

# YALE CLASSICAL STUDIES

EDITED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

BY

AUSTIN M. HARMON

HILLHOUSE PROFESSOR OF  
THE GREEK LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

*VOLUME ONE*



NEW HAVEN

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

*London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*

MDCCCXXVIII

# VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION IN THE ROMAN PROVINCE OF SYRIA

## INTRODUCTION

*General definition of the difference between a village and a city. The manner in which a village sometimes developed into a city. Division of the Syrian lands.<sup>1</sup>*

IN the ancient world we find a distinction between cities and villages. Ancient as well as modern critics have attempted to explain this difference. Aristotle, in describing the origin of a city, implies that the difference is primarily one of size. He writes: "The union of several village communities forms, when complete, an actual city, attaining so to speak the limit of perfect self-sufficiency: at the outset a union for bare livelihood, it exists to promote a higher life."<sup>2</sup> The village, then, is a group of secondary importance as compared with the city. The city is larger and has what Aristotle terms a higher life. In principle the village is an open town (*ἀρείχουρος*). Thucydides tells us this when he is describing life in a backward part of Greece, Aetolia.<sup>3</sup> The same description would be applicable to the Ozolian Locrians and the Acarnanians.

The etymology of the word *kome* is not clear. It may be identified with *κείμαι*, as Fougères suggests,<sup>4</sup> but Kuhn connects it with *κοιμάσθαι*.<sup>5</sup> The people of a *kome* are called *κομηῆται*.<sup>6</sup>

The next problem is the relation between *kome* and *demos*. Aristotle maintained that *kome* and *demos* were the same thing under different names, and that the difference was purely linguistic, the Peloponnesians using *kome* where the Athenians used *demos*.<sup>7</sup> Stephanus of Byzantium agrees with Aristotle.<sup>8</sup> This

<sup>1</sup> A bibliography, together with a key to the abbreviations used in the notes, will be found at the end of this paper, pp. 166-168.

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle, *Politics*, 1252 b.

<sup>3</sup> Thucydides, I, 5, 1; II, 80, 8; III, 94, 4; IV, 43, 1.

<sup>4</sup> Daremberg-Saglio, *s.v. kome*, p. 854.

<sup>5</sup> Kuhn, *Über die Entstehung der Städte der Alten*, p. 13 (Leipzig, 1878).

<sup>6</sup> Plato, *Leg.*, VII, 794 a; XII, 956 c; Ditt., *Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 883, 3; and Wad., 2399, 2505.

<sup>7</sup> Aristotle, *Poetics*, III, 1448 a.

<sup>8</sup> Steph. Byz., *s.v. demos*.

view is incorrect, as is proved by Kuhn<sup>9</sup> and Fougères.<sup>10</sup> We find *demoi* in the Peloponnese (namely, in Elis), and the *τρίκωμοι* and *τετράκωμοι* in Attica.<sup>11</sup> In general we find that the term *kome* is more inclusive, while *demos* is confined to such places as are organic elements and territorial subdivisions of a city community.<sup>12</sup>

But before describing the characteristics of a village more carefully let us look for a moment to its origin. Swoboda maintains that Aristotle's view that the first unit larger than the individual was the family and that out of the family developed the *kome* is wrong.<sup>13</sup> Fougères accepts Aristotle's opinion.<sup>14</sup> It would seem that Swoboda would deny only the universality of this rule, not all particular instances of such a development. Fimmen, on the contrary, puts more faith in the ancient testimony that the settlement in unfortified villages was widespread and well-nigh universal.<sup>15</sup>

Greek philosophers and historians had a twofold interest in villages. First, because they believed that villages were the common unit of early Greek civilization, and second, because the backward parts of the country were still organized on a village basis even in the time of Thucydides and Aristotle. This view of early Greek life is clearly shown by Thucydides.<sup>16</sup> In speaking of piracy, for example, he indicates that its prevalence was owing to the ease with which unfortified villages could be plundered. Now if most of the population was settled in unfortified villages, it is nevertheless true that some fortresses were built, to which flight could be made in case of attack. Such a fortified place was called a *polis*, and a village might be situated below and round its walls. An example of such a *polis* is the Arcadian Mantinea.<sup>17</sup>

W. W. Fowler has distinguished four fundamental characteristics of the village community.<sup>18</sup> These are: kinship of its members, a government by a council composed of the heads of the

<sup>9</sup> Kuhn, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

<sup>10</sup> Daremberg-Saglio, *s.v. kome*, p. 857.

<sup>11</sup> Kuhn, *op. cit.*, pp. 60 ff.; Daremberg-Saglio, *s.v. kome*, p. 854.

<sup>12</sup> Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde*, I, p. 146, n. 1.

<sup>13</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. kome*, p. 951.

<sup>14</sup> Daremberg-Saglio, *s.v. kome*, pp. 853 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Fimmen, *Die kretisch-mykenische Kultur*, p. 28 (Berlin, 1924); *cf.* Thucydides, I, 5, 1; I, 10, 2.

<sup>16</sup> Thucydides, I, 2; I, 5.

<sup>17</sup> Pausanias, VIII, 12, 7. For the *polis* in Attica, see De Sanetis, 'Αθῆναι, pp. 27 ff. (New York, 1912).

<sup>18</sup> Fowler, *The City State of the Greeks and Romans*, pp. 30 ff. (London and New York, 1895).

families which constitute the group, community of property, and common worship. There can be no doubt of the general truth of Fowler's view. Where we find divergence from this rule we shall discover that there has been only modification and development, not a radical change. For example, instead of finding a council of family heads in control of a village we may find a headman. We cannot tell whether the headman or the council is the older institution, but clearly either they worked together, if found in the same village, or where only one or the other was present, the one present fulfilled the same functions as the other would have done had it been present. Where a council exists it is almost necessary for it to have a leader to call it together. His powers may be purely nominal, or he may even supersede the council entirely.<sup>19</sup> The point to bear in mind is that where no council exists the headman probably fulfills its functions.

Similarly we may find a modification of the rule that the members of the community are bound together by kinship. As a village comes down through the years, its members may forget their common origin. It may be that outsiders not possessing a common heritage creep in. At all events, the unity of blood is supplanted by a unity of interest, born of a long possession of common land and common fortune. In the same way the communal land of the village may belong to it in different degrees. Either the village may own it outright, or the village itself may be the property of a city or landlord, only managing its land in common by the permission of its master. Also the traces of a worship peculiar to a village are often effaced by the spread of a common religion such as Christianity.

The tendency of history seems to be for men to aggregate themselves in ever larger units. First comes the family, then follows the village, next the city, and finally the nation. But there was a period in the history of Greece when villages were the largest units. No collective authority united these communities. A description of the condition of affairs in Attica before the time of Theseus, which Thucydides gives us, well illustrates this fact: ἐπὶ γὰρ Κέκροπος καὶ τῶν πρώτων βασιλέων ἡ Ἀττικὴ ἐς Θησέα δὲ κατὰ πόλεις ᾤκειτο πρυτανεῖά τε ἐχούσας καὶ ἄρχοντας καὶ ὁπότε μὴ τι δείσειαν, οὐ ξυνησαν βουλευσόμενοι ὡς τὸν βασιλέα, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἕκαστοι ἐπολίτευον καὶ ἐβουλευόντο.<sup>20</sup> Each little town was an independent unit with the vague title of *polis*. Thucydides probably uses the expression

<sup>19</sup> Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

<sup>20</sup> Thucydides, II, 15.

κατὰ πόλεις to show that the towns of Attica were independent, for had he used such an expression as κατὰ κώμας, it would have led to confusion, since in his time the word *kome* was not associated with independence but with dependence. The expressions κατὰ κώμας, κομηθόν, and κατὰ δήμους came in at a time when the contrast between people living in a central city and those living in isolated villages had already appeared.<sup>21</sup> At first, of course, there was no such distinction, and each unit was independent, so that Thucydides is quite correct in using the expression κατὰ πόλεις to avoid an anachronism of a sort. This primitive state was modified by the necessities of defense against external aggression and piracy. Towns which could afford the expense girded themselves with a wall.<sup>22</sup> Villages in the vicinity of such a fortified town would come to regard it as their place of refuge in case of attack, and this fact tended to put an end to the complete independence and isolation of each village.

In other parts of Greece as well as in Attica we find *komai* as the underlying unit. This is true of the Aetolians<sup>23</sup> as late as 314 B.C., when a sympolity was formed,<sup>24</sup> but under the sympolity we find a gradual concentration of the population into the cities in the middle, even if traces of the old village system remained.<sup>25</sup> The villages which centered about a fortified city might at first maintain their autonomy, but a great step in advance was taken when each of them surrendered its own peculiar local powers, and helped to form a government in common with other villages settled about the fortress. In describing the foundation of Athens by Theseus, Thucydides pictures such a development: καταλύσας τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων τὰ τε βουλευτήρια καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐς τὴν νῦν πόλιν οὖσαν, ἐν βουλευτήριον ἀποδείξας καὶ πρυτανεῖον, ξυνέκτισε πάντας. . . .<sup>26</sup> To be sure it is quite possible that Thucydides made few scientific researches into Attic antiquities, but his conclusions coincide with the probable truth. In 314 B.C., as a result of the invasion of Cassander, the Acarnanians bordering on the Aetolians made settlements in strong places,<sup>27</sup> and developed an Acarnanian sympolity.<sup>28</sup> The same conditions held true for the Ozolian Locrians

<sup>21</sup> Daremberg-Saglio, *s.v. kome*, p. 853.

<sup>22</sup> Thucydides, I, 8.

<sup>23</sup> Thucydides, III, 94, 4; III, 97, 1.

<sup>24</sup> Diodorus, XVIII, 24, 2; XVIII, 25, 1; XIX, 74, 6.

<sup>25</sup> Swoboda, *Staatsaltertümer*, p. 331, 3.

<sup>26</sup> Thucydides, II, 15.

<sup>27</sup> Diodorus, XX, 67, 4 ff.

<sup>28</sup> Swoboda, *op. cit.*, p. 299.

as for the Acarnanians.<sup>29</sup> In general it may be said that the village was the common unit of life in early Greek times.<sup>30</sup>

We have seen that the villages sometimes surrendered some of their local powers and combined in a central city. Sometimes the villagers would continue to live in their villages, but often they would move into the new city. This process of centralization was known as synoecism. The advantages of life in these larger units overruled the disadvantages. Life in villages necessitated living in arms, as there were no adequate means of defense. Its greatest advantage, on the other hand, was its adaptability to agricultural pursuits. But, as I have said, the advantages of city life prevailed, and only backward people continued their village life. Historians speak in a derogatory fashion of living κατὰ κώμας. Strabo writes, ἀγριοὶ γὰρ οἱ κατὰ κώμας οἰκοῦντες.<sup>31</sup> The villages of a city formed by synoecism lost sovereignty and became politically impotent. Their material prosperity would depend upon circumstances.

Swoboda has shown that the union of several villages did not necessarily mean a decrease in the power of the villages composing this union.<sup>32</sup> The reason for forming a union was to increase the power of defense, or to foster some particular cult, or to further economic interests. Unions of *komai*, which in many cases had the citadel as the central point, often confront us among the Ozolian Locrians.<sup>33</sup> These *συστήματα δήμων* are found in Achaea and Arcadia and are mentioned by Strabo.<sup>34</sup> According to Strabo, Mantinea was originally a union of five *komai*, and Tegea and Heraea of nine *komai*. But this does not imply the subservience of the *komai*.

There appear to have been various types of synoecism. Sometimes several villages would form a voluntary combination. Part of the village population transferred to the new city of their own free will, entirely without coercion, and the rest remained in the villages surrounding the city. This is the way in which Mantinea, Tegea, and Heraea were formed,<sup>35</sup> and also the other Arcadian cities which we hear of in the fourth century before Christ. The Achaean cities also developed in this fashion.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Busolt, *op. cit.*, I, 146.

<sup>30</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. kome*, pp. 950-955.

<sup>31</sup> Strabo, III, 163.

<sup>32</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. kome*, p. 955.

<sup>33</sup> Busolt, *loc. cit.*

<sup>34</sup> Strabo, VIII, 337, 386. Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. kome*, p. 955.

<sup>35</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. kome*, p. 955.

<sup>36</sup> Strabo, VIII, 337, 386.

Another type of synoecism resulted when a village, becoming more powerful than the neighboring villages, developed into a city and forced the other villages to become dependent upon it. In a case of this sort the people of the dependent villages would not be given a share in the political rights of the new city.<sup>37</sup> The relation of Sparta to the perioecic towns, which were for the most part unfortified, was of this character.<sup>38</sup> It was not uncommon for a city to be deprived of its independence and to be made dependent upon another city and, politically speaking, to be regarded as a village. Such was the fate of Mycenae, which was made a village dependent upon Argos.<sup>39</sup> Swoboda points out that with the introduction of democracy the villagers achieved political equality with those living in the city.<sup>40</sup> The result is that in the end the situation of the inhabitants of villages which had been forced into a position dependent upon a city would be the same as that of those who lived in villages which had participated in a voluntary synoecism. That is, they would enjoy full civic rights in the new city. That this was the case with the village of Mycenae is proved by the fact that the *φυλαί* of Argos extended to the Mycenaeans also.<sup>41</sup>

Sometimes a synoecism was not the natural result of one village being more powerful than its neighbors, but was the result of the arbitrary foundation of a city by some prince. A city would be founded, and villages in the neighborhood would be incorporated. Only part of the villagers would go into the new city. The villages would retain some of their inhabitants, and thus the villages did not cease to exist. Demetrius, founded by Demetrius Poliorcetes, is a good example of such a synoecism.<sup>42</sup> We cannot determine the relationship of the people who lived in the city to those who remained in the villages. The transplantation of the villagers to the new city may have been either voluntary or compulsory. Again in certain cases only some of the villagers may have been compelled to take up their residence in the new city, whereas in other cases whole villages may have been transplanted. In the latter event the villages would cease to exist. Swoboda gives a clear account of the history of the development of Megalopolis.<sup>43</sup> This city was composed of the population of thirty-nine

<sup>37</sup> Kuhn, *op. cit.*, pp. 186 ff., 194 ff.

<sup>38</sup> Busolt, *op. cit.*, I, 139 ff.; II, 636, 663.

<sup>39</sup> Ditt., *Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 594.

<sup>40</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. kome*, p. 957.

<sup>41</sup> Ditt., *Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 594.

<sup>42</sup> Strabo, X, 436; Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 53.

<sup>43</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. kome*, 959.

villages. Pausanias' account of the opposition of the inhabitants of these villages to transplantation<sup>44</sup> and Diodorus' account of their attempt to break away after they had been incorporated, following the battle of Mantinea, which attempt was frustrated by Pammenes, show that the synoecism was not complete before 361 B.C., after which time the villages that had contributed inhabitants to Megalopolis became uninhabited and were entirely abandoned.<sup>45</sup> Only a few of the villages thereafter continued to exist as *komai* of Megalopolis.

The counterpart of synoecism was dioecism or the dissolution of a city into its original villages or other villages. Dioecism, however, was not a phase of the historical development of political institutions. It was rather a check, imposed by conquerors upon the conquered, against the tendency to form ever larger units. Occasionally the dissolution of a city may have been the result of economic rather than military causes. A city may well have found it impossible to support life as a unit, and consequently have disbanded into villages. A good example of dioecism is afforded by Mantinea, which was dismembered in 384 B.C. by the Spartans into five *komai*.<sup>46</sup> This dioecism of Mantinea was soon followed by a new synoecism in 370 B.C.<sup>47</sup> The Greek historians tell us that after the peace of Philocrates in 346 B.C. the Phocian cities were broken up and divided again into villages.<sup>48</sup>

In these pages something has been said of the origin, the nature, and the development of village communities in Greece. We must now seek to discover whether similar conditions prevailed in other parts of the ancient world, and especially in Syria, the particular subject of this study. We must bear in mind from the outset that it is impossible to lay down general laws about conditions in Syria that apply to the whole of Syria. Since conditions in the various parts of Syria differed, it will be advisable to attempt to distinguish between these parts. Rostovtzeff to this end has made a useful division of the Syrian lands.<sup>49</sup> He divides Syria into the Aramean north lands, bordering on Asia Minor, the Phoenician coast, Palestine, and the lands bordering on the desert. Then there are the Transjordanian lands, the so-called Decapolis, and Arabia Petraea. In the North Syrian lands in Hellenistic and

<sup>44</sup> Pausanias, VIII, 27, 5 ff.

<sup>45</sup> Diodorus, XV, 94, 1-3.

<sup>46</sup> Xenophon, *Hellenica*, V, 2, 7; Pausanias, VIII, 8, 9; Polybius, IV, 27, 6.

<sup>47</sup> Xenophon, *Hellenica*, VI, 5, 3 f.

<sup>48</sup> Diodorus, XVI, 60, 2; Pausanias, X, 3, 1-2.

<sup>49</sup> Rostovtzeff, *A Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, pp. 244-253 (Oxford, 1926).

Roman times there were four prominent cities: Antioch, Apamea, Laodicea, and Seleucia. These four cities probably controlled most of the land in North Syria. These cities were founded in Hellenistic times, and at least part of the city population was Greek. The villages surrounding them were of course entirely composed of natives, who certainly had no share in the government of the cities. In addition to the city territories of North Syria we also discover land belonging to temples, such as the land connected with the village of Baetocaece, which will be discussed later.<sup>50</sup>

Little is known of the organization of the cities on the Phoenician coast, but it is apparent that they were important as commercial and industrial centers. Rostovtzeff has pointed out that in Palestine a distinction must be made between the old Graeco-Philistine cities of the coast, such as Gaza, Joppa, and Askalon on the one hand, and the new foundations of Herod on the other. A third type was the Roman city of Neapolis. The Hellenized cities managed their territory and surrounding villages much as other Hellenic cities did, but the greater part of Palestine was a land of villages. The Gospels give us a clear idea of the pastoral life of the people. We see that part of the land was under the control of large landowners who were patrons of the villages.<sup>51</sup> When we turn to the lands east of the Jordan, namely, to Batanea, Auranitis, and Trachonitis, we find a different situation. Under Alexander and his successors many cities were founded in these regions. Native villages were transformed into Hellenic cities, but gradually they relapsed into their original condition. Under the Romans, however, there was a rebirth of colonization in connection with the attempt made by the Romans to supplant the old pastoral life by an agricultural life. The Romans were deeply interested in the prosperity of this part of the country, and the interest which they felt is reflected in the large number of buildings that were constructed by the Romans in the cities and villages. Although there were cities in these regions, the villages appear to have retained their independence to a greater extent here than they did in other parts of Syria, and the result of this was that village organization was more fully developed in Batanea, Auranitis, and Trachonitis than elsewhere in Syria.

Appian gives a list of the cities founded by Seleucus in his kingdom, and they are fifty-nine in number.<sup>52</sup> It was by the

<sup>50</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1020.

<sup>51</sup> Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

<sup>52</sup> Appian, *Syriaca*, 57.

foundation of these polities that the work of Hellenization was carried out. Of the cities founded by Seleucus the greater part lay in Syria, between the Euphrates and the sea.<sup>53</sup> Antiochus continued this work and was particularly active in developing the urban system in the eastern portion of his kingdom.<sup>54</sup> Then there followed a period of lesser activity in the foundation of cities, but in the reign of Antiochus IV there was a revival, especially in Palestine, a new acquisition of the Seleucid empire. As a result of this foundation of a large number of cities in Syria by the Seleucids little work of this sort was left to the Romans to do after their annexation of Syria as a province in 64 B.C. In the more backward districts where the Seleucids had planted few cities, the Romans were contented to let matters rest very much as they found them. But those cities which Rome did found were for the most part the result of development in trade routes and for the establishment of veterans.<sup>55</sup>

The fact that the record of but few foundations of cities in Syria exists has a direct bearing upon the extent of our knowledge as to the manner in which villages rose to the status of cities. Had more cities been founded by the Romans, we should probably have either literary or epigraphical reference to the promotion of villages to cities. But the fact is that there is but slight inscriptional evidence on this point, and the literary evidence is not so great as we could wish. In regard to the foundation of cities by the Seleucid kings, all we have is the bald statement that cities were founded, but as to the manner in which they were founded we are left in ignorance.<sup>56</sup> We are told that these cities were built by Seleucus Nicator, but it is probable that in many places where such a city was built a village already stood, to form, as it were, the nucleus of the new city. But some evidence does in fact exist regarding the promotion of a village to the rank of city, or the gathering together of villages to form a city.

Josephus has given us an account of the foundation of the city of Tiberias on the west shore of the lake of Gennesereth by Herod Antipas, which reminds us of a Greek synoecism: "And now Herod the tetrarch, who was in great favor with Tiberius, built a city of the same name with him, and called it Tiberias. He built

<sup>53</sup> Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire* (translated by W. P. Dickson), II, 132 (New York, 1906).

<sup>54</sup> Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism*, p. 196 (Boston, 1913).

<sup>55</sup> The planting of a colony of veterans by Agrippa at Berytus is an instance of the latter type of development. See Strabo, XVI, 2, 19.

<sup>56</sup> Appian, *Syriaca*, 57.

it in the best part of Galilee, at the lake of Gennesereth. There are warm baths at a little distance from it, in a village named Emmaus. Strangers came and inhabited this city; a great number of the inhabitants were Galileans also; and many were necessitated by Herod to come thither out of the country belonging to him, and were by force compelled to be its inhabitants; some of them were persons of condition. He also admitted poor people, such as those that were collected from all parts to dwell in it. Nay, some of them were not quite freemen; and these he was a benefactor to, and made them free in great numbers; but obliged them not to forsake the city, by building them very good houses at his own expense, and by giving them land also.<sup>57</sup> Compulsion was used in this case, and both rich and poor were forced to take part in the synoecism. The site was chosen because of the proximity of warm baths and the fact that it was on the lake of Gennesereth. Some of the new citizens came from regions outside of Galilee, but others apparently came from the neighboring villages. No mention is made of these villages directly, but we know very well that Galilee was a land covered with hundreds of villages.<sup>58</sup> One gathers from this account of Josephus that village life was preferred to city life by the Galileans, as Herod has to force the inhabitants of the new city not to forsake it, and induces them to stay by giving freely from his own purse.

Josephus also tells us that Philip the tetrarch advanced the village Bethsaida, by the lake of Gennesereth, to the dignity of city.<sup>59</sup> It was given the name Julias in honor of the daughter of Augustus, which is quite strong evidence that the foundation must have taken place before the year 2 B.C., since Augustus banished Julia in that year.<sup>60</sup> Nothing is said by Josephus to indicate that there was any transfer of new people to help compose the city of Julias.

Another interesting example of the rise of a village to the status of city is the rise of a village sometimes called 'Εακκαία and sometimes Σακκαία to the rank of city with the name Philippopolis. The city of Philippopolis was founded in all probability in A.D. 244. The reason for the elevation of this village was that it was the birthplace of the emperor Philip, and he wished to honor it

<sup>57</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, XVIII, 2, 3 (translation by W. Whiston). For the character of the population of Tiberias see Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, chap. VII, n. 30.

<sup>58</sup> Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

<sup>59</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, XVIII, 2, 1.

<sup>60</sup> Beer, in Pauly-Wissowa, under *Julias*. See also Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II<sup>4</sup>, 208 (Leipzig, 1898-1902).

by changing its status and making it a Roman colony.<sup>61</sup> The new city was doubtless composed not only of the inhabitants of the village which stood on this site but also of the other members of their tribe. These people are properly known as the Saccaei.<sup>62</sup> The city was also augmented by another element, namely, Roman colonists, for we know that Philippopolis became a Roman colony.<sup>63</sup>

The development of villages into cities by synoecism or by the implanting of colonists from abroad is the most natural course of advance, but we have evidence of another sort of promotion, which to us appears highly artificial. The Romans bestowed the title and rights of a city upon a town as a reward for good conduct, and withdrew these rights as a punishment for disloyalty. Thus we find in Herodian the account of the degradation of Byzantium and of Antioch.<sup>64</sup> Antioch was made dependent upon Laodicea. The reason that Severus deprived Antioch of its civic status was that it had helped Niger in his revolt.<sup>65</sup> Severus also took away the civic rights of Neapolis in Palestine.<sup>66</sup> Both Antioch and Neapolis were degraded from their rank as cities, but in neither instance is there any evidence of dioecism. In fact, we know that Antioch very soon regained its position of preëminence.<sup>67</sup> We cannot suppose that the city of Antioch underwent any radical change when it lost its high status, and conversely its reëntry into imperial favor can have been marked by no important outward change.<sup>68</sup>

Three methods emerge by which a village might rise to the rank of city. The first method was by synoecism. The usual type of development was the synoecism of a cluster of villages, as in the case of Tiberias. The second method was by the infusion of a body of colonists. In some cases the colonists may have been legionary veterans, as at Berytus. Often these two methods may

<sup>61</sup> W. Kubitschek, "Zur Geschichte von Städten des römischen Kaiserreiches," in *Sitz. Wien. Akad.*, 177 (1916), pp. 40 ff.

<sup>62</sup> Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, chap. VII, n. 32.

<sup>63</sup> Kubitschek, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

<sup>64</sup> Herodian, III, 6.

<sup>65</sup> *Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Vita Severi*, IX, 4; *Vita Caracallae*, I, 7; see also Platnauer, *The Life and Reign of Septimius Severus*, p. 92 (Oxford, 1918).

<sup>66</sup> *Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Vita Severi*, IX, 5.

<sup>67</sup> Platnauer, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

<sup>68</sup> The promotion of Abonuteichos to be the new city of Ionopolis in Asia Minor is a good instance of the arbitrary promotion of a village. See Lucian, *Alexander the False Prophet*, 58; cf. G. Hirschfeld in *Sitz. Berl. Akad.* (1888), p. 886, for two inscriptions from this city.

have been combined, as was probably the case at Philippopolis. The third method was by the proclamation of the emperor or of someone else in authority, either as a reward for meritorious service or because of personal reasons. Conversely, a city may have been degraded to the rank of village either by dioecism, or by the proclamation of authority as a punishment for disloyalty. This latter type of degradation was probably seldom, if ever, attended by an actual dioecism.

Cities also may have fallen to the position of villages by reason of an adverse change in the trade routes or by economic pressure of one sort or another. Moreover, the coming or the departure of troops may have sensibly affected the progress or decline of a community. In some cases villages may have grouped themselves into a city to form a stronger defense against aggression. The rulers of the land, on the other hand, may have dissolved cities into villages in order to weaken possible centers of revolt against their administration.

## I.

*The organization of the Syrian village. Its officers, assemblies, and councils.*

## 1. Village Officials.

THIS section purposes to deal only with those officials who are purely local functionaries of the village, but it is often difficult to determine which of the officials mentioned in inscriptions and in our literary sources are really local and which are representatives of some higher unit upon which the village may depend. We do, however, discover in inscriptions dealing with villages in Syria a number of titles which clearly belong to village officials. We know the titles of these officials, but comparatively little is known of their peculiar functions. Of course in some cases the title itself gives an indication of the general nature of the office. We can often form a reasonable judgment as to whether an office was a high one or a low, and within these limits we can make further distinctions. The names of some offices indicate the superiority of those offices, while other offices appear more highly specialized and inferior.

To the category of high village officials clearly belongs the

*komarchos*. The existence of such officials in various parts of the ancient world is well attested.<sup>69</sup> However, a *komarchos* is mentioned in a single inscription of Syria only:

ἔτους ενχ', Ἀρτεμισίου β', ἐτελέσθη τὸ κτίσμα  
Εὐστολίου, ἐπὶ Ἀ(γ)απητοῦ, τοῦ πραγματοῦτοῦ, κέ  
Ἀββώσου κωμάρχ(ο)υ.<sup>70</sup>

We see in this inscription that a building of some sort was finished under the agent Agapetos and a *komarchos* named Abbosos. The date of this inscription is A.D. 344, and it comes from Il-Mishrifeh in northern Syria. We cannot judge from this inscription whether Abbosos was the sole *komarchos* of his village or not. Although this is the only inscription of Syria in which mention is made of a *komarchos*, the speech of Libanius, *Περὶ τῶν Προστασιῶν*, in which he discusses the evils arising from the patronage of villages, makes it apparent that the title *komarchos* was familiar in Syria. This speech was probably delivered between the years 386 and 389 of our era.<sup>71</sup> In this speech the village *archons* are represented as being interfered with by the patrons,<sup>72</sup> and they appear to be the principal officers of their villages. The inscription cited above and this oration by Libanius are both of the fourth century documents, but we have no reason to suppose, by the argument *e silentio*, that village *archons* were a new creation of that century.

However, despite the lack of evidence, the *komarchos* may have been quite a common official in Syria, for we find *komarchoi* often mentioned in inscriptions from Asia Minor, where governmental conditions seem to have been quite analogous to those in Syria. For example, on the road between Sardis and Philadelphia was found an inscription in which two *komarchoi* figure.<sup>73</sup> It is interesting to discover that a *summa honoraria* was paid by the *komarchoi* of certain Lydian villages. The amount of the *summa honoraria* in the period between A.D. 213 and A.D. 272 advanced from 250 to 500, to 750, and finally to 1,000 denarii. Another interesting feature is that the position of *komarchos* in these vil-

<sup>69</sup> Xenophon, *Anabasis*, IV, 5, 10; Pollux, *Onomasticon*, IX, 11; C.I.G., 3420, 3641 b, line 66; O.G.L.S., 527, line 110; I.G.R.R., I, 721 and 728; and I.G.R.R., III, 886.

<sup>70</sup> P.A.E.S., 881.

<sup>71</sup> Zulueta, "De Patrocinii Vicorum," pp. 39 f., in *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History* (Oxford, 1909).

<sup>72</sup> Libanius, *Περὶ τῶν Προστασιῶν*, 7.

<sup>73</sup> Wad., 1669.



lages was sometimes held by the citizen of a community other than the village concerned, which suggests that the position may have been almost nominal in some cases and have been granted to these persons *honoris causa*.<sup>74</sup> We learn further from another Lydian inscription that a *katoikia* could have *archons*. This inscription comes from Darmara.<sup>75</sup> *Komarchoi* are also mentioned in an inscription from Lampsacus.<sup>76</sup> In an inscription from Hierapolis in Phrygia we learn something about the duties of the *komarchos*. It appears that unjust demands were put upon the *komarchoi* by officials known as *paraphylakes*. This inscription is a decree of the city of Hierapolis which sets forth the demands which the *paraphylakes* may justly make upon the villages and the *komarchoi*, and it will be considered more fully later in connection with village expenditure.<sup>77</sup>

Whether the idea of collegiality was inseparable from the office of *komarchos* cannot be determined with finality. In two of the inscriptions cited, two *komarchoi* are expressly mentioned by name, and in none of the other inscriptions connected with this office is there anything which shows that it could not be held by more than one man.

It has been said that the *komarchos* appears in only one inscription from Syria, but the oration of Libanius cited above adds weight to the belief that such an officer was not uncommon. Moreover, it should be noted that in the Syrian inscriptions it is but seldom that an official is mentioned whose presence would probably exclude that of a *komarchos*. Only the title of *protokometes* and *strategos* seem to indicate supremacy, and thereby make the existence of a *komarchos* unlikely in the particular villages in which they appear. It is probably mere chance that only one mention is made of a *komarchos* in the inscriptions of Syria. One reason for this may be that most of the village inscriptions of Syria concern the erection of buildings and monuments, and with these works other officers were concerned who had charge of the disposal of funds.

Leontius Neapolitanus in his life of St. Symeon mentions a *protokometes* in Syria,<sup>78</sup> and in the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius there is also a reference to such an official in the following words:

<sup>74</sup> See Keil and von Premerstein in D.W.A., vol. 57, p. 79, no. 109; no. 109, note; no. 110; and Fontrier in *Mουσείον*, 1886, pp. 87 f.

<sup>75</sup> Γ. Σαπυρίδης in *Ath. Mitt.*, XX (1895), 242.

<sup>76</sup> C.I.G., 3641 b, lines 66 ff.

<sup>77</sup> O.G.I.S., 527.

<sup>78</sup> Leontius Neapolitanus, Migne, 1725 d.

ἔοικας τῷ τῆς πλησίον κόμης πρωτοκομήτη.<sup>79</sup> From Leontius and Palladius we get the distinct impression that the *protokometes* was a single officer, not one of a group of colleagues. If he be the only man in his village with such a title, he must be the headman of that village, for otherwise his title would be exceedingly misleading. An inscription from Il-Umta Iyeh in Auranitis mentions a *protokometes* who appears to have been the headman of the village, if the restoration of the word *protokometes* be correct. It reads as follows:

Και(αμα)[ς] (ἐ)π(οί)ση Θ(εῶ) τῷ  
ΑΩ. Κ(ύρι)ε ἐπιστήμ(ηνον). μ(νή)σθητι, Κ(ύριε) Χ(ρ)ιστ(έ)  
ναιού σ(οῦ). πρωτοκω(μήτου) αἰλή.<sup>80</sup>

From Agraena (old name) in Trachonitis comes another inscription in which the restoration of the word *protokometes* is possible, although quite uncertain: *Χαιρανης Νιδ(ρ)ου Οτουου Αιατου ἐτ(ῶν) ο', πρωτ[ο]κ[ω]μητ[η]τ[η]ς*.<sup>81</sup> Another inscription, from Raifa in Auranitis, should be considered in this connection. The reading of Fossey follows:

Σευῆρος  
Οὐαβιέλου προτ[ικτωρ  
κ]ώμ(ης) Καπαρζίζ(ω)ν  
κεκτημένος ἐν τῇ  
μ(η)τρ[ο]κ[ωμιά] 'Ρόγα(?)<sup>82</sup>

Reinach suggests that the reading προτ[ικτωρ κ]ώμ(ης) be changed to προτ[οκ]ώμης.<sup>83</sup> Perhaps, however, προτ[οκ]ωμ[ή]της might be read.

There is no further mention of a *protokometes* either in the inscriptions of Syria or in literature concerning Syria, and it is noteworthy that in every instance cited, the *protokometes* appears to have been the only official with such a title in his village. This differentiates the Syrian *protokometes* from the *protokometes* in Egypt, for we have evidence that the villages of Egypt had a college of *protokometai*.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>79</sup> Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, Migne, 1169 b.

<sup>80</sup> P.A.E.S., 38.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 793<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>82</sup> Fossey in B.C.H., XXI (1897), p. 54, no. 54 b.

<sup>83</sup> Reinach in R.E.G., XI (1898), 339.

<sup>84</sup> See *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, I, no. 133, in which we find the phrases τὸ κοινὸν τῶν πρωτοκομητῶν. For the *protokometes* in Asia Minor see Keil and von Premerstein in D.W.A., LIV, 72, no. 152, and H. S. Cronin in J.H.S., XXII (1902), 358, no. 119.

*Strategoï* appear in several inscriptions from the villages of Syria. At Schechbe in Batanea was found an inscription dated between A.D. 177 and 180 in which a *strategos* is mentioned. The inscription contains the following phrase: ἐπὶ Αἰλάμων Δαβάνου στρατηγού.<sup>85</sup> We learn from the rest of the inscription that it was inscribed under the direction of a centurion of the Legio XVI Flavia Firma. The use of the word ἐπὶ seems to show that the *strategos* was the eponymous magistrate of the community. Schechbe is the site of the ancient city of Philippopolis, but at the time of this inscription it had not yet been made a city.<sup>86</sup> Before this time a village occupied the site and Ailamos was the *strategos* of the village.

An inscription was found at Kefr-Liha in Auranitis, which contains the following phrase: οἱ κομηῆται ἔκτισαν ἐξ ἰδίων τῶ κοινῶ καὶ ἐκ φιλοτιμίας τῶν ὑποεταγμένων ὀνομάτων, στρατηγείας Οὐλ(πίου) Σκαυριανού.<sup>87</sup> The date of this inscription is A.D. 236. The name of the *strategos* is Ulpus Scaurianus; Waddington assumes without question that he is the *strategos* of the village and Cagnat appears to support him in this view. This is a reasonably safe conclusion, but not an absolutely sure one. Ulpus Scaurianus may have been the *strategos* of some unit larger than the village, but the arrangement of the words points to Waddington's conclusion. At Ma'ar-rith Betar in the Djebel Riha was found another inscription testifying to the existence of a *strategos* of a village, if the reading be correct: ἔτο[vs] ἀξφ'. Βαρούμ[ου] τοῦ Διονυσίου στρατη(γ)οῦ [κώμ]ης, ἐπὶ ἐγενόμην. μη[νός] Πανήμου δκ'. εἶδε.<sup>88</sup>

We can see from an inscription of Eitha in Trachonitis that a *strategos* may have been the eponymous magistrate of that community. The inscription ends thus: ἐπὶ Ἡρακλίτου Χάρητος στρατηγού.<sup>89</sup>

In the inscriptions just cited the *strategos* appears to be the most important official in his village. His name is apparently used in fixing the year. From this we may conclude either that he was the one supreme official of the village or at least that his was the eponymous office. The first conclusion is the more probable, and it is quite likely that where there was a *strategos* there was no *komarchos*. But in an inscription from Sha-Ara in Trachonitis

<sup>85</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1195.

<sup>86</sup> Kubitschek, *op. cit.*, pp. 40 ff.

<sup>87</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1213. This is the same as Wad., 2399. For comment see Waddington's note to this inscription.

<sup>88</sup> A.A.E.S., part III, no. 150.

<sup>89</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1137; see also Wad., 2113, n., for the status of the town.

dated between A.D. 161 and 169 three *strategoï* appear who seem to constitute the supreme administrative board of the community. The inscription ends with the following words: Πρόκλος Γερμανοῦ καὶ Σαῖος Ζοβαΐδου καὶ Αδειος Αβαβου στρατηγοὶ ἀνέθηκαν.<sup>90</sup>

At Palmyra the title of *strategos* was used by the *duoviri* of the colony, and appears in many inscriptions of this city between A.D. 224 and 262.<sup>91</sup> This is not relevant to the question of village *strategoï* except to show that at Palmyra *strategoï* were the highest officials of the city, and that the title of *strategos* might be expected to apply to the highest officials of a village.<sup>92</sup>

No mention of a *komogrammateus* is made anywhere in the East except in Egypt and Palestine. In Egypt he was a very important official, as is evident from many papyri and inscriptions. In Egypt the *komogrammateus* was the assistant of the *komarchos*, and had charge of the village archives and the grain register on which taxes were based. He appears to have been the second highest officer of the Egyptian village. Both the *komarchos* and the *komogrammateus* were inferior to the *strategos*, who was in charge of the *nome*.<sup>93</sup> Of course the whole system of municipal organization in Egypt was unlike that of the rest of the ancient world, but Herod introduced certain elements of this system into Palestine. For example, Josephus frequently refers to the three toparchies of Samaria, Galilee, and Perea which adjoin Judaea.<sup>94</sup> This organization of the country on the Egyptian model seems to have extended down even into village administration, for we find the *komogrammateus* here also. In his account of the domestic troubles of Herod, Josephus tells us that the sons of Herod by one wife threatened that if they should secure the kingdom they would degrade Herod's sons by his former wives to the position of *komogrammateis*.<sup>95</sup> In this passage the *komogrammateus* is spoken of in a derogatory manner, but we should not infer from this that he stood low in the list of village officials, for it would be sufficient degradation for a son of Herod to be connected with the administration of a village in any capacity. Josephus' words

<sup>90</sup> P.A.E.S., 803.

<sup>91</sup> Wad., 2597, 2598, 2606 a, 2607.

<sup>92</sup> From Aphrodisias in Caria comes an inscription mentioning *strategoï* of a different character (Wad., 1611). They were styled *strategoï ἐπὶ τῆς χάρας*. They appear to have been officials of the city, but supervised the villages in the territory of the city.

<sup>93</sup> Daremberg-Saglio, *s.v. kome*, p. 859.

<sup>94</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, XIII, 2, 3.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, XVI, 7, 3.

suggest perhaps that bookkeeping was a part of the duty of the *komogrammateus*, and this is what we should expect to be the case.

No further reference is made to a *komogrammateus* outside of Egypt. An inscription from Chamon in Syria, however, may be mentioned, in which we see that a village probably had a secretary. The inscription reads thus: ἡ κώμη ἐπο(ι)ησεν κὲ τὴν δαπάνην τῆς κώμης Βηλιάβος Σαφαρᾶ [ἔ]γραψ[ε]ν.<sup>96</sup> Beliabos apparently kept a record of the expenses in connection with the erection of this building or statue, whichever it was. His function closely corresponds to that of the Egyptian *komogrammateus*. Whether or not Beliabos was entitled *grammateus*, it is reasonable to regard him as a sort of financial secretary.<sup>97</sup>

The next group of officials to be considered comprises those officials who appear to have had charge of public works and the disposal of funds. This group includes the *pistoi*, *pronoetai*, *dioiketai*, and *epimeletai*. W. K. Prentice has published an instructive article upon the nature and duties of these officials.<sup>98</sup> He has discussed these officers in the light of the meaning of the phrase ἐκ προνοίας καὶ σπουδῆς. He has indicated that although *pronoia* and *σπουδή* convey somewhat different notions, both terms are often ascribed to the same person or persons in the same inscription.<sup>99</sup> However, when either of these words is used in an inscription which shows that the persons in charge of the public work differed in authority, *pronoia* is usually attributed to those in higher authority and *σπουδή* to inferior officials.<sup>100</sup> Prentice further points out that neither *pronoia* nor *σπουδή* necessarily implies the initiative in the decision to undertake a public work, and there are inscriptions which show that the use of these terms does not necessarily involve provision for the expense of the undertaking on the part of the officials mentioned as acting by or with *pronoia* or *σπουδή*.<sup>101</sup> It appears moreover that certain equivalent phrases or expressions are sometimes used instead of ἐκ προνοίας

<sup>96</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1074.

<sup>97</sup> An understanding of the position of the *grammateus* in the cities of the East may help us in our knowledge of the village *grammateus*. See Chapot, *La Province Romaine Proconsulaire d'Asie*, pp. 243 ff. (Paris, 1904), and Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, pp. 388 f. (Oxford, 1895-1897).

<sup>98</sup> Prentice in A.P.A., XLIII (1912), 113-123.

<sup>99</sup> Wad., 1910, 1964, 1970, 2046, 2188, 2217, 2239.

<sup>100</sup> A.A.E.S., part III, 432 c.

<sup>101</sup> P.A.E.S., 915, 992, 993; Wad., 2187, 2053 b.

καὶ σπουδῆς.<sup>102</sup> Prentice has concluded that the use of the word ἐπί with the name of an official is equivalent to the use of the expression ἐκ προνοίας with the name of that official, and that διά corresponds in similar fashion to ἐκ σπουδῆς or σπουδῆ.<sup>103</sup> In view of these considerations he believes that *pronoia* has to do with the formation of a plan and *σπουδή* with its execution. Prentice quotes a passage from Polybius to support this view: "If there should be need to send an embassy, to settle a difficulty, or to convey an invitation, or to deliver a command, or to take possession, or to declare war it [the Senate] makes the arrangement (ποιεῖται τὴν πρόνοιαν)."<sup>104</sup>

Let us now make a study of these officials, commencing with the *pistoi*. It is noteworthy that they are seldom mentioned singly and that they are always connected with some public work or building. We must not, however, argue from this that they had no other function. We shall see that *pronoia* rather than *σπουδή* characterizes their activity. The number of *pistoi* varies considerably in the different inscriptions. From Btheine in Batanea comes the following inscription: Ἀῦσος Γαύτου Θεό[δω]ρος Παισιφείλου, Ὀνενοσ Αβίβου, Ἄναμος Γαύτου, Ζόβεδος Ναταμέλου πιστοὶ ἀνέγειραν τὸ τυχεῖον ἐκ τῶ τῆς κώ[μ]η[s].<sup>105</sup> We see that five *pistoi* have erected a temple to Fortune with the funds of the village.<sup>106</sup> *Pistoi* appear in three inscriptions found at Wakm (modern name) in Trachonitis. In one of these we learn that the number of *pistoi* was three and that a house was built at the common expense of the whole village. The inscription reads thus: ὑπατίας Σαβίνου καὶ Ῥουφίνου ἐκτίσθη ὁ οἶκος ἐκ κοινῆς δαπάνης πάσ(η)ς τῆς κώμ(ης) διὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου κ(αὶ) Οὐίκτορος καὶ Σατορνίλου πιστ[ῶ]ν.<sup>107</sup> As this house was built at common expense it seems likely that it was a public house of some kind. The date of this inscription is A.D. 316. The other inscriptions from this site are fragmentary, but in one we see that the number of *pistoi* was six and in the other, seven.<sup>108</sup>

Two inscriptions from Deir-el-Leben in Auranitis mention *pistoi*. The first of them reads as follows: Διδὸς ἀνικητῶν Ἡλίον θεοῦ

<sup>102</sup> A.A.E.S., part III, 305, 306; P.A.E.S., 915, 992; Wad., 1963, 2053 b, 2497.

<sup>103</sup> Wad., 2042, 2043, 2044, 2046, 2238, 2239, 2239 a, 2240.

<sup>104</sup> Polybius, VI, 13, 6.

<sup>105</sup> Wad., 2127.

<sup>106</sup> *Pistoi* appear in another inscription from this same site (Wad., 2130), but the inscription is too fragmentary and the Greek too poor for us to learn the number of the *pistoi* or what they did.

<sup>107</sup> P.A.E.S., 788.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 7882, 7881.

Αὔμου ἐκτίσθη τὸ περιβόλεον τῆς ἀλλῆς διὰ Κασσίου Μαλιχάθου κόμ(ης) Ρειμέας καὶ Παύλου Μαξιμίνου κόμης Μαρδόχων, πιστῶν.<sup>109</sup> This is a case in which a man with the title of *pistos* seems to represent his village in an enterprise undertaken by two villages in common. The *pistoi* of two villages take part in the construction of a court for the god. Each village, however, is represented by but one *pistos*, which is unusual, as we find extremely few instances of this. In another inscription Cassius appears not as *pistos* of Rimea alone, but of both Rimea and Rodon.<sup>110</sup> In this instance the *pistoi* erect an altar to the god. We cannot be sure whether Cassius was the *pistos* of two really distinct villages or whether Rodon was merely an insignificant appendage of Rimea. Another inscription from Deir-el-Leben mentions the same men, although the title *pistos* does not appear. The date of this inscription is A.D. 320 and in it we are told that a hall or court was built for the god and that Cassius and Paulus contributed generously of their own time. This leads one to the conclusion that these men were acting as private individuals, and not officially. The omission of the word *pistos* adds weight to this opinion.<sup>111</sup>

*Pistoi* are mentioned in six inscriptions from Bosana in Batanea.<sup>112</sup> In each case they are mentioned in connection with some public work or building. In four of these inscriptions two *pistoi* are associated with a *syndic* in the work. Whether or not the *syndic* was one of the *pistoi* is not stated, but it is unlikely, if we may judge by the wording. The quotation of one of these inscriptions will suffice to show the type of all four: ἐπὶ συνδικίας Ταυρίνου Ταυρίνου συνδίκου καὶ Ταυρηάγου Σέου καὶ Θεσπεσίου Φιλίππου πιστῶν ἐκτίσθη ἡ καμάρα τοῦ δήμου.<sup>113</sup> Although the ruins of Bosana are quite extensive, it seems highly probable that this place was not a city but a village.<sup>114</sup>

From 'Auwas (modern name) in Auranitis comes an inscription which records the building of a temple. It reads thus: ἐκ προνοίας καὶ σπουδῆς Οὐάλεντος Ἀζίζου καὶ Σοβέου Ἀουίτου καὶ Μάγνου Ἀβγάρου καὶ Μάνου Οὐιέμου πιστῶν ἐκτίσθη τὸ Θεανδρίτιον, ἔτ(ει) σπθ'.<sup>115</sup> The date is A.D. 394, and there are four *pistoi*. Waddington be-

<sup>109</sup> Wad., 2394.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 2395.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 2393.

<sup>112</sup> P.A.E.S., 732; Wad., 2238, 2239, 2239 a, 2240, 2243.

<sup>113</sup> Wad., 2240.

<sup>114</sup> Eusebius leaves the point unsettled (*Onomasticon*, s.v. βῶξ) for he writes: Βῶξ. ἐν γῆ Κηδάρ. ἐν Ἱερεμίρ. But an inscription from this place ends with the words: ἡ κόμη εὐχαριστεῖ (Wad., 2237).

<sup>115</sup> Wad., 2046.

lieves that he has discovered the ancient name of the town in the phrase κόμης Βοσορηῶν.<sup>116</sup> If his conclusion be correct, we see that Boso(?) was a village.

In an inscription from Il-Mu'Arribeh in Auranitis, if the reading be accepted, we learn that two *pistoi* and two *pronoetai* shared in the erection of a κοινὸς οἶκος in A.D. 336.<sup>117</sup> According to the interpretation of Prentice the *pistoi* were in all probability the commissioners who formed the chief executive board of the community, while the *pronoetai* constituted a special committee for the construction of the building.<sup>118</sup> Although there is no sure evidence that this place was a village, we have no indications that there was a city here.

*Pistoi* are also mentioned in three inscriptions from Mjedil (modern name) in Trachonitis. On this site stood a village, as we see in an inscription from this site containing the following words: ἐκ τοῦ κοινῶ τῆς κόμης.<sup>119</sup> One of these inscriptions is so fragmentary that we do not even know the number of *pistoi*,<sup>120</sup> and in a second inscription all we learn is that there were five *pistoi*.<sup>121</sup> But from the third inscription we gain more information. It reads thus: ἐπὶ Μάλλχου Κασσίου καὶ (Κ)υριακοῦ Οὐρανίου πιστῶν οἰκοδομή(θ)η ὁ οἶκος ἐκ τῶν τοῦ κοινῶ. Σορεχος καὶ Καρονος Γαδος [ξ]δωκαν τὸν τόπον.<sup>122</sup> There are two *pistoi* and they appear to have constructed a house from the funds of the village. It is interesting to notice that the site for the house was given by two men, who so far as we know gave it as private persons.

Three *pistoi* built two apses in a village on the site of the modern Damit il-Alya in Trachonitis, as we learn from the following inscription: Ἀὐρ(ήλιος) Μιλιχο(ς) καὶ Σαγαδεος καὶ Εὐτρόπις πιστοὶ ἐτελείσαν τὰς δύο ἀψίδας.<sup>123</sup> We know from another inscription that a village stood on this site and that the ancient name of the place was Damatha.<sup>124</sup> Five *pistoi* are named in an inscription from Melah is-Sarrar in Batanea.<sup>125</sup> The names alone of the *pistoi* are preserved. An inscription from Burak in Auranitis also mentions

<sup>116</sup> Wad., 2053 b; cf. 2041, note.

<sup>117</sup> P.A.E.S., 611.

<sup>118</sup> Prentice in A.P.A., XLIII (1912), 116 f.

<sup>119</sup> P.A.E.S., 787.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, 7872.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 7878.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 7877.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 8005.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 8002, in which the words τὸ κοινὸν κώ[μ](ης) Δαμά(θ)ων occur.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, 709.

*pistoi*, but their number cannot be determined.<sup>126</sup> An inscription from Ayoun also in Auranitis mentions a single *pistos*. However, the inscription is too fragmentary to help us in the determination of the character and function of the *pistos*.<sup>127</sup>

At Migdala (ancient name) in Auranitis three *pistoi* took part in the erection of what was probably a public hall. The inscription from which we learn this is dated A.D. 302, and reads as follows: ἐκ προνοίας καὶ σπουδῆς Γαδούου καὶ Σωπάτρου καὶ Ἀμυράθου πιστῶν ἐκτίσθη ὁ δημόσιος οἶκος ἔτ(ει) σνζ'.<sup>128</sup> It seems probable from the absence of any evidence to the contrary that a village occupied this site. From Tell-Ghariye in Auranitis comes the mention of two *pistoi* as village officials in the following inscription: εἰς θεὸς ὁ β(ση)θῶν τὴν κ(ώμη)ν. ἐπὶ προνοίαν Ἀναμον κ(αὶ) Ἀβδισάρ(ου) πιστῶν ἐτε(λιώθη) ἐν ἔτει. . .<sup>129</sup> In this case also the *pistoi* appear to have been connected with some building or public work. *Pistoi* appear again in an inscription from Nedjran in Trachonitis which reads thus: οἱ ἀπὸ φυλῆς Μανιηνῶν εὐτυχίσοντες ἔνδοξον οἰκοδομὴν ἐτελίωσαν προνοία Ἀνδρονίκου Ἀγρίππου καὶ Κάρου Μοσαμάμου πιστῶν.<sup>130</sup> The tribe of the Manienoi have erected a handsome building by the *προνοία* of two *pistoi*. Another inscription from this site contains what may possibly have been the ancient name of the town in the words [κ]ώ(μης) Νορεράθης.<sup>131</sup> It is interesting to notice this mention of a tribe in a village inscription, and it causes us to wonder what the relation between village and tribe may have been, but our information on this subject is too limited to solve the problem.

Finally we find mention of *pistoi* in the following inscription from El-Mouschennef in Batanea: ἐκ προνοίας κα[ὶ] σπουδῆς Ταυρίνου συνδίκου [κ]αὶ Ἀνέρου καὶ Τα[ν]ήλου πιστῶν ἢ ἀψὶς ἐγένετο.<sup>132</sup> This inscription concerns the same men that were mentioned in an inscription of Bosana, a neighboring town, which has been referred to above.<sup>133</sup> It may be that one of the two stones is not *in situ* and that the officials mentioned were officials of one town only, or it may show that one of these towns was dependent upon the other and had the same officers.

We see from these inscriptions that there might be as many as

<sup>126</sup> P.A.E.S., 174.

<sup>127</sup> Wad., 1984.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 2029.

<sup>129</sup> Dussaud and Macler, M.S.M., p. 272, no. 93.

<sup>130</sup> Wad., 2427.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, 2431.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, 2219.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, 2240.

seven *pistoi* in a village, and that their number varied. With them in some cases a *syndic* was associated. However, in most of the towns in which *pistoi* appear no other higher officials appear, and for this reason it is reasonable to conclude that in these towns the *pistoi* constituted the highest executive authority in the community.<sup>134</sup>

*Pronoetai* appear to have had functions very similar to those of the *pistoi*. A study of the inscriptions in which these officials appear will make this evident. The first of these inscriptions, which comes from Umm Iz-Zetun in Trachonitis, reads as follows: Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ. τὸ κοινὸν τῆς κώμης καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἱερὰν καλυβὴν ἔκτεισεν διὰ Οὐλπίου Κασσιανοῦ οὐιτρανικοῦ, καὶ Γαδουου Σαουρου βουλευτοῦ, καὶ Νιγρεῖνου Μαρρίνου οὐιτρανικοῦ προνοητῶν.<sup>135</sup> This inscription is dated A.D. 282. The *κοινον* of the village and of the god has erected a sacred *καλυβή*. The *καλυβή* is peculiar to this section of the country.<sup>136</sup> This building was erected by three *pronoetai*, and their relation to the building enterprise is expressed by the word *διά*. This inscription makes it seem not unlikely that this was a sacred village. An inscription from Er-Rouchaide in Auranitis also mentions three *pronoetai*, who have in this case erected a house. The inscription reads thus: ἐκ προνοίας Φεσάνου Ἀμέρου κ(αὶ) Ἰδδου Ναγόσου κ(αὶ) Δάλλου Ὀβέδου προνοητῶν ἀνεώθη ἔτους σμά ὁ οἶκος. Εὐτυχίτω ἡ κώμη.<sup>137</sup>

There are three inscriptions from Orman in Auranitis in which *pronoetai* appear. Two of these inscriptions were originally at 'Auwas (modern name), a place which seems never to have been a city, whether or not Waddington is right in his belief that the old name of the town is indicated by the phrase *κώμης Βοσοηνῶν*.<sup>138</sup> The first of the inscriptions at Orman reads as follows: ἐπὶ Μά[ρκ]ου Πρίσκου καὶ Βοσελου Σαβίνου καὶ Γαλεσου Μάλχου προνοητῶν ἐγένετο ὁ τίχος καὶ ἡ ἀψίδες ἔτ(ει) σιθ' Σόμενος οἰκοδ[όμος].<sup>139</sup> The date is A.D. 324, and we see that three *pronoetai* were connected with the building of a wall and apses. The second inscription mentions four *pronoetai* and they are concerned with the erection of a

<sup>134</sup> Prentice in A.P.A., XLIII (1912), 118.

<sup>135</sup> I.G.R.E., III, 1187.

<sup>136</sup> P.A.E.S., II A, part V, p. 361. Butler writes: "A *καλυβή* is a simple building peculiar to the Hauran. The façade consists of a broad arch flanked by two arched niches of rectangular plan, and is almost twice as wide as the square building behind it which was roofed by a dome."

<sup>137</sup> Dussaud and Macler, M.S.M., p. 265, no. 74.

<sup>138</sup> Wad., 2053 b, cf. 2041, note. See also Dussaud and Macler, *Voyage au Safa*, p. 167, no. 34 (Paris, 1901).

<sup>139</sup> P.A.E.S., 685.

basilica and a door. The date of this inscription is A.D. 330. The phrase which describes the activity of the *pronoetai* is ἐκ προνοίας καὶ σπουδῆς.<sup>140</sup> The third inscription also mentions four *pronoetai*. It reads thus: ἐπίνοια τρικλίνου καὶ τοῦ ἔνδον βουστασί[ο]ν προνοητῶν Να(σ)ερου Ουε[νο]ν καὶ Αζιζου Μοσαρου καὶ Μ(ά)νου [Θι]έμ(ου) καὶ Σιλουανοῦ Ουεμου, ε. . . . ΝCVTA. . . . καὶ ἀναλύσεως καὶ διορ(θ)ώσεως πύργων δύο ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἔτει σξξ'.<sup>141</sup> It seems that an inn and a stable are referred to in the words τρικλίνου and βουστάσιον. It is also noteworthy that this town had two towers. The date of the inscription is A.D. 372. The mention of so many elaborate buildings as being erected by the *pronoetai* of this town leads one to the conclusion that the village from which they came must have been of considerable size and importance.

*Pronoetai* appear also in an inscription found at 'Auwas itself and not transferred to Orman. The date of this inscription is A.D. 310. It reads thus: ἔτ(ους) σέ, ἐπὶ Νασέρου 'Ουεμίον καὶ 'Αλασάθου Γαλέσου, 'Ουεμίον Αῦσου, Μάνου Οὐαλέντου προνο(η)τῶν.<sup>142</sup> From the wording it is not clear whether there were two or four *pronoetai*. An inscription from Ayoun in Auranitis mentions two *pronoetai* and we are told that they built something, but we are not told what the building was.<sup>143</sup> The last inscription in which *pronoetai* appear was found at Aqraba, also in Auranitis. It reads as follows: Θεῶ 'Ηρακλεῖ διὰ ἐπιμελητοῦ Ζηνοδώρου Κλυμένου καὶ Μάθου Ναέμου προνοη(τῶν).<sup>144</sup> A building was evidently erected in honor of Hercules. There were two *pronoetai* and one of them was also an *epimeletes*.

These inscriptions show that the duties of the *pronoetai* were very similar to those of the *pistoi*. Their number varies from two to four. Both *pronoetai* and *pistoi* appear most frequently in inscriptions of the fourth century of our era. Prentice, by a study of the inscriptions from 'Auwas in Auranitis, has concluded that between A.D. 330 and 394 it became the custom at Bosoa (?) for *pistoi* instead of *pronoetai* to have charge of public works.<sup>145</sup> In A.D. 310 *pronoetai* conducted a public work of some sort and in 324 *pronoetai* had charge of the building of a wall and apses. Again in A.D. 330 a basilica and a door were consecrated by four *pronoetai*, but in the year 394 in the same town the Θεανδρίτιον was

<sup>140</sup> P.A.E.S., 701.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 696.

<sup>142</sup> Wad., 2042. Cf. I.G.R.R., III, 1313, where in an inscription of A.D. 294 or 295 another list is given, probably of *pronoetai*.

<sup>143</sup> Wad., 1984 d.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 2413 c.

<sup>145</sup> Prentice in A.P.A., XLIII (1912), 116.

built by four *pistoi*. Either *pronoetes* and *pistos* were interchangeable titles or else the title of *pistos* was introduced at Bosoa (?) after A.D. 330. Whereas the *pistoi* appear almost always to have had the *πρόνοια*, the *pronoetai* did not have it so regularly. It may be that their title implies it without further explanation, but in one case the relation of three *pronoetai* to the erection of a *καλυβή* was explained by the word *διά*, which Prentice regards as the equivalent of *σπουδῆ* rather than *προνοία*. But the inscriptions do not warrant so great a distinction between these officials as Prentice makes.

Officials with the title of *dioiketes* appear in six inscriptions of Syria. One of these inscriptions merely gives us a list of the *dioiketai* of a certain community. These *dioiketai* are thirteen in number and their action, whatever it may be, is characterized by the word *πρόνοια*.<sup>146</sup> This inscription was found at Umm Iz-Zetun, which was, as we have seen, a village of considerable size and importance. Two inscriptions from Harran, also in Trachonitis, mention building undertaken by *dioiketai*, the first of which reads as follows: ἀντὶ πολλῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ μνήμης, προνοία Μαξίμου 'Ουέζου καὶ Μαλιχάθου καὶ 'Αμέρου καὶ Πρίσκου διοικητῶν, ἐτελέσθη τὸ δη[μ]όσιον πανδοχίον, ἔτους σμβ' τῆς Βοστρηνῶν ἰνδ(ικτιῶνος)ί.<sup>147</sup> There are four *dioiketai*, and the date is A.D. 396 or 397. The second of these inscriptions is dated one year later, and concerns the building of the same inn. The *dioiketai*, however, have changed, which makes it seem probable that *dioiketai* were in office for a year only. The inscription reads as follows: ἀντὶ εὐχαριστίας καὶ μνήμης <νη>ς προνοία [Γ]ορεπου Αὐμου καὶ Ουαραν(ου) Βά[σο]ν καὶ Αμερου Ουαβηλου καὶ Αχ[α]μου Μαρκανοῦ διοικητῶν ἐ[τ]ελέσθη τὸ κοινὸν πανδοχίον ἰ(ν)δ(ικτιῶνος) ἰά, ἔτους σμβ' τῆς ἐπαρχίου.<sup>148</sup> There is no evidence that a city stood upon this site in ancient times, and these inscriptions in all probability concern a village community.

In the following inscription from Djeneine in Batanea we see that *dioiketai* were elected by the people of the village:

τοῦτο αροίμον(?) ἔθηκεν το σ . . . . . κώμης ἀπάσης  
ἐκ προνοίας καὶ σπουδῆς τιμωτάτων διοικητῶν  
'Ολυμπίου Σαβινιανοῦ 'Αγρίππου τε Σωπάτρου,  
Δωσιθέου Εὐνόμου καὶ Δωσιθέου Σαμέθου υἱοῦ·  
τούτους πάνν σπουδαίους κώμης ἐπελέξατο δήμος.<sup>149</sup>

<sup>146</sup> Wad., 2547. This inscription may be dated as of A.D. 331 because one of the *dioiketai* is mentioned in another inscription of that year (*Ibid.*, 2546 a).

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, 2462.

<sup>148</sup> P.A.E.S., 7941.

<sup>149</sup> Wad., 2188.

There are four *dioiketai* in this village. The next inscription in which *dioiketai* are mentioned is from Namara in Batanea. The number of *dioiketai* is uncertain, but they have been instrumental in the construction of a gate. The inscription reads thus: ἐκ προνοίας τῶν διοικητῶν τῶν Ἐκάτων, διὰ Ἀσθάθου κὲ Σαοόρου κὲ Κασάνου κὲ Τιμοθέου ἐκτίσθη ἡ π[ύ]λη.<sup>150</sup> According to Jerome Namara was a village: "est usque ad praesens vicus grandis Namara in regione Batanea."<sup>151</sup> At Sur in Trachonitis was found the last inscription in which *dioiketai* appear, and it reads as follows:

Ἀ]γαθῆ Τύχη.  
ἡ οἰκοδομὴ τοῦ οἴκου ἐπετε-  
λέσθη διὰ Γορα Σαιανου συνδίκου  
καὶ Ἰσου Αννηλου καὶ Πρίσκου Φι-  
λοκάλου καὶ Ζορεου Μάγνου  
διοικητῶν τῆς μητροκωμίας,  
ἔτους διακοσσιαστοῦ εἰκοστοῦ  
πρώτου τῆς ἐπαρχείας.<sup>152</sup>

The date is A.D. 326, and there appear to have been four *dioiketai*, one of whom was also a *syndic*. It is possible, on the other hand, that the *syndic* was not a *dioiketes*, and that there were only three *dioiketai*. This town was a *metrokomia*.

This survey of the inscriptions in which *dioiketai* appear shows that their function was similar to that of the *pistoi* and *pronoetai*, but that their number varied more, and in one instance rose to thirteen. It is also interesting to notice that in one case they were elected by the people of the village, which may mean that this was the manner in which all village officials were chosen.

In the inscriptions of Syria we frequently find officials styled *epimeletai*. Two of these officials are mentioned in an inscription from Hareira in the Antilibanon. Through their agency something has been done from the funds of the god and of the village.<sup>153</sup> An inscription from Agraena (ancient name) in Trachonitis tells us that the *koimon* of the village did something through two men. The word used to describe the activity of these men is *ἐπιμελία*, which suggests that they may have been *epimeletai*,<sup>154</sup> and the probability of this conjecture is strengthened by the fact

<sup>150</sup> Wad., 2184.

<sup>151</sup> Jerome, *Onomasticon*, s.v. *Nemra*.

<sup>152</sup> P.A.E.S., 7972.

<sup>153</sup> Wad., 2556.

<sup>154</sup> P.A.E.S., 7932.

that in another inscription from this site four *epimeletai* are named,<sup>155</sup> although we do not know what they did. It is clear that the *epimeletai* were not the highest officials in their village, for another inscription from this same site mentions a *protokometes*.<sup>156</sup>

From Bosana in Batanea comes an inscription containing the phrase ἐξ ἐπιμελίας καὶ σπουδῆς]. This probably means that the men who are named were *epimeletai*. The inscription reads thus: ἐξ ἐπιμελίας καὶ σπουδῆς] Μογαιρον Μάρκου κα[ὶ Α]ττου Ναζα(λ)ου ἐκτίσθη τὰ ἐργαστήρια ἐν ἔτι σπ[ά].<sup>157</sup> Two *epimeletai* supervised the construction of workshops in the year 386.

An inscription of Sala in Batanea tells of the opening of a church through the agency of two *epimeletai*. This inscription is dated between the years 566 and 574. There is no indication as to whether this town was a city or a village. It is interesting to note that the *epimeletai* were subjected to the indignity of swearing that they had not misappropriated any of the funds at their disposal.<sup>158</sup> *Epimeletai* are also mentioned at Eitha (ancient name) in Trachonitis. We have already seen that this town had a *strategos*.<sup>159</sup> In the following inscription from this site two *epimeletai* appear: Αἴλιος Μάξιμος ἑπαρχος τῆ πατρίδι ἐκτίσεν διὰ Ἡρώδου Ἡρώδου ἰδίου καὶ διὰ Φιλίππου Μάλλχου καὶ Ἀδδου Ἀκραβάνου ἐπιμελητῶν.<sup>160</sup> A private citizen has aided the two *epimeletai* in their undertaking. In a second inscription from this site one *epimeletes* appears, who out of his private means has contributed to the making of a door.<sup>161</sup>

Mouterde has published an inscription from Hammarah in the Antilibanon. His reading is:

Ἀγαθῆ τύχη] [τὸν ναὸν θε]οῦ Διὸς—α[ῦ]ξι τύχη Αἰν[γαρ(ρίας)]—  
ἐπὶ Ἀβιμμέου] vs Ἀπολ]λιναρίου ἀρχιερέως, ἐ[ξ]  
Ἀδρήλιοι, Βαρέαλας Φιλίππου καὶ Ὀκβεος Ὀκβέου  
καὶ Βήρυλλος Ἀβιμμέου καὶ Ἀειάνης Γερμά[νου]  
καὶ Μακεδόνις Ἀβιμμέου καὶ Βεελίαβος δ', οὐ δ[ί]ς],  
ἐπιμεληταί, ἀπὸ κόμης Αἰν[γαρ(ρίας)] ἐκτίσαντο.<sup>162</sup>

<sup>155</sup> P.A.E.S., 7936.

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, 7939.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, 734.

<sup>158</sup> Wad., 2261.

<sup>159</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1137.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 1138.

<sup>161</sup> Wad., 2117.

<sup>162</sup> P. R. Mouterde, *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph Beyrouth*, Tome VIII, fasc. 3, p. 108 (Beyrouth, 1926).

If this reading be correct, and Mouterde ably defends it, this village had six *epimeletai*. Mouterde dates this inscription shortly after A.D. 212. He raises the question as to whether the *epimeletai* were officials of a purely religious character or whether they also had civic duties. His conclusion that they represented both the village and the god seems reasonable.

*Epimeletai* appear in several inscriptions from Syrian cities. One of these inscriptions concerns Palmyra, and in it an *epimeletes* is described as being in charge of the water coming from a certain spring.<sup>163</sup> The official in charge of the water supply, or an important part of it, of a city such as Palmyra would be very important, as his responsibility was great. This inscription is cited merely to give some idea of the importance of the duties of the *epimeletes* in this case and similar cases. It also shows that *epimeletai* were not always associated with building enterprises, and that their work may often have had a more permanent character.<sup>164</sup>

Another official who is frequently mentioned in the inscriptions of Syria is the *episkopos*. We are not here concerned with him in his religious capacity, but as a municipal official. Liebenam is of the opinion that *episkopoi* were regular officers in charge of building,<sup>165</sup> but Magie and Stuart believe that at least in certain cases the *episkopoi* formed temporary committees for the construction of certain buildings, and that they did not constitute a regular board of overseers.<sup>166</sup>

From Kanata in Auranitis come two inscriptions which refer to men who were probably *episkopoi*. The first of these reads thus: ἐπισκοποῦντος Μονίμου Φλαοίου βουλευτοῦ.<sup>167</sup> This man was certainly a councillor, and perhaps an *episkopos* also. The other inscription mentions three men who appear to have been *episkopoi*. The inscription reads as follows: Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ. ὑπε[ρ σ]ωτηρίας τῶν κυρίων, ἐπισκοποῦντων Ἀνέμον Σαβίνου καὶ Βαυλάνης Ὀδενίθου καὶ Πασίφιλος Καμασάνου, ἐκτίσθη ὁ οἶκος ἐκ φιλοτιμίας τῆς κώμης ἐξ ὧν ἔδωκεν Ἰουλιανὸς Διονυ(σί)ου \* φ' . . . ἔτους ρμζ'.<sup>168</sup> The *episkopoi* built a house as the result of the generosity of the village, some of whose inhabitants contributed from their private purses, in the year 253. Wad-

<sup>163</sup> Wad., 2571 c.

<sup>164</sup> For further evidence as to the character of the *epimeletai* in cities see Wad., 2070 c and 2077. Cf. also Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche*, p. 385, n. 1 (Leipzig, 1900).

<sup>165</sup> Liebenam, *op. cit.*, p. 384, n. 2.

<sup>166</sup> P.A.E.S., 37, note.

<sup>167</sup> Wad., 2412 e.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, 2412 f, or I.G.R.R., III, 1284.

dington is of the opinion that Kanata was a city and not a village. In support of this contention he cites the fact that in an inscription from El-Afine in Batanea is recorded the building by a certain man named Cornelius Palma of a conduit to lead water to Kanata.<sup>169</sup> Such a conduit, he thinks, would not be built in the interests of a mere village. Moreover, Waddington believes that certain coins which have been attributed to Kanatha properly belong to Kanata,<sup>170</sup> and lastly, in his opinion, the mention of a councillor in an inscription from this site gives a presumption in favor of the belief that a city, not a village, stood here. Waddington's first argument is quite strong, but there seems to be no justification for his opinion that coins attributed to Kanatha really belonged to Kanata. The third argument, to the effect that Kanata must have been a city because it had a council, I shall attempt later to invalidate. The appearance of the word *kome* in the second inscription quoted from this site argues that *episkopoi* were village officials, for had they been officials of a unit other than the village where the stone was cut, the name of that other community would in all probability have been given.

The title *episkopos* occurs in its civic aspect in two inscriptions from Salkhad in Auranitis. This town was one of considerable importance in antiquity. One of these inscriptions seems to record the erection of a building under the superintendence of four *episkopoi*. It reads as follows: Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ. Θαῖμος Ναέμου, Σάβας Σίχμου, Βάσσος Οἰλπίου, Βόρδος Σαι[ρή]λου ἐκ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκτίσαν, ἔτους ρμζ'.<sup>171</sup> The date of this inscription is A.D. 252. In a note on this inscription Waddington gives the definition of Charisius of the functions of *episkopoi*: "Episcopi, qui praesunt pani et caeteris venalibus rebus, quae civitatum populis ad quotidianum victum usui sunt."<sup>172</sup> The *episkopoi*, then, were analogous to *agoranomoi* in Greece and in other parts of the Hellenic world. There is only one instance of an *agoranomos* in Auranitis (at Kanatha).<sup>173</sup> Where there were no *agoranomoi* some other officials must have fulfilled their tasks, and it is quite possible that this was one of the principal functions of the *episkopoi*, namely, to supervise local markets. But the frequency with which *episkopoi* appear in connection with some building enterprise makes it seem that they

<sup>169</sup> Wad., 2296.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, 2412 d.

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, 1990. The other inscription concerning *episkopoi* from this site is *ibid.*, 1989. See also note to *ibid.*, 1990.

<sup>172</sup> *Digest*, L, 4, 18, 7.

<sup>173</sup> Wad., 2330.



were not so engrossed in duties connected with markets, as the definition of Charisius would lead us to expect.

*Episkopoi* appear in two inscriptions from the southern part of Auranitis. The first of these inscriptions was found at Kara'ah, and *episkopoi* appear as overseers of the temple enclosure: . . . τοῦς τοῦ τεμ]ένους ἐπισκόπους . . . Ζεδος(καί) Βανιος.<sup>174</sup> The other inscription comes from Umm Liwan and from it we learn that something was done by provision of the village, and that several men were acting as *episkopoi*:

. . . . ἐπισκοπία (Σ)ου . . . .  
 μου κὲ (Μ)ανος . . . . . πρνονή  
 τῆς κόμης(ς) Κ . . . . .<sup>175</sup>

An inscription from Il-Umta-Iyeh in Auranitis of the year 330 or 331 tells of a building erected from the funds of the Lord by *episkopoi*: ἐκτίσθη . . . ἐ]κ τῶν τοῦ Κυ[ρίου ἐπιμελουμένων] τῶν ἐπισκόπ[ων . . . .]ρου Βαχρου καὶ . . . . ἔτους σκέ.<sup>176</sup> But this shows the *episkopos* perhaps as a religious official rather than a purely municipal officer. This also is true in the case of an inscription found in a village near the foot of Mount Hermon, whose ancient name may have been Segeira. This inscription is dated between the years 103 and 116 of our era. The *episkopos* in this case is concerned with honoring the goddess Leucothea.<sup>177</sup> But the religious cult of an ancient community played so important a part in the life of that community that there can have existed no sharp line of division between an official of the cult and an officer charged with ordinary municipal matters.

It is probable that Syrian villages sometimes had officials known as *oikonomoi*. An inscription from Namara in Batanea tells of the building of a dovecote under the direction of two men who were probably *oikonomoi*: ἐπὶ τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ Πρίσκου καὶ Ἀνατολίου τῶν Ἀμπαρῆς ἐκτίσθη ὁ περιστηρεών.<sup>178</sup> Namara, as has been said above, was a village, and the *oikonomoi* appear to have been local officials. *Oikonomoi* appear, or at least their presence is implied, in three inscriptions from Sha'Areh in Trachonitis. The first of these inscriptions reads thus: οἱ ἀπὸ πρώτου τεμένους οἰκονομίας Σεκ-οῦνδου καὶ Ἀύρηλιου Φίρμου.<sup>179</sup> In the next inscription three *oikono-*

<sup>174</sup> P.A.E.S., 220.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, 222.

<sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>177</sup> O.G.I.S., 611.

<sup>178</sup> P.A.E.S., 758.

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*, 803<sup>1</sup>.

*moi* figure: [οἱ . . .] . . . μαω(ν) τεμ[έν]ους οἰκονόμ(αι), Αὐρ(ήλιος) Νασρος Ἄλλ[ασ]αθου Οσαι(δ)ε[λ]ος Φα(σε)λου [Μ]οκειμος Θαιμ[ο]ν ἀνέθηκα[ν].<sup>180</sup> The *oikonomoi* appear to have consecrated an enclosure to some deity. The third inscription is like the first in that *oikonomoi* are not expressly mentioned, although the use of the word *οικονομίας* makes it seem likely that the three men whose names follow were *oikonomoi*. The inscription reads as follows: οἰκονομίας Σομισου καὶ Ῥούφου κ[α]ι Ἰουλιανοῦ.<sup>181</sup> We have seen that this community had a board of *strategoï*.<sup>182</sup> As the *strategoï* were presumably the chief magistrates of the community, it is highly improbable that *oikonomoi* should be the eponymous magistrates, as has been suggested.<sup>183</sup> It is incorrect, therefore, to regard the phrase *οικονομίας τοῦ δέινος* as giving a date to an inscription. The phrase should not be translated "in the administration of," but "under the direction of." The difference is great, for the first translation is intended to indicate that the officers were eponymous, whereas the second is not. It is difficult to decide whether the *oikonomoi* mentioned in these inscriptions are really municipal officials. Justinian writes of *oikonomoi* as follows: "Oeconomus autem et xenodochos et nosocomos et ptochotrophos et aliorum venerabilium locorum gubernatores et alios omnes clericos iubemus pro creditis sibi gubernationibus apud proprium episcopum cui subiacent conveniri et rationem suae gubernationis facere, et cetera."<sup>184</sup> The *oikonomoi* whom Justinian describes are religious officials, but that does not prove that all *oikonomoi* were of that character. In the absence of more evidence it is impossible to decide whether the *oikonomos* in Syria was always a religious official or whether sometimes he may have been an officer charged with secular duties.

The title *ekdikos* occurs in several inscriptions of Syria. From Hebran in Batanea comes an inscription in which three men are described as *ekdikoi*. It reads thus: ὁ ναὸς ἐκ τῶν ἱερατικῶν ἐκτίσθη ἔτους ὀκτωκαιδεκάτου Ἀντωνείνου Καίσαρος, προνοησαμένων Ἀριστείδου Θαίμου, Ὀαιθέλου Ἐμμέγνου, Ἐμμεγάνη Χαμένου ἐγδ(ί)κον, etc.<sup>185</sup> The date of this inscription is A.D. 155, and the *ekdikoi* are connected with the building of a shrine or temple.

An *ekdikos* is mentioned in the following inscription from Il-

<sup>180</sup> P.A.E.S., 803<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*, 803<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, 803.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, 803<sup>1</sup>, note.

<sup>184</sup> Justinian, *Novella*, 123, 23.

<sup>185</sup> P.A.E.S., 659.

Umta-Iyeh in Auranitis: Γερμανὸς ἑκδικος.<sup>186</sup> Another mention of an *ekdikos* occurs at Tafha in Batanea: διὰ Ἰλμου Συμάχου Γαμήλου Ζαβαδάνου καὶ Θανούμου Τανήλου Μαξίμου Κασσίου καὶ Σαβίνου ἑκδικου ἐκτίσθη ὁ οἶκος.<sup>187</sup> As only one of the men described as having helped in the construction of the house was an *ekdikos*, we cannot be sure that his character of *ekdikos* had any connection with his help in the erection of the building. The word *kome* occurs in an inscription from this site, and there is no evidence in support of the belief that this town was more than a village.<sup>188</sup> An *ekdikos* also appears in an inscription from the city of Mothana in Auranitis, and again he is mentioned in connection with building: . . . προνοίας Διχνος? βουλ(ενοῦ) ἐγδικου καὶ Ῥουαίου καὶ Ἀέδου καὶ Αὔσου πιστῶν τὸ χῶμα ἐκαθαρίσθη καὶ ἡ πλάτις ἱερατικῆ οἰκοδομήθη καὶ ἐκτίσθη ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ πόλις.<sup>189</sup> It is instructive to notice that the *ekdikos* appears to have the same concern in building operations in a Syrian city as he does in the villages of Syria.

So far we have seen the *ekdikos* associated with building. His functions in Syria appear to have been quite different from the functions of the *ekdikos* in the cities of Asia Minor. We have both inscriptional and literary evidence on this point. There is, however, one inscription of Syria which may at least suggest that the Syrian *ekdikos* was not always so distinct from the more usual type. This inscription comes from Phaena in Trachonitis, and indicates that it was possible for a *metrokomia* to complain to the governor in case of ill treatment at the hands of soldiers or civilians. The word *ekdikos* does not appear, but the use of the verb ἐκδικηθήσεται at least suggests the possibility that the man who conveyed the complaint might be styled *ekdikos*. The inscription reads thus: Ἰούλιος Σατουρνίνος Φαινησίοις μητροκομία τοῦ Τράχωνος χαίρειν. ἐάν τις ὑμῖν ἐπιδημήσῃ βιαίως στρατιώτης ἢ καὶ ιδιώτης, ἐπιστείλαντές μοι ἐκδικηθήσεται, etc.<sup>190</sup>

In the cities of the East we often encounter officials known as *ekdikoi* and *syndikoi*.<sup>191</sup> The function of the *ekdikos* and that of the *syndikos* were very similar, but they were not identical. The fact that the two offices sometimes differed is illustrated in an inscription from the city of Prusias in Bithynia, in which the various offices which a certain man had held are enumerated as

<sup>186</sup> P.A.E.S., 44.

<sup>187</sup> Wad., 2169.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, 2165.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.*, 2034.

<sup>190</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1119.

<sup>191</sup> Liebenam, *op. cit.*, pp. 303 f.

follows: κοινόβουλον διὰ βίου, τιμητεύσαντα, ἀγορανομήσαντα, ἐκδικήσαντα, γραμματεύσαντα, συνδικήσαντα, πολλάκις, etc.<sup>192</sup>

Brandis has divided *ekdikoi* into two categories.<sup>193</sup> One type is that of specially appointed emissaries from a city to the central government to settle particular matters of litigation, and the other is that of regular standing officials who acted as intermediaries between the city and the higher authorities in disputed questions. In support of this classification he cites a passage from Cicero and two inscriptions, one from Lydia, the other from Pisidia.<sup>194</sup> But a study of the evidence which Brandis cites in support of his opinion makes it seem probable that *ekdikoi* were always officials of a permanent character, and never specially selected for a particular mission.<sup>195</sup>

This brief survey of the character of the *ekdikos* in the cities of Asia Minor shows that his character here was quite different from what we have seen it to be in the inscriptions of Syria. It may be that the *ekdikos* has no real and essential connection with building in Syria, but the evidence points the other way. It is possible that the name was borrowed for some reason from Asia Minor, but that the duties of the Syrian *ekdikos* had no resemblance to the duties of the *ekdikos* of the cities of Asia Minor. The inscription from Phaena, already quoted, is the only one in which any possible similarity between the position of the *ekdikos* in Syria and in Asia Minor is suggested.

Officials with the title of *syndikos* appear frequently in the inscriptions of Syria. Seven inscriptions from Bosana in Batanea mention such an official. This place was probably a village, as has been said above, and in four of the inscriptions we see that two *pistoi* are associated with a *syndikos* (see above in connection with the *pistoi*). In another case the *syndikos* appears also to have been at the same time a *pistos*, and to be one of two *pistoi* who laid the foundations for a well: ἐκ προνοίας καὶ σπουδῆς Παυλείνου συνδίκου καὶ [Α]ουκ[ιλαν]οῦ πιστῶν, τῶν . . . . . εταξυτων? . . . . . ἡ πηγὴ ἐθεμελιώθη καὶ ἀνευρώθη ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ, ἔτους σξ' τῆς ἐπαρχ[είας].<sup>196</sup> In the cases in which the *syndikos* is not also at the same time one

<sup>192</sup> Wad., 1176.

<sup>193</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. ecdicos*.

<sup>194</sup> Cicero, *Ad Familiares*, XIII, 56; *Ath. Mitt.*, XXIV, 224, no. 55; Wad., 1212.

<sup>195</sup> For further proof of the permanent character of the office we have the following inscription from Nicaea in Bithynia: [γ]ραμματέοντος Αὔρ. Συμφόρου [ἐ]κ[δ]ικοῦν[τ]ος διὰ βίου Αὔρ. Στεφάνου. (C.I.G., 3749.)

<sup>196</sup> Wad., 2239.

of the *pistoi*, it appears likely from the wording of the inscriptions that the initiative in the matter of building may have rested with him, whereas the *pistoi* were responsible for the actual construction of the building. However, such a distinction may not have existed. Perhaps the mention of the *syndikos* merely indicates that he was one of the highest officials in his community, and as such interested in all the activities of his village.

From El-Mouschennef, not far from Bosana, come two inscriptions in which *syndikoi* appear. One of these inscriptions has already been quoted in connection with *pistoi*,<sup>197</sup> and it is another instance of a *syndikos* being associated with two *pistoi* in the erection of a building. It is significant that the name of the *syndikos* is the same in this case as it is in one of the inscriptions at Bosana. This may mean that one of the towns was dependent upon the other, as has been suggested above, or it may point to the conclusion that these two towns were both under the same supervision from above, and that the *syndikos* was not an official of the community in which the inscription was found, but rather the officer of a higher unit upon which these two communities both depended. In that case there would be no evidence that the *syndikos* was a village official at all. The other inscription from El-Mouschennef in which a *syndikos* figures reads thus: ἐπὶ συνδίκου Σέου Διογένους συνδικο[υ] φυ(λῆς) Ἀουδρένδον οικοδομήθη ἡ καμά[ρ]α.<sup>198</sup> In this case the *syndikos* appears as a tribal officer and again is associated with a building enterprise. It seems probable that the site was occupied by a city in the time of these inscriptions. One of the inscriptions from this site contains the word Νηλκωμίας,<sup>199</sup> and Hierocles mentions Νιλακώμη, which may well be a corruption or an alternative form of Νηλκωμία, among the cities of Arabia between Bostra and Adraa.<sup>200</sup> But its name indicates that it was a village in origin.

An inscription from Namara in Batanea also mentions a *syndikos*. It reads thus: προνοία Πρόκλου καὶ Παννονίου ἀδελφοῦ συνδίκου, ἰῶν Κρησκεντέινου, ἐκτίσθη τὰ τεῖχη εὐτυχῶς.<sup>201</sup> Namara was a village, and it is interesting to see that it had walls.

We have seen already that the *metrokomia* of Sur in Trachonitis had an official known as a *syndikos*,<sup>202</sup> and a *syndikos* also

<sup>197</sup> Wad., 2219.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*, 2220.

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.*, 2217.

<sup>200</sup> Hierocles, *Synecdemus*, 722.

<sup>201</sup> Wad., 2173.

<sup>202</sup> P.A.E.S., 797<sup>2</sup>.

appears at Philippopolis, the *syndikos* likewise being a councillor and *epimeletes*.<sup>203</sup> But we gain no new information about the position of the *syndikos* from the inscriptions of these towns. We have also a fragmentary inscription from El-Mouschennef in which a *syndikos* of nomads appears: Θεόδωρον, συνδίκου νομάδων.<sup>204</sup> I think that Prentice is wrong in regarding this as the title of an Arab sheikh. The name Theodorus is Greek, and this man may have been the representative of the tribe in its dealings with the central government or else he may have been the agent of the central government itself. However, in all the inscriptions which are more than mere fragments the *syndikos* seems to be associated with building.

But an inscription from Palmyra sheds further light upon the *syndikos*. This inscription mentions several *syndikoi*: ἐ[πι]μελίσθαι δὲ τοὺς τυγχάνοντας κατὰ καιρὸν ἄρχοντας καὶ δεκαπρώτους καὶ συνδίκ[ους τοῦ] μηδὲν παραπράσσειν τὸν μισθούμενον.<sup>205</sup> This inscription is a decree of the senate of Palmyra regulating financial matters, and it shows clearly that *syndikoi* were regular officials. Moreover their jurisdiction is of the kind we should expect, to judge from the notices in the *Digest* in which *syndikoi* figure. This is the only case in which several *syndikoi* are mentioned in an inscription of Syria. In this instance the *syndikoi* appear to have been of the character that was usual in the cities of Asia Minor.

In Asia Minor the *syndikos* appears to have been an official whose function was essentially the same as that of the *ekdikos*. His duty was to act as intermediary between his city and the higher authority. An inscription from Caryanda in Caria shows that in this city a *syndikos* was elected, and that the office was regarded as a liturgy: αἰρεθεῖς δὲ καὶ σύ[νδικος ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ λει]τουργία ἐκτενὴ καὶ φιλότιμον ἑαυτὸν παρέσχετο.<sup>206</sup> The restoration of this inscription is confirmed by a passage from Charisius: "Defensores quoque, quos Graeci syndicos appellant, et qui ad certam causam agendam vel defendendam eliguntur, laborem personalis muneris adgrediuntur."<sup>207</sup> We have seen already that the office of *syndikos* could be held more than once.<sup>208</sup> But another passage in the *Digest* implies that a *syndikos* had a more permanent character: "Quibus autem permissum est corpus habere collegii societatis sive cui-

<sup>203</sup> Wad., 2077.

<sup>204</sup> A.A.E.S., part III, no. 383.

<sup>205</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1056, lines 12 ff.

<sup>206</sup> Wad., 499, lines 2 ff.

<sup>207</sup> *Digest*, L, 4, 18, 13.

<sup>208</sup> Wad., 1176.

usque alterius eorum nomine, proprium est ad exemplum rei publicae habere res communes, arcam communem et actorem sive syndicum, per quem tamquam in re publica, quod communiter agi fierique oporteat, agatur fiat.<sup>209</sup> This passage shows clearly that the *syndikos* was chosen not merely to settle particular disputes, but that he was a regular official ready to act in any case, should it arise.

The relation between the *syndikos* of the cities of Asia Minor and the *syndikos* of the villages of Syria seems to be just as unsubstantial as the relation between the *ekdikoi*. It would be quite unreasonable to suppose that a mere village would have a permanent official whose sole duty was to represent his village in its dealings with the central authorities. If that were the case, his position would be a sinecure.

The last official to be considered in this chapter is the *pragmateutes*. Such an official is mentioned only once in a Syrian inscription, and this inscription has already been cited in connection with the *komarchos*.<sup>210</sup> The *pragmateutes* in other parts of the Roman empire was an imperial official in charge of an imperial estate. As the inscription mentioned is our only evidence for the existence of such an officer in Syria, it would be unsafe to draw any definite conclusion as to his functions, except that he is not likely to have been a village official but rather the representative of the central government in the administration of a village.

In the preceding pages the various officials who appear in inscriptions concerning Syrian villages have been discussed. The following officials have been considered: *komarchoi*, *protokometai*, *strategoï*, *komogrammateis*, *pistoi*, *pronoetai*, *dioiketai*, *epimeletai*, *episkopoi*, *oikonomoi*, *ekdikoi*, *syndikoi*, and *pragmateutai*. The references to the officials in this list are very scattered, and we never find many of them mentioned in the inscriptions from any one village. The fact that these inscriptions are for the most part found on stones which formed parts of ancient buildings gives us a one-sided view of the duties of these officials, for the inscriptions usually record the erection of these same buildings, and the names of the local officials who had to do with their construction are included in the inscriptions. But we must not be misled by the unbalanced character of our evidence about the duties of these officers.

<sup>209</sup> *Digest*, III, 4, 1, 1.

<sup>210</sup> P.A.E.S., 881.

Any attempt to localize the Syrian village officials is unsafe, from the character of our evidence. Most of the inscriptions in which any of these officials are mentioned are found in Auranitis, Trachonitis, and Batanea. As we have far more inscriptions from these districts than from other parts of Syria, it is not at all surprising that our information is more complete about these districts, but we must not infer the nonexistence of certain officials in other parts of Syria merely because we have no mention of them. We do, however, find occasional references to village officials in parts of Syria other than Auranitis, Trachonitis, and Batanea. The *komarchos*, for example, appears in an inscription from Il-Mishrifeh in northern Syria, and an *epimeletes* appears in an inscription from Hareira in the Antilibanon. Then there are several general references to officials who existed in Syria, such as the reference to *komarchoi* made by Libanius in his oration on the evils of military patronage. Another reference of this character is made to *protokometai* by Leontius Neapolitanus and by Palladius.

Despite the scattered nature of our evidence we find references to more than one type of official in some of the villages of Syria. At Il-Umta-Iyeh in Auranitis mention is made of a *protokometes*, an *ekdikos*, and *episkopoi*. Sha'Areh in Trachonitis had both *strategoï* and *oikonomoi*. Eitha in Trachonitis had *strategoï* and *epimeletai*. Bosana in Batanea boasted of *pistoi* and a *syndikos*. In four inscriptions from this place two *pistoi* appear to have been associated with a *syndikos* in some building enterprise. Both *pistoi* and *pronoetai* are mentioned in an inscription from Il-Mu' Arribeh in Auranitis. Umm Iz-Zetun in Trachonitis had *pronoetai* and also many *dioiketai*. The village of Aqraba in Auranitis had an *epimeletes* and two *pronoetai*. Namara, a village of Batanea, had two *oikonomoi*, an uncertain number of *dioiketai*, and possibly a *syndikos*. It is probable that the villages in Auranitis, Trachonitis, and Batanea for the most part maintained their independence of cities in the neighborhood. Had the villages become dependent parts of city territories, it is not probable that they would have retained such an elaborate organization of their own.

Most of the inscriptions in which village officials are mentioned are of the third and fourth centuries, so that it is impossible to set the date at which the various offices were created or the date at which they fell into disuse.

## 2. Village Assemblies and Councils.

From the discussion of village officials we naturally pass to that of village assemblies and councils. Many public works appear to have been undertaken by the village as a whole. The following expressions point to the corporate action of a village: τὸ κοινὸν τῆς κώμης, οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς κώμης, ὁ δῆμος, ἡ κώμη ἐποίησέ τι.<sup>211</sup> We cannot be sure who composed this *koinon*. Either it was an assembly of all the magistrates, or more probably an assembly of all the inhabitants of the village. In all the many references to action on the part of a village *koinon* no mention is made of any particular magistrates as having composed it. In the absence of any such evidence, it appears more reasonable to regard the *koinon* as a general assembly open to all the villagers. A study of the inscriptions in which the words τὸ κοινὸν τῆς κώμης or equivalent phrases occur will help to strengthen this opinion.

From Umm Iz-Zetun in Trachonitis come two inscriptions which tell of the erection of a sacred *καλυβή* by the *koinon* of the village and of the god. One of these inscriptions has been cited above in connection with the *pronoetai*,<sup>212</sup> and the other reads as follows: Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ, ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ νείκης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Μ(άρκου) Αὐρ(ηλίου) Πρόβου Σεβ(αστοῦ) ἔτ(ους) ζ', ἐκτίσθη ἡ ἱερὰ καλυβὴ ὑπὸ κοινοῦ τῆς κώμης εὐτυχῶς.<sup>213</sup> The date of this inscription is A.D. 282. Four inscriptions from Lubben record the action of the village of Agraena, which was clearly the name of the ancient village which stood on this site.<sup>214</sup> It will suffice to quote one of these inscriptions to show the type of all four: ἔτους ιβ' κυρίου Καίσαρος Ἀλεξάνδρου τὸ κοινὸν Ἀγραίνης ἐπ[ό]ησεν Θεῷ Αὐμον δι(ὰ) Πλάτωνος καὶ Αβουνοῦ.<sup>215</sup> The date of this inscription is A.D. 233. The two men here mentioned were temple treasurers,<sup>216</sup> and the *koinon* of the village appears to have erected some building or monument in honor of the Θεὸς Αὐμου.

An inscription from Damit il-Alya, also in Trachonitis, mentions a building in honor of the same god, and again we see that the building was undertaken by the common action of the village: Θεῷ Ἀνικήτῳ Αὐμον ο(ὶ)κοδόμησεν τὸ κοινὸν τῆς κώ[μ](ης) Δαμά(θ)ων.<sup>217</sup> An inscription from Schaqra in Trachonitis tells of the

<sup>211</sup> Wad., 2457 a, 2502, 2188, 2237.

<sup>212</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1187.

<sup>213</sup> P.A.E.S., 76512.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*, 793, 7931, 7932, 7933.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, 7931.

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, 793.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, 8002; cf. 8007.

common approval of the people of the village in a certain project. Part of the inscription reads as follows: ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἀπὸ Κω[ρ]ίνου? κώμης ἐκ κοινῆς α[ὐ]τῶν εὐδοκίσ[εως] μηδένα τῶν αὐτῶν κωμητῶν . . . ἐπὶ κοινῷ [τ]όπῳ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν χώματι Δαναβων.<sup>218</sup> From Harran in Trachonitis comes an inscription recording another building enterprise undertaken by a village. The inscription ends with the following words: [ἡ κώμη ἀν]έσ[τη]σεν διὰ [Αὔ]σου Λαν. . .<sup>219</sup> An inscription from Egla in Batanea tells of the erection of a public building by the villagers: οἱ ἀπὸ κώμης Ἐγλων θεῷ αὐτῶν Ἐθάφ ἀνέστησαν δημοσίαν τὴν οἰκοδομήν.<sup>220</sup> An inscription from Djeneine in Batanea has been cited above as showing that the people of a village elected *dioiketai*.<sup>221</sup> Here we see the common action of a village, namely, in the election of its officials. This probably means that the village had an assembly in which the voting took place.

Another mention of collective action on the part of a village is made in an inscription from Kefr-Liha in Auranitis. This inscription has been cited above in connection with the *strategos*.<sup>222</sup> In this inscription, instead of the phrase τὸ κοινὸν τῆς κώμης, we find the words οἱ κωμηταὶ ἔκτισαν. Finally, we have an inscription from El-Mouschenef in Batanea, in which we learn that the *koinon* of a certain town built an upper story in a house. The inscription reads thus: τὸ κοινὸν Μανηνῶν ἔκτισεν τὸ ὑπερφῶν.<sup>223</sup>

These inscriptions make it abundantly clear that villages were capable of common action. There is no mention of special officials or committees determining the action for the community as a whole. The expression οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς κώμης especially must apply to all of the villagers, as no particular men are designated. The only way in which the villagers may reasonably be supposed to have formed common projects is by a common assembly.

The evidence that Syrian villages, sometimes at least, had councils or *βουλαί* is not so clear, but it appears that some of the more highly organized villages had these councils. The word *βουλή* is not found in Syrian village inscriptions, but the word *βουλευτής* is found. In an inscription from Umm Iz-Zetun in Trachonitis a *bouleutes* appears. This inscription has been quoted above in connection with *pronoetai*.<sup>224</sup> Had the councillor been the councillor

<sup>218</sup> Wad., 2505.

<sup>219</sup> *Ibid.*, 2460.

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*, 2209.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, 2188.

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*, 2399.

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*, 2213.

<sup>224</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1187.

of a community other than the village mentioned in the inscription, the name of that other community would probably have been included. We have also seen that this village had an assembly, which shows that the village was highly organized.

Two inscriptions from Kanata in Auranitis have already been mentioned.<sup>225</sup> In one of them a *bouleutes* appears. As has been said above, Waddington believes that Kanata was a city, and one of his arguments in support of this theory is that this town had a council. Now, if it can be established that villages may have had councils, this argument of Waddington's falls down. As I have attempted to show above, there is no clear evidence that Kanata was a city, so the mention of a *bouleutes* in an inscription from this town may be a further proof that villages sometimes had councils.

From Mjedil in Trachonitis comes an inscription in which, if the restoration be correct, a *bouleutes* figures. It has been pointed out that a village stood on this site,<sup>226</sup> and since the name of no town is mentioned together with the name of the *bouleutes*, the logical inference is that he was the councillor of the village. The inscription is too fragmentary to permit us to learn anything as to the character or activity of the *bouleutes*.<sup>227</sup>

From El-Kusseib in Batanea comes an inscription in which a *bouleutes* figures: *προνοία Αἰθου βουλ(ευτού) καὶ Ὀδενάθου καὶ Σαβεΐνου υἱῶν Σαμέθου ἐκτίσθη τὸ μνημῖον.*<sup>228</sup> Waddington assumes without question that Authos was *bouleutes* of the city upon which El-Kusseib depended. Such an assumption does not seem justified. It is at least possible that Authos was *bouleutes* of the village where the inscription is found. There is, moreover, no evidence that El-Kusseib was anything but a village.

The word *bouleutes* occurs in an inscription from It-Taiyebah in Auranitis. There is no likelihood that this place was ever a city, and the *bouleutes* may well have been the councillor of the village where the inscription was found. The inscription reads thus: *Αδβηλος Σοαιμος βουλευτῆς ἐτ(ῶν) ρ'.*<sup>229</sup> From Khabeḥ in Trachonitis comes an inscription in which mention is made of a *bouleutes*, and there is no evidence that a city stood on this site. The inscription reads as follows: *ὑπατ(ε)ίας Διοκλητιανοῦ τὸ ἠ' καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τὸ ζ' Σε(βαστῶ)ν, Αὔρ. Οὔρος Ἀουίδου βου(λευτῆς) τὸ Τύχ(ε)ιον ἐξ*

<sup>225</sup> Wad., 2412 e, 2412 f.

<sup>226</sup> P.A.E.S., 787.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, 787<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>228</sup> Wad., 2204.

<sup>229</sup> P.A.E.S., 624.

*εἰδίων ἐποίησεν.*<sup>230</sup> From Khulkhula, also in Trachonitis, comes an inscription in which a *bouleutes* appears: *Θεόμνηστος Αἰλάμου ὁ καὶ Θαῦμος βουλ(ευτῆς) καὶ Γαῦτος ἀδελφός, ὀπτίον λεγ(ιῶνος), ἐποίησαν τὸ ἡρώων.*<sup>231</sup> Waddington assumes that there must either have been a city here or else that the *bouleutes* was councillor of the city on which this town depended. A third alternative is possible, and that is that a village stood here at the time of our inscription, and that the *bouleutes* was councillor of the village.

An inscription from the *metrokomia* of Phaena in Trachonitis mentions a *bouleutes*, and it is not surprising that *metrokomiai* should have councils, as we should naturally expect their organization to be more elaborate than that of ordinary villages. The inscription reads thus: *. . . . Δη]μητρίου βου[λευτοῦ . . . . ου τοῦ καὶ . . .*<sup>232</sup> One other inscription may be cited as containing a possible reference to a village *bouleutes*. This inscription comes from Umm Il-Kutten in Auranitis and reads as follows: *Βανιος Γαδδου βουλευτῆς κὲ Ομηρ Σολαιμου σύμβιος αὐτοῦ ἔκτισαν τὸ τρίκλιον.*<sup>233</sup> However, despite the absence of any direct testimony to that effect it is highly probable that a city stood upon this site, as the ruins of this place are very extensive.<sup>234</sup>

From the inscriptions cited above it can be seen that in all probability Syrian villages sometimes had councils. The inscriptions from Umm Iz-Zetun, Kanata, and Mjedil make this belief especially plausible, and the inscriptions from El-Kusseib, It-Taiyebah, and Khabeḥ add weight to this opinion. Of the size and mode of selection and power of these councils nothing is known. Old age is much revered in the East, and perhaps the council was composed of the oldest and most influential men of the village. We have seen already that practically all the inscriptions in which officials of the villages are mentioned come from Auranitis, Trachonitis, and Batanea. The same is true of the inscriptions which refer to village assemblies and village councils. In these districts there is very little evidence of cities controlling large territories in which villages were situated. Each village seems to be a more or less independent unit, with comparatively little dependence upon a unit higher than itself, except of course the central administration of the Romans.

<sup>230</sup> Wad., 2514.

<sup>231</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1131, or Wad., 2537 e.

<sup>232</sup> Wad., 2535.

<sup>233</sup> P.A.E.S., 209.

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*, Butler, II A, part II, p. 137.

## II.

*The administration of the Syrian village. Village revenue. Village expenditure. Relation of the village to the city on which it depended and to Rome in financial matters. Private ownership of villages. Patronage of villages.*

## 1. Village Revenue.

In the last section we have seen that many buildings were erected and public works undertaken at the common expense of this or that village.<sup>235</sup> The citation of two more inscriptions will impress this point more deeply on the mind. The first of these was found at Qreye in Auranitis, and it reads as follows: Ἐπισημὴ ἢ Λίμνη ἔτους ρθ' ἐ(κ) κοινῶν ἀναλωμάτων τῆς κώμης, (δηναρίων) ἐμ(υριάδων), ἐκ προνοίας Φλ(αβίου) Κορνηλιανοῦ π(ριμι)π(ιλαρίου).<sup>236</sup> The date of this inscription is A.D. 294 or 295. This village clearly had a common fund. It is interesting to note that a veteran was the benefactor of this village.<sup>237</sup> The other inscription was found at Dâna in the Djebel Rîhâ, and reads thus:

.....] Εἰσεβίου πᾶσαν σπο[υδή]ν  
 .....] (ἀ)πὸ τοῦ ἀναλώματος τῆς κώμης  
 .....] ΔΕΓΟΥ μ(ηνό)ς (Δ)ίου -(?)του μψ' ἔτου(s).<sup>238</sup>

The date of this is A.D. 428. These inscriptions make it evident that villages must have had a considerable income. This income, however, need not have been fixed or regular and, in point of fact, it probably was not. The question then arises as to what the sources of this income were. Among these sources may be enumerated: the sums paid by magistrates upon their entrance into office, fines for the violation of law, gifts from private individuals, income from the rent of public buildings and from the control of the water supply, and lastly taxes payable to the village by the users of its common land or the taxes from land owned by private persons. We shall now proceed to study these various sources of income in detail.

## A. Summae honorariae.

It was customary for municipal officials upon entering office to pay a certain sum to the municipality. Liebenam has published

<sup>235</sup> E.g., P.A.E.S., 7877, 788.

<sup>236</sup> I.G.E.R., III, 1317.

<sup>237</sup> Cf. Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, chap. VII, n. 33.

<sup>238</sup> A.A.E.S., part III, no. 256.

a list of these sums, together with the places in which they were paid and the offices for which they were paid.<sup>239</sup> This list shows that the evidence for the payment of a *summa honoraria* is much less complete in the eastern part of the Roman Empire than in the western. But we are not totally without information as to *summae honorariae* paid by village officials in the eastern provinces upon their entrance into office.

We have seen above that such sums were paid by men on their entrance into the office of *komarchos* in certain villages of Lydia, and that the sum advanced from 250 to 500 to 750 and finally to 1,000 denarii. Another Lydian inscription, moreover, bears witness to the fact that a *summa honoraria* was payable for the office of *logistes* in a village community. The part of this inscription which is relevant to the *summa honoraria* reads as follows: Αἰ-ρ(ήλιος) Ἐρμόλαος Ῥουστίκου ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἀρχῆς λογιστείας, καθὼς ἔδοξε τοῖς κωμῆταις (δηνάρια) διακόσια πενήκοντα προσχωρήσαντα εἰς τὴν τῶν ΤΕΙ-ΡΩΝΩΝ συντέλειαν.<sup>240</sup> Kerameus thought that the name of the village was Τείρα, but Keil and von Premerstein are probably right in thinking that the word ΤΕΙΡΩΝΩΝ is not a proper name, and that it really means *tirones* or recruits. This point will be discussed more fully later. The *logistes* is an official who does not appear in the village of Syria. The amount of the *summa honoraria* which he pays is 250 denarii.

There is no record of a *summa honoraria* being paid by any village official in Syria. However, such payments may have been made. The table published by Liebenam shows how widespread was the practice of imposing this payment upon municipal officials, and in the later days of the Empire at least the Roman tendency to uniformity may have caused the spread of this form of tax to Syria, if it did not already exist there.

## B. Fines for the violation of law.

There are many inscriptions in Asia Minor and Syria which bear witness to the fact that fines were imposed upon the violators of tombs. The fines were in several cases payable at least in part to villages. One inscription from Bithynia and four from Lydia mention the village as the recipient of part of the fine in case a tomb should be violated. The inscription from Bithynia was found at Lesa, and ends thus: [ε]ι [δ]έ τις [παρ]ὰ τ[α]υ[τα] πο[ι]ήσ[ει]

<sup>239</sup> Liebenam, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-65.

<sup>240</sup> Keil and von Premerstein in D.W.A., vol. 57, p. 87, note to 110. Cf. Kerameus in *Ath. Mitt.*, III (1878), 56.

δ[ότ[ω] τῷ ταμείῳ δηνάρια ε [καὶ τ]ῇ κ[ώ]μη Ἀησαν[ῶ]ν δηνάρια α.<sup>241</sup> The part of the fine payable to the village is one-sixth of the total fine and amounts to 1,000 denarii. From Falaka in Lydia comes an inscription also recording the fine payable to a village in case of the violation of a tomb: εἰ δέ τις παρὰ τὰ προγεγραμμένα τι ποιήσει, δώσει τῷ φύσκῳ (δηνάρια) βφ' καὶ τῇ Θναιρηγῶν κώμῃ (δηνάρια) αφ'.<sup>242</sup> In this case the village is to receive three-eighths of the total fine. Another Lydian inscription informs us that a village is to receive 500 denarii, which is one-third of the total fine.<sup>243</sup> At Kurdeli in Lydia was found an inscription according to which the village is entitled to one-sixth of the fine imposed for the violation of a tomb, and the share which was payable to the village amounted to 500 denarii.<sup>244</sup> An inscription found at Ajasurat, also in Lydia, shows that the share of the village in the fine for violation of a tomb was to be one-third of the total fine.<sup>245</sup>

When we turn to Syria we find no instance in which any part of a fine imposed for the violation of a tomb was payable to the village. However, we do find that provision was made for the punishment of those who violated tombs, and in the event of such a transgression taking place in a village it is quite probable that part of the fine would be payable to the village. An inscription providing for the inviolability of a tomb was found at Kasr Il-Baik in Auranitis.<sup>246</sup> This inscription unfortunately is very incomplete and does not concern a village, but at least shows the same concern for the safety of tombs as the inscriptions of Asia Minor show. An inscription from Palmyra also prohibits the violation of a tomb, and this prohibition must have been supported by a fine for its infringement.<sup>247</sup> In cases in which a fine is to be paid for the violation of a tomb it is very probable that at least part of the fine should be payable to the community in which the tomb is situated, as there would be no other means of interesting the community in the enforcement of the penalty for the violation of the tomb. An inscription from Nedjran in Trachonitis closes with the following words: μὴ ἐξόν τινα μετὰ τὸν (θ)ά(να)-τόν μου τὴν σορὸν ἀνύξει, δόσι ταμίῳ (δ)ι(σ)χίλια π· \* (ε)ντα[κ]ῶ[σια].<sup>248</sup> In

<sup>241</sup> Wad., 1171.

<sup>242</sup> A. Fontrier in R.E.A., vol. IV (1902), p. 263, no. 12.

<sup>243</sup> Keil and von Premerstein in D.W.A., vol. 57, p. 91, no. 120.

<sup>244</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 77, no. 108.

<sup>245</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59, no. 67.

<sup>246</sup> P.A.E.S., 23.

<sup>247</sup> Wad., 2622.

<sup>248</sup> P.A.E.S., 7851.

this instance the fine, which seems to amount to 2,500 denarii, is payable to the *fiscus*, and there is no indication that the village is to receive any share in it; but it is not at all impossible that the village was intended to share in the fine, as being the agent through which the *fiscus* might collect the fine.

There is no record of any other fines such as we might expect to find. Fines for damage done to public property, for interference with the water supply, for the disturbance of property boundaries, for corrupt practices in administration, for pollution of sacred precincts, and for trespass are the sort of fines for which we look, but which we fail to find.<sup>249</sup>

### C. Gifts from private individuals.

Several inscriptions of Syria record the giving of large private gifts for public purposes. In these inscriptions it is often difficult to distinguish secular from religious gifts. It is only the secular gifts which properly concern us here, although the religious gifts from private persons must have lessened the financial obligations of a community to religious purposes. From Mjedil in Trachonitis comes an inscription in which we learn that a building was erected from the common fund of the community, which we know to have been a village, and we also learn that the site for the building was given by two individuals who appear to have had no official connection with the erection of the building. This inscription has already been quoted in connection with the *pistoi*.<sup>250</sup> An inscription from Kefr-Liha in Auranitis has been cited above in connection with the village *strategos*.<sup>251</sup> In this case the villagers make a contribution from their private means to the common fund of the community. Again an inscription from Kanata in Auranitis, which has been mentioned above in connection with the *episkopoi*, tells of the contribution made to a building by a certain Julianus, apparently in a private station.<sup>252</sup>

An inscription from Zorava (ancient name) in Trachonitis records the erection of baths from private funds. This inscription ends with the following words: οἱ ἀπὸ μητρο]κωμίας Ζοραωνῶν ἔκτισαν τὸ βαλανεῖον ἰ[δίας δαπάναις.<sup>253</sup> Zorava was a *metrokomia*. An inscription from the city of Kanatha in Auranitis shows how generous the gift of a citizen might be to his city, and there is no

<sup>249</sup> Cf. Liebenam, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-36.

<sup>250</sup> P.A.E.S., 7877; see above, n. 122.

<sup>251</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1213; see above, n. 87.

<sup>252</sup> Wad., 2412 f., or I.G.R.R., III, 1284.

<sup>253</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1155.



reason why a villager should not be equally generous to his village: Ἀγαθῆ Τύχη. Μάρκος Οὐλπίος Λυσίας Ἰκαύρου πρόεδρος ἐφιλοτειμήσατο τῇ γλυκυτάτῃ πατρίδι [ἐκ] τῶν ἰδίων εἰς τὸ κτίσμα τοῦ θεατροειδοῦς ὠδείου δ[η]ρία μύρια, \* Μ, εὐτυχῶς καὶ καλῶς.<sup>254</sup>

There are, however, many inscriptions which testify to the frequency with which gifts were made by private persons to assist in the erection of temples to the gods. A good illustration of this generosity is afforded by an inscription from Athila (ancient name) in Auranitis of A.D. 151, which contains the following words: . . . τὰς παραστάδας καὶ κίον(ι)α καὶ τ[ᾶ] ἐπάνω αὐτῶν ἐπιστόλια καὶ καλι(ὰ)ς ἐκ τῶ(ν) ἰδίων ἐποίησεν ἔτους ἰδ' Ἀντωνεῖνου Κ(αίσαρος).<sup>255</sup> The inscription shows how liberal the gift of a private person might be, and although the gift was made to a temple, it must undoubtedly have relieved the community of great expense. For had such gifts not been made by private persons the community would probably have been obliged to meet these expenses.

These inscriptions show that communities, whether cities or villages, were often helped in the construction of public buildings by private persons. These gifts may in some cases have been quite large and have formed no inconsiderable part of the total revenue of the community, but they formed at best but an irregular and insecure form of income.

#### D. Income from the rent of public buildings and from control of water supply.

As has been suggested above, it is quite probable that villages may have derived a small and irregular income from the renting of their public buildings, but we have no evidence to support this view. A safer assumption can be made in the matter of the water supply of the village. We know that Syria was a rather dry country, and the regulation of the water supply was vital to the prosperity of the country.

We have seen that at Palmyra an *epimeletes* was in charge of a certain spring.<sup>256</sup> It is quite reasonable to infer from this that particular officials would be responsible for the water coming from special sources. Moreover, an inscription from Bosana in Batanea, which has been cited above, shows us that two *pistoi* were responsible for the inauguration, so to say, of a spring.<sup>257</sup> Probably the *pistoi* themselves or other officials were responsible for

<sup>254</sup> Wad., 2341.

<sup>255</sup> *Ibid.*, 2372.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*, 2571 c.

<sup>257</sup> *Ibid.*, 2239.

the subsequent regulation of the spring. We have also seen that the *metrokomia* of Zorava in Trachonitis had public baths.<sup>258</sup> These baths must have been under the management of an official of some sort, and a charge may have been made for their use. Finally, an inscription from Qreya in Auranitis speaks of the construction of a *λίμνη*, or reservoir, at the common expense of the village.<sup>259</sup> Probably some charge was made for the water taken from this reservoir. It is evident from these inscriptions that Syrian villages were deeply concerned in their water supply, and it is not unreasonable to assume that the control of this water supply gave the village a considerable income.

#### E. Income from public land.

The main source from which the revenue of a village was derived was in all probability its public land. We have evidence that in certain cases villages in the East had common land. An inscription from Castollus in Lydia will serve to substantiate this statement: ἐν Καστωλλῷ κώμῃ Φιλαδελφέων, γενομένης ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν κωμητῶν παντῶν, καὶ βουλευσαμένων αὐτῶν διελέσθαι τὸν ὑπ[άρχ]οντα αὐτοῖς ἀγρὸν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις ὄροις [τό]πῳ τῷ λεγομένῳ Ἀγάθωνος μά[νδ]ραῖς [δ]ῖντα ὀρ(ε)ινόν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντ[ε]ς οἱ κωμ[ῆ]ται.<sup>260</sup> We see from this that the village divides its land into private lots, taking into consideration that all the land was not of equal value because some of it was rough and hilly. This division of the common land reminds us of a similar division into lots in medieval villages of Europe. The inscription, however, leaves us in doubt as to whether the common land was divided into lots which were to be held privately in perpetuity, or whether the lots were simply assigned to individuals temporarily. In either case the legislation of the village had as its object the fair distribution of the land. In passing, it is interesting to note that the village of Castollus had quite a complex organization, comprising both a *gerousia* and an *ecclesia*. A discussion of the character of the *gerousia* is not relevant to a study of the Syrian village council, however, as Chapot has shown that the *gerousia* did not really correspond to the *boule*.<sup>261</sup>

As further evidence that villages had common lands, the case of Baetocaece may be cited. In Hellenistic times this village seems to have formed an independent unit. It had common land

<sup>258</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1155.

<sup>259</sup> *Ibid.*, 1317.

<sup>260</sup> O.G.I.S., 488.

<sup>261</sup> Chapot, V., *La Province Romaine Proconsulaire d'Asie*, pp. 216-230.

which Antiochus bestowed as a favor upon the god of Baetocaece. It is clear that the possession of these common lands was profitable, for otherwise they would not have been given to the temple as a favor. The revenue from these common lands is mentioned in the phrase ἡ ἀπὸ ταύτης πρόσσδος.<sup>262</sup> Before this village was given to the god of Baetocaece it belonged to a certain Demetrius, who undoubtedly enjoyed its revenue. Now it is apparent that if the owner of the village derived profit from it, it must have had an income larger than was needed to meet its necessary expenses, and an income from land is the only conceivable source of large and steady income.

In what way the village made use of its common land is not known, and probably the practice varied. The land may either have been given to the villagers for use in return for a small percentage of its produce, which was to be paid to the village chest, or if the land were pasture, farmers may have been taxed according to the number of their sheep or cattle grazing on the common pasture. It is also possible that some villages may have sold part of the produce of their common land to other communities. The city of Laodicea, for example, was able to export wine to Alexandria.<sup>263</sup> The tax for pasturage was common on *ager publicus*, as Pliny tells us: "etiam nunc in tabulis censoriis pascua dicuntur omnia ex quibus populus reditus habet quia diu hoc solum vectigal fuerat."<sup>264</sup> This is a general statement and it indicates that a pasturage tax was widely established. It is probable that the Romans for their *ager publicus* employed much the same taxes as they found already existing in the territories of municipalities.

The direct evidence that villages held land in common is comparatively slight. But we can feel sure that the land surrounding a village, however held, must have been a source of revenue for the village. The income from land was probably the only source of income for a village which was both regular and considerable in amount.

### 2. Village expenditure.

By far the largest expense that villages had to meet was for the construction of public buildings. These buildings were erected for both secular and religious purposes, and sometimes, as in the

<sup>262</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1020.

<sup>263</sup> Strabo, XVI, 2, 9.

<sup>264</sup> Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, XVIII, 3.

case of a temple, the expenditure must have been very great.<sup>265</sup> But the Syrian village community was spared many expenses which a modern municipality has to face. In the first place, no salaries were paid to the village officials. On the contrary, as we have seen, the officials paid certain sums to the village. There is a record that, in some cities in the East, public slaves performed menial labor. This sort of labor costs a modern community much, and to be freed from this financial burden was a great help to ancient municipalities.<sup>266</sup> There is no record of the presence of such public slaves in the Syrian villages, but they may have existed. A third expense that villages were spared was that for public lighting. The city of Antioch was famous for its lights, but its fame came to it by way of contrast to other communities.<sup>267</sup> There is no record of village police in Syria. Any police duty that was done in the villages was probably performed by the city in whose territory the village lay or by officials of the central administration. We have no record of a village expending any money for education, for public health, or for charity. However, there is an inscription from Bakousa near Antioch which may refer to a village school: οἱ ἐπαναβαίνοντες παῖδες εἰς τὰ ἐ' ἔτη ἐμβαίνοντες εἰς τὰ ις', ἵνα συμβαστάζωσι τῇ κώμῃ τας. . . .<sup>268</sup> This inscription is difficult to understand, but even if it does refer to a village school, there is nothing to indicate that the village contributed to its upkeep.

Thus it can be seen that the only large expense, except for taxation by the city on which it depended and by Rome, which will be treated in the next section, that villages had to meet was for the construction and maintenance of public buildings and public works. We have no direct evidence of other expenses, and we are compelled to study them entirely by a consideration of analogous conditions in cities and by a consideration of the probability that had any expenses of this sort occurred, we would have at least occasional record of them.

### 3. Relation of the village to the city on which it depended and to Rome in financial matters.

The relation of the village in Syria to the city on which it depended in the field of finance has to be studied entirely from

<sup>265</sup> Wad., 2046.

<sup>266</sup> Pliny, *Epistolae*, X, 31.

<sup>267</sup> Ammianus, XIV, I, 9.

<sup>268</sup> A.A.E.S., part III, no. 18.

negative evidence. We learn of special exemptions granted to this or that village for some particular reason, and from this we infer that certain taxes were the general rule. One great difficulty that confronts us is in deciding whether certain taxes were levied directly by the imperial government upon the village or whether the city to whose territory the village belonged acted as the agent of the central authority in the collection of these taxes, which was the method used in Asia from the first century before Christ onwards. Still a third possibility is that the city levied these taxes quite independently of any higher authority.

The most important source of the revenue of a city was the land owned by it.<sup>269</sup> The possession of a large *territorium* was regarded as an advantage to a city. As a reward for service, additions of land were made to cities by Roman generals. Sulla, for example, rewarded Stratonicea in Caria for loyalty to Rome in the Mithridatic war by an increase in territory.<sup>270</sup> In what fashion the city would derive profit from its territory is not clear, but that it did so is evident. In a letter, Cicero refers to the territory of the Campanian municipality of Atella. This land is situated in Gaul, but it is clear that it was important in the support of the Italian city: "Locutus sum . . . de agro vectigali municipii Atellani qui esset in Gallia . . . municipii fortunae omnes in isto vectigali consistere."<sup>271</sup> And again Cicero speaks of the profit derived by Arpinum from its Gallic land: "Quorum (Arpinatium) quidem omnia commoda omnesque facultates, quibus et sacra conficere et sarta tecta aedium sacrarum locorumque communium tueri possint, consistunt in eis vectigalibus, quae habent in provincia Gallia."<sup>272</sup> The dwellers in the *territorium*, then, had to pay *vectigalia* to the municipality.

There are several ways in which a city could profit by its territory. It might lease out its land to farmers in exchange for a fixed money payment or for a payment in kind. Unfortunately we have no evidence on this point. Whether the land would be leased out to individual tenants or to villages as a whole would probably be dictated by circumstances. Again, cities granted the right of pasturage on their common land in return for a certain payment. This tax would naturally apply to those living in the villages dependent upon the city. In an inscription of the year 115 B.C., con-

<sup>269</sup> Liebenam, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

<sup>270</sup> Diehl and Cousin, in B.C.H., IX (1885), 446, fragment E. Cf. Liebenam, *op. cit.*, p. 1, n. 2.

<sup>271</sup> Cicero, *Ad Familiares*, XIII, 7.

<sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

cerning a boundary dispute between Genua and one of her neighbors, it is apparent that the people of a certain hamlet in the territory of Genua must pay the twentieth part of their corn and the sixth part of their wine to the city.<sup>273</sup> Apparently the village as a whole is required to pay taxes to the city.

Taxes were sometimes levied on village markets. The inscription of Baetocaece, referred to above, may be divided into three parts. The first part contains a clause whereby the emperors Valerianus and Gallienus confirm to the people of this village the privileges which formerly had been bestowed upon them by the Seleucid monarchs. The second part contains the decree of Antiochus concerning the privileges of this village, and the third part is a decree of the city, probably Apamea, granting still further privileges to the village. Certain immunities are granted and among them is the right of holding its semimonthly markets without taxation. Presumably this tax would ordinarily fall upon the merchandise bought and sold at these markets. The portion of the inscription which deals with these markets reads as follows: ἄγωνται δὲ κατὰ μῆνα πανηγύρεις ἀτελεῖς τῇ πεντεκαίδεκάτῃ καὶ τριακάδῃ.<sup>274</sup> The Greek word *πανήγυρις* has the signification of the English word "fair," and the Romans translated it by the word "*mercatus*." This special exemption seems to imply that it was customary for such markets to be taxed. From the form in which the inscription as a whole is cast it appears that under the Seleucid kings this market tax was ordinarily payable to the central authorities, but that under Roman administration, at least from the time of Augustus, the tax went to the city. The tax on markets prevalent under the Seleucids is analogous to the Roman *centesima rerum venalium*. This inscription makes quite reasonable the inference that local village markets in Syria were liable to taxation.

The third portion of the Baetocaece inscription, which is a decree of the city, contains a clause relative to live stock and slaves: ἀνδράποδα δὲ καὶ τετράποδα καὶ λοιπὰ ζῶα ὁμοίως πωλείσθω ἐν τῷ τόπῳ χωρὶς τέλους ἢ ἐπηρείας τινὸς ἀπαιτήσαις.<sup>275</sup> Since this part of the inscription originated with Apamea, these words may be interpreted to imply that but for the especial dispensation granted, the live stock and slaves in the village would be subject to tax by the city in whose territory the village lay. It is interesting to note the way in which the city of Apamea complied with the spirit of

<sup>273</sup> Liebenam, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

<sup>274</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1020.

<sup>275</sup> *Ibid.*, 1020.

Antiochus and even increased the good fortune of Baetocaece. Of course this further grant by the city of Apamea did not necessarily take place in the time of the Seleucids; in fact, the vote of the city was sent to the Roman emperor, and the vote may not have been taken by the city until the city was under Roman rule. The confirmation by Rome of an old arrangement made by the Seleucid kings illustrates her willingness to let existing conditions stand without unnecessary change.

We learn from Velleius that Syria became a stipendiary province in the time of Pompey: "ut Syria, quae tum primum (64 B.C.) facta est stipendiaria."<sup>276</sup> The *stipendium* may have been either a fixed sum or a special proportion of the produce of the land. The former seems more probable, as it was the system employed in Asia. Under the Roman Republic, in case of emergency an additional personal tax may have been levied. In the second century of our era a one per cent property tax was levied in Syria: *ἔστι δὲ Σύρας καὶ Κίλιξιν ἐτήσιος ἑκατοστὴ τοῦ τιμήματος ἑκάστῳ*.<sup>277</sup> Under the Empire a clear distinction was made between *tributum soli* and *tributum capitis*. A *tributum capitis* was levied in Syria, and males between the ages of fourteen and sixty-five and females between twelve and sixty-five were liable to it, according to Ulpian: "Aetatem in censendo significare necesse est, quia quibusdam aetas tribuit, ne tributo onerentur: veluti in Syriis a quattuordecim annis masculi, a duodecim feminae usque ad sexagensimum annum tributo capitis obligantur."<sup>278</sup> We learn from Cicero of the existence of a similar tax in Cilicia: "Audivimus nihil aliud nisi imperata ἐπικεφάλια solvere non posse."<sup>279</sup> Tyrrell regards this as an extortionate poll tax,<sup>280</sup> and the account in Appian of the way in which this tax was regarded in Syria possibly indicates that here too the tax was irregular and extortionate. The collection of these taxes was probably entrusted to the cities. In the days before Roman occupation the tribute of the king was collected by municipal officials, and the adoption of this system by the Romans would save them much trouble. That the *tributum capitis* might exist simultaneously with the *tributum soli* is shown by a passage in Appian in which the condition of Africa is being discussed: *φόρον ὄρισαν ἐπὶ τῆ γῆ*

<sup>276</sup> Velleius, II, 37. Cf. Bouchier, E., *Syria as a Roman Province*, p. 25 (Oxford, 1916).

<sup>277</sup> Appian, *Syriaca*, 50.

<sup>278</sup> *Digest*, I, 15, 3.

<sup>279</sup> Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, V, 16, 2.

<sup>280</sup> Tyrrell, *Correspondence of Cicero* (ed. 1890, Dublin), III, appendix 3.

*καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασιν, ἀνδρὶ καὶ γυναικὶ ὁμοίως*.<sup>281</sup> It is self-evident that the taxes would fall upon those dwelling in cities and those dwelling in villages alike. The city would probably be held responsible by Rome for the collection of taxes within her territory. In like manner in that part of the country where cities were few the *metrokomiai* would probably be the collectors for the central authorities.

Rostovtzeff has shown that the levying of *aurum tironicum* goes back at least to the third century of our era.<sup>282</sup> His proof is quite convincing. He has brought together an inscription from Pizos in Thrace granting certain exemptions to this town, an inscription already quoted in connection with the *summa honoraria* from a Lydian village, and a passage from the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates concerning a levy of this kind by Valens in the fourth century. The passage in Socrates reads thus: *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἡμέλει τοῦ λοιποῦ τοὺς Ῥωμαίων στρατιώτας ἀξέησαι. καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἤδη πάλαι στρατενομένους καὶ κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους γενναίως ἀγωνισαμένους ὑπερέωρα, τὸν δὲ συντελούμενον ἐκ τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν κατὰ κόμας στρατιώτην ἐξηργύρισει ὀγδοήκοντα χρυσίνους ὑπὲρ ἑκάστου στρατιώτου τοὺς συντελεστὰς ἀπαιτεῖσθαι κελεύσας, οὐ πρότερον τὰς συντελείας κουφίσας αὐτοῖς*.<sup>283</sup> The inscription from Pizos contains the following clause: *τοῦτέστιν πολεμικοῦ σείτου ἀνεισφορίαν καὶ συν[τε]λείας βουργαρίων καὶ [φ]ρουρῶν καὶ ἀγγαρειῶν ἀνεῖν*. The date of this is A.D. 202. The people of Pizos were exempted from the duty of providing *burgarii*, guards, and transports. The *burgarii* were corps of native troops charged with the duty of defending small frontier forts. Such *burgi* existed in Syria.<sup>285</sup> These *burgi* were small watchtowers built to protect either roads or frontiers.

The inscription of Pizos shows us that in the third century of our era police soldiers were levied upon towns by compulsion.<sup>286</sup> The burden of supplying these soldiers evidently rested upon the villages from which the *emporium* drew its population. The Lydian inscription shows us that the burden of supplying soldiers fell upon the village as a whole. The passage from Socrates informs us that the levy was made upon villages in the fourth century. We have seen that *burgi* existed in Syria, and we may conclude that the burden of defending them fell upon native troops,

<sup>281</sup> Appian, *Libya*, 135.

<sup>282</sup> Rostovtzeff, J.R.S., vol. 8 (1918), p. 26.

<sup>283</sup> Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.*, IV, 34.

<sup>284</sup> Ditt., *Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 880, as read by Rostovtzeff.

<sup>285</sup> P.A.E.S., 233.

<sup>286</sup> Rostovtzeff, J.R.S., vol. 8 (1918), p. 30.

especially in the later days of the Empire, when the strain of defense grew greater. Whether the levy for these military purposes was made directly by Rome or, as is more probable, through the agency of cities cannot be determined, but the levy was clearly an imperial one.

In addition to regular taxes many requisitions were made upon Syrian villages. Requisitions for lodging and supplies were made by Roman officials and soldiers. In the Baetocaeae inscription, immunity from such requisitions is granted to this village, apparently as a special favor. The words granting this favor are: *καὶ εἶναι τὸ μὲν ἱερὸν ἄσυλον, τὴν δὲ κώμην ἀνεπίσ[τ]α[θ]μον μηδεμίᾳ ἀπορρήσειως προσερχθείσης.*<sup>287</sup> Strictly speaking, this clause shows only that such requisitions were ordinarily made by the Seleucid kings, but it seems likely that this exemption was also an especial favor bestowed likewise by the Romans. From Cicero we learn that it was the custom of provincial governors to cost the towns in which they visited a great deal of expense; at least, this can safely be inferred from his insistence upon his own restraint in this matter in Cilicia. A passage relevant to this subject reads thus: "Levantur tamen miserae civitates, quod nullus fit sumptus in nos neque in legatos neque in quaestorem neque in quemquam. Scito non modo nos foenum, aut quod e lege Iulia dari solet, non accipere, sed ne ligna quidem, nec praeter quattuor lectos et tectum quemquam accipere quicquam, multis locis ne tectum quidem, et in tabernaculo manere plerumque."<sup>288</sup> As in the case of Baetocaeae, so also to the *metrokomia* of Phaena in Trachonitis freedom from billeting is promised: *οὔτε γὰρ συνεισφορὰν τινα δφέιλετε τοῖς ξένοις, καὶ ξενῶνα ἔχοντες οὐ δύνασθε ἀναγκασθῆναι δέξασθαι ταῖς οἰκίας τοῖς ξένους.*<sup>289</sup> This implies that it was usual for soldiers or civilians to make unfair demands upon the people of provincial towns.

A case analogous to that of Phaena appears in the well-known appeal of Scaptoparene in Thrace to the Emperor Gordian. Outsiders have demanded hospitality and have forced their way into the markets of the village.<sup>290</sup> The soldiers in two neighboring camps have made too free use of the thermal baths which belong to the village. Here again we do not have an instance of regular and authorized levy, but unofficial and importunate requisition made by the Roman army upon the native population.

Official extortion appears to have been general in Syria. Vel-

<sup>287</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1020.

<sup>288</sup> Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, V, 16, 3.

<sup>289</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1119.

<sup>290</sup> Ditt., *Syll.* 3, 888.

leius tells us that Varus, who was governor of Syria from 6 to 4 B.C., extorted much from the province: "Varus Quintilius . . . pecuniae vero quam non contemptor, Syria, cui praefuerat, declaravit, quam pauper divitem ingressus dives pauperem reliquit."<sup>291</sup> Tacitus also says that under Tiberius, in A.D. 17, both Syria and Judaea were exhausted by their burdens: "et provinciae Syria et Judaea, fessae oneribus, deminutionem tributi orabant."<sup>292</sup> These burdens would fall upon cities and villages alike.

Another requisition which was made upon villages was made by *paraphylakes*. The *paraphylakes* were perhaps a Pergamene institution. Their duty was to maintain the peace.<sup>293</sup> Some of the requisitions which were made by the *paraphylakes* were legal, but others were illegal. In a decree of the city of Hierapolis in Phrygia we see their powers of requisition limited to the mere necessities of life.<sup>294</sup> The *paraphylakes* are obliged to live at their own expense, and the articles which they may justly demand from the villages are strictly limited in number and variety: *μόνον ξύλα καὶ ἄχυρα καὶ μόν[η]ν ἄλλο δὲ μηδέν.* This inscription shows that Hierapolis put *paraphylakes* in charge of the maintenance of order in its villages. It seems that the *paraphylakes* had been in the habit of demanding a *στέφανος* against the wishes of the *komarchoi*. The support of the *paraphylakes*, whether a regular tax or an irregular requisition, was an arrangement between city and village, quite independent of imperial administration. No inscription of Syria makes mention of *paraphylakes*, but their existence there is not impossible.

We see that the financial obligations of villages were of two kinds. One obligation was the payment of regular taxes, the other that of meeting certain irregular demands. The most important regular tax was that which was paid for the use of land. Then, under the Empire, was established a regular *tributum capitis*. Moreover, there is mention of a tax on the markets of a village, and a further tax for the rights of pasturage. *Aurum tironicum* may well have been demanded by Rome from the villages of Syria. Also *aurum coronarium* may have been demanded by returning governors. The chief imposition that was made upon villages seems to have been the billeting of soldiers and even civilians upon them. City officials were often importunate in their exactions from

<sup>291</sup> Velleius, II, 117.

<sup>292</sup> Tacitus, *Annales*, II, 42.

<sup>293</sup> Anderson, *J.H.S.*, XVII (1897), 412.

<sup>294</sup> O.G.I.S., 527.

village communities, as we have seen in the case of the *paraphylakes* in one of the villages dependent upon the city of Hierapolis. The real extent of the financial obligations of villages in Syria to Rome and to the cities upon which they depended cannot be determined from the limited material at our command.

It may be well at this point to utter a few words of caution. We must remember that no general statement can be made about financial arrangements that will be applicable to the whole of Syria. For naturally the financial arrangements were not the same in those regions of Syria where flourishing cities existed as they were in the more backward parts of the country where few cities were situated, and where the villages would be in large measure, if not entirely, free from the control of cities. Furthermore, we must not forget that Rome's financial policy in the provinces was not a constant one, but was continually undergoing change. This paper is not the proper place for a detailed study of the financial administration of the Roman Empire, but the general lines along which the finances of the Syrian villages were administered have been traced.<sup>295</sup>

#### 4. Private ownership of villages.

It was not an uncommon thing in the ancient Mediterranean world for villages to be owned by private individuals. Strabo, in describing the foundation of Rome, mentions Collatia, Antemnae, Fidenae, and Labicum, as well as other similar places. He tells us that these places were formerly cities, but that in his time they are villages owned by private individuals.<sup>296</sup> Strabo even tells us of a city belonging to an individual; for he says that in front of Onugnathus lies the island of Cythera, having on it a city of the same name, which is the property of Eurycles, the Lacedaemonian commander.<sup>297</sup>

In Syria also we have the record of the private ownership of a village. Baetocaece, to which several references have already been made, was at one time the property of a certain Demetrius: *κώμην τὴν Βαιτοκαί[κῆ]ν, ἣν πρότερον ἔσχεν Δημήτριος Δημητρίου τοῦ Μνασαίου ἐντουριώνα τῆς περὶ Ἀπάμιαν σατραπείας, σὺν τοῖς συνκύρονσι καὶ καθήκουσι πᾶσι κατὰ τοὺς προνάρχοντας περιορισμούς.*<sup>298</sup> If we could in-

<sup>295</sup> For a good study of some of these financial questions see Rostovtzeff in Pauly-Wissowa, under *fiscus*.

<sup>296</sup> Strabo, V, 3, 2.

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 5, 1.

<sup>298</sup> I.G.R.R., III, 1020.

terpret the word *ἐντουριώνα* it might help us to explain the ownership of the village by Demetrius. It may show the relationship of Baetocaece to the district of Apamea, or it may mean that Demetrius was an officer of that district.<sup>299</sup> How did Demetrius come into possession of the village? It is quite possible that he secured it by gift from a royal personage. We know that land was sometimes given away in this fashion, and presumably if a village were within the bounds of this land, it would be included in the gift.

A few years ago an interesting inscription from Sardis was published.<sup>300</sup> It contains the record of the mortgaging to the goddess Artemis of certain properties by one Mnesimachus. The facts of the case appear to have been as follows. Antigonus awarded to Mnesimachus a large estate in the satrapy of Lydia. In order to secure capital for the working of this estate, so far as can be ascertained, Mnesimachus borrowed thirteen hundred and twenty-five gold *staters* from the treasury of Artemis at Sardis. Unable to pay back this sum when called upon to do so, he mortgaged his land to the goddess. What we have is the mortgage deed. In the list of Mnesimachus' properties are included several villages. Mnesimachus does not own these villages outright, but holds them as the tenant of Antigonus. For some of these villages Mnesimachus has to pay a fixed rental of fifty gold *staters* a year to the chiliarchy of Pytheus. For another village the rental is fifty-seven gold *staters* payable to another chiliarchy, the name of which is not fully preserved. It is stated that Antigonus can take the lands away from Artemis *διὰ Μνησίμαχον*, that is, by taking them away from him. The lands were probably part of the *χώρα βασιλική* of Antigonus, as no dependence on Sardis is indicated, and the regular *φόρος* of the royal domains is mentioned.<sup>301</sup> The Hellenistic kings regarded the land which they conquered in war as their own. They gave it away to their officers as they pleased, according to one of two methods. The first method was that of hereditary tenure with *φόρος* payable to the king, and the second method was to give the land in absolute ownership. It was by the first method that Mnesimachus held the villages which he mortgaged.

A certain Laodice bought from Antiochus II some of his royal domain. She became the absolute owner of the property with full right to dispose of it at her pleasure: *ἐφ' ᾧ οὐθὲν ἀπολεί εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν*

<sup>299</sup> Cf. O.G.I.S., 262, note.

<sup>300</sup> Buckler and Robinson, A.J.A., XVI (1912), 11-82.

<sup>301</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

καὶ κυρία εἶ[σ]ται προσφερομένη πρὸς πόλιν ἢν ἀν βούληται. κατὰ ταῦτὰ δ[ε] καὶ οἱ παρ' αὐτῆς πριάμενοι ἢ λαβόντες αὐτοὶ τε ἔξουσιν κυρίως καὶ πρὸς πόλιν προσοίσονται ἢν ἀμ βούλω[ν]ται.<sup>302</sup> The date of this inscription is 254 or 253 B.C. Included in the property sold to Laodice is the village of Pannos. In a similar fashion Antiochus I gave property near Ilium outright to a certain Aristocides.<sup>303</sup>

It is likely that Demetrius received possession of Baetocaece in one of these ways: either by gift or by sale. The fact that the village later comes into the possession of the temple may point to the conclusion that this village was not given to Demetrius outright. On the other hand, the village may have been given to him as a gift to be his in perpetuity, but later have been confiscated by the crown and then have been given to the temple.

##### 5. Patronage of villages.

In the fourth century of our era and thereafter it was quite common for influential men to take large estates or villages under their patronage.<sup>304</sup> The principal motive of these patrons was their own territorial aggrandizement, and the increase of their income thereby. The client was willing to submit to the patron, as he thought that he could avoid the tax-gatherer in this way. The loss of a *vicus* by a *civitas* to a *patronus* was a serious menace to the *civitas*, for it would mean the loss of a large part of its territory. This would mean that part of its revenue would be lost without any corresponding decrease in its liability to taxation.<sup>305</sup> Patronage arose out of the unfairness of the imperial system of taxation. A certain tax would be levied upon a *civitas* as a whole, and the repartition and distribution of that tax among the villages dependent upon the city caused much trouble. The collectors were weak, and patronage flourished as a revolt against this system.

The evils of patronage are dealt with in certain titles of the *Codex Theodosianus* and the *Codex Justinianus*.<sup>306</sup> Under these titles are included eight constitutions ranging in date from 360 to 534 A.D. "They are directed against the patronage afforded by powerful folk to the peasantry, primarily with a view to defeating the tax-gatherer."<sup>307</sup> The constitutions in the Theodosian code are

<sup>302</sup> O.G.I.S., 225, line 10.

<sup>303</sup> *Ibid.*, 224.

<sup>304</sup> Zulueta, *De Patrociniis Vicorum*.

<sup>305</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>306</sup> *Codex Theod.*, XI, 24; *Codex Justin.*, XI, 54.

<sup>307</sup> Zulueta, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

directed mainly to Egypt, but in one of the constitutions from the *Codex Justinianus* we see that the evils of patronage extended to Thrace, Pontus, and Asia as well.<sup>308</sup> The forty-seventh oration of Libanius, *Περὶ τῶν Προστασιῶν*, shows that Syria was also affected by these evils. The probable reason for the especial prominence of Egypt in this matter is that it was the most important granary of Constantinople, with the result that the emperors of the East were particularly interested in its proper administration.<sup>309</sup>

The patrons appear to have formed a very heterogeneous class. They were both military and civilian, and after a time the churches served as patrons also.<sup>310</sup> The purpose of the constitutions in the *Codex Theodosianus* is to prevent the lands from passing into the patronage of the rich and powerful, who are able to avoid the payment of taxes. They are designed to protect the villages, which are a "particularly easy and willing prey for the *potens*."<sup>311</sup> Thus the government tried by excluding outsiders to strengthen the natural unity of the village in order to give it powers of resistance to patronage. The corporate liability to taxation of a city made the patronage of a village especially harassing, as no one component of the city could be favored without corresponding hurt to its fellows.

But we are more particularly concerned with the oration of Libanius concerning the evils of patronage. This speech is addressed to an unnamed emperor in the latter half of the fourth century. The emperor is probably Theodosius, and an appeal is made to him by Libanius for the enforcement of an edict in regard to patronage.<sup>312</sup> The oration of Libanius is divided into two main parts. The first of these contains a description of the various kinds of patronage and the evils arising from them. The second part is devoted to the refutation of hypothetical arguments advanced against the suppression of patronage. The first part of the speech, concerning the various forms of patronage, may be further subdivided into four sections.

The first section deals with the military patronage of large vil-

<sup>308</sup> *Codex Justin.*, XI, 54, 1.

<sup>309</sup> Zulueta, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

<sup>310</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 10, 12.

<sup>311</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 39 f., sets the date of this speech between A.D. 386 and 389. His argument in support of this date is reasonable, but not conclusive. However, we do not need for our present purpose to settle the date exactly. All we need to know is the approximate date.



lages in which there are many landowners. The villages buy the assistance of the local soldiery with money gifts or presents of various sorts. The villagers then take to a life of debauchery, and the police close their eyes to what is happening. Patronage gives the villagers the necessary force to resist the tax-gatherer. When the tax-gatherers ask for the taxes, the villagers mock them, and when the collectors proceed to arrest the archons of the village, they are assaulted and wounded. Incidentally, it is interesting to note again at this point the reference to village archons, as if they were the usual village magistrates. When the tax-collector returns to the city, he has either to make good the deficit or submit to a flogging.<sup>313</sup>

The second section of the speech deals with the patronage of *ἀγροί*, where there is a single master. In this case the master pays the taxes, and the patron interferes in behalf of the tenants and causes them to stop their honest work for the master. Villages are involved in this type of patronage also. The tenants pay the patron at the expense of their master. When the master seeks atonement before the law, he loses his case by reason of the noisy influence of the patron.<sup>314</sup>

The third section of the first main division of Libanius' speech concerns his troubles with his Jewish tenants. This section is a sort of particularization of the preceding one. Under the influence of a patron the *coloni* of Libanius have determined to throw off the yoke of Libanius, to which they have submitted for generations. The *patronus* seems to have interfered to protect the *coloni* from impositions at the hands of Libanius. This type of patronage seems very fair to us. It is only natural that the *coloni* should appeal to powerful men to protect them from the oppression of their masters.<sup>315</sup>

The last section, dealing with the nature and forms of patronage, mentions the widespread character of this abuse.<sup>316</sup> Libanius appeals to the emperor to put a stop to these evils.

In the second part of the oration, directed against those who maintain that patronage should not be suppressed, Libanius admits that patronage may be legitimate. The master is the *patronus* of his tenants, but they have no right of appeal above him to a more powerful *patronus*. The patronage of the gods is also admitted. The difficulty is that some forms of patronage are legal

<sup>313</sup> Libanius, *Περὶ τῶν Προστασιῶν*, 4-10.

<sup>314</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>315</sup> *Ibid.*, 13-19.

<sup>316</sup> *Ibid.*, 17-18.

and others are not. If the adoption of a *patronus* involves the serving of two masters, it is wrong. Then Libanius launches a tirade against the generals, and shows that patronage is profitable to them. He urges that no source of illicit gain be left to them.<sup>317</sup>

We see from Libanius that the patronage of villages was an important factor in the economic life of Syria in the fourth century. It was dangerous chiefly because it tended to break up the city financial organization. One of the great evils of patronage which Libanius emphasizes is the use of force by the *patronus* and his clients in opposing lawful authority. Moreover, the *patronus* exercised an undue influence in the court room if he were brought to trial.<sup>318</sup> Another result was a weakening of the village organization. Under a strong *patronus* the officials of a village would lose all practical power. Patronage was a factor in the decay of municipal institutions and in the rise of feudalism. "Patronage is an indication at once of the ruin of the middle class, and of the growing power of the aristocracy."<sup>319</sup>

The aim of this chapter has been to show the manner in which Syrian villages were administered. A certain revenue was necessary to enable the village to live and act as a community, and various expenditures were incumbent upon the village. Village revenue, as we have seen, was derived from the sums paid by magistrates on entering office, from fines payable to the village for the violation of local ordinances, from gifts made by private persons to the village, and, most important, income from public land. In addition, the village may have profited by the renting of its public buildings, and by the control of the water supply. On the expense side of the ledger the largest item was for the construction and maintenance of public works. It must be reiterated at this point that ancient municipalities were spared many of the burdens which a modern town has to bear, such as the payment of salaries to its officers, and the upkeep of education, charity, and health, not to mention public lighting.

When we turn to the financial relation of the village to the city on which it depended and to Rome, we see that the obligations of the village were some of them in the nature of regular taxes, and some of them took the form of irregular requisitions with which the village was forced to comply. The land tax was the most important tax, but in addition to this there was the *tributum capitis*,

<sup>317</sup> Libanius, *op. cit.*, 19-27.

<sup>318</sup> Zulueta, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

<sup>319</sup> Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, p. 263 (2d ed., London and New York, 1906).



pasturage tax, market tax, *aurum tironicum*, and *aurum coronarium*. The most frequent imposition upon villages was the billeting of troops in them.

Villages were occasionally owned by private persons. These persons became the owners of the village, either by gift or by sale from royal personages in Hellenistic times. In the fourth century of our era the patronage of villages in Syria became common. The effect of private ownership and of patronage would be the same. The strength of the village organization would wane, and the village would depend upon the owner or patron to manage both its internal affairs and its relation with the central administration. Villages through the interference of a patron often succeeded in evading the payment of their taxes, and the spread of patronage did much to break down the municipal structure of the Roman Empire.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Together with a list of the abbreviations used)

- A.A.E.S. Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria (New York, 1903-1914).  
 A.J.A. American Journal of Archaeology.  
 A.P.A. Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.  
 Ath. Mitt. Mittheilungen des deutschen archaeologischen Instituts, Athenische Abtheilung.  
 B.C.H. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.  
 C.I.G. Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, I-IV (1828-1877).  
 Daremberg-Saglio. Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines (ed. C. Daremberg et E. Saglio, Paris, 1877-1917).  
 Ditt., Syll.<sup>3</sup> Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum (3d ed., W. Dittenberger, I-IV, 1915-1923).  
 D.W.A. Denkschriften der oesterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.  
 I.G.R.R. Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes (ed. R. Cagnat et G. Lafaye, III-IV, Paris, 1901—).  
 J.H.S. Journal of Hellenic Studies.  
 J.R.S. Journal of Roman Studies.  
 M.S.M. Mission dans les régions désertiques de la Syrie Moyenne (ed. R. Dussaud et F. Macler, Paris, 1903).  
 O.G.I.S. Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (ed. W. Dittenberger, I-II, 1903-1905).

- P.A.E.S. Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria.  
 Pauly-Wissowa. Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.  
 R.E.A. Revue des études anciennes.  
 R.E.G. Revue des études grecques.  
 Sitz. Berl. Akad. Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.  
 Sitz. Wien. Akad. Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien.  
 Wad. Voyage Archéologique en Grece et en Asie Mineure (ed. Ph. Lebas et W. H. Waddington, I-III, Paris, 1870).

## General Works:

- Bouchier, E. Syria as a Roman Province (Oxford, 1916).  
 Busolt, G. Griechische Staatskunde, Muenchen, 1920-1926 (Müller, Handbuch, IV, i, 1).  
 Chapot, V. La Province Romaine Proconsulaire d'Asie (Paris, 1904).  
 De Sanctis, G. *Ἀρχαία* (2d ed., New York, 1912).  
 Dill, S. Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire (2d ed., London and New York, 1906).  
 Dussaud, R., and Macler, F., M.S.M. Mission dans les régions désertiques de la Syrie Moyenne (Paris, 1903).  
 Dussaud, R., and Macler, F. Voyage archéologique au Safa (Paris, 1901).  
 Ferguson, W. S. Greek Imperialism (Boston, 1913).  
 Fimmen, D. Die kretisch-mykenische Kultur (Berlin, 1924).  
 Fowler, W. W. The City State of the Greeks and Romans (London and New York, 1895).  
 Kuhn, E. Über die Entstehung der Städte der Alten (Leipzig, 1878).  
 Liebenam, W. Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche (Leipzig, 1900).  
 Mommsen, T. The Provinces of the Roman Empire (translated by W. P. Dickson, New York, 1906).  
 Platnauer, M. The Life and Reign of Septimius Severus (Oxford, 1918).  
 Ramsay, W. The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia (Oxford, 1895-1897).  
 Rostovtzeff, M. Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (Oxford, 1926).  
 Schürer, E. Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes (Leipzig, 1898-1902).  
 Swoboda, H. Griechische Staatsaltertümer (K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Griechische Antiquitäten, I, 3, 6, Tübingen, 1913).

## Special Articles:

- Anderson, J. G. C. *A Summer in Phrygia*, in J.H.S., XVII (1897), 412.  
 Beer. See *Julias*, in Pauly-Wissowa.  
 Brandis. See *ekdikos*, in Pauly-Wissowa.

- Buckler, W. H., and Robinson, D. M. *Greek Inscriptions from Sardis*, in A.J.A., XVI (1912), 11-82.
- Cronin, H. S. *First Report of a Journey in Pisidia*, in J.H.S., XXII (1902), 358.
- Diehl, C., and Cousin, G. *Sénatus-Consulte de Lagina*, in B.C.H., IX (1885), 446.
- Fontrier, A. *Inscriptions de la Plaine du Caystre*, in R.E.A., IV (1902), 263.
- Fontrier, A. in *Μουσείον* (1886), p. 87.
- Fossey, C. *Inscriptions de Syrie*, in B.C.H., XXI (1897), 54.
- Fougères, C. See *kome*, in Daremberg-Saglio.
- Hirschfeld, G. *Inschriften aus dem Norden Klein-Asiens*, in Sitz. Berl. Akad. (1888), p. 886.
- Keil, J., and von Premerstein, A. *Bericht über eine dritte Reise in Lydien*, in D.W.A., LVII (1914).
- Kubitschek, W. *Zur Geschichte von Städten des römischen Kaiserreiches*, in Sitz. Wien. Akad., Vol. 177 (1916), pp. 40 ff.
- Monterde, P. R. *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de Syrie*, in Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph, Beyrouth, Tome VIII, fasc. 3, p. 108 (Beyrouth, 1926).
- Prentice, W. K. *Officials Charged with the Conduct of Public Works in Roman and Byzantine Syria*, in A.P.A., XLIII (1912), 113.
- Reinach, T. *Bulletin Épigraphique*, in R.E.G., XI (1898), 339.
- Rostovtzeff, M. See  *fiscus*, in Pauly-Wissowa.
- Rostovtzeff, M. *Synteleia Tironon*, in J.R.S., VIII (1918), 30.
- Sarantides, G. *Funde*, in Ath. Mitt., XX (1895), 242.
- Swoboda, H. See *kome*, in Pauly-Wissowa.
- Zulueta, F. *De Patrociniis Vicorum*, in Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History, I (1909, Oxford).