



HAL
open science

Livia's Prosodos Land in Philadelpheia. A Short-Lived Remnant of a Ptolemaic Tradition

Yanne Broux

► **To cite this version:**

Yanne Broux. Livia's Prosodos Land in Philadelpheia. A Short-Lived Remnant of a Ptolemaic Tradition. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 2019, 210, pp.201-211. halshs-02393301

HAL Id: halshs-02393301

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02393301>

Submitted on 6 Dec 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

YANNE BROUX

LIVIA'S *PROSODOS* LAND IN PHILADELPHIA
A SHORT-LIVED REMNANT OF A PTOLEMAIC TRADITION

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 210 (2019) 201–211

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

LIVIA'S *PROSODOS* LAND IN PHILADELPHIA
A SHORT-LIVED REMNANT OF A PTOLEMAIC TRADITION*

Landed property held by family and friends of the emperor is generally known as an οὐσία or an '(imperial) estate'. Up till now, the most encompassing work regarding Egypt is still Parássoglou's overview *Imperial Estates in Roman Egypt*¹. Several new sources with important, yet enigmatic, information have been published in the past 40 years, however. Moreover, Parássoglou limited himself to evidence from the Julio-Claudian period, touching only briefly on important reforms under later emperors. Hence these properties, and the institutions surrounding them, deserve some fresh attention.

As a part of the project *PATRIMONIUM: Geography and economy of the imperial properties in the Roman world*², I am therefore mapping the evidence from Egypt, which will be incorporated in a single database, the *Atlas patrimonii Caesaris*, together with all relevant sources from the other Roman provinces. This will allow us to explore the economic, political and social role of the *patrimonium Caesaris* and to conduct a comparative study of imperial possessions throughout the Roman Empire.

Some of the earliest attestations of holdings in Egypt that can be linked to the imperial family concerns land generally described as 'the πρόσοδος of Livia' in the village of Philadelphia in the Arsinoite nome. In this paper, I will argue that Livia's πρόσοδος land was a short-lived continuation of a Ptolemaic practice. For this purpose, I will first demonstrate that there is no decisive evidence that Ptolemaic πρόσοδος land was as a rule confiscated land, as is generally accepted. It seems, rather, that the term was used to designate land of which the revenue was set aside for a special purpose, often for the benefit of the royal family, and in the late Ptolemaic period for Roman allies. Like the Ptolemaic queens before her, Livia seems to have been entitled to the revenue of some of this land, but only for a brief time.

The πρόσοδος of Livia

In 1982, Hanson published two copies of a petition, most likely drafts, dated to AD 5³. They describe the struggles of Isidoros, who was compelled to make a sworn declaration (χειρογραφία) to cultivate a plot of land belonging to Livia by Tryphon, the στρατηγός of the nome in which the property was located⁴. As he was registered in another nome, however, he did not qualify for this service. Over the past decades, six new papyri have been published that are related to this dispute, all dated to the spring of AD 6. The entire group probably constituted a small archive⁵.

What is interesting is that the property in question was not referred to as an οὐσία, but generally as ἡ Λιβίας (or [Λιο]υίας) πρόσοδος⁶. In this context of imperial possessions, the editors translated the term

* I would like to thank Prof. A. Jördens and Prof. C. Armoni for their valuable suggestions and notes.

¹ G. M. Parássoglou, *Imperial Estates in Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology 18), Amsterdam, 1978.

² Funded through an ERC Starting Grant 2017–2022 at the Université Bordeaux-Montaigne. More information is available at <https://patrimonium.huma-num.fr/>.

³ SB 16 12713 and 12714 (= TM 14651 and 14652).

⁴ In one of the petitions, Tryphon is also styled ἐπὶ τῆς προσόδου, which was later struck out by the scribe. Hanson considers this to be mere stylistic variation for the usual title ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων (A. E. Hanson, A New Letter from the Archive of Isidoros from Psophthis, Memphite Nome, in: P. Schubert (ed.), *Actes du 26e congrès international de papyrologie. Genève, 16–21 août 2010*, Genève, 2012, 325); according to Hengstl, this was simply because the scribe was confused by the mention of πρόσοδος land and later realized that Tryphon did not hold that office: J. Hengstl, Das Archiv des Isidoros aus Psophthis aus rechtshistorischer Sicht, in: B. Palme (ed.), *Akten des 23. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Wien, 22.–28. Juli 2001* (Papyrologica Vindobonensia 1), Vienna, 2007, 275.

⁵ Called 'Isidoros vs Tryphon lawsuit'; see www.trismegistos.org/archive/113 for more information on this collection of texts.

⁶ SB 16 12713 (= TM 14651, AD 5) and 12835 (= TM 14678, AD 6), P. NYU 2 18 (= TM 47208, AD 6), Pap. Congr. XXVI (Geneva, 2010) p. 323–329 (= TM 130712, ca. AD 6), and *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 54 (2014), p. 37–44 (= TM 10546, AD 6).

πρόσοδος as ‘estate’, assuming that it was simply a synonym for οὐσία⁷. I find this rather doubtful, as land designated as πρόσοδος already existed in the Ptolemaic period. Moreover, why would the administration use a term that refers to a subset of royal land (see below) to denote private property?

Ptolemaic πρόσοδος land

In general, πρόσοδος simply means revenue, and can be used in various contexts, one of which is a specific land category in Graeco-Roman Egypt. References to πρόσοδος as a designation for land are relatively scarce though. Four alternative descriptions were used in the Ptolemaic period: γῆ ἐν προσόδῳ, κεχωρισμένη πρόσοδος, προσόδου γῆ (or προσοδικὰ ἐδάφη) and ἡ πρόσοδος τοῦ δεῖνος (see the appendix for a list of all attestations)⁸.

a) Γῆ ἐν προσόδῳ is used in very specific contexts, namely regarding the temple and the royal family. There are only two examples where ‘land in revenue’ points to (former) temple land. The first belongs to the so-called Erbstreit dossier, in which a plot of land is the subject of an inheritance dispute⁹. The land used to belong to the domain of Hathor in Pathyris, but was confiscated after the Great Revolt of 206–186 BC and was sold by auction. In several of the demotic texts of the dossier, the land is still described as ‘land which is in the northern high land of Pathyris, which is in the god’s offering (*htp-ntr*) of Hathor, which makes 35 arouras’¹⁰. In the Greek version of this contract, *htp-ntr* is translated as πρόσοδος¹¹. Even though the plot was in effect private land at this time, its outdated description shows that before the revolt, its revenue was destined for the goddess. The same phrasing is used in a sales contract, also from Pathyris, from 163 BC (P. Ryl. Gr. 2 248 = TM 227).

Γῆ ἐν προσόδῳ in the context of the royal family is attested in seven different texts. At the end of the second century BC, a report of seed distribution lists seed for sowing wheat for ‘the land in revenue of the children of the king’ among temple land in Philadelphiea¹².

Several documents from Herakleopolis, a neighboring nome, attest to similar property during the first half of the first century BC. P. Berl. Salmenkivi 15 (= TM 78013, 86 BC) is a copy of another seed distribution, this time for seed distributed to royal farmers who cultivate ‘land in revenue formerly of the mother of the king’ (i.e. Kleopatra III, wife/stepdaughter/niece of Ptolemy VIII and mother of Ptolemy X). What is

⁷ The only exception is Pap. Congr. XXVI (Geneva 2010), p. 323–329 (= TM 130712, ca. AD 6), where Hanson translates the description as ‘the revenue-estate of Livia’, without discussing this particular terminology, however. Others explicitly consider πρόσοδος to be a synonym for οὐσία, e.g. L. Capponi, *Augustan Egypt: The Creation of a Roman Province* (Studies in Classics 13), New York, 2005, 106 and C. Armoni, *Drei ptolemäische Papyri der Heidelberger Sammlung, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 132 (2000), 234. The other examples she gives, apart from Livia, where πρόσοδος and οὐσία are supposedly interchangeable, are the lands of Tigellius, Chairemon and Theon, but nowhere is their property designated as an οὐσία. The Philodamiane ousia of the second century AD is indeed called πρόσοδος once in P. Phil. Gr. 9, l. 9–10 (TM 12741, AD 158), but this estate is not a typical imperial ousia. It does not seem to have been part of the οὐσιακὸς λόγος, the department in charge of the imperial estates in Egypt, but of the διοίκησις, which managed public (and πρόσοδος) land (the most well-known example is P. Bouriant 42 [= TM 10284, AD 166–167] where the Philodamiane ousia is not listed among the other imperial estates, but under the heading βασιλικῆς γῆς καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἐν ἐκφορίοις [l. 7]). Furthermore, there seems to be a particular link between this estate and the Jewish population of the Arsinoite nome (L. Capponi, *Le fonti storiche e i documenti sulle finanze dei giudei in Egitto*, in: L. Troiani and G. Zecchini (eds.), *Le fonti storiche nei primi secoli dell’impero*, Rome, 2005, 163–171). Given its special status, I will conduct a detailed study of this estate in light of the *PATRIMONIUM* project.

⁸ All examples were found through the new word search tool at www.trismegistos.org/words, which has the benefit that it is not case sensitive, and results, including the date, provenance, and textual context, can be exported as a table easily.

⁹ K. Vandorpe and S. Vleeming, *The Erbstreit Papyri. A Bilingual Dossier from Pathyris of the Second Century BC* (Studia Demotica 13), Leuven, 2017.

¹⁰ E.g. P. Erbstreit (2017) 2 and 3, l. 3 (= TM 145, 184 BC); P. Erbstreit (2017) 6, l. 7 (= TM 113818, 153 BC); P. Erbstreit (2017) 11, l. 5 (= TM 382621, 136 BC).

¹¹ P. Erbstreit (2017) 13 (= TM 5882, 134–133 BC); B l. 30 [= Greek translation of Demotic P. Erbstreit (2017) 6 (= TM 113818)] and C l. 41–42 [= Greek translation of Demotic P. Erbstreit (2017) 11 (= TM 382621)].

¹² P. Petrie 3 97, l. 10–11 (= TM 7552, 214–205 BC). For the provenance, see W. J. R. RübSam, *Götter und Kulte in Faijum während der griechisch-römisch-byzantinischen Zeit*, Bonn, 1974, 142, 145–147, and 212.

interesting, moreover, is that these royal farmers are not designated by the usual term βασιλικοὶ γεωργοί, but as βασιλίσσης γεωργοί (l. 5)¹³. The same description is used in P. Berl. Salmenkivi 3, l. 6 (= TM 78001, 86 BC), where a distinction is made between βασιλικοῖς καὶ βασιλίσσης κα[ὶ] πασῶν προσόδων γεωργοῖς, i.e. royal farmers, farmers of the queen, and those of all (other) revenues¹⁴. This distinction between revenue for the queen and 'other revenue' can also be found in P. Berl. Salmenkivi 20 (= TM 47217, 78 BC), again reporting a delivery of seed to royal farmers (βασιλικοὶ γεωργοί here) who have sworn to sow 'all the royal land around the village, both of the queen and of the other revenues' (l. 10–11). The same group of documents from Herakleopolis also includes a very damaged text reporting a delivery of grain, of which the second line reads [βασι]λι[κ]ῆς γῆς ἐπεὶ (l. ἐπὶ τ[ῶν] προσόδων βασιλίσσης¹⁵. Salmenkivi, the editor of these four texts, has suggested that the revenues produced on these plots of royal land were designed to support the royal cult of Kleopatra III¹⁶. I believe the texts are pretty straightforward here, and we are dealing with revenues set aside as a private income for the queen's personal expenses. In Belgium, for example, select members of the royal family are granted an endowment to compensate for the lack of a regular income derived from professional activities. This allocation is awarded by the state and is intended to maintain these members and cover any operating and staff expenses¹⁷.

In 119 BC, two farmers appeal to the στρατηγός in regard to the 'land in revenue' they cultivate in Kerkesoucha, a village not far from Karanis in the Fayum (the exact complaint is lost)¹⁸. The line mentioning this land is heavily damaged, and the editors only restored the smaller lacunae: τὴν [ἐ]ν προσ[όδ]ωι τῆ[ς]ισ[] γῆν. D. Kaltsas proposes the supplement τῆ[ς] βασιλ[ίσσης] γῆν, which seems very plausible in light of the previous examples¹⁹.

Finally, P. Tebt. 1 87 (= TM 3723, 116–115 BC) should be mentioned: it is a land survey of a village near Kerkeosiris in the southern Fayum. The first column starts by describing a plot ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν προ(σόδωι) (γῆς) (l. 1). No information about the beneficiary is given, but further on the same land is described as κεχω(ρισμένης) προ(σόδου) (l. 7), which brings us to the second description.

b) The expression κεχωρισμένη πρόσοδος appears 35 times in texts that are mostly from Kerkeosiris, Magdola and Tebtynis (three villages in the southwest of the Fayum), and are dated between 119 and 111 BC. The few first-century attestations are from the neighboring Herakleopolite nome. According to Rostovtzeff, this designation is specifically used for confiscated δωρεά²⁰, but this is probably based on a misinterpretation of some texts, including P. Tebt. 1 77²¹, where (πρότερον) Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλίνου (l. 5) does not point to the former owner, but to an official who was in charge of bringing derelict land back into cultivation²².

In land registers in the archive of Menches²³, this type is registered as a subset of royal land: in some instances, it had been derelict land (ὑπολόγος) but was brought back under cultivation²⁴. Here too, the

¹³ BGU 18 2734 (= TM 69808, 86 BC) refers to the same distribution; the phrasing of the relevant passage is nearly identical.

¹⁴ I follow Kaltsas' interpretation of this passage: D. Kaltsas, *Aus den Archiven der Königlichen Schreiber Peteimuthes und Harchebis. Zu Erja Salmenkivi, Cartonnage Papyri in Context. New Ptolemaic Documents from Abū Šīr al-Malaq, Tyche*, 18 (2003), 10; contra E. Salmenkivi, *Cartonnage Papyri in Context. New Ptolemaic Documents from Abū Šīr al-Malaq* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 119), Helsinki, 2002, 84, n. 5–6.

¹⁵ P. Berl. Salmenkivi 6 (= TM 78004, 86 BC).

¹⁶ Salmenkivi, *Cartonnage Papyri in Context*, 59–60.

¹⁷ www.monarchie.be/en/information/contact.

¹⁸ P. Mil. Vogl. 3 128, l. 6–7 (= TM 5247).

¹⁹ Armoni, *Drei ptolemäische Papyri der Heidelberger Sammlung*, 235–236 with note 39.

²⁰ M. Rostovtzeff, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Archiv für Papyrusforschung, Beiheft 1), Leipzig–Berlin, 1910, 145.

²¹ TM 3713, 110 BC.

²² Armoni, *Drei ptolemäische Papyri der Heidelberger Sammlung*, 236, n. 41.

²³ For more information on this archive, see www.trismegistos.org/archive/140 with references to further literature.

²⁴ Not only the aforementioned P. Tebt. 1 77, but also P. Tebt. 1 60, l. 56 and 99 (= TM 3696, 117 BC); P. Tebt 1 67, col. 5 (= TM 3703, 117 BC); and P. Tebt. 1 61 B, l. 9 (= TM 2622, 117 BC) for example.

editors consider this category of ‘separated revenue’ to be cultivated land of which the rent is set aside for a specific purpose, perhaps as an endowment for members of the royal family²⁵, just like the examples described under a). This is confirmed by a rather fragmentary land survey from the Herakleopolite nome, where the heading καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν κεχωρισ[μ]ένων [προσό]δων is followed by a village name (Toou) and then by the label βασιλίσις²⁶. In this case, the revenue was destined for the queen.

Four documents mention some sort of ‘overseer of the separated revenue’, a προστάς (for προστάτης?) τῆς κεχωρισμένης προσόδου²⁷. Perhaps he was responsible for collecting the rents on these lands, which, according to Rathbone, fell to the department of the ἴδιος λόγος²⁸. In one of these texts (P. Tebt. 1 81 = TM 3717, 115 BC), a group of such overseers lays claim to the κλήροι of some policemen, which, as Armoni already remarked, is the only instance that could point to πρόσδοος land being confiscated land²⁹. However, since the κλήροι are not specifically styled as πρόσδοος, and the reason for the interference of the προστάται is not known, this is rather meager evidence indeed.

c) The only attestation of πρόσδοος γῆ dates to the second half of the second century BC³⁰. In a petition to the chief of the police, Peton complains that his father, who leased four arouras of this type of land in the village of Phnebieus from Herakles and Demetrios, already paid them the rent, but afterwards Apollonios, styled as προστάς τῆς προσόδου harassed them to pay a second time.

Armoni turns to the Roman period to look for an explanation for this πρόσδοος land, in particular to a land register from Hiera Nesos and surrounding villages, where πρόσδοος land is registered as a subcategory of royal land³¹. There, it is interpreted as land that has been confiscated by the fisc (the διοίκησις) and is managed by that department until the time that it is sold again³². The land mentioned in our petition was situated in the κλήρος of Chauros³³. If it was indeed confiscated, then Chauros may have been the person from whom the land was taken, but the κλήρος name may just as well be a fossilized toponym referring to the original owner³⁴. Moreover, Apollonios’ title is strikingly similar to that of the προστάται τῆς κεχωρισμένης προσόδου found in the Tebtynis evidence discussed above³⁵. The πρόσδοος land leased

²⁵ P. Tebt. 1, Appendix 1 §7.

²⁶ BGU 14 2439, l. 82–84 (= TM 4035, 99–70 BC).

²⁷ P. Tebt. 1 60, l. 125–126 (= TM 3696, 117 BC): Dionysios; perhaps the same as Dionysios son of Ptolemaios, who is overseer of derelict land in P. Tebt. 1 66 (= TM 3702, 120 BC), P. Tebt. 1 74 (= TM 3710, 113 BC) and P. Tebt. 1 75 (= TM 3711, 112 BC), and simply overseer in P. Tebt. 1 77 (= TM 3713, 110 BC). P. Tebt. 1 64, B, l. 14 (= TM 3700, 115 BC) and P. Tebt. 4 1113, B, l. 259–260 (= TM 3708, 113 BC): Asklepiades, who in P. Tebt. 1 76, col. 2, l. 3–4 (= TM 3712, 112 BC), together with Kephalon, is styled ὁ χειρικῶς τὴν κεχωρισμένην πρόσδοον. P. Tebt. 1 81, col. 5, l. 20 (= TM 3717, 115 BC) speaks of οἱ προστάται τῆς κεχωρισμένης προσόδου in general.

²⁸ D. Rathbone, Egypt, Augustus and Roman Taxation, *Cahiers du Centre G. Glotz*, 4 (1993), 106. The standard reference for the ἴδιος λόγος is still P. R. Swarney, *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos* (American Studies in Papyrology 8), Toronto, 1970. This separate account was created in the early second century BC, perhaps after the Great Revolt, to manage confiscated property as well as other income that went directly to the royal family instead of to the state treasury (the διοίκησις).

²⁹ Armoni, *Drei ptolemäische Papyri der Heidelberger Sammlung*, 236.

³⁰ SB 26 16801 (= TM 44708). Both 147 and 136 BC are possible dates.

³¹ P. Bouriant 42 (= TM 10284, AD 166–167). Royal land, also called crown land under the Ptolemies, and public land in the Roman period, was non-private land leased to royal farmers and was taxed at a higher rate than private land. See K. Blouin, *Between Water and Sand. Agriculture and Husbandry*, in: C. Riggs (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*, Oxford, 2012, 23–26 for a short overview of different land types in Roman Egypt. A more extensive analysis of land categories in both periods is offered by A. Monson, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans. Political and Economic Change in Egypt*, Cambridge, 2012, chapter 3.

³² P. Collart, *Les Papyrus Bouriant*, Paris, 1926, 156–159.

³³ In Ptolemaic Egypt, the term κλήρος was used to denote land that was awarded to soldiers (i.e. clerouchic land). Although this was not private land, at the death of the father it was generally transmitted to his heir, who was expected take over the military duties tied to it as well; see C. Fischer-Bovet, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Armies of the Ancient World), Cambridge, 2014, 225ff.

³⁴ Armoni, *Drei ptolemäische Papyri der Heidelberger Sammlung*, 235, n. 37 with references to further literature on the subject of permanent κλήρος names.

³⁵ See especially note 27.

by Peton's father thus also seems to have been some kind of 'separated revenue' land, of which the rent was normally collected by a special official who was perhaps affiliated to the department of the ἴδιος λόγος, as Rathbone suggests.

Προσοδικὰ ἐδάφη is also attested only once in a receipt acknowledging that an unknown person has paid a compensation for the hay his sheep grazed down in a plot of revenue land in the village of Sethrempais in the Fayum³⁶.

In contrast to the plots described as γῆ ἐν προσόδῳ (see a) above), the beneficiary of the revenues is not mentioned in either of the two examples here. In my communication with professor Armoni, she kindly pointed out that the reason for this might simply be that these were the only plots of πρόσδοδος land in Phnebieus and Sethrempais, and that it was therefore known which land was meant. She pointed to P. Tarich. 9a and b (= TM 316251 and 316252, 185–184 BC), where a certain Demetrios is described as τῷ πρὸς τῆι δωρεάι ('the one in charge of the δωρεά'), without it being specified which estate, i.e. to whom it belonged³⁷. On the other hand, in the examples where κερωρισμένη πρόσδοδος is used, the recipient of the revenue is generally not added either, so it does not seem to have been mandatory.

d) In the late Ptolemaic period, a new type of designation appears: ἡ (πρότερον) τοῦ δέινος πρόσδοδος. There are two examples, and in both cases, the names are Latin and thus refer to Romans. The first occurs in a petition from 52–51 BC by Ptolemaios to the strategos Seleukos concerning taxes on the πρόσδοδος land he cultivated³⁸. The plot is described as 'the πρόσδοδος (land) formerly of Apicius in the former kleros of Agelaos'. It has been suggested that he was a soldier, either in the Ptolemaic army, or a Roman legionary who had settled in Egypt (perhaps after Aulus Gabinius' intervention in Alexandria in 55 BC?)³⁹. High-ranking Romans were also granted land and privileges by the Ptolemies sometimes, as the examples of Lucius Septimius⁴⁰ and Publius Canidius⁴¹ demonstrate. It is therefore tempting to suggest an earlier relative of the gourmet Marcus Gavius Apicius⁴², who was close to Tiberius, but too little is known about his family history to back this up.

The second example is a short note from Korkodeilos, scribe and manager of 'the πρόσδοδος (land) formerly of Tigellius', concerning cattle⁴³. The text is dated as late-Ptolemaic – early Imperial on paleographical grounds. The name Tigellius is rare, and all attestations outside Egypt are dated to the end of the first century AD or later⁴⁴. The editor suggests an identification with Marcus Tigellius Ialysos, who is attested in an Alexandrian loan contract in 11–10 BC⁴⁵. Cicero and Horace both mention a poet by the same name who was a friend of Julius Caesar⁴⁶. Since no papyrological evidence attesting to Caesar's

³⁶ P. Ryl. Gr. 2 73 (= TM 5291, 32–31 BC).

³⁷ See also the introduction to this edition (p. 13), where she surmises whether this designation is perhaps the same as προεστηκὸς τῆς τοῦ δέινος δωρεᾶς, like in SB 20 15150, l. 8–9 (= TM 8130, 145 BC), for example.

³⁸ BGU 8 1828 (= TM 4907).

³⁹ L. Rossi, Romans and Land Property Rights in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Identification of Lucius Septimius, *Ancient Society*, 44 (2014), 140.

⁴⁰ Ibidem.

⁴¹ *Ancient Society*, 30 (2000), p. 29–34 (= TM 78025, 33 BC). K. Zimmermann, P. Bingen 45: Eine Steuerbefreiung für Q. Cascellius, adressiert an Kaisarion, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 138 (2002), 133–139, however, reads the name Quintus Cascellius, while Capponi, *Augustan Egypt*, 225, n. 57 offers two other alternatives: Publius Carisius and Lucius Caninius Gallus.

⁴² He is known from several anecdotes by authors such as Tacitus, Seneca and Pliny the Elder; see PIR² G 0091.

⁴³ BGU 7 1669 (= TM 69744).

⁴⁴ A search in the Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss–Slaby of Latin inscriptions (www.manfredclaus.de) gives only one inscription (CIL VI 27413 = TM 227202, second century AD); the Packard Humanities Institute database of Greek inscriptions (<https://epigraphy.packhum.org>) lists 9 instances, 6 of which refer to the same M. Tigellius Lupus, a member of the elite of Ephesos.

⁴⁵ BGU 4 1168 (= TM 18620).

⁴⁶ B. L. Ullman, Horace, Catullus, and Tigellius, *Classical Philology*, 10 (1915), 271.

dealings in Egypt survives, it would be very exciting to claim that this text indicates that Caesar (or perhaps Kleopatra⁴⁷) awarded land to his loyalists. There is, however, no firm basis on which to do so.

In neither of the two instances is it clear whether the land was initially private, and only became *πρόσοδος* land after Apicius and Tigellius lost ownership (through sale or confiscation?), or whether it was already revenue land at the time they profited from it. In the case of the latter, we would have a clear precedent for the land that in the dispute between Isidoros and Tryphon is described as ‘the revenue (land) of Livia’ (see below).

To summarize: Ptolemaic *πρόσοδος* land seems to have been a type of state land from which the royal family or private individuals received an income on a long-term basis, or land that used to belong to the temple and thus provided revenue for this institution. Only one text may indicate that (some) Ptolemaic *πρόσοδος* land consisted of confiscated land: in SB 26 16801 (= TM 44708; see type c)), the *πρόσοδος* land is part of a *kleros*, which at some point in the past therefore must have been clerouchic land⁴⁸. Although this type of land was hereditary, it never became fully private under the Ptolemies. Confiscations are still attested in the first century BC, upon which the plots were reverted to the status of royal land⁴⁹. Since *πρόσοδος* land was a subset of this crown land, it is therefore possible that some of the other attestations of revenue land, of which the origins are not specified, consisted of confiscated land. This does not mean that this was the rule, however, as is currently the scholarly consensus. It is equally plausible that some of the *πρόσοδος* land was originally “regular” crown land that was converted into revenue land in response to the accession of a new queen, the birth of a prince, or the establishment of a royal cult, for example, in order to provide an income. If the two examples of type d) were already *πρόσοδος* land at the time of Apicius and Tigellius respectively, this would mean that they were not the actual owners, but were merely granted the privilege of benefitting from the revenue. In this scenario, the owner remained the king.

A Ptolemaic tradition for a Roman lady

Ptolemaic *πρόσοδος* land thus provides a plausible precedent for the early-Roman revenue land associated with Livia. More, albeit indirect, evidence can be presented when looking at the location of some of the examples discussed above. Since revenue land was a subset of royal land, it is only natural that most attestations are situated in the Fayum and the neighboring Herakleopolite nome, where crown land was paramount. What is striking, however, is that in some cases continuity can be traced on the village level (see tables 1 and 2).

Phnebieus (Herakleopolite nome)	
136 BC	TM 44708 ⁵⁰ : τῆς προσόδου γῆς
52–51 BC	TM 4907 ⁵¹ : τῆς πρότερον Ἀπικκίου προσόδου

Table 1: *πρόσοδος* land in Phnebieus

Both in the case of Apicius and Livia, the existence of *πρόσοδος* land in Phnebieus and in Philadelphia respectively can be traced back to previous centuries. This not only lends further credit to the assumption that Apicius was not the actual owner of this land, but merely profited from its revenues. It also suggests that the Ptolemaic tradition of setting aside revenue for expenses related to the royal family was continued, at least for a short while, in the case of Livia.

⁴⁷ Monson, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans*, 86–93.

⁴⁸ But how far back in time is impossible to tell, since we may be dealing with a fossilized κλήρος.

⁴⁹ Fischer-Bovet, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, 227.

⁵⁰ SB 26 16801, l. 10.

⁵¹ BGU 8 1828, l. 7–8.

Philadelpheia (Fayum aka Arsinoite nome)	
214–205 BC	TM 7552 ⁵² : τῆς ἐν προσόδοι τῶν τέκνων τοῦ βασιλέως
Late Ptolemaic/early Roman	TM 69744 ⁵³ : τῆς (πρότερον) Τιγελλίου προσόδου
AD 5–6	TM 14651, 10546, 14678, 47208, 130712 ⁵⁴ : τῆς Λιβίας προσόδου

Table 2: πρόσδοος land in Philadelpheia

We can only guess at the reason why this solution of assigning πρόσδοος land to someone of the imperial family was so short-lived. Perhaps the idea of using state land for personal benefits was simply too un-Roman. In the image Augustus had created of himself (and thus his family) of *primus inter pares*⁵⁵, it was probably not justifiable to bestow public revenue upon his wife. Owning private property, on the other hand, was a different matter.

The πρόσδοος of Livia is not the last attestation of this type of land, however. In a petition of AD 37, for example, Herakles complains that hay was stolen from the revenue lands he cultivated⁵⁶. Especially interesting is that he explicitly mentions that this revenue was stored in a separate account, i.e. the account of the νομάρχης, but that it belonged to the state: προσοδικοῖς ἐδάφεσι χόρτον τεθηκοποιημένο(ν) (l. τεθηκοποιημένον) εἰς τὸν λόγον τοῦ νομάρχου ἰδιοσπορίᾳ δημόσιον (l. 14–19). Since during the first century AD the νομάρχης was still responsible for grain transport⁵⁷, the hay was perhaps stored in his account as payment for the μονοδεσμία χόρτου, a tax in kind on hay (levied per aroua)⁵⁸. A quick search through TM Words yields over 100 results for πρόσδοος (excluding texts where it is not used in the context of land), with a large number from second-century Karanis. The last attestation of revenue land is dated to AD 222–223⁵⁹.

To be clear: with this short overview I do not want to posit that the estates of the Julio-Claudian emperors and their family members as a rule consisted of Ptolemaic πρόσδοος land. The example of Livia's plot may well have been the only case where someone of the imperial entourage was entitled to the profits of such land. Most estates were no doubt created out of land confiscated from supporters of Kleopatra or Marcus Antonius. Cassius Dio's passage 51.17.6–8 is often quoted in support of this⁶⁰, although he does not mention whether Octavian kept the land or distributed it to his family or friends, but rather that the wealth generated by these confiscations was used to pay his troops, repay loans, and enrich the empire and its temples. For now, there is no evidence from Egypt apart from a single papyrus mentioning land owned by Augustus⁶¹, and even in this case, we do not know the exact history of the property, which is described as [τῆς πρότερον] Πετενεφιεῖους νυνεὶ δὲ Κα[ί]σαρος Αὐτοκράτορος γῆς]. The editor suggests that the land originally belonging to Petenepheis had probably been temple land, since the few people we know called Petenepheis in the Ptolemaic period all happen to have been priests. This is perhaps a bit much to infer

⁵² P. Petrie 3 97, l. 10.

⁵³ BGU 7 1669, l. 2.

⁵⁴ SB 16 12713, l. 10; *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 54 (2014), p. 37–44, l. 8; SB 16 12835, l. 3; P. NYU 2 18, l. 9; and Pap. Congr. XXVI (Geneva, 2010) p. 323–329, l. 9 respectively.

⁵⁵ As stated in the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 34, for example: *Post id tempus auctoritate omnibus praestiti potestatis autem nihilo amplius habui quam ceteri qui mihi quoque in magistratu conlegae fuerunt* – ‘After that time I excelled all in influence, although I had no more power than those others who were my colleagues in each magistracy’ (Latin text from <http://data.perseus.org/citations/urn:cts:latinLit:phi1221.phi007.perseus-lat1:34>).

⁵⁶ P. Ryl. Gr. 2 142 (= TM 12928).

⁵⁷ F. Reiter, *Die Nomarchen des Arsinoites. Ein Beitrag zum Steuerwesen im römischen Ägypten* (Papyrologica Coloniae 31), Paderborn, 2004, 95–99, especially 98.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 199–201.

⁵⁹ P. Giss. Univ. 6 52 (= TM 11284).

⁶⁰ E.g. D. J. Crawford, *Imperial Estates*, in: M. I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Roman Property*, Cambridge, 1976, 40; J. Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt: The Social Relations of Agriculture in the Oxyrhynchite Nome*, Oxford, 1996, 55.

⁶¹ SB 14 11933 (= TM 14532).

from just a name, and the editor was perhaps too keen to link this only known example of Augustus owning land to the prevailing view of widespread temple confiscations under the first Roman ruler. As Connor's recent refutation of the scholarly consensus of large-scale confiscations of temple land shows⁶², we should be careful to put too much emphasis on such assumptions. Petenepheis' land may have well simply become unproductive during the long-lasting struggles of the previous decades. Both Cassius Dio and Suetonius mention that the canals needed clearing after a long period of neglect⁶³. If Petenepheis died without heirs, the land would also have been confiscated by the state and put up for sale again. Perhaps Augustus resorted to such unproductive land to benefit his friends and family⁶⁴. Whether they obtained the land as a gift, or through purchase, just like "normal" property owners, remains unclear. Until further evidence surfaces, we will have to resign ourselves that there are simply many things we still do not know ...

Yanne Broux, Institut Ausonius–LaScArBx, Université Bordeaux Montaigne
yanne.broux@u-bordeaux-montaigne.fr

⁶² A. Connor, *Temples as Economic Agents in Early Roman Egypt: The Case of Tebtunis and Soknopaiou Nesos*, Cincinnati, 2014 (unpublished PhD dissertation), chapter 3.

⁶³ Cassius Dio, *Hist. Rom.* 51.18.1 and Suetonius, *Aug.*, 18.3.

⁶⁴ D. J. Thompson, Imperial Estates, J. Wachter (ed.), *The Roman World. Volume II*, London–New York, 1990, 558–559.

Appendix: attestations of πρόσδοσις land in Ptolemaic Egypt (+ the πρόσδοσις of Livia)

TM number	Publication	Attested form	Date	Written
7552	P. Petrie 3 97, 10	τῆς ἐν πρόσδοσι τῶν τέκνων τοῦ βασιλέως	-214	Egypt, 00a – Philadelpheia (Gharabet el-Gerza)
44962	P. Wash. Univ. 2 76, 16	κεχω(ρισμένης) πρ(οσόδου)	-199	Egypt, U19 – Oxyrynchos (Bahnasa)
227	P. Ryl. Gr. 2 248, 2	ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ πρόσδοσι τῆς Ἀφροδίτης	-163	Egypt, U04a – Pathyris (Gebelein)
113818	P. Erbstreit (2017) 6, 7	<i>htr-ntt n [H.t]-Hr</i>	-153	Egypt, U04a – Pathyris (Gebelein)
382621	P. Erbstreit (2017) 11, 5	<i>[htr-ntt H.t-Hr]</i>	-136	Egypt, U04a – Pathyris (Gebelein)
44708	SB 26 16801, 10	ἀπὸ τῆς προσόδου γῆς	-147	Egypt, U20 – Phnebieus
5882	P. Erbstreit (2017) 13B, 30	[ἐν τῇ] προσόδοι τῆς Ἄθωρ	-134	Egypt, U04a – Pathyris (Gebelein)
5882	P. Erbstreit (2017) 13C, 41–42	ἐν τῇ προσόδοι τῆς Ἀθέρ[βε]νταίως	-134	Egypt, U04a – Pathyris (Gebelein)
5247	P. Mil. Vogl. 3 128, 6	τὴν [ἐ]ν προσόδοι τῆς βασιλ[ισσῆς] γῆν	-119	Egypt, 00a – Karanis (Kom Aushim)
3786	P. Tebt. 4 1117 fr. a–b (col. 1–3), 118	ἡ κεχω(ρισμένη) πρόσδοσις	-119	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3720	P. Tebt. 1 84 fr. a + c (col. 1–3 + 10), 25	ἡ κεχω(ρισμένη) πρόσδοσις	-118	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3720	P. Tebt. 1 84 fr. a + c (col. 1–3 + 10), 209	κεχω(ρισμένης) προσόδου	-118	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3703	P. Tebt. 1 67, 92–94	εἰς τὴν κεχω(ρισμένην) πρόσδοσιν	-117	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
2622	P. Tebt. 1 61 b, 9	ἐν τῇ[ι] [κ]εχειρισμένην πρόσδοσι	-117	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
2622	P. Tebt. 1 61 b, 250	κεχω(ρισμένης) πρ(οσόδου)	-117	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3696	P. Tebt. 1 60, 56	κεχω(ρισμένης) προσόδου	-117	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3696	P. Tebt. 1 60, 99	κεχω(ρισμένης) πρ(οσόδου)	-117	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3696	P. Tebt. 1 60, 126	[τοῦ] ... προστάτος τῆς κεχω(ρισμένης) πρ(οσόδου)	-117	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3807	P. Tebt. 4 1118, 200	[ἡ] κεχω(ρισμένη) πρόσδοσις	-117	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3723	P. Tebt. 1 87, 7	κεχω(ρισμένης) πρ(οσόδου)	-116	Egypt, 00c – Tebtynis (Umm el-Baragat)
3723	P. Tebt. 1 87, 53	κεχω(ρισμένης) προσόδου	-116	Egypt, 00c – Tebtynis (Umm el-Baragat)
3723	P. Tebt. 1 87, 60	κεχω(ρισμένης) πρ(οσόδου)	-116	Egypt, 00c – Tebtynis (Umm el-Baragat)
3717	P. Tebt. 1 81, 4	ἐν τῇ κεχω(ρισμένη) π[ρο]σ[ό]δοι	-115	Egypt, 00c – Magdola (Medinet Nehas)
3717	P. Tebt. 1 81, 19	οἱ προστάται τῆς κεχω(ρισμένης) πρ(οσόδου)	-115	Egypt, 00c – Magdola (Medinet Nehas)
3719	P. Tebt. 1 83, 49	ἐν τῇ [ε]σπαρ[ι] κεχω(ρισμένη) πρ(οσόδου)	-115	Egypt, 00c – Magdola (Medinet Nehas)
3700	P. Tebt. 1 64 b, col. 2, 1. 14–15	[Ἀσκληπι]άδου τοῦ προστάντος [τῆς] [κεχω(ρισμένης)] [προσόδου]	-115	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3848	P. Tebt. 4 1119, 20	ἡ κεχω(ρισμένη) πρ(οσόδου)	-115	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3848	P. Tebt. 4 1119, 36	ἡ κεχω(ρισμένη) πρ(οσόδου)	-115	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris

3848	P. Tebt. 4 1119, 81	ἡ κεχω(ρισμένη) πρ(όσοδος)	-115	-114	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3848	P. Tebt. 4 1119, 106	ἡ κεχ[ω(ρισμένη) πρ(όσοδος)]	-115	-114	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3708	P. Tebt. 1 72 + P. Tebt. 4 1113, 260	Ἀσκληπιάδου τοῦ προστάντος τῆς προσόδου	-114	-113	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3712	P. Tebt. 1 76, 4	τὴν κεχωρισμένην πρόσδοον	-112	-112	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3714	P. Tebt. 1 78, 6	ἐν τῇ κεχωρισμένῃ προσόδῳ	-111	-107	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3899	P. Tebt. 4 1120, col. 1, 1.8	ἡ κεχω(ρισμένη) πρ(όσοδος)	-111	-111	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
3713	P. Tebt. 1 77, 4	ἐν τῇ κεχωρισμένῃ προσόδῳ	-110	-110	Egypt, 00c – Kerkeosiris
4528	BGU 6 1216 a, 81	κεχωρισμένης προσόδου	-110	-110	Egypt, L01 – Memphis, Mit Rahina (?)
4035	BGU 14 2439, 4–5	τῆς κεχωρισμένης προσόδου	-99	-70	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolites
4035	BGU 14 2439, 11	κεχωρισμένης προσόδου	-99	-70	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolites
4035	BGU 14 2439, 82–83	ὀπὸ τῶν κεχωρισ[μ]ένων [προσό]δων	-99	-70	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolites
4035	BGU 14 2439, 93	κεχωρισμένης πρ[ο]σόδου	-99	-70	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolites
4029	BGU 14 2433, 26	κεχωρισμένης προσόδου	-99	-70	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolites
69744	BGU 7 1669, 2	Κορκοδείλου ἡραμιματέως προσετώτος τῆς (πρότερον)	-99	99	Egypt, 00a – Philadelphiea (Gharabet el-Gerza)
5542	P. Yale 1 58, 4	Τιγγιλίου προσόδου	-98	-98	Egypt, 00c – Tebtynis (Umm el-Baragat)
78013	P. Berl. Salmenkivi 1.5, 6	κεχωρ(ισμένης) [π]ρ(οσόδου) ἐν προσόδοις (πρότερον) τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως γῆς	-86	-86	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolis (Ihnasya el-Medina)
78013	P. Berl. Salmenkivi 1.5, 10	πᾶσαν ἐν προσόδοι γῆ[v]	-86	-86	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolis (Ihnasya el-Medina)
69808	BGU 18 2734, 6	[ἐν] προσ(όδοι) (πρότερον) τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως γῆς	-86	-85	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolites
69808	BGU 18 2734, 10	πᾶσαν ἐν προσόδοι γῆ[v]	-86	-85	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolites
78001	P. Berl. Salmenkivi 3, 5–6	τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ τόπου βασιλικοῦς καὶ βασιλίσσης κα[ῖ] πασῶν προσόδων γεωργίως	-86	-86	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolis (Ihnasya el-Medina)
78002	P. Berl. Salmenkivi 4, 2–3	τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ τόπου βασιλικοῦς γεωργίως καὶ κεχω[ρισμένων] [πρ]οσόδων	-86	-86	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolis (Ihnasya el-Medina)
78004	P. Berl. Salmenkivi 6, 2	[βασι]λι[κ]ῆς γῆς ἐπεὶ τ[ὸν] προσόδων βασιλίσσης	-86	-86	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolis (Ihnasya el-Medina)
47217	P. Berl. Salmenkivi 20, 10–11	πᾶσαν τὴν περὶ τὴν κόμην βασιλικὴν γῆν καὶ βασιλίσσης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πρ[ο]σόδων	-78	-78	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolis (Ihnasya el-Medina)
4907	BGU 8 1828, 7–8	ὀπὸ τῆς πρότερον Ἀπικκίου προσόδου	-52	-51	Egypt, U20 – Herakleopolites
5291	P. Ryl. Gr. 2 73, 13	ἐδαφῶν προσοδικῶν	-32	-31	Egypt, 00b – Euhemeria (Qasr el-Banat)

πρόσодος of Livia TM number	Publication	Attested form	Date	Written
14652	SB 16 12714	τῶι Τρύφωνι [τῶι ἐπὶ τῆς προσόδου]	5	Egypt, 00a – Philadelpheia (Gharabet el-Gerza)
10546	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i> , 54 (2014), p. 37–44, 8	ὀπὸ τῆς Λιβίας προσόδου	6	Egypt, 00a – Philadelpheia (Gharabet el-Gerza)
14651	SB 16 12713, 10	τῆς Λιβίας προ[σὸδ]ο[υ]	6	Egypt, 00a – Philadelpheia (Gharabet el-Gerza)
14678	SB 16 12835, 3	[ἐπὸ τῆς Λιο]βίας προσόδου	6	Egypt, 00a – Philadelpheia (Gharabet el-Gerza)
47208	P. NYU 2 18, 9	ὀπ[ὸ τ]ῆς Λιβίας προσόδου	6	Egypt, 00a – Philadelpheia (Gharabet el-Gerza)
130712	Pap. Congr. XXVI (Geneva, 2010), p. 323–329, 9	τῆς Λιβίας προσόδου	6	Egypt, 00a – Philadelpheia (Gharabet el-Gerza)
41420	SB 24 15909, 4–5	τῆς προσόδου καὶ οὐσιακ[ῆς]*	6	Egypt, 00a – Philadelpheia (Gharabet el-Gerza)

*Note: the reading καὶ οὐσιακ[ῆς] seems very doubtful, since the feminine singular οὐσιακῆ (in the sense of οὐσιακῆ γῆ) is not attested before the final quarter of the first century AD. Apart from the κ (supplemented as καί) and the υ, none of the other letters read by Hanson are clearly visible on the image available at [papyri.info \(http://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;24;15909\)](http://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;24;15909). Moreover, as is visible from the word προσόδου (l. 4), σπυδῶσαι (l. 6) and οὐ (l. 7) on the image, the letters of the combination 'ου' are written separately, while on l. 5 (where Hanson reads οὐσιακ[ῆς]), the υ seems to be connected to the preceding letter.