FROM THE PTOLEMIES TO THE ROMANS

This book gives a structured account of Egypt’s transition from Ptolemaic to Roman rule by identifying key relationships between ecology, land tenure, taxation, administration, and politics. It introduces theoretical perspectives from the social sciences and subjects them to empirical scrutiny using data from Greek and Demotic papyri as well as comparative evidence. Although building on recent scholarship, it offers some provocative arguments that challenge prevailing views. For example, patterns of land ownership are linked to population density and are seen as one aspect of continuity between the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. Fiscal reform, by contrast, emerges as a significant mechanism of change not only in the agrarian economy but also in the administrative system and the whole social structure. Anyone seeking to understand the impact of Roman rule in the Hellenistic east must consider the well-attested processes in Egypt that this book seeks to explain.
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Abbreviations and notes on the text

The editions of Greek and Demotic papyri and ostraka are abbreviated according to the conventions in the Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets, Web Edition (http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html). An equal (=) sign is usually used to indicate new editions: for example, P. Eleph. Dem. 6 = P. Bürghsch. 14. Those documents not included in the checklist are cited using an inventory number or conventional designation followed by a reference to the publication: for example, P. Haun. inv. 407 = Christensen (2002). For convenience, the date and provenance have often been given in parentheses alongside references in the footnotes of this book. Sometimes both the village or city and the name of the nome or administrative division (typically ending in -ite) are given: for example, P. Bour. 42 (166/167 CE; Hiera Nesos, Arsinoite). If the village or city is uncertain or irrelevant, only the name of the nome is given. For example, P. Tebt. I 5 (118 BCE; Arsinoite). PP is the abbreviation used for the Prosopographia Ptolemaica, a multi-volume reference work edited by W. Peremans, E. van ’t Dack, and others, and published in Leuven as part of the series Studia Hellenistica.
Greek and Egyptian words

In many instances the arguments in this book depend on the interpretation of terms used in the ancient sources. To make it easier for non-specialist readers, it seemed preferable to use an English translation wherever possible and to provide the original word or phrase only in parentheses. There are a few exceptional terms that needed to be incorporated into the main text because their English renderings are too misleading, but these are then thoroughly defined and discussed. Examples include the Greek term katoikos (plural katoikoi), which indicates a special status of military settlers and the Grecized Egyptian term lesonis (plural lesones), which refers to a temple official. Latin transliteration has been consistently adopted to facilitate pronunciation and a macron has been added to distinguish long vowels occurring in the last syllable. Only in a few longer quotations in the footnotes did the use of the Greek script seem warranted.

A further note on pronunciation may be helpful for readers who are unfamiliar with the Egyptian language. Diacritical marks and special signs are needed to represent particular sounds. The aleph (𐤀) and ayin (𐤁) are usually simplified in English as an a-sound and the y and yod (𐤉) as an ee-sound, while the š represents a sh-sound and the ŝ a ch-sound. Other diacritical marks are used to signify aspirated or guttural consonants. Because neither the hieroglyphic nor the Demotic writing system employed vowels, these do not show up in the transliteration. When articulating the words, however, it is conventional to insert an e-sound between consonants in order to make them pronounceable. For instance, the Egyptian word for a temple estate h. tp-ntšr can be read out loud as hetep-nehur. Such transliterations reproduce the Egyptian scribes’ historical orthographies, which do not necessarily correspond to the spoken language of the Greco-Roman period anyway; hence the discrepancy, for example, between the Egyptian temple official mr-šn or mer-shen and its pronunciation in Greek as lesonis.
Money and measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek and Egyptian money</th>
<th>Capacity and area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obol</td>
<td>artaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drachma</td>
<td>8 chalkoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talent</td>
<td>6 obols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deben</td>
<td>6000 drachmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aroura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 drachmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.78 liters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.756 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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