

## 1. THE CAMP OF HIBIS

(Roger S. Bagnall)

In his work on the oases of Egypt, Guy Wagner mentions briefly the late antique remains of Deir Mustafa Kashef, located to the northwest of the ancient city of Hibis. "Pris longtemps pour un couvent fortifié, sa véritable nature de forteresse byzantine a été méconnue. Nous pensons qu'il s'agit du kastron de la ville d'Hibis dont parle Jean Moschus et que nous connaissions déjà, au IV<sup>e</sup> s., sous le nom de κάκτρα Ἰβεωσ." <sup>1</sup> This view of Deir Mustafa Kashef goes back to a visit to the site in 1978 in the company of Jean Gascou and Béatrice Meyer, when Gascou and Wagner recorded their impression of its character: "...qui nous apparaît de plus en plus comme une forteresse et non comme un couvent." <sup>2</sup> No detailed argument is provided to support this impression, but Deir Mustafa Kashef is seen as part of a larger system of defenses: "[Tahunet el Hawa, a tower in the plain] constitue un relais entre le Deir Mustapha Kashef et le Borg el Hammam que nous allons voir et, par delà, vers le Nord, avec tous les points fortifiés dont le plus septentrional sera le fort d'El Gib." <sup>3</sup> The 1979 article was a report of site visits and contains no bibliographic documentation, but in his book Wagner specifies the scholar he views as having misunderstood the nature of Deir Mustafa Kashef, namely Wolfgang Müller-Wiener, in a fundamental article on "Christian monuments" near Hibis. <sup>4</sup>

In Wagner's view, then, the defensive system of Hibis consisted of its military camp, where the main body of the garrison was based, located at Deir Mustafa Kashef; of outlying forts; and of a series of signal relay towers connecting them. There is no doubt that the Kharga Oasis possessed, at least in late antiquity, a number of outlying forts located at various points on the road system connecting the oasis to the northeast (the Nile valley), the south (the Darb el-Arbain to the Sudan) and the west (the Dakhleh Oasis). But Michel Reddé has recently argued that Wagner's scheme imposes too much on a collection of remains that do not give the impression of being part of an overall defensive strategy; Reddé emphasizes, rightly in my view, the role of protecting the lines of communication. <sup>5</sup> The other elements of Wagner's view of the defenses of Hibis appear to me improbable and to need more detailed discussion. I shall deal in turn with (1) the nature of Deir Mustafa Kashef, (2) the nature of the towers, and (3) a more plausible candidate for the camp of Hibis. I shall then (4) turn to consider a side-issue which plays a role in Wagner's argument, the meaning of κάκτρον in Greek of this period and a passage of John Moschus adduced by Wagner as evidence for the military camp of Hibis.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Les oasis d'Égypte à l'époque grecque, romaine et byzantine d'après les documents grecs*. IFAO, Bibl. d'Étude 100 (Cairo 1987) 171. The 4<sup>th</sup> cent. data come from *O.Douch* III 218, 220 and the (then) unpublished *O.Douch* 397 (see commentary to *O.Douch* 218). For John Moschus, see below.

<sup>2</sup> J. Gascou, G. Wagner, and P.J. Grossmann, "Deux voyages archéologiques dans l'Oasis de Khargeh," *BIFAO* 79 (1979) 1-20 at 13. Only Gascou and Wagner were responsible for this part of the article.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 14. The same point is urged in Wagner, *Les oasis* 170-1.

<sup>4</sup> "Christliche Monumente im Gebiet von Hibis (el-Kharga)," *MDAIK* 19 (1963) 121-40. It is also called a monastery by Ahmed Fakhry, *The Necropolis of El Bagawat in Kharga Oasis* (Cairo 1951) 1.

<sup>5</sup> "Sites militaires de l'oasis de Kharga," *BIFAO* 99 (1999) 377-96.

### 1. The Nature of Deir Mustafa Kashef

Deir Mustafa Kashef is described in detail in the article by Müller-Wiener referred to above.<sup>6</sup> As one leaves the ancient city of Hibis and its temple behind heading north, the Christian cemetery of Bagawat—but already a burial zone long before Christianity—lies ahead and somewhat to the west, at the south end of a low ridge which is the southernmost extremity of the Gebel Teir (see [map](#)). This ridge was, indeed, the one natural and permanent zone in the area of Hibis for burial, outside any possible cultivation. As one reaches the entrance to Bagawat, a track to the northwest skirts the foot of the ridge and in a little under two kilometers reaches the site of Deir Mustafa Kashef. The complex consists principally of two structures. On the brow of the ridge is a building of about 24 x 28 meters (measured at its widest point; it is not regular in plan), with high walls and five levels in its original state; adjacent to this are some minor outbuildings [image 1].<sup>7</sup> Below it on the plain is a roughly square complex (about 27 x 29 meters) built entirely of mud brick [image 2]. As Müller-Wiener points out (p. 124), the building on the hillside is built around a rock tomb located in the lower level of the building, cut into the sandstone hillside, which was provided with two antechambers axially arranged [image 3]. This he reasonably interprets as an old tomb reused as the dwelling-place of a hermit, probably the eponymous (but to us unknown) patron saint of the monastery. Such a rock-cut chamber constitutes probably the oldest part of the church at the Monastery of St. Antony, for example, and similarly was the nucleus of the Monastery of Epiphanius on the west bank at Thebes.<sup>8</sup> Although this chamber is perhaps not absolutely decisive for the character of the building, it would certainly require an explanation if the building were claimed to be a military installation. It is also to be noted (p. 135 n. 2) that in some rooms of the lower two floors (that with the rock tomb and that above it) were Coptic graffiti in red paint, including a cross at the east end of the tomb chamber which is still visible by a lamp niche [image 4]. It is also striking that the high wall around Deir Mustafa Kashef has no defensive towers or other signs of military use, and it bears no resemblance to other Roman or late Roman forts in the Kharga Oasis. Reddé, although without argument, concurs: "L'interprétation traditionnelle qui voit dans cet édifice un couvent nous paraît toutefois infiniment plus vraisemblable."<sup>9</sup>

Müller-Wiener had less to say about the mud-brick complex in the plain below the main building, in part because at the time of his visits too much lay buried under debris for the plan to be entirely clear. It has subsequently been cleared in large part by local antiquities officials, and the plan is considerably clearer. But Müller-Wiener already saw the critical point, that the long main room (oriented north-south) [image 5] was a kind of waiting room for the small chapel opening off its east side (with an apse toward the east) [image 6]. Another room opening from the east side, and with a further room opening off it, could also have been a chapel but shows no clear signs of such use. "In den handwerklichen Einzelheiten, Mauertechnik und Ziegelformen, unterscheiden sich die sichtbaren Reste dieser Ruine nicht von denen des Hauptbaues," he says (p. 138). The walls of the large room are thickly covered with Coptic graffiti, Christian in character [image 7], and the small apsidal chapel has a large cross on the wall. An example of these graffiti is given in this volume as Text 31. There are benches all around the large room, and in the three smaller rooms leading from the entrance to the large room [image 8].

<sup>6</sup> *Op.cit.* (above, n. 4) 123-38. My description here is based on this article and on visits to the site on 8 January 1999 and 15 January 2000, the latter time accompanied by Lynn Meskell.

<sup>7</sup> Color images of some buildings, landscapes, and objects mentioned in this paper are available at [www.columbia.edu/cu/classics/personal/bagnall/hibis/index.html](http://www.columbia.edu/cu/classics/personal/bagnall/hibis/index.html). These are indicated by references in brackets like the one given here.

<sup>8</sup> On the monastery of Epiphanius, see most recently the synthesis of L.S.B. MacCoull, "Prophethood, Texts, and Artifacts: The Monastery of Epiphanius," *GRBS* 39 (1998) 307-24.

<sup>9</sup> Reddé, *op.cit.* (above, n. 5) 383.

It seems to me beyond doubt that this valley building is religious in character, and the dispositions seem to suggest that it contained a small chapel with large waiting areas between the entrance and the chapel. Müller-Wiener, without the benefit of a clear view of the plan and fittings, was inclined to suggest a "Teilkloster (vielleicht für Frauen?)," but it may be as likely that this is a building for handling pilgrims to the shrine of the saint whose shrine lay in the lowest level of the building on the hill. At a much grander scale, the example of Saint Symeon in North Syria comes to mind, with its abundant facilities at the foot of the hill where the pillar and the four basilicas around it are situated.

North of the Deir Mustafa Kashef complex is a cluster of remains, partly funerary (on the lower reaches of the ridge), partly not (at the foot of the ridge). The funerary monuments were briefly described by Gasco and Wagner (14-5) under the name of Aïn Zaaf. Of the mud-brick construction in the plain they made no mention [image 9]. Müller-Wiener (139-40) mentions all of them and describes them briefly. Of the complex in the plain, he indicates that it was at the time of his inspection largely covered with sand. He speculates, however, that the entire group of remains at Aïn Zaaf was monastic in character and probably an offshoot of the monastery at Deir Mustafa Kashef. Since his time, the complex has been cleared but is now largely recovered by sand.<sup>10</sup> The plan, nonetheless, is still visible. It is larger than the valley complex at Deir Mustafa Kashef. Only a couple of rooms preserve now-visible plaster with graffiti, partly incised and partly painted. The exact nature of the complex is not evident to me, but the Coptic graffiti, which are manifestly Christian (ΟΥΔΔΙ ΖΝ ΠΔΘΕΙC, "health in the Lord!" occurs in one) do suggest a religious use.

Taken together, the constructions of the southwest quadrant of Gebel Teir are evidently all of late antique date and (unsurprisingly) all Christian. In part they are funerary, in part apparently monastic. There is no reason to see any part of them as military in character, and particularly no reason to think of Deir Mustafa Kashef, which is not even visible from Hibis, as that city's military camp.

## 2. The Nature of the Towers

The two towers are described briefly in the 1979 article on the basis of a short visit. Borg el Hammam is a square tower, 8 m on a side. It is located in the plain to the west of the ridge (Gebel Teir) on which is located Deir Mustafa Kashef, about one kilometer north of Tahunet el Hawa (see below) and about 2 kilometers to the west of Gebel Teir. The lowest level consisted of vaulted rooms, one of which (on the west side) Gasco and Wagner think provided the entrance in the original state of the building [image 10]. Above this level is one with "des niches carrées disposées en ordre régulier sur toute la surface des murs; ces niches semblent accréditer l'hypothèse selon laquelle il s'agirait d'un columbarium (cf. le nom arabe), un pigeonnier" [image 11]. They also note that in the immediate vicinity of this tower are the remains of six wells with a water-distribution network. What they do not remark is the extensive sherd cover of the surrounding fields.<sup>11</sup> Taken in conjunction with the water-distribution channels, the sherds suggest that the tower was the central building of a farm.<sup>12</sup> A similar building in the Dakhleh Oasis has

<sup>10</sup> I have not been able to obtain any information about the excavations of this site, which were presumably the work of the local SCA office.

<sup>11</sup> Observed on a visit on 8 January 1999.

<sup>12</sup> Sherd cover can mean various things, depending on density. It is not likely that this tower is part of an otherwise disappeared village site, and the density of the sherds seems to me more consonant with the habit of carting garbage to the fields as fertilizer. There is extensive discussion of the subject; for recent comments with some bibliography, see B.A. Ault, *Hesperia* 68 (1999) 556-9. Colin Hope remarks (conversation of 10 January 1999) that villagers even in recent times have taken ancient sherds out to the fields to improve the tilth of the otherwise easily-compacted soil; this is not likely to be a modern development.

been published by A. J. Mills [image 12].<sup>13</sup> At the Dakhleh example, inside an enclosure wall stands a structure about 5 m square. At the lowest level are two vaulted rooms with separate entrances; above them is a columbarium. Mills sees this building as a combination of storage and pigeon-house, pigeons being valuable both for meat and for fertilizer. There are numerous additional such buildings in the Dakhleh Oasis, although none is as well-preserved as the one published by Mills.<sup>14</sup> It is most natural to see Borg el-Hammam, as Gasco and Wagner were also tempted to do, as such a farm tower.

If so, however, its role as a watchtower is dubious. The situation with Tahunet el Hawa ("the wind-mill" in Arabic) is somewhat less clear, because less of its inside structure and fittings has survived. It is about 5 x 7 m in dimensions and survives to a height of 11.5 m [image 13]. It is located about 1 kilometer south of Borg el Hammam (much closer than a relay station would require). The entry level, once again, consisted of vaulted rooms, of which only parts survive [image 14]. Above, one can see the emplacements for beams supporting four floors.<sup>15</sup> As with Borg el Hammam, this site offers a large amount of pottery [image 15]. To its south is a good-sized mound of sherds. To the east and immediately to the north are now sand dunes, but if one emerges to the north beyond the sand, in the direction of Borg el Hammam, the pottery cover resumes. It is hard to see why a watchtower (holding only a few men, as Gasco and Wagner note) would produce such an abundance of pottery. Moreover, all around in this plain are the remains of the checkerboard of ridges from abandoned cultivation; this feature is not limited to the area of Borg el Hammam. Before the coming of the sand dunes, the entire plain between the Gebel Teir and the escarpment bordering the oasis on the west was not barren, as it is today; much of it must have been under cultivation.<sup>16</sup> Given what we know of other towers, it seems far more plausible that Tahunet el Hawa was also a farm tower, perhaps the center of what is sometimes termed an *epoikion*, a large farmstead.<sup>17</sup>

### 3. Nadura: κάστρα Ἰβρωσ?

As noted above, Deir Mustafa Kashef is not visible from the town site of Hibis. When one stands in the remains of Hibis, in fact, there is one, and only one, high place with walls, the walled temple of Nadura, which is located just to the southeast of the Temple of Hibis. This temple is mentioned only in passing by Wagner (*Les oasis*, 157), but for the visitor to Hibis the perimeter wall is a dominant feature, towering over the site. The sandstone temple itself is not very large, about 12 x 21 m.<sup>18</sup> But, as Naumann says (p. 11), it "liegt in einer rechteckigen Lehmziegelumwallung auf einer die Landschaft weit überragenden

<sup>13</sup> "The Dakhleh Oasis Columbarium Farmhouse," *Alexandrian Studies in Memoriam Daoud Abdu Daoud*. BSAlex 45 (Alexandria 1993) 193-8.

<sup>14</sup> I visited about a dozen of those in the western end of the Oasis on 9 January 2000 in the company of A.J. Mills and Lynn Meskill. All of those where the upper story is preserved are fitted for pigeons.

<sup>15</sup> Gasco and Wagner, *op.cit.* (above, n. 2) 13-4.

<sup>16</sup> This point is noted by Müller-Wiener, *op.cit.* (above, n. 4) 138 with n. 3, stressing the virtually continuous spread of the signs of cultivation between the valley building of Deir Mustafa Kashef and the tower to the north (meaning Tahunet el Hawa rather than Borg el Hammam, I think).

<sup>17</sup> Reddé, *op.cit.* (above, n. 5) 381, for once abandoning skepticism, says "il s'agit naturellement d'un édifice militaire, servant au guet et à la signalisation, à la sortie nord de Kharga." This view is no doubt connected to his concept of Tahunet el Hawa as part of the chain of defenses along the road coming from Lykopolis, as he expresses it on p. 382. But that is incompatible with his depiction of the lines of communication in fig. 38 (p. 396), where he quite rightly shows the road from Hibis to Lykopolis running to the east of Gebel Teir. Tahunet el Hawa, to the contrary, would be part of a route leading to the west of Gebel Teir, to Um Dabadib and thence to Farafra.

<sup>18</sup> For a brief description see Rudolf Naumann, "Bauwerke der Oase Khargeh," *MDAIK* 8 (1939) 1-16 at 10-3 and Tafel 9.

Anhöhe." The major entrance was on the east side [image 16]; to the north of the gateway there are remains of a bastion; to the south of the gateway the wall is collapsed and the situation less obvious to the eye. This entrance does not quite align with the axis of the temple, which points toward the bastion. The wall is not especially impressive as such things go, and Naumann remarks that it "besteht aus verhältnismäßig schwachen Mauern, die für militärische Zwecke sicher nicht geeignet waren." That does not mean, of course, that they were not eventually used for such purposes. Reddé notes that it is one of a number of temples with circuit walls, clearly not built as fortresses but which nonetheless "ont pu servir de points d'appui à un maillage défensif de l'Oasis, au Bas-Empire, mais sans constituer pour autant de véritables forteresses construites par et pour l'armée."<sup>19</sup> "Military purposes" are not all of one sort. Defense against assault or siege by a major army is not likely to have been the purpose of any military installation in the oases; protection against marauders is much more likely. However unimpressive these walls, those at Deir Mustafa Kashef are not (despite their height) much more substantial.

The site commands an unobstructed view of the entire eastern plain of the oasis, from the north to well south of Hibis [image 17]. The entire course of the north-south road can be seen as far as the eye can see. To the west, the view is again panoramic, with only the part of the plain to the northwest lying in the shadow of Gebel Teir not visible. It is difficult to imagine that the Roman military would fail to use this site for military purposes, given its proximity to the city and its commanding height. To say this is not to suppose that the entirety of the Ala I Abasorum was stationed there; the dispersion of army units was normal.<sup>20</sup>

#### 4. Κάστρον and Κάστρα

In *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 27 (1997) 43-54, Adam Łajtar discusses the meaning of the phrase τὸ κάστρον τῶν Μαύρων τὸ πλησίον Φιλῶν ("the *kastron* of the Mauroi near Philai") occurring in *P.Haun.* II 26. He seeks to show (44-5) that the singular κάστρον does not mean "army camp" as its plural κάστρα does, but rather refers to a settlement, albeit generally a fortified one: "eine Burg, Festung in oder neben einer Siedlung, in die sich die Einwohner bei fremdem Angriff flüchten konnten." It is this usage, he argues, that is the source of the Arabic *qasr*. κάστρον (*castrum*) "ist nicht mit dem Plural κάστρα (lat. *castra*) = 'Militärlager' zu verwechseln. In den griechischen Urkunden Ägyptens ist der Terminus κάστρα nur für das 3./5. Jh. belegt."

That κάστρον came to have this meaning, I do not doubt; indeed, I shall argue that this is the meaning in the passage of John Moschus mentioned earlier. But Łajtar's description of late antique Greek usage in Egypt is overly schematic. There is in fact clear evidence of the use of the singular to refer to a military installation. The following instances are known to me:

*P.Oxy.* XVI 1883.2, where a οὐκάριος κάστρου Ψώβθ(εως) is attested in 504. The same camp is mentioned in *P.Oxy.* XVI 2004, a fifth-century papyrus in which a *cornicularius* of the camp is mentioned (in this case κάστρου) is abbreviated, but the other papyrus shows that this is the correct resolution). The Latin papyrus *CPR* V 13 mentions the *praef(ectus) k( ) Psoftis* in 395 and 396. The editor resolves *k(astri)* on the basis of the use of the singular elsewhere in the text. The appearance of the military titles shows that "camp" is the correct translation here.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Reddé, *op.cit.* (above, n. 5) 382.

<sup>20</sup> Before making this point, Reddé, *ibid.*, 383 momentarily suggests that the the ala was at Ed Deir, to the northeast of Hibis. It seems most unlikely that the *Notitiae Dignitatum* would have referred to Ed Deir as Hibis.

<sup>21</sup> In G. Wagner, *op.cit.* (above, n. 1) 197-8, we find an argument that this Psothis is to be seen as the fortress of the metropolis of the Small Oasis. Wagner cites J. Gascou as proposing a date in the early fifth century for *P.Oxy.* 2004.

*P.Cair.Masp.* III 67296.3 (Antaiopolite), where a petitioner describes himself as ἀποπραιπο-  
 ς[(ίτου)] κάκτρον Π[--- τοῦ αὐτ]οῦ νομοῦ in 535. The petitioner was certainly *praepositus* of a camp,  
 not of a city or village.

*P.Lond.* IV 1433.18 and 276, where the κάκτρον Βαβυλ(ῶνος) is mentioned. Although there was  
 indeed a settlement at Babylon, it will not be disputed that this was a major military fortress and army  
 camp.

Slightly more difficult is the attestation in *P.Laur.* I 33.2, a contract of 391 addressed to Νι]κήτη  
 Καρμάτου ἐπιμ[ε]λητῆ κάκτρον τῆς [. The lacuna at the start of line 3 deprives us of precise informa-  
 tion about this κάκτρον. Nonetheless, the editor's view (note to line 3) that this must be a matter "delle  
 forniture per l'esercito" must be correct. The parallel furnished by two ostraka from Douch is striking:

*O.Douch* III 218.6: ἐπιμελ(ητῆς) κάκτρ(ων) Ἰβεωσ

*O.Douch* III 220.2-3: ἐπιμελιτῆς κάκτρων Ἰβεωσ

Here the resolution is guaranteed by no. 220. The editors cite also no. 397 (then not yet published)  
 as containing the phrase but do not give the precise form. This text has now appeared in *O.Douch* IV,  
 and the text reads ἐπιμελιτ(ῆς) κάκτρων Ἰβεωσ. The office is no doubt the same as that in the  
 Laurenziana papyrus, but with a plural rather than singular (both readings can easily be checked on the  
 plates provided). The exact date of the Douch ostraka is not known, but they will belong to the second  
 half of the fourth century or the early fifth century.

In sum, it appears that in the period from the fourth to early eighth centuries the usage of these  
 words was not yet fixed. Both singular and plural could refer to an army camp. The fact that such camps  
 were routinely enclosed by walls, of varying degrees of strength, must have made the shift to using the  
 term for a settlement surrounded by walls very easy. Just how early the singular became truly special-  
 ized with this meaning is difficult to say on present evidence, but it appears that the distinction was not  
 firmly entrenched until at least the eighth century. The Copenhagen letter which forms the starting point  
 for Łajtar's inquiry is dated only palaeographically, to the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> century. At this period, the meanings  
 may not have diverged clearly, but even this remains to be shown.

In this light, a passage in John Moschus's *Pratum spirituale* cited by Guy Wagner as evidence for  
 the military camp at Hibis is interesting. In this story (chapter 112, PG 87C, 2976-8; translation in  
*Sources Chrétiennes* 12, pp. 163-5), a number of monks in the Oasis are taken prisoner by the maraud-  
 ing Mazikes, not later than the time of the emperor Tiberius II (578-582). One of them is taken to the  
 city, in order to try to get 24 solidi to ransom a group of elderly and ailing monks. But the bishop can  
 find only 8 solidi, and the barbarian spokesman refuses this sum: ἢ δότε μοι κδ' νομίσματα ἢ μόναχον,  
 he says: "either give me 24 solidi or a monk." The story proceeds, ἠναγκάσθησαν οὖν οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ  
 κάκτρον δοῦναι τὸν ἀββᾶν Ἰωάννην τῷ βαρβάρῳ, "so those from the *kastron* were obliged to give  
 (back) Abba Ioannes to the barbarian." It is clear here that the *kastron* is the same as the *polis* already  
 mentioned, and that it is the seat of the bishop.<sup>22</sup> It has nothing to do with an army camp. This passage is  
 therefore not, despite Wagner, evidence for the camp at Hibis.<sup>23</sup> Rather, this is a clear instance of the use  
 of the singular to refer to a town, the meaning posited by Łajtar.

To summarize: Hibis certainly had a military camp in the fourth century. How much earlier it ex-  
 isted, and how much later, is difficult to be certain. It was probably centered on, even if not limited to,  
 the most visible strong point in the immediate vicinity of the city, namely the hill of Nadura with its

<sup>22</sup> This passage is given a very approximate translation by William Dalrymple, *From the Holy Mountain: A Journey  
 among the Christians of the Middle East* (New York 1998; first ed. London 1997) 451-2. Dalrymple suggests (451) that "the  
 ruined temple [of Hibis] is almost certainly the site of the Lavra [the monastery] of the Great Oasis which Moschos men-  
 tions." He seems not to have known about Deir Mustafa Kashef and the other buildings in its area.

<sup>23</sup> Wagner, *op.cit.* (above, n. 1) 171. On 397-8, by contrast, he recognizes that *polis* and *kastron* are the same.

mud-brick enclosure walls, probably sufficient for the purposes of the fort, which were local security and policing rather than defense against major military formations. The area to the west of the Gebel Teir, to the northwest of the city, included an extensive cultivated zone, with towers housing farm activities like pigeon-raising, and an area at the west edge of the Gebel Teir (and just north of the cemetery at Bagawat) full of monastic establishments. John Moschus uses the term *laura* to refer to one of these, but it is impossible to know if this was one of those the remains of which are visible today or not. Be that as it may, the desert terrain at this east side of the plain was typical monastic territory, in the desert but not very far from the cultivated land or the city. The walls of Deir Mustafa Kashef no doubt bear witness to exactly the insecurity depicted by John Moschus and the need to be secure against raids by small parties of marauders.

*Columbia University*