

OFFPRINT FROM  
JARCE XIV (1977)  
J.J. AUGUSTIN, PUBLISHER  
LOCUST VALLEY, N.Y. 11560

## Army and Police in Roman Upper Egypt\*

ROGER S. BAGNALL

Life in rural areas in antiquity was hazardous to person and property. As one moved away from the centers of population, the risk of being robbed, assaulted, or killed increased.<sup>1</sup> Both travellers and country residents were constantly beset by these problems. The extent and nature of the lawlessness in any area, naturally, depended in part on the degree to which it was thickly settled, had urban centers, and had a tradition of controlling violence.

Roman Egypt had a large measure of both violence and the means to control it. Several groups were the sources of this rural insecurity. The principal external threat was various groups of (non-Egyptian) nomads in the deserts to the east and west of the Nile Valley; the border of the cultivated land with the desert was a long one and hard to defend, while the targets in the valley were tempting. The nomads were hard to ward off, and even harder to pursue after a raid. By contrast, the southern neighbors of Egypt were, in the Roman period, only a minor threat and more easily kept out.<sup>2</sup>

The internal enemy was still more difficult. Egypt had its share of ordinary criminals, or more exactly, of criminal behavior on the part of ordinary people; many of the numerous complaints and petitions in the papyri are accusations against known persons. But there were also brigands at large whose crimes were more anonymous, whose victims could denounce the deed but not the doer. These would normally live in the area of the desert nearest to the cultivated area — within a few miles of the “Black Land”, in fact — reasonably secure in the numerous hiding places afforded by the wadis and hills. Their numbers were in part provided by those who had fled from their homes to avoid prosecution or taxes, the ἀνακεχωρηκότες. These and the brigandage they caused throughout the countryside were not a new phenomenon under the Romans;<sup>3</sup> even under the fairly flourishing conditions of the middle of the third century B.C., one finds in a papyrus the injunction, “But if any, being driven by a storm, are not able to anchor on the promontory when they come to the harbor and its appurtenances, let them announce to the police the reason and the place in which they have anchored. To those who have reported, the chief of police shall send a guard adequate to protect them while they are moored, so that no violence may be done.”<sup>4</sup>

Unlike most areas of the Roman Empire, Egypt also had a tradition of professional police forces to guard the desert confines and maintain peace in the valley. The police, called Medjay (*Mdꜣw*) in the New Kingdom, were organized and dressed in much the same way as the army, but they formed a distinct organization; the provision of such police goes as far back as the Old Kingdom.<sup>5</sup> The Ptolemies had, apparently, continued the main lines of this system with their *phylakitai*, who were also not a part of the army but were organized rather like it.<sup>6</sup> The *phylakitai* were, at any rate, professionals, career police with a permanent position and regular pay, serving voluntarily like soldiers.<sup>7</sup>

This professionalized force was not an institution characteristic of the rest of the empire acquired by the Romans, neither of the Greek cities, nor of Italy, nor of the less civilized and largely tribal areas of Europe (the urbanization of which was in its infancy). The Romans themselves had never

taken much interest in providing police protection in areas they ruled, particularly not in a costly professional form.

In the empire at large, the emperors, like the Senate, did not take any comprehensive action, preferring as usual to leave such matters to local authorities, but they did begin to develop what in fact became the dominant security system outside of the cities, the network of military *stationes*, principally along roads, which will be discussed later. This development was, however, anything but deliberate and organized, and it is not until the second half of the second century that this use of military police can be called a system.<sup>8</sup> Much of the burden fell, then and later, on the cities; we have considerable evidence, especially in Asia Minor, of officials (liturgic and civic, not part of the imperial administration) in charge of preserving order.<sup>9</sup>

In Egypt, the Romans soon brought about the dissolution of the professional police force of the Ptolemies (the *phylakitai*), though an ἐπιστάτης φυλακῶν continues to appear for a few decades more, himself vanishing after A.D. 42.<sup>10</sup> Whatever his function was in this period, it was certainly not the command of *phylakitai*.<sup>11</sup> In the countryside the *phylakitai* were replaced by a two-part structure. There were military *stationes*, analogous to those found elsewhere in the empire, with officers of the rank of centurion or lower in command. But there were also φύλακες, guards, who as a body served as a sort of village police force.<sup>12</sup> These positions were paid, though not well; and there is no evidence before the second century for any of them as liturgies.<sup>13</sup> Our evidence for the date when these positions became liturgical, however, is very scanty — only a few documents are responsible for most of the dates now available.<sup>14</sup> When the posts do become liturgical, they carry a *poros* (in the sense of the holder's independent annual income) of 200 to 800 drachmas, even though the holders continued to be (badly) paid.<sup>15</sup> The variety of these positions was large: some fifteen words compounded with φύλαξ are known for titles of positions which were liturgical by the end of the second century.<sup>16</sup> It appears that persons were nominated simply to be guards, and only later assigned to some specific duty.<sup>17</sup> Collectively, they were called the *demosioi* of the village, and one finds them receiving orders from military officers detailed to police duty.<sup>18</sup>

These military security officers were certainly present from the earliest days of the Roman occupation of Egypt, but it is only in the latter part of the second century that they achieved a dominant role; they received far more complaints in the late second and the third century than in earlier periods.<sup>19</sup> The further development of the police system in the Byzantine period does not directly concern us here, but it showed a very similar parallelism of military and civilian police.<sup>20</sup>

Most of the evidence cited so far comes from the Fayûm and other areas in Middle Egypt, that part of Egypt for which our knowledge of Roman administration is best. Nothing overtly suggests that these institutions were not also operative in the Thebaid, the area with which we are here concerned; at the same time, the Thebaid had differences with the rest of the country which made the needs of the area somewhat different and which may lie behind some of the institutions peculiar to this region which I will be describing later.

The Thebaid was the area of Egypt least Hellenized in the Ptolemaic period, and it was the source of many of the rebellions which occurred then.<sup>21</sup> The population was nearly all Egyptian, and the virtual destruction of Thebes itself in the first century B.C. had eliminated the only major urban center of the district and replaced it with a collection of villages. It must have been harder, under these circumstances, for a liturgic system depending on a supply of prosperous farmers with a *poros* of 200 drachmas or more to serve as guards to function properly. The land was farmed largely by poor peasants, who were not proprietors but lessees from the state.

The Thebaid was also the terminus for numerous roads leading from the Eastern Desert, where many mines and quarries were operated, and through the desert from the Red Sea ports of Berenike, Myos Hormos, and Leukos Limen.<sup>22</sup> The products of the desert were of great importance to the

Romans. Such activities indeed must have needed careful protection, involving as they did isolated settlements and long lines of communication through difficult country, and there is abundant evidence of military units stationed in the area and active both in the desert itself and on its edges.<sup>23</sup>

The Thebaid was, finally, the part of Egypt nearest to Nubia, and hence a border zone, even if a relatively calm one. It was also certainly the area most exposed to the depredations of whatever nomads of the desert might be present, the more so as it was the first part of Egypt encountered by any such nomads moving north from the Nubian desert. These various threats to security, then, combined with a poorer and less Hellenized population, traditionally recalcitrant in the face of foreign rule, must have made the Thebaid perennially difficult to police.

A substantial body of new evidence has recently been added from several collections of ostraka, principally those of Florida State University and the University of Amsterdam. The Florida ostraka include approximately equal numbers of official and private letters, all in Greek except for three Latin fragments. These letters are written from decurions and other officers to their fellow officers and *curatores* of *praesidia*. They come from the encampment of the Cohors I Augusta Praetoria Lusitanorum Equitata at Contrapollinis Maior (Resediyah), across the river from Edfu; they date approximately to the middle third of the second century. Several of these texts are of interest for the problem of police work which we are considering here.

The general context in which these texts appear is worth describing a bit further.<sup>24</sup> The garrison at Resediyah controlled the terminus of one of the major routes across the Eastern Desert to the port of Berenike, although this route was not used extensively for caravan trade during the Roman period, since that trade came down to Berenike from the more northerly Coptos. The desert area entered by the road from Resediyah did, however, hold a number of gold mines, quarries for building stones, and mines of precious stones. This road was also of considerable importance for the military control of the desert in general against any possible marauders from the south, and in all periods appears to have had considerable military significance. We are dealing here, then, with a combination of border defense and control of strategic roads.

The Roman army maintained a network of roads, with numerous desert stations with wells or cisterns, well-fortified garrison points (*praesidia*). Small detachments, for the most part, held these points; several of the ostraka deal with the dispatch of soldiers to one point or another. *O.Florida* 3 refers to one such action; the place Aphis to which men were sent is not locatable, but it recurs in the Amsterdam ostraka and is probably a desert station. A number of the ostraka reveal the natural concern with supplies which obsessed those living far from the Nile Valley, a concern frequently at issue in the ostraka from the Wadi Fawakhir, further north, published by Guéraud more than three decades ago. *O.Florida* 15 and 17 also provide graphic evidence for the attempts of the relatives and family of soldiers on duty (as cavalry, it seems, in no. 15) to provide otherwise unobtainable food for them, especially meat. Other documents originating from the soldiers in such situations and their families also reveal the great difficulties caused by the loneliness, separation, and boredom which were the natural accompaniments of the life of the desert outposts.

*O.Florida* 2 is a letter of the decurion Herennius Antoninus to an Amatius whose title is not given, but who is probably a *curator*. He says, "Since the son of Balaneus who is in the watchtower is a boy, speak to the *dekanos* so that he may place a young man in his stead; for I also have sent orders to him about him."<sup>25</sup> One has here a contingent of persons commanded by a *dekanos* and in charge of a watchtower (σκόπελος), but in turn under the command of the military officers. Some further information is provided by the fragmentary *O.Florida* 6, in which a decurion writes to a *curator praesidii*, giving some order relative to *skopelarioi* and their *dekanos*. We learn, thus, that the men in a *skopelos* were called *skopelarioi*; in both cases their commander is a *dekanos*, but he in turn is controlled by military officers.

*O.Florida 24* is a list of guards headed with the words σκοπ(ελάριοι) Ἰσιδήου, watchtower-guards of Isideion, which is almost certainly a place-name of the theophoric sort common enough in desert stations.<sup>26</sup> The names are all Egyptian, a number of them previously unattested; but that is not astonishing in a locality from which large numbers of texts do not survive. Above lines 5 and 9 appears a symbol somewhat like that for *dekanos* in the Theban lists which will be discussed later, and it is likely enough that the commander would be indicated in a list of these guards; but there are two, and we cannot be certain of the meaning. We cannot tell whether the watchtower of these guards was in the valley, on the edge of the desert, or actually out in the desert, but we can at least conclude that these guards played a part in supplementing the system of military policing and surveillance of the desert and its adjacent areas with which the ostraka in general deal.

Some further information is provided by the Amsterdam ostraka, which were purchased in Luxor but whose provenance is unknown.<sup>27</sup> *O.Amst. 8* is made up of several fragments from what was originally a very large "ostrakon" — the better part of a large pot, in fact. Fragment *a-b* begins with a broken word which is probably *stationes* or *stationarioi*, followed by a list of *skopeloi* with place names (Hebeion, Ision, Palaia Kome) and the names of persons. The list is composed by days, for the ἀλλαγὴ of each of several days is mentioned. Fragment *d* refers to the ἀλλαγὴ σκοπέλων Φαμενώτ ξ, proceeding to list again the same *skopeloi* and names of persons with them, one to a *skopelos*. Fragment *e* lists *stationes*, with four names for each day of the month, the first followed by *prima* in Greek characters, the second by *secunda*, the third by *tertia*, and the fourth by *quarta*. After two days this changes to giving Roman numerals.

The second column of this fragment is headed οὐεγτιγαλιωνες; there follow dates from 1 to 15 before the sherd breaks off. Each date has two names, one denoted ἄνω and the other κάτω. Each pair of men serves on alternate days, reversing positions each time (an ab, cd, ba, dc ab, cd pattern). Now *vectigalio* is not attested in Latin (nor in Greek; indeed no derivative of *vectigal* is listed by *LSJ*, its *Supplement*, or the *Wörterbuch*). It is most likely to be a synonym for *vectigaliarius*, attested only in Firmicius Maternus as a collector of *vectigalia*; alternatively, one may see it as a term for the place rather than the person, a synonym for *vectigalium*.<sup>28</sup> It is interesting that these are listed on the same ostrakon with *stationes*; but they are distinguished from the latter.

*O.Amst. 10* is a list headed κατ' ἄνδρα σκοπ[ελάριοι] and containing the names of 8 Egyptians. There is no extant mark for a *dekanos*, but it could have stood in the middle of the lines, as in the Florida list, for the sherd is broken off at the right. *O.Amst. 12* lists ἁ Τῦβι στατιωνάριο[ι]. The list proceeds to the second and third of the month.

One ostrakon from a private collection recently published by P. J. Sijpesteijn is also of interest here, even though it is fragmentary.<sup>29</sup> It is the right-hand side of a letter to a *duplicarius* named Appianus, in which his correspondent appears to be informing him of the identities of the φύλακας for a certain month; as the letter is dated Epeiph 30, the month in question is probably the next one, Mesore. There are six guards listed, with their ages given (ranging from 24 to 39). Not much is preserved of the names of the guards, but what there is points unmistakably to an Egyptian identity for them.<sup>30</sup> It is worth pointing out that φύλακας is broken, and that there may well have been a compound word there instead of the simple form.

We must turn now to an examination of the details and implications of the system of policing in use in the Thebaid as it is suggested by this new evidence, with particular attention to the *stationes* and the *skopeloi* and their occupants.

The system of *stationes*, as we saw earlier, was known through much if not all of the Roman empire.<sup>31</sup> In some provinces many of the holders or commanders of these *stationes* were *beneficarii*, often *beneficarii consulares*. It is not at all clear whether they held their posts alone or with some subordinates; in all likelihood practice varied according to local circumstances and the manpower

at the disposition of the higher military authorities.<sup>32</sup> They were intended primarily to keep the peace and to afford security in the countryside, but as time went on the government used them in conjunction with other officials, notably the *colletiones*, for various other purposes such as the exaction of taxes or at least the security of that process.<sup>33</sup> The references to *stationarii* in Asia Minor are numerous — and often uncomplimentary in the third century at least.<sup>34</sup> The *stationarii* were persons of some importance on the local scene, and the *stationes* were the skeleton of the Roman security system; in later times the *stationes* also served as the backbone of the *cursus publicus*.<sup>35</sup>

We saw earlier that in Egypt the establishment of *stationes* goes back to the earliest days of the empire but that the importance of these military police posts grows greatly in the more insecure days of the later second century. This is in fact typical of the empire as a whole; in the time of Marcus Aurelius the *stationarii* had practically reached the point of being a standing police force, still retaining, however, their military character.<sup>36</sup> A similar conclusion was reached by G. Alföldy for Noricum, where almost all of the datable dedications come from the Severan period or after.<sup>37</sup> The characteristics of the Egyptian system do not seem to have been much different from those of the *stationes* of other provinces, and their method of operation has long been fairly clear.<sup>38</sup> Centurions, decurions, *beneficiarii*, *optiones*, and *principales* are all attested as heads of *stationes*.<sup>39</sup> The people who commonly sent petitions and complaints to these officials regarded them as having a local jurisdiction of a well-defined sort. It must be remarked that such posts can have provided only minimal policing in any area with a significant population.

Where do the *skopelarioi* fit into such a system? There was only one attestation of the term before these new ostraka, and that also on an ostrakon from the desert, from Kôm Kolzum in the area of Suez; the context of that mid-third century text, however, does not advance our inquiry.<sup>40</sup> The *skopelarioi* are evidently Egyptians, and as their nomenclature is quite different from that of the auxiliary soldiers of the Cohors I Lusitanorum, we must conclude that they are not members of this army unit.<sup>41</sup> They surely come, in fact, from the non-hellenized stratum of the population, whereas the auxiliaries of the Roman army in Egypt came mostly from the Hellenic or Hellenized populace. The *skopeloi* seem to be smaller than what we would normally think of as *stationes*, but it is perfectly possible that their occupants did not use these terms with technical precision. Before we turn to a further category of Egyptian evidence, it will be useful to look further at the comparative material in other parts of the empire.

The most directly parallel institution elsewhere, one known in several provinces, is that of the *burgi*, towers, and their occupants the *burgarii*. The *burgus* was a small tower or fort; late writers define it as a "castellum parvulum" (Vegetius 4.10) or "habitaculum" along the border (Isidore, *Or.* 9.4).<sup>42</sup> These small forts were constructed to fill in the gaps between the larger fortresses (*praesidia*) on the border; they provided opportunities for surveillance of the more remote regions otherwise difficult to patrol.<sup>43</sup> They were, in turn, larger than  $\phi\rho\rho\rho\rho\rho\rho$ .

The construction of these *burgi* began at least as early as Trajan, but our evidence centers chiefly on the extensive building of them by Antoninus, Commodus and, much later, by Valentinian. Numerous copies have been found of the inscription of Commodus' reign, ordered by his legate, which defined the purpose of the construction: "ripam omnem bu[rgis] a solo extractis item praes[i]dis per loca opportuna ad clandestinos latrunculorum transitus oppositis."<sup>44</sup> This series was found in lower Pannonia; Andreas Alföldi has demonstrated that the *latrunculi* are to be regarded as barbarians attempting to raid the settled country for plunder.<sup>45</sup> On the other hand, other purposes were possible. An inscription from the time of Valentinian (A.D. 371) is worth quoting, even though it is later than the period we are concerned with:<sup>46</sup> it is the dedication of a "praepositus legionis primae Martiorum una cum militibus sibi creditis," who "hunc burgum cui

Commercium, qua causa et factus est a fundamentis et construxit et ad summam manum operis in diebus XXXXVIII." On the other hand, an inscription from Thrace reveals that Antoninus Pius had *burgi* and *praesidia* built for the safety of the province.<sup>47</sup>

Similar establishments are also found in North Africa; an inscription from a locality to the south of the oasis of El-Kantara in Numidia notes the construction of a *burgus* for *speculatores* between two roads, an upper one and a lower, in A.D. 188, *ad salutem commeantium*.<sup>48</sup> More evidence could be cited, but the point is clear: these *burgi* were constructed in considerable numbers, very quickly, to control crucial points along roads and river crossings, especially on frontiers, principally to protect communications and defend settled areas from marauders. Their precise purpose naturally depended on their location and time.<sup>49</sup> The policing of borders has many possible motives, several of which can operate simultaneously without any logical difficulty: the exclusion of unwanted outsiders, the collection of customs duties and taxes, providing security for traders in a remote region.

About the tenants of the *burgi*, the *burgarii*, we are somewhat less well-informed. The most useful text is the foundation inscription of Pizos in Thrace, from A.D. 202.<sup>50</sup> One of the privileges granted to this new emporium is συ[τελ]εῖας βουργαρίων καὶ [φ]ρουρῶν καὶ ἀγγαρειῶν ἀνεῖν, dispensation from providing *burgarii* and guards and transport. Who are the *burgarii*? Rostovtzeff says, "it is well known that the *burgarii* in the second century (beginning with Hadrian) were corps of native troops (*numeri*) who had to defend the small forts built on the frontier."<sup>51</sup> He cites a variety of evidence for the *burgi*, but I do not think it is self-evident that all guards in a *burgus* must be precisely *burgarii*, in a technical sense. We must examine the evidence more closely.

The point of the remark in the Pizos inscription that the new emporium does not have to provide *burgarii* is rightly explained by Rostovtzeff on the basis of other evidence for cities' being required to furnish recruits for the army. Some further evidence comes from two inscriptions from the Roman fort at Kopačeni in Dacia Inferior (at the emergence of the Oltul from the Carpathians), a few years apart in date (the end of Hadrian's reign and the start of Antoninus'), dedications by a *numerus burgariorum et veredariorum*.<sup>52</sup> It is difficult, with so little evidence, to comment meaningfully on the status of these *burgarii*. Labrousse (*supra*, n. 49) argued that they were militarized but not really soldiers, serving rather functions of construction and communication. This, I think, goes beyond the evidence. We do not know if recruitment was already compulsory under Hadrian, but clearly in 202 it was. Rostovtzeff remarks on this that the situation in the Pizos text foreshadows the general situation in the fourth century, but that "it is impossible to state if this *munus* was a personal one (*munus personale*) or a *munus* combined with the tenure of land (*munus patrimonii*). In every case it is certain that the responsibility for it rested not only on individuals but on the village-communities as a whole."<sup>53</sup>

These *numeri* of *burgarii* were in fact military units, but it is certain that they were recruited on a rather different basis from the regular army, and we can say nothing about their term of service, pay, or other conditions of military life. This is all the more regrettable in that it makes it difficult for us to reinforce any conclusions about the *skopelarioi* of the Thebaid, whether they too are to be regarded as a *numerus* and thus part of the army, or rather as civilians performing a more temporary liturgy or *corvée*. We must now turn back to some further Theban evidence for investigation.

The group of texts I propose to examine is that of the so-called *dekania* lists commonly found on Theban ostraka. Among the thousands of published ostraka is a certain number, running into the hundreds, of lists of names, and we may imagine that the collections of Europe and North America contain a considerable number more, since they are not usually of very great interest to an editor. Their contents range from the pure list of names with no other information to the list whose

purpose is in some way defined, even if we cannot always understand it. Among the latter is the group which editors commonly call *dekania* lists.

Three characteristics serve to distinguish these lists from others: a heading, most often simply a number, a totalling of the number of men at the bottom of the text; and a mark ( $\bar{\iota}$  or  $\bar{\imath}$ ) indicating δεκανός in the margin by one of the names. Some texts have all three of these characteristics, others one or two; since many ostraka are not perfectly preserved, one cannot always be certain whether a given piece originally was a *dekania* list or not. One other characteristic is important to notice: all of these ostraka come, so far as can be determined, from the Theban region; there are none of this type from other parts of Egypt.<sup>54</sup>

Editors of ostraka have generally chosen not to say much about these lists, a reticence which appears natural in the face of the uninformative nature of the texts. The most detailed discussion was that of Paul Viereck,<sup>55</sup> who noted that the *dekania* lists did not always have ten men; that the *dekanos* was not always the first-named; that the numbers at the top of the texts indicated that there were many collected together; and that they had an official origin, connected either with liturgy or with taxes. He also thought that Milne<sup>56</sup> was probably right in connecting the *dekanos* with the tax on hunting-boats. Except for the last of these observations, Viereck's remarks are correct, and when subsequent editors have provided any commentary at all, they have simply repeated Viereck's conclusions.<sup>57</sup>

I have collected in an appendix (*infra*, pp. 77 ff.) information on 158 *dekania* lists, all those so far available which can be attributed to this group with some confidence.<sup>58</sup> A large number of these (about three-quarters) has been published since Viereck wrote,<sup>59</sup> and the evidence is thus much more plentiful than what he had available. The arguments below are based on this appendix and cite documents by the numbers assigned to them there.

Of 126 ostraka where a heading is present or the top of the ostrakon is complete, 81 have numbers (not counting dates). These numbers range over a scale of 1 to 89. There is a preponderance of the lower numbers: 35 are in the range 1-10, 16 in 11-20, 10 each in the next two decades, 5 between 51 and 60, and 3 between 81 and 89 (none between 61 and 80 are extant). Even if we make some allowance for accident of preservation, we can be certain that we are dealing with something which ranged routinely up to 40 and not infrequently beyond, but which tended to frequent largely the lower end of the range. It is clear that this phenomenon cannot represent days of the month. A number of ostraka in fact provide evidence of what the phenomenon is:

- 27 Ἀγορᾶς
- 70 Χά(ρακος) β̄ τόπου
- 74 βο(ρρᾶ) β̄
- 75 Ἀγο(ρῶν) βο(ρρᾶ) β̄
- 81 η (line 1); εἰς ἰβ̄ (3); εἰ(ς) δ Ἀγο(ρῶν) βο(ρρᾶ) (5,8)
- 94 π . . . Ἀγο(ρῶν) βορρᾶ ἰ̄
- 122 Κερα(μείων) β̄ δ[εκ(ανίας)]; Κεραμέων γ̄ δεκ(ανίας); δ̄ δεκ(ανίας)
- 142 τόπου Πανίσκου νεωτ(έρου) δεκ(ανοῦ)
- 149 Χ(άρακος) πθ

From these we are justified in concluding that the various quarters of the Theban region — Charax, Agorai, Agorai North, Kerameia, and no doubt the others not represented here — could have attached to their names numbers which indicated τόπος or δεκανία. These two designations seem to function interchangeably, so that *dekania* must have a significance for location.

We do not know how many districts there were in the region which was covered by this system, but 15 may not be too far from the total number of significant discrete districts.<sup>60</sup> If these had an

average of 40 of these places or *dekaniai*, and if each of them had about 9 men actually in it,<sup>61</sup> one would have 5,400 men listed at one time in these lists. Even if these numbers are incorrect by conceivable margins, the amount of men can hardly have been less than half this nor more than twice it. Anything in this range is to be most reasonably viewed as a significant fraction, but certainly not the totality, of the adult male population of the Theban region.

For some reason, then, the Roman government of the Theban region found it useful to keep rosters of a portion of the male population. Women are not found in the lists, and several lists which give after the name of one of the men 18S, i.e. 14 years old, indicate that it was at this age that one was added to the available pool.<sup>62</sup> Other factors worthy of note are that frequently members of the same family occur on the same list — sometimes dominating their group, indeed — a fact which emphasizes the local character of the groups; and that the persons listed are universally Egyptian peasants of the same class responsible for most of the money and grain tax receipts of the Theban ostraka; some of them are specifically identifiable as such.

In one text, no. 105, we find a Καλόκαιρ(ος) Αἰθίοψ δουλ(ος) κλη(ρονόμων) Αἰλο(υρίωνος) ν(εωτέρου) Ἄσκ(λᾶτος). The identification of the deceased master suggests that his obligation for the year was not extinguished by death, and that his heirs chose to have one of his slaves discharge it. It may be that no son of legal age survived the man in question, something which would not be at all unlikely given the high mortality rate in this population.<sup>63</sup> That the obligation survived the person may suggest that it lay not on the individual but either on his holding of land (one recalls Rostovtzeff's remarks about *burgarii*) or, perhaps more likely, on the community or its subdivisions as entities rather than on specific persons.

The survival of the system of *dekaniai* in the form represented by these lists cannot be demonstrated for a period after about the mid-third century; one cannot be precise because of the absence of dating criteria except the handwriting. There is, however, an interesting indication that a system of *dekaniai*, designating subdivisions of an area, existed in the sixth century at Aphrodito in the Antaiopolite Nome. *Agrophylakes* were assigned for a period of a year to provide surveillance of irrigation and other activities in a specific *dekania*, these *dekaniai* having place names.<sup>64</sup> It is possible that this is in some way a survival of such a system of subdivision.

What, then, was the purpose for which these lists were maintained, and what did the *dekanoi* do? The evidence on *dekanoi* and *dekaniai* from elsewhere is not very helpful. It tells us principally that the terms can occur in a variety of situations, in connection with different public services and taxes. Among these are transportation, boats, dikes, wheat and some not comprehensible. The evidence is not abundant for any of them, and they do not suggest an explanation for what seems a fairly coherent system in the Thebaid. A few examples will show what I mean.

One of these is a group of *dekanoi* (four or more) in A.D. 325 from the village of Paneuei who hire a ῥαβδοῦχος for 2000 drachmas per day to provide animals they are responsible for sending to Babylon for the imperial visit; they are thus concerned with land transport.<sup>65</sup> More common are mentions of boats; we have already mentioned Milne's connection of the *dekanos* with hunting-boats, which rests on *O.Theb.* 77 and 78, where a *dekanos* and his associates pay for these boats. Another connection with boats appears in the Byzantine payment-order SB I 4907, given for a payment to a *dekanos* ὑπὲρ [πλοίων ἀπερχομέ]νων ἐν Ἀλεξανδρ(εία).<sup>66</sup> A text from year 30 of Augustus is a complaint from the surety of two men, τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης δεκανῶν χώματος τοῦ κατὰ Κόμα, who had failed to appear, causing the surety financial loss.<sup>67</sup> A *dekania* of wheat is attested by a text of A.D. 125, an agreement of ten Egyptians describing themselves as οἱ δέκα . . . οἱ . . . ἔχον[τες] δεκα[νε]ίαν πυροῦ.<sup>68</sup> There are a number of other references to *dekanoi* and *dekania*, but they provide so little context as to be useless for understanding the term.<sup>69</sup>

We are not much advanced by a direct attack on these texts mentioning *dekanoi* or *dekania*,



then, except to realize that these are in themselves vague terms referring to practically any chief of a group of small size, engaged in various sorts of enterprise, or to his group.<sup>70</sup> We must work from within the body of the material to seek further understanding.

A series of titles on *dekania* lists which do not have the usual district number at the top may help provide a direction:

25	ἡμεροφύλ(ακες) μηνὸς Μεσορή τοῦ ι (ἔτους)	4	νυκτοφύλ(ακες) Θῶθ τοῦ ιε (ἔτους)
43	ἡμεροφύλ(ακες) μην(ὸς) Χοϊάκ τοῦ ια (ἔτους) Ἄδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου	3	πρὸς ῥύμη Αἰλουροταφίου
44	ἡμεροφύλ(ακες) μηνὸς Ἀθύρ	97	πρὸς τῆ ῥύμη Ἐρμοδώρου
54	ἡμ(ερο)φύλ(ακες) Φαρμουῖθι β (ἔτους)	47	ⲓⲕⲮ οἱ ἐν τῷ Θερμουθίωι
135	ἡμεροφύλ(ακες) Τῦβι	12	Ⲯ ἄλωνο(ς)
123	ἡμεροφύλ(ακες) μηνὸ(ς) Φαῶφι τοῦ ς (ἔτους)	127	ἄ]λωνος
152	ἡμεροφ[ύλ(ακες) -- --]	100	Φαῶφι ιῆ
158	ποταμοφύλακες Μεσο (ρή) τοῦ ς (ἔτους)	154	Ἐπ(εῖφ) ιἔ Ψ.[ (line 4)

These lists are of rather a different sort from the others, for instead of listing the persons registered or available from a place they list those designated for some specific duty.

The parallel between the list of *νυκτοφύλακες* and those of *ἡμεροφύλακες* is obvious; not only are the titles closely parallel, the size of the groups involved is the same (always 5-6), and the *dekanos* is usually listed first. Now night-watchman is well-known as a liturgical service,<sup>71</sup> and this fact prompted Naphtali Lewis to inquire whether the day-watchman was liturgical also.<sup>72</sup> He concluded that it was not, arguing that all of the attestations of the day-watchman come from a small group of Theban ostraka of the second century, that they are monthly rather than annual, and that we are dealing with a Theban practice whereby daytime guard service "rotated monthly among teams of six men."

There cannot be much doubt that Lewis is right about the characteristics he enumerates, but his conclusion does not speak to the question we are considering. What he says about the day-watchmen is also true of the night-watchmen on the ostrakon cited (no. 4): the night-watchmen are a monthly crew also, at least in Thebes. They no doubt came from the same class of people as day-watchmen, although whether young men (of 14, say) were used at night at Thebes (while 30 was the minimum elsewhere), we do not know.

On the other hand, it appears to me that these must both be compulsory services. If these lists of people were maintained and the people were rotated through monthly shifts, it is very probable that the state imposed the burden upon them. There is no reason to suppose that night-watchman was a duty which elsewhere in Egypt had to be assigned as a liturgy, but which in Thebes alone was so welcome as to be undertaken by these peasants without any state compulsion. The real distinction here is between the use of liturgies properly speaking in other areas of Egypt and a system more like a *corvée*, but no less compulsory than a liturgy, in Thebes.

The other place-names in headings of this sort suggest that we are not dealing with quite the same thing but something very similar, lists of the guards assigned to specific locations, streets or sanctuaries. Whether these are particular applications of day-watchmen or night-watchmen, or some other duty, is not apparent. The two dates on the list are something of a puzzle; the evidence is too slight to allow a judgment on them.

We may now usefully sum up the point to which the argument has gone. On the one hand, we know that the administration of the Theban area maintained lists of a substantial portion of the adult male population, organized by subdivisions called *topoi* or *dekaniai* within the general quarters of the area; that each of these subdivisions was headed by a *dekanos*; that it was local in character;

that men became liable at 14 and that a liability might persist after their death. The conclusion that this organization is at least principally concerned with some service to the state seems to me inevitable. This kind of list had been kept in the past by pharaonic governments for purposes of rotation of *corvée*.<sup>73</sup>

On the other hand, we have evidence of groups of guards filling various functions, organized into small groups with a *dekanos* at the head of each one: night-watchmen, day-watchmen, watchmen over various specific localities, and watchtower guards. Some of them were under the direct control of the military officers of the vicinity, and some perhaps served on the edge of the desert. One may cite here not only the Florida ostraka but the letter to the *duplicarius* listing six guards for a specific month, a contingent strikingly reminiscent of the ἡμεροφύλακες in their squads of six for each month.<sup>74</sup>

There is no way that I know of to provide a rigorous proof that these two conclusions are related, although it seems to me overwhelmingly likely that they are. One document that may be suggestive in this regard is *O.Theb.* 138, a list headed δεκ(ανίας) λᾶ ἕως λᾶε; one is immediately struck by the connection with the numbers at the top of lists. There follows a line reading διὰ Ἀρσιήσιος Καλήους, then five names, obviously one for each *dekania*. After the first name comes the abbreviation μῆ, followed by a number, then λοιπ and another number, the two numbers adding up to twelve. Each successive person has ὀμ(οίως) followed by a number, then λοιπ and a second number, with the sum always twelve. What interpretation shall we place on this text?

Milne saw in it a list of taxes on trades, with μη(νιαῖα) the correct expansion.<sup>75</sup> But one may doubt that there were 35 *dekaniai*, let alone 89, of nine or ten men each, all of tradesmen of one particular trade in one quarter. The economy of Roman Thebes was not one of large numbers of craftsmen. Tait offered, instead, the resolutions μῆ(νας) and λοιπ(οί), so many months and so many left. This is much better, but Tait did not offer any interpretation of the whole text.<sup>76</sup>

One must admit that without further examples any explanation is tentative. But it is difficult to see what kind of tax could be involved here, for we know that none of those levied on the entire population of second-century Thebes was paid on the basis of monthly assessments. I suggest, rather, that we have a list of for how many months each of these *dekaniai* had provided a watchman during the year to date, and how many more man-months would be required before its end. What the intermediary Harsiesis son of Kales is doing, I do not know; perhaps there was a level of captain over each group of five *dekaniai*, or some such. If the main lines of this interpretation are correct, then, *O.Theb.* 138 is part of the link between the lists of persons available for compulsory service and the lists of persons actually performing them.

The system that appears from these documents is a natural product of the land, the population, the traditional practices of governments of Egypt, and the Roman taste for accomplishing public tasks by making them temporary and compulsory, rather than paying enough for them to attract permanent personnel. The pharaohs and the Ptolemies had, like other Near Eastern states of antiquity and later, resorted to the *corvée* to accomplish many necessary public services, notably the maintenance of the dike and canal system of Egypt and the transportation of grain at the proper time of year. Their police, however, had always been a paid professional force, organized along military lines and para-military in its nature. The Romans abandoned this tradition; it certainly had nothing in common with their practices elsewhere in the empire, as we have seen. In most parts of Egypt a combination of scattered military posts and a liturgical system of village guards (paid, but probably not very well) was at least minimally sufficient. But in the Thebaid fewer persons with the substance for regular liturgies could be found, while the need for policing, both within the cultivated land and along its borders, was greater than elsewhere, rather than less.

The Roman response was to create a system in which surveillance became another corvée, in which the population was systematically catalogued and rotated through guard duty over a period of time. We do not know the length of the cycles, but it appears that these guards served for a month at a time when their turn came. The nature of the duty varied, and we may imagine that those sent to the desert's edge were not pleased. But like the annual dike corvée, this police duty was kept to dimensions sufficiently manageable for the peasants. It is perhaps no accident that no ostrakon mentions a force of guards during the harvest months of Pachon and Pauni, when no one could spare time from work in the fields.

Two questions remain: when was this system instituted, and what was its relationship to the use of *burgarii* elsewhere? The only dated list of guards comes from year 15 of Hadrian, but some of the hands in other texts may be earlier, though probably not much earlier. There is no *dekania* list which can be assigned with confidence to the first century. Either Trajan or Hadrian could have ordered the creation of the system. The same is true of the *burgarii*, which first appear under Hadrian — as does the *numerus* in general, it seems — but again one cannot be certain who was the originator. In Egypt and the Danubian region both, one might speculate that the drain of troops to the east for Trajan's war against Parthia provided an impetus to fill gaps in defensive manpower; but this is only a speculation.<sup>77</sup>

The *skopelarioi* and *burgarii* have in common that they defended roads, especially near borders, with small forts; that they were not members of the regular army; and that they were under the command of officers in the army or the imperial administration. But the *burgarii* were probably actually a military unit, since they are called a *numerus*, with an extended term of service, while the *skopelarioi* were civilians forced into a limited corvée; the Romans, after all, never showed much inclination to take the Egyptian fellahin into their army. The spirit behind the two systems is Roman, and the need they fill is very similar, but the Egyptian version took a different form, above all because of the peculiar conditions created by the remarkable land and people of Egypt.

Columbia University

## APPENDIX

As we have seen, the distinction between a *dekania* list and a list of names of unidentified purpose is sometimes uncertain. The roster below includes only those lists which I think can be with confidence described as *dekania* lists. Any list with a  $\bar{\iota}$  or  $\iota$  for *dekanos* in the margin next to a name was included; so were most lists with a total at the bottom in a form such as  $\gamma(\iota\nu\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota) \bar{\alpha}\nu\delta(\rho\epsilon\varsigma) \iota$ , which is associated in a large proportion of the complete texts with the *dekanos* sign; and so were lists headed by a phrase or a number standing in a line above the first name, unless there seemed some reason to exclude the list.

Document Number	Publication Reference	No. of Men	Total Given?	Heading	dekanos	complete	
						top	foot
1	WO 1210	5	no	[...]. $\beta$	no	yes	yes?
2	WO 1212	8	no	?	2nd	yes?	yes?
3	WO 1486	4	yes	πρὸς ῥύμη Αἰλουροταφίου	no	yes	yes
4	O.Theb. 139	4	no	νυκτοφύλ. Θῶθ τοῦ ΙΕΣ	1st	yes	no

Document Number	Publication Reference	No. of Men	Total Given?	Heading	dekanos	complete top	foot
5	SB I 5348	9	no	α	no	yes	?
6	SB I 5812	6	no	δεκανός	1st	yes	yes?
7	O.Brüss. 15	10	no	ιθ	8th	yes	yes
8	O.Brüss. 73	12	no	β	1st	yes	no?
9	O.Brüss. 74	10	yes	none	no	yes?	yes
10	O.Brüss. 75	5	yes	γ	2nd	yes	yes
11	O.Brüss. 76	5	yes	κ	2nd	yes	yes
12	O.Stras. 520	2	no	γ̄ άλλωνο(ς)	no	yes	yes
13	O.Stras. 522	6	no	γ̄	no	yes	no
14	O.Stras. 523	10	yes	ς̄	5th	yes	yes
15	O.Stras. 524	7	no	ιβ̄	3rd	yes	no
16	O.Stras. 525	10	yes	ιγ̄	2nd	yes	yes
17	O.Stras. 526	10?	yes?	ιλ̄	no	yes	yes
18	O.Stras. 527	10	yes	κδ̄	no	yes	yes
19	O.Stras. 528	12	no	λλ̄	1st	yes	yes
20	O.Stras. 529	10	no	λθ̄	no	yes	no
21	O.Stras. 530	10	no	νᾱ	10th	yes	yes
22	O.Stras. 531	9	yes	νς̄	4th	yes	yes
23	O.Stras. 532	7	no	ς̄	no	yes	no
24	O.Stras. 533	10	no	ιλ̄	no	yes	?
25	O.Stras. 534	6	yes	ήμεροφύλ. μηνός Μεσορή τοῡ ιL	1st	yes	yes
26	O.Stras. 537	9	yes	none	no	no	yes
27	O.Stras. 538	5	yes	Ἄγορᾶς	4th	yes	yes
28	O.Stras. 539	10	yes	none	6th	yes	yes
29	O.Stras. 546	5	no	η	no	yes	no
30	O.Stras. 547	8	yes	none	no	yes	yes
31	O.Stras. 548	12	yes	none	no	yes?	yes
32	O.Stras. 549	10	yes	none	no	no	yes
33	O.Stras. 552	9	no	none	4th	yes	no
34	O.Stras. 553	8	no	β	no	yes	no
35	O.Stras. 554	16	no	ε	no	yes	no
36	O.Stras. 555	17	yes	ιβ̄	1st	yes	yes
37	O.Stras. 556	10	no	μ̄	1st	yes	no
38	O.Stras. 559	7	yes	none	no	no	yes
39	O.Stras. 564	10	yes	none	no	no	yes
40	O.Stras. 565	10	yes	none	8th	no	yes
41	O.Stras. 567	9	no	none	8th	yes	no

Document Number	Publication Reference	No. of Men	Total Given?	Heading	dekanos	complete top	foot
42	<i>P.Bad.</i> 104	6	yes	none	no	no	yes
43	<i>P.Bad.</i> 105	6	yes	ἡμεροφύλ. Χοίακ τοῦ ιαλ. Ἀδριανοῦ	1st	yes	yes
44	<i>P.Bad.</i> 106	6	yes	ἡμεροφύλ. μηνὸς Ἀθύρ	1st	yes	yes
45	<i>O.Ashm.</i> 76	10	yes	ιδ	no	yes	yes
46	<i>O.Ashm.</i> 77	7	no	none	1st	no	yes?
47	<i>O.Ashm.</i> 79	7	no	κ̄γ οἱ ἐν τῷ Θερμουσίῳ	no	yes?	no
48	<i>O.Ashm.</i> 80	5 + 1	yes	none	no	no	yes
49	<i>O.Ashm.</i> 82	10?	no	ι	no	yes	no
50	<i>O.Petr.</i> 317	4	no	κ̄η	no	yes	no
51	<i>O.Petr.</i> 318	10	yes	none	no	no	yes
52	<i>O.Petr.</i> 320	9	no	Γν	no	yes	yes?
53	<i>O.Cam.</i> 79	5	no	κ̄γ	1st	yes	no?
54	<i>O.Cam.</i> 80	6	yes	ἡμ(ερο)φύλ. Φαρμουῖσι βλ	1st	yes	yes
55	<i>O.Cam.</i> 81	12	yes	none	no	no	yes
56	<i>O.Cam.</i> 82	12	yes	ε̄	4th	yes	yes
57	<i>O.Cam.</i> 83	11	no	ε̄	1st	yes	no
58	<i>O.Cam.</i> 84	10	yes	none	6th	yes?	yes
59	<i>O.Cam.</i> 85	11	no	none	7th	?	?
60	<i>O.Cam.</i> 86	4	no	κ̄η	no	yes	no?
61	<i>O.Cam.</i> 87	12	yes	none	5th	no	yes
62	<i>O.Minor</i> E5	13	no	πα	1st	yes	yes?
63	<i>O.Wilb.</i> 78	5	yes	ξ	1st	yes	yes
64	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1862	3?	yes	none	no	yes	yes
65	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1863	7	no	κδ	no	yes	yes?
66	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1864	10	yes	none	no	no	yes
67	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1865	7	no	νς	no	yes	no
68	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1866	10	yes	none	no	no	yes
69	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1867	8	no	none	2nd	yes	no
70	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1869	11	yes	Χά(ρακος) β̄ τόπου	7th	yes	yes
71	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1870	7	no	λη	3rd	yes	no?
72	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1871	6	no	none	4th	yes	yes
73	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1872	5	no	ια	no	yes	?
74	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1873	10	yes	βο(ρρᾶ) β̄	7th	yes	yes
75	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1874	10	yes	Ἄγο(ρῶν) βο(ρρᾶ) β̄	2nd	yes	yes

Document Number	Publication Reference	No. of Men	Total Given?	Heading	dekanos	complete	
						top	foot
76	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1875	10	yes	νγ	3rd	yes	yes
77	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1876	10	yes	α	5th	yes	yes
78	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1877	10	yes	ς'	8th	yes	yes
79	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1878	8	no	α	1st	yes	no
80	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1879	10	yes	λε	7th	yes	yes
81	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1880	5	yes	$\overline{\eta}$	no	yes	yes
82	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1881	6	no	$\overline{\mu\delta}$	1st	yes	no
83	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1882	5	no	none	4th	yes	yes
84	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1884	10	no	none	5th	yes	yes
85	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1885	10	yes	ι . .	3rd	yes	yes
86	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1886	11?	no	none	1st	yes?	no
87	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1887	10	yes	$\overline{\gamma}$	6th	yes	yes
88	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1888	10	yes	none	no	no	yes
89	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1889	10	yes	$\overline{\iota\eta}$	4th	yes	yes
90	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1890	10	yes	none	5th	no	yes
91	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1891	12	no	$\overline{\iota\gamma}$	9th	yes	yes
92	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1892	10	no	none	9th	yes	yes
93	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1893	11	no	none	1st	yes	yes
94	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1894	10	yes	π . . . . 'Αγο(ρῶν) βορρα̅ ξ	4th	yes	yes
95	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1895	10	no	$\overline{\eta}$	8th	yes	no
96	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1896	10	yes	$\overline{\pi\eta}$	5th	yes	yes
97	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1897	4	yes	πρὸς τῆ ῥύμη 'Ερμοδώρου	1st	yes	yes
98	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1898	5	yes	$\overline{\eta}$	1st	yes	yes
99	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1899	7?	no	$\overline{\iota\zeta}$	5th	yes	no
100	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1900	8	yes	Φαῶφι $\overline{\iota\eta}$	2nd	yes	yes
101	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1901	11?	no	none	2nd?	no	no
102	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1902	4	no	none	1st	yes	yes
103	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1903	5	no	$\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$	4th	yes	no
104	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1904	6	yes	none	1st	yes	yes
105	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1905	10	yes	$\overline{\zeta}$	2nd	yes	yes
106	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1906	10	no	none	4th	yes?	yes?
107	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1907	12	yes	none	no	no	yes
108	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1908	6	yes	none	no	?	yes
109	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1909	10?	no	$\overline{\kappa\gamma}$	no	yes	no
110	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1910	8+	no	ζ	no	yes	no
111	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1911	10	yes	none	no	yes?	yes
112	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1913	10	yes	none	no	no	yes

Document Number	Publication Reference	No. of Men	Total Given?	Heading	dekanos	complete top	foot
113	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1914	10	yes	none	no	?	yes
114	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1915	5	yes	none	no	yes	yes
115	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1916	10	yes	ῑ	3rd	yes	yes
116	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1917	10	yes	μα	no	yes	yes
117	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1918	10	yes	none	no	no	yes
118	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1919	12	yes	ιγ	7th	yes	yes
119	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1920	7	no	η	4th	yes	no
120	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1921	6	no	κδ̄	1st	yes	yes
121	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1922	9	no	ε	2nd	yes	yes
122	<i>O.Bodl.</i> 1923	6	no	Κερα(μείων) β̄ δ[εκ(ανίας)]	no	yes	yes
123	<i>O.Heid.</i> 287	6	no	ἡμεροφύλ. μηνὸ(ς) Φαῶφι τοῦ 5L	1st	yes	no
124	<i>O.Leid.</i> 62	5	yes	none	no	yes	yes
125	<i>O.Leid.</i> 63	10	yes	κη	2nd	yes	yes
126	<i>O.Leid.</i> 65	8	no	ι	no	yes	no
127	<i>O.Leid.</i> 66	11	yes	ἄ]λωνος	no	yes	yes
128	<i>O.Leid.</i> 67	5	yes	none	no	yes	yes
129	<i>O.Leid.</i> 68	11	yes	η	9th	yes	yes
130	<i>O.Leid.</i> 69	10	yes	λε̄	1st	yes	yes
131	<i>O.Leid.</i> 70	12	yes	ιᾱ	10th	yes	yes
132	<i>O.Leid.</i> 112	10	yes	λς̄	no	yes	yes
133	<i>O.Leid.</i> 145	6	yes	none	no	yes	yes
134	<i>O.Leid.</i> 146	10	no	ᾱ	6th	yes	?
135	<i>SB X</i> 10284	6	yes	ἡμεροφύλ. Τῦβι	1st	yes	yes
136	<i>O.ROM</i> 246	10	no	ξ	no	yes	yes
137	<i>O.ROM</i> 247	10	no	none	1st	yes	yes
138	<i>O.ROM</i> 249	12	yes	none	no	no	yes
139	<i>O.ROM</i> 253	10	yes	none	no	?	yes
140	<i>O.ROM</i> 256	29	no	none	7th?	no	no
141	<i>O.ROM</i> 257	8	yes	α	6th	yes	yes
142	<i>O.ROM</i> 258	5?	no	τόπου Πανίσκου νεωτ. δεκ(ανού)	1st	yes	yes
143	<i>O.ROM</i> 260	9	no	λζ	2nd	yes	no
144	<i>O.ROM</i> 261	9	no	δ̄	1st	yes	no
145	<i>O.ROM</i> 262	7	no	none	2nd	no	yes
146	<i>O.ROM</i> 264	5	no	none	5th	yes	yes
147	<i>O.ROM</i> 266	10	no	λα	2nd	yes	no
148	<i>O.ROM</i> 267	5	no	ιδ	no	yes	no

Document Number	Publication Reference	No. of Men	Total Given?	Heading	dekanos	complete top	foot
149	<i>O.ROM</i> 268	3	no	Χ(άρακος) π <sup>9</sup>	1st	yes	no
150	<i>O.ROM</i> 271	8	no	ἰ <sup>9</sup>	no	yes	no
151	<i>O.ROM</i> 273	10	no	none	10th	yes?	no
152	<i>O.ROM</i> 274	5	no	ἡμεροφ[ύλ.]	no	yes	yes
153	<i>O.ROM</i> 275	13 <sup>?</sup>	no	λα	1st	yes	no
154	<i>O.ROM</i> 276	13	no	none	no	no	no
155	<i>O.Amst.</i> 78	5	no		4th	yes	no
156	<i>O.Amst.</i> 79	11	no	none	2nd?	yes	yes
157	<i>O.Florida</i> 26	6	yes	φύλ(ακες) μηνός) 'Επειφ	no	yes	yes
158	<i>P.Aberd.</i> 94	11	no	ποταμοφύλακες Μεσο (ρή) του ζλ	1st	yes	no

Note: (1) It is not always clear from a publication, or even with the ostrakon in hand, whether it is complete. (2) Ostraka where totals are preserved are listed at the number given, even if part of the ostrakon is missing and not all of the names are preserved. (3) No indication is given of breaks at left and right, which may sometimes affect presence of various elements without showing up in the last two columns.

\* A shorter version of this paper was given at the International Papyrological Symposium in Urbana, and the fuller version was delivered to a session of the Columbia University Seminar in Classical Civilization in April, 1976; I am indebted to William M. Calder III for the invitation to present it there. I owe to Naphtali Lewis and William H. Willis several useful suggestions on various points.

<sup>1</sup> The evidence is extensive and scattered; a readable recent account is given by Ramsay MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations* (New Haven, 1974), chapter 1, especially p. 5 with notes.

<sup>2</sup> J. Lesquier, *Recherches sur l'armée romaine en Égypte* (Cairo, 1918), 377 ff., states this standard view. Manfred G. Raschke suggests to me that a full analysis of recent excavations in Lower Nubia may point to more activity there than has generally been thought, citing B. G. Haycock, *JEA* 53 (1967), 107-20. E. G. Turner, *JRS* 40 (1950), 57-9, has argued that a papyrus published by Vogliano describes an action between the Roman army and desert dwellers in the later first century A.D., which might point to a more coherent external threat than is usually believed to have existed.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. for example H. Braunert, *Die Binnenwanderung* (Bonn, 1964), 166-67, with bibliography.

<sup>4</sup> *P.Hib.* II 198, perhaps the most suggestive text, but by no means the only one. My reading and translation are argued in *BASP* 6 (1969), 73-118, esp. 93-96 for the passage quoted here.

<sup>5</sup> See in general *Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>3</sup> II.1 (Cambridge, 1973), 370 (W. C. Hayes); G. Posener et al., *Dictionnaire de la civilisation égyptienne* (Paris, 1970), 227-28. For the Medjay in the New Kingdom, see Alan R. Schulman, *Military Rank, Title and Organization in the Egyptian New Kingdom* (Münch. Aegypt. Stud. 6: Berlin, 1964), 24-5, with references. Schulman tells me that the use of corvée to provide police is unknown in pharaonic Egypt.

<sup>6</sup> The standard monograph is Pieter Kool, *De Phylakieten in Grieks-Romeins Egypte* (Amsterdam, 1954); he expresses the opinion (p. 100) that the Ptolemaic system largely reflects Egyptian practice.

<sup>7</sup> The evidence for amateur guards being required to serve under the Ptolemies is limited to the institution of nominating persons of some substance to serve as guards of the crops; this is described in *P.Teb.* I 27, and *P.Mich.* I 73 and *P.Teb.* III 731 show men being nominated for this task. *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59296 lists some payments for guards and for dike guards at rates of pay of 6 dr. and 2 1/2 dr. per month; Edgar regards them as "probably impressed from the



peasants", but in the absence of any evidence one should be cautious; the pay is for 12 and 5 months respectively, and no peasant could reasonably be impressed into full-time service for such periods at such a low rate of pay. I suspect that these were not full-time occupations but rather part-time.

<sup>8</sup> The most systematic treatment of the subject is O. Hirschfeld, "Die Sicherheitspolizei im römischen Kaiserreich," *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1913), 576-612, originally in *Sitzb. Berlin* 1891, 845-77. My references throughout are to the *Kleine Schriften*. On the problem of a lack of systematic organs of security, see especially 591-99.

<sup>9</sup> Hirschfeld (supra, n. 8), 601-03: the *eirenarchai*.

<sup>10</sup> See P. Kool (supra, n. 6), 81-3. The evidence is mainly from *P.Ryl.* II 125-152, of A.D. 28-42, from Euhemeria in the Arsinoite Nome. There is a tax called ἐπιστοπία φυλακῶν attested in the second century, cf. *P.Ryl.* II 213.29n., but it is uncertain what its purpose was.

<sup>11</sup> In the Rylands texts (supra, n. 10), he receives petitions about crimes; so does the *strategos* at the same time, and the chart in *P.Ryl.* II, p. 118, shows that at the start of this archive the *epistates* is more important than the *strategos* (more commonly has a Roman name, receives more petitions), but that the situation reverses itself later, and in A.D. 42 one T. Claudius Philoxenus holds both positions, the last ἐπιστάτης φυλακῶν attested.

<sup>12</sup> For the general lines of the development, see P. Jouguet, *La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine* (Paris, 1911), 261-66.

<sup>13</sup> See Jouguet (supra, n. 12), 265-66. For the dates of liturgy, see infra, n. 14.

<sup>14</sup> The information is collected in Naphtali Lewis, *Inventory of Compulsory Services* (Am.Stud.Pap. 3: New Haven, 1968; 2nd ed. of some pages, New York, 1975). Of 13 liturgies in this domain for which an exact date can be given to the earliest document attesting liturgy, 11 are represented by 4 documents, with *P.Achmim* 7 being responsible for 3 and *P.Berl. Leihg.* 6 for 5.

<sup>15</sup> The *poros* for each position, where known, is given by Lewis (supra, n. 14) *s.v.* Cf. Jouguet's remark (supra, n. 12), 266, that a *poros* was required so that the state would have property to confiscate from a liturgist if he failed to execute his duties properly and caused loss to the state. The *poroi* for these positions are comparatively small, as liturgies go.

<sup>16</sup> See Lewis (supra, n. 14), entries for ἀλωνοφύλαξ, ἀρχινυκτοφύλαξ, ἀρχιφύλαξ, ἀφεισιοφύλαξ, γεννηματοφύλαξ, εἰρηνοφύλαξ, μαγδωλοφύλαξ, νομοφύλαξ, νυκτοφύλαξ, ὄρεοφύλαξ, ὄρμοφύλαξ, παραφυλακή, πεδιοφύλαξ, and φύλαξ.

<sup>17</sup> This is the conclusion of N. Hohlwein, *Musée Belge* 9 (1905), 394-99, who remarks that *phylakes*

without a more specific tag appear principally in lists of those nominated for liturgical service.

<sup>18</sup> N. Hohlwein, *Musée Belge* 9 (1905), 189-94 argues that the *phylakes* specifically constitute the *demosioi* of the village. For orders from the military cf. R. MacMullen, *Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 52-3; he curiously refers to the *demosioi* as "public slaves doing guard duty".

<sup>19</sup> MacMullen (supra, n. 18), 53, n. 11, gives a useful list of petitions and complaints to military officials. The range goes from Augustus to the fourth century, but the distribution is interesting: 10 before 192, 14 from 192 to 217, and 13 after 218 (MacMullen's own count does not follow from his citations and is to be ignored.).

<sup>20</sup> One interesting feature of third-century development is that of the ληστοπιασται, who are shown by a papyrus letter to have been a designated group of men who were to assist the village police in catching criminals when the police wanted help; see O. Hirschfeld, "Die ägyptische Polizei der römischen Kaiserzeit nach Papyrusurkunden," *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1913), 613-23, originally *Sitzb. Berlin* 1892, 815-24. The text was republished as *BGU* I 325 and *W.Chr.* 472. Hirschfeld comments (614): "Da die Diebsfänger hier als eine feste Kategorie erscheinen und die Verbindung τοῖς ὑπογεγραμμένοις ληστοπιασταῖς geradezu auf einen titularen Gebrauch des Wortes hinzuweisen scheint, so dürfte anzunehmen sein, daß immer ein bestimmter Teil der Dorfbewohnerschaft zu diesem Posten designiert war." On the situation from 284-382, see J. Lallemand, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte de l'avènement de Dioclétien à la création du diocèse* (Acad. Royale de Belgique, Cl. des Lettres, Memoires 57.2: Bruxelles, 1964), 162-68, and for the later period, G. Rouillard, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte Byzantine*<sup>3</sup> (Paris, 1928), 165-66, with references to liturgical police. Such documents as *P.Cair.Masp.* III 67328 show a rural liturgical police called *agrophylakes* in the sixth century.

<sup>21</sup> See A. Bataille, "Thèbes gréco-romaine," *Cd'É* 26 (1951), 325-53, for a general description of the Theban area in this period.

<sup>22</sup> The bibliography is abundant and scattered; I give a partial synthesis in *The Florida Ostraka: Documents from the Roman Army in Upper Egypt* (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Monogr. 7: Durham, N.C., 1976).

<sup>23</sup> See *O.Florida* (supra, n. 22).

<sup>24</sup> This section summarizes the findings of the introduction to *O.Florida* (supra, n. 22).

<sup>25</sup> τὸν ἰδὸν τοῦ Βαλανέος τὸν ἐν τῷ σκοπέλῳ ὄντα μικρόν, εἰπέ τῷ δεκανῶ ἵνα ἀντ' αὐτοῦ βάλῃ νεανίσκον. ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ ἐνετιλάμην περὶ αὐτοῦ αὐτῷ.

<sup>26</sup> On these, see *O.Florida* (supra, n. 22).

<sup>27</sup> *Ostraka in Amsterdam Collections*, ed. Roger S. Bagnall, P. J. Sijpesteijn, and K. A. Worp (Studia Amst.: Zutphen, 1976).

<sup>28</sup> The equivalence of *vectigalium* and *τελώνιον* is given in G. Goetz and G. Goendermann, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* II, 453, 12.

<sup>29</sup> Published in *ZPE* 14 (1974), 236. The editor dates the text to the second century, presumably on the basis of the handwriting.

<sup>30</sup> The only complete name, a patronymic, is Senpamonthes. Endings of names in *-ου* and *-σιος* suggest the numerous Egyptian names familiar from the Theban ostraka with those endings like Pamonthes and Pekysis.

<sup>31</sup> See Hirschfeld (supra, n. 8), 595, who describes the *beneficarii* who often headed *stationes* as being either independent or the top subordinate to a centurion. In independent commands the position of *stationarius* is sometimes denoted by the phrase *curam agens*, reminiscent of the use in Egypt of the term *curator* (see *O. Florida*.) for the commander of a small isolated garrison post, especially in the desert, for whom *curator* was not a rank but only a more or less temporary position (cf. J. F. Gilliam, *TAPA* 83 [1952], 51-5). A fairly full if now somewhat out-of-date treatment of the *beneficarii* and their *stationes* is given by A. von Domaszewski in *Westdeutsche Zeitschrift* 21 (1902), 158-211.

<sup>32</sup> J. J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* (London, 1969), 124-27, views the *beneficarii* and other *stationarii* as acting alone without staff, in contrast to the view of Hirschfeld (supra, n. 8), 595; since Wilkes' evidence is the solitariness of these men in their dedications, it is possible that this situation reflects only the nature of the dedications, not the solitude of the post (on the cult of the *beneficarii* see von Domaszewski [supra, n. 31], 206-11).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. for example the remarks of M. Rostovtzeff, *JRS* 8 (1918), 33, for the link with the *colletiones*, and see infra, n. 34.

<sup>34</sup> L. Robert has on several occasions discussed the inscriptions referring to *stationarii* in Asia Minor, giving references and bibliography; see *Études anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937) 285, n. 2; *Hellenica* X, 175, nn. 1 and 6, and XII, 80. Rostovtzeff (supra, n. 33) points up the unpopularity of these officials in third-century Asia Minor. A papyrus of the second century from Egypt lists payment to a *stationarius* and a *colletio* for extortion, and L. Robert gives the parallels in discussing the papyrus in *Revue de philologie* (1943), 111-19, esp. 113 (*Opera Minora Selecta* I, 364-72, esp. 266).

<sup>35</sup> On this development see Hirschfeld (supra, n. 8), 595. J. J. Wilkes (supra, n. 32), 124-27, flatly denies any connection of the *stationes* with the *cursus publicus* or with customs collection. Against the first

of these denials, see G. Alföldy, *Noricum* (London, 1974), 162-63, who cites almost 20 *stationes* in that province, ranging from ca. 100 to 238, all along roads and fairly certainly connected to the *cursus publicus*. The link to customs collection is more difficult; the junction in *O. Amst.* 8 of *stationes* and *vectigaliones*, however, suggests at least some connection.

<sup>36</sup> Hirschfeld (supra, n. 8), 598.

<sup>37</sup> Alföldy (supra, n. 35), 162-63 lists exactly datable attestations from 168, 192, 200, 202, 209, 211, 213, 215, 217, 219, 226, 230, and 238; a tendency in the period to give the information necessary for an exact date does, of course, influence the Severan preponderance; there are earlier instances which are not exactly datable.

<sup>38</sup> The classic description is J. Lesquier (supra, n. 2), 235-37, and U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge* I, 413-14 is also helpful.

<sup>39</sup> For attestations of *stationarii*, see S. Daris, *Aegyptus* 37 (1957), 100; some references also in R. MacMullen, *Soldier and Civilian* (supra, n. 18), 55, n. 17. A papyrus published by R. Rémondon, *Cd'É* 27 (1952), 196-204, from the Severan period (text reprinted as *SB* VI 9238) is a petition to *ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων στασιωνάριος* about a crime, a typical specimen of the genre.

<sup>40</sup> J. Schwartz, "Documents grecs de Kôm Kolzum," *Bull. de la Soc. d'Études hist. et géogr. de l'Isthme de Suez* 2 (1948), 25-30 at p. 27.

<sup>41</sup> On nomenclature, cf. *O. Florida*.

<sup>42</sup> For some general remarks, the article of O. Seeck in *RE* III (1897), col. 1066-67 s.v. *burgus* is still useful. Some physical description is given by R. MacMullen (supra, n. 39), 38-9, with a bibliography in n. 52.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. G. Alföldy (supra, n. 35), 150 with 330, n. 52.

<sup>44</sup> *CIL* III 3385; for other copies see *Intercisa* I (*Archaeologica Hungarica* 33: Budapest, 1954), 319-20, nos. 297-307. Most of the copies were never used; they have the emperor's and legate's names erased, and they were found in town, not with the *burgi*. This stretch of the "Danube bend" between Aquincum and Brigetio received renewed attention under Valentinian; see the remarks of A. Mócsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia* (London, 1974), 291-93, with a figure on 292 showing the thick dotting of forts and *burgi* along this stretch of the border.

<sup>45</sup> A. Alföldi, *ArchErt* 3 ser. 2 (1940), 40-48. In this he followed the arguments for a defensive purpose of the *burgi* put forth by A. Dobó, "Publicum Portorium Illyrici," *Dissertationes Pannonicae* 2 ser. 16 (= *ArchErt* 3 ser. 1 [1940]), 144-94; the remarks in question come on 193-94 (in the Italian version). Mócsy (supra, n. 44), 197, argues that those *burgi* were instead devoted to the regulation of traffic across the river, but it is not likely that this is the main reason.

<sup>46</sup> *CIL* III, 3653; discussed by Mócsy (supra, n. 44), 322.

<sup>47</sup> Published by G. Kacarov, *Bull. de l'Inst. d'Arch. Bulgare* 4 (1926-7), 107-12 (in Bulgarian); text reproduced in *Année épig.* (1927), 49 (cf. Rostovtzeff, *Soc. and Econ. Hist. of the Roman Emp.*<sup>2</sup> [Oxford, 1951], 724-25 with n. 51). There is a detailed discussion by G. Mikhailov in *Studi Urbinati di storia, filosofia e letteratura* 35 (1961), 42-56. Antoninus is credited in one inscription with building 4 *praesidia*, 12 *burgi*, and 109 *phruri* in a particular area.

<sup>48</sup> *CIL* VIII, 2495, cf. 2494. These both come from the gorge of El-Kantara, at 35°13' N., 5°41' E., a critical passageway on the most important North-South road in this region (the only major road and the only railway in modern western Algeria) and an oasis. The *burgi* were built on hilltops by a *numerus* under the command of a legionary centurion. Cf. R. Cagnat, *L'armée romaine d'Afrique* (Paris, 1892), 568-69, on the importance of the places for communications.

<sup>49</sup> The examples of *burgi* and the functions of the *burgarii* are discussed by M. Labrousse in *MélRome* 56 (1939), 151-67. He describes the various emplacements; see esp. pp. 154-55 on *burgarii* in Mauretania, 155 on Pizos (but he is ignorant of Rostovtzeff's article), 158-59 on Kopačeni (see below).

<sup>50</sup> Usually cited as *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 880, now reedited as *IGBulg.* III.2, 1690e.61, with a considerable bibliography and good lemma. The reedition is important *inter alia* for its incorporation of M. I. Rostovtzeff's important contribution in precisely this passage, in *JRS* 8 (1918), 26-33 at p. 29; the restoration  $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon[\tau\epsilon\lambda]-\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  is Rostovtzeff's. Those who have subsequently cited this inscription have sometimes been lamentably unaware of Rostovtzeff's article. H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (Am.Stud.Pap. 13: Toronto, 1974), 31 s.v.  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  gives an incorrect reference, a quotation which curiously begins with one word of the previous phrase, thus wrenched from its context, and the incorrect restoration of Seure in his *editio princeps* (*BCH* 22 [1898], 491 and 542), without indicating with brackets that it is a restoration. (See Thomas Drew-Bear's review in *CP* 71 [1976], 349-55 on the methods of Mason's book.) Equally unfortunate is the remark of R. MacMullen (supra, n. 39), 85-6, n. 35, who says "the implication is that less favored places were subject to some charge for the upkeep (certainly not the recruiting, as some editors would have it) of the troops there stationed." The only editors whom MacMullen cites are Seure and Dittenberger; it is hard to know how either of these suggested the recruiting of troops to MacMullen [Seure thought it was a question of cultivation of a *burgarius tractus* under compulsion], but it is what MacMullen rejects which is precisely correct. A know-

ledge of Rostovtzeff's article would have prevented this muddle.

<sup>51</sup> *JRS* 8 (1918), 29.

<sup>52</sup> *ILS* 8909 and 9180; the *veredarii* are native cavalry. Dittenberger, in his commentary to *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 880, cites the Theodosian Code (12.19.2) for *burgarii* (they are also mentioned in 7.14), as "servos", following Seure. It is likely enough that the element of compulsion in their service grew by the time of the edict cited (A.D. 400), but the second-century evidence does not warrant a retrojection to 202 of this situation. Kopačeni is on the Aluta (mod. Oltul) river where it comes out of the Carpathians, and thus controls a critical military road along the frontier of Dacia as it stood in Trajan's times; see supra, n. 49.

<sup>53</sup> Rostovtzeff (supra, n. 50), 30. Labrousse (supra, n. 49) sees the essential activity as being the *cursus publicus*.

<sup>54</sup> *O.Mich.* 82-88 contain lists of names, described by L. Amundsen as "lists of liturgical workers". One of these has a numeral at the top like the Theban ones, and a mark next to a name to indicate *dekanos* (82), and 85 also has a numeral at the top. These texts are all late third to early fourth century, much later than any of the Theban *dekania* lists. I think it likely that these are concerned with transportation, a view reinforced by the recent publication of *O.Mich.* 1136 (*ZPE* 18 [1975] 277). This text has the phrase  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \Delta\iota\omicron\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa(\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\nu)$  in its heading; Youtie notes that the only known village of that name was in the Delta near Naukratis, and it is hard to see what besides transportation could have been meant. Cf. infra, n. 65.

<sup>55</sup> *O.Brüss.-Berl.*, pp. 129-30 (*ad* no. 15); this discussion was published in 1922.

<sup>56</sup> *O.Theb.*, p. 117.

<sup>57</sup> See, for example, Sijpesteijn's remarks on *O.Leid.* 62. Préaux does not comment on *O.Wilb.* 77-78, and, while some of Tait's notes in *O.Bodl.* are important, he nowhere offered an extended discussion. Wilcken does not treat the subject because *WO* II contains hardly any such lists. One presumes that Viereck would have included a more detailed treatment in the volume of commentary to *O.Stras.* which was planned but never published.

<sup>58</sup> For the principles of inclusion and exclusion in this roster see the introduction to the appendix.

<sup>59</sup> Even with the Strassburg ostraka, Viereck can have had only 41 of the ostraka at his disposal.

<sup>60</sup> Counting the following: Agorai, Agorai North, Agorai South, Upper Toparchy, Hermonthis, Lower Toparchy, Kerameia, Memnoneia, metropolis, Nesoi, Notos, Lips, Ophieon, Charax, E. . . . There are some other minor possibilities, but their infrequency in the ostraka suggests that they cannot be counted with

the above-listed places. Even within this group, of course, there is inequality of importance, but the setting of a low average (less than half of what Charax is known to have had) should compensate conservatively for this.

<sup>61</sup> The average of those probably complete at both top and bottom in the roster is about 8.36.

<sup>62</sup> For example, nos. 45, 96 and 106.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. *O.ROM I (Death and Taxes)*, pp. 26-7.

<sup>64</sup> *P.Cair.Masp.* III 67328, from A.D. 521, contains the surety contracts for some of these guards (there are as many as three for one place). For further references see G. Rouillard, *L'administration civile de l'Egypte Byzantine*<sup>2</sup> (Paris, 1928), 165-66, and *P.Michael.* 45.19, 48.19.

<sup>65</sup> *P.Oxy.* XIV 1626. The date and the connection with transportation remind one of the Michigan ostraka lists discussed in n. 54, supra.

<sup>66</sup> Boats appear in several contexts in connection with a δεκανικόν tax: *Stud.Pal.* XXII 183.38 (a Soknopaiou Nesos account) mentions a payment ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλιευτικῶν πλοίων, and another account from the same source, *BGU I 1.1*, speaks of δεκανικοῦ ὁμοίως τῶν αὐτῶν πλοίων. These are perhaps connected with *P.Ryl.* II 196.6, in which a person designated as χειριστῆς δεκανικός ἰχθυομεταβόλων appears.

<sup>67</sup> *BGU IV 1189 (1a/1p)*.

<sup>68</sup> *BGU III 834.11* (cf. *BL I 71* for Rostovtzeff's correction of the text). This is the text referred to as *BGU 894 ad P.Oxy.* XII 1512.

<sup>69</sup> Such are *P.Oxy.* XII 1512, a fourth-century list in which three men at Tholthis are assigned *dehaniai*; one has one, one has four, the third has five. They are numbered from one to ten. *SB I 1.2*, a third-century letter, notes the receipt from one Soterichos

son of Petechon, *dekanos*, of forty-four κλισιοῦς ἱματίων and other items. Other texts cited by the *WB* are still less informative: *P.Fay.* 156, *P.Oxy.* II 387, *P.Flor.* III 388.3,5. *SB I 972 (IGR I 1046)*, the dedication of one of the *dekanoi* of the fleet, is not relevant and raises problems of its own. *SB I 5812* is a list of names whose purpose is unknown. The texts from outside Egypt are not very helpful; the citations in H. J. Mason (supra, n. 50) p. 33 yield nothing similar to our documents and themselves abound in problems.

<sup>70</sup> One illustrative example is *O.Meyer* 66, which is, on Wilcken's interpretation, concerned with the rules of an organization which calls its officer a *dekanos*.

<sup>71</sup> N. Lewis, *Inventory of Compulsory Services* (Am. Stud.Pap. 3: Toronto, 1968), s.v.

<sup>72</sup> *Antidoron M. David* (Pap.Lugd.Bat. 17: Leiden, 1968) 53-4.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. William C. Hayes in *Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>3</sup> II.1 (Cambridge, 1973), 377-78: irrigation, cultivation and transportation, crucial corvée work of the Egyptian countryside in any period, were managed in the New Kingdom from lists or "numberings" drawn up by government commissioners and assigned on a rotating basis. This system was not, however, used for police.

<sup>74</sup> *ZPE* 14 (1974), 236; cf. above, p. 70.

<sup>75</sup> It was the editors of *P.Oxy.* XII 1512 who advanced the resolution δεκ(ανίας).

<sup>76</sup> *BL II 41*.

<sup>77</sup> See F. A. Lepper, *Traian's Parthian War* (Oxford, 1948), 173-78 on the troop movements in connection with this war. The Danube may have lost three legions.