

On the “πολίτευμα in Heracleopolis”

Bradley Ritter

The publication of Cowey and Maresch’s *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Heracleopolis* (hereafter *P.Polit.Jud.*) in 2001 provided a remarkable increase in our knowledge of Jewish life in Egypt in the Ptolemaic era, as well as of the urban environment of Heracleopolis.¹ Heracleopolis was home to a board of Jewish archons who received complaints from Jews throughout the entire Heracleopolitan nome, and, in one instance, from a nearby village in the Oxyrhynchite nome. These plaintiffs sought arbitration in new cases or in cases already heard by their local Jewish elders.

Cowey and Maresch’s collection contains three petitions to a *politarchēs* and *politeuma*, and one reference to citizens (πολίται). In their introduction Cowey and Maresch argue that these petitions to the *politarchēs* and *politeuma* refer to a Jewish *politeuma*, or — as the term is commonly understood — association;² they also assume that the term *politarchēs* refers to the head of this association, not a meaning of the term attested elsewhere;³ finally, they conclude that the term *politai* refers to members of the *politeuma*, a meaning not yet clearly attested for this term either.⁴ According to their arguments, the Jewish *politeuma* of Heracleopolis was similar to what many have claimed existed in Alexandria and in other cities.⁵ I will leave aside the much larger question of the organization of Jewish communities throughout the Diaspora, and merely address the evidence for Heracleopolis in *P.Polit.Jud.*⁶ In this article, I propose a simpler explanation for these three terms.

¹ Cowey and Maresch 2001.

² For useful synopses of most of the evidence for *politeuma* as an association, see Zuckerman 1985/86 and Lüderitz 1994. And for two of the more well-known *politeumata*, see Thompson 1984 and Lüderitz 1983, nos. 70 and 71.

³ For evidence for the term *politarchēs*, see F. Schnitzer, ‘Politarches’, *RE Suppl.* 13 (1973), cols. 483-500. See Horsley 1992 and 1994. These are also cited by Cowey and Maresch 2001, 10, n. 37.

⁴ See discussion in Cowey and Maresch 2001, 38. For arguments that the term πολίτης should not be taken as a reference to a member of a πολίτευμα see, again, Lüderitz 1994, pp. 193-95, as well as Méléze-Modrzejewski 1995a, p. 82. Méléze-Modrzejewski 1993, p. 79; Méléze-Modrzejewski 1995b, pp. 301-2. See also Zuckerman 1985/86, p. 184.

⁵ See Cowey and Maresch 2001, pp. 1-2.

⁶ Some have argued that Jews, universally, were organized into ethnic associations called πολιτεύματα, for which the most strident argument was made by Aryeh Kasher (1985, pp. 30, 233-309 and Tcherikover 1959, pp. 63, 315-6). Many more scholars have emphasized the importance of the *politeuma* structure to the community of the Jews of Alexandria: see Jouguet 1911, pp. 18-22; Engers 1918, p. 84; Fuchs 1924, p. 102; Bell 1924, pp. 13-14; Wolfson 1944, pp. 165-68; Tcherikover 1959, p. 63; Smallwood 1961, p. 20; Smallwood 1976, p. 240; Barclay 1996, pp. 64-5, 71, and van der Horst 2003, pp. 153-54. *Contra*, see Zuckerman 1985/86, and Lüderitz 1994.

The term *politeuma* more commonly denoted a body of sovereign citizens or, more simply, a city or state made up of such citizens.⁷ The ‘πολίτευμα in Heracleopolis’ was not a Jewish association, but rather the body of citizens or city of Heracleopolis, supervised by its own *politarchēs*. The Jewish archons in Heracleopolis existed independently of the *politeuma*. Any citizen (*politēs*) mentioned without any further qualification could simply be understood as a citizen of Heracleopolis. That is to say, although the archons oversaw a Jewish community in Heracleopolis, the *politeuma* was not that Jewish community. The *politeuma* was a much wider organization whose members were simply citizens of Heracleopolis, and not necessarily Jewish.

In the first section, I will be discussing the primary evidence used by Cowey and Marsech to link the Jewish archons and the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis, *P.Polit.Jud.* 8. This evidence, which they take to be a reference to the association of the Jews, might better be understood as a reference to the civic body of the nome capital Heracleopolis. In the second section, I will discuss the evidence for other *politeumata* to make the case that the supposed Jewish *politeuma* of Heracleopolis is more extensive in scope than any other such institution for which we have evidence. In the third section, I will examine the evidence in *P.Polit.Jud.* for members of the *politeuma*, in the light of patterns of terminology for residents of Heracleopolis, with the aim of arguing that membership in the *politeuma* meant membership in the civic body of Heracleopolis. Lastly, I will demonstrate that other than in *P.Polit.Jud.* 8, the *politeuma* is never associated with the Jewish archons, although it may well have had Jewish members. The basic authority of each of the bodies, the *politeuma* with its judges on the one hand, and Jewish archons on the other, seems to have been saliently distinct.

1. Theodotos’ letter to the archons of the Jews

P.Polit.Jud. 8, a letter from Theodotos, a Jew from the Oxyrhynchite nome, to the Jewish archons, is the only evidence we have that directly associates the archons with the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis. Notwithstanding this association, I will argue that the association between the two is problematic. The archons referred to in the document are archons of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis, but this *politeuma* is the civic body of Heracleopolis. Although there are numerous examples of ethnic *politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt, nevertheless there are good reasons for assuming that the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis was not an ethnic association. The jurisdiction of the archons was wide enough to occasionally include the Jews.⁸ Still, if we take into account the complexities of Jewish community life within the overarching local governments of Ptolemaic Egypt, they might reasonably be considered archons within the wider *politeuma*, or civic body of Heracleopolis, even if in practice their jurisdiction was a limited one over local Jews.⁹ By the same token, we can also explain the close association Theodotos makes between the *politeuma* and Heracleopolis. What is more, corrections from the author’s own hand

⁷ See below, pp. 15-17, for ample testimony for this meaning.

⁸ Though normally addressed as “the archons” or “the archons” for the year (3.1, 4.2, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 9.1, 10.1, 11.1, 12.1, 13.1, 14.1), Theodotus (8.1-2) and ‘the elders in Tebetnoi, of the Jews’ (20.2) both address their letters to archons in Heracleopolis ‘of the Jews’ (τῶν Ἰουδαίων).

⁹ See below, pp. 5-7, for further discussion.

suggest he associated the archons primarily with the Jews; the *politeuma* was important, but secondary. Lastly, close investigation of this letter is necessary because this is the only piece of evidence connecting the *politeuma* and the Jews. The editors have emended part of another letter in such a way that the archons of the Jews become the archons ‘of the πολίτευμα’, but the emendation is gratuitous and does not necessarily fill a lacuna. It is based solely on the supposed parallel in Theodotos’ letter.

In *P.Polit.Jud.* 8, Theodotos son of Theodotos requests that the archons in Heracleopolis intervene in a dispute over the repayment of a loan he made to Plousia, a Jew, and to her son Dorotheos. The Jews of Teis, in the Oxyrhynchite nome, had already intervened by laying out a repayment schedule. Plousia had failed to honor the schedule and did not repay the loan. Theodotos asked the archons in Heracleopolis to force the Jews of Teis to resolve the matter, either in writing or by summoning them to Heracleopolis. In addressing the archons, Theodotos writes ‘to the archons for the year 37 of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis, of the Jews’ (τοῖς ἀρχουσι τὸ λζ (ἔτος) τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολίτευ[μα]τος τῶν Ἰουδαίων) (*P.Polit.Jud.* 8.4-5).

Cowey and Maresch favor the idea that the archons ruled over a *politeuma* of the Jews. They render this phrase ‘die Archonten des Politeuma der Juden in Herakleopolis’.¹⁰ This interpretation is at first sight unexceptionable. But it minimizes or even ignores the apparently close connection made in the original between the *politeuma* and Heracleopolis. Accordingly, they posit a direct connection between the Jews and Heracleopolis (‘die Juden in Herakleopolis’) which is not made in the original text. Instead, I would suggest that the phrase be translated ‘to the archons of the Jews, of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis, for the year 37’.¹¹ Any translation should retain the basic syntactic structure of the original text, and Heracleopolis is to be associated primarily with the *politeuma*, not with the Jews.

For the sake of argument, let us temporarily retain the reading of Cowey and Maresch. Theodotos addressed the *politeuma* or ethnic association of the Jews. In so doing, he specified where precisely that ethnic association was located: it was the ethnic association in Heracleopolis. It would have been reasonable for Theodotos, coming from the Oxyrhynchite nome, to specify that he was sending the document to ‘the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis.’ But why not write ‘of the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis’? He himself twice refers to the ‘Jews in Teis’ (*P.Polit.Jud.* 8.8, 32-36). Why not the ‘Jews in Heracleopolis’? Why does he choose the more contorted phrasing to stress the connection between the *politeuma* and Heracleopolis? The answer seems to be derived from the close association petitioners and Jewish archons themselves made between magistrates and locale.¹² Such parallels at least invite us to examine other possible interpretations.

¹⁰ Cowey and Maresch 2001, p. 102.

¹¹ Note the very close parallel between this address — literally, ‘to the archons for the year 37 of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis, of the Jews’ (τοῖς ἀρχουσι τὸ λζ (ἔτος) τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολίτευ[μα]τος τῶν Ἰουδαίων) (*P.Polit.Jud.* 8.4-5) — and the self-description of ‘the elders in Tebetnoi of the Jews’. ([τῶν ἐν] ἐν Τεβέτνοι πρεσβυτέρω[ν] τῶν [Ἰ]ουδαίων) (see *P.Polit.Jud.* 20.2 = *P.Münch.* III. 1, 49).

¹² In addition to *P.Polit.Jud.* 8.2, see *P.Polit.Jud.* 19.1 (τῶν ἐν Πένει πρεσβυτέρων), *P.Polit.Jud.* 20.2 (Παρά τῶν ἐν] ἐν Τεβέτνοι πρεσβυτέρω[ν] τῶν [Ἰ]ουδαίων) (= *P.Münch.*

Assuming, again for the sake of argument, that the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis was rather the civic body or city of Heracleopolis; in this scenario, the most natural interpretation, at least grammatically, would be that the archons ruled in some sense over the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis. Institutionally, of course, this would be somewhat surprising, but the arguments based on the phrasing should be carefully weighed. Had Theodotos been trying to indicate their local origin ('the archons, from the *politeuma* ...'), this might have been more commonly expressed by a genitive plural article with a postposition (τῶν ἐκ, τῶν ἀπό), with numerous parallels from this same collection.¹³ Moreover, to judge from parallel formulae addressed to other Jewish magistrates, the location or jurisdiction of the magistrate is often placed between article and noun (in attributive position between the article τοῖς and the noun ἄρχουσι cf. *P.Polit.Jud.* 19.1, 20.8-9, and also 20.2, 'From the elders in Tebetnoi, of the Jews'). The closest formulation is the one found in *P.Münch.* III 1.49, a petition from the elders in Tebetnoi, which seems to follow this pattern, being addressed 'to the archons in Heracleopolis of the Jews.' The editors of *P.Münch.* III 1.49 read τοῖς [ἐ]ν Ἡρακλέους πρό(λει) ἄρχου[σι] τῶν Ἰουδαίων ('to the archons in Heracleopolis, of the Jews'), whereas Cowey offers τοῦ πολιτεύματος based on the texts gathered in *P.Polit.Jud.* (see pp. 8-9 below for discussion). Because Theodotos neither used the genitive plural article with a postposition (τῶν ἐκ, τῶν ἀπό) ('of those from' or simply 'from') nor placed Heracleopolis in the normal attributive position, it is unlikely that he meant to say that the Jewish archons were merely in or from the *politeuma*. To address one more possibility, the genitive alone (τοῦ πολιτεύματος) might be taken to express that the archons are members of the body of residents of Heracleopolis, since the genitive was occasionally used in papyri to express membership in a political body, but this is relatively rare and hence not compelling.¹⁴

With other interpretations ruled out, if the *politeuma* is in fact the civic body of Heracleopolis, then Theodotos is pointing to the Jewish archons' jurisdiction over it. Though this is at first sight puzzling, we have good reason to suspect that the jurisdiction of these Jewish archons really extended somewhat beyond the Jewish community proper. First, in two cases the Egyptian name of the defendant has led the editors to suspect that cases could be heard by the archons involving defendants who were not Jewish (*P.Polit.Jud.* 10 and 11). It is appropriate, then, for Theodotos to suggest that their authority extends beyond the Jewish community in Heracleopolis itself, because the identities of defendants in the above-mentioned documents seem to corroborate this.

Second, the procedure used in addressing the archons suggests that although most litigants were Jewish, not all necessarily were. Of the eleven individuals who sent petitions to the archons, for whom we have the full initial address (*P.Polit.Jud.* nos. 3

III. 1, 49), and for 20.8-9 reading instead the text of *P.Münch.* III 1.49: τοῖς [ἐ]ν Ἡρακλέους πρό(λει) ἄρχου[σι] τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

¹³ Cf. *P.Polit.Jud.* 6.7: Τιμόθεον τῶν ἐξ Ὀνυῆ; 9.3-4: Βερενίκης τῆς Ἀρχαγάθου Ἰουδαίας τῶν ἐξ Ἀφ[ρο]δίτης ὀλε[ω]ς; 13.3-4: παρὰ Ἰππάλου καὶ Θεοδότου καὶ Πολυ[γ]·[·]·[·]·[·]·[·]·[·] τῶν γ' Ἰουδαίων τῶν ἐκ Πειμπαζβύ[τρω]ς and, more generally, see E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, vol. 2, pp. 125-126.

¹⁴ See e.g., the case of Dryton, who is simply 'of the deme Philotereios' (παρὰ Δρύτωνος δήμου Φιλωτερείου) (*P.Dryton* 32, written in the same decade as *P.Polit.Jud.* 8).

through 13), six actually identify themselves as Jews. Others do not. In three of these other cases, it would seem that the litigant was a Jew, but simply chose not to identify himself as such.¹⁵ Hence, by a slight majority, most petitioners do identify themselves as Jews. But the identification seems otiose, if it was indeed assumed that all litigants coming before the archons would be Jewish. Ultimately, the fact that some cases concerned those who might not have been Jewish (again, in *P.Polit.Jud.* 10 and 11) is far more clear-cut; yet the declaration of some petitioners that they are Jews does seem to suggest that it is not to be assumed in all cases.

As already noted, Theodotos could have avoided any reference to the archons' jurisdiction over the *politeuma* had he addressed them as the 'archons of the Jews of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis', or even as the 'archons of the Jews of Heracleopolis'. This has a distant parallel in a much earlier reference to Arab *dekadarchs* in Philadelphia (cf. *PSI V 538*: δεκαδάρχαι τῶν ἐν Φιλαδελφείαι Ἀράβων). I would like to argue that the archons' authority was manifestly greater than that. Moreover, and as important, association with the governmental apparatus of the nome capital, rather than merely with the Jews who dwelt there, suggests its importance to the entire nome, rather than merely to the local Jews. The authority of the *politeuma* and its *politarchēs* extended fairly widely throughout the nome.¹⁶ The Jewish archons' jurisdiction may have paralleled it. The cautious title used by Theodotos reflects a complex hierarchy, with several intersecting institutions. Not only were there multiple bodies of Jewish elders throughout the Heracleopolite nome, but also in other nomes, such as in Teis in the Oxyrhynchite nome. Even in Heracleopolis, the archons coexisted with other institutions there and with its *politeuma*, as I will argue below. These archons were there to govern local Jews, but, given their prestige, they clearly had authority which extended to others in Heracleopolis and its harbor, and, for Jews, throughout the nome and beyond. The complexity of the titles Theodotos uses reflects an underlying administrative complexity. The reference to archons of the *politeuma* (the civic body of Heracleopolis), who were at once further described as archons of the Jews, suggests a Jewish board of archons with a distinct jurisdiction over Jews, but one officially recognized also by the local population. In short, Theodotos' formulation was accurate, and the most accurate, given the alternatives.

A parallel Jewish institution from the end of the Ptolemaic era and the beginning of the Roman era may serve as a useful point of comparison. Strabo knew of a Jewish *ethnarch* of Alexandria who managed the Jewish community in the city. Josephus preserves Strabo's otherwise lost testimony, which is roughly datable to the principate of Augustus:¹⁷

¹⁵ Either because the name of the litigant is clearly Jewish (e.g., Dorotheos, in *P.Polit.Jud.* 7), or because the case involved Jewish law (*P.Polit.Jud.* 4), or had already been heard by other Jewish elders (*P.Polit.Jud.* 3). Incidentally, in two cases (*P.Polit.Jud.* 5 and 10), where the petitioners are not identified as Jews, we have no idea whether the matter concerned a prospective Jewish litigant or a Jewish defendant.

¹⁶ See *P.Polit.Jud.* 17 and 18 for relations with archons in Tebetnoi and judges who operated in Peempasbytis, both in the Heracleopolite nome. For discussion, see pp. 23-25 below.

¹⁷ Generally speaking, sometime during the first half of Augustus' principate seems the likeliest window for the time of publication of Strabo's *History*, though any date between 37 BCE and 23 CE is possible. For a full discussion, see Diller 1975, pp. 4-6. It is significant

καθίσταται δὲ καὶ ἐθνάρχης αὐτῶν, ὃς διοικεῖ τε τὸ ἔθνος καὶ διατᾶ κρίσεις καὶ συμβολαίων ἐπιμελεῖται καὶ προσταγμάτων, ὡς ἂν πολιτείας ἄρχων αὐτοτελοῦς

And even an ethnarch is appointed who manages the people (ἔθνος) and arbitrates suits and has oversight of contracts and edicts, as if he were the ruler of an independent government. (Strabo in Jos. *AJ* 14.117)

Philo refers to the same officer as a *genarchēs*, although he himself uses the two terms interchangeably elsewhere.¹⁸ Strabo's metaphor of the Jewish community as a separate city is striking. But the limitation which even Strabo applies — 'as if ... he were' (ὡς ... ἄν) — is important to bear in mind. He was not the archon of a separate *politeia*, after all, and the ethnarch and the Jews remained, in a vaguely defined way, part of Alexandria itself.

Just as the ethnarch of Alexandria was not independent, neither was he sovereign, and his office benefited from official external recognition. We know this was the case in the Augustan period, when the ethnarch or the Jewish archons of Alexandria received sanction from Rome. Jewish self-government in Alexandria underwent major changes not long after Strabo's visit. By the time Philo wrote *In Flaccum*, the *gerousia* was the institution familiar to Jews in Alexandria as a governing body, and to which Philo refers more generally as 'the archons' (*IF* 80). The changes in the hierarchy were made under Augustus. We find two somewhat contradictory reports about the *ethnarchēs* and the *gerousia*, which are ultimately resolvable. Josephus reports that after the death of one ethnarch, while C. Iulius Aquila was in Alexandria, Augustus did not want to prevent other ethnarchs from being appointed (*AJ* 19.283). Aquila was prefect at least in 10/11 CE. According to Philo the *genarchēs* was replaced by a *gerousia* at the start of Magius Maximus' second term as prefect, authorized by Augustus 'to take care of Jewish affairs' (ἐπιμελησομένην τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν) (*IF* 74).¹⁹ Aquila was perhaps briefly followed by P. Octavius, who was in turn succeeded by Magius Maximus.²⁰ P. Octavius had apparently completed his term by May of 12 CE, and Maximus may have succeeded him directly.²¹ Lacking a consensus on a candidate, the Jews might have decided to go without an

that Strabo visited Alexandria when Aelius Gallus was prefect in 25/4 BCE, as he himself tells us (2.5.19; 17.1.46). On the date of the prefectship, cf. *PIR* 1, 28, where the date is extracted from Dio 53.29 and Joseph. *AJ* 15.317.

¹⁸ Cf. *IF* 74. He sees the two terms *ethnarchēs* and *genarchēs* as synonymous at Philo, *Heres* 279, cited by Box 1939, p. 102. We cannot be certain, then, that when he uses the term *genarchēs* at *IF* 74 that he did not see the term as synonymous with *ethnarchēs*.

¹⁹ That this means affairs of the Jews and not merely matters peculiar to Jewish law and custom, is well illustrated by an immediately preceding use of the phrase τὰ Ἰουδαϊκά (*IF* 73).

²⁰ cf. *PIR*² 4, 144 for references to *IGRR* I, 1056 and *PSI* 10, 1149, 13. In the former, Aquila is described as rerouting a river from Schedia to Alexandria in the fortieth year of Caesar (Augustus), hence in 10/11 CE. In the latter, he is described as serving as prefect, along with P. Octavius, who is plausibly understood to be his successor.

²¹ For P. Octavius' absence from the post by 25 May, 12, see *SB* 5235, 1, cited in *PIR*² 5(2), 146. Magius Maximus was prefect at least until 14/5 CE, as is made clear by the publication of inscriptions from the first year of Tiberius' reign. Maximus still seems to be active at this time (see *BE* 1974, no.701, p. 329, cited in *PIR*² 5(2), *loc. cit.*). See Box's discussion as well (1939, 102-3) (n. 18 above).

ethnarch. In such circumstances, Augustus was willing to give authority to the council. What is remarkable in his intervention for both ethnarchs and *gerousia* in such short succession is that Augustus gave official recognition to both. These magistrates had a public role to play in the city at large, and as such they needed recognition from Augustus, who consented to intervene on two separate occasions within a three-year span. In 10/11 CE, one could likely speak of an official ethnarch of the Jews of Alexandria. The ethnarch of the Jews of Alexandria was ultimately the official ethnarch of Alexandria, established to oversee the affairs of the Jews.

It is evident that the archons of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis in *P.Polit.Jud.* 8 can be identified as archons of the Jews. Although they were associated with the *politeuma* and Heracleopolis, their jurisdiction was first and foremost over the Jews of the city and the nome. Apparently, the first thought of the author of *P.Polit.Jud.* 8 had been to refer to them as the archons of the Jews. His own revisions suggest as much. Maresch informs us that the author had originally written τοῖς ἄρχουσι τὸ λζ (ἔτος) τῶν; the same hand then corrected this to τοῖς ἄρχουσι τὸ λζ (ἔτος) τοῦ, so that we have τοῖς ἄρχουσι τὸ λζ (ἔτος) τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολιτεύ[μα]τος τῶν Ἰουδαίων.²² He conjectures that the writer had meant to say τῶν Ἰουδαίων, certainly the most plausible assumption.²³ But this initial impulse on Theodotos' part is not unusual, since it is reminiscent of the self-description of the Jewish elders in Tebetnoi (*P.Polit.Jud.* 20.2) and, possibly, their description of "the archons in Heracleopolis of the Jews."²⁴ In fact, Theodotos is the only petitioner to further describe the archons as archons 'of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis'.²⁵

There is a simple explanation both for the addition and for the fact that this addition was made only in Theodotos' case. Theodotos is also the only petitioner in the corpus who actually identifies himself as coming from outside the nome and is likely the farthest flung of all the petitioners.²⁶ Not only does he use the most elaborate description of the

²² For Maresch's comments, see Cowey and Maresch 2001, p. 96. I am thankful to Klaus Maresch for providing me with an image of the papyrus by email. That image confirmed the awkward nature of the upsilon in the article (τοῦ) and its relatively thick and clumsy lines. It is clear that τῶν had indeed been written first and that the author of *P.Polit.Jud.* 8 has written τοῦ in its place.

²³ See n. 10 above for the reference.

²⁴ See notes 12 above and 24 below.

²⁵ Although the elders in Tebetnoi refer to them as either 'the archons in Heracleopolis of the Jews' (τοῖς [ἐ]ν Ἡρακλέους) πρό(λ)ει ἄρχου[σι] τῶν Ἰουδαίων) (*P.Münch.* III 1.49, 1.8) or 'the archons in Heracleopolis [of the *politeuma*] of the Jews' (τοῖς [ἐ]ν Ἡρακλέους) πρό(λ)ει ἄρχου[σι] τοῦ πολιτεύματος] τῶν Ἰουδαίων) (*P.Polit.Jud.* 20, 1.8). See discussion below, pp. 8-9.

²⁶ The author of *P.Polit.Jud.* 8 repeatedly specifies the nome from which Theodotos comes and even the nome in which his village is located (see II.7, 9, 17-18). Berenike, a Jew, identifies herself as 'of those from Aphroditopolis', but does not specify where that town is located (*P.Polit.Jud.* 9.2-3). As the editors note, we cannot be certain which Ἀφροδίτης πόλις is meant, the nome capital, or the towns of the same name located nearby in the Fayyum, whether in the Ἡρακελίδου μερίς or in the Πολέμωνος μερίς (see Cowey and Maresch 2001, p. 106). Without knowing the location of Teis and which Aphroditopolis was meant, it is difficult to say precisely whether Theodotos' petition came from the one farthest afield. If we can take the town of Palosis (see *P.Polit.Jud.* 8.17), the location of the vineyard at issue

Jewish archons, but the description of his own provenance is more specific than for any other petitioner in the entire collection.²⁷ The author seems initially to have intended, to refer to the archons as the ‘the archons of the Jews’. As he was an outsider it seemed best, on second thought, to add the fullest description possible of the archons’ jurisdiction and provenance. It is comparable to what we find in the Menches correspondence, where Verhoogt describes the tendency of officials of lower rank to ‘include reminders of the geographic distance separating them from the superior officials they address’.²⁸ Theodotos’ request is made with a similar emphasis upon their distance, with his own location and that of the archons in Heracleopolis. It is interesting, then, that Theodotos is the only petitioner who identifies them as archons of the *politeuma*. Had the *politeuma* been merely an ethnic association, Theodotos might well have added the same reference to Heracleopolis. But would the locals have been unanimously silent regarding the archons’ leadership of the *politeuma*? I would suppose not. Their proximity might explain why they failed to mention that they were in Heracleopolis, but not their silence about the institution over which the archons supposedly presided. This is especially true since, according to Cowey and Maresch, they took enough pride in the *politeuma* that they referred to its members as *politai*.²⁹ All this suggests that the reference to the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis is merely a geographic marker. Locals do not mention the *politeuma* (or city) in Heracleopolis because it is already obvious.

Finally, *P.Polit.Jud.* 8 is the only piece of evidence that clearly establishes any connection between the *politeuma* and the Jews. As I have argued, this connection is ambiguous, since it is just as likely to be identified as an ethnic association or the civic body of Heracleopolis. One additional emendation by James Cowey is made on the presumption that the Jews were organized as a *politeuma*, but the assumption is unnecessary. In *P.Polit.Jud.* 20, Cowey has supplied *politeuma* in the verso “address” ‘to the archons in Heracleopolis of the Jews’: τοῖς [ἐ]ν Ἡρακλέους πό(λει) ἄρχου[σι τοῦ πολιτεύματος] τῶν Ἰουδαίων. As indicated by the brackets, a large portion of the papyrus is missing, from where Cowey has supplied the missing portion of the case ending of ἄρχουσι. Without *P.Polit.Jud.* 8 before them, the previous editors of *P.Polit.Jud.* 20 (= *P.Münch.* III 1.49) read here τοῖς [ἐ]ν Ἡρακλέους πό(λει) ἄρχου[σι] τῶν Ἰουδαίων, noting that it was impossible to say what might be missing after the word ἄρχουσι, but that the connection between ἄρχουσι and τῶν Ἰουδαίων was defensible based on parallels (citing *P.Lond.* III 1177 = *W. Chrest.* 193 = *CPJ* II 432, 1.57). In other words, there is no certainty that there was a lacuna. In fact, even a survey

in Theodotos’ petition, as a clue to the location of Teis, it would be the farthest point of origin only if Berenike was from an Aphroditopolis either in the Ἡρακελίδου μερίς or in the Πολέμωνος μερίς. Still, whatever town Berenike came from, her case could be described as local, since her adversary, Demetrios, comes from Peenpasbytis within a toparchy in the Heracleopolite nome.

²⁷ See the foregoing note for the elaborate descriptions of Theodotos’ locale. The text which gives the most detail is unfortunately corrupt: παρὰ Θεοδότου τοῦ Θεοδότου Ἰουδαίου τῶν ἐν τῷ Ὄξυρυγίτηι / στρα. λειστων / ἐν κώμηι Τηει τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ (*P.Polit.Jud.* 8.6-9).

²⁸ See *P.L. Bat.* 29, p. 71. I am thankful to Todd Hickey for suggesting this comparison.

²⁹ See note 32 below.

of these brief indications of the addressee and sender, the “envelope” as it were, suggests the line length is more or less what we would expect, and so, that there was no lacuna.³⁰

What started, then, as an argument for why the *politeuma* and Heracleopolis are so tightly connected in Theodotos’ phraseology (‘the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis’) has turned into something more. Theodotos’ description of them as ‘archons of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis, of the Jews’ might instead be seen as a precise phrasing meant to highlight the complicated position of the Jews in regard to fellow Jews through the Heracleopolite nome and beyond, but also in regard to the other residents of Heracleopolis. Our only evidence, then, that links the Jewish archons and the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis is ultimately ambiguous. Theodotos’ own corrections suggest he added a reference to the *politeuma* as an afterthought, but one appropriate to his geographical separation from the archons of the Jews in Heracleopolis. It remains to be seen whether other ethnic associations referred to as *politeumata* functioned in the way that the supposed ethnic association in Heracleopolis did, and, if not, whether other references to the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis make more sense as references to a civic body or an ethnic association.

2. *Politeumata* as Private Associations

If, indeed, the *politeuma* of *P.Polit.Jud.* 1, 2, 8 and 18 had been a Jewish association as defined by Cowey and Maresch, one would have expected to trace clear parallels with other such associations. According to Cowey and Maresch’s reconstruction, the *politarchēs* and archons of the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis heard private disputes between Jews, and could incarcerate members of the community.³¹ The archons and *politarchēs* were associated in their rule over the *politeuma*. The *politeuma* of Heracleopolis, they also suggest, was so critical a part of the Jews’ identity that members of the *politeuma* were known as ‘citizens’ (πολιται).³²

To show how unique and unprecedented this institution would have been, I will provide a brief survey of *politeumata* that were private associations. Useful compilations

³⁰ There are ten similar addressee descriptions among the papyri in Cowey and Maresch’s edition (*P.Polit.Jud.* 1.25-26, 4.32-33, 6.41-42, 7.26-27, 8.37-38, 9.46-47, 12.26-27, 13.5-6, 14.8-9, 18.12-13). In most cases, the addressee line on the *verso* is considerably shorter than the normal line length of the letter on the *recto* (see 6.41-42, 7.26-27, 8.37-38, 9.46-47, 13.5-6, 14.8-9, 18.12-13), just as that of *P.Münch.* III 1.49 (= *P.Polit.Jud.* 20) is without the supplement of τοῦ πολιτεύματος. Only if the line lengths of the *recto* are unusually short to begin with, is an addressee description given which is of equal length (see 1.25-26, 4.32-33, and 12.26-27). The line lengths of *P.Münch.* III 1.49 (= *P.Polit.Jud.* 20), on the contrary, are somewhat long to begin with. So it is probable that there is no lacuna, and the addition is likely not required.

³¹ For their discussion of private disputes between Jews as the basic authority of the *politarchēs* and archons of the Jewish *politeuma*, see Cowey and Maresch 2001, pp. 11-18. For their interpretation of the *politarchēs* as responsible for the incarceration of local Jews, see *op. cit.*, pp. 40 and 134.

³² See Cowey and Maresch 2001, pp. 22-23. Their evidence is *P.Polit.Jud.* 1.17.

of the existing evidence for these types of *politeuma* have been made elsewhere.³³ As Zuckerman concluded in his survey of the same material (written, however, before the publication of most of the papyri published in *P.Polit.Jud.*), the typical Ptolemaic *politeuma* was primarily a “cult association” without official status or authority over its members.³⁴ Certainly we must take into account our source for such ethnic *politeumata*. Since most references are found in honorific inscriptions, we might expect there to be far more references to the social and religious aspects of the associations — the sphere where benefactors were most vital and most likely to be honored. It is unlikely that there will be many references to the judicial capacities of the leaders of the *politeumata*. But not all of our information comes from inscriptions, and two papyri will be discussed below (cf. *P.Tebt.* 32 = *Chrest.Wilck.* 448 and *SB* 5.8757). Still, given the limited quantity of the evidence, the goal of this section is to establish that we are missing evidence suggesting that such *politeumata* had judicial powers, not that they could not have enjoyed such powers. *P.Polit.Jud.* 1, 2, 8 and 18 would represent a significant departure from the existing evidence for *politeumata*.

The associations I survey here clearly had important religious dimensions; they presumably fulfilled a social need for their members, and, by virtue of their centralized organization, could offer a structure for foreign groups to be organized into the larger Ptolemaic world, especially helpful in the administration of the army.³⁵ Some of the *politeumata* I discuss produced inscriptions that commemorated dedications to their god or gods, as well as the dedicator or benefactor. Some simply memorialized their deceased members on tombstones. Judging from this evidence, these clubs had strong social and religious dimensions. Many were military in character, and may well have helped provide religious and social reminders of a more familiar culture. We cannot be certain, however, that any of these associations heard court cases and appeals, or, what is less likely, that any had the authority to incarcerate members for transgressions. These associations could own property, including real estate, but such properties seem only to have helped provide locations for religious meetings; alternatively, they were designated for collective burial for members of the association. Lastly, there is no clear evidence that members, *qua* members, were known as *politai*. In one *politeuma*, it is clear that this term was reserved for actual citizens of the local city.³⁶ It is doubtful that the term *politēs*, with its rich associations and cultural prestige, would be used to denote mere membership in a local club.

³³ See Zuckerman 1985/86 and Lüderitz 1994. A recent survey of Ptolemaic religious associations covers only Demotic papyri, and hence has no discussion of the *politeuma* (see Monson 2006).

³⁴ Zuckerman 1985/86 defines the *politeuma* as ‘a cult association most commonly following the particular ancestral rite of its members, or just united on a “professional” basis ... There is nothing to indicate that *politeumata* enjoyed any official status, no evidence that they were established by a royal “charter” or with royal approval, or that they possessed any judicial authority over their members or secured them any privileges; in short, no evidence that their status was preferential in any respect to that of other voluntary associations so widespread in Ptolemaic Egypt’ (pp. 177-78).

³⁵ See below the discussion of *P.Tebt.* 32 (p. 12). See also Thompson 1984, and especially pp. 1074-1075.

³⁶ See note 51 below.

Some *politeumata*, whatever their other functions, clearly could help ensure their members' proper burial, perhaps according to their native customs. For example, the earliest inscription we have describing ethnic associations called *politeumata* is from Sidon (perhaps the early second century BCE), where, in a necropolis, fellow-citizens set up a burial *stēlē* memorializing their deceased compatriots.³⁷ Since the paintings on the *stēlē* represented soldiers — and on the basis of other details from the inscription itself — we can be fairly certain that these soldiers were mercenaries. One of the goals of their association was apparently to see to the burial of their fellow soldiers and citizens while serving abroad. This was a *politeuma* of Caunians, honoring their fellow citizens, that is, those who were Caunians as well (τοὺς αὐτῶν πολίτας). Another inscription — that of a *politeuma* of Pisidians — honors a fellow citizen who is also a Termessian at Oenoanda.³⁸

Other *politeumata* may well have given their members a proper venue for carrying out religious rites according to their local traditions. Such is the case with the *politeuma* of the Idumaeans. In an inscription from 112/111 BCE, we learn that the association met in an 'Upper Appollonieion' in Memphis, together with other local Idumaeans. On this occasion, Dorion, a prominent Ptolemaic official identified in the inscription as both a *stratēgos* and a *syngenēs*, was being honored for plastering and whitewashing the Idumaeans' temple.³⁹ It is difficult to determine what the activities of the *politeuma* proper were and what those of the other Idumaeans in Memphis may have been. As part of the honors Dorion was to receive, there were sacrificial events at which Dorion was to be awarded a palm branch according to paternal custom. Priests and "sacred psalmists" sang hymns. There were feasts of the *politeuma* at which Dorion was to be routinely crowned. The inscription itself is a decree (ψήφισμα) of this joint meeting of the *politeuma* and local Idumaeans. The *politeuma* may well owe the inspiration for its form — including its decrees and the voting of honors to benefactors — to the government of the *polis*. This *politeuma* even presumes to speak on behalf of the city of Memphis in honoring Dorion (see *OGIS* 737.20). But far from being an autonomous institution of Idumaeans self-government in Memphis, it consisted of a formal association of Idumaeans

³⁷ For the inscription and the proposed date, see Macridy 1904.

³⁸ See Macridy 1904, pp. 547-56, under inscriptions A (p. 549) and stele 2 (p. 551). As Lüderitz points out, they are *politai* precisely because they are fellow citizens of Caunus, just as the Termessians seem to be fellow citizens of the other members of the *politeuma* of the Pisidians (see Lüderitz 1994, p. 194). However, these arguments were written before the publication of *P.Polit Jud*.

³⁹ For the inscription, see *OGIS* 737. Even here there has been some doubt as to the nature of the *politeuma* mentioned. Was it the civic body of Memphis, as maintained by some (see Launey 1950, vol. 2, p. 1074, Fraser 1972, vol. 2, p. 438, n.752, and, even earlier, see Dittenberger's own note in *OGIS* 737)? Or was it an ethnic *politeuma*, as argued in Thompson 1984? Thompson succeeds in making clear the Idumaeans character of the Appollonieion, and shows conclusively that this was an association (p. 1073). See also Zuckerman 1985/86 (p. 176), who connects the reference to a body of 'sword bearers' (μαχαροφόροι) to the Idumaeans unit stationed in Memphis (see *SB* 1.681). The inscription is merely dated as year 6, but there are compelling grounds to take this as Ptolemy X. See Thompson 1984, p. 1070, for references to Dorion's career and the identification of his family members in Memphis.

mercenaries who met for feasting, gave honors to especially dedicated members, and issued decrees to that effect. It organized rituals of sacrifice and sacred hymns. But its authority seems to have ended there. In fact, it does not even seem to have been the only association of Idumaeans in Memphis.⁴⁰

At times, the thorough organization and strong social bonds formed in *politeumata* could be put to use by society at large. We know of one *politeuma* that was used to gather information on its members for outsiders. In a dossier of letters from 145 BCE, the heads of a *politeuma* named Sosos and Aegyptos communicate orders for the assignment of Asklepiades to a local cavalry division.⁴¹ Asklepiades had joined the *politeuma* of the Cretans and was being assigned to the cavalry division at the same time. Though we cannot be certain that the members of the *politeuma* largely overlapped with those of the local cavalry, it is at least noteworthy that Apollodoros, the *epistatēs* and scribe of the cavalry, could rely on the *politeuma* to convey the order that Asklepiades was being assigned to the company (*syntaxis*) of Pankrates. The chain of command amongst the soldiers remains as we would expect: the head and scribe of the cavalry communicates information to the head of the *syntaxis*. While the involvement of Sosos and Aegyptos as heads of the *politeuma* in the “circuit” of communication is noteworthy, it only illustrates the extent to which the *politeumata* could help complement and structure life outside military service. The army apparently relied upon the association to convey orders of transfer.

Normally the fragmentary information which survives suggests only the religious and social dimensions of the *politeuma*. In a second century BCE inscription, a *politeuma* records its dedication of a sacred enclosure. Kaphisodoros, a Boeotian, chief bodyguard and στρατηγός of the nome of Xoïs, dedicates, along with his sons, the Boeotians in Xoïs, and ‘those [συμ]πολιτευόμενοι’ (perhaps ‘organized into the association with them’) a sacred enclosure and its furniture on behalf of Ptolemy and Cleopatra to Zeus and the other ancestral gods (163-145 BC).⁴² Kaphisodoros has it recorded that he is *stratēgos* and ‘priest of the πολίτευμα’. The second group, οἱ [συμ]πολιτευόμενοι, have been claimed to be members associated with the *politeuma*, but not officially part of it.⁴³ Doubtless the *politeuma* and associate members would meet in this enclosure for the celebration of their common religious rites. We hear nothing else of the other functions of the *politeuma*.

Other such dedications give us the same picture — a *politeuma* was an association founded for religious and social purposes, possessing some property which was probably used only for enabling meetings and religious celebrations. Arrhenides of Syrbenda, who belonged to the first friends, chiliarchs and sword-bearers of the kings, dedicates a gatehouse and its furniture to Zeus, Athena and the *politeuma* of the Cilicians.⁴⁴ Another dedication is made by ‘the *politeuma* of soldiers in Alexandria’. They record that their

⁴⁰ See *SB* 681 for the κοινόν of founders, with its list of Semitic and likely Idumaeian names (for the identification of its Idumaeian character, see Thompson 1984, p. 1072).

⁴¹ The ‘fifth hipparchy’ of a local ‘resident cavalry’ (*P.Tebt.* 32 = *Chrest. Wilck.* 448).

⁴² See *SB* 3.6664.

⁴³ See Zuckerman 1985/86, p. 175; Launey 1950, pp. 1032-35; E. Van’t Dack 1984.

⁴⁴ The inscription is from the third or second century BCE. *SB* 4.7270 = *SEG* 8.573 and Bernard, *Recueil*, vol. 1, no. 15.

prostatēs was Dionysios, and their scribe was Philippos. They describe themselves as ‘founders’ and dedicate a prayer to Zeus Soter and Hera Teleia (either 112/11 or 75/5 BCE).⁴⁵

The basic social and religious functions of *politeumata* continue in the Roman era, although we no longer hear of any reference to their military character. Gaius Julius Hephaestion served as priest of a *politeuma* of Phrygians. In 19 CE, he dedicates a statue, of which only the base apparently survives, to ‘Zeus Phrygios’.⁴⁶ Back in Egypt, a place of the *politeuma* of Harthotos is dedicated on behalf of Domitian in 93 CE. Harthotos is described as ‘great’ and ‘blessed of the goddess Sachypsis’. Abdon the προστάτης saw to it that the place was built.⁴⁷ In another reference to a *politeuma*, the head of the ἴδιος λόγος in Egypt, in 120 CE, had noted in his official records a meeting between Ulpus and the ‘Lycians from the *politeuma*’ together with Dionysius. Ulpus and the others had argued that the keeping of the tombs belonged to them as an ancestral possession and that it was not shut off to them by Dionysios.⁴⁸

In Berenike, one of the cities of the Cyrenaean Pentapolis, there was a Jewish *politeuma* that did in fact have annually appointed archons. In this respect, it bears a strong resemblance to the sort of association the Heracleopolitan Jews enjoyed according to Cowey and Maresch, namely, a *politeuma* of Jews with archons managing the association. Two inscriptions mention the association (τῶι πολιτεύματι τῶν ἐν Βερνίκῃ Ἰουδαίων). They come from the principates of Augustus and Tiberius, respectively.⁴⁹ The first is a memorial of thanksgiving for the benefaction of Decimus Valerius Dionysius, both a Roman by status and a member of the *politeuma* of the Jews. His endowment (ἐπίδομα τῶι πολιτεύματι) for the plastering of the floor and decoration of the walls of the amphitheater is memorialized on a marble *stelē* within the same amphitheater.⁵⁰ And he is, in addition, to be free of any liturgical duties, which suggests that membership in the *politeuma* carried dues. The second decree is a similar thanksgiving memorial for M. Tittius Aemilia. He is praised for the good-will he had shown to the entire province, to citizens generally, but also to the members of the *politeuma*, at large as well as to individuals. Not only is the memorial enshrined on a marble *stelē*, but he is to be praised and crowned with an olive crown and woolen fillet at the monthly celebrations of the new moon and at other meetings (Lüderitz 1983, no.71.22-27).⁵¹ Both decrees (Lüderitz

⁴⁵ SEG 20.499; see, also, Fraser 1959/60, no. 11.

⁴⁶ SB 7875.

⁴⁷ See Bernand, *Recueil*, vol. 2, no. 121.

⁴⁸ SB 5.8757.

⁴⁹ For the references to the *politeuma*, see Lüderitz 1983, nos. 70.11-12 and 71.21-2. The first of these may perhaps be assigned to 9/8 or 7/6 BCE. See Lüderitz 1983, pp. 150-151. The second is from 24/5 CE (p. 153).

⁵⁰ Lüderitz 1983, no. 70.25-6.

⁵¹ Lüderitz 1983, no. 71.9-18: ἐπεὶ Μάρκος Τίτιος Σέξτου υἱὸς Αἰμιλία ἀνὴρ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς παραγενηθεὶς εἰς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν ἐπὶ δημοσίων πραγμάτων τὴν τε προστασίαν αὐτῶν ἐποίησατο φιλανθρώπως καὶ καλῶς ἐν τε τῇ ἀναστροφῇ ἡσύχιον ἦθος ἐνδικνύμενος ἀεὶ διατελῶν τυγχάνει οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τούτοις ἀβαρῆ ἑαυτὸν παρέσχηται ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς κατ’ ἰδίαν ἐντυγχάνουσι τῶν πολιτῶν ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἡμῶν Ἰουδαίοις (‘Since Marcus Titius Aemilia, son of Sextus, a good and noble man, came into the province and, in public affairs, oversaw them humanely, and happens to continue to

1983, nos. 70 and 71) contain a list of archons, seven and nine in number respectively. The *politeuma* is as intricately organized as that of the Idumaeans of Memphis, complete with archons, with voting for honors (with pebbles), and, possibly, the ownership of an amphitheater with publicly displayed decrees.

There are at the same time some important differences. First, the *politeuma* of Jews in Berenike does not refer to its members as *politai*, as Cowey and Maresch argue happened in the *politeuma* of Jews in Heracleopolis. In fact, the decree of the *politeuma* in Berenike reserves that title for actual citizens of Berenike. It designates citizens of Berenike as *politai*, and refers to its members as the Jews ‘from the πολίτευμα’.⁵² Secondly, we have no indication here that these archons could incarcerate members. The *politeuma* of Jews in Berenike served as a religious and social nexus for many local Jews, and so bears close resemblances to the other *politeumata* discussed above. In the decree in honor of Marcus Tittius, we are explicitly told that the gathering takes place during Sukkot.⁵³ The *politeuma* also enjoys regular meetings (σύνοδοι) and other assemblies on the first of the month. Both Passover and Sukkot begin on new moons. The *politeuma* of Jews in Berenike had, as did other *politeumata*, religious functions. A generation later we find an association of Jews in Berenike (συναγωγή) with its own archons — ten in all — and a synagogue building. The editor of the inscription suggests that the organization has become nothing more than a religious club. It is unclear whether the *politeuma* was so deeply transformed in the interim that it took on a new name, or whether this was a second organization in the city.⁵⁴ If it was a second organization, this would suggest that the *politeuma* could not have had the sweeping authority Cowey and Maresch attribute to the supposed *politeuma* in Heracleopolis.

In short, the supposed Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis finds its closest parallel in the *politeuma* of Jews in Berenike. But we have reasons to doubt that the *politeuma* in Berenike could have been as significant an institution as Cowey and Maresch claim existed in Heracleopolis. That *politeuma* would have had a court, a jail, and an indeterminate jurisdiction over Jew and Gentile alike, none of which is clearly attested in Berenike. The supposed *politeuma* in Heracleopolis was so important to the daily identity of Jews that its members refer to themselves as *politai*, and consider non-members ‘foreigners’. Not only is this not the case in the *politeuma* in Berenike, but it is not to be found in any other *politeuma* in Egypt. It follows that we need to seek a better explanation for the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis.

successfully demonstrate a rather peaceful character in his behavior, and since he has not only shown himself unburdensome in these things, but even to those of the citizens he encounters individually; and making his administration useful still also to the Jews from our *politeuma*, both in common and individually, he does not stop doing deeds worthy of his excellence ...’).

⁵² See the previous note.

⁵³ See Lüderitz 1983, no. 71.1: [E]τους νε’ Φαῶφ κε’ ἐπὶ συλλόγου τῆς σκηνοπηγίας ... (‘In the year 55, the 25th of Phaoph, during the gathering of Sukkot’). About twenty years after the second inscription, Philo suggested that the archons of the Jews in Alexandria were responsible for organizing a celebration of Sukkot for all of Alexandria (see Philo, *IF* 116-117).

⁵⁴ See Lüderitz 1983, no. 72.

3. The “πολίτευμα in Heracleopolis”

As noted, a second and even more common meaning of the term *politeuma* was a sovereign body of citizens. I will discuss evidence for the clear use of the term for citizen bodies throughout the Greek world, as well as in Ptolemaic Egypt. Admittedly, it is not yet attested for nome capitals. I will also argue that a parallel with another papyrus suggests that the members of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis were not members of a Jewish *politeuma*, but members of the civic body of Heracleopolis. And if we separate the letters to and from the *politarchēs* and other officials of the *politeuma* from those to the archons of the Jews, we discern some basic differences in jurisdiction. Finally, examining the letters to and from the *politarchēs*, *politeuma* and the officials of the *politeuma*, I emphasize the point that the *politeuma* and *politarchēs*, except one tenuous reference in *P.Polit.Jud.* 8, are never directly connected either to the Jewish community of Heracleopolis or to its archons.

As already discussed, the word *politeuma* could be used either to denote a “citizen body” or was simply a term used to refer to a “state” or “civic community”. Instances are plentiful enough to show that this was not only a fairly universal meaning of the term *politeuma*, but also the prevailing sense in this period. This is not the place to discuss the complex history of the word, which spans from the fifth century BCE Attic literature until Justinian.⁵⁵ But already in Aristotle the term can refer to a “policy”, the state power or “government” itself;⁵⁶ and Aristotle also uses it to denote “citizen body”, “electorate” or “governing class.”⁵⁷ Epigraphic evidence from the third and second centuries BCE and beyond, show a more restricted usage. It is used to refer to a “citizen body”, a sense plentifully represented in inscriptions of the third and second centuries BCE.⁵⁸ It

⁵⁵ Ruppel 1927 still provides the clearest discussion.

⁵⁶ See Aristotle *Politics*, 1978b10; 1279a25; 1321a26; 1283b20, 30; 1293a12; 1293a21; 1297b6, 1297b10; 1297b13. In Messene, there is a reference to the ‘government’ (*politeuma*) of other cities. See the inscription published by A.P. Matthaiou in Mitsopoulos-Leon 2001, pp. 227-31 (= *SEG* 51.457).

⁵⁷ *Politics*, 1302b15; 1303b19; 1303b25; 1305b30; 1306a14; 1308a3; 1308a13; 1332b31. See also *SIG* 283: πολίτευμα εἶναι ἐν Χίῳ δῆμον.

⁵⁸ See I. K. 24, 1, (Smyrna), 573 II, ll. 58-60 (cf. I.72, as well): ὁμόσαι δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐμ Μαγνησίαι κατοίκους τῶν τε κατὰ πόλιν ἰππέων καὶ πεζῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ὑπαίθροις τασσομένους κα[ι] τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς καταχωριζομένους εἰς τὸ πολίτευμα τόνδε τὸν ὄρκον (ca. 243 BCE); *SIG* 543. 6-8, 29-31, 32-34: ἕως ἂν οὖν καὶ ἑτέρους ἐπινοήσωμεν ἀξίους τοῦ παρ’ ὑμῖν πολιτεύματος, ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος κρίνω ψηφίσασθαι ὑμᾶς, ὅπως τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν παρ’ ὑμῖν Θεσσαλῶν ἢ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων δοθῆι ἡ πολιτεία; ὅτι γὰρ πάντων κάλλιστόν ἐστιν ὡς πλείστων μετεχόντων τοῦ πολιτεύματος τὴν τε πόλιν ἰσχύειν καὶ τὴν χώραν μὴ ὡσπερ νῦν αἰσχροῦς ... χερσεύεσθαι, νομίζω μὲν οὐδ’ ὑμῶν ἂν ἀντεπεῖν ... [sc. Ῥωμαῖοι] οἱ καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας ὅταν ἐλευθέρωσωσιν προσδεχόμενοι εἰς τὸ πολίτευμα καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων με[ταδι]δόντες, καὶ διὰ τοῦ τοιούτου τρόπου οὐ μόνον τὴν ἰδίαν πατρίδα ἐπηξήκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποικίας ... ἐκπεπόμπφασιν (219 and 214 BCE); *SIG* 633.59-61 (ca. 180 BCE): ... μὴ εἶναι αὐτοῖς προσγραφῆναι πρὸς τὸ πολίτευμα τὸ Μιλησίων, ἐὰν μὴ πρότερον οἰκήσ(ωσ)ιν Ἡράκλε(λ)αν ἢ μετοικήσωσιν ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἔτη πέντε; see also, more recently published, P. Nigdelis and K. Sismanidis, in *Ancient Macedonia* VI 810/811 A 22-23 (= *SEG* 49.855 A.22-23): τῶν δὲ μὴ κατεκε[χ]ωρισμένων [πρό]τερον ἐν τοῖς πολιτεύμασιν μήτε οἱ ἐπιστάτα[ι] μ[η]δέν]α προσγραφέτωσαν τῶν

continued to be used in this sense in the Ptolemaic world. First, we see it used in the reconstitution of Cyrene by Ptolemy I. The well-known inscription designates 10,000 residents in Cyrene as the *politeuma*, or “civic body”.⁵⁹ In Egypt itself the citizens of Alexandria are referred to as a *politeuma* in the early Roman era. The Alexandrians worry that their civic body might be corrupted by men who were ‘ill-nourished and ill-bred’ (ἄθρεπτοι καὶ ἀνάγωγοι).⁶⁰ Alternatively, in the same period, the sense of *politeuma* often straddles both “citizen body” and, more simply, state or city.⁶¹ The term

τ[οι]ούτων [ἐ]ν [ταῖς] π[υ]ροκαύσε]σιν εἰδότες μήτε ὁ ἐπὶ τὰς διαγραφὰς ... (late third or early second century BCE); cf. also, from Kassandreia (Poteidaia), where the same formulation has been restored in a lacuna, P. Nigdelis and K. Sismanidis, in *Ancient Macedonia* VI 808/809.11 (=SEG 49.722.11); J. Bousquet and Ph. Gauthier, ‘Inscriptions du Létodon de Xanthos’, *REG* 107 (1994), p. 321: ὅσοι ἂν βούλωνται Ξανθίων ἐν Μύροις προσγράφεσθαι πρὸς τὸ πολίτευμα ... (ll.15-17) (second half of the second century to the beginning of the first century BCE).

⁵⁹ See *SEG* IX 1.

⁶⁰ See *PSI* 1160, though this can only be dated to the early first century CE; Ptolemais may also be referred to as a *politeuma* in the late Ptolemaic era, but the papyrus is too fragmentary for us to be certain (*SEG* 4.7403). For a full discussion of its date, see *CPJ* II, pp. 26-27. Harker 2008 (pp. 28-29) dates the text to the first century CE on paleographic grounds, like Musurillo 1954, p. 83.

⁶¹ See the letter of Eumenes II (197-159 BCE) to Tyriaion, or the Toriaitai in Jones and Riel 1997, ll.27 and 34 [=SEG 47.1745]: συγχωρῶ καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς μεθ’ ὑμῶν συνοικοῦσιν ἐν χωρίοις εἰς ἐν πολίτευμα συνταχ[θ]ῆναι καὶ νόμοις τε χρῆσθαι ἰδίους, and later, περὶ τοῦ νομίζεσθαι πολίτευμα τὸ ὑμέ[τ]ε[ρ]ον. In honors voted to foreign judges in Tenos, see *IG* XII 5, 870.11-12 (second century BCE): [οὐ]δὲ[ν] ἐνλείποντ[ες] καλοκαγαθίας εἰς τὸ τ[υ]χ[εῖν] π[ᾶ]ν[τας] τοῦ δικαίου, βουλόμενοι τὸ πολίτευμα κατ[α]στῆσαι εἰς [ὁ]μ[ό]νοιαν (though Tenos is otherwise referred to as a πόλις in the same inscription); Bosnakis and Hallof 2003, pp. 208-10, no.3, 13-15 (=SEG 53.863, 13-15), again for foreign judges: τῶν τε εἰσδοθ[ε]μισῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς κρίσεων πεπεύρανται τὰς μὲν [π]λείστας ἀγαγεῖν εἰς σύλλ[ο]γον ἀκόλουθοι γιν[ό]μενοι τῆι τῶν μετπεψαμέ[νων] παρακλήσει *vac.* καὶ προαιρούμενοι ἐφ’ ὅσον ἦ[σαν] δυνατοὶ ἐν ὁμοιοῖα κατεστηκὸς ἀπολι[τεῖν] τὸ π[ο]λίτευμα (here, again, Chalkis, the city which drafted the decree, refers to itself at least twice as a πόλις) (second century BCE); see also, from a *synoikismos* of Herakleia on the Latmos with the Pidaseis, Wörrle 2003, ll.32-33, with a translation (123), and a discussion (137) of the word πολίτευμα as a “Gemeinwesen” or “corps civique” (= *SEG* 53, 1198): [ὁ]μόσαι δὲ Πιδασείων ἄνδρας ἑκατὸν οὓς ἂν Λ[ά]τμιοι γράψωσιν καὶ Λατμίων διακοσίους οὓς ἂν Πιδασεῖς γράψωσιν ταύρω καὶ κάπρω ἐν τῆι ἀγ[ο]ρᾷ ἐμμενεῖν ἐν τῶι ψηφίσματι καὶ τῶι πολιτεύματι τῶιδε (ca. 323-313 BCE); ὅπως εἰς βελτίονα καὶ εὐδαιμονεστέραν π[α]ραγίνηται κατ[ά]στασιν τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ πο[λι]τεύματος (Pergamum, 138-133 BCE); in W. Blümel, *I. K.* 28, 1 (Iasos), 4, ll.9-11, Laodike III mentions Antiochus III’s promise to help augment the civic body: ...καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ προτέθειται συναῖξιν τὸ πολίτευμα καὶ εἰς βελτίονα διάθεσιν ἀγαγεῖν (between 195 and 190 BCE, according to Blümel, *I. K.*, 28, 1 [Iasos], p. 23); in a decree from Keramos, E. Varinlioglu, *I.K.* (Keramos) 30, 6, ll.7-10: μετὰ τε ταῦτα ἐν δυσχερεῖ καταστάσει γενομένου τοῦ πο[λι]τεύματος οὐ καταπλαγείς τὴν τινῶν ἀνάτασιν πολὺ βεβαιότεραν ἐπειράτο τὴν πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος αὔξιν εὐνοίαν γνησίως καὶ ἀληθινῶς ἅπαντα καὶ λέγων καὶ πράσσων (between 167 and 133 BCE, according to Varinlioglu, *op. cit.*, p. 18); In *IG* XII 7, 49 from Arkesine, Theodosia is honored for her refurbishment of the agora and, generally, for ‘ornamenting the city’: ἐπηγγείλατο εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν τῆς πόλε[ως] διὰ τὸ εἶ[ναι]

becomes a common variant for the word *polis* itself.⁶² Moreover, Polybius, whose writings are exactly contemporaneous with the proposed date of the papyri published as *P.Polit.Jud.*, frequently uses the word *politeuma* in the sense of ‘state’ or ‘city’.⁶³ There was a well-documented trend to refer to cities as *politeumata*, and the use of this terminology in Heracleopolis would have made perfect sense in this larger context.

In Heracleopolis, an earlier papyrus demonstrates that locals were commonly identified by their association with either the harbor or the city proper. In a second century BCE papyrus, we see a contrast between ‘those from the harbor’ (τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὄρμου) and ‘those from Heracleopolis’ (τῶν ἐξ Ἡρακλέους πόλεως).⁶⁴ This distinction between two separate but related administrative centers made in *P.Münch.* III 1.52 would be one of long standing. The terminology is echoed, with little alteration, in a letter from Heracleopolis from the second century CE. The local scribe (γραμματεὺς) is described as serving the needs of the μητρόπολις — that is, Heracleopolis — as well as those of the harbor (ὄρμος).⁶⁵ Even though the scribe served in that capacity for both communities, the distinction between the two survived in the official titlature of his office.

εὐσεβεστάτη καὶ κηδε[μονικὴ τὴν] ἐκ πολλῶν χρόνων] ἡμελη[μένην καὶ πεπτ]ωκ[ύ]αν ἀγορὰν ἐπι[φανῶς κατα]σ[κ]ε[υ]άσα[ι, ταί]ς ἰδί[αι]ς δαπάναις [ἐθέλου]σα κοσμήσαι τὸ πολίτευμα; *IG XII 7, 392*: ὅπως [οὖν καὶ] ἡ πόλις τοὺς εὐνοοῦντας προ[κα]λεσαμένη πρὸς εὐνοίαν αὔξη τὸ [π]ολίτευμα τῶν προγόνων, τοῖς ὑ[π]άρχουσιν χαριζομένη (from Aegiale in Amorgos, first century BCE); See *I. Magnesia* 100.11-13, a dedication of a cult image of Artemis Leukophryene: ἐπειδὴ θείας ἐπιπνοίας καὶ παραστάσεως γενομένης τῷ σύνπαντι πλήθει τοῦ πολιτεύματος (second half of the second century BCE); Also *I. Magnesia* 101.13, a decree of the council and people of the Larbenoi in honor of Magnesian judges: τίνας δὲ καὶ συνέλυσαν ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ βελτίστου εἰς ὁμόνοιαν ἀποκαθιστάντες τὸ πολίτευμα (second half of the second century BCE).

⁶² See Robert 1963, pp. 476-8. He calls the use of the term ‘une question de style’, and cites numerous examples in which the word *politeuma* is used in the third to first centuries BCE to refer to a “corps civique”. I have included most of those examples in the preceding note, and added a few which have been published since the publication of Robert’s book.

⁶³ The papyri of *P.Polit.Jud.* are dated by the editors from 144/3 until 133/2 BCE (see Cowey and Maresch 2001, p. 1). This is well within the range of the initial writing of Polybius’ histories and the revisions which went on until his death (see the brief synopsis of discussions of the various possible publication dates of the *Histories* in Walbank, *Historical Commentary*). For a complete discussion of the word as used in Polybius, see Lévy 1990; and also Ruppel 1927, pp. 275-279. I will give a list of passages in Polybius, not meant to be exhaustive but simply illustrative of a pattern of use. He often uses the word *politeuma* to describe either Rome or Carthage or both: 1.3.7-8, 1.12.8, 1.13.12, 1.26.9, 1.35.5, 1.64.5, 3.85.7, 4.47.4, 6.18.2, 6.18.6, 6.51.4, 6.52.11, 6.56.6, 8.1.1, 8.2.7. He uses the term to describe any city, large or small: 3.3.7, 31.31.1 (Rhodes); 6.3.1, 28.9.5, 38.12.11 (Greek cities generally); 5.86.7-8 (cities of Coele-Syria); 21.17.12 (all Greek cities to the west of the Taurus); 6.46.7 (of cities generally); 6.56.10 (of a hypothetical city); 3.4.1 (undefined); see also 24.10.7, 24. 10.4, 30.6.8; 30.7.9, 30.13.2, 30.32.8. The word continues to be used in this sense in later Greek authors, though not exclusively. See, for example, D. S. 12.12.2, 18.69.4; Strabo 3.4.8, 160C; 12.3.37, 560C; Plut. *Lyc.* 30. Most of these instances are noted by Ruppel 1927.

⁶⁴ *P.Münch.* III 1. 52.3, 5-6.

⁶⁵ *P.Oslo* 98.12: γραμματεὺς) μητροπ(όλεως) καὶ ὄρμο(υ).

The use of the term *politeuma* to refer to a “citizen body” or a “city” in *P.Polit.Jud.* could perhaps shed light on the shared and contrasting references to the city of Heracleopolis vis-à-vis the harbor seen in numerous documents before and after the individual documents of *P.Polit.Jud.* were prepared. In several documents from *P.Polit.Jud.* we see a contrast reminiscent of the one found in *P.Münch.* III 1.52. No group in *P.Polit.Jud.* is designated as ‘those from Heracleopolis’. Instead, some residents are ‘of those from the *politeuma*’, and others are ‘of those from the harbor’ (τῶν ἐκ τοῦ πολιτεύματος and τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρμου) (1.4, 4.4, 7.2; 1.8, 10.3-4, 11.4-5). Rather than assume that the former were members of the Jewish association and the latter residents of the harbor, and that not one person in the collection is identified by his affiliation with Heracleopolis, it seems far easier to assume that these references mirror the two prominent centers which we know already served as points of identification for residents of Heracleopolis — Heracleopolis proper and its harbor.

In one papyrus, a resident of Heracleopolis makes the contrast between *politeuma* and harbor explicit. Andronikos, who is ‘of those from the *politeuma*’ brought a case before the *politarchēs* and the *politeuma* and wrote that he was abused verbally by Nikarchos, who was ‘of those from the harbor’. He notes that ‘some were on hand, both citizens and foreigners’ (1.16-17). Instead of assuming that members of the *politeuma* are part of a Jewish ethnic association, I would suggest that Andronikos is making a similar distinction as the one made explicitly in *P.Münch.* III 1.52 and probably implicit elsewhere in *P.Polit.Jud.* On the one hand, there are those who belong to the official, civic body of Heracleopolitans, the citizens of Heracleopolis (identical to the *politai*, πολῖται, as they are described in 11.16-17, though the ‘foreigners’, ἀλλόφυλοι seem to be a broader group than just ‘those from the harbor’) and, on the other, there are those living in and associated with the harbor.⁶⁶ Moreover, the *politarchēs* is not a leader of a *politeuma*, etymologically untenable and otherwise unattested, but the leader of the local *politai* assembled and registered in the *politeuma* (cf., again, 1.16-17). One could make a

⁶⁶ Cowey and Maresch translate the term ἀλλόφυλος as ‘Nichtjuden’ and provide ample documentation to justify their translation (see Cowey and Maresch 2001, pp. 38-39 and 22-23). In Honigman 2002, a review of their work, it is suggested that there was a close connection between this term’s use in the Ptolemaic papyri and its use in Jewish texts such as the *Septuagint* and, supposedly, in *P.Polit.Jud.* 1 (p. 260). But she does not elaborate on this point. There is some question about the exact usage of this term in Ptolemaic papyri, whether it referred to another ethnicity (approximately, foreigner) or to a geographical outsider. See the discussion of *P.Mon.inv.* 344 and 346.viii.18,32, xii.32 (180 BCE) by Clarysse and Thompson 2009, pp. 186-87. However, they do understand it as a reference to ‘origin elsewhere’ in a large number of texts, ranging from the mid-third century to the early second century BCE. From Clarysse and Thompson 2006, see 1.16-19 (254-231 BCE) and 23.122-125 (254-231 BCE), as well as *P.Mon.inv.* 343, 344, 346 and 347 (180 BCE); *P.Tebt.* III 833.36. All these citations are given in Clarysse and Thompson 2009, pp. 186-187. *P.Polit.Jud.* 1.18 seems to offer another example of this, given the contrast between πολῖται and ἀλλόφυλοι. This is in line, incidentally, with the sense of the term in Attic Greek. In Thucydides, for instance, the term ἀλλόφυλοι seems to suggest merely ‘foreign’ (4.86.5) or possibly refers to a foreigner with a strong derogatory connotation (4.92.3, 1.102.3, 4.64.4).

ready contrast between local residents enrolled in the citizen body in Heracleopolis and those who are from the harbor, a distinction similar to but not necessarily the same as that seen in *P.Münch.* III 1.52.

It is impossible to determine the exact relation between ‘those from Heracleopolis’ and ‘those from the πολίτευμα’ without further information. The terms may well have been synonymous, and the latter, for whatever reason, came to be more commonly used over the course of the second century BCE. Alternatively, those from the *politeuma* might have constituted a smaller portion of the population than those from Heracleopolis, that is, a core of citizens instead of mere residents. In any case, both terms seem to be conveniently contrasted with residents from the harbor. This was a contemporary reality in Heracleopolis which persisted through the time of the *P.Polit.Jud.* papyri and, in one form or another, well into the second century CE.

This new interpretation of the meaning of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis also helps to explain the curious absence in *P.Polit.Jud.* of locals who present themselves as locals. According to Cowey and Maresch’s argument, there is not a single case in the papyri in which someone refers to himself as a resident of Heracleopolis. This absence may be reconciled if we interpret *P.Polit.Jud.* 1, 4 and 7 as petitions from members of the civic *politeuma* in Heracleopolis. Of the petitions addressed to the archons and the *politarchēs*, only thirteen have the identity of the plaintiff intact. Four explicitly or implicitly identify themselves as coming from a different locale (see *P.Polit.Jud.* 6, 8, 9, 13); another plaintiff mentions his connection with a local military force (see *P.Polit.Jud.* 5), and another five plaintiffs simply offer their father’s name by way of identification (*P.Polit.Jud.* 3, 10, 11, 12, 14). Certainly all of those who give a patronymic may well be from Heracleopolis itself. But three explicitly declare that they are members of the *politeuma*. According to Cowey and Maresch, these are to be considered members of the Jewish association (*P.Polit.Jud.* 1, 4, 7). Nonetheless, natives of Aphroditopolis (9.3) are identified as such, as are residents of the villages of Teis in the Oxyrynchite nome (8.9), of Tebetnoi, Onneous, Penei, Peempasbytis (cf. 6.7, 13.3) and even the harbor of Heracleopolis (*P.Polit.Jud.* 1, 10, 11). Several petitioners identify themselves as Jews, and, according to Cowey and Maresch, as members of the Jewish *politeuma*, but not one identifies himself as a native of Heracleopolis. If we take the three references to plaintiffs who are members of the *politeuma* as references to locals, or registered citizens, of Heracleopolis proper (*P.Polit.Jud.* 1, 4 and 7), there is no such curious omission.

Admittedly, we have no other reference to the term *politeuma* in the sense of the city or civic body of a nome capital. Nome capitals of the Ptolemaic era, however, are notoriously poorly documented and parallels, therefore, cannot be found.⁶⁷ We do have one reference to a *politarchēs*, not necessarily connected with a nome capital, but it is not certain to what else it might refer.⁶⁸ A linguistically related word (πολιταρχῶν) which appears in a funerary epigram refers to the Jewish leader Abramos, but it is most

⁶⁷ Cf. Bingen 2007: ‘The loss is especially considerable for the nome metropoleis. For none of these do we have, even for a brief period, documentation with any consistency. And this condemns us to work with extremely narrow samplings’ (p. 114).

⁶⁸ See *P.Oxy.* 4.745.1-2, 4: τ[ὸ]ν δὲ οἶνον ἠγόρασας ἐκ (δραχμῶν) ἕξ ... ὡς καὶ ὑπέσχου διὰ τοῦ πολειτάρχου Θεοφίλου ...

reasonable to assume that he administered towns, including Leontopolis, and not ethnic associations.⁶⁹ Heracleopolis' status as a *polis* was real, and in this case the integration of the word *polis* into the very name of the city is not coincidental. However limited its governmental machinery, it *was* a *polis*. For, by the time of Ptolemy II's revenue laws (259 BCE), Ptolemaic officials were referring to nome capitals as *poleis*, making a clear distinction between villages and the *poleis* (nome capitals) within the *χώρα*.⁷⁰ In his study of the development of the urban milieu in the nome capitals, Jean Bingen argues that the social structure of the nome metropoleis is likely to have developed in the late Ptolemaic period and that their institutions of political autonomy were strengthened under Roman rule rather than founded under it.⁷¹

⁶⁹ The epitaph of Abramós seems to contain a reference to his rule over Leontopolis and another small center (see W. Horbury and D. Noy 1992, no. 39 and comments on pp. 100-102). L. Robert was the first to make this argument (*Hellenica* I (1940), pp. 18-24). Though Robert suggests that the Abramós in the epigram was the head of a Jewish *politeuma*, he seems to have something very different in mind from an ethnic association. He considers it likely that Abramós was the head of the *polis* of Leontopolis in the Heliopolite nome, or the nearby *vicus Iudaeorum* (see pp. 22-23 and 24, respectively). For the former, for instance, he is careful to argue that this was referred to as a *polis* (he cites *SEG* VIII, 483), probably to make sense of the clear reference to an actual *polis* in the epigram (1.5). Hence Robert, too, has in mind actual towns, instead of ethnic associations. As noted, this is the argument later made by Horbury and Noy, *loc. cit.*

⁷⁰ See *P.Rev.* 26.14; 40.18; 75.1, and 40.18, in particular for the reference to *poleis* and villages in the *χώρα*.

⁷¹ See Bingen 2007: 'But the social structures of the nome and of the new metropolis which those magistrates symbolise were for the most part acquired before the wave of urbanisation of the Julio-Claudian period. They joined what was altogether an evolution and a return to Hellenistic or even Hellenic standards, with such constituents as the right of ownership of the soil or the habit of living in an urban milieu on the product of farm rents. This was not the only normalization at work, but others reinforced it: ...the attrition of the royal administrative structures, which led to greater autonomy in the organization of the nome; the inevitable development through this autonomy of a certain number of more or less conscious political mechanisms, which created, with the aid of Roman power, the stereotyped metropolis of the *archontes* ...' (pp. 120-21).

The earliest documents establishing that residents of nome capitals had themselves registered as privileged residents or citizens come from the last quarter of the first century CE (see Nelson 1979, 23). This is the earliest documentation we have that they existed. The first such list may well have come from the first years of the Roman occupation, and contained a registration of the first privileged residents of nome capitals, and perhaps gymnasium declarations, as well (see Mertens 1958, 109-10 and Nelson 1979, 23). Since one of the functions of the metropolite status was to guarantee that the registrant paid a reduced poll-tax, this privilege was probably due to the first metropolites' preexisting involvement with the nome capitals, and, as Nelson speculated, 'they ... were more likely to have been influenced by the Hellenic culture and probably were involved in local government and assisted in the administration of the nomes' (Nelson 1979, 23). This privileged status was passed on from one generation to the next until it showed up in the status declarations first appearing in the last quarter of the first century CE.

Heracleopolis does have a history of self-governance, at least insofar as it had a court by 271 BCE.⁷² To take one example: two Macedonians who served under the same commander had made a contract (συγγραφή) regarding a loan. One had a document sent to the other reminding him of his repeated attempts to have him pay the debt, and informing him that he would be bringing him to trial in Heracleopolis.⁷³ The case, he says, ‘will be registered at the court in Heracleopolis’.⁷⁴ This formulation is a direct parallel to the language used in the indictment (ἐγκλημα) found in a report of a trial held at a similar court in Crocodilopolis (*P.Gur.* 2.35).⁷⁵ Even these early references to courts in the nome capitals presuppose a selection of jurors from some organized pool, such as a small civic body or a *politeuma* would provide. Now we have explicit evidence that by the early second century BCE the court of Heracleopolis was a court of jurors appointed by lot (δικαστήριον κληρωτόν).⁷⁶ I would suggest that we have more evidence for the civic court in Heracleopolis in four documents from Cowey and Maresch’s collection (*P.Polit.Jud.* 1, 2, 17, 18). Not only was there a court, but the *politarchēs* and the *politeuma* could decide whether to accept cases as well as hear appeals. The *politarchēs* issued directives to the court’s supervisor about matters normally handled by the court, as I will discuss below.

Cases heard by the *politeuma* and the archons have fundamental differences, lending further credence to the idea that the *politeuma* and the archons were separate bodies, the one an association of the citizens of Heracleopolis and the other magistrates with jurisdiction primarily over the Jewish community. In fact, all four cases concerning the *politarchēs* or the judges (κριταί) of Heracleopolis involve basic policing and issues of public violence. First, the *politeuma* is found incarcerating free citizens on two occasions; the archons are never independently attested doing so.⁷⁷ In one other case, a certain Andronikos asks the *politarchēs* Alexander and the *politeuma* to investigate Nikarchos. Andronikos alleges that Nikarchos purposefully began an argument with him on the street. Nikarchos insulted him and then brought a baseless accusation against him in public, before both citizens and foreigners. In another letter, addressed ‘to the πολίτευμα’ (*P.Polit.Jud.* 18.1), we find that one Straton supervised a board of judges in Heracleopolis (κριταί, *P.Polit.Jud.* 18.13). He receives a letter from Alexander and some judges in Peempasbytis (see *P.Polit.Jud.* 18.1-3, 12-13). The letter is very fragmentary, but following Cowey’s reconstruction, it would seem that after a drunken brawl, a defendant failed to appear before the court. The case, addressed to the *politeuma*, was then brought to Straton and the judges in Heracleopolis. Unlike the cases heard by the Jewish archons, all of those brought before the *politeuma*, the *politarchēs* or

⁷² For the date of *P.Hib.* 1.30, see Wolff 1962, p. 38, n.3. Wolff also stresses the permanent nature of the δικαστήριον in both Heracleopolis and Crocodilopolis (*op. cit.*, pp. 38, 47).

⁷³ *P.Hib.* 1.30.17

⁷⁴ ἡ δίκη σοι ἀναγραφῆσεται[α] ἐν τῷ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει δικαστηρίῳ ... (*P.Hib.* 1.30.25-26).

⁷⁵ ἡ δὲ δίκη σοι γραφήσεται ἐν τῷ δικασ[τηρίῳ τῷ ὄντι ἐν τῷ [[δικα[στηρίῳ]]] Ἀρσινοίτηι νομῶι (*P.Gur.* 2.31-2).

⁷⁶ *P.Heid.* VIII 412.2-3 and 9.

⁷⁷ See *P.Polit.Jud.* 2.17-18, 17.13-14.

the judges of Heracleopolis involve incarceration, public violence or the immediate spur to public violence, and public verbal abuse (*P.Polit.Jud.* 1.8-18).

By contrast, the cases heard by the Jewish archons of Heracleopolis bear some resemblance to the activities of their later counterpart in Alexandria, the Jewish *ethnarch*. While the cases heard by the archons of the Jews are varied, the clear trend, in seven of the nine surviving cases, shows that Jewish archons heard cases dealing with the enforcement of contracts.⁷⁸ Admittedly, some non-contractual issues are discussed before them on occasion,⁷⁹ but they are in the minority. As noted above, Strabo describes an *ethnarch* who manages the entire Jewish community of Alexandria ‘and arbitrates suits and has oversight over contracts and edicts, as if he were the ruler of an independent government’.⁸⁰ If indeed there were two bodies in Heracleopolis, on the one hand a civic *politeuma* with its judges and, on the other hand, Jewish magistrates, all of the cases heard by the latter, or those heard by the elders (πρεσβύτεροι) in Onneous (6.11-16) or the Jews in Teis (8.2, 22-25, 33), could theoretically have been brought before a local court of Heracleopolis.⁸¹ This close parallel between one type of case heard by the Alexandrian *ethnarch* and most of the surviving cases heard by the Jewish archons of Heracleopolis is persuasive. It suggests that Jews were more likely, in certain types of cases, to seek out the Jewish elders’ arbitration. This is all the more striking if we bear in mind the very different types of cases heard by the *politarchēs* and the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis, at least the four surviving cases in *P.Polit.Jud.*

Moreover, while the documents of *P.Polit.Jud.* clearly suggest that the *politeuma* and *politarchēs* were at the center of a network of village administrators, judges and local prisons, no instance shows that the *politeuma* and *politarchēs* were directly connected to the Jewish community of the Heracleopolite nome. In the letter of Andronikos to Alexander the *politarchēs*, already mentioned, we see no names which are unequivocally Semitic. To be sure, the absence is not itself conclusive. But neither do we see any reference to Jewish elders or archons. The *politarchēs* alone is mentioned. In a second letter, the Jewish prisoner appeals to the *politarchēs* Alexander and the *politeuma* for his

⁷⁸ Enforcement of a dowry (*P.Polit.Jud.* 3); enforcement of a debt repayment schedule (*P.Polit.Jud.* 8); enforcement of a contract for the purchase of a slave girl (*P.Polit.Jud.* 9); ruling regarding a promise of marriage revoked (*P.Polit.Jud.* 4); enforcement of a contract for wool-spinning (*P.Polit.Jud.* 10); enforcement of a contract for the payment for wine received (*P.Polit.Jud.* 11); enforcement of a rental contract (*P.Polit.Jud.* 12).

⁷⁹ For an investigation into the death of a child, see *P.Polit.Jud.* 6; another case concerns either the loss of a household servant, or the custody of a child formerly in his care (*P.Polit.Jud.* 7).

⁸⁰ καθίσταται δὲ καὶ ἔθναρχης αὐτῶν, ὃς διοικεῖ τε τὸ ἔθνος καὶ διατᾶι κρίσεις καὶ συμβολαίων ἐπιμελεῖται καὶ προσταγμάτων, ὡς ἂν πολιτείας ἄρχων αὐτοτελοῦς (‘And an ethnarch is even appointed who manages the people [ἔθνος] and arbitrates suits and has oversight contracts and edicts, as if he were the ruler of an independent government’) (Strabo in Joseph. *AJ* 14.117).

⁸¹ Pointed out by Cowey and Maresch, 2001, p. 28 as well. This may be just what the judges mentioned in *P.Polit.Jud.* 17 and 18 constituted.

release from prison (2.1-5). Here too, the name of the *politarchēs* is not Semitic, nor do we hear any mention of Jewish archons.⁸²

In a third document (*P.Polit.Jud.* 17) the link between the *politarchēs* and the Jewish archons seems, at first sight, more promising. Maresch argues for a clear connection between the two. But on closer investigation the link is not as obvious as it first appears. Straton writes a letter to five officials, ordering that they release some people associated with Alexander son of Stephanus from prison. The title of the five officials is nowhere mentioned. Straton notes that a meeting had taken place between the *politarchēs* and some archons ‘in Tebetnoi’, a local village. The *politarchēs* and archons ‘in Tebetnoi’ have met and written to Straton to order the release of Alexander’s associates, and Straton passes on this message to the five officials. As for the first group of officials, two of the five names mentioned by Straton may or may not have been Jewish, but the other three names are not Semitic.⁸³ Still, this board is not referred to as Jewish elders or archons. The connection between the *politarchēs* and the Jewish archons instead hinges on a reading of a damaged text:

τοῦ πολιτάρχου
 κ[α]ἰ τῶν ἀρχόντων
 τῶν ἐν Τεβέτινοι []
 . . χ . . μένων ὑπὲρ
 τῶν παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου
 τ[ο]ῦ Στεφάνου τῆς αὐτῆς
 κώμης καὶ ἡμεῖν δὲ
 γεγραφότων καλῶς
 προήσετε ἀφέντες
 ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς

‘Since the *politarchēs* and the archons in Tebetnoi ... (or, the archons ... in Tebetnoi) on behalf of those from Alexander son of Stephanus, of the same village, and also wrote us, it would be good for you to release them from prison’ (*P.Polit.Jud.* 17.5-14).

Maresch insists that Straton’s reference to ‘the *politarchēs* and the archons’ (*P.Polit.Jud.* 17.5-7) needs to be parsed in such a way as to separate both ‘the *politarchēs*’ and ‘the archons’ from the reference to Tebetnoi. The reference to Tebetnoi, he argues, is to be taken instead with the following participle, which is illegible.⁸⁴ Maresch’s chief reason for insisting that these are not ‘the archons in Tebetnoi’, hence village elders who are not necessarily Jewish, is his conviction that these must be the archons of the *politeuma*, and therefore should be directly connected with the *politarchēs*.⁸⁵

⁸² Onomastics are mentioned here merely to establish that they do not provide positive evidence for the connection between the *politarchēs* and the *politeuma* and the Jews.

⁸³ Theodotos and Theodosios may well have been Jewish. But nothing suggests Marsyas, Antipatros and Chaireas were (see *P.Polit.Jud.* 17.2-4).

⁸⁴ For discussion, see Cowey and Maresch 2001, pp. 135-36.

⁸⁵ ‘Die Archonten, die anscheinend ἐν Τεβέτινοι getagt haben, sind sicherlich die Archonten des Politeuma von Herakleopolis gewesen, ἐν Τεβέτινοι ist also syntaktisch zum nachfolgenden Partizip zu ziehen, das nicht entziffert werden konnte, und ist nicht Attribut zu τῶν ἀρχόντων. Im Rahmen unseres Archivs wäre es sicherlich abwegig, die ἄρχοντες

Following this line of thought, the activities of the archons were carried out in Tebetnoi, but they were not ‘the archons in Tebetnoi’. What participle could have suited both the former (ἐν Τεβέτινοι) and the latter phrase?⁸⁶ Maresch himself suggests that διεγνωκότων (‘having given judgment’) was rewritten as διεγγυωμένων (‘having taken bail’). Yet the question remains: Why did the *politarchēs* and archons from Heracleopolis travel to Tebetnoi to render their decision, or to receive bail on behalf of those who were with Alexander? The reference to Tebetnoi might conceivably have made more sense if Straton had merely referred to their meeting there. But even so, it seems immaterial where they rendered their decision (or received surety), and so the reference to the location of their meeting is quite unnecessary. It seems far likelier that the ‘archons in Tebetnoi’ and the *politarchēs* together or separately rendered a decision on behalf of those who were from Alexander. The location in which they rendered it would not have been important, but the archons’ association with Tebetnoi would, since Alexander son of Stephanus was from that same village. It is far easier to assume, then, that the *politarchēs*, on behalf of the associates of Alexander, simply met or rendered a decision with the village administrators of Tebetnoi (τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν ἐν Τεβέτινοι[]) (II.6-7).

This passage in itself, then, does not represent independent evidence that the *politarchēs* and the archons of the Jews worked in conjunction with each other; it only reflects that possibility when read in light of that same theory. And Maresch himself notes that there is a good parallel suggesting that village administrators were referred to as archons.⁸⁷ Nothing in the letter even suggests that the archons in Tebetnoi were a Jewish body. In fact, there were Jewish officials in Tebetnoi, though they are elsewhere called ‘elders’, not archons (πρεσβύτεροι).⁸⁸ The connection between the *politarchēs* and the regular archons of Tebetnoi seems fairly clear. It is impossible to make a connection between the *politarchēs*, and the Jewish archons of Heracleopolis, nor can the connection be made on the basis of this passage.

A fourth letter addressed ‘to the πολίτευμα’ (*P.Polit.Jud.* 18.1) implies, once again, connections between the *politeuma* of Heracleopolis and Straton, and also between Straton and a board of judges (κριταί) in Heracleopolis, but does not refer to any archons of the Jews. This is particularly important since we have already seen in *P.Polit.Jud.* 17 a clear connection between the *politarchēs* and Straton. In *P.Polit.Jud.* 18 Straton is contacted by Alexander and some judges in Peempasbytis (see *P.Polit.Jud.* 18.1-3, 12-13). As stated before (see p. 21), a defendant was summoned to court in Peempasbytis for his involvement in a drunken brawl and failed to appear. In the letter, Alexander and the judges in Peempasbytis referred the matter to Straton and the judges in Heracleopolis. As village administrators within the nome, the judges in Peempasbytis

eine solche bezeichnen konnten: *UPZ* I 9, 8 (161/60 v.Chr.) τούτων δέ (die Brüder des Petenten) διασειομένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ κώμη ἀρχόντων’ (Cowey and Maresch 2001, p. 136).

⁸⁶ He himself rules out the possibility of συνηδριωμένων (see Cowey and Maresch 2001, pp. 135-6).

⁸⁷ See *UPZ* I 9, 8, and Cowey and Maresch, *loc. cit.*

⁸⁸ [Παρὰ τῶν ἐν] ἐν Τεβέτινοι πρεσβυτέρω[ν] τῶν [Ι]ουδαίων (see *P.Polit.Jud.* 20.2 = *P.Münch.* III. 1, 49).

were in communication with similar administrators within Heracleopolis, Straton and the judges in Heracleopolis. A second hand addresses the letter to ‘the πολίτευμα’. The connection between Straton, his judges and the *politeuma* is certain. But once again, there is no apparent connection between the *politeuma* and the Jews. Since we have documentation from the early second century of a court (δικαστήριον) in Heracleopolis, Straton and the judges in Heracleopolis are arguably fulfilling the same or a similar function in 143 BCE. The fact that this one document refers to Straton’s associates as κριταί and not δικασταί does not necessarily rule out that they were considered a δικαστήριον.⁸⁹ Together, *P.Polit.Jud.* 17 and 18 suggest that the *politarchēs*, the *politeuma*, Straton and the judges of Heracleopolis had defined roles within a local bureaucracy, with an agreed-upon hierarchy which is only to some extent clear-cut from this limited evidence. But we cannot assume that any, much less all, of these bodies were Jewish organizations.

In conclusion, there is good evidence for a circuit of authority in the Heracleopolitan nome between certain institutions and magistrates, none of which seem to have an exclusively Jewish identity. It is equally clear that this circuit is nowhere explicitly connected to the Jewish archons of Heracleopolis. We saw in *P.Polit.Jud.* 17 that the *politarchēs* who supervised the *politeuma* had some jurisdiction over Straton as well. The *politarchēs* heard appeals and occasionally decided on which cases the judges could be asked to hear, while Straton (perhaps an εἰσαγωγεὺς) managed the court on a day-to-day basis. The *politarchēs* could confer with archons in Tebetnoi and refer such appeals to Straton. Judges in Peempasbytis could also refer cases to Straton and the judges in Heracleopolis, describing Straton and the judges in Heracleopolis as part of ‘the *politeuma*’. There is a clear connection between certain institutions and magistrates of the nome capital — *politeuma*, *politarchēs*, Straton and the judges in Heracleopolis — and certain magistrates in the nome, local magistrates in Tebetnoi and judges in Peempasbytis. Even more important, none of these necessarily involved the Jewish archons of Heracleopolis, or any other exclusively Jewish boards of magistrates. In fact, besides the tenuous connection in *P.Polit.Jud.* 8, no reference to the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis points to any exclusive link between this body and the Jews of Heracleopolis. Jews may well have been registered as citizens in Heracleopolis and hence belonged to the *politeuma*.⁹⁰ They may even have acted as village archons from time to time throughout the nome, and not merely as administrators of the Jewish community.⁹¹ But there is no clear evidence that the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis was exclusively Jewish.

⁸⁹ For instance, despite the distinction in *P.Hal.* 1.26 between δικασταί, δαιτηταί, and κριταί, the court of *chrēmatistai* is elsewhere known as both δικασταί and a κριτήριον (*Papyri Graecae Berolin.* 6a). This suggests that the word δικαστής, at least, could be used in a wider sense. In a papyrus from Heracleopolis, dated by its editor to the early second century BCE, procedural rules for cases before δαιτηταί and κριταί are mentioned, perhaps applicable to the δικαστήριον (*P.Gen.* III 136). Demokritos Kaltsas sees this as a possible reference to the δικαστήριον of Heracleopolis — *P.Heid.* VIII, p. 6. The text is simply too fragmentary to make this conclusion. But the connection between the κριταί and the δικαστήριον is much more likely.

⁹⁰ Cf. *P.Polit.Jud.* 4.3-4 and 7.2.

⁹¹ *P.Polit.Jud.* 17.2-4.

4. Conclusion

Returning to *P.Polit.Jud.* 8, we may review some of these conclusions with respect to the petition of Theodotos to the Jewish archons in particular: τοῖς ἄρχουσι τῷ λζ (ἔτος) τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολίτευμα]τος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ('to the archons of the year 37, of the πολίτευμα in Heracleopolis, of the Jews'). As I have argued, his phrasing suggests that they had some jurisdiction throughout Heracleopolis, though it was the *politarchēs* who most properly bore the title 'the archon' of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis. Loosely speaking, the 'judges in Heracleopolis' functioned as archons, and so there was no room for confusion between the archons of the Jews and the other officials of Heracleopolis. After noting their year of office, Theodotos had intended to write a genitive plural, probably to indicate that these were the archons of the Jews. Instead, he rewrote the text to say that they were 'of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis'. But the addition of τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολίτευμα]τος provides essential information — namely, to which locale the archons in question belonged.

The association referred to as a *politeuma* in four of the papyri from *P.Polit.Jud.* (nos. 1, 2, 8 and 18) does not bear a strong resemblance to other *politeumata* which were ethnic associations. As my brief survey shows, these private associations are primarily known through inscriptions which memorialized deities, benefactors and association members. Clearly they served important religious goals and, judging from the number of prominent administrators somehow connected to them, it follows that their role entailed important social and perhaps political dimensions. There is no evidence that any of them had coercive power, either to arbitrate cases, or to incarcerate members and non-members for transgressions in the society at large. They met for religious purposes, sometimes saw to the burial of their own members, and, at times, their collective voice made them an important participant in their communities. But there is no hint that they defined their members as "citizens", or that they incarcerated members for violations of any sort.

I went on to explore the other and, in fact, more general meaning of *politeuma*, a state or body of citizens with certain autonomy over the governance of their community. By comparison with documents pre- and post-dating the documents in *P.Polit.Jud.*, it seems equally plausible that the members of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis were members of the civic body of Heracleopolis. There were two separate administrative centers in Heracleopolis, Heracleopolis' urban center and its harbor. In *P.Polit.Jud.*, we find a contrast between members 'of the *politeuma*' versus residents 'of the harbor' parallel to the contrast made in another second century BCE text from Heracleopolis (*P.Münch.* I 52) between 'those from the harbor' and 'those from Heracleopolis'. It is a reasonable assumption that 'those from the *politeuma*' were simply members of the civic body of Heracleopolis. Nome capitals were known as *poleis*, and Heracleopolis itself with its long history of maintaining a court might well have used this sort of civic structure to provide itself with sufficient jurors to keep its 'court appointed by lot' (δικαστήριον κληρωτόν) stocked at any given time.⁹² Moreover, the cases from *P.Polit.Jud.* which refer to the *politeuma* or the *politarchēs* seem to suggest that the *politeuma*, its

⁹² *P.Heid.* VIII 412.2-3 and 9.

politarchēs, and the judges of Heracleopolis had a basic policing function beyond the normal powers of the Jewish archons. The Jewish archons, on the other hand, weighed in on contract disputes, this being precisely one of the prerogatives of the later Jewish *ethnarch* of Alexandria as reported by Strabo in Josephus. Aside from the ambiguous connection made in the petition of Theodotos son of Theodotos between the Jewish archons and the *politeuma* over which they enjoyed a certain jurisdiction, we have no clear link between the ‘*politeuma* in Heracleopolis’ and its *politarchēs*, on the one hand, and the Jewish community of the Heracleopolite nome and its archons, on the other. Instead, if the argument that the *politeuma* was rather the civic body of Heracleopolis is borne out by additional evidence, we will have been amply compensated with an intriguing look into the workings of a nome capital in the late Ptolemaic era.

Ave Maria University, Florida

Bibliography

- Barclay, J.M.G. 1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Bell, H.I., W.E. Crum. 1924. *Jews and Christians in Egypt*. London: British Museum.
- Bernand, É. 1975-81. *Recueil des inscriptions grecques du Fayoum*. 3 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bingen, J. 2007. *Hellenistic Egypt: Monarchy, Society, Economy, Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bosnakis, D., K. Hallof 2003. ‘Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos, I’. *Chiron* 33: pp. 203-262.
- Clarysse, W., D. Thompson 2006. *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt: 1, Population Registers (P. Count.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarysse, W., D. Thompson 2009. *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt: 2, Historical Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cowey, J.M.S., K. Maresch 2001. *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Keracleopolis (144/3-133/2 v. Chr.) (P.Polit.Iud.)*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Diller, A. 1975. *The Textual Tradition of Strabo's Geography*. Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert.
- Engers, M. 1918. ‘Die Staatsrechtliche Stellung der alexandrinischen Juden.’ *Klio* 18: pp. 79-90.
- Fraser, P.M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fraser, P.M. 1960. ‘Inscriptions from Ptolemaic Egypt.’ *Berytus* 13: pp. 123-161.

- Fuchs, L. 1924. *Die Juden Aegyptens, in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit*. Wien: M. Rath.
- Harker, A. 2008. *Loyalty and Dissidence in Roman Egypt: the Case of the Acta Alexandrinorum*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Honigman, S. 2002. 'The Jewish Politeuma at Heracleopolis.' *SCI* 21: pp. 251-266.
- Horbury, W, D. Noy 1992. *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horsley, G.H.R. 1994. 'Politarchs in Macedonia and Beyond'. *Mediterranean Archaeology*, 7: pp. 99-126.
- Horsley, G.H.R. 1992. 'Politarches'. In: David N.Freedman et al. (eds.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, V. New York: Doubleday.
- Jones, L. and M. Riel 1997. 'A New Royal Inscription from Phrygia Paroreios: Eumenes II Grants Tyriaion the Status of a Polis.' *Epigraphica Anatolica* 29: pp. 1-28.
- Jouguet, P. 1911. *La Vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine*. Paris: Fontemoing.
- Kasher, A. 1985. *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: the Struggle for Equal Rights*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Launey, M. 1949. *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques: 1, recherches ethniques*. Paris: Boccard.
- Launey, M. 1951. *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques: 2, recherches sociologiques*. Paris: Boccard.
- Lévy, E. 1990. 'Politeia et politeuma chez Polybe.' *Ktéma* 15: pp. 15-26.
- Lüderitz, G. 1983. *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Lüderitz, G. 1994. 'What is the Politeuma?' In: J.W. van Henten and P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*. Leiden - New York - Köln: Brill, pp. 183-225.
- Macridy, Th. 1904. 'À travers les nécropoles sidoniennes.' *Revue Biblique* 13: pp. 547-572.
- Mayser, E. 1923-35. *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. 2 vols. Berlin: W.de Gruyter.
- Mélèze-Modrzejewski, J. 1993. 'How to be a Greek and Yet a Jew in Hellenistic Egypt.' In S.J.D. Cohen, E.S. Frerichs (eds.), *Diasporas in Antiquity*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, pp. 65-92.
- Mélèze-Modrzejewski, J. 1995a. *The Jews of Egypt: from Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*. Tr. Robert Cornman. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Mélèze-Modrzejewski, J. 1995b. 'Jewish Law and Hellenistic Legal Practice in the Light of Greek Papyri from Egypt.' In R. Feenstra, H. Ankum et al. (eds.), *Collatio iuris Romani: études dédiées à Hans Ankum à l'occasion de son 65e anniversaire*. Amsterdam: Gieben, 299-315.
- Mertens, P. 1958. *Les services de l'État civil et le contrôle de la population à Oxyrhynchus au III siècle de notre ère*. Bruxelles: Palais des Académies.
- Mitsopoulos-Leon, V. (ed.) 2001. *Forschungen in der Peloponnes: Akten des Symposions anlässlich der Feier '100 Jahre Österreichisches archäologisches Institut Athen'*, Athen, 5.3.-7.3 1998. Athens: Österreichisches archäologisches Institut Athen.
- Monson, A. 2006. 'The Ethics and Economics of Ptolemaic Religious Associations'. *Ancient Society* 36: pp 221-238.

- Musurillo, H. 1954. *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta alexandrinorum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nelson, C. 1979. *Status Declarations in Roman Egypt*. Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert.
- Robert, L. 1963. *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie-mineure gréco-romaine*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.
- Ruppel, W. 1927. 'Politeuma: Bedeutungsgeschichte eine staatsrechtlichen Terminus.' *Philologus* 82: pp. 268-312, and pp. 433-454.
- Smallwood, E.M. 1961. *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- , E.M. 1976. *Jews Under Roman Rule: from Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden: Brill.
- Tcherikover, V. 1959. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Thompson, D.J. 1984. 'The Idumaeans of Memphis and the Ptolemaic *Politeumata*.' *Atti del 17 Cong. Int. di Papirologia*, pp. 1069-1075.
- Van der Horst, P.W. 2003. *Philo's Flaccus: the First Pogrom*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Van't Dack, E. 1984. 'Notice au sujet de SB I 1106.' *Atti del 17 Cong. Int. di Papirologia*, pp. 1325-1333.
- Walbank, F.W. 1957-79. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wolff, H.J. 1970². *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Wolfson, H.A. 1944. 'Philo on Jewish Citizenship in Alexandria.' *JBL* 63: pp. 165-168.
- Wörle, M. 2003. 'Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos III: Der Synoikismos der Latmioi mit den Pidaseis.' *Chiron* 33: pp. 121-143.
- Zuckerman, C. 1985/86. 'Hellenistic Politeumata and the Jews: A Reconsideration.' *SCI* 8-9: pp. 171-185.