which long continued to bear the typically Ptolemaic termination -itis—Ammanitis, Esbonitis, Moabitis, and so forth—and if so were larger than the Egyptian nome. The document makes no allusion to any administrative division between these and the villages, but the system would seem to have been later elaborated; for we hear in the second century B.C. of units much smaller than the hyparchies called nomes or later toparchies. We also hear of meridarchs, a title which implies a corresponding territorial unit called a 'section' (*meris*), but this may be only a later name of the hyparchy. The document further alludes to the financial managers (*oekonomi*) of the hyparchies and the village headmen (*comarchs*). The system of economic exploitation does not seem to have been so elaborate, for the revenue of each village was farmed *en bloc*; but a list of taxes given in a letter of the Seleucid king Demetrius II is formidable enough—the salt monopoly, the crown tax, 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on cereal crops, and 50 per cent. on the produce of fruit trees, not to speak of other unspecified taxes.²⁴

The system was maintained intact by the Seleucids when they annexed the country, and was perhaps not greatly modified by the grant of civic charters under Antiochus IV. The taxes remained the same, and there were still royal administrative officials in Jerusalem after it had become Antioch; the offices of *strategus*

and meridarch were conferred on Jonathan by Alexander Balas. The city authorities probably controlled only the town, and perhaps only its cultural institutions; central officials continued to administer the country-side and to collect the taxes. With the collapse of the Seleucid government the cities no doubt generally usurped the entire administration of their area. But in Judaea and in the districts which they conquered the Hasmonaeans maintained bureaucratic administration and ultimately handed it on to the Herodian dynasty. The Ituraean princes would also seem to have maintained the rudiments of the system until they also handed on what remained of it to the Herodians, and something rather similar is found in the Nabataean kingdom, which absorbed much territory that had been Ptolemaic. But in the hands of these inefficient rulers the system became a caricature of its former self: we happen to know that the *strategi* of the Nabataean kingdom—still called by that title transliterated into Aramaic characters—held their office for life by hereditary tenure.²⁵

Most of the minor barbarian kingdoms were governed on the same lines. Cappadocia was, we are told by Strabo, divided into ten *strategiae*. We have no precise information on Pontus, but Strabo's description of the country is based on a division into eparchies, most of which bear names with the characteristic endings -itis or -ene. Paphlagonia is divided by him into similar districts, which were probably entitled hyparchies. Of Bithynia we know nothing at this date, but its later history suggests that the interior, which was devoid of cities, was governed on bureaucratic lines. There is a little evidence which suggests that Com-magene was divided like Cappadocia into *strategiae*, four in number, and that the little Cilician kingdom of Tarcondimotus was similarly organized. In none of these cases is it likely that the administration was as ruthlessly efficient and pervasive as the Ptolemaic; we know for instance that in Pontus and Cappadocia the great temples were left in full control of their lands and serfs, the crown merely arrogating to itself the nomination of their high priests.²⁶

The Seleucids seem never to have attempted to introduce such a system into their kingdom, which was too vast to be administered in such meticulous detail. In Asia Minor they maintained the old Persian satrapies—Lydia, Caria, and Great and Hellespontine Phrygia. Within them it is true they introduced a smaller division, the hyparchy, but even the hyparchies were still very large areas, and their governors had to leave local administration to the native

authorities. In Syria the Seleucids created smaller satrapies—there were four, probably Antiochene, Apamene, Cyrrhestice, and Chalcidene—but there is no evidence that these were further subdivided; they were large units comprising a number of cities and tribes. In Macedonia the Antigonids made no attempt to introduce a bureaucratic system, which would have been utterly alien to the temper of their people. The Macedonians had always been grouped in self-governing communities, cities in the plain and tribes in the western highlands. As the kingdom expanded it had incorporated the Greek colonies of the coast and a number of Illyrian, Paeonian, and Thracian tribes. Royal commandants of these turbulent frontier districts are recorded, but they were probably military officers rather than civil governors. Even the Ptolemies, much though they interfered with the internal affairs of their cities, permitted a façade of autonomy in those parts of their empire where city life was already strongly developed—Cyrenaica, Cyprus, Lycia, and Phoenicia, including probably the Palestinian coast. The Attalids also, though they intervened much more actively in local administration than had their Seleucid predecessors, did not formally challenge the autonomy which the communities of western Asia Minor had achieved under Seleucid rule.²⁷

Bureaucratic government, in so far as it fostered the growth of towns round the centres of administration, provided the raw material for the eventual development of civic life, and, if the administrative language was Greek, diffused the knowledge of that language, since all officials had to learn it, and thus ultimately promoted the spread of Greek culture: it no doubt also trained the upper strata of the native population, from which the minor officials were drawn, in the technique of government. But it gave no chance to the indigenous political institutions of the native communities to develop; on the contrary it condemned them to inactivity and allowed them to wither away. Its effects were particularly disastrous among a primitive population. A loose tribal organization could not stand up against it and rapidly became atrophied, while on the other hand towns did not develop in a sparsely populated and purely agricultural or pastoral country. In Cappadocia and Pontus, for instance, the centres of administration remained merely large villages, or even royal fortresses, while no vestige survived of whatever political institutions the people had previously possessed.

In the story of the diffusion of Greek political institutions

through the East the kings bulk large. This is partly the inevitable result of the glamour which surrounds the deeds of royalty. Partly it is due to the excellence of royal propaganda; the immense array of dynastic names has successfully dazzled the eyes of later observers, as no doubt it impressed contemporaries. In reality the contribution of the kings was not of first importance. The side of their work that had the most solid worth was colonization. But colonization cannot have been carried out on any very large scale, if only because the supply of human material was limited. It is of course impossible to estimate with any precision the number of European immigrants who settled in the East during the late fourth and the third centuries B.C., but certain considerations suggest that it was not very large.

It is noticeable how prominent a part Macedonians play in the colonization of the East. Seleucus' military colonies all—with the single exception of Larissa—bear the names of Macedonian towns and, so far as our evidence goes, were peopled with Macedonians; the military settlements in western Asia Minor were almost all of Macedonians; Macedonians formed a very large proportion of the soldier settlers of Egypt. Macedonians moreover participated in many city foundations; they are stated to have been among the settlers at Antigoneia of Bithynia and of Syria and there is evidence for them at Alexandria and Ptolemais in Egypt; some cities—Stratonicea of Caria and Apamea of Syria, for instance—were on our evidence entirely Macedonian. The total levy of Macedonia was reckoned in Alexander's day at 30,000, and Alexander took half this number with him to Asia. He did not increase the numbers of the Macedonian army in Asia, for the fresh drafts merely replaced men discharged. The Successors therefore cannot have had more than 15,000 Macedonians to divide amongst themselves on Alexander's death, and it is on the whole unlikely that they extracted many more men from Macedonia itself.²⁸

We have no means of estimating the population of Greece, but it was certainly very much larger; Greece was moreover very definitely overcrowded in the fourth century. But the facts set out above suggest that the number of Greek settlers in the East cannot have been very great; otherwise the Macedonians would not bulk so large in the picture. And conditions in Greece during the third century support this view. It was still easy down to the early second century B.C. to raise large bodies of mercenaries in Greece: and wages, despite the enormous rise in prices caused by Alexander's release of the accumulated Persian treasure, tended if

anything to sink. The labour market was, that is to say, overstocked, and there was a large floating population of landless and workless men. This would hardly have been the case if hundreds of thousands of Greeks had migrated to the East. By the middle of the second century B.C., it is true, the population of Greece had according to Polybius begun to dwindle alarmingly; but by this time the movement of colonization had long ceased, and the decrease is in fact attributed by Polybius to the reluctance of the upper and middle class to marry or to rear more than one or two children.²⁹

Why there was relatively so little settlement of Greeks in the East it is rather difficult to understand. Partly no doubt it was due to the policy of the kings. In their eyes the primary object of settlement was military, and Macedonians, both as being better soldiers and as being harder to obtain, received preferential treatment: the kings normally maintained large bodies of Greek mercenaries under arms on garrison duty, but the need of creating a reserve of Greeks by settlement was less pressing since it was generally possible to enlist additional mercenaries at moments of stress from Greece or the west coast of Asia Minor.

But partly the meagreness of Greek settlement seems to have been due to the unwillingness of the Greeks of this age to emigrate. The royal civil services of course attracted men of enterprise and ability, and the new markets thrown open to Greek trade and even more the great opportunities offered by public contracting in the new kingdoms drew business men to the East. To the masses mercenary service was undoubtedly an attraction; but mercenaries seem to have been reluctant to settle in the East. The Greek troops whom Alexander left in the far east were 'discontented at being planted out among barbarians' and 'longed for Greek life and ways' (the phrases are those of Diodorus), and as soon as Alexander was dead proceeded to march home *en masse*. This is no doubt an extreme case, for the far eastern satrapies were very remote from Greece. But it seems to be symptomatic of the feelings of the average Greek, who wanted to make his pile in the East and then return to live in civilized comfort at home: the returned mercenary, who boasts of his familiarity with kings and ostentatiously displays his oriental treasures, is a stock figure in the Athenian comedy of the late fourth and the third centuries B.C. The system adopted by the kings of requesting drafts of colonists from the Greek cities under their control implies that spontaneous immigration did not fulfil their requirements; for

there can be little doubt that the requests of the kings were really orders, and the guarded praise given by Antioch in Persis to Magnesia on the Maeander for the batch of colonists it had sent—they are described as 'respectable in character and adequate in number'—suggests that the Greek cities found some difficulty in fulfilling the requirements of their royal masters.³⁰

It is improbable therefore that immigration took place on any very large scale. The movement can have had no appreciable effect on the racial composition of the population; the immigrants were on any reckoning a minute proportion of the total population of the East, and were important only as a leaven which gradually permeated the mass. Nor did colonization, as directed by the kings, contribute greatly to the establishment of cities. A large proportion of the colonists were absorbed in rural settlements, and not very many can have been left to man new cities. Since the proper complement of a city seems to have been reckoned at about 5,000 men, it is manifest that the kings cannot have founded very many, and the record of their colonial foundations must be regarded with the utmost caution, not to say scepticism.³¹

The other aspects of the city-building campaign of the kings are not very significant. By promoting synoecism they raised the standard of city life and perhaps, in relatively backward areas like Caria, created it. But here they were merely encouraging a movement which was in progress before they intervened, and which continued after they had gone. In so far as they granted charters of autonomy to native towns and encouraged the adoption of Greek constitutions they certainly promoted the growth of cities. But in this sphere their activity was not very whole-hearted, nor perhaps entirely voluntary. Some dynasties, notably the Ptolemies and those of north-eastern Asia Minor, were on the whole reactionary, preferring direct administration to local self-government. The Ptolemies, it is true, granted autonomy to the Cypriot and Phoenician cities when they deposed their kings, but these cities had already a strong republican feeling and some republican institutions. The hellenizing policy of Ariarathes V was more genuine, but its scope was very small. The Seleucids were certainly more liberal, but it may be suspected that their toleration of local self-government was largely due to the impossibility of administering directly so large a kingdom; this was certainly true in the outlying province of Asia Minor. And even the progressive policy of Antiochus IV may have been in part dictated by financial weakness; he is known to have been short of money and

his charters were certainly sold. On the whole, though in deference to Greek and hellenized public opinion they professed a great zeal for civic autonomy, royal governments for the most part preferred direct administration. And from their own point of view they were right. Civic autonomy was a disruptive influence, and when the Seleucids became involved in civil wars the cities which they had founded or to which they had granted autonomy immediately took advantage of the weakness of the royal power to extract further privileges for themselves and eventually to secure independence. The Ptolemies became involved in similar internecine struggles, but the bureaucratic machine continued to function, and the kingdom of Egypt was still a going concern when Octavian annexed it, whereas Syria had broken up into a medley of warring cities and principalities long before Pompey formally abolished the shadow of Seleucid rule.

CHAPTER II

HELLENIZATION

HELLENISM, before Alexander made it the dominant culture of his empire, had spread but little beyond the area of the Greek settlements. In Thrace the foothold of the Greeks had always been insecure. The colonists had in many cases had a hard struggle to establish themselves, and the cities they had built had never been more than isolated posts. The Thracians were an intractable people, who did not take kindly to Hellenism, and relations between the Greek cities and the neighbouring tribes had usually been hostile. Philip's recent conquest of Thrace and his colonization of the interior seemed to mark the beginning of a new era, but the Gallic invasion was soon to sweep away his work when the foundations were barely laid. Along the northern coast of Asia Minor conditions were similar. The Greek colonies were mere islets of civilization in a sea of barbarism: one, Heraclea, had won security by conquering and reducing to serfdom the native tribe in whose territory it lay, the Mariandyni, the others maintained a precarious foothold amidst a hostile population. The natives differed greatly in their degree of culture, ranging from the utterly savage tribes east of the Halys to the relatively civilized Paphlagonian and Bithynian kingdoms, but none were sufficiently advanced to assimilate Greek culture.³²

Along the west coast of Asia Minor Greek settlement was of greater antiquity and far more intensive. But even here the line of Hellenism, though almost continuous, was very thin. The vast majority of the Greek cities lay on the actual sea coast or on the adjacent islands; very few, like Ilium and Scepsis in the Troad, Aegae, Larissa, and Magnesia in Aeolis, or the southern Larissa on the Cayster and the southern Magnesia on the Maeander, lay even a few miles inland. Nor does Greek culture seem to have made much progress in the interior. The relatively barbarous Mysians appear to have been the most receptive of Hellenism; Pergamum, we know, adopted the Greek annual magistrature in the middle of the fourth century B.C. The Lydians with their ancient native culture seem to have remained, despite the Hellenism of their kings in the past, impervious to Greek culture.³³

In the south-western corner of Asia Minor, though Greek

settlement was much more sparse, Hellenism had achieved a considerable conquest. The Carian people were temperamentally akin to the Greeks and took readily to Greek culture. We hear of bilingual Carians in the fifth century B.C., and in the fourth century the Hecatomnid satraps of Caria adopted Greek as their official language. The original Greek settlers had intermarried freely with the natives, and the Greeks seem never to have developed any racial prejudice against them: when in 408 B.C. the three cities of Rhodes formed a united republic they felt no scruples in incorporating the Carian communities of the adjacent mainland as demes of the new city and admitting their inhabitants as full citizens. The political organization of the Carians was on the same lines as that of the Greeks, if at a rather backward stage. The typical Carian community was very small, and was usually called by the Greeks a village rather than a city. But these villages were often grouped in local federations around some sanctuary, and were in process of coalescing by sympolity or synoecism into larger units which might truly be called cities. By the fourth century Mylasa, Alabanda, and Tralles at any rate were considerable cities; the first bears in its complicated constitution evident marks of its gradual growth by sympolity. The great cities were under the Hecatomnids completely hellenized: we possess from Mylasa decrees of that period, passed in full Greek constitutional form and recorded in Greek.³⁴

The neighbours of the Carians to the east, the Lycians, were less hellenized than the Carians—they continued to use their national language and script for public purposes down into the third century—but politically they were more developed; the Lycians were one of the very few barbarian peoples whose institutions Aristotle thought it worth while to record. Their communities were recognized as cities by the Greeks, and certainly were republican in constitution by the middle of the fourth century, when the local coinage begins to be issued not, as hitherto, in the names of dynasts, but in those of the cities.³⁵

The Pamphylian plain was occupied by a group of large Greek cities of ancient origin. The lawless highlanders of the mountainous hinterland, the Milyae and the Pisidians, would not at first sight seem to have been promising pupils for Hellenism. Their organization was tribal, and they lived for the most part scattered in villages. But in some cases the central stronghold of the tribe had developed into an important town, and the government of the tribes, though usually no doubt a hereditary monarchy, was some-

times of a crude republican type; the Termessians were in the late fourth century ruled by a council of elders, whose decisions required the ratification of a mass meeting of the fighting men. Such communities might be styled rudimentary cities, and some of them were beginning to assimilate the culture of their Greek neighbours on the plain; the Selgians and the Etenneis began about the middle of the fourth century to issue coins with Greek legends.³⁶

Further east, where the mountains come right down to the coast, the Greeks established only a few scattered trading stations, whose influence on the barbarous Cetae of the interior seems to have been slight. In the Cilician plain on the other hand Greek culture was dominant. Several of the great cities of this area were of a very ancient Greek origin, and others, whose claim to be Greek colonies is very questionable, had by the fourth century become completely hellenized: the civic coinage of this area is entirely Greek.³⁷

There were two other areas of Greek settlement in the East, Cyprus and Cyrenaica. Cyprus was colonized during the period of the great migrations, and its cities with the exceptions of autochthonous Amathus and Phoenician Citium claimed to be foundations of Greek heroes of the Homeric age. The culture of Cyprus was Greek, but, isolated as it was from the main stream of development, it remained down to the fourth century in a curiously primitive phase. The Cypriots did not adopt the Greek alphabet, but continued to use a clumsy syllabary—derived apparently from the Minoan script. Their cities were still in Alexander's day ruled by hereditary kings, many of whom claimed descent from Homeric heroes.³⁸

The Greek cities of Cyrenaica were the product of the later movement of colonization, and showed the normal political development of the Greek world, passing from the primitive monarchy to republican government and thereafter oscillating violently between oligarchy and democracy. The Greek settlers had intermarried freely at first with the Libyan natives, and had later subdued and hellenized the more settled agricultural tribes; but the nomadic Libyans remained a thorn in their side.³⁹

Outside the areas of settlement Greek influence was rather superficial. In Egypt the Saite kings had based their power on Greek mercenaries, many of whom settled in the country, and had welcomed Greek traders, granting them a treaty port, Naucratis, which developed into a regular Greek city. The rebel

Pharaohs of the fourth century B.C. had also made extensive use of Greek mercenaries and Greek military experts in their struggles with Persia, and had employed Greeks to reorganize the financial system of the country. But it may be doubted whether it was more than the court and the official aristocracy which was hellenized; one member of the latter, Petosiris, nomarch of Hermopolis, has left a striking monument to his Hellenic tastes in a temple tomb, much of whose sculpture was obviously executed by Greek artists.⁴⁰

In Syria the Phoenician cities were in close commercial contact with Greece; there were many Tyrians and Sidonians resident in Athens, and we hear of an Athenian commercial colony at Ace. The kings of Sidon were great patrons of Greek art, as the magnificent series of their sarcophagi testifies, and one of them, 'Abdastart or in Greek Strato, is recorded to have modelled his dinner parties on those of the Greeks. But the dilettante tastes of the aristocracy cannot be taken as very serious evidence of Hellenism either in Egypt or in Phoenicia.⁴¹

Alexander's conquest of the Persian empire and the resultant establishment of Macedonian dynasties in Egypt, Syria, and western Asia Minor gave an enormous impetus to the hellenization of the East. Not only was there direct propaganda—for the Successors took up with zest Alexander's policy of celebrating gymnastic and musical games—but the movement of colonization which Alexander initiated and the Successors pursued with vigour provided new centres for the spread of Hellenism in regions which had hitherto hardly seen any Greeks save occasional tourists and merchants and passing companies of mercenaries. New Greek cities were built far inland, bodies of Greek colonists were planted in old native towns, Greek military settlers were scattered through the country-side. The native populations of Syria and Mesopotamia, of Upper Egypt, and of the interior of Asia Minor, were now for the first time brought into intimate contact with Hellenism.⁴²

And not only were there new opportunities; there was also an obvious motive for learning the Greek language at any rate. For Greek was now the language of government. Any one therefore who aspired to a government post must learn Greek, and, if he knew it, had a good chance of employment; for, since the Greeks rarely troubled to learn barbarian languages, there was a considerable demand for bilingual orientals who would serve as intermediaries between the higher officials, who were almost invariably Greeks, and the mass of the people.⁴³

But far more important than these practical considerations must have been the psychological effect of Alexander's conquest. The qualities of the Greeks had, it is true, been long appreciated in the East. The Persian kings often employed Greek doctors, because they were the best available; Democedes of Croton and Ctesias of Cnidus are famous examples. Connoisseurs commissioned Greek artists, who could produce far more lifelike statues than their oriental rivals; besides the Sidon sarcophagi and the tomb of Petosiris, the Mausoleum and the Harpy Tomb at Xanthus testify to the vogue of Greek art. Greek financial experts were well known to be ingenious in thinking out new methods of raising revenue; Chabrias of Athens for instance helped King Tachos of Egypt to squeeze money out of his exhausted country. Greek generals and admirals were valued for their scientific knowledge of strategy and given responsible commands: Conon of Athens was for a time admiral of the Persian fleet, the armies of Artaxerxes III and his rebellious subjects were led almost entirely by Greeks—Iphicrates, Chabrias, Agesilaus of Sparta, and others of less fame—and Darius III entrusted the defence of Asia Minor against Alexander to a Greek, Memnon of Rhodes. Greek mercenaries were acknowledged to be the best trained and disciplined troops on the market: Cyrus the Younger entrusted his fortunes to the famous Ten Thousand, Artaxerxes III, Nectanebo, and Tachos of Egypt, Tennes of Sidon, and the various rebel satraps all employed Greeks in large numbers, and Darius III's best and most loyal troops were Greek mercenaries.⁴⁴

But hitherto the oriental had stood in the relation of employer to the Greek. He had found his talents useful and had been prepared to pay for them, but though he might admire the cleverness of the Greek, it had never occurred to him to question his own essential superiority; the Persian king was, after all, incomparably richer and more powerful than the Greek cities. When Alexander knocked over the stately edifice of the Persian empire like a house of cards and the Greeks became the ruling race of the East, the sudden reversal of fortune must have come as a profound shock: Oriental society had been tried in the supreme test of war and had been found wanting. It is little wonder in these circumstances that the peoples of the East began to question the superiority of their own static cultures and to take to heart the outspoken contempt which the Greeks showed for barbarians. They began to realize that, while they had been stagnating in complacent self-satisfaction, the Greeks had been forging ahead; Greek civilization

was modern and up to date, their own was backward and archaic. Their natural reaction was then to shed their native cultures of which they were now ashamed, and to strive to assimilate Hellenism.

The hellenization of the East was a gradual and imperceptible process, and it is from the nature of the case impossible to describe its progress in any detail. We can in general do no more than infer its advance from its eventual triumph, and it is rarely that we can mark the stages through which it moved. The movement as a whole naturally affected mainly the upper classes. The peasants of the country-side had little contact with Hellenism, which was centred in the towns, and were in any case too ignorant to appreciate it. The urban proletariat had greater opportunities of acquiring a smattering of Greek culture, but lacked the leisure or the education to do more. But though the class affected was small, within that class the process of hellenization was extraordinarily thorough. Educated men in the East had no further use for their native cultures, and they adopted that of their conquerors, lock, stock, and barrel. Greek rapidly became the universal language of polite society. Most hellenized orientals were no doubt bilingual in so far as they could talk to their humbler neighbours in their native tongue. But amongst themselves they probably normally spoke Greek, and certainly they were for the most part literate in Greek alone. As a result the oriental languages tended to sink to the level of peasant patois or at best colloquial vernaculars.

There were of course exceptions to this tendency. At Palmyra and in the Nabataean kingdom Aramaic remained an official language well into the Christian era; but these regions were on the fringe of the Hellenic world. In Mesopotamia too it would seem that Syriac must have continued to be used both for official purposes and as a literary vehicle, since we find it employed at Edessa in the early third century A.D. for legal documents and shortly afterwards blossoming out into a literature. But in Mesopotamia Hellenism had enjoyed a relatively short spell of power when the country fell into the hands of the Parthians and of local Semite dynasties.⁴⁵

In Egypt the study of hieroglyphs was maintained for ritual purposes by the priests, and hieroglyphic inscriptions continued to be cut as long as paganism endured. This survival was, however, pure archaism, and it is fairly certain that no one except the priests could read hieroglyphs and very doubtful in view of the

blunders they committed whether the priests themselves really understood them. More important is the survival of the demotic script, which lasted long enough to contribute a few characters to the Coptic alphabet. It must have been in fairly common use in the Ptolemaic period. It is chiefly used for legal documents, and here its survival is to be attributed to the policy of the Ptolemies, who allowed the Egyptians to continue to use their native law and thus perpetuated the class of native notaries. But the use of demotic in tax receipts shows that many minor officials still learned it in preference to, or in addition to, Greek, and there is some popular literature—such as the famous *Prophecy of the Potter*—written in it. It is also significant that the decrees of the priestly synods were in the later Ptolemaic period inscribed not only in hieroglyphs, the ritual script, and Greek, the language of the government and the upper classes, but also in demotic. In Egypt, the land of scribes, literacy probably penetrated lower down the social scale than in most oriental countries, and thus, when the upper classes were hellenized, there still remained a middle class literate in their native tongue.⁴⁶

In Palestine Hebrew is rather a special case. Since the Scriptures which were the basis of the whole of Jewish life were written in Hebrew, Hebrew survived as a learned language—Aramaic was spoken colloquially—and a very large percentage of the Jews, even in the humbler classes of society, no doubt knew enough to read the Scriptures in the original. Religious and historical literature continued to be produced in Hebrew till a late date: the original versions of Ecclesiasticus and 1 Maccabees, written at the beginning and the end of the second century B.C. respectively, were in Hebrew, and the Hebrew texts of Esther and Daniel, which date to about the same period, are still extant. And when Hebrew decayed the colloquial Aramaic rose to the rank of a literary language; the Talmud was compiled in that tongue in the third century A.D. But it may be questioned whether either language would have survived (except for ritual purposes) had it not been for the religious reaction of the Hasmonaean rebellion, which rejected all things Greek. The Jews scattered over the East very soon forgot their Hebrew, and the Scriptures were for their benefit gradually translated into Greek in the course of the last three centuries B.C. The literature which they produced—the last three books of Maccabees, for instance—was written in Greek and was to a large extent modelled on Greek literary forms.⁴⁷

This was the normal course of events throughout the east. The

ancient literatures perished except in so far as they were preserved for their antiquarian interest in Greek synopses, like the Egyptian history of Manetho. The educated classes turned to Greek literature as the only subject worthy of serious study, and when they began to produce a literature of their own, slavishly followed Greek models.

In the arts a similar development took place. Greek sculpture and painting had found a market in the East even before Alexander's day: now they swept the field. For architecture it is difficult to speak with certainty, since virtually no hellenistic buildings have survived save in Greek lands. But the universal prevalence of Greek architecture and its high technical development in the Roman period strongly suggest that it was widely used in the Hellenistic age. In this sphere also Egypt is a partial exception: the temples of the Egyptian gods continued throughout the Ptolemaic and Roman periods to be built in a strictly traditional style. But the survival of religious architecture, like that of the hieroglyphic script, was the merest archaism. A similar religious archaism compelled Herod the Great to build the Jewish temple in accordance with the detailed prescriptions of the books of Kings and Chronicles. But it is worthy of note that it was only the temple itself that preserved its ancient form: the surrounding complex of courts were, it is clear from Josephus' description, in the Greek orders. If even so rigidly conservative a people as the Jews approved of the use of the Greek style in their most sacred building—and there is no question that Herod's temple was greatly admired—Greek architecture must have been universally accepted as the one admissible style. There can be little doubt that outside Egypt temples were regularly built in the Hellenistic age, as they were later, in the conventional Greek form; the priests of the Great Mother at Pessinus, a barbarous and backward town, were willing to accept a temple with marble colonnades—surely in the Greek orders—from the Attalid kings in the third century B.C.⁴⁸

Social customs were more deeply rooted, and here the transformation was less complete. In Egypt trial marriage continued to be practised even in the hellenized strata of society, and both in Egypt and in Mesopotamia the marriage of brother and sister remained common. But the more superficial features of Greek life were universally imitated. Particularly striking is the enormous vogue enjoyed by athletics. The cult of physical exercise for its own sake was something quite alien to the oriental mind, and the

exposure of the naked body repellent. Yet in the wave of enthusiasm for all things Greek, the Greek custom of gymnastic training and of athletic sports swept all over the East. Wherever Greeks went they established gymnasia; in Egypt these sprang up even in villages where there were enough military settlers to form a club. Orientals followed suit. In Egypt they secured admission to the Greek gymnasia. Where there were no Greek gymnasia they formed their own. We have in the second book of Maccabees a vivid picture of the enthusiasm which athletics evoked in Jerusalem in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. The hellenizing Jews had successfully—if at considerable expense—petitioned the king for a licence for the establishment of a gymnasium and the institution of ephebic training for the young men. No sooner was the gymnasium opened than athletics became the rage, and the pious were shocked to see the young men parading the town clad in the broad-brimmed hat of the ephebe, and even the priests scamping the temple services to rush off to the gymnasium. Such scenes must have been common in many oriental towns in the third and second centuries B.C.; by the end of the second century even in backward Cappadocia Tyana had its gymnasium. Closely allied with the opening of gymnasia was the celebration of athletic games: Tyre was already in the first half of the second century B.C. holding a regular quadrennial contest in honour of its patron god, Melkart, or as the Tyrians now preferred to call him, Heracles.⁴⁹

In religion a less radical readjustment was required. The Greeks wherever they went were prepared to worship the gods of the land, whom they were prone to identify on the slenderest of evidence with the members of their own pantheon. Hellenized orientals were naturally flattered to accept these identifications—the Jews were exceptional in resenting the assimilation of their national god to Zeus Olympius—and the oriental religions were thus covered with a Greek veneer. But the veneer was very thin. Even the native names of the gods often survived side by side with their Greek equivalents and some native gods entered the Greek pantheon unashamed of their oriental origin.⁵⁰

How far the form of the cult was hellenized it is difficult to say. The Egyptian gods certainly continued to be worshipped in their native land with the traditional ritual, and Isis carried her Egyptian priests and rites wherever she travelled over the Greek-speaking world. Many less conservative gods no doubt adopted the Greek forms of worship, just as they were housed in temples

of Greek design; the story of the books of Maccabees shows that Antiochus Epiphanes favoured the adoption of Greek ritual. Nevertheless cults of oriental origin often retained primitive features; ritual prostitution, for instance, continued to be practised at many oriental temples down to the days of Constantine. On the whole the East gave more to the Greeks in the sphere of religion than it received. Very few genuinely Greek gods became acclimatized in the East, whereas a number of oriental cults achieved great popularity among the Greeks.⁵¹

A curious and significant by-product of the movement of hellenization was the adoption of Greek personal names by orientals. The Greek name was sometimes selected for its accidental phonetic resemblance to an oriental name; thus even before Alexander's day 'Abdastart of Sidon had called himself in Greek Strato, and in the early second century B.C. the Jewish high priests Jesus and Eliakim transformed themselves into Jason and Alcimus. More often the Greek name was a translation; on Greco-Phoenician bilingual inscriptions of the third century B.C. we find Sama'ba'al equated with Diopeithes, 'Abdtanit with Artemidorus, 'Abdshemsh with Heliodorus and so forth. But frequently it was chosen quite arbitrarily: thus a Sidonian called Shem adopted the name of Antipater and the Jewish high priest Onias became Menelaus. The Greek name was originally additional to the native name; the former was used in Greek documents and when speaking in Greek, the latter at home. But as Greek became the normal language of everyday intercourse native names tended to drop out and Greek names only to be used. Nomenclature thus ceased during the Hellenistic age to be a valid test of nationality. A native name, it is true, generally signifies oriental origin, but a Greek name means nothing. Proved examples of the adoption of Greek names by orientals are naturally not common, but a study of the type of Greek names prevalent in the East shows how very usual the practice was. Personal names in the East, in Egypt and in the Semitic lands at any rate, were very frequently theophoric, meaning the servant or the gift of some god. The overwhelming preponderance in the East of Greek theophoric names, such as Apollonius, Dionysius, Demetrius, or, more characteristically, Theodorus, Metrodorus, Isidorus, is therefore significant. The popularity of dynastic names, such as Alexander, Ptolemy, or Antiochus, is also suspicious: for it was naturally such well-known names that orientals would choose.⁵²

The adoption of Greek personal names is typical of the ambition of the oriental upper classes. They wished not merely to imitate the Greeks, but to forget their oriental origin and become Greeks. And this ambition they ultimately achieved. The Greeks had no colour bar, and intermarriage between Greeks and orientals was common. In the Greek cities, it is true, citizenship was according to the regular Greek custom confined to those of citizen birth on both sides; this at least was the later rule, though it is hard to see how it can have been observed in the early generations when Greek women must have been very scarce. But even in the cities many hellenized orientals secured admission by more or less surreptitious means; at Alexandria there are constant references to the percolation of Egyptians into the citizen body. And this prohibition was of political and not of racial significance. Greeks who were not members of cities had no objection to marrying oriental women, and they regularly did so: the documents from Europus in Parapotamia show that even in the best families, descended from Seleucus' military settlers, the women regularly have Semitic or Iranian names. The Greeks, it is true, despised barbarians; but barbarian had always been as much a cultural as a racial term, and as time went on came to have a purely cultural content. And Hellene similarly came to be a cultural term. Jewish writers of the second century B.C., like the author of 1 Maccabees, describe the neighbours of the Jews as Hellenes. Cicero did not think it a contradiction in terms to say 'Lycii, Graeci homines', nor the author of St. Mark's gospel to speak of 'a Hellenic woman, a Syro-Phoenician by race'.⁵³

The pace of hellenization naturally varied very greatly in different regions in accordance with local circumstances. The relative density of Greek immigration was obviously a factor of importance. Perhaps equally important was the character of the administration; a ubiquitous bureaucracy like that of the Ptolemies hastened the spread of the Greek language. The degree of civilization achieved by the native population also affected the issue. An urban population was more susceptible to Hellenism than a rural. A completely barbarous people remained unaffected; on the other hand a people with strongly developed native culture might consciously resist Hellenism.

The cultural hellenization of the East inevitably carried with it Greek political ideas. Orientals could not read Greek literature without imbibing the dogmas that subjects of a king were slaves, and that the ideal life could only be lived in a self-governing

community. The immense prestige which Greek civilization acquired as a result of Alexander's conquest of the East naturally enhanced the estimation in which the typical political organization of the Greeks, the city, was held. As orientals became hellenized and began to esteem themselves Greeks, they claimed to share the political privileges of Greeks. How far these ambitions were effective depended on many factors, not only on the degree of cultural hellenization of the community in question, but also on the strength of its corporate feeling and the character of its social organization, and above all, on the attitude of the central government and its power to enforce its will.

In Egypt, though there was some nationalistic anti-hellenic sentiment, which found literary expression in such works as the Prophecy of the Potter, and occasionally broke out into organized rebellion, the density of Greek settlement on the one hand and the administrative system on the other were powerful forces working for the spread of hellenism. In fact the upper classes seem to have become assimilated to the ruling race by the latter part of the second century B.C., when Egyptians are found holding the highest official posts, and the Greek language was familiar even to the upper stratum of the peasantry; the innumerable village scribes of Egypt, who were drawn from this class, did all their official business in Greek. But Egypt had been from time immemorial a centralized monarchy, ruled by a bureaucracy which allowed no scope for local autonomy, and the Ptolemies not only maintained but elaborated this traditional form of government. Under their rule neither the Greek immigrants nor the hellenized natives of Egypt seem to have felt any aspiration towards local self-government, and they certainly never achieved it.⁵⁴

In Syria the social and political background was more complex. Along the coastal plain the towns had a strongly developed corporate feeling, and, though they were for the most part ruled by kings, possessed rudimentary republican institutions; the kings were assisted by councils of notables, and might on occasion be replaced by elected 'judges'. Along the fringe of the Arabian desert and in the arid steppe of Mesopotamia there were also, interspersed among the nomadic tribes, a number of important commercial towns which lived on the caravan trade; little is known of them, but they would seem on the whole to have been on a lower level of political development than the commercial towns of the coast. The mountain belt which forms the backbone

of Syria was occupied by tribal communities. Their economy was agricultural or pastoral, and their chief towns, the centres of their government, religion, and trade, were insignificant. Politically they were for the most part subject to royal governors, sometimes to native princes; but they mostly possessed rudimentary forms of self-government in councils of elders and mass assemblies.

After the Macedonian conquest political development was rapid in the coastal area. The Phoenician dynasties were successively deposed about the middle of the third century B.C., and the cities which they had ruled became republics, proudly dating their acts by a new era 'of the people'. The population of these commercial towns took readily to Greek ways, but actually autonomy was granted in advance of hellenization. The official language of the cities remained Phoenician, which is regularly used in inscriptions of the third century B.C. Even their political institutions seem to have been evolved from native forms; 'judges' are recorded in these inscriptions. It was only gradually that the Phoenician cities, already autonomous, became hellenized; their transformation can be followed on their second-century coinage, where Greek legends gradually supersede Phoenician. A parallel development took place in Cyprus, where the native dynasties, Greek and Phoenician, were suppressed towards the end of the fourth century: the Greek cities rapidly shed their Cypriot archaisms, the Phoenician cities more slowly hellenized themselves.

In the interior of Syria there is very little sign of any similar development during the early Hellenistic period. In the south the Ptolemies applied a bureaucratic system modelled on that of Egypt, which, though it no doubt spread the knowledge of Greek, put an effectual brake on the progress of local autonomy. In northern Syria and Mesopotamia the Seleucids by their policy of intensive colonization promoted the hellenization of the country but left little scope for self-government by indigenous communities; nearly all the important native towns received Macedonian military settlers who henceforth dominated their political life. Seleucus Nicator is, however, recorded to have given to Bambyce its later name of Hierapolis, and this may mean that he suppressed its sacerdotal dynasty, which still flourished in Alexander's day, and granted to it republican institutions. It was not until the second century B.C. that there was any marked advance. The forward policy of Antiochus Epiphanes in granting Greek constitutions to native towns has already been described. It need only be emphasized here that this policy was based on the spontaneous

demand of the now hellenized native aristocracy for autonomy. The towns affected were naturally for the most part in the former Ptolemaic sphere in the south, since in the north there were few native towns on which a Greek or Macedonian colony had not been imposed. The new cities were for the most part the commercial towns of the desert fringe, Urima (Antioch on the Euphrates), Hamath (Epiphaneia), Susitha (Antioch by Hippos), Abila (Seleucia), Gerasa (Antioch on the Chrysorhoas) and so forth, with which can be classed Scythopolis (Nysa), which controlled the trade route through the Esdraelon gap. But some also of the tribal capitals of the mountain belt, such as Jerusalem, also achieved city status. Damascus curiously does not seem to have secured autonomy (as Demetrius) till the beginning of the first century B.C.

City government was far from universal in Syria by the time that Seleucid rule broke down, and in many parts it suffered a relapse in the anarchy which supervened. In the far south-east the Nabataeans of Petra had remained unaffected by Hellenism and retained their tribal monarchy. In the south-west the Jews in their reaction against Hellenism not only themselves reverted to a sacerdotal monarchy but destroyed, for the time being at any rate, the nascent city life of Samareitis and Idumaea and in great part of the coastal plain and Coele Syria. In central Syria the Ituraean highlanders, who, though from the end of the second century B.C. their princes adopted Greek names, were still utter barbarians, built up a large principality, partly at the expense of the cities. In Mesopotamia and northern Syria there remained many agricultural or pastoral tribes interspersed among the cities, such as the Nazerini of mount Bargylus and the Rhambaei of Chalcidene, and their princes not infrequently subjected the cities to their rule; thus the phylarchs of the Osrhoeni made Edessa their capital. In the extreme north the kingdom of Comagene under its Persian dynasty retained its oriental traditions.

In Cilicia Pedias also, where Greek civilization had been spreading steadily inland, and a number of native towns, such as Anazarbus, Castabala (Hieropolis on the Pyramus), and Oeniandus (Epiphaneia), had blossomed into Greek cities during the second century B.C., there was a relapse. The upper valleys of the Pyramus and its tributaries had remained at a tribal stage of development, and the prince of this backward region, Tarcondimotus, proceeded in the early first century B.C. to incorporate the cities on his borders into his principality.⁵⁵

Northern and eastern Asia Minor was, except for the area occupied by the invading Galatians, ruled by oriental dynasties; indigenous kings reigned in Bithynia and Paphlagonia, and Persian families in Pontus and Cappadocia. All these dynasties became in various degrees hellenized. They adopted Greek as their official language; their kings took the usual cult surnames of Eusebes, Epiphanes and so forth, and in some cases Greek names—Nicomedes for instance became a dynastic name in the Bithynian house, and the later Paphlagonian kings, discovering their Homeric ancestry, called themselves Pylaemenes; they employed Greek technical advisers to organize their armies; and some of their members—Ariarathes V of Cappadocia, for instance—were men of real culture.

But though the courts and to some extent the administration were hellenized, the mass of the population was but little affected by Hellenism. In Bithynia there were a fair number of Greek cities; but they were all on the coastal fringe, and the rural interior was hardly affected by them. The Paphlagonians lived remote from any Greek influence in the interior. In Pontus there were a few scattered Greek colonies on the coast, but apart from these there were scarcely any towns: of those that there were, Amaseia and Cabeira, being royal capitals, were no doubt relatively hellenized, and commerce may have done something to make Greek culture familiar in the towns which clustered round the great sanctuaries of Comana and Zela. But the vast bulk of the population was rural and had little opportunity of learning what Greek civilization meant. Cappadocia was even more backward. Mazaca, the capital, and Tyana, an important commercial town, were to some extent hellenized: there were few other towns of any size, and the mass of the people were peasants, a byword for their ignorance and boorishness. The Galatians were also a rural people and, though some of their princes had by the first century B.C. acquired a smattering of Greek education, maintained their Celtic culture.

In these circumstances no spontaneous political development was to be expected and conditions remained primitive except where the hellenized royal families took the initiative. The Gauls retained their perversely complicated tribal organization, and such of the old Phrygian towns of their territory as survived remained unchanged; Pessinus was still in the first century B.C. ruled by the high priests of the Great Mother. In the kingdoms the primitive tribal life of the mass of the population seems to have broken

down under a centralized administration. The few towns were for the most part either royal residences or centred in great temples. The former were probably subject to royal governors, the latter continued to be ruled in patriarchal fashion by their high priests, who had absolute authority—except to execute a death sentence—over the sacred serfs who formed a great part of their population. Only in a few of the Cappadocian towns was constitutional government introduced, and this by the initiative of Ariarathes V.⁵⁶

In western Asia Minor hellenization was under Seleucid and Attalid rule rapid and unusually complete. There was a certain amount of Greek settlement in these regions, but more important was the influence of the Greek cities of the coast-line, which, when Hellenism became the dominant culture of the East, rapidly penetrated inland. In Caria this process had been well under way before Alexander's day and was soon completed, the Carian language dying out by the first century B.C. if not earlier. Lydia also rapidly succumbed, and Lydian was extinct by the beginning of the Christian era. The highlanders of Mysia, particularly in the inaccessible eastern part of the country, were less susceptible to Greek influence, and Phrygia, though penetrated by several important trade routes, along which urban life was well developed, remained in some areas little affected by Hellenism; in the remote south-east the Phrygian language survived till the third century A.D. and later.⁵⁷

The social and political background of this area is complex and obscure. The institutions of the Carians have already been described; they lived for the most part in small communities, which were sometimes grouped in local federations and sometimes had combined to form cities. The primitive organization of the wild Mysian highlanders was tribal, and in the remote eastern half of the country several large tribes, the Abbaeitae, Abretteni, and Olympeni, retained their cohesion till the Roman period. Tribal life also prevailed till a late date in many of the remoter parts of Lydia and Phrygia. In the Cayster valley and the surrounding mountains lived the Caystriani, the Cilbiani, the Tmolitae and the Mysotimolitae, round the gorge of the middle Maeander the Hyrgaleis, and in the mountainous border country of Lydia and Phrygia the Moccadeni, the Moxeani and the Corpeni. Even in the lower Hermus valley we find two cities whose names show that they were once tribal capitals, Hyrcanis and Mostene, and it is probable that in the fourth century B.C. tribal organization was far more widespread.

In many areas, however, it had already owing to various causes broken down. One of these causes was probably foreign conquest. The Persian kings, no doubt following in the footsteps of their Lydian and Phrygian predecessors, made a practice of granting fiefs to their nobles. The villages that had once constituted a tribe thus came under the authority of a number of landlords and the cohesion of the tribal group broke down.

The other and probably more potent force was trade. Along the principal routes we find a number of towns, apparently of great antiquity. Many of them, like Hierapolis or Aezani or Pessinus, clustered round temples and doubtless owed their growth to the fairs for which the religious festivals provided occasion. Others, like Sardis and Celaenæ, probably originated as centres of government; the royal court naturally attracted trade. Others, like the 'Market of Pots' which Xenophon saw, seem to have had a purely commercial origin. It would appear that the towns stood outside the tribal organization of the surrounding country, being composed of stray immigrants from many parts. Some, the centres of government, were ruled directly by royal commanders; those which centred in a temple were usually under the authority of its high priest; but all, and especially those of purely commercial origin, seem to have evolved some form of communal organization based on the trade guilds into which the population was divided.

These towns tended inevitably to disrupt the tribal life of their neighbourhood. The wealthy men who lived in them invested their superfluous money in mortgages and thus became landlords of the neighbouring village communities; and in particular the temples, since their estates were never divided by inheritance, became landowners on a vast scale. In these ways in many areas of Mysia, Lydia, and Phrygia the tribal grouping of the population was broken up, and the villagers came to be serf tenants either of the Persian nobility or of the temples or of the rich merchants of the towns.⁵⁸

Of Seleucid rule in Asia Minor we know little, but what evidence there is suggests that it was at all times loose, leaving local government very largely to local initiative, and that it was often quite powerless. In Caria it encouraged the process of amalgamation into larger units. The royal foundations of this type have already been noted, and we also possess a fragment of a royal decree ordering the sympolity of the Chalctoreis with another community. But the process went on spontaneously

either by mutual agreement or by the conquest of the smaller communities by the larger; by the end of the Seleucid period Bargylia had absorbed Cindye, for instance, and Caunus Calynda, while the Rhodians had greatly enlarged their Peraea. A similar process went on throughout the coastal area of Ionia, Aeolis, and in particular the Troad.

The tribal areas were probably left much to themselves, and it is not known whether they made much progress. The commercial towns on the other hand were rapidly hellenized and, adopting Greek constitutions, achieved the status of cities; by the end of the third century Sardis was recognized by Delphi as a Greek city, and even the obscure Lydian town of Nacrasa had its elective magistrates. But many of these towns retained a trace of their origin in the grouping of their citizen body: some, it is true, adopted the Greek division into tribes, but a fair number, including some royal foundations, still kept up their primitive guild organization. The power of the priests seems everywhere to have been broken. There is no evidence for confiscation; even when at Aezani the sacred estates were distributed by the kings into lots for their military settlers, the new tenants continued to pay a rent to the temple. But political control was vested in the people of the town; Hierapolis had by the early Attalid period a normal Greek democratic constitution.

The new cities were presumably granted jurisdiction over the neighbouring country which was already economically subject to them. The scattered fiefs of the nobility were also to a large extent incorporated in city territories. They were regarded as crown lands, at the free disposal of the government, which granted or sold some directly to cities; inscriptions record the grant of royal land to Miletus and its sale to Pitane. Others were granted or sold to individuals with leave to incorporate them in the territory of a neighbouring city—in order by converting them into private land to gain security of tenure; various areas in the Troad are recorded to have been thus incorporated into the territory of Ilium or Scepsis. Others the crown seems to have retained in its own hands, and in them the village community became the governing body: much of the eastern Troad and western Mysia appears in this way to have come to consist of a mass of small village communes.

With the defeat of Antiochus the Great in 189 B.C. Caria south of the Maeander came for about twenty years under Rhodian rule, and the rest of the Seleucid dominions passed to the Attalids. In

Caria the same line of development continued unbroken. We possess one highly interesting document which well illustrates one side of the process, a treaty between Miletus and its little Carian neighbour Pedasa, whereby the citizens of the latter migrate to Miletus, receiving full political rights and certain temporary privileges, and their lands are protected by Milesian troops and connected with Miletus by a new road.

Attalid rule was more efficient than Seleucid but maintained the same liberal attitude to local autonomy, and the process of hellenization gathered momentum. Inscriptions show that towns even in the remoter parts of Phrygia, Peltae and Synnada, had adopted Greek constitutions, and some of the more advanced tribes perhaps now developed into cities; the temporary name of Eumeneia borne by Hyrcanis probably marks the synoecism of the Hyrcanians at this period.⁵⁹

In the mountain massif of southern Asia Minor no royal government exercised effective sway except on the coastal fringe. Here the Lycians under Ptolemaic rule became during the third century B.C. thoroughly hellenized, abandoning their native tongue and script in favour of Greek, and at the same time completed their political development. After a brief spell of Seleucid rule and a rather longer period of uneasy subjection to the Rhodians, they emerged in 168 B.C. as a free league of cities. This league was ingeniously accommodated by a system of proportional votes and obligations to the very various size of the Lycian cities, even the smallest securing representation without losing their individuality by combining in sympolities to exercise one vote. The result was that in Lycia the lesser cities did not as in Caria become merged in the greater, and that Lycia always remained predominantly a country of small towns.⁶⁰

Inland the Seleucids occasionally tried to make use of the mutual feuds of the Pisidian communities to assert their authority, but with little effect. The Attalids who succeeded them in 189 B.C. were perhaps more successful, but they had to fight a war with the Selgians, and when the Attalid kingdom was dissolved in 133 B.C. even the shadow of central control was removed; these districts, together with Cilicia Tracheia, which had since the beginning of the second century been nominally Seleucid, became the head-quarters of the piracy which flourished in the eastern Mediterranean after the decline of the Rhodian sea-power.

Despite the perennial disorder which reigned in these regions, Hellenism continued to percolate slowly among the Milyae and

the Pisidians from the Greek cities of the coast and their already hellenized Pisidian neighbours, and there was some political progress. In many areas, it is true, a purely rural life persisted. The Oroandeis, the Homonadeis, and the Isaureis, though they possessed one or more central strongholds, lived scattered in villages; they are to be described as confederations of clans rather than as tribes, and probably had little cohesion except in time of war: the Cetae of Cilicia Tracheia had even less. On the other hand more and more of the Pisidian communities seem to have been adopting urban life; at any rate we hear of more cities. Many of these cities were of a rudimentary type; Amblada was for instance in the Attalid period ruled by its elders. But the larger cities were becoming hellenized. A considerable number of them issued coins inscribed in Greek towards the end of the second century, and an inscription records a treaty between Termessus and Adada in regular Greek forms. In the Cabalis the four cities of Cibyra, Oenoanda, Bubon, and Balbura, though actually ruled by dynasts bearing the name of Moagetes, were in constitutional theory united in a league modelled on the Lycian. Even in Cilicia Tracheia there was some progress in the more hellenized eastern area ruled by the high priests of Zeus Olbius; the mass of the people was still organized in the two tribes of the Cennatae and the Lalasseis, but the holy city of Olba itself had achieved a Greek constitution. As a whole the political conditions in these parts were very fluid. Loosely organized tribal confederations might subsist unchanged, or might consolidate into one large city or might split, according to their degree of culture, into a number of separate clans or cities, or again might become a league of cities; the several communities might develop regular Greek constitutions or remain under the rule of their tribal aristocracies, or become subject to dynasts.⁶¹

The spontaneous way in which city life developed in western and southern Asia Minor is well illustrated by the diffusion of the titles borne by the principal civic magistrates. Had the development been initiated by the central governments one would expect these titles to be uniform in the areas ruled by the several dynasties. This is not the case. In one part of the Seleucid dominions, Phrygia, Lydia, and Caria, the usual style of the eponymous magistrates of the cities was *stephanephorus*, while the executive power was exercised by a board of *strategi*. In other Seleucid areas, Pamphylia and Cilicia Pedias, a type of constitution prevailed in which a *demiurgus* was eponymous and

the principal executive magistrates were styled *prytaneis*. This second type is found, moreover, not only in Seleucid areas, but in Cilicia Tracheia, ruled by the Ptolemies, while in another Ptolemaic province, Lycia, the cities were ruled by boards of *prytaneis*, and in the independent Pisidian communities the eponymous demiurgate was popular. Thus the geographical distribution of titles bears no relation to the political boundaries of the third century B.C. Nor does it correspond with those of the second century. The Attalid kingdom embraced areas in which both principal types of constitution prevailed, and both extended beyond the boundaries of the kingdom, the *stephanephorus* and *strategi* type into Caria, which was first ruled by Rhodes and then independent, the *demiurgus* and *prytaneis* type into Seleucid Cilicia.

The diffusion of titles can only be explained as the result of a spontaneous movement; the institutions of a prominent city were copied by its neighbours or even by distant communities with which it had intimate trade relations, and they in turn passed them on to the humbler communities of their districts. The original home of the stephanephorate was probably Miletus, where it was of great antiquity. It was adopted in the late fourth century by several other Ionian cities, including Smyrna. The influence of these two great commercial towns is sufficient to account for the wide popularity which it enjoyed in their hinterlands, Caria and Lydia, whence it penetrated by the great trade route to the East into Phrygia. The ultimate source of the second type of constitution was probably Rhodes, where the *prytaneis* were the principal executive board, but important secondary sources were the old Hellenic cities of Pamphylia, where the eponymous demiurgate is attested in the late fourth century B.C., and probably also those of Cilicia Pedias. These may well have modelled their political institutions on those of Rhodes, but at a much earlier date; for the eponymous *demiurgi* of the several cities of Rhodes were after their synoecism in 408 B.C. overshadowed by the priest of the Sun, by whom the united republic dated its documents. The popularity of the demiurgate is, therefore, probably to be attributed to the influence of such great cities as Aspendus and Soli, itself a Rhodian colony; Lycia, it may be noted, which was more directly under Rhodian influence, did not adopt it. The spread of the prytanate may on the other hand, be as much due to the example of Rhodes itself as to that of the Pamphylian and Cilician cities.⁶²

The ambition of native communities to rank as Greek cities

produced some curious by-products. Indigenous cities showed a rather childish desire to conceal their humble origin, and many of them tried to do so by a change of name. Those which were lucky enough to possess Greek names already hallowed by tradition had merely to adopt them. Thus Phoenician Gebal had long been known to the Greeks as Byblus. Similarly, the Ter-milae had been dubbed by the Greeks for reasons unknown the Lycians, and many of their cities had been arbitrarily given Greek names—Arna, for instance, was called Xanthus. The Lycians took over these names with all the more eagerness because they occurred in the sacred pages of Homer.⁶³

In other cases a native name which fortunately bore an accidental resemblance to a Greek was tendentiously mis-spelt. Pella of Coele Syria was not a Macedonian military colony; the town is mentioned in the ancient Egyptian records, from which it appears that its true spelling was P-h-l. Orthosia of Phoenicia similarly appears in the Tel-el-Amarna letters as Ardata. It may be suspected also that Anthedon, near Gaza, was merely a hellenized version of 'Ain Teda. Greek immigrants no doubt gave the lead in these transformations; Greeks were never good at pronouncing barbarian names and they would naturally catch at any seeming resemblance to a Greek name familiar to them. But the natives certainly exploited this tendency, which gave them the opportunity of claiming Greek origin for their towns.⁶⁴

In other cases the native name was translated. Thus Apollonia of Palestine, the modern Arsuf, originally bore a name derived from the Semitic god Reseph; Reseph was regularly identified with Apollo, and the city became Apollonia. Translation may well account for many of the theophoric names—Heraclea, Aphrodisias, Metropolis, Diospolis, and so forth—borne by barbarian cities. Often, however, such names are rather to be regarded as descriptive; they were adopted because the chief god of the town was identified with Heracles, Zeus, or whoever it might be, although the native name of the town might bear no allusion to its god. Such descriptive titles were often invented by the Greek immigrants, to avoid the trouble of pronouncing intractable barbarian names: thus the great majority of the towns of Egypt, except those in the Delta which had long been familiar to the Greeks and whose names had acquired a pronounceable Greek form, were given descriptive titles, derived either from the Greek god with whom their tutelary god was identified or from their totem animal; of the former type are Letopolis, Pano-

polis, Eileithyopolis, of the latter Crocodilopolis, Leontopolis, and Oxyrhynchus and Latopolis, both named from kinds of fish. Other descriptive names are less precise: Palaeopolis, 'the ancient city', occurs several times, and Hieropolis, 'the sacred city', is embarrassingly common. In all these cases, though the name was usually not of their invention, the hellenized natives were very willing to use it.⁶⁵

Another means of concealing their barbarian origin of which the native cities made free use was the fabrication of foundation legends connecting them with great cities of Greece or with the heroes of the epic cycle. Some races and cities were fortunate enough to figure in Greek legend already, and they had only to advertise their Homeric forebears. The Paphlagonian kings took the name of Pylaemenes, the leader of the Paphlagonians in the *Iliad*. The Abbaeite Mysians honoured their 'forefather Chromius', who likewise figures in the *Iliad*. Phrygian Stectorium boasted of the tomb of Mygdon, and its neighbour Otrus named itself after Otrus; these heroes led the Homeric Phrygians. Many Phrygian cities claimed Midas as their founder. The Lycian cities named their demes after Sarpedon, Bellerophon, and other Lycian heroes of the epic cycle. Sidon was naturally proud of her son Cadmus, who had given the Greeks their alphabet and founded Thebes; as early as the third century B.C. the Sidonians in a Greek inscription honouring their suffete Diotimus, the first of their citizens to win a victory in the chariot races at the Nemean games, allude to their city as 'the house of the noble sons of Agenor', and aver that 'the holy city of Cadmeian Thebes glories when she sees her mother city splendid with victories'.⁶⁶

Other cities, less fortunate, had to forge their title deeds. Pisidian Selge claimed Calchas for its founder; Cilician Tarsus hesitated between Perseus, Triptolemus, and Heracles; Syrian Scythopolis between Dionysus and Orestes; Mysian Pergamum claimed both Telephus, an Arcadian hero, and a son of Pyrrhus and Andromache, appropriately called Pergamus. Many Phrygian cities not content with their native heroes adopted Greek founders: Iconium preferred Perseus to its indigenous Nannacus, Nacoleia and Synnada claimed Heracles and Acamas respectively, and Dorylaeum combined both claims. Some of the Greek colonies of the Hellenistic age also, discontented with their modernity, sought to put back their origins to the heroic age. Antioch claimed to be one of the numerous foundations of

Triptolemus, and Nicaea, according to Memnon, was called not after Lysimachus' wife, but after a nymph beloved of Dionysus. It was naturally the wandering gods and heroes, like Dionysus, Heracles, Perseus, Triptolemus, and Orestes who were most hardly worked; they could be plausibly supposed to have founded cities in the most remote districts in the course of their travels. The origin of most of the legends is obscure, but in some cases they can be clearly traced to false etymologies; Perseus is for instance said to have left the image (*εἰκων*) of the Gorgon's head at Iconium. The origin of the name of Scythopolis is unknown, but it is evident that it gave rise to two divergent legends to explain it, one of which made use of the Scythians of Tauris, who accompanied Orestes and Iphigeneia, and the other postulated Scythian companions of Dionysus.⁶⁷

A curious feature of the legends is the vast and extremely implausible colonial activity attributed to Sparta, especially in south-western Asia Minor, where Alabanda, Cibyra, Sagalassus, Selge, Synnada, and Amblada claim to be Lacedaemonian colonies. From the very curious correspondence between the high priest Onias and king Areus preserved in I Maccabees it would appear that the Jews at one time thought of establishing kinship with the Spartans, though with characteristic arrogance they claimed that the Spartans were descended from Abraham and that Sparta was thus their colony.⁶⁸

The diffusion of city government over the lands of the East owed far more to the imperceptible progress of spontaneous hellenization than to the spectacular foundations of the kings. The triumph of Hellenism would not, it is true, have been possible but for the work of the kings. By encouraging Greek immigration—for their own purposes—they introduced to their oriental subjects living models to imitate. By giving to Greek—once again for their own convenience—the status of an official language, they compelled their subjects to learn the tongue in which the political philosophers of Athens had written. Above all by their own power and glory they impressed on the oriental mind the superiority of the culture which they represented. But their direct contribution was small. Of the scores of cities which sprang up in the Hellenistic East a very small proportion owed their origin to royal initiative; even of those which bore the names of kings not a few achieved their own autonomy. The motive force which produced the vast majority of the cities of the East was the ambition of the native upper class to adopt the Greek way of life.

CHAPTER III

THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

THE Roman republic was at first reluctant to annex eastern lands; it gained no territory by its victory over Philip V of Macedon in 197 B.C. or by its more spectacular defeat of Antiochus III in 189 B.C., though it redrew the map of Asia Minor on this occasion. The senate rightly felt that once the republic had commitments in the East it would inevitably be drawn into further conflicts, and that the administration of distant dependencies was a troublesome burden. This reluctance was gradually overcome either by strategic necessity, real or imaginary, or by financial considerations. Powers which threatened, or were supposed to threaten, the security of Rome, or later of the Roman possessions in the East, had to be crushed, and the lands they had ruled had to be governed somehow. One of the early provinces, Asia, brought in a very handsome profit, and it seemed foolish to reject this means of balancing the republic's budget. But though Rome thus came to govern most of the Greek lands up to the Euphrates, the senate remained uninterested in the provinces it had acquired. Absorbed as it was in the political struggle at home, it would rarely spare the time to look at them, save when they became pawns in that game, or when the attacks of foreign powers or internal commotions threatened to destroy their financial value. In these circumstances it is useless to look for any constructive policy in the republican administration of the provinces; there was no policy at all save a tendency to favour the autonomy of the Greek cities—a tendency which was partly due to sentimental reasons and partly to the nuisance value of cities in curbing the more dangerous power of the kings.

The one occasion on which the internal affairs of a province came up for serious consideration was when it was annexed. It was usual on these occasions to send out a commission of senators to assist the magistrate who had annexed the territory to draw up a code of regulations laying down the general lines of the future administration, and this code, the *lex provinciae*, had to be considered by the senate before it was finally ratified. Thereafter, unless some major catastrophe such as a general revolt demanded its radical revision, this code remained the basis of the administra-

tion, and it was only in exceptional cases that the senate modified its provisions. The political development of any district annexed tended therefore to be stabilized at the stage which it had reached on annexation.

If the senate had no constructive policy in the provinces, their governors had even less. It is characteristic of the indifference of the senate to provincial administration that it never evolved any special machinery for the purpose. At first additional praetors were elected annually by the Roman people to look after newly acquired provinces. But as the provinces grew more numerous no effort was made to increase the number of praetors proportionately, and by the time that the first eastern provinces were acquired it had become the usual practice to fill the additional posts for which no praetors were available by prolonging the command of some magistrates for an extra year or two. Sulla attempted to systematize this practice by arranging that each year a sufficient number of magistrates should be elected in Rome to supply an ex-magistrate to each province in the subsequent year; the provinces could thus be governed by a regular succession of proconsuls and propraeors each serving for a year. The system broke down because some magistrates refused to take up their year of provincial administration, and because once again no provision was made for newly annexed provinces. The distribution of the provinces between the magistrates was more or less haphazard; for although the senate decided each year which provinces should go to the consuls and which to the praetors and which should remain under their present governors for another year, the consuls and praetors balloted for the provinces assigned to either grade.

Such a system was not conducive either to efficiency or to continuity of policy in provincial administration. The man who eventually became a provincial governor had not been originally elected for his administrative ability, and he was not appointed to his particular province for his knowledge of it or interest in it, but purely by chance. When he arrived he expected to stay for a year only, and not knowing whether his tenure would be prolonged or not he naturally embarked on no schemes which might be overturned by his successor. Few governors had the time to learn the problems of their provinces, much less to think out or to execute any constructive policy. For not only was their period of office too short, but they were, if they took their duties seriously, grossly overworked. The average province was very large;

Macedonia, for instance, included not only the old kingdom but all the cities of Greece, and Bithynia-Pontus was constituted out of what had been two separate kingdoms. The governor had no trained assistants—his legates might, it is true, have some experience, but his quaestor and *comites* were raw young men, just entering political life—and no adequate clerical staff. His duties were multifarious. In some provinces he or his quaestor had to collect the tribute from the communities, and even when, as was generally the case in the East, the taxes were raised by contractors directly responsible to Rome, the disputes between the provincials and the contractors came under his jurisdiction and were often a troublesome problem. He was commander-in-chief of the army of occupation and might, in some provinces, have to spend most of his time in border wars. Finally, he had very heavy judicial duties, being obliged to administer justice to all Roman residents, an influential and litigious class.

Lack of government might have done no great harm to the provinces, though the frequent change of governors must have produced an atmosphere of uncertainty unfavourable to their development. But this was not the worst that provinces had to endure. The brutality and rapacity of Roman governors has perhaps been exaggerated—most of our evidence comes, it must be remembered, from the prosecutions of the worst—but there can be little doubt that the majority regarded their office as a perfectly legitimate opportunity of recovering their election expenses and feathering their nests for the future. The exactions of the revenue contractors and of the money-lenders who followed in their wake have probably not been exaggerated. During the greater part of the last century of the republic they had complete control of the situation, for from 122 to 80 B.C. they were the judges in the court before which cases of extortion were tried at Rome, and in 70 B.C. they regained a dominant position in it. A governor whose hands were not too clean—and even one who like Scaevola was perfectly honest—was thus at their mercy. Very few governors had the courage to stand up to the Roman financial interest, as did Lucullus, and the natural result was that the financiers exploited their opportunity to the utmost. The provinces were thus exposed to a government which was at the best inefficient and discontinuous, and at the worst arbitrary and rapacious. To political uncertainty was thus added economic decline. In these circumstances little spontaneous progress could be expected in the provinces.

It is obvious that the system of provincial government outlined above could not have functioned at all unless the greater part of the administration had been devolved upon the local authorities. It had in fact grown up on that assumption. The first provinces acquired had been groups of cities, like Sicily, or groups of cities and tribes, like Sardinia and Corsica, and the senate had naturally taken the line of least resistance, and allowed the provincial communities to govern themselves, giving to the Roman governor the task of supervising and co-ordinating their activities and at the same time watching over the security of the territory and protecting the interests of Roman citizens.

The districts earliest annexed in the East fortunately fitted in with this conception of provincial government. Macedon, the first kingdom to fall before the advance of Rome, had consisted under its later kings of a league of communities. The senate at the beginning tried to do without any provincial government, merely splitting the kingdom into four federations in the hope of destroying national sentiment. The revolt of the Macedonians under the leadership of a pretender of the royal line proved that this hope was baseless, and in 148 B.C. Macedonia was constituted a regular province under a governor. This province included a number of Illyrian tribes and Greek cities on the Adriatic which had not belonged to the kingdom, and also some Thracian tribes along the shore of the Aegean; it may thus be described as a zone of territory flanking either side of the Egnatian Way, which led from Dyrrachium to the Thracian Chersonese. The governor of the new province also had to supervise the cities of Greece, who, having ventured in 146 B.C. to defy the will of the senate, were reduced to subjection.⁶⁹

The next acquisition was the kingdom of Pergamum, which was in 133 B.C. bequeathed to the Roman republic by its eccentric king Attalus III. The senate, it would appear, originally decided to grant freedom to the former subjects of the kingdom, but the revolt of Aristonicus, an illegitimate son of Attalus III, received such widespread support that the necessity of a governor became evident. The new province, Asia, comprised the civilized western part of the kingdom only—the Troad, Mysia, and Lydia—together with Caria, whose inhabitants had in 168 B.C. been declared free but had apparently supported Aristonicus. To these regions was later—probably in 116 B.C.—added Phrygia, which had originally been ceded, as a reward for his aid in suppressing Aristonicus, to Mithridates V of Pontus.

These districts afforded few problems to the Roman commissioners who organized the province, for the Attalid kingdom had consisted almost entirely of autonomous communes. In the immediate neighbourhood of Pergamum there seem to have been some directly administered areas, which had formed the nucleus of the original Attalid principality, but these were probably among the lands bequeathed by Attalus III to the city of Pergamum. The greater part of the Thracian Chersonese was crown property, the cities which had formerly occupied it—Lysimacheia and others—having been destroyed in the Thracian wars and never reconstituted. The territory of the Trocnades, a Galatian tribe on the north-eastern frontier of Phrygia, was perhaps also royal land. Furthermore Stratonicea of Mysia seems to have been punished for its obstinate support of Aristonicus—it was his last stronghold—by the confiscation of its territory, the Indeipedion. These small areas of public land—the rights of the crown were transferred on the annexation to the Roman people—did not present any great administrative difficulty; the Trocnades and the Indeipediatæ, at any rate, seem to have been granted autonomy though they continued to pay rent for their land; how the Chersonese was administered it is more difficult to see, for its inhabitants apparently had no communal organization. The province of Asia received only one accession later, a part of the Moagetid principality, comprising the city of Cibyra and considerable tracts of crown lands adjacent to its territory on the east and west. The villages on these lands were granted autonomy while continuing to pay rent for them.⁷⁰

The districts of the Attalid kingdom which had not been incorporated in the province of Asia—the Milyas, Pisidia, Pamphylia, and Lycaonia—became during the next generation, when they were apparently left to their own devices, such a stronghold of piracy that eventually in 101 B.C. the senate was driven into establishing a military command to keep them in order. This was apparently the origin of the province misleadingly called Cilicia, not, it would seem, because it included Cilicia proper, but because the pirates were generically styled Cilicians. Administratively this area presented no new problem, for it comprised a number of hitherto independent cities and tribes and petty principalities. In the course of the punitive wars which were frequent on this coast the territories of several cities and tribes were confiscated; Servilius Isauricus deprived the cities of Phaselis, Olympus, and Attaleia and the tribe of the Oroandeis

of their lands. But administratively these measures made no difference.⁷¹

The next acquisition was the little kingdom of Cyrenaica, bequeathed by its king Ptolemy Apion to the republic in 96 B.C. Cyrenaica consisted of five Greek cities and a much more considerable area of royal land, inhabited by Libyan tribes, to the east and west and south of them. The senate declared the cities free, and apparently appointed no governor; it must however have made some arrangements for administering the royal lands, seeing that it drew revenue from them. The arrangements, whatever they were, proved unsatisfactory; for in 74 B.C. Cyrenaica was constituted a regular province, the freedom of the cities being revoked. When a few years later Crete, whose cities had been harbouring pirates, was annexed, the two were combined under one governor.⁷²

Of the districts annexed by Pompey the former Seleucid dominions in Cilicia and Syria presented no radical difficulties. The kingdom had already fallen apart into a medley of cities, tribes, principalities, and kingdoms, and on the whole all that Pompey did was to recognize the *status quo*. In Cilicia he restored a number of coastal cities which had been desolated by piracy, repopling them with captured pirates, and confirmed Tarcondimotus in his little principality in the hinterland. In northern Syria he admitted Antiochus of Commagene to the friendship and alliance of the Roman people, and recognized the various minor Arab dynasts, together with the cities and tribal communes. In central Syria he confirmed Ptolemy as tetrarch of the Ituracan principality and restored republican government in such of the Phoenician cities as had fallen into the hands of tyrants. Only in the south did he make a considerable change. Here he reconstituted the many cities destroyed by the Jews and reduced the Jewish kingdom to a sacerdotal principality comprising only rural districts—Galilee, Samareitis, Judaea proper, and Peraea. The Nabataean kingdom he did not have time to deal with, but it was shortly afterwards admitted to the friendship and alliance of the Roman people by Scaurus, the first proconsul of Syria.⁷³

In Cilicia and Syria Pompey thus revived city life in areas where it had recently been weakened or destroyed but shelved the problem of the backward districts by allowing them to remain under their kings and dynasts. In Bithynia and Pontus there was no such easy way out. These two kingdoms had both been administered on a centralized system, which it was manifestly im-

possible to maintain, since Roman governors, untrained in administrative method and changing at frequent intervals, would be utterly incapable of controlling the bureaucratic machine. If the kingdoms were to be put under a Roman governor, administration had to be devolved onto local authorities, but in many cases no corporate bodies existed which could undertake the responsibility.

Bithynia was the less difficult problem, because in area it was much smaller and it contained eight Greek cities (including Heraclea, which had by its adherence to Mithridates during the war forfeited its independence) as well as two military colonies in the Paphlagonian territory incorporated in the kingdom, Bithynium and Creteia. The situation had, however, been complicated in that the directly administered areas, which were apparently regarded as crown lands, had already been leased to a Roman company when Pompey undertook the organization of the kingdom. Pompey's solution was very rough and ready. He took the existing cities as the basis of his scheme, granting autonomy, if they did not already possess it, to the military colonies, and apportioned the formerly royal and now public lands between them. The geographical distribution of the cities was such that the division had to be very unequal: to Nicaea, the only important city of the interior, was assigned a territory of fantastic size, including all the middle valley of the Sangarius and all the hill country lying within its curve. The administration of the kingdom was thus devolved upon the cities. But the vested interest of the Roman company seems to have been respected; for it apparently collected the revenue of the former royal land, which remained public.⁷⁴

Pontus was a more intractable problem, since its area was so much larger and its few cities were confined to the coast. The most backward districts, those on the eastern frontier only recently incorporated in the kingdom, Pompey did not attempt to bring under the provincial administration; Colchis, Armenia Minor, and the group of savage tribes which inhabited the hinterland of Pharnaccia and Trapezus were assigned to dynasts. The rest of the kingdom—with the exception of an area surrounding Comana, which was assigned as a principality to Archelaus, whom Pompey appointed high priest of that town—was divided into eleven city territories. Four of these territories were assigned to the four Greek colonies of the seaboard, and three to the old towns of the interior, Amaseia, Cabeira, and Zela, which Pompey organized as cities. To govern the remaining four Pompey had to

create new cities, two, Pompeiopolis and Neapolis, in Pontic Paphlagonia, another, Megalopolis, far inland on the upper Halys, and the fourth, Magnopolis, in the plain of Phanaroea at the junction of the Lycus and the Iris. The last had already been begun by Mithridates under the name of Eupatoria, and Pompey had merely to complete the work. The other three seem to have been mere villages which Pompey enlarged by the synoecism of the neighbouring population.⁷⁵

In Pontus the Roman government, through its agent Pompey, thus for the first time founded Greek cities. The motive for the innovation was not elevated. Pompey may have prided himself on his enlightenment in introducing Greek city life into the backward regions of north-eastern Asia Minor, but it is plain that his principal concern in creating a substructure of local self-government was to lighten the burden of administration which had hitherto been carried by the central executive. The foundation of these cities was in fact simply a confession of the incapacity of the Roman provincial system to administer the provinces. The rough and ready way in which the change over from central to local responsibility was effected wholesale, with the minimum of constructive effort, reveals the true motive of the whole proceeding: Pompey had to run up some kind of administrative framework before he left the country to the incompetent hands of a succession of Roman governors. The civilizing effects of the change must have been minimal; for the vast rural areas subjected to each city can hardly have been conscious of their change of masters.

A similar reorganization of the Jewish principality was effected by Gabinius, one of Pompey's followers, during his proconsulate of Syria. The government of the country was entrusted to councils of local notables sitting at Sepphoris, Jerusalem, Jericho, Amathus, and Gadara, and the principality can thus be said to have been split into five cities. This change was, however, revoked by Caesar, who made Hyrcanus, the high priest, ethnarch of the whole country once more.⁷⁶

The last acquisition of the Roman republic, Cyprus, offered no problems. It had consisted under its Ptolemaic kings of a league of cities, and the local government continued under Roman rule to be conducted by them. The leaders of the popular party hankered after Egypt and several moves were made to annex it, but the senate wisely hesitated to undertake the formidable task of governing it, and it was left to the first of the emperors to make it a province of the Roman people.⁷⁷

CHAPTER IV

THE PRINCIPATE

IN Augustus the eastern provinces recognized at long last, after an interminable series of ephemeral governors who seemed to owe allegiance to no one, a king. And in essence they were right. With the establishment of the principate the Roman empire acquired a permanent head, who was sufficiently interested in the welfare of the provinces to formulate a policy for them, and moreover had the authority to carry it through. To the republican governors and to the tax-collecting companies the provinces had too often been simply fields of exploitation; and the senate and the equestrian order at Rome had been inclined to be complacent about the misdeeds of their own class. The emperors at least took a longer view; in their own interest they were careful to maintain the provinces at a reasonable level of prosperity, in order to assure a stable revenue for the future, and they had no reason to condone the exactions of governors and tax-collectors, who enriched themselves to the ultimate detriment of the treasury. Furthermore the emperors took an interest in the provinces for their own sake which the senate had never felt; as autocrats of the whole empire they tended to regard all their subjects as equal and to give as much thought to the well-being of the provincials as to that of the citizens of the ruling city.

The emperors not only had the will to improve the state of the provinces, but the power to enforce their will. Under the division of powers between the princeps and the senate many of the eastern provinces remained, it is true, under the authority of the latter—Asia, Macedonia, Achaëa, Crete and Cyrene, Cyprus, Bithynia and Pontus. These provinces continued to be governed as before by pro-magistrates serving for a year. But they could, if maladministration produced a serious decline in prosperity, be temporarily transferred to the emperor's care, and even while they remained under senatorial control were subject to the overriding authority of the emperor, who could by edict reform serious abuses. More important than these direct controls was the emperor's power to regulate admission to the senate and retard or advance a senator's career; any ambitious senator was obliged to satisfy the emperor's standards, and gradually the composition

and the tone of the senatorial aristocracy were utterly transformed, and it came to consist no longer of politicians but of civil servants. In his own provinces the emperor could choose his own governors, either from the senatorial or the equestrian order, and could keep them at their posts as long as he judged convenient. Throughout the empire the abandonment of the farming system for direct taxes and their assessment according to a methodical census greatly diminished fiscal extortion.

The increase in security and the growth of prosperity which resulted from these reforms gave a fresh impetus to the long dormant tendency towards hellenization and the concurrent growth of city life. At the same time the Roman government, now that it had become monarchical, adopted the traditional policy of the Hellenistic kings and regarded it as its mission by promoting the growth of cities to advance the civilization of the empire. Dio Chrysostom enumerates as the everyday tasks of the good emperor to 'marshal an army, pacify a district, found a city, bridge rivers and span the earth with roads'; and Aelius Aristides, in his speech 'To Rome', vindicated the superiority of the Roman to the Persian empire not by the greater number of its provinces—which might be disputed—but by the multitude of its cities: 'the shores of the sea', he writes, 'and the inland regions are filled with cities, some founded, some enlarged under your sway and by your act'.⁷⁸

But the idealism of the emperors was, like that of the kings, tempered by practical considerations. They had, it is true, little to fear from the cities. The might of the empire was too overpowering for the cities to entertain any ambitions of shaking off its rule, and moreover the technique of control evolved by the republic and continued under the empire was far more efficient than that adopted by the kings; the upper classes, to whom the Roman government gave the rule of the cities, knew that their power depended on the support of that government and were unswervingly loyal to it. But the motive of profit remained. Directly administered areas brought in a very high revenue so long as the administration could be efficiently run, and the imperial government felt itself capable, as the senate had not been, of controlling a bureaucratic system. In this idea it proved mistaken, but there was in some provinces a determined attempt to maintain direct administration before its growing inefficiency compelled the devolution of government.⁷⁹

The emperors made no attempt to romanize the Greek-speaking provinces. One aspect of their activities might seem at first

sight to be an attempt in this direction—the planting of Roman colonies in the East. This process was begun before the establishment of the principate by the dictator Caesar. His programme, interrupted by his death, was completed and extended by the triumvirs; and their work was consolidated by Augustus, who also made a number of new settlements. It is not always easy to fix the exact date of a colony during this period, for many were refounded after their first deduction. In the present state of our knowledge Sinope in Pontus and Corinth and Buthrotum in Achaëa can be definitely assigned to Caesar; Dyme in Achaëa may also be his. Lystra in Lycaonia and Cassandreia and Dium in Macedonia were founded shortly after his death, and no doubt according to his plans. Alexandria Troas, Parium, and Lampsacus in Asia, three more Macedonian colonies, Philippi, Dyrrachium and Pella, and Apamea and probably Heraclea in Bithynia also fall in the first quinquennium of the triumvirate. Cnossus in Crete was founded in 36 B.C. Two of these colonies, Lampsacus and Heraclea, disappeared during the civil wars, never to revive: of the others Augustus restored the majority, planting fresh settlers. In addition he founded Patrae, attributing the existing colony of Dyme to it, and perhaps Actium also in Achaëa, Antioch, and four smaller towns, Olbasa, Comama, Parlais, and Cremna in Pisidia, Berytus in Syria, and perhaps Byllis in Macedonia. Thereafter the movement slowed down. Claudius planted three colonies, Aprus in Thrace, Archelais in Cappadocia, and Ptolemais in Syria; Vespasian another three, Deultum and Flaviopolis in Thrace and Caesarea in Palestine; Domitian two, Germa in Galatia and Claudiopolis in Cilicia Tracheia. Hadrian founded the colonies of Iconium and Aelia Capitolina, and may also have colonized Cyrene and Taucheira. Marcus Aurelius founded Faustiniopolis in Cappadocia.⁸⁰

These settlements were clearly too few and far between seriously to modify the predominantly Greek culture of the regions in which they were planted, and in point of fact they for the most part gradually took the tone of their surroundings; Greek supplanted Latin on their inscriptions and even on their coins the Latin legends, engraved by Greek artists, became progressively more illiterate and ultimately in some cases became Greek. The motives for Roman colonization in the East are not to be sought in any policy of cultural assimilation. They were strictly practical.

Some of the colonies were no doubt intended to restore regions

rendered desolate by war. Caesar seems to have had this end in view in most of the foundations. Epirus had been frightfully ravaged and depopulated in 168 B.C. and Corinth had been destroyed in 146 B.C., and in neither place had the destruction ever been repaired, while Pontus had recently suffered severely in the final campaigns against Mithridates. Hadrian's Aelia Capitolina replaced Jerusalem, destroyed in A.D. 70, and his colonization of Cyrenaica was intended to repair the havoc caused by the recent Jewish revolt in that province.

Other colonies were primarily military in character, fortresses to hold in check unruly regions. Augustus' Pisidian colonies are certainly to be regarded in this light, and Berytus was evidently intended to overawe the Ituraean brigands who had recently been giving trouble; its territory included their central sanctuary, Heliopolis. The Thracian colonies were undoubtedly fortresses to control the warlike tribesmen of this region, and it is probable that Claudiopolis was intended to hold in check the notoriously turbulent Cetae; Ptolemais and Caesarea may have been similarly meant to overawe the Jews.

But although many colonies performed a useful economic or military function in the district in which they were planted, the choice of a site was probably often influenced by an even more practical consideration, the availability of land. The site of Corinth was already *ager publicus*: we happen to know that Buthrotum had forfeited a part of its territory by its failure to pay a communal fine inflicted by Caesar; and Sinope may well have incurred his displeasure by its half-hearted resistance to Pharnaces. It would appear from Augustus' boast that he was the first to pay for land required for colonial settlements that the triumviral colonies also were planted on *ager publicus*, no doubt territory confiscated from communities which had taken the wrong side in the civil wars. Nor is it likely that all the land required for the Augustan and later imperial colonies was purchased. The territory of Flaviopolis was taken from the Attalid royal lands in the Chersonese, which had eventually passed into the imperial patrimony. And it is highly probable that in the turbulent districts to which the more distinctively military colonies were sent and in devastated areas such as central Judaea and Cyrenaica there was much land available for settlement which had been confiscated from the rebellious inhabitants.⁸¹

The primary motive of the colonial movement was in fact to provide land for certain classes of Roman citizens, and any services

which the settlements might perform in the districts where they were planted were a secondary consideration. Caesar was chiefly interested in the urban proletariat of Rome, and his eastern colonies were probably peopled from this class—Corinth, about which alone we have definite information, certainly was so. The triumvirs and the emperors were principally concerned to find land for their veterans. Augustus in particular had a vast mass of troops to pay off after Actium, a fact which explains the large number of colonies he restored or founded; these were chiefly of veterans, but some, such as Dyrrachium and Philippi, consisted in part at any rate of Italians dispossessed by the veterans planted in Italy. Of the first-century colonies some are definitely known to have been composed of veterans—the coins of Ptolemais bear the standards of the four Syrian legions, and Deultum is stated by Pliny to have been a veteran settlement—and most were no doubt of this character. For the second-century colonies recorded above we have no evidence, but it is very probable that Colonia in Armenia Minor was a veteran colony and was established in the second century; it was obviously a pendant of the legionary fortress of Satala built in this neighbourhood by Trajan. Satala itself became a colony, perhaps already in the second century, and the earlier legionary camp in Melitene, established by Vespasian, was granted civic organization by Trajan; we have no information on the type of constitution it received, but its origin suggests that the new city was given the status of a colony.⁸²

The origin of the Roman colonists in the East may in part explain the rapidity with which the majority of the colonies were hellenized. The settlers, though legally Roman citizens, must to a very considerable extent have been of oriental origin. Caesar's colonists at Corinth were for the most part freedmen, and to the majority of them Greek was probably more familiar than Latin. Not a few of the veterans belonging to Antony's army whom Augustus settled in his colonies were orientals who had received the Roman citizenship on enlistment, and the eastern legions were henceforth normally recruited locally. The men who were enrolled in the later veteran colonies knew Latin—it was the official language of the army everywhere—but their mother tongue was Greek, and, since they lived all their lives in Greek-speaking areas, Greek probably remained their everyday language.⁸³

The emperors of the Severan house founded a large number of colonies in Syria and Mesopotamia. Some of these are known to have been veteran settlements: the standards of legions appear on

the coins of Tyre and of Rhesaina, and it seems on general grounds probable that in Mesopotamia, a newly-conquered province constantly liable to Parthian attack, the majority of the colonies were of a military character. But at this period—and probably earlier—the title of colony was coming more and more frequently to be granted to cities as an honour, which conferred certain privileges, without any settlement taking place. It continued to be conferred on cities down to the fourth century A.D., but it had long before that time become entirely meaningless.⁸⁴

The colonial movement contributed but little to the development of city life in the East. The great majority of the Roman colonies were superimposed on existing Greek cities. Some few were revivals of destroyed cities. Corinth is the most obvious example, but Flaviopolis was in a sense a restoration of Lysimacheia; it occupied the same or almost the same site, and its territory was taken from the land which had escheated to the Attalid kings on the destruction of Lysimacheia. A very few were new centres of civic life. The process common on the western frontiers, whereby the *canabae* of military stations grew into towns and were ultimately accorded self-government, is rare in the East. The legions were normally quartered in cities, and it was only on the upper Euphrates frontier, where town life was undeveloped, and in the desolate waste that central Judaea became after the destruction of Jerusalem, that legionary camps were situated in rural districts. The *canabae* of XII Fulminata and XV Apollinaris became the colonies of Melitene and Satala; and it may be that those of X Fretensis formed the nucleus of Aelia Capitolina. Aprus and Deultum in Thrace, Colonia of Armenia Minor, and Faustianopolis in Cappadocia were also new autonomous communes in areas hitherto administered on bureaucratic lines.

The emperors did not always plant their veterans in colonies. Augustus seems to have settled some of his men in Greek cities, enrolling them in the citizen body but not altering the status of the community. Later emperors planted small groups of veterans in the directly administered areas without giving them any corporate organization: Vespasian for instance settled eight hundred men in the village of Emmaus near Jerusalem, and similar groups of veterans, called *κολωνίαι* in Greek but lacking the status of a colony, or indeed any corporate life, are not uncommonly found in Egypt.⁸⁵

The Roman colonies, however, formed a very small proportion

of the cities founded by the emperors. The main line of development lay in the foundation of Greek cities, and to this development the emperors made a considerable contribution, though not perhaps so large a one as the vast number of dynastic names and titles scattered all over the eastern provinces would suggest. There is scarcely an emperor from Augustus to Philip the Arab who is not commemorated by some city. Names like Caesarea, Diocaesarea or Neocaesarea, Sebaste, Sebasteia or Sebastopolis are found by the dozen. Titles ranging from Julia to Gallieniana are borne by innumerable cities. But in many cases the initiative did not come from the emperors. A fair number of the earlier foundations are to be credited to the *client kings of the empire*, who thought it prudent to honour their suzerain, and in many cases it is highly probable that the community itself, when it built itself a new town or reorganized its constitution, asked permission to celebrate the event by adopting a new name in honour of the sovereign. A very large number of the dynastic names and titles are of little or no significance. They sometimes commemorate some imperial benefaction: several of the Asiatic cities which were damaged by earthquakes in Tiberius' reign and were granted remission of taxation in consequence changed their names to express their gratitude, Philadelphia becoming Neocaesarea, Myrina Sebastopolis, Sardis, Hyrcanis, Mostene and Cibyra Caesarea. Dynastic titles seem often to commemorate merely the vanity of the great cities and their jealous emulation; the cities of Cilicia were greatly addicted to dynastic titles and between them collected a remarkably complete series ranging from Hadriana to Gallieniana.⁸⁶

In the older provinces there is comparatively little to record because their development was more or less complete. Even in Achaea, however, there were backward districts, and in the north-west in particular what cities had developed had through the ravages of war sunk into decrepitude. Here Augustus made a great change, sweeping the decaying cities and villages of Ambracia, Amphiloehia, Acarnania, Leucas, and the greater part of Aetolia into the great city which he built to celebrate the victory of Actium, Nicopolis. This vast synoecism, which exceeded the most ambitious efforts of the Successors, was justified in that it created one very flourishing city, though at the expense of many little towns which were rendered desolate. Southern Aetolia was by a similar policy attributed to the colony of Patrae, as were also, but probably at a later date, the Ozolian Locrians. To the north

of the Nicopolitan territory Epirus remained a sparsely populated and primitive country, and little was done to restore it. The only imperial foundation in this region is Hadrianopolis, which perhaps marks the synoecism of one of the Epirot tribes.⁸⁷

In Macedonia also a primitive tribal life still prevailed not only in the Illyrian country which the Romans had incorporated in the province on the west, but in the Paeonian and Thracian borderlands of the old kingdom and even in the western highlands of Macedonia proper, where inscriptions of the second century record the continued existence of the tribes of the Antani and Lyncestae near Heraclea and prove that the Oresti were still divided into a number of rural communes. Apart from the colonies, there is little sign of imperial activity; Parthicopolis in the Strymon valley is perhaps the work of Trajan, who reorganized the neighbouring Thracian country.⁸⁸

In Cyprus there is no progress to record. In Crete and Cyrene only one new city appears. After the Jewish rebellion in Cyrenaica Hadrian not only colonized the old cities but founded a sixth member of the Pentapolis, called after himself Hadriane or Hadrianopolis, on an outlying portion of the public land near the western coast. The settlers were probably, like the colonists of the older cities, drawn from other parts of the empire.⁸⁹

In Asia the development of city life was by the beginning of the principate complete in most areas and only minor adjustments had to be made. In Caria the age-long process of amalgamation still continued; Aphrodisias and Plarasa, which had been two cities under the republic and had in the triumviral period been united in a sympolity, became during the principate the single city of Aphrodisias. In Mysia similarly the decayed city of Atarneus was in the late first century B.C. or early first century A.D. absorbed in Pergamum, and Stratonicea formed under Trajan a sympolity with its old subjects, the Indeipediae; the two communities were definitively amalgamated as Stratonicea Hadrianopolis by Hadrian, who transferred to the new city the revenues hitherto accruing to the Roman treasury from the Indeipedion. The mainland territory of Samos was on the other hand made into an independent city, Neapolis, by Antoninus Pius.⁹⁰

More interesting is the development of city life in many of the surviving tribal areas. One of the best documented instances is that of the Cilbiani of the upper Cayster valley. They appear in the Augustan *formula provinciae* and in an inscription of the same period as divided into two rural communes, the Upper and Lower

Cilbiani. When in the second century A.D. they begin to issue coins, the Lower Cilbiani style themselves 'the Cilbiani about Nicaea'—their principal town, and in the early third century this style changes to 'the Nicaeans in the Cilbian district'. Here it is possible to observe in all its stages the progress from tribe to city, and it may be noted that there is no sign of imperial initiative; the whole movement seems to be spontaneous. The Moxeani, similarly, who appear on the Augustan register as a single tribe, split into two sections, both of which had by the early third century become cities. The Corpeni broke up rather earlier into four cities, and the Moccadeni even sooner—before the end of the first century—into two, Silandus and Temenothyrae. Only in the last case is there any hint of imperial action: Temenothyrae adopted for a while the style of Flaviopolis. The development of the Abbaeite Mysians can be more definitely attributed to the imperial government; the three cities into which the tribe divided were Synaus, Julia Ancyra, and Tiberiopolis. The tribes hitherto mentioned all split into two or more subdivisions before developing city life. This was not invariably the case. The two great tribes of eastern Mysia, the Abretteni and the Olympeni, became two cities, Hadrianeia and Hadriani. In this concerted movement the initiative clearly came from the emperor; Hadrian is in fact known to have stayed in this district and the name of another city in this district, Hadrianotherae, commemorates a successful bear hunt in which he took part. The concentration of each of these extensive tribes into a single city has, moreover, an air of artificiality: the natural development was the growth of several small towns.⁹¹

The name of Sebaste celebrates the amalgamation by Augustus of a number of small communities in the valley of the Senarus. The significance of most of the other dynastic names borne by the cities of Asia is obscure. Carian Larba was certainly a city before it became Sebastopolis; Ipsi was a very ancient Phrygian town which must have attained autonomy long before it was renamed Julia; Hieracome was, despite its name, no longer the sacred village of the Persian Goddess but already a city when it took the name of Hierocaesarea. The majority of these dynastic names probably, like the style of Caesarea adopted by Cibyra, celebrate imperial benefactions or merely reflect the effusive loyalty of the cities to the imperial house.⁹²

The regions which had formed the first republican province of Cilicia—before Pompey annexed Cilicia proper—were granted by

Antony to Amyntas, whom he also made king of the Gauls. Hence, when they were annexed on Amyntas' death in 25 B.C., the new province was styled Galatia. Claudius, when he deprived the Lycian league of its freedom, united the southern part of Galatia with Lycia, and when the Lycian league, having, probably under Nero, regained its freedom, was again deprived of it by Vespasian, the province of Lycia and Pamphylia (which included southern Pisidia) was revived.

In this area there were great contrasts in the degree of political development and of civilization in general attained in the different districts. The Lycians had two centuries before worked out a constitution which was admirably adapted to their needs, and they preserved it almost unchanged. The league continued to function after the annexation, and though its activities were more confined they never became entirely formal; there were still federal law courts under the empire and the federal authorities collected the imperial tribute. Some of the Lycian cities grew in importance and others declined, and corresponding changes were made in the distribution of votes on the league council and assembly. But Lycia continued to be what it had always been, a land of many cities, some large but mostly very small.⁹³

The great cities of Pamphylia and Pisidia had also attained their full development. But in many parts of the Milyas, Pisidia, and the Isaurian country, conditions remained very backward; it is notable that when the *formula provinciae* was drawn up shortly after 25 B.C. there were still many areas ruled by chieftains. The loose tribal federations which had existed in many parts of the country tended to break up into groups of clans or villages or small cities. The development of the Milyae can be roughly traced. They are mentioned in official documents cited by Cicero as the 'commune Milyadum'. An inscription, probably of the second century A.D., records the transition from the federal constitution to the city constitution at one of the Milyadic towns, Pogla, and at about this period a number of other little cities—Andeda, Verba, Sibidunda—begin to emerge in the neighbourhood and issue their own coins. The Milyadic league was thus dissolved and its constituent communes achieved the rank of cities. A similar development can be traced among the Etenneis or Catenneis, who had in the Hellenistic age issued a common coinage, but were in the principate divided into a number of little cities, two of which, Etenna and Cotenna, bear names derived from that of the tribe.⁹⁴

Elsewhere the development was not complete. Old Isaura, the metropolis of the Isaurians, became during the principate a regular Greek city, but the mass of the Isaurians continued to live in village communities. The Homonadeis after their subjugation by Quirinius in about 6 B.C. seem to have been divided into many small clans, none of which developed into cities. The Oroandeis, whose territory had been confiscated by Servilius Isauricus, broke up into several communities. One of these, Pappa, was granted city status under the style of Tiberiopolis: it is to be presumed that Tiberius granted a portion of the *ager Oroandicus* to it. The rest of the *ager Oroandicus* continued to be administered by an imperial procurator, and the communities living on it do not seem to have attained the status of cities. The general result of these developments was that, apart from the great cities which had early consolidated themselves, the Pisidian communities tended, whether they were cities or villages or clans, to be very small.⁹⁵

The three Gallic tribes were on Amyntas' death organized as republics on the Greek model. Each tribe took as its capital the principal Phrygian town of its territory, the Tolistobogii Pessinus, the Tectosages Ancyra, the Trocmi Tavium. The coins and inscriptions of the three tribes form an interesting study. At first the name of the town is ignored; then it is added to that of the tribe as part of the official style; and finally the tribal name is dropped. This development no doubt reflects a change in the habits of the Galatian aristocracy, who at first lived on their estates, only going into the town for business, and eventually became town dwellers, who occasionally visited their country houses.⁹⁶

In Bithynia and Pontus the main outlines of Pompey's settlement stood. Antony, it is true, undid much of his work by granting many districts to the kings of Paphlagonia and other minor dynasts and by creating a small kingdom of Pontus on the eastern frontier; but as the several kings and dynasts died or were deposed Pompey's arrangements with minor modifications were re-established, except that most of the cities instead of being reunited to Bithynia Pontus were incorporated in Galatia or Cappadocia.

In Bithynia three new cities were founded in the early principate. On the western frontier of the province Caesarea was built on land near Lake Dascylitis which had hitherto belonged to Cyzicus and Byzantium; in A.D. 17 it added Germanice to its name

and celebrated Germanicus Caesar, then in charge of the Eastern provinces, as its founder, but it already existed in Augustus' reign. On the eastern frontier of Bithynia a dynast whom Antony had appointed, Cleon of Gordiucome, converted his principality, which had presumably been carved out of the public lands, into the city of Juliopolis. Another section of the Bithynian public lands, which had been granted to the kings of Paphlagonia, formed the territory of the city of Caesarea of the Proseilemmenitae, later known as Hadrianopolis.⁹⁷

In Pontus most of Pompey's cities survived, though several changed their names. Magnopolis disappeared, but its loss was counterbalanced by the foundation of Polemonium on the neighbouring coast by Polemo II of Pontus. Comana ceased in A.D. 34 to be a sacerdotal principality and became a city. The little district of Caranitis, which Antony had detached from the territory of Zela and granted to a Galatian noble named Ateporix, was on the death of its ruler not reunited with Zela, but organized as a separate city, its capital Carana being enlarged and renamed Sebastopolis.⁹⁸

Of the minor kingdoms which Pompey had allowed to subsist, Paphlagonia was annexed in 6 B.C., when its capital Gangra became a city, later known as Germanicopolis; its territory seems to have comprised the whole of the principality. Armenia Minor, having passed through many hands, was ultimately annexed in A.D. 72. It then possessed one city only, Nicopolis, which Pompey had founded, and the rest of the country seems to have been administered on bureaucratic lines: later, after the establishment of Satala and Colonia, the whole country was partitioned between the three cities. The tribes behind Pharnaceia and Trapezus seem on the dissolution of the kingdom of Pontus in A.D. 64 to have been placed under the rule of these two cities.⁹⁹

In Cilicia and Syria the only important developments took place in the various client kingdoms and principalities which Pompey had allowed to subsist or which had subsequently been created. In Cilicia Tracheia there was an ancient sacerdotal principality, ruled by the high priests of Zeus Olbius, who claimed descent from Ajax the son of Teucer. How Pompey had organized the rest of the country is unknown, but it was granted by Antony to Cleopatra, and Augustus did not on Antony's defeat re-annex it but granted it to Amyntas, and on his death five years later gave the greater part of it to Archelaus of Cappadocia, from whom it passed to his son Archelaus II, and then to Antiochus IV

of Commagene. His kingdom, which included Lycaonia, was annexed by Vespasian in A.D. 72, with the exception of the inland district of Cetus, which was granted to Antiochus' son-in-law Alexander. The Olbian principality, which had passed into the hands of Polemo II, seems to have been annexed at the same time.

The two tribes which, with the holy city of Olba, formed the principality of Polemo II continued during Vespasian's reign to issue a joint coinage, but under Domitian Diocaesarea, the capital of the Cennatae, began to strike its own coins, and later Claudiopolis, the capital of the Lalasseis, followed suit. The latter of these towns at any rate—and probably the former also—must, it may be noted, have received its dynastic name from Polemo; but the evolution from tribe to city was not completed by him. The inhabitants of the other kingdom, particularly the barbarous Cetae of the interior, gave considerable trouble to their successive kings; the efforts of both Archelaus II and Antiochus IV to introduce a regular administration resulted in serious rebellions. Antiochus seems, however, to have won the upper hand eventually, and celebrated and confirmed his victory by the establishment of many cities, some of which were no doubt of the nature of military colonies: his foundations include Iotape and Antioch on the western coast of the kingdom and Irenopolis, Claudiopolis, Germanicopolis and Philadelphia in the interior. The natives were gradually weaned from their barbarous ways, and after the annexation a number of other cities began to coin in the interior. The Lycaonians also blossomed out in the reign of Antoninus Pius as a league of cities.¹⁰⁰

The dynasty of Tarcondimotus ruled the upper valleys of the Pyramus and its tributaries till A.D. 17. On the other side of Mount Amanus the kingdom of Commagene was also suppressed in A.D. 17, but was revived by Gaius, and apparently enlarged with some of the territory of the Tarcondimotid kingdom: it was finally annexed in A.D. 72. Both regions seem to have been administered on bureaucratic lines, though they contained a number of cities. The Tarcondimotid kingdom included, besides the three tribal areas of Bryclice, Characene, and Lacanatis, two cities, Hieropolis on the Pyramus and Anazarbus, refounded in 20 B.C. by Tarcondimotus II Philopator as Caesarea by Anazarbus; but an inscription found at Hieropolis suggests that its territory, called the Castabalis from the native name of the town Castabala, was administered by royal officials. Commagene contained besides its capital Samosata, which had been founded by King

Samos in the late second century B.C., two recent foundations, Caesarea Germanicia and Antioch in Taurus, the former certainly and the latter probably the work of Antiochus IV, who also founded Neronias in Lacanatis. It is, however, by no means certain that these foundations greatly modified the original centralized system of administration.

On the suppression of the Tarcondimotid dynasty Anazarbus and Hieropolis assumed control of their territories, and one of the rural districts, Bryclice, was shortly afterwards transformed into the city of Augusta. The kingdom of Commagene was on its final annexation resolved into four cities—Samosata, Caesarea Germanicia, Antioch in Taurus, and Doliche; the two Cilician districts attached to the kingdom were also urbanized, Neronias of Lacanatis being changed into Irenopolis and Flaviopolis being founded in Characene.¹⁰¹

In northern Syria there were still, when the Augustan *formula provinciae* was drawn up, many tribal communities and tetrarchies or little principalities interspersed among the cities. The history of most of these is not known, but the Sampsigeramid house ruled Emesa and Arethusa till the Flavian period, and Chalcis was the capital of a little kingdom, whose last king was probably Aristobulus, the son of Herod, until A.D. 93, while the last king of the tetrarchy of Arca was Agrippa II, who also ceased to reign about A.D. 93. Emesa, Arethusa, Chalcis, and Arca were granted autonomy, the last being renamed Caesarea under Libanus. The other tribes and tetrarchies had by the fifth century A.D. disappeared from the map, apparently absorbed by the cities, but when this process took place it is impossible to say. A rather similar state of affairs still prevailed in Mesopotamia when Lucius Verus conquered it from the Parthians. Here most of the local dynasties were suppressed at once; the Abgarids survived till 214, when Edessa became autonomous once more after three and a half centuries of royal rule. The majority of the Mesopotamian towns, as noted above, received Roman colonies. One new Greek city, Antoninopolis, was founded, apparently by the grant of a constitution to the native town of Tela.¹⁰²

The Ituraean tetrarchy did not long survive the establishment of the principate. Its prince Zenodorus, so far from checking, positively encouraged the predatory habits of his lawless subjects, and in 24 B.C. he was deprived of most of his dominions. Large areas of the principality were added to the territories of Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, and the colony of Berytus; the area attached

to Berytus, which included Heliopolis, the sacred city of the Ituraeans, was subsequently organized as a separate colony by Septimius Severus. A small district round the old capital Chalcis was later made into a kingdom for Herod, the brother of Agrippa I; it seems on his death to have been treated as an imperial estate. A larger area, Abilene, became the tetrarchy of a certain Lysanias and eventually passed into the hands of Agrippa II; Abila itself later became a city, but two other districts of the tetrarchy continued to be directly administered under Roman rule. Finally, a group of districts in the south, Paneas, Ulatha, Gaulanitis, Batanaea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis were assigned to Herod the Great, and passed to his son Philip, and then to Agrippa I and II. Philip founded a city named Caesarea in Paneas; its territory seems to have embraced Ulatha also. He also rebuilt Bethsaida in Gaulanitis and renamed it Julias, but Gaulanitis continued to be directly administered.

In the turbulent districts of Batanaea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, no very elaborate system of centralized control can have been attempted by the Herodian kings, whose energies were chiefly directed to stamping out brigandage and enforcing law and order. In this task they were successful and by the time that these regions were annexed their inhabitants had settled down to agriculture, and their old clan organization was dissolving and giving way to village life. The Roman government allowed the development of these regions to take its natural course. It neither enforced centralized rule—the supervision of the entire area was entrusted to a centurion of one of the Syrian legions, who acted as a kind of district commissioner under the legate of Syria—nor divided the country into city territories, but allowed the villages to govern themselves. The villages gradually developed a very flourishing communal life, which differed very little, to all intents and purposes, from that of small cities: they had their annual magistrates, their assemblies which elected these magistrates and passed by-laws, their communal funds from which they built for themselves temples, baths, and even theatres. The chief town of Auranitis, Canatha, alone enjoyed the official status of a city, having long ago been recognized as such by Pompey: how it had achieved this privileged position is unknown, but most probably it had been in the hellenistic period, as it was under the Herodian kings, the administrative capital of the region, and thus had early become hellenized and had perhaps been granted autonomy by the later Seleucids. No other community of this district received

city rank until Philip the Arab ennobled the village of his birth with the status of a Roman colony and the name of Philipopolis.¹⁰³

The Nabataean kingdom was annexed in A.D. 105, becoming the province of Arabia. What little is known of the earlier organization of the region suggests that it was divided into small districts each ruled by a *strategus*, who may officially have been appointed by the crown but in fact held his post on a hereditary tenure. It was, however, not difficult to carve up the new province into a number of cities, for it was rich in towns: the whole life of this arid region depended on the caravan trade, and the kingdom may roughly be said to have consisted of three lines of trading posts strung out along the routes which radiated north, south, and west from the central emporium Petra. The more important of these commercial towns were granted autonomy and entrusted with the government of the areas surrounding them. One of them, Bostra, which was selected as the capital of the province in place of Petra, was so greatly enlarged by Trajan that it almost deserves to be called a new foundation.¹⁰⁴

In all the districts hitherto discussed the imperial government followed the line of policy initiated by Pompey, liquidating—with a few trifling exceptions—the system of direct administration where it existed and entrusting local government to cities, creating them where necessary, or to villages. This policy was no doubt partly dictated by idealistic motives; but in many cases the areas in question were too small to make it worth while to maintain a special administration for them, and it was simpler *to assimilate them to the general pattern of the provinces to which they were added*; and in others the system of centralized control was in a moribund condition and was not worth reviving. But there were other larger kingdoms annexed under the principate—Egypt, Judaea, Cappadocia, and Thrace—where the bureaucratic system was in good working order, and in these cases the emperors for a time at least maintained the system. Their motives were various and complicated. Sometimes perhaps it was felt that the population was too backward to be capable of managing its own affairs, sometimes that it was politically untrustworthy and that the grant of autonomy might make rebellion easier to organize. But the dominant motive in most instances was undoubtedly finance; several of the kingdoms in question were, under their existing scheme of administration, productive of a very large revenue, and the system of economic exploitation

which made possible so high a return was dependent on centralized control.

To govern these annexed kingdoms the emperors did not employ, as elsewhere, legates of senatorial rank. Though they could pick and choose among the senatorial order for their legates and having selected the ablest men keep them regularly in their service, it was difficult to find men of the class with the traditions and training required for the task of running a bureaucracy; in particular members of the senatorial aristocracy lacked financial experience. The emperors employed in their place men drawn from the equestrian order. This class had a strong business tradition—its members had under the republic run the companies which took up the contracts for collecting the provincial revenue and executing public works and supplying stores for the government—and was utilized by the emperors for staffing their revenue departments. Governors drawn from its ranks might therefore be expected to be capable of handling the intricate machinery of government which the emperor wished to preserve.

At any rate all the four kingdoms mentioned above were placed under equestrian governors. In Egypt, it is true, other motives contributed to the decision to appoint an equestrian prefect; Egypt was so rich a country and so easily defensible that it was an ideal base for rebellion, and it was therefore prudent to entrust it to members of the humble equestrian order, who could have no hopes of usurping the throne. But in the other three provinces there were no political issues to complicate the question and in them the appointment of equestrian procurators must be attributed to their peculiar administrative régimes. In Thrace it may be noted that the substitution of a senatorial legate for the procurator coincides exactly with the radical transformation of the system of government carried out by Trajan. In Judaea and in Cappadocia Vespasian appointed legates when he garrisoned these provinces with legions; but by this time the senatorial order was becoming assimilated in its tone to the equestrian, and it is furthermore probable that the financial procurators of these provinces took over much of the work of the former presidial procurators.

Egypt was annexed at the very inception of the principate, and Octavian decided to maintain the existing system of administration before even his own position as head of the state had been regularized. The principal officials—the *epistrategi*, who supervised the three districts into which Egypt was divided, and the *Idios Logos*, the junior finance minister who dealt with casual

receipts—were replaced by Roman knights, and the supreme control of the whole province was entrusted to a prefect, whose duties comprised not only the command of the troops and the administration of justice—in this department he was assisted by an assessor, the *iuridicus*—but also finance; the royal office of *dioecetes*, or general manager of the revenue, seems to have been suppressed and its work assigned to the prefect. Later various minor procuratorships were established, but in the main even the personnel of the administration remained unchanged, the *strategi*, royal scribes and all lesser officers being selected from the local population.

But though in all essentials the system of government remained unchanged, Augustus made one small concession to the notion of local autonomy. In the metropolis of each nome there existed a nucleus of Greeks—in the cultural sense, for very few of them can have been of pure Greek descent and the majority were no doubt hellenized Egyptians. These were registered separately and allowed to pay poll-tax on a lower scale than the rest of the population, and were furthermore granted a very limited form of autonomy which seems to have been modelled on that enjoyed by Alexandria. Alexandria had under the later Ptolemies gradually lost most of its rights. By now it no longer had a territory and in the city itself taxation, public security, and the administration of justice were controlled by royal officials; finally, it had been deprived of its city council. All that the Alexandrians retained of their civic rights was the election of a number of magistrates who controlled the city market and the corn supply, the cult of the city gods, the gymnasium, and the training of the ephebes; these magistrates were apparently elected by the assembly of all Alexandrian citizens from a smaller body, who were alone enrolled in the demes and tribes, and who seem also to have been distinguished by their hereditary right to pass through the ephebic training and become members of the gymnasium. The metropolitans were given very similar rights. An aristocracy of 'members of the gymnasium' was selected in each metropolis—the privilege was henceforth, like metropolitane status itself, hereditary—and from it the body of metropolitans elected a series of magistrates with titles and functions precisely similar to those of Alexandria. This measure was entirely harmless, since it left the major items of government—police, justice, and above all finance—in the hands of the central government. It may be regarded primarily as a concession to Greek sentiment.¹⁰⁵

The system of government as regulated by Augustus remained in force, superficially at any rate unchanged, for over two centuries. The only spectacular event during this period was the foundation by Hadrian of a new Greek city in Egypt. Antinoopolis commemorated the death by drowning of the emperor's favourite Antinous, and was conceived in a rather theatrical vein. It was emphatically a Greek city, as its official style 'the city of the Antinoeis, the New Hellenes' proclaimed. Its laws were borrowed from Naucratis, the oldest Greek settlement in Egypt. Its citizen body was composed of drafts from Ptolemais (and no doubt the other Greek cities of Egypt) and from 'the 6475 Greek men of the Arsinoite nome', who were supposed to be the descendants of the military settlers planted in that district by the Ptolemies, and was supplemented by veterans from the Roman army of Egypt, which was also supposed to be recruited from the Greek population; but as veterans were entitled to marry Egyptian women and often did so, Hadrian had to allow intermarriage between the citizens of his Greek city and Egyptians. Antinoopolis cannot be regarded as a very serious contribution to the development of city life in Egypt. The Antinoeis, though possessing full autonomy and many privileges, were not even entrusted with the government of a territory, the district surrounding the city being administered as a subdivision—the title given to it was 'nomarchy'—of the Hermopolite nome.¹⁰⁶

But though there seemed to be little change, a profound transformation in fact took place. The Ptolemaic administration had been based partly on the services of a professional bureaucracy and partly on the farming system, whereby the revenues were put up to competitive auction. Under Roman rule both these foundations of the structure gave way. For causes which are obscure and which need not be discussed here, the revenue which actually came in soon began to fall short of the estimate which the government had formed of it. The government refused to accept this decline. When a tax was farmed, it insisted that the bids for it should at least not be lower than previous bids; the individual who had obtained the contract for the previous term was accordingly compelled to renew at the old figure, and when his resources were exhausted, the contract was compulsorily allotted to a person of suitable means. The farming system thus died: sometimes the forms were maintained, sometimes direct collection was introduced, but the result was the same, for the collectors inherited the farmers' liability for the total estimated

by the government and were conscripted for the service. The professional civil service was affected by the same process. Most officials had some connexion with the revenue, and under the Ptolemaic system they had always been liable to make good any losses arising from their negligence. Now that deficits were the normal rule their position became intolerable: no one would enter the service voluntarily and the government was accordingly obliged to conscript its minor officials. Only the heads of the local administration, the *strategus* and royal scribe of each nome, continued to be recruited on a voluntary basis; these officials were of sufficiently high standing to pass on their responsibilities to their subordinates, and could no doubt add perquisites to their salaries.¹⁰⁷

This system of compulsory service seems to have grown up in the latter part of the first century A.D. By the end of the second century it was showing obvious signs of collapse. The substitution for professional officials, who made administration their career, of conscripts, who served for a limited term of years only, naturally led to growing confusion and inefficiency, which in its turn caused the revenue to sink. And as the gap between actual and estimated receipts grew wider, the system ceased to provide the government with adequate guarantees for the deficit. The collectors appointed sometimes did not possess sufficient means to pay the sums required, or, if they did, employed ingenious legal devices to divest themselves formally of their property while retaining its use; some even preferred to abscond rather than to undertake the onerous duties thrust upon them. In such cases the government possessed no guarantor: for the persons responsible for the appointment of the officials, the local scribes, were too poor to guarantee their solvency. It was obviously desirable to spread responsibility over a large number of persons.

Septimius Severus finally took this step. The Greeks of the metropoleis were the wealthiest class in Egypt, and they already possessed that limited form of corporate organization which had been granted to them by Augustus. These institutions had developed in a rather curious way. The magistracies involved the expenditure of considerable sums of money and candidates gradually ceased to offer themselves. Committees of ex-magistrates had accordingly been formed who contributed to the expense and in practice made themselves responsible for filling the posts each year. Severus amalgamated these committees

into a council for each metropolis (and for Alexandria), gave the councils the right to co-opt new members, and made them responsible for the appointment not only of the metropolitan magistrates but of the chief officials of the nome below the *strategus* and royal scribe. A few years later the humbler classes in the metropoleis were divided into tribes which each for one year in rotation elected an officer who made appointments to minor posts. Something resembling city organization was thus established in each metropolis. But the concession of autonomy was very incomplete. The *strategus* and royal scribe were still appointed by the crown and they directed the administration; the council and the tribes had only the privilege of appointing—and, it need hardly be added, standing surety for—the officials, who took their orders from the agents of the central government.¹⁰⁸

In Egypt the imperial government appears at its worst. It regarded the country first and foremost as a source of revenue, and therefore maintained the elaborate system of fiscal exploitation organized by the Ptolemies and the scheme of direct administration on which it was based, making only such trifling concessions to the ideal of autonomy as would have no effect on the revenue. But it had not the capacity to maintain the economic productivity of Egypt at the high level to which the Ptolemies had raised it. Owing to sheer inefficiency it was reluctantly compelled to devolve some part of its responsibility onto local authorities; but even so it clung tenaciously to its powers of control, and thus evolved the curious hybrid between civic autonomy and centralized bureaucracy which resulted from Severus' reforms.

We know, thanks to Josephus, more of the Herodian kingdom than of any of the minor kingdoms of the East. It was administered on a rigidly centralized system which in its main outlines closely resembled the Ptolemaic administration of Egypt and was probably in part derived by direct descent from the Ptolemaic régime of the third century B.C. The kingdom was—apart from some Greek cities attached to it—divided into four main sections, Galilee, Samareitis, Judaea, and Peraea, and these were subdivided into toparchies, and these again into villages. We hear as in Egypt of village scribes (*comogrammateis*), appointed by the crown, and of royal banks in the administrative capitals.

Herod the Great, as an enlightened hellenistic king, posed as a great founder of cities, but despite his imposing array of new

foundations he did more to eliminate local autonomy than to promote it. His two principal creations, which he named Caesarea and Sebaste in honour of his imperial patron, were already Greek cities before he refounded them: he rebuilt Strato's Tower, it is true, and provided it with a magnificent artificial harbour, and he not only rebuilt Samaria but colonized it with six thousand military settlers drawn from his mercenary army, but in neither case did he withdraw any territory from the jurisdiction of his civil service. The name of Agrippias given to Anthedon similarly celebrated merely material improvements to this city. Herod's minor foundations, which he named after himself or members of his family, were for the most part not cities, but merely new towns. Herodium was the capital of a new toparchy south of Jerusalem; Phasaelis, north of Jericho, was apparently a village in that toparchy. Antipatris on the coastal plain may have been a city, but it did not issue coins till the third century A.D. Against this one dubious foundation must be set the reduction of Joppa, Jamnia, and perhaps Azotus, which had been granted autonomy by Pompey, to the status of toparchies, and the suppression of the two cities of Marisa and Adora which Pompey had established in Idumaea. Herod's zest to found cities was outweighed by his fear of his Jewish subjects. He dared not grant autonomy to towns inhabited by Jews, and he found it wise to suppress the autonomy of existing Jewish cities such as Joppa.

Archelaus, who succeeded him in Judaea (with Idumaea) and Samareitis, was equally unpopular and could thus make no concessions; the one foundation of his short reign, Archelais, was a village in the toparchy of Jericho. Antipas, on the other hand, whose portion was Galilee and Peraea, established a *modus vivendi* with the upper classes and was thus able to take a more liberal line. His one foundation in the Peraea, Livias (later altered to Julias), was, it is true, spurious; the town, whose native name was Betharamphtha, remained what it had been before, the capital of a toparchy. But in Galilee both Antipas' foundations, Sepphoris (temporarily called Autocratoris) and Tiberias, were cities of a sort. They enjoyed local self-government and had Greek constitutions of a normal type; they fell short of full city status in that they had no territorial jurisdiction, the surrounding districts remaining toparchies and being administered as before by royal officials. Tiberias was an entirely new creation; its population was drawn principally from the

surrounding country-side, the inhabitants of which were conscripted, and partly from casual immigrants; its aristocracy was largely recruited from the officials of the kingdom. Sepphoris was an old town, but must have been rebuilt and repopulated, since it had recently been destroyed and its inhabitants sold as slaves.

Archelaus' portion was annexed in A.D. 6, and, after a brief revival of the kingdom under Agrippa I, the whole was finally brought under Roman rule in A.D. 44. But no change was made in the system of administration. Partly perhaps from mere inertia, partly no doubt for fiscal reasons—the Herodian kings had managed to extract a very large revenue from a naturally poor country—but chiefly, in all probability, because the restive temperament of the Jews made any concession of autonomy seem dangerous, the old system of centralized bureaucratic government was maintained under the direction of an imperial procurator. When after the great revolt of A.D. 67–70 a legion was posted at Jerusalem, a legate was substituted for—or perhaps rather superimposed upon—the procurator, but little change was made in the system. Vespasian established a new city, Neapolis, near Sichem, the religious centre of the Samaritan community, which had apparently not joined in the revolt, and allotted to it an extensive area of Samareitis; the citizens of Neapolis seem to have been native Samaritans. One of the Flavian emperors also converted the Joppic toparchy into a city; here the citizens were pagans, the greater part of the Jewish inhabitants of the town having been massacred in the war.

Hadrian's attempt to found a Roman colony at Jerusalem provoked a second revolt of the Jews, which was suppressed with even greater slaughter than the first. He then completed his new foundation, peopling it with alien settlers and allotting to it two or three toparchies as its territory. He seems also to have settled the Jewish cities of Tiberias and Sepphoris, now renamed Diocaesarea, and Samaritan Neapolis, with alien colonists—the coinage of all three becomes abruptly pagan in type—and perhaps granted to the two first the territorial jurisdiction which they had hitherto lacked but later possessed. The process was carried a stage further by Septimius Severus, who gave city rank to the toparchic capital Lydda, renaming it Diospolis and granting it its own toparchy and another, the Tharnitic, and founded Eleutheropolis, giving it also two or perhaps three toparchies. Both these cities were pagan and perhaps peopled with immigrants. Severus may also have allotted the toparchy of

Acrobatene to Sebaste when he colonized that city. Elagabalus gave city status and the rule of its toparchy to Emmaus; the new city was named Nicopolis and was like the others pagan.¹⁰⁹

The total result of these successive foundations was that the greater part of the old Herodian kingdom was partitioned into city territories; the only important areas still directly administered were northern Galilee, the plain of Esdraelon, and the Jordan valley. The development of the whole region seems to have been dictated by the intractable character of its inhabitants. Ruined and depopulated by their two rebellions it ceased to be financially profitable, and one major reason for maintaining the Herodian administrative system was thus destroyed. But the Jews had shown by these rebellions that it would be unsafe to grant them local autonomy, and accordingly the government of the country was entrusted to the alien settlers who were introduced to replenish the population.

Very little is known of Cappadocia. Its last king, Archelaus, who had been appointed by Antony and reigned till A.D. 17, renamed the town of Garsaura Archelais; this may mean that he granted it autonomy. He also seems to have converted the town of Comana, hitherto ruled by the high priests of the local mother goddess and peopled for the most part by her sacred serfs, into a city, to which he perhaps gave the name it officially bore later, Hieropolis. But these changes did not substantially modify the general administrative scheme, which remained of the centralized type. The kingdom when annexed was entrusted to a procurator, and the old régime was maintained; despite its cultural backwardness the kingdom was a profitable concern financially, and Tiberius was able to make substantial reductions in the taxes falling on Roman citizens in view of the additional revenue which its annexation brought to the central exchequer. Some few cities were founded in Cappadocia in the course of the principate. Nazianzus acquired in the first century the name of Diocaesarea, which presumably implies city status, and in the second century the legionary camp of Melitene was granted autonomy by Trajan and the Roman colony of Faustinopolis was founded by Marcus Aurelius. But the total number of cities remained under ten, and as each had quite a small territory, the great bulk of the country remained under bureaucratic rule.¹¹⁰

The kingdom of Thrace was of recent growth when it was in A.D. 44 annexed by Claudius. The royal house of the Sapaevi, the tribe which occupied the Aegaeon coast adjacent to Macedonia,

had partly by conquest and partly by marriage alliances and partly by imperial favour extended its rule over the greater part of Thrace during the reign of Augustus. The policy of the dynasty was naturally directed to breaking down the tribal sentiment of its warlike subjects, and with this end in view it suppressed the dynasties of the several tribes and whatever rudimentary organs of self-government they may have possessed, and substituted direct administration by royal officers, entitled *strategi*. The districts which these officers ruled may at first have coincided with the territories of the tribes, but later each territory was subdivided into several *strategiae*. There are traces at a later date of a further subdivision into toparchies and comarchies, which last comprised a small group of villages, and it is probable that this scheme was introduced by the kings.

On the annexation this system of government was maintained by the emperors, probably for the same reasons for which it had been introduced by the kings. An equestrian procurator was put in charge, but the *strategi* were drawn, as probably they had been hitherto, from the Greek or hellenized parts of the local population. There were a number of Greek cities on the coasts—of which some had belonged to the kingdom, others had not, being free—but their territories were small. Inland there was one city only, Philippopolis, when the kingdom was annexed, and the emperors during the first sixty years of their rule added only two more, both Roman colonies; these were Aprus, founded by Claudius, and Deultum, founded by Vespasian.

Trajan began and Hadrian completed a radical transformation of the system of government. Nine new cities were founded, and the entire area of the province—except for the territories of the old coastal cities and small districts allotted to some of them—was partitioned between these nine and Philippopolis and the two Roman colonies. The majority of the new cities were old native towns; many of them, such as Pautalia or Topirus, retained their native names with the addition of the title *Ulpia*, and others, which were given dynastic names, are known to have had native names—*Augusta Trajana* for instance later reverted to *Beroe*. They had in all probability mostly been tribal capitals by origin; *Serdice* was obviously the town of the *Serdi*, *Bizye* is known to have been the residence of the kings of the *Astae* and *Uscudama*, later *Hadrianopolis*, had been the capital of the *Bessi*. Under the kingdom they had no doubt continued to be administrative centres, and their population had thus become hellenized.

All that Trajan probably did in effect was to grant autonomy to the Greek or hellenized official class in these towns—in other words to make the officials administer the country on their own responsibility instead of as agents of the central government.

How slight the real change was is shown by the survival under the new régime of the lower grades of the old bureaucratic scheme; toparchs were appointed by the city council of Augusta Trajana, and in the territory of Philippopolis phylarchs supervised groups of comarchies. The motive of the change was probably idealistic; Trajan no doubt felt that the Thracians were sufficiently detribalized to make direct administration no longer necessary, and, since the existing system cannot have been particularly profitable financially, there was no objection to raising the culture of Thrace to a higher level by the introduction of civic autonomy. The effects of the change must have been nugatory; for, as in most schemes of artificial urbanization, the number of cities in relation to the total area was far too small, and the peasants who inhabited the vast territories subject to the several cities can hardly have noticed whether their toparchs and comarchs were imperial officials or city magistrates.¹¹¹

Geographically a part of Thrace, the Chersonese was administratively separate. The Attalid royal lands of this district—which did not comprise the whole peninsula, since Sestos and Callipolis were cities during their supremacy and after—passed into the hands of Augustus, and were henceforth administered by a procurator. Two cities were subsequently founded in this area. The Roman colony of Flaviopolis was built by Vespasian on the isthmus, and on the narrows of the Hellespont there appears in the middle of the first century A.D. the Greek city of Coela, which was raised by Hadrian to the rank of a Roman *municipium*. The origins of Coela are obscure, but the town is known to have been the head-quarters of the imperial administration; many officials no doubt resided there and these would have become the governing body of the city. The fact that these officials would have been Roman citizens may have suggested to Hadrian the grant of municipal status, a privilege almost unknown in the East, to the town. These two cities did not absorb in their territories the whole of the imperial lands. An inscription proves that 'the Chersonesites by the Hellespont' remained under the jurisdiction of the procurator and that they possessed no communal organization; for when they wished to thank him for his good offices they could only do so by a decree of the Aelian *municipium* of Coela.¹¹²

CHAPTER V

THE BYZANTINE AGE

DURING the middle decades of the third century A.D. the Roman empire seemed to be doomed to collapse. In every province the local armies set up pretenders, and no sooner had one established himself as sole emperor than he in turn fell before another pretender; meanwhile, taking advantage of the internecine struggles of the Roman armies, the Persian kings and hordes of barbarians from the north swept over the undefended provinces. At length Diocletian arrested the growing anarchy, and initiated a period of relative stability and security. The order which he established was based on a greatly strengthened central control. The imperial bureaucracy was enormously enlarged and reorganized in a regular pyramid, the apex of which was the emperor and the palatine ministries and the base the innumerable officials who minutely supervised the administration of the provinces, now greatly multiplied in number and correspondingly reduced in size.

This increase of centralization was not favourable to local self-government, but it was inevitable because local government was decaying from within. Since the beginning of the second century A.D. and perhaps earlier the vitality of city life had been imperceptibly ebbing, and the anarchy of the third century had accelerated its decline. The emperors had perforce, since they were unable to arrest the decay of local government, to introduce more and more direct control, but they strove by legislation to infuse new life into the cities. They had been in the past very useful institutions—they had collected the taxes, maintained public security, built the roads and performed countless other functions for the imperial government—and if they could retain sufficient vigour to continue to perform these tasks, so much the better.

Despite the efforts of the imperial government the growth of the bureaucracy absorbed more and more of the strength of the cities during the fourth and succeeding centuries. But this movement only added another motive for endeavouring to maintain local self-government. The bureaucracy as it grew became more and more unwieldy and less and less obedient to

its master; the officials became a class whose interests were far from identical with those of the empire they served and who pursued those interests without scruple. The only effective check on their depredations was to give the provincials whom they oppressed more effective power to resist them, and some of Justinian's measures show that he realized the value of local autonomy as a means of curbing the bureaucracy.

The emperors thus had practical motives for maintaining the cities, and indeed for promoting the growth of city life where it did not hitherto exist. But it would be unjust to assume that the Byzantine emperors were moved by practical reasons only. It was still in this age, despite the actual decay of civic institutions, accepted as an axiom that civilization meant cities, and it is probable that many of the emperors genuinely felt that in their efforts to sustain and promote city life they were the champions and missionaries of culture. Constantine's letter to his praetorian prefect Ablabius authorizing the foundation of Orcistus is worth quoting as testimony to this sentiment. 'The inhabitants of Orcistus', he writes, 'now a town and city, have afforded a joyful occasion for our munificence, my dear Ablabius. For to one whose ambition it is either to found new cities or to revive those that are moribund, their petition was most welcome'. Such phrases were no doubt a common form of the imperial chancellery, but they do at least show that city life was still an ideal to be treated with respect. And that it was still considered a meritorious act to found a city is amply proved by the vast number of dynastic names with which the emperors from Diocletian to Justinian commemorated their foundations, genuine or spurious.¹¹³

In very many cases a dynastic name seems as in earlier periods to denote no change of importance and probably commemorates only some passing benefaction. Nevertheless, the emperors of the later empire did found many cities. They did something to liquidate the remaining fragments of direct administration. In Egypt Diocletian completed the changes initiated by Severus, converting the nomes into the territories of the metropoleis, henceforth officially cities. The change was chiefly one of terminology, since the office of *strategus* was replaced by that of *exactor civitatis*, whose character was so similar to it that the Egyptians for a time used the two titles synonymously. However, the Egyptian cities henceforth shared the general development of civic institutions throughout the empire, and as the

office of *exactor* soon became elective, in practice they ultimately gained in autonomy. To celebrate his reform Diocletian founded in Egypt two new cities, named after himself and his colleague, Maximian.¹¹⁴

In Palestine he founded a city named Maximianopolis, whose territory comprised the plain of Esdraelon, and Constantine's mother built another, Helenopolis, probably in northern Galilee; the Jordan valley, where the four toparchies of Amathus, Gadara, Jericho, and Livias still survived as 'regions', thus was the only substantial area left to direct administration. In Cappadocia also cities were founded. The south-eastern part of the country, the Byzantine province of Armenia II, consisted of six cities, three of which—Comana, Ariaratheia, and Melitene—were old, but the others probably were recent creations. The western part of the country, made into the separate province of Cappadocia II by Valens, also consisted mostly of cities, some of which—Tyana, Cybistra, Archelais, Diocaesarea, and Faustinopolis—were old, but some—Nyssa, Parnassus, Sasima—were probably new. The central part of the country, Cappadocia I, surrounding the capital Caesarea, remained almost entirely under direct administration, even after Justinian had founded the two cities of Mocissus and Camulianae. There was a special reason for this: the revenues of this district were earmarked for the imperial privy purse.¹¹⁵

Some even of the Armenian satrapies annexed by Diocletian and by Theodosius I were converted into cities. Amida, founded by Constantius II, probably replaced one, Theodosius I and Leo built cities named after themselves in Daranalis and Acilisene respectively, and Justinian raised Martyropolis, the chief town of Sophanene, into a city which ruled that satrapy and Ingilene. There were also a number of isolated pieces of public land and great imperial estates which were converted into cities. The 'region' of Lagania, for instance, which had apparently once been part of the Bithynian public land, but had been detached from the province of Bithynia, in the extreme south-eastern corner of which it lay, had thus been withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Bithynian city to which Pompey had allocated it and brought under direct administration: Anastasius made it a city. Two areas in the Axylon, which had apparently been royal land of king Amyntas, and had passed to the emperors on his death, became the cities of Eudocias (Gdammaua) and Verinopolis (Psibela). The *saltus* of Zalichen, a large imperial estate which

had been detached from the territory of Sinope, was similarly raised to city rank by Leo.¹¹⁶

These changes were probably in part at any rate dictated by practical motives. Though nominally direct administration might bring in a higher revenue, the peculations of the officials of the *res privata* were often so exorbitant that the imperial exchequer did not actually get much of it: it was better for the emperors to cut their losses and be satisfied with the usual tribute, guaranteed by the decurions of the newly founded city. In other cases the motives of the imperial government seem to have been less interested. There were still a few communities at a tribal stage, and some of them were raised to the status of cities. The Oresti of Macedonia were concentrated into a city by Diocletian. The Upper Cilbiani became, over two centuries after the Lower Cilbiani, like them a city, which was named—apparently in honour of Valentinian III—Valentinianopolis, while the Hyrgaleis of the Maeander valley were organized as a city by Anastasius. Many of the villages of the Isaurians were amalgamated by Leo into the new city of Leontopolis, while the rest seem to have been added to Isaura, the old capital of the tribe.¹¹⁷

In some regions, notably in Batanaea, Auranitis, and Trachonitis, the unit of government was still the village. In the Byzantine period several more of these villages were raised to the rank of cities. Saccaea was converted by Diocletian into the city of Maximianopolis. Soada became, probably in the same reign, Dionysias, and later another village was granted the status of a city by Constantine or Constantius II—its new name is variously given as *Constantine* or *Constantia*. A city of *Neapolis* also appears in this region, and several villages, such as Phaena and Neve, were raised in status without change of name. Elsewhere isolated village communities were elevated in rank. Tymandus in Pisidia, for instance, which had apparently once been subject to Apollonia but had since the middle of the second century A.D. been an independent village, was made a city by Diocletian.¹¹⁸

A number of fortresses on the eastern frontier also achieved self-government in the Byzantine period. Diocletian's reinforcement of the *limes* involved the advance of the legions and other substantial bodies of troops from the cities of Syria and Mesopotamia to posts farther out in the desert. Many of these posts grew into substantial towns, as is proved by their becoming the seats of bishoprics, and some were given the rank of cities. The stretch of desert between Damascus and the Euphrates which

had once been ruled by Palmyra seems, after the suppression of the ephemeral Palmyrene empire by Aurelian, to have been divided into two military districts, the Scenarchia, along the south bank of the Euphrates, attached to the province of Euphratensis, and the Eastern District, north-east of Damascus, attached to Phoenice Libanensis. In these two areas several military posts became cities. In the Scenarchia, for instance, Resapha was converted into Anastasiopolis—its rise was not entirely due to its military importance, for it boasted the grave of a famous saint, Sergius, and was a centre of pilgrimage—and in the Eastern District Euaria, the post of the *Equites scutarii Illyriciani*, was granted city rank in A.D. 573. In Syria proper Anasarthra, a fortress on an inner line of defence, was given by Justinian the status of a city and the name of Theodoropolis. In Mesopotamia, where a state of war was almost endemic, fortresses played a yet more important part in the life of the population, and not a few became cities. Callinicum, a military post which had replaced the ruined city of Nicephorium, itself became a city under the style of Leontopolis; Anastasius built the fortress city of Dara facing Nisibis, surrendered by Jovian to the Persians; and Justinian raised to city rank the castle of Circesium which Diocletian had built to guard the junction of the Chaboras and the Euphrates.¹¹⁹

The principal achievement of the Byzantine emperors was to even out in some degree the very unequal distribution of cities which had resulted from the different lines on which the several provinces had developed. In those provinces where city life had grown up spontaneously, the number of communities tended to be very large, and though there were some cities which had acquired extensive territories, the average size of the community tended to be very small. In Greece, side by side with substantial cities such as Athens or Elis there were tiny places like Panopeus, 'a city of the Phocians', to quote Pausanias, 'if one may call it a city, when it has no government offices and no gymnasium; they have no theatre, no market, no piped water supply, but live in hovels, rather like the huts up in the mountains, on the brink of a ravine. But still the boundaries of their territory are marked out against their neighbours, and they send delegates to the Phocian federal assembly.' If Pliny is right in stating that the province of Macedonia comprised a hundred and fifty communities, many of them must have been as insignificant. In Asia the Augustan *formula provinciae* reckoned two

hundred and eighty-two communities, and these, we know, included besides great cities with extensive territories like Cyzicus, Pergamum, Ephesus, or Apamea, many tiny communes like the Ormeleis, Lagbeis, Tacineis and others around Cibyra, or the Upper and Lower Cilbiani, the Mysomacedones, Coloe, Palaeopolis and more round the upper waters of the Cayster. In Lycia, too, and in Cilicia Tracheia the majority of the cities were minute, and the original province of Galatia comprised no fewer than one hundred and ninety-five 'peoples and tetrarchies', while in northern Syria there were in addition to the cities twenty to thirty tribal communities and tetrarchies on the Augustan register. On the other hand in the provinces which had been artificially carved up into city territories by the Roman government cities were few and far between. In Thrace there were in Hadrian's reign only twenty-three, including those in the Chersonese, and in the vast area of northern Asia Minor which had once been the kingdoms of Bithynia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus (including Armenia Minor) between thirty and thirty-five.¹²⁰

These anomalies had by the sixth century A.D. been rendered rather less glaring by the amalgamation of small communities on the one hand and the division of the larger territories on the other. The first process is in the nature of the case difficult to trace. It is far easier to discover when a new city came into being, since its creation is often celebrated by a dynastic name, than to discover when an old city was suppressed, particularly since the cities suppressed were naturally those that had always been insignificant. The date of amalgamations is therefore almost always extremely uncertain. In some cases the civic coinage proves that a city which later ceased to exist survived to the date of the latest issue at least, but such cases are rare; for it was not often that a city important enough to issue coins was later suppressed. Sometimes an inscription may prove the continued existence of a city which subsequently vanished; but this again is a rare chance. Such evidence as we have, however, suggests that the suppression of the minor communities in areas such as Macedonia, Greece, and south-western Asia Minor was mainly the work of the Byzantine emperors.

The final result can be best appreciated from a comparison of the figures given by Pliny from the Augustan register with those provided by Hierocles, whose work is probably based on a register drawn up in the reign of Theodosius II (428 A.D.), imperfectly revised up to a point in Justinian's reign rather over

a century later. In the area equivalent to Asia the number of communities had sunk from two hundred and eighty-two to about two hundred and twenty-five. In the districts which had been included in the original province of Galatia the drop is more striking—from one hundred and ninety-five to about one hundred and twenty. In Macedonia the fall is enormous—from one hundred and fifty to under sixty. For Greece under the principate there are no statistics, but the evidence of the coins and inscriptions and above all the detailed account of Pausanias prove that there were very many small cities then which no longer appear in Hierocles' list; of the eighteen cities of the Eleutherolacones, for instance, only three survived. In northern Syria, too, where we have no precise figures for the principate, there had been a considerable amalgamation of communities; nearly all the tribes and tetrarchies had been absorbed in the cities. In Lycia on the other hand there were fully as many cities in the Byzantine period as there had ever been, and, so far as we can tell, there was no appreciable reduction in Cilicia Tracheia.¹²¹

The extent to which the smaller communities were suppressed depended no doubt largely on the economic condition of the district. Macedonia suffered greatly from the ravages of barbarian invaders, and its cities were brought to poverty; hence the drastic reduction in their number. Asia was on the other hand relatively prosperous, and here the Byzantine lists prove the survival of many tiny cities and even some rural communes. In Galatia too quite a large number of very small cities, like those of the Milyadic group, and a fair number of small rural communes survived, and the great fall in the number of communities is largely to be accounted for by the amalgamation into cities of a few large groups of villages like those of the Homonadeis and the Isaurians.

The converse process, the partition of large city territories, is easier to trace. There are isolated examples of it in the provinces discussed above. In northern Phrygia, for instance, there were some very large territories, and here a number of new cities appear. The town of Orcistus was detached from Nacoleia by Constantine, and Ambasum, which seems also to have been subject to Nacoleia, became in the Byzantine period the city of Metropolis; Meirus likewise, which was in the third quarter of the third century A.D. still a village, probably of Dorylaeum, had by the beginning of the fourth century gained its independence. In Galatia proper also a number of cities sprang up in the

extensive territories of the three Gallic tribes, Verinopolis in that of the Trocmi, Aspona in that of the Tectosages, Eudoxias and Justinianopolis in that of the Tobistobogii. But the process is most noticeable in the provinces which had been artificially divided into huge territories by the Roman government. In Pontus three new cities appear, Euchaita, Verisa, and Ibora. In Bithynia Julian founded Basilinopolis and Justinian Justinianopolis in the vast tract of public land under the jurisdiction of Nicaea, while Praenetus and Helenopolis were built on territory once subject to Nicomedia. In Thrace many new cities appear, some like Diocletianopolis, Diospolis, Maximianopolis, or Sebastopolis in the northern and western parts of the country, but mostly in the province of Europe, the area adjacent to the Propontis, where Arcadiopolis, Eudoxiopolis, and some half-dozen others came into existence during the Byzantine age.¹²²

The foundation of new cities was, like the suppression of old ones, normally dependent on the economic condition of the district. The government did not normally create new towns, but granted the status of a separate city to a town which had grown up spontaneously. Hence there was little development in the economically backward regions of north-eastern Asia Minor. In Thrace on the other hand the foundation of Constantinople greatly stimulated trade, especially along the shores of the Propontis, where the sea route up the Hellespont and the land route along the Via Egnatia converged, and in this region many towns sprang up, to be subsequently made cities. Bithynia also benefited from the transference of the imperial capital to Constantinople; Helenopolis and Praenetus owed their prosperity to their position at the terminus of the land route across Asia Minor to the new capital. And even farther afield the increased importance of the direct route across Asia Minor from Constantinople to the Cilician Gates stirred up the long stagnant agricultural life of the Gallic tribes, and encouraged the growth of towns among them.

The motive of the government both in suppressing the smaller communities and in creating new cities in the larger territories was probably in the main administrative convenience. In the former process there can hardly have been any other motive. Throughout the empire the number of decurions was falling, and in small cities it might fall to so low a figure that the council could no longer fulfil its most important function in the eyes of the central government, the guarantee that the full amount of the taxes would be collected. When therefore the number of de-

curions fell below the safety-point, it was better to amalgamate the city in some neighbour whose council was more flourishing.

In the creation of new cities other motives entered in. There was the glory of being a founder. There was also during the fourth century religion. One of Constantine's avowed motives in granting independence to Orcistus was the fact that the majority of its inhabitants were Christians, whereas it is to be inferred that the Nacoleans who had hitherto ruled them were not. Constantine also detached Antaradus from Arad and its Maiuma (or port) from Gaza for the same reason; the people of Arad and Gaza were stubborn pagans, while the inhabitants of their ports were Christians. But the main motive must have been administrative. It was difficult for the council even of so great a city as Nicaea to govern a territory parts of which were eighty miles distant, and in many cases the cities ruling large territories were not particularly rich, and their decurions might not be able to give an adequate guarantee for the revenue. Decentralization was obviously desirable, and if there existed in the territory of a city flourishing towns whose leading inhabitants could take up the burden of the decurionate for their districts, the additional security gained by spreading responsibility was a great gain. But even if no addition was made to the number of decurions, their geographical distribution might be advantageous. In normal course Nicaea sent out its decurions to the various 'regions' of its vast territory. Julian converted one of these 'regions' into the city of Basilinopolis by transplanting thither a number of Nicene decurions.¹²³

The essential point in the foundation of any city was in the Byzantine period the creation of a council of decurions, numerous and wealthy enough to guarantee its taxes to the central government. In raising the village of Tymandus to city status Diocletian is insistent on this point; 'whereas', he writes, 'it is our natural desire that throughout the whole of our empire the dignity and number of the cities should be increased, and we see that they are exceedingly eager to receive the honourable designation of a city; seeing that they also clearly undertake that there will always be an adequate supply of decurions among them, we have thought fit to grant their petition.' Here the emperor orders the governor to create new decurions. Valens in his abortive attempt to found a new city in the 'region' of Podandus, a directly administered area in Cappadocia II, used the alternative method, transporting thither many of the decurions of Caesarea.¹²⁴

But though qualitatively city life was degraded, the area in which it prevailed was substantially increased by the Byzantine emperors. There were by the sixth century very few tribes and, except in the province of Arabia, very few villages, and direct administration was confined to Cappadocia I, the Armenian satrapies, the Jordan valley and a few other scattered areas. In the lists of Hierocles and Georgius Cyprius cities are the almost universal units of government.

PART II

RELATIONS WITH THE SUZERAIN

CHAPTER VI

THE KINGS

THE constitutional relation of a Hellenistic king to the cities in his dominions is obscure; nor perhaps did either party wish it to be very clear. The king wished to control the cities, but in deference to public opinion preferred not to express this control in set constitutional terms. The cities, if they could not be free, took care at least, from motives of *amour propre*, to behave as if they were. The ambiguity of the mutual relations of kings and cities arises in fact from two conflicting political theories. A king tended to regard his dominions as a complex of territories, within which, it might be, there were a number of privileged communities. The cities, while not disputing the sovereignty of the kings over their Macedonians and over the barbarians whom they had conquered, liked to regard themselves as sovereign states in alliance with the king. This conflict of ideas is illustrated by the varying terminology used on the one hand by the cities and by the kings when they were addressing cities, and on the other by subjects of the kings and the kings themselves in unguarded moments. The Ilians in a complimentary decree in honour of Antiochus I make a pointed distinction between the cities and the kingdom; 'he established the cities in peace' they write, 'and the kingdom in its ancient condition'. The person who made a dedication to Ptolemy III at the distant trading station of Adulis, on the Red Sea coast, more realistically asserts that he 'inherited from his father the kingdom of Egypt, Libya, Syria, Phoenice, Cyprus, Lycia, Caria and the Cyclades', and 'made himself master of all the land within the Euphrates, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Ionia, the Hellespont and Thrace'; no distinction is drawn between barbarian lands and districts like Ionia and the Cyclades which consisted entirely of Greek cities.¹

In the oriental kingdoms the 'country' (*χώρα*) is normally distinguished from the cities. Antiochus I, it is true, in a letter to his satrap Meleager, is not very precise on this point: in one passage he speaks of 'the cities in our alliance', in another of 'the

cities in our country and alliance'. The distinction is, however, usually observed. Alexandria was not technically in Egypt, but 'by Egypt', and one spoke of going from Alexandria into the 'country'. In Cyrenaica similarly Ptolemy the Younger in his will used the phrase 'either the cities or the country'. And in one matter, land tenure, the distinction seems to have been real. In the territories of the cities private ownership of land was the rule; some land belonged to the city corporately, but the rest was the absolute property of the gods, the citizens or those to whom the city gave the right of ownership. Outside the cities the land was deemed, in accordance with the Greek conception of the oriental monarchy, to be the property of the king. The Persian king was in Greek eyes a master whose subjects were slaves, and it naturally followed that he was in the same sense master of his dominions—he owned the land, and his subjects had only such precarious tenure as their master might from time to time allow them. This position the Hellenistic kings of the East inherited by right of conquest. They were proprietors of their kingdoms, and it seems in fact to have been deemed impossible for them to alienate land in their kingdoms to their subjects. A king could only create private property by detaching the land in question from his kingdom, and this he could do only by incorporating it or authorizing the occupier to incorporate it in the territory of a city.²

This distinction did not of course arise in the Macedonian kingdom proper, where the king was the chief of the Macedonians, not the owner of Macedonia. But the relationship to the king of his Macedonian and Greek subjects differed. The former were his subjects in the full sense of the word, owing personal allegiance to him: the latter were members of communities under his sway but had no direct contact with him.

The cities were thus not exactly part of the kingdom in the strict sense of the term. What positively their relation to it was it is more difficult to say. Their own ambition was to be free, that is independent sovereign states, and many of the kings sought to gratify this desire, in the letter at any rate, by treating them as allies. Alexander laid it down as the first clause in the treaties which bound the Greek cities to the league of Corinth that 'the Hellenes should be free and autonomous'—the two terms are in practice interchangeable—and as he conquered the Persian empire declared the Greek cities hitherto subject to the Great King to be free. His regent in Macedonia, Antipater,

provoked by revolts, abandoned the principle, establishing oligarchies of his supporters and stationing garrisons in the cities, and his son Cassander followed the same line. This gave an opportunity too good to be missed to his opponents. Polyperchon, whom Antipater had appointed his successor as regent of the kingdom, when he saw that Cassander was going to challenge his position, promptly circularized the Greek cities, renewing the policy of Alexander. When, despite the support which he thus won from the Greeks, he was defeated by Cassander, Antigonus, ambitious to step into Alexander's shoes, revived the doctrine that the Hellenes should be free, and, aided by the revolts which his proclamation provoked, succeeded in winning many of the Greek cities from Cassander. But it was a game at which two could play, and Ptolemy issued a proclamation in the same terms. After indecisive fighting Antigonus was compelled in 311 B.C. to sign a peace with his rivals, Cassander, Ptolemy, and Lysimachus; but he made astute use of his defeat by insisting that the peace should include a clause guaranteeing the freedom of the Hellenes and widely advertising the fact among the cities. He doubtless gained popularity thereby; but Ptolemy again turned the tables on him by accusing him of having violated the pact and freeing the cities under his control. At a later stage in the struggle his son Demetrius, when forced to withdraw from Greece to assist his father, inserted a similar provision in the treaty he made with Cassander on this occasion, hoping thereby to retain the good will of the cities when he was no longer able to control them.³

The principle that the Greeks should be free was thus widely acknowledged by the Successors in their early struggles. But by becoming so widely acknowledged it ceased to serve the purpose for which it was intended by its authors. It does not need the express statements of Diodorus to prove that the several kings championed Greek freedom not from the idealistic motives that they professed but in order to win the support of the cities against their rivals, and if their rivals adopted the same policy they were checkmated. One king would of course represent the 'protection' given by another to his cities as tyranny, and in fact normally did so. And since the cities as a rule found the control of their suzerain irksome and always hoped for better things under a new master, this line was often successful. But as the policy of the kings grew clear to the cities, it became more and more difficult to rouse enthusiasm by the cry of the freedom of the Hellenes; it is last heard of as a universal doctrine, until the

Romans revived it, in 267 B.C., when Ptolemy II championed the Greeks against Antigonus Gonatas, and in this case the Greek cities might reasonably hope that the distant king of Egypt would be a less exacting suzerain than the king of Macedonia.⁴

Furthermore the doctrine was not only useless but embarrassing to the kings in dealing with cities which were genuinely free. To a city which was independent and thought that it required no champion to protect its liberty, proclamations that all the Greeks should be free made no appeal. Already in the fourth century Rhodes had been an awkward problem for Antigonus. Rhodes, relying on its wealth and its naval power, preferred to maintain a policy of strict neutrality in the struggle of the Successors, and its sympathies were, in view of its trade connexions, with Ptolemy. Antigonus on the other hand needed the Rhodian fleet in his struggle against Ptolemy. Since the Rhodians rejected his proposals of alliance he was obliged, despite his professed advocacy of the freedom of the Hellenes, to attempt to subdue the city by force, and his failure to do so was only more disastrous to his military prestige than his success would have been to his political reputation.⁵

In these circumstances the tone of the royal chancelleries began to change. They no longer proclaimed as a universal dogma that all the Greeks must be free, but instead offered freedom to individual cities as a prize for their support or a reward for their loyalty. As early as 301 B.C. Lysimachus, in attacking the dominions of Antigonus, gave autonomy to Lampsacus and Parium, because they submitted voluntarily, but subdued cities which resisted him. The Seleucids, when their conquest of Asia Minor brought them into contact with the Greek world, seem to have pursued the same policy. We hear of no general promise of freedom to the Greeks, but a number of inscriptions record the grant or confirmation of liberty to individual cities—Erythrae, Smyrna, Miletus—or groups of cities—the Ionian league—by Antiochus I and II in view of their loyalty to the dynasty. Philip V of Macedon adopted similar tactics in Greece. In 216 B.C. he offered freedom to Elis, then a member of the Aetolian league, if it would side with him, but the suggestion did not attract the Eleians. Later in his reign (202 B.C.) a similar offer to Thasos, being backed by armed force, was accepted, and Lysimacheia was rewarded for its submission by being received into Philip's alliance; Cius, on the other hand, which refused his offers, was stormed and destroyed.⁶

The later attitude of the kings to the question of Greek autonomy is well illustrated by the measures taken by Antiochus III to restore Seleucid rule in Asia Minor. The situation there was complex. Some of the cities were under Ptolemaic suzerainty. Some had been recently acquired by Philip V of Macedon and were held by him, although the Romans had ordered him after his defeat at Cynoscephalae to evacuate them. Others had taken advantage of the weakness of the Seleucid power in the previous generation to make themselves independent. Antiochus' view, as expressed, perhaps rather crudely, by Appian, was that the cities 'belonged to him as ruler of Asia, because they used in times past to obey the kings of Asia': he regarded his kingdom, that is, territorially, as an area over which he had rights of sovereignty. He had, on the other hand, no objection to the cities being free, provided that they owed their freedom to him. His policy was accordingly to menace the cities which did not acknowledge his suzerainty, at the same time offering them freedom if they should willingly accept it.⁷

Seeing that he was in a position to enforce his will, most of the cities accepted his terms. We possess a letter of Antiochus confirming to Amyzon the status which it had possessed 'in the alliance of Ptolemy', and from a decree of Iasus we learn that the autonomy of that city, recently occupied by Philip, was maintained by Antiochus when it passed under his sway. But three of the independent cities made a stand—Lampsacus, Alexandria Troas, and Smyrna. Antiochus' offer to Lampsacus well illustrates the view of freedom taken by the kings. Antiochus protested 'that they would soon have what they wanted, but only when it was apparent both to themselves and to every one else that their freedom had been granted by the king and not surreptitiously usurped'. To Antiochus his sovereign rights were paramount, and freedom he regarded as a privileged status which he and he alone was entitled to confer. The appeal of the free cities to Rome and Rome's intervention on their behalf yet further complicated the problem. Antiochus might have been prepared to tolerate the freedom of an independent city which owed its liberty to its own efforts, but he could not permit the existence in his kingdom of free cities which leant upon a foreign power. As he himself is reported to have described his position, 'those of the Asiatic cities which were autonomous ought to receive their freedom not by the order of the Romans but by his own grace'.⁸

How generally freedom was granted by the kings to the cities under their suzerainty it is difficult to say, but since the privilege was in fact a harmless formality most kings preferred to bestow it. The Antigonids technically treated even the Thessalian cities, which were in fact virtually a part of the Macedonian kingdom, as free allies. The Seleucids were extremely liberal in their grants of autonomy to the Greek cities of western Asia Minor. Even the Ptolemies, who were in fact hard taskmasters, professed to treat their cities as allies. The league of the Nesiotes, comprising the Cycladic islands, speaks of itself as free under Ptolemy I, and about a century later the Rhodians protected 'the freedom of the cities allied to Ptolemy' on the coast of Caria. Attalus I made treaties with the Greek cities which accepted his suzerainty.⁹

The position of the later Attalids was rather different. The older dynasties had for the most part acquired their cities by expelling in the role of liberators a rival power. Eumenes received his as a gift from the Romans, the conquerors of Antiochus III, and had, moreover, since the Romans had professedly fought the war as champions of the freedom of the Hellenes in Asia and the Rhodians had after their victory tactlessly pressed for the fulfilment of this pledge, been obliged expressly to oppose the liberation of the cities subject to Antiochus in order to establish his own sovereignty over them. In fact no allusion to freedom is found in any Attalid document, whether royal letter or civic decree, and it may be that the kings and the cities subject to them thought it prudent to avoid this awkward topic. But the apparent silence on the subject of liberty may be accidental. For it might be argued that what the Rhodians urged and Eumenes opposed was freedom in the sense in which the cities used the word; if the cities had been freed by Rome at the instance of Rhodes they would have been independent; or, if they owed allegiance to anyone, they would have owed it to their conqueror and liberator, Rome. And Eumenes might, while opposing this step, have been willing as sovereign of the cities to confirm their freedom in the royal sense of the word. The Roman government in fact found it convenient at a later date to represent that they had granted the Lycian and Carian cities to Rhodes 'not in gift but as allies', and the same conditions presumably applied to the exactly analogous grant to Eumenes of the rest of Asia Minor. If this phrase has any meaning it must mean that the Romans, when they refused freedom to the Greek cities of Asia, meant by freedom independence, and expected the powers to whom they gave the sovereignty

of Asia to maintain the freedom which they had hitherto enjoyed under Seleucid suzerainty.¹⁰

The doctrine of freedom applied, it may be noted, to Greek cities only. Alexander interpreted the term 'Greek' generously, freeing not only the Aeolian, Ionian, and Dorian cities of Asia and the Greek colonies of later date, but also Pamphylian and Cilician cities whose claim to Greek origin was more shadowy; he did not, however, grant liberty to the Cypriot cities, but maintained the power of their kings. In 189 B.C. the Rhodians apparently took a narrower view; they pressed the claims of Soli, as a sister colony of Argos, but took no interest in the other cities on the south coast of Asia Minor, and they ignored utterly the colonies which the kings had founded in the interior of Asia Minor, and the cities of barbarian origin which had in course of time come to regard themselves as Greek.¹¹

But both the royal foundations and hellenized barbarian cities came gradually to regard themselves as on the same footing as old Greek cities, and therefore as entitled to freedom; and the kings naturally found it expedient to humour them. Carian Alabanda informed the Amphictyonic League that Antiochus III preserved their 'democracy and peace', and we possess a letter wherein one of the last Seleucids, Antiochus VIII or IX, notifies Ptolemy IX of Cyprus that he has, in view of its devoted loyalty to himself and to his house, granted freedom to Seleucia in Pieria; the kings were evidently slow to grant freedom to cities which their ancestors had founded and which they no doubt regarded in a proprietary manner. Seleucia adopted the date of this grant—108 B.C.—as a new era, and in the light of this evidence we may deduce that the various Phoenician cities which started new eras about this time—Tyre in 125 B.C., Sidon and Tripolis in 111 B.C., Ascalon in 104 B.C., Berytus in 80 B.C.—were granted freedom by the Seleucid kings.¹²

The content of the term 'freedom' is defined in many royal proclamations and letters and civic decrees. It meant the maintenance of the city's own or ancestral constitution and laws, and it further included immunity from tribute and from a garrison and, it is sometimes added, from billeting of troops. In practice it rarely meant any of these things. The kings preserved the form of democracy—which was generally assumed to be the ancestral constitution of every city—but they often introduced such modifications in the constitution as would give them effective control. They expelled the garrisons put in by their opponents, but they

normally left a garrison of their own to protect the city's new-won liberty. Indeed the cities themselves on occasion demanded a garrison, for they did not want to be left at the mercy of their former masters from whom they had just revolted; and once a garrison was installed it was difficult to ask for its withdrawal without arousing suspicions of disloyalty. Finally, the kings abolished the tribute which the cities had paid to their former masters. But the cities could hardly refuse a contribution to the war chest of their liberator, if only to cover the cost of their own protection.¹³

The position of a city differed very little in fact whether it was free or not, and in considering the practical relations of the kings to their cities the constitutional status of the latter may be ignored. But this of course does not mean that all cities were treated uniformly. Much depended on the general policy of the king or the dynasty; some kings preferred to rule with a light hand, others kept a very tight rein on their cities. Much again was determined by the position of the city in question. An outpost of the kingdom would be strongly garrisoned against external attack and against rebellion, while a city which was secure from foreign enemies and had no hope of revolt might have no garrison. Important cities, which were the centres of the royal administration, in particular the royal capitals, were naturally more closely supervised than small cities remote from the king's eye. No uniform scheme was in fact applied, and as our evidence is too fragmentary for us to attempt to draw a detailed picture, we must be content to summarize what is known of the relations of various kings to various cities.

A very convenient instrument of political control was a federation. Greek cities could without loss of autonomy surrender some of their sovereign rights to a league, and if the king were executive head of the league he thereby won a *locus standi* in the affairs of the constituent cities. Philip established his power over Thessaly by getting himself elected *archon* of the Thessalian league and his friends put in command of the four tetrarchies into which it was divided. The successive kings of Macedon in this way kept a close hold on the Thessalian cities without violating their autonomy till 197 B.C. Philip likewise evolved the more ambitious project of a league of all the Greek cities, of which he was *hegemon*. Alexander succeeded to this position, and as he freed the Greek cities of Asia from the Persians seems to have added them to the league. The constitution of the league of

Corinth carefully safeguarded the rights of members—the cities were to be ‘free and autonomous’, and the constitution existing in each city at the date when it swore the oaths of federation was guaranteed—but the *hegemon* had certain prerogatives such as that of leadership of the federal army in a war declared by the league. Philip maintained some garrisons in Greece—they are perhaps the enigmatic persons ‘appointed to watch over the public security’ alluded to in another clause—and Alexander assumed the right of arranging the constitution of cities freed from the Persians and himself trying disputes arising therefrom. He later interfered in the internal affairs of all the cities by decreeing the restoration of all exiles, but this measure was probably *ultra vires* and certainly aroused bitter indignation.¹⁴

Antigonus, who in so many ways carried on his master’s ideas, endeavoured to revive the Panhellenic league, but in the wars which followed Alexander’s death the idea of a universal federation faded away. A number of local leagues were, however, created by the kings. To Antigonus is probably due the creation of the league of the Islanders, which was taken over by Ptolemy I when he gained the supremacy of the Aegean. We know little of its constitution, but the chief officer of the league, the nesiarch, was apparently a nominee of the king—it is notable that none of the nesiarchs known was a citizen of any of the member states—and acted in close collaboration with the royal admiral. Various other groups of cities were later organized as leagues under royal suzerainty. The Pentapolis of Cyrenaica seems to have been created by Demetrius the Fair, when he ruled the country as husband of Berenice, daughter of Magas. The Cypriot cities formed a league in the later part of the Ptolemaic period, and it may well be that the Lycian league dates from the Ptolemaic supremacy—it appears a very few years after its close. Antigonus Doson formed a federation of Greek cities under his own presidency, and, more curious, organized his own kingdom as ‘the league of the Macedonians’, thus liquidating the archaic tribal monarchy of Macedonia, and raising its communities to the full status of cities.¹⁵

The kings controlled some cities by reserving to themselves the appointment of one or more of their executive magistrates. Cassander seems to have invented the system when on the capture of Athens in 318 B.C. he ordered that his supporter Demetrius of Phalerum should be elected *strategus*, perhaps with enlarged powers, year after year. Antigonus Gonatas similarly arranged

that the commander of his garrison, who happened to be an Athenian, should be elected *strategus* by the people. Ptolemy I when he rearranged the constitution of Cyrene ordained that besides the five elective annual *strategi* he should himself be perpetual *strategus*; in fact he delegated his office. It may be suspected that a similar arrangement prevailed in Ptolemais of the Thebaid—it is at any rate suspicious that a royal officer was *prytanis* for life in that city, in which the chief magistracy was a board of six *prytaneis*. The Attalid kings were more exacting; in Pergamum they appointed all five *strategi*.¹⁶

In other cases the kings seem to have reserved to themselves the right to disallow decrees of the assembly. The people of Aegina, in the period when it was subject to the Attalids, conclude a decree with the clause 'that the *strategi* send this decree to the king, in order that its provisions may be with his consent put into force', and the preamble of a decree of the people of Halicarnassus runs: 'whereas king Ptolemy, in response to a delegation of the city, has permitted that the young men have a gymnasium'. In yet other cases the control of the assembly seems to have been vested in a local representative of the king, the superintendent (*ἐπιστάτης*). A decree of Thessalonica is proposed by the deputy superintendent and the five judges, who are apparently the executive board of magistrates, and a decree of Seleucia in Pieria is moved 'with the assent of Theophilus, the superintendent, and the magistrates'. In the second case the letter of the king (Seleucus IV) which is the occasion of the decree makes it plain that the superintendent is not a city magistrate but something in the nature of a royal governor; it is addressed 'to Theophilus and to the magistrates and city of Seleucia in Pieria'.¹⁷

The precise character of these superintendents is obscure, but it is on the whole simplest to regard them as in origin and in essence commandants of the local garrison. It is evident from both the literary and epigraphic sources that the kings very frequently stationed garrisons in the cities within their sphere of influence, whether free or not; for the ostensible object of the garrison was not to control the city but to protect it from its enemies. The practice of the different dynasties varied in accordance with the character of their kingdoms. The Antigonids, who incidentally were too poor to afford a large standing army, contented themselves with garrisoning a few places of importance; in Greece they do not seem to have regularly occupied more than Athens and the famous three fetters of Hellas, Demetrias, Chalcis,

and Corinth. The Ptolemies maintained large numbers of troops in their scattered empire; they were rich enough to do so, and the isolated cities which they held dotted along the south coast of Asia Minor and the shores and islands of the Aegean were highly vulnerable. The Seleucids for their part were obliged to garrison their coastal cities to protect them from the Ptolemaic fleet.¹⁸

The commanders of these garrisons bear a variety of titles. The straightforward 'commander of the garrison' (*φρούραρχος*) is found in early documents but seems to have been regarded as offensive and was generally abandoned. More usual was 'general of the city' (*στρατηγὸς τῆς πόλεως*) or 'general in charge of the city' (*στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως*) or more vaguely and tactfully 'he who is stationed in charge of the city' (*ὁ τεταγμένος ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως*) or even 'he who is in charge of the city' (*ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως*). Or finally the title of 'superintendent' (*ἐπιστάτης*) is used. That this title was military is definitely proved in some cases. At Seleucia in Pieria itself, in 219 B.C., when it was in Ptolemaic occupation, officers styled 'superintendents' were in charge of the city, and these officers were clearly military, since the commanders of the units comprising the garrison were subordinate to them. At Panamara in Caria a Rhodian superintendent—the Rhodian republic, it may be noted, adopted, as an imperial power, precisely the same methods as the kings—is praised for having watched over 'the security of the country'.¹⁹

These officers had in origin no civil function, being merely in command of the troops protecting the city. But it was natural for the king on the one hand to delegate to them, as his local representatives, such constitutional powers of control as he possessed over the cities, and for the cities on the other hand to appeal for their aid when they required help from the royal power; and, it may be added, for individual citizens to do the same. They thus acquired something of the character of 'residents' or 'high commissioners'. They might sometimes, as appears to have been the case at Thessalonica and Seleucia, possess some measure of political control over the cities, and they seem very frequently to have had police or judicial functions of a somewhat ill-defined character.

The kings on the whole made little attempt to interfere systematically with the administration of justice in the cities. Alexander at Chios and Ptolemy at Cyrene reserved to themselves the decision of cases between the old citizens and the exiles whom

they restored when they remodelled the constitutions of these cities; but this usurpation of jurisdiction was temporary only—at Cyrene a time limit of three years is expressly set—and was obviously necessary. In other cases the interference of the kings was less direct, and always sporadic in character. It is evident from many inscriptions that the jury courts of the cities were extremely inefficient. They worked slowly and huge arrears of litigation were piled up. The machinery for enforcing their judgements was cumbrous and ineffective. Above all, suits between citizens of different cities, which were governed by treaties, took long to settle and the verdicts eventually reached were particularly difficult of enforcement. In these circumstances it was natural for citizens who sought redress for their wrongs to appeal to the local military commander instead of instituting legal proceedings: he would often by virtue of his prestige secure a settlement with dispatch and without long legal formalities.²⁰

Two examples may serve to illustrate this tendency. A decree of Carthaea thanks Timocrates the superintendent of Arsinoe (both cities lay on the island of Ceos) for his services and gives details of one: the country-house of one of the citizens had been robbed, and Timocrates had recovered and restored to its owner most of the stolen property and exacted the price of the rest. The Zeno correspondence gives another instance of the use made of the local officers by citizens in distress. Theopropus of Calynda had supplied wine on contract to his city for a festival, but when the festival was over the treasurers paid him only 600 drachmae of the 850 stipulated, alleging that the subscriptions had not come in. Theopropus took them before the general and the comptroller (a royal finance officer). The result in this case was not satisfactory, for the treasurers claimed that they could not pay without a decree of the city, and the *prytaneis* and the secretary delayed moving the decree. Theopropus thereupon, happening to be sent on a mission to Alexandria, appealed to the great Apollonius, the Egyptian finance minister, asking him to write both to the council and people of Calynda and to the local general.²¹

Both the cities and the kings were conscious of the shortcomings of the courts, and both tried to remedy the situation. No radical reform was however attempted, but instead a thorough clean-up of arrears was undertaken from time to time. The most usual method was for a city whose litigation was in hopeless confusion to ask another city to send a judicial commission to settle all outstanding cases. The parties were by various devices

encouraged as far as possible to accept arbitral awards; the remaining cases were then formally tried. Cities often adopted this procedure spontaneously; at any rate the majority of the documents relating to it contain no reference to a king, though this may be due partly to the *amour propre* of the cities, which preferred as far as possible to ignore their suzerains. But sometimes it is definitely attested that a king or a royal officer suggested the adoption of the procedure, laid down the rules governing it, or arranged for the dispatch of the judicial commission. In some cases the interference of the royal government was more direct. Antigonus Gonatas sent a special commissioner to Syros to settle arrears of litigation. The Ptolemaic admiral Patroclus sent a 'superintendent and judges from Iulis' to Thera. Two Rhodian 'superintendents', one at Syros, the other the officer already mentioned at Panamara, are recorded to have exercised this emergency jurisdiction. Finally, at Aegina the jurisdiction of the Attalid 'superintendent' though remaining extraordinary in character—arbitral awards were favoured as against regular legal verdicts—ceased to be an emergency measure and became the standing rule: one superintendent, Cleon, exercised his judicial functions for a period of sixteen years.²²

Though the kings interfered in its administration, they did not attempt to change the law itself except to meet special emergencies. Alexander, when he decreed the return of the exiles, apparently enacted certain rules respecting the return of their property, and the cities decided the cases which arose according to Alexander's decree and their own laws. Similarly when the kings ordered judicial commissions they enacted special rules to expedite procedure; in order to encourage settlement of cases out of court Antigonus enacted that defaulting debtors who paid up voluntarily should pay twice the original debt only, whereas those who were convicted should pay three times the amount. For the cities which they founded the kings must presumably have often drawn up new codes or arbitrarily imposed codes already existing elsewhere. But in some cases the choice was left substantially to the citizens; Antigonus allowed the people of Teos and Lebedus, when he amalgamated them, to agree on a code *ad interim*—that of Cos was actually chosen—and to appoint a commission to draw up a definitive body of law, reserving for himself only the right to decide on clauses over which dispute arose. Some such procedure may have been the general rule, for it is noticeable that the foundations of each dynasty are far from

uniform in their constitutions, which usually follow a type prevalent locally.²³

The financial relations between the kings and the cities were diverse and complicated. In principle freedom included immunity from tribute, and few kings seem to have exacted money from their cities under this opprobrious name; but very few cities were immune from any kind of payment to their suzerains. Under the provisions of the league of Corinth the original members, the cities of Greece proper, were obliged to supply contingents for a war, and some of the cities freed from the Persians were admitted on the same terms: Chios for instance contributed twenty ships. But in other cases Alexander, while abolishing the tribute they had hitherto paid to the Persians, imposed a 'contribution' (*σύνταξις*), which is probably to be interpreted in the sense in which the term is used in the Second Athenian league, as a payment in lieu of men or ships made to the federal war chest. Antipater exacted levies (*εἰσφοραί*) for war expenses from the cities, probably under the terms of the Corinthian league. Antigonos demanded military contingents from the members of his Hellenic league, but he, like Antipater, seems also to have exacted levies, and Ptolemy I maintained this system of levies in the league of the Islanders. Lysimachus is likewise known to have exacted from his cities regular payments, which his opponents at any rate called tribute, and the early Seleucids levied a variety of payments, including a special Galatian tax—whether to finance military operations against the Gauls or to pay the blackmail that they demanded is not clear.²⁴

These various levies rapidly developed into a regular system of taxation which was in one way more oppressive than the old tribute. The kings did not, as a rule at any rate, demand, as the Great King had done, a block sum from each city, and leave it to the city authorities to collect it in any way they thought fit. They normally appropriated to themselves certain specific taxes and collected these taxes through their own agents, usually by farming them.

This system is amply attested in the Ptolemaic kingdom. The Ptolemies maintained royal comptrollers (*οἰκονόμοι*) in the overseas dominions; one is recorded at Calynda in the third century B.C. and others at a later date, when the Ptolemaic sphere was reduced to parts of Crete, the island of Thera and Arsinoe (Methana) in the Argolid, in control of this circumscription. There were also royal treasurers (*γαζοφύλακες*); one of these was

stationed at Halicarnassus and it is interesting to observe that he had at his disposal the proceeds of a civic tax (*τὰ ἰατρικά*). A papyrus of the end of the third century B.C. records a number of taxes levied in Lycia—the money revenues, the purple tax, the timber tax (or tax on fruit trees) and the *octroi*; several of these taxes are spoken of in terms which show that they were farmed by the royal government. A more detailed picture is given by an inscription of Telmessus in Lycia, which had been granted to a certain Ptolemy, son of Lysimachus, probably a cadet of the royal house; the new prince remitted the tax on fruit-trees and the pasture dues, and regulated to the satisfaction of the citizens and the tax farmers the tithe on cereal crops. It is probable, in view of the existence of local treasuries, that taxes on the overseas dominions were farmed locally. In Syria on the other hand it would appear from the famous story of Joseph son of Tobias that the contracts were allocated at Alexandria. In Egypt itself the revenues of the few cities were taken over by the crown—a comptroller of Naucratis is recorded—and eventually their territories were assimilated to *nomes*.²⁵

For the Antigonids there is little evidence, but a letter from Philip V to Abae in Phocis, granting it immunity for its sacred land, implies the existence of a land tax. Still less is known of the Seleucids, but the remission by Antiochus I to Erythrae of 'all payments including that for Galatian affairs' implies the existence of a number of taxes, and a very fragmentary letter of Antiochus III to Seleucia (Tralles) contains allusions to a tithe, perhaps on cereal crops, payable to the royal exchequer. The Attalids, according to Antony, levied not percentages but fixed taxes based on assessments; this presumably applies to land tax only. Their system of financial exploitation was extremely thorough-going. They appropriated so many taxes that the cities had not enough left to carry on their own services, and then returned a portion of the revenues to the cities in the form of treasury grants.²⁶

Regular taxation did not exhaust the liabilities of the cities. They were expected to vote 'crowns' to their suzerains on festal occasions. They were furthermore liable for various services. The Successors do not seem to have levied contingents of troops from them, preferring to use mercenaries, but the cities were apparently sometimes expected to pay the wages of the troops which protected them and generally to find quarters for them and to supply hay and fodder for the horses of the cavalry. An

inscription from Cilician Soli has preserved a severe letter from one of the Ptolemaic kings, correcting abuses of billeting, and a letter in the Zeno correspondence throws vivid light on the system. The writer, Neon of Calynda, urges a friend, Damonius, to make representation to Zeno, the secretary of the finance minister Apollonius; it appears that his father, Therarchus, had had exemption and that he wished the privilege to be expressly confirmed to himself, 'for as it is I have men billeted on me and supply hay and fodder to the cavalry'. Zeno was sympathetic and a letter was duly sent to the local comptroller and to the council and people, who, it would appear, apportioned the burden among the citizens. Another letter in the Zeno correspondence suggests that the cities had to supply ships to the royal navy under a system resembling the Athenian trierarchy. The trierarch concerned, Xanthippus, did not command his ship in person, entrusting it to a deputy, Antipater, but he was responsible for its expenses: the object of the letter is to extract from Xanthippus certain sums borrowed by Antipater from the royal treasurer at Halicarnassus for his ship.²⁷

The above account has of necessity, since our information comes almost entirely from their inscriptions, been largely concerned with the Greek cities in the narrower sense, and principally with the cities of the Aegean area. What little evidence there is indicates that in point of fact the policy of the kings was more or less uniform to all cities. Of the evidence already cited some concerns royal colonial foundations—Seleucia in Pieria and Ptolemais of the Thebaid—and some hellenized barbarian cities such as Tralles and Amyzon in Caria. Such differences in policy as can be detected are clearly attributable to practical causes. In the highlands of Pisidia the arm of the kings was not strong enough to introduce the elaborate system of control and taxation which was employed in more civilized regions, and here we find the Attalids were content to exercise rough and ready methods of government more like the old Persian régime. The letter of Attalus to the Ambladeis shows that the kings secured the obedience of the Pisidian communities by exacting hostages from them, punished their insubordination by communal fines, and levied from them block payments of tribute, leaving it to the local authorities to collect the amounts due. On the other hand when cities were founded in regions previously under a bureaucratic régime, the kings often retained much of the existing machinery of administration side by side with the new autono-

mous government. There was, for instance, still a royal officer who held the combined posts of *strategus* and meridarch at Jerusalem long after the foundation of the city of 'the Antiochenes in Jerusalem', and it may be suspected that the control of Jerusalem and its district, especially on the financial side, remained substantially in his hands. Under the Herods similarly the district of Tiberias did not cease to be a toparchy when that city was founded.²⁸

The attitude of the kings to the cities was superficially polite and even genial, but this politeness veiled a deep and justifiable suspicion. It was rarely that a king so far forgot himself as to issue commands to a city; he was usually scrupulous to give advice and offer suggestions. But the kings did all in their power to rob the cities of any effective means of rejecting their advice. On the political side they obtained for themselves or their agents what was virtually a power of veto on the acts of the assembly. But the methods of political control devised by the kings were on the whole unsatisfactory since they felt obliged to support democracy in the cities, and were thus unable to create and effectively support monarchist parties which should rule in their interest; the few attempts made—notably by Antipater and Cassander—to establish oligarchies of their supporters roused such violent discontent that this policy became utterly discredited.²⁹

Instead the kings relied partly on military force, partly on financial pressure. How little the kings trusted the cities is shown not only by their methodical use of garrisons, but also by the fact that they never, as the Persian kings had done, raised military contingents from the cities subject to them. They formed military alliances with genuinely free cities, it is true, and the contingents of those cities fought side by side with the royal armies. But if a city was in their power they exacted money from it to pay their own mercenaries; the Ptolemaic trierarchy is no exception to this rule, for it was primarily a financial burden. And in their methods of taxation the same mistrust is evident. Instead of raising contributions from the cities, a system which would have left them to some extent dependent on the loyalty of the city governments who collected and paid over the sums demanded, they levied taxes directly through their own agents in the cities; and the Attalids perfected the system by taking for themselves nearly all the taxes and thus making the cities dependent on the royal government for the revenue needed to meet their own internal expenses.

On their side the cities were effusive in their expression of loyalty and gratitude to the kings, heaping upon them every honour which they could bestow on friends and benefactors and even worshipping them as gods. It is hard to say what their genuine feelings were. Some kings were really popular—Antigonos and Demetrius for instance when they started on their campaign of liberating the Greek cities from Cassander, and Antiochus I when he saved Asia from the Galatian terror. But such popularity was usually transient; as soon as he had done his work and freed them from their oppressors the citizens had no further use for their benefactor, as the Athenians plainly demonstrated when, in 301 B.C., after his defeat at Ipsus, they refused to admit within their walls their liberator Demetrius, whom they had only six years before deified for his services.

The cities must be judged by their deeds rather than their words. Free cities would fight desperately for their liberty, but subject cities rarely put up a serious struggle for their suzerains; indeed they often welcomed a change of masters, since it afforded them an opportunity of bargaining for better terms. And even their language, it may be noted, though effusive, is not servile. They contrive in praising their masters to emphasize the fact that the true glory of kings is to protect the liberty of the cities, and make even their panegyrics into sermons. And they always maintain a strictly correct constitutional attitude; when the king sends them 'advice' they place the matter before the assembly, and only when the royal command has become a decree of the people do they act upon it.³⁰

CHAPTER VII

THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

THE Roman republic was first drawn into Greek politics by its fear of Philip V, king of Macedonia, and was shortly afterwards still further involved in them by its fear of Antiochus III. It was natural therefore that in its search for allies it should have revived the ancient cry of the freedom of the Greek cities, first in Greece proper, then in Asia also. After the defeat of Philip at Cynoscephalae Rome proclaimed at the Isthmian games the fulfilment of her pledge, declaring that she left 'free, without garrisons or tribute, under their own ancestral laws' the peoples hitherto subject to Macedon, 'the Corinthians, Phocians, Locrians, Euboeans, Phthiotic Achaeans, Magnesians, Thessalians and Perrhaebians'. As far as garrisons and tribute were concerned the pledge was fulfilled. But Titus Flamininus and the ten commissioners sent to settle the affairs of Greece, being Romans, did not think that freedom included the right of each community to determine its own foreign policy. They assigned some cities to the Aetolian and Achaean leagues and grouped others in separate federations, laying down rules for their mutual relations therein. The clause regarding 'ancestral constitutions' was also curiously interpreted; for we are told that in Thessalian cities at any rate Flamininus 'chose the council and the jurors principally on a property qualification and gave preponderance to that part of the cities in whose interest it was that everything should be secure and quiet'. The Roman republic thus from the first took up the attitude of a suzerain to the cities which she freed. And not only did Rome arrange the mutual relations and internal constitutions of the cities before allowing them to govern themselves; she maintained these arrangements. The cities in their quarrels with one another, and the parties within the cities in their internal struggles not unnaturally appealed to the senate, and the senate in its decisions upheld and interpreted the rulings of its commissioners.³¹

In the settlement of Asia which followed the victory of Magnesia the senate was less meticulous in fulfilling its pledges. Though it had fought the war largely on the pretext that the Hellenes of Asia must be free, it actually granted freedom only

to those cities—apart of course from those which were already free when the decisive battle was fought—which had been subject to Antiochus and had supported the Roman cause. Those which had been subject to Rome's ally King Attalus were restored to his successor Eumenes, and those which had accepted Antiochus' rule without protest were divided between Eumenes and Rome's other principal ally, Rhodes. In Asia the senate thus demonstrated even more clearly than in Europe its view that Rome could dispose at will of the cities which it had won by war. Twenty years later it showed that it regarded the right of sovereignty thus acquired as permanent, when it took from Rhodes the cities of Lycia and Caria which it had granted and declared them free.³²

When in 169 B.C. the Antigonid dynasty was abolished, Rome maintained her principles. The decree of the senate which settled the fate of Macedonia opened with noble phrases: 'in the first place it is our pleasure that the Macedonians and Illyrians [the subjects of King Genthius deposed at the same date] be free, that it may be plain to all peoples that the arms of the Roman people do not bring servitude to free men but on the contrary liberty to men in servitude'. But from the practical content of the decree it appeared that the concept of freedom was being gradually watered down. Not only was the Macedonian league arbitrarily divided into four parts, the inhabitants of which were forbidden to intermarry or to hold real property in one another's territories, but various other restrictions were laid down—gold and silver mines might not be worked, ship timber might not be felled, the import of salt was forbidden, troops might not be maintained except on the barbarian frontiers. The constitutions of the individual cities were probably remodelled with an oligarchic bias, though this is nowhere very explicitly stated. Finally, freedom did not bring immunity from tribute, though the amount was reduced by half.³³

In 149 B.C. a pretender who claimed to be of the old royal line appeared, and the Macedonians, or at any rate the majority of them, willingly threw away their freedom in his favour. On the suppression of this rebellion most of the Macedonian communities probably ceased to be even technically free, being placed under a Roman governor: it is possible that the peoples of Upper Macedonia—the mountainous western district which had always maintained separatist tendencies—did not support the false Philip, and this may account for their later being still free, as were two

or three coastal cities of Greek origin, which may also have resisted the pretender.³⁴

In Greece the cities conquered by Rome from Macedonia already enjoyed a qualified freedom by grace of their liberator. The stages whereby the remaining cities fell under the suzerainty of Rome are complex and obscure. Some forfeited their independence by taking the side of Rome's enemies; the Aetolian league for instance and some other cities allied themselves with Antiochus III, the Epirot league and a number of Boeotian cities supported Perseus. The senate, moreover, by deciding appeals made to it by the remaining independent states in their mutual quarrels, imperceptibly assumed the attitude of a suzerain over them, and when in 146 B.C. the Achaean league disregarded its decision and declared war on its seceding member Sparta, this act was regarded by Rome as a *casus belli*, and the Achaean league with those cities which had supported it, notably Thebes and Chalcis, was subdued by force of arms. Not even now, however, was the theoretical doctrine of the freedom of the Hellenes abandoned. Corinth was destroyed, but the other vanquished cities were declared free and autonomous. But aristocratic constitutions were imposed upon them—and maintained by force if the cities proved restive. And freedom was not deemed incompatible with the tribute, which was levied henceforth from most of the Greek cities. After this nothing occurred to modify the status of the Greek cities till the Second Mithridatic war, and it is questionable whether even then Sulla made use of the support given to Mithridates by the Greeks to take their nominal freedom from them. The chief culprit, Athens, was certainly allowed to retain its liberty under a constitution not much more oligarchic than that which it had adopted not long before the war.³⁵

The Hellenes of Asia do not seem to have inspired in the breasts of the Romans the same sentiments as did those of Europe and their treatment was considerably more brusque. What Attalus III precisely meant by his last will and testament is a matter of some doubt, but it is a reasonable hypothesis that he intended the cities of his kingdom to be free under Roman suzerainty in much the same way that the Macedonians were after 169 B.C., and that the senate accepted the bequest in this sense. In Asia, however, the experiment was never put into force, for a pretender, Aristonicus, arose at once and many of the cities supported him. Rome was thus compelled to instal a governor

from the first, and in all probability revoked the grant of freedom for all cities save those that had resisted the rebels. In Caria also it would appear that many cities supported the revolt, and their freedom, which dated from 168 B.C., was likewise cancelled. On the other hand Phrygia Major, which was granted on the suppression of the revolt to Mithridates V of Pontus, was declared free, when a few years later it was taken from his infant son.

According to Antony, as reported by Appian, no taxation was levied on the cities till Gaius Gracchus instituted the tithe in 122 B.C., but this is scarcely credible. It may be, however, that the senate originally, before the rebellion, remitted taxation, and imposed it only on those cities which took part in the rebellion. The tithe on the other hand seems to have been imposed on all cities, subject and free alike, except, if we may believe Sulla, again as reported by Appian, those of Phrygia Major, who did not come under Roman protection until after its establishment.³⁶

The Second Mithridatic war completely upset all these arrangements. Since the cities had with a few exceptions accepted the rule of Mithridates, and had, moreover, on his orders massacred their Roman residents, Sulla had no scruples in revoking the freedom of all except a favoured few who had shown conspicuous valour in opposing the enemy; these seem as a rule to have enjoyed immunity from taxation. Some more were freed by Lucullus and Pompey as a result of the Third Mithridatic war, and others, for services rendered during the civil war, by Pompey, Caesar, and Antony, but the free communities remained henceforth in a very small minority.³⁷

When Ptolemy Apion left his kingdom of Cyrenaica to the Roman people the senate declared its cities free, and as no governor was installed it is probable that they enjoyed liberty for a while; tribute was paid from the beginning, but perhaps only by the inhabitants of the crown lands. After twenty-five years, however, the district fell into such disorder that a governor was installed and the freedom of the cities was probably thereby revoked.³⁸

With this exception no general grants of freedom are recorded after 133 B.C. The communities of 'Cilicia', that is of the south-eastern part of the Attalid kingdom not taken over in 129 B.C., seem to have been treated as subject from the time that a command was set up in these regions, and the cities of the kingdoms of Bithynia and of Pontus and of Seleucid Cilicia and Syria and of

Cyprus were not declared free on the deposition of their kings, nor was their liberty restored to the Cretan cities upon their subjugation in 67 B.C.; later, in 43 B.C., Antony secured the passage of a decree whereby no governor was to be appointed after Brutus, and the Cretans were to be free. In all these regions liberty was granted to a few communities only, either those which had obtained it already from their kings and secured its recognition by the Roman people, or those which won it by special services to Rome or to one of the rival factions which disputed the control of the republic.³⁹

Though legally, and still more actually, freedom came under the later republic to be increasingly restricted, the notion still survived that transference from the rule of a king to that of Rome was liberation, and in literature and in semi-official documents cities are still said to have been freed from kings when they in fact became subject to Rome. Thus the Ephesians on the conclusion of the Second Mithridatic war were not constituted a free city, but in a dedication at Rome they assert that by the defeat of Mithridates Rome conserved 'their ancestral freedom'; Josephus can say without consciousness of contradiction that 'Pompey liberated and assigned to the province' of Syria the cities hitherto ruled by the Hasmonaean kings. Even under the principate the same idea underlies the adoption of the date of annexation as the starting-point of a new era by cities which had been subject to client kings; for new eras celebrate the beginning of freedom.⁴⁰

In Roman constitutional law free cities were divided into two classes, *civitates foederatae* and *civitates liberae sine foedere*. In the former case the status of the city was assured by a treaty of mutual guarantee, in the latter it depended on a unilateral act, normally a *senatus consultum* or a *lex* of the Roman people. Theoretically therefore the status of federate cities was more secure than that of those which were merely free, since a *foedus* was irrevocable, whereas a law or decree could be repealed. In effect the difference was not very great, for free cities were not arbitrarily degraded and if a federate city offended Rome it could generally be found that it had violated the terms of its *foedus*, which thereupon became void.

The actual degree of freedom enjoyed by different cities varied enormously, but this depended not so much on their constitutional status as on the circumstances in which they acquired or gained recognition of their liberty from Rome. Some cities entered into

treaty relations with the Roman republic or were recognized as free when they were in fact independent states, and in such cases Rome had no say in their internal affairs. The extant *foedera* with Methymna and Astypalaea, the latter dated 104 B.C. and the former about thirty years earlier, are treaties of mutual guarantee pure and simple, and the internal affairs of either party, which are not mentioned, were presumably unaffected by them. Rhodes when it signed its *foedus* in 168 B.C. was still an independent state, and though thereafter it ceased to have a foreign policy of its own, it still kept its peculiar democratic constitution and full internal autonomy. The same probably applies to Byzantium which formed an alliance with Rome in the reign of Philip V, and perhaps to Tyre and Sidon, which seem to have signed *foedera* at an early date, and to Athens.⁴¹

In fact a *foedus* did not protect a city from interference by Rome in its internal constitution; shortly before the defection of Athens to Mithridates its constitution was under review by the senate, and the constitution which was established shortly before 100 B.C. is stated by Appian to have been imposed by Rome. It must be presumed that the Athenians had submitted their troubles to Rome, but Rome was only too willing to consider the pleas of discontented elements in free cities, particularly if they were pro-Roman, and it was difficult for a city, however free in theory, to reject the authoritative advice of the senate.⁴²

Some non-federate free cities probably also enjoyed complete internal autonomy. Rome probably recognized the freedom of Seleucia in Pieria as soon as it was granted to that city by its Seleucid king in 108 B.C., and since Seleucia maintained that era when Syria became a province it is to be presumed that Pompey did no more than confirm that recognition. Ascalon similarly maintained its primitive era of freedom (104 B.C.). In these cases the Roman republic, since it did not grant freedom, can hardly have defined its content.⁴³

When on the other hand a city was conquered from a king and liberated, or a hitherto subject city was granted freedom, the situation was very different. Here Rome defined the liberty which it bestowed, and even if a *foedus* was signed this *foedus* merely guaranteed the privileges previously granted; this fact comes out most clearly in the *senatus consultum de Plarasensibus et Aphrodisiensibus* where the privileges of the double community are fully set forth and the *foedus* is a mere annex. The actual privileges vary considerably. The principal clause normally guarantees

autonomy (*suis legibus uti*), but from the beginning this phrase meant to the Romans not freedom to use what laws the citizens preferred but the right of self-government under a constitution which might be imposed by Rome; the modification of the constitutions of the Thessalian and Achaean cities has already been mentioned. Freedom of jurisdiction was also normally granted, sometimes over all residents including Romans, sometimes with reservations in favour of the latter. The free cities continued under Roman suzerainty their old practice of borrowing judges from one another; the system is attested by inscriptions at Mylasa and Stratonicea, and in the Lycian league it was regularly organized on a federal basis. The right to levy local taxation, in particular customs dues, is often mentioned; in this matter also there were sometimes reservations in favour of Roman tax-farmers or even all Romans and Latins. Immunity from billeting of Roman troops and from military requisitions is also sometimes specified, again with reservations—at Termessus troops might be billeted by a special decree of the senate and requisitions under the Lex Porcia were allowed.⁴⁴

Finally, immunity from taxation might be granted. Rome soon severed the notions of liberty and immunity. The Macedonian communities, as already stated, paid tribute, and so did the Achaean and some other Greek cities after 146 B.C., despite the restoration of their liberty. It would seem too that the free cities of Asia were subject to Gaius Gracchus' tithe; Ilium, which was almost certainly free, paid tithe before the Mithridatic war. But as freedom became a more exceptional privilege it became usual to couple immunity with it. Most of Sulla's grants to Asiatic cities included freedom from tribute, and so also did most of the grants of the rival leaders in the civil wars. That immunity from tribute was regarded as a privilege and not a right of free cities is shown by the limitation often put upon it, that it applied only to land within the city territory possessed by the city corporately or the citizens individually. This limitation expresses perhaps in the clearest form the attitude of Rome to free cities. They were not sovereign states—if so Rome could have had no conceivable right to levy taxation in their territory—but subject states to which certain specific privileges and no more had been granted. And these privileges were often limited to those persons who were citizens at the date of the grant and their descendants: the city might admit others to its citizenship, but these new citizens would not share the privileges which Rome had granted.⁴⁵

The obligations of the free and federate cities are difficult to define, largely because the Roman government left them undefined. The *foedera* of the eastern cities did not, like those of the Italian cities, oblige them to provide a specified contingent of troops (or ships), but merely to assist Rome in case of war. It was generally expected that free cities also should in this circumstance give aid to their suzerain. In point of fact Roman commanders demanded from them troops, ships, corn or money, as the case might be, and it was difficult to refuse. This practice was obviously liable to abuse, and in 168 B.C. the senate passed a decree to the effect that no demand not specifically authorized by itself need be obeyed. This appears to have remained the official rule—the Rhodians appealed to it when Cassius demanded ships of them—but it was, especially during the civil wars, frequently ignored.⁴⁶

The status of the subject cities in each province was uniform, being regulated by its fundamental law, the *lex provinciae*. The methods of control adopted by the Roman republic were different from those of the kings who preceded it. The Romans did not normally garrison cities or appoint high commissioners with power of constitutional control or nominate to the important magistracies. Instead they so arranged the constitution of the cities that the power rested with the wealthier classes; the precise arrangements will be discussed in the next part.⁴⁷

That this policy was possible for them, whereas it had not proved successful in the hands of the kings, was due to a number of causes. In the early Hellenistic period democracy was still full of vigour, and it had public opinion overwhelmingly on its side. If they wished to be popular, the kings were obliged to follow Alexander's example and uphold democracy; and even if they defied public opinion the oligarchies which they installed were often too weak to maintain themselves. By the time that Rome entered Greek politics the vogue of popular government was on the wane, and the Roman republic had itself no strong sentimental regard for democracy in its Greek form, preferring a form of government more closely approximating to its own. Rome had thus no scruples in imposing timocratic constitutions, nor did these constitutions evoke the storm of protest that would have arisen in the fourth or third century B.C.

There was, it is true, some opposition, but the Roman governor had discretionary power to suppress 'faction', that is, attempts to upset the constitution imposed by Rome, and to confirm the

authority of the 'best people', that is, the wealthy. On the whole the system worked smoothly. The oligarchies were naturally loyal to the power that guaranteed their supremacy, and the wealthy, having more to lose, were prone to support the existing state of affairs rather than to risk the penalties of unsuccessful revolt for the sake of the problematical blessings of independence; particularly since the enormous military power of Rome made it very improbable that a revolt could succeed. Such rebellions as did occur were generally the sequel of a popular revolt against the local oligarchies.⁴⁸

Having established in power persons likely to watch over her interests, Rome left them in practice a fairly free hand. There was little direct political interference. Financially the cities were allowed as a rule to manage their own affairs, levying local taxes, raising loans, and spending their money as they thought fit, though in this sphere also the Roman governor had discretionary power to intervene. He could veto expenditure; Cicero greatly angered his predecessor Appius Claudius by severely curbing the grant of travelling expenses to the envoys which the cities were sending to honour him, and there were some standing regulations, inscribed in every governor's edict, restraining the cities from unnecessary expenditure. He could forbid the levy of extraordinary taxes; here again Cicero offended Claudius by vetoing a property-tax which the city of Appia was imposing on its citizens in order to erect some monument in Claudius' honour. It may be also that he had power to enact extraordinary taxation; Cicero speaks of the poll-tax, clearly an internal levy, as *imperata*, that is, presumably, ordered to be raised by Claudius. He also had power to audit the accounts of the cities, a power which Cicero exercised to good effect; he discovered that the financial embarrassment of the cities was largely due to the peculations of their own magistrates, whom he compelled to refund the moneys that they had embezzled over the past ten years.⁴⁹

In one sphere, jurisdiction, Rome interfered far more systematically than had the kings. The precise division of jurisdiction between the local courts and the governor, both in theory and practice, is difficult to discover, and it certainly varied in the different provinces. Our information is fullest for Sicily, where Cicero recounts the provisions of the *Lex Rupilia* in some detail. Here cases between citizens of the same city were decided according to local law in the city concerned; cases between citizens of different cities by judges chosen by lot by the governor according

to rules not specified; cases between citizens and communities by the council of a city agreed upon by both parties out of three selected by the governor; cases between Romans and Sicilians by a judge of the nationality of the defendant, apparently selected by the governor; there were also special courts for revenue cases under the *Lex Hieronica*; other cases, it is not clear of what character, came before judges selected from the resident Roman population.⁵⁰

In Cyrenaica the system was far less liberal. Cases involving death and exile were either tried by the governor personally or before a jury, presided over by the governor, composed of resident Romans; civil cases were decided by a judge of Roman nationality appointed by the governor. In Cilicia the governor could apparently claim all cases for himself, for Cicero in his edict allowed 'the Greeks to litigate with one another according to their laws', as a result of which all the cities 'using their own laws and courts and recovering their autonomy have sprung into new life'. Thus it appears that the cities of Cilicia had no jurisdiction guaranteed to them by the *lex provinciae*, and the same apparently applied to the cities of Asia, for Cicero copied this clause of his edict from that of the famous proconsul of Asia, Scaevola.⁵¹

It would seem then that in the eastern provinces the cities rarely if ever had any rights of jurisdiction secured to them by the *lex provinciae*. How much jurisdiction was in practice allowed to them is another question. In a small province like Cyrenaica it may be inferred from the Augustan edicts that the governor with the *conventus* of resident Romans actually tried all cases. In large provinces like Asia this obviously cannot have been the case. Much must always have been left to the cities, and the point of Scaevola's edict was probably that he guaranteed not to take cognizance of cases between citizens of one city, whereas the normal governor, while in practice leaving most local cases to the local authorities, reserved to himself the right of trying any case if he wished. It would seem to have been usual for the governor to claim for himself and try personally (*cognoscere*) cases involving death or exile. He was probably obliged to appoint a judge (*iudicem dare*) in cases between citizens of different cities, certainly in any case involving a Roman citizen; some privileged provincials also had the right of being tried before the governor or a judge appointed by him (or, should they prefer it, in their native cities by their own law). On the other hand the governor had the power either to try personally or to appoint a judge to decide any

case—except when a privileged provincial opted for the local courts.⁵²

The governor went round on circuit to administer justice. Each province was divided for judicial purposes into a number of *conventus* (διοικήσεις) in the principal city of which he periodically held his court. In Asia there were under the republic twelve such *conventus*, their capitals being Adramyttium, Pergamum, Smyrna, Sardis, Ephesus, Tralles, Magnesia on the Maeander, Mylasa, Alabanda, Laodicea, Apamea, and Synnada. In Cilicia there seem in Cicero's day to have been five, the Lycaonian, the Pamphylian, the Isaurian, Cilicia proper, and Cyprus. The *conventus* were arranged to suit the convenience of the governor rather than that of litigants; in Asia, for instance, he did not have to leave the coastal area except for one journey along the main east road up the Maeander valley, whereas litigants from northern Phrygia had to come all the way to Synnada, and those from eastern Mysia to Adramyttium. The governor could moreover summon (*evocare*) cases from other *conventus*—Cicero in fact tried at one session all the cases arising from several *conventus*.⁵³

The law administered by the governor was defined by himself in his edict. It was in practice, it would seem, the law administered by the praetors at Rome, as set forth in their edicts, with some additions, which in effect became stereotyped by custom, dealing with specifically provincial problems, especially revenue cases. In the local courts the code of the city was applied. The constitution of these local courts is obscure, and it is indeed doubtful if it is correct to speak of courts, in the Greek sense of jury courts, at all. The phrases officially used to define local jurisdiction (*domi suis legibus*, ἐν ταῖς πατρίων κατὰ τοὺς ἰδίους νόμους) are extremely vague, and Cicero, in explaining Verres' perversion of this clause of the Lex Rupilia, seems to imply that even in these cases the practice was that a judge (*iudex*) should be appointed, by what procedure it is not clear. In expatiating on the effect of his own edict in Cilicia, he declared that the Greeks were pleased at having 'foreign judges' (*peregrinis iudicibus*), as if the only difference lay in the nationality of the *iudex*. It is possible then that the Romans abolished the jury system, which was already moribund, and substituted for it in the cities an arrangement like their own civil procedure, whereby a judge was appointed to try each case, perhaps by the local magistrates.⁵⁴

In the matter of taxation the Roman republic wavered between two systems, that of levying from each city a block sum, leaving

the collection to the local authorities, and the practice of the kings which it succeeded, the collection of certain specific taxes through farmers from the actual taxpayers without the interposition of the city governments. If specific taxes were levied, the use of the contract system was inevitable; for the Roman republic possessed no machinery whereby it could calculate their yield, and the cities, if left to assess it themselves, would naturally have underestimated it. The republic could safeguard its own interests only by putting the taxes up to auction, in the hope that competition would force the price up to a point somewhere near their maximum yield in the estimation of the bidders.

The decree of the senate which settled the affairs of Macedonia in 169 B.C. speaks with such violent disapprobation of farmers—'where there was a tax-farmer public law was void and the freedom of the cities null'—that it must be inferred that the tribute imposed on the Macedonians was not farmed, and from certain clauses in the decree it would seem that the four federations collected it. It is, however, not improbable that with the establishment of the province of Macedonia farming was introduced; the tribute imposed at about the same time on the Greek cities was certainly farmed at a later date.⁵⁵

We know more of the taxation of Asia. This consisted—apart from the customs dues (*portoria*) which were levied at the frontiers of all provinces and were naturally no concern of the cities—of two main taxes, a tithe (*decumae*) on the crops and pasture dues (*scriptura*), and these taxes were put up to auction, apparently *en bloc*, at Rome by the censors for five-year periods. This procedure in effect gave the contract to large companies, managed by Roman business men, since they alone could raise sufficient capital to guarantee the vast sum involved. In practice these companies subcontracted with the city governments for the amount due each year from each city, but this was in theory a voluntary arrangement. To the company it was obviously convenient; and the tax-farmer could make himself, with the support of the governor, so unpleasant, that the city government preferred by payment of a block sum to keep him out of its territory, and, though pressure from the governor was often required to induce it to come to an agreement (*pactio*) satisfactory to the farmer, it seems invariably after some tedious haggling to have yielded in the end. This system was, as is well known, extremely oppressive, since in effect the cities had to accept quite arbitrary valuations of the amount of the tithe and pasture dues. After the first Mithridatic war Sulla

exacted five years' arrears of tribute and a war indemnity directly from the Asiatic cities, allocating its quota to each according to an assessment which was used by subsequent proconsuls for the collection of special levies. There is no evidence, however, that he abrogated the Sempronian law so far as the regular taxes were concerned. Levies whose total was fixed in advance—and arrears clearly come under this heading since they must have been arbitrarily assessed at a lump sum—could without great difficulty be apportioned among the cities and collected by them. But so long as the tithe subsisted it had to be farmed. The Gracchan system in Asia was finally abolished by Caesar, who apparently substituted for the existing taxes a fixed tribute equivalent to two-thirds of their current yield and entrusted its collection from the cultivators to the cities.⁵⁶

For the other provinces our information is extremely scanty. Tax-farmers seem to be ubiquitous, but it is not always certain that they dealt with direct taxes levied in the city territories. In Cilicia—in the Roman sense—the *Lex Antonia de Termessibus* envisages Roman tax-farmers transporting produce across Termessian territory, and unless some of the Asiatic tithe was shipped from Pamphylian ports this implies that a similar tithe was levied in a similar way in Cilicia. Cicero also as governor of Cilicia had much to do with tax-farmers, but since his province included three dioceses of Asia we cannot be certain that in the recently annexed parts of it, Cilicia proper and Cyprus, the farming system was employed. In Cyrenaica we hear of farmers again, but they may have been concerned only with the public land, and the same may be true of Bithynia. Here pasture dues and tithe are recorded, and the former at any rate were collected by a Roman company, which as in Asia subcontracted with the cities; but many of the cities had large areas of public land under their jurisdiction. Farmers are incidentally mentioned by Caesar in Pontus.⁵⁷

For Syria more detailed evidence is supplied by the decree of Caesar preserved in Josephus—unfortunately in a very corrupt form—regulating the taxation of the ethnarchy of Hyrcanus. It would appear from this document that Judaea paid a quota and Joppa a fixed sum (both in wheat). It is tolerably certain that the former tax had under Pompey's arrangements been farmed—Cicero speaks of Judaea being *elocata* by him and inveighs against Gabinius for 'delivering the tax-farmers into slavery to the Jews and Syrians' and cancelling their contracts. We may then distinguish two systems, block sums levied from the cities—

presumably without the intervention of a farmer, who would have been superfluous—and quota taxes levied by farmers from client kingdoms and from public land. This distinction may be due to Pompey, who would thus have compromised between the interests of the equestrian order and those of the cities, both of which he patronized. It may on the other hand be due to Caesar, whose preference for fixed taxes collected by the cities may not have been confined to Asia.⁵⁸

In addition to regular taxation the cities were liable to sundry services and supplementary levies. They had to supply labour for building the military roads. They had to provide lodging, a certain amount of hospitality, which was defined and redefined by various laws to little effect, and beasts of burden for Roman magistrates and others furnished by them with a pass (*diploma*) and for envoys of the Roman people. The first heading normally meant the governor and his agents, under the second were included many senators travelling for pleasure or on private business, who secured the grant of a *libera legatio*. They had to supply quarters to Roman troops billeted upon them; many cities preferred to pay substantial sums to avoid this unpleasant charge. The governor had the right to make compulsory purchases of corn for the use of himself, his staff, and his army. As the price was fixed at a quite reasonable figure by the senate, this would not seem to be a burden; but the cities were obliged to deliver the corn free of charge, and governors took advantage of this rule to order their corn from extremely remote cities and then to offer to commute it for a money payment which was considerably in excess of the price they paid for it.⁵⁹

The Roman republic, like the kings, does not seem usually to have levied detachments of troops, but again like the kings it levied ships. The normal practice would seem to have been that described by Cicero as prevailing in Sicily, whereby the several cities had each to produce its quota of ships, seamen, and marines and each supplied to its captain or captains the money and corn required for upkeep, pay, and rations. Verres preferred to handle the money himself, and Flaccus in Asia commuted the whole service for a tax. These were normal peace-time burdens. In time of war the cities were subject to levies of men, ships, corn, and money, which seem to have been limited only by the discretion of the Roman commander, and during the civil wars were on a fantastic scale. Unofficial charges on the cities included the nominally voluntary offer of crowns to the governor to celebrate

his real or fictitious military exploits. This form of exaction became so shameless that Caesar in his first consulship passed a law forbidding the offer or acceptance of crowns except when a triumph had been voted to the governor.⁶⁰

That the rule of the Roman republic over the cities of the east was oppressive can hardly be denied, though the sources from which we derive most of our information—the speeches of Cicero against provincial governors and the letters which he wrote from Cilicia contrasting his own enlightened policy with that of his predecessor—give us an exaggerated idea of its faults. Control by the home government was ineffective and half-hearted. Most governors were out to make money and used their almost unlimited military, judicial, and financial powers to levy various forms of blackmail, some of which, like the device outlined above for making a profit out of compulsory purchase of corn, and the money received for not billeting troops, were so normal as not to be condemned by public opinion. The tax-farmers, with the assistance of the governors, undoubtedly extorted far more than the amounts to which they were legally entitled, and their friends the money-lenders often extracted fantastic rates of interest from cities which were forced to borrow from them. But perhaps the republic was on the whole more easy-going than the kings in the degree of control it exercised. Having put in power a class which was bound from self-interest to support them, the Romans in practice left the cities very much to their own devices.

It is indeed somewhat surprising that since they allowed the cities so much freedom they did not devolve more of the business of government on to them. The republic did at the very beginning, in the case of Macedon, entrust both the collection of the revenue and the military defence of the country to the cities. But it soon abandoned both experiments. In the question of taxation the introduction of the tithe and with it the farming system in Asia by Gaius Gracchus, whatever its motive, whether it was from the first intended to put money into the pockets of the equestrian order at Rome, or aimed at producing a higher revenue for the treasury, or even, as Antony later suggested, was a humanitarian measure, designed to make taxation vary according to annual income, actually created a powerful vested interest which insisted on the retention and expansion of the system. On the military side the revolt of the false Philip probably proved that local levies, which would naturally be drawn from the humbler strata of the population, and not from the pro-Roman

aristocracy, were unreliable. Thus in these two spheres the Roman republic continued the policy of the kings, farming the taxes and maintaining its own army at the charge of the cities. Where it intervened most conspicuously in the internal affairs of the cities, in jurisdiction, Rome was probably actuated in the main by the desire to protect the interests of its own citizens. In this sphere therefore the republic was naturally less liberal than the kings, who had no interests to protect save their own and seem normally to have intervened in the administration of justice from the mainly disinterested motive of relieving the judicial anarchy into which the cities tended to fall if left to themselves.⁶¹

CHAPTER VIII

THE ROMAN EMPIRE

AUGUSTUS seems to have made free use of his rights as conqueror of the East from Antony to revise the status of many cities, usually in a downward direction. He revoked the freedom granted by Antony to Crete except in two cases, Cydonia and Lappa. In Macedonia he would seem to have rescinded the ancient liberty of Upper Macedonia, preserving only the rights of the Oresti, who had been free ever since they deserted Philip V in the Second Macedonian war. On the Adriatic coast Apollonia, which had been declared free as early as the First Illyrian war, had its ancient status revived or confirmed, and two neighbouring tribes, the Amantini and the Dassaretae, were likewise left free. The only other free communities recorded in Macedonia by Pliny are Thessalonica, Amphipolis, Scotussa, and the islands of Thasos and Samothrace: in all cases their liberty probably dated from an early period.⁶²

In Greece proper Augustus was yet more drastic. He made it into a regular province, annulling the nominal liberty which the Greeks had apparently up to now possessed except in a relatively few cases, Pharsalus in Thessaly, Amphissa, and the Ozolian Locrians (who are recorded in Pliny as immune but were apparently later attributed to the newly founded colony of Patrae), Thespieae and Tanagra and perhaps Plataea in Boeotia, Abae and Elatea in Phocis, Athens, Delphi, Sparta, the eighteen little cities of the Eleutherolacones, and the island cities of Corcyra, Cephalonia, Zacynthus, and Aegina—the last taken from Athens to which Antony had given it: Nicopolis was also constituted a free city by Augustus, its founder. Nero granted freedom and immunity to the whole of Greece, but this concession was quickly revoked by Vespasian. Other emperors added a few members to the ranks of the free cities. The Thessalian league, whose liberty Augustus had revoked despite its recent confirmation by Caesar, was free again under Hadrian. Trajan gave freedom to Mothone in Messenia and Antoninus Pius raised the village of Pallantium in Arcadia, the legendary home of Evander, to the status of a free and immune city.⁶³

In the other provinces, where free cities were more sparse,

Augustus was more conservative. On the coast of Thrace Abdera and Aenus (but not Maronea) still preserved the liberty which they had gained after the Third Macedonian war, and Byzantium, which had broken its original *foedus* by aiding the false Philip, retained the freedom which had been granted to it in Cicero's day. This city had many vicissitudes; it was deprived of liberty by Vespasian, regained it shortly after—perhaps under Titus, was degraded to a village by Septimius Severus, but soon restored by him to the status of a free city. Of the new cities created in the interior of Thrace by Trajan and Hadrian one, Augusta Trajana, is later recorded to have been free. In Bithynia-Pontus Augustus did not restore the freedom of Cius (Prusias ad Mare) which had been put under dynasts by Antony, but regranted its liberty to Amisus in similar circumstances. Chalcedon remained free as it always had been, and on the suppression of the Pontic kingdom in A.D. 64 Trapezus was granted its liberty.⁶⁴

In Asia free cities were relatively numerous. Rhodes, Chios, Ilium, Stratonicea, Alabanda, whose liberty had been confirmed or granted by Sulla, Mitylene, Cnidus, and Aphrodisias which owed theirs to Pompey, Caesar and Antony, all retained their rights. Astypalaea, Mylasa, and Bargylia also remained free, and Samos and probably Caunus were liberated by Augustus himself. On the other hand two cities, Magnesia by Sipylus and Apollonis, lost the liberty granted them by Sulla; Tabae, also freed by Sulla, and Phocaea and Miletus, freed by Pompey and Antony respectively, though not recorded to have been free cities in the principate, may still have been so. Cyzicus lost in 20 B.C. the liberty that Lucullus had granted to it, and after recovering it in 15 B.C. finally lost it in A.D. 25. Of the later emperors only one, Claudius, is recorded to have added to the list of free cities: he granted immunity to Cos, the home of his doctor Xenophon. Hadrian confirmed the liberty of Minoa of Amorgos, but it is not known who granted it. Several cities temporarily or permanently lost their freedom. Vespasian degraded Samos. Claudius took away and then gave back its liberty to Rhodes, Vespasian took it away again and Titus finally restored it. Nerva restored to Stratonicea the freedom it had lost on some unrecorded occasion. Caunus had ceased to be a free city by the reign of Titus, when it was subject to Rhodes.⁶⁵

The Lycians had maintained their liberty, confirmed by Sulla after the Mithridatic war and by Antony after their conquest by Brutus, ever since they were declared free in 168 B.C. They kept

it under the principate until A.D. 43 when Claudius reduced Lycia to provincial status; after having been for a brief while again freed, probably by Nero, they were degraded again by Vespasian. In Pisidia Termessus Major retained the liberty it had acquired in 72 B.C. In Cilicia Tracheia, Seleucia on the Calycadnus remained, despite the grant of all the surrounding districts to kings and dynasts, a free city. In Cilicia Pedias Tarsus, freed by Antony, and Aegae and Mopsuestia retained their status, but Soli Pompeiopolis, constituted a free city by Pompey, lost hers under Augustus; on the other hand Elaeussa Sebaste, which was subject to the various kings of Cilicia Tracheia, gained its liberty in the later principate. In Syria Seleucia in Pieria and Ascalon still retained the freedom granted to them by the Seleucid kings, as did Laodicea on Sea and Antioch by Daphne that granted them by Caesar and Antony. Tyre and Sidon, on the other hand, despite their *foedera*, were deprived by Augustus of their ancient liberty, but seem to have recovered their old status not long after.⁶⁶

The policy of the emperors was thus distinctly illiberal. They made very few new grants—with the exception of the romantic philhellene Nero—and many of them, particularly Augustus, Claudius, and Vespasian, freely cancelled old privileges. Some of these were later restored, but on balance the number of free cities was severely pruned. *Foedera* were still struck under the early principate at any rate; Augustus conferred them on Amisus, Cnidus, Mitylene, and his own foundation of Nicopolis. But a *foedus* was in this period very little protection. Augustus is recorded by Suetonius to have 'deprived of their liberty several cities which were federate but were heading for ruin by their licence'—in other words internal disorders were a good enough excuse for cancelling a *foedus*.⁶⁷

The legal privileges of such cities as remained free do not seem to have been impaired except that appeals from the local courts now lay to the emperor or even to the provincial governor. In the matter of taxation it is difficult to say what the position was. Many of the later republican grants of freedom are expressly stated to have included immunity. Pliny on the other hand distinguishes between free and immune cities, placing in the latter class only Amphissa, the Ozolian Locrians, and Ilium. His list is incomplete—Strabo states that Sparta paid no tribute and Alabanda on its late imperial coins boasts its immunity—but the distinction which he draws is probably derived from the Augustan *formulae provinciarum*, and implies that exemption from taxation was now

a rare additional privilege. We happen to know that two free cities—Byzantium and Mylasa—did pay tribute under the principate.⁶⁸

The constitutional status of free cities was on the whole more scrupulously observed under the principate than it had been under the republic, when governors had often ridden roughshod over their privileges. It was, however, observed in so meticulously legal a spirit that it gradually came in practice to be restricted. Trajan's attitude to Amisus is typical. Pliny had received information—it must be remembered that there were always persons in the free cities ready to call in the Roman government—that the Amisenes permitted friendly societies, which were always frowned upon by Rome, and asked for the emperor's instructions. Trajan replied: 'if by their laws, which they enjoy thanks to the *foedus*, it is permitted to have a friendly society, we cannot prevent their having them'. If every free or federate city had to prove, whenever the Roman government objected to any activity, not that such activity was not forbidden by any clause in its charter but that it was expressly allowed by its constitution as guaranteed by its charter, the scope for Roman interference was enormous. No innovation was possible, and even old customs which had no express legal sanction might be abrogated.⁶⁹

Two new classes of privileged cities made their appearance in the eastern provinces in the principate, colonies and *municipia* of Roman citizens; the Latin right was so far as we know never granted in the East. Colonies, which were actually first introduced by Caesar before the establishment of the principate, have already been discussed: the earlier were really colonies of settlers from the west, later the status was often granted without or with very little settlement. *Municipia* were not even theoretically supposed to be settlements, but were created by granting Roman citizenship to a provincial community. It is another proof that the imperial government had no desire to Romanize its Greek-speaking subjects that such grants were excessively rare. Two, Denda and Stobi, were on the western and northern fringe of Macedonia, in areas which were scarcely hellenized and where Latin culture was as strong as Greek: these two were relatively early—they existed before the publication of Pliny's *Natural History*. A third *municipium* was created by Hadrian at Coela in the Chersonese; here again special reasons may be urged, for Coela, as the centre of the imperial administration of the Cherso-

nese, is likely to have contained a substantial number of imperial civil servants who with their families would be Roman citizens.⁷⁰

But little is known of the privileges of colonies and *municipia*. According to Strabo even communities of Latin right were exempt from the authority of the provincial governor, and *a fortiori* Roman communities must have been so under Augustus. But their independence seems to have been gradually encroached upon, and their fate was probably like that of the free cities. The colony of Apamea stated to Pliny when he desired to investigate its financial position that 'it had the privilege and very ancient custom of administering its public affairs at its own discretion', and that no proconsul had hitherto examined its accounts. This 'privilege and very ancient custom' was probably nothing more than the normal right of a Roman colony, which had, evidently in a rather exceptional manner, been hitherto unchallenged in this case. In this particular instance the Apamenes were quite willing to submit their accounts to Pliny, and Trajan, remarking rather impatiently that he had been wondering why they were so anxious to prove that previous proconsuls had refrained from inspecting their accounts when they did not object to Pliny's doing so, ordered Pliny to proceed 'saving the privileges which they possess'. Despite this saving clause the precedent established was no doubt used to claim further powers of interference in the future, and it was probably in this kind of way that the status of colonies and *municipia* was gradually degraded.⁷¹

In the matter of taxation some Roman communities were privileged and others were not. Claudius' colony of Ptolemais is known to have possessed no exemption, and Caracalla in granting colonial status to Antioch by Daphne reserved the tribute. Others had partial or complete immunity. Vespasian exempted Caesarea from *tributum capitis*, and Titus from *tributum soli* also; Hadrian's Aelia Capitolina enjoyed the same immunity. A fuller form of immunity was provided by the *ius Italicum*, whereby the community was placed on the same level as an Italian city. This would mean that its land came into the full Quiritarian ownership of its possessors; the most important practical result was probably that it paid no taxes whoever possessed it, whereas in an immune city only the citizens held their land-tax free. Many of the Caesarian and Augustan colonies are recorded to have possessed the *ius Italicum*, and it may have originally been assumed to be a natural corollary of colonial status. If so the right was soon—as

early as the reign of Claudius—separated from colonial status, but was granted as a special privilege down into the third century; Severus gave it to Tyre and Laodicea on Sea, Caracalla to Emesa.⁷²

The universal grant of Roman citizenship by Caracalla in A.D. 212 should presumably in theory have raised all the cities of the East which were not colonies to the rank of *municipia*. In fact no change of status is perceptible. Even special grants of colonial rank were not deemed to extinguish previous peculiarities of status, but were superimposed on them. Thus Ascalon in the late third century calls itself a 'free colony', and the colony of Tyre was 'most tenacious of the *foedus* which it struck with the Roman people'. It is difficult to see how a part of the Roman republic could be other than free, and still more difficult to understand how the part could be in treaty relations with the whole. In fact the constitutional origin of the various classes of cities was forgotten, and cities proudly accumulated incompatible titles, which might in fact carry with them certain specific privileges worth keeping—Aphrodisias was, for instance, still in the reign of Severus Alexander immune from visits from the proconsul in virtue of its ancient freedom.⁷³

The system of control employed by the imperial government was in its general lines the same as that invented by the republic—to maintain the ascendancy of the wealthier classes. As before, the constitutions of the cities were so arranged as to give the control to the rich, and any attempts to upset this arrangement were severely checked. Left-wing politicians found themselves relegated to islands. If the assembly proved too active its meetings were suspended. Above all the formation of clubs which might organize the voting power of the lower orders was strictly supervised and often prohibited: Trajan would have no friendly societies in cities where his writ ran, and forbade the organization of a fire brigade at Nicomedia because 'whatever title, on whatever pretext, we grant to those who form unions, they will become highly noxious political clubs'.⁷⁴

Jurisdiction tended more and more to be concentrated in the hands of the governor, though local courts still existed. The law administered in the provinces therefore tended to approximate to Roman law, which after the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in A.D. 212 became officially the universal code of the empire; local variations however survived even after this date and some Hellenistic practices were eventually incorporated in Roman law.⁷⁵

In general the vague powers of supervision which the governor

had always possessed were more methodically exercised. This applied in particular to the internal finances of the cities, which by their incompetence and extravagance tended to endanger their own solvency, impoverish their citizens, and ultimately, it was feared, might imperil the imperial revenue. The gradual encroachments whereby the imperial government asserted its control are difficult to date because our principal sources of information are the Digest and the Code, and lawyers naturally quote the latest and not the earliest enactment on any subject. The rule, for instance, that *ex gratia* payments from public funds were void is cited in the Digest from Ulpian, who wrote in the first half of the third century, but it appears from Pliny's letters that it was contained in Trajan's mandates, and was at that time a well-established principle; for Trajan in allowing grants made over twenty years ago to stand implies that even then they were illegal. Similarly, the rule that cities could not institute new taxes nor alter those which existed by increasing or decreasing them is cited from Hermogenian, who wrote not earlier than the late third century. The Code, however, contains two constitutions of Severus forbidding the enactment of new taxes, a rescript of Marcus and Verus is cited in the Digest to the effect that a tax might not be abolished even if money had been left to the city with that specific purpose, and from Vespasian's letter to the Saborenses it appears that even in his day a city had to obtain leave from the governor to levy new taxes.⁷⁶

The main purpose of the regulations which were gradually built up by successive precedents was to restrain the cities from extravagant expenditure. Not only was the expenditure of public funds severely regulated, but even private munificence which might involve the city in expense of upkeep was curbed. Other rules were designed to prevent the cities from dissipating their revenues and also from overtaxing their citizens. The prohibition of *ex gratia* payments (or remissions of debt) and of increases in taxation has already been discussed. Vespasian limited the number of a delegation which a city could send to the governor or to the emperor to three. The establishment of new games seems also to have been subject to imperial licence; Valens, a contemporary of Hadrian, cites a decree of the senate forbidding money left to a city for the celebration of games to be used for that purpose and ordering it to be converted to the more pressing needs of the city.⁷⁷

But the greatest extravagance of the cities was building, and

it was here that regulation was most rigid. According to the third-century lawyer Aemilius Macer no new building might be erected from public funds without the emperor's permission, nor even by a private citizen if it were in emulation of another city or might cause sedition, or were a circus, theatre, or amphitheatre. This precise rule may be of late date, but Marcus' rescript that the governor when consulted on the building of city walls or gates must refer the matter to the emperor implies that provincial governors exercised regular supervision in his day, and a rescript of Antoninus Pius directing that money left to a city for new works should be converted to the upkeep of existing works rather than spent on starting new ones shows that the imperial government took an interest in the building programmes of the cities at an even earlier date. In Trajan's reign Pliny as legate of Bithynia evidently had instructions to scrutinize all projects for public works, but since his was an extraordinary commission it cannot be inferred that such a scrutiny was one of the normal functions of a governor, and the fact that the Bithynian cities had been recently embarking on building projects on a reckless scale might suggest that hitherto the proconsuls of Bithynia had not been instructed to intervene. It is equally possible, however, that they had been too accommodating in granting permits, and Dio Chrysostom, in his speeches about the colonnaded street which he caused to be erected at Prusa, seems to imply that the governor's consent was already in Nerva's reign required as a matter of course for any important building project.⁷⁸

This tendency to interfere in the internal finances of the cities culminated in the appointment of special commissioners, usually called in Latin *curatores* but in Greek 'auditors' (λογισταί), a title which better conveys their functions. Apart from a perhaps apocryphal auditor of Smyrna in the reign of Domitian, mentioned by Philostratus, the earliest imperial commissioner of whom we know in the East was appointed by Trajan 'to regulate the position of the free cities in Achaea'—free cities being to some extent exempt from the regular supervision of the governor were most in need of special commissioners, and could only be dealt with by them. Under Hadrian we hear of another man who was legate of the emperor in Athens, Thespieae, Plataea, and Thessaly; he was evidently a special commissioner in a senatorial province and his sphere was again free cities. We also read in Hadrian's reign of a *corrector et curator* of Bithynia, who evidently

had special powers which Pliny had not possessed, and of two men who are described as 'auditor of Syria' and as commissioned 'to audit the accounts of the cities of Syria'.⁷⁹

These early commissioners all supervised fairly large groups of cities, and the same practice is sometimes found later; in the late second century a man is recorded to have been auditor simultaneously of three important Bithynian cities, Nicaea, Nicomedia, and Prusa, and another of a group of Greek cities including Thebes, Chaeronaea, Coronea, and Epidaurus. Under Caracalla we hear of an auditor of Seleucia in Pieria, Alexandria by Issus, Rhodus, Augusta Trajana, Tropaeum Trajani, and Colonia (the first three were probably a group, and perhaps the last three, but which Colonia is meant is obscure), in the same period of another *curator et corrector* of the free cities of Achaea, and even later an auditor of the diocese of Pergamum is recorded. But it became more usual to appoint auditors to individual cities—Hadrian gave one to Apollonia on the Adriatic, Antoninus Pius one to Ilium, and probably another to Ephesus, and others are known in the late second century at Gordus, Aphrodisias, Cius, and Nicomedia. By the early third century the appointments of *curatores* had become so regular a policy that Ulpian wrote a treatise on their duties; these were to manage and safeguard the property and revenue of the city and to veto illegal expenditure.⁸⁰

The persons originally appointed as *curatores* were of senatorial rank and often of senior standing. Senators continued down to the third century to be sent to important cities, but as the number of *curatores* rose the office was thrown open to men of equestrian status and also to distinguished provincials—men who were Roman citizens and often had held the high priesthood of their province: a Cyzicene was appointed curator of Ilium by Antoninus Pius, Asiarchs are found holding the office at Gordus under Marcus Aurelius and at Aphrodisias under Commodus, a Bithyniarch and Pontarch at Cius at the same period. As the office became more and more common it tended to pass into the hands of provincials altogether.⁸¹

The last stages in its degradation are obscure, but it would seem that about the middle of the third century it had become normal for the *curator* to be a citizen of the city which he supervised, and that his appointment, though subject to imperial approval, was in effect left to the city itself. This attempt to exercise direct control over the cities thus broke down, probably because the central government was unable to keep up with the

enormous number of appointments that had to be made, and the cities regained control of their finances. The only effect of the attempted reform was to create a new civic office which overshadowed the others because its holder had no colleague, had unusually wide powers, and served for longer than the usual annual term.⁸²

The central government found itself obliged to intervene from about the middle of the second century in another sphere of the internal affairs of the cities. For reasons which will be discussed in the next chapter the cities found it increasingly difficult to fill their offices, and in response to this difficulty successive emperors issued a growing stream of constitutions regulating and limiting the grant of immunity from these offices, and establishing rules for their equitable distribution. By the third century the government was passing beyond the stage of laying down general regulations to direct intervention. According to Ulpian it was the duty of a provincial governor to see 'that public charges and offices are equitably imposed in the cities in rotation according to age and rank'. This remark may refer primarily to the judicial functions of the governor, for it was to him that appeals against illegal or inequitable nominations went. But in another passage Ulpian states that governors were in the habit of writing to a city council instructing it to elect a person named to a specific office, and even that governors often attended the sessions of a city council and gave it verbal instructions. It is to be noted, however, that in such cases the governor was deemed to be giving advice in his private capacity, so much so that the person that he nominated could appeal to him in his official capacity against his own proposal.⁸³

The emperors made much more systematic use of the cities than had the republic, regularly devolving upon them the local administration of imperial services. The modest part played by the cities is naturally little noted in our authorities, but scattered hints make it clear that in many spheres they did the spadework under the supervision of imperial officers. In taxation for instance the farming system, already abolished in some provinces by Caesar, was completely abandoned by Augustus for direct taxes. Many points are obscure in the imperial fiscal system, but it would appear that two fixed taxes, *tributum soli* on land and *tributum capitis* on personal property (probably including a poll-tax), were normally substituted for the old quota taxes. Both were based on detailed assessments, the materials for which were

collected by a series of censuses carried out in different provinces in Augustus' reign. These assessments had obviously to be kept up to date, and the census was therefore periodically revised. From inscriptions we know only of the higher officers responsible for provinces, who were of senatorial or equestrian rank, but it seems very probable that, after the initial census, much of the routine work of the periodical revisions was entrusted to officers appointed by the cities; two lawyers of the late third century A.D. allude to civic officers deputed to receive the census returns.⁸⁴

The collection of the taxes was certainly carried out by the civic authorities; in Lycia the machinery of the league was utilized for this purpose, federal officers exacting the imperial tribute. Little is known of the precise method of collection. There were collectors of tribute, elected by the cities, who are mentioned by Papinian, Paulus, and Ulpian. From the second century an important part was played in the imperial fiscal system by the 'first ten' or 'first twenty' (*δεκάπρωτοι, εικοσάπρωτοι*) of each city. This body, first attested in the latter years of the first century A.D., would seem to have been in origin a finance committee of the council. During the second century it became responsible for the city's quota of taxation, and the collection of the tribute seems to have been its principal function by the early third century, when it was introduced into Egypt. The relation of the 'first ten' to the collectors is obscure; both are stated to have exacted the tribute and both were liable to make good deficits from their own property. The 'first ten' seem, however, to have been of higher rank than the collectors, who no doubt worked under their orders, and their liability was perhaps limited to making good deficits which were not covered by the property of the collectors.⁸⁵

It is further stated that the 'first ten' 'make up the fiscal deficits for the names of persons deceased'. The meaning of this statement probably is that each city was liable for the amount assessed at the last census until another was held, and that the 'first ten', had to make good any deficits arising from a fall in taxable value in the interval. The imperial treasury was thus assured of the full payment of the tribute assessed on each city, first from the property of the collectors, then from that of the 'first ten', and finally from that of the council as a whole, which had to stand surety for the officers whom it elected. This system was not perhaps inequitable so long as the taxes were regularly readjusted in accordance with the census returns, but it became

an instrument of oppression when Aurelian made the city councils liable for the taxes on deserted estates, which should have been written off. The cities were entitled to make up their quota of tribute from what sources they pleased. Mylasa used the profits of its banking monopoly for the purpose. Lycosura in Arcadia drew on the revenue arising from its mysteries, to which many strangers flocked. In Tenos a local benefactor established an endowment to pay the citizens' poll-tax, and in Andros it would seem that the revenue of certain public lands was allocated in Hadrian's reign to the same purpose.⁸⁶

An irregular but not infrequent addition to regular taxation was exacted in the form of 'crown money' (*aurum coronarium*). In theory and in origin 'crowns' were voluntary gifts voted by the cities to the emperor by way of congratulation for some notable achievement. In practice they were regularly decreed to each emperor on his accession as well as on other auspicious occasions, such as triumphs, and were from the beginning compulsory, since no city would dare to be behindhand in showing its loyalty. They gradually became a normal charge. Some considerate emperors—Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Severus Alexander are cited—either refused crown money or remitted a proportion of it, but others, such as Caracalla, multiplied the occasions on which it should be offered.⁸⁷

The majority of the old services continued to be exacted from the cities. Our information on road-building in the provinces is very limited, and it is difficult to distinguish between local roads, which were naturally a civic responsibility, and the military trunk roads. The milestones tell us that the latter were built under the direction of the provincial governors and procurators, and many were, we know, paved by military labour, presumably at the expense of the imperial treasury. Sometimes, however, the milestones record that the expense was borne by the cities; a road near Gortyn was paved under Commodus 'from the money of the Dictæan Goddess' and another near Damascus under Marcus 'at the charges of the Abilenes'. Another inscription of the second century A.D. records that the city of Amyzon paved 'the portion allotted to it' of an imperial road (the work was done under the supervision of a procurator), and yet another preserves an imperial letter allocating the expense of building a road—probably the via Egnatia—between the city of Heraclea Lyncestis and the tribe of the Antanes. In the third century the expense seems regularly to have been laid on the cities, for milestones are often no

longer erected by the emperor but dedicated to the emperor by a city. Third-century lawyers allude to the election of officers by the cities to superintend road construction; the duty of providing labour and money was incumbent on all landowners.⁸⁸

The duty of providing lodging, hospitality, and beasts of burden also survived. The charge was naturally very severe when the emperor and the court or the army travelled, and many inscriptions record the munificence of rich citizens who undertook on behalf of their cities the burden of entertaining emperors—notably Hadrian—who toured the provinces. But such occasions were fortunately rare. A less exacting but more regular burden was inflicted by the tours of the provincial governor and his subordinates through the province.⁸⁹

To facilitate the journeys of imperial officials and messengers a regular imperial post (*cursus publicus*) was organized by Augustus. The system was that passes (*diplomata*) were issued by the emperor and by provincial governors, and that persons armed with these passes were entitled to receive horses, beasts of burden and draught animals, lodging and hospitality from the cities through which they passed. Lodging (with, it would seem, fuel, bedding, and fodder) was provided gratis; provisions and animals were obtained by requisition against payment, that is by compulsory purchase in the one case and compulsory hire in the other. The city magistrates had the duty of organizing the supply of these requirements, and we hear of civic officers deputed to requisition animals (*ad cogendas angarias*), to collect provisions, and to furnish lodging (*ad exhibendum cibum, potum, tectum et similia, xenoparochi*); some cities preferred to maintain public rest-houses rather than billet their guests on private houses.⁹⁰

The system was liable to abuse and was constantly abused; the emperors strove in vain to limit the number of passes issued—often to persons who were not travelling on public business and had no right to them—and to check the arbitrary exactions of officials and soldiers who, though not armed with a pass, demanded the services of the post none the less. But apart from its abuses the post was a severe burden on the cities; for it would appear that it was they, and not the imperial exchequer, that indemnified the owners for the requisitions. Hadrian was the first emperor who attempted a radical reform. He is stated to have instituted 'a regular fiscal post, to prevent the magistrates being overburdened by this charge'. No details are known of this reform, and it must have been soon abandoned—perhaps by

Pius. Septimius Severus is next stated to have transferred the burden of the post from private persons to the *fiscus*. It was perhaps he who introduced the contract system, which is attested in Italy under Caracalla, and the remnants of which are found throughout the empire in the fourth century. Under this scheme state contractors (*mancipes*) maintained supplies of animals in public stables along the trunk roads. The reform must have greatly relieved the cities on frequented routes, which were the most heavily burdened. The obligation to provide animals remained in force, however, perhaps for emergencies only on the trunk roads, but as the regular system on others.⁹¹

With the establishment of regular imperial fleets there was less need to exact ships from the cities, but Rhodes continued to contribute a few vessels to a fleet stationed at Corinth. The institution of a standing professional army likewise meant that the cities were more rarely ordered to supply military contingents than under the republic. The obligation however survived. Arrian mentions that in his campaign against the Alani he had under his command a contingent from the free city of Trapezus, and in Cestius Gallus' hastily improvised expedition against the Jewish rebels the cities supplied troops whose military incapacity was, according to Josephus, compensated by their anti-semitic zeal. Roman colonies, it may be noted, were expected to contribute troops in emergencies: Berytus furnished Varus with 1,500 men at the time of the disturbances in Judaea which followed the death of Herod the Great.⁹²

The cities also had many duties in connexion with the regular army. The army seems normally to have been recruited by voluntary enlistment, but conscription was occasionally enforced when numbers fell low. The officers in charge of the conscription were Romans of senatorial or equestrian rank, but it was the cities that had to send up the recruits to them. This practice was already in force in the period of civil wars, when large armies were raised from the eastern provinces by Pompey, Brutus and Cassius, and Antony, and it seems to have continued under the principate. The land surveyor Agennius Urbicus notes that boundary disputes between cities often arose in connexion with the furnishing of recruits, and the third-century lawyers mention this function (*tironum productio*) as a civic office. The supply of remounts was similarly allocated to the cities; civic officers were elected to furnish horses (*equorum productio*) and camels (*καμηλασία, camelorum agitatio exhibitioque*) for the use of the army; the animals

were obtained by compulsory purchase, the imperial treasury providing the cities with the money to indemnify the owners.⁹³

Finally, army supplies (*annona*) of all kinds, wheat, barley, beans, meat, oil, wine, vinegar, even uniforms, wood for spear shafts, and hides for the manufacture of shields, were supplied by a similar method. During the first two centuries of our era requisitions were occasional and the imperial treasury normally paid for supplies, though not perhaps at full market-prices. An inscription of Lete in Macedonia, dated A.D. 123, in honour of one of its citizens, Manius Salaris Sabinus, records it among his benefactions to the city that 'when the armies of our lord Caesar passed through he supplied for their *annona* 400 bushels of wheat, 100 bushels of barley, 60 bushels of beans, and 100 measures of wine at far below the current price'. The implication is that the indemnity paid by the government was 'far below the current price' and that but for Sabinus' generosity the city would have had to bear the loss. From the reign of Septimius Severus requisition of *annona* became a regular routine, and by the time of Diocletian no indemnity was paid, so that the *annona* became a tax—the principal direct tax. The history of this transformation is obscure, but it is probably to be connected with the inflation of the currency which began at the end of the second century. As the imperial treasury became more embarrassed owing to the decline in the real value of the taxes which it received in cash, it must have found it increasingly difficult to pay for the supplies which it required, and payment grew more and more irregular. At the same time the scale of indemnity was, it may be suspected, not adjusted to meet rising prices, so that, when payment was made, it was worth very little.⁹⁴

The reaction of the local authorities to this state of affairs seems to have varied. Sometimes, it would appear, they made up from civic funds the gap between the market-price of the supplies and the indemnity, if any, provided by the imperial treasury. More usually they passed on the burden to their citizens, requisitioning the supplies from them and letting them wait for payment till the money was forthcoming—if it ever arrived. The machinery of collection is best seen in Egypt. The provincial government fixed the quota of goods to be delivered by each city, and the cities on its instructions elected officers to collect, deliver, or in general to take charge of the several assignments. The following notice posted by Aurelius Eudaemon, the president of the council of Oxyrhynchus, in A.D. 284 gives a good idea of the

procedure: 'The transport of the *annona* of the most noble soldiers does not admit even a short delay, and for this reason and because letters from his excellency the finance minister, Aurelius Proteus, and also from his excellency Ammonius are pressing us on this matter, and the ships to receive the supplies are already in port, it has become necessary to call a special general meeting of the council in a suitable place to discuss this business only, in order that the services may be performed as quickly as possible. . . . I have thought it right that you should know by this notice that I have instructed you, being in possession of the facts, to assemble without delay in view of the orders, since no other business remains for the present meeting, and to vote on the election of those who are to serve.' Earlier minutes of the council of Oxyrhynchus record the election, on the instructions of the central government, of other similar officers to supervise the 'convoy of wine', 'convoy of barley', and 'the convoy of animals' for 'the most noble soldiers', and in a document from Hermopolis dated A.D. 261 an officer appointed 'for the supervision and preparation and delivery of uniforms for the school of gladiators' undertakes to deliver at Alexandria 'half the quota of tunics allotted to the city'.⁹⁵

The emperors thus made free use of the cities as local agents for executing the business of the central government. They left to them, to a greater or a less extent, the assessment and collection of direct taxes, the building of roads, the management of the imperial post, the supply of recruits, remounts, and provisions for the army. It was perhaps unfortunate that they did not see their way to trusting the cities with responsibilities of a more interesting kind. They no longer threatened any danger; separatist sentiment was dead, and the governing class no longer aspired to freedom but were proud of their membership of the empire. There would seem therefore to have been little risk in trusting the provincials with arms, and had the cities been afforded the opportunity of supplying military contingents they might have found in this service a useful outlet for their civic patriotism and, if the service had been organized on competitive lines, for their mutual emulation. But the emperors preferred to rely on an exclusively professional army, and the services which they entrusted to the cities were of a menial type such as they could hardly feel much pride in fulfilling: it is significant that in the thousands of honorific inscriptions to patriotic citizens which we possess there is scarcely a mention of the various civic offices

enumerated above which were concerned with imperial services. The result was that the very genuine civic patriotism which flourished under the principate was directed into futile channels, the celebration of games and the erection of vast and unnecessary public buildings, and the healthy spirit of rivalry between the cities found vent in trivial disputes over titles and precedence or in competitive displays of magnificence which were, owing to the heavy expense which they involved, positively harmful.

This lavish and futile extravagance was the principal cause for the increasing intervention in civic affairs of the imperial government, though other reasons contributed. There can be no doubt, for instance, that the civic authorities were often incompetent, failing to get as much out of their revenues as they might and allowing themselves to be cheated by dishonest contractors, and that sometimes they were corrupt, winking at the misappropriation of public funds. But whatever the causes which contributed to it, the growing financial embarrassment of the cities and the increasing burden thrown on their wealthier citizens, who had usually to foot the bill, caused grave concern to the emperors, who feared not only that the prosperity of the empire would be undermined but that eventually their own revenues would be imperilled.

Their intervention was not very effective. It was easy to frame general rules, but the application of these rules demanded the study of each individual case, and this was beyond the powers of most provincial governors, who had often several hundred cities under their charge. The appointment of special commissioners for small groups of cities or later for individual cities brought more effective control for a time, but as this system became universal it broke down through the difficulty of finding suitable candidates for the ever-increasing number of posts, and eventually the imperial government virtually abandoned this form of direct supervision by allowing the cities to choose the officers who were supposed to control them.

In another way imperial control was positively harmful, in that it tended to deaden local initiative. It is difficult to apportion the responsibility for this tendency between the central government and the cities. The fault lay in the system of provincial administration, which gave virtually unlimited powers to the governor, should he choose to exercise them, and guaranteed no definite rights to the cities. The result was that, once the imperial government began to interfere, the cities, never knowing whether any

given measure would be approved, tended to ask approval for all. This feeling of helplessness undoubtedly accentuated the decay of civic patriotism, already moribund for lack of any useful outlet.

From the beginning of the second century, if not earlier, there are signs that the governing classes of the cities were beginning to regard civic office as an irksome task rather than a coveted honour. The extravagant standard of living which the cities adopted and the emperors had failed effectively to curb threw a heavy burden on the civic officers, and the increasing demands of the central government, caused by the many wars, foreign and civil, in which the empire was involved from the reign of Marcus Aurelius onwards, by the increase in the size and pay of the army, and above all by the inflation of the currency begun under Commodus, which forced the government to supplement regular taxation by requisitions in kind, laid a yet heavier financial responsibility on them. In the second century evasion of office was already common, and by the third century the city governments were in danger of breaking down from the reluctance of the governing classes to undertake their responsibilities. Thus the emperors were forced to intervene, first by general regulations and then by the direct interposition of the provincial governor, in order to force qualified persons to take their due share in the government of the cities, whose survival was essential not only for the civilization of the empire but for the proper functioning of its administrative machinery.

CHAPTER IX

THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

ONE of the leading principles of Diocletian's reforms was uniformity, and it is questionable whether any diversity of status between cities survived them. Free cities are certainly heard of no more. The title of colony was, on the other hand, still granted in the fourth century and it may be that the *ius Italicum* still meant something then: it is probable that Valentinian and Valens in restoring to Constantinople in A.D. 370 its *ius Italicum* were conferring something more than an empty title. How long the *ius Italicum* survived is again doubtful—the fact that Justinian inserted in the Digest such *obiter dicta* of the jurists as he could find on colonies and their privileges may mean that these privileges were still in force in the sixth century, or may on the other hand be mere antiquarianism. It probably did not amount to much in any case; for, seeing that the cities of Italy itself were subject to taxation, it is unlikely that the cities in the provinces whose status was assimilated to theirs remained tax free. Perhaps colonies with *ius Italicum* retained their immunity from the old *tributum*, but this was a negligible item compared with the *annona*, the *aurum coronarium*, and the new taxes invented by the Byzantine emperors.⁹⁶

The main preoccupation of the Byzantine emperors with the cities was to keep them alive. This anxiety was to some extent disinterested, for the city was still in this age the symbol of civilization, and the emperors wished them as far as was compatible with the pressing needs of defence to be prosperous and to continue to afford to their inhabitants the amenities of Greek culture. But to a very large extent the efforts of the emperors to prop up civic institutions were actuated by the interests of the central government. The cities were essential cogs in the administrative machine; they collected most of the taxes and performed many other services in a far more reliable manner than did the central bureaucracy. From time to time, it is true, the imperial government, wishing to relieve the cities of a part of their burden or despairing of their future, transferred some of their functions to the bureaucracy. But these experiments were not a success. The imperial civil service might at first sight seem to be more

amenable to the emperor's will, being directly appointed by and responsible to him, but in fact its members were far harder to bring to book than the civic officers, whose defaults could be visited upon the council which elected them. And not only did the imperial civil service cheat the emperor, but it also grossly oppressed the taxpayers. Hence arose a third motive for maintaining the civic governments; if the emperor could not himself protect his subjects from the ruinous rapacity of his own servants, he could at least encourage them to protect themselves.

The efforts of the emperors to keep the cities alive found expression in a huge volume of legislation designed to prevent their governing classes from shirking their duty. The execution of these laws was, as in the preceding period, entrusted to the provincial governors. The burden laid upon these officials had already by the end of the third century become intolerable, and it steadily grew as the city governments required more and more active goading to make them perform their duties. For this reason Diocletian multiplied the number of the governors by subdividing the provinces, and subsequent emperors pursued the same policy. This measure of Diocletian is often attributed to his desire to weaken the power of the governors, whose constant rebellions had in the recent past endangered the stability of the empire. It is true that some of the governors were dangerously powerful, and that some of Diocletian's reforms, notably the separation of civil from military commands and the subdivision of the latter, were directed to breaking their power. But it is not on record that the governors of the unarmed provinces had during the third century raised rebellions, and yet these were as drastically divided as the great frontier commands—Asia for instance became five provinces—and the policy of subdivision continued in the fourth and fifth centuries, when the provincial governors had lost all importance. It seems probable therefore that Diocletian's main motive was, by reducing the number of cities subject to each governor, to enable him to exercise more effective control over them; and this is the motive attributed to him by a contemporary, Lactantius.⁹⁷

Even the domestic services of the cities, especially the maintenance of their public buildings, tended in the Byzantine period to depend on the initiative of the governor. The cities had some excuse for neglecting them, for not only were their governing classes, who had in times past paid for a large proportion of them, greatly reduced in numbers and wealth, as well as in willing-

ness, but their corporate revenues had mostly been swallowed by the imperial exchequer. The details of this process are obscure. The sacred lands were perhaps the first to go, under Constantine. The revenue from these was not strictly civic, and, since the purpose to which they were devoted, the public worship of the gods, was not encouraged and was soon prohibited, the cities could not greatly complain. The civic lands and taxes were perhaps seized by Constantius. Julian restored both the sacred lands to the gods and the civic lands and taxes to the cities, but both measures were revoked by Valens.

The result was that the cities abandoned even their most essential services, and Valens was obliged to return to them a third of the revenue derived from their lands and taxes in order to enable them to keep their walls in repair. The cities thus became pensioners on the imperial treasury for their internal expenses, and they found the situation most unpleasant: Eutropius, the proconsul of Asia, reported in 370 that 'the same revenues are both long and piteously demanded and grudgingly and reluctantly paid by the agents of the *res privata*', who managed the confiscated land; nor did the imperial exchequer profit, for these same agents swallowed up all additional profits over and above the fixed revenues payable to the cities and to the state.

Valens in this case rather favoured the plan of placing all the civic lands in the charge of the cities once more, allowing them to keep their proportion of the fixed revenue and any additional profits that they made out of them, but holding them responsible for the payment of the rest of the fixed revenue to the imperial exchequer. This plan does not seem to have been generally adopted, for we subsequently find civic lands under the administration of the *res privata*. The third of the lands whose revenues went to the cities seems, however, to have been later placed in the charge of the civic authorities, as were also the buildings and sites within and adjacent to the city walls when these—both those that had been sacred and those that had been civic—were restored to the cities in A.D. 401. The management of the third of the civic taxes which was allocated to the cities was also later—in A.D. 431—restored to the city governments, which thus regained full control of what remained of their former revenues for a while. Justinian appears to have made the cities once again dependent for their revenues on the central government.⁹⁸

Whether they managed it themselves or received it from the imperial exchequer, the cities found their third quite inadequate

for their needs, and they therefore naturally undertook no expenses that they could avoid. The initiative in maintaining civic services was thus thrown on to the provincial governor, and it became his responsibility to see that the games were celebrated, that the food-supply was maintained, and in particular that public works, especially fortifications, were kept in repair. He was usually instructed to use for this purpose the portion of the city concerned. If one city was in exceptional need, he might spend upon it those of others. If this failed he fell back on a general levy upon the landowners of the city territory; the use of imperial revenue was strictly forbidden.⁹⁹

The governors, after the manner of the age, used their power over the civic revenues to claim a rake-off for themselves, and Zeno attempted to check this abuse by restoring full control of the city's income and public works to its 'father', as the *curator civitatis* was now called. Justinian in his mandates (535) instructed the provincial governors to keep civic buildings in repair and to use the civic revenues for the purpose, but later in his reign (in A.D. 546) he reverted to Zeno's policy; the collectors were ordered to pay over their revenues to the cities without deductions of any kind, and the governor was strictly forbidden to meddle with the way in which they were spent. During the sixth century the praetorian prefects also began to intervene in civic finance by sending out special commissioners, ostensibly to supervise public works. Justinian set his face firmly against this abuse, forbidding any commissioner to be dispatched without his personal authorization, and empowering the civic authorities to refuse admission even to those armed with an imperial letter until reference had been made to Constantinople and its authenticity proved.¹⁰⁰

The city courts seem by the end of the third century to have disappeared entirely, and all jurisdiction devolved upon the provincial governor, who was authorized to delegate minor cases to *iudices pedanei* (*χαμαιδικασται*). This concentration of jurisdiction in the hands of the governor bore hard on the provincials, and in particular on the humbler classes, who had often to travel to the metropolis of the province to obtain justice and could not afford the gratuities expected of litigants by the governor and his officials. Moreover, when as was often the case their grievance was oppression by these very officials, they had little chance of satisfaction if they obtained a hearing.¹⁰¹

To remedy this state of affairs the emperors adopted the

curious device of the *defensores civitatum* (ἐκδικοί). These officials, though not mentioned in the Theodosian Code till A.D. 368, when they were introduced into the prefecture of Illyricum, appear in Egypt in A.D. 332. They were according to the Code persons of high official standing (decurions were specifically excluded) and they were appointed by the praetorian prefect. Their function was to protect the humbler classes (with whom the decurions are later classed) from the oppression of the great, among whom the governor and his officials are expressly included, and they were accordingly armed with petty jurisdiction. In minor civil cases they could deliver a verdict; in major civil and in criminal cases they acted as *juges d'instruction*, drawing up a statement of the issue with the relevant documents and depositions, and forwarding it to the governor, who might be expected to take more notice of complaints thus officially on record.¹⁰²

It is questionable whether this attempt to set a thief to catch a thief—for the *defensores* were drawn from the same class and appointed by the same authority as the provincial governors—was very successful. At any rate in A.D. 387 Theodosius decided to allow each city to choose its own *defensor* subject to the approval of the praetorian prefect, and since the rules regarding the rank of the *defensor* were allowed to become dead letters, the office became in effect a civic magistracy. Its later history will accordingly be discussed in the next part; here it may suffice to state that the *defensores* ceased when they became civic magistrates to be very effective champions of their cities, but that the imperial government did its best to maintain their authority. Justinian still hoped to find in them a check against the ever-encroaching powers of the provincial governors, who at this date were in the habit, despite the fulminations of the emperor, of appointing a deputy (τοποτηρητής) in each city, who was to all intents and purposes its governor.¹⁰³

Of the services performed for the state by the cities the collection of direct taxes—the *tributum* with which the *annona* had now been consolidated—remained the most important. The part played by the cities in this work varied very considerably not only at different dates but in different regions at the same date, and it is difficult to draw from the material at our disposal—principally the Codes and the papyri—any very coherent picture, especially since in the imperial legislation the humble role of the cities tends to be taken for granted. The general rule was that the provincial governor with his officials apportioned the taxes between the cities

and that the cities then appointed collectors who extracted the taxes from their inhabitants and handed them over to the governor, but there were many temporary and local exceptions to this rule, and the functions of the city collectors and the officials of the governor seem often to overlap.

On two occasions the imperial government tried the experiment of appointing a collector of taxes for each city. Early in the fourth century (the first dated example is in A.D. 309) there appears the *exactor civitatis*. This official seems originally to have been a member of the imperial bureaucracy, and he was certainly appointed by the central government. His function was perhaps rather to supervise the activity of the civic collectors, who were his subordinates, than to undertake the collection himself, though it would appear that he extracted arrears. The office still survived in A.D. 345 in its original form, as we learn from a letter written by Aurelius Eulogius, president of the council of Arsinoe, to his friend Flavius Abinnaeus, asking the latter, who is going up to court, to obtain for him from the emperors the post of *exactor* of the city. At this date the post was a desirable one; Eulogius is even willing to pay Abinnaeus what he euphemistically calls the expenses involved in the transaction. But the office was no longer, as it apparently had originally been, reserved to members of the official bureaucracy, since a *curialis* could aspire to it. Within the next forty years the *exactor* had become a civic officer, elected by the city council. The reason for the change is probably to be found in a papyrus from Hermopolis, in which the city council objects to being made responsible for the default of an *exactor* whom it had not elected. As taxation grew more difficult to collect, the liability of the *exactor* for arrears became more pressing—though it would seem that the office was still often lucrative—and might exceed his assets. This liability could not legally be passed on to the city council as long as the *exactor* was appointed not by them but by the emperor. The only solution was then to transfer the appointment, and with it the liability, to the city council, and the *exactor* thus sank to be merely the head of the civic taxation service.¹⁰⁴

The second experiment was the institution of *vindices* by Anastasius. The constitution creating the office has not been preserved and we possess only literary evidence on its nature. We therefore have little precise knowledge about it. A *vindex* was appointed by the imperial government in each city, and the post is said to have been allocated to the highest bidder. Anastasius'

reform thus amounted to a revival of the farming system abandoned some five centuries earlier. But the city councils do not seem to have been relieved of their burden by the change. Like the *exactor*, the *vindex* appears to have been a director of collection rather than a collector himself, and the civic officers still continued to do their work, presumably as his subordinates. *Vindices* still existed under Justinian, who, though he alludes to them in abusive terms, is proved by these very allusions not to have abolished them.¹⁰⁵

The actual collection of the taxes seems normally to have been entrusted to civic officers, usually styled *procuratores* (ἐπιμεληταί) or *susceptores* (ὑποδεκταί, ἀποδεκταί). Officers were also appointed for the *erogatio* or *divisio annonae* (διαδοταί). An important part in the business of tax collection was also played by the *praepositi pagorum* (usually πραιπόσιτος πάγου, sometimes translated πάγαρχος); these officers were instituted in A.D. 307–8, and took over many of the functions of the 'first ten', who were at this time abolished. Their duties seem however to have been administrative rather than strictly fiscal; they administered the several districts (*pagi*) into which the city territory was divided, appointing the collectors of each village, who delivered the quota of the village to the city collectors. The Code also mentions *praepositi horreorum*, the managers of the state granaries where the *annona* was stored. All these officers were normally elected by the city council. The *compulsores* (ἀπαιτηταί), on the other hand, were usually officials of the provincial governor, though the title is sometimes applied to civic officers; their function seems to have been to extract arrears either from or in conjunction with the *susceptores* or *procuratores*.¹⁰⁶

This was the normal division of functions. Valentinian and Valens at the beginning of their joint reign endeavoured to transfer the entire work of tax-collection to the *officium* of the governor, but many governors protested that their officials were unequal to the task and the rule was never uniformly applied—Cilicia is mentioned as an exception—and seems soon to have lapsed. The cities were subsequently from time to time relieved of a part of their burden. A constitution addressed to the vicar of Pontica in 385 directs that the officials of the governor collect the taxes from the *potentiores*, that is, the great landlords who were exempt from service on the city council; the council was according to this constitution to collect from its own members, the *defensor* from the lower orders. In 396 the taxes on the estates of senators were

transferred to the care of the provincial *officia*; this reform was short-lived, for next year it was found that these taxes were in arrear to the extent of 50 per cent and their exaction was accordingly restored to the city councils. In 412 the praetorian prefect of Illyricum was instructed that governors must not expect the cities to collect the *annona* destined for their own use but exact it for themselves through their own officials. Finally, during the fifth century many great landlords obtained or arrogated to themselves the right of 'self-collection' (*autopraetorium*); that is, they collected the taxes of their tenants and forwarded them direct to the provincial governor; the same right was also accorded to some villages of peasant proprietors.¹⁰⁷

Of the other taxes the *aurum coronarium* was at this date subscribed by the members of the city council, which naturally organized its collection. The *collatio lustralis*, a tax on traders, was at first exacted by the councils, but was transferred by Julian to the trade guild of each city, which elected the officers responsible for its collection; this arrangement, as far as we know, remained in force till the tax was abolished by Anastasius. Even the indirect taxes (*vectigalia*) were sometimes collected by the cities. In theory they were farmed, but in practice the contractors (*conductores*) were often not voluntary *entrepreneurs* but were arbitrarily allotted their contracts at a figure fixed by the government. These pseudo-contractors were in some dioceses—notably Egypt—elected by the city councils. In some provinces, amongst them Macedonia, the cities were responsible for revenue arising out of mining royalties, electing the superintendents of mines (*procuratores metallorum*). In Egypt—but not, it would seem, elsewhere in the empire—they collected the rents of the imperial estates: a papyrus records a city councillor holding the office of *praepositus patrimonialium* in the tenth *pagus* of Oxyrhynchus.¹⁰⁸

The Codes make no mention of the cities in connexion with recruiting, but the papyri prove that in Egypt at any rate they were responsible; they elected the recruiting officers (*ἐπιμεληταὶ τρωάνων*) and likewise the collectors of the recruit tax which was often levied instead of recruits (*ὑποδεκταὶ χρυσοῦ τρωάνων*). Roads and bridges were in the Byzantine period regarded as a purely civic concern, and were paid for either from the civic revenues or by levies on the landowners of the city territory. The imperial post was also generally a charge on the cities. It was still managed by persons called contractors (*mancipes*) and the government in some provinces at any rate provided (by way of taxation, levied of

course by the cities) the animals and fodder for them. These allowances do not, however, seem to have covered the cost of the post, and the contractors were in fact compelled to undertake their expensive charge. The class from which the contractors were drawn and the method by which they were selected varied from time to time and from district to district; but very frequently they were elected by the city councils. This is stated in 392 to have been the normal practice in Egypt, and the statement is confirmed by a papyrus of 322, wherein a singularly illiterate city councillor of Oxyrhynchus complains of his appointment as contractor of the post (*κονδοουκτορία τοῦ ὀξέως δρόμου*). Not all roads were provided with a fiscal post, and on these requisitions (*parangariae, paraveredi*) remained the rule; the civic authorities were still responsible for organizing these. The duty of providing lodging for the emperor, imperial officials, and soldiers on their travels remained in force, and this service (*metata*) was also, it would seem, managed by the civic authorities, who had likewise to prepare baths for travelling officials of high rank.¹⁰⁹

By the Byzantine age the attitude of the central government was precisely the opposite to what it had been in the Hellenistic. The kings had feared the cities, had endeavoured to curb their independence, and as far as was possible had dispensed with their support. The Byzantine emperors had no need to hold the cities in check; their chief anxiety was to galvanize them into activity. And so far from wishing to increase the powers of their civil service they preferred to use the cities as their agents. The cities had in the nine hundred years which passed between the reigns of Alexander and of Justinian sunk from independent states which resented submission to any external authority, to organs of local administration. As such they were still in Justinian's day of some importance, as is proved by the sedulous efforts of that emperor to maintain them. They were still useful servants of the emperor, and Justinian hoped that, as a result of the measures he had taken to check their decay, they always would be so. And he hoped that they might be something more, bulwarks against the licence of the common enemy of the emperor and his subjects, the bureaucracy, and to this end he endeavoured to give them a larger degree of independence. But the attempt was doomed to failure. The vigorous spirit of civic patriotism which had once inspired the cities had been allowed by the emperors to die for lack of anything to feed upon, and now that it might have been useful to the emperor it could not be revived by a stroke of his pen.

PART III
INTERNAL POLITICS

CHAPTER X

THE HELLENISTIC AGE

WHEN Alexander freed the Greek cities of Asia he everywhere deposed the tyrants and oligarchies which had been ruling them in the Persian interest and established democracies. From this time on democracy and freedom became closely allied concepts. The old ideal of autonomy, that every city should keep its own or its ancestral constitution, was not formally abandoned, it is true; but it was tacitly assumed, often without much historical justification, that democracy was the normal constitution of every city. Popular sentiment being unanimous on the point, the kings for the most part followed suit. Antipater and Cassander tried the experiment of governing the cities through oligarchies of their supporters, but the experiment was unsuccessful. Though they gained for the moment what all the kings desired, control over the policy of the cities, they incurred in so doing enormous unpopularity, which Antigonus was quick to exploit. By proclaiming himself the champion of freedom and democracy, he won for himself the support of public opinion, and in his campaigns in Greece his armies were materially assisted by uprisings of the citizens against the governments which his rivals had established. Antigonus' policy was so abundantly justified by its results that it was generally copied by later kings. Whatever devices they might invent to secure their control over their cities, there was one which they could not use, the formal limitation of political power to a small class.¹

Democracy was then in the hellenistic age universally recognized as the proper constitution of a Greek city, and as the institutions of the Greek city spread over barbarian lands it was the democratic type of constitution which was accepted as the norm. The colonies planted by the kings seem, from the scanty information that we possess as to their internal institutions, to have been democratic, and as barbarian cities adopted Greek constitutions they too followed the mode. Theoretically

democracy was universally triumphant. It is more difficult to discern how far it prevailed in spirit and in actuality.²

The people were in almost every city divided into a number of tribes. These were often of great antiquity, and the original basis of the division can only be conjectured. Many cities of Asia Minor, for instance, preserved the primitive six Ionic tribes, with local variations, and in most Dorian cities the traditional threefold division survived, again with occasional local differences. In some old Greek colonies the citizens were grouped into tribes according to their provenance. In some Carian cities also the tribes were bodies of great antiquity and had perhaps once been separate communities which had united to form the city. But in the vast majority of cases the tribal division seems to have been artificial and of relatively recent date. This was so in many old Greek cities; at Athens for instance the ten tribes had been created by Cleisthenes. In the royal foundations of the Hellenistic age and in the cities which during that period adopted Greek constitutions the tribes seem almost invariably to have been purely artificial. Artificial tribes were usually named after gods, heroes of local fame, and, in the case of royal foundations, kings and queens of the dynasty and their reputed divine and heroic ancestors. Dynastic tribes were also often introduced into existing cities; it was a common form of compliment to create a new tribe or rename an old one after a royal benefactor. These names are of no very great interest, save in so far as they reveal the dynastic affiliations of the cities or their foundation legends, for barbarian cities often named their tribes after the heroes of antiquity whom they appropriated: Pergamum thus commemorated Telephus, Pelops, Cadmus, and others, and Sardis had a Mermnad and a Masdnid tribe.³

The real basis of division is unknown, but it was probably in most cases local. There is no evidence that other cities had so complicated a system as Athens. A tribe appears not infrequently to have corresponded to a block of the city territory, or again to a ward of the town—at Antioch by Daphne the tribes were of this character, and it may be suspected that the five tribes of Alexandria of Egypt were identical with the five wards. No doubt in most cases the tribes each comprised a section both of the town and of the territory in order to maintain an even balance. The number of tribes varied greatly, from two (at Samos) to ten or twelve, both very popular figures, or even more (Antioch had eventually eighteen), and bore no relation to the size of the city:

insignificant places like Ilium had twelve and huge towns like Alexandria or Ephesus five only.⁴

The tribes were regularly subdivided into smaller units, generally called as at Athens demes. In the old cities these divisions were either villages or family groups. In the new cities they were as artificial as the tribes, bearing the names of gods, kings, and heroes: demes of this type are recorded at Alexandria and Ptolemais of Egypt, at Seleucia in Pieria, and at Cassandreia and Thessalonica, and were no doubt universal in the royal colonies. In the Lycian cities the demes were named after Homeric heroes connected with the country, Bellerophon and the like.⁵

A primary rule of any democratic constitution is that all citizens irrespective of their birth or wealth should have equal political rights. It is probable that in theory this principle was generally observed. The constitution drafted by Ptolemy I for Cyrene is an exception, for here the exercise of political rights was limited to a body of 'ten thousand', defined by a property qualification. But this constitution was drawn up in exceptional circumstances, since Ptolemy had intervened in Cyrenaean affairs on the appeal of exiled oligarchs, and was therefore bound to show some respect to their interests; it is indeed noteworthy that in the circumstances Ptolemy adopted so liberal an attitude as he did, for it is plain that his constitution was far less oligarchical than that under which his protégés had previously held sway, in which the 'thousand' was the governing body. In any case, the Cyrenaean constitution was probably drafted in 321 B.C., that is to say before Ptolemy had adopted the slogan of freedom and democracy.⁶

There are, however, other instances which indicate that in Africa, whatever their policy in Greece, the Ptolemies did favour restriction of citizen rights. In the third century B.C. Ptolemais of the Thebaid passed a decree that in future members of the council and of the jury courts should be chosen from a select list, and by the end of the Ptolemaic period there was at Alexandria a distinction between those citizens who were enrolled in the demes, and the rest who were Alexandrians merely. The significance of the distinction is not known, but it has been conjectured that full political rights were confined to the former class. This distinction did not exist in the third century B.C., and was perhaps the result of the troubles in the reign of Euergetes II. Elsewhere in the Greek world there is no trace of any limitation of political

rights, and in Greece proper the action taken by the Romans in introducing property qualifications implies that none had hitherto existed; even in the cities which had been subject to the Antigonids it seems to have been the work of their liberator Flamininus to limit democracy in this way.⁷

Though all citizens seem as a rule to have possessed equal rights, the citizenship might itself be limited to a relatively restricted number of the inhabitants. In all Greek cities citizenship was of course determined in principle by birth and not by residence. Citizen descent on both sides was normally required, unless, as came to be increasingly common, a special arrangement was made whereby men and women of two cities or of a whole group might contract legal marriages with one another. Citizenship was frequently granted by special decree to foreigners who had been benefactors to the city, and it also became increasingly common for pairs or groups of cities to make their citizenship interchangeable; there survive for instance treaties between Miletus and several of its Carian neighbours, Heraclea, Mylasa, and Tralles, whereby any Milesian establishing a domicile in one of these cities became automatically a citizen and vice versa.⁸

There were, however, in every city a number of domiciled aliens (usually called *κάτοικοι* and not as at Athens *μέτοικοι*), many of whom had no doubt lived there for generations. Slaves, moreover, did not as a rule acquire citizenship on manumission, as they did in Roman law, but freedmen and their descendants remained a separate class, which might in some cities become a substantial element in the population. Philip V of Macedon was greatly struck by the Roman practice of admitting freedmen to citizenship, and commented upon it in a letter which he wrote to Larissa, recommending them to fill up their depleted population by the enfranchisement of aliens. He did not, however, venture to advise the Larissaeans to follow the Roman practice. Greek sentiment seems to have been far more exclusive towards freedmen than Roman. At Pergamum in the crisis which followed the death of Attalus III they were raised only to the status of domiciled aliens.⁹

Apart from immigrants and freedmen and their descendants there was in some cities a portion of the native population excluded from the citizenship. It is doubtful if any such class survived in Greece proper after the final break up of the Laconian state, whereby the communities of the *perioeci* became independent cities. In the old Greek colonies the native population was

certainly sometimes and perhaps often a subject class. At Heraclea Pontica the Mariandyni who inhabited the neighbouring country are known to have been reduced to serfdom. At Zeleia an inscription mentions the Phrygians who cultivated the public lands of the city; these appear from other inscriptions to have been serfs. At Priene the Pedieis seem to have been a similar class. Strabo also records that at Cyrene the population was divided into citizens, domiciled aliens, Jews—a privileged class of aliens—and peasants; the last are probably the native Libyans.¹⁰

These situations arose from conquest. It seems likely, though there is no evidence on the point, that a situation of this sort might also arise when a Greek city added barbarian country to its territory by purchase or by grant; it is for instance difficult to believe that, when the lands granted by Antiochus I to Aristodicides of Assus were incorporated in Ilium, the Ilians admitted the native serfs who tilled these lands to citizenship, and at Pergamum the inhabitants of 'the places', that is, probably the royal lands incorporated in the city territory by the will of Attalus III, continued after that event to be listed separately from the old citizens, who alone were enrolled in the tribes. In the new colonies planted by the kings it would also seem highly probable that only the Greek colonists were citizens, and that the natives, not only those that inhabited the surrounding territory but those that had been moved into the new town, remained outside the pale; at Alexandria the citizens were certainly a very small percentage of the population and are sharply distinguished from the Egyptian residents of the city.¹¹

Not all Greek cities, however, adopted so exclusive an attitude. Rhodes, as it acquired its mainland territory, incorporated the Carian communities as demes of the republic, granting their members Rhodian citizenship; and Miletus similarly, when it swallowed up Carian Pedasa, accepted the Pedasians as Milesian citizens. Much no doubt depended on the degree of culture attained by the native population. Carians were by this period so fully hellenized that they could be readily assimilated to the body politic. Egyptians, and no doubt Syrians, were still too alien to be accepted as fellow citizens.¹²

Where a city, Greek by blood, was planted in a barbarian environment, the racial, or perhaps rather cultural, exclusiveness of the Greeks might result in the disfranchisement of a large proportion, often the majority, of the inhabitants of the town and its territory. When a native community adopted the institutions

of a Greek city, there was less reason why any part of the population should have been excluded from the citizenship. But no doubt there were cases where there was already in existence a governing and a subject class, and in such circumstances it may often have happened that the former became citizens of the new city and the latter remained in their previous condition.

Many of the towns of Lydia and Phrygia seem to have developed on much the same lines as the towns of medieval Europe. They were essentially centres of industry and commerce, and trade guilds were the basis of their development. When they attained the status of cities, they seem still in many cases to have based their civic organization on the guilds, which took the place of the tribes of a normal Greek city; in one instance, Philadelphia of Lydia, the guilds were actually given the title of tribes. It would follow that in these towns the citizenship was confined to members of the guilds. Originally the towns probably possessed no territories; an inscription of the late fourth century B.C. suggests that the country round Sardis was royal land, and was granted out on a quasi-feudal system by the king to his officers. But in the course of the Hellenistic period, presumably as the towns were granted the status of cities, they acquired territorial jurisdiction: an inscription alludes to a royal demarcation between the territories of Thyateira and Hieracome. It seems unlikely that the peasants of these rural areas brought under the rule of the town would have been enrolled in the guilds, and they no doubt remained a disfranchised class.¹³

It was an essential principle of Greek democracy to curb as far as possible the power of the executive, the magistrates, and to ensure that the magistracies were equally accessible to all citizens. One of the devices by which the Athenians secured these objects, the appointment to all but the most important posts by lot, does not seem to have been greatly favoured in the Hellenistic east; magistrates appear generally to have been elected by the people, except for certain priesthoods which were hereditary, and others which were sold by auction for a limited term or for life—a practice very commonly adopted by Hellenistic cities. On the other hand many cities limited the term for which the posts were held more severely than did the Athenians. A year was the most usual period, but at Rhodes, for instance, at Cnidus, at Stratonicea, at Tenos, and at Tarsus, magistrates were changed every six months, and at Erythrae and Chalcedon some of them, including the most important, the *strategi*, served for four months only.¹⁴

The practice of entrusting each department of state not to a single officer but to a board, the members of which were often drawn in proportion from the tribes, was very general, though it does not seem everywhere to have been carried to such an extreme as in fourth-century Athens. The important offices, in whose hands lay the direction of policy, were invariably collegiate. Those whose duties were of a more routine character were often entrusted to a single magistrate, or if a board were elected, its members served in rotation for a month each. Property qualifications were demanded only for certain financial offices in which it was desirable to have a substantial surety against speculation. All magistrates were subject to a scrutiny, both financial and general, on laying down their office.¹⁵

The titles and functions of the several departmental magistrates will be described in the next part, and here it will suffice to mention certain offices whose powers were of a more general kind. In many cities there was an eponymous magistrate by whose name public documents were dated. His functions were as a rule purely formal—to make certain sacrifices on behalf of the state and to walk at the head of civic processions—but he was usually expected to entertain on a lavish scale during his year. The title of the eponymous magistrate is often curious and interesting, for in many cities he had in the distant past been the head of the state, whose powers had been gradually whittled down to a purely formal presidency. Elsewhere a priest was eponymous; this was a practice indigenous in some old Greek cities and widely adopted in the Hellenistic age, when royal foundations commonly dated their acts by the priest of the dynastic cult and the sacred office of the *stephanephorus* was made eponymous over a large area of western Asia Minor.¹⁶

In cities which forwent the luxury of a special eponymous magistracy, public acts were generally dated by the chief board or its chairman. In some districts one supreme college dealt with both civil and military affairs; in Macedonia, for instance, there were the politarchs, in Thessaly the *tagi*, in Laconia the ephors, in Crete the *cosmi*. Elsewhere there were two boards, one civil and one military: thus in the cities of the Achaean league the *demiurgi* directed home affairs while the *strategi* led the armed forces. The balance of power between the two boards varied greatly from place to place. In some cities the *strategi* were, as at Athens, virtually the heads of the government, and the civil board had, like the Athenian archons, almost purely formal duties. At Rhodes,

on the other hand, the civil *prytaneis* directed policy, and the generals were confined to their strictly military duties, and the Rhodian example was widely followed in southern Asia Minor.¹⁷

The key institution in any Greek democracy was the council. It had very considerable executive functions, especially in the sphere of finance, since it had to co-ordinate and control the multifarious boards of magistrates. It also had important deliberative functions. All Greek cities, however democratic, recognized that the primary assembly was a dangerously irresponsible body, and therefore, while leaving to it the ultimate decision on every point of importance, took care that no ill-considered proposal could be suddenly sprung upon it and passed in a snap division. One precaution, which seems to have been universal, was that no measure might be brought before the assembly which had not been considered and approved by the council. In some cities this procedure is expressly set forth in the preambles of decrees—'whereas the council has passed a preliminary resolution' is part of the regular formula employed in the cities of Lesbos. More usually it is briefly summarized in the formula 'it was enacted by the council and people'.¹⁸

In the council naturally no measure could be moved except by a member, or in some cities by the principal magistrates, who might attend its sessions. A private citizen, or even a magistrate, unless specially empowered, was obliged therefore, if he wished to promote a measure, to apply for leave to address the council: this procedure in the decrees of some cities is expressly set forth in such formulae as 'whereas so-and-so approached the council and stated that . . .' or 'whereas so-and-so made a communication in writing to the council'. The usual procedure was then—if the proposal found favour, and naturally we have record only of proposals which ultimately became law—that a member of the council or a magistrate or board vested with the requisite powers should formally move a resolution in the sense of the proposal; this appears from the fact that the formal mover of a decree is generally not the person who appeared before the council. In some cities, however, a private person might obtain leave from the council himself to move a measure; in Syros the formula was 'So-and-so, having made a written application to the council, moved'.¹⁹

Under such rules of procedure it is plain that the council had a very complete control over legislation. It might not necessarily use its powers. It might regularly hand on private motions to the

assembly. It might also frame its preliminary resolution in the vaguest terms, making no definite recommendation to the assembly, but merely inviting it to make a decision on a topic which had been brought to its notice: members of the assembly had also the power of moving amendments of a far-reaching character to the resolutions of the council. But only with its approval and by its formal initiative could any measure be moved in the assembly. It was therefore essential, if democracy was to be effective, that the council should accurately reflect the general sentiments of the people. As far as can be discerned from our scanty evidence the same means were employed for achieving this end as at Athens. The council was a large body—five hundred was probably a fairly typical figure—selected in equal numbers from the constituent tribes of the people; and its membership was changed at frequent intervals. The usual term of office was a year, but at Rhodes and its neighbour Stratonicea it was only six months; in the Ptolemaic constitution of Cyrene members seem to have sat for two years, and the council to have been renewed annually by halves. The method of selection seems usually to have been, as at Athens, the lot.²⁰

The chairmanship of the council and of the assembly (the office was usually one) might be a position of some authority, since it was the chairman who drew up the agenda of either body, and nothing not on the agenda might be discussed. Not all cities took the elaborate precautions of Athens to secure that the office should be held by a member of the council selected by chance for one occasion only. In some cities something like the Athenian system prevailed: the council was divided into committees which were in rotation responsible for the conduct of business and from which the actual chairman was selected. At Magnesia on the Maeander, for instance, the tribes of the council took it in turn to serve for a month as *πρόεδροι*, and from the *πρόεδροι* was selected the *ἐπιστάτης*. At Cyzicus similarly the tribes served for monthly periods as *πρυτάνεις*, and at Carystus the council was divided into twelve groups of *πρόβουλοι*, who evidently served for a month each, and in each group was an *ἀρχιπρόβουλος*. It may be noted that most cities preferred to change the presidency by the month, though this might involve complicated adjustments if the number of their tribes were not a factor of twelve, rather than to divide the year, as did the Athenians, into a number of presidency periods equal to the number of tribes. Allusions to presidents (known by a great variety of titles including besides those

mentioned above *προστάται, κατάλογοι* and *αἰσυμνηταί*) who served for the term of a month are fairly frequent, and many of these committees were probably subdivisions of the council, as were clearly *οἱ ἐπιμήριοι τῆς βουλῆς* at Smyrna and Lampsacus.²¹

In other cities, however, the principal magistrates had at least a concurrent power of putting motions on the agenda and presiding. In Thessaly for instance the *tagi*, jointly or severally, presided at many, but not all, assemblies of the people. In the Aeolian cities the *strategi* both tabled motions and presided in the assembly, but not, it would appear, in the council. In other cities, Iasus for instance and Rhodes, the presidency both of the council and assembly was vested in a board of magistrates; this system doubtless prevailed, though definite evidence is lacking, in many cities where the principal magistrates bore such titles as *prytaneis*, *probuli* or *proedri*, which mean presidents. Yet larger powers were given to the executive in the cities of the Achaean league, where every proposal had to be approved by the magistrates before it could be submitted to the council and people. A similar practice is implied in Crete and in Lycia by the formula of the decrees, which was 'it was enacted by the magistrates and people'.²²

These last provisions had a distinctly oligarchic trend, for though in theory there might be no restriction of birth or wealth to debar the humblest from office, in fact persons of standing and substance tended always to be elected. This tendency had been prevalent even in fifth- and fourth-century Athens; the reasons seem to have been partly that for elections the peasantry, always a conservative body, came into town and voted, and partly that even the city proletariat, though they might be persuaded by the arguments of a humble orator and frame policy accordingly, did not like to entrust responsibility to such persons—nor, it may be noted, were they very willing to take it.

This tendency grew in strength during the Hellenistic period, and for new reasons. In foreign politics the most important persons with whom the cities had to deal were the kings and their ministers and later Roman magistrates. All these were much more likely to treat with respect citizens of wealth and standing with whom they had a natural fellow feeling, than plebeian demagogues. And in the second place the people liked magistrates both willing and able to spend. The standard of living was rising throughout the Hellenistic age; cities were ambitious to beautify their public buildings, to raise the level of education in

their gymnasia, to ensure their food supply more adequately and to make their festivals more numerous and more magnificent. Yet at the same time they had less money to spend on these objects. Cities subject to kings had to pay a large proportion of their taxes into the royal exchequer and those that kept their independence had to maintain more expensive military and naval establishments than had been necessary in the past. The obvious solution, heavy taxation of the rich, was in practice not feasible. The upper classes were, whatever professions might be made to the contrary, under the protection of the kings; the League of Corinth even had a specific clause whereby the royal troops could intervene to check anything savouring of a social revolution—redistribution of land, confiscation of property, remission of debts, or freeing of slaves, and Antigonus' League seems to have had a similar clause. A certain amount was it is true raised by taxation, and more by voluntary subscription. But on the whole the most common solution was a tacit convention whereby the people elected rich men to magistracies, and they as magistrates contributed freely to the public services under their charge.²³

A result of this tendency was that the old distinction between magistracies and liturgies became blurred. In the old days at Athens a magistrate was either elected or chosen by lot (from voluntary candidates) and had no expenses but might on the contrary draw pay; liturgies were imposed compulsorily by a magistrate on wealthy persons whose whole duty was to spend money. The liturgies were abolished at Athens by Demetrius of Phalerum, who created elective magistrates to fulfil their functions and gave assistance to these new magistrates from public funds. Some such system seems to have prevailed generally in the Hellenistic world. The term liturgy continued to be used, but it apparently ceased to bear any technical meaning, denoting merely minor offices, and posts such as the gymnasiarchy, which had been liturgies, were everywhere elective. Legally therefore it would seem that compulsory spending ceased. On the other hand a moral obligation to spend rested not only on the magistracies which had formerly been liturgies but on all alike.²⁴

When times were good no difficulty was found in filling the magistracies. But in times of stress citizens hesitated to offer themselves as candidates. Unessential offices were in such cases often left unfilled; the ornamental eponymous stephanephory at Miletus and Priene for instance, which by custom involved a vast expense on public entertainments, was in many years held by the

tutelary god of the city or a tribal hero. How essential offices were filled in difficult times is not clear. The procedure of election was that names were proposed; the persons proposed might then either accept or refuse nomination; and if more than one candidate stood, a vote was taken; but even after election a magistrate might refuse office, though in this case he had to make an affidavit, adducing some reasonable cause. There seems little room for compulsion in this procedure, but compulsion was apparently sometimes exercised: in the sympolity between Stiris and Medeon it is decreed that citizens of the former city who have already held office shall not be compelled to hold office in the latter—the phrase used (*τὰς ἀρχὰς λειτουργεῖν*) is an interesting revelation of the merging of magistracy and liturgy.²⁵

Democracy was then in the Hellenistic age tempered by a convention that the rich should have a virtual monopoly of office, provided that they paid for it liberally. And on the whole the compromise seems to have worked very well. The sanguinary class war which was the curse of Greek politics in the fifth century died down, and the upper classes fulfilled their part of the bargain in no grudging spirit. A very strong sense of civic obligation grew up among them, and they served their cities loyally both with their persons and their purses, as countless inscriptions testify.

But the inscriptions reveal another and less desirable result of the compromise. More and more frequently as time goes on motions in the assembly are proposed not by an individual but either by the presiding committee of the council or by a board or boards of magistrates or by both jointly. In some cities this practice is so uniform that it has been conjectured that only these bodies had the right of proposing motions. At Pergamum for instance the *strategi* (who were incidentally appointed by the kings) invariably—with one exception, the earliest decree but one extant—propose; and it has been suggested that the king thus possessed an indirect veto on the acts of the assembly. At Erythrae also the same combination of boards—the *strategi*, the *exetastae* (a financial office) and the *prytaneis* (probably the presiding committee of the council)—bring forward all the decrees extant save one, which is of early date. In these two cases the exceptions may be explained by their date: the rule was not yet absolute in early times. But in many cities a board normally proposes, but individuals occasionally, and no chronological sequence can be established. The phenomenon is therefore

perhaps better to be explained as the result not of a definite legal restriction but of custom. If so it indicates that public interest in politics was waning. The ordinary member of the council no longer liked to face the responsibility either of bringing forward motions of his own or of sponsoring those of other citizens. He preferred to leave the initiative and the responsibility to 'the government'. This meant that in effect the control of policy was left in the hands of the upper classes.²⁶

CHAPTER XI

THE ROMAN AGE

DEMOCRACY had in these ways ceased by the beginning of the second century B.C. to be a living reality, but it remained a popular ideal. No government, however oligarchic, would confess to the hateful title of oligarchy, or even to the more respectable name of aristocracy, and the term democracy came to be watered down so that it meant little more than constitutional republican government. The cities were thus able to welcome the Romans as champions of democracy without any misgivings, despite the tendency of the Romans to favour aristocracy. Lampsacus in appealing for Roman aid against Antiochus III uses the familiar slogan of freedom and democracy, and more curiously the cities freed from Philip V by Rome pointedly call themselves free and democratic, though as a matter of fact they had recently had definitely timocratic constitutions imposed upon them.²⁷

The Roman method of controlling cities was quite frankly to place the power in the hands of the well-to-do. Flaminius after the defeat of Philip V established a property qualification for councillors and jurors in Thessaly, and after the destruction of Corinth the tenure of magistracies was similarly restricted in the Achaean cities. For the other provinces we have no evidence, but there can be no doubt that this rule was universal. In the Achaean cities the Romans seem to have judged that no other constitutional changes were necessary. The structure of the council remained unaltered, though membership, being technically a magistracy, was presumably confined to the rich: an inscription dating from shortly after the settlement of 146 B.C. implies that the council of Dyme was still an annually changing body. The Roman government probably relied on the magistrates, who under the already existing rules of procedure had the power to disallow legislation, and it appears to have given similar powers to the magistrates in other Greek cities: in Boeotia the formula 'it was enacted by the magistrates and council and people' makes its first appearance in the middle of the second century B.C.²⁸

Later Roman policy underwent a change. In Asia the powers

of the magistrates do not seem, at first at any rate, to have been enlarged, but the character of the council had already by Cicero's day been transformed: the members now sat for life unless expelled for misconduct. Rome was tending to assimilate the councils of Greek democracies to the model of her own senate, but it is not certain that as yet she had introduced her own system of recruiting new members. Election is the term still used by Hadrian for the appointment of an Ephesian councillor, and it may be that in Asia, as in Sicily, members of the city council were elected by the people. The final step was taken by Pompey. We know, thanks to Pliny's letters to Trajan, much of the constitutional scheme which he established in the cities of Bithynia. Here the system was quite Roman. Censors enrolled the council at intervals; their choice was limited by various rules—there was for instance a minimum age and *ex-magistrates* had a right to a seat; and members once enrolled could not be removed from the list except for certain specified causes. Pompey no doubt applied similar rules in the other provinces he annexed, and Cato followed his example in Cyprus, where an inscription records that a citizen of Citium 'held the censorship of the council'. The same policy was maintained under the principate; in Galatia, annexed in 25 B.C., officers styled enrollers of the council (*βουλόγραφοι*) are found.²⁹

The policy of giving the power to the upper classes was thus achieved by two principal measures. The one, the property qualification for office, probably did not actually make much difference. It gave legal sanction to what was already the general practice, making illegal for the future what had in the past been theoretically possible—that the people might elect to office radically minded politicians of humble station. Perhaps also it affected the composition of the city councils, since hitherto these would not have been completely dominated by the well-to-do. The second measure was far more revolutionary in its effects. The council was already vested with very wide powers, including a potential veto on the proceedings of the assembly. When it came to be no longer a mere committee of the assembly, renewed at frequent intervals and responsible to the popular courts for its acts, but a permanent and therefore irresponsible body, it inevitably became the governing body of the city.

Apart from these innovations the formal constitution of the cities seems to have suffered little change throughout the principate. In the existing cities the people continued to be divided

into tribes, many of which were given names commemorating the imperial families. In newly created or reorganized cities also a tribal division was introduced. This was normally on a local basis; at Philippopolis, for instance, after Trajan's reorganization of Thrace, the tribes represented blocks of territory, each comprising a number of comarchies or groups of villages, and when the second instalment of civic autonomy was granted by Severus to Egypt, the wards of each metropolis were grouped into tribes, which were in an unimaginatively practical spirit given numbers instead of names. In the earlier Roman colonies the population was divided into wards (*vici*), which sometimes were given names recalling the city of Rome, sometimes merely numbered; in later grants of colonial status the original organization of the community was preserved though the tribes might be renamed. At Palmyra and perhaps also at Bostra the tribes of the city were by exception genuine tribes, the several clans who united to form these cities thus retaining their corporate existence.³⁰

Citizenship was, it would seem, based on the same general principles as before, but there is no more record of general interchange of citizenship between cities (isopolity), and some restrictions were placed on the grant of citizenship to individuals. At Alexandria such grants were the prerogative of the emperor, and in Bithynia under the Pompeian law the cities were forbidden to confer their citizenship on one another's citizens; this law was however by Pliny's day a dead letter, and in fact double or multiple citizenship was not uncommon throughout the east. Roman citizenship was under the principate compatible with local citizenship, whose obligations were unaffected by it.³¹

Freedmen apparently continued to remain outside the citizen body. The Ephesians to strengthen themselves against Mithridates gave the citizenship to the descendants of their freedmen; freedmen of Alexandrians are mentioned in the *Gnomon* as a separate class; and at Sillyum they are distinguished from citizens in a second-century inscription. No doubt such other sections of the population as had hitherto been excluded from the citizenship remained excluded, and in newly created or augmented cities a similar disfranchised class seems sometimes to have been created. At Prusias ad Hypium a distinction is drawn between 'those on the register' and 'those who inhabit the rural district': the latter are perhaps the Bithynian peasants who cultivated the royal lands assigned by Pompey to the city territory. In Egypt the citizenship of the metropoleis was confined to a

hereditary caste which apparently comprised the Hellenized stratum of the urban population.³²

The planting of Roman colonies may also have sometimes created a subject class. This result would naturally follow when a colony was founded in an area which had hitherto lacked self-government or where the population was hostile; in such cases the old inhabitants would certainly have become subjects of the colony. But when colonists were planted in a city which had deserved no punishment, it is difficult to believe that the citizens were disfranchised. Theoretically two alternatives are possible. The inhabitants of the city might be granted the Roman citizenship and enrolled in the colony. For this there is no evidence, but it is not improbable that it was often done in the later foundations, when colonial status was beginning to be granted to Greek cities without colonization. In the earlier foundations, however, the Roman settlers certainly formed a separate body; when they were massacred at Heraclea Pontica, the colony ceased to exist and the city reverted to its previous status. The facts rather suggest the second alternative, that the old city continued to exist side by side with the colony. There is no evidence for such double communities in the east, where the coinage of the city invariably ceases when that of the colony begins, but it may be that the Greek cities continued to exist though subject to the colonies and therefore deprived of the right of coinage.³³

The whole concept of local citizenship was revolutionized by the *Constitutio Antoniniana* of A.D. 212, whereby all free inhabitants of the empire were given the Roman citizenship. The *cives* of the several cities thereby became *municipes*, and local citizenship was converted into *origo*. Under the rules governing this concept, legitimate children acquired the *origo* of their father, illegitimate that of their mother, freedmen that of their patron. It is probable that the measure was also made retrospective, and that all persons (except *dediticii*) who had hitherto lacked local citizenship acquired the *origo* of their domicile. Henceforth therefore every free inhabitant of the Roman empire was the *municipes* of some city except for the *dediticii*. These were probably the inhabitants of directly administered areas, and seem to have included the Egyptians, who remained excluded from citizen registers of the metropoleis.³⁴

Formal restriction of political rights to a limited section of the population does not—apart from the universal property qualification for office—seem to have been usual. Cases are however

known. At Tarsus a fee of 500 drachmae was required for the exercise of political rights, and as a result the great mass of the industrial proletariat who worked in the linen mills were in effect disfranchised. This seems, however, to have been a local rule and perhaps of pre-Roman origin. In Egypt, both at Alexandria and in the metropoleis, the magistracies were reserved by Augustus to a select hereditary class, called in the latter 'the members of the gymnasium'. At Sillyum and at Poglea in Pisidia a distinction is drawn between members of the assembly and mere citizens. Since both cities belonged to the original province of Galatia, it is possible that this distinction reflects a provision of the *lex provinciae*, in which case Augustus here also went one step farther than the republican government in applying timocratic principles; for no doubt there was a property qualification for membership of the assembly.³⁵

Of the magistracies there is little to say. The eponymous magistrates and the executive boards continued for the most part to be known by their old names, and many picturesque titles survived to a late date. Thus Chalcis still dated its acts by its 'commander' (*ἡγεμῶν*) in the third century A.D., and Cyzicus continued under the principate to name the year after its 'master of the horse' (*ἵππαρχος*), Samothrace and Heraclea Pontica after their 'kings', Cos after its 'monarch'. Caracalla and Severus Alexander held the demiurgate at Anazarbus and Tarsus, and in Aeolis and Ionia the ancient eponymous office of *prytanis* survived, though it tended to be superseded by that of *stephanephorus*, which continued its triumphant career during the Roman period, spreading over the islands of the Aegean and even penetrating to Boeotia, where hitherto the rather colourless title of *ἀρχων* had been eponymous. Many cities on coming under Roman rule established a priesthood of Rome, or later of the emperor, which either superseded the old eponymous office or was combined with it or existed side by side with it. Now that the provision of feasts and entertainments was one of the principal functions of the magistrates, ornamental offices which existed for that end alone tended to be multiplied. The executive boards on the other hand became less prominent; their principal field of activity had been military and foreign affairs, and here there was nothing to be done. In the newly created Egyptian cities there was no separate executive magistracy, the several departmental officers forming a board which fulfilled its functions.³⁶

Magistrates continued, technically at any rate, to be elected by

the people, and the term of office was still normally one year, though offices involving heavy expense, such as the gymnasiarchy, were often held for shorter periods—six, four, or three months. 'Perpetual' (αἰώνιος) magistrates are indeed not infrequently recorded, but the title was honorary only, denoting that its holder had provided a perpetual endowment for the office. The qualification 'for life' (διὰ βίου) seems on the other hand to bear its literal meaning. It is generally applied to agonothetes and to priests, and in both cases the further qualification 'by hereditary right' (διὰ γένους) is sometimes added. The priesthoods were often hereditary offices of immemorial antiquity, but sometimes life tenure or even the hereditary right to a priesthood was granted to a citizen who founded a new cult or simply endowed an old one. Similarly, a benefactor who endowed new games was often rewarded with—or himself stipulated for—the privilege of himself being their agonothete and handing on the office to his descendants. Some priesthoods were still sold by auction in the Roman age, though the practice does not seem to have been so common as in earlier times. Women, now that ability to spend was the principal qualification for office, not infrequently held magistracies, particularly those of a more ornamental character.³⁷

The distinction between magistracies and liturgies remains almost as obscure as before. The line drawn between them varied, we know, in different cities, the office of treasurer, for instance, being reckoned in some a magistracy and in others a liturgy. But a definite line must have been drawn, for constitutionally the distinction was of a certain importance: in many cities a magistracy entitled the holder to a seat in the council, while a liturgy did not. Liturgies in general were deemed less honourable, and immunity from them was a privilege, whereas exclusion from magistracies was a penalty. Thus a man who became a Roman senator was deemed to cease to be a citizen as regards liturgies, but not as regards magistracies, and contrariwise an accused person, a man condemned for a scandalous offence, or a public debtor, was excluded from being a magistrate but might hold liturgies. Similarly, it is probable that before the Constitutio Antoniniana only citizens could be magistrates, while liturgies were imposed on all residents: the Jews complained that in Greek cities they were compelled to take part in liturgies. After the Constitutio Antoniniana this last distinction lapsed: though the city of his *origo* had a prior claim on his services,

a man might, and indeed must, hold magistracies in the city in which he was domiciled. The other distinctions had likewise ceased to be enforced, since a magistracy was by now as much to be avoided as a liturgy. By the third century there seems to have been no distinction between magistracies and liturgies in the method of appointment, and it is possible that there never had been any. *Liturgies were probably always like magistracies elective; and magistracies from the beginning might be, as in practice they later generally became, like liturgies compulsory.*³⁸

The council was in most cities the element of the constitution most affected by the Roman supremacy. In Greece it is possible that it continued even under the principate to be an annually changing body. An inscription from Carystus, which is not known to have been a free city, reveals that in Hadrian's reign the council was still chosen by lot each year: it is worthy of note that the gerusia of Sparta was under the principate, in defiance of the Lycurgan constitution, an annual body. Some of the free cities of Asia also retained councils of the old democratic type; those of Stratonicea and Rhodes still changed every six months. All councils seem however by the end of the third century to have become permanent bodies: no doubt it gradually became customary to re-elect the same members, and eventually the annual election became purely formal.³⁹

Elsewhere the council was in theory as well as in practice a permanent body, but even so it retained some features reminiscent of its past. It was in the first place as a rule far larger than the *ordo* of a western city; at Ephesus it numbered 450, at Oenoanda 500, at Tiberias and in most Syrian cities 600. In the second place it was still divided into tribes. There is evidence for this fact at Laodicea and perhaps Eumeneia in Phrygia and at Bostra, and it is significant that the new councils introduced into the Egyptian metropoleis by Septimius Severus had a tribal division: the arrangement must still have been normal in the Greek world at the very end of the second century. There would, it may be noted, be no great difficulty in maintaining the balance of the tribes on a permanent council. Where, as probably in Asia, vacancies were filled by popular election, only candidates of the tribe of the deceased would be eligible. Where as in Bithynia and elsewhere censors enrolled the council their choice was to some extent limited by the right of ex-magistrates to a seat, but it must be remembered that the boards of magistrates were often elected one from each tribe, and in any case many more vacancies

must have occurred on so large a body as a Greek council than ex-magistrates could fill.⁴⁰

The assembly was still in theory the sovereign body, electing the magistrates and passing decrees. The former process was, it is true, as will be explained later, gradually reduced to the acclamation of a list of candidates presented by the council, and the latter amounted to no more than ratifying the council's resolutions. But the assent of the people was still technically necessary for the enactment of any decree which was not a matter of mere administrative routine. Resolutions of the council alone are relatively rare, and if some of them deal with matters of practical importance, they are matters which had always been within the council's competence. The decree of the council of Palmyra on the tariff, for instance, did not establish a new tax but merely regulated one which already existed; and finance had always been part of the council's business. And the decree of the council of Hierapolis on the misconduct of police officers merely defined the penalties to which they were liable; here again the council had always exercised a disciplinary control over magistrates. Decrees of the council and people are on the other hand very frequently of no practical importance: the vast majority are grants of honours. But some deal with serious topics, such as gifts of immunity or of pensions, which were probably not valid without the assent of the people; and several are concerned with finance.⁴¹

As time went on the assent of the people became more and more formal, and eventually, the assembly ceased to meet. But the process of decay was slow. Plutarch speaks as if oratory still flourished in the assemblies of the Greek cities in his day, and it is easy to believe that in an age so passionately devoted to rhetoric so admirable an opportunity for its display was not neglected. An inscription from Chalcis in Euboea gives a report of an assembly held in the third century. 'Novius Lysanias, *strategus* for the second time, said: "You do well in rewarding good men and in conferring honours not only on themselves but on their children; for only thus do we encourage others to do the like. This decree has already been passed by the council. If you also agree, hold up your hands." The people shouted: "Agreed."

The forms of popular government might be expected to linger longest in Greece, their homeland, but curiously enough the latest record that we possess of a meeting of the assembly comes from

a country where self-government was not introduced till it had ceased to be democratic. A papyrus has preserved the official minutes of an assembly of the people held at Oxyrhynchus at the very end of the third century. The proceedings consist for the most part of frequently repeated loyal acclamations, but the gist of the matter is that the people demand that a decree be passed that very day in honour of the *prytanis*, who is they assert worthy of many decrees. The *prytanis* is, however, bound to refuse the honour: 'I welcome the honour from you and am deeply pleased at it; but I beg that such testifications may be postponed to a lawful occasion, when you may confer them securely and I may receive them without danger.' The syndic—the legal adviser to the city—then proposes that the matter be referred to the council. From this it would appear not only that the assembly really did meet to pass honorary decrees even in third-century Egypt, but that it sometimes had ideas of its own: in this case the council had apparently not passed a resolution to honour the *prytanis*, and the demand of the people for a decree was therefore unconstitutional.⁴²

It is a much vexed question whether under Roman rule the initiative in legislation came to be confined in Greek cities as in Latin to the magistrates. Where any restriction of this type already existed the Roman government certainly maintained it. It has already been mentioned that in the Achaean league, where it was already the rule that proposals had to be sanctioned by the magistrates before they were presented to the assembly, decrees continue under Roman rule to be enacted by the magistrates (and council) and people. In Crete also the old formula, 'it pleased the *cosmi* and the people', persists in the Roman period. In Greece the Achaean system was extended, apparently by the Roman government, to other groups of cities; the Achaean form of decree, as noted above, appears in Boeotia from the middle of the second century B.C. Outside these areas the magistrates are included in the actual formula of enactment only in the metropoleis of Egypt, where no council existed and the magistrates had to fulfil its functions, and in two cities of Amorgos, Minoa and Aegiale; here the *strategi*, with whom are later associated the *decaproti*, are definitely stated to possess 'the authority of *prytaneis*', which perhaps is a translation of *ius agendi cum populo*.⁴³

In the republican period there certainly was no such restrictive rule in the cities of Asia. Decrees are still moved by non-official

persons at Priene and at Ephesus after they had become subject cities. Under the principate the formal mover of a decree, if put on record at all, is almost invariably a magistrate or group of magistrates, and private members of the council are stated merely to 'introduce the proposal' and to 'request a vote' on it, processes which were apparently preliminary to the formal motion: in a number of cases the introducer and his seconder, if he may be so called, are alone recorded, but in these it is probably assumed that the magistrates moved. Decrees of the people moved by private persons are recorded only at Athens and Delphi, both free cities. Resolutions of the council are proposed by unofficial members at Ephesus and Carystus, which were not free cities; but it is questionable whether these are relevant to the issue. The evidence thus points strongly to the conclusion that it was the universal practice, outside a few free cities where democratic tradition was strong, that magistrates should propose decrees, and that private members of the council should confine themselves to introducing proposals. This uniformity of practice, however, hardly justifies the assumption that magistrates alone had the right of moving decrees; if they had possessed such a right the fact would have been expressed, as it was in the cities of Amorgos, by a change in the formula of enactment.⁴⁴

It is rarely recorded in the Roman period who presided in the council or the assembly. In a few old-fashioned cities, such as Athens and Cyzicus, the old formulae, stating which tribe of the council was presiding and the name of its foreman, still survive under the principate. These were probably, however, exceptional cases, and in general no doubt the magistrates took the chair. In many cities, such as Rhodes, this had always been the rule. In Macedonia there is evidence that the politarchs summoned the council in the Roman period. Many cities of Asia possessed magistrates styled *bularchs* during the principate; nothing is known of them save that they were annual, but their title implies that they presided in the council, and no doubt, according to the usual Greek practice, in the assembly also. When councils were instituted in the Egyptian metropoleis a new magistrate with the title of *prytanis* was created to preside over them; the office was annual and elective.⁴⁵

To turn from formal rules to realities, one of the most important changes which took place under Roman rule was the formation of a curial class, consisting of members of the city council with their families, sharply distinguished socially and legally from

commoners or plebeians. A sign of the social distinction is that, when distributions of money were made by public-spirited magistrates or from the proceeds of benefactions, councillors often received a substantially larger sum than commoners. In the public law of the empire also city councillors and their families enjoyed certain privileges. They were not subject to the more degrading punishments of flogging or hard labour in the mines, and if apprehended for a crime involving the death penalty, could not be tried and executed by the provincial governor; their cases had to be sent up to the emperor for decision. Most of these legal distinctions are first observable in Hadrian's reign, and it may be presumed that by that time the social stratification was clearly marked.⁴⁶

An inscription which draws a distinction between plebeian and curial magistracies indicates that, though no such rigid *cursus honorum* as existed in the west ever established itself in the east, nevertheless the dictum of Paulus, that plebeians are forbidden to occupy the magistracies of decurions, applied to Greek as well as to Latin cities. The higher offices were reserved for persons already members of the council; only the minor offices were accessible to commoners. The line seems to have been drawn at different levels in different cities—the prefect of Egypt had to ask the representatives of the council of Arsinoe whether in their city councillors or commoners are appointed to the office of *cosmete*—and was no doubt fixed by custom, but it was none the less rigidly binding. A similar distinction was also drawn between curial and plebeian liturgies, the former being esteemed honourable if expensive, the latter less costly but menial.⁴⁷

The curial class was primarily determined by wealth. There was in the first place the statutory property qualification. This, however, was probably not very high and many well-to-do families must have possessed it, at any rate in the prosperous days of the early principate, without holding curial rank. A more severe test was the scale of expenditure on public purposes demanded of a local politician; this must have debarred many men in moderate circumstances from aspiring to office. The standard of wealth and of expenditure varied of course enormously in different cities, but as a rule curial rank was confined to the richest citizens, though once again within the council of any city there were great differences between the wealthiest and poorest members.⁴⁸

The curial class tended as time went on to become hereditary. As early as Trajan's reign this tendency was strong in Bithynia:

Pliny, finding that the cities had some difficulty in filling their councils, advocated lowering the minimum age of entrance rather than admitting commoners. The hereditary character of the curial aristocracy is frequently emphasized in inscriptions, which laud the ancestral patriotism of prominent citizens. It was not of course absolute. Many men of moderate means no doubt neglected Plutarch's advice to them—'there is nothing ignoble or mean in acknowledging your poverty and standing out from the munificence of the wealthy instead of making yourself both pitiful and ridiculous by borrowing for your liturgies'—and even wealthy men like Dio's grandfather at Prusa could easily dissipate their ancestral fortunes and unlike him not have the enterprise to rebuild them but end their days, as did Julius Piso of Amisus, on a pension granted by the city that they had enriched. Old families thus sometimes became impoverished and dropped out, and new families which acquired wealth came within the charmed circle. But until the economic crisis of the late third century at any rate *there seems to have been little fresh blood infused into the curial class.*⁴⁹

A second change which took place concurrently with that already described was the virtual transfer of the election of magistrates from the people to the council. The cause of this transfer was in the ultimate analysis the growing aversion of the upper classes from taking office. This again was a tendency which did not operate uniformly everywhere or follow an uninterrupted line of development in time. It was due in part to heavy financial burdens associated with office, burdens which tended to increase as the standard of munificence expected by the public rose. This cause operated most strongly in places which were poorly endowed with public revenues and therefore depended more on supplementary expenditure by the magistrates; an extreme case was Egypt, where the metropoleis had practically no financial resources. In old cities with ample endowments magistrates might have to spend little, and might indeed find opportunities of filling their own pockets; an inscription of the reign of Claudius reveals how at Ephesus the vast wealth of Artemis found its way, by means of corrupt bargains with the priests appointed, into the hands of the city government, and to judge by Plutarch's tone peculation was by no means unknown in second-century Greece. The strength of this cause also varied with the prosperity of the upper classes, which naturally differed from region to region—there is evidence of great financial embarrassment in Greece in

the early principate—and fluctuated from time to time. There was throughout the eastern provinces much distress under the later Republic, followed by complete exhaustion during the civil wars. With the principate more prosperous times began, though famines and frontier wars, with their accompanying requisitions, caused local distress from time to time, until in the latter part of the second century prosperity began to wane generally.⁵⁰

A less easily discernible but probably more important cause of the growing unwillingness to take office was the flagging interest in local politics. Of the two main subjects which had occupied politicians in the past, foreign policy had ceased to exist ever since the Roman empire had destroyed its last effective rivals, and the class war had been settled once for all by the strong hand of Rome. As Plutarch regretfully remarks, 'Now that politics comprise neither leadership in wars nor the overthrow of tyrannies nor diplomacy, what opening can a man find for a distinguished and brilliant political career?' Local politics had become a rather futile make-believe in which no important question could ever be raised, and it is little wonder that the upper classes tended to lose interest in them. It had been worth their while to spend money in order to secure their own dominance, but now that their position was assured by an outside power, the heavy demand on their purses made by the political game was an irritating nuisance.⁵¹

The tradition of local patriotism indeed maintained itself for a surprisingly long period, all things considered. Men still in the third century A.D. took pride in their cities, and the great families still in many cases felt the traditional obligation to pay for their position by lavish expenditure, and still appreciated the cheers of their fellow citizens and the statues and inscriptions which were the rewards of their public spirit. But the spirit of politics had changed. Office was no longer so much an honour to be keenly contested as an obligation which should be loyally fulfilled, but might by less public-spirited persons be shirked: the recurring phrase in the inscriptions, 'having fulfilled every magistracy and liturgy', reflects the former spirit, the latter is naturally not recorded on stone, but is revealed by the legal texts.⁵²

In these circumstances a man might be willing to undertake the regular series of posts which his rank and wealth demanded of him, but there would be no competition for office. The members of the local aristocracy would therefore arrange among themselves who was to hold which magistracy, and one candidate would be presented to the people for each vacancy. The machinery of

election was, as recorded above, first the proposal of names (*προβολή*) and then a vote (*χειροτονία*) between them in the assembly. The latter process, if there was one name only, would become a mere formality, and was no doubt often dropped in the course of time; but even in Egypt, where elections ceased very early to be a reality, 'the bystanders from the city' of Hermopolis still shouted 'let Achilles be crowned to the office of cosmete' in A.D. 192, and elsewhere a formal acclamation of the candidate may have lasted longer.

The proposal of candidates could apparently in Athenian constitutional law take place either in the council or in the assembly: the election of magistrates, like every act of the assembly, required a preliminary resolution of the council, which might include a list of candidates submitted by the council, and additions to this list might be suggested in the assembly. In later practice, it would seem, the council always submitted a complete list, and no additions to it were ever made. Thus in effect the resolution of the council became the act of election, and it is sometimes spoken of as such by the early third-century lawyers and in papyri of similar date. The actual proceedings in council, however, as revealed by the papyri and the legal texts, are confined to the proposal of names.⁵³

The recruitment of the council itself followed a similar course of development. Where, as apparently in Asia, vacancies were filled by popular election, the procedure would be precisely similar to that of electing magistrates: the council would draw up a list of candidates for ratification by the people. Hadrian, when supporting the application of his friend Erastus for a seat on the council of Ephesus, addresses himself to the magistrates and council only, ignoring the people: popular election had evidently already become a formality. Where, as perhaps happened in Achaëa, the council was appointed annually by lot, the existing council could easily arrange who should offer themselves for the next year. In provinces in which the councils were enrolled by censors it is more difficult to see how the development occurred, but it would seem that the censors failed to do their duty and were eventually abolished. An early third-century inscription from Ancyra records that a censor held an enrolment of the council, which had been omitted for many years. If the council had meanwhile been supplemented only by ex-magistrates its numbers would have gradually dwindled, and eventually nomination by the council must have been introduced to keep up numbers. The

city council was, it would appear, normally a co-optative body by the end of the second century, for the new councils created in Egypt at that time chose their own new members.⁵⁴

The next logical stage in the degeneration of civic politics came when there was no longer a sufficient number of candidates to fill vacancies. It is impossible to put a date to this stage any more than to the others which logically preceded it, since the phenomenon might occur in any time of depression, and might be more prevalent in some regions than in others. It has already been recorded that eponymous offices were at times filled by a god in Hellenistic times: this phenomenon recurs under the rule of the Roman republic and occasionally under the principate. Some difficulty was found in filling essential offices in Greece during the early principate. It is not recorded in these cases that compulsion had to be employed to secure a supply of magistrates, but in Egypt we are told that the wealthy Lampon was compelled to undertake the gymnasiarchy at Alexandria in the reign of Tiberius, and in a decree of the province of Asia dating from the reign of Augustus there is a mysterious allusion to appeals in connexion with elections which may indicate that candidates were forced to stand against their will. On the whole, however, it would seem that after the effects of the civil wars had worn off there was a sufficient supply of voluntary candidates till the latter part of the second century, when imperial legislation on the subject becomes common, and inscriptions and papyri begin to praise magistrates for serving of their own choice (*αὐθαίρετοι*) or spontaneously (*ἐκούσιοι*).⁵⁵

Compulsion was applied by the process of nomination (*ὀνομασία*), which must be carefully distinguished from proposal (*προβολή*). A man proposed might refuse, but a man nominated must serve unless he could claim legal exemption, or prove that his nominator was actuated by malice, indicating another more suitable candidate. The legal exemptions are complicated and confused. The principal classes which had immunity were the following. Roman senators and their descendants for three generations ceased to belong to their native cities as regarded liturgies; they could hold magistracies but it may be doubted if it was easy to compel them to accept them. Persons absent on the service of the state were exempt from all claims; this elastic phrase included not only senatorial and equestrian officials, but members of their staff (*comites*), and also soldiers. Veterans enjoyed a plenary exemption for life from the reign of Severus;

they had previously possessed certain privileges but their precise character is obscure. Farmers of state revenues and cultivators of state lands, whose property was pledged to the *fiscus*, were not liable to civic liturgies and might indeed be forbidden to undertake them. Members of the guild of shippers engaged in transporting foodstuffs to Rome were rewarded for the risks which they undertook in this speculative and apparently not very profitable business by immunity from liturgies, which were later interpreted to include magistracies. Doctors and professors of grammar and rhetoric employed by the cities were granted immunity by Vespasian. Athletes and Dionysiac artists victorious in the sacred games already enjoyed exemption from civic liturgies in Antony's day, and the privilege still survived in a modified form under Diocletian. There were also exemptions (from liturgies only) on the score of age or number of children, and temporary exemptions for those who held or had recently held other offices in the city.⁵⁶

Those who considered themselves wrongfully nominated had to enter a legal appeal before the governor of the province within a statutory time limit, and no claim to exemption, however just, could be entertained unless such appeal was made. In default of any statutory or equitable objection to the nomination, the nominee had only one other chance of escaping, to offer to cede his property, less a competence for himself which was, it would seem, conventionally fixed at one-third, to his nominator. This cession had apparently to be approved by the governor and in the event of its being sanctioned, the nominator had to serve himself. This application of the rule of *cessio bonorum* to nomination is first mentioned under Caracalla and was finally prohibited by Diocletian.⁵⁷

To prevent frivolous nominations of men of straw it was laid down that the nominator automatically stood surety for his candidate. Nomination was thus a dangerous game to play, and there is some evidence that it was at first used sparingly and with hesitation. A document from Hermopolis dated A.D. 192 gives a vivid picture of how a magistrate was then appointed; it is not quite typical, because as yet the *metropoleis* of Egypt had no councils, but *mutatis mutandis* it illustrates what must have been happening in many cities of the empire. The principal magistrates produce one Achilles—actually before the *strategus*, in a normal city it would have been before the council. They are apparently under the impression that he has offered himself for

the office of *cosmete*, but unexpectedly he declines the honour: 'In deference to the wishes of my native city', he declares, 'I undertake the crowned office of *exegete*, on condition of contributing two talents annually and being released from the inspectorship of leased lands.' An advocate who has been briefed for the magistrates replies: 'The fortune of our lord the emperor provides magistracies in abundance and increases the prosperity of the city, as might have been expected under the auspicious government of Larcus Memor. If then Achilleus wishes to be crowned to the office of *exegete*, let him pay the entrance fee forthwith, but if not he has none the less proposed himself for the urgent vacancy in the office of *cosmete*.' Achilleus bluntly rebuffs this ironical suggestion that he might serve as *exegete* and *cosmete* at once: 'I have undertaken the office of *exegete* on condition of contributing two talents annually: I cannot manage the office of *cosmete*.' The advocate now also drops his irony: 'He ought not by undertaking the lesser office to shirk the greater.' After an irrelevant interlude, in the course of which a bystander accuses Achilleus of assault, the *cosmetes* are summoned. They explain that there is no vacancy for an *exegete* and that Achilleus' offer is therefore unconstitutional, but this hardly advances the real problem, which is to induce Achilleus to undertake the office of *cosmete*. At length one *Aspidas*, father of *Hermas* ex-*cosmete*, announces, 'I crown Achilleus to the office of *cosmete* at my own peril.' The advocate seizes on these words: 'We have the declaration of *Aspidas* that he crowns him at his own peril; and he should be crowned. Now the office is assured to the city.'⁵⁸

This kind of thing must have been happening everywhere: magistrates were bullying and prospective candidates were haggling. Often no doubt a candidate yielded to moral suasion and made a 'spontaneous' offer, in which case he bore the risks of office by himself; but sometimes, as in this case, he was obdurate, and had to be nominated by some one, who thereby became surety for him. It is clear from the scene depicted above that any citizen could nominate—*Aspidas* has no official standing in the matter—but that no one was anxious to do so, or would do so unless he had some pressing motive. *Aspidas*' motive was probably that his son though ex-*cosmete* was still making an annual contribution towards the expenses of the office, from which he might be relieved on a new appointment. Similar motives would induce magistrates in general to nominate successors for themselves, and for regular magistracies this form of nomination

(ἀντρονομασία) became the normal practice and eventually, by the middle of the third century at least, the legal rule. For posts which did not occur in a regular sequence, including membership of the council itself, this device was not applicable, and here, as we learn from the papyri, the rule was laid down that the several tribes into which the council was divided served in rotation for a year as nominators.⁵⁹

How the fully developed system worked we can see from the unfortunately fragmentary minutes of the council of Oxyrhynchus. The *prytanis* introduces the business: 'You exegetes', he says for instance, 'suggest some names', and the exegetes reply: 'Let Serenus be suggested for the office of exegete.' 'Nominate others', goes on the *prytanis*, 'so that the body of exegetes may be completed.' 'Let Ion be suggested', reply the exegetes. 'Let the other magistracies nominate also; and nominate councillors too.' The reply comes—evidently to the second appeal—from the member of the third tribe. At intervals the process is interrupted by bouts of haggling. A certain Ptolemy, the high priest, has been nominated by the officiating tribe to the post of public banker. He protests: 'I beseech you, I cannot; I am a man of moderate means; I live with my father.' The *prytanis* hounds on the nominators: 'Ptolemy still needs pressure from you; by himself he shrinks from so great a liturgy.' Another councillor, Eudæmon the exegete, speaks up for Ptolemy: 'Ptolemy is a man of moderate means and cannot support the burden.' Ptolemy reiterates his plea: 'The liturgy is beyond my strength, I beseech you. I cannot undertake two liturgies at the same time.' The council meanwhile shouts: 'Upright loyal Ptolemy!' 'Ptolemy will not refuse his tribe!' And eventually Ptolemy seems to have yielded.⁶⁰

This haggling, it may be noted, is now no longer directed to extorting a 'spontaneous' candidature, which seems to have been beyond the wildest dreams of the council, but to secure the consent of the nominee: if he consented he forfeited his right to appeal, and this would save the council much trouble. But despite his consent he was nominated and his nominator was thus surety for him. The syndic, or legal adviser of the council, is careful to get the minutes precise on this vital point. After an undisputed nomination of new members of the council he states: 'Those who were nominated just now were nominated by Pheleas and Heraclidion.' The council protests that they were nominated by the whole tribe and to make assurance doubly sure proceeds to acclaim its members, with their property, individually: 'Loyal,

upright Horion, landowner at Nesmeimi! Loyal, upright Leonides, landowner at Dositheus!', and so forth.⁶¹

If the appropriate persons refused to nominate an awkward situation arose. The ultimate responsibility lay with the president of the council, and he might himself make a nomination. But this would involve his standing surety and he was better advised to report the matter to the provincial governor. We possess a letter from the *prytanis* of Oxyrhynchus reporting such a crisis to the prefect of Egypt. The office of eutheniarch and *agoranomus* had of late years been suspended, and had recently been revived. There being no ex-eutheniarchs or ex-*agoranomi* the gymnasiarchs had been ordered to nominate, but had revolted at the additional burden. They had nominated only two out of the three candidates required, and these had after protest eventually consented to serve for eight months of the year. The *prytanis* now appeals to the prefect to take steps which are unfortunately not on record. In a later case, also concerned with the agoranomy of Oxyrhynchus, an *agoranomus* is haled before the prefect, and obliged to nominate a successor in his presence. It might also happen that the provincial governor would send orders to the council to nominate a person named, or even himself attend a session of the council and put forward a name: he of course did not in such cases stand surety, being deemed merely to be giving advice, on which the appropriate persons acted.⁶²

Evasion of office was no doubt very often due to genuine poverty. It is clear that no one would resort to *cessio bonorum* unless he calculated that the expense of office would amount to not less than two-thirds of his property—though no doubt more than the legal third could be saved with the help of an ingenious lawyer. Persons also sometimes absconded when nominated to office; if however they succeeded in converting their property into cash and taking it with them, this was no very great sacrifice. Public office must indeed have been a heavy drain on the poorer councillors. But unwillingness to spend money is not a peculiarity of the poor, and there is evidence that the rich were often as reluctant to take office. It had for instance been laid down that magistracies and liturgies should be undertaken in due order according to seniority of membership in the council. Antoninus Pius had to reprove one city for abusing this rule, designed to secure an equitable distribution of burdens: the rich members, he complained, would only take their exact share of offices and compelled the poor councillors to fulfil the same number.⁶³

Though every effort was made to evade magistracies and liturgies, the rank of councillor seems still to have been valued in the third century. An edict of Caracalla makes expulsion from the council and reduction to a dishonourable station the penalty for assault or abusive language towards the president or a fellow member, and the lawyers of the same period regard deprivation of curial status as a severe punishment. The reason for this was probably in part the social prestige enjoyed by councillors, but more their legal privileges, which had no doubt been originally granted as a compensation for the burdens of curial status and a bait to tempt men into the councils, and became progressively more valuable as the arbitrary violence of the imperial officials increased. But though members of the curial class were unwilling to sink in the social scale in order to escape the burdens incumbent on their position, some of them endeavoured to exploit such grants of immunity as would allow them to keep their status or acquire an equivalent or higher rank. The imperial government did not as yet attempt to prevent members of the city councils from adopting careers which carried immunity from civic duties, but it set its face against the fraudulent exploitation of the privileges granted to certain professions, and in some cases tightened up the conditions on which immunity could be earned and limited the numbers of those who could earn it.⁶⁴

Abuses seem to have begun earliest and been most prevalent in connexion with the guild of shippers. Hadrian remarks that wealthy persons, having bought a few ships for a modest sum, claimed exemption from their civic obligations on that score, although the greater part of their property was invested elsewhere. Antoninus Pius laid down the ruling that, when inquiry was being made into the case of a shipper, it should be established whether he was assuming the empty title to avoid liturgies. Marcus Aurelius remarked that there were some who neither sailed nor had the greater part of their property in shipping but nevertheless claimed exemption from liturgies as members of the guild. Papinian records a similar ruling with regard to contractors for state revenues: only those who personally did the work were immune. Antoninus Pius had to limit the number of doctors and professors to whom the cities might grant exemption. Ulpian states that, if a man liable to liturgies in his city enlisted in the army to avoid them, the city's claim was not affected, and also that, when persons who were among those who could be elected to the highest magistracies in the city, in order to avoid the greater burden,

became lessees of state lands, so as to be subject to a lesser burden, their claim was not to be admitted. Diocletian found that the immunity granted to victors in the sacred games was being exploited, and 'to prevent the opportunity of evading civic liturgies being offered to every one on the pretext of crowns', which were sometimes obtained by bribing the other competitors and sometimes apparently existed on paper only, he limited the privilege to bona fide professionals who had won at least three crowns.⁶⁵

Towards the end of the second century many councils were finding it difficult to keep up their numbers. A certain number of persons obtained immunity in one of the ways suggested above—doubtless the wealthiest, who possessed the necessary influence and could afford bribery on an adequate scale. Many modest families must have sunk under the strain and gone bankrupt. Moreover, each family tended to supply fewer members to the council: an inscription records it as unique that a father and two sons had seats on the council simultaneously. It therefore became necessary to infuse fresh blood into the councils. One of the objects of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* was probably to widen the field from which councillors could be drawn by sweeping away many archaic distinctions. Hitherto only citizens had been available, and many wealthy persons, such as descendants of freedmen and members of the various other disfranchised categories which existed in many cities, were exempt. Now every one was bound to serve the city of his *origo* or, if not, that of his domicile.⁶⁶

In the third century we find cities hunting in the highways and byways to fill their magistracies. The tenants of an imperial estate in Lydia complain that they are molested and robbed on the score of magistracies and liturgies despite their legal immunity, and in Egypt the city of Arsinoe endeavoured unsuccessfully to impose its magistracies on the villagers of the nome, who were likewise legally exempt. Under the pressure of economic necessity the old snobbery began to break down: Callistratus recommended, though with evident distaste, that even shopkeepers who possessed sufficient means should be allowed to stand for the council if it was greatly depleted. Some commoners were apparently willing to pay the heavy price exacted for social advancement, but some preferred their modest obscurity: Septimius Severus had to reprove a plebeian father for endeavouring to veto his son's nomination to the council by the exercise of his paternal authority.⁶⁷

The city councils must have changed considerably in their

composition during the last century of the principate: many old families must have vanished one way or another, and many new have been enrolled. But the extent of the change must not be exaggerated. Libanius paints a picture of the council of Antioch as it was in the recent past which is very different. The councillors are all of ancient family: their ancestors have all held magistracies and liturgies for generations and have trained up their descendants to a proper sense of civic spirit. They are still a rich and exclusive clique, owning large landed estates and intermarrying among themselves. The picture is doubtless idealized, and the break-up of the old order of things is probably post-dated—Libanius attributes it to the hated Christian emperors. But many old families certainly survived the third century and continued to serve their cities loyally.⁶⁸

CHAPTER XII

THE BYZANTINE AGE

MEMBERSHIP of the city council was in effect by the end of the third century an obligation incumbent on any one who, while not disqualified by servile birth or infamous character, possessed the requisite amount of property, and, since property normally passed from father to son, was hereditary in the family of any one who had once been nominated. Hitherto, however, it had been possible to avoid the obligation by taking up certain professions which carried with them immunity from curial burdens. From the end of the third century imperial legislation begins to take a harsher tone. As the councils dwindled in numbers the emperors became alarmed lest the whole machinery of local government, on which depended not only the maintenance of city-life but the collection of the imperial revenue, should collapse, and they began to oppose not only fraudulent evasion of curial obligations but any attempt by members of the curial class, that is, councillors and their sons and others financially qualified for a seat on the council, to adopt careers which would remove them from the service of their cities.⁶⁹

Imperial legislation thus tended to make of the curial class a hereditary caste, from which every avenue of escape was barred. Even in theory, however, the emperors were not consistent in pursuing this repressive policy, and in practice they were only very partially successful. A vivid, if confused, picture of their efforts to preserve the city councils is presented by the title 'de decurionibus' in the Theodosian Code, whose one hundred and ninety-two constitutions cover the years 312 to 438, and by the corresponding title in the Code of Justinian, which includes some earlier and later legislation. This same body of laws betrays how ineffective the efforts of the imperial government were. Time and again the same rules are re-enacted, and often retrospective sanction is given to past breaches of them. Ambition and wealth could defy every law, when the law was administered by a civil service never proof against corruption, and even men of modest means found it possible to evade their obligations by exploiting their obscurity or by trading on the greed of their richer neighbours to gain immunity at the cost of their property.

One effect of the reorganization of the empire by Diocletian and his successors was to throw open to members of the curial class avenues of escape which had hitherto been in effect closed to them. The equestrian service had up to now been relatively small, and but few members of the city aristocracies can have obtained posts in its ranks. Now it began to be rapidly expanded: new positions were being created everywhere and many naturally fell to members of the city councils. At the same time the privileges of the equestrian order began to be increased. Hitherto only members on active service had been excused from their civic duties; the emperor Carus had reasserted the rule that ex-procurators had no immunity. Under Diocletian officials were allowed to retain their exemption after retirement, and thus mere membership of the equestrian order (*egregiatus*) became a title to immunity. Under Constantine a new class of civil servants, that of the imperial counts, was created, and this rank (*comitiva*) likewise gave exemption for life from civic duties.⁷⁰

Many of the most enterprising and the richest of the curial class must during this period have transferred their services from their cities to the state; but the imperial government needed their services and was unwilling to curtail their rewards, and no attempt was made to stop the movement. The emperors did, however, do their best to check the exploitation of the *egregiatus* and the *comitiva* by unscrupulous persons who, usually by interest and bribery, obtained honorary codicils which gave them the privileges of these ranks without any service to the state. A series of laws directed against this abuse shows that it was prevalent in the fourth century, and that the government had little success in combating it. Since the immunity obtained by these means was personal only, it was not refused to those who had performed all their obligations to their cities, and an honorary *comitiva* was indeed the lawful prize of those who crowned their civic services with the tenure of the high priesthood of their province.⁷¹

As the fourth century progressed more and more posts in the imperial bureaucracy began to carry senatorial rank, and the senatorial order, hitherto a very select body, gradually expanded to vast dimensions. This development was far more dangerous to the welfare of the cities than the earlier expansion of the equestrian order and the creation of the *comitiva*. These had been personal privileges only, and the sons of members of the two orders, though their fathers naturally tried to obtain for them the same rank, and in fact often did so, were legally liable for the

obligations of their native cities. Senatorial rank was on the other hand hereditary, and thus, if a member of the curial class gained admission to the senate, not only he but his sons after him obtained immunity. It was accordingly around the question of senatorial rank that the battle between the imperial government and the curial class raged most fiercely.⁷²

In 326 Constantine forbade access to the senate to persons of curial status, at the same time confirming the rank of existing senators of curial origin. It proved impossible to maintain this repressive rule and in 340 the government was merely insisting that decurions must fulfil all the obligations to their cities before entering the senate. Access to the senate was again absolutely barred in 361; this time the law was made retrospective. Three years later the government tacitly admitted that this rule was a dead letter, and at the same time began to evolve a more constructive policy. To debar decurions from the senate was not only impracticable but unjust and inexpedient, since it involved the exclusion of many able men from the service of the state. The interests of the cities would be safeguarded if decurions in the first place performed their civic obligations before entering the central administration, and secondly left an heir to serve their city after they had risen to a higher sphere. It was accordingly ruled that only sons born to a decurion after his ennoblement inherited his senatorial rank, and that he must leave at least one son to the curia. In 371 these principles were further elaborated. A decurion who had no son was excluded from the senate: a decurion with one son must leave him to serve the city; but one who had several sons was allowed to take one of them with him to the senate. With this exception only sons born to men already senators inherited their rank. It was further enacted that 'empty shadows and vain image of dignities' were, with the exception of the consulate, no title to exemption: in other words only those who won senatorial rank by the actual tenure of administrative offices gained immunity from their curial obligations.⁷³

In 380 and 382 constitutions were addressed to the praetorian prefect of *Illyricum*, ordering the return of all senators of curial origin to their native cities; but these were apparently emergency measures, limited in their application to the sorely tried Illyrian prefecture. Elsewhere the compromise of 371 remained in force till 390, when a much harsher rule was introduced whereby decurions might indeed enter the senate but gained no exemption thereby from their civic duties either for themselves or their sons

whether born before or after their promotion. This proved difficult to enforce because decurions alleged, perhaps sometimes with truth, that they could not afford the very expensive obligations of senatorial as well as those of curial status, and accordingly neglected the latter. The government therefore fell back on its original policy, and in 392 closed the senate once more to decurions. Five years later it reinforced this rule by forbidding decurions to aspire to provincial governorships, which conferred the *clarissime*, the lowest of the three grades of the senatorial order.⁷⁴

The *clarissime* was once again forbidden to decurions in 416, and seems never again to have been officially open to them. But persons of curial status were, by being expressly excluded from the *clarissime*, given implicit leave to enter the two higher grades, and in 436 a constitution acknowledged this fact. It confirmed the status of all who had so far acquired the rank of *spectabilis* or *illustris* and ruled for the future that decurions who became *spectabiles* must fulfil their curial duties in person, while those who obtained the honorary rank of *illustris* might perform them through deputies. Those on the other hand who earned the *illustrate* by tenure of an office carrying that rank became, with their sons born after their ennoblement, immune from curial obligations.⁷⁵

Three years later, finding once more that senators of curial origin could not or would not perform their curial as well as their senatorial duties, the government again forbade access to the senate to decurions for the future, remitting to curial senators already admitted under the new law their senatorial burdens. In 444 it was again found necessary to prohibit decurions from aspiring either to illustrious offices or to the honorary *illustrate*. But neither of these two laws remained for long in force, and the constitution of 436 was in substance the last word of the imperial government on the question of the admission of decurions to the senate. It was emended by Zeno, who struck a number of illustrious offices off the list of exemptions, and as emended by Zeno was re-enacted by Justinian. In his reign it was only by holding the praetorian or urban prefectures or the mastership of the soldiers or by being decorated with the consulate or patriciate that a man of curial origin could free himself, and his children born thereafter, from his obligations to his city.⁷⁶

This tangled mass of legislation concerns the richest stratum of the curial class. Only men of very considerable means could

maintain the status of a senator, who (till 450) had to pay a super-tax, the *collatio glebalis*, over and above the regular tribute, and had in the *aurum oblativum* a heavier burden than the *aurum coronarium*, and in the praetorship a liturgy heavier by far than all curial charges. It was, moreover, in the ordinary way a very expensive matter to acquire senatorial rank. The posts which conferred the rank might on occasion be won by luck or merit, but were normally purchased: honorary codicils nearly always involved bribery on a vast scale. For decurions the transaction must have been more than usually expensive, since it was generally illegal.⁷⁷

Those who could not afford the glories of the senatorial order sought refuge in the lower ranks of the central services. This career was closed to them as early as 326 and always remained in principle illegal. The law was, however, as its frequent re-enactment proves, laxly enforced, and the government often condoned the offence of men who had been long in the service. Thus in the law of 326 those who had served twenty years were allowed to retain their posts. In a comb-out of the services held ten years later decurions in the palatine ministries were left undisturbed. In 341 and 357 five years' service earned exemption, in 362 fifteen years', in 382 thirty years', in 423 fifteen years'. The palatine service secured a personal exemption only, till in 413 those who reached the rank of *princeps* in the corps of the *agentes in rebus* were rewarded with immunity from curial duties both for themselves and for their sons born after their promotion. Men who achieved the position of *proximi* in the *scrinia* also enjoyed this privilege in Justinian's reign: it is not recorded when it was granted.⁷⁸

Closely allied with service in the palatine ministries was practice at the bar of the praetorian or urban prefects. This career is not stated to have been closed to decurions till 436. With its usual illogicality however the government in 440 granted to advocates at the bars of the praetorian prefect of the East and the urban prefect who attained the rank of *patronus fisci* immunity from curial status for themselves and all their sons: this privilege was extended in 500 to the bar of the praetorian prefect of Illyricum. Justinian limited the privilege to sons born after their fathers' promotion.⁷⁹

These careers required a certain amount of capital; for posts in the palatine services and admission to the bars of the supreme courts of the empire were greatly coveted and could not be

obtained save by those who could pay for them. Decurions moreover must have had to pay at a higher rate to cover the vendor against the risk that he underwent in breaking the law. Both careers furthermore required a relatively expensive training. For the bar a legal course, obtainable in the East only at Berytus, or after 425 at Constantinople, was necessary. For the palatine services a knowledge of Latin was in the fourth century essential, and it seems to have been usual to spend a few years studying at Rome in order to acquire a competent grasp of the language.⁸⁰

Decurions who could not afford so great an outlay had to be content with a post on the staff of the master of the soldiers in the East or of the vicar of a diocese or even of a provincial governor: this last was esteemed the lowest grade of the civil service, and was, like the curia, the hereditary obligation of a caste to which all promotion was debarred, but it was apparently preferable to membership of a city council. These careers were also legally debarred to decurions, but here again the frequent re-enactment of the prohibition shows that it was laxly enforced. The government was not, however, so complacent to these humble officials as to the members of the palatine ministries, and rarely permitted a decurion, whatever his length of service, to retain his post if his curial origin were detected. His sons, moreover, always remained liable to curial obligations. Decurions of a more active spirit might endeavour to enlist in the army. Military service was closed to them by Diocletian, and remained in principle always closed. Here the imperial government was at times generous in condoning past offences. Decurions who had served five years were in 357 allowed to retain their rank: in 362 ten years' service was required, and again in 423. By military service a decurion did not free his son from the service of the curia.⁸¹

Of the other immune professions little is heard after the third century. The privileges of victors in the sacred games fell into desuetude as the sacred games themselves ceased to be celebrated. Public doctors and professors retained their exemption, but, since the cities could scarcely afford to employ their legal quota, they were not a numerous class. Decurions were, except in Egypt, excluded from contracting for state revenues, and in Egypt revenue contracting was regarded as one of the regular curial burdens, and carried no exemption. Tenants of state lands were after 342 no longer exempt from their civic duties if they owned more than a minimum acreage of private land. Members of the

guild of shippers were still in the fourth century immune from civic burdens and decurions were allowed to join the guild: in 371, when a separate eastern guild was organized, decurions are specifically mentioned among the classes eligible for enrolment. In 390, however, service as a shipper ceased to carry exemption from curial charges for decurions who thereafter entered the guild. Persons of curial status were debarred from membership of other guilds, like that of the armament manufacturers, which, in virtue of their service to the state, were immune from civic duties.⁸²

One new professional immunity was created in the fourth century. Constantine in the ardour of his recent conversion granted exemption from civic duties to the Christian clergy. The result was that a flood of decurions rushed into holy orders, and in 329 Constantine, while not revoking his former grant, robbed it of its effect by ordering that henceforth no person of curial status should be ordained. This restriction was clearly unfair both to the curial class and to the church, and later a compromise was achieved whereby decurions might take holy orders, but had to prove the sincerity of their vocation by surrendering their property to a relative or to the curia itself. This rule seems to have been applied in the East from the year 368, but with no great success, and in 398 the government fell back on its old policy of banning the ordination of decurions. By 442 this law had become a dead letter, for in that year bishops and priests of curial status were permitted to fulfil their civic duties by deputy. Finally in 531 Justinian revived the ban of 398 on the ground that persons so inured to extortion as decurions were unfit to preach the gospel of charity. In consonance with this reasoning he permitted persons of curial status who had become monks before reaching man's estate (and had abandoned their property, one-quarter, later three-quarters, going to the curia) to receive ordination after fifteen years' probation in their monastery.⁸³

Some decurions, probably those of the humbler sort, endeavoured to evade their curial duties merely by absconding. Some retired no farther than their own country estates; the government ordered them back to town and confiscated the estate on which they had taken refuge. In Egypt many withdrew into the desert, taking up the life of hermits: since, however, they did not first sell all their goods and give to the poor, the government suspected the genuineness of their vocation and

ordered them to return to their cities under pain of surrendering their property to the curia. Others went farther afield, hoping that all track of them would be lost; the imperial government ordered that when they could not be traced their councils might distrain upon their property. Others again took refuge under the wing of some powerful landlord, serving as bailiff or tenant a senator who could defy the council and even the provincial governor.⁸⁴

The flight of decurions was not the only cause of the gradual depletion of the curial class. Two other factors contributed to the same result, the loss of their property, and therewith of their seats on the council, by decurions of the humbler sort, and the refusal of richer decurions to breed legitimate sons who could succeed to their property and their rank. A decurion might sell his estate to secure ready cash for the purchase of a post under the government—Libanius mentions a decurion of Antioch who bought a provincial governorship with the proceeds of his ancestral estate, and then, having secured his object, senatorial rank, bought back his lands and more also with the ill-gotten gains of his office. He might also sell his estate to a senator whose patronage he wished to gain. But not all sales were voluntary. Libanius inveighs bitterly against the unscrupulous greed of the richer members of the council, who misused their power to grind the faces of their poorer colleagues and bullied them into selling their estates either to themselves or to powerful outsiders whose favour they wished to win.⁸⁵

It was apparently to remedy this abuse that a constitution was issued in 386, ordaining that henceforth no decurion might sell his property without authorization from the provincial governor, who was to hold a thorough investigation into the circumstances and to disallow sales unless a reasonable cause, such as payment of debt, could be proved. The penalties of the law were directed against the purchaser, and a hope was expressed that, in view of the publicity of the new procedure, vendors would have no reason in future to complain that they had been the victims of conspiracy or intimidation. It was for many years assumed that this procedure was applicable only when a leading councillor (*principalis*) wished to purchase his colleagues' estates. In 423, however, it was expressly ruled that purchasers 'of other rank or dignity' were equally liable to the penalties of the law. The purchase of curial estates by great men exempt from curial duties was of course an even more serious abuse than their concentration in the hands of

the upper ring of decurions. In the latter case the numbers of the council were reduced, but the property remained liable to curial charges, in the former the property also was lost to the council. Justinian applied the same restrictions to deeds of gift.⁸⁶

Decurions were already in the latter part of the fourth century beginning to refrain from regular marriage and content themselves with concubines, usually slaves. By so doing they gained two advantages. They avoided the curial charges which they would otherwise have had to bear on behalf of their sons; for illegitimate sons did not inherit their fathers' status, and, if their mothers were slaves, as they generally were, were ineligible on the score of servile descent. Secondly, since illegitimate children were by a law of Constantine incapable of inheriting more than a small fraction of their father's estate, the father was free, both legally and morally, to leave his property to whomsoever he wished, and was therefore courted by persons of influence who hoped by present favours to win a future inheritance. The council thus suffered a double loss: it was deprived of its future members, and the property which they would have inherited often passed to members of the official aristocracy, who were exempt from curial charges.⁸⁷

The government for long neglected this abuse, but eventually in 428 attacked the second aspect of it by authorizing the council to claim one-quarter of the estate of a decurion bequeathed to an outsider. In 443 it tackled the whole problem from a different angle, by permitting a father to legitimize his natural sons and leave them all his property, provided that he enrolled them on the council of his native city: this law it may be noted applied to all fathers, and not only to those who were of curial status themselves. All these rules were tightened up in various ways by Justinian, who raised the proportion of the estate which the council could claim to three-quarters, and worked out a most elaborate scheme whereby this three-quarters must go either to the legitimate sons of a decurion or failing these to his illegitimate sons, if enrolled in the council, or to his daughters if married to decurions, or finally to the council corporately. This awkward arrangement was later, on the suggestion of members of the curial class, abrogated in favour of the simple rule that a decurion might leave his estate to whom he wished provided that the heir to three-quarters became a decurion of the testator's city.⁸⁸

Despite all the efforts of the imperial government the curial class steadily dwindled in numbers and in wealth until in 536

Justinian could say, probably with little exaggeration, 'if one will count the city councils of our empire one will find them very small, some well off neither in men nor in wealth, some perhaps with a few men but none with any wealth'. The chief factor in their decline was probably the emigration of their richest members into the senatorial order. Against this movement the emperors, as their extant legislation shows, were never able to maintain a firm stand. Time and again the senate was closed to decurions, but they continued none the less to trickle in, and the emperors generally had in the end to admit defeat and condone past offences. The compromise whereby decurions were obliged to leave one son at least to their native cities was, as its frequent reaffirmation proves, often evaded, and, even if it had been enforced, betrayed half the battle; for a part of the property—and no doubt the lion's share—passed to the senatorial branch of the family and thus became permanently exempt from curial charges. The experiment of making senators of curial origin continue to serve their cities is frequently admitted by the emperors themselves to have been a failure, and in 436 curial service ceased to be required of those who were already senators. From 439, when curial senators were relieved of the praetorship, decurions who entered the senate had less excuse for shirking their curial charges, and it may be that they were really compelled to undertake them. If so, only the illustre duly earned by office henceforth carried exemption.⁸⁹

It is interesting to note that a certain number of persons of curial status actually did rise to illustrious offices in the latter part of the fifth century—a fact which proves that there were still some decurions of considerable wealth and standing. This conclusion is borne out by the strange story of Valerian, a decurion of Emesa, who in 445 secured for himself honorary codicils of illustrious rank—decurions, it may be noted, had been expressly forbidden to aspire to the senate six years before—and in the pride of new dignity broke into the provincial governor's palace with a band of barbarian retainers, cleared out the staff, and sitting on the governor's right hand took over the administration. A man who could venture on such an escapade, and moreover go unpunished, must have possessed considerable means.⁹⁰

Another important factor in the decline of the curial class was the migration of its members into the palatine services. Hereditary exemption could, it is true, be legally gained only by reaching the highest posts in certain favoured ministries, and even this

privilege does not seem to have been formally granted till the fifth century. But there can be little doubt that many decurions not only managed to retain their posts till retiring age, since the laws reinforcing the ban against decurions generally exempted those of any long standing, but also secured posts for their sons; sons of civil servants had a practical—and eventually a legal—preference in filling vacancies, and the services tended as time went on to become hereditary. Many also migrated into the legal profession. Here again permanent exemption from curial status was granted only to those who rose to the top of the profession and that not till the fifth century. But the same conditions prevailed here as in the palatine ministries; sons of advocates were given priority in filling vacancies in the bar, and the profession tended to become hereditary.⁹¹

That these were the most important among the many causes which contributed to the impoverishment, if not to the numerical decline, of the curial class is suggested not only by the Codes but also by two speeches of Libanius, one addressed to the council of Antioch and the other to the emperor Theodosius on behalf of the councils of the empire. His emphasis is all on the evasion of their duties by the rich. The instances which he cites are men who have obtained governorships of provinces, posts in favoured corps like the *agentes in rebus* or *protectores*, or commissions in the army. He is especially indignant against those who send their sons to the law school of Berytus or still farther afield to Rome to learn Latin. Here the professional jealousy of the Greek rhetorician for his own subject no doubt colours Libanius' view, but he was certainly right in stating that it was no abstract interest in Roman law or Latin literature which prompted fathers to give their sons so expensive an education.⁹²

The principal reason why the laws could not be enforced is taken for granted both by the Codes and by Libanius. They state quite frankly that offices of state, *codicils of rank*, and posts in the services were bought, and it is evident that if the price paid were high enough no legal prohibition was of any avail. Libanius stresses another aspect of the problem, the reluctance of the councils themselves either to restrain or to recall their errant members. The councils admitted their weakness but alleged in excuse that it was useless to institute proceedings against persons of influence—even if restored to the curia they would soon find another avenue of escape—and secondly that they were afraid of incurring the enmity of ex-councillors who

now held positions of authority. Libanius admits the partial truth of both pleas, but insists that they were not the real causes of the criminal negligence of the councils in failing to assert their rights. He openly accuses the councils of corruption—'the decurions of Apamea have granted—the word is more polite than sold—many such favours'. But a stronger force than ready cash was the hope of favours to come: the surviving members of the council hoped one day to secure exemption themselves, and their former colleagues who had obtained posts of influence could, if their favour were secured, lend a helping hand. Finally, Libanius asserts, the last thing that the leading men in the council desired was that former members wealthier than they should resume their seats. They were now the cocks of their dunghills, and even if they could not use their position to secure exemption, made a very good thing of it: their restored ex-colleagues would not only block their way to promotion but appropriate the perquisites which fell to the dominant clique on the council.⁹³

Such considerations as these obviously did not apply to decurions of the humbler sort. They could not afford to bribe their colleagues on any adequate scale, nor did the modest posts which their purses could command—in the ranks of the army or on the staff of a provincial governor—give them any influence or patronage. None the less the frequent repetition of the laws prohibiting these careers shows that many decurions did gain admittance to them. Whether many maintained their footing is more difficult to estimate. The government was relatively lenient to soldiers, but always ruthless to officials, and in any case never spared the sons of either class. Humble decurions had, however, one great asset, their obscurity. If they migrated to another province they might reasonably hope never to be traced, and if so they might well shake off curial status permanently: both the army and the provincial offices were hereditary services, and their sons would, unless challenged, automatically succeed them in their new way of life. Other humble decurions may have insinuated themselves into hereditary guilds, like that of the armament manufacturers, and been with their descendants lost to view. But those who succeeded in evading the law must generally have forfeited their property—unless they had prudently disposed of it before absconding—since they would rank in the eyes of the law as vagrants, and the curia thus suffered in numbers but not in wealth.⁹⁴

The numbers of the councils were also depleted by the

extinction of many curial families through lack of legitimate heirs and by the elimination of poor decurions who, under duress or to secure the patronage of a wealthier neighbour, sold their estates; and if the heirs in the one case and the purchasers in the other were, as they often were, of privileged status, the councils also lost the property. To these many causes for the decline of the curiae must be added yet another, the bankruptcy of poorer decurions who were unable to meet their curial charges.

It is highly improbable that many bankruptcies were caused, as in the spacious days of the principate, by reckless munificence. This tradition had died by the fourth century, and the public services of the city, which had been maintained to a large extent at the expense of the members of the council, were gradually whittled down. Cases are, however, known in which a poor decurion, unfairly saddled with a heavy liturgy, had to sell his land. The liability of the council for the collection of taxes may have sometimes involved the curial collector in bankruptcy. Libanius draws a highly coloured picture of a tax-collector returning empty-handed and being sold up and struck off the roll of the council. But the circumstances here envisaged are exceptional: the peasants from whom the taxes were due had enlisted the support of the local garrison and put up an organized resistance. In the ordinary way the members of the council usually managed to pass on their burdens, and more also, to their humbler neighbours. On occasion it may have been impossible for them to extract the amount demanded from the taxpayers, but the government, despite its bluster, was very lax in collecting arrears, and made a regular practice of remitting them at intervals, so that defaulting collectors had a fair chance of escaping. The most damage seems to have been caused by extraordinary war-time levies: the decurions responsible for these were very liable to be ground between the upper and the lower millstone, for the taxpayer often could not support the additional burden, and the government in an emergency gave little grace. Libanius laments the ruin of many old Antiochene families by the prolonged exactions of the Persian wars which dragged on throughout the reign of Constantius.⁹⁵

While the curial class was continually subject to all these forms of leakage and attrition, it acquired very few recruits after the middle of the fourth century. The laws of Diocletian and Constantine debar from privileged status not only decurions and their sons but all persons financially qualified for the curia. Later

legislation does not generally mention any save those who were bound to the curia by birth, and the enrolment of commoners becomes an exceptional measure. Julian, who took a very real interest in the condition of the city councils and was in the opinion of Ammianus Marcellinus excessively severe in enforcing the laws designed to maintain them, gave a general licence to the cities to enrol commoners: 'plebeians, citizens of the same town, whom ampler means have advanced to support the charges of decurions, may be nominated in regular form'. After this the promotion of commoners is recorded in two constitutions only, which prescribe special measures for two poverty-stricken provinces, Moesia (383) and Tripolitana (393): 'It is conceded to the councillors of the province of Moesia that, if they have any persons from the commons suitable, they may summon them to the charges of the decurionate, that persons rich in the possession of slaves may not evade the burdens for which property is demanded owing to the obscurity of a despised name'; and 'Whoever among the plebeians are proved in the presence of the councils of the several cities to be qualified by land or money, are to be enrolled for curial duties. Those who have no family property are not forbidden to serve on the governor's staff'. The phraseology of these two laws suggests that conditions were desperate and that normal rules were relaxed for the emergency: the commoners to be enrolled possessed no land, which was the normal qualification, or at any rate a fortune below the standard usually required.⁹⁶

It would seem then that by the middle of the fourth century all persons who possessed the property qualification for curial rank were decurions, and that the councils could henceforth hope for no more recruits from the commons. Their only resource, apart from the sons of members, was such sons of veterans as refused to join the army. These were by a number of fourth-century constitutions relegated to the curia, but even this meagre source seems to have dried up; for none of the laws in question, the latest of which is dated 381, is reproduced in the Code of Justinian, and all had probably by then long fallen into desuetude. From 443 onwards persons of whatever position were invited to enrol their natural sons in the curia, but it may be doubted if the offer appealed to many fathers who were not themselves of curial rank.⁹⁷

Many motives contributed to the general urge to escape from the curia. One of these was undoubtedly the desire to evade the

financial burdens incumbent on decurions. This is not to say that the curial class as a whole was crushed beneath the weight of its burdens. This is manifestly untrue of the wealthier members of the class, who preferred to undertake the much heavier charges imposed by senatorial rank. Curial charges cannot have been a serious burden to them, even if they had shouldered their fair share, which in fact they often did not. They had the dominant voice on the council, and, what was more important, they had the ear of the governor, and complaints are common that they exploited their position to thrust all the more onerous tasks on their humbler colleagues, while they themselves appropriated the perquisites of office.⁹⁸

For the poor decurions the financial charges of their position were thus rendered heavier than they need have been, but even so they cannot have exceeded the capacity to pay of any save perhaps the poorest. The curial class was from the middle of the fourth century, as has been pointed out above, virtually a closed hereditary caste. That, despite the enormous leakage of men and money that still went on, it still subsisted two centuries later, and still consisted of men of property, if on a modest scale, is proof enough that curial charges were well within the average decurion's income. But it is not in human nature to pay a super-tax if one can avoid it, and civic liturgies, now that the spirit of local patriotism which had prompted them was dead, were a mere super-tax. Nor is it surprising that the most persistent efforts to evade these charges were made by those who could best afford to pay them.

The personal aspect of curial charges was perhaps as important as the financial. The decurion was obliged to organize public entertainments, see to the heating of the baths, inspect the market, and perform multifarious other functions in the administration of his city, and also on behalf of the imperial government to collect the taxes, levy recruits for the army and labour for road-building and other public works, requisition animals and supplies for military purposes and for the public post. These tasks were, now that the service of one's native city had no emotional appeal, felt to be exacting and tedious, and it is natural that many decurions aspired either to more interesting work in the higher grades of the public services or the dignified ease which was the lot of the many senators who did not pursue a public career.⁹⁹

The financial risks involved in tax-collection and analogous

duties must also have contributed to make curial status unpopular. These functions were probably in the ordinary way not unprofitable. Curial collectors, like all others, allowed themselves a small commission—exacted as a surcharge from the taxpayer and not deducted from the total due to the state—and their position gave ample opportunities for extortion which they did not neglect to use. Nevertheless, every decurion must have been haunted with the fear of being saddled with the collection of some exorbitant requisition which no violence could extract from the taxpayer, and in bad years the curial collectors must have watched with trembling the mounting total of arrears, wondering whether an edict of remission would be issued in time.¹⁰⁰

But more important than all these considerations was social status, and all that social status implied in the Byzantine world. Under the principate the members of the city councils had been the aristocracy of the provinces. Senators and *equites*, it is true, ranked above them, but these were rare and distant luminaries. From the reign of Diocletian the enormous growth of the imperial bureaucracy altered the whole scale of values. As imperial officials became more numerous and more intrusive the prestige of decurions correspondingly fell, and as the wealthier decurions entered the ranks of the imperial aristocracy, the social status of the poor decurions who remained in the council sank yet lower. Decurions, it is true, still ranked substantially above the commons. They were down to the end of the fifth century distinguished from them in dress, wearing the toga which had once been the official costume of every Roman citizen, but had since the universal grant of Roman citizenship been reserved to the upper classes. In the penal law also they still were counted among the superior ranks of society: as late as 439 decurions, with senators, members of the government services and the clergy, are condemned to deportation for an offence which involved for plebeians the death penalty, and a century later Justinian could still take from Jews, Samaritans, and heretics of curial status the privileges attaching to their rank.¹⁰¹

But as the social status of decurions sank, their privileges tended to be neglected and curtailed. Several fourth-century constitutions re-emphasize the immunity of decurions from corporal punishment, and Libanius indignantly recounts case after case in which provincial governors, in flagrant defiance of the law, flogged men of curial rank. In 387 flogging was authorized as a punishment for peculation and extortion in collecting the

taxes. The flogging of decurions, Libanius asserts, was the major cause of the flight from the curia, and Theodosius II confirms his verdict: 'we have learnt', he declared in 439, 'that certain persons of curial status, in their desire to escape the outrages of provincial governors, seek refuge in the prerogatives of the senatorial dignity'. Personal security could only be found in high rank, in the government service, or in the church; for senators could be condemned only by the prefect of the city and a jury of their peers, government servants as a rule by the head of their department, and clergy by their bishop. In an age when government was so brutal and so arbitrary it is little wonder that decurions sought refuge in these classes, and were even willing to become the clients of senators, who could in practice shelter their agents and tenants under their own dignity and might prove kinder masters than the governor of the province.¹⁰²

Curial status gradually sank so low that it came to be regarded as a penalty for persons of standing. The emperors were shocked at this development. Valentinian wrote in 365: 'No one must be enrolled in the ranks of the councils, whose dignity we have greatly at heart, except those who have been nominated and elected and whom the councils themselves deem fit to be enrolled in their numbers; no one must be introduced into the council for an offence for which he ought to be expelled from it'. In 384 the provincial governors of the East were warned not to relegate their officials to the curia as a penalty. This law is reproduced in the Code of Justinian, and was therefore presumably still in force. It was however, it would seem, deemed to apply only to officials guilty of a scandalous offence, for imperial constitutions dated 442 and 471 order that officials who presumed to seek a higher rank than was legally permitted to them should be degraded to the curia of their native city.¹⁰³

By the end of the fifth century the councils, reduced to a handful of small landowners, had ceased to be in any way representative of the aristocracies of the cities; in every city most personages of importance were by now of senatorial rank and as such had no responsibility for the local administration and no voice in it. This anomalous situation was rectified by Anastasius. The principal magistrate of each city was at this time the *defensor* (ἐκδικος), whose function it was to protect the city and its citizens against the oppression of the central officials. Originally himself an imperial official, his appointment had in 387 been vested in the council, subject to the confirmation of the praetorian prefect,

and the natural result had followed—the office had fallen into contempt, and the *defensor* had often become a tool of the provincial officials whose usurpations he was supposed to check, being appointed on their nomination. In 505 Anastasius vested his appointment no longer in the council but in the bishop and clergy and the principal landowners and decurions. Anastasius made the same body responsible for the election of a corn-buyer, whenever the city required to make purchases of corn from civic revenues, and it is likely, though the actual constitution has not been preserved, that he transferred to it the appointment of the other important regular magistrate which every city possessed, the *curator* (λογιστής) or, as he was called in the sixth century, father of the city (πατήρ), who controlled civic finance.¹⁰⁴

By Justinian's time the *defensor*, the father of the city, and other minor magistrates, including the corn-buyer, were all elected by the bishop and clergy and the principal landowners—decurions are not mentioned as such, but the more important of them would no doubt be included in the last category. Anastasius' reform had apparently not been so effective as had been hoped, because the great men of the cities, though made electors to the office of *defensor*, had not been obliged to hold it and had refused to do so. Justinian, determined to make the office a reality, decreed that all inhabitants of the city, however elevated their rank, should be compelled to hold it in rotation for two years.¹⁰⁵

By these measures the council ceased to be the governing body of the city, and, it would seem, to have any corporate existence. John of Philadelphia, who was born in 490, writing as an old man at the end of Justinian's reign, declared that he could himself remember decurions wearing their white togas 'in the days when the councils still governed the cities, but now that they are gone the species has vanished with the genus'—this enigmatic clause apparently means that decurions, when they lost their powers, also lost their distinctive dress. Evagrius, in the latter part of the sixth century, definitely attributes the ruin of the city councils to Anastasius, and paints a rosy picture of their past glories—'for before that time the nobles used to be enrolled on the registers of the cities, each city having in its councillors a kind of senate'. Evagrius rather unexpectedly associates the degradation of the city councils not with the measures recorded above but with the contemporary creation of the office of *vindex*. This measure, which took out of the hands of the councils the control of—though not, it would seem, the responsibility for—imperial

taxation, must indeed have greatly diminished their importance.¹⁰⁶

Though the council ceased to meet, the curial class still subsisted as a caste, responsible for the performance of certain menial tasks, principally, it would seem, the collection of taxes. As such it was still an important cog in the administrative machine, as Justinian's meticulous legislation testifies. The precise date of its disappearance we do not know, but when *Leo the Wise* deleted from the Code all titles concerned with decurions, they had long ceased to be operative.¹⁰⁷

PART IV
THE CIVIC SERVICES

CHAPTER XIII
MATERIAL NEEDS

THE public services which the cities provided for their inhabitants naturally varied both in scope and in scale according to their size and wealth. Ephesus and Smyrna, Nicomedia and Nicaea, Tarsus, Antioch, and Alexandria could offer to their citizens amenities and luxuries which the average large town, the capital of a province or of a judicial circuit, could not afford. These again lived on a grander scale than ordinary provincial cities, and among these last there were many gradations, from substantial towns, which took a pride in their games and public buildings, to humble rural communes, which, though officially dignified with the name of city, lacked the barest essentials of civic life—municipal offices, a gymnasium, a theatre, a market-place, and a public water-supply, to quote Pausanias' list. But despite these wide contrasts in achievement, the ideal to which all cities aspired was monotonously uniform. The spread of Hellenism through the near East was to a large extent the product of imitation, and the place of any city in the scale of civilization was gauged by its success in reproducing the culture of the universally acknowledged archetype, the cities of the Aegean basin. Architecture, athletics, music, drama, and education were cosmopolitan; and from Macedonia and Thrace through Asia Minor and Syria to Egypt the cities, one and all accordingly to their varying resources, erected the same type of buildings, celebrated musical and gymnastic games with identical programmes, and provided for their citizens the same opportunities for physical and intellectual culture.¹

What is to-day considered the most elementary duty of any government, the maintenance of law and order, seems, from the absence of reference to it, to have been almost ignored by the Hellenistic cities. There was indeed in Ptolemaic Alexandria a commander of the night watch (*νυκτερινὸς στρατηγός*), but he was probably a royal officer; and in general police functions in cities governed by kings seem to have been fulfilled by their

commandants. The only civic police on record in the Hellenistic age are the frontier guards of Miletus and Heraclea, one of whose duties it was to arrest runaway slaves. Under the principate many more civic police officers are recorded. These were of several types. Commanders of the night watch (*νυκτοστράτηγοι*), perhaps based on the Alexandrian model, are found in the second century in several cities of Asia, and regularly in the Egyptian metropoleis of the third century. They commanded a corps of night watchmen (*νυκτοφύλακες*), who in Oxyrhynchus, a modest town, numbered fifty or sixty: we possess a list of the posts to which they were assigned, seven to the principal temple, the Thoereum, six to the Serapeum, three to the theatre, two to the gymnasium, one to the Iseum, and the remainder one to each street. The watchmen were humble citizens, cobblers, potters, fullers, and the like, and were conscripted for the service, but apparently paid for their trouble.²

Frontier guards are in the Roman period commonly found in Asia Minor. The magistrates in charge of this force were styled *παραφύλακες*, and their men, the *όροφύλακες*, who were naturally mounted, were drawn from the sons of the gentry; at Apollonia of Caria a party of ten, with their cadet officer (*νεανισκάρχης*) and the *παραφύλαξ* himself, were attended by six slaves, who served as grooms. The service was perhaps modelled on the Athenian ephebate, in which cadets in their second year of training garrisoned the frontier forts. It was their duty to tour the outlying villages of the city territory; a decree of the Phrygian Hierapolis forbids them to demand hospitality from the villagers over and above lodging, wood, and chaff, and reproves them for extorting 'crowns' from the village headmen. Another inscription, probably also of Hierapolis, bears more directly on their duties: they are instructed to deal with shepherds who graze their flocks in other people's vineyards.³

Neither of these forces was capable of dealing with serious crime; to suppress this was the duty of the wardens of the peace (*είρηνάρχαι*). This magistracy is found from the beginning of the second century throughout the Roman East, and was probably created on the order of the Roman government, which controlled appointments to it; irenarchs were not directly elected, but nominated by the provincial governor from a list submitted by the city. They commanded a force of mounted constables (*διωγμίται*), and their principal activity seems to have been to hunt down brigands: they acted as examining magistrates, but had no

authority to inflict punishment, sending up the delinquents whom they captured to the governor, with a *dossier* of the evidence against them. Their sphere of operations was the country-side. At Smyrna the irenarch pursued Polycarp, when he fled from justice into the country, whereas in a later persecution Pionius, who stayed in town, was arrested by another officer, the commander of the cavalry (*ἵππαρχος*). This office, originally military, survived under the principate in a number of Asiatic cities, where no doubt, as at Smyrna, it sank to be the captaincy of the city police: the hipparch was also supported by mounted constables (*διωγμίται*). Every city had its jail, where prisoners were confined pending their trial: the warders were normally public slaves.⁴

What are to-day regarded as the municipal services *par excellence* are not very frequently mentioned in antiquity. They were in the larger cities at any rate entrusted to a special board, the controllers of the town (*ἀστυνόμοι*), and what we know of them is largely derived from the Pergamene law defining the duties of this office: as this law, framed by one of the Attalid kings, was inscribed under the principate, it may be inferred that Hellenistic and Roman practice was uniform in this field. The first duty of the *astynomi* was the care of roads and bridges, both in the city itself and in its territory. They had to prevent encroachments on the public highway; the Pergamene law lays down minimum widths for country roads, thirty feet for a main road, twelve feet for a by-road. They had to remove obstructions; shopkeepers were allowed to display their wares outside their shops, but not in such a manner as to block the traffic. They had to prevent rubbish being tipped into the streets, and were themselves responsible for having them scavenged. They had finally to see to the maintenance of the surface. According to the legal authorities, landowners and householders were responsible in both country and town for the paving of the roads on which their property fronted, and the *astynomi* had to enforce this obligation and only as a last resort to give out the work to contract, claiming the expense, plus a fine, from the delinquents. It is difficult to believe, however, that the magnificent and uniform paving which we see to-day in the principal streets of excavated cities was maintained by this system, and it seems likely that householders regularly commuted their obligations for a cash payment, and that the city undertook the work; we know that cities maintained gangs of public slaves for street paving.⁵

The cities were very proud of their streets and spent enormous sums on them. The regular chequer-board system of town planning invented by Hippodamus of Miletus was universally admired in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and not only were new cities laid out according to this scheme, but many old towns were gradually remodelled to conform to it. The principal streets were very generally flanked by colonnades which sheltered pedestrians from the rain in winter and from the sun in summer. Street lighting seems to have been something of a rarity; the brilliant illumination of Antioch by night was a source of great pride to its citizens, as two of them, Ammianus and Libanius, testify. Some few lights outside public buildings, like the brilliant festoon of hanging lamps outside the *praetorium*, were no doubt maintained by the city, but the ordinary street lamps by the occupants of the shops outside which they hung.⁶

Another care of the *astynomi* was drainage. Progressive cities had a regular system of drains, running under the streets, which carried off both surface-water and sewage. Strabo remarks with surprise that Lysimachus' architects in building New Smyrna failed to provide any, so that the sewage had to flow along open gutters; Josephus praises the up-to-date system installed by Herod in Caesarea; and a century later Pliny, as governor of Bithynia, covered in a malodorous canal which served as the main drain of Amastris. It was the duty of the *astynomi* to see that the drains were maintained in good condition and cleaned; a gang of public slaves did this work. They had also to keep clean the public conveniences, which Pergamum and probably most large cities provided.⁷

For their water-supply all ancient cities relied to some extent on wells and rain-water cisterns, and it was the duty of the *astynomi* to see that the owners of these kept them in good order. As late as the reign of Hadrian so flourishing a place as Alexandria Troas had no other source of supply, but in the Roman period an increasing number of cities built themselves aqueducts which tapped springs often many miles away. These great arched structures, of which many impressive ruins still survive, were enormously expensive, but they brought the advantages of pure, copious, and regular supply, which could moreover be distributed under pressure to all parts of the city; the last advantage was so much appreciated that at Arsinoe of Egypt, where there was no possible source of supply save the canal on which the city lay, a costly pumping-system was maintained. The public water-supply

was devoted mainly to public buildings, such as baths, and to street fountains. These were often architectural features of great magnificence—the ‘*nymphaea*’ of Syria were particularly splendid—and it was one of the duties of the *astynomi* to see that they were kept clean and in repair, and to prevent the citizens from washing clothes or watering animals in them. At Arsinoe only a few private institutions, such as a brewery and a Jewish synagogue, had a private supply. At Antioch many private houses indulged in this luxury, but Libanius suggests that the citizens were lucky in not having to queue up round the public fountains. Aelius Aristides implies that Smyrna was as well off in this respect as Antioch. At Alexandria many private houses had cisterns, fed by a system of underground channels from the Nile, but the common people had to draw their water direct from the river, there being no public fountains. Private users naturally paid a water rate, but this by no means covered the cost of the service.⁸

Precautions against fire were as a rule most inadequate. Nicomedia in Trajan’s reign had no apparatus and no brigade; and, though Pliny saw to it that in future hoses and hooks (for pulling down adjacent buildings and thus isolating the outbreak) should be available, he was unable to persuade the emperor to allow him to establish a volunteer fire brigade, such as existed in many Italian cities. The reasons which Trajan gave for his refusal were based on local circumstances; Bithynia, and Nicomedia in particular, was a hotbed of faction, and any association would inevitably be turned to political ends. But a story in the life of Polycarp reveals that in Smyrna also at this date, though apparatus was provided, the general public were expected to turn out to extinguish fires. This suggests that the imperial government, at this time at any rate, uniformly forbade the formation of fire brigades in eastern cities; there is no evidence that it later changed its policy.⁹

Astynomi are not very frequently mentioned, and it is probable that in many smaller cities their functions devolved on the controllers of the market (*ἀγορανόμοι*). The market was normally a paved square, surrounded by colonnades, on to which opened shops. The city drew a considerable revenue from the rents of these shops, and from leasing sites for stalls, which were regularly placed between the columns of the colonnades; and it was the duty of the *agoranomi* to keep the fabric in repair and to collect the rents. They fixed the hours at which the market opened and closed, and proclaimed them by ringing a bell. They had further

to inspect the quality of the goods exposed for sale, and to see that correct weights and measures were used. For this purpose standard weights and measures were kept in their office and those used by traders were tested and stamped by them. The *agoranomi* also enforced currency laws, controlling the rate of exchange, a complicated matter when almost every city issued its own copper coins for local use and these bore no fixed relation to the gold and silver currencies of various standards minted by kings and important cities, or later by the imperial government.¹⁰

But these were the least onerous duties of the board. It was also required to regulate the hiring of casual labour, enforcing the payment of wages and performance of work as stipulated, but not apparently interfering with the rate of wages or labour conditions. Finally, it was the duty of the *agoranomi* to see that an adequate supply of provisions was put on the market at a fair price: vivid evidence of what was expected of them is afforded by a series of inscriptions in the market of Ephesus, recording the names of *agoranomi* 'under whom there was plenty and fair dealing', and appending the prices which prevailed in their year of office. The means adopted to secure this happy state of affairs varied according to circumstances. *Agoranomi* were authorized to fix prices by decree and in some cases did so. At Cyzicus, for instance, when Antonia Tryphaena was financing great public works and there was an influx of labour, the *agoranomi* were instructed by the city to punish any tradesman who raised his prices by disfranchising or deporting him and boarding up his shop and placarding his offence upon it. This was a special measure to meet an emergency, but other inscriptions prove that the *agoranomi* of Messene in the first century B.C. and of Pergamum in the second century A.D. regularly fixed the prices of certain wares.¹¹

Such measures, however, could for obvious reasons be applied only to home-grown produce, and in dealing with importers less drastic methods were used. Delos in the third century B.C. ruled that importers of firewood must declare their prices on arrival to the *agoranomi*, who could compel them to fulfil their undertaking by banning sale at a higher price and meanwhile charging them for the stall which they occupied. The same law forbade sale by importers to middlemen; Hadrian similarly at Athens endeavoured to keep down prices by eliminating unnecessary middlemen—importers were allowed to sell to local dealers but no further resale was permitted. In times of scarcity, however, no mere regulations were of avail to prevent prices from rising, and in

these circumstances not a few public-spirited *agoranomi*, especially in the Roman period, are recorded to have taken the heroic course of entering the market themselves and underselling the dealers, bearing the loss out of their own pockets.¹²

The most crucial question was the supply of corn, which was at once the staple foodstuff, especially for the poorer classes, and was subject to the most violent fluctuations of price. Some larger cities, whose territories were not suited to the production of corn, regularly depended on supplies imported from overseas, and their position was peculiarly insecure: owing to the very high cost of transport imported corn was always dear, and any disturbing factor, a crop failure in one of the producing areas, storms at sea, or political troubles, might raise the price above the purchasing power of the humbler classes. As early as the fourth century B.C. many cities of the Aegean adopted special measures to secure a regular supply. The system was to establish a capital fund (*οἰκουμένη παράθεσις*) which was lent each year to merchants on condition that they used it to import corn to the city. This system ensured a regular supply in normal times, but it did not cope with times of serious shortage. Even cities which were normally supplied from their own territory or the immediate neighbourhood not infrequently got into difficulties: if the local harvest failed, merchants who imported corn to supply the deficiency charged much higher prices than the local population was used to paying.¹³

In such emergencies a persuasive *agoranomus* might occasionally induce a merchant to sell below the inflated market price: not a few Hellenistic decrees are preserved which heap honours and privileges on such generous merchants. Local landowners also often came forward and either sold at a cheap rate or distributed free the corn from their estates. But often the city took action: a fund was raised by public subscription or by an extraordinary levy, and corn-buyers (*σιτῶναι*) were appointed to purchase corn with this sum and retail it below cost.¹⁴

The *sitonae*, originally extraordinary officers, had already in some cities, such as Delos, which depended entirely on imported corn, become a permanent institution in the second century B.C. In the Roman period they were almost universal; by the second century A.D. they were established, under the name of directors of the corn supply (*εὐθημάρχαι*), even in the metropoleis of Egypt. The cities thus undertook as a normal part of the administration not merely the supervision of the corn market but the actual supply of corn. They did not always have to rely exclusively on

purchase; for some had the right of levying corn from all landowners in their territory, and most drew some rent in corn from public lands. Usually, however, they had to buy in the open market, and many are recorded to have possessed standing funds for the purchase of corn (τὰ σιτωνικὰ χρήματα), administered by special treasurers. It would seem that these funds were capital sums, which the *sitonae* spent each year on buying corn, and repaid as the corn was sold, and that the corn supply did not ordinarily involve the government in a loss. When there was a shortage, however, the richer citizens were expected either to give corn to the city or subscribe additional sums for its purchase, and public-spirited *sitonae* often sold corn at below cost price; thus at Magnesia on the Maeander a *sitones* boasts that he lost 5,000 denarii, and at Aphrodisias a father and two sons call themselves '*sitonae* of the 10,000 denarii which they themselves gave'.¹⁵

It is unlikely that the *sitonae* went very far afield for their corn save in exceptional cases. For an inland city import of corn from any distance was quite impracticable owing to the prohibitive cost of transport. The most that the *sitonae* could try to do in a famine was to buy up local stocks and put them on the market at a moderate price, and in this they were often embarrassed by the avarice of the landowners, who withheld their corn from the market, hoping for a rise. In Domitian's reign Antioch of Pisidia had to appeal to the provincial governor, who ordered all landowners in the territory to sell their entire surplus stock to the *emptores coloniae* at one denarius the bushel (the normal price was about half this sum), and at Aspendus Apollonius of Tyana is alleged to have achieved the same result by the sheer force of his personality: the anecdote is interesting as showing how much even maritime cities relied on local production. Import from Egypt was, it must be remembered, subject to imperial licence, which was very sparingly granted to the cities. It is recorded among Hadrian's great benefactions to Ephesus that he allowed shipments of corn from Egypt, and a *sitones* of Tralles relates with very great pride that he 'bought the sixty thousand bushels of corn from Egypt which was conceded to his native city by our lord Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus and advanced out of his own pocket the price of the corn and all the expenses incurred up to its arrival'.¹⁶

Having supplied the corn, the cities naturally maintained a very strict control on the millers and bakers, lest they should turn the cheap supply to their own profit. At Ephesus the city council was

so exacting that it provoked a strike among the bakers, who were however soon brought to heel by the proconsul. At Oxyrhynchus the directors of the corn supply themselves leased mills and had the corn ground, and it would seem that the city also bought the monopoly of baking from the Roman government and operated its own bakeries.¹⁷

The most direct contribution of the cities to the department of public health was the maintenance of salaried public doctors. Some Greek cities had employed doctors from a very early age, and in the Hellenistic period the practice became general. Under the principate almost every city had a number of official doctors (*ἀρχίατροι*); Antoninus Pius limited their number to ten for metropoleis of provinces, seven for capitals of assize districts, five for ordinary cities. The principal business of these doctors was to give medical attention to the citizens; they were apparently allowed to take fees but were not expected to confine their attentions to those who could pay. They also served as police doctors, certifying the authorities of the causes of deaths, when suspicious, and of the injuries sustained by plaintiffs in alleged cases of assault. They often also gave instruction in medicine: at Perge a public doctor is praised for the excellent lectures that he gave in the gymnasium, and at Ephesus under the principate they were members of the medical faculty of the local 'museum' or university, and took a prominent part in the annual competitions which were held in surgery, instruments, and, it would appear, a prepared thesis and an unprepared problem set by the examiners.¹⁸

Under the heading of public health may also be reckoned the public baths, of which most cities maintained several, besides those attached to the gymnasium. A charge was made for admission, but it was very small and by no means covered the cost of upkeep: fuel for the heating of the public baths was a large item in the city budget, and there were also the salaries of the bath attendants and stokers, usually public slaves, and the cost of the water. Oxyrhynchus ingeniously made a little money by leasing out the post of cloakroom attendant: stealing the clothes of bathers was a very popular form of petty larceny, and the attendant no doubt made a good thing out of tips. Oil was not normally provided for bathers, but public-spirited citizens often supplied it gratis to all comers on festal occasions.¹⁹

CHAPTER XIV

EDUCATION

TOWARDS the end of the fourth century B.C. the Greek cities began to take an increasing interest in education, a subject which hitherto most of them had left to private enterprise. Education to the Greeks meant both physical and intellectual training, and it centred in the gymnasium. This institution became in the Hellenistic age an essential element of Greek life and a hallmark of Hellenism. Wherever any body of Greeks was gathered together a gymnasium would spring up as a centre of communal life: thus the Greek settlers in Egypt, though denied city life by the policy of the Ptolemies, built gymnasia for themselves in every town and village in which they were planted, and these associations ultimately formed the nuclei around which in the Roman age civic institutions were built. Any barbarian community which aspired to the status of Greek city must found a gymnasium: the petition of the progressive party in Jerusalem to Antiochus IV comprised two main items, leave to establish a gymnasium and incorporation as a city, and Ariarathes V, when he gave a Greek constitution to Tyana, at the same time endowed it with a gymnasium. Any city with pretensions to civilization thus had to provide itself with at any rate one gymnasium, and the richer and more progressive built several, allotting them to the several age groups of the population. The Attalid kings provided Pergamum with three, for the boys; the ephebes and the young men respectively, built one above the other on the terraced slope of the acropolis; and by the Roman period these had become five. Many cities are recorded to have possessed three—Tralles, Thyateira, Salamis of Cyprus, and Miletus, where they were devoted to the young men, the citizens, and the fathers. So small a city as Iasus had in the Roman period four gymnasia.²⁰

The building was in essence an open court for wrestling and similar sports (*παλαίστρα*) and a running track (*δρόμος*). To these many refinements were gradually added, and the fully-developed gymnasium of the Hellenistic and Roman age was a most elaborate structure. The central court was surrounded with colonnades, and off these opened a variety of rooms—a cloakroom (*ἀποδυτήριον*) where the members undressed and left their clothes, an anointing

room (*ἀλειπτήριον*) where they rubbed in the oil which was kept in a neighbouring store (*ἐλαιοθήσιον*), a dusting room (*κονιστήριον*) where they powdered themselves, rooms for ball play (*σφαιριστήρια*) and for the punch ball (*κωρυκεῖον*), a bathing establishment with its usual suite of cool, tepid, and hot rooms and plunge baths, loggias, fitted with seats (*ἐξέδραι*), and halls (*οἴκοι*), which could be used for rest and conversation or alternatively for classes: some gymnasia possessed regular lecture-rooms (*ἀκροατήρια*), planned like miniature theatres.²¹

In supreme charge of the institution was the director of the gymnasium (*γυμνασίαρχος*), who was sometimes assisted by a sub-director (*ὑπογυμνασίαρχος*): when there were several gymnasia there were usually several gymnasiarchs, of the boys, of the ephebes, of the young men, of the old men, though on occasion a public-spirited citizen might undertake the entire charge of them all. One care of the gymnasiarch was the fabric, and zealous holders of the office are often recorded to have repaired or improved the buildings at their own expense; to have added new rooms, or, if their means were more modest, to have presented smaller gifts, whether practical, such as wash basins, or ornamental, such as statues. The gymnasiarchs had also to attend to the heating of the baths and to manage the staff of public slaves: these included at Tegea in the second century A.D. a watchman (*παλαιοτροφύλαξ*), a furnace man (*καμινίων*), attendants to serve out the oil (*ἐλαιοπάροχος*) and towels (*σινδοφόρος*), a barber, a doctor, a huntsman, and a secretary.²²

Above all the gymnasiarch had to see to the provision of oil. Members generally expected to get this free. Some cities assigned a portion of their revenues to the purchase of oil, and in many there were trust funds which benefactors had left for this purpose. The funds thus available (*τὰ ἐλαιωνικὰ χρήματα*) were sometimes managed by special treasurers, and oil buyers (*ἐλαιῶναι*) were elected to buy oil with them. At Rhodes on the other hand the provision of oil was a liturgy, the richer citizens being appointed in rotation to supply the oil for a number of days, varying according to their wealth. But, even if such arrangements existed, a generous gymnasiarch would supplement them, not content with the regular distribution at a fixed hour but serving out oil uninterruptedly all day. And in many cities he was expected to undertake the whole burden: in the Egyptian metropoleis in the third century A.D. a rota of gymnasiarchs provided oil for a few days each, and if, as often happened, one of them failed to do his

duty, the members of the gymnasium had to do without it. No form of generosity is more universally attested of gymnasiarchs, both in the Hellenistic and in the Roman period, than the provision of oil. The office of gymnasiarch tended to be very onerous, and in a number of cities it was endowed by generous benefactors.²³

The gymnasiarch had general control over the physical and intellectual training provided in the gymnasium, but on this side of his duties he was often assisted by other magistrates. Primary education was in many cities entrusted to the controller of the boys (*παιδονόμος*), who sometimes, as at Teos, looked after the girls as well: elsewhere, at Smyrna and at Pergamum, there were special magistrates in charge of female education (*οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς εὐκοσμίας τῶν παρθένων*), and at Magnesia on the Maeander it was included in the department of the controller of the women (*γυναικονόμος*). The actual teaching was often, perhaps usually, left to private enterprise, but some cities had a regular system of public education. Eumenes II and Attalus II endowed Rhodes and Delphi with funds for the payment of teachers, and at Miletus and Teos private citizens at about the same period left money for this purpose. These latter specify in some detail how the money was to be laid out. At Miletus there were to be four schoolmasters (*γραμματοδιδάσκαλοι*) and four athletic trainers (*παιδοτρίβαι*), who were to be elected annually by the people and paid forty and thirty drachmae a month respectively. At Teos the boys and girls, who were taught together, were divided into three classes, and a master was provided for each, at 600, 550, 500 drachmae respectively. There were also to be two trainers at 500 and a music master at 700, who was to teach the two top classes and also the ephebes. These were elected by the people: the gymnasiarch and *paedonomi* were also to appoint, subject to the approval of the assembly, an instructor in arms drill and another in archery and throwing the javelin, who were to teach the top class of boys and the ephebes: they received only 300 and 250 drachmae but were not full-time employees.²⁴

Even where no public instruction was provided, the cities often sought to maintain the standard of teaching by holding competitions for boys: the gymnasiarch or *paedonomus* organized these and often gave the prizes out of his own pocket. The lists of prize-winners which have been preserved give some idea of the curriculum: subjects mentioned include reading, writing, recitation, arithmetic, painting, playing on and singing to the lyre, comedy,

tragedy, verse and song writing and general knowledge, besides running, wrestling, boxing, and in some cases military exercises such as archery. The only surviving record of a girls' competition includes epic, elegy, reading, and singing. Not only did the pupils thus demonstrate their progress, but the teachers had to prove their efficiency by exhibitions of their prowess (*ἐπιδείξεις*), which were often rewarded with prizes.²⁵

Nearly all our information on primary education dates to the last three centuries B.C., and the bulk of it comes from the Aegean area. Under the principate the offices of *paedonomus* and gymnasiarch of the boys are still occasionally recorded, and occur as far afield as Attaleia of Pamphylia, Termessus, Pessinus, and Lapethus of Cyprus. But the rarity of the records and the lack of any detailed descriptions, such as abound in the Hellenistic age, of the activity of these magistrates, suggest that public interest in primary education was not very widely diffused and nowhere intense: in the majority of cities the first stage in education was left to private enterprise and was not even subject to public control. It was far otherwise with the second stage of education, the ephebic training. This was instituted in Athens in about 335 B.C. and spread like wildfire through the Greek world, and into barbarian lands beyond. It was regularly given in the gymnasia of Ptolemaic Egypt, and even Jerusalem had its corps of ephebes under Antiochus IV. Moreover, it continued to flourish under Roman rule, and to be yet more widely diffused; it may be taken as evidence both of the vitality of the institution and of the extreme backwardness of north-eastern Asia Minor that the ephebate was first organized in Pompeiopolis of Paphlagonia towards the end of the second century A.D. A papyrus from Oxyrhynchus shows that ephebic training still survived in that city in the reign of Constantine.²⁶

In this department the gymnasiarch was often, but by no means always, assisted by a magistrate called the leader of the ephebes (*ἐφήβαρχος* or less commonly *ἀρχεφήβος*) or the director (*κοσμητής*): the latter title was used at Athens, in some Bithynian cities and throughout Egypt. The training was in origin primarily military. Young men were enrolled at Athens when they reached the age of eighteen and served for two years, which was soon reduced to one. Elsewhere the age of admission varied and tended to sink: in Roman Egypt it was fourteen. Length of service also varied from one up to three years. The ephebate was originally at Athens compulsory, and to enable the poor to serve rations were given.

During the third century B.C. it became voluntary, and naturally came to be a preserve of the leisured classes, whose sons alone could spare the time for it and support the incidental expenses, which were many—uniforms, subscriptions for special lectures, for the library and for crowns, statues and other dedications, not to speak of oil, in so far as it was not provided by the city or the magistrate in charge. It was in this form that it became diffused over the Greek-speaking world, as a kind of university training for the sons of the well to do. Normally it seems to have been open to any one who could afford it, though in Roman Egypt it was confined to the hereditary class of 'the members of the gymnasium'.²⁷

The training, as originally constituted, included both athletics and specifically military exercises. In the little city of Coresus on the island of Ceos the gymnasiarch was in the third century B.C. himself expected to lead out the ephebes three times a month to practise archery, throwing the javelin, and firing the catapult, and in many small cities there were probably no professional instructors. Athens, however, provided salaried instructors in these arts and in arms drill and also athletic trainers; and at Teos, as has already been mentioned, the public instructors of the older boys also trained the ephebes in military exercises. At Teos the ephebes furthermore received instruction in music, and everywhere intellectual training was soon added to the original athletic and military course. At Athens it became the practice in the second century for the ephebes to attend lectures at the philosophical schools established in the city. Other cities, less fortunate, had either to provide teachers or to rely on lectures from itinerant sophists. At Pergamum there were two teachers (*παιδευταί*) whose salaries were paid from public funds, but several Hellenistic gymnasiarchs, not content with these, added one or two more at their own expense. At Eretria in the second century B.C. one gymnasiarch paid out of his own pocket not only for an instructor in arms drill but also for a professor of rhetoric, while another provided a Homeric scholar, and at Priene in the early first century B.C. the gymnasiarch secured the services of a teacher of literature. Gymnasiarchs are also praised for entertaining visiting professors and for supplementing from their own pockets the fees paid by the students. Libraries were not infrequently founded in gymnasia. A famous instance is that of the Ptolemaeum at Athens, to which each ephebic year had to contribute one hundred volumes.²⁸

The cities regularly held competitions to stimulate and test the proficiency of the ephebes, prizes being offered in running, wrestling, boxing, and other athletic sports, in military exercises such as archery, javelin throwing, and shooting with the catapult, and also in physical fitness, discipline, and industry. Conscientious gymnasiarchs organized additional competitions, giving the prizes themselves: several emphasize that in these they paid special attention to the intellectual attainments of their charges. Ephebic games continued to be popular throughout the principate. As late as the reign of Septimius Severus a citizen of Oxyrhynchus bequeathed a sum of money to the city to provide prizes in the local contest, and even in A.D. 323 the ephebes of this city gave a gymnastic display. The inscriptions of the Roman period tell us less of ephebic training, but from the legal sources we learn that cities usually maintained a number of salaried professors of literature and rhetoric, whose courses were doubtless attended by the ephebes; Antoninus Pius limited their number to five in either subject for metropoleis, four for capitals of assize districts, three for other cities. In some cities the professors together with the public doctors formed associations styled, in emulation of the famous institute at Alexandria, museums.²⁹

When an ephebe had completed his training and become officially a 'young man' he often did not wish to abandon his exercises and studies altogether, but continued to attend the gymnasium. From quite an early date such young men formed a club (*σύνδος* or *συνέδριον τῶν νέων*) under the patronage of the city, which often provided them with a gymnasium of their own and elected a gymnasiarch to direct their activities. These societies became in the course of time a regular feature of city life in the Greek east. They often acquired by way of gifts and legacies considerable funds, which were usually devoted to supplementing the allowance of oil which the city granted to them, and these funds were managed by special administrators, treasurers and auditors; they also had their own secretaries to keep their records. They pursued much the same activities as the ephebes, though no doubt in a less strenuous and systematic fashion. The cities often stimulated their zeal by competitions on the same lines as those of the ephebes.³⁰

For men of mature age there was formed in many cities a similar society (*γερονσία*, *σύστημα τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, &c.). This also centred in a gymnasium and its principal officer was a gymnasiarch. Like the young men, the elders often received an allowance

for oil from the city, and they too acquired endowments, chiefly for the provision of oil or for the distribution of cash bonuses. They had their secretaries to keep their records, and their treasurers, administrators, and auditors to manage their funds: the finances of the Ephesian gerusia were sufficiently important to justify the appointment of an external auditor by the proconsul in Marcus Aurelius' reign. The societies of elders seem to have been more select than those of the juniors. In some cities, at any rate, membership was limited to a fixed number. Thus, when a gerusia was established at Sidyma in the reign of Commodus, fifty-one councillors and fifty commoners (including himself) were enrolled by the first gymnasiarch, and at Pergamum the rules of a society which seems to be the gerusia envisage contested elections for vacancies caused by deaths. From these rules it further appears that an entrance fee was charged, and that it was twice as high for an outsider as for the son of a member of five years' standing. These rules suggest that birth and wealth were more important qualifications for membership than age in the societies of the elders. These aristocratic clubs naturally enjoyed some political influence, and are frequently coupled with the council and people in honorific decrees: there is, however, no evidence that they had any legal prerogatives. Some gerusiae had religious functions, being responsible for the conduct of certain cults.³¹

CHAPTER XV

RELIGION AND GAMES

IN the worship of the gods the cities played a prominent part. There were, of course, in every city many unofficial cults, chiefly importations of relatively recent date, maintained by private societies. There were also in many cities very ancient cults which had never been completely assimilated but retained some degree of independence. The Egyptian temples continued throughout their history to be managed by their native priests, who formed a hereditary caste. They were strictly controlled by the Ptolemaic, and even more strictly by the imperial government, but the metropoleis, even when in the third century they had almost acquired the status of cities, never had much say in their affairs. Little is known of the later history of the great native temples of Syria and central Asia Minor, whose high priests had often under the Hellenistic kings been territorial dynasts, but in several cases Strabo asserts that their power was broken when Rome took over the government, and it is probable that in general they were brought under municipal control. Many, however, seem to have retained some remnants of their former independence. It is noteworthy that at Pessinus the college of priests which governed the temple of the Great Mother consisted under the principate of five Phrygians and five Galatians, the Phrygian members ranking as senior: the control of the temple was thus shared between the old native priesthood and representatives of the tribe whose capital Pessinus was. At Emesa the high priesthood of Elagabal was, it would seem, still hereditary in the third century A.D., and even in old Greek cities the priesthoods of certain ancient cults were not infrequently hereditary in old families.³²

Normally, however, the appointment to priesthoods was vested in the people. The people might in consideration of great services to the city or to the cult in question grant a priesthood to a citizen and to his heirs for ever: thus at Gytheum in the first century B.C. one Philemon and his son offered to repair a derelict temple and were duly rewarded with its hereditary priesthood. Priesthoods were also not uncommonly conferred for life on distinguished citizens. But usually they were either assimilated to magistracies,

vacancies being filled annually by election or more rarely by lot, or were sold by auction for a term of years or for life. The latter practice was very common in the Hellenistic age, and, though records are scarce, is sometimes mentioned in the Roman period. It was very reasonable; for the duties of priests were purely mechanical and their qualifications formal, and their posts were as a rule lucrative. Not only were priests very generally immune from liturgies, but by universal custom they received as their perquisite certain portions of all animals sacrificed and must have made a considerable income from this source alone: one gathers from the Acts that most of the meat placed on the market had been 'sacrificed to idols'. In some cities they were also paid salaries from the public funds, probably in commutation for their primitive right to free meals in the town hall. In such cases the city in selling priesthoods was virtually raising a loan: the purchaser paid a capital sum into the city treasury, and the city paid him interest for life in the form of salary and sacrifices, the majority of which were provided at public expense.³³

The sale of priesthoods was, however, a device which might also be used for a more questionable object, to tap sacred funds in the interest of the city. The property rights of the gods were as a rule scrupulously respected. The sacred revenues were, it is true, normally administered by the city, which elected sacred treasurers (*ιεραρχαίαι*) or other officers, such as temple-builders (*ναοποιοί*), to keep the accounts, lease the sacred lands and gather in their rents, and lay out the capital and collect the interest. But sacred revenue could be used only for sacred purposes, such as building and repairing temples and paying the staff: for secular purposes loans might be raised, but these must be repaid with interest. In many native temples it was customary for the priests to appropriate the surplus revenue, and since some gods enjoyed an income far in excess of their needs, their priests were often extremely rich: in Strabo's day the high priest of Zeus at Venasa drew fifteen talents a year. In these cases it was natural for the cities, when they acquired the right to appoint, to sell the posts for what they would fetch, and where the priests were not entitled by custom to enjoy the revenue, it was tempting for the city to allocate to them very large salaries from sacred funds in order to increase the purchase price of the posts. The council of Ephesus, tempted by the fabulous wealth of Artemis, went yet further in the early principate. According to Paullus Fabius Persicus, proconsul of Asia under Claudius, they had reduced Artemis to penury by the

enormous salaries that they granted to her priests. But the price paid to the city was not correspondingly high: gifts to individual councillors made up the difference.³⁴

Besides administering the sacred funds and appointing the priests the cities offered sacrifices to the gods and organized the festivals held in their honour: these duties might be entrusted to the relevant priests, but were often attached by custom to secular magistracies; and for more important festivals special commissioners were elected. Into the multifarious rites and ceremonies performed it is unnecessary to enter, but it may be noted that official representatives of the city played a large part in them. The magistrates and the boys, the girls and the ephebes marched in the processions which were a feature of most festivals. The young people were also often called upon to sing hymns to the gods: thus at Stratonicea it was one of the duties of the *paedonomi* to select and train a choir of thirty noble boys, who sang a hymn to Hecate in the council chamber once a month. Some cities also maintained professional choirs. At Ephesus there were the choristers of Artemis, and under the early principate many cities in the province of Asia supported 'choristers of the Goddess Rome and the God Augustus'. This practice, however, the imperial government considered extravagant: Paullus Fabius Persicus complained that the choir absorbed the greater part of the revenues of Ephesus, and ordered that in future the ephebes should sing the hymns, stipulating however that they must be properly trained.³⁵

The great festivals were occasions for popular merry-making, and some attracted vast crowds not only from the city which celebrated them but from far afield: Lucian has described the feast of the Syrian Goddess at Hierapolis, to which pilgrims flocked from all Syria, and inscriptions reveal that Stratonicea extended official invitations to all the cities of the neighbourhood to attend the festival of Hecate at Lagina. Such great feasts were naturally very profitable to the inhabitants of the cities which celebrated them, and sometimes to their governments also, since fees might be charged for admission: initiation fees at popular mysteries were a valuable source of revenue to the cities which controlled them. These large gatherings required careful organization: a long decree of Messene on the conduct of the mysteries of Andania, passed in 92 B.C., illustrates the elaborate arrangements. The rites were celebrated by a body of 'holy men' and 'holy women', chosen annually by lot from a select list, under the

direction of ten commissioners elected by the people from the same list. This body had to place the contract for supplying the victims required, to engage musicians, to marshal the procession, and to inspect the dress of all participants, male and female, to see that it conformed with the sacred law. But their duties were not merely ritual. They were also responsible for the pitching of tents in the sacred enclosure, for the maintenance of order and decorum, and for the punishment of theft and assault and the recovery of runaway slaves. For these purposes twenty of the 'holy men' were enrolled as special constables, armed with rods, while the whole body formed a court of summary jurisdiction. A temporary market was also organized under the supervision of the city *agoranomus*, who likewise controlled the water-supply and the provision of baths. Five commissioners were also elected to collect the fees paid by initiates.³⁶

Priests had many opportunities of displaying their public spirit. An obvious form of munificence was to refuse the money allocated by the city to pay for public sacrifices and to supply the victims at one's own expense. It was appropriate also for a priest to restore and beautify the temple of his god and adorn it with dedications. But it was in connexion with festivals that priests had the greatest opportunity of spending money. They could remit to the citizens their subscriptions, if these were payable, and they could add to the general gaiety by giving public banquets to all and sundry, by distributing wine free of charge, by providing oil gratis in the gymnasia and baths during the festival, or, more simply, by giving to every citizen a present in cash which he could spend as he wished. They also very frequently provided additional entertainments for the crowds, hiring singers and musicians and dancers, or organizing the baiting of wild beasts with dogs, bull fights, or, most expensive of all, fights of gladiators.³⁷

The most characteristic form of festival remains to be described: the celebration of competitions in athletics, with which were often associated chariot-races, and in music, including the drama and later oratory. These games, inasmuch as they were normally celebrated in honour of some god, may be ranked as religious festivals. Those of the boys and girls and the ephebes and young men already described may be more properly regarded as part of the educational system of the cities, and so also may those which were officially limited to citizens, or, being on a modest scale, attracted local competitors only. For the most part,

however, the games were public entertainments, in which the citizens were mere spectators and the competitors professionals.³⁸

In the musical games the professional status of the performers was openly recognized from the very beginning of the Hellenistic period, since they received wages. Musical performers, or as they called themselves 'artists in the service of Dionysus' (*οἱ τεχνῖται οἱ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον*) had already in the Hellenistic age grouped themselves into international trade unions. The oldest of these comprised the performers at Athens, another those who attended the Isthmia and Nemea: these two societies covered all Greece proper. There was a third whose sphere was Ionia and the Hellespont, and this society after the dissolution of the Attalid kingdom absorbed the artists who served Dionysus Kathegemon, who were probably the court troupe of Pergamum. Other groups embraced Egypt and Cyprus. These local unions eventually, probably in the reign of Trajan, amalgamated into one 'holy ecumenical synod'. They included not only singers, musicians, and actors, but also poets and dramatists. Athletics, on the other hand, never became officially professional, wages never being paid, and athletes seem on the whole to have belonged to the wealthier classes. Inasmuch, however, as they spent the whole of their lives in touring from festival to festival, they may be regarded for all practical purposes as professionals, and in one way or another, as will appear, many of them made a good income out of their career. Athletes also formed local unions, though not, it would seem, till the Roman period, and these unions eventually amalgamated into a universal synod, which is first recorded under Hadrian.³⁹

Games fell into two main grades, those in which money prizes were offered (*θεματῖται*), and the sacred games (*ἱεροί*) in which the victors were crowned (*στεφανῖται*). Any city which could afford the necessary outlay could celebrate games of the former class, and they were exceedingly common and became with the progress of time steadily more numerous. During the Hellenistic and Roman periods the cities were constantly founding new games, often in honour of kings and emperors, and no form of benefaction was more popular than a sum of money whose interest could be spent on providing the prizes for a new competition. The quality of the games naturally depended to a large extent on the value of the prizes offered. The contest founded in the third century A.D. by Aurelius Parmenides at Ambryssus, where the maximum prize was fifteen denarii, did not attract a

very large field of competitors: the victors recorded mostly hail from northern Greece. On the other hand, even international champions did not despise talent and half-talent games, and complacently record the vast number of prizes that they had won, often running into three figures.⁴⁰

Originally the only sacred games at which victors received a crown were the four great festivals of Greece. The crowns were of no intrinsic value, but owing to the great reputation of the games competition was extremely keen and victors received high honours from their native cities: they made a triumphal entry (*εἰσέλασις*)—whence games of this class were technically known in Roman times as 'iselastic'—and also were granted material rewards, usually in the form of a pension and immunity. During the Hellenistic age a number of cities were desirous either of raising their local games to the status of the four great festivals or of founding new games of equal status. This of course they could not do by their own act, since the whole essence of the matter was that the games should receive general recognition as worthy of sacred rank, and in particular that the cities of the Greek world should award to victors the same privileges that victors in the four great festivals received. The only way in which a city could establish sacred games was to send envoys to all the kings, leagues, and cities of the Greek world, requesting them to recognize the new foundation; a great collection of decrees at Magnesia on the Maeander, relating to the games of Artemis Leucophryene, illustrate this cumbrous and lengthy procedure. It is little wonder that in these circumstances relatively few cities managed to establish sacred games.⁴¹

Under the principate the recognition of iselastic games rested with the emperor, and it was thus a much simpler matter for a city to establish them. Whether it was easier or not would depend on the temperament of the individual emperor. There were strong reasons for being sparing in the grant of sacred games; for not only was it inadvisable to cheapen the title by indiscriminate grants, but the question of expense had to be considered. This fell not only on the city which celebrated them—for there is reason to believe that prizes of substantial value were offered in the newer sacred games, and not mere crowns as in the old—but on all other cities, on which fell the burden of the privileges granted to 'sacred victors'. Nevertheless, the number of sacred games increased steadily under the principate. During the first two centuries it was still a matter of some difficulty to secure

them: a 'sacred contest' is recorded among the great benefits that the famous rhetorician Polemo persuaded Hadrian to grant to Ephesus. In the third century grants became far more frequent, and by the end of the principate many cities of quite modest rank celebrated sacred games, and great cities like Ephesus, Pergamum, or Tarsus had three or four. These games were often old local celebrations, and preserved their primitive title: there were for instance the Didymeia of Miletus or the Chrysanthina of Sardis. Others were more recent foundations in honour of emperors: Sebasteia or Augusteia and Hadrianeia are particularly common. A large number were granted not only the privileges but the title of the old Greek games: more than a score of cities by the third century A.D. celebrated Olympia and as many Pythia.⁴²

In the athletic games the events were the usual Greek series, foot races of various lengths, a race in armour, boxing, wrestling, the pancration and the pentathlon; competitors were divided into age classes, boys, youths, and men. Chariot racing was quite common: even the modest celebration at Ambryssus contained it. Prizes were also offered for the herald and trumpeter who should announce the results. No buildings were necessarily required for these sports, but many cities provided their stadia and hippodromes with tiers of stone benches to accommodate the spectators.⁴³

Musical games comprised playing the flute and the lyre and singing to these instruments, and also tragedy, comedy, and satyric drama; for these prizes were offered to both the authors and actors of new plays, and to the actors in old plays. The production of new plays continued at least to the end of the second century A.D.—games founded at Aphrodisias in the reign of Commodus included competitions for tragic and comic poets—but would seem to have ceased in the third century, by which time the mime was ousting genuine drama. Prizes were also offered for the composition and recitation of epic verse, and for the writing of panegyrics, both in verse and in prose, to the patron god of the festival, and later to the emperor also. For musical games a theatre was necessary, and there were few cities that did not possess one. In the Hellenistic age they were usually contrived against the slope of a hill, but in Roman times they were sometimes built on level ground, the auditorium being supported on vaults. Many cities indulged in a second smaller roofed theatre, specially designed for music, called an odeum.⁴⁴

All games of importance were celebrated at intervals of four

years, only minor celebrations being annual or biennial; as a rule they comprised both athletic and musical events. Their organization was entrusted to special 'stewards of the games' (*ἀγωνοθέται*), whose office was usually elective but might be hereditary in the family of the founder. It was the duty of the *agonothete* to engage musical artists, and to enrol athletic competitors. At the actual celebration he umpired the contests, assisted by attendants armed with whips (*μαστιγοφόροι*), and awarded the prizes, except in the more pretentious Olympic games where there was a board of *Hellenodicae*, modelled on that of Elis. These formal duties, however, were but a small part of what a public-spirited *agonothete* might undertake. Titus Flavius Gerrhenus, *agonothete* of the new games founded at Gerasa in honour of Trajan, is praised by the synod of Dionysiac artists not only for his efficiency in organizing the competition and his fairness in awarding the prizes, but more particularly for the lavish hospitality with which he entertained the competitors, victors and defeated alike: one may well imagine that the success of a competition depended not a little on the style in which the competitors were received. Gaius Julius Epaminondas of Acraephiae went yet farther in his efforts to popularize the recently revived Ptoia in Gaius' reign, serving refreshments to the audience in the theatre, and distributing wine and money to citizens, strangers, and slaves for the duration of the festival.⁴⁵

In addition to the festivals and games officially celebrated by the city there were many entertainments provided for the citizens by magistrates and other members of the local aristocracy. It was customary for magistrates, and in particular for the holders of ornamental offices, such as the eponymous magistracy of the city, to celebrate their coronation by public entertainments on a vast scale. Owing to this custom eponymous magistracies became among the most difficult to fill; it has already been remarked that in any time of stress they had to be conferred on the tutelary god of the city in default of a human candidate, and in some cities benefactors endowed them with perpetual revenues. A good idea of the kind of thing expected of an eponymous magistrate is given by some inscriptions of Priene. One *stephanephorus* who held office about 130 B.C. is praised for giving a collation to the whole citizen body, as well as distributing to them corn and wine. A second, about fifty years later, revived the custom, suspended during the Mithridatic wars, of giving a sit-down dinner to all the citizens, ranged in their tribes, hired a musician and a mime for

their entertainment, threw open the baths free of charge and supplied oil to bathers gratis, and later during his year of office provided more feasts and performances by a singer, a flautist, and a singer to the lyre, lasting over two days. Such entertainments may be counted as semi-official, being given by magistrates in virtue of their office. Festivities on as large a scale were commonly given to the citizens by members of the aristocracy on more domestic occasions, such as coming of age and marriage.⁴⁶

CHAPTER XVI

PUBLIC WORKS AND RECORDS

PUBLIC works rivalled public entertainments in the claims they made on the revenues of the cities and the purses of their richer citizens. Throughout the Hellenistic and Roman age the cities were perpetually erecting new buildings or rebuilding old on a more magnificent scale, impelled by a rising standard of luxury and excited by mutual emulation. Of the buildings which every self-respecting city had to possess many have already been mentioned—colonnaded streets and market squares, aqueducts and fountains, temples, gymnasia, baths, a stadium, a hippodrome, a theatre, an odeum. To these may be added buildings to house the various administrative services—the offices of the several boards of magistrates, the record office, the treasury, and the council chamber; for meetings of the people the theatre was usually employed, and there was rarely a special hall of assembly. Furthermore defence required city walls. These were universally necessary in the disturbed centuries during which the Hellenistic kings and the Roman republic were fighting out their quarrels; and even after the establishment of the Roman peace they remained essential on the frontiers and in many other unsettled districts, and, though frequently neglected, were retained even in peaceful areas, to become useful once more when in the third century civil wars and barbarian raids again threatened the security of the cities. Finally, many cities indulged in purely ornamental buildings, notably triumphal arches, of which many fine specimens survive in the eastern provinces.⁴⁷

Except in so far as sacred funds were allocated to the building of temples, the cities rarely found the money for their public works out of revenue. Some during the Hellenistic age voted a regular credit for the essential work of maintaining the city walls, and a few endowments were ear-marked for the repair of buildings; but as a rule all public works were treated as extraordinary expenditure. By no means all buildings were erected at the expense of the city which possessed them. Cities newly founded by kings or emperors generally started life equipped with a fine set of public buildings, and many old cities were rebuilt on a lavish scale, sometimes on new sites, by royal or imperial

benefactors. The Hellenistic kings also presented many individual buildings to the cities which were subject or allied to them, and to others whose favour they wished to win, and this tradition was maintained not only by the emperors but by the client kings of the empire—Josephus gives a long list of theatres, gymnasia, baths, aqueducts, and other monuments presented by Herod the Great to various cities of Syria—and even by millionaires of private station, like Herodes Atticus or Opramoas of Rhodiapolis, whose liberality was on an international scale.⁴⁸

External benefactions, however, account for a very small proportion of the total number of public buildings which all the cities possessed, and the vast majority were financed in various ways from public revenues or from the subscriptions of the citizens. Money normally allocated to some other service might be diverted to building; thus Prusa paid for its new baths in Trajan's reign out of the revenue usually spent on buying oil. New sources of revenue hitherto unallocated, like the admission fees of the additional councillors allowed by Trajan to Claudio-polis, might be employed. Pliny also found it possible to finance many public buildings out of arrears of regular revenue which he extracted. Alternatively a loan or an extraordinary levy might be raised, but such a proceeding was never popular and during the principate was usually forbidden.⁴⁹

The great majority of buildings, however, were erected from more or less voluntary contributions from the richer citizens. A wealthy man might give or bequeath a whole building or a sufficient sum to cover its entire cost. But often when a large building was projected a subscription list was opened and gifts and promises were collected; the latter were often in kind, individual donors undertaking to supply a column or an architrave. Such promises were sometimes conditional on the grant of some favour by the people, such as election to a magistracy, and were, if so, enforceable according to the normal principles of Roman law. But promises for building were also by exception enforceable at law, even though no consideration had been received, if made on the occasion of some public disaster, such as an earthquake, or in any case where work had been begun on the building concerned.⁵⁰

The erection of public buildings was entrusted to special commissioners (*ἐπιμεληταί, ἐργεπιστάται, &c.*) appointed *ad hoc*. Their duties were arduous and responsible. They had in many cases to negotiate the purchase of the site: Dio Chrysostom

complains bitterly of the obstruction offered to his grandiose colonnaded street by the owners of shops which had to be expropriated and demolished. Then, since large-scale contracting was unknown, they had to purchase the materials or arrange for the quarrying of the stone and the felling of the timber, contract with many small building firms for separate parts of the building, and compel citizens who had promised columns to produce them when the building had reached the stage at which they were required. The commissioners were likewise responsible for the quantity surveying: *Plutarch* recalls that he spent many hours in the wearisome work of counting tiles. And finally they had to present accounts showing exactly where all the money with which they had been entrusted had gone. Some Hellenistic cities maintained an official architect to advise on public buildings, but this practice seems to have been abandoned in the Roman period.⁵¹

The administration of the city involved a heavy burden of clerical work. Some Hellenistic cities like Athens appointed a clerk to serve almost every board of magistrates; at Rhodes for instance the presidents, the generals, the treasurers, the overseers, and the curators of aliens each enjoyed the services of a clerk. Such profusion was not, however, at any time common, and seems to have been abandoned even by the greatest cities in the Roman age. Normally there was one clerk, variously styled of the council, of the people, of the council and people, or of the city, who, assisted by a staff of permanent employees, often public slaves, was responsible for keeping the records of the city. He had to take the minutes of the council and assembly, to file copies of decrees, of treaties, of correspondence with foreign powers, of edicts of emperors and governors and of a vast mass of miscellaneous documents, and to publish them, painting or chalking up those of transitory interest on a wooden noticeboard or a convenient wall, and inscribing those of permanent importance on stone.⁵²

The post demanded a certain degree of specialized ability, and sometimes tended to become almost professional. Thus at Priene in the late fourth century B.C. one Apellis was re-elected for twenty years continuously as clerk of the city, and during fourteen of these held concurrently two subordinate clerkships, that of the generals and that of the guardians of the laws and the *timuchi*. The post was not, however, one of great political importance during the Hellenistic age. But as the vitality of politics ebbed

and the magistrates tended to become lay figures, the clerk of the city, who was bound from the nature of his office to know the ropes of the ship of state, became a more and more dominant figure, and in the Roman period he, either alone or supported by the principal magistrates, very frequently moves decrees and takes the lead in council and assembly: it will be recalled that it was the clerk of the city who dealt so firmly with the riotous and unconstitutional assembly at Ephesus which Demetrius the silversmith provoked. Being of such political importance the office was no longer allowed to remain for a long period in the hands of one man, but was held, like the other magistracies, by the greatest in the city in rotation: in some places, in order to give it greater *éclat*, a priesthood was regularly combined with it. The post, though demanding much hard work, would hardly seem to give as much scope as the other magistracies for generous expenditure. The wealthy Zosimus of Priene, however, who held a number of offices early in the first century B.C., found an outlet for his munificence even in the clerkship of the city, by keeping all the records in duplicate, not only on papyrus but also on the durable, and expensive, parchment.⁵³

The clerk of the city was sometimes relieved of parts of his multifarious duties by other magistrates. In the cities of Bithynia and Galatia, for instance, a censor (*πολιτογράφος*) is found, whose duty it was to keep the register of citizens. In other cities there was during the Hellenistic period a board charged with recording or guarding the laws (*νομογράφοι, νομοφύλακες*). The latter office, which still survived in Asia under the principate, was of some importance. Its duties seem to have comprised not merely keeping a record of the laws but enforcing their observance on magistrates.⁵⁴

Not only were all public documents filed in the archives, but in most cities of the Hellenistic and Roman east a registry was maintained in which certified copies of private deeds could be deposited. The types of records which could be registered differed according to local law and custom. In some cities births, adoptions, and marriages were recorded, and in many manumissions. It was very usual to register loans and mortgages, wills, conveyances of real property and of slaves, leases, deeds of gift, and dowries, in fact any transaction important enough to demand a written deed. How far registration was compulsory is not clear, but it gave greater security to any transaction, and was very commonly employed, despite the fact that fees were normally

charged. The management of the record office was in some cities entrusted to one of the magistracies concerned with the market, to the *agoranomi* for instance in Egypt, to the *astynomi* in Tenos. In very many cities, however, there was a special magistracy, known by a variety of titles (*χρεοφύλαξ, γραμματοφύλαξ, ἀποδοχεὺς τῶν ἀρχείων, &c.*). A building with considerable storage capacity was naturally required. Sometimes a temple was utilized, but more often a structure specially designed for the purpose: the record office of Aphrodisias was an imposing building with a colonnaded central court.⁵⁵

CHAPTER XVII

FINANCE

FINANCE was the weakest point of the cities. Few drew up anything like a budget, and in the tortuous undergrowth of departmental accounts even an expert may have found it hard to discover how much the city was spending and how much revenue it was receiving, whether it was accumulating an unnecessary surplus or was undertaking commitments which it could not afford. The general supervision of finance was nominally the duty of the council, but so large a body could hardly be expected to exercise any very effective control. Some few cities had a magistracy in supreme charge of finances; at Athens, for instance, there was for a period the controller (or controllers) of the administration (*ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως*), and the same title is recorded at Priene in the Hellenistic age. In the Roman period a controller of the revenues (*ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων*) is found at Laodicea on the Lycus, and in an Aeolian city one of the generals had finance as his department (*στρόταγος ἐπὶ τῶν πόρων*). In Hellenistic Miletus some degree of centralized control was exercised by a board (*ἀνατάκται*), who both farmed the revenues and allotted their credits to the several spending departments, and in Roman Smyrna and Thyateira the receiver of the civic funds (*ἀποδέκτης τῶν πολιτικῶν χρημάτων*) may have exercised similar functions. A number of cities, both in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, elected magistrates styled *οἰκονόμοι*, who may have exercised a general control over finance. But in general there was a lamentable lack of centralization until the imperial government imposed *curatores* to pull the financial systems of the cities into shape.⁵⁶

The treasurers (*ταμίαι*), which every city possessed, were as a rule magistrates of very junior standing, and their functions were quite mechanical, receiving revenue which came in and paying out sums in accordance with laws or decrees or on the order of a senior magistrate. They kept the books and generally had custody of the actual cash; in a number of Hellenistic cities, however, this was lodged in a public bank, managed by an elected banker or bankers. Sums were allocated to the different public services according to a permanent law, or, if annually voted, were fixed by custom. Thus at Athens there was an annual sum allotted for

expenses arising out of decrees of the people—that is, the cost of engraving them and so forth—and at Ephesus and at Abdera there was an allocation for sacrifices, and at the latter city another for embassies. Usually these allocations took the form of grants to the various magistrates in charge of the public services: at Apamea of Phrygia, for instance, 15,000 denarii was voted annually by custom to the gymnasiarch in the Roman period. Some departments were financially autonomous: the funds for buying corn and oil had their own treasurers in some cities, and the societies of young men and old men often had their separate financial system, as did the several gods. Many cities also possessed trust funds under separate management, whose revenues were ear-marked according to the donors' wishes for specific purposes. The accounts were regularly audited by special boards of magistrates, who bear a bewildering diversity of titles (*λογισταί, ἀντιγραφεῖς, ἐξετασταί, κατόπται, &c.*).⁵⁷

The principal expenses of the cities have been indicated in the account of the public services given above, and it will suffice here to summarize them under their main headings. The wage bill was not on the whole a very heavy item. In some Hellenistic cities, as at Athens, members of the council, jurors, and certain magistrates received small allowances, but this practice did not survive under Roman rule save in a few free cities like Rhodes: priests also received similar allowances in some cities. Salaries were paid both in Hellenistic and Roman times to the public doctors, and to the instructors of the ephebes and boys—if any—in the Hellenistic age, to the public professors of rhetoric and literature under the principate. Wages were also paid to the lower grade employees of the city, if free men. Paullus Fabius Persicus reproved Ephesus for its extravagance in employing free men for work that might be done by slaves, and it would therefore appear that the wages of free employees were on a higher level than the allowances given to public slaves, but these were in many cases no mere pittance. Scales no doubt varied according to the duties performed, which might range from cleaning the sewers to the management of the city's property; and while some public slaves may have got little more than their keep others ranked socially high enough to be elected to cult societies and athletic clubs of citizens, and were rich enough to buy deputies who did their work for them while they enjoyed the emoluments. In a large city the total number of public employees—the police, the gymnasium and bath attendants, the

repair gangs for the streets, aqueducts, and public buildings, the clerks and accountants—must have been very considerable, and the total wage bill cannot have been an altogether negligible sum.⁵⁸

The cost of controlling prices was a variable item: in a normal year it might be little or nothing, in a famine it would be crippling. Fuel for heating the baths and the gymnasia was a heavy charge, but heavier beyond all comparison was the expense of providing oil. The worship of the gods involved the provision of numerous victims and also of incense, a very costly commodity. Games required prize money for all victors, wages for the artists who competed, and indirectly pensions for iselastic victors. Large sums were also spent both at religious festivals, at the games, and on other occasions, on feasting and merry-making. Public buildings involved a very heavy initial outlay, and considerable charges for upkeep.

Some other expenses must be added. As time went on the cities became ever more lavish in setting up honorific inscriptions and statues to kings, emperors, and governors and to local benefactors and worthies. Inscriptions, unless inordinately long, were not very expensive, but statues were quite a heavy charge. Local celebrities not infrequently displayed their public spirit by paying for their own, but outsiders, especially those of elevated rank, could hardly be expected to do this: the Rhodians solved the problem by reinscribing old statues, of which they had a plethora, in honour of new benefactors.⁵⁹

In the second place the cities were much given to sending embassies to their suzerains. Some of these served a practical purpose, to call attention to a grievance or to beg a favour. But a very large number were entirely otiose, and merely conveyed expressions of the city's loyalty, and greetings and congratulations. Such complimentary delegations were no doubt more or less obligatory on important occasions, such as the accession of a monarch, but some cities in their thirst for self-advertisement carried the practice to absurd extremes: Pliny found that Byzantium was sending one envoy to greet the emperor and another to greet the governor of Moesia every year. Since the cities liked their representatives to cut a dash, the bill for travelling expenses (*ἐφόδια*) was heavy: Byzantium allocated 12,000 sesterces to its envoy to the emperor. Public-spirited citizens not infrequently waived their allowance.⁶⁰

Thirdly, the cities were much addicted to litigation, often on

trivial issues. This proclivity, since the office of counsel to the city (ἔκδικος, σύνδικος) was unpaid, was not so heavy a charge on civic finance as it might have been; but as the trial was often held at a distance before the provincial governor or the emperor, it might involve many incidental expenses. Counsel were normally, like ambassadors, appointed *ad hoc* to plead each case, but in some cities standing public counsel seem to have been regularly elected with the function of prosecuting all who might infringe the rights of the city. Finally, most cities had under the principate federal expenses as members of a provincial diet: we know that the cities of Asia contributed in proportion to their means to the provincial cult of the emperor.⁶¹

The revenues which covered these expenses fall into three main categories, taxes, with which may be reckoned monopolies, fees, and fines; income from property, including endowments; and contributions, some voluntary, some fixed by custom, from magistrates and other members of the aristocracy. Regular direct taxation was rarely imposed by the cities. In the Hellenistic age some independent cities are known to have levied a land-tax or a percentage of the crops, but in subject cities the suzerain power generally appropriated such revenues, and Mylasa seems to have been exceptional in imposing a civic land-tax in addition to the royal. In the Roman period the tithe, and later the *tributum soli*, was invariably imperial, and the only form of civic land-tax known is the quota of corn which some cities were entitled to levy in order to feed their urban population. Extraordinary property taxes (εἰσφοραί, in Latin *tributa*) were not infrequently imposed on the wealthier citizens in the Hellenistic age to meet emergencies—to purchase corn in a famine or to pay for public buildings—and became increasingly common under the rule of the Roman republic in order to meet deficits in the tribute or to cover extraordinary requisitions. When under the principate the tribute was regularized and requisitions were curbed, levies for these purposes ceased to be necessary, nor did the imperial government view with favour extraordinary taxes to meet internal expenses.⁶²

Among the indirect taxes the most profitable were import and export duties. These were regularly raised by the Hellenistic cities, and probably continued under Roman rule. The Roman government, it is true, collected its own customs at the frontiers of provinces, but there are allusions to civic customs also, levied by each city at its boundaries. The tax might be a

uniform *ad valorem* duty—2 per cent. was the standard figure in the Hellenistic age—or might consist of specific dues on various types of merchandise, as in the Palmyra tariff. Its value would naturally vary enormously according to the commercial importance of the city concerned.⁶³

Market dues of various kinds were universal. These might take the form of a charge for a site in the city market, or of a licence for selling: licence taxes were also often imposed on various professions, such as prostitutes and cooks. A tax was sometimes exacted on sales of land, slaves and so forth, graduated, like the modern stamp duty, according to the amount of money which changed hands, and in some cities a duty was charged on manumissions.⁶⁴

Many cities made a profit out of monopolies. Salt was a civic monopoly at Palmyra, money-changing at Pergamum and Mylasa. Fishing rights were also frequently monopolized, not only in lakes and rivers, but in the open sea: thus Byzantium drew a large revenue from the tunny fishing of the Bosphorus. Myra made the ferry across its harbour into a civic monopoly. Some cities are also stated to have enjoyed regalian rights in mines and quarries, but these were generally imperial property in the Roman period. All these indirect taxes and monopolies were farmed to concessionaires.⁶⁵

Certain public services brought in a little revenue. Those who had a private supply paid water-rate. A charge was made for admission to the public baths, to some religious functions, and also, it would seem, to the theatre. Ephebes had to pay subscriptions, and there was an entrance fee for membership of the clubs of young and old men. Fees were also exacted for the registration of deeds. Fines for breaches of civic by-laws—especially those which, like the market regulations or the rules for the disposal of rubbish, were frequently broken—brought in some revenue. The owners of graves also often directed that a fine should be payable to the city by any one who violated them, but it may be doubted whether such fines were often collected. In cities whose priesthods were sold, their price went into the civic treasury.⁶⁶

Almost every city possessed some public land. Some no doubt was common land, which had belonged to the community from time immemorial. Some again had been acquired by conquest: thus Zeleia owned lands cultivated by Phrygian serfs who had doubtless been subdued in war. Other tracts had once been royal land, and had been bought or usurped by the cities: it is

noteworthy that Apamea on the Orontes, where the Seleucids had maintained the herds of horses and elephants which supplied their armies, in Roman times possessed extensive public pasture lands. Some public estates had been confiscated from felons, others had escheated to the city from citizens who left no heirs. Under Roman rule most of these sources dried up, only a few cities preserving the right of escheat. Henceforth public lands could be increased only by purchase, gift, or bequest. Many inscriptions record gifts and bequests of land to cities: the revenue was normally ear-marked for special purposes by the donor or testator. Purchase was probably rarer, but gifts and legacies in cash were frequently invested in land, and unexpected surpluses in revenue might be used to buy real estate. Pliny would have liked to put the funds which he had realized for the Bithynian cities by his financial reforms into land if he could have found suitable properties on the market, and in the regulations of several endowments it is directed that any surpluses must be invested in land. Most cities also owned a certain number of houses and shops. These were partly the product of confiscation, escheat, gift, or bequest, but many were the result of civic enterprise. The markets and colonnaded streets built by the city were flanked with rows of shops, and shops were often accommodated on the street fronts of public buildings, such as baths and gymnasia.⁶⁷

Not only the city itself but its constituent elements, the tribes, owned land and houses and shops. So also did various public institutions, such as the clubs of young and old men. But the greatest holders of real estate beside the city itself were the gods. The origin of these possessions is for the most part unknown, but it is probable that they were in the main the result of the gradual accumulation of pious gifts and bequests; some were perhaps also acquired by purchase and by foreclosure of mortgages, for the great temples were rich in cash and often carried on an extensive banking business. Public and sacred lands were exploited in different ways according to their character and to local custom. Some were rack-rented, some let on hereditary leases. Pasture lands were often kept in hand and grazing dues charged.⁶⁸

Many cities also possessed funds in cash, which were lent out, normally on mortgages, and brought in interest. These funds were sometimes the result of budget surpluses: Pliny's financial reforms in Bithynia resulted in the cities finding themselves

possessed of substantial sums of money. More usually they were trust funds, given or bequeathed for some particular purpose.⁶⁹

Whatever their resources in taxes, rent, and interest, all cities relied to a greater or less extent on contributions from their richer citizens. These contributions might take a great variety of forms. In the first place magistrates were generally expected to pay some part of the expenses of their own departments. *Agoranomi* and *sitonae* would keep prices down in a shortage by underselling, gymnasiarchs would supply oil gratis, priests would furnish victims for sacrifices and entertain the citizens at religious festivals, agonothetes would offer hospitality to the athletes and artists at the games.

Secondly, candidates for magistracies were expected to offer to the city some *quid pro quo* for the honour of being elected. Inscriptions of the Roman period very frequently record gifts of sums of money, of buildings or parts of buildings, or of other services—an unpaid embassy to Rome for instance—in consideration of various offices. These gifts were in some cities made obligatory and stabilized at a fixed sum, or at any rate a fixed minimum, but this practice was not introduced so early in the east as in the west, and perhaps never became so universal. In Bithynia Pliny was surprised to find that in some cities no regular fee was paid by councillors, and that the amount varied from city to city when it was paid, having been fixed at various dates by successive proconsuls. He itched to introduce a uniform scale, but Trajan preferred to leave the matter to local custom and law, and this seems to have been the general attitude of the imperial government. Allusions to fixed obligatory payments are not common in the inscriptions, but from the papyri we know that 'coronation fees' or 'entrance fees' (στεπτικά, εἰσιτήρια) were paid by the councillors and magistrates of the Egyptian metropolises. Apart from the contributions made by candidates in order to obtain office and by magistrates when in office all wealthy citizens were expected to respond to special appeals, for a new public building, for instance, or for the purchase of corn in a famine, and to entertain the citizens when they came of age or married.⁷⁰

It is impossible to calculate how much of the civic expenditure was covered by taxation, endowments, or contributions. The proportion of course varied very considerably from city to city. In the great commercial centres the customs must have brought in a substantial revenue, and cities fortunate enough to control

popular mysteries drew large sums from initiation fees. On the whole, however, taxes and fees cannot have been a very important source of revenue. Some cities again were richly endowed with public lands; others, especially those of recent origin, had little income from this source. Whatever expenses were not covered by taxation or endowments the local aristocracy had to make up, and their burden therefore varied considerably from place to place. This is a point emphasized by Arcadius Charisius in his monograph on civic liturgies. 'But', he writes, 'the liturgies which we have stated above to be personal, if those who fulfil them by the law of their city or by custom also make payments from their own means . . . will be included under the heading of mixed liturgies.' And he gives many concrete instances: as a personal liturgy, for instance, he cites the heating of the public baths, but only 'if money is furnished to the overseer from the revenues of a city'. In practice the burden was to some extent equalized, because the public expected more lavish services in the richer cities than in the poorer. But in very poor cities, the Egyptian metropoleis, for instance, which were destitute of taxes and had scarcely any endowments, the burden on the local aristocracy was severe.⁷¹

As time went on the share of the expenditure borne by taxation steadily sank. When the principal taxes had been appropriated by the kings, and later by Rome, the cities had not many important sources of revenue left to exploit; and under the principate they were rarely allowed to use the levy on property which had been their last resort, and were also restrained from imposing new taxes or increasing the rate of old ones. The revenue from taxation therefore remained more or less constant, but expenditure was constantly increasing as the standard of living rose. The new luxuries were partly paid for from endowments, which were generally ear-marked for such purposes as new games, a more generous supply of free oil, and especially distributions of cash to the citizens on festal occasions. But the bulk of the expenditure on every department, and especially on public works, was contributed by the aristocracy.⁷²

The lavish expenditure of the upper classes on public purposes is a phenomenon which demands some explanation. It was to a large extent the expression of civic patriotism, which, denied an outlet in politics, found vent in munificence. Even under the principate men still regarded their cities not merely as the towns in which they happened to have been born but as their native

countries. They were intensely proud of them, and since they could no longer add to their glory by war or diplomacy, they endeavoured to magnify them in the only ways still available. The emulation between cities which had in times past provoked wars still survived: the feuds between Nicomedia and Nicaea, Smyrna and Ephesus, Antioch and Apamea were notorious, and Tarsus quarrelled with all its neighbours, Mallus, Soli, Adana, and Aegae. Now, however, this mutual rivalry found its outlet through less destructive channels. The cities pursued endless litigation over frontier disputes and hotly contested honorific titles and points of precedence. But emulation was keenest in magnificence. A city, as Dio Chrysostom reminded the Prusans when they grumbled at the disturbance which his colonnaded street had caused, is assessed by the splendour of its games and of its buildings. Or, as Aelius Aristides expresses it in his lyrical address 'To Rome': 'All the world makes holiday, and, laying aside its former raiment of iron, has turned with freedom to adornment and all jollity. All other rivalries have ceased among the cities, and this one quarrel occupies them all, how each one shall appear as beauteous and lovely as it may. Everywhere is full of gymnasia and fountains, of propylaea and temples, of studios and schools. . . . So the cities all shine with brightness and grace, and all the earth is adorned as a garden. The smoke and the beacons of friends and of foes have vanished from the plains, as if the wind had blown them beyond land and sea. Instead have entered every grace of spectacle and a countless multitude of games. So that like a holy unquenchable fire holiday never ceases, but moves around, now here, now there, but somewhere always.'⁷³

To civic patriotism was added personal ambition. A man who wished to make a name for himself could no longer under the Roman peace lead his fellow citizens to victory in war, nor had he, as Plutarch remarks, much chance of suppressing tyrannies or winning fame as a wise legislator, when the constitution was fixed by the *lex provinciae*. If blessed with rhetorical gifts, he might cover himself with glory by persuading the emperor to make the city an assize town or a centre of the imperial cult, but once again the most obvious way of making himself prominent was to spend lavishly on the magistracies which he held and to give shows and feasts and distributions and buildings.⁷⁴

It must not be imagined, however, that all the expenditure of the upper classes was entirely voluntary. The richest and

most munificent set the pace, and the force of custom and public opinion compelled the rest to follow. Once a public-spirited magistrate had set a precedent, it was difficult for his successors to do less without incurring the odium of meanness, and it must have needed courage to refuse a subscription to a new public building when an ambitious colleague had opened the list with a magnificent donation. In a small community, such as most ancient cities were, the force of public opinion is very strong. No councillor would wish to be cold-shouldered by his colleagues, and the people, though deprived of political power, could still hiss and boo in the theatre, and, when driven to extremity, could riot. Dio Chrysostom nearly had his house burnt about his ears because in a famine he did not sell corn from his estates cheap or subscribe adequately to the corn buying fund.⁷⁵

And finally it must be remembered that the city aristocracies had plenty of money to burn. Many provincials enjoyed very large incomes, and, for lack of anything else to do with them, had to spend them. The possibilities of investment were very limited, since there was no public debt—the cities did it is true occasionally raise loans but only in extreme emergency and on short terms—and no large-scale industry organized on capitalistic lines. Virtually the only investments available were either land or mortgages, and these were in the nature of things limited in amount. Pliny found it impossible to dispose of the public funds of the Bithynian cities, because there was no land on the market and no one wanted to borrow the money, and though the rich certainly did gradually increase their estates, they had to be cautious, for land-grabbing was unpopular: Dio Chrysostom is most anxious to convince the people of Prusa that though he had many humble neighbours he had never pressed them to sell. The great men of the cities were therefore obliged to spend the greater part of their incomes, and since the amount which any one can spend on personal luxuries is limited, especially in a small community, they spent it on winning glory and popularity.⁷⁶

CHAPTER XVIII

THE BYZANTINE AGE

THE finances of the cities received a succession of crushing blows in the late third and early fourth centuries. The depreciation of the currency must have destroyed the value of their outstanding mortgages. Constantine confiscated the sacred lands, and about the same period the civic lands and civic taxes were appropriated by the imperial treasury. Julian restored their property and revenues to the cities, but on his death this measure was promptly rescinded. Under Valens, however, a compromise was reached whereby a third of the rent of the civic lands and of the product of the civic taxes was remitted to the cities.⁷⁷

Gradually new sources of revenue were acquired. Early in the fifth century the cities were empowered to impose additional indirect taxes, and under various laws they acquired new lands. The right which some cities still possessed to the *bona vacantia* of their deceased citizens had been abolished by Diocletian, but in 352 Constantius granted to all cities the property of such of their decurions as died intestate without heirs. Under various fourth-century laws the estates of decurions who absconded and of those who took holy orders and left no substitute to fulfil their functions passed to the city councils, and in 428 one-quarter of any curial estate which was bequeathed to an outsider was allotted to the council; the proportion was raised by Justinian to three-quarters. The cities also continued to receive a certain number of gifts and legacies, but these were probably not numerous: in the Byzantine age piety was a stronger force than patriotism, and the church was the usual beneficiary. The civic funds were administered by the *curator* (λογιστής) or, as he came to be called in the sixth century, the father of the city (πατήρ τῆς πόλεως).⁷⁸

The partial loss of their lands and taxation revenue made the cities all the more dependent on the contributions of their leading citizens. But this source of income also dried up during the late third and fourth centuries. Civic patriotism had for long been living on the past. It derived its vitality from an age when the city had been the state, and, as its object sank to be a mere organ of local government, the emotion gradually died of inanition. The liberality of the governing class had by the end of the third

century largely ceased to be spontaneous. The contributions of magistrates had hardened by an accumulation of precedents into obligatory payments, and the tenure of magistracies had become compulsory. Wealthy and ambitious decurions regarded their curial duties as a tedious and exacting burden and preferred to spend their money in buying themselves positions in the imperial aristocracy, which freed them from local ties, and the men of humbler means who remained on the council did all they could to evade their obligations, which, as the council grew poorer, weighed more and more heavily on each member. In these circumstances it is surprising that the cities managed to maintain their public services as efficiently as they apparently did. Our evidence is, it is true, meagre for the Byzantine age, and perhaps ill balanced. Public inscriptions, our principal source of information in Hellenistic times and under the principate, almost cease, and we are thrown back on the legal codes and on literary texts. These deal very largely with the great cities, which were perhaps better able to maintain their services than the ordinary provincial town.⁷⁹

Police was still in the Byzantine age a civic service. As under the principate, irenarchs were nominated by the city councils, subject to the approval of the provincial governor. Commanders of the night watch were still elected in the cities of Egypt, and Libanius alludes to night-watchmen in Antioch. He also mentions a paid force of constables, armed with truncheons (*κορυνηφόροι*), at the disposition of magistrates whom he describes as guardians of the peace (*εἰρηνοφύλακες*). Service in the police, though paid, was in Egypt at any rate compulsory on the humbler stratum of the population.⁸⁰

Roads and bridges had still to be maintained, the expense being normally covered by levies on the local landowners. What little is known of ancient street lighting refers to fourth-century Antioch. Here the cost fell mainly on the shopkeepers, who had to maintain lamps on their street frontages, and Libanius make a bitter attack on a provincial governor who insisted on a higher standard of lighting and thus aggravated the burdens of the humbler classes. Procopius, however, alludes to the lighting of public places as one of the normal charges on the civic budgets. Aqueducts were a heavy burden on the depleted resources of the civic treasuries and many cities found it hard to keep these great structures in repair. Theodosius II was moved to restore to the cities lands wrongfully usurped from them by the miserable condition of Heraclea,

whose walls and aqueducts had fallen into ruin for lack of funds to repair them, and among Anastasius' and Justinian's benefactions to the cities the rebuilding of aqueducts is several times mentioned. The baths were still maintained at public expense, and the cost of heating them seems to have been one of the heaviest items on the civic budget: it is specially mentioned in 395 as a purpose to which the third of the revenues restored to the cities might be properly devoted, and again in Justinian's edict on the civic revenues of Alexandria. In many cities, however, the cost of providing the fuel fell on the magistrate deputed to manage the baths: Libanius often cites it as one of the heaviest liturgies.⁸¹

In a Christian age, in which nudity was condemned and the human body vilified, the Greek cult of gymnastics did not flourish. Epehebic training is last mentioned in A.D. 323, and the gymnasia are heard of no more after the fourth century. On the intellectual side, on the other hand, the public educational system was maintained. The cities still in Justinian's reign supported salaried professors of rhetoric and literature. The stipends were, it is true, according to Libanius meagre and irregularly paid, and the professors supplemented them by charging fees to their pupils. Nevertheless, the city councils took a real interest in education and competition was keen for famous men of letters: Libanius occupied the chairs of Nicaea and of Nicomedia and received an offer from the council of Athens before he finally settled down at his native Antioch. The cities also still paid salaries to their public doctors.⁸²

The suppression of paganism relieved the cities of one item on their budgets. Public sacrifices were prohibited, and the temples, when they were not destroyed by Christian mobs, were either converted into churches, or more commonly allowed to decay, being gradually pulled to pieces for building materials. The expenses of Christian worship did not fall on the cities; for the church had already developed its own financial organization by the time that it was recognized, and preferred to maintain its independence, living on its own endowments and the offerings of the faithful. The revenues of the church were spent, it may be noted, not only on the salaries of the hierarchy and the building and upkeep of places of worship, but also on services of a more secular kind. Orphanages and hospitals, institutions unknown to the pagan world, were established everywhere, and poor relief was regularly given. Some bishops even employed church funds for public services normally undertaken by the city. Theodoret

of Cyrrhus states that he had built out of ecclesiastical revenues two bridges and a number of colonnades, as well as maintaining a bath and an aqueduct. Inscriptions record the erection under the auspices of the local bishop of a bath at Gerasa and an aqueduct at Zenonopolis.⁸³

Despite their pagan associations the games were too dear to the heart of the populace to be abandoned. The Olympia of Antioch were regularly celebrated down to A.D. 520, and though their specifically pagan features were no doubt gradually eliminated, public entertainments continued to be given by the cities down to Justinian's day. Though frowned upon by the church, theatrical shows remained very popular. The genuine drama had by this time died a natural death, and the standard form of entertainment was the mime: the themes of the ballets continued to be drawn from Greek myth, a fact which reconciled Libanius to the low artistic level of the production. Another form of entertainment which was highly popular in the Byzantine age was the *maïuma*. It also was considered licentious by the church, and was banned by the imperial government on at least two occasions. Very little is known of it save that its name is of Semitic origin and is derived from the word meaning water: a small theatre adjoining the city reservoir was built for its celebration at Gerasa in 535. Rhetoric was still highly prized and declamations were an important feature of the games—Libanius regularly composed a *panegyric for the Antiochene Olympia*—and were frequently delivered in the theatre by local or visiting orators of repute.⁸⁴

Athletic competitions of the old type still formed part of the Olympia at Antioch in the last decade of the fourth century, but seem later to have been abandoned. Chariot racing on the other hand enjoyed a tremendous vogue in the Byzantine age. The production of a chariot for the races is frequently mentioned as one of the most onerous liturgies incumbent on decurions, but it was apparently one of the least unpopular: Libanius complains that the frivolous decurions of his day thought and talked of nothing except horses and charioteers. The competition was based on the two factions of the Greens and Blues, to one or other of which every inhabitant of the empire seems to have attached himself, and whose rivalry not infrequently culminated in sanguinary riots.⁸⁵

We know of one chariot race where the interests at stake were of a higher order. *Italicus*, one of the few Christian decurions of the still predominantly pagan city of Gaza, was allotted the task of

starting a chariot against one of the principal supporters of the local deity, Marnas. Italicus was anxious to uphold the glory of the true faith, but he was despondent, because his rival had retained a very potent magician, who it was believed would infallibly baulk the opposing chariot. In his extremity he went to the famous Christian hermit Hilarion. Hilarion was at first contemptuous and told him to sell his horses and give to the poor, but being at length convinced that Italicus had no option in the matter, and was fulfilling a compulsory public duty, he consented to bless the chariot. The rivalry of the two decurions and their respective holy men was well known and on the day of the race excitement was high. Amid cries of 'Marnas is beaten by Christ' the Christian chariot was victorious, and many pagans were converted to the true faith on that day.⁸⁶

Certain other forms of entertainment which had commonly been given by magistrates under the principate had become so regular a feature of public life that they could not easily be abandoned. Gladiatorial shows do not seem to have endured long in the East, where they had never had so universal a vogue as in the West, and where Christian sentiment, which condemned them, was stronger: in the West they were abolished by Honorius, but in the East they probably were extinct half a century earlier. The baiting of wild beasts with dogs and fighting with wild beasts continued on the other hand to be popular down to Justinian's reign. The task of providing the animals and the fighters was another very heavy liturgy. Shows of this type, expensive though they were, were nevertheless given in quite small places. Libanius relates how Tisamenes, governor of Syria about 385, when he was unable to bully the council of Antioch into providing a wild beast fight, put them to shame by ordering a decurion of the obscure city of Beroea to bring his animals and men to Antioch.⁸⁷

The city market was as vigorously controlled as under the principate and the *agoranomi* still punished traders who used false measures or sold above the prices fixed by authority. The tendency was to rely on drastic penalties rather than subsidies to keep prices down, and this policy in times of real shortage often produced disastrous results: Libanius records how on several occasions the bakers of Antioch fled *en masse* to the mountains rather than continue to work on the terms laid down by the authorities. The office of public corn-buyer still survived, however, in Justinian's reign, and the purchase of corn is still mentioned as one of the principal items on the civic budget.⁸⁸

A certain amount of expenditure on public works was inevitable. The majority of the cities had in the peaceful days of the principate neglected their walls. Now that public security was deteriorating and foreign invasions were becoming more common fortifications were essential, and many cities found themselves obliged to devote large sums to extensive repairs, and not a few which had spread beyond their original circuit or shrunk within it had to build new walls. Apart from this few new buildings were required except churches, and these were provided from ecclesiastical, not from civic funds. But provincial governors were very prone to demonstrate their energy and gratify their self-importance by initiating large public works, especially in the metropoleis of their provinces, where they themselves resided. Imperial constitutions again and again reprove governors for this practice, and instruct them to spend the available funds on repairs rather than on new buildings. Repairs were a very heavy liability. In their prosperous days the cities had saddled themselves with a superfluity of grandiose public monuments, and now that their revenues had shrunk the maintenance of these was a serious problem. Some attempt was made to keep up appearances, but as their buildings collapsed from old age or were overthrown by successive earthquakes or burnt in war, the cities found it impossible to keep pace with repairs, and as time went on they must have presented an increasingly dilapidated appearance.⁸⁹

If the resources of the cities were severely curtailed in the Byzantine age, their expenditure was also considerably reduced. Certain items were removed from the budget altogether. The cult of the pagan gods ceased and the Christian worship which replaced it was not paid for out of public funds. The closing of the gymnasia released the cities from their previous heavy expenditure on oil. Luxuries such as public banquets and distributions of cash gradually ceased to be expected on festal occasions: in Libanius' day the agonotheses of the Olympia at Antioch were still expected to give a public banquet at the conclusion of the festival, but the practice of giving presents to the guests was suspended, since it was feared that the festival might lapse altogether unless the expenses of the *agonothesia* were reduced.⁹⁰

Other items were greatly reduced. Though public entertainments of all kinds figure prominently among civic expenses, there can be little doubt that the games were considerably reduced in number. Expenditure on public works again, though in view of their depleted resources a heavy burden to the cities, was on a far

more modest scale than in the principate. Relatively few new works were undertaken at the expense of the city, and the cost of both new works and repairs cannot have been high. It was scarcely ever necessary to quarry new stone, since there was a superabundance of worked stone available from abandoned temples and other public buildings ruined beyond repair: nearly all the buildings of the age are in fact a patchwork of re-used blocks of classical date, and the only expense, apart from the cartage of the stone, the burning of lime, and the actual laying of the blocks, must have been for roofing timber and for the fittings—the mosaics of the floors and the revetments of the walls.⁹¹

The incidence of civic expenditure is difficult to gauge. At first, when the old civic revenues had been wholly or partially confiscated and as yet no new lands had been acquired or taxes imposed to fill the deficit, and at the same time expenditure had not been scaled down correspondingly, a very large proportion of the civic expenditure must have fallen on the decurions. The burden was, however, soon readjusted. Of the expenditure which was cut down the greater part had hitherto come out of the pockets of the decurions, and they were better off than before in no longer being expected to give feasts and distribute money to the citizens, to supply oil for the gymnasia, or to subscribe to public works; for such works as were undertaken were no longer financed by public subscription but out of civic funds or, if these were inadequate, by a general extraordinary levy.

Furthermore though a number of public services hitherto usually provided by public funds or endowments were made into liturgies, the decurions did not necessarily bear these liturgies unaided. The councils were authorized by Arcadius to allocate any additional taxes which they raised either to public requirements or to the charges borne by their members, and civic lands were similarly often distributed among the members of the council. Libanius mentions the practice and does not criticize it, in so far as the beneficiaries undertook liturgies. Julian granted 3,000 *iuga* of land which had ceased to be cultivated to Antioch tax free, and blamed the council only for distributing it to those who did not need it: he himself allotted it to the decurions who bred horses for the chariot races. The system was liable to abuse, as the examples cited above show, and Libanius more than once declares that the dominating clique of the council drew all the profits and paid none of the charges; but it must have appreciably lightened the burden of the curial class. Gradually as services

were reduced and corporate revenues built up, liturgies seem to have been suppressed almost if not quite completely. In the reign of Justinian all the normal services—salaries, games, the heating of the baths, the purchase of corn and public works—were covered by the civic revenues, and extraordinary works by general levies.⁹²

PART V
THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE CITIES
CHAPTER XIX
ECONOMIC

IN assessing the contribution of the cities to the civilization of the Greek East it will be convenient to begin with an aspect of the question on which ancient writers say little, their economic function. Since they speak so little of the subject, it is a reasonable deduction that the Greeks and Romans took but a slight interest in it, and it is therefore on the whole improbable that in the foundation of cities economic motives were dominant. Kings and emperors naturally chose for the cities that they built sites which promised to them future prosperity, and they often took into account not only the fertility of the soil but the prospects of commercial activity. But it may be strongly doubted whether they founded cities with the object so often attributed to them by modern historians of promoting the economic development of the country. Nevertheless, the effect of the policy of colonization on the economic life of the ancient world must be assessed if a just balance is to be struck between the benefits and the disadvantages which that policy involved. A full study of this subject would mean a complete social and economic survey of the Greco-Roman world, and all that can be attempted here is an outline sketch of the problem, which may be most simply posed in the question how far the wealth which was concentrated in the towns was earned by services rendered to the country.

Every city was a market for the surrounding district, whence the peasants came in to sell their produce, receiving in exchange the cash with which to pay their taxes, and in some cases rents also, when these were payable in money, and to buy imported goods and such manufactured articles as village industries could not supply. There were thus in every city a number of retailers, who marketed agricultural produce, and also groups of artisans, who made such simple articles as the peasants required, and usually also sold them in their own workshops. The volume of such local trade was naturally not large, and, in view of the very limited purchasing power of the peasants, local industry was

negligible. Moreover, the area which each city served was small, since a peasant would normally prefer to walk in with his donkey, do his business, and walk back within a day. Where cities were closely set, they were no doubt the sole markets of the country. But in many districts territories were large, and here the cities served only their immediate neighbourhood, and in outlying areas the peasants frequented small market towns or seasonal fairs.

Market towns (*ἐμπορία*) are attested in the vast rural districts ruled by the Thracian and Bithynian cities; the imperial government sometimes artificially created them in areas where they did not exist, but not, it may be noted, to foster the economic life of the district, but in order to provide more comfortable accommodation and more abundant supplies for officials and soldiers traveling by the imperial post. Fairs (*πανηγύρεις*) are frequently mentioned. An inscription records a monthly fair held at Baetocaece in the territory of a city which is probably Apamea: it was already in existence under the Seleucids and still flourished in the reign of Valerian. Another inscription mentions the establishment of a similar monthly fair at Tetrapyrgia in Lydia during the third century A.D. Libanius emphasizes the importance of village industries and fairs in the extensive territory of Antioch. He speaks of 'large populous villages which have a greater population than some cities and possess industries like towns; they share their products with one another by means of fairs, each inviting the others and being invited in turn; in this they take pride and pleasure and profit at once, giving what they have in excess and receiving what they lack, selling some things and buying others'. The final sentence of this passage is an interesting commentary on the role of the cities in local trade: 'Through their mutual exchange they have little need of the city.'¹

In long-distance commerce and large-scale industry the cities played a greater part, but it must be remembered that in the ancient world the total volume of these activities was relatively small. That this was so was due to the slowness and expensiveness of transport. For the former reason perishable goods could not travel far. For the latter it was rarely profitable to carry heavy or bulky goods any distance, especially by land; for though maritime freights were maintained at a high level owing to the heavy risks involved in navigation, transport by land was vastly dearer since the actual carriage or haulage was so laborious.

Thus there was, apart from the state-controlled transport of

corn from Egypt to Rome, which was not commercial in character, very little trade in corn, and this little was largely dependent on subsidies from the city governments. Some large maritime cities regularly imported corn and in them the price was, despite subsidies, far above the average. Most cities, even the greatest, normally lived on the harvest of their territories, and imported only on emergency, if at all. Such great towns as Ephesus, Tralles, and Tarsus, record the import of corn from Egypt as an event. At Antioch of Pisidia the governor, when appealed to by the council in a famine, could only order local producers to sell their stocks, and even at Aspendus it was to the landowners of the city and not the merchants that Apollonius of Tyana appealed in a shortage. In the fourth century Antioch seems normally to have depended on its own territory; for Julian imported corn from Chalcis and Hierapolis as an emergency measure to redress the shortage caused by the residence of the imperial court and army. At Caesarea of Cappadocia in the same period the import of corn was, according to Gregory of Nazianzus, impossible even during a severe famine owing to its prohibitive cost.²

There was a more extensive trade in other staple foodstuffs, such as dried or salt fish, wine, and oil, whose price was greater in relation to their weight and bulk. But the volume of this trade also cannot have been very large since it catered mainly for the well-to-do. It is known that for the wine and oil trade one of the most important markets was Egypt, which was unsuited for the culture of either vines or olives. But the Egyptian peasants drank beer and filled their lamps, washed, and cooked with sesame oil, and even in Alexandria the populace drank either beer or a local wine which Strabo found disgusting: it was only the Hellenized aristocracy of Egypt that could afford imported wine and oil. Otherwise trade in agricultural produce was confined to special delicacies, such as the Salonite cheese of Bithynium or Syrian nuts and fruit, and to rare plants used for making up drugs and perfumes, many of which are enumerated by Pliny. Of other natural products, base metals and salt, which were universal necessities of life, were probably alone of serious commercial importance. The trade in rare woods and marbles catered only for a wealthy minority; local stone or brick was normally used in building, and where timber was not obtainable locally it was dispensed with—in the villages of Trachonitis and Auranitis basalt slabs were used for roofing and even for doors. Trade was in fact mainly confined, apart from a few necessities which even the poorest could afford

in small quantities, to luxury or semi-luxury articles for which the well-to-do were prepared to pay a substantial price.³

The same factors which restricted trade naturally affected industry also. Since it was as expensive to transport manufactured articles as natural products for any considerable distance, it was on the whole only those industries which produced luxury goods, for which a high price would be charged, that commanded an extensive market. The principal industries of which we have record in the Greek East are in fact mostly of a luxury type. Purple dyeing, which flourished at various points on the Greek coast, at Nicaea, Miletus, and a number of Lydian towns, in Cyprus, and above all at Tyre and other places in Phoenicia and northern Palestine, obviously catered only for the rich, as did the perfume and unguent industry of Alexandria. The papyrus manufactured at Alexandria was used chiefly by the government and the literate stratum of the population, a small minority. The glass industry of Sidon and Alexandria produced for the most part highly-priced *objets d'art*, and even the pottery made at Pergamum, Tralles, and above all Samos, was designed for the tables of the upper classes. Only textiles, which were very easily portable, may have commanded a larger market. Linen was woven in the cities of Cilicia Pedias, the Syrian and Phoenician coast, northern Palestine and Egypt. Woollen cloths were manufactured chiefly in Galatia and the districts of Miletus and the Phrygian Laodicea. These industries produced not only fine fabrics but cheap cloth of lower grades, which may have been bought by the humbler classes; it is not known, however, how far their products supplanted those of local cottage industries.⁴

Large-scale industry and commerce were sufficiently important to make the fortunes of a few cities and to contribute substantially to the prosperity of a number of others. Most of the principal industrial centres have already been mentioned. Trade profited chiefly a few great ports, such as Thessalonica, Ephesus, or Alexandria, which tapped extensive areas. A number of cities along the eastern fringe of Syria, Palmyra, for instance, and Damascus and Petra, served as ports for the caravan traffic of the Arabian desert, which carried to the Roman empire the valuable products of the Far East. A few other inland towns, like Apamea of Phrygia, were owing to their position at the junction of several roads important as clearing houses for large districts. But for most cities trade can have been of little importance. All ports no doubt had some share in the coastal trade which distributed goods

from the great commercial centres and collected local produce for export, and towns on the principal roads and waterways took a similar part in inland traffic. But trade on such branch routes cannot have been sufficient in volume to play any appreciable part in the economic life of the average town.⁵

In answering the question asked at the beginning of this chapter it must further be remembered that industry and commerce mainly served the towns and not the country. Merchants, it is true, bought not only manufactured articles from the towns but also the agricultural produce of the country-side, but they sold both in the main to the well-to-do, who were town-dwellers; the balance of payments to the peasants was completed chiefly in cash, with which they paid their taxes and rents. Both trade and industry in fact were dependent upon a rich urban class, which cannot itself have derived any large proportion of its total wealth from these activities.

A certain number of cities owed a large part of their prosperity to factors which were not strictly economic. Centres of government drew great profit from their official rank. Dio Chrysostom enlarges on the benefits brought to Apamea of Phrygia by the assizes held there every other year by the proconsul of Asia: 'There gathers together a countless multitude of litigants, judges, advocates, officials, servants, slaves, procurers, muleteers, merchants, prostitutes, and workmen, so that those who have goods for sale obtain the highest prices, and nothing in the city is unemployed, donkeys, houses or women.' If even an occasional assize counted for so much in the prosperity of a city, provincial capitals must have profited enormously from the regular presence of the governor.⁶

Other cities owed much to their reputation as centres of learning: Athens seems to have lived very largely on its university, the sophists of Smyrna attracted pupils from all western Asia Minor, and later the law schools of Berytus catered for the whole of the Roman East. Towns which controlled religious festivals and mysteries of wide repute often drew considerable profit from the pilgrims who resorted to them. Lucian describes the huge concourse which flocked to the festival of the Syrian Goddess at Hierapolis, and Strabo notes the prosperity which its religious fame brought to Pontic Comana. Here again it is to be noted that the special prosperity enjoyed by these cities was in the main derived from and dependent on the urban upper class; for it was from this class that most of the students at the universities and the pilgrims

at religious festivals came, and lawyers and most litigants were persons of means.⁷

Since the wealth of the cities was mostly concentrated in the hands of their aristocracies, the question whence the cities derived their wealth can be more concretely put in the form, how did their ruling class make its money? Obviously no single answer will cover the whole field. Some members of the class earned their fortunes in the professions. The few who made their way into the equestrian service received good salaries, and those who obtained commissions as centurions in the army got high pay and a substantial bonus on retirement. Famous rhetoricians and sophists made fabulous fortunes from the fees, gifts, and bequests of grateful pupils, and even the ordinary professor no doubt made a comfortable living from his salary and the payments of his students. Doctors similarly received salaries from the cities as well as fees from their richer patients. Architects must have done well in an age when building activity was so intense, and are known to have sometimes been men of considerable means. Athletes seem to have made a good living out of their pensions and prize money, and actors and musical artists were paid for their performances as well as winning prizes. Lawyers are little heard of, probably because rhetoricians were engaged to plead in the courts.

Professional earnings cannot however have formed a substantial part of the income of the upper class. A small minority only were engaged in the professions, and many of these were already wealthy men before they embarked on their careers. To enter the equestrian order a man had to possess a fortune of 400,000 sesterces, and we know that many of the famous sophists came of wealthy families, and that athletes also were often the sons of rich men. It is further to be noted that, though part was derived from the imperial treasury and part from the civic revenues, a fair proportion of professional earnings came out of the pockets of the rest of the upper class, either directly as fees, or indirectly, in so far as prize money at the games and the cost of buildings were provided by donations.⁸

Industry, as has been already stated, was except in a few cities on so small a scale that it can have produced little wealth. It is in fact questionable whether the upper class took much part even in the important industries. Some of these were imperial monopolies, or at any rate to a large extent owned by the government. Mines and quarries and salt-pans were for instance

generally claimed by the state; the manufacture of papyrus at Alexandria was managed by an imperial procurator; and in the third century A.D. the state began to establish its control over purple dyeing. Such imperial industries were not necessarily run directly by the state, but even if they were leased to concessionaires, these were not allowed under the principate to make more than a bare minimum of profit. Other industries seem for the most part to have been in the hands of small craftsmen, each operating his workshop with the aid perhaps of a few slaves, apprentices, and hired workmen. Some of these craftsmen may have been slaves or freedmen themselves and have paid their *masters a percentage of their earnings*, but the fact that they were commonly grouped in guilds suggests that most were free men. The aristocracy can therefore have drawn little profit from industry save as landlords of the workshops in which it was conducted.⁹

Trade probably contributed more substantially to the wealth of the upper classes in the great commercial towns. In some cities the aristocracy themselves engaged in commerce: we know, for instance, from their inscriptions of the merchant princes of Palmyra, who personally conducted caravans across the desert, and among the shippers of Alexandria was a figure important enough to raise a rebellion in the third century A.D. And even when they did not own ships and themselves engage in trade, the rich men of the great ports no doubt often invested their money in nautical loans, which, if speculative, carried a very high rate of interest. Commercial activity on a large scale was, however, as stated above, confined to a few important centres. Who conducted the branch traffic which alone reached most cities we do not know, but it was probably in the hands of small itinerant merchants and tramp shippers.¹⁰

It would then appear by a process of elimination that the greater part of the wealth which the urban aristocracy undoubtedly enjoyed was derived from the ownership of land. This conclusion is supported by what meagre evidence we possess on the subject. We rarely have any record of the estates owned by the aristocracy until they passed by confiscation to the imperial treasury, or their owners gave or bequeathed them to their cities. The type of gifts presented to the cities by their magistrates and councillors is, however, suggestive. Corn and oil are the commonest; wine is fairly frequently mentioned; some benefactors are recorded to have given timber for public

buildings, and one at Hierapolis of Phrygia contributed the labour of his rustics. It is moreover significant that in times of shortage the rich men of the city, in particular the members of the council, are often accused of holding up large stocks of corn for a rise in the price.¹¹

How they acquired their land it is more difficult to say. In most parts of the Greek East there had no doubt existed from time immemorial a class of landed gentry, and the growth of cities meant that they tended to move into towns and leave their estates in the charge of bailiffs. Land was also in antiquity almost the only safe and permanent form of investment, and all wealth however earned therefore tended to be put into land for the sake of security as well as for the social prestige which it brought. Thus many estates represented the invested profits of a successful professional career or a fortunate commercial speculation by an ancestor of the owner. Others again resulted from the gift of crown land by the kings to their favourites, officials, and officers, or from similar grants of land by the imperial government to time-expired soldiers. There was also a constant tendency for existing landowners to increase their estates at the expense of peasant proprietors. This class has always in the near East lived near subsistence level, and in a run of bad harvests must have found it very difficult to pay the imperial taxes, which were under the principate a fixed sum assessed on the value of the land, payable in cash, and not a quota of the crop. The landlords on the other hand had large reserves of cash, which they were only too willing to invest in mortgages, many of which were no doubt ultimately foreclosed.

Not only was land (including mortgages) the principal source of the wealth of the urban aristocracy in the wider sense of all rich men residing in cities: it was almost the sole asset of the governing class of the cities in the narrower sense of those who bore magistracies and liturgies. Most of the important professions—government service, the army, higher education, medicine, athletics, and the theatre—were exempt from civic obligations, and though some patriotic professional men are recorded to have held office in their native cities, most no doubt made use of their privileges. Even incomes made in commerce seem in practice to have been exempt; for what was required for civic offices was capital, and capital in practice meant land or mortgages, since money invested in commercial enterprises was owing to their highly speculative character a very unsafe guarantee of solvency.¹²

In the Byzantine age conditions remained fundamentally similar, the tendencies of the previous period being accentuated. The total volume of trade and industry diminished owing to the general economic decline, and with the growing concentration of wealth in the hands of a small minority and the increasing dominance of the state both tended to devote themselves more and more to luxury articles and the requirements of the government. Industry came increasingly under the control of the state, which both requisitioned ready-made articles by way of taxation and operated its own armament factories, weaving establishments and dyeworks to supply the needs of its servants. The workers in these industries were either state slaves, or, if technically free, hereditarily bound to their crafts and grouped in guilds with a corporate obligation to supply goods to the government. Private trade was also to a large extent elbowed out by the state, which used the imperial post and the compulsory services of the guild of shippers to transport its goods; and these, since taxation was now largely in kind and much of industry was state owned, formed a large proportion of the total volume of goods in circulation. Commerce and manufacture therefore contributed even less than before to the wealth of the urban aristocracy. Some of the professions—architecture, athletics, and the theatre—waned, but the bar on the other hand prospered, and government service became a very important factor owing to the increase in numbers of the imperial bureaucracy and the huge fortunes made by its members, usually by corrupt methods. Land, however, remained the principal source of wealth, and, as before, all profits tended to be invested in land, a growing proportion of which passed out of the hands of peasant proprietors, who were severely hit by the increased taxation and multifarious requisitions and exactions, into those of large owners, who could evade many of these demands.¹³

In the economic life of the cities the principal change was that the greatest landowners, though they still often resided in the towns, ceased to be members of their governing bodies and to contribute directly to their public expenses. It is, however, abundantly clear from the legal sources that the curial class still consisted in the main of rentiers, though of more modest means than in the preceding age. Decurions were forbidden to retire to their country estates in order to evade their civic duties, or to sell their real property without authorization: the only outsiders who were normally enrolled in the curiae were the sons of army

veterans, who had received a grant of land from the government. The curial class was not liable to the *collatio lustralis*, the tax on trade, 'unless by chance it be established that a decurion conducts some commerce', and this impost was collected not by the *curia* but by the guild of traders (*corpus negotiatorum*). Traders are classified by several laws as distinct from and inferior to decurions, and were, another law suggests, liable to civic duties only if they purchased land: it was as an emergency measure that in 383 persons whose wealth lay in slaves were enrolled in the councils of the much tried cities of Moesia.¹⁴

Throughout the period under review the cities were, it would thus appear, economically parasitic on the country-side. Their incomes consisted in the main of the rents drawn by the urban aristocracy from the peasants, and the trade and industry which flourished in some of them catered largely for this class and were dependent on it for their existence. The movement of urbanization was not, it is true, responsible to any large degree for the creation of the landlord class: only in the relatively few colonial foundations did the establishment of a city include the grant of estates to its members. But the growth of cities meant the concentration in towns of the larger proprietors and converted them into absentee landlords. This in itself was an unhealthy state of affairs. The wealth of the country-side—and it must be emphasized that the bulk of the wealth of the empire was derived from agriculture—was drained into the towns. The peasants were thus reduced to a very low standard of life, and this fact in turn impoverished the urban proletariat.

We know very little of this class. In the great industrial centres the majority were naturally occupied in the workshops; Dio Chrysostom tells us that at Tarsus the bulk of the common people were linen weavers. In the large commercial towns most of them earned their living as sailors, muleteers, and porters—guilds of porters are recorded at several great ports, such as Ephesus and Cyzicus—or by keeping inns, eating-houses, and brothels. In the average city the opportunities for employment were more limited. Domestic servants and civic employees were normally slaves, and the only occupations left to free men were retail trade and handicrafts: even in small towns inscriptions record guilds of bakers, potters, fullers, smiths, shoemakers, builders, market gardeners, and so forth. These trades catered for the peasants and the aristocracy; but as the purchasing power of the former was very slight, and the latter could not spend the whole

of their incomes on consumable goods, business must have been rather slack. The urban proletariat seems in fact to have been miserably poor, since any substantial rise in the price of corn meant starvation to them, and it is probable that without the frequent free meals and distributions of corn and cash given by the aristocracy they could hardly have subsisted. Whether they were poorer than the peasants it is difficult to say. They received more assistance, by way of a subsidized price for corn and direct gifts, but this may have been because they were more vocal and indeed active in demanding the right to live: a shortage which produced famine in the country would provoke a bread riot in the town. It is, however, significant that in the Byzantine age the government did not attempt to levy from the urban proletariat the poll-tax (*capitatio plebeia*) which it collected from the peasantry, and that the one tax which hit the lower classes in the towns, the *collatio lustralis*, by general consent caused dreadful hardships, driving them to sell their children into slavery: its abolition almost redeemed Anastasius' good name from the taint of heresy.¹⁵

CHAPTER XX

POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE

IF their economic life was so unhealthy, it is all the more necessary that the cities should be justified by their political and cultural achievements. Politically the movement of urbanization was, judged by the standards of the democratic faith in which it was launched, far from successful. The suzerainty exercised by the kings of course limited the sovereignty of the cities, but as they usually interfered only in their own imperial interests, which were mainly military and fiscal, this limitation was of no very great importance. Even in their internal constitutions, however, the ideal of Greek democracy, that all should rule and be ruled in turn, was rarely realized. Apart from slaves, freedmen, and aliens, for whom Greek political theory did not profess to cater, there was, as has been pointed out in an earlier chapter, in a fair number of cities, especially colonial foundations, a substantial disfranchised class of natives, who usually comprised the bulk of the peasantry and often a fair proportion of the urban proletariat. But, such legal qualifications apart, effective power tended even in the Hellenistic age to be concentrated in the hands of the well to do, who alone possessed the authority expected of magistrates and the money to meet the expenditure increasingly demanded of them.

This tendency was accentuated and given legal sanction by the Roman republic, which further assured the dominance of the upper class by making the city councils permanent, and therefore irresponsible, bodies. The part of the common man thus came more and more to be to elect his betters to office and to pass decrees approved by the council, whose members, though elected, directly or indirectly, by him, he could no longer unseat. These powers became under the principate increasingly unreal, and the election of the magistrates and councillors passed gradually, in substance if not in legal form, to the council, while legislation was not only dependent on the initiative of the council but was more and more closely controlled by the central government in the interests of economy and efficiency. In A.D. 212 all legal distinctions between citizens and non-citizens within each community were swept away by the universal grant of the Roman

franchise, but by this time any active share in politics was confined to the curial class, which was a limited clique determined by wealth, chiefly in land, and therefore in effect largely hereditary. Finally, in the Byzantine age, this class grew weary of its duties, and the government of the cities almost ceased to function, save in so far as it was prodded into movement by the central administration.¹⁶

As long as they retained any formal powers, and indeed after they had lost them, the urban proletariat had some influence on the policy of the governing class. They could easily attend meetings of the assembly, especially as, being chronically under-employed, they had plenty of time to spare, and even though they could initiate nothing, they could cheer those candidates and measures which pleased them and hiss those that they disliked. To judge by Plutarch's advice to a young politician, the management of the assembly was an important art in the second century A.D., and it would even appear that there were still bold demagogues who proposed radical social reforms, such as cancellation of debts and redistribution of land, whose alluring programmes had to be countered by a judicious mixture of advice, threats, and moderate largess. The imperial government evidently thought that the danger to the existing régime was serious; for it was prompt in applying such disciplinary measures as the deportation of agitators and the suspension of the right of assembly when disorders occurred, and it was very careful about licensing clubs, which, according to Trajan, however innocent their ostensible purpose, invariably became political cells (*ἐτραπείαι*), with the object presumably of promoting demonstrations and perhaps even of organizing the voting power of the lower classes behind revolutionary candidates and programmes. Apart from such more or less constitutional methods, it was easy for the townspeople to hold informal protest meetings, like that at Ephesus against Paul's missionary activity, or to voice their feelings at social gatherings, in the theatre or the hippodrome. Finally, they could in an extremity raise a riot and burn the houses of unpopular councillors. These powers the urban proletariat still preserved and frequently exercised even in the Byzantine age, as the speeches of Libanius abundantly prove.¹⁷

The country people, on the other hand, even when democratic institutions really functioned, could not come into town for every assembly, and probably as a rule attended only important meetings, like the elections, whose date was fixed. As city politics

became more and more meaningless, they no doubt ceased to attend at all; for, unlike the urban population, they could not easily spare the time, and living scattered in villages they developed no sense of common interest, much less a common policy for which to agitate. In their own villages, however, they had by the principate evolved a lively local political life, the evidence for which comes chiefly from western Asia Minor and central Syria. The villages (*κῶμαι*), known also, particularly in Lydia, as settlements (*κατοικίαι*) and, if of large size, as communes (*δῆμοι*), were democratic in constitution, and long remained so when the cities had fallen under the rule of oligarchies.

The sovereign body was a mass meeting of the villagers, usually not officially styled the assembly (*ἐκκλησία*), but known by less formal names (*σύλλογος*, *ὄχλος*). Some villages also possessed a council of elders (*γερονσία*), never officially called the council (*βουλή*), which institution was the hallmark of a city, and, it would seem, lacking the constitutional prerogatives of that body. The assembly, guided no doubt by the elders, who are sometimes recorded to have occupied seats of honour in front, passed decrees on all manner of topics of local interest—the use of common land, the contributions of magistrates to the village funds, the organization of trust funds, and so forth—and annually elected the magistrates. These formed a board and were known by a great variety of titles. The commonest was perhaps village headmen (*κώμαρχοι*), but arbiters (*βραβευταί*) are frequently found in Lydia, and administrators (*διοικηταί*) or trustees (*πιστοί*) in Syria; the civic title *strategi* seems to have been reserved for independent villages. In the third century the auditor (*λογιστής*) becomes the chief magistrate in the Lydian villages, and in Syria the advocate (*ἔκδικος*) rises to prominence in the fourth. Some villages had secretaries and treasurers also.¹⁸

Political life was most flourishing naturally enough in villages inhabited in the main by peasant proprietors, but even those owned by great landlords (including the imperial government) possessed some communal organization on a more modest scale. At Ormela, for instance, which was owned by a great Roman family, in whose honour most of the inscriptions are dedicated and by whose bailiff, agents, and lessees they are dated, the villagers had their own headman (*προάγων*) and assembly (*ὄχλος*). Only in the bureaucratically administered areas, or in some of them, at any rate, was village self-government given no chance of development. In Ptolemaic Egypt and in Judaea under the

Herodian régime the village clerk was appointed by the crown. Under Roman rule all the village officials, including probably the council of elders, were conscripted for service by the *strategus* of the nome on the nomination of the clerk, or in the third century the headmen of the village, who were themselves appointed in the same way on the nomination of their predecessors. The same procedure was followed when city government was finally introduced into Egypt by Diocletian, except that the duties of the *strategus* were early in the fourth century taken over by the *praepositi pagorum*, who were elected by the city council.¹⁹

The political development of the villages certainly owed much to the example of the cities, some of whose institutions they patently borrowed. But there is no indication whatever that the city governments in any way actively promoted the growth of village autonomy, and the curious local titles often borne by the magistrates suggest that the growth proceeded from indigenous roots: it is also notable that in one of the areas where village life was, on our evidence, most developed, the region of Batanaea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, the cities were few and insignificant, and mostly of very late origin.

Furthermore, there was no organic connexion between the political institutions of the city and the villages subject to it. The villages certainly had no say in civic affairs, and, what is more curious, the city government very rarely intervened in village affairs. In areas once administered on bureaucratic lines the cities sometimes inherited the functions of the central government. This was so in Egypt, as explained above, and in Thrace there are traces of a similar phenomenon. The territory of Philippopolis was divided into 'tribes', over each of which presided an officer (*φύλαρχος*) who was probably elected by the city council: his precise functions are unknown, but the groups of villages (*κωμαρχίαι*) which constituted the 'tribe' thank him for his upright, humane, and law-abiding rule. Elsewhere there is no trace of political control till the Byzantine age, when the office of *praepositi pagorum* was introduced throughout the empire by the imperial government. It is improbable, however, that these officers had in other provinces such far-reaching powers as in Egypt, where they inherited a ready-made system of control. They were probably concerned mainly with rural police and taxation, which had always been civic departments.²⁰

Even as individuals the members of the civic aristocracy seem to have taken little interest in village affairs. City magnates some-

times acted as patrons (*προστάται*) of villages in the territory: a prominent Thyateirene is thanked by two communities for championing their rights. They sometimes also held village magistracies, but evidently in the capacity of local landowners; for city councillors are found holding office as often in independent villages as in those within their territory, and at Apateira, a village of Ephesus, not only prominent Ephesians but a councillor of Hypaepa take a part in local politics.²¹

The cities changed gradually from political corporations to administrative districts. The Hellenistic kings made but sparing use of the civic governments as agents for their administration, preferring to keep taxation in the hands of their own officials and concessionaires and to maintain mercenary armies with which not only to fight their wars but to police the cities. The Roman republic on the whole kept up the same policy, and it was not until the principate that the central government made any extensive use of the cities for imperial services. From now on the civic authorities took a predominant part in collecting taxation, in maintaining the post and, from the third century at any rate, the roads along which it ran, in policing the country, and in supplying recruits, remounts and provisions for the army. These functions they continued to fulfil as long as they retained sufficient vitality to shoulder the burden, and even in the sixth century A.D. their part was important, though by now the central government was obliged to intervene extensively through its own officials to goad the councils into action. The responsibility of the councils varied enormously in accordance with the size of their territories, which ranged from the tiny areas, extending no more than five or six miles from the town walls, ruled by the average Lycian city, to the vast tracts, running into thousands of square miles, with which Nicaea or Antioch had to cope. But big or small, between them they did most of the routine work of administering the empire, and the unpaid services of the councillors, both their actual time and labour, and even more their financial guarantee for their districts, were probably in the eyes of the central government the principal use of the cities, and a cogent motive for the policy of urbanization which it pursued.²²

How efficiently and how justly the civic aristocracies performed their duties it is difficult to say. That they were more efficient than the lower grades of the imperial bureaucracy is suggested *but not proved by the growing preference of the emperors for local self-government as against direct administration*; for it was

not so much the superiority of the civic magistrate over the imperial official that counted as the corporate financial guarantee of the council for its members and the wealth that lay behind that guarantee. As to their justice to the governed our evidence is on the whole not unfavourable to the city magnates, due allowance being made for the standards of the age. An inscription from Hierapolis of Phrygia reveals the civic policemen in a rather unpleasant light, extorting from the villagers hospitality to which they were not entitled and, to add insult to injury, demanding crowns from their headmen. But such conduct was mild compared with that of imperial officials and soldiers travelling by the post, and the council did in this case endeavour to curb the misconduct of its members. Of their behaviour as tax-collectors we hear almost nothing, and what little we do hear is laudatory: a president of the Macedonian League paid the whole poll-tax of the province, for which he was probably responsible, out of his own pocket, and an officer of the Lycian League advanced the money due for tribute and subsequently collected it humanely and with strict regard to the assessments. This evidence is not worth as much as it might seem, because those who were most likely to suffer, the lower classes, have left no record, but there can be no doubt that the conduct of the civic collectors contrasted very favourably with that of the tax-farmers of the later republic.²³

In the Byzantine age we get more detailed evidence, and the effect of it is not so favourable; but even then decurions were not worse than their contemporaries. That they should have levied an extra-legal commission for themselves from the taxpayers and should have adjusted the assessment to their own advantage are not very serious charges: the collector's tip was a regular feature of all ancient systems of taxation, and tax evasion by the rich, who thereby throw a heavier burden on the poor, is after all not unknown to-day. That decurions were sometimes brutal in their methods of collection cannot be denied. We possess two pictures of curial tax-collectors, both from northern Syria. In one, drawn by Libanius, the decurions at first present their demands to the villagers 'mildly and in a subdued tone; then, when they are treated with contempt and derision, with annoyance and more loudly'. Only as a last resort do they have recourse to threats and endeavour to lay hands on the villagers. In the other, presented by Theodoret, there are no preliminary displays of politeness: 'about this time collectors arrived who

compelled them to pay their taxes and began to imprison some and maltreat others'. Theodoret's story is, from its matter of fact brevity, more convincing than Libanius', and there can be no doubt that it is more typical. But even so decurions had to suffer as much and more themselves from the provincial governor and his officials.²⁴

CHAPTER XXI

CULTURAL

IT remains to consider how far the cities fulfilled their mission of maintaining and developing Greek culture and diffusing it over a wider area. The promotion of civilization in backward areas had been the original mainspring of the movement of urbanization and remained its professed object to the end. It is therefore by its success in the cultural field that it ought in the ultimate resort to be judged.

On the material side the cities provided their inhabitants with many minor but not unimportant amenities of civilized life—drainage, a pure water-supply, baths, medical attendance, commodious and healthy streets and markets. In a higher sphere they were generous patrons of the arts. Of the visual arts two in particular, sculpture and architecture, owed much to the lavish expenditure of the cities. Their demand for statues must have been prodigious. The temples, gymnasia, streets, and public places of every city were lined with statues of emperors, empresses, provincial governors, and above all of local worthies who had served their city well. Older and more distinguished cities such as Rhodes positively suffered from overcrowding: every available space was filled by the end of the first century A.D. and room could only be found for new benefactors by ejecting the old. The work produced in response to this demand was not perhaps of very high quality, but for this the cities can hardly be blamed. They were generous patrons and they can at any rate be credited with keeping the art of sculpture, and particularly of portrait sculpture, alive. It is noteworthy that when the cities in the late third century withdrew their patronage the art very rapidly declined from inanition and soon died out.²⁵

In architecture their patronage was even more lavish. Their mania for building must have given employment to countless architects. We know that they swarmed in the eastern provinces. Trajan was provoked to momentary irritation when Pliny asked that one be sent from Rome to Bithynia: 'You cannot be short of architects; there is not a province that has not men of skill and talent; do not imagine it is simpler to have one sent from Rome when they habitually come to us from Greek lands.' The

principate must have been a golden age for the profession. The cities never stinted their architects for funds. They were willing to put huge sites at their disposal, buying out the owners and sweeping away whole streets. They were prepared to pay for the most grandiose buildings: indeed, the more extravagant the design the better were they pleased. And there was no monotony in their demands. Buildings of the most diverse types were required—temples, theatres, baths, gymnasia, triumphal arches, fountains, colonnaded streets and squares.²⁶

The response of the architectural profession to the stimulus offered by the cities was more lively than that of the sculptors. Much of the civic architecture of the principate is, it is true, banal. Temples in particular, though often grandiose and even impressive from their sheer size and splendour, tend to be uninteresting: the rigid form prescribed by tradition cramped the designers' originality. Other types of building which were not confined by any set canons gave more scope to original treatment. On the structural side the vaulting of great halls like the chambers of the baths presented new problems and evoked interesting responses. The problem of super-imposing a dome on a square substructure was solved by the Syrian architects of the principate. In the great baths of Gerasa there still stands a square chamber—the survivor of three in the original plan—vaulted with a dome: the mathematical problem has been successfully solved and the whole building is beautifully executed in ashlar. On the decorative side also a new technique was required for the ornamentation of great façades such as those offered by the *proscenia* and exteriors of theatres. Here again there was an interesting response. The traditional orders of Greek architecture which were the architect's stock-in-trade were modified to fit new requirements. Entablatures were recessed, pediments were broken, orders on different scales combined in one façade and eventually an interesting and vigorous baroque was developed.²⁷

The credit for the development of what is generally called Roman architecture is probably to be ascribed in large measure to the Greek cities of the East. The architecture of the eastern provinces seems actually to have been more progressive than that of the capital: new experiments seem to have been tried out in the east before they were adopted in Rome. Whether this is true or not there is no doubt—we have Trajan's word for it—that the eastern provinces were the training school from which imperial architects were drawn. When the cities in the late third

century ceased to build, architecture fell rapidly into a decline: Constantine was alarmed at the decay of the profession and issued legislation to protect and encourage it. Eventually the church and the imperial government stepped forward to fill the place vacated by the cities as patrons of architecture. But there had in the interval been a great relapse in technical skill: the masonry of the provincial buildings of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries is shoddy in the extreme; the columns and ornamental carving are almost invariably old work re-used; the structure is primitive—the wooden-roofed basilica, the simplest of all architectural forms, replaces the vaulted halls of the baths. Gradually, however, in response to the patronage given by the imperial government and the church, the architects of the empire recovered their mastery of their craft. The new style which they evolved, the Byzantine, carried to their logical conclusion two lines of development to which the architects of the cities had pointed the way, the free treatment of classical motifs of decoration and the use of domical construction.²⁸

One of the most characteristic features of Greek culture was the emphasis which it laid upon athletics. Here also the cities played their part. Every city provided at least one and often several gymnasia for the use of its citizens, and a regular course of athletic training for boys and youths. It also encouraged athletics by the celebration of competitions and the presentation of prizes. It is rather difficult to tell how genuine the cult of athletics was in the Roman east. The more important games were dominated by men who were in all but name professionals: numerous inscriptions record long series of victories won in every *important city of the east* by men who clearly must have made athletics their career. It does not follow from these facts that athletics were entirely professionalized. In addition to the great games, which were open to general competition, the cities sometimes also celebrated civic games, confined to their own citizens, and more regularly held competitions open only to boys and young men who had been trained in the city gymnasium. Such games were clearly intended to encourage local talent. On the whole it seems probable that among the upper classes at any rate athletics were genuinely cultivated. Most upper class boys went through the prescribed course of training and competed in the ephobic games. Many kept up their training in later life, though in a less intensive form, and some competed in local games. In the more widely advertised games the standard was too high for

the amateur and these were reserved for men who devoted their whole time to athletics.²⁹

The cult of athletics declined in the fourth century under the disapproval of the church and eventually died out. The only element of the old athletic games which survived in the Byzantine period was chariot racing. Chariot racing was enormously and universally popular. Libanius complains that the aristocracy of Antioch thought and talked of nothing else, and the populace was passionately devoted to it: every city was divided into the rival factions of the Blues and the Greens and popular excitement often culminated in riots. The only rivals to the chariot races in popular esteem were the wild beast hunts, which had been introduced into the east under Roman influence during the principate. The cities spent large sums on providing both these forms of entertainment, but neither can be counted as a notable contribution to civilization.³⁰

Music and the drama were encouraged by the celebration of competitions. Every city possessed a theatre and often a concert hall as well, and in them it periodically gave at public expense displays of music and drama. The holy oecumenical synod of Dionysiac artists, the union of singers, musicians, actors, and poets, depended for its existence on the patronage of the cities, which paid them for their performances, rewarded the successful competitors with prizes, and gave them the most lavish entertainment during their visits: many inscriptions testify to the gratitude of the synod to the managers of the competitions for their munificence. Of the quality of the performances given we have no means of judging. No work of the numerous composers, song-writers, and dramatists who competed has come down to us. It can only be said that the cities offered the best that there was to give to their citizens, and that they endeavoured to stimulate excellence by the presentation of prizes. Taste nevertheless declined, and by the third century the mime was ousting the drama. In the Byzantine period the entertainment offered in the theatres was, according to the judgement of moralists at any rate, of the crudest kind.³¹

Higher education was regularly subsidized by the cities, which maintained professors of rhetoric and grammar who received salaries from the civic funds and were immune from civic charges. They similarly encouraged one branch of science, medicine, by supporting public physicians, who were expected not only to practise but to teach and conduct research. They

also provided appreciative audiences to travelling rhetoricians and poets, who often made substantial incomes by their lecture fees.³²

The vast bulk of literature produced in the eastern provinces is a testimony to the high standard of education maintained by the cities in the Roman age. During the first two centuries after Alexander's conquest the east made but little contribution to Greek literature. Nearly all the great authors of that period came from the old Greek lands. The native cities were as yet gradually assimilating Greek culture and had not reached a productive stage. The colonial foundations of the Hellenistic kings were, with the exception of Alexandria, as barren as the native cities, and Alexandria drew its talent ready-made from the home country. Already, however, in this early period outlying areas of the Greek world like Pamphylia and Cilicia which had hitherto made no contribution to literature and learning began to rise into prominence. Perge of Pamphylia produced the celebrated mathematician Apollonius. From Cilician Soli came the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus and the scientific poet Aratus, from Mallus the grammarians Crates and Zenodotus. Even Tarsus, whose claim to Greek origin is very dubious, produced an epic poet Dioscurides and had the singular honour of contributing in Dionysiades a star to the Pleiad of tragedians. By the first century B.C. Tarsus was the home of a very active philosophical school, rivalled only in Strabo's estimation by that of Alexandria, and more remarkable than it in that it relied almost exclusively on local talent.³³

By this time barbarian lands were becoming so completely imbued with Greek culture as to compete with the old Greek world in the literary field. Districts like Lydia and Caria which had long been in contact with Greek culture naturally took the lead. Sardis produced two famous rhetoricians both named Diodorus, the earlier of whom flourished at the time of the first Mithridatic war, the later towards the end of the first century B.C.; the second Diodorus was also a historian and a lyric poet. Many Carian cities possessed flourishing schools of rhetoric. From Alabanda came Apollonius Malacus, one of the protagonists of the Asiatic school of oratory, Meneclæ and Hierocles and the celebrated Apollonius Molo. From Tralles Strabo records Dionysocles and Damasus. From Mylasa came Euthydemus and Hybreas under whom Cicero studied. In Nysa the Stoic philosopher Apollonius taught. Nysa also produced a celebrated

family of grammarians under one of whom Pompey studied and another of whom was tutor to Pompey's sons.

More remarkable is the rapid progress which Greek culture made in Semitic lands. From Marathus came the philosopher Menelaus, from whom Gaius Gracchus was alleged to have borrowed his ideas. Towards the end of the second century Phoenicia produced a Greek poet, Antipater of Sidon. By the first century philosophy was flourishing in Phoenicia and Palestine. From Sidon came the peripatetics Boethus and Diodorus, from Tyre the historian of Greek philosophy Apollonius, from Ascalon Antiochus the founder of eclecticism. In Gadara there flourished a notable circle of literary men, Meleager the poet and the compiler of the first anthology, Philodemus the poet and epicurean philosopher, Menippus the satirist and at a rather later date Theodore the rhetorician, who was tutor to the emperor Tiberius.

By the first century B.C. the colonial foundations of the east had also begun to awake. Nicaea produced the epigrammatist Parthenius, Laodicea upon the Lycus the rhetorician Zeno, Apamea of Syria the celebrated philosopher and historical geographer Poseidonius, Antioch of Syria the epic poet Archias whom Cicero defended in a well-known speech.

It would be wearisome to continue this catalogue into the principate. The bulk of the literature has perished, and of what survives little is now read. But it would be unjust to deduce from this fact that it was all of poor quality. The scientific writing of the age has naturally now become obsolete, but the medical treatises of Galen of Pergamum and the mathematical, geographical, and astronomical works of Claudius Ptolemy of Ptolemais, to name two notable figures only, were for centuries the standard text-books on these subjects. Nicomedia and Nicaea produced two very competent historians, Arrian and Cassius Dio, who are still appreciated, and the biographies of Plutarch of Chaeronea, if not his other voluminous works, have a perennial appeal. In philosophy two new schools arose in the eastern provinces, the Neopythagorean and the Neoplatonic, and one exponent of the latter, Plotinus of Lycopolis, is not forgotten.

On the *belles lettres* of the age it is more difficult to be charitable. Poetry sank to a low ebb, and except for a few epigrams of a certain charm, its products were tedious and uninspired: instructive poems, like the still surviving treatises of Oppian of Anazarbus on hunting and fishing, were the chief vogue. Prose was dominated by a vicious rhetorical training which concentrated entirely

on form to the neglect of matter. It is difficult to-day to appreciate the diffuse speeches even of Dio of Prusa, who was an intelligent man and often had something to say. It is still harder to understand the enthusiastic response which the banal orations of Aelius Aristides of Hadrianotherae evoked throughout the civilized world. But it must be remembered that technically the rhetoricians of the principate, who are legion, were highly skilled, and that formal perfection of composition, though not greatly appreciated by the modern European mind, still in the near East commands immense admiration, as any one can testify who has heard an Arab audience groaning in raptures of delight at a speech of quite trivial content, if well composed and delivered in the classical tongue. Some other forms of prose literature are more interesting. The satirical sketches of Lucian of Samosata still amuse some readers. The romances of such writers as Charito of Aphrodisias or Heliodorus of Emesa deserve mention as forerunners of the novel. The monumental collection of gastronomical anecdotes compiled by Athenaeus of Naucratis is, on the other hand, valuable only as a mine from which fragments of more ancient authors can be quarried.

What is remarkable about the literary culture of the principate is not its quality, which is mediocre, but its wide diffusion. Many authors naturally came from the ancient seats of learning, but not a few, though they tended to migrate to the large centres to complete their training and secure a larger audience, were citizens of, and presumably received their early education in, the smallest and most remote cities. This can be seen even from the brief catalogue of notable figures given above. If minor stars be taken into account, there is scarcely a district, with certain significant exceptions, which did not produce some literary figure. Phrygia was rich in rhetoricians of note—Polemo of Laodicea, Alexander of Cotiaem, Metrophanes from tiny Eucarpia. Lycian Rhodiapolis possessed in Heracleitus 'the Homer of medical poems'. Even in barbarous Lycaonia Laranda could boast of two epic poets, Nestor and his son Pisander. The recently and imperfectly urbanized areas of Thrace and north-eastern Asia Minor produced very little, however—Strabo of Amaseia is a brilliant exception—and the bureaucratically administered areas practically nothing. The few Cappadocians who attained literary eminence came from the two ancient cities of the region, Caesarea and Tyana. In Egypt, though Alexandria, Ptolemais, and above all the tiny city of Naucratis were quite productive, the nomes and their metropoleis

were utterly barren till in the third century Lycopolis gave birth to the exotic genius Plotinus. The coincidence may be fortuitous, but it would seem that city life was a real stimulus to literature.

Byzantine literature is perhaps even less read than that of the principate, but it does not entirely deserve its ill repute. The bulk of what was written was theology, and theology, however good—and much of the Byzantine work is excellent in its kind—is not congenial to the modern mind. The age is, however, notable for a number of excellent historians, mostly Syrians, foremost among them Ammianus Marcellinus, who though he wrote in Latin was an Antiochene, and Procopius from the Palestinian Caesarea. Poetry had a remarkable revival, and prose, though it was still permeated by rhetoric, sometimes, despite its verbosity and pedantry of form, attains real eloquence, particularly in the mouths of Christian preachers who had some real message. But what is striking about Byzantine literature is its ever-widening geographical range. Cappadocia blossomed out with such great figures as Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa: northern Asia Minor could boast of two leading rhetoricians of the fourth century, Himerius and Themistius; and, strangest of all, Upper Egypt produced a bevy of epic poets; the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus of Panopolis has survived, and shows that the school was not altogether contemptible.

Perhaps the most striking evidence of the wide diffusion of literary culture in the Byzantine age is the high development of the art of letter writing. We possess many large collections of letters written not only by prominent literary figures of the age such as Libanius, Basil, or Theodoret, but also by others like Isidore of Pelusium whose correspondence is their only title to fame. Letter writing was a fine art: every letter, however trivial its content, was a finished literary piece, composed in the elaborate antithetical style taught in the rhetorical schools and often adorned with erudite historical or mythological allusions. The vast range of correspondents to whom the letters of the surviving collections are addressed shows that it was a very widely and indeed universally practised art.

The culture of the Greek East may have been banal. It may have lacked originality and venerated too obsequiously the classical past. It may have laid too much emphasis on the more superficial qualities of correct style and formal exactitude, and too little on the spirit and meaning of the arts. But such as it was, the Greek culture of this age was geographically diffused over a remarkably

wide area. From the shores of the Adriatic to the upper waters of the Euphrates, and from the Black Sea coast to the cataracts of the Nile, there were scattered, in some parts thickly, in others more sparsely, communities where the arts were appreciated and literature was read, where a travelling poet or orator would find an enthusiastic reception and actors and musicians could reckon on a discriminating audience.

It remains to be seen how far down into the social scale this culture penetrated. The urban proletariat obviously had a certain share in the amenities of city life. They had the benefit of the pure water-supply, the drainage, the well-paved and airy streets and squares with their shady colonnades. They had luxuriously fitted baths at their disposal for a few pence. They could enjoy as much as their betters the splendid public architecture of the cities, though it would seem that they were more appreciative of such solid benefits as free meals and gifts of cash.³⁴

Technically the educational services of the city were probably as a rule open to them. In the Egyptian metropoleis, it is true, membership of the gymnasium was restricted to a hereditary class, comprising the best families of the town; but no similar rule is known elsewhere. Nevertheless it seems unlikely that the poorer citizens can in practice have often been able to put their children through the boys' and ephebes' course of training, which, even if no fees were demanded, involved many heavy incidental expenses. It is significant that the professional athletes, who were the flower of the city gymnasia, seem as a rule to have belonged by birth to the aristocracy. The literary education offered by the cities must also have been largely inaccessible to the lower orders. Primary education, though sometimes endowed by Hellenistic cities, seems rarely to have been provided at public expense in Roman times: schoolmasters did not even enjoy that immunity from civic liturgies which was accorded to professors. It was thus only the class which could afford to send their sons to a private school that profited from the subsidized higher education given by the public rhetoricians and grammarians. The lower orders were probably for the most part not even literate: it is highly significant that, when in the late third century the richer among them were being pressed into the city councils, Diocletian had to rule that illiteracy was no bar to the decurionate.³⁵

Public entertainments the proletariat could and did enjoy. It is rather difficult to believe, it is true, that in the Roman period they can have greatly appreciated the literary, dramatic, and musical

events of the games, if the works produced were as erudite and precious as is most of the surviving literature of the age. But they no doubt enjoyed the show, which became as time went on more adapted to popular taste. Even the most illiterate could understand and appreciate the mime, which was the standard theatrical entertainment of the Byzantine age; artisans and shopkeepers, according to Libanius, though they had never opened a book in their lives, knew all the Greek myths from watching the ballets and hearing the songs of the theatre. We do not know how much interest was taken by the general public in professional athletics, but Libanius' description of the Antiochene Olympia shows that in the fourth century this part of the programme was watched by a very select audience; nor can the spectators have ever been very numerous, for the *plethron* where the athletic events took place, which was built in the reign of Commodus, had a very limited seating accommodation. Chariot racing, on the other hand, aroused universal enthusiasm, as did side-shows such as gladiatorial combats and the baiting and hunting of wild beasts.³⁶

The peasants could partake of the culture of the cities only by going to them. Except for collecting the taxes, maintaining public security, and providing roads, the civic authorities did virtually nothing outside the town walls. If a village wanted a pure water-supply, it had to build—and sometimes actually built—its own aqueducts and fountains. If it wanted baths, it provided them from its own funds. The villages maintained their public buildings—temples, rest-houses, fortifications, watch-towers, markets, even sometimes theatres and gymnasia—all at their own expense, and celebrated their own festivals without any assistance from the city. Whence the villages derived the common funds to which they frequently allude, it is not very easy to say. There is no allusion to any local rates, and it seems unlikely that they had the power to levy them. Many rural communities, however, possessed land, either commons, from which pasture dues may have been derived, or estates left by benefactors: we have records of a number of bequests of land to villages, the rent of which was assigned to feasts and merry-makings. Some villages also held cash endowments, similarly arising from bequests and usually ear-marked for special purposes. For the rest the villages like the cities relied to a large extent on the generosity of their magistrates and leading residents. The records of Ormela consist largely of such items as 'Aurelius Artemes, son of Chares, son of Mongus, stood the people a breakfast and 370 Attic drachmae'. It is interesting to

observe that several Lydian villages aped the cities by demanding a money payment from candidates for local offices: at Apateira the price of the auditorship was fixed by a resolution of the villagers at 250 denarii.³⁷

The scale of the rural services was, as the sums of money cited above suggest, very moderate. The major item in their festivals was usually a common meal, and their public buildings were very simple. The only village, it may be remarked, that is recorded to have possessed a theatre, was the important independent commune of Saccaea in Auranitis, which was raised by Diocletian to the status of a colony, and a gymnasium is mentioned only at Orcistus, which, though subject to Nacoleia, proudly cherished the memory that it had once been a city, and regained that rank under Constantine. Such minor amenities as the villages provided for their inhabitants were a very pale reflection of the glories of civic culture, and, though they were for the most part obviously inspired by the shining example set by the cities, they owed nothing either to the initiative or to the financial aid of the civic governments. Since the latter drew very little by way of direct taxation from their territories—the corn levy was the only official contribution made by the country to the town, and it was not universal—the villages had, it is true, little cause for complaint against the cities corporately. It must, however, be remembered that the splendours of civic life were to a large extent paid for out of the rents which the urban aristocracy drew from their estates, and to this extent the villages were impoverished for the benefit of the towns.³⁸

. It is highly improbable that either the masses in the towns or the peasants in the country had any share in the literary culture of the age. This is indicated by the character of the literature itself. The products of the Roman and Byzantine periods, whether in poetry or prose, are highly erudite: they teem with historical and mythological allusions which only the highly educated could have understood. Their style becomes progressively more artificial and pedantic; its subtleties could only be appreciated by persons who had gone through the laborious rhetorical training which the rich alone could afford, and the very meaning of many sentences must have been as obscure to the ordinary man as it is to the reader of to-day. Finally, all literature was written in an artificial classical dialect which became as time went on more and more divorced from ordinary spoken Greek: the orators of the Byzantine age still tried to speak the language of Demosthenes

and studiously avoided such vulgar neologisms as *dux* (δοῦξ) or *jugum* (ἰουγον). The literature of the Roman and Byzantine ages is, in fact, a typical product of an aristocratic culture, and with a very few exceptions, such as the sixth-century chronicle of John Malalas of Antioch, made no attempt to cater for the popular taste.

A final test of the diffusion of Greek culture is language. It is a negative test only; for, even if it be proved that the proletariat and the peasantry spoke Greek, that is no proof that they were educated or even literate. But as a negative test it is damning: if the lower orders knew no Greek or even habitually spoke a barbarian tongue, it is *a fortiori* certain that they can have had no share in the literary culture of the aristocracy.

The language question is from the nature of the case a difficult one. Literature was written for a Greek-speaking public and dealt with their interests and activities. Our literary sources therefore give an overwhelming impression of a Greek-speaking world. Greek was also the official language of the eastern provinces. Official documents are invariably in Greek even if they deal with the lower classes or proceed from them; not only were edicts published in Greek but petitions had to be drafted in Greek. The epigraphic and papyrological material therefore also gives the impression of a Greek-speaking world. Greek was finally to all intents and purposes the only written language: even the humblest peasant therefore had his tombstone inscribed in Greek, or, if he wished to send a letter, went to a Greek letter writer. In these circumstances only the most fragmentary evidence of the existence of native languages can be expected. But any casual references which do occur acquire very great significance. And the later in date that the evidence is, the more convincing does it become. In the principate the Hellenization of some backward areas was still in progress, and the survival of native languages in that period may have been merely a vanishing relic of the past. If in certain districts and in certain social strata native languages survived in the Byzantine age despite centuries of Hellenization, it is plain that Greek culture never penetrated to them.

First may be cited two pieces of evidence of general bearing. John Chrysostom, in a sermon delivered in the Gothic church at Constantinople, declares that the scriptures have been translated into Scythian, Thracian, Sarmatian, Moorish, and Indian. Gregory of Nyssa, discussing the diversity of human speech, cites, apparently as languages current in his day, Greek, Latin, Hebrew,

Syriac, Persian, Cappadocian, Moorish, Scythian, Thracian, and Egyptian. Both passages are rhetorical, and cannot be pressed, but it is probable that John and Gregory were alluding to well-known languages. Hebrew (unless Aramaic is meant) was, it is true, not a living language at that date, but was known to scholars. Of the others most can be proved to have been spoken in the fourth century, and some, such as Thracian and Cappadocian, which possessed no literature, can only have been cited as living tongues.³⁹

In Greece and Macedonia Greek was of course the indigenous language of all classes of the population. In Thrace, however, the native tongue seems to have survived till a late date. Apart from the evidence quoted above, we are told that in the monastery of the Bessi in Palestine the monks still in the sixth century recited their prayers in their native language.⁴⁰

In Asia Minor Greek had in some districts been from time immemorial the universal language, on the west coast, in Pamphylia and in Cilicia Pedias. In other districts the native languages had been superseded by Greek in the Hellenistic age. There was according to Strabo not a trace of Lydian in the Lydia of his day. Carian seems also to have been obsolete by the first century B.C.: in discussing the Homeric phrase 'Carians of barbarous speech' Strabo cites the evidence of an antiquarian for the character of the Carian language though he himself knew Caria well. Lycian probably died out at the same time as Carian: it disappears from the inscriptions at approximately the same date.⁴¹

In inner Asia Minor the native languages made a more stubborn resistance. In the Cibyratis, according to Strabo, four languages had been in use; the remark apparently refers to the recent past. Beside Greek, there were current the language of the 'Solymi', by whom are apparently meant the original Caba-lians; Lydian, introduced by the colonists who founded Cibyra; and Pisidian, spoken by the invading tribes who had overrun the country from the east. If Pisidian survived so long in the comparatively accessible district of the Cibyratis, it may be inferred that it endured yet longer in the remote mountain fastnesses of Pisidia proper; of this there is, however, no positive evidence. In Lycaonia we know from the Acts that the common people still spoke the native language in the middle of the first century A.D. This piece of evidence is of particular value since it shows that the urban proletariat there still spoke Lycaonian: *a fortiori* the peasantry must have continued to speak it far later.⁴²

For other districts there is later and therefore better evidence. In parts of Phrygia inscriptions prove the survival of the native language in the third century. There was at this date an attempt to rehabilitate Phrygian as a written language, and many tombstones in country districts are inscribed in the Phrygian language written in Greek characters. The Celtic language of the Galatians certainly survived in the fourth century and probably in the fifth. Jerome in his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians attests that Celtic was spoken in his own day and adds the circumstantial detail that the dialect resembled that of the Treveri. One of the posthumous miracles of Saint Euthymius suggests that in or rather shortly after his day Celtic was the normal speech of the Galatians. Basil of Caesarea alludes in a sermon to the Cappadocian language as being familiar to all his hearers. If it was still commonly spoken in Caesarea side by side with Greek, it was probably the only language of the vast rural districts of Cappadocia. We possess no evidence for northern Asia Minor, Mysia, Bithynia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus, but since cities were so sparse in these regions and their literary output was so small, it is probable that Greek did not make much headway in them and that the rural population remained untouched by Hellenism.⁴³

From Syria the evidence is fuller. In some outlying districts Hellenization began very late. Aramaic was the official language of the Nabataean kingdom until its annexation. In Palmyra Aramaic remained an official language side by side with Greek down to the third century. In these regions the long survival of the native languages is not very significant. In Mesopotamia similarly, though Greek civilization had been introduced at an early date, it had not been able to take firm root. Under Parthian rule the growth of the Greek cities had been stunted and native dynasties had been favoured. It is not therefore very surprising that in Mesopotamia Syriac retained its hold on the educated classes and was revived as a literary language as early as the third century A.D.⁴⁴

More significant is the evidence for the survival of Aramaic in apparently Hellenized regions. From the epigraphic evidence it would appear that even in Batanaea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, admittedly backward districts, where cities were rare and village life was the rule, Greek was nevertheless universally spoken: the thousands of inscriptions, some recording the humblest villagers, are all in Greek. One inscription, which records an interpreter of the procurators, destroys the illusion. Commagene was again

a remote district, but the inscriptions both of the royal and of the imperial period give the impression that Greek was its language, and its capital Samosata produced a notable figure in Greek literature, the satirist Lucian. Lucian himself betrays the superficiality of the hellenization of Commagene. He was of humble origin, and was apprenticed to a sculptor. He casually remarks of this period of his life, 'being quite a boy and still a barbarian in language'. The admission is highly significant: even in Samosata, the former royal capital and the metropolis of the district, the lower classes spoke Aramaic.⁴⁵

In the Byzantine period the evidence is much more abundant. John Chrysostom in a sermon delivered at Antioch urges his congregation to give a kindly welcome to the peasants from the city territory, who would soon be thronging into the town for a great festival; for they are, he says, 'a people divided from us in language but agreeing with us in faith'. The tales of the hermits who swarmed in northern Syria abound in references to the common, and indeed exclusive, use of Aramaic in country districts. Of one of these, Maesyman, Theodoret says, 'He was a Syrian by language, brought up in the country'. On interviewing another, Thalelaeus, he was surprised to find that he spoke Greek: the explanation was that he was a Cilician by origin. Another, Macedonius, called by the people Gubba, was persuaded to go into Antioch to intercede for the city in the matter of the destruction of the statues of Theodosius. Theodoret gives his speech to the imperial commissioners and adds, 'This he said using the Syrian language, and, as the interpreter rendered it into Greek, they listened and trembled'. The story of Publius of Zeugma is very instructive. He was himself a decurion and spoke Greek, and his early associates in the eremitic life were also Greek-speaking. But presently he attracted 'those who spoke the native language'. He admitted them after some hesitation, remembering our Lord's command, 'Go, teach all nations'; but he built a separate monastery for them and the two communities met only at divine service, and then they were 'divided into two sections, each using its own language'. After Publius' death it was found more convenient to have separate abbots for the Greek and native communities.⁴⁶

It is fairly clear that the peasantry was untouched by the Greek culture of the cities. There is evidence that the urban proletariat was but little affected by it. Jerome records that when the townspeople of Elusa in the course of a pagan festivity met the hermit

Hilarion they approached him reverently, saying, Barech. Elusa was, it is true, according to Jerome a half-barbarian town, but it certainly possessed a cultured upper class: several of Libanius' correspondents, one of them a rhetorician, were residents of Elusa. But there is evidence from cities whose claim to Hellenism is less ambiguous. In Scythopolis it is recorded that there was a reader in the church who translated the liturgy into Aramaic for the benefit of the common people. Socrates thought it necessary to mention that two Tyrian boys, one of whom was destined to be the evangelist of Abyssinia, were 'not unacquainted with the Greek language'; and they were relations, if poor relations, of the philosopher Meropius. An anecdote in the life of Porphyry bishop of Gaza is particularly instructive, since Gaza was in the Byzantine period one of the most flourishing centres of Greek literary culture. Porphyry had received from Arcadius an authorization to destroy the pagan temples of Gaza, but the Marneum, the principal temple, resisted all efforts at demolition. At this juncture a miracle occurred. A small boy of the lower orders propounded the solution of the problem first in Aramaic and then in Greek. The point of the miracle was not so much the precocious intelligence of the boy as the fact that he spoke in Greek: it was proved on investigation that neither he nor his mother knew a word of the language.⁴⁷

In Egypt the papyri prove that the knowledge of Greek was comparatively widely disseminated. Thousands of administrative documents survive drafted by village officials, and thousands of private letters written by persons of quite humble station. The explanation probably lies in the administrative system of the country. The elaborate bureaucratic régime established by the Ptolemies required scores of minor officials with at any rate an elementary knowledge of Greek, and it was a paying proposition for upper-class peasants to learn enough Greek to apply for a post under the government. It was, moreover, in a country where the government interfered so intimately in the daily life of its humblest subjects, a matter of practical importance for every one to know the language of the administration.

The papyri do not, however, prove that Greek was the normal language of the country. It gradually became the normal written language. The use of the demotic script was deliberately discouraged by the Ptolemies. A demotic contract was valid only if a Greek copy was attached: demotic notaries thus naturally lost their practice and with their extinction the art of committing the

native language to writing gradually waned, surviving chiefly among the priests. Receipts for taxes were, however, still issued in demotic under the principate, especially in Upper Egypt, and it is recorded that Paul, the first hermit, knew both Greek and Egyptian letters: the demotic script lived long enough to contribute some letters to the Coptic alphabet.⁴⁸

Egyptian thus never ceased entirely to be written. It probably always was the normal spoken language, at any rate of the lower classes, and there were very many people who knew no Greek at all. An incident in Rufinus' *Historia Monachorum* is revealing. A party of Greek visitors, whose tour of the monasteries of Egypt Rufinus describes, having enjoyed the hospitality of Abbot Apollonius were preparing to move on to their next objective. The abbot with kindly forethought picked out three of his monks who knew both Egyptian and Greek to accompany them, with the object, says Rufinus, 'that they might both interpret for us as was necessary and also be able to edify us with their conversation'. It is evident that it was difficult to travel cross country in Egypt without a knowledge of the native language. Even the government in the sixth century admitted that many of its subjects were unacquainted with Greek. An edict of that period survives which was issued in both Greek and Egyptian.⁴⁹

The most convincing proof of the general prevalence of the native languages both in Syria and in Egypt is the fact that the national churches of these countries adopted Syriac and Coptic respectively as their literary and liturgical languages. The orthodox church, which the government supported—it is significant that it is known in the Near East to-day as the royal or Roman church—clung to Greek. The monophysite churches to which the mass of the people belonged abandoned Greek in favour of the native languages. Syriac and Coptic were thus resurrected from the condition of peasant patois to which they had fallen. They began to be written once more, Coptic in a new alphabet which was the Greek with the addition of a few demotic letters, and they became the vehicles for such literature as the church provided for the edification of the faithful.

When the Arab conquest brought an end to Roman rule in Syria and Egypt, Greek rapidly died out. The few surviving champions of the orthodox church continued to use Greek for a while; St. John of Damascus still wrote in Greek under Arab rule. Greek was also at first preserved as the language of government: it was the only language which possessed the necessary

technical vocabulary. But when orthodoxy died and the Caliphs insisted on the substitution of Arabic for Greek in the government offices, Greek perished utterly. Syriac and Coptic on the other hand survived far into the middle ages as the popular languages of Syria and Egypt.⁵⁰

Another sign that the mass of the population did not speak Greek is the survival of pre-Greek town names, Semitic and Egyptian. The Greek names in some cases, when the town was a completely new creation or was substantially remodelled, have survived. Instances are Alexandria (Iskanderiya in Arabic, though Rakoti in Coptic), the cities of the Syrian tetrapolis (Antakiya and Latakiya still current in modern times, Selefkiya and Afamiya mentioned in Arabic geographers), some other Seleucid foundations, such as Nicopolis (Niboli), Seleucia ad Belum (Selukiya), and Europus (Jerabis), and several Herodian foundations, Sebaste (Sebastiya), Caesarea (Kaisariya), Tiberias (Tubbariya). In very many cases, however, the old name has survived. In Syria there are Kinnesrin for Chalcis, Haleb for Beroea, Hama for Epiphaneia, Baalbek for Heliopolis, 'Amman for Philadelphia, 'Akka for Ptolemais, Baitjebrin for Eleutheropolis, Amwas for Nicopolis, Arsuf for Apollonia, to name only some of the well-attested cases. In Egypt similarly names such as Latopolis, Apollinopolis, Panopolis, Lycopolis, Hermopolis, Heracleopolis, and Cynopolis have vanished, and the modern names are derived from the ancient Egyptian, Esna from Tesnet, Edfu from Dfot, Akhmim from Khemmi, Assiut from Siaut, Ashmunein from Khmunu (via the Coptic Shmun), Ahnas from Hat-nen-nesut (via the Coptic Hnes), Qeis from Kais. The conclusion to be drawn from this phenomenon is that the mass of the people continued throughout the period of Roman rule to call the towns by their native names, ignoring the names universally used in Greek because they did not speak Greek.

No similar evidence from survival is available for Asia Minor. Asia Minor remained for another five centuries under the rule of a Greek-speaking government and under the influence of a Greek-speaking Church. The native languages eventually died and Greek conquered. Even in the most backward regions the Greek names of cities have survived rather than the indigenous. In Pontus Niksar is derived from Neocaesarea, not Cabeira, Sivas from Sebasteia; even the fancy name Ionopolis has supplanted the old name Abonuteichus, and survives as Ineboli. In Cappadocia Caesarea (Kaisarieh) and not Mazaca has survived. In

Lycaonia Ladik represents Laodicea. In the mountains of Cilicia Tracheia a large number of Greek names survive, Sebaste (Sevasti), Germanicopolis (Ermenek), Irenopolis (Irnebol), Domitiopolis (Dindebol), and even Zenonopolis (Isnebol). This fact is, however, no proof that by the sixth century Greek was universally spoken. There is no indication that hellenization was more complete in many parts of Asia Minor than it was in Egypt or Syria; in some parts there is every reason to believe that it was less advanced.

The difference in language between the urban aristocracy and the peasantry implies a deep cultural cleavage, and there was, it would seem, little love lost between them. As in many sophisticated societies there was, it is true, a literary cult of the simple life among the aristocracy. The Idylls of Bion of Smyrna draw a rosy picture of Arcadian shepherds and shepherdesses, and the same theme is repeated by many later writers, such as Longus, who wrote his 'Pastorals concerning Daphnis and Chloe' in the third or fourth century A.D. A famous example of this genre, which has sometimes been taken too literally by modern scholars, is Dio Chrysostom's *Euboicus*, which describes the author's adventures in the wilds of Euboea, where he is entertained by a peasant who is a typical product of a townsman's imagination. John Chrysostom in a sermon delivered at Antioch likewise paints a highly idealized picture of the simple joys of rustic life, but on this occasion with a purpose: real peasants of flesh and blood would soon be coming into town for a great festival, and John was anxious that his aristocratic congregation should give them a decent welcome. It is plain from this sermon that the gentry regarded the peasants as boors and barbarians, and this was probably the general attitude; in a third-century letter which we possess from Egypt the writer asks his correspondent with rhetorical horror: 'Do you take me for a barbarian or an inhuman Egyptian?'⁵¹

Of the attitude of the peasants to the city aristocracy we have little direct evidence, but they had not much ground for liking them. The city magnates came into contact with the villagers in three capacities only, as tax-collectors, as policemen, and as landlords. The tax-collector is never a popular figure, and, as we have seen, the decurions, in the Byzantine period at any rate, did not trouble to endear themselves to the humbler inhabitants of the city territory. The policeman again has never been beloved by the lower classes, and in this capacity also the decurions do

not seem to have made themselves popular. On the conduct of the urban aristocracy as landowners it is of course impossible to generalize, but they had as a class the usual failings of absentee landlords. They seem to have done little for their tenants, and they were inconsiderate about the rent in bad seasons.

John Chrysostom fiercely denounces the rapacity of the Antiochene aristocracy. 'Should one examine how they treat the miserable long-suffering peasants, one will see that they are more brutal than savages. The peasants are wasted with hunger and toil their life long. The landlords impose unceasing and intolerable payments on them, and demand from them laborious services. They use their bodies like asses or mules, or rather stones, never allowing them to pause a moment for breath, and whether the land yields or does not yield, they keep them at it just the same and give them no mercy. What sight could be more pitiable than when, having toiled the whole winter through in frost and rain, spent with work, the peasants return with empty hands and even in debt, dreading and fearing more than this ruin and more than hunger the torments inflicted by the bailiffs, the seizures, the demand notes, the arrests, the unescapable forced labour?' Elsewhere he castigates the owners of vineyards for their treatment of the casual labour employed at the vintage. 'They fill their presses and vats from the toil and sweat of the labourers, but they do not allow them to take home even a small measure of the produce, but put it all into the jars of their iniquity, throwing them a little money for it.' These denunciations cannot be discounted as mere commonplaces of Christian oratory; for the pagan Libanius, whose sympathies lay on the whole with the city magnates, confirms them in one passage. 'Some treat them like slaves: if the cultivators do not praise their extortionate treatment of them, a few syllables are spoken, a soldier with chains appears on the estate, and the jail receives them.'⁵²

These denunciations are borne out by an anecdote told by Theodoret, which vividly illustrates the ordinary relations of a great landlord to his tenants. 'They say that one day the owner of the village—he was Letoius, who held the first rank in the council of Antioch, but was wrapped in mists of impiety—came down and proceeded to exact the crops from the peasants with more violence than was right.' The parish priest endeavoured to induce him to take pity on the villagers, 'but he remained inexorable. But in the event he learned the wickedness of his

disobedience. For when it was time to start back, and the carriage was ready, he took his seat and ordered the driver to whip up the mules. They pulled, straining with all their strength and struggling to draw the shaft, but the wheels were as if bound with iron and lead. When the crowd of peasants had tried to move the wheels with crowbars, and this had also proved unavailing, one of the more friendly of them, taking Letoius' side, told him the reason'—which was that the priest had cursed him.⁵³

This story shows that the peasants regarded their landlords with a certain hostility. A passage in one of John Chrysostom's sermons suggests that their discontent might reach dangerous proportions. He is urging Christian landowners to build churches and endow priests in their villages, and having made his appeal to higher motives he ends up with a word of worldly wisdom; 'this will be useful for the tranquillity of the peasants. For the priest will be revered and this will contribute to the security of the estate.' Libanius in his speech on patronage reveals that where the peasants could secure armed support by bribing soldiers stationed in the village, this unrest developed into open revolt against the landlord, and that villages of peasant proprietors often in similar circumstances drove off the decurions who came to collect their taxes with showers of stones.⁵⁴

The normal attitude of the peasant proprietor to the tax-collector and of the tenant to his landlord was thus one of sullen hostility, which, if opportunity offered, developed into revolt. It cannot be concluded from this that the peasantry had as a whole any class consciousness or that they regarded the cities with hatred as the symbols of an alien domination. Their attitude to the cities was rather one of indifference. This indifference is strikingly illustrated on the tombstones of the Syrian villagers who migrated to western lands to make their fortunes. These exiles always record their village on their tombstones. Their city they either ignore or record merely as a geographical determinant. A typical inscription runs: 'Here lies Azizus son of Agrippa, a Syrian of the village of Caprozabada in the territory of Apamea.' Azizus did not regard Apamea as his native city: it was to him merely the capital of the district in which his native village lay.⁵⁵

One important contribution the men of the cities made to the life of the country-side, Christianity. Till the rise of Christianity town and country had in religion, as in other things, little in common. The gods whose cults the cities maintained were

naturally often worshipped throughout their territories, and sometimes over a wider area; and the peasantry flocked in at festivals to enjoy the sumptuous shows provided by the civic authorities. But they also continued to worship their own local gods, building them temples and altars and celebrating their feasts with merry-making, and it was probably to these gods that their real devotion went. Scores of village inscriptions record dedications to obscure local deities with uncouth names, and from a number of rural temples in Lydia and Phrygia comes an interesting group of documents which show how dominating an influence these village gods had on the life of the peasantry: they are records of penances imposed on worshippers by the god for ritual or moral offences and faithfully performed. Of the international cults of the Hellenistic and Roman world none save emperor worship, which was more or less obligatory on all classes, took root in the country-side till Christianity.⁵⁶

Christianity, though it originated in a rural environment, became very rapidly an essentially urban religion. It appealed mainly to the proletariat, and especially to its upper stratum, the prosperous freedmen. When in the third century members of this class began to be pressed into the councils, Christianity rose in the social scale and gradually conquered the curial order, though the richest and most aristocratic decurions, most of whom filtered into the imperial bureaucracy, remained for long, despite the pressure and the patronage of the Christian court, pagan at heart. But all this while the country-side was hardly affected. In the West the name given to the adherents of the old religion, pagans or countrymen, testifies to this fact. In the East, by a literary tradition deriving from the Jewish writers of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, pagans were called Hellenes, a title appropriate enough to the aristocratic intellectuals who were the most vocal section of the opposition, but singularly ill fitted, as Julian once remarks, to describe the barbarian peasantry who formed the bulk of the conservative party.⁵⁷

This sketch is of course highly schematic and ignores many local variations. Some cities long remained obstinately pagan: Gaza for instance was still almost solidly devoted to its old gods in the reign of Arcadius. Elsewhere villages early became Christian: in Bithynia Pliny notes with alarm the spread of the superstition into the rural areas as early as Trajan's day, and in Cyprus and Cyrenaica the large number of village bishoprics testifies to the early popularity of Christianity in the country. But in

general the fact that bishoprics nearly always correspond with cities shows that in the formative period of the Christian hierarchy the faithful were normally to be found in the towns. Julian's pagan revival found its chief support, apart from the old aristocracy, in the villages. He himself comments on the welcome change when he left the rabidly Christian atmosphere of Antioch and Beroea and passed through villages where the smoke of sacrifices rose to welcome him. In the internecine struggles which raged in the cities of the East during Theodosius I's reign the followers of the old gods are stated to have called in bands of peasants to their aid, and Libanius' pamphlet on behalf of the temples, addressed to that emperor, defends almost exclusively the still flourishing rural sanctuaries.⁵⁸

The conversion of the country-side was a long task which was still incomplete in Justinian's reign. It was in part the work of hermits, who were particularly active and numerous in Syria and Egypt. Many of these were townsmen who had fled from the turmoil of urban life: Publius, for instance, who made many converts in north-eastern Syria, was a decurion of Zeugma. More were peasants themselves, but many of them owed their conversion to a city education: the famous Hilarion, son of a prosperous peasant family in the territory of Gaza, was converted as a school-boy at Alexandria. Some credit is therefore due to the cities for this casual missionary work. But more important was the work of the bishops of the cities, who, unlike the secular magistrates, regarded the whole territory and not merely the town as their charge. The correspondence of Basil of Caesarea gives a vivid picture of the minute care with which he supervised his vast diocese and directed the fifty 'rural bishops' (*χωρειπίσκοποι*) who ruled its subdivisions. John Chrysostom as a priest at Antioch is insistent in his sermons on the duty of the rich members of his congregation to build churches and endow priests in the villages which they owned. Theodoret of Cyrrhus tells us in one of his letters that his diocese comprised no less than eight hundred parishes. It was the parochial system, whereby the bishop ordained a priest for every village, that won the country-side for the faith of the town. In Asia Minor the church by its means eventually succeeded where the cities had failed, and made the peasants Greeks.⁵⁹

It would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that the history of Greco-Roman civilization is the history of the cities. So long as they held the loyalty of their citizens, they supplied the motive

power which kept the mechanism of society in action: when they lost their attraction, the machine ran down. For the ancient world evolved no larger loyalty than that of the citizen to his native town. The leagues of the Hellenistic age, important as were their achievements, never superseded their constituent cities in the regard of their members, and for that reason they failed in the struggle for existence against the monarchies. But the Hellenistic kingdom had no essential unity: it was a mere agglomeration of communities, united only by their common subjection to the king, whose power rested on the co-operation of his 'friends' and the support of a mercenary army. The empire of Rome, which succeeded to the kingdoms, had greater stability, since its ruler was not an individual but a community. But it too lacked organic unity. The force which built it and held it together in its early days was the tenacious loyalty of the Roman people, both the ruling aristocracy and the mass of citizens who formed the army, to the city of Rome. Under the principate this sentiment gradually mellowed among the aristocracy into a sense of imperial responsibility for the welfare of the subject communities: and as the governing class developed into a cosmopolitan bureaucracy, what remained of the spirit of civic loyalty was transmuted into professional solidarity. The army similarly, once inspired by a vigorous patriotism, became a professional body, held together by its own *esprit de corps*. But neither in the bureaucracy nor in the army did any true imperial loyalty emerge. The force which maintained their efficiency was rather professional pride, and though they successfully fulfilled their functions of administering and defending the empire, they ruthlessly neglected the interests of its inhabitants.

If in the imperial services themselves no genuine loyalty to the empire developed, still less could it be expected to arise among the provincial population. For the vast majority of men their city remained the focus of their loyalties and the boundaries of its territory their political horizon. Under the Hellenistic monarchies very little attempt was made to stimulate any sentiment of unity. There was no common citizenship, no term even to describe membership of a kingdom; the ordinary inhabitant of a kingdom, who was not one of the king's 'friends' or soldiers, was the citizen of such and such a city, which was in alliance with the king. The sole bond of unity—and it was a weak one—was the cult of the monarch and the dynasty. Under the Roman empire there was some progress. Since the mistress of the empire was a

city there was an imperial citizenship which could be extended to the provincials. In the West it was granted to an ever increasing number of subject communities: in the East, however, wholesale grants were very rare and on the whole only selected members of the upper classes achieved the Roman citizenship till the universal grant of A.D. 212. After that date, it is true, all free inhabitants of the empire were technically citizens of Rome; but the sentimental effect of this sudden transformation was nugatory—'Roma communis nostra patria est' was in the East, at any rate, a mere lawyer's maxim. The cult of Rome and of the emperors meant perhaps rather more. As the memories of their freedom faded, the cities had ceased to chafe at subjection to a sovereign. The establishment of peace and orderly government after the oppressions of the republican period and the horrors of the civil wars produced under the principate a revulsion of gratitude to the imperial house, and gradually there grew up a sentiment of pride in membership of the Roman empire. But it was a purely passive sentiment. The empire was regarded almost as an external power, whose benefactions were received with gratitude, whose triumphs excited admiration, and whose demands were met with proper submission.

The sentiment of civic loyalty was, on the other hand, deep and strong. Unhappily the development of larger political units, useful and indeed necessary though these were to curb the bad side of local patriotism, the never-ending internecine wars between cities, tended to deprive it of any useful outlet. Since political unity was imposed by force against the will of the cities, the kings who first imposed it could hardly count on their co-operation. They were therefore driven to restrict as far as possible the powers and responsibilities of the cities and to build up an independent military and administrative system. They thus took out of the hands of the cities the departments of war and taxation, and entrusted them to their own mercenary armies and revenue officials and contractors. The Roman republic continued the same policy, partly because it too ruled by force, and partly from mere inertia, and furthermore, in order to protect the interests of its citizens, deprived the subject cities of the department of justice. Under the principate the cities no longer resented their subjection, and it was safe to return to them certain powers. But by this time the system of imperial administration had hardened and it was impossible to make a radical reversal of policy. In fact the cities were entrusted only with minor administrative

functions in connexion with taxation. These services, which allowed no initiative and no responsibility, save to fulfil orders punctually, made little appeal to the spirit of civic pride.

Little attempt was thus made to guide the forces of civic patriotism into the service of the empire. The imperial army and the imperial judicial and fiscal system were divorced from the local governments, and the ordinary citizen could in effect enter these services only by severing his connexion with his city. Only the social services were left to the civic authorities, and even here they were cramped by inadequate finance, since the major taxes were appropriated by the central government, and by restrictions imposed in its own interest by the suzerain power. The kings as a rule felt more sympathy for the propertied classes than for the commons, and, since this sympathy was reciprocated by political support, used their influence to maintain the cause of the rich. Democracy was in the Hellenistic age so powerful a movement that they were unable to do this overtly or with complete success, and the democracies of the Hellenistic age were able to make striking progress in the sphere of the social services. Public control of the market and direction of the corn supply kept the prices of essential foodstuffs within the means of the lower classes. Drainage, a pure water-supply, baths, and a state medical service made for a better standard of health. Some cities even supplied free education and physical training to all alike. But the kings set their faces against radical readjustments, the abolition of debts and redistribution of the land which were the slogans of the left wing, and in default of these the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few continued unchecked, as it invariably does in a peasant economy, especially when, as in the ancient world, taxation is not steeply enough graded. Moreover the social services were financed, not by taxation of the rich, but by voluntary subscription, and those who gave the money naturally gained control. Thus the cities gradually fell under the dominion of the upper classes, whose rule was legally established by Rome, when she became the suzerain power. From now on the cities were governed by a narrow and mainly hereditary clique of wealthy men, and simultaneously the social services ceased to expand. In some spheres there was, it is true, no retrogression: the public health services were maintained, and the food supply had still to be controlled and subsidized in order to keep the masses quiet. But education and athletics seem to have become an upper class preserve, and an ever increasing

proportion of expenditure was devoted to amusements, whose quality as steadily deteriorated.

Civic patriotism was thus not only debarred by the jealousy of the central government from diplomacy, war, justice and high finance, but, owing to the composition of the governing classes, which was largely the work of the suzerain power, found no outlet in the social services. It slowly degenerated into arid bickerings between the cities over points of precedence and honorific titles or an equally futile but more harmful emulation in magnificence. Civic extravagance in its turn provoked stricter control by the central government, which began to interfere more extensively in the narrow field which was still left to the local authorities. At length even the governing classes, wearied by the tedium of their petty duties, irked by continual interference from above, and resenting the drain upon their purses, lost interest in local politics and were no longer willing to perform the services that they traditionally owed. The urban proletariat, deprived of political power and responsibility, had long ceased to care for their cities. The peasants had in most regions never learnt to take any interest in the town which governed them; only intensive education could have awakened their loyalty, and this neither the urban democracies nor the landlord class which succeeded to power ever troubled to give to them.

Civic patriotism died from inanition, and as it died the machinery of local government began to run down. The only remedy was to apply compulsion, and from the third century onwards the conscription of the local gentry for the work of civic administration became more and more overt. To enforce this system in every city of the empire the imperial bureaucracy had to be enormously enlarged, and the flood of new officials—many of them drawn from the very class which they were supposed to control—which poured into the service swept away its old code of professional honour. There set in an age of dreary individualism. The imperial administrative machine, its lower ranks filled by unwilling conscripts, its direction in the hands of careerists whose main objects in life were power and money, lumbered on more from the momentum of the past than from any present driving force, and friction and leakage steadily slowed down its action, as the increasing brutality needed to enforce compulsory service set up a stronger antagonism and as the unashamed venality of the officials absorbed more and more of the public revenues. Imperial patriotism was stillborn: civic patriotism,

which had eased the strain on the central government by taking off its hands the local administration, was dead: there remained no force to keep the empire alive, for the religion which responded to the mood of *the age* was one of escape. The church urged submission to authority upon the lower orders, and castigated the brutality and corruption of the ruling class. But it had no positive political doctrine to offer and propounded no ideal of civic duty. Rather it despaired of the republic; the world was evil, and if a man would save his soul he had better withdraw from it. In the West the empire crumbled before the attack of a few thousand barbaric invaders. The East received a new lease of life only when the onslaught of Islam infused into Christianity a fighting spirit and thus gave the empire in its religion a principle of unity and a motive for survival.

NOTES ON PART I

1. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 4-5. PHILIPPI: Diod., XVI. 8. HERACLEA: Steph. Byz., s.v. 'Ηράκλεια, κτ' Μακεδονίας, Ἀμόντου τοῦ Φιλίππου κτίσμα (no such person existed, so Philip, son of Amyntas, is probably meant); Oberhummer (*P.W.*, VIII. 429) is certainly right in attaching this reference to the Sinitic Heraclea on the Thracian frontier.
2. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 303-6. An unpublished papyrus (*P. Oxy.*, 2177) demonstrates that under the principate the Alexandrians still remembered with pride that their laws were derived from Athens; I owe this information to the kindness of Mr. C. H. Roberts, whose commentary should be consulted.
3. ALEXANDRIA: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 303-4. EASTERN COLONIES: Arrian, *Anab.*, IV. 4, 22, 24, V. 29, VII. 21, cf. V. 27; Diod., XVII. 83; Pliny, *N.H.*, VI. 138.
4. GAMES: Arrian, *Anab.*, II. 24, III. 5, 6, 16, 25, IV. 4, V. 3, 8, 20, VII. 14, Plut., *Alex.*, 29, 72. INTERMARRIAGE: Arrian, *Anab.*, VII. 4, 12; Wilcken would have Alexander favour intermarriage only with the (Aryan?) Persians (*Alexander der Grosse*, p. 195) but Arrian speaks of the Ἀσιαναὶ γυναῖκες of the common soldiers; the nobility naturally married women of native nobility, i.e. Persians.
5. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 239 (Antigoneia of Syria), 151 (of Bithynia), 306-7 (Ptolemais).
6. *Ib.*, pp. 216-19, 243-8; cf. also Amm. Marc., XIV. viii. 5-6, Libanius, *Or.*, XI. 101 seqq.
7. Lesquier, *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 44-5.
8. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 198, 217-19, 244-7, 441-2. I was perhaps too sceptical about Cyrrhus and Arethusa; though their Macedonian names may have been suggested by their native names, they may none the less have been genuine colonies.
9. ANTIPATREIA: Polyb., V. 108, Livy, XXXI. 27; since Antipater the regent could not have assumed the quasi-royal prerogative of giving his name to a city, his son Cassander must be the founder. CASSANDREIA: Diod., XIX. 52, Strabo, VII, fr. 25, Paus., V. xxiii. 3, Livy, XXXI. 4-5, XLIV. 10-11. THESSALONICA: Strabo, VII, fr. 21, Dion. Hal., I. 49. PHTHIOTIC THEBES: Diod., XX. 110. ACARNANIANS: *id.*, XIX. 67. DEMETRIAS: Strabo, 436, Plut., *Dem.*, 53, *Syll.*³, 1157, Steph. Byz., s.v. Δημητριάς (1); Stephanus' second Demetrias in Macedonia is otherwise unknown and probably a doublet of the first. Other early royal foundations in Greece and Macedonia include Pyrrhus' Berenice (Plut., *Pyrrhus*, 6, Steph. Byz., s.v. Βερενίκαι (1), Appian, *Mith.*, 4), and Alexarchus' Uranopolis (Strabo, VII, fr. 35, Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 37, Ath., III. 98e, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 206).
10. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 5 (Lysimacheia), 42 (Arsinoeia), 150 (Amastris), 41-2 (Lebedus and Teos, Smyrna, Alexandria Troas), 198-9 (Seleucia ad Calycadnum, Alexandria ad Issum), 245 (Seleucia in Pieria).
11. *Ib.*, pp. 42 (Pleistarcheia), 201 (Antioch on the Cydnus). The name Demetrias taken by Sicyon (Diod., XX. 102, Strabo, 382) celebrated only the rebuilding of the city on a new site by Polioretetes. Lysimacheia and Arsinoe in Aetolia (Polyb., V. 7, Livy, XXXVI. 11, Strabo, 460, Steph. Byz., s.v. Ἀρουῖνη (8), were presumably so named by the Aetolians themselves, who were allies but never subjects of Lysimachus.
12. ANTIGONEIA IN CHAONIA: Polyb., II. 5, 6, Livy, XXXII. 5, XLIII. 23, Steph. Byz., s.v. Ἀντιγόμεια (1), Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 2, Ptol., III. xiii. 5. ANTIGONEIA IN PAEONIA: Pliny, IV. 34, Ptol., III. xii. 33, *Tab. Peut.*, VII. 5; probably Steph. Byz., s.v. Ἀντιγόμεια (3), Μακεδονίας, κτίσμα τοῦ Γονάτου. ANTIGONEIA IN CHALCIDICE: Livy, XLIV. 10, Scymnus, 631, Ptol., III. xii. 35, probably *O.G.I.*, 441. On these

- three see Tarn, *Antigonus Gonatas*, pp. 197-8, 312, 321. STRATONICEA: Ptol., III. xii. 9, *O.G.I.*, 441; probably founded by Gonatas in honour of his sister. PHILA: Steph. Byz., s.v. Φίλα, Livy, XLIV. 2. PERSEIS: Livy, XXXIX. 53. There is no reason to doubt that all these were true cities: Livy, XLIII. 23 shows that Antigoneia in Chaonia had a territory, and the ethnic *Antigonensis* (of which city is not clear) is used by Livy (XLII. 58) of officers of Perseus. 'Αντιγόμεια ἢ ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ and Στρατονίκεα ἢ ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ are cited in the *Sc. de Stratonicensibus* (*O.G.I.*, 441) among the cities accepting the *ἀσπίδα* of Hecate. *Antigonenses* in Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 2, must come from the Augustan *formula provinciae* and proves that Antigoneia in Chaonia was a city then. I find the *Antiochenses* of Pliny's list of Macedonia (*N.H.*, IV. 35) very puzzling; can they be named from Antiochus, Stratonice's second husband, or are they a mistake for *Antigonenses*? PHILIPPOPOLIS-COMPHI: Steph. Byz., s.v. Φίλιπποι, Livy, XXXIX. 25. PHILIPPOPOLIS-THEBES: Polyb., V. 100, Diod. XXVI. 9, Steph. Byz., s.v. Φίλιπποι. OLYMPIAS-GONNOCONDYLUM: Livy, XXXIX. 25. Antigoneia-Mantineia was not a royal foundation, being so named in honour of Dosoḅn by the Achaean league (Paus., VIII. viii. 11, Plut., *Aratus*, 45).
13. ARSINOE-LYTTUS: Steph. Byz., s.v. Ἀρσινόη (9), *Inscr. Magn. Mae.*, no. 21. ARSINOE IN CEOS: *ib.*, no. 50, *I.G.*, XII. v. 1061, cf. *B.C.H.*, 1906, p. 97. ARSINOE-METHANA: *O.G.I.*, 102, cf. 115. For the others, see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 42 (Lebedus), 100 (Patara), 200 (Pamphylia and Cilicia), 372 (Marium), 359 (Cyrenaica), 241 (Ace).
14. For the Red Sea stations, see Tschirikower, 'Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen', *Philologus*, Suppl. XIX. (1927), pp. 12-15. For the metropolis and villages of the Arsinoite, see *P. Tebt.*, II, pp. 343 seqq. SYRIAN FOUNDATIONS: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 241-2.
15. *Ib.*, pp. 128-9.
16. *Ib.*, pp. 42-4, cf. 70, 74.
17. *Ib.*, pp. 246 (Arad), 251 (Berytus).
18. *Ib.*, pp. 200-1, 218, 248-53.
19. *Ib.*, pp. 47, 54-5, 130-1.
20. *Ib.*, pp. 151-2.
21. *Ib.*, pp. 153 (Pharnaceia), 175-6, 178-82 (Cappadocia).
22. *Ib.*, pp. 48-50 (Docimium, &c.), 265 (Samosata), 467 (Eboda), 256 (Chalcis).
23. See the authorities cited in *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 551-2.
24. For Ptolemaic Syria add to the account in *C.E.R.P.*, p. 241, the papyrus since published in *Aegyptus*, 1936, pp. 257 seqq.
25. For the survival of the system under the Seleucids see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 253-4; in the Jewish kingdom, *ib.*, pp. 274-6; in the Ituraean principality, *ib.*, pp. 283, 285; in the Nabataean kingdom, *ib.*, p. 292.
26. *Ib.*, pp. 177-8 (Cappadocia), 155 (Pontus), 163 (Paphlagonia), 161-2 (Bithynia) 265-6 (Commagene), 203-6 (Cilicia).
27. SELEUCID SATRAPIES: *Ib.*, pp. 46 (Asia Minor), 242-3, 248 (Syria). MACEDONIA: Macedonians are from the days of Philip and Alexander officially known by their ethnic (city or tribe), cf. *Syll.*³, 267-9, Arrian, *Anab.*, III. 5, § 3, VI. 28, § 4, *Ind.*, 18, and for later times, *Syll.*³, 492, 585, Livy, XL. 24, XLII. 51, 58, XLIII. 19. When the monarchy was weak the cities were capable of independent action (*Xen., Hell.*, V. ii. 13) in the fourth century B.C. Under the Antigonids they seem to have been subject to royal governors (Polyb., V. 26, *Syll.*³, 459) but had their own revenues (τὰς πολιτικὰς sc. προσόδους in *Syll.*³, 459) and could pass decrees (*Ath. Mitt.*, 1905, p. 173). Royal governors of frontier districts are recorded in Livy, XL. 21, 'Didas ex praetoribus regiis unus qui Paeoniae praeerat',

- 23, 'Paeoniae praetor', XLII. 58, 'Paeoniae praefectus Didas', XXXIX. 34, 'Onomasto qui praecerat maritimae orae', XXXI. 27, 'Athenagoras quidam regius praefectus' (in Illyria). PTOLEMAIC RULE: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 240 (Phoenicia), 99-100 (Lycia), 371-3 (Cyprus), 360-2 (Cyrenaica). ATTALID RULE: *ib.*, pp. 55-6, 131-2.
28. For the military colonies, *vid. sup.*, notes 7 and 8; to the Macedonian settlements in Syria may perhaps be added Dium, Samaria, and Gerasa (*C.E.R.P.*, pp. 238-9), in Mesopotamia Batnae and Carrhae (*ib.*, pp. 216, 218). For Egypt Lesquier (*Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, pp. 110 seqq.) gives some useful figures: the 'réguliers' and ἐξ ἐπιγονῆς, who are alone relevant to the issue, since they alone were settlers, number 24 Macedonians and 34 Greeks; but it is noteworthy that of the latter 9 are Cyrenaeans, who hardly rank as immigrants in Egypt, and 5 Thessalians, i.e., Macedonian subjects. The more up to date but less clearly analysed figures in Griffith, *Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, p. 242, are (again for 'military settlers' and ἐπιγονῆς) 41 Macedonians and 33 Greeks (including Thessalians but excluding Cyrenaeans). For Macedonians in the cities, see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 470 (Alexandria), 306 (Ptolemais), 239 (Antioch), 151 (Nicaea), 43 (Stratonicea), 244 (Apamea). POPULATION OF MACEDONIA: Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*², III. ii, pp. 322 seqq.
29. GREEK MERCENARIES: Griffith, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-46; for recruiting in the second century B.C., see Polyb., XXII. 17, XXIX. 23, XXXI. 17, XXXIII. 18, Jos., *Ant.*, XIII. 86, Strabo, 477. WAGE RATES IN GREECE: Tarn, in *The Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 115-27. DEPOPULATION OF GREECE: Polyb., XXXVI. 37.
30. THE BACTRIAN COLONISTS: Diod., XVII. 99, XVIII. 7, cf. Arrian, *Anab.*, v. 27 and Paus., I. xxv. 5 for the unpopularity of Alexander's policy of colonization among the Greek mercenaries. The levying of drafts of colonists is attested in *O.G.I.*, 233 (from Magnesia on the Maeander for Antioch in Persis) and may be suspected in the case of Antigoneia of Syria and Bithynia (*C.E.R.P.*, pp. 239, 151) and Antioch of Pisidia (*ib.*, p. 129).
31. The number of colonists at Antigoneia of Syria is given as 5,300 by Malalas (p. 201, ed. Bonn). The citizens of Seleucia in Pieria numbered 6,000 at the end of the third century B.C. (Polyb., v. 61).
32. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 1-5 (Thrace), 148-9 (Pontic coast).
33. *Ib.*, pp. 28, 32-7.
34. *Ib.*, pp. 28-32; cf. Thuc., VIII. 85, Κέρα δὲ γλωσσόν, Xen., *Hell.*, II. i. 15, ἦσαν δὲ μισθάρβαροι οἱ ἐνοικαδόντες (in Cedreae), and Herod., I. 146, for the mixture of races at Miletus.
35. *Ib.*, pp. 96-9.
36. *Ib.*, pp. 124-8.
37. *Ib.*, pp. 192-8.
38. *Ib.*, pp. 365-9.
39. *Ib.*, pp. 351-6.
40. GREEKS IN SAITE EGYPT: Herod., II. 152 seqq.; in the fourth century, Diod., XV. 90-3, XVI. 42, 47-50, [Arist.], *Oec.*, II. ii. 25. The tomb of Petosiris is published by Lefebvre, *Le Tombeau de Petosiris* (Cairo, 1924).
41. PHOENICIANS AT ATHENS: *I.G.*, II. 170-1, 2836, 3316-24. ATHENIANS AT ACE: Isaeus, IV. 7, [Dem.], LII. 20. STRATO: Ath., XII. 531. He made a commercial treaty with Athens (*I.G.*, II. 86).
42. An early example of the celebration of games is Diod., XX. 108 (Antigonus in 301 B.C.).

43. The employment of natives in administrative posts is illustrated by the Egyptian papyri; most of the early nomarchs and royal scribes are Egyptians, working under Greek *strategi*; cf. also [Arist.], *Oec.*, II. ii. 33, 35.
44. DEMOCEDDES: Herod., III. 129 seqq. CTESIAS: Diod., II. 32. CHABRIAS AS FINANCIAL ADVISER: [Arist.], *Oec.*, II. ii. 25. CONON: Xen., *Hell.*, IV. iii. 11. IPHICRATES, ETC.: Diod., XV. 41-3, 90-3, XVI. 42-52. MEMNON: Arrian, *Anab.*, I. 12, 15, 20, 23, II. 1. For Greek mercenaries see, besides Xenophon's *Anabasis* and the passages of Diodorus cited above, Arrian, *Anab.*, I. 12, 16, II. 7, 8, III. 11, 16, 21. It may be noted that orientals did not distinguish Macedonians from Greeks; cf. *Daniel*, VIII. 21, X. 20, I *Macc.*, VI. 2, and the Prophecy of the Potter (*Sb. Ak. Berlin*, 1915, pp. 287 seqq.).
45. At Palmyra and in Nabataean Arabia the official use of Aramaic is proved by the inscriptions (collected in *C.I.S.*, II. i. 2, and iii). For the use of Syriac in Mesopotamia, see Cumont, *Études Syriennes*, p. 144 (an inscription), *Yale Classical Studies V* (1935) (a contract) and *C.E.R.P.*, p. 224.
46. Some very late hieroglyphs are published in *The Bucheum* (by Sir Robert Mond and others, Oxford, 1934). For the use of demotic in legal documents, see Bevan, *A History of Egypt, the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, p. 159; in priestly decrees, *op. cit.*, pp. 208, 232, 262; in tax receipts, H. Thompson in *Theban Ostraca*; as a literary vehicle, *Sb. Ak. Berlin*, 1915, pp. 287 seqq. Professor Glanville informs me that there are a fair number of legal documents (mostly concerning priests) and some literary pieces in demotic as late as the second and third centuries A.D.
47. For the original language and the date of the biblical literature, see the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* under the several books.
48. Some of the best preserved temples of Egypt are Ptolemaic or Roman (Baedeker, *Egypt*, pp. 261-7, 370-8, 390-5). HEROD'S TEMPLE: Jos., *Ant.*, XV. 391-420 (especially 414), *Bell.* V. 184-226. PESSINUS: Strabo, 567.
49. For the *ὑπαφός γάμος* in Egypt, see Mitteis, *Grundzüge*, pp. 200-8; it was also practised in Mesopotamia, Rostovtzeff, &c., *Excavations at Dura-Europus (sixth season)*, p. 432. For brother and sister marriage in Egypt, see Diod., I. 27 and Nietzold, *Die Ehe in Ägypten*, pp. 12-14; cf. *P. Gnomon*, 23; in Mesopotamia, *C.E.R.P.*, p. 224. GYMNASIA: *Ib.*, pp. 309-11 (Egypt), 250 (Jerusalem), 179 (Tyana). GAMES: *Ib.*, p. 250.
50. The adoption of Greek names by oriental gods is of course almost universal. The best attested examples are from Egypt, where the hieroglyphic texts give the native names. Elsewhere we often know of gods who are obviously oriental, e.g., 'Zeus' of Venasa and 'Enyo' of Comana with their sacred serfs (Strabo, 537, 535) or 'Artemis' of Castabala and 'Zeus' of Heliopolis with their primitive rites (Strabo, 537, *Soc.*, *H.E.*, I. 18), only by their Greek names: it may be noted that 'Artemis' and 'Enyo' had linked themselves with Greek myth, posing as foundations of Orestes. Some oriental gods, e.g., Men Pharnacu (Strabo, 557), kept their own names, some, e.g., the Syrian Goddess or the Persian Goddess (Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 777, *O.G.I.*, 333), preserved a discreet anonymity. The identification of Jehovah with Zeus by the Samaritans (Jos., *Ant.*, XII. 257-64), whether genuine or not, probably represents the average reaction of an oriental city.
51. For Antiochus IV's enforcement of Greek ritual, see I *Macc.*, I. 44-50, 2 *Macc.*, VI. 1-7. For popular oriental cults, see Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*.⁴ For religious prostitution, see Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, pp. 406-7 (Tralles), *Soc.*, *H.E.*, I. 18 (Heliopolis and Aphaca), Strabo, 558, cf. *Dig.*, L. I. 1, §2 (Pontus).
52. *C.E.R.P.*, p. 249-50; other examples are the later Hasmonaeans (see Head, *Hist. Num.*², pp. 807-8). The Palmyrene bilingual inscriptions afford many

examples of a later date. For Egypt, see Polyb., XXXI. 18, *Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Συμπετηῖον, ὃς ἦν τὸ γένος Αἰγύπτιος*, Diod., XXXI. 15a, *Διονύσιος ὁ καλούμενος Πετοσάπαις . . . πάντων Αἰγυπτίων προέχων*, *Chr.*, I. 51, *Εἰρήνη [κ]αὶ Θεοξένα . . . αἷς καὶ Αἰγύπτια ὀνόματά ἐστιν Νεφεροῦχος καὶ Θανῆς*.

53. RULES OF CITIZENSHIP: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 302, 304, 306-7, cf. 318 for the analogous *ἐπίκρισις* rules. EGYPTIANS AND ALEXANDRIAN CITIZENSHIP: *P.S.I.*, 1160, Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, p. 24 (lines 53-7), *P. Gnomon*, 44. INTERMARRIAGE AT EUROPUS: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 223-4; the Ptolemaic charter of Cyrene (Oliverio, *Riv. Fil.*, 1928, p. 186) established the singularly liberal rule that children of Cyrenaean fathers and Libyan mothers were admissible, but this was no doubt an emergency measure to make good the depletion of the population by recent wars, and perhaps reflects Alexander's policy. HELLENE AS A CULTURAL TERM: Cic., *Verr.*, IV. 21, cf. the *pro Flacco*, *passim*; *Mark*, vii. 26, cf. 2 *Macc.*, vi. 8, *εἰς τὰς ἀστυγείτονας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις*. A very clear example is Jos., *Bell.*, II. 266-8, where the Syrian population of Caesarea is equated with *οἱ Ἕλληνες*; cf. also *Ant.*, XVII. 320, *Bell.*, II. 97, where Gaza, Gadara, and Hippos are called *πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες*.

54. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 308-11.

55. *Ib.*, pp. 227-58 (Syria), 365-72 (Cyprus), 216-21 (Mesopotamia), 192-202 (Cilicia).

56. *Ib.*, pp. 118-19 (the Gauls), 148-57 (Bithynia, Pontus), 162-3 (Paphlagonia), 175-82 (Cappadocia). The anxiety of these dynasties to pose as philhellenic is well exemplified by their cordiality to Athens, the spiritual centre of Hellenism (see Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 300-11).

57. Carian was in Strabo's day a dead language, studied by antiquaries, and Lydian he expressly states to have been extinct save in Cibyra (Strabo, 661-3, 631). For the survival of Phrygian, see Calder, *M.A.M.A.*, I. p. xii.

58. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 28-40. I ought perhaps, if only out of respect to the memory of its author, Sir William Ramsay, to whom I and all students of ancient Asia Minor owe so much, to explain my reasons for rejecting the view held by him, and by many other scholars who follow him, of the primitive social structure of Asia Minor; though I feel that the *onus probandi* rests rather on them, since they have not to my knowledge anywhere systematically set forth the theory and the evidence on which it rests. The theory is, if I am not mistaken, that all Asia Minor was once ruled by temples, which were owners of the soil and lords of a serf population, and that this system was broken up by the Hellenistic (and earlier?) kings and the Roman government, which confiscated the land and either granted it to their followers, held it in domain, or founded cities on it. The evidence cited is:

(a) The large amount of royal, public or imperial land found in Asia Minor; this in itself of course, unless it can be demonstrated that the kings and the Roman government obtained their land by confiscation from the temples, proves nothing, and can I think be more simply explained on other hypotheses: for the imperial estates, see Broughton, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, LXV (1934), pp. 207-39.

(b) The existence in later times of a number of temples which owned extensive landed property. Instances are Aezani (*I.G.R.*, IV. 571), Antioch of Pisidia (Strabo, 577), Cabeira (*id.*, 557), Comana of Cappadocia (*id.*, 535), Comana of Pontus (*id.*, 558), Pessinus (*id.*, 567, *O.G.I.*, 315, § 1), Venasa (Strabo, 537), Zela (*id.*, 559). It is assumed on the view in question that these temples were a remnant which survived the confiscations of the Hellenistic kings. It is also, I take it, assumed that the lands owned by these temples in historical times were a small residue which remained after most of their property had been taken from them. The second assumption is necessary for

the theory, for the figures given by Strabo show that the areas owned by the temples, though very considerable if the temples be regarded as landlords, were not on the scale of principalities; the case of Comana Pontica, where Pompey converted a high priesthood into a principality by vastly enlarging the area ruled by the high priest, is conclusive evidence on this point. I can find no justification for these assumptions. I know of no proved instance of the confiscation of sacred land by the Hellenistic kings. The often cited case of Aezani is evidence in the opposite direction; the sacred lands of Zeus still in the second century A.D. belonged to Zeus and paid their rent to him, and all that 'the kings' had done was to plant settlers as tenants on the land. To go farther afield there is evidence in Syria of the Seleucid kings giving land to the gods (at Baetocaece, *O.G.I.*, 262) but none of their taking it away. In Egypt similarly there is evidence of gifts to the gods by the kings (the Cairo stele and the Edfu inscriptions, cited in Bevan, *A History of Egypt, the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, pp. 28 seqq. and 186) but no evidence of confiscations. In Pontus and Cappadocia in particular Strabo strongly implies that the kings had studiously respected the temples. Furthermore if the sacred lands of historical times were the remnant of a once more extensive principality, one would expect them to form a solid block surrounding each temple, and it is generally assumed that this was the case. In most instances we have no means of telling whether this was so or not. But at Antioch Strabo's words (*πλήθος ἔχουσα ἱεροδούλων καὶ χωρίων ἱερῶν*) suggest rather scattered estates, and a boundary stone of Men found at Apollonia (*J.H.S.*, iv., p. 417, no. 32), confirms this suggestion; for it can hardly be imagined that in the Roman period Men of Antioch owned all the land between Antioch and Apollonia, and the boundary must therefore mark an isolated estate. Similarly at Aezani it is clear from the correspondence recorded in *I.G.R.*, iv. 571, that parcels of the sacred land of Zeus existed in the territories of cities contiguous with Aezani; it is hardly likely that Zeus in the second century A.D. owned the whole of the territory of Aezani and parts of the territories of the contiguous cities, and it is more plausible to assume that the sacred land consisted of widely scattered estates. It is more likely that the scattered estates owned by the various temples were acquired by the process suggested in the text than that they were remnants of a once continuous domain. There is positive evidence, it may be noted, of the acquisition of lands by a temple through mortgage in Buckler and Robinson, *Sardis*, vii, no. 1.

The theory needs very substantial evidence to prove it, for it runs counter to all historical analogy. Religious foundations in all ages tend to accumulate property, because they hold in mortmain and because they are generally protected by their sacrosanctity against spoliation. In medieval Europe the church owned vast areas, but this does not prove that it once owned the whole of the land: we know how it gradually accumulated its lands by gift, bequest, and occasionally by purchase or conquest. Medieval Europe seems to me to offer a striking analogy to ancient Asia Minor, with its territorial lords and their serfs, its ecclesiastical foundations with their lands and serfs, and its commercial towns, organized by guilds. I suspect that these phenomena had a more or less similar origin in either case.

59. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 40-57.

60. *Ib.*, pp. 99-105.

61. *Ib.*, pp. 128-33 (Pisidia, &c.), 49 (Cabalis).

62. Much of the evidence cited below is perforce, in the absence of Hellenistic inscriptions, of Roman date; its use for my purpose is justified by the conservatism of the cities in preserving old titles. STEPHANEPHORUS: Miletus, *Milet*, 122-8 (cf. Rehm's commentary); Priene, *Inschr. Priene*, 3, 4, 8, &c. (contrast 2);

- Magnesia, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 9, &c. (contrast 2, 4, 5, 8); Smyrna, *O.G.I.*, 229, II, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1393, 1464; Iasus, Michel, 460, 463-5, 469; Mylasa, *ib.*, 472-6; Stratonicea, *Wadd.*, 517, 519; Aphrodisias, *ib.*, 1630 seqq.; Tralles, *Milet*, III, p. 321; Amyzon and Heraclea, *Inscr. Priene*, 51; Nysa, *Syll.*³, 781; Gambrium, *ib.*, 1219; Sardis, *Sardis*, VII. 21, 105-10; Magnesia by Sipylus, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1342; Maeonia, *ib.*, 1374; Hypaepa, *ib.*, 1608. STRATEGI: Pergamum, *O.G.I.*, 265, 267, 299; Sardis, *Sardis*, VII. 4; Hierapolis, *O.G.I.*, 308; Synnada, Michel, 545; Tralles, *Milet*, 143B; Antioch by Pisidia, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 80-1; examples of Roman date are common. DEMIURGUS: *I.G.*, XII. i. 696, 703-4 (Camirus of Rhodes), cf. *Syll.*³, 722 (Astypalaea), *I.G.*, XII. v. 38 (Naxos), both under Rhodian influence, and *Syll.*³, 953, *C.I.G.*, 2654 (Cnidus); the title also occurs at Samos (Michel, 368, *Inscr. Priene*, 67), whose influence may have affected southern Asia Minor, where it had colonies (*C.E.R.P.*, p. 195). In southern Asia Minor the demiurgate is attested as eponymous in the fourth century B.C. at Aspendus (*Mon. Linc.*, XXIII, p. 116, no. 83), and in the second at Anisa (Michel, 546); also at Side in A.D. 151 (*Chr.*, II. 272). Elsewhere the office is not directly attested as eponymous, but was highly honourable and expensive and often associated with an important priesthood; it was not the principal executive magistracy (see below). Examples are Perge (*I.G.R.*, III. 794, 796), Silyum (*ib.*, 800-2), Selge (*ib.*, 378), Pogle (*ib.*, 407-8), Isinda (*Mon. Linc.*, XXIII, p. 13, no. 1), Ariassus (*B.C.H.*, 1892, p. 433), Tarsus (*I.G.R.*, III. 879, 880, 883, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 733), Anazarbus (*ib.*, p. 717), Aegae (Heberdey and Wilhelm, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, XLIV. vi. 42), Mallus (*ib.*, 19), Seleucia on the Calycadnus (*ib.*, 181), Antioch by Cragus (*ib.*, 260), Soli (*B.C.H.*, 1881, p. 318), Castabala (*I.G.R.*, III. 901, 906, 909-11), Olba (*ib.*, 844, 851), Iotape (*ib.*, 831, 833-4), Nicopolis of Syria (*Inscr. gr. et lat. de la Syrie*, 166). PRYTANEIS: Rhodes, *Syll.*³, 619, cf. 110, 581, I. 91, 644, Polyb., XIII. 5, xv. 23, xvi. 15, xxii. 5, xxvii. 7, xxix. 10, Livy, XLII. 45; Tarsus, Dio Chrys., XXXIV. 35-6; Castabala, *I.G.R.*, III. 904; Seleucia on the Calycadnus, *Jahresh.*, 1915, Beiblatt, 23, *Mon. Linc.*, XXIII, p. 59, no. 48; Comana of Cappadocia, *S.E.G.*, VI. 794; the office also occurs at Aspendus (Lanckoroński, *Städte Pamphylens*, I, no. 98, *πρυτανείας*), Isaura (*B.C.H.*, 1887, p. 70), Iotape (*I.G.R.*, III. 833), and commonly in Lycia (*ib.*, 476, 514, 516, 590, 596, 605, 640-1, 648, 650-3, 658, 680, 692, 714, 736, 764).
63. GEBAL-BYBLUS: Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 791. LYCIANS: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 96-7, 100-1.
64. PELLA AND ORTHOSIA: *ib.*, pp. 232-4.
65. APOLLONIA: *ib.*, p. 231.
66. *ib.*, pp. 163 (Paphlagonians), 89 (Mysians), 67, 71, 82 (Phrygian cities), 100-1 (Lycians), 249-50 (Sidon).
67. *ib.*, pp. 126 (Selge), 193 (Tarsus), 242 (Scythopolis), 34 (Pergamum), 128 (Iconium), 67 (Nacoleia, &c.). ANTIOCH: Strabo, 750, Libanius, *Or.*, XI. 44-57, Malalas, p. 28, ed. Bonn. NICAEA: Memnon, xli, *F.H.G.*, III, p. 547. Such legends may be found *ad nauseam* in Stephanus of Byzantium.
68. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 30 (Alabanda), 49 (Cibyra), 126 (Selge and Sagalassus), 132 (Amblada), *I.G.*, V. i. 452 (Synnada). SPARTANS AND JEWS: I *Macc.*, xii. 5-23, Jos., *Ant.*, XII. 225-7, XIII. 166-70.
69. SETTLEMENT OF 167 B.C.: Livy, XLV. 17-18, 29. SETTLEMENT OF 148 B.C.: Livy, *Ep.*, I, Florus, I. 30, 32. That Macedonia included the Illyrian and Thracian districts is proved by Cic., *de prov. cons.*, 5, in *Pis.*, 83, 86, 93, Caesar, *B.C.*, III. 4; Polybius' description of the Egnatian Way (Strabo, 322-3) makes it very probable that this arrangement dated from 148 B.C. For the free cities of Greece, see pp. 113, 115.

70. ANNEXATION OF ASIA: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 57-9. ROYAL LAND NEAR PERGAMUM: *ib.*, pp. 48, 57. THE CHERSONESE: *ib.*, pp. 15-16. THE TROCNADES: *ib.*, p. 65. STRATONICEA: *ib.*, pp. 84-5. CIBYRA: *ib.*, pp. 75-6.
71. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 132-3.
72. *ib.*, pp. 360-2.
73. *ib.*, pp. 202 seqq. (Cilicia), 258 seqq. (Syria).
74. *ib.*, pp. 160-2.
75. *ib.*, pp. 158-60.
76. *ib.*, p. 259.
77. *ib.*, p. 373.
78. Dio Chrys., III. 127, Ael. Arist., xxvi. 92 seqq.
79. Not only Egypt but naturally poor countries like Cappadocia (Tac., *Ann.*, II. 42) and Judaea (Jos., *Ant.*, xvii. 318-21, xix. 352) produced considerable surpluses.
80. My account of the Caesarian, triumviral, and Augustan colonies is based on Mr. Michael Grant's forthcoming book, *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, which he kindly allowed me to see in MS.; the numismatic evidence which he has collected and interpreted has revolutionized the history and in particular the chronology of these colonies. I give below the published evidence only. BUTHROTUM: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 4, Strabo, 324, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 320, Cic., *ad Att.*, xvi. 16. CORINTH: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 11, Strabo, 381, Paus., II. i. 2, Cassius Dio, XLIII. 50, § 4, Head, *Hist. Num.*², pp. 404-5. DYME: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 13, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 414. PATRAE: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 11, Strabo, 387, Paus., VII. xviii. 7, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 415; attribution of Dyme, Paus., VII. xvii. 5; Mr. Grant informs me that the colonial coins of the reign of Tiberius assigned to Dyme (Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 414) really belong to Dyrrachium. ACTIUM: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 5, 'colonia Augusti Actium cum templo Apollonis nobili ac civitate libera Nicopolitana', there is no other evidence of a Roman colony, but even in the sixth century Actium seems to have been a separate community from Nicopolis (Hierocles, 651, 7, 'Ακτίου). Megara is also styled a colony by Pliny (*N.H.*, IV. 23), but the coinage (Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 394) disproves this. CNOSSUS: Strabo, 477, Head, *Hist. Num.*², 463, Dessau, 8901. DYRRACHIUM: Pliny, *N.H.*, III. 145, Cassius Dio, LI. 4, § 6, *Dig.*, L. xv. 7, 8, § 8, Dessau, 7188. BYLLIS: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 35, Dessau, 2724. PELLA: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 34. DIUM: *ib.*, 35, Ptol., III. xii. 12, *Dig.*, L. xv. 8, § 8, *C.I.L.*, III. 7281. CASSANDREIA: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 36, *Dig.*, L. xv. 8, § 8. PHILIPPI: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 42, Strabo, VII. fr. 41, Cassius Dio, LI. 4, § 6, *Dig.*, L. xv. 6, 8, § 8, Collart, *Philippe, ville de Macédoine*. For the coinage of the last four, see Gäbler, *Die antiken Münzen Nordgriechenlands*, III. ii, pp. 52-5, 60-1, 97-100, 102-3, and *Z.N.*, 1926, pp. 116-41, 198-9, 1929, pp. 260-9. LAMPSACUS: Appian, *B.C.*, V. 127. PARIUM AND ALEXANDRIA TROAS: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 86. APAMIA, HERACLEA, AND SINOPE: *ib.*, pp. 163, 167. THE PISIDIAN COLONIES: *ib.*, pp. 136, 140, 143-4. BERYTUS: *ib.*, p. 272. On Augustan colonies in general, see *Mon. Anc.*, cap. 28. LATER COLONIES: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 18 (Aprus), 182 (Archelais), 281 (Ptolemais), 17-18 (Deultum and Flaviopolis), 278 (Caesarea), 123 (Germa), 213 (Claudiopolis), 136 (Iconium), 278-9 (Aelia), 363 (Cyrene, Taucheira), 183 (Faustinopolis).
81. BUTHROTUM: Cic., *ad Att.*, xvi. 16. PURCHASE OF LAND: *Mon. Anc.*, cap. 16.
82. FREEDMEN AT CORINTH: Strabo, 381. DISPOSSESSED ITALIANS AT PHILIPPI AND DYRRHACHIUM: Cassius Dio, LI. 4, § 6. The evidence for veteran settlements is collected by Ritterling in *P.W.*, XII. 1215, 1241-2, 1252, 1274-5. SATALA: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 172. MELITENE: *ib.*, pp. 182-3.
83. For the provenance of the soldiers of the eastern legions, see Parker, *The Roman Legions*, pp. 169 seqq.

84. SEVERAN COLONIES: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 221-2 (Mesopotamia), 267-8, 280, 283, 289, 467 (Syria), 182 (Tyana), 209 (Mallus). LATER COLONIES: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 172, 286-8, 406, 424, 463, 556-7, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 246, *I.G.R.*, III. 479.
85. Broughton, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, LXVI, pp. 20-4. Isaura was perhaps colonized without receiving colonial status, cf. *I.G.R.*; III. 292, 294, *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 556-7. Apollonia of Pisidia may be another case (*ib.*, pp. 411-12). EMMAUS: Jos., *Bell.*, VII. 217. EGYPT: Lesquier, *L'Armée romaine d'Égypte*, pp. 328-32.
86. It is impossible in most cases to judge on whose initiative a city took a dynastic name, but Vespasian's letter to the Saborenses (Dessau, 6092) shows that the city itself sometimes asked for the honour. For the cities of Asia and Tiberius, see Tac., *Ann.*, II. 47, IV. 13, Dessau, 156, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1351, 1514; cf. 1502 (Sardis), *I.B.M.*, 498 (Hyrchanis), Pliny, *N.H.*, V. 121 (Myrina), Head, *Hist. Num.*², pp. 653 (Mostene), 655 (Philadelphia), 669-70 (Cibyra). TITLES OF CILICIAN CITIES: Head, *Hist. Num.*², pp. 717, 725, 733.
87. NICOPOLIS: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 5, Tac., *Ann.*, V. 10 (wrongly called a colony), Cassius Dio, LI. 1, § 3, Suet., *Aug.*, 18, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 321, and especially for its territory, Strabo, 325, 450, Paus., V. xxiii. 3, VII. xviii. 8-9, VIII. xxiv. 11, X. xxxviii. 4, *Anth. Pal.*, IX. 553. PATRAE: Strabo, 460, cf. Paus., VII. xviii. 8-9, XX. 1. Pausanias also states (X. xxxviii. 9) that Augustus attributed the Ozolian Locrians to Patrae; but as they are styled *immunes* in Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 7 (which is probably derived from the Augustan *formula provinciae*), this change must be later. HADRIANOPOLIS OF EPIRUS: Hierocles, 651, 8, Proc., *Aed.*, IV. 1.
88. TRIBES: *B.C.H.*, 1897, p. 162 (Antani and Lyncestae), *B.S.A.*, XVIII, p. 179, *J.H.S.*, 1913, p. 337 (Oresti); cf. also Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 3, 'Dassaretas supra dictos liberam gentem' and Demitzas, *ἡ Μακεδονία*, no. 330, [d]ασσαρήτιοι Δρύαντα Κα[ι]πίωνος [τὸ]ν προστάτην. PARTHICOPOLIS: Ptol., III. xii. 27, Hierocles, 639, 8, Schwartz, *Act. Conc. Oec.*, Tom. II, vol. I, p. 64; Steph. Byz. gives the name as Parthenopolis with an appropriate legend, but the texts cited above are confirmed by Phlegon of Tralles (*F.H.G.*, III, p. 609), whose version Παρθικόπολις is clearly a corruption of Παρθικόπολις; the citizens mentioned have, it may be noted, Thracian names.
89. *C.E.R.P.*, p. 363.
90. APHRODISIAS: *ib.*, pp. 57, 63, 77. ATARNEUS: *ib.*, pp. 82-3. STRATONICEA: *ib.*, pp. 84-5. NEAPOLIS: *ib.*, p. 78.
91. CILBIANI: *ib.*, pp. 78-9, cf. *Forsch. Eph.*, 56, τὴν Νεικαίων Κιλβιανῶν πόλιν. MOXEANI: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 71-2. CORPENI: *ib.*, p. 66. MOCCADENI: *ib.*, p. 81. MYSIAN TRIBES: *ib.*, pp. 89-90.
92. SEBASTE: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 72. SEBASTOPOLIS: *ib.*, p. 77. JULIA: *ib.*, p. 65. HIEROCAESAREA: *ib.*, p. 83.
93. *Ib.*, pp. 106-9.
94. MILYAE: *ib.*, pp. 143-4. ETENNEIS: *ib.*, p. 140.
95. *Ib.*, pp. 137-40.
96. *Ib.*, pp. 120-1.
97. *Ib.*, pp. 163-5, 169.
98. *Ib.*, pp. 167-72.
99. *Ib.*, pp. 168-9, 172.
100. *Ib.*, pp. 209-14 (Cilicia Tracheia), 136 (Lycaonia).
101. *Ib.*, pp. 203-6 (Cilicia), 265-6 (Commagene).
102. *Ib.*, pp. 262-5 (northern Syria), 282-3 (Arca), 220-2 (Mesopotamia).

103. *Ib.*, pp. 271-3, 282-8.
104. *Ib.*, pp. 291-5.
105. *Ib.*, pp. 316-29, *J.E.A.*, 1938, pp. 65 seqq.
106. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 312-13.
107. *Ib.*, pp. 316-17.
108. *Ib.*, pp. 329-38.
109. *Ib.*, pp. 273-81. I am now inclined to doubt whether Antipatris was originally a city. On its earliest coins (Elagabalus) it bears the surname Aurelia, and it may be that Elagabalus (who founded Nicopolis) first gave it city status. Perhaps the curious entry in Steph. Byz., s.v. 'Αντιπατρίς, πόλις (Ἰουδαίας), Ἡρώδου κτίσμα ἐπὶ Ἀντωνίνου (or Ἀντωνίου) Καίσαρος may be a conflation by the epitomator of two statements in the original, that Herod was the founder and that it was re-founded under Antoninus Caesar (i.e. Elagabalus).
110. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 177-83.
111. *Ib.*, pp. 8-22; Abdera apparently gained territory under the reorganization (*Année Epigr.*, 1937, 170-1).
112. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 15-17.
113. ORCISTUS INSCRIPTION: Dessau, 6091; cf. the similar language in the Tymandus inscription (Dessau, 6090).
114. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 338 seqq.
115. *Ib.*, pp. 281-2 (Palestine), 183-91 (Cappadocia).
116. *Ib.*, pp. 224-6 (the satrapies), 166 (Lagania), 137 (Gdammaua and Psibela), 172-3 (Zalichen).
117. The peculations of the *actores rei privatae* are openly admitted by Valens (Bruns, 97a), who preferred management by decurions. DIOCLETIANOPOLIS: Hierocles, 642, 12, Proc., *Aed.*, IV. 3; the town is clearly identical with the Celetrum of Livy, XXXI. 40, §§ 1-4, which was a town of the Oresti (cf. *B.S.A.*, XVIII, pp. 178-9). VALENTINIANOPOLIS: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 79. ANASTASIOPOLIS: *ib.*, p. 73. LEONTOPOLIS: *ib.*, p. 139.
118. *Ib.*, pp. 286-8 (Auranitis, &c.), 142 (Tymandus).
119. *Ib.*, pp. 269 (Syria), 222-3 (Mesopotamia).
120. Paus., x. iv. 1. Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 33. For the other provinces see *C.E.R.P.*, *passim*.
121. For the Augustan *formulae*, see *C.E.R.P.* App. I, for Hierocles, *ib.* App. III and IV. I have not analysed the evidence for Macedonia and Greece in detail, but from a comparison of Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 33 seqq. (the figure 150 and extracts from the *formula* giving many names later non-existent) with Hierocles' lists of Macedonia I and II and New Epirus it is plain that the number of communities in Macedonia had been drastically reduced. A comparison of Pausanias with Hierocles gives a similar result for Greece; for the Eleutherolacones, see Paus., III. xxi. 6-7, Hierocles, 647, 9, 11-12.
122. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 68-9, 72-4 (northern Phrygia), 122-3 (Gauls), 172-3 (Pontus), 165-7 (Bithynia), 23-7 (Thrace).
123. ORCISTUS: Dessau, 6091. ANTARADUS: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 268. MAIUMA OF GAZA: *ib.*, pp. 281-2. For Basilinopolis and Nicaea and its 'regions', see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 166, 424, note 28, 426, note 35.
124. TYMANDUS: Dessau, 6090. PODANDUS: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 184.

NOTES ON PART II

1. The relations, both theoretical and practical, of the Hellenistic kings to the Greek cities have recently been exhaustively analysed by A. Heuss, 'Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus', *Klio*, Beiheft, xxxix (1937), to whom I may refer the reader for a fuller account; in some points, it will be seen, I disagree with his conclusions. Cf. also Zaccan, *Il monarcato ellenistico nei suoi elementi federativi*, and for the Seleucids, Bikerman, *Institutions des Séleucides*, pp. 133 seqq. DECREE OF ILIUM: *O.G.I.*, 219. ADULIS INSCRIPTION: *ib.*, 54.
2. LETTER OF ANTIOCHUS I: *ib.* 221. TERM χώρα: *P. Tebt.*, 5, line 98, τοῖς δ' ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ χώρᾳ πρὸς τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας προσδοῦναι ἀ[λλ]α (ἔτη) γ', 6, line 26, ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ καὶ ἐπὶ χώρᾳ (Egypt), *Année Épigr.*, 1932, 80, ἢ ταῖς πόλεσιν ἢ τῇ χώρᾳ (Cyrenaica). TITLE Ἀλεξανδρεία πρὸς Αἰγύπτου: *O.G.I.*, 193. For land tenure see Rostovtzeff, 'Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates' (*Archiv. Pap.*, Beiheft 1, 1910). For the Greek conception of property rights in the Persian kingdom, Xen., *Hell.*, iii. i. 26 is illuminating.
3. ALEXANDER: [Dem.], xvii. 8 (league of Corinth), *Diod.*, xvii. 24, Arrian, *Anab.*, i. 18 (Asiatic cities), cf. 19 (Miletus), *O.G.I.*, 1, *Syll.*³, 278 (Priene), *O.G.I.*, 223 (Erythrae). ANTIPATER AND CASSANDER: *Diod.*, xviii. 55, cf. 18, *Plut.*, *Phoc.*, 27-8 (Athens), *Diod.*, xviii. 68 (Megalopolis). POLYPERCHON: *Diod.*, xviii. 55-6, cf. 69. ANTIGONUS: *id.*, xix. 61, cf. 64, 66, 74-5, 77-8, 87, xx. 45-6, 100, 102-3, *Plut.*, *Dem.*, 8, *Syll.*³, 322, 328, 342-3, *O.G.I.*, 223. PTOLEMY: *Diod.*, xix. 62, cf. xx. 19, 37. PEACE OF 311 B.C.: *id.*, xix. 105, cf. xx. 19, *O.G.I.*, 5, 6. TRUCE OF 302 B.C.: *Diod.*, xx. 111.
4. See Diodorus' comments (xviii. 55, xix. 61-2). Polybius, too, makes some caustic remarks about the kings and freedom (xv. 24). For the attitude of the cities, see *Livy*, xxxv. 17, § 7. PTOLEMY II IN 267 B.C.: *Syll.*³, 434.
5. *Diod.*, xx. 81 seqq.
6. LYSIMACHUS: *Diod.*, xx. 107. THE EARLY SELEUCIDS: *O.G.I.*, 222 (Ionia), 223 (Erythrae), 226 (Miletus), 228-9 (Smyrna). PHILIP V: Polyb., iv. 84 (Elis), xv. 24 (Thasos), 23, cf. Oikonomos, *Ἐπιγραφαὶ τῆς Μακεδονίας*, no. 1 (Cius and Lysimacheia).
7. Appian, *Syr.*, 1, 2.
8. AMYZON: *Anz. Ak. Wien*, 1920, p. 40. IASUS: *O.G.I.*, 237. LAMPSACUS: *Livy*, xxxiii. 38. ANTIOCHUS AND THE ROMANS: Polyb., xviii. 51, Appian, *Syr.*, 3. Bikerman (*R.E.G.*, 1934, pp. 346 seqq.) contends that there was from Alexander's day a *de jure* distinction between the freedom which the cities of Greece and the islands enjoyed of right and under treaty, and the freedom granted as a revocable favour to the cities of Asia conquered from the Persians. The view seems to me excessively legalistic, and the arguments on which it rests prove only (a) that Alexander conquered the Asiatic cities before freeing them, which no one denies, and (b) that his treatment of them was often arbitrary: but so was his conduct to the cities of Greece and the islands. The Successors impartially enslaved and freed Greek cities wherever they were situated, and Antigonos proclaimed freedom to the Greeks of Europe and Asia in the same terms (*Diod.*, xx. iii). There certainly was a difference between genuine freedom (independence) and bogus freedom (under royal protection), but it depended on the *de facto* situation, and I question whether the kings ever gave it precise legal formulation—it was to their interest to maintain the ambiguity of the term ἐλευθερία.
9. THESSALY: Polyb., iv. 76. NESIOTES: *Syll.*³, 390. CARIAN CITIES: *Livy*, xxxiii. 20. ATTALUS I: Polyb., v. 77.

10. For the dispute between Eumenes and Rhodes over the free cities, see Polyb., XXI. 19-23, Livy, XXXVII. 53-4; for the senate's interpretation of its grant to Rhodes, Polyb., XXV. 4, Livy, XLI. 6.
11. Arrian's language is not very clear, but the grant of democracy to Soli and the remission of tribute to Mallus (*Anab.*, II. 5) are analogous to the treatment of Ephesus (*ib.*, I. 17). The terms imposed on Aspendus for its contumacious resistance (*ib.*, I. 27) imply that otherwise it would have been free. For Cyprus see *C.E.R.P.*, p. 369. RHODIANS' VIEW: Polyb., XXI. 22-3, Livy, XXXVII. 54.
12. SELEUCIA: *O.G.I.*, 257. ALABANDA: *ib.*, 234. For the Phoenician cities, see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 254-5.
13. The fullest definitions of freedom are in Polyb., IV. 84, XV. 24; cf. *O.G.I.*, 223, 228 (immunity from tribute), Diod., XIX. 61 (freedom from garrison). The league of Corinth guaranteed the maintenance of existing constitutions ([*Dem.*], XVII. 10), and so apparently did Antigonos' Hellenic league (*I.G.*², IV. 68, line 39). For the association of freedom and democracy, see Part III, note 1. For political control and financial exactions see pp. 103-10. Garrisons figure frequently in the wars of the Successors. They were the regular policy of Antipater (Diod., XVIII. 55, 18, 68) and Cassander (*id.*, XIX. 63-4, 66-7, 77-8, 89, XX. 45-6, 103), also, it would appear, of Lysimachus (*id.*, XIX. 73, XX. 111) and Asander of Caria (*id.*, XIX. 75). It is more significant that Alexander the Great used them (*Syll.*³, 283, Diod., XVIII. 8, 10), as did other champions of freedom such as Polyperchon (Diod., XIX. 64), Antigonos (*id.*, XIX. 66, XX. 37) and Demetrius (*id.*, XX. 103, 111, Plut., *Dem.*, 31, 33-4, 39), or Ptolemy (Diod., XIX. 19, XX. 37, 102); garrisons were asked for by Corinth (Diod., XX. 103) and Athens (Plut., *Dem.*, 34) of Demetrius. For later garrisons, *vid. inf.*, note 18.
14. Philip's election as *archon* of the Thessalian league is inferred from Diod., XVII. 4, Justin, XI. 3; for the tetrarchies, see Theopompus, fr. 234 (*F.H.G.*, I, p. 317), *Dem.*, IX. 26. THE LEAGUE OF CORINTH: Diod., XVI. 89, *Syll.*³, 260, [*Dem.*], XVII. 8, 10, 15-16, 19, cf. *Syll.*³, 261, 283, Arrian, *Anab.*, I. 16, II. 1, 2, III. 24; for discussions, see Wilcken, *Sb. Ak. München*, 1917, no. 10, *Sb. Ak. Berlin*, 1922, pp. 97 seqq. The constitution of Antigonos' Hellenic league (*I.G.*², IV. 68), which is probably based on that of the League of Corinth, illustrates the prerogatives of the *ἡγεμόνων*. PHILIP'S GARRISONS: Diod., XVII. 3, cf. [*Dem.*], XVII. 15, τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ κοινῇ φυλακῇ τεταγμένους. ALEXANDER AND THE CONQUERED CITIES: *Syll.*³, 283. ALEXANDER AND THE EXILES: Diod., XVII. 109, XVIII. 8, *O.G.I.*, 2, *Syll.*³, 306. Bikerman (*R.E.G.*, 1934, pp. 346 seqq.) contends that only the cities of Greece and the islands, autonomous under the King's Peace, were admitted to the League of Corinth: Ehrenberg (*Alexander and the Greeks*, pp. 1-51) also denies that the Asiatic cities were enrolled. The evidence either way is slight, but the *ἀνταξίς* of Priene (relegated by Bikerman to a footnote as 'obscure') seems to me best explained as a federal payment. I would also claim in my favour the case of Chios, which was treated as a league member after its reconquest from the Persians (*Syll.*³, 283). Ehrenberg denies that it was, but his arguments do not convince me: why mention of Ἕλληνες if Chios was not to be a member? Bikerman gets over this case by the curious assumption that cities autonomous under the King's Peace were autonomous for ever. He does not explain why this particular treaty had so sacrosanct a validity. One would naturally think that Chios by accepting Persian rule put itself in the same position as other cities ruled by the Persians.
15. ANTIGONOS' LEAGUE: Diod., XX. 46, Plut., *Dem.*, 25, *I.G.*², IV. 68. The NESIOTES: *Syll.*³, 390; on the nesiarchs and their relation to the navarchs of the Ptolemies, see Tarn, *J.H.S.*, 1911, pp. 251 seqq. I do not agree with Tarn's view of the

- office of nesiarch, which must by analogy with Boeotarch, Lyciarch, &c., mean president of the league; Tarn's evidence shows that whatever his constitutional position he was in fact a Ptolemaic agent. CYRENAICA: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 359. CYPRUS: *O.G.I.*, 164-5. LYCIA: *O.G.I.*, 99. DOSON'S GREEK LEAGUE: Polyb., II. 54, cf. IV. 9, 22, 25-6, Plut., *Aratus*, 45. MACEDONIA: *Syll.*³, 575, τὸ κοινὸν Μ[ακε]δόν[ων] βασιλεία Φίλ[ιππον βασιλέως] Δημητρίου; the date of the change is inferred from the alteration of the title of the kingdom from βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος Μακεδόν to βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος καὶ Μακεδόνες; see Holleaux, *B.C.H.*, 1907, p. 97, Tarn, *J.H.S.*, 1909, p. 268. In Perseus' reign the cities of Macedon offer their aid to the king, thus maintaining the fiction of their independence (Livy, XLII. 53).
16. CASSANDER AND ATHENS: Diod., XVIII. 74, cf. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 47-8. GONATAS AND ATHENS: *S.E.G.*, III. 122. CYRENE: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 357-8, 486, note 13. PTOLEMAIS: *O.G.I.*, 51; for a conjecture about Alexandria, see *C.E.R.P.*, p. 305. PERGAMUM: *O.G.I.*, 267, cf. Cardinali, *Il regno di Pergamo*, pp. 244 seqq.
17. DECREE OF AEGINA: *O.G.I.*, 329. DECREE OF HALICARNASSUS: *Jahresh.*, 1908, p. 56. Ἐπιστάται: Michel, 322 (Thessalonica), *S.E.G.*, VII. 62 (Seleucia).
18. For garrisons in the wars of the Successors, *vid. sup.*, note 13. THE ANTIGONIDS: *Syll.*³, 454, *S.E.G.*, III. 122, *B.C.H.*, 1930, p. 269 &c. (Athens under Gonatas), Polyb., XVIII. 11 (the three fetters of Greece); it may be noted that in Euboea Oreus and Carystus had no regular garrisons (Livy, XXXI. 46, XXXII. 16). THE PTOLEMIES: Polyb., v. 63 (in general), *O.G.I.*, 59 (Thera), 102 (Thera, Crete, and Arsinoe), cf. *I.G.*, IV. 854, *Syll.*³, 410 (Erythrae), Polyb., v. 36 (Caria and Syria), 60 (Seleucia), *C.E.R.P.*, p. 371 (Cyprus), Griffith, *Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, pp. 126 seqq. (Alexandria), *Chr.*, I. 447 (Ptolemais). For the early Seleucids there is little evidence; see *Chr.*, I. 1 for Soli. Antiochus III regularly garrisoned his cities, Appian, *Syr.*, 2.
19. Φρούραρχος: *O.G.I.*, 20 (Citium), 119 (Itanus), *I.G.*, IV. 769 (Troezen), Diod., XVIII. 68, XX. 45 (Athens), 103 (Aegium). Στρατηγὸς τῆς πόλεως: *O.G.I.*, 743 (Alexandria), 268 (Nacrassa), cf. 754 (Castabala under the Tarcondimotids), *Hermes*, 1901, p. 445 (Thera); cf. the use of στρατηγός without qualification to denote a royal commandant, e.g., Diod. XX. 102 (Sicyon), 103 (Corinth), *O.G.I.*, 12 (Priene), *S.E.G.*, III. 122 (Athens), *P. Zen. Cairo*, 59341 (Calynda). Στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως: Diod., XIX. 63 (Argos), *Syll.*³, 368, στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν πόλεων τῶν Ἰώνων, 454, στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ταπτομένων μετὰ τοῦ Πειραιέως; cf. *O.G.I.*, 134, τ[ὸ]ν γενόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως ἡγεμόνα (Citium), Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer*, p. 252, no. 99, τὸν γενόμεν[ο]ν ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεω[s] ἡγεμόνα (?) (Salamis). Τεταγμένος, etc. ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως: Diod., XIX. 88 (Leucas), *O.G.I.*, 102, 110, 735 (Thera), *Syll.*³, 642 (Aegina), *S.E.G.*, IX. 5 (Cyrenaica). Ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως: *O.G.I.*, 113 (Citium), 155 (Salamis), Strack, *op. cit.*, p. 275, no. 171 (Amathus), *O.G.I.*, 329 (Aegina), 483 (Pergamum), Polyb., v. 39, *SB.*, 2100 (Alexandria), *B.C.H.*, 1930, p. 269, ἐπὶ Ἐλεύσιος γενόμενος, Michel, 546 (Mazaca), Rott, *Kleinas. Denkmäler*, p. 370, no. 78 (Tyana). The transition from ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως to ἐπιστάτης is made by *O.G.I.*, 329, where Cleon is given both titles. Clear examples of military ἐπιστάται are Polyb., v. 60 (Seleucia), Michel, 479 (Panamara). For other royal ἐπιστάται, see Polyb., v. 26 (in Macedonia and Thessaly generally; perhaps the unspecified officers in *Syll.*³, 459 and 552, are ἐπιστάται), *O.G.I.*, 44 (Thera), Michel, 395 (Syros), *I.G.*, XII. II. 527 (Eresus), v. 1061 (Arsinoe of Ceos), *S.E.G.*, II. 536 (Caria), Robert, *Études Anatoliennes*, p. 229 (Prusa); it is questionable whether the ἐπιστάται of *O.G.I.*, 268 (Nacrassa), *B.C.H.*, 1922, p. 36 (Amphipolis) are royal officers. For a full discussion of the office, see *B.C.H.*, 1933, pp. 25-31.
20. ALEXANDER AND CHIOS: *Syll.*³, 283, PTOLEMY AND CYRENE: *Riv. Fil.*, 1928, p. 187, lines 40-2.

21. CARTHAEA: *I.G.*, XII. v. 1061. CALYNDIA: *P. Zen. Cairo*, 59341.
22. JUDICIAL COMMISSIONS: Michel, 235, 355, 357, 448, 462, 468, 508, 514, 542, 543. Royal initiative is mentioned in *O.G.I.*, 7, 43, *I.G.*, XII. v. 1065, Michel, 417, *Syll.*³, 426, *S.E.G.*, I. 363. ANTIGONUS AND SYROS: Durrbach, *Choix d'inscriptions de Délos*, no. 45. PATROCLUS AND THERA: *O.G.I.*, 44. RHODIAN ἐπιστάται: Michel, 395 (Syros), 479 (Panamara). ATTALID ἐπιστάτης AT AEGINA: *O.G.I.*, 329.
23. Alexander's decree on the exiles is mentioned in *Syll.*³, 306, *O.G.I.*, 2; cf. also *O.G.I.*, 8, lines 35, 127, 141, κατὰ τὸν [νόμον] καὶ τὰν διαγράφαν τῷ βασιλέος Ἀλεξάνδρου], 149, τὸν τε νόμον τὸν περὶ [τῶν τυράντων γεγράμμενον ἐν τῇ στάλλῃ τῇ [παλαιῇ] καὶ ταῖς διαγρά[φ]αις τῶν βασιλέων ταῖς κατὰ τούτων. Royal διαγράμματα, governing procedure, are mentioned in *O.G.I.*, 7, ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ δικαστήριον τὸ παρεγόμενον] ἐν Μαγνησίας κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα τὸ Ἀντιγόνου ἐπὶ ταῖς δίκαις ταῖς ἰδίαις ἐγδεδίκακε, *Syll.*³, 344, § 6, κ[ατὰ τοὺς ἐκατέρων νόμους καὶ τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν διάγραμμα (with the suggestion about debts), Michel, 417, κατὰ τε τὸ διάγραμμα τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τοὺς νόμους, *I.G.*, XII. v. 1065. Alexander ordered the election of νομογράφοι at Chios to draw up a constitution, to be submitted to him for approval (*Syll.*³, 283); for Antigonos' procedure at Lebedus and Teos, see *Syll.*³, 344, § 8. On the other hand the constitution of Cyrene is styled a διάγραμμα (*Riv. Fil.*, 1928, p. 187, line 38, p. 188, line 65) and at Pergamum the astynomic law is entitled βασιλικὸς νόμος (*O.G.I.*, 483).
24. ALEXANDER: military contingents, Diod., XVI. 89, XVII. 17, 74, Arrian, *Anab.*, III. 19; naval contingents, *Syll.*³, 283; σύνταξις, *O.G.I.*, 1. ANTIPATER: *O.G.I.*, 4, Ἀ[ντιπ]άτρῳ γὰρ ἐπιτάξαντος χρήματα εἰς τὸν πόλεμον εἰσέφερον. ANTIGONUS: military contingents, *I.G.*², IV. 68, lines 95-9; levies, *ib.*, line 127 (where εἰσφοραὶ are mentioned), cf. *Syll.*³, 390. PTOLEMY: *Syll.*³, 390, τῶν εἰσφορῶν κουφίσας. LYSIMACHUS: *Milet.*, 138, τῶν χρημάτων ὧν δεῖ ἀποδοῦναι ἡμῶς βασιλεῖ Λυσισμάχῳ εἰς τὴν δευτέραν καταβολήν, 139, φόρων τε σκληρῶν καὶ χαλεπῶν ἀπολύσαντα καὶ παραγωγίαν παρ' ἡμῖν ἃ τινες τῶν βασιλέων κατέστησαν (Ptolemaeus loquitur). SELEUCIDS: *O.G.I.*, 223, ἀφορο[λογ]ήτους εἶναι συγχωροῦμεν τῶν τε ἄλλων ἀπάντων καὶ [τῶν εἰς] τὰ Γαλατικὰ συναγομένων.
25. Οἰκονόμοι: *O.G.I.*, 59, 102 (Thera, &c.), *P. Zen. Cairo*, 59341 (Calynda). Γαλοφύλακες: *ib.*, 59036. Taxes: *P. Tebt.*, 8 (Lycia), *O.G.I.*, 55 (Telmessus), *Jos.*, *Ant.*, XII. 167-85 (Syria), *P. Zen. Cairo*, 59036 (Halicarnassus); for the ἱατρικά here recorded cf. *S.E.G.*, II. 579. For Alexandria and Naucratis see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 303, 305. Further evidence for the appropriation of specific taxes is provided by grants of immunity passed by the cities, which now have a saving clause, πάντων ὧν ἡ πόλις κυρία οἷ ὧν ἡ πόλις ἐπιβάλλει τελῶν (Michel, 349, 463, 519, *C.I.G.*, 2673, 2675-7, *S.E.G.*, II. 580).
26. ABAE: *Syll.*³, 552. BRYTHRAE: *O.G.I.*, 223. TRALLES: Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, 41; the suggestive phrases are [τῶν σπειρομένων] δεκάτην and [τὴν ἀποτελουμένην εἰς τὸ] βασιλικὸν δεκάτην τῶ[ν σπειρομένων]. ATTALID TAXATION: Appian, *B.C.*, V. 4, *S.E.G.*, II. 580, ἐκ τῶν πρῶτων δοθησομένων αὐτοῖς ἐν βασιλικῷ εἰς τὴν τῆς πόλεως διοίκησιν (Teos), cf. for the 'administration fund', *Inscr. Perg.*, 157 (Temnus), *S.E.G.*, II. 663 (Apollonia ad Rhyndacum?), *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 94, 98 (Magnesia ad Maeandrum). Other allusions to Seleucid and Attalid taxation in Asia Minor are not very illuminating. Polyb., XXI. 24, 46, would, if taken strictly, imply that both dynasties exacted block sums of tribute; but the language is obviously untechnical (φόρος and σύνταξις are used synonymously). Inscriptions speak of a number of πρόσδοι e.g. *S.E.G.*, II. 663, ἀτελείας ἐπικεχωρημένης πασῶν τῶν προσόδων, *Sardis*, VII. no. 2, ἕως μὲν ἑτῶν ἑπτα μῆθ' ἐν αὐτοῖς διορθῶσθαι εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀλλὰ ἀπολε[λύσθαι] ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ οὐδοῦ ἔτους δίδόναι τρε[ῖς ἀναφορὰς ἐκ] πασῶν τῶν γνωσμένων προσόδων πα[ρ] ἑκατον[τὴν] ἑαυτὸν ἀργ[ο]σίον μῶς εἴκοσι.

27. CROWNS: *Syll.*³, 390 (the Nesiots), *O.G.I.*, 223 (Erythrae), *P. Zen. Cairo*, 59036 (Halicarnassus), *S.E.G.*, I. 366 (Samos), *I.B.M.*, 247 (Cos). PAY OF TROOPS: *Syll.*³, 283, *τρέφειν δὲ ταύτην* (sc. *φυλακὴν*) *Χίους* (Alexander and Chios), 410 (the Ptolemies and Erythrae), 502 (the Ptolemies and Samothrace), *I.B.M.*, 247 (Antigonos and Cos). BILLETING: Welles, op. cit., 30, *P. Zen. Cairo*, 59341. FODDER: *P. Zen. Cairo*, 59341. TRIERARCHY: *P. Zen. Cairo*, 59036.
28. AMBLADA: *O.G.I.*, 751. For Jerusalem and Tiberias, see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 252-3, 277.
29. A good example of royal modesty is Antigonos' correspondence with Lebedus and Teos, where the phrase used repeatedly is *οἰόμεθα δεῖν* (*Syll.*³, 344). Philip V addressing Larissa is less diplomatic, saying *κρίνω* (*Syll.*³, 543, line 6, but *παρακαλῶ* in line 34). Attalus in 206 B.C. is brutally frank, saying *τὰς ὑπ' ἐμὲ πόλει[s]* and *καὶ αἱ πόλεις δὲ αἱ π[ειθόμε]ναι ἐμοὶ ποιήσουσιν ὁμοίως*, but even he only gives advice—*[ἐγγραφα] γὰρ αὐταῖς παρακαλῶν* (*O.G.I.*, 282).
30. Examples of meticulous constitutional procedure are *Syll.*³, 543, *S.E.G.*, VII. 62, *I.G.*, XII. v. 1065.
31. ROME AND FREEDOM: Polyb., XVIII. 44. Livy, XXXIII. 30. THE PROCLAMATION AT THE ISTHMIÆ: Polyb., XVIII. 46, Livy, XXXIII. 32. MILITARY EVACUATION: Livy, XXXIV. 51. TERRITORIAL ARRANGEMENTS: Polyb., XVIII. 47, Livy, XXXIII. 34. CONSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS: Livy, XXXIV. 51. *Syll.*³, 674, *κατὰ νόμους τῶν Θεσσα[λῶν]*, *οἷς [νό]μοις ἕως τα[ν]ῶν χρῶν[τ]αι, οὓς νόμους Τίτος Καίγκτιος ἕπατος ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν δέκα προσηβυτῶν γνώμης ἔδωκεν*.
32. The Roman attitude to the free cities of Asia can be traced in Polyb., XVIII. 47, 50, XXI. 14, 24, 46, Livy, XXXIII. 34, XXXIV. 57-8, XXXV. 16, XXXVII. 35, 55, XXXVIII. 39. FREEDOM OF LYCIA AND CARIA: Polyb., XXX. 5, Livy, XLIV. 15.
33. MACEDONIA: Livy, XLV. 18 (*senatus consultum*), 29-30 (detailed arrangements). The only hint of a constitutional reorganization is in Chap. 18, 'ne improbum vulgus ab senatu Romano aliquando libertatem salubri moderatione datam ad licentiam pestilentem traheret'. Cf. also Justin, XXXIII. 2, 'magistratibus per singulas civitates constitutis libera facta est, legesque quibus adhuc utitur a Paulo accepit'.
34. For the annexation of Macedonia, see p. 54. UPPER MACEDONIA FREE: Strabo, 326, Caesar, *B.C.*, III. 34. For the other free communities of Macedonia, *vid. inf.*, note 62.
35. That the Greeks were declared free in 146 B.C. is attested by Zoharas, IX. 31, *Syll.*³, 684, *[τ]ῆς ἀποδομένης κατὰ [κ]οινὸν τοῖς Ἑλλ[λοῖσιν] ἐλευθερίας*. There is evidence that in the last years of the republic most at any rate of the Greek cities were free; Appian, *Mith.*, 58, Cic., *in Pis.*, 37, *ad Att.*, I. 19, § 9, Caesar, *B.C.*, III. 3. CONSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS: Polyb., XXXIX. 5, *τὴν δεδομένην πολιτείαν*, *Syll.*³, 684, *τῇ ἀποδοθείσῃ τοῖς [Α]χαιοῖς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων πολιτ[εία]*, Paus., VII. XVI. 9, *δημοκρατίας μὲν κατέπαυε, καθίστατο δὲ ἀπὸ τιμημάτων τὰς ἀρχάς*. TRIBUTE: Paus., loc. cit., Bruns, 41 (Euboea), 42 (Oropus), Paus., X. XXXIV. 2 (Elatea); I see no reason for regarding these communities as exceptional cases.
36. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 57-60.
37. *Ib.*, pp. 62-3.
38. *Ib.*, pp. 360-2.
39. CRETE FREED: Cic., *Phil.* II, 97, Cassius Dio, XLV. 32, § 4. For individual free cities, *vid. inf.*, notes 41, 43.
40. Dessau, 34, Jos., *Ant.*, XIV. 76. The phrase *ὑπὲρ τε τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας καὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας* (*Syll.*³, 742) used by the Ephesians in 85 B.C. is a curious contradiction in terms.

41. *FOEDERA*: Polyb., XXI. 32, Livy, XXXVIII. 11 (Aetolia), Polyb., XXX. 31, cf. Livy, XLV. 25, Cic., *ad Fam.*, XII. 15, § 2 (Rhodes), *I.G.R.*, IV. 2 (Methymna), 1028 (Astypalaea), *O.G.I.*, 762 (Cibyra), *Syll.*³, 694 (Elaea), 732 (Thyrreum), *I.G.*², IV. 63 (Epidaurus). For Byzantium the evidence is Tac., *Ann.*, XII. 62, whose history is fantastic; as Henze, *de civitatibus liberis*, pp. 62-3, points out, Byzantium must have signed her *foedus* in or before the Second Macedonian War and broken it in the Third (cf. Diod., fr. XVI, *F.H.G.*, II, p. xv). For Tyre and Sidon the evidence is slight; both were free in Antony's day (Jos., *Ant.*, XV. 95) and were deprived of their freedom by Augustus (Cassius Dio, LIV. 7, § 6) and Suetonius may refer to them when he writes (*Aug.*, 47), 'urbium quasdam foederatas sed ad exitium licentia praecipites libertate privavit'. In the case of Tyre the argument is reinforced by *Dig.*, I. xv. 1, 'foederis quod cum Romanis percussit tenacissima', cf. *C.I.L.*, X. 1601. It seems to me not improbable that many independent cities of the east may like the Jews (I *Macc.*, viii. 17-32, cf. xii. 1-3, xiv. 24, xv. 15-24, Jos., *Ant.*, XII. 417-19, cf. XIII. 163-5, 264) have made treaties with Rome as a guarantee against the possible aggression of kings. For Athens there is no earlier evidence than Tac., II. 53. Other cities which may have been federate under the republic are Cyzicus (on the basis of Cassius Dio, LIV. 7, § 6, Suet., *Aug.*, 47) and Dyrrachium (Livy, XLII. 48, cf. Cic., *ad Fam.*, XIV. 1, § 7, which proves that it was free).
42. Appian, *Mith.*, 39, Ath., V. 213 c, d.
43. King Antiochus notified the freedom of Seleucia in Pieria to the Roman senate (*O.G.I.*, 257), which presumably recognized it; for the era of the city, see Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 783. For other free cities under the republic see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 7 (Abdera, Aenus, Maronea), 62-3 (Asia after Sulla; add Miletus, *Milet.*, 126), 101, 105-6 (the Lycian League), 130-1 (Pamphylia and Pisidia), 153, 160 (Chalcedon, Heraclea in Pontus, Prusias ad Mare), 167 (Amisus), 203, 207, 209 (Cilicia), 259-61 (Syria). For Asia before Sulla's day our information is too fragmentary to be of much value. We know some at any rate of the cities which were recognized as free in 189 B.C. (see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 52-4), but the situation seems to have been entirely changed by Aristonicus' revolt, and for the early provincial period we know scarcely anything (see *C.E.R.P.*, p. 59); to Sardis and Ephesus may be added Smyrna (Cic., *pro Balbo*, 28) and perhaps Mylasa and Bargylia which were free in Augustus' reign, and, as no grant is recorded, may have maintained their freedom from 189 B.C. without interruption. Byzantium, having broken its *foedus* in 148 B.C., was granted freedom in Cicero's day (*Verr.*, II. 76, *de prov. cons.*, 7).
44. The actual *foedus* (ῥρκιον) of Aphrodisias is not preserved but is alluded to in Antony's covering letter (*O.G.I.*, 453). AUTONOMY: Bruns, 14, 'eique legibus suis ita utunto itaque iis omnibus suis legibus Thermensis maioribus Pisideis utei liceto quod advorsus hanc legem non fiat', *O.G.I.*, 441, line 47, [δικαίους τε καὶ νόμοις καὶ ἔθισμοῖς τοῖς ἰδίαις οἷς ἐχρῶντο ἐπάνω ὅπως χρῶνται, line 89, [οἷς] τε νόμοις ἔθισμοῖς τε ἰδίαις πρότερον [ἐχρῶντο τούτοις] χράσθωσαν (Stratonicea), *O.G.I.*, 442, [ὅπως ἰδί]οις τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσασιν τε ᾧσω (Tabae), *I.G.R.*, IV. 943, ὅπως νόμοις τε καὶ ἔθεσι καὶ δικαίοις [χρῶν]ται ἃ ἔσχον ὅτε τῇ 'Ρωμαίων φίλῃ προσήλθον (Chios). INDEPENDENT JURISDICTION: Bruns, 14, 'quae leges quodque ious quaeque consuetudo L. Marcio Sex. Iulio cos. inter civeis Romanos et Termenses maiores Pisidas fuit, eadem leges eidemque ious eademque consuetudo inter ceives Romanos et Termenses maiores Pisidas esto (this implies some reservation in favour of Romans), *O.G.I.*, 455, τῷ [τε] δικαίῳ καὶ ταῖς [κρίσεσι] ταῖς ἰδίαις τὴν πόλιν] τὴν Ἰλαρασιέων καὶ Ἀφροδισιέων χρῆσθαι μήτε ἐγγύην εἰς 'Ρώμην αὐτοὺς κατὰ δόγμα τι καὶ κέλευσιν ὁμολογεῖν, *I.G.R.*, IV. 943, οἱ τε παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄντες 'Ρω[μαῖ]οι τοῖς Χείων ὑπακούουσιν νόμοις. For the exchange of judicial commissions under Roman rule see Wadd., 349-58 (cf. *S.E.G.*, II. 556-63, *B.C.H.*, 1890, p. 621, nos. 19-21) (Mylasa), *B.C.H.*, 1891, p. 200, 1904, p. 39 (ξερικὸν δικαστήριον at Stratonicea; for

this term see Michel, 543), *I.G.R.*, III. 563, 680, 736, cf. Strabo, 665 (μετάπεμπτα δικαστήρια in Lycia; for this term see Michel, 357), *I.G.*, XII. v. 722 (Adramyttium). LOCAL TAXATION: Bruns, 14, 'quam legem portorieis terrestribus maritumeisque Termenses maiores Phisidae capiundeis intra suos fineis deixerint, ea lex ieis portorieis capiundeis esto, dum nei quid portori ab ieis capiatur quei publica populi Romani vectigalia redempta habebunt, *I.G.R.*, IV. 33, τὸ ἐξείναι ὑμῖν . . . ταῖς] τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς χώρας προσόδοις καθ' ἣ[συχίαν χρῆσθαι βούλομαι οὖν] ἀποφῆνασθαι ὅτι οὐδένι συγχωρῶ οὐδὲ συγχωρήσω ἀτελεῖ παρ' ὑμῖν εἶναι] (Mitylene), Livy XXXVIII. 44 (Ambracia). BILLETING AND REQUISITIONS: Bruns, 14, II. 6-17 (Termessus.)

45. IMMUNITY: *O.G.I.*, 455 (Aphrodisias), *R.E.G.*, 1898, p. 258, *Hermes*, 1899, p. 305 (Alabanda), Appian, *B.C.*, v. 7 (the Lycians, Laodicea, Tarsus), Paus., x. xxxiv, 2 (Elatea), *I.B.M.*, 792 (Cnidus), Cic., *Phil.*, II. 97 (Crete), *F.H.G.*, III, p. 436 (Apollonia). The limitation of immunity is proved by Cic., *Verr.*, III. 91-3 (Halicya and Segesta). The passages cited by Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, III, p. 657, note 3, prove that (a) *stipendiariae* was a convenient label for subject cities, which in fact all paid tribute. But it cannot be argued that therefore no free cities paid tribute; on this line of argument it could be proved that *civitates foederatae* were not free because they are distinguished from *civitates liberae*; (b) that freedom and immunity commonly went together. But the very phrase *liberae et immunes* seems to imply that a city could be *libera* and not *immunis*. I do not think that the cases of the Macedonians, Illyrians, and Greeks can be lightly brushed aside. For freedom and immunity under the principate, *vid. inf.*, note 68. The limitation of privileges to citizens by birth is clearly set out in Bruns, 14, 'Quei Thermeses maiores Peisidae fuerunt queique eorum legibus Thermesium maiorum Pisidarum ante k. April. quae fuerunt L. Gallio Cn. Lentulo cos. Thermeses maiores Peisidae factei sunt queique ab ieis prognati sunt erunt, iei omnes postereique eorum Thermeses maiores Peisidae leiberi amiceci socieique populi Romani sunt.'
46. For the terms of the eastern *foedera*, see the texts cited in note 41. It is hardly necessary to quote the ample evidence in Polybius and Livy for the aid given by the Greek cities to Rome in the First and Second Macedonian, the First Syrian, and Third Macedonian Wars. For the *senatus consultum* regulating contributions, see Polyb., xxviii. 13, Livy, XLIII. 17, cf. Appian, *B.C.*, IV. 66 (Rhodes and Cassius). For the later republic the following examples may suffice. SHIPS: *Jahresh.*, 1908, pp. 69-70 (Halicarnassus in 130 B.C.), *I.G.R.*, IV. 1116 (Rhodes in 102 B.C.), Memnon, xxix, *F.H.G.*, III, p. 540, *I.G.R.*, I. 118 (Heraclea Pontica, Miletus, Clazomenae, Carystus in the Social War), Appian, *Mith.*, 33, 56, Plut., *Luc.*, 2-3 (Rhodes in the First Mithridatic War), Cic., *ad Att.*, v. 11, § 4, 12, § 1 (Rhodes and Mitylene escort Cicero), Caesar, *B.C.*, III. 3, 5, 26-7, Cic., *ad Att.*, IX. 9, § 2 (Athens, Corcyra, Achaeans, Rhodes, Chios, Lycians, Byzantium, Tyre, Sidon with Pompey in the Civil War), Caesar, *B.C.*, 106, *B. Alex.*, I, 11, 13-15, 25, *B. Afr.*, 22, *Syll.*³, 763 (Rhodes, Lycians, Cyzicus with Caesar in the Civil War), Appian, *B.C.*, IV. 60-1 (Tyre, Sidon, Rhodians, Lycians with Cassius in the Civil War). TROOPS: *R.E.A.*, 1919, pp. 2, 7 (Bargylia in 129 B.C.), Diod., xxxvii. 8 (Thessalians and Acarnanians in the Sicilian Slave War of 103 B.C.), Appian, *Mith.*, 30, 41, *B.C.*, I. 79, Plut., *Sulla*, 16 (Greeks in the First Mithridatic War and with Sulla in Italy), *I.G.*², IV. 66, *Syll.*³, 748 (Epidaurus and Gytheum with Antonius Creticus), Cic., *ad Fam.*, xv. 4, § 3, 'populorum liberorum regumque sociorum auxilia voluntaria', *ad Att.*, VI. 5, § 3 (Lycians with Cicero), Appian, *B.C.*, II. 49, 70, 75, 88, Caesar, *B.C.*, III. 4, 61 (Greeks with Pompey and Caesar), Appian, *B.C.* IV. 88, Plut., *Brutus*, 41 (Thessalians and Spartans with Brutus), Paus., IV. xxxi. 1, VIII. xiii. 12, xlvi, 1 (Greeks with Antony and Octavian). MONEY, SUPPLIES, ETC.: *S.E.G.*, III. 710 (Methymna in 131-129 B.C.), Appian, *Mith.*, 30, Plut., *Sulla*, 12 (Greeks in First Mithridatic War),

- Syll.*³, 748 (Gytheum and Antonius Creticus), *I.G.*, v. 1432-3 (Messene, occasion uncertain). For the exactions of the civil war it is scarcely necessary to cite evidence. I suggest that the auxiliary units of the imperial army named after free cities (e.g. Antioch, Seleucia, Tyre, Ascalon, see Cheesman, *The Auxiliaries of the Roman Imperial Army*, pp. 181-2) may have been in origin contingents raised by these cities.
47. *Leges provinciarum* of which anything is known are the Lex Rupilia of Sicily (Cic., *Verr.*, II. 32) and the Lex Pompeia of Bithynia (Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 79, 112, 114). For constitutional arrangements, see pp. 170-1.
48. SUPPRESSION OF 'FACTION': *Syll.*³, 684, Cic., *ad Q. f.*, I. 1, § 25.
49. Cicero speaks of cities raising money without any apparent sanction, e.g., *pro Flacco*, 20. For the *legationes*, see *ad Fam.*, III. 8, §§ 2-5, 10, § 6; from 8, § 4 it appears that one *caput* in Cicero's edict was *ad minuendos sumptus civitatum*, and that one clause in it, forbidding public embassies on private business, was *tralatitium*. On the *tributum* at Appia, see *ad Fam.*, III. 7, §§ 2-3. IMPERATA *ἐπικεφάλαια*: *ad Att.*, v. 16, § 2; from the context it is clearly like the *ἀνάι* (i.e., the farmed civic *vectigalia*) a local levy; cf. also *ad Fam.*, III. 8, § 5, 'ne in venditionem tributorum et istam acerbissimam exactionem, quam tu non ignoras, capitum atque ostiorum inducerentur sumptus minime necessarii'. For Cicero's examination of accounts, see *ad Att.*, VI. 2, § 5, cf. VI. 1, § 15 (the heading *de rationibus civitatum* in the edict) and *ad Q. f.*, I. 1, § 25.
50. LEX RUPILIA: Cic., *Verr.*, II. 32.
51. CYRENAICA: *J.R.S.*, 1927, pp. 33 seqq. CILICIA AND ASIA: Cic., *ad Att.*, VI. 1, § 15, 'multaque sum secutus Scaevolae: in eis illud in quo sibi libertatem censent Graeci datam, ut Graeci inter se disceptent suis legibus'.
52. The distinction between *cognitio* and *iudicis datio* is clearly drawn in *J.R.S.*, 1927, pp. 33 seqq. It appears from the Lex Rupilia that all mixed cases involved the intervention of the governor in Sicily. In Cilicia the evidence on this point is not clear, but Cicero had to try cases involving Romans (*ad Att.*, v. 21, § 6). PRIVILEGED PROVINCIALS: Bruns, 41, *ἐξουσία καὶ αἰρεσις* [ἡ] *εἰάν τε ἐν ταῖς πατρίοις κατὰ τοὺς ἰδίους νόμους βούλωνται κρίνεσθαι ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀρχόντων* (ἢ) *ἐπὶ Ἰταλικῶν κριτῶν*, *Syria*, 1934, p. 35, § 8.
53. CONVENTUS OF ASIA: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 61. CONVENTUS OF CILICIA: Cic., *ad Att.*, v. 21, § 9, cf. v. 16, § 4, VI. 2, § 4, *ad Fam.*, III. 6, § 4, 8, § 6, for Cilicia Pedias, *ad Att.*, v. 21, § 6, for Cyprus. *EVOCATIO*: Cic., loc. cit., 'nam evocari ex insula Cyprios non licet', cf. v. 21, § 9, VI. 2, § 4, for Cicero's great combined *conventus*.
54. The only provincial edict of which we know much is Cicero's (*ad Att.*, VI. 1, § 15, cf. v. 21, § 11, *ad Fam.*, III. 8, § 4). Cicero also quotes parts of Verres' dealing with taxation (*Verr.*, III. 25, 26, 35, 37) and jurisdiction (II. 33). LOCAL COURTS: Cic., *Verr.*, II. 32, cf. 33, 'quod civis cum civi ageret, aut eum iudicem quem commodum erat . . . dabat, aut si legibus erat iudicium constitutum et ad civem suum iudicem venerant, libere civi iudicare non licebat', *ad Att.*, VI. 1, § 15, 'Graeci vero exsultant, quod peregrinis iudicibus utuntur', 2, § 4, 'omnes suis legibus et iudiciis usae *ἀνονομία* adeptae revixerunt', Bruns, 41.
55. Cicero outlines the systems of provincial taxation in *Verr.*, III. 12. MACEDONIA: Livy, XLV. 18 (abuse of *publicani*), 29, 'eo concilia suae cuiusque regionis indici, pecuniam conferri, ibi magistratus creari iussit' (this suggests federal collection), cf. Diod., XXXI. 8. FARMING IN GREECE: Bruns, 42 (Oropus and the *publicani*), 41, *ἀρχοντες ἡμέτεροι οὗτινες ἂν ποτε Ἀσίαν Εὐβοίαν μισθώσιν*.
56. ASIA: Cic., *Verr.*, III. 12, Appian, *B.C.*, v. 4, Cassius Dio, XLII. 6, § 3. The working of the farming system can be seen in *Verr.*, III, where it is plain that the

- pactiones* with the cities (67 seqq.) were private arrangements, and that the *Lex Hieronica* envisaged direct dealings between the *decumanus* and the *arator* (e.g., 25 seqq., 36 seqq.). It is probable that the *pactiones* to which Cicero alludes in his own province (*ad Att.*, v. 13, § 1, vi. 1, § 16) were with the cities; in Bithynia this was certainly the case (*ad Fam.*, XIII. 65). SULLA'S INDEMNITY: Appian. *Mith.*, 62, *μόνοὺς ὑμῖν ἐπιγράψω πέντε ἐτῶν φόρου ἐσσευκεῖν αὐτίκα καὶ τὴν τοῦ πολέμου δαπάνην . . . διαίρησάω δὲ ταῦθ' ἐκάστοις ἐγὼ καὶ κατὰ πόλεις*, Cic., *ad Q.f.*, I. 1, § 33, 'nomen publicani aspernari non possunt qui pendere ipsi vectigal sine publicano non potuerint quod iis aequaliter Sulla descripserat', *pro Flacco*, 32 (subsequent use of Sulla's *descriptio* for ship money).
57. CILICIA: Bruns, 14, Cic. *ad Att.*, v. 15, § 3 (at Laodicea) 16, § 1 (at Synnada), 21, § 4 (at Iconium), vi. 1, § 15-16, 2, § 5, 3, § 3, *ad Fam.*, II. 13, § 3, III. 8 § 4. CYRENAICA: Cic., *pro Plancio*, 63, Pliny, *N.H.*, XIX. 39-40, cf. *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 361-2 BITHYNIA: Cic., *ad Fam.*, XIII. 65 (pasture dues), XIII. 9, Dio Chrys., xxxviii. 26 (tithe), cf. *C.E.R.P.*, pp., 161-2. PONTUS: Caesar, *B. Alex.*, 70.
58. SYRIA: Cic., *de prov. cons.*, 10, 'iam vero publicanos miseros . . . tradidit in servitutum Iudaeis et Syris . . . pactiones sine ulla iniuria factas rescidit', *pro Flacco*, 69 (Judaea is 'elocata'), Jos., *Ant.*, XIV. 202-3, 206, cf. my analysis in *J.R.S.*, 1935, pp. 228-9.
59. ROADS: Cic., *pro Fonteio*, 17. HOSPITALITY: Cic., *ad Att.*, v. 10, § 2, 16, § 3, 21, § 5; these passages mention a *Lex Julia* regulating hospitality, Bruns, 14, records an earlier *lex Porcia*; animals are not mentioned in these passages but it would appear from Livy, XLII. 1, that it was usual to requisition them; cf. also the speech of the elder Cato quoted in Fronto, *Ep. ad Ant. Imp.*, I. 2, 'numquam ego evectorem datavi, quo amici mei per symbolos pecunias magnas caperent'. DIPLOMATA: Cic., *in Pis.*, 90, cf. *ad Att.*, x. 17, § 4, *ad Fam.*, vi. 12, § 3. LIBERAE LEGATIONES: Cic., *Leg.*, III. 18, *pro Flacco*, 86, cf. *ad Fam.*, XII. 21, *ad Att.*, xv. 11, § 4. FRUMENTUM IN CELLAM: Cic., *in Pis.*, 90, *pro Flacco*, 45, *Verr.*, I. 95; the whole system is fully discussed in *Verr.*, III. 188 seqq., the abuse of commutation in 189-94; from 211 it appears that corn was compulsorily purchased for the army as well as the staff. BILLETING: Bruns, 14, Cic., *ad Att.*, v. 21, § 7, and perhaps § 11.
60. SHIPS: *pro Flacco*, 27-33, *Verr.*, I. 86-90 (Asia), cf. v. 43 seqq. (Sicily); also in time of war, Appian. *Mith.*, 56 (Pamphylia in the First Mithridatic War), *I.G.R.*, I. 843 (Cos in 84-82 B.C.), Cic., *ad Att.*, IX. 9, § 2, Caesar, *B.C.*, III. 3, 5, 7, 40, 101, 106, *B. Alex.*, I. 13-14 (fleets from all the eastern provinces, in particular Arad, Smyrna, Cos, with Pompey and Caesar), Cassius Dio, XLVII. 30 (Arad with Dolabella). TROOPS: *Syll.*³, 700 (Macedonians in border wars). Appian, *Mith.*, 41, *B.C.*, I. 79 (Macedonians with Sulla in Mithridatic war and Italy), *O.G.I.*, 443 (Poemanenum in 80-79 B.C.), Appian, *B.C.*, II. 49, 71, 75, Caesar, *B.C.*, III. 4, 102 (provincial levies with Pompey in the civil war), Caesar, *B. Alex.*, 26, Jos., *Ant.*, XIV. 129, *Bell.*, I. 188 (contingents from Syrian and Cilician cities in the Alexandrine War), Cic., *ad Fam.*, XII. 13, § 4 (Tarsus and Laodicea with Dolabella), Appian, *B.C.*, III. 79, IV. 75 (Macedonians with Brutus); here again I suggest that auxiliary units such as the Damascenes and the Apamenes (Cheesman, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-2) may originally have been contingents raised by these cities, probably during the civil wars. For the monetary and other exactions during the civil war it is superfluous to quote evidence. CROWNS: Cic., *in Pis.*, 90.
61. Cicero is very outspoken on the unreliability of levies from the provincial cities; *ad Fam.*, xv. 1, § 5, 'nam sociorum auxilia propter acerbiteriam atque iniurias imperi nostri aut ita imbecilla sunt ut non multum nos iuvare possint aut ita alienata a nobis ut neque expectandum ab iis neque committendum iis quicquam esse videatur'.
62. CYDONIA AND LAPPA: Cassius Dio, LI. 2, 3. ORESTI: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV. 35, cf. Polyb., XVIII. 47, Livy, XXXIII. 34, Cic., *de Harusp. Resp.*, 35. APOLLONIA:

- F.G.H.*, III, p. 436, cf. Appian, *Ill.*, 8. OTHER MACEDONIAN COMMUNITIES: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV, 3, 35-6, 38, 73, cf. Cic., *ad Att.*, III, 8 seqq. for Thessalonica, Polyb. XVIII, 44, 48, Livy, XXXIII, 30, 35 for Thasos.
63. FREE CITIES OF GREECE: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV, 5, 7, 8, 16, 24-6, 29, 52, 54, 57, and Paus., X, xxxiv, 2 (Elatea), xxxv, 2 (Abae), III, xxi, 6 (Eleutherolacones); the freedom of Plataea is inferred from its being with Athens, Thespieae and Thessaly in charge of a special commissioner under Hadrian (Dessau, 1067). NERO AND VESPASIAN: Suet., *Nero*, 24, *Vesp.*, 8, Cassius Dio, LXIII, II, § 1, Pliny, *N.H.*, IV, 22, Paus., VII, xvii, 3-4, *Syll.*³, 814. THESSALY: Appian, *B.C.*, II, 88, Plut., *Caesar*, 48 (Caesar's grant), Dessau, 1067 (free under Hadrian). It is not recorded as free in Pliny and perhaps Plut., *Praec. reip. ger.*, 19, refers to the loss, and Suet., *Tib.*, 8, to the recovery of its liberty. MOTHONE: Paus., IV, xxxv, 3. PALLANTIUM: *id.*, VIII, xliii, 1.
64. BYZANTIUM: Suet., *Vesp.*, 8, Dio Chrys., xxxi, 105-6, Cassius Dio, LXXIV, 14, § 3, Herodian, III, vi, 9, *Hist. Aug., Carac.*, 1. For the others, see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 14-15 (Abdera, Aenus, and Maronea), 380, note 24 (Augusta Trajana), 160 (Chalcedon), 163 (Cius), 168 (Amisus), 171 (Trapezus).
65. *ib.*, pp. 76 (Mylasa), 77 (Rhodes, Bargylia, Cnidus, Stratonicea, Caunus, Alabanda, Aphrodisias, Astypalaea, Cos), 80 (Chios), 85 (Mitylene), 86 (Ilium), 87 (Cyzicus). SAMOS: Cassius Dio, LIV, 9, § 7, Pliny, *N.H.*, V, 135, Suet., *Vesp.* 8. Apollonis and Magnesia ad Sipylum are recorded in the Augustan *formula provinciae* (Pliny, *N.H.*, V, 126, 120) without being qualified as free, and therefore certainly were not. Tabae is not mentioned by Pliny, and Phocaea and Miletus only in his account of the coast, not drawn from official sources; it is therefore possible that they were free. MINOA: *I.G.*, XII, vii, 242.
66. LYCIA: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 105-6. TERMESSUS: *ib.*, p. 144. SELEUCIA ON THE CALYCADNUS: *ib.*, p. 209. FREE CITIES OF CILICIA PEDIAS: *ib.*, p. 207. FREE CITIES OF SYRIA: *ib.*, pp. 260, 263; Tyre had regained its *foedus* by the third century (*vid. sup.*, note 41), and the independent attitude of Tyre and Sidon to Agrippa I (*Acts*, xii, 20) rather suggests that they had already recovered their freedom then.
67. AUGUSTAN FOEDERA: Pliny, *Ep.*, X, 92-3, *O.G.I.*, 530 (Amisus; probably granted by Augustus since he freed the city), *Aθηνά*, 1899, pp. 283-4 (Cnidus), *I.G.R.*, IV, 33d (Mitylene), Servius, *in Aen.*, III, 501 (Nicopolis). Many cities during the principate style themselves (φίλη) σύμμαχος Ρωμαίων; Aspendus (Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 701), Side (*ib.*, p. 704), Silyum (*ib.*, p. 705), Sagalassus (*ib.*, p. 710, *I.G.R.*, III, 350-3). Nicomedia (*I.G.R.*, III, 6), Mopsuestia (*ib.*, 915), Amorium (*I.G.R.*, IV, 619), Sardis (*ib.*, 1528), Laodicea (*I.G.*, III, 479). As only two of these cities, Mopsuestia and Laodicea, are otherwise known to have been free, the title was presumably meaningless at this date, though it may recall the fact that the city had once been an ally of Rome; the Pamphylian cities seem to have been declared free and perhaps struck *foedera* in 189 B.C. (*C.E.R.P.*, pp. 130-1). The official Greek for *foederata* was, it may be noted, ἐνασπονδος (*O.G.I.*, 530). CANCELLATION OF FOEDERA: Suet., *Aug.*, 47.
68. APPEALS: *I.G.*², II-III, 1100, *I.G.*, V, i, 21, *I.G.R.*, IV, 1031, 1044. AMPHISSA AND THE OZOLIAN LOCRIANS: Pliny, *N.H.*, IV, 7, 8. ILIUM: *ib.*, V, 124; according to Strabo, 595, Caesar τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὴν ἀλειτουρησίαν αὐτοῖς συνεφύλαξε, but according to Suet., *Claud.*, 25, Claudius gave them immunity from tribute; it would seem therefore that Augustus deprived even the Ilians of immunity, unless there is some confusion between different grants of various immunities; Tacitus (*Ann.*, XII, 58) describes Claudius' grant as 'ut Ilienses omni publico munere solverentur' and the Ilians had a very complete set of privileges (*Dig.*, XXVII, I, 17, § 1). SPARTA: Strabo, 365. ALABANDA: Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 607. TRIBUTE PAID BY BYZANTIUM: Tac., *Ann.*, XII, 63; by Mylasa, *O.G.I.*, 515, καὶ διὰ

τοῦτο καὶ ἡ εὐ[πορία ἢ πρὸς τοὺς κυρίους αὐ]τοκράτορας τῶν φόρων βραδύνει. The often cited cases of Apollonis and Magnesia ad Sipylum (Tac., *Ann.*, II. 47) are not valid, since these cities were not free in the principate (*vid. sup.*, note 65). That of Antioch (*Dig.*, L. xv. 8, § 6) is also doubtful, since Severus had annulled the privileges of the city. The case of Chios (Jos., *Ant.*, XVI. 26) is probably irrelevant, for τὰ πρὸς Καίσαρος ἐπιτρόπους χρήματα cannot mean tribute, which was paid to the proconsul, but must be a private debt: the εἰσφοραὶ are a civic property tax—it is the normal word. Cos (Tac., *Ann.*, XII. 61) and Pallantium (Paus., VIII. xliii. 1) are the only Greek cities known to have been granted immunity during the principate, if Nero's short-lived grant to the Greeks (*Syll.*³, 814) be excepted.

69. TRAJAN AND AMISUS: Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 92-3.

70. DENDA: Pliny, *N.H.*, III. 145. STOBI: *ib.*, IV. 34, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 245. COELA: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 16.

71. LATIN RIGHT: Strabo, 186-7. PRIVILEGE OF APAMEA: Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 47-8; Pausanias' statement (VII. xviii. 7) that Augustus ἔδωκε μὲν ἐλευθέρους Ἀχαιῶν μόνους Πατρεῦσαν εἶναι, ἔδωκε δὲ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα γέρα σφίσιν ὅποσα τοῖς ἀποίκους νέμειν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι νομίζουσι implies that Roman colonies enjoyed the status of free cities.

72. TAX-PAYING COLONIES: *Dig.*, L. xv. 1, § 3, 8, § 5. From *I.G.*, IV. 1600 it appears that Corinth paid taxes under Hadrian. IMMUNE COLONIES: *Dig.*, L. xv. 1, § 6, 8, § 7. IUS ITALICUM: *ib.*, L. xv. 1, 6, 7, 8; the following colonies are stated definitely to have had the right: Philippi, Dyrrachium, Cassandreia, Dium, Alexandria Troas, Parium, Antioch of Pisidia, Berytus among the early foundations, Tyre, Laodicea, Heliopolis, Emesa among the Severan, also the *municipium* of Stobi. About Apamea and Sinope (early), and Palmyra and Sebaste (Severan), Ulpian's language is ambiguous. An inscription (*B.C.H.*, 1909, p. 35) proves that Nicopolis of Armenia Minor had the *ius Italicum*. If a Marsyas statue be accepted as evidence of *ius Italicum* (see *Philologus*, 1891, p. 639, *Mél. Arch. Hist.*, 1898, p. 146) the doubtful cases of Apamea (Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 510) and Palmyra (*B.M.C., Galatia &c.*, p. lviii) are confirmed, and the following colonies are added: Olbasa (*C.I.L.*, 6888), Cremna (Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 708), Patrae, Deultum (Eckhel, *Doctr. Num. Vet.*, IV, p. 439), Claudiopolis (*B.M.C., Lycaonia &c.*, p. 117), Sidon, Caesarea ad Libanum (*B.M.C., Phoenicia*, pp. cxvi, lxxii), Bostra (*B.M.C., Arabia*, p. 21), Neapolis (*B.M.C., Palestine*, p. xxxiii), Damascus (Eckhel, *loc. cit.*); also the *municipium* of Coela (Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 259).

73. ASCALON: *B.G.U.*, 316, ἐν κολωνίᾳ Ἀσκ[άλων] τῇ πιστῇ καὶ ἐλευθέρᾳ. TYRE: *Dig.*, L. xv. 1, 'splendidissima Tyriorum colonia . . . foederis quod cum Romanis percussit tenacissima.' APHRODISIAS: *R.E.G.*, 1906, p. 86.

74. For constitutional arrangements see p. 171. PUNISHMENT OF LEFT WING POLITICIANS: Plut., *Praec. reip. ger.*, 17. SUSPENSION OF ASSEMBLY: Dio Chrys., LXVIII. 1; cf. Acts, xix. 39-40. Maecenas' advice in Cassius Dio, LII. 30, § 2, οἱ δῆμον μῆτε κύριοι τιῶς ἔστωσαν μῆτε εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὸ παράπαν φοιτάτωσαν does not, however, represent the policy of the emperors even in Dio's day (see p. 177). PROHIBITION OF CLUBS: Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 34, 93, Dessau, 7190, *Dig.*, XLVIII. xix. 28, § 3.

75. JURISDICTION: I can find no reference (outside free cities) to local courts in the east save *I.G.R.*, III. 736 (the μεταπεμπτα δικαστήρια of Lycia) and Plut., *Praec. reip. ger.*, 19, where he laments the decline of καὶ βουλὴ καὶ δῆμος καὶ δικαστήρια καὶ ἀρχὴ πάσα owing to the habit of referring every trivial affair to the governor; it may be noted that these δικαστήρια were not jury courts, cf. Plut., *op. cit.*, 10, where a young man is advised to make his mark in politics by a δίκη μεγάλη καλῶς δικασθεῖσα.

76. EX GRATIA PAYMENTS: Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 90-1, *Dig.*, L. ix. 4 (Ulpian), ii. 8 (Hermogenian), *Cod. Just.*, x. xlvii. 2 (Diocletian). CHANGES IN TAXATION: Dessau, 6092 (Vespasian), *Dig.*, L. xii. 13 (Marcus), *Cod. Just.*, iv. lxiii. 1, 2 (Severus), *Dig.*, xxxix. iv. 10, (Hermogenian), cf. Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 24, where Trajan forbids the levy of a *tributum* for the baths at Prusa.
77. DELEGATIONS: *Dig.*, L. vii. 5, § 6 (Vespasian), cf. Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 43. GAMES: *Dig.*, L. viii. 6 (Valens), cf. Cassius Dio, lII. 30, § 3-8.
78. Dio Chrys., xl. 6, xlV. 15, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. *passim*, *Dig.*, L. x. 7 (Pius), 6 (Marcus), 3 (Macer), viii. 7, § 1 (Paulus), cf. Cassius Dio, lII. 30, § 3.
79. EARLY IMPERIAL COMMISSIONERS: Philostr., *Vit. Soph.*, i. xix, p. 512 (Smyrna), Pliny, *Ep.*, viii. 24 (Achaëa), Dessau, 1067 (Athens, &c.), 8826 (Bithynia), 1066-7 (Syria).
80. LATER COMMISSIONERS OF SEVERAL CITIES: *Année Epigr.*, 1928, 97 (Nicaëa, &c.), *I.G.*, III. 677 (Thebes, &c.), *I.G.R.*, iv. 1213 (Seleucia, &c.), *I.G.*, III. 631 (Achaëa), Dessau, 8842, cf. III. 2, p. cxc1 (Pergamene diocese), cf. *I.G.*, XII. iii. 1119, πόλεων ἐπιφανεστάτων λογιστείας εὐράμενον (perhaps not simultaneously). EARLY COMMISSIONERS OF SINGLE CITIES: *O.G.I.*, 492 (Trapezopolis; *curator* is here by exception rendered ἐπιμελητής), *S.E.G.*, II. 410 (Apollonia), *I.G.R.*, iv. 218 (Ilium), III. 69 (Cius), iv. 1294 (Gordus), *Année Epigr.*, 1926, 79 (Nicomedia), 1932, 50, *S.E.G.*, iv. 519 (Ephesus), *C.I.G.*, 2741 (Aphrodisias). Ulpian's *De officio curatoris* is quoted in *Dig.*, xxii. i. 33, L. ix. 4, x. 5, xii. 1, 15.
81. SENATORIAL COMMISSIONERS: Pliny, *Ep.*, viii. 24, Dessau, 1066-7, 1140-41, 8826, *I.G.R.*, III. 39-40, iv. 1307, *I.G.*, III. 10, 631, *Année Epigr.*, 1926, 79, *C.I.G.*, 2782, λογιστήν μετὰ ὑπατικοῦς δοθέντα τῆς Κυζικηνῶν πόλεως. EQUESTRIAN COMMISSIONERS: *I.G.R.*, III. 6, iv. 1213, *Année Epigr.*, 1928, 97, *O.G.I.*, 500, *I.G.*, XII. iii. 1119, *S.E.G.*, iv. 519, vii. 826. PROVINCIAL HIGH PRIESTS AS COMMISSIONERS: *O.G.I.*, 492, *I.G.R.*, III. 63, 69, 491, iv. 1168, 1294, 1642, *C.I.G.*, 2741, 2912, *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 197, *B.C.H.*, 1887, p. 216, *S.E.G.*, II. 410. PROVINCIALS FROM OTHER CITIES AS COMMISSIONERS: *I.G.R.*, III. 440, 474, iv. 218, *C.I.G.*, 2782 (this man's father had been high priest of Asia, and his grandfather and great-grandfather senatorial), *I.G.*, III. 677 (a very distinguished Athenian of senatorial ancestry).
82. The transition to the Byzantine practice is difficult to trace, but is illustrated by inscriptions which record a λογιστής holding local magistracies, e.g. *I.G.*, v. ii. 152, τὸν ἀξιολογώτατον δεκάπρωτον πάσης ἀρέτης κεκοσμημένον ἐν τε ταῖς ἄλλαις πολιτείαις καὶ λογιστεύσαντα ἀκαταγνώστως (Tegea), *C.I.G.*, 2926, τὸν ἀγορανόμον, τὸν ὑπέρτατον λογιστήν καὶ κτίστην τῆς πατρίδος (Tralles), *I.G.R.*, iv. 1359, λο[γιστήν] στρατηγὸν γ[υμνασ]ί[α]ρχον πρίτ[αν] ἀ[γ]ωνοθέτην (Hierocaesarea?), III. 264, πρίνκεψ καὶ λογιστής τῆς λαμπρῆς Εἰκοσιῶν κολωνίας, cf. *S.E.G.*, vii. 826-7 (Gerasa). Even in the fourth century the *curator civitatis* was appointed by imperial *epistula*; see *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 20 (PPO. Or., 331). In the west he continued to be in the Ostrogothic kingdom (Cassiod., *Variae*, vii. 12) and after Justinian's reconquest (*Nov.*, 75, 104, where *pater* is equivalent to *curator*, see Part III, note 104), but in the east no imperial codicil seems to have been issued in Justinian's reign; the *pater* does not appear in the list of fees attached to *Nov.* 8. The duration of the office might be considerable, cf. *I.G.*, iv. 796, τιμηθέντα λογιστέα ὑπὸ τῆς βασιλείας εἰς δεκαετίαν (Troezen), probably an exceptional case. The importance of the office is shown by the practice, almost universal in the third century, of dating monuments ἐπὶ λογιστοῦ. For an account of the system, see Liebenam, *Philologus*, 1897, p. 290, Kornemann, *P.W.*, iv. 1806. A list of λογισταί is given by Tod, *J.H.S.*, 1922, p. 172.
83. See pp. 184 seqq.
84. In the first census of Syria an imperial officer was delegated by Quirinius to assess a single city, Apamea (Dessau, 2683). This would hardly have been

necessary later. CIVIC ASSESSORS: *Dig.* L. iv. 1, § 2, 'personalia civilia sunt munera . . . ad census accipiendum' (Hermogenian), 18, § 16, 'pari modo qui acceptandis sive suscipiendis censualibus professionibus destinantur ad personalis muneris sollicitudinem animum intendunt' (Arcadius Charisius). As to the date of these two lawyers I agree with Krüger (*Gesch. der Quellen und Litteratur des röm. Rechts*², pp. 254-5) that the evidence for placing them after A.D. 331 is not cogent, and I would add that their allusions to the *decaprotia* (*Dig.*, L. iv. 1, § 1, 18, § 26), which was abolished in A.D. 307-8 (*vid. inf.*, note 106), prove that they must have written before A.D. 308.

85. TAX COLLECTION IN LYCIA: *I.G.R.*, III. 739, 11, [ἀρχιφύλαξ Λυκίων τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν ἐπεικῶς [καὶ σεμνῶς τελεῖ τῆς τε εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς εὐθηνίας] μετὰ πάσης φροντίδος προνοούμενος, τὰ δὲ ἀναλώματ[α] μεγαλοψύχως ὑφίστα[ται] τὴν πρὸς τὸν φό[σ]κον ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους ε[ὐ]σέβειαν ἐκπληρ[ῶ]ν ἐν οἷς ποιεῖται προσ[ε]ισοδ[ι]ασμοῖς ἐκ τῶν [ἰ]δίων τῇ δὲ ἀναπράξει με[τ]ὰ πάσης φιλανθρωπι[ας] σ[υ]ν[α]ρχόμενος [π]ροσέρχεται, 739, III, ἀναδεξάμενος δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔθνει τὴν ἀρχιφυλακίαν πάντα σεμνῶς καὶ φιλαγάθως καὶ φιλοτείμως δι' ὅλης τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐτέλεσεν τοὺς τε φόρους ὑπερῆσοδιᾶσας κομίζεται, 488, ἀρχιφυλακῆσαντα ἐν τῇ πρὸς τῷ Κράγῳ συντελ[εί]α καὶ μετὰ πάσης εἰρήνης κα[ὶ] εὐσεβείας τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκτελέσαντα πληρώσαντα καὶ [εἰς] τὸ ἱερώτατον ταμεῖον τοὺς ἱεροὺς φόρους καὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν ποιησάμενον ἐπεικῶς καὶ τειμητικῶς. It has been suggested on the basis of *Arch. Δελτ.*, 1916, p. 148, where a president of the Macedonian κοινόν pays the poll tax on behalf of the province, that in Macedonia also the κοινόν collected the imperial tribute; but the inference is far from certain. CITY COLLECTORS: *Dig.*, XLIX. xviii. 5, § 1, 'sed et ab exactione tributorum habent (sc. veterani) immunitatem, hoc est, ne exactores tributorum constituentur' (Paulus), L. i. 17, § 7, 'exigendi tributi munus inter sordida munera non habetur et ideo decurionibus quoque mandatur' (Papinian), iv. 3, § 11, 'exactionem tributorum onus patrimonii esse constat' (Ulpian). DECAPROTI: Turner, *J.E.A.*, 1936, pp. 7-19. The low rank of the *exactores* appears from the citation from Papinian, their financial responsibility from that from Ulpian. *Decaproti* were always decurions; it may be noted that the office is frequently recorded in inscriptions, which implies that it was honourable. Their responsibility is described in *Dig.*, L. iv. 3, § 10, 'decaprotos etiam minores annis xxv fieri, non militantes tamen, pridem placuit; quia patrimonii magis onus videtur esse' (Ulpian); see also the passage cited in the next note.

86. *Dig.*, L. iv. 18, § 6, 'nam decaproti et icosaproti tributa exigentes et corporale ministerium gerunt et pro nominibus defunctorum fiscalia detrimenta resarciunt' (Arcadius Charisius citing Modestinus). The responsibility of the council for the officers it elected is proved by many Egyptian documents, e.g. *Chr.*, I. 378, ἵνα ἐκάστης αὐσίας ἕνα τινὰ φροντιστὴν ἀφ[ι]σ[τ]οχρεῶν κινδύνῳ ἐκάστης βουλῆς αἰρεθῆναι ποιήσητε, *C. P. Herm.*, 97, ἐλόμενοι τοὺς ὑπογεγραμμένους λειτουργήσου[σ]ιν τῷ κινδύνῳ ἐαυτῶν καὶ ἀπάσης τῆς κρατ[ι]σ[τ]ῆς ἡμῶν βουλῆς. All the evidence for fiscal responsibility is third century, but there is no evidence bearing on the question at all at an earlier date, and the *fiscus* must from the beginning have had some guarantee to replace that of the *publicani*. For Aurelian, see *Cod. Just.*, xi. lix. 1; Arcadius Charisius perhaps refers to this measure when he writes: 'Sed ea quae personalia esse diximus, si . . . annonam exigentes desertorum praediorum damna sustineant, mixtorum definitione continebuntur' (*Dig.*, L. iv. 18, § 27). For the allocation of miscellaneous revenues to payment of tribute, see *O.G.I.*, 515 (Mylasa), *Syll.*³, 800 (Lycosura), *I.G.*, XII. v. 724 (Andros), 946 (Tenos).

87. AURUM CORONARIUM: *Hist. Aug., Hadr.*, 6, *Ant. P.*, 4, *P. Fay.*, 20 (proved by Wilcken, *Zeitschr. Sav.-Stift.*, XLII (1921), p. 150, to belong to Severus Alexander, and citing Trajan and Marcus as precedents), Cassius Dio, LXXVII. 9, § 2 (Caracalla), *P. Oxy.*, 1413, l. 25, ὁ ἐπείκτης χρυσοῦ στεφάνου καὶ νείκης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἀύρηλιανοῦ Σεβ[ασ]τοῦ. Free cities were also expected to pay, cf. *Syll.*³, 832.

88. GORTYN: *C.I.L.*, III. 13566. ABILA: Dessau, 5864. AMYZON: *Jahresh.*, 1910, *Beiblatt*, p. 77. HERACLEA: *B.C.H.*, 1897, p. 162. At Beroea the roads built by

Popillius Python (*Ἀρχ. Δελτ.*, 1916, p. 148) may have been local, and at Troezen those repaired by Ision son of Timotheus (*I.G.*, iv. 758) were almost certainly so. For the third century see *I.G.R.*, iv. 1206, ἡ λαμπροτάτη Θυατειρηῶν πόλις κατεσκευάσεν τὰς ὁδοὺς, cf. 1165-6, 1208, 1305, 1315 (milestones dedicated by Thyateira). Such milestones are very common, e.g. *I.G.R.*, i. 828 (Trajanopolis), 669, 670, 672 (Pautalia), 687-8, 692-3 (Serdice), 724-5 (Philippopolis), 741, 753 (Augusta Trajana), 772 (Hadrianopolis), iv. 1482-3 (Smyrna), 1380 (Silandus), 1364 (Daldis). In the legal texts there is some confusion between the *munus personale* of supervising road building and *munus patrimonii* or *locorum* of actually building the road. The former is mentioned in *Dig.*, l. iv. 18, § 7, 'sed et qui ad faciendas vias eligi solent, cum nihil de proprio patrimonio in hoc munus conferant', § 15, 'si aliquis fuerit electus ut compellat eos qui prope viam publicam possident sternere viam, personale munus est', and presumably, l. iv. 1, § 2; the latter presumably in XLIX. xviii. 4, l. iv. 14, § 2, v. 11, where it is classed with *praediorum collatio*. The earliest reference (l. iv. 12, Javolenus, who wrote in the late first century) is ambiguous.

89. ENTERTAINMENT OF EMPEROR, COURT, ARMY: *I.G.R.*, III. 62, 66, 68, 1421 (Prusias), 173, 208 (Ancyra), 714 (Myra), 739, iv (Rhodiapolis), 1033, *O.G.I.*, 640 (Palmyra), *I.G.R.*, iv. 1247 (Thyateira), *Forsch. Eph.*, III. 72, 80 (Ephesus), *S.E.G.*, I. 276 (Lete); in most of these cases the entertainment is provided by a prominent citizen, but his service is reckoned among his *λειτουργίαι* on behalf of his *πατρίς*; that the burden officially rested on the city is shown by *I.G.R.*, III. 739, iv. a letter of Caelius Florus, procurator of Lycia-Pamphylia, to Opramoas of Rhodiapolis: καὶ δημοσίᾳ [πρὸς τὴν] πόλιν ὑμῶν ἐπέσταλκα ὡς τ[ὸ] ἀναγκ[α]ιώτατα εἰς τὴν εὐτυχιστάτην τοῦ [κ]υρίου ἡμῶν ἐπάνοδον ἐτοιμάσασθαι.

90. The *cursus publicus* is authoritatively analysed by Seeck, *P.W.*, iv. 1846, and I need only quote references for particular points relevant to my subject. The system of requisitioning lodging, provisions and transport is best revealed by Egyptian documents; for discussions, see Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 358-9, 375-6, Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 88-94. The edicts of Germanicus (*SB.*, 3924) and of Vergilius Capito (*O.G.I.*, 665) show that lodging (*ξενία*) and certain extras (*O.G.I.*, 665, καὶ τοὺτους δὲ στέγη μόνον δέχεσθαι τοὺς διερχομένους, ὑποκείμενόν τε μηδένα μηδὲν πράττειν ἔξω τῶν ὑπὸ Μαξιμου σταθέντων) were provided gratis. The edict of Germanicus shows that a *μισθος* was paid for *ἀγγαρεῖαι* and that of Aemilius Rectus (*Chr.*, I. 439) and also *P.S.I.*, 683, a document concerned with Severus' visit to Egypt, that a *τίμη* was paid for provisions. The responsibility of the city magistrates is proved by Plut., *Galba*, 8, *Hist. Aug.*, *Hadri.*, 7. The proper procedure was probably that the diploma holder should apply to the magistrates, not requisition himself; cf. *P.S.I.*, 446, where the prefect M. Petronius Mamertinus complains of soldiers, &c., τὰ μὲν αὐτοὺς π[ρ]ὸς βίαν ἀποσπώντας τὰ δὲ καὶ κατὰ χάριν ἢ θεραπείαν π[ρ]ὸς τῶν στρατηγῶν λαμβάνοντας. SPECIAL OFFICERS: *Dig.*, l. iv. 18, § 4, 'angariorum praebitio personale munus est' (Arcadius Charisius), *Cod. Just.*, x. xliii. 1, 'curator ad cogendas angarias' (Carus), xi. xxxviii. 1, 'munus exhibendarum angariorum' (Diocletian); *Dig.*, l. iv. 1, § 4, 'ad exhibendum cibum potum tectum et similia' (Hermogenian), 18, § 10, 'xenoparochi'; ib. 'curatores ad extruenda vel reficienda . . . mansiones' (Arcadius Charisius), *I.G.*, v. i. 7, *B.S.A.*, XIII, pp. 39-40, κατάλυμα τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ δικαστῶν (at Sparta), *I.G.*, v. ii. 515 (Lycosura), cf. *I.G.R.*, III. 1119, for a public rest-house built by an independent village. Here again the legal texts apparently confuse the supervisory offices with the duty of taking in guests (*Dig.*, l. iv. 3, § 13-14 (Ulpian), 18, § 29, 30 (Vespasian and Hadrian), v. 10, § 2 (Paulus), 11 (Hermogenian), cf. *Syll.*³, 881) and supplying animals (*Dig.*, l. iv. 18, § 21, § 29 (Arcadius Charisius), v. 10, § 2 (Paulus), 11 (Hermogenian)).

91. Who ultimately paid for the *cursus publicus* is a difficult question, but Oertel (*op. cit.*, pp. 92-3) has, I think, conclusively shown from an examination of

- O.G.I.*, 665, that in Egypt the expense was not paid by the treasury but debited to the nome in which it was incurred; his argument is I think reinforced by *P.S.I.*, 683, where money is paid for provisions *ἐκ τοῦ ἱερωτάτου ταμείου* but only *ἐν προχρεῖα*, i.e., the *fiscus* in this case advanced the money which would later be raised by supplementary taxation. This supplementary tax was called *μερισμὸς διπλῶν* (Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt*, pp. 153-4). By analogy the cities would pay in other provinces, and this conclusion is confirmed by their complaints, which would not be very reasonable if they were reimbursed, of the burden of the *cursus publicus* (e.g., Dessau, 214). ABUSES OF THE *CURSUS PUBLICUS*: *Chr.*, I. 439, *O.G.I.*, 665, *I.G.R.*, IV. 598, I. 674, I. 31, ἀναγκάζουσιν ἡμᾶς ξενίας αὐτοῖς παρέχειν καὶ ἕτερα πλείστα εἰς ἀνάληψιν αὐτῶν ἀνευ ἀργυρίου χορηγεῖν, I. 37, κατεπέγουσιν παρέχειν αὐτοῖς τὰς ξενίας καὶ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια μηδεμίαν τιμὴν καταβαλόντες, I. 79, μηδὲ καταναγκάζειν ἡμᾶς χορηγεῖν αὐτοῖς προῖκα τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ξενίαν αὐτοῖς παρέχειν οἷς μὴ ἔστιν ἀνάγκη (from these passages it is plain that in A.D. 238 the same rule applied as in the first century, lodging gratis, provisions for payment). HADRIAN'S REFORM: *Hist. Aug., Hadr.*, 7; that Pius discontinued the fiscal post is inferred from *Hist. Aug., Ant. P.*, 12. SEVERUS' REFORM: *Hist. Aug., Sev.*, 14, cf. Dessau, 452, for the *mancipes*; these are frequently mentioned in the Byzantine period, *vid. inf.*, note 109. The passages cited above from the Digest and the Code show that *angariae* continued throughout the third century; cf. also *I.G.R.*, I. 766, I. 43, IV. 598, I. 17. Hermogenian and Arcadius Charisius both speak of *res vehicularis* or *cursus vehicularis sollicitudo* as a civic *munus* (*Dig.*, L. IV. 1, § 1, 18, § 4), but they differ as to its nature, the former calling it patrimonial, the latter personal.
92. SHIPS: Dio Chrys., XXXI. 103, cf. *I.G.*, XII. iii. 104, στρατευοσάμενον ἐν τριημιολίᾳ ἔ ὄνομα Ἐδανδρία Σεβαστά. MILITARY CONTINGENTS: Arrian, *Exp. c. Alanos*, 7 (Trapezus), Jos., *Bell.*, II. 502 (Syrian cities), *Ant.*, XVII. 287, *Bell.*, II. 67 (Berytus).
93. RECRUITING: Jos., *Ant.*, XIV. 225-7, 230-2 (from the fact that the Roman governors circularize the cities on the matter of Jewish exemption it would appear that the civic authorities were responsible for supplying recruits), Agennius Urbicus (Thulin, *Corp. Agrim. Rom.*, p. 45), 'res publicae controversias de iure territorii solent movere quod aut indicere munera dicant oportere in ea parte soli aut legere tironem ex vico aut vecturas aut copias devehendas indicere', *Dig.*, L. IV. 18, § 3, 'tironum sive equorum productio' (Arcadius Charisius). REMOUNTS: *Dig.*, L. IV. 1, § 2, καμηλασία, id est, camelorum agitatio exhibitioque' (Hermogenian), 18, § 3, § 11, 'camelasia quoque similiter munus personale est; nam ratione habita et alimentorum et camelorum certa pecunia camelariis dari debet, ut solo corporis ministerio obligentur'; for the system of compulsory purchase see Lesquier, *L'armée romaine d'Égypte*, pp. 369 seqq.; *P. Flor.*, 278, gives an excellent idea of the procedure which must have been general in the empire *mutatis mutandis* (i.e., city magistrates being substituted for the *strategi* of the nomes).
94. ANNONA: the best evidence for the whole system is from Egypt, see Wilcken, *Gründzüge*, pp. 359-62, Lesquier, *L'Armée romaine d'Égypte*, pp. 349 seqq. That the *fiscus* paid for *annona* is attested by Pliny, *Pan.*, 29; Tacitus (*Agr.*, 19) makes an obscure allusion to malpractices, apparently similar to those described by Cicero (*Verr.*, III. 189-94), in connexion with compulsory purchase of corn. LETE INSCRIPTION: *S.E.G.*, I. 276. For the third century *annona*, see Van Berchem, *Mém. Soc. Nat. Ant. de France*, 1937, pp. 117 seqq. The question of payment is very difficult. Most of the Egyptian documents which mention the *annona* are receipts for the delivery of supplies or money in commutation thereof, and give no hint of indemnity; but there is no reason why they should, for the payment of indemnity was a separate process, and the receipts would presumably be filed in the government records. The legal sources cited by Van Berchem also treat *annona* as a burden on the landowner and mention no indemnity; but

annona was in fact a burden, if payment was inadequate and irregular. On the other hand a few documents suggest payment. In *P. Oxy.*, 1414, lines 1-15, there is a clear statement that the *fiscus* paid a sum, which was inadequate and had to be supplemented by the city council, for a delivery of linen: the delivery in question was, I suspect, not *annona* but *anabolicum* (in line 11 I would read τὴν ἀθόνην τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀναβολικοῦ] and in line 4 I think that ἀναβολικοῦ has probably dropped out between τοῦ ἱεροῦ and γραφ[ῆ]ν—the allusion to a temple makes no sense, and on the other hand linen was an *anabolica species*), but if Wallace (*Taxation in Egypt*, pp. 214-19) is right in regarding *anabolicum* as a special variety of *annona*, the case is relevant. See also next note.

95. For payments from civic funds for *annona*, see *P. Oxy.*, 1419, *C. P. Herm.*, 92-3 (the ἐπιμεληταί are apparently collectors of *annona*, in 92, line 9, 93, line 7, read τοῖς γεννεοτάτοις στρατιώταις). In the first document the *prytanis* demands from a collector of civic revenues 1500 drachmae which the latter has paid to a collector as the price of corn (commuted *annona*?) and 300 drachmae *eis λόγον ἀννώνης λεγιωναρίων* (presumably to pay for supplies in kind). In the other two documents civic collectors of *annona* demand payments from the civic treasury ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντος τῇ πόλει τρίτου μέρους (explained by Van Berchem as the third instalment of the year's delivery), and promise to account for the money in the civic audit: the last clause suggests that they made a number of payments in detail—to persons from whom *annona* was requisitioned. *P. Tebt.*, 404, λόγο[s] ἀφέσεως στατήρων . . . *eis λόγον ἀννώνης* (classified under the various *species*), also looks like a civic account. *P. Oxy.*, 1573, proves that payment was made to a private person ὑπὲρ τιμῆς οἴνου οὐ πάροχε [*is λ*]όγον ἀννώνης, but from what source does not appear. MACHINERY OF COLLECTION: *P. Tebt.*, 403, παρὰ . . . αἰρεθέν[των] ὑπὸ τῆς κρατίστη[s] βουλῆς] ἐπὶ ὄξους ἀννώνης] (A.D. 212-17), *P. Oxy.*, 1194, (report of ἐπιμεληταί ἀννώνης τῶν ἀελλθόντων ἅμα τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ ἡγεμόνι Κλαυδίῳ Φίρμῳ στρατιωτῶν, mentioning bread, meat and wine, c. A.D. 265), 1414, l. 19 (καταπομποὶ ζῶων, A.D. 270-5), 1415, ll. 5-7, (καταπομποὶ οἴνου and κριθῆς, ἢ καταπομπὴ τῆς ἀννώνης τῶν γεννεοτάτων στρατιωτῶν], late third century), 1115 (ἀναπομποὶ ἄρτου, also styled ἐπιμεληταί, A.D. 284), 1412 (quoted in the text, A.D. 284), cf. also 1191 (on the election of ἐπιμεληταί in general, A.D. 280). UNIFORMS: *P. Lips.*, 57 (quoted in text, A.D. 261); cf. also *P.S.I.*, 465, ὁμολογοῦμεν ὀφείλειν σοι ὑπὲρ τῆς μητροπόλεως ι L καὶ ια L καὶ ιβ L δέρματα . . . χωροῦντ[α *eis*] κατασκευὴν ὄπλων (A.D. 265). In inscriptions references to officers connected with the *annona* are rare, but see *I.G.R.*, III. 407, παραπεμφ[αντα] τὰ δ' ἱερὰν ἀννώναν, 409, πέμψαντα ἀννώναν *eis* τὸ Ἀλεξανδρέων ἔθνος. In the Digest they are mentioned only by Hermogenian (L. iv. 1, § 2, 'annonae ac similitum cura . . . annonae divisio') and Arcadius Charisius (L. iv. 18, § 3, § 8, 'qui annonam suscipit vel exigit vel erogat', § 27, § 29).
96. BYZANTINE COLONIES: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 287 (Maximianopolis of Arabia, Diocletian), Dessau, 650 (Nicomedia, probably Diocletian), *C.I.L.*, III. 181 (Gadara, Valens). *IUS ITALICUM* OF CONSTANTINOPLE: *Cod. Theod.*, XIV. xiii. (373), cf. *Cod. Just.*, XI. xxi (421). Most of our information on *ius Italicum* is derived from *Dig.* L. xv.
97. For imperial legislation on decurions, see pp. 192 seqq. DIOCLETIAN'S PROVINCES: Lactantius, *de Mort. Pers.*, 7, 'provinciae quoque in frusta concisae, multi praesides et plura officia singulis regionibus ac paene iam civitatibus incubare'.
98. SACRED LANDS: confiscated by Constantine, *Lib., Or.*, XXX. 6, 37, LXII. 8, ὁ μὲν γὰρ (Constantine) ἐγύμνωσε τοῦ πλοῦτου τοὺς θεοῦς, ὁ δὲ (Constantius) καὶ κατέσκαψε τοὺς ναοὺς; restored by Julian and confiscated by Valens, *Cod. Theod.*, v. xiii. 3, x. i. 8 (364), cf. the many later references to *fundi iuris templorum* as being under the *res privata* (*Cod. Theod.*, x. iii. 4, x. 32, *Cod. Just.*, VII. xxxviii. 2, cf. *Cod. Theod.*, x. x. 24, XI. xx. 6, Marc., Nov. 2, *Cod. Just.*, XI. lxii. 14, lxx. 4, where they are classed with *patrimoniales*, &c.). CIVIC LANDS: restored by Julian, *Amm. Marc.*, XXV. iv. 15, 'vectigalia civitatibus restituta cum fundis', *Lib., Or.*, XIII. 45, τὰ ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐπανορθῶσαι τὴν πενίαν ἐξεληλαμέναις ἀρχαίων τε καὶ δικαίων κτημάτων,

- Cod. Theod.*, x. iii. 1, *Cod. Just.*, xi. lxx. 2 (362); confiscated by Valens, *Cod. Theod.*, iv. xiii. 7, xv. i. 18 (374), v. xiv. 35, xv. i. 32, 33 (395). These laws deal with the remission of one-third of the rents to the cities. A detailed and interesting picture of the situation is given by Bruns, 97a, which is an earlier measure of Valens (A.D. 371); the system of administration is still in an experimental stage and the proportion of the rents to be refunded still apparently unfixed. RESTORATION OF URBAN BUILDINGS AND SITES: *Cod. Theod.*, xv. i. 41 (401); x. iii. 5 (400) apparently refers to the same measure, but is so corrupt as to be unintelligible. Since the actual lands are here handed over to the cities with their rents, it may be presumed that by this date the cities administered their rural lands also. They certainly did in 443, as appears from *Theod.*, *Nov.*, 23; *Marc.*, *Nov.*, 3 (451) is not explicit on this point, but *Cod. Just.*, xi. lxx. 5 (480) expressly restores to Nicaea 'ius exactionis quadringentorum solidorum annui canonis civilis reditus ad suam patriam pertinentis ex possessionibus . . . cum ipsis'. References to *fundi iuris reipublicae* under the management of the *res privata* are frequent, e.g., *Cod. Theod.*, x. iii. 4, *Cod. Just.*, vii. xxxviii. 2, xi. lxxi. 2, cf. *Cod. Theod.*, v. xiv. 33, x. x. 24, xi. xx. 2, *Marc.*, *Nov.*, 2, *Cod. Just.*, xi. lxii. 7, where they are classed with *patrimoniales*, &c. CIVIC TAXES: restored by Julian, *Amm. Marc.*, xxv. iv. 15, 'vectigalia civitatibus restituta'; confiscated by Valens, *Cod. Theod.*, iv. xiii. 7 (374; the heading of the title, *de vectigalibus et commissis*, shows that the *reditus reipublicae* include taxes); this law also proves the restoration of one-third of the revenue; management of the third given to the cities, *Cod. Just.*, iv. lxi. 13 (431). That the cities no longer collected their own revenues in 545 appears from *Just.*, *Nov.* 128, § 16. Perhaps Procopius' assertion (*Hist. Arc.*, 26, § 6) that Justinian confiscated the civic revenues, which is palpably false, may be a distorted version of a measure transferring the collection of civic revenues from the cities to the state.
99. The initiative of the provincial governors in public works is amply illustrated by *Cod. Theod.*, xv. i, 'de operibus publicis', *passim*; the city councils are only thrice mentioned, in laws 33-4 (395-6) and 37 (398); cf. *Syll.*³, 905 (an edict of the proconsul regulating the allocation of civic revenues to public works at Chalcis). TRANSFER OF CIVIC REVENUES: *tit. cit.*, 18 (374), 26 (390). LEVIES: *tit. cit.*, 34 (396), 49 (407), cf. 5 (338), 7 (361), 23 (384). The use of imperial revenue is forbidden in *Cod. Theod.*, v. xiv. 35 (395).
100. ZENO'S REFORM: *Cod. Just.*, viii. xii. JUSTINIAN'S MANDATES: *Just.*, *Nov.*, 17, § 4, cf. 24, § 3 (Pisidia), 25 § 4 (Lycaonia), 26, § 4 (Thrace), 30, § 8 (Cappadocia) (535-6). JUSTINIAN'S REFORM: *Just.*, *Nov.*, 128, § 16 (545). SPECIAL COMMISSIONERS: *Cod. Just.*, i. iv. 26, x. xxx. 4 (530), cf. the mandates cited above. For public games see *Cod. Theod.*, xv. v. 1, (372) 3, ix. 2 (409); for food supply, *Just.*, *Nov.*, 17, § 4 (535), *τῆς ἀφθονίας τῶν ἐπιτηδείων*, 24, § 3 (535), *τῆς τῶν πόλεων ἀφθονίας*, 30, § 8 (536), *τῶν καλουμένων σιτωνικῶν*. Libanius' speeches illustrate the constant interference of the governor in civic affairs; e.g. *Or.*, xxxiii. 14 seqq., where Tisamenus endeavours to bully the council of Antioch into giving a *venatio* despite a recent law which made the celebration of games voluntary, and eventually conscripts a decurion of Beroea to produce a *venatio* in Antioch, and *Or.*, i 205 seqq., 226 seqq., xxix. 2 seqq., which describe the measures taken by various governors over the head of the council to cope with food shortages. It may be suspected that the activities of governors in these fields were generally confined to the metropoleis of their provinces, where their popularity depended on their providing the urban proletariat with bread and games.
101. PEDANEI IUDICES: *Cod. Just.*, iii. iii. 2 (294), *Cod. Theod.*, i. xvi. 8 (362).
102. DEFENSORES: earliest examples, *P. Oxy.*, 1426 (332), 901 (336); appointment and qualifications, *Cod. Theod.*, i. xxix. 1, 3, 4 (368); powers and functions, *tit. cit.*, 2 (365), 7 (392), *Cod. Just.*, i. lv. 4 (385). For a picture of the *defensor* at work, see Kraemer and Lewis, 'A Referee's hearing on ownership', *Trans. Am.*

- Phil. Ass.*, LVIII (1937), pp. 357-81. For a full discussion of the office, see Seeck, *P.W.*, IV. 2366. I question whether the *defensor* of *Cod. Just.*, VI. i. 5 (319), is an imperial *defensor civitatis*; his duties suggest rather the civic officer (ἐκδικος or σύνδικος) discussed on p. 244.
103. *Cod. Theod.*, I. xxix. 6 (387). For the later history of the office, see pp. 208-9. It may be noted here that the *defensor* was still under Justinian officially appointed by the emperor, as appears from the list of fees attached to Nov. 8. The practice of appointing *τοποτηρηταί* is denounced in *Just., Nov.*, 17, §10, 28, §4, 29, §2 (535), 128, §20 (545), 134 (556). Two inscriptions from Gerasa (*S.E.G.*, VII. 873-4) testify to their local importance.
104. The earliest evidence for the *exactor civitatis* is from Egypt; *P. Giss.*, 103R (309), *P. Cairo Preis.*, 4 (320), *Chr.*, I. 240 (322). In these documents the office is equated with that of the *στρατηγός* whose primary function was to direct the collection of the revenue. That the *exactor* was an imperial appointment is to my mind proved by Aur. Eulogius' letter (*Chr.*, I. 44). Martin (*Actes du V^{me} Congrès internationale de papyrologie* (1938), pp. 260-85) has challenged the accepted view of this document, on the ground that the post of *exactor* cannot have been desirable; but his arguments are not cogent. *Cod. Theod.*, XII. vi. 22 suggests that the office, even when it had become curial, gave opportunities for profit; if it was imperial, its superior authority would have given even more scope for extortion. But even if, as Martin argues, Eulogius was applying for an *epistula honorariae exactoriae* (or *ex exactoribus*), the fact remains that he required an imperial *epistula*, and this proves that the post was imperial. I can find no support in the Codes for Martin's suggestion that the imperial government conferred honorary tenure of civic offices by *epistula*; in all recorded cases *epistulae* (or *codicilli*), whether honorary or not, are to imperial posts, usually in the equestrian or senatorial services. And this was only natural. The normal procedure for making a *bona fide* imperial appointment was an *epistula* or *codicilli*; the grant of honorary *epistulae* or *codicilli* was abuse of this procedure. That the *exactor civitatis* was at first a member of the official bureaucracy is indicated by *Cod. Theod.*, XI. vii. 1 (313), which also proves that the institution was not confined to Egypt (the law is addressed to the proconsul of Africa). For the relation of the *exactor* to the curial collectors and *praepositi pagorum*, see *P. Thead.*, 13, *P. Amh.*, 142. ELECTION OF THE EXACTOR: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. vi. 20, 22 (386), *P.S.I.*, 684, τὴν θε[ί]αν διάταξιν . . . τὴν διαγορευ[ούσαν] τοὺς ἐξάκτορας ἐξ ὁ[μο]μασίας τῆς βουλῆς δεῖν κ[α]ταστ[ῆ]ναι. This papyrus further cites τὰ δύο με[γα]λοφυῆ ἡδίκτα ὧν τὸ μὲν προστάττει μηδένα βουλευτικὸν φρόντισμα[α] ὑπεισελ[θεῖν] ἀνευ ὁ[μο]μασίας τῆς βουλῆς, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο κατ' ἀναλογί[αν] τῆς ἐκάστου ὑποστάσεως τοὺς πολιτευομένους τὰς [πολιτι]κάς λειτουργίας ἐκ[.]λ[.] . . . ὥστε ἡ Ταυρίνον ἐξωθεῖσθαι τῆς ἐξακτορίας ἀνευ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου κ[α]τασταθέντα κατὰ τὴν θε[ί]αν διάταξιν καὶ τὰ μεγαλοφυῆ ἡδίκτα ἢ ἀναμερισμὸν γενέσθαι κατ' ἀναλογίαν τῆς ἐκάστου ὑποστάσε[ως] εἰ ε[ύ]ρεθε[ι]τ[η] κατὰ γνώμην τῆς βουλῆς ὀνομασθεῖς. This amply explains why the imperial government preferred the *exactor* to be elected by the curia, and is incidentally the only explicit explanation of what κινδύνω βουλῆς means. See also *Chr.*, I. 424, for the responsibility of the council for the *exactor* in the late fourth century. In *P. Oxy.*, 2110 (A.D. 370), several members of the council of Oxyrhynchus are styled ἐξακτορεύσας, which implies that the office was already curial by that date.
105. *VINDICES*: Joh. Lydus, *de Mag.*, III. 49, Evagrius, III. 42, Malalas, p. 400, ed. Bonn, *Just., Nov.*, 38 (536), τοὺς ἀλεθρίους μισθωτὰς οὓς δὴ βίνδικας καλοῦσι, *Edict*, 13 (538-9), §14, τὸν κατὰ καιρὸν βίνδικα τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείων, §15, Ποταμῶνος τηρικαῦτα (under Anastasius) τῶν δημοσίων τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείων προεστῶτος κατὰ τὸ τοῦ βίνδικος σχῆμα, *Nov.*, 128, §5 (545), εἴτε ἀρχοντες εἴτε πολιτευόμενοι εἴτε ἐξάκτωρες εἴτε βίνδικες εἴτε κανονικάριοι ἢ ἄλλαι τινές, §8, οἱ πολιτευόμενοι ἡγοῦν ἐξάκτωρες ἢ βίνδικες ἢ ταφεῶται. The last passages show that the decurions continued to collect taxes under the new régime.

106. TITLES OF CURIAL OFFICERS: *Cod. Theod.*, VII. iv. 1 (325), 'procuratores seu susceptores vel praepositi pagorum et horreorum' (not specified to be curial but probably so in the context), XII. vi. 8 (365), 'susceptorum et eorum qui ad praeposituram horreorum et pagorum creantur' (clearly curial from the mention of *periculum nominatoris*), VII. iv. 32 (412), 'procuratores curiarum' (for *annona*), XII. i. 49 (361), 'praepositi horreorum iique qui suscepturi sunt magistratum praepositi etiam pacis seu susceptores diversarum specierum', XI. vii. 14 (393), 'ne longinqui itineris diversitate susceptor abductus et curiae suae desit', XII. vi. 1 (321), XII. i. 54 (362), both mentioning *susceptores*. For the Egyptian evidence, see Gelzer, *Studien zur Byz. Verwaltung Ägyptens*, pp. 36-63, Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 214-21 (*ἐπιμεληταί*), 221-2 (*διαδόται*), 222-5 (*ἀπο- or ὑποδέκται*), 301-2 (*praepositi pagorum*). To the evidence cited in these works may be added the very interesting *P. Oxy.*, 2110, which speaks of elections by the council *εἰς παραρχίας* and *εἰς ἐπιμέλειαν στρατιωτικῆς ἐρεᾶς ἐσθῆτος* in A.D. 370. The date of the change from *decaprotus* to *praepositus* has been fixed to 307-8 by Boak (*Mélanges Maspero*, II, pp. 125-9). *Praepositi pagorum* are mentioned in their police functions in Eusebius, *H.E.*, IX. 1 (the edict of Galerius, A.D. 311), and *Cod. Theod.*, VIII. xv. 1 (Constantine, τῷ τόπῳ ἐκείνῳ οὐκ ἐπαρχεῖ . . . τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου πραιπόσιτος οὐκ ἦν). The former passage proves that *praepositi pagorum* were introduced throughout the eastern empire at the same date as in Egypt; *decaproti* similarly disappear not only in Egypt, but throughout the eastern empire—there is no mention of them in the Codes. The latter definitely establishes the identity of the *πάραρχος* with the *praepositus pagi*. For the *compulsor*, see Maj., *Nov.*, 7, § 14, 'compulsor tributi nihil amplius a curiali noverit exigendum quam quod ipse a possessore suscepit', Marc., *Nov.*, 2, § 2, 'curialis exactor vel cohortalis compulsor', *P. Lips.*, 55, *βενεφ[ε]κταρίῳ τάξεως ἡγεμονίας Θηβαῖδος ἀπαιτητῆ τινῶνων*, 64, *ὀφικιαλίους ἀπαιτηταῖς ἐλαίου*, cf. *Chr.*, I. 424. A curial *ἀπαιτητής* is recorded in *Stud. Pal.*, II, p. 34.
107. THE REFORM OF VALENTINIAN AND VALENS: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. vi. 7 (364), 5, 6, 9 (365). THE LANDS OF POTENTIORES: *Cod. Theod.*, XI. vii. 12 (383). THE LANDS OF SENATORS: *Cod. Theod.*, VI. iii. 2, 3, 4 (396-7). THE GOVERNOR'S ANNONA: *Cod. Theod.*, VII. iv. 32 (412). AUTOPRACTORIUM: XI. xxii. 4 (409); it is here forbidden to all save officials of the highest rank; for an autopract village, see *P. Cairo Masp.*, 67019, *μία τις κάμη ἐπιλε[γ]ομένη Ἀφροδίτη . . . αὐτοπρακτος οὔσα καὶ αὐτοτελής τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ δημοσίων [ὑμῶν] ε[πι]σφορῶν . . . ἐχόντω[ν] τὸ προνόμιον αὐτ[ῶν] ἀπὸ θεῖο[ν] τύπου τοῦ τῆς θείας λήξεως Δε[σ]πο[υ]τος*. Other examples of the transfer of taxation from the curiae to the *officia* are *Cod. Theod.*, XII. vi. 31 (412, the *susceptio vestis* in Africa), Val., *Nov.*, 13 (445, Numidia). Regional variations are expressly mentioned in *Cod. Theod.*, XI. vii. 16 (401), 'apparitores sive curiales consuetudine servata regionum'. The part played by the curiae in the collection of taxes is not much noticed in the Codes, but in addition to the passages already cited, see *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 8 (323), 117 (387), 186 (429), *Cod. Just.*, X. xxiii. 3, 4 (468), *Just., Nov.*, 130, § 3 (545), *Edict* 13, proem (538-9) and *Cod. Theod.*, XI. xxviii. 9 (414), Marc., *Nov.*, 2 (450), where the curiae are mentioned as beneficiaries in general remissions of taxes. In the literary sources especially notable are Libanius' story (*Or.*, XLVII. 7-10) of the collector whom the villagers defied and who was in consequence sold up and deleted from the curia, and Theodorct's appeal for the decurions of Cyrrhus (*Ep.*, 42, Migne, *P.G.*, LXXXIII. 1217), *φείσασθαι μὲν τῶν ἀθλίων συντελῶν, φείσασθαι δὲ τῶν τρισθλίων πολυτενομένων, ἀπαιτουμένων ἅπερ εἰσπράττειν οὐ δύναται*.
108. AURUM CORONARIUM: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. xiii. 2 (364), 3 (368), 4 (379). COLLATIO LUSTRALIS: *ib.*, XIII. i. 4 (362), 17 (399). VECTIGALIA: *ib.*, XII. i. 97 (383). PROCURATORES METALLORUM: *ib.*, I. xxxii. 5 (386). IMPERIAL ESTATES: decurions were normally excluded from managing (*Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 30 (340), XI. vii. 21 (412)) and from leasing (*ib.*, X. iii. 2 (372), *Cod. Just.*, XI. lxxiii. 1 (401)) imperial land,

but the latter rule is relaxed by *Cod. Theod.*, x. iii. 4 (383) for a 'fundus qui ex publico vel templorum iure descendit', if a willing *conductor* could not be found. From Theodoret (*Ep.*, 42, Migne, P.G., LXXXIII. 1220) it appears that in Syria in the fifth century the decurions were not responsible for imperial lands (τὰ ταμιακά), which were under central officials (οἱ κομειτανοί). For Egypt, see *Chr.*, I. 437.

109. RECRUITS AND *AURUM TIRONICUM*: *Chr.*, I. 465 (a speech in the council of Hermopolis about τῶν νεολέκτων τῶν στρατευθέντων ὑφ' ἡμῶν), 466 (ἐπιμελητῆς τειρώνων), *P. Lips.*, 34-5, as corrected in *Archiv Pap.*, III, p. 563 (ὑποδέκτης χρυσοῦ τειρώνων and πρόπομπος τειρώνων), cf. *Chr.*, I. 188. ROADS AND BRIDGES: *Cod. Just.*, I. iv. 26, x. xxx. 4 (530), *Just., Nov.*, 17, § 4, 24, § 3, 25, § 4 (535), where they are included among the public works of the cities, to be paid for from civic funds. In *Cod. Theod.*, xv. iii. 'de itinere muniendo', there is no mention of the cities or of civic funds, but only of levies on landowners, but there can be little doubt that these levies, like all the *sordida munera*, of which there are interesting lists in *Cod. Theod.*, xi. xvi. 15 (382), 18 (390), were organized by the city councils. One of them, the provision of *operae atque artifices*, was certainly so: see *P. Theod.*, 34-6, recording βουλευταὶ ἐπιμεληταὶ ἐργατῶν and τεχνιτῶν recruiting labour for the quarries, masons, and carpenters; also, a more exact parallel to roadmaking, *P. Oxy.*, 1426, the supply through the *curator* and *defensor* of Oxyrhynchus of an ἐργάτην τῶν ἀποσ(τ)ελλομένων ἐπὶ τὸν Τραιανὸν ποταμὸν. Cf. also *Syll.*³, 908, which regulates the contributions of the cities of Greece for the upkeep of the state granaries at Scarphia and Corinth. THE *CURSUS PUBLICUS*: the *mancipes* are mentioned in *Cod. Theod.*, VIII. v. 15, 24, 26, 34-6, 42, 53, 65; for curial *mancipes* in Egypt, see law 51 (392) in the same title and *Chr.*, I. 437. There is no other evidence in the Code for curial management of the post in the East, but Libanius in his account of Julian's reform of the *cursus publicus* implies it was a civic liturgy (*Or.*, XVIII. 143-4, τὴν βλαβὴν δὲ πάλιν εἰς χρημάτων λόγον αἱ πόλεις ἐδέχοντο τοῦτο δὲ ἦν τοὺς ταῦτα λειτουργοῦντας ἀπολαλέναι). *Cod. Theod.*, VIII. v. 64 (403), indicates that *paraveredi* and fodder and money *pro equorum cursualium sollemni ratione* were raised by the decurions of the cities. HOSPITALITY: *Cod. Theod.*, VII. ix. 2 (340); note the mention of *magistratus*. BATHS: *ib.*, VII. xi. 1 (406).

NOTES ON PART III

1. ALEXANDER AND DEMOCRACY: Arrian, *Anab.*, I. 18, cf. I. 17, II. 5. ANCESTRAL CONSTITUTIONS: [Dem.] XVII. 10; the same clause is probably to be restored in *I.G.*², IV, 68, line 39. FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY: *O.G.I.*, 222, 226, 229, 237, *Syll.*³, 317, 322-3, 442.
2. DEMOCRACY IN BARBARIAN CITIES: *O.G.I.*, 234 (Alabanda), Diod., XXXIII. 5a (Balbura), Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge*, II. (*Sb. Ak. Wien*, CLXVI, iii), p. 12 (Termessus and Adada).
3. IONIAN AND DORIAN TRIBES: Szanto, *Die griechischen Phylen*, pp. 39 seqq., 4 seqq.; for a tribal division by provenance in colonies, cf. Herod., IV. 161 (Cyrene), Diod., XII. 11 (Thurii), *C.E.R.P.*, p. 419, note 3 (Cierus). CARIAN TRIBES: Szanto, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-9 (cf. *A.J.A.*, 1935, p. 315). DYNASTIC TRIBES: in royal colonies, Demitzas, ἡ Μακεδονία, no. 378, *O.G.I.*, 49, Westermann, *Vit. script. Graec. min.*, p. 50, *S.E.G.*, VII. 62, Steph. Byz., s.v. Ἀντιόχεια (II), Van Diest, *Nysa ad Maeandrum*, p. 68, Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics*, p. 75, no. 9, *J.H.S.*, 1897, p. 408, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1422, *Sb. Ak. Berlin*, 1888, p. 878; in old cities, Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 96, 242, 271, *C.I.G.*, 3615-6, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1907, p. 467, *S.E.G.*, I. 355, *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 5, 89, 98. Tribes named after gods and heroes are too numerous to be worth recording; for Pergamum, see *Ath. Mitt.*, 1907, p. 467, 1908, pp. 385-6, for Sardis, *Sardis*, VII, nos. 12, 34, 124-7 (cf. Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, pp. 155-8); other more or less complete sets are *I.G.*, V. i. 1433 (Messene), ii. 36 (Tegea), *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 2, 4-6, 9-11, 14, 90, 110-11.

4. TERRITORIAL TRIBES: *I.G.*, XII. v. 872 (Tenos), cf. *Ath. Mitt.*, 1902, p. 118, no. 124, *πάροιχος Τηλεφίδος* (Pergamum) and *I.G.*, v. ii. 36, where *πολίται* and *μέτροικοι* of the several tribes of Tegea are distinguished. WARDS AND TRIBES: Libanius, *Or.*, xi. 231, 245, Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 16. NUMBER OF TRIBES: *Syll.*³, 976 (two at Samos), *I.B.M.*, III, pp. 68-71 (five at Ephesus), *Chr.*, I. 25 (five at Alexandria?), *Inscr. Priene*, 114 (ten at Priene), *O.G.I.*, 212 (twelve at Ilium), Libanius, *Or.*, XIX. 62 (eighteen at Antioch).
5. ALEXANDRIA: *Archiv Pap.*, v, pp. 82 seqq. PTOLEMAIS: Plaumann, *Ptolemais in Oberägypten*, p. 23. SELEUCIA: *S.E.G.*, VII. 62. CASSANDREIA: *Syll.*³, 380. THESSALONICA: Steph. Byz., s.v. *Κεκρονία*. LYCIA: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 403, note 7.
6. CYRENE: *S.E.G.*, IX. i, § 1.
7. PTOLEMAIS: *O.G.I.*, 48. ALEXANDRIA: Schubart, *Archiv Pap.*, v, pp. 104 seqq.; contrast *P. Hal.*, I, col. xi. For the changes made by the Romans, *vid. inf.*, note 28.
8. The isopolity decrees mentioned are *Milet*, 143, 146, 150.
9. FREEDMEN: *Syll.*³, 543, *I.G.R.*, IV. 289. Cf. note 32 for later evidence.
10. HERACLEA: Strabo, 542. ZELEIA: *Syll.*³, 279, Michel, 531. PRIENE: *Syll.*³, 282, cf. *Inscr. Priene*, 17, where *οἱ πολῖται* and *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας* are contrasted. CYRENE: Jos., *Ant.*, XIV. 115.
11. THE ILIAN GRANT: *O.G.I.*, 221. PERGAMUM: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 387, note 31. ALEXANDRIA: *ib.*, pp. 303-4; the fact that the tribes of Alexandria and Antioch corresponded to wards of the town and not, so far as is known, to regions of the territory, suggests that citizenship was limited to the urban population.
12. RHODES: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 383, note 6. MILETUS: *Milet*, 149.
13. For the Lydian and Phrygian guilds, see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 54, 70, 73, 83-4. For the organization of the countryside, *Sardis*, VII. 1, and Keil and Premerstein, 'Zweite Reise in Lydien', *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, LIV, no. 18.
14. For the magistrates in Greek democracies, see Swoboda, *Lehrbuch der griech. Staatsaltertümer*⁶, I. iii, pp. 136-55. SALE OF PRIESTHOODS: *B.C.H.*, 1927, p. 224. TERM OF SIX MONTHS: Polyb., XXVII. 7, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 55 (Rhodes), *C.I.G.*, 2654 (Cnidus), *B.C.H.*, 1891, pp. 423-5 (Stratonicea), *I.G.*, XII. v. 881-6 (Tenos), Dio Chrys., XXXIV. 35-6 (Tarsus); cf. also *O.G.I.*, 233 (Antioch in Persis). TERM OF FOUR MONTHS: *Syll.*³, 410, 442 (Erythrae), 645 (Chalcedon).
15. Service in rotation is frequently recorded for *ταμίαι*, e.g., *Syll.*³, 284 (Erythrae), 368 (Miletus), 426 (Bargylia); in many inscriptions offices are mentioned in the singular or the plural indifferently, and the explanation is often no doubt that in the former case the board, in the latter the acting member is meant. FINANCIAL QUALIFICATION: *Syll.*³, 976, *I.G.*, IX. i. 694.
16. For the functions of eponymous magistrates, see pp. 234-5; for some titles, pp. 46-7, 174. EPONYMOUS PRIESTS: dynastic, *O.G.I.*, 233 (Antioch in Persis), *Syll.*³, 380 (Cassandreia), *J.H.S.*, 1935, p. 56 (Europus); not dynastic, *I.G.*, v. ii. 36, 39, 40, 43, 50 (Tegea), 367 (Demetrias), *P.W.*, Suppl., v. 834-40 (Rhodes). Other eponymous priests, of whom is not stated, are *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 59 (Laodicea), Michel, 544 (Themisonium), *O.G.I.*, 55 (Telmessus), 229 (Smyrna), 339 (Sestus). For *stephanephoroi*, see pp. 46-7.
17. For the titles and functions of magistrates in Greece proper, see Schönfelder, *Die städtischen und Bundesbeamten des griech. Festlandes*. COSMI: *P.W.*, XI. 1495. POLITARCHS: Pelekides, 'Ἀπὸ τὴν πολιτεία καὶ τὴν κοινωμία τῆς ἀρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης', pp. 23-5; though there seems to be no very positive reason for dating any of the inscriptions before 169 B.C., it is on general grounds likely that under the monarchy the Macedonian cities had magistrates with some title, and unlikely that the Romans would have changed it. For the Rhodian magistrates

see *Syll.*³, 619; for the importance of the *prytaneis*, Polyb., xxii. 5, xxvii. 7, xxix. 10, and especially Livy, xlii. 45.

18. On the functions of the council in a Greek democracy, see Swoboda, *Lehrbuch der griech. Staatsaltertümer*⁶, I. iii, pp. 127-36. For the procedure in passing decrees the standard work is still Swoboda, *Die griech. Volksbeschlüsse*; see also Brandis, *P.W.*, v. 2163 seqq. *PROBULEUMATA*: *O.G.I.*, 8, Michel, 357, *I.G.*, xii. ii. 5, *Milet*, 152A, B, C (cities of Lesbos), *I.G.*, xii. v. 722 (Adramyttium), *S.E.G.*, I. 363, 365, 368 (Samos), Michel, 351-3, *I.G.*, xii. viii. 158 (Samo-thrace). In the Boeotian and some neighbouring cities the formula is different, the proposer of a decree moving that the council pass a *probuleuma*, e.g., Michel, 170-1, 204, 206, 214-15, 222, 346; the double vote is sometimes recorded at length, e.g., *I.G.*, ix. i. 109 (Elatea), *I.B.M.*, 788 (Cnidus).
19. APPLICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL: *I.G.*, xii. ix. 6, *Λάϊππος εἶπεν ἐπειδὴ παραγενόμενοι τινες τῶν πολιτῶν εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον ἀγγέλλουσι . . .* (Carystus); *Syll.*³, 353, *Ἡρογείτων εἶπεν περὶ ὧν οἱ νεωποῖαι καὶ οἱ κούρητες κατασταθέντες διελέχθησαν τῇ βουλῇ . . .* (Ephesus), cf. also *I.B.M.*, 470; *R.E.G.*, 1923, p. 2, *Λύκος Ἀπολλοδότ[ου εἶπε] περὶ ὧν προεγράφατο εἰς τὴν βουλήν Δημοδάμας Ἀρ[ιστείδου] . . .* (Miletus); *I.B.M.*, 232-3, 235-6, 238, 250, 279-80, *γνώμα προστατῶν ἐπειδὴ ὁ δεῖνα ἐπελθὼν ἐπὶ τε τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δᾶμον ἐμφανίζει . . .* (Calymnos); *Sb. Ak. Wien*, cxxxii. ii, p. 12 [τῶν ἀρχόντων εἰσαγγειλάντων τῇ βουλῇ, cf. *S.E.G.*, II. 539, [γνώμη ἀρχόντων . . . Ἐκα]ταῖου, Ἀριστωνίμου περὶ ὧν εἰσεγράψεν *T* [. . .], *Milet*, 146B, *γνώμη ἀρχόντων εἰσεγραφεμένην αὐτῶν* (Mylasa); Maiuri, *Νμισσα Sill. Epig. Rodi e Cos*, *Φίλτος Δαμισοστράτου εἶπεν ὑπὲρ ὧν προεγράφατο Ἐπικούρος Ἀλκίθου εἰς τὴν βου[λήν] . . .*, cf. *S.E.G.*, I. 366, *γνώμη πρυτάνεων ὑπὲρ ὧν προεγράφατο Ἰπποδάμας Παντωνακτίδου*, 368, [γνώμη πρυτάνεων ὑπὲρ ὧν προεγράψαντο] Ἐπιφῶν [. . . .] *Σ[τ]ασίας Φιλίστου . . . καὶ ἡ βουλὴ προεβούλευ[σεν] λέγειν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαιραῖαις . . .* (Samos). In other cases where similar formulae are used the council is not named but is probably to be supplied: Michel, 468, *πρυτάνεων γνώμη περὶ ὧν ἐπῆλθον Πρωτέας Ἐρμίου καὶ Ἐκαταῖος Ποσειδίππου*, 469, *ὑπὲρ ὧν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι προεγράψαντο . . . πρυτάνεων γνώμη περὶ ὧν ἐπῆλθον οἱ [πρεσ]βύτεροι*, 470, *πρυτάνεων γνώμη περὶ ὧν ἐπῆλθον προστατῆται καὶ στρατηγοί* (Iasus); Michel, 450, [γνώμη προστατῶν] περὶ ὧν τοὶ Βάκ[χοι] ἐπῆλθον (Cnidus); *I.G.*, xii. v. 715-16, *Ἀριστο[κ]λήης Βαυκᾶ εἶπεν ὑπὲρ ὧν Κτησικράτης Σ[ε]νοφῶντος τὴν πρόσσodon ἐποίησατο* (Andros); *Syll.*³, 562, [Κ]αλλιθεῖ[δ]ης Νήσιος εἶπεν ὑπὲρ ὧν οἱ ἀρχο[ν]τε[ς] προε[γ]ράψαντο . . . (Paros); *I.G.*, xii. iii. 248, *ἀρχόντων Ξενομάστου Ἀρισταμάχου Σωσικλεῦς καὶ βουλᾶς γνώμα ὑπὲρ τᾶς ἐφόδου ἃς ἐποίησατο Τιμόθεος Σωσικλεῦς* (Anaphe), *Milet*, 152 A, B, *Ἐρμίας Ἀρχίου εἶπεν περὶ ὧν ἂ βόλλα προεβούλευσε καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ προτίθεισι καὶ τῶν τιμῶν καὶ πρεσβυτέρων οἱ παρόντες ἐπῆλθον* (Methymna), C, *Μανδρόδικος Ἀρχεαστράτω εἶπεν περὶ ὧν ἂ βόλλα προεβούλευσε καὶ τῶν ἀρχο[ν]των οἱ παρόντες προτίθεισι καὶ ἐπῆλθον* (Eresus). The procedure in the cities of Lesbos would seem to be that certain magistrates approached the council, the council resolved, the *strategi* (or magistrates) now (note the contrasted tenses) place the resolution on the agenda of the assembly. Resolutions of the council are also made on the suggestion of outsiders; e.g., Michel, 528, [*Ἀνδρό]μαχος Ἀνδρσοθ[ένους εἶπεν] . . . [εἶ]πεῖ οἱ οἰκείαι καὶ οἱ φίλοι τοῦ Πυθώνακτος πρόσσodon ἀπογραφάμενοι εἶπαν*] (Lampsacus), *I.G.*, ix. i. 694 (Corcyra). THE SYROS FORMULA: *I.G.*, xii. v. 652-3, *ὁ δεῖνα ἐφόδον ἀπογραφάμενος ἐπὶ τὴν βουλήν εἶπεν*.
20. RENEWAL OF COUNCIL: *S.E.G.*, ix. 1, § 2 (Cyrene), *I.G.*, xii. i. 53, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1110, 1127-9, cf. Cic., *Rep.*, III. 35, § 48 (Rhodes; twice yearly), *B.C.H.*, 1920, pp. 77-8 (Stratonicea; twice yearly), *Syll.*³, 261 (Argos; twice yearly), *Milet*, III. p. 321, [ἡ] ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Μητροδώρου [βου]λή (Tralles), *I.G.*, xii. v. 802, *τοὺς βουλευτὰς τοὺς αἰεὶ ἀρχοντας* (Tenos), *Wadd.*, 406, *γεγονῶς δὲ καὶ βουλευτῆς πλεονάκεις*, *B.C.H.*, 1888, p. 20, *πρότερόν τε αἰρεθεὶς βουλευτῆς* (Mylasa), *I.G.*, xii. ix. 11 (Carystus), *Syll.*³, 684 (Dyme); cf. *O.G.I.*, 48, *ἐξ ἐπιλέκτων ἀνδρῶν τὴν βουλήν [καὶ τὰ] δικαστή[ρια αἰρεῖσθαι]* (Ptolemais of Egypt), *P.S.I.*, 1160, *τὴν βουλήν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν γεί[εσθαι]* (Alexandria; the suggestion was no doubt based on precedent). The committee system (see next note) is also presumptive evidence of the renewal

of the council. For non-committal *probuleumata*, see *S.E.G.*, I. 367-8; for an amendment which is virtually a substantive motion, see *Syll.*³, 562.

21. MONTHLY COMMITTEES: *πρυτάνεις*, Hasluck, *Cyzicus*, pp. 251-2, 266 (*Cyzicus*), *I.B.M.*, 895 (*Halicarnassus*), *I.G.*, XII. iii. 169 (*Astypalaea*), *I.G.*, XII. vii. 389, 515 (*Aegiale*), *Inscr. Priene*, 64 (*Phocaea*), *Syll.*³, 976 (*Samos*); *πρόεδροι*, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 2-6, 9-11, 14, 89-90, 98, cf. 110 (*Magnesia*); *πρόβουλοι*, *I.G.*, XII. ix. 11. (*Carystus*); *ἐπιμήριοι*, *O.G.I.*, 229 (*Smyrna*), *C.I.G.*, 3641b (*Lampsacus*), cf. *O.G.I.*, 4 (*Nesos*); *προστάται*, *I.B.M.*, 261B (*Calymnos*); *αἰσυρνῶται*, *G.D.I.*, 3053-4 (*Chalcedon*).
22. PRESIDENCY OF MAGISTRATES: *I.G.*, IX. ii. 11, 69, 515, 517, *B.C.H.*, 1935, pp. 55-6 (*Thessaly*), but contrast *I.G.*, IX. ii. 9, 506; *B.C.H.*, 1888, p. 360 (= Michel, 511), 363 (*Cyme*); the *tagi* table a motion at *Cierium* (*I.G.*, IX. ii. 258, [τ]οὺν ταγοῦν λόγον προθέντων), and the *strategi* (or magistrates) regularly do so in Aeolic cities, *I.G.*, XII. ii. 15, *περὶ ὧν οἱ στρατάγοι προτίθεισι προσταξάσας τ[ᾶς βόλλ]ας*, *Milet*, 152A, B, C (cited in note 19), *O.G.I.*, 4, [μὴ ἐ]μμεναι [παρ τ]αῦτα μήτε [ἀ]ρχοντι προθ[ε]μεναι μήτε ῥ[ῆ]τορι εἶπαι μ[ῆ]τε ἐπιμηνη[σ]ω ἐ[σ]ένεικαί· αἱ δ[ε] κέ τις ἢ ῥήτωρ[α] εἶπη ἢ ἀρχων[ε]σ[α]γάγη [ἢ ἐπ]ιμηνη[σ]ιος ἐσ[ε]ν[ε]ίκη . . . The functions of the ἀρχοντες and the ἐπιμήριοι at Nesos are difficult to distinguish, but since, to judge by the practice of the other Aeolic cities, the magistrates made their *πρόθεσις* after the passing of the *probuleuma*, that is to say, in the assembly, it may be the ἐπιμήριοι were a monthly committee of council (as at Smyrna and Lampsacus) and presided over it and introduced motions to it. At Iasus one of the six *prytaneis* is stated to preside; *C.I.G.*, 2677b, *B.C.H.*, 1889, p. 25. At Rhodes Polybius and Livy (see note 17) reveal the double function of the *prytaneis* as chief magistrates and presidents of the assembly; cf. *Syll.*³, 619, where the ὑπογραμματεὺς βουλῆ καὶ πρυτάνειοι shows the close connexion of the *prytaneis* with the council, and *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 55. The probuleutic powers of the magistrates are expressly described in *Syll.*³, 642 (*Megara*), Michel, 172 (*Aegosthena*). The same practice is implied by the fact that individuals apply to the magistrates instead of the council for leave to present a motion, as for instance at Sparta (*I.G.*, V. i. 4) and at Gytheum (*ib.*, 1144); cf. also *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 97, where a citizen proposes a motion ἐπελθὼν ἐπ[ὶ τοῦ]ς ἀρχοντας καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (*Teos*). The formula of enactment ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀρχουσι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ (with variations) is found (in pre-Roman times) at Troezen (*I.G.*, IV. 751, 753, 756), in Crete (Michel, 30, 52-3, 55-60, 62-6, 440-2, 447-8), and in Lycia (*T.A.M.*, II. 262, *Riv. Fil.*, 1932, p. 446, *Annuario*, VIII-IX, 315).
23. The civic services and finance are treated in Part IV. For the anti-revolutionary clause in the league of Corinth, see [Dem.], XVII. 15; the phrase μηδ' ἐπὶ νεωτερι[σ]μῳ] in *I.G.*², IV. 68, line 43 is probably part of a similar clause.
24. On the abolition of the liturgies at Athens, see Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 55 seqq. ELECTION OF GYMNASIARCHS: *Syll.*³, 578 (*Teos*), 958 (*Coressus*), 714 (*Eretria*), *O.G.I.*, 339 (*Sestus*): the two last illustrate the extra expenditure of gymnasiarchs; for expenditure by ordinary executive magistrates, see *Syll.*³, 410 (*Erythrae*), 547 (*Athens*).
25. OMISSION OF STEPHANEPHORY: *Milet*, 122-8, *Inscr. Priene*, 4, 18, 21, 37, 44, 108-9, 141, 201-2; other instances of the practice are collected by Robert in *Istros*, II (1935). PROCEDURE OF ELECTION: Dem., XVIII. 149, Aesch., II. 18, *Syll.*³, 591, 671, 976. The difficulty of securing candidates is alluded to in *Syll.*³, 591 and in *O.G.I.*, 339, παρακληθεὶς γυμνασιαρχῆσαι ὑπέμεινεν ἐν καιροῖς δυσκόλοις. COMPULSORY OFFICE: *Syll.*³, 647, μὴ ἔστω δὲ ἐπάναγκ[ε]ς λειτουργεῖν τοὺς Μεδεωνίους ἐν Στίρι τὰς ἀρχὰς δασι γεγένηται ἐν Μεδεῶνι ἀρχοντες, cf. also *Inscr. Priene*, 4, where a γραμματεὺς αἰρεθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου . . . τὴν τοῖς στρατηγοῖς γραμματεῖαν λελητούργηκε and asks παραλυθῆναι τῆς γραμματείας, and *Syll.*³, 1003, where a priest is granted exemption from a number of posts some of which, the γυμνασιαρχία, οἰκονομία, νεωποία, and

- ἀρχιθεωρία (cf. *Inscr. Priene*, 108, line 26), must be magistracies. The later very common practice of coupling ἀρχαὶ καὶ λειτουργίαι as a single phrase occurs at an early date in *I.G.*, XII. vii. 26, and *O.G.I.*, 339, ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρχαῖς καὶ λειτουργίαις εἰς ἃς ὁ δῆμος αὐτὸν προκεχειρίσται (note that the people elect to liturgies, cf. also *Syll.*³, 591).
26. OFFICIAL MOTIONS: *O.G.I.*, 265, 299, 323, 338, contrast 267 (Pergamum), *Syll.*³, 285, 412-13, 442, Michel, 508, contrast *Syll.*³, 410 (Erythrae); on Pergamum, see Cardinali, *Il Regno di Pergamo*, pp. 253 seqq. For the alternation of official and private motions good examples are Eretria, *I.G.*, XII. ix. 205-6, 208-9, 212, 217 (οἱ πρόβουλοι καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ εἶπαν), 234-6 (οἱ πρόβουλοι εἶπαν), 210-11, 213, 218-19, 221-2, 224 (ὁ δεῖνα εἶπεν); Iasus, Michel, 464, 468-70 (πρυτάνεων γνώμη), 463, 465 (ὁ δεῖνα εἶπεν); Calymnos, *I.B.M.*, 232-3, 235-6, 238, 249-50, 279-80 (γνώμη προστατῶν), 231, 234, 237, 248, 258, 283-5 (ὁ δεῖνα εἶπεν).
27. LAMPSACUS: *Syll.*³, 591. THE GREEK CITIES: *ib.*, 613. At a later date the Lycians use δημοκρατία as a translation of *libertas* (Dessau, 31) and the Pergamenes celebrate the restoration of constitutional government by Servilius Isauricus as δημοκρατία ἀδούλωτος (*O.G.I.*, 449).
28. PROPERTY QUALIFICATION: Livy, XXXIV. 51, Paus., VII. xvi. 9. For the probuleutic powers of Achaean magistrates, *vid. sup.*, note 22; instances of the formula ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀρχουσι, κ.τ.λ., in Roman times are *Syll.*³, 1073 (Elis), *I.G.*, IV. 758 (Troezen), 932 (Epidaurus), V. i. 1331 (Cardamyle), ii. 266 (Antigoneia), 345 (Orchomenus of Arcadia), cf. *Syll.*³, 736, xi, οἱ ἀρχοντες καὶ οἱ συνέδρου δογματοποιεῖσθωσαν (Messene), and *I.G.*, VII. 190 (Pagae), 2711-13, 4148, *S.E.G.*, II. 184, *B.C.H.*, 1935, p. 438 (Boeotia); cf. *Klio*, x, pp. 327 seqq. for Boeotia. THE COUNCIL IN ACHAEA: *Syll.*³, 684, τῶν περὶ Κυλλάνιον συνέδρων (Dyme); cf. also *I.G.*, V. ii. 266, τοῖς ἀρχουσι καὶ τοῖς συνέδρου τοῖς ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ καὶ ἑκατόστῳ ἔτ[ε] (Antigoneia).
29. THE COUNCIL IN ASIA: permanent, Cic., *pro Flacco*, 42 seqq.; elective, *Syll.*³, 838, [τῆς ἀρχαί]ρεσίας [ἐ]νεκα, cf. Cic., *Verr.*, I. 120 seqq. for the Sicilian analogy. BITHYNIA: Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 79, 112, 114, cf. *I.G.R.*, III. 60, 64 for censors (τιμηταί). CYPRUS: *I.G.R.*, III. 930, τιμητέους τὴν βουλήν. GALATIA: *I.G.R.*, III. 179, βουλογραφῆσαντα τὸ β', 206, τὴν βουλογραφίαν ἐκ πολλοῦ κατ[α]λελειμμένην μετὰ [λό]γου ἀκριβῶσαντα. It is perhaps significant that in the abundant inscriptions of Asia the office of τιμητής is recorded once only (*I.G.R.*, IV. 445-6); had the council of every city been enrolled by censors the title must have been more commonly found.
30. TRIBES: named after emperors in old cities, Hasluck, *Cyzicus*, p. 250, *I.B.M.*, III, pp. 68-71 (Ephesus), *I.G.R.*, III. 1422 (Prusias, where eight out of twelve tribes are imperial); similar in new cities, Kühn, *Antinoopolis*, p. 124. REGIONAL TRIBES: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 21 (Philippopolis), cf. p. 409, note 10 for the tribes of Ancyra, some of which bear apparently local names. WARD TRIBES: *ib.*, p. 334. CLAN TRIBES: *ib.*, pp. 267 (Palmyra), 293 (Bostra?). VICI: Dessau, 5081, 7198 (Antioch of Pisidia), 1018, 2178 (Alexandria Troas), *Année Epigr.*, 1916, 120 (Sinope); tribus (φυλαί) in later colonies, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1905, pp. 324-5 (Iconium), cf. *I.G.R.*, III. 1483, αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς κολιωνείας (Lystra), *Année Epigr.*, 1923, 4, 8, 1934, 4 (Corinth).
31. CITIZENSHIP: of Alexandria, *P. Gnomon*, 40, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 7; of Bithynian cities, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 114. ROMAN AND LOCAL CITIZENSHIP: *S.E.G.*, IX. 8, iii.
32. FREEDMEN: *Syll.*³, 742 (Ephesus), *P. Gnomon*, 49 (Alexandria), *I.G.R.*, III 800-2 (Silyum). DISFRANCHISED CLASSES: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 162 (Prusias), 318 (Egypt).
33. ROMAN COLONIES: Heraclea Pontica, Strabo, 542-3. Strabo's phraseology here and elsewhere (e.g., 546, νυνὶ δὲ καὶ Ῥωμαίων ἀποικίαν δέδεκται καὶ μέρος τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς χώρας ἐκεῖνων ἐστί) suggests that in his day the colonists were a separate

intrusive body. Pausanias on the other hand regards the people of Patrae as a homogeneous body, Greeks enjoying the privileges of Roman colonists (VII. xviii. 7); so that perhaps by his time the citizens of Patrae had been assimilated to the *coloni*; on the other hand the Ozolian Locrians are stated by Pausanias (x. xxxviii. 9) to be ruled by the people of Patrae; their cities were apparently subject dependencies of the colony.

34. See my article in *J.R.S.*, 1936, p. 223.
35. TARSUS: Dio Chrys., xxxiv. 21-3. EGYPT: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 318; the almost self-evident fact that only one of *οἱ ἀπὸ γυμνασίου* could become *γυμνασιάρχος* is demonstrated by van Groningen, *Le gymnasiarque*, pp. 40-1. SILLYUM AND POGLA: *I.G.R.*, III. 800-1, 409.
36. EPONYMOUS MAGISTRATES: *ἡγεμῶν Syll.*³, 898; *ἵππαρχος*, *I.G.R.*, IV. 135, 144-6, 153-5; *βασιλεύς*, *I.G.R.*, III. 81 (Heraclea), I. 844, 846, 848, 851-2 (Samothrace); *μόναρχος*, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1087, 1101, 1060; *δημοῦργος*, see p. 310, note 62; *πρύτανις*, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1586-9 (Colophon), see also below; *στεφανήφορος*, see p. 310, note 62, and for the islands and Greece, *I.G.*, VII. 4173 (Anthedon), XII. iii. 1116 (Melos), v. 602 (Iulis), 659 seqq. (Syros), 804, 813, 820-2, 825 (Tenos), ix, 11 (Carystus); at Chios the *prytanis* was superseded by the *stephanephorus* (*I.G.R.*, IV. 953, 941); at Phocaea the two offices seem to have been combined (*ib.*, 1322-3, 1325); at Cyme they existed side by side (*ib.*, 1302). A priest of Rome was in the early first century B.C. eponymous at both Ephesus and Sardis (*ib.*, 297); in the former city he existed side by side with the *prytanis* (cf. also *Forsch. Eph.*, II. 30), in the latter he superseded the *stephanephorus* (cf. also *Sardis*, VII. 93, 112-15). The offices of *prytanis* and priest of Rome seem to be united at Thyateira (*I.G.R.*, IV. 1228) and Hierocaesarea (*ib.*, 1304), those of *demiurgus* and priest of the emperors at Castabala (*I.G.R.*, III. 906, 909-11). For the magistrates of the Egyptian metropoleis, see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 319-20.
37. SHORT TERMS OF OFFICE: *agoranomi*, *O.G.I.*, 485, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 170 (Magnesia), *I.G.R.*, III. 66, 1423 (Prusias), IV. 1169 (Attaleia), 1250, 1255-6 (Thyateira); gymnasiarchs, *O.G.I.*, 485 (Magnesia), *Jahresh.*, 1898, p. 181 (Amphipolis); Kraeling, *Gerasa, city of the Decapolis*, p. 374-5, nos. 3-4, (Gerasa), *Ath. Mitt.*, 1883, p. 318 (Tralles). PERPETUAL MAGISTRATES: Laum, *Stiftungen*, pp. 46-50. LIFE OFFICES: examples of agonothetes and priests are too numerous to quote; for the origin of life (and hereditary) agonothetes, see the will cited in *Dig.*, L. xii. 10, and *I.G.R.*, III. 360, Π. Αἰ. Κοίντων Κλ. Φιλιππιανὸν Οὐάρον, ἀγωνοθέτην διὰ βίου ἀγώνων Κλαρείων καὶ Οὐαρείων (Sagalassus), 489, συστησάμενον εἰς πάντα τὸν αἰῶνα πανήγυριν ἀγώνων . . . ἀγωναθέτην διὰ βίου (Oenoanda), 519, ἐπὶ ἀγωνοθέτου διὰ β[ί]ου . . . Ἰο[υ]λίου Μεττίου Ἀυρηλίου Φιλώτου τοῦ Ἀττάλου . . . πέμπτης ἀγόμενης θέμιδος ἧς κατέλιπεν Φανιανὴ ἢ καὶ Ἀμμία Φανίου τοῦ καὶ Φιλάτα (Cadyanda); for the establishment of hereditary priesthoods, see *Syll.*³, 898, 1007, *I.G.*, v. i. 1144, ii. 515, *I.G.R.*, III. 933. Other life offices include πολιτογράφος (*I.G.R.*, III. 65, 69), δεκάπρωτος (*ib.* 1376), ἐπὶ τῆς εὐκοσμίας ἀρχῶν (*I.G.R.*, IV. 582), βούλαρχος (*ib.*, 1230, 1233, 1247), σειτοδότης (*ib.*, 1630). SALE OF PRIESTHOODS: *Jahresh.*, 1915, Beiblatt, 23 (Seleucia on the Calycadnus), *Milet*, 203-4, Dörner, *Der Erlass des Statthalters von Asia Paullus Fabius Persicus*, p. 38. For the tenure of offices by women, see Paris, *Quatenus feminae res publicas . . . attigerint*.
38. MAGISTRACIES AND LITURGIES: *Dig.*, L. iv. 14 (Callistratus), 'Honor municipalis est administratio rei publicae cum dignitatis gradu sive cum sumptu sive sine erogatione contingens . . . publicum munus dicitur, quod in administranda re publica cum sumptu sine titulo dignitatis subimus'; in ordinary language ἀρχή and λειτουργία are often used synonymously, e.g., *B.C.H.*, 1885, p. 128 and *Syll.*³, 876, where the στρατηγία is implied to be a liturgy. For the variation in local usage, see *Dig.*, L. iv. 18, § 2 (Arcadius Charisius), 'et quaestura in aliqua

- civitate inter honores non habetur sed personale munus est', and for the constitutional importance of the distinction, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 79, 'eadem lege comprehensum est ut qui ceperint magistratum sint in senatu'. Immunity seems in general to have been originally from *munera* only; *Dig.*, L. iv. 12 (Javolenus, in general), i. 23 (Hermogenian, senators), v. 2, § 1 (Ulpian, on the score of age or number of children), v. 9, § 1 (*navicularii*; Paulus interpreted it to include honores). EXCLUSION FROM OFFICE A PENALTY: accused persons, *Dig.*, L. i. 17 § 12 (Papinian), 21 § 5 (Paulus), iv. 3, § 9, 6, § 2 (Ulpian), 7 (Marcian), *Cod. Just.*, x. lx. 1 (Sev. Alex.); public debtors, *Dig.*, L. iv. 6, § 1 (Ulpian); *infames*, *Dig.*, L. ii. 12 (Callistratus), *Cod. Just.*, x. lix. 1 (Diocletian): for the later assimilation of honores to *munera*, see *Dig.*, XLVIII. xxii. 7, § 22 (Ulpian). That magistracies were confined to citizens is implicit in Pliny, *Ep.*, x, 114; the imposition of liturgies on Jews (*Jos.*, *Ant.*, xvi. 28) was illegal only because of their peculiar privileges. For the rules of *origo* and *domicilium*, see *Dig.*, L. i. 17, § 4 (Papinian), *Cod. Just.*, x, xxxix, 1 (Caracalla).
39. COUNCIL OF CARYSTUS: *I.G.*, XII. ix. 11. SPARTAN GERUSIA: *I.G.*, v. i. 92-122. For Rhodes, Stratonicea and also Mylasa and Cyzicus, *vid. sup.*, notes 20 and 21.
40. NUMBERS: *I.B.M.*, 481, lines 129 seqq. (Ephesus), *I.G.R.*, III. 492 (Oenoanda), *Jos.*, *Bell.*, II. 641 (Tiberias), Libanius, *Or.*, II. 33 (Syria); the endowment in *I.G.R.*, IV. 1222 (Thyateira), implies a numerous council. TRIBAL DIVISION: *Ath. Mitt.*, 1891, p. 146, *J.H.S.*, 1897, p. 408 (Laodicea), *B.C.H.*, 1884, p. 234 (Eumeneia), *I.G.R.*, III. 1277 (Bostra? cf. *C.E.R.P.*, p. 293), *P. Oxy.*, 1413, 1415 (Egypt).
41. DECREES OF THE COUNCIL: *I.G.R.*, III. 1056 (Palmyra), *O.G.I.*, 527 (Hierapolis). Some decrees of the council and people of practical importance are *Syll.*³, 807 (grant of immunity), Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 110 (grant of pension), *O.G.I.*, 515, 572 (finance), *I.G.R.*, IV. 146 (regulation of prices).
42. ORATORY IN THE ASSEMBLY: Plut., *An seni resp. ger. sit*, 21, 26. PROCEEDINGS AT CHALCIS: *Syll.*³, 898; at Oxyrhynchus, *Chr.*, I. 45. It may be noted that the advice which Cassius Dio (LII. 30, § 2) puts into the mouth of Maecenas, *οἱ δῆμοι μῆτε κύριοι τιῶς ἔστωσαν μῆτε ἐς ἐκκλησίαν τὰ παράπαν φοιτᾶτωσαν*, is not true even of his own day but must represent the policy which he himself would have favoured.
43. For Achaea and Boeotia, *vid. sup.*, note 28. CRETE: *I.G.R.*, I. 960-1. EGYPT: *Chr.*, I. 33. AMORGOS: *I.G.*, XII. vii. 240 (Minoa), 396-410 (Aegiale); in 395, which seems to be the earliest of the Aegiale decrees, the *ἄρχοντες* are omitted from the formula of enactment, and the clause *ἔχοντων δὲ καὶ τὴν πρυτανικὴν ἐξουσίαν* is missing, and it would therefore seem that the magistrates had not yet acquired their special powers, and at Arcesine they apparently never had them (see no. 54, which is third century); the omission of the *ἄρχοντες* in 239 seems to be accidental.
44. PRIENE: *Inschr. Priene*, 108, 112-14. EPHEBUS: *I.G.R.*, IV. 1029, *Μοσχίων Μενέτου* [ε]ἶπεν προγραφημένων εἰς τὴν βουλὴν τῶν στρα[τ]ηγῶν, *Jos.*, *Ant.*, XIV. 262, *Νικάτωρ Εὐφῆμου* εἶπεν εἰσηγησαμένον τῶν στρατηγῶν; it is unlikely that 'introduction' by the *strategi*, though at this date a regular practice at Ephesus (cf. also *Syll.*³, 742, *γνώμη* προέδρων καὶ τοῦ γραμματέως τῆς βουλῆς . . . εἰσαγγελαμένων τῶν στρατηγῶν) was constitutionally necessary, for private members retained till a much later date the right to introduce. Under the principate the fullest formula is *γνώμη* (of the magistrates), *εἰσηγησαμένου τοῦ δεῖνος*, *ἐπιψηφισαμένου τοῦ δεῖνος*; e.g. *I.G.*, XII. vii. 239-40 (Minoa), 396 seqq. (Aegiale), ix. 4 (Alabanda), *B.C.H.*, 1885, p. 127 (Nysa); the *ἐπιψηφιστής* is omitted in *I.G.*, XII. vii. 54 (Arcesine), 395 (Aegiale), *Wadd.*, 1611 (Aphrodisias). *Εἰσηγεῖσθαι* is clearly by origin one of the many terms used for the introduction of a proposal into the council by an outsider (*vid. sup.*,

note 19); it is used as an equivalent of *προγράφεσθαι εἰς τὴν βουλὴν* or *εἰσαγγέλλειν* in the Ephesian decrees cited above, and *εἰσαγγέλλειν* is substituted for it in the formula of the Roman period at Nysa (*B.C.H.*, 1885, p. 127). It is in the Roman period still not equivalent to moving a decree, but was a preliminary process. This appears most clearly in *Syll.*³, 898, where the *εἰσηγηταὶ* do not figure in the formal voting of the decree, but have already done their part. *Ἐπισηφίζεσθαι* (or *ἐπισηφίζειν*) in classical and hellenistic usage normally denotes the function of the president, and still does in Roman Athens (cf. *Syll.*³, 796, *I.G.*², II.—III, 1072). In the regular Roman formula it is clearly a complementary action to 'introducing' and must mean something equivalent to 'seconding'. That it does not denote the action of the president appears from *P. Lond. Inv.*, 2565, lines 3-4, 17, 34 (cf. the editors' note, *J.E.A.*, 1935, p. 238); the *πρωταῖς* was president of the *βουλὴ* in the Egyptian metropoleis, but each proposal had none the less its *εἰσηγητὴς καὶ ἐπισηφιστὴς*. In the hellenistic age also it might mean to second, e.g., *I.G.*, XII. vii. 515, *ἐὰν δέ τις εἴπῃ εἰ* (= ἢ) *ἐπισηφιστῆς ἢ ὁ ἐπιστάτης εἰ* (= ἢ) [*οἱ πρόεδροι προβάσω*]. The full formula is abbreviated in various ways. Sometimes *γνώμη* (of the magistrates) is found alone, e.g., *O.G.I.*, 572 (Myra), *Syll.*³, 807 (Magnesia on the Maeander), *Wadd.*, 1604 (Aphrodisias); or more rarely, (a magistrate) *εἶπεν*, e.g., *Syll.*³, 793 (Cos), *I.G.R.*, IV. 144, 146 (Cyzicus; in the former decree the mover is actually hipparch though not so qualified). Sometimes there is no *γνώμη* or *εἶπεν* and only the *εἰσηγητὴς* and *ἐπισηφιστὴς* are recorded: e.g., *I.G.*, XII. iii. 326 (Thera), *I.G.R.*, III. 582 (Sidyma), IV. 261 (Antandrus), *S.E.G.*, IV. 263 (Stratonicea), *Syll.*³, 867 (Ephesus), cf. *I.G.*, XII. iii. 247 (Anaphe), where [*γ*]νώμην ἀγορεύσατος is substituted for *εἰσηγησαμένου*. Or again the *εἰσηγητὴς* is alone given; e.g., *Jos., Ant.*, XIV. 256 (Halicarnassus), *Syll.*³, 898 (Chalcis); *Jos., Ant.*, XIV. 259 (Sardis), cf. *I.G.R.*, IV. 1756, I. III. IV (Sardis), *Inscr. Ol.*, 53 (Cos), *Inscr. Perg.*, 260, *I.G.R.*, IV. 293 (Pergamum), where *εἰσαγγέλλειν* is used, and *O.G.I.*, 493, *I.B.M.*, 481, *Forsch. Eph.*, II. 18 (Ephesus), where the formula is *περὶ ὧν ἐνεφάνισαν* or *εἰσφέρουσι*. That *γνώμη* (of the magistrates) is to be understood in these cases also is, I think, apparent from *Syll.*³, 898, where in the actual proceedings quoted the *γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου* puts the question (*ἐπιρώτησε*) in the council and the *στρατηγός* moves (*εἶπεν*) in the people. If this assumption be correct the fact that the *εἰσηγητὴς* is not infrequently not a magistrate (e.g., *I.G.*, XII. iii. 247, *I.G.R.*, IV. 261, *S.E.G.*, IV. 263, *Jos., Ant.*, XIV. 256, *O.G.I.*, 493) is of no great significance; from Philo, *de Jos.*, § 72, it would appear that in Roman times only *βουλευταὶ* had the right *εἰσηγεῖσθαι*. Real motions by non-magistrates are *Syll.*³, 796B, 885 (Athens; in the second case *ἄρχων τῶν Ἐὐμολιδικῶν* is not a magistracy), 836 (Delphi; an interesting case, the same man *εἰσηγή[σα]μένου καὶ εἰπόντος*) in the assembly, and in the council *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 114 (Ephesus), *S.E.G.*, III. 758 (Carystus); I doubt if *I.G.R.*, I. 421 (Tyre) is a decree.

45. ATHENS: *Syll.*³, 796B, *I.G.*², II.—III, 1072. CYZICUS: *I.G.R.*, IV. 144-6. At Tyre the *proedri* (probably the principal magistrates) took it in turn day by day to preside in council (*I.G.R.*, I. 421). BULARCHI: *I.G.R.*, IV. 116 (Mitylene), 658 (Acmonia), 740 (Eumeneia), 820 (Hierapolis), 870 (Colossae), 1230, 1233, 1247 (Thyateira), 1308 (Hierocaesarea), 1543-4 (Erythrae), 1621, 1634, 1637 (Philadelphia), *C.I.G.*, 2811 (Aphrodisias), 2881-2 (Miletus), 2997 (Ephesus), 3201 (Smyrna), *Wadd.*, 610 (Tralles) 985 (Aezani), *B.C.H.*, 1890, p. 233 (Nysa). POLITARCHS: Demitzas, ἡ Μακεδονία, 258, τῶν περὶ . . . ἐν Δερριόπῳ πολιταρχῶν συναγαγόντων τὸ βουλευτήριον; the three persons described as τῶν ἀποκληρωθέντων προέδρων δόγματος ἀναγραφῆ are evidently not presiding officers but equivalent to the three *δογματόγραφοι* who are often appointed by lot in other cities, e.g., *I.G.R.*, IV. 45 (Mitylene), 259 (Assus), 661 (Acmonia), *I.B.M.*, 481, lines 297, 315 (Ephesus), *R.E.G.*, 1893, p. 161 (Iasus). For the Egyptian *πρωταῖς*, see *C.E.R.P.*, p. 330.

46. THE CURIAL ORDER: *I.G.R.*, III. 833b, βουλευτικ[κ]ο[υ] τάγμα[τ]ος (late second century?). HIGHER PAYMENTS TO COUNCILLORS: *I.G.R.*, III. 800-2, cf. 833, IV. 216, *I.B.M.*, 481, Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, p. 343. PRIVILEGES OF COUNCILLORS: *Dig.*, XLVIII. XIX. 9, §§11-15 (Ulpian), 15 (Hadrian), 27, §1-2, 28, §5 (Callistratus), XLIX. IV. 1, L. II. 2, §2 (Ulpian), 14 (Ant. Pius).
47. CURIAL MAGISTRACIES: *I.G.R.*, III. 623, βουλευτοῦ τελέσαντος ἀρχὰς δημοτικὴν μὲν μίαν βουλευτικὰς δὲ πάσας, *Dig.*, L. II. 7 §2 (Paulus), 'decurionum honoribus plebeii fungi prohibentur', *P. Lond. Inv.*, 2565, line 69 (*J.E.A.*, 1935, p. 231), ἰδιώ[τ]αι γίνονται πα[ρ'] ἡμῶν (read ὑμῶν) [κο]σμη[τ]αί ἢ καὶ [β]ουλευ[τ]αί; ἀπεκρ[ι]νατο ἰδ[ε]ῶται. CURIAL LITURGIES: *SB.*, 7261, where βουλευτικὰ λειτουργία are contrasted with δημοτικὰ ὑπηρεσίαι, cf. *Dig.*, L. I. 17, §7 (Papinian), 'exigendi tributī munus inter sordida munera non habetur et ideo decurionibus quoque mandatur'.
48. From *SB.*, 7261 it appears that there were persons who possessed βουλευτικὸς πόρος who even in the third century were not βουλευταί.
49. HEREDITARY TENDENCY: Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 79, 'quia sit aliquanto melius honestorum hominum liberos quam e plebe in curiam admitti'. Owing to the absence of family names it is difficult to work out long pedigrees in the east; some of fair length have been established at Sparta (*I.G.*, V. I, p. 334), at Termessus (Heberdey, 'Termessische Studien', *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, LXIX, pp. 58 seqq.), at Tralles and at Ephesus (*Jahresh.*, 1907, pp. 282-99), and at Oenoanda one is given in *I.G.R.*, III. 500. There are countless allusions to distinguished ancestors in the inscriptions but few are precise; some Lycian inscriptions (*I.G.R.*, III. 495, 524, 603, 735, 739, V, VIII) are of more than usual interest in that persons who flourished in the mid-second century claim for their ancestors federal offices which had been abolished in A.D. 43. PLUTARCH'S ADVICE: Plut., *Praec. reip. ger.*, 31. DIO'S GRANDFATHER: Dio Chrys., XLVI. 3 seqq. JULIUS PISO: Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 110; by the end of the third century such cases were apparently so common that a ruling was given permitting the grant of pensions to ruined decurions (*Dig.*, L. II. 8, Hermogenian).
50. The financial system will be discussed in Part IV. For the case of Ephesus, see Dörner, *Der Erlass des Statthalters von Asia Paullus Fabius Persicus*, p. 38, col. IV. I-VI. 13, and for peculation in general, Plut., *Praec. reip. ger.*, 26.
51. Plut., *op. cit.*, 10.
52. For πάσαι ἀρχαὶ καὶ λειτουργίαι see, *exempli gratia*, *I.G.R.*, IV. 460, 619, 844, 881, 1159, 1236, 1525, 1632, 1689. For evasion, *vid. inf.*, note 65.
53. See *J.E.A.*, 1938, pp. 65 seqq. Proposal in the council is attested in the second century by Aelius Aristides, L. 88 (ed. Keil), πρὶν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βουλὴν ἐμὲ καὶ γενέσθαι λόγον ὀντινοῦν περὶ τούτων—ἦσαν δ' ἀρχαιρεσίαι κατ' ἐκείνου τὸν χρόνον πρυτανεῖαι—προῦβάλετό με ἡ βουλὴ δυοῖν καὶ τριῶν ὑπεμπάντων, cf. 94-9 (a dispute with the council of Smyrna over another nomination) and *S.E.G.*, VI. 59, προταθεῖς ὑπὸ τῆς ἱερωτάτης βουλῆς (an agonothete at Ancyra); also Dio Chrys., XLIX, *Παρατήσεις ἀρχῆς ἐν βουλῇ*.
54. HADRIAN'S LETTER TO EPHEBUS: *Syll.*³, 838. CENSORSHIP AT ANCYRA: *I.G.R.*, III. 206. For the Egyptian councils, *vid. inf.*, note 59.
55. For eponymous offices, see Robert, *Istros*, II (1935). The difficulties of the Greek cities are revealed by *I.G.*, IV. 4 (Aegina), *Syll.*³, 800 (Lycosura), *I.G.*, VII. 2711-12, *B.C.H.*, 1935, p. 438 (Acraephia). ALEXANDRIA: Philo, in *Flaccum*, § 130. ASIA: *O.G.I.*, 458, line 82, παρὰ τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαιρεσίαις ἐπικλήσεις. A constitution of Marcus and Verus deals with persons 'qui compulsi magistratu funguntur' (*Dig.*, L. I. 38, §6). Ἐκουσίος: *Chr.*, I. 33, *Milet*, 176. Ἀθθαίρετος: *I.G.*, XII. V. 660, 668, *I.B.M.*, 579, *S.E.G.*, IV. 535, *Wadd.*, 152, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1525, *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 163; an unusually early example is *I.G.R.*, III. 933 (Cyprus in A.D. 29). For a case due to a local and accidental cause, see *B.C.H.*, 1891, p. 186, διὰ τὸ μῦθον θελήσαι ὑπομεῖναι τὴν ἱερωσύνην διὰ τὴν γενομένην ἀπροσδόκητον τῶν ἐλακωῶν καύσων.

56. PLEA OF MALICE: *Cod. Just.*, x. lxxviii. 1 (Sev. Alex.). PLEA OF ANOTHER'S GREATER SUITABILITY: *Cod. Just.*, x. lxxvii. 1 (Caracalla). Both these grounds of appeal are suggested in *P. Oxy.*, 1642. SENATORS: *Dig.*, L. i. 22, §5 (Paulus), 23 (Hermogenian). PUBLIC SERVICE: *Dig.*, L. v. 4 (Neratius), cf. v. 12, §1 (Paulus, *comites*), iv. 3, §1, 4, §3 (Ulpian, soldiers). VETERANS: *Dig.*, XLIX. xviii. 2 (Ulpian), 5, §1-2 (Paulus), L. iv. 18, §24, §29 (Arc. Charisius), v. 7, 'a muneribus quae non patrimonii indicuntur veterani post optimi nostri Severi Augusti litteras perpetuo excusantur', cf. 8, §2 (Papinian), *Cod. Just.*, x. xliv. 1 (Sev. Alex.); an edict of Octavian as triumvir (*Chr.*, 1. 462) grants '[mi]litiae muneribusque publicis fu[ngend]i vocat[i]o (sic)' to veterans but this grant seems to have been later restricted, since in A.D. 172 a veteran claims five years' immunity only (*Chr.*, 1. 396). FISCAL CONDUCTORES: *Dig.*, L. v. 8, §1 (Papinian), vi. 6, §10 (Callistratus). FISCAL COLONI: *Dig.*, L. i. 38, §1 (Papirius Justus), vi. 6, §11 (Callistratus). NAVICULARII: *Dig.*, L. iv. 5, v. 3 (Scaevola), ii. 9, §1, v. 9, §1 (Paulus), vi. 6, §§3-6, §8-9 (Callistratus). DOCTORS, ETC.: *Sb. Ak. Berlin*, 1935, p. 971, *Dig.*, L. iv. 18, §30 (Vespasian and Hadrian), xxvii. i. 6, §§1-4, §§8-10 (Ant. Pius and Commodus), *I.G.R.*, III. 599, 733, IV. 116, *Syll.*¹, 876, Aelius Aristides, L. 75, cf. 87 (ed. Keil), *Cod. Just.*, x. liii. 1 (Caracalla), xlvi. 1, liii. 5 (Diocletian). SACRED VICTORS: *Class. Rev.*, 1893, p. 476, *Hermes*, 1897, p. 509 (Antony), *Chr.*, II. 381, *Cod. Just.*, x. liv. 1 (Diocletian), cf. *Dig.*, xxvii. i. 6, §13 (Ulpian); all Dionysiac artists seem to have been immune in early times (*I.G.*, VII. 2413-14). AGE OF SEVENTY: *Dig.*, L. ii. 2, §8, iv. 3, §6, §12, 6, §4, v. 1, §3, 2, §1, vi. 4 (Ulpian), v. 8 (Papinian), *Cod. Just.*, x. xxxii. 10, 1. 3 (Diocletian). FIVE CHILDREN: *Dig.*, L. iv. 3, §6, §12, 6, §4, v. 1. 2, §2-5 (Ulpian), 8 (Papinian), 14 (Modestinus), *Cod. Just.*, x. lii. 1 (Sev. Alex.), lxi. 1 (Gordian), lii. 2. 3 (Philip), 5 (Diocletian). CUMULATION AND ITERATION: *Dig.*, L. i. 17, §3 (Papinian), 18 (Paulus), iv. 3, §16 (Ulpian), 10, v. 14, §1 (Modestinus), *Cod. Just.*, x. xli. 1 (Severus), 2 (Gordian), 3 (Diocletian).
57. *CESSIO BONORUM*: *Chr.*, 1. 402, II. 375, *P. Oxy.*, 1405, 1642, *P. Lond. Inv.*, 2665, lines 95-7 (*J.E.A.*, 1935, p. 232), *Cod. Just.*, VII. lxxi. 5 (Diocletian).
58. *PERICULUM NOMINATORIS*: *Dig.*, L. i. 11, §1, 13, 15, §1, 17, §14-15 (Papinian), iv. 14, §4 (Callistratus), *Cod. Just.*, XI. xxxiv. 1, 2, xxxvi. 2 (Gordian), 3 (Carus), 4 (Diocletian). THE ACHILLEUS CASE: *P. Ryl.*, 77, cf. Jouguet in *R.E.G.*, 1917, pp. 294 seqq., van Groningen in *Mnemosyne*, 1923, pp. 421 seqq., and my own discussion in *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 321 seqq. and *J.E.A.*, 1938, pp. 69 seqq.
59. *Ἀυτονομασία*: *P. Oxy.*, 1642; the word is apparently found only here, but the practice is often attested both in Egypt (*C.E.R.P.*, p. 478, note 42) and elsewhere, e.g., *Dig.*, L. i. 2, §3 (Ulpian), 15, §1, 17, §14 (Papinian), *Cod. Just.*, XI. xxxiv. 2 (Gordian). NOMINATION BY TRIBE: *C.E.R.P.*, p. 478, note 42; a similar practice is implied elsewhere than in Egypt by Wadd., 407, [ἀ]λθεῖς ὑπὸ τῆς φυλῆς ὑπέμεινευ γυμνασιαρχος (Mylasa).
60. *P. Oxy.*, 1413, 1415.
61. *P. Oxy.*, 1413
62. The *prytanis* seems to have made a nomination himself in *P. Lond. Inv.*, 2565, lines 47-8, 50-1 (*J.E.A.*, 1935, p. 230), in *B.G.U.*, 8, vol. II, and in *Chr.*, 1. 402, where a nominee offers him *cessio bonorum*. APPLICATION TO THE GOVERNOR: *P. Oxy.*, 1252, v, cf. 1642. NOMINATION BY THE GOVERNOR: *Dig.*, XLIX. iv. 1, §3-4 (Ulpian).
63. Flight from liturgies was common in Egypt among the lower classes, but does not seem to be recorded of councillors till a late date (*P. Oxy.*, 1414). EVASION BY THE RICH: *Dig.*, L. iv. 6 (*divi fratres*).
64. EXPULSION FROM THE COUNCIL: *P. Oxy.*, 1406 (Caracalla's edict), cf. *Dig.*, XLVIII. XIX. 38, §10, 43, §1 (Paulus), L. ii. 2, 3 (Ulpian), §1, 5 (Papinian). I hesitate to

use as evidence Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 113, 'eos qui inviti fiunt decuriones', because I believe that the textual corruption which has made nonsense of the rest of the sentence has affected this clause also. Trajan's brief replies to Pliny's verbose queries are always strictly relevant. In this case Pliny has asked whether the *honorarium decurionatus* is to be paid, and has mentioned two classes of decurions, 'qui in bulen a censoribus leguntur', and 'quos indulgentia tua quibusdam civitatibus super legitimum numerum adicere permisit'. The first part of Trajan's reply deals with regular decurions; the second part should mention additional, not unwilling, decurions.

65. *NAVICULARII*: *Dig.*, l. vi. 6, §6 (Marcus), §8 (Hadrian), §9 (Pius). *FISCAL CONDUCTORES*: *Dig.*, l. v. 8, §1 (Papinian). *DOCTORS, ETC.*: *Dig.*, xxvii. i. 6, §§1-4 (Ant. Pius). *MILITARY SERVICE*: *Dig.*, l. iv. 4, §3 (Ulpian). *COLONI*: *Dig.*, l. v. 1, §2 (Ulpian). *SACRED VICTORS*: *Chr.*, II. 381, *Cod. Just.*, x. liv. 1 (Diocletian).
66. For the frequency of bankruptcies, *Dig.*, l. ii. 8 (Hermogenian) is significant. For the unwillingness of a family to have many members on the council, see *C.I.G.*, 2987, *μόνον καὶ πρῶτον τρίτον βουλευτὴν σὺν πατρὶ καὶ ἀδελφῷ*. For the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, see *J.R.S.*, 1936, pp. 223 seqq.
67. *COLONI IN LYDIA*: Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, LVII. 55, τῶν ἐπὶ προβάσει ἀρχῶν ἢ λειτουργιῶν τοὺς ὑμετέροισ ἐνοχλοῦντων καὶ σκυλλόντων γεωργούς. *VILLAGERS IN THE ARSINOITE*: *P. Lond. Inv.*, 2565, col. iii. (*J.E.A.*, 1935, p. 231). *SHOPKEEPERS*: *Dig.*, l. ii. 12 (Callistratus). *PLEBEIANS*: *Dig.*, l. iv. 14, §4 (Severus).
68. Libanius, *Or.*, XLIX. 2, XI. 133 seqq.
69. I can detect no definite date at which curial status became legally hereditary; it had long been so in practice, and no doubt became so in law by a gradual process. Freedmen are debarred from the curia and *infames* from *honores* (which included the decurionate) by constitutions of Diocletian which were included by Justinian in his Code (x. xxxiii. 1, lix. 1) and were therefore presumably still in force: neither class was of course thereby excused *munera* (x. lviii. 1, lix. 1).
70. In this and the following notes I correct the dates of the constitutions according to Seeck, *Regesten*. I give the addressees of the constitutions because during certain periods (e.g., 395-438) constitutions issued by the western emperor were not enforced in the east, and some of these constitutions, having already been superseded by 438, would not have applied in the east even after the publication of the Theodosian Code; for the same reason I omit western Novels issued after 438. Moreover, even if a law was of universal application, it was usually provoked by local circumstances, and the addressee often gives a clue to the region where the abuse prohibited was most prevalent. *EQUESTRIAN RANK*: *Cod. Just.*, x. xlviii. 1 (Carus), 'etiam ii qui nostra procurasse monstrantur muneribus civilibus quae dignitati eorum congruunt fungi debent'; contrast *P. Oxy.*, 1204 (A.D. 299), where τὸ τῆς κραιωρίας ἀξίωμα is admitted as a valid excuse from curial charges, and *Cod. Just.*, x. xlviii. 2 (Diocletian).
71. *ABUSE OF HONORARY EQUESTRIAN RANK*: *Cod. Theod.*, VI. xxxviii. 1 (317), XII. i. 5 (317, Bithynia), VI. xxii. 1 (324, PU. Rom.), XII. i. 26 (338, vic. Afr.), 41 (339, Carthage), 36 (343, PPO. Gall.), 42 (346, Caesena), 44 (358, vic. Afr.); of these laws nos. 26, 41, 36, 44 also refer to the honorary *comitiva*; other early laws which refer to *honores* and *dignitates* probably mean thereby equestrian rank or the *comitiva*, e.g., *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 24 (338, vic. Afr.), 25 (338, *dat. Emesae*), 27 (339, *proc. Afr.*), 34 (342, *praes. Augustamn.*). *LEGAL GRANT OF COMITIVA TO DECURIONS*: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 75 (371, PPO. Gall.), 109 (385, PPO. Or.), 127 (392, PPO. Or.), 189 (436, PPO. Or.).
72. The tendency of the equestrian order to become hereditary is regulated in *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 14 (326, *praet. praef.*).

73. *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 14, 18 (326, praet. praef.), 29 (340, Circa), 42 (346, Caesena), 48 (361, Sen. Const.), 57, 58 (364, PPO. It.), 69 (365, vic. As.), 74 (371, PPO. Or.), 73 (373, proc. Afr.).
74. *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 82 (380, PPO. Ill.), 93 (382, PPO. Ill.), 90 (383, com. Or.), 110 (385, PPO. It.), 111 (386, PPO. Or.), 118 (387, PPO. Or.), 122 (390, PPO. Or.), 123 (391, PPO. Or.), 129 (392, PPO. Or.), 130, 132 (393, PPO. Or.), 155 (397, PU. Rom.), 159 (398, PPO. Or.), 160 (404, PU. Const.). Libanius cites *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 118, 122 in Or., XLIX. 5, 6.
75. *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 180 (416, PU. Const.), 183 (418, PPO. Or.), 187 (436, PPO. Or.).
76. *Theod.*, Nov., xv. 1 (439, Sen. Const.), 2 (444, PPO. Or.), *Cod. Just.*, x. xxxii. 61 (459-65, PPO. Or.), 63 (471-4, Sen. Const.), 64 (Zeno, PPO. Or.), 66 (497-9, PPO. Or.), 67 (529, PPO. Or.), *Just.*, Nov., 70 (538, PPO. Or.).
77. For the *gleba* and *aurum oblativum*, see *Cod. Theod.*, VI. ii, *Cod. Just.*, XII. ii. 2; for the praetorship, *Cod. Theod.*, VI. iv, *Cod. Just.*, XII. ii. 1; the expensiveness of senatorial rank is stressed in *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 58. It is hardly necessary to cite evidence for the universal practice of buying offices and codicils.
78. DECURIONS AND THE *MILITIA PALATINA*: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 5 (317, Bithynia), VI. xxvii. 1, VII. xxi. 2, VIII. vii. 5, 6 (326, praet. praef.), XII. i. 22 (336, PPO. It.), 31 (341, PPO. It.), 38 (357, PPO. Ill.), VI. xxvi. 1 (362, PPO. Or.), XII. i. 88 (382, PPO. It.), 100 (383, PPO. It.), 120 (389, PPO. Or.), VII. xxi. 3 (396, PPO. Or.), XII. i. 153 (397, PPO. Or.), 154 (397, PU. Rom.), 147 (416, PPO. It.), VI. xxxv. 14 (423, PPO. Or.), *Theod.*, Nov., vii. 4 (441, mag. mil. Or.); I have included under this heading all *officia* in the capital and the imperial guard. There are many other constitutions (*vid. inf.*, note 81), which allude vaguely to *militia*, and some may mean *militia palatina*, e.g., XII. i. 82 (380, PPO. Ill.), which speaks of service in *officia maiora*, and 188 (436, PPO. Or.), which couples *militia* with *causidicina in foro amplissimae praefecturae*. PRIVILEGES OF PRINCIPES AND PROXIMI: *Cod. Theod.*, VI. xxvii. 16 (413, PPO. Or.), *Cod. Just.*, x. xxxii. 67 (529, PPO. Or.).
79. DECURIONS AND THE BAR: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 188 (436, PPO. Or.), *Theod.*, Nov., x. 1 (439, PPO. Or.); *Cod. Just.*, II. vii. 11 (460, PPO. Or.), 17 (474, PPO. Ill.), since they exclude *cohortales*, exclude *curiales*. PRIVILEGES OF PATRONI FISCI: *Cod. Just.*, II. vii. 8 (440, PPO. Or.), 21 (500, PPO. Ill.), x. xxxii. 67 (529, PPO. Or.).
80. For the purchase of posts it is hardly necessary to quote evidence; for Berytus and Rome, *vid. inf.*, note 92.
81. DECURIONS AND THE LESSER OFFICIA: under the master of the soldiers of the East, *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 175 (412, mag. mil. Or.); under vicars, VIII. vii. 6 (326, praet. praef.), I. xv. 12 (386, all vicars); under provincial governors, XII. i. 96 (383, PPO. Or.), 134 (393, PPO. Or.), I. xii. 4 (393, proc. Afr.), 6 (398, proc. Afr.); XII. i. 22 and 31 also refer to other *officia* besides the palatine; the following laws refer to *officia* in general, XII. i. 13 (326, PPO. Or.), 42 (346, Caesena), 137 (393, PPO. Or.), 139 (394, PPO. Or.), 161 (399, PPO. It.), 181 (416, PPO. Or.). DECURIONS AND *MILITIA ARMATA*: *Cod. Just.*, XII. xxxiii. 2 (Diocletian), *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 10 (325, vic. Or.), 13 (326, PPO. Or.), VII. xiii. 1 (326, praet. praef.), XII. i. 38 (357, PPO. Ill.), 56 (362, *dat. Antiochiae*), 88 (382, PPO. It.), 95 (383, proc. Afr.), VII. ii. 1 (383, PPO. Or.), 2 (385, PPO. It.), XII. i. 113 (386, mag. mil. It.), 154 (397, PU. Rom.), VII. xx. 12 (400, mag. mil. It.), XII. i. 147, 181 (416, PPO. It.), *Cod. Just.*, XII. xxxiii. 4 (472, PPO. Or.). The following constitutions refer to *militia* in a quite ambiguous manner: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 11 (325, PPO. Or.), 37 (344, PPO. It.), 43 (355, PPO. It.), 40 (357, PPO. It.), 45 (358, vic. Afr.), 58 (364, PPO. It.), 94 (383, vic. Pont.), 143

- (395, proc. Afr.), 164 (399, PPO. Or.), 168 (409, PPO. Or.). That sons of decurions who successfully completed their militia were still liable to curial charges is clearly stated in *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 64 (368, Mauretania), 184 (423, PPO. Or.).
82. DOCTORS AND PROFESSORS: *Cod. Theod.*, XIII. iii. 1. (321, PPO. It.), 3 (333, *ad populum*, *dat. Const.*). CONDUCTORES: XII. i. 97 (383, C.S.L.); *κονδοκτορῆαι* are treated as regular curial *munera* in *P. Oxy.*, 2110 (A.D. 370). COLONI: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 33 (342, com. Or.), 114 (386, PPO. It.). NAVICULARII: XIII. v. 5 (329, PPO. Or.), 14 (371, PPO. Or.), 16 (380, corp. navic.), 19 (390, PPO. Or.), XII. i. 134 (393, PPO. Or.), 149, XIII. v. 25 (395, proc. Afr.). FABRICENSES, ETC.: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 37 (344, PPO. It.), 81 (380, PPO. Ill.), X. xxii. 6 (412, PPO. Or.).
83. THE CHURCH: *Cod. Theod.*, XVI. ii. 1 (313), 2 (313, corr. Luc.), 3 (329, PPO. It.), 6 (329, PPO. It.), 7 (330, cons. Num.), 9 (349, proc. Ach.), XII. i. 49 (361, PPO. It.), 59 (364, Byzacium), XVI. ii. 19 (370, PPO. Or.), 21 (371, PU. Rom.), XII. i. 104 (383, PPO. Or.), 115 (386, PPO. Or.), 121* (390, PPO. Or.), 123* (391, PPO. Or.), IX. xlv. 3 (398, PPO. Or.), XII. i. 163* (399, PPO. Or.), 172 (410, PPO. Ill.), *Cod. Just.*, I. iii. 21 (442, PPO. Or.), 52 (531, PPO. Or.), *Just., Nov.*, 6, §1 (535, patr. Const.), 123, §§1, 4, 15 (546, mag. off. Or.), 137, §2 (565, mag. off. Or.). The laws marked with an asterisk all refer to the year 368.
84. RETIREMENT TO THE COUNTRY: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. xviii. 1 (367, praef. Aeg.), 2 (396, PPO. Or.). RETIREMENT TO THE DESERT: XII. i. 63 (370, PPO. Or.). MIGRATION: XII. i. 119 (388, PPO. Or.), 143-4 (395, proc. Afr.), 161 (399, PPO. It.). PATRONAGE: XII. i. 6 (318, *dat. Aquileiae*), 50 (362, PPO. Or.), 76 (371, PPO. Or.), 92 (382, PPO. Or.), 146 (395, PPO. It.), *Theod., Nov.*, IX. 1 (439, PPO. Or.).
85. SALE OF ESTATES: to purchase office, Libanius, *Or.*, XXVIII. 22, XLVIII. 11; to secure patronage, *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 6 (318, *dat. Aquileiae*); under pressure, Libanius, *Or.*, XLVIII. 37 seqq.
86. CONTROL OF SALES: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. iii. 1 (386, PPO. Or.), 2 (423, PPO. Or.), *Cod. Just.*, X. xxxiv. 3 (Zeno, PPO. Or.), *Just., Nov.*, 38 (536, PPO. Or.).
87. Libanius in an obscure passage (*Or.*, XLVIII. 30) alludes to these abuses; cf. also *Or.*, II. 36, 72, XLIX. 14.
88. LEGISLATION ON INHERITANCE: *Cod. Just.*, X. xxxv. 1 (428, PPO. Or.), *Theod., Nov.*, XXII. 2 (443, PPO. Or.), *Cod. Just.*, X. xxxv. 3 (528, PPO. Or.), *Just., Nov.*, 38 (536, PPO. Or.), 87, 111 (539, PPO. Or.). LEGITIMATION BY *OBLATIO CURIAE*: *Theod., Nov.*, XXII. 2 (443, PPO. Or.), *Cod. Just.*, V. xxvii. 4 (470, PPO. Or.). The normal disabilities of natural children are set forth in *Cod. Theod.*, IV. vi.
89. Justinian's description of the curiae, together with an analysis of the causes of their decline, which is not, to my mind, very wide of the mark, is to be found in *Nov.*, 38, *proem.*
90. That decurions actually achieved illustrious offices is proved by *Cod. Just.*, X. xxxii. 61, 63, which cite individual cases, as well as by Zeno's reduction of the number of illustrious offices carrying exemption (ib. 64) and by Anastasius' law repealing Zeno's in so far as it was retrospective (ib., 66). The story of Valerian is told in *Theod., Nov.*, XV. 2. Even in Justinian's reign decurions were securing codicils of the illustrate (*Nov.*, 70).
91. For the hereditary tendency, see *Cod. Theod.*, VI. xxiv. 2 (365, *domesticis*), XXVII. 8 (396, *agentes in rebus*), *Cod. Just.*, XII. xix. 7 (444, *sacra scrinia*), II. vii. 11 (460, *advocati*).
92. Libanius is so averse from using technical terms that it is often difficult to see what he means. Examples of *ἀρχαί* (which means provincial governorships at least) are *Or.*, XLVIII. 11 and 13 (? proconsul of Asia). In *Or.*, XLVIII. 7, οὗτος ἐπιλήτης, καὶ σιωπᾶται· ἐκεῖνος φέρει τὰς τοῦ βασιλέως ἐντολάς, ἄπτεται δ' οὐδεὶς, he means

- presumably in the former clause not ordinary soldiers but some special corps like the *protectores*, in the latter certainly *agentes in rebus*. In *Or.*, XLIX. 19, *λοχῶν ἡγησαμένους ἀνθρώπους καὶ στρατιώταις ἐπιτάξαντας*, are clearly retired army-officers. See also *Or.*, XVIII. 135, which mentions *ἀγγελιαφόροι* (*agentes in rebus*) and *πευθῆνες* (*curiosi*), and 146, which records the escape of decurions *τῶν μὲν εἰς τὰ στρατιωτῶν τῶν δ' εἰς τὸ μέγα συνέδριον*; here *militia*, associated with the senate, must be *palatina*. For Berytus and Rome, see not only *Or.*, XLVIII. 22 seqq., XLIX. 27 seqq., but I. 214, XLIII. 4-5, LXII. 21-3.
93. Purchase of offices is lightly alluded to in *Or.*, XLVIII. 11 and of posts in the services in XXVIII. 22; references in the Code are countless. The attitude of the councils is the main theme of both XLVIII and XLIX. For the two excuses of the councils, see *Or.*, XLVIII. 8, XLIX. 15 seqq., 21 seqq. Corruption is suggested in XLVIII. 14-15, XLIX. 13; collusion in many passages, especially XLVIII. 28 seqq.; the reluctance of the leading councillors to readmit wealthier colleagues in XLVIII. 4, XLIX. 8-9. Libanius' analysis of the situation is borne out by several laws which threaten the councils with penalties unless they reclaim their former members, e.g., *Cod. Theod.*, VII. ii. 2, XII. i. 110 (385, PPO. It.), 113 (386, magg. mil.).
94. The difficulty of tracing decurions who took service in other provinces is stressed in *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 139 (394, PPO. Or.) and 161 (399, PPO. It.), where the penalty of confiscation is threatened.
95. Libanius states in his funeral oration for Julian (*Or.*, XVIII. 146) that after nearly all decurions had escaped into government service or the senate, the few who were left were reduced to beggary by their liturgies. The passage is obviously rhetorical, designed to throw Julian's reforms into relief. For strictly civic liturgies, see Part IV; a specific case of bankruptcy is cited by Libanius, *Or.*, LIV. 22, 45. For tax-collection, see Part II. Extortion by curial collectors is implied by *Cod. Theod.*, XII. vi. 22 (386, praef. aug.), i. 117 (387, PPO. Or.). An imaginary case of bankruptcy is depicted in Libanius, *Or.*, XLVII. 7-10. For remissions of arrears, see *Cod. Theod.*, XI. xxviii., Marc., Nov., ii; the curiae are often mentioned as beneficiaries in these laws, which were a regular routine—Procopius (*Hist. Arc.*, 23, §1) regards Justinian's refusal to remit arrears as gross oppression. For the ruin caused by the Persian war, see Libanius, *Or.*, XLIX. 2.
96. The nomination of outsiders is regarded as a normal procedure in *Cod. Just.*, XII. xxxiii. 2 (Diocletian), *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 10 (325, com. Or.), 13 (326, PPO. Or.), XVI. ii. 3, 6 (329, PPO. It.); I can find no later instances. SPECIAL ENROLMENT OF PLEBEIANS: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 53 (362, PPO. Or.), 96 (383, PPO. Or.), 133 (393, duc. et corr. lim. Trip.); it is noteworthy that Justinian did not think it worth while to reproduce the first half of this law, though he cites the second half in *Cod. Just.*, XII. lix. 4.
97. SONS OF VETERANS: *Cod. Theod.*, VII. xxii. 1 (313, corr. Luc.), 2 (318, vic. It.), XII. i. 18 (326, praet. praef.), 15 (327, pp. *Karthagine*), VII. xxii. 5 (333, PPO. Or.), XII. i. 32 (341), 35, VII. xxii. 4 (343, PPO. Or.), 7 (365, dat. *Beryti*), 11 (380, PPO. Ill.), XII. i. 83 (380, cons. Phoen.), 89 (382, PPO. It.); the curia of Edessa had the curious privilege of enrolling one son of the *princeps* of the provincial *officium*, *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 79 (375, PPO. Or.), 105 (384, PPO. Or.). For *oblatio curiae*, *vid. sup.*, note 88.
98. Unfair distribution of liturgies and emoluments is stressed by Libanius, *Or.*, xxxii. 8, XLIX. 8-9; cf. *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 140, 148 (399, PPO. It.), 173 (409, PPO. Or.).
99. For civic liturgies, see Part IV, for imperial, Part II. Leisure is frequently mentioned as the prerogative of the senatorial order, e.g., *Theod.*, Nov., xv. 1, and Libanius, *Or.*, XLIX. 5.

100. For extortion by curial collectors, *vid. sup.*, note 95. Their regular quasi-legal commission is mentioned in Maj., *Nov.*, vii, §16. The painful situation of the curia when ordered to collect a quite impossible sum is depicted by Theodoret, *Ep.*, 42 (Migne, *P.G.*, LXXXIII. 1217).
101. THE TOGA: Libanius, *Or.*, XXVIII. 23, Joh. Lydus, *de Mag.*, I. 28. PRIVILEGES IN THE PENAL LAW: *Cod. Just.*, II. xv. 2 (439, PPO. Or.), *Just.*, *Nov.*, 45 (537, PPO. Or.).
102. FLOGGING: *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 39 (349, cons. Syr.), 47 (359), 80 (380, praef. Aeg.), 85 (381, PPO. Or.), 117 (387, PPO. Or.), Libanius, *Or.*, XXVII. 13, 42, XXVIII. *passim* and especially 22, LIV. 51, cf. *Theod.*, *Nov.*, xv. 1 (439, Sen. Const.).
103. *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 66 (365, PPO. It.), 108 (384, PPO. Or.), *Cod. Just.*, XII. lvii. 13 (442, PPO. Or.), 14 (471, PPO. Or.). In *Cod. Theod.*, XVI. ii. 39 (408, PPO. It.) unfrocked priests are to be relegated either to the curiae or to one of the *corpora* according to their wealth and standing; this law was revived by Justinian (*Cod. Just.*, I. iii. 52).
104. For the earlier history of the *defensor*, see pp. 150-1. The appointment was transferred in the west as early as 409 (*Cod. Just.*, I. lv. 8) but it is doubtful if this law was ever enforced in the east, since it was not included in the Theodosian Code. ANASTASIUS' REFORMS: *Cod. Just.*, I. iv. 17 (*σιτώνης*), 19 (505, PPO. Or., *defensor*), cf. also *M.A.M.A.*, III. 197A, a constitution, probably of Anastasius, putting the election of the *ἐδικκος* and *ἐφορος* (the title is not mentioned elsewhere and may be equivalent to *curator*) in the hands of the bishop, clergy, and τῶν [ἐν πάσι τοῖς κτήτοροι] κ(αὶ) οἰκήτοροι λογάδων and warning the *principes τῆς κατὰ χώραν τάξεως* not to interfere.
105. JUSTINIAN'S REFORMS: *Just.*, *Nov.*, 15 (535, PPO. Or., *defensor*), 128, §16 (545, PPO. Or., *πατήρ, σιτώνης, &c.*). For the title *πατήρ* see *Cod. Just.*, XI. xxxiii. 2 (where it is substituted for *curator calendarii*), I. iv. 26, VIII. xii. 1, x. xxvii. 2, xxx. 4, XII. lxiii. 2, *Just.*, *Nov.*, 160 (civic finance); in *Cod. Just.*, x. xlv. 3, the *pater* is evidently a very senior magistrate, and in I. iv. 25-6, v. 12, 14, III. ii. 4, xliii. 1, VIII. li. 3, *Just.*, *Nov.*, 85, the *defensor* and *pater* are the chief magistrates of each city. In *C.I.G.*, 2746, *Milet*, 206, civic monuments are dated by the *pater*.
106. Joh. Lydus, *de Mag.*, I. 28, Evagrius, *H.E.*, III. 42.
107. Leo, *Const.*, xlvi.

NOTES ON PART IV

1. Paus., x. iv. 1.
2. ALEXANDRIAN νυκτερινὸς στρατηγός: Strabo, p. 797, cf. Bevan, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, p. 103; for the police functions of royal commandants, *vid. sup.*, pp. 104-7. 'Οροφύλακες of MILETUS AND HERACLEA: *Syll.*³, 633, xi. On the civic police of the Roman period the most recent study is Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, pp. 96-110. Νυκτοστράτηγοι: *Dig.*, L. iv. 18, §12, *I.G.R.*, IV. 860 (Laodicea), *C.I.G.*, 2930 (Tralles), 3948 (Attuda), *B.C.H.*, 1885, p. 347 (Sebastopolis), Robert, *op. cit.*, p. 322 (Tabae), Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 281-3 (Egypt). Νυκτοφύλακες: *Chr.*, I. 474 (list of posts, liturgic system), *P. Oxy.*, 2128 (pay implied); Libanius alludes to night-watchmen (φύλακες) at Antioch (*Or.*, xxxiii. 37).
3. Παραφύλακες: *I.G.R.*, III. 516 (Cadyanda), 640 (Arneae), 649 (Acalissus), 650, 653 (Idebessus), 834 (Iotape), IV. 524 (Dorylaeum), 739 (Eumeneia), 870 (Colossae), 1531 (Aeolis), *O.G.I.*, 485 (Magnesia ad Maeandrum), *M.A.M.A.*, IV. 152 (Apollonia of Pisidia), *Ath. Mitt.*, 1883, p. 328 (Tralles), *I.B.M.*, 579a, *Forsch. Eph.*, II. 53 (Ephesus), *B.C.H.*, 1883, p. 273 (Nysa), 1885, p. 76 (Aphrodisias), p. 347 (Sebastopolis), 1892, p. 432 (Ariassus); for their duties, see *O.G.I.*, 527, *M.A.M.A.*, IV. 297 (Hierapolis). 'Οροφύλακες: Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, pp. 106-8.

4. The literature on irenarchs is cited in *B.C.H.*, 1928, p. 408, note 3. They are most often mentioned in Asia Minor, e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 203, 208, 226, 407, 450, 452, 454-5, 782, 784, 830, 1458, IV. 130, 461, 585, 658, 740, 785, 870, 993, 1161, 1250, 1271, 1438, 1541, 1543, *C.I.G.*, 2768, but occur in the European Greek provinces, e.g., *I.G.R.*, I. 698 (Thrace), Collart, *Philippes*, p. 262 (Macedonia), *I.G.*, IX. II. 1077 (Thessaly), and in Syria, e.g., *S.E.G.*, VII. 138 (*ορπαρχὸς ἐν τῆς εἰρήνης*, cf. *I.G.R.*, IV. 1435), and in Egypt (Oertel, op. cit., pp. 283-4). DUTIES: *Dig.*, XLVIII. III. 6, L. IV. 18, §7, *Mart. Polycarpi*, VI, VII. APPOINTMENT: Aelius Arist., L. 72 (ed. Keil), *S.E.G.*, VII. 138. *Διαγμήται*: *B.C.H.*, 1928, p. 409, note 2 (literature), *S.E.G.*, VI. 688, 690., *M.A.M.A.*, III. 305, *I.G.R.*, IV. 580, *Mart. Polycarpi*, VI, VII. *Ἰμπαρχος*: *Mart. Pionii*, XV (as police officer with *διαγμήται*), cf. *I.G.R.*, IV. 1167, 1248, 1637; a real military hipparch is mentioned at Tabae in 43 B.C. (Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, p. 325), but these, who are of imperial date, are probably police officers. It may be noted that the various types of police cited might all exist in the same city at the same time, cf. *B.C.H.*, 1885, p. 347. PRISONS: Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 19-20.
5. *Ἀστυνόμοι*: *Syll.*³, 313, 375 (Athens), 645 (Cyzicus), *I.G.*, XII. I. 44, 55 (Rhodes), V. 872, 880-6 (Tenos), *I.G.R.*, III. 1332 (Bostra), IV. 239 (Hadrianeia), *C.I.G.*, 4019, 4026, 4069 (Ancyra), 4085 (Pessinus). ROADS: encroachments, *O.G.I.*, 483, lines 2-23, *Dig.*, XLIII. X. 1, §2; dimensions, *O.G.I.*, 483, lines 23-9; obstructions, *Dig.*, XLIII. X. 1, §4; tipping of rubbish, *ib.*, §5, *O.G.I.*, 483, lines 36-60; scavenging, *ib.*, lines 47-53, 78-89; maintenance, *ib.*, lines 29-35, *Dig.*, XLIII. X. 1, §3, cf. Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 32 for the use of public slaves.
6. On Hellenistic and Roman town-planning, see Haverfield, *Ancient Town-planning*, pp. 28-56, 135-6, von Gerkan, *Griechische Städteanlagen*; on the commodity of colonnades, Libanius, *Or.*, XI. 213-17. STREET LIGHTING: Amm. Marc., XIV. I. 9, Libanius, *Or.*, IX. 267, XXII. 6, XXXIII. 36-7.
7. DRAINS: Strabo, p. 646 (Smyrna), Jos., *Ant.*, XV. 340 (Caesarea), Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 98 (Amastris); cleaning by public slaves, *ib.*, 32; householders had to clean and maintain open gutters (*Dig.*, XLIII. X. 1, §3), which were prohibited at Pergamum (*O.G.I.*, 483, lines 60-78). LATRINES: *O.G.I.*, 483, line 220.
8. WELLS AND CISTERNS: supervision of, *O.G.I.*, 483, lines 190-219; sole supply, Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.*, II. I (p. 548). AQUEDUCTS: Jos., *Bell.*, I. 422, Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 37, 90, Philostratus, loc. cit., *I.G.R.*, III. 466, 804, 848, 1273, 1276, 1289, 1291, IV. 1411-12, 1505, *M.A.M.A.*, IV. 70, 333, Dessau, 337, *C.I.L.*, III. 6703. PUMPING AT ARSINOE: *P. Lond.*, III. p. 181; cf. *P. Oxy.*, 2128 (a payment from civic funds *ὑδρομαχόσις*). PUBLIC FOUNTAINS: *O.G.I.*, 483, lines 159-89 (care of), *Sardis*, VII. 17 (list of); Jos., *Bell.*, I. 422, *I.G.*, IV. 875, VII. 3099, *I.G.R.*, IV. 242, *S.E.G.*, VII. 866, *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 251. NYMPHAEA: *I.G.R.*, III. 811, 1273, *Klio*, X, p. 235; see *P.W.*, XVII. 1517-24. PRIVATE SUPPLY: *Chr.*, I. 193 (payments), Aelius Arist., XVII. 11 (ed. Keil), Libanius, *Or.*, XI. 246-7. For Alexandria, see Caesar, *B. Alex.*, 5. It may be noted that in *Chr.*, I. 193, the water account is only balanced by substantial contributions from magistrates. Some cities had a special magistrate or board in charge of the water-supply, e.g., Athens (*Syll.*³, 281), Pergamum (*Ath. Mitt.*, 1908, p. 410), Arsinoe (*Chr.*, I. 193); cf. *Dig.*, L. IV. 18, §6.
9. Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 33-4, *Vita Polycarpi*, xxviii, xxix.
10. ASTYNOMIC FUNCTIONS OF AGORANOMI: *Syll.*³, 313, cf. 284, *I.G.*, V. I. 497. MARKETS: plan, *P.W.*, XIV. 1869-76; rent of shops, *Chr.*, I. 296; charge for sites, *Syll.*³, 736, xx, 975; for the practice of putting stalls between columns, cf. Libanius, *Or.*, XI. 254, *S.E.G.*, IV. 539-40, *J.H.S.*, 1930, p. 274. For the interest of *agoranomi* in the fabric of market, see *C.I.G.*, 2930, *B.C.H.*, 1893, p. 279, Sterrett, *Wolfe Exp.*, 423. FIXING OF HOURS: *Syll.*³, 736, xx, cf. Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, p. 290. INSPECTION OF QUALITY: *Syll.*³, 736, xx, *I.G.*, XII. V. 129. WEIGHTS AND

MEASURES: *Syll.*³, 736, xx, 945, 975, *I.G.*², II-III. 1013, cf. *I.G.*, v. ii. 125, and, for the stamping of private weights, *B.C.H.*, 1934, pp. 506-11. CONTROL OF CURRENCY: *Syll.*³, 729.

11. CONTROL OF LABOUR MARKET: *I.G.*, XII. v. 129. CHEAPNESS: *Syll.*³, 946, *S.E.G.*, IV. 518, *Forsch. Eph.*, III. 10-16. PRICE FIXING: *I.G.R.*, IV. 146, 352, line 16, *Syll.*³, 736, xx.
12. DECLARATION BY IMPORTERS: *Syll.*³, 975. PROHIBITION OF MIDDLEMEN: *ib.*, and *I.G.*², II-III. 1103. UNDERSELLING: *B.C.H.*, 1887, pp. 306, 474, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 179, cf. Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, p. 347, note 3, for other examples of παραπωλείν and παραπιπράσκειν and pp. 546-8 for επενωπιόμος.
13. On the problem of the corn supply, see Francotte, 'Le pain à bon marché et le pain gratuit' in *Mélanges Nicole*, pp. 135-57. Σιτική παράθεσις: *Syll.*³, 344, §10, cf. *Inscr. Priene*, 108, lines 42, 68. At Samos a corn-buying fund of a different kind was established (*Syll.*³, 976). Here the interest only was to be used, and the corn purchased was to be distributed free. The document is of great interest as revealing clearly the political ideal behind all schemes of market control, that it was the duty of the city to provide subsistence for its members. But the project is, so far as I know, unique: Greek cities as a rule lacked the resources to carry through so ambitious an ideal, which even imperial Rome found a heavy burden on its finances. At Samos, it may be noted, the corn was normally to be bought locally from sacred land belonging to the city, and purchase money thus accrued to Hera and formed in effect a reserve fund for the state.
14. CHEAP SALES BY MERCHANTS: Michel, 216, 386, *Syll.*³, 304, 354, 640. CHEAP SALES OR GIFTS BY CITIZENS: *Inscr. Priene*, 108, lines 42 seqq., 57 seqq., 68 seqq., *I.G.*, IV. 944, v. ii. 515. Σιτανταί: *Syll.*³, 304, 493, 671B, 976, *S.E.G.*, I. 366, III. 710; εἰσφορὰι for raising the necessary funds are mentioned in *I.G.*, XII. v. 1011, *S.E.G.*, III. 710; for ἐμβόσις, see Kuenzi, 'Ἐμβόσις', pp. 20-1, 41-2, 76-8.
15. For the Delian *sitoniae*, see Larsen in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV. pp. 344-8. *Sitoniae* are very frequently mentioned in the Roman period, e.g., *Dig.*, XXVII. i. 6, §8, L. iv. 18, §5, *I.G.R.*, III. 833-4, 1013, IV. 130, 658, 740, 1167, 1228, 1248, 1273, 1290, 1543, 1572, 1637-8, *O.G.J.*, 485, *C.I.G.*, 2927, 2930, *I.G.*, III. 645, 708, IV. 609, v. i. 526, 551, XII. ix. 20, *S.E.G.*, II. 653, *Milet*, 263-4, *Inscr. Cos*, 108, 113; for the εὐθημάρχας of Egypt, see Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 339-43; the title is also found at Amastria (*I.G.R.*, III. 89) and an εὐθηνίας ἐπιμαλήτης at Corinth (*I.G.*, IV. 795). CORN LEVY: *Dig.*, L. iv. 18, §25, cf. *I.G.R.*, I. 766, line 40, πολεμικοῦ σελ[τ]ου [δὲ] εἰσφορίαν. CORN-BUYING FUNDS: *I.G.R.*, III. 1421-2 (with ταμίαι), IV. 580, 1632, *I.G.*, III. 645, 646 (with ταμίαι), 687, IV. 2, cf. IX. ii. 1029, 1093, σιτοταμιεύσας; rules for the administration of such a fund are given in the very obscure inscription, *I.G.*, v. i. 1379 and in *Dig.*, L. viii. 2, §§2-5, and suggest that it was normally self-supporting like the Delian (see Larsen, *loc. cit.*). LOSSES BY SITONAE: *I.G.R.*, IV. 1290, *O.G.J.*, 485, *B.C.H.*, 1887, p. 32, 1920, p. 93, Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, pp. 199-200. For the pressure brought on rich citizens in a shortage, see Dio Chrys., XLVI. Gifts and cheap sales of corn, and gifts and loans of money to buy corn are frequently recorded, e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 493, 796, IV. 580, 785, 870, 941, 1523, 1632, *I.G.*, III. 687, IV. 944, v. ii. 515, Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, pp. 343, 347; *agoranomi* still found it sometimes necessary to be generous, e.g., *I.G.*, IV. 2, 932, Demitzas, ἡ Μακεδονία, no. 248, *Klio*, x. 235.
16. IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL SUPPLY: *J.R.S.*, 1924, p. 180, Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.*, I. xv, *I.G.R.*, IV. 914, cf. the remarks of Gregory Nazianzen, *In laudem Basilii*, 34-5 (Migne, *P.G.*, XXXVI. 541-4). IMPORT FROM EGYPT: *C.I.G.*, 2927, 2930, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1883, p. 328, *Syll.*³, 839, *Forsch. Eph.*, III. 16, Head, *Hist. Num.*², 733; even Herod found it hard to get an export licence, *Jos., Ant.*, xv. 307.

17. BAKERS' STRIKE: *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 114. CIVIC MILLING: *Chr.*, I. 426. CIVIC BAKING: *P. Oxy.*, 2128; cf. *Sardis*, VII. 166, ἀροπαίου πολειτικοῦ, and *Dig.*, L. IV. 18, §12, 'pistrinorum curatores'.
18. On public doctors, see Pohl, *De Graecorum medicis publicis*, and Oehler, *Epigr. Beiträge zur Gesch. des Arztestandes*. NUMBERS: *Dig.*, XXVII. I. 6, §2. SALARIES: *ib.*, L. IX. 4, §2. POLICE FUNCTIONS: *P. Oslo.*, 95 (where other references are collected). TEACHING: *Mon. Linc.*, XXIII, p. 60, no. 48. COMPETITIONS: *Jahresh.*, 1905, pp. 128 seqq.
19. Baths are very frequently mentioned in the inscriptions, e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 66, 273, 507, 659, 679, 690, 700, 704, 739, XII, XIX, 833, IV. 257, 1378, 1440, *M.A.M.A.*, V. 6, *S.E.G.*, VI. 61, *I.G.*, V. II. 127. An admission charge is implied by *Inscr. Priene*, 112, lines 76-80, 113, lines 76-8, and *I.G.R.*, IV. 555, λούσαντα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων; cf. the anecdote in *Ath.*, VIII. 351 f. COST OF FUEL: *Dig.*, L. IV. 18, §5, *I.G.*, XII. V. 946. ATTENDANTS AND STOKERS: *P. Oxy.*, 1499, 1500 (wages), Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 32 (public slaves), *P. Gist.*, 50 (cloak-room attendant). FREE OIL IN THE BATHS: *Inscr. Priene*, loc. cit., *I.G.*, IV. 597, 602, 606, *S.E.G.*, IV. 301-2.
20. On the gymnasium, see Oehler in *P.W.*, VII. 2004-26. For the early gymnasia in Egypt, see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 309-11; in Jerusalem, 2 *Macc.*, IV. 9-14; in Tyana, *S.E.G.*, I. 466. NUMBERS OF GYMNASIA: Pergamum, *I.G.R.*, IV. 454; Thyateira, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1217, 1246, 1264, 1266-9; Salamis, *Wadd.*, 2756; Tralles, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1883, p. 318; Miletus, *Milet.*, 265; Iasus, *R.E.G.*, 1893, p. 175.
21. For gymnasium buildings the *locus classicus* is Vitruvius, V. 11; for modern discussions, see K. Schneider, *Die griechischen Gymnasien und Palästren*, pp. 88 seqq., Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, chap. XXII. For the Pergamene gymnasia, see Schazman, *Alt. von Pergamon*, VI, *Das Gymnasium*.
22. For a list of gymnasiarchs (now naturally incomplete but hardly worth completing), see Oehler, *P.W.*, VII. 1970-5; for hypogymnasiarchs, *ib.*, 1979-80; for gymnasiarchs of the several age groups, *vid. inf.*, notes 26, 30-1. Gymnasiarchs of several gymnasia are common, e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 783, IV. 446, 1269, *O.G.I.*, 472, *Milet.*, 265, *R.E.G.*, 1893, p. 175, *C.I.G.*, 2885. Additions to the fabric and fittings made by gymnasiarchs are listed in *P.W.* VII. 2019-24, Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, pp. 77-9. HEATING OF GYMNASIUM BATHS: Laum, *Stiftungen*, no. 62 (an endowment), *P. Oxy.*, 2127 (payment from public funds), *P. Lond.*, III, p. 104 (payment by a gymnasiarch), cf. *Chr.*, I. 150. GYMNASIUM STAFF: *I.G.*, V. II. 46-8, 50 (Tegea) cf. *I.G.*², II-III, 1960 seqq., for similar lists of attendants at Athens; the δημόσιοι of the gymnasium are mentioned in *Inscr. Priene*, 112, line 112 and *Ath. Mitt.*, 1907, p. 274, line 7.
23. OIL: supplied by the city, Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 23, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 116, 179, *Syll.*³, 691, *I.G.*, XII. IX. 236; supplied by endowments, Laum, *Stiftungen*, nos. 9, 11, 16, 25, 68, 71-2, 73a, 121-4, 136. 'Ελαιωνικά χρήματα: *I.G.R.*, III. 60, 68, 1423, Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, p. 316, cf. *Ath. Mitt.*, 1910, p. 417. 'Ελαιῶνας: *Dig.*, XXVII. I. 6, §8, L. IV. 18, §5, *I.G.*, XII. IX. 20, *I.G.*², II-III. 1100, *Inscr. Cos*, 108, 113, *R.E.G.*, 1906, pp. 208, 246, *B.C.H.*, 1887, p. 474. OIL LITURGY AT RHODES: *Syll.*³, 974. Gifts of oil by gymnasiarchs are very common, e.g., *O.G.I.*, 339, 622, 713, 764, *Syll.*³, 691, 714, *I.G.*, XII. III. 104, *Milet.*, 368, *Wadd.*, 496, 517, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 163, *I.G.R.*, III. 801-2, 804, IV. 182, 216, 454, 522, 555, 788, 1110, 1269, *Chr.*, I. 33. For the regular service of oil at a fixed hour, see Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge*, V. 45-7, and especially *Inscr. Priene*, 112, lines 57-61; in *Ath. Mitt.*, 1910, pp. 410, 468, two distributions, morning and evening, are recorded. For the rota of gymnasiarchs in Egypt, see *Chr.*, I. 151, *C. P. Herm.*, 57-65, *P. Oxy.*, 1413, lines 19-20. Αἰῶνας γυμνασιαρχίας: Laum, *Stiftungen*, I, p. 47.
24. On the educational system, see Ziebarth, *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen*². Παιδονόμοι: Forbes, *Greek Physical Education*, p. 229; that they supervised girls

- as well at Teos is proved by *Syll.*³, 578 and *O.G.I.*, 309. *Οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς εὐκοσμίας τῶν παρθένων*: *C.I.G.*, 3185 (Smyrna), *Inschr. Perg.*, 463, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1912, p. 277 (Pergamum); for the *γυναικονόμος* at Magnesia, see *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 98, line 20. EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS: Polyb., *xxxi.* 31 (Rhodes), *Syll.*³, 672 (Delphi), 577 (Miletus), 578 (Teos). Teachers (*διδάσκαλοι*, *παιδευταί*) of the boys are mentioned in connexion with the *παιδονόμοι* elsewhere, e.g., *C.I.G.*, 3185 (Smyrna), *I.G.*, vii. 1861 (Thespieae), *Inschr. Priene*, 114 (Priene), Michel, 544 (Themisonium), *C.I.L.*, iii. 14195⁹ (Ephesus), but there is no proof that these were state employees.
25. SCHOOL COMPETITIONS: *C.I.G.*, 3088 (Teos), *Syll.*³, 959 (Chios), 960 (Magnaesia), *I.G.*, xii. ix. 952 (Chalcis; athletic only), *Ath. Mitt.*, 1912, p. 277 (Pergamum; girls); these are prize lists, and there are many other allusions to such competitions, e.g., *Inschr. Priene*, 114 (Priene), *Syll.*³, 1028 (Cos), *I.G.*, xii. vii. 515 (Aegiale), *R.E.G.*, 1893, p. 168 (Iasus), Lanckoroński, *Städte Pamphyliens*, ii. 34 (Termessus). *Ἀποδείξεις* OF MASTERS: *Syll.*³, 577-8, 1028, *Inschr. Priene*, 113, line 30.
26. Under the principate *παιδονόμοι* are recorded at Nicomedia (*I.G.R.*, iii. 7), Pergamum (*I.G.R.*, iv. 318), Cyzicus (ib., 145), Colophon (ib., 1587), Ephesus (*I.B.M.*, 481, lines 170, 174), Miletus (*Milet.*, 265), Iasus (*R.E.G.*, 1893, p. 168), Stratonicea (Wadd., 519), Termessus (Lanckoroński, op. cit., ii. 34, 44), Pessinus (*Ath. Mitt.*, 1900, p. 441); *γυμνασιάρχαι παιδῶν* at Attaleia (*I.G.R.*, iii. 777, 783) and Lapethus (ib., 933). It may be noted that there is no trace of public education for boys in the Egyptian metropoleis, though the ephebate was universal. For the Athenian ephebate, see *P.W.*, v. 2737-41, Forbes, *Greek Physical Education*, pp. 109-78; for the ephebate elsewhere, *P.W.*, v. 2741-6, Forbes, op. cit., pp. 179-257. EARLY EPHEBATE: in Egypt, *O.G.I.*, 176, 178, cf. *SB.*, 1569, 7246, (*κομμηταί*); at Jerusalem, 2 *Macc.*, iv. 9-14. LATE DEVELOPMENT IN PONTUS: *I.G.R.*, iii. 1446. LATE SURVIVAL IN EGYPT: *P. Oxy.*, 42.
27. *Ἐφήβαρχοι*: *P.W.*, v. 2735-6. *Κομμηταί* (outside Athens): Dessau, 8867 (Nicaea), *B.C.H.*, 1891, p. 481 (Cius), Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 329-32 (Egypt). For the history of the Athenian ephebate, *vid. sup.*, note 26. AGE OF ADMISSION IN EGYPT: Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 141. LENGTH OF SERVICE: *Syll.*³, 959 (Chios; three years?), *B.C.H.*, 1887, p. 86 (Apollonis; two years). EXPENSES: uniforms, *Syll.*³, 870, Philostr., *Vit. Soph.*, ii. i. 550; lectures, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1908, p. 380; library, *I.G.*², ii-iii. 1009, 1029-30, 1041, 1043; dedications are regularly listed in the Athenian ephebic inscriptions; note also the payments made by incoming ephebes to the gerusia in *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 116. Athenian cosmetes are often praised for keeping down expenses, and persuading richer ephebes to pay for the poorer (*I.G.*², ii-iii. 1028, 1039, 1043). At Apollonis generous magistrates paid the whole expenses of the course (*B.C.H.*, 1887, p. 86, Keil and Premierstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, liii, no. 96). For the hereditary ephebate of Egypt, see Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 140-1.
28. CORESUS: *Syll.*³, 958. PUBLIC INSTRUCTORS: Athens, Arist., *Ἄθ. Πολ.*, 42, §2 and the ephebic inscriptions, *passim*; Teos, *Syll.*³, 578; Pergamum, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1907, p. 279, 1910, p. 417. INSTRUCTORS PROVIDED BY GYMNASIARCHS: Pergamum, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1907, p. 279, 1908, p. 376; Eretria, *Syll.*³, 714, *I.G.*, xii. ix. 235; Priene, *Inschr. Priene*, 112, line 73. Other ephebic instructors are mentioned at Priene (op. cit., 112, line 112, 113, lines 26-31), and also at Themisonium (Michel, 544), Smyrna (*C.I.G.*, 3185) and Mylasa (*Sb. Ak. Wien*, cxxxii. ii, p. 12) but their status is uncertain. LECTURES (*ἀκροάσεις*): Pergamum, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1908 p. 380, 1910, p. 404; Sestus, *O.G.I.*, 339, line 75; cf. Ziebarth, op. cit., pp. 122-3, for touring professors. At Athens attendance at the lectures of the philosophers is recorded in *I.G.*², ii-iii. 1006, 1011, 1028-30; grammarians and rhetoricians are also mentioned in 1039-43, as well as extra *ἀκροάσεις*. GYMNASIUM LIBRARIES:

Athens, *vid. sup.*, note 27; also Wadd., 1618, [Dio Chrys.], xxxvii. 8, Maiuri, *Nuov. Sill. Rodi e Cos*, 4, cf. 11, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1908, pp. 384, 409, cf. Poland, *Öffentliche Bibliotheken in Griechenland und Kleinasien*.

29. EPHEBIC GAMES: prize lists, Michel, 896, 898-900; prizes for *εὐεμία*, *εὐραβία* and *φιλοπονία* are recorded in Michel, 900 (Samos) and *O.G.I.*, 339 (Sestus); contests are frequently mentioned elsewhere, e.g., *Syll.*³, 958, 1028, and the Athenian ephebic inscriptions, *passim*. For extra prizes offered by gymnasiarchs, see *Syll.*³, 714, *O.G.I.*, 339, lines 78 seqq., 764; for intellectual prowess, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1908, p. 376, *Inschr. Priene*, 112, lines 80-4, 113, lines 28-31. ENDOWMENT OF EPHEBIC GAMES: *P. Oxy.*, 705. EPHEBIC CONTEST IN A.D. 323: *P. Oxy.*, 42. PROFESSORS UNDER THE PRINCIPATE: *Dig.*, xxvii. i. 6, §2 (numbers), l. ix. 4, §2 (salaries). On the 'universities' of the empire, see Herzog, *Sb. Ak. Berlin*, 1935, pp. 967 seqq., esp. 1001-9. MUSEUMS: *Forsch. Eph.*, II. 65, III. 68, *Jahresh.*, 1905, pp. 128-38 (Ephesus), *I.G.R.*, IV. 618 (Smyrna); those of Alexandria and Athens (*Hesperia*, III. 191-6), being subsidized and controlled by the central government, do not concern this work.
30. On the *νέοι*, see Forbes, *Νέοι* (list of gymnasiarchs on pp. 6-10). ENDOWMENTS: *R.E.G.*, 1893, p. 159 (Iasus; for oil), *O.G.I.*, 748 (Cyzicus; for oil), *I.G.R.*, IV. 1302 (Cyme; a bath and fund for upkeep), *B.C.H.*, 1935, p. 514 (Pharsalus; for oil and games). ALLOWANCES FROM CIVIC FUNDS: *Jahresh.*, 1898, p. 180, cf. also *Ath. Mitt.*, 1910, p. 417. *Ταμίαι*: *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, 1897, p. 28, no. 28, *I.G.R.*, IV. 657. *Διοικηταί*: *R.E.G.*, 1893, p. 161. *Λογιστής*: *I.G.R.*, IV. 1678. *Γραμματεῖς*: *I.G.R.*, IV. 350, Wadd., 1602a, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1895, p. 243. GAMES: *Syll.*³, 959, 1062, *I.G.*, XII. ix. 952.
31. For a list of *γερονταί*, see Poland, *Gesch. griech. Vereinesens*, pp. 577-87 (gymnasiarchs on p. 401). Their character has long been hotly disputed; the latest contribution is by Turner in *Archiv Pap.*, XII. 179-86, where the previous literature is cited (p. 181, note 2). In view of their close connexion with the gymnasium, I cannot but regard them as primarily social societies, like those of the *νέοι*, though being both senior and more select they no doubt had some political influence. GRANT FROM PUBLIC FUNDS: *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 116, cf. *Ath. Mitt.*, 1910, p. 417. ENDOWMENTS: Laum, *Stiftungen*, nos. 73a, 85-6, 92, 108, 113, 120, 122, 183, 185, 187-8, 190, 202; cf. *Forsch. Eph.*, II. 20, *ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν τῆς γεροντίας χρημάτων*, *R.E.G.*, 1893, p. 167, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1572, *γεροντιακοῖς χρήμασι* and *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 116; among the many curious sources of revenue here recorded are the rents in kind of various estates, presumably endowments, and also what seem to be taxes, perhaps made over to the support of the gerusia by the city. *Ταμίαι*: *I.G.R.*, I. 729, III. 516, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1900, p. 122. *Διοικηταί*: *R.E.G.*, 1893, pp. 170, 172. *Λογισταί*: *I.G.R.*, III. 65, IV. 652. EXTERNAL AUDITOR AT EPHEBUS: *O.G.I.*, 508 (completed in *Forsch. Eph.*, II. 23), cf. *Syll.*³, 833. *Γραμματεῖς*: *C.I.G.*, 3429, 3462, 3749, *O.G.I.*, 479, *I.G.R.*, III. 707, *I.B.M.*, 483, 577, 587. FOUNDATION OF THE GERUSIA OF SIDYMA: *T.A.M.*, II. 175 (decree), 176 (list of members); cf. Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, p. 602 for a similar list at Sebaste. Limited numbers are also suggested by *P.S.I.*, 1240. On the other hand, the members of the gerusia of Istria, refounded under Hadrian (*S.E.G.*, I. 330), do not total to a round number. RULES OF ELECTION AT PERGAMUM: *Ath. Mitt.*, 1907, pp. 294-5, 298-9 (neither inscription mentions the gerusia); cf. the similar rules of *ἡ ἐπὶ γεροντία τοῦ Σωτήρος Ἀσκληπίου* at Hyettus, *Syll.*³, 1112. These inscriptions make no allusion to age, but in Egyptian documents (*Archiv Pap.*, XII. 179, *P.S.I.*, 1240) candidates state their age. Gerusiae figure quite commonly in honorific decrees, e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 557-9, 561-2, 679, 704 II B, 801, 1505, IV. 642, 827, 1127, but so do the *νέοι* also sometimes, e.g., *I.G.R.*, IV. 657, 818. The gerusia of Ephesus was interested in the cult of Artemis (*I.B.M.*, 449, 470); other religious gerusiae include that mentioned above of Hyettus and the Athenian *ἐπὶ γεροντία* which was connected

- with the Eleusinian mysteries (*I.G.*, III. 702, *Syll.*³, 872); at Messene too the gerusia is interested in the Andanian mysteries (*Syll.*³, 736, xi). These gerusiae may have been institutions of a quite different origin and character from the normal social club, but it is significant that the Ephesian gerusia had its gymnasiarch (*I.B.M.*, 587, *Jahresh.*, 1915, Beiblatt, 281).
32. On private cult societies, see Poland, *Gesch. griech. Vereinwesens*, pp. 173-270. THE EGYPTIAN TEMPLES: Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 128-9. TEMPLES OF ASIA MINOR: Strabo, pp. 559-60 (Zela), 567 (Pessinus), 577 (Antioch of Pisidia); cf. *O.G.I.*, 540-1, for the compromise at Pessinus, and Dessau, 7200, for municipal control at Antioch. TEMPLES OF SYRIA: Herodian, v. 3 (hereditary priesthood); cf. *I.G.R.*, III. 1020, where a temple apparently independent under the Seleucids is subject to a city under Augustus.
33. For the various types of priesthoods in the Greek cities, *vid. sup.*, p. 162. PRIVILEGES OF PRIESTS: immunity, *Syll.*³, 1003, 1007, 1018, *I.G.*, v. ii. 515; perquisites, *Syll.*³, 1002-3, 1006-7, 1009-10, 1013, 1015-18, 1037; salaries, *Milet.*, 147, lines 18-21, 203, *S.E.G.*, IV. 706; cf. the *πρόσοδοι* attached to some posts, e.g., *Syll.*³, 1009, 1011, 1018. For the sale of sacrificial meat, see *Acts*, xv. 29, xxi. 25, 1 *Cor.*, viii, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 96, §10.
34. *ἱερογραμμαῖαι*: *I.G.R.*, IV. 571, 1086, 1129, *S.E.G.*, II. 829-32, cf. *Syll.*³, 633, line 20, *O.G.I.*, 473, for *γραμμαῖαι παρεδρεύοντες* (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ), *I.G.R.*, III. 605, 714, for *γραμμαῖαι τῶν παρρώων θεῶν* (τῶν Σεβαστῶν), and Dessau, 7200, for *curator arcae sanctuarii*. *Νεωποιοί*: *P.W.*, XVI. 2433-9. For the administration of sacred funds, the accounts of the *ἱεροποιοί* of Delos (see Larsen in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV. 334 seqq.) are typical. For the incomes enjoyed by native priests, see Strabo, pp. 535 (Comana Capp.), 537 (Venasa), 557 (Cabeira), 559 (Zela), 567 (Pessinus), cf. *Plut.*, *Cat. Min.*, 35 (Paphus). For the Ephesian scandal, see Dörner, *Der Erlass des Statthalters von Asien Paullus Fabius Persicus*, p. 38, col. iv. 1-vi. 13.
35. COMMISSIONERS FOR FESTIVALS: *ἐπιμεληταὶ μυστηρίων*, *Syll.*³, 384, 540, 736; *πανηγυριάρχαι*, *O.G.I.*, 485, *I.G.R.*, III. 916, 1545, IV. 143, 493, 555, 584, 993, 1248, 1525, 1541, 1637, 1640, *S.E.G.*, II. 653. CIVIC PROCESSIONS: *Syll.*³, 589, 695, 885, *I.G.R.*, IV. 292. CHOIRS OF BOYS, ETC.: *Syll.*³, 450, 695, *O.G.I.*, 309, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1587, *Wadd.*, 519. PROFESSIONAL CHOIRS: *I.B.M.*, 481, lines 192-3, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1665 (of Artemis), *Jahresh.*, 1908, pp. 101 seqq. (of Rome and Augustus); on the latter, note especially Dörner, *op. cit.*, p. 39, col. viii. 4 seqq. (suppression of the paid choir at Ephesus), and *I.G.R.*, IV. 353 (the rules of the Pergamene choir).
36. FESTIVAL OF THE SYRIAN GODDESS: Lucian, *de Syria Dea*, 49 seqq. INVITATIONS BY STRATONICEA: *S.E.G.*, IV. 247-61. INITIATION FEES: *Syll.*³, 736, xi, cf. 800. ARRANGEMENTS AT ANDANIA: *Syll.*³, 736.
37. GENEROSITY OF PRIESTS: refuse allowance for sacrifices, *Syll.*³, 384, 540, *Sardis*, VII. 52, *S.E.G.*, II. 717; buildings, *I.G.R.*, III. 364-5, 1355, IV. 1533, *S.E.G.*, IV. 268 seqq.; remit subscriptions, *Syll.*³, 1045-6; distributions, entertainments, &c., *I.G.R.*, I. 1453, III. 115, 382, 500, III. 631, 780, IV. 175, 225, 555, 1632, and *S.E.G.*, IV. 301 seqq.
38. For the games of the boys, ephebes, &c., *vid. sup.*, notes 25, 29. GAMES LIMITED TO CITIZENS: Paus., III. xiv. 1, *C.I.G.*, 2758, *I.G.R.*, III. 382, 411-14.
39. DIONYSIAC ARTISTS: societies, Poland, *Gesch. griech. Vereinwesens*, pp. 129-47, *P.W.*, VA, 2473 seqq.; pay, *S.E.G.*, I. 362, *I.G.*, IX. i. 694, XII. ix. 207, *S.E.G.*, IV. 303, 306, 308, *Syll.*³, 1077, cf. 489, 690, *Rev. Arch.*, 1929 (XXIX), p. 85. ATHLETES: societies, Poland, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-50; social status, *Rev. Arch.*, 1934 (LIII), pp. 55-8, cf. also *I.G.R.*, I. 381, III. 500, 623, 625-6, IV. 844, 1344, for athletes of aristo-

- cratic family; many of course were councillors (e.g., *I.G.R.*, I. 153, III. 370, 1371, IV. 855, 1419, 1761) and not always merely honorary councillors (e.g., *I.G.R.*, IV. 460).
40. For the contrast of *ἱεροί* with *θεμαῖται*, *ταλαντιαῖοι*, *ἡμεταλαντιαῖοι ἀγῶνες*, cf. *I.G.R.*, I. 444, *C.I.G.*, 1720, 2810, Wadd., 1620b; the contrast is implicit in many other inscriptions (e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 1012, IV. 161, 1432, 1442, *I.G.*, III. 128, *I.B.M.*, 605, *Inscr. Ol.*, 237) where a catalogue of sacred games is followed by a total of prize games. ENDOWMENTS OF PRIZE GAMES: Laum, *Stiftungen*, I, 32, 63, 101, 103, 118-19, 134-5, 138, 141-2, 143a, 145-9, 151-61, 163, 165-8, 170-2, 179, 192, 194-5, 208. GAMES AT AMBRYSSUS: *I.G.*, IX. i. 12 (= Laum, 32); contrast the scale of the prizes at Aphrodisias (*C.I.G.*, 2758-9). FOOT-HUNTING: *I.G.R.*, I. 444 (127 prizes), IV. 1442 (over 100), *Inscr. Ol.*, 237 (250 prizes).
41. The *locus classicus* for the establishment of a *ἱερὸς στεφανίτης ἀγών* is *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 16 seqq.; cf. also *Syll.*³, 390, 402, 457, 590, 629. Most of these inscriptions mention the honours paid to victors in general terms; *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 85 specifies their *σπηρέσια*, for which see also *Milet*, 147, lines 18-21, *B.C.H.*, 1879, pp. 467-8; for the immunity of *ἱερονίκα*, *vid. sup.*, p. 185. For the technical meaning of *εἰσελαύνειν*, see Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 118-19; *ἱερὸς εἰσελαστικός ἀγών* is the usual formula in the Roman period, e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 370, IV. 336, 460, 858, 1519, *C.I.G.*, 2932, 3426, though *ἱερὸς στεφανίτης* is still found, e.g., *I.G.R.*, IV. 496, *I.G.*, V. i. 668.
42. IMPERIAL GRANT OF ISELASTIC GAMES: Pliny, *Ep.*, X. 118-19, cf. *I.G.R.*, IV. 336, 1251, 1431, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 180. PENSIONS OF VICTORS (Roman period): Pliny, *loc. cit.*, Cassius Dio, LII. 30, §§4-6, *Chr.*, I. 157; I know of no evidence save for athletic victors. For the grant of prizes in later sacred games, cf. *Inscr. Ol.*, 56, line 12; it is implied in Cassius Dio, *loc. cit.* For the number and titles of the later sacred games I must refer the reader to the relevant indices of *C.I.G.*, *I.G.*, *I.G.R.*, and Head, *Hist. Num.*²; for Pythian and Olympic games, see also Krause, *Olympia* and *Die Pythien Nemeen und Isthmien*. The increase in their number is well illustrated by *I.G.R.*, IV. 1519 (early third century), where many games are qualified as *νῦν ἱερός*.
43. ATHLETIC EVENTS: *I.G.*, VII. 414, 416-17, 420, 1764-5, 1772, IX. i. 12, IX. ii. 525-34, *C.I.G.*, 2758, *S.E.G.*, III. 335-6, 367. For a grandiose stadium, cf. *I.G.R.*, IV. 845, 861, τὸ στάδιον ἀμφιθέατρον λευκόλιθον, Philostr., *Vit. Soph.*, II. i, p. 550.
44. MUSICAL EVENTS: *C.I.G.*, 2758-9, *I.G.*, VII. 414, 416-20, 540-3, 1760-3, 1773, 1776, 2727, 3195-7, XII. IX. 91 seqq., *S.E.G.*, III. 334, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 88, *B.C.H.*, 1895, pp. 321-66; on the development of the mime, see *P.W.*, XV. 1738-61. There is a striking example of a free-standing theatre at Bostra (Brünnow and Domaszewski, *Die Prov. Arabia*, III, pp. 47 seqq.). For an odeum, cf. *I.G.R.*, III. 1235, τοῦ θεατροειδοῦς ὕψελου.
45. Annual games are not often mentioned (e.g., *I.G.R.*, IV. 144, *S.E.G.*, VII. 825), nor are biennial (properly *τριετηρικός*, *I.G.R.*, IV. 292-3, sometimes *διετηρικός*, *ib.* 850). Quadrennial (*πενταετηρικός*) are very common, e.g., *I.G.R.*, I. 445-6, III. 61, 67, 319, 411-14, 487, 780, 798, 804, 1422-3, IV. 160, 297, 579, 584, 654, 858, 1568. *Ἀγωνοθέται*: method of appointment, *vid. sup.*, p. 175; enrol competitors, *Inscr. Ol.*, 56, line 18; attended by *μαστιγοφόροι*, *Dig.*, L. IV. 18, §17, *S.E.G.*, II. 704, *Inscr. Ol.*, 56, line 51, Libanius, *Or.*, X. 4; umpire contests, *I.G.*, XII. IX. 207, *Syll.*³, 1076-7; award prizes, *S.E.G.*, VII. 825. HELLENODICAE: *I.G.R.*, I. 444 (Ephesus and Smyrna), *I.G.*, IV. 932, 946 (Epidaurus), Libanius, *Or.*, X. 15, XI. 269 (Antioch). For entertainments by agonothetes, see *Inscr. Priene*, III, lines 167 seqq., *I.G.*, VII. 2712, lines 55 seqq., and especially *S.E.G.*, VII. 825; cf. also *I.B.M.*, 618, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1568 (extra prizes), *S.E.G.*, VI. 59 (lavish expenditure).

46. For the tenure of eponymous magistracies by gods, *vid. sup.*, pp. 167, 184; for their endowment, Laum, *Stiftungen*, I. 48; entertainments, &c., *Inschr. Priene*, 108, lines 254 seqq., 109, lines 190 seqq., 111, lines 238 seqq., 113, lines 36 seqq., 114, lines 23 seqq., cf. also *Milet*, 134, *I.G.*, XII. v. 597, 602, 659 seqq., *I.G.R.*, III. 800-2. ENTERTAINMENTS ON DOMESTIC OCCASIONS: Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 116-17, cf. *Inschr. Priene*, 109, lines 162-70, *I.G.*, XII. v. 863-5.
47. For the use of the theatre for assemblies, see Cic., *pro Flacco*, 16, *Acts*, xix. 29, Dio Chrys., VII. 24, XL. 6, Tac., *Hist.* II. 80.
48. *Τειχοποικία*: *Syll.*³, 368. ENDOWMENTS FOR BUILDING: Laum, *Stiftungen*, 46, 62, 67, 77, 98, 108, 168. For the architectural aspect of the city-foundations of the Hellenistic kings there is little explicit evidence, but the regular plans of such cities as Nicaea, Smyrnia, Antioch, or Alexandria suggest that they were at least laid out by their royal founders; detailed accounts are given of Herod's buildings at Sebaste (Jos., *Ant.*, xv. 296-8, *Bell.*, I. 403) and Caesarea (*Ant.*, xv. 331-41, *Bell.*, I. 408-15). For the emperors also there is little explicit evidence; *Chron. Pasch.*, I. 474 (ed. Bonn) enumerates Hadrian's buildings at Aelia, and Antiochopolis was clearly set out on one plan. For buildings given by Hellenistic kings to existing cities, see Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, p. 85, notes 1 and 2; for Herod, see Jos., *Bell.*, I. 422-5; also for Agrippa I and II, *Ant.*, XIX. 335, XX. 211-12; for Herodes Atticus, Philostr., *Vit. Soph.*, II. i. 550-1; for Opramoas, *I.G.R.*, III. 739. Examples of buildings presented by emperors are *Syll.*³, 839, *I.G.R.*, I. 712, III. 1472, IV. 121, 202, 902, 1505, *C.I.L.*, III. 6703, 14195⁴³, *Année Épigr.*, 1912, 216, Paus., I. xviii. 9, xlii. 5, II. iii. 5, VIII. x. 2, X. xxxv. 4, 6.
49. BUILDING FUNDS: by transfer of revenues, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 23; from unallocated revenues, *ib.*, 39; from arrears recovered, *ib.*, 23, 90, 98, cf. *I.G.R.*, III. 729, *T.A.M.*, II. 396, 651, *S.E.G.*, VI. 811, *Forsch. Eph.*, II. 40; by loan, *O.G.I.*, 46, *Syll.*³, 544; by levy, *Inschr. Priene*, 108, lines 75-9, *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 92, but Trajan forbade an *intributio* at Prusa (Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 24).
50. Gifts of buildings by individuals are too numerous to be worth collecting; for bequests, see for example, *I.G.R.*, III. 402, 468, 848, IV. 1422, 1572, *Syll.*³, 841, *T.A.M.*, II. 179, *Forsch. Eph.*, II. 41-2, 61, III. 9, *Année Épigr.*, 1935, 96. LISTS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS AND PROMISES: *I.G.*², II-III. 2329-37, *I.G.*, V. ii. 440-1, VII. 42, 3077, 3191-2, XII. v. 185-6, 1019, 1082, IX. 1189, *G.D.I.*, 3722, 4262, *I.G.R.*, IV. 501 (cf. 447, 461), 1418 (cf. *C.I.G.*, 3140-3), 1431, *T.A.M.*, II. 550-1, *S.E.G.*, I. 367, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1890, p. 261, 1911, p. 281, *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 118, Kraeling, *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis*, pp. 373-8, nos. 2-6. On the law of promises, see *Dig.*, L. xii. 1, 3-4, 6-9, 11-14, cf. Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 39-40, Dio Chrys., XLVII. 19. Many inscriptions record gifts of parts of buildings, e.g., *C.I.G.*, 2748, 2751-3, Wadd., 589-90, 1587, 1591, *R.E.G.*, 1906, pp. 220-5 (columns and architraves at Aphrodisias), Wadd., 313-18, *B.C.H.*, 1881, p. 99 (the same at Mylasa); such gifts are often stated to be *ἐξ υποχρέσεως* or *ἐξ επαγγελίας*, e.g., *S.E.G.*, II. 410. For gifts in consideration of office, *vid. inf.*, note 70. Interesting records of the procedure of promises are *Syll.*³, 852, *I.G.*, IV. 203, V. ii. 456, 515, XII. vii. 50.
51. On the duties of commissioners of works, see *Dig.*, L. x. 1-2, Dio Chrys., XL. 7-9, Plut., *Praec. reip. ger.*, 15, *Chr.*, I. 34, 194-5, cf. also 48, 196-7, *C.P. Herm.*, 82-5. On the system of contracting, see Buckler in *Anatolian Studies presented to Sir William Ramsay*, pp. 33 seqq. OFFICIAL ARCHITECTS: *Syll.*³, 577, vii, 581, xxi, 679, 725, 736, xviii, xxiv, 969, vii, 971-2, 1185.
52. For *γραμματεῖς*, see *P.W.*, VII. 1710-40 (Athens), 1747-70 (other cities); for Rhodes, see *Syll.*³, 619. On their duties *I.G.*, V. i. 1432, XII. v. 721, *Inschr. Priene*, 112, lines 21 seqq., 113, lines 15 seqq., 114, lines 8 seqq., are illuminating; cf. Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, pp. 229 seqq. for the publication of documents. PUBLIC SLAVES AS CLERKS: *I.G.*², II-III, 463, line 28, 583, XII. i. 31, 701, Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, p. 454.

53. LONG TENURE OF OFFICE: *Inschr. Priene*, 4. LATER IMPORTANCE OF CLERK: *Acts*, xix. 35, and numerous decrees, e.g., *Syll.*³, 742, 807, 867, *O.G.I.*, 493, *I.G.R.*, III. 582, IV. 145, 1756, XII. Wadd., 519-20, 1604, 1611, *Inschr. Ol.*, 53, *B.C.H.*, 1885, p. 127. CLERKSHIP COMBINED WITH PRIESTHOOD: *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 169-71, 184-7, 193. For Zosimus, see the Priene inscriptions cited in note 52.
54. *Πολιτογράφοι*: *I.G.R.*, III. 63, 65, 67, 69, 179, 204. *Νομογράφοι*: *Syll.*³, 559, 1051, *I.G.*, v. ii. 24, 433. *Νομοφύλακες*: *C.I.G.*, 3794, *I.G.*, v. i. 78-91, ii. 367, IX. i. 694,* ii. 1108-9, *O.G.I.*, 483,* *Syll.*³, 282, *I.G.R.*, IV. 116, 860, 870, 1167, 1558*, 1637, *S.E.G.*, IX. 131-2; consult the starred numbers for the duties of the board, for which see also Cic., *de Legibus*, III. 46.
55. For the registration of private deeds, see Weiss, *Griech. Privatrecht*, 355-425; the *locus classicus* on the practice is Dio Chrys., XXXI. 51. SCALES OF FEES: *B.C.H.*, 1926, p. 226, *Jahresh.*, 1915, Beiblatt, 286-306. KEEPERS OF ARCHIVES: *ἀγορανόμοι* in Egypt, Mitteis, *Grundzüge*, pp. 58-65; *ἀστυνόμοι* at Tenos, *I.G.*, XII. v. 872; *χρεοφύλακες*, *I.G.R.*, IV. 555, 580, 585, 657, 801, 820, 1638, *I.G.*, IX. i. 375-6; *γραμματοφύλακες*, *C.I.G.*, 3191, 3201; *ἀποδοχεῖς τῶν ἀρχείων*, &c., *I.G.R.*, IV. 1228, 1248, *S.E.G.*, II. 653. THE RECORD OFFICE: *Jahresh.*, 1933, p. 57.
56. On the financial system of the Greek cities, see Francotte, *Les finances des cités grecques*, pp. 129-56. *Ἐπι τῆς διοικήσεως*: Athens, Swoboda, *Gr. Staatskunde*, II. 1149-50; Priene, *Inschr. Priene*, 4, 14, 33, 87. *Ἐπι τῶν προσόδων*: *I.G.R.*, IV. 860, 862. *Στρόταγος ἐπι τῶν πόρων*: *ib.*, 1531. *Ἀνατάκται*: *Syll.*³, 577, II. 633, XII. *O.G.I.*, 213, *Milet*, 147. *Ἀποδέκται*: *I.G.R.*, IV. 1248 (Thyateira), *S.E.G.*, II. 653 (Smyrna). *Οἰκονόμοι*: *Inschr. Priene*, 6, 18, 83, 108-9, 115, 117, 119, 174 (Priene), *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 12, 89, 94, 99, 101, *Syll.*³, 589, 695 (Magnesia), 352 (Ephesus), *I.G.*, v. ii. 389 (Lusi); in the Roman period, *C.I.G.*, 2717 (Stratonicea), 2811 (Aphrodisias), 3162, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1435 (Smyrna), 813 (Hierapolis), 1630 (Philadelpheia). Other *οἰκονόμοι* of the Roman period are public slaves, equivalent to the Latin *actor publicus*, e.g., *Syll.*³, 1231, 1252, *C.I.G.*, 3793. For the imperial *curatores*, *vid. sup.*, pp. 136 seqq.
57. For *ταμίαι*, see *P.W.*, IV. 2105-34. PUBLIC BANKS: *Syll.*³, 577, II. *Milet*, 37f, 141, 143-7 (Miletus), *C.I.G.*, 3641b (Lampsacus), 3679 (Cyzicus), *I.G.*, XII. v. 880-6 (Tenos), Michel, 731 (Ilium), *I.G.R.*, IV. 1558 (Abdera), Cic., *pro Flacco*, 44 (Ternus). ALLOCATIONS: *εἰς τὰ κατὰ ψηφίσματα*, *I.G.*², II-III. 330, 338, 343-4, 347, 351, 360, 368, &c.; *εἰς τὰς θυσίας*, *O.G.I.*, 493, *B.C.H.*, 1913, p. 123; *εἰς τὰς πρεσβείας*, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1558. VOTES FOR MAGISTRATES: *I.G.R.*, IV. 788, 790, cf. Dörner, *Der Erlass des Statthalters von Asia Paullus Fabius Persicus*, p. 39, col. vii. 4-10. For corn and oil funds, societies of young and old men, sacred funds, *vid. sup.*, notes 15, 23, 30-1, 34. For the management of trusts, see Laum, *Stiftungen*, I. 227-31. AUDITORS: *λογισταί*, *Syll.*³, 742, *I.G.*, XII. iii. 168, v. 880-6, vii. 515, ix. 236, cf. *Chr.*, I. 194-5 for τὸ πολιτικὸν λογιστήριον; *ἐκλογισταί*, Michel, 731, *I.G.R.*, IV. 739, 1756, iii, v, vi; *ἀντιγραφεῖς*, *I.G.*, IX. ii. 506, *Inschr. Priene*, 108-9, *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 98; *ἐξετασταί*, *Syll.*³, 284-5, 412-13, 442, 694, 976, 1014-15, 1047, *O.G.I.*, 4, 46, 229, *I.G.*, XII. ii. 5, 15, 527, *Inschr. Priene*, 59, 63-4, *Inschr. Mag. Mae.*, 53, 80, *I.G.R.*, IV. 818, 946, *Chr.*, I. 193; *κατόπται*, *I.G.*, VII. 303, 3171-3, 3202, 4130-1.
58. For the salaries of priests, doctors, and professors, *vid. sup.*, notes 18, 24, 28-9, 33. For the extravagance of employing free men, see Dörner, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-9, col. vi. 13-18; for allowances of public slaves, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 31. SOCIAL STATUS OF PUBLIC SLAVES: *C.I.L.*, III. 633, *I.G.*, VII. 1777; for their buying *vicarii*, see Dörner, *op. cit.*, p. 39, col. vi. 18-22. For the various services performed by public slaves, *vid. sup.*, notes 5, 7, 22, 52; cf. also *I.G.R.*, IV. 352, lines 45 seqq. for those in the finance department, *I.G.*², II-III. 1013 for those under the *agoranomi*, and *Forsch. Eph.*, II. 23, for the *δημόσιοι* of the gerusia.
59. EXPENSE OF STATUES: Dio Chrys., XXXI., esp. 26.

60. EMBASSIES: *viaticum* (*ἐφόδιον*), *Dig.*, L. iv. 18, §12, *Syll.*³, 833, *I.G.*, VII. 2870, *I.G.R.*, IV. 566, 1156, cf. III. 796, 804, IV. 251, 783, 914, 1244, 1702 for embassies *προῖκα* or *διωρεάν*; extravagance of Byzantium, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 43; on the duties of ambassadors in general, see *Dig.*, L. vii.
61. Ἐκδικοί, σύνδικοι; *Dig.*, L. iv. 18, §13 (a personal liturgy); for expenses, see *I.G.R.*, IV. 1169, *Cod. Just.*, x. lxx. 2. No clear distinction seems possible between *ἐκδικος* and *σύνδικος*. On the one hand, *I.G.R.*, III. 64, *ἐκδικήσαντα, γραμματεύσαντα, συνδικήσαντα πολλάκις*, implies that the former was a regular, the latter an occasional magistracy, and this is supported by *I.G.*², II-III. 1100, where *σύνδικοι* are elected to plead a special case. On the other hand, *ἐκδικίαι* are commonly coupled with *πρεσβείαι*, e.g., *I.G.R.*, IV. 101, 914, 1169, 1757, *C.I.G.*, 2719, 2771, cf. also Cic., *ad Fam.*, XIII. 56; while in *I.G.R.*, III. 1056, the *σύνδικοι* are clearly a standing board, and in *P. Oxy.*, 1413-14, the *σύνδικος* is likewise apparently a regular magistrate. CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROVINCIAL CULT: Dio Chrys., XXXV. 17, Dörner, op. cit., p. 39, col. viii, lines 9-19.
62. On direct taxation in Hellenistic cities, see Francotte, *Les finances des cités grecques*, pp. 49-53. The coexistence of royal and civic land-tax at Mylasa is attested by Wadd., 404. For the corn levy of Roman times, *vid. sup.*, note 15. For *εἰσφοραὶ* for the corn supply and public buildings, *vid. sup.*, notes 14, 49; for deficits in tribute, &c., Cic., *pro Flacco*, 20, cf. the *ἀκρώβολος εἰσφορά* of *I.G.*, V. i. 1432-3. Trajan did not allow *intributiones* for public buildings (Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 24).
63. For customs in Hellenistic cities, see Francotte, op. cit., pp. 11-15. It is sometimes inferred from the *Lex de Termessibus* (Bruns, 14) that the right of levying customs was a privilege of free cities under Roman rule. Another free city known to have levied them is Sparta (*I.G.*, V. i. 18) and Palmyra (*I.G.R.*, III. 1056) is generally regarded as specially privileged in this matter. The Palmyrene tariff, however, refers to rules current in other cities (col. iv a, line 53, *ὡς καὶ ἐν ταῖς λοιπαῖς γέινεται πόλεσι*), and Augustus mentions civic as well as imperial customs (*Syria*, 1934, p. 35, *τούτων τῶν πραγμάτων τέλος οὔτε πολέτειαν οὐ[τε δημοσι]ώνην παρὰ Σε[λεύκου εἰσπράττειν*).
64. MARKET DUES: *I.G.*, V. i. 18, *I.G.R.*, III. 1020, *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 121 (a tariff); for charges for *τόποι*, *vid. sup.*, note 10. In the Palmyrene tariff there are various taxes on shops and itinerant vendors (*I.G.R.*, III. 1056, col. iiib, lines 32-9, Aramaic, iib, lines 3-7), on prostitutes (Aramaic, col. iia, lines 46 seqq., iic, lines 26 seqq.), on slaughtering (col. iva, lines 40-6, Aramaic, col. iic, lines 3-10); in *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 116, the items *μαγειρικῆς καὶ ἰχθυικῆς* (sc. *ὠνῆς*) and *λαχανικῆς καὶ καταπρατικοῦ* seem to be taxes on cooks, fishmongers, and greengrocers. For the *ἐπάνιον* in Hellenistic times, see Francotte, op. cit., pp. 19-22. Perhaps the *ἐγκύκλιον τοπικόν τέλος* of *I.G.R.*, III. 634, is the same tax in Roman times; in Egypt the sales tax was called *ἐγκύκλιον*, and it may be that the term was introduced into Lycia when it was under Ptolemaic rule. Manumission taxes were certainly paid to the cities of Roman Thessaly (*I.G.*, IX. ii. 13, 22, 207, 280, 302, 349, 415, 546, 561, 1042, 1295-1301).
65. MONOPOLIES: salt, *I.G.R.*, III. 1056, col. iiib, lines 22-6, Aramaic, col. iic, lines 31-7; money-changing, *O.G.I.*, 484, 515, cf. *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 116, *τραπεζωνίας*; ferries, *O.G.I.*, 572; fisheries, *Dig.*, XLIII. xiv. 1, §7, Strabo, p. 320, *S.E.G.*, 1. 329. Civic regalian rights are mentioned in Suet., *Tib.*, 49.
66. WATER RATE: *Chr.*, I. 193. ADMISSION FEES: to baths, *vid. sup.*, note 19; to religious festivals, *vid. sup.*, notes 36-7; to the theatre, implied by *S.E.G.*, 1. 362, (an actor) *τὰ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου γενόμενα ἐκομίσατο, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐπέσχησε τῇ πόλει*, and Wadd., 252-8, *ἡ θεὰ ἐγένετο διωρεάν*, cf. also *Sardis*, VII. 56, a gift to every citizen of one *denarius* *ὑπὲρ θεωριῶν*. EPHEBIC FEES: *Inscr. Mag. Mae.*, 116. ENTRANCE FEES TO THE GERUSIA: *Ath. Mitt.*, 1907, pp. 294-5, 298-9, *Syll.*³, 1112. FEES FOR REGIS-

TRATION: *vid. sup.*, note 55; FINES: *O.G.I.*, 483, 515, 527, 572. Funerary fines are collected in Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung*, pp. 43-8. For the sale of priest-hoods, *vid. sup.*, pp. 162, 175.

67. Were they not confused in such reputable works as Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung* (pp. 2-12) and Abbott and Johnson, *Municipal Administration* (p. 138) I should not have thought it necessary to emphasize the distinction between the territory of a city and its public lands. The former was the area ruled by a city; Pomponius (*Dig.*, l. xvi. 239, §8) defines it as 'universitas agrorum intra fines cuiusque civitatis' and derives the word from the verb *terrere*, because the city magistrates had the right of terrifying people in it. The public lands were the lands owned by a city and were not necessarily, as *Année Épig.*, 1934, 86 and some of the instances quoted below show, within the city territory. The distinction is carefully drawn by Dio Chrysostom in xxxi. 47-8. The city drew rents, like any other landlord, from the lands which it owned. It did not draw rent from the land which it ruled, which was owned by private landlords. It does not seem indeed to have derived any direct income from its territory since the land-tax went to the imperial treasury. In xxxv. 14 Dio Chrysostom compliments Apamea on the extent of its territory but he does not say that this increased the wealth of the city: it increased the amount of the tribute paid by the city, which is likened by Dio to an ass which bears heavy burdens. Occasionally a city drew tribute from subject communities, e.g., Stratonicea (*O.G.I.*, 441) and Rhodes (*Cic.*, *ad Q.f.*, l. i, §33) under Sulla's arrangements, but it is doubtful whether the tributary communities were part of the territory of the city to which they were subject. For the public land of Zeleia, see *Syll.*³, 279, for that of Apamea, compare Strabo, p. 752, and *Cod. Theod.*, vii. vii. 3. ESCHEAT: Michel, 546, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 84, *Cod. Just.*, x. x. i. GIFTS AND BEQUESTS OF LAND: *C.I.G.*, 3570 (Assus), *I.G.R.*, iii. 422 (Ariassus), 451 (Termessus), 499 (Oenoanda), 583-5 (Sidyma), 679 (Tlos, ἀγρὸν ἐν τῇ Κορυθαλλικῇ), iv. 502-3 (Aezani), 1302 (Cyme), Wadd., 1006 (Synaus), 1611 (Aphrodisias), *B.C.H.*, 1933, p. 502 (Larissa), *J.H.S.*, 1890, pp. 121-2 (Ceramus), *Abh. Ak. Berlin*, 1925, v. 26-9 (Cyrene), Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, liii, no. 47 (Philadelphia), liv, no. 270 (Blaundus), Libanius, *Or.*, l. 5 (Antioch), *P. Fay.*, 87 (Alexandria, estate in the Arsinoite nome). PURCHASE OF LAND: from bequests, *I.G.R.*, iv. 1168; from surpluses, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 54, *I.G.R.*, iv. 915, *R.E.G.*, 1893, p. 161. CIVIC HOUSE AND SHOP PROPERTY: Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, liv, no. 117, Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 70, *B.C.H.*, 1935, pp. 514-15, Laum, *Stiftungen*, no. 98; these are bequests, but obviously rents would also accrue from property built by the city, cf. *P. Oxy.*, 2109 (lease of a shop under the Capitol of the city), *Chr.*, i. 296 (rents of shops in the civic market).
68. PROPERTY OF TRIBES: Wadd., 338, 404, *Sardis*, vii. 12; tribal revenues are mentioned in *I.G.*, xii. v. 863-6, vii. 515, Wadd., 1111, and are implied in the many dedications made by tribes, e.g., *I.G.R.*, i. 727, iii. 173, 176, 179, 191-2, 194, 199, 202-4, 208, 801, 811, 1424, 1483, ii. 216, 525-7, 915, 1325, 1632. For the property of the gerusia and *πόλις*, *vid. sup.*, notes 30-1. For the sacred lands, see Broughton in *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, iv. 676-84 (Asia Minor), *I.G.R.*, iii. 1020 (Syria). On the management of public lands, see Gaius, *Inst.*, iii. 145, *Dig.*, l. viii. 2, pr., §1, 3, §2, 5, pr., ii, §2, *Cod. Just.*, xi. xxxi. 1, xxxii. 2, *Syll.*³, 884; for pasture dues, see *I.G.*, vii. 2870, cf. *I.G.R.*, iii., 1056, col. ivb, line 34.
69. INVESTED FUNDS: Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 54, Laum, *Stiftungen*, i. 140 seqq.
70. HONORARIUM DECURIONATUS: Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 39, 112-13, *Syll.*³, 838, Dio Chrys., xlvi. 11, *P. Oxy.*, 1413, cf. *I.G.R.*, iii. 154, *προϊκα βουλευτοῦ*. The εἰσιτήριον for a magistracy is mentioned in *P. Ryl.*, 77, and *P. Oxy.*, 1413, records στεπτικά of magistrates as well as councillors. Examples of gifts ἐπέρ or ἀντί an office are

- I.G.*, iv. 203, v. ii. 302, *Wadd.*, 300, *I.G.R.*, III. 66, 484, iv. 862, 941, 1294, 1637, *S.E.G.*, II. 591, *Syll.*³, 875, *C.I.G.*, 3948, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1884, p. 18, *B.C.H.*, 1886, p. 454, 1892, p. 425, *Jahresh.*, 1915, *Beiblatt*, 55, Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, p. 339, *M.A.M.A.*, III. 103.
71. Arcadius Charisius' remarks are in *Dig.*, L. iv. 18, §§5, 27.
72. For the rules restraining the cities from increasing local taxation, *vid. sup.*, p. 135.
73. For inter-city feuds, see Dio Chrys., xxxiv, xxxviii, xl, cf. also *Syll.*³, 849. On emulation in games and buildings, see Dio Chrys., xl. 10, Cassius Dio, lII. 30, §3, *Dig.*, L. x. 3. The passage cited from Aelius Aristides is *Or.*, xxvi. 97-9 (ed. Keil).
74. Plutarch (*Fraec. reip. ger.*, 10) laments the rarity of the opportunities offered in his day to a young politician to make his name and deprecates lavish expenditure to this end (*ib.*, 29, 31).
75. Plutarch (*ib.*, 24, 30) shows that meanness in a politician was strongly resented by the people, and that it was difficult for a man of modest means to resist the pressure of public opinion, even if he could not afford it (*ib.* 31). It appears from *Syll.*³, 850, that the public preferred games, shows, and distributions to buildings. The riot over the price of corn is described in Dio Chrys., xlvi.
76. On the difficulty of investment, see Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 54; cf. Dio Chrys., xlvi. 7 on the unpopularity of land-grabbing.
77. For the confiscation of the sacred and civic lands and revenues, *vid. sup.*, p. 149.
78. NEW CIVIC TAXES PERMITTED: *Cod. Just.*, iv. lxi. 10 (C.S.L. *Or.*, 400-3); a Byzantine civic *vectigal* is recorded at Mylasa (*C.I.L.*, 7151-2) and at Alexandria the *dinumium vectigal* (*Cod. Theod.*, xiv. xxvi. 2) seems to have been the principal source of revenue (cf. *Just.*, *Edict* 13, §15-16). ESTATES OF DECURIONS: if dying without heirs, *Cod. Theod.*, v. ii. 1 (PPO. *Gall.*, 318), *Cod. Just.*, vi. lxii. 4 (PPO. *Or.*, 429); if absconding, *Cod. Theod.*, xii. i. 139 (PPO. *Or.*, 394), 143-4 (*proc. Afr.*, 395), 161 (PPO. *It.*, 399); if taking orders, *ib.*, xii. i. 49 (PPO. *It.*, 361), 59 (Byzacenses, 364), 123 (PPO. *Or.*, 391), 163 (PPO. *Or.*, 399), 172 (PPO. *Ill.*, 410). THE RULE OF THE QUARTER: *Cod. Just.*, x. xxxv. 1 (PPO. *Or.*, 428), *Theod.*, *Nov.*, xxii. 2 (PPO. *Or.*, 443), *Cod. Just.*, x. xxxv. 3 (PPO. *Or.*, 528); raised to three-quarters, *Just.*, *Nov.*, 38. GIFTS AND BEQUESTS: Laum, *Stiftungen*, no. 30 (Delphi, A.D. 315), *Just.*, *Nov.*, 160 (Aphrodisias); cf. *Cod. Just.*, xi. xxxii. 3 (PPO. *Or.*, 472). For the Byzantine *curator* the evidence comes mostly from Egypt, see *P.W.*, XIII. 1020-1; for the *παῖρ τῆς πόλεως*, *vid. sup.*, p. 348, note 105.
79. It is worth noting that even in the Byzantine age civic magistracies were sometimes undertaken voluntarily by persons immune from curial service, cf. *Cod. Just.*, x. xlv. 2 (Diocletian), 3 (465), 4 (528).
80. IRENARCHS: *Cod. Theod.*, xii. xiv. 1 (PPO. *Or.*, 409), *Cod. Just.*, x. lxxvii. 1. *Νυκτοστράτηγοι*: Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 281-3. *Εἰρηνοφύλακες*: Libanius, *Or.*, XLVIII. 9. For the rank and file in the police, see Libanius, *loc. cit.* (*καρνηφόροι*), XXXIII. 37 (nightwatchmen), *Chr.*, I. 404 (compulsory service in Egypt), cf. also 476 for the *δημόσιοι* and *ἐφοδευταί* who served under the *νυκτοστράτηγοι*.
81. For roads and bridges, *vid. sup.*, p. 334, note 109. For street lighting, *vid. sup.*, note 6, cf. *Proc.*, *Hist. Arc.*, 26, §7. AQUEDUCTS: *Theod.*, *Nov.*, xxiii, Malalas, p. 409 (ed. Bonn.), *Proc.*, *Aed.*, v. 3, §1, vi. 2, §11; in *Cod. Just.*, I. iv. 26, x. xxx. 4, they are mentioned among the civic expenses. HEATING OF BATHS: from civic revenues, *Cod. Theod.*, xv. i. 32 (C.S.L. *Occ.*, 395), *Cod. Just.*, I. iv. 26, x. xxx. 4 (*τὰ λουτρονικὰ χρήματα*), *Just.*, *Edict* 13, §14 (Alexandria), *Nov.*, 160 (Aphrodisias); as a liturgy, Libanius, *Or.*, I. 272, II. 34, xxvi. 5-6, xxviii. 6, XLIX. 10, cf. XI. 134, XXXV. 4.
82. Ephebes are last mentioned to my knowledge in *P. Oxy.*, 42 (A.D. 323), gymnasia in Basil, *Ep.*, 74, Migne, *P.G.*, xxxii. 448 (A.D. 371), gymnasiarchs in *P. Oxy.*, 2110 (A.D. 370); professional athletics continued later (*vid. inf.*, note 85).

- PROFESSORS: salaries, *Cod. Theod.*, XIII. iii. 1 (PPO. It., 321), Libanius, *Or.*, XXXI. 19, *Proc.*, *Hist. Arc.*, 26, §§5-7; fees, Libanius, *Or.*, XLII; appointment, *Cod. Theod.*, XIII. iii. 5 (362), cf. Libanius' career (*Or.*, I. 48, 82-4). DOCTORS: *Cod. Theod.*, XIII. iii. 1, *Proc.*, *Hist. Arc.*, 26, §§5-7. The *σαλάρια* mentioned in *Just.*, *Nov.*, 128, §16 are presumably those of professors and doctors.
83. CHURCH FUNDS FOR CIVIC PURPOSES: Theodoret, *Ep.*, 81, Migne, *P.G.*, LXXXIII. 1261, *Année Épigr.*, 1911, 90 (Zenonopolis), Kraeling, *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis*, p. 475, no. 296.
84. THE OLYMPIA OF ANTIOCH: suppressed in 520, Malalas, p. 417 (ed. Bonn.); they are frequently mentioned by Libanius and by John Chrysostom, and also in Anastasius' reign (Malalas, pp. 395-8). For theatrical shows in provincial cities, see *Cod. Theod.*, xv. v. 2 (PPO. *Or.*, 394), 5 (PPO. *Or.*, 425), *Cod. Just.*, xi. xli. 5 (*histriones* is added by Justinian to the original law, *Cod. Theod.*, xv. v. 3), *Proc.*, *Hist. Arc.*, 26, §8; for a typical Christian attack on the mime, see John Chrys., *Contra ludos et theatra*, Migne, *P.G.*, LVI. 263-70, for Libanius' defence, *Or.*, LXIV, especially 112. THE MAIUMA: *Cod. Theod.*, xv. vi. 1 (PPO. *Or.*, 396), 2 (PPO. *Or.*, 399); theatre at Gerasa, Kraeling, *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis*, p. 471, no. 279; cf. *P.W.*, XIV. 610-12 on the general character of the festival. RHETORICAL DECLAMATIONS: at the Olympia, Libanius, *Or.*, I. 184, 222; *ἐπιδείξεις* are constantly mentioned in Libanius, e.g., *Or.*, II. 23-5, cf. LIV. 55-7 for public recitations by a poet.
85. GYMNASTIC GAMES: *Cod. Theod.*, xv. vii. 3 (*proc. Afr.*, 376), Libanius, *Or.*, I. 139, v. 43 seqq., x *passim*, XI. 135, XXXV. 4, cf. XXXIV. 19, LIII. 18, John Chrys., *Hom. in Matt.*, xxxiii. 6, Migne, *P.G.*, LVII. 395. I presume that the retention by Justinian of *Cod. Just.*, x. liv. 1, is a mere piece of archaism. CHARIOT RACES IN PROVINCIAL CITIES: *Cod. Theod.*, xv. v. 2 (PPO. *Or.*, 394), 3 (PPO. *Or.*, 409), 5 (PPO. *Or.*, 425), *Proc.*, *Hist. Arc.*, 26, §8; for the competition of the Blues and Greens in the provinces, see Malalas, pp. 395-8 (Antioch), *Proc.*, *Hist. Arc.*, 29, §§26 seqq. (Tarsus), and in general Malalas, pp. 416-17, *Proc.*, *op. cit.*, 7. LITURGY OF *ἰσποροφία*: Julian, *Misopogon*, 371, Libanius, *Or.*, XXVII. 13, XXXV. 14, LIV. 45, cf. XI. 135, John Chrys., *de statu*, xiii. 2, Migne, *P.G.*, XLIX. 139, *P. Oxy.*, 2110; for the excessive interest of the decurions of Antioch in the races, see Libanius, *Or.*, XXXV. 3-5, XLVIII. 9.
86. Jerome, *Vita S. Hilarionis*, xx, Migne, *P.L.*, XXIII. 36-8.
87. For the abolition of gladiatorial games by Honorius, see Theodoret, *H.E.*, v. 26; Libanius already alludes to them as a thing of the past in *Or.*, I. 5. WILD-BEAST FIGHTS IN PROVINCIAL CITIES: *Cod. Theod.*, xv. v. 2 (PPO. *Or.*, 394), *Cod. Just.*, xi. xli. 5 (*bestias* is added by Justinian to the original law, *Cod. Theod.*, xv. v. 3), *Proc.*, *Hist. Arc.*, 26, §8. LITURGY: Libanius, *Or.*, XXVIII. 7, XXXIII. 14 seqq. On the burden of games in general on decurions, see *Cod. Theod.*, xv. v. 1 (PPO. It., 372), ix. 2 (PU. Const., 409). On the other hand their celebration depended partly on civic funds, *Proc.*, *Hist. Arc.*, 26, §§6-8, (where *θεωρητικά* are mentioned), and Marcian, *Nov.*, 3 (*agonotheticae possessiones*).
88. The offices of *ἀγορανομία* and *σιτωνία* are mentioned in *Cod. Just.*, x. lvi. 1; the *σιτώνης* also in *Cod. Just.*, x. xxvii. 3 (Anastasius), *Just.*, *Nov.*, 128, §16. The *σιτωνικά χρήματα* of the cities are mentioned in *Cod. Just.*, x. xxvii. 2, §12 (Anastasius), I. iv. 26, x. xxx. 4 (530) and in *Just.*, *Nov.*, 128, §16, *σιτωνικά* are among the normal civic expenses. Alexandria was granted an allowance of corn from state revenues by Diocletian (*Proc.*, *Hist. Arc.*, 26, §41); this was increased in 436 (*Cod. Theod.*, XIV. xxvi. 2) and reduced by Justinian (*Proc.*, *loc. cit.*). The governor often took control in famines, e.g., Libanius, *Or.*, I. 205-10, 226-9, XXIX *passim*. The officers immediately in charge of the market were however members of the city council (cf. Libanius, *Or.*, XLVI. 5-6, LIV. 42), and the council

was apparently responsible (note the panic among its members when famine threatened, *Or.*, xxix. 4). For control of weights and measures, see *Or.*, xxvii. 11; for price fixing, *Or.*, xxvii. 27, iv. 35.

89. The urgency of refortifying the cities is stressed by many laws, e.g., *Cod. Just.*, xi. xlii. 1 (Diocletian), *Cod. Theod.*, iv. xiii. 5 (358, vic. Afr.), Bruns, 97a (370-1, proc. As.), *Cod. Theod.*, v. xiv. 35, xv. i. 32 (395, C.S.L. Occ.), 33 (395, PPO. Gall.), 34 (396, PPO. Or.), 49 (407, PPO. Ill.); the extensive repairs executed by Justinian (*Proc.*, *Aed.*, II-VI. *passim*) show how inadequately the walls were kept up. For the ambition of governors, see *Cod. Theod.*, xv. i. 3 (362, PPO. Gall.), 14 (365, PPO. It.), 15 (365, vic. Afr.), 16 (365, PPO. It.), 17 (365, cons. Pic.), 20 (380, praef. Aeg.), 21 (380, PPO. Or.), 28 (390, PPO. It. Ill.), 31 (394, PPO. Or.), *Cod. Just.*, viii. xi. 22 (472, PPO. Or.).
90. For the banquet of the Olympia, see Libanius, *Or.*, LIII, *passim*; for the abolition of the presents, *Or.*, xxxviii. 5, LIII. 16.
91. On Byzantine buildings and the re-use of old blocks, see Crowfoot, *Churches at Jerash*, pp. 35 seqq. The use of temples as building material is authorized in *Cod. Theod.*, xv. i. 36 (397, com. Or.); the demolition of other buildings is prohibited in 14 (365, PPO. It.), 37 (398, PPO. It.).
92. The allocation of tax revenue to decurions is allowed in *Cod. Just.*, iv. lxi. 10 (C.S.L. Or., 400-3), 'vectigalia quaecumque quaelibet civitates sibi ac suis curiis ad angustiarum suarum solacia quaesierint sive illa functionibus curialium ordinum profutura sunt seu quibuscumque earundem civitatum usibus designantur'. For the assignation of civic lands, see Libanius, *Or.*, xxxi. 16-17, γεωργεῖτε τοὺς ἀγροὺς τῆς πόλεως σχεδὸν (ἅπαντας) οἱ βουλευόντες ὑμεῖς . . . τοὺς μὲν οὖν μείζους ὑμετέρους εἶναι δεῖ τῶν ἀναλισκόντων καὶ χορηγούντων καὶ πολλαῖς δαπαναῖς ταῖς μὲν ἐγκυκλίους ταῖς δὲ καιναῖς ὑπακούοντων, cf. Julian, *Misogogon*, 370-1, γῆς κλήρους οἶμαι τρισχιλίους ἔφατε ἀσπίρους εἶναι καὶ ἠτήσασθε λαβεῖν, λαβόντες δὲ ἐνείμασθε πάντες οἱ μὴ δέσμενοι . . . ἀφελόμενος δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐγὼ τῶν ἐχάντων οὐ δικαίως . . . ταῖς βαρυστάταις ἐνεῖμα λειτουργίαις αὐτοὺς τῆς πόλεως, καὶ νῦν ἀτελεῖς ἔχουσιν οἱ καθ' ἕκαστον ὑμῖν ἐνιαυτὸν ἵπποτροφούντες γῆς κλήρους ἐγγὺς τρισχιλίους. With regard to the misappropriation of 'the perquisites of the decurionate' (τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πολιτεύεσθαι κέρδη) Libanius in two passages (*Or.*, XLVIII. 4, XLIX. 9) alleges that the decurions deliberately preferred to be few in number in order that on that score they might claim relief from liturgies, while at the same time there were fewer to share the profits. In the sixth century civic revenues seem to have covered all services; *Cod. Just.*, i. iv. 26, x. xxx. 4, *Just., Nov.*, 128, §16, 160, *Edict* 13, §14, and *Proc., Hist. Arc.*, 26, §§5-8, cf. *Just., Nov.*, 17, §4, 25, §9, 26, §4.

NOTES ON PART V

1. On local trade and industry, *vid. inf.*, note 15. Ἐμπόρια: *I.G.R.*, III. 1427, *Année Épigr.*, 1927, 71-3, 75, *B.C.H.*, 1900, pp. 407, 415, cf. Robert, *Ét. Anat.*, pp. 243-5, *Istros*, I. ii; founded by the government, *I.G.R.*, I. 766. The motive is explicitly stated, line 4, τῇ πρόβφει τῶν σταθμῶν, cf. the allusion to τοὺς ἐπι[στρά]θμους στρατιώτας and τὰ πραιτώρια in lines 49-52. Πανηγύρεις: *I.G.R.*, III. 1020, IV. 1381, Libanius, *Or.*, xi. 230, cf. *Dig.*, I. xi. 1.
2. Corn was regularly imported in the Hellenistic age to Delos, for instance, (Larsen in *Ec. Surv. Anc. Rome*, IV. 344-8; note the high price, pp. 383-6). In the principate Tyre and Sidon were apparently dependent on Agrippa's kingdom (*Acts*, xii. 20). Dio Chrysostom (XLVI. 10) comments on the great local variations in price. On import from Egypt and famine measures, *vid. sup.*, p. 350, note 16.
3. The agricultural products of eastern lands are catalogued in *Ec. Surv. Anc. Rome*, II. 1-7, IV. 127-40, 152-5, 483-5, 607-20, 626-7; minerals, *ib.*, II. 239-42,

- IV. 156-7, 486-9, 620-6. It is unfortunately impossible in most cases to determine whether these products were objects of commerce, and, if so, in what quantities. EGYPTIAN WINE TRADE: Strabo, p. 751-2, *Expos. Tot. Mund.*, 29; for the use of local wine and beer by the lower classes, see Strabo, pp. 799, 824, amply supported by the papyri. EGYPTIAN OILS: *P. Rev.*, *passim*, cf. Strabo, p. 824; on the import of oil, see *P. Rev.*, coll. 52, 54, *P. Gnomon*, 102; on the lack of olive oil in Egypt, see Strabo, p. 809, *Expos. Tot. Mund.*, 34.
4. On industries, see *Ec. Surv. Anc. Rome*, II. 335 seqq., IV. 189-98, 485-6, 817-39.
 5. See Charlesworth, *Trade Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire*², Chap. II-VII.
 6. THE ASSIZES: Dio Chrys., XXXV. 15 seqq.; the eagerness of cities to become assize towns (e.g., *I.G.R.*, IV. 1287, *S.E.G.*, VII. 813) may be partly due to economic causes, but was rather a point of honour (cf. Dio Chrys., XL. 10 seqq.).
 7. UNIVERSITIES: Athens, Walden, *The Universities of Ancient Greece*; Smyrna, Philostr., *Vit. Soph.*, I. XXI. 518, XXV. 531, II. XXVI. 613; Berytus, Bouchier, *Syria as a Roman province*, pp. 115 seqq. RELIGIOUS FESTIVALS: Hierapolis, Lucian, *de Syria Dea*, 49; Comana, Strabo, p. 559; the eagerness of cities for the neorate of the emperors (e.g., *I.G.R.*, IV. 1431, Tac., *Ann.*, IV. 55-6) may have been due to practical as well as to sentimental reasons.
 8. An excellent sketch of the professions is given by Broughton, in *Ec. Surv. Anc. Rome*, IV. 849-57 (for Asia Minor only). *Equites* are catalogued, *ib.*, 715-33, 746-94; senators are of course evidence for wealth, but the senatorial career was not particularly lucrative. Centurions, especially *primipili*, are often mentioned as civic worthies or among their ancestors, e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 451, 474, 500 (III, line 30), 576, 810-11, IV. 617, 1695; mere veterans less often, e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 142, IV. 735. For rhetoricians, see Philostr., *Vit. Soph.*, *passim*; the only lawyer who is at all eminent (an Asiarch) was a *rhetor* as well (*I.G.R.*, IV. 1226). Doctors are frequently wealthy and generous, e.g., *I.G.R.*, III. 534, 693, 732-3, IV. 116, 182, 520, 1359. For a rich architect, see Wadd., 1381-3. For athletes, *vid. sup.*, p. 354, note 39.
 9. On the exploitation of mines and quarries, see *Ec. Surv. Anc. Rome*, II. 239-42, IV. 461-5, 693-5. PAPYRUS: Dessau, 9470, *P. Gen. Lat.*, I, R II, cf. Pliny, *N.H.*, XIII. 74 seqq. (where all the brands, save one manufactured at Rome, have imperial names). PURPLE: Dessau, 1575, *Hist. Aug., Alex. Sev.*, 40. On the organization of private industry we are lamentably ignorant. We sometimes hear of small factories operated by slaves (e.g., Libanius, *Or.*, XLII. 21) but guilds are very common, especially in Asia Minor (see *Ec. Surv. Anc. Rome*, IV. 841-4). On workshops as an investment, see Dio Chrys., XLVI. 9, XLVII. 21, and p. 359, note 67.
 10. For the merchant princes of Palmyra, see Rostovtzeff, *Caravan Cities*, pp. 142 seqq.; for Alexandria, *Hist. Aug., Firmus*, 3. For a nautical loan, see *Dig.*, XLV. i. 122, §1. The existence of tramp shippers is implied by *R.E.G.*, 1929, p. 36, *οἱ ναυκλήροι κ[αὶ οἱ] ἐπὶ τοῦ λιμένος ἐργ[ασταί]* (Chios); the shippers of this guild must have been small men; cf. Libanius' scornful account of the obscure origins of Ablabius (*πλέων ὑπὲρ δβέλων*) and Heliodorus (*γάρου κάπηλος*) in *Or.*, XLII. 23, LXII. 46.
 11. For a catalogue of estates in Asia Minor, see *Ec. Surv. Anc. Rome*, IV. 664-76; cf. p. 359, note 67 of this book for land bequeathed to cities. For gifts of corn, oil, and wine, *vid. sup.*, pp. 217-8, 221-2, 234-5; timber, *J.H.S.*, 1922, p. 167; agricultural labourers, *I.G.R.*, IV. 808. HOARDING OF CORN BY THE RICH: Philostr., *Vit. Apoll. Tyan.*, I. 15, Julian, *Misopogon*, 368-70, Libanius, *Or.*, XVIII. 195, Greg. Naz., *in laud. Bas.*, 35, Migne, P.G., XXXVI. 544, cf. the accusations brought against Dio Chrysostom (XLVI. 8).

12. On the immunity of the professions, *vid. sup.*, pp. 184-5. In Egypt the *πόρος* required for liturgies was invariably land.
13. For a general sketch of economic conditions in the Byzantine age, see Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, II. iii, chaps. 6 and 7.
14. DECURIONS: forbidden to reside on their estates, *Cod. Theod.*, XII. xviii. 1 (367), 2 (396); forbidden to sell their estates, *ib.*, XII. iii. 1 (386), 2 (423), *Cod. Just.*, X. xxxiv. 3 (Zeno); recruited from veterans, *vid. sup.*, p. 347, note 97; not liable to *collatio lustralis*, *Cod. Theod.*, XII. i. 50 (362), XIII. i. 17 (399), XII. vi. 29 (403). NEGOTIATORES: *corpus* of, *ib.*, XVI. ii. 15 (360), XIII. i. 17 (399), XII. vi. 29 (403); distinct from decurions and plebeians, *ib.*, VII. xxi. 3 (396), XVI. v. 52 (412); enrolled in the *curia* on acquiring land, *ib.*, XII. i. 72 (370), *cf.* 96 (383) for the exceptional enrolment of owners of slaves.
15. LINEN WEAVERS OF TARSUS: Dio Chrys., XXXIV. 21-3; *cf.* the description of Alexandria in *Hist. Aug.*, Saturninus, 8, and of Patrae in Pausanias, VII. xxi. 14. GUILDS OF PORTERS: Waltzing, *Les corporations*, III, no. 137, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1881, p. 125, *A.J.A.*, 1885, p. 140, 1938, p. 56, Dumont, *Inscr. de la Thrace*, no. 66, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1414, *cf.* *R.E.G.*, 1929, p. 36, [ο] ἐπὶ τοῦ λιμένος ἐργ[ασταί]. LOCAL TRADES AND GUILDS: *Ec. Surv. Anc. Rome*, II. 392 seqq., IV. 208, 839 seqq. BREAD RIOTS: Dio Chrys., XLVI. 1-2, Philostr., *Vit. Apoll. Tyan.*, I. 15, Libanius, *Or.*, I. 205, XXIX. 4. IMMUNITY OF PROLETARIAT FROM *CAPITATIO*: *Cod. Theod.*, XIII. X. 2 (311). OPPRESSIVENESS OF *COLLATIO LUSTRALIS*: Zosimus, II. 38, Libanius, *Or.*, XLVI. 22; Libanius often expresses sympathy with the poverty and misery of the shopkeepers (e.g., *Or.*, IV. 26-9, XXXIII. 33-7, XLV. 4, XLVI. 7, 10 seqq., 19, 21).
16. See Part III.
17. For 'sedition' and its suppression, *vid. sup.*, p. 134. UNLAWFUL ASSEMBLIES: *Acts*, XIX. 29. RIOTS: *vid. sup.*, note 15, *cf.* the evidence for strikes in *Anatolian Studies presented to Sir W. Ramsay*, pp. 27 seqq. Libanius frequently records demonstrations in the theatre (*Or.*, XVIII. 195, XXIX. 2, XLVI. 5), and warns governors against yielding to popular clamour (e.g., *Or.*, XLI).
18. VILLAGE ASSEMBLIES: *J.H.S.*, 1937, p. 4, *O.G.I.*, 488 (ἐκκλησία); *I.G.R.*, IV. 1665 (σύλλογος, also in *J.H.S.*, 1937, p. 4); *I.G.R.*, III. 1192, IV. 892 (ἄχλος). COUNCILS: *O.G.I.*, 488, *I.G.R.*, IV. 550, 552, *J.H.S.*, 1937, p. 4; *cf.* also Swoboda, Keil, and Knoll, *Denkm. aus Lykaonien, Pamphylien und Isaurien*, no. 282. DECREES: *O.G.I.*, 488, *Wadd.*, 2505, *J.H.S.*, 1937, p. 4, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1304, 1666, Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, lvii, nos. 109-10, *S.E.G.*, IX. 354. MAGISTRATES: κάρμαρχοι, *I.G.R.*, IV. 592, 1492, 1635, Keil and Premerstein, *op. cit.*, no. 109, *B.C.H.*, 1894, p. 539, *S.E.G.*, VI. 673 (annual election), 674; βραβεύται, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1304 (annual), 1348, 1497, Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, liii, no. 107 (annual); for διοικηταί and πτωχοί, see *J.R.S.*, 1931, pp. 271-2; for στρατηγοί see *I.G.R.*, III. 311, and for Arabia, *J.R.S.*, 1931, pp. 270-1; in Cyrenaica village magistrates bear the title of πολιανόμοι (*S.E.G.*, IX. 354); λογιστής, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1660, 1664-5, Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, lvii, no. 116; ἐκδικος, *J.R.S.*, 1931, pp. 271-2; γραμματεὺς, *J.H.S.*, 1937, pp. 3-4; ἀργυροταμίης, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1657.
19. ORMELA: *I.G.R.*, IV. 887-93, esp. 890-1 (προαγών), 892 (ἄχλος). For the administration of the Egyptian villages, see Bevan, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, pp. 143-4, Milne, *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule*, pp. 129-30, 143, 149. For Judaea, *cf.* *Jos.*, *Ant.*, XVI. 203.
20. PHYLARCHS IN THRACE: *I.G.R.*, I. 721, 728. For *praepositi pagorum*, *vid. sup.*, p. 333, note 106. Στρατηγοί ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας are found in various Carian cities, e.g., *Wadd.*, 1604, 1611, *C.I.G.*, 2837 (Aphrodisias), *B.C.H.*, 1891, p. 423 (Stratonicea), 1904, p. 80 (Tralles), *cf.* 1886, p. 313 (Alabanda, στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τοὺς δῆμους),

- but these officers were probably, like the *στρατηγός ἐπὶ τῷ πέραν* of Rhodes, military in origin.
21. CITY MAGNATES: as *προστάται*, *I.G.R.*, iv. 1381, 1635, 1665; as legal representatives, *I.G.R.*, iv. 1237; as magistrates, &c., *I.G.R.*, iv. 1665 (an Ephesian), 1666 (a Hypaepene), cf. Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, lvii, nos. 109-10 (Hypaepenes), *B.C.H.*, 1894, p. 539 (an Ephesian); see *J.R.S.*, 1931, pp. 272-3 for *βουλευταί* in the independent villages of Arabia; and *I.G.R.*, iv. 893 for an *Ὀλβασεύς βουλευτής* at Ornela.
 22. See Part II.
 23. POLICE AT HIERAPOLIS: *O.G.I.*, 527; for the abuses of the imperial post, see p. 329, note 91. TAX COLLECTION: *Ἀρχ. Δελτ.*, 1916, p. 148, *I.G.R.*, III. 488, 739, ii, iii.
 24. UNFAIR ASSESSMENT AND COMMISSION: *vid. sup.*, pp. 347-8, notes 95, 100. BRUTALITY: Libanius, *Or.*, XLVII. 7-10, Theodoret, *Hist. Rel.*, xvii, Migne, P.G., LXXXII. 1421.
 25. For Rhodes, see Dio Chrys., XXXI.
 26. ARCHITECTS: Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 40.
 27. For an appreciation of the hellenistic and 'Roman' architecture of the East, see Fyfe, *Hellenistic Architecture*. For the baths at Gerasa, see Kraeling, *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis*, Plate VIb and Plan XXXVII; the building cannot be precisely dated (*op. cit.*, p. 54, note 137).
 28. CONSTANTINE'S LAW: *Cod. Theod.*, XIII. iv. 1 (334).
 29. For the gymnasia and the games, *vid. sup.*, Chap. xiv.
 30. *Vid. sup.*, pp. 354-5.
 31. *Vid. sup.*, Chap. xv.
 32. For public education, *vid. sup.*, pp. 219, 224-5.
 33. For further information on the literature of the Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine periods, I must refer the reader to some such standard work as Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*,⁶ vol. II.
 34. For the preference of the people for games, &c., rather than buildings, see *Syll.*³, 850.
 35. For the gymnasium class in Egypt and the expenses of the ephebate, *vid. sup.*, p. 352, note 27. SOCIAL STATUS OF ATHLETES: *vid. sup.*, p. 354, note 39. PRIMARY EDUCATION: *vid. sup.*, pp. 220-3; status of schoolmasters, *Dig.*, L. v. 2, §8. DIOCLETIAN ON ILLITERACY: *Cod. Just.*, x. xxxii. 6 (293); cf. *P. Oxy.*, 71, col. 1 for an illiterate decurion at this period.
 36. POPULARITY OF THE MIME: Libanius, *Or.*, LXIV. 112. POPULARITY OF ATHLETIC SHOWS: Libanius, *Or.*, x. 1-8; cf. Malalas, p. 290 (ed. Bonn.) for the date of the building.
 37. VILLAGE PUBLIC WORKS: water-supply, *I.G.R.*, III. 1317, IV. 1491, 1653, 1657, Wadd., 2239; baths, Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, lvii, nos. 110, 116, 171, *I.G.R.*, III. 1155; market, *I.G.R.*, IV. 1607; theatre, *I.G.R.*, III. 1192; gymnasium, *J.H.S.*, 1937, p. 2; for other buildings, see *J.R.S.*, 1931, pp. 270, 272. COMMON LANDS: *O.G.I.*, 488, Wadd., 2505. BEQUESTS OF LAND: *I.G.R.*, IV. 1666, 1675, *S.E.G.*, VI. 673; cf. 674 for purchase of land from a bequest; of shops, *Ath. Mitt.*, 1895, p. 242; of capital funds, *J.H.S.*, 1937, pp. 2-4, *I.G.R.*, IV. 887, 1348; these are mostly for festivities. *SUMMA HONORARIA*: *I.G.R.*, IV. 1664-5, Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, lvii, nos. 109-10, 116, *B.C.H.*, 1894, p. 539. Funerary fines are sometimes payable to villages, e.g., Keil and Premerstein, *Denkschr. Ak. Wien*, liii, nos. 117-18, lvii, nos. 67, 108, 120, 127, 133.

- Gifts to villages are frequent, e.g., *I.G.R.*, iv. 887 (breakfast), 892 (cash), 891, 893, 1653 (altars, buildings).
38. For the history of Orcistus (gymnasium in *J.H.S.*, 1937, p. 2) and Saccaca (theatre in *I.G.R.*, III. 1192), see *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 68-9, 286-7.
39. Joh. Chrys., *Hom. hab. in eccl. Pauli*, Migne, *P.G.*, LXIII. 501; Greg. Nyss., *contra Eunom.*, xii, Migne, *P.G.*, XLV. 1045.
40. Simeon Metaphr., *Vita S. Theod. Coenob.*, ix, Migne, *P.G.*, CXIV. 505.
41. CARIAN: Strabo, pp. 661-3. LYDIAN: id., p. 631. LYCIAN: *T.A.M.*, I, pp. 5-8.
42. PISIDIAN: Strabo, p. 631. LYCAONIAN: *Acts*, xiv. 11.
43. PHRYGIAN: Calder, *M.A.M.A.*, I. xii. GALATIAN: Jerome, *Comm. in Ep. Gal.*, II, Migne, *P.L.*, XXVI. 357; I owe the anecdote of S. Euthymius to the Rev. D. J. Chitty. CAPPADOCIAN: Basil, *de Spir. Sancto*, 29, Migne, *P.G.*, XXXII. 208. I cannot accept Holl's argument for the survival of Mysian (*Hermes*, 1908, p. 241); in Byzantine Greek *Mvola* normally means Moesia, and the language is presumably the 'Scythian' of John and Gregory.
44. For the survival of Aramaic in Petra, Palmyra, and Mesopotamia, *vid. sup.*, p. 32.
45. BATANAEA, ETC.: *I.G.R.*, III. 1191. COMMAGENE: Lucian, *Bis Accus.*, 27.
46. ANTIOCH: Joh. Chrys., *Hom. ad pop. Ant.*, xix. 1, Migne, *P.G.*, XLIX-L. 188. HERMITS: Theodoret, *Hist. Rel.*, v, xiii, xiv, xxviii, Migne, *P.G.*, LXXXII. 1352-7 (Publius), 1404 (Macedonius), 1412 (Maesymas), 1488 (Thalelaeus).
47. ELUSA: Jerome, *Vit. Hil.*, xxv, Migne, *P.L.*, XXIII. 41; cf. Libanius, *Ep.*, 101-2, 170, 315, 334, 532. Scythopolis: Schürer, *Gesch. Jüd. Volkes*, II. 381, note 139. TYRE: Soc., *H.E.*, I. 19. GAZA: Marcus Diac., *Vit. Porph.*, 66-8; cf. Bouchier, *Syria as a Roman province*, pp. 240-4.
48. On the survival of demotic, *vid. sup.*, p. 33; for Paul, see Jerome, *Vita Pauli*, iv, Migne, *P.L.*, XXIII. 20.
49. THE MONKS: Rufinus, *Hist. Mon.*, vii, Migne, *P.L.*, XXI. 420. BILINGUAL EDICT: *P. Cairo Masp.*, I. 67031. On the superficiality of Hellenism in Egypt, see Bell, *J.E.A.*, 1922, pp. 139 seqq.
50. Many Greek administrative papyri survive in Egypt from the Arab period (see *P. Lond.* V). The Colt expedition has recently discovered some in Palestine.
51. Joh. Chrys., *Hom. ad pop. Ant.*, xix, Migne, *P.G.*, XLIX-L. 188 seqq.; *P. Oxy.*, 1681.
52. Joh. Chrys., *Hom. in Matt.*, lxi. 3, Migne, *P.G.*, LVII-LVIII. 591-2; Libanius, *Or.*, XLV. 5.
53. Theodoret, *Hist. Rel.* xiv, Migne, *P.G.*, LXXXII. 1413; Letoius was a contemporary of Libanius and is often praised by him as a model decurion (*Or.*, XXXI. 47, XLVIII. 42, XLIX. 19).
54. Joh. Chrys., *Hom. in Act.*, xviii. 4, Migne, *P.G.*, LX. 147; Libanius, *Or.*, XLVII. 11 seqq.
55. See Bréhier, *Byz. Zeitschr.*, 1903, pp. 1 seqq.
56. For local gods, consult the indices of *I.G.R.*, *M.A.M.A.*, or any corpus. For penances, see Steinleitner, *Die Beicht in Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtspflege in der Antike*.
57. I cannot here enter into the question of the rise of Christianity. The general outline is fairly clear but a detailed study of the classes from which converts

came would be interesting and profitable. Julian's remarks on Hellenes are in *Ep.*, 27.

58. GAZA: Marcus Diac., *Vita Porph.* BITHYNIA: Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 96. CYPRUS AND CYRENAICA: *C.E.R.P.*, pp. 489, 486-7. The relation of city to bishopric is discussed *ib.*, 505 seqq.; see also the index under Bishoprics. PAGAN VILLAGES: Julian, *Ep.*, 27, Soz., *H.E.*, vii. 15, Libanius, *Or.*, xxx. 9-10, 13, 16 seqq.
59. Stories of the conversion of pagan villages abound in the many collections of lives of hermits, such as Theodoret's *Historia Religiosa*, or Rufinus's *Historia Monachorum*. For Publius and Hilarion, *vid. sup.*, notes 46-7. DIOCESAN ORGANIZATION: Basil, *Epp.*, *passim*, esp. 53-5, 169, 270, 290-1, Joh. Chrys., *Hom. in Act.*, xviii. 4-5, Migne, *P.G.*, lx. 146-50, Theodoret, *Ep.*, 113, Migne, *P.G.*, lxxxiii. 1316.